DEC 16 1949

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 95—PART 12

JANUARY 3, 1949, TO MARCH 12, 1949

(PAGES A1 TO A1420)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

DEC 1 e 1940

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Repeal of Federal Antimargarine Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, today, the first day of the session, I have introduced a bill to repeal Federal antimargarine legislation.

Undoubtedly a number of other bills will or have been introduced to accomplish the same purpose.

I am hopeful that one of these measures will be acted on very soon by the House and that the Senate also will vote on this issue early in the session.

The subject has been thoroughly discussed by committees of both Houses and on the floors. Last session, as many of you will recall, the House approved a repeal bill by a 260 to 106 vote. The bill was not passed by the Senate only because it was blocked by the last-minute legislative jam and never reached a vote. The repeal bill had strong support from both sides of this Chamber. The issue is a bipartisan one.

Since Congress adjourned, spokesmen for the butter groups have come forward with a so-called compromise.

They say they are willing for the taxes and license fees on margarine to be repealed but in return they want legislation which would prevent the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine.

This proposal is unacceptable to me and I am certain it is unacceptable to almost everyone who opposes antimargarine legislation. I am ready to give butter every possible protection from anyone who might try to sell margarine as butter. I am willing and anxious that butter and margarine should compete on fair and equal terms, but I am not willing to concede that any food product has any monopoly on any color.

Today I propose to discuss in some detail the color phase of the margarine argument.

The butter interests assert that a ban on yellow margarine is necessary to prevent deception. Otherwise, they say, margarine will be sold as butter and the public and dairy industry injured.

What are the facts?

Most of the margarine sold in the United States is bought by the consumer in packaged form.

Even the butter interests admit there is little likelihood of fraud in these store sales. In the first place, the product, itself cannot be seen because of the package. No purchaser can be deceived by its appearance, no matter what the color. Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act the packages are clearly and prominently labeled oleomargarine. Failure to so identify the product is a violation of that act.

Moreover, misrepresentation of oleomargarine as butter is an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

When backed into a corner the butter interests will concede that store sales to the average consumer present no problem so far as fraud is concerned and would present no problem after repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws.

But, they ask, how about the possibility of fraud in restaurants and other eating places?

Today, they assert, margarine is being sold in eating places as butter and point to this fact as a reason for preventing margarine from being colored yellow.

They disregard the fact that there is just as much opportunity for evading the law today as there would be after Federal antimargarine legislation is repealed. Now, for example, a restaurant proprietor can buy margarine already colored, take it out of the wrapper and serve it as butter. Or he can buy white margarine, color it himself, and serve it as butter. It is true that in so doing he violates the law but he stands to profit by such violations, even more than he might stand to profit by violations after the Federal antimargarine laws are repealed.

Forty-seven of the forty-eight States have pure food laws and the sale of margarine as butter would be a violation of these laws after repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws just as it is now. Also, at least two-thirds of the States have laws requiring public notice if margarine is served in public eating places. No real evidence has thus far been produced to support the charges of fraud with regard to margarine sales. At congressional hearings in 1948 the butter industry cited six instances where margarine has been sold as butter. These six instances extended all the way back to 1900—one about every 8 years. They amounted to nothing so far as quantity was concerned.

And insofar as the Federal pure food laws are concerned, butter's record is not nearly as good as margarine's. Total seizures of butter for violation of pure food laws from 1930 through 1947 totaled 2,910, of which 652 were for filth, decomposition, and the like. In 1947 alone, there were 127 seizures of butter.

For the 1937–47 period, margarine seizures totaled 32, of which two were for filth or decomposition. In 1947, there were no seizures of margarine.

Moreover—and this is very important—the measure proposing repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws actually would strengthen the laws against fraud and would make it much less likely that margarine would be sold as butter.

When the Senate Finance Committee reported H. R. 2245, which would completely repeal existing taxes and discriminations against margarine, it added an amendment aimed specifically at fraud in restaurants and other public eating places.

I have incorporated a similar provision in my bill. The provision, section 3 of the bill, provides (1) that each separate serving of margarine sold by a public eating place must bear labeling identifying it as oleomargarine, and (2) requires a public eating place serving colored oleomargarine to place a prominent and conspicuous notice in the establishment or to set forth on its menu a notice stating that oleomargarine is served there. This provision applies regardless of whether the margarine served is transported in interstate commerce or whether it is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced.

The forces which are seeking repeal of the antimargarine laws accepted the amendment without qualification and plan to give it full support.

Ninety percent or more of all the margarine sold is sold in stores to householders. The remainder of the business is with bakers and restaurants.

As has been stated, there is little danger of fraud in the store sales, the great bulk of the business. For example, if a grocer deliberately takes the wrapping off sticks of margarine and sells them as butter, he is liable to a 3-year prison term, or a

$10,000 fine, or both. Few grocers will risk such a penalty.

There is no danger of fraud in sales to bakers. They use margarine for mixing with other foods; they are not interested in color.

The great majority of the restaurants which serve margarine scrupulously observe the laws requiring public notice of that fact.

Passage of repeal legislation with an amendment aimed specifically at fraud would certainly sharply reduce the number of restaurants which may be serving margarine as butter.

Instead of supporting such a proposal, one which clearly would lessen the possibility of fraud, the butter interests want to continue to force the consumer to buy white margarine and color it at home. And to repeat, there is little or no danger of fraud in a store sale to the average consumer.

Because then there is the possibility of fraud in the sale of margarine as butter in public eating establishments, the butter bloc wants to force consumers to continue a burdensome task for which there is absolutely no reason.

The refusal of the butter interests to accept repeal legislation, even with additional protection against fraud, shows that they are not really concerned with fraud. They are concerned with the legitimate competition which margarine gives butter. They want to force margarine to use a color which people do not like in their table fats.

There is no valid reason for any ban or tax against margarine, yellow or white. There never has been.

The butter industry is trying to maintain an unfair advantage over margarine, an advantage it has had and maintained by legislation for more than 60 years.

The proposal to remove the taxes on uncolored margarine, on manufacturers of margarine, and on handlers of margarine is made only when the butter lobby is on the run. Legislation for complete repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws failed of passage in the Eightieth Congress by a narrow margin. In 1948, five States scrapped legislation which prohibited the manufacture and sale of colored margarine—the prohibition which the dairy industry now would make Nation-wide.

The butter lobby made no concession and offered no compromise on margarine until it realized that public opinion and the legislators no longer would stand for the un-American and outmoded antimargarine laws.

Now, butter comes forward with a claim that it has a monopoly on the color yellow, to the exclusion of margarine.

No other food, or product, in the United States makes a similar claim.

Butter uses artificial coloring freely. Butter uses artificial coloring for the same reason that margarine uses artificial coloring. Furthermore, the artificial coloring added to butter is not uniform. It is colored differently for different markets, depending on consumer preferences. For example, the butter sold in the New York market is lighter than butter sold in the Chicago market. Consumers prefer their table spreads, whether butter or margarine, yellow, just as they prefer their milk white, their oranges yellow, their watermelons red and cherries red, and so on through a long list of products.

Foods by the score are artificially colored to meet consumer tastes. This fact is recognized by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, which merely requires that if color is added to food, the fact be noted on the label.

However, butter, by a special legislalative enactment, is exempted from the legislative requirement that the presence of artificial coloring be declared on the label.

The butter industry has no more right to prohibit margarine from being colored yellow than any other domestic product has to prevent its competitors from using a particular color.

Thousands of products imitate another product, look like it, and are used for the same purposes. The very essence of competition is to develop new products which are like the old and which may be better and cheaper.

Rayon closely resembles some cotton fabrics, is colored like cotton, and is used for the same purposes. Some fabrics closely resemble wool. Nylon stockings resemble silk stockings and have made great inroads upon the latter's market. Nylon resembles and substitutes for other silk fabrics and for cotton fabrics also, so far as that is concerned.

No one has seriously advanced the proposal that the synthetic fibers be prohibited from being colored like cotton, silk, or wool. Imitation leather looks very much like leather and it is used as leather is used. But leather has not asked that it have a monopoly on the color brown, to the exclusion of the imitation.

Hundreds and hundreds of plastic products resemble the original, are colored like the original product, and are used for the same purposes.

No one has proposed that they be prohibited from using any color associated with the original, or from imitating and competing with the original.

Mayonnaise is a special kind of salad dressing. It may not contain any added water, nor may it contain any starches, and it must contain at least 50 percent in vegetable oils. It is higher in quality and sells for a higher price than some other salad dressings which it closely resembles in color and taste. But no manufacturer of mayonnaise has come forth with the proposal that other salad dressings be prohibited from using the color yellow, which is the color of mayonnaise.

The relationship of lard to the vegetable cooking fats is very interesting in connection with this color argument.

Lard is white. White was the original color of lard. It was used long before the vegetable cooking fats were thought of, and unlike butter, lard uses no artificial coloring.

The vegetable cooking fats are white. They look like lard. They are used for the same purposes.

But lard has not asked for a tax on the vegetable cooking fats, nor have the manufacturers of lard proposed that the vegetable cooking fats be prohibited from using the color white.

Lard has the same justification for asking such a prohibition as butter has to ask that margarine be banned from using the color yellow to prevent fraud.

There are hundreds of instances where glass or some other comparatively valueless substance has been sold as a precious stone.

But no one seriously proposes that legislation be enacted prohibiting the coloring of imitation jewelry on the grounds that it might be sold as genuine gems.

One fur often is dyed to imitate another, and sometimes also is sold as another. But nobody insists that such imitation be prohibited because of the possibility of fraud.

If every product which looks like another product and is used for the same purposes is to be prohibited by law, our free-enterprise system will come to an end.

By insisting upon a ban against yellow margarine, butter is confessing its unwillingness to compete in the open market against another perfectly good domestic product.

When the first Federal antimargarine laws were enacted in 1886, the butter interests did not claim a preemptive right to the color yellow. That measure imposed a tax of 2 cents a pound on all margarine. It did not differentiate between the colored and uncolored product. It imposed license fees on manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, and there were various requirements for the labeling and packing of margarine and for the keeping of records. Butter was defined as the product of the cow and all other table spreads as oleomargarine.

Senator Miller, of New York, one of the proponents of the bill, frankly described the purpose of that first measure:

> I want no money from this bill in the Treasury. I want protection to the dairy industry of New York. I want it to go so far as to exterminate the rival industry, if necessary.

The destruction or crippling of the margarine industry has been the goal of every piece of Federal and State antimargarine legislation from 1886 to the present day.

The butter interests failed to kill the margarine industry with the 1886 law. In 1902, they were back again seeking legislation which imposed a heavy tax on yellow margarine. Representative Wadsworth, of Massachusetts, father of Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. This is what he said about the color proposal and his words are true today as they were then:

> It is claimed by the extreme butter men that yellow is the natural butter color and that practically no other food product has the right to use it. If that claim is true, what shade of yellow is it entitled to? * * * It is only in the months of May and June, and I speak as a practical butter maker myself when I make the assertion, that creamery butter, and that, of ccurse, is the butter of commerce, has a decided yellow color or tint and that color disappears entirely or almost

so when the fall and winter sets in. * * * Here are samples of butter purchased by me this morning and no two are alike. As a matter of fact, every sample is artificially colored.* * *

I deny that butter has the copyright, patent right, or any other right to any particular color, whether yellow or otherwise. * * * If coloring oleomargarine a shade of yellow helps to perpetrate a fraud, then the coloring of butter is actually a fraud because it makes the consumer believe, and necessarily, that fall or winter or white butter of any season of the year is June butter, which is generally considered the best.

The butter industry is not the only industry which has tried to kill off its competition by legislation.

History is full of such instances. In the end, all have failed.

In the seventeenth century, for example, the wool industry in England tried very hard to kill off calico and other cotton prints by law and even passed legislation forbidding the purchase of cotton goods.

Eventually, the laws prohibiting the manufacture and use of cotton goods were repealed. England became one of the great manufacturers of textiles.

There was room for both industries just as there is room in this country for both the margarine and butter industries.

The butter interests know very well that consumers like their table spread yellow. That is why butter is colored yellow when its natural color is not yellow enough to meet consumer preferences.

The butter makers are not acting in good faith when they say margarine should be sold without coloring, or with any other color save yellow.

They are well aware that consumers would not like either butter or margarine if it were colored pink, or red, or some color not associated with a table spread.

They know very well that white margarine, or white butter, would be associated in the consumer's mind with lard or the vegetable cooking fats which are white.

As has been stated, hundreds of food products, including butter, use artificial coloring. This coloring is permitted by the pure food laws when the colors used are certified or approved. Artificial coloring adds nothing to the direct nutritional value of foods but by satisfying consumer habits and preferences it makes the food more palatable, and consequently more digestible.

A University of Illinois study of margarine and butter developed an interesting point in connection with color preference in foods. Two hundred and seventeen children were used in the experiment. One group was fed margarine; another butter. The investigators reported that the younger children, who were not accustomed to a yellow table fat, ate uncolored margarine with the same relish that they ate colored margarine or butter. But the older children, already conditioned to want their table fat yellow, definitely preferred a colored product.

Legislation against fraud and misrepresentation are depended upon to protect the public in the case of all food products with the sole exception of butter. Butter alone can legally be artificially colored without notice to the public. Margarine asks no such special privilege.

Margarine manufacturers are proud of their product and want it sold as margarine, and they are willing to tell the public if and when it is colored.

They want their product sold on its merits and want it to compete fairly in the open market. They seek no special advantages and will seek none.

They feel that butter should be required to compete fairly also and to forego the special advantages it has insisted upon all these years.

The time has come to do away with all antimargarine legislation. The bill I have introduced does this and at the same time gives every protection against fraud or deception that any fair-minded man could ask.

John Heagney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered at the dedication exercises, John J. Heagney Post, No. 27, AMVETS, on Wednesday, August 25, 1948, at Lee Hall, Lynn, Mass.:

To the parents who mourn the loss of his bright youth, to the many relatives and friends who cherish his memory, and to his comrades who have come to dedicate this post in his name, I convey the humble gratitude of the people for his gift of life to protect us.

In the reverent spirit in which we meet we recall all that was precious in the life of one young man.

We speak not of the crime that is war, caused by the evil of a few men, for which the many must pay so dearly.

We speak rather of the miracle of life in its coming and its going. We have come to honor John Heagney and to reach out with our hearts, reaching for that nobility in him that is beyond our understanding. And so we gather, drawing strength and comfort from each other, as if out of our accumulated awareness we can rise above our small selves to attain the clear vision that came to him.

Youth is the sweetest time of life.

In that last June, when he received his diploma from St. Mary's High School, John Heagney felt all the joy that comes with commencement.

In the prime of health and glowing with ambition he left the cloistered halls of study and faced the great adventure of experience. An only child, he was determined to make good, not only for his own fulfillment but to repay the sacrifices which his devoted parents had made for him during the tender years of his development.

And then it came, the urgent and terrible call of duty summoning him to leave the normal pursuits of life, to step aside from the door which he had just opened and take another one which led to the agony of war.

What irony it was that we, who were older and supposed to be wiser, should call upon these boys to do that which our failures had made so tragically necessary.

And while we worried they went forward. Perhaps they knew better.

Behind their smiles, perhaps they sensed that they were stronger in every way, leading us not to a hollow victory but to a finer way of life that must follow from their sacrifice.

And when it was over, some came back covered by a flag.

That John Heagney proved his manhood far better than many others who round out their full quota of three score years and ten we fittingly pay tribute to at this dedication.

We raise the name of John Heagney as an example for other youths to admire and imitate as they open the door and step out into the fuller life which he made possible for them.

At this ceremony of perpetuation, we christen this chapter for him, conscious that this new post of a new veterans' organization has a great future stretching before it. As the years unfold, the AMVETS will take an active part in the life of Lynn, and, in the many civic, charitable, and patriotic services they will perform, the name of John Heagney will always lead them, to his increasing honor and to theirs. Whether here or in the Great Beyond the comradeship of spirit which joins them in fellowship is immortal.

Not far from where we meet, the mortal remains of John Heagney rest in peace. The good earth which covers him is warmed by the sun and washed by the rains and the gentle wind which ripples through the grass whispers to us of hope beyond the grave.

For out of death there is resurrection and the life eternal.

He rests, but we cannot.

The burden of his sacrifice weighs heavily upon us.

Restlessly we search our minds and hearts, seeking ways and means of atonement to them.

They were too young to die—John and Bill and Harry—and all the others in that gallant company who went forth to save us from the errors of our ways.

To say that we are humbly grateful is not enough.

Keeping their courage ever fresh in our memories, we must drive ourselves to equal theirs and build a better world in which the door to life shall never be closed on youth again.

The way may be long and hard, but we pledge ourselves to this duty.

And we pray to our Heavenly Father that He, in His infinite wisdom and mercy, may grant to us the strength of spirit that was revealed in John Heagney so that we may find fulfillment in helping others.

May God bless the United States and all of her sons and daughters.

Rules Committee Change a Victory for Democratic Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a great step for representative government has been taken. The elimination of the veto powers of the Rules Committee will increase the responsibilities of the legislative committees of the House where

there is opportunity for full public hearings and ample time to obtain the necessary technical advice in drafting legislation.

The amendment of the rules is completely nonpartisan. It merely assures that a majority of the House, regardless of party, shall prevail on any issue. This is really democracy in action.

On December 10, 1948, I wrote each Member-elect of the Eighty-first Congress as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1948.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Implicit in the American form of democratic government is the proposition that a majority of the Congress shall enact the laws. Yet a practice has grown up in the House of Representatives which enables a few men sitting on the Rules Committee effectively to thwart the will of a majority of the House. This has happened time and again, and the Eighty-first and the succeeding Congresses will be no exception, if we can judge by the past.

In theory the Rules Committee is a traffic director on the legislative highway, determining the order of business on the floor of the House. In practice this committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. The committee often allows bills to come before the House only on its own terms. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committee of the House by holding hearings and reviewing the merits of bills that have already been carefully studied by the proper legislative committees.

A reform of this undemocratic system is long overdue. Congress is constantly engaged in a struggle for the respect of the people. The people never have and never will be able to understand how the will of a majority of the House of Representatives can be set aside by the judgment of a few men on a powerful committee.

The spectacle of a legislative committee unable to bring a bill to the floor after a favorable recommendation based on careful hearing and consideration, because members of the Rules Committee do not favor that bill on its merits, adds nothing to the luster of the democratic process. The cumbersome, time-consuming discharge petition procedure is, as a practical matter, fairly useless to cope with this problem.

This basic contradiction of democratic government has been studied by parliamentary experts and legislative draftsmen, and a draft of an amendment to the House rules will be ready for consideration when the Eighty-first Congress convenes on January 3, 1949.

It is at this time that proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the Rules Committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment, after the election of officers and the notification of the Senate and the President that the House is ready for business, an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers to block consideration of, or to demand changes in, legislation and limiting the committee to the task of scheduling legislative debate on the House floor.

This amendment would then become the pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The change would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

This proposal is completely nonpartisan. Its adoption should still permit the Rules Committee to schedule the priority of debate in the House, but should enable the House membership, after a reasonable opportunity for the Rules Committee to act, to call up any measure for consideration by majority vote. Unless the amendment carries on opening day, its chances are slim, for it will be referred to the Committee on Rules, where it would doubtless be buried.

On the opening day, however, the House operates under general parliamentary law until it adopts the rules for the session, and a proposed amendment has a unique opportunity to reach the floor without benefit of the approval of the very Rules Committee whose powers it seeks to curtail. For a brief hour, we have a golden opportunity to strike a blow for democratic procedure and majority rule. We must not let it slip by. For this reason, I have undertaken to communicate these views to all Members of the House of Representatives.

No possible change in the personnel of the committee under present rules and precedents will obviate the difficulties experienced in the past. And a little thought will suggest that increasing the membership of the Rules Committee from 12 to 13, or even to 15, will not effect even a temporary cure. Indeed, the problem is not so much the composition of the committee as the function it has exercised in reviewing and vetoing the substance of bills reported by the other committees. The authority presently exercised by the Committee on Rules reflects adversely both upon the other committees and upon the general membership of the House. A committee must have responsibility for legislation favorably reported, if the committee system is to work. And any authority exercised by a few members that can be used to block the desire of a majority, even to bring a bill up for general debate, assumes that the membership of the House does not have the collective good judgment to pass or reject the legislation in question.

If you agree with the principle of majority responsibility and control over the legislative program of the House of Representatives, regardless of what political party may be in power, will you please share your conviction with other Members of the House. Change is always difficult, and careful advance thought, preparation, and organization will be required.

Will you also please give me the benefit of your views, and indicate your willingness to serve on an informal committee to sponsor this general proposition both in party caucuses and on the House floor.

With high personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER.

Mr. Speaker, I was greatly encouraged by the initial response of nearly one-third of the membership of the House; most of them indicating support for my proposal to limit the powers of the Rules Committee to the scheduling of legislation on the floor. The plan received the support of some of the most responsible editorial writers of the country. From the editorial comment I have selected examples for insertion elsewhere in the Appendix. Although the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House found it advisable to modify slightly my original proposal, I am very pleased and gratified that they have seen fit to support in all essential respects my amendment to the rules.

Congress Can Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, of Friday, December 31, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

CONGRESS CAN REFORM

The record of the Eighty-first Congress will be decisively determined by its first day. Can it improve the legislative machinery which was so largely responsible for the major mistakes of the old Congress? The opening day, when the rules can be changed by majority vote, affords the best opportunity.

Reform should have two objectives: (1) To make congressional machinery more efficient; (2) to make it more representative of the people.

For these purposes the Congress meeting Monday will have before it three major opportunities: (1) Reform of the House Rules Committee; (2) curbing of filibusters in the Senate; (3) abandonment of the seniority system for choosing committee chairmen.

Prospects appear good for some reform of the Rules Committee. Annoyance with its arrogant abuse of power is widespread. The committee performs a useful function in directing legislative traffic, but it should have no power to pass on the wisdom of legislation. Even its decisions as to when and how a bill is to come up for debate should be subject to reversal by majority vote of the House.

Reform of the Rules Committee is complicated by the drive of President Truman to carry out his campaign pledges. A coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats has controlled the committee. This coalition—unless it has changed its views—would veto most of the Truman program. One proposal is to break this control by enlarging the committee through addition of several Truman men. Such "packing" procedures usually tend too much to expediency. A change in the rules to prevent the committee bottling up legislation—a change badly needed in any case—offers a wiser method.

It is unlikely that filibusters will be completely abolished by the Senate. One proposal for curbing them would limit each Member to 2 hours for debating any bill—which would permit the talking to go on for 8 days. The most likely change is a rule revision—by vote or by interpretation of the new presiding officer—to facilitate a vote of the Senate to close debate.

This question also is complicated not only by tradition but by current politics. Many southern Senators see the filibuster as their last defense against Mr. Truman's civil-rights program. Apparently the President is willing to go slow. He does not wish to split his party more deeply. And he may recognize the value of an unwritten law of American politics which provides that the majority shall not force a minority to the point of desperation, particularly in matters of deep-seated feeling and custom. Given this attitude by Mr. Truman plus some Republican pressures for reform, the more moderate southern Democrats might join in a perceptible curbing of filibuster abuses.

The hopes for getting rid of the seniority system for committee chairman are slim. There is no rule requiring a committee to elect the member having the longest service as chairman. On a few occasions chairmen have actually been chosen for competence. But the seniority custom is almost iron-bound in normal circumstances.

The custom gives power into the hands of men of long experience but not necessarily any other qualifications for leadership. Usually their tenure depends not on any individual excellence but on the fixed political complexion of their constituencies. They may have been chosen originally on issues no longer in debate and their ideas may be

wholly out of joint with the times—and even with their party's national program.

Such committee chairmen, particularly in the House, were largely responsible for the actions which put the Eightieth Congress in bad with many voters. The shift of parties has not wholly altered that situation. The system may go far to balk Mr. Truman in carrying out his party's pledges, thus frustrating the fixing of party responsibility. Regardless of one's feelings about the Truman program the weakening of party responsibility must be considered a blow at responsive and effective representative government. But reform of the seniority system will require even more vigorous and vocal public demand than has yet arisen.

Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Evening Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on November 9, 1948:

NEW ARGUMENT FOR CHANGE

The antiquated, outmoded features of the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States were made more apparent to the American people than ever before in last week's election. Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, and Gov. Fielding Wright, of Mississippi, the Dixiecrat candidates, gained the 88 electoral votes of 4 Southern States. The race between President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, and United States Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, and Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, and Gov. Earl Warren, of California, was so close that at times it seemed unlikely that either pair would get the required majority of 266 electoral votes.

If neither the Democratic nor the Republican candidates had attained the required majority, that would have thrown the election into the new United States House of Representatives taking office in January. It would have been obliged to select a President from the three top candidates under complicated rules. Thurmond and Wright would have held the balance of power under such conditions and could have dictated the choice of the President and Vice President. It might not have been in accord with the indicated will of the people. There have been several such elections in the country's history and not all of them have been satisfactory.

Fortunately, that irregular occurrence was averted when President Truman and Senator BARKLEY won by more than the necessary majority. Still, it was entirely too close for comfort for most Americans. As a consequence, when the Eighty-first Congress convenes in January no time should be lost in initiating steps to modernize the election of the President and Vice President.

United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts, has a resolution pending before the Senate for a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college. Electoral votes would be retained, but those of each State would be divided among the candidates in proportion to their popular votes. No longer would one pair of candidates get the entire electoral vote. That is a big improvement over the present arrangement. It still is not as good as electing the President and Vice President by direct popular votes of the people, as is done in the case of all other elective offices below that level. The need for a change is great and Congress should not delay in sanctioning one or the other of those improved plans and in sending it along to the legislatures of the States for their required approval.

The Farmers' Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, rarely have I had the privilege of reading an article which is more interesting and instructive as The Farmers' Side, by Eva Conley, of McDougal, Ark. The problems confronting the farmers of this Nation are depicted in this article accurately, skillfully, and forcibly.

Mrs. Conley's timely comments reserve a broad coverage and careful reading. I include the complete article as an extension of my remarks:

THE FARMERS' SIDE

(By Eva Conley, McDougal, Ark.)

"And as a sheep before her shearers is dumb," so too is the farmer as he meekly takes the blame for the high cost of living.

Prices are too high, but we farmers are not to blame. We sincerely wish there was a better understanding between the producer and the consumer.

My father was a farmer. My husband is a farmer. I've spent my entire life on the farm. I feel that I understand the problems, hazards, and expense connected with farming.

Unless farmers present their side, we can scarcely blame city dwellers for thinking the farmer is wallowing in profits. Those who haven't tried it little realize the expense connected with farming.

There are 140,000,000 people in the United States. They all want three meals a day, and they need clothes. This makes the need for farm products stable, but the demand (desire plus purchasing power) is unstable. The demand varies from year to year in a manner that is difficult to predict accurately very far ahead of time.

The farmer does not know how his crops will be affected by such hazards as drought and flood, hail and wind, cold and heat, insects and disease—nor what sort of program the Government will clamp on him.

The one in this environment has a difficult job. He is like a man with imperfect eyesight, shooting an inaccurate rifle, through a fog, at a jumping jackrabbit.

Cyclic price movements result from unpredictable forces affecting the sizes of crops. As a result we do need a program stabilizing supplies and prices.

Since 1933 the Commodity Credit Corporation has been engaged in a commodity loan and storage program designed to stabilize the market supplies and prices of the so-called basic commodities—wheat, corn, rice, peanuts, cotton, and tobacco. Under this program excess over average production in good crop years is removed from the market supplies and put into storage to be taken out and added to supplies later in poor crop years.

With or without a price-stabilization program, individual farmers' incomes are still affected by variations in the crop yields on their individual farms.

The total food bill for the United States in 1944 was $30,400,000,000—exactly double the cost in the period between 1935–39. The bill was then $15,200,000,000.

The farmer's share of the food bill in 1939 was 40 percent. Most farmers believe the share the middleman takes out of the consumer's dollar is inordinately large. In this case it was 60 percent.

Seeds, feeds, fertilizers, machinery, fuel, sprays, labor—everything connected with farming—is extremely high. Labor is scarce, too. When spring and summer rains continue, the cost for hoeing a field of cotton doubles and trebles the price which the farmer was prepared to pay. When one good chopper can clean only two rows per day, and that not over a quarter mile in length, imagine the cost per acre. That happened this year. Fertilizer (March 19, 1948) was $70 per ton. This is all actual money costs. Nothing has been said about the long, hard hours the farmer and team or tractor worked.

This fall we got one bale of cotton picked for $3 per hundred pounds. Since then it has cost $3.50, and we have only two pickers. That means it is moving slowly and we are losing money as it dries out on the stalk. Some of our neighbors are paying $4 and $5 per hundred for pickers, but that does not make them more plentiful.

At present we are getting from 30 to 32 cents per pound for lint cotton. A 500-pound bale of cotton brings approximately $170. Sounds good, doesn't it? Suppose the producer is a renter, as thousands are; one-fourth goes to the landlord, there's $42.50. At $3.50 per hundred (1,500 pounds seed cotton to a bale), $52.50 goes for picking. There is already $95 gone. He has $75 left to begin paying on the loan he received in the spring to finance the making of the crop. One neighbor told us he would have about $7 per bale when all expenses are paid. That is better than some will do, who have a good crop, too. Some will not get out of debt on it.

During the war years when farmers received 20 cents per pound for lint cotton, seersucker dresses sold for prices ranging from $9 to $27. One pound of lint cotton make 4 yards of seersucker. Four yards of material will make a long dress for a large woman. The farmer received 20 cents for the cotton that went into that expensive cotton dress. Now who is charging exorbitant prices for what? Did it cost that much for the manufacturer to weave the cloth and make the dress? If it did, don't blame the farmer. He did not get those profits nor wages from the factory. He got 20 cents. A large percentage of farm women made and still make their dresses out of feed sacks. They cannot afford the chambrays and ginghams now. They are almost as high as seersucker was then.

The thing that is true of cotton is true of other things as well.

That chicken that you pay $2.75 to $3 for probably brought some farmer $1 to $1.50.

We get $2 for a bushel of sweetpotatoes (57 pounds). What do you pay per pound?

A bushel of cucumbers brings us $1. What do you pay for one cucumber? There is little waste to cucumbers. A bushel cans out a nice number of quarts, yet you pay 50 cents for a pint.

Cattle average about 20 cents per pound to the farmer. After it is dressed the cost of the beef is about 45 cents per pound. Yet steak sells from 80 cents to $1, and there is no part of the beef you can buy for 45 cents. If it were all sold at soup-bone prices, there would be a profit.

The farmer gets $1.50 to $2 a bushel for tomatoes. They weigh from 50 to 55 pounds per bushel. When you pay 20 cents a pound for them, the bushel brings $10 or more.

Who got that profit? Not the one who raised the tender plants, prepared the soil, carried water, transplanted, cultivated, sprayed for insects, and harvested them. He didn't get any profit out of the eye-catching package they are sold in, either.

I grew sweet peppers this year. For 1 week during an extremely dry time, I carried

water each evening and poured into punctured cans that had been buried near each plant to try to keep them alive until rain came. I received 10 cents per pound for the ones I sold. While I was yet in the store, the customers began carrying them out at 19 cents per pound—lacked only 1 cent doubling in price. The producer carried them in—the consumer carried them out.

For months egg producers have been receiving 35 cents a dozen for eggs. This winter you consumers will pay—well, you'll know what you'll pay when you dig down into your pocket for the money to hand over.

Sure we know it costs to keep them in cold storage, 3 cents a dozen for storage for 6 months. They are bulky for their value, but this old processing cry won't work, because they reach you in the same form they left the hens except for age.

I have paid $5 to $5.75 for every 100 pounds of laying mash I have bought. I also paid $5 per hundred for shelled corn during the 35-cents-a-dozen period.

Next year I will keep hens enough to supply home needs—no more. I plan to raise only enough young chickens for home use.

If the farmer's profits were cut 50 percent, it would not reduce the cost of living 10 percent. Less than one-fifth of the population of the United States produce food for the remainder of the population.

The agricultural people are in a minority. The 80 percent who need and want food we work to produce are objecting violently to prices being stabilized. I wonder if those objectors realize that most farmers have to borrow money each year with which to make a crop. The crop and other property as well are mortgaged as security before the ground is even broken in the spring. There is no need to start unless he knows he can finish. What he generally doesn't know is what the yield will be—he never knows that—nor the price he will get. He never sets a price on anything. When he has something to sell he asks, "What will you give?" The merchant, commission man, or whoever it happens to be, sets the price. When the farmer buys he asks, "What is the price?"

In 1937 we were on a 140-acre farm—our own. We had the best prospects for a good crop yield we had ever had. Our cotton and corn were almost all "laid by." Truck crops of all kinds were fine. On the morning of July 3 a hailstorm completely destroyed it all in a few minutes. The crop was made on borrowed money, too. There was no fruit or vegetables to can. We got one small bale of cotton, which brought us $61. There wasn't an ear of corn to harvest. The feed had to be bought to winter the stock; then more money borrowed to farm with in 1938. By selling the last milk cow we had, after the crop had been sold and all the money applied on debt of making those two crops, we did clear the loan in 1938. There was 2 years of hard work with nothing for ourselves.

You may ask, "How do people go on and on like that?"

They don't. That is one of the reasons people lose their homes. It's a reason for delinquent tax notices.

We are on a small place now. Early in 1947 my husband had meningitis. He wasn't able to make a crop. There certainly isn't enough profit to hire all the work done. We wouldn't have risked farming this year if the price on cotton hadn't been stabilized.

I am not bidding for anybody's sympathy—only understanding. These financial reverses that have happened to us are only typical of the same and similar things that have happened to thousands of farmers.

What we produce wouldn't be missed off the market if we never do sell another thing, but there are thousands upon thousands of small farmers just like us. Taken together, we are important in agricultural production. In spite of major calamities and adverse publicity, farmers keep plodding on.

The spread between farm product values and retail cost does seem to be too wide. I don't know the answers. Maybe it is bungling and inefficiency in distribution. There are so many costs that reflect in the retail price that farmers don't have anything to do with at all.

Consumers demand that their products be put up in more and more elaborate form. Our parents and grandparents bought supplies in large quantities and hauled them home themselves. Today we buy foods in small quantities, and they require very little processing in the home. We buy very little flour. Our bread is baked and sliced. Much food is bought in cans, ready-cooked, or frozen foods are used. Bacon is sliced and wrapped in cellophane. All this processing widens the margin between what the consumer pays, and what the consumer gets.

Advertising costs in 1937 were $2,000,000,000. Most of this was charged to distribution.

Retailing costs are high partly because consumers make them high. Many customers will pay higher prices in stores that have an atmosphere of quiet elegance and luxury.

Most customers want a large variety of brands to choose from, even though the real differences between them may not be great. Most customers patronize the stores and lines of goods that are advertised most. Each of these items may be small but they add up to a large item in retail costs. A good many costs of which consumers complain lie pretty close to home in the buying habits of consumers themselves.

We were promised stabilized prices through 1949. Because of the pressure of public opinion the program is rocking. If the public had to live on its opinion for a while it would find it far from filling the stomach.

If support prices are scaled down in 1949 the farmer will have very little faith left in anything promised by Congress.

The bankers don't intend to loan money to farmers unless they know there will be a market at reasonable prices for farm products. This isn't guesswork either. Ask the banker if you think it is.

We farmers take large financial risks every year. We only ask live-and-let-live prices (don't get them often) and a little understanding.

Unless somebody gets busy and helps to fight for the farmer, we may face a serious food shortage in 1949.

We need to be sure, too, that we know the difference in the high cost of living, and in the cost of high living.

We have three married children who, with their families, live in the cities of Detroit, and St. Louis, so we have a fair understanding of both sides of the question.

I don't pretend to be a writer, nor do I know very much, but I do know farmers are not to blame for the high cost of living.

If each of us would only praise God from whom all blessings flow and be more thankful for those same blessings there would be less misunderstanding.

I may wish I had picked up my pen and broke the point off instead of writing this, but I've tried honestly to present our side.

Amendment of House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Saturday, December 18, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

MR. EBERHARTER'S IDEA

Among others, Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pittsburgh Democrat, will seek to strip down the all-too-powerful House Rules Committee.

The Rules Committee was set up, as Mr. EBERHARTER points out, as a sort of traffic director for House legislation.

With all the standing committees of the House pouring legislation onto the House floor, it was considered more efficient to funnel it through a single group so there would be some order in the proceedings.

On that basis, the Rules Committee served a useful purpose.

But the committee, in recent years, has not been content to serve as a traffic cop. It has set itself up as the final authority on all issues. If its handful of little dictators didn't like a bill, they shelved it.

The judgment of other Congressmen, serving on standing committees which had spent in many cases months studying a subject, was vetoed by the arbitrary action of the Rules Committee.

And, under legislative rules, apparently nothing could be done about it.

Mr. EBERHARTER proposes to keep the Rules Committee as a traffic cop. But he urges a new rule which will give the House, by a simple majority vote, the power to determine for itself what legislation should come to a vote on the floor.

As he points out, the spectacle of a standing committee being unable to bring a bill to the House floor—despite its careful hearings and considerations—because the Rules Committee didn't favor the bill "adds nothing to the luster of the democratic process."

In the last session, the Rules Committee—and the Rules Committee alone—blocked such important legislation as, for instance, universal military training.

Mr. EBERHARTER's plan is a modest attempt to eliminate the obstructive tactics of the House Rules Committee.

Congressman John W. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News on Sunday, October 17, 1948:

MAN OF VISION

One of the most eminent statesmen of our day is Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who has carved a niche for himself in American history because of the erudition, foresight, and common sense he has exhibited during his years as a leader on the national scene.

The clear-thinking, straightforward legislator, who was the majority leader in Congress during the Rooseveltian era, and who is still a power on Capitol Hill, holds the respect and admiration of fellow lawmakers from all sections of the Nation. He has ever been a champion of the cause of the common people, and his long years of experience in Washington have brought him to the fore as a man whose opinion must be consulted

when issues concerning the well-being of the United States are under discussion in Congress.

A defender of the weak and oppressed, a vigorous foe of communism, and a courageous leader in the field of both government and religion, Congressman McCormack heard words of high praise bestowed upon him last week by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing at the National Conference of Catholic Charities in Boston. His Excellency spoke as follows:

"I want to make a public expression of gratitude to Congressman John W. McCormack, and I want to assure him that he has the abiding appreciation of the entire hierarchy of the Catholic Church."

First duty of government is to assure justice for its people, and that is the watchword of Congressman McCormack, whose every waking moment in Washington is devoted to the task of improving the lot of the common man. The defeat of communism is his aim, and, as he has said time and again, economic insecurity is the root of that evil force which seeks to dominate and enslave the world.

"Government should and must give special consideration to the weak, the poor, the sick, and the exploited," he contends.

Congressman McCormack is an outstanding Catholic layman, a pious, God-fearing statesman who is unafraid of facing the volleys of communistic calumny. He has often put forth the truth that national security will be forthcoming if family security is promoted throughout the Republic. His is a potent voice in the Halls of Congress.

Great honors which have come to the noted Congressman have been shared with him by his devoted wife, Mrs. Harriet Joyce McCormack, through the years in Washington. Congressman McCormack has frequently said that she has been his guiding light and sympathetic adviser in his endeavors as a barrister and legislator. A former singer of prominence, Mrs. McCormack relinquished an operatic career to become his helpmeet. It was an example of her selflessness, for she cherishes the wifely role.

Are We Biting Off More Than We Can Chew?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Bruce Barton from the Reader's Digest for December 1948:

ARE WE BITING OFF MORE THAN WE CAN CHEW?

(By Bruce Barton)

When we hear ourselves called "the greatest and most powerful nation in the world" it should not fill us with pride, but with a deep and solemn apprehension. For who have been our predecessors in this very role? Greece, Rome, Portugal, Spain, Holland, France, England, Germany. And where are they now? Most of them are looking to us to keep them on our dole. Over all of them could be written the same epitaph: "They bit off more than they could chew."

No nation can play God to the world with any final result except its own self-destruction. The American President who has the courage to say this to his people—and implement it with a realistic foreign policy—will win their gratitude and with it the surprised respect of every other nation.

Let us not kid ourselves. One of the most unpopular nations in the world today is the United States. We make too many sweeping promises, when we have no program for fulfillment. In every country in the world are millions of people who have been led to believe that the United States is pledged to solve all their problems and wash away their worries.

Well, we just can't do all these things. We have not solved innumerable of our own domestic problems. Our streets are so glutted with traffic as to be well-nigh impassable; our schools are overcrowded; our railroads are outworn; millions of our people are half-homeless; inflation is destroying the purchasing power of the dollar. Yet we go on promising and promising and promising.

To nations and groups that approach us saying, "What do you propose to do about this or that?" we should answer: "Tell us first what you propose to do, and then we'll tell you where, if at all, we fit in."

And for goodness' sake, let's quit saying to other nations, "We don't want anything." Can you imagine what happens when the United States delegate steps into a conference of hard-bitten, cynical foreigners, each one fighting for his own political life and the survival of his own country, and gives forth that smug remark? Every man in the room regards it as a hypocritical lie. And it is.

There are lots of things we want. We want closer economic cooperation among nations in Europe, in order that they may become less dependent upon United States aid. We want stabilized currencies and fair business opportunities. We want our share of the oil in the middle east. We want many raw materials and products which we don't produce, or which can be produced more cheaply in other parts of the world.

I listened a few days ago to a private report of a man who had been to Europe under the highest governmental and journalistic auspices, conferring with the top people in England, France, and western Germany. He said: "Paul Hoffman is a good man and a smart one, but he has an almost impossible job. More and more the European nations take the attitude that their problems are our responsibility even more than theirs. Many Englishmen go further; they say frankly that, of course, the Marshall plan is not set up in the interests of Europe; that the United States simply must give away $10,000,000,000 worth of food, goods, and money a year to maintain full domestic employment and escape a destructive depression. They honestly feel they are doing us a favor in taking our goods and dollars. With steadily lessening embarrassment and self-consciousness, they let it be known that they expect to be on our relief rolls for many years to come."

Let our representatives open every conference by saying bluntly: "Gentlemen, make no mistake about it, I and my colleagues must first of all consider the welfare and security of the American people." That is language every foreign statesman understands.

Until we, the strongest nation, make up our minds what we want and state it honestly, other nations can make no constructive plans. And you can be sure they won't change their ways of doing things unless we insist.

Why should we, for instance, pour millions of dollars into France, without insisting that the French Government collect full income taxes from well-to-do citizens—something that it is not doing now? A banker loans money on terms; we could and should do at least as much when we give our money away.

It seems obvious that we could no more occupy Russia than Napoleon or Hitler could occupy it. Yet our Army wants universal conscription. It seems equally obvious that our great airplane carriers, attempting to operate anywhere near enemy shores or bases, would be as helpless as ducks in a swimming pool. The record of the last war proves with grim finality that only destruction awaits naval units which enter the range of superior land-based air power. Yet we continue to pour millions of dollars into carriers.

Once we accept the fact that we are living in an air age, that any future war will be an air war and that our one hope is to curtail expenditures on the Army and Navy and concentrate on a supreme Air Force, we'll begin to make sense.

If we do this we can save the American taxpayer four or five billion dollars a year. And that is an important item in foreign policy. For let it never be forgotten that a primary Soviet objective is to weaken and destroy the American economy—because it is the bastion of capitalism and hence of the freedom which springs from capitalism. To be profligate with our resources is a disservice not only to ourselves but to all nations on our side in the world-wide struggle for liberty.

Undeniably, the Soviets hope for world conquest. But no nation, let us remember, has ever made world conquest stick. Alexander tried it in his day, and he was hardly cold on his bier before the battle broke out between his successors, and his empire fell apart. An overextended Roman Empire went down before the onslaught of the relatively small forces of barbarians. Hitler might have beaten Russia and temporarily conquered Europe, but even before he died the seeds of his destruction were sprouting in the jealous and angry hearts of his own generals.

Consider, too, the trouble Moscow has been having with Tito in Yugoslavia and with its satellite regimes elsewhere. Tito is a traditional Russophile Slav who happens also to be a fanatical Communist. Yet Moscow cannot manage him. Consider also the police-state measures which the Kremlin has to rely on to remain in power in Russia and in the satellite states on her borders.

Another reassuring factor: Communism is nowhere in the world today winning a popularity contest. Peoples everywhere want liberty. No nation ever voted for communism in free elections, or ever succumbed to a Communist dictatorship except under the pressure of military might.

But suppose Russia should become more aggressive. Must we then fight a third full-fledged war on the Continent of Europe? That is an all-important question for the American people to decide. Can there ever again be a winner in a full-sized war? Two World Wars should have taught all peoples that when you destroy an enemy's country you must, as a matter of self-interest, build it up again; that when you shoot enemies you shoot customers; that when you take over a country you take over the feeding of tens of millions of people; that war today is a devastating set-back to civilization, creating more problems than it solves. Another war would result in universal chaos, for Russia, for the United States, and for any other nation involved.

Our best hope for peace is a realistic foreign policy, backed by an Air Force so overwhelmingly powerful that no nation will dare attack us. This we can do. The sooner we do it, the better it will be for every freedom-loving person in the world. Meanwhile, in making any further commitments to other nations, let us stop, look, and ask ourselves: Are we biting off more than we can chew?

Progress in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Monday, January 3, 1949, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House Rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

PROGRESS IN THE HOUSE

The new Democratic majority in the House of Representatives has got off to a good start. Its caucus on Saturday voted to break the throttling powers of the Rules Committee and to prepare the way for organization of the House on the basis of party responsibility. Both moves suggest that the House and the President will be working in closer cooperation than at any time since the early days of the Roosevelt administration. Yet there is no reason to believe that Congress will this time become a mere rubber stamp for approval of any proposal that may have the President's blessing.

The checkrein that is to be applied to the Rules Committee should be much more effective, in our opinion, than the scheme to ease the dislodging of bills from that group by petition. It resembles the proposal recently offered by Representative EBERHARTER in a letter to all Members of the House. Under it all bills approved by standing committees will go to the Rules Committee as at present. So long as that committee performs its proper function of directing the flow of these bills to the House floor in orderly fashion, with appropriate limits on debate, it will encounter no interference. But if it attempts to bury a bill, as it has often done in the past, the chairman of the legislative committee reporting the bill out can take the issue directly to the House floor.

If this venture is approved by majority vote, the measure can then be called up for debate and passed as a matter of the highest privilege. The effect will obviously be to put the Rules Committee under pressure to cease obstructionist tactics, for if it fails to act for 3 weeks the House may grant a far more favorable rule than the committee itself would suggest. This is a reform of far-reaching significance. Its operation will depend, of course, upon recognition of protesting legislative committee chairmen by the Speaker on the discharge day, but that ought to be taken for granted.

The selection of Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, who will parcel out all other Democratic committee assignments, also reflects administration influence. The original slate of new Ways and Means committeemen, against which we protested a few days ago, was weighted to give disproportionate power to southern Congressmen. The slate approved by the caucus has only two southerners, Congressmen BOGGS of Louisiana and COMBS, of Texas. Since 6 of the 10 members on the committee in the Eightieth Congress were southerners, it was imperative to give the East and West a majority of the new seats if a balance were to be achieved; 11 of the 15 Democratic members of this powerful group are now said to be liberals. The committee thus promises to reflect the will of the majority with some degree of accuracy.

The chief disappointment comes in the retention at the head of all congressional committees of chairmen selected by the blind seniority system. The House Democratic caucus could have elected chairmen for the 19 standing committees as easily as it elected 6 Ways and Means Committee members to make the other committee assignments. The progressive steps taken will have the effect of centering criticism upon the unchanged "senility system."

Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following nominating speech in behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, for majority leader, which I delivered on Saturday, January 1, 1949, at the Democratic caucus:

Friends and colleagues of the United States House of Representatives, today we meet to organize the team which must carry forward to victory that program which we have promised to the people.

Immediate, constant, and effective cooperation between the executive and legislative branches is necessary if our form of Government is to meet the urgent problems of this challenging age.

The key figure in carrying out a President's program is the majority leader of this House. For this position we require an alert, resourceful, and vigorous leader, who will not fumble the ball. We cannot entrust this responsibility to a substitute. The public demands the very best talent we can summon from our ranks.

The gentleman I am honored to place in nomination for this important post comes from the city of Boston, where a man has to be on his toes to prove his mettle for leadership. There is the environment which nurtures a man with the best in our tradition. There is the rich variety of racial origin which makes our party of today human, progressive, and alive.

From there comes a man who brings together in his character and personality a wealth of sturdy Americanism. Hard working and God fearing, he possesses a knowledge of the theory and practice of Government which is unexcelled, thoroughly seasoned by his service in the Massachusetts House of Representatives and in the Massachusetts Senate, of which he was majority leader.

He was promoted to the Congress of the United States, where he has been a distinguished Member for more than 20 years. His abilities were soon recognized by a President who governed during the most critical years of our history. That such faith was fully justified is a matter of record intimately known by many Members of this House and by the people of a grateful Nation. In the councils of our party he has worked with boundless zeal and loyalty. He has never spared himself but has ever fought with superb devotion to the Democratic Party, its leaders, and its policies.

He has been the trusted confidant of two Presidents, and his advice has had much to do with revision of executive programs so as to make them most readily acceptable to the majority views of this legislature.

Himself a veteran of World War I, he understands and speaks for that heightened awareness of our freedoms and responsibilities in a world where our Nation has assumed the burdens of leadership; an awareness that has been earned the hard way by the millions who have served in our armed forces. He enjoys the confidence of business and labor and is in a position to exert that balanced judgment which is necessary to reconcile the differences between the two.

Ever close to the people, he represents them with that sure grass-roots knowledge of their problems, which is the essence of democratic government. For the back-breaking task of majority leader, the Nation expects us to decide wisely and well. The burdens of this position demand that happy combination of experience and stamina which this man possesses.

Skilled in parliamentary procedure, forceful in debate, and fortified by a comprehensive knowledge of economic, social, and international problems, the candidate we offer is therefore fully qualified for leadership in this House.

As we well know, all the world loves a fighter who does not give up even against impossible odds. Such a man forces through and gets things done.

We have a fighter in the White House, and we need a fighter as a right-hand man to the President in this House to carry forward to enactment that program which we have pledged to the people. Honest, fearless, and dynamic, this legislative veteran inspires warm respect among those who have had occasion to work with him.

It is this faculty of setting a high example of selfish service that sets a pattern of extra effort for all of us.

The obligations facing the Eighty-first Congress make it imperative that we choose the finest executives for the administration of the legislative duties of this assembly. None but the very best will do. President, Vice President, Speaker, majority leader—these are the four highest honors in our National Government. If we approach the task of fulfilling the mandate granted to us by the American people, it is well that we work on a truly representative basis.

President Truman hails from west of the Mississippi; Vice President Barkley from a border State; Speaker Rayburn from Texas. Certainly the great industrial Northeast is deserving of the fourth honor to round out an organization that gives recognition and proportion to our team.

Our man has been and is a veritable work horse for the Nation and for the party, which has been consistently chosen to direct its destiny. In my humble opinion, subscribed to by many both in and out of this Congress, he is deserving of greater honors than it is within our present power to confer, but we are personally concerned at this moment with what we can and should do to show our gratitude to an exceptional public servant whose proven abilities we cannot afford to lose.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I offer for your unanimous approval as majority leader of this new Congress New England's favorite son, a legislator to whom the whole Nation is indebted for his untiring labors, our tried and true friend, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Graveyard Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following edi-

torial from the Washington Post of Friday, December 17, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

"The people never have been and never will be able to understand," says a letter by Representative EBERHARTER to all his fellow Congressmen, "how the will of a majority of the House * * * can be set aside by the judgment of a few men on a powerful committee." His letter is a sharp indictment of the dictatorial Rules Committee as it has operated in the past. We suspect that his criticism will find a sympathetic echo from a great majority of the legislators who have seen important measures having majority support defeated by the Rules Committee's silent veto.

What is most significant about Mr. EBERHARTER's letter, however, is that it offers a feasible and democratic way of ending this outrage. He would leave it to the committee sponsoring a bill to suggest the conditions for its consideration. All that the Rules Committee could then do would be to give each bill a priority number and suggest the time to be allowed for debating it. If the committee did not act within 2 or 3 weeks, the bill could then be called up on the floor and the entire House could decide whether or not to consider it. Several variations of this plan have been suggested by other Members of the House. It is possible that some abuse might arise from leaving the legislative committees free to fix rules for their own bills.

The important point, as Mr. EBERHARTER says, is to restore the Rules Committee to its proper function of legislative traffic director. It now functions as a sort of legislative gravedigger. If Mr. EBERHARTER can induce the House to adopt this reform on its opening day, so that the reform itself will not be buried in the Rules Committee, he will earn the applause of the entire country.

Religious Freedom Does Not Exist in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a most timely article that appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of January 2, 1949, concerning the religious persecutions existing behind the iron curtain.

Hungary, as well as Poland and the other satellite nations that are in the clutches of ruthless outside influences, are being constantly deprived of their God-given rights to the freedom to worship as they will, to the freedom of speech, and their rights to govern themselves in accordance with their background and traditions.

The article follows:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DOES NOT EXIST IN HUNGARY—ARRESTED CARDINAL SAYS REDS MAKE A MOCKERY OF THE CHURCH—SPIES REPORT SERMONS; NEWSPRINT DENIED CATHOLIC PRESS

(Gerhard Werkman, editor-at-large for the Netherlands Newspaper Syndicate (RDP), obtained one of the last interviews with Cardinal Mindszenty before his arrest by the Communist Government of Hungary. Mr. Werkman then obtained the Primate's permission to put the interview into a by-lined first-person appeal, which follows.)

(By Joszef Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary)

BUDAPEST.—The Communists claim that there is freedom of worship and belief in Hungary. If freedom of religion stands for one's personal freedom to attend church without being molested, then that is true. But if, by religious freedom one means the absolute spiritual freedom of the church, then there is none in Hungary.

The church today is subject to a systematic government campaign of slander. Sermons are taken down in shorthand by Red spies, Catholic newspapers are denied newsprint, railway tickets are refused to would-be pilgrims and even wholesale arrests of priests are the order of the day. That is what the Communist government of Hungary means by freedom of religion. I call it a mockery.

PROTESTS ARE IGNORED

Our press is banned. Not officially—but in practice it amounts to the same thing. Thus the church stands powerless against the persistent slander campaign which the government has launched in ever-increasing violence in the Communist press and in Parliament. There is no hesitation about attacking the Pope, the priesthood, all Roman Catholic institutions, and even the morals of the church.

The Reds have prevented pilgrimages by instructing railway clerks not to sell tickets to well-known places of pilgrimage on certain days. They prevent our religious processions from taking place.

I have sent many written protests to the government. So far not a single reply has ever been received.

All church lands and properties have been requisitioned and shared out among the farmers. Our schools have been nationalized. Although the government subsidizes us to some extent, this sum is far below our former revenue.

Even our bishops have been "nationalized," as they are now on the state pay roll. Of our youth organizations, 1,500 have been officially forbidden; their club buildings have been requisitioned for Communist offices.

VOTED FOR FEAR OF JOBS

Nationalization of the schools was one of the first open government acts against the church. Until 1750, the only schools in Hungary were Roman Catholic schools. It was not until then that the state began to show some interest in educating the people. Even so, the church to this day has spent vast sums of money on schools to which our people contributed their hard-earned money.

Many of our teachers nevertheless voted in favor of nationalization. They did so for fear of their jobs. It was a matter of choosing between their convictions and their bread and butter. The over-all majority of the Hungarian people want to retain church schools.

NO VATICAN REPRESENTATIVE

I objected when the Communist government declared recently that religion would be a compulsory subject in the new state schools. I objected because a mere statement is insufficient. Besides, there have already been organized Communist demonstrations against compulsory religious teaching. What guaranty is there that in due course it will not be forbidden?

The government, in turn, has blamed the church for not supplying enough of the right sort of textbooks. But the government said it would be necessary to revise all schoolbooks. Now, Education Minister Gyuala Ortutay's censorship division has purposely delayed their delivery for such a time that the shortage of textbooks on every subject has become general. Is the church to be blamed for that?

There is no diplomatic representative of the Vatican in Hungary any longer. There is no longer a single Catholic daily in the country. There are 11 major daily newspapers in Budapest and 48 in the provinces. Just imagine that and then realize that there are 68.2 percent Catholics among Budapest's population of 1,162,800.

The President of the Republic promised to allow us to print one daily paper. We never received any newsprint allocation. Of the 81 political weeklies, there is only 1 Catholic weekly. In addition, we have exactly 1 purely religious weekly. Yet both our political and religious weeklies are subject to the most rigid censorship. Very often Communist compositors and printers refuse to handle certain of our articles. We have no presses of our own. So, to all intents and purposes, we are subject to a double censorship.

SPIES TAKE DOWN SERMONS

All sermons are taken down in shorthand by Communist spies. Even with the Russian occupation forces long departed, village priests are still frequently arrested. Education Minister Ortutay, who is also in charge of religious affairs, has never even tried to deny the arrests. Nor did he deny that vital newsprint was withheld from us.

As if to remove doubts about the Communist Party's good intentions, Ortutay is paying the nationalized bishops a cabinet minister's salary. He also had the Budapest Catholic Basilica repaired at state expense, on the initiative of Mattyas Rakosi, secretary general of the Communist Party.

But, as against these outward signs, our work is being hampered and destroyed. We continue to resist. And we raise our voice to be heard in a free world—west of the iron curtain.

Republican Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article by our colleague, Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH, in the December 29, 1948, issue of Human Events. This article is indeed a thoughtful analysis of conditions in this country and the tendency toward socialism and statism, and will appeal to those who are concerned with the problem of the continuation or destruction of the basic American principles upon which our country was founded.

At the commencement of the Eighty-first Congress, Representative SMITH's article is most timely and appropriate, and under leave to extend my remarks I include the following:

REPUBLICAN RESPONSIBILITY

(By LAWRENCE H. SMITH)

The building of constructive political action on the principles of justice and freedom must now be the firm objective of the Republican Party. In the debacle of another stunning defeat this challenge is more imperative than ever. This last reversal may provide the urge for the development of a real opposition movement so necessary in the present political situation.

The Republican Party has faced crises in the past, and as it looks ahead it must realize that our domestic problems and foreign affairs are in a critical state, calling for prompt attention and revision. The party has had men of wisdom with the capacity to solve the problems which it has faced in previous national emergencies. There is no reason to conclude that comparable leadership cannot be found today.

Lincoln had to deal with a divided Nation, and had the common sense to meet the issues of that day by the application of sound principles. It was a Republican administration that passed the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, designed to curb greedy practices by large corporate combines. Wise income tax laws were enacted under the Republicans. When Theodore Roosevelt reached the Presidency, he struggled with those in his party who placed personal gain above the public interest. It is to his credit and that of the Republican Party that T. R. won his fight.

Today the party must demonstrate that it is forward looking and seeks to establish freedom and justice in a complex domestic economy and on a global basis in foreign affairs. The ability and willingness to lead in that direction exists, but whether there is the courage and honesty to follow through remains to be seen.

There is little doubt that the Republican Party, under the leadership of Governor Dewey, expected to coast to victory in November on the weaknesses of President Truman; it had no intention of meeting the fundamental issues. Now the Republicans in Congress must organize to meet the challenge of Truman's New Deal. As the drift toward state socialism is accelerated, the real political problem stands out ever more clearly as that of maintaining freedom. Republicans in and out of Congress can vigorously resist the industrious efforts of psuedoliberals to concentrate more and more administrative power in a small ruling oligarchy, which has as its ultimate objective to control and regulate the entire economic machinery of this country.

II

For 16 years, the Democrats have blacked out private-business initiative by restrictive legislation and confiscatory taxation. Their top policy makers have endorsed the principle that government can do more for the people than the people can do for themselves.

Mr. Truman went overboard for the socialistic state in his acceptance speech at Philadelphia. It was a historical statement in that he broke with the past completely. In effect he said to the people: "Don't worry about the future, the Government will take care of you." Just campaign oratory, of course, but serious when uttered by the President of the United States, and now it is his responsibility. It must be recognized that this appeal finds lodgment in the minds of many who honestly believe that government has some obligation to provide for them if they are in need. And there can be no doubt that this paternalistic assurance was an important factor in the last campaign.

The drift to socialism and statism in the United States has been constant for 16 years, and in the other parts of the world for a longer period. The Republicans in the Eightieth Congress tried to do something about it, but their Presidential candidate failed to stand by them and now the movement is to be accelerated.

Human Events, on November 17, 1948, pointed out the significance of President Truman's campaign speeches as they indicate Democratic Party policy for the future. It was said:

"The Chief Executive assured all elements of our society, with the single exception of big business, that under his continued direction their material benefits will increase. The Democratic Party has pledged itself to this accomplishment."

Is this the proper function of American government? Yet even the Republican majority, in the Eightieth Congress, supported New Deal measures in the fond hope that such action would win the election. It was bound to fail.

III

The Republican Party must build a program to meet the issues as they exist today. Fundamental principles of justice and freedom must be invoked; there must be no temporizing. In domestic affairs the fight against state socialism is inevitable. Abroad, our global commitments are such as to require a review of our allegedly bipartisan foreign policy. The peace of the world is involved and there is no more important business before us. Will Mr. Truman have more diplomatic success in the next 4 years than he has had in the past? International morality has hit a new low and the Republicans cannot escape responsibility for some of it. We can, however, do something about it by advocating and sticking to principle.

Nearly 4 years have elapsed since the Nazis collapsed, and yet we have failed to write a peace with either Germany or Japan. It is recognized that if Europe is to recover it must be upon the basis of a reconstructed Germany. Ten Marshall plans will not do the job so long as industrial Germany is crucified. What will the Republicans do about this? Have they the courage to give the lead which the electorate has the right to expect from those who assert a claim to leadership?

In the absence of peace we are engaged in an armaments race, greater than anything ever attempted in this country in time of peace. Fifteen billions are to be spent in the current fiscal year; another fifteen next year. In addition, there is conscription of young men for military service. Further, there is talk of a military alliance with other European countries, and the lend-lease of guns, ammunition, and air-force equipment at an estimated cost of fifteen or twenty billion dollars. Obviously, this is a confession that Russia took Roosevelt and the United States of America for a ride; that in effect we lost the war. No other deduction is possible. It is only when the diplomat fails that the Army steps in.

The present situation could and should have been anticipated. Before the shooting stopped in Europe and the Pacific our leaders were compromising principle. The high idealism expressed in the Atlantic Charter was ignored in the rush to achieve a military victory—at any price. In our blind hate for Hitler and Hirohito we were trapped by Stalin and his Politburo. They outsmarted Roosevelt and his subservient State Department, and we now know that they were parties to a cunning deception of Poland, Yugoslavia, and China. In a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, there was testimony that Chiang Kai-shek was not even informed of Roosevelt's deal with Russia, whereby the Communists obtained special rights in Manchuria, the Port of Dairen, half of Korea, and all the Kuriles. Yet Chiang was our ally. This sort of double dealing went on at Moscow, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. It was a wholesale violation of the principles of justice and decency and constitutes a national disgrace.

What will the Republicans do about this? Did not top flight party leaders attend these conferences?

The Republican minority in the Congress cannot avoid its responsibility in these matters; it cannot honestly use the cloak of bipartisan foreign policy as an excuse for avoiding its definite obligation to the people. Fortunately, there is evidence that some Republicans in Congress realize their responsibilities.

IV

Last April Representative CASE of South Dakota, as chairman of the House subcommittee reporting on Germany, raised two important questions: (1) The present military occupation of Germany; and (2) the future disposition of Germany as a conquered nation. The report implied a responsibility on the part of Congress for United States policy in Germany.

The report also implies that Congress had a responsibility in the disposition of plants, railroad transportation, productive facilities, shipping, and other captured equipment in the American zone of occupation. But it was pointed out that the whole reparations and demolition programs were being carried on through agreements and commitments made by the President entirely on his own initiative. There is no justification, in law, for such conduct. There is certainly no justification, in the American tradition, for such arrogation of executive power.

Temporary military occupation, of course, called for certain action under the rules of war, administered by the military government by direction of the President as Commander in Chief. The ultimate objective, however, is permanent settlement by the writing of an honorable treaty of peace. What did we do?

At the close of the war Mr. Truman secretly adopted the Morgenthau plan, contrary to the principles of international law. It is evident now that this was intended as the permanent peacetime policy for Germany. The plan was seemingly designed to prevent German rearmament by keeping the German people impoverished both in natural resources and in productive capacity. It has been well said that: "Advocates of this permanent policy thus sought to find in our military occupation a status novel in international law."

There is such a thing as a code of morality for nations, and we invoked it to justify our cause. Republicans must now make a real fight for those basic American principles which the administration has not upheld. Only in this way can we hope for a decent peace.

Wool Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of John G. Wright, president, Boston Wool Trade Association, at the annual meeting held at the Parker House, Boston, at 12:30 p. m., November 16, 1948:

There is no stock of fine wools in this country or the world, and the world is consuming more of the wanted fine wools than there is being produced. There are less sheep in this country than there were in 1867, when the population was only 35,000,000. Men's-wear fabrics are slow, despite the fact they are based on wool bought on a much lower market. Continuation of present high rate of national prosperity insures heavy consumer demand. It seems, therefore, that fabrics must soon be based on the much higher world level of wool prices.

You have heard the reports of your many committees and it is apparent, both from their reports and from the circulars sent out during the year, that they have spent a lot

of time in useful efforts for the trade as a whole. It seems probable that your committees will have as much or more work in the coming year, and I think we are fortunate in having so many able men willing to give their time freely on these committees. It is particularly gratifying to have progressed to a program which is mutually satisfactory to the wool growers and our trade. I am not going to dwell further on the activities of these committees, for, as important as they are, they are secondary to the major problem which the trade as a whole has to face.

According to the Department of Agriculture, in the first census of the sheep population in 1867, there were 39,000,000 sheep on the farms. At that time the population in the United States was only about 35,000,000 people. Today there are only about 35,000,000 sheep, while the population has risen to 145,000,000, of which over 60,000,000 are gainfully employed. Putting it a little differently, in 1867 there were one and eleven one-hundredths sheep for every person in the country, while now there is only twenty-four one-hundredths of a sheep per person. This emphasizes very clearly how dependent we are today on the foreign markets for our wool supply.

A year ago our Government still had a very large stock pile of domestic wool. Despite the fact that much of this wool was of the less desirable types, the great bulk of it has been sold.

A year ago the stock pile of colonial wools owned by J. O. was felt by some to be a weight over the market which might prove a serious detriment to the orderly marketing of the clips of the Southern Hemisphere. By spring it was apparent that the world had been consuming since the war far more than was being grown of apparel wools, and that while the J. O. stock pile still contained some 3,000,000 bales, there was very little left of the badly wanted free, fine-combing wools.

A year ago there was a large surplus of low wools in the Argentine and the growers were contending that it was impossible to raise low wools at the then current prices. Since then the surplus wools have been almost completely cleaned up together with the current clip, and the new clip of low wools will probably not be more than 80 percent of the previous one. There was no carry-over of fine wools and the Argentine industries have been contracting the new clip at prices well above the Australian level. It is predicted that the increased demand from the local industries will leave little fine wools available for export. The reduced clip in low wools and increased use of fine wools, together with new taxes and regulations which have been recently imposed, will certainly make this market a less dependable source of supply.

Uruguay starts their new season with no carry-over from previous years and a somewhat increased demand from their own local industries.

The International Wool Study Group, which met in London in October, estimated that the world clip of apparel wool for this year would be slightly less than 3,000,000,000 pounds, whereas they estimated the consumption would be 3,750,000,000 pounds.

So far this season the rest of the world has readily absorbed the offerings in the Southern Hemisphere with very little help from the United States. After some recession in prices in October, prices have climbed to what is reported to be the highest point in history.

Despite the fact that in this country the pricing of the manufacturers' goods has lagged well behind the world wool market, there has been a distinct slowing up in the men's wear end of our business. If this is due, as some claim, to price resistance by the consumer, there seems to be little relief in sight at present with the big gap between the basis for our manufactured goods and the world market price for wool. Certainly there are no signs of reduced labor costs.

Consumption in this country up to September 1, which is as far as the reports are available, was approximately equal to the consumption in 1947, and though the consumption may be at a reduced rate in the last four months, the year's figure will still be very large and will undoubtedly leave the smallest inventory on January 1 that we have had since the early years of the war, when we were very short of wool because of the lack of shipping; and even this small stock contains mostly the unwanted medium wools.

Many have felt that the high prices being paid in the world markets for wool were induced by a flight from currency. So far, though, there has been no indication of any surplus wool having been accumulated on the continent or in England.

The man in the street has been fortunate for the last few years in having available finely tailored garments made from fine fabrics at the lowest prices in the world.

With our national income at the amazing height that it is, it seems improbable that we will continue to have for any length of time a lack of a healthy consumer demand for both woolen and worsted fabrics.

Just as this country has come to realize that it can no longer live within its own boundaries, so must our trade realize that we are now dependent on the world wool market for the major part of our raw material. We can only influence the trend of world prices insofar as our requirements are larger or smaller than usual.

—And the Brass Feud's On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a copy of an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, of date January 2, 1949, entitled "—And the Brass Feud's On," which I think is of interest to the Congress and the country, especially in view of the reports that our armed forces are not getting together under the unification of the armed services under the legislation enacted by the Congress.

The article follows:

—AND THE BRASS FEUD'S ON

Just about 2 years ago President Harry S. Truman and his Eightieth Congress did United States defense a potential good turn by pushing through a general unification and streamlining of our armed forces. One new feature was a separate Air Force, which most hands agreed was a step forward, militarily.

Another important innovation was to be a super-duper intelligence agency. Purpose: to prevent another Pearl Harbor from catching Uncle Sam with his battleships down.

So what happened? Well, the now-called Central Intelligence Agency was set up—on paper, anyway. The armed forces rotated some available colonels and admirals into the outfit. Some civilian radio experts and economic specialists were given office space. And probably a few useful, energetic, honest-to-goodness spies were hired.

But, on best evidence available, our Nation's intelligence service was foggy and fumbling before and during the late war, and actually hasn't improved much since.

One of the pithiest commentators on Uncle Sam's outmoded intelligence habits has been Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias (retired), ex-deputy chief of Naval Intelligence.

Zacharias was one of our few military chiefs who called his shots correctly on Pearl Harbor. Now, in the current issue of United Nations World, he unburdens himself of more peppery opinions.

We just didn't learn our lesson at Pearl Harbor, Zacharias points out. In fact, he believes it's possible that our fumbling military intelligence set-ups did the country an even worse turn at Yalta, in February 1945.

THE BLAME FOR YALTA

The admiral, a true Navy gentleman, doesn't point his finger at Roosevelt alone for Yalta's classic boners. Instead, he explains tactfully that our sick-unto-death President might have been the victim of overmuch faith in his Joint Chiefs of Staff. This high brass, in turn, apparently has been hornswoggled by one of the worst-bungled intelligence reports in history.

The big problem then, of course (Germany was almost licked), was how much strength Japan had left. Could our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps subdue Tojo on their own, without too great losses? Or would Stalin have to be invited, or bribed, into living up to his Tehran promises to help us out?

That's where our military intelligence pulled the boner which is still giving the world the miseries. Three reports, Zacharias says, were handed in. His low-rated Tojo.

One Army Intelligence report echoed these we-don't-need-Russia sentiments. But another Army estimate said that the Japs had an extremely tough and powerful fighting machine in Manchuria, and recommended that we concede anything or everything to Stalin, to get his help in Asia.

WHO HID THE FACTS?

So our Chinese allies were sold down the river to Stalin because, in Zacharias' pointed words, "the more accurate evaluation of Japanese potentialities was pigeonholed by a competitive intelligence outfit in the Assistant War Secretary's office."

Also, the disgusted admiral adds, "I have reason to believe that they (Roosevelt and his Joint Chiefs) lacked access to vital documents, filed and forgotten * * * on the lower echelons of War Department Intelligence."

Sabotage or just dumbness? Zacharias doesn't say.

Too many reports are now coming in, however, indicating that our old-time intelligence set-ups are still continuing their feuds and jealousies, and are hamstringing the work of the new Central Intelligence Agency.

Last spring, in Bogota, Colombia, alert CIA operatives learned that Commies were planning to sabotage the Pan American Conference with strikes and riots. Somebody kept this important report from reaching our State Department.

ALMOST A WAR

Also this spring, an inept Army intelligence unit almost got us into a shooting war in Germany, by reporting that Stalin might be plotting a sneak attack. The CIA's correct dope on that one was almost ignored, too.

So, unless a lot of expert observers are wrong, our brass is still balking at any drastic revision of its intelligence habits—despite its past failures. United States military chiefs, apparently, just don't like spies, even ours.

It's about time, our feeling is, for Mr. Truman to step into this situation again, and perhaps read a bit of a riot act to our military gents before it's too late. As fighters, our boys are the best in the world. But they're not even fair gumshoe artists. The world being what it is, we need lots of spies, and good ones; so let's have them and let's listen to their reports.

Power Grabbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Wednesday, December 22, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House Rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

POWER GRABBERS

Representative EBERHARTER reports that 25 percent of the House Members have responded to his recent proposal for curbing the dictatorial Rules Committee, and nearly all the replies are favorable. If this reform is adequately presented to Members of the House, it will probably have the support of a large majority. For the average Congressman is interested in getting legislation enacted and is as disgusted as other citizens when the Rules Committee takes upon itself the responsibility of saying that the House shall not vote on measures that a majority may favor.

Legislators of the Seventy-ninth Congress will remember that when the House Labor Committee reported out a labor-relations bill the Rules Committee impertinently discarded it and gave a special rule to the much more drastic Case bill The latter bill had been introduced only 2 days previously and had never been considered by a legislative committee. In other words, the Rules Committee usurped the function of the Labor Committee and disrupted the orderly process of lawmaking instead of aiding it. This year the Rules Committee forced the emasculation of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before permitting it to go to the floor. It was responsible in very large measure for the defeat of that bill and thus contributed immeasurably to the Republican debacle in November.

Of course, the House never intended to give any small group of men such arbitrary power. It created the Rules Committee only to facilitate the flow of legislation by granting priority to important bills and prescribing conditions under which they may be debated. The rule makers have come to be dictators only because House leaders and a long-suffering membership have tolerated that breach of trust. Once before the House surrendered its powers of legislation in accord with the wishes of the majority, but those abuses were swept away in the revolt against Uncle Joe Cannon in 1910. Now another uprising must curb the powers of the Rules Committee if the House is to become a reliable instrument of the popular will. The first duty of every progressive, democratic, and liberal-minded Representative in the Eighty-first Congress will be to reduce the power-grabbing Rules Committee to its proper status as a legislative traffic director.

Repeal of Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the infamous Taft-Hartley law, and to reestablish the Wagner Labor Act as the legal foundation of labor-management relations. In so doing, I know that I am acting in accordance with the will of the people as expressed in the recent election.

For if the November 1948 election means anything, it represents a clear-cut mandate to strike from the statute books the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law—that measure which was conceived in hysteria, written by labor-hating NAM lawyers and designed to shackle and destroy the American labor movement.

There can be no doubt but that the Taft-Hartley law has been a complete failure—it has not brought stability to industrial relations—it has not increased industrial productivity—it has not eliminated strikes. Instead it has brought about resentment and bitterness on the part of labor, and has become a symbol of oppression to working men and women everywhere.

And labor has made its opposition to the law felt in several ways. On one hand, labor went to the polls and voted against the Taft-Hartley law in the last election, and by so doing, a number of those responsible for its enactment have been retired to private life. Every labor organization in America—the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the railroad brotherhoods—have adopted resolutions demanding its complete repeal.

I might mention that even a majority of businessmen now agree that the Taft-Hartley law was ill-advised. As the conservative McGraw-Hill publication, Business Week, stated on December 28, 1948:

What was wrong was that the Taft-Hartley Act went too far. * * * Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act * * * could wreck the labor movement. * * * By going so far, the law defeated itself.

With the overwhelming majority of the American people in open opposition to the Taft-Hartley law, it is my hope that the Eighty-first Congress will take immediate action to implement the people's mandate by repealing this vicious antilabor measure, and by restoring the Wagner Labor Act in the interests of sound labor-management relations and industrial peace. It is my firm conviction that the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law should be placed on our agenda as the first item for consideration.

To End a House Oligarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, December 14, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

TO END A HOUSE OLIGARCHY

A sensible and politically feasible plan for reducing the House Rules Committee's excessive powers has been proposed by Representative EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania.

If the proposal had to go through the Rules Committee, obviously it would be killed. The only time when it would not have to go through the committee is on the first day of Congress before the rules for the session are adopted. Mr. EBERHARTER proposes during that brief moment of opportunity to amend the powers of the committee so that it will be less dictatorial and more regulatory, as it is intended to be.

At present a bill may be extracted from the Rules Committee's pigeonholes only by a petition signed by a majority of the House. The Eberharter proposal would force a vote on bringing up the bill if the Rules Committee had not reported it out a reasonable length of time after the date when the committee from which it came had recommended its being brought up. The committee would still have the power to schedule the priority of bills, the length of debate, and the terms on which amendments could be offered.

The Rules Committee has been an empire-building group since it began reaching out for special prerogatives more than a century ago—and getting them. The instances of its abuses of authority are many. It refused to report the wages and hours bill, although sentiment was so overwhelmingly for it, that a petition bringing the measure to the floor was signed in less than 3 hours by a majority of Members.

It permitted only a teller vote on the public utilities holding company bill to protect members against being put on record for the way they voted. It refused to report the Taft-Ellender-Wagner public housing bill in the Eightieth Congress.

There is no way to justify the Rules Committee's powers on the grounds of propriety or efficiency, but House Members sometimes find it persuasive that these powers may be exercised in their behalf, to stymie an issue in which they are in the minority, or to relieve them of the necessity of casting an embarrassing vote.

On the new Congress' convening it will be interesting to see which of these considerations govern the majority of Representatives.

TVA After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 2, 1949:

TVA AFTER 15 YEARS

In a little over 15 years the Tennessee Valley program has grown from a dream to a great achievement. Under TVA the Valley now produces 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, as contrasted with about one-tenth of that amount in 1933; per capita income in the Valley has risen from 40 percent to 60 percent of the national average; the people of the Valley now pay 6.3 percent of the individual income taxes of the Nation, as contrasted with 3.4 percent in 1933; the Tennessee River has been made navigable to Knoxville; improved fertilizers and farming practices have helped to save the wasting

land; new industries, big and little, have come in; the initiative of the people has had a chance to show itself. These are some of the gains of which TVA has a right to boast in its fifteenth annual report, made public on the last day of the old year.

There may never be unanimous agreement as to the financial aspects of TVA's operations. The Authority pays sums in lieu of taxes, but it does not carry all the burdens of a private corporation. On the other hand, it is now earning a net return of 4¼ percent on the average net power investment of $405,000,000. It is doing this by selling power at reasonable wholesale rates. The great savings to private consumers are found in the low rates made available by municipalities and cooperatives using TVA power. Yet these distributing agencies have a combined net income of 20 cents on each dollar of revenues. If we assume that the Tennessee River had to be developed as a unit and that no private agency could or should have done this, we must admit that a great and necessary task has been accomplished, efficiently, honestly, and without deliberate or careless waste.

TVA had a heavy load to carry during the Second World War, and it carried that load superbly. We now know that when its facilities seemed insufficient during the final war years this was because a huge block of power was being diverted into the secret atomic project of Oak Ridge. This one service alone, made possible by the record-breaking construction of new dams, would have justified TVA. Now we face the problems of other possible river authorities—and they are not simple. What TVA has done is to show that they can be solved in a democratic way, with few or none of the evils of a centralized bureaucracy.

Germans as Arrogant as Prewar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following article is essential reading for every Member. The basis for German aggression three times repeated, and the last time with almost fatal consequences to civilization, is the German people. Before we go overboard on the industrial rehabilitation of Germany which may lead to her rearmament let us remember the character of the Germans. It will cost us far more to fight another war with Germany as the spearhead of aggression than to work out our problems in Europe and in Germany's occupation today even if it costs some money for a few more years. A good beginning has been made in the agreement for international control of the Ruhr. It would be shortsighted economy indeed if we nullified this agreement in the course of our consideration of American occupation policies in Germany during the next few months:

[From the New York Post Home News of December 12, 1948]

BIZONAL GERMANS JUST AS ARROGANT AS PREWAR

(By Ernest Leiser)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY, December 11.—The arrogance of the west Germans is on the way back. Gone is the unctuousness and servility which marked the defeated Germans of 1945. In their place is self-importance and a demanding cockiness.

When the Germans spot an American on foot, and they're driving, they'll do their best to send him hopping out of the way. When the Germans are the pedestrians, they'll saunter perversely and stolidly in front of an American auto.

More serious, perhaps, is the attitude of the new crop of German politicians. Two years ago they were the latter-day personifications of Uriah Heep. Today they're every bit as rude and pompous as in the days of the Kaiser or Hitler.

HOW TIMES HAVE CHANGED

This writer made the rounds of the Bizonal Economic Council in Frankfurt with a liaison officer of United States Military Government the other day. A couple of years ago the same officer would have been flattered, fawned on, and treated with the greatest humility by German functionaries.

Now one official's secretary said with the utmost self-righteousness that the Herr Direktor simply hadn't time to see the MG man. Another official brusquely broke off his conversations with the United States liaison officer in the middle of a question to say that he had to leave for a conference; a third German used the entire interview for loud denunciation of the Americans.

Two years ago any request would have been couched in humble terms, but today the demands are sharp and strident: German officials demand that occupation costs be cut, demand that dismantling be halted, demand that United States aid be increased.

In a recent speech of August Hausleiter, deputy chief of Bavaria's rightist Christian Social Union Party, charged that the presence of one American Army private costs the German economy 1,000 marks monthly (which is untrue), and demanded that occupation costs be reduced. He asserted that dismantling of plants for reparations cost twice as much as Germany's Marshall plan dollar grants (again untrue) and demanded that the dismantling cease and the grants be increased.

Two years ago it would have been a venturesome German who dared make such a statement in public. Today no United States official has even suggested that he be taken to task.

OFFICIALS IN QUANDARY

Perhaps the most discouraging factor is that the cockiness increases in direct proportion to German economic recovery. United States military government is committed to that economic recovery. Does that mean, military government officials ask, that they are also committed to acceptance of the arrogance?

After a day of bickering with bizonal bigwigs and listening to their complaints and criticism, one irritated officer in the Civil Administration Division declared:

"Officially, we say that Europe cannot live economically without a strong Germany. Personally, I'm convinced by now that neither Europe, nor anyone else on this earth, can live politically with a strong Germany."

Happy New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit, at the request of one of my constituents, New Year's greetings to the President, in the form of the following telegram:

OPELOUSAS, LA.

Congressman HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C:

My wish for a Happy New Year,
Please give President Truman, the dear.
His inauguration I must miss,
But just ask old Harry this,
From his inauguration platform,
Which I will never see,
Get Harry to send, WAA style,
His civil-rights plank to me.

SAM TARLETON.

Status of Merchant Seamen Under Draft Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing in regard to a group of merchant seamen which made up a great part of the November draft quota.

During the war we were considered essential to the national war emergency, and for that reason were draft exempt, and also received a certificate of substantial service, covered by the congressional Public Law 87.

Looking up the statistics of death and casualties of merchant seamen in comparison with all armed forces combined, it was listed that there were more, of course, per ratio.

One point that should be brought to attention is the fact that most drafted seamen have spent over 3 months in maritime training regulated by the Government under the jurisdiction of the United States Coast Guard, which is equivalent to the 3-month period which exempts any discharged man from being redrafted, spending this length of time in the Army, Navy, or any branch considered under military service.

After this pretraining, the majority of we seamen here at Fort Knox spent well over 3 years at sea during wartime and feel certain that this time given to their country should be considered eligible for exemption from the provisions of the draft law.

Most of we seamen here are 26 or very near that age, and think it unjust to give up more time again in peacetime and feel certain that if another war would arise we seamen here would be grateful to serve our country again.

We feel sure that you will not overlook the fact that we have served our country and some consideration should be made on our behalf.

George B. Ravis, Charles J. Stahl, Joseph D. Bonadio, Jack L. Stumpf, Warren A. Anderson, George M. Mallory, Gino Perzeri, Robert N. Eiben, William Vargo, Harold K. Johnson, Joe B. Davis, Samuel P. Chaney, a group of merchant seamen, Battery C, Fifty-fourth AFA Battalion CCC, Third Armored Division.

FORT KNOX, KY., *December 20, 1948.*

Credit Squeeze Can Be Very Dangerous and Could Cause Devastating Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the new year, 1949, last Saturday, I authorized the following news release, which is self-explanatory:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 2, 1949.—Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, today charged the Federal Reserve Board with "drying up credit channels and threatening the United States with a serious depression."

The Congressman, who is in line for the chairmanship of the Small Business Committee of the Eighty-first Congress, said: "I am particularly concerned over how the present credit squeeze is hitting small business and depriving millions of people of the chance to buy automobiles. It really is depriving those of modest incomes of the chance to buy better new cars or forcing them to buy second-hand cars, while the rich with large incomes can go merrily on, needing no credit channels which the Federal Reserve Board has closed by making monthly payments higher than the great masses can afford."

Mr. PATMAN demanded speedy modification of the Federal Reserve Board's regulation W, which forces auto purchasers to pay in the short period of 18 months. He declared that unless the period is extended to 24 months, the mass market for medium-priced cars will be choked off, causing substantial business failures and unemployment among tens of thousands of workers.

"A credit squeeze is being imposed by the Federal Reserve Board that can start a chain reaction leading to a wholly unnecessary depression," Mr. PATMAN said. Already warning signals are appearing like led up to the 1929 panic.

"Reports indicate commercial banks are calling loans which will cause, if not stopped, a credit squeeze which has led to every man-made depression in the past.

"A depression is unnecessary; the urgent need is for action now to prevent this.

"Many consumer-goods industries are undergoing hardships from too stringent Federal credit rules. Inventories are beginning to stack up, not because there are not people who want to buy the goods, but because they cannot meet the high monthly payments required by the Reserve Board.

"The Federal Reserve Board has received thousands of telegrams and letters of protest from small-business men. In Pennsylvania alone, I am informed, 95 percent of the State's auto dealers reported regulation W is curtailing car sales. Manufacturers have notified the Reserve Board they will have to cut back production and lay off great numbers of employees unless the payment period is extended to 24 months, so buyers can return to the market.

"The 18-month period makes it necessary for the purchaser of a medium-priced car to pay more than $100 a month. Only persons of upper-bracket incomes can afford to pay $100 a month and up. But if the payments were extended over 24 months, then literally millions of citizens of the great middle class could afford to pay the resulting $75 or so a month to buy the cars which they want and which now are available for the first time since the war.

"The payments could be increased to 30 months and thus provide a greater insurance against depression.

"I voted against the controls on consumer installment credit which the Eightieth Congress authorized the Federal Reserve Board to impose. Events have shown the Board is abusing the powers given it. The Federal Reserve Board has not carried out the intent of the legislation. Congress instructed it to see that the controls resulted in the least possible dislocation of industry. Instead, the Board has caused sales of durable goods to fall off, thereby causing production to decline and unemployment to mount.

"The Federal Reserve Board by its tyrannical administration of arbitrary credit controls on automobile and other installment purchases is threatening to cause mass layoffs in basic industries where sales are being drastically curtailed by these unrealistic Federal Reserve restrictions.

"The time to act is now, before the damages snowball into a depression. Some day the people will rise en masse and punish those who, with grave responsibilities, fail to act—and thus create man-made depressions.

"The Federal Reserve Board members must act now and swiftly before they are charged with too little thought and too late."

The Red Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William T. Dillon, J. D., president of St. Joseph's College for Women, at the annual red Mass at St. Charles Borromeo Church on Thursday, September 23, 1948:

ASSERTS THAT LAW FACES PARALYSIS—BISHOP CELEBRATES RED MASS; MONSIGNOR DILLON PREACHES

The profession of the law is "in grave danger of becoming paralytic, ancient and respected as it is," and members of the profession "are in vast danger of being senescent without so much as suspecting," declared Rt. Rev. Msgr. William T. Dillon, J. D., president of St. Joseph's College for Women, at the annual red Mass at St. Charles Borromeo Church Thursday morning.

Citing evidence of the lack of quality in the profession of the law today, Monsignor Dillon charged that the "lamentable machinery that curses the criminal branch of law, not less than the unprovable perjury that is so rampant in negligence, has grown in such wise that it has become a source of demoralization." The text of the sermon appears below.

The Mass of the Holy Ghost was offered by Bishop Molloy. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J. Reilly, V. F., pastor of Our Lady of Angels Church, was master of ceremonies to his excellency, assisted by Rev. William F. Donohue, assistant pastor of St. Charles Borromeo's. A large number attended the Mass, including leading civic and judicial figures, lawyers, and officials of the Army and Navy.

Present in the sanctuary were Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward P. Hoar, P. A., V. G.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis P. Connelly, V. F.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Jerome Reddy; Rev. Ambrose S. Aitken, pastor of St. Charles Borromeo's; Rev. Harold Folser, S. J.; Rev. Anthony De Liberty; and Rev. Joseph A. Murphy, Ph. D.

BISHOP MOLLOY SPEAKS

Bishop Molloy, addressing the congregation after the Mass, commended Monsignor Dillon's sermon for its fearlessness and frankness.

Declaring that it was a privilege to offer the Mass of the Holy Ghost each year for the members of the bar and bench, his excellency reminded the men and women that the joy of the occasion should be tinged with sorrow upon recalling those who had died since the red Mass the previous year. He asked that the latter be remembered in the prayers of those attending.

He emphasized that the Mass is the source of all grace and truth and that it is Christ, who is God, present on the altar. The purpose of the Mass, he continued, is to adore and to praise God, to thank Him for His kindness and goodness and to beg of Him, as the giver of all gifts, protection and guidance during the year.

Children, his excellency said, do not fully comprehend God's beneficence nor do they realize what He is giving them, but adults should at all times be grateful for the blessings of mankind. He cited the incident in which but one of the ten made clean by Christ returned to thank Him and he urged that no one present fall into the class of the nine who failed to return to give thanks.

God only asks men to try to do better, Bishop Molloy said, because He is conscious of man's shortcomings; He desires, nevertheless, that each man strive to improve himself.

SEES FAILURE TO SEEK GOD

His excellency also pointed out a paradox of the day, namely, that men who believe in God rarely seek His help and guidance. The saddest situation of our times, he said, is the lack of acknowledgment of responsibility to God and the negation of God by man's self-sufficiency and negative living.

Quoting George Washington's First Inaugural Address to the effect that it "would be peculiarly improper if I were to begin my official life without supplication to Almighty God," Bishop Molloy said the words of the first President should be a guidepost today, when the affairs of men are in such a critical shape. The Nation, he added, can only be as good as the individuals who comprise it.

His excellency concluded his talk by urging the members of the bar and the bench to remain close to God during the months to come.

THE SERMON

Following is the text of Monsignor Dillon's sermon:

"In the last chapter but one of the Great Book there is a vision of a brand new world. It is John on his lonely island of exile writing and he says: 'I saw the new Jerusalem and I heard a great voice saying "Behold the tabernacle of God with men and He shall dwell with them and they shall be His people" and He who sat on the throne said "Behold I make all things new" (and He said to me "Write, for these things are true").'

"What follows is hardly more than epilogue to the greatest joint venture of literature and inspiration that has ever come from the mind or pen of man. The very essence of Christianity is here epitomized. Christ came to make things new, to cast fire upon the earth, and so to renew it.

"The growing seasons tell of the cycle of the years. Each dawn announces a world made new. We think of God as new if we really think, for we know that He has no age—no years, no time. It is unfortunate that He is ever depicted as venerably old. Rather, does He rejoice to run the ways of the world—forever young.

"It has ever been the way of age to look with caressing approval upon the past. Too long the perpetuation of what was has been the standard for what is to be. Conservatism has been regarded by too many as the virtue

paramount and progressivism as the original sin.

"I should be the last to minimize the wisdom of age. I would be a poor teacher if I failed to recognize the fact that we have our roots in the past and that much of life's grandeur is what grows out of its historical origins. I know that palimpsests can teach us much and I cherish a fine regard for all things good that were.

"For all of this and in face of it I am still sure that the angel of wisdom who spoke in revelation is still abroad, still counseling the while we listen with calloused ear and in our lethargy bless the past and find no challenge. It is so much easier to follow old roads than to cut new paths through rock and across dense forests. We are by nature apathetic, not given to dare the darkness. This is as true in the world of spirit and of theory as it was geographically in all the centuries until a brave Genoese led a trio of phantom ships into the strange harbor of San Salvador. Mayhap we shall find that same savior in our questing search.

"I have listened these many years to sermons at the red Mass here and elsewhere. They have been preached by eminent scholars and worthy men, but I have always come away with the conviction that they were merely regurgitating mentally. Almost without exception there has been the insistence that the law of the jurisdictions is a phase of the natural law. I wonder how many in any audience ever doubted that. I grant you that we are likely to forget but historically most of us agree to that and such a reminder even as brief as this is, in my opinion, sufficient.

"When I listen I expect to be challenged. I come to think—to be shaken out of my sullen security if that must be—to be made new spiritually.

PROFESSION IN GRAVE DANGER

"I am satisfied that our profession of the law is in grave danger of becoming paralytic, ancient and respected as it is. Perhaps this very element has given it undue contentment with itself. You and I are in vast danger of being senescent without so much as suspecting. We must be reminded that life is ever new and young, however senile we may be—that we as priests in the temple of justice must be zealots for that justice and that we have no right to sit in ancient shadows.

"Do not be alarmed. I am not asking that we destroy the arches of this great cathedral that we have builded so patiently, so slowly, and so arduously. I am not attacking the foundations of our system of judicature, not yet complete but always growing. I have supremest respect for the law of this land—and its votaries. I believe in the ultimate honesty of its judiciary and in the solid scholarship of its advocates, but I think that any plan or pattern that pretends to be perfect this side of the stars is steeled to dissolution and I am certain that no one of us cherishes such an attitude towards the law.

"It is in this mood that I speak to you. I submit that we must begin to do some very radical thinking if we are going to preserve the profession in its pristine dignity. What is more important, we must soon become revolutionary or fail humanity, and that is vastly more terrible to contemplate.

"It is true that the very heart of our jurisprudence is the principle of stare decisis but it is no less true that within that very structure we have succeeded for centuries in keeping a wondrous virility. We have done it partly by a series of fictions in which all law seems to abound. Sir Henry Maine in his classical treatises has demonstrated the fecund function of fiction in Roman and oriental as well as in English law. All peoples seem to have loved to dramatize and to indulge in play acting at least in the origins of their codes.

"So we have to some degree pretended that we followed precedent when in reality we used endless inventiveness to make new situations fall into old categories until you and I, reading the decisions, have sometimes smiled and more often wept to observe the kind of circuitous reasoning used to establish parallels where in reality there were but angles.

"The Romans of the postclassical age were much more realistic. They demanded that you establish your equities by adducing the weight or authority in numbers, boldly assigning to one Ulpian, as I recall, a numerical superiority.

CAN MAKE RENOVATIONS

"I am convinced that, adhering to our principles, we can still make all necessary renovations by doing exactly what those whose ideologies we repudiate have done. With the zeal of evangelists, they have written new law and all within the purview of our Constitution.

"When they found that they could not achieve their ends in face of the dangers of review by courts of higher authority, they introduced administrative and commission law—a thing foreign to our genius. We may not like it but the fact remains that it was found constitutional and it arrived at the destiny they sought. In too many cases it may have been directed to ends that seem to you evil. The process reversed, it should and could be effective unto good—why not?

"You can't avoid the discouraging truth that in most cases it was used to effectuate new and sometimes startling ultimates.

"May I remind you here that it had a very lordly and excellent background? The most unacademic amongst you know the origin of equity. You know how when the law had become sterile and had put a serious burden on the conscience of the king (who too frequently had no conscience for anything else) there came magnificent relief in the person of the Chancelor of the Privy Seal, who cut through the horrible formalism of legality and found writs—mandamus—certiorari—discovered injunction and specific performances—found a way for accounting and marshaling and did a thousand other things, and the law that was all but moribund took on new life. I would emphasize to this Catholic audience that this was done by churchmen largely who were supposed to be steeped in conservatism (a worse calumny has never been perpetrated).

"The good cleric, like the good Catholic—the good man the world over, of whatever creed—will be the brave man who dares to say the thing he honestly and courageously thinks, however stodginess and rump authority may disapprove. It is my thesis that as good Catholics you must be root thinkers, not content to solve all problems contemporary with the yardstick of the Chaldeans.

WORLD PROBLEMS

"We have seen a country laid waste because a Goering dared a new, if terrible, instrumentality of war. We shall see civilization decimated by a new and much more deletive weapon of the soul unless we of the west can meet the psychic weapons of a new and terrifying power—a power of a man's soul gone spiritually berserk.

"We of America have grown arteriosclerotic even in our youth. We of the churches have all alike sat calmly by the while the powers of dissolution were maniacally active, and we of the law have surrendered our prerogative as watchmen of the night because we are mentally inert and temperamentally satisfied. We do not look to roots where others have been planting. We do not make things new. How can we hope to see the new Jerusalem?

"I have insisted that what I say is said in no spirit of the seer or of the reformer. I do not propose to offer you some simple remedy for the world's maladies or even for the law's deficiencies. I have not even the notion that I should proffer any specifics, although I do not consider that too difficult, and I have and shall enunciate shortcomings that anyone who runs may read. I shall be more than content if I succeed in making you more cognizant of world problems—less interested in your own personal advancement.

"The great things in any area of man's travail have been done forever by those who were ready to sacrifice their personal future—sometimes their names and very lives. The great litterateurs have died unknown—the great artists have lived in penury and succumbed to starvation. The great musicians have sung their lovely songs upon a waste of beach where no one heard and the waves drowned their singing.

"I venture the thought that no great lawyer has ever died wealthy and few of them have been acclaimed. Indeed, the reverse is almost the literal truth. It is almost invariable that the opulent lawyer has sold his genius to the stagnating business of keeping the status quo—however stupid that may be.

A STAGNANT SCIENCE

"It is a matter of personal concern to me, as well as a social problem, that the law in its wide reaches is presently about the most stagnant of all the sciences, at least here in America. It is also disturbing to observe that where it is most operative and achieving it is about 100 percent left of balance. You and I may rationalize about that if we will and defend ourselves. We may even allege that this is proof that we should follow all the old paths, but we are living in a fool's paradise if we do.

"Economics, sociology, the physical sciences, medicine, even mathematics, have made prodigious changes, many of them advances. In some cases they have been torn loose from their wharfage—sometimes tragically. We of jurisprudence have sat idly by as though these cataclysms could not so much as touch us.

"In Europe, where Roman law still points the way, the literature has been so vastly superior in quantity and quality to curs as to mock comparison. It can be truly said that we have no modern literature in our field, and where it exists even in phantasy it is utterly pagan. Can anyone gainsay this? Can anyone explain it? I wish I could. I so wish it were not so.

"We are dedicated to the glory that was. We are the knights of the preterite and the champions of the accomplished. Most of you who listen must confess that this thought has not occurred to you or where it has you have been content to cast it away with the reflection that this is the business of judges or of law reviews or of texts.

"This is not the attitude of your confreres at the bar. You have seen some things done that your brethren of a generation ago would have labeled impossible. True, NRA was declared unconstitutional, and WPA died of its own weight, and a score of other codes have perished, some aborning; but no one will ever kill save by blood the things—the bastard things in too many cases—that they forgot. Why could not you have fathered things that led to light and luster?

URGES RETHINKING

"The Nuremberg trials are an outrage upon the common law, however speciously Justice Jackson or anyone else may write. They are a breach of international law as we knew it. I am not at all sure that they were not justifiable under the law of nature. This by way of illustration.

"I wish I had the time to point out some of the things within our own pattern that need revamping. May I simply indicate.

"Is there anyone who believes that the tax laws are builded upon the principles of

equity? Are they not rather the fabrication of opportunism and postulated upon the hypothesis that the government will take all that the traffic will bear. This is only one aspect of a general proposition that the law is not concerned with morality, and we are certainly reaping the legitimate harvest of that axiom. The tax laws, like the traffic laws, are honored mostly in dishonor. To ignore this is to belie fact. Is this not the problem of the jurist?

"The lamentable machinery that curses the criminal branch of law not less than the unprovable perjury that is so rampant in negligence has grown in such wise that it has become a source of demoralization. Is this no business of ours?

"We can find ways of diagonalizing when we want to do it. For centuries insurance was taboo because, if you please, it was an aleatory contract. I submit that it still is, although I can't see what is wrong with it. Captious reasoning calls it a contract of indemnification and it becomes thereafter lily pure.

"Surely you can see that we have not been doing the kind of basic thinking so necessary in such a vital aspect of our culture—indeed of our very life.

"Almost anyone here would be able to tell the Un-American Activities Committee how to operate. You probably glory in your hatred of communism. (Incidentally could you tell that same body how to get around some of the chicanery that our much exploited Bill of Rights makes possible.) I know that freedom of speech is one of the noblest things we have, but I know that all freedoms are bound (speech included) or we lose all freedom. There is no freedom save by law.

"What I would like to point out about communism is that we have wantonly allowed this kind of political theory to become the law of half the world because we as legists insisted that we had no stake or interest in economic or social or philosophical theories. We have now become interested in socialized medicine because it may ultimately mean socialized advocacy and that will touch us personally.

"Please don't misinterpret. This is not said in cheap criticism. I love this profession and its exponents. I believe them to be an exemplary body of men, but I feel that they have sold their competence and bartered their birthright, that they have grown all but sterile in a world of youth.

"I am no prophet nor am I his son. I do not speak from Grecian loneliness. I have no thought of destruction. I ask only that you rethink everything—that you make all things new.

"To hate Communists is un-Christian and gives them fair logic for hating in return—for reprisal and all these other things of which we read with so much alarm and concern. It is very well to talk about loving Communists and hating communism. I fear that is a bit of psychic nonsense. I don't believe hatred is an answer to anything. We must evolve the answer—a real solution—not an empty phraseology, and we must begin not in Russia, not beyond the curtain of steel, but here in America.

CITES MOVEMENT IN EUROPE

"Lest you think I am talking like a candidate on the so-called Progressive Party, lest you think this is academic froth or long-haired theory, I would refer you to the Christian movements now current in Europe. Have you read France Alive, by Claire Bishop, or Priest Workman in Germany, by Perrin, or Fisher of Men, by Van der Meersch? Have you read the fictioned Letters of Pope Celestine the Sixth, by Giovanni Papini? Here are people writing out of the fullness of hearts and living in the red shadow of the blood of their bravest. Here are men and women who are making things new after Christ's own novelty. I don't approve of all they say or do but I stand in ecstatic awe of their achievements, for they are not preachers of the word alone but doers.

"I would have each one of you read Human Destiny, by Le Comte Du Nouy, that you might see how new old thoughts can become. If you must, skip the first half of that volume that is purely scientific. Eliminate what may be questionable dogma, and then breathe the inspiration of his magnificent thoughts.

"See what a scientist can offer the world of reality by way of definite procedure and logical thought. That volume should have come from some philosopher, some publicist—some lawyer to show men's minds what way we travel.

"Read that book and set it against such propaganda as Shadow in the Earth, presumably the work of a Catholic. The critics writing about this latter volume told that it was a man's struggle for faith. In truth it is a fair picture of the complete collapse of what was never more than an anaemic counterpart of a faith, while the former is verily the slow calvarian climb to a gorgeous summit of a paschal evening.

TELLS OF RESPECT FOR LAW

"My brethren in the law—I love the things you represent. I love the atmosphere of the courts with their spirit of reverence for the majesty of justice still maintained. I love the noise of busy corridors and the quiet of dim libraries where great minds of the past speak through buckram-covered reports. I cherish all the memories of my association with you. I dream of a world made better because of you.

"A recent picture has given current meaning to a very simple message that told a very vital story. Written where anyone with soul might see stood the seemingly stoical statement 'Some one passed this way.'

"That is the history of each of us, and most of us pass as pass the clouds or the seasons or a bird in flight, and no one even marks our going or chronicles the fact, and life is nowise different for that passing.

"Not that your names be written in flame of fire—not that you win acclaim in books of light do I ask your help this hour, but that a world in doubt may learn to believe that a humanity lost may find its way, that Christ's heart brutally outraged may once again be whole—that His blood that incarnadines the world in endless rivers may wash us clean. This is not done in days or years. We have not come here as of yesterday but through epochs. This is not done by red Mass sermons or mere good intentions but only by the daily living of such men as you—virile, faithful, honest men. It is not the fruit of chance but the bitter harvest of a sun-drenched drought. It is not the easy spawn of carelessness but the tireless labor of supreme intelligence, and this, my friends of bench and bar, is at once your Golgotha and your Olivet.

"No one will praise you—not even a grateful people. This is the way of virtue and of good men. No one will bless you save only God. No one will write of you but someone who peruses the magical Apocalypse will lay down the volume with a sense of deepest gratitude and find new meaning as he reads: 'I saw the new Jerusalem and I heard a great voice saying "Behold the tabernacle of God with men and He shall dwell with them and they shall be His people" and He who sat on the throne said, "Behold, I make all things new." '"

Meeting of Congress Seen Marking Epoch of Lavish Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, January 3, 1949:

MEETING OF CONGRESS SEEN MARKING EPOCH OF LAVISH SPENDING—MANDATES HELD TO MEAN NEW MILESTONE IN AMERICAN EVOLUTION

(By David Lawrence)

This is not just another political turn-over in Congress—one political party taking over today from the other.

This day is historic, for it marks the beginning of an epoch. It is a milestone in American evolution. For the new Congress which was voted into power in November 2 has been given a mandate which many pressure groups are claiming is an instruction to break up American businesses of large size, levy penalties on profits, give labor unions unhampered power to do as they please, and permit all manner of strikes and work stoppages, no matter how the public interest may be jeopardized.

It is being interpreted also as a mandate to spend vast sums of money in the name of social welfare, irrespective of the fact that a $250,000,000,000 debt hangs over the national economy and already imperils the future value of the dollar in terms of gold.

The Members of the new Congress have been elected on a platform that repudiates the economy policies of the Eightieth Congress and denounces its unwillingness to vote more money or privileges for special groups. So the converse of that policy of thrift and conservatism apparently has now been given sanction.

It means that the party which promises the most out of the Public Treasury can count on support at the polls. The efforts made by the Republicans to hold the scales even as between management and labor are termed reactionary while the new program of giving the labor unions power to maintain closed-shop monopolies is characterized as a return of New Dealism or liberalism.

STALIN SEEN SATISFIED

To be liberal with the taxpayers' money is the political philosophy that dominates the scene—the theory being that America's resources are inexhaustible and that tax moneys are to be gathered in merely by legislating a new set of tax rates.

"Good old Joe Stalin," as President Truman in a momentary bit of good-natured comment once called him, must be looking on with unconcealed satisfaction. His hope is that some day the system of capitalism and private initiative must break down. He has said so in his writings over and over again. He visualizes the first step inside the democracies as the breaking up of the managerial and property-owning classes simultaneous with the rise of the working class.

In America, where there is an honest belief among so-called liberals that capitalism and the private-enterprise system can be subjected to any amount of political punishment and still thrive and keep its economic strength, there is an unwitting but determined effort to intensify the very class con-

flict on which the Communists pin their hopes so strongly.

Britain has already weakened under the strain of the first step toward disintegration, which is socialism. No longer is the British economic system able to hold up its head in the world, and were it not for the alms of a benevolent America, through direct loans and now the Marshall plan, Mr. Stalin would be witnessing a greater infiltration of Communist and left-wing philosophy in England than has appeared thus far.

RISK CAPITAL AFFECTED

In America the managerial class has for the last 15 years taken a real beating through punitive taxes which not only impair incentive but actually prevent the rise of an equity market out of which the risk capital to build new enterprises or expand old ones must be derived.

When American businesses, by reason of efficient production and the fortunate circumstance of an unprecedented demand for goods following the war, manage to accumulate profits large enough to furnish risk capital to finance out of their own bank accounts the needed expansion or replacement of equipment, the radical left wing promptly starts a move to do away with that sinew of strength by urging a higher tax on profits.

The new Congress, being sponsored by radicals and aided and abetted by the most powerful left-wing movement America has witnessed in all its history, now will take over the job of performing a surgical operation on American business enterprise. All this is going on at a time when the huge public debt has failed to impress the managers of governmental funds that there is need for a smaller instead of a larger annual budget.

The end result inevitably must be a climax in which economic upheaval will stir up more and more demands for more socialism and state control.

Liberalism or Reaction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, it is strange commentary on the age that today the House of Representatives should, without a word of debate being permitted, undo in the name of liberalism what was done in the name of liberalism 39 years ago.

Probably no single incident in the history of parliamentary government in America has been more often cited as an example of progressivism than the revolt against the domination of the House by Speaker Joe Cannon back in 1910. The movement was led by a Member from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

If memory serves me correctly, when Mr. Norris retired from the political scene no lesser leader of the New Deal than Franklin Delano Roosevelt paid tribute to George Norris as the great liberal.

Back in 1910, George Norris led the movement to take from the speakership certain powers. What were they? First, the chairmanship of the Committee on Rules; second, the right to name Members to the various committees.

Of the first battle—one that ran through several hours of historic session, marked by sharp debate all the way—permit me, under the permission given by the House, to quote briefly from the proceedings of March 19, 1910.

One Member said:

Mr. Speaker, no man in this presence realizes more thoroughly than I do the seriousness as well as the importance of this occasion. * * * This is not a personal fight, so far as I am concerned, or ever has been, against the Honorable Joseph G. Cannon, from the State of Illinois, personally. [Loud applause on both sides of the Chamber.] * * *

I want to say another thing. * * * I have believed ever since I was in the House long enough to understand the work of the Committee on Rules that the fact that the Speaker of the House was chairman of that committee, and practically the Committee on Rules, gives the Speaker of this House more power than any one man ought to have over the destinies of this Republic. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That Member, Mr. Speaker, was a fairly distinguished Member of the House in his day. He later became Speaker himself. His name was Champ Clark, of Missouri.

Did he speak in a temporary way? He answered that question a bit further in his remarks by saying:

The enlargement of the Committee on Rules even in itself has some beneficent features attached to it because it takes into consideration, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Cooper) stated the other night, the larger portion of the country. But I am not giving my adhesion to any proposition concerning this rules business that does not remove the Speaker now, and so far as we can control it, for all time to come, from the Committee on Rules. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If Champ Clark were alive today, what would he say? What would he say when the House, so far from removing the Speaker from the Committee on Rules, makes of him and the chairman of a legislative committee, a super-Committee on Rules of two members, without minority representation, with authority to override a Committee of Eleven, representing both majority and minority and chosen by the House to give "consideration to the larger portion of the country"?

Was Champ Clark alone among the distinguished statesmen of his day in taking such a position with George W. Norris? There was another outstanding statesman in the House in those days—one who spoke somewhat convincingly. He said in part:

Mr. Speaker, if this resolution is adopted by the House, we have reached the end of an era in the parliamentary history of this body. * * * We recognize today that there has to be leadership; that some man must be the leader of the majority and some man must be the leader of the minority, but we say the place for that leadership is not in the Chair. [Applause from the Democratic side.]

I say that, no matter how high or of what pure character a man may be who occupies the Speaker's chair of this House, that leader cannot divorce the leadership and the partisanship of the leader from the Speaker when he is presiding over the deliberations of this House. This great parliamentary body is entitled to a presiding office who wields the scales of justice between man and man, between the two contending political parties, and that is what we are standing for today. [Applause from the Democratic side.]

Whose words? The Member who spoke those words was Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama. And did he and Champ Clark stand alone with George W. Norris in their fight that day?

The roll call supporting the Norris resolution included such names as Byrns and Hull of Tennessee, of Penroot and Poindexter, of Rainey and Sherley. Yes; and, yes, strange as it may seem, the name of the one Member whose service bridges from that day to this, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the man who offered the motion to restore to the speakership the power to overrule the Committee on Rules, the probable chairman of that committee, Mr. SABATH.

Well, times change, and I shall not labor the obvious point of these remarks.

The truth is, and every Member should know it, that the real protection to the membership in getting floor consideration for bills reported by a legislative committee but unwanted by the Rules Committee should be found in Calendar Wednesday. If a legislative committee fails to report a bill out, there is the discharge petition, a method which can be used by a majority of the House.

The basic rules of the House provide for 1 day of the week, Wednesday, when the committees of the House are called in order—or are supposed to be. And when called, they may bring up any bill the committee chooses, failure to obtain clearance from the Rules Committee notwithstanding.

The trouble, as those who have been Members for the last 5 or 10 years know, is that, along about 1940, the leadership adopted the practice of dispensing with Calendar Wednesday. It may have been brought on by the press of business during the war. That practice may have been continued because of the dilatory tactics that were sometimes followed by those who wanted to prevent a vote on final passage.

The remedy, if the latter was the reason, however, was to strengthen the rules against dilatory tactics on Calendar Wednesday. This, it was my understanding, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] proposed to do today, had the motion for the previous question been voted down. There was no opportunity afforded him, or anyone else, however, to explain that situation today. And so we have the strange spectacle of undoing today what George Norris, Champ Clark, Oscar Underwood, and the others did in the famous revolt of the insurgents 39 years ago.

Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit a statement issued by Hon. Chep Morrison, mayor of

the city of New Orleans, La., including the text of a resolution of the American Municipal Association adopted at its recent Washington, D. C., conference in regard to the question of tidelands, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, December 28, 1948.—Mayor Chep Morrison, of New Orleans, newly elected president of the American Municipal Association, today made public the contents of a resolution adopted by the American Municipal Association at its recent Washington convention, urging congressional action to secure title to oil tidelands to the State governments.

In calling attention to the resolution, Mayor Morrison said:

"Louisiana members attending the American Municipal Association convention were among those actively promoting this resolution. The American Municipal Association board will vigorously urge the new Congress to take the action recommended in this resolution. The American Municipal Association, representing the officials of 9,500 cities and towns of America, believes that the States should have title to the oil tidelands, and the consolidated weight of this organization will be thrown behind our position in this matter. I have sent a copy of the resolution to members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, with the request that they all personally interest themselves in this fight."

Following is the text of the AMA tidelands resolution:

"Whereas the title to lands lying beneath tidal and navigable waters has been resolved against the States and political subdivisions thereof by the Supreme Court decision in the case of *United States* v. *California;* and

"Whereas this decision has created multiple conflicts of opinion as to the validity of the title to these lands in the States and their several grantees; and

"Whereas Federal legislative action appears to be the sole remedy which States and cities have to secure title to these tidelands upon which billions of dollars have been expended by such State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association urge the Congress of the United States, during its next session, to adopt legislation to correct the injustices which would follow from the Supreme Court's decision and restore to the States and their municipalities their property rights and titles in accordance with the law of property established by the Supreme Court of the United States in a long line of decisions handed down throughout 100 years, to the effect that the States and their grantees hold complete title and ownership to all lands lying beneath tidewaters and navigable waters within their respective boundaries; and that this organization lend its cooperation and full support to securing the enactment of such legislation."

Curbing the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, December 15, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

CURBING THE RULES COMMITTEE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—It is now certain that action will be pressed against the power of the autocratic House Rules Committee when Congress meets January 3.

Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, Democratic whip and member of the important House Ways and Means Committee, has stated that he will offer an amendment to the parliamentary rules of the Chamber. He has written to all 435 Members of the House in an effort to get bipartisan support.

The Rules Committee is a political as well as a legislative organization and as such is one of those smaller orbs in the legislative planetary system which follow their own paths and are answerable only to themselves.

In theory, the committee is a traffic director on the legislative highway determining the order of business on the floor of the House. Too often, however, it flashes a red stop light for important legislation. Then the Nation witnesses a spectacle like that in city traffic when a small 40-watt red bulb can hold back immense lines of traffic. In this case the majority vote of a small committee flashes a "stop" signal that may hold up needed bills and reforms for months or years.

The Rules Committee received much of the power which was formerly held by the Speaker of the House. Then in the revolt against "Cannonism," the authority of the "czar" Speaker was broken up and distributed. The trouble is that the reforms of yesterday often become the problems of today.

It is agreed that the Speaker formerly held too much power. But at the same time he represented his party and party discipline. If the Speaker refused to let legislation come before Congress, as the ardent young liberal reformers like the late George Norris charged, at least the responsibility was firmly fixed. The party to which the Speaker belonged was held responsible.

America has just gone through another big election in which the record of the Eightieth Congress was an important issue. Today, instead of one man—the Speaker—the charge of usurpation of power is directed largely against the Rules Committee, a body of 12 men. Thus the responsibility has been diffused but the traffic road block, it is alleged, still remains.

"The committee," charges Mr. EBERHARTER, "often allows bills to come up before the House only on its own terms. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees of the House by holding hearings and reviewing the merits of bills that have already been carefully studied by the proper legislative committees."

Today the Rules Committee is composed of eight members of the majority party and four members of the minority. In the Eightieth Congress the members who had worked their way up to this committee were somewhat more conservative, as it seemed, than even the Legislature itself. Representative LEO E. ALLEN (Republican), of Illinois, the chairman, looked on foreign financial commitments with some of the suspicion of the Chicago Tribune. Among the four Democrats, veteran ADOLPH J. SABATH, of Illinois, represented the newer point of view of his party, but the three other members were southerners and in their suspicious approach to recent social and economic changes indistinguishable in most respects from the Republicans.

The obvious difficulty is to get any better system under the present legislative set-up. The House membership is actually far too large for effective debate. The detailed work of the Chamber is consequently divided up among powerful committees.

Under the Eberharter plan, when a member of any House committee, usually the chairman, favorably reports a bill to the House with recommendation that it be passed, he would at the same time introduce a House resolution. This resolution, or rule, as it is known, would call for debate of whatever length and kind the reporting legislative committee thinks would be desirable. At present, the power to decide this is in the hands of the Rules Committee.

Once the proposed House resolution had been passed it would then be referred to the Committee on Rules. This committee would continue its present power only to the extent of scheduling the priority and length of debate. The Rules Committee, however, could recommend shortening or lengthening the time for debate requested by the committee in charge of a bill as well as the terms under which amendments might be offered.

But if the Rules Committee declined to act, or failed to act, within reasonable time (as it did on several vital occasions in the 80th Cong.) then a privileged motion would be in order.

Curb the Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Monday, December 27, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

CURB THE RULES COMMITTEE

Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of this district, is now sponsoring a plan which, if adopted, will put an end to the House Rules Committee's role as "the graveyard of legislation."

This committee is the most powerful in the House. Though its ostensible function is to fix a timetable and rules of debate for House consideration of bills drawn up in the various committees, actually it has too often proved a roadblock to progress. It has used its powers to strike out from legislation those provisions of which it does not approve. Worse, it has pigeonholed measures to prevent their being voted on at all. Thus in the Eightieth Congress the House Rules Committee, under the reactionary leadership of Representative LEO ALLEN, killed the public housing section of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill and also universal military training legislation.

At present the Rules Committee can be forced eventually to discharge a bill by a petition signed by a majority of the House, but this procedure is cumbersome and dilatory.

Under Representative EBERHARTER'S plan, the chairman of each House legislative committee would propose the rules for debate on bills approved by his committee. Then the Rules Committee would have, at most, 3 weeks in which to modify those rules.

Address by Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, at the Town Hall Dinner Honoring Senator Barkley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on December 15 last, at the Waldorf Astoria, in New York, a dinner was tendered by Town Hall in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. On this very historic and auspicious occasion, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] paid a very fine and deserved tribute to the Senator from Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to have this tribute printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Town Hall has performed a gracious and appropriate act in arranging this dinner in honor of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President-elect of the United States. It is a gracious act because Town Hall has a Nation-wide radio audience built up over the years, an audience which has become accustomed to have presented to it, under the sponsorship of Town Hall, the most important subjects and the most distinguished personalities in the Nation. So, tonight, you pay tribute to one of the greatest public leaders in our history before a distinguished group of business leaders assembled in this hall and before a much larger assemblage of all the people who may be listening on the radio.

It is appropriate because Senator BARKLEY ranks among the great statesmen of this Republic. The modesty, the good humor, and the poise which have always characterized him have, I think, to some extent concealed his great stature. How many of us know, for example, that as majority leader of the Senate he made the greatest record in history. He served longer in that capacity than any man since John Adams, as Vice President under Washington, first opened the sessions of that body.

The 10 years in which he occupied this post were among the most difficult in the life of the Nation. The legislative problems which came before the Senate were among the most controversial ever debated in our Chamber. They covered a wider range of subjects than at any previous time. They required a broader knowledge and greater parliamentary skill than previous occupants of that post were called upon to display. They cast a greater physical and mental burden upon this leader than any of his predecessors was ever called upon to carry.

He discharged this great responsibility with sympathy and patience and when I speak of patience I ask you to remember that he was dealing with a group of Senators who, because they were Democrats, were congenitally inclined to run their own independent course.

It was my privilege to observe Senator BARKLEY throughout this period, including also the two additional years in which he served as minority leader, and I can assure you that even during these two latter years he lost none of the patience and good humor that characterized him during the long period in which his party was in power—in spite of all the temptations.

I shall not speak of Senator BARKLEY as a statesman. A great Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, Thomas Brackett Reed, once said, "A statesman is a dead politician," and the Vice President-elect is anything but dead, as all who will trace his airplane travels during the last 3 months will readily testify. Senator BARKLEY is a real politician, that is to say, he is a man skilled in the science of politics and, may I say, that politics, in the real sense, is not the search for personal preferment or selfish gain, it is the science of government, the science of getting results in the public interest.

All of the great and successful leaders of the United States from Jefferson down through Jackson and Lincoln and both Roosevelts were politicians measured by this standard of the capacity to produce beneficial results in the public good.

The Vice President-elect belongs in this category of great and able politicians and, therefore, when you ask me to say a word upon the Outlook of 1949 I ask you to remember that the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate during that year will be a man skilled as few have been in our history in the science and art of democratic government. The greatest service in the world can be performed now by men who have the capacity to make democratic government work. It is what the world needs. The future of freedom, of economic and political freedom, for individuals throughout the world depends upon the success with which the people and the Government of the United States can demonstrate to all the world that the free system produces better results than any totalitarian or dictatorial regime.

The people of the United States have selected for their Vice President a man who possesses rare qualities of leadership. We shall, however, need more than that. We shall need cooperation among all groups and classes and, above all, we shall need faith in the wisdom of the people of the United States.

We are involved in a world-wide conflict of political and economic objectives, a conflict between the ideology of Soviet Russia, upon the one hand, and that of the democratic nations of the world, upon the other. This dispute is over which system, totalitarian or democratic, will provide the highest and most stable standard of living and of human dignity for the masses of the people.

The leaders of communism tell us that capitalism will fail because they say a capitalistic nation cannot rise above the immediate urge of acquisitiveness to serve the long-range objective of the common good.

So the leaders of the Kremlin go down the road of dictatorship confident that agreement is so difficult among the individuals who constitute a democratic capitalistic society that the latter is bound to collapse through economic depression before its overall objectives can be attained.

The Soviet leaders are waiting for this collapse. It is our task to disappoint them, not through our capacity to make war but through our ability to raise the standard of living for all of the people, to stabilize the economy, and to give the whole world a demonstration of the ability of a free people not only to attain but also to maintain prosperity for all.

Under the leadership which is offered in the new administration represented here tonight by Senator BARKLEY, we are presented with a great opportunity for cooperation. Your Government does not want to impose any rule upon the people. It does not want to regiment or to dictate. It wants to make effective the great objectives of common progress which the people of this land have repeatedly shown they desire to achieve.

This task has been committed to the Government, and, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacities."

The people cannot win the peace of the world in their separate and individual capacities. It must be done by the Government. To do this the Government must be able to call upon all the resources of the people, for unless the peace of the world is established, there will be no resources left for the people or for any group among them.

We must be concerned with more than the outlook for 1949. We must be concerned with the outlook for the future because free institutions cannot survive another war or another depression.

It is war and depression which undermine freedom. How clearly this was seen by another Republican President may be understood from the inaugural address that was delivered 28 years ago on the 4th of March next, by Warren G. Harding:

"I can vision the ideal Republic," said he, "where every man and woman is called under the flag, for assignment to duty, for whatever service, military or civil, the individual is best fitted; where we may call to universal service every plant, agency or facility, all in the sublime sacrifice for country, and not 1 penny of war profit shall inure to the benefit of private individual, corporation, or combination, but all above the normal shall flow into the defense chest of the Nation."

We stand now upon the threshold of a new era of good feeling. The people of the United States have spoken. Their desires have been clearly enunciated. We need only the strengthening of a spirit of understanding and cooperation under wise and tolerant leadership.

Here in the presence of this group and in the presence of the Vice President-elect of the United States, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, I say to you without reservation that you have a Government under wise and tolerant leadership. You can give it your trust and your support.

Record for Speaker Rayburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the popularity of our Speaker is widespread. The dignity and the ability with which he has served as Speaker of this House has often been the subject of newspaper articles and editorials throughout the Nation.

It is pleasing to me that the Courier-Post newspapers of Camden, N. J., within the district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States, has also seen fit to recognize, by an editorial appearing in the issue of these newspapers on January 3, 1949, the qualities that have made Speaker RAYBURN the great man that he is—loved and respected by all who have had the honor to serve with him in the House. It has also been gratifying to note that the editorial likewise stresses the fact that Speaker RAYBURN has served longer

as Speaker than any of his predecessors in that high office.

Under the unanimous consent granted, I herewith insert as part of these remarks the editorial to which I have referred. It reads as follows:

RECORD FOR RAYBURN

Six men have served 8 years as Speaker of the House of Representatives, either consecutively or with intervals between terms. The first five were Henry Clay, of Kentucky; Andrew Stevenson, of Virginia; Schuyler Colfax, of Indiana; Joseph H. Cannon, of Illinois; and Champ Clark, of Missouri.

Some famous names are in that list. Other men who made history as Speaker, however, are missing—"Czar" Reed, Nicholas Longworth, and "Cactus Jack" Garner, to mention some of the more recent ones.

All these will be eclipsed in length of service by SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who now takes office again.

RAYBURN also held the speakership for four terms, prior to losing it to Republican JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, in the Eightieth Congress.

The popular Texan has achieved a truly unique distinction. The Speaker no longer has the autocratic power over legislation exerted by the Reeds and Cannons. A good deal of that power has passed over to the House Rules Committee, and it is doubtful whether the change has been entirely for the better. Yet the Speaker's office remains one of the most important in Washington, and it is good to know that for the next 2 years it will be filled by a man as scrupulously fair and as well liked by his colleagues of both parties as the gentleman from Texas.

Planning for Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planning for Chaos," by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, from the New York Journal-American of December 30, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLANNING FOR CHAOS

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

Success in personal life, as in business, is the outcome of courageous action designed to surmount obstacles.

There are inevitable risks in trade and in the business of living.

Only in the surcease of death is there serenity and complete security.

As the current post-armistice boom is watched for indications that it may be tapering off, there are sufficient inevitable hazards to challenge the mind and the heart of the strongest leaders.

In the circumstances, it seems superfluous to add to the complexities and uncertainties through deliberate, man-made crises.

Nevertheless, the Federal Trade Commission and the Supreme Court created such additional man-made chaos by a somewhat theoretical view of the freight absorption basing point situation.

On the basis of the court ruling in the cement case, the steel industry voluntarily relinquished its time-honored system whereby the seller, in quoting prices, absorbed freight charges.

With uncertainty as to whether the rules of business will be permanently changed, businessmen are in a dither.

Factories had been located throughout the land on the basis of the former belief that the basing point technique was legal and desirable.

If the new view is to prevail, then the economic map of the country needs to be redrawn, and many factories need to be relocated.

At a time when war-bred shortages of factory facilities and housing still exist, it would indeed be more socially useful to use manpower and materials to provide for such pressing human needs rather than to redraw the industrial map in order to satisfy the arbitrary, changing theories of a few highly placed bureaucrats.

Relocations of plants would resemble the type of industry carried on by inmates of a prison who carry boulders down the road and back again just for the self-discipline involved.

While admittedly there is room for argument as to whether a new pricing system might not be as good as the old one, the very practice of needlessly and frivolously changing the rules should be discouraged.

The nature of the technical dispute can perhaps be clarified by an analogy taken from auction bridge. At present the game is played with 52 cards. If a theorist had the power of the Federal Trade Commission and the Supreme Court behind him, he might insist that—say—56 cards would be better. Such an arbitrary ruling would tend to make obsolete and unusable all the decks of cards in the hands of the people.

In light of the uncertainty as to the legal and economic status of the highly technical dispute, the Senate Trade Policies Committee, under the Chairmanship of Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, has been conducting immensely useful hearings into the merits of the basing point. Spokesmen of business and labor unions have spelled out the practical significance of the issue.

Out of the hearings is developing the know-how for a congressional act clearing up the whole muddle.

If the Eighty-first Congress has the wit to pass clarifying legislation, it will contribute to prosperity by ending the present nervousness and chaos. Many job-creating projects are being postponed until business knows which road is legal.

The old basing-point set-up was a system whereby prices, including freight charges, were averaged by the convention of using nominal shipping points, instead of actual ones. It made for simplicity and for the widening of the trading area of a given factory.

In upsetting the old arrangement, the Supreme Court specifically outlawed basing-point pricing where conspiracy is involved. But the vagueness of its legalistic words left some doubt as to whether it did not also forbid all forms of freight absorption by the seller, even in cases where no conspiracy existed.

Senator CAPEHART'S fruitful campaign to write a statute which will substitute clarity and economic soundness for the existing doubt and uncertainty deserves widespread bipartisan support.

There is enough confusion on the horizon without creating unnecessary man-made crises and hurdles.

"Exhuming" an Economic Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 2, 1949, entitled " 'Exhuming' an Economic Law."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXHUMING" AN ECONOMIC LAW

The old and much-maligned law of supply and demand and a few of the other old-fashioned principles of economics and human nature—thought to be dead and buried long since—may play some tricks on the incoming Congress and administration.

You will recall that President Truman and some United States Senators and Representatives were elected on platforms which contained planks calling for Government price and wage control and rationing as necessary means of dealing with inflation.

Although the controls and rationing may have been requested only on a stand-by basis, the very thought of such a course in peacetime made cold shivers run up and down the spines of those possessing any degree of foresight or backsight.

Those with even average memories shuddered to think that OPA conditions might be returning. They remembered the black markets, the empty shelves, the blight on production, the stamp nuisance, and the times when it didn't matter who you were, or what you had, but, rather, whom you knew.

And those who can look ahead a little were terrified by the probable consequences of peacetime rationing and price and wage control. They foresaw the deterioration of production with the great reduction or elimination of profit incentives and, eventually, the police state as more and more controls were added in an endless effort to make effective the controls already imposed.

To the students of economic history it was not a pretty picture. They knew that since the beginning of recorded time man has never found a way to outlaw inflation or legislate prosperity. No; the threatened return of controls was not a happy prospect.

Then, lo, we awaken in the past few weeks to find that some of the economic laws are not dead, but had been put to sleep by the knock-out drops administered by war and Government controls.

Our fifth-grade economics primer used to teach that, in a free economy, supply will tend to equal effective demand. That simply means that if the supply of goods exceeds demand, prices will drop until the supply is reduced and brought into balance. And, conversely, if effective demand (demand backed by money or credit to buy with), exceeds supply, prices will go up, stimulating more production until the supply is increased sufficiently to equal demand.

It is an economic law, as faithful in operation as the natural or physical law of gravity, provided you have a free economy and don't tamper too much with it so that it gets a chance to work.

Since the termination of OPA the law of supply and demand has had a chance to work and it has been working. Now, for the first time since 1941, the supply of most

things is about equal to demand. In many cases supply exceeds effective demand at these prices, so many prices are on their way down. We all should hope that they do not go down too fast or too far.

So controls are becoming quite unlikely. Price control is not needed if the price trend is downward. And rationing does not make sense if goods are in surplus.

After Taft-Hartley, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "After Taft-Hartley, What?" from the December 30 issue of the Register-Guard, of Eugene, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER TAFT-HARTLEY, WHAT?

Out of our experiences with the Wagner Act and with the Taft-Hartley Act, there is an opportunity for the Eighty-first Congress to evolve a new program which will salvage out of both laws those features which have proved good, discard those which have been proved bad. There is need of a new law for labor relations, under a new name, and we believe it can be achieved, if the two great factions will approach the problem now with tolerance and with full recognition of the fact that "the success of any law must rest on public consent."

In the January issue of Fortune there is a forthright discussion of this situation by Archibald Cox, professor of labor law at Harvard, in which he offers this keynote: "The time is ripe for both industry and labor to repudiate the extreme positions already rejected by public opinion."

In the Wagner Act labor received its Magna Carta, the right to bargain collectively was guaranteed, and this is a guaranty which must be preserved and protected, but the Wagner Act went too far when it denied to the employer virtually all rights, including the right to talk freely with his employees.

The Taft-Hartley Act was the creature of the Congress elected at the end of the war which reflected the reaction of the American people to the many excesses which were perpetrated by labor unions under the cover of the Wagner Act. Now the Taft-Hartley Act has been repudiated, and Professor Cox reads this meaning into the 1948 election:

"There is an equally powerful public conviction that union abuses should not be made to cover a general attack on labor unions."

And we find the progressive magazine Business Week expressing the situation another way:

"Only a police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects. The Taft-Hartley law crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate from one which could destroy."

The Taft-Hartley Act was not so bad in its entirety as it was painted by labor leaders, but as the Christian Science Monitor points out:

"Given a depression and a surplus of labor, and an unfriendly administration, employers who wished could (1) wait for or bring about strikes on wages and hours; (2) replace just enough strikers with strikebreakers; (3) demand collective-bargaining elections in which replaced strikers could not vote; (4) throw out the unions."

But, from the public point of view, it will be as great a mistake to interpret the 1948 election as a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and put nothing constructive in its place as it was to interpret the 1946 congressional elections as a mandate to repeal the Wagner Act and hand the employers the driver's seat and the whip.

The public demands that both labor and management shall be regulated and shall accept such procedures as will protect both sides in their essential rights, but forbid both to indulge in those practices which lead to constant turmoil and imperil the safety and welfare of the public.

There is need of a new labor relations law, under a new name embodying what is sound and fair and acceptable out of past experience. There is need of a law which will be so fair that it will have behind it the great American principle of consent.

Europe-First Policy Has Weakened United States in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of January 2, 1949:

EUROPE-FIRST POLICY HAS WEAKENED UNITED STATES IN PACIFIC

(By Constantine Brown)

The American military strategy of World War II—which was to concentrate our principal effort on Europe while making the Pacific a secondary theater of operations, to be taken care of after the defeat of the Axis—is being repeated now in the diplomatic field.

President Roosevelt, who was Commander in Chief of American armed forces in fact as well as name, had good reasons for directing his admirals and generals to liquidate the European war first. The Nazis and their associates unquestionably were the strongest of the Axis combination.

The British, the Russians, and other Allies clamored for action against the Germans and Italians first, fearing with good reason that if we were to direct our main effort against Japan, they might be overpowered by the Germans.

Top strategists and logistic experts in Washington agreed that a victory against Japan at the expense of our effort in Europe would be futile if, during the interval, Hitler succeeded in overwhelming Britain and Russia.

SITUATION IS CHANGED

During World War II we had to keep in mind the power of resistance of our European associates. We were not fighting the war alone. The people across the Atlantic had not been exhausted, as they are now. We had not become the main target for destruction on the Nazis' schedule. The Nazi ideological propaganda had failed utterly in this country and we were one united Nation in our fight against nazism and fascism.

The situation is different now. We have become the No. 1 enemy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, whose boundaries extend from western Germany to the Pacific. We are the only barrier to this semi-Asiatic expansion, which has been making great strides since 1945 by a policy of terrorism.

The nations adjoining Russia have, for the most part, succumbed to the Kremlin's attack. Those more distant from the Soviet Union—such as Italy, France, and the lesser western European states—are in constant turmoil created by agents of the Moscow Politburo with the indirect support of the masses of Red soldiers, poised within striking distance of their frontiers.

If it had not been for America's direct intervention with many billions of dollars to support non-Communist governments, there is little doubt that those governments would have come under the domination of the Kremlin. Their physical power of resistance was destroyed by World War II, and the will to survive as free and independent states would have been no real obstacle to the Soviet drive, which would have enlisted segments of the intellectual and labor classes in each country.

DOMINATION IS THE AIM

Communism does not establish itself in a country by the free will of the people. It establishes itself by the domination of the few over the great majority. Had it not been for the active intervention of the United States in European affairs, the Old World would have come under the Russian heel.

This is realized even more acutely in Moscow than in America, and it has increased the determination of the handful of men who rule the destinies of hundreds of millions to crush this opposition.

Because we are so much closer intellectually to Europe than to Asia, our major strategic interests have been sacrificed by our diplomats to our ideological emotionalism over the old country. The Russians, however, are not emotional in their policies. They appreciated soon enough that we would neglect the Pacific again, and impelled America—by means of the cold war and semiviolent actions—to direct its effort toward Europe at the expense of our real interests in the Pacific.

While we were worrying about Europe, from which periodic rumors reached us that the Soviet armies might attack at almost any time, we neglected the Pacific.

HELPED CHINA'S WAR

While waging a cold war in Europe, the Russians were helping to keep the shooting war going in China. Within 2 years, the armies of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek have been pulverized by the Communists, headed by the Moscow-trained Mao Tse-tung. When China finally collapses, the strategically most important lands of Asia may follow.

The Russians realize what we apparently have failed to do. They know that America will be far more vulnerable if they gain possession of the great arc extending from the Kurile Islands to the Indian Ocean than if they simply take all of Europe.

In spite of the difficulty of obtaining positive information from inside the U. S. S. R., even the feared MVD has not been able to prevent information from reaching this country about the military establishments organized by the Soviet high command in the area facing Alaska. While our intelligence services may lack complete details, they know that there are upward of 10 divisions, including 3 paratroop divisions, in the region between Vladivostok and Wrangel Island in the Arctic. Between 3,000 and 4,000 planes are available at airfields constructed since 1944, principally with lend-lease materials.

High-octane gasoline plants have been established in the vicinity of those fields, with equipment provided by the United States during the war. Until last June, Soviet tankers carried large quantities of gas and oil from the west coast to Siberia. It was more convenient for our Soviet friends to purchase these in America and send them to Vladivostok nad Nikolaevsk than to ship gasoline from Baku and other oil-producing centers in European Russia.

STRATEGY BECOMES CLEAR

These men and planes are not stationed in what once was the wasteland of Siberia for purposes of sport and recreation. Obviously they have a definite mission. Since we would not move in that area, even if we had aggressive intentions toward the U. S. S. R., the logical conclusion is that these troops and planes have been located where they will be handy in case Russia decides to carry out another Pearl Harbor on Alaska.

The Alaska Territory—and this may sound strange to the average American—is completely defenseless. The few troops we had there last summer—some 7,000 in all—have been moved back to the United States, because not enough money was appropriated to provide them with winter quarters. It is no exaggeration to say that today the Soviets could move into Alaska without meeting more than perfunctory opposition from the ground crews on our airfields.

What is more tragic is that if Russia decides to put its scheme into effect and the Moscow dictators act in the same manner as Tojo did December 7, 1941, the Soviet forces would face no more than two and a half fully trained divisions, which is all we possess in the continental territory of the United States. So much for the short-range danger to this country.

WEAK IN PACIFIC

Our position in the Pacific is becoming weaker by the day. The Nanking Government and Generalissimo Chiang may be considered as eliminated from the international picture. Strategically vital Manchuria now is in the hands of the Reds. The most optimistic estimates are that it will not be long before the "democratic" government of North Korea takes over the south, where a free government has been established. Korea is of strategic importance because of its proximity to the Japanese islands.

In his frequent and alarming reports from Tokyo, General MacArthur repeatedly has pointed out that the establishment of the Reds on the Yangtze River and in Korea will make his position in Japan untenable, unless large reinforcements are sent to him from the United States. He has explained that with the Russians making great strides on the Asiatic mainland, our position in Japan is rapidly deteriorating. The Japanese Communist movement, which only a year ago was hardly noticeable, is gaining new strength among the Socialists.

Japan cannot produce and sell unless it has free access to the Chinese mainland, and especially to Manchuria. With that whole area in the hands of the Communists, Japan has only dim prospects for the future and her sole hope, say the representatives of business, lies in closer association with the Communists. Since this is not possible unless Japan embraces the Communist form of government, they believe that Japan ultimately will be compelled to do so, although it will involve giving up the Emperor and all of Japan's traditions.

CONCERN IN HOKKAIDO

General MacArthur does not conceal his concern over a possible Russian coup in the near future in the island of Hokkaido. He remembers that in December 1945 when Secretary of State Byrnes went to Moscow to discuss the various problems with Foreign Minister Molotov, he agreed in principle to the Russian demand that Russian troops participate in the occupation of Japan, in accordance with the Japanese armistice. He also yielded to the request by Mr. Molotov that Russian troops be separated from other forces of occupation and be permitted to take over Hokkaido.

Energetic protests from General MacArthur, who claimed the right as supreme commander of the Allied powers to designate the numbers of troops and their assignment, compelled our Government to refuse to confirm the agreement, which is believed to have been verbal.

But the Russians did not give up. Because of diplomatic and other considerations they did not insist. But there are reports now from Moscow and Vladivostok that General MacArthur might be confronted one of these mornings by a strong Soviet expeditionary force ready to take over Hokkaido, in accordance with the armistice terms.

The British, Australians, and French have withdrawn practically all of their troops from Honshu. By the end of March there will be only a corporal's guard in that Japanese island. We still have about 100,000 men in Japan, with half that number combat troops. But unless they are strongly reinforced, they will not be able to cope with the situation.

This is not, of course, a cheerful new year picture. But unfortunately it is a correct one. In our efforts to hold off the Russians in Europe the diplomats have overruled the military leaders and are letting Asia go by default.

State Cigarette Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to curtail the nefarious practice of evading tax on cigarettes by mail-order firms who are now sending cigarettes through the mail, into those States having a tax on the sale of cigarettes. There are now 39 States who levy taxes on cigarettes. These taxes range from 10 to 80 cents on a carton of 10 packages. They are taxes on the consumer of cigarettes, and by ordering from concerns in tax-free States, the citizen evades the law and does not pay his share of the cigarette tax.

Certain mail-order houses through radio and newspaper advertising make inducements to the consumer to save this tax by direct shipment to the consumer. It is estimated that 20 percent of the entire consumption of cigarettes in some States evade the State tax. This of course reduces the revenue to those States. The 39 States having taxes on cigarettes collect nearly $400,000,000 from this source. It can be readily seen that when they lose 15 or 20 percent of this tax, it is a considerable loss. It seems that wholesale distributors in nontax States secure a list of cigarette smokers in States which impose cigarette taxes and then circularize the list with tempting offers to mail their remittances in advance for cigarettes which will be sent to them by mail, thus saving the amount of the State tax. The House did pass a bill last year which would prevent some of these mail-order houses from sending tax-free cigarettes through the mail.

It seems to me that it ought to be a function of Congress to protect the States in this form of bootlegging of cigarettes.

The bill I am introducing is designed to stop this type of mockery and evasion of the law. It will be of benefit to those wholesalers and retailers who are not bootlegging cigarettes. These deserving businessmen are now penalized merely because they are located in the States which impose a cigarette tax or refuse to violate the law.

The Federal Government in 1947 collected about one and a quarter billion dollars in cigarette taxes.

The bill, if enacted into law, does not require another governmental agency. It merely places in the hands of the State tax administrator, the means for removing any inequity in the collection of State taxes on cigarettes. It does seem to me that Congress should come to the rescue of those States who do have a cigarette tax, and that it is in the public interest to see that they are protected.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Portland Labor-Management Committee regarding management and labor relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas one of the functions of the Portland Labor-Management Committee is to provide and recommend orderly and peaceful procedures for labor or management to settle their disputes and to assist in any manner possible to protect the rights of the public and to further recommend, promote, and assist in closer, harmonious relations between labor and management in the city of Portland and in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the Portland Labor-Management Committee has been successful since its inception in maintaining its influence and by its actions a stabilized friendly condition between labor and management in this area; and

Whereas the fact that the cost of living, Bureau of Labor index all items for the city of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity has been a major factor in the settlement of labor relation disputes due to four out of five contract negotiations either being determined direct by the percentage increase of the cost of living, Bureau of Labor Statistics Index, or by the Index constituting a major factor; and

Whereas such Bureau of Labor statistics index figures for the city of Portland, Oreg., and vicinity are being surveyed and released

only in 3 months' periods rather than monthly as in other larger areas and cities in the United States; and

Whereas such delay in the issuance by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the index for this particular area has brought about disputes and misunderstandings due to there being no computable or acceptable index to replace it during the months in which it is not issued for this area; and because such issuance has been found impossible by the Bureau of Labor Statistics due to the curtailment of appropriations to the United States Department of Labor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Portland Labor-Management Committee recommend to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics that if any surplus funds are available in the Department that such moneys as are necessary be allotted to the Bureau of Labor Statistics to permit issuing a 30-day Cost of Living Index for the Portland area; and be it further

Resolved, That should no such funds be available that the Portland Labor-Management Committee recommend to the Congress of the United States that sufficient moneys be appropriated to the United States Department of Labor in order that its subdivision, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, be enabled to function in a manner compatible in the best interests of labor and management in this area; that the statistics showing the Cost of Living Index may be issued on a monthly basis; and that the Department of Labor so order the Bureau of Labor Statistics to issue these indexes on a monthly basis for the Portland area as soon as sufficient moneys have been appropriated and as soon as feasible thereafter in order that labor and management may take advantage and use timely these statistics so necessary in the prompt and orderly settlement of labor management disputes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Senators GUY CORDON and WAYNE MORSE and United States Congressman HOMER D. ANGELL.

(Resolution passed this 27th day of October 1948 by the officers and board of directors of the Portland Labor-Management Committee.)

Curtailing Power of Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to curtail the power of the Rules Committee for the purpose of making more certain the consideration of legislation by the House is a progressive move and entitled to the support it has received.

I am now and always have been strongly of the opinion that the Rules Committee should not have the right to substitute its judgment on proposed legislation in the place and stead of the regular committees of the House. The latter are authorized by the Rules of the House to study and report legislation within their respective jurisdictions. Such reports are preceded by hearings in which interested parties are given an opportunity to express their views for or against the proposed legislation. After days, and sometimes weeks of hearings, together with careful consideration by the members of the committee, the report is finally made to the House. However, notwithstanding all of this preliminary study it has been necessary in most cases in addition thereto to obtain approval of the Rules Committee before the House could consider the bill. Many times, regardless of what political party was in control of the House, I have seen legislation of worth-while character prevented from coming to the floor of the House by either the refusal or adverse action of the Rules Committee. This in my opinion is not representative government at its best. Therefore I have given my support to the proposed amendment.

In giving my support to the amended rule I am, nevertheless, aware of the fact that even this new rule will not necessarily insure that all legislation approved by appropriate committees will come before the House for action. In my opinion the amendment could and should have been stronger in its terms to insure this result. However, it is better than the old procedure that so often was utilized to thwart the will of the House.

Too often the Rules Committee has exercised an arbitrary attitude. Frequently it has prevented consideration by the House of progressive and worthwhile legislation desired by the people. Furthermore, in most instances, members of the Rules Committee have cast their votes behind closed doors. Consequently, in many cases of important legislation the public has not known who voted for or against the consideration of the legislation by the House. Therefore, even with the limitations of the new rule it is in my opinion a great improvement over the rule that has been in existence for many years. Public business should be done in the open and representatives of the people in Congress should have the right to express upon behalf of their constituency, by their votes on the floor of the House on all proposed legislation what they consider to be the will of the people whom they represent.

The proposal to discharge the Rules Committee of legislation by giving to the chairman of the committee that approved the legislation the unrestricted right to move for such discharge after the expiration of 21 days, is undoubtedly a step in the right direction. It makes it possible for legislation to be considered by the entire House Membership instead of by the few Members constituting the Rules Committee. Thus, the people, through their elected Representatives are empowered to have a direct vote on all matters of legislation that has been approved by the standing committee of the House having jurisdiction in the matter.

Ours is a representative form of government. To achieve the accomplishments that such a form of government is intended to provide it must be representative in fact as well as in name. To the extent that it is not it will fail to accomplish all that it should. The amendment of the rule, that has so long held sway, is an effort to eliminate arbitrary action of the few and substitute the action of all the members, and, thus provide more representative government. It consequently has my fullest support.

Majority Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if the exhibition in the House on Monday is a fair example of what we may expect from the Eighty-first Congress, representative government, as we know it, faces some rough going at this session. Discussion and floor revision are of the very essence of sound legislation. Yet in the very first measure presented to us for consideration, on a subject and at a time which furnished no justification for such action, both debate and amendment were foreclosed by the parliamentary device selected by the majority.

It is recognized that there are some types of legislation which inherently do not lend themselves to the privilege of amendment from the floor in the interests of orderly procedure. Certainly the rules governing the conduct of proceedings in the House do not fall in this category.

Also, at some points in the progress of the Legislative Calendar, notably at the end of a session, there may be some justification, because of the time element, for shutting off debate and curtailing amendments. Even then this imposition of a gag should be administered sparingly. Indeed, I can think of almost no situation which justifies the procedure adopted here of presenting a resolution, immediately moving the previous question and thereby completely eliminating any possibility for discussion, debate, or questions from the floor. Certainly at the very beginning of the session, when there is ample time for debate and when the Congress is in session for only 3 or 4 days a week and then only perhaps 2 hours a day, the membership should not be saddled with an important change in its basic rules of procedure, even assuming the eminent soundness of the change which does not presently appear, without a thorough exploration of the pros and cons of this important subject.

As soon as I gained any familiarity at all with the rules governing the conduct in the House, I became convinced that they should be changed to prevent the Committee on Rules, composed of 12 members, from blocking consideration by the entire membership of legislation which has been favorably considered by one of the legislative committees.

I agree that one of the first things we should do at this session is to put our own house in order. We should take effective action to end the possibility of virtual minority rule by seven members.

The present permissive procedure by discharge petition to bring a bill to the floor of the House is admittedly not adequate to insure consideration of important measures by the membership.

In an effort, however, to remedy an abuse resulting from the concentration of too much power in the hands of one committee of 12 Members representing both political parties, we have now created a situation fraught with possibilities of infinitely greater danger by vesting dictatorial authority to two men, the chairman of a legislative committee and the Speaker, both necessarily of the majority. Through the medium of the votes which they control the majority has seen fit to deprive the minority of any voice whatever in the scheduling of legislation for consideration. Concededly the majority should be dominant. That is the way democracy works. My vigorous opposition is to the usurpation of dictatorial power.

Through his power to recognize a committee chairman or withhold recognition, the Speaker will become an absolute dictator over the course of legislation. Although we all have profound respect for the gentleman from Texas who has resumed the post of Speaker, that fact has no bearing on the consideration of this legislation. It is the principle of one-man dictatorship under the claim of liberalism which I am attacking.

We were not sent here to delegate our prerogatives to another. True, it will grease the wheels for another rubber-stamp Congress such as we witnessed in the middle thirties, but such a maneuver should be fought tooth and nail by every Representative, regardless of political affiliation, who intends to vote his own convictions rather than turn over to someone else his legislative responsibility.

Under a false veneer of liberalism, this is reaction of the rankest type.

Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following, which I received from Mr. Edward F. Connelly, chairman, social-security committee, Associated Industries of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.:

AUGUST 13, 1948.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
Lawrence, Mass.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are enclosing a memorandum with reference to a situation of serious magnitude that faces one of the most important departments in the State government, namely, the operations of its employment-security division, engaged in the task of administering the Commonwealth's unemployment-compensation law.

The memorandum speaks for itself in its emphasis upon the immediate necessity for securing for Massachusetts additional funds whereby the division can efficiently administer its law. In the absence of these additional funds, we can assure you that the present problems which face the Commonwealth under its unemployment-compensation system will increase tenfold.

We urge you in the strongest fashion we know to help in securing additional administrative funds, and as quickly as possible thereafter to bring about a change in the law that will permit the Commonwealth of Massachusetts itself to determine the disposition that shall be made of the funds which members now pay to the State government for the administration of unemployment compensation.

Until this absentee control of the administration of the Commonwealth's law is finally eliminated, we shall continue to be completely frustrated in any efforts that are made to make our unemployment-compensation system serve the purpose for which it was originally created.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. CONNELLY,
Chairman, Social Security Committee, Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEM OF THE MASSACHUSETTS EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION

It is not too much to say that the problem of employment security in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is today rising to the point of desperateness. The factor that has intensified the problem to the breaking point, is the recent cut by the Federal Bureau of Employment Security of $504,000 in the request of the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security for administrative funds for the last 6 months of 1948.

During the first 6 months of 1948, the allotment by the Federal Bureau to the Commonwealth's division of employment security for the administration of the latter's employment security and employment service programs, was $2,785,293. The Commonwealth's division requested $2,857,651 as administrative funds for the last 6 months of 1948; the regional representative of the Federal Bureau of Employment Security recommended $2,787,605; the Federal Bureau approved $2,353,484.

The amount requested by the Massachusetts division for the last 6 months of 1948 was 3.8 percent more than for the first 6 months, which was the lowest percent increase sought in the Nation. The amount actually allocated by the Federal Bureau to the Massachusetts division represented, under one method of calculation, the third highest cut of requested allocation of all States in the Nation, and under another method of calculation, the second highest cut.

On a yearly basis the amount allocated to Massachusetts for the administration of its employment security and employment service functions, is approximately $4,707,000, whereas the three-tenths of 1 percent Federal unemployment compensation tax on wages sent by Massachusetts employers to Washington now is in the neighborhood of $10,000,000.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the administration of its division of employment security has the reputation of being one of the most, if not the most, efficiently administered employment security divisions in the United States. The fact that the Commonwealth's requested increase in allocation for the last 6 months of 1948 over the first 6 months of 1948; namely, 3.8 percent, was the lowest percent increase requested in the entire Nation, is indicative of the care with which this Commonwealth administers the fund, and of the efficiency of its operations.

Under the circumstances, the cut in the requested allocation can only mean that employees must be laid off. It can only mean that the efficiency of the Bureau will be seriously impaired. It can only mean that levied on top of the other problems that face the Commonwealth in its employment security problem, the net result is that we have truly reached a stage of desperation in our unemployment compensation problems.

Despite the extraordinary employment condition that exists now in Massachusetts beyond any previous expectation, we are paying out unemployment-compensation benefits under our law at the rate of $50,000,000 a year. Last year we paid out over $53,000,000 in benefits. The provisions of the Massachusetts law are so attractive in their incentive to individuals to remain unemployed that the pressures upon the Massachusetts Employment Security Division are tremendous, and require the most careful administration in order that the law may not run wild and become an object lesson throughout the Nation.

No analysis of the problems of the division of employment security can be made without reaching the conclusion that we have truly come to a stage of desperateness that requires the immediate action on both the State level and the national level.

The immediate problem is to find the means whereby additional moneys can immediately be allocated to Massachusetts in order that the efficiency of the administration of the Massachusetts division may not recede to the point where millions of dollars of increased cost will accrue, and where, in the absence of proper administration, benefit checks would be held up for weeks beyond the time when they should be properly paid.

It is obvious from the present plight of Massachusetts that the absentee control now exercised by the Federal Government over the administration of our law is an error of the gravest magnitude. Efficient administration of such a program can never be attained under a continuance of this relationship, and it is a fraud on Massachusetts when it is taxed to the extent of approximately $10,000,000 for the administration of the law and receives in return less than $5,000,000 under circumstances where the more efficiently the attempt is made to avoid unnecessary expense, the greater becomes the problem of securing the moneys that are needed for the proper administration of the law.

If the heart of the problem is to be reached, the law must be changed in Congress to allow Massachusetts to determine what amount should be spent for administrative purposes, and the employers who are taxed for these administrative funds insist that this be done.

But there is the immediate responsibility resting upon the State government and the representatives of the Commonwealth in Congress to immediately seek and obtain from the Federal Bureau of Employment Security the necessary funds to enable the Commonwealth to meet the desperateness of the situation with which it is now faced.

EDWARD F. CONNELLY,
Chairman, Social Security Committee, Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

The Late Honorable John J. Delaney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, one of my warmest friends, a Member of this

House, has passed away since the recess of the special session.

The death of the Honorable John J. Delaney, who represented the Seventh District of the State of New York since the Sixty-fifth Congress and the Seventy-second Congress, has saddened his many friends on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Delaney for years was active in the civic, religious, and fraternal life of his community and represented with great ability his district in the House of Representatives.

I have been closely associated with Jack Delaney since I first came to the Congress. I counted him as one of my personal friends. He was a man of great understanding, sympathetic to all who brought their problems to him, and a great humanitarian.

To his widow, his son, and his daughter I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Justice George A. Larkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there has just been retired from the bench because of age a great jurist who has rendered conspicuous service as a lawyer, as a distinguished justice, and as an outstanding American. I refer to Justice George A. Larkin, of Olean, N. Y. I include as a part of my remarks his record as published in the Olean Times-Herald of December 31, 1948:

JUSTICE LARKIN ENDS CAREER ON BENCH—TO RETIRE SATURDAY

Justice George A. Larkin of the Appellate Division, New York State Supreme Court, stepped down from the bench today, ending a judicial career that spans 33 years.

Justice Larkin's retirement Saturday, January 1, 1949, is mandatory under the retirement law.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey appointed Justice Henry J. Kimball, Watertown, who has been serving on a temporary basis, to a full 5-year term as a regular associate justice to succeed Justice Larkin.

Justice R. Foster Piper, Buffalo, was named by the Governor to a temporary appointment in place of Justice Kimball.

SURROGATE IN 1915

Justice Larkin has served 33 years on the bench. His first judicial office was that of surrogate judge for Cattaraugus County, to which he was elected in 1915.

After serving 2 years, he resigned to be elected county judge on both Republican and Democratic tickets. After his 6-year term as county judge ended in 1923 he was elected supreme-court justice, and his 1937 bid for reelection was successful.

He was elected that year for a 14-year term, but the law requires trial and appellate jurists to retire at age 70, which Justice Larkin reached December 10.

He was appointed to the appellate division of the supreme court by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey January 1, 1944, succeeding Justice Harley N. Crosby, of Falconer.

NATIVE OF OLEAN

Justice Larkin was born in Olean December 10, 1878, and was educated in the public and parochial schools of this city. He was a member of the first graduating class of St. Mary of the Angels Parochial School in 1893, and in 1895 he graduated from Olean High School.

Then, in a competitive examination, he won a New York State scholarship for Cornell University from Cattaraugus County. He entered Cornell in 1896, winning also a competitive examination for a university scholarship. He graduated from Cornell in 1900, having been elected to Phi Beta Kappa, national scholastic fraternity, and having also become a leading track athlete at Cornell.

STARTS LAW PRACTICE

After leaving Cornell, he returned to his home town to study law in the office of Carey, Rumsey, and Hastings. In 1903 he was admitted to the bar.

Taking an early interest in politics, Justice Larkin successfully managed the candidacy of a Republican candidate for mayor of Olean in 1907 and again in 1913.

He served as city attorney from 1907 to 1909, and in 1915 he entered a spirited primary contest for the Republican nomination for surrogate of Cattaraugus County. He won the contest and in the fall of that year was elected surrogate for a 6-year term.

ON TWO TICKETS

In the 1917 compaign for county judge he ran as both Republican and Democratic nominee.

In the 1923 campaign for justice of the supreme court he was the Republican candidate, and in the 1937 campaign he was the standard bearer for the Republican and Democratic Parties, being endorsed by both judicial conventions.

Soon after his reelection in 1937, Justice Larkin became widely known through western New York when he presided at an extraordinary term of supreme court in Buffalo to investigate municipal affairs in that city. He was appointed to that term by Gov. Herbert H. Lehman.

Justice Larkin is a member of the Cattaraugus County Bar Association, the City Club of Olean, the Bartlett Country Club, and the Olean Lodge of Elks. He is a member of the Olean Council of the Knights of Columbus and the Holy Name Society of St. Mary of the Angels Church.

Justice Larkin's office has been located in the First National Bank Building. He lives at 144 South Union Street.

Supreme Court Decision in Cement Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "United States Supreme Court Decision in Cement Case Brings Serious Problem," delivered by me and published in the journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists on December 20, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION IN CEMENT CASE BRINGS SERIOUS PROBLEM

(By HOMER E. CAPEHART, United States Senator from Indiana)

The Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case has created a great deal of confusion as to what pricing practices are now legal.

This uncertainty involves uniform national delivered prices, uniform zone prices, freight equalization practices, and freight absorption to meet the lower price of a competitor located closer to the customer.

Not only are businessmen and their lawyers in disagreement as to the legality of these pricing practices, but the members of the Federal Trade Commission and their staff are in equal disagreement among themselves. This confusion as to what practices businessmen may lawfully follow does not promote the best interests of our industrial economy. It seems to me that businessmen who wish to be law-abiding citizens are entitled to know what pricing practices they may lawfully follow.

The Trade Commission has done a commendable job in policing price-fixing conspiracies. It must remain free to continue to do so. There is no room in our economy for price-fixing conspiracies.

The attacks of the Federal Trade Commission on price-fixing conspiracies have my wholehearted and sincere approval.

The fundamental question which must now be answered is: What about delivered prices and freight absorption which are not practiced by conspiracy or agreement among sellers?

In 1936 a bill was introduced in Congress for the admitted purpose of outlawing delivered prices and the basing-point systems.

Later a bill was introduced in Congress which would have defined "price" in the Robinson-Patman Act as meaning the seller's "mill net."

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has said that that definition of "price" would have outlawed delivered prices and basing-point systems.

In 1941 Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY'S TNEC advocated legislation of a similar nature.

The proposed legislation was supported by the Federal Trade Commission.

In each case, Congress refused to pass the bill outlawing delivered prices and the basing-point systems.

Finding the pricing policies which will best serve to further our American free enterprise competitive system is most important.

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has appointed an advisory council of 47 people to aid in finding the answer to that question. They include businessmen from all sections of the country. Some are small-business men, others are from rather large companies. The advisory council also includes prominent economists, labor union leaders, farm group leaders, and representatives of chambers of commerce. We tried to procure for the advisory council representatives of as many parts of the country and as many segments of our national economy as the limitations of a working group permitted.

The advisory council is at liberty to reach any conclusions and to follow any course in making its study which it thinks proper and beneficial.

At the opening session of the advisory council, without meaning in any way to limit the scope of its study, I told the members that I would be grateful to them for whatever help they could give our committee in reaching bedrock with respect to four questions which I feel must be answered to determine what pricing policies will best serve our national economy.

Referring to the pricing policies apparently advocated by the Federal Trade Commission, I asked the advisory council to help answer these questions:

1. Will these pricing policies foster and promote competition in industry and advance the free enterprise American way of business life?

2. Will these pricing policies promote a beneficial decentralization of industry in the furtherance of our national security?

3. What will be the effect of these pricing policies on the cost to the consumer of the manufactured articles he buys?

4. Will these pricing policies result in shifts in population which will materially affect the Nation?

The answers to those questions will be of considerable help to the inquiry we are now making.

THREE STATUTES

The Federal Trade Commission attacks pricing policies under three statutes: (1) the Sherman Act, which prohibits all price-fixing conspiracies; (2) the Federal Trade Commission Act, which prohibits unfair methods of competition; and (3) the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, which prohibits price discriminations.

The Federal Trade Commission takes the view that price-fixing conspiracies may be most readily eliminated by compelling all sellers in heavy industries to sell f. o. b. mill. This would result in different delivered prices to different buyers of the same sellers. It would also result in different prices to the same buyer from different sellers. Such pricing practices would substantially eliminate agreements to fix prices at uniform levels. But uniform f. o. b. mill pricing would also do a great many other things to our national economy.

Congress must determine whether the cure is worse than the disease.

The Federal Trade Commission contends that a single seller individually and knowingly following a pricing practice parallel to his competitors is guilty of collusive action.

Most businessmen feel that parallel conduct resulting from conspiracy must stand on wholly different ground from parallel conduct resulting from honest competition.

The Federal Trade Commission has further contended that buyers located close to the seller's mill have an economic right to buy at lower prices than more distantly located buyers. It calls this the advantage of location.

VARYING MILL NET PRICES

The Federal Trade Commission also contends that price discriminations occur whenever a seller has varying mill net prices among his buyers. Varying mill net prices occur whenever a seller sells at the same price to two customers who are located at unequal distances from his plant. These discriminations are illegal when the Federal Trade Commission finds they may injure competition.

The Federal Trade Commission says that economic philosophy is directed at achieving price competition. Its goal in the field of competition seems to be limited to the level of price. It does not seem concerned with competition at the levels of service, quality, or business integrity.

The pricing policies that may be lawfully followed are of considerable concern to industry. But the larger and the far more important question is: What pricing policies will serve the best interests of the Nation? That issue involves the economic future of the country as well as our national security.

We must explore the pricing policy based on advantage of location.

It is the obligation of Congress to determine the extent to which advantage of location will alter the economic future of the country and our ability to defend ourselves against foreign aggressors. We must determine whether a business enterprise should be required to locate its plant at that site having a freight advantage of location, or whether industry should be permitted to locate at a site which is desirable as to raw materials, labor, climatic conditions, available markets and security from bombing attacks by foreign aggressors, in addition to the advantage of location freightwise.

NATURE DECIDES

Coal, iron ore, sand, silica, limestone, timber, clay, oil and countless other minerals are found only where nature deposited them. Sugar, corn, and countless other commodities may be grown only in the soil which nature conditioned for that purpose. Such basic commodities are the primary ingredients of a number of the products of American industry, including steel. The greatest number of products are generally consumed where the most people live. But nature did not locate our minerals and farm lands at the same locations chosen by man for our highly populated areas.

Chicago is a substantial business center near the center of the Nation. It has a large consuming population. Thus there are many advantages in locating a plant in southern Illinois, Iowa, or Wisconsin. We must find out if a producer is to be required to locate in Chicago in order to compete in that market. It does not seem to be an answer to say that he may locate in Iowa and adjust his plant price to that level which, with the addition of freight to Chicago, will permit him to compete in that market, for the freight to Chicago is different from the freight to St. Louis or Omaha. And the seller may wish to compete in all three markets.

At this point, it may well be asked why the inbound freight advantage of one seller doesn't offer the outbound freight advantage of the other seller, and leave each in an equal competitive position. This would be true if there were only two manufacturers in an industry, or, if all manufacturers in an industry were competing only in one market.

The Robinson-Patman Act, however, seems to require a seller to have a uniform mill net price to all of his competing customers.

A seller might be able to adjust his mill price so that the delivered price will be competitive in any one market, but it does not appear possible for a seller to have a uniform mill net price which will permit his delivered prices to be competitive in all of the markets which he may choose to invade. It has long been the unquestioned practice of manufacturers of shirts, shoes, and suits to equalize their material costs. I suppose that you small fellows pay a part of the cost for the extra material that I get in the clothes I buy.

MANUFACTURERS PROTEST

Manufacturers have asked why they cannot equalize the cost of freight between their nearby customer and the distant customer if they can equalize the cost of material between small and large manufacturers. Many substantial industrial plants in America are now compelled to pay substantially higher prices for steel because they are not located near steel mills. Some say they must move their factory to a more advantageous location if freight absorption is to be outlawed. Quite recently the owners of plants in Muskegon, Mich., and Watertown, N. Y., said they would have to move to Pittsburgh if freight absorption were not permitted.

The Congress has the serious problem of determining whether investments in plants in such cities as Muskegon and Watertown whose location have a freight disadvantage are to be wiped out. We must also consider the welfare of the many people who have made their homes in those communities.

I have said on many occasions that I favor those pricing practices which will best promote competition in our American free enterprise competitive system. I am sure the members of the Federal Trade Commission want to promote competition. And I am certain that the Congress has for its fixed policy the promotion of competition in American industry. But we must determine what pricing practices will best serve those purposes.

I have pointed out the activities of the Federal Trade Commission to achieve price competition. It seems to be conceded, however, that buyers will not, and competitively cannot, pay more for identical steel, cement, or other similar commodities from one seller than from another seller. Thus, we must find out whether we should require buyers of steel and cement to purchase only from the closest seller in order to receive the lowest price. Or, shall we permit other sellers to invade those territories by meeting those prices? Shall we give the buyer a choice in his source of supply?

Service and quality of products are vital in any business. Many buyers are vitally concerned with the integrity of the sellers with whom they do business. We have been deluged with protests from buyers who say that they much prefer to do business with a particular seller with whom they have had satisfactory and pleasant relations over a great number of years. These buyers demand the right to purchase from those sellers without being compelled to pay higher prices. They may not do so if the seller cannot absorb the freight.

I am told that f. o. b. mill pricing will favor multiple plant operators and be to the disadvantage of, and discriminate against, single plant operators. It seems that f. o. b. mill pricing in basic commodities will create local monopolies for each seller within what the Federal Trade Commission calls his "natural freight advantage territory." The Congress must determine whether that economic result best serves our national economy.

We must seriously consider any practice that tends to create an artificial trade barrier between any sections of our country.

NATIONAL POLICY

It is our national policy to encourage the elimination of the trade barriers now existing between the small countries of Europe. We know only too well what those European trade barriers have done to the standard of living and the achievement of mass production economics in industry in Europe. We must be cautious lest we permit any pricing policy to create artificial trade barriers in this country.

Our economy, and the economic principles that have made us the greatest nation in the world, have long been predicated on free commercial intercourse between all sections of the country. National distribution has long been the legitimate goal of most producers.

Among the problems which we must consider is the financial integrity of the railroads. We learned in the late war how vital the railroads are to national defense. I need not remind you of the strategic bombing of railroad facilities in Europe which led to the breakdown of the enemy's transportation system. We cannot permit a breakdown of American railroad systems.

Let us assume that losses in mass production economies resulting from a number of small plants replacing one large plant will be offset by savings in the eliminating of cross-hauling. We must still consider the loss of revenue to the railroads.

The contention of the Federal Trade Commission is, in effect, that it is an economic waste to haul soap from Boston to Cincinnati while other soap is being hauled from Cincinnati to Boston. We must consider not only whether such market invasions are the essence of competition, but what the elimination of those well-established practices will do to our present railroad system—a system which is essential to our national security.

I have but one more observation to make with respect to the scope of this problem. That is its effect on national security. The national security requires the dispersal of American industry to rural areas. Concentrated industry is vulnerable to enemy air attack.

The Government's National Security Resources Board has urged that industry be dispersed to the rural communities. It has pointed to an increasing trend since 1940 of locating manufacturing plants in the smaller cities and towns. We know that some large manufacturing plants have recently been located in the sparsely settled areas of the south, southwest and the middle west. They are there less vulnerable to enemy air attack. This trend must not be reversed.

WOULD ABANDON PLANTS

I have noted in the public press indications that many businesses intend to abandon present plants that are not strategically located. I have already referred to such plants in Muskegon and Watertown. I am told that there are many steel fabricating plants, particularly in the Southwest, West and far West, whose current inability to procure steel from eastern mills is causing them to shut down. This is said to result from the eastern mills trying to satisfy the requirements of their nearby customers, good will of whom they will need in a buyers' market. Those plants, even though located at greater distances from steel mills, are a part of the industrial capacity of this Nation. Such plants contributed to the tremendous war production that made us the arsenal of democracy and furnished the weapons to defeat the Axis. We cannot afford to make obsolete any part of our industrial capacity. This can be permitted only if the advantages more than offset the loss of industrial production.

We must find out if our national security will permit us to make obsolete any plants, solely because they are located in communities that do not have an advantage of location with respect to freight rates.

You are, of course, most concerned with how this pricing policy affects the drug industry.

Retail druggists have for many years fought a vigorous battle for the uniform fair-trade laws which are now a part of the statutes of 45 States and are embodied in the Miller-Tydings Act.

It seems elementary that the enforcement of fair-trade agreements requires that drug manufacturers be permitted to sell at uniform national delivered prices, so that uniform resale retail prices may be established. It is equally elementary that a drug manufacturer cannot have a uniform delivered price without having varying mill net prices. These are illegal when the Federal Trade Commission finds they may injure competition.

Parke-Davis drugs are made in Detroit, Lilly drugs are produced in Indianapolis, and Abbott's drugs are manufactured in Chicago. It is cross hauling, and may well be an economic waste, for Abbott's to invade the Detroit market or for Lilly to invade the Chicago market. We must inquire, however, whether this is not the essence of competition.

When Indianapolis drugs are sold in Detroit at the same price at which they are sold in Indianapolis, they compete with drugs manufactured in Detroit and, at the same time, result in a higher net mill price being paid by Indianapolis druggists than is paid by Detroit druggists. This results in varying mill net prices.

It is obvious from the foregoing facts that such pricing practices may well be construed as injuring competition.

I think it is safe to predict that compulsory f. o. b. plant pricing would be a serious blow to the uniform fair-trade agreements for which retail druggists have fought so vigorously in these past years. I have been advised by wholesale druggists that f. o. b. plant pricing would probably increase the volume of business of drug manufacturers having several plants or having regional warehouses throughout the country. I am told that a corresponding reduction in volume would occur to the smaller drug manufacturers operating a single plant and not having the benefits of regional warehouses. It is feared by some that this would result in a tendency toward monopoly in the bigger drug companies and the elimination of many of the smaller companies. We must not permit the possibility of that prospect to become true likelihood.

The tremendous number of items which you sell in a drug store, and the varying prices at which they are sold, seems to create a substantial problem for the small druggist in tending to his bookkeeping. This is particularly true with respect to many drugs, usually high priced, which the average small druggist does not carry in stock, but which he is occasionally required to procure for a customer.

The manufacturers' price lists are invaluable to the small druggist in determining the prices of products which he wishes to buy. These price lists would be of considerably less value if they indicated only factory prices to which the druggist would be required to add the cost of transportation. There are no doubt many advantages in the drug business of f. o. b. factory pricing.

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would welcome any such suggestions. It is our goal to find that pricing policy which will best preserve our American free-enterprise, competitive system. It is our determined policy to encourage competition. Our problem is to find that pricing policy which will do so and put it into law.

This is one Nation; it is one great and united country. Our strength lies in that fact. We must certainly preserve that strength.

Issues Facing the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me, I herewith include as part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Long and Urgent Calendar Faces Eighty-first Congress." It appeared in the January 3, 1949, issue of the Courier-Post newspapers, Camden, N. J.

The editorial sets forth in a short but complete way the issues that face this Eighty-first Congress. It reads as follows:

LONG AND URGENT CALENDAR FACES EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Few peacetime Congresses have faced so crowded a calendar as the one convening today.

Moreover, few have faced the necessity of acting so rapidly as the Eighty-first Congress must on several major items of legislation, though most of its business probably will consume months of hearings and debate.

In the main, domestic legislation occupies the preponderant place on the congressional agenda. At least three items concerning foreign policy, however, will have high priority, because of time pressure.

Export controls expire within 2 months and require renewal. This is likely to be accompanied by a stricter license system to prevent fraud.

April must see the renewal of the ECA program, and there will be a fight over the size and allocation of funds if not over the renewal itself.

Another program expiring is that of reciprocal trade agreements, in June. This is likely to be strengthened by the repeal of amendments made by the Eightieth Congress and a return to the original law.

Among the domestic issues requiring immediate attention is rent control, which will lapse March 31 unless extended. Renewal is expected, possibly with a 15-percent increase in rentals.

The proposal to raise the President's salary, because of constitutional limitations, must go through before January 20 if it is to take effect during Mr. Truman's full term.

If the House Un-American Activities Committee is to continue operating it will need an early authorization of funds. This may stir up one of the hottest fights of the session, with the abolition or reorganization of the committee a possibility.

Most of the issues coming up are less urgent in the time sense than those listed above but many of them are of equal or greater importance.

Repeal or amendment of the Taft-Hartley law will provide one of the great battles of the year. An increase in the minimum wage is another major item of labor legislation.

Civil rights legislation on such matters as the poll tax, lynching, and tightening of the espionage laws will be a burning issue.

Congress waits on President Truman's message to see whether price controls will be another storm center. The message likewise will furnish the clue to what the line-up on taxes will be.

Farm price supports and conservation legislation will be battlegrounds of agriculture.

Housing, Federal aid to education, broadening and liberalization of social security, national health insurance, and reclamation projects are other major subjects coming up.

While dealing with affairs concerning the Nation and the world, Congress also must wrestle with matters of procedure. Another attempt will be made to abolish the filibuster in the Senate, while the House may restrict the powers of its Rules Committee. Both these changes would be in the interest of speeding legislation.

The Democrats have regained control of Congress, but their internal divisions continue and make it most doubtful that President Truman will be able to put through legislation as easily as Franklin D. Roosevelt did early in his administration.

Bitter and prolonged struggles over much of the expected Truman program are the prospect for 1949.

River Valley Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Saturday, November 27, 1948:

A MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

One of the major developments that depended on the election is the Missouri Valley Authority. The TVA made history, and even geography, when Roosevelt endorsed it in 1933. Since then the whole idea of river valley development has been under attack from the private utility interests which have

been nesting in the ruins of the Republican Party.

These interests were sufficiently powerful to prevent the integration of the Columbia Valley's Federal power developments, despite the great structures at Grand Coulee and Bonneville. These interests even went so far as to hamstring the Central Valley Development in California and had placed plans for the valley-plan type of Federal project on the Missouri in the deep-freeze of Republican reaction.

Now that President Truman has won his first election to the White House, however, there is no reason to fear that the entrenched influence of the privately owned public utilities will prevent the logical extension of the TVA idea into separate projects for the Missouri Valley and for other tributaries to the Mississippi River system.

As a matter of fact, one of the developments in this field, is the opposition of the original TVA'ers to the MVA. Such a project would create competition in public interest and for public funds with their own unique plan, and it would be ironical though not unexpected if some of the leading advocates of the TVA were to appear in opposition to the MVA.

However, in this case the TVA group will carry little political weight. The question already is being asked in Washington: "Where was Dave Lilienthal at Armageddon?" Where, indeed, were the members of the Atomic Energy Commission which have sprouted like mushrooms around the TVA output of hydroelectric energy? Where, oh where, were the public power boys when the light went out?

The Missouri River is not only the largest tributary to the Mississippi it also is the most logical place to start our next major national development in headwater and watershed control. Some of the elements, such as the Fort Peck Dam, already have been installed. Now it remains for the Army engineers and Congress to devise ways and means for the progressive development of navigation, power, flood control, and irrigation on the Missouri River.

After the Missouri Valley Authority, it will be time to turn attention to the other valleys of mid-America. Until the Big Muddy is brought under control, however, all of our other valley-planning experiments will be secondary and remote. For the meaning of the election is that the American people expect President Truman to do the job they want done. High on the list of their desires stands the extension of the TVA idea to other major river basins of this country.

George Heron Milne: Well Done, Thou Good and Faithful Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, upon my recent return to Washington, I was deeply distressed at learning of the passing of one of our most useful and esteemed public servants on Capitol Hill.

On October 25 death ended the long career of George Heron Milne, custodian of the congressional reading room in the Library of Congress. To some of us his name was not known, but I dare say there are very few of us who at one time or another have not had occasion to consult with him, either in person or by telephone, and receive benefit of his wise counsel. Those of the present Congress who did not have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Milne will be less fortunate, for he did impart to those with whom he came in contact a certain reverence for all that is worth while.

His quiet, unassuming manner won for him the friendship and respect of thousands, both in and out of Congress. No problem seemed too great or too small for George Milne. He made each individual Member's problem his own, and never did he complain that there were other equally important demands on his time and energies. For 39 years Mr. Milne served that trust, and served it well.

A native Washingtonian, born to Alexander and Isabella Metcalfe Milne on July 3, 1887, he started his early career as a messenger with the Evening Star in 1902, and remained there until 1905. In 1906, and for several years thereafter, he was employed with a haberdashery firm, but this held no special appeal for him. During his spare time he assisted his father, who was in the furniture business and was an interior decorator of high esteem, his services having been requested at the White House on many occasions. On these trips to the White House George was always delighted to accompany his father, for he and the Roosevelt children had developed a mutual friendship.

In 1909 he was appointed to a position in the Reading Room of the Library of Congress. After a few months service there, he was transferred to the Library Station in the Capitol, and his excellent work in that position further prepared him for the future role he was to fill. His personal service to Members of Congress won him many friends.

Returning to the main reading room a year or so later, he carried on his reference service to the public and did research in many fields. In 1917 his fine record brought him another promotion. He was assigned to the Congressional Reading Room in charge of one of the alternating shifts. In this new assignment there were many added responsibilities. He proved to be most ideally suited for this job, for his service to Congress has received the highest praise.

The Library of Congress seemed to be the mecca of all his dreams, for he was a lover of books, and this was his great opportunity. Books now became the guiding light in his life. No small collector himself, he amassed a considerable library of his own with a goodly portion of rare and first editions, and autographed volumes.

He did not, however, let this be his only interest, for he had a great liking for the theater as is attested by numerous letters, autographed photographs, and other expressions from his friends in that profession.

Nature and the out-of-doors also had a special appeal to him, and he was never happier than when spending a week end at his mountain cottage, or in his rose garden at home. He knew the names of all domestic flowers and plants as well as most wild flowers and could spot them at a glance. He has related to me how as a boy he would go on treks through the woods in search of new wild species of plants not generally known.

Only death ended this keen sensitiveness, when he was stricken with a heart ailment after a prolonged illness. His often-repeated remark that "There are not enough hours in the day to get the things done that I would like to do," seemed to be truly characteristic of him, for he never knew an idle moment. His dreams and plans for the future were cut short only too soon.

Mr. Milne was married in 1917 to Ella Baldwin Lower, a Cleveland girl with whom he had become acquainted shortly after joining the staff of the Library of Congress.

In final tribute, I consider it an honor to have known such a man as George Heron Milne. His keen intellect, his sincerity of purpose, and greatness of character enrich the lives of all who knew him.

Government and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article which I prepared at the request of certain newspapers in my State on the subject of government and health.

This article deals with possible approaches to this problem, and has special reference to the proposed compulsory national health insurance program recently advocated by Mr. Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND HEALTH

(By Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH)

It is very gratifying that so much discussion is taking place nowadays on the subject of the health of the American people. Our national health is a vital ingredient of our economic productivity, our national security, and—above all—of that greater fulfillment of the democratic promise of American life which we must be ever seeking to achieve.

My position in the Senate during the last 2 years has kept me in daily contact with this health question. The health subcommittee of which I am chairman held hearings which cover over 2,000 pages in the printed record in an effort to develop a sound Federal health program. I was therefore closely interested in Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing's report to the President, published in September under the title "The Nation's Health: A 10-Year Program."

This document sets up goals for national accomplishment by the year 1960 in training of medical personnel, construction of hospitals, improvement of local public-health services where these are inadequate, and pursuit of certain especially important special programs in the fields of mental health, chronic diseases, vocational rehabilitation, and child care. In his presentation Mr.

Ewing states very forcefully the discrepancy between our present level of achievement in all these fields and what he considers a feasible ideal.

Of course, in the nature of the case the Federal Security Administrator is a special pleader for expanded Federal health activities. It is therefore not surprising that, in the fields just mentioned, he calls for a total Federal health expenditure of some $2,300,000,000 by 1960—more than three times the present figures. Yet, if there is room for difference of opinion on size and detail, still I find myself substantially agreeing with his presentation of these needs; they are all of great importance and probably all of them should benefit by greater Federal participation, as Mr. Ewing suggests, side by side with the States and local communities.

PARTING OF THE WAYS

So far, so good. But where Mr. Ewing and I part company is in approaching the central question of national health—the question of how to achieve the best distribution of medical and hospital services among all the people, regardless of their location or economic status. His answer constitutes the heart of his report. By now it is a familiar answer to many of us. He advocates a Nation-wide, compulsory system of health insurance, to be financed primarily by a percentage tax on all wages. Under this system the insured person would be guaranteed whatever care he needed without charge. Doctors and hospitals would be reimbursed out of the national insurance fund. Both the States and the Federal Government would be involved in determining the method of payment, the extent and standards of services to be rendered under the system, and the respective rights of patients, doctors, and hospitals.

It is, of course, beyond dispute that a large proportion of the American people cannot pay for the medical and other health services they need. But to say that compulsory health insurance, with all its glaring disadvantages, is the only way to meet this problem is a premature admission of defeat.

Such a system would involve a very considerable administrative cost on all levels, which would have to be paid out of the wage-earner's special tax. It would involve Government inspection of medical and hospital facilities and Government adjudication of any complaints by either patients or doctors in order to assure them their respective rights under the law. All this would add to the cost of actual medical care. Meanwhile, if foreign experience with compulsory health insurance is a reliable guide, we could expect the quality of medical care to suffer, and preventive medicine to fall into disuse, as more and more efforts were bent toward administering the largest possible amount of treatment to the greatest number of patients.

DOUBTS FEASIBILITY

In view of these probabilities, I have the most serious doubt that the services promised under Mr. Ewing's proposal could be delivered. I think it very possible that we would find ourselves taxing the people under false pretenses. This consideration alone would be enough to deter me from voting to put such a scheme on the statute books.

But to my mind there is an even more compelling reason for opposing the compulsory system. Our Federal system, with its balanced division of responsibilities between the local communities, the States, and the Central Government, is one of our great sources of strength as a Nation. Before we do violence to this system by granting to our Central Government such a vast new power as Mr. Ewing proposes, there must be an overriding necessity for it. Those who are urging this grant of power have tried to make out a case for such a necessity—but in so doing they have had to exaggerate the size and urgency of the country's health needs, and they have minimized the possible achievements of activity by States and voluntary groups.

The plan for American health which I support is very different. It would preserve the existing Federal-State relationship in the health field. The Federal role would remain one of stimulation and support through grants-in-aid to the States. Under these grants, each State would be challenged to work out its own approach to the most urgent health problems facing it—especially the problem of making good medical and hospital care available to those who cannot afford to pay for this care. The keynote of the whole program would be experimentation. With 48 laboratories working at once to develop and mobilize their health resources, I am confident that sound and fruitful solutions would emerge to fit the different needs of the various States.

COSTS ALREADY STUPENDOUS

The share of the Federal Government in health activities is already large—nearly $750,000,000 a year—and is sure to grow larger. Therefore the question of organization of these functions becomes increasingly important. Governor Dewey has already proposed the creation of a new Cabinet department to include all the Government's social (welfare) functions—in social security and education as well as in health. The logic of this idea appeals to me, since clearly the health, the education, and the general economic security of the people are very closely bound together. The proposals of the so-called Hoover Commission, which will report to Congress in January on the organization of the entire executive branch, should be of value in this connection. Whatever organization we finally agree on, the vitally important point is that the Federal Government should play its proper role in the effort to improve the health of America. That role is one of consultation, encouragement, and stimulation by financial and other means—to the end that the States, the professions involved, and the consumers of medical services may be enabled to work out their own salvation in this vital realm.

Address of Joseph K. Carson, Jr., Commissioner, United States Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Joseph K. Carson, Jr., Commissioner, United States Maritime Commission, at a luncheon meeting of the Propeller Club of the Port of New York at the Waldorf Astoria, New York, on September 15, 1948:

Mr. Chairman, guests, and members of the Propeller Club, I should like to make it clear that the remarks I am about to make represent my own ideas and may not be shared by other members of the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, it is customary, I presume, for a speaker to employ a ghost writer to prepare his paper, with the clear admonition that it is to be devoid of anything controversial, shot through with platitudes, and properly surfeited with complimentary references to the audience. Well, the speech I am about to give is my own. Therefore, it would appear appropriate that I ask you to apply to my remarks the marine-insurance principle of particular average and let the blame lie where it falls.

Now, I am fully aware that the maritime industry is confronted with some obstacles which, while not insurmountable, are nonetheless a grave threat to the future welfare of our merchant marine. I shall not catalog them all in this short preface but shall refer to only two. The first is the erroneous belief on the part of the public generally that the American merchant marine is in such a prosperous condition that it can meet with ease and without aid the impact of foreign competition. The second is the belief of some, in and out of Government, that we should abandon the high seas to other nations in order that they may build up dollar credits and thereby bolster their foreign exchange.

We can, of course, do much to correct the public misconception respecting the ability of American-flag vessels to compete with the foreigner. But when it comes to those who favor letting foreign-flag vessels have a preferential position in world-wide shipping we have a more serious problem. They are of that school of thought which favors a form of appeasement which in their opinion will buy good will. They forget that good will must be earned—that it cannot be bought. Further, they fail to realize that when dollar credits shall have melted away through juggling of international exchange or otherwise, much of civilization's requirements must still be transported in real tangible things, called ships.

Before beginning a discussion of the subject in hand, I wish to make it clear that while the merchant marine is an auxiliary, if not a concomitant, of the armed services in time of national emergency, in peacetime it is a civilian activity and I hope it will ever remain such. Except for the purpose of meeting an emergency, there must be a complete separation of the merchant marine and the regulation thereof from the military. If we integrate the merchant marine with armed forces in time of peace, we shall have nationalization of shipping—period.

Although there are many maritime matters I might talk about today, I do not propose to discuss the decline of ship construction, the softening of rates, the virtues of our merchant marine in war, nor the importance of our reserve fleet. Indeed, I shall leave unsaid many of these and other important things maritime which have been better said time and again by others far more qualified than I. I shall discuss instead a subject which may be equally engaging—namely, some aspects of the mission of the Maritime Commission. As you know, that mission is the regulation, operation when imperative, and the promotion of the welfare of the American merchant marine.

Regulation or management—which road? In order that the area of discussion be made clear—by regulation I mean that degree of supervision by government necessary to insure compliance with the law and public policy; and by management, I mean the exercise by those in proprietary control of complete discretion in the conduct of their business so long as they violate no law, offend no public policy, or invade no rights of others.

The regulation of shipping and the management of shipping are, of course, separate provinces. The problem which the Commission and the maritime industry face is, How may the Commission exercise its regulatory powers properly without impinging upon the functions of management or narrowing the area of free enterprise?

This is not an academic question. I have not erected a straw man merely to attack and destroy him as an empty shibboleth. There is a real and fundamental issue involved here. It is an issue that encompasses not only the regulation of shipping but the

whole field of government as well. In a recent editorial on this subject, the liberal Washington Post admirably defined the basic issue, as follows:

"The problem that confronts the country today is how to preserve the narrowing field reserved for free enterprise under a necessarily costly system of government that is becoming more and more paternalistic."

It, of course, must be made clear that Government regulation per se is not an unwarranted invasion of the individual's independence. For example, I believe it is generally recognized that the public interest required regulation of the securities market. The excesses of the late 1920's and the operations of some men, whom you and I could name, made manifest the need for regulation in that field. I would much rather have seen such regulation proceed from within the market, but since it did not, action by government became necessary.

Let us take another example. On every side we hear concern and alarm over the spiraling of living costs. There is real cause for alarm. How to control prices without erecting a police state presents a problem which now challenges the best there is in us. I don't know the answer, but I do know this: I had not been back from the European theater of operations but a short time when I became thunderstruck at the arrogance of some who were holding the line. I know that the task of those charged with enforcement of price control was not easy. But it is no secret that the bossy way in which some things were done brought about near revolt.

In my opinion, price controls were removed—not because the people wanted rises in prices but because they were willing to take the risk rather than contend with what millions felt was an unwarranted invasion of their personal rights. To avoid further inflation, some form of price control may prove to be imperative. If it comes, we can ascribe to private enterprise the failure to provide its own method. Therefore, we must accept regulation as a part of the warp and woof of our intricate and complex economic system. But in so doing we need not and should not so administer regulation as to deprive management of its rightful functions or relieve management of its manifest responsibilities.

What may we say of free enterprise and of rights of management? In the first place we must recognize that management has certain rights under the law and that these rights may be asserted with the same vigor that government is permitted to apply the the law. I accept the doctrine that government has no greater power than the people clearly give. I oppose the theory that we are all creatures of the state and have no greater rights than government hands down. This fundamental difference in concept is the real issue we consider today.

In certain self-styled liberal quarters it has become verboten even to mention the words free enterprise. Most of the advocates of government paternalism regard competition, individual initiative, and related concepts as remnants of a bygone day, asserting that their virtues may have had a valuable purpose in the remote past but they no longer function. Actually in these uneasy times we need fair competition carried on by men of daring and strong convictions.

If the Commission accepts the philosophy of the self-anointed liberal and approaches its duties in the belief that no one is capable of deciding what is good for him, it will impose conditions which will make prudent management impossible. In my view the discharge of public duty does not require a belief that man is essentially all dishonest. Rather, I believe in the principle that all men are presumed to be law abiding until the contrary is proved. I cannot support the premise that in the discharge of a public duty proper stewardship requires denying to one that to which he is lawfully entitled. In my view we are not commissioned to extend, enlarge or modify the law. Our job is not to legislate through contract. Our administration of law should be as strong as the law, and no stronger. Confronted with the fundamental policy, to foster and encourage a privately owned and privately operated American merchant marine, the Commission in my opinion is obliged to give management as much freedom of choice, as much scope of authority, and as much independence of control as the law commands.

I have deep-rooted convictions, long established and continuously confirmed, that men are creative, ingenious, imaginative, and daring to the extent that they are free from external compulsion. My convictions urge me to do everything within my power for the promotion of individual freedom, for the defense of the individual against the aggressions of the state or of any other organization or interest that threatens his sovereignty, so long as his sovereignty is not inconsistent with the general welfare.

A few days ago I received a letter from a Belgian officer whom I came to know while I was in France and Germany serving on the staff of Gen. Omar Bradley. He said in part: "The time I was with the Americans was a good time for me and comes to good stead now and then. I liked your Army, that is more civilian than military—and yet so damned efficient." What this officer, now a member of the Belgian Senate, has not had full opportunity to know is that our efficiency was the product of individual initiative, not regimentation.

I have heard it said that in carrying out regulatory powers a Government agency properly and of necessity must take a definite part in conducting the affairs of private business. That is not so. When such a step is taken the agency in question abdicates its role of regulation.

In order to confuse the issue the position is taken by some that in the case of the subsidized operator the Commission must of necessity take a part in managing the affairs of the contractor.

None will deny that when one applies for and receives an operating-differential subsidy such applicant must in turn meet and comply with the conditions set forth in the law. Nor will it be disputed that the applicant must throughout the life of his contract continue to meet all statutory requirements. The real point involved is whether the operator upon entering into an operating-differential subsidy contract becomes a ward of the Government? My answer is a most emphatic "No."

In the first place, before an applicant is granted an operating-differential subsidy he must possess the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to enable him to conduct the proposed operations of the vessel or vessels as to meet competitive conditions and promote foreign commerce. It would indeed be paradoxical for the Commission one day to declare operator X possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and other qualifications necessary to accomplish certain statutory requirements and on the very next day decree that he needs a guardian.

In the second place, it should ever be borne in mind that the subsidy granted is not nor is it to be regarded as a bonus, gift, or contribution. If a subsidy payment were to fall in either category, the Commission would be remiss in its duty. In truth, any subsidy must, if lawful, represent a recompensable disparity—nothing more.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not consciously lend my assent to entering into a contract with an applicant who does not know how to manage his own business. The subsidized operator takes on certain obligations. My concern is whether he is discharging those obligations—not how.

To get at the very meat and substance of the subject, let us discuss a few examples wherein it will be evident how a basic policy can materially affect administration and thereby encourage or inhibit freedom of management.

The contractor (the subsidized operator) and every affiliate, domestic agent, subsidiary, or holding company connected with, or directly or indirectly controlling or controlled by, the contractor shall keep books, records, and accounts in such form and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission; and that the contractor, etc., file, upon notice from the Commission, balance sheets, profit and loss statements, and such other statements of financial operations, special reports, memoranda of any facts and transactions which in the opinion of the Commission affect the financial results in the performance of, or transactions or operations under, such contract; and that the Commission shall be authorized to examine and audit the books, records, and accounts of all persons referred to in this section whenever it may deem it necessary or desirable.

This does not mean that the Commission is invested with the authority conferred in order to manage the business of the operator. Quite the contrary, it means to me that the Commission has that authority in order that it may know if the contractor is managing his business in compliance with the applicable law and policy.

Let us take a look at pooling agreements. Should a subsidized operator be permitted to enter into such an arrangement? That depends upon what kind of a pooling agreement it is. Policy should, of course, attach to the question as to whether the pooling agreement is detrimental to the American merchant marine.

I use the phrase "detrimental to the interest of the American merchant marine" rather than the statutory language "to the detriment of the commerce of the United States" advisedly. I do not mean to distinguish between the two, but to emphasize the fact that there is no distinction between them. That which is detrimental to the interest of the American merchant marine necessarily operates to the detriment of the commerce of the United States, and nothing detrimental to the interest of the commerce of the United States can conceivably be in the interest of the American merchant marine.

This identity of interest furnishes us with a touchstone to be applied to pooling agreements and joint operating arrangements of all kinds. And the more widely we disseminate the knowledge that the prosperity of American shipping on the one hand and the prosperity of the American producer and taxpayer on the other necessarily go hand in hand, the better it will be for all concerned.

Capital necessarily employed. Frankly this subject is provoking of various interpretations. The question is now before the Commission. Therefore I cannot discuss it here today.

Conferences and contract rates offer a good example of conflicting interests and hair-line questions of regulation and management. As long as a conference agreement is not unjustly discriminatory or detrimental to the commerce of the United States, the parties thereto are entitled to the enjoyment of all their rights thereunder.

When we come to the determination as to the type, speed, and number of vessels a subsidized contractor is required to have to enable him to operate and maintain a service, route, or line to meet competition and promote foreign commerce, the question arises as to whether the Commission or the operator has the primary duty of making this determination. Traffic offered will

likely determine the number. As to type and speed, the operator should know the answers respecting type and speed else he is not competent to operate the required berth and liner service assigned him.

When we consider such matters as a proper charter policy or essential trade routes we are confronted with a different aspect of the Commission's responsibilities. While much valuable aid can be supplied to us by private industry, the decision is for the Commission alone. By the way, I understand there is quite some interest in what the future charter policy of the Commission is to be. Is my information correct?

Other subjects can be cited to illustrate into which field of competency responsibility should fall, but time will not permit.

The appropriateness or timeliness of the discussion of the regulation-management subject at this time may be questioned. My reason for broaching it now is twofold. First, the road or course chosen now by the Commission and by the industry may well presage whether future performance by the Commission and management will be in keeping with the declaration of policy in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, and second, it is timely because the routine functions of the Commission dislocated by war are now being overhauled so as to be geared for long-range activities.

During the war the Maritime Commission became to all practical intents and purposes a construction agency. At the same time the War Shipping Administration became the largest ship operator the world has ever known. Each was in fact quasi-military or at least served military objectives. The scope and absoluteness of the authority of each of them as constructor and operator, respectively, meant that each accordingly assumed and exercised all of the functions of management and even more. As for military functions, each performed with amazing efficiency—wartime efficiency—but war is waste and wartime methods are not suited to peacetime conditions.

We are essentially creatures of habit. We fall naturally into patterns of behavior. Seldom do we voluntarily relinquish authority, because once we have used authority it becomes second nature to us. We are told that once a function becomes established in government it continues almost invariably forever. My experience supports that observation and it is for that reason that I am concerned that we should chart carefully our future course. As I have already stated, we should not permit our procedures and practices to lead virtually to legislation by contract.

To sum up my position on the invasion of management's province, it can be stated that I oppose in principle any attempt to saddle management with controls and strictures not sanctioned by law or public policy. In order to foster and encourage a privately owned and operated merchant marine we must guard against the imposition of such restraints upon the industry.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that among the obstacles which confront the American merchant marine are an uniformed public and those who wish to abandon world shipping to foreign flags. There is a third one which should also be mentioned. This third obstacle is the fellow who interprets the term private enterprise to mean a private right to secure by any means that to which he is not entitled or as a preferential right to dine lushly out of the taxpayers' pocket. We must keep such out of the American merchant marine. To men of that ilk most credit is due for troublesome and oppressive laws and regulations. They set the stage for a certain type of reformer, the chap who attacks the ill-advised with great zeal and brings about disaster.

I am seeing no hobgoblin when I express concern lest the fate of other nations overtake us. My concern stems from facts as I know them.

During World War II, I was among those participating in the planning for the occupation and postwar administration of the defeated Axis nations. In the course of this work it was necessary to study carefully the political phenomena of the rise of fascism and nazism.

Please bear with me while I point out briefly what happened in Italy and Germany prior to World War II. A multiplicity of parties and a tightly woven system of internal regulation made it virtually impossible for any government to function in Italy after World War I. Cabinet after Cabinet fell. A new premier was powerless to carry out his commitments. Dissident political elements and a maze of red tape frustrated every move. The people of Italy, in sheer desperation, turned to Mussolini—who promised corrective measures. In order to put his plans into effect he resorted to force and propaganda. The Italians are a peace-loving people. They wanted security and got it—that is, a brand of it—but at a terrible price. Too late they discovered they had no freedom left. I am reminded of the Fascist expression: "Il Fascisti tutti hanno questo merito: non discutono il capo." The Fascists all have this virtue; they do not question the chief.

Bear in mind the fact that the steps taken by Mussolini to acquire power and keep it were taken within the framework of the statute—the Italian basic law. Little by little, aided by a complacent judiciary and subservient legislation, Il Duce enslaved the Italian people—and curiously enough for a time their economic lot was greatly improved.

That which happened in Germany followed much the same pattern In that country they had what was said to be the best organized and most efficient functioning civil government in the world. Germany had a constitution—the Weimar Constitution—Hitler got his first office, that of Chancellor legally. President Hindenburg called upon him to form a cabinet, which he did. Hitler had to have an incident to grasp power. The Reichstag was fired and he used that as an excuse for securing emergency legislation. From then on the way was cleared for a welter of crime which cost the lives of millions, nearly brought about the end of civilization—and it all started legally.

The corporate state which existed in Italy of which we have heard so much was a development within the law of that country. Of course, to make it work there had to be force to insure no deviation from the established order and, of course, that meant dictatorship. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Herman Finer, formerly a reader at the University of London, for a succinct and cogent statement of the substance of the corporative system. In his work "Mussolini's Italy" he says:

"Among the many questions that divide the Italian oligarchy is this, whether the corporative system means the Fascist system as a whole, or whether it has only the narrower meaning, the regulation of economic relations between workers and employers and between the various branches of production. Does it include the militarism, the dictatorship, and all the rest, or only the problem of economic production? Does it imply a theory of just economic distribution? These are not mere academic questions. For there are many who would accept the mere planning and conciliatory functions of the corporations, but not the dictatorship in their background. There are others who want the dictatorship, as many employers do, but not the control of industry embodied in the corporations. The direct observer cannot escape the conviction that the term 'corporative' has been used, if not invented, to rouse a sense of wonder in the people, to keep them guessing, to provoke inquiry, and to contrive, out of the sheer mystification of an unusual word, at once to hide the compulsion on which the dictatorship finally depends and to suggest that a miraculous work of universal benevolence is in the course of performance. The fundamental truth, however, is that the Fascist state claims the right to regulate economic as well as other aspects of life, and has aimed at accomplishing the former through the corporate organization. The dictatorship is the necessary rack and screw of the corporate system; all the rest is subordinate machinery."

My attention has been called to the great number of governmental activities and agencies with which the maritime industry must cope. You naturally desire less governmental supervision and regulation. Your principal concern now should be that you do not get more. I warn you not to become too complacent, because I am told there are no less than 19 Federal departments and independent agencies and 67 other subdivisions that are concerned with maritime affairs. To these must be added, of course, 23 standing committees of Congress. It is doubtful if any other industry encounters more regulation, supervision, and what not than the shipping industry.

Our real cause for concern does not lie in the fact that so much of our time is consumed responding to governmental requirements. The continual encroachment of Government into the private affairs of our people would obviously extinguish all free enterprise and result in the equivalent of a corporate state. Should that happen, little else will matter.

May I ask your indulgence while I refer to one aspect of the law affecting the merchant marine—i. e., the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It is a good law and should remain on the statute books. It places great discretion in the hands of the Commission; hence it is the manner in which the law is applied that matters most.

It is an accepted principle of statutory construction that a remedial law is to be liberally construed in order to effectuate the purposes for which it was enacted. Right here is where I differ violently with some. In the execution of my duties as a Commissioner, I take the position that the palpable intent of the Congress was that our merchant marine be privately owned and privately operated.

In construing and applying the 1936 act we should ever bear in mind the purpose for which the law was written rather than to apply strictures and road blocks to everything private industry seeks to do. At the same time the Commission must, in keeping with its plain duty, resist any attempt anywhere by anyone to evade compliance with every facet of regulation which the law or public policy enjoins upon us all.

Now there will naturally be suggestions from time to time that the laws affecting shipping be amended. Many of such suggestions will emanate from the maritime industry. Those now receiving benefits or aid under present law will be tempted to ask for more. Well, that for which you ask may indeed be proper but I adjure you to proceed with utmost care. Please never lose sight of the fact that if you do get more, you will get with it a full need of regulation. More regulation will occasion offices and more officers. If we don't watch out we may have cause to say of ourselves much the same as the American colonists had to say in the Declaration of Independence of the King of England. They said, and I quote: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out our substance."

As we bring this discussion to a close let us summarize our respective responsibilities.

In your case, you must not only interpret your duties accurately but you must discharge them without being driven into action.

In our case, we must not only determine truly our job, but we must also be so organized as to insure speed and accuracy in performance. The Commission has undertaken a complete reorganization. The aim is better administration of applicable law in order that our task and yours will be less onerous. We have a right to expect of you businessmen full cooperation in the Commission's efforts to give better service to the industry. Former Commissioner Richard Parkhurst said not long ago: "The Commission was created to aid shipping—not to dominate it." I agree with him.

The ideal situation would be one wherein the maritime industry could so conduct its business as to obviate the necessity for regulation, but unfortunately such a happy estate is not ours to enjoy. However, as we accept regulation as an inevitable part of our official responsibility we should so administer that responsibility as to relieve those subject to regulation of as many costly and time consuming details as may be consonant with public duty. In a word, we should not regulate for the sake of regulation.

Therefore, since regulation is here, let us be sure that neither Government nor management invades the competency of the other. A commingling of our respective responsibilities impairs the integrity of each.

The Maritime Commission and the former War Shipping Administration, in common with many other Government agencies, have been subjected to almost continuous attack from one source or another. Some have recommended that the Commission be abolished and that a radically different organization be set up to administer maritime matters. Others have suggested that it be placed under some department of the Government, while others have argued for a splitting up of this agency among other offices of the Government.

I cannot support any of these proposals because I believe that none of them offers the opportunity for service to the public and the industry that are afforded within the framework of existing law. The Maritime Commission is now empowered to carry out our national policy to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, to promote the commerce of the United States, and to aid in the national defense.

There is nothing wrong with the law, but to meet the residual problems of war and to resolve a multitude of new ones, the Commission has, as already indicated, undertaken the most extensive reorganization in its history.

I predict that the steps we have been and are taking will not only result in getting things done but will also strengthen the confidence of the public, the Congress and the industry in the policies and performance of the Commission.

As a citizen, as an ex-serviceman, and as a public official, I recognize that a strong merchant marine is indispensable to the continued growth and prosperity of the United States and I also recognize that it is imperative that we have such a merchant marine as a weapon of national defense. And, furthermore, I believe that such a merchant marine should be privately owned and privately operated.

I accepted my present post in the hope that I could make a contribution to the maintenance of a merchant marine adequate to meet all of our national requirements. I intend to do all I can to aid in the accomplishment of that objective.

If you give the Commission your cooperation and support, we are certain of success.

Political Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every thoughtful American should begin to give heed to the socialistic road this Government is traveling. Just how long the taxpayers of this country can finance foreign socialistic governments presents a question of paramount importance to every person who loves liberty.

Step by step there are pressure groups demanding the nationalization of our free enterprise system—a system that has made possible our high standard of living, now envied by the entire world. It has been said by a wise man that people can lose their liberties and not miss them for a century. It has now been demonstrated that people can lose their liberties and miss them very soon—after it is too late to salvage them.

Just to stimulate thought on the part of those who love liberty and deplore our present rapid trend toward socialism, I am, under leave to extend, inserting a statement made by Merwin K. Hart, president of the National Economic Council, Inc., entitled "Political Medicine":

POLITICAL MEDICINE

American medicine—except for the licensing of physicians and nurses and certain restrictions on harmful drugs—has always been free from the meddling of Government.

If a member of your family falls ill, you get a doctor. If hospitalization is required, you can get a free bed, if you cannot afford to pay; or you can get a private room if you can pay. The services of the best surgeons are available. If you are well to do, you pay a good fee for a serious operation. In most cases, if you are of moderate means, you get the same services for less. If you can't afford to pay anything, you can get them for nothing.

Many thousands of the finest men and women in the land give their services free as trustees of hospitals.

Roughly 160,000 physicians and surgeons are today taking care of the sick and injured in America and are rendering them better service than in any other country in the world.

We can remember 45 years ago, when Germany led the world in medical development, listening in Berlin to a well-informed German medical man explaining to several surprised medical colleagues that American medicine was offering great promise of improvement. Since then German medicine and surgery have gone down, and American practice has risen to its present high level.

American medicine thus gained ascendancy because American doctors have been capable, earnest and ambitious, and have had a high sense of duty. It happened, too, because they were practicing medicine in a free country where as yet Government bureaus have been prevented from extending their tentacles over the care of the sick. Save in rare and isolated cases, Government has had no part in, and can claim no credit for, its astounding development. In fact, the contrary is true: for in those countries where the medical profession has been placed under the dictation of the state, political control has been stultifying and disastrous.

Of course, American medicine and surgery have not been perfect—what human activity is? Of course, faults can here and there be found. Some neighborhoods are without enough capable practitioners or lack an adequate hospital. Some doctors are better than others. It is true, too, that those able to pay most often get the best services—though this advantage is tempered by the earnestness and high character and the desire of most doctors to minister to the sick whatever their economic status or station in life.

In all these respects, though further improvement is still to be accomplished, great advances have already been made.

America's supremacy in the field of medicine has been possible largely through two factors. Since nowhere else on earth have these factors existed in comparable measure, nowhere else on earth have the same good fruits appeared.

The first factor is the complete liberty our fathers won for us. Liberty places in human hands the power of choice—the power to excel, the will to excel. It is the mainspring of creative effort—the power that inspired a young race to conquer and people a virgin continent, to perfect communications, invent new ways of doing old tasks, and then, still unsatisfied, to dream new dreams and bring them to amazing fulfillment. Save for the dynamic energy released by the practice of liberty, little progress might have been made in the standard of life and living upon the American continent.

The second factor is the profound impulse of Christian philanthropy. Often other peoples, usually the less successful, have condemned Americans as money getters and profiteers. Nothing could more clearly show the falsity of this charge than the lavish manner in which the fruits of American business have been poured out for humane causes. Wherever human needs have appeared, Americans have been warm-hearted and generous, giving freely of the substance earned by foresight and industry. As in no other land on earth, the earnings of Americans have been given to erect hospitals, sanitaria, medical schools, and foundations for medical research. It is this profoundly Christian impulse, made possible by the economic freedom that alone implements the will to give, that has provided American medicine with the physical facilities necessary to its development.

The important fact is that the practice of medicine and the care of the sick have reached in the United States the highest level any country has ever seen. We may be sure continued effort along the same lines will bring ever greater improvement.

CLOUDS ARE GATHERING

But there is trouble on the horizon. Politicians, at the instance of Marxist schemers, have long had their eye on this whole business of the care of the sick. Great Britain has politicalized her medicine, which means simply that political bureaucrats have stepped in, and from now on will tell doctors, dentists, nurses, and patients what to do to the very last detail.

And the same political move threatens here and now in the United States. It will rise to full height during the coming session of Congress. A supreme effort is to be made to convert our magnificent system of caring for the sick into a government-run machine of political medicine.

The fate of 160,000 doctors is at stake. But, more important still, is the stake of the 148,000,000 people to whom they minister.

If you, Mr. and Mrs. American, are willing to let Government bureaucrats tell you just how your sick and injured are to be cared for, then pay no attention to this letter. But if you are not willing, now is the time to do something about it.

It may shock many to be told that the incomparable fabric of American medicine has enemies, and that these enemies wish first to destroy it, and then replace it by something else under their own control.

Who are these enemies? They are certain groups now high in the Federal bureaucracy. And behind them, directing the fight, are sinister persons and forces of whom we shall speak presently.

What do they wish to do? They wish to destroy the freedom of American medicine by placing it under the political management and control of Government—that is, themselves. They wish to destroy the most successful medical system the world has ever seen, and substitute for it a system that has failed everywhere else.

The physicians of America, who are probably in a better position to see the disastrous consequences of political control than anyone else, are doing what they can to fight this evil thing. But they can devote little energy to it; they are out on the firing line every day in their battle against sickness and death. The whole burden of the fight to keep medicine free should not be left to them.

The National Economic Council does not enter this fight in the special interest of the medical profession. The politicians who seek to muscle in, try to smear the medical profession by sneeringly accusing the doctors of being selfishly concerned with profits in opposing political control. That's just the old Marxist tripe. We believe there is no more unselfish profession, taken as a whole, than the medical profession, and that there is no more power-hungry, grasping type of person in the world than the political bureaucrat. Yet it is not to protect one group against the predatory spoliation of the other, that we raise our voice.

We are against political control of medicine because it will be disastrous to the American people. It will inevitably lower the standards and efficiency of medical care. It will in the long run cost every American family many hundreds of dollars more each year, for the offer of free medicine is only a sucker's come-on. It will, if adopted, destroy American freedom, not only as it relates to medicine, but as it relates to our whole life. It is the door to the police state.

In the last several sessions of Congress a bill for political control of medicine has regularly been introduced. With minor alterations it will be introduced into the forthcoming session of the Eighty-first Congress. In the last session it was called the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Powerful forces are arrayed behind it. The President will call for its adoption—he thoughtlessly promised it in the campaign, unquestionably at the instance of left-wingers at his elbow. Unless the American people rise, and rise now, to defend their liberties as they rose at Lexington and Bunker Hill, this measure will be fastened upon them.

WHAT THE SCHEME IS

Just what is proposed in this scheme to politicalize American medicine?

First of all, a National Social Insurance System would be set up. The Federal Security Agency would collect all "security" taxes. It would be closely integrated with the other "security" programs—for disability and old age. Vast sums of money would be required, both to support the horde of new officeholders necessary to run the system and to build up reserve-fund accounts in the Treasury. Perhaps for the first year or two taxes would be small. But that is just bait. Commissioner of Social Security Arthur J. Altmeyer, chief advocate of political medicine, who would probably administer the whole program, proposed to the Advisory Council of the Senate Finance Committee on December 4, 1947, that the pay-roll tax should be 6 percent on employees and 6 percent on employers on the first $4,800 of income.

To administer the proposed system, the whole United States would have to be divided into administrative districts, each of about the population of a city police precinct. There would be many thousands of administrative offices, together with administrators, assistants, clerical help and investigators to staff them. Before its return to the States in 1947, the United States Employment Service had over 3,000 employment offices in operation to take care of the needs of a few million unemployed.

The administration of political medicine would be infinitely more complex, for people consult doctors far more often than they change employment. And with 15 to 20 times the number of people to handle as were handled by USES at its peak, political medicine would probably require 100,000 field offices alone. It is likely that within 5 years of coming into operation political medicine would have at least a million persons on its pay rolls.

Now the chief appeal of the advocates of political medicine is, that low-cost medical coverage will be supplied to all. But it hardly takes a wizard of finance to see that if you add a million more persons to the number who have to be paid to furnish medical coverage, the total cost to all the people will be, not less but more. Some of it will be taken from pay-roll taxes, and the amounts will be more than the average family now spends in a year on medical fees. But part of the cost will be hidden in income taxes, which must inevitably be increased to pay for the mounting expenses of the ever-growing bureaucracy.

In New Zealand, where political medicine was set up less than 10 years ago, the expense today absorbs 40 percent of all revenues collected by Government, and deficit financing has been resorted to in a desperate attempt to furnish the benefits promised. Forty percent of the comparable revenues of the United States would exceed $15,000,000,000 a year.

WOULD THE HIGHER COST BRING BETTER SERVICE?

But even if the cost were several times greater than the present cost of medical service to the American people, might it not be worth it if everybody got better medical care? Let's see.

In the first place, there is no magic in the mere spending of money. The Government cannot create more physicians or nurses by appropriating vast sums to bureaucrats for the control of physicians and nurses. Only medical schools and hospitals can produce such qualified practitioners, and no Federal funds can make the numbers who will graduate greater than they will be anyway.

In the second place, the history of political medicine in every country where it has ever been tried has presented one outstanding fact. Nothing is so dear to the heart of a bureaucrat as rules and regulations. There is no record in any department of any government telling of rules that have at first been long and complicated, and have then been made short and simple. It always works the other way.

The pioneer country in political medicine was Germany under Bismarck. There, the early rules were simple. Forty years later, they had become so complicated that no single mind in the land knew them all. Dr. Walter Sulzbach, a recognized authority on the subject, has said that in the 1920's "so many changes in laws on social insurance were made that the pertinent commentaries were no longer published in book form but in loose-leaf catalog form, so that any entry could quickly be replaced by another."

The story is the same everywhere. In England at first national health insurance covered only 20,000,000 people, yet within 30 years the rules and regulations required a volume of 1,300 pages to set them forth.

In the United States, less homogeneous, where there is greater variation in every way, and where 148,000,000 people would be affected, rules and regulations would pass beyond the power of any individual to understand and interpret. Physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, and applicants for medical treatment would alike be overwhelmed by them. A vast policing system would have to be set up to enforce them. Such matters as the number and cost of all prescriptions issued by physicians and the prices the 80,000 pharmacists could charge the Government for every free prescription, would be among the many matters to be controlled. Every item of expense in every hospital would be subject to bureaucratic scrutiny. Such a system, in which physicians would have to spend hours daily writing out reports, would lead to deterioration of medical services, if not to downright distintegration.

One major respect in which political medicine would work adversely to the interest of the individual patient would be in the freedom of choice in selecting his physician.

Despite assurances that freedom of choice will be preserved, such freedom is impossible if the system is to work at all. Many advocates admit as much privately. It is generally agreed that a "capitation" system will be used in the beginning, though later it is probable that all physicians will be salaried Government employees. A "capitation" system means that each physician will be permitted to have so many patients sign up in advance to be treated by him, and when his quota, to be fixed by the bureaucrats, is filled, he may take on no more. He will be paid so much per person, or "head," each year.

So the only free choice the individual might have would be at the moment of signing up. If the physician were known to be a good one, his list would be quickly filled, and the patient would have to go looking for another whose quota had not yet been filled. If he still wanted to consult his favorite physician, he would have to do it at his own expense (assuming the bureaucrats would permit it at all), and so pay twice—once in taxes and again in fees.

It is contemplated that, in time, all patients will have to visit the doctors in public-health clinics. This is the plan followed in Great Britain. There, according to a noted actuary, Elizabeth W. Wilson, writing in the Christian Science Monitor for September 18, 1948, "Any Britisher can go to, and not—except under unusual circumstances—send for, the physician of his choice. He waits possibly an hour or more in a queue for a visit which lasts, on the average, 4 to 6 minutes." Seventeen minutes has been considered the average necessary in America for diagnosis and adequate treatment.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE DEMAND FOR POLITICAL MEDICINE?

Only in Soviet Russia has political medicine been thoroughly carried out. If the United States of America adopts political medicine, as called for in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, it will have taken a long step toward state medicine as rigidly controlled as Russia's.

It is therefore no surprise to find that American Communists are working hard for political medicine. If political medicine comes, the eventual socialization of American business will be so much the easier. Conspicuous among Communist influences working for such a bill is the Morning Freiheit of New York, a Yiddish language daily read by over 300,000 persons. Alexander Bittelman, notorious Communist now under deportation proceedings, is the moving spirit of this journal.

Louis F. Budenz, ex-Communist editor of the Daily Worker, has stated that in 1930 Manuilski, then secretary of the Communist International, told a gathering of American agents in Moscow, "In the United States * * * the Communists must

launch a powerful movement for social insurance." Manuilski added that state medicine would be used to promote communism in the United States.

We have had occasion more than once to mention the ILO (International Labor Organization). The United States of America joined ILO in 1934, at the instance of Frances Perkins. And ever since that time ILO, directly and through numerous affiliates, has engaged heavily in propagandizing for social insurance, including political medicine. First fruits of its efforts was the original Social Security Act. Since then it has worked for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Indeed, it is known that ILO publications furnished much of the material from which the bill was drafted, and there is more than a suspicion that the bill was drawn in collaboration with ILO personnel.

We pointed out in Letter 200 that a pending convention of ILO, if ratified by the United States Senate, would mean the abdication by the American Government to an international body of all control over relations between American employers and employees. It is this same ILO that seems to be the author and prime mover in the present drive to fasten political medicine on the American people.

A powerful influence for the adoption of political medicine has come from within the Federal Government itself, notably from the Public Health Service and the Federal Security Agency, whose top directors have an incalculable amount of power to gain if the scheme is adopted. These persons have, in violation of the criminal statutes, been using the money of the taxpayers to influence legislation and enhance their own prestige, power, and emoluments. Conspicuous among these are three officers of the Federal Security Administration: Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner; Isidore S. Falk, Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics; and Wilbur J. Cohen, Falk's assistant.

Representative Harness of Indiana has exposed the so-called Physicians' Forum, which has been advocating political medicine, under the chairmanship of Dr. Ernest P. Boas, of New York—identified by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being a member of no less than eight Communist-front organizations.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Against all the sinister forces working together for enactment of political medicine, those striving to defeat it have one chief reliance. That is in the innate good sense and love of liberty of the American people.

The American people do not have to have this scheme, fathered by communism, mothered by socialism, and wet-nursed by power-hungry bureaucracy, imposed upon them. It is not inevitable. Nothing that limits freedom is inevitable so long as enough free men and women have the courage to stand up and fight against it. The hour is late, but there is still time.

Army Organized Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant steps taken to strengthen the Reserve components of the armed services during the past year was an Executive order issued by the President of the United States directing more adequate recognition and expeditious organization of the Reserve components. Vigorous work on the part of the Reserve organizations is credited in large measure with the issuance of the President's directive. A very fine statement on this entire subject was published in the Reserve Officer for December 1948. It was written by Col. William H. Neblett, USAFR, who was president of the Reserve Officers' Association. Colonel Neblett's splendid article is in keeping with the excellent service he rendered the Reserves, and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

A DEADLOCK IS BROKEN—WITH THE ISSUANCE OF AN EXECUTIVE ORDER A NEW ERA SEEMS IMMINENT FOR THE RESERVE

(By Col. William H. Neblett, USAFR)

The deadlock between Regulars and Reserves has been broken. It took the President of the United States to break it. Because of the failure of the Regulars to appreciate the great asset which national defense has in the Reserves, all efforts to get them to organize the Reserve since VJ-day have failed. With his Executive order of October 15, 1948, the President has made us into a living military organization and set the pattern to build us into a powerful citizen force.

ROA would make a big mistake if it rested upon the President's order without a militant program to assist in its development. We will not help the program by viewing our task eye to eye with the Regulars through the peephole which they have always regarded us. Already the professionals are raising the old bug-a-boo of no funds and the lack of facilities for training. The claim of no funds never had any foundation. Funds could have been provided for the training of the Reserve if the Regulars had wanted a Reserve. All they had to do was to ask for an allocation to the Reserve of a part of the money appropriated for them.

The President has said that proper allocation will be made in the 1949–50 budget. ROA believes that Congress will approve this allocation with an overwhelming majority. The Reserve has always had enthusiastic support from Members of Congress. President Truman, in all of his official and State papers on the subject of military preparedness, has consistently urged the organization of our military forces as a predominantly citizen army.

The Regulars were strong enough at the end of World War II to ignore an act of Congress which required them to transfer every man released from the services to a unit of the Organized Reserve. Releasing all of the men without transferring them to the Reserve as required by congressional act was a new departure from the rule of constitutional government. ROA believes that the Regulars' extraordinary assumption of power, great enough to repeal a Congressional act, has been effectively checked and changed in the right direction by President Truman's order.

The Regulars object to the organization of the Reserve into real live units because they say it would be too expensive. It is felt that organization of the Reserve as directed by the President will be less expensive than the great horde of pensioners which is being built up by easy retirement provisions made for those who have had relatively short enlistments in the great professional force which the regulars propose to maintain.

Our armies in World Wars I and II were over 98 percent civilian. The sprinkling of 2 percent Regulars took and held, throughout both wars, the commands solely in themselves. They did a good job, but in modern times there is considerable disagreement as to whether or not they did a better job than the citizen soldiers would have done if they had been allowed to hold some part of the high command. The citizen soldier had no chance to show how good he would have been in command. The citizen soldier was not permitted to compete with the Regulars. The Regulars had control; they carefully guarded it. Since the end of the shooting war all plans which have come out of the Pentagon place the command solely in the Regulars. The Regulars have already set up a command structure which leaves no opening for the Reserve officer above company grade. This situation must be changed. The President's order is the beginning of the change.

History will probably record that President Truman's Executive order was the beginning of the decentralization of professional control of our military forces and the greatest of all democratic moves to bring the control of our military forces where it belongs—into the hands of our citizens. No longer will the citizen soldiers be considered just a "number" or a "body." This unenviable position occupied by him might have gone on for years if it were not for the wise disposition made by the President. It is probable that the President had in mind, when he made the order, that the great victories which our citizen armies won in World Wars I and II should be credited to the civilian soldiers in the proportion of 98 percent to 2 percent, which were the proportions occupied in these wars by citizens and Regulars. Our citizen armies destroyed the great professional armies of Germany and Japan, the two nations which invented the modern professional army. It follows that citizen armies are more efficient than professional forces.

We were roundly scored at our Denver convention by General Bradley because of our criticism of the professionals for not providing a plan for the reserves. It seems that we get along better with the regulars than the regulars do among themselves. Speaking at Des Moines, Iowa, on Navy Day, General Bradley said, according to the press, that "Generals and admirals are blind to the future, aspirants more concerned with careers than their obligations, reckless specialists intent on beating their own drums." General Bradley went on to say that these generals and admirals should put "service to the Nation before the old school tie. * * * The United States cannot stake its national defense requirements on a popularity contest where glitter, glamor, and shrewd public appeal become more important than military judgment. You cannot risk your security to a bout for public favor and congressional indulgence." We hope that General Bradley will put some of these fine words into orders which he has the power to do.

We believe that the services, for whom the public has done so much, should settle their quarrels among themselves before they criticize reserves for whom the services have done so little. General Bradley went on in his speech to say that "If a budget dollar is to produce a dollar's worth of defense, then it must be apportioned to the services in the terms of D-day and follow-up missions—with likely enemies in mind." We wonder what General Bradley meant by the apportionment of the dollar. We hope he meant that a considerable sum of the budget dollar would be apportioned to the reserve, upon which our national defense has always rested in an emergency and is likely to continue to rest in the future. However, we think that what he meant was apportionment among the regular services with the same old 1-percent allocation from the military budget to the reserve. If this is what he meant, the President's order is in time to save the citizen force and to begin to build our defenses in accord with our time-honored national policy, a policy which has been much talked of but for which little had been done up until President Truman signed the Executive order organizing the Reserves.

Minor advantages of this order are that it will give Reserve members the opportunity to gain credits for inactive duty training pay, for promotion, and for retirement. The major advantages are that the order is the beginning of the establishment of defense forces which will be so organized that they will be able to meet the menace of atomic and bacteriological weapons, which are the only types of weapons an enemy can now use with effectiveness against us.

In the Church of Brooklyn's Poles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include with these remarks the following very interesting article entitled "In the Church of Brooklyn's Poles," by Margaret Mara, which was published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Friday, December 24, 1948.

I am proud of the fact that Our Lady of Czentsochowa Roman Catholic Church, of which Rt. Rev. Msgr. Boleslaus Puchalski is the founder and only pastor, is located in Brooklyn within the confines of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

IN THE CHURCH OF BROOKLYN'S POLES

(By Margaret Mara)

Old World customs still prevail in borough churches founded by immigrants, going hand in hand with the marked piety of the people in the congregation. Our Lady of Czentsochowa R. C. Church on Twenty-fourth Street, between Third and Fourth Avenues, is one of the churches I have in mind. It was founded by south Brooklyn's Polish colony 52 years ago and built at a cost of $80,000 contributed by parishioners who largely were hard-working laborers. It was erected on the site of the first parish church, a frame building which was destroyed by fire.

Gothic in design, the brick and sandstone church has three steeples, the tallest of which is 175 feet from the ground. Striking contrast to the immediate neighborhood of factories and shipyards a block away, Our Lady of Czentsochowa Church draws the wondering eyes of motorists on the nearby Belt Parkway.

LOVE THEIR PASTOR

The houses on Twenty-fourth Street are modest in the extreme, but they are neat and cheerful looking. The parish has a strong hold on the affections of its people, nurtured by the venerable Right Reverend Monsignor Boleslaus Puchalski, founder and only pastor of the church.

Old Poland is ever present in Our Lady of Czentsochowa Church. Its famous St. Cecelia Choir sings typical Polish hymns and on special occasions the congregation participates in a revered old-country devotion.

This particular ceremony is the lowering from the high altar of a large and beautiful painting of the Miraculous Mother of Czentsochowa. The painting is lowered slowly before a congregation that usually crowds the church to the doors. First seen is the Crucifixion, then the head and shoulders of Mary with the Child Jesus in her arms, and finally the entire picture is in sight. At this point the congregation falls on its knees in prayer.

HONOR THE SEASON

Children from other parts of the borough as well as those in the parish attend the School of Our Lady of Czentsochowa, which is conducted by nuns of the Order of the Holy Family of Nazareth. The gleaming windows of the school are now decorated with sketches made by the children in honor of Christmas. The simplicity of the decorations is particularly appealing. There is no tinsel or ready-made wreath. Instead, the Star of Bethlehem is depicted, and the humble stable.

Our Lady of Czentsochowa parish, cherishing as it does the colorful customs of prewar Poland, seems to me a wonderful and inspiring part of life in our borough. Its presence enriches us, and I, for one, am grateful.

Congress and Its Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of Wednesday, December 29, 1948, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

CONGRESS AND ITS RULES

Representative ADOLPH SABATH has rendered many services to the cause of progressive legislation during his long career in Washington. He now has the opportunity to come up with one which might eclipse all the rest.

Representative SABATH'S prestige and influence are needed if the progressive movement to reform the House Rules Committee is to succeed. Representative SABATH is chairman of that committee. If he arose on the first day of the Eighty-first Congress to ask that its powers and privileges be revised, his counsel would probably be respected.

A change in the Rules Committee's position is essential if progressive legislation is to have a fair hearing during the Eighty-first Congress. A change is essential if the lower House is to become permanently more responsive to the people's will.

Under both Democratic and Republican leadership, the Rules Committee has been obstructing legislation for a long time. During the Eightieth Congress its power to strangle was dramatically illustrated when it single-handedly doomed the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.

The housing bill had been passed by the Senate and approved by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. But the Rules Committee, which is supposed to be a legislative traffic cop, undertook to substitute its own judgment for that of the proper House committee.

It refused to permit the House as a whole to consider the T.-E.-W. bill, and even substituted a bill of its own. The House never had a chance to decide whether its membership favored T.-E.-W. or something else.

Several proposals have been made to deal with this situation. Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, suggests that when the Rules Committee bottles up a bill which has won approval of another committee any member of the latter should be empowered, after a suitable interval, to obtain a House vote on it.

Representative A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, proposes that the Rules Committee be required to report every bill, favorably or unfavorably, within a specified time.

Representative CHRISTIAN HERTER, Republican, of Massachusetts, suggests that the Rules Committee function as a "second-thought" agency. It could return to other committees any legislation it did not approve; but if the committee sent the legislation back a second time, the Rules Committee would then be required to submit it to the House.

Whatever method may be adopted, some means of returning the Rules Committee to its original function—that of regulating legislative traffic—is clearly desirable. This is not a partisan issue. Nor is it a question of committee personnel, to be solved merely by enlarging or changing the membership.

No matter which party runs the committee, no matter whether the leadership is progressive or conservative, it is undemocratic to give a few men unlimited power to dictate the content of legislation or to decide whether the House shall consider it.

On the opening day of Congress the House can change its rules by a simple majority vote. For about an hour on that day the House will have the power to restore the original function of the Rules Committee without subjecting the proposal to a committee veto.

Chairmen do not often sponsor a movement to clip the wings of their own committees. Representative SABATH would make history and score a notable victory for progressivism if he violated that custom and assumed leadership of the movement for a more democratic House.

The Preservation of a Free Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on December 10 last, at the invitation of the New York Security Dealers' Association, I spoke to that group at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on the preservation of a free economy. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESERVATION OF A FREE ECONOMY

Your committee on public relations in its memorandum advising members of this meeting and of the identity of the speaker, stated that it felt it appropriate to have a representative of the Government speak in view of what it called the confused thinking upon the part of many since the election. There is really no reason for confusion, provided you have thrown away the dream books written in Washington which were read so widely prior to November 2.

This Government of ours is an American Government with no interest to serve but that of the people. You have a President from Missouri, a Vice President from Kentucky, each of whom has a background rich in the tradition of personal courage and character which have made this country great. Each of them is wholly loyal to the traditional concept of American Government and

American business, namely, that there should be freedom and opportunity for all.

You will have in the Eighty-first Congress a group of representatives fresh from the people in every State, with only one ambition, namely, to serve the general welfare.

President Truman is guided by a firm purpose to lead the world to peace. He knows that cannot be accomplished unless we maintain a prosperous and stable economy here at home. He may be depended upon to continue as he began with his effort to balance the budget, to avoid every possibility of depression, to hold Government expenditures down to those which are essential to the preservation of a high level of production, while at the same time to do those things which only Government can do to win the peace. His over-all objective to accomplish this purpose is to maintain a high standard of living for all of the people. One fact stands out—neither the world nor the United States can afford another depression, and it is the solemn obligation for statesmanship in business and in Government to make certain that such a catastrophe is avoided.

THIS IS A TIME FOR STATESMANSHIP

Certainly if ever there were a time for clear thinking, it is now. If there ever was a time for statesmanship in business and in Government, this is it. What we think and say and do must be viewed against the background of world events. Nothing that we can say or do can have the slightest effect except within the structure created by the world problem which, reduced to its bare bones, is the struggle between communism and democracy, between the philosophy of those who would have the economic affairs of the people managed for them, and the philosophy of those who believe that these affairs must be managed by the people themselves. I have no hesitation in saying that the people of the United States have accepted the destiny of this country to play a decisive role in world affairs for the preservation of individual freedom and real democracy, and that in domestic affairs they are committed to working out a program of social and economic progress with emphasis upon the humanitarian rather than on the mere administrative objectives.

If this be true—and certainly it is true, witness our bipartisan foreign policy and the declaration of all political leaders in the recent campaign of their devotion to social progress—if this be true, I say, then clearly we must measure every political and economic proposal by the effect it has on the power of the people to control their own political and economic destiny.

We have a world problem only because the power of the people to control their own affairs has been undermined in our time. It has been undermined by the concentration of both political and economic authority, but we shall not begin to understand the significance of the events of which we are a part unless we realize first of all that the concentration of political power in totalitarian government has always been preceded by concentration of economic power. The rise of Hitler would have been utterly impossible if there had not already been erected in Germany a concentrated economic structure that he was able to take over by a wave of the hand. The concentrated arbitrary power of Lenin and Stalin was erected only upon the foundations of the old concentrated economic power of the czars and their nobles. The people of Russia did not direct the old regime any more than they direct the new regime now. The change from the czars to the Communists was merely an exchange of dictators.

WAR WAS WON FOR FREEDOM

World War II was a struggle between the peoples of the democratic nations of the world who believe that the people should control their own destiny, and totalitarian dictators who wanted to turn back the clock of reaction by reestablishing arbitrary central power in the world. As a matter of self-preservation, the Communist dictators aligned themselves in that struggle with the democracies. We thought during the war that after victory they would see the value of democracy, but we are now learning they are quite as steeped in their totalitarian ideologies as when, before they were attacked, they had made common cause with Hitler. The war was won for democracy because the habits of freedom had made our armies and navies and air fighters more resourceful, more competent, more effective as individuals than were the regimented hordes of the dictators. We know perfectly well that the capacities of the fighting men of America were not measured by their origin, their calling, their social or economic status. Whether they were recruited from the ranks of labor, the ranks of management, agriculture, business, or the professions, their competence was the result of the fact that they were the products of free institutions. Surely we have seen enough to know that the future progress of all the races of men depends wholly upon the degree to which the opportunities of freedom are extended to the peoples of all nations.

This, then, is the background against which we must view the economic problem in America. This is the background against which we must examine the plans and purposes of business as well as the plans and purposes of government.

NO ONE IN WASHINGTON WANTS POLICE STATE

I undertake to say to this group that despite all the slogans of the political campaign, there is no purpose among the members of your Government, whether they are in the executive or the legislative branches, to establish in the United States a police state. The time has come to take off the blinders of mere partisanship, of mere factionalism, and to look at facts exactly as they are. When this is done, we shall have much better eyes to appraise our problem and to see precisely where we want to go. I feel very strongly that it ought to be possible to recruit among the members of this organization a group of militant evangelists dedicated to the preservation of a free economy without any thought or purpose of hostile action against any group or any individual so long as such group or individual remains loyal to the American tradition of freedom and opportunity for people. We shall find the solution of our difficulties, not in punitive action but in constructive action, not in the punishment of alleged or, indeed, of real offenses but in the framing of an economic structure that will protect an expanding economy of opportunity against the restrictive and deadening influences of economic concentration. I undertake to say that the difficulties in which the security dealers find themselves at the present moment are not due to any deliberate plan upon the part of any person or any group to create such a situation, but solely to the fact that we have not understood the forces which have been drying up the flow of investment capital and making difficult the establishment of new free, competitive enterprise.

No one knows better than the members of this organization that comparatively few investment houses have for years been doing the bulk of the security business. This was made clear during the study of the Temporary National Economic Committee. It is equally clear now. During the period from January 1934 to June 1939, six New York City firms handled more than 57 percent of all security issues. During the period from January 1938 to April 30, 1947, the percentage fell off slightly. There were more issues, but the same six firms managed more than 51 percent of the total. The fact that the percentage of concentration fell off in the more recent period and that the number of issues increased shows that there has been a slight gain, and that all the talk in Washington during the past 16 years about economic freedom has not been wholly without avail. At the same time there has undoubtedly been a steady increase in the area of private placement by financial and insurance institutions. I do not cite these figures as evidence of any direct purpose among investment bankers to promote or to retard concentration. I cite them only to illustrate the cold facts and to indicate that if it is desirable to bring about a broader distribution of this type of business, the time has come for us to understand the forces which of themselves promote concentration even without any planned purpose on the part of any group.

In saying this, I do not wish to be understood as meaning that concentration has not been actively promoted in some instances. I know, for example, that many mergers of industrial companies have been brought about by investment houses for the purpose of issuing new securities. Industrial engineers and investment bankers have been known to look over the field seeking to discover firms which, for a fee or a commission, could be brought together in corporate merger. The result inevitably is to narrow rather than to expand the field of competition, to increase concentration of economic power, and, therefore, to some extent to reduce the number of security issues. The practice also results in denying to the far reaches of the country, to the extent to which the mergers are carried out, the normal development of a free, competitive economy.

All that, however, I believe is only an incident to the progress of concentration, although, of course, in the early days of this century industrial mergers, out of which came some of our well-known industrial giants, were promoted by those who were primarily concerned in the fiscal phases of the transaction.

GROWTH OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

What I desire to call to the attention of this group is that neither in business nor in Government has there been a clear appraisal of the differences between little business and big business, nor does the public understand the degree to which big business has come to dominate the entire economic and social scene. The Government in Washington has expanded, not because of any plot upon the part of any Member of Congress or of the Executive to increase Federal powers, but because the progress of economic concentration in the field of big business has turned the attention of little and local businessmen all over the country to Washington and to the Government as a source of protection and of necessary capital. It was clearly shown during the studies of the Temporary National Economic Committee that the savings of the people through banks and insurance companies flow into the financial centers where, under central management, they are available, practically exclusively, for the use of big business. The head of the greatest insurance company in the country testifying only last week before the Joint Insurance Committee of the New York State Legislature, pointed out that more than $14,000,000,000 of the total of $37,000,000,000 in insurance issued by his company is supported by weekly and monthly premium payments of less than $10 a month. More than one-third of the insurance policies issued by this company are carried by individuals in the lower income brackets who can afford to pay their premiums only weekly or monthly, and whose pennies flow from all parts of the country into the central reservoirs of investment here in New York City. Thus it was that the pennies of the poor built the Empire State Building and Rockefeller Center. The head of another great national insurance company with its head offices here in New York City told the Tem-

porary National Economic Committee almost 10 years ago that his company was not interested in a loan of less than $250,000 and, as I recall, that it would prefer not to be bothered by loan applications for less than one-half million dollars.

That is understandable, of course, when one considers the annoyances of the detailed work necessary to serve the small loans which little business wants, but it also illustrates why the demand is continually rising from all parts of the country for Government loans to little business. The people turn to government for action only when the service they need is not provided for them by the institutions which exist. So Congress is constantly under pressure, not from any radical group, not on the part of any State planners, not upon the part of any advocates of a police state, but upon the part of the people themselves to provide, through RFC or otherwise, sources of Government capital to supply the need which the expanding economy of the country demands but which is not met by the loaning institutions we have.

The dispatches from Hollywood, Fla., tell us that at the meeting of the Investment Bankers' Association there this week the retiring president, Mr. Julian H. Collins, declared that there is still opportunity for a thriving private business for resourceful and aggressive firms in spite of what he called the persisting drift toward socialism in the United States. I say to you that if there be a drift toward socialism it is due to the fact that industrial and business statesmanship has not yet looked at facts as they are and has not clearly appraised the conditions which are promoting the drift toward centralism. More than that, industrial and financial leaders sometimes seem to give more concern and attention to things they fear may happen than to the things which are taking place under their own noses. Only the day before yesterday, for example, the Washington correspondent of a well-known insurance journal came to me during the hearings on business profits and showed me a telegram from his editor directing him to interview me and get a good story on the legislation to provide Federal regulation of insurance which, the editor told him, I was busily engaged in preparing. There was not even the slightest basis for the report, and the massage was the first and only knowledge I had had about my alleged activity. This is another illustration of the wisdom of the remark made a few years ago by a very competent lawyer of the Far West, who said, "The worst things in life seldom happen."

If, instead of planning defenses against things that are not happening in government, business and financial leaders would devote their attention to the things that are happening in business, better progress would be made all along the line both in government and in business. This would be particularly true if business leadership would devote itself to a constructive campaign for the preservation of the free-enterprise system, in which it professes to believe, from internal dangers.

BIG-BUSINESS DOMINANCE

Now let me turn to the amazing fact that out of a total of 3,316,000 business firms and persons engaged in business in the United States in 1939 employing 28,707,500 persons, 26,900 firms, less than 1 percent of the total, in fact only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the total, employed 15,955,700 workers, or 56.6 percent of all. In other words, all the business firms in the United States employing less than 100 persons, though they constitute 99.2 percent of the total, actually employ only 44.4 percent of all the workers. More amazing, the 4,900 firms, each of which employs 500 or more workers, though they constitute one-tenth of 1 percent of the total, employ 40 percent of all workers.

These are not my figures. They are not the figures of any New Deal propagandist. I have taken them from page 25 of the study on Small Business: Its Place and Problems, written by Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, of the Brookings Institution, for the businessmen's Committee for Economic Development and published by McGraw-Hill, the New York publishers, who, by no strain of the imagination, can be called propagandists for the police state. They show the degree to which economic concentration has already advanced and is continuing to advance.

This is the most significant social and economic fact of our time. The little firms, the little businesses, see the savings of the communities in which they live siphoned off into the big city reservoirs of capital where they are available, not for the free, independent developments of the communities in which these savings were earned, but for distribution to the big-business enterprises which finance their capital needs either by loans from the huge fiscal institutions of New York or from some Government agency.

So I say to the investment fraternity, don't blame the politicians for the growth of big government. Blame yourselves, because you have not taken the initiative to provide the capital which a growing free economy demands; nor have you taken the necessary steps to protect little business from being overwhelmed by centralism. If you permit the free economy to starve for lack of private capital, don't complain if the people turn to Government for what they want.

Now, I do not pretend to say that business leaders alone are responsible for this condition. Government leaders, too, must share the responsibility. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in announcing its willingness to act upon small business applications for loans, has made it a practice of asking local bank participation, but local banks are reluctant to participate for two reasons: First, perhaps because they would like a better rate of interest than proposed; and, secondly and primarily, because the banking arm of the Government frowns on long-term loans by commercial banks. So there are many cases of businesses throughout the country who, because they cannot get their capital needs from the RFC because of Federal Reserve or Comptroller of the Currency regulations, turn to the insurance companies of New York or sell out to big business, thus affording an opportunity for big investment bankers to issue new securities for a new merger.

WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

Well, you say, what are we going to do about it? First, we must recognize not only the difference between little business and big business, but the difference between individual business and organized corporate business. We must recognize the fact that in present circumstances corporations with unlimited charters are permitted to set up any number of subsidiaries and affiliates and engage in any number of businesses their directors desire. Accumulated earnings in the hands of the big corporations seek new avenues for investment, and so they go into nonrelated lines as well as into actual subsidiary lines. They expand out geographically into a dozen, a score, or even more States, and business institutions in localities far from the central office of the mother corporation are under the supervisory direction of the central managers who sit at the top of vast industrial empires which are in fact governed not by the real owners, the stockholders, but by employed experts. Thus, local economic independence is broken down and in its place is built a managerial economy which sets the pattern for the managerial state.

If local economic independence is broken down, how can you expect to escape the expanding power of the Government in Washington? The growth of the Federal Government and the undermining of local economic independence are two aspects of the same thing. There can be no cure by mere railing against the growth of government if we pay no attention to the preservation of local economic independence. It is idle to talk about States' rights in the political field when we abandon States' rights in the economic field.

The security dealer of a big city like New York is just as much a victim of this drift as are the little businesses of the country, and as are the localities which are turning to Washington for aid and assistance.

Let no one forget that the Government has expanded steadily ever since the close of the Civil War, no matter what political party was in power. Business has clamored against every extension of Government activity. It denounced the establishment of the parcel post system under the administration of President William Howard Taft just as vigorously as it denounced any of the legislation of the New Deal. The Federal meat inspection law demanded by Teddy Roosevelt at the turn of the century was roundly condemned as an adventure in socialism. It was President Harding who signed his name as Chief Executive to the Packers and Stockyards Act which gave the Secretary of Agriculture more power to regulate the packers and stockyards industry than was ever granted by any administration to any Government agency.

We are in the hands of events, and if we do not control the events, the events will control us. I have no hesitation in saying to you that neither President Truman nor any responsible leader of the Democratic Party in Congress, nor, for that matter, any Member of Congress, wants to expand the power of government for the mere sake of building up an all-powerful state. The Federal power grows merely because in the modern world with modern technology and the modern corporate system, the concentration of economic power proceeds relentlessly with the inevitable result that the people turn to Washington for relief. Unless we learn the solemn fact that economic concentration is but the prelude to political concentration, we must be prepared for that eventuality.

THE PRESERVATION OF CAPITALISM

Over and over again during the past 15 years I have expressed the personal opinion that the preservation of the capitalistic system depends upon our recognition of the characteristics of the modern corporate system as it has developed. It is the dominant social and economic institution of our age. It is necessary enough. Without the modern corporation, we couldn't possibly develop and use the instruments, to say nothing of the tools this new age demands, but it is the instrument through which we have permitted economic concentration to proceed. I talk about the degree to which economic power has been concentrated in the hands of a few managers, but by that I do not mean and never have suggested that big business should be broken up. I do say that we shall not be able to prevent this continued drift toward centralism in business and in government unless we make up our minds definitely to define by Federal law the powers, the authority, and social responsibility of the corporation that does business in the field of interstate and foreign commerce, the regulation of which, by the Constitution of the United States was committed to the Congress of the United States, for otherwise, the position of little business will become steadily weaker and the power of government steadily greater.

Though I have introduced a bill in Congress after Congress to provide for Federal charters, I do not pretend to say that any single person is competent to define all these powers and responsibilities. I feel that it is highly desirable that there should be a conference of business experts, of corporate-law experts, of consumers, of farmers, and of workers—called by authority of law—to study this problem and to present to Congress its recommendations for a national charter law. We need an economic constitutional convention now just as much as our predecessors after the American Revolution needed a political constitutional convention.

Labor and management have already made great progress in developing a better relationship. Universities have established seminars in which labor and management leaders confer and study their problems with most beneficial results. I am convinced that there is a much greater degree of agreement among all affected by this problem than there is disagreement, but it is the disagreements that get into the headlines, thus cultivating the fears which hold business leaders back from the cooperation which is essential to a sensible solution of the problem before us.

Security dealers have so vital an interest in this problem of concentrated economic power, they have so vital an interest in the free flow of capital, that they could well take the lead in promoting this basic understanding of the meaning and effects of continued concentration, so that our capitalistic economy can demonstrate to all the people of the world that freedom makes for stability and progress far better than any system of arbitrary central power.

You gentlemen are professionally concerned in the investment of capital. You are primarily concerned in the investment of risk capital. You have seen the flow of savings become steadily more institutionalized. You have seen private placement and investment bankers and savings institutions dry up the "free market" for money, and I wonder whether, like most of us in Government, you are not overlooking the greatest new source of money seeking investment. The Treasury of the United States in World War I, by the issuance of savings stamps and savings bonds in small denominations of $100 and less, opened the eyes of the business world to the tremendous possibilities for new capital existing among the rank and file of the people. Full employment in our time has created a new reservoir for risk capital in the savings of the people in the lower and middle income brackets who are now earning more than they ever earned before.

How many of us realize that the total amount received in income during a single year by taxpayers under the 1948 tax law who receive an annual income of less than $2,000 is more than three times as great as the aggregate sum received by every income recipient in the United States whose annual income is over $25,000. The millions in the under $2,000 group receive a total of $35,300,000,000, whereas all over $25,000 receive only $10,800,000,000. Indeed, the total receipts of all individuals with an income of over $10,000 amount only to $19,800,000,000, whereas all under $5,000 a year receive a sum more than five times greater, or $103,700,000,000.

If business leadership will join with Government leadership to protect the investment of these little fellows at the bottom of the economic scale from being wiped out by the operation of economic concentration, we shall then be able to save both the free economy and the free political system which are the traditional ideals of the people of the United States.

The Seattle Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an account in the press section of the January 3 issue of Newsweek magazine of an outstanding public service performed by a newspaper and newspaperman in the State of Washington. The public service rendered by the Seattle Times, of Seattle, is typical of the fine work being done by many newspapers and newspapermen throughout the Nation. In this case the reporter was a veteran ace editor, Mr. Don Magnuson; his city editor is Mr. Henry MacLeod, and his managing editor is Mr. Russell MacGrath. They all deserve commendation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DETECTIVE STORY

Slowly, as he kept handing the prisoner a chain of cigarettes, the reporter's steel skepticism crumbled into sympathy. The lifer swore his innocence, and somehow Don Magnuson believed him.

Then back in the Seattle Times newsroom Magnuson told Henry MacLeod, his city editor: "It would take some time and cash. But we might have one chance in four of getting a pardon." "Where a man's liberty is at stake," MacLeod snapped back, "a 25-percent chance is good enough for me."

It took cash and it took time, but last week the Washington State penitentiary gates clanked open, and Clarence Boggie, after 13 years of prison for a murder he almost unquestionably didn't commit, sped home for Christmas with his aged parents.

TIPS

A letter, the kind of letter with which newspapers are deluged every day and often discard simply as crank mail, unfolded to The Times the strange case of prisoner No. 16587:

In 1935 in Spokane the ruddy, talky Oregon logger, then 42, was doomed to life for the brutal blackjack murder two and a half years before of old Moritz Peterson. More than anything else, an overcoat convicted him. Boggie wore the murdered man's coat, which he swore he bought in a pawn shop.

Over the seemingly endless years No. 16587 amassed an imposing heap of documents, including a 720-page transcript of his trial, to back his innocence. He talked many people, among them Warden Tom Smith, into believing his story.

MacLeod kept the letter. When Magnuson was going to the Walla Walla prison last January on another story, the city editor handed it to him. See Clarence Boggie, he ordered. Magnuson returned convinced.

ON THE TRAIL

For 6 months the tall, lean, graying 37-year-old reporter pored over evidence. He and other Times men went on the road—2,000 miles through three States—to grill jurors, friends, cops, witnesses; anyone who might hold even a hint of a tip.

A 15-year-old trail is a hopelessly cold path to follow. Most persons important to Magnuson's search had moved. At least nine were dead, and even Boggie's parents required an 8-hour sales talk before consenting to an interview. Sensitive, the Spokane officials were reluctant to help.

But by late August Magnuson had plowed up enough evidence that, if it did not conclusively clear Boggie, at least proved thin the grounds on which he was imprisoned. These facts the reporter presented to Gov. Mon Wallgren and told to the public in a flood of Times stories.

RECANTINGS

Three of the four Boggie jurors The Times could find had confessed that, after all, maybe they hadn't been so positive, and Magnuson pointed out, among other things, that the state's star witness admittedly had not seen the slayer's face.

Too, all Magnuson's sleuthing pointed squarely to another suspect, a hotel porter with a crablike gait, who before the killing had publicly brandished a homemade blackjack. The victim had gasped to detectives his attacker was a porter. Witnesses described the murderer as a man who walked like a crab. Boggie never walked that way.

Yet Governor Wallgren was wary. After all, even before the murder, two robbbery convictions had blotched Boggie's record.

Then 2 weeks ago Don Magnuson turned up the clinching clue. In the home of a retired Spokane detective he uncovered an old police file showing that 2½ years before five witnesses positively identified Boggie as the killer, the same five had positively put the finger on another suspect. Wallgren signed a pardon.

MAGNUSON'S WAY

The case of 16587 is the second whacking scoop Donald Hammer Magnuson's methodical, plodding reporting has uncorked for the Times. In 1942, at the height of the wartime labor drought, he posed 2 weeks as a shipyard worker to ferret out an exposé of loafing in the yard.

At the University of Washington, an instructor advised him to give up his journalism course, that he'd never make a newspaperman. Magnuson graduated anyway, in 1931, smack into the middle of the depression. He was a gas-station attendant, brickyard worker, riveter, and $1-a-day wheat harvesting hand before he finally got a job in 1934 on the little Olympia Daily Olympian.

There he covered everything from society to murders and got a scoop on the Weyerhaeuser kidnaping. He turned off the lights in a self-service elevator, scooted up to the floor where G-men were booking the kidnapers, and then listened quietly through the ajar elevator door. He went to the Times in 1941.

No sentimentalist, Magnuson can be as cynical, or as compassionate, as the next newsman. Somehow, though, other reporters know he means it when he says as he did on the Boggie story: "I cry inside."

Puerto Rico's Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Washington Daily News of January 3, 1949:

PUERTO RICO'S INAUGURATION

The inauguration of Luis Munoz-Marín yesterday as the first governor of Puerto Rico to be elected by its people was a significant event for the United States and for world democracy, as well as for that island itself.

In the 50 years since Puerto Rico was taken from Spain its governors have been appointed by American Presidents. Some were capable men who devoted themselves to their duties, others were political hacks or plain misfits. Not until 1946, when President Truman appointed Jesus T. Pinero, was a Puerto Rican chosen for the position.

Mr. Truman and the Eightieth Congress wisely provided that the island should elect its own governor, by popular vote. Last November Mr. Munoz-Marín was elected overwhelmingly, with more than three-fourths of the qualified voters casting their ballots, thus receiving a clearer mandate than Mr. Truman, or, indeed, any American President in modern times has obtained.

Puerto Rico, overpopulated as it is, faces grave economic problems even in these prosperous times. Beyond desiring greater autonomy, its leaders themselves have not agreed upon what the island's future political status should be—statehood, independence, or continued existence as a Territory.

But for the present Puerto Rico is a part of the United States and its people are American citizens. It is notable that, whatever their feelings toward the United States, Puerto Ricans have so absorbed the principles of democracy that communism has made little headway there.

In permitting Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor, the United States has taken an important step toward carrying out a goal of the United Nations—greater self-government for territories and possessions of the great powers.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *January 4, 1949.*
Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is resolution believed self-explanatory:

"Whereas the Christian world is angered and saddened by the flagrant disregard of the dignity of the human personality in the arrest and imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government: Be it

Resolved, That the Monsignor Peter E. Blessing Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Providence, R. I., protests this latest outrage of Hungarian communism and asks that our Representatives in Congress direct the appropriate authorities to take immediate steps to register this country's formal protest and to exert the influence of the United States through its representatives in the United Nations to probe the charges leveled against this stalwart proponent of Christian ideals in Hungary and to secure his release if they are found false; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Congressional Representatives of Rhode Island and to the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee."

Unanimously adopted by Msgr. Peter E. Blessing Division in meeting duly assembled this 3d day of January 1949.

JAMES F. SHIEL.
EUGENE F. COCHRAN.
PETER C. MORAN.

Method of Election of President and Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor has editorially commented on the outmoded method by which the President and Vice President of the United States are elected. I hope the Eighty-first Congress will correct this situation by submitting a constitutional amendment along the lines of the Lodge-Gossett resolution. I have introduced a similar resolution, not to detract in the least from the credit due my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], but to tangibly express the support of a Member on this side of the aisle.

The editorial follows:

THE MACHINERY CREAKED

On December 13 Harry S. Truman was elected President. Legally, that is more correct than to say that he was elected on November 2. For under the Constitution and the controlling Federal statute it was only when 303 votes were cast in the electoral college on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December that the actual election took place.

The ancient machinery creaked more audibly than usual. And more Americans were listening. For on the night of November 2 millions had been concerned lest their voting produce a stalemate in the electoral college and force an election by the House of Representatives. Happily, that invitation to political deals was bypassed.

But there was still the prospect of a three-way split and much uncertainty about how many States' Rights Democrats would keep their pledge to vote against Mr. Truman. In the end, all but one did so, and he came from a State whose popular vote went to the President. Another elector from the same State chose to keep his pledge rather than follow the vote.

Citizens had fresh opportunity to see that the electoral college is anything but accurate and efficient. Governor Dewey got only 189 of the 531 votes, although receiving nearly half the popular total. And President Truman got none of New York's 47 electoral ballots although he ran only 60,000 behind Mr. Dewey in a vote of 6,000,000. Citizens learned again that under this unsystematic system they might choose a President at the polls and have him beaten in the electoral college.

This time the antique college performed its function, but also pointed up faults which should put fresh steam behind proposals for reform. It is not necessary to throw out the apportionment of electoral votes which gives small States a bit of extra weight. But it would be helpful to give each candidate his fair proportion of electoral votes according to his popular vote in each State. The new Congress should adopt the plan to do this, proposed as a constitutional amendment in the Lodge-Gossett resolution.

Amendment of House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House on Monday reducing the powers of the Rules Committee is something that will rise up to plague this body and the country in the months to come.

The reason given for amending the rules was that it was necessary to make possible majority control, but this was not the real reason, as there has never been a time when a majority of the House could not work its will upon any measure properly falling within its jurisdiction.

While the Rules Committee has, on occasions, held up bills that have been reported by legislative committees, it was always within the power of the majority to take these bills from the committee and do with them what it pleased. The Rules Committee has functioned as a screen to keep out of the House controversial measures on which the majority did not wish to take a public position. It has simply served to insure moderation and to prevent precipitant action.

The resolution may, to the uninformed, seem harmless and inconsequential, but to the informed it will be construed as a violent turn to the left that may well sweep the country into an advanced form of socialism, for by its adoption the House broke down the barrier that has held back the flood tide of radicalism and protected the country against the killing effect of statism. What was done could mean—it may mean—that we are going the way that England went, and without the restraint, caution, and moderation that England has shown. Certainly it will have a frightening effect upon business which will kill off expansion, slow down production, lower commodity prices, and create such a state of uncertainty in the minds of the people as to cause liquidation when expansion is needed.

What has been done will result in the creation of the greatest social disturbance that this country has ever experienced, for it opens the door for the whole of the so-called civil-rights program and all of its companion radical measures. It is a blow to the institution of private ownership, for under laws that will follow the management of one's own private property will, in part, be taken away from him, as he will no longer be permitted to exercise a free discretion in the choice of his associates or his employees.

The disturbance in the South will be greater than in any other part of the

country, for there the racial question is greatest. The color line will be completely wiped out and all distinction between the races outlawed. There will be no more separate schools, separate hotels, separate churches, separate fraternal lodges—no more separate anything—and State laws against the marriage of whites and blacks will be federally invalidated. There is not a Member of Congress who does not know that this is so, and when in the months to come a Federal gestapo moves into the South and takes her people by the throat in the enforcement of laws, regulations, and edicts that are obnoxious to them, no one can plead ignorance, for we are all fully informed and have been so since the first hour in the life of the present Congress. A vote for the resolution was a vote for the FEPC, which is a weapon aimed at the heart of the South, her civilization, and the institutions that her people have erected. It was to those of us who come from the South a test of our loyalty to our people. As for myself, I had to meet it with proper respect of the position that I have heretofore taken, and with due regard to the welfare of those who sent me here.

What has been done makes certain the adoption of laws that will repudiate the principle that "the excellence of every government is its adaptation to the state of those to be governed by it" and that laws which affect their happiness "must flow from their own habits, their own feelings, and the resources of their own minds."

The powers of the States are going to be further reduced and the Constitution in regard thereto further circumvented. Laws will be imposed upon the people that are as completely disregardful of their habits, manners, and ways of thinking which constitute a part of their nature as if they were dictated by a foreign power.

Amendment of House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the Congress we of the minority were steam-rollered into accepting a change in the rules without being able to read the changes suggested except as they had appeared in the press. Furthermore, the suggested changes were read once by the Clerk of the House, and even today, 2 days later, there is a drastic difference of opinion among parliamentary leaders as to what these changes mean.

In effect, these changes permit any committee chairman on alternate Mondays to call up for consideration any bill which has been favorably reported by his committee and has sat awaiting a rule in the Rules Committee for a period in excess of 21 legislative days. It has been argued by those in the highest position in the Democratic caucus, at which agreement was reached on this change in the rules, that the matter of recognizing the committee chairman for the purpose of calling up such a bill is discretionary with the Speaker. It is also argued by eminent parliamentary authorities that under the wording of this change, the Speaker has no authority and must recognize the chairman. Whichever interpretation is correct, the change is a very drastic one.

There is no need whatever for this change in order to take care of a situation against which there has been considerable complaint; namely, the killing of bills by the Rules Committee. Many years ago, the House had adopted a rule setting aside every Wednesday as a day on which committee chairmen or other members of a committee, upon instructions from their committee, could, when their turn came, call up for consideration any matter already favorably voted upon by the committee and listed on the Union Calendar. In the past 8 or 10 years, Calendar Wednesday has been almost always dispensed with by unanimous consent; however, if anyone objects to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday, it take a two-thirds vote to dispense with it. Hence one-third of the Members have always been and still are in a position to insist that Calendar Wednesday be proceeded with. The only difficulty with respect to the handling of very controversial bills on Calendar Wednesday has arisen from the fact that dilatory tactics could successfully achieve an adjournment of the House before general debate on such a bill had been finished, in which case the particular bill could not be again brought before the House until the turn of the committee sponsoring it came up again on some succeeding Calendar Wednesday. General debate for all bills called up on Calendar Wednesday is limited to 2 hours. When that debate is finished, the committee chairman in charge of the bill makes a motion for the previous question. If this motion is adopted, the bill is then read for amendment under the 5-minute rule and becomes unfinished business of the House. In other words, even though action on it is not completed on that Wednesday, further consideration is not postponed to succeeding Calendar Wednesdays, but is continued on succeeding days.

While I realize that this explanation is somewhat technical, it does, I think, show clearly enough that if Calendar Wednesday is properly observed, every committee has an opportunity of bringing important legislation on the floor of the House without resorting to the Rules Committee. However, dilatory tactics in order to make Calendar Wednesday ineffective have been resorted to so frequently that a slight change in the rules would undoubtedly be desirable to prevent such tactics. Had the vote on the previous question offered by Congressman SABATH not prevailed on Monday, then I would have offered a substitute amendment to the rules which had received the full approval of the Republican steering committee. That amendment read as follows:

Amend clause 7 of rule 24 by adding thereto the following: *"Provided further,* That pending action on the previous question no motion for adjournment or other motion which in the opinion of the Chair is frivolous or has for its purpose delaying consideration of a motion on the previous question shall be entertained by the Chair."

In view of the fact that the procedure with respect to Calendar Wednesday is still a part of our rules and that in order to get around making use of Calendar Wednesday, motions will have to be made dispensing with it every single week, I am convinced that it is much more logical and orderly a procedure for us to stick by the existing rules with the amendment which I had planned to offer. For that reason, I am now filing the proposed amendment as a separate resolution.

The Businessman's Obligations to the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the December issue of the magazine Dun's Review, published by Dun and Bradstreet, contains an article prepared by me on the subject of the businessman's obligations to our Government and to our people.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN WAYS IN WHICH BUSINESSMEN CAN HELP THE NATIONAL WELFARE

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The scene was at a chamber of commerce convention. A group of important businessmen were gathered around a table with myself discussing problems of the day.

At last one of them said dejectedly, "Well, after we go home, what can we do to make a serious and constructive contribution to our country? It seems that you fellows in Washington are the only ones who can really do anything about taking care of the problems of America at home and abroad. The citizen can't do much more than sit back and pray that Congress will make the right decisions. Yes, he can write letters and telegrams to Congress, but, in the long run, it's what Congress itself thinks and decides that really tells the story."

I listened to the businessman and recognized in his thinking the views of many other folks—businessmen, laboring men, housewives, clergymen—all types in our population.

But I disagreed with this viewpoint and I proceeded to explain why. I said that the American businessman enjoys a basic bill of rights as does every other citizen of our country. Congress has been seeking to implement the businessman's bill of rights because, for too long, private enterprise was

abused by arbitrary labor-union practices, by interference with employers' freedom of speech, and by the mass intimidation and coercion of employers, and so on.

But while Congress has been seeking to assure true liberty for the businessman, as well as for everyone else in our population, no one, I said, should lose sight of the fact that each of us has a bill of obligations, particularly the businessman. Why? Because the businessman in his community is a leader, a builder, a sustainer of community life. It is he who creates jobs, who creates wealth. It is he to whom public and private officials look for support in community development campaigns. Obviously, therefore, the businessman has heavy obligations and responsibilities commensurate with his power and prestige.

IMPORTANCE OF OBLIGATIONS

Moreover these are not empty obligations in the sense that the businessman has to do them as a matter of form without actually expecting important consequences from them. On the contrary, it is by fulfillment of these obligations that the businessman individually and collectively can actually do as much of significance for the benefit of the Nation as can the Congress.

That may seem like a pretty broad statement, but it is nevertheless true. It is at the grass roots of America that the real American decisions are made. Nothing the Congress does, no laws it enacts, no amendments that it writes, can have any meaning or validity unless the businessmen back at the grass roots of the Nation continue to keep the economic and other currents moving.

Well, what are these obligations of the businessman?

Here they are, as I see them:

1. Demonstration of personal qualities of leadership: It is up to each businessman to radiate sincere courage, confidence, and hope. He can do this by starting off and counting his blessings as an American instead of counting his woes, his tax troubles, his labor troubles, his material shortages, and so on. How many businessmen do you know whose every public utterance is one of gloom and dissatisfaction? How many businessmen do you know who can only talk in terms of calamity, catastrophe, and tragedy for America unless certain things are done? I don't mean that businessmen can or should be Pollyannas, making believe that all is sweetness and light. I do mean that they should be realists. It is an essential truth about realism that you can't start off toward success without realistically believing in your mission and having faith in it, in yourself, and in your Nation.

2. Moderation in business charges: Too often in the past, some businessmen have been accused of charging for their product "all the traffic would bear." Sometimes that charge has been true. More often it has been false. Through chambers of commerce and other enlightened institutions, that very small minority of businessmen who insist on abusing their authority, has been brought increasingly into line. This minority has been made to understand that it is a part of its obligation to charge moderately and ask only a reasonable profit, rather than to create bad public relations for business as a whole by reckless profiteering. Still, some elements of that profiteering minority exist, just as such racketeering elements exist in every other segment of our economy. We should progressively, however, seek to decrease the numbers in that minority.

HASTY JUDGMENTS

3. Exemplifying caution: A brother Senator once said: "Why should I study bills here in the Congress when all I need to do is ask any businessman from my home State, who has never even been to Washington and has never even studied the bills, for his opinion, and he can proceed to give me a 10,000-word lecture on just what should be done and how it should be done?"

This Senator was voicing reactions of many other legislators who have received the impression, justified or not, that businessmen have gotten into the habit of giving curbstone advice, snap judgments, without actually studying issues. We can understand why that happens. After all, businessmen are usually active during every minute of their working day on problems vitally affecting their own industry and don't have too much time to devote intensively to national and international affairs. That fact should, however, give them more of a sense of caution than some of them frequently evidence.

I don't mean that they should be overly shy about communicating their judgment to Congress. On the contrary, I believe that they have a long way to go in making their voice heard and respected in the Congress. But they will be more heard and more respected if they refrain from posing as seers and prophets, just as no other segment of our economy should assume that it automatically knows more than Congressmen who may have studied particular problems for months and months.

4. Faith in government: Businessmen's experiences with government during the years—their being victimized by Government snoopers, by Government questionnaires, by bureaucrats with arbitrary directives—have caused many businessmen to lose their faith, not only in the present Government as it is politically constituted but also in government itself as an institution. This, too, we can understand, in view of American businessmen being so long at the receiving end of bureaucratic blows. Of course, our businessmen are grateful for those many public servants who are truly servants—faithful employees of the people—and who try to do a conscientious, helpful job in Government service. In spite of some experiences that businessmen have with arbitrary bureaucrats, every community in the Nation is looking to its businessmen for faith in the American Republic, in the American processes of government, and the businessmen should live up to the people's expectations of that faith.

STILL ROOM FOR ADVANCEMENT

5. Sound labor relations: In these days there is an increasing emphasis on farsighted and intelligent labor relations. Little need be said on this topic, because American industry has made spectacular advances in getting an understanding of employees' problems and in enabling employees to understand the problems of management. There have been wonderful advances made in labor-management conferences, in employees' suggestion programs, and in other devices designed to blend labor and management into an effective team. We still, however, have broad horizons toward which to advance in this field of labor relations. You need only look at America's recent heavy strike record to recognize that.

6. Fairness in tax payments: No one loves to pay taxes. But we recognize taxes as the inevitable consequence of living in this atomic age with a huge Government establishment, particularly for national defense. Of course, Congress should go a long way toward eliminating unnecessary Government overhead, streamlining government, and achieving more efficiency, less duplication of effort. At the same time, no businessman should attempt to justify evasion of taxes on the grounds that some of his tax money is being misspent. You and I know that with America's staggering $250,000,000,000 national debt and with her vast forty-billion-dollars-or-so budget, we all must carry our tax load if Uncle Sam is to maintain his solvency.

THE NATION WILL BENEFIT

7. Supporting worthy movements: Every mail to the businessman brings appeals from charities and from various community organizations, asking a helping hand for various projects. It is a tribute to America's free-enterprise system that we can support our great private charity set-up, our wonderful private educational system, and many other institutions which depend so vitally upon the support by the men and women of industry. Still, there are other movements afoot, designed to create better and nobler living, better human relations, better appreciation of man's spiritual responsibilities and aesthetic values. It is up to the businessman to support these movements, consistent with his means, as should everyone else.

It is very important that we do not support sucker outfits designed to bleed the public and bleed business. We should definitely not support alien-minded, subversive organizations hiding behind letterheads with glittering titles. We should, however, advance movements for nobler living that will truly contribute to the Nation.

8. Aid to youth: In perhaps no other field can the businessman make a greater contribution than in the field of aid to the young men and women who will be the leaders of the America of tomorrow. That is no new revelation, because in every community throughout our land businessmen, already, through their chambers of commerce, through their fraternal clubs, and through veterans' organizations, are lending the hand of a father or a big brother to the Nation's youth, seeking to curb the problem of juvenile delinquency, seeking to infuse in the Nation's young people a love of our free way of life. Here too, however, business and the rest of us still have a long way to go. Any reading of today's newspapers, with their reports of youth caught in the web of crime or in alien movements, shows how vast and unfulfilled the need still is.

UPHOLD AMERICAN BUSINESS

9. Aid in Government procurement: Now that America has embarked on the $6,000,000,000 Marshall plan, as well as on a tremendous national defense preparation, there will be a huge amount of procurement in the goods and services of business. It is essential that this procurement be conducted on the highest plane, not only in order to save the money of the taxpayers, not only in order to maintain the citizen's faith in his Government (which has too often been tarnished by cynical observations about corruption and graft in procurement), but in order to uphold the name of American business itself (which has often been smeared because of deficiencies in procedures and results of procurement with Government agencies). Here is a tremendous challenge to American business—to be worthy of the billions of dollars that will be poured into it and to give a fair return for every cent of the taxpayers' money, without indulging in any of the shady or the fraudulent practices which have sometimes (if only in very slight proportion) characterized Government procurement.

10. Aiding better public service: Perhaps a final point in business' bill of obligations is rendering support to the public servants of our land in every possible way, including, where necessary, sending business experts, if only temporarily, into Government service in order to help fulfill necessary programs. The record of American business' contributions to government during the war effort is so well known that it needs no repetition. Today, however, in a time when there is less patriotic appeal because, fortunately, we are at peace rather than in the midst of a terrible war, business has no less of a responsibility to supply needed personnel to government and to aid Government employees in performance of their vital work.

This does not mean that business should allow any Government employees to make arbitrary demands upon business. On the contrary, there are some Government employees with a master complex which they must lose and they must start behaving like the servants that they are supposed to be. At the same time, business should not allow two wrongs to make a right and should not fail to cooperate with government just because government at times has been arbitrary and has overextended its authority.

These, then, are some of the obligations of American businessmen. You undoubtedly could add many more. This seems like quite a list and quite a burden upon the businessman, but in our society, as in every society, it is the true leaders who must bear the primary burden. I know that business will indeed shoulder that burden as it has always shouldered the tasks that have been assigned to it in the American way of life—the greatest way of life in the world.

Better Home Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current controversy over the capability of private builders to fill America's housing needs the questions involved are not only about housing for low-income families but also about giving their money's worth to home buyers. The greatest public interest can be served by the strict attention of all—rather than only some—builders and contractors to the public interest. This is admirably stated by the following editorial from the New York Times today:

BETTER HOMES NEEDED

Many home builders who are worried over increasing buyer resistance to their product need not look beyond the interiors of their own houses to find the reason for slackening sales. Even after due allowance is made for the reduced value of the dollar, it is obvious that the industry must offer a better value than it is now doing if it hopes to check a further decline in the market.

A study of some of the new residences quickly shows why the market has become selective and why certain groups of homes are standing vacant in the face of a continuing housing shortage. Tiny rooms, cramped quarters, and poorly planned lay-out of space are the rule rather than the exception, even in dwellings built to sell for as much as $25,000. One of the complaints most often received these days from disillusioned home seekers is the failure of the builders to provide adequate closet space. Some of the smaller houses have virtually no storage room, a shortcoming which is more keenly felt because many of these homes are without basements.

Many of the smaller cottages are able to meet suburban zoning and building restrictions only by counting unfinished garret space as part of the floor area to bring the house up to the minimum requirements of 900 to 1,000 square feet. This space generally is advertised as an "expansion attic," but the inadequacy of windows and utility connections will make it difficult to transform it into convenient living quarters.

In the frantic pursuit of shelter just after the war, anxious families by the thousands in every metropolitan area were purchasing such homes before the foundations were laid, but the sponsors are now learning lessons from competition and from the growing feeling that prices have advanced out of proportion to the value of the product. In this connection it is reassuring to note that some of the more reliable builders who have studied the needs of housewives and who recognize the value of satisfied customers by erecting satisfactory houses on conveniently situated sites are continuing to sell their output as rapidly as before. With most materials of good quality now readily available, it is time the others improved their homes in keeping with modern living standards. It would be good business for them to do so, but over and above that consideration is their obligation to the public. Pleasing homes make a happier people.

Panama Boondoggling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the large questions now before the Congress is the modernization of the Panama Canal. The November 1948 edition of the Work Boat, a magazine dedicated to the development and operation of waterways, published an enlightening article on the canal question, under the title of "Panama Boondoggling" by Arthur Stanley Riggs.

Published with the article is the following biographical sketch of its author:

Arthur Stanley Riggs, commander, United States Naval Reserve, retired, is an archeologist, historian, and lecturer specializing in Spanish and Italian fields. His long period of travel, residence, and research in Europe, Africa, and the Orient, together with intensive studies of canals and their problems, equip him with the proper background for a discussion of the Panama Canal. His naval service afloat and ashore qualifies him further to consider the naval aspects of our vitally essential big ditch. Something must be done about the Panama Canal and Commander Riggs presents the case very clearly.

I recommend this informative article on the Panama Canal be read by every Member of Congress. It follows:

PANAMA BOONDOGGLING

(By Arthur S. Riggs, commander, U. S. Naval Reserve (retired))

"A commission," reads H. R. 4833, presented to the House of Representatives on January 6, 1948, by Capt. Willis W. Bradley, U. S. N., retired, Member of Congress from California, authority on naval ordnance engineering, practical shiphandler and holder of our highest decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor, "is hereby created to be known as the Interoceanic Canals Commission * * * to be composed of nine members * * * to conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems arising in connection with" the present canal at Panama and any other possible canals to link the two oceans.

Most Americans are unimpressed nowadays by the statement that our big ditch will be inadequate by 1960, and that to make it capable of handling world trade will be expensive. We are used to growth, to thinking in billions. So the typical response would be a complacent assumption that if we really need a bigger and better canal, we will build it and the cost will take care of itself.

First of all, however, is the natural question: "What's the matter with the Panama Canal?"

It has the defects of its qualities. It was imagined by the French. When they could not finish it, we took hold and with improved machinery, more cash and unlimited skills, brought a greater canal to a successful conclusion. But the Canal was conceived by engineers, built by engineers. The men who have to get the ships through were never consulted. As a result there are defects of design which create hazards that endanger every vessel going through. After all, the object of any canal is to afford safe and speedy transit for vessels, since it is cheaper to send certain cargoes by water than by any other means. The principal problems that canal transit presents are accordingly operating problems. Their solution is so obvious that anything beyond that solution is merely creating an unwarrantable liability.

When Ferdinand de Lesseps, diplomat and promoter, not engineer or seaman, suggested the Panama Canal, he was thinking in terms of the Suez Canal, which runs between sandbanks across level terrain. He naturally thought of a sea-level waterway in spite of the warnings of the French engineer, Godin de Lepinay. After years of wasted effort and vast sums of money, he abandoned the sea-level idea as completely unfeasible. A mountain range, the Continental Divide, rising more than 600 feet in height, had to be slashed through, and the floodwaters of the Chagres River Valley had to be controlled. To cut a tidal channel through both that vast mass and great swamps was a task beyond the capacity of any French machinery of the day within any reasonable period.

So the high-lake-type canal was adopted in 1906, and has served its purpose within limits for the ocean traffic of the entire world. Those limits developed only as experience in handling vessels in the canal revealed them. First of all to show itself was the lack of balance between Atlantic and Pacific ends. The prime flaw in the design, which created some of the most dangerous features, was the location of the Pacific locks. At the Atlantic end the Gatun locks are arranged in two parallel sets of three lifts, a logical design for ease, safety, and speed of handling. When the geologists studied the nature of the ground for the foundations of the Pacific locks, they believed no solid footings existed in a continuous series for the vast structures. So they made the fatal error of placing the Pedro Miguel single-lift lock squarely across the mouth of the Gaillard cut, creating a traffic bottleneck. At the southern end of Miraflores Lake, about a mile away, they placed the two-stage Miraflores locks. As a result of this all vessels have to be separately locked twice, losing about an hour in transit, and being exposed to unnecessary risks.

But the Pedro Miguel lock has a far more serious effect than delay. Every time it is filled, the millions of cubic feet of water are drawn from Gaillard cut, a lockage surge results whose amplitude is about 3 feet, its speed about 25 miles an hour. This surge oscillates back and forth; when one lockage follows another in quick succession, the surges either amplify or damp. In either case they create local currents and eddies which at times make vessels impossible to control. The banks of Gaillard cut are rocky, and striking them is always hazardous. The accident statistics of the canal show this clearly. They also show that the relatively low accident record is due to highly efficient piloting rather than to sound planning.

A year or two ago the Navy began a scientific study of this condition with elaborate tests at the David Taylor Model Basin at Carderock, Md. The results of these tests, which were conducted with especially designed channels reproducing as nearly as possible

canal conditions, and scaled models representing both naval and commercial vessels of several types, gave astonishing data. They clearly revealed the relation between the size and type of the vessel, her speed, maneuverability and draft, and the width and depth of the channel. The mathematical tables worked out from the tests disclosed the point at which vessels become unmanageable, and the angle of rudder necessary to keep them under control. The pilots who take all ships through are highly skilled and extracompetent, with long experience. Yet cautious as they are, the accident tables divulge a relatively large accident record in Gaillard Cut, where striking the rocky banks is a serious matter.

The dividing of the Pacific locks between the one-stage Pedro Miguel and the two-stage Miraflores increases the accident risks in approaching the narrow lock chambers, and greatly delays transit. On top of all this is the occurrence of impenetrable nocturnal fogs in Gaillard Cut. These fogs generally descend after 10 p. m., completely fill parts of the cut with heavy vapor and make safe navigation impossible. Fog occurs on the average one night out of every three, and is especially frequent during the rainy season, but always clears after sunrise the following morning.

When students of oceanic commerce and military necessity began to study the Canal with relation to the future, one of the first important items to be considered was the vulnerability of any type to the atomic bomb. Someone conceived the notion that a sea-level canal would be less liable to crippling or destruction by the bomb than a high-lake canal. Not long thereafter the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted Public Law 280, directing the Governor of the Canal to investigate the situation. The curious text of this law indicates that its original draft was made on the spot by the Canal authorities, with a predetermined objective. It reads in part that—

"The Governor of the Panama Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized and directed to make a comprehensive review and study, with approximate estimates of costs, of the means for increasing the capacity and security of the Panama Canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense, including restudy of the construction of additional facilities for the Panama Canal authorized by the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409). He shall also make such study as he may deem desirable to permit him to determine whether a canal or canals at other locations, including consideration of any new means of transporting ships across land, may be more useful to the future needs of interoceanic commerce or national defense than can the present Canal with improvements."

The Governor has now submitted his report, written with the advice of a number of consulting engineers not a man of whom ever had 5 minutes' experience in the construction of the original canal. Famous engineers, with years of experience on the Isthmus, are active, eligible, and competent to the last degree. Why were they not selected?

Though the report has not yet been published, its recommendations are fully known, and no less a person than Governor Mehaffy himself publicly contradicted part of it in a public hearing before the congressional committee which examined him. The Governor's denial concerned the atomic-bomb scare given as the reason why we should abandon the present canal for a sea-level waterway. The latter, the report stated, would be far safer, more easily cleared if attacked, and could not possibly be closed. In his testimony before the inquiring Congressmen, the Governor finally admitted that no matter what type of canal we have, it must be defended adequately. Recently Congressman Bradley extended his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by saying of the bomb and its relation to the canal:

"As far as I can ascertain, the greatest authorities on modern weapons of war who have given this subject serious attention hold that any type of canal would be critically vulnerable to the atomic bomb, regardless of type; that a sea-level canal would be in the same security class as a lake canal; that a sea-level canal could be closed for long periods of time beyond any hope of speedy restoration; and that a sea-level canal cannot be considered secure in an atomic war. These same authorities also agree that the atomic bomb is irrelevant as a controlling factor in the planning of operational improvements of the Panama Canal."

That disposes of the atomic-bomb propaganda. Any canal is subject to sabotage. We can be reasonably prepared for that by proper local measures. But it should never be overlooked that the only security for any canal resides in the combined military, air, and naval power of the United States, not in inherent physical characteristics.

Study of the technical papers covering the sea-level plan that have appeared in various engineering journals immediately reveal two glaring evasions. No paper known to the writer has mentioned that before we can decide upon a sea-level canal we must negotiate an entirely new treaty giving us permission to build it. In the case of Panama, the political difficulties are grave. It is necessary only to read canal history[1] to understand the conditions.

Every engineer and geologist who participated in building the canal knows the entire lack of homogeneity in the region. The Isthmus is an "area of complex Tertiary geology * * * Engineering projects * * * have to reckon with conditions of soil and rock instability, and particularly with landslides and foundation hazards." Dr. Donald F. McDonald, who wrote that as consulting geologist to the Canal, also analyzed the causes of the slides which blocked it repeatedly during construction and which still cause trouble. He told of the 74,400,000 cubic yards of slide material that had to be removed; of the 200 miles of railway tracks completely rebuilt because of slides; finally that slopes which had been apparently permanent, after more than 30 years began to give way in slides.

In the face of such evidence as this the sea-level advocates declare that in 10 years they can move four times as much material, not counting the inevitable slides, as we moved between 1906 and 1916; 1,069,000,000 cubic yards compared with 267,000,000. Without an independent check by engineers experienced in building the existing canal, can such a claim be accepted at face value? Congressman Bradley went even farther than this in a notable address when he called attention to the statement in the Governor's report that the sea-level canal would cost $2,483,000,000, the high-lake type canal $2,308,000,000. The latter figure is highly misleading as well as grossly exaggerated in that it conceals a tremendous expenditure for alleged defensive armament not only useless in the military sense but which could actually render operation of the canal machinery more difficult and time-consuming.

Study of the sea-level plan reveals one vital objection after another. Instead of a Gaillard cut some 7 miles long, the sea-level narrows would extend more than 30. The fogs that fill Gaillard cut would also fill this much longer and deeper channel and increase navigational hazards proportionally. Some 31 miles of retaining dams to control flood waters of the Chagres and other rivers would have to be built, in good part on muck bottoms, Gatun Lake dewatered on the Canal side of these dams, the present Canal cut in five places, and—. The list is incredible and endless. Moreover, the proposed sea-level plan would junk the existing Canal and require an entirely new one in the same area.

No engineer who had anything to do with building the Canal regards the sea-level idea with anything but consternation. These gentlemen ask how we are going to construct dredges to excavate under water at depths up to 147 feet. None believes the present estimates of cost and of 5 to 10 years for building are anything but a rough minimum, with the present Canal out of operation so long no one knows what the economic, political, and strategic effects might be.

Against that the obvious solution is the simple, sensible terminal lake plan, which has the tremendous advantages of working with instead of against nature and of being something we can pay for without having to raise Canal tolls so high shipping would be bankrupted or the public pay heavily increased taxes. The terminal lake plan, while it is not a solution of all the difficulties, is the rational proposal for making the Canal safer, faster in operation, and capable of increased traffic.

Briefly, it wipes out the lockage surges by removing the present Pedro Miguel lock at the south end of Gaillard Cut, concentrates all Pacific locks in three lifts in a new location at Miraflores, where there is a substantial foundation for them, and thus creates a natural terminal lake balancing the Atlantic terminal lake at Gatun, and affording vessels safe anchorage at the Pacific mouth of the cut. While it is being constructed the present Canal will go right on functioning regularly except for a few hours. Its real cost is estimated at perhaps half a million dollars, the time to build it from 4 to 6 years without interference with routine traffic. The certainty born of 30 years' experience at Gatun that it is entirely practical as contrasted with the sea-level idea makes it difficult to understand why, once the facts are known to responsible legislators, there should be any debate. The Canal serves business; business will pay its costs, directly or indirectly; and business will know how to convince the Congress that it wants common sense and usefulness, not politics or boondoggling, for no realistic businessman abandons a project of proven worth and reasonable expense for one of doubtful value at unbearable cost.

[1] The two standard works are: Cadiz to Cathay and And the Mountains Will Move, both by Capt. Miles P. Du Val, U. S. Navy, and both published by Stanford University Press.

China Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the December 1948 issue of the magazine Columbia:

THE AMERICAN FAILURE IN CHINA

(By James F. Kearney, S. J.)

KEYSTONE TO THE PACIFIC ARCH

(Some do not see why an all-Red China would be so vitally important to the United States, since China is so far away; but the big military men with oriental experience do. General Wedemeyer has stated publicly that unless appropriate measures are taken

in time to stop communism in the Far East it will ultimately mean the shedding of American blood. General MacArthur, who should know what he is talking about, insists that China is not only important but is the "fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch." To those who consider Europe as the vital American frontier he replied unequivocally: "In bulwarking the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than the other." Which means, in everyday language, that if you say you are trying to stop, to pen up, to contain any living things, whether chickens, or pigs, or expanding Soviets, it is childish to think you can do it by putting up wires on one side only.—J. F. K.)

On a recent swing around the United States, after 18 years in China, this writer was astonished to find how badly informed even intelligent Americans were about the Orient; but then highly pleased to note how interested and sympathetic they became when a few simple facts were laid before them, facts that show how the very existence of Christianity, of American business and educational interests, not to mention the survival of the United States as a nation, are at stake today in far-off China—facts which have been deeply and doubtless deliberately buried by interested parties under a mass of half truths and pink propaganda.

"China is so far away," I have been told by people as an excuse for their lack of attention to the tragedy that has been going on out there—a tragedy that involves a fifth of the human race. But the fact that our feet are a long way from our head does not prevent us from taking an interest in what happens to them. The reason is that they are a part of our body—what happens to them happens to us. If they are injured, we suffer. Now, the church in China is a part of the mystical body of Christ; as much a part of it as is the church in America. What happens to the church is, therefore, of real concern to American Catholics. When it suffers, they suffer. When it is persecuted—and a major persecution is raging against it now in Red China—they, as members of the same body, are being persecuted. One who says China is too far away to concern him is not speaking as a Catholic.

BLAME ENOUGH TO GO AROUND

The present deplorable situation out there should interest us also as Americans. Who is responsible for the China tragedy? Some try to lay all the blame on the central government, others on the Chinese Communists backed by Moscow. While both share the blame, it is also true that a large part of the responsibility for the mess must be charged to certain Americans, who have played a shameful, perhaps short-sighted, role where they might have played a splendid one.

Despite the extraordinary generosity of the American people toward suffering China, the queer shenanigans of the Far Eastern Bureau of our own State Department have given the United States a bad name not only among the Chinese but among the many foreigners of different nationalities in the Far East, while a large proportion of the American press correspondents have done more damage than they realize, both in China and the States, by the way they have reported the situation out there.

To put things in their proper perspective first: There is one American who has spent but little time in the Orient and does not, I believe, pretend to understand it fully, yet who deserves the thanks of Catholics as well as other Americans. For he has done more than all the correspondents together to give the American people a correct evaluation of the importance of present-day China to the United States. That man is William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to Soviet Russia (1936–40) and later to France. In 1946, in his book, The Great Globe Itself, he gave 14 points for stopping Russian aggression, most of which, by the way, turned up in the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan.

One of the 14 was: "Maintain steady and active opposition to the efforts of Soviet imperialism to swallow Manchuria, North Korea, North China, etc., which it now controls." This point, unfortunately, was not adopted. Then, while our far eastern "experts" were still blithely telling the American public that of course the Chinese Communists were not real Communists but only idealistic agricultural reformers who should be admitted forthwith into the national Government, Mr. Bullitt visited China and returned to publish his Report to the American People, in Life, October 1947, in which among other things he warned bluntly that unless the tragic United States policy in China were quickly reversed it would be too late. Our State Department, which had based its policy on the falsehood that the Chinese Reds weren't really Reds, paid little heed. The public, apparently finding the China situation too confused for understanding and believing they had already done enough for the Chinese, followed suit. A third and more insistent warning was sounded by Mr. Bullitt in Life, August 30 and September 6, of 1948, in a masterly article entitled, "How We Won the War and Lost the Peace." This time the present writer found that, save in our far eastern bureau, very many intelligent people were at last awake to the danger in the East and the necessity of paying the closest attention to what was happening out there.

Mr. Bullitt's thesis on the Far East fits in with the traditional United States global policy based on the Monroe Doctrine, the Atlantic Doctrine and the Open Door, i. e., the people of the United States must: (1) prevent any European or Asiatic power from extending its political system to the Western Hemisphere (Monroe Doctrine, 1823); (2) prevent any power which might become hostile to us from controlling the Atlantic coasts of Europe and Africa, and the water gates to the Atlantic—the North Sea, the English Channel and the Straits of Gibraltar (this Atlantic doctrine guided President Wilson's acts during World War 1); (3) prevent any power from destroying the independence of China and mobilizing the manpower and resources of China for eventual attack on the United States. This was a development of the old open-door doctrine of 1899, which had two aims: (a) to prevent the dividing up of China into spheres of influence by other powers, and (b) to prevent any one power from getting complete control of China. Mr. Bullitt contends that the maintenance of all three of these doctrines is essential to the very survival of the United States.

Not all Americans remember that when imperial Russia got into Port Arthur and Dairen at the start of the century, she promised to hand the territory back to China on October 8, 1903. Shortly after she had failed to evacuate Manchuria at the stipulated time, Japan, fearing further Russian encroachments in the direction of Korea, and with the backing of Great Britain and a financial loan from the United States, declared war and drove her out. The Russian menace in the Far East was thus halted and did not seriously arise again till Yalta when, as Mr. Bullitt puts it, "our weary President was on the verge of thrombosis but was obliged to travel to Russia for the privilege of talking once more with the Soviet dictator. He was not at his best, and in a moment of weakness gave the Kurile Islands and control of the Chinese ports of Port Arthur and Dairen to the Soviet Union."

This action, so contrary to the traditional interests of both China and the United States and so helpful to Soviet Russia, was but one of many strange moves that have since been made by our Far Eastern Bureau, practically all of which have likewise harmed us and the Chinese, but have aided the Soviets. In her statement after being elected, in 1947, as President of the American China Policy Association, which insists that our Government return to the traditional open-door policy defined in 1899 and solemnly pledged again in the nine-power treaty of 1922 guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of China, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce stated: "We urge on our Government the removal from their positions of the officials who have advised and implemented the policies which for the last 4 years have conflicted with the objectives for which the war in the Pacific was fought; and the appointment in their place of men who will guide and implement our policy along traditional American lines, with no trace of defeatism and no trace of appeasement of the Soviet Union or communism. * * * Only such a policy can restore American honor, American pledges, and American prestige in China, and only by such a policy can the 500,000,000 people of China continue to remain our friends and allies in a free world."

POLICY ATTRIBUTED TO HENRY WALLACE

Who formed this about-face China policy, which has proved so detrimental to everyone but the Soviets? The American China Policy Association insists it was Henry Wallace, who was sent in 1944 by President Roosevelt to Siberia and China, accompanied by Mr. Carter Vincent, who was later to head the Far Eastern Bureau of the State Department and try to carry it out. It is claimed on the very best authority that Mr. Wallace's report was the basis of the demands made on China at the time of the unfortunate Stilwell incident; that the American Ambassador to China, Mr. Patrick Hurley, was instructed to consider the Wallace report as a policy directive, and that the mission of General Marshall to China to bring about a coalition government—a united front, and hence a traditional Soviet, not an American policy at all—was also in accordance with the Wallace recommendations. President Truman was openly challenged in April 1948 to make public this report lest "continued implementation of Mr. Wallace's recommendations lead to a Far East defenseless against communism, an untenable Korea, a Japan just strong enough to be a second Bataan, and a Communist-ruled slave state of 800,000,000 human beings in East Asia, regardless of the success or failure of our efforts to stop communism in Europe." The President did not accept the challenge, the report was not published, the pro-Soviet policy was not altered, and, as a result, the Reds have continued their triumphant march in the Far East.

Some do not see why an all-Red China would be so vitally important to the United States, since China is so far away; but the big military men with oriental experience do. General Wedemeyer has stated publicly that unless appropriate measures are taken in time to stop communism in the Far East it will ultimately mean the shedding of American blood. General MacArthur, who should know what he is talking about, insists that China is not only important but is the "fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch." To those who consider Europe as the vital American frontier he replied unequivocally: "In bulwarking the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than the other." Which means in everyday language that if you say you are trying to stop, to pen up, to contain any living things, whether chickens, or pigs, or expanding Soviets, it is childish to think you can do it by putting up wires on one side only.

Today, Stalin's iron curtain cuts off Dairen and Port Arthur from all but his own

vessels. It is only logical to conclude that if he gains control of all the east coast of Asia he will drop his iron curtain over every port there, too. Japan today depends upon the Asiatic Continent for food and raw materials for its factories and markets for its products. Those Americans who have been busily counselling Uncle Sam to withdraw entirely from China and stake everything on his Japanese bases will soon, if allowed to continue with their nonsense, have us facing an oriental Berlin airlift of incredible magnitude, where we would have to supply the Japanese with raw materials clear across the Pacific and then buy all their manufactured products, not to mention the trifle of feeding close to half of their 80,000,000 people jammed without enough food into the small area of the Japanese islands. How long could even America keep this up? Marshal Stalin must be highly pleased with the way so many top United States experts have been preparing both China and Japan to come behind the iron curtain, to join the hordes he would lead against us.

The preceding point is nicely and authoritatively summed up in a quizz of General Marshall by Representative WALTER JUDD after the former had testified at the congressional hearings in March 1948:

JUDD: "If the present Chinese Government, with all its admitted weaknesses—some of which are not matters to be ashamed of as they were honorably acquired in years of resistance against a vastly stronger enemy—if it were to go down, would you agree there is in China no third party that could possibly take over and organize the Government?"

Marshall: "That would appear to be the case at the present time."

JUDD: "If North China and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?"

Marshall: "I think it would not be tenable."

JUDD: "Do you think that Japan can ever become self-sufficient or long remain secure if the continent of East Asia north of the Yangtse is controlled by Marxists?"

Marshall: "That would present a great problem, for Japan to take care of herself without help from outside."

JUDD: "We would be faced with withdrawal from Japan and abandonment of the western Pacific, or else almost endless subsidies of Japan and military support as well as economic?"

Marshall: "There is no question but what we would be faced with a very serious situation in Japan."

That was evidently Marshall, the military man speaking; yet Marshall, the Secretary of State, has shown no eagerness to change the United States far eastern policy to prevent the above clearly envisaged catastrophe from taking place. What is the key to this mystery? There has been a bipartisan foreign policy for Europe, and it seems to have been succeeding fairly well. Why not one for Asia? Whether it is because of General Marshall's blindness, as Bullitt charges, or his stubbornness in pretending to be right about China when events have proved him clearly and tragically wrong; or merely a deep-seated personal dislike for Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek that prevents him from backing him more than half-heartedly, I do not know. But it would seem difficult to exonerate the Secretary of State for his China blunders which have brought, and continue to bring, so much misery on China's millions as well as the possibly complete destruction of the Christian missions, both Protestant and Catholic, while imperiling the safety of our far eastern defenses, entailing the eventual withdrawal of the United States frontier in this time of crisis 5,000 miles back, to the American side of the Pacific.

I was shocked to see, from this side, how much of the news from China is slanted left. Whether there is an open alliance between the pinks in the far eastern bureau and those among the foreign correspondents in China is a matter of conjecture. One thing is certain—our Catholic missionaries of a dozen different nationalities, men who have spent years in China and know the Chinese language and the Chinese psychology in a way that makes them far better authorities than the majority of the correspondents, have been unanimous in denouncing the half-truths and the flagrant falsity of a very large proportion of the reports on China that appear in American papers.

This is not a blanket indictment, for there are at least two quite distinct groups among the correspondents. There is the Time-Life-Fortune and Scripps-Howard group, whose analysis of the situation corresponds with that of Messrs. Bullitt, Judd, etc.; while opposed to them is the New York Herald Tribune and Washington Post group, followers of Edgar Snow, Ted White, and, out in China, of J. W. Powell, of the China Weekly Review, which has a big following among Chinese students. As this sharp division has apparently resulted in almost hopelessly confusing the American reading public, it may be valuable to Catholics to know that our missionaries, who need not apologize for claiming to be well informed on China, agree almost unanimously with the former group and roundly denounce the second group for consistently misrepresenting the China scene.

The Snow-White group acknowledge as their leader Owen Lattimore. Who is he? He became years ago quite an authority on Mongolia, a prominent member of the Institute of Pacific Relations, was later named by President Roosevelt as political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, and still later joined the faculty of Johns Hopkins University. He apparently plays an important behind-the-scenes role. Former Communist Freda Utley has something interesting to say about him in her Last Chance in China:

"Having worked in Moscow up to the summer of 1936," she writes, "in the Pacific Ocean Cabinet of the Institute of World Economy and Politics, I know that the Chinese Communists never ceased to be under Moscow's orders. * * * There was never any question but that the Communist Parties would do what they were told. The Kremlin was in a better position to help its friends and discomfit its enemies in the Far East than anywhere else, thanks to the Institute of Pacific Relations. The institute where I worked was a branch of the Communist Academy * * * and was also the Russian branch of the IPR. It was we who received its American delegates when they came to Moscow for help and advice. To hear these Americans submit themselves to our dictates on theory and policy was amusing, if sad. In the spring of 1936 one of them, Owen Lattimore, attempted to argue with the theoreticians of our institute on questions concerned with Mongolia, but he was overborne by the prestige of these high priests of communism." Apparently Moscow is still dictating to some obedient American fellow travelers exactly how it wants China and all east Asia handed over to it on a silver platter.

Only one man prevents this from happening. He discovered years ago what the Reds were and has consistently thwarted them in China ever since. For that reason they have done everything to discredit him. To read the "pink" reports from China, one would think that he, Chiang Kai-shek, is America's great enemy and that if he could only be ousted all would be lovely. It would be—for Moscow. By holding out against the Reds, however inefficiently, he is protecting United States interests, even while flocks of supposedly good Americans are stabbing him in the back. The latest attempt to discredit him is Ted White's edition of the Stilwell Letters, which has impressed many readers in America. No one doubts that Stilwell really had the difficulties with the Generalissimo that he recounts. It must be remembered, though, that "Vinegar Joe" allowed himself to be surrounded and advised by a group of pro-Communists, including Agnes Smedley, John Davies, of Mission to Moscow notoriety, and Col. Evans Carlson. That made him look so benignly upon the Reds that, according to The Tyrannous Decade (Fortune, February 1948), "At the end of July 1945 there was dispatched to Chungking for urgent discussion with Chiang a United States plan proposed by General Stilwell: The landing of his Tenth Army north of Shanghai, the supply of arms to a million Chinese Communists, the capture of Shanghai, and the clearing of the Yangtze—a great coup for the Chinese Communists. As soon as Chiang saw the plan, he became enraged and refused to see any American for days."

Those of us who were interned at Shanghai had no desire to see the city fall into the hands of the Reds. Chiang was right, and "Vinegar Joe" was wrong; for had the latter had his way, the Communist conquest of China would have been much further advanced than it is today—and with naive American assistance. White's statement is interesting: "For Stilwell union of all Chinese parties seemed to be essential. Such a unity, moreover, would bring China through to peace as a mighty unified nation, able to face and repel all foreign enemies with her own resources. "It is strange that in the light of what happened to General Marshall's ill-starred China mission, so many Americans could still believe that "Vinegar Joe" was right about China. He wasn't. Neither is Ted White.

As White is a typical leftist correspondent, we might here join the American Policy Association in asking, "What is wrong with the American correspondents in China? Why are most of them sympathetic to the Chinese Communists and to Soviet Russia? * * * We suggest that the editors urge the press agencies to replace the fellow-travelers and dupes in the Far East with Americans who have at least some knowledge of the history and culture of the countries to which they are assigned, and who understand the meaning of America's open-door policy."

Even well-disposed correspondents can't get behind the Red iron curtain in China to find out what is going on there. Hence, all their difficulties are with the Chiang government, not with the Reds. They therefore compare the National Government not with its only present alternative—the Communists—as they should, but with the United States Government which they know; and the comparison is unfavorable. Nine-tenths of the reports I have read in the States were unfavorable to the Chiang group, while not even one-tenth said anything unfavorable to the Reds, though it should be clear even to a child that the Reds are America's No. 1 enemy. That is unfair and dangerous reporting. Any correspondent interested in getting the facts about the Red regime can easily do so. In all the big cities of China there are scores of foreigners and thousands upon thousands of Chinese who have lived under it and can give him all the details he wants about the tyranny that reigns there. Our missionaries, who have lived under both regimes, state that life under the Reds is incomparably more difficult for them and the people than under Chiang. If the correspondents think the Central Government is bad, let them realize that the Red government is 10 times worse. Why don't they discover this and tell the United States public? Their consistently unfavorable reports

are later translated into Chinese and published in Government territory, where they have done perhaps irreparable harm to Chinese morale.

In conclusion, what should be done? First of all, China is difficult to help. But Almighty God gave us intelligence, and we should begin to use it at long last on the China situation to protect our vital interests. If the Chinese Reds are Reds, and they are, the war there is not just a civil war but a war of conquest directed by Soviet Russia. Mr. Bullitt insists that if the President wishes now, in this hour of danger, to protect the future of the United States, he should, unless he is so foolish as to believe that 46,000,000 Americans can resist a future attack by all the rest of the world united under the Red banner, send at once to China the munitions and the top-quality military advisers—with orders to advise on strategy, tactics, and operations—essential to prevent the subjugation of China and Japan by Stalin.

We might add, those put in charge of dealing with Chinese problems should learn to face the facts, not to try to change everything in China overnight; to take the Chinese as they are, not as they would like them to be; to remember that just as Americans are Americans and not Chinese, so Chinese are Chinese and not Americans, nor can they be made Americans next week, or next year, or 50 years from now. That reflection would prevent our representatives from making a lot of the puerile and costly blunders that have disgraced our policy there in recent years. They should think more of cooperating with than of reforming China. Finally, since foreign correspondents are playing such a major role in short-sightedly discrediting the Chinese Government and thus weakening the morale of the anti-Red forces, their employers could help by sending better qualified men who have sense enough to put the press to work for China and America instead of for Soviet Russia; for now it seems bent chiefly on dropping the iron curtain over the open door. We wouldn't then have to apologize to missionaries of other nationalities for what our pink reporters have done to ruin the Catholic Church in China.

The Reserve Components Provide the Cannon Fodder When the Shooting Starts—They Are Entitled to a More Important Place in Time of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present an article taken from the January 1949 issue of the Reserve Officer entitled "The Reserve Components Provide the Cannon Fodder When the Shooting Starts—They Are Entitled to a More Important Place in Time of Peace," by the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Congressman from the State of Florida. Mr. SIKES is an able and conscientious Member of the House of Representatives, and, in my judgment, this article is worthy of consideration by all of the Members of the House who are interested in the welfare and safety of this Nation. The article is as follows:

THE RESERVE COMPONENTS PROVIDE THE CANNON FODDER WHEN THE SHOOTING STARTS—THEY ARE ENTITLED TO A MORE IMPORTANT PLACE IN TIME OF PEACE

(By Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, House of Representatives, U. S. Congress)

America at long last has a world policy. She no longer walks indecisively in world affairs and a great part of the world recognizes and welcomes the change. She now positively seeks world peace, world security, and world democracy. To achieve these things she is engaged in an ideological struggle as old as time; a struggle between free government and dictatorship. Figuratively, America walks a tightrope and war and chaos are on either side.

The Eighty-first Congress will play a vital role in the shaping of American world policy and the pattern of world recovery. Legislation and appropriations essential to the success of America's efforts abroad will hinge upon congressional action. Congress cannot insure the success of American world policy. That is a responsibility of the administrative branch of the Government. But Congress provides or withholds the tools for the job.

There is no reason to believe that the Eighty-first Congress will seek to cripple world progress by refusing to implement our bipartisan foreign policy. The American people have shown clearly that they are defense-minded and world-minded, and the work of Congress will reflect that attitude. But we can well efford to concern ourselves with the types of legislation by which Congress will express the will of the people.

If world recovery, now unmistakably in motion, continues its present pace, the heavier expenditures of government will be for defense rather than for the Marshall plan or for like programs. This is due to the fact that there is no indication from Stalin that preparedness will not be a continuing necessity until the show-down between this country and Russia.

We are headed for a show-down and we apparently intend to allow Stalin to choose the time for it. This is a weakness in our foreign policy. We now hold the trumps but time may work against us. Since, however, such is our policy we can do no less than keep up the armament race until Stalin chooses peace or war.

In other words, full military preparedness is essential. But preparedness is costly. Present-day weapons and the newest aircraft cost much more than their World War II counterparts. Then good bombers could be built for a quarter of a million dollars each. They have given way to jet jobs costing 10 times as much. The cost of carriers and other battlecraft has doubled. Pay and maintenance of a soldier and sailor are two or three times as great. Small wonder that the Government's $40,000,000,000 budget is largely due to past wars or future ones.

There are ways of keeping down defense costs without sacrificing essential military strength. Congress and the Nation should be interested. True unification is one way and we have not achieved it. The application of an over-all policy of promotion by merit, provided by recent legislation, will help when made fully effective. The Navy has benefited for years by such a policy. Greater reliance upon the Reserve components can cut many millions from the present costs of national defense.

In time of war the Infantry is the unsung hero of battle. But when peace comes, it is the Reservists who are forgotten. The Reserve components offer an excellent media for maintaining training standards and a valuable backlog of trained men. There are millions of men who are eligible for Reserve activities. Their use offers another effective argument for those world statesmen who still measure world security by armed force.

Heretofore the Reserve components actually have been used for little except in time of war. They have not even been trained adequately in peacetime. Yet the cost of training and maintaining a Reservist is many times less than that of a Regular.

There are minimum limits, of course, below which the strength of the regular services cannot safely be cut, but any fair-minded observer knows that the Reserves can be used to implement the work of the regular services to a greater extent than they are now being used.

Greater emphasis on research and development, the use of highly trained specialists in key activities and more reliance upon the Reserve components will reduce costs and maintain a needed backlog of trained men. It need not result either in serious loss of efficiency or in lowered morale. The Reserve components provide the cannon fodder when the shooting starts. They are entitled to a more important place in time of peace.

The generals and admirals won't like this suggestion. It is easier and more spectacular to operate under the conventional big army and big navy pattern. Their immediate striking power is undeniably greater. But it is the responsibility of Congress to achieve adequate national defense as economically as safety permits. If safety plus savings can be achieved, it's worth a try.

The work of the Eightieth Congress brought the Reserve components out of the middle age. It vigorously advanced a legislative program designed to strengthen them. But the job is not finished. Congress has other work to do if the Reserve components are to reach their rightful stature. The same progressive efforts, if applied in the Eighty-first Congress, can complete the elevation of the Reserve components to a plane commensurate with their great service in wartime.

It should be in order to touch briefly on some of the pressing needs. One is for federally sponsored armories, to be jointly used by all the Reserve components in a community. Another need is for the common commission bill, which nearly became law in the Eightieth Congress. It is highly important that greater use be made of the inactive duty training pay measure and the Reserve components retirement plan. They automatically open the way to greater expansion of Reserve activities. There are other important objectives.

These will not come unassisted. Much work will be required, in and out of Congress. Those who believe there is a real place for the Reserve components in our defense program, a place beyond that presently assigned them, will have to make it known. The groundwork is laid. Intelligent, cooperative action can complete the job during the Eighty-first Congress.

Rev. Arsenio Caprio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of the people who reside within the confines of the Twelfth Congres-

sional District which I represent were saddened on August 11 last upon the death of Rev. Arsenio Caprio, D. D., pastor of Sacred Heart-St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include the following beautiful and scholarly eulogy which was delivered at the solemn mass of requiem for Father Caprio by Rev. Vincent O. Genova, pastor of Holy Family Roman Catholic Church, Canarsie, N. Y.:

"Be thou faithful unto death: I will give thee the crown of life."—Apocalypse II: 10.

Dear brethren, in one of the Western States a strange sight draws the attention of travelers. There is a place where people are brought for burial—but it is not called a cemetery. There are no crosses because no graves are visible. There is a beautiful landscape dotted with pleasing monuments, surrounded by flowers, trees, and shrubbery, while music from hidden sources fills the air; all so cleverly put together so as to banish every thought of the death that lies beneath the surface. This cemetery is the masterpiece of travesty of those who during their lives have fled God as though He were an enemy, and who attempt to hide beneath a covering of beauty, two facts from which no mortal can escape—death and the judgment that faces every human soul.

The church makes no attempt to illude her children. As she teaches us the truth during life, she does not want to hide it from us at the moment of death. In fact, when God sees fit to summon us from this life the church makes clear to us, in colors, words, and ceremonies which we can all understand, the four last things in all their stark reality. Death, judgment, heaven, and hell are realities we must all face. They cannot be hidden or put aside as an illusion. Every funeral mass then is a concrete lesson, with a friend, a relative, or even a stranger as the subject, on the great truth that death is the threshold to eternal life, the passageway that leads to God. Every funeral mass is a warning on the need of preparation for a holy death, the only kind that will lead to heaven. In the black vestments and the sadness of the chant is to be found the expression of sorrow of the church joined to our grief at the loss of someone dear. And the frequent refrain, Requiem Aeternam, in the holy sacrifice is the voice of our spiritual mother pleading to the mercy of God to have pity on one of her children, to grant him eternal life and happiness through the infinite merits of Christ the Redeemer.

The dread angel of death strikes impartially the sheep of the fold and the shepherds of the flock of Christ. This morning we are gathered in this Church of the Sacred Hearts with the solemn realization that it is the pastor of this parish, the Reverend Arsenio Caprio, for whom the bell tolls. Priests and people, family and friends, parishioners and strangers, we have been called to pay our last respects to one whom we admired and esteemed as brother-priest, as pastor of a great parish and a great people, as sympathetic friend, as zealous and devoted priest. After 46 years of priesthood, at the age of 71, Almighty God has lifted from the soul of Father Arsenio Caprio the burden of pastoral office and called him to his eternal reward. And we the clergy and religious of the diocese share the grief of his devoted family and the sorrow of his faithful flock, as we unite with the right reverend celebrant in pleading with our Divine Redeemer for the eternal repose of the deceased pastor. We pray that the Father of all consolation may lighten their burden of sorrow with the thought that he who in the words of Daniel the prophet "instructed many unto justice," and who was faithful to his ministry unto death, may soon receive "the crown of eternal life."

A priest is another Christ, because he exercises the saving mission of the Redeemer among men. His voice is the voice of Christ, because he preaches the gospel and the doctrine of Christ. His hands are the hands of Christ because in the sacrifice of the mass they are raised in supplication to the Eternal God on behalf of the living and of the dead. His is the heart of Christ, because it is concerned with the salvation of the members of the Kingdom of God on earth; because it is filled with compassion and mercy toward human frailty and sinfulness; because it is sympathetic to human sorrow, suffering, and misfortune. Not without reason did our Lord pick men, not angels, to represent Him on earth, and to be the dispensers of his sacred mysteries among the sheep of the true fold.

For this fulfillment of Christ's mission the sublime vocation of the Catholic priesthood is reverenced by the faithful and honored even by those without faith. It is the remembrance of many years of faithful accomplishment of pastoral duty that makes the loss of a pastor so keenly felt and so deeply mourned by the members of his parish. In the passing of Father Caprio you have sustained a great loss. You had in him a tireless worker, a priest who deemed the hours of each day too few to contain the energy and zeal which he devoted to the spiritual, moral, and educational needs of this great parish. This was his way as a young priest, and he did not shorten his strides with the passing years. You had in him a priest of personal courage, who was not afraid to face an issue squarely that involved the spiritual welfare of his people. You will remember him as one who felt at home with all classes, because of his knowledge and culture. As his learning did not make him superior, so his heavy responsibilities never caused him to lose that native wit and sense of humor characteristic of his people. As he served his Lord with a happy heart, he served his people in that spirit of friendliness which made his parish as happy as his priests.

Father Caprio's priestly ministry centered around his church and the Catholic school. On the church, the home of the eucharistic Lord, he lavished his loving care. Nothing was too good for it; the best in ecclesiastical decorative art, the most precious in marble altars, the finest in music had to adorn the house of God and the worship of God. In all these works which redound to the glory of God you had a part and you share the merit, because they were possible through your generous cooperation with your zealous pastor. In the large Catholic school of the parish, your pastor saw the indispensable instrument for the Christian education of the young. His 11 years of teaching experience as seminary professor had given him a competent grasp of practical pedagogy, which was never forgotten. The tried methods of the past and the soundest of the present were encouraged in the school directed by the competent Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, in an effort to give a solid religious education which would produce virtuous, God-fearing, faithful youth.

With all that his many parochial responsibilities weighed heavily upon him Father Caprio gave cheerfully of his time to diocesan duties to which he was appointed by the bishop. For 15 years he has served as a member of the board of directors of Il Crociato; for over 20 years he gave important service to the chancery office in the role of judge in the diocesan tribunal.

As it is true that there is no one institution in the world which does as much good to humanity as the church; so, it is no exaggeration to state that there is no individual who in a lifetime does as much good to others as a priest. Yet, there is no one who is more quickly forgotten. No one would have it otherwise, least of all the priest. For it is the priesthood itself, perpetuating itself, and continuing its beneficent Christ-like mission, that is really important.

There is only one kind of remembrance which is desired by a priest. It is not that of idle praise, useless to a soul that has passed through the portals of death. It has already heard the only judgment and appraisal that counts—that of the mercy and justice of God.

If there is gratitude in human hearts for the great blessings you have received from a lifetime of priestly ministry, it should be expressed in prayer for the repose of his soul. There is nothing more consoling and so encouraging to priests than to know that people will not forget them in their prayers, that they will have masses said for the eternal repose of their souls.

Your deceased pastor lies before you, visible to you for the last time. He lies in death, not as a layman facing the altar, but as a priest facing his flock. His last sermon comes from silent lips, but it penetrates clearly into your hearts and souls. "Farewell, my people my family, my friends in Christ. May you be close to God in this life, that you may possess Him in the next. Pray for me, always. I, your shepherd, lift my arms in prayer for you, my flock. Now the shepherd is smitten, the flock must pray for the shepherd. Lift unceasingly your hands and hearts in earnest prayer that the merciful God may grant me eternal repose, peace and happiness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The Bible and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the editor of the world-renowned magazine the Christian Herald, for his courtesy in publishing in its January 1949 issue an article which I prepared on the subject the Bible and the Constitution. The editor of this distinguished publication is the distinguished Rev. Daniel A. Poling, a spiritual leader famous in his own right, a man known for the vigor and courage of his opinions. He is also the father of one of the four heroic chaplains who gave up their lives when the ship *Dorchester* was torpedoed and sunk. These chaplains, as Members of the Senate will recall, offered their life belts to servicemen and thereby perished themselves. Their sacrificial deed has since been memorialized in a commemorative stamp which is symbolic of the spiritual faith and selflessness which these heroic chaplains represented in their unforgettable deed. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIBLE AND THE CONSTITUTION

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

Do you remember that old story about the man who had just got religion? He was all

enthusiastic about his new discovery. When his minister remarked to him, "Well, brother, now that you have got religion, I know that you are going to cast off all sin." The enthusiastic convert answered, "I certainly am, reverend." Then the minister asked him, "I assume that you are going to pay your debts on time?" The convert looked a little perplexed at that one. "Wait a minute, reverend. You are not talking religion now. You are talking business."

This old story illustrates the unfortunate division in the minds of many people between the things of the spirit and material things. Somehow some folks still conceive of religion as a strictly Sunday affair, or as being in a little compartment all by itself, uncontaminated by everyday things. Yet we know that if man is to truly manifest his religion, he must do so every minute of every waking hour. We are told in 2 Corinthians 3: 6, "Not of the letter but of the spirit. For the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."

You may wonder how I as a United States Senator am interested in this question. It is because, unfortunately, some of us have forgotten the spirit not only of our religion but of our patriotic faith. We look upon the United States Constitution, for example, with its Bill of Rights and merely admire it. We look upon the Declaration of Independence and respect it. We contemplate our whole system of checks and balances of this Republic—checks and balances which prevent autocratic use of power—and we feel that it is a wise system. We look upon the statutes of the great American founding fathers, and we know that we should feel pride in their achievements.

But in all these things there is unfortunately for too many of us a lack of true spiritual piety, of real vitality, of dynamic understanding. Our respect and admiration is superficial. We do not feel it down to the very roots of our being.

What I propose, therefore, is that each of us take it upon ourselves to quicken our spirit, to reinvigorate ourselves with the great truths, the great values which have made this Nation the envy of all the peoples on earth. We must, in sum, reinvigorate our patriotic faith.

So, too, we must read the Holy Gospel and understand it and appreciate it with every fiber of our being. We must recognize it as the true answer to man's problems—the means by which he can secure adequacy, by which he can achieve the harmony, the love, the peace, which were meant to be his.

Similarly, we must read and reread our civic bible, the United States Constitution, taking hold of the great truths which our founding fathers had when they breathed the spirit of life into this miraculous document.

Just as the Bible must not be a dead letter for us, so the Constitution should not be a dead letter. Imbedded within the Constitution are eternal laws of God and man which assured its success in succeeding generations. We must breathe the spirit of life into it, as its original writers did.

These great sources of inspiration must inspire us to action, they must give us continuous direction.

We are told that God is spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. Let this be the guiding note of all our undertakings.

In the same way, let the spirit of the Constitution be truly respected, truly applied and fulfilled and we will be worthy of the heritage which is ours. To absorb that spirit, to catch hold of it, to make it a part of us—this is the great challenge to you and to me in these troubled times.

There is too much synthetic thinking about these values, too much thinking of the Constitution only as a dead letter, as something that was good enough for our fathers but perhaps outdated for us. We must quicken our spirit and it will give us true life.

Prayers by the Senate Chaplain, Dr. Peter Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch a thoughtful and timely editorial regarding the prayers by Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, with which the daily sessions of the Senate are opened. This editorial deserves wide reading, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. MARSHALL'S PRAYERS

The Democratic Senators deserve congratulations upon their decision to retain the Reverend Peter Marshall as Senate Chaplain, even though they were not altogether Christian in the manner of announcing it.

As Majority Leader LUCAS put it, the Democrats "decided not to mix politics with religion, as the Republicans did 2 years ago" when the incumbent Chaplain was ousted and Dr. Marshall was installed.

That Presbyterian Dr. Marshall has succeeded almost in causing the triumphant Democrats to cast malice from their hearts in this matter is perhaps due to the fact that he is one of the most powerful supplicants of our times.

Dr. Marshall's short, pungent, and pithy—and deeply reverent—supplications are well calculated to stir his Senate listeners. Consider a sentence from his invocation at the opening session Monday: "May they [the Senators] be aware of a mandate higher than that of the ballot box, a mandate from Thee to legislate wisely and well."

The Senate Chaplain has mastered the art of public prayer, which, as the Manchester Guardian recently remarked, is a most difficult one. Because of the sacred nature of such addresses, their form and content usually escape criticism, and therefore all too many public supplications are wafted above with slight editing.

The Guardian recounts the story of the young preacher in the north of England whose petition was reminding the Almighty that He was omnipotent and omniscient, eternal and infinite, when a devout old saint in the front, after waiting patiently for a time, interrupted with, "Eh, lad! He knaws He's all that. Ask Him for summat!"

In simple language, with a keen awareness of the needs of the legislators to whom he ministers, the Reverend Dr. Marshall usually asks the Lord for "summat," and in doing so manages to remind the men of the Senate of true and lasting values.

End That Press Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Rocky Mountain News of November 21, entitled "End That Press Subsidy." It discusses particularly the matter of the large magazines being able to send their publications through the mails at great loss to the taxpayers of the country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END THAT PRESS SUBSIDY

The Post Office Department estimates that it will have a whopping deficit of $540,000,000 for 12 months ending next June 30.

The largest single item in the deficit, according to the Department, will be a loss of about $207,000,000 on carrying second-class mail, chiefly newspapers and magazines.

Department officials predict President Truman will ask the new Congress to increase postal rates. The boost most certain to be proposed, they say, will be on second-class mail.

Some of them are reported as saying that this has nothing to do with the fact that a majority of the Nation's press opposed Mr. Truman's election.

We're sure of that. Long before the election—in January 1947 and again in January 1948—Mr. Truman asked for higher postal rates. In 1947 the Department drafted a bill which, among other things, would have increased second-class rates sharply, but Congress didn't act on it.

We hope the new Congress will raise those rates.

The money the Post Office loses by carrying newspapers and magazines at less than cost of the service is a Government subsidy to the press.

And we don't believe the Government should subsidize the press.

As long as it does, newspapers and magazines which advocate Government economy and oppose subsidies for other special interests will be accused of insincerity.

We repeat what we have said here many times before:

"The Rocky Mountain News and the Scripps-Howard organization, of which we are a member, want no free ride at the taxpayers' expense. We are willing to pay the cost of distributing our newspapers. We would like to see other newspapers and magazines join in asking for abolition of this Government subsidy."

The United States Needs Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The United States Needs Experts," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of December 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS EXPERTS

Gen. Patrick J. Hurley has summarized in unsparing fashion the failures of American diplomacy and statesmanship that now are resulting in the capture of China by communism. There was more than failure. There was surrender of pledged American principles, and of American war objectives. The Kurile Islands, Darien and Port Arthur, Sakhalin,

Korea, Manchuria, passed in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, to Russian control.

The consequences of all this are now spread before us.

"Half the dam" designed to "contain communism" has gone out.

What of the other half—the European half?

In Europe, too, there were calamitous surrenders to the Soviet despotism—at Tehran, at Yalta, at Potsdam. Eastern Europe—a large portion of Europe—passed into communism and the major part of it into Russian control. With these peoples and territories lost, the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan were invoked in an effort to save what was left. The effort, while it has not failed, is meeting with but partial success.

Unhappily the record goes back further than that.

It goes back to the timid betrayal of Czechoslovakia at Munich—that made Hitler "great"; that made him believe his power could not be challenged; that it was irresistible—and that brought on World War II.

What part, if any, did American statesmanship play in that surrender?

The question arises once more because of allegations that stolen state papers unearthed by a congressional committee would confirm the fact, if all of them were made public, that President Roosevelt supported Chamberlain's foreign policy that led up to the Munich disaster.

"This is a fact fully confirmed on the public record," says the Chicago Daily News. "Yet it is a record that seems never to have penetrated deeply into the public consciousness."

After Munich, Roosevelt's friends claimed that he had saved the peace of the world and, confesses the News, "he was granted praise to the same effect even by some of his opponents." The facts are "already known to every student and to innumerable informed laymen. They are certainly known to the diplomats of every nation."

This recital of failure is not a pleasant one. The time has passed when it could serve any partisan advantage.

But the time is at hand, when similar problems press upon us, when the possibility exists of similar disastrous errors, for the United States to study carefully and prayerfully what it can learn from experience.

No responsible person charges there was deliberate, conscious betrayal on the part of American statesmanship. The charge does lie, abundantly supported by the record, that a succession of ghastly errors resulted from lack of understanding, lack of vision, from lack of trained diplomatic ability to deal with the inflamed mind of a Hitler as with the crafty Muscovite minds that spin their webs in the Kremlin.

Some of these errors were to be expected. The United States had for long been isolated from the European and Asiatic game of power politics. Following the advice of the founding fathers we had held ourselves aloof. And so, when we did venture in—to our ankles, to our knees, finally up to our ears—our diplomacy, our world statesmanship, was inexperienced, untrained, and but poorly informed. As amateurs, with confidence and glorious motives, we were playing poker—carelessly—with card sharps.

But it has been a long while—and a terrible while—since Munich. We have been long in the game. We are in the game still and have our shirts left. Surely we should have graduated from the sucker ranks. If we are to continue to play with any remote prospect of retrieving our losses, we must have graduated.

No use calling for a new deck. The decks have been changed often. The call is for better players, better playing. For realizing keenly the astuteness that confronts us, and for measuring up to it. Americans are anything but dumb. They are keen and shrewd and able to learn. All their hopes, so often disappointed, depend now upon their ability to prove it in the ugly game of power politics.

Possibly the players who now are pushing our remaining chips into the middle of the table have learned so much the hard way that they have become expert. And possibly not. Perhaps some deeply concerned kibitzers should be called in as replacements.

And this, of course, is for the President and his trusted advisers to decide. Theirs is a solemn responsibility.

The Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD two letters which have recently passed between Mrs. Alma G. Madden, of Bellingham, and the junior Senator from Washington. This correspondence may be of real interest to all Republicans and to those Americans who belong to neither of our two great political parties. Mrs. Madden has made it seem very much worth while, as it is worth while, to be a Republican on the basis of a deliberate choice. I was privileged to endorse her findings, and to wish her well.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
December 29, 1948.

Senator HARRY CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Tonight in the evening paper I read your courageous statement about fighting to defeat unworkable laws. Further, I agree with you heartily that we need to do a merchandising job on the record of the Eightieth Congress. It is a good record, and when it becomes safe to say so, that is, when it has been tried long enough to prove its worth, the Democrats, many of whom helped put that record across, will say so too. I shouldn't wonder that years from now some of them may even be bragging about it.

They know some of these things must be done if we are ever to get on our feet in this country. That is, they know it if they haven't lost the sense they were born with. But right now they don't want to take any blame for its temporary unpopularity. We all knew that whoever began the disagreeable but necessary job of putting this country on a sound basis again would have to take a lot of smearing, a lot of grief and punishment. Well, the Eightieth Congress did the job, took the punishment, and now the Eighty-first will reap the reward. If the Eighty-first Congress has good sense, and patriotism enough to put the welfare of this country first, they will keep the foundation so laid and go on from there. Only the dear Lord knows whether they have the qualities to do the job.

This talk of liberalizing the party, if it means simply adopting a watered-down version of the New Deal, leaves me cold. What are we a party for—why do we maintain headquarters and go to the expense of national organization at all, if we are merely a pale imitation of what we already have in the White House and the administration party in Washington? Why not just join forces with the New Deal and save expenses?

I am a Republican because I believe in certain things, because I adhere to certain principles of Government, because I feel my party has a distinct and important function to perform in this Government, and that function is distinct and separate from those of the Democratic Party.

We are the conservative branch of the two-party system. I do not shy away from that word nor coyly and bashfully reach for cover under the label of being either a progressive or liberal. I am a conservative and proud as heck of it. It is a good word with an honorable lineage. Its prototype is to be found in the last chapter of Proverbs. It means to conserve, to guard, to foster, to protect, to build, to enlarge, to produce. It has no common interest with reaction or stand-pattism. It is no more reactionary than the mother guarding and rearing her children, no more stand-pat than the father who invests in a home or life insurance or savings for his family. Conservatism is as forward looking as a young man working his way through college, as a farmer trying out a new kind of wheat, as a mechanic working on a new gadget, as a man setting up in business. That is the kind of conservatism the Republican Party believes in. And this kind of conservatism is the warp and woof of what America itself is. What is there in that to be ashamed of or apologize for?

Too long we have permitted others to say what we are, and they have missaid us. Too long we have permitted others to pin labels on us which were mislabels. For permitting this we have been much to blame. We have been timid about our own virtues, hesitant about proclaiming our own beliefs. Our timidity has looked like consent, our hesitation like guilt. It is my conviction if we had been proudly forthright in our support of our own party convictions and about the record of the Eightieth Congress, of which we were a controlling part, we would have won the election. And even if we had not, we should have gone down with banners flying and in honest fight.

Any party worth the name should be willing to say:

"This I do believe; on this I take my stand, though all the world believe otherwise. Let all who feel as we do join us."

Maybe at the time what we believed wouldn't be popular enough to win an election that time but it would the next. At least such a program would have honesty, courage, and integrity. And I have a quaint conviction that honesty, courage, and integrity—the kind of honesty which states a conviction even if it loses votes, the kind of courage which sticks to unpopular convictions—are still mighty potent things in American life. It seems to me I recall a man standing up in the House of Burgesses in Virginia and saying something like that. And he didn't do so badly.

We at home have our work cut out to do a job of merchandising. If you will write a letter telling us women what we might do in our State Republican Federation along these lines, I shall be glad to read it at our board meeting in January.

I didn't mean to preach a discourse. I meant to leave that for you. Thank you for letting me blow off steam.

Yours sincerely,

ALMA G. MADDEN.

JANUARY 5, 1949.

MRS. ALMA G. MADDEN,
Bellingham, Wash.

MY DEAR MRS. MADDEN: Your letter of December 29 is before me as it has been since it came yesterday. I am more grateful than you can possibly imagine for your comments

CAN LIBRARY
FEDERAL ARCHIVES DEPOT

and attitude of mind. I know of no letter which has so stimulated and excited my interest. I can think of receiving no letter which I have encouraged every member of my staff to read with thoughtful concern. I don't know at the minute what I am going to do with your letter but I want to discover some way through which I can distribute its contents rather widely throughout the State. I share your convictions and pride about and in our party. Like yourself I want only for us to define what we stand for and live by our code. There are those among us who say we need a new look and by their conduct I think they want to outdo those who are doing too many things we don't stand for. Our monumental responsibility and task is to popularize our own conservative position. If this can be done, and it will call for sacrifice and very hard work, I am completely convinced that we shall be ultimately successful and happy as a party because people everywhere will make it so. Our prevailing uncertainty and distress as a party results from not knowing exactly what we are. Your definition of an intelligent conservative, and there is no point in being anything less, ought to reinspire those who are so fortunate as to read and understand it. You have made a contribution to me and I shall pass your gift along to just as many as I can.

May your understanding, common sense, and courage bring hope and satisfaction to all you come in contact with.

With warm personal regards, I want to remain,

Most cordially yours,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Congress Must Continue Its Spy Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities recently has uncovered shocking revelations of the existence of espionage in our Government involving the theft of highly secret documents for transfer to agents of a foreign government. There is overwhelming evidence that this exposure has not yet been completed. If this job is to be finished, it is highly essential that the Congress give unstinting support to the Committee on Un-American Activities. The American people insist that there shall be no whitewash or cover-up and that all guilty persons shall be brought to justice.

The necessity for continuing this investigation has been stated clearly and logically by the Saturday Evening Post in an editorial published in the issue of January 8, 1949. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS MUST CONTINUE ITS SPY INVESTIGATION

If there was ever any doubt as to the imperative need for the continuing services of the House Un-American Activities Committee, it must have been dispelled by the amazing attitude of President Truman and the Department of Justice toward the committee's sensational year-end revelations of Soviet espionage in the State Department. About the best that can be said for the President's performance is that it assures the continuance of the committee by the Eighty-first Congress. A left-wing statesman may be planted in the committee to pipe smear items out to compliant columnists, but a committee there will undoubtedly be. Everybody will be trying to get into the act.

President Truman's attitude on this vital matter has been, to say the least, uninformed. Top-secret and highly restricted documents, which had been removed from the confidential files of the State Department by somebody 10 years ago, were found on Mr. Whittaker Chambers' farm, as Chambers said they would be. The President, at his earliest opportunity to comment on this revelation, repeated his inept campaign declaration that the whole thing was a red herring. The Department of Justice, which from the first has belittled the discoveries of the committee, insisted on grabbing the committee's witnesses for a New York grand jury under circumstances which suggest greater eagerness to punish Mr. Chambers for confessing than to discover who represented Stalin's apparatus in the State Department. Instead, the grand jury indicted Alger Hiss for perjury, thereby indicating its belief that the committee had turned up something more substantial than red herring. This event did nothing to enhance the cogency of the President's earlier remark that he had no intention of getting into a controversy with a dead committee.

Fortunately for the safety of the United States, the Un-American Activities Committee lived long enough to produce this amazing piece of evidence—evidence which confirms the suspicions of those of us who have long feared that Stalin's tentacles had reached into the most intimate circles of the New Deal government. These suspicions are confirmed. We are left with new and darker suspicions—to wit, that the Truman administration regards the possible embarrassment of its own officialdom as more dreadful than the operation of Stalin's spies in this country. The President's remark that the committee should have turned over its evidence to the Department of Justice, which has been sleeping on this information for months, was a new low in cynicism. Despite some belated energy in the Department, presumably the result of competition, the fact remains that it was a committee of Congress which turned up the key information.

It is no wonder that the Communist conspirators take on new boldness throughout the world. They are aware that, however blustering the speeches of the representatives of the "free nations," there is little to fear from the United States of America under present management. When Igor Gouzenko uncovered the spy ring's operations in Canada and made it plain that the real Red objective was the United States, Washington was indifferent. It was apparently bad taste to disturb Soviet spies. Earlier, in 1945, the Amerasia scandal had made it plain that top-secret material had been stolen and copied by Communists and fellow travelers, but nothing much happened to the document thieves. Instead, former Under Secretary of State Grew was smeared out of the Department for the crime of having caught them at their thievery. Last month, with more of the disgraceful story brought forth by a congressional committee, Mr. Truman talked about red herrings. For once, we suspect, the President missed the popular note.

The Un-American Activities Committee of the Eightieth Congress is about to go behind the Truman iron curtain. Unless the Eighty-first Congress contains men of sufficient honor and patriotism to forget politics and insist that this investigation be carried forward, the whole matter will be brushed under the rug and, for all we know, Soviet agents will continue to have access to American plans and documents. From present indications, one must conclude that the President is still too ignorant of Communist methods to rebel against the Red strategy of using his administration as a front. For a real probe of this situation, the country must continue to rely on Congress.

Duplicate Taxes Imposed by the Federal, State, and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address which I delivered before the Council of State Governments at Detroit, Mich., on December 2, 1948:

I am very happy to be here today to consider the problem of duplicate taxes imposed by Federal, State, and local governments.

The Federal Government, being a national government, reaches more people and has jurisdiction over more transactions than is possible in the case of States which are confined to taxing persons and subjects within their borders. It is, therefore, necessary that the Federal Government should have a tax system which is much more comprehensive and of a much greater variety and range than is possible under a State or local tax system. The Federal income tax itself reaches about 50 million taxpapers out of a total population of over 140 million. The remainder of the people are reached through selective excise taxes, a striking example of which is the admissions tax which by its very nature reaches a class of people which could not be reached under an income tax. From the standpoint of the individual in the low brackets, an excise tax of this nature is much less burdensome than an income tax, because the individual always has a choice as to whether or not to pay the tax or refrain from making the transaction subject to the tax. Included in this category are the taxes on liquor and tobacco. The Federal Government derives over three billion dollars from taxes on liquor and tobacco, alone. In addition, the Federal Government imposes taxes on gasoline, lubricating oils, automobiles and trucks, tires and tubes, refrigerators, radios, electrical energy, retail taxes on furs, jewelry, and toilet preparations, and luggage. There are also taxes on transportation of persons and property, admissions and communications, social security, and stamp taxes, not to overlook a tax on every telephone conversation.

Federal excise taxes alone yield over $8,500,000,000, with another $2,500,000,000 derived from customs and miscellaneous receipts. The remainder, approximately $33,000,000,000, comes from our Federal income tax on individuals and corporations. In fact, the total receipts of the Federal Government for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1949, are estimated at around $45,000,000,000. Adding to this our State and local taxes of approximately $13,000,000,000, the grand total is $58,000,000,000, compared with a prewar total of around $12,000,000,000. It can thus be said over 30 percent of our national income is—30 cents out of every dollar—now being absorbed by taxes, Federal, State, and local.

One of the primary reasons for this enormous increase in the Government tax bill is

the large increase in governmental expenditures. The cost of government has been steadily increasing in recent years. But nowhere has the increased cost been so pronounced as in the case of the Federal Government.

This enormous Federal tax bill is caused by a great many factors. In addition to the expenditures resulting from the aftermath of the war, including the European recovery program, the Federal Government is undertaking more and more to carrying on functions which fundamentally and properly belong to the States and local governments. Thus, we not only are faced with a duplicate tax system of Federal, State, and local governments, but also with duplicate expenditures for many of the same functions. The Federal Government is now engaging in a great many varied activities, which a few years ago were confined to the States, the local governments, and the people. To see this, one only need to compare 1913 Federal expenditures and State and local expenditures with present Federal, State, and local expenditures. In 1913 the Federal Government expenditures amounted to only 24.6 percent of the total governmental expenditures, State and local expenditures accounting for over 75 percent of the total. Today the Federal Government is accounting for approximately more than 75 percent of the total governmental expenditures, and State and local governments for approximately less than 25 percent of the total.

In terms of dollars, the Federal expenditures amounted to $700,000,000 in 1913. Today they exceed $40,000,000,000. In 1913, State and local expenditures by $1,300,000,000. Today they lag behind Federal expenditures by $27,000,000,000. This shows strikingly how far we are getting away from home rule by the States and local governments and getting more and more into a centralized Federal system. I am a great believer in leaving to the States and local governments those functions which essentially belong to them and which they can perform much better than the Federal Government, because they are so much closer to the people in their particular locality and are more familiar with the individual needs of the community.

While, of course, much of the increased Federal expenditures were caused by the war, nevertheless a considerable part of such increase is due to the assumption by the Federal Government of functions and activities which formerly were undertaken by the States and local governments. If we are ever going to get our Federal expenditures down to a sane and reasonable basis, State and local governments must refrain from asking Federal aid for projects which should be undertaken by State and local governments. Furthermore, State officials should use their influence through their Representatives in Congress to see that many activities which are now being carried on by the Federal Government be curtailed and returned to the States. Many of these requests for aid when granted by the Federal Government are hedged in by conditions and limitations which are unsuited to the needs of the particular community.

To curtail nonessential spending by the Federal Government is the real key to the elimination of duplications by governments in both the tax and expenditure field. I am convinced that by this means, and this means alone, will it be possible for the Federal Government to withdraw from certain fields of taxation, which are now being tapped by State and local governments.

But even here I wish to exercise a voice of caution. There are certain taxes which operate as a threat to business expansion, production, management incentive, and employment. Particular examples of these taxes are the Federal income taxes on individuals and corporations.

The Congress believed it necessary in the Revenue Act of 1948 to reduce income taxes on individuals. This reduction was deemed essential because the income taxes under the present tax law constituted a serious restriction upon new investment, management incentives, and employment.

As has often been said, tax rates do not produce income. Without the income, the rates are meaningless. Increased income and increased revenue go hand in hand. The wisdom of such a course has been evidenced by the way revenue receipts are running at the present time. In the current fiscal year, July 1 to October 29 receipts are running only $512,000,000 less than the actual receipts for the same period in the fiscal year 1948. When we consider the heavy income-tax collections to be received in March, April, and May of this fiscal year, it appears likely that even with the tax-reduction bill, our Federal receipts for the fiscal year 1949 will approximate our receipts for the fiscal year 1948.

But if the States had immediately tried to take advantage of this Federal tax reduction by imposing increased State income taxes to take up the reduction, the result would have nullified the benefit of the tax reduction. I therefore hope the States will not increase their income taxes so as to interfere with business expansion, production, and employment.

In the field of taxation, there are always four parties to be considered: the Federal Government, the State governments, the local governments, and the taxpayer. Too often the taxpayer is overlooked in the scramble for revenue. If governments are to adequately receive revenues to support their activities, it is vital that the taxpayer be kept in a sound, healthy, and prosperous condition. We cannot do this if we overburden him with oppressive and burdensome taxation. His incentive to earn and to invest must not be destroyed through oppressive taxation, whether imposed by State, Federal, or local governments. We have made a start in this direction by the Revenue Act of 1948. Let us try to make another step in the same direction. This can only be made possible through a reduction in Federal expenditures. Our present budget is the greatest peacetime budget in our national history. You can all help in this great work by using every means at your command to keep demand for Federal spending and increased activities down to a minimum.

I do not need to call it to the attention of this distinguished group that for the past 16 years or more there has been a steady growth of centralized power. More and more under a system of various aid to the States local and State governments are becoming subservient to the Federal Government. Home rule is gradually disappearing through these subventions.

I have lived in a period of home rule and even a city of only 15,000 people saw fit to revamp and rebuild the city. It desired industrial expansions and its facilities were not adequate to this purpose. Without turning to the State or the Federal Government for assistance the local people built 3,000 model homes for workers; called in experts and planned the city for the future, including transportation. High schools costing millions of dollars were erected. Parks and playgrounds were developed. The largest stadium west of Harvard University was built in 1917 and has been used almost every day since then. A golf course was established for the benefit of the workingman; a general hospital and a maternity hospital were built. A city health department was created which has functioned ever since. This was home rule in action. Did this program of home rule require the aid of the State or the Federal Government? No. All this was done through local effort and local expense. This home-rule program resulted in the growth of the city from 15,000 to 151,000 population, with a resulting era of prosperity from increased pay rolls.

The people were proud of their independence and never thought of being placed in a position of servitude to a centralized bureaucratic government advertising itself as the munificent almoner of indefinite charities.

Home rule was the strength of our Government in those days, and if any persons had been told that home rule was to be surrendered and replaced and controlled by a sprawling Federal bureaucracy, they would have deemed such a statement as coming from a disordered mind.

It is not necessary for me to furnish examples outside of this State, because in many of the Michigan cities today the great system of free enterprise came as a result of home rule. Some of the largest industries were started by venture capital furnished by those living in the community who had saved and were willing to take a risk in a new venture.

I repeat again that the constant turning of communities to the Federal Government to finance local projects not only has a demoralizing effect upon the citizens but leads to the first steps toward socialism. The surest way to permit the States to have the benefit of that part of the field of taxation now occupied by the Federal Government, I repeat, is to cut the expenditures of the Federal Government to the point where it will not have to tax practically everything, and especially to duplicate the taxes collected by the States.

We are on the verge of a great decision as to whether or not the States are to become weakened, the people reduced to servitude by an extravagant, wasteful Federal system in the use of the taxpayers' money. The answer is in the hands of the sovereign citizens who love liberty.

I wish to thank the members of this distinguished audience for their patience in listening to my views on the subject I have discussed.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the annual message to the New York Legislature on January 5, 1949, by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York. His remarks deal with the proposed power development of the river by New York and Ontario.

The excerpts follow:

The plans for the construction of the St. Lawrence power project, approved by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, have been in existence since 1941, yet the unbridled power of this great river still flows wastefully to the sea. The State of New York is suffering from a power shortage. We are presently required to obtain from the Province of Ontario over 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year to maintain existing production. Meanwhile, Ontario, itself, is in such dire need for this power that its people have been required to resort to brown-outs and night operations to avoid normal peak loads.

To each new session of Congress there has been presented a bill to make possible the

development of the St. Lawrence. Conflicting interests have repeatedly made the passage of such a bill impossible. I have always favored the full development of the St. Lawrence seaway and will continue to support any program which respects the agreed rights of our State.

But, meanwhile, the power can be developed without reference to the seaway and, let me emphasize, without impeding it when and if it is approved by the Congress. Accordingly, last year, New York State attempted to go ahead under the terms of the existing Boundary Waters Treaty between the United States and Canada. The power authority of this State has applied to the Federal Power Commission for approval, and to the United States Department of State to transmit its application to the International Joint Commission.

Again the needs of the people of this State have been disregarded. The State Department has refused even to transmit the application of the State of New York.

Power in human terms means many things. It means new business, new employment, and greater prosperity. It means the extension of the modern conveniences of life to rural areas. It means a greater number of labor-saving appliances in every home. These benefits are being denied the people of the State of New York without valid reason.

Your honorable bodies can take the following steps to assist in clearing the way for action when and if Federal cooperation can be procured.

First, the law under which the New York State Power Authority acts should be improved by relaxing the requirement that the power authority must have firm contracts for the sale of its power before issuing any bonds.

Second, the authority should be empowered to construct transmission lines where necessary to bring this great supply of power to the load centers.

The Nation in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Milwaukee Journal, January 2, 1949:

THE NATION IN 1949

Today, just over the threshold of 1949, we cannot escape the fact that, on the national scene, 1948 was a do little year.

Congress, confronted with an election, dawdled in indecision on too many questions. The basic problems of our times—those made patent by the great depression as well as those rising out of the great war—remained unsettled. In fact, to a considerable extent, they remained unapproached.

We enter 1949 with the national elections over. The question is whether we enter it determined to accomplish what cries for accomplishment.

The first problems in 1949 involve the government itself. There is the matter of the budget, swollen by defense needs to a figure beyond anything we have known in peacetimes. Unless economies can be effected, there will have to be an increase in revenues from taxes.

Where will we go? Will we, following the suggestions of the Hoover group, really make a valiant effort to cut waste, extravagance, and duplication from our national activities? Or will we ignore the suggestions, pass a needlessly high budget, and raise the tax burden on the people?

Then there are the problems involved in inflation. Will we again in 1949 largely ignore this important matter, except in the field of rent control? Or will we act positively to sustain production while lowering prices?

Then there are the problems involving labor. What will we do about the Taft-Hartley act, about minimum wages and kindred matters? Will we yield entirely to labor's dictation or will we develop legislation in the interests of all the people?

Finally there are the many still unsolved problems concerning social security, housing, education, and health. Where will we go with these? Will we lean toward the pauperizing solutions of the Socialists or will we carry on according to the American tradition?

We can, of course, head toward "cradle to the grave" security, toward housing by Government, toward a federally directed education, and a federally managed health service. But will we then be headed in the American direction?

In these things we are likely to go far astray if, considering each problem separately, we act without the solid foundation of a basic American philosophy. In a chartless course there is always a tendency to yield to isms and panaceas, to lines of action which have no root in national experience and are fraught with ultimate danger.

There is little present need to fear that we will deliberately embark at this time on a new philosophy, as Britain did when she turned from an empty conservatism to an unproven socialism. The danger here is that, by forgetting our heritage, we may be hoodwinked into un-American solutions to some of our American problems, gradually setting a pattern foreign to our traditions.

In seeking solutions, whether it be for racial intolerance or for financial security, we must always remember that the greatness of our past lies in the development of private initiative and the protection of legitimate private enterprise.

Our American objective must always be to maintain a people free from unnecessary restraint and able through its individual efforts to enjoy an increasingly high standard of living, with a decreasing economic difference between those at the top and those at the bottom.

We must measure the effect of everything we do on the essential liberty of the sovereign individual. We must avoid a cumulative regimentation for health, for education and for security, which may in the end so weaken liberty that the state will be the master and the individual will be submerged.

The problems of 1949 bring us a basic challenge. We stand at a crossroads in our existence, with needs pressing from every side. The question is whether, approaching our needs, we have the wisdom to proceed calmly and with determination to rely wholly on American solutions—whether we have the prescience to know the right road from the wrong in this critical moment.

Small Business and the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I append hereto a resolution recently passed by the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., to be presented to Congress as expressive of the views of small business with reference to proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley Act:

Whereas we believe that true collective bargaining can take place only when both labor and management sit down at the bargaining table on equal terms; and

Whereas experience has shown that the Taft-Hartley Act has made the situation less one-sided than it was previously under the Wagner Act: Now be it

Resolved, That we, the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc., hereby petition our Representatives in the Congress of the United States not to allow the provisions of that act, especially those pertaining to the jurisdictional strike and the secondary boycott, to be weakened, even though it may be considered desirable to make some changes in some parts of that act.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very fine editorial from the Bloomington (Ill.) Pantagraph under date of November 2, 1948. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act was the result of misdirected activities of labor leaders in this country who were thinking more of their own welfare than of the welfare of the rank-and-file members of their unions. Congress, in my opinion, has never been and is not now antilabor.

The editorial follows:

WILL CONGRESS KILL TAFT-HARTLEY BILL?

Organized labor is hailing the November 2 election results as a mandate given to Congress for outright repeal of the Tart-Hartley Labor Management Act. Philip Murray of the CIO, following his post-election call on President Truman at the White House, declared that "now the people have spoken," the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed. William Green, A. F. of L. president, has called for congressional action to "wipe out the antilabor program of the last Congress."

Labor leaders want a repeal bill to have high priority when the new Congress convenes January 3. They point to the Democratic platform, Secretary of Labor Tobin's speeches, President Truman's campaign pronouncements, as prorepeal. However, none of these Democratic attacks on the Taft-Hartley Act denied the need for labor legislation of wider application than the 1935 National Labor Relations (Wagner) Act.

President Truman wanted something more than the Wagner Act when on December 5, 1945, he asked Congress for some action against the postwar strike wave. On May 6, 1946, the President asked Congress for authority to draft essential-industry strikers into the armed forces during the war emergency. In his 1947 address to the new Republican Congress the President asked for legislation the effect of which would be to restrict some of labor's prerogatives under the Wagner Act.

Further support for revision instead of outright repeal can be expected from many of the Democrats and Republicans who, as Members of the Eightieth Congress, voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. They will note that 80-odd Members, Democrats as well as Republicans, who voted for it will not be Members of the new Congress.

Senator MCKELLAR (Democrat, of Tennessee) who voted for Taft-Hartley in 1947, has said: "After the overwhelming expression of the American people as to the Taft-Hartley law, I believe that law should be repealed or modified in accordance with the expressed will of the people as shown by the vote on last Tuesday." In 1947 only two Senators who had voted for the bill shifted over to vote to sustain President Truman's veto, LUCAS (Democrat, of Illinois) and SPARKMAN (Democrat, of Alabama).

Among congressional leaders who will be calling for quick action on the Taft-Hartley law is Representative LESINSKI (Democrat, of Michigan), scheduled to become chairman of the House Labor Committee. Representative LESINSKI on June 24, 1947, 4 days after President Truman's Taft-Hartley law veto was overridden in the House, introduced a bill for its repeal.

Vice President-elect ALBEN BARKLEY has indicated that if there is compromise legislation it will be nearer to the Wagner Act than to the Taft-Hartley law.

What the American people want is a responsible body of organized labor that will act in the best interests of the country. The people want no more regulation of labor by Government than the conduct of labor makes necessary. The Taft-Hartley Act was the result of irresponsible, monopolistic actions of organized labor that virtually paralyzed this country's economic processes at the time we were trying to switch from war to peace production. It was less severe than President Truman himself sought in his May 6, 1946, request.

But under Democratic, Republican, or even labor government organized labor will be confronted with rigid controls if its conduct ignores the welfare of society as a whole. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act would not solve the problem. Revision would not solve it. Organized labor itself will determine what kind of labor laws we have—not by its lobbying power but by the actions of its leadership in industrial relations.

What Will We Do About China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 4, 1949, entitled, "What Will We Do About China?":

WHAT WILL WE DO ABOUT CHINA?

The time has come when the United States must decide what it will do about China. Our policy of do-nothing and drift has finally come to the end of the way and is faced with grave disaster unless we meet the pending crisis squarely.

The Communists have swept over most of north China down to the Yangtse River, and the question now is whether they are to be allowed to dominate all Asia. For that is exactly what the present proposal of peace through a coalition means. Recent developments in Europe in the form of coalition governments with the Communists have demonstrated that they lead inevitably to one result—Communist domination. And Communist domination of all China will eventually include Malaya, Indochina, Burma, Thailand, India, and Indonesia. With the potential resources of all Asia at their disposal, the Russians would be in a good way to dominate the earth.

Unless we are absolutely oblivious of our welfare, this must not happen. China is not yet lost. The whole southern half of the country is as yet untouched by the Communists, and there is no reason why with a strong protective policy they should not be stopped at the Yangtse. As Hanson Baldwin, military analyst of the New York Times, has said, "It is still perfectly possible to create somewhere south of the Yangtse and north of Hong Kong and Canton a rampart or series of ramparts to contain communism."

This line of defense is as important as the line now drawn against communism in Europe, and its maintenance is as vital to the interests of world democracy. As Mr. Baldwin has said, a balance of power must be created in Asia, just as a balance of power is being created in Europe by the Marshall plan and the projected Atlantic alliance.

We must throw our strong support behind south China leaders—if not Chiang Kai-shek, then some others who will arise—and win friends and influence among the peoples of southeast Asia. This will be a diffcult task, but it is not impossible. Preserving south China from Communist domination not only will save southeast Asia for democracy and freedom but will provide a base from which later the recovery of north China from Communist control can be accomplished.

And we must act at once. There can be no delay. With the knowledge of strong American backing, the anti-Communist forces in south China will be encouraged to keep up the fight. Without that knowledge, they are certain to throw in the sponge either through abject surrender or by accepting a coalition government in which the Communists will dominate, which is the same thing. The hour has struck. We must act.

Cross-Filing in the California Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have been confused and do not understand the system of cross-filing which the California election laws permit in the primary election. The Stockton Record, under date of December 20, 1948, had an editorial in which some of the results of cross-filing are mentioned, as well as some of its features. In order to understand it, we should remember that under the primary system the voters themselves select the candidates. Each voter must register his party preference, or if he has no preference, he may refuse to designate. When primary election day comes, there are as many separate elections at the same time as there are qualified political parties. The voters who are registered and wish to vote enter the precinct election booth and the clerk in the booth determines, from the registration list, with which party they are affiliated, and consequently hands them the appropriate ballot—Republican, Democrat, and so forth.

In order to cross-file, the candidate must have sponsors from the party whose nomination he seeks, whether it be his own or other parties. For instance, I, as a Republican, when I enter my name as a candidate for the nomination for Congress by the Democratic Party, must be sponsored by from 40 to 60 registered Democrat voters. This enables me to get my name on the Democratic primary ballot, and gives the voters of that party the right to determine whether or not they would like me as their candidate. In effect, it merely means that voters of one party may endorse the candidacy of a person registered in another party. Since the voters are the ones who must make this determination, I can see no harm in permitting them a chance to vote on the name of anyone, sponsored by members of the party whose nomination is sought, who may be seeking the nomination irrespective of his party. If in their judgment he is the man that they think would be a good nominee for their party, why should they not have the right to say so? This is exactly what the California primary does.

In order to retain party identity and preserve party integrity, the law provides that in order to obtain the nomination of any other party than the one in which he is registered, a nominee must obtain the nomination of his own party. In other words, if his own party does not designate him as the nominee and therefore indicates they do not want him as their candidate, he is not permitted to have the candidacy of the other party whose nomination he was also seeking. In that event, the State central committee of each party selects a candidate to appear as the candidate of the respective party in the final election.

The article, which I ask leave to include in my remarks, gives in brief form the basic underlying idea of the cross-filing system, and indicates that in the past, as undoubtedly it will in the future, benefit the candidates of both parties. It distinctly takes the control of the party away from political bosses and keeps it in the hands of the voters themselves. The article referred to follows:

GOP RECALCITRANTS SEARCH FOR SCAPEGOATS

Calling themselves partisan Republicans, some 125 southern Californians are out searching for scapegoats on which to place the onus for defeat in the Presidential election. One member of the committee hit the nail squarely when she said, "We were defeated by ourselves." Then she went on to blame the wishy-washy, namby-pamby attitude of our leaders, especially Earl Warren.

The committee has two specific aims: To abolish by initiative and election the practice of cross-filing, and to retire Governor Warren from public office.

Cross-filing in primary elections permits a Democrat to seek the Republican nomination, and vice versa. More important, it enables the voters to express their approval of candidates for what they are, not for their party affiliation. The practice has been widely approved by political observers as giving the primary back to the people, making the primary a truly popular election rather than a strictly party affair as it is in most of the South. Neither party has been an exclusive beneficiary of the system, both Democrats

and Republicans virtually have won office in the primary by winning both nominations.

The Republican recalcitrants aim to restore party purity in the primary, a goal which means restoration of control and authority to party leadership at the expense of the people's full participation in determining who shall be nominated.

In attempting to explain the defeat of the Republicans on November 2, it is logical to center fire on the candidates. Where the unity theme originated is difficult to say. Both Governors Dewey and Warren were its spokesmen, and the theme was carried out by lesser party leaders as well. At the time most political sages nodded wisely in the belief that the party had only to avoid stirring antagonism by discussing issues; they pursued the strategy of floating along on the anticipated tide of public opinion.

To center blame on Governor Warren is absurd. At best, a Vice Presidential candidate is a secondary campaigner, not a policymaker. Nevertheless, on some issues of particular interest to the West, notably public power, Mr. Warren acted as Mr. Dewey's spokesman.

In attacking Governor Warren, the GOP faction appears to be dissenting from the progressive principles which have been stirred within the party. The results of the election demonstrate that a reversion to traditional conservatism would have made more decisive the defeat which was suffered and is likely to result in an extension of Democratic holds on administrations and legislatures in the future.

Senator Lucas His Party's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans alike in the great State of Illinois are in hearty accord with the sentiment expressed in an editorial published in the Alton (Ill.) Evening Telegraph, Tuesday, January 4, 1949, commenting on the unanimous choice of Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, as majority leader of the United States Senate.

Under leave to do so, Mr. Speaker, I herewith include the Evening Telegraph editorial as part of my remarks:

SENATOR LUCAS HIS PARTY'S CHOICE

Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, was elected unanimously as majority leader of the Senate. It was an impressive tribute given to the Illinois Senator by his party. With many able men who would have esteemed it an honor to be chosen as the leader of the majority party in the United States Senate, the choice fell upon Senator LUCAS. He has made Illinois people feel that they are not represented by a nobody. No matter what the party lines of the administration may be it is important to Illinois that she have a representation amounting to something. Senator LUCAS has displayed a power of influence in the Senate that has given him attention of the men in the posts of party command that go to the long time Senate Members. It had been a foregone conclusion for sometime that Senator LUCAS would be the choice of his party members for leader of the Democratic forces in the United States Senate, but it would have seemed a bit too optimistic to think that the post of leader would go to him without opposition. Yet that is what has happened and the choice of him by his party becomes more complimentary. Senator DOUGLAS, who might have been urged as party leader because of his ability, was disqualified by reason of his being a novice in Senate Membership, but he will doubtless display a fast growing influence and he too become a highly important Member of that body.

It is recalled that when Senator LUCAS was up for renomination for the Senate he had no opposition in Illinois, getting the nomination with no contest.

Did We Buy Socialism With Truman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of December 4, 1948:

DID WE BUY SOCIALISM WITH TRUMAN?

After all that has been said in felicitation of President Truman and his gallant fight against overwhelming odds, one has to face up to what this election may mean to the future of the United States. The people didn't hate Harry Truman enough to defeat him or love Governor Dewey enough to elect him. But after all, a contest for the office of President is not a golf match and all this talk of closing ranks and showing superior sportsmanship can hardly dispose of the fact that, unless Mr. Truman's campaign promises were so much guff, the country may be in for a rough ride.

If the President had stood on the record of his public acts, the prospects would not be bad. He has been right on a lot of things, among them aid to Greece and western Europe, defense, and control of atomic energy. But these things, for which Governor Dewey also stood, were not what elected President Truman. He owes his election pretty much to the fact that some millions of people have come to accept the philosophy of the heroine of Gentleman Prefer Blondes: to wit, that love and affection are very nice, but a diamond ring lasts a lifetime. The sterling American farmer reasoned that Dewey might be wonderful, but it was Truman who was paying the support prices. Other groups were persuaded by promises that Uncle Sam would build them a house, pay their doctors' bills, or guarantee hamburgers at 30 cents a pound. It all comes to the same thing.

President Truman is, of course, entitled to the hearty support of all citizens in his genuine efforts to promote peace and keep America free and prosperous. However, whenever the implementation of his campaign promises tempts him and his followers into measures involving a planned economy or some sort of benevolent national socialism, then the duty of such conservatives as remain in Congress becomes more complicated. In extreme circumstances it may become what it was during the first New Deal: to fight a rear-guard action to preserve as much of our free economy as possible. This blocking and tackling is a thankless and unprofitable job, but if all politicians had shirked it in the frenzied years from 1932 to 1940, the damage from the New Deal would have been more disastrous than it was.

There will be men in the new Congress, even in the President's own party, who will exert a conservative influence. It is hard to imagine SAM RAYBURN, who will be Speaker of the House, breaking his neck to help pass a too drastic civil-rights program, or Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, who will go back as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, supporting an inflationary program. Such stalwarts seem less conspicuous in the House than in the Senate, but the run-of-mine, middle-of-the-road Democrats plus a good share of the Republicans ought to be able to erode the more bizarre items down to size. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law may prove difficult, too. The measure may be doctored up and repassed as the Thomas-Lesinski bill, but Congress is sure to debate some time before repealing the law which President Truman himself used to end the coal strike, particularly since the large industrial States voted for Dewey. With prices leveling off, the Truman demand for price control will find opposition, too. Nevertheless, the President can fairly claim a mandate for the measures he stood for in his campaign. A fair share of them will land on the statute books.

President Truman, while he may not have understood all the implications of his multitudinous promises, intends them to be carried out. Many of them sounded like irresponsible enticements by a man who realized that it was impossible to overestimate the number of crackpots on the voting lists. But Kansas-City-type politics do not altogether explain Mr. Truman's campaign. Anyway, President Truman cannot now retreat from his program, the result of his decision to ignore the conservatives in his party and play for the lefties. Politically, this proved sound strategy, but it will cause a lot of headaches. The President is hooked with zealots like Senator-elect HUMPHREY, of Minneapolis, who wants to push so-called civil rights down the throat of the South. The CIO will expect prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Other pressure groups will remind Mr. Truman of his promises of price control, rent control, housing and health programs. And he'll have to go along, even if, like the Little Old Lady in the nursery rhyme, he wakes up some morning to the bewildered realization that "this is none of I."

We might as well not kid ourselves. Mr. Truman's program, as pieced together from his campaign pledges and speeches, contains the seeds of planning and a regimented economy. Call it a police state if you want to, because this is the way police states begin. The unending largess adds to the already backbreaking load on the Government credit. The consequent acceleration of inflation brings a new clamor for price control, with all the ubiquitous snoopers and spies needed to make it appear that there is compliance. When the producer, compelled to meet all wage demands, but forbidden to raise his prices, makes a squawk, he is first persecuted as an obstructionist and then forced to stand aside while functionaries of the state manage his business for him. Higher taxation discourages investment and dries up the supply of capital, so that the one remaining source for the succor of industry becomes the state. Finally, the worker, the supposed beneficiary of the intended Utopia, is reminded that things are going to pot because he—quite naturally—isn't producing enough. This would be where we came in, except that, normal incentives being frowned on as Fascist, direction of labor by the state takes its place. Take it away, Sir Stafford Legree.

Too gloomy? We hope so, but it seems reasonable to expect that the country will get at least some of what it voted for. If there are people so naive as to imagine that the Truman program could be carried out under a free economy, they are in for a rude awakening. And if there are even more naive people who believe you can have a state-controlled economy without regimentation and loss of freedom, their awakening will be

ruder. Of course, the voters didn't consciously vote for national socialism, but that makes little difference. The world's most prominent dictatorships started from small beginnings—social reformers giving the customers what they wanted without the least idea that they were sapping the structure of human freedom. Ironically, the most tyrannical dictatorship in history began its career by informing the suckers: "You have nothing to lose but your chains."

Such hope as remains of escaping this dreary routine lies in the historic distaste of Americans for change which goes too far. If repeated defeats for old-style liberalism have not convinced the conservatives in Congress that they are facing a wave of the future which there is no use fighting any longer, they may take the inevitable abuse certain to be heaped on anyone who tries to check the drive toward regimentation. But the disagreeable truth is that the American people have given the green light to the planners and the big government boys. Everywhere else in the world such people have needed but one lease on power to push their countries over the cliff. If we in America have better luck, we can hardly be said to deserve it.

Resolutions of Pure Milk Products Cooperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 1948, the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, a fine organization of Wisconsin dairy producers, held its annual convention at Fond du Lac. There, after careful deliberation, the organization went on record regarding several important national issues of direct concern to America's dairymen. These are, or ought to be, of interest to every Member of the House of Representatives. Under unanimous consent, I include certain of these resolutions in my remarks, as follows:

FARM PRICES

Newspapers, magazines, and radio commentators the past year have been protesting the high cost of living. A close analysis of these protests would lead one to believe that the farmer is mainly responsible for the present inflation. The press and radio imply the farmers are rolling in wealth, are gouging the American public, and they further imply that the farmer is public enemy No. 1.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative holds no brief for the present rubber dollar, and we heartily favor sound methods of curbing inflation.

We wish, however, to point out these pertinent facts to the American public.

1. All-out production and a superabundance of goods is the first step to be taken in controlling inflation. American agriculture has taken this first step. While labor has been staging one strike after another and industry has been jockeying for price advantage, thereby curtailing the production of much needed goods, American agriculture has gone all out in its effort to produce an abundance of food. There have been no strikes staged and no price maneuvering by the American farmer. We have done our part, through production, to control inflation.

2. Due to the Marshall plan and other exporting policies of our National Government, many important foods are scarce, and, consequently, cost the consumer more money. The farmer is not responsible for this. It is part of the price all American citizens, both rural and urban, must pay for the stabilization of world governments and the alleviation of world misery.

3. Due to the fact that neither labor nor industry has met the challenge of all-out production, the farmer is forced to buy his necessary supplies and equipment on a market of scarcity rather than that of abundance, and he is consequently forced to pay inflationary prices. No economic class in America buys as high a percentage of consumer goods as does the farmer. Agriculture is thereby paying more than its proportionate share of high prices caused by the failure of labor and industry to meet their responsibilities.

4. The economic collapse of 1929 was largely brought about because prices which labor, industry, and agriculture received were out of ratio. The depression for agriculture started in 1921. For 8 years farm prices were depressed, while wages and industrial profits were rising. In this span agriculture lost through reduced prices and declining values, an amount of money equal to the cost of the First World War. The result was inevitable. No economic system can possibly prosper where one important economic segment receives high prices and another segment low prices. The respective incomes of labor, industry, and agriculture must be kept in balance. Thoughtful analysis will disclose that present food prices are not too high, but too low, when compared to the earnings of labor and industry.

The members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative assert that we have done our full share in curbing inflation through all-out production and that we are not responsible for the failure of labor and industry to do likewise. The American farmer is not responsible for present governmental policies which produce a scarcity of food in this country. We are not disposed to be penalized for the policies and failures of others.

Pure Milk Products Cooperative is opposed to inflation. Inflation has always been detrimental, even ruinous, to the farmer. We favor any sound method for curbing rising prices. The curb, however, must be imposed equally on the things the farmer sells and the things he buys. We insist that present farm prices in comparison with other prices are not too high—and furthermore—any curtailment of present farm prices must be met with a corresponding reduction of wages and prices of consumer goods and services which the farmer must buy.

FLOOR PRICES

Pure Milk Products Cooperative favors a floor price-support program for dairy products that will keep and maintain a production of dairy products adequate to meet the nutritional needs of our Nation. It is in the public interest that the returns for labor and investment to dairy farmers should be equal in comparison with other branches of agriculture, and we strongly urge the adoption of a comparable price system in such floor price program.

Further, that Pure Milk Products favors a program of floor price support sufficiently flexible to give consideration to the perishable nature of milk and butterfat, which first must be processed before they enter the main channels of trade and become adaptable to storage; and that further consideration should be given to the fact that farm loans, farm storage of milk and butterfat, and direct purchases of milk and cream from farmers for price-support purpose are impracticable, and that ways and means to overcome these impracticabilities should be developed in the floor price system; and, further, that wherever possible such floor prices should be announced far enough in advance to permit dairy farmers to gear their production goals in accordance with anticipated support prices.

We instruct the State board of directors of Pure Milk Products Cooperative to transmit a copy of this resolution to each Member of Congress from Wisconsin and to the secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation in annual convention at Portland, Oreg.

OLEOMARGARINE—NATIONAL

Pure Milk Products Cooperative, in their annual convention duly and legally assembled, wish to state clearly and concisely to the American public, our press, magazines, and newspapers, and especially to Congress our viewpoint and position relative to the controversial issue of oleomargarine versus butter.

In order to clarify the issue, let us understand:

1. The present controversy is not concerned with the superiority of one spread over another. Pure Milk Products is willing to let the discriminating taste of the consuming public decide this question.

2. Nor should the nutritive value of margarine or butter enter into our consideration. The proper place to decide this controversial point is in the laboratory.

3. We are perfectly aware that in this fight for a place on the table of the American consumer both margarine and butter must stand or fall on the basis of their own merit. The Congress should impose no oppressive restrictive measures on either. Any tax on colored margarine must therefore be regulatory, not discriminatory.

Down through the ages, from the days of Abraham and Isaac, the golden yellow color has been the distinctive and exclusive badge of butter. Through the years many competing spreads have come upon the market for a while, then vanished. Through the centuries, until now, no competing spread has ever attempted to deceive and defraud the public by usurping butter's golden-yellow color. Because of custom and usage, the consumer infers, without question, that the yellow color and butter are synonymous.

Margarine is attempting to deceive and defraud the buying public by stealing butter's yellow color. A careful study of the history of the entire controversy, a careful analysis of propaganda in newspapers and magazines, a minute scrutiny of congressional debates and court records, and a glance at margarine's present-day advertising leads to but one conclusion. Margarine manufacturers are not willing to sell their product on its merits but through fraud and deception are determined to pass their product off on the unsuspecting public as butter.

The butter industry of America is perhaps the most decentralized of all industries. Butter is the product of thousands of family-sized farms interspersed throughout the United States. Margarine is the fruit of the concentration of millions, even billions, of dollars in the hands of a relatively few men. The farmer has only one means at his disposal to protect himself against the attempted fraud and deception of the margarine industry. He must turn to the Congress and the several State legislatures.

We wish to reiterate that the present controversy is not over price, nor is it one of taste or quality. It is not a debate over taxes. The entire controversy boils down to this: Shall a competing spread be permitted to defraud the public by using butter's yellow color?

For this reason, we, the members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative at this, our annual convention, are resolved, that Congress should retain the present tax of 10 cents a pound on colored oleomargarine; not as a

tax in principle but as a regulatory measure, until by court action or through legislation butter is given the exclusive right to the use of the yellow color.

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTION

We again urge that nothing be done to impair the right to income-tax exemption bona fide farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative associations. To this end we oppose any change in section 101 (12) of the Internal Revenue Code in the regulations promulgated under that section or in the interpretation of those regulations that have been made by the Treasury Department.

The principal address at the Fond du Lac convention was delivered by that great good friend of Wisconsin dairymen, our colleague from the Seventh Wisconsin District, the Honorable REID F. MURRAY.

I submit a condensed text of Mr. MURRAY's address at that time:

IS THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN JEOPARDY?

(Address delivered by Hon. REID F. MURRAY, Member of Congress)

My contention is that never before in the history of our country has the dairy industry been in jeopardy as much as it is at the present hour. While one of the main controversies on the subject is based on oleo versus butter, the important issue is the battle between the vegetable oils and animal fats. Still another and perhaps greater issue is between the soil-depleting crop system of farming as opposed to livestock farming, which up to this time has been recognized as the system of farming which maintains the soil fertility.

That we may orderly approach the consideration of this problem, permit me to make the following statements:

Chicago is the "food capital" of the world and comparatively few States around Chicago furnish a large percentage of the food of the Nation. Iowa and Illinois alone provide nearly one-third of the country's total production of hogs. Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa produce one-quarter of the milk.

This great Midwest is the largest area of rich, productive, fertile soil to be found anywhere in the world. There are times, however, when it appears that certain interest and certain sections have gone a long way toward ruining their own soils and now want to support an agricultural program which will ruin the soils of this great Midwest—which is not only the bread basket of the world—but the milkshed of the Nation and the largest meat-producing area in our country.

The dairy industry in the immediate future is confronted with the unfair competition of vegetable oils. In this connection I wish to point out that no experiment as yet conducted has proven that vegetable oils are nutritionally equal to animal fats.

The experiments conducted by Wisconsin and California showed certain results that have been interpreted as proving that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat, but the ridiculous part of the experiments has been that dairy products were used in conjunction with vegetable oils in order to prove that the vegetable oils are equal to animal fats.

The Chicago experiments in the orphanages, where some children were fed oleo and other children were fed butter, was not a real experiment and the conclusions were not justified because the children eating the oleo were also furnished butterfat in the form of milk to drink in addition to the skim milk contained in the oleo used in the experiment.

I repeat—there never has been any experiment which has proven that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat.

No experiment has been conducted by any agricultural scientist in any State or in the United States Department of Agriculture, that proves that a synthetic vitamin A is equal to a natural vitamin A.

There are many synthetic dairy products which now threaten the dairy industry. To mention a few:

1. Oleo, which propagandists would have us believe is equal to butter.

2. The "coconut cow" milk, which is made by incorporating vegetable oil with skim milk and which product is sold in competition with evaporated natural milk. It is a produce which at this time cannot be shipped interstate, although Dr. Carlson at the Catholic Rural Life Conference in La Crosse, on October 18 stated that in his opinion, is equal to evaporated natural milk.

3. Synthetic cheese, which has already been manufactured experimentally and which is just waiting until after the oleo bill is passed.

Here is some of this synthetic cheese made by the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture some 6 months ago. It is made of vegetable oil and skim milk. I gave some of this cheese to some people a few years ago and they thought it was pretty good—but I think anyone who knows anything about the cheese industry—would not rate this synthetic cheese very highly.

4. Now, in connection with filled milk, I am reliably informed that filled milk was made and distributed to the Mexicans last year. This same source advises that when the foot-and-mouth disease stopped the supply of fluid milk in certain Mexican cities, their first approach was to buy dried milk from the State of Wisconsin. However, this mixture appeared to be too expensive and so a certain company conceived the idea and put it into practice, of taking skim milk and incorporating coconut oil, subjecting it to certain mechanical processes and selling it in lieu of natural cow's milk.

It might be well to point out also that ice-cream manufacturers have already found competition where vegetable oils are being substituted for at least part of the butterfat in ice cream.

Did you know that considerable amounts of filled cream were sold illegally on some markets in large cities during the war? Vegetable oil was used to supplant some of the butterfat in this cream.

Here, then, my friends, are four direct threats to the dairy industry.

You will ask, "Where are we going to get the skim milk to make these synthetic products?" Well, I am sure you have heard of the reciprocity agreements which have been operating from the very beginning in opposition to the livestock industry and in favor of soil-depleting crops.

The duty on skim milk is only a fraction of 1 cent per pound and there is no reason why large quantities of dried skim milk cannot be obtained from Argentina—the present source of huge amounts of casein imports. You might also be interested in knowing that Canada is stepping up its exports of dried skim milk to the United States since the duty on this commodity has been reduced to an insignificant amount.

It must be remembered that 30 percent of the evaporated milk is produced in Wisconsin. Now, if cheap imported dried milk and vegetable oils are to be processed and sold in competition to evaporated milk, do you think that evaporated-milk plants could continue to operate?

In August 1948, 67,000,000 pounds of oleo were manufactured in the United States. One hundred and seventeen million pounds of butter were produced in the United States. In other words, at the present time, 20 oleo manufacturers produce one-third of the spread of the Nation and it would not require a very long time for 60 oleo manufacturers to take over the entire spread-manufacturing business of the Nation.

If cheap imported skim milk is incorporated with vegetable oils in the manufacture of synthetic cheese, just exactly how many cheese factories do you think will be eliminated from the picture?

Mr. Fluid-milk Man, you have deceived yourself in many instances if you have believed that it would not affect you if the Rivers bill had been passed, because you do not sell butter, but sell milk. You should be apprised of the fact that it is just as mechanically possible to make synthetic products out of skim milk and vegetable oils to compete with your bottle of milk as it is to any other synthetic dairy products.

Oleo is 80 percent vegetable oil and 15 percent skim milk. If by passing certain legislation this product is made equal to a 100 percent dairy product such as butter, it is apparent that it is but a short step to pass legislation making cocoanut cow's milk (which is composed of 6 percent vegetable oil and 94 percent skim milk) equal to evaporated natural milk, which is composed of 7 or 8 percent butter fat and 92 or 93 percent skim milk.

Do you think it will be a very long step to legalize filled cream?

Do you think it will be a very long step to legalize filled ice cream?

There is no use trying to sidestep this issue. Facts are facts. If, by legislation or otherwise, vegetable oil is made equal to animal fat, who is there to say that the synthetic products which I have mentioned, should not be produced?

Let us get this question straight and get it on the record.

If any individual, group, or organization wants to dismantle the evaporated milk business of this State; jeopardize the cheese industry and allow all of the spread to be made by 60 oleo manufacturers and close up the thousands of creameries and promote filled cream and ice cream; or be a party or organization to promote the manufacture of synthetic whole milk—that is a responsibility that they may assume and one for which they must answer.

I have given considerable time and study to this entire problem. I have diligently sought out the facts and I have always kept my argument based on scientific facts. I have accepted these scientific facts because they have been established by one of the greatest biochemists and nutritionists that the world has ever known, Dr. E. B. Hart, of our own University of Wisconsin. His experiments are beyond question. The statements which I have made concerning past experiments and tests have been cleared through this recognized authority on scientific facts.

So that no one will get the impression that the manufacture or production of synthetic dairy products and the controversy over oleo and butter applies just to the man who milks the cow, I hope that the people working in the dairy plants not only in our State, but throughout the country in handling the various forms of dairy products, will stop and ask themselves what kind of jobs they are going to have when a few plants manufacturing synthetic dairy products are given the green light. Ask yourselves what the effect will be on the dairy industry of our great State of Wisconsin.

It is evident that any State where the agricultural economy is based on the dairy cow, with 50 percent of the farm income from milk and milk products, will decline in economic importance.

The health of the State, of the country, and the world is closely allied with the dairy industry. We must be ever alert to the encroachments made upon it.

The Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac Cases Are a Threat to Religious Freedom Everywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote a letter which I have today addressed to our colleague the gentleman from New York, Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, urging the appointment of a special subcommittee to consider and take appropriate action on the shocking manifestations of communistic excesses involved in the recent imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government and the equally outrageous action of the Yugoslav Government taken 2 years ago regarding Archbishop Stepinac.

I urge that all Members of this body who share my concern over these incidents express their views to the chairman and members of this committee, in order that we may not allow to go unchallenged this dangerous threat to the Christian church and to those who courageously dare to profess and proclaim their faith.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 6, 1949.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: The purpose of this letter is to request the appointment by you of a special subcommittee to inquire into the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary and Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia. The outrageous action of the governments of these two countries in incarcerating these two courageous Christian leaders is an affront not only to the church they represent, but to right-thinking people the world over.

Certainly, the very least we should do as legislative representatives of the world's leading Christian nation is to condemn this action in the most emphatic terms of which we are capable.

In December 1946 I took up with the Department of State the sentencing of Archbishop Stepinac to a 16-year prison term at hard labor. Secretary Byrnes at that time wrote me that it was the contention of the Yugoslav Government that the case was an internal matter, and in the circumstances he intimated that it was not considered proper for his Department to interfere. Presumably, they would take the same position regarding the present situation.

Both Hungary and Yugoslavia were liberated in part by the blood of thousands of American boys who believed they were fighting to preserve ideals and principles now shattered in an alarming manner by these arbitrary governments. Probably these two fearless men of God care not what suffering and physical and mental torture faces them. It seems to me, however, we cannot sit idly by, as these Communist outrages recur, but must register our protest and exert the influence of our United Nations representatives to request a thorough probe of the actions taken against these stalwart Christians.

It is toward that end that I ask your cooperation through the appointment of a special subcommittee, which will serve to focus the attention of all nations on this great international and humanitarian problem.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

Workers Not Permitted To Join Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from Detroit, under date of December 26, came a signed letter, giving the writer's address, and which reads in part as follows:

I read in the papers from time to time of your investigation of labor practicer, etc. How about helping some of us slaves, for that is what we are here in Detroit. Men have and are working here for 20 years and not allowed to join this union. The treatment we get is inhuman but we must pay union dues.

The enclosed clipping from Free Press and News will give you some idea.

The clipping from the Detroit Free Press reads as follows:

FILM UNION ACCUSED OF MONOPOLY—PROJECTIONIST SUES TO REGAIN HIS CARD

(By Clyde Bates)

Czarist tactics were charged to the Detroit Motion Picture Projectionists' Union (A. F. of L.) by a union operator in a circuit court suit Wednesday.

The operator was Louis G. Havens, 36, of 654 West Ferry.

He accused four officials and local 199, the operators' union, with violation of Michigan's antitrust laws. He said they maintain a manpower monopoly in the projectionist trade.

He also charged that the union holds scores of skilled operators as nonmember vassals.

These men are never admitted to membership, it was charged, and are liable to dismissal from day to day at the whim of union bosses.

Havens claimed he had been working in Detroit on this vassal basis since 1942—although the local accepted his $200 membership fee 3 years ago.

But he found another operator at his booth early this month, he said, when he angered the local by protesting to the international union.

Havens said that his union card and membership fee were returned to him.

Return of the card, he said, constitutes blacklisting in Detroit. He seeks an injunction ordering reinstatement of his job and admission to membership.

Union officials named in the suit were Local 199 President Frank Kinsora; Roger M. Kennedy, business agent; Joseph A. Sullivan, treasurer; and Roy R. Reuben, financial secretary.

The suit also named Wade E. Allen, owner of the Fine Arts Theater, where Havens was employed until his ouster by the union, December 10.

During the time when he was being refused union membership, Havens said, scores of sons, relatives, and friends of union members were admitted to full membership. They could then take nonmembers' jobs, he added.

Another signed letter from a union member reads:

I—a union man of long standing—some 20 years a builder, who served 5 years learning at my trade, receiving $9 per week, now at this late date when I am receiving $3 per hour, or $24 for 8 hours' work, I am compelled to work alongside a bunch of goons, who know as much about building as a hog does about Sunday, and who are admitted to the union regardless of their knowledge or experience, because they have the initiation fee. This type of goons get almost the same wages I do, yet cannot file their own saws, if they own one, which many don't. This type of crooks, due to the union, gyp the public and make it harder to get a home well constructed. We all wear buttons, advertising the fact that we are un-American and belong to a clique, which can tie up all the railroads, ships, factories, telephones, busses, streetcars, and anything you can think of within 24 hours, which goes to prove that laws, soldiers, and arms are useless when we decide to take over and change our system to that of Stalin; yet under our system of cheat, lie, steal, and murder to accumulate our gods and idols which bear these inscriptions, "In God we trust," our dumb, Christianized, legalized, politicalized, civil-servicized crooks are aiding Stalin's system faster than he ever hoped for. I at one time was proud to be an American, but don't advertise that fact any more.

Our system worked at Kalamazoo and other places; why not in Washington, D. C.?

Heaven in the Hills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a poem by a valued friend of mine entitled "Heaven in the Hills."

The author of this poem is A. R. Grinstead. Mr. Grinstead is an attorney at law in the romantic little city of Sonoma, Calif. In this city, on June 14, 1846, the bear flag of California was raised. While California was at that time a part of Mexico, certain Americans, who had migrated westward, made up their minds that California should be a free and independent political unit. In this romantic little city many of the buildings are arranged in the original pattern laid out by the Spaniards, and I believe some of the original buildings are still in existence.

The place Mr. Grinstead refers to as heaven in the hills is known as Pinecrest, and is a mountain colony around an artificial lake. This area is located in Tuolumne County and is within the Stanislaus National Forest. It is a beautiful place and the Forest Service has done a fine job in trying to develop it. In fact, it is getting almost too thickly populated

for the sanitary facilities that are available in the area. The poem referred to follows:

HEAVEN IN THE HILLS

You will find it to the eastward—in the mountains clean and high,
Where it seems somehow suspended 'twixt the valley and the sky.
With blue skies that bend above it, bluer waters there below,
Turquoise shades in marked contrast with the white of mountain snow.
Fleecy clouds, its faithful guardians, sentinels—the fir and pine,
Standing on the green clad mountains which to waters edge incline.
It's a region of repose where we may cast aside our ills,
In the peace of lovely Pinecrest—that Heaven in the Hills.

I'm tired of fog and winds that drive the sunshine from the sky,
I'm tired of crowded buses, trains, I'm tired of buildings high,
I'm tired of geometric blocks, the rigid city street;
Of people's clamor, raucous sounds, and countless pounding feet.
So let me go where I can see, down there between the trees,
The white sails gliding to and fro before a lazy breeze,
Where crooning pine trees lull me and the protest in me stills.
I'm heading up to Pinecrest, to that Heaven in the Hills.

With gaudy lights I'm surfeited, the glamor of the towns.
Their colors have depressed me, the grays, the blacks and browns.
And so I seek a region where soothing colors blend,
For from Nature's own gay palette there's no color to offend.
So I've left behind the cities, the bridges and the bays,
Behind the sizzling valleys, in their hot and dusty haze;
And now I glimpse the timber, and its green my vision fills.
For I'm drawing near to Pinecrest, to that Heaven in the Hills.

Oh, I've seen too many people, I've been jostled by the crowd,
So I seek again the solitude of mountain top and cloud:
The sunshine slanting through the trees, the fragrant camp-fire smoke,
The snow flower, iris, columbine; the aspen and the oak.
Now Mother Lode's behind me, I climb the curving grade,
The giant trees surround me, I've reached their welcome shade.
The granite peaks, and now the lake, my stifled spirit thrills.
Once again the joy of Pinecrest—that Heaven in the Hills.

—*A. R. G.*

Presidential and Congressional Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. W. B. Jones, adjutant of East Atlanta Post, No. 159, of the American Legion, Atlanta, Ga., has forwarded to me a copy of resolution originally adopted by East Atlanta Post on December 19, 1944. This resolution was readopted by that post 4 years later, on December 16, 1948.

In order that the Members may know of this resolution twice adopted by East Atlanta Post, I am inserting it herewith in the RECORD:

Whereas the salary of the President of the United States, together with the Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, is fixed by the United States Congress; and

Whereas because of the drastic change in economics the salary is inadequate to meet the requirements commensurate with the dignity of the office held: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the resolution committee in the American Legion in executive committee assembly petition the United States Congress to enact such legislation necessary to increase the salary of the President of the United States to $100,000 and each member of the United States Senate and House of Representatives to $25,000 per year with the usual concessions.

Respectfully submitted by East Atlanta Post 159, the American Legion:

H. L. TERRY,
Acting Commander.

Readopted December 16, 1948.

E. E. SISK, *Commander.*
W. B. JONES, *Adjutant.*

Reform in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Tuesday, January 4, 1949, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

REFORM IN THE HOUSE

House action taking from the Rules Committee its power to pigeonhole legislation gets the Eighty-first Congress off to an auspicious start. The reform offers real hope for a constructive legislative session.

The change of rules will allow the chairman of the legislative committee which prepared a bill to call for a vote of the House if the Rules Committee fails to grant the bill clearance after 21 calendar days. He will be recognized by the Speaker to call up a stalemated bill on the second and fourth Mondays of any month. If a majority of a quorum approves, the bill will become immediate House business. That will do far more to assure action than the present method of having to obtain 218 signatures to a discharge petition.

Thus, one of two badly needed legislative reforms is obtained before Congress is 24 hours old. Now it is up to the Senate to effect the other reform by amending its rules so that a majority rather than a two-thirds vote will halt filibusters. Congress will not function in a truly democratic fashion until it has deprived obstructive minorities of the power to keep from the floor legislation favored by the majority. We hope the Senate will promptly follow the House's fine example.

Meanwhile, Pennsylvania's delegation can take much of the credit for reform in the House. Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pittsburgh, promoted the change in the Democratic caucus on Saturday. Then, on Monday, Pennsylvania's 16 Democratic House Members, as well as some of the State's more progressive Republicans, gave it their support.

New York City Bar Association Suggests Rules Governing Procedure of Congressional Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 5, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, in considering various proposals for statutory rules for congressional investigations, I believe that Members of the Congress will find the report of a committee of the New York City Bar Association helpful. Composed of outstanding attorneys, the committee has produced a report suggesting certain specific rules which appear to have merit. Because of the interest in this problem and the thoroughness with which the committee has made its study, I include, under leave to extend my remarks, the following resolutions of the committee:

After giving careful consideration to the matter, your committee proposes that it be recommended that the association adopt the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this association recommends to the Congress of the United States the adoption, by concurrent resolution or otherwise, of the following principles to govern the conduct of investigations by committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

"1. The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated. In cases of special investigations authorized by congressional resolution, the subject of the investigation shall be so stated in the resolution, and in the case of investigations initiated by the committee, the subject shall be so stated by the committee and announced before the commencement of the hearings.

"2. Any witness summoned at a public hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before a private hearing shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

"3. Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a written or oral statement, which shall be made part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with regard to which he has previously been examined.

"4. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel, and, if given in public session, he shall be furnished with a copy

thereof if he so requests, and if given in executive session, he shall be furnished with a copy thereof in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

"5. No photographs, moving pictures, television, or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying.

"6. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified and who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

"(a) To file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"(b) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

"(c) To have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel, but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period. (A minority of your committee herewith submit a report recommending the insertion of the phrase "Unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise" at the beginning of subdivision 6 (c).)

"(d) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

"7. These principles shall apply to investigations by all committees of either House of Congress, including standing committees, select committees, or joint committees of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing."

Respectfully submitted.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE BILL OF RIGHTS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR.

Navy Day Address of Hon. John Nicholas Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a profound speech made by Hon. John Nicholas Brown, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, which he delivered to a joint luncheon of the Navy League and the Kiwanis Club of Memphis on Navy Day, October 27 last.

Secretary Brown is a man of culture and splendid ability. He has brought to the Navy the highest sort of public service, and I wanted the membership of the House to have the benefit of reading this extraordinary address.

The speech follows:

In June of last year, when I visited Memphis for the first time, I learned, to my surprise, that here, a long way from the ocean, is a community that understands and appreciates the Navy. I discovered one of the most active councils of the Navy League. Furthermore, I found that quite a number of members of the council had taken off from the deck of an aircraft carrier.

These gentlemen are fortunate, because permission has been withdrawn for distinguished citizens to fly from carriers. Although carrier pilots are highly trained and their planes are as good as we can make them, we cannot deny that accidents occur.

Your Navy League Council was kind enough to ask me to dinner on my other visit, and there I believe I learned why this inland city is so conscious of the Navy. The council members had succeeded in having Memphis accept their view of the Navy. I must say that their efforts appear to have been aided by Admiral Stump and the officers and men of the naval air technical training center, and by Captain Taff and his people at the naval air station. While I was in the city of Memphis, I heard nothing but good of the training center, and while I was at the center itself, I heard among naval personnel nothing but good of Memphis.

One of the things that has impressed me since I went to the Navy Department has been the good feeling and understanding that exists between members of the service and members of the communities where they serve while ashore.

The Navy, like the Army and the Air Force, now is engaged in rebuilding after having fallen into a state of weakness following demobilization. The two naval facilities at Memphis typify important phases of naval expansion; one, the training of technical men and the other, preparation of the Reserve for active duty.

Training in the mechanical skills is a fundamental requisite of a sea service. From the time when ships first were sent out to carry fighting men over the waters, the naval service has been a technical service. Navies have incorporated the most advanced techniques of each period as rapidly as they could. This arises from the fact that naval warfare is mobile. Navies move, and that which can move fastest and farthest is that which returns victorious. This is a principle which has not been altered by time, but instead was proven sound in the last war, and if there is another war will be demonstrated again.

The first fleets were small craft in the Mediterranean, able to sail and fight only in calm weather in that inland sea. The first vessels designed for combat were propelled by oars. They could move rapidly for short periods and for short distances, since their motive power had the limitation of human strength.

To the north, where rough waters prevail around the British Isles, there arose another kind of combatant fleet which depended upon sail for its power. There the British refined the lines of their clumsy but seaworthy cargo vessels and produced ships of war which did not depend on men for their movement. However, the early British warships, like the Mediterranean galleys, really were only platforms on which foot soldiers stood and fought each other. The ships lay to alongside each other, and the fighting was much like that on land, except that a man could not retreat.

However, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and under his sponsorship, there were developed guns which were designed to damage other ships rather than to injure men, and here arose the true fighting seamen.

This development did not occur in the Mediterranean at the same time, and so in a single day—in fact, in a single hour—because of its technical advantage in ships and guns, the British Fleet sailed into Cadiz in 1587 and there established its dominance of the sea which lasted for centuries. A year later it was their smaller, faster ships with guns of greater range which enabled the British to break up the Spanish Armada near their own shores.

Since that time all the navies of the world have striven for greater speed and for weapons of greater reach. Today the superiority of the United States Navy does not depend entirely upon its size. Instead, it is due to the fact that we have developed and refined far beyond anyone else a seagoing weapon which can reach farther than the weapons of other navies. This weapon is the carrier aircraft.

The principal striking power of the United States Navy against enemies afloat or ashore consists of aircraft launched from carrier as much as 700 miles away. The technical skills involved in such an operation are impossible for anyone to imagine who has not devoted years to their study. An aircraft carrier is the most complex machine that man has ever made and moved. It is, in fact, a town of two or three thousand people, with an airfield, with great machine shops, with stores of food, fuel, ammunition, and with every facility for living from bakeries and banks to a drug store and a church.

Its size, however, and its complexity are not the characteristics that distinguish it most. There are ashore larger communities with very much larger airfields in many places. What distinguishes the carrier is its ability to move.

Three-fourths of the surface of the earth is covered by salt water. It is fair to say, although we should be careful not to say it boastfully, that nothing can move on these seas except with the approval of the United States, because our Navy is able to control them. This is a vast responsibility. Actually, we do not use this power to hinder the movement of anyone on the seas. Instead, we use it to assure that the oceans are safe and that anyone who wishes to may traverse them without fear of molestation.

In time of peace that is not difficult. The mere presence of units of our Navy and of those of our allies serves to guarantee that the freedom of the seas shall not be an empty phrase. We must remember that unless the seas are free and open to our own commerce the industry of our country soon would grind to a halt. There is no prospect of such an occurrence in time of peace, but in time of war it would be a primary objective of any enemy to endeavor to cut the sea routes which bring us the raw materials for our enormous industrial organization.

This must be prevented at any cost. Therefore, the character of the Navy is changing step by step to meet circumstances which would arise in the event of hostilities. These changes are not made and cannot be made all at once, but since the end of the last war the shape of the Navy has altered. By that I mean that the Navy is not preparing to fight World War III but is endeavoring to be ready for World War III, should it arrive.

I regret that in discussing the Navy, or in discussing any of the armed services, it is necessary to speak of them in terms of a next war. However, there is no reason for maintaining them except to insure the security of our own country and to make sure that if we are attacked at any place a war would be fought to victory abroad and not here at home. Therefore, the Navy stands today ready to perform functions it has performed in all our wars, although it will not accomplish its missions in the same manner. It is ready to keep open the ocean highways so that we will not be lost for want of supplies, and it is ready to gain footholds abroad for the other services so that they may meet and defeat an enemy.

This brings to mind, of course, the submarine. There is without question a fear

that modern submarines may be so fast, so plentiful, and able to travel such distances that they cannot be dealt with. But I think many of the exaggerated fears that I have heard expressed are not warranted.

Antisubmarine warfare by plane and ship, and even by submarine, has been the subject of most intense study and experiment since the end of the war. There are now in existence a good number of hunter-killer teams made up of light carriers with their air groups and surface ships, and these teams work constantly to perfect the intricate tactics and the highest degree of coordination between naval officers in the air and naval officers on the bridges of the ships. I would not say that we would not suffer losses to merchant shipping should a war occur, but it is my opinion that we can hold such losses within manageable bounds and that we can eventually clear the seas of submarines. This would not be simple and it would not be immediate, but antisubmarine warfare has many aspects to which I have not alluded and I think a combination of them would be most effective.

Protection from submarines of shipping throughout the world is a primary responsibility of the Navy. However, I can assure you that if the Army or the Air Force should find itself able to assist the Navy in this form of warfare, such assistance would be heartily welcomed.

There is a tendency to speak of both the Navy and the Air Force in terms of material things, of planes and ships. That is not the right way to think of them. The planes of the Air Force, the ships and planes of the Navy, the tanks and guns of the Army are the sinews of war, but they are not the Army, the Navy, nor the Air Force. The sinews of war are no stronger than the hearts of the men who work them. The enthusiasm, the devotion, the esprit de corps, all the factors that enter into morale, are no less vital to the strength of the services than are their weapons.

The Navy never loses consciousness of the fact that it is made up of men. In all its planning for the man-machine team, the man comes first. I believe that the men of the Navy would be surprised to know how carefully their individual aptitudes and desires are considered in order that each may be placed in the billet in which he may serve most profitably.

In October 1775, the Continental Congress provided for a Navy. Throughout the years since, the Navy has grown large or sunk into a state of ineffectiveness as Congress determined what kind of a Navy the country required. Soon after this century began, Theodore Roosevelt became Assistant Secretray of the Navy and, through the efforts of this forceful and energetic man, a modern fleet was constructed of a size consistent with the rise of the United States to be a world power. Two years after Theodore Roosevelt's death, a group of men, many of whom had been his friends, selected October 27, his birthday, as a date most suitable to be annually observed as Navy Day.

The celebration of this day is in the hands of the Navy League, made up of people who recognize the importance of the Navy to the United States and who endeavor to keep it strong. Their efforts have played a vital part in the well-being of this country. The work of education that they did before the war had an important bearing on the readiness of the Navy when the blow fell at Pearl Harbor. And if there should come, as we pray there does not, another day when bursting bombs and clouds of smoke tell us that years of conflict lie ahead, we will owe to them in large measure the fact that we have a strong, a good, and a ready Navy to defend us.

The TVA and the Fertilizer Industry—Address by Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, more than 15 years have passed since Senator George Norris and I waged a successful battle for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Every promise that we made has been realized, and every human being in the United States who turns an electric switch is getting his electricity at a cheaper rate than he would have received it if we had failed in that undertaking.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. Nothing that has been done, or attempted, since the building of the pyramids, compares with it.

When I entered this battle for the development of the Tennessee River in 1921 the American people were using only 37,181,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

We were told then there was a surplus and that additional power was not needed.

During the year ended October 31, 1948, the people of this country used 278,105,609,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, or considerably more than seven times as much as they were using in 1921—and the demand for additional power is greater today than it has ever been before.

There are 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste every year in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 894) for the development of the water power of the entire Nation. With a reasonable amount of "firming up," this additional 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours could be raised to 500,000,000,000, which added to the present supply would make this the richest and most powerful country of which the world has ever dreamed.

Then our fuel supply would last for centuries to come.

In addition to the development of the hydroelectric power in the Tennessee River and its tributaries, and the promotion of navigation, flood control, and so forth, the Tennessee Valley Authority is rendering a great service in helping to supply the farmers of the Nation with the ingredients necessary to fertilize their farms.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address delivered by Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the convention of the National Fertilizer Association in Atlanta, Ga., on November 17, 1948.

It reads as follows:

THE TVA AND THE FERTILIZER INDUSTRY

During the past year your association and the TVA have begun to reexplore mutual interests. By meetings and correspondence we have tried to find a basis for constructive cooperation—cooperation that does no violence to the integrity of the basic purposes and methods of each. We believe the effort has been worth while; I think we understand each other a little better.

For the TVA I can say that these discussions have left us with the conviction that there are important areas of work offering opportunities for constructive relationships with your association that will advance the public interest.

We recognize that you are engaged in a complex business. Your membership includes many business enterprises large and small. Your business affects the farmer. It affects the farmer's use of the land, and those who consume the farmer's products. The kinds and amounts of fertilizers you manufacture and sell and the ways in which they are used—these things affect the kind, quality, and quantity of the ways the land can produce to feed and clothe people and to supply industry with raw materials.

The TVA is engaged in a complex program which has for its primary objective the strengthening of an entire region. TVA's responsibilities embrace a pervasive concern for the abundant water which can be a blessing or a curse in its effects upon the welfare of the people of the region and the Nation. That is why the TVA dams have been built—to control and use water for human benefit; that is why TVA concerns itself with the problems of making water work for the people who live on the land.

Because your interests and TVA's responsibilities at several points affect the same things—farmers, the soil, the consumers of food—our respective interests inevitably affect each other.

Your association has rediscovered the TVA in the past 2 or 3 years. Shortages of phosphate and nitrogen have plagued your ability to meet the fertilizer demands of farmers. Under these circumstances, any producer of basic chemical nitrogenous or phosphatic materials has been sought out by the fertilizer industry as a possible source of supply.

Your recent interest in the TVA seems to be based upon these circumstances. We produce triple superphosphate and ammonium nitrate at Muscle Shoals. Our production is a small part of the Nation's total supply. You know and farmers know that both materials are efficient fertilizers. Naturally, you want TVA to turn the output of our operations, especially the nitrogen, into the mixing and distributing channels that lie between the chemical industries and the farmer and his land. But when you began to offer to buy these materials from the TVA you found that these materials were being committed to a long-range educational program under distribution arrangements which had been worked out primarily through farmers' association and cooperatives.

Your members and the TVA have discussed this problem. We have enjoyed a most extensive correspondence with many of you. It seems clear that our relationships for the moment could be welded together if we were to withdraw TVA ammonium nitrate from farmer-controlled distribution channels and transfer it to you. But it is clear to TVA, after the most careful examination of this proposed change in distribution policy, that such a change would add nothing to and

might subtract much from TVA's ability to help farmers revise their farming practices, shift their land use, and thus help control and use the abundant water resources of the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere.

We are sure that such a solution would not serve the interest of the farmers, of the consumers of food and fiber, or of the Nation as a whole. It is not clear to us that a change in our distribution policy would even serve the long-run interest of the fertilizer industry.

The fertilizer industry can get a great deal more benefit from what the TVA is doing than a certain tonnage of nitrate or phosphate. TVA's nitrate, for example, if equally distributed among the fertilizer dealers of the Tennessee Valley States alone, would supply less than a carload to each dealer. It is difficult to believe that relationships between the members of this association and the TVA will stand or fall on such a small and fleeting issue. We would hope that you might be interested in the broader range of services the TVA has rendered and will continue to provide—services that should be of fundamental interest to the fertilizer industry.

One of these services, the test-demonstration farm program, is raising the level of efficiency of the whole farm system through the use of fertilizer, and thus increases the value of fertilizer to the farmer. The other major service, research in new processes and products, is increasing the concentration of the product and pointing the way to lower costs to the industry and to the farmer.

The record is clear, I believe, that these two fields of service benefit you as well as the farmer. These services help to expand and stabilize the market for fertilizer by increasing its value and lowering its cost to the farmer. We confidently expect that, among other things, TVA's new processes and products will provide the means for utilizing the western phosphate deposits to serve the expanding fertilizer requirements of the Central West.

Because these services and their effects contain the basis for constructive cooperation between your association and the TVA, I want to discuss each one in brief detail.

1. THE TVA PROGRAM HAS INCREASED YOUR MARKET

As you know, the TVA, with the assistance of the land-grant colleges, the Agricultural Extension Services, and tens of thousands of farmers in their organizations and associations, is carrying on a test-demonstration program. In this program TVA experimental fertilizers are tested and demonstrated on privately owned farms, operated as practical farming units. On these farms more efficient use of fertilizer makes possible more efficient long-range farm-management systems, thus realizing for the farmer the full value of his fertilizer.

For your purposes the test-demonstration program can be accurately regarded as a successful attempt to develop and educate new fertilizer markets. The educational use of TVA materials on the soils of the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere has increased your sales of fertilizers to farmers.

Here are a few facts: Between 1935 and 1943 the consumption of normal superphosphate in the United States increased 58 percent. In the Tennessee Valley States the increase was 63 percent; in Tennessee, 63 of whose 95 counties are in the Tennessee Valley, the increase during the 1935–43 period was 99 percent.

Recently we compiled figures showing the increases in the consumption of commercial fertilizer in the 107 counties of the Tennessee Valley, compared with consumption in the 258 counties outside the valley but in the States of Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee. Between 1935 and 1948 the average increase in the sale of commercial fertilizer in the nonvalley counties was 63.5 percent. In the valley counties, where the number of active test-demonstration farmers has averaged about 12,000, the increase was 232.3 percent, nearly four times as much. Note that this increased sale of commercial fertilizer in the test-demonstration areas is over and above the TVA phosphate allotted to test-demonstration farmers. What happens is that both the test-demonstration farmers and their neighbors buy greatly increased amounts of fertilizer. The more intensive the test-demonstration activity and the longer it is maintained, the more the use of the TVA materials stimulates sales of commercial fertilizer.

2. A DIVERSIFIED AGRICULTURE WILL IMPROVE THE STABILITY OF YOUR MARKETS

The test-demonstration program as carried on in the Tennessee Valley and elsewhere is doing more than creating a new market for the sale of your products; this program is encouraging farmers to transform their farming methods by the introduction of practices that are essential to the full development of the soil and water resources and the welfare of the people.

In the 15 years the TVA has been at work with the agricultural agencies and the farmers of the Tennessee Valley, 1,000,000 acres have been shifted from open cultivated crops to grass and cover crops.

The acreage of pasture has increased 14 percent.

The application of phosphate and lime to grass and pasture lands is becoming an established and expanding practice.

Land in row crops in the Tennessee Valley decreased 19 percent while in the United States as a whole row crop acreage increased 2 percent.

With fewer acres in row crops, there has been a more intensive cultivation and greater use of fertilizers to increase the total yields of corn, cotton, and tobacco on less land, thereby helping the farmer to finance his new crop rotation systems, his new emphasis upon phosphate, pastures, and livestock. This brings a rapid increase in the diversity of farm products; and with this reform the farmer's income will be less sensitive to the fluctuations of price on a single cash crop. Grass, pastures, and livestock in addition to corn, cotton, and tobacco, will help to stabilize your fertilizer markets. Your business can become less dependent upon the price of a few cash crops—as it is now and has been for too long.

These results are important byproducts of the farm test-demonstration program. TVA's primary objective is the development and use of fertilizer as a tool in a regional demonstration of soil and water conservation and use. It is well known that regularity and volume of stream flow are influenced by the kind of crops grown on the watershed and the seasons at which they make their maximum growth. It is not so well known that the farmer can use that fertilizer in managing his land to serve both his own interest and that of helping to regulate stream flow in the interest of the region and the Nation.

One of the things we are learning through the test-demonstration program is how best to use TVA's new fertilizer materials to shift the prevailing farm systems of the Tennessee Valley from dependence on summer row crops, that make their maximum use of water when it is most needed in the streams, to a greater use of winter sod crops, which reach their peak use of water during the spring flood season. As farmers shift from corn to winter grown pastures and grains they check erosion losses; they build and maintain the fertility of the soil. This increases the utility of the water resources of the whole region.

TVA's experience in the utilization of fertilizers to adjust land use in the interest of better control and use of rainfall is readily applicable on other watersheds. As these practices spread they produce a new demand for fertilizers over and above ordinary uses. In helping to develop this demand, the TVA as a regional demonstration in soil fertility conservation serves as a pilot plant operation conducted in the interest of the Nation as a whole.

I suggest that the fertilizer industry can gain great benefit from this regional demonstration if it will study its effects and be prepared to meet the mineral requirements of the soil in this and other regions.

3. RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENT IN NEW PROCESSES OF PRODUCTION AND NEW FERTILIZER PRODUCTS POINT THE WAY TO GREATER SUPPLY FOR GREATER MARKETS

Behind the new fertilizer materials supplied by TVA to the test-demonstration farmers and their neighbors is a program of chemical research and experimental manufacture. In the reconstructed and improved nitrate plants built at Muscle Shoals during World War I—plants that did yeoman service in supplying munitions in World War II—TVA is carrying on research in the development of new processes and new fertilizer products. As one of its objectives, this research is designed to help you or anyone else open up the great undeveloped phosphate deposits of the West.

There is a shortage of phosphate fertilizer now—gaged by what the farmer is willing and able to buy. Figures released in February 1947 by the Production and Marketing Administration compare phosphate consumption with our estimated annual needs in the United States. These figures show that the average annual consumption was about 700,000 tons of P_2O_5 during the prewar period 1935–39. During the war years of 1944–45 the figure jumped to nearly 1,340,000 tons. But that, according to the USDA and the land-grant colleges, was only about half what the farmers could have used effectively if they had been able to buy as much as they needed. This estimate—nearly 3,000,000 tons of P_2O_5—was based largely on the experience of TVA test-demonstration farmers, who have led the way in the consumption of commercial fertilizer.

Many agriculturists consider this estimate of the phosphate requirement to be a very conservative goal. If the experience of the most successful of the TVA test-demonstration farmers had been used as a standard of potential profitable use, it would have been necessary to double the estimate at the very least. And even that total does not represent the true need of our soils for phosphate and other fertilizer materials if we are to protect our watersheds and operate our agriculture at a sustained high level of productivity and efficiency.

As I am sure all of you understand, TVA's fertilizer research is a balanced operation, necessarily concerned with both fertilizer use and fertilizer production—the development of new processes and products. One research supplements the other. The recorded experience of thousands of test-demonstration farmers helps to set production research targets. It tells the chemists and engineers the kinds of fertilizers they should try to develop to serve the present and future needs of the farmer and his soil.

You know from your long experience that important new fertilizer uses are emerging out of the experience of farmers throughout the Nation. I have mentioned the growing

use of mineral fertilizers as a means of helping the farmer to shift land use in the South and elsewhere; large amounts of phosphate especially are required to change from summer row crops to winter sod crops. There is also a steadily expanding market for fertilizer in irrigated agriculture.

Of these new markets, the most important, probably, is the expanding fertilizer need of the Nation's breadbasket—the 12 States of the Central and Middle West that grow 60 percent of the Nation's total production of food. In the past these States haven't used much fertilizer, but they are using more now and they would use a lot more if they could get it.

During the war and postwar years middle western farmers discovered that the natural fertility of their soils was declining and that it paid to fertilize. Phosphate consumption increased fourfold, fivefold, sevenfold, in the principal States of the Nation's breadbasket, and still the demand is far from satisfied. Over 25 percent of that phosphate is coming from Tennessee, which today holds only about 1 percent of our national phosphate supply. The great western phosphate deposits, representing nearly 70 percent of the Nation's total, have been supplying only 5 percent of the Nation's annual production. The rest comes from Florida. Freight and other distribution costs largely explain this situation. The cost of the long hauls between phosphate ore deposits and the areas that need the soil minerals must be reduced. One way to reduce shipping costs is to increase the concentration of the product.

TVA's calcium metaphosphate, with over 60 percent of P_2O_5, is a made-to-order fertilizer tool designed to break that bottleneck of distribution costs, open up the barely scratched western deposits, and underwrite the future of the most important agricultural producing area of America. That is its purpose and its promise. Whether this new product will fulfill that promise only research will tell—research in its use and research in its production.

We are making progress on both ends of the research. During the last fiscal year over 5,000 tons of calcium metaphosphate were spread on several hundred farms in a score of States. The large pilot plant that produced this material will soon be succeeded by an industrial-scale demonstration plant using a greatly improved process. Meanwhile from the field are coming hundreds of reports describing what happens when calcium metaphosphate is introduced into farm and farm community improvement programs under varied conditions of soil and climate. Thus far the evidence shows that calcium metaphosphate is excellent when used on soils in the humid belt; it is less effective than triple superphosphate on the high lime soils of the Dakotas, Nebraska, and parts of Kansas and Iowa.

In the TVA Act you will find some very specific language in the section dealing with fertilizer. We are instructed not just to produce new and better fertilizers but to get them used in better ways and in larger amounts. That means as we interpret it, that a fertilizer product can be considered successful when its value exceeds its cost to the farmer. Its value must be demonstrated by successful use in sound systems of farming. The qantities used by the farmer must be sufficient to build and maintain the soil; and the demand from farmers using the product must be sufficient to provide a steady outlet for the production of at least one plant operating at a practicable industrial scale. Only when that point is reached and industry begins to adopt the process—only then can our research be said to have attained its object. For example, when and if calcium metaphosphate is thoroughly tested and its value demonstrated so that some private agency begins to produce it to supply the demand we have stimulated, we will then begin to try out another product, developed from the laboratory and pilot plant.

Success in fertilizer research is not to be had overnight. It takes years of time and the combined energies of thousands of people to carry through the research and demonstration job on a single new fertilizer product. And there must be many new products. There will probably never be a universal fertilizer; we have too many kinds of soil in this country, too many climates, too many types of farming, and too wide a range of economic and other variables. That is why we now have at various stages of laboratory and pilot-plant development at least a half dozen processes for producing high-analysis phosphatic and double nutrient nitrogen-phosphate fertilizers. Our engineers consider at least two of these products to be almost as promising as calcium metaphosphate.

For years we have enjoyed cordial and mutually helpful relations with the technical personnel of the industry. Your engineers talk the same language and use the same slide rules as ours do. They visit us at Muscle Shoals, and are encouraged to inspect these public plants and laboratories. Frequently they ask for blueprints and specifications and usually they get what they ask for. They tell us and write us that our research has been useful to them. Recently they have begun to prove this by utilizing our technical developments and processes in whole or in part.

If more of the fertilizer and chemical industries will study the results and discoveries of this research—as some of you are doing—and if you can adopt and adapt these results in your program to expand production, we believe you may put yourself in a position for the first time to serve adequately the tremendous, the almost unlimited soil-fertility needs and requirements of the Nation's breadbasket—the Central West.

The problems on which the TVA is working at Muscle Shoals are your problems and the Nation's problems. They are problems that involve the future of the Nation's agriculture and the security and survival of our people.

If these problems are to be solved, if the fertilizer needs of the Central West are to be supplied and the western phosphate reserves are to be utilized, it will take the best efforts of industry and Government to do it. When I say Government I do not mean just the TVA; the land-grant colleges, the Extension Services, and many other agencies of Government are committed to the solution of these problems.

Here, then, I think, is where we find a natural and hopeful ground for agreement and cooperation with your industry. For its part the TVA is wholly committed to a cooperative policy with industry, with farmers, and with other agencies of Government. There are great and challenging tasks ahead. I think it is our mutual duty and obligation to work together and approach these tasks with courage and imagination.

Victory Day Talk of Gen. George C. Kenney

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address delivered by Gen. George C. Kenney, on the occasion of the Victory Day luncheon of the Memphis Post, No. 1, American Legion, at Memphis, Tenn., on November 11 last.

General Kenney has long enjoyed a distinguished military career, and his speech, delivered before a very large and representative audience, was well and favorably received.

The address follows:

Thirty years ago we observed our first Armistice Day. Since that November 11 in 1918, this day has become an occasion when we not only commemorate an achievement in our history, but we commemorate the individual Americans, living and dead, who by their sacrifices made that victory and other victories possible.

Each year, for one brief minute, we stand in silent homage to those heroes whose lives have paid for the maintenance and security of this country so that we may enjoy it.

Today we are paying special homage to those American soldiers, sailors, and airmen of World War II who made the supreme sacrifice to preserve this country, its ideals and its way of life. We owe them a debt that we cannot repay.

Today we are simply acknowledging that debt.

But isn't there something else we can do? Those rows of white crosses scattered around the world, from the Arctic to the Antarctic, on every continent and on the islands of the seven seas, should remind us of something besides mere acknowledgment of a debt.

Did those men think that their deaths were simply part of a series of inevitable catastrophes that were to plague us every generation? I don't think so. I believe that the vast majority of them hoped and believed that by their sacrifice peace would return and that we, the living, would see to it that never again would we allow our national defense insurance policy to lapse.

They realized that our unpreparedness had invited the attack by an aggressor confident of victory and scorning our capability to resist.

They realized too that while we had survived the initial blood bath, our very unpreparedness and the long process of rebuilding our armed forces were prolonging the day when we could force our opponents to accept defeat. Each additional day of warfare had its additional casualty list.

They hoped and believed that we would, in future, remember that 5,000 years of history shows that a defenseless nation is the nation most subject to attack.

I believe that our veterans of World War II, living and dead, expected something like that. We are paying tribute to over three hundred thousand of them today, who cannot speak for themselves; but I believe that they still expect us to keep faith with them. They saved this country and this generation. They have a right to expect us to look after this country and future generations.

Mere homage does not mean much unless it is accompanied by our firm resolve that every resource of our power, wealth, industry, and science will be used to secure the safety of this country and to preserve the principles and ideals that we have come to call our American way of life. We like our way of life, and I firmly believe that if there are any improvements to be made in it we intend to make them ourselves, without any help from anyone else.

We have fought two world wars in the past 30 years for our principles, and if necessary we will fight again to preserve them.

We sincerely want peace. We have and will continue to go to almost any length to have peace. We are not a warlike nation. We want to avoid war; but not at the expense of our freedom.

We want the kind of peace that goes with "government of the people, by the people, and for the people;" not a peace imposed

upon us by some alien conqueror and enforced by fear of the firing squad and the concentration camp.

We want to remain free men and women. We want a government that recognizes that we are human beings and not soulless cogs in a state machine.

I have spoken of ideals. What are those ideals? They are freedom, justice, fair play, honesty, decency—not just a lot of words, but things that make us the nation we are. As long as we keep them, we are a thinking, living, progressive, and driving force toward a better world—a better world for ourselves and a better world for all mankind. If we lose them, we lose our way of life, our freedom, our civilization. We must keep our ideals. We must guard them. We must be alert and prepared to defend them.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty. Apathy still brings the penalty of defeat and the slave-labor camp.

We must not shirk our obligations and our responsibilities as citizens of this country. It is one of the countries of the world in which we may live our lives according to the dictates of our consciences, speak our thoughts according to the dictates of our hearts, and worship at our altars according to the dictates of our faiths. Let us keep it that way.

After World War I we lost interest in our national defense. On December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor woke us up when it ushered in World War II. We are already beginning to forget that our margin of victory in that struggle was dangerously slim. We must not lose interest again, for if we again relax our vigilance and neglect our defenses, the probability is that the United States, as we now know it, will cease to exist. If war comes again, we will not have a couple of years to get started on production of weapons and war materials so that we can begin to fight. If we are not ready to fight at the beginning, we may not be able to fight at all.

As General Eisenhower pointed out in his final report as Army Chief of Staff, and I quote:

"What we are able or not able to do within the first 60 days of another war will be decisive in the determination of our ability to carry the war to a successful conclusion. If war comes, no amount of feverish activity, or great expenditure, can build our defenses in a day. Our chances of survival in any future war would depend on our state of readiness at its beginning."

Just a few years ago that statement would have been hailed as visionary and calculated to produce headlines for the tabloids. It would have been sensational, but few people would have taken it seriously. Today it is generally accepted as a true and realistic analysis of the situation confronting this country and the world. Aggressors have found that a comparatively small, well-prepared, hard-hitting, fast-moving force, striking without warning, gains a tremendous initial advantage. Sometimes that initial blow has gained the decision. Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France can give us some excellent testimony to that effect.

During both World War I and World War II the aggressor dispensed with the formality of declaring war and attacked without warning. To do it according to the old established procedure requires several days. During that time a small neighbor can be overcome and occupied; a Pearl Harbor can take place; another greater or a hundred greater Hiroshimas can smash the resistance of a surprised victim.

The blitzkrieg of World War II would look like a snail's pace compared with the superblitz of a world war III.

In a few years we will no longer be the sole possessor of the atomic bomb. When that day arrives we will have to face the fact that a fairly modest force of bombers with atomic bombs can cause more damage and snuff out more lives in a single attack than was accomplished by all the TNT-loaded bombs throughout World War II. We must accept the possibility that a blow of this nature could gain the decision if we are unprepared to counter it and instantly strike back.

In this troubled world of ours today an adequate, effective, well-organized, and intelligent Military Establishment is our best guaranty of peace, peace which calls for respect of nations for the rights of others, for international law and order.

We need such an establishment just as this city or any city needs an adequate, effective, well-organized, and intelligent police force, to guarantee respect of individuals for the rights of others, for community law and order.

When banks are not adequately guarded thieves break in.

We will not have peace if we are too weak to fight for it.

We do not need that military establishment because we covet anything belonging to any other nation or because we seek new political or new economic aggrandizement. On the other hand, without any thought of political or economic concessions we are pouring billions into a devastated, hungry, disheartened Europe to give those peoples a chance to live, to give them some hope for the future, and to permit them to stand on their own feet again as free peoples.

In spite of the terrific obstacles of international jealousies and distrusts we are trying desperately to make the United Nations work. But it will not work unless we can furnish the moral leadership that the vast majority of its members look to us for. That leadership, in turn, cannot be exercised unless we are ready to back it up. It may be unfortunate, but it is nevertheless true, that in this world today, at the councils of nations the strong are listened to, the weak are largely ignored. We are the only hope of nations daily living in fear of aggression. They know and any would-be world conqueror knows, that with the United States defeated the conquest of the rest of the world would be easy. Western Christian civilization itself would perish.

We daily face new challenges. They are challenges to our national integrity and challenges to the general principles for which we have fought since 1775. If we resolve to meet those challenges now, with the courage of our national convictions, secure in the knowledge that our motives are unselfish, and determined to exercise our power to preserve peace, I believe that we have little cause to fear another international conflict.

Since 1775 a million Americans have given their lives for this country. They have given us a heritage which I believe they expect us to preserve and to hand down to our children and our children's children. I believe if they could speak today they would express profound concern both for our future security and the survival of civilization.

We must not disappoint them. We must not let them down. We must keep faith.

Why Georgians Have Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Wellington Wright from the Atlanta Constitution for January 2, 1949:

WHY GEORGIANS HAVE FAITH—KILOWATTS KEY THE ECONOMIC MARCH OF GEORGIA'S REVOLUTION AS '49 DAWNS

(By Wellington Wright)

At the threshold of 1949—and Georgia is on the march.

That's the outlook for this New Year and for many other New Years which are to follow it; the outlook for Georgia in the throes of an economic revolution—the Georgia revolution.

It's an epic of progress in both industry and agriculture, the economic fronts which reveal ever so clearly the material aspects of this revolution. But the greatest progress of all—and by far the most important—is on still another front, that immaterial realm of the spirit which determines the way the people of Georgia think and feel about Georgia.

On this far-flung psychological front, the spirit of economic defeatism, heritage of another era, has vanished into the limbo of painful memories. In its place, another spirit has appeared, such a spirit as whispers eternally to Georgians that they have nothing to fear except fear itself.

All over Georgia, there are signs to prove that the people of Georgia are beginning to have faith in this new vision and to act upon what it tells them. New industries, new jobs, new pay rolls, new wealth. All these, along with an expanding program of diversified agriculture, are the earmarks of Georgia's progress—heralds of the Georgia revolution.

Thus, through the hard lessons of experience, Georgians all over Georgia now have learned that with vision, courage, and unity of effort nothing can stop them and nothing can beat them. And that's why at long last Georgia is on the march again.

So the economic revolution is under way in Georgia—the Georgia revolution. It is a State-wide movement—a movement born of faith, courage, and a vision.

Yes; it has a slogan:

"Have faith in Georgia."

And that's the story of Georgia for 1948.

And what of 1949 and after?

Signs of economic progress lie in every direction throughout Georgia. They are the barometers which surely foretell the economic future of the State, yet perhaps the best barometer of all is in the index of the increasing demand for electric power in Georgia.

Throughout the United States as a whole, experts predict with assurance that the demand for electric power will double within the next 10 years. But in Georgia they say the demand is going to double within 6 years * * * nearly twice as fast as in the Nation as a whole, and they say, too, that such a fact alone is sufficient proof of the Georgia revolution.

But some of the details of that increasing demand for electricity in Georgia furnish even more convincing proof of the economic revolution now under way in Georgia.

For example, the Georgia Power Co. distributes electricity throughout 85 percent of the area of the State, and it reports that the demand for electric power in its area of Georgia is now increasing at the rate of more than 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. The same reports also come from companies which serve other areas of the State.

And there are still other figures to confirm these reports:

In 1947 the Georgia Power Co. alone sold 8,229,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power.

In 1951 this company expects to sell 4,814,000 kilowatt-hours—a figure which represents a 50-percent increase over 1947.

And the approximate figures for 1948 indicate the sale of 500,000,000 kilowatt-hours more than in 1947.

With the economic revolution in Georgia now well under way, where will Georgia get the electric power it is going to need in the

coming years to supply the demands of agricultural and industrial expansion?

On this score both private and public agencies have done much thinking and planning. At this moment they are working on a $200,000,000 program to expand the electric-power facilities of the State. Of this amount, the Georgia Power Co. is spending about $85,000,000. The Federal Government plans to spend the rest of it to harness the vast waterway resources of Georgia.

Yet even this vast program looks no further ahead than 1952. After that there will be other programs and there are people at work on plans for them now. The Georgia Power Co. alone expects to have to spend $20,000,000 a year for an indefinite number of years, and the plans of the Federal Government call for a much greater and more comprehensive program.

To supply the future demand, the Georgia Power Co. already has planned, or under construction, two new plants—Plant Yates, on the Chattahoochee River near Newnan, and the Furman Shoals plant, on the Oconee River, near Milledgeville.

Plant Yates, scheduled for completion in 1950, will have an initial steam-generating capacity of about 750,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Ultimately, the company plans to double the capacity of this plant.

The Furman Shoals plant will be a hydroelectric plant and will have a capacity of 15,000 kilowatts, or about 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. The company expects to have it in operation in 1951.

On another front, the plans of the Corps of Engineers for projects which will generate electric power in the Georgia area are even more vast. They are:

Allatoona Dam, on the Etowah River, near Cartersville, scheduled for completion in the fall of 1949. This dam will generate 160,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power a year. It will cost about $17,500,000.

Jim Woodruff Dam, on the Apalachicola River, in Decatur County, Ga., a $30,000,000 project which will generate 208,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power. Scheduled for completion late in 1951.

Clarks Hill Dam, on the Savannah River, near Augusta, is a $26,500,000 structure in a $60,000,000 project. It will generate more than 700,000,000 kilowatt-hours and is scheduled for completion early in 1952.

Buford Dam, on the Upper Chattahoochee River, near Atlanta, a $22,500,000 project will generate 170,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power. Work has not yet started on the dam itself and thus there is no date fixed for its completion.

In addition, the Corps of Engineers has plans for other dams on the waterways of Georgia. In fact, when the Corps of Engineers completes its plans for this area, its dams will generate 2,100,000 kilowatts of electric power, or more than 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. And by that time this low-cost electric power will have made Georgia the center of one of the greatest industrial and agricultural areas in the world.

Thus, the economic revolution in Georgia—the Georgia revolution. And that's the reason why the people of Georgia have renewed faith in Georgia.

End of Globaloney?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news letter by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

END OF GLOBALONEY?

The frosty reception of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek in Washington indicates that the dreamers of global utopias are beginning to climb down from the clouds. Theories have collided with facts. Dreamers have gotten cold feet. Mr. Roosevelt's great design for one world is broken in many pieces. There isn't even one Germany, one Greece, one India, one Palestine, one China.

As Mr. Will Shakespeare wrote: "Our revels now are ended and * * * leave not a rack behind."

Woodrow Wilson said: "It is the discovery of what they cannot do and ought not to attempt that transforms reformers into statesmen."

Although President Truman has not explicitly repudiated the Roosevelt fantasy of an alliance of communism and freedom, he is doing so in fact. The Truman plan for Greece 2 years ago marked his break from the policies of his predecessor. The President then announced an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to include the world. It then became our policy to contain communism and help everybody, everywhere, to resist aggression. This new policy was globaloney, also, and has now bounced back on Mr. Truman in China that now asks for the same prescription he gave the Greeks.

The President has just reported to Congress on Greece where we have sent $170,000,000 of guns, munitions, and military equipment in addition to civilian relief. It is a sad story. The Greek guerrilla forces have increased. We have lost ground. And guns we sent the Greeks have apparently been resold to other forces behind the iron curtain.

Something of the same sort has happened to Marshall plan aluminum and lead. It now comes out that aluminum bought by Great Britain at 16 cents a pound, with money we supplied, has been resold to American buyers for 24 cents—thus netting the Attlee government a nice little profit on our own money.

Now comes Hon. SOL BLOOM, who, in the next Congress, will be the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He is reported to favor immediate aid to China "that would not involve the United States in war." We have heard that before.

China does not want "aid short of war." She wants aid to win a war. Not only guns, but American commanders and organizers of her retreating armies. In short, men.

When will we stop kidding ourselves? When lend-lease was before Congress in the spring of 1941, only one or two men, urging lend-lease had the uncommon honesty to admit that when a Government supplies military equipment to a belligerent, it commits an act of war under every principle of international law known to men.

We are on a hot spot today. Shall we plunge deeper into China or pull out? Can we get deeper in without finding ourselves up to the neck in world war III? That is the question. I do not know the answer, and know no one who does.

A couple of years ago, President Truman on two occasions favored a shotgun wedding of the Nationalist and Communist forces in China. He sent Secretary Marshall to China to bring that about. That was when we were told that the Chinese Communists were not Communists at all, but poor peace-loving peasants fighting their landlords.

Since VJ-day, we have poured $3,000,000,000 into China and now we are asked for more tools and more men. Our hush-hush bipartisan foreign policy which was not to be debated while our master minds blundered on, has brought us to this tragic pass.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Love for His Fellow Man Marks Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alice Dixon Bond from the Boston Herald of November 28, 1948:

LOVE FOR HIS FELLOW MAN MARKS SOL BLOOM

(By Alice Dixon Bond)

Even Horatio Alger did not dream up such a man as SOL BLOOM. The "rags to riches" are there, the goodness and the quick wit, but Mr. BLOOM goes far beyond these in his innate kindliness, in understanding, in shrewd intelligence and generosity and his genuine love for his fellow man, which he translates into deeds, rather than words.

The youngest of the six children of Polish immigrants, SOL went to work in a factory in San Francisco when he was only 7 years old. Sixty-eight years later, a little more than a month after his seventy-fifth birthday, the man who had been that boy stood on the balcony leading from his room at the Fairmont Hotel in that same city and gazed out across its beauty.

IMPRESSIVE TASK

But he was not thinking about the things he could see. In a few days, the representatives of 51 nations would meet here in San Francisco to begin the task of drafting a charter. He had been sent, one of seven American delegates, to help write this instrument which men of good will everywhere in the world hoped would be the foundation for a future free of wars and destruction—the United Nations Charter. And he thought—"This must be all a dream."

For the man on the balcony was again the kid who had washed windows and swept floors and run errands in a brush factory down there on Sacramento Street. He was only the little Jewish boy who had peddled violets on Market Street near Lotta's Fountain, who had quit school forever after only 1 day because he lacked money to buy a single book.

The images of his early years in California crowded his memory. The boy who had daily trod the wooden sidewalks and cobblestoned streets carrying a lunch box on his way home from house to factory, where he had earned a dollar and a quarter a week, now the man chosen to draft the preamble for the document of the United Nations, the man who knew that, "We the people," was the way it must begin, whatever else it might include.

INCREDIBLE STORY

In between that boy and his moment is the incredible story of the lad who, at 19, had made enough money to start on a tour around the world, a tour which ended in Paris, which, he told himself, was equivalent to such a universal tour since all the world came to that city; the story of a theatrical manager, who became counselor to four Presidents; of a high-powered real estate operator, who emerged as chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs to guide the most important legislation in connection with World War II; of a sometime song writer and publisher who was chosen to draft the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations; the story of many careers; of San Francisco in the seventies and eighties; of his sainted mother who, even when they literally lacked a penny of

their own, would gather up the coins in their charity box and give them to someone who had still less; the story of his own wife and daughter and the multiple ramifications of a full and useful life; all of which he has told in a recently published book, which is gay, wise, and engrossing and which, with characteristic simplicity, and straightforwardness he calls merely The Autobiography of SOL BLOOM (Putnam's $3.50).

I saw SOL BLOOM in New York the other day, an unpretentious gentleman, at ease in his comfortable suite at the Madison, wearing a gray lounging coat trimmed in red, his eyeglasses hanging from the inevitable black ribbon.

WARM AND FRIENDLY

Yet, because he was in it, the room became a gracious place, the atmosphere warm and friendly. Flowers were everywhere, some sent from his own beautiful gardens in Washington. They stood as they always do, before the picture of his lovely wife, who died in 1941, as well as in front of the photograph of his father and mother, without both of which he never travels.

We had been speaking of his own 26 years as Congressman and of the elections; of his attempts to explain the different issues connected with them to various audiences and of the listener who demanded to know if it would not be terrible if Dewey were elected and the Congress should turn out to be Democratic.

"My answer," he said, "was simply: 'It would not be terrible if Congress was made up of Americans.' "

"God will take care of this country," he continued, "if civilization is big enough to give us such a thing as the atomic bomb, it will not allow it (the bomb) to destroy us. If we teach a boy how to write, he can forge a check or write a poem. Automobiles kill many people, but there is no reason why we should do away with them. We must use care.

"As we look backward or forward, we find that everything has its place and that the good will always prevail over the bad—or evil. No word in the dictionary is stronger than the word truth—but with it we must have love.

"CONFIDENCE OF PEOPLE

"I tell the truth even against the legislation for which I am working, for one must have the confidence of the people, which can only be based on your integrity.

"The late President Roosevelt said to me once: 'SOL, did you say I did not have the right to pack the Supreme Court?' My reply was: 'You may have the right to do something, but you must then ask yourself if it is the right thing to do.'

"I believe that we should keep people up to our own level and not go down to the gutter to lift them up.

"You get from life only what you put into it," he added, "and there is no sense in pretending you are something you are not. A cat wants to impress a dog with the fact that he is a big animal, so he puts up his tail and fluffs out his fur. But all the time he is the same size cat, and the dog is bound to find that out.

"So we can never make ourselves bigger than we are. I have found, also, that we can never lick a person if we drive him away from us. He isn't there.

"My mother taught me two great things. The first was to read with understanding, the second to desire to know.

"My dearest wife never allowed even for the possibility of failure in any undertaking she considered worth the effort of beginning."

There has been no starting or stopping with SOL BLOOM, either. Direction has been and is his; that, and courage and faith, hope, and an all-embracing charity.

Northwest Hit by Most Acute Power Lack in History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Rural Electrification magazine for January 1949:

NORTHWEST HIT BY MOST ACUTE POWER LACK IN HISTORY

As 1948 drew near an end the entire economy of the Northwest was being strangled by a power shortage which multiplied the crisis felt in the area the previous year.

Industrial plants had been asked to end their day shift at 4:30 instead of 5 to conserve power, switches had been pulled on lines serving four aluminum plants, some factories had been requested to postpone certain operations until late at night.

The effects of the power shortage did not stop with industry, but reached down into the homes of the area. Thousands of dollars were spent on advertisements urging private citizens to cut their power consumption. Space heating was banned in some areas. But the lights still dimmed in numerous homes. Late in December the only remaining answer was to start pulling switches.

Oregon was worried. An official of the State chamber of commerce reported that "we're losing new industries every day because of the power situation."

The Northwest saw little hope for an easing of the shortage in the near future, as over-all studies indicate insufficient power in the area at least well into the 1950's.

Even when generator facilities now planned or under construction are completed, the spiraling demands for power will be far from filled.

Blairs Creek Dam, Shannon County, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SECURITY LAND & ABSTRACT CO., INC.,
Eminence, Mo., December 31, 1948.

Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
Congressman, Eighth Missouri District, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: From talking with my acquaintances, I believe that a great many, in fact a majority of the citizens of this section, feel as I do: That the proposed Blairs Creek Dam on the Current River in Shannon County, Mo., is a tragic disaster threatening the homes and property, and our beloved way of life here. We feel helpless and that it is probably useless to protest since it appears that forces far removed from us and more powerful than anything we can muster, have made this decision which will irrevocably affect us now, and the future of our children and all those who are to come after us.

It would be less than honest for me to pretend that my opposing this proposition has nothing to do with sentiment. My father's family came here before the War Between the States, and the seventh generation of my mother's family now lives along the Jacks Fork and Current Rivers. The clear waters of these streams are like the blood in my veins and the beauty of their valleys and the splendor of the giant springs which feed them are a part of my heart. Infinitely more precious to me is the manner of living in the villages and rural communities along these rivers. Here a woof of leisurely contentment and independence of spirit is woven with a warp of neighborly kindness, human tolerance, and friendly good will to form a tapestry of fine living, which is not duplicated in any other place on earth. It is a truly American way of life with a native flavor which distinguishes it to all who have ever lived here. We furnished our quota of fighting men in the recent war, and it is my conviction that when these men were fighting and dying in foreign lands, they strove for the broader ideals of all America, but that primarily they fought to preserve those things so dear to their hearts which the waters of this dam would sweep away forever. To those who came back it is a sickening betrayal that what they struggled so bitterly to keep is to be destroyed by the very powers they secured in that conflict.

From a practical point of view, we have seen the results of Bagnell and Wappapello Dams on the economic life in the sections where they are located, and it seems that opinion is strengthening every day that it is not good. They have, for the most part, failed to accomplish their promised objectives; the finest farm lands are finally destroyed; the most valued improvements are lost; and the people who had built up these things and created solid community life are a scattered, disbanded, and in many cases, a wandering, drifting people.

I fully realize that I am only one very, very small voice, indeed, but for what it is worth, I suggest that the millions of dollars proposed for the Blairs Creek Dam be diverted to a soil-conservation and erosion-control program, combined with good forestry practices, with well-placed small dams along many of our tributary streams. This will effect the desired flood control while leaving intact our fine farm lands along the streams and the more intangible asset of a settled worth-while population. It will also leave unravaged beautiful Round Spring, Alley Spring, Pulltight Spring, and their lovely surroundings.

Mr. CARNAHAN, if I could have one wish fulfilled, it would be that those who are bringing about the construction of this dam would make a trip through this entire area during the spring and summer or in the colorful weeks of autumn. I feel sure that in bringing about this wholesale destruction of natural beauty, which is surely as bountiful as can be found in all the world, "they know not what they do."

Very truly yours,
LENA WILLIAMS LAMKINS.

Uncle Sam: Trustee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Bristol (Pa.) Courier for January 6, 1949:

UNCLE SAM: TRUSTEE

So much emphasis has been put on the spending functions of Government, during recent years, that many people have lost sight of the fact that one of Uncle Sam's most important jobs is to serve as trustee of the assets and resources of the American people.

Of course all governments—down to the boroughs and townships—are the trustees of the funds they collect in taxes. A proper sense of this stewardship is a basic duty of public officials. Waste of the people's money is a crime which is nearly as serious as letting it be stolen.

But Uncle Sam has a responsibility of trusteeship which is much broader than merely over the tax moneys which pass through his hands. The United States Government, through its policies, determines the stability, the value, of all privately owned property in the country.

Real estate prices today are the result of what the Federal Government has done in the fields of housing and rent controls. The United States Treasury's interest rates dominate all interest rates. Government openly fixes the price of the milk you buy. Indirectly, but just as definitely, it is responsible for whatever prices you pay for meat, bread, and many other foods not directly under Government control.

It is the policies of the National Government which determine whether values rise or fall over a period of time, whether investments continue to be sound or "turn sour," whether industry shall be flourishing or sluggish, whether jobs shall be numerous or few.

In the long run, prosperity is the fruit of wise Government policies, and depression the result of unwise ones.

As Alexander Hamilton pointed out long ago, the Federal Government is trustee for the national economy, just as clearly as for the money which goes into and out of the National Treasury.

That didn't mean Uncle Sam really owns the national economy, or that he has any right to the title and control of the private property which you possess. A trustee isn't an owner; quite the opposite. A trustee handles property which definitely belongs to someone else.

If the time comes when the American people don't see this distinction, and assume that because Uncle Sam is trustee for the Nation's wealth, the Government owns it and can spend it as the national officers wish—then we will no longer be a free republic. We will have moved bodily over into socialism. It is Communist Russia, for example, that believes the state owns everything, its citizens nothing.

The matter of Uncle Sam's trusteeship becomes especially important during times like the present. We are far along in inflation. Prices of everything are far above normal; some of them three times or more what they were only 3 or 4 years ago.

There is great uneasiness about the future. Many signs exist that we are about to undergo a readjustment, in which there will be a general decline of these inflated prices. Most everyone agrees that we need some measure of deflation as an antidote for the rapid inflation since the end of the war.

Now, when it comes to Government spending—or to spending by anyone, and especially those who are trustees for others—there are excellent financial arguments for postponing anything which can be delayed, so that it may be bought or built for considerably less money sometime in the future.

Current reports out of Wall Street are that many industrial corporations have pushed off plans for expansion, waiting to see whether these cannot be made for much less capital expenditure at some future date.

There is every sign that the public itself has made the same decision—for example, with regard to housing. Demand for new homes has fallen way off in the face of present high prices. Obviously, many who want homes are waiting for what they feel is inevitable—a chance to buy the dwellings at a large reduction from present prices.

In private affairs, a trustee who bought at the top of the market, when he could have bought for much less merely by waiting a while, would be severely criticized for his negligence.

Does the same principle apply to government?

It is not being applied to the National Government by President Truman. He has not retrenched Federal spending. The higher prices go, the more he spends. Federal spending has become one of the biggest of the inflationary factors—every time we have approached a sufficiency of any scarce commodity, the Government has bought it up and thus re-created the scarcity.

The coming Truman budget is expected to be the biggest budget yet. A great deal of it is devoted to long-range programs, which, if delayed a year or two, would make no great difference.

If the Government were to hold these over, the resulting savings might run far into the billions of tax dollars. Moreover, the mere fact that Uncle Sam was doing something tangible to stop the inflationary cycle would be the strongest reinforcement to our weakening national credit which it is possible to imagine.

If the White House concept of the National Government's first job was that of being a trustee for the resources of the American people, there is no question that Uncle Sam would be waiting out the present high prices—that he would postpone all nonemergency spending until costs come down.

But that is not the White House concept of the Government's responsibility. The Truman emphasis is on spending—on the Keynesian idea of pouring out government appropriations as a means of keeping inflation alive.

It is argued at Washington that any curtailing of Government spending would be deflationary. Of course it would. But how, except by deflation, are we ever going to get away from continued inflation?

This Government spending policy, in its present form, was introduced by the New Deal between 1934 and 1936. It was first called pump-priming.

It was no secret then that overspending by Uncle Sam was inflationary—that's what it was intended to be.

Now, at the peak of inflation, we are witnessing constantly increased Government spending—at the very moment when our leaders are declaiming about how badly they want to hold the line against further inflation.

This doesn't make sense. It's as silly as someone who had started a fire with kerosene, trying to put it out by pouring on still more kerosene.

As the American people are going to find out to their sorrow one of these days, Uncle Sam has been making a botch of his job as trustee of their resources.

Future generations especially are not going to be satisfied with any accounting of stewardship which can ever be rendered on behalf of the present National Government.

The heritage of Americans—their wealth and their freedoms—are in process of being despoiled.

Security and liberalism today—and bankruptcy tomorrow.

Attendance of Marine Band at Final Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I introduced a bill to send the United States Marine Band to the final encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The few remaining Boys in Blue will meet for the last time—in this world—where they first met at Indianapolis.

They are our last representatives of a stalwart army of men who so loved their country that, as teen-age boys, they proffered their lives to preserve the Union.

It is a fitting tribute to them that the music that resounded at the Halls of Montezuma should measure their tread as they march in this, their last encampment.

I am honored to make this request on their behalf.

My district is also honored as is my State. In fact, all of my Indiana colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, are joining me in spirit in sponsoring this bill.

Had the rules permitted, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. HALLECK, Mr. CROOK, Mr. KRUSE, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. HARDEN, Mr. NOLAND, Mr. DENTON, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. HARVEY would have been cosponsors of this bill.

All of us in the Eighty-first Congress are honored with the rare opportunity to make this last and final salute to the Grand Army of the Republic.

Meaning of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malcolm W. Bingay from the Akron Beacon-Journal for January 3, 1949:

PROFESSOR BINGAY TEACHES LITTLE BUSINESSMAN A LESSON ON MEANING OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

I am told that I must read an article by DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small-Business Men's Association. I am told that free enterprise has been the backbone of our economic life for 150 years and that in this essay Mr. Emery makes vividly clear what's wrong with us. His article in part reads:

"The other evening my son, who is in his first year of high school, asked me to help him write a piece on free enterprise. I

told him I would be glad to help but that I was not going to write it for him.

"About a half hour later he said, 'Dad, I can't find anything at all on free enterprise in the encyclopedia.' I couldn't believe that so I looked too. He was right.

"In the end, and between us, we worked out the following: 'Free enterprise is, first, the right of each individual to decide for himself what his occupation shall be and to change occupations whenever he wishes; and, second, the private ownership and management of the tools and other means of production and distribution.'

"We also had a little discussion about free enterprise, how it was guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

"The next morning my secretary went over to the public library, one of the largest and best in the world, and asked where she could find a definition for free enterprise.

"The librarian in the reference section said she could find it and confidently pulled out White's Political Dictionary. There was nothing. She was surprised but went on to a volume of American political terms and from there to a set of political encyclopedias and then even to a book of law terms. She found nothing.

"If I had my way, a clear and simple understanding of freedom of enterprise would be included as a must in the curriculum of every school in America, even if imparted to our youngsters merely through one lesson or through a paper such as my boy had to write.

"No wonder the Reds and other radicals are able to create so much confusion in the minds of so many Americans concerning our economic system when none of our reference books contain a definition of what free enterprise is, how it works, who benefits, and why. This is a serious oversight. Yes; it is a colossal oversight which all publishers of encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other reference books should correct immediately."

I would say that what this country needs is business leaders who have better understanding of government and economics than Mr. Emery reveals in this naive story.

Free enterprise is not guaranteed by the Constitution. There never was any such thing as "free enterprise" anywhere or at any time unless we go back to the jungle life of our aborigines before they had developed codes of laws.

"Free enterprise" is English for "laissez faire," which means "keep hands off, let things alone, don't interfere with business."

The first laws ever enacted by the United States Congress were for the control of business. The first law was a tariff bill in favor of American shipping, the second was the establishment of a Federal bank, and the third voted bounties to New England fisheries.

There never was a time when the United States Government was not regulating and controlling business with grants or restraints.

If Mr. Emery wants to talk about "private enterprise," that is something else again. The expression "free enterprise" is meaningless and tautological. Men who write dictionaries have to know the meaning of words and all dictionaries agree on the meaning of "enterprise," which is, "A project which requires initiative, courage, vision, and perseverance." Of necessity such an adventurous spirit is free.

When our business leaders quit worshipping catch phrases a good many of our national problems will solve themselves.

As for "free enterprise," you will not find such poor English in any good dictionary, Mr. Emery. But you will find "free enterprise" as a synonym for laissez faire in every textbook on economics.

Personally I recommend to you a brochure written by Father Benjamin L. Massee, S. J., entitled "Economic Liberalism and Free Enterprise." It is published by the America Press, 70 East Forty-fifth Street, New York 17.

Then you will not be saying that the country is going to hell in a hand basket because it has not got something it never had and which has never existed.

For Economic Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times for January 6, 1949.

FOR ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

President Truman, in his message to Congress yesterday, proposed a charter for American economic democracy.

With complete fidelity to the ideas he propounded during the campaign, he called upon Congress—and upon all elements of the country—to work with him for the realization of those ideas.

He made the call with a new sense of confidence and strength. He could say with quiet conviction:

"We have rejected the discredited theory that the fortunes of the Nation should be in the hands of a privileged few. We have abandoned the 'trickle-down' concept of national prosperity. Instead, we believe that our economic system should rest on a democratic foundation and that wealth should be created for the benefit of all."

The President could add, with equal sincerity, something that Congress should keep in mind:

"The recent election shows that the American people are in favor of this kind of society and want to go on improving it."

The idea of economic democracy is not new.

Thomas Jefferson expressed it, in terms appropriate to another age, when he set this Nation on the path of a native American liberalism.

Andrew Jackson expressed it in his struggle against an all-powerful private bank.

Abraham Lincoln expressed it by leading a war against human chattelhood.

Grover Cleveland spurned the idea that the Government shall take care of the rich, while the rich shall take care of the poor.

Theodore Roosevelt's crusades for conservation and against the trusts; Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom; Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal—each in the spirit of its time proclaimed the ultimate sovereignty of the people over their own economic fortunes.

President Truman planted himself squarely in that tradition—one which progressive Americans will always regard as the pure strain of our history, shining through the dross and alloys of occasional reaction.

What is new about the Truman program is not its basic principle, but its courageous application of the progressive idea to the needs of America midway in the twentieth century.

The President believes that the people, acting together through their Government, should strike out boldly to protect their welfare as individuals.

Therefore he proposes a system of national medical insurance to bring the best medical care within the reach of all. Therefore he asks Federal aid to improve education. Therefore he asks broader social security, a vigorous housing program, unyielding dedication to civil rights.

The President also believes that the people should act together to protect their welfare as members of economic groups.

Therefore he proposes a fair statute of labor relations; therefore, a farm program to give agriculture a fair share of the national income; therefore, steps to invigorate a competitive business economy.

Finally, the President believes that the people should act together to protect their welfare as members of a great democratic society in which all share a common stake. He urges a tax program to balance the budget and combat inflation; the development of natural resources to encourage expanding production; the imposition of price ceilings and material allocations where necessary to safeguard the Nation from a runaway boom or collapse.

This is not a prolabor program, a profarm program, or an antibusiness program. It is a program which seeks justice for the people as individuals; justice for the people as workers, farmers, businessmen or consumers; both rights and responsibilities for the people as citizens.

Perhaps the key to the whole message is the President's determination to bring about expansion of productive capacity in such industries as steel—whether by Government loans, or direct Government construction of plants.

The steel corporations, in resisting pressure for expansion, have been betting on a decline in demand at some future date—in other words, a depression. Mr. Truman asks them to bet on an expanding economy instead. He adds that if they won't do it, the Government will.

What this means, in sum, is that the basic decision on our national steel capacity shall rest with the United States people, rather than with United States Steel. It means, in sum, economic democracy.

Economic democracy—an idea as old as America, but one which demands new applications for twentieth century America—that is Mr. Truman's message. We believe he has the people behind him in proclaiming it.

A Ghastly National Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted to me, I herewith include as part of my remarks a letter by Norbert O'Leary, of Garden City, Kans., which appeared in the Garden City (Kans.) Daily Telegram on October 16, 1948.

The time has come that we stop committing national suicide—destroying our Nation—by depleting its natural resources. The time has come that we give up the idiotic idea that we were divinely ordained to police the world. The time has come to return to the ideals of the founders of our Nation.

The letter speaks for itself. Here it is:

DEAR EDITOR: As a free American citizen I want to exercise my rights of free speech by

publicly expressing the following ideas and opinions.

The maximum military preparedness within our power, is the right national policy to pursue. And if we are ever attacked in our own country, our American fighting forces and our American people can be depended upon to defend our homes with all that we have got. That will be genuine self-defense, and we can do it successfully if our money and our fighting forces are not scattered all over the world, even to the shores of Greece and China, where civil wars are raging.

But mixing in the politics of Europe and Asia is a ghastly national mistake. What do we gain by it? The saving of face as the Chinese call it? The saving of our dignity, self-esteem, and national pride, and of our so-called world leadership?

All of those things put together are certainly not worth the ghastly price of a further impoverishment by taxation of the rank and file of our citizens, a further piling up of a crushing interest-bearing national debt, a possible destruction of many of our cities, including the cities of Washington and New York, and the blinding, maiming, and death of hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of our citizens—perhaps including you who are reading this—all of which would be the natural and probable fruits of a third world war.

Have you ever stopped to think this through?

Have we forgotten the wise advice of the Father of our Country, George Washington, who warned us against engaging in foreign entangling alliances?

President Truman has been quoted as talking about working out constructive and peaceful solutions of our problems abroad.

The best way to solve our problems abroad is not to have any. That could be done by withdrawing into our own country and minding our own business, letting the people of Europe and Asia attend to theirs in their own way. If they don't like the way they are governed, they will change it themselves.

Our ancestors did that when they didn't like the way an English king was governing them, or trying to. The people of Russia did likewise a generation ago when they did not like the way the czar and his appointees were governing them.

And the people of Europe and Asia no doubt can work out their own problems in their own way, without our money, our blood, and our butting in. Or if, on the other hand, they, or the majority of them, like the way their respective countries are being run, that is their business and not ours.

The alleged unity which professional politicians talk about is not as important as democracy, which means control by our people of the policies of our own country. How much control do the people have over our State Department, and its policies, as they are being formulated and carried out today?

The administration and the State Department have given us their own opinions. But with the radio and printing press, and all the modern facilities which could be used by the common citizens generally if they were open and available to them to discuss public issues; how much have they sought for our opinions, the opinions of our citizens, and provided facilities for free discussion and free expression by the people themselves on the question of whether the American people want a third world war in the hope of thereby being able to control the affairs and regulate the politics of Europe and Asia?

Managing our own country, with its inflation and strikes, is a big enough job for us without attempting to manage the world.

Human nature is such that there are always wide differences of opinion on national policies if people are free to express themselves.

Of course if war comes we will have unity then—the unity harassed and endangered humanity endeavoring to save themselves, their country, and their possessions from destruction.

But otherwise the only way unity of opinion can be had on national issues, or rather apparent unity, is by un-American and undemocratic methods of making people afraid to speak their minds.

And much more important than any such alleged unity is the preservation of true democracy, real freedom of opinion and speech, and healthy prosperity, in our own country.

NORBERT O'LEARY.

Code for Investigators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post for January 6, 1949.

CODE FOR INVESTIGATORS

It is especially gratifying to this newspaper to note that Majority Leader LUCAS in the Senate and Majority Leader MCCORMACK in the House are introducing a resolution to set up a code of fair procedure for congressional investigations. Just a year ago we launched a campaign to bring about the adoption of such a code after carefully studying the conduct of congressional investigations and the feasibility of laying down rules for the investigators. We have since supported every constructive step in that direction. We confess, therefore, an extraordinary interest in this reform, which appears to be coming to fruition even sooner than we had hoped.

The Lucas-McCormack resolution would substantially clarify the status of witnesses before congressional committees and in large measure protect them against false and malicious accusations. Every witness subpenaed could be accompanied by counsel and would have the right to file a sworn statement or make an oral statement in his own behalf at the end of his testimony. Persons believing their reputations to have been damaged by testimony before an investigating committee would have the right to testify personally, to file a sworn reply which would be made part of the record, to present witnesses in their behalf, and to cross-examine their accusers for not more than an hour. Accused persons would have to be given a chance to reply before the committee could issue a report reflecting upon them. And no reports of investigations could be published until approved by a majority vote of the full committee at a meeting called on proper notice.

Every one of these points was recommended to Congress in our series of editorials entitled "Turning on the Light." Some other suggestions in those editorials and in the more recent code of fair procedure sponsored by the New York City bar have not been included in the Lucas-McCormack resolution, but so far as it goes it is both sensible and constructive. Congress has been shamed by the manner in which its investigative powers have frequently been used. We suspect that a great majority of its Members will now see the necessity of throwing safeguards around this great power of compelling witnesses to testify for the enlightenment of Congress and the public. The power of turning on the light in a democracy is too vital to be entrusted to those who abuse it. We hope that congressional investigators will never feel free to substitute the smear for the careful unearthing and verification of facts.

Labor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. Many of us during the last campaign supported the Taft-Hartley Act and recalled for the benefit of our constituents the deplorable conditions in our country in January 1947 when the Eightieth Congress convened. We all have to admit that the Taft-Hartley law corrected that unhealthy situation in a large degree which resulted in fewer strikes and a great increase in production. We also stated during the last campaign that we realized the Taft-Hartley Act was not perfect and that the law would have to be amended in a world where conditions are ever changing to keep labor and capital in proper balance.

It is encouraging to learn through the following editorial that Mr. Philip Murray believes labor and management groups can reach substantial agreement through the framework of the President's message. I wonder whether that statement can really be depended upon. I think it is high time that our Chief Executive brings another very important segment of our country into the picture when he decides to have a conference on this vital issue, and that is the public. It has been stated that the Chief Executive plans to have a conference in Washington of top representatives of labor and management. We can recall a similar conference held 4 years ago called by President Roosevelt. This conference lasted for weeks and ended in a stalemate. Both labor and management took uncompromising positions and the conference ended in failure. If a stalemate resulted 4 years ago, what is to stop it from happening again? For this reason I hope the administration realizes how essential it is to have all three groups represented, labor, management, and the public.

Everyone wants labor legislation equitable and fair to all segments of our citizens. We must have industrial peace if we are to accomplish all that we hope for—so why not, Mr. President, call a conference which would receive the confidence of the entire country?

The editorial from today's New York Herald Tribune follows:

LABOR POLICY

That the President in his message should have advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was expected and inevitable; in view of his

campaign promises he could hardly have done less. There will be few, even among those who have considered the act a forward step, who will wish to take their stand four-square against his recommendation. The problem of adjusting the relations between labor and management is a delicate one, with only a brief legislative history, and with much still to be learned by trial and error. The Taft-Hartley Act is admittedly experimental, and in any circumstances would have been due for amendment. To insist that changes be incorporated in the present act, rather than that a new act be framed, would be to take a stand on a secondary point—and, in view of the recent elections, on a hopelessly unrealistic one.

What is important is the substance of a new labor law. In his message President Truman defined the problem constructively; and the offers of cooperation which have come from labor leaders give reason to hope that a valid solution can be adopted. The President stated the need for curbs on jurisdictional strikes, on certain forms of secondary boycotts, on the use of economic power in the interpretation of existing contracts, and above all on strikes in vital industries affecting the public welfare. To ask as much is to recognize very definitely that labor's powers must be adjusted in the modern community so as to make them consonant with the general interest; it is to reaffirm the principle, and indeed to reenact many of the details, of the present law. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, has said that "both labor and management groups, meeting within the spirit and the framework of the President's message, can reach substantial agreement." If he really means that, and if his colleagues in the labor movement will back him up, a new and more hopeful chapter in labor legislation has opened.

The immediate question, of course, is whether the new law is to be achieved in one legislative step, or whether repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is to reinstate the Wagner Act, with changes and amendments being worked out subsequently. It is easy to conceive the gratification and sense of triumph which labor would experience in outright repeal; nor is there need to question the good faith of those who promise that the Wagner Act will be swiftly modified. Yet there will be strong temptations to delay after the first step, and the danger of advancing through even a short period without some control over nationally disruptive strikes is great. Mr. Green objects to the immediate framing of a new act on the ground that there will be dickering and horse-trading in the Congress. Yet it is precisely by such a process, with the interest of all groups being represented, that laws are made in a democracy. The importance of the present problem, as well as the widespread interest which centers upon it, should enable Congress to formulate with reasonable speed a constructive and acceptable law.

Don't Blame the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the earnest effort of national leaders to provide adequate medical care for all Americans suffers at the hands of public opinion whenever the advocates of socialized medicine desert sound argument in favor of berating the medical profession for its legitimate opposition to the program.

There is much we can do to increase our health facilities, but we gain nothing by taking out our impatience on one of our most overworked professions. Accordingly, it is refreshing to find a newspaper editor who gives credit where due and searches for solutions to the problem in accord with established American principles. For that reason, I include in the RECORD the following article by Mr. Fred C. Koch, of Wenatchee, which will bear some thought.

I might add that my State of Washington has made an important move in the right direction this year by opening a new medical school as part of the State University of Seattle, to train doctors badly needed in the Pacific Northwest. Also, the medical profession of the State of Washington, through its county medical associations, now provides a practical form of health insurance to over 300,000 individuals. Certainly any health-insurance proposal should fully recognize the work of these groups.

The article follows:

[From the East Wenatchee (Wash.) Journal of December 16, 1948]

(By Fred C. Koch)

There's not much conflict in the open yet, but the undercurrents portend a real knockdown, drag-out fight when the socialized-medicine issue hits the floors of Congress. It'll be a fight that will make the oleo battle of the last Congress look like a skimmed-milk party.

The American Medical Association's plan to raise $3,500,000 to combat the nationalization of the medical profession is drawing harsh criticism—and fingers are being readied to point out the program as the lobby of lobbies.

Thought seeds are being allowed to fall among the gullible who immediately connect such a large war chest with big-stick tactics (and maybe even a little palm softening here and there).

The medics need to spend a percentage of such a war chest on a good public-relations man who should correct these embryonic misconceptions—if the war-chest plan is adopted.

If the medical profession wants to spend $25 per member to defend and protect its position in the society of American democracy, that's a cheap price. But it has been suggested this money should be used in support of local health causes, etc., instead.

The fact is this: The average doctor probably spends 10 times that much every year on public-health causes—and he probably writes off his books enough every year on the account of people unable to pay their bills to make that proposed $25 look like a Sunday-school donation.

In Wenatchee doctors wrote off probably 30 percent during the bad years. They took it on the chin as individuals.

If Uncle Sam had been the doctor, the taxpayer would have taken that 30 percent on the chin.

What most people don't know is that doctors as a rule do a great deal of charity work—and they would rather do it that way than to have a GP (Government Petrillo) back there in Washington looking down their collective throats.

To me, welfare of the medical profession as such is of no concern; the medics can, and no doubt will, look after themselves as free Americans.

But the principle is something else again. The principle of socialized medicine is just one more step—a tremendous step—away from American free enterprise, American initiative of profession and enterprise. It's just another step into foils of state socialism that sooner or later becomes nothing more nor less than fascism.

If the white knights want to do something worth while about public health and medical services, let them initiate a program for creation of more medical-school facilities. It's about as hard for a candidate to get into a medical school today as it is for a recruit to get into West Point.

If the "people" want to change something let them work on a change in that situation—but let's leave basic American principles alone, because they're the principles that made this the healthiest, happiest, and most prosperous nation in the world today.

United States Foreign Policy Is Frying in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the people of the United States want evidence of the failure of the Truman doctrine in Greece, they should read his last report to Congress on this subject. It is common knowledge in Washington that resistance to the present government in Athens is increasing every day, not by Communist guerrillas, as is charged, but by patriotic and loyal Greek people who distrust the Government. Obviously we are supporting the wrong crowd. It is time to examine this situation very thoroughly.

In this connection the Christian Century, December 22, 1948, contained the following pertinent editorial:

MR. TRUMAN CHANGES HIS MIND ABOUT GREECE

By this time the American public should be accustomed to extraordinarily sudden changes in President Truman's foreign policy. Yet even past experience had hardly prepared us for the remarkable about-face which the President performed when reporting to Congress on what happened in Greece during the 3 months that ended September 30. Early in October, when the campaign required that the Truman doctrine should be regarded as a notable achievement, the President told Congress that the first year's operation of that doctrine in Greece had been a conspicuous success. On December 6, with Madame Chiang Kai-shek camping on his doorstep asking for money and military advisers to defeat the Chinese Communists, Mr. Truman sent Congress another report on Greece which was a confession of almost complete failure. Despite $170,000,000 worth of American arms and the advice of an American military mission headed by a four-star general, a military stalemate exists and the number of Communist guerrillas has actually increased from 15,000 to 22,000. This much Mr. Truman now openly admits. He might also, had complete candor been his purpose, have told of the increase of civilian refugees from 100,000 at the time Truman doctrine aid was voted to almost 700,000 at present, of the precipitous drop in the value of the

drachma during the same period, and of the way in which funds originally earmarked for reconstruction purposes have had to be fed into the insatiable military maw. In his latest report Mr. Truman blames this sorry outcome on the Greek Army's lack of fighting spirit. Maybe so. But maybe also Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart was speaking for more than Asia when he told the Cincinnati meeting of the Federal Council that "no Asiatic government can hereafter hope to neutralize the Communist menace unless it is able to concern itself with the welfare of the common people as has never been done in the past."

Things To Be Thoughtful About in the Present World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered December 8, 1948, at the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., under the auspices of the Institute of World Affairs of the University of Southern California, entitled "Things To Be Thoughtful About in the Present World Situation."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THINGS TO BE THOUGHTFUL ABOUT IN THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION

If I remember my history aright, at the celebration held by the people of Philadelphia in 1787 in honor of the writing of the Constitution, two toasts were drunk—first, "to the United States of America," a fact which had been projected into the world; and second, "to freedom and liberty to all mankind," an idea which inevitably followed the reasoning, the philosophy, and the argumentative words which were uttered by those who took part in the discussions which brought our Constitution into existence. In a sense the toast to the United States of America represented a toast to something accomplished. The second, to freedom and liberty for all mankind, represented a toast to a theory. The first represented the practical, the necessary, that which had to be done if the fruits of the Revolutionary War were to be realized. The second represented faith, an idea as great and as broad as was ever uttered by a group of men believing in the ultimate purposefulness of man's life in the earth, an idealization of the justification of what had been done. This was to grow and become the American spirit. Throughout our history this purpose for America's existence has dominated the writings of our leaders and has reflected the heart of that America which promises the possibility of a democratic world and furnishes the fundamental belief in the wisdom of popular sovereignty. These two toasts do not actually reflect two systems of thought, but they are idealizations of the conflicting spirits which are in the world today—one represents that which is, the other that which is hoped for. Our words are words of hope and faith and trust. Our acts are sometimes acts which display that practicality which ultimately destroys faith, hope, and trust. We have it in all of us. "Trust in the Lord and pass the ammunition" is the type of blending of the practical with the ideal that America loves so well.

In a late magazine I was attracted by a picture of one of our great war leaders who pointed out the books he had been reading. The new ones that he listed will probably never be turned to for a second reading. But he turned to others for the fourth or fifth reading. Those he reread contain hopes and aspirations for a better world. The new ones mentioned are stories of what the writer had helped to accomplish. But in none is there the spirit of the toast to liberty and freedom for all mankind.

The age in which we live and this immediate year drawing to a close witnessed a non-Christian, who believed in Christianity more sincerely than most Christians, stricken down by the practicality of a mind and an action which thought that if we got rid of idealism the world would go further in its practical way. We are today, in our attempts to bring about a lasting peace, turning to the techniques which make peace impossible. We are talking again of balances of power, offensive and defensive alliances, the rebuilding of armaments on such a grand scale that every other nation will be frightened of us and thereby the peace will be kept. One of our secretaries testifying before us in advocating the European recovery program said that we must restore a balance of power in order to have peace in the world. When in the history of mankind was peace assured by a balance of power? A balance of power is ultimately impossible because the minute the balance ends, fear, distrust, and suspicion take hold of the souls of men.

We want, of course, to see unity in Europe. But unity cannot come to Europe as long as fear, distrust, and suspicion hold the hearts of men there. And any arrangement of nations such as a balance of power destroys unity. We should be thoughtful about the past. Study the lives of Mussolini, of Hitler, and advantage-taking philosophy of any self-seeker of a single-will and you find a person who is attempting a forced unity. Forced unity will always depend on oppression which invites disunity. If we build a united Europe as a result of the hatred of some other part of the world it will be impossible to ever drive fear and suspicion from any part of the world. Hatred, fear are elements that divide. It is trust that makes for unity.

It is all right for us to make fun of Calvin Coolidge who reflected so well the practical of a past generation when he said, "They hired the money, didn't they?" It is all right for us to make fun of the weakness of a Chamberlain who uttered, "Peace in our time." Both were practical men. When we smile at them let us at least know the reasons why they failed. We may though, while we smile, be making their mistakes if we act without knowing why. Each made a compromise which we all know now destroyed peace. The fact of the hiring of the money was the big thought in Coolidge's mind, not the purposes behind the lending. "Peace in our time" to Chamberlain seemed an end in itself, but how could there be peace with those who existed for the purpose of destroying all peace. There is no peace for the man who must sleep, eat, and work with loaded pistols in each hand.

Some old expressions are becoming current again. Some of us are justifying what we are doing in Europe on the basis of national self-interest. Can national self-interest ever be worth anything if we have got to be reconciled to everlastingly making alliances with the wrongdoer and the advantage-taker in the nations of the world? If we are going to justify ourselves on our movements for peace in the world on the basis solely of national self-interest in the good old Bismarckian sense, we must expect the results which Bismarck produced.

Let me show you how this works by giving you a practical illustration of what we have done and see whether you are proud of what we have done. I shall speak of the invention of the atomic bomb. Some of us were told of developing before Hitler could what was thought to be his unknown weapon. The rivals in our political life were satisfied to live a life of trust while the bomb was being perfected. But as soon as it was discovered when I said in my weak way that $2,000,000,000 of the people's money had been spent in the perfecting of the bomb and the discovery of a new energy and that the blessings which were to flow from the discovery of that new energy must remain in the hands of the people whose money brought it into existence, I was condemned. I was condemned by the practical minds who uttered national self-interest with the same fire of Bismarck and who since have tried to confine the growth and development of the new energy to wholly warlike purposes. Look at the struggle for the science bill and discover the conflicting spirits. Oh, we have faith in peace as long as we force the peace. Oh, we have faith in democracy as long as we control democracy. Oh, we have faith in freedom of thought and freedom of the press as long as we control the mind and the press. But we, the good, the wise, must control. But why? Not to make the good better or the wise wiser, but to see that no one else be wise like us or good like us. Thus, distrust begets distrust, as hate begets hate.

I want a strong America because America actually and really is the only hope left mankind in the world to have that liberty and freedom our fathers toasted. But I do not want an America strong only because of our ability to destroy. There is a strength that comes from justice. There is a power that comes from right. What makes America strong? It is the strength of our youth. It is the belief that democracy rests upon a trained citizenry. It is the knowledge that the four freedoms whether they be the Jeffersonian freedoms or the Rooseveltian freedoms are the bases of any real democracy. Strong America does not mean the curbing of the soul of America by those who would support the will of the people for the perpetuation of a national self-interest along the lines we have heard so much of late. An alliance with wrongdoing, injustice, the lending of our strength to perpetuate wrong will result only in evil. The world needs the political ethics of a Jefferson who said he knew but one code of morals for men and nations. Is it asking too much to insist that money given to feed the starving be used to feed the starving? Is it asking too much to insist that money given to restore a destroyed bridge be used to restore the bridge? Is it asking too much if we take dollars from honest taxation to restore a national economy that it be as honestly spent as it was honestly taken from the people's earnings? If we cannot teach some decent trade habits it is better not to restore trade. I am told I am asking too much. I am reminded that everyone knows that our American Government is the only one on earth which exists for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of the Government and that to insist upon our standards is to expect the impossible. If impossible, why attempt it? "Let's restore Europe and Asia and leave reform to another day." That has been said. If we do not do some reforming we'll merely rebuild for more war. Build America on the basis of hate, on the theory of suspicion, on the foundation of distrust, and upon a nationalism built upon expediency which compromises every ideal of honesty upon an altar of dealing with and sup-

porting the dishonest and corrupt in governments out of self-interest and America very soon will reflect the ideals of the dishonest with whom we deal.

If we cannot bring about some reforms in thinking, in habits, and simple ways of doing things, all that we are spending and all that we are giving will be as naught, and European and Asiatic recovery will turn themselves into a series of operation ratholes. We cannot build the economy of Asia on "squeeze." The Chinese did, but see the results. We cannot rebuild the economy of Europe on the notions of preserving the advantage taker. Some say that the old Europe developed on the basis of advantage-taking, but what did they build?

Long before what we call the Marshall plan was announced by our great general during his afternoon at Harvard these things were said by others who, I think, were thinking straight. In 1922 I wrote that administrators should base their actions in government on virtue and the people functioning as thoughtful individuals whose natures are good should be the makers of the standards of political virtue. In 1944 I wrote: Bit by bit before the war ends many details in the peacemaking will have been worked out. In the interim period between war and peace when chaos in many countries might make peace impossible, it is for us in this country to take relief and rehabilitation out of the class of charity and give the nations of the world a chance to help themselves. To help other nations restore the world to stability is our task and it is a task which we must do. The liberated countries can help themselves if we attend to the real business of America, which is to build civilization everywhere. * * * In no union can responsibility be delegated to one party while others merely enjoy the advantages. When we made our peace with Germany in 1921 we demanded all the advantages of the peace treaty of 1919, but refused to assume any of its obligations. The peace left America internationally in a state of drift, and we were swept with the world current into conditions which made war inevitable. Peace is hard; like civilization, it must be built. If the coming peace is to last, it must be based on a generous resolution to share America's social, political, and economic security with the world. We know that security, even on a small scale, does not come cheaply. Still less will international security be easily won. I am not afraid to be an American, although I acknowledge the heavy obligations of our national position. Nor am I afraid to have all men enjoy the freedoms we enjoy here in America. The only peace worthy of our tradition will be one where men choose freedom, knowing the demands it imposes, but knowing, too, its infinite blessings.

These statements did not receive the praise of the European press. They are just the impractical mutterings of a man who believed in the fundamentals of American democracy and who accepted the words of our leaders as being the basis of our American thought. When we think of the fact that we have not yet been bold enough to administer our plan in accordance with clean-cut principles of what we call free enterprise, American honesty makes me wonder if we are being taken for another of those rides in world politics. Is it time for another Will Rogers to rise up and say, "America has never lost a war, but she has never won a peace"? Is it time for the cynical again to control our thinking? Or is it time for us to renew our faith in the basic principles that have made America what she is and to turn our backs upon every political technique used by the advantage-taker in the world and to say that the basis of all proper economic relations is trust, that the basis of all democratic action rests upon faith in one another, honest dealing, telling of the truth, and common consent; that American wealth will never be used in forcing an idea against the will of a people, but will only be used on a basis of mutuality and cooperative endeavor?

If we continue operating our export licenses on the basis of taking care of our national interest then other nations will operate their import licenses on the basis of taking care of their national interest and we will have a condition so much worse than that resulting from the high tariff which destroyed the trade of the world and then the peace in the last generation that there will be no comparison. Can we, who at least maintain that we believe in honest money and in a taxation system which at least attempts to equalize the burden, long remain free with a nation that believes in imposing taxation on the many for the protection of the few? Can we long support the use of depreciating a money in order to avoid taxation without inviting what the world calls communism as a way out from an unjust, advantage-taking governmental action?

We have the gold and the silver of the world now. We have an economy built upon debt. Are we going to preserve the savings of our children, the profits of our workers? Are we going to see to it that the $250,000,000,000 worth of war bonds retain their value, or are we going to do the easy thing—use depreciation, use inflation, use our gold or knowledge of a newly discovered energy in building up and making strong our people, or are we going to dissipate it and become expedient?

Some nations of the world vote even more universally than we do. Hitler's "Ja" elections showed more people voting than voted in our last election. Where are the civilizations, the cultures of the governments of strength in the earth today? Does not the British imperial strength at this very moment rest firmly upon the democracies of the Commonwealth nations rather than upon the old imperialism of the empire based upon the strength of the British Navy. Are we going to destroy ourselves by accepting the thesis of the victors or the neutrals or the vanquished nations of Europe. France and Britain have won two world wars. Look at them. Holland and Norway, Sweden and Spain have been neutrals in two world wars. Look at them. Russia was on the side of the victors of the First World War only to find herself crushed by her own revolution. Look at her. Japan became one of the Big Five of the world but learned the lesson of national self-interest to such an extent that we had to buy her off in the Shantung settlement. Look at her. The Philippines, with the strength of America behind her, has seen defeat, misery, but starts a new life of hope. Look at her. Look at the new Pacific based entirely upon friendship between the commonwealth nations and the honest promise of an American trusteeship, with a new world law which says that the people of dependent territories shall no longer be exploited, but shall be developed for the benefit of the people who live in those territories. Look at them. Here is a new Japan allowed to work out her salvation on the theory that war shall not be used as a medium of national policy. Look at her. Russia and China, one suffered from the stagnation of squeeze and exploitation of the nation within, the other cursed by the iniquities of a single will which destroys the freedom of thought and information and thus crushes the souls of workingmen. For what reason have we supported China and opposed Russia? Is it because of national self-interest or is it because we honestly believe that an unhampered democracy based upon a trained citizenry with guaranties of property ownership results in the best type of life? Or is it because if Italy and France and Greece and Turkey become communistic we ourselves may become engulfed? If the latter, how are we to survive?

Are we in favor of the Monroe Doctrine because we believe that the spread of autocracy to American continents would endanger our own democracy or are we in favor of our western defense and the building up of our friendship in the Americas merely as a means of national self-interest? In other words, are the people and all that people aspire for worth while? Or shall we build our strength upon guns, navies, alliances with those who have lost faith or who join up in order to preserve the advantages which they have?

America has always been at the crossroads. That is no new thing. Shall we have faith in the dreams of our founding fathers, in the notion that liberty is worth while and that a nation conceived in liberty shall not perish from the earth, or shall we live by national self-interest and allow ourselves, with the advantage-takers, the weak, and those who have tried to preserve themselves and their systems in the world by arms, by alliances and by advantage-taking restrictions upon trade, upon money, upon the very liberties of men? The decisions must rest with us. Were the dreams of our fathers worth while? Shall we fight two world wars, the first to save democracy and then to become engulfed in cynicism; the second to restore democracy and now to give ourselves over to the techniques of force, or shall we remain American? The easy way is to give ourselves over to the techniques of force. War is simple. It is easy. Hitler convinced his people that arms were better than butter. Mussolini convinced his people that if they would surrender all their liberties he would make the trains run on time. And he did. Stalin does not yet let the Soviet Constitution function. He believes in the single will. The American people have been invited to accept the philosophy of the single will.

The articulate among us, the powerful among us, the powerful of the press were never so united in the whole history of America as they were on the first day of November 1948. The people spoke as one. Did they speak with wisdom? Did they speak with hope and faith in America, or did they speak with fear? Did they show unity of fear, or did they show a unity of trust? No one can answer that question and it all remains to be seen.

But I have this to say to you; that as Bismarck failed; that as the Kaiser failed; as Hitler failed; and as Mussolini failed, we, too, will fail if we lose faith in ourselves, our liberty, and our freedom. Do you want the single will in America? You say "No," because at this moment you hate the thing that is called communism and Russia today, as she is practicing the techniques of the single will.

The peoples of Europe have lost their faith in themselves. They are divided. They are uncertain. They need leadership. They will follow a Hitler again as they did before if they are not freed from the despair they suffer. But if we offer the helping hand with the spirit of a Bismarck, we cannot help but develop the techniques he developed. What we must preserve is the America of a Franklin, a Jefferson, a Lincoln, and a Wilson, who more often than anything else realized and said that liberty and freedom are the important things. How to build liberty and freedom? Build it by building men, men who think, men who aspire, men who have the right to come and go, men who have the right to change their avocation in life, men

who have the right to have and to hold, men who have strength because they are free from fear and free from want, men who are not afraid of the soldier-education bill. Believe it or not, but within the last month while I attended an international conference after I had praised the soldier-education bill, because the new leadership of America was being trained to the tune of 1,400,000 soldier boys and girls reaping the benefits of that bill for the purpose of building leadership in America, I was astounded to be asked, What are you going to do with such a trained mass, and how are you going to find places for so many leaders? Ladies and gentlemen, I can tell you that few people in the world have grasped the meaning of what we call America.

Freedom House Award for 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, each year Freedom House, in New York City, gives an award to that outstanding American who in the judgment of Freedom House has done for that year the most for world peace and freedom. In 1948 that award very justifiably and very naturally was bestowed upon one of our own distinguished Members, the great senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. In bestowing the award Freedom House conferred the following citation:

Above party and ambition he led a united American people in the service of a free world.

I know that every Member of the Senate fully concurs in that citation, and fully approves the bestowal of the award upon the Senator from Michigan.

At this time, in connection with these remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I think it is more apt to be read there, the great address which the Senator from Michigan delivered upon the occasion to which I refer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, OF MICHIGAN

I am indebted to Freedom House for the overgenerous consideration which inspires this award and this reception. My immediate reaction is a sense of responsibility to try to justify the addition of my name to those of the six distinguished Americans who have preceded me on your annual honor roll. This reaction is emphasized by the gracious presentation in your behalf by my cherished friend, Sumner Welles, who has personified the finest ideals of service in his own public career.

I feel bound to reiterate what I said to your award committee last July. I do not believe that any one citizen can possibly deserve this accolade. The heroic and unselfish dedication of our whole people to peace with justice and to human rights and fundamental freedoms is a universal epic which crowns the Nation with universal glory in which uncounted millions have a right to equal share.

I am intimately reminded of a parallel. When I was a quarter century younger than I am tonight, the enthusiasm of impetuous youth impelled me to undertake, historically, the identification of Alexander Hamilton, all things considered, as the greatest American. With a pontifical assurance which has mellowed with the years, I bravely wrote a book under that title to prove that point. But with no less appreciation of my youthful hero, I have lived to learn that there is no one "greatest American." I should say now that "the greatest American" is a composite type and not an individual. He is the average citizen, at the hearthstone of his home, who lives his unsung loyalties to God and country and to the honorable tasks which build the free life of all our people. As Lincoln said—and praise be to heaven that, as usual, he spoke the truth—"God must have loved them, because he made so many of them."

ACCLAIMS UNITED POLICY

The recital of this incident pretends no personal analogy in connection with tonight's award. Yet it points a moral to adorn my tale. In this award we confront a concept which depends for its validity upon the extent of its general acceptance and support. The important thing to celebrate tonight is the fact that in the last 3 years as the result of constructive collaboration we have produced to a remarkable extent a united, unpartisan voice for America at the water's edge in defense of those elemental ideals of justice and of liberty by which free men live, here and everywhere. Despite fragmentary and often pitiful discords, we have spoken as the United and not the disUnited States.

I frankly confess that in my lexicon this unity is the equivalent of many an armed division upon the land, many a flight of eagles in the sky, and many a fleet of ships upon the sea in terms of national security.

This is saying a great deal, because the Berlin air lift is one of the most impressive demonstrations of superb military efficiency in the whole history of the whole world.

This does not mean that we have silenced our traditional process of democratic debate—nor should it. It does not mean that we have surrendered to rubber-stamp dictation as is the totalitarian fate of communized countries whose people live by sufferance rather than by right. It does not mean that we all agree upon all the pattern we pursue.

SEES STEP TO PEACE

But it does mean that, regardless of partisan politics, through full and free discussion we strive for common ground where our minds substantially can meet upon solid, basic attitudes. Then these attitudes, through predominating unity, can give American authority the moral power best calculated to lead us and the world away from the tragedy of new aggression and the unutterably ugly consequence of war.

It has been my privilege to participate in this labor. But the thing I am trying to say is that all such labors are vain without the widest sharing of these concepts.

Therefore, it is only in this spirit that I could accept your personal award tonight. I acccept it as a symbol. It is a symbol of the work of many others. It is a symbol, for primary example, of the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—and please mark this well—where seven Republicans and six Democrats, after long travail and often after drastic editing, voted unanimously (13 to 0) upon 49 treaties, agreements, bills, and resolutions, many of transcendent importance, in the Eightieth Congress.

We unanimously closed ranks 49 times. I do not disguise my pride in that unique record of service at a moment when America's opponents are waiting to divide and conquer us both at home and abroad. Every member of that committee is entitled to this award.

Nor is that all. This substantial unity has carried on into heavy, unpartisan majorities in the Congress itself. It has dominated the final court of American public opinion. So, I say tonight let our acknowledgments be universal. Let our prayers ask for a legitimate and justified continuation of this benediction no matter who is President of the United States. Nothing finally matters but our country.

Your citation speaks of "service to a free world." America has rendered—and continues to render—that service in prodigal degree. Its like is not to be found in history. We are doing it in a spirit which puts to shame the miserable slanders that selfish imperialism is our aim. Our chief foreign critics upon that score would do well to consult a mirror. That's where they will see imperialism on the march. The humanities, not conquest, are our goal. If stabilities and honorable peace shall fail, it will not be for want of our devoted trying.

We are not dodging the finger of responsibility which destiny points at this most powerful, free nation on the globe. Free souls and self-government are the precious stakes, here and everywhere. Dark horizons are the alternative. Ours in an obligation of leadership and example. The Statue of Liberty is miles high tonight in New York Harbor. We dare not foreshorten its spiritual altitude. We dare not dim its moral flame.

As long as 40 years ago the new pattern began to take its shape. Following the Spanish-American War, President Theodore Roosevelt then said of us:

"We have no choice, we the people of the United States, as to whether or not we shall play a great role in the world. That has been determined for us by fate, by the march of events. We have to play that part. All that we can decide is whether we shall play it well or ill."

If that was so in 1908, its truth—underscored through the intervening years—is even greater in 1948. I think we have made the great decision. We have decided, God willing, to "play it well."

EACH STEP CALLED RISK

The difficulty is that often we must "play by ear." There is no sure course. Each step is a calculated risk. No man can say with finality: "This is the way." Yet some axioms are obvious. One is that peace without justice is only an uneasy truce. Another is that the appeasement of aggressors only multiples the hazards from which we seek escape. Another is that we never voluntarily exchange the council chamber for the battlefield except as an unescapable last resort. Another is that we always scrupulously respect the rights of others with the same fair consideration which we demand for our own. Another is that we say what we mean and mean what we say.

The need for this candor and this resolute purpose is well put by one contemporary sentence in an article by Hamilton Fish Armstrong in the magazine Foreign Affairs.

"The danger that Soviet Russia will deliberately choose to make war on the west does not at the moment seem so strong as the danger that credulity and arrogance to which all dictatorships are prey will mislead her as to the limits of our tolerance and that in her ignorance she will commit an act so little different from aggresison that we shall inevitably adopt countermeasures with unpredictable results."

I vote for candor and resolution against credulity and arrogance. I believe I thus vote for peace—unless it has been blackballed in the Kremlin.

But the vital point I want to make to our own people in respect to this service to a free world is this. Let us never for an instant forget that in this service we indispensably serve our own American welfare and security and the free institutions which we hold dear. This is not a fuzzy excursion into dreamland. It is the bare bones of reality. It is a common cause. Indeed, it seems to me that it involves practical considerations where the so-called internationalist and the so-called nationalist can agree.

In all realism and humility let us never forget—with thankfulness to God and a just regard for others—that one of the reasons for our relative eminence today is the fact that not one bomb fell on the continental United States in two world wars. This does not discount the immensity of the magnificent fighting effort which we brought triumphantly to bear upon our own and the Allied victory. But it recognizes our advantage in having had those allies, including Russia. We could not expect a similiar immunity again. But simple, common sense tells us that our strength multiplies in proportion to other like-thinking, peace-loving peoples can persevere in their independence and their ideals. Our own strength thus multiplies for peace and our own peace thus multiplies its strength against a war which not even the victor can afford to win, and which sanity will prevent—if this sanity is reciprocal.

This is not the world of yesterday when the oceans were moats around our ramparts. Science has annihilated time and space and made of the earth an overnight community. Progress in the swift, grim business of mass destruction has been appalling. New shadows of subversion and aggression cross the paths of all free governments. Simple, common sense warns us that these new conditions demand the widest possible pursuit of international cooperation and collective security for peace for the sake of all independent governments, our own emphatically included. For example, world disarmament, with automatic disciplines against bad faith, can only be a partnership affair. So too with effective warnings to aggressors that their piracy is not going to be allowed to pay. Furthermore western civilization cannot safely be left to precarious survival on any one isolated island even though it be our own.

CANDOR NEEDED AT HOME

We shall keep our powder dry. We shall not lean upon illusions. But let us never forget that we powerfully serve ourselves when we help others to help themselves to stand upon their own free and independent feet.

I have spoken of the need for candor. This need equally exists at home. It also exists in dealing with our friends abroad.

At home, our people need continuously to know the truth. While diplomatic negotiations cannot always proceed in a goldfish bowl, diplomatic commitments are the business of the whole people of the United States. Open covenants are the only instruments we can tolerate. Suspicions to the contrary sap morale. Belated disclosures stay confidence. Anxiety and confusion stay unity. When possessed of adequate information, American public opinion can be trusted to come up with the right answers. Misinformed or uninformed, it can grievously blunder through no fault of its own. Iron curtains are dangerous anywhere.

Another thing. Our people need to confidently know that we use prudence in these matters as well as courage. There are limits to our resources. There are boundaries to our miracles. The fondest hope of our adversaries is that we shall defeat ourselves not only through disunity but through overextension and through collapse from our own exhaustion. That suicide would be the greatest possible "disservice to a free world."

Those who count upon this sinister expectation are going to be disappointed. We shall match our ideals to our abilities. I remind you that Congress wrote this specific mandate into the Marshall plan.

It wrote another important mandate—and again candor, this time with our friends abroad, is elementary wisdom. It said that our cooperation under the Marshall plan shall be continuously contingent upon self-help and mutual aid among the 16 participating nations in western Europe. That, too, means precisely what it says. Our overriding aim is not to contain Russia. Our purpose is not to Americanize Europe. Our objective is to return Europe to the Europeans—and take them off the dole. When this is done, our objective is to retire from a Europe which has restabilized itself.

If our purposes excite any contrary suspicion in Moscow, and if it is feared that our anxiety to reestablish German autonomy portends an ultimate resurgence of Axis aggression, let there be an immediate renewal of our proposal for an automatic Big Four power alliance of defense against any such resurgence for 50 years—a proposal which Moscow has thus far spurned.

This depends far more upon self-help and mutual cooperation than it can possibly depend on us. We speak of the need of unity over here. There is just as great a need of unity over there. It is difficult. The habits of the centuries resist. The clash of ideologies intrudes. But the goal is indispensable. We must not be too impatient. But we must be firm for their sakes as well as ours. They can never recover economic health or independent security in 16 airtight competitive compartments. It is not for us to dictate the formula. It is for them to find it in their own intelligent self-interest. They are making progress. Much has been courageously done. Brave plans are on the trestleboard. We cheer these planners and these pioneers. But I am sure it lies within the jurisdiction of a proven friend of the Marshall plan to urge them that they must get on with the realities of this vital job. A very critical moment for all of us approaches when the next American Congress audits the record to determine the telltale values which self-help and mutual aid have produced. This will be the acid test. Concrete results are required to tip the scales.

UN'S LIMITATIONS

Now, my fellow countrymen, the theme I am discussing—service to a free world—involves so many problems in this critical era of universal flux that I would wear out my welcome if I prolonged the inventory. I have only scratched the surface. But there is one, final consideration to which I must advert.

The United Nations was born with the prayers, the blessings, and the hopes of a war-weary world, including the overwhelming benediction of the people of the United States. We all recognized its limitations. No one thought it perfect, least of all those of us who struggled at San Francisco to make it as sound as possible in the light of previous commitment and in the presence of unfolding Soviet intransigence. It was not intended to make but to keep a peace that never has been made. But no sooner was it launched—and long before its essential implements were provided—it became the seething core of the cold calculated controversy through which the Soviets deliberately have made peace impossible.

It was asked to run before it had even learned to walk. The wonder is not that it has stumbled. The wonder is that it has kept its feet at all. The wonder is that it continues to be the central reliance of those peace-loving nations of the earth who prefer to talk things out rather than shoot them out. It continues to be the town meeting of the world where the conscience of mankind can speak those moral verdicts which some day will have a powerful impact on events. Despite its handicaps, its limitations, and its failures, I hesitate to think what would have happened in the last 2 years if its forum and its restraints, however feeble, had been unavailable. And that goes for this present critically dangerous hour, come what may. The greater the world's rifts the greater the world's need for an umpire.

CITES BERLIN ISSUES

I have just referred to the present dangerous hour, I am thinking obviously of Berlin. The Charter of the United Nations requires its members to seek amicable settlement of their disagreements. We have done so. France has done so. Britain has done so. With a patience which I hope has not been misunderstood, we have sought a fair working formula with the Soviets to end a Berlin blockade which violates our rights in Germany as an occupying power, which is a famine siege aimed at millions of defenseless Germans for whom we are responsible, and which is a threat to international peace and security.

Our negotiations have come to naught. What seemed to be initial progress with Stalin subsequently collapsed in a complete Soviet reversal in the Allied Council in Berlin. Further direct discussion became a transparent futility in the presence of this tricky, provocative, and insidious Soviet run-around.

We did not resort to force as might too easily have been the recourse in other days. We have resorted to organized reason and to the conscience of human kind in the United Nations forum. The Soviets cannot ignore this forum in such a situation unless they are prepared to present the world with conclusive confession that they are incapable of allegiance to the most fundamental of all peace pledges to which any nation can subscribe.

WE'LL STAY IN BERLIN

I believe it entirely possible that the Security Council can restore this problem to the basis of pacific negotiation. Of course there are some things we cannot negotiate. We are in Berlin by right. We shall not be driven out. We shall not negotiate under duress, but if there is any reciprocity answering our will for peace, there is every reason why the Security Council should be able to lift the blockade, establish realistic negotiations on related problems, and proceed to a conclusion in civilized fashion.

But now that we have gone to the United Nations, we must intelligently avoid any unilateral independent action on our own account lest we confuse our friendly associates, cramp the Security Council, and encourage our opponents to think our appeal to the United Nations is either timid or insincere. I must say we have just had a narrow escape upon this score at Washington.

The Soviet vetos inside the United Nations have disclosed the same world split which exists outside the United Nations. Peace with justice looks down a gun barrel in both instances. As a result there is wide discussion among our people regarding new procedures to make the United Nations more competent to deal with wrecking crews. It is significant that this discussion rarely proposes to abandon collective peace. It is significant that almost all proposals hunt for more effective power to deal with them.

This is neither the time nor the place to explore these alternatives. Suffice it to say for myself that I favor the trial of curative devices within the charter rather than the more ambitious—and I fear less practicable—plans which hold less hope for prompt results. Specifically, I favor the maximum trial of article 51 as a basis for developing the regional cohesion of nations with a common peace interest—always subordinate, of course, to the obligations of the parent

charter. I favor the thesis endorsed June 11 last, by the overwhelming vote of the United States Senate which recommended progressive development of regional and other collective arrangements for individual and collective self-defense in accordance with the purposes, principles, and provisions of the charter.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude as I began, I want America to live in a free world of freemen. I want it ever to be free itself. I believe in justice under the law for nations as well as people. I believe in a live-and-let-live world which recognizes the independent right of self-determination. I do not believe it can be gained by surrender to conquest or appeasement. I believe that collective action is necessary to a peace worth keeping. I believe this peace is possible. I believe our united American leadership, within its means, is indispensable to these achievements. I believe its exercise is inseparable from our own self-interest. I believe in a strong America on land and sea and in the air pending those happier days when peace through reason is a dependable concept. I believe in a strong America at those councils where this concept is relentlessly pursued by the moral and spiritual forces of humankind.

Ladies and gentlemen, again I thank you for your very kind consideration.

America's Domestic Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] on Saturday night at the National Women's Press dinner in Washington, D. C. The address deals with the domestic problems of our country. I venture to ask its insertion in the RECORD since the Senate is now approaching the point where it must consider for the first time on this side, or as has been said, in the history of our country, the admission to this august body of a woman who comes here entirely under her own steam, and her analysis of our problems and her presentation of viewpoints regarding them, which I am sure will be extremely helpful as in some degree being the voice of the women of America, regarding the problems with which Congress must now deal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this first week of the Eighty-first Congress—in this first week of mine in the United States Senate—I have experienced the sharp impact of clashing political philosophies. During the 9 years that I served in the House, I was subjected to the many pressures of opposing political views—not of the Republican or Democratic variety but rather of the reactionary or radical tinge or the conservative or liberal tone.

I experienced this in my campaign for election as United States Senator. The reactionaries called me a Communist and a traitor to my party because I had shown political independence on such votes as the proposed budget cut. I was labeled as a tool of labor because I voted against the Smith-Connally Act and the Case bill. But almost in the same breath, I was called a tool of reactionary management because I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. They said that I was a militarist when I voted in committee for universal military training. Yet when I said that Reserve legislation rated priority over universal military training, I was accused of being a pacifist.

And I am not unmindful that there have been those who have predicted that the 6-year Senatorial tenure will make my voting record more liberal according to the prophets' self-chosen standards of liberalism. And an equal number of political phophets have said that I would swing to the conservative side.

Because of the publicized so-called rebellion of the original 12 self-styled liberal Republican Senators, I realized that my votes in the Republican conference meeting Monday morning would be interpreted as the beginning of a swing to the liberal or conservative side. If I didn't go along with the 12 rebels then it would be said that I was taking orders from the very people who opposed my candidacy in Maine.

The vote on the chairmanship of the Senate Republican Policy Committee was heralded as separating the conservatives from the liberals. Although the vote was by secret ballot, I had no hesitancy to reveal that I had voted for Senator TAFT because I knew that he had sponsored certain liberal legislation in the past and would in the future and those opposing him did not offer any positive substitutes but only negative proposals.

I am glad to see that many editors and columnists share my belief that this was not a test vote of liberalism and observed that on liberal legislation Senator TAFT's voting record compares favorably with those of many of his opponents. One liberal columnist summarized the issue in his Tuesday column with the observation:

"Yet it was Senator TAFT, more than any other man, who gave the Senate in the Eightieth Congress a relatively liberal tinge as compared to the House. He strove manfully, and successfully so far as the Senate was concerned, for better housing, education, and health, only to see his work nullified by the House. His record, all in all, is quite as good as most of those now labelling themselves liberals. He even had the distinction, which few of the others could claim, of being called a Communist by the real estate lobby.

"Assuming, however, that the 'young Republican liberals' are right and it is time for a change, they should make sure that it is a change for the better."

These are quotes from a columnist who is considered a New Deal champion by several of the young Republican liberals. From reading his column and other editorial comment, I would like to suspect that they had taken their lead observations from my own previous press release on the matter.

But the point that I am attempting to make is that our democracy has become so much of a pressure-group government that it is a matter of all or nothing at all with the pressure groups. You can't be like Ivory soap with them, 99 44/100 percent pure. You must vote nothing less than 100 percent of the time the way they want you to vote, or they call you an anti—99 percent is not acceptable.

I'm afraid that I don't vote 100 percent of the time in favor of any pressure group. This is probably because I don't believe that any one side is 100 percent right all of the time or that any one side is 100 percent wrong all of the time. I didn't even vote 100 percent with the so-called conservative block in the conference Monday.

So that when I am asked, as I was on the Meet the Press radio forum a few weeks ago, as to what I am, liberal or conservative, I answer by saying that I like to think of myself as being a moderate. The question is "What is a moderate?" The best answer I have is one who does not go to either extreme, one who adopts and supports what he or she conceives to be the good of both sides—one who takes something from the liberal viewpoint and something from the conservative viewpoint.

I am pleased to see that since I used the word "moderate" on the Meet the Press program it is appearing in the press with increasing frequency. It seems to be replacing the term "middle of the road." I conceive a moderate to be one who is somewhat more liberal and somewhat less conservative than one in the past category of "middle of the road."

But a policy of moderation must avoid the weakness of pseudo-liberals who attempt to be all things to all men all of the time. It must not be mistaken for straddling that rightfully results in political suicide.

There is a growing friction that the Democratic Party is the party of labor and that the Republican Party is the party of big business. The fact is that both parties are essentially parties of the people. They have to be in order to receive 49 percent and 45 percent of the total vote. Just because the Democratic Party received 49 percent of the 1948 national vote, it does not mean that the American people are 49 percent labor. Nor does the 45 percent vote for the Republican Party mean that America is 45 percent big business.

Basically there is no difference between the rank and file of the Democrats and the rank and file of the Republicans in this country. Equally there is no difference between the consciences and morals of big labor and those of big business. Control of a political party by either big labor or big business is equally wrong and should be opposed by the people. The political parties belong to all the people, not just the more articulate pressure groups.

This does not mean that we cannot have honest differences in ideologies and philosophies. But too often ideological differences are made cloaks that hide selfishness, greed, and the desire to push other people around. We must recognize that there is a true liberalism that cannot be characterized as leftist just as much as there is an intelligent conservatism that cannot be classified as rightist.

In proposing the moderate view, I do not mean to suggest unabated compromise. Our country and our Republic were founded on compromise. America has grown to become the greatest power on earth because of our operation and administration of compromise. One way of describing American democracy is as a constant, living compromise. But again in the application of moderation, the creed of a moderate, we cannot go to extremes even in compromise. There can be no compromise between right and wrong. Nor can we accept a compromise between security and insecurity. We may live between security and insecurity as we have ever since the war but we cannot compromise our efforts toward security.

Your security, my security, the individual security of the citizen call for a positive approach by the Government. That is why I did not vote with the so-called liberals on the chairmanship of the Senate Republican Policy Committee. Their approach was a negative one. They had no positive substitute for that which they opposed.

The United States is a prosperous and productive Nation today because of individual initiative. Our risk capital system, which has encouraged maximum individual initiative, has given us the most powerful military potential in the world. Without this military potential we would not enjoy even the limited individual and national security that we have today.

We Americans have the best standard of living at the lowest cost; something that has been produced not by fascism, communism, or state capitalism, but rather by a system of risk capitalism, free labor, and free press, in which private initiative and free competition has been encouraged.

You and I know that some in public life are solely dominated and motivated by personal ambition just as there are men in business and in labor who would exploit the rank and file of the voters through propaganda of distortion. It is imperative that the truth about our economic affairs be exposed in order that public policies may be adopted that do not brush aside the wishes of any such number as the nearly 22,000,000 voters who voted on the losing side.

Beyond question the election strongly indicated that the mood of Americans, that is the 55 percent who made the effort to vote, is definitely proliberal. But this doesn't justify granting special privilege to particular groups any more than it means that Americans are in favor of public spending to the point of insolvency. It doesn't mean that Americans have lost faith in the American business system or that they believe anybody who is successful in business is necessarily a conservative or rightist.

Americans are essentially fair. They want economic soundness. But they believe that the leadership for that economic soundness can be found inside as well as outside government. They believe that what is good for Republicans is also good for Democrats, and vice versa. They do not believe that there are rules of thumb by which the Democrats can be lined up on one side and Republicans on the other with respect either to economic security proposals or social legislation.

The Republican Party has lost five consecutive Presidential elections because too many Republican leaders have clung steadfastly to the notion that it is not the business of the Federal Government to intervene in the economic affairs of the people. They have refused to recognize a simple principle of politics.

Nor is this a mere question of expediency for the little fellow has a right to economic security just as the big man wishes to protect his own interests when he requests legislation beneficial to his business.

But the Government doesn't owe anyone a living. There is no need for the Government to support the citizen. Such would mean surrender of the individual to the supremacy of state socialism. Instead the Government must encourage self-reliance, self-help, and self-control. The privilege of individual freedom carries with it the responsibility of individual restraint and independence of thought. But that independence of thought must always be mindful of the interdependence of us all. When we glory in our individual freedom, we must think of the other fellow and realize that the manner in which we exercise and enjoy that freedom affects all the rest of us.

We must be more cognizant of the fact that there are some things which cannot be done by individuals alone. The third party to every public issue, the public itself, has always demanded that certain areas of regulation and aid are the proper concern of government. Increasingly the Government assumes the role of referee—of protector of the public interest.

Where then is the line between public and private control areas to be drawn. The increasing complexity of our economic problems stems from our growing population. And the greater the complexity, the less the ability of individuals to solve the problems. The inevitable result is an increase in the duties of government. But this in itself emphasizes the necessity for our politics to be approached by both parties with the same unswerving interest in individual security.

Moderation can influence the future of both parties. It can become the public policy of the Nation as a whole for just as no one pressure group owns either party, no combination of pressure groups owns this Nation. Extremes in the form of special privileges granted by either party to any pressure group would not be permissible under a policy of moderation. This concept of moderation cannot be without vigor. It must be based upon fervent desire to conserve the life and energies of the people against waste and exploitation. It must require exposure of true facts about our financial and economic resources. It must mean prudence and a sense of responsibility in handling public funds.

It must mean that the economic system as a whole be permitted to operate so that as far as possible all may share equitably in its benefits—or the too forgotten corollary, that all may bear equitably its reverses.

When the people of America are given the truth and understand fully the advantages of a system of free enterprise—when businessmen who believe in monopolies or cartels see the light—when labor leaders who believe in closed shops and other forms of monopoly, including denial of the civil right to work, are converted to an intelligent moderation—then, and only then, will America have obtained the desired true liberalism that so many talk so glibly of and do so little about.

The handwriting on the political wall should be clear enough to both major parties. The Republican Party has lost five consecutive Presidential elections because, rightly or wrongly, it had the reputation of being the party of big business. The Democratic Party won this last time with the lowest winning edge in 36 years—the first minority President since 1913. This winning edge is too thinly cut to permit the Democratic Party to be identified as the labor party. The people have clearly shown that they don't want a big business Republican Party or a labor Democratic Party.

The people want moderation with each group having a fair share instead of unfair privileges for special groups. They want equality and not extremes. They want the traditional compromise of the greatest good for the greatest number—but without compromise of principle in right and wrong.

Yes, the people want moderation—they don't want the extreme right or the extreme left. A policy of moderation can achieve an overwhelming majority. The party that first identifies itself in the eyes of the public as the moderate party will achieve that overwhelming victory—because it will have acceded to the will of the people rather than to any special groups.

Reply by Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, to New York Times Editorial of October 3, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in the October 3, 1948, edition of the New York Times there appeared an editorial which started as follows:

The New York Times, which supported Mr. Roosevelt against Mr. Dewey in 1944, now supports Mr. Dewey against Mr. Truman.

Then followed the New York Times' full and frank statement. On October 6, 1948, I answered the New York Times editorial. Because of its general interest I ask unanimous consent that my reply be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 6, 1948.

To the EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Your thoughtful and thought-provoking announcement last Sunday of support of Mr. Dewey against Mr. Truman is an exercise of the right of every newspaper to make known its conclusions about the Presidential campaign. To such an expression no reader is entitled to make any more extended comment than "I agree" or "I disagree."

The second paragraph of your editorial, however, gives the announcement a different status from that of mere expression of opinion. When you wrote that "A full and frank statement of the considerations which have led us to this choice is due our readers," you recognized publicly that the exercise of your right entailed a corresponding responsibility. Unfortunately the statement in three important respects is neither full nor entirely frank, in my opinion. In such circumstances it seems to me legitimate for your readers to point out these deficiencies, so that others may become aware of them, and so that you may clarify your position, if you care to do so. I want to assure you that I do not question the sincerity or earnest intention of your statement. My thought is that as opinions are subjective, so a personal explanation of their causes is likely to lack some objectivity.

Summarized, the three deficiencies in your statement are:

1. You give the impression, probably unintentionally but no less definitely because of this, that the actions and domestic policies of President Truman as an individual have played a large part in determining your support of Governor Dewey, when the specific facts cited by you, as well as the whole editorial position of the New York Times over the years, show that this is not the case.

2. Your description of Republican domestic policies as largely in agreement with basic New Deal or Roosevelt-Truman policies is inadequate and fundamentally inaccurate, even regarding the specific reforms you mention.

3. Your failure to mention the major issue of this campaign, which also was the major issue of all four of Franklin Roosevelt's campaigns, is remarkable. This issue is the charge that Republican policies are determined by a small group of individuals whose desires and actions conflict with the interests of the whole American people.

Regarding the first deficiency, the opening sentence of your statement says dramatically: "The New York Times, which supported Mr. Roosevelt against Mr. Dewey in 1944, now supports Mr. Dewey against Mr. Truman." This salvo, when coupled with a later estimate of President Truman in his domestic program as vacillating, contradictory, inept, slipshod, and disorganized, gives the distinct impression that your newspaper has reversed in 1948 a political policy of long standing because of Mr. Truman's alleged faults. And this is buttressed by the implication that in domestic policies the Republican Party has adopted all that is good in the New Deal.

Yet an examination of your statement shows that you supported Roosevelt in 1944 only because you believed that foreign policy was "the great overriding issue of the campaign." Your statement fails to mention

that you opposed Roosevelt in 1940, supporting Wendell Willkie instead. It also fails to mention that, though you supported Roosevelt in 1932 and 1936, your editorial comment on specific New Deal issues was very largely if not entirely adverse during the greater part of Roosevelt's incumbency. More than this, your statement points out in some detail that the alleged changes in Mr. Dewey's attitude toward foreign policy are the real reason for your support of him—that you believe that he is no longer "the Mr. Dewey of 8 years ago, who in 1940 denounced the interventionists and expressed his faith that the United States could find security in isolation," nor "the Mr. Dewey of 1944 * * *" who "had deliberately avoided discussion of foreign policy after 1942."

The impression, therefore, that your opposition to President Truman is a newly born result of his individual actions in the field of domestic policy is obviously false, and I am sure you did not intend to give such an impression. Your statement and your editorial record show conclusively that you would today oppose Roosevelt himself or any other Democratic candidate supporting the domestic policies of the New Deal, provided you had faith in the foreign policies of the Republican candidate.

The second deficiency in your statement is more startling and more important. Let me quote in full this paragraph: "Mr. Dewey is now running on a platform that takes for granted the survival and continuation of all the major reforms and innovations of the first Roosevelt administration. There is no good reason to question the sincerity of this position. Times have changed; the early hysteria has died away, and even the extreme right wing of the Republican Party knows that such Roosevelt measures as social security and the Fair Labor Standards Act, the SEC, and TVA are here to stay."

I think you will agree after consideration that the casual reader of this paragraph will hardly notice your careful restriction of major reforms and innovations to the period of 1933–1936, which was that of the first Roosevelt administration. Instead he is likely to think you refer to all major reforms and innovations of the past 16 years. And many a careful reader, noticing the restriction, will still be hard put to it to recall exactly which measures came within that period.

You yourself were apparently confused in this regard, for of the four measures you mention, the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted in 1938, and the legislation creating one of the three major activities of the SEC was passed in 1939.

So, as in the case of the first deficiency in your statement, an erroneous impression is created. But the deficiency is greater than creating a false impression. Even granting your time restrictions as to measures taken for granted by Republicans, one needs only to examine your news columns for the past 2 years to find abundant evidence that every New Deal major measure has been under strong and fundamental attack by the Republican Party. For these 2 years I have sat in Senate committee meetings and on the Senate floor and have watched a violent, systematic, almost continuous effort to undermine or obliterate every trace of the progressive measures of the Democratic Party since 1933.

To revert to the four measures you mention, I have witnessed a successful assault on social security by which almost a million persons have been deprived of its benefits. I have seen the hamstringing of the Fair Labor Standards Act by the Republican refusal either to support bringing its minimum-wage provisions up to date or to permit the Congress to vote on the revised measure. I have watched the ingenious technicalities by which the onslaught on the power of the SEC to protect American investors has proceeded. I have observed with melancholy heart the manipulations of appropriation measures and the efforts to disrupt the morale and efficiency of administrators and employees which have marked the determined march to destroy the TVA.

The American people did not believe the "me-too" promises of Governor Landon in 1936, nor of Wendell Willkie in 1940, nor of Governor Dewey in 1944. Now, that even the promises are not being made by the Republican candidate and that the plain record of 2 years of performance by Republicans is open for all to see, should your readers be asked to believe the outworn fictional claim?

I have already called the third deficiency in your statement remarkable. This is your failure to mention the major issue of this campaign among the considerations which led you to your choice for the Presidency. It is your right to accept or to reject the charge and the thesis which make up this issue, and it is outside my province in this communication to urge either course upon you. But for you to ignore the issue completely—to act as if it did not exist—smacks of having made your decision in a vacuum or in a dream world. If the charge and the thesis are correct, this issue outweighs all others in importance, including that of foreign policy, for the liberty, prosperity, and even the existence of our Nation revolve about it.

The issue has two phases. The first is that the policies and actions of the Republican Party have been dominated for approximately 52 years, beginning with the Mark Hanna era in 1896 and continuing through what may be called the Grundy era of today, by a small group of individuals possessing so much power that the identity and personal beliefs of specific Presidential candidates and other Republican officials have been relatively unimportant. Even the most forthright, independent, and courageous of the Republican Presidents in this period, Theodore Roosevelt, found himself first shackled and made almost impotent as President, and later ousted in toto from party authority and leadership. Republican stalwarts like the elder Robert La Follette and George Norris, to whom our Nation owes an eternal debt of gratitude, found themselves doomed to disgrace and excommunication by those who dominated—and today dominate—the Republican Party. If this belief is true, then the personal views and lofty intentions of Mr. Dewey are of little practical consequence in the scheme of things. Besides, his nomination with the approval and support of the dominating group when more popular and progressive candidates were available, plus his refusal up to this time to reveal his specific program, make him suspect as a member in good standing of this group.

The second phase of this issue is that the plans and actions of the dominating group of the Republican Party are in direct conflict with the interests of the whole American people. As promoters of monopoly, dispensers of special privilege, grabbers of excessive profits, engineers of inflation and of depression, the members of this group necessarily oppose all moves to stem their power. There is nothing new in their being exposed, nor in holding their policies and actions in public view. From the stirring cry of more than half a century ago, "Shall mankind be crucified upon a cross of gold?" through the denunciatory descriptions, "malefactors of great wealth" by Theodore Roosevelt, "economic royalists" by Franklin Roosevelt, and "gluttons of privilege" by President Truman, this half century has echoed with the protests and the prayers of the defenders of the basic rights of the American people. And since 1933 Franklin Roosevelt and President Truman have continuously kept the issue before the Nation.

There is no need and this is not the place to elaborate on the issue. Mr. Truman is taking it to the people by day and by night. The fact that Mr. Dewey chooses to ignore it does not keep it from being an issue; it simply makes it an issue that Mr. Dewey prefers not to talk about, and the American people can express their own view in the privacy of their polling booths next month. My only point here is that Governor Dewey's silence in the matter is understandable, but that your own is not, for you are not running for office. You are trying, like the honest newspaper that you are, to tell your readers honestly what you think and why you think it, with nothing to hide.

Since I first ran for the Senate in 1932 I have been called almost everything disagreeable by political opponents. I think, though, that you will agree with those who know me that I am not a hysterial figure nor a sensation monger. It is in a spirit of sober, friendly interest that I appeal to you to carry out fully your sincere intention to make clear the reasons for your political choice.

Most sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senator from Utah.

Political Stabilization in China: United States Interest In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Congress and the country certain articles dealing, in two instances, with our foreign and, in one instance, with our domestic affairs.

First I ask to have printed in the RECORD an address on the far eastern situation. It deals with political stabilization in China. The address was delivered by Stanley K. Hornbeck, at the meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago on December 28, 1948. Mr. Hornbeck was formerly in charge of foreign affairs in our State Department, and subsequently was the Ambassador to the Netherlands. He is a gentleman who speaks with great knowledge and authority from a background of 25 years of experience. I think everyone may well read his address dealing with the Chinese situation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL STABILIZATION IN CHINA: UNITED STATES INTEREST IN

(By Stanley K. Hornbeck, at American Political Science Association meeting, Chicago, December 28, 1948)

The foreign policy of the United States was for more than a century rooted in attitudes and concepts which were by and large common to and among our people. Typically expressive of those attitudes and concepts were (and are) the pertinent parts of President Monroe's message of 1823 and the substantive portions of the Nine Power Treaty of Washington of 1922, relating to

principles and policies to be followed in matters concerning China.

The United States did not at all times and in all instances live up to all of its principles or every letter of our commitments, but in general it was guided by them, and on the whole it made a good record.

Even so, and partly in consequence of failure to live up to the full implications of our principles, we were drawn in 1917 into a World War and again in 1941 into another.

We are today being subjected to probably the greatest test of our capacities that has ever been imposed upon us.

We have become a party to, and we are a combatant in, a third world conflict: communism versus democracy, or the Kremlin versus free peoples: a global conflict which is being fought on many fronts in terms thus far of cold war but on some fronts in terms already of hot war.

Communism, under the Red flag and militant, is the challenger. All non-Communist nations and states are under attack. The conflict may be expected to continue until either the Kremlin desists from the policy and the practices of conquest to which it is committed or the United States, beaten on all fronts, including the home front, capitulates to communism and, along with all the other once-free states, becomes a satellite of Russia. In other words, you cannot compromise with militant communism activated from the Kremlin.

Today the dictator-headed oligarchy which governs Russia and controls her satellites is fully committed to the objectives of (a) destroying bourgeois regimes wherever such exist and (b) establishing a Communist regime or regimes (Moscow-manipulated) throughout the world. The Government and the people of the United States are committed to the objectives of (a) preserving the independence of the United States, (b) making the world safe for the way of life in which we believe, and (c) toward those ends, resisting and pushing back the tide of communism.

In pursuance of their course of aggression Russia's rulers are employing every method and means conceivably useful, including violence, toward achievement of their objectives. In pursuance of our objectives the Government of the United States has adopted a policy of strengthening our agencies of defense and giving moral and material assistance to other countries, toward general economic recovery, and a common resistance to the spread of communism.

In two countries, Greece and China, resistance to the spread of communism has reached the stage of "hot" war.

In the conflict between communism and democracy, and therefore between Russia and the United States, China would perhaps be of negligible importance if she were or could be fenced out, be a neutral quantity. But that she cannot be. China is important because of her location, her size, her resources (including the number and character of her people), her place in history, her influence in the politics of Asia, her actual part and her potential weight in world politics.

China will be an asset either to the United States, on the side of democracy, or to Russia, on the side of communism. As China goes, so in all probability will go all of eastern Asia. This view is expressed not alone in China but in Korea, in Japan, and even by an apparent majority of the many people in the United States, who seem to regard the Communist advance in China with complacency.

It is therefore highly desirable, as an American interest, that resistance in China to the spread of communism be continued, and that efforts toward stabilization of the situation in China continue to be efforts favorable to the cause of the democracies.

At Cairo in 1943 President Roosevelt made to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek certain important commitments. At Yalta in 1945 President Roosevelt made to Generalissimo Stalin concessions inconsistent with earlier American commitments and with his own Cairo pledges. Thereafter the American Government made itself the go-between toward causing the Chinese Government to assent to the concessions, unfavorable to China, made by President Roosevelt to Russia. American official action at Yalta affected the course of United States foreign policy in three imporant respects:

(1) A deviation from traditional principles;

(2) A disregard of existing commitments;

(3) A creation of a moral obligation as an underwriter of the agreement consequently concluded between China and Russia.

Briefly stated, decisions made at Yalta by three governments, the Russian, the British, and the American, weakened the position of China's National Government; and those decisions plus Russian action in the aftermath greatly increased the physical strength and the morale of China's Communists.

With the sequel, thus far, all here present are familiar, Russian armies occupied Manchuria; Russia has kept none of her pledges to China; Russia, for practical purposes, set the Chinese Communists up in business in Manchuria, gave them enormous quantities of arms, equipment, and supplies captured from the Japanese, and thus made possible the vigor with which the Communist armies have since then conducted campaigns toward overthrow of the Nationalist Government.

In December of 1945 the American Government proclaimed its commitment to a new policy regarding China. It announced that the United States would be inclined to give aid to China if and as China made progress toward unity and peace. In pursuance with that policy and toward trying to stabilize the situation in China, it sent General Marshall to urge compromise and coalition. The new policy was conceived and General Marshall's mission was conducted on a basis of false assumptions. The simple facts were: There could be, and there can be, no real progress by China toward unity and peace by any route other than that of victories either by the armies of the National Government or the armies of the Communists. Compromise and cooperation between mortal enemies, if achievable, are mere truces and do not lead toward unity, enduring peace, or stability.

It is not an end objective of the Chinese Communists to achieve admission to positions in and with the Nationalist Government. It is their objective to establish a Communist regime. They wish to oust Chiang Kai-shek, disrupt and destroy the Kuomintang, and themselves govern China. This was true in 1946. It has been true for 20 years. It is true now.

The American Government's announcement of its new policy weakened the position of the Chinese National Government. The operations of the Marshall mission further weakened the position of the National Government. The American Government's placing of an embargo on export of arms to China and its statements when the failure of the Marshall mission had become obvious still further weakened the position of the National Government. And all these developments were, conversely, good grist for the mills of the Chinese Communists.

In its formulation in 1947 of the Marshall plan, the executive branch of the American Government wished to exclude China. At that point the Congress intervened. It decided in February 1948 that an operation toward stabilizing situations abroad and stopping communism should include aid to China and should provide, for China, both economic aid and military aid. The amount appropriated for aid to China was, however, relatively small, 2 years of time had been lost, and deliveries thereunder have gone forward belatedly.

An objective study of the so-called aid which the United States has supplied to China since VJ-day—to which some observers have given an exaggerated evaluation of as much as $3,000,000,000—shows that much of what we have sent has in no way been warrantably chargeable as aid to the National Government or as contribution to the war chest of that government in its battle against Communists.

Weighing the aid we have given the National Government against the contributions which we have consciously or unconsciously made to the cause of the Communists in China, since 1945, it may well be asked: into which pan of the scales has the weight of our influence really been thrown. On balance have we really given the National Government, since the time of the Yalta agreement, and in and for its battle against the Communists, any aid at all?

It now looks as though, unless there goes further aid from the United States to the Nationalist Government, the Communists may soon be in control—at least as regards a substantially major part of China.

However, Chiang Kai-shek has not yet given up, nor has the National Government. More, they are far from being politically finished.

I do not know what the future may hold, nor do some people know who think they know. I am moved to recall a long line of prognosticators who in another situation thought they knew. Soon after the Japanese attack at the Marco Polo bridge, in 1937, the line began to form. From then, for eight long years, scarcely a day went by without someone, someone who was sure that he knew, telling me that within 3 or 4 months, 6 at the most, the Chinese Government would capitulate and the Japanese be masters of China. Well, Japan's armies took the Chinese Capital, Nanking, but the Chinese National Government did not capitulate and finally it was the Japanese who did that.

Conditions in China, both political and economic, are indeed chaotic, distressful and distressing beyond words. But no one man and no one government has made them what they are. No one government could have prevented their being substantially what they are. Innumerable factors, some indigenous, many entirely external, most of them connected with aggressions and resistance thereto, have brought upon China the misery and apprehensions which afflict her people today. And no one government, no matter who might be its head and no matter what the ability and probity of its personnel, would or will be able, until the world has been made safe for free peoples, to do very much toward improving the lot of the Chinese people and giving China stability.

A Communist victory in China, if achieved, will not do it—there or anywhere. It might contribute, in the long run, to the development in China of a stability such as prevails in Russia, a stability of totalitarianism, but not to a kind that would be agreeable to us and tend to make us secure.

If the Communists gain control in China, the natural sequel will be successes for Communism in areas to the south, to the west, and to the east of China; the influence of the democracies (Western Europe and North America) will be diminished, Russian influence will flourish, and the interests, investments and commitments of the United States in particular, in the Philippines, in Korea and in Japan will be endangered. At what point or exactly how these or other developments would lead to our being involved in war, one cannot know.

The question of adding to or discontinuing United States aid to China, i. e. aid to the National government, is not a question of aiding or not aiding a government the qualities and deserts of which are subjects of debate. It is a question of making or not making a further effort toward preventing a development which, if consummated, would tend to wipe out all the advantages that have accrued to us—and to the peoples of Asia—from a hundred years of our investment of democratic influence in the field of Far Eastern affairs.

There is no warrant for an assumption that a Communist regime in China could or would be friendly or helpful to the United States. Leaders in such a regime might at the outset express a desire and give indication of an intention to have amicable and reciprocally profitable relations with us; but communism is by nature intolerant of democracy, and the Chinese Communists are avowedly committed no less than is the Russian Government to the objective of overthrowing all capitalistic or bourgeois governments and making the victory of communism universal. Their leaders have declared that Chiang Kai-shek is their enemy No. 1 and the United States their enemy No. 2. They've copied the Russian pattern; they use the Russian methods; they follow the Moscow line. Once in control in China, they should be expected to conduct themselves, toward consolidation of their position, just as their counterparts or prototypes in other countries have done.

It is a great mistake to believe that the Russians are not supporting and will not support the Chinese Communists. Over the years, they have alternately given support and withheld support according to varying local circumstances and needs of varying international situations. Since VJ-day they have given substantial material support—in Manchuria—and, recently, official blessings. They do not need to be giving currently, for more is not currently needed. But should the Chinese Communists for any reason suffer severe reverses there is ample warrant for expecting Russian support again to be forthcoming. This is a universal belief in China. And China has had more experience with Russia and with communism than have we.

As a result of a hundred years of good neighborliness on the part of the United States there exists both on the part of the Chinese people and on that of the National Government a feeling of respect for the United States and of confidence in us. Even in moments of tension and of possible doubts, reciprocally, they regard us as a people upon whose will to be friendly and helpful they can rely. In international matters they have, except on rare occasions, followed our lead and given us their support.

These facts should not be overlooked in our accountings, estimates, and calculations.

If now, in this moment of crisis, we, persuading ourselves that the situation in China is beyond redemption, listening to those who tell us that the National Government is utterly bad and that the Chinese Communists are different, arguing that we must not intervene (whereas we already have intervened and are intervening not only in China but wherever our foreign-aid program is in operation), and that we cannot afford aid both in Europe and to China, abandon in regard to China the policies which we long have pursued; and if the National Government then goes under and the Chinese Communists take over, we shall stand to lose almost at once all that we have with over a century of effort gained throughout eastern Asia, including the relief which we gained at a great price from the threat to our security which was all along implicit in Japan's policy of expansion by force. Still more, we shall stand to see our losses become Russia's gain.

The authors and factors of the Marshall plan speak of the foreign-aid program as an investment conceived and operated on a basis of calculated risk. The pros and cons of aid to Europe without aid to China have been debated and will be debated. I shan't go over that ground here. One thing is certain, Europe cannot make a full economic recovery without access to the resources and trade of eastern Asia. And another, the more the gains of communism in Asia, the greater the likehood of the conflict with Russia reaching the phase of hot war and our investment in aid to Europe being lost to us and becoming an asset to the Russians. Defeat for our side on the Asiatic front will greatly increase the risk feature of our investment on the European front.

The National Government of China is today asking of the United States two things, moral support and material aid.

The cost to the United States of giving that Government moral support would be nil. We are already committed to a policy of intervention—wherever we are giving aid toward opposing communism. We would not by giving such support lose the good will of the Chinese Communists; we have never had that and we cannot ever have it. We might retain the good will of the Nationalists.

The cost to the United States of giving the National Government further material assistance might ultimately run to several billion dollars. Absolutely viewed, this would be a large expenditure. Relatively viewed, by comparison with the whole amount that we are going to have to spend if we intend to make our foreign-aid program effective, or with the expenditure which we are likely to have to make later if we do not make that program effective, it would be a small amount.

The real question with regard to our giving further aid to the National Government is, not can we afford to give it, but can we afford not to give it.

Yes, the hour is late. But the National Government still is fighting; and it is the only independent and indigenous government in all of Asia that is thus resisting the Communist advance. If we are making gains, as reported, in Europe, why jeopardize our investment there and chance losing all that we have in Asia, by an abandoning of a friendly government, to the fashioning of whose predicament we have contributed, while that government still lives and still is resisting a common enemy? Would that be discouraging to the Kremlin? Would it be encouraging to other free nations whom we exhort to stand with us in a common effort to produce conditions of security and stability?

Our recent deviations from the dictates of our traditional policies have been bad enough. If, having done in and to China as we have done, we now, recoiling from estimates of possible dollar costs and looking at the clock, do this, wash our hands of China, we will have gone from bad to worse. It will in the long run cost us dearly.

Only by making global and unlimited our policy of resistance to the spread of communism, and giving maximum of support to other peoples resisting it and most hard pressed, will we really contribute toward stabilizing any situation anywhere.

The condition precedent to progress toward stability in China, in Korea, in Japan, in all of Asia, in Europe, and even in America, is, that free people by common effort make it impossible for communism to advance or the will of the Kremlin to be imposed anywhere by use of armed force.

Structure of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered October 3, 1948, at the Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, under the auspices of the Brigham Young University Women's Auxiliary Organization, entitled "Structure of Peace."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRUCTURE OF PEACE

Over two decades ago I taught my first class to university women. It is good to be back before such a group again. It is good to be back in an atmosphere of purely academic speculation. In such an atmosphere one finds freedom of speech at its best. No one cares what I say or how I say it. If any of you are awake and still here at the end of my remarks that will be sufficient reward.

That idea is not wholly and completely mine. It comes from a statement made by the late Chief Justice Hughes, who, as president of the American Society of International Law, was one of my greatest personal inspirers. He came down from the Capitol—the Supreme Court Building was not then finished—to one of the business meetings of the society and as he left the Capitol he told Mr. Justice Holmes where he was going and Mr. Holmes said, "Go down, talk your head off freely. No one will pay any attention to what you say down there, but if you breathe up here the heavens may fall." This is Sunday. There isn't anyone who cares a hang what I say within 100 miles, so here goes.

The most significant bit of history in the making and in a sense the most terrifying to us is the three revolutions that are rampant in the earth. They are responsible for most of our fears and our uncertainties, but if we can become optimistic in the face of them we shall reflect a faith in the fundamental unfoldment of God's purposes for man here on earth which cannot be shattered by even the burst of an atomic bomb. These revolutions are, of course, the Russian, the Indian, and the Chinese. The rest of the world is hesitant and uncertain about the effects of these three revolutions.

Now what is the significance of the three great revolutions and why is it they produce to the thoughtful of the earth a misgiving, even an actual fear. The underlying unifying fact is that behind these revolutions is the breaking of the shackles of centuries which held men in an attitude stronger than an iron band.

Only 30 years ago the people of all Asia and nearly all of Russia in Europe were caught by a fatalistic assumption that so many of their fellowmen must starve each year and that nothing could be done about it. Then almost simultaneously Lenin, Sun Yat-sen, and Gandhi told their peoples that this was not necessary. Sun Yat-sen said if we can develop a transportation system in China starvation can be overcome, and he designed a complete change of Chinese industry based upon a nation-wide railroad distribution

system. Gandhi said if we will all work during our idle moments and produce more and in greater variety starvation will be overcome and he set the example by working at the spinning wheel even while he prayed. Lenin, harsher and more brutal, was to save his people by a revolutionary process which would crush skulls and kill, and he said, "No matter if three-quarters of mankind disappear; the important thing is that what is left should finally be incorporated in communism." He was going to save his people by the Communist revolution.

The point I would make is this. Before Gandhi, Sun Yat-sen, and Lenin three-quarters of the world was made up of small farmers who could produce only enough to feed 80 percent of their fellow men and who were resigned to the fact that 20 percent of them must starve to death each year. Then Gandhi, Sun Yat-sen, and Lenin broke the bonds of fatalism. Through work, planning, and distribution a new world was built; a world released from fatalism.

Through reading history, we have found that new ideas have been more shattering than earthquakes. Never were three ideas turned into unifying action among so many people in the world at the same time as what has occurred since Sun Yat-sen, Gandhi, and Lenin started their revolutions.

World-wide movements cannot be stopped by just being against them. You might just as well try to level the Rocky Mountains by being against them as to stop the onrush of these great revolutions merely by being against them. By this, please do not get the idea that I accept the thesis of Spengler's Decline of the West. I talked against that thesis years ago. Please do not think that I accept the thesis that the end of European civilization has come and that the onrush of Asia has hit, for I do not fear the yellow peril as Emperor Wilhelm did or as our modernists assume today. I do not even believe that the end of the 400 years of the white man spreading himself over the earth has come. And as for the break-up of Christian-Hebrew-Greek philosophy, based upon the worth of the individual and the ideal of democracy and the power of people to unite for their own good under democratic auspices in government, I do not see their end.

Foreboding as is the present, a brighter future is almost around the corner if man will but look and accept the inspiration of its promise. And what is this promise? It is this. Man today is more the master of the nature in which he lives than he ever was before. He is more capable of bringing about the suicide of the human race than he ever was before. But he is not going to do it. Man still knows little about himself. Up until the present, he has not given much thought to this. There is still not a satisfactory definition of man. Thought of individually, there have been men who seem to be almost gods. But a general mass is still a general mass. Judging from what it has done to itself mankind seems to be a great beast. While we still have not a definition of man there are many definitions that have been used throughout the ages that have implied much. Aristotle called him a political animal and Seneca thought of him as a social animal who lived by reason. Buddha thought of him as something not worth while and that the sooner the eternal element in man got rid of the body of man the better. Our own religionists have thought of him as a son of God and have dignified the greatest of all men as the Son of Man. But the mere description of us as children of God does not in reality tell much about us. We are still struggling with the question as to whether the individual is free or whether he is a victim of his environment.

Mankind goes on making the same mistakes he has always made and the judgment of man's success seems to turn on the question as to how many of his fellowmen he can or has destroyed. "Saul has killed his thousands, but David has killed his ten thousands." Just as the greatness of the state has always been its strength in time of war so the test of greatness of individual man has generally been the power he could exercise over his fellow men. In other words, the history of mankind's success has been the history of war and mastery. Now and again we have had a Washington who stands first in peace as well as in war. But the average man today does not know whether to be happy or sad that we know as much as we do of what we call atomic energy. As of today, it is a thing to fear rather than something to rejoice over. But even with that recital one need not be any more pessimistic than I have been.

Socially we do know how to make a better world if individual man had sense enough to make the right decision in regard to building a better world. We all know that we cannot have world-wide peace without some type of world-wide government. We know, too, that we cannot have world-wide government and still have complete and absolute sovereignty in each particular part of the world.

Today we feel certain that if the Russians would just reform and see things as we see them everything would be all right. And judging from what we are constantly saying and reading, all that is wrong with the Russians is one or two men—Stalin and Molotov. But it is time for us to stop and think and not live by headlines. The world had fears long before there were any Stalins, Trotskys, and Lenins. It is a long time since Cato first declared, "Carthago delenda est." And Carthage has been destroyed. But the destruction of Carthage did not bring peace to the world. And the blowing up of Russia with two or three thousand atomic bombs would not bring peace to the world. We can no more become free from fear through killing than could Cain ever free himself from the fear of guilt. The law of life which we learn from the story of Cain that the blood of his brother cried up from the earth seems to be a rule which applies quite as readily to nations as to individuals. Cain thought he was going to be free if he got rid of Abel. He did free himself of Abel but he took on the fear of all mankind.

In one of the executive sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee, when Mr. Hoffman was being considered for Director of the European Recovery Program, someone remarked that even America could not stand a defeat. I asked, Can she stand another victory, because victory after world-wide war brings its obligations and uncertainties quite as much as defeat brings its misery and frustration. England has won two world wars in a generation and so has France, and Holland has remained neutral throughout two and so has Denmark. Look at them.

In the last months of the war with Japan, when I was attempting to deliver my messages to the Japanese people in such a way as to bring about a constitutional surrender in order to avoid anarchy and the type of defeat we had imposed upon Germany, one great United States Admiral said that anarchy in Japan would not matter. We brought a surrender of 4,000,000 well-armed and well-equipped soldiers who had learned how to live on the land they were occupying and who had never shot a bullet at an enemy, because by appeals to their hearts and to their minds we convinced them they were defeated and that they could surrender with honor. Had we not done this our boys would still be chasing guerillas over much of China. Still men think that it is the nature of the American people, as judged from our conduct during and after two great world wars, that while we give our whole energy toward attempting to kill our enemies, when once they are defeated we do our best to feed them. I repeat, our economy cannot afford another world-wide victory. But when I say that I do not wish to even imply that we must not have another war because it is going to be so destructive. I have no sympathy for those pleas that another war will destroy civilization.

In the history of this world civilization and war have never been separate things. Our civilization is a civilization of war. Nor do I even think we will have peace because war can be made so destructive or so costly or so terrible. We are not going to go into a period of peace from fear of the atomic bomb. If we do, someone is going to use the bomb on us.

Now, I seem to have talked myself into admitting that this thing we call man and this thing we call civilization are both pretty damnable propositions. But both can be cured by a changed attitude and by making slightly different decisions. I merely look at the history of our own country to prove that. It wasn't because Franklin said, "We had better hang together, or we will hang separately," that developed our union and instituted the American substitute of law for war and ballots for bullets. We had law and we had ballots, but still we had a Civil War. And after the cost of the Civil War and the loss of a million lives, we just decided that the whole was greater than any of its parts. After the cost of two world wars and the loss of millions of lives we have still not decided anything. I am sure that that law of physics was understood before 1865, but it had not been applied to the fundamental law of American politics. We have yet to apply it to the fundamental law of world politics.

Now the world is greater than any of its parts. The sovereignty of the people of the world is greater than the sovereignty of the people of any nation. If the individual is a thing of dignity then the individual, wherever he is found, is a thing of dignity. That does not make yellow or black men white. But if in law within one sovereignty, we consider all men and women, whether black, white, or yellow, persons and give them certain rights as persons, why cannot it be done for all persons everywhere?

Am I dreaming dreams that have never been thought of? Of course I am not. Men today are struggling for a bill of rights for all mankind. We are talking now of a school of world law. Most of the nations of the world have accepted a treaty outlawing war. These same nations, though, did not provide an enforcement agency. Men have been hanged for committing war crimes against humanity so there is a new type of law in the world. Whether it lasts remains to be seen. That law was not just international law. The courts that imposed it were not merely international courts. The men who were hanged were not hanged by the order of one nation or a group of nations. The court seemed to represent the outraged justice of mankind. A sovereignty of the people of the whole world seemed to be speaking.

When God asked Cain, "Where is thy brother?" and Cain answered, "Am I my brother's keeper?" God did not say "yes" and he did not say "no." Neither answer would have been correct. But he did say, for what you have done you are not worthy of living with your fellowmen and therefore I will put a mark on you. Conscious of becoming a vagabond wherever he went, Cain protested that this was more than he could bear and told the Lord that those who sought him would kill him. But the Lord laid down the great rule that the crime against Abel was a crime against society and put a mark on Cain so that people would not slay him. Thus was established not only the great rule in law that society and not individuals should

punish the wrongdoer but also the great rule of life that vengeance belongs to no man and therefore to no nation. Leave punishments against society to society to rectify and society will rectify such punishments if it will but follow the rule laid down by Jefferson where he said he recognized but one law of morals for both men and nations. If nations would accept the theory of moral law for states, the world would be a changed world almost overnight. Yet the acceptance of such a rule is today such a little thing, comparatively speaking, after the struggle for it for so many years.

The killing of Abel was not just an offense against Abel, but was an offense against all men, and from that day until the present murder has been an offense against the state. Is there not such a thing as an offense against humanity? Cannot war be made an offense against all mankind? When once the consciousness of the sovereignty of all men is recognized the judgment can be enforced.

It doesn't hurt us in America to realize that we are subject to many jurisdictions. In a sense, therefore, all of us in America have a plurality of citizenship and our Constitution says that we do, for all men born in the United States or under its jurisdiction are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No one denies the sovereignty of the State of Utah and the sovereignty of the United States. And no one yet has questioned the right of the outraged nations of the earth to pass judgment on the men who have been hung because they waged war against humanity. Can we not take the next step? We can and it has been proved by the growth of the Federal system in the United States. We can take all of the steps without marring in any way life within the States or within the Nation. Life within the United States is almost as complex as life throughout the civilized world when we analyze that life, person by person wherever we see those persons. Thus when man once becomes thoughtful of himself, his nature, and exactly what he is in this world, something he has not yet seriously done, and when he makes decisions as a result of the discoveries about himself, I have no fear for the future. As we discover what man is we will learn to appreciate his individuality, but we will find that that individuality only becomes important as it develops a social conscience. Man in society is an individual of dignity only when he is moved and controlled by a social conscience.

We have now delved into our physical surroundings. We can blow mankind to smithereens. We have photographed this earth we live on from 100 miles up in the sky and we discovered that when we get even that little distance away that not even a single thing man has built upon this earth is visible or recognizable. The camera that took the picture of our globe from 100 miles out was able to get within its focus 200,000 square miles. We used to say that the Chinese wall was the only thing on the earth made by man which is discernible from Mars, but that occurred before we took this 100-mile-up photograph. In other words, when you get 100 miles away from this earth all that man is and all that he has done is not discernible, but that which can be seen is not life in its fullest. We know that that which man has done is important in his life and in his history. Imperfect as we have pictured man, he who lives by faith and he who accepts the philosophy that there is a purpose behind nature and a reason for things knows that the day will come when judgments and decisions will be made so that justice in the big will be recognized, that the bond which we call religion which ties every man to the past and to the future will in time make all those men persons who can live in the past and project themselves into the future to such an extent that their decisions will be based not upon the reason of their own individual experience, nor based upon the reason of their own national experience, but based upon the reason of man's eternal experience. Man thus discovered will make decisions which will in reality prove him to be partners with God in working out the eternal purposes. That day will come. It may be closer than we think. Its spirit is here. Its actuality may not be apparent. The way to its realization is in the world. Whether man will tread that path or not remains to be seen.

New Year's Message by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the former eloquent and beloved Chaplain of the Senate, writes a column for the Washington Sunday Star. His column for Sunday, January 2, was particularly challenging, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDANCE—AND YOUR LEVEL BEST

A NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE ON PERSONAL ENDEAVOR PLUS DIVINE HELP IN MEETING LIFE'S PROBLEMS

(By Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

With democracy throughout this seething planet being tested in a fiery furnace seven times hotter than ever before, this first week of 1949 will witness solemn scenes enacted under the white dome of the Nation's Capitol. Newly elected Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives will take the oath to defend and preserve the Constitution of the United States of America. In this desperate and dangerous day that instrument of government is the chief bulwark against ruthless tyranny masquerading in the garments of democracy.

Not only in Washington, but in the capitals of various States and in county seats across the Nation, executive, legislative, and judicial leaders will assume the duties of public office. Among those who, at the convening of the Senate, will stand with uplifted hand to take the oath of office, will be one already tried and tested as a worthy servant of his State and of the Republic. This Senator-elect replying to a letter of congratulation from a friend penned words more golden than gold. Here they are, on this first Sunday of January, offered as suggesting an all-inclusive New Year's resolution to readers of this column: "I am indeed humble when I realize the weight of responsibility that comes with the office to which I have been elected. It frightens me when I realize how difficult it is going to be to justify even a small part of the belief that these wonderful friends have in me. All I can say is that with guidance I shall do my level best to justify their faith."

Any sensitive and contrite heart, greeting the new, unknown year, solemnized by its challenge, will face its 365 new chances with the consciousness which Daniel Webster declared was the greatest thought which ever entered his mind—"Personal responsibility to Almighty God." In the white light of that revealing conception, with all other voices hushed save that of conscience, what more appropriate New Year's dedication could be conceived or coined than this, "I resolve to seek guidance and to do my level best, in every circumstance and relationship"?

Now, guidance is never forced upon any man. It diligently must be sought. As Dean Inge keenly observes, "If we spend 16 hours daily of our waking life in thinking about the affairs of the world and about 5 minutes in thinking about God, it is quite natural and inevitable that the world will appear more than 200 times more real than God." But if any man, lacking wisdom, ask of God, and if the kindly light illuminating the next step is followed patiently and humbly and selflessly, the sincere pilgrim shall be led on, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent, to the desired haven. The formula always is guidance and one's level best.

Depending on guidance alone is never a substitute for our own utmost effort. Once when the famous evangelist Dwight L. Moody joined a circle of farmers seeking for guidance with regard to what they ought to do about their church debt, he was asked to offer prayer. Knowing that these well-to-do farmers had the ample wherewithal to easily answer their own prayers, Mr. Moody blurted out: "I wouldn't bother God about this mortgage, if I were you; I'd just pay it." And they did.

God takes over when we are at wit's end: That is, man's extremity is God's opportunity. That does not mean that wit's end is the only place we meet God or need Him. We need Him when, in crucial or humdrum tasks, we are just doing our best. When one of the most celebrated of surgeons had been invited to operate before a distinguished group of fellow surgeons he was asked afterward how he could possibly work with such a crowd around him. "Well," he said, "it is like this. There are just three people in the theater when I operate—the patient and myself." "Three," said his friend, "but that is only two. Who is the other?" And the surgeon answered, "God."

It is lamentable that a man should go on working year in and year out and never see the thing he toils at with the light of the Divine upon it. That light touching into glory even the commonest toil and the trivial round gives for every task a strength that does not bend or break, even in a crisis. It gives the kind of stamina that cannot be bowled over by calamity. It gives the kind of faith that falters not, though pressed by every foe. It gives the kind of purity of heart that sees God and the Godlike everywhere.

This is the only way to true greatness: The humble acceptance of responsibilities, not dodging them but grappling them; trusting God and doing our best, and then, at last, greeting the unseen with a cheer.

Guidance—and our level best, this is a combination which will solve every problem, surmount every obstacle, dissolve every doubt and, in all the give-and-take of life, bring beauty for ashes. Our best is the pavement over which God hastens to our help.

Guidance—and his level best, that was ever Robert Browning's secret. And so he sings:

"Be sure that God
Ne'er dooms to waste the strength he deigns impart.
I see my way as birds their trackless way.
I shall arrive—what time, what circuit first,
I ask not; * * *
In some time, His good time, I shall arrive:
He guides me and the bird. In His good time."

A Good Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL J. WELCH
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WELCH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of January 6, 1949:

A GOOD MESSAGE

A chastened opposition, a contrite press struck its collective breast when the miracle man did it November 2. To the consternation of the critics of the administration and in the face of contradictory predictions by poll and press, the man from Missouri confounded his opponents. He was elected to the White House in his own right, when just a few short weeks before, for instance, when he addressed a one-third filled auditorium in Omaha, nobody gave him a chance.

Yesterday Harry S. Truman gave his constitutionally required address to the Congress on the state of the Union.

Let the Nation, let the opposition, let the press, consider that address in the same spirit the press had when it saw the returns from the general election.

The message was a good one. It was what should have been expected. It was conservative, exceedingly so, in view of what one or more radio commentators have been telling us he would deliver. The best reaction to a Presidential message is in that mercurial and temperamental institution, the stock market. Yesterday, after that speech, the stock market went up. Business reaction was not unfavorable.

The President went strong; yes. What else did we expect after the promises he made in that campaign? For our part we admire him for sticking to his guns. His request for repeal of Taft-Hartley was softened by asking for safeguards against labor recklessness. His request for national health insurance did not include all the far-reaching socialized medicine eccentricities our medical friends have been crying against.

Corporation taxes always are abominable to corporations, but all taxes are offensive. No matter in what direction the President hit in talking on taxes he would be criticized. Let us wait and see what will happen.

The President's speech represents the wishes of a man who amazed the Nation by his election. True, he is not a majority President. Half a million more people voted against Mr. Truman than voted for him. But do not harp on that. That half million, for the most part, represented voters whose ideology—thinking now of the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule—is faulty. In view of the Red-Wallace defection and the anti-civil-rights southern defection, Mr. Truman can be proud he is a minority President.

Therefore, for all practical purposes, let us heed and pay respect to the word of Harry S. Truman, the humble Missourian, as if he carried a mandate from a large majority over all his opponents.

There will be criticism that Mr. Truman asked for too much. Turn back history's pages. That snappy March day in 1905 when Theodore Roosevelt addressed the Congress on the state of the Union after his first election in his own right, the reactionaries cried to heaven. T. R. shook the ground from under the feet of the Aldriches and the Cannons and their plutocratic company. Other Presidential messages could be cited. Presidents ask for much, but they learn—especially when they are on their final term and need cajole no lunatic fringe—to veer to the right.

After those long and harrowing years of Franklin Roosevelt, we accept the Missourian's message with complacency. We cannot concur with everything he recommends to the Congress. But the speech lacked wild-eyed recklessness or slipshod inaccuracies that have at times marked his predecessors. On the whole we of Missouri are prouder of our President today than we have been at any time since he astounded a nation that thought he had been buried in oblivion.

Let us hope for what Mr. Truman asked—understanding and cooperation between the White House and the Congress. Neither can get its own way in everything, but this Nation has become great by compromise.

The state of the Union speech of President Truman January 5, 1949, will rank high above the husting speeches of Candidate Truman last summer and fall.

European Countries With Free Economic System Make Greatest Postwar Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, a lifelong and sympathetic student of events in Europe. It reports the hard fact that European socialism is not working out according to the predictions of its advocates. At a time when there is so much sentiment in this country for moving toward more and more Government controls over our economic life, surely it is the part of wisdom to examine carefully what actually happens under such a system. Let us at least look before we leap.

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WITH FREE ECONOMIC SYSTEM MAKE GREATEST POSTWAR PROGRESS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

WASHINGTON.—Over in Europe more and more people agree with American Ambassador Lewis Douglas: "Only rich countries can afford socialism and only poor countries adopt it."

Back here at home, in the midst of a universal luxury beside which most of Europe still looks shabby, I am amazed at the number of people who consider planned economy to represent economic progress. For the European experience seems to show just the opposite.

Now first of all a parenthesis: I am not opposed to planned economy—in principle. If it can demonstrate its ability to provide a richer spiritual and material life—more freedom and more goods—I shall embrace it wholeheartedly.

The fact is that in Europe, where during the last 3 years it has in varying degrees been tried, it has produced less freedom and fewer goods.

THE EXAMPLE OF ENGLAND

Last September I sat with a Dutch economist at a cafe in the city of Luxemburg. With a wide gesture he embraced the entire prosperous country. "It's wonderful," he said, "what economic freedom can do for a country."

"Tell me," I urged, "what countries in Europe now enjoy the highest standard of living in comparison to prewar?"

He smiled. "That's easy. Belgium, with Luxemburg, and Switzerland."

"And the lowest?" I asked.

"England."

"Largely owing to the loss of income from overseas investments, I suppose?"

He looked at me quizzically. "Nonsense. How you say in America—nuts! Britain's income from overseas investments was, in 1946, only £55,000,000 smaller than in 1938. Just over £1 a head. Would that account for the catastrophic fall in Britain's living standard?"

"But one-third of the English people are living better than they did before the war."

"Yes. And two-thirds are living worse."

THE CASE OF BELGIUM

"But the poorest are being taken care of. Isn't it true that in Belgium the apparently high standard is being maintained at the expense of the workers?'

"It is not true. You want the facts? I'll give you the facts. In 1938 wages and salaries in Belgium represented about 48 percent of the national income and profits 22 percent. In 1947 wages and salaries had risen to nearly 54 percent while profits had sunk to just over 10 percent. Does that look like exploitation of labor?"

"No," I admitted. "Does the same thing hold for Switzerland?"

"I haven't got the Swiss figures. I know that certain types of skilled labor in Switzerland receive salaries almost on an American level. I know that the relations between labor and capital have never been so good."

"And you attribute this Belgian and Swiss prosperity to reliance upon classical economics and capitalism?"

EXAMPLES OF FRANCE AND ITALY

"Principally, yes. And I'll tell you more: The Socialist and Catholic Parties in Belgium owe their continued popularity to the fact they insisted upon a sound financial and economic policy at the time of liberation. In France, where they went in for planning under the direct influence of the Communists, they have both dwindled to the place where De Gaulle may almost wipe them out at the next election. In Italy it would be the same except that the Italians have not produced a De Gaulle and therefore have to count upon the Catholics to save them from Moscow."

I thought hard. "You tell an unusual story. If you were an American, just what would you do to hasten European rehabilitation?"

"That's easy. I would induce the European governments to take off all exchange control and let every single currency find its own level. Then the peoples would know whether they are or are not living above their means. If so, they would correct their spending—unless, of course, you Americans intend to run a permanent orphan asylum for European allies."

"I doubt that," I answered. "But would such action not cut the European countries off from precisely those American products which they need in order to recover?"

The Dutch economist hesitated. "In my judgment, it would not. It would compel every European government to put its disordered house in order and cut subsidies, import controls, and the like. Once this were done, each country could get what it needed from you on private credit, if necessary guaranteed under the Marshall plan by your Government. Believe me, by 1952 Europe would be much further along than it is going to be if the present socialistic experiments continue."

"You seem to have very positive views about the failure of socialism," I countered.

He smiled, "I ought to. I used to be a Socialist myself."

Decision of Supreme Court on Closed Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very illuminating editorial in the January 5, 1949, edition of the Milwaukee Journal. This editorial relates to the Supreme Court's recent decision upholding the right of States to ban closed shops if they choose.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES CAN BAN CLOSED SHOPS

The United States Supreme Court has unanimously held that States may ban the closed shop, if they choose.

The decision, written by Justice Black, says that the "States have power to legislate against what are found to be injurious practices in their internal commercial and business affairs, so long as their laws do not run afoul some specific constitutional prohibition, or some valid Federal law."

At present the Taft-Hartley law specifically bans the closed shop and regulates terms of establishing a union shop—whatever State laws say, or don't say, about these matters. If the Taft-Hartley ban on closed shops should be repealed, however, then the State bans would still be effective, according to this decision.

The Supreme Court decision is important, also, because it provides a simple approach to the closed-shop problem in States that choose to ban them. The NLRB procedure is slow and cumbersome; the NLRB is overloaded. Enforcement of the closed-shop ban under the Taft-Hartley act is not simple.

Under State laws, however, it is merely necessary to bring a suit and the suit is tried. Relief, or enforcement, is relatively simple to obtain.

Twelve States now ban closed shops. Wisconsin does not. It is among the States that regulate conditions under which a union shop, and, by implication, a closed shop, may be established.

The Court holds that if a State can prevent discrimination against union labor, it can also prevent discrimination against nonunion labor; if it can protect the rights of members of unions, it can protect the rights of nonmembers. The decision says:

"There was a period in which labor union members who wanted to get and hold jobs were the victims of widespread employer discrimination practices. Contracts between employers and their employees were used by employers to accomplish this antiunion employment discrimination. Before hiring workers, employers required them to sign agreements stating that the workers were not and would not become labor union members. Such antiunion practices were so obnoxious to workers that they gave these required agreements the name of 'yellow dog contracts.' This hostility of workers also prompted passage of State and Federal laws to ban employer discrimination against union members and to outlaw yellow dog contracts."

The court drives its point home by saying that just as it has held that States may protect the rights of union members, "we now hold that legislative protection can be afforded nonunion workers."

In this instance, at least, the Supreme Court is enunciating a principle too long neglected—especially in the days of the Wagner Act and the old biased NLRB. That principle is that the Constitution and the laws should protect all the people, regardless of color, religion, political belief—or even membership or nonmembership in labor unions.

Our Free Press Asks No Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Free Press Asks No Subsidy," published in the Worcester, Mass., Sunday Telegram of December 19, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FREE PRESS ASKS NO SUBSIDY

Certain do-gooders, and those who know a lot about nothing, are preparing for their regular romp at the expense of the American press in attacking what they call a subsidy in the form of low second-class mail rates.

The occasion is Postmaster General Donaldson's recent announcement that he will ask Congress to increase all postal rates, except first class, to offset part of an estimated $550,000,000 deficit. Only first-class mail, Mr. Donaldson said, pays its way. He estimated the second-class deficit at $207,000,000, the third class at $129,000,000, and fourth class at $85,000,000.

To the general public, burdened by high governmental costs, these deficit figures may sound alarming. To understand these recurrent fusses about postal deficits and rates, and to see through the propaganda smoke that inevitably rises, it is, however, necessary to take a close look at Post Office Department operations. It is important to know the basis of the historical development of the postal routes as a public service, begun in Colonial times to build a nation. The public should recognize just what these various mail classifications are, and who really does benefit from the postal rates.

It may be said immediately that the idea that the American newspapers of this modern age benefit greatly from any so-called second-class rate subsidy is a myth. It is part and parcel with the do-gooders' legend that advertisers control the press. The early era when daily newspapers used the mails extensively has long since gone. Mail service is too slow for the daily today.

The Worcester Telegram, the Sunday Telegram, and the Evening Gazette, to be specific, do have the second-class mailing privilege. These newspapers, because they are published regularly by an accredited publisher to disseminate information to a list of subscribers, are delivered free in county areas where there is no letter-carrier service—in actuality, very few these days. Where there is a carrier service in the county, the charge is 1 cent a copy. Outside the county, rates are determined by zones and by the proportionate amounts of space the publisher gives to news and advertising in his publication.

Second-class postal rates represent only an infinitesimal fraction of the cost of delivering your Telegram and Gazette. These daily newspapers, like most modern ones, are rushed within minutes after they come from the press by a fleet of trucks carrying them to distributors. They are, for the most part, home delivered by carrier boys. Only a very few copies are sent by mail.

There is certainly no subsidy here for these newspapers. Indeed, it is immaterial to the publisher of the Telegram and Gazette whether second-class rates are raised or not. In fact, he believes they should be.

Cranston Williams, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, says he has not talked with a single publisher, large or small, who wants any kind of a subsidy from the Post Office Department or anyone else. Subsidies are repulsive to American newspaper publishers, who know well enough the danger to a free press inherent in them. The venal French press of prewar years resulted largely from governmental subsidies.

Magazines weighing considerably more than newspapers and circulated largely by mail to points across the Nation are, of course, the main cause of whatever deficit may exist in second class. This was emphasized by the Postmaster General. He said the major part of any increase in rates should be borne by the magazines because it is far more costly to handle magazines than newspapers.

This whole issue is of major importance to the general public. The question far transcends the importance of the relatively few dollars any increase in second-class rates would cost newspaper publishers. It poses the interesting question whether the Post Office Department is to serve the public or not in the sense that other Government agencies do.

For just why should the Post Office Department make a profit anyway? Just why should the Post Office Department even meet expenses? There is an annual hullabaloo over the postal deficit, with rising demands from officials and some others that rates must be raised—a bill, incidentally, that would add millions to the cost of living. Yet no one expects the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Forestry Service, the Interior Department or the Labor Department to pay their own way. These, and the myriad of other Washington agencies, furnish a public service paid for out of the general treasury—from taxes. Just why, then, should so much point be made of an occasional deficit in the Post Office?

Postal service was established historically in this country as a necessary public service. The early Colonists quickly saw the urgency of establishing communication if the wilderness was to be conquered, and a nation developed. Highways were pushed to open up the frontiers. In 1639 the General Court of Massachusetts first asked for the start of a formal postal service. In 1692 Thomas Neale was granted a patent by the Crown to establish post offices in the young Colonies. An era of pamphleteers. Independence. The Constitution. The encouragement of small newspapers to carry news to the people. The act of 1792—the first after adoption of the Constitution—recognized letters, packets, and newspapers as mail matter. Magazines and pamphlets were recognized in 1799, circulars and handbills in 1845, and books in 1851. It was the intent through the years to encourage newspaper and magazine distribution through the mails for the good of the country. The pound rate for second class was established in 1874; the present system of four classes was set up in 1879.

If it is granted that larger expenditures do justify some increase in postal rates—and this may be argued, as we have said—these newspapers support increases in the second- and third-class categories only. Third-class mail includes circulars, catalogs, manuscripts, drawings, photographs, merchandise, seeds, plants, and hotel keys.

These newspapers oppose any increase in the fourth-class rate. This is the familiar parcel post, which takes mailable matter exceeding 8 ounces and not exceeding 70 pounds in weight. This service is one of the cornerstones of our domestic economy, enabling merchants, manufacturers, and individuals to ship packages quickly and at reasonable rates. To increase these charges would place too great a burden on the public. On first-class mail, the sending of ordinary letters, there has been no suggestion of a rate increase.

Economy, as in all departments, should be the watchword of the postal service. Its free services contribute greatly to its over-all deficit. In 1946, for instance, it handled 2,000,000,000 pieces of mail free of charge for the Government. This included some 18,000,000 pieces of registered mail sent by Government agencies. The handling of savings bond sales, documentary stamps, civil-service exam notifications, and migratory-bird stamps contribute to the deficit. The Department's bookkeeping system is the one established in 1836, and there is no real basis for ascertaining costs against any particular class of mail, anyway.

We and other newspapers, recognize these problems. We object, however, to this annual habit of making the American press the goat for a propaganda barrage that the postal rates for mailing newspapers are responsible for a big deficit. The press wants no subsidy; actually, in fact, it hasn't any now.

How Can We Aid China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement made over the Mutual Network News Round-up on December 28, 1948:

Question. What can we do immediately to aid China?

Mr. JUDD. The first essential is to determine our objectives. If it still is important from the standpoint of the security of the United States, as it was in 1941, that China remain independent and friendly to ourselves, and that the spread of Communist totalitarian rule in Asia be checked, then the first thing is to say so frankly. More than anything else the Chinese—exhausted from 11 years of war and invasion, discouraged because of betrayals by their allies—need moral support, the same sort of support we have given to the Italians, Turks, and others in Europe engaged in an exactly similar fight to prevent being taken over by Communists and made Soviet satellites.

Second, is military aid to enable the Chinese to hold the Yangtze River line—one of the best natural barriers in the world; or, if it should prove too late to hold that, then the strong natural line through the mountains dividing south China from central China.

Military aid means munitions, including light field equipment for guerrilla warfare and ammunition for the heavier American equipment supplied to China during the war against Japan. It also includes a top-flight American military spark plug in China with adequate staff to train and advise the Chinese armed forces at all levels—and in strategy, tactics, and operations. Without such American advisory personnel—not combat troops—the aid cannot be successful. China doesn't have a single military leader with adequate training or experience to handle more than one army in the field—or even on the maps. The military men we have had there since the last war have been forbidden by directive from Washington to participate in actual planning of operations—although they have been permitted to do so in other countries. Munitions without such advice and assistance in their use cannot succeed; just as advice without munitions cannot succeed.

Only if we are prepared to give such moral and military aid is there justification for economic and financial aid to help stabilize the Chinese currency and get their productive enterprise going again south of the Yangtze—factories, coal mines, power plants, and so on.

We who have lived in China and built institutions there in the past know that if well handled in terms of ancient Chinese customs and practices you can get as much for your dollar there as in any other foreign country. That fact has recently been demonstrated afresh. UNRRA was loaded with theorists who refused to make adequate use of persons experienced in China. It became a scandal. But even governments learn, and the sound practices adopted by our post-UNRRA relief mission in China and Paul Hoffman's men carrying out the relief aspects of the present program there, have already dispensed millions of dollars' worth of goods without criticism from either Chinese or American sources.

The key essential in China as elsewhere is the will to win. Until our administration decides it is imperative for our own interests to keep Asia free and on our side, nothing will avail. If it does so decide, before too much longer, then at least the southern half of China can be retrieved, and our position in Japan, the Philippines, and southeast Asia and Alaska—as well as in Europe and the Middle East—be greatly eased.

Almost all our top military and naval people agree with this view. The outcome depends on whether it will be accepted in time by the policy makers in our State Department.

Dave Shapiro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, in these frenzied times, when so much emphasis is being properly placed on youthful delinquency, it is extremely gratifying to find an occasion when emphasis may properly be placed upon youthful integrity and fortitude.

I am prompted in this thought by newspaper accounts of the highly laudable action of young Dave Shapiro, of the George Washington University basketball team, in reporting to the authorities the vicious gamblers who sought to corrupt him for their greedy benefit. His course of action is most commendable and I am sure that the Members of this House, as lovers of clean sport, all hail him and proudly say, "Well done, Dave. You have the stuff of real manhood."

It was no easy thing this young man did. Those who tried to bribe him are evil persons to whom any crime might well mean less than selfish gain. Yet he unhesitatingly placed his own well-being in jeopardy in order to defend the good name of the game he loved—to protect the cause of clean sport everywhere.

I offer you Dave Shapiro as an examplar of clean, young American manhood—living testimony as to what American youth may and should be. I recommend him as a splendid example for youth, teen-agers and all-agers, to earnestly strive to emulate.

Zionist Memorandum on British Role in War Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement was issued, the developments over Hillel Silver, head of the Zionist Emergency Council, dealing with the Palestine situation. Even since the statement was issued the developments over the week end have pointed up in very telling fashion the implications of the analysis which Dr. Silver has made, and which I trust are going to result in our State Department and those responsible for our foreign policy giving the most urgent consideration to what seems to be a most threatening and menacing affair.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIONIST MEMORANDUM ON BRITISH ROLE IN WAR AGAINST ISRAEL CHARGES BRITISH GOVERNMENT IS ACTIVE ALLY OF ARAB STATES—BRITISH THREAT OF UNILATERAL ACTION IN SUPPORT OF EGYPT IS DESIGNED TO INDUCE UNITED STATES INTO JOINING SANCTIONS MOVE AGAINST ISRAEL, ZIONIST COUNCIL DECLARES

The American Zionist Emergency Council today released the text of a memorandum charging that "the most recent actions of Great Britain with regard to Israel have established conclusively that the British Government is in fact an active ally of the Arab states in their war against Israel." The council is headed by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman, and represents all Zionist organizations in the United States.

The memorandum, which is being submitted to Members of Congress and other leaders of American public opinion, assails the British Government's threat of unilateral action in support of Egyptian warfare with Israel and declares: "Great Britain obviously hopes to induce the United States into joining a renewed British attempt to bring about the imposition of sanctions against Israel by the Security Council, and in order to achieve this, Britain warns that if she fails to bring about the international action she desires she will be 'compelled' to act unilaterally in support of Egypt."

Noting that Israeli accusations concerning British troop movements to the port of Aqaba in Transjordan have now been confirmed by British sources, the memorandum states: "Having committed itself to the support of Egyptian warfare against Israel, it would seem that the British Government is

now concerned lest peace materialize between Transjordan and Israel. If the British-officered, British-supplied, and British-financed Transjordan Arab Legion should reenter the war at any time in the future, it will be generally understood that Great Britain alone will be responsible."

Declaring that "at this time the American Government and people would profit from a review of the British record in the war against Israel," the memorandum presents a six-point outline of that record, as follows:

"1. Immediately after the adoption of the partition resolution by the United Nations General Assembly on November 29, 1947, the British authorities in Palestine systematically and deliberately opened the frontiers of that country to armed Arab bands entering for the express purpose of engaging in a military struggle with the Jews in order to upset the decision of the United Nations by force of arms. At the same time, British representatives in Arab countries incited and encouraged the Arab States to greater efforts against the Jews and the United Nations resolution.

"2. Britain also actively participated in this aggression by supplying the Arab States with financial aid, by creating a stock pile of war supplies and equipment for the Arabs, by providing officers and administrative help to the invaders. Simultaneously, Britain made every effort to prevent the Jews from arming for their own defense.

"3. When—despite all of these British maneuvers—the Arab attacks did not succeed in overcoming Jewish resistance and the State of Israel was proclaimed on May 14, 1948, Great Britain encouraged the Arab governments to launch full-scale military invasions of Palestine with the declared aim of overrunning and subjugating Israel. The attack was led by the Transjordan Arab Legion, a military force completely equipped, financed, and officered by Great Britain.

"4. In the early days of the war, when the invaders were on the move, Great Britain did nothing to bring hostilities to a halt but, on the contrary, maneuvered ceaselessly in the Security Council to keep the Arab States from being punished as aggressors. At that time Great Britain saw no violation of the United Nations Charter, although the action of the Arab States in invading Palestine was explicitly denounced as international aggression by United States Delegate Warren Austin (May 22, 1948). Then the British worked indefatigably to induce the Security Council to refrain from taking the action which was clearly indicated.

"5. However, when the tide turned and the Israeli Army turned back the aggressors, there were immediate British moves for truces, Israeli troop withdrawals, and, finally, the bitterest irony, sanctions against Israel for successfully defending its own territory.

"6. Now that Israel has inflicted a series of decisive defeats on the Arab armies and has, in the course of one military engagement, attacked legitimate military objectives on Egyptian soil, Great Britain threatens unilateral military action against the Jewish state."

Pointing out that the United Nations truce is being used by Egypt as a mere device to continue in occupation of territory outside the national boundaries of Egypt, the memorandum states: "In the circumstances, the Israeli Government is naturally concerned with the need to eliminate the aggression within its territory and the threat to its existence. Any military action undertaken by Israeli authorities and designed to expel the Egyptian invaders from its national territory and to eliminate this threat is a lawful and necessary exercise of sovereignty and is fully consonant with the fundamental right of self-defense accorded under international law to all sovereign states and referred to in article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

"As long as the necessity for such self-defense has not passed, it would be unjust and unfair to interfere with the conduct of military operations by one party only, permitting the Egyptian forces to occupy parts of Palestine but prohibiting Israel from taking action against the bases of the enemy's attack. If this attitude were sanctioned, it would amount to nothing less than assurance to the aggressor that he may indefinitely continue his attack in the knowledge that he will never suffer a counterattack on his home grounds.

"We cannot believe that the Government of the United States or the American people would for one moment sanction so biased and unfair an approach.

"It is generally understood today, despite the distortions and misrepresentations of British propagandists, that Israel has no designs on the territory of any of its neighbors and retains but one objective in its current defense of its political and territorial integrity—peace. The prolongation of the conflict and the resulting strain on the young state's economy has created an unendurable situation for Israel and its people—a situation which cannot be further continued if Israel is to maintain itself economically. It has no alternative but to compel Egypt to negotiate peace—and this all-important fact must be considered in connection with Israeli military operations in the Negev.

"Finally, it is respectfully suggested that the Government of the United States should refuse to lend itself, either directly or indirectly, either in its diplomatic relations with the parties to the Palestine controversy or as a member of the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Palestine Conciliation Commission of the United Nations, to any attempt to restrict the freedom of Israel to eject the Egyptian invaders. Instead, it is respectfully suggested that the Government of the United States, both in its direct relations with the parties to the controversy and as a member of the United Nations, should pursue the aim of achieving an armistice and peace between Egypt and Israel on the basis of mutual respect of the respective territories of the two states."

Inaugural Housing Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the following information which I have received from the Inaugural Housing Committee.

It is good to know that people from all parts of the country are planning to come to the inauguration of President Truman on January 20. Although most of the Washington hotel rooms are reserved by now, persons may contact the Inaugural Housing Bureau, 509 Fourteenth Street NW., in the Nation's Capital, for advance reservations in private homes. Those working on the Inaugural Housing Committee are to be commended in the thorough job they are doing.

The Inaugural Housing Bureau has been busy for the past few weeks prevailing upon private householders in the Washington area to rent their rooms to out-of-town visitors. Rooms are reasonable in price, and it is important to write for reservations in advance.

Many of the events of the inauguration, as well as the many interesting sights of the Nation's Capital, can be seen either free or for a nominal sum. There are still some grandstand seats for sale for the parade, but this, too, can be seen free from the vantage point of any street along the route.

The Inaugural Committee considers the inauguration an event for all Americans, just as the election was an election for all the people in the country.

Postmaster General's Case Shows Federal Pay Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks by including an article of Jerry Kluttz that appeared in the Washington Post under date of January 9, 1949.

I commend its reading to my colleagues in the Congress.

The necessity of retaining competent executives and administrators in the Government service is axiomatic. It is just as important that we also make Government service attractive enough to retain the potential good executives and administrators who now are serving their apprenticeships in less publicized positions in Government.

POSTMASTER GENERAL'S CASE SHOWS FEDERAL PAY INJUSTICE

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Congress has permitted an accident of circumstance to do to the Federal service something it would never attempt by legislation.

You couldn't get a single Member of Congress to take seriously a bill that would limit the holding of high Government office to:

1. Men who have independent private wealth and incomes;

2. Mediocre people for whom even comparatively low Federal executive salaries are high in comparison with what they could make in private business;

3. Individuals who are willing to jump in and out of Government at personal financial sacrifice, and finally,

4. To deny executive jobs to able career people coming up through civil-service ranks because they do not have the necessary private income to afford the jobs.

Yet, a combination of inflation, high taxes, and an executive salary structure that hasn't been changed in years has brought about a situation in which this is about true.

This is a prize example of what I have in mind.

Not long ago I went in to see Jesse M. Donaldson, the Postmaster General, who is unquestionably the outstanding career man in Government. The "General" happened to be in a retrospective mood about his beloved postal service and his amazing career. But he chilled me when he said:

"I'm terribly sorry to say it, but if I had my life to live over again I wouldn't enter the postal service. The rewards, the com-

pensations, are too meager." Then he slowly added:

"I love my job, and it is a great personal satisfaction to me to hold it, but, frankly, I can barely afford to be the Postmaster General. This position requires money. I have been in the Federal service all of my working life, and I haven't had the opportunity to accumulate it."

Here's a man whose career has followed the best American traditions. He entered the postal service as a $50 a month mail messenger more than 40 years ago. He has literally worked his way up the ladder through sheer ability and merit to take over a Cabinet post that had been reserved exclusively in recent years for the chairman of the political party in power.

Donaldson's down-to-earth views on his remarkable career would be akin to a degree if something similar were said by Charles Wilson of General Electric, Louis B. Mayer of M-G-M, and Winthrop Aldrich of Chase National Bank.

But it would be a much smaller degree, as the postal service is so much larger than any private business and the responsibility on the Postmaster General is so much greater. The Post Office Department is the largest single and the most extensive business in the world, which took in $1,700,000,000 last year.

It's also the largest single employer, savings bank, real-estate owner and renter, etc.

Executives of private business a fraction the size of the postal service are paid many times more than Donaldson's $15,000 a year. And that isn't a net figure for the Postmaster General. His associates in the Department estimate he must spend around $2,500 a year out of his salary on legitimate expenses of his office, such as travel, etc.

Business long ago learned it was good business to pay its executives good salaries. The biggest business of them all—the Government—has yet to learn the lesson.

It is no exaggeration to say that Donaldson daily must make decisions involving millions of the public's dollars, but when it comes to his personal finances he must concern himself with dollars and cents. The Cabinet member is frank to say that he must use care to stretch his salary check to cover the needs of his family and to do the many things his official position requires.

Taken by itself, Donaldson's personal affairs are relatively unimportant. The issues at stake, however, are of vital concern to those of us who want an effective and efficient Government—a Government operated by the best qualified people.

The President himself is the authority for the thought-provoking statements that the inadequate executive salary scale has definitely impaired the Federal service, and that it now constitutes a serious threat to the efficiency of government. He made the statements in a letter to congressional leaders several days ago appealing for prompt approval for the bill that would raise executive salaries.

As the President also explained in his message, it is most difficult for him to attract and to hold the best qualified people. But this dangerous condition will multiply as time goes on unless Congress acts to correct it. Here's why:

The big group of able career civil servants, of which Donaldson is the leader, are sticking to their jobs out of intense and stubborn loyalty to their country and their President.

But the potential Donaldsons of 5 and 10 years hence who have been inspired by the recognition of career people to top-rank jobs are becoming discouraged and are dropping out of the Federal service. They wonder if it's worth the effort unless some measure of financial security goes with it.

Religious Persecution in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of a statement which I have sent to Milwaukeeans of Hungarian extraction joining my protest with the protests of many other men of good will against the terrible religious persecution in Hungary. I ask that following my statement there be printed the telegram which I have received from two of the leading clergymen of Hungarian extraction of my State.

There being no objection, the statement and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROTEST OVER PERSECUTION OF HUNGARIAN CHURCHMEN

(Statement by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin)

I want to add my fervent expression of protest to the sincere protests which have already come from men of good will throughout the Nation whose conscience has been outraged by the persecution of Hungarian church leaders by the Red Government in that unhappy Communist-controlled land. The arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is one more sinful indication of the ruthless determination of the Soviet Government and of its satellite puppets in trying to exterminate the spiritual leadership of the Catholic Church and indeed, of religion everywhere throughout the world.

The Soviet Government may believe that its long record of diabolic intimidation and persecution of religion has become so commonplace in the eyes of the world that we have almost become complacent and indifferent in noting these repeated Red outrages. Such a Red belief is, however, entirely wrong, because the American people and all decent people throughout the earth feel more deeply than ever before a righteous and wrathful indignation over the shocking persecution by the Red authorities.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who was arrested by the Nazis—by the Fascists of the Right—has now been imprisoned by the Communists—the Fascists of the Left. This valiant churchman will not, however, surrender to the anti-Christ principalities of evil and will not abandon his principles any more than his devoted associates and followers will abandon their adherence to God and to the concepts of their spiritual faith.

I believe that the State Department should continue to make the most vigorous representations to the Red authorities to let them know in no uncertain terms the anger and the disgust of the American people at this newest of the Red outrages against man's conscience. The American Government and the American people have always spoken frankly and freely in righteous protest against persecution of religion or of race wherever it has occurred in this so-called civilized globe. We must continue to do so and must use every means of pressure at our command to fight the godlessness manifested by the arrest of the primate of Hungary.

Americans of Hungarian descent with their rich background of love of freedom and pride in the heritage of their forefathers, are joined by all Americans of all types of backgrounds in proclaiming to the Soviet fanatics this: We will do all that is within our power in protest against the persecution of religious leaders in the land of Kossuth and elsewhere.

I understand that the Vatican radio has forthrightly rejected a Red offer to negotiate a so-called settlement of church-state differences in Hungary. It is obvious that this rejection by the Holy See is sound from the standpoint of all the peoples on earth who prize religious freedom. There can be no compromise with evil, no phony agreement with those who regard agreements as mere scraps of paper. Cardinal Mindszenty's courageous stand will be an inspiration to the members of his faith throughout the world, to all men and women of Hungarian descent, and to the men of all religious faiths.

(The telegram addressed to Mr. WILEY is as follows:)

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Americans of Hungarian extraction of the State of Wisconsin protested at mass meeting today against persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Ordass. We respectfully ask your help for intervention in these shameful persecutions.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. JULIAN FUZER.
Rev. RAYMOND DOBAY.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Not Funny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an effective editorial, Not Funny, that appeared in the December 18, 1948, issue of the Pilot, the officials news organ of the Archdiocese of Boston:

NOT FUNNY

The Pilot has had occasion many times to point out that a great deal of material available for sale on newsstands is of a decidedly unhealthy nature. In several sections of our country there have been organized recently drives to remedy this situation by persuading news dealers to refuse unseemly publications and not to present them for sale at all. Mothers of families, especially, have been happy to join in a crusade of this sort because they look upon it as a requirement of our times for the protection of their children. There are for example, many comic books published for children which treat in a graphic manner the most atrocious crimes that can be imagined by lewd and unprincipled authors. As the children grow into young manhood and womanhood they are urged to improve their taste by buying the various assortments of lurid confessions and love tales. There is, it seems, an appeal for every age and the more impressionable the better.

This has been a national scandal about which all thinking citizens have long been

anxious. There has recently come to us evidence that it is now about to become an international scandal.

It is now suggested that with funds guaranteed by the Economic Cooperation Act we should make available to the German people these products of the least worthy section of American life. No one will quarrel with the idea that we should send to Germany, or anywhere, journals of lasting interest and significance. Thus scientific, literary, religious, or news magazines will readily find a place on such a list. It is however, preposterous that we should export as an American product a commodity that is at home a national shame. It is, at least incongruous that we who are pretending to educate against crime should export the most lurid descriptions of all kinds of gross conduct. Let us share by all means with all peoples the enlightenment with which, under God, America has been blessed but let us not pretend that matters which at home provide a worry for those preoccupied with the care of youth are in any way suitable for export.

The family and most especially the child in it, is of prime importance in confirming the vigor of our own Nation and rebuilding the lost strength of other nations. Whatever title may be given to the expression of attacks on this basic unit, they definitely are not funny.

The Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of editorials on the question of the bipartisan foreign policy, and the undermining of that bipartisan foreign policy by a change in the ratio on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer of January 6, 1948]

ONE-WAY BIPARTISANSHIP

The picayune politics which entered into the composition of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the new Senate provides ample cause for alarm about the future of the bipartisan foreign policy.

When the Republicans controlled the Senate, they took seven places on the committee, leaving the Democrats six, as an illustration of the common determination that foreign policy would not be subject to partisan wrangles. Most of the committee votes on major questions were unanimous.

Now the Democrats have changed all that. They took eight places, and gave the Republicans five. Senator VANDENBERG, former chairman of the committee, rightly objects.

The explanation of Vice-President-elect BARKLEY that the eight places were allotted Democrats to work out certain problems in that party is alarming in itself. If one of the elements of bipartisanship is to be junked to satisfy demands of a few Senators for prestige, what assurance is there that the bipartisan approach itself won't be discarded on equally frivolous grounds?

Bipartisanship in foreign policy means just what the word says. It's not one thing when the Republicans are in control, another when the Democrats have a majority. It will be maintained with a little more difficulty because of this sample of petty partisanship.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 7, 1949]

SMASHING A SYMBOL

There was a drop of anger and an ocean of anguish in what Senators VANDENBERG, MORSE, and SMITH had to say Wednesday about the change of party ratio in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What had been a 7-to-6 division in the Eightieth Congress was altered to an 8-to-5 spread. And there was more than a little wind in Senator BARKLEY's explanation of why it was done. The steering committee's right to make this change cannot be questioned, but the decision to do it has most disturbing connotations for the bipartisan approach to foreign policy.

A party division as nearly equal as possible in the Foreign Relations Committee is not, of course, a cornerstone or even a necessity of bipartisanship. Conceivably a completely lopsided committee could function in bipartisan fashion. And, conversely, the most equal committee division guarantees nothing unless the administration, too, is dedicated to real bipartisanship. But the 7-to-6 division of the Foreign Relations Committee in the last session was assuredly a symbol of bipartisanship. And the unnecessary departure from that symbol in the present Congress inevitably appears to have its own symbolism. The dismal implications of this change stand out all the more sharply because the steering committee at the same time altered the party ratio on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in exactly the opposite way.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy, a longtime goal in the United States, achieved its closest approximation to reality during the past 2 years under Republican control of Congress. We see no compelling reason why the new Democratic majority should have abandoned even the forms of that achievement. In our opinion, the Democratic steering committee has called a misplay, the consequences of which will be impossible to repair unless the decision is immediately reversed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of January 7, 1949]

STATE OF THE NATION

BYPASSING BIPARTISANSHIP

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Fortunately, Senator VANDENBERG is big enough not to let the administration's finagling with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee impair his support of bipartisan foreign policy.

The offense of putting an 8-to-5 Democratic majority on the committee is not horrendous. It is a partisan action which easily can be exaggerated. But after that much has been said there is no escaping the fact that it is at once unfair, unwise, and unnecessary.

It is unfair because the 8-to-5 party ratio shows the administration giving the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a larger partisan majority than six other Senate committees. Here is the committee above all committees which should be treated bipartisanly, yet the administration has cut from it more Republicans and added to it more Democrats than it has to Armed Services, Executive Expenditures, Finance, Interior, Labor, and Senate Rules Committees.

The action is unwise because it is an evident—though perhaps not an intended—affront to Senator VANDENBERG, whose initiative, prestige, and freedom from partisanship steered all of President Truman's foreign policies through the Republican Eightieth Congress. What wisdom can there be in undercutting Senator VANDENBERG's influence in his own party at a time when he can do more than any single administration figure to keep Congress and the White House at one on the vital foreign-affairs decisions which soon will be coming up?

It is unnecessary because the record of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the past 2 years proves that there is no need whatsoever for the administration to give this committee a larger Democratic majority than it has given six other Senate committees. What reason is there to think that the Democratic majority needs eight Democrats to get what it wants out of the Foreign Relations Committee but needs only six Democrats to get what it wants out of the Labor Committee?

And what is the record of the Foreign Relations Committee during the 2-year chairmanship of Senator VANDENBERG?

Over this extended and critical period the committee has acted upon 47 important matters—and every action was by unanimous vote. Week in and week out, the committee stood 13 to 0 on every vital issue. On the committee then were seven Republicans and six Democrats. Now the administration cuts off two Republican members from a committee which, under the most effective bipartisan leadership conceivable, has been its perpetual and total ally.

No wonder the administration's most valuable Republican supporter in bipartisan foreign policy, Senator VANDENBERG, is a little annoyed, quite a little concerned. He says that the new partisan ratio carries the implication to the country that the administration does not consider the Republican Senators quite trustworthy. Has President Truman ever had a Democratic committee in a Democratic Congress which ever gave him unanimous backing on even one thing, let alone on everything?

Senator VANDENBERG is careful to make clear that this single action is relatively insignificant in itself. He hopes it is not and warns that it cannot safely be an omen for the future, because, as he says, "we are still in the grip of those times * * * when in respect to foreign relations we must think of our country first and our party second."

In reducing the Republican membership to five instead of six, the administration denies a post on it to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. In consequence, the committee will have no west-coast representation of any kind.

Senator BARKLEY, in answer, gave the Senate the best that could be said on the other side. He avowed that the administration acted without partisan thought. That is a welcome assurance, and it can be accepted in good faith. The administration leaders were subjected to great pressure of competition for seats on the Foreign Relations Committee, and yielded to it. That is the explanation—and not a very good one.

Obviously, it doesn't make sense to have a larger one-party representation on the most bipartisan committee dealing with the most nonpartisan issues before Congress.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

MATTER OF FACT

(By Stewart Alsop)

ACHESON, TRUMAN, AND VANDENBERG

In the American Government a new appointment as important as that of Secretary of State is like the introduction of a new and powerful chemical into a complicated and delicately balanced formula. All sorts of subsidiary reactions are bound to take place. The most interesting and important of the reactions to the appointment of Dean G. Acheson will be its effects on the White House and on the Congress.

Acheson is distinctly the personal choice of President Harry S. Truman for Secretary of State. In part, of course, the appointment

was a consequence of a process of elimination—the choice of Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson or of Justice William O. Douglas would have disrupted the Supreme Court, and W. Averell Harriman's Wall Street background was thought to be a political disadvantage. In part, too, the objective conclusion was reached that Acheson, by experience and ability, was preeminently fitted for the post.

But an even more compelling reason, according to those who should know, was simply that the President likes Acheson very much personally, admires him greatly, and is certain that he can work with him closely and successfully. This in itself suggests one change which is likely to take place in the relationship between the White House and the State Department.

Until now, Truman's role in the making of foreign policy has been with few exceptions confined to an almost automatic approval of what his Secretary of State was doing. This will be so no longer. Truman has no intention of becoming his own Secretary of State. But he does intend that the final authority should be definitely and clearly his. And it was largely for this reason that he appointed as Secretary a man with whom he was certain that a successful working relationship could be established.

This does not mean, of ccurse, that the basic direction of American policy will be altered. Aside from Truman's own testimony and the appointment of Acheson, himself one of the chief architects of the policy of firmness toward the Soviet Union, the most striking evidence on this point is Truman's attitude toward Secretary of Defense James Forrestal.

Forrestal has been one of the chief targets of those who have been calling on the President to "stop the cold war" by turning over most of the world to the Soviet Union. Reports have emanated from these sources that Forrestal will be asked to resign soon after Marshall leaves. It fact, it can be stated on undoubted authority that Truman has let Forrestal know that he is deeply grateful for the service Forrestal has rendered, and that he wants Forrestal to stay as long as he can be prevailed upon to do so.

Yet, though the President is in no mood for appeasing either the Soviet Union or the admirers of Henry Wallace, the appointment of Acheson is fortunate for the country, in view of Truman's well-known impulsiveness. For Acheson has a deep and hard-earned understanding of the real nature of the conflict between the Soviet Union and the western world. The President occasionally seems tempted to believe that he can resolve the conflict by pulling a rabbit out of his hat. Acheson knows that he cannot, and the President is pretty certain to rely on Acheson's judgment, in which he has great confidence.

Yet there is no assurance that the successful relationship which seems to be in prospect between the State Department and the White House will also evolve between the State Department and the Congress. Two great issues will soon confront the Congress. One is the North Atlantic Pact, designed to form the keystone of American foreign policy. The other is the rearmament of western Europe, without which the pact will have no meaning.

Clearly both measures will require Republican support. Yet the plain fact is that the bipartisan basis of foreign policy has been most gravely weakened. One reason is simply the imminent departure of Marshall and Robert A. Lovett, with whom the Republican foreign-policy leaders, and especially Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, have developed an intimate understanding. By contrast, the relationship between VANDENBERG and Acheson, who have had serious policy differences in the past, is one of mutual, but distinctly chilly, respect.

Bipartisanship has always been weakened by the small-minded action of the Senate Democrats in reducing the Republican representation on the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. This has caused the Republicans angrily to suspect that the administration has decided since the election to freeze them out of foreign policy. In fact, it can be said with assurance that Truman has no such intention, and that the White House had absolutely nothing to do with the Foreign Affairs Committee action. Even so, Acheson will certainly need all his energy and ability to rebuild and preserve the structure and bipartisanship which has been one of the major achievements of those great public servants, George C. Marshall, Robert A. Lovett, and Arthur Vandenberg.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., of January 8, 1949]

NEW LOOK FOR FOREIGN POLICY

Hasty, oversimplified appraisal of the shift in the State Department calls it a reversal of American foreign policy. We hope Moscow will not make that mistake. It has doubtless heard the story that President Truman is fighting a battle within his own Cabinet to soften policy toward Russia. But even without the President's emphatic denial, there is plenty of reason to believe that the Marshall-to-Acheson shift involves at most a reassessment, not a reversal, of policy.

Put another way, this is not a change of policy so much as a change of dress. Something new has been added. Dean Acheson is no advocate of softness, no friend of communism. He has urged firm resistance to Soviet domination. He does not believe concessions can halt Soviet policy. But he believes the policy is defeating itself. He points out that despite its expansive efforts Russia has not pushed beyond the lines held by its armies in Europe at war's end, and meanwhile the Marshall plan is promoting recovery and pushing back Soviet influence. And he would keep the door of negotiations open.

Right here may be the most notable feature of the new look at the State Department. Secretary Marshall has been negotiating—negotiating month after month—but at times it has appeared that American patience was exhausted. That is not unnatural. But diplomacy's role is never to give up, never to become rigid. At times in recent months the State Department has appeared more military than diplomatic. It has been as if Washington, finding that the language of power was best understood in the Kremlin, was forgetting other tongues.

Possibly a fresh negotiating team, like a fresh team on the football field, will be able to break the deadlock. Mr. Acheson is known as a man of wit and imagination. He is also noted for objective judgment and skill in argument. The surprise naming of James Webb as Under Secretary indicates that another reorganization of the State Department, not on policy lines but for efficiency, is coming. But this move tends to make more than ever necessary the retention of other top-bracket men who are experienced in policy, such as Charles Bohlen and George Kennan.

If such advisers remain, the essential continuity of policy will be emphasized, whatever its new dress. And it should be remembered that foreign policy in its main directions is not a one-man affair, subject to overnight change. Even if Mr. Truman intends now to make policy, he will have to build on the past. And if Mr. Acheson can give a more flexible and imaginative turn to it, he will succeed only because of good work that has prepared the way.

It would be ungrateful and inaccurate for Americans to fail to appreciate the unselfish devotion and tremendous services of Secretary Marshall and Under Secretary Lovett. If Moscow is soon brought to a point where it sees the value of less militant tactics in pursuit of its long-range strategy, much of the credit must go to their work. The combination of firmness, expressed especially in American rearmament and effective economic aid to free countries, expressed in the Marshall plan, have turned the tide in Europe and may well have laid the foundations for a workable truce, not a basic peace, with Russia.

Support of H. R. 49 To Provide Immediate Statehood for Hawaii Asked by Hawaii Statehood Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter addressed to Members of the Eighty-first Congress by the Hawaii Statehood Commission in support of immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The Commission is an agency created by act of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and entirely financed by public funds.

The legislation for which the commission asks support was introduced by myself as Delegate to Congress from Hawaii on the opening day of this Congress.

This bill has again been designated as H. R. 49, as it was in the last Congress, and has been referred to the Public Lands Committee of the House.

The letter follows:

In extending our congratulations to you as a Member of the Eighty-first Congress, may we call to your attention one of the important matters which will be before you for decision. We refer to statehood for Hawaii.

On June 30, 1947, the House passed an enabling act, H. R. 49, which the Public Lands Committee, after thorough study, had reported favorably by unanimous vote. In the Senate, action was postponed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to enable its members to conduct a further investigation.

When Congress reconvenes new bills will be introduced to carry out the pledge of statehood contained in both party platforms. In the Larcade report (H. Rept. No. 1620, 79th Cong. 2d sess), the committee report (No. 194, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Cordon report (Senate Committee of the Interior and Insular Affairs, 80th Cong. 2d sess.), you will find set forth reasons why Congress should without further delay authorize our fellow citizens in Hawaii to proceed to draft and submit for approval a constitution for the new State.

More than 50 years ago Hawaii voluntarily surrendered its status as an independent sovereignty to be incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof. The organic act established a territorial government to continue until the people of Hawaii qualify themselves to pass from second-class citizenship into full-fledged Americans. We feel certain that when you have examined the record you will concur in the practically unanimous judgment of the large number of

your present colleagues and former associates who have journeyed to the Territory for personal investigation. They returned with the firm conviction that Hawaii now meets every proper test for immediate statehood.

The war established the complete loyalty of Hawaii's people to America. In Hawaii a system of public education, the keystone to the success of democratic government, ranks with the best on the mainland. Its courts of justice, its free press, its devotion to religious liberty and civil rights are second to none. Its economy and business structure are sound. There is awareness of the danger of subversive influences and a clear determination to hold them in check. In no state is there a higher percentage of participation in voting and in the exercise of the other privileges of citizenship in a democracy. It is not too much to say that the people of Hawaii have demonstrated a remarkable genius in governmental affairs.

Such a people have earned the right to pass out of trusteeship and to become in truth free men; to choose their own governing officials; to have a voice in selecting their President; to no longer be taxed without representation (Hawaii now pays more annual taxes into the Federal Treasury than any one of 12 States); to send to Congress able spokesmen who will have full power of participation in the molding of legislative policy.

The Second World War greatly enhanced Hawaii's position as the gateway to the Pacific. In the years ahead America will have large and constantly increasing interests, permanent in nature, throughout this whole vast area. Prompt action now in welcoming into the Union on terms of full equality with the 48 States this Territory, where people of diverse racial stocks have demonstrated that they can live and work in peace and harmony, will add immeasurably to our stature and prestige among the millions who inhabit the areas of the far Pacific.

This letter is addressed to you by the Hawaii Statehood Commission, which was established by the Territorial legislature to advance the cause of statehood to which all but a minor fraction of its people are devoted. We want to become better acquainted with you and we hope that you will consider it worthwhile to learn more about this American community in the Pacific. If there is any information you want or if you care to express an opinion, we suggest that you communicate with our Washington representatives who will be pleased to serve you in any way. They are: George H. McLane, executive secretary, Hawaii Statehood Commission, suite 907, 704 Eleventh Street NW., phone, Executive 5632; Edward R. Burke, legal adviser, Hawaii Statehood Commission, 514 Southern Building, phone, National 7259.

We earnestly solicit your active support in what we sincerely believe to be a just and righteous cause.

Most respectfully yours,

HAWAII STATEHOOD COMMISSION,
A. T. LONGLEY, *Chairman.*

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, January 10, 1949:

ON THE RECORD—TRUMAN SEEN CREATING WELFARE STATE WHICH WILL STIFLE LIBERTY, INITIATIVE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Since President Truman can make the most revolutionary statements sound like an address to the Kiwanis Club, the full text of his state of the Union message had to be read to be fully appreciated.

If he has a docile majority in Congress we now are full steam ahead toward the welfare state which, in modern times, President Roosevelt started here, Bismarck in Europe, and which has engulfed western civilization.

This state tends toward a condition in which creative forces are drained out of society and paralyzed within the state; in which those who take no personal risks and suffer no personal losses become the master class; in which the earnings of the people are expropriated and returned to them (minus a high commission) in the form of services they may or may not want or need; in which independence is discouraged, and docility and emotional immaturity fostered in the people; and out of which, finally, dictatorship inevitably emerges as social vitality decays and the monster state is bankrupted through the anemia of society.

MASSES' APPROVAL SEEN

The masses of the people will hail it because they cannot foresee the consequences, are unaware of what a departure it is from the political philosophy which has made this country great, and because they will not link the welfare state with the decline and fall of Europe.

Big business publicly will fight it, but actually will make an alliance with it, as the biggest big business always has done. Under it monopoly will increase, not diminish, as it increased under the wartime extensions of state economic power. Despite President Truman's call for strengthening the antitrust laws, it won't work out that way because it can't. Those who will feel the squeeze and go under will be small business and the professional classes, who eventually will become employees of the state or of business big enough to ally itself with the state without going under.

The program, in general, is the triumph of European state ideas—especially German state ideas—over the American revolution, and exactly when Europe is in ruins.

The greatest contribution which America, especially, made to political science through Jefferson and on down through all the authentic American radicals, notably Henry George, was the clear recognition that the state is the enemy of society, and that when you extend the police power (which is the essence of the state) into overexpanding areas of social and economic life, stagnation sets in.

LIBERTIES SEEN DIMINISHED

Insofar as the state has a function in economic life—so argues the authentic American philosophy—it is to protect the widest liberties of the people in their spheres, and relentlessly prevent their encroachment upon the liberties of others, while holding and conserving the legitimate public domain.

But when it extends its powers to assuming responsibility for the lives of all, it expropriates the people's liberties, for no matter how you cut the design, liberty consists of the right to make one's own bed and lie in it. Children are not free because they are not responsible for themselves. The welfare state reduces adults to semi-infantile condition.

It does not create opportunities for independence. It aggrandizes all opportunities to itself. And once the independence of the people is destroyed, it is never restored until the huge structure pyramided on their backs breaks down into anarchy, either through war or by its own weight—as it invariably has.

There is nothing new about the development. The posthumous history of all great states shows this graph. It never has been a sign of youth but of senility, nor of progress but of decay.

But, as things are, such words are whistlings into the wind.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in what is roughly called socialized medicine, and I have not the slightest intention of voting for any plan which will force upon our people something they do not individually want, which will extend the power of the Federal Government.

If this country gets socialized medicine, in my humble opinion, it will be due to the attitude of the medical profession. There is a shortage of doctors, no question about it; and, as so often happens, a very few are taking advantage of the situation, creating a lot of ill will. The Government drafted medical students when it should have exempted them.

We are told, but I have no proof of the statement, that relatives of doctors are being favored when applications are made for admission to medical schools.

So that the doctors may know how some folks feel about some of the methods of a few doctors, inserted herewith is a letter just received:

JANUARY 6, 1949.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Unfortunately, President Truman is right on all counts on the medical and dental situation.

I wanted medicine myself, but couldn't go to school because I had my parents to care for. My daughter, however, is halfway through nurse's training and is going beyond regular requirements, into the field of diagnosis and therapeutics, because she is so interested.

If you investigated by closed hearings, you would find such as the following facts—things that have happened to us and to our friends:

——— went to Kalamazoo hospital, where our daughter is in training, for an X-ray. While waiting, said the daughter to her mother, "See that fellow going there, he gets $25 for an office call—and no medicine."

I need dental work. Extractions and two plates start at $250. My teeth are tough to pull, however. It's the work of an oral surgeon, then to a dentist for teeth.

I happened to know that it cost $5 per plate to make common plates before the war.

A physician friend of mine, who really works, and charges a modest fee, had this to say: "The bunch that makes me boil are the eye doctors. I have two old ladies that need attention badly, and do you suppose I can get them in? Not for 3 months; and when they do get in, he'll charge them such an outrageous fee that I won't see them again for 6 months," and added, "the situation is pitiful."

As this is being written, our phone rang. Our daughter has made an appointment with a physician for one Mrs. ———. This is the lady's first attention for what daughter (still in training) believes to be a cancer.

——— has two boys in school. Husband has low income. The Lord have mercy upon her, and deliver her from the evil of illness, and is it too much to add, from the evil of the medical profession also?

Instead of the American Medical Association, pounding the doors of Congress, crying, "save me from the wicked socialized medicine idea," they could apply their time and money by knocking at the doors of their membership, presenting a copy of Christ's Sermon on the Mount and a good-sized book on morals.

The profession has much dirty linen to wash, and they could throw their souls in for the cleaning process.

Meanwhile the masses suffer, physically, mentally, and financially.

The President is right; something should be done, and quickly.

If it isn't too much to ask, please send this to Senator VANDENBERG.

The Late Thomas M. Owen, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, my heart was saddened recently by the untimely passing of Mr. Thomas M. Owen, Jr., an Alabamian of distinguished lineage and outstanding service to the people of the State of Alabama and of the Nation.

Mr. Owen was the grandson of Senator John H. Bankhead, the nephew of the second Senator John H. Bankhead, as well as of our illustrious former Speaker, Hon. William B. Bankhead. Mr. Owen's mother is Mrs. Marie Bankhead Owen, who has long served the State of Alabama as director of the department of archives and history. Under her guidance, Tom became interested in similar work, and, after leaving Alabama in 1933, for 15 years was a responsible member of the staff of the National Archives here in Washington. During these years he was also national historian of the American Legion and served the members of the Legion long and faithfully. Tom Owen loved his fellow man.

It is a privilege for me to pay this small tribute to his memory and I am happy to make a part of it the statement below, which concerns him and which was issued by Hon. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, and addressed to all of the employees of the National Archives:

The death of Thomas M. Owen, Jr., a retired member of the staff of the National Archives, occurred at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center on December 5, 1948, after several months illness.

In point of service, Mr. Owen was one of the oldest employees of the National Archives. He was appointed Chief of the Division of Accessions on May 14, 1935. When the Division of Veterans' Administration Records was created in June of 1938, Mr. Owen became its Chief. Although changes subsequently occurred in the name of that division, Mr. Owen continued to serve as its Chief until March 1948, when he was compelled by his physical condition to give up active work. He retired because of physical disability on August 20, 1948.

Mr. Owen was a graduate of the University of Alabama. He served as an officer in the field artillery during World War I and thereafter was active in organizing the American Legion in Alabama. For some years prior to joining the National Archives staff he served as assistant director of the department of archives and history of the State of Alabama. In 1933 Mr. Owen was elected national historian of the American Legion and he served in that capacity until his death.

As a veteran himself and as a national officer of the American Legion, Mr. Owen was intensely interested in the welfare of veterans and particularly in the preservation and administration of veterans' records in a manner that would facilitate their use for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. Because of this interest and by reason of his previous archival experience, Mr. Owen, during the decade in which he had charge of the noncurrent pension records of our Government, contributed immensely to the work of the National Archives by providing for the adequate preservation of these valuable records and by making them, year by year, more and more readily available for use by veterans and their dependents and by others.

Tom Owen was not only a capable and faithful employee, but he was a kind, friendly, and considerate man who had an abiding faith in his fellow men. He loved people and was genuinely interested in them, their problems, and their successes. The welfare of employees under his supervision was a matter of real and continuing concern to him. He will be missed by a wide circle of friends.

The National Archives is grateful for the faithful and efficient manner in which Tom Owen performed his duties and is glad that it had on its staff a man of such outstanding good will.

WAYNE C. GROVER,
Archivist of the United States.

Communism in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter sent to President Truman on December 20, 1948, by Common Cause, Inc. The letter deals with the acute Chinese crisis, which is of such grave importance to the United States, and was signed by officers and directors of the national anti-Communist organization. Among the signers were Mrs. Natalie Wales Paine, president; Christopher Emmet, chairman of the board; the Reverend Robert I. Gannon, S. J.; Dorothy Thompson; Arthur Bliss Lane; William Henry Chamberlin; and Eugene Lyons.

The letter follows:

COMMON CAUSE, INC., CALLS ON PRESIDENT TRUMAN TO MAKE A STATEMENT SUPPORTING ANTICOMMUNIST FORCES IN CHINA

In common with all other Americans and with friends of freedom everywhere, we are deeply concerned over the developments in China, which threaten the loss of a great part of the human race to totalitarian communism.

We fully realize that America's resources are not unlimited, that we must not abandon our commitments in Europe, and that the situation in Asia is partly the fault of the Chinese Government. We do not attempt to prescribe the exact amount of American aid which it is wise or possible to give. But we do submit that certain basic facts are clear and that certain basic principles must be preserved.

1. The United States cannot oppose the advance of aggressive communism in Europe while passively accepting it in Asia. Our policy must be consistent and it must be honorable. It must not discriminate against the majority of the human race who live in Asia.

2. We are disturbed by the statement attributed to Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of the ECA, that the United States would continue to aid a coalition government in China in which the Communists took part, provided such a coalition government would agree to preserve freedom. We believe such a formula to be a contradiction in terms, for we know that coalition governments with the Communists have always led to loss of freedom. The experience of Europe proves that the Communists are willing to proceed mildly until American aid has helped consolidate their power and that they can then use this power to establish dictatorship.

There is no reason to hope that the Chinese Communists will prove independent of Moscow, even to the extent recently shown by Marshal Tito, and Tito himself has restored none of the freedoms to Yugoslavia. The Chinese Communist leader, Mao Tse Tung, has repeatedly denounced Tito for his heresy toward the Politburo, and recently Mao again praised the Soviet Union as "the leader of the Communist world revolution" in the Cominform Bulletin in Bucharest. He has been a member of the executive committee of the Communist International, and we believe still is. It was Foreign Minister Molotov who told Donald Nelson that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers.

However inaccurate the report of Mr. Hoffman's statement in China may have been, it has been widely published throughout the world, and it suggested a return to a disastrous policy of appeasement. Hence, despite Mr. Hoffman's partial disavowal, we fear that it may not only raise doubts about America's firmness in China but in Europe as well, until the impression is removed by a clear-cut statement on China of your own.

3. In China, as in Europe, it is not a question of personalities but of principles. Our interest is not tied to the personal fate of the President of China, but it is tied to the fate of the legitimate Nationalist Government of China, which is fighting to preserve the unity and independence of the Chinese people.

4. The more aid we give the more it will be possible for us to promote reforms in China, such as your aid program has achieved at least with some success in Greece, where the same problems exist on a smaller scale. In recent years we have not helped China enough to have the right or the power to insist on such improvements.

5. We are not concerned with recriminations about the past, but for the sake of the future we must state that it is wrong to say that a policy of vast American aid to China has been tried and failed. The lend-lease delivered to the Chinese during the war was only 2 percent of the total, although they had been fighting the longest. We delivered $47 in UNRRA supplies to Greece, on a per capita basis, and $1.16, on a per capita basis, to China. We have actually delivered $220,000,000 worth of military supplies to Greece in the last 2 years, whereas only $60,000,000 worth have been shipped

to China, parts of which have not yet arrived. We realize that this apparent neglect of China was partly due to factors beyond our control, nevertheless, in fairness the facts should be recognized.

We cite all this not to criticize our aid to Greece under the Truman doctrine, which you so wisely proclaimed and which on the whole has been so successful, but these figures do prove that our aid to China has been too little and too late. Above all it has been too uncertain, hence the results even of moderate aid have never been tested. And because of the poverty, inefficiency, and devastation of China there is reason to believe that a comparatively little aid, under American direction, might go further than anywhere else.

We do not question that Europe's greater military and industrial resources justify some priority in aid to Europe over China, but we do think that priority has been excessive.

6. For all these reasons it is dangerous defeatism to assume that China is already lost. Manchuria had been lost to the Japanese ever since 1931. It was lost again after the war, through no fault of the Chinese Government, due to our concessions to Russia at Yalta, and due to Russia's direct violation of her treaty pledges in turning over vast stores of Japanese arms and ammunition to Chinese Communist armies, and by refusing entry to government troops until the damage had been done.

Manchuria was the arsenal of Japan in Asia and it became the Communist arsenal. The defeat of the Nationalist armies in other parts of China has been partly due to the immense effort which President Chiang Kai-shek made to preserve Chinese rights in Manchuria, over impossible lines of communication. There some of his best armies, hampered by Russian control of the chief ports as well as by her arming of the Communists, were isolated and worn down. Perhaps it was a strategic mistake for Chiang to attempt to hold his few hard-won Manchurian bases, but at least it was a forgiveable mistake, since China has fought for 7 years to regain her richest province.

But regardless of this tragedy, three-fourths of China outside Manchuria is still in Government hands. Those who say it is now too late to help the Chinese Government are mostly the same people who have opposed such aid all along. If it is too late it would be largely their fault, but their judgment may be as unreliable now as it was before.

The collapse of the same Chinese Government which is still fighting now was unanimously predicted by the experts in 1937, in 1942, and again in 1944, yet it held on. That Government holds a far larger area of China now than it did in any of those years; and even if the Yangtze Valley is lost, the Communist weakness in sea and air power compared to Japan should make it far easier this time to hold the great cities of Canton and Chungking.

7. In any case, every day the Chinese anti-Communists continue to resist and every bit of territory they hold preserves just that much more of the area of freedom and reduces by that much the Communist threat to all Asia. It is cheaper in money and in lives to defend than it is to reconquer, and everything lost in China would have to be regained later at the cost of American dollars, and perhaps of American lives. General MacArthur estimates that the fall of China would necessitate six more divisions and a proportionate increase in sea and air power to defend Japan. The creation and maintenance of these divisions would cost more each year than the billion dollars in aid which China has asked.

The complacent belief that the Chinese may eventually assimilate the Communists is irrelevant to the present crisis, when the future of civilization will be determined either by the peaceful triumph of freedom or by the cataclysm of an atomic war. It took the Chinese 268 years to overthrow the small band of Manchus who dominated the country and set up in 1644 the reactionary Manchu dynasty which ruled over the whole of China.

8. The Nine Power Treaty binds us and the other democratic signatories to do everything in our power to preserve China's independence and integrity. We owe an obligation to the legitimate Chinese Government for its faithfulness to our side during the war, when Japan made repeated offers of a separate peace. The provisions of that treaty, the promises at the Cairo Conference, the principles of the Atlantic Charter and our mistakes at Yalta, all place an inescapable obligation of honor to help the Chinese Government now.

9. It is for you, Mr. President, in the light of your knowledge to decide in agreement with Congress how much material aid we can give, but it certainly lies within your power to give the incalculable moral aid which a clear-cut statement of America's intentions would provide. For the demoralization and defeatism in non-Communist China has been partly due to the uncertainties of American policy as well as to our delays in carrying it out.

The 30,000,000 refugees from Communist China show that the people do not welcome communism, but many of them have lost faith in the possibility of defeating it. That loss of faith is partly our fault and it is in your power to restore it. For few doubt the ultimate capacity of America and the rest of the free world to triumph over communism, whatever the limitations on our immediate ability to act.

It is our will, not our power, which is questioned, and you, and you alone, can set those doubts at rest. As the leader of America, freely chosen in your recent victorious election, you are the spokesman for the free world.

We therefore beg you not only to give all the aid which is possible but to proclaim the steadfast principles on which that aid is based. We believe such a statement would be worth many divisions to the hard-pressed people of China.

Warsaw Wars on Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Thursday, January 6, 1949, written by Ann Su Cardwell, relating to the action of the Polish Communist regime with reference to the liquidation of private enterprise in Poland:

WARSAW WARS ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By Ann Su Cardwell)

The Polish Communist regime by its pronouncements and by its daily acts has convinced even the few remaining optimistic Poles that a deliberate attempt is being made to liquidate private enterprise in Poland. Most observers consider this as basic a part of Polish Communist policy as it was of Russian Bolshevik policy.

Indeed, the Polish drive against private enterprise follows the pattern set by the Soviet Union in the 1920's. Polish economists throughout the world who are following developments foresee the extirpation of the middle class, small firms, independent artisans, merchants, and the free professions.

Tax laws and regulations have been manipulated to force many thousands out of business. A special commission was appointed with full authority to go into any place of business at any time and ascertain the amount of cash on hand as well as the prices asked for all articles. Inspections have taken place almost daily, in some instances lasting hours, interfering seriously with business and having extremely damaging effects upon owners and helpers.

HOW SYSTEM WORKS

As an example of the work of this commission, a Polish commentator now in London writes: "In a restaurant, which is run by a man and his wife without other help, the wife went out to market, taking 3,000 zlotys ($3) from the cash and leaving no note of so doing. While she was out, members of the special commission appeared, and although she returned before they had completed their inspection and had her purchases and the receipted bills with her, she was charged with breaking the law and fined.

"Thousands of such instances could be cited," the Polish writer continues. "A friend of mine lent an acquaintance 1,000 zlotys and when it was repaid he dropped the small sum into the firm's cash box instead of putting it into his pocket, and by so doing made very serious trouble for himself. * * *

"Here is a further example of the special commission's procedure. At the request of a purveyor, a merchant agreed to accept delivery of certain merchandise on a Saturday after closing hours. The bill was to be presented early Monday morning. Apparently some employee, a Communist Party member, learned of this and reported it. Before opening time on Monday members of the special commission were waiting at the door. For merchandise valued at 5,000 zlotys ($5) the fine and costs amounted to more than 50,000 zlotys, although in this case as in that of the restaurant owners, the bill was presented while the commission was at work." Thus wrote a person recently in Poland.

INCOME-TAX DECREE

A government decree of October 25 strikes at private enterprise by what is labeled a "tax on general income." The hitherto progressive tax has been superseded by a tax according to the source of income, the sources being listed in five groups.

A regime paper, Rzeczpospolita, on November 3 writes in connection with this tax: "It is no secret that up to today private enterprise provides incomparably greater income than can be earned as an employee, whether the work is physical or mental. The social injustice in this stands out too clearly to necessitate our pointing it out; and yet arguments are offered—arguments brought up in defense of this state of affairs in capitalist countries—that these are the rewards for private initiative, for inventiveness, for energy, and for the capital invested. We shall fight such private initiative with all the forces at our command."

For a proper understanding of the editorial one should remember that salaries and wages are fixed by the regime and that employees and workers have no means of getting them raised. Neither strikes nor appeals are permitted. Average wages, according to latest reports, are from 8,000 to 15,000 zlotys a month, while the minimum required for the satisfactory maintenance of a family of three is 20,000, and this does not include allowance for clothing and shoes.

FOOD COSTS SOAR

Food prices have been mounting steadily, the continued shipment of food to Russia being reported the cause. Bread prices at the end of November were 45 zlotys a kilogram (2.2 pounds), eggs 25 to 30 zlotys each, one kilogram of beef 220 zlotys, of sausage 500 zlotys, a liter of milk 60 zlotys, a bar of soap 350. While the official rate for the dollar is 400 zlotys, on the black market it is now 1,200 to 1,500.

Commenting further on the October 25 decree, Rzeczpospolita states that the Government has a very significant means of controlling private capital. This is interpreted to mean that if the source of income does not lie in party institutions or state-owned enterprises, it will be listed as fifth category, in which the income tax has been raised 25 percent and where there are a whole series of special taxes.

The degree of success already achieved in the drive to liquidate private enterprise is indicated by figures given by the president of the Central Planning Office (CUP) in a recent speech before a conference of activists of the Social Party. In 1946, private enterprise and hand workers accounted for 363,000 employed; state-owned enterprises and cooperatives, for 1,111,000. In 1948 the latter had risen to 2,170,000, the former to only 466,000.

STRICT HOUSING EDICT

In connection with the Government's attitude toward private enterprise, recent changes in housing control should be noted. First there was a rise up to 1,000 percent in rents, according to reports from Warsaw. Individuals who had their workshops or little places of business located in their apartments, or, perhaps better stated, combined living quarters with places of business, found themselves compelled to give up their dwelling, which was rented again at a higher rate. However, the owner of the building did not profit from the rent increase. He got 15 percent of it, which was immediately burdened by an additional tax, and the state collected almost the whole of the 85 percent as a fund for building purposes.

This rent rise was followed by a startling action on the part of the administration. Owners of buildings who had succeeded in rebuilding or putting into repair their partly destroyed homes are being evicted and the places taken over by party members.

This is altogether contrary to the promises made after the Communist regime came to power. At that time it did everything possible to encourage the rebuilding and repairing of ruined buildings. Since owners were fearful that their investments would be lost and all property nationalized, the Government issued a declaration in 1945 to the effect that an owner who rebuilt in whole or in part a ruined building would be exempt from anything like nationalization for a long period of time.

Trusting in this declaration, a great many owners devoted their funds and their energies to such rebuilding, believing that at any rate they and their families were assured a roof over their heads. But on November 23, Mayor Tolwinski of Warsaw issued an order nullifying that promise.

Certain conditions are named under which owners may be allowed to remain, but these are so elastic that in practice they are of no value. Any apartment or house that is wanted by a Communist can be taken. And since early in December a committee consisting of three Communists has been making the rounds of the places that had received permits to rebuild or repair. The purpose of the inspection is to establish reasons for the eviction of the owners and for the installation of other persons or groups.

Congressional Council for the Second Massachusetts District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

M. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call the attention of Members of the Congress to something new that I have inaugurated in the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts. Several of the Congressmen who have asked me for details of the plan have suggested that I bring it to the attention of all the Members at the opening of this session of the Congress.

I have established a Congressional Council for the Second Massachusetts District. It is an experiment in democracy that is intended to give the people a greater voice in Government than they now have. The Congressional Council is basically and fundamentally the creation of a people's lobby. It is aimed to subject the Congressman to the only type of lobbying power he is not subjected to at the present time: a lobbying power of the average, everyday citizens who are the constituents we represent.

We all know that every Congressman is constantly lobbied by various interests and pressure groups. I do not use the word "lobby" in its sinister or underhanded connotation because a great part of the lobbying that is done is carried on openly and publicly. Most so-called lobbying is simply an attempt by certain interests to persuade the Congressman to think and vote along certain lines. That is the function of those who lobby for farmers, labor unions, manufacturers and industrialists, veterans, old-age groups, and so on.

A great part of the legislation passed by Congress, both good and bad, has been written or promoted by lobbyists. The influence lobbyists may have on our legislation is perhaps indicated by statistics which show that in the last Congress over a thousand registered lobbyists spent over a reported $6,000,000 in their attempts to show why certain legislation should be passed or defeated. There were, of course, other unregistered lobbyists who spent unreported sums of money for the same purpose.

Lobbying can be both beneficial and harmful. It is beneficial when it brings to the Congressman's attention certain facts and arguments showing why certain legislation will be good or bad. That educational phase of lobbying is advantageous to the country. Lobbying is harmful when it does not disclose all the material facts to those who must vote on legislation that will affect all the people. Unfortunately, the average lobbyist's function is merely to represent his particular client's side of the story. He skillfully performs that duty without feeling any obligation to ascertain or inform the Congressman of the effect of that legislation upon other groups or segments of the population whose interests may be adverse or conflicting to the lobbying influence.

I assume that lobbying either should not or cannot be abolished. Its educational benefits should certainly be retained. While its deleterious effects can probably never be completely suppressed, they should at least be controlled. Is there any reasonably practicable way to achieve that result?

I can merely outline my own suggestion, which, to the best of my knowledge, has never before been tried. Briefly it is this: I have called upon many of the leading citizens of my district to form what I have termed a congressional council. The group is nonpartisan and nonpolitical and has not been handpicked by me. Of the 45 members, only 5 were selected by me. The rest were chosen by their own organizations or by virtue of their election by the people.

My district is composed of 3 cities and 17 towns and has the usual segments of population in all walks of life and varieties of occupations. The cooperation that has been extended to me by the citizens in accepting the duties of membership on the congressional council is perhaps best illustrated by a quick breakdown of the membership of the council.

Members from the local town and city governments include the 3 mayors and 14 selectmen, 1 from each town. The boards of selectmen of three towns did not accept my invitation to send a representative to the council. The three large labor organizations in my district, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, each sent a representative selected by the organization itself and not chosen by me. The same is true of the veterans of World Wars I and II, each group sending a veteran. The chamber of commerce has a representative as does the local association of employers, the nearest approach to the NAM in my district. Farming interests are represented by an editor of the National Grange publication and by a small farmer who is not a member of the Grange. There is also a small-business man and a nonunion workingman. The council has one member who is fairly representative of the needs and wants of the aged. The high schools have cooperated by sending two seniors who have the point of view of the coming generation. A representative of the fish and game and wildlife conservation interests is also on the council because my district has thousands of people who are outdoor-life enthusiasts. There being several institutions of higher learning in the district, the council also has a professor of economics and a professor of government among its membership. Education is also further represented by the presence on the council of the author of the nationally known Springfield plan, which is the local school system's answer to the racial problem. Four of the five large newspapers in the district have sent representatives as have the two radio stations. These representatives are not there in any reportorial capacity but

rather from the public service viewpoint. Incidentally, the council's meetings are public and are covered by reporters who are not members. Two representatives from the State legislature, known in Massachusetts as the general court, are also on the council. We also have at least one white-collar office worker, a Federal employee, and three housewives, one of whom is a widow with two small children. I selected the housewives myself because, at least to date, we don't have any organization of housewives, whether that is fortunate or unfortunate. However, I felt it was important to have the viewpoint of women who have to do the buying and run a home on the pay envelope.

I probably have not mentioned all the membership of the Congressional Council but what I have said should indicate the general make-up. It is a cross-section of my district. I believe that anyone in the district who looks at that Congressional Council can feel that someone in his walk of life, with his general problems and needs, and with his viewpoint, is on the council.

Geographically, the council includes people from every section of the district; politically, it is divided about equally between Democrats and Republicans. With people of every race, creed, and color, the Congressional Council is truly an experiment in democracy conducted in the melting pot of the world.

The functions of the Congressional Council are many and varied and, because there is no precedent for it, we are of necessity proceeding by trial and error method. Probably its primary function is to enable the Congressman to rapidly obtain a cross-section opinion on the effect of legislation upon his district. He knows how legislation will help or hurt because the members of the council, who are representative of the walks of life from which they come, keep him posted. Of course he is not bound in any way by their opinions—but he at least knows their opinions and then acts as he himself sees fit, having their opinions in mind.

Secondly, the council knows what is going on. It keeps a constant check on the activities of the Congressman and thus brings the Government closer to the people and the people closer to the Government. I think that is a worth-while goal, especially in a democracy we want to keep. Experience in other parts of the world proves that when the people get away from the government it is not long before the government gets away from the people.

Thirdly, the existence of the council makes it almost impossible for a Congressman to be lobbied without the knowledge of the people of his district—and it insures the Congressman that he will always get all sides of the story. He is sure of that because someone who knows a different side of the problem is on the council, comprised as it is of representatives of manufacturers, farmers, labor—both union and nonunion—small business, landlords, tenants, taxpayers, employers, veterans, education, Federal employees, housewives, town, city, and State officials, the aged, youth, and so on.

Fourthly, the Congressional Council should be helpful to the district even in noncongressional matters. It brings together in one body all the leading officials of the towns and cities in the district, which should tend toward greater cooperation by the local governments of the district. It also brings into one group many of the outstanding civic leaders and public-spirited citizens of the district, making possible joint action by influential people that should benefit the residents of the district

Fifthly, it provides an ideal sounding board for various nonmember organizations and groups which wish to create a public opinion for or against some project.

Unquestionably, there are, of course, certain disadvantages from the purely personal point of view of a Congressman. The Congressional Council can be politically dangerous to a Congressman if the members seek to use it for political obstructionism and other partisan tactics. I am confident no one in the group in my district has accepted membership with that aim in mind. However, in my opinion, even the possibility of that happening is unworthy of consideration when weighed against the tremendous good that can be accomplished for the district by a Congressional Council.

Secondly, let no Congressman adopt the Congressional Council plan through any desire to ease the burdens of his office. It increases the burden. It will keep a Congressman alert and of necessity make him better informed because the council wants to know more than just a vote. It will also want to know the why and wherefore of that vote.

As one who has not yet earned his spurs in the Halls of Congress, I have been hesitant and reluctant to present this topic to those who have already won respect and admiration for their legislative service. I do so only because of the urgings of those Members to whom I have described the Congressional Council plan and who feel that it should be brought to the attention of all the Members of the Congress.

I cannot give any proof that a Congressional Council will succeed admirably or fail miserably in its purposes. I can merely briefly outline its machinery and goals. I repeat that, to the best of my knowledge, the plan has never before been tried any place. Consequently, the Congressional Council in my district is proceeding by trial and error method. There will undoubtedly be changes in its membership, procedure, and functions, as the passage of time proves the need.

The Congressional Council is purely a voluntary plan, not created by legislation. Strictly speaking, it has no legislative function. Yet I believe that if each Congressman adopted what I have termed the Congressional Council plan, it would help promote more good legislation and prevent more bad legislation than anything I can think of. I offer it for the consideration of Members of the Congress.

Farm Commodity Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting common sense editorial appeared in today's Washington Times-Herald entitled "How High Are Those Prices." This editorial states that the only scientific way to measure prices is by comparing whatever you want to buy with the hours you have to work to earn enough to pay for it. Some of the country's leading economists find that in 1914 the average wage earner had to spend 30 hours on the job to buy a week's supply of food for his household. They also discovered that in 1948 while that same family-sized basket of food costs quite a few dollars more than it did in 1914, the average wage earner earns money enough to pay for it by only 12 hours work. I congratulate the Times-Herald, Mr. Speaker, on its approach to this very important problem of prices. In accordance with permission heretofore granted, I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

HOW HIGH ARE THOSE PRICES?

We've enjoyed complaining, as loudly as anybody, about prices which we've had to pay for food and other necessities, the past few years. Many of these high price tags, we have noted, were brought about deliberately by our New Deal masters, in accordance with their standing policy of fattening up the voting-age farmer, at the expense of the average American consumer and taxpayer.

Our good housewives have had considerable to say also in recent years about politicians who plow under good food and kerosene grade-A potatoes, and we've applauded every indignant girlish yelp.

Nevertheless, we're now wondering about prices in general. Many of them were needlessly high, of course. But were they, even in record smashing 1948, so high as to be completely out of line with our American economy?

As it happens, some of the country's leading economists have been busying themselves with just that question.

YARDSTICK FOR PRICES

One of the best recent roundups on prices has just been completed by the economists and statisticians of the National Industrial Conference Board, and we'll try to boil down a few of their points to fit this space.

First of all, these experts say, we shouldn't think of prices in terms of mere dollars. Dollars have a tricky habit of changing their own value in times of inflation and depression. In the United States today, for instance, $5 would be much too high a price for a one-passenger steak. But in China, using inflated Chinese money, the same grub would be a bargain, maybe, at $5,000,000.

The only scientific way to measure prices, the economists say, is by comparing whatever you want to buy with the hours you'd have to work to earn it.

Using that yardstick, you'd probably consider an egg cheap if you could get it by working for, say, just 1 minute. But if you were to be charged a whole hour's labor for that one egg you'd probably switch to spinach.

Employing this system of comparison, NICB statisticians have gone back for a third of a century, checking scores of United States food prices against the average wages per hour of that particular year. And most of their answers seem to prove that today's groceries, despite the high dollar price tags, are even cheaper than they were in the good old days of, say, 1914.

Back in 1914 they found, if you were an average wage earner with an average-sized and average-hungry family, you had to spend 30 hours on the job to buy a week's supply of food for your household.

In 1948 you were doing considerably better, by comparison. That same family-sized basket of food costs you quite a few more dollars than it would have in 1914. But you earn it by only 12 hours' work, instead of 30.

CHICKEN ON THE TABLE

Take a 5-pound roasting chicken as an example. In 1914 a factory worker would have had to labor for more than 4 hours to get the bird. The same weight roaster costs a 1949 worker just a bit more than 1½ hours on the job.

It's the same story with other modern consumer commodities, especially foods. The price of round steak, as any housewife knows, is away up there in dollars and cents. In fact, round steak in 1948 was a whopping 370 percent higher than it was in 1914. But hourly wages have gone up even more. In terms of work-hours, that piece of round is now down approximately 40 percent.

So that's the economists' story about some prices today, and we think their way of reckoning is not only cheerful but sound. By improving his efficiency and letting machinery do as much of his work as possible, the average American has achieved the world's highest real living standard, no matter what the price tags say.

In other lands that's not the story. In Pal Joe's workers' utopia, for instance, Ivan still sweats 70 minutes to get the loaf of bread an American earns in 7½. And Ivan works 10½ hours for a pound of butter, which is worth half an hour's labor here.

Maybe, before we let out our next yelps about those outrageous pork-chop prices, or whatever, we'd better try figuring out the bill by the price-wage system.

Frankly Socialistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a statement by Gould Lincoln appearing in the Washington Evening Star January 6, 1949. This statement conveys clearly the socialistic tendencies of the President as expressed in his state-of-the-Union message.

The shortest definition I know for socialism is that it is Government ownership. That philosophy is repugnant to every principle upon which this Nation stands. If this country is to build, if it is to grow, and if it is to live, the principle of private ownership and the free competitive enterprise system must be preserved. The President's philosophy would destroy it.

TRUMAN MESSAGE HELD FRANKLY SOCIALISTIC—LITTLE CONGRESS ENTHUSIASM SEEN FOR MANY OF HIS PROPOSALS

(By Gould Lincoln)

Judging from the reception given President Truman's state-of-the-Union message, the Chief Executive may find it easier to lead this Democratic Congress to the trough than to make it drink. While Congress gave the President personal recognition—because of his great fight for election—when he appeared before it, its enthusiasm for many of his proposals was at most restrained. The very size and character of his program, with the huge costs it may entail, made some of his own party gasp.

In addition, Mr. Truman's message was the most frankly socialistic ever presented by a President of the United States. At the very outset he said that: "We have abandoned the trickle-down concept of national prosperity. Instead, we believe that our economic system should rest on a democratic foundation and that wealth should be created for the benefit of all." The trickling down in the future will come from Washington as it pursues the already well-established Democratic custom of Government hand-outs. His statement is construed as the very foundation of a system under which the Government takes wealth from the people—all the people, for all pay taxes in one form or another—and redistributes it as it sees fit.

"RED HERRING" SEEN

The President requested Congress to authorize an immediate survey of the adequacy of production facilities, particularly of steel, for the purpose of authorizing Government loans for the expansion of production and of authorizing Government construction if action by private industry fails "to meet our needs." This may have been made at the request of CIO President Philip Murray, whose steel workers will be interested, but it proposes a long step toward the socialization of industry. Yet the President continues, in his message, to proclaim his affection for the free-enterprise system, and in so doing seems to be dragging a "red herring" himself.

Except for this proposal to have the Government go into the steel business, if necessary, the myriad recommendations submitted by the President are not new, from the repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law down to providing stand-by authority to impose price and wage controls.

Apparently the President recognizes that the program is going to cost more money, for he recommends an increase in taxes designed to bring in an additional $4,000,000,000 revenue. That, however, might be a mere drop in the bucket if the entire Truman program were carried out. His tax recommendations are designed to fall upon the medium well-to-do and the wealthy rather than upon the great mass of workers. But even so, the sound of increased taxes, in peacetime, does not sit well even upon members of his own political party.

OTHER DISCREPANCIES NOTED

How long Mr. Truman will be able to make such recommendations as contained in his message and not openly commit himself to state socialism remains to be seen. Already British and other foreign commentators are interpreting his present remarks as lining him up, on all fours, with the socialistic governments of Europe. They can see little difference, for example, between Mr. Truman's proposals and those of the Socialist government in Britain. One cynic remarked that, at any rate, if the Truman program goes through, the American people will be so busy paying for their own socialistic measures they will not have money to spare to continue support of the British system.

Mr. Truman's devotion to the free-enterprise system while offering a socialistic program is not the only discrepancy in his message. His determination to keep up farm prices and wages of industrial labor and at the same time bring about a reduction in the cost of living will be a good trick, if he can work it. He opened his message with a statement that he was happy to report the state of the Union is good and then listed a long series of ills from which the American people are suffering.

Also Mr. Truman's message sounded just as optimistic as that of President Hoover in 1929, in that Mr. Truman said the American people, and himself, have decided that poverty is just as wasteful and just as unnecessary as preventable disease. Mr. Hoover spoke of a chicken in every pot and the elimination of poverty.

Polish Socialist Party Swallowed Up After Purges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this country seems to be proceeding step by step to change our government under the pattern of Karl Marx, who in his manifesto of 1848 recommended to the workers of the world definite means of destroying free enterprise and the capitalistic system as follows:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax;

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance;

Third. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Fourth. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state;

Fifth. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Thursday, January 6, 1949, which tells what is occurring in Poland under the leadership of the communistic power and communistic ideology:

WIDENS COMMUNIST GRIP—POLISH SOCIALIST PARTY SWALLOWED UP AFTER PURGES

ZURICH.—Formal merger of the Polish Socialist and Communist Parties has served to register before the world a fact that already had been achieved and may be accepted as a proclamation that Communist power and Communist ideology are to dominate in Poland.

A special manifesto, which was issued on the eve of the congress at which the merger was formally effected and was presented as the product of both Communist and Socialist headquarters, declared that the new United Workers Party would put an end to the breach which has existed for more than 50 years in the ranks of the Polish working class and bring the final victory of Marxism-Leninism over reformism and nationalism.

FIFTY-YEAR SETBACK?

One can hardly escape the conclusion that the fusion terminates Socialist influence in Poland for the time being. A half century's

work seems to have been wiped out. Ever since its inception at the end of the nineteenth century, the Polish Socialist Party has been fighting for liberty, freedom, and independence for Poland on the lines and fundamentals of western democracy. It also fought against communism. This will cease completely, apparently, as communism becomes the all-embracing force in the country.

The merger took place after ruthless and bitter purges in both the Communist and Socialist Parties. No figures are available, but those in the know maintain that altogether more than 100,000 members of the Socialist Party were expelled in the course of a few weeks. The number of Communists expelled was much smaller but also included many who had played a prominent role in party affairs.

Like those expelled from the Socialist Party, these are living in constant dread of arrest and persecution. It is reported that several hundred Socialist purge victims already have been arrested. Some are to be tried shortly on various charges, according to information from reliable sources.

COMMUNIST TAG AVOIDED

The Communist leaders have avoided the word "Communist" in connection with the merged party, because they are conscious of the unpopularity of communism among Poles and of the widespread popular hostility to the present rulers of Poland. That is why they call the new organization the United Workers Party.

But very few Poles are deceived. Practically all know very well what the fusion means. They are aware that although some good Socialists remain in the fused party for various reasons, everything will be run as the Communists dictate.

Leaders of the other progovernment parties that are still allowed to function in a vestigial form are hastening to get on the band wagon. They give their blessings to the merger and hail it as a great achievement in Polish history.

ABRUPT ABOUT-FACE

Thus the leaders of the Polish Peasant Party, along with those of the Democratic Party and even the Roman Catholic Party, made declarations welcoming the merger. Special representatives of all these parties attended the congress to demonstrate their joy at this historic event.

Nothing probably shows more clearly the debasement of political affairs in eastern Europe than these laudatory speeches and articles by leaders of parties known formerly for their hostility to communism—today they are overreaching each other in praise of it.

On the eve of the congress, both President Bierut as secretary general of the Communist Party and Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz as leader of the Polish Socialists issued statements outlining the immediate purpose of the merger and laying down fundamentals for the future.

SOVIET PATTERN SET

Mr. Bierut formulated an 8-point program the main item in which declares that the new party, "enriched by the experience of watching the building of a Socialist state in the U. S. S. R.," will aspire to construct a socialistic Poland on the same fundamentals. Similarly Mr. Cyrankiewicz, who now has dropped his Socialist mask, openly supports the same policy as the Communists.

While the leaders disport themselves as though filled with joy, the people at large look on with much apprehension and anxiety. Only here and there has some enthusiasm been demonstrated. The workers in the factories held mass meetings as an anticipatory celebration of the merger. In nearly all cases Communists organized these meetings and drew up the congratulatory cables to the leaders.

In the Polish countryside silence prevails. There not even the Communists as yet have dared to organize a welcome for the merger. The Polish peasant is clearly aware that the first step after the merger will be the organization of collective agricultural cooperatives in the villages.

COLLECTIVES DREADED

He dreads this more than anything else.

Government spokesmen have been urging such cooperatives for months, and the Polish peasant realizes that the Communists are going to start putting this policy into effect without much more delay. "The United Party," says the precongress manifesto, "will be the supreme form of the working class organization and will express the interests of the working people in the cities and villages."

How strong will be the emerging United Workers Party? About 6 months ago the two emerging parties claimed to have had a membership of nearly 1,000,000 each. Taking into consideration the recent purges, it is believed that the new organization will number about 1,750,000. This does not take into account the new united youth organization, numbering well over 1,000,000. It is also Communist led.

TEMPORARY GAIN

In a nation of 24,000,000, which the Poles number today, this certainly could constitute a very strong Communist preponderance—but only superficially. Merger or no merger, most Poles will tell you that, were it not for fear of losing their jobs or suffering discrimination, the vast majority of the membership in the Communist and pro-Communist organizations would desert in a single day.

The few thousand fanatics would be helpless and ineffective. The merger of the Polish Socialists with the Communists is unquestionably a victory for the Communists and for communism, but most Poles are inclined to regard it as temporary.

Housing Legislation Is First Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is no fault of uncounted thousands of American families that they are in acute distress on account of lack of available dwellings. But it would be the serious fault of this Congress if legislative action is not taken immediately. There is the problem of the would-be home buyer who finds the cost, the down payment, and installment payments out of range of his pocketbook and his earnings. There is the even graver problem of the renter in communities where no rental properties are available. There is the problem of the young married veteran who finds that all his GI benefits are of no aid to him in finding a home for his family. In the city of Detroit for example, it is almost a miracle if one can find a house to rent. The rent control law still permits evictions for many reasons, even where the tenant is paying his rent. Judgments of eviction in scores of such cases are being rendered every day with a hopeless outlook for the evicted tenant who can not find a place to rent and has to break up and disperse his family letting them find shelter where they may.

There is a crying challenge to this Congress in this situation. We Democrats have taken over the reins of authority and responsibility in this Congress just because hopeful millions throughout this Nation turned to us in their despair at legislative lassitude and neglect. Let us not follow the example which brought the Republican Party to an untimely end of their regime after a scant 2 years of congressional majority and responsibility. Ample hearings have been had. The voters have decisively expressed themselves. Let us get to the earliest possible consideration of such legislation as H. R. 525, the National Housing Act of 1949 and enact it into law and put the resources and vigor of this country into making it possible for these hundreds of thousands of American families to live in homes.

Medical Care for Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an Associated Press article as it appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, January 9, 1949. While this story refers to the soft-coal fields, a separate fund is being used for the great anthracite-coal field workers to the same wonderful purpose. Here, indeed, is a milestone of progress in American social and industrial history.

MEDICAL CARE PLAN FOR MINERS BEGINS

(By the Associated Press)

John L. Lewis began yesterday to put into operation the United Mine Workers' far-reaching program of free hospital and medical service to ailing coal miners.

The service will be provided by the UMW welfare and retirement fund, of which Lewis is chief trustee. A 20-cent royalty on each ton of coal finances the fund, now building up at $100,000,000 a year.

From this, Lewis, the union's president, has announced he plans eventually to finance all medical and hospital care for the 400,000 soft coal miners. A separate fund is being used for Pennsylvania's 80,000 hard coal diggers.

As a start, activities will be directed to the hospitalization of miners who are already receiving disability benefits and pensions. These men, because they are not working, are unable to obtain services through an existing wage check-off system.

Also among the first to be cared for will be those with serious ailments who are unable to get adequate treatment in their communities.

Besides the hospital and medical program, the huge welfare fund finances monthly pensions of $100 to 62-year-old miners who have worked 20 years.

The medical and hospital program is headed by Dr. Warren F. Draper, former Deputy Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Dr. Draper was major general in charge of the Public

Health Branch at Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Forces, during World War II. He also was former State health commissioner of Virginia.

Dr. Draper announced today the establishment of 10 area offices, with a physician in charge of each, to serve the 24 union districts in the soft coal fields.

Agriculture and the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to include an article by Mr. Harry J. Beermink, general manager of the Washington Cooperative Egg and Poultry Association. This article deals with the general principle behind price supports and is an excellent example of the fairness of the thing of one of the ablest leaders in agriculture.

AGRICULTURE AND THE PUBLIC

I am going to discuss with you in this message today a subject which needs to be told to every consumer in the cities, and is a story which farm leaders among cooperatives, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and other farm organizations are telling before city groups at every opportunity. It is a story that every member could well be conscious of and when opportunity presents carry the message to friends in the cities.

We are living in a time when agriculture is in the spotlight and in a world that is food conscious. We hear rumors from some sources again advocating Government price controls and rationing. Farmers know the clumsy hand of Government controls, which spells dislocations, black markets, and fails to reflect the sensitive balances between supply and demand.

The city housewife, pressed to make her dollar stretch, frequently accuses the farmer of profiteering at her expense when prices are high. The facts are that the farmer receives approximately one-half of the consumer's dollar, averaging during the past year from 50 cents to 53 cents, varying between commodities. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar is highest for poultry, turkeys, meats, dairy products, and eggs, ranging from 62 cents to 77 cents, and the lowest for vegetables, cereals, and fruits, ranging from 16 cents to 50 cents.

The difference between the price the farmer receives and the consumer pays in the city—which the farmer and the consumer both frequently question as being too high—represents jobs off the farms in the processing, wholesaling, retailing, transportation, advertising, packaging material, electrical energy, gasoline, rubber, taxes, interest, telephone, and other costs. These off-the-farm jobs in the handling and processing of food and fiber provide employment to approximately 25 percent of the people in America, and from that standpoint materially help our economy, including markets for agricultural commodities. When the city dweller understands these facts she is in a much better position to appreciate that when farm prices drop, everyone suffers.

Many people are under the erroneous impression that the prices of meats, turkeys, eggs, and many other commodities are the result of Government hand-outs to farmers. As an example, the Government support price for eggs is 35 cents to the producer, which has little or no effect on the price the consumer pays. The same could be said for meats, turkeys, and poultry—and the support price for wheat has little if any effect on the cost of a loaf of bread in the city.

Unfortunately, city people do not know these facts, and as a result farmers and agriculture in general fail to develop good public relations. Farmers need to produce. They are happiest when they can produce to capacity, but by the same token they need customers. Therein lies the importance of good will and friendly relations between people in the rural areas and the people in the cities.

We have a story to tell. A constructive, interesting, and wholesome story. All of us working together can be far more productive and effective, so, when you see your friends in the cities take advantage of the opportunity of creating good will and understanding, which is in the interest of farmers as well as consumers.

Washington Spy Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington Spy Case May Tax Imagination, But It Happened, and Can Happen Again," published in a recent issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON SPY CASE MAY TAX IMAGINATION, BUT IT HAPPENED, AND CAN HAPPEN AGAIN

In a letter to a Washington newspaper recently a noted Harvard professor condemned the House Un-American Activities Committee in strong language. His scholarly diatribe was based on the premise that the whole spy case was a perverse dream whipped up for a political circus and all connected with it were innocent. He did not entertain for a moment the possibility that anybody could be guilty.

Perhaps his letter represented a segment of current American thinking. After all, it is difficult for the average loyal citizen to conceive that a trusted official high in Government circles would actually steal confidential state papers to have them passed to a foreign power.

Beyond the imagination or not, absolute proof has been brought forth, and now the plain facts should be recognized and action taken to prevent such a thing from continuing.

A careful summary of what happened has been written by Roscoe Drummond, authoritative Washington correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor. Here it is:

1. As far back as 10 years ago, when Russia was getting ready to collaborate with Hitler, the United States Government began to be infiltrated with American Communist espionage agents who succeeded in stealing some 200 secret dispatches.

2. The security provisions were so loose and lax in the State Department at the time that there can be no assurance that many more confidential papers did not find their way into the hands of Communist agents. While security procedures of a decade ago have been strengthened greatly, they are not spyproof, certainly not from spies able to work from within today.

3. The probable spy ring within the State Department very likely was larger than the Chambers-Hiss case by itself suggests. It should not be overlooked that a year ago the State Department discharged 11 employees because they were found to be bad security risks, and all of them, in varying degrees, were implicated in the Communist apparatus operating within the Government.

4. Latest developments, including the indictment of Alger Hiss, probably insure the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which suffered badly in the recent election and very likely would be on the way out today if it had not succeeded in bringing to the surface evidence which eluded other agencies of the Government for several years.

Hostile critics point out that the first batch of Whittaker Chambers' microfilms was unearthed not by the committee, but by the pre-trial Chambers-Hiss libel hearing in Baltimore. The catch there is that there would have been no Chambers-Hiss libel hearing to bring out these microfilms but the evidence which came out in the committee hearings.

Furthermore, the stolen State Department documents were only a part of the cache. But the FBI and the Justice Department apparently did nothing about tracking down the rest of them.

Fortunately, the administration is beginning to disbelieve its own red herring propaganda enough to give serious attention to strengthening the Nation's espionage laws.

Note that the innocent-until-proved-guilty Mr. Hiss is indicted not on a charge of turning over secret Government documents to a confessed Communist spy; he is just being indicted for saying he didn't do it.

In other words, he is indicted for perjury only, because the espionage law permits any peacetime traitor who tampers with American security to go free if he can conceal his crime for 3 years.

How Is Our Income Distributed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by William Hard which appeared in the December 1948 issue of the Reader's Digest:

HOW IS AMERICAN INCOME DISTRIBUTED?

(By William Hard)

Preachers and teachers are among America's most forceful influences. As a group they feel their social responsibility. They are interested in "economic justice." Large numbers of them believe that our present distribution of income is grossly unjust. They express that view in the pulpit, in the classroom, in their writings. Their sincerity cannot be successfully assailed.

One question, though, can properly be asked: How accurately are they informed about the true facts of income distribution in this country?

The American Economic Foundation has attempted to find an answer to that question. It employed the Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N. J.—Dr. Claude Robinson, president—to make a poll of representative clergymen and teachers in communities

of more than 2,500 population. The clergymen were Protestant, Catholic, Jewish. The teachers were social-science teachers.

Among the questions asked by Dr. Robinson's trained interviewers were three that had to do with the general national distribution of the following forms of income: (a) Wages and salaries; (b) dividends and interest; (c) rents.

In each case the person interviewed was asked: "What proportion of this form of income do you think goes to people whose total income is under $5,000 a year? And what proportion do you think goes to people whose total income is $5,000 or more?"

The answers showed clearly that these preachers and teachers, as a group, gravely overestimated the income payments going to the upper brackets and gravely underestimated the income payments going to the lower brackets. Let us grant that our present income distribution contains many flaws. Surely, though, it is desirable that our spiritual and intellectual leaders know the facts about it.

On the point of wages and salaries, the answers given in the poll averaged out to the following estimate: Only 66 percent of wages and salaries goes to the people with total income under $5,000.

This answer is at great variance with the facts. These facts are disclosed in a pamphlet published last year on the national income and its distribution by the Rev. Edward A. Keller, director of the bureau of economic research of the University of Notre Dame. Father Keller took the official figures, as issued by the United States Department of Commerce and by the Treasury Department, and broke them down into tables showing the actual distribution of all the main forms of income.

The tables showed that our $5,000-and-over group gets only 10.2 percent of our total of wages and salaries, while our under-$5,000 group gets not 66 percent, as Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers think, but 89.8 percent.

Moreover, when the people in the $5,000-and-over group get through paying Federal income taxes, their proportion of all wages and salaries shrinks to 5.5 percent. There is not enough fat any more on these "bloated" individuals to make a meal of any heartiness for the rest of the population, even if they were swallowed whole.

Let us look at dividends and interest. The people in the $5,000-and-over group own large quantities of corporation stocks and bonds. On the other hand, the people in the under-$5,000 groups own millions of savings-bank deposits and insurance policies and shares in building and loan associations, on all of which there are interest payments. So how does it come out?

Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers—on the average—think that the people in the under $5,000 group get only about 29 percent of the total of dividends and interest. The fact is that they get 69.4 percent of it. The people in the $5,000-and-over group get only 30.6 percent of it. And, after Federal income taxes, they get only 17.3 percent.

Now dividends and interest are the supremely capitalistic form of income. They represent a return on investment. They represent profit. Is profit disgraceful? It often seems to be thought so. Then let it be understood that the overwhelming bulk of this disgrace goes to Americans with incomes under $5,000 a year. That is American capitalism as it actually is.

Now let us consider a character who in many minds is particularly obnoxious. Let us consider the landlord. That last syllable of his title indicates his descent from medieval times, when there were lords and serfs. He still retains his feudal reputation for arbitrary grasping behavior. So today we have special Federal legislation controlling rents on behalf of the tenant, who is by definition deserving, against the landlord, who is by definition predatory. Who, then, are these peculiarly predatory Americans?

Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers, on the average, think that the people in the under $5,000 group get about 30 percent of the total of all income from rents. The fact is that they get 83.1 percent of it. The people in the $5,000-and-over group get only 16.9 percent of it. And, after Federal income taxes, they get only 9.6 percent.

In many countries landlordism is a habit of the few. In the United States it is a habit of millions.

The fact is that, partly by a natural American process and partly through certain artificialities of taxation, the millions in this country are steadily getting a larger and larger proportion of the total national income from all sources. And what has happened to the few citizens who have incomes of $25,000 a year and over—the former economic royalists who are now gluttons of privilege? Father Keller's calculations exhibit their fate from 1917 to 1944.

In 1917, after paying Federal income taxes, they had 6.7 percent of all national income distributed to individuals. In 1932—under President Hoover—they sank to 3.4 percent of the national income. Under President Roosevelt they continued sinking. In 1938 their share of the national income was 3 percent. In 1941 it was 2.5 percent. In 1944 after paying their fantastic uppermost-bracket taxes, they garnered into their privileged pockets, as their proportion of the national income of the American people, just 1.3 percent. And Father Keller's studies of subsequent years convince him that no substantial change has occurred since 1944 in the distribution of income between higher- and lower-income groups, except perhaps in favor of the lower groups.

It is often said—and especially by the men of Moscow—that our whole American economic life is controlled by a handful of monopoly-capitalists—that is, by persons among those in the income group above $25,000 a year. If such persons do indeed control our whole American economic life, how big hearted they are. Of their own free will they have deliberately reduced the share of their group in our total national income to one-fifth of what it was in 1917.

The fact is, of course, that forces far beyond the control of our monopoly-capitalists are reshaping the distribution of our national income, in some ways for the better, in some ways for the worse. Our central effort now should be to cease the abuse of one group by another and to come to agreement on the facts.

Some statistics issued by some corporations are misleading. Equally so are some statistics issued by some unions. If there could be agreement on statistics, one of the great causes of conflict between corporations and unions in the course of their collective-bargaining negotiations would be removed.

That point has been strongly stressed by Fred G. Clark, general chairman of the American Economic Foundation. He has earnestly suggested: In a labor dispute let all the arithmetic of both sides be checked by impartial accountants. Let agreed figures be accepted by both sides. Management then could not be accused of hiding profits. Union leaders could not be accused of distorting them. Negotiations could proceed not on suspicions but on facts.

If Mr. Clark could ever get total agreement on identical facts for corporation executives and union leaders and agricultural leaders and Government politicians to use in their controversies with one another, he would certainly be one of America's greatest benefactors. We would make national progress much faster. We would cooperate for that progress much more fraternally.

In any free society there must always be freely expressed tensions between group and group. The only way to ease those tensions is through facts accepted by all groups. In the United States today there is no group—not the preachers, not the teachers, not the businessmen, not the labor men, not the farmers, not the politicians, not the journalists—that could truly say:

"As a group we have a comprehensive and clear image in our minds of the interlocking rights and wrongs and of the interlocking activities and ambitions of all the various segments of the American economy."

We must travel far before we really understand this America of ours in its economic workings. But let us start traveling, and traveling fast, lest the present tensions between our groups split us apart into chaos.

Imitation of Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint statement by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association:

A JOINT STATEMENT

The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association believe that the time has come to urge Federal and State legislators to prohibit the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in semblance of butter.

Impartial surveys in public eating places indicate widespread fraud and deception in the sale of yellow substitutes for butter. When the public asks for and pays for butter in stores or public eating places it is entitled to get real butter—not a product artificially colored to resemble butter.

The major Federal curb on "butterleggers" has been exercised in the past through the power to tax oleomargarine. Recent Supreme Court decisions now appear, however, to extend and strengthen the Federal Government's power to cover those intrastate activities which may affect interstate commerce.

Such decisions would seem to authorize a ban on oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation or semblance of butter, and should enable the Government to do away with the present commodity taxes and license fees on retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers.

We, therefore, propose that the commercial imitation of butter be prohibited for the protection of consumer and dairy farmer alike, with adequate funds for enforcement by the Food and Drug Administration and appropriate State agencies.

Under this plan consumers will be able to buy all the oleo they want in its most economical, uncolored form without the payment of any taxes whatever. Retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers would be freed of all burdensome bookkeeping and reporting requirements. Hospitals and other institutions would be enabled to serve uncolored oleo without license or tax.

WHY THIS POLICY?

With yellow oleomargarine readily available in semblance of butter, dairy farmers believe that consumer fraud and deception in retail outlets would increase.

There is every incentive to pass off imitations of butter as real butter—the difference in cost; the huge volume of sales involved; and the ease of substitution. No other basic food is so easily copied. There is no such thing as an imitation potato, for instance, or imitation bread.

Butter's naturally yellow color is the only key by which real butter can be identified at sight. And butter is the balance wheel of a dairy industry which supplies about 40 percent of our beef and veal as well as all of our milk. Proper soil conservation and a due regard for diversified agriculture require that butter outlets be maintained.

For the protection of dairy farmer and consumer alike, therefore, three leading dairy organizations believe that removal of taxes and other controls on oleomargarine should be accompanied by a flat ban on the commercial imitation of butter in stores and public eating places. The policy of the National Grange is in harmony with this viewpoint.

It's fair to consumers. No more taxes—free choice of spreads.

It's fair to retailers and wholesalers. No more license fees, withdrawal records or reports.

It's fair to 2,750,000 dairy farmers and dairy industry workers. It protects them and their customers from fraudulent competition.

It's fair to oleo manufacturers. It offers complete distribution through unrestricted retail outlets.

And it's supported by farmers the Nation over.

Community Contribution to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, the city of Rochester, N. Y., will again lead the country, as it has so often done in the past, in a new field of activity. This time it is in the matter of national defense, specifically in connection with the recruitment of a class of 40 aviation cadets.

Sparked by the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle and the Rochester Times-Union, Rochester will set an example of unification at work when this celebration is held, involving the cooperation and active participation of all regular and reserve components in the area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter which I have received from Mr. Ira C. Sapozink, executive secretary, Rochester's All-Services Review, and associated with the department of public relations of the Gannett newspapers, outlining some of the plans and objectives of this celebration:

ROCHESTER TIMES-UNION,
DEMOCRAT AND CHRONICLE,
December 29, 1948.

Congressman KENNETH B. KEATING,
Fortieth District, New York,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just about a year ago this past November, Maj. Gen. Robert F. Webster, commanding general of the First Air Force, addressed a group in Rochester interested in aviation, and told of the need for procuring aviation cadets. Herbert W. Cruickshank, general business manager of the Gannett newspapers, was the toastmaster.

Inspired by the general's talk, Mr. Cruickshank took up the challenge of the First Air Force chief by announcing an all-out drive for aviation cadets in the Rochester area. General Webster at that point invited Mr. Cruickshank to act as chairman of an aviation cadet procurement committee in the Rochester area.

A few months passed during which time the machinery was set into motion to procure cadets for a July 1948 class. With the prime objective to stimulate recruiting interest, the Democrat and Chronicle and the Rochester Times-Union of the Gannett newspaper group launched an effective promotion and publicity campaign under the supervision of Mr. Cruickshank which resulted in the procurement of 26 cadets for the July class. This was termed by Air Force leaders as a remarkable feat and great tribute was showered the Rochester Gannett newspapers for their outstanding interest in the development of America's much needed air might today.

Following the successful procurement of the summer class, Col. Henry L. Barrett, acting for Major General Webster, invited Mr. Cruickshank and the Rochester Gannett newspapers to attempt to procure 40 cadets for the 1949 March class. Presently this campaign is under way with a most unique approach.

We have heard many stories about general unification of the armed forces. Well, Rochester is a community with great belief—Rochester manufactured means quality. This holds true in the promotion of public-service campaigns, too. In the challenge facing Rochester for the procurement of 40 cadets, Mr. Cruickshank called a meeting a few weeks ago of all of the commanding officers of the reserve components of the armed forces in the Rochester area including the National Guard, Naval Reserves, and Marine Reserves, as well as the regular Rochester area Army and Air Force recruiting commander to plan a military night in Rochester to be called the Rochester all-services review.

On January 14 between 5,000–6,000 Rochester area citizens and prospective candidates for military services are expected to attend the all-services review which will be held in the Main Street East Armory in Rochester, N. Y.

Chairman Cruickshank in a special announcement in the Democrat and Chronicle and Rochester Times-Union pointed out that the main reasons for the all-services review are as follows:

1. To honor United States Air Forces and to stimulate the procurement of aviation cadets in the Rochester area.

2. To stimulate recruiting of men for the Rochester area reserve units participating in the show.

3. To make citizens or Rochester more conscious of our need for national defense.

Highlight of the Air Forces night in Rochester will be the Five Hundred and Eighty-first Air Force Band which will be flown up to Rochester for the occasion through the personal interest of General Webster.

High ranking Army, Air Force, National Guard, Naval, Marine, and Organized Reserve officers have accepted an invitation to take the review.

I am writing you this letter to point out the general promotion support being given the Army and Air Force Recruiting Office, National Guard, Naval Reserves, Marine Reserves, and Organized Reserve in their recruiting efforts by the Democrat and Chronicle and the Rochester Times-Union, and to also emphasize the unity and harmony existing among the Reserve components in the Rochester area.

This information I thought would be of interest not only to you but to all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Cordially,

IRA C. SAPOZINK,
Executive Secretary,
Rochester's All-Services Review.

The Seattle Air Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to Mr. Joseph J. O'Connell, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, by one of Seattle's leading and most civic-minded citizens, Mr. Lawrence M. Arnold. The self-explanatory letter relates to the tragic airplane disaster in Seattle on the night of January 2, in which 11 young college students were killed. Along with Mr. Arnold's letter I ask that an editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of January 5, 1949, be printed, as well as a news column from the Seattle (Wash.) Times of January 5, 1949, written by Mr. Ross Cunningham, associate editor of that newspaper. Both news items deal with this plane crash.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 6, 1949.*

Mr. JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. O'CONNELL: In all likelihood, you will probably not hear directly from any of the saddened, bereaved, and grief-stricken mothers and fathers of the 11 Yale students who were unnecessarily killed, and the many others who were critically injured and burned in the crash of a nonscheduled and charted DC-3 plane at Boeing Airport in Seattle on Sunday night, January 2, which plane was unable to leave the runways. You are, however, going to hear about it from many other sources and from me, not because my own son, a Yale student, barely missed taking this same flight, but because I have known most intimately many of these boys since childhood, and am one of the many thousands of incensed citizens who places the blame for this tragedy on the Civil Aeronautics Administration for lack of regulatory procedure at the airport.

The Seattle newspapers have carried headlines and photographs for 3 or 4 days about the tragedy and that its causes were being investigated in the usual manner by the officials of the CAA. Irrespective of all of the charges and counter charges, there was obviously only one cause for the incident, and that is that there was no one in authority to prevent the flight from taking place. The local newspapers, airport and CAA officials, and other observers have stated that:

1. The field was very icy and a fog was hanging over it.

2. Both visibility and ceiling were below the minimums required for a take-off.

3. Regularly scheduled air lines had canceled flights in and out of Boeing Field due to poor flying weather at that particular time.

4. Emmett G. Flood, Jr., who was to have piloted the plane, refused the flight, for reasons he failed to disclose, and a substitute pilot, William Chavers, agreed to take the flight.

5. William Chavers, the pilot, was warned twice that conditions were "below minimum," which was tantamount to telling him that the field was closed.

6. Ice, which had presumably been washed from the wings, not with hot water, but with an alcohol solution, had again formed before the plane took off.

7. All scheduled air lines serving the Nation are under strict company and civil aeronautic regulations, and are not permitted to take a plane in the air under field minimums, etc.

8. There must be a prompt and sweeping investigation of allegations that emergency equipment available at the airport was most inadequate.

9. Regulations must be changed to make sure that planes are not permitted to take off under weather conditions of the kind which prevailed at the time of the crash.

I think that most people realize that nonscheduled flights are not subject to the usual regulations and restrictions which are imposed on the regular air lines, but such chartered planes are, nevertheless, public carriers, and under your jurisdiction, and should be similarly safeguarded in every respect. I feel confident, however, that the public is unaware that such nonscheduled flights cannot be properly serviced because adequate facilities are not available to them. The local press has stated for instance, that all United and Northwest Airlines' planes out of Seattle earlier and later that same evening, had obviously been most thoroughly de-iced before departure.

There can be, therefore, no justification whatsoever for the inexcusable and virtually deliberate slaughter of these fine young boys, all of whom are from prominent Northwest families, and the only comment one hears is that, "they never should have permitted the flight to take off." I am sure that the public feels it is your responsibility, above all others, to provide safe air travel at all times, whether it is in nonscheduled or scheduled flights. I think the public furthermore appreciates the fact that the so-called nonscheduled flight business in the United States is providing employment to many World War II veterans and many others, but there have been so many catastrophes in nonscheduled flights that you, more than anyone else, must realize that the confidence of the public in plane travel generally, becomes much impaired as the result of such tragedies. To permit such a condition to continue is, among other things, grossly unfair and detrimental to our major air lines, most of which, as the result of proper regulation, provide an excellent service. It would seem, therefore, if regulatory legislation is needed to prevent such outrageous incidents from occurring in the future, that the CAA would seek it immediately.

I am addressing a copy of this letter to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to several members of the Cabinet, to our entire congressional delegation from the State of Washington, as well as to certain other Members in Congress. I am also forwarding copies of this letter to the Seattle Times and Seattle Post Intelligencer with the request that these newspapers continue to give this very unnecessary catastrophe all of the unfavorable publicity which it deserves, such as the article enclosed herewith.

If the Federal and local supervisory authorities do not take every possible measure to safeguard nonscheduled air travel, and prevent similar occurrences, I am sure that the public will censor them severely and feel that they are not only derelict in their responsibilities but are unworthy of a public trust, which is to safeguard the lives of our citizens.

In conclusion, may I say that I would very much appreciate a response from you, indicating how, in your opinion, such measures can best be taken.

Very sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE M. ARNOLD.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 5, 1949]

AIRPLANE DISASTER POINTS TWO LESSONS

There is considerable controversy over the cause of the disastrous airplane accident at Boeing Field Sunday night which resulted in the death of 14 young men.

That was to be expected, under the circumstances, and the public should not form any final judgment in the matter until all the charges and counter charges have been thoroughly sifted.

But out of the welter of confusion which invariably surrounds such tragic incidents two facts emerge crystal clear:

1. There must be a prompt and sweeping investigation of allegations that the emergency equipment available at the airport was inadequate.

2. Regulations must be changed if necessary to make sure that airplanes are not permitted to take off under weather conditions of the kind which prevailed at the time of the crash.

The assertion that fire-fighting and ambulance equipment at both Boeing Field and the Seattle-Tacoma Airport at Bow Lake is deficient is particularly ironical.

Only a few days ago the whole world was thrilled by the rescue of a dozen Americans who were marooned on the Greenland ice cap. Both the Air Force and the Navy threw all their resources into the effort and they kept at it until every man was safe. The cost came to approximately half a million dollars, but no one questioned the expenditure because human lives were at stake.

Yet here we have a case, in the same country, in which it is alleged that a far greater number of lives are being jeopardized every day for lack of equipment which would cost only a fraction of half a million dollars. That just doesn't make sense.

It is obviously the duty of the county commissioners, who have jurisdiction over Boeing Field, and the port commissioners, who operate Bow Lake, to get together with the companies using the two airports and see to it that any deficiencies in the way of equipment are remedied without delay.

It would seem that there must be considerably more than local action to keep planes grounded when weather conditions are as hazardous as they were Sunday night.

There is a dispute over just what conversation took place between the operator of the control tower at Boeing Field and the pilot of the plane immediately before the take-off. A Civil Aeronautics Administration official says the pilot was warned twice that visibility was below minimum and was advised that it would be illegal if he left the ground. On the other hand, an attorney representing the independent company which operated the charter plane maintains that there was a clearance for take-off.

Regardless of which version is correct, it appears that the operator of the control tower lacked the absolute authority to forbid a flight. He can keep a plane grounded if it would endanger other planes in the air or on the field, but he acts only in an advisory capacity as far as weather is concerned. The pilot has the final responsibility. If he makes an illegal take-off, a complaint can be filed against him subsequently—but that is palpably too late to do any good if his plane has already crashed.

Clearly someone—and the control-tower operator is the logical person—should have the power to keep a plane from taking off under any circumstances which endanger the lives of those aboard.

Pilots employed by the commercial air lines operating regular schedules do not make a practice of ignoring warnings from the control-tower operator.

But there are others who do not have the same sense of responsibility and they must be restrained.

[From the Seattle Times of January 5, 1949]

SCHEDULED AIR LINES USUALLY MORE CAUTIOUS

(By Ross Cunningham)

The crash of the Yale students' plane at Boeing Field Sunday night focuses attention on the question of the relative safety of the scheduled and nonscheduled air carriers. Both types of carriers operate under the safety standards prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration—but the fact remains that there are a good many veteran air passengers who follow a rule of staying out of nonscheduled planes.

Most of the insurance companies recognize a distinction because many policies remain in force if the insured travels in a scheduled carrier but are void if he goes aloft in a nonscheduled carrier.

There is the case of the woman who accompanied her nephew to Boeing Field Sunday night to see him off on the Yale special, but for some reason she induced him to board a scheduled plane instead.

A scheduled air carrier is one that operates regularly over routes certified by the Civil Aeronautics Board; a nonscheduled carrier—known in the trade as a nonsked—is one that operates on a charter basis when a pay load can be drummed up.

The two types of carriers often are in competition—and the scheduled carriers would like the CAB to drive the nonskeds off the routes. The nonskeds usually charge lower fares and are troublesome competition for the regular carriers, particularly in the Alaska trade.

The nonskeds have the sympathy of being underdogs because they are small, usually are operated by veterans and some of them have made outstanding records for safety and performance.

But an air passenger can walk into the office of a scheduled carrier's office and buy a ticket with complete assurance that every last precaution is being taken for his safety.

Unless the passenger is familiar with the nonsked he buys a ticket from, he may find himself going aloft in a craft whose mechanical condition and ground-crew support barely meet Civil Aeronautics Administration standards. Or he may travel in a plane as safe as the best.

The big carriers have learned over the years that they must maintain extensive ground facilities to hold accidents to a minimum. There are the mechanical crews, meteorologists, supervisory personnel, and dispatchers. When a scheduled air carrier is about to go aloft, the power of veto of the flight rests with at least two persons—the pilot and the dispatcher. If either is uncertain about safety the trip is off.

There is no financial consideration on the part of the dispatcher for a scheduled operator; he gets the same pay whether the plane flies or not. The pilot gets a fixed base pay plus additional pay for air mileage. Pilots have been heard to grumble that the dispatchers are too cautious. The policy from central headquarters of big air carriers is to keep the planes on the ground when in doubt.

There appears to have been a disagreement Sunday night between ground personnel and the plane's crew over the advisability of the flight; the decision to take off was

made by the plane's crew. If it had been a scheduled carrier, its dispatcher's veto would have halted the flight.

Some of those studying the crash have decided this is what happened: The efficiency of a wing is reduced if it has any amount of ice or frost. (Some pilots like to be able to read the wing numbers in take-off; because it assures them the wing is clear—sometimes ground crews follow the plane to the end of the runway to clear its wings before it makes its run to go aloft). The Yale special had just enough frozen moisture on the wings to hamper its efficiency and it fell off to the right in a stall and an attempted correction by the pilot dug the left wing into the runway and it crashed into the hangar, according to the theory advanced.

The Need for a Single Supply Catalog for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the bill entitled "National Defense Catalog Act" or H. R. 321 may be the key to unification of the services that the Congress prescribed in the National Security Act of 1947. It could be used as a pattern for the manner in which all the functions performed by the services may be organized and handled and it so affects every other operation of the services that in solving this single problem the way is open for the solution of many others.

When a log jam blocks the movement of logs down the stream, keen eyes search the log jam for the key log. When this is dynamited out, the log jam is broken and the logs resume their steady course down the stream.

Passage of H. R. 321, by solving the supply catalog problem, will remove the key obstacle that has been holding up unification.

Among other things the bill provides for the following:

The Secretary of Defense is directed to establish a single supply catalog to be used by all units of the National Military Establishment and is empowered to issue the necessary directives to the services to see that this is done. Apparently the National Security Act is lacking in this authority.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to delegate this authority to the Chairman of the Munitions Board who is directed to assign this authority to a single competent person, a Director, who shall report directly to the Chairman. This eliminates the "administration by debate" that is hamstringing the entire Military Establishment.

The qualifications of the Director should be carefully considered. A big name or a brass hat will not achieve a workable catalog system—that has been tried in the past.

What is needed is a man having a knowledge of industry, of military supply and cataloging, and who, if possible, is an engineer. Perhaps the appointment of the Director should have the approval of Congress.

Under the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Munitions Board the Director will be responsible for establishing all policies and for seeing that all operations pertaining to cataloging are carried out properly and efficiently.

A National Defense Catalog Agency is established within the National Military Establishment on the staff of the Chairman of the Munitions Board whose organization shall be determined by the Director.

Cataloging is defined for the first time. At the present time every unit of the National Military Establishment has a different idea of cataloging. This is about the same situation that would result if the term "widgeon" meant to one person five elephants, to another one cow, to another a flock of geese, and so forth. It is almost impossible to discuss over-all cataloging in the services because of the confusion as to terms and definitions.

As in any well-run organization, the top staff will establish policies and procedures and resolve differences arising in the operations units.

All operations are to be delegated to operations agencies to be established with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the supply services and bureaus or in any common supply agency established by the Secretary of Defense, such as the Army-Navy Procurement Agency. The head of such operating agency will be appointed with the approval of the Director of the National Defense Catalog Agency and will report only to the head of the supply service or bureau.

This is extremely important because catalog operations, if they are to be of the greatest service to supply operations, must be carried on so that both appear to be one great operation.

If it were possible for desks of the two men charged respectively with supply and cataloging to be placed next to each other, the maximum efficiency and economy would be achieved in supply operations. One of the principal reasons for the failure of catalog operations carried on by the Government has been the separation of supply and catalog operations.

To insure that the policies and schedules of cataloging are coordinated within each department, the Secretary of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are directed to designate a staff officer whose sole responsibility will be to perform these functions and advise the Secretary as to the status of cataloging operations. This officer will not perform any actual operations; consequently will not need a large staff.

One of the most important and far-reaching provisions is that which directs the head of the National Defense Catalog Agency to assign each item of supply carried on the records of any supply activity of the National Military Establishment to one and only one of the catalog operations group where all catalog operations will be performed on it, including identification, writing descriptions, establishing standards, and publishing the information in the catalog. This information when published will be used by all supply activities of the armed forces. Although the same criteria used to assign catalog responsibility could be used to assign procurement responsibility, no attempt is being made at this time to assign item procurement responsibility.

The benefits to be derived from establishing a single catalog system for the armed forces are so great that it is believed best not to attempt to assign procurement responsibility at the same time. After the catalog system is operating, it would then be comparatively easy to assign procurement responsibility.

In order to provide an incentive to the services to cooperate in the establishing of the catalog system, it has been directed that no item may be used by or procured for the use of the services unless the catalog agency has had a chance to analyze it and catalog it. The Director is empowered to determine after what period items cannot be used by or procured for the services until they have been cataloged. This will be done in such a manner as to prevent delay in supply operations.

An Advisory Council is provided whose representation includes the officers on the staffs of the Secretary of the Army, of the Secretary of the Navy, and of the Air Force; also it includes representatives from industry, from other interested Government departments, and perhaps from allied nations. This Council will be purely advisory and will in no way detract from the responsibility of the Director. Additional specialized representation from industry, from other technical services or bureaus, or from other interested departments may be provided as an advisory committee assisting the head of each catalog-operations division. Industry has yet another channel of contact through the inspection or quality-control service.

With the authority to assign items and functions to catalog operating agencies must go the authority to consult upon, advise, and approve the budget of any catalog-operating agency before it is submitted to the budget officer of the department.

In this way I believe it is possible for Congress to assist the National Military Establishment in achieving unification, assist industry by simplifying the multiplicity of Government specifications and regulations, and, above all, reducing the tremendous waste and inefficiency of military supply operations.

Amputee Automobile Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H. R. 283, to permit the furnishing of automobiles with special equipment for amputees of World War II. The bill I

am offering is identical to the bill that passed the Senate in 1947 and extends the benefits of the present law to those who have suffered the loss or the loss of the use of one or both hands and/or permanent impairment of vision. The present authority is restricted to those who have lost the use of one or both feet.

There are a number of veterans who have sustained the loss of the use of one or both hands who are disabled to a greater degree than those who are now qualified for benefits. Amputees of all classes have found it most difficult to travel in public-transportation facilities and maintain their balance making transfers, change, and other necessary adjustments for their safety and welfare.

The furnishing of cars to this group is in every sense of the word a prosthetic appliance needed for the rehabilitation of this group of veterans who have given so much for their country.

The Government would contribute, under my bill, not more than $1,600 per car, and if the total purchase price was in excess of that amount, it would have to be paid through an arrangement agreed upon by the seller and the veteran purchaser. The benefits of the bill are limited to 3 years after the date of enactment or 3 years after the veteran's discharge, if such discharge does not occur until on or after such effective date.

Some 22,500 cars have been furnished under this program since it was first started in the Seventy-ninth Congress. The men who have been fortunate enough to obtain cars have reported great success and many of them have established businesses of their own.

The latest figures which I have obtained from the Veterans' Administration show that some 7,610 veterans would be eligible for the benefits of this legislation by the passage of my bill. Based on previous experience, approximately two-thirds of this number will ultimately receive cars. This means that the cost as a result of this bill will be something in the neighborhood of $8,000,000. This figure might be further reduced by use of unexpended balance. Surely this is not too much to ask in a day when we spend billions for the relief and rehabilitation of people overseas. So that we may have a complete history of this legislation, I include at this point the following excerpts from the public laws which authorize the furnishing of cars for amputees:

PUBLIC LAW 663, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: To enable the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide an automobile or other conveyance, at a cost per vehicle or conveyance of not to exceed $1,600, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II who is entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use of one or both legs at or above the ankle under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, $30,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this paragraph shall be used for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this paragraph until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manenr consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided further*, That under such regulations as the Administrator may prescribe the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

"SEC. 303. This act may be cited as the "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947."

"Approved August 8, 1946."

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 161, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS; CHAPTER 206, FIRST SESSION

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements: *Provided*, That amounts expended hereunder shall be deducted from such appropriation for 1948 when H. R. 3839 is enacted into law.

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: The authority and funds provided under this heading in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.), are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948."

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 271, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $5,000,000 to be available for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663)—$5,000,000."

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1948; PUBLIC LAW 785, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: For an additional amount for 'Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans,' $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services,' and to be available until June 30, 1949, for the purposes specified under this head in the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 663), as extended by the Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1949; PUBLIC LAW 904, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS; VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

For an additional amount for "Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans," $5,000,000.

Bevin Strikes in Blind Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the sending of British planes over Palestine by Mr. Bevin is a wicked act. It is a violation of the UN Charter and a violation of international law as well. Mr. Bevin acted deliberately to prejudice the peace talks between Egypt and Israel at Rhodes. It is an act without justification and is provocative of war. The Israelis had no recourse but to shoot them down. Mr. Bevin wants to drive the Israelis out of the Negev and stops at nothing to accomplish this end, despite the fact that the Negev is Israeli territory and that the presence of Egyptian forces therein is a clear-cut act of aggression on the part of Egypt. This violation of the UN Charter and of international law on the part of Britain call for protest of the United States.

Israel has stepped on Bevin's pet corn and he strikes out in blind, wild frustration.

The Present Administration Is Antidairy in Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the present administration that now calls itself the Fair Deal has not bothered to be too fair with the dairy industry. When the oleo-versus-butter controversy was at its height, a certain incident took place which is shown in the following letters:

AUGUST 2, 1948.

Secretary CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRANNAN: On the last day of the session an attorney for some firm called me off the floor and said that his plant wished to import butter from Denmark which cost 62 cents a pound laid down in New York. His story was that it was not to be used for domestic consumption, but was to be reexported. I was so busy keeping track of what was going on in the oleomargarine business that I did not go into too much detail and told him that I did not know anything about the situation.

He said that he could not bring this butter in as a result of an embargo or that he could not get permission to do so. In thinking this over since, I have wondered if there was an embargo on imports of any products. I am not taking the position that there should or should not be, but I wish to have the facts about the situation.

Sincerely yours,

REID F. MURRAY,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, August 16, 1948.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of August 2 concerning import restrictions on butter from Denmark.

A brief review of the policies which have been in effect with respect to trade in butter may be summarized as follows:

1. In view of world-wide shortages of butter and other fats and oils, the United States has continued to maintain restrictions on exports and imports of butter and other fats and oils. In this connection, it is necessary

for exporters to secure export licenses before making export shipments, and for importers to secure import licenses before arranging for shipments of butter to this country from foreign supplies.

2. Exports of butter from the United States are being limited almost entirely to Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippine Islands. These areas have normally depended upon United States supplies. Such exports, however, do not exceed 1 percent of United States supplies.

3. Imports of butter are not being authorized at this time. The principal reason for restricting such imports is because the United States is currently shipping substantial quantities of fats and oils to deficit countries in Europe. In this connection, it is apparent that imports of Danish butter would reduce supplies available for other European countries with the result that the United States would be requested to make compensating shipments of either butter or other fats and oils. Furthermore, fats and oils are under international allocation and supplies of butter are taken into account in such allocations.

4. Since it is the declared policy of the United States to assist economic recovery in Europe, we have considered it inadvisable to authorize United States importers to bid on foreign supplies of butter intended for European countries. If such bidding were permitted, it is probable that world prices would be further stimulated.

5. If imports of butter into the United States were to be authorized in substantial quantities, it is believed that considerable difficulty would be encountered in continuing restrictions on exports. The United States butter industry would be confronted with competition of imported foreign butter while at the same time it would not be able to sell freely in foreign markets.

6. With respect to imports of butter for subsequent reexport, we have followed a practice of permitting ordinary transshipments. We have not, however, permitted United States firms to import butter to be placed in storage warehouses awaiting the development of export sales.

7. Recently we have requested the State Department and Economic Cooperation Administration to review the Danish butter situation in relation to United States import policies for the purpose of determining whether the economy of the European countries would be helped or hindered if the United States were to authorize very limited imports for ships' stores and reexport. The problem is now under consideration by Mr. Harriman and the ECA coordinating committee in Paris.

In view of the foregoing considerations, we do not believe that any substantial change in import or export policies with respect to butter would be in the interests of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
Under Secretary.

The points to note are these:

First. That this administration prevented butter from being laid down in New York at 62 cents per pound at a time the oleo forces were using the price of butter at $1 per pound as a talking point for passing the Rivers bill.

Second. It may not have made economic sense to import butterfat in the form of butter when millions of tons of cattle feed were being exported, but if that is the situation, why have imports of butterfat in the form of cheese been so acceptable? Imports of butterfat in the form of cheese from Italy even has not seemed to disturb the administration.

This is just one more piece of evidence showing that the President has had the power, authority, and money to control prices—whether high or low prices—and in this case he gave aid and comfort to the oleo interests who were trying to make legislative capital out of the higher butter prices.

Surely so long as this administration furnishes even the children in the school-lunch program with skim milk—although not in Wisconsin—it does not make good sense to be furnishing feed to others so that they can send butterfat to us.

This was also at a time when the armed forces were trying to break down the requiring of butter being served in the Army and Navy in order to save a few dollars to put more brass on the brass hats.

The Air Corps uses butter because they know that eyesight is protected by the vitamin A contained in butter and they do not wish to use a fish-oil product for their supply of vitamin A.

Dams on Current River, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BIRCH TREE, MO., *January 5, 1949.*
Hon. A. S. J. CARNAHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARNAHAN: I have just listened to the good state of the Union address by President Truman, and am much pleased with his recommendations to the new Congress. I am especially pleased with the part regarding the continued harnessing of our abundant water power to provide electricity and flood control.

It is my understanding that the Congress will soon be called upon to give consideration to the matter of making or refusing to make authorization for the two dams on Current River. You will no doubt be in a key position in this matter, and I want to assure you that at least 80 percent of the people in Shannon County, including the people in the affected area, do want to see these dams built and we would be much pleased to know that you favor them. It is our understanding that failure to make authorization for them now may mean that we may never again have the opportunity to secure such a great improvement in our section. Recent articles carried by St. Louis and other papers against these dams do not convey the sentiment of our local people who must remain here and pay taxes in future years. Taxes, as you know, have just about doubled in the last few years and, with our economy at its present level, they are not such a burden but with a few bad years down here and with but very little industry to employ our idle people, it will be next to impossible to pay our taxes.

If a true survey of the sentiment of all the people in Shannon County could be had, I am sure my estimate of 80 percent would be conservative. The sentiment in Shannon County is: Let's get this huge amount of improvement while we can, with the hope that it might bring into this section small or large manufacturing plants to employ the many good people here who must have outside employment or Government aid to exist. Many believe that if these lakes were built, it would expedite the completion into our section of higher-type highways in order to handle the additional traffic.

Sincerely,

J. L. WEBB.

Radio Address of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast of my colleague, Hon. GERALD R. FORD, JR., Fifth District of Michigan, delivered January 9, 1949, to his constituents:

This is the first edition of your radio congressional report. Each week in the next 2 years while Congress is in session I, as your Representative from Ottawa and Kent Counties, plan to make a 5-minute report on just what has been going on in the Nation's Capital. When the President speaks to a joint session of the Senate and House, as he did this week, I will analyze his words as they pertain to our district. Important pending legislation will also be discussed, pro and con. When local citizens are in Washington they will appear on the program with me. Please remember this is your program, just as I am your Representative. With suggestions and comment from you, both the program and I will benefit.

The Eighty-first Congress convened at noon on Monday, January 3. After the individual roll call by States the majority party nominated Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, as Speaker of the House. The Republicans in turn nominated Representative JOE MARTIN. The result was a foregone conclusion but the procedure is apparently carried out each 2 years, regardless of the known result beforehand. Mr. MARTIN remains as Republican minority leader.

After Mr. RAYBURN assumed the Speaker's chair the first real battle took place. During the last 2 years there has been considerable criticism of the manner in which legislation was bottled up in the House Rules Committee. For example, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill and the universal military training proposal were held up and died in the Rules Committee even though acted favorably upon previously by the House Banking and Currency Committee and the Armed Services Committee. Many Republicans and Democrats both in Washington and at home objected to this apparent arbitrary action by the Rules Committee in preventing a vote on these and other measures on the floor of the House.

To make it easier to get legislation before the House of Representatives, Mr. SABATH, of Illinois, proposed that the rules of the Eightieth Congress be adopted with an amendment providing that if the Rules Committee fails to act on a bill within 21 days the chairman of the committee which originally handled the bill can move to have it brought up for House action. A sufficient number of Representatives of both parties,

including myself, voted in favor of this change.

On Wednesday, January 5, the President gave his state of the Union address to a joint session and before a packed gallery. It was a most impressive ceremony to see the President escorted to the rostrum by three of the leading Members of the Senate and a like number from the House. Mr. Truman stated that "the state of the Union is good," and then launched into his proposed program and indicated that he would seek favorable action on all of the legislation advocated in his party's platform. This includes outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the readoption of the old Wagner Act with some amendments. He also asked that the Labor Department be strengthened and the minimum wage increased to at least 75 cents an hour. He likewise hopes to keep the budget in balance and reduce the national debt by increasing individual income taxes in the middle- and high-income groups and by increasing taxes on corporate earnings. He reaffirmed his stand on civil rights but failed to spell out any specific proposals in this regard.

He charged that prices are too high, production too low, and that natural resources were being wasted. He asked for strict controls on American business and suggested that the Government build industrial plants to augment the steel supply if action by private industry fails to meet our needs.

It was an all-inclusive and a rather general message with a promise that he would appear before us in the future with specific programs. Perhaps the most interesting observations I can make would be to tell you of the response from the Members of Congress as the President mentioned certain legislation. Mr. Truman's comments on foreign policy received practically a unanimous ovation. In contrast, the southern Democrats did not applaud when he talked of civil rights while most Republicans and the Democrats from the North did approve enthusiastically this suggestion. When Mr. Truman spoke of balancing the budget everyone applauded, but when he mentioned how this was to be accomplished the response was mixed and hardly unanimous.

In the cloakrooms following the recess it was interesting to note the comments on his speech. As this session progresses I feel you will appreciate the great diversity of feeling among the elected Representatives on the various legislative proposals. Party lines will be split on many issues.

Thanks for listening, and I welcome your suggestions and comments.

In a Nation as Rich as Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

• OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 8, 1949:

IN A NATION AS RICH AS OURS

This week President Truman outlined the program which he promised in his campaign for reelection.

Filled with words like "must," his message demanded that Congress "cooperate." He made quite clear that his idea of Congress's cooperation is to give him everything he wants, in a hurry, and with no back talk.

His proposals make up the most costly program which any national President ever laid before the American Congress—or, for that matter, any other ruler in history ever laid before any legislative body.

Carried out, this program would presently push Federal spending into two or three times its present level, which already is four times what President Roosevelt spent in his palmiest prewar years, and 10 times what was considered normal the last time the Republicans were in control.

In 10 years, the Truman program would dwarf all the gigantic overspending of the World War period.

Quite aside from the merits or demerits in his proposals, the immediate question arises:

Where's the money coming from?

Mr. Truman devoted little time to such a question, which he made clear he would consider to be frivolous, obstructive, and noncooperative.

"In a nation as rich as ours," were his words.

That raises the next question, which is the jack-pot question of the present generation:

Is Uncle Sam rich?

Mr. Truman says so, and apparently thinks so. But on what grounds?

Is it right to call anyone rich who owes more than he owns? The national debt, which is the visible debt of the United States Government, stands at $252,000,000,000. Outstanding paper currency, which is also a public debt, stands at about $32,000,000,000. Add these two together, and the total visible debt owed by the Government is $284,000,000,000, which is nearly equal to the entire total of all assets and resources of all the American people together—estimated at $300,000,000,000.

But that isn't all the debt. Uncle Sam has assumed countless other liabilities, obligations, etc., which would capitalize over two or three times more.

This Nation owes in debts and obligations about three times its total valuation.

How can we be rich when that is our condition?

Saying, as the New Dealers often do, that this kind of debt doesn't count because we owe it to ourselves, is double talk.

This great bulk of this money is owed by Mr. Truman's government to the American people. They turned their earnings over to Uncle Sam in exchange for war bonds. They are entitled to get their money back—and to get it back, incidentally, at face value; not in 50-cent dollars.

It's the Government which owes this money—Mr. Truman's government. What does the Government own with which to pay it back?

Under the system set up by our Constitution, the Government owns very little—a chain of post offices, some battleships and airplanes, scattered parks, public buildings, etc. You can't use this sort of thing to pay debts. Government spending isn't done with what the Government owns, but with what the people own. The Government takes away part of their earnings and savings—about 25 percent of it at present. That's what the Government spends. And the people have to be able to earn money to be taxed, before the Government can collect taxes to be spent.

As to the Government's own resources available for repayment of the debts it has incurred, there is no mystery about them.

Uncle Sam issued two reports at frequent intervals which are his financial statements. They list his assets and his visible debts. (As to the invisible ones, the Government just pretends they don't exist.)

One of these financial reports is the daily statement of the United States Treasury. Turn to it and you will find listed the major liability against the public credit the aforesaid national debt, $252,000,000,000.

As a resource to balance against this debt, there is listed the sum of $24,000,000,000 in gold.

Considering that President Truman, as head of the Government, is also head of the United States Treasury, isn't that a beautiful financial showing for a man who says "we are rich?"

Debts, $252,000,000,000; assets, $24,000,000,000—less than 10 cents on the dollar available to liquidate the liabilities.

The other principal financial report of Uncle Sam is that of the Federal Reserve Bank System. Turn to this, and you find, as a principal liability against the public credit, the sum of $28,000,000,000 in paper currency. (Four billions of paper dollars are in other than reserve notes—principally silver notes.)

Listed as an asset against this is $24,000,000,000 in gold.

But it's the same gold.

A private businessman who hypothecated the same assets for two different debts would be guilty of fraud—but when the Government does it, that's statesmanship.

Combining these two principal financial reports of Uncle Sam, and you find: Visible debt, $280,000,000,000; tangible assets, $24,000,000,000.

Actually, the balance sheet is even worse that shows. The $24,000,000,000 valuation for gold is a purely arbitrary figure, "marked up" back in 1934, and pegged there simply because Uncle Sam has held his corner on gold. What it would bring in an open market, or in a distress sale, no one can guess—probably not more than half of its purported value.

Meanwhile, inflation is surging on to the run-away stage. The value of the American dollar steadily declines, it becomes harder and harder to bolster up the Nation's credit.

Since all private assets are involved with the Government's financial jugglery, if there should be a crack, we then would be much less likely to have merely a panic than to suffer the worst collapse and crash in history—in which all the American people would be rendered destitute.

Is anyone rich who is only a hop, skip, and jump away from receivership and the poorhouse?

The most sensational part of Mr. Truman's address Wednesday wasn't his fantastic socialistic scheme of vast new Federal spending—but his announcement that, despite our debts, watered currency, and overstrained credit, we are rich.

In weighing the Truman program, the first step Congress should take is to call upon President Truman to prove it.

Devastating Freezes in Southern California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, southern California has just experienced one of the most devastating freezes in its history. It has resulted in extensive damage to our citrus fruit throughout that area which is one of the major producing sections for citrus fruits in the Nation.

The losses to citrus groves have been estimated up to $60,000,000 and will have a shattering effect on the economy of southern California, and this disaster

will wipe out hundreds of small growers if action is not taken immediately to extend assistance to them.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has extended loans to many industries in times of financial stress, and I believe it would be proper for the RFC to extend financial aid to our California citrus growers at this time of need, and that the Department of Agriculture should also help in any way possible to save the citrus fruit industry from widespread ruin as the result of the recent freeze.

The following is a resolution adopted by the city council of Los Angeles, Calif., urging that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Agriculture give sympathetic consideration to the proposals for assistance to the citrus growers of southern California:

Whereas the biggest freeze in California's history has brought disaster to the southern California citrus growers, many of whom have already counted their entire groves as a total loss; and

Whereas this citrus-grove loss, which has been estimated all the way up to $60,000,000, will have a shattering effect on the economy of southern California, and is being reflected already in increased prices of citrus fruits to the consumer; and

Whereas this shocking disaster, the worst since 1937, will undoubtedly wipe out completely hundreds of small growers already burdened with bank loans on their destroyed crops; and

Whereas the present administration at Washington is committed to a program of protection for various divisions of agriculture in the form of price controls, crop-storage facilities for the farmers, etc.; and

Whereas the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has extended a helping hand in the form of loans to many industries in times of financial stress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Los Angeles, the legislative body that represents the largest number of people outside of the State government, does by the passage of this resolution respectfully urge that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Agriculture give sympathetic consideration to the proposals for assistance to the citrus growers of southern California, which will be presented by the California congressional Representatives, to the end that hundreds of growers who annually pledge their savings and their borrowing power in the citrus industry, so important to the economy of our State and the health of our Nation, might, through RFC long-term loans, survive the devastation of their present heavy losses.

JANUARY 6, 1949.

Address Before National Conference of Catholic Charities and Society of St. Vincent de Paul

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the dinner meeting of the thirty-fourth national conference of Catholic Charities and Society of St. Vincent de Paul at Hotel Statler, Boston, October 12, 1948:

Mr. Toastmaster, Most Reverend Archbishop of Boston, Most Reverend Archbishop of Washington, most reverend bishops, right reverend and very reverend monsignors, reverend fathers, ladies and gentlemen, in a sermon delivered on September 19, in St. Peter's Church in Lowell, Mass., our beloved forward-looking spiritual leader of the Boston archdiocese, Archbishop Cushing, said, in part:

"The clenched fist of communism against the rich and the closed fist of the capitalist against the poor can learn a better and happier way from Christ and St. Vincent de Paul."

And he then made the following dramatic and forceful statement, the truth of which cannot be denied.

"The cry of the poor is that which rocks the whole world today and prepares the way for atheistic communism."

The cry of the poor, as he well said, meaning thereby economic insecurity on the part of too many.

In those two statements our beloved archbishop analyzed and stated the causes of our present world upheaval. For it was leaders of nations abroad in years of the past, not too remotely removed from the present, who failed to heed and follow Christ and St. Vincent de Paul, and left in their wake misery, suffering, starvation, hopelessness, and despair on the part of their people, and in desperation the seething millions listened to the voices of the false prophets in the hope of bread and food, and as in the case of Russia, produced a Lenin and a Stalin, and the dreadful results that have followed.

The answer to the challenge of atheistic communism is forward-looking, courageous leadership in the field of religion, of government, in all walks of human activity, and particularly where the closed fist of the capitalist exists, a small percentage, true, but a contagious percentage, with its soulless actions and aspects affecting the lives of millions, for such person or persons to realize either voluntarily or by law that they can learn a better and happier way from Christ and St. Vincent de Paul.

For after all, the first duty of government is to assure justice to its people, a duty that covers many fields. This is constantly changing obligation in accordance with existing conditions. It is when there is a rapidly changing economic system that serious political problems arise. This duty must be performed with a sound and proper regard for the welfare of a nation and a people as a whole, and no segment of society should be destroyed or discriminated against, nevertheless, in practical operation government should and must give special consideration to the weak, the poor, the sick, the exploited, those facing or undergoing economic insecurity. For in practical operation, government must function for the weak. The strong do not need its assistance or protection.

This has particular emphasis in this machine era of mass production, with the existence of an economic system that is pressing in its demands and its influence upon the life and outlook of every individual. The leadership that undertakes to meet and solve, as far as possible, and in a sound way, the needs and demands of social security or as it might well otherwise be termed economic insecurity, here and abroad, is the type of affirmative leadership that will help to effectively meet and defeat communism, and its attempt to enslave and dominate the world.

It is not negative leadership based on defeatism, or status quo or backward-looking leadership, but everywhere, affirmative, courageous, sound leadership following Christ and St. Vincent de Paul which will receive the respect and confidence of the masses that constitute the answer to the challenge now existing or that may exist at any future time.

COMMUNISM BREEDS ON HUMAN SUFFERING AND DISTRESS, ON HUMAN MISERY

There is no moral or political appeal to communism. It's appeal is in the economic field where widespread poverty and distress exists.

While legislation may be necessary to make unlawful and criminal certain acts not contemplated in the past, the real answer is the right kind of leadership. The observations I have made have a direct bearing on the subject, Looking Ahead in Social Security.

By this is meant in a sense the methods employed by our Government, as well as the extent to which it goes, in establishing a social-security program consistent with our way of life as the means of meeting in our country the problem of economic insecurity.

As we know, this problem covers a wide field in the life of human beings; unemployment, sickness, accidents, medical care, old age, the handicapped, housing, slum clearance, delinquency, health, are mainly the considerations. A sound social-security program is the affirmative means used to meet these serious problems that exist so intensely in this age of mass production.

CHANGING CONCEPT OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The Social Security Act was originally passed in 1935 and expanded in 1939. Important amendments to the act were made in 1946, 1947, and 1948.

The object of the social-security program is to help prevent poverty and want. Its purpose is to serve as a defense for the individual, the family, the community, and the Nation.

The original Social Security Act of 1935 was based on the idea of protecting the family and the Nation by providing benefits to the individual wage earner. The insurance benefits were limited to the risks of old age and unemployment. In recent years a broadened concept has developed. In 1939 Congress amended the then old-age insurance law to provide monthly benefits to the wife of an insured individual and to the widow, orphans, and dependent parents. Four States, including Massachusetts, now provide for the payment of additional unemployment benefits in those cases where the unemployed wage earner has dependents. Three States provide for payments to the individual when he or she is out of work because of sickness. Thus in recent years the emphasis in the social-security program has shifted from an individual basis to a family basis and to recognizing the need for protecting not only the individual but also the family in connection with new risks.

It is important that this fact be constantly kept in mind. Since the family is the foundation of our entire society, we must always see to it that the amount and the type of benefits provided under the social-security program are designed to assure effective family security. If we promote family security then we can be sure we are promoting national security.

THREE TYPES OF SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAMS

There are three main ways in which our social-security system helps individuals and families:

1. Social insurance for individuals and their families is a way of spreading over a large group of people who may be affected at one time or another the losses that some of them suffer at any particular time. We now have social insurance in this country covering workmen's compensation, unemployment, old-age and premature death. We do not have any Nation-wide program covering the risk of sickness or disability or the cost of medical care.

2. Public assistance is a method by which the Federal Government and the States use tax money to make payments to needy persons. At the present time Federal money can only be used to help the aged, the blind, and certain classes of dependent children. Federal money cannot be used, however, to take care of the handicapped, the medical needs of most needy people, and for many other types of cases in connection with dependent children or chronically sick people.

3. The third part of the social-security program includes efforts to extend public services to improve health and well-being, especially the health and welfare of mothers and children. The present program, however, does not cover all cases of crippled and neglected children that should be aided.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

At the present time some 25,000,000 persons gainfully employed for a living are not included under the present old-age and survivors insurance program. Moreover, the benefits are grossly inadequate not only for the aged people but also for the widows, the orphans, and dependent parents. While benefits are paid in case a person becomes 65, or to his survivors if he dies, no payments are made whatsoever if he becomes permanent and totally disabled. An advisory council of 17 distinguished citizens, under the chairmanship of former Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, has recently reported to the Congress recommending extension of coverage of the insurance program to persons not now covered, liberalization of the benefits, and the addition of permanent total disability benefits. These same recommendations have been made on several previous occasions by President Truman.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SOCIAL-SECURITY RECOMMENDATIONS

On May 24 of this year President Truman sent to the Congress a five-point program for improving the social-security system. His five recommendations were as follows:

1. More adequate benefits under old-age and survivors insurance.

2. Extended coverage for old-age and survivors insurance.

3. Extended coverage for unemployment insurance.

4. Insurance against loss of earnings due to sickness or disability.

5. Improved public assistance for the needy.

One of the most important areas for extension of social security is insurance against loss of income from permanent and total disability. According to the report to the Senate Committee on Finance from the Advisory Council on Social Security on permanent- and total-disability insurance, there are about 2,000,000 persons on an average day who are kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months. A surprising fact is that the cost of combining disability insurance with old-age and survivors insurance would not be greater than one-quarter of 1 percent of total pay rolls. Since such protection is already provided for civil-service and railroad employees, it would seem to be a logical extension of the social-security system. Protection against loss of income from temporary disability or sickness would still be reserved to the States.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S HEALTH PROPOSALS

On several occasions President Truman has sent to the Congress recommendations for improving the health of the Nation as essential steps in assuring family security. His five recommendations were as follows:

1. Construction of hospitals and related facilities.

2. Expansion of public health, maternal and child health services.

3. Additional funds for medical research and medical education.

4. Health insurance for the employed person and his family.

5. Insurance against loss of earnings due to sickness or disability.

SOCIAL-SECURITY CHANGES

A number of the provisions of existing social-security laws discriminate against the family, particularly against wives, mothers, and orphans who must seek gainful employment. The old-age and survivors insurance program, for instance, now prohibits payment of benefits to the children of an employed woman when she dies leaving a dependent disabled husband. Some wives and some children cannot draw their insurance benefits because of technical provisions in some State marriage laws. This is due to the anomaly that Federal law provides that the insurance benefits are dependent upon the varying provisions of State law with respect to the determination of family relationships.

Some State unemployment insurance laws do not pay benefits to unemployed women when their unemployment occurs within a certain period following childbirth. Other States disqualify women from receiving unemployment benefits when they are unemployed after having taken care of a sick husband or child. Two of the three State laws covering temporary disability do not pay sickness benefits to an insured woman during periods of childbirth. These provisions should be changed in order that adequate protection be given to assuring family security.

Massachusetts is one of the five States in the Union which provide additional unemployment insurance benefits on behalf of the dependents of an unemployed person. Similar provisions should be included in the unemployment insurance law of every State in the Union.

As our courageous President has rightly said: "Over the last 12 years we have erected a sound framework of social-security legislation. Many millions of our citizens are now protected against the loss of income which can come with unemployment, old age or the death of wage earners.

"Our ultimate aim must be a comprehensive insurance system to protect all our people equally against insecurity and ill health.

"The recommended broadening of social insurance would increase the receipt and expenditures of the trust accounts over what they would have been.

"There are now more than 10,000,000 people in the United States, about 8 percent of the total population, who have reached the age of 65, but our systems of protection against the economic hazards of old age and dependency are still inadequate. The coverage of old age and survivors insurance should be extended, and benefits should be adjusted upward with a higher limit upon earnings which may be received after retirement.

"About 4,000,000 people now depend on public assistance, in part because existing social insurances, particularly old-age and survivors insurance, are deficient and because there is no national health insurance program and expansion of social insurance will decrease the need for public assistance expenditures."

At the present time there are over 2,000,000 individuals now receiving monthly benefit checks under the provisions of the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the law. This number includes men and women over 65, who have retired from gainful employment, and the surviving widows and children of insured wage earners. More than $530,000,000 a year are now being paid to these individuals out of the trust funds accumulated from the contributions collected under the law and this amount will increase substantially in the years ahead.

Approximately half a billion dollars is being paid annually to the States of the Nation to assist them in meeting the financial costs of their public assistance programs—State old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind. About 44,000,000 wage earners are now covered by the unemployment compensation program. More than a billion dollars in unemployment compensation benefits has been paid to those wage earners unemployed through no fault of their own. The unemployment compensation trust fund amounts to about $7,000,000,000 and the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund amounts to about $10,000,000,000. These two funds are sufficient to meet any demands that may be made upon them in the foreseeable future.

If the recommendations for expansion of coverage and increase in benefit payments, disability insurance and a well-considered program for health and medical care, would come into being so that we might have an integrated social-security program for the benefit of all the people, what a wonderful future social security could look ahead to.

But with all that has been said—and coming back to the main subject of this address—only the Congress can determine what the future of social security will be. Unless the majority of the membership of the next Congress and future Congresses shall be imbued with the same degree of progressiveness that moved the majority Membership of the Congress which created, nurtured, and brought the combination of program purposes to their position of success today attained, I am fearful of any substantial progress until the people are in pain again as a result of another depression.

We cannot overemphasize the importance of the family life. It is the oldest of our social institutions.

It is the basis of society, a strong family life means a sound government: weak family life means weak government.

It is where weak family life exists in this world of ours due to insecurity that the dictator with his false promises prospers.

Economic insecurity to any degree, but particularly where it affects an appreciable or substantial part of a people, has marked disintegrating effects upon the family unit and, therefore, on government itself. A sound social-security program has a stimulating and strengthening effect. It preserves and strengthens.

It is a wise government that plans ahead to strengthen * * * by taking necessary and proper steps to prevent the disintegration of its family life, rather than to wait until the forces of decay have started into operation.

Comprehensive Veterans' Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 777, a bill designed to enable World War II veterans to acquire homes and farms at prices and rentals which the great bulk of veterans can afford. To achieve this broad purpose, the bill provides aid to veterans through two major channels: First, to build homes at actual cost for veterans through Government loans to veterans' housing associations; and, second, to bolster the present consumer

credit supports available under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to veterans who need such aid to buy homes and farms. This new bill is closely patterned after H. R. 4488, veterans' homestead bill, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during the Eightieth Congress.

Veterans' housing associations can build homes at prices and rentals within the average veterans' ability to pay, through the elimination of speculative profits, of profits presently realized by inflated allowances for contingency costs, of landlord profits, through Federal contributions to public facilities necessary for housing, through lower interest rates, and through longer amortization periods.

The preservation of the advantages of the GI loan at the present 4-percent interest rate is aided by supplementing the ability of private lending institutions to make these loans, by affording Government secondary market support, by supplying money for GI home loans to lending institutions through the Home Loan Bank Board and for farm loans to Federal land banks and to the Farmers Home Administration, and by providing direct 4-percent loans to individual veterans who are unable to obtain them from private lenders.

These objectives can be realized under the proposed bill at far less direct or indirect cost to the Government than the costs involved in any alternative housing proposal of comparable scope which has yet been advanced. At the same time the proposed measure is designed in a manner calculated to temper the inflationary aspects usually attendant upon Government credit supports.

Of all members of our citizenry, the veteran and his family are unquestionably the hardest hit by the current housing shortage. Despite the efforts of the home-building industry in achieving the current level of house production, there is abundant evidence that the great majority of veterans are not able to meet the prices of these homes, and further, these veterans who can meet them are experiencing great difficulty in obtaining favorable financing terms. Any legislation aimed at alleviating this shortage must, in all fairness, give real meaning to veterans' preference by giving veterans an effective competitive position in their attempts to buy or rent suitable shelter.

The initial attempt of the Congress to afford a housing credit assistance to veterans, through title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, has until recently proved to be the greatest single housing aid which the Government has made available to veterans. Almost 1,400,000 World War II veterans have solved their housing problem by purchasing homes under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Since the fall of 1947, however, the GI loan program has been progressively hampered by an increasing tightening of credit and by excessive housing costs and prices, caused at least in part by the diversion of materials and labor into upper-bracket housing priced far above the ability to pay of the vast majority of prospective veteran purchasers.

This bill is designed to reverse these trends and to put the veteran once again in the housing market. It will help the veteran help himself.

OPERATION OF BILL LIMITED TO 2-YEAR PERIOD

The chief objection to the veterans' homestead bill introduced during the Eightieth Congress hinged upon the money expenditures which that bill involved. There was little concern over the final costs to the Government of the bill because the great bulk of the expenditures called for by the original homestead bill represented self-liquidating loans which would be repaid to the Government with interest. There was concern, however, over the large cash outlays which the original bill authorized over a 10-year period. These outlays would have totaled approximately $10,000,000,000, a sum which critics of the bill contended would aggravate the inflation problem.

To meet this objection, the veterans' housing bill of 1949 has been revised, on a 2-year basis. All of the advantages to veterans in the original proposal have been retained, but the operation of the bill has been shortened to a 2-year term, and the loan authorizations and cash outlays have been reduced accordingly.

Such an approach has a number of compelling advantages: First, it will keep Federal cash outlays to a minimum, thus dispelling apprehension over the inflation problem; second, it will give the bill a chance to prove what it can do for veterans' housing; and, third, if the housing shortage has been met at the end of the 2-year period the Government will not be committed for a longer time.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS

SECTION 512. HOMESTEAD ASSOCIATIONS

Section 512 authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant charters in nonprofit veterans' housing associations for the purpose of acquiring or constructing housing for sale or rent at actual cost to veterans. Charters would be granted only to associations which offer a reasonable prospect for success in the judgment of the Administration. Such associations would be authorized to borrow money from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs at an interest rate one-quarter of 1 percent in excess of the cost of the money to the Government. Loans to the associations would be repayable to the Administrator on either a short-term or a long-term basis. Long-term loans would be amortized over a period of 40 years if the housing constructed or acquired is held by the associations for rental to veterans. The associations would be empowered to construct single-family dwellings, either urban or rural, for sale to individual veterans, but individual purchasers would be required to finance such purchases through local financing institutions, and the associations would be required to apply the proceeds of such sales upon the indebtedness of the association to the Administrator. Where units in multiunit structure are sold or held on a cooperative or mutual ownership basis, the associations would be permitted to finance the cost over a 32-year period. Veterans purchasing single-unit housing from an association could obtain loans guaranteed by the Administrator under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act amortizable over a 32-year period.

The estimated cost of units to be constructed or acquired by an association could not average more than $10,000 per unit, and the associations would be compelled to sell or rent such units at prices reasonably representing the cost to the association. The associations would be regulated and supervised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Approval would be denied for the purchase or construction of units in excess of local veteran demand, or involving a cost found to be too high locally in comparison with the current price or rental of similar units.

Membership in associations would be limited to veterans of World War II and each association could otherwise prescribe its own bylaws defining eligibility to membership in the particular association. Each veteran desiring to become a member would be required to deposit $100 with the association and to file with the Administrator an affidavit to the effect that he is not a Communist and does not belong to any subversive organization.

The net incomes of associations would be exempt from Federal taxation and State and local taxing authorities would be precluded from imposing any taxes upon associations greater than taxes imposed in the locality upon similar nonprofit corporations—similar authority now exists for Federal savings and loan associations. Associations would, however, be required to pay normal property taxes. Associations could be dissolved or placed in receivership by the Administrator, if necessary, by suit in the Federal courts. Upon dissolution of any association the net assets of the association remaining after payment of its obligations would be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Authority to charter associations and to make loan commitments to them would expire June 30, 1951.

It is expected that an association will actually undertake its construction through private building contractors, but that through the award of firm contracts, the elimination of speculative profits, the cutback or recapture of contingency margins, the advantageous financing, the land-development grants, and the elimination of sales expenses, the net cost to the association of each unit constructed will be substantially lower than the price of any comparable units which could otherwise be made available to veterans. Once completed, the monthly carrying cost or rental of the individual units, due first, to the lower initial cost, and second, to the longer repayment periods in conjunction with low interest rates, will be substantially less than veterans could obtain under either existing facilities or those contemplated by other pending legislation. Prior review and approval by the Administrator of each project proposed by an association will insure against unwise or unsound activity. Annual audit of the associations' accounts and records will, with other proper regulatory and procedural requirements, supply needed safeguards to assure against improvident or inefficient operations.

SECTION 513. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

As an integral part of this broad attack on the veterans' housing shortage,

section 513 is intended to offset the present scarcity and high cost of improved land. It authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to aid State and local governments or associations by 50 percent grants for streets, water, and sewer and other similar facilities wherever the Veterans' Administrator finds such community facilities necessary for effective use of the housing provided under section 512 of the bill. Subsections (c) and (d) contain safeguards to assure that the public facilities will conform to local standards and will be adequately maintained, as well as that the veterans and their families will receive the benefits extended. Where the grant is made to an association, the bill provides for the transfer of the completed public facilities to the appropriate local government.

This section will substantially lower the first cost of the home as well as the annual assessments and other charges usually imposed on home owners for public facilities. It will also assure that those vital facilities are ready to serve the veteran when he moves into his home.

Perhaps the $50,000,000 here authorized is not enough to finance all the community facilities that may be required for the new housing under the bill. It will, however, fulfill the most urgent needs. It is contemplated that the remainder will be provided through usual channels without Federal aid.

Federal aid for local community facilities has ample precedent. During the war, more than $300,000,000 was granted by the Federal Government to local public bodies for public facilities related to housing for industrial workers. Surely we have as great an obligation to our veterans.

SECTION 514. INVESTMENTS IN LENDING INSTITUTIONS

Section 514 authorizes the Home Loan Bank Board to make investments in savings banks, cooperative banks, and institutions (savings or building and loan associations, etc.) that are members of the Federal Home Loan Bank system or insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. For this purpose the bill would make available to the board such sums, up to $750,000,000, as the board may request.

This section is designed (1) to relieve the current shortage of capital for loans to veterans for the purposes of section 501 of title III, since the inability of veterans to obtain financing under the present provisions of title III in many localities is daily becoming more acute; (2) to assure that mortgage money will be available to permit the financing through private institutions of homes constructed by veterans' housing associations under section 512 (e) (1) of title III as added to the act by this bill.

Funds provided under this section may be used by the specified classes of institutions only for loans not over $9,000 which are made for the purposes of section 501 of title III (purchase, construction, improvement, and repair of homes) which are guaranteed or insured under that title. A limitation of $9,000 on loans made with such financing, is placed in the bill to provide an incentive to builders to provide homes for veterans within that amount, and to channel these funds into housing the purchase price of which is realistically within the repayment ability of the great bulk of veterans. Preference must be given by the Board to institutions in areas where money for veterans' loans is otherwise scarce. The institutions in which the money is invested will pay dividends or interest to the Government, just as they do to private investors. Rates currently paid by these institutions average between 2 and 2½ percent per year, and are generally more than the average cost of money to the Government.

This provision will relieve credit stringencies throughout the country by the use of the facilities of existing privately owned and managed institutions the staffs of which are already well experienced in the same type of lending, and which in fact originated up to 80 percent of all veterans' home loans in the earlier stages of the title III program. Assurance is provided to institutions which accept these funds for investment that precipitous governmental action in demanding withdrawal will not upset their normal cash position. This assurance is given in the provision limiting required payments in any one year to not more than 4 percent of the total amount thus invested in the institution; however, any investment may be voluntarily repaid to the Government in whole or part at any dividend or interest date.

There is ample precedent for the making of such investments in these institutions. By a provision added in 1935 to the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was authorized to make investments in shares of Federal savings and loan associations and in shares, deposits, and investment certificates of any member of a Federal home-loan bank or any institution insured under Title IV of the National Housing Act. The statute provided that $300,000,000 of the total authorized bond issue of the Corporation should be eligible for purposes including these investments. One of the major purposes of the provision was to increase the funds then available for home financing.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the United States Treasury made such investments in a total amount of about $275,000,000. These investments have been most satisfactory, and repayments have been well in advance of schedule. The outstanding balance of these investments has been reduced to about $6,000,000 and about $55,000,000 has been received by the Government as dividends.

SECTION 515. FARM LOANS

Section 515 is designed to make farm credit available to veterans on favorable terms. Funds for farm loans at so low a rate as 4 percent are limited in many agricultural areas and as a result many World War II veterans qualified to succeed in farming have been unable to find any lender to make them guaranteed or insured loans.

Federal land banks are authorized by this section to make farm real estate loans to veterans under title III without regard to certain of the limitations and restrictions under the Federal Farm Loan Act and other statutes. It also authorizes the Federal land banks to purchase such loans made by other lenders and to pledge loans so made or purchased as security for farm loan or other bonds and to issue or to cause to be issued farm loan or other bonds secured thereby.

The Federal Farm Loan Act limits the ratio of all loans made by the Federal land banks to 65 percent of the normal agricultural value of the farm real estate and authorizes the issuance of bonds secured by such loans. Section 500 (d) of the amended Servicemen's Readjustment Act removed somewhat similar restrictions from national banks and other lenders in the case of GI loans but did not remove restrictions on Federal land banks. Federal land banks are a large factor in farm real estate lending and are now prevented by restrictions, which this section seeks to remove, from being of service to World War II veterans in connection with guaranteed or insured loans. This section and section 518 (f) provide methods by which Federal land banks can obtain funds for these loans.

This section also authorizes loans to veterans under the Farmers Home Administration Act in that loans so made are to be charged by the Administrator to the veterans' gratuity entitlement and the 4-percent gratuity payment is to be made thereon just as if guaranteed or insured.

Private lending institutions are also encouraged to make guaranteed or insured farm loans to World War II veterans through the secondary market facilities under section 516.

SECTION 516. SECONDARY MARKET

Section 516 establishes a long-range Government secondary market for home and farm loans which are guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. The secondary market is designed to correct the inadequacies and imperfections of the secondary market now existing in the Federal National Mortgage Association.

The problem is by no means confined to lenders in rural communities where there is a dearth of mortgage money, nor to those lenders which have reached a saturation point in their ability to make additional GI loans in the absence of assured secondary market support for a portion of their further commitments. The incentive for lending institutions in urban areas as well to invest in 4-percent GI mortgages has been greatly weakened apace with the recent firming of yields in the money market. The effects of the lack of an adequate secondary market are evident in Veterans' Administration statistics showing the trend of GI home-loan applications received during recent months. The number of home-loan applications has declined sharply since September 1947. During September and October 1948 receipts were more than 50 percent below the September 1947 level. The phenomenon of a decline in GI home-loan activity during a period when new-home completions have been approaching a near-record peak is partly attributable to the aggravation of the secondary-market problem.

The secondary market provided for in section 516 of this bill is designed to in-

clude safeguards ample to prevent abuse of the market and to encourage lenders to sell GI loans to the Government only in case of acute future need.

The major provisions of the market and the supporting reasons for the inclusion of each provision are these:

First. A market for farm loans, which were not eligible for sale to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company market, and which are only eligible in theory under the present FNMA market, is established. The extension of the market to include farm loans will fill a conspicuous void and, by encouraging private lending institutions to make farm loans at the 4-percent maximum interest rate permitted by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, will enable veterans to obtain liberal financing from lending institutions in their local communities.

Second. Only loans made after December 31, 1948, are eligible for purchase by the market. Inasmuch as the purpose for creating the Government secondary market is to provide additional GI home- and farm-loan credit where it is now nonexistent or difficult to obtain, the market does not and should not apply retroactively to loans already made to veterans.

Third. Loans are eligible for sale to the market for a term of 5 years from the date of origination of the loan. This provision is deemed necessary to prevent the recurrence of a flurry to sell GI loans such as the one which took place just prior to the termination of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation secondary market by Congress on June 30, 1947, and more important, to introduce a stabilizing influence upon the mortgage portfolios of lending institutions. The firm assurance to the lender that he may sell a fixed percentage of his loans at any time during the 5-year period after origination should encourage him to hold his GI loans as earning assets and to sell them only in case of real need.

Fourth. Each lender is limited in the amount he can sell to the market. He can sell no more than 50 percent of the original amount of his future loans at par, and an additional 25 percent at a discount of 1½ percent, i. e., at 98½ percent of the outstanding balance. This provision will require that the lender retain a substantial proportion of his GI loan portfolio and will prevent entry into the program of lenders with slender capital who would count on selling 100 percent of their loans to the market as fast as turn-over would permit.

Fifth. The Administrator is directed to refuse to purchase any loan which, in his judgment, does not reflect acceptable credit and security requirements in its origination. This provision is included to permit the Administrator to screen out those mortgages made without full adherence to the usual standards of good lending practices, so that the Government's risk of loss may be minimized, and high standards of lending practice encouraged.

Sixth. No loan may exceed $10,000 in original amount. The intention of this limitation is to induce lenders to give preference to the financing of low-cost homes.

Seventh. No monetary limitation has been placed upon the aggregate dollar amount which may be used by the Administrator for the purchase of eligible loans. This is intended to allay the fears that lenders might have that they might be excluded for lack of funds in the market when they should find a real need to sell more of their loans. A market with a limited amount of funds, on the other hand, would encourage lenders to rush their loans for immediate sale to the Government.

SECTION 517—DIRECT LOANS TO VETERANS

Section 517 authorizes the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans at 4-percent interest to otherwise eligible veterans who can show that they have been unable to obtain a guaranteed or insured loan for home purchase from a private lending institution. This section would supplement the mortgage-credit facilities otherwise available, but would not put the Government into competition with private sources willing to provide mortgage funds at 4 percent. This authority to make direct loans has several important advantages, as follows:

(a) Under the plan there would be no question of a lack of capital for GI loans and all veterans, in communities of every size, would be assured of obtaining a GI loan, provided of course that their credit position qualifies them as a sound risk. In short, the 4-percent GI loan would again become an actuality obtainable by an eligible and qualified veteran.

(b) The precedent of a system of Government direct lending as a supplement to private lending in the field of mortgage finance is already firmly established in the farm-mortgage field. Such a system is presently in operation in the farm lending program of the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture. This agency stands ready to make direct farm-mortgage loans to qualified veterans and others at 4 percent whenever the farmer can show that he has been unable to obtain a conventional farm-mortgage loan at a moderate interest rate from a private lending institution in his community. The proposed solution, then, has precedent in other fields of Government finance.

(c) The costs of a system of supplemental direct lending would be negligible and there is every likelihood that these costs would be exceeded by the income which the Government would receive in the form of interest from veteran borrowers. Since the cost of money furnished by the Treasury to the Veterans' Administration would probably range from 2 to perhaps 2½ percent, the VA would be able to apply from 1½ to 2 percent of its interest income for administrative expenses and for the establishment of reserves. Assuming that the national levels of income and employment are maintained at or near present levels, there would be every expectation that the VA would show a sizable surplus from its direct lending operations. And moreover, even if a period of recession and of real estate decline should set in, it is important to remember that the possibility of loss to the Government on a direct loan is no more than the possible loss the Government may experience on the million and one-third loans which it has already guaranteed.

(d) Even though there has been a marked tightening up in the GI lending activity of lending institutions generally, many of these institutions are still making some GI loans available to veterans. Thus the plan does not provide for across-the-board direct lending but merely makes GI loans available where lending institutions do not want to make them.

SECTION 518. PROVISION OF FUNDS

Section 518 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to the respective agencies of the Government specified, the sums allotted to each of them to accomplish the objectives of the bill. These sums are as follows:

First. To the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs the following:

(a) For loans to veterans housing associations, up to $1,000,000,000.

(b) For direct loans to veterans unable to obtain loans from other sources, up to $350,000,000.

(c) Such sums as he may from time to time require for the operation of the secondary market.

Second. To the Home Loan Bank Board up to $750,000,000 for investment in eligible institutions.

Third. To the Secretary of Agriculture for loans to Federal land banks, and loans under the Farmers Home Administration Act, up to $100,000,000; and

Fourth. To the Federal Works Administrator for grants for public facilities, up to $50,000,000.

Advances on account of these sums are required to be deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury on request of the respective agency. Such advances, until repaid, with the exception of the Federal Works Agency grants, and moneys made available to Federal land banks, carry interest at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. The interest rate on loans to Federal land banks is to be such rate, not in excess of 2¼ percent per annum, as is fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury. This maximum rate is specified in the light of rates currently payable on land bank bonds to assure their continued ability to make guaranteed loans at 4 percent per annum, which is their current rate on loans. Moneys for such advances are to be obtained by the Secretary of the Treasury by using the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, the purposes of which are extended for such financing.

Broad discretion with respect to the management of such funds, within the specific purposes and limitations defined in the bill, are given to the various agencies. It may be pointed out that in their respective exercise of this discretion and the related functions, these various agencies will not be engaged in financial activities novel to their present operations, but rather, will merely augment and extend somewhat the various services which are typical to their customary duties, and in which their officers and employees are well experienced.

SECTION 519. TERMINATION OF SECOND-MORTGAGE LOAN GUARANTY

Section 519 proposes the deletion from the GI bill of section 505a, which permits the guaranty of a second-mortgage loan in conjunction with a primary loan insured by the Federal Housing Administration. This form of combination loan, while much less advantageous from the standpoint of the veteran, is more advantageous from the standpoint of the lender. In many cases the combination loan costs the veteran up to 10 percent more than would a straight section 501 loan in a corresponding amount. Section 505a is not in fact achieving its purpose, since down payments are as frequently required to cover the balance above the combination loan as they are in section 501 loans. Moreover, the combination loan, affording as it does three layers of price support, is regarded as being more inflationary than the 501 loan. It is thought that if eliminated from the GI loan program at this time, when accompanied by the secondary market provisions of section 516 and the direct lending authority (sec. 517), the impact of the deletion upon the ability of the veteran to get home-loan financing will be negligible, and will net a benefit rather than a detriment to veteran borrowers as a whole.

SECTION 2. AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Section 2 of this bill amends the secondary market established under the title III National Housing Act, by providing that no GI loans shall be purchased under the old authority after 30 days from the enactment of this bill, except pursuant to prior commitments. This provision will eliminate any conflict of authority between the National Housing Act and section 516 of this bill, and will thereafter confine the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Company to the purchase of loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

ESTIMATE OF COST

It is not possible to estimate with precision the probable cost of this bill. However, it should be noted that all funds authorized to be expended under the program, with the exception of the $50,000,000 for grants for essential public facilities, are repayable to the Treasury with interest. The cash outlays over the 2-year period—5 years in the case of the secondary market—are estimated at $2,750,000,000, as follows:

Cash outlays

	Per year	Total
1. VA loans to veterans' housing associations	$500,000,000	$1,000,000,000
2. HLBB investment in home-financing institutions	375,000,000	750,000,000
3. Purchase of GI loans by VA secondary market (5 years)	100,000,000	500,000,000
4. Direct 4 percent loans to veterans	175,000,000	350,000,000
5. Department of Agriculture investments in Federal land banks and Farmers Home Administration	50,000,000	100,000,000
6. FWA grants for home-site development	25,000,000	50,000,000
7. Administrative expenses	2,500,000	5,000,000
Total	1,227,500,000	2,755,000,000

Final costs should be minor in terms of the benefits to be achieved. Because most of the cash outlays should be completely repaid, final costs are estimated to total only about $80,000,000, including a reasonable allowance for losses on loans made by VA pursuant to sections 512 and 517, as well as estimated administrative costs. The components of this estimate are summarized in the following table:

Final costs

1. VA loans to veterans' housing associations	$20,000,000
2. HLBB investment in home-financing institutions	None
3. Purchase of GI loans by VA secondary market	None
4. Direct 4-percent loans to veterans	7,000,000
5. Department of Agriculture investments in Federal land banks and Farmers Home Administration	None
6. FWA grants for home-site development	50,000,000
7. Administrative expenses	5,000,000
Total	82,000,000

Not only is this final cost to the Government trivial in comparison with other expenditures for far less worthy purposes than the providing of homes for our war veterans, but the total cash outlay is of manageable proportions. The total outlay for each of the 2 years—$1,200,000,000—involves an amount equal to about one-fifth of the current annual rate of new investment in residential building, and probably even less. Further, the important cost-saving devices available to the housing associations and the reasonable value protection provided as ceilings on loans to individual veterans, will have a salutary and profound influence in helping to bring stability to the entire home realty market at levels below those now prevailing.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF THE VETERANS' HOUSING BILL (H. R. 777)

First. It authorizes granting of charters to veterans' housing associations by the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of acquiring homes for sale or rental to World War II veterans.

Second. It provides housing at prices veterans can afford to pay—limits average per dwelling unit to $10,000.

Third. Rental and multi-unit housing as well as construction of individual homes is provided.

Fourth. It makes provision for community facilities where not otherwise furnished.

Fifth. Interest rates are at 4 percent or less with long amortization periods.

Sixth. It channels funds to lending institutions which need money to make GI housing loans.

Seventh. It gives special attention to needs of veterans on the farm.

Eighth. It provides long-range secondary market for GI housing loans.

Ninth. It authorizes Veterans' Administrator to make direct loans to individual veterans where lending institutions are unable to do so.

Tenth. Virtually all expenditures are on a reimbursable basis with final cost to the Government estimated at approximately $82,000,000.

What Is the Fate of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star, one of the great newspapers of the country, has pointed out with rare clarity the danger manifest and expressed in the President's state of the Union message.

The editorial of January 6, 1949, should be read by every thoughtful American citizen.

Are the American people to share the same fate as the people of England, who are now engulfed in a Labor-Socialist government?

I include in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the editorial above mentioned:

LEFT TURN AHEAD

Anticipating criticism of some of the proposals in his state of the Union message, the President seeks to discount it by predicting that there will be "strong opposition from selfish interests." Probably so. But there is no justification for the implication in this that only those who are serving some selfish interest will look askance at the philosophy embodied in the message, for there is reason to believe that adoption of Mr. Truman's proposals would mark a long step in the direction of state socialism. And there are many people, not identified with any selfish interest, who will be extremely reluctant to take this step without a more persuasive showing of necessity than the President sets out, and without a clearer understanding of the long-range consequences of adoption of Mr. Truman's program.

The essence of this message is an appeal for big government—for a government that will get bigger and bigger as it takes over more and more new functions. Repeatedly, the President uses such terms as the "increasing responsibilities on the Government," and "the Government has still other opportunities" to do one thing and another. Perhaps a continued expansion of government is inevitable, and it may be that this is not, in and of itself, a bad thing. But the President ignores the consequences, and they should be made clear. The people should understand that bigger government means more Federal employees and bigger Federal budgets. They should understand that the area of individual initiative and responsibility diminishes as that of government expands. And it should also be made clear that historically, the tendency of expanding government is to feed upon itself, and to grow constantly larger in the process.

Is it necessary that the Government take on ever-increasing responsibilities? Mr. Truman points out that since the boom year of 1929 there has been a population increase in this country of only 20 percent. In the same period agricultural production has increased by 45 percent and industrial production by 75 percent. So we have been making progress, although, in the President's judgment, not enough progress. He would go faster and further. Business, he says, should expand and produce more at lower prices. In event business and industry cannot or will not do this, the President submits an interesting though somewhat ambiguous proposal. In the case of materials in critically short supply, like steel, he suggests Government loans for expansion of production facilities. If this does not do the trick, he wants authority for construction of such facilities directly. Presumably this means

construction by the Government. If it also means Government operation or Government-directed operation, as it probably does, then the champions of free enterprise may well wonder whether they have not come to their Waterloo.

What is the prospect that private industry will meet the demands laid upon it by the President? He wants $4,000,000,000 in new tax revenue, to come "principally" from corporations. He demands enactment of all of the economic controls heretofore advocated. He attacks the Taft-Hartley Act on generalized grounds which are not supported by the facts, and demands its repeal. Finally, in the background, he brandishes the club of direct Government competition. Is this an atmosphere in which private investors will want to risk their money, or in which private industry will care to expand its plant facilities? The answer is no, and the inference can be drawn that the President, consciously or otherwise is calling for a state of affairs in which private industry cannot expand and in which the scope of government will have to be enlarged.

These things are by no means all that the President proposes. While calling for lower prices he wants higher minimum wages, maintenance of farm support prices and, one can infer, higher over-all wage levels which would not necessitate price-ceiling increases. Other items on his program are extended rural electrification, river development, better health facilities, Federal aid to education, and an expansion of public housing. Meanwhile, he urges that the Federal budget be balanced and that a substantial surplus be raised for public-debt retirement. No one can be blamed for wondering where the money for all this is coming from.

There are certain important facts on the other side of the picture. One is that private industry has not been able to give the people all they want in the way of better homes, better health, better schools, etc. Another is that the proposals in the message are, in the main, the proposals upon which the President made his bid for reelection, and he won. If it be pointed out that he won with slightly less than a majority of the total vote, the fact remains that the congressional results were somewhat of a sweep for the Democrats.

So when Mr. Truman says the election shows that the American people are in favor of the kind of society he advocates, he may well be right. Certainly, he and the new Congress cannot be blamed for thinking that it is good politics to try to create this utopian society. The people, by voting or by not taking the trouble to vote, can fairly be said to have given the signal for a turn to the left. Whether they will like what they find when the turn is made remains to be seen. But the chances are that the disillusionment, if there is to be one, will come too late.

Service Pensions for Veterans of World War I and World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD W. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Congress has allocated huge sums of money for the Public Treasury for the purpose of rehabilitating the peoples of Europe and Asia. Millions of dollars, American dollars, have been expended and millions more are to be spent for the sole purpose of building the morale of conquered enemies as well as that of our former allies. This is being done to gain world confidence in our Republic and its political and economic system. I think that money spent abroad for this purpose, if properly controlled, is a farsighted approach toward stemming the tide of communism in those countries and establishing worldwide understanding and peace.

What our Government is doing at the present time is a repeat performance of its action in making loans to friend and foe alike at the close of World War I, except we now make no pretense of expecting the repayment of these tremendous outlays of American wealth. We are investing in national security as well as world peace.

In our eagerness to pour out our resources for building morale and confidence abroad, are we neglecting to maintain them in our own war veterans? How do the veterans of World War I and World War II feel when they read of these gigantic gifts of money and other wealth to people far across the seas?

A grateful Government granted pensions to the veterans of our other wars—modest annuities, to be enjoyed in their declining and less productive years. I believe the men and women who served honorably in both world wars are justly entitled to a monetary reward and an insurance of security which will last long after the fanfare of hero's welcomes and thanksgiving speeches fade away.

In humble appreciation of the service they rendered to our country, I introduced H. R. 847, which would grant service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II. I am confident every Member of this Congress feels that some provision should be made to compensate these veterans for the loss of earnings, retardation of education, and risk of life and limb while in their country's service.

The provisions of H. R. 847 are, in brief:

First. That any person who served in the armed forces of the United States at any time between April 5, 1917, and July 3, 1921, or between December 7, 1941, and December 31, 1946, shall be eligible, provided: He was honorably discharged after 90 days or more service or for a disability incurred in line of duty;

Second. The pension shall be at the rate of $75 per month after attaining the age of 55, and $100 per month after attaining the age of 62;

Third. The amount of the pension is not modified by a person's other income. The payment of this pension is not reduced or discontinued because of other compensation under any law or veterans regulation, but a person may elect to receive this pension in lieu of such other compensation or pension;

Fourth. The Administrator of Veteran's Affairs is authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

It is my judgment that these pension payments, high as the cost may seem, will be worth many times their intrinsic value when measured by the lift of morale given our veterans along with their increased confidence in our Government.

From an economic standpoint, we should not overlook the buying power that would be created by these pension payments, thus helping to maintain the increased production vital to our country's prosperity and progress.

I sincerely urge every Member to give H. R. 847 his earnest consideration.

Congress Reforms Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, of Tuesday, January 4, 1949, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

CONGRESS REFORMS RULES COMMITTEE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The first act on the first day of the first session of the new Congress was to carry through a solid reform of the House Rules Committee.

By a vote of 275 to 142, the House placed a constructive curb on the deadly powers of the committee, which for a long time has been called—accurately and not fondly—the "graveyard of legislation."

The effect of this action is to prevent this heretofore all powerful committee from being a permanent blockade on legislation, which in the past it has been able to keep from the floor of the House whenever it didn't like it.

It now is provided that the chairman of any legislative committee whose regularly reported bill has been sidetracked for 21 days can appeal directly to the House to call it up. The new rule also provides that the Speaker of the House "shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege." If the committee chairman's motion receives a majority vote, then the bill is at once extracted from the clutches of the House Rules Committee and goes to the floor for action.

Two significant consequences flow from this reform:

It means that majority rule can find readier expression in the lower House of Congress; it can function more freely than it has been able to for many years.

It also means that the party in control of Congress tends to be made more visibly responsible for the legislative record which Congress writes—or fails to write.

At different times over the past 10 years individual members of the Rules Committee have acted autocratically to block proposed legislation either against the wishes of the party majority or against the overwhelmingly favorable vote of the legislative committee charged with particular bills. Democratic rules chairmen have done it, and last year the Republican rules chairman was up to the same tricks. Single-handedly, he prevented the House from voting on the universal military training bill, and his committee refused to let the Senate-approved Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill go to the floor until the committee had removed from it all the provisions it didn't care for.

Now there is less chance of the party majority being blocked by a recalcitrant minority in the House, regardless of whether the party majority is Democratic or Republican.

It is argued by some that the new rule vests near-dictatorial power in the hands of the Speaker by leaving him to "recognize" the committee chairman when he rises to move a 21-day-delayed bill out of the embrace of the Rules Committee.

But much of this interpretation probably was written prematurely when in its first phrasing the new rule provided that the Speaker may recognize the committee chairman for this purpose. As finally proposed and as finally passed, the new rule required that the Speaker shall recognize him.

It will be well to wait until the new rule proves itself in operation and until we see whether there is any tendency or any trick by which the Speaker could, at times, get around it. It seems to me the rule clearly is binding, and that failure of the Speaker to live up to it would be violating it in fact and in spirit. In any event, the responsibility of the Speaker is more visible, more get-at-able, by the public than that of the surreptitious "killings" of the Rules Committee. At the critical points he will have to operate in the open, and his actions, under most circumstances, will be the actions of the administration in power.

The net effect of the opening voting this week is to show:

That the Democrats begin the new session with even more effective control than they first anticipated.

That, as shown in the vote on the rules change, there appear to be at least as many House Republicans who are likely to side with the administration as there are southern Democrats likely to side against it. (All the Democratic votes—31 against the rules change came from the South; 40 Republicans voted for the change.)

That the bloc of 13 anti-Taft Republican Senators may prove a frequent ally of the administration, but will be capable of exerting a great balance-of-power influence over both Democratic and Republican actions in the Senate.

Hawaii Fights for Enlightened and Modern Point of View on Leprosy Under Leadership of Former Gov. Lawrence M. Judd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address made by Lawrence M. Judd, former Governor of the Territory of Hawaii and now superintendent of the settlement for lepers maintained by the Territory at Kalaupap, county of Kalawao, on the north shore of the island of Molokai.

The address was made at a meeting at the settlement last October that was attended by the patients and a group of visitors including myself.

For close to 100 years Hawaii has been combating the disease of leprosy. The settlement at Kalaupapa was established in 1866, just after the American Civil War. The great sacrifice and work of Father Damien at this settlement in those early days has caused him to be canonized by the Roman Catholic Church.

Former Governor Judd appeals for an abandonment of the medieval attitudes toward this disease that have brought unusual hardship and suffering to its victims.

Under Mr. Judd's leadership an outstanding contribution is being made by Hawaii to the development of a more modern point of view toward this disease. His work is bringing to the settlement new hope and a new life to the patients. It is a great inspiration to all persons who visit this settlement today.

The text of former Governor Judd's statement follows:

Leprosy is perhaps the oldest disease known to man. It dates back in history to 2000 B. C. It was spread by mass migrations, military expeditions, and by the slave trade. It was brought to the Americas as early as 1543.

The best available evidence shows that leprosy is widespread throughout the world and that it is increasing. There are perhaps 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 persons afflicted in the world today.

Hawaii has been a participant in the age-old struggle with the baffling problem of leprosy for about 100 years.

Compulsory segregation was enacted on June 5, 1865, in the reign of Kamehameha V. The first contingent of patients, 25 in number, arrived at Kalawao on January 6, 1866. The original settlement was not located at Kalaupapa but at Kalawao, on the eastern side of the Kalaupapa Peninsula.

Patients lived in grass houses, caves, or under puhala trees, for the Government provided no facilities even for shelter.

It was not until 1878 that the legislature passed appropriations for some frame buildings and made meager provision for the care and comfort of the inmates. A physician was sent to the settlement at that time.

The records disclose that during the year 1866, 142 patients were admitted. Of these, 36 died the first year.

In 1890, for instance, there were 184 admissions, 154 deaths, and 1,174 active patients in the settlement at the end of the year.

What is the situation today?

On July 1, 1948, we had 280 active cases and 38 patients on temporary release within the settlement. During the year 18 new cases were admitted. Fourteen active patients died during the year. Of these deaths, the average period of commitment was 12 years and 8 months, the longest being 58 years and 11 months. During the year there was a period of 3 months and 8 days between patient deaths.

In 1931, the people of Hawaii spoke as one voice, through its legislature. An enlightened program for new administrative proceedure was adopted, leprosy affairs were reorganized and funds were provided for a well defined program of rehabilitation.

The steady decline in the incidence of the disease proves that the program and policies were sound.

We are trying conscientiously to improve the welfare of the people of the settlement and while we are in no way satisfied with the results so far attained, we are confident that substantial progress is being made. Needless to say, we have encountered many discouragements.

The general appearance and cleanliness of the settlement have been improved. Vocational, educational, and occupational therapy programs have been initiated. Additional opportunities for social intercourse have been instituted. The general moral tone of the settlement has been ameliorated. Worth-while forms of entertainment—cultural, edificatory, as well as amusing—have been brought in for the benefit of the people.

We are trying to recognize patients as individuals, with widely different aptitudes, who for a physical affliction producing much suffering and anguish have been banished to Kalaupapa, some of them for life. It is manifestly proper that the best humanitarian conscience and intelligence should be directed toward improving the lot of the patients.

But we must not rest content with that progress. Sufficient time has elapsed to justify a complete review of the present program with the hope and expectation that the people of Hawaii will again speak as one voice to make provisions for badly needed improvements, modernization of methods, treatment, procedures, and research.

No one disease has been so shamefully misunderstood or badly misrepresented as leprosy.

The unfortunate sufferer, throughout the ages, has been kicked from pillar to post, driven out of his home and community, and often locked up like a wild animal lest he contaminate some other member of society. Then to climax it all, the name "leper" has been applied to him, rendering him a social outcast and often bringing shame to his entire family as well as unjust disgrace and unfair treatment to himself. There is no reason why the ignorant superstitions of the dark ages should be continued today.

People still fear leprosy and think of it as the most contaminating of infectious diseases. Actually, except for other than children, it is much less communicable than tuberculosis and many more common infections. It has not been possible for scientists to induce infection in laboratory animals and even in human volunteers. All of us are exposed every day to more contagious diseases.

Not a single nurse or doctor at the National Leprosarium has contracted the disease in 52 years.

I do not speak with the authority of those who are charged with the responsibility of administering leprosy affairs in Hawaii but as an individual and a citizen who has devoted much thought to the problem and whose interest in the welfare of leprous people has been spread over a period of nearly 50 years, I do not advocate nor recommend that the present policy of segregation be completely abandoned. But I do advocate that the policy should be liberalized, modernized, and brought up to date in the light of the advancement of science and of the better knowledge of the problem.

We must treat the problem with greater wisdom, more charity, and better common sense. Our laws should be modernized and should embody only general principles. Authorizations and regulations should be made by experts and should be revised periodically in the progress of epidemiological knowledge.

Undoubtedly, some isolation is important, particularly in "open" cases, but the period of isolation should depend upon the progress of the disease and its response to treatment.

The control of leprosy involves precautions and measures which vary but need not be nearly as excessive as in the past or as at present. But these changes cannot be brought about at once because of the present error of public opinion that leprosy is a Biblical scourge and that the patient is cursed.

It is therefore of the utmost importance that public opinion should be enlightened. A new and more accurate understanding on the part of the public of this territory upon the subject of leprosy is one of the major essential requirements to effect control and

elimination of leprosy in Hawaii. There should be disseminated to the general public pertinent facts concerning leprosy, including information upon the latest improved medicine and methods for treating this disease. There should be fostered a spirit of tolerance and understanding upon the part of the public, in the interest of persons who have, or who may in the future contract leprosy, by showing the injustice of the leprosy stigma and for the purpose of allaying the unreasonable fear of this disease in the public mind.

I sincerely believe it will be desirable, both from sociological and economic viewpoints, to give serious consideration to a plan of compensation for disability incident to leprosy so that patients at the time they are placed upon temporary release or are finally discharged, will have determined the degree of physical disability sustained due to leprosy and/or treatment therefore. Appropriate disability compensation should be authorized and paid to all such patients who elect to live a normal life without the confines of the Kalaupapa settlement and Kalihi hospital. Such a plan will enable them to do so with some degree of financial security and with a minimum financial burden to their families and friends.

Furthermore, home isolation might be permitted under proper guaranties and prophylaxis.

I do hope that I have given you some food for thought and that you will lend your assistance toward improving the condition of our patients as well as changing the ridiculous, antiquated unjust attitude of the public.

I like to feel that a new day is coming for those who for centuries have been branded with the stigma, leper.

We must unite not only in improving their care and treatment, and in encouraging research, but in convincing the people of Hawaii that we are indeed living in a new era, the most important one since Biblical days, the era of hope for those who have, unfortunately, contracted or who may contract leprosy.

Reforming the Rules of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD, I include the following under leave to extend my remarks in article from the Christian Science Monitor of Monday, January 3, 1949, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

REFORMING THE RULES OF CONGRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—In all the news and headlines you shortly will be reading about reforming the rules of Congress—from the lethal power of the filibuster to the "Stop, road closed" dictatorship of the House Rules Committee—one central fact should be borne in mind: The purpose of proposed changes is to permit representative government to function more effectively, to permit the majority, instead of the minority, to govern Congress.

The purposeful opponents of changing the rules under which Congress functions—or doesn't function—will try to make it appear that the public has little stake in these reforms—that only Congress is concerned, that it's all just a technical dispute which the innocent bystander had better sidestep. But that's sand in the eyes of the voters. The issue is whether a party clique shall run Congress and substitute its views at very critical points for the majority of Members of Congress.

When, 25 years ago, Vice President Charles G. Dawes led a good fight—but an unsuccessful one—to end the antidemocratic filibuster, he characterized the Senate rules as "putting into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President."

Dealing with the techniques of minority rule in both Houses of Congress in his valuable book "Congress at the Crossroads," Dr. George B. Galloway, one of the Library of Congress experts who helped to shape the recent Congressional Reorganization Act, speaks carefully when he writes: "There are many points on the legislative highways and byways where a few legislators lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take the toll of passing traffic."

Obviously, the immediate incentive to reforming the rules of Congress comes from President Truman and the Democratic majority, who are concerned lest minority tactics prevent them from fulfilling their party's campaign commitments.

To this end, the Democratic caucus has just voted to curb the authority of the House Rules Committee through which it has been accustomed periodically to pigeonhole measures which the legislative committees of the House have approved. It now is proposed that after the Rules Committee has held up a bill 21 days, the chairman of the committee responsible for it may take the bill to the floor of the House and get the Rules Committee blockade removed by a majority vote.

But the validity of such a reform is not tied to the President's legislative program. It is a reform which Congress itself needs, which representative government needs, regardless of any particular election mandate. Time and again, a powerful minority clique blocked Republican measures in the House in the Eightieth Congress, just as it will do in the Eighty-first Congress unless something is done about it.

The House Rules Committee has become not a traffic regulator, as it was supposed to be, but a traffic dictator. And when it doesn't like a measure Congress' legislative committees send along to it, the committee either shunts it to a dead-end siding or substitutes a new measure of its own. Three recent examples will show how imperative it is to take the committee's stranglehold off the flow of legislation.

Two years ago this legislation "traffic" committee decided it didn't like the labor bill recommended by the House's own Labor Committee; it refused to give it clearance; it then substituted the Case bill, which had been introduced only 2 days before, which had not been approved by the Labor Committee, and on which there had been no public hearings. (The modern "pirates of Tripoli" at work.)

Frequently the Rules Committee assumes the authority to change, even radically rewrite, bills passed to it by the legislative committees. Last winter it removed all the provisions bearing upon public housing and slum clearance from the Taft-sponsored Senate bill. Its verdict was that it wouldn't let the House vote on the bill at all if it contained these Senate-approved provisions. It then forbade the offering of any amendments to the bill from the floor. (A smooth operation, but not democracy.)

On another occasion the Rules Committee refused flatly to pass to the House the administration-endorsed universal military training bill after it had been approved overwhelmingly by the Armed Services Committee. Thus, the Rules Committee simply refused to allow the Members of the House to vote on one of the most significant decisions before the country. It decided to reject the bill, regardless of what the majority of Congress wanted. (Quite a committee; quite a racket.)

These facts may be useful to bear in mind in appraising the motives and acts of those who try to stand in the way of reforming the congressional rules—of those who want to impose minority rule on Congress and turn it into unrepresentative government.

Berlin Air Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, one of the greatest achievements in the history of the American armed forces is, in my opinion, that by which the United States Air Force has been maintaining the supply of the beleagured inhabitants of the city of Berlin; indeed, all history tells no story to compare with it. A military arm of government has been carrying out the most effective peace mission ever undertaken. Operation Vittles, as it has been called by the gallant airmen who have been conducting it, was described last month by Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, before the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. I ask unanimous consent that the substance of his address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT DEVELOPED BY HAP ARNOLD

The last war proved the necessity of strategic air transport as an indispensable element of fighting a modern war. Or, as Hap Arnold put it in his final report to the Secretary of War: "Cargo and passenger air transport * * * operating with air-line precision and techniques is an essential part of military operations." General Arnold foresaw that development and organized during the war the largest air line in the world, the Air Transport Command. He gave it a separate organizational status so that it might not be hindered by subordination to the combat commands representing perhaps more glamorous aspects of war.

After the war, there was some opinion in respectable sources that in peacetime the service should substantially reduce transport operations, and instead create nucleus organizations for training and depend much more heavily upon commercial air lift for their requirements. Both the Air Force and Navy successfully opposed that doctrine and fortunately, otherwise Operation Vittles would not be a reality.

Today the air line General Arnold started and the Naval Air Transport Service which merged into the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) is operating the strategic air lift for all the services. It is MATS that is carrying out Vittles.

AIR ROUTE ONLY ACCESS TO BERLIN

How did Vittles start? It seems inconceivable that it was almost 5 months ago that the Russians barred the railroad and highway entrance to Berlin. June 21, 1948, was that date.

You merely have to glance at the map placed at your table to realize the predicament we were in. The only apparent access to Berlin from the British, American, and French zones required passage through the Soviet zone. Unless some means of getting through could be devised, the alternatives were clear. A city of 2,500,000 people (including 9,000 American citizens) was hopelessly doomed to starve or else we had to pull out of Berlin, and that was an action our diplomatic people feared might finally erase hope of maintaining peace in Europe.

Actually, the air provided the sole source of hope. Fortunately, by written agreement with the Russians there were provided three narrow air corridors from the Allied zones through the Soviet zone into Berlin, three 20-mile lanes of space upon which the effectiveness of our diplomatic policies might depend.

What did we have in Europe with which to support by air a city of 2,500,000 people? Physically, the answer was—not much. We had a couple of troop carrier groups on occupation duty in our German zone. These outfits were equipped with C–47's, the Douglas two-engine DC–3 that was a reliable workhorse of the war, but by no means a modern transport. Those C–47's could give us a potential lift of a few hundred tons a day, only a fraction of the 3,000 tons a day that General Clay originally estimated would be needed to do the job. Besides our planes, the British had at the start a few assorted transports, small assistance for the job at hand.

It wasn't just the aircraft picture that was bad. Even if we had had the aircraft in substantial quantity, we didn't have the people to maintain them. We had no adequate supply line back to the United States. The airport situation in Berlin was appalling. The British had one base at Gatow and a lake in which they could land amphibians—if they had them. We had Tempelhof Airdrome, but you would never have picked that for an air-freight terminal—an airport in the midst of a city—with only one short runway.

Fortunately, we had some intangibles, and among these were the personalities and leadership of two men. One is General Clay, the United States commander for all our forces in Europe. The other was Gen. Curt LeMay, head of our air forces there.

General Clay knew what had to be done and was ready to support whatever General LeMay needed to get the job done. General LeMay moved just as he did when he headed the B–29 operations for the strategic demolition of Japan. Curt LeMay set about doing the unbelievable, mostly with what he had, finding out what more he needed, and then joining with General Clay in hard-hitting cables back to the United States, clearly stating his requirements.

But he couldn't wait for his resources. On June 26, the "LeMay Coal and Feed Company," as the boys still call it, went into business. Our little fleet of two-engine C–47's made 25 trips carrying 80 tons, a far cry from the tonnage required. However, we were in business, carrying flour and coal so that Berlin could continue to eat and have available electricity so that trolleys and subways could run; power had already been cut 75 percent to conserve coal.

For the next few days the tonnage inched gradually upward. Already steps were being taken by headquarters USAF in Washington that affected almost every outfit in the Air Force all over the world.

CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN INGENUITY

C–47's—the Douglas DC–3—could not get the job done. C–54's—the big Douglas four-engined DC–4—could carry 9½ tons instead of 3 tons. We had to get C–54's to Germany. They came from Alaska, the Caribbean, Hawaii, and Japan. As one crew member put it to me, "Where was I on the night of June 26? I'll never forget. I was having a quiet small beer in a joint in Anchorage, Alaska. Somebody hollered that they wanted me back at the base. In a few hours, we're in the air. And by the Fourth of July I'm delivering 'vittles' for the LeMay Coal and Feed Company."

That crewman's experience was typical. Pilots, copilots, and crew chiefs climbed into their C–54's, loaded a supply of precious spare parts and flew them to Germany. Skilled maintenance personnel were requisitioned from each command and sent overseas in chartered commercial planes.

At the beginning we had to use airlift almost entirely. Naval air transport and crews came to our help also. We chartered planes to carry tires and engines across the ocean; terribly expensive, but vital if we were to keep going. The cables back to Washington kept demanding those engines and tires. At one point, we were so low on tires at Berlin and Wiesbaden that they were shipping them direct from the factory without ever going through our depot system.

There was another obvious problem from the beginning and that was the development of communications facilities necessary to keep the airlift going during the bad weather in which Berlin seems to specialize most of the year. We had to get ground control approach, the GCA, to make sure that we could fly in the instrument conditions that were prevalent so much of the time. The principle of GCA, for those of you not familiar with it, is simple. The man on the ground sees the incoming planes by radar. He can tell where they are and how high they are. By radio, he directs the pilot what to do in order to land. That sounds easy, but the equipment is highly technical, and operating and maintaining it is an art.

One of the worst shortages of skills in the Air Force has been in flight control communications people necessary to operate GCA equipment. We just didn't have the skill within the Air Force to do the intense flight control job required.

WARTIME TRAINING MAKES AIRLIFT POSSIBLE

Your military services developed outstanding communications men, but after the war many of them returned to civilian life. These were the type of men who had developed our air-to-ground systems for use throughout the world, developed radar, ground control approach, drone airplanes, and many other inventions in which the role of perfect communications played a dominant role. But we did know where to turn for help, because we keep a constant check on our reservoir of highly skilled technicians in the Organized Reserves, and they helped us solve our communications.

With replacement pilots for Vittles, we had to do somewhat the same kind of thing. Three months after Vittles, we had a specialized pilot training school going at Great Falls, Mont. Our replacement training program there became known as the Little Corridor because it consisted of a lane of 10 miles on either side of an imaginary line among the buttes and ravines. We duplicated the same hurdles in communications, weather, and instrument flying as the Berlin corridor with a lot of stress on the GCA techniques so essential to safety at Berlin. In 2 months, our alumni and current enrollment of that specialized school amount to almost 650 pilots and flight engineers.

BRILLIANT PERFORMANCE UNDER PRESSURE

I've outlined some of the steps we had to take to support Vittles. The examples chosen are a few of many. But I'm sure there's another aspect of the operation that you're interested in. How do they actually operate in Germany and what are some of the human factors involved?

We have four separate starting points where the Army delivers the freight to the Vittles operation. We fly from Fassberg and Celle in the British zone, and Wiesbaden and Rhein-Main in the United States zone. Although we have three separate landing fields in Berlin, you can appreciate that we are converging on a very limited air space.

Because that air space is so restricted we have to use a block system on the same principle as the railroad trains.

If you will look at the map I will try to explain a few things about it. I am sure that you will wonder with me how in the world so much traffic in the air can pass through clouds without tearing them to tatters.

On the map, you will notice the chart in the lower right-hand corner. This diagram shows a total of 26 airplanes in the air at four different altitude levels. Those planes are heading toward Tempelhof Airdrome at a time space of only, I repeat only, 3 minutes apart. In other words, the planes are flying 10 miles apart at about 200 miles per hour. In order to continue this high-pressure operation, our planes must land at Tempelhof every 3 minutes. Now once again look at the map. You will notice that the planes travel a course from Wiesbaden, for instance, that is not direct. This route must be followed in rain, fog, night, and sunshine. I am sure that you will all agree that the matter of successfully keeping about 26 airplanes in the air at once, and having them land as frequently as every 3 minutes for 16 hours a day, is a real job.

The essence of the operation is pressure. All you have to work with is time, whether your concern is the actual operation or the maintenance of the plane. In Berlin, each plane is timed from the moment its wheels are set down on the runway until it is clear of the runway. The taxiing to the stopping point is timed, opening the hatches and unloading are timed. Then the plane taxies to the take-off point, the crews are briefed and fed aboard the plane, flight clearances are handed them on the plane. They don't leave the plane during the maintenance check.

At Tempelhof planes frequently can land, taxi up, and be unloaded and airborne again within 30 minutes. Under favorable weather conditions this time of turn-around may be decreased and planes may get off at an even faster rate. Of course, the time that it takes to unload a plane is determined by the type of cargo the plane carries and ease or difficulty with which that cargo may be handled. In some cases, such as on the Fassberg-Gattow coal run, the displaced persons unloading planes have made a contest of the off loading. One such group set a record of 7½ minutes for unloading 10 tons of coal.

DOLLAR COST OF AIRLIFT

Well, I've talked about the background and how it works. What has it done? What does it cost the American taxpayer, and what does it mean? As of today, we have a fleet of 168 C–54's and a few C–82 packets

in Germany. From June 26 until the close of business of December 3—161 days—we flew 52,574 flights, 40,471 in C–54's, and we have carried 425,803 tons of coal and food into Berlin. On September 18, Air Force Day, we broke a record made during the war over the Hump in China by carrying in 5,583 tons to Berlin, and in weather so bad as to require flying on instruments 18 out of the 24 hours. This record was made without impairing our required average on subsequent days.

In addition to our own accomplishment, the British have flown in an additional 28.4 percent of the total lift, a magnificent feat considering that their fleet consists of a miscellany of planes, mostly the small C–47.

The result has been that Berlin's food stocks have been increased since last June. It is not going to be luxury eating, but Berlin will not starve. Likewise, with coal. Heating and electricity will be severely rationed; it won't be a cozy winter in Berlin. But Berlin will survive. And, as Gen. Bill Tunner, now in charge of the operation, says, "We can keep pouring it in for 20 years if we have to."

What does this cost? Let me again read from my daily report. As of the close of business on December 3, the latest cost figures read as follows:

Total operating costs	$18,365,000
Total support costs	25,323,000
Reserve for termination and undistributed costs	21,032,000
Aircraft wrecked (5 C–54's, 1 R5D, 5 C–47's)	2,410,000
Depreciation of aircraft	6,232,200
Total cost	73,362,000

Here's another cost. It cost 16 lives. That is a great price. As Charley Murphy, of Fortune, said, "The Berlin airlift is Rolls Royce delivery service to the greatest poorhouse in the world."

PERMANENT VALUE OF VITTLES OPERATION

But the cost of Vittles against the cost of war is not the only fact of significance.

In addition, Vittles is the most convincing proof possible of the American determination to support the cause of peace with much more than eloquent platitudes. Vittles is of the same pattern as our European economic cooperation program. Vittles is a heartening demonstration, not only to the Germans but to the whole world, that we know and are prepared to act upon our knowledge that the airplane has so reduced the size of the world that the last basis for any degree of isolation has been removed.

Vittles has been of great value in permitting us to make some valuable appraisals of our set-up for national security and the effectiveness of our military services. It has called for teamwork among the services and civilian agencies. The Army, with the purchasing help of the Department of Agriculture, has done a fine job in getting the food supplies to the airlift. The Navy has supplied many of the crews operating the airlift, and, in addition, the Navy has assisted in the sea-lane support of Vittles and has filled up the holes in our Pacific airlift caused by Vittles The project has proved beyond a doubt the effectiveness of the unified Air Force-Navy airlift organization—the Military Air Transport Service, which operates as an agency of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. We know that unification of the services can function without destroying their respective identity and morale.

The actual operation of the lift itself has been a great test of the Air Force We have learned our lessons about our physical resources, strength, and weaknesses. For example, we know how critically dependent we are upon our supply of skilled enlisted maintenance personnel. We know, more forcefully than ever, that we are going to have to keep pressing to make the Air Force an attractive career for those men. Even an Air Force of volunteers cannot be effective unless those volunteers are willing to stay with us year after year.

We have been greatly encouraged by the evaluation of our organization, planning, and controls. You can understand the position we were in last summer—we did not know how long the Operation Vittles might continue. We had some tough questions to answer. For instance, how good were our procedures for planning such critical factors as the flow and training of personnel; or projecting the effect of Vittles upon our short supply of C–54 spare parts? What could be the effects on our combat potentials by our taking on this additional load? I can answer you that we have done a good job of the difficult forecasting problems involved, so that our operations people have been well advised of the areas in which they must take action, to keep the operations rolling with minimum dislocation to other missions.

You heard me give the bill of costs a little while ago. These cost figures are the proof that our business-management program, started 2 years ago by Secretary Symington of the Air Force, is paying off. Using our normal cost-accounting organization and procedures as a framework, we expanded quickly so that we could be able to assemble all costs of Vittles; the actual flying of the lift to Germany; maintenance operations in Europe and here; and the cost for our supplies.

We know now that we can do a good costing job even where our operation is so extensive and complex as this one we speak of today, but, even better than that, we have found we can interest all our commanders in cost control for the benefit of taxpayers, and instruct them in reducing costs as a part of their job—even under the stress of an abnormal operation.

As you businessmen know, a cost-control program is a success in business when the boys in the plant accept cost control as a logical and personal challenge. Our operations people are becoming cost-conscious, and the result will be greater insurance for the national security premium for which you pay.

Now once again, I would like to summarize the points we have covered:

In addition to giving a city of 2,500,000 people light, heat, and food—

1. We have established that, even under extraordinary and adverse conditions, the Air Force today is equipped to use air power in the furtherance of our security at home, or to strengthen our foreign policy as determined by the President and the State Department.

2. We have trained hundreds of flight crews who time and again have flown through fog, ice, and night to reach their objectives with only instruments and the teamwork of ground communications to guide them. These teams are all a vital element of our readiness.

3. As long as Operation Vittles lasts, the Air Force will grow stronger because we are learning under pressure. We have conclusively put the chaos of demobilization behind us, we are no longer a collection of plans, people, and units but a vital force that can do things.

4. We are seriously conscious of the economic burden of expenditures for national security and we are successfully implanting the business discipline of cost control in our military commanders.

5. And, finally, we have been teaching the world that we are not only the bankers for democracy but we are fighters for it as well.

Italian Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by me on December 22, 1948, relating to the Italian colonies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The people of Italy are among the best friends we have. I fear that we underestimate them, that we underestimate both the intensity of their friendship and the extent of their remarkably rapid recovery from the ravages of war.

In recognition of Italy's great friendship for us and the splendid strides she has made toward postwar reconstruction, I believe that the United States should work vigorously and emphatically to bring about Italian trusteeship over the prewar Italian colonies.

The situation as to these colonies is now as complicated as it is tragic. The peoples of Libya, Eritrea, and the Somaliland are handicapped in their progress toward eventual self-government because of the uncertainty which now surrounds their future.

One of the gravest problems which confront Italy herself is that of overpopulation. The crowded soil of Italy cannot support all the many mouths which must be fed. Until the pressure of excess population is relieved, the Italian economy can never be considered healthy and robust.

Although some emigration to the United States and to South America will be possible, the prewar Italian colonies are the logical and inevitable place for Italian emigres to found a new home. While the fate of the colonies remains in doubt, the population pressure in Italy builds higher and higher.

Moreover, many Italian families which lived permanently in the colonies before the recent war have not yet been able to return. Thus, hard-pressed Italy must provide for these temporary residents, as well as for the natural increase in her home populace.

It is a continuing and justifiable source of bitterness to the Italian people that they have not been accorded fully sympathetic treatment with regard to the colonies.

For all these reasons, it is pressingly necessary that a decision be reached, that the matter be settled, that this part of the debris left behind by the recent cataclysm be cleared away.

The Italian peace treaty provided that the Council of Big Four Foreign Ministers would reach an agreement as to the disposition of Italian colonies. The treaty also provided that if they failed to agree within a specified time limit, the problem would be placed before the General Assembly of the United Nations. The time limit did, in fact, expire without an agreement among the foreign ministers, and therefore the General Assembly takes over.

The General Assembly is to meet in special session next April largely for the purpose of considering the colonies. The Assembly must shoulder its responsibility and arrive at a just solution which will further encourage the Italian people in their efforts to help themselves and, by helping themselves, to help Europe and the world.

It is true that the Italiar colonies problem, like all important and vexatious issues, has many sides. Britain made a wartime promise to the Senusei tribes of Cyrenaica that they would not be returned to Italian administration. Likewise, justice demands that Ethiopia be given an outlet to the sea through Eritrea. The present Italian Government is itself wholly in favor of such an outlet for Ethiopia.

The United Nations statesmen will have to take these factors and many others into account, but the primary importance of restoring Italy to her historical role in the colonies cannot be gainsaid.

I want to emphasize and underscore the fact that all the colonies were in Italy's possession prior to the First World War. They are in no sense territories gained as a result of Fascist aggression.

I also want to stress that the Italian people, over a period of decades, spent a great percentage of their scant revenues in the development of these colonies, particularly the North African colonies. The results which could be achieved under a progressive and democratic government, like the present Italian regime, would be far more beneficial.

The Italians have definitely demonstrated their genius as colonial administrators. They have turned deserts into farm land; they have created schools where illiteracy once was rampant; they have introduced trade and stimulated industry. No nation is more fit than Italy to serve as a trustee, under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

As Italy's friend, we must leave no stone unturned to help the brave Italian Government. Certainly, one indispensable way of helping is to throw our weight behind Italy's claims, so far as they are just, to trusteeship over the colonies.

The President's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 5 my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] made a brief radio broadcast commenting on the President's message. I ask unanimous consent to publish his observations in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For me, this has been an amazing day. As I listened to the stupendous task which the President has assigned to the Eighty-first Congress and heard his tax program, I could not help but wonder how his many very worthy objectives could be attained and still comply with his directive that we must balance the Federal budget.

I was thrilled with his appeal for legislative cooperation, and then I was deeply shocked when I returned to the Senate to hear the excuses which were offered by his own Democratic leaders to the threat of our all-American bipartisan foreign policy.

But I am here tonight primarily to discuss those portions of the President's message devoted to business, prices, and taxes.

As to business, it is essential that we maintain a high rate of production, and this can best be done by the free-enterprise method. Even the President conceded this in today's message to Congress. If, as the President claims, our economic system must rest on a democratic foundation based on free enterprise, then we must continue to let business initiative remain in the thousands of Main Streets throughout our Nation rather than to center such initiative in Washington.

In respect to the President's price proposals, they are much too general and indefinite for me to form a conclusion at this time. I realize the threat of inflationary pressures and will support legislation to guard against them, but I will not be catapulted into action upon any program for the control of prices until I am convinced that that program is based upon real need rather than purely political consideration.

As to new taxes, it is quite apparent from the President's message that they are as certain as that night follows day, and I am willing to support new taxes which are absolutely essential to meet the actual needs of our great economy, but, as I have suggested, if the Eighty-first Congress is to carry forward the President's all-embracing program in its entirety, I predict that we will exhaust all of our tax resources and leave our cupboard completely bare.

Lastly, I believe that economies should be the first order of business. When we know we have effected a maximum of these, then wherever a genuine need is shown, we are justified in enacting tax measures to meet that need.

The American Air Force — Tribute to Hon. Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address of special interest by Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, at the Town Hall dinner in New York on December 15, 1948, honoring Vice-President-elect ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Entering 1949 the Air Force looks forward eagerly to the continuance of its development in the interest of our national security and world peace.

There have been milestones during the past 12 months which illustrate the constant great advancement in this new art of the air; milestones such as men still alive who have flown hundreds of miles an hour faster than the speed of sound (which is 760 miles an hour at sea level); and another young flyer who broke the official world's speed record with a tactical airplane when he flew, with his six guns and a full load of ammunition, over 670 miles an hour; and now we have the recent flight of 9,400 miles, with bomb load, by our latest, highest, and fastest long-range operational bomber.

And so we will move on this coming year, with breath-taking rapidity, into equally extraordinary accomplishments, in an air age that has brought all the world so close together, a matter of great interest as we enter the threshold of this strange atomic era.

The Air Force is proud also of such evidence of savings in the unification of the services as illustrated by the combination of the two great Air Force and naval airlines into one system—the Military Air Transport Service—MATS.

This consolidation has already resulted in the handling of 54 percent more ton-miles with but 4 percent additional personnel, to the great benefit of the American taxpayer.

Most of all, however, the Air Force looks with satisfaction on the Berlin airlift, the so-called Operation Vittles that started last June 26, and which is handled as a team with the Army and Navy.

Someone remarked this operation was a "Rolls Royce delivery service to the world's largest poorhouse." Well, that may be a clever wisecrack. It is expensive transportation, but here is the other side of the story.

The airlift prevents the starvation of millions of people. To prevent such an occurrence is in the American tradition. Because of the lift we are learning a great deal about handling planes at airports. As example, the Tempelhof landings are spaced 3 minutes apart in good weather, 5 minutes in bad; and the schedule is so tight that if a pilot fails to land on his first pass, he has to return with his load to the loading point.

This same 6-month operation has cost 17 American lives, as against 233 American lives lost daily in World War II.

Finally, the money cost of Vittles for an entire year will be less than the cost of World War II for a single day.

How could there be a more accurate and conclusive demonstration of the truth of the slogan that air power is peace power; and thus, too, we sustain the opportunity and hope for democratic solutions? Air power strengthens the hands of our diplomats, as under President Truman they work day and night for international accord.

When I was in Berlin last fall General Clay had a little ceremony which illustrates how much the German people appreciate the American planes of which they once were so terrified.

A Berlin businessman who asked that his name be kept anonymous, because some of his family were in East Prussia, said to Clay:

"My family have nothing left of value except this beautiful watch which chimes the hour, an old family heirloom. We know we are only alive today because of your flyers. Would you pick out one you think merits it most and give him this watch?"

And so there was a little ceremony in front of the Berliners and a young American flyer who had completed 42 round-trip missions in 46 days received this token, symbolic of the gratitude of a people.

In 1949 the Air Force looks forward to its continued development and continued support in the United States and at its stations all over the world. That support will be implemented by the President and the Congress; and with that in mind may I dwell a moment tonight with respect to the leading Member of the next Congress who has graced us with his presence this evening?

When one thinks of our Vice President-elect there comes immediately to mind all that is fine in our American traditions.

Just to meet and talk with ALBEN W. BARKLEY is in itself rewarding. It renews faith in the important and fundamental characteristics of America that have meaning and endure. When you think of Senator BARKLEY you think of America. Woodrow Wilson once said of Henry Clay:

"No man of his generation represented more of America than he did."

That tribute applies to Senator BARKLEY with even greater significance than to his illustrious predecessor from Kentucky.

During the recent campaign, voters of America felt and responded to his deep and abiding humanity. There is something of Senator BARKLEY's personality, as well as his deeds, that inspires confidence in his leadership. The people sensed to an unusual degree that here is a man they could trust.

He communicated to them his own qualities of integrity, of tolerance, and of faith. They sensed the essential bigness of the man who went among them espousing with great eloquence his own deep conviction that this Nation and its people can surmount and survive any crisis; and can deal effectively and democratically in the solution of common problems.

They sensed, too, that ALBEN BARKLEY is completely and utterly devoid of any meanness. Rare indeed has been the time when in a long career fraught with controversy Senator BARKLEY ever yielded to the mortal temptation to speak unkindly or harshly about an adversary.

Under great provocation, Senator BARKLEY has never lost his capacity for patience and understanding. Is it not indeed remarkable that no one, either his political opponents or others who may have disagreed on a particular course which Senator BARKLEY has advocated, has ever been able to accuse him of vindictiveness or bitterness—emotions all too common in political life.

Indeed there is something Lincolnesque about this great quality of Senator BARKLEY to love even his enemies. It is reminiscent of the famous passage in the Lincoln-Douglas debates, when, as history records, only once did President Lincoln descend to personalities—and then so whimsically that the sting was taken out of his recrimination. Lincoln in this historic campaign had his patience severely tested. On one occasion, he said of Douglas, as Senator BARKLEY might have been tempted to say of some of his political adversaries:

"I don't want to quarrel with him. I don't want to call him a liar, but when I come to square up to him, I don't know what else to call him."

As most of you will recall, Senator BARKLEY has repeatedly, during the campaign, told the story of the man with two sons. One went to sea. The other became Vice President. And nothing was ever heard of them since.

But I can predict with confidence that our next Vice President will not obtain the tranquillity which the Vice President normally provides.

The American people look to Senator BARKLEY for the counsel and guidance, and the wisdom of his mature and humanitarian leadership, to assist his chief, the President, in steering this country into the open seas of peace and abundance. His role will be significant because, among other things, the President has so often expressed complete confidence and trust in his former colleague in the Senate, and expects that his leadership will not be lost because he has become Vice President. In fact, our new Vice President is one of our great natural resources. To the challenge of our times, Senator BARKLEY will respond, as he has so often in the past.

I have read that the influence of Woodrow Wilson on ALBEN BARKLEY has been profound; and I have further seen attributed as Senator BARKLEY'S own political philosophy an excerpt of Wilson's great address at the dedication of Congress Hall in Philadelphia in 1913, wherein Wilson laid down this credo:

"Politics, ladies and gentlemen, is made up in just about equal parts of compensation and sympathy. No man ought to go into politics who does not comprehend the task that he is going to attack. He may comprehend it so completely that it daunts him, that he doubts whether his own spirit is stout enough and his own mind able enough to attempt its great undertakings, but unless he comprehend it he ought not to enter it. After he has comprehended it, there should come into his mind those profound impulses of sympathy which connect him with the rest of mankind, for politics is a business of interpretation, and no men are fit for it who do not see and seek more than their own advantage and interest."

Certainly our next Vice President is possessed in as great a degree as any man of our time of these impulses which connect him with the rest of mankind.

I am privileged to join with you tonight in paying tribute to one of the greatest men America has produced.

Policies of the Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter of January 11, which was written to me by Mr. James Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense. The subject matter of Mr. Forrestal's letter will be of interest to all Senators.

In the recent past the junior Senator from Washington has received an avalanche of mail from his State which severely criticized Mr. Forrestal for demanding dictatorial and militaristic powers. The thought was expressed by most of the writers that Mr. Forrestal was conspiring with the administration to throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress. I requested Mr. Forrestal to submit his views in order that the letters from my constituents might be intelligently and fully answered. Mr. Forrestal's prompt and thorough response speaks for itself. As a Member of the Congress I would not resent the right of the administration to submit any proposal to the Congress. The Congress is charged by the Constitution with determining the character of that legislation which it thinks will serve the best interests of all the people. The Congress ought to welcome for study any proposal submitted by the executive branch of the Government. Any proposal which is either unreasonable or detrimental ought to be denied, and the reverse is likewise true. I am grateful to Mr. Forrestal for having made clear his position and some of his responsibilities as the Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 11, 1949.

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I have looked into the matters referred to in your telephone call to my office of last week, and the only conclusion which I can draw is that the broadcast mentioned by your constituent appears to be an attempt to discredit the foreign policy of this Government.

The broadcast contained a statement to the effect that the administration was seeking power to "throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." From other statements contained in the broadcast, it seems clear that this language has reference to proposed legislation which would set out in clear and simple terms the authority of the President, under certain circumstances directly involving our national security, to furnish military supplies to other countries.

As you know, the field of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President, and the President generally formulates policy in this field after seeking the advice of the Secretary of State. The National Military Establishment does not make foreign policy. The National Military Establishment is, however, one of the organizations which the President may, if he so desires, utilize in carrying out certain aspects of foreign policy. The occupation duties of the Army are an illustration.

In order that our foreign policy may be kept in balance with our military strength, Congress established the National Security Council, and gave the Council the duty of advising "the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

In accordance with the congressional language just quoted, the National Security Council—with a membership including, among others, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense—recently advised the President of the desirability of seeking the legislation referred to above. The President has approved this recommendation of the National Security Council.

In his budget message of January 3, President Truman discussed this matter as one of the most important items of his legislative and budget program, and said: "In existing circumstances, economic strength is not enough to assure continued independence to free people. Under the Charter of the United Nations, therefore, we have been discussing with some of the western European countries measures designed to increase the security of the North Atlantic area. To further this objective, I expect later to request funds for providing military supplies to those countries and to certain other countries where the provision of such assistance is important to our national security."

This same subject was discussed at some length in a State Department press release of December 29, a copy of which I attach. It was also discussed at pages 13 and 21 of my annual report (copy attached), as released to the press for use in morning newspapers of December 30.

The broadcast referred to by your constituent described this proposed legislation as a request for "the power * * * to throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." In the light of the information set out above, I trust you will agree with me that there is no basis whatever for such an allegation with respect to the proposed legislation—which, of course, as the President has clearly stated, is being submitted by him to Congress for congressional consideration.

In the broadcast referred to by your constituent, a second matter—and one which has no relation whatever to the subject I have discussed above—was mentioned. This second matter appears to be a reference to an investment which I made 20 years ago in a Canadian company organized by me. This 1929 investment was made 11 years before I severed all my connections with the banking firm with which I was associated in order to become an administrative assistant to President Roosevelt.

In 1933, when I was testifying before a committee of the United States Senate, I stated that the applicable tax laws of the United States and Canada had led me to make the investment. On this same occasion I also testified that the total income taxes paid by me to the United States and the State of New York for the year under discussion were in excess of $300,000.

This particular hearing was a public hearing conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate, and the full text of the testimony is readily available to the public in a volume which can be identified as follows: Stock Exchange Practices, hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Seventy-third Congress, second session, on Senate Resolution 84 (72d Cong.) and Senate Resolution 56 and Senate Resolution 97 (73d Cong.).

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with any inquiries you may have concerning the broadcast in question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

Taxpayers Dig Up Billions That Are Used Against Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial, I am presenting an editorial from the December 16, 1948, Detroit Free Press entitled "Uncle Sam, International Boob—Taxpayers Dig Up Billions That Are Used Against Us."

In view of the conditions outlined in this splendid editorial, it seems to me the administration should take heed and proceed upon a basis that will at least gain us the respect and confidence of those nations throughout the world which we are attempting to aid, and they in turn will extend to us the treatment which we in all conscience are entitled to.

UNCLE SAM, INTERNATIONAL BOOB—TAXPAYERS DIG UP BILLIONS THAT ARE USED AGAINST US

The discovery that Great Britain, Belgium, and Netherlands have been using Marshall-plan dollars to buy aluminum in Canada at 16 cents a pound and reselling it to us at 26 cents a pound is shocking but not surprising.

We asked for it.

We proclaimed our moral responsibility not only for financing World War II but also for rebuilding the world it wrecked.

We said to all nations in lend-lease, UNRRA, and ERP: "Ask, and it shall be given you."

We boasted of our wealth.

Why shouldn't others pad their requests for easy money from Uncle Santa?

"Help yourself!" we told the world. "And see what the boys in the back room will have."

The aluminum deal reveals a number of things of interest to American taxpayers. The Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) should have known that Europe was not short of aluminum when it can resell to us what it has purchased out of the money we gave it.

We are short of aluminum, as shown by our willingness to buy it back at a premium of 10 cents a pound.

The aluminum industry estimates that American taxpayers will lose $26,000,000 this year through the Anglo-Belgian-Dutch transaction.

What it amounts to is that we have been buying aluminum and giving it to Europe and then buying it back.

American aluminum users will lose another $2,000,000 this year through premium payments to get back metal which, as taxpayers, they paid for in the first place.

A spokesman for the British Embassy in Washington says that "our conscience is clear." The amount of aluminum resold to the United States was nearer 1,000 than 12,000, as reported!

The theft of $1,000 may be less reprehensible than the theft of $12,000. The principle, though, is the same. You can't have just a "touch of honesty."

You shouldn't cheat even Uncle Santa, poor kindly sentimental old fellow giving away taxpayers' money.

Yet everybody seems to be doing it.

The Italian Government has just signed a series of trade and reparations agreements with Russia.

They call, first, for the early delivery to Moscow of 33 Italian warships. They also provide for Russia's taking over all Italian holdings in Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary as part payment of the $100,000,000 in reparations awarded to Russia in the Italian peace treaty. The balance will be paid out of Italy's current production.

The two countries agree to exchange annually $50,000,000 worth of goods for the next 3 years.

We now observe how well Russia fared under the peace treaty with Italy in the negotiation of which Secretary of State James F. Byrnes represented the United States.

The treaty virtually disarmed Italy, while Tito licked his chops for Trieste, and loaded down its ruined economy with burdensome reparations.

As we are now financing Italian recovery, any part of current production taken for reparations comes out of our pockets.

The story of World War I is repeated. Again we find ourselves paying the indemnities of a former enemy, turned friend, to a former ally, turned sour. The unpublished "pumpkin papers" can't contain anything less creditable to American statesmanship.

What is more, while we, for security reasons, are refusing to sell strategic commodities to Russia and its satellites, Great Britain, Canada, and Italy are reported to be selling aluminum to Russia for gold.

Great Britain is also charged with selling 240 American-made lend-lease military tanks to the Peron government of Argentina.

We expect corruption in China, where Confucius railied against it five centuries before Christ.

Columnist Marquis Childs, a liberal and an ardent one-world advocate, wrote on this page yesterday:

"This country during the past 2 years has sent upward of $2,000,000,000 to China in aid of one kind or another.

"A large proportion of this aid has eventually fallen to the Communists."

We thought in our ignorance and innocence that a higher standard of honor prevailed in Europe.

Yet, during the war, a furore was caused by the report that in the Middle East the British were reselling American goods supplied free to them.

After the war, UNRRA supplies from this country were used in eastern Europe for political purposes by the Communists. American flour from Minneapolis was distributed in Yugoslavia and the people were told that it came from Stalingrad.

We canceled a credit to Czechoslovakia when it was discovered that the Czech Government was making a profit by reselling to Yugoslavia.

After World War I we were called Uncle Shylock because we expected loans to Europe to be repaid.

As soon as World War II warmed up in Europe, we took the dollar sign out of transactions with our future allies.

We have since given them approximately $10,000,000,000 and are pledged inferentially, through ERP, to stake them to another $17,000,000,000.

The European simply cannot understand our motives. There is no parallel in history to our cosmic philanthropy—our universal WPA.

What other nation ever strained its own economy in peacetime to aid others and asked nothing in return?

The Europeans have concluded that either we are trying to buy them to fight on our side in the next war—in which case they ask why we don't pay them more as bribes—or else that we are just plumb daffy.

The British should know better.

Yet it was seriously claimed in Parliament and in a section of the British press that our $3,750,000,000 credit of 1946 was a plot to wreck the British economy.

We loaned them money, it was charged, to buy American goods and then immediately engineered an inflation to boost the prices of those goods so that the loan would go only half as far as expected.

Congress is about to be asked for more billions to pour into Europe through ECA.

A big build-up is now occupying the front pages of certain newspapers in this country.

The fact that Europe has done little or nothing to help itself, as contemplated by the Marshall plan, except on paper, appears, if at all, only under minor heads in the back pages.

What is more, as Barbara Ward, famous foreign affairs editor of the London Economist points out in The West at Bay, western Europe can get on its own feet and off the American bounty only by forming a customs and currency union and surrounding it with a tariff wall to keep out American goods.

Along the same line, another British economist recently proposed that all the world outside the United States form a trade alliance against it.

After having built Europe up, that is to say, we are to be kicked into outer space.

Congress should reexamine the Marshall plan from stem to stern and from A to Z before it votes ECA another dollar.

Americans don't mind, in their palsy-walsy sentimental, let's have another mood, being called Uncle Santa or even Uncle Shylock, but they should resent Uncle Sucker.

How much longer can we play the role of international boob before we, too, go bankrupt?

We Need An Air Force Second to None—View of an Idaho Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, thoughtful people throughout the country are giving close attention to the protection of our country and the defense program of our Government.

Herewith is submitted the views of a prominent citizen of north Idaho for the consideration of Congress:

BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO, *January 10, 1949.*

Mr. COMPTON I. WHITE,

Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to touch on a couple of subjects at this time.

First, the appointment of Dean Acheson as our Secretary of State. In my opinion, it would be the height of folly to put in that important position anyone who has the slightest hint of communistic tendencies. I

know not if Mr. Acheson is a Communist or not, but the fact remains that he has been closely associated with them in the past. If you cannot aid in blocking his ascension to this important position, then I believe it to be your duty to our country to use every effort to secure a very thorough investigation of all his activities, both past and present, and make public the findings, regardless of whose toes they might tread on. No effort should be spared to prevent the infiltration of Communists into the offices of our Government.

Secondly, all this stink the Army and Navy is raising about building up the Air Force.

It is well recognized that Russia is our only potential enemy. In the event of a war with Russia, of what use would an oversize Navy be, when Russia is not a great naval power? We need at least our present-sized Navy to combat submarines and other war craft Russia might put out, but certainly not an expanded Navy. Navy big wigs point to carrier-based bombers, but it has just been proven in combat that carrier-based planes, while excellent for reaching outlying posts, are greatly inferior to land-based planes, and there is no place in Russia beyond the reach of our present land-based bombers. Money spent enlarging our Navy only weakens our economy and robs the Air Force, which plays right into Russia's hands. I've no doubt but that the men in the Kremlin are keeping their fingers crossed, hoping that we will pour out billions on an expanded Navy.

And somewhat the same can be said for the Army. We would not be waging an offensive war, therefore we do not need a huge army for invasion and occupation, at least not at the present.

What we do need is the mightiest Air Force on the face of the earth, constantly on the alert, and kept up to date with the finest planes and latest equipment to come out of our experimental laboratories. No effort or expense should be spared in attaining that end.

We do need an expanded force of technicians to develop newer and better weapons, all the way from planes to bombs. We need more research into guided missles, and all other forms of modern warfare. Forget the old-fashioned idea of warships, and ground armies. They are as out-dated as the horse and buggy. You wouldn't think of sending a soldier equipped with a medieval sword and helmet out to combat another equipped with a machine gun. Of course not! That's out-dated; but no more so than the thinking of many of our top military men. All the top military men of France could think of before the last war was a super Maginot line. But what good did it do them? Let's not be caught like the French were.

Further, we are in bad need of equipment (and personnel to man it) for the detection of approaching planes or guided missiles. If Russia were to make a surprise attack today, when would we first be aware of it? When the first bombs fell? And supposing they should be atomic bombs, delivered en masse, and directed at all of our key cities? It's not a very pretty picture, is it? But, some may say, Russia hasn't got the atomic bomb. Perhaps not, but make no mistake, they will get it, and when they do we will receive it.

No, we have tarried too long already, for, after all, it will take considerable time to implement this program even after it is authorized, so let's get on the ball and make up for lost time, lest we be caught like we were at Pearl Harbor.

In the interest of our national security, yes of our very lives, you should use all your influence to secure passage of these measures, and quickly. If selfish and near-sighted Army and Navy men stand in the way, have them removed. Nothing should block so important a piece of legislation.

Yours respectfully,

WALTER D. STILES.

Great Britain Versus the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the people want peace. They want to live, to develop their future, to rear their families; but there is no peace.

Wherever there are natural or human resources to be exploited, the empire builders are pressing the yokes on the necks of the people. In Indonesia the Netherlands Government, with a cruel cynicism and swift terror that might make the ghost of Adolph Hitler envious, has forsworn all its fine promises and is in the process of destroying the Indonesian Republic while hypocritically trying to tell the world that the military might marshaled against the people's republic is mere police action.

GREAT BRITAIN PUTS ALL TO SHAME

But, Mr. Speaker, for the ultimate in cynicism, betrayal, double-dealing, double-talk, the whited sepulcher which is the Government of the British Empire, puts all others to shame.

Lie after lie, callous and cold and deliberate, flows from the treacherous depths of the British Foreign Office.

While Great Britain does in fact sabotage the United Nations and support, encourage, abet, incite, and arm the medieval and feudal Arab states toward Israel, her calculating and ruthless statesmen blandly tell the world that Great Britain does no wrong.

While in fact Great Britain imprisons thousands of hapless victims of the Hitler horror on Cyprus without shadow of legal right or process, holding them helpless, hapless, hungry, the venal press of Britain tells us that Great Britain loves everybody and is giving up her tottering and bankrupt Empire.

GREED AND AVARICE RULE

While Great Britain does in fact hold out both hands for American dollars and use those dollars to forestall our own traders and investors and cut American products out of the world markets, the British financiers and the Board of Trade give us soft words and broken promises; if the gentlemen will forgive a bad pun, they give us business, but not in a business sense.

Mr. Speaker, the peace-loving people of the world, and of America, demand that we crack the whip of economic superiority and bring the faithless British Government to heel.

In our hands, in the economic cooperation program and in our other loan agreements with Great Britain, we hold the power to force this Nation of heartless tradesmen to hold to its promises in the Middle East, in Germany, in South America, in the East—wherever British interests clash with our own, and that is almost everywhere.

These are strong words, Mr. Speaker, but I feel them deeply. We need a new American revolution against the crushing weight of British imperialism.

Under consent, I insert at this point a full-page advertisement inserted by the American Zionist Council in the Washington Post of Wednesday, January 12:

BRITAIN'S NEW WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

The British Government is launching a new war against Israel—even as direct armistice negotiations between Egypt and Israel are getting under way.

The evidence is clear and unmistakable:

Great Britain has admitted that British troops have been sent to the port of Aqaba in Transjordan. A long-standing truce has been in effect between Israel and Transjordan. It would seem that the British Government is concerned lest this truce eventuate into a permanent peace between the two countries. If the British-dominated Transjordan Arab Legion should reenter the war at any time in the future, it will be clear that Great Britain alone will be responsible.

There are reports that large numbers of British fighters and bombers are being landed at Mafrak, Transjordan, and that British armed strength is being concentrated on the Egyptian-Palestinian frontier. Large units of the British Navy are being moved into the area and are maneuvering, not far from Israel's shores. In addition, Israeli spokesmen have disclosed that Britain has been training troops in Tripolitania under conditions identical to those to be found in Israel.

British propagandists are trying to make it appear as if current British military moves were "provoked" by the shooting down of RAF planes by the Israelis. It should, therefore, be remembered that the afore-mentioned British troop movements of Aqaba were first disclosed by Israel almost 2 weeks ago.

Great Britain has persisted in sending planes into the battle-front areas of the Palestine war, but assumes an air of righteous indignation when the inevitable happens and British aircraft are shot down. It will be recalled that both Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden recently arose in the House of Commons to question the necessity and propriety of sending Royal Air Force planes over such a "dangerous and delicate" area. Nevertheless, Mr. Bevin continued to send British planes into this "dangerous and delicate" area. Why?

Furthermore, it has now been revealed that British arms deliveries to Egypt during the last few months have amounted to £50,000,000 ($200,000,000) and included shipment of the most modern jet fighter planes, naval vessels, heavy artillery tanks, heavy caliber shells, and aviation gasoline. All this took place at a time when Great Britain was publicly avowing strict neutrality and maintaining that it was not sending arms to the Arab countries.

THE POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

These military moves should be considered in relation to the panic propaganda which British officials had attempted to disseminate in this country on the basis of Israel's so-called invasion of Egyptian territory and the consequent obligation of Great Britain to come to Egypt's aid under the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936. Great Britain had obviously hoped to induce the United States to join a renewed British move to bring about the imposition of sanctions against Israel by the Security Council. In order to achieve this, Britain warned that if she failed to bring about the international action she desired, she would be "compelled" to act unilaterally in support of Egypt.

But—to the great embarrassment of the British—Egypt, while confirming that Britain had offered to provide her with military aid if she would invoke the 1930 treaty, decided to let the British do their own fighting for a change. Instead of invoking the treaty,

Egypt proceeded to reaffirm her earlier denunciation of it and, at the same time, asked for direct armistice negotiations with Israel.

Great Britain has thus been forced into the open and stands revealed before world opinion in her true role—the real enemy of Israel. She can no longer cloak her own selfish ambitions behind the actions of the Arab states whom she had encouraged to make war on Israel. The Arab aggressors have been defeated, and Britain must either become reconciled to a settlement which will keep Israel's political independence and territorial integrity intact, or commit British arms and troops to a new war against Israel.

Britain is seemingly choosing the latter course and is currently flooding the American press with distortions and misrepresentations of the situation in the Middle East. We believe, therefore, that the American people would profit from a review of the facts in the war Britain has waged with the primary objective of obtaining the Negev for her own use and exploitation.

THIS IS THE RECORD

1. Immediately after the adoption of the partition resolution by the United Nations General Assembly on November 29, 1947, the British authorities in Palestine systematically and deliberately opened the frontiers of that country to armed Arab bands who entered for the express purpose of engaging in a military struggle with the Jews in order to upset the decision of the United Nations by force of arms.

2. Britain also actively participated in this aggression by supplying the Arab states with financial aid, by creating a stock pile of war supplies and equipment for the Arabs, by providing officers and administrative help to the invaders. Simultaneously, Britain made every effort to prevent the Jews from arming for their own defense.

3. When—despite all of these British maneuvers—the Arab attacks did not succeed and the State of Israel was proclaimed on May 14, 1948, Great Britain encouraged the Arab governments to launch full-scale military invasions of Palestine, with the declared aim of overrunning and subjugating Israel. The attack was led by the Transjordan Arab Legion, a military force completely equipped, financed, and officered by Great Britain.

4. In the early days of the war, when the invaders were on the move, Great Britain did nothing to bring hostilities to a halt, but, on the contrary, maneuvered ceaselessly in the Security Council to keep the Arab states from being punished as aggressors. At that time Great Britain saw no violation of the United Nations Charter, although the action of the Arab states in invading Palestine was explicitly denounced as international aggression by United States Delegate Warren Austin (May 22, 1948). Then the British worked indefatigably to induce the Security Council to refrain from taking the action which was clearly indicated.

5. However, when the tide turned and the Israeli Army repelled the aggressors, there were immediate British moves for truces, Israeli troop withdrawals, and—finally, the bitterest irony—attempts to impose sanctions against Israel for successfully defending its own territory.

6. After Israel inflicted a series of decisive defeats on the Arab armies and, in the course of one military engagement, attacked legitimate military objectives on Egyptian soil, Great Britain threatened unilateral military action against the Jewish state.

It is against this background that Britain's current moves should be viewed.

AMERICA MUST TAKE A STAND

Whether or not Mr. Bevin continues his vendetta against Israel depends largely on the stand which our own Government will now take. The United States, which has accorded recognition to Israel, and which has pledged itself to support Israel's claims to territorial integrity, will surely not ignore the latest British efforts to renew the political and military offensive against Israel. Nor can our Government overlook the fact that Great Britain's current moves to frustrate the peace which now seems to be in the making between Israel and the Arab states, along with her threats of unilateral military action, flaunt the United Nations and its efforts to hasten a settlement between the Arab states and Israel.

American interest in peace in the Middle East can best be served by a firm warning to the British Government to desist from its present policy of war and intrigue against Israel.

AMERICAN ZIONIST EMERGENCY COUNCIL.
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Why Imitate a Failure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Journal-American by E. F. Tompkins, I hereby present one appearing on January 6, 1949, entitled "Why Imitate a Failure?"

In this editorial Mr. Tompkins deals with the British experience in attempting to socialize the medical and dental professions of Great Britain. I would suggest that those who are inclined to believe that the socialization of these two great professions will bring ultimate utopia into the lives of all of us read this editorial carefully and give its views serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the pages of history for the past several thousands of years are replete with attempts on the part of many governments to socialize themselves. In each instance these attempts failed, bringing ruination and suffering to all the people. A most significant thing in connection with each of these attempts is the fact that in the last analysis the greatest sufferers were always the great mass of poor people. Why is it that we in this supposedly enlightened age cannot profit by the experiences of the past?

WHY IMITATE A FAILURE?

(By E. F. Tompkins)

If British experience has any meaning for the American people, the New Deal's scheme for national health insurance will not get very far in the Eighty-first Congress.

The Socialist Labor Government put its national health service into operation about 4 months ago.

Approximately 98 percent of the population has been covered into the plan, and all but a few of the doctors and dentists have been enrolled as "panel" practitioners.

The bureaucracy which is in arbitrary control—officially, the Ministry of Health—receives the pay roll and other taxes collected for the service and assigns patients and prospective patients to the licensees, with a maximum of 4,000 on any doctor's panel.

Each doctor or dentist receives a fixed annual fee of about $3.20 a patient, paid by the Government, and every person—even aliens and tourists—is entitled to free service, including glass eyes and false teeth.

Millions of Britons have taken advantage of the dispensation, to such an extent that there is a shortage of some 9,000,000 sets of dental plates and bridges.

The socialist administration are finding themselves unable to redeem their promises to their constituents.

Furthermore, the fixed incomes of the doctors and dentists have been set so low that the two professions are coming into rebellion and physicians' and dentists' strikes against socialism are being openly advocated.

The British Medical Journal, the most authoritative publication in its field, is carrying warnings that doctors may withdraw wholesale from the service and, if not permitted to practice privately without interference, will simply leave the country.

In other words, as between regimented poverty and exile, they prefer exile—they remember the song of their forefathers, "Britons never will be slaves!"

But the doctors and dentists intend to make a fight of it.

All branches of the British Medical Association have been asked to hold emergency meetings to vote on full resignation from the service unless the basic capitation fee is more than doubled by the Government to give them the income which they say a practitioner must have.

In one respect, dentists feel themselves to be worse off than the physicians.

Under existing regulations, dentists have been allowed twice as much as physicians.

With the physicians demanding that their fees be doubled to equal the dentists, the health officials have decided to cut the dentists' allowance in half.

Consequently, the executive council of the British Dental Association has asked its 8,000 members to expect an emergency meeting in London.

Some of the complaints made in the British Medical Journal are bitter.

Dr. R. E. Newman writes:

"Deterioration in the standards of practice is depressing and makes it impossible to tackle the problem of the sick without the carking care of financial insecurity.

"No man can give of his best with the wolf howling at the door."

Dr. J. A. H. Sykes says:

"The alternative to a Ministry refusal to give adequate living facilities seems to be a wholesale resignation and a return to private practice, or emigration."

From Dr. G. Neil Fleet comes this:

"To work a 7-day week, with numerous night calls and 24 hours on duty, and find at the end of the quarter that one's check is exactly half the monthly check of a dental colleague, is more than human flesh can bear.

"The situation, if not remedied, calls for a 90 percent resignation."

Plainly, in its very inception, socialized medicine is a failure in Great Britain for the public and the professions alike.

Despite denials at Washington, the New Deal's national health insurance plan is merely an American replica of the British scheme, both of them being derived from the fantastic Beveridge formula of security "from the womb to the tomb."

What socialism is doing to medical science in Great Britain is exactly what socialism did in prewar Germany and Austria.

It is exactly what socialism under any other name will do to American medical service, which under our free-enterprise system has made itself unquestionably the best medical service ever known.

The Nation's Second Greatest Basic Industry—Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation stands predominant among world governments. Our armed forces are triumphant in all parts of the world, due in a large measure to the utilization of our mineral deposits—in oil, iron, and nonferrous minerals found beneath the soil of our country. It is heartening at this late day to find that the representatives of the departments of Government are coming to recognize the vital importance of developing our vast mineral resources.

There is attached herewith an address entitled "A Program for Tackling the Minerals Shortage," by Hon. C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior:

A PROGRAM FOR TACKLING THE MINERALS SHORTAGE

(Address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Hon. C. Girard Davidson, before the Northwest Mining Association annual convention at Spokane, Wash., Saturday, December 4, 1948)

The miner with pick and shovel was for many years the recognized symbol of the West. This year, the one hundredth anniversary of the discovery of gold at Sutters Mill, Calif., we pay him special tribute for his role as the cutting edge in opening our western lands for development.

The gold rush which followed this first strike saw men spreading out through these unpopulated Western States, exploring every nook and cranny. The lives of the forty-niners were rough and tough. They lived in hastily constructed boom towns and they paid the inflated prices you would expect in a situation where almost everything they needed had to be brought over the long sea voyage from the East. They found it wasn't easy to go it alone before the creation of the diversified economy which was to support them. They needed the settlers who came shortly after to grow their food, and the traders and craftsmen to provide them with goods at reasonable prices.

The Government, too, played a part in those days in developing a balanced society and a balanced economy that backed up and supported the miners. In its traditional role of aiding private industry to do its job, the Government offered the services which made the boom towns livable and orderly. Important services then were law and order, post offices, land grants to bring the railroads through, and assay offices where the miner could be sure he got a fair evaluation of his strike.

Today the pick-and-shovel miner has practically disappeared in the wake of advancing mechanization. The emphasis is no longer on gold and silver but instead on the by-products found with them which, in terms of our present day society, are more precious than the precious metals.

Today the Government in its role of facilitating industrial operations is going forward with great programs of regional development that will again assure the miner a balanced economy. We are harnessing the waters of our rivers by the construction of multiple-purpose dams. We are irrigating new lands to feed a phenomenally expanding population. We are providing public power at low cost to energize new industries.

Today, on the hundredth anniversary of the opening of the West, we are discarding the pick-and-shovel techniques with which the early miner made his success. We might well emulate, however, the spirit and daring of the forty-niners which set them off into what were then uncharted lands to find something they could only hope would be there. With the same inspiration and determination, we must face up to the new facts in our minerals situation.

Today our requirements for zinc, lead, copper, and other minerals are fantastic. During 1947 alone we consumed 93,000,000 tons of iron ore, 7,500,000 tons of phosphate rock for fertilizer, one and one-third million tons of copper, and more than 1,000,000 tons of lead. These raw materials are the sinews of our industrial strength, the base of an industrial system which has given us full employment and a living standard unparalleled in world history.

The importance of these minerals has been brought home to us in recent years because now, for the first time in our history, we find we don't have enough of them. This country with its seemingly limitless distances, with its infinite variety of climate and terrain, has bred in us Americans a concept of abundance. As we spread across the continent from East to West always finding new lands, it was assumed we could always find beneath the lands the minerals we were seeking. Now at last we find that these resources are limited. To date we have been extracting our irreplaceable mineral assets with little regard for the future. Now as a result, we are already deficient in whole or in part in 30 different metals and minerals and the list will inevitably increase. We are driven to rely more and more on imports, on the use of lower-grade ores, and on substitutes for those materials which are close to exhaustion.

The dwindling of our mineral resources brings us face to face with new problems.

One of the most important of these is exemplified in our stock-piling program. Only 2 years ago when the Stock Piling Act was amended after the war, we were operating on the assumption that we could obtain sufficient quantities of strategic and critical materials to meet current industrial needs and to build a stock pile as well. Of these two possible end uses, current production was given the priority in the law which stated that the stock pile "shall be made, so far as practicable, from supply of materials in excess of the current industry demand." The present inadequate state of our stock pile proves that there has been practically no excess in many commodities. In fact, now we can't even meet the requirements of current industrial production. Recent events have intensified the need for the stock pile along with other forms of preparedness. Military authorities are now insisting that we complete the stock pile and that we do it quickly.

Another vital issue is the maintenance of full employment for our expanding population. It is being forecast that if we maintain full employment our gross national product should increase one-third or even one-half in the next decade or so. By 1960 then we could be turning out from our factories, our farms, and our service establishments 30 to 50 percent more goods than we are producing today. Incidentally, this forecast of a constant increase of over two and one-half per year is not at all fantastic; it coincides with the actual rate of increase over the 30-year period between 1917 and 1947. You all know that this increase in total production will require a proportionate increase in the output of many of our metals and other minerals.

Let us see, for example, what would be required to expand steel production one-third from 90,000,000 to 120,000,000 tons annually. First, we should need an equivalent increase in iron ore—but we are in sight of the end of the high-grade, readily mineable ores in the Mesabe Range vicinity. Second, each ton of steel requires 14 pounds of manganese, of which nearly 90 percent of our requirements is imported. Third, this level of steel production would require about 700,000 tons of metallurgical-grade chromite, although known domestic reserves are only 25,000 tons—a drop in the bucket relative to long-run needs—and we are dependent on Soviet Russia, which is currently furnishing half of our requirements.

Against these two national objectives of a stock pile for security and an expanding economy for full employment, we have the fact of shortages in many of our basic minerals. Does this mean then that we are not going to build the stock pile necessary to keep our country strong and secure? Does this mean then that we are not going to expand our production to the extent necessary to assure our people continued full employment and a rising standard of living?

If we answer these questions in the spirit of the forty-niners, our answer must be "No." Our question is not properly "can we" or even "will we"; it is "How are we going to do it?"

In order to do this gigantic double-barrel job, we shall need the fullest cooperation of industry, labor, and Government, and an awareness of its importance by every American. I believe it will entail allocation of scarce materials for a while. Of course, the fact is that we have allocations right now, allocations by producers who in a sellers' market decide to whom shall go commodities which are in short supply. Any program for stockpiling and maintaining full employment is going to require somewhat more effective allocations of materials which will direct them into the right channels to insure future adequacy of production. Who does the allocating is a very pertinent question. We in the West especially have need for impartial umpires. My experience would not lead me to choose as umpire the eastern steel men, who can use a voluntary allocation program to continue to impede western development.

In this great Nation I don't believe in making the doling out of scarce articles a permanent public policy. Ours is not a starved, constricted, eroded economy of a European state. American initiative and American ingenuity can do better than parcel out the scraps from a poverty-stricken table. If we are forced to allocate some items in short supply, we should do it only to make possible the eventual expansion of supply and insure abundance for everybody.

An excellent example of rationing scarcity is the operation of the voluntary allocations program in terms of the current steel shortage. We have seen many letters from the mining machinery industry, which serves you and which has already felt the pinch in steel. Let me quote these samples: "Our production has been reduced almost every month." "* * * unless our industry is approved for allocation of steel we will be unable to continue operations." "* * * the prospects for 1949, unless we obtain assistance, are much worse than 1948." "We do not like the old priority system, but it was a blessing to what we have been up against during the past few years." "* * * it is now obvious that we would be better under such an arrangement than we are now and better than, I believe, we can hope to be under any voluntary plan which does not include the allocation of all available materials."

Representing the western miner, the mining machinery industry, and the oil industry, the Department of the Interior went before the allocations committee of the steel industry with a request for 38,000 tons of steel monthly for mining machinery. At first we were given a brush-off but at the next meeting of the committee, after November 2, they gave us the steel we had asked for.

Getting this allocation was at best a small victory. Allocations of steel, even to essential uses, such as mining machinery, will neither satisfy our requirements nor end the steel shortage. Steel production this year is about 10,000,000 tons short of actual demand and there is little reason to hope that the situation will be any better next year or the year after. Today the eastern steel magnates are opposed, as they have always been, to any substantial enlargement of our capacity to make steel. These men of little faith are in constant dread of a depression which might leave them with too much steel. They have, it is true, at last recognized the public interest in the shortage and are now advertising that the steel industry is expanding. This expansion, however, totals only 3,000,000,000 tons over a 3-year period as against our 10,000,000-ton shortage each year. In addition, this expansion is largely in modernization and construction of finishing plants and not in basic steel ingot capacity. The new steel plants look bigger in the brochures than in reality when measured against the Nation's needs.

Steel is so vital to our full employment and our growing economy, as well as to our preparedness program, that the country cannot stand idly by while we suffer from a lack of steel. Public interest requires that we take every possible step to get the expanded steel capacity we need. If the steel men feel that they can't raise the capital to build new steel plants, then we should help them out by authorizing RFC to loan them the money. If the steel men then should reject these loans because of their basic opposition to expansion, then the Government itself must build the steel plants as it did during the war.

Not all, in fact, not many products are so vital in our national life that they require such drastic action. Steel, however, is at the very core of our industrial structure, and thousands upon thousands of producers depend upon it. We have pledged ourselves not only during campaigns, but also in law, to maintain full employment. As the population continues to grow each year, we shall need to make more products to make good this pledge. Without more steel, it can't be done.

Throughout the minerals field, industry and Government have the task of making available the minerals and their equivalents which are needed for an expanding economy and national security. Just as we needed the European recovery program to put a floor under Europe's sagging economy, so now we need a minerals recovery program at home to assure a secure base for our own economy.

The Department of the Interior, which would have the major responsibility for carrying out the Federal Government's share of such a marshaling plan for minerals, is hardly equipped for the job. Our present minerals activities are operating on a paltry $30,000,000 budget. This is two-tenths of 1 percent of the budget for national defense. Compare this with the value of the products of the mining industry, which comes to $12,500,000,000. Our Department needs between $50,000,000 and $60,000,000 to get started on a real MRP.

Here are some of the things we want to do.

We should like to maintain a continuous appraisal of where we stand in the minerals field so that we can always look ahead to where we are likely to be short and thus be ready to initiate action to relieve the shortage. Such a continuous appraisal will, of course, provide the mining industry with the up-to-date information which we are unable to give you in full now. We want to have more information on known deposits, usable reserves, mining production, refining and smelting capacity, consumption, and demand.

We would encourage greatly expanded exploration for new deposits, including submarginal, both here and abroad. We could do a much better job in research to improve exploratory methods, and we could go a great deal faster with the geologic mapping which makes search possible.

We would do more metallurgical research, experimentation, testing, and pilot-plant operation in order to make usable our current submarginal and unused raw materials.

We should be doing much more than we are doing today in finding substitutes to take the place of scarce minerals.

We should develop better conservation practices. We should promote more intensive and efficient use of minerals and eliminate the waste which is undesirable to industry and the consumer alike.

We want to study exhaustively the effect of the present tax structure on minerals development. If it is true that present practices do not give due allowance to the exhaustible nature of mineral deposits; if it is true that they inhibit exploration; if it is true that there is insufficient correlation between State and Federal tax procedures, then we want to propose recommendations to remedy the situation. Our Minerals Advisory Council, made up of industry representatives, is already examining this question, and we should like to be able to hire the experts necessary to carry their studies to a successful conclusion.

We would at long last move in on examination and revision of our archaic mining laws so that they would encourage the mining industry to develop minerals on the public lands. We are told that the present laws make discovery of hidden deposits almost impossible; that they do not take into account new scientific methods of exploration; and that they do not permit land tenure sufficient for satisfactory subsurface operation. We have a report from the Minerals Advisory Council on this problem also, and we are going forward with our analysis to the extent that our limited staff allows.

We want to consider seriously tariff problems as they affect mining. The dilemma created by the requirements of a healthy domestic minerals industry and healthy economic relations abroad to insure necessary minerals imports certainly calls for a comprehensive reexamination of the tariff structure.

We should inquire into the necessity for incentives, financial and otherwise, which will assist miners to find new deposits. Perhaps the answer to this problem will be found in our examination of the tax structure, if not, we want to pursue the study of other forms of incentives.

What I have recited here amounts to a large order. But it seems to me to be in keeping with the Government's traditional role of assisting industry and looking forward to meeting the needs of our ever-expanding economy. The mining industry itself will carry forward some of these projects in cooperation with government. The industry will, of course, continue to extract and process the minerals, exercising its great ingenuity, imagination, and skill in these activities which, as a segment of our private enterprise system, have contributed so much to giving America the highest standard of living in the world. Government can do its share only if it gets the funds and, where necessary, the additional legislative authority from the Congress.

To vitalize a minerals-recovery program we need the courage and initiative, the American genius for turning the impossible into reality, which is our heritage from the forty-niners. Jointly ours is a tremendous responsibility to the American people: To develop out of wasting resources the continuing minerals base for our security and prosperity.

Federal Aid to and Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the truths of a radio broadcast by Dr. George S. Benson, of Harding, College, Arkansas, over ABC network, December 26, 1948.

Every citizen reading this convincing broadcast should bring it to the attention of community leaders, members of the board of education, educators, heads of service clubs, labor union leaders and others in position to give leadership on public thinking. Many of these who recognize the unanswerable logic of this experienced educator, Dr. George S. Benson, speaking from one of the poorest States in the Union measured in terms of material things, will wish to send copies of Dr. Benson's broadcast with their personal comments to their Representatives in Washington and to distribute copies in local service clubs.

Dr. Benson's complete address follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

(By Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark.)

Federal aid to public schools of all 48 States of the Nation is now a very live subject. It involves much more, however, than merely an alternate method of financing public education. It involves principles that are vital to the future of our own American way of life.

In the beginning, let me say that American public school teachers are seriously underpaid. They should, can, must, and will be paid more, whether there be Federal aid or not.

There are two methods of financing our public schools. One is to continue financing them through local, city, county, and State taxation, as we have done throughout our history. The other is to supplement this local support by appropriations from the Federal Government. During the past 10 years there has continuously been one or more bills before Congress for such Federal aid, and one will shortly be presented to the new Congress, proposing Federal aid to every public school in every one of our 48 States.

Both the proponents and the opponents of Federal aid are agreed that the present bill, calling for $300,000,000 if adopted, would be only the beginning. Both sides are agreed that once the principle is adopted, aid would increase rapidly. In my opinion, it would increase until the Federal Government would be carrying the major part of the load within a decade after the start had been made. Of course, by that time, the matter of Federal control now considered so serious, would have been fully accepted and the consequences ignored.

Should the principle of Federal aid to public schools become the rule, we may be assured the principle would shortly be extended to the junior-college level. In fact, that is already being discussed. With the

principle in operation up to the junior-college level, we can expect that it would gradually be extended to the senior level. With that accomplished, private schools and colleges would tend to be squeezed out of existence through one of two procedures, or a combination of both. First, Government policies of cheap money and low interest rates have destroyed the effectiveness of their endowments. High income taxes and high inheritance taxes have also greatly shrunk the sources from which gifts for private schools may come. With a federalized public-school system this threat would become much more serious.

In the second place, there is already some agitation for legislation to require all children to attend public schools for national indoctrination. With a federalized system of education it isn't difficult to foresee the day when such legislation would be adopted, and even to the extent that private schools would be virtually eliminated.

Consequently, the real issue at stake today is not a mere $300,000,000 to be distributed among the public schools of the 48 States. The real issue is whether we shall maintain a locally supported and locally controlled public-school system that would virtually eliminate local control and tend to eliminate private and church related schools and colleges. The real issue is extremely significant. Upon our decision hinges the future of this Republic.

The consequences are not difficult to foresee. If we even modestly subsidize the administration of the public schools of the Nation, there will certainly be a tendency for instructors to teach the views of the government in power. As Federal aid and Federal influence should increase, this tendency would become stronger and stronger. In fact, it is my firm conviction that should we start Federal aid to our public schools now, we would see virtual Federal control within a decade, to be followed within one more decade by nationalization of industrial production, transportation, utilities, and agriculture.

The real issue before us today is not merely $300,000,000 in aid to our public schools. The real issue is whether or not we shall take this most crucial step toward the socialization of America.

It should be remembered by all American citizens that freedom is the priceless heritage for which our forefathers so bravely fought, bled, and died. It is the proud heritage they so nobly handed to us. It is the secret of our present greatness, and the one hope of our future prosperity. Every American citizen should also remember that freedom has been enjoyed by less than 5 percent of the people who have walked on this earth and that even in our own day less than 25 percent of the people of the world have any reasonable amount of freedom.

It should further be remembered that freedom and prosperity throughout the history of man have gone hand in hand; while ignorance, regimentation, and poverty have likewise gone hand in hand. Greece lost her freedom and lost her greatness. Rome lost her republic and ushered in the Dark Ages. England and France are losing their freedom as they move along the road of socialism and nationalism. France demonstrated the agonies of this road a few weeks ago when French soldiers, under government orders, were fighting government-employed coal miners to protect government-owned coal mines. England adopted a scheme of nationalization in 1945, which she was forced to follow in 1947 with a law giving the government power to tell any man or any woman (with certain limitations) where to work, what to do, and with penalties for failure to obey, or for absenteeism. The American public doesn't want to follow that dismal road. But Federal aid to the whole of our public schools, in all 48 States, as all these Federal-aid bills now require, would be a decisive step in that direction.

Federal aid to the public schools of America is not necessary and it is not desirable. It has been accurately said that the debt of the Federal Government is about $258,000,000,000. The debt of all the 48 States, added together, is about $2,500,000,000. The debt of the Federal Government is, therefore, 100 times as much as the total debt of all the States.

Since 1940, the debt of the Federal Government has gone up terrifically, while the debt of the 48 States has gone down. There is not a single State of the 48 which has not reduced its debt since 1940. There is not a single State in the Union that is not financially better off than the United States. There is not a single State that is not better able to pay the expense of the education of its youth than is the Federal Government. Why, therefore, should we saddle the cost of education on the Federal Government.

If Congress believes that all of the States or any of them is unable financially to provide an adequate system of public education, then there is a way that Congress can help much more than through a Federal-aid bill providing for $300,000,000 to be distributed among all the States. For instance, it is estimated that the present Taft bill would provide for my home State of Arkansas approximately $8,903,000 a year. Of this appropriation, Arkansas taxpayers would contribute $1,604,000. Thus Arkansas would gain about $7,300,000 at the expense of taxpayers of other States. There is a much better way to help Arkansas, while at the same time actually helping all other States too. It is a very simple method, except it might cost some votes. One-third of the Federal civilian employees could be removed from the pay roll without decreasing efficiency of the Government. This would save the entire Nation over $2,225,000,000 in pay roll alone. This saving to Arkansas taxpayers would be approximately $14,000,000. Arkansas could then increase her own State support to education by $14,000,000, which is approximately double the aid offered in the present bill, without having any heavier burden on herself, without any burden on taxpayers in other States, and without all the complications and implications of Federal aid.

I insist that this is the right way for Congress to help my State, and at the same time all the rest of the States. Arkansas is now actually paying to Washington in Federal taxes $114,500,000 a year. She would actually be aided by the present bill only $7,300,000, or 7 percent of what she pays to Washington.

It is like a doctor draining 4 pints of blood from a man and then exclaiming, "Why, you look anemic. I am sorry for you. You need aid. I am going to give you a transfusion of one-fourth pint of blood from my plasma bank."

Furthermore, it is my firm conviction that Federal aid would soon become a millstone about our necks. The Federal Government has no record for economic handling of expenditures. Were our present educational system, just as we now know it, operated by the Federal Government, it would likely be costing us 50 percent more to operate than is now the case.

When the Federal Government controlled and operated the railroads during World War I, it lost nearly $2,000,000 a day. During World War II they were operated much more efficiently under private management, paid over $3,000,000 a day in taxes, and still made a profit.

At the present time, the Federal Government is educating the American Indians. The cost per pupil is more than two times as high as the average per pupil in our public-school system in the average State in the Union, but the schools are not better.

It should, also, be made very clear that Federal aid is not necessary in order to put both grammar school and high school opportunity within the reach of all the youth of the Nation. Arkansas passed last November 2 an initiated act for the reorganization of the entire public-school system of the State. This reorganization will place grammar-school and high-school facilities within reach of every boy and girl in Arkansas. Although teachers' wages in Arkansas have been increased more than 150 percent in the past 7 years, this reorganization bill will further increase them materially. What Arkansas, one of the poorest States in the Union, can do for her pupils and her teachers, every State in the Union can do. There is no more reason for the Federal aid for increasing teachers' salaries in Arkansas than there is for aid to increase the salaries of ministers, policemen, and firemen, all of whom, like the teachers, work in the public interest.

The States, moreover, are bravely solving their own educational problems. During this past year alone they have increased salaries to teachers more than the total of $300,000,000 perennially sought in Federal aid. Still more important the increases have been greatest where the need was greatest. The average increase for the entire Nation was 86 percent from 1940–48, but for the 12 Southern States, including the poorest, the increase was 117 percent.

There is another still more important fact. The differential between the income of the wealthy States and the poorer States is rapidly narrowing. While the 16 wealthiest States averaged 46 percent more income per person in 1940 than the 16 poorest States, by 1947 that difference had been cut down to only 14 percent. With more oil being discovered and more industry moving to the South, that differential will continue to narrow until the North may be seeking aid from the South within a generation or two.

It should further be understood that Federal aid to education within itself would do absolutely nothing to bring into the schoolroom those children between the ages of 5 and 17 who are now out of school by choice. This would still remain a problem to be solved locally.

New York and California, the two wealthiest States in the Union, and the two with the highest average expenditure per student for education, still have their problems. They also have dreamers telling them they are not spending enough. So it is evident that neither the Nation as a whole, nor any part of it, can afford the expenditures the dreamers can recommend.

Moreover, the percentage of crimes and the number of Communists in those two States testify to the fact that it takes more than money to provide proper education.

No longer should the major emphasis be upon how much money we can spend. On the contrary, emphasis should be upon moral purpose—upon character and citizenship, without which no nation can long preserve a glorious republic like our own.

The State of Utah spends only about the national median, an amount per school pupil which all of our Southern States can reach. While this figure is only half the amount spent per pupil by California and New York, yet Utah gets the best results. Dr. E. L. Thorndyke, in a thorough study published in 1944, showed that Utah produces 100 percent more men of science and of distinctive achievement in proportion to population than does either California or New York.

Since every State in the Union can reach the present recommended minimum level, and since Utah's record proves that a State with that much money can produce the best results in the Nation, is it not imperative that we all put our shoulders to the wheel, adequately finance our own schools, and emphasize moral purpose, sterling character, and

genuine loyal citizenship—qualities that can be developed everywhere, but that money alone can buy nowhere? These greater values can be obtained only with keener local interest. But Federal aid will tend to decrease local interest and thereby push to a still lower level the development of character and citizenship.

Children are what they are taught. That is why most children in Egypt and Turkey are Mohammedan, while most in India are Hindu, and while most in America are Christian. They are what they are taught to be.

With a federalized school system we may expect, within a generation, that our children will have come to believe in the principle, and we may then expect its extension to industry, distribution, and agriculture.

England started down that road in 1945. Now she has announced a plan for nationalization, even down to the farms, by 1952.

The danger of Federal control is always present with Federal participation, and should never be overlooked. When farmers accepted subsidies, they also got controls. When some of them objected to the controls, a test case went to the Supreme Court. Justice Jackson ruled: "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

While the present Federal-aid bill does all that words can do to assure the public of no Federal control, it should be remembered that a Supreme Court decision already establishes a precedent for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes. Moreover, as the amount of aid should increase there would be abundance of opportunity for revised legislation—in fact, it would be the miracle of the ages if it didn't come. These aren't days of miracles, so we had better protect our future by rejecting Federal aid to our public schools.

In all the excitement we should not lose sight of our present achievements under a decentralized government.

Our national income is equal to the combined national incomes of the next highest six nations (before the war or since). Our workers can buy with their wages two times as much food, clothing, housing, travel, entertainment, education for their children as workers at similar jobs in England, Sweden, or Switzerland, and five times as much as in Russia. America, with one-sixteenth of the world's population, sends more young people to high school and college than does all the rest of the world. Only one nation was able to arm itself adequately to meet the Axis Powers; only one nation was able to lend liberally to its allies in that war; only one nation is able now to extend help to its neighbors. I am not one of those who now think that that one nation must now surrender the fundamental principles that made her great in order to remain great.

On the contrary, I am thoroughly convinced that if we keep our freedoms and our liberties we can again double the purchasing power of the workman's wages in another generation, as we have in the past generation. Should we, on the contrary, turn to nationalization of education and production, we would likely go down by 50 percent in production, in wages, and in standard of living. There is much at stake.

Dr. Charles Seymour, president of Yale University, has recently declared that he wants no part of Federal grants for educational purposes. General Eisenhower is strongly opposed to Federal controls in the field of education. It is high time we all should wake up and stop this drift toward state socialism before we reach the point beyond which there is no turning back.

Remember, Federal aid is not necessary to the financing of an adequate public-school system. Every State in the Union can reach the necessary level. It is character and citizenship that should concern us and which money can't buy.

Remember that Federal aid will ultimately mean Federal control, and Federal control would reflect in the classroom the views of the Government in power, and would quicken our pace toward state socialism.

Remember that Greece achieved her best during the days of her democracy, that Rome achieved her best during her republic, and that England established her great Empire following the Magna Carta.

America, under still greater freedom, has achieved still greater power and prosperity. Federal aid to all the public schools in all the 48 States is not necessary and is not desirable. It would mean a definite about face in a system which has succeeded in providing the best for the public that any segment of mankind has yet experienced. As American citizens, it is our responsibility to pass on to our children unimpaired the priceless heritage of individual freedom which our fathers so proudly passed to us. Federal aid to our entire public-school system would constitute a decisive step in the wrong direction.

The Paradox of Force and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am happy to include an article by the president of Harvard University, Dr. James Bryant Conant, which appeared in the Washington Post editorial page yesterday. It is a summary of an article appearing in the Atlantic Monthly and it contains much food for thought for all Americans who really love freedom.

The article follows:

THE PARADOX OF FORCE AND FREEDOM

(By James Bryant Conant)

(The following article by President Conant of Harvard is reprinted from the January issue of the Atlantic Monthly with the permission of the publishers. Copyright, 1918, by the Atlantic Monthly Co. All rights reserved.)

Can there be a moral basis for freedom in a world of force? This is one of the ugly questions which disturb many intelligent people at this moment. Can we reconcile the doctrine of military force—the idea of killing men in war—with a moral purpose? As a matter of history, freedom has often emerged from the successful use of force; yet we abominate war as intensely as we love freedom. How are we to resolve this paradox?

I should be ready to maintain that while liberty has repeatedly been gained by war, once won it can be protected only by adherence to those moral principles which were repudiated in its achievement. The distinction between the ethics of war and the ethics of peace, I believe, must be a fundamental postulate of our free society. If this be so, it is of the utmost importance to emphasize the distinction in these confused and gloomy days.

Either history is devoid of meaning or else we must believe that a study of the past will enrich one's understanding of the present. "To be ignorant of what occurred before you were born is to be always a child"—from which it follows that we must read the book of history diligently and scrutinize with the utmost care the events recorded. In that spirit one may venture to approach the difficult problems of reconciling force and freedom in our day by a glance at certain events which took place in England 300 years ago.

THE CAMBRIDGE PLATFORM

Everyone familiar with even the outlines of modern history will recall that the 1640's were a period of civil war in the British Isles. All who have traced the connection between the evolution of democratic institutions in the seventeenth century and the history of the United States will be well aware that the outcome of these wars left a lasting mark on the development of the Colonies of North America.

For example, a commission of the Congregational and Unitarian Churches of this country recently commemorated the tercentenary of the adoption of the Cambridge platform. This document was essentially a statement of the local independence of the churches of the Puritan colonies. It was a manifestation of a current running strongly both in old England and in New England as to the importance of local control and initiative in matters of religion.

Ambitious claims have been made that this platform was basic in the development of the cultural pattern of the United States. Certainly we are all aware of the significance of the twin doctrines of local responsibility and local initiative, and even the members of other Protestant denominations can give due credit to those early Congregationalists who proclaimed the independence of each one of the New England churches.

Any celebration, however, which rejoices in the influence of the New Englanders of three centuries ago must likewise recognize the role of force in the drama which was being enacted in the 1640's. The tramp of Cromwell's soldiers echoes through the years. For just when the learned ministers were writing the Cambridge Platform in New England the genius of Oliver Cromwell and the discipline of his red-coated new model army were settling the claim of rival church parties for the organization of the Protestant religion in the Anglo-Saxon world.

A second civil war had broken out in April 1648; the Royalists defeated in the earlier struggle were allies with the Scotch and the discontented Presbyterians. If this strange alliance should prove successful, there was a strong possibility that a combination of Scotch and English Presbyterians would control the form of church government in both Great Britain and the Colonies. But the victory by Cromwell and his followers at Preston in August 1648 eliminated this danger. The Congregationalists of New England and the Independent Party in old England were made secure.

OUT OF HARSH SOIL

The relationship between force and freedom in the seventeenth-century history of the English-speaking people is evident. Without the victories in the first civil war there would have been no possibility of a Cambridge Platform; a triumphant King would have seen to that. If the Presbyterians had won at Preston there would have been a prompt suppression of independent churches at home and in the Colonies.

But it was more than the victories on the battlefield which firmly established in a relatively few months the New England way of life. Between the time when the Cambridge Platform was adopted by the ministers and enacted by the general court, the influence of Cromwell and his soldiers had become literally overpowering. It is the irony of history that the arbitrary action of Cromwell's officers in Pride's Purge of Parliament in December 1648 and Cromwell's subsequent

dissolution of what remained, the so-called Rump Parliament, made secure a rule which was one of the sources of American freedom. For Cromwell's Independents saw eye to eye with the New England men.

The Cambridge Platform was certainly something more than a passing resolution of a handful of stout church rebels only because of the continuing victories of an extraordinary army, and perhaps only because of the arbitrary action of the same army against a representative assembly. Just as in England religious tolerance grew out of a period of military dictatorship of godly men, so our liberties in this country can claim to have drawn nourishment from the same harsh soil. Cromwell's soldiers fought for freedom of the Parliament from the King, freedom of all Christians from the Pope, and from Anglican Bishops. Cromwell's officers and men later manipulated the political scene and coerced the nation on behalf of independent church government and the consequent independence of a great variety of sects.

The problem of reconciling force and freedom by a historian reviewing the seventeenth century has a familiar modern ring. One can envy the men of 300 years ago on one point at least—they were spared some of the more disturbing doubts which three centuries have forced on the Western World. One can feel the sincerity of Cromwell's remarks when, describing one of his great battles, he said, "And the Lord made the enemy stubble unto our swords."

There is no evidence that aside from the Quakers the pious people of England or New England in those days had any scruples about the use of force, provided it was used by them. Whether the doubts which now assail so many honest men represent a slackening of our religious faith or a quickening of our sensitivity as human beings or a better appreciation of the Christian message is a question I leave to the theologians and preachers of this day.

RULE OF ARMED SAINTS

If one may venture to express a judgment on the actors of the great drama of the Puritan rebellion, I should say that Cromwell and his followers are to be praised for having fought well in both the civil wars. Indeed, I fail to see how anyone who rejoices in our liberties could well maintain the contrary. The behavior of the army leaders after the close of the second civil war is another story.

The verdict of history must be that they failed to execute a plan by which an orderly development of a broadly based government would be possible in England; they failed in spite of Cromwell's conservative instincts and his prayerful attempts to find a constitutional basis for his regime. The considered judgment of all who believe in the western definition of democracy and freedom must be that they were wrong to establish a military dictatorship even of godly men; in short the rule of armed saints is to be condemned on both pragmatic and moral grounds.

History is full of examples of earnest men so dedicated to a cause that they did not scruple to use violence as an adjunct to political action. To their minds the issues between themselves and their opponents were of such a nature as to justify the application of the rules of war even in times of peace. Fanatics who believe they are divinely led, or that history is on their side, usually maintain that the end justifies the means. Hence, an admixture of violence and treachery in affairs of state is for them the equivalent of the taking of life on a field of battle.

Any unwillingness to admit the validity of the moral distinction between war and peace is at once exploited by all apologists of dictatorships—past, present, or future. At the present moment those who believe that nothing can be worse than war are eagerly sought as allies by those who believe that nothing can be worse than our American practice of democracy.

The two join hands in pointing the finger of scorn at the apparent paradox that a nation founded on the principle of the sacredness of human life is ready to secure its liberties by war if need be. The one group bases its case on the consistent application of Christian teachings, the other on equally consistent denial of the Christian ethics. Yet the Pacifist and the Communist unite in exposing the logical inconsistency of the traditional American attitude toward force and freedom.

THE TOTALITARIAN PREMISE

Today, as in the past, the vast majority of the citizens of the United States, while abhorring war, nevertheless believe that it is not always wrong. They have a deep-seated conviction, however, that war is always totally different morally from peace. The consequences of abandoning this illogical position by proclaiming that fighting is never justified are all too clear.

If we were to lay down our arms as a matter of Christian principle, and as a Nation take an eternal vow of nonresistance, those who feel otherwise could hardly fail to accelerate the course of history as they see it. From their point of view they would be negligent in their duty if they failed to eliminate the Christian basis for our brand of democratic freedom.

I have not the slightest fear that we shall adopt the doctrine of nonresistance. I am not so certain, however, that we might not adopt the exactly opposite course of action. And if we did, we would very shortly destroy our freedom.

If we became sufficiently oppressed by the logical inconsistency of our emphasis on the distinction between war and peace, we might repudiate the paradox by accepting the premise of the totalitarians that at all times the end justifies the means. Once we had gone over to their position, the doctrine of a preventive war, so-called, against a potential enemy would be quite compatible with the philosophy of the Nation. But so, too, would be strong-armed methods at the polls, intimidation of a legislature, even a coup d'etat and political assassinations.

THE KREMLIN'S DREAM

The few who have been flirting with the idea of a preventive war have failed to see the implications of their position. Their argument says in effect, "In the next decade the Russians will have perfected their instruments of mass destruction; let's smash 'em now before they're ready." This reasoning of those who wish to force Russia to fight now might seem attractive at first sight to all who pride themselves on being hardheaded. I suggest that it is vulnerable, however, on realistic grounds.

Basically the argument for a preventive war fails to consider the fundamental nature of the struggle which underlies the present uneasy armed truce with the Soviet Union. We need to probe deeply into the question of what the Soviets' ambition would be if and when they have weapons of mass destruction in sufficient quantity and are ready with suitable methods of delivery.

I think it extremely probable that the men who rule Russia do not dream of a military victory over the United States followed by an occupation and control by Russian commissars, but rather a revolution in this country which would result in a totalitarian socialistic state with native American rulers. Once this is accomplished, the Russian dream appears to foretell, the world revolution is achieved and the utopian aspects of communism are possible.

I think the Russians now accept their Marx-Engels-Lenin doctrine with fanatic seriousness. If my assumption about the nature of the thinking in the Kremlin be admitted, it follows that the over-all strategy of the United States must be aimed primarily at preserving the type of free society we have inherited from the past and now enjoy. Our open society rests on a fundamental moral basis; once we destroy this basis, we have destroyed the essence of this Nation.

If I am right about my analysis of war and peace, any acceptance of the doctrine that the end justifies the means would be the moral equivalent of dropping atomic bombs on a dozen of our own cities. For us to develop a Machiavellian foreign policy which would culminate in our launching a surprise attack on the Soviet Union or declaring war for the purpose of a destruction of their armament would negate the very premises on which our culture rests. In short, it seems to me the moral argument against a preventive war is by no means softheaded, but rather a realistic appraisal of the fundamental issue which divides the world.

Let me make it plain, I am not advocating any policy of appeasement in regard to the present. The whole problem of our strategy for the months immediately ahead is another matter. If the Soviets force us into war by their own actions, that is another story. What I am opposing is the notion that we should precipitate a war a few years hence in order to beat the enemy to the punch in this matter of weapons of mass destruction.

PANIC AS A WEAPON

We have been told by more than one authority who has access to governmental secrets that sometime in the 1950's Russia will probably be able to produce atomic bombs. Assuming this prophecy to be true, one may well ask: How is the United States to survive as a free society in such a hideous era? But another question has priority: How will the rulers of Soviet Russia use the threat of their possession of atomic weapons (if and when they have them) to forward their own ends?

What would you do if you were living in the Kremlin and were a firm believer in the Marx-Engels-Lenin doctrine which includes the idea that the eventual triumph of communism is scientifically assured? I suggest that first of all you would prepare defensively against the possibility that a preventive war party in the United States might develop and gain control, and a superblitz from North America to Russia might some day come. Second, you would lead the United States to believe that Russia was well prepared offensively to attack that country by a superblitz, hoping thereby to cause panic among the people. One might feel certain that the citizens of a free society, sufficiently disturbed and frightened, in their frantic attempts to ward off military damage would wreck their economy, their social structure, and eventually their political framework.

If there be any merit in this analysis of mine, those in whose hands will rest the determination of the military policy of the United States a few years hence may have to solve a most baffling problem. On the one hand the United States must be well prepared for war in the age of atomic bombs, of a superblitz on the other, we must see that the methods used in such preparation do not lead to the very ends that the Russians may have in mind, namely, a breakdown of our economy, of our political system, with the consequent internal destruction of our Nation.

WALKING A KNIFE EDGE

To me it means we must deliberately refrain from taking out all the forms of military insurance that may come to mind. For example, to do everything that could be thought of to insure against destruction of our cities might involve such drastic shifts

in our whole life as to destroy our national being. Even in terms of dollars and cents I believe military preparedness could wreck us.

If I were sitting in the Kremlin, I should have great faith in the power of an inflation to ruin the United States. One way to cause a runaway inflation is surely to spend too freely and too fast on military equipment. Already, perhaps, one can smell danger in the air.

There has been a considerable amount of talk about the atomic age. It may be argued that we shall not be living in that age until two or more powers have atomic bombs in sufficient quantity to constitute a military menace to each other. If and when this time comes, those who are responsible for spending this Nation's resources on military matters will be confronted with the century-old problem of force and freedom in a new and terrible form.

They must walk a perilous knife edge—on the one side will be inadequate defensive and offensive military power, the possibility of outmoded strategic concepts and antiquated equipment; on the other will be the precipice which drops to domestic ruin—the destruction of the basis of a free society.

I see no escape from the fact that in planning for this possible future we must take some calculated risks. And the calculations will be difficult indeed. They involve the analysis of a complex situation, an appraisal of many technical and military factors. A vast amount of staff work by professionals must provide the necessary data. Fortunately we have high talent in the Military Establishment and men of wide vision and imagination.

But the rules of war must never be allowed to dominate the ethics of our people. Control must be in civilian hands. The basic judgments must be made by the voters and transmitted by them through Congress to the President and the civilian Cabinet members.

If all concerned keep in the forefront of their minds the vital issue, the survival of our free society, then we may believe the eventual decisions will be sound. We must never falter in our faith in the moral basis of this Republic. On these terms and these alone can we hope to resolve the paradox of force and freedom in an atomic age.

Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, worthy of space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a definition of success, written 40 years ago by Mrs. A. J. Stanley, of Kansas City, Kans. Its literary value, its clear thought and concise expression won its author a prize in a Nation-wide contest, and widespread recognition.

Elbert Hubbard included it in his famous Scrap Book. It can be found in Bartlett's Quotations, and many other nationally known works.

The thought contained in this definition is as fresh and appropriate today as it was when it was first penned.

Reprinted, recently, in a magazine of national circulation, Mrs. Stanley's definition of success follows:

SUCCESS

He has achieved success who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much; who has gained the respect of intelligent men and the love of little children; who has filled his niche and accomplished his task; who has left the world better than he found it, whether by an improved poppy, a perfect poem, or a rescued soul; who has never lacked appreciation of earth's beauty or failed to express it; who has looked for the best in others and given the best he had; whose life was an inspiration; whose memory is a benediction.

United States Foreign Policy in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in the current maelstrom of conflicting views and revolutionary events in China and southeast Asia, a precipitate decision may well determine the fate of our Nation and the world for centuries.

Mr. Walter Lippmann, in the following column in today's New York Herald Tribune, offers a valuable and informed view of what our policy in Asia could be:

AMERICA IN ASIA

(By Walter Lippmann)

In trying to decide what we should do we must begin, I think, by recognizing that we cannot shape and direct the course of events in Asia. We may be able to exert a useful influence in maintaining friendly relations between the western democracies and the emerging peoples of Asia.

Even that will be difficult to do. But if we try to do more than that, or something quite different—as for example, to support puppet governments against the rising tide of nationalism and social revolution—we shall almost certainly fail and lose what influence we might otherwise have.

When we assess our position in Asia, as we must in order to form a policy, we may begin with the fact that we defeated Japan by dominating the Pacific Ocean and the islands of Japan—not by defeating the Jappanese Army and then liberating and occupying the vast territories in China, Indonesia and in southwest Asia which Japan had conquered. The American victory gave the United States undisputed supremacy north of the Equator and up to the coasts of the Asiatic Continent. But we did not attempt or presume to deal directly with the immense areas which Japan had conquered from the Chinese, the British, the French and the Dutch.

Having made the fundamental and unavoidable strategic decision to strike at the heart of Japan, and not to become involved in large land operations on the contineht or south of the Equator, it was left to our allies to take over the conquered territory evacuated by Japan.

Among our allies who were conceded the right to take over after the Japanese defeat, the Chinese under Chiang Kai-shek, the French and the Dutch had been too gravely weakened by the war to take over successfully. They have not been able to pacify the territory they lost to Japan.

Not only were they weak in material power. They were without real moral authority. Chiang Kai-shek's government, though it has received far greater help from the United States than the Chinese Communists have received from Russia, has collapsed. It has not collapsed because it was beaten in battle, but because it has lost the support of the Chinese people. In Indonesia and in Indo-China the Japanese destroyed, probably forever, the prestige of western Empire. Though the Japanese were in the end defeated by the Americans, they had proved that an Asiatic nation could defeat the European empires in the Orient. Their slogan of Asia for Asiatics continues to work, despite the surrender on the battleship *Missouri*.

Where, then, shall we look for allies, now that Nationalist China, the Netherlands, and France are so manifestly unable to play the role in Asia which we had supposed they would play? That, it seems to me, is the fundamental problem which has to be solved in order to form an American policy in Asia.

My own view is that the right direction was indicated by Mr. Attlee when he took the bold and far-reaching decision to treat India and Pakistan as leading members of what is now no longer the British Commonwealth but simply the Commonwealth. I am told that at the conference of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers in London last summer Nehru, who is certainly the greatest figure in Asia, suggested that in the future India might become the intermediary between Asia and the west. We would be well advised, I think, to enter into intimate consultation with Nehru about our whole course in China and in Indonesia. In doing that we should find ourselves in harmony with the Australians, who are surely among our dependable friends, as well as with Mr. Attlee and the wisest makers of modern British policy.

This is not only the most promising way of approaching the tremendous convulsion in Asia. It is also the most truly American way. For our position in Asia rests on a great tradition, unique in modern history. We have been, and still are, the only world power which has refused to become the imperial ruler of subject peoples. That reputation originated in the fact that we are ourselves a colonial people that won its independence. It has been confirmed by our long support of Chinese independence, by our history in the Philippines, and in Cuba. Our most precious asset in Asia is our abilily to persuade the people of Asia that there is a nation in the Western World, more powerful than the Soviet Union, which sympathizes with their struggle for independence, and has no wish to exploit it.

Our friends in western Europe should try to understand why we cannot and must not be maneuvered, why we dare not drift, into general opposition to the movements for independence in Asia. They should tell their propagandists to stop smearing these movements. They should try to realize how disastrous it would be to them, and to the cause of western civilization, if ever it could be said that the western union for the defense of freedom in Europe was in Asia a syndicate for the preservation of decadent empires.

A Brilliant Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of Tuesday, January 4, 1949, which is in agreement with my proposal to amend the House rules to limit the power of the Committee on Rules:

A BRILLIANT BEGINNING

In curbing the excessive powers of its Rules Committee, the House of Representatives has got off to a brilliant start.

Its vote to democratize the rules procedure does more for the effective functioning of Congress than anything since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The objective had been sought long before the reorganization act, but was left out of that measure for political expediency.

It became a practical political possibility at the outset of the Eighty-first Congress because of a bold strategy of pressing for it before the House had adopted its rules. Later on, the proposal would have had to be referred to the Rules Committee itself, whose mercies could not have been expected to be tender.

For this considerable improvement in the way Congress works, there is little to thank the Republican Party as a party. If it had been left to the Republican Party alone, the reform would have been defeated two to one. Democrats could have managed it without Republican aid, for they mustered 225 votes, 7 more than a majority.

This is not to belittle in any way the fine record of the 49 Republicans who voted for the change. They showed that progressivism is a living force in the Republican Party though the withered hand of Old Guardism still dominates its councils in the House—and elsewhere.

Nor was the vote of the Republican progressives an empty gesture. It had concrete results in dampening hopes of an effective coalition between Old Guard Republicans and Dixiecrats, and in adding emphasis to Republican National Chairman SCOTT's call to the party to renew itself by means of forward-looking policies.

Reform of the Rules Committee is a direct carrying out of the mandate which the voters gave November 2. The blow falls hardest on two of the political relics who continue to occupy seats in the House though virtually everything they stand for has been repudiated at the ballot box. EUGENE COX, of Georgia, and HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, used to run the committee pretty much as they pleased by teaming up with the four Republican members. They are now reduced to life-size.

More important still, an essentially unfair and stultifying method of operation has been corrected. As the Rules Committee's power had come to be used and abused, it was a sort of House counterpart of the Senate filibuster.

The old provision for involuntarily extracting a bill from the committee and bringing it to the House floor for debate and vote was a cumbersome one. A petition had to be circulated and signed by a majority of members. Now, if the committee does not send a bill along to the House within 21 days, the chairman of the committee that sent it to the rules group can move to consider the bill and a majority vote can place it on the calendar.

Since the House has seen how possible it is to strike off one incubus of obsolescence, it should be inspired to proceed against still another incubus, the seniority rule or custom. In the upper chamber, the Senators have a stimulating example to follow when MORSE, of Oregon, brings up his filibuster curb, as he plans to do immediately. All the Eighty-first Congress needs to do in order to write a distinguished record is to keep going in the direction in which it has started.

Labor Chiefs To Crack Whip of Dictatorship on Congress Soon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks and include therein an article by David Lawrence, I present the same herewith:

LABOR CHIEFS TO CRACK WHIP OF DICTATORSHIP ON CONGRESS SOON—DEMAND FOR CLOSED-SHOP MONOPOLY APPROVED BY TRUMAN FORCES

(By David Lawrence)

America has always prided itself on being different from the dictatorship countries in that no man here can act as dictator. But the test after next January on the dictatorship issue will come in an entirely different way. Congress will be called on to decide whether it is going to yield to the dictatorship of a minority group which claims to have received a mandate in the last election to do as it pleases with the labor-management relationship.

Already the issues are shaping up and the lines of cleavage are forming. Unless Congressmen are willing to submit to the dictatorship and become prounion, they are to be threatened at the polls. Already the same minority claims it is responsible for the election of President Truman.

The concrete question at issue is whether labor unions shall have no restrictions placed on them—whether, for example, they shall not be touched by Federal law when they engage in mass picketing and intimidation and interfere with the right to work or when they demand the right to say who shall be hired.

DEMAND FOR CLOSED SHOP

The demand for a monopoly privilege, legalizing what is known as the closed shop—where no American can work except with the permission of a labor union no matter how efficient or qualified he may be for a job—has been approved by members of the Truman administration.

The right to work—the most fundamental of all civil rights—is to be swept away and in its place the closed-shop monopoly is to be restored if, as planned, the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed in its entirety.

Labor unions, assisted by the Democratic Party's managers, now have announced that they want the entire Taft-Hartley Act repealed. The Democratic national chairman formally takes the position that this is what the public voted for in the last election.

While most Republicans and some Democrats say they want a fair law to substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act, this is apparently not the desire of the Truman administration, which acknowledges that the labor unions won the election for the President and that hence the administration is politically obligated to do as labor dictates.

Theoretically, for generations in America, the public interest has superseded that of any group or bloc. Thomas Jefferson inveighed against special privilege. Today special privilege is handed out to whatever faction or bloc produces enough votes to help win an election. There is no longer any shame about accepting such plain assertion of a claim to special privilege.

Today also the labor unions want those provisions of the existing law wiped out which place on them the same restrictions on the use of money in elections that have for decades been placed on corporations. The labor unions will insist—and doubtless President Truman will go along—that businesses must not use any of their funds for election purposes but labor unions may collect billions of dollars in dues and do as they please about using those funds for political purposes.

ONE-PARTY SYSTEM

Nobody has arisen from labor's ranks to say that a worker might possibly differ in his political views from another worker. His dues money can be appropriated against his will for a political purpose, no matter what he thinks—and he better not think out loud, because under a closed-shop monopoly he can cease to be in good standing in the union and be fired from the job by order of the union. This is a move toward a one-party system, which Moscow will, of course, not miss when it looks about for propaganda accusing America of hypocrisy.

Time was when labor unions were like any other groups—their petition for special legislation was considered only in the light of the public interest. Today there is no group in Congress representing the public interest as such. The labor unions have a list of those Members of Congress whom they consider prounion. All others are considered antiunion.

The labor leaders do not believe there is such a thing as objectivity or neutrality. Nobody who disagrees with a labor union is ever considered to be anything but antiunion.

This is totalitarianism with a vengeance, but the American people are going to learn all about it soon after January 1, when the new Congress meets and labor begins to crack the whip of dictatorship to the assembled Senate and House. No controversy in half a century presents as much drama as the coming battle to wipe out the Taft-Hartley Act in its entirety and substitute for it a law that hamstrings management and leaves labor unions free to do as they please. That same repeal action will wipe out the rights of workers to be free from coercion, economic and physical, exerted against them by labor-union organizers and officers.

The maximum power ever exerted by a single group in American politics will be manifest soon. It's going to happen largely because the spokesmen of management are apparently in a defeatist frame of mind while the defenders of the public interest are not organized at all.

Peace in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, Members may well be concerned by the news from the Middle East and the complexities created by the British charges against the Israeli forces in connection with the shooting down of five RAF planes.

A conservative London newspaper is reported to have asked how it was that RAF planes happened to be at the scene of a battle between the Israeli and Egyptian forces. We in the United States could also rightfully ask whether Britain's policy in the Middle East is contributing to the world's peace and security.

Competent observers of the military scene, like Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times, see in the action of the

Israeli forces against the Egyptians a drive for peace. This interesting analysis is contained in the article appearing below from the New York Times of January 6, 1948.

The New York Herald Tribune editorial sees the world's security and even the best British interests served by peace in Palestine, as shown by the editorial appearing below of January 10, 1949.

Let us hope that Great Britain will at long last use her real influence with the Arab countries to let peace descend on the Middle East, else the United States and the rest of the world may very well ask her why.

[From the New York Times of January 6, 1949]

ISRAELIS DRIVE FOR PEACE—RENEWED PALESTINE FIGHTING VIEWED AS EFFORT TO END CONFLICT BY CRUSHING FOES

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The resumption of fighting in Palestine obviously represents an Israeli attempt to achieve in the field what the Israelis have not been able to accomplish in the council chamber—peace.

Peace in Palestine is of great importance to the new state of Israel; it is also of importance to the world, for the longer the strategic middle east is plagued by war the greater the advantage to communism.

Israel has rather well demonstrated that she need not fear too greatly the strength of the Arab armies; her military victories made the new state a fait accompli. But the longer a state of war and armed-on-guard continues the more difficult Israel's economic situation will become.

The little land is in no sense a self-sufficient country; it has been, and still is, largely dependent for its well-being upon economic aid in the form of gifts and other assistance from Jewish and other groups outside its borders. It is hoping to absorb thousands of immigrants during the next year. Yet perhaps 75,000 of its people are under arms, and other thousands are engaged in supplying and supporting them, in manufacturing small arms ammunition, Piats (anti-tank weapons) and other war equipment.

Intermittent bombings and forays interfere, even though slightly, with normal life. Much of the country's money is going to purchase planes and other war equipment in Czechoslovakia and wherever they can be bought, in adding to the two converted corvettes that form the backbone of its tiny navy and in adding artillery and armor to its army, which is now organized on a divisional basis.

LONG CONFLICT WOULD BE DRAIN

There is no doubt that long continuation of conflict and the consequent economic drain upon the body politic would be a severe blow to the fledgling state. Israel would like to demobilize her men and establish a Swiss-type military system, which would minimize military expenditures.

But peace is essential to any such plan.

The Israeli operations in the Negeb Desert region have been largely an attempt to force Egypt to negotiate peace and, if possible, to secure all of the Negeb for Israel. Though veiled by a black-out, these operations have been fairly clear in their purpose. The beleaguered Egyptian garrisons along the coast from Gaza through Khan Ynis to Rafah on the Egyptian frontier have been partially encircled.

Faluja, where about 2,000 Egyptians have been virtually cut off for weeks, also has been under attack.

In addition to shelling and bombing the Egyptian strong points, the Israeli forces have swung south in attempts to cut the coastal road—the only supply route for the Egyptian forces in Palestine. In one outflanking movement south of Khanunis and Rafah Israeli units crossed the Egyptian frontier and drove as far as 30 miles into Egypt. The objective, however, was very plainly not Egyptian terrain—the Israeli forces have since withdrawn—but Egyptian supply dumps, airfields and rear installations supporting the Egyptian combat units in Palestine.

DRIVE MAY BE BROADENED

It is not yet possible to appraise the success of the Israeli military operations, for the struggle, which seems to be increasing in intensity and may well spread to other areas in Palestine, is continuing. The Egyptians still continue to hold their Palestine positions but those positions undoubtedly have deteriorated somewhat despite an initial check the Israeli forces seem to have encountered at Rafah. The operations may be broadened in the future to include Israeli amphibious landings near Gaza, for the Israeli Government seems determined to force Egypt to negotiate for permanent peace or to force the Egyptian forces out of Palestine entirely.

The anxiety that has been aroused in some quarters—reflected by British troop movements—by these Israeli operations stem in part from Irael's flouting of United Nation's authority—a practice in which the Arabs have also indulged—and in part from the extremist ambitions of some minorities in the Israeli state—notably the former members of the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Band. It is these former underground groups, definitely a small minority, but a fanatical one, which are one of the real threats to the peace that Israel is trying to achieve. For these men make no secret of their expansionist ambitions; all of the Negeb, all of Transjordan, they believe, should be part of Israel and some of them dream of greater achievements, of wider horizons.

If such ambitions should be pursued relentlessly it is obvious that the achievement of peace would be difficult and the maintenance of it still more difficult for the threat of Israeli expansionism would be a continuous unstabilizing factor in the Middle East.

The Israeli Government, therefore, which late this month must stand the test of its policies at the polls, must be able to control these minority factions and to moderate their extremism if it is to achieve and maintain what it is hoping for—peace. Its role is all the more difficult for a good many Jews who are not in sympathy with the extremism or terrorism of the former Irgun and Stern groups feel that now is the time to end the Arab menace for good and all, and—flushed with victory—to take advantage of victory.

These facts undoubtedly provide the background for the British concern about the Israeli invasion of Egypt. That concern is overstated, and Israeli spokesmen quite cogently point out that Britain has exhibited no similar concern about the invasion of Palestine. It is, nevertheless, clear that if peace is to come soon to the Middle East moderation must guide the aims and actions of all concerned, and if it is to be maintained extremism and fanaticism of either Arab or Jew, American or Englishman, can have no place in policy.

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1949]

TRAGEDY OF CONFUSION

The confusions underlying the recent accession of tension between Britain and Israel have had their tragically logical climax in the destruction of five British planes at Israeli hands and the death of at least one pilot. From whatever standpoint this muddled and dangerous situation is approached, perplexities arise.

There are a great many elements in the tangle, all of them posing difficult questions. What are the rights of Israel in the border areas of Egypt and Palestine under the General Assembly's partition plan? Under the truce orders of the Security Council? What are the rights of Britain in the Sinai Peninsula under the Anglo-Egyptian treaty? How does the war in Palestine and the intervention of the United Nations in that dispute affect the British position in relation to Transjordan and Aqaba? And, most puzzling of all, is there any essential conflict between the respective interests of Britain and Israel which would justify the present state of mutual hostility?

There will be efforts to resolve some of these questions by protests and counterprotests to the United Nations. The realinement of British forces in the Mediterranean will doubtless be met by measures on the Israeli side. Harsh words will be exchanged through diplomatic channels and harsher expressions through unofficial spokesmen and the press. But it is quite obvious that nothing will go to the roots of the matter except a speedy peace in the Near East, the peace which the forthcoming negotiations between Egypt and Israel seem to presage.

Such a peace is to the advantage of all parties. It is the only way in which the confusions which involve all nations whose interests meet in the Near East can be dissipated, the only way in which the rights of all parties can be clearly stated, the boundaries can be delimited, and the explosive incidents which a state of war or partial war provokes can be brought under firm control. For the Arabs it would mean the end of an exhausting and unprofitable struggle which has already endangered the governments of several states; for Great Britain it would mean an opportunity to pursue legitimate ends in the region in an atmosphere of stability; for Israel it would allow the work of creating a nation to go forward without distraction.

It is, therefore, of the first importance that the negotiations agreed upon between Israel and Egypt proceed without interruption or deviation. Any provocative acts, from whatever quarter, could only hamper the peacemakers and delay the possibility of drawing other Arab states into the discussions. The role of the United States should, and probably will, be directed to discouraging such acts, and bringing international efforts in relation to Palestine down to fundamentals, which is to say, to the promotion of a lasting peace.

England's Excursion Into Genocide at Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 3, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing revulsion in this country and abroad against the wide gulf between the public assurances of the British Government in the forums of the world, and the actual brutality of the British in their far-flung empire of oppression, war, exploitation, and monopolistic hogging of world trade, while they allow American taxpayers to finance their frenetic efforts at recapturing mercantile supremacy by fraud, force, and deception.

I am not minimizing the gallantry of the British people in war and in arduous peace; I am attacking the callous heads of the British Government who are betraying the peace and the United Nations for the sake of imperialist exploitation.

In this connection, under consent, I am inserting a paid advertisement of the American Jewish Congress which appeared in a number of daily newspapers, together with my own comment thereon.

Rabbi Wise, in his open letter to the British Embassy, bitingly comments on the difference between the magnificent humanitarianism and ring of freedom in Magna Carta, and the brutal reality of England's excursion into genocide at Cyprus.

[From the Washington Star of January 7, 1949]

CYPRUS 1948 VERSUS MAGNA CARTA 1225—A LETTER TO THE BRITISH AMBASSADOR FROM DR. STEPHEN S. WISE

DECEMBER 27, 1948.

His Excellency Sir OLIVER FRANKS,
Ambassador from Great Britain,
British Embassy, Washington, D. C.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I write this letter as a lifelong friend of the British people. I write it as one who during two world wars did all he could to mobilize American support, both Jewish and non-Jewish, for Britain because of the principles of freedom and justice your country inspired and defended.

Last week there was returned to you, as representative of the British Government in this country, the manuscript of the Magna Carta of 1225 which your Government generously loaned to our own Library of Congress 2 years ago. Freemen throughout the world, and millions still struggling to be free, are the eternal debtors of your forefathers who centuries ago won the guaranties of individual freedom inscribed in that charter. We Americans are grateful to your Government for having enabled us to view this document. It has served to remind us of the priceless nature of the heritage it gave to the world and to render us more zealous in the defense and furtherance of the principles it set forth.

I hope, however, that when the Magna Carta reaches the shores of your country, it will not immediately be consigned to its vault in the British Museum. For, I deeply regret to say, there are members of your Government who need to be reminded anew of the principles which the Magna Carta established. They need to be reminded that by order of your Government thousands of Jews are forcibly detained on the island of Cyprus, where they are languishing in concentration camps. These long-suffering heroes and heroines of the modern odyssey of the displaced persons seek only admission to the land of their fathers, the land of Israel. Their only crime is their passionate belief in and dedication to the principles of the Magna Carta. Yet they continue to be imprisoned by your Government in violation of every principle of law, justice, and humanitarianism, and in defiance of the guaranties of individual freedom your forefathers won.

When the Magna Carta arrives in England every member of the British Government should read it carefully and rededicate himself to its principles. Let them particularly read the "Golden Passage," which asserts that—

"No free man shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlaw'd, or banished or by any ways destroyed; nor will we pass upon him or commit him to prison, unless by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We will sell to no man, we will deny to no man, or defer right or justice."

Let them search their hearts and souls and answer to God, their consciences, and mankind, whether they can permit the interned Jews on Cyprus to continue under imprisonment for a single day. Unless your Government immediately provides for their release and their journey to Israel it will have to suffer the inevitable judgment of mankind; though the parchment on which the Magna Carta is inscribed rests once again in Britain, its contents and spirit will have abandoned, and have been abandoned by, your land.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN S. WISE,
President, American Jewish Congress.

[From the Washington Post of January 12, 1949]

CYPRUS DETENTION

I fully support the sentiment expressed by Dr. Stephen S. Wise, president of the American Jewish Congress, in his open letter to the British Ambassador to the United States, as published in the Washington Post. I share his admiration and gratitude to the British people for the magnificent principles contained in the Magna Carta, but I also share his outrage over the continued detention in Cyprus of Palestine-bound Jewish refugees.

The British are detaining these Jews under a unilateral interpretation of the Security Council resolution of May 29, 1948, which barred the entry of fighting personnel into the territories of the states involved in the Palestine war. In its reference to men of military age, the resolution stated that these, when they enter the territories involved, should not be drafted into the armed forces. There is nothing in that resolution that lends credence, even inferentially, to the British contention that the resolution obliges them not to permit the departure from Cyprus of Jewish men of military age, all of them European survivors who were forcibly transshipped to Cyprus from Palestine when that country was still under a British mandate.

When the May 29 resolution was passed, the French delegate moving the amendment on men of military age, made it very clear that it was not the intention of the amendment to bar the entry of such men into Israel. When the resolution was voted on, the members of the Security Council were well aware of this explanation.

The July 15 resolution, setting the second truce, was based on the general intents and purposes of the May 29 resolution. It reaffirmed some specific provisions of that resolution, as for example in its references to Jerusalem, but, significantly, it made no mention of men of military age.

It is true that the mediator had subsequently made statements in which he expressed anxiety lest the entry of men of military age increase fighting personnel. It was within his purview to consult the governments concerned and request assurances on this point. These statements cannot serve as a legal basis for Britain's unilateral action in preventing the Cyprus detainees from departing for Israel.

There is some concern over the fact that some countries appear not to have kept their pledge on the return of German war prisoners by a certain date. The Jews detained in Cyprus are not prisoners of war. Their detention in Cyprus is an unprecedented example of the flagrant flouting of international law. It is a stigma on Britain's reputation which attaches itself, by inference, to all governments that do not denounce this conduct by the British authorities. Such flouting of international law and violation of morality lends comfort to those who labor to discredit the Western democratic powers.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Representative from New York.

WASHINGTON.

Address by Gov. Horace Hildreth at National Grange Convention, Portland, Maine, November 9, 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by former Gov. Horace Hildreth, of Maine, at the National Grange Convention, held at Portland, Maine, on November 9, 1948:

Worthy National Master Goss and Mrs. Goss, Worthy State Master and Mrs. Bean, honored guests, brother and sister patrons, I wish to speak to you of the freedom of individual opportunity which is the heritage of New England. I desire to place before you a decision which we must make. Whether we desire it or not, we must determine whether individual enterprise and the capitalistic system as we have known it are to continue or whether we shall experiment with some other form of society, following the development of government in Europe, in which centralized government will have complete dominance over industry and the individual.

We can no longer assume that the way of life we developed will continue simply because it has been proven a good way. Unless we act to protect it, it will be replaced. We are challenged to abandon the passive acceptance of our system of living and doing business and take positive action to protect it. If we underestimate the power of the challenge, we shall lose a priceless heritage.

It is time for us to ask ourselves some very important questions.

Have we forgotten that since the dawn of civilization a very small percentage of the men who have walked this earth have known any appreciable degree of freedom? Have we lost sight of the fact that probably less than 5 percent of all the men and women who have lived their span on this planet actually could call their souls their own? Have we overlooked the terribly significant truth that even in this enlightened day, less than one-fourth of the world's population knows or has experienced freedom even remotely comparable to that which we consider the inalienable right of every American?

These are very important questions, because the answers remind us that less than one-fourth of the earth's population does enjoy a great measure of freedom and—coincidentally—produces the vast majority of the world's manufactured goods.

This Nation has undergone the most phenomenal growth of any that the world has known. In a century and a half it has become the most influential in the world, meanwhile developing the highest standard of living for the great majority that history has yet recorded. As long as 10 years ago, the United States had brought its national income to a point where it equaled the total national income of the next six highest countries in the world.

Although we count only one-sixteenth of the population of this planet, we send more young people to high school and college than all the rest of the nations combined. Our workers, with their wages, are able to buy two times the quantity of necessities and luxuries that workers in France, England, Sweden, or Germany can; five times as much as the Russians; and more than ten times as much as in a good part of the Orient. All this before the war and since.

The paramount fact to remember is that freedom of individual opportunity is the keystone of American achievement, of America's wealth, and of America's high standard of living.

We have only to read the history of other and older nations to know how much that boon of individual opportunity has meant to our growth. The people of Russia have a very low standard of living despite that nation's vast resources, labor abundance, and fertile lands. It is because the Government of Russia does all the planning, operates all the plants, distributive systems, and farms. The Russian fears his government. He knows that if he so much as speaks of individual freedom he has committed a crime against the state.

The history of little Switzerland is a shining example of the other extreme. There, with few natural resources and only enough land with which to raise half of the food needed, the greatest per capita wealth in the world has been developed. From the viewpoint of resources, Switzerland should be the poorest of countries. Yet, it is quite the opposite because the Swiss enjoy the freedom of independent opportunity. The Swiss can own personal property, can create a business or an industry, is free to fulfill his individual dreams, to belong or not to belong to a labor union, to work or not to work.

It is a significant truth that throughout the world freedom of individual opportunity and prosperity go hand in hand. They are invariably found together. It is equally significant that governments have no freedom to give. They can only restrict and limit freedom. A government of a prosperous and happy people can only be the servant of the people, never its master.

Any system of government that is dynamic and which is quickly responsive to need for change or adjustment is certain to face temporary dislocations. We are meeting these dislocations, however, and we know that our economy makes possible a higher living standard, even at its worst, than other countries have ever known, even at their best. One very important thing to remember is this: When you have governmental regimentation with guaranteed full employment and security for all, you also have perpetual poverty.

Where lies the danger to our system? It is difficult to understand, yet it is true—and you all recognize it—that despite the incontrovertible proof history gives that individual freedom and enterprise provide the only avenue to general prosperity and a high standard of living, the tendency of the whole world today is toward regimentation.

What brought on World War II? The activities of highly regimented Germany, Italy, and Japan. What nation today blocks the road to peace and economic recovery? Highly regimented Russia.

For some strange reason we do not seem to absorb history's lessons, nor do we fully profit from examples which are plain before us. England and the British experiment in government management ought to be the most potent argument possible for individual freedom.

There we have a vivid picture of the consequences of even a limited regimentation. It is the British who cherished and—above all other European nations—stood for individual freedom. If any nation in the world could succeed in both nationalizing its industries and maintaining individual freedom, Britain is that nation.

Yet, after 2 years of the experiment, the so-called crisis bill was passed, giving the Government the power to direct any man between 18 and 50, or any woman 18 to 40, where to work. To make that law even more effective, penalties are provided for failure to accept that direction or for absence from work. Thus the Government was given the power to uproot a man from his community, force him to take any work assignment anywhere, and make sure that he obeyed in every respect. It would hardly be possible to find a surer admission that Government-managed economy had failed. Perhaps equally important was the new British tax of 50 percent on all income from investments in addition to an already high income tax.

It is astonishing to think, in the face of this evidence, that there are a great many Americans who urge more and more Government controls, with less and less individual freedom. What they say, in effect, is: If you want to remain great, you must depart from the fundamental principles that made you great. And so skillful is the propaganda supporting this view that our present younger generation is growing up almost entirely in ignorance concerning the outstanding achievement of our American economy and the basic factors which make it a successful economy.

And this is our challenge. We must recognize and neutralize these skilled propagandists who have invaded our country and who are anxious to destroy private capitalism.

It is quite clear, I think, that these enemies of a free economy have one aim—to destroy the one great capitalistic nation. They plan every move shrewdly. Theirs is the old technique of division and destruction. They would divide employers and workers by attempting to make us believe that industrial leaders are profiteers, oppressing workers and bleeding the American public. They are attempting to convince young people and workers that competition and the profit motive are evil forces destined to oppress the weak. These, they say, should be abolished in favor of Government ownership and Government operation of industry.

Let us look into the picture of profits and see what the situation actually is, for it is imperative to our safety that profits be understood. You may be told that American industry made $28,000,000,000 in profits last year, a sum which, it is argued, should have gone to workers. The fact is that industrial profits last year amounted to $28,700,000,000. However, $11,300,000,000 of that money went into taxes, leaving $17,400,000,000. Of this amount, $10,600,000,000 was invested in plant and machine facilities to improve the productive system. The direct beneficiaries of that investment are workers and the public. The investment reduced actual payment to stockholders to $6,800,000,000, in the form of dividends as their share of income for the use of machines and tools. Of this amount, a large part was taken in taxes from individuals by the Government. Remember, too, that about 90 percent of the work was done by those machines and tools, with a direct increase in wages paid to employees.

Now, as to those workers. Wages totaled $100,000,000,000, about 16 times the amount paid investors. The investors are the owners of the tools of production, and it is well to bear in mind that if their return is too little, ultimately, investments will decrease, fewer machines and tools will be in operation, production will decrease, wages will follow, and thus the economy of the whole Nation will be impaired.

Look into the income records of all corporations. In the years 1946 and 1947 they averaged less than 6 percent, more than half of which was turned back immediately into the industries. To stockholders, less than 3 percent was paid as dividends. Not only has industry not been profiteering, but on the contrary has been providing the highest wages ever known, the greatest volume of manufactured goods, and the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any people.

It ought to be plain enough for anyone who will make the effort to read and to think that capital is far from being the enemy of the workingman. There is a good deal of criticism, on the part of the propagandists, of the high salaries which are paid officers of some of our corporations.

I submit that our able industrial leaders are not taking bread from the mouths of workingmen, but are, as a matter of fact, their benefactors. The presidents of large corporations, with salaries of $100,000 a year or more, are the geniuses of production and distribution. Their services cost the average worker only 1 cent or 2 cents a day, while that same genius increases the wage of the average worker by a dollar or two a day.

For an example of the way that works, consider the automotive industry. When automobiles were first being built, it took one workman an entire day to shape the top half of a gasoline tank, for which he was paid $1. Careful and competent management constantly reinvested profit in better and better plant facilities and better and better tools. Today a workingman, with the aid of a giant machine, shapes the top half of a gasoline tank in 1 minute. He receives $10 a day for his work. In this fashion profits improved the plant, raised production, and increased wages. This same application of profits to plant improvement and facilities has made it possible for the average American to own and enjoy an automobile, electric refrigerator, telephone, radio, better clothing, education, improved housing, and a great many other things which, not so long ago, were luxuries beyond the reach of his family.

All these things were recognized if we think about them. And yet, there is the threat to this kind of economy, the only kind of economy which has proved itself capable of producing an abundance for the vast majority of the people. We can only meet that threat by convincing the public—and particularly our young people—that free competition and the profit system are not evil forces. Their condemnation should be recognized for what it is—a part of a planned attempt to destroy our capitalistic system, which has achieved more for the average American than any segment of the human race has ever enjoyed.

We have examples from the past to warn us what the future will bring, unless we take heed and protect ourselves. The glory of ancient Rome was surrendered to a dictatorship which spawned the Dark Ages. The destruction of American private enterprise would bring dictatorship to us—would introduce a period of degeneration, of poverty, of spiritual as well as material stagnation which would rival the Dark Ages.

It has been well said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Let us resolve that the great Nation we have built in the free exercise of individual initiative—the Nation that has provided so much of good living to so many—shall not be undermined by those who, in ignorance or cupidity, would plunge into a world of economic darkness. Let us each shout the praises of the best system of government the world has yet known. In that, let us be both vigilant—and vocal.

Gov. John W. Bonner's Address to the Montana Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 5, 1949, the Honorable John W. Bonner, Governor of the State of Montana, delivered his address to a joint session of the Montana Legislature. The speech is well thought out, well put together, and shows the real interest of our Governor in our State.

Governor Bonner has stated in no uncertain terms that the promises he made during his campaign he intends to keep. He recognizes that his job will be a difficult one, but Montana is assured that he will give to the State an honest and a capable administration. He deserves the assistance of every Montanan at home and I can assure him that I will do my very best to give him every aid from Washington and to cooperate with him fully in the difficult task ahead.

Montana is proud of John Bonner and he has our State's full confidence and support.

Good luck, John.

The address follows:

I can find no language within my vocabulary to adequately express my gratitude to the people of Montana who have so signally honored me. Upon assuming office as your Governor, I am not unmindful of the great responsibility of my position, and right here and now I desire to thank you from the very bottom of my heart for the confidence reposed in me.

On Monday, the chief justice of this great State did, in the presence of a convocation of friends, administer to me my oath of office. I desire to give you the positive assurance that I shall not regard indifferently the sacredness of that oath.

With the present deplorable world conditions threatening to stamp out every essence of democracy and with our own perplexing governmental problems which call for straightforward action and thinking—now more than ever, each public official and employee must realize his position as one of trust—the violation of which may well be a contributing cause to the weakening of our cherished democratic form of government.

PLEDGES UNSELFISH SERVICE

I pledge anew my love and loyalty to my native State and pledge to her unselfish service. Born and reared on Montana soil, educated and trained in her educational institutions, honored beyond measure by her people, I am ready to give my very best to her upbuilding.

For nearly two centuries, the territory comprising Montana has been a vital factor in the political affairs of men. During this era at least three countries have endeavored to manifest their sovereignty over her.

Woven in her thrilling history of war and peace has been exploration, the hardy endeavors of our pioneers, romance and heroism.

Today we are here assembled for the thirty-first time in the history of our State, as a new legislative administration is being mobilized for service. As members of this legislature, I know the spirit with which you enter upon your duties. You are all imbued with the great desire to perform a useful service for the people of Montana and upon this foundation democracy rests. Government must be responsive to the wishes of its citizens. In order to attain a real democratic government, we all must have a keen understanding of the lessons of experience, a broad vision of the future, a thorough appreciation of the factors which determine Montana's economic welfare, and last, but not least, an attitude of unselfishness.

I know the people of Montana. Recently I have met them face to face all over this great State of ours. No one can travel this great State and meet its people without experiencing the thrill and throb of the growing pulse of the people for a fine type of civilization which permits no dishonesty in private thinking, no camouflage in social life, and no double dealing in public service.

We, as Montana elected servants, have the duty to direct the destinies, to make and administer the laws, to lift high the ideals, to protect the weak and curb the greed of the strong, to perpetuate the liberty, to guarantee the industrial freedom of over half a million people.

It is a challenge that comes but once in a lifetime and I know that we all are more than willing to accept that challenge by doing our very best for the interests of all our people.

ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

Only a part of the men and women of Montana elected me Governor—yet as I took the oath of office Monday, I stepped beyond the narrow and selfish confines of partisan politics, and became the Governor of every man, woman, and child who lives within the boundaries of Montana. And so it is with you, as representatives of the people. The future is before us. No prejudices should thwart our purpose—no bias should encumber our judgment and no personalities should becloud our vision or hamper our endeavors. Petty political bickerings should not exhaust our energies which are now so sorely needed for the welfare of our people.

We are not here to build political fences or to construct political machines. Personally, I shall call around me to fill positions those in whom I have confidence and I shall remove from office, without fear or one single thought of the future, any or all of them if I find that they do not live up to my expectations.

Conforming to our constitution, I will now proceed to give you information concerning the condition of our State, recommendations for the enactment by you of such measures as I deem expedient, and my estimates of the amount of money required to be raised by taxation for all purposes in the State.

FINANCES

Our State auditor has informed me that on December 1, 1948, we had a balance of $8,993,592.89 in the general fund and our State accountant has informed me that our actual income for the fiscal year 1947–48, as compared to the estimated income for the same period, is as follows:

Income source	Amount of income	Amount of estimate	Increase
Beer Act	$782,769.06	$550,000	$232,769.06
Trade stimulator	691,820.02	500,000	191,820.02
Cigarette license	1,292,228.87	850,000	442,228.87
Photographers' license	306.00	70	236.00
Slot machines	250,815.96	70,000	180,815.96
Other income	12,430,899.20	8,001,249	4,429,650.20

The State accountant has also informed me that our present income far exceeds our unexpended appropriations.

It is common knowledge that present salaries paid to city, county, and State officials and employees are generally inadequate when we take the cost of living into consideration and salaries paid by others for the same type of work and responsibility. I therefore recommend that you do everything possible to rectify this situation.

If our income is carefully expended, I am convinced that, save for highways, our present revenues will adequately provide for the proper function of State affairs without additional new taxes except in cases where commodities are not now taxed and which are akin to those commodities now subject to taxation.

We have duplications of duties in our State government. I recommend that a committee be appointed to study the duplications which exist in our State government and that you pass appropriate legislation during this session, eliminating such duplications, which will result in a saving to the taxpayers of this State.

Unless we call a halt to duplication of duties and practice economy wherever possible, it is obvious that we cannot live within our income, no matter what new taxes are imposed upon our citizens. If you see fit to increase the expense of State government, you should also consider the source of revenue or taxation to take care of these expenses.

Montana's tax laws have not been revised since 1921. It is my belief that the State's whole tax structure should be carefully reappraised, and I therefore further recommend that you set up a commission, with the necessary finances, to study Montana's tax structure and report its finding to the next legislature.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Everyone is conversant with the fact that we are faced with a serious problem concerning our public-school system. It is needless to say that all the children of this State, whether they reside in rural areas or in towns or cities, are entitled to equal educational opportunities, but such a condition does not exist.

Many of our districts do not have the same financial means as other districts and because of such inequalities, our public-school system is not what it should be. It is my opinion that we should have superior public schools from kindergarten through college. This we do not have and it is therefore obvious that we must inaugurate a new system of organization if we are to have the type of school system we desire in this State and to which our children are entitled.

It would appear that the inequalities of taxation concerning our schools may be removed by an adequate contribution from a State level which would insure equalities of educational opportunities for any child regardless of where he lives in Montana.

Contributions from a State level could well be in the nature of non-real property taxes, which would, in effect, constitute replacement taxes in that they would tend to reduce and eliminate further taxes on real property for school purposes.

Numerous revenue proposals have been advocated in order to solve our present educational problem and such proposals, in my opinion, must be considered in light of the entire financial condition and obligations of the State. Additional sources of revenue will, of course, depend on all financial measures considered and passed by you in this session for the State as a whole. For this reason I am not at this time making specific recommendations as to sources of revenue for the solution of our school problem because at the present time it appears that this is a matter wholly within your good judgment and discretion.

Our school problem should be solved during this legislature and I therefore recommend that you give the closest scrutiny to the recommendations of the Montana citizens committee on education and the recommendations of any other committee whose objective is to better the public school system of this State.

TEACHERS' RETIREMENT ACT

The Montana Teachers' Retirement Act has been of great value to our retired teachers and our educational system. The provisions of this act are far from perfect and may be improved. I therefore recommend that you carefully consider this act with the view of liberalizing it in light of the changing employment conditions since its enactment. I know we all agree that we must continue to do everything possible in order to attract worthy persons to the teaching profession in order to maintain a high standard of education. I therefore recommend that you seriously consider any legislative program presented to you for the betterment of our teachers' retirement act.

HOUSING

It is common knowledge that we have a serious housing condition existing in Montana and I recommend that you memorialize Congress to pass legislation which will provide means with which our citizens may procure reasonable and adequate housing facilities at the earliest possible moment.

PUBLIC WELFARE

We all recognize that it is our duty to adequately care for the needy aged, the blind, and neglected and dependent children so that they may live in decency. It is obvious to every one of us that the increasing living costs have far offset payments, and I therefore recommend that you carefully examine the situation affecting these worthy beneficiaries of State assistance and enact appropriate legislation which will substantially increase their monthly allowances. At the present time their allowances are far from adequate and therefore should be given special attention.

HOME FOR THE AGED

One of the most serious problems confronting Montana today is that of caring for the needy aged persons who are not insane, by providing a home for them in order that they be adequately cared for. This is a matter that should not be delayed and I earnestly urge that you provide a home for the needy aged separate and distinct from our State hospital so that these unfortunate persons will not be committed to Warm Springs, as is now the case in many instances.

STATE HOSPITAL

Another serious problem confronting the people of Montana is that of making our State hospital a fit place for the unfortunates who are committed there. I know we all feel a deep responsibility for our mentally ill fellow citizens. We must see to it that these patients receive the best of medical care, that they are well housed, receive just treatment, and have a high standard of living. I therefore ask that you give special consideration to this problem and make adequate appropriations to meet the objectives which I have just enumerated. From my information, with the completion of the present building program, the patients will be adequately housed and special attention should now be given to appropriations for the food and other requirements necessary to meet a high standard of living—medical care and adequate and efficient personnel.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

In light of the high cost of living, I recommend most earnestly that the weekly payments made under our workmen's compensation law be increased substantially because payments now made are inadequate. In order to bring about more justice in the administration of the workmen's compensation law, I also recommend that the waiting period for a single person be reduced to 1 week, as is the case with a married person.

Furthermore, I recommend that in case of an injury causing death, that the beneficiary be paid for 500 weeks, as is the case with those who sustain permanent disability and I also recommend a 25-percent increase in the number of weeks for specific injury.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Labor in this State is entitled to not only official recognition but to a separate department in our State government in order that there be an efficient administration of our labor laws. In order to establish this vital and worthy department it is necessary that you pass appropriate legislation so that a constitutional amendment providing for a labor department be submitted to the voters at the 1950 election. I recommend that such legislation be passed by you at this session.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Because of the present high cost of living and in order to further aid those who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed, I recommend that our unemployment compensation laws be amended to provide for a substantial increase in the maximum weekly benefits, dependents' allowances, a longer uniform potential duration, and a reduction of the waiting period to 1 week.

From my information, these beneficial changes may be accomplished without a change in the contribution rate.

In legislation affecting the provisions of our unemployment compensation laws, it is my opinion that we should at all times be certain to protect and maintain an adequate reserve in our unemployment fund in the event of a period of economic stress which might arise in the future.

INDIAN HOSPITAL FOR TUBERCULAR

By virtue of Public Law 332, Eightieth Congress, there was appropriated by the United States the sum of $750,000 for the purpose of cooperating with the State of Montana for the construction, extension, and improvement of a tubercular sanitarium at Galen for tubercular Indians. The original appropriation was for $1,500,000 and Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, United States Senator from Montana, as well as Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, Congressman from the western district of the State of Montana, have both expressed their opinions that the Eighty-first Congress will appropriate the additional $750,000 for this purpose. In order to avail ourselves of this appropriation, the State of Montana must provide additional funds to complete the construction, extension, and improvement, including regulation equipment of the said hospital. From my investigation, I am convinced that it is necessary we do everything possible in order to construct the hospital for the benefit of our tubercular Indians and I therefore seriously recommend that a contingent appropriation be made at the earliest possible moment which will be effective upon Congress appropriating the remaining $750,000 as I have heretofore related.

Personally, from my investigation, I believe that in order to comply with the congressional appropriation that our contingent appropriation need not exceed $700,000.

VETERANS

As we all know, the veteran and his dependents do not want something for nothing, but simply a chance to make a decent living and establish themselves in their respective communities. In order to accomplish this, worthy legislation concerning them should always be carefully considered. In order to help the veterans and their dependents to accomplish the objectives I have heretofore enumerated, I recommend that legislation be enacted giving nondisabled veterans a credit of at least 5 percent and a disabled veteran a credit of at least 10 percent on all examinations required before employment by the State. And I further recommend that such legislation also give such credits to their dependents in such examinations. Again, in order to help insure the education of children of veterans killed in action or who died of disease during World War II, I recommend that legislation be passed giving those children free tuition at any of our Montana public educational institutions.

I also recommend that you memorialize Congress to pass the veterans' economic development bill as embodied in H. R. 521 and S. 1652 in the Eightieth Congress. This bill proposes to set up a $5,000,000 backlog from which loans may be made to develop and create new industries. The act would operate in the same manner as does the Home Owners Loan Corporation and other like Federal agencies which have been entirely self-supporting. This legislation would help both veteran and nonveteran and bring new business to Montana.

I also recommend that you give serious consideration to appropriations asked for by the Veterans' Welfare Commission.

The foregoing constitute matters which I deem essential at this time in order to help the veterans and their dependents and undoubtedly many other worthy measures will be presented to you by the veterans and their dependents for your consideration and I know you will give these proposed measures your utmost attention.

MEMORIAL BUILDING

Though $400,000 has heretofore been appropriated, from my investigation it is my opinion that $350,000 more must be appropriated in order to construct the pioneer-veterans' memorial building. This is due to increased building costs since the last appropriation and because an additional room is needed for the reason that I will now give. At the present time, a committee is working with the view of procuring a great number of paintings by Charles E. Russell for the State of Montana. These paintings, in order to be adequately kept, must be placed in a room with favorable atmospheric conditions. In my opinion, the plans for the pioneer-veterans' memorial building should be altered in order to provide for such a room. The appropriation I have just mentioned includes the cost of this room. The appropriation will not entail new taxes because ample money for the construction of this building, so I am advised, is already in the capitol building fund and the veterans' memorial fund.

I recommend that these appropriations be made so that the pioneer and veterans' memorial building may be constructed without further delay.

HIGHWAYS

We have reached a crisis, as far as our highway situation is concerned, in Montana. In my opinion something must be done by this legislature if we are to save what highways we have and to have an adequate program of highway construction in this State. I think it is obvious to all that the people of Montana want action now on our highway program.

Since the last general election, I have obtained from our State highway commission the statement of our financial situation and what is going to be necessary in order that we can take advantage of Federal funds already available. Our present highway

financial situation, as given me by the highway commission, is as follows:

	State	Federal	Total
Work remaining to contract the 1944 Federal act	$5,720,000	$8,580,000	$14,300,000
Wor remaining to contract the 1948 Federal act	9,000,000	14,000,000	23,000,000
Total	14,720,000	22,580,000	37,300,000
Deduct State funds available including debentures	5,720,000		
Additional State money required in order to match available Federal funds under 1944 and 1948 Federal acts	9,000,000		

The additional $9,000,000 of State money which is required to match the present available Federal funds, as heretofore shown, over and above that of all State funds available including the debentures which will be sold, would undoubtedly provide a real aggressive program of highway construction for approximately 3 years. This means, of course, that we must provide revenue during this session of the legislature which will provide $3,000,000 a year because it is reasonable to assume that Federal funds in the same proportion will continue in future years. From my investigation it is my conclusion that we need this type of program in the amounts just stated if we are to have the type of highway construction and maintenance to which this State is entitled.

There are, in my opinion, at least six equitable methods by which additional revenue may be obtained. These are:

1. Increased gasoline tax.
2. Increased tax on Diesel fuel.
3. Imposition of a tax in proportion to the gasoline tax on propane, butane, and all other fuels excepting gasoline by rating of pounds per horsepower hour, used for propelling vehicles of any kind upon the highway.
4. An annual tax on trucks determined by tonnage.
5. An annual tonnage tax on trailers and semi-trailers.
6. A caravan law providing that a fee be paid on each vehicle transported for hire on our highways which fees would go to the building and maintenance of our highways.

I do not believe that any further tax or license should be placed on private passenger vehicles for the obvious reason that a further tax or license on such vehicles would be inequitable.

The people of Montana know that the revenue must be raised for the maintenance and construction of our highways and I again seriously recommend that you find ways and means during this session to obtain revenue which will insure a real program of highway maintenance and construction for Montana.

Delay in solving this problem will avail us nothing, but on the contrary will lead, in my opinion, to a substantial loss of the millions of dollars which we have already invested in our roads. Not only this, but the lack of a real highway program will inconvenience our own residents and will substantially diminish the revenues which Montana each year receives from its tourists. In considering our highway situation, I also earnestly call to your attention the feasibility of working out a program for farm-to-market roads which is essential to the farmers and ranchers of this State.

STATE HIGHWAY PATROL

Our State highway patrol is a very efficient organization. It is composed of a high caliber of men and is a credit to this State. However, the salaries paid these patrolmen are grossly inadequate and I recommend that you seriously consider appropriations which will insure them salaries commensurate with the fine service they render to this State.

MUNICIPALITIES AND COUNTIES

Streets and roads in many of our municipalities and counties are fast deteriorating because of inadequate funds, and I therefore recommend that you seriously consider any legislation which will aid such towns, cities, and counties in providing better streets and roads.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

We are progressing well with rural electrification in Montana and I am sure you will agree with me that we should continue to do everything possible with the view of extending rural electrification wherever we can to every farm and ranch in Montana.

APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL

I heartily endorse the work of the Montana State Apprenticeship Council in conjunction with the Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship. The work of these agencies is of primary interest and importance to industry, including management and labor. At the present, more than 1,200 apprentices in Montana are registered under apprenticeship programs developed jointly by the State apprenticeship council and the Federal agency with management and labor in over 50 apprenticeable trades. Approximately 85 percent of these apprentices are veterans of World War II, learning the skills of their chosen trades, thus equipping them with the knowledge for future journeymanship resulting in security for themselves, providing skilled workers to employers, and the public benefiting by having skilled craftsmen performing their work. Because of the most worth-while work being performed by these agencies, I request the legislature to again provide adequate funds for the continued successful operation of the Montana State Apprenticeship Council, under the State apprenticeship law.

RADIO PRIZE CONTESTS

Participation in radio prize contests has been held illegal in Montana. In order that our residents have the same rights as others who reside in the United States to take part in radio prize contests, I recommend appropriate legislation in order to rectify our outmoded laws in this respect.

AVIATION

The increasing importance of aeronautics and its functions is becoming more and more apparent in its relationship to the economy of our State. The use of the airplane by the rancher and businessman is no longer a novelty. Crop spraying by air for weed and insect control is a proven additional utility of the airplane. We must continue to plan ahead in the development of landing strips and airports for all communities. Airport development is necessary before we can establish feeder air lines to link all of our communities with the present excellent air lines now operating through Montana.

I would like to bring to your attention the good work of our State aeronautics commission. This agency, financed only by the industry it represents, has accomplished a great deal in the promotion of aeronautics, airport development, and air education. The commission has been aided in this work by the Montana Pilots' Association, the Flying Farmers, and other aviation groups. Your support of any recommendations the commission may make will be justified. Montana can benefit materially in fostering aviation.

LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD

I recommend that you thoroughly investigate our liquor control system with the view of squeezing politics and corruption out of its operation so that it will be operated efficiently for the benefit of the people of this State.

As long as I am governor there will be no brokerage system and I recommend that legislation be passed prohibiting brokerage, in connection with our liquor monopoly system.

In order to more efficiently administer the liquor control act and to procure more revenue for the people of this State, I recommend the enactment of legislation which will authorize and direct the Montana liquor control board to purchase, safely keep, and sell identification stamps serially numbered to be affixed to each and every bottle of distilled spirits, wines, cordials or liquors sold by or under the authority of the liquor control board.

During the last session a law was passed limiting the number of retail liquor and beer licenses. As a result newly established posts of national veterans organizations and lodges of national fraternal organizations are without liquor and beer licenses because such licenses have been oversubscribed in the area in which these posts and lodges are situated. In order to remedy this situation, I recommend legislation which will give a legitimate national fraternal or legitimate national veteran organization, which has been in existence for at least 5 years, the right to procure liquor and beer licenses. In order to avoid speculation in beer and liquor licenses, I recommend legislation which will provide that all liquor licenses and beer licenses which are not actually used by the owners thereof within 60 days after issuance by the liquor control board be automatically canceled.

In order to permit the retail liquor dealers to legitimately carry on their business with the prospect of a reasonable return on their investment, as is the case with other merchants, I recommend that this legislature enact legislation giving the retail liquor dealers a 10 percent discount on liquor purchased in quantities by them from the State. This procedure would conform to standard merchandise practices, as where the retail merchant purchases in quantity from a wholesaler.

Under the present law, one selling liquor to a minor can be tried only in justice court. The selling of liquor to a minor, in my opinion, is a grievous offense and is one for the district court, where a greater penalty can be meted out in the event the defendant is found guilty. I, therefore, recommend appropriate legislation which will make the selling of liquor to a minor a major offense, with a severe penalty in the event of conviction.

SOCIAL CLUBS

Since you last assembled here, social clubs have grown over this State like mushrooms. There has not been a case, as far as I know of, which has determined whether or not any of these social clubs have conformed to existing laws. These clubs, in many instances, have received licenses from the State to operate slot machines. Many of these clubs carry on open gambling. At the same time, as most everyone knows, without the guise of social clubs, slot machines are being illegally operated openly and notoriously in violation of law in many counties of this State. In many instances, I am informed, individuals or syndicates control the operation of these slot machines. This practice is, of course, a racket, constitutes corruption, and should not be tolerated. Only the illegal operators and corrupt public officials profit under this system.

I am informed that the United States (Bureau of Internal Revenue) licensed 6,019 slot machines in Montana last year, while only 3,162 of such machines were licensed by this State during the same period of time. Some of our retail liquor dealers benefit from the operation of social clubs because of their right to have licensed slot machines. This

causes unfair discrimination among the liquor retail dealers, for the reason that those who are not benefiting from slot machines obviously cannot compete successfully with those retail dealers who are benefiting from the operation of social clubs, or illegal gambling, whether it be by slot machines or otherwise. The result is, therefore, unfair competition. I believe we should face the issues as they stand. Either all slot machines operating in the State should pay a high State license tax for the benefit of our citizens or be completely banned by honest, decent, and courageous enforcement of the law, save those which are operated under license by truly recognized fraternal and veteran organizations or by truly charitable institutions. These are matters for you, and for you alone, to rectify during this session, and I so recommend.

WATER-CONSERVATION BOARD

One of the essential programs for Montana is, of course, reclamation. We must go ahead with this fine program, and any adequate financial provisions which will permit the water-conservation board to proceed with its projects merits, in my opinion, your serious consideration.

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Chapter 218, Revised Codes of Montana, 1935, was declared unconstitutional with respect to interstate commerce, in *State* v. *Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.* (114 Montana 161). Thus natural gas exported through a pipe line originating in Montana for use without the State escapes taxation. In order to correct this situation, I suggest that a law taxing the production of natural gas be enacted, incorporating a provision that the production tax be offset by any distribution tax paid on the same gas.

At the present time Montana has no law providing for a tax on aircraft engaged in interstate commerce. I recommend that the legislature give careful consideration to the enactment of legislation which will correct this deficiency in our present taxation law.

Our freight line company tax law as amended in 1935 was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in December 1945. Since the decision, no taxes have been collected on freight line property. The law formerly brought in about $35,000 annually, which was credited to the State public school general fund. A new law should be enacted to again place this property on the tax rolls and I so recommend.

Throughout this State most hotels and other public lodging places have portable coin-operated radios, supplied by foreign concerns, for the use of their patrons. Being portable, they can easily avoid taxation on the first Monday of March, but if they are required to be licensed, the State will derive substantial revenue from that source. For that reason, I recommend that a law be enacted to license each such coin-operated radio.

The State board of equalization has found evidence that tax stamps issued by this State to evidence payment of a tax upon required articles have been removed for use upon other taxable items or forged, thereby depriving the State of revenue. I recommend that a law be enacted prescribing the manner of affixing of such stamps and prescribing a penalty for defrauding the State of Montana.

Of major importance is the matter of reclassification and revaluation of real property and improvements in rural and urban areas in each county and I recommend appropriate legislation to bring this about. Unequal tax burdens exist among the taxpayers and among different classes of property. Section 2028, Revised Codes, 1935, enacted in 1921, authorizes a levy to defray the cost of classification in each county, but does not authorize or provide for reclassification. There is no other statute pertaining thereto.

A resolution was passed by the county assessors of Montana at their last annual meeting that the reclassification should be done under the supervision, or by the State board of equalization, in order to obtain uniformity throughout the State.

While much preliminary work has been done under the limitation of the said statute, in cooperation with the soil-analysis department of Montana State College, the extension service, the county assessors, and the boards of county commissioners, a new act is necessary before authority exists for such reclassification and revaluation. If the work is to be done by the State board of equalization, an appropriation sufficient for the purpose will be needed.

FISH AND GAME DEPARTMENT

We must inaugurate a program of immediate restoration and development of fish and game resources to the fullest extent in this State, and I especially invite your attention to any legislation which will aid in bringing this about.

PURCHASING AGENT

The present laws relating to State purchases by the State purchasing agent are impractical. The statute requiring notice by publication before purchase would, in many instances, cost the State of Montana over the period of a year, many thousands of dollars. Because of this fact, purchasing agents for many years, in order to avoid the heavy costs of publication, have sent out invitations by mail to persons and corporations interested in submitting bids. This practice has at times caused confusion, delay, and needless litigation.

I therefore recommend that you pass appropriate legislation which will make workable our laws relating to State purchases by the purchasing agent which will be economical to the people of this State and yet at the same time safeguard all purchases made by the State.

INCOME TAX

Many of our citizens are contributing more than 50 percent of the support of persons over 18 years of age. Under our present law (sec. 2295.10, RCM, 1935) these persons are not entitled to an exemption. In my opinion, this is unfair, and I believe that the law should be amended to change the rate of $300 to $500, with the elimination of any age, provided the taxpayer contributes more than 50 percent to the support of such dependent.

I recommend the foregoing changes in our income tax law because many of our people are supporting children going to college as well as persons who are incapable of support because of mental or physical defects.

POSTWAR PLANNING PROGRAM

Inasmuch as our postwar planning program has not been completed and in order to insure its completion, I recommend that the balances in the postwar planning program for the various institutions be reappropriated in order to carry them beyond the June 30 fiscal period.

INDUSTRIAL SURVEY

With our great resources, undoubtedly we can encourage new business to come to this State. However, this will take initiative and planning and cooperation on the part of all of us. With this in mind, I recommend that a Montana resources development board be created in order to make a study and survey of the State's resources and industrial and business possibilities with appropriate policy recommendations for the next legislature.

CONCLUSION

At no time do I intend to encroach upon the prerogative of your functions. I sincerely believe that the two departments of government should function independently. Heretofore, I have pointed out to you several matters which I believe should be treated by law. It is your province alone to prepare and pass measures embodying suggestions on which the people of Montana have so clearly spoken in this last election. At all times, I am ready to help you either individually or collectively, and to you I offer the fullest measure of cooperation.

The people of Montana are expecting much of this legislature and, without question, many of these expectations will end in disappointment unless the executive and legislative branches carry out their respective duties in utmost harmony. I am confident that all of you know full well how intensely the people are thinking. It is your duty and my duty to see to it that our actions during this session of the legislature meet the approval of the people of Montana.

President Truman's Message to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just As We Expected," published in a recent issue of the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST AS WE EXPECTED

President Truman offers us nothing ahead which we had not already foreseen.

His message to the Congress is a repetition of his demand for more taxes, more spending, more controls over American life and business.

He wants Government to provide prepaid medical assistance, have a larger part in education, and force our youth into universal military training.

At a time when inflation seems to have reached its peak he proposes inflationary Government spending on a larger scale.

This policy alone will serve to add new life to higher prices.

He wants to control goods in short supply even as the supply of goods is rapidly reaching the point where needed articles are available.

The President proposes to put the Government in business in competition with private industry if free enterprise fails to measure up to his ideas of what it should produce.

And so none may escape, he favors a study of a move toward increasing income taxes on wage earners in the middle as well as upper brackets.

His program means more taxing, more spending, more regulation by Government. It means a more powerful state, more Federal employees, more chances to elect and elect.

Water Problems of Los Angeles Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, to understand the water problems of the

Los Angeles area of southern California, it is necessary to have some knowledge of the climate and topography of this region, and the history of the development of water sources to meet the growing needs of this area.

The following summary sets forth these vital facts concerning our Los Angeles water problems, and I recommend it to the attention of the Members of the House:

CONSERVATION REPORT SUMMARIZES FACTORS IN WATER PROBLEMS OF LOS ANGELES AREA

TOPOGRAPHY

Los Angeles County embraces slightly more than 4,000 square miles, which can be divided into three general sections of approximately equal area. The northern third is an inland valley completely surrounded by mountains which separate it from the coastal or Los Angeles area. These mountains, which occupy the middle third of the county, are characterized by peaks ranging from 5,000 to 10,000 feet above sea level.

The southerly third is the Coastal Plain ranging from sea level to approximately 1,000 feet. On this plain lies the city of Los Angeles and forty-odd other municipalities.

The latest population figure for Los Angeles County is 3,818,713, of which 1,930,561 represents the city of Los Angeles. This area, including the southern base of the mountains, is drained by the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, which, in turn, are fed by numerous small mountain streams.

PRECIPITATION

Practically the entire precipitation, including the snow which falls on the highest mountains, occurs between November 1 and April 30. The total varies according to elevation from approximately 11 inches at sea level, 20 inches at 1,000 feet, and 33 inches at 5,000 feet in the higher mountain area. The average rainfall for the four summer months amounts to thirty-four hundredths of an inch.

WATER HISTORY

For more than 150 years, the Los Angeles River, the original source of the local water supply, has continuously served the community. Since 1781, when El Pueblo was founded, residents have used this water. Even today, the river with its average flow of 80 second-feet (52,000,000 gallons a day) supplies a 40-square-mile area within the city, including a part of the original business district.

The Los Angeles River is unique in that, except during the winter rains, it seldom has more than a trickle of surface water, none of which is directly diverted for domestic needs. Instead, the city has constructed a system of underground galleries and some 75 wells.

The deepest gallery is 150 feet below the river bed. In the winter months the water flows from the galleries into conduits leading to storage reservoirs, and the river replenishes the galleries and gravels with water.

Early in 1900, the city was faced by the necessity of getting additional water to supply its growing population. In 1908, construction was commenced on the Los Angeles-Owens River aqueduct, a 238-mile water carrier which tapped the snow-fed creeks on the east slope of the High Sierras. The project was completed in 1913 at a cost of $24,500,000.

As the population of Los Angeles steadily forged ahead from its 1930 mark of 1,500,000 people, the city continued to anticipate its water needs. To insure an ample supply for 2,000,000 people, the Mono Basin, located 350 miles north of Los Angeles and adjoining the Owens River watershed, was developed to augment the aqueduct supply.

Therefore, at the present time, the city has available 80 second-feet from local sources, plus 430 second-feet from the Owens River and Mono Basin, or a total of 330,000,000 gallons per day. On the basis of our present consumption, this is adequate for a population of 2,000,000 people.

Water is stored in seven reservoirs along the aqueduct and, in addition, there are 37 reservoirs within the boundaries of the city.

In the early twenties, the city began preliminary studies of the Colorado River as a source of additional water supply. In this project, the city of Los Angeles was joined by other municipalities, and in 1928 the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California was organized with 11 member cities.

In 1930, the district contracted with the United States for storage of 1,500 second-feet behind Hoover Dam and the actual construction of the project was begun in the last week of 1932. The construction of the project took 9 years, and its net construction cost to date approximates $198,000,000.

At the present time, the district embraces 26 cities, the coastal municipal water district, and the San Diego Water Authority, the latter embracing a large part of the most populous section of San Diego County. When this latter district joined the Metropolitan, it brought with it a contract for 112 second-feet of Colorado River water.

The original agreement between the cities provided for the sharing of the cost on the basis of their assessed valuation, and allocated the water to them on the same basis. This would entitle the city of Los Angeles to considerably more than 50 percent of the available supply, or at least 800 second-feet (520,000,000 gallons a day), which is more than sufficient to supply water for an additional population of 3,000,000 people. Thus, Los Angeles, by its foresight, has put itself in a position to care for a population of some 5,000,000 people.

IRRIGATION

Agriculture has through the years been one of the principal sources of income in Los Angeles County. Its products in 1947 amounted to $222,882,990, of which $33,991,700 came from fruits and nuts, $27,835,600 from vegetables, $45,018,600 from field crops, and $116,037,090 from livestock and dairying.

The total irrigated area in the county, according to the census in 1940, amounted to 185,000 acres. Of this amount, approximately one-half is located on the coastal plain and the balance within the San Fernando Valley, in the city of Los Angeles, and the Antelope Valley north of the main range. While this area may be divided roughly 50–50, more than one-half of the values produced come from the area lying on the coastal plain.

This area is underlaid by water-bearing gravels which are fed partly from the rains that fall upon the surface, but principally from the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and lesser streams that debouch directly onto the coastal plain.

The winter run-off from the mountain and foothill area is controlled and conserved by 16 dams. Plans call for the construction of several more such structures in order to fully control and conserve the run-off for beneficial use.

The irrigated area is served by numerous small water companies largely by pumping from the underlying gravels. In addition to water needed for irrigation, these companies furnish the domestic supply for some 30 cities and a dense rural population.

Water from the excess supply brought from the Colorado River is available in the case of necessity for both irrigation and serving the communities not at the present time members of the district itself.

American Business and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered before the Association of American Colleges at their thirty-fifth annual meeting on January 11, 1949, by the chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Mr. Frank W. Abrams. Mr. President, I make this request because of the widespread interest in this address, interest not only for what the address says but because of the theme presented. In Chairman Abrams' speech he presents a legal question which I cannot answer, but in his remarks he has this sentence which to me represents an ideal definition of what a corporation should be when he says:

A corporation is not an isolated selfish phenomenon in society, but a part of the world in which it operates. Like any other person—legal or human—its best interest cannot be served by narrow selfishness.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CAN AMERICAN BUSINESS HELP AMERICAN EDUCATION?

A year ago last September I took part in a meeting which inaugurated the crisis in education campaign of the advertising council.

I presented my views and the views of my associates on the board of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) regarding the stake of business in American education.

I have never made a speech which produced a wider response. I am still getting letters about it.

This fact is evidence to me that education today is looking to American business for help, and welcomes a growing recognition on the part of many enlightened business and industrial managements that an independent and progressive American educational system has been, and will continue to be, vital to American business and industry.

What I would like to do this morning is to discuss the question: How can American business help American education?

I have in mind especially higher education.

Let's first look at some of the reasons for finding ways to help.

It is my personal opinion that the peace, prosperity, and security of this Nation may depend as much on the way we treat our teachers and our religious leaders as it does on any other single influence. The ideas, the faiths, the beliefs which will affect our government and our institutions 10, 20, and 30 years from now (and I am thinking very specifically of our corporate institutions) are being strongly influenced by the teachers of today. It seems to me vital that we attract a substantial percentage of the best minds of every generation into the teaching profession. To do this, we must offer them more than bread and water and a chance to do good. Education must be competitive. It must be able to attract its fair share of the ablest young people.

I have included religious leaders because I believe the case is similar and equally strong. Our American belief in freedom for the individual is essentially a religious belief. Our political structure has a moral and spiritual foundation. We believe that the individual is important and should always come first.

The problem of higher education is familiar to this audience. Before the war American colleges and universities had to accommodate about a million and a half young men and women. Today they are required to take care of nearly one million more undergraduates. During a period when population has increased about 9 percent, the number of young men and women in our colleges and universities has increased about 60 percent; and even though the number of GI's has begun to fall off, the total attendance may be expected to increase. Higher education is expanding. Like all expansions this one develops large capital requirements and creates other problems.

It is generally acknowledged, I think, that the increase in higher educational demand is almost certain to result in a tremendous expansion of our publicly supported institutions of higher education—our State colleges and universities.

No one will dispute that some of the greatest educational institutions in this country are State colleges and universities. But in the opinion of many wise observers, this is true in part because of the existence of outstanding private, or so-called independent, colleges and universities. If these independent institutions are absorbed into a State educational system, or become wards of the State (I use a capital "S" in both cases) American higher education would be seriously weakened, in the opinion of many Americans.

If independent colleges and universities are to remain strong and vigorous in order to supply not merely an alternative for the undergraduates and for the teachers of the Nation but a vigorous and effective quality competition for State colleges and universities, they must receive continued financial support from outside sources. Tuition and other direct charges cannot cover the costs of an education. They never have. Every young man or woman who graduated from an independent college or university got a free ride part of the way because money given to these colleges and universities by private individuals has always covered a substantial part of the costs of higher education.

If tuition charges were increased high enough to cover full costs, we would automatically close the doors to a great many of our most competent young people. Furthermore, the independent colleges and universities in our free society must compete with public institutions which can charge less over the counter for an education because the tax-supported institution will get the difference between its costs and its price from the Public Treasury.

The independent college or university finds itself in a dilemma. Its costs have grown enormously. Some fortunate institutions have been able to raise their endowments very substantially and I understand that 1948 has been a banner fund-raising year. But when the total dollars are discounted by their purchasing power (and a dollar is only worth what it will buy) we find that our independent institutions of higher education are having to run very, very fast to stay in the same place. The value of their new endowments, even if they reach record-breaking levels, will be worth little if any more than the amounts raised during the depression years of the early thirties.

Colleges and universities find themselves in the same spot that many industrial corporations do. Record-breaking dollar income is inadequate to meet their postwar obligations to reconstruct and expand.

Colleges and universities are today more and more looking to business and industry for help—and I think they are quite right in doing so. More and more the corporate individual is being asked to assume some part of the responsibility that the private individual is not so well situated to carry with present taxes and surtaxes—and I think it is interesting and significant that corporation giving to various forms of philanthropy has increased tenfold in the past decade.

I believe that the will to contribute exists very widely today in the field of business and industry, but I find that very few people (among them very few educators) are aware of the substantial obstacles to giving which the law puts in the path of the public-spirited corporation management. It is textbook law that corporate managers may not make "gifts" of corporate funds. An English judge remarked some 60 years ago: "Charity has no business to sit at boards of directors." However, the right of a corporation to assume that it owes an obligation to society or the community has been established slowly by our courts and by a process of identifying more and more progressive programs with the self-interest of the enterprise and its shareholders.

For many years the basic legal doctrine was so rigidly applied that corporations were not permitted to include in pension plans any payment in recognition of past services.

I think you should be aware also that the law may impose upon corporate managers financial responsibility as a group and as individuals for any "wrong guessing" they may do regarding judicial attitudes in matters of this kind. Perhaps particularly today, when a good many business directors are men of limited means, they must take a very serious view of the legal fences which surround them and must stay well within the not-always-clear boundaries marked out by the law and the courts.

The courts have relaxed somewhat the rigid application of the "no gift" rule. If it can reasonably be held that some legitimate business interest of the corporation is benefited by a contribution, the courts have upheld the contribution as proper and warranted. It is recognized and acknowledged today, for example, that pensions are good, not only for retired employees but for the corporations which provide them. That a corporation's best interests may be served by many forms of fair and far-sighted dealing, which could not be approved on a strictly "Scrooge" type of reasoning, is a view which has been reflected in court decisions and in legislation over the years.

In this our courts and legislatures have been not only socially enlightened but intelligent. A corporation is not an isolated selfish phenomenon in society, but a part of the world in which it operates. Like any other person—legal or human—its best interests cannot be served by narrow selfishness. Unadulterated selfishness destroys men, and it also destroys institutions.

At the present time reasonable pensions to retired employees—including amounts in recognition of past services—are generally not considered gifts because of the benefit to the corporation which stems from improved morale of the organization and the increased efficiency and loyalty of employees who have not yet been retired. The business benefits accruing to companies from contributions to local hospitals and other community welfare services have been recognized by the courts.

Coming now to education—scholarships and fellowship grants in a specific field of study which is related to the corporation's principal business activity are considered justified and in the interests of the enterprise. The same thing is true of grants to be devoted to the creation or maintenance of physical equipment and facilities useful in study and research in some specific field of science or business which is closely related to the corporation's principal business activity. General grants to educational institutions which devote their major endeavors to work in fields closely related to the corporation's principal business activity also seem warranted by the same logic. But other types of contributions in support of education, such as grants to the general endowment funds of an undegraduate college, have still to be supported by court decisions or otherwise before corporate managers can face the legal dangers and risks without considerable uncertainty.

From our point of view, the present legal situation is unsatisfactory. We think it is unsatisfactory also from the viewpoint of the American people and of the Nation. Our reasoning is this:

1. Whatever the law may say, and however much the courts may have altered the "no gift" rule by their decisions, the American people do not, in fact, consider that corporations should be cold, selfish, impersonal institutions with no responsibility except to their shareholders. The American people—with that great good sense which marks so many of their decisions—insist that the legal persons which we call corporations have responsibilities to society.

In our view, the American people are entirely right. Furthermore, we believe that the long-term interests of shareholders cannot run counter to the long-term interests of the American people.

2. We live in a world in which public opinion has become increasingly important and effective. Business and industry must constantly be aware of the fundamental faiths of the people of this Nation and must live and grow in accordance with those faiths. That is merely good sense. If you want, you may call it business statesmanship.

I do not mean that business and industry must blow hot and cold or fly hither and yon in response to every gust of wind from some new quarter. The fundamental beliefs of the American people change slowly and after a long association with some satisfactory or unsatisfactory experience.

I simply mean to say that no corporation and no group of people in this country can be intelligent and, at the same time, hope to be the only one in step when everybody else is marching to a different beat.

3. The increased importance which we today attach to public opinion is not derived from some copybook but from experience. We are all aware of its force. We are all increasingly conscious that we must not only do right but be known by our fellow citizens as decent, honorable and fair-dealing men and institutions. Good relations with the American people are important to the shareholders of Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and to shareholders of every other major corporation.

It is important to our shareholders that we deserve and get public confidence and respect—that we do right and are known to do right—that we identify and accept responsibilities for the general welfare.

And in this regard I think that no field is fundamentally more important to modern American business and industry than the field of education.

Business and industry have long been beneficiaries of the vast American educational system which has given us not only trained and more productive manpower, but prosperous and more valuable markets. It seems to me that one of the major problems of the world is to increase the educational level of people everywhere so that they can deal more effectively with the conditions that surround them and build better societies and higher standards of living.

It seems to me that it is no more strange today to propose that business and industry recognize and acknowledge a direct and important interest in higher education than it

was 25 years ago to urge the practical virtues of pensions for employees.

If we can agree that existing legal restrictions may run counter to the public need in this area, the question is what can be done about it?

Enabling legislation in various States might be of some help. About a dozen States already have such legislation. But it is not clear in all cases whether the statute has educational contributions in mind when speaking of charitable grants. Furthermore, judicial precedents in some States cast doubt on whether charitable or educational contributions which might otherwise be considered unjustified by the courts can be validated by legislation enacted after the date of the company's incorporation. The theory is that the State is only one of the parties to the charter and cannot change it.

There are States where this whole problem may not arise; other States where legislation has already been enacted; and still other States where legislation may be needed for the future.

The most effective course, however, seems to be to go to the courts for an interpretation of the existing law and to find out how far judicial opinion coincides with public opinion as we see it. It is important to realize that for more than a quarter of a century, so far as we know, there has been no court decision directly dealing with the right of corporate managers to give to education.

I feel sure that some of you have already begun to say to yourselves: "Your heart seems to be in the right place—but what are you going to do about this problem?"

Let me say first that we have already made some moves. A little less than a year ago I asked myself the same question I think that you are asking. Then I invited a group to dinner. My guests included several businessmen and industrialists, two college heads, two men from the field of educational foundations, a banker, a lawyer, and one or two personal friends. I put the question to them. Among other things, we began to explore such questions as: What is the need; what might be the machinery of giving; should we think in terms of a foundation to which many might contribute; how much good are we likely to do?

The discussion continually ran head-on into the hard fact that it had not yet been legally demonstrated that managers of corporations can give corporate funds for general educational purposes. Discussions which we in our company have had since that time led us continually back to the central question: "Have we the right to give?"

I want to report to you today where we stand on that question.

Our board of directors has agreed that, if we can feel legally privileged to do so, our company as a corporate person, living in a great free nation and as a long-term beneficiary of our national educational system, will be one American corporation (we hope one of many) which will give to independent colleges and universities for general educational purposes. We have asked our legal department to propose to us what steps we may take to find out whether we have that privilege.

I know you will begin to ask yourselves what higher education might expect to get from business and industry for general educational purposes if it appears that corporations have the right to make such contributions.

I can't answer that question for you. We ourselves are not thinking in terms of any large sums at this time. We are already making substantial contributions to education for specific purposes. The same thing is true of a good many other companies. Furthermore, it would not be in the best interests of education to look to business and industry for the solution of its financial problems. All segments of the national life, including business, are the beneficiaries of education and should participate in its support.

I would guess that in time, however, the independent colleges and universities of this country might expect to receive substantial annual support from the business and industrial community.

The problem today, however, is to establish clearly that the interests of shareholders are, in fact, served by reasonable and thoughtful corporate giving to general education and general educational purposes.

Today, certainly, it is the establishment of this principle which is important rather than the amount which might be given. It is our hope that we may be able to carry out our own conviction that such a course is in the interests of our shareholders, and that in doing so, we may establish a useful precedent.

Investigation of Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Hamilton Fish to President Truman, dated December 23, 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 23, 1948.*

Hon. HARRY TRUMAN,
President, White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have persisted in attacking the Un-American Activities Committee, duly appointed by the House of Representatives, and denouncing its recent startling exposures of spies and traitors in our midst as "red herrings." I sincerely respect you, Mr. President, because you were a tough combat officer in World War I, and on account of your Missouri mulishness, but there is such a thing as carrying stubbornness too far. You must know by this time that you were wrong in raising the "red herring" issue.

Who appointed Alger Hiss to the State Department?

Who appointed him as adviser to F. D. R. at the Yalta Conference?

Who appointed him as executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944?

Who appointed him as secretary general of the San Francisco Conference for the organization of the United Nations in 1945?

In order that I may not be considered raising a partisan issue I agree that the public is entitled to know from John Foster Dulles, a Republican, if he had anything to do with various key appointments of Mr. Alger Hiss in the State Department and as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

We have already had too much secret diplomacy at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam which we are now paying for in Berlin and China, and not enough faith in the American people.

Why should any public official or loyal American want to protect Communist spies and traitors? Every individual implicated in this stealing of secret documents from the State, War, or Navy Departments should be publicly exposed and punished.

Mr. President, who is the State Department trying to cover up?

Mr. President, who were and who are the agents of the Communist Party in the State Department and other departments of the Government?

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know how Alger Hiss and other Communist sympathizers and Red stooges infiltrated into important Government positions.

Mr. President, how long will Communist spies and traitors be permitted to infest the Federal service and abuse the patience of the American people? It is time that the various departments of the Government realized that they are the servants and not the masters of the people.

The diabolical espionage plot with its stolen documents and microfilms must be openly exposed, and everyone connected with it punished. Let no guilty man or woman escape, no matter how important or powerful, dead or alive.

The Un-American Activities Committee has rendered an important public service. It should be commended, not condemned, and its activities continued by the incoming Congress.

There can be no appeasement of Communist spies and traitors, or those aiding and abetting them. There can be no compromise with treason under any guise.

I am writing this as an American and not as a partisan Republican.

Respectfully yours,

HAMILTON FISH,
Chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Propaganda and Activities in 1930–31.

British Aid to Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gene Currivan, which appeared in the New York Times on January 10, purporting to be a report on the activities of the British in regard to arms deliveries to Egypt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS AID TO EGYPT PUT AT $200,000,000—ISRAELI SOURCE SAYS BRITISH SHIPMENTS INCLUDED MOST MODERN JET FIGHTERS

(By Gene Currivan)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL, January 9.—British arms deliveries to Egypt during the last few months have amounted to £50,000,000 ($200,000,000) and included shipment of the most modern design jet fighters, according to a reliable source close to the Israeli Government. In addition to aircraft the supplies also are said to have comprised naval vessels, heavy artillery tanks, heavy caliber shells, and aviation gasoline.

Most of the deliveries were made between August and the latter part of December, it was said. It was in August that Brig. John Bagot Glubb (Glubb Pasha), commander of the Arab Legion in Transjordan, visited London and was reported here to have suggested immediate aid to the Egyptians in the Negeb if the Jewish settlements were to be reduced according to plan. The latest known

arrival of the large consignments of aircraft from the United Kingdom was in mid-December when 30 Mosquito bombers were flown to Egypt, according to these confidential sources.

Other British aircraft said to have been supplied to the Egyptian Air Force include two types of British jets for which contracts were signed by Col. E. P. J. Ryan, regional representative of the Society of British Aircraft Constructors in Cairo. Six Vampires are known to have been delivered while a second consignment of Meteors is expected, according to this informant.

There was also an undetermined number of Stirling bombers, one of which crashed at Almaza Airport when it was coming in, and some Mark 9 Spitfires, all of which arrived toward the latter part of November. These deliveries were made, according to the same source, 3 weeks after the Egyptian Government had placed an order with Britain on November 9 for nine fighter-bombers. The amount of aviation gasoline said to have been placed at the disposal of the Egyptian Army and Air Force during the period January to September was estimated at 500,000 gallons.

Early in November, this informant alleged, three modern British mine sweepers of the Algerine type were turned over to the Egyptian Navy in Alexandria Harbor. Craft of this type recently shelled the Tel Aviv shore after intercepting and boarding an Israeli-bound merchant ship 60 miles off the coast. They carry a single 4-inch gun and four 20-millimeter antiaircraft guns. It is further alleged that three British Navy ships with a nearly 90 percent Egyptian complement have been cruising the Mediterranean for training purposes and that one of these ships was seen in the port of Venice last September.

These reports indicate also that British troops no longer are confined to the Canal Zone area as required by the terms of the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty, but have now spread out through the Sinai Desert and Nile Delta, where abandoned airfields have been reused and are receiving RAF reinforcements. Sinai Desert detachments are said to include the North Staffordshire Regiment, a body of Lancers, and the Essex Regiment.

The informant alleged that when Glubb Pasha was in London he outlined the precarious position of the Egyptians in the Negeb and legion forces in the central front and suggested that Britain transfer as inconspicuously as possible the equipment of their medium artillery regiment that had left Palestine on its way to Misurata, Tripolitania. Glubb Pasha is said to have pointed out that the regiment at Misurata could easily be reinforced with equipment from the United Kingdom. On October 17 an American military intelligence query requested clarification of the unusual situation at the British medium artillery regiment at Misurata. It appears that the regiment had double equipment. Whether the surplus ever reached the Egyptians or was intended for them has not been disclosed.

Cash Value of the Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the question of displaced persons, appearing in the Philadelphia Bulletin for January 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASH VALUE OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS

In answer to those who think that refugees from Europe may take away jobs from American workmen, Government officials offer some surprising figures. They estimate that the 205,000 displaced persons who will enter this country in the next 2 years will increase the Nation's income by a minimum of $200,000,000 a year.

This does not represent their own earnings. Only about 70,000 of them will be workers, the rest are wives and children. But most of them are highly skilled workers, selected as such, for certain trades and industries which badly need them. The tailoring industry is given as an example. New York State alone needs 20,000 more master tailors. And 1 clothing company states that for every additional tailor on its staff it will hire 10 to 15 other workers who have lesser skills and abilities.

It is said in so many words that in no cases will DP's be taking jobs away from American labor. They will be making more jobs for American labor. The basic principle involved is often overlooked by those who want to protect their jobs and wages by limiting the numbers employed in any industry. More people at work, producing more goods and merchandise, increase the national wealth and income for the benefit of all.

Reasons for the Recent Election Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Why It Happened" relating to the result of the recent national election, published in the El Paso Herald Post of the issue of November 4, 1948, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY IT HAPPENED

Second guesses being the order of the day, we venture a few of our theories about why the election came out as it did.

Most of the credit belongs to President Truman and the fight he made. And don't overlook ALBEN BARKLEY'S part. The next Vice President didn't get many big headlines during the campaign, but he was in there plugging hard every step of the way.

We think Mr. Truman reaped the benefit of a lot of public sympathy because, right up to Tuesday, he was so generally pictured as the underdog—the game little fellow doing his best in a hopeless cause.

Editorials that criticized him harshly, cartoons that poked fun at him, columnists and commentators who pontificated about his errors, all probably helped him.

For mighty few people ever have found it possible really to dislike Harry S. Truman, while an amazing number seem to find it extremely easy not to love Governor Dewey, much as they may admire his competence.

Prosperity—high employment, high wages, record-breaking national income—worked for the President. It's tradition that the American people don't turn an administration out of power when times are good. It was not, in our opinion, consistent of Mr. Truman to claim Democratic credit for prosperity and put all the blame for the high cost of living on the Republicans. But millions of voters must have believed him.

His victories in such agricultural States as Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Ohio were thumping surprises. Evidently many farmers, too, like to be prosperous, want to keep prices for their crops high, and were persuaded that the Democrats would be most likely to keep them propped up.

Organized labor's efforts were more effective than most campaign observers thought. The union leaders, we believe, grossly misrepresented the Taft-Hartley Act, but they succeeded in making it a rallying point. And they got out the votes in industrial areas for Mr. Truman and for Democratic congressional candidates.

Incidentally, we suspect that more union members than ever before refused to tell pollsters how they intended to vote. That may have accounted for the big "undecided" figures in the polls—the figures which, as the surprised Dr. Gallup has pointed out, now appear so largely in the Truman-Barkley column.

Finally, we think Mr. Dewey was a victim of overconfidence. Like many others, including us, he put too much faith in the polls and the predictions of professional experts. Whether the outcome would have been much different if Mr. Dewey had made another type of campaign—if he had come down from the heights, scrapped his platitudes and generalities, and talked more specifically about the issues—could be debated endlessly. And fruitlessly.

The important fact is that Mr. Truman is back in the White House for a new term. And this time he got there on his own power, not as a coattail rider, not by accident. He owes nothing to the Democratic bosses who tried to ditch him at Philadelphia, to the Dixiecrats, or to the Wallaceites, or, for that matter, to the newspapers and the commentators.

For the next 4 years he will be President of the United States in his own right, and for at least the next 2 with a Congress controlled by his own party. We hope he will be one of the best and most successful Presidents this country has ever had.

No UMT Action?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No UMT Action?" published in the South Bend Tribune, of December 7, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO UMT ACTION?

Apparently the universal military training project will not be vigorously pushed, at least in the impending first regular session of the new Congress. A UMT advocate who will be in a strategic legislative position when the new Congress is organized expresses pessimism. Representative CARL VINSON, Georgia Democrat, announces formally that he will not ask the Armed Services Committee to consider the project in the next session. As Representative VINSON will become chairman of that committee in January his stand has much practical import.

Representative VINSON emphasizes the prospect that Congress will not appropriate sufficient money to raise the Army to the strength set forth in the Selective Service Act for the Regular Establishment. Approval of a universal military training program would make necessary a large increase in the Federal military budget. Actually President Truman has indicated determination to limit the military budget. Mr. VINSON finds it best not to mention the President's attitude which, after all, may be the determining factor in congressional planning and actions where military matters are concerned.

Universal military training remains decidedly controversial. This distinguishes it from the peacetime selective-service system already in operation with congressional sanction. Even if sentiment in favor of UMT were more extensive in the next Congress it would appear rather incongruous to sanction spending of money for that at a time when the Regular Army expansion program authorized basically by Congress is not being fully carried out. Impliedly President Truman is not enthusiastic about universal military training at this time.

The President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Beyond Safe Limits," from the Washington News of January 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND SAFE LIMITS

President Truman's budget for fiscal 1950—the 12 months beginning next July—calls for record Government peacetime spending of $41,858,000,000.

That's 40 times as much as the Government ever spent in a fiscal year before World War I; more than twice what it spent in that war's most expensive year; nearly 5 times what it spent in the New Deal's peak year of war against depression; two-fifths as much as it spent in the costliest year of World War II.

To balance the budget, and provide a surplus for use in cutting down the public debt, Mr. Truman wants $4,000,000,000 in new taxes on corporations and individuals. He also wants nearly $2,000,000,000 in new pay-roll taxes, to start health insurance and expend social security.

These taxes—if the national income stays high—would boost the Government's revenue to about $46,000,000,000. That's almost as much as it collected in fiscal 1945, at the height of World War II, and more than six times what it collected in any year before that war.

We agree with Mr. Truman that a prosperous country cannot afford an unbalanced budget—that the Government must take in more than it spends and apply the difference toward retiring the debt.

But peacetime taxes of the magnitude proposed could so burden the national economy that the national income would fall and higher tax rates would produce less revenue. That, in our opinion, is a grave danger.

So we think it is the urgent duty of Congress to apply the acid test to Mr. Truman's statement that his spending proposals present a minimum level below which our responsibilities will not permit us to go.

It is true, as the President points out, that past wars and efforts to prevent another war—or to be prepared to win it if it cannot be prevented—are responsible for more than three-fourths of the expenditures he advocates.

Of each dollar in his proposed budget national defense costs would take 34 cents; international spending, chiefly to help other countries recover and withstand Russian aggression, 16 cents; services and benefits to veterans, 13 cents; interest on the debt, 13 cents. Only 6 cents would go for social welfare, health, and security programs, and 18 cents for all other Federal activities.

And it is true that what Mr. Truman asks for national defense is less than what many military authorities say is essential.

But it is also true that the 6 cents of each Truman budget dollar proposed for social welfare, health, and security programs would account for the spending of about $2,400,000,000 in fiscal 1950, and for more than that in future years. The 18 cents of each Truman budget dollar proposed for "all other" Federal activities would account for the spending of $7,500,000,000.

Those two items total $9,900,000,000—which is more than the entire cost of the Government only 10 years ago, in fiscal 1940. We are sure there is no compelling reason that they should be that large.

Now is the time for Congress to adopt, and observe, a legislative budget of its own, as required by the La Follette-Monroney congressional reorganization law.

First step should be to determine how much the American people can afford to pay for present and new or expanded governmental activities.

Next step should be to fix what the people can afford as a ceiling on appropriations, and to stay within that ceiling.

We believe Mr. Truman's budget would push spending beyond safe limits, and that is no way to insure social welfare, or security, or prosperity, or peace.

The Truman-Democratic Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stupendous Surprise," published in the Birmingham Age-Herald for November 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STUPENDOUS SURPRISE

The surprise and the significance of the Truman-Democratic victory in the presidential election are so stupendous as to overwhelm any human power of immediate, precise, and assured analysis. But certain things are clear and profoundly impressive. The Democratic Party, in the face of intense internal dissension and an apparently strong sentiment for a change in executive control of the Government, has won an astounding and sweeping victory. President Truman, subject to a terrific barrage of criticism, much of which came from within usually Democratic ranks, and widely proclaimed a sure loser, has won a tremendous personal triumph.

The party and its leader have been given a clear and strong mandate by the people. After 2 years of divided control in Washington, the Democrats are once more in full command.

How did that come about? Discussion of that question will proceed for many a year. It is difficult, indeed impossible, to generalize a complete answer. Many factors were influential. But conspicuous considerations immediately present themselves.

This paper, having expressed its continuing faith in the merits and potentialities of the National Democratic Party, nevertheless had come to feel that the sentiment for change and the division in party ranks and the widespread criticism of the President, some of it extreme, were too much for Mr. Truman and the Democrats to overcome.

But Mr. Truman himself never lost hope. One must grant now that there was reason for his proclamations of confidence, that such expressions did not issue merely from political expediency.

Generally, close observers, trying to appraise the outlook objectively, seem to have grossly underestimated the factors favorable to Mr. Truman and the Democrats and to have overestimated those which appeared to assure a Republican victory.

What counted decisively for the Democrats apparently was a continuing lack of faith that the Republican Party and Mr. Dewey gave assurance of a satisfactory dealing with domestic and international problems. Mr. Truman bore down heavily on this contention. He pointed to the Republican attitude on aid to foreign nations, on housing, on inflationary dangers. He upheld vigorously the Democratic record on labor and farm legislation. The upswell of response is the most outstanding of the factors contributing to his victory.

The record of the Eightieth Congress, vulnerable in important respects and subjected to an unrelenting, hammering attack by Mr. Truman, had much to do with producing the result. The President was resolved that the people should not overlook these shortcomings. He drove hard in his attack and he made great headway with it. The 1946 election resulted from a healthful reaction against certain extremes of the New Deal administrations, but the Republicans, tending toward power-drunkenness after long exclusion from control, went too far. Tuesday's election was in part a counterreaction to such extremism.

Against the sharp denunciation of the President's own record, there was evidently a growing sympathy for him as an underdog candidate, an accelerating response to his aggressive campaigning.

On the other hand, Governor Dewey did not call forth a great popular enthusiasm. His emphasis—and that of Governor Warren—on unity was admirable in spirit but many voters must have felt that his campaign and his party failed to provide adequate specific assurances for the future respecting matters of deep concern to them.

One of the remarkable aspects of the result is presented by the number of Americans who made independent decisions for themselves despite the strongly dominant expressions of sentiment that a Dewey victory was virtually certain. Whether or not one agrees with those who in this spirit decided for Mr. Truman and the Democratic Party, such independence commands high respect and is refreshing and heartening as a manifestation of the free American spirit.

With the Democrats taking over control of both executive and legislative branches of the Government, after a campaign of much bitterness and grave concern; with the Nation and the world still confronting urgent and complex problems of tremendous import and danger, our country faces a new

summons to basic unity and wholehearted patriotic devotion.

The messages of congratulation and good wishes to the President from Governor Dewey and Governor Warren sets a lofty example of the spirit which should govern all Americans.

President Truman has won one of the most extraordinary personal triumphs in American history. The Democratic Party has again been given a very remarkable vote of confidence.

The President, we hope and believe, will be sincerely humbled by the outcome. We believe he will continue trying to give his best service to the Nation. He has limitations. He has made serious mistakes. But we have never doubted his intent, his devotion, his courage. The spirit he showed when he suddenly found the immeasurable responsibilities of the Presidency imposed on him commanded the confidence and admiration of the country. We believe that his true spirit.

Learning much from gruelling experience, growing under the demands of his exalted and powerful office, he faces an opportunity of staggering magnitude.

Of course he should have the good wishes and the support of all our people as he strives to serve us all.

As for the party, instead of the break-up which many felt was threatening it, it has achieved vigorous renewal and is challenged to prove that it merits the confidence which has been expressed in it. That, we are confident, will be its high aim. Good will, magnanimity, moderation, and courageous fidelity to what is in the highest interest of the Nation should be the resolute purpose of us all.

ECA Double-Cross

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "ECA Double-Cross," published in the South Bend Tribune of December 16, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECA DOUBLE-CROSS

The Governments of the Netherlands, Belgium, and the United Kingdom are indicating irritation because the United States Government has decided that they have not been entirely fair in the ECA or Marshall plan period. As beneficiaries of the Marshall plan, they have been and still are asking for and receiving supplies of aluminum and lead from the United States. At the same time they have been buying aluminum in Canada at relatively low prices and reselling it in the United States with the "scrap" label at prices guaranteeing them substantial profits. Lead is classified as an "associated" metal.

From the viewpoint of Americans who are straining if not actually overstraining their own national economy to assist western European nations, this is fantastic and practically intolerable. Spokesmen for the American aluminum industry estimate that the cross hauling of the metal to and fro across the Atlantic is costing American taxpayers about $26,000,000 a year. They estimate also that aluminum users in this country are paying a large annual premium because of the effect on the domestic market and supply of the diversion of metal to the purportedly needy European countries. Ironically the Europeans are said to be evading the American tariff levies on their exports of aluminum and associated metal to the United States by classifying the shipped metal as scrap.

No matter what fine diplomatic explanations are contrived, nobody can convince intelligent Americans that this is not fundamentally a form of double-crossing. It has been going on for many months. The United States Government could and should have taken corrective steps earlier this year. Only now, apparently because the ECA set-up will have to run the congressional gantlet before next July 1, first because an ECA deficiency appropriation is to be requested and, second, because Congress must vote an appropriation for the full 1948–49 fiscal year, the executive department in Washington is making an issue of the foreign double-crossing.

The public in this country, for the most part, has reconciled itself to the Economic Cooperation Administration system on the assumption that it is a vital necessity. The public, however, is made resentful by evidence that the good will, honesty, and high spirit of the system are confined to the United States. No doubt this aluminum-lead revelation, whether or not complete correction is forced in the meantime, will cause much discussion in Congress. The legislators would be derelict if they ignored it.

The Christian in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued November 21, 1948, by the bishops of the United States:

THE CHRISTIAN IN ACTION

Human life centers in God. The failure to center life in God is secularism—which, as we pointed out last year, is the most deadly menace to our Christian and American way of living. We shall not successfully combat this evil merely by defining and condemning it. Constructive effort is called for to counteract this corrosive influence in every phase of life where individual attitudes are a determining factor—in the home, in the school, at work, and in civil polity. For as man is, so ultimately are all the institutions of human society.

To combat secularism, the individual Christian must get the full vision of Christian truth. It is not divisible. One cannot pick and choose from it. Either it is accepted as a whole or it counts for little in real life. When the Christian does get this full vision, he becomes enthusiastic in trying to share it with the world about him. It is a wonderful vision which gives new meaning to human life and an impelling urge to selfless action. The sorry fact is that many, very many Christians, see this vision only dimly and vaguely and miss its impact on reality. They hold themselves to be Christians and are accepted as Christians, but they have never been thrilled by the glory of the truth of Christ in action. By their apathy they actually abet those who work for destruction and chaos. They criticize and even deplore the decay of morality and the spread of corruption in public life, but they feel no obligation to do anything about it. They simply do not realize that the great wonder of divine love is that it brings the divine into human life and that godliness in living is giving self to God. The great Christian paradox is that to find you must lose, to get you must give. Much of the confusion and chaos about us is attributable more directly to the inaction of Christians than to the effectiveness of the feverish efforts of the destroyers. The destroyers are definitely a minority, and yet the work of destruction goes on. The crisis is at hand. Today every Christian must face the full Christian vision and with no thought of compromise must seek vigorously to live it. Every day he must ask himself: What am I doing to build a Christian world? No matter what his condition or state, there is much that he can do. The reconstruction must start with the individual. He must be vigorously Christian in thought and in action—in the home, in the training of his children, in his office or workshop, and in his community.

RELIGION IN THE HOME

In the full Christian vision, there is the divine ideal of the home—the basic social institution. It is not enough to profess the Christian truths of the stability and sanctity of the marriage bond and to keep in mind the purposes of marriage. The Christian must make his home holy. It remained for modern history to record the first experiment in secularizing the home, an experiment which is at the root of so many of our greatest social evils. The Christian home must realize the Christian ideal. The whole atmosphere of the home must be impregnated with genuine Christian living. The domestic virtues must be practiced, and family prayer made a daily exercise. It is in the home that the children learn their responsibility to God and in this responsibility their duty to others. The home is the child's first school, in which he is taught to make the vision of Christian truth the inspiration of all living. We strongly commend organized effort to make the home more truly Christian. Our Catholic Family Life Bureau plans and offers programs which make for a veritable apostolate of the Catholic home. It is gratifying to see the use that is being made of these programs by our Catholic lay organizations and the spread of this work in our dioceses. These activities serve as a powerful antidote to the venom of secularism and withstand its withering effect on piety and virtue in the American home. All of us are familiar with the problems which the family faces in our complex and maladjusted society. In trying to solve these problems we must not compromise our Christian principles. The solution of these problems is only a part of the solution of the wider social problems of our day. To do their part, our homes must be thoroughly Christian and must let the glory of the full vision of Christian truth illumine them.

RELIGION IN EDUCATION

We know the sacrifices made by our people to educate their children in schools in which the "superabundant wisdom" is the gospel of Christ. Catholic parents closely associate their schools with their Christian homes, because they know that human living must center in God. Year after year we are making wider provisions for the education of our Catholic youth. At a time when secularism has captured the minds of very many leaders in education, it is heartening that Catholic parents are becoming more insistent in their demand for schools in which the best standards of instruction and training are integrated in the teaching of religion. It behooves us to see that we enable our schools to work out fully the Christian educational ideal. The field of higher education in particular demands a

wider and more active interest. Our institutions of higher learning are the natural training grounds for Christian leadership. The ranks of Christian leadership will draw recruits largely from the undergraduate schools, but these ranks will not be filled without the Christian scholars who are formed in graduate schools. Perhaps much of the success of the secularist is due to the fact that the number of excellent Christian scholars is inadequate for the needs of our times. We ask a deeper appreciation of the contribution our institutions of higher learning are making to a Christian reconstruction of society, and we urge a more generous support of their work. For if we as Christians are to do our part in restoring order to a chaotic world, Christ must be the Master in our classrooms and lecture halls and the Director of our research projects.

RELIGION AND ECONOMIC LIFE

Christian principles should be put into action in economic life. It is not enough to find fault with the way our economic system is working. Positive, constructive thought and action are needed.

The secularist solutions proposed by eighteenth century individualism or twentieth century statism issue either in perpetual conflict or deadening repression. Christian social principles, rooted in the moral law, call insistently for cooperation not conflict, for freedom not repression in the development of economic activity. Cooperation must be organized—organized for the common good; freedom must be ordered—ordered for the common good. Today we have labor partly organized, but chiefly for its own interests. We have capital or management organized, possibly on a larger scale, but again chiefly for its own interests. What we urgently need, in the Christian view of social order, is the free organization of capital and labor in permanent agencies of cooperation for the common good. To insure that this organization does not lose sight of the common good, government as the responsible custodian of the public interest should have a part in it. But its part should be to stimulate, to guide, to restrain, not to dominate. This is perfectly in line with our Federal Constitution which empowers Government not only "to establish justice" but also to promote the general welfare.

Catholic social philosophy has a constructive program for this organic development of economic life. Pope Pius XI, rounding out the social principles formulated by Leo XIII, laid down the broad outlines of this program 17 years ago. In line with that constructive program we advocate freely organized cooperation between the accredited representatives of capital and labor in each industry and in the economy as a whole under the supervision but not the control of government. The agencies of this freely organized cooperation have been called by various names: occupational groups, vocational groups, or more recently industry councils. American Catholic students of the social encyclicals have expressed their preference for the name "industry councils" to designate the basic organs of a Christian and American type of economic democracy into which they would like to see our economic system progressively evolve. This evolution can come only as the fruit of painstaking study and effort to safeguard, in justice and charity, the rightful interests of property and the rightful interests of labor in the pursuit of the dominant interest of all, which is the common good.

Such a constructive program of social order seems to us to be the answer to the questionings of high-minded leaders of industry and to the explicit proposals of sound and responsible leaders of organized labor. We bespeak for it in these critical times dispassionate consideration and calm, open discussion in an atmosphere of good will, and in a disposition to seek solutions by agreement rather than by force, whether political or economic. We call upon men of religious faith and principle, both in management and labor, to take the lead in working out and applying, gradually if need be, a constructive social program of this type. For the moral and social ideals which it would realize are the heritage.

RELIGION AND CITIZENSHIP

The inroads of secularism in civil life are a challenge to the Christian citizen—and indeed to every citizen with definite religious convictions. The essential connection between religion and good citizenship is deep in our American tradition. Those who took the lead in establishing our independence and framing our Constitution were firm and explicit in the conviction that religion and morality are the strong supports of national well-being, that national morality cannot long prevail in the absence of religious principle, and that impartial encouragement of religious influence on its citizens is a proper and practical function of good government. This American tradition clearly envisioned the school as the meeting place of these helpful interacting influences. The third article of the Northwest Ordinance passed by Congress in 1787, reenacted in 1790, and included in the constitutions of many States enjoins: Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good citizenship and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged. This is our authentic American tradition on the philosophy of education for citizenship.

In the field of law our history reveals the same fundamental connection between religion and citizenship. It is through law that Government exercises control over its citizens for the common good and establishes a balance between their rights and duties. The American concept of Government and law started with the recognition that man's inalienable rights—which it is the function of Government to protect—derive from God, his Creator. It thus bases human law, which deals with man's rights and his correlative duties in society, on foundations that are definitely religious, on principles that emerge from the definite view of man as a creature of God. This view of man anchors human law to the natural law, which is the moral law of God made clear to us through the judgments of human reason and the dictates of conscience. The natural law, as an outstanding modern legal commentator has written, "is binding over all the globe, in all countries and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this." Thus human law is essentially an ordinance of reason, not merely a dictate of will on the part of the state. In our authentic American tradition this is the accepted philosophy of law.

On this basically religious tradition concerning the preparation of the citizen through education and the direction of the citizen through law, secularism has in the past century exercised a corrosive influence. It has banned religion from tax-supported education and is now bent on destroying all cooperation between government and organized religion in the training of our future citizens. It has undermined the religious foundations of law in the minds of many men in the legal profession and has predisposed them to accept the legalistic tyranny of the omnipotent state. It has cleverly exploited, to the detriment of religion and good citizenship, the delicate problem of cooperation between church and state in a country of divided religious allegiance. That concrete problem, delicate as it is, can, without sacrific of principle, be solved in a practical way when good will and a spirit of fairness prevail. Authoritative Catholic teaching on the relations between church and state, as set forth in papal encyclicals and in the treatises of recognized writers on ecclesiastical law, not only states clearly what these relations should normally be under ideal conditions, but also indicates to what extent the Catholic Church can adapt herself to the particular conditions that may obtain in different countries. Examining, in the full perspective of that teaching, the position which those who founded our Nation and framed its basic law took on the problem of church-state relations in our own country, we find that the first amendment to our Constitution solved that problem in a way that was typically American in its practical recognition of existing conditions and its evident desire to be fair to all citizens of whatever religious faith. To one who knows something of history and law, the meaning of the first amendment is clear enough from its own words: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or forbidding the free exercise thereof." The meaning is even clearer in the records of the Congress that enacted it. Then, and throughout English and Colonial history, an "establishment of religion" meant the setting up by law of an official church which would receive from the government favors not equally accorded to others in the cooperation between government and religion—which was simply taken for granted in our country at that time and has, in many ways, continued to this day. Under the first amendment, the Federal Government could not extend this type of preferential treatment to one religion as against another, nor could it compel or forbid any State to do so. If this practical policy be described by the loose metaphor "a wall of separation between church and state," that term must be understood in a definite and typically American sense. It would be an utter distortion of American history and law to make that practical policy involve the indifference to religion and the exclusion of cooperation between religion and government implied in the term "separation of church and state" as it has become the shibboleth of doctrinaire secularism.

Within the past 2 years secularism has scored unprecedented victories in its opposition to governmental encouragement of religious and moral training, even where no preferential treatment of one religion over another is involved. In two recent cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has adopted an entirely novel and ominously extensive interpretation of the "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment. This interpretation would bar any cooperation between government and organized religion which would aid religion, even where no discrimination between religious bodies is in question. This reading of the first amendment, as a group of non-Catholic religious leaders recently noted, will endanger "forms of cooperation between church and state which have been taken for granted by the American people," and "greatly accelerate the trend toward the secularization of our culture."

Reluctant as we are to criticize our supreme judicial tribunal, we cannot but observe that when the members of that tribunal write long and varying opinions in handing down a decision, they must expect that intelligent citizens of a democracy will study and appraise these opinions. The Journal of the American Bar Association, in a critical analysis of one of the cases in question, pertinently remarks: "The traditionally religious sanctions of our laws and government are challenged by a judicial propensity which deserves the careful thought and study of lawyers and people."

Lawyers trained in the American tradition of law will be amazed to find that in the McCollum case the majority opinions pay scant attention to logic, history, or accepted norms of legal interpretation. Logic would

demand that what is less clear be defined by what is more clear. In the present instance we find just the reverse. The carefully chiselled phrases of the first amendment are defined by the misleading metaphor "the wall of separation between church and state." This metaphor of Jefferson specifies nothing except that there shall be no "established church," no state religion. All the rest of its content depends on the letter of the law that sets it up and can in the concrete imply anything from the impartial cooperation between government and free religious bodies (as in Holland and traditionally in our own country) all the way down to bitter persecution of religion (as in France at the turn of the century). As was pointedly remarked in a dissenting opinion: "A rule of law cannot be drawn from a metaphor."

A glance at the history of Jefferson's own life and work would have served as a warning against the broad and devastating application of his "wall of separation" metaphor that we find in this case. The expression first appears in a letter written by Jefferson in 1802 and, significantly enough, in a context that makes it refer to the "free exercise of religion" clause rather than to the "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment. Twenty years later Jefferson clearly showed in action that his concept of "separation of church and state" was far different from the concept of those who now appeal to his metaphor as a norm of interpretation. As the rector of the State University of Virginia, Jefferson proposed a system of cooperation between the various religious groups and the university which goes far beyond anything under consideration in the case at hand. And Mr. Madison, who had proposed the first amendment and who led in carrying it through to enactment by Congress, was one of the visitors of the University of Virginia who approved Jefferson's plan.

Even one who is not a lawyer would expect to find in the opinion of the Court some discussion of what was in the minds of the Members of Congress when they framed and adopted the first amendment. For it would seem that the intent of the legislator should be of capital importance in interpreting any law when a doubt is raised as to the objective meaning of the words in which it is framed. In regard to the establishment of religion clause, there is no doubt of the intent of the legislator. It is clear in the record of the Congress that framed it and of the State legislatures that ratified it. To them it meant no official church for the country as a whole, no preferment of one religion over another by the Federal Government—and at the same time no interference by the Federal Government in the church-state relations of the individual States.

The opinion of the court advances no reason for disregarding the mind of the legislator. But that reason is discernible in a concurring opinion adhered to by four of the nine Judges. There we see clearly the determining influence of secularist theories of public education—and possibly of law. One cannot but remark that if this secularist influence is to prevail in our Government and its institutions, such a result should in candor and logic and law be achieved by legislation adopted after full popular discussion, and not by the judicial procedure of an ideological interpretation of our Constitution.

We, therefore, hope and pray that the novel interpretation of the first amendment recently adopted by the Supreme Court will in due process be revised. To that end we shall peacefully, patiently, and perseveringly work. We feel with deep conviction that for the sake of both good citizenship and religion there should be a reaffirmation of our original American tradition of free cooperation between government and religious bodies—cooperation involving no special privilege to any group and no restriction on the religious liberty of any citizen. We solemnly disclaim any intent or desire to alter this prudent and fair American policy of government in dealing with the delicate problems that have their source in the divided religious allegiance of our citizens. We call upon our Catholic people to seek in their faith an inspiration and a guide in making an informed contribution to good citizenship. We urge members of the legal profession in particular to develop and apply their special competence in this field. We stand ready to cooperate in fairness and charity with all who believe in God and are devoted to freedom under God to avert the impending danger to a judicial establishment of secularism that would ban God from public life. For secularism is threatening the religious foundations of our national life and preparing the way for the advent of the omnipotent state.

(Statement issued November 21, 1948, by the bishops of the United States and signed in their names by the members of the administrative board, National Catholic Welfare Conference: Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Edward Cardinal Mooney, Archbishop of Detroit; Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago; Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York; Francis P. Keough, Archbishop of Baltimore; John T. McNicholas, O. P., Archbishop of Cincinnati; Robert E. Lucey, Archbishop of San Antonio; Richard J. Cushing, Archbishop of Boston; Joseph E. Ritter, Archbishop of St. Louis; John Mark Gannon, Bishop of Erie; John F. Noll, Bishop of Fort Wayne; Emmet M. Walsh, Bishop of Charleston; Karl J. Alter, Bishop of Toledo; Michael J. Ready, Bishop of Columbus.)

The Man Who Fights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Man Who Fights", appearing in the Arkansas Gazette, of Little Rock, Ark., for November 6, 1948.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MAN WHO FIGHTS

Just as the "Message to Garcia" furnished an inspiring example of asking no questions, raising no difficulties, but going on with the mission, so the fight that Harry S. Truman made for his election as president was an inspiring example of unfaltering courage and unflinching resolution.

The prospects and the predictions were enough to discourage any man, enough to take the starch out of any candidate, to shake his will and make his words belie his true belief as to his chances. But Mr. Truman was adamant against the dismal and the despairing. He was unmoved by desertions in high places and impervious to the insidious needles of doubt and pessimism. He bounced and bounded with joyful enthusiasm in the face of the most widespread assumption that his defeat was certain. It was not alone the partisan spokesmen who gave him no chance. The political poll takers' figures showed him defeated, and sincerely impartial observers and commentators were convinced that nothing short of a miracle could save him.

But instead of letting himself be sunk by succumbing to the idea that he had been nominated by the Philadelphia convention as the leader of a lost cause, he came out fighting and lifted up the Democratic delegates into sorely needed enthusiasm. Then he swung through the country with unbeatable optimism and with confidence and defiance. There must have been millions of people who were not going to vote for him, or people who felt that their faithful votes were going to be thrown away, who still admired his indomitable fighting spirit. If he had for a moment faltered, he would have left limp and downcast many members of his own party who stood by him through the campaign with little or no hope that he could be elected.

The way this Presidential election was won is the way many a battle has been won in war. Some military leader has refused to count odds, has stood firm against conventional judgment of the situation, has struck fire from cold ashes, and laid on the attack with all his army had in it.

The lesson has been taught again that has been taught so many times in human experience, from mighty conflicts on the field of battle to football fields, from beds of serious illness to lesser things—the battle is not lost until it is over. And the man who has won at last against forces that seemed remorselessly to doom him to failure has new confidence in his own star of fortune and new respect and admiration from others—as Harry S. Truman is now fairly entitled to have.

Statement of the University Bank of Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by the University Bank, of Kansas City, Mo.:

GUARD US AGAINST THOSE THAT WOULD DESTROY OUR LIBERTY AND FREEDOM

(Statement of the University Bank, Kansas City, Mo.)

"GIMME" CHECKS

That was the answer! Santa Claus could not be shot so close to Christmas. The labor racketeers, now so gleefully frothing in anticipation of the rescinding of the Taft-Hartley law, are grasping with alacrity all credit for Truman's election, even in the face of failing miserably in carrying such highly industrialized States as Pennsylvania, Michigan, and others, though up in Republican Iowa, where the tall corn grows, and in similar agricultural States, where the "gimme" checks have been flowing for years, the story was different. But, or, how sad will this fantastic vote-buying scheme prove to be as our cycle of bankruptcy unfolds!

In proof of the potency of these "gimme" checks, allow me to give you an example. I said to an old friend who owns hundreds of acres of choice farm land: "Jim, you are well to do and should not accept these gratuitous checks from your Government that is so deeply in debt. Instead you should be setting an example of integrity. No man with a good farm should be paid money that is leaving a debt on unborn children."

His reply: "Rolla you are just a d—— —— fool. The New Deal is putting out

this money, and if any of it is ever paid back I will have to help do it, so I am taking it."

Further, the farmers like those "gimme" checks, and you are never going to be able to take them away. It is like a fellow getting a pension that he does not deserve; after receiving it for awhile he is not going to give it up.

There is nothing more vital or necessary than the education and encouragement by the Government of sound soil conservation, but to pay a farmer to improve his own soil is political demagoguery.

It is the billions upon billions that we are shipping abroad, representing both the fruits of labor and our natural resources, which has made everything scarce and high at home, thus creating a synthetic prosperity. This continuation of our inflation has given our unthinking masses more money to spend than they have ever known before, producing an unnatural economic condition. They do not realize where this money is coming from and that we all will be punished for this waste in the future as they are not concerned about the solvency of their Government; it simply means prosperity to them now.

So it was this artificial prosperity of the present time that elected Truman. It is a serious reflection upon the economic intelligence of our people and is only the continuation of Roosevelt's vote-buying schemes, with additional promises of new and fantastic spending, more Marxist philosophies, subterfuges, paternalism, and bureaucacy.

The theory of socialism always subtracts, and never adds, to the wealth of a nation. Socialism and communism spring from the same seed. The difference is that socialism represents the transition period between private ownership and communism, and its followers increase only during the confiscation of private accumulations. When poverty seeks its level for all, communism follows. This has been the history in the Old World. A perfect example is Russia, where human freedom has been lost and the people are slaves of the state, without even the right of emigration.

If socialism is such a utopia why are England, France, and other countries pleading with this Nation of private enterprise for help? And if our demagogues continue in power how long will it be before we will be in the same condition as they?

The New Dealers have been using the poison of socialism for 16 years in their frenzy to gain the votes of that class demanding something for nothing, though, like oil and water, it cannot mix with the principles of a government founded, as was ours, upon individual responsibility and, in the end, will destroy man's most precious heritage—human liberty and the private ownership of property.

The more involved nations become financially the more hysterical their people and politicians become in their desires to climb on the back of the government. The deeper the morass the greater the demands for increased salaries, pensions, price control, guaranteed jobs and wages, and socialized medicine and dental care. Like a child looks to its parent, they demand Federal aid for all the necessities of life, including guaranteed security.

And the tragedy is that they will vote for the demagogues that promise them the most. Differing from the Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock and our pioneers who blazed the trails that made possible this great Nation, they are now treading the pride of their ancestors in the mire of iniquity. Our New Dealers have so poisoned the minds of our people that they can't realize that liberty and freedom specifically have but one price tag, and that is individual responsibility.

If one doubts this statement, look at England; once the proudest nation in the world, its integrity unquestionable, now but a mendicant nation, constantly begging without a thought of repaying her obligations, yet she is continuously increasing her socializations. Another perfect example of this transition period.

Lord Macaulay, that great economist of his day, speaking of our form of government, said we were "all sail and no anchor," implying the Government of England was on a sounder basis. Little did he realize that bankruptcy would come to his beloved England first, though, alas, I fear she will not be for long alone in these days of economic snares and delusions.

Everyone who thinks at all knows that these vote-buying schemes will eventually bankrupt this Nation for the reason there simply is not enough of our people with that old pioneer pride, who pay their own way and stand upon their own feet, to continue carrying the financial burdens of all the world together with the demands of our increasing class of "gimme's" in our own country. The results are inevitable.

"The power to tax is the power to destroy." Never were truer words uttered by mortal man nor a time when they need to be so harkened to and indelibly impressed upon the minds of the American people. The hundreds of billions we have squandered in the past few years now remain a mortgage upon the lives of unborn generations. This waste and its inflation should have produced some of the prosperity the demagogues brag about. But these debts and interest are a fixed liability upon the backs of our taxpayers, and if the New Dealers keep the demagogic promises they made in their desperation to win, it is impossible to imagine what the necessary increases in our taxes will be on top of our present confiscatory rates.

Granting that this country has been wonderfully blessed in natural resources, which we have been wasting, we have been piling up a bonded debt, a currency-inflated debt, and unknown contingent debts, totaling, no doubt, over $500,000,000,000. This means that our spending in the past 15 years has been astronomical. This economic camouflage cannot last, for somewhere along the line there is bound to be a breaking point. There will be no money in Europe to buy our surplus products, and our people, now geared to this artificial spending, prices, and wages, and stuffed full as they are about the "abundant life," and so forth, will have a rude awakening. What then? Just history repeating itself. The unsound promises of oily tongued demagogues have bankrupted another country.

Harry Truman's entire success in life is due to machine politics. His affiliation with the corrupt, ruthless Pendergast machine made him a Senator, and as a rubber-stamp follower of Roosevelt he is now President. His political code is of machine quality and more precious to his way of thinking than the preservation of this Nation. Like others unsuccessful in business but highly successful in politics, he has little respect for the successful businessman because everything that comes first with him is wrapped up in politics. This background and record of Truman should be a solemn warning to all businessmen and patriotic Americans.

Practically every law passed under the New Deal was a vote-buying scheme and is proving to be gradually bankrupting this Nation; no doubt with the approval of Moscow, which is bleeding us white with the expense of its cold war.

If it were not for the fact that our country needed, as never before, a thorough housecleaning and that far more conservative men would have been elected on the Republican ticket, Dewey personally got what was coming to him for the millions of "gimme's," now receiving billions in gratuitous checks, were in no mood to vote for an imitation promiser after enjoying a sure thing for so many years, coming from the billions squandered and the taxing of literally everything but the air we breathe.

What Dewey grossly underestimated was the millions of patriotic citizens who read lightly and know little about economics but whose votes he could have received if he had crusaded earnestly, simply by explaining the true facts of the New Deal's economics, how great is the danger of our national debt and our present inflated currency, and how necessary it is to restore our Government to solvency.

I still have enough faith that if our people realized the truth of what has really happened to our country they would refuse to travel further on the road to socialism and slavery for it is the serious responsibility of every parent to protect the future freedom of his children.

Truman laid himself wide open with rank, reckless, and bankrupting promises, and Dewey failed to explain the inevitable results if those promises are kept. Honor and sound principles were all on his side, but he failed to take a militant stand and fight for the right with convincing proofs, which he could so easily have done.

The terms "Democrat" and "Republican" are today misnomers. The Democratic Party is now under the control of the Socialists, "gimme's," and racketeers. And all the Republican label does is to separate the good people of the North from those of the South, yet both believing, as did our founding fathers, in human liberty, States' rights, and a solvent, constitutional form of government. So why not the Constitutional Party, uniting our virile citizens instead of allowing only a name to separate us?

With hope that springs eternal, though the hour be late, with your prayer and mine, encourage our people to restore the pride and integrity of our pioneer ancestors. Scorn the demagogue and his promises of handouts unearned. Be proud to choose the hard right road instead of the easier wrong road. Encourage individual responsibility and make sacred charity for all those in need. Guard us against those that would destroy our liberty and freedom, and help us sweep back this tide of poisoned thinking, for we want no nursemaid state that would enslave us and spoon us out our food.

J. R. BREED.

Any man whose allegiance to Moscow is more sacred than to his native land is not a citizen. If he refuses to answer with pride that he is not a Communist, he has convicted himself. He should be given 30 days to leave this country, never to return, or shot like a spy, which he is.

J. R. BREED.

SOMETHING IS WRONG

When we increase salaries instead of cutting debts; when consumers are promised cheaper food and farmers higher prices; when the canons of government show no desire to economize; when citizens are promised low-priced houses and unions higher wages; when the masses say, "What do we care about the debt?"; when midgets, mental and economic, are in the seats of the mighty; when people are encouraged to desire something for nothing; when politicians assume the power to fix wages and hours of work; when unions are given a monopoly and politicians surrender to their power; when any method other than economy and sacrifice is used to restore financial soundness; when an American boy is forced to join a union to have the right to work; when mob psychology is for it; when the farmer votes the same political ticket as the labor racketeer; when Senators and Representatives vote themselves pensions; when the taxpayer is considered a sucker and the forgotten man; when governments encourage 100-percent loans on inflated prices, with grief to follow for all; when magic replaces solvent government and the science of simple arithmetic; when people are paid for not working; when politicians are made

custodians of insurance funds (social security); when a country, billions upon billions in debt, can only work 40 hours a week; when any excuse other than squandering is given as a cause of inflation; when the financial judgments of human parasites control a nation; when "gimme" checks soothe the conscience and integrity of men; when the intelligent class lose the financial control of a nation; when Communists are allowed to remain citizens; when parlor pinks call themselves Democrats; when the indolent are promised the abundant life and given pensions; when industry and frugality cease to be the foundation of good government; when taxes of one State are used to build Moscow apartments in another; when people are encouraged to look for Government doles in their old age; when the bankrupting abilities of New Dealers are rewarded with higher salaries; when men willingly trade freedom for socialism; when a government, hundreds of billions in debt, promises social security; when the votes of the indolent are more sought after than those of the diligent; when there is no fear of billions of debts; when your own Government competes with private business yet exists on its taxes; when a government encourages cooperative associations yet lives from the taxes of private business; when farm products are sky high yet must be subsidized; when so-called social security funds are used for current expenses; when men that have been failures in private life are elected Presidents; when the earning power of the dollar is artificially made nearly worthless; when our Post Office Department, a monopoly, loses 300 million dollars in 1947 and 500 million in 1948, while paying no interest or taxes, thus proving socialism in action; when a man owning a good farm is subsidized but little children are encouraged to buy Government bonds; when citizens, cities, and States consider Federal aid manna from heaven instead of their taxes returned at a discount; when Communists call themselves Democrats; when so-called Democrats lead us step by step in the direction of a totalitarian state; when we send billions to the four winds of the world and increase our "gimme's" at home; when politicians become auctioneers of something for nothing instead of statesmen; when the budget jumps from 5 billion to 40 billion in a few years; when raw gold brings $40 an ounce in America and $100 an ounce in Europe; when a political party that has passed laws or violated these truisms is again reelected; when the whole world has gone crazy; something must be wrong. J. R. B.

Country Almanac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Country Almanac of December 1948 by A. B. Genung, Freeville, N. Y.:

HINDSIGHT

We certainly don't know much about politics. Neither does anyone else.

Our Democratic friends fancy that the people voted for Mr. Truman. What they voted for was perpetual Christmas. We know now that the Democrats could have elected Charlie McCarthy this time had he been put up. Those Corn Belt rugged individualists showed how ruggedly they were for high incomes and fat subsidies, the factory workers for fantastically high wages, and the innumerable hand-outs that they have come to expect from the New Deal. After all, we're all human.

This is not to disparage Mr. Truman's fighting spirit. He showed himself a dead-game fighter and we all admire that, notwithstanding that his campaign was the lowest exhibition of demagoguery since Andrew Johnson. As a human sort of person, he shows up well in victory, too. But we think that the Truman political saga is subject to about 98-percent discount.

Incidentally Mr. Dewey shows up equally well in defeat, which is much harder. Whatever his errors, he is a game loser and maintains the priceless American tradition of sportsmanship in elections.

Actually the narrow Truman victory was not the significant thing about this election at all. He was incidental, a chip riding the wave. The really impressive thing was the landslide in Congress and in State governorships. It was in these local sweeps that the full strength of New Dealism showed itself.

Labor and farmers have had a long draught out of the inflationary jug, the socialistic jug that fills itself from capital and pours out its libations to labor. They want more. They voted for a continuation of the inflationary pattern, with all that it implies, and against deflation, which means paying the bills. They voted to postpone the day of reckoning—they hope. Incidentally a lot of housewives voted for artificial lids on the high cost of living.

The total vote was surprisingly small. Only three times in a hundred years has a candidate been elected by as small a percentage of the electoral vote as was Mr. Truman. The New Dealers won, in a sense, by default. Labor got out its vote. Then there's always the South, which votes solely by prejudice, most of it safely in pocket even this time. A lot of fatuous Republicans, listening to that slumber song of the pollsters, didn't bother to vote. And that was that.

The fundamental issue in this country was never presented to the people by Mr. Dewey. That is statism, the issue of individual liberty and free enterprise versus the authoritarian, socialistics of the New Deal. Mr. Dewey chose again, as he did once before, to soft-pedal that basic issue, and again it availed him nothing. The thinking people the people who might have arisen to a real crusade on that ground, were lulled and many of them did not bother to vote. Well, they have no kick coming.

That Mr. Truman and his new Congress will push us further along the socialistic road is certain. Tax policies, Federal spending, controls, repressive tactics against the corporations, and many other fields will reflect it. As for economy in Washington—what a joke!

But there are a couple of other certainties in the picture, too. One is that Mr. Truman will make mistakes. He can be depended upon to do that. The other is that he and his New Dealers will have the Big Depression to handle. Wait and see.

A ME-TOO PARTY?

A group of "Young Turks" are said to be trying to grab Republican leadership with a view to "liberalizing" that party, making it "more responsive to the will of the people." This is to be expected—and discounted. Apparently they are more interested in personal and partisan maneuvering than in principles.

It would be well to recall that the term Liberal, which has been brazenly misused in this country for 16 years, derives from the word Liberty. If it stands for anything, it means freedom, free enterprise, free markets, free men. What it does not mean is this collection of controls, political coercions, and bureaucratic management which has been slowly imposed upon us behind the benign whiskers of a Santa Claus system. It has given the people a wonderful spree and the bills have not yet been presented. This was a rich country and could put a lot on the cuff.

If these Young Turks want a liberal Republican Party, let them start fighting for the economic freedoms that are so rapidly passing out of our hands.

But is that what they want? Rather, what they seem to want is to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. They apparently want to get in on the system of being liberal with other people's money; what they are seeking, by implication, is more sponsorship of this social servility system, more hand-outs for labor, farmers, pensioners, and so on, more forced redistribution of the national income to the largest pressure groups. What their talk boils down to is, in the last analysis, virtual abandonment of the two-party system.

What reason is there to suppose that Republicans will vote for a watered-down imitation of the New Deal? Why should they when, if so minded, it's just exactly as easy for them to vote for the real thing—as a lot of them did last month. In 1944 Dewey actually outbid Roosevelt at every hand of the game, and how many votes did it impress?

What would be stimulating right now would be to see the Republican leaders taking their licking like men, stiffening their backbones, and planting more firmly the banner of real liberalism, liberty, for a better fight next time. It is our opinion that the New Deal has a well established corner on socialistic offerings to this country; that no leftists are going to be weaned away from that camp by any amount of Republican pandering; that the country needs and will support a forthright, free enterprise party; and that over the long pull it will win as many elections as the radicals who thrive by taking money away from the thrifty and giving it to importuning pressure groups.

It is our quaint notion that more than half the people of this country are sufficiently thoughtful and intelligent to demand a sound economic and social system, once they become concerned enough to assert themselves. A feather would have tipped the scales even in this time of inflationary fever. This Santa Claus phase in America is already pretty well along on its road to trouble. When the tide turns, a more solvent party will inherit power and keep it for a full generation. We personally want no stock whatever in a Republican leadership that thinks it can put on a dab of pink rouge and entice the boilermakers' union.

HAVE WE MANAGED PRICE LEVEL?

Inflation is a man-made thing. The Government can inflate credit and the total money supply of the country just as easily as a child can blow up a toy balloon; can and has. It has tripled the money supply in the last 10 years, from $36,000,000,000 to $110,000,000,000. It borrowed some $275,000,000,000, mostly from the banks, to finance the New Deal and then the war, giving the banks a trainload of bonds to play with. What we then had was the most gigantic balloon of expanded currency and credit ever seen in any solvent nation.

The retail price level went up 74 percent.

After the war the Government tried, very cautiously, the experiment of letting a little gas out of the bag. Over a period of about a year and a half, beginning in latter 1946, it reduced the public debt some $25,000,000,000.

That experiment nearly drove the experimenters into a nervous break-down. Last February they saw prices of farm products along with the stock market, always the most sensitive barometers, start down the toboggan. Sensing how the wind blew, buyers began to lay off textiles, clothing, shoes, rubber

goods, furniture, radios, and what not, and as summer wore on a string of these consumer goods began to slide off, too.

Here was a fine kettle of fish for an administration facing an uphill election fight: deflation and falling prices. Unemployment just around the corner. Union leaders and farm leaders hot-footing it to Washington, quoting the prophets and proverbs. Hell to pay.

To make a long story short, the Treasury and a divided but acquiescent Reserve Board turned off the valve and stopped the balloon from losing any more gas. The Marshall plan and defense plans and cold war and European relief and a dozen other big spending projects just happened to enlarge the Federal outlay amazingly in early 1948. Retrenchment in Washington just happened to reverse itself and the Government pay roll began taking on people by the hundreds per day. Money poured out to industry and the farmers.

The price level stopped going down.

The balloon began to expand again. New nonfarm mortgages by individuals in the first half of this year $1,800,000,000; new loans insured by FHA first 8 months $2,200,000,000; new borrowings by corporations and public units $6,300,000,000 in first 9 months; all large increases over last year.

Yes, the fire was stoked up and the pot was put back where she'd boil again, with good results for the cook, too.

If the country were operating under a free economy there isn't a doubt that farm products and most soft goods lines and the stock market would be declining. As it is, these commodities are resting on artificial props, while durable goods and wages are being elevated by equally artificial jacks.

Maybe this situation, new in our history, is the long-sought formula for raising ourselves by our bootstraps. At least union labor and the Corn Belt certainly like it, so far. Why shouldn't they? Yea, Lord, give us this day our daily gas, laughing gas.

CAN WASHINGTON CALL THE TUNE?

Summing things up, as we view the prospect from our barn door, we get the impression of the managers of the managed economy running a close race now with the ordinary forces of supply and demand.

If you look at the field of consumers' goods—clothing, textiles, shoes, housefurnishings and so on—you see the market already turned into substantially a buyers' market. The same is true of foods, fibers, and nearly all products of the soil.

If you look at durable and capital goods, steel products, housing, new plant and equipment, it is true that you still see a strong and unsatisfied domestic market; yet even in some of these major lines, activity is slowly tapering off.

It is to Government spending and Government supports that you have to look for the real bullish elements in the picture ahead. Of course the administration is set to spend and spend, subsidies, price supports, internal projects, defense program, new lend-lease, cold war, Marshall plan, operation "Chiang Kai-Rathole."

In short, on one side of the picture ahead stand out the forces of natural restoration and lower prices that should be, and are, appearing at this interval after a great war. The other side shows a labor government committed to holding the whole structure of prices, wages, and costs up at the wartime levels, and taking steps to do just that with its artificial props and stimulants.

Can Atlas hold up the globe, and, if so, for how long? We wonder what would happen if his bonds started to weaken. For we are reminded that the stuff that fills his globe is largely borrowed from the banks, and at low interest rates. What would one little frosty shiver passing over the Government bond market do to that distended balloon?

MENACING SHADOW OF ASIA

Back there east of the Black Sea are one and a half billion people. For a thousand years they have lain in the vast reaches of Asia like a great human sea, dammed back by deserts and mountain ranges, but spilling forth from time to time to overrun Europe in a barbaric tide.

In the year 451 the Huns under Attila, the "Scourge of God" swept westward out of central Asia like a devastating plague, on across the Rhine to the very Atlantic and down into Italy. The bloody battle of Chalons finally turned them back, but all Europe groaned under their savage depredations.

Eight hundred years later another Asiatic tribesman, Genghis Khan, brought all China under his heel and resolved to conquer all the peoples of the then known world. Three quarters of a million Mongols and Tartars marched under his banner as they pressed slowly westward. In their first battle with the Persians they killed 150,000 in 1 day. Those who would oppose them were overwhelmed as by a convulsion of nature. Gibbon relates the sieges and destruction of scorces of cities, dozens of countries, "five centuries have not been sufficient to repair the ravages of 4 years."

From Gengis' harem of 500 women emerged 4 sons who completed their father's destructive work. One of them, Octai, sent his chieftain, Batou, with three-quarters of a million men to invade the west. In 6 years they had completed that mission. They overran modern Russia, Poland, and all central Europe clear to Germany, obliterated the cities, ravaged the lands, harried the people with a fury beyond imagination. After the Battle of Lignitz, for instance, they filled nine sacks with the ears of the slain.

Gibbon tells how they disposed of the inhabitants of each conquered city always in three batches: the able-bodied men butchered, the young women and skilled artisans sold into slavery, the old and useless returned to the ruins of their town and taxed for the privilege of living. Such was the ordinary routine.

"But the most casual provocation, the slightest motive of caprice or convenience, often provoked them to involve a whole people in an indiscriminate massacre; and the ruin of some flourishing cities was executed with such unrelenting perseverance that, according to their own expression, horses might run without stumbling over the ground where a city had once stood. The three great capitals of Khorasan—Maru, Neisabour, and Herat—were destroyed by the armies of Gengis; and the exact account which was taken of the slain amounted to 4,347,000 persons."

A hundred years later Tamerlane was overrunning the west again, another Mongol conqueror of unimaginable ruthlessness. Human life was the cheapest of commodities to him and his horde of barbarians. He might choose to bury alive all the men in a conquered city, as with 4,000 Armenians at Suvas.

"In his camp before Delhi, Tamerlane massacred 100,000 Indian prisoners who had smiled when the army of their countrymen appeared in sight."

Or, as from the people of Ispahan who displeased him, he built "a structure of several lofty towers out of 70,000 human skulls. A similar tax was levied on the revolt of Baghdad, the exact account is stated at 90,000 heads." And so on, to fill volumes.

It is against a present-day reservoir of a quarter of a billion men east of Suez, with a 3,000-year background of that kind, that we must consider the steady Russian consolidation of power in Asia.

Is the potential merely Russia against western Europe? Or could it be the towering shadow of Asia surging up to threaten the entire west once more? We would do well to recall that this is not a fanciful hypothesis merely; it is a thing that has happened repeatedly in past history. In Asia still resides the most ruthless and barbaric power in this world. It is a thing that could obliterate, and several times has all but obliterated, western civilization. It is a thing that force alone can meet.

Veterans' Compensation and Pension Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sam Stavisky, in the current issue of the American Legion Magazine has analyzed all legislation affecting veterans' compensation and pensions, which is very informative and I am sure will be of great interest to every Member of the House. Veterans' benefits are an important part of our congressional work and this article explains in detail just how the veterans are affected:

For the past 3 weeks I've been hacking my way through a vast, dark jungle and have just come out of it alive and kicking. I've been through jungles before, from Guadalcanal up through the Solomons into New Britain and up to Dutch Guinea, and it was jungle every inch of the way.

But, brother, I now must confess that those Pacific blotches were Gardens of Eden compared to this last trek of mine. This was a jungle right here in civilized United States of America, an immense area of mystery, choked with legal jabberwocky, medical abracadabra, and governmental gobbledygook, surrounded by nigh-unscalable mountains of red tape and infested with terrifying swamps of ignorance.

I've been banging my head through that jungle referred to as veterans' compensation and pensions.

I started out eagerly, with a running jump and tripped over a law that had its roots in the Continental Congress. In a little while I became thoroughly lost in the tangled underbrush of laws and regulations that sprang up in the wake of the Civil War. And by the time I caught up with the veterans' benefits of the most recent Eightieth Congress, brother, I was dragging tail.

Think of it. Virtually every one of the 80 Congresses that have met to date have done something or other about the laws dealing with veterans' benefits. Major alterations were made after each war beginning with the Revolution. Government agencies, in carrying out some 300 Federal laws on the subject, have issued thousands of regulations, some contradictory, all subject to various interpretations. Special boards of appeals on veterans' claims have handed down tens of thousands of decisions covering all kinds of cases, circumstances, and conditions.

So, it's not astounding to learn then that few people really know what veterans' compensation and pensions are all about. No person knows it all. He couldn't, and still be human.

And since I'm human, it can be safely assumed that I don't know it all either. But I have been around a bit, talked with the big shots in Washington and the captains in the field, with experts in the Veterans' Administration, in the American Legion, and the other veterans' organizations, and with Joe Veterans and dozens of his comrades of one war or another. I've read laws, statutes,

regulations, codes, manuals, decisions, instructions, guides, circular letters, information bulletins, etc., etc., and found myself talking out of both sides of my mouth like some governmental directives.

Still, I've come out of all this with a few solid facts about compensation and pensions which every veteran ought to know.

I'm not talking about the kind of facts which ought to be filed in the back of your head with the interesting-if-true department. Nor is it the kind of information that will make you a whiz at parlor-party question games.

I'm talking about the kind of facts which put money into the pocket, brother.

(At this point we pause momentarily so that readers interested in money-in-the-pocket can call over the other members of the family to gather round and bend an ear.)

First of all, it would be wise for us to be sure we are all speaking the same language, because the language of compensation and pensions is a thing unto itself.

What do I mean by compensation and pension? Most folks take it for granted that the two words mean the same thing, that is, a monthly check from Uncle Sam. There's just enough half-truth to that opinion to cause a lot of trouble and stir up needless gripes.

So let's get the record straight:

Compensation is the monthly cash benefit paid by Uncle Sam to veterans disabled while serving in the armed forces. It also refers to the monthly cash benefit paid to the dependents of a veteran killed in uniform or who died as a result of a disability incurred in the armed forces. This group of veterans and dependents is known as service-connected.

Pension is a monthly cash benefit paid disabled veterans and the dependents of deceased veterans whose disability or death had nothing to do with the veterans' service in uniform. This group of beneficiaries is known as non-service-connected. The word also refers to a monthly cash payment to veterans of certain wars who reach the age of 62.

So, remember, compensation means service-connection. Pension means non-service-connection.

For example: George Reed was so severely wounded in World War II that under the law he is considered totally disabled and draws $138 a month compensation. His buddy, Jim Blake, came out of the war unscathed, but a year later was so severely burned in an auto accident, that he'll never be able to work again. Jim draws $60 a month pension because he is considered to be permanently and totally disabled.

Reed, the service-connected disabled veteran, gets compensation from a grateful Government to repay him—in part—for the injury or disease he suffered while in uniform and the resulting loss in earning power when he returned to civilian life. In like manner, the widow, or orphans, and dependent parents of a service-connected deceased veteran receive monthly compensation to compensate them—partially—for the loss of their breadwinner.

Note that the monthly compensation is regarded as partial repayment for the loss suffered. Not even the most heartless type of bureaucrat thinks that money can pay for the loss of a limb, for the death of a husband, father, son, or daughter.

Jim Blake's pension is based on another concept of the Government's relationship to its citizen-soldiers. Our Government feels that every war veteran has done something for his country which entitles him to a special consideration when that veteran becomes incapacitated by disease or injury after he leaves the service. So that when Jim lost his ability to earn a living, Uncle Sam granted him a pension to prevent Jim from becoming a charity case. Jim earned his pension for past services rendered in uniform. In the same way, the Government gives a small pension to dependent widows and children of deceased veterans.

If you have been confused and bewildered by definitions of compensation and pension, you are in the majority, brother. It was not until 1946 that Congress wrote a clear-cut definition of the two words. Hitherto, the two terms had been used interchangeably.

The American Legion and other groups had urged Congress to establish the two distinct definitions because the term "pension" has at times been in disrepute due to certain abuses in the system. During the roaring eighties, for example, some politicians freely bartered pensions for votes. Also there was a time when the term "pension attorney" had the same connotation and stigma as "ambulance chaser." The "pension attorney" sought out veterans, and offered to get them Federal pensions. There was a legal $10 fee permitted, but kick-backs were part of the shameful racket.

It is a sad fact that in the past unscrupulous veterans tried to make a gravy train out of the pension system. But they were in a minority.

On the other hand, it has been estimated by experts of the veterans' organizations that many thousands of eligible veterans have never applied for compensation or been granted the proper compensation due them under the law as a right.

These experts say there are probably an additional 1,000,000 veterans of World War II who may be entitled to compensation—yet for one reason or another they have failed to file for compensation, or are drawing less compensation than they rightfully should be getting.

In other words, there may be as many as 1,000,000 missing veterans—missing the opportunity to help make up for loss of earning power sustained in the war.

And you may be one of the missing million.

How could this be?

Well, you don't get your compensation—or pension—automatically. You must file a claim with Veterans' Administration.

There are no exceptions to this statement, because it's the law. Even if you lost an eye in the Battle of the Bulge and all the buddies in your platoon can vouch for it having happened, you still must file a claim. That goes for the dependents of deceased veterans, too. They must file a claim.

Out of the 15,000,000 veterans who participated in World War II, less than one-third have filed claims.

Among the remaining 10,000,000 are thousands of veterans who have just and valid claims, but who have failed to file because of apathy, ignorance, laziness, in some few cases a false sense of pride, or failure to recognize the urgency of filing the claim now.

Approximately 1,670,000 veterans of World War II are drawing compensation. Their average monthly payment is $39.93 (according to latest available figures). This sum is over and above the monthly earnings of these veterans. Even a totally disabled veteran drawing the maximum compensation of $138 a month can hold down a full-time job. Uncle Sam makes it a policy not to penalize disabled veterans who have the courage and enterprise to overcome their service-incurred handicaps.

(For those who like statistics, here are a few worth reading: There are 2,277,000 veterans of all wars and the peacetime armed forces who are today drawing compensation or pensions. There are also 940,000 dependent widows, children, and parents drawing compensation or pensions.

(Average monthly compensation payment for World War I is $54.80, compared to $39.93 for World War II. The average monthly compensation payment to dependents of World War I deceased veterans is $59.24, compared to $70.68 for dependents of World War II.)

For the most part, it is true, you may file your claim for compensation or pension at any time—tomorrow as well as today. But every day you delay you also lose money, and possibly the ability to prove you are entitled to compensation. With one exception, benefit payments begin with the date of application for pension or compensation. World War II veterans may file for compensation any time within a year after discharge and get the full benefits for the whole year. But that is the lone exception, and, of course, most World War II veterans have been out of service more than 1 year. Dependents will be paid compensation or pension from date of veteran's death only if claim is filed within 1 year.

But there's an even more important reason for filing your claim right away.

"The longer a veteran puts off making a claim, the longer it takes us to develop his claim, gather together all the necessary evidence supporting the claim, and reach a just decision in the case."

So states Willis Howard, VA director of claims and the Federal Government's No. 1 expert on the subject. Experts of the Legion and other veterans' groups agree.

After all, as nice a guy as he is, Uncle Sam just doesn't take your word for it that a Jap sniper nicked you while on patrol on August 23, 1943. Now your elbow is giving you trouble, and you're losing a couple of days' work each month visiting doctors. Then you remember you never did turn into sick bay, and there probably is no medical record on your case. But there were witnesses. Sure, two of your buddies were there, and they'd be glad to sign affidavits—if you could only find out where they are living these days.

"When in doubt, file a claim," says T. O. Kraabel, American Legion National Rehabilitation Director. "Develop it fully and the Government will decide whether or not you deserve compensation or a pension." Kraabel, who has personally assisted thousands of veterans with their claims, speaks from long, deep experience.

Thus far, 4,400,000 veterans and dependents of World War II have taken the trouble to file a claim. Of these, 2,000,000 applicants have been granted compensation or pension, but more than half have been turned down.

There's no question, pension experts say, that many of the rejected claims would be valid if they were properly prepared and developed. Besides, VA was overwhelmed with a flood of claims right after VJ-day and was in no condition to give full consideration to each case. By February 1946, a backlog of 661,000 cases piled up in VA, and in the effort to catch up with the pending cases, it was only natural that a few short cuts were taken. In the ensuing rush of work, many of the pension rating boards had their sights set on quantity production, rather than quality of consideration.

Anyhow, the fact is that a good number of veterans probably failed to get thorough consideration of their cases and have since failed to do anything about it.

Here's where these veterans, and all veterans with a claim or pension gripe can and should turn to their veterans' organization for advice and counsel. Here's where the 17,000 American Legion service officers of posts throughout the country can and will give you a genuine helping hand.

If there is one thing I learned in the exploratory trip through the jungle of compensation and pension, it is this:

You can save yourself a lot of time, trouble, and expense by having a veterans' service representative handle your claim for you.

Fed up by the abuses of the "pension attorneys," Congress in 1924 authorized reputable veterans' and welfare organizations to

be recognized by VA as representatives of veterans with claims against the Government. In return for this privilege, these organizations provide the service to veterans for free.

There are today 24 such recognized organizations and 43 State agencies. According to the Legion's claims staff, of all the veterans who have turned to the recognized organizations for a lift with their claim, two out of five veterans turned to American Legion service officers.

These service representatives are, more or less, experts in the complex and multifarious laws and regulations dealing with veterans' benefits. They know the ins and the outs. They know how to talk the language—a highly technical language. And they're willing and ready to go to bat for you in developing your claim with the proper evidence, in presenting it to a VA rating board, and, if necessary, in pushing the fight to the Board of Veterans' Appeals.

The law says that VA must help you develop your case, help you put your best foot forward, so to speak. The entire VA claims' set-up—adjudication officer, rating board, authorization service, and so forth—must help you in every reasonable way to obtain the evidence necessary to support your claim for compensation or a pension.

But these officials are only mortals, and may miss a few angles you know nothing about. An alert service officer will worm this data out of you if you give him half a chance. VA officials have a duty to perform to each veteran, but a service representative has a service to perform.

It is no reflection on Veterans' Administration and its thousands of conscientious, hard-working employees to state that a veterans' representative has just a little more curiosity about a veteran's case. Nor is it a reflection to say that the service officer will help you prepare a better case than you can yourself with the help of the VA staffers. The service representative will also help you prepare a stronger appeal, should you be dissatisfied with the decision of the local rating board. And that's important to remember.

A check-up with R. L. Jarnagin, Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in Washington, discloses that out of every hundred veterans whose claims are rejected on the local level only one ever bothers to appeal his case.

Yet, of those who do take the time and effort to make the appeal, as many as 1 in 5 may win the appeal.

It is significant that well over three-fourths of the appeals claim cases are handled by veterans organization service representatives. In Washington, as in the local town, it is not a question of influence, but of evidence. The service representative is like an attorney, conversant with the procedure and the laws. Armed with your power of attorney, he serves as your champion or advocate, at no cost to you whatsoever.

The American Legion has the largest network of service representatives. Besides the 17,000 service officers in the posts, who are unpaid volunteers, there are some 1,500 full-time (and part-time) career service officers, in the county, State, regional, and national headquarters. It is a glowing testimony to their good work that more than half of the veterans seeking the aid of legion service representatives were not legionnaires at the time their case was taken up.

"Veterans seeking our help do not necessarily have to be members of the legion," says Rehab Director Kraabel. "Nor do we coax them to join as a condition for our helping them. We do encourage them, however, and we know that as a matter of course many of these assisted veterans will join the legion, and will become steadfast members, because service makes membership."

Now let's see how VA handles a claim for compensation or pension.

VA has around 9,000 employees whose chief job is to process the claims. You can get your claim started in one of three ways: write or visit one of the 600 VA offices scattered around the country, or get in touch with a veterans organization service representative.

You fill out the proper form, and attach any medical evidence you might have to support your claim, such as a statement from you local doctor about your ailment, or a statement from your employer about the days you missed on account of illness. You add any statements or papers you think will help your claim.

Your claim is then channeled to the nearest VA regional office, where it is given a C-number (claim number). Then a request is sent out from the VA regional office for your military records, which may be at any one or more of several record-collection stations operated by the Federal Government. This business of getting your records takes a little time—perhaps a month or two, so don't get impatient. Because, in dealing with compensation claims, it is a fact that delay in reaching a decision in your case may mean that more consideration is being given to your case.

In due course, a VA adjudicator figures there's enough evidence on hand to send your case along to a rating board for a decision.

The rating board is made up of three experts; a lawyer, a doctor, and an occupational specialist. There are 400 such rating boards within VA, distributed among the regional offices. Each veteran applicant rates having a full three-man board consider his case, but sometimes in the rush of business or for the lack of personnel, this rule may be short-circuited by various VA offices.

The board can decide that the veteran ought to take a physical examination, and if so, order it. The veteran has the right to appear in person before the board, and the board is supposed to lean backwards in every way to help the veteran with his case. The board will make two decisions:

1. Is the disability service-connected or non-service-connected?

2. How severe is the disability, and therefore how much compensation or pension shall the veteran get?

Compensation for disability for veterons of World Wars I and II ranges from $13.80 a month for 10 percent disability to $138 a month for 100 percent disability. Additional cash awards are made to veterans who lost an eye, leg, or arm. The last Congress also passed a new benefit for disabled veterans, providing extra compensation to the more severely disabled veterans (suffering 60 percent or more disability) on the basis of dependents. This new law was passed not to encourage disabled veterans to have large families, but to help disabled veterans with large families meet the spiraling costs of food, clothing, and shelter.

It is possible for a veteran to have a service-connected disability of less than 10 percent—in fact, as little as 0 percent—and still be, under the law, a disabled veteran. For example, an ex-GI who had been given a medical discharge was originally found to be suffering from 30 percent disability caused by neuro-circulatory asthenia—which are mighty big words for nervous fatigue. Recently, he was reexamined and found to have no current symptoms of the ailment, and as a result the VA rating board reduced his disability to 0 percent. This action cuts off the veteran's cash compensation, but leaves the case open for a reappraisal later, if and when the disability should flare up again.

For disabled veterans with less than 10 percent disability, there is no cash compensation, but they are still entitled to three valuable advantages.

First, although every veteran is pretty much entitled to free hospitalization, service-connected cases get precedence in obtaining a VA hospital bed. This privilege is important in those areas in which VA hospitals are short of beds in face of the demand for hospitalization.

Secondly, only service-connected cases are entitled to out-patient treatment, either at a VA clinic or with the home-town doctor. A non-service-connected case can get free VA medical attention only by becoming a hospital patient.

Thirdly, and for many veterans most important of the advantages, a veteran with a service-connected disability—even 0 percent—gets a 5-point preference over other veterans, and a 10-point preference over non-veterans, for civil-service jobs. This extra 5 points might mean the difference between getting a Federal position or not.

Between holding onto a Federal post, or losing it, during one of the frequent economy waves which sweep through the Government, a minimum rating of 10 percent is required.

Early in 1947, VA ordered a 15 percent cut in personnel rolls. In round numbers, the order meant that 31,000 VA employees would be let go. Veterans had a preference, to be sure, but since most VA employees were veterans anyhow, it was a case of veteran versus veteran. Hundreds rushed to the Legion to seek help in obtaining the extra five points for compensable service-connected disability. That could be obtained only by filing a successful claim for compensation.

Since all claims against the Government by VA employes must be handled in the central Washington office, the small Legion staff in the Washington headquarters office found itself swamped with pleas for help by buddies all over the country. During the next 18 months the Legion's Capital staff literally knocked itself out pushing and appealing cases.

"We knew we were fighting for jobs not only compensation," recalls Charles Stevens, assistant director of rehabilitation.

"Everybody waited for the last minute to file a claim or prosecute one already filed, and then we caught hell from all over," recalls T. O. Kraabel.

Now, back to the rating board and your claim.

The rating board comes up with a decision, and informs you of it in writing. Theoretically, at least, the board's decision must be written in nontechnical language, so that even you can understand it. If you believe the verdict to be just, everything's fine and dandy.

But if you feel dissatisfied—as is your privilege—there are two things you can do: Either file a new claim with new evidence, or appeal your original claim to the Board of Veterans' Appeals in Washington.

The Board of Veterans' Appeals is an independent division of VA. It has no tie-up with the claims division. Chairman of the Board Jarnagin and Claims Director Howard are of equal rank, assistant administrators. Thus your appeal is handled by a fresh slate of judges.

There are 35 members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals: a chairman, a vice chairman, and eleven 3-man teams of judges. Each team includes two lawyers and one doctor, and each team can turn to six or seven full-time legal and medical consultants for advice and assistance.

Any one of the teams may get any one of the cases. If the decision of a team is unanimous, it is also the final decision of the Board.

If there's a split decision, the chairman or vice chairman may call upon two teams to deal with a controversial case and settle it on a majority vote of six team-judges. The chairman or vice chairman would cast his

vote in case of a tie, and that would be the final decision of the Board.

Not even the courts can overrule the decision of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in matters of compensation and pensions.

However, any claim may be reopened at any time on the basis of new evidence.

Last year the Board of Veterans' Appeals turned out 40,000 decisions. This year it expects to come up with 60,000 decisions.

A veteran can, if he wishes, make a personal appearance before the Board in Washington, or arrange for a hearing before a traveling Board team. In most cases, though, he will authorize a veterans service representative to handle the case for him. And that's good judgment.

There are lots of veterans who have false and fuzzy ideas about rating boards and the appeals board. I'll clear up a few of the most popular fallacies.

Some folks feel that Uncle Sam is a penny-pincher when it comes to compensation and pensions, and throws all kinds of obstacles in the way of a claimant.

That feeling probably stems back to the days right after the First World War when certain Government officials took a callous attitude toward the legitimate requests for assistance by veterans.

In 1919, on assignment by the American Legion Weekly, noted biographer Marquis James investigated the situation and exposed a confidential order issued by the Federal Board for Vocational Education, an agency no longer in existence. The order read:

"The organs used in approving cases are the eyes and the brain. The ears and heart do not function.

"Be hard-boiled. Put cotton in your ears and lock the door. If you are naturally sympathetic, work nights when nobody is there."

Nowadays, by direction of Congress, VA officials must resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of the veteran who files a claim. Uncle Sam says point blank that when it comes to a border-line case, the breaks must go to the veteran.

There's another feeling that if a rating board calls up a veteran for examination, he's doomed to have his compensation or pension cut off. That's just not so.

It is true that certain types of disability improve with the passage of time, and when the veteran gets better it is only just and proper for his monthly payment to be cut down accordingly. Thus, most of the 200,000 malaria disability cases out of World War II may by now have lost their malarial symptoms, and their compensation as well.

But there are diseases and disabilities which grow worse with time, and for these cases, VA will increase the compensation or pension. In one 6-month period, for example, the Board of Appeals allowed 60 percent of the appeals for higher payments on gunshot cases..

The example of the gunshot cases, by the way, should kill once and for all the phony belief that any veteran who dares appeal his case will suffer a loss in compensation or pension. That's plain hogwash.

The Board of Veterans Appeals is restricted to dealing with the question at hand. Its decision deals only with your request, and nothing else. The Board does not cut benefits.

Then there's the veteran who knows another veteran who has "the very same kind of a disability" but who is drawing a bigger monthly check from the Government. Anybody who stops to think will realize that the two veterans, while they may feel they have the same disability, probably don't have the same disease or injury to the same degree, medically speaking.

Veterans of different wars, different peacetime service, different periods of service, etc., etc., come under different laws of benefits. From the medical aspect alone, the latest schedule of disabilities of veterans (1945) contains a list of 750 disabilities, with 10 rating steps for each disability. Since the First World War there have been five similar schedules, and one such schedule contained nine "variants" for each disability.

I could go on, but it only gets more confusing. I mention these details in order to impress you with the wisdom of getting your Legion representative to handle your case—especially your appeal—on a claim. In Washington, a special Legion medical staff headed by Dr. H. D. Shapiro, senior concultant, is in constant contact with the VA authorities on newly arising medical questions.

"Through curiosity, through give and take, we often get VA to see the veteran's case from an entirely new angle," says Dr. Shapiro.

"After all, VA and the Legion representatives are aiming at the same goal: the best possible development of a veteran's claim."

Veterans' leaders are pretty much agreed that, on the whole, our pension and compensation laws are today fairly generous. True, the benefits lag behind the rising cost of living, but so do most kinds of earned income. There have been two high-cost-of-living increases on most compensation and pension benefits, and the Legion is heading up a drive to get another equitable adjustment upward from the next Congress.

There are many individual gripes, and these, with time and patience, can be adjusted. There are some people, of course, who are never satisfied—including veterans. Well, there's only one honest answer to chronic gripers: The line has to be drawn somewhere.

Every veteran can't be declared 100-percent disabled and given a maximum pension, else the basis for the system—partial compensation for the loss of earning power—loses its meaning.

Up through the Spanish-American War veterans the Federal Government has recognized that as a veteran reaches the age of 62, his earning power dwindles. Therefore, the Government has voted these veterans a pension based on age. Thus 106,000 Spanish-American War veterans are drawing up to $90 a month pension.

In the past several years, as the World War I veterans have moved along in their fifties, there has been growing agitation for a pension based on age. This first emerged as Legion policy by action of the 1948 convention in Miami. There has also been some demand in Congress for establishing all veterans' compensation and pensions on a uniform basis, but that demand has thus far failed to crystallize into action.

Veterans who lost an arm in the last war feel that they, as well as the leg amputees, ought to get a free auto. There's no satisfactory answer when that question is raised, except that a line has to be drawn somewhere.

"But why draw it with us?" cry the arm amputees. O. K., then what about the veterans suffering from tuberculosis, heart conditions, arthritis, and other disabilities which make it difficult for them to get around? Should they be given a free auto, too? Congress batted the issue around for months before limiting that benefit to those who lost a leg or the use of a leg. Congress can, if it wishes, pass out the benefit to any other veterans.

Of course, no line can be drawn anywhere without leaving some disabled veterans on the wrong side of that line; and none of the benefits—cash, equipment, autos, or houses—are meant to make up completely for what the disabled veteran lost in the service to his country. Compensation is meant to assist in that veteran's rehabilitation, but Uncle Sam recognizes that a lot depends on the disabled veteran's character, courage, and initative, and no VA rating board can give those things to a veteran.

There's one more point to be driven home. There's a curious impression among many veterans that a service-connected disability has something to do with combat wounds, injuries sustained on the front lines, and perhaps heroism in hand-to-hand fighting. "Service-connected disability" covers a much wider swath. Simply put, "service-connected disability" means disability from disease or injury held incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service.

After all, malaria often was worse than a bullet wound; mental and nervous maladies took a heavier toll among servicemen than submarine torpedoes; schistosomiasis—a parasite infection—might lay you up longer than shrapnel.

Furthermore, a veteran having a service-connected disability does not have to be feverish with malaria, racked with pain, or shaking with spasms to prove that he suffered the disability in war service. In fact, a veteran does not have to be actively disabled—crippled, sick, ailing, etc.—to establish his service-connected disability. To draw compensation his disability must be measured as 10 percent or more. But he may establish service-connection any time he can prove it—then half the job will be done should the disability increase to 10 percent or more in the future.

All the veteran has to do is show through his military medical record or through other evidence that during his wartime service he broke out with symptoms of one kind or another. These symptoms, meaningless at the time, may later prove to be indications of brucellosis, encephalitis, or some other chronic disease which will not break out in full force until perhaps years after you left the armed forces and returned to civilian life.

Hundreds of World War I veterans are today trying to establish evidence of disability incurred 30 years ago. You have only to refer to the Comrades in Distress column of The National Legionnaire to see how desperate some of these veterans are.

Every one of these late appeals underlines the compelling necessity of your filing your claim for service-connected disability and compensation now, while World War II is still fresh in memory.

Remember, there are at least one million veterans of World War II who have missed their opportunity so far.

These veterans have more than just lost an opportunity—they've lost money, like dropping it out of their pockets.

And they're missing the chance of providing a little extra insurance that their families will be provided for when they—the veteran and breadwinner—are gone.

Heed the words of Legion Rehabilitation Director Kraabel:

"The disabled veteran who files his claim today makes it easier for his widow and orphans tomorrow. The veteran who puts it off makes it tougher."

Compensation of Higher Federal Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We've Got To Pay More for Leadership," written by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and published in the American Magazine for January 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'VE GOT TO PAY MORE FOR LEADERSHIP

(By HERBERT R. O'CONOR, United States Senator from Maryland)

Our Federal Government risks losing its brain power through its failure to pay adequate salaries to top-flight men. Salaries of higher executives in industry in many cases are 2 to 10 times as much as our Government is willing to pay men in comparable positions. As a consequence, a wholesale exodus of executives from Washington has threatened since the end of the war.

The United States has been forced by circumstances into the leadership of the world. Aside from the tremendous pressure of international problems, including a cold war with Russia, the business of Government has become a colossal one—a $40,000,000,000-a-year affair employing more than 2,000,000 civilian workers. To conduct this business properly we must have the best brains in the country.

Russia can conscript her brains; we must obtain ours as we obtain everything else, through open competition. Yet we pay the nine members of the President's Cabinet, men charged with huge responsibilities, only $15,000 a year each, much less when income taxes are taken out. Then there are something like 3,000 high administrators appointed by the President, as well as upper-bracket civil service appointees, who receive in the neighborhood of $10,000 a year. This is paltry compensation compared to the huge salaries paid in private industry.

When industry calls, therefore, our top administrators, executives, planners, and economists, out of justice to their families, are quick to answer. If they continue to leave their Government posts, as many have been doing in the last 4 years, we shall be confronted with a crisis of the gravest type. Our parsimonious policy in the matter of rewarding our leaders has proved itself to be a most shortsighted one. We have failed in our obligations to this group of valued public servants, whose capabilities are vital to the proper conduct of Federal business.

The President of the United States, head of the biggest business in the world, receives only $75,000 a year as against salaries of twice and three times that much and more paid to many by private industry. The President receives the highest salary paid by the Federal Government, but many men under him, whose jobs in the Government far exceed in responsibility and importance most jobs in industry, get far less.

According to a survey we recently conducted, four American oil companies in 1946, our last record, and four metal-processing and manufacturing industries, paid their presidents more than $100,000 each. The president of one large rubber company received $306,282.72 in the same year.

The Vice President of the United States is rewarded for his high office with a salary of only $20,000. When Governor Warren, of California, ran for the Vice Presidency, the second highest office in the land, he knew that victory would have meant a pay-cut for him of $5,000 a year. His salary as Governor of California is $25,000 a year.

My experience over a quarter of a century in public positions has enabled me to see at close range the plight of many public-spirited citizens who were desirous of rendering public service but could ill afford to make the required financial sacrifice. For instance, if one of the $25,000- to $50,000-a-year members of a legal staff goes to Washington as a Government man, he must take a cut of about $15,000 to $40,000 in salary and establish a new home in Washington, today the most expensive city in the United States.

Such men rightly aspire to careers with futures. In Washington, a Presidential appointive job lasts for the duration of the President's administration. No future, in terms of incumbency or advancement, is assured. He who takes the job, knowing this, usually must keep his old home while establishing a new one. He figures that sooner or later he must go back to his old home. Very often he loses his old job when he gives it up to go with the Government.

As a consequence, many able men refuse Government jobs. That is why the President, Cabinet members, and bureau heads sometimes find it difficult these days to get the best men to take the important jobs that our Federal Government has to offer. And when the underpaid executives in Washington see a chance to take their wives and children to a pleasant, not-too-expensive industrial town at a tripled or a quadrupled income, they do so. They want their children to have the best.

At present salary levels we just can't keep top men in Government and can't fill their places when they leave. We can't compete with industry with a pay roll that isn't too attractive for intelligent college graduates 5 years out of school.

Illustrative of the way our Government suffers by its own penurious policy, I cite an experience I had with President Franklin D. Roosevelt. When the war clouds were at the darkest in the last World War, I happened to be lunching alone with him at the White House. He asked who were the two outstanding Maryland men who were qualified to give the greatest help in production for the armed services. I immediately suggested Howard Bruce and another executive.

Mr. Bruce unhesitatingly accepted the invitation to join the war effort in Washington, and demonstrated his great ability in the War Department's matériel branch, winding up as one of the few civilians to be awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

The other Marylander, equally public-spirited, was confronted with a tragically difficult problem when he was invited to Washington. Dependent on his income for the support of a growing family, he would have been compelled to dispose at a loss of securities he held, and then take a sizable reduction in salary. If the assignment lasted for very long he would have been back where he started years ago, as far as finances were concerned. In justice to his family he reluctantly declined the War Department's offer.

While he continued wholeheartedly in the private output of one product essential to the war effort, Uncle Sam lost the services of a highly capable man in the bigger production job just when the threat of the Axis Powers was at its height. And all because statutory limitations prevented increasing an official's salary a relatively small amount. And this, too, when the man to be appointed was to have the responsibility of handling war supplies worth billions.

Since I have been in government, I have seen many capable and earnest men go to the brink of financial disaster before they finally gave up and took the lucrative jobs that industry is constantly offering to brainy men. There is no excuse for this pitiable state of affairs in a nation as wealthy as ours.

I think one of the first big tasks of the new Congress is to correct the injustice we have done our leaders and raise the salaries of top executives in the Government.

President Truman, having received such an overwhelming vote of confidence in the November election, should be given bipartisan support by the Senate and the House of Representatives in a concerted effort to get and to keep the best brains in America for the efficient administration of governmental affairs. No better investment could be made than by assuring the greatest efficiency in the functioning of the democratic process. This can be achieved by realistic provisions for adequate salaries which will pry loose from private enterprise some of its great men.

We cannot ever hope, perhaps, to match dollar for dollar in government the tremendous salaries paid to industrial executives, nor do we want to. A public servant must have motives other than financial to serve the country's best interests. He must have a sincere desire to serve his fellow man and feel that in government he finds the most satisfying outlet for his talents. If a top-flight man is out for money alone, he should go into private business. But if he is qualified and eager to serve the Nation, he should be enabled to go into government without being penalized too sharply for his desire to be a public servant.

A conscientious public official has a right to live in the dignity to which a high administrative position entitles him. Such a position in Washington is very costly, indeed. When a Government executive receives a foreign official of corresponding rank from abroad, as he frequently does, he must, by all the rules of international usage, entertain his guest appropriately, a propriety which runs into considerable money if it happens often. And it happens often. Government bureau heads who make $10,000 a year simply cannot foot the bill. They have no expense accounts.

When Federal employees are required to make official trips, they are granted transportation and $6 a day for living expenses, which, as any traveler knows, is insufficient for dignified and comfortable maintenance.

An executive in private industry, entertaining a buyer or some other useful visitor, usually has an unlimited expense account. It pays business to be lavish. It would pay our Government, too, in terms of international good will, to play the gracious host for important personages from abroad. Men in our diplomatic service, on their niggardly salaries, find it very difficult to keep their heads above water in the social whirl of foreign capitals.

The present salary crisis in government was high-lighted first in 1946 by the resignation of the late Harold D. Smith as Director of the Budget, one of the most important administrative jobs in Government, which Mr. Smith filled for 7 years in a most able fashion. During his administration he received a salary of $10,000 a year. He resigned to take the vice presidency of the International Bank at a taxable salary of from $35,000 to $40,000. While he was a zealous and inspired public servant, he felt he would be disloyal to his family to continue in a $10,000-a-year job in a high-priced city. His resignation was a signal loss to the economy of the Nation.

Another $10,000-a-year man, Daniel W. Bell, resigned his Under Secretaryship of the Treasury for the presidency of a moderate-sized commercial bank paying more than twice his Government salary. As a Government executive, Mr. Bell supervised Treasury operations running into billions of dollars, many, many times as much as he handles in his new job.

Milo Perkins, who directed the Board of Economic Warfare during the recent war at a salary of $10,000 a year, resigned from Government service just after the war, although his ability was much needed in reconstruction, and opened an office as a foreign-trade consultant. He is reported to be making from $30,000 to $40,000 a year.

One man, who had served for 25 years in the United States Forestry Service at a salary of $7,000 a year, recently went to the American Pulp and Paper Association at a salary of $20,000. An industrial chemist in the Department of Agriculture, with 24 years of service at $6,400 a year, recently accepted a job in private industry at an increase of from 100 to 200 percent in salary. An attorney who had spent 19 years, the best part of his life, in the service of his Government for

$6,500 a year, gave up his job not long ago for a $50,000-a-year law practice.

Since 1944, the Federal Communications System has lost three chairmen, James Lawrence Fly, Paul Porter, and Charles R. Denny. The Chairman of the FCC gets $10,000, the same as the members. Mr. Fly and Mr. Porter returned to the successful practice of law. It has been reported that Mr. Denny, now employed by NBC, draws a salary of $37,000 a year.

Such inconsistent policies in Federal Government, which force men from the public service to undertake more lucrative tasks in private practice, are also found in State governments. I recall a case in Maryland when we were projecting a road program to cost more than $100,000,000. The chairman of our State roads commission, a brilliant engineer, could not afford to continue on a salary of $10,000, when engagements in a consulting capacity were being pressed on him. One of these engagements would pay him several times his annual salary. Who could blame him for leaving the public service? Numerous other cases could be cited to show that Government is the loser in such instances.

The Department of Justice has suffered heavily in the last 5 years by the resignation of attorneys. It is not to be wondered at. In many corporation cases Uncle Sam's young lawyers, at salaries of $10,000 or less, find themselves pitted at the bar against highly paid corporation counsel, whose very prestige and prosperity are intimidating factors. Indeed, these "big lawyers" may well act as talent scouts for their own money-making firms while vying with Uncle Sam's underpaid legal talent.

Thurman Arnold and Wendell Berge, both former Assistant Attorneys General, resigned their posts in the last few years for the private practice of law, where they could make more money. In his resignation Berge stated that he made his new move "in justice to my family." J. Edgar Hoover, director of the FBI of the Department of Justice, is reputed to have repeatedly turned down offers of from $50,000 to $70,000 a year from private industry, preferring, as an earnest and diligent public servant, to serve his Government for $14,000 a year.

Blocked by low salaries from getting able businessmen into Government, the Federal administration naturally would turn to the training ground of city and State governments for able administrators. But even the States and cities of the Nation, in many instances, outbid the Federal Government in salaries paid.

Occasionally the States even outbid one another, as I learned not many years ago when I was Governor of Maryland. I was called on the telephone one afternoon in the friendliest manner by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York. He stated that we had an outstanding specialist at the University of Maryland who, they had decided after a country-wide search, was the best man for an important assignment in New York State. Governor Dewey was most considerate in asking if I could meet the salary offer which he was prepared to make. I couldn't, under the rigid legal requirements, and in consequence the specialist moved up. The unfortunate result in such cases is that the difference of a few thousand dollars means the displacement of a seasoned expert around whom an important governmental activity had been organized.

Of the governors of the five territories of the United States, all Presidential appointees, none is paid more than $10,330 a year, while 15 of our State governors receive $10,500 or more a year and, in addition, in some cases rent-free houses and sizable expense accounts. The head of the Federal Security Agency, under whose authority the United States Office of Education operates, gets $12,000 a year. Five State officials of education in the United States receive as much or more. The superintendent of schools of the city of New York gets $25,000 a year. In Los Angeles the general manager and chief engineer of the department of water and power is paid $27,000 a year, more than is paid any Federal official, with the exception of the President of the United States.

If the Federal Government can't compete with private industry or even with the States and cities of the land for trained leadership, I see nothing ahead of us but disastrous loss to the most important governmental system in the world. Others see that it pays in the long run to reward leadership. Our Congress, apparently, has had a blind spot on this subject.

Quite as dangerous to the morale of the Federal service as the disparity between Government salaries and those of private industry are the inequalities of the Government compensation system itself. It must be disheartening, for example, for the Under Secretary of the Treasury to know that, within his own Department, there are men below him in authority who are paid more than he. The Under Secretary himself gets only $10,000 a year, while a number of men under him receive $11,000 or even more.

One Cabinet member, the head of a large and consequential department, said some time ago that he had invited a very able man, who made more money than the President of the United States, to go to Washington as head of an important bureau.

"How much would I be getting?" asked the businessman.

"Ten thousand dollars a year," the Secretary replied.

The businessman said, "What would the next two or three people under me be getting?"

The Secretary replied, "Ten thousand dollars a year."

"Then I don't know what you need me for," said the businessman.

The point was that there was nothing in the position offered to the businessman that distinguished him from his subordinates. The businessman said he wasn't concerned particularly with the salary he would receive, but if the salary had been $15,000 and the people under him were to receive $10,000 he would have thought that he had some recognition and responsibility.

In the Bureau of the Budget, from which Mr. Smith resigned, the Director, the Assistant Director, 5 chiefs of division, and 20 top technicians all receive $10,000 a year each, the subordinates getting exactly the same salary as their boss.

Top leadership in our democracy should have a top reward, if for no other reason than to win the respect and challenge the competitive zeal of subordinates in lower brackets of income. This is in keeping with the philosophy of our system. There seems to be no rhyme or reason in the salary structure of the Federal Government.

If you can make any sense out of the Federal Government's compensation system you are better than a number of us who have spent months studying the problem. We tried to get results in the last Congress, when a bill asking for higher salaries for top men was under consideration, but once more was sidetracked. We shall try again, as a patriotic duty in the next session of Congress, because the rate at which we are losing leadership to private enterprise is becoming alarming.

The bill, which is now in the final drafting stage, does not provide, by any means, the salaries which our top leaders should have if we are to stay in business as a growing concern. But it appears to be the best bill that can be successfully supported.

Generally, the proposed provision for upper-bracket increases are these:

Cabinet members from $15,000 to $20,000.

Under Secretaries from $10,000 to $18,000.

Assistant Secretaries from $10,000 to $15,000.

Heads of the seven largest agencies of Government, whose present salaries range from $10,000, as in the case of the Bureau of the Budget, up to $17,500 in the exceptional case of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—all to $18,000.

The bill will include other raises for heads of boards and commissions and such, all in keeping with the general increase.

Zealous and self-sacrificing public servants should not be asked to devote a lifetime to the common weal, and resist the siren call of higher salaries from private enterprise, unless Government is prepared to reward them in a manner that is at least comparable to financial rewards for leadership in industry.

Some Enduring Achievements of the Lincoln Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an essay by J. Duane Squires, professor of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, New London, N. H., entitled "Some Enduring Achievements of the Lincoln Administration, 1861-65." This essay appeared in the Abraham Lincoln Quarterly for December 1948, and I recommend its reading to my colleagues.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make four pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $284.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME ENDURING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LINCOLN ADMINISTRATION, 1861-65

(By J. Duane Squires)

Viewing the Lincoln administration in retrospect, many able scholars have emphasized its accomplishment as chiefly that of waging a tremendous civil conflict to a victorious conclusion. That the total defeat of the Confederacy was a vital aspect of Lincoln's leadership between 1861-65 there is no doubt whatsoever. That the preservation of the Union was an achievement without which nothing else would have much mattered is not to be gainsaid, and yet there is another aspect of the Lincoln administration which has not always been adequately stressed by students of the Civil War period. President Lincoln and his colleagues instituted an extraordinary number of innovations, many of them only tangential to belligerent activities, which have effected enduring changes in American life.

In seeking to make an estimate of these innovations, it is not necessary to undertake the delicate and perhaps impossible task of assessing the exact degree of credit which should go only to President Lincoln on the one hand and only to members of his administration on the other. It is true that some of the innovations which are to be discussed were not conceived by Abraham Lincoln himself. In several instances they were the projects of members of his Cabinet or of persons entirely outside the inner circle. Yet, to the extent that they were endorsed by the Chief Executive, or supported by him in divers ways, or bound

up in congressional statutes signed by him, or facilitated by him in the exercise of his constitutional powers, they properly belong to the administration of Abraham Lincoln.

In order that there may be a unifying scheme for our approach to this aspect of the Lincoln administration, we shall examine it from the respective viewpoints of the executive departments as they were at the time of the Civil War. In the order of their establishment by Congress, these were State, War, Treasury, Postmaster General, Attorney General, Navy, Interior, and Agriculture. The first seven of these were in existence in 1861. Although the Department of Agriculture did not attain full Cabinet status until 1889, it was founded in 1862, and, as we shall see, was of special concern to Abraham Lincoln. Each of these principal divisions which constituted our National Government during the administration of President Lincoln was responsible for enduring achievements.

I

In foreign affairs, the realm of the State Department, the Lincoln administration may be given credit for six lasting accomplishments. Those relating directly to the governments of foreign states were four in number: (1) President Lincoln's realization of the necessity of Anglo-American harmony as a permanent requisite for American security; (2) President Lincoln's emphasis on our national desire for the good will of Russia, an emphasis made with singular clarity in his communications to the Czar of February and October, 1862, which beyond doubt helped to pave the way for the acquisition of Alaska 5 years later; (3) the acceptance by the Lincoln administration of doctrines of blockade, contraband, and continuous voyage, which became the basis for Allied policy toward neutrals in both world wars of our century; and (4) recognition of the Negro Republic of Haiti, a development long desired by the Haitians, but in the United States politically impossible heretofore.

In addition to these four achievements directly relating to foreign states, two other phases of the Lincoln administration within the purview of the State Department may be noted. One was the issuance by the Secretary of State on behalf of the President of a proclamation dated October 3, 1863, which set aside the last Thursday in November as a national day of thanksgiving. Thus began the practice of Presidential designation of that particular day as the time for the annual observance of this traditional New England holiday. With the exception of the 2 years in which President Franklin D. Roosevelt sought to change the date from the last to the fourth Thursday in the month, every American Chief Executive has followed the precedent set by President Lincoln.

The final achievement of the Lincoln administration in the area of the State Department was not so much a tangible policy as it was a spiritual attitude. It was the President's unvarying sympathy and friendliness toward individuals from other lands. There was not a trace of xenophobia in the mind or heart of Abraham Lincoln, and his administration faithfully reflected his personal generosity and friendliness. In his party's 1864 platform plank on immigration, in his own gracious communications to such persons as Garibaldi, the King of Siam, and the governing council of San Marino, one notes this attitude. Above all, one finds it in Lincoln's willingness as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States to grant posts of high command to notable foreign-born and foreign-trained officers. Among these one thinks of Ferrero from Italy, Stolbrand from Sweden, Turchin from Russia, Karge from Prussia, de Trobriand from France, Krzyanowski from Poland, and many others. It was this attitude of Abraham Lincoln's toward the foreigner which two decades later found embodiment in the Statue of Liberty, and which should be more vividly remembered today as we face the problems of displaced persons and concentration camps.

II

Turning now to the enduring achievements of the Lincoln administration in the range of activities encompassed by the War Department, we find a whole series of remarkable innovations. Writing on The Place of War in History, Herbert Rosinski in the Infantry Journal for November 1947 reminds us that the impact of the industrial revolution upon preindustrial warfare was first apparent on a large scale in the American Civil War. Trite as this may seem to students, it is a fact which ought never to be forgotten. The war which Abraham Lincoln had to wage was the first modern war. His administration made contributions to military art and science which were noteworthy even by the standards of the 1860's. To us of the present generation they loom even more important as foreshadowings of the future. Eight of them are worth noting.

1. In June 1861, with the direct approval of the President, the Army Signal Corps was established under the direction of Col. Albert J. Myer, and the original experiments in military aeronautics were begun under the guidance of that remarkable son of New Hampshire, T. S. C. Lowe. Lowe became the chief aeronaut for the Army of the Potomac. His balloons were in constant use as observation craft during every campaign from the first battle of Bull Run to Chancellorsville.[1]

2. On July 12, 1862, President Lincoln signed a bill originally introduced by Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, creating a national award for valor to be known as the Congressional Medal of Honor. From that day to the present, this has been accepted as the highest distinction of its kind in the gift of the United States. Maj. Rankin Roberts, of the Public Information Division, has informed the present writer that the Congressional Medal of Honor was granted to 327 individuals in the armed forces of the United States during the Civil War period. Among the first to receive it were certain members of the famous volunteer group that "stole" a Confederate train in Georgia in the spring of 1862.

3. Toward the end of the second year of the war a provost marshal general for the Army was authorized. On March 17, 1863, James B. Fry, the first provost marshal general in our history began his duties. From that beginning have come all the manifold aspects of the military police and related activities with which we are so familiar today.

4. Dr. Richard Shryock in his recent volume, The History of Modern Medicine, has reminded us that contemporary military medicine, surgery, nursing, and hospitalization owe much to the innovations begun during the anguished years of the Civil War. Early in the struggle President Lincoln appointed Dorothea Dix as the first superintendent of United States Army women nurses. Her stated duties were "to select and assign women nurses to general or permanent military hospitals, they not to be employed in such hospitals without her sanction and approval."[2] Before the end of the war 2,000 women had participated in this work of mercy. It was the services of Miss Dix, Miss Clara Barton, and many others—finely summarized by Marjorie Barstow Greenbie in her book, Lincoln's Daughters of Mercy—which led three decades later to the formal establishment by law of the Army Nurse Corps.

Another important development of the Lincoln administration in this field was the so-called Letterman plan for the evacuation of sick and wounded men from the battlefield. Devised in 1862 by Dr. Jonathan Letterman—for whom the present hospital of that name in the Presidio of San Francisco is a lasting monument—the Letterman technique was extended to the entire United States Army in 1864. It became standard practice in our armed forces after 1865, and was copied in other armies all over the world.

Supplementing the nursing and evacuation programs was the development of large general hospitals all over the North. Typical of these was the Lincoln General Hospital in Washington, D. C., and the Harvey General Hospital in Madison, Wis. The latter was so named at Lincoln's own request in honor of a war Governor from that State.[3]

5. On March 3, 1863, President Lincoln approved the first draft law in our history. Despite the many and well-known defects in this original venture into conscription, it became the precedent for later and more efficient draft legislation in 1917 and 1940. An amplification of the principle is now being advocated as a permanent American peacetime policy.

6. The first experiments in absentee voting ever attempted in the United States were carried out in the autumn of 1864. This little-known development is ably summarized by Joseph H. Benton in his book, Voting in the Field: A Forgotten Chapter of the Civil War (1915). Eleven of the 25 Union States, at the suggestion of the Lincoln administration, that year enacted soldier-vote laws. Approximately three-fourths of the military personnel who took advantage of this opportunity for absentee voting cast their ballots for the administration. This innovation of 1864 became the precedent not only for analogous legislation in 1918 and in 1944, but also for all subsequent civilian voting by absentee ballot.

7. The Union armies fought the Civil War largely with muzzle-loading muskets. But between 1861 and 1865 the Lincoln administration experimented in the field with at least twenty different kinds of breechloaders, among which were the noted Spencer and Henry carbines. By 1873 both these models had been taken off the market and developed into the Winchester rifle by the famous gunsmith of New Haven, Conn., Oliver Fisher Winchester.

8. The ponderous collection entitled "Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies in the War of the Rebellion," comprising upward of one hundred and sixty volumes, was authorized by the Lincoln administration and begun in the autumn of 1864. This project, although smaller in quantity than similar endeavors planned for World War I and World War II, was the first large-scale effort of its kind in American history. It is still basic to a proper understanding of the belligerent aspects of the Civil War.

Even this abbreviated summary of these eight developments of the Lincoln administration in the area served by the War Department will suggest its resourcefulness and intellectual flexibility. One is impressed by the fact that much which is basic to modern warfare had its origin in the years between 1861–1865.

III

A third category of enduring achievements of the Lincoln administration comprises a number of remarkable developments in the

[1] Fragments of these balloons and papers relating thereto have been examined by the present writer, whose monograph upon Lowe and his work was published in the American Historical Review for July 1937.

[2] The Army Nurse (War Department, 1944), p. 8.

[3] There is a notable account of these wartime general hospitals in the recent book by Dr. Victor Robinson entitled "White Caps" (Lippincott, 1946).

related fields of wartime taxation and finance, which came within the province of the Treasury Department. Here the Lincoln administration made five lasting contributions to our national life.

Chronologically speaking, the first of these innovations was Federal paper currency. The original issue of such money in the United States consisted of non-interest-bearing Treasury notes authorized under the acts of July 17 and August 5, 1861. This issue was soon supplemented by the United States notes, commonly called greenbacks, circulated under authority of the act of February 25, 1862. Since these issues of paper money, the Government has always had some kind of paper currency in circulation.

The second fiscal innovation of the Lincoln administration was the placement of the famous words, "In God we trust," upon certain of our common coins. Authorized by Secretary Salmon P. Chase on the last day of November 1861, the phrase actually appeared for the first time upon the 2-cent piece of 1864. Since that date the phrase has been in continuous use on various coins. For example—and very appropriately—it first appeared upon a penny in the Lincoln-head issue of 1909, and upon the dime in 1916. It has been in continuous use on these two coins since those dates.

The third fiscal innovation was the income tax. This now-familiar type of taxation received its first national application in the decade beginning in 1862. Although declared invalid by the Supreme Court decisions in the 1890's, the tax was revived after the passage of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution. Abraham Lincoln's advisers patterned their income taxation after current practice in Great Britain. The basic rates established in the act of July 1, 1862, were 3 percent on personal income between $600 and $10,000, and 5 percent on income above that. Modest enough, by contemporary standards. So far as national officeholders were concerned, the principle now described as the withholding tax was applied. Despite legal doubts, based on section 1 of article II of the Constitution, President Lincoln faithfully paid his income tax. It is interesting to note, however, that in 1872 his entire payments were refunded in a special warrant payable to his estate.

The fourth, and doubtless most familiar of all the financial achievements of the Lincoln administration, was the banking system introduced into our economic structure by the National Bank Acts of February 25, 1863, and June 3, 1864. The principal results of the establishment of national banks were the introduction of an additional kind of currency, the elimination from the monetary system of State bank notes, and the consolidation of powerful financial interests behind the United States Government. Thanks to the new national banks, the flotation of war bonds was most successful, and ample funds for the winning of the war were made available. (Incidentally, the national debt climbed from $75,000,000 on March 4, 1861, to $2,800,000,000 on September 1, 1865, or an increase of almost 4,000 percent.) But to the present hour, whenever one observes the word, national, in a bank's name, one should think of the financial ingenuity of the Lincoln administration.

The fifth accomplishment falling within the scope of Lincoln's Treasury Department was the formation of the United States Secret Service. The actual installation of the first chief of the Secret Service took place a few weeks after Lincoln's assassination, on July 5, 1865, William P. Wood, whose name is not even mentioned in the Dictionary of American Biography. But the plans for the Secret Service had been previously laid by Treasury Secretary Hugh McCulloch, and President Lincoln was cognizant of them. As the Treasury Department has written the present author, it is worth noting that the original chief of the United States Secret Service was Wood and not Allen Pinkerton or Lafayette C. Baker, as so often stated. Both these men had indeed been active during the war years, but they were on the pay roll of the War Department for activities akin to those of modern G-2 or of the OSS in the last war. The Secret Service was organized to protect the national banking system and the Federal paper money against the menace of counterfeiters. Confusion arises from use of the name as the equivalent of espionage.

IV

Perhaps less spectacular than the developments in the Treasury Department, but nonetheless worthy of note, were certain achievements of the Lincoln administration in the post office. Four developments under Lincoln should be remembered today. First among these in interest and importance was the inauguration on July 1, 1863, of urban free delivery by mail carrier in the 49 principal cities of the North. Thus, at the very hour when most American eyes were strained toward the fields around Gettysburg or toward the bluffs above Vicksburg, there began the indispensable plodding of the postman on his daily route.

In the law of March 3, 1863, which authorized city carrier service, a second innovation appeared. This was the establishment for the first time in our history of a uniform rate of letter postage, regardless of distance transmitted. Always heretofore, mail rates had varied directly in proportion to the distance the letters were to travel. Breaking through the rate complex which this system involved, the Lincoln administration inaugurated the present basic principle of uniform postage for first-class mail anywhere in the United States.

The remaining two developments may be briefly stated. In 1861 the Postmaster General issued the third series of United States postage stamps. This series, in use from August 17, 1861, to February 27, 1869, as every philatelist knows, was the first to include a 2-cent stamp. It was the well-known "Black Jack," bearing the stern face of Andrew Jackson. Since Lincoln's Presidency the Nation has never been without such a stamp, and scores of designs have been issued. In 1864, 3 years after the appearance of this stamp, came the introduction of the domestic money-order system into American life. Once again an experiment was destined for a permanent place in our national scheme of things.

V

In the field of jurisprudence and constitutional interpretation three enduring achievements of the Lincoln administration may be mentioned. They all are concerned with clarification of the Constitution or of custom.

The first of these was an elucidation of the meaning of article I, section 9 of the United States Constitution. This clause, of course, is the one relating to the suspension of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus. By the actions of President Lincoln, by statutes of Congress, and by subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court, it was established that the President cannot suspend the writ by virtue of his own authority, but must wait for congressional authorization to do so. As a further result of the Lincoln administration's actions in the habeas corpus matter, it has been agreed that the writ shall be suspended only in the zones of military operations and then only when the civil courts fail to function properly.

The second constitutional clarification which occurred during Lincoln's administration was set forth in the so-called Prize Cases of 1863. These established the principle that Congress cannot declare war on a member State of the Union. Such a declaration may be made only against a foreign state. If on a small scale, conflict with a member State is to be treated as insurrection only; if on a large scale, it will be treated as rebellion.

The third clarification involved an American custom which in our own generation has been shown to be deeply rooted in the public mind. It is related to the size of the Supreme Court. As originally constituted in 1789, this august body had numbered six justices. Its membership was reduced to five in 1801, increased to seven in 1807, and further increased to nine in 1837. At that size it remained until the Lincoln administration. In 1863 Congress increased its membership to 10 justices. This was done because of a desire to provide a new circuit court of appeals for California and Oregon. Despite this plausible justification, however, the innovation was disapproved by the country. Four years after Lincoln's death the size of the Court was restored to nine. At that number it has remained since. Thus, by what logicians would call the method of the obverse, American feeling on this matter was permanently clarified.

VI

The Lincoln administration's enduring achievements in naval affairs were two in number: (1) a convincing demonstration of naval blockade as a means to victory; and (2) the introduction of ironclad warships in naval warfare. Familiar as these two developments may be, each deserves a brief mention. Gen. Colin R. Ballard, a distinguished British military critic, in his volume published in 1926 entitled "The Military Genius of Abraham Lincoln," pays high tribute to Lincoln's perspicacity and inexorable purpose concerning the blockade. General Ballard declares that the Lincoln administration in general, and the President in particular, thoroughly understood the principle of command of the sea and gave a never-to-be-forgotten demonstration of that principle during the years 1861–65. In the enforcement of the blockade the United States Navy increased from 90 to 670 ships, the officer corps rose from 1,300 to 6,700, and the enlisted personnel expanded from 7,500 to 51,500. The coast line blockaded by "Uncle Sam's web-feet," as Lincoln humorously termed the Navy, was 3,500 miles in length. But the results of that blockade were so effective that no responsible person since then has questioned the decisive nature of this technique of war. American naval policy in the twentieth century is based squarely on this precedent of the Lincoln administration.

Since this subject has been so thoroughly explored, it is unnecessary to go into the details of the adoption of ironclad warships by this country. Inquiry at the Office of Naval Records and Library in the Navy Department, however, brought the present writer a helpful letter from Capt. John B. Heffernan, its director. Captain Heffernan's communication furnishes some interesting data on the members of the Lincoln administration who were involved in the fateful decisions of 1861. The principals were President Lincoln himself; Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy; and Gustavus V. Fox, the First Assistant Secretary. They proceeded by authority of an act of Congress dated August 3, 1861.

A crucial meeting between these officials and naval experts occurred on October 4, 1861. That gathering was to decide which, if any, of the various designs for ironclad warships submitted by ambitious inventors was worthy of adoption. At this meeting Lincoln saw the plans for John Ericsson's *Monitor*. The President was pleased with the design, and made a typically alert remark concerning its practicality: "All I have to say is what the girl said when she stuck

her foot into the stocking. It strikes me there's something in it."[4] The meeting resolved to undertake the construction of three ironclad warships, one of them the *Monitor*, and the outcome of that decision is history familiar to all.

VII

Among the truly remarkable achievements of the Lincoln administration were three that for convenience may be listed under the general heading of the Department of the Interior. It is true that this Department was not responsible for their origin, nor was it charged with their development. But each of them pertained to an important aspect of internal or domestic affairs in the United States, and in that sense they may be considered as a related group.

The first was the Homestead Act, approved by President Lincoln on May 20, 1862. A final step in liberality to the westward-moving pioneer, this famous piece of legislation—still in effect in 1948—allowed a poor man to acquire a farm and home, carved from the public domain. The homestead question had been a political issue since 1848. It had been earnestly advocated by men like Galusha Grow, of Pennsylvania, and had actually progressed to the stage where only a veto by President Buchanan in 1860 prevented its enactment into law. In 1862, however, the Lincoln administration made real the homestead principle. Henceforth it was to be the cornerstone for agricultural development in the trans-Mississippi West.

Parenthetically, it may be noted that the Lincoln administration in July 1864, enacted the alien contract immigration law. Many students believe that this was the compensation offered to the industrial leaders of the Nation for the favors extended to the farmers under the provisions of the homestead law of two years before. It was under the provisions of the alien contract immigration law that the unique labor situation in North Adams, Mass., developed, a situation so deftly summarized by Frederick Rudolph in The American Historical Review for October 1947. Under this law, during the last 2 years of the Lincoln administration more than 300,000 immigrants were brought to the United States.

Allied to the Homestead Act in philosophy and results was the Morrill Agricultural College Land Grant Act, which became law on July 2, 1862. A delightful account of this congressional statute appears in the late Carl Becker's volume entitled "Cornell University: Founders and the Founding." Energetic as were men like Jonathan B. Turner, of Illinois, and Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont, in urging the passage of the act, it is clear today—as Becker so convincingly demonstrates—that no one in the Lincoln administration fully sensed the possibilities inherent in this provision of 1862 for agricultural and mechanical education in the United States. Knowing today, however, that every one of our 48 States has taken advantage of this statute of the Lincoln administration, we may venture the opinion that it is to date the most important single piece of educational legislation in American history.

Last in the related trilogy of achievements in our domestic economy was the chartering of two Pacific railroads. The Union Pacific was authorized by Congress in a law of 1862, and an amended act of 2 years later. The Northern Pacific was chartered by the same body in 1864. Most informed persons today are aware that these two so-called transcontinental railroads were established by the Lincoln administration during the Civil War years. With the name of the Union Pacific-Central Pacific project from Nebraska to California we associate the personalities of Grenville M. Dodge, Leland Stanford, and many others prominent in the history of engineering and finance. With the Northern Pacific line from Lake Superior to Puget Sound we link the names of Josiah Perham and J. Gregory Smith, two Yankees, respectively, from Maine and Vermont, and of Jay Cooke and Henry Villard. We know that both railroads were built with the aid of Federal land grants—a practice begun in behalf of the Illinois Central Railroad in 1850 and continued thereafter for 21 years. We know that certain railroad rate problems connected with these land grants of the Civil War period persisted until final settlement thereof by the Eightieth Congress in 1947.

But some aspects of this important railroad legislation of the Lincoln administration have sometimes been overlooked. Especially is this true with regard to President Lincoln's own connections with these projects. Because the Union Pacific was the first one chartered, and because, as John W. Starr has reminded us, Lincoln was profoundly interested in it, we may consider the Chief Executive's relationship to that enterprise.[5]

Under the statute as passed by Congress the President was charged with important responsibilities. He was directed to locate the point for the beginning of the line at that place in Nebraska which seemed best to him. Lincoln selected Omaha, and the Union Pacific still has its operating headquarters there. Likewise, the President was directed to locate the 300 most difficult miles of construction for which the Government had pledged the maximum subsidies. This Lincoln and his successor did, basing their decision on the rule that the dominating grade could not exceed that of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad where that line crossed the Alleghenies. Finally, under the statute, President Lincoln was to fix the gage for the Pacific railroad.

The importance of this provision in the law was great. Prior to 1861 American railroading had employed as many as 23 different track gages in the construction of various lines. Most popular in the North and East was the Stephenson gage of 4 feet 8½ inches, brought over from Great Britain. In the South and in California, however, the prevailing gage was 5 feet. So confusing was the resultant situation that not until after 1865 was there continuous railroad passage across either the Potomac or the Ohio Rivers. All observers in 1863 agreed that the gage decided upon for the Union Pacific would probably be decisive in guiding the future operations of American railroads. President Lincoln at first was inclined to favor the wider gage. On March 3, 1863, however, he acquiesced in the desire of Congress and specified that the new line was to be built with the 4-foot 8½-inch gage. How vital this decision was may be inferred from the fact that within barely two decades all main lines in the United States had followed suit, and standard gage rolling stock was operating everywhere in the Nation. Aside from winning the war itself, the action of the Lincoln administration in thus insuring a standard gage for our railroads was its major accomplishment in attaining a true national unity.

Before leaving this fascinating topic of Lincoln's relation to railroads, it may be remarked that during his years in the White House the first steel rails ever used in the United States were imported; that, as Robert S. Henry has so ably pointed out,[6] the Civil War developed into the first truly railroad conflict of history, whose lessons were heeded in the great emergencies of 1917–18 and 1941–45; that during the war years the first post-office cars were added to American trains; that the oldest existent railway labor union, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, was organized; and that to Lincoln's funeral train in 1865 there were coupled the original Pullman sleeping car and the first Presidential private car ever built for an American Chief Executive. While the administration was not responsible for all these developments, it is worth remembering that they occurred.

VIII

So far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, the Lincoln administration's contribution was to establish it as a truly important branch of our National Government. Building on a tiny foundation of previous work in the United States Patent Office, the Congress established the autonomous Department of Agriculture by an Organic Act approved by the President on May 15, 1862. Lincoln promptly appointed his good friend, Isaac Newton, a prominent farmer from Pennsylvania, as the first Commissioner for the new department. In his first annual report, issued the next year, Commissioner Newton aptly summed up the objectives of his department by saying that it was to help the agriculturist "make two blades of grass grow where one grew before."[7] From this telling phrase came the title for Thomas S. Harding's notable recent history of the Department of Agriculture (Two Blades of Grass, 1947).

Back of the Lincoln administration's decision to establish such a department were the rapid urbanization of the North, the war-induced need for increased production of foodstuffs, and the insistent pressure of agricultural societies all over the country. Confident of the President's support, Commissioner Newton rapidly expanded his new department. Within the first 2 years he had organized the divisions of plant industry, entomology, agricultural economics, and chemistry. In addition, Newton named the noted American botanist, William Saunders, as head of the department's experimental gardens. It was to Saunders that Abraham Lincoln turned for advice in designing the national cemetery at Gettysburg, and it was Saunders who was a pioneer in introducing into the United States selected plants of foreign origin, among these the eucalyptus tree and the valencia orange.

IX

These, then, were the enduring achievements of the Lincoln administration in the great areas of national life approximately within the scope of the eight principal departments of government as they were between 1861 to 1865. The story, however, is not yet complete. There were several other accomplishments which do not fit easily into the above pattern of reference.

Perhaps the most significant of these was the foundation of the National Academy of Sciences. The congressional statute establishing this institution was heartily approved by the President on March 3, 1863. The original incorporators included such well-known men as Joseph Henry, of the Smithsonian Institution; Asa Gray, from Harvard; and Alexander Dallas Bache. From the beginning the National Academy of Sciences has been quasi-governmental in nature, its nearest equivalent being the British Royal Society and the French Academy. Since 1863 it has limited its membership to 350 citizens of the United States, and 50 foreign associates.

[4] William C. Church, Life of John Ericsson (1890), I, 246–253. See also J. P. Baxter, the Introduction of Iron-Clad Warships (1933), pp. 254–255.

[5] John W. Starr, Jr., Lincoln and the Railroads (1927), p. 194.

[6] The Story of Reconstruction (1933), pp. 419 ff.

[7] That Lincoln had something to do with the phraseology of Newton's report is suggested by the fact that Lincoln used the phrase in his address before the Wisconsin State Agricultural Society, September 30, 1859.

In 1916 the National Academy of Sciences offered its services to President Wilson; from that offer grew the National Research Council of the First World War. In June 1940, as the Hitler armies were overrunning Western Europe, the leaders of the National Academy of Sciences and certain others were requested by President Roosevelt to form the Defense Research Committee. In 1941 this was rechristened the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Now in the postwar period, with many doubts and heartsearchings in various places, efforts are going forward to estalish a National Science Foundation to encourage research in civilian and military endeavors. To us today, however, it is noteworthy that this entire trend of institutionalizing and subsidizing scientific research stems from an innovation of the Lincoln administration.

Three other miscellaneous but enduring accomplishments of Lincoln's Presidency may be named. One was the establishment of Washington Territory with the same boundaries as the present State in March 1863, the recognition of the State of West Virginia in June 1863, of Nevada in 1864, and the formation of Montana Territory in May 1864. Another was President Lincoln's invitation to all the governors of the North to met with him at the White House on September 26, 1862, an innovation from which the modern annual governors' conferences have evolved. The third was the use by the President of the press conference in a way that foreshadowed its development in our time. James E. Pollard in his volume entitled "The Presidents and the Press" (1947) has written as follows: "In his sense of public relations and in his dealings with the press, Abraham Lincoln showed more skill and acumen than any previous President and, allowing for the differences in time, more than all but one or two since." [5]

William H. Herndon once remarked of his celebrated law partner: "Mr. Lincoln thought too much and did too much for America and the world to be crammed into one epigram or shot off with a single rocket." Benjamin P. Thomas in his recent book, Portrait for Posterity, declares: "As our portrait of Lincoln becomes true, it also becomes more superb."

Both these aphorisms take on new proof from a review of the enduring achievements of the Lincoln administration. The mind that was as keenly interested in balloons as in the best gage for a Pacific railroad, that was as alert to the possibilities of a breech-loading rifle as to the need for improved agriculture, that was as sensitive to the feelings of the Negro republic of Haiti as to the demands of the financial magnates for a new banking system, that was as aware of the possibilities in Ericsson's designs for a naval ironclad as of Joseph Henry's dream of a National Academy of Sciences—such a mind is in very truth superb.

If we should include only the accomplishments sketched in this essay, there are more than 30. If we disregard all those directly connected with the actual prosecution of the war, i. e., those related to the War and Navy Departments, there are yet left a score of noteworthy achievements. If we strike from this list all those that seem inconsequential or of little import, there still remain a dozen achievements of first-rate importance in the shaping of American life and national character. Surely it is not too much to say that in creative imagination, in intellectual vigor, and in moral recognition the Lincoln administration left a heritage unsurpassed in our history.

The statue of Freedom surmounting the dome of our Capitol in Washington was placed there during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln. On December 2, 1863, it was erected on what was then the highest man-made elevation in our Capital City. There it stands today, symbolic of the spirit and aspirations of our people. The Lincoln administration stands equally high in American memories. Its enduring and constructive achievements will always be cherished as proofs of democracy's vitality when enobled by leadership like that of Abraham Lincoln.

[5] P. 389.

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the December 12, 1948, radio broadcast by a leading San Francisco attorney, Mr. Aaron M. Sargent, entitled "Socialized Medicine."

I recommend every person reading this convincing statement bring it to the attention of community leaders, members of health departments, educators, heads of service and women's clubs, labor unions and farm leaders, and others in position to give leadership on public thinking.

I am going to start this broadcast by reading some propaganda:

"The Soviet Union is a bulwark against war and aggression. It works unceasingly for peaceful international order. It has eliminated racial prejudice. It has established higher living standards. Its constitution guarantees free medical care, security in sickness and old age."

Screwy, isn't it? Particularly that stuff about international peace. I have just been reading part of an open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union published in the September 1939 issue of a Communist magazine, Soviet Russia Today. You can get the original from appendix IX of the Dies committee report on the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

Some of the signers of that statement were university presidents, college deans, professors, clergymen, writers, poets, and other intellectuals. It contained the signatures of 170 gullible American liberals—theoretical and inexperienced people who are supporting a lot of the experiments being tried out by your Federal Government today.

HERE IS THE EVIDENCE

My subject is socialized medicine. I am not a professor. I am here to give you the evidence arranged as an attorney would present a case. This is not a dry subject which concerns only the business of your doctor.

Actually, it is your business. It is no longer safe for you to let theoretical and impractical people tinker with that business.

Suppose we get down to brass tacks. What is socialized medicine? What is the history of that movement? Perhaps we should start with Karl Marx, who worked out the theory of communism in 1848. That was 100 years ago. Socialized medicine is nearly as old as that. Bismarck introduced it in Germany in 1883. They called him the Iron Chancelor. He had no interest in the common man, nor in social reform. But he was interested in socialized medicine because it would strengthen the monarchy by making the people dependent on the state.

AS GERMANY TRIED IT

The German system spread to Austria in 1888 and was introduced in France in a modified form in 1918. Now, what was the German system?

Medical care was free—at least it was free in the sense that the patient made no direct payment for the service. The entire cost was paid by the state. It came out of a fund raised by general taxation.

When the French took over that system with the Province of Alsace, after World War I, they found it involved in huge deficits and wide-spread corruption. They substituted a medical reimbursement plan under which the patient paid the bill and then applied for a refund from the state. The service did not improve. Deficits continued. Medical care was free. The people abused their privilege and took advantage of the system.

Socialized medicine started in Great Britain in 1911. The present Labor Government passed a drastic law, this year, as a part of its nationalization program. New Zealand has been experimenting with a medical plan for the last 10 years.

The New Zealand statute provides that "every person is entitled, without cost to himself, to such medical care as is ordinarily given by medical practitioners in the course of general practice." Under that law the patient is free to visit as many doctors as he wishes, per day, per week, or per year—all without cost to himself. He has that right and he takes advantage of it. His prescriptions are free—so are his X-rays and so is everything else. It is all free—something for nothing.

The New Zealand system has a pension angle. With a doctor's certificate, a man can get on the pension list, at least temporarily, and sometimes for life. He can see one doctor after another until someone will certify him for the pension fund.

In New Zealand the annual cost is $60 per person. That means $240 per family. It would be a large item to come out of your budget. The direct tax takes five and a half cents out of every dollar paid as wages. That covers only a part of the cost. The balance comes out of the general fund.

NO TIME FOR RESEARCH

Even then, medical standards are low. A very small amount is voted for research. Physicians have little time for study. They must see too many patients in the course of a day. Ethical doctors are at a disadvantage. Those who will certify pension claims get most of the business. Medical practice is a question of endurance and survival.

The failures of social medicine in Germany, France, Great Britain, and New Zealand have certain elements in common:

The deficits put a squeeze on both doctor and patient. To avoid excessive cost the state had to limit the amount of service. Pressure was applied to force the doctor to use cheap remedies, even where more expensive treatment was necessary.

Some doctors had to see as many as 50 and even 100 people in a single day. Adequate care was impossible. Since the service was free, the patient had no interest in keeping down the cost. He did have a very definite interest in building up a pension claim.

THE APPROACH IN AMERICA

Our Federal Security Agency is backing a plan for compulsory health insurance. Its program is based on the following argument:

1. That the Nation's health is in a deplorable state;

2. That adequate care can be provided only under a compulsory system.

Draft rejection statistics are cited to prove an emergency.

Rejections during World War II amounted to 36 percent of the men called for duty. If that figure were an index of our public health, we would really be in a dangerous fix. But that is not the truth of the matter.

Many rejections were for nonmedical causes. Others involved conditions which could not have been prevented by any form of medical treatment. Men were eliminated for illiteracy, mental deficiency, and insanity—for minor difficulties such as eye trouble, defective hearing, and even for flat feet. There was quite a bit of venereal disease. It is a social rather than a medical problem. These items covered 60 percent of the rejections in some places.

The examinations were for combat duty, not to determine whether the men were in good general health, nor even whether they were fit for civilian employment.

So much for the medical angle. How about the economic consequences of this compulsory scheme? Group plans and private insurance companies will be eliminated. They are unable to pay the claims that will pile up under a free—get something for nothing—type of law. Health insurance will be a Government monopoly. There will be more waste, the result of bureaucracy. In France the cost of social security increased until it consumed 25 percent of the nation's pay roll.

LIFE INSURANCE NEXT

The next move will be to socialize life insurance, to make it part of the national pension system. Step by step the process will go on. Government invasion of insurance, or of any other business, is like creeping paralysis. It takes over one operation after another until the people have lost control of everything.

Very well, let's be practical and look at this as you do—the way you have to look at it. You want to do something about your own security. You are not a capitalist, or an executive, or a businessman. You work for wages. Maybe you are a white-collar worker.

Does this thing really affect you and your future?

You will find that there is nothing free about free medical care. It is a direct tax on wages. You pay the bill. You carry the burden of every man who takes advantage of the system. It will reduce your scale of living.

You will discover that you have gambled and lost your opportunity to get real security under voluntary plans. Fifty-two million persons now have some form of hospitalization insurance. Instead of turning over your future to a Government bureau, don't you think you should arrange for more security by an extension of that system?

DANGER OF SOCIALISM

Have you considered the danger of socialism? Freedom of employment can only exist in America where there is private operation of business. You may not always agree with your boss. It may be necessary to pass more laws to regulate his business. But think twice before you put him out of business.

Government ownership of business will bring political control over jobs and wages. Some public official will decide whether you or someone else is hired. You will have to play politics to make a living. No labor union in this country is strong enough to protect you against such a monopoly.

Under our system of private operation of business with an independent medical profession, we have the best health record of any large nation in the world.

Do you realize that in our generation 20 years of life have been added to the average expectancy of individuals at birth? Disastrous epidemics have been virtually eliminated; we have stronger, better-fed children; there has been a sharp reduction in the death toll from many diseases that were formerly high on the mortality list; and we have a vast storehouse of knowledge about the prevention and treatment of disease. This is the record of what has been achieved by freemen in the medical field in our time.

Do you know that the United States is the only country which spends an adequate amount on medical research? We have funds supporting the study of heart disease, cancer, and infantile paralysis. An amazing amount of progress has been made in the last 37 years—nearly all of it in this country. During the same period nothing of importance has come from Soviet Russia, or from any country in the grip of either socialism or communism.

You had better think about the effect of all this on the morale of our people. Every time we lead men to believe they can get something for nothing, we bring them closer to dictatorship. Lenin said, "Socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of the Socialist state."

There are at least 10 Communist fronts working for social insurance. Do you think they are trying to improve conditions in the United States? Do you have the idea they are trying to build a strong nation, able to stand up against Soviet Russia?

COULD BANKRUPT UNITED STATES

No, the key people in these Communist fronts realize that compulsory health insurance will bankrupt the United States, as it has exhausted the finances of every nation which has tried that experiment. They know disorder will follow—that we will become disunited. And they know something else—they realize that controls established under that system will be available to set up a dictatorship.

Social security is the greatest delusion of our time. We have come to believe we can get security without working for it—that it is only necessary to vote for it. The people of another great nation went to destruction because of their belief in that delusion. They voted for a promise of their leader. He said: "We shall banish want. We shall banish fear. The essence of national socialism is human welfare. National socialism is the revolution of the common man. National socialism means a new day of abundance at home, and a better world abroad." Those are the words of Adolf Hitler, and that is the delusion.

What does America intend to do about its own delusion? What do you propose to do about it?

State Medicine in Practice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1948, an article entitled "State Medicine in Practice" appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. This article was written by Elizabeth W. Wilson, who is one of the outstanding women actuaries in the United States and the only woman sent from America to the Congress of Actuaries in London this past summer. She made a study of the British socialized medicine program and her findings are being circularized by the American Medical Society. Because there is so much interest in this problem at this time, I feel that the membership of the House would be interested in reading this article. By leave granted to me, I include her article herewith in my remarks:

STATE MEDICINE IN PRACTICE—WAITING FOR THE DOCTOR PUTS DIFFERENT EMPHASIS ON BRITISH HEALTH SERVICE

(By Elizabeth W. Wilson)

One rainy mid-August afternoon I sat in Dr. Brown's surgery in an English provincial town. On hard benches around the walls were elderly women, young women, and a few children, new panel patients in the 6-week-old national health service. One matriarch grumbled, "In the old days, the doctor would have come to my house on a day like this; now he says, 'The government expects you to come to me.'"

Another woman spoke up, "Dr. Brown is better about that than Dr. Anderson. He won't go to you unless you have a fever of 102."

A toddler whimpered. Her mother apologized. "She gets so restless when we have to wait. It seems that is all we do nowadays. My brother had to wait 2 weeks until his dentist could get permission from a government dentist to put two gold teeth in his mouth, and the London man never even saw my brother."

The old woman assented. She continued, "Waiting, waiting, always waiting. We queue for the bakery, we queue for the busses—now we have to queue for the doctor. I could do half a day's work in the time I waste in line."

Her daughter soothed her with "You ought to be thankful that you can sit down here. Tonight, when the men come in, the line will be out in the street."

The woman who knew the doctor's wife reported: "Last Friday the doctor had 120 patients in his surgery and made 25 calls."

I made a quick calculation—120 patients in 2 hours; that was 2 minutes each. Other doctors were having similar experiences. A doctor in a northern industrial town had showed me his books for the first week of the new system. Together we had worked out the average time given an office patient. It was 6 minutes. In an eastern university town, a doctor said he averaged 3½ minutes.

I asked, "Doesn't the line move quickly?"

A woman, previously silent, replied, "Sometimes it does. When there are lots of certificates they take only a couple of minutes each. We have to get a new prescription every time our medicine is renewed, and certificates for glasses, stays (specially made corsets), and lots of other things." No wonder one of my general practitioner friends had written me that he was getting writer's cramp signing certificates.

The baby's mother said, "When the doctor is in a hurry, he pushes you right along; other times he lets you tell him everything."

The old woman sniffed. "Who wants to tell the doctor everything? The local executive committee can see his records and that gossipy little Minnie Smith is the committee secretary. Once she got hold of anything it would be all over town in a hurry."

Later I asked the doctor about this. He said that it was true. Despite the fact that before the service went into operation, the people of Britain were assured that their relationship with the doctor would remain personal and confidential. Regulation 507 provides that the doctor must allow his records to be inspected, and even turn over the records to the committee.

I asked him, too, about the report that family doctors were becoming mere distributing centers, pushing patients along to hospitals and/or specialists. He shook his head sadly. "There are only about 5,000 accredited specialists in Britain. Not quite all of them are in the service, but about 40,000,000 people have joined. Such a small group cannot do much to lighten the general practitioner's load. Of course, the outpatient departments of the hospitals help some, but it is next to impossible to get

patients into hospitals except in case of emergency. The Royal Devon in Exeter has a waiting list of over 1,400."

That checked with stories I had heard elsewhere. A 300-bed hospital in Cambridge has a waiting list of 1,800, and one of the big London hospitals has more than 4,000 applicants. The problem is not just building more wings but finding nurses to service the beds in them. A survey is being made of the possibility of more efficient use of existing facilities, but no one in authority seems to think that it can solve the problem. No other solution seems imminent.

As I walked back to my hotel from the doctor's office I saw another long line, this time in front of a chemist's shop (drug store). The next morning I interviewed the proprietor. He told me that since the new service had come into operation the number of prescriptions he had to fill had almost doubled. "Everyone seems eager to get something for nothing," he said. Moreover, the average cost per prescription has also increased. Doctors are using more proprietary drugs.

Under the old national health insurance doctors were forced to prescribe the less expensive drugs, but the Government has promised that under the present scheme such prohibition will not be used

What do the people think of the new service? Some like it. Some do not. Businessmen and farmers fear the cost. Factory worker and bus driver think it is a wonderful experiment. They brag that it is their service. One riveter actually told an eminent surgeon, "You must do as I say—you doctors are working for me now."

John Burroughs boasted, "Serene I fold my hands and wait." The Britisher has to fold his hands and wait for doctor, for hospital accommodation, for his prescription, and for governmental permission to have dental work done. The question is, How long will the laborer who owns the system remain "serene"?

The Liberalism Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader attempted to point out in remarks on January 7, 1949, the manner in which the Democratic majority, through the device they saw fit to adopt the opening day of the session, have liberalized procedures in the House. One of the best answers to this chimerical claim is contained in the enclosed article by Mr. William S. White, of the New York Times staff. It shows the practical manner in which the new system will work.

The absolutism inherent in the changed rule is well known to the membership, which is familiar with the practical operations of such matters, and to the politicians who tailored the rule to suit their purpose.

The retrogressive step may not be equally apparent to the public. For that reason, Mr. White's illuminating explanation is extremely helpful.

HOUSE GIVES TO SPEAKER LARGE GRANT OF POWER—UNDER NEW RULES HE WILL BE ABLE TO HOLD UP OR EXPEDITE LEGISLATION

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, January 8.—The Democratic House, with the help of 49 Republicans who perhaps had in mind the events of last November 2, has now laid it down in the rubrics that its Rules Committee shall be forever curbed.

The committee, through the current Roosevelt-Truman decade, has been a bottleneck—and its members perhaps would not be the last to concede it—for many programs for innovation in many fields.

Its power has been, by inheritance, by tradition, by precedent, and by age, the power to decide, generally speaking, which bills should get to the floor, and which should die undebated.

Its personnel, for years, has been usually of the right-wing because about half—giving or taking a bit for the run and ebb of party control of the House—have been Republican. Most of the other half have been southern Democratic, since the southerners as a group run to high seniority, which is the key qualification.

ACTION INDICATED

When Mr. Truman was elected in his own right it was obvious, of course, that he and his associates had to do something about the situation. For it was the Rules Committee that had successfully put out orders, in the President's "worst" Eightieth Congress, that there should be no public housing, no universal military training, and nothing done about certain other items to which the President was committed.

However, when it came to putting down on paper ways and means to re-form the committee (the outright abolition of which was unthinkable because of the necessity of controlling the enormous flood of bills annually), many difficulties at once rushed to hand.

There was an early thought of packing it—until it was realized that the congressional system must take care of the minority, too. Therefore, if the leaders added new members, roughly in the proportion of one Republican to one Democrat (beyond a certain initial weighting in favor of the Democrats), the character of the committee would remain the same as it had been.

EVIDENT DISADVANTAGE

There was a notion to permit, say, 100 House Members to circumvent and dislodge the Rules Committee by direct appeal to the floor. However, administration Democrats soon recognized that under this scheme 50 Republicans and 50 southern Democrats, all with hostile purpose, could bring off embarrassing revolts.

So, at length, the administration forces settled on the ultimate design: any chairman (meaning any Democrat) of a legislative committee (meaning one directly responsible for making up bills) may now appeal to Speaker SAM RAYBURN if the Rules Committee insists on sitting unduly on his projects.

The Speaker, in this arrangement, is under direction to recognize the dissident—that is, to let him bring his proposal directly to the floor.

COMPLICATING FACTORS

There are, however, certain complications. There is nothing really substantial in House rule or law or custom—and custom is in every case the most powerful factor of all—to compel any Speaker to recognize anyone. He may, by design or simple omission, see someone else first, so to speak; and the first man on his feet may be the last man standing there.

Moreover, it is customary in the House for those seeking the Speaker's official ear on the floor to go to him in advance, perhaps the day before, and privately advise him as to what is afoot. Persons not taking these preliminary dispositions, which are, of course, in the nature of provisional requests, rarely get very far when the hour for recognition arrives.

But then, assuming one had sought out the Speaker in advance, there are other possible difficulties. If the applicant contemplated bringing up over the head of the Rules Committee a bill which the leadership did not want, various things might then ensue.

SPEAKER'S POWERS

The Speaker, who apart from his high constitutional office is almost always the unchallengeable boss of his party in the House, could indicate a certain displeasure. He could suggest that for ponderous reasons, including the disfavor of the administration, the bill should not immediately come in. He could, in the next to last resort, if the chairman-applicant remained adamant, arrange things so that not even all of the chairman's own members would stay with him in a show-down.

He could, in the last resort, cast all the party hierarchy's influence against the applicant.

Thus it is that Mr. Rayburn, as he is well aware, has received a power and a responsibility not given in generations to a Speaker of the House. He will be in command; and he will be responsible, in almost the complete sense of that term, for what the House does, insofar as the administration Democrats are not outweighed, from time to time, by the orthodox Republicans and whatever bloc of rebellious southern Democrats may be marshaled.

The House, in short, has recognized what has been recognized there since the middle nineteenth century: that in a body so large and inchoate some aspect of bossism is indicated, until some not yet devised scheme may be brought forward that makes a better and more democratic scheme possible.

The wheel, in all reality, has turned very nearly full circle toward the old days of czarism—in the hands of the Speaker.

The Rochester Institute of International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, informed public opinion is perhaps the most important factor in enhancing the prospects for world peace. On December 11 last, the Rochester Institute of International Affairs was held in Rochester, N. Y. The institute was established a year ago as a joint venture of the Rochester Association for the United Nations—the largest dues-paid association in the country, the Rochester branch of the Foreign Policy Association, and the City Club of Rochester, Inc. The program this year was enlarged into both afternoon and evening meetings, follow-

ing the extremely favorable response accorded the inaugural program.

At the afternoon meetings Mrs. Vera M. Dean, director of research for the Foreign Policy Association, spoke on Our Responsibilities in World Affairs and Mr. Francis H. Russell, Director of the Office of Public Affairs of the State Department, on the subject Problems of Peace. In the evening the speakers were Maj. Gen. Gordon P. Saville, commanding general of the Air Defense Command, on The Role of the Military; Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, chairman of the General Advisory Committee for the Atomic Energy Commission, on the Open Mind, and the Honorable Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, on A Decisive Moment in American Foreign Policy. The addresses by these leaders in their respective fields were uniformly informative and thought provoking.

Dr. Oppenheimer's address, it is understood, will appear in the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly and Mr. Welles' address in the magazine the Changing World, published by the American Association for the United Nations. The latter was also carried coast-to-coast by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

It was a moving experience to watch thousands of people from all walks of life crowd into these meetings, all searching hungrily for peace.

A letter was read from Mr. Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations, to Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, general chairman of the institute. Mr. Lie said:

Please accept my best wishes for the success of the Rochester Institute of International Affairs.

Real international understanding can only be founded on an alert and enlightened public opinion and this in turn can only be developed if individual citizens will take it upon themselves, and are given the opportunity, to study and to discuss international affairs.

In affording such an opportunity to your fellow citizens I feel that you are performing a fine public service.

Mr. Linowitz, who did an outstanding job in making the arrangements for these meetings, described their purposes in these words:

The sole aim of the institute is to make an effective contribution toward the development of an alert public opinion, enlightened with respect to world issues and mobilized in support of intelligent leadership in international affairs. In conformance with this objective, the institute presents distinguished authorities, eminently qualified to discuss world problems.

It is significant that this year, even while the dread of another major war hangs heavy over the peoples of the world, the various segments of our community have made common cause in sponsoring this institute. Rochester's churches, civic organizations, professional associations, labor and management groups, youth agencies, and institutions of learning have here united to explore together the prospects for world peace.

We hope that the institute will continue as an annual community-wide event in Rochester. We trust that it will become an important force in the development of a fuller understanding of world issues and a clearer perception of the fundamental bases for an enduring peace.

The Rochester institute has now clearly attained Nation-wide significance. It represents a tangible and effective expression of community-wide devotion to the problems of world peace.

The Years Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Alf M. Landon to Washburn Bar Association, January 11, 1949:

There are three subjects of intense interest and general discussion that will only be answered in the years ahead by the kind of government we have.

Government being used here to mean the administration of our public affairs.

These three subjects are one and the same. They are:

1. Our relations with Russia.
2. National defense.
3. Future business conditions.

In attempting to evaluate the years ahead, we must get a sound foundation in our thinking.

No longer can the fact be concealed from the American people that we have again lost the peace. This time by no stretch of the imagination can it be blamed on either the Republicans or the isolationists.

The hallelujah internationalists hysterically refused to permit any examination or consideration of what we were doing from the first trip of Secretary Hull to Moscow to the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

Every attempt to point out that things were not as they seemed to be represented to the American people—that we ought to and had a partner's right to examine the colonial policies of our allies—that we had no foreign policy except revenge—that we were getting the cart before the horse at Bretton Woods or at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco—was met with hysterical cries of perfectionism or isolationism by the hallelujah internationalists.

The hallelujah internationalists had their way. The peace is lost again. America today faces its greatest menace in a great totalitarian government on three fronts. Every strategic position which Russia occupies today in the world was handed her on a silver platter by the U. S. A., and now superficial liberals would belittle the discoveries of a Communist conspiracy in America.

I have said heretofore that whether the contest between communism and capitalism would result in a war in the near future or not was more or less a guess. Personally, for some time I have not thought that it would result in a war in the near future—unless some explosive incident occurred. There are many opportunities for that to happen scattered over the world. I think the Russian strategy is based on the Marxian concept that the capitalistic system will fall under its own weight—undermined by subversive activity from within. That, however, does not mean that war with Russia is remote.

It is high time we believe Lenin and Stalin. They have repeatedly announced that the conflict between communism and capitalistic democracy is irreconcilable.

Their strategy of sabotage boring from within is well known. Confident of our strength, we have ignored it too long. Many a political campaign as well as key fortresses or battles in war has been lost by overconfidence.

Whatever their methods the end never changes—the destruction of the U. S. A.

The greatest menace to America today is to believe that if we are reasonable with Russia she will be reasonable with us—when there is not a spot on the globe where Russia has not precipitated a conflict with us.

The center of the conflict is not in western Europe or Asia or the Mediterranean. The crucial field of conflict is here in America—not Berlin—nor even China.

If our grand and glorious republic—the citadel of world democracy—can be conquered and crushed by the Trojan horse tactics prescribed by Marx and Lenin—the world battle against Russian imperialism will be lost.

More vital than rearmament is the task of tearing off the masks of so-called Americans—who by conviction, whims, or perversity, not gold—are destroying our country. Itching palms do not cause their treachery.

Spying—the cloak and dagger stuff—the delivery of secret state documents into the hands of the Communists—has dramatized but must not divert us from the vital job of penetrating the heart of Communist conspiracy to conquer America from within.

"In this cold-war period which has many world leaders far more frightened than they were during hostilities," to continue to ignore the gravity of the revelations of the House Un-American Activities Committee—not so much as spying as of infiltration—is to invite tyranny of communism and the ruination of our beloved Republic.

Regardless of smearing attacks on congressional committees—or of the personal habits of the men whose names have been involved—the fact that documentary evidence of a Communist conspiracy has been uncovered with plain indications that it is continuing today.

In the light of startling and shocking events—until at least some other Government agency proves as diligent in defense against Communist activities in America—and the surface of the Communist conspiracy has only been scratched—America is weakening by the systematic campaign attacking the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Hysterical cries of a witch hunt by superficial liberals and by the dupes of artful Communists—who are serving in false front organizations—must not divert our finishing of the job of removing the Communist gangrene eating into the heart of the Nation.

An administration that neglects to deal vigorously and immediately with the Communist conspiracy honeycombing America—in government—in labor unions where anti-Communist labor leaders are battling Communist labor leaders—in educational circles where Russian-first writers, lecturers, and teachers are busy as beavers—has as heavy a responsibility as if it failed to prepare for armed defense.

From the questions asked me daily, it is evident that people are increasingly mystified and concerned by the administration's attempt to sit on the lid of the Communist conspiracy in America and its failure to follow up vigorously the exposure and the prosecution of traitorous Americans uncovered as a result of the Canadian spy investigations.

The right of investigation by the legislative branch is a precious one. It extends from the National Capitol to statehouses and even municipal government under a council. Repeatedly it has proved its value. But as I have said heretofore, these investigating committees need to set up some standards and principles of procedure. The worst usurpations of the rights of citizens in modern times were the New Deal investigation

committees in the early thirties. But there were no protests then from the "totalitarian liberals"—even though private files were rifled and telegrams seized—something the Un-American Activities Committee has never stooped to.

I am convinced that the Russian dictator of half the world is waiting for us to knock ourselves out through our own financial excesses. By creating turmoil at home and abroad, the burden is increased on us. Capital investment is being diverted from reconstruction to rearmament in all the democracies.

The Eighty-first Congress should take stock of our resources and our potential expenditures and cut the cloth of its appropriations to fit the measure the same as any simple family—after first complying with the President's request for a sizable debt reduction.

No document in recent years measures the importance of the Hoover report. It shows how billions of dollars can be saved in the reorganization of the maze of Government bureaus. It deserves the intense attention of the entire country.

Both the Finletter report and the Hoover Commission estimate that billions of dollars could be saved if we have a real unification and an efficient administration of the armed services. Unification of our armed services is a joke—but a costly one. The bill passed by the Congress was a weak act, and it has been weakly administered.

The squabble between the top brass—their wasteful expenditures and unsatisfactory results—is a scandal. They ought to be fired and Congress should pass a real unification act not only for the sake of the already overburdened taxpayer—who cannot last forever the way we are going—but also for the sake of a more modern efficient planning and administration of our national defense.

I have repeatedly said for a year or more that the real crises we faced were in our defense program. Our national security is threatened by the dispute between the armed services. Under the supposed Unification Act, we have four secretaries where we had two before, and we have a flock of under secretaries and assistant secretaries.

The Secretaries for the Army, Air, and Navy and their Under Secretaries and assistant secretaries should be immediately abolished, and we should have but one Secretary for Defense with one Under Secretary and assistant secretaries. We should have one Chief of Staff for all the armed services.

Neither the Congress nor the President should tolerate the continuing disputes between the civilian and military heads of the three services—each lobbying for their own separate claims on the already heavily burdened Treasury and taxpayer.

The business conditions in the years ahead will depend on Government policies more than they have heretofore. I do not mean that government can plan successfully their arrangement or that government can guarantee economic security for any private individual. I mean that a wasteful and prodigal government can exhaust the resources of even so great a people as Americans.

Instead of seeking economies wherever possible in order to sustain our defense program, ERP, the draft, the rearmament, further expansion of Government spending is projected. Contrary to the plain intent of the Congress the ERP is being administered to too great an extent as a relief measure. A high-ranking ECA official says that only 26 percent of its funds are being used in what he calls multipliers.

Whether European economic recovery can ever be attained on a long-run basis under present policies is a big question.

Obviously domestic business will continue a mirage of prosperity as long as we are dishing out the money.

But we are duplicating our experience after World War I when we lost our shirts through the Dawes plan and kindred financing of European countries that led to the smash in 1929.

I made a good many speeches in 1933 and 1934 in which I said that a man that owned the little piece of Kansas land—free of debt—as near self-sustaining as possible—was in the best position to ride out the social, economic, and political storms ahead of us. I think that is becoming more prophetic every day.

As America goes so goes the world. And America can only be destroyed by Americans.

It can be destroyed by biting off more than we can chew through a wasteful and extravagant expenditure of the fruits of American labor, in local, State, and Federal Governments.

The American taxpayer is the first line of defense for democracy—the world over—today.

America can be destroyed in the factories—on construction jobs where men are not doing an honest day's work.

The battle is being fought when dishonorable executives of large corporations have participated on the side in the gray market of their product.

The battle is being fought when men do not realize the value of cooperative collective bargaining as well as cooperative organizations in business and agriculture.

The battle is being fought not by spies obtaining secret official documents but by traitorous Americans systematically striving to shape American policy—thinking—and labor activities to orders from the Kremlin.

These indefatigable followers of Russian imperialism masquerading under the false front of Communism would betray their America wherever they can.

Not itching palms but perverted thinking motivates their treachery to their country.

They would substitute:

1. Arbitrary imprisonment for the right to trial.
2. Slave labor for free labor.
3. Dictatorship for free elections.
4. Atheism for religion.
5. Tyranny for freedom.
6. Control of teaching—literature—arts—and sciences by the central committee in Moscow. Servile thinking for academic freedom.
7. Murder for debate.

The tyrants of Russia are proving their determination to kill by the sword or by slave camps every human being whose political beliefs differ from theirs.

We are in a situation where failure to resolutely and immediately uncover the deceptions and the trail of treasonable Americans who follow Moscow will be fatal.

The strength of the democratic world is the strength of America.

The strength of America is the strength of her farms and factories.

We have been thinking a lot about our external strength and not enough about external strength being dependent on internal strength.

It Might as Well Be Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, just to keep the record straight, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the President has appointed Dean Acheson Secretary of State without consulting Republican members of the so-called nonpartisan Foreign Affairs Committee, which means, of course, that the nonpartisan foreign policy has been tossed out the window. The Republicans have been forced into the position where they must either appear very pitiful or they must accept the minority responsibility to investigate and criticize.

Mr. Acheson was the acknowledged head of that triumvirate that spearheaded the pro-Soviet bloc, namely, Mr. Acheson, Alger Hiss, and Harry D. White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. These three claimed most of the credit—and probably deserved it—for drafting the Charter of the United Nations, the Morgenthau plan, the Yalta agreement, and for the adoption of the Bretton Woods monetary agreements, all of which have proved to be inimical to the best interest of the United States.

Soviet Russia is not a military threat to the United States; their war talk is intended only to frighten and cause huge expenditures in the hope we will suffer an economic collapse. The Marshall plan and the administration's spending program are furthering Russian objectives. This triumvirate is also responsible for spreading the poisonous propaganda that the Chinese Communists are merely agrarian reformers and for betraying Chiang Kai-shek, our wartime ally, who has been consistently fighting communism for 20 years. By abandoning the Chinese Nationalist Government we are making it possible for Russian communism to overrun all of Asia, including the Philippines, and seize control of raw rubber, tin, bauxite, and manganese, all of which are so vitally essential to our economy; and once Russia controls these raw materials she can force us to pay through the nose or cripple us economically.

I am appending the lead editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 10, 1948, just to keep the record straight:

IT MIGHT AS WELL BE HISS

President Truman has appointed Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. He might as well have named Alger Hiss.

Dean Acheson was Assistant Secretary of State through the war, and Under Secretary from 1945 until July 1, 1947. Alger Hiss was his man. It might be said also that he was Hiss' man. Hiss was his principal follower in the State Department. They were widely recognized as leaders of the pro-Soviet bloc there.

Adolf Berle, another New Deal Assistant Secretary of State, testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities that in 1944 he fell out with the Acheson-Hiss clique because he "felt that the Russians were not going to be sympathetic and cooperative." He lost that fight and was exiled to Brazil as American Ambassador, ending his diplomatic career, he said.

Berle was a little less than frank. He told the committee that he was "worried" about Hiss. Actually, Whittaker Chambers had been taken to him 5 years before this incident, and Chambers had named Acheson's man, Hiss, to Berle as one of the persons in the State Department who was serviceable to Russian spies.

Acheson was the real father of the Marshall plan, insofar as it had a father on this side

of the Atlantic. He suggested its essential details in a speech in Mississippi before Secretary Marshall made his speech at Harvard. The give-away scheme originally included gifts to Russia. After the plan got rolling, Acheson quit the State Department and went back to the practice of law in Washington. He took Alger Hiss with him, as well as Alger's brother, Donald, another pro-Russian character.

A MILLION DOLLAR FEE

Acheson and the Hisses started lining up foreign governments as clients, for whom they solicited American gifts from the European-aid funds that Acheson had suggested and helped obtain. At one time they were reported to be trying to get half a billion dollars for Soviet-dominated Poland, for which service the fee was to be a million dollars.

Acheson was scheduled to be a witness before the Un-American Activities Committee, but never appeared. That would be an appropriate body to question him on his qualifications for the office to which he has been named.

Jay Franklin, the columnist who wrote campaign speeches for President Truman last year and has utilized that connection to write what is represented as inside information on the President's plans, comes out with a new one in the current issue of Life magazine. He alleges that what he calls the Marshall-Forrestal-Byrnes-Vandenberg foreign policy is to be replaced by a Truman foreign policy, of which the keystone will be an attempt to reach an agreement with Russia.

The Acheson appointment would fall in with such a theory. Although Acheson aroused Russian fulminations 2 years ago when he was beating the drums for the Marshall plan, he has a long record of pro-Russian conduct before then—conduct so pro-Russian that there is evidence on which to consider it anti-American.

Whatever the merits of efforts to end the cold war, and they may be considerable, Dean Acheson is not the person to handle them.

The New Crisis in the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The New Crisis in the Republican Party," which I made to the Young Republicans Convention at Salem, Oreg., on Saturday, December 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW CRISIS IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

It is a great honor to be invited by the young Republicans of Oregon to address this convention. It is also a great responsibility to address you because these are days in the life of the Republican Party when we must engage not only in critical analysis of Republican mistakes but also in constructive building of a great party which will represent and protect the common good.

I do not ask you to agree with my analysis of some of our party's problems. I never ask audiences to agree with me, but I do ask them to think with me about the various issues of government which I endeavor to raise for consideration in my speeches. It is easy for a politician to win audience approval or at least avoid audience disapproval if he says nothing in a speech but uses a lot of words accompanied by sound and fury in saying it. Unfortunately, too many Republican speeches have been like that and I suggest that Republican platitudes are part of the explanation for our party's not being in control of the affairs of our Government today.

Our defeat on November 2 has in no way changed my determination to continue to do whatever I can to help build public confidence in the Republican Party so that our party will be entrusted with the executive and legislative responsibilities of our Government. I am as convinced today as I was before the election that a Republican victory on November 2, 1948, was needed if we are to protect constitutional government in America and bring to our national administration the efficient farsighted statesmanship which I think it so sorely needs and which the election of a Republican President would have given it.

There is room in the Republican Party for broad differences of opinion on specific issues. In fact, one of the great strengths of our party is to be found in the fact that we have made great progress in our party over the years by hammering out on the anvil of conscionable compromise the differences of opinion which have existed from time to time between conservatives and constitutional liberals within our party. We Republicans have always recognized the importance to sound Republican government of making steady middle-of-the-road progress within the checks and balance system of constitutional procedures. Conservatives and liberals alike in the Republican Party have rejected the technique of the Democratic Party of circumventing constitutional procedures whenever the Constitution stood in the way of some end sought by the Democrats. One need mention only a few incidents to illustrate the point. Yalta and Potsdam stand out as clear examples of circumventing the treaty making procedures of the Constitution. The price we are paying for those mistakes is a dangerous threat to the peace of the world.

It was at Yalta that Korea was sacrificed on the altar of Russian Communism. It was at Yalta that concessions were made to Russia in Asia which never would have been approved by the Senate of the United States had those concessions been submitted as a part of the settlement of the peace through a treaty as they should have been. It was at Potsdam that the Berlin crisis was born. It needs no argument to prove that the Senate of the United States would have at least asked for a corridor into Berlin and would most certainly have insisted upon a clarification of our rights, prerogatives, and jurisdiction in Berlin.

It has been difficult to get the American people to fully appreciate that the Democratic administration has been willing to circumvent the Constitution and it has been more difficult at times to get people to understand the danger of that policy of the Democratic Party to their rights as individual citizens and to their daily living. It sometimes seems that to many people the Constitution is but a mere document of empty words—something to be praised in the abstract but not to be practiced in fact. Too many fail to see that it is a dynamic, living set of principles which grants them their political rights and economic freedoms. Thus they were not too alarmed or at least not as alarmed as they should have been over a court-packing plan or a proposal to draft men into private industry at the whim of the President and in the name of government direct them to be transferred from point to point in this country and required to work under the instructions and orders of private industry for the profit dollars of private employers. Too frequently the people have not seen the basic conflict between the highly discretionary, arbitrary, and capricious procedures of the Democratic administration and the provisions in this country of principles of government for which we Republicans have fought—namely, government by law in accordance with the liberalism of the Constitution.

Many people call me a liberal, but my liberalism consists of putting into practice the liberalism of the Constitution. It is that type of constitutional liberalism which I am convinced the overwhelming majority of the young Republicans of America, and I believe the rank and file of Republicans of all ages, really desire to put into practice.

Thus tonight I propose to address you briefly on the subject The New Crisis in the Republican Party. At the outset I would stress that irrespective of what differences may exist in the Republican Party, the leaders of that party, conservative and liberal alike, have a responsibility now of trying to weld together a sound program of constructive legislation—a program which will convince all groups within our society that we are the party which seeks to protect the legitimate interests of all segments of our economy without becoming the political tool of any economic pressure group. We must convince the American people that we are striving against the development of political alinements in this country based upon economic class consciousness. Nothing will wreck more quickly or more completely political and economic democracy in America than the development of political alinements based upon class conflict. If I were a member of the Democratic Party, I certainly would be greatly concerned with and deeply disturbed over the rapidity with which the Democratic Party is fast becoming a class-conscious party in America.

One of the troubles with the Democratic Party is that it has made so many inconsistent and conflicting promises to so many economic pressure groups in America that I am sure it will find it necessary to revive as its theme song during the next administration the old ditty, Yes, We Have No Bananas.

However, the Democratic Party is bound to slip on the peelings of its own promises. Therefore, we must prepare our party now to stand for a program which will restore the confidence of the American people in a forward-looking statesmanship. My campaign experiences in the 1946 and 1948 congressional campaigns have left me with a deep-seated conviction that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of registered Republican voters of this country are much more forward looking in their point of view as to what the Republican Party should stand for than are many of our Republican leaders who in the Eightieth Congress followed a legislative course of action which cost us the election on November 2, 1948.

In the campaigns of 1946 and 1948 I gave a great many speeches for the party. In the 1948 campaign I traveled across this country speaking in behalf of the Republican National Committee before many audiences which were greatly concerned over the issues of labor, agriculture, cost of living, taxes, education, and war or peace. I believe that every man who holds high office in the Republican Party has an ethical duty to do whatever he can to help win elections for the Republican Party. Until we can place our party in control of both the White House and the Congress, we cannot demonstrate to the American people that we can be counted upon to meet in the people's interest the many issues which are causing the worries that are troubling all citizens these days. I am particularly critical of those so-called liberals in the Republican Party who in times past have accepted high office from the Republican Party, have enjoyed the benefits that the party gives them through their offices, have accepted committee assignments in the Congress of the United States from

the Republican Party and then have sulked in their tents during a campaign. In fact sometimes some of them have even gone so far as to bolt their party because their party has not accepted in toto their views on every subject.

Many of you have heard me say before, but it is worth repeating now, that Republican conservatives and liberals alike have an ethical duty to work together in campaigns in an endeavor to elect a Republican administration in this country. I recognize that one's intellectual honesty makes it necessary for him on occasions to remain silent rather than support an individual or an issue which in his honest opinion cannot be reconciled with either the best interests of the party or of the country. However, that's quite a different thing from doing what some Republicans, both conservatives and liberals, have sometimes done in recent campaigns—namely, injure their party's chances at election by either bolting their party or failing to cooperate in a campaign.

Of course, some of you may ask how consistent are you in living up to the principle of political ethics which I have just enunciated? Haven't you at times in the Senate of the United States refused to support the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate? I plead guilty to that charge if charge it is. I most certainly have at times voted contrary to the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the Senate. I shall continue to refuse to support the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate whenever in my judgment the facts do not support those recommendations. It should be self-evident to every Republican in Oregon that the voters in Oregon did not send me to the United States Senate to let the chairman of the Republican policy committee, be he BOB TAFT or any other Republican, cast my vote for me. They sent me to the Senate to vote for issues on their merits in accordance with the facts as they are presented.

I shall always vote with the chairman of the Republican policy committee whenever he and his committee can demonstrate that their recommendations on an issue are sound on the merits and are not based primarily on partisan strategy. It needs to be emphasized that the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate is not the Republican Party. The Republican Party is composed of millions of rank and file registered Republican voters of this country. I shall always be willing to take my chances any time with those voters when it comes to my honest differences of opinion with recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the Senate as to what are sound Republican policies and principles.

When I first went to the Senate it was a common practice when one was sitting in committee and was called to the floor of the Senate by the vote bell to have some Republican leader tell you when you arrived on the floor of the Senate that such and such a bill had been called up for a vote and that it was an administration bill and that the vote should be "no." Sometimes after I went to my desk and pulled out the bill I would discover that it was a much-needed bill which should be passed in the public interest, and so I would vote "yes." Sometimes after the roll call on such occasions the Republican adviser who had met me at the door would say, "WAYNE, did you miss the instructions on that one? Didn't you realize that it was an administration bill and the vote was 'no'?" To which I would reply, "I understood the instructions all right, but you failed to tell me what was wrong with the bill."

We will never build a strong Republican Party in the Congress of the United States unless and until the Republicans in Congress demonstrate to the American people that we are willing to subordinate partisan and political strategy to the merits of needed legislation. In fact, in the Eighty-first Congress, I think we should proceed without delay to offer constructive legislation needed in the fields of labor, agriculture, taxation, education, veterans' affairs, conservation, reclamation, civil rights, and improved policies in foreign affairs plus legislation on many other issues which are causing such great concern to the American people. It is my hope that Republican strategy in the Eighty-first Congress will not be a defensive one trying to block the advance of the party of the opposition. Rather we should grab the ball at the beginning of the session and start our own march down the field of political statesmanship in support of sane, reasonable, workable legislation aimed at bringing about the needed stability in American policies, both domestic and foreign. If we do not take the offensive, I am fearful that a majority of the American people will cheer the opposition party on to further victories in 1950 and 1952.

Right now is the time for us to analyze the new crisis in the Republican Party. What do I mean by the new crisis in our party? Obviously, I refer to the significance of the walloping which the voters handed the Republican Party at the polls on November 2, 1948. It is clearly the worst election licking the Republicans have taken since 1932, especially when viewed in the light of the long head start which our party was given.

These are days when all Republicans, conservatives as well as liberals, should conduct a searching post mortem in an endeavor to detect any heretofore undisclosed political diseases which killed our party's expectant victory at the very critical time when most of us thought it was aborning. There is no point in trying to rationalize or alibi the political realities which caused our defeat.

So many campaign advantages were handed to the Republican Party during the weeks preceding election day that we cannot, with intellectual honesty, deny the fact that President Truman gave us an unmerciful whipping.

Republican advantages in the campaign were many. The Democratic Party suffered from the bitterness of the Wallace and the leftist commie-line attacks against Truman. The Dixiecrat split in the Democratic Party was also a serious handicap to Truman and those responsible for it wrote a disgraceful page in American history. It is shocking to think that in the year 1948 any group of Americans would attempt to form a political party based upon bigotry, intolerance, racial discrimination, and desecration of the Bill of Rights.

Truman's next handicap was his lack of campaign finances. His expected defeat was so completely taken for granted by former financial supporters of the Democratic Party that most of them refused to buy any hay for the Democratic donkey. One frequently heard the jesting remark that Truman was looking for a railroad siding on which to park his special train because his empty pockets were sure to reduce him to a campaign of political hitchhiking.

The epidemic of political laryngitis, which seemed to confine most of the top Democratic speakers to their tents for the duration of the campaign, was another liability to Truman. Only a few of the Democratic platform battlers such as Barkley, Brannan, Tobin, O'Mahoney, Ickes, Clark, McMahon, McGrath, and some others were willing to stand up for Truman and fight it out until the final bell sounded.

We now know that the hardest and toughest puncher of all was Truman, who threw such terrific right and left hooks into the body of the Republican policy that the American people counted us out, though we were still on our feet, on election day.

In an article in the February 1948 issue of the Progressive I warned that the Republican leaders in Congress who were responsible for the political-gesture anti-inflation bill passed during the 1947 special session of Congress deserve the rebuke recently handed them in President Truman's sound criticisms of the bill.

I also said it was fortunate that the great majority of registered Republican voters and people generally, did not share the reactionary economic views of those responsible for the bill, and suggested that it was not too late for the Republican Party to recover the anti-inflation bill which it so clumsily fumbled in the 1947 special session of Congress.

Finally, I said: "Let my Republican Party never forget that there are not enough Republicans to elect a Republican President, nor enough Democrats to elect a Democrat as President. Fortunately there are not enough fellow-travelers to elect Wallace.

"In 1948, as always, the political balance of power will be held by the millions of independent voters in our country. Their eyes are watching the Republican majority now sitting in the Eightieth Congress.

"The record of that Republican Congress in the months immediately ahead will determine in a large measure whether the voters' verdict in November 1948 will be victory or defeat for my party." Subsequent events speak for themselves as to whether that warning was sound.

Thomas E. Dewey was handicapped throughout the campaign by the failure of the Republican Party to make a record in Congress which would convince the American people that my party could be counted upon to protect the economic weak from the exploitation of the economic strong. Mindful of that record, it is understandable that powerful political groups, such as farmers, teachers, organized labor, many small-business men and large numbers of other consumers, were so politically frightened by economic-fear arguments in the campaign that they voted for Truman.

I would emphasize as strongly as I can that Thomas E. Dewey, the candidate, did not lose the election but rather the Republican Party and its strategy lost it for him. Further, I would stress that Dewey is the outstanding public administrator in the country today. He would have given to our National Government an administrative efficiency and a sound program of constitutional liberalism which are needed if we are to have government by law rather than by arbitrary men. Dewey's great record as Governor of New York, his devotion to efficiency in the handling of governmental affairs, and his support of progressive legislative policies make his future leadership a continued source of strength within the Republican Party.

However, there is no sense in Republicans trying to hide the fact that Dewey's defeat was a great blow to the party. Now is the time for the Republican Party to reorganize along the lines of constitutional liberalism so that the next Republican candidate for the Presidency, whoever he may be, will not have to plunge into the political swim of a campaign with the heavy stone of a reactionary congressional legislative record around his neck.

There is no doubt about the fact that Truman succeeded in convincing millions of American people that the Republican Eightieth Congress had let them down. It did let the people down on some issues. Nevertheless, it made a much better record than the people were led to believe. For the most part, Truman's attacks on the Eightieth Congress were unanswered. That was a mistake in Republican strategy. Dewey was entitled to reinforcements from Republican leaders of the Eightieth Con-

gress all across this Nation in answer to Truman's charges.

It needed to be pointed out, in clear terms, as some of us endeavored to do, that the record of the Eightieth Congress, in carrying out a sound bipartisan foreign policy under the able statesmanship of ARTHUR VANDENBERG, was historically a great one. It needed to be pointed out that this record in foreign relations had been marred on occasion by the blunders of the Democratic administration, including the Presidential mistakes growing out of the Potsdam Agreement and the White House proposals to sidestep the United Nations.

The public should have been reminded that the Taft-Hartley Act was no more the product of Republicans than of Democrats. While it unfortunately wears a Republican label, it was passed by Democrats as well as Republicans. The veto would have been sustained if the President had made a vigorous fight and if those of us who were battling to sustain the veto had received any substantial support from the Democrats in the Senate.

The point should have been stressed during the campaign to a much greater extent than it was that the Republican Party stood for needed revisions in the Taft-Hartley law. Some drastic revisions are needed in order to correct the injustices which have developed under the law since its passage. It should have been pointed out as some of us did during the campaign, particularly those of us who were sent by the Republican National Committee before large labor audiences throughout the country that both our Philadelphia platform and Dewey's Pittsburgh speech on labor pledged our party to a revision of the Taft-Hartley Act in light of facts which can be established showing that injustices exist in the law. It should have been pointed out that increasing numbers of employers for months past have been urging amendments to the Taft-Hartley law along the lines of the procedures of the Morse-Ives bill. There simply can be no doubt about the fact that too many Republican leaders, partlcularly in the Eightieth Congress disenfranchised in their thinking the overalls of America. They forgot that those overalls were on legs which would walk to the voting booths on November 2 carrying heads that entertained resentful determinations against the labor legislation of the Eightieth Congress.

Too many of our Republican leaders fell for the line that only the labor leaders disliked the Taft-Hartley law. The unsoundness of that observation was demonstrated on November 2. Too many of our Republican leaders victimized their own thinking by falling into the non sequitur that because there was a decline in strikes after the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill there was some cause to effect relationship between the law and the decline in strikes.

Now we are confronted with a concerted drive on the part of labor aimed at swinging the pendulum so far to the other extreme that they propose to have the Taft-Hartley law repealed and the Wagner Act repassed without change. In my speech before the CIO convention the other day in Portland I made crystal clear that I will be just as opposed to that extreme pendulum swing as I was opposed to the extreme swing which changed the Morse-Ives bill into the Taft-Hartley bill.

So far as I am concerned sound legislative principles must be applied equally and without discrimination to both labor and industry. In this instance one sound principle is that labor legislation must be designed to protect the legitimate rights of both labor and industry and thereby protect the public welfare. One of the issues of my 1944 campaign for the United States Senate was my stand for the equalization of the Wagner Act. Contrary to the opinion of some in Oregon who have yet to read the constructive proposals I made in the Senate for an equalization of rights under the Wagner Act, I delivered on my pledge to fight for fair labor legislation in the Congress of the United States. Come January 1949 I shall continue to carry on that fight by advocating a substitution for the Taft-Hartley Act in the form of legislation which revises the old Wagner Act in those ways necessary to make it a fair and workable piece of labor legislation.

No extended comment needs to be made about the loss of the labor vote. Everyone knows now that the Taft-Hartley Act was a terrific political liability to the Republican Party. In vain some of us in the Republican Party argued in the Senate that if the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley bill without removing its unfair, unworkable, and unconstitutional sections, the party would hear about it at the ballot boxes of America.

Here again, Thomas Dewey is not to blame for the loss of the labor vote. He pointed out in his speeches that as the facts were presented showing existing injustices, he would support amendments. Some of us who were campaigning for Dewey assured many labor audiences that we would propose specific amendments to correct what is now generally recognized by employers and the general public as well as labor to be necessary in order to have a fair and just labor law. However, too many workers were afraid they could not count upon a Republican Congress to correct a wrong which it never should have committed in the first place.

As to the issue of inflation, it needed to be pointed out that the so-called anti-inflation bill, offered in the closing days of the special session of 1948, was a monstrosity. It is common knowledge that a majority of the Democrats in the Senate would not have voted for it if they had thought there was any danger of its passing. Furthermore, Republican campaigners should have made clear that the so-called Barkley antiinflation bill of the special session was nothing more or less than a clever piece of political strategy which the Democrats knew had no chance of passing but which they hoped would pin on the Republican Party the onus for the failure to take effective steps against inflation.

I say it was up to the Republican leaders of Congress rather than Dewey to point out to the American people the good features of the record of the Eightieth Congress. It also was their obligation to confess its serious failures.

We Republicans cannot afford to ignore the valiant fight made by Harry Truman. His chief strategy consisted of discussing his differences with the Eightieth Congress. Republican speakers, for the most part, ignored those differences but the voters didn't. Thus, the Republican organization as a whole failed to take unequivocal yes-and-no stands on a series of specific issues which were disturbing large groups of voters. For example, one of the primary causes of our defeat is to be found in the fact that millions of housewives voted against us because Truman convinced them that the Eightieth Congress was directly responsible for high kitchen costs in America.

We lost several million farm votes also, because many Republican leaders and candidates in farm States talked in broad generalities about farm problems. It is not true that Tom Dewey failed to take a definite stand on protecting the purchasing power of American farmers; but it is true that many individual Republican candidates on State tickets tried to soft-pedal the farm issue during the campaign, with resulting dissatisfaction and defection in the farm vote. The political reality is that at this moment too many farmers do not look upon the Republican organization as being sufficiently friendly to farm interests. I think the farmers are mistaken on this point, but it is up to the Republicans in the next session of Congress to demonstrate it.

It was most unfortunate that many farmers developed the notion that the Republican Party will not take those steps necessary to maintain the purchasing power of the farmer. As I said many times during the campaign and repeat now, the Republican Party recognizes that the standard of living of American workers, of American businessmen, of men and women in the professions, and of our consumers generally depends upon the purchasing power of the American farmer. The reason for that is an obvious economic fact. We are basically an agricultural economy in the sense that when the purchasing power of the American farmer falls below the standard which permits him to maintain himself in health and decency, the inventories of American business backlog. Unemployment then walks the streets of America and a depression is the inevitable result.

In the 1920's the American farmer experienced his depression 6 or 7 years before the rest of us. Those in charge of our Government at that time did not act fast enough to check the economic toboggan ride toward the depression which the farmer took in the early 1920's. I am afraid it is true that the Republican Party failed to make clear in the election just ended that we have no intention of withdrawing a support program necessary to maintain the purchasing power of American agriculture at that level essential to maintain national prosperity.

No one can deny that there are inequities in the support price program and that some changes are needed in that program in the interest of the farmers as well as the interest of the public at large. One cannot talk to a farm leader of any of the national farm organizations who will not tell you that there is a need for a revision in the program. However, the need for revision is in the interest of making the program more economically sound so as to lift from American farmers the criticism and resentment that is developing among some consumer groups of the country as a result of some of the inequities and abuses which have developed in the program.

Before the election, plans were already under way on the part of agricultural leaders in this country to sit down, for example, with the Agriculture Committee of the Senate under the direction of that great Republican agriculture leader in the Senate, GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont. It was planned that agricultural leaders should work out with the committee the needed reforms and modifications which the farm leaders themselves recognize in the interest of American agriculture need to be adopted in an improved Agricultural Adjustment Act. The result of such a cooperative effort between our party leaders and the farm leaders would have been a strengthened and not a weakened Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Nevertheless, we cannot deny the fact that too many farmers became confused about the farm issue in the campaign and voted against our party on November 2. As I said a moment ago, we must demonstrate in this next session of Congress that the Republican Party stands for a sound and fair Agricultural Adjustment Act.

To my great surprise, in campaigning for Dewey, I found that many small-business men were impressed with Truman's arguments that continued prosperity could best be assured through a Democratic administration.

We have an obligation to our party to make perfectly clear that we are not an anti-business party. In speech after speech before labor audiences during the campaign I

stressed the point that the standard of living of American workers depends upon a successful operation of our capitalistic system. The soak-the-rich philosophy which characterizes the thinking of many so-called liberals cannot be reconciled with the public interest. The soak-the-rich attitude is but another example of class-conscious bitterness which we must guard against in America. The notion that special privilege through big business and American monopoly controls the Republican Party is without foundation in fact. Unfortunately, we cannot escape the political reality that too many Americans believe that our party is controlled by big business. Whenever special privilege, be it in the form of big business or labor or agriculture or the pressures of any other economic group in this country, ever seek to foist upon the American people a legislative proposal which is not in the interest of the common good, we must make clear that the Republican Party can be counted upon to oppose it.

Likewise, we must make clear that we stand for a legislative program which will protect the legitimate rights of business as well as of labor and the farmer and the professions and all other economic groups. Take, for example, the need for a complete revision of our tax laws in this country. Such a revision is necessary if we are to encourage venture capital in this country to invest in productive enterprise which will create new jobs and new wealth out of which we can obtain the new tax dollars to meet the tremendous obligations of government which will be with us for years to come. Any system of confiscation through taxation which has characterized many of the tax proposals of the Democratic Party in recent years truly threaten the economic welfare of the people of this country as a whole and of each economic segment within the country. Likewise, a tax-reduction program which is not based on a sound revision of existing inequities in our tax structure will always cost our party dearly at the polls as it did on November 2, 1948.

Another group the Republicans lost in the last election was the teachers of America. Their votes are not numerous, but their influence is great. Some way, somehow, they developed a notion that the Republican Party could not be counted upon to raise the minimum standards of education in America, and they blamed the Republican House of Representatives in the last session of Congress for knifing a sound Federal aid to education bill. Contrary to the arguments of some very sincere opponents of Federal aid to education, BOB TAFT'S bill on this subject, of which I am one of the co-authors, does not endanger our educational system to the evils of socialization and nationalization. If there is any amendment to that bill which anyone wants to offer which will make it any clearer that the local school authorities shall have complete control over any funds allocated to any State under the bill, I shall be glad to introduce the amendment. I am satisfied that the Taft bill, which is a Republican Federal aid to education bill, has within it all the safeguards necessary to protect local control of our schools. However, we must as a great political party recognize that the educational opportunities of an American boy or girl should not be dependent upon the tax-paying ability of the district into which he or she has been so fortunate or unfortunate enough to be born. The development of an enlightened citizenry through high standards of education across the Nation is our hope for intelligent voting. The right to a free ballot is democracy's answer to totalitarianism. An enlightened and well-educated citizenry is democracy's assurance of preservation.

Republicans, young and old, need to recognize that constitutional liberalism does not mean any form of socialism or economic statism. It does mean that representative government has the responsibility of maintaining those minimum checks and regulations necessary to prevent our free enterprise system from degenerating into license to take advantage of the economic weak. It means having our Government cooperate with all segments of our economy to the end of doing for the people as a whole in cooperative effort with business, labor, agriculture, and the professions only those things which they cannot do for themselves, as Lincoln put it and which need to be done for the common good.

To illustrate the point, let us take the problem of national health. In my judgment, it is sound Republican policy to work for an improved Public Health and Welfare Department, for cooperation of the Federal Government in establishing a sound National Science Foundation, for Federal assistance in cancer research and heart disease research, for improved hospital facilities, for assistance to medical schools and similar aids to improve health facilities in America. However, such a program is a far cry from any proposal to make private practitioners of medicine the employees of the Federal Government. Thus, I have always stood opposed to the basic principle of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill because it rests on the clear proposal to socialize the medical profession. There are those in Oregon who persist in trying to create the false impression that I favor the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. My record in the Senate is a complete denial of such falsehoods. In this last session I voted in committee against reporting the bill favorably to the floor of the Senate and on previous occasions since I have been in Congress I have spoken against the bill as I did in my 1944 campaign. Apparently, what bothers some people is that I do not share the view that Congress should not consider any problem that involves public health problems. Medical statesmen among the doctors of this State and this county do not share that view and I intend to continue to work with such medical statesmen in an endeavor to meet the public health needs of this Nation without in any way socializing the medical profession.

If we are to meet successfully the new crisis in the Republican Party, the Young Republicans must take our Republican cause to the young people of America. You are entitled to and must receive the wholehearted support of all Republicans, young and old. In this State, for example, you must be given a large allotment of Republican organization funds so that your program and work can be carried on 12 months of the year, every year. We must stop the mistake of thinking that we can win campaigns by working hard just during the 3 months preceding a national election. We have a 4-year job of political work cut out for us, starting right now, if we are to win in 1952, and win we must. However, we must stop talking to just fellow Republicans. That is one of the troubles with us. Votes are not made at Republican dinners given by Republicans for Republicans. Let us get out and talk to the independent voters of America—to the farmer, laborer, housewives, students, professional men and women, to consumers generally. Your obligations as Young Republicans are mighty important ones and our State and National organizations cannot spend party funds to a better purpose than seeing to it that your organization is generously financed.

The future of the Republican Party, as I see it, will have further defeats unless the party can unite its forces in support of a sound, middle-of-the-road program of constitutional liberalism. Such a program will be unacceptable to the leftists who seek to destroy our capitalistic economy and set up economic statism; it also will be opposed by the political and economic reactionaries—and there are too many in both major political parties—who stand for a laissez faire economy and a return to the normalcy of the boom-and-bust cycle of the 1920's. The election has demonstrated, in unmistakable terms, that these extremist philosophies are not favored by the American people. It is plain, therefore, that constitutional liberals within the Republican Party have a real opportunity. They must offer a program based upon the view that one of the primary objectives of the American system of representative government should and must be to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong. Such a program, however, must be achieved within the framework of a private-property economy and in accordance with the legal principles and guaranties of the Constitution, including its precious Bill of (human) Rights.

The Young Republicans of Oregon and the Nation have a great opportunity to revitalize the Republican Party by reorganizing it along the lines of constitutional liberalism. Unless we win the confidence and support of the young voters of America future defeats rather than victories will confront us. Although the crisis in our party is a serious one, the challenge facing Young Republicans to lead the Republican Party down the road of constitutional liberalism is a great one. The hour is a historic one, and the opportunity for political statesmanship squarely confronts us. You must not fail either our party or our country meeting the challenge of political leadership essential to a Republican victory in 1952.

America, the Last Hope of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Last Hope of Mankind Rests With Us," delivered on August 21, 1948, by Daniel L. Marsh, the distinguished president of Boston University.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAST HOPE OF MANKIND RESTS WITH US

(Commencement address, August 21, 1948, by Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University)

The most intelligent and serviceable patriot is not necessarily blind to the intermittences, exceptions, and faults of his native land. Intelligent patriotism seeks the improvement of one's country, and the correction of errors which may be found in it. Thus, if a patriotic American sees anything menacing the freedom upon which our Republic rests, it is his duty to warn his fellow patriots.

Democracy is the catchword of the hour. Unfortunately, it has been bandied around so much by so many different kinds of persons, and has been made the vehicle for as many pet "isms" that it stands in need of new definition for the new generation. The word "democracy" comes from the Greek word demos, which means the people. Democracy is the rule of the people. It stems from the principles of liberty and equality, and is

plainly a progressive aspiration. With the dawn of history we can dimly see the principle of democracy at work in the embryonic government of the hunting or collecting tribe or group. From that simple beginning we can trace the rise and fall, the emergence and submergence, the development and destruction of democratic elements in governments across the continent of the years.

Historic is the democracy of the city state of Athens and of the other parts of the Greek world; but in time it ceased to be. We note also the representative democracy of Rome through several centuries; but it ceased to be. We see the principle of democracy at work among the Germanic and other peoples, but it ceased to be.

Hope for the larger share of the good things of life—food, shelter, pleasure, education, beauty, security, and all the other good things—has lured mankind up from slavery through feudalism to full democracy. The history of mankind has been a struggle for freedom. Freedom is the most sovereign idea of democracy. It is an indispensable condition for the realization of the good life. Hegel concludes his Philosophy of History with the oft-quoted declaration that the history of the world is nothing but the development of the idea of freedom. The idea of freedom has been given sporadic application in democratic governments across the ages, and has come to its finest flower and fruitage in our American form of government.

Ours is a republican form of government. It is a government by law and not by men. Its theory rests upon the idea that chosen representatives make the laws, and that all citizens give to the laws due and reverent obedience; for it is by law that individual conduct is socially controlled. As Samuel Johnson once said, "The law is the last result of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public."

At the laying of the cornerstone of Bunker Hill Monument, Daniel Webster said: "Our history hitherto proves that the popular form of government is practicable, and that with wisdom and knowledge men may govern themselves; and the duty incumbent on us is to preserve the consistency of this cheering example, and take care that nothing may weaken its authority with the world. If, in our case, the representative system ultimately failed, popular governments must be pronounced impossible. No combination of circumstances more favorable to the experiment can ever be expected to occur. The last hope of mankind therefore rests with us."

The ideas and ideals upon which democracy rests are the sacred worth of the individual; equality of opportunity, equality of rights, and equality before the law; justice, which is the maintenance of that which is right, and the practice of the Golden Rule in everyday life; the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God; service as the mark of greatness and freedom.

The fundamental concept in our political philosophy is that this equality and this freedom are inherently our rights. That is why mankind uniformly and universally applauds Patrick Henry's demand: "Give me liberty or give me death." Freedom and equality are ours by nature. We do not need to beg anybody for them, and nobody can confer them upon us. Herein lies the difference between the Magna Carta and the Declaration of Independence. In the case of the Magna Carta, tyrannical King John was forced by the barons to sign the statement that he gave to the English certain rights and privileges. He was so mad about it that after the barons went away, gleeful over their achievement, King John flung himself upon his face and gnashed his teeth in the dust as he exclaimed: "Why didn't they ask me for my kingdom while they were about it?" In the case of our Declaration of Independence, our forefathers boldly asserted that "all men are endowed by their Creator with" these inalienable rights.

But no democracy, no republican form of government, will automatically remain pure and vigorous. Every generation is faced with the necessity of saving society. Its accumulated moral strength will subside and ultimately end in a spurious democracy, if not actually in a dictatorship or some other form of despotism, unless its strength is renewed in each new generation.

Recall the warning of Daniel Webster, "The last hope of mankind rests with us." Are we so accustomed to the justice, the tranquillity, and the blessings of liberty secured for us and our posterity that we take them for granted, or as a matter of course? Will the forces that have ruined former attempts at self-government ruin ours? Will some future historian write the Decline and Fall of the American Republic? Is our form of democratic government to disappear as all others have in the past? Are we to lose our freedom? Are we to suffer the perversion of our rights? To make certain that such a calamity does not befall us, would it not be sensible for us to ascertain from a study of history what have been the principal factors in encompassing the ruin of former efforts at self-government? I have been a student of history for a good many years, and I give it to you as my calm judgment that three forces have more often wrought the destruction of free government than all other forces put together; that under three headings can be classified nearly all the factors contributing to the failure of self-governments across the ages. Let me name them for you.

The first is war. "War," declared Napoleon Bonaparte, who was in a position to know something about the subject—"War is an anachronism." War is worse than that. It is organized insanity. It is a recrudescence of the jungle. War never solved any problem. We were assured, at the beginning of World War I, that we were waging war to end war; that we were offering our lives and our treasure "to make the world safe for democracy." We have had terrible evidence ever since that that war did not end war, nor did it make the world safe for democracy.

At the beginning of World War II, we were glibly assured that we were fighting to establish "four freedoms": Freedom of discussion, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. The first two of these were named in the Constitution of the United States, and therefore could not be called new objectives. The other two objectives which were sought at tragical cost turned out to be empty mockery. Never in the history of the world have gaunt want and famine stalked among more human beings than since that war closed, and never before have so many persons been racked by fear.

History teaches nothing more plainly than that such freedom as the people may have is sooner or later a casualty of war. That, as any truthful and accurate historian will testify, is the story concerning Babylon, Assyria, Greece, Rome, Spain, Germany—each of these was in its day the great nation of the earth; but where are they now? Each took the sword and perished with the sword. It was naval defeats that brought an end to the Grecian Empire. It was extended wars that spelled the collapse of Rome. It was the First and Second World Wars that not only brought a practical end to the Germany that was great, but that also started the disintegration of the British Empire. It was the First World War that gave Russia communism. The Second gave it to the countries that we now describe as Russia's satellites. A third world war will probably give communism to the world.

No matter how democratic a government may be, and no matter how much freedom the citizens may enjoy, when the nation is at war the citizens yield more and more of their rights and their liberties to the government. They must in order that the war may be carried forward; for the very organization of war is dictatorial, and its conduct is bound to be despotic. Then in its wake the people find that the nation has come to rely upon physical force and violence; that the idea of the sacred worth of the individual has been scrapped; that there is a changed attitude toward private property; that control for the average warrior's daily life has been transferred from self to others; that hate and intolerance have been engendered; that family life has been broken down, and that reverence for things sacred has been lost. Every war takes from the people more than it gives back, not only in the way of life and treasure, but also in ideals, liberty, and self-government.

It appears that the full Christianization of international law will have to wait the slow action of Christianized public opinion. One thing is certain, we must have an international organization that will possess power to enforce its decisions. Nations must be willing to surrender some of their sovereignty to a representatively constituted United Nations. The international organization must make its decisions in a democratic way, by vote of the majority rather than by veto of a single member. It must have at its disposal an international police power to enforce its decisions. And certainly the nations of the earth must agree upon some form of gradual disarmament; for history has proven that a high state of military preparedness inevitably leads to war.

Education cannot escape its responsibility in this matter. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote a letter last January, explaining why he would not allow any political party to nominate him for the Presidency of the United States. In the course of that letter, he said: "It is my conviction that the necessary and wise subordination of the military to the civil power will be best sustained and our people will have more confidence that it is so sustained when life-long professional soldiers * * * abstain from seeking high political office. * * * Nothing in the international or domestic situation especially qualifies for the most important office in the world a man whose adult years have been spent in the country's military forces."

If this is sound (and it is sound to the core), then by the same token, no professional military man should be made Secretary of State, and no professional military man should be appointed as an ambassador to a great foreign country; for a professional military man is accustomed to giving orders and having them obeyed, and that is not the way it is done in diplomatic circles. No professional military man knows how to compromise, nor does he know that political and civic progress is usually the result of compromise. The typical military mind is more likely to be concerned with face saving than with peace saving.

Just a year before General Eisenhower uttered his wise decision, he was present as an honored guest at a dinner which the trustees of Boston University, and others, tendered me on the twentieth anniversary of my presidency of the university. In the course of his address, General Eisenhower said: "I venture almost to challenge, why doesn't Dr. Marsh and the president of every great university throughout the world teach his people to put people of my profession permanently out of a job?"

We must teach the peoples of the world to stop glorifying war. We must teach them the ugly naked truth that war is the summation of all villainies, and that it is generally worse than the thing it is waged to overcome. We should educate them to develop a sense of national humor equal to their sense of national honor.

The second cause of loss of freedom, as historically demonstrated, is too much regimenting, controlling, and "Santa Clausing" by the Government and other agencies. Freedom of choice and freedom of initiative are indispensable to progress. Anything that trammels or restricts individual initiative, independence, or self-reliance leads inevitably to a loss of national freedom and democracy. Compare the material progress alone in the United States for the past 150 years with other countries, ages, and civilizations, and you will find that more substantial progress has been made here than was made in the 2,000 years preceding. It is not accurate to say that this is because of our unlimited natural resources; for the savage Indian had the same resources. Neither is the explanation found in our greater industry; for all over the world and through all ages, human beings have generally worked harder than Americans work. We cannot claim it is because we are inherently superior; for that is probably not so, even though it flatters our ego to think so.

The real reason is found in the dictum of the American Economic Foundation, namely: "Man's material progress depends upon natural resources plus human energy multiplied by tools." It is the release and control of human energy, and the extension of that energy by tools which human ingenuity has devised, that makes the difference. The energy of an individual can be used effectively only when he himself is free to use it.

Americans have been free to seek the truth in their own ways; free to investigate; free to express opinion; free to reach their own conclusions and to announce their own convictions; free to invent and to make the best possible use of inventions. It was this freedom of initiative and the virtue of self-reliance that nerved Americans to the physical conquest of this continent in a relatively short time, which is the greatest physical accomplishment in the history of the world.

Now take away incentives to excel and to achieve, take away the necessity to dare and to do, take away freedom to produce and encouragement to productivity, and you have taken away the secret of human progress.

This is the verdict of history. When the Roman government began to provide food and amusements for the citizens, and to do everything for them, then Rome was on its way out. When the Government of France began to issue orders defining exactly what businessmen might do—what amount of wool might be used in a factory, and what color of warp and what color of woof should be used—then France was on the toboggan. When Spain became a government of bureaucrats, each bureaucracy limiting and trammeling and restricting the freedom of the citizens, issuing orders across the wide expanse of the Atlantic to Central and South American colonies, giving them orders in the most minute detail, then Spain had passed the zenith of her power and glory.

So it is with every nation: Self-government is lost because the freedom upon which it rests is lost. When a government undertakes to do everything for the people—to order their business and private lives, to prescribe now an economy of scarcity, now control of production, and now subsidy for this and that and the other thing, then the cost of government mounts terrifically. The natural consequence is such an increase in taxation that the nerve of business adventure and business initiative is cut. It is pleasant to have the Government take from me the necessity of arranging my own affairs while I work, and to provide for me when I loaf. It seems pleasant until I awaken to the fact that the very Government that I thought was doing everything for me is headed toward the destruction of the blessings of liberty and self-government which, according to its Preamble, the Constitution of the United States was adopted to insure.

The founding fathers knew that soundness of our Republic's economic structure was interknit with protection of the individual citizen's right of free enterprise.

Individual corruption is the third principal cause of freedom's collapse. When the citizens become corrupt, they lose their liberties and despoil their democracy. In 1787, Benjamin Franklin (who was one of the most influential members of the Constitutional Convention) said: "I believe that this Constitution is likely to be well administered for a course of years and can only end in despotism as other forms have done before it when the people shall become so corrupt as to need despotic governments, being incapable of any other." It would be a good thing to have that statement printed in bold-faced type on the front page of every newspaper in the United States on the 17th of every September.

President Monroe in his inaugural address gave expression to similar convictions, thus: "It is only when the people become ignorant and greedy, when they degenerate into a populace, that they are incapable of exercising their sovereignty. Usurpation is then an easy attainment, and the usurper soon found. The people themselves become a willing instrument of their own debasement and ruin."

The French historian, Guizot, once asked James Russell Lowell, "How long will the American Republic endure?" Lowell replied, "As long as the ideas of the men who founded it continue dominant."

To such warning we should give heed. One country after another has risen to power, only to decline and fall. One civilization after another has risen to preeminence and then has collapsed—and in every instance, the fall, the collapse, has followed in the wake of corruption on the part of the people. Verily, the ancient scripture is true, "Where there is no vision, the people perish," and again, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any poeple."

Herbert Spencer declared: "The republican form of government is the highest form of government; but because of this it requires the highest type of human nature."

That means that any American who is intelligently devoted to the preservation of our form of government must live a life of personal integrity. When I was in Washington recently, I had time between engagements to stroll along its magnificent streets. As I passed the building which houses the United States Department of Justice, I read on one facade these words: "Law alone can give us freedom," and on another facade, I read: "Justice in the life and conduct of the state is possible only as first it resides in the hearts and souls of the citizens." The same thing can be said concerning all the other virtues that make for the safety of our Republic: honesty, efficiency, courage, temperance, tolerance, good will, thrift, industry, fidelity to duty, and all the rest. Socrates called morality the art of self-possession and self-government. The only fundamental freedom he taught was "rule over one's self."

Reorganization of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by my colleague from Massachusetts, Hon. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER:

EVERYBODY IS FOR IT, BUT—

(By Representative CHRISTIAN A. HERTER)

No crystal ball is needed to predict the reception which will greet the report on the reorganization of the Federal Government when it is made public. The newspapers will hail the potential saving of billions of dollars. Our political and business leaders will praise the vastly more efficient executive machinery of the future. For some time it will look as though the reorganization plan submitted by former President Herbert Hoover and his commission will become law without difficulty.

It won't work out that way, however. It never has. Even before the cheers have died away, groups all over the country will be starting quiet campaigns to block this or that section of the proposal. And some of these groups, I am sorry to say, will include the very businessmen who have been loudest in their praise. Their attitude, if unfortunate, is perfectly understandable. But they ought to realize that, if they persist, reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has as much chance of success as a fur coat salesman in Africa. For all the other vested interests—including Federal employees—will be encouraged to turn on their own varieties of heat.

All my friends in industry and finance constantly tell me they want less government in business. They think they mean it, too. But the fact is that business demands, year by year, more and more services from Washington. Executives have long since grown accustomed to getting what they want from specific agencies. Their relationship with the officials who run them is cordial. If a particular agency is abolished for the sake of greater efficiency, some businessmen will have to make their contacts all over again. Like nearly everybody else, our business leaders are often allergic to change.

Further, the services rendered American industry by Washington often result in substantial financial savings. Let me illustrate what I mean by describing an imaginary board meeting of a fictitious corporation. The concern manufactures a type of oil used for precision machinery. Now I am not familiar with the recommendations to be made by Mr. Hoover's commission. But suppose, just as an example, that the Bureau of Mines were absorbed into some other agency. The board of the XYZ Oil Co. is meeting to discuss the change:

Director Jones: "We can't do anything to upset that bill. We all know that. It means savings of billions to the taxpayers."

Director Brown: "That's right. All the industrial leaders of the country must support it."

Director Smith: "I'm for the reorganization plan as a whole—heart and soul. But take this idea of shifting the Bureau of Mines."

Director Jones: "What of it"

Director Smith: "Well, those folks have been doing a good job for us for years. They analyze our oil. How do we know the new agency will continue to do it?"

Director Brown: "Why can't we test our own oil?"

Director Smith: "Well, I've looked into that. I estimate it would cost us a couple of hundred thousand dollars a year."

And in due course, if the XYZ Oil Co. happens to be in my district, I receive a letter from its board chairman. This assures me that he is enthusiastically in favor of reorganzing the Government. He has publicly so stated. But his associates and he would like to point to the minor matter of the Bureau of Mines. Why make this change? So I am supposed to offer an amendment to

the reorganization bill which will preserve the Bureau of Mines.

Perhaps it wouldn't matter so much if requests for such special amendments were isolated One Congressman fighting single-handed to save a lone bureau could scarcely thwart the reorganization program. He might be an impressive debater and fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with material that would convince his constitutents he was on the job. But, no matter how forceful his arguments, they could not prevail against the logic of reorganization were his the only plea of its kind. Unfortunately, there may be many such pleas.

Take any Representative. We shall assume that he refuses to back that amendment to the reorganization bill which will maintain the status quo of the Bureau of Mines—the one my constituents have asked me to offer. The day that he reaches this high-minded decision he gets a barrage of telegrams from his own district, in California. He learns that adoption of the reorganization plan will mean the shutting down of a Pacific Coast navy yard, as of no possible value.

When I meet this colleague in the House restaurant he is in deep gloom. He tells me the curtailment of that navy yard will throw 1,000 of his constituents out of jobs, and the loss of pay roll will be bad for business. Over the potato salad he recalls my interest in the Bureau of Mines and tells me I can count on his support to save that Bureau if I will help him keep his navy yard.

Soon things start to snowball. A third colleague, from a farming area, says he's under pressure to prevent any change in the Department of Agriculture. A fourth, from a railroad center, wants to preserve the Railroad Retirement Board as an independent agency, and so on.

What started out as a lone Representative asking for just one little amendment to preserve just one little bureau has become 300 Representatives joining hands to support 300 little amendments to preserve 300 little bureaus. Whether we like it or not, that is the way Congress works, and such is the situation that the reorganization bill faces at this session—unless, of course, the folks back home want things done differently.

On the one hand, voters send Members to Congress to represent them in the Government of the United States. As such, the Representative is expected to legislate with a view to the national interest. When considering the general welfare, the Member from Massachusetts is expected, in theory at least, to be as much concerned about the effect of a law on the people of California as on those of his home State.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

On the other hand, the voter often asks his Congressman to give first loyalty to his district and even to special interests within that district. When there is a clash between the national interest and the local interest and the Representative is called on to make a compromise that will keep his constituents satisfied, he is statesman enough to see the larger view and bargainer enough to make a good deal for the old home town.

In January 1933 President Hoover was awaiting his successor in the White House. He was making a final effort to reorganize Government departments. In a press conference he quoted remarks he had made 5 years earlier:

"Practically every single item in such a program has inevitably met with opposition of some vested official, or it has disturbed some vested habit, and offended some organized minority. It has aroused the paid propagandists.

"All these vested officials, vested habits, organized propaganda groups, are in favor of every item of reorganization except that which affects the bureau or the activity in which they are specially interested. * * * In the aggregate, these directors of vested habits surround Congress with a confusing fog of opposition."

The fogs of similar confusion will surely be rolling across Capitol Hill before spring touches the trees this year. Unless, that is, those who might suffer by details of the reorganization plan subordinate their selfish interests to the greater good. Reorganization has been a primary objective of every President and every Congress for the past five decades. Never before, however, has so searching a study of possible improvements been made or the problem approached on so broad a front. The Nation's business leaders would do well to ponder the quality of the men serving the Hoover commission before they presume to oppose its findings. The members are, in the main, businessmen.

The Federal Government has grown so vast that no group could effectively examine all of it. So the job was broken down into 22 projects with experts working on each. Here are the names of a few of the men: Robert R. Nash, formerly director of the purchase analysis division, Ford Motor Co.; J. H. Geary, formerly assistant manager of stores, Erie Railroad Co.; Leon J. Jacobi, inspection and standards engineer, Detroit-Edison Co.; Franklin D'Olier, former board chairman, Prudential Life Insurance Co.; Thomas M. Searles, president, Equity Co.; Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, board chairman, United Fruit Co.; John A. Stevenson, president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Ferdinand Eberstadt, president, F. Eberstadt & Co.

GREATER EFFICIENCY

The report now being presented will go much further than recommendations for better housekeeping in Washington. Such minor improvements might save $300,000,000 or more and would arouse slight opposition. It is safe to predict that the Hoover commission changes will be basic. In addition to grouping or eliminating overlapping functions, they will seek to eliminate some of the checks and balances which, because they seemed essential to honesty in government, have grown to such a degree that they threaten to bring the whole executive machine to a dead stop. In the past year, I am informed, the Veterans' Administration made 1,000,000 separate purchases which averaged less than $10 each. But it actually cost $24 per article to authorize, check, inspect, approve, and audit each $10 purchase.

During the early stages of World War II it was sometimes said in Washington, not wholly facetiously, that the surest way to win the struggle would be to burn the General Accounting Office.

I did not share this yearning for arson, but I did sympathize with harassed procurement officers as they struggled to disentangle themselves from the binding red tape of this or that agency. Inherent in the forthcoming plan will be simplification of the Federal Government. This will result in some cases in fewer branches which means, or should, a cut in the number of employees. Strange to say some business leaders will take the side of the Federal workers in their efforts to save their jobs.

Take again, just as an example of possible economies, the field offices of many of the departments. These offices, like many others, offer special services to industry and to the farmer, for which all of the taxpayers are assessed. But let me presume to say what will happen if some of them are shut down. The original protest will probably arise within the agency. A representative of the endangered workers will appeal to some official in the local chamber of commerce or in a trade association.

"Look, Joe," he will say, in substance, "I know your crowd is on record for the reorganization bill. And you're right, perfectly right. But you can't go along with the section which proposes to shut down our office here. We've worked with you for years. Your members use our statistics every day in their business. We've saved you countless trips to Washington. And what's the saving? A mere half a million, while we're spending billions in Europe."

LITTLE HEART FOR ECONOMY

Our business leaders should be on their guard against such arguments. They sound persuasive. They can be effective. The sad truth is that Americans really have slight taste for economy. They are generous and open-hearted. Whether in business or not, they like to do a favor for a Government official—particularly when he may be in a position to return it at some later date. Sometimes, on the other hand, Americans suddenly get disgusted with extravagance in their Government and demand cuts which go too deep. The Hoover commission's plan may be a last chance to effect intelligent economies.

Businessmen do a lot of talking about the multiplicity of agencies, about the hours they must spend in filling out questionnaires, being inspected and regulated. But some of them prefer a known nuisance to an unknown improvement. At least three agencies now regulate the Nation's banks—the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. I must repeat that I have no advance knowledge of the reorganization plan. But suppose the powers of the Comptroller of the Currency were trimmed: I am fairly sure a howl would arise from a lot of normally dignified bankers. They have worked with the Comptroller of the Currency for many years. They understand the methods and policies of his staff.

I don't want to give the impression that businessmen, alone, will fight parts of the plan. Opposition will come from doctors, from lawyers, and other professional men. A distinguished committee of physicians has been spending months looking into the hospitals operated by the Veterans' Administration, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and their relationship to existing hospital facilities. Duplication and waste are unquestioned. Yet here vested interests are again at stake.

DESIRE FOR LOCAL OFFICES

Local doctors will not like the prospect of some installation being closed. So there will be resolutions by county medical societies which will reach the desks of my colleagues and myself. Do we oppose, these will demand, adequate medical treatment for our boys? Election day is never less than 2 years off to an unhappy Representative. Some of us will conclude that it is rash to cut medical services, even when they are a duplication of adequate existing services.

But, unless the business and professional men of America really do give their wholehearted support to reorganization, it is doomed. For opposition, bitter and effective, may be expected from the professional politicians. No branch of our Government, whether county, city, or State, is any longer unrelated to the Federal system. Enormous financial grants are made in Washington for education, highways, health, and other benefits. The actual administration of these funds is frequently left to the States, under certain regulations. Contractors, builders, and supplymen get their share of the funds. Their share, obviously, increases in direct ratio to the inefficiency of government.

Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. FRANK WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 6, 1949

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, United States Navy, Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., delivered at the twenty-first national convention of the Fleet Reserve Association at Dallas, Tex., on August 30, 1948:

Gentlemen of the Fleet Reserve Association, I am at once honored and delighted to have been extended your invitation to speak to you here in Dallas at the twenty-first annual convention of our great Fleet Reserve Association. For many years I have been keenly interested in and appreciative of your objectives and accomplishments. As some of you may know, I was privileged greatly in April 1947 to have been made an honorary member of the Fleet Reserve Association at Branch 24, Annapolis.

I also want to convey to each of you here and to all members of the association warm personal regards, and best wishes for continued success both now at this convention and on into the future from my great chief, Admiral Denfeld. You all know that he is an honorary member of long standing of your organization. I will read you his greeting, which I have brought with me.

This is a unique and distinctive organization. Your membership is distinctive in that 6 years' service in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps is a prime prerequisite; no other service may be counted. It is also unique in the fact that it owes its existence to the fact that Congress, in order to carry out its constitutional power of providing a Navy, has provided for a Fleet Reserve. It is an identifying feature that this association is therefore composed of both those who are still on active duty and those who have been retired from active peacetime duty. I do not believe that there is anywhere else an organization quite like this. It is the voice of the enlisted career man of the Navy, and is so recognized by the senior officers of the Navy, and by the legislative bodies whenever they have any action pending concerning this subject. An important example of this reliance and interdependence was evident when the Roper board, which was making recommendations concerning the revision of the Reserve Act of 1938, submitted copies to your national directors and service committee for their recommendations and comments. In a sense, you are the alumni club of those who have devoted at least 6, and usually more, years to service in the world's greatest training organization.

There is another unique feature of your organization. I refer to the fact that although you are called Reserve, you are the very essence of the highly developed professional and Regular Service man. Your 6 years active service man likewise adds to the current career synthesis of the Fleet Reserve Association.

I believe that from time to time as indicative of a healthy condition, we should all pause to summarize the prominent features of the noble institution, the Navy, of which we are a part. Otherwise we may become so involved in the routine details of every day living that we will soon lose sight of those ideals for which we must strive and we will soon arrive in the position of the man who said he could not see the forest because of the trees.

To me one of the most prominent features of the Navy was originated more than three decades ago in the establishment of the Fleet Reserve System. It was recognized, then as now, that some such system was vitally necessary for the welfare of our country and of our Navy. We are a democracy, and as such we have never believed in the necessity or the advisability of maintaining during peace a large permanent military force; on the other hand we do not want to lose those hard-won and jealously guarded freedoms for which we stand through insufficient preparation. To be adequately prepared therefore, it is necessary to have a ready reserve of highly trained personnel who, when our fundamental rights are threatened, will be ready to resist and destroy those who would destroy us. So, in times of peace we turn our energies to planning and training.

If ever a system paid for itself a thousandfold and justified every penny put in it, it is the Fleet Reserve Organization. Wherever I served during World War II, whether it was in the field in command of a destroyer squadron, a task group, or a fast battleship, the steading influence and tenacious fiber of the Fleet Reserve and long-service enlisted man was everywhere present. Likewise in the training establishment it was indeed magnificent to see the retired men of the organization called forth and pass the torch of training and ideals of service on to the neophytes that joined us with such delight and loyalty. Again and again during this last war we found synthesized in the key activities the mature wisdom and experience of the Fleet Reservist with large groups of enthusiastic and able personnel drawn in for the war from other sources. It was this combination of talents and capacities and know-how, this wise synthesis, that produced dynamic and brilliant organization of our wartime Navy that spearheaded across the Pacific to victory in 1945.

That we had such a force is, I believe, proved in various ways, foremost of which is the establishment and growth of this association. Twenty-four years ago, on Armistice Day, November 11, 1924, a charter was granted in Philadelphia, Pa., to a small group who have so well expressed their reasons for uniting in the preamble of the association's constitution, and in the motto: Loyalty, protection, and service.

From this beginning the association has grown until now we have more than 100 branches, and over 30,000 members. I am positive that the association will continue to grow, and I know that opening membership to those who have had 6 years' service was a step forward. The association is indeed a unique and distinctive organization not only because its members are those who have had at least 6 years' active service in the Navy or Marine Corps exclusively, but it is the only organization which represents the Regular Navy and Marine Corps enlisted man. It is founded on the basis of being shipmates, which is our Navy way of expressing the golden rule of doing for others what you would have them do for you.

Another reason for thinking that we have reached our objectives is most cogently set out by the record established collectively and individually by those members of the Fleet Reserve who were recalled to active duty. From September 1939 until December 1945, some 15,000 members of the Fleet Reserve were recalled to active duty. This put into practice one of the chief reasons why the Fleet Reserve had been inaugurated many years prior, and to no one's—unless possibly our enemies'—surprise the system accomplished its objective of providing trained, loyal personnel when and where they were most needed. The Navy recognized the value of those people who were recalled by offering to a very high percentage of them the opportunity of a commission with its increased privileges and responsibilities. There are still on duty many of those officers of the Fleet Reserve whose know-how and ability is still needed to accomplish those purposes for which they are so eminently fitted.

Many years ago the framers of our United States Constitution stated in the preamble various purposes and aims which made the drawing of this Constitution necessary, among them were to establish justice, to provide for the common defense, and to promote the general welfare. In order to achieve these goals, however, it would be necessary that each participant would have to relinquish some of the sovereign acts which it had heretofore exercised. It was more than astonishing that this could be accomplished; nevertheless it was. The provisions of the Constitution which provide authority for the laws governing the Navy are in two categories: the power of Congress and the power of the Executive. Among the congressional powers are those to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make all laws and regulations necessary to execute these powers. It is the President's duty as the Executive, and Commander in Chief, to see that laws so established are faithfully executed. His function as Commander in Chief authorizes him to issue, personally or through his military subordinates, such orders and directives as are necessary and proper to ensure order and discipline in the Navy. His function as Executive empowers him personally, or through the Secretary of the Navy, to prescribe rules, where requisite, for the execution of the statutes relating to the Naval Establishment.

Among the regulations and instructions issued for the information and guidance of persons in the Naval Establishment are Navy Regulations, General Orders, Courts and Boards, Uniform Regulations, and the manuals of the various bureaus. These regulations may be considered as being in aid or complement to the statutory laws. Also in aid and complement to the statutes are the many administrative directives which are issued by the various departments, bureaus, or by commanding officers. All of these statutes, rules, regulations, and directives are tested for legality before they are issued and promulgated to the Naval Establishment. Ordinarily there is no question but that the regulation sought will be a valid one, but if any question at all arises it is given a thorough and exhaustive scrutiny. Naval custom, too, has the force of law, much in the nature of the English common law, but one of the limitations of a custom is that it must not be in opposition to the terms and provisions of a statute or lawful regulation or order.

The result of all of this is that each and every act in the naval service, whether in war or in peace, is neither capricious nor arbitrary, but falls within a legal pattern. This pattern has been designed to encompass the activities of those who have committed themselves to a higher discipline of loyalty and patriotism to defend their country and its institutions of fundamental freedoms against those aggressors who would destroy them.

It is thus evident that when a person enters the naval service he has changed his legal status. He has given up certain freedoms which he would otherwise enjoy, and is dedicated to loyalties in sharp focus specifically calculated to guard the larger whole. This sacrifice of certain freedoms and acquisition of others, however, and the complete regulation of every act either directly or indirectly by law, gives an individual a moral independence of the highest order.

As a matter of fact, I mean that we in the Navy possess a particularly high order of responsibility and moral independence through this very pattern of law and reg-

ulation whicl encompasses us. We unhesitatingly "render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," so to speak, without sacrificing those personal and human dignities so dear to Americans and to western civilization.

During the period of the emergency from September 1939 to December 1945, 15,000 (15,200) members of the Fleet Reserve were recalled to active duty; of those who remained on active duty, about 2,700 accepted temporary commissions. In the recent transfer program the selection board for permanent appointment to the Regular Navy has considered, as of August this year, 37,303 applications. Of these 14,502 have been selected and have accepted, and of these 4,288, or 30 percent, were from officers in a temporary status and 10,214, or 70 percent, were from Reserve officers. Public Law 381 of the Eightieth Congress, on the advice of the Navy Department, set up the provisions for accepting certain qualified and enlisted personnel as limited-duty officers. The Bureau of Naval Personnel has, after considerable study, established 12 classifications: 6 in the general-line categories (deck, ordnance, administration, engineering, hull, and electronics), 4 in aviation (aviation operations, aviation ordnance, aviation engineering, aviation electronics), and 1 in supply, and 1 in the Civil Engineer Corps. Applications have been accepted from chief warrant officers, warrant officers, chief petty officers, and petty officers first class. Of the 6,000 applications received the board has just recently offered commissions to the 930 who have been selected thus far. Of the 930 selected 89 will be in the Supply Corps, 14 in the Civil Engineer Corps, and 727 in the other branches. There are 101 lieutenant commanders, 373 lieutenants, 276 lieutenants junior grade, and 230 ensigns selected. After August 7, 1949, when the program has become stabilized all appointments will be made, by law, in the grade of ensign. The establishment of this limited duty classification is of great importance. Heretofore many enlisted men have been discouraged from seeking commissions in the line because to do so would place them at a distinct disadvantage because they would have to compete with all other line officers for promotion who had generally considerably more formal education. It was, however, a waste of valuable experience when a man who had all of the officer-like qualities was prevented from attaining officer status because he had sacrificed formal education for on-the-job experience. To circumvent this and to make the best use of these men, the law provides that those in limited-duty status will compete with each other and not be subject to the same conditions for promotion as an unrestricted officer. In addition the rate of attrition has been placed at a very low level, which insures to those who do accept a good possibility for an uninterrupted career. Moreover, line limited-duty officers will be eligible to succeed to command when fully qualified and specifically designated. Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps limited-duty officers will be eligible to succeed to command of those activities which officers of their respective corps may command.

Nearly half, or 46 percent, of the 36,737 active Regular Navy officers have had previous enlisted service; this does not include those officers who held permanent commissions prior to 1941, or those Reserve officers who had enlisted service and were permanently commissioned in the transfer program.

I believe you will see and agree that the Navy today as never before offers an excellent professional or career opportunity. To those who have the desire and either the formal education or the experience, it offers a commission. To the younger man it offers the opportunity to follow either of these courses of advancement; once he has been sworn in the door is open. He has a tremendous opportunity for advancement, and the Navy will advance him—commensurate with his background, ability, aptitude, and interest along the path which he himself selects. For the man who does not desire more formal education, such as provided by college or post-graduate work, the Navy provides professional training. The Navy is actually the most extensive scientific and professional school in the world; operating afloat, ashore, in submarines, and in the air, there is a constant demand for technically trained men. To accomplish this end the Navy has 80 professional training schools which offer such varied courses as commissary, pattern making, fire control, deep-sea diving, refrigeration, and welding. In addition to these schools the man has available facilities for enrolling in and studying courses offered by USAFI, college extension programs which offer courses in both professional subjects and in the social-humanistic field. For the enlisted men who would pursue further a formal education there are also many opportunities. For those who have not finished a high-school course there are several ways in which they may accomplish that objective. For those who have completed high school and desire to take work on a college level there are again several possible ways in which it may be achieved. Ten percent, or for this year 200 candidates, will be selected from the enlisted personnel on active duty, for training in one of the 52 colleges and universities throughout the country which participate in the NROTC training program. This program provides a college education and may eventually lead to commissioning. In addition, 320 Regular Navy and Reserve enlisted personnel will be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to the Naval Academy during 1948. These enlisted personnel may be appointed from the Regular or Reserve Navy or Marine Corps. Any enlisted man desiring to become a candidate makes this known to his commanding officer as soon as possible. Those in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps must have 1 year enlisted service prior to July 1 of the year in which they enter the Naval Academy.

Those who come from the Reserve must have had at least 1 year in the Reserve by July 1 of the year of admission to the Naval Academy. Formerly it was necessary for the Reserve applying for admission to have a minimum of 27 drills, or its equivalent, between July 1 and the third Wednesday of April of the year following. This requirement has but recently been liberalized, so that 2 weeks' active training duty is equivalent to the necessary drills. This offers encouragement to those who for various reasons not within their own control could not perform the requisite drills.

Those enlisted personnel on duty in the Regular Navy who have taken the preliminary physical and have been recommended by their commanding officers are then given a special examination to determine their aptitude for those subjects involved in the Naval Academy entrance examination. Those who are successful in passing these preliminaries are then sent to the United States Naval School, Academy and College Preparatory, at Bainbridge. From October until the April entrance examination they are given courses which will enhance their preparation for the entrance examination, and in the cases of those who are successful therein continue further to prepare them for the first year's work at the Naval Academy. This school is also open to enlisted men on active duty who hold nominations from any other source. It is not, however, open to those nominated from the Organized Reserve.

The law provides that 160 shall be taken from each of these sources, so that those 160 who stand highest in the entrance examination from each component receive the appointments, but the others who pass become alternates and are appointed if for some reason the eligible candidates do not enter as midshipmen. There is also a degree of flexibility at this point since the vacancies in the Presidential quota, which at present is set at 75, may be filled by either men from the fleet or the Reserve, and any vacancy in the fleet or the Reserve quota may be filled by the other.

In addition to the technical and professional training offering so many and so varied a selection of opportunity to all of us in the Navy, regardless of our mode of entry or our rank or rate, is that education and development of the spirit and of the heart without which there is no life or substance insofar as accomplishment is concerned in the organization. This is a difficult field to describe—there are intangibles and imponderables which we share and appreciate. However, if there is anything that to me characterizes the Navy spirit which we all absorb and to which we all adhere, it is the cheerful, tenacious, loyal approach to our mutual tasks which is so evident in our service. I know of no organization where there is such a complete mutual recognition of respect, a mutual recognition which by its very existence ensures a loyalty unsurpassed in any organization in the world. We find this in the Navy team, whether it is in the submarine, or the cruiser, or the battleship, or the airplane; each officer and man recognizes that his effort is integrated with that of others and appreciates that his own success and contribution is at once necessary to his brethren just as their effort is necessary to his effort.

It is this high sense of loyalty, this sense of responsibility that over the years has made an honorable discharge from the Navy one of the finest letters of recommendation a man could present upon seeking employment in any field.

The new Selective Service Act specifically requires that all services vigorously prosecute an enlistment program, to the end that the required number of voluntary enlistments be obtained, and the number of inductees will correspondingly be reduced to a minimum. This is the present plan and there is every indication that the Navy will be able to obtain the necessary number of recruits with the present mental, physical, and moral standards. The Navy has traditionally relied on volunteers, which I think we all agree is a healthy way to ensure participation in responsibility. But to maintain this it will be necessary for all of us to individually and collectively help sell the Navy to as many young men as we can find who are eligible. A sale in this case should be very simple since it is something we all know and believe in. The Fleet Reserve Association is continually of inestimable help to ensure that we can continue to follow the volunteer method.

The total strength of the Navy on June 1 of both officers and enlisted men was 389,086. Of these the officers accounted for 42,980 and of these 38,400 were Regular and 4,573 were Reserves. Three hundred and forty-six thousand one hundred and six were enlisted; of which 344,095 were Regular and 2,011 Reserves. The ceiling which has been placed by the President on the present size of the enlisted Navy is 430,000. However, the Navy has set a limit of 409,900, which means that the average daily strength will be about 386,000. To maintain this average it has been determined that we must enlist an average of 10,000 per month. Of course this will vary from month to month, and sometimes it will be necessary to put on a restricted recruiting program because the recruit-training bases can only accommodate so many at a time. This restricted recruiting is in effect at the present time because during June and July we were able to recruit considerably more than the training establishment could train. The figures which we have for June, July, and August,

of this year, are to me very pleasing and I hope indicative of a trend which will increase as time goes by. As an over-all figure 35 percent of those whose enlistments expired during the past year have reenlisted and it is believed that this percentage will be increasing over the next few years.

Of those first enlistments in June and July, 50 percent of all enlistments were high-school graduates. And for the first part of August this percentage has risen to 60 percent, which in round numbers shows that for a little more than 2 months we have 16,000 high-school graduates. This fact is very encouraging since it means that we are receiving a recruit who has a good foundation on which we can build a good career Navy man. And in addition these men have not been produced by lowering any of the present physical or moral standards. The Navy does not and cannot spend money for direct advertising in daily newspapers or local and national magazines, but must rely on the cooperation with civilians and civilian enterprises. There are, however, issued posters and pamphlets describing Navy life; work is now being conducted toward making movie shorts showing the various phases of life in the Navy, of which the first two are presently available, and the others will be released from time to time over the next year.

In order to do the most effective job of recruiting, however, a survey was made of a representative group of young men to find out among other things why they would like the Navy, and what had influenced them in making the Navy their service career.

The main reasons given by all of the young men for liking the Navy were, in order of precedence: Travel and adventure, health and physical training, specialized training, good pay, educational opportunities, and job security.

To me, however, the most important point of the survey was the fact that almost half of the boys said that their opinions of the Navy had been influenced by parents, relatives, and friends, including ex-Navy men. This indicates that word-of-mouth is one of the best methods and that although formal recruitment by posters and recruiting offices is not to be neglected, both together will produce the maximum results. Who has the inside track on how the Navy operates, who can give these boys the encouragement needed, who knows the best type of men who will make Navy careers? Who, by their loyalty, can personally demonstrate that the Navy is a great team? I think the answer is obvious. The members of the Fleet Reserve Association, and you are certainly needed.

In fiscal 1950 the President has authorized the enlisted strength of the Navy to be raised to 500,000. This means that from our present strength of 409,900 we would have to secure 90,000 new recruits. That may look easy; however, there will be about 90,000 persons during this time who will be discharged. So you can see that means we must secure 180,000 recruits, which is not easy. The members of the Fleet Reserve Association can be of considerable assistance in filling this quota. Each member must have had at least 6 years' active service, therefore you are all well prepared to give the best possible information to those young men whom we need. You know 90 percent of the Navy's recruits are only 17 or 18. Many of them take formal recruiting with perhaps the proverbial grain of salt, but they will take the advice of someone whom they may know from a more personal angle—Fleet Reservist. You men on the other hand know what type of man will be a credit to our Navy and an eventual member of the Fleet Reserve, so why not hand pick your potential shipmates for yourself? In addition to the professional and career possibilities I have mentioned before, there are many other features such as life insurance, medical and dental care, the fact that the Navy dollar's pay is worth much more, or is equivalent to a civilian pay of a great deal more than the actual cash. And especially you know those intangible things which we all know and call being a shipmate.

As we become more stable, and I believe we are becoming increasingly so every day, that average will rise. To the career man the outlook is much better than ever, in addition to the limited-duty officer scheme which makes the attainment of officer status more equitable, the enlisted personnel can look forward to certain features which I am sure you will agree are most desirable. In addition to retirement benefits I should like to mention some things which are important to the welfare, morale, and comfort of those who are still on active duty and who are of course of interest to the association because you are unique in having those men on active duty in your membership.

At the present time plans are being drawn which will provide for the definite assignment of men being transferred. Previously it has been the practice to assign men to a station for further transfer. Soon, however, several months before a man is being transferred he will indicate his choice for duty, and insofar as possible it will be granted. The ship or station which he has selected will be informed well in advance and his request will be integrated into that organization at the point he desires, so that when the time comes for his actual transfer, he will have a fairly good idea of exactly where he will eventually settle down. This will permit those career men, especially those who have families, to make plans for transportation along with their household goods.

The Bureau at the present time is working to alleviate the bottleneck which had developed in the seashore rotations program. The main cause for this has been the disparity between sea-and-shore billets for certain rates, and the fact that there was overcrowding in certain rates and in certain levels. A plan is now in operation which calls for those officers who have planning within their cognizance, to make room in certain places by opening up billets for those rates who have had more than the required sea duty and are eligible for rotation. The number of months of sea duty required for shore duty eligibility varies from 21 months to 48 months between the various rates and pay grades. There are, however, certain other requirements to justify the cost of transportation from sea to shore. A man must have 2 years' obligated duty, or if he has his dependents with him at an overseas station, he must complete his normal tour of duty at that station, but he is not penalized, however, if he cannot accept shore assignment for that reason. Those personnel who can show that a hardship exists at home are given preference, and even those who are not on an eligibility list may apply and be given up to 4 months' shore duty. If they are not eligible and need more than that time they may be given a hardship discharge.

The man who is eligible has three choices for duty ashore: first the naval district including naval missions or office of naval attachés, and a particular place therein. Second choice is other naval district. Third choice is anywhere in the United States for those without any particular preference. Orders for the place which is then available will be issued 2 months in advance of expectant date of reporting. If the man does not like the place assigned he can have the orders canceled. However, in that event, he must wait 1 year before he may again apply.

Housing is another critical factor regardless of whether you are in or out of the Navy. It is recognized as being a very definite morale problem and everything possible is being done to alleviate the existing situation. The standards set up by the Bureau of Yards and Docks call for approximately 20 percent married housing for enlisted personnel. This is estimated to take care of the first three pay grades, which means again that the career man is being given consideration.

At the Naval Academy I have been especially interested in providing for a pattern of the very best in all things. I believe it to be a fundamental necessity to provide there at the very beginning of naval life a model condition in everything for everyone which will result in the furtherance of mutual confidence, mutual respect, and mutual appreciation which will come from such a condition. To provide for this a model village for enlisted families containing 260 units has been built and is now occupied. In conjunction with the houses and as an integral factor therein a commissary store, a ship's service store, and a church have been built. The interior of the church, the altar and its adjacent area were built and installed by the men themselves on their own suggestion.

The Organized Fleet Reserve of Anne Arundel County, Branch No. 24, is also calculated to be a model. Recently, after many years of untiring effort, a new clubhouse, costing nearly $100,000, was commissioned, and I had the distinct pleasure of being present on that occasion. The Naval Academy assists the branch as far as practicable with its officers and its facilities for drill; and its membership and attendance places it high in the entire area.

The Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Reserve Association are pillars of our naval organization. They represent in synthesis the career men of our Navy. They have been tested in peace and in war, and have proven their value many times over. It has been and will be the policy of those senior officers of the Naval Establishment to collaborate with the Fleet Reserve Association and to seek its advice in matters which concern the welfare of our men, since it most adequately and articulately represents the men in the service and out who have devoted at least 6 years to the Navy. It is a noble organization because it carries on those principles of loyalty, service, and protection. It is, in a manner of speaking, the alumni association of one of the world's greatest organizations.

Department of National Health and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for a Department of National Health and Welfare. This would be headed up by an individual who would have Cabinet rank, and will handle all the problems pertaining to health and welfare.

It is interesting to note that the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government reports that there are 44 separate Federal agencies who now deal with some phase of health and medicine, and they spent a billion and a quarter dollars on these medical services in 1948. It shows that one out of every six people in the United States received medical aid from the Government in 1948. It would seem that it is high time to bring all agencies

dealing with health under one umbrella in order to eliminate the duplication, waste, and inefficiency in the program.

The Government's building and operation of Federal hospitals has been a costly procedure. In the building field, the survey notes that the cost per bed in Federal hospitals ranges from $20,000 to $51,000. The average cost in the building of private hospitals is $16,000 per bed.

The armed services have 276 hospitals supported by the tax dollar; there are 125 veterans hospitals in the United States; the Interior Department has 67 hospitals mostly for Indians.

There seems to be little coordination not only in the building of Federal hospitals, but in their purchasing program. The same can be said in the use of professional personnel and the general availability of the hospitals to the patients outside of the agency concerned. This all adds up to a waste not only in professional services, but of the taxpayer's dollar. The entire hospital program should be coordinated in order to bring efficiency and to eliminate the terrific waste of the taxpayer's dollar.

Will the People Give Up These Powers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., for January 6. It is a timely editorial on a subject about which we are all concerned:

WILL THE PEOPLE GIVE UP THESE POWERS?

President Truman's recommendations in his state of the Union speech to Congress Wednesday reveal the symptoms of a change that no American citizen can ignore.

Something has happened to American individualism and integrity. We have been schooled for 16 years in a new scheme of things American, a new concept of the citizen's relationship to his Government and to himself.

In the founding of these United States our early statesmen were imbued with the determination that individual freedom is paramount. In order to make the new democracy work the key figure in America was to be the individual citizen.

Here, on these shores at last, was to be a new Nation and this was to be a government of the people, not of the States. "We the people of the United States," begins the preamble of the Constitution. It was a new Nation, deriving its just powers from the consent of the governed.

Our Government is one of delegated and enumerated powers. The powers named in the Constitution are all that the United States Government possesses. All others are retained by the people.

"I ask for no straining of words against the general government," wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1823, "nor yet against the States. I believe the States can best govern over home concerns and the general government over foreign ones. I wish, therefore, to see maintained that wholesome distribution of powers established by the Constitution for the limitation of both, and never to see all offices transferred to Washington."

Concerning surrender of powers of the State to the National Government, the Supreme Court in 1911 used this language:

"Among the powers of the State not surrendered—which power therefore remains with the State—is the power to so regulate the relative rights and duties of all within its jurisdiction as to guard the public morals, the public safety, and the public health, as well as to promote the public convenience and the common good."

We quote these authorities merely to emphasize the fact that most of the President's recommendations run counter to the purposes so well expressed by this country's founders. He would take from the individual and from the State powers which would be centralized in Washington.

His proposals express a weakening of the powers vested in the people, and eventually this centralization of power in Washington would react to the detriment of the people.

To attempt control of inflation the President asks for more control over bank credit and continuation of control over consumer credit—powers he already has to a considerable extent.

Rent control should be relaxed as housing is made available, but the President wants that control extended and strengthened.

He asks for authority to regulate commodity speculation, allocate scarce key materials, and control wages and certain prices, if necessary. Members of Congress have doubted the need of this drastic authority to date.

He asks for power to put the Government in the steel business, build plants and run them, if industry can't do what is needed. This is not the first direct attempt to take private enterprise out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of politicians, but it is obviously a first step toward nationalization of industry.

When Government takes over industry it also takes over labor. Americans should readily see the dangers in such proposals, for their freedoms, their incomes, their jobs, their opportunities would thus be jeopardized.

Are we ready to hand over to Government these precious heritages which our Constitution guarantees to each individual? Are we ready to succumb to the power of a centralized, dominant bureaucracy in the hope of gaining some elusive security?

This kind of program calls for straight thinking. It calls for individual action to preserve the kind of America we inherited. It calls for backbone and hard-headed realism.

Will Americans ignore the dangers that face them and their freedom to be Americans?

The Atomic Bomb and the Isthmian Canals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in certain technical magazines, in recent months, the subject of the atomic bomb with relation to isthmian canals has received considerable attention, but very few authoritative articles of like import have appeared in nontechnical publications. However, in the Cosmopolitan magazine for January 1949 there is carried a most informative discussion of the destructive power of the atomic bomb, written by Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, former head of the Manhattan atomic-bomb project, entitled "Can New York Hide From the Atomic Bomb?"

In this article General Groves does not specifically deal with the Panama Canal, but he does present some of the features of atomic destructiveness in such a way as to lead—as many informed and thoughtful people believe—quite necessarily and inevitably to the conclusion that the same kind of devastation which might be expected from atomic-bomb attack on the Nation's greatest metropolis would result from a similar assault on any type of isthmian canal and its defenses whether of lake-lock, sea-level, tidal-lock, or other construction.

Under leave accorded, I am placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a part of these remarks, this most timely and informative contribution on this tremendously important subject, and it would be well, indeed, if all Members of Congress and our citizens in general should read and ponder what one of the world's greatest authorities has to say in this connection.

The matter follows:

CAN NEW YORK HIDE FROM THE ATOMIC BOMB?
(By Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, U. S. Army, retired)

Just what would an atomic-bomb attack do to New York? Less than a year ago the city was hit, not by a bomb, but by just a snowstorm. True, it was the greatest snowstorm on record, and also it was a complete surprise. The morning weather forecast on December 26, 1947, had read: "Snow, ending in afternoon. Fair tomorrow." But the papers the next morning told of a record 25-inch snowfall, of a city crippled. Thousands of workers were marooned. Avenues and side streets were blocked by mountains of snow and by thousands of abandoned automobiles, taxicabs, buses, and trucks. Snow plows experienced the greatest difficulties in their attempts to clear passageways through the main downtown traffic arteries. Fire was greatly feared. Citizens' groups were called upon to help open potential fire runs on the main arteries and to clear spaces around fire hydrants.

The Long Island Railroad suspended service out of New York early in the evening, bus lines were brought to a standstill, even the subways ran badly behind schedules. The suburban highways, on Long Island, and to New Jersey, Westchester, and Connecticut, were completely blocked. Thousands of New Jersey commuters walked across the George Washington Bridge. Many workers did not get home until well into the next day.

The city hospitals had the greatest number of calls in their history. The major number of the police patrol cars had to be assigned to emergency ambulance service. Policemen acted as doctors in many cases. Weeks passed before the city was completely back to normal. But there were few deaths and little permanent damage to any of the buildings.

An atomic attack on New York would probably be the first attack of the war. There are many possible variations. It could consist of a single bomb or of many. The bombs could be dropped from long-range airplanes with fuzes adjusted so they would explode at ground level or at a considerable altitude, as at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The bombs might be exploded under water, as in the second test at Bikini. In this case, they might be dropped from planes, or they

might be discharged from enemy submarines or even from merchant ships. While the latter might be ships of the attacking power, they might—particularly if tension had been mounting—be those of an enemy's secret ally, or even of a supposedly friendly power.

There is still another way in which the bombs could be delivered. That is by the surreptitious importation of the bomb parts and their secret assembly within our borders. While I am inclined to believe that such bombs would probably be exploded in the same rooms in which they were assembled, it is also conceivable that they could be placed in trucks, moved to the desired points, and exploded without removal from the trucks.

Of one thing we can be certain; the more bombs that are to be exploded in a single attack the more careful must be the planning by the attackers. And such planning would have to be based upon the belief of the enemy participants that they have an excellent chance of escaping unharmed, not only from the actual blast but from the general area afterward. Men possessing the highest degree of technical knowledge, courage, initiative, and good judgment would be required. They would also have to be men who, while they might be appalled at the prospective loss in human life, would be firm and unwavering in their convictions that the best interests of their country, of the world, of all humanity, would be served by their action. The slightest doubt on the part of any of the participants might well imperil the success not only of the entire operation but even of the contemplated war itself.

If an atomic attack comes, it will certainly come by surprise. We cannot rely on normal air-warning facilities to give us any advance notice. Atomic bombs are so valuable that the enemy will take every precaution to avoid successful interception. We must assume that they will be delivered to the target successfully. Successful delivery implies effective surprise as well as accuracy. An atomic-bomb attack carried out under conditions which would permit of any preparatory defense measures whatsoever would be uneconomical to the aggressor.

Let us assume that a single bomb, of the power of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs, is detonated in the air at a point about midway between the Battery (at the tip of Manhattan Island) and Central Park around 5:30 (the heart of the rush hour) of a summer afternoon. The huge ball of fire and the characteristic mushroom cloud, rising to a height of 40,000 feet, convey the signal to the people within a radius of more than a hundred miles. Directly below the point of detonation, there is immediate, utter destruction. People are killed instantly by the tens of thousands. An equal number are seriously injured. Hundreds of buildings crumble into piles of rubble, and fires are raging in all directions. The extent of the damage decreases in proportion to the distance from the target center (that point on the ground directly below the point of detonation), but even 11 miles away there is some blast damage.

The destruction and damage from an atomic bomb is caused primarily by flying debris, fire, blast, and radiation. At the instant of detonation deadly neutrons and gamma rays are emitted. Exposure to this radiation, which lasts for less than a second after the detonation, takes a heavy toll of casualties. Persistent or lingering radioactivity is negligible in the case of a bomb detonated at a considerable altitude, as practically all of the radioactivity is dissipated in the atmosphere. Almost all of the radiation injuries result from exposure to gamma rays during the first second. Nausea and vomiting, diarrhea, and fever are the usual symptoms. Severe exposure causes death within 9 or 10 days. In less severe cases temporary loss of hair, emaciation, and a variety of disabling symptoms are prevalent.

The fire damage is, in part, a direct result of the intense heat generated by the bomb. No one knows exactly what the temperature of the ball of fire is at the time of the explosion. Attempts have been made to measure it approximately, but that is a figure which I feel it is not in our national interests to disclose to the scientists of all nations. It is sufficient to say that this temperature is beyond the understanding of the average man. An emission of intense heat rays takes place after detonation and lasts for a very short time. In that time, however, much damage is done. Flash burns on the surfaces of objects will occur up to distances of 13,000 feet from the target center. The flash burns on human beings vary in degree, depending upon the distance from the target center and the amount of shielding. A great variation in the protective effects of simple clothing results from whether the color is a reflecting (white) or an absorbing (black) one. It has been estimated that over 50 percent of the total deaths at Hiroshima and Nagasaki were caused by such burns. These intense heat rays also result in the ignition of combustible material, which in turn generates many conflagrations. Most of the fires are started, however, as a direct consequence of the enormous physical destruction by the blast. Badly damaged buildings with broken gas lines and power lines, upset furnaces and stoves, broken oil lines, are extreme fire hazards.

The blast effect of a Hiroshima- or Nagasaki-type bomb is equivalent to that produced by approximately 20,000 tons of TNT. The enormous pressures developed produce a shattering and crushing effect which varies from pulverization at the center of the affected area to minor damage, such as broken windows, over 3 miles away. Within a radius of 1 mile practically all buildings, except those of heavy reinforced concrete and steel construction, will be completely destroyed. And even these, though standing, will have door and window frames and interior partitions ripped out

Possibly the greatest number of casualties will result from the flying fragments that will be hurled about at high velocities. At the flash of the explosion, many poeple will rush to the windows to see what has happened. Tens of thousands will be killed or injured by flying glass.

The biggest death toll will come in the streets where pedestrians and those in vehicles will be bombarded with flying bricks and stone stripped off the faces of almost every building in the serious blast area. A brick falling from 5 to 30 stories is a decidedly deadly weapon by the time it hits the street. Such missiles will be coming down not singly, or by twos and threes, but by the thousands. They will be as impossible to dodge as the drops in a driving rainstorm.

These, then, are the general effects of a high-burst, conventional atomic bomb. It has been exploded at a high altitude to eliminate any persistent radioactive contamination on the ground. In addition, this is an altitude which, though well above the highest building in Manhattan, will cause the maximum damage to buildings over the largest area. On this basis the height of detonation was selected for both Hiroshima and Nagasaki; in neither case was there any persistent radioactive contamination on the ground. The deaths and injuries resulting from radioactivity occurred at the instant of the explosion, not later. The percentage of such deaths was comparatively small. In Japan there were no high buildings, but it is quite possible that there will be some persistent radioactive contamination on upper floors of Manhattan skyscrapers directly under the center of the blast.

What is the picture in New York City after the blast? If the enemy's aim was good, the center of the destroyed area is in Washington Square at the foot of Fifth Avenue. Within a radius of a half mile, perhaps 30 or 40 percent of the people have been killed instantly as a result of intense burns and falling debris. An equal number will soon die from the same causes. Most of the survivors have been injured more than slightly from the same causes. Many of those who escape death, possibly 5 or 10 percent of the total, have been exposed to so much gamma radiation that they will die in 9 or 10 days. Even if facilities were available to treat them, they could not be saved.

For 10 blocks in all directions streets are no longer usable. They are hardly discernible because of the piles of debris which have fallen into them. Fires are spreading out radially, engulfing all burnable material in their paths. All means of surface communication are gone. Fire trucks, ambulances, and the other emergency vehicles which handle the city's minor disasters cannot move into the area. All assistance from our machine age is gone, and we are reduced almost entirely to what we can do by manpower alone. The subways are troubled with water from broken water lines. Power-line failures have already stalled the trains. Surface cave-ins have trapped thousands underground.

Within a radius of a mile and a half, an area extending from about Thirty-fourth Street to the City Hall, and from the Hudson to the East River, there is very heavy damage to most of the buildings. The Empire State Building, at the northern edge of this area, will have suffered heavy damage to its upper floors. The tower may be riddled. Many of the panel walls on the north and south sides of the building will have been blown out. Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village, the enormous new apartment developments on the East River, are a mass of rubble and twisted steel. Just north of these, Bellevue Hospital, with its adjoining medical center, is wrecked to the point where it needs help instead of giving it. The superstructure of the Hudson River docks between Houston Street and Twenty-third Street has been crushed. Fires are raging along the water front.

Appreciable damage from the blast effect extends all the way to Times Square. Many buildings, which might otherwise have been saved from fires, must be sacrificed. There is no pressure in the water mains because of the thousands of broken hydrants and service lines. For the thousands of wounded and burned victims there is no hope. Few persons are venturing into the area. Those who try to enter are overwhelmed by movement in the other direction, for most of those who can move are fleeing in panic.

Everyone is trying to get off the island, by public and private transportation and on foot. All exits are one-way streets, but broken-down vehicles block most of them. These blocks are cleared only by the desperate drivers, struggling to get through, who throw the vehicles off the pavements where that is possible. Who knows but what another bomb is scheduled to drop momentarily, north of Central Park or in Wall Street? As in the case of Hiroshima, the most significant effect of the bomb is not the physical damage, death, and injury; it is the panic among survivors.

In the event of another war, New York City could be completely destroyed as a strategically valuable seaport by seven well-placed air bursts of conventional-type bombs. A map and a compass can prove this quite readily to the interested. Two of the bombs, as has already been indicated, are sufficient to destroy Manhattan. One bomb dropped over city hall and another over the Pennsylvania station would knock out practically

all of the Manhattan dock facilities. On the New Jersey side of the Hudson, neutralization of all major shipping facilities and railroad freight terminal yards could be effected by one burst over the Lincoln Tunnel Plaza, one over the Jersey City city hall, and one over the Bayonne Navy Yard. Along the Brooklyn shore, the targets would be the Navy Yard and Red Hook. These seven bombs would eliminate New York City as a major factor in our war potential for many months. To rebuild the city as a major port would probably take 5 or 6 years.

What would be the effect if these bombs were to detonate near the ground? First of all, although the destruction in the immediate vicinity, say within a quarter-mile radius, would be absolute, the effective area of damage would be diminished because of the rapid dissipation of energy as the pressure wave moves out along the ground. Persistent radioactivity fission products would not be dissipated so readily in the atmosphere, in this case, and would induce further radioactivity in all matter with which they came in contact. This would, of course, deny access to the affected areas for a considerably longer period of time and would thereby retard reconstruction.

If one or two or three more bombs were added to the original seven and were exploded in the deep water of the rivers, the results would be even more horrible. This would be due to the persistent radioactivity from the spray. As we learned at Bikini, if there was a breeze, thousands of tons of water would drench the area, leaving a deadly radioactive contamination which would persist for years. I won't venture an estimate of loss of life from radiation alone, but the figure would be staggering.

What can be done to lessen the damage to be expected from a possible attack? We must not assume that we can be certain of intercepting or preventing any bomb attack. Passive defense measures must be exploited to the maximum degree. Dispersion of industry and population would obviously be effective in reducing damage and loss of life, but they are difficult to accomplish without seriously impairing our normal standards of living. A reasonable realization of the tremendous power of the bomb should, however, influence future industrial development. We cannot afford to keep building big targets.

The only effective protection against the bomb is to make certain that no bomb will ever reach us. This can be done only by the maintenance of our national security on such a level that no aggressor nation will be anxious or even willing to attack us.

We must—by the maintenance of well-balanced, effective, military strength—serve notice that no matter how powerful a surprise attack may be, we will eventually win any war in which we are engaged. Until such time as effective international control of atomic energy and of other weapons of mass destruction becomes a reality, the only deterrent to an atomic-minded aggressor is certain retaliation. We must remain strong. We must continue to develop our own atomic-warfare potentialities. But, at the same time, we must continue to strive for the abolition of war. For then, and only then, can we be reasonably sure of achieving a lasting peace.

Pumpkin Pie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a poem written by Dr. John Ashton, of College Station, Tex., and entitled "Pumpkin Pie":

PUMPKIN PIE

(By John Ashton)

When nations speak of pumpkins,
It makes one wonder why:
There's something in the woodpile—
Some traitor, foe, or spy!

Whoever heard of pumpkins
All hollowed out to hold
Microfilms and secret pacts?—
Not half has yet been told!

Don't talk to me of pumpkin pie,
Nor of Jack o' Lantern sing,
For pumpkins now are used to hide
Some grave top-secret thing.

Our country looks to Truman
To purge or not to purge:
The guilt lies in the pumpkin;
Just watch the truth emerge!

Now when you buy a pumpkin, dear,
Be sure that deep inside,
No microfilms in secret code
Were put in there to hide.

So long as spies steal vital facts,
And pumpkins grow from seeds,
So long, henceforth, will guilty men
In pumpkins hide their deeds.

—*John Ashton.*

COLLEGE STATION, TEX., *January 5, 1949.*

Truman Plan To Resume "Big Government" March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Sunday Star, Washington, D. C., January 9, 1949, entitled "Truman Plan To Resume 'Big Government' March":

TRUMAN PLAN TO RESUME BIG GOVERNMENT MARCH—EXPANSION CALLED FOR IN STATE OF UNION MESSAGE INDICATES BIGGER FEDERAL PAY ROLL AND MORE POWER

(By Gould Lincoln)

The problem of big Government continues to press itself upon Congress and the country. President Truman's message on the state of the Union makes it clear that the onward march of expanding governmental functions and agencies, begun when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 16 years ago, threw overboard his plans for governmental economy, is progressing.

The recommendations contained in Mr. Truman's message, if enacted into law, will enormously increase not only the civilian personnel of the Federal Government, but also will help to multiply the statutes which touch the lives of the people. Here are some of them:

Public power lines, in connection with further rural electrification.

More river valley development, after the Tennessee Valley Authority model.

Continued price supports for farmers.

Expansion of social security.

Federalized medicine.

Federalized public education.

Federal aid for public (subsidized) housing.

The civil-rights program, including a Federal fair employment system.

Extension of existing credit controls.

New controls on speculation in commodity markets.

Extension of export controls.

Continuation of the authority to allocate transport facilities.

Authorization of allocation and priorities in key commodities.

Continuation of rent controls.

Stand-by power to impose price ceilings on scarce commodities which go into industry or affect the cost of living.

Stand-by power to limit "unjustified" wage increases.

WILL NEED MORE HELP

These standby powers, if and when they are used, will require many new employees and officers. No estimate is made by the President of the number of additional Federal employees all these recommendations would place on the Government pay roll.

The most recent report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, dealing with Federal personnel and pay, is revealing. It shows that civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government during November totaled 2,104,585—an increase of 12,405 over October. November was the ninth of the 11 calendar months of the year (up to and including November) in which increases in personnel were recorded. Agencies reporting major increases in November were the Post Office Department with 9,764, the Military Establishment with 3,285, and the Veterans' Administration with 1,903.

Take a look at the cost of this army of Government employees—their pay only. For the first 4 months of the current fiscal year, which began July 1, 1948, the civilian Federal pay roll totaled $2,117,736,000. Multiply this by three and you have an estimate of $6,353,358,000 for the entire year.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, has for years been a voice howling in the wilderness of Government spending. It is popular to spend Government money. It is popular to multiply Government jobs, and it is politically wise, judging from the returns at the election polls. So popular that the Republicans in Congress have become impressed. There is a quiet rumor going about today that the minority party will take a leaf out of the Truman book.

The problem of big government has several sides in addition to its cost to the taxpayer. It impinges upon the freedom of action of the citizens in many ways. The cry is for "security" today, security against poverty, against unemployment, against sickness and old age—all serious ills, when and if they arise. In this search for security, however, there is constant lessening of individual initiative, and constant increased reliance on the Government. It may be that in so large a country, with an ever increasing population, all of this may be wise and necessary to put the brakes on misfortune which might overtake people on a large scale. But even so, this galloping advance of Government seems to have only one ultimate goal—statism, socialism, call it what you will.

WHERE TO DRAW THE LINE

The Government of the United States is today a huge organization, the largest business in the world. It accomplishes many beneficial things for many people. The real question, however, is whether it is to continue expanding—where to draw the line. President Truman in his message to Congress suggested that the Government be given authority to build steel mills, if and when this may become necessary to fill consumption requirements. He did not limit the proposed action to steel—merely mentioning it as an example.

Those who believe in state socialism with the Government's hand in every enterprise, see this country on its way toward such a

system. The Presidential program, for which the White House claims the last election gave a people's mandate, contains many features of the platform adopted by the Communist Party. It undertakes to give aid to important minority groups—special privileges, but special privileges handed out by Government.

The lobbyists for special groups have descended on Washington like a flock of vultures. To them, this is the big opportunity. Most active of them all is the labor group, who loudly proclaim that they won the election for the Democrats. Certain farm groups are not far behind, with their demands for Government subsidy to keep farm prices high. Individually, these groups are not looking for State socialism. What they seek is an immediate gain for themselves.

Veterans' organizations are making their demands upon the Government, too. There is stirring a plan for a veterans' bonus—which would require a huge sum of money.

The recent change in the House rules, giving chairmen of standing committees of the House the right to demand recognition to move to bring up bills reported by their committees, if the Rules Committee does not report them out, may give the soldiers' bonus a big lift. Let the Veterans' Committee report such a bill, and even if the the administration leaders oppose it, there now seems no way to keep the measure off the floor.

The ever-increasing expenditure of Government money, with its drain upon the taxpayer, may result in driving industry to the wall. And if industry fails, the only step left will be for Government to take it over. It could happen.

Is the Dairy Industry in Jeopardy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the dairy industry has been the orphan of the New Deal and now it appears to be the orphan of the Fair Deal.

Millions of dollars are used annually to subsidize crops producing vegetable oils, but the old dairy cow stands on her own four legs without the thought of subsidy. She converts the grass of noncrop land into the greatest single food ever known to man.

While much vocal concern may be expressed about the health of the people, the fact remains that milk is recognized as the most perfect protective food available to our people.

I hereby include an address delivered by me on October 26, 1948, at the annual meeting of the Pure Milk Products Co-op at Fond du Lac, Wis.

The address follows:

IS THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN JEOPARDY?

(By Hon. REID F. MURRAY, Member of Congress)

My contention is that never before in the history of our country has the dairy industry been in jeopardy as much as it is at the present hour. While one of the main controversies on the subject is based on oleo against butter, the important issue is the battle between the vegetable oils and animal fats. Still another and perhaps greater issue, is between the soil depleting crop system of farming as opposed to livestock farming which up to this time has been recognized as the system of farming which maintains the soil fertility.

That we may orderly approach the consideration of this problem, permit me to make the following statements:

Chicago is the "food capital" of the world and comparatively few States around Chicago furnish a large percentage of the food of the Nation. Iowa and Illinois alone, provide nearly one-third of the country's total production of hogs. Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa produce one-quarter of the milk.

This great Midwest is the largest area of rich, productive, fertile soil to be found anywhere in the world. There are times, however, when it appears that certain interest and certain sections have gone a long way toward ruining their own soils and now want to support an agricultural program which will ruin the soils of this great Midwest—which is not only the bread basket of the world—but the milkshed of the Nation and the largest meat-producing area in our country.

The dairy industry in the immediate future is confronted with the unfair competition of vegetable oils. In this connection I wish to point out that no experiment as yet conducted has proved that vegetable oils are nutritionally equal to animal fats.

The experiments conducted by Wisconsin and California showed certain results that have been interpreted as proving that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat, but the ridiculous part of the experiments has been that dairy products were used in conjunction with vegetable oils in order to prove that the vegetable oils are equal to animal fats.

The Chicago experiments in the orphanages, where some children were fed oleo and other children were fed butter, was not a real experiment and the conclusions were not justified because the children eating the oleo were also furnished butterfat in the form of milk to drink in addition to the skim milk contained in the oleo used in the experiment.

I repeat—there never has been any experiment which has proven that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat.

No experiment has been conducted by any agricultural scientist in any State or in the United States Department of Agriculture, that proves that a synthetic vitamin A is equal to a natural vitamin A.

There are many synthetic dairy products which now threaten the dairy industry. To mention a few:

1. Oleo, which propagandists would have us believe is equal to butter.

2. The "coconut cow" milk, which is made by incorporating vegetable oil with skim milk and which product is sold in competition with evaporated natural milk. It is a product which at this time cannot be shipped interstate, although Dr. Carlson at the Catholic Rural Life Conference in La Crosse on October 18 stated that in his opinion, is equal to evaporated natural milk.

3. Synthetic cheese, which has already been manufactured experimentally and which is just waiting until after the oleo bill is passed.

Here is some of this synthetic cheese made by the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture some 6 months ago. It is made of vegetable oil and skim milk. I gave some of this cheese to some people a few days ago and they thought it was pretty good, but I think anyone who knows anything about the cheese industry would not rate this synthetic cheese very highly.

4. Now, in connection with filled bottle milk, I am reliably informed that filled milk was made and distributed to the Mexicans last year. This same source advises that when the foot-and-mouth disease stopped the supply of fluid milk in certain Mexican cities, their first approach was to buy dried whole milk from the State of Wisconsin. However, this mixture appeared to be too expensive and so a certain company conceived the idea and put it into practice of taking skim milk and incorporating coconut oil, subjecting it to certain mechanical processes and selling it in lieu of natural cow's milk.

5. It might be well to point out also that ice cream manufacturers have already found competition where vegetable oils are being substituted for at least part of the butterfat in ice cream.

6. Did you know that considerable amounts of filled cream were sold illegally on some markets in large cities during the war? Vegetable oil was used to supplant some of the butterfat in this cream.

Here, then, my friends, are six direct threats to the dairy industry.

You will ask, "Where are we going to get the skim milk to make these synthetic products?" Well, I am sure you have heard of the reciprocity agreements which have been operating from the very beginning in opposition to the livestock industry and in favor of soil-depleting crops.

The duty on skim milk is only a fraction of 1 cent per pound, and there is no reason why large quantities of dried skim milk cannot be obtained from Argentine—the present source of huge amounts of casein imports. You might also be interested in knowing that Canada is stepping up its exports of dried skim milk to the United States since the duty on this commodity has been reduced to an insignificant amount.

It must be remembered that 30 percent of the evaporated milk is produced in Wisconsin. Now, if cheap imported dried milk and vegetable oils are to be processed and sold in competition to evaporated milk, do you think that evaporated milk plants could continue to operate?

In August 1948, 67,000,000 pounds of oleo were manufactured in the United States. One hundred and seventeen million pounds of butter were produced in the United States. In other words, at the present time, 20 oleo manufacturers produce one-third of the spread of the Nation, and it would not require a very long time for 60 oleo manufacturers to take over the entire spread-manufacturing business of the Nation.

If cheap imported skim milk is incorporated with vegetable oils in the manufacture of synthetic cheese, just exactly how many cheese factories do you think will be eliminated from the picture?

Mr. Fluid-Milk Man, you have deceived yourself in many instances if you have believed that it would not affect you if the Rivers bill had been passed, because you do not sell butter but sell milk. You should be appraised of the fact that it is just as mechanically possible to make synthetic products out of skim milk and vegetable oils to compete with your bottle of milk as it is to any other synthetic dairy products.

Oleo is 80 percent vegetable oil and 15 percent skim milk. If by passing certain legislation this product is made equal to a 100-percent dairy product such as butter, it is apparent that it is but a short step to pass legislation making "coconut cow's" milk—which is composed of 6 percent vegetable oil and 94 percent skim milk—equal to evaporated natural milk, which is composed of 7 or 8 percent butterfat and 92 or 93 percent skim milk.

Do you think it will be a very long step to legalize filled cream?

Do you think it will be a very long step to legalize filled ice cream?

There is no use trying to sidestep this issue. Facts are facts. If, by legislation or otherwise, vegetable oil is made equal to animal fat, who is there to say that the synthetic products which I have mentioned, should not be produced?

Let us get this question straight and get it on the record.

If any individual group, or organization wants to dismantle the evaporated milk business of this State; jeopardize the cheese

industry and allow all of the spread to be made by 60 oleo manufacturers and close up the thousands of creameries and promote filled cream and ice cream; or be a party or organization to promote the manufacture of synthetic whole milk—that is a responsibility that they may assume and one for which they must answer.

I have given considerable time and study to this entire problem. I have diligently sought out the facts and I have always kept my arguments based on scientific facts. I have accepted these scientific facts because they have been established by one of the greatest biochemists and nutritionists that the world has ever known, Dr. E. B. Hart, of our own University of Wisconsin. His experiments are beyond question. The statements which I have made concerning past experiments and tests have been cleared through this recognized authority on scientific facts.

So that no one will get the impression that the manufacture or production of synthetic dairy products and the controversy over oleo and butter applies just to the man who milks the cow, I hope that the people working in the dairy plants not only in our State, but throughout the country in handling the various forms of dairy products, will stop and ask themselves what kind of jobs they are going to have when a few plants manufacturing synthetic dairy products are given the green light. Ask yourselves what the effect will be on the dairy industry of our great State of Wisconsin.

It is evident that any State where the agricultural economy is based on the dairy cow, with 50 percent of the farm income from milk and milk products, will decline in economic importance.

The health of the State, of the country, and the world is closely allied with the dairy industry. We must be ever alert to the encroachments made upon it.

Mr. Truman Moves Far Over to the Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cumberland (Md.) News of January 10, 1949:

MR. TRUMAN MOVES FAR OVER TO THE LEFT

Restrained in style but extreme in content. That was President Truman's anxiously awaited message on the state of the Union. That Missouri twang more and more suggests mild-mannered Clement Attlee calmly "socializing" the economy of Great Britain. With his first message to Congress as an elected President, Harry Truman, of Independence, Mo., has swung far over to the left.

At the beginning of his address the President said that government and business must work together for the common good. He then proceeded to scare the daylights out of business with a program that would dangerously extend the powers of government over the American economy.

Everything that Mr. Truman demanded of the Eightieth Congress in that precampaign special session which was calculated to put the Republicans in a political hole was repeated here, and more was added. To avert a deficit, the President asked $4,000,000,000 in new taxes, chiefly on corporations but not neglecting higher income levies—of course, on the middle and upper brackets. Still harping on inflation even as prices fall, he asked again for power to allocate scarce raw materials and impose price and wage ceilings.

A new and deadly dart was aimed at the steel industry. If, said the President, Congress finds that the steel shortage is serious, it should authorize Government loans for expanded output. If private industry then fails to meet the needs, the Government should itself go into the steel business. That direct leap toward state socialism is of a piece with his demand for development of our river basins, with "power" named as the first objective.

As expected, Mr. Truman repeated to Congress all the promises he made to all minority groups during his campaign. Something is here for everybody—higher minimum wages, "improved" farm price supports; expanded social security, in coverage and payments, which will require higher pay-roll taxes; Federal aid to education; Government compulsory medical insurance; a public housing program to build 1,000,000 new homes in 7 years, and so forth. As expected, the President called for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and revival of the Wagner Act, with a ban on jurisdictional strikes and "unjustifiable" secondary boycotts. He repeated his civil rights program, in general terms.

What will be the reaction of Congress to this legislative program that would flatter and bribe every pressure group in the country? A purely negative reaction is undesirable as well as impossible. Some of the proposals are sound and will be supported by Republicans and Democrats. But even a Roosevelt rubber-stamp Congress would not approve everything in this message, and the new Congress is not likely to be a rubber stamp.

Under the new line-up in Congress, a Truman bill that had 7 Democrats against it could be defeated in the Senate; and there are 17 Democrats from Southern and border States. In the new House, 47 dissident Democrats could defeat a Truman measure; and 97 have voted in the past against the administration as often as with it.

For the Republicans, if they wish to be an opposition party in fact as in name, the course is clear. Stick together and work with anti-Truman Democrats to meet squarely the real social and economic problems facing the Nation; but keep always in mind that the heart of American power and prosperity is our basic system of free enterprise. Would that be opposing the will of the voters? Mr. Truman and the new New Dealers may be persuaded that he was given a mandate on November 2. Actually, he received less than 50 percent of the popular vote.

The President's extremist message should draw together the representatives of the real majority of Americans, who, regardless of party labels, do not look to Washington for the solution of their every problem.

Shipments Under the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that without exception every Member of this House is definitely against the proposal of ECA Administrator Hoffman to ship all bulk cargoes under the Marshall plan in vessels flying foreign flags. I have vigorously protested that this would help ruin our American merchant marine at a time when as many ships as possible should be in operation on the high seas. Such action would be contrary to the present law which insists that a minimum of 50 percent of bulk cargoes be shipped in American bottoms, and would deprive thousands of American seamen of work.

I am glad that the Seafarers International Union of North America, Atlantic and Gulf district, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, has taken a prominent part in protesting Mr. Hoffman's proposal. Under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include with these remarks a splendid article which appeared in the January 7, 1949, issue of the Seafarers Log, weekly publication of that union:

THE FACTS, MR. HOFFMAN

In a letter to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, former chairman of the congressional watchdog committee on the Marshall plan, ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman tried to justify his infamous proposal to move all bulk Marshall-plan cargoes in foreign vessels by a statement that simply does not fit the facts.

He declared that the cost of shipping a ton of coal from the United States to France is sometimes as much as $4.50 less on a foreign ship than on an American ship. He strongly implies that this big differential was the rule rather than the exception, and he forgot to note that it was an exception that was no longer happening on December 3 when he wrote the letter.

The facts are these: The American rate for carrying coal from the east coast to France is $10.85 a ton. This rate is set by the Maritime Commission. On foreign ships the rate ranges from $8.50 a ton to about $9. This week, in an effort to get at the truth, a shipping official called three operators of foreign-flag vessels to inquire about the coal rate. Two of the operators quoted $8.50. The third wouldn't talk about any rate below $9, and seemed to prefer a higher one.

Thus, the actual differential about which Hoffman has been bleating turns out to be no more than $2.35 a ton at the most, and only $1.85 or less in some cases. And the story doesn't end there, because the differential is just about wiped out later so far as American taxpayers are concerned. Coal is not the only bulk cargo, but the coal rate continues to be the root of the controversy.

Another facet of the Marshall-plan shipping situation has been overlooked completely by Hoffman and his executive assistants. At least they have not mentioned it in their public statements. Whether Hoffman knows it or not, foreign operators are getting away with a scheme so obvious that one can only conclude that Hoffman is a very gullible gent.

It is no secret that representatives of French shipping interests recently told a member of the Maritime Commission that they deliberately depressed their rates in a maneuver to get a bigger slice of the melon. Later on, the Frenchmen continued, up would go the rates. The Americans would be hoodwinked.

Shipping men of other nations participating in the Marshall plan are reported to have said substantially the same thing, although they said it less bluntly than the Frenchmen. Foreign rates already are rising as the foreign operators smack their lips in anticipation.

Foreign operators haven't been worrying about making or losing money for the present period. If they lose money they expect to

be reimbursed directly or indirectly through the Marshall plan. This would mean American subsidization of European merchant fleets with low labor standards. And if they get the extra cargoes and raise the rates, too, their chances of losing money are very slight. Yet Hoffman, in his letter to BRIDGES, wailed that to pay the American rates was to subsidize the American merchant marine, and copies of that letter were sent to many trade unionists, Senators and Congressmen, who have taken up the cudgels in the SIU's fight to have the Hoffman order rescinded. In the early days of the battle, Hoffman and his assistants apparently believed that this letter was enough to fool everybody. Actually, it fooled nobody.

What of the rate differential that remains? Is it as devastating as Hoffman would have it sound? The answer is a resounding "No," after some of the elements in steamship financing are examined.

If a minimum of half of the bulk cargoes are to be carried under the American flag as the law now provides, despite Hoffman's peculiar interpretation, they will go for the most part in Liberties under bare-boat charter from the Maritime Commission.

When a company charters a Liberty from the Commission, it pays $7,500 a month in rent. If 150 Liberties should fail to operate because of the Hoffman order, it would mean a dead loss in revenue to the Government of $1,125,000 a month. The charter hire for Victory ships is $10,000 a month, and if any Victory should fail to operate because of the order the loss of revenue would be correspondingly greater.

Maritime Commission spokesmen point out that the money from chartering a ship is almost entirely profit to the Government. The loss to the Government is even greater, however, for a ship in the boneyard costs the Commission about $10,000 a year to maintain.

Then there is the matter of taxes. If a company charters a Liberty, the first 10 percent in gross profit on the capital invested in the operation of that ship is subject to normal corporate income taxes. When the profits go higher, the taxes spiral. After the 10 percent has been taxed separately, the Government divides additional gross profits by the number of days the company actually operated the ship.

The company is then taxed 50 percent of the first $100 a day profit, 75 percent of profit between $100 and $300 a day, and 90 percent of any profit above $300 a day. The steamship companies still pay substantial dividends while the Government gets millions and millions in taxes.

In short, if the Maritime Commission ships are in the boneyard, the Government loses: (1) Millions of dollars in charter hire; (2) millions of dollars in maintenance charges; (3) millions of dollars in corporate taxes; (4) millions of dollars in unemployment benefits paid to seamen and others in the maritime industry.

Hoffman maintains that if all the bulk cargoes go on foreign flag ships, this country will be able to ship more goods to Europe. This is a dubious argument at best, since shipping costs are only one item in the Marshall plan.

However, he might better insist that 60 or 70 or even 100 percent of the bulk cargoes go in American ships. And he might ask that the extra taxes collected by the Government from the shipping industry be appropriated to purchase the goods that the people of the war-ravaged nations of Europe must have, despite chiseling in shipping and other matters by some of their businessmen.

The SIU will carry on its fight to have the Hoffman proposal defeated. This battle is far from over, but each day we gain new allies in the labor movement and Congress. The SIU never has lost a beef and will not lose this one.

Investigations of Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two letters and one editorial—a letter from the Honorable Hamilton Fish to President Truman and the President's reply, and an editorial by Westbrook Pegler on a similar subject:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *December 23, 1948.*
Hon. HARRY TRUMAN, *President,*
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have persisted in attacking the Un-American Activities Committee, duly appointed by the House of Representatives, and denouncing its recent startling exposures of spies and traitors in our midst as red herrings. I sincerely respect you, Mr. President, because you were a tough combat officer in World War I, and on account of your Missouri mulishness, but there is such a thing as carrying stubbornness too far. You must know by this time that you were wrong in raising the red-herring issue.

Who appointed Alger Hiss to the State Department?

Who appointed him as adviser to F. D. R. at the Yalta Conference?

Who appointed him as executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks conference in 1944?

Who appointed him as secretary general of the San Francisco Conference for the organization of the United Nations in 1945?

In order that I may not be considered raising a partisan issue I agree that the public is entitled to know from John Foster Dulles, a Republican, if he had anything to do with various key appointments of Mr. Alger Hiss in the State Department and as president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

We have already had too much secret diplomacy at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam which we are now paying for in Berlin and China, and not enough faith in the American people.

Why should any public official or loyal American want to protect Communist spies and traitors? Every individual implicated in this steal of secret documents from the State, War, or Navy Department should be publicly exposed and punished.

Mr. President, who is the State Department trying to cover up?

Mr. President, who were and who are the agents of the Communist Party in the State Department and other departments of the Government?

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know how Alger Hiss and other Communist sympathizers and Red stooges infiltrated into important Government positions.

Mr. President, how long will Communist spies and traitors be permitted to infest the Federal service and abuse the patience of the American people? It is time that the various departments of the Government realized that they are the servants and not the masters of the people.

The diabolical espionage plot with its stolen documents and microfilms must be openly exposed, and everyone connected with it punished. Let no guilty man or woman escape, no matter how important or powerful, dead or alive.

The Un-American Activities Committee has rendered an important public service. It should be commended, not condemned, and its activities continued by the incoming Congress.

There can be no appeasement of Communist spies and traitors, or those aiding and abetting them. There can be no compromise with treason under any guise.

I am writing this as an American and not as a partisan Republican.

Respectfully yours,

HAMILTON FISH,
Chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Propaganda and Activities in 1930–31.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 6, 1949.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. FISH: I read your letter of December 23 with a lot of interest and sometime or other I shall explain just exactly the situation to which you refer.

You naturally are looking at the programs, which you claim are wrong, with a partisan prejudiced eye for which I can't blame you.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I know of no better way to illustrate to the American laity the squirming, trimming elusiveness of the overeducated Harvard doubledome of the Felix Frankfurter cult than to quote some gobs of the gummy text that Adolf A. Berle left in the record when he took his intellect up the Hill and blew the whistle, through his ears, on his old college chums in the State Department.

You will hear a thousand men allege that they covered Harrison Street Station in Chicago when the policemen really knew how to lead a witness, but I won't say any more than just that I used to study social science there on Saturday nights and got some lessons that might quiet a gabby guy like Berle and keep him on the subject.

There was a sergeant at Harrison Street who for some personal bigotry took a narrow view of the profession of pandering and I have an adolescent recollection of him sitting in his big armchair, facing a client of the Saturday night rush, who sat in a similar chair facing him, giving evasive answers.

The sergeant was cooing at him and smiling like a lover and the mackerel was using an awful lot of language to say nothing and thought he was getting away with it.

At a certain point, however, the sergeant whapped him a clop on the side of the head with a heel of a hand as big as a paving block and tumbled him clear across the room.

When he came up he popped yes-and-no answers, right names and numbers with the crackle and snap of a string of firecrackers, and just a flick of the sergeant's thumb was enough to bring him back to the subject. He gave a much better performance than Mr. Berle and the sergeant didn't thank him either as the committee thanked Berle, nor help him on with his coat.

Here is a brow from Harvard, a prodigy no less, who muzzled his way into the Peace Conference after the First World War and as some kind of expert at the age of 23, now testifying in a Communist dirty mess at the State Department.

These people can learn less out of a given situation than you would expect of an apprentice mongoloid and yet that magic name of Harvard law seems to hex the lower classes, for the Congressmen salaam and murmur thank you when they ought to throw this kind in the cooler to make up their minds.

Listen to this:

"Question. Did you do anything officially or unofficially about this information?

"Answer. (By the brain) Yes; I did a great deal. I was disturbed a good deal but not so much at the three or four men named. Mr. Pressman was out of the Government.

"To be blunt about it, Mr. Witt's statement and sympathies were so well known that what Mr. Chambers had said added nothing to anything that wasn't public knowledge at the time."

Now, let us count up and see what our flannel-mouthed friend said. He was disturbed. But not so much about the three or four men named.

No answer at all so far. And after saying he was disturbed he pulls the rug from under himself to make damn sure he hasn't said anything that anyone could sink a tooth into. That's Harvard law for you, where old Weenie carved the motto: "To derive plain meanings from plain words is pernicious oversimplification."

But all right. Take Berle at his word about Nathan Witt. The pair of them were happy hot dogs of the Frankfurter cult, so you can be sure he knows his man.

Yes; it is true that Witt was understood to be as red as a firecracker. He was known as the man who controlled the board during the bloody anarchy of the early thirties which gave birth to the misbegotten CIO with all its terror and its continuing corruption of the American system of life. But Berle never said so. Yet, he is an officer of the court, isn't he? He is a citizen, supposed to be patriotic, isn't he?

Well, then, what did he ever do to inform the public, to denounce Witt's "well-known sympathies" and protect the country against him?

Not a thing. Nothing.

He just thought it was amusing, that's all. Quaint fellow, Witt, Roguish.

But let Berle dribble along:

"I looked into the then position of the Hiss boys first."

He calls these twirps boys although Alger is 44 and the other is 42. They certainly get a lot of mileage out of adolescence up at Harvard law.

I must quit interrupting the mugg. I am acting like that sergeant with the fish at Harrison street.

Now remember, the question was, what did he do?

"Answer (by Mr. Berle). According to my recollection, neither of them (the twirps) had any position that amounted to very much in the State Department. My recollection is that at that time Alger Hiss was doing some relatively unimportant work in, I think, the legal department, and I have forgotten what Donald was doing, but neither was in a position where he either had access to confidential information or where he had much to do with policy, so for the moment there was no immediate danger.

"Further, the idea that the Hiss boys and Nat Witt were going to take over the United States Government didn't strike me as any immediate danger."

Still no answer, you observe, and the four-flusher hasn't really got his mouth open yet. And note how he cuts the ground from under himself with the stuff about "my recollection" and "I think" and "I have forgotten" and anyway it was all very harmless at worst.

But here we go again: "I checked on the two Hiss boys. Specifically, I checked with Dean Acheson and later I checked when Acheson became the Assistant Secretary of State and Alger Hiss became his executive assistant.

"That to my knowledge was the first time when Alger Hiss would have been in a position to do anything effectively. Acheson said he had known the family of these boys from childhood and could vouch for them absolutely.

"I further found that Mr. Justice Frankfurter would give them an exactly similar indorsement. You had therefore a chain of indorsements by the men for whom they worked, but reputable men, whether you agreed with them or not, and this seemed to negative any danger."

Remember now, Berle has just admitted before he goes into this dance of the dying swan that Chambers had told him the two Hiss children were preparing to go into the Communist underground in our Government.

"Schematically, I believed that Chambers was telling the truth"—and Berle dances back again—"Telling the truth as he saw it, so I caused the Department to establish very close relations with the FBI. A little later, a section was organized in the State Department known as the foreign activities correlation division.

"The name is meaningless and designedly so. Its business was to follow all of these various activities as they appeared in Washington and in respect of any group that might appear to be sympathetic either with the Communists or with the Nazi-Fascist point of view.

"I think a couple of weeks ago it was merged with the Security Division or some similar section in the State Department. We tried to trace out the groups which endeavored to have representation through any individuals in Washington, and we endeavored to reach back to see whether the Communist apparatus was beginning to try to activate the foreign-language groups in the United States."

Had enough?

How the United States Government fell into the hands of these Harvard maypole dancers you will never find out from any of them without the aid of the likes of my old hero of Harrison street.

But that is Harvard law to the life. There is your happy hot dog, slippery as an eel in a tub of soft soap and him an American, a patriot, and an officer of the court.

Don't ever ask this joker the time of day. It will be tomorrow night before he really gets going.

Progress in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as the new year begins, certainly one objective sought by men and women of good will the world over is peace and justice to all in the Holy Land. A singularly dispassionate analysis of both accomplishments and aspirations is contained in a letter from the executive council of the American Christian Palestine Committee to the New York Herald Tribune which, under leave to extend my remarks, follows:

PROGRESS IN PALESTINE—COMMITTEE EXPRESSES SATISFACTION AT ISRAEL'S EFFORTS TOWARD STABILITY AND PEACE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

As members of the executive council of the American Christian Palestine Committee, we express our satisfaction over the progress, internal stabilization and growing measure of international recognition accorded the new state of Israel. We express our best wishes to the Government and people of Israel on the occasion of the coming new year and hope that this year will ban the last vestiges of war from the Holy Land and will inaugurate a reign of peace throughout the Middle East.

We regret that the Arab part of Palestine, still an object of rival ambitions on the part of neighboring Arab countries, has not yet consolidated its separate political existence. We hope that the international intrigue concerning the Arab part of Palestine will soon cease, permitting the people of that area to live in peace and freedom.

We express our satisfaction over the scrupulous manner in which the Government of Israel is observing its well understood duties of respect for and protection of the Christian holy places and shrines on Israeli territory. Particular satisfaction is expressed over the way in which far-reaching measures have been taken by the authorities of Israel in the midst of a war to offer all facilities for the Christians in Israel to celebrate the holy day of Christmas in keeping with the dignity and tradition of that revered festival. We express our satisfaction that energetic measures were taken by the Israeli authorities to check any regrettable incidents of interference with Christian churches and shrines which occurred during the height of the battles last summer and we rejoice in the safety which Christian churches and institutions enjoy in Israel today.

We express the hope that international agreements will soon be entered into in order to place on a permanent and satisfactory footing the protection of and free access to the holy places of all religions, both in Israel and in the Arab part of Palestine. We are of the opinion that the old city of Jerusalem and the city of Bethlehem, which occupy a particularly revered place in the hearts of untold millions all over the world, should be placed under the direct supervision of an international body entrusted with the safeguarding of the holy places.

We regret the continued military and diplomatic pressure on Israel aiming at the detachment of all or part of the Negeb from Israel, a pressure evidenced by the continued presence of Egyptian forces in the Negeb and supported by diplomatic maneuvers on the part of Great Britain. We call upon the United Nations to demonstrate its faithfulness to its own charter by taking strong measures to insure the evacuation of all non-Israel forces from the entire Negeb area allotted to Israel under the UN resolution of November 29, 1947. In view of the concerted effort of the Arab states to nullify the effect of the UN partition resolution by force of arms, and in order to safeguard the state of Israel against similar attempts in the future, we recommend that western Galilee and the new city of Jerusalem be joined to Israel.

We regret the failure of the United Nations to admit Israel to membership and hope that such admission will soon be forthcoming, thus enabling the new state to take its due place in the family of nations, in peace and harmony with all other nations of the world.

We welcome the efforts of the international community and of the Government of the United States in giving aid and relief to Arab refugees from Palestine. We express our regret that the governments of the Arab states, whose initial aggression in Palestine and whose action in inciting the Arab population of the holy land to flee from their homes were responsible for the plight of the refugees, have not contributed their full share in relieving a problem which they themselves had created.

We respectfully draw the attention of the Government of the United States and of the international bodies dealing with the relief of Arab refugees from Palestine to the need to extend these activities so as to embrace the Jewish populations of Arab countries,

which are finding themselves uprooted and displaced because of measures of discrimination and persecution imposed by the governments of those countries.

We call upon the government of our friend and ally, Great Britain, to forsake the attitude of antagonism and rancor which it has hitherto displayed toward Israel, an attitude unworthy of the great Christian traditions of that realm. May the day come when the government of Great Britain, to its own greater glory, will deal with Israel in the same equitable and generous spirit for which the British people have been renowned so often in history.

We plead with our fellow Christians, in positions of strategic leadership in the American colleges and missions throughout the Middle East, to consider seriously their attitude and influence toward Israel. We would remind them of our great debt in the religious heritage which came to us through Israel's prophets and Jesus, a son of Israel. We know of no other solution to the tragic national homelessness of the Jewish people—who have suffered as have no other people through the ages—than is offered by the state of Israel now recognized by 21 nations.

We send our respectful greetings and best New Year's wishes to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman. We invoke upon him the blessings of the Almighty in his historic task of guiding the United States and of assisting the world toward peace, progress, and prosperity.

We express the hope that the President will direct the policy of the United States Government on all questions concerned with Palestine in keeping with his past pledges and in accordance with the suggestions formulated above.

Rev. Carl Baehr, executive secretary; Dr. John W. Bradbury, Rev. Karl Chworowsky, Judge James W. Donoghue, Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, Rev. David R. Hunter, Dr. Howard M. LeSourd, Rev. Wendell Phillips, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Dr. Guy E. Shipler, Prof. Paul Tillich, Dr. Earl Hollier Thomlin, Dr. Carl Hermann Voss, Chairman, Executive Council.

NEW YORK, *January 3, 1949.*

Shepherd Versus Wolf Pack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this new Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 8, protesting the action of the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary in arresting and imprisoning Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who received similar persecution at the hands of the Nazis.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, I include herewith the following article, entitled "Shepherd Versus Wolf Pack," which was published in the January 12, 1949, issue of the Pathfinder News magazine:

SHEPHERD VERSUS WOLF PACK

Behind the iron curtain in Hungary the only voice still bravely raised against Communist tyranny was that of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. Priest and prelate for 33 of his 56 years, the cardinal, spiritual leader of Hungary's Catholics, 68.2 percent of the population, fought the Communists as he had the Nazis before them.

The Nazis hustled him off to a concentration camp when he dared to intervene in their pogrom against Jews. The Communists used different tactics. They let the cardinal speak while they seized church lands, turned church buildings into Communist headquarters, suppressed Catholic magazines and daily newspapers. (Exception: one weekly permitted to publish 100,000 copies in a Communist-run print shop under strict censorship.)

NO QUARTER

A shining knight in threadbare cassock, the cardinal fought back with tongue and pen. Traveling fast and widely, he spoke from pulpits and at outdoor meetings, drew great crowds with defiant words like these: "Our bleeding country is floundering in the greatest economic, constitutional, and moral whirlpool in history. We are sitting by the waters of Babylon, and they want us to learn songs as foreign to us as the sounds of an unstrung lute."

A tall tale testifies to the cardinal's popularity. As the story goes, Communist boss Matyas Rakosi congratulated President Arpad Szakasits, a Communist stooge, on getting a whopping turn-out at a rally, asked him how he did it. Szakasits replied, "It was easy. I passed out word I would make a speech of resignation. That brought out 20,000. Then I said you would announce your resignation. That brought 40,000 more. Then I said Cardinal Mindszenty would speak and that brought out 200,000."

CLIMAX

The fight between the cardinal and his enemies went into the last round in June. The Communists took over the church schools—lock, stock, and textbook. Cardinal Mindszenty forbade nuns to teach in schools run by Communists who "see in the human soul only the future party member and party man."

Once Communist toughs stoned his battered automobile. The cardinal stopped the car, got out, walked up to the gang, and said, "Here I am. Stone me if you wish, but please leave the car alone." The stone throwers slunk away.

Not long after that mobs paraded in Budapest with placards screaming, "Mindszenty wants a kingdom. Hang him on a tree." The Communist Minister of the Interior vetoed the suggestion. "We have," he said, "no intention of obliging Mindszenty by making him a martyr."

LAST CHAPTER

But last week the cardinal lost his immunity. In the quiet of a Christmastide Sunday evening secret police invaded his episcopal palace and placed him under arrest. The Communists threw the book at him, charged him with plotting to overthrow the government and restore a monarchy, espionage, and black-market operations. In Communist courts, which mock at justice, conviction seemed certain. Likely sentence: A long term in prison or death on the gallows.

His arrest was no surprise to the small, wiry cardinal who once told an American friend, "Ultimately all that my enemies can take from me is my life." The cardinal's last pastoral letter was at once a "grave warning of grave times" and a challenge to his priests to carry on the fight. He wrote: "If the number of my pastoral letters diminish in the future due to conditions, read instead of them past pontifical encyclicals.

"Put your faith in the patron saint of the Hungarians—the Virgin Mary. When maligned, be happy. Be on guard and pray to be worth the events to come."

The Veterans' Rent Can Be Reduced and Increased Private Housing Units Constructed Through Exemption From Federal Taxation of Income on Obligations Issued by Nonprofit Housing Development Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, many States have enacted laws similar to one passed in New York, known as the redevelopment companies' law, which are designed to encourage the formation of corporations to construct and operate nonprofit low-rent housing projects. Pursuant to such enabling legislation, many communities, through public-spirited individuals and institutions willing to advance the initial capital, have made substantial progress in meeting the housing needs of the modest-income group. In the city of Rochester, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, three extensive developments, Norton Village, Fernwood Park, and Romano Park, have been constructed under this law.

The pattern is for the city to turn over the land in exchange for capital stock; then the money for construction is borrowed from local banks or other interests to which are issued notes, later converted into mortgages. These mortgages are insured by the Federal Housing Administration under the provisions of the National Housing Act of 1934. An agreement is entered into providing that no dividends shall be paid on the stock and when the obligations of the corporation are liquidated the title to the property reverts to the municipality. The corporation is thus organized strictly to serve a public purpose and there is no possibility of any profit or gain for the stockholders.

Under Federal law interest and all obligations issued by the public-housing agencies in connection with low-rent housing projects are exempt from taxation. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has ruled, however, that the holders of obligations such as I have described cannot have the benefit of this nontaxable feature, since they are not strictly public-housing agencies.

Since this ruling results in a higher interest charge than would pertain if such income were tax exempt, that, in turn, increases the carrying charges of the corporation, which results in raising the rent of the tenant. Since the profit motive is completely absent from these transactions, there is no more reason for assessing a tax against such income than there is in the case of public housing obligations. I introduced a measure at the last session to extend the advantage of tax exemption to these private nonprofit low-cost housing projects. Some objec-

tion was voiced tc the bill on the ground that it was too broad and should be limited only to those corporations which are subject to supervision and control by a department or agency of the United States or a State or local government.

I have today introduced a bill which I believe meets this objection and also provides expressly that the only corporations embraced within its terms shall be those that agree that no dividends shall be paid on their stock and that all profits realized from their operations will be applied in payment of the cost of the project, including any mortgages issued and that the balance shall revert to the State or one of its political subdivisions. This insures definitely against the possibility of any private interests realizing a profit exempt from the usual operation of the taxing statutes.

In offering this legislative suggestion no contention is necessarily implied that private enterprise and initiative will be able to solve all of the problems connected with providing homes for those of modest incomes. This measure is by no means intended as a cure-all; undoubtedly it must be supplemented by other housing legislation. Nevertheless it certainly seems to me that every legitimate encouragement should be extended to those who seek, through the medium of private enterprise and local management and control, to assure moderate-cost housing accommodations to tenants of modest income, among whom are numbered so many of our veterans and their families, as well as the millions who served faithfully and patriotically on the home front. This legislation, if enacted, will result in substantial rent reductions for those occupying such housing units and will materially assist those who, when their country turned to them in its hour of emergency, responded without hesitation and without condition.

Since this is a Nation-wide problem in all States which have enacted laws similar to the redevelopment companies' law of New York, it is my hope that many Members will support the legislation and urge its favorable consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means.

China Can Be Saved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following editorial which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 10, 1949, entitled "China Can Be Saved":

CHINA CAN BE SAVED

Former Ambassador William C. Bullitt has confirmed the opinion of Representative WALTER JUDD and other authorities on Far Eastern affairs that the conquest of China by the Communists may yet be prevented by a positive, aggressive United States policy.

Bullitt was sent to China by the congressional watchdog committee, of which Senator STYLES BRIDGES is chairman, to study the situation first-hand and report for the information of the committee. His competence for a job of this kind has never been questioned.

Briefly Bullitt's decision is that while it is very late, it is not yet too late to save China. The Communists, he believes, can be stopped at the Yangtse River, if definite steps are taken by the United States Government. Among these steps he proposes:

1. Military and economic aid to China.
2. Assignment of an American military officer to direct the Chinese Government's military operations.
3. Re-creating the Flying Tigers as proposed by Gen. Clare Chenault.

These are practical recommendations, and they should be promptly adopted. There is no time for further delay. We should recognize, as Bullitt said, that we are at one of the turning points in history in this Chinese situation and that we cannot afford to be wrong. The stake in China is not only the independence of that country, but it may well be the independence of the United States.

If China is dominated by the Communists, all Asia will speedily become alined with the enemies of the United States. Consider what it means if an area embracing half the population of the globe is swung into the Communist camp.

No issue today is more crucial to American welfare than this one. Make no mistake about that. For a generation American policy has been based on the demand that the independence and integrity of China must be respected. We fought a war with Japan in defense of that policy. By what mental twist or ignominious surrender is that policy now suddenly abandoned and China turned over to an enemy far more dangerous to American welfare than Japan ever was?

This pusillanimous attitude does not make sense. The time has come for action, to put an end to what Senator BRIDGES has called a "tremendous gamble" in which not only the future of China but of the United States is at stake.

New Rules Committee Method More Democratic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, it is most encouraging to note how favorably certain sober-minded press editors have received the action of this House in democratizing its rules so that the President's platform may have a fair chance to be enacted into law. Under my permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following editorial from the Evening Standard, of Uniontown, Pa.:

NEW RULES COMMITTEE METHOD MORE DEMOCRATIC

It has been argued that the House of Representatives' decision to limit the power of its Rules Committee simply transfers a potential dictatorial power from the committee to the Speaker. It has also been argued that this decision is a triumph for Mr. Truman and a first step toward putting through the legislative program that he promised the voters in his campaign.

Those arguments are debatable, and incomplete. To take up the second point first, this reform, like many others, is not limited to the present. Unless repealed, the new procedure for bringing bills before the House will continue indefinitely. The question is not whether it helps Mr. Truman, but whether it helps to translate the people's wishes into law more effectively.

There are indications that the new procedure will make legislation a more truly democratic and representative process. They may be no further back in history than the record of the Eightieth Congress. Polls showed—and polls do show, in spite of their record in the Presidential election—that the majority of Americans favored universal military training. The November vote, we believe, showed that a majority also favors a program of public housing and slum clearance.

Both these measures had strong bipartisan support. Mr. TAFT, leader of the late Republican Senate, was coauthor of the housing bill approved by the Senate and appropriate House committees. But the Rules Committee would not even permit the House to consider and debate these two highly important bills, much less vote on them.

That is not democracy. Neither is it a proper function. The committee was conceived as a channel—a bottleneck, perhaps—through which a mass of legislation could pass from committees to the House in orderly fashion. It was not meant to be a bottle stopper. And that is what it had become. Under both parties, the Rules Committee has often exerted the power of censorship.

The first major decision of the new Congress curtailed this power. Formerly it took a petition with 218 signers to bring a bottled-up bill before the House. Now the chairman of the committee which has approved a legislative bill can move to have it brought out after the Rules Committee has had it for 21 days. To do this he must first be recognized by the Speaker.

Opponents of the change say the Speaker can fail to recognize a chairman and thus censor bills as effectively as the committee. But there are important, if perhaps intangible, differences. The Speaker is a powerful officer of the Government, and there have been men who abused that power. But it is highly debatable whether their abuses match those of past Rules Committees.

The very nature of the Speaker's office works against this. While the average citizen may know little and care less about the Rules Committee chairman, he is likely to know the Speaker. The Speaker is elected by the majority party of the House. His is a position of honor. And, unlike a committee chairman, he works in the open and in the full view of the press and public.

For those reasons alone we believe that the average Speaker conducts himself with a consciousness of the dignity of his office and of his personal responsibility and vulnerability in fulfilling its duties. And for those reasons, we believe that the change in House procedure will produce its obvious benefits in spite of its possible dangers.

Hazleton: City of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton (Pa.) Standard Sentinel of January 7, 1949:

HAZLETON: CITY OF COURAGE

What a let-down. That was our feeling after reading City of Courage by Henry M. Lewis, Jr. This story about Hazleton and its successful industrial fund campaign was published in the Everybody's Weekly magazine section of the Philadelphia Inquirer last Sunday.

The article was a great disappointment, for we had advance information that a story about our city was going to be released. We even called our readers' attention to it in our columns last week, thinking, of course, it would be excellent publicity for Hazleton and a great boost for the city and all its people.

Proud of the accomplishment of our city, we started to read City of Courage. As we progressed in our reading, we began to wonder, What is this all about? It's been many a day since we have read a newspaper story which in so many ways is so far from the truth.

We don't know where Mr. Lewis got some of his information. He never came to Hazleton and talked to anyone in the know. Vic Diehm, president of the chamber of commerce advises that he never saw the author, but that he did receive a telephone call from him several months ago. Mr. Lewis was seeking human interest material for his story. Vic Diehm referred him to the chamber of commerce office, but no records exist to show that any information was supplied by that office. We're not objecting to the human interest angle of Mr. Lewis' article in which he relates the reaction of the retired railroader, the marine veteran, the shoeshine boy, the high-school student, etc., to the campaign. We are objecting to his misstatements about our economic condition, which information, we know, he never secured from our chamber of commerce. No copy of the story was ever submitted to anyone connected with the chamber for their suggestions or corrections; in fact, since the first telephone contact, nothing further was heard about the matter until the article appeared in print in the Sunday Inquirer.

The Hazleton Industrial Development Corp. was never contacted, nor were we at the local daily newspapers. Therefore, it's very obvious Mr. Lewis was content to accept second rate information, never checking the accuracy or authenticity of his informers' statements; and as a result Hazleton received very much of a left-handed compliment. We don't hesitate to tell the Philadelphia Inquirer that Hazletonians, full of civic pride, were plenty nettled by Mr. Lewis' ideas about our city of courage.

For the benefit of the Philadelphia Inquirer and Mr. Lewis, we would like to state that Hazleton never was, is not now, and never will be a ghost town with grass growing in its streets. Hazleton was never "down at the heels, industrially, as no other city, town, or village in the United States has been in a decade," as friend Lewis puts it. And we challenge his statement that our "seventy-odd small industries were like a bunch of ribs without a backbone," despite the fact he attributes this opinion to Frank Mantz, former executive secretary of the chamber of commerce, who hasn't been around these parts for more than a year and a half.

True, we wanted more industry in our community. We needed a large, male employing plant, but so do all the other cities and towns in the anthracite field and, as a matter of fact, so do hundreds of other wide-awake small cities throughout the entire United States of America.

For many years our businessmen through the chamber of commerce had been bringing new industry to Hazleton. Granted the majority of the new plants were small, but it was industry nonetheless, giving employment, providing pay rolls and helping all of us to grow and prosper. Our civic leaders were angling continually for another large industry that would come here and take its place alongside our major, well-established concerns. Success finally came with the acquisition of the Electric Auto-Lite Co. plant and we are sure this concern would not be interested in locating here simply to revive a dead city. Auto-Lite officials were convinced Hazleton had a promising future. They were happy to come here and we are happy to have them, knowing the industry will help to guarantee our industrial well-being in the years ahead.

Brother Lewis says, "Hazleton calls itself the highest city in the Commonwealth, but frankly admits that during the last few years its industrial health has been hovering around sea level." As mentioned above, Hazleton already had some large and thriving industrial plants before our drive for new industry was contemplated. Just for the record and to refute the intimations that Hazleton didn't know where its next industrial pay roll was coming from, we would like to mention a few of our "backbone" industries and list some facts and figures on employment.

First of all, there is the Duplan Corp., a concern that in 1948 celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. During all that long period, it has been a mainstay in the industrial life of Hazleton, employing during recent years approximately 1,800 persons with an annual pay roll of $5,000,000. Then, to mention only a few of our large industries, we have Publix Shirt Corp. (Liebovitz), Shirtcraft, Tung-Sol, all with 500 to 1,000 employees; Oliver United Filters, Inc., Hazleton Dress Co., Geissler Knitting Mill, Barrett Haentjens & Co., Reidler Knitting Mill, Luxite Silk Co., Columbia Novelty Slipper Co., Freeland Shirt Co., Spaulding Bakeries, Ashmore Shops, Janov Shirt Co., Eikov Manufacturing Co., Hazleton-McAdoo Sports Co., Weatherly Foundry & Machine Co., Wilmot Engineering Co., Atlas Powder Co., each employing between 100 and 500 people. There are countless other smaller industries, too numerous to mention individually, but all are an integral part of our community. In all our industries large and small, approximately 11,000 persons have been employed during the last few years. This figure does not include employees of the utility companies, such as Pennsylvania Power & Light, Bell Telephone Co., the railroads and other transportation companies. Add approximately 2,000 workers for this group. Then add the 8,800 workers of the coal companies and stripping contractors. Now if we take into account some 2,900 miscellaneous workers not previously classified, we find that in the Hazleton area we have had during recent years about 25,000 wage earners.

We think this is quite an impressive industrial picture. It is an economic condition of which we can be proud and certainly not indicative of a city down at the heels industrially, as no other city, town, or village in the United States.

Just this week, taking a cross section of employers in the Hazleton area, we made a spot check of conditions in March 1947 the time of the industrial fund campaign. Our survey reveals conditions were very good. Things, literally, were humming. The mines were working full schedule, 6 days a week. Railroads were busy with coal and freight hauling. All our factories and machine shops were enjoying good business, many working 6 days a week and also operating 2 and 3 shifts a day. Most industries were on the way to the best year in their history.

Mr. Lewis, in his story, mentions Vic Diehm as president of the chamber of commerce and chairman of the industrial fund campaign. That is as it should be for Vic, as the chairman, spearheaded the drive and did a splendid job. All of our citizens should be praised for their respective parts in the campaign; for their all-out effort and unbounded civic pride. There are several men, however, who should be referred to by name whenever the story of the campaign is told and honors are being conferred. Four men, together with Vic, namely, John Davidson, Frederic Deisroth, James Koch, and Allan Holman rendered such outstanding service to their community that Mr. Lewis would not have omitted them if he had come to the proper source for his information. These five civic leaders got the tip on the Electric Auto-Lite Co.'s desire to locate a plant in the East, sold that company's officials on the idea of coming to Hazleton and then acted as the steering committee in presenting the plan to Hazleton and in pushing the campaign through to a successful conclusion.

And finally, Brother Lewis says we raised $500,000. He failed to explain to his readers that the campaign goal was set as $500,000, but that when the drive ended on scheduled time and we counted the last dollar, we had collected in cold cash through outright contributions a grand total of $658,000.

Well, that brings to an end our rebuttal on Mr. Lewis' masterpiece. And we hope the writer of City of Courage as well as the Inquirer will understand that Hazletonians don't like half-truths about their fine mountain city and they don't like the kind of a pat-on-the-back that knocks you down.

Deceitful Propaganda—The People of the West and South Must Wake Up, Realize What Is Attempted in Congress Against Their Interests and Take Immediate Steps To Prevent It—Many Sections of the North and East Should Be Equally Interested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Big Steel is making a desperate effort to deceive the people into believing that the Supreme Court committed an awful error when it held that it was unlawful to fix prices, through a conspiracy among competitors by using the basing point as a vehicle.

In 1945, the Supreme Court handed down an opinion to that effect in the Corn Products case without a murmur of protest. But in 1948, when the same kind of opinion was handed down that stepped on the toes of Big Steel and Big Cement, a noise of protest went up that could be heard around the world; they got real attention quickly. The newspapers were filled with articles and news items advising the people how their interests had been trampled under foot by the Supreme Court and prophesying the immediate death of the private-enterprise system; something had to be done at once, according to these propagandists.

One thing should be made clear. The basing point has not been outlawed except when it is used illegally. There is

no confusion about the Supreme Court's ruling, but clarity instead.

ALARM SOUNDED—LOOPHOLES INSTEAD OF NOOSES

Big Steel is trying to deceive the people into believing that there is such confusion that business cannot continue unless a law is passed at once that will give the proper relief. What is proper relief, according to Big Steel? It is taking the nooses out of the antitrust laws and putting loopholes there instead. It is denied that a repeal of the antitrust laws is contemplated; the goal of Big Steel is only to make them wholly ineffective.

AMENDMENT DESIRED

It is lawful for a person to use a gun for hunting. But because it is lawful for a person to have a gun for that purpose does not mean that he is authorized to use the gun to commit murder and be exonerated because he legally possesses the gun.

The basing point is perfectly legal and may be used by any concern, but it is illegal for the concern using it to frame up against the people and fix identical prices with competitors; that is what the Supreme Court outlawed and that is what Big Steel and Big Cement want made legal.

NEW STEEL AND CEMENT PLANTS

If the basing-point system is allowed to operate as in the past, new steel plants and new cement plants will not be built. No sane person would, under normal conditions, invest his money to construct either, if his big competitors are allowed to destroy his business by the wrongful use of the basing-point system.

PEOPLE IN GRIP OF CEMENT MONOPOLY

We have 175 cement plants in the United States. During the past 20 years, only two new ones have been constructed—one by an exporter of cement in Pennsylvania, who doubtless had a backlog of orders that enabled him to get the money for that purpose, and the other by Henry J. Kaiser, constructed in California to furnish cement at 30 cents a barrel less than the Cement Trust had bid to build Mount Shasta Dam. Mr. Kaiser's bid saved the Government $1,500,000 on cement for that dam alone. When Mr. Kaiser proposed building a plant to furnish the cement, his credit for that purpose was attacked, because the project was heralded by the Cement Trust as a rank and useless undertaking. For more than 15 years the cement companies—many of them owned by Big Steel—have bid identical prices, down to the fifth decimal point on contracts to furnish cement for all purposes. That is one reason more tax money has been necessary to provide highways; there has been no competition in the sale of cement to individuals, corporations, or to the United States Government.

HAND OF GREED

Big Steel does not want any steel mills built unless built by Big Steel. Any intruder into the steel business would not be welcome. If the people can be deceived to the extent that Congress will be persuaded to pass a law legalizing the wrongful use of the basing point, neither Big Steel nor Big Cement will have any competitor troubles to worry about. But the people will again feel the cold hand of greed and monopoly on their throats.

CARPET-BAGGERS

Carpet-baggers are descending on 30 principal cities in the country from Pittsburgh, Pa., for the purpose of organizing local groups in these cities to help the Big Steel Trust convince Congress that the Hitler-cartel basing-point system should be restored to steel and cement.

MOST POWERFUL LOBBY

The big steel and cement interests have hired a Pittsburgh publicity man as their lobbyist to get the job done. He is to receive the unprecedented amount of $11,000 a month, or $132,000 a year, plus all expenses, to form what he calls chapters in these 30 cities to high-pressure Congress. This is the fattest salary by far of any registered lobbyist. It is very unusual that Big Steel representatives expect Members of Congress to believe they are sincere when they make the argument that the basing-point system is against their interest—that they can make a lot more money if it is outlawed—but they want to help the little fellow, and in the interest of the little fellow, they are asking that the wrongful use of the basing-point system be restored.

SMALL BUSINESS THREATENED

One thing they fail to tell and that is, the basing-point system has never been outlawed except where used as a vehicle to fix prices or create a monopoly. So, in effect, what is attempted now is to get Congress to legalize price-fixing and monopolies, which, if adopted, would be a death sentence for a substantial number of small businesses.

All Americans Profit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the front page of the January 10 issue of the Detroiter, a weekly publication of the board of commerce of the city of Detroit.

Our whole economy is based on the profit motive. Destroy profits and we destroy employment. Every wage earner's pay check must be paid out of profits.

The hue and cry at the moment seems to be that profits should be eliminated by Government competition, the threat of public ownership, and the promise to tax and tax. That philosophy means the destruction of the free, competitive-enterprise system, which has given our people more of the better things of life than any other people on earth and a wider distribution of the goods of the country.

Why should that system be destroyed and replaced by state socialism, as proposed in the President's message of January 5?

The article follows:

ALL AMERICANS PROFIT

Politicians, Government economists, labor leaders, and rabble rousers are shouting about the peril of business profits. No one need apologize to anyone for the success of business. Profit is the magnet of America's dynamic enterprise system. We should proudly boast of our profits.

They built the vast Ford industrial plants, furnishing employment to tens of thousands of people and helping to put America on wheels. GMC profits, poured back into research, development, and job-making facilities, have produced a parade of progress in automobiles, Frigidaires, Diesel engines, and locomotives. Parke Davis profits paid for the development of many chemical and pharmaceutical items that improved health and lengthened lives of people around the world. Profits of du Pont gave the world rayon and nylon. Profits from radio now give us television, far in advance of expectations.

What's all the shouting about? Are the shouters sincere? Politicians who want to tax and tax and spend and spend demand that corporations distribute most profits and then go to stockholders for new capital. Do you know why? They want government's iniquitous double tax take—38 percent from the corporation and 20 percent to 91 percent more from the stockholder. Should millions of stockholders—substantial American voters—be even more discouraged? Why should risk capital be repulsed?

Remember when labor leaders and Government officials demanded expansion of the steel industry and threatened Government construction and operation of new facilities if steel didn't comply? Now the steel industry has poured millions of dollars of profits and new capital into expanded production—and it is charged that too much of earnings went to plant expansion. Sincerity?

Profits are not too high. For many corporations they are too low. Inflation has increased the cost of living for business enormously. Added cash demands are tremendous and result in less take-home pay or real earnings for stockholders—and a threat to all insurance policyholders.

Taxes take two and one-half times as much of our national income as all net profits. Candid public officials would recognize tax reduction as a profit shared by all people.

An attack on profits is an attack on job security, investment security, and the progress of dynamic America.

WILLIS H. HALL.

JANUARY 10, 1949.

Bill Benton: American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD, an article on Bill Benton, Idea Man on the Run, which was published in the September 1948 issue of the Coronet.

Bill Benton is much more than an "idea man." He is a statesman in the best meaning of that word; he is a man of integrity and ability; and he is an American of whom all of us should be proud.

Bill Benton is a rare public servant who serves his country with his whole

heart and soul because he believes in its people, respects its past, and unselfishly works for its future. A thinker who keeps his feet on the ground; an organizer who does bring order out of chaos; and a builder with the long view—all these typify the man.

In these difficult times we need men of Bill Benton's courage and vision. Our country can benefit tremendously through his services, and it is my hope that before long he will once again occupy a position where his many talents can be put to the best possible use in behalf of our country. We need more men like Bill Benton.

BILL BENTON: IDEA MAN ON THE RUN

(By Arthur Bartlett)

William Benton used to be an advertising man. He was, in fact, so sensationally successful as an advertising man that most people still think of him as such. Which just goes to show how hard it is for a man to live down his past.

When the New York Herald Tribune recently referred to Benton as a publisher, he was as elated as a teen-ager being addressed as Mister. For 12 years he has been in the unusual situation of a man struggling to rise above his own success. In the process, he has been an educator, a radio impresario, a film producer, a music dispenser, an economist, a statesman, a patron of the arts, and a publisher.

Benton has probably stirred more cultural pots to a boil than anyone else in America—and he has also made several million dollars. But he does not consider the money making important, for he could have done that as a top-flight advertising man.

Part I of the Benton saga is a fabulous Alger success story. He was the poor boy from the West who came to New York. He was the $25-a-week beginner who skyrocketed to $250,000 a year. He was the young man who started a business on a shoestring 3 months before the 1929 crash—and pushed it to the top while all old and established companies found it difficult to hold their own. Finally, the Alger story has an O. Henry ending.

It came in 1936, when Benton was still only 36. He had made money—reputedly a million—but bigger and easier earnings lay ahead. He had become one of the great men of advertising while he still had half a lifetime in which to enjoy his commanding position and profit from it. Instead he sold out and retired from the advertising business. It was time, he announced, to start reaching for higher things.

Currently, he is chairman of the board of the Encyclopedia Britannica, of Encyclopedia Britannica Films, and of the Muzak Corp. He is special consultant to Secretary of State Marshall on matters concerning the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which Benton was largely responsible for vitalizing during a recent term as Assistant Secretary of State.

He is vice chairman of the Committee for Economic Development, a group of long-range planners in the higher brackets of American economic life, which he helped to form. He also has numerous other interests, but none whatsoever in the thriving advertising firm of Benton & Bowles, from which he retired in 1936. From 1937 to 1945 he was vice president of the University of Chicago, a longer time, as he points out, than he spent with Benton & Bowles. Yet people still insist on thinking of him as an advertising man.

This insistence is not difficult to understand. Now 48 years old and well groomed, assured, and almost professionally affable, Benton might well be picked by the student of occupational types as an advertising man. Moreover, he is still by nature the archetype of American advertising man—eager, intense, bubbling with ideas, and always under such mental steam pressure that he invariably makes trains with only seconds to spare, and long since stopped using his middle name, Burnett, because it took too much time to write a middle initial.

Characteristically, Benton spent his first day as vice president of the University of Chicago in preparing a presentation aimed at selling the Rockefeller Foundation on investing $4,000,000 in an educational-film project which he had dreamed up for the university.

At 11 o'clock that night, with an assistant, Benton put the finishing touches on the presentation; then was ready to drop into a night club for a bite of supper. (Incidentally, he didn't get the $4,000,000, but he later launched the educational-film project anyway.)

Benton considers the Ediphone an indispensable tool to record instantly the ideas that are constantly effervescing from his mind. On his first day as Assistant Secretary of State, he indicated where he wanted one of these instruments placed in his office.

"Oh, we never use Ediphones in the State Department," he was told.

"You do now," said Benton.

This was only the first of many shocks experienced by the staid old State Department during his hectic sojourn in its hallowed halls. In that job, he was officially in charge of public affairs, but even this high-sounding phrase failed to convince people that he was not an advertising man. His task was to sell America to the world, and when he resigned, the New York Times rubbed it in with well-meant praise:

"It needed an advertising man of Mr. Benton's energy and persistence to tune up and get this new organ going, and to persuade and browbeat a reluctant Congress not to cut the whole overseas program out of the budget."

Benton is obviously proud of his triumphs as an advertising man, but his friends think he is also secretly embarrassed by them. He is a man who likes to be called Bill, and his urge to associate himself with things on a higher plane than soap and breakfast food, they explain, carries with it no parallel urge to wear a high hat, but comes from a feeling somewhat akin to guilt; for Benton comes from a long line of poor but high-minded clergymen and educators, and he was the first in his family for generations to devote any time or effort to getting rich.

Benton was born in Minneapolis in 1900. His father, an ex-minister who had become a college professor, could write three degrees after his name. His mother had been superintendent of schools in Otter Tail County, Minn., when she married Professor Benton. After his death in 1913, she filed a claim on some free land in Montana, and mother and son lived there 4 years, proving up the claim. Thus Benton is one of those rare men in America today who experienced the pioneer struggles of a homesteader in his youth.

By 1917, the homestead had been secured, and Mrs. Benton, going back to teaching, set her son's feet firmly on the academic path. A good boyish voice helped him get a scholarship at Shattuck School in Fairbault, Minn., which had a choir. From there, he went on to Carleton College, also in Minnesota, and then transferred to Yale, where his father and grandfather had preceded him.

Unlike them, he failed to make Phi Beta Kappa; yet as chairman of the board of editors of the Yale Record, he demonstrated his own kind of talent by developing an editorial campaign which boosted the Record's circulation and profits to a new high, meanwhile earning $1,200 for himself.

One of his classmates was Robert M. Hutchins, a serious-minded young man who later was to become president of the University of Chicago. Three years after him, in 1924, was a young man named Chester Bowles, whom Benton did not know at Yale but who was to become his partner in Benton & Bowles before heading the OPA during World War II.

After Benton retired from Benton & Bowles, the legend grew that he had vowed, while still a Yale student, to make a million by the time he was 35, and then retire. Today he smiles at this story, but admits that by the time he was graduated in 1921 he was thinking definitely of a big business career.

Upon departing from New Haven, Benton's first job was selling cash registers, which he carried from store to store in upstate New York in a truck. His mother, however, was still not reconciled to the idea of his becoming a mere businessman. If he was determined not to be a teacher or preacher, like his forbears, she wrote him in 1922 from St. Louis, where she had become head of a girls' school, he could at least be a lawyer—and she had taken steps to enter him at Harvard Law School.

Until she died in 1942, Benton was devoted to his mother, and her firm view as to his proper future swayed him—at least temporarily. He took a train and started for Cambridge. But when he reached New York, ambition again overcame his sense of family tradition, and he walked into an advertising agency to apply for a job. He was hired—at $25 a week.

From this point onward, the success story moves rapidly to its unusual ending. He began his climb, while still an obscure novice, by offering to talk at the regular weekly conference of the creative staff. By 1928, having had a constant stream of ideas about everything in the advertising business, he was a junior partner in another firm, making $12,500 a year. Then he met one of the seldom-mentioned hazards in the standard success formula. He stepped too hard on the toes of the president, and was fired.

With the self-assurance of the perfect advertising man, he went back to the first agency for which he had worked and landed a job as general manager of the Chicago office. Within 6 months he was making $25,000 a year.

By this time Benton, only 28, was looked on as a 9-day wonder. Devising questionnaires to be submitted to women all over the country as the basis of sales campaigns for household items, he had given the advertising business a new concept of the value of what has now come to be known as product research.

He helped sign up beauty-shop operators all over the world to endorse Palmolive Soap, and assembled so many charts, statistics, procedures, and plans for a proposed advertising campaign that it took all day for Benton to explain them to Palmolive executives—and made old-fashioned advertising methods look amateurish.

Chester Bowles, whom Benton had hired as his assistant at the George Batton agency (later Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn), had also come up fast in the business; and now the two young men decided to form an agency of their own. Benton was then with Lord & Thomas, whose boss offered him $50,000 a year to stay. He declined. It was the summer of 1929, and America was booming.

Benton & Bowles started on $18,000 capital. Three months later the stock market crashed, and business—including the advertising business—began its long dive. Benton, however, ignored the depression and went after new business with techniques that made even advertising men marvel. He was not interested in small accounts, he announced Benton & Bowles would take only accounts with a lot of money to spend. This attitude frightened off many prospects, but it worked with some.

"Bill was always a good salesman with about 10 people out of a hundred," Bowles reminisced recently, "and that is what counts in the advertising business—to knock one guy over, even if you lose 10 others."

It is a point of pride with Benton that the agency took on fewer than 20 clients during the years he was there, yet business kept going up and up. By the time he quit, the firm was doing a business of $18,000,000 gross billings per year, and he was drawing $250,000 a year.

The agency's first account was Certo, and Benton went to New Jersey and Bowles to Connecticut, to ring doorbells and ask housewives pertinent questions about jelly making. After 4 months the partners had compiled 533 pages of data, which they used to such good effect that General Foods, which owned Certo, gave them a dozen more products to handle within the next few years.

Benton & Bowles put most of their clients heavily into radio, starting such stars as Fred Allen and Gladys Swarthout on the air. The elaborate hour and half-hour variety shows which the agency pioneered seemed fantastically expensive—until business got used to the idea and other agencies began doing the same thing.

When Benton suddenly quit the agency after its meteoric rise, his business associates—and competitors—were open-mouthed in wonder. In explanation, Benton said he didn't want to get into a mental rut, and saw no reason to go on merely piling up money.

"I was never interested in yachts, or things like that," he declared.

Whether he had made a round million or not, he had enough so that money no longer seemed urgently important. In the $25-a-week days, he had paid $10 for room rent, and had stretched the remaining $15 so thin that his regular breakfast was a chocolate bar, bought on the way to the office. As he grew more prosperous, he drove the agency so hard that copy writers sometimes muttered about its being a sweatshop. Yet he became more and more liberal with salaries, and thought nothing of sending a secretary abroad when he decided she had been overworked.

Old friends who found the going hard during the depression could always look to him for a stake; and he started his present sizable collection of paintings by his college classmate, Reginald Marsh, by buying them on a picture-a-month basis for a time during the depression.

In the best-seller, The Hucksters, author Frederic Wakeman has his hero express a superbly cocky and contemptuous attitude presumaby peculiar to advertising men: "It's only money." Benton, although he has always had a keen grasp of finances, displays a measure of this confident unconcern. In fact, his wealth has been considerably enhanced by his lack of hesitancy in writing a check when he has confidence in a man.

Some years ago, a friend decided to go into the shoe-manufacturing business. Benton put up $5,000 to help him get started. The Joyce shoe company became so successful that Benton eventually sold out his interest for $125,000.

When the newspaper PM was being started in New York, editor Ralph Ingersoll persuaded Benton to serve as consultant, and gave him $7,500 in stock as payment. After the paper had been launched, Benton found himself in disagreement with its policies, and asked that his stock be taken up. Meantime, another friend, Emory Thomason, had asked him to invest in the Chicago Times, which he was trying to build up. Benton transferred his PM check—amounting, with increment, to $7,825—to the Times, agreeing, as he had with Joyce, that his friend could buy him out whenever he wished. His interest was eventually taken up for $55,000.

Such investments, however, are not purely casual with Benton. He decided, when he withdrew from Benton & Bowles, to invest in small businesses rather than in the stock corporations. "Big business did not build the wealth of this country," he wrote in a 1944 magazine article. "It was individual, hard-hitting, and hard-working men who started small, independent, competitive businesses."

As if to emphasize his break with his past, one of Benton's first investments of this sort was in Muzak, a company which pipes recorded music, without advertising, into restaurants and other subscribing institutions. When the company was still in the idea stage, Benton bought a one-third interest for $30,000. Later he bought another third, and then the rest of it, raising his total investment to $132,500. He has since expanded Muzak into record-making and allied activities, and has been offered more than 20 times what he paid for it.

When he quit the advertising business, Benton told friends that he didn't know just how he was going to occupy himself, but that he might go into missionary work—a field in which some of his forebears had been active. Instead, his Yale classmate, President Hutchins of the University of Chicago, persuaded him to join the university as vice president and overseer of public relations.

Promptly, Benton asked for a comprehensive report on research activities, and when he was handed a sheaf covering about 50 projects, his mind started popping ideas faster even than had his questionnaires about jelly making. Plans for magazine articles, news releases and radio programs came forth in a steady stream.

Benton's chief aim was to broaden the university's services as a cultural and educational force in the national community. The making of educational films was one way to achieve the goal, and although the Rockefeller Foundation failed to respond to his $4,000,000 appeal, he arranged the purchase of the Western Electric Co.'s film facilities and also persuaded the Eastman Kodak Co. to donate its collection of classroom films to the university.

Benton also exploited the radio, receiving a $50,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to build up the University of Chicago Round Table, on which world-famous authorities tackled political, social, and economic problems. To dramatize research work at the university, he also developed a science program called The Human Adventure, which was so popular with the public that he was able to turn it over to a commercial sponsor and make money for the university, instead of sharing its production cost.

The program managed to interest radio audiences in such unlikely subjects as chlorophyll, cosmic rays, Pavlov, and blood; and a program on the Einstein theory of relativity, of all things, had to be rebroadcast by popular demand.

Probably Benton's most effective coup in making the university—and himself—a more powerful cultural force was the taking over of the Encyclopedia Britannica. Many years before, when the Britannica had seemed doomed, Julius Rosenwald, the Chicago philanthropist, had bought it as head of Sears, Roebuck & Co. When he offered it to the university, the trustees declined. Under new management, it became a paying property, even though Sears had little interest in publishing or academic research.

After Gen. Robert E. Wood took over the direction of Sears, Benton characteristically reopened the subject of the Britannica with the abrupt query: "Do you think it appropriate that a mail-order house should own the Encyclopedia Britannica? Why don't you give it to the university?"

Wood looked startled, but a few hours later formally offered to do so. The trustees, however, again balked at using university funds for what they considered a risky venture. Benton, quick as ever with the check book, offered to put up an amount said to be $100,000, under a stock deal acceptable to the university. Today, Benton owns all the company's outstanding common stock; and has built the company up so that it now pays the university several times as much every year in royalties as he originally invested in working capital.

The educational-film project was incorporated as a subsidiary, Encyclopedia Britannica Films, into which Benton put a million dollars of Britannica money. He has also branched out into allied publishing fields, with the result that Britannica has a series of educational picture-story books for children, as well as the Britannica Junior, the Book of the Year, and the Britannica World Atlas. Soon to appear is a 54-volume set, The Great Books of the Western World, on the preparation of which the company has spent $1,400,000.

In 1945, Benton was appointed Assistant Secretary of State. Since then, he has said that he went to Washington thinking that he was to do a job that everybody wanted done, and found out that hardly anybody was interested. The job involved the liquidation of the old Office of War Information and the Office of Inter-American Affairs, neither of which was popular with economy-minded Congressmen and the integration of their functions into the State Department.

Benton had to spend most of his time selling his ideas to Congress and, to some extent, to the State Department itself. When he resigned a year ago, President Truman wrote him a "Dear Bill" letter, saying that he knew "only too well the difficulties and frustrations which you have encountered," and praising him for the solid foundation which he had laid.

Benton was characteristically busy in Washington, using luncheons, cocktails, dinners, and frequently breakfasts as occasions for conferences, and keeping his Ediphone busy far into the night. It came nearer to satisfying his urge to be a high-powered modern missionary, his friends think, than anything else he ever experienced; and many predict that he will soon be back in public service, one way or another.

An indication of his inclinations in this respect took form last March after he left for a 3-month vacation at his winter home near Phoenix, Ariz. Unhesitatingly, he abandoned his vacation when he was asked to become chairman of the American delegation to the UN Conference on Freedom of Information and hastened East to catch a boat for Geneva.

Just how much he would have relaxed, even had he stayed in Arizona, is questionable. His usual routine when sojourning there is to start the day with a swim, then spend most of the rest of it dictating into an Ediphone installed at the edge of the pool.

Benton has been married since 1928, and has four children; and when his mind is on family affairs, it is the same effervescent mind which has created so many sales ideas. Not long ago he was visiting the home of a friend where the family cat had just had kittens. What a wonderful way for children to see Nature reproducing herself, he said; and his little black notebook came out of his pocket for a notation: "Get a pregnant cat."

The cat acquired by his secretary next day turned out to meet the specifications so thoroughly that it had kittens even before it could be introduced into the Benton home. "Perhaps I shouldn't have been in quite such a hurry to put the idea across," said Benton.

It is a habit, however, which the ex-advertising man shows no signs of breaking.

Oppose International Gangsterism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement in the form of a paid advertisement, appearing in the New York Times on Tuesday, January 11, 1949. The statement, entitled "Bevin's Blockbuster," is a reprint of an editorial from the Washington Post which is sponsored by International Latex Corp. It is prompted by the recent regrettable incident in which five British RAF planes were shot down in the conflict between Israel and Egyptian forces.

Mr. Speaker, we are seeking a world truly at peace. We want an end to armed conflict and we must use this Nation's mighty influence and resources to assure the settlement of international disputes in a peaceable manner. The United Nations was intended for, and was established as, the instrument by which such differences might be settled in accordance with the practices of reasonable men and our efforts must be devoted unceasingly toward strengthening that body and bringing it to ultimate fruition.

I resent very much the efforts of Great Britain to overthrow, by its unilateral action in the conflict, the effort of the United Nations to bring armistice between the Arabs and the Israeli in the creation of its conciliatory commission. I object to international gangsterism as much as I object to criminal gangsters within this country, and I sincerely trust that President Truman and our State Department will do their utmost to thwart Britain's attempt to "muscle in" on the Middle East dispute. Only with the cooperation of all its members can the United Nations exist as an effective tribunal. Unilateral action by any nation in opposition to the will of the family of nations can only lead to its early destruction.

Although the following article appears in the form of an advertisement, I believe it correctly states facts and I sincerely recommend it to all Members of the Congress for their reading.

BEVIN'S BLOCKBUSTER

(Editorial from the Washington Post)

That Mr. Bevin is engaged in a personal war with Israel has long been apparent. The proof is evident even to a schoolboy in the deplorable clash on Saturday on the Egyptian frontier of Palestine. On December 30 the State Department, ignoring a British appeal to President Truman to reprove Israel, addressed a tactfully worded request for a definite cease-fire to both Tel Aviv and Cairo. Both sides accepted, the Egyptians for the first time leaving out reservations. On January 6 Azzam Pasha, the Egyptian secretary of the Arab League, after a review for home consumption of Egyptian victories, said that the Egyptians had decided to bow to a cease-fire because of the American appeal. Everything was set for the cease-fire to take effect 2 days later, or Saturday morning.

An hour or so before the dead line, however, four British planes and one Egyptian plane appeared over Rafah, a base on the border spread, like Goritzia in Venezia, between two jurisdictions. The moment was as delicate as the place. The Israeli gave battle, and three British pilots, flying armed reconnaissance planes, were downed. Later another 12 British planes flew over the area to find out what had happened to the previous group, and two more were grounded. Three of the British pilots are presumed dead, and the others whose machines were destroyed were captured by the Israeli, presumably on Palestine territory. The British have responded with all the preliminaries—diplomatically at Lake Success and militarily in the Middle East—for a show-down with tiny Israel.

If anything were calculated to obstruct Israel-Egyptian agreement, it was this appearance of British aircraft. All along Tel Aviv has expressed fear of British interference. It warned the world ahead of time of British troop movements in the direction of Aqaba, Transjordan port in the Red Sea. The report was stigmatized in London as propaganda, but in due course the reinforcements did arrive, as Tel Aviv had warned. The planes that came over Rafah, however, hailed from the Suez Canal zone, and if the Egyptians requested this aid, they have not announced such request. Nor, of course, have the United Nations. The British seem to have acted on their own responsibility in launching a sightseeing tour of the worst danger zone at the most critical moment.

What are the British up to? The answer in the context of everything we have said on the situation in the Middle East is clear enough to this newspaper. Mr. Bevin is desperately anxious to insure his strategic position in the Middle East. It is a preoccupation against which Mr. Churchill has never ceased to inveigh. Last week he and Mr. Eden raised their voices against the dispatch of reinforcements. But Mr. Levin, with what the London Observer yesterday called a blustering persistence in error, has acquired an obsession that has become pathological. It looks as if he is a kind of Dr. Jamieson, the Englishman who led an unofficial raid into the Boer Transvaal, and set the match to the South African War. If there is no settlement with Britain in the role of honest broker, then he will wreck it. He wants all the parties to be beholden to the British, so that he, acting in the interests of a nineteenth century concept of strategy, can insure an imperial overland line between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. Egypt may well ask to be saved from her friends in her present predicament, and the reaction in Israel, now holding its first elections, will be to encourage extremism. The United States simply cannot afford to be entangled with persons with brains located in their spleens, as Mr. Bevin's is. It should press the cease-fire and a direct settlement without allowing itself to be deterred by the Israeli-British collision.

Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., Playtex Park, Dover, Del.

"You and every man in business are trustees of this Nation and the world."

The Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the power to tax is a mighty one, and I want to include a timely editorial by Spencer Canary, editor of the Sentinel-Tribune of Bowling Green, Ohio:

It is interesting to note the difference of opinion which close associates have regarding statements and problems of the day. This is illustrated by the comment in the Cleveland Plain Dealer regarding President Truman's message.

In the editorial column it says that "much of the message was predicated on the thesis of continued inflation." On the other hand, Walter Weisman, its economist, who writes daily columns and is a professor at Western Reserve University, thinks the message had a deflationary tone.

Mr. Weisman suggests a point worthy of grave consideration. It is that a reduction of 15 percent in incomes would automatically reduce revenue from taxes. This, he says, would prevent a balancing of the budget short of tax rates that would be clearly confiscatory. As someone has said: "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

During the war the rates of taxation of the largest incomes, corporate and personal, dangerously approached confiscation. It is actually being done in some cases in England today as some people there have to sell a part of their property to pay taxes which are even more than their income. Excessive taxation is the biggest cause of unrest in China today but this is due to the system of imposing and collecting them; tax officials along the line are ruthless and greedy for personal gain and get it.

But let us see what Mr. Weisman's suggested 15-percent reduction of incomes and, hence, revenues, might do. On the basis of $42,000,000,000 being collected in income taxes for 1948, a 15-percent reduction would be $6,300,000,000. This would mean that the Government would get $35,700,000,000 instead of $42,000,000,000—and would go in the hole.

Let us carry the idea further. Recently an estimate of the Nation's total income in 1948 was two hundred and twenty-five billions. If this were reduced by 15 percent, it would be thirty-three billions seven hundred and fifty millions less. If your income of $2,500 a year were reduced 15 percent, you would receive $375 less for your services. If your income were $5,000, it would be reduced to $4,250.

This shows reasons why the Government must exercise as much economy as the world situation will permit. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

The West Virginia Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. H. HEDRICK
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein the West Virginia plan for veterans' housing:

THE WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

Housing: Corporation-sponsored, for World War II veterans.
Erection: Production-line methods.
Financing: Title III, Public Law No. 346.

I. PROPOSAL—WHAT IT IS

A. To suggest a way to contribute to the solution of veterans' housing problem, viz, by corporation sponsorship of home construction projects for resale at cost to World War II veteran employees of the corporation.

B. Making use of production-line methods for building homes as developed by the Byrne organization, at Baltimore, Md., Moline, Ill., and elsewhere.

II. OPERATION—HOW IT WORKS

A. Finance arrangements made by corporation to—

1. Procure extension of bank credit to—
(a) Acquire suitable land.
(b) Develop the subdivision re—
(1) Surveying, landscaping, plotting.
(2) Water.
(3) Sewerage.
(4) Streets.
(5) Electricity.
(6) Gas.
(7) Parks and playgrounds.
(8) Schools (if necessary).
(9) Stores (if necessary).
(10) Miscellaneous improvements.
(c) Coordinate construction of houses.

2. Contract with veteran employees to purchase houses and lots at actual accrued cost by—

(a) Loans from banks and loan associations for 100 percent purchase price which is guaranteed under title III of Public Law No. 346, under escrow trust agreements.

III. RESULT—WHO BENEFITS

A. To corporation:

1. Will improve corporation's relations with its (a) employees, (b) community, (c) customers.

2. Will indirectly increase production.

B. To veterans:

1. Will ease housing shortage by (a) enabling war veterans, who cannot presently purchase building lots or make usual down payments, to purchase corporation-sponsored houses at cost; (b) enabling corporation's war-veteran employees to move into their own homes, thus releasing additional housing for its nonveteran employees and other community citizens.

IV. GENERAL

A. Fortifies private enterprise methods for solving problems of public concern by—

1. Financial sponsorship by corporations to provide homes for their veteran employees.

2. Utilization of banks and loan associations to finance veteran home loans.

3. Multiple construction methods which maximize values and minimize costs.

V. FEASIBILITY OF WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

A. Plan in operation in West Virginia and other States.

B. The John Byrne organization has demonstrated that by using production-line methods the cost of housing can be reduced from one-third to one-half. In this manner veterans can secure good homes within their incomes.

VI. ENDORSEMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA PLAN

A. National convention of the American Legion, August 28, 1947, at Madison Square Garden, New York, N. Y.

B. West Virginia Bankers Association in convention at Wheeling, W. Va., October 26, 1947.

Mr. Speaker, a method has been developed whereby World War II veterans who have regular jobs but who have no substantial savings with which to buy building lots or make down payments on homes could purchase suitable homes under the loan guaranty provisions of title III of Public Law No. 346.

These loans are particularly attractive because, first, under corporation sponsorship the veteran would get full value for the money he puts in his home; second, the veteran has a steady job whereby he can keep up his payments; and, third, the loan is guaranteed by the United States Government.

These loans would also be attractive to banks as the servicing of such a large number of loans could probably be arranged with the corporation sponsoring the project.

This plan eliminates faulty construction and thereby decreases the number of defaults on veterans' loans.

The proposal is that the original finances can be provided by some corporation, labor union, or cooperative, which can arrange for the purchase of a site of land on which to construct a substantial number of homes, on a multiple-construction basis, such as worked out by the Byrne organization, thus effecting substantial economies of construction and making it possible for the corporation, labor union, or cooperative to sell the completed homes to World War II veteran employees on an actual cost basis, including the cost of landscaping, surveying, plotting, and improving the land, under a contract for sale that could be worked out ahead of time, supplemented by regular trust agreements with a bank or building and loan association, which might be persuaded to advance the necessary funds, particularly where all the coordinating planning should have been approved by the loan guaranty division of the regional office of the Veterans' Administration, as to the contemplated individual loans to be advanced by the bank or the loan association to the individual veteran home purchasers.

Upon completion of such an arrangement the sponsoring corporation, labor union or cooperative would thus be reimbursed as to all of its original expenses. The bank or the building and loan association would feel secure as to its individual loans on the basis of the loan guaranty under title III of Public Law No. 346, extended by the loan guaranty office of the Veterans' Administration. The loan guaranty office of the Veterans' Administration could feel assured of the repayment of such loans, that is providing, of course, that the planning has been coordinated and the construction had been safely performed and supervised, because of the fact that all such veterans would be regular employees of a particular sponsoring corporation, or members of the particular labor union or veterans' cooperative.

Ordinarily, it would be more feasible for a corporation to sponsor such a multiple-construction project as to its own World War II veteran employees, than would be the case as to a veterans' cooperative, or as to a labor union, because of its ability to give assurance of the probable continuance of employment of its World War II veteran employees and purchases of such sponsored homes.

Sponsorship of such homes for its World War II veteran employees by the corporation would probably directly bring considerable additional good will to the corporation, on the part of its employees, on the part of the local community in which its plants may be located and on the part of its customers. Satisfied employees—not constantly worried about the housing shortage—would be relieved of much of their anxiety, and consequently their energies would be converted into greater productiveness and serviceability to the corporation, that had assisted them in the solution of their housing problems.

The feasibility of the West Virginia plan nationally is established because it is already in operation on a sound basis in several States.

As the Year Expired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from one of our leading and outstanding newspapers in Florida, the Miami Daily News of Sunday, January 9, 1949, summarizing the significant events of the year 1948, entitled "As the Year Expired":

AS THE YEAR EXPIRED

(For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.—Matthew 12:31.)

The year 1948 expired with a sigh of sadness, a frown of frustration, an air of apprehension—yet by no means without a breath of hope, hope based on achievement fully as much as on man's incorrigible drift into wish-thinking.

The year 1948, to be sure, was crammed with discouragements.

The cold war was intensified. The Russians showed less and less sign of a willingness to understand the west and to work with it in the spirit of the old inter-allied agreements. The severest of all challenges short of war they laid down when they decided to blockade Berlin.

The Russian tide rolled westward in Europe and extinguished a democracy of noble aspirations and fine traditions. In its rape of Czechoslovakia, the Kremlin tore off the mask. Cynically destroying the vaunted "bridge" between east and west, it left no further doubt of the fate in store for democracies which think they can do business with the Communists.

The Communists, toward the end of the year, began making seven-league strides in Asia. The year's end saw the government of Chiang Kai-shek in virtual collapse, the Communists threatening to dominate most of the half-billion people of China.

War was the portion of 1948 in Palestine. The Arabs invaded the Holy Land, and war has raged there with only temporary interruptions. The end now seems in sight, but still the guns are speaking.

In India there was war in Kashmir, successful aggression against Hyderabad, communal rioting in many places, though on a decreasing scale, and, most tragic of all, the assassination of the saintly apostle of independence, peace, and brotherhood, Gandhi.

In southeastern Asia there was strife—strife in French Indochina, assassinations in the new free state of Burma, civil war and an exercise of repressive colonialism in Indonesia.

In South Africa the government of the fine old warrior-statesman, Jan Christiaan Smuts, was voted down in favor of an administration devoted to racism and supernationalism.

In Latin-America there were coups and palace revolutions. A fine Liberal government, one of the most democratic in the hemisphere, was overthrown by a military putsch in Venezuela. An overturn in Peru gained no ground for democracy. Costa

Rica, a democratic land whose President announced that he was about to disband his army, was invaded by Nicaragua. Peron, through a typical "Ja" plebiscite, got his Presidential term extended to life in Argentina.

In the United Nations there was much fruitless arguing and a full quota of vetoes. There was a hopeless impasse, an indefinite break-down of negotiations, in the search for a secure international control of atomic weapons. No progress was made in the talks that were supposed to lead to mutual reduction in conventional weapons. Indeed, the year 1948 was given over to a full-fledged armaments race, and it looks as if neither side in 1949 will dare to stop it.

On the domestic stage there was a full share of substandard performances. Three-quarters of the year was dominated by the Eightieth Congress, which worked, not for the people, but for the pressure groups and special interests. Pitiably small progress was made toward the goals of more abundant housing, better public health, and improved educational opportunities.

Savage and selfish raids were made on America's vital national resources. There were fewer strikes than in recent years, but some that occurred were bitter, long-drawn-out, and damaging to the public interest. The President's civil rights program for minority groups was stalled pretty much on dead center, and civil rights long taken for granted under the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were placed in jeopardy, faintly, on occasion, by the President's loyalty boards, more crassly by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Inflation continued its sway through most of the year, and when, led by foods, prices began to level off, there was no comforting certainty about what would happen. Perhaps inflation would gain a fresh start after the first of the year. If not, if things continued to move the other way, they might move too far and too fast and plunge us into a depression.

Yet 1948 was anything but a year without achievement, a year without hope.

In 1948 the people of the United States made full and final their commitment to military and economic support of freedom's outposts.

It was the year America committed itself to the Marshall plan, and by the end of the year the program was achieving startling results. It was the year of the Berlin airlift, with Russia effectively checkmated in the German capital and on the Elbe. It was the year in which western union took its provisional economic shape and began to prepare for military collaboration by speeding negotiations toward a North Atlantic security pact.

During the year—indeed, at the very end of the year—a basic decision was made on the economic role of the Ruhr industries. Under the program adopted the Ruhr will be restored as the industrial heartbeat of western Europe, but international control will prevent its perversion into an arsenal of a recrudescent nazism.

During the year past the Communists were turned back in the French and Italian elections. The guerrillas were contained in Greece, thanks to the Truman doctrine. Stalin had unlooked-for trouble from one of his satellites; no one can tell for sure the extent or final outcome of Tito's disaffection.

The Jewish national state was born, in travail to be sure, but became a lusty, well-established infant. India and Pakistan got through their first full year of independence without a general war between them. Gandhi's murder was not the signal, as so many with good reason had feared, for break-down and chaos. And Gandhi's spirit marched on and was written on the historic decree of the Hindu Government banishing untouchability. Final, titular freedom from the shrinking British Empire was won by Ireland.

The United Nations held together, in spite of specific and implied threats of desertion. Its commission on human rights framed a noble document—one whose terms will be honored partly in the breach, but which stands nonetheless as a fine text of freedom. Good work was done by UNESCO, by the world-trade organization, as reflected in the Geneva and Habana agreements, and by the food and agricultural organization.

In the United States, prosperity and employment were carried to record levels, even if the year's end was clouded by the potential overhang of recession. Inflation, strikes, all sorts of unpleasant phenomena took their toll—but on the whole the Nation ended the year united, solvent, vigorous, and producing. Crops were the best ever, spelling stabilization in our economy and succor to the world's hungry hundreds of millions.

Social progress was restrained during most of the year but the elections seemingly decreed an advancing tempo. The threat of ruthless exploitation of dwindling national resources was pretty well dissipated. As to the election itself, be its ultimate outcome for better or for worse, it demonstrated the freedom with which Americans vote, the spontaneity of their decisions, their insistence on thinking for themselves, their refusal to rush for the bandwagon.

In science, startling advances were made, even if largely in the name of preparation for war. There were some heartening trends in the Nation's cultural development, perhaps enough of them to offset the scatterbrained escapisms that seized the souls of so many of us.

All in all, 1948 deserved to pass on with no more censure from us who lived through it than words of blessing. And 1949 stands before us an open page—a page on which men and women of high minds and brave hearts can write a message to posterity worth preserving.

Disgrace in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 13 indicates clearly the urgent need for a Federal law to punish crimes like lynching, in such manner that this country will be free for all time of mob terrorism.

It was disgraceful to read in the press of the calling of two white jurors from the jury box, at Lyons, Ga., to testify as character witnesses for the defense in the trial of a white man accused of the lynch murder of a Negro.

They said they were well acquainted with the defendant, considered his reputation good, and would not believe the chief witness for the prosecution under oath. Shortly after they testified, they joined the other jurors in returning a not-guilty verdict.

News accounts say that the white prosecutor did not object to letting the two jurors appear as defense witnesses, and that such procedure, though rare, is not illegal in Georgia. Certainly, however, it made the trial a travesty of justice. And certainly incidents of this kind build up sentiment behind demands for Federal law to punish crimes like lynching in States like Georgia.

I am introducing this morning a bill known as Federal Antilynching Act, which, in my opinion, would wipe out this curse for all time. I trust the House will give it immediate and favorable consideration.

DISGRACE IN GEORGIA

Georgia, where Herman Talmadge rules and white supremacy is doctrine, has reason to feel uncomfortable. A Negro was lynched last November, apparently because he was too uppity for Toombs County taste. A white-robed mob waylaid him on a country road, murdering him in the sight of his wife and two cousins. This was the evidence of the survivors; it was the only Negro lynching in the country last year. Some people in Georgia were outraged, others remained lethargic. There was an investigation, considerable clamor, two white men were indicted—and acquitted in 20 minutes. No surprise need be expressed. The prosecution's case apparently depended chiefly on the widow's identification. But far more important was the defense lawyer's contemptuous gesture (legally permissible, to be sure) of calling two jurors to convert themselves for a quick moment into witnesses who blandly asserted that the widow's word under oath was worthless. It was a shabby trick, an expressive footnote on a foul episode. Here was mockery complete. In one day Georgia took a long step backward.

If this is a fair example of States' rights in operation, the practice of the theory that a locality knows the best solution of its own problems, then the prospect is indeed depressing. Within recent weeks Governor Talmadge, a subtle reincarnation of his famous father, has proposed a program which aims to disfranchise the Georgia Negro up to the legal hilt. By stern qualifications, mostly educational, about 80 percent of the Negroes may be barred from voting. White supremacy in Georgia has no intention of yielding; its full and ugly force as a political cry is to be feared. Possibly the lynching is merely coincidental, but the atrocious affair, and its attendant circumstances, gives grim warning that all is not well in Georgia.

Communist Conquests in China Another Defeat for Us in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the State Department and our proleftist and liberal writers have persuaded so many Americans that almost our sole concern and effort in foreign policy should be to stop communism in Europe, it is revealing to learn with what realistic apprehension the Europeans themselves view events in China. Out of their greater experience in world affairs, they realize, as we have not yet done, what a disaster the Communist conquest of China—while we stood by and gave moral lectures to the Chinese Government plus some relief to the people—means to

Europe's hopes for security, as well as our own.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the monthly European supplement to Human Events, written by the distinguished French observer, Bertrand de Jouvenel:

EUROPEAN SUPPLEMENT TO HUMAN EVENTS

(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

For every thoughtful European, local events are completely overshadowed by the Chinese collapse. This major disaster brings home the brutal truth that we are losing the "cold war."

Western eyes have been concentrated upon "the remnant that has escaped" of Europe, the countries which were liberated by American and British forces, and, as a consequence, have not been overrun by the Red Army and subjected to Soviet rule. American efforts have been directed to the bolstering-up and consolidation of this remnant. The elimination of Communists from the French and Italian governments, the political encirclement of the Communist parties in these countries and the failure of their counterattacks, have been accounted great victories. In fact they are no more than the gradual reduction of far-flung vanguards, unsupported by any forward push of the main enemy force. Moscow has attempted nothing in the West.

All well-informed observers agree that even the local Communist forces have on no occasion really mobilized and exerted their full power. Their appointed task appears to have been to make themselves a nuisance, to slow up recovery, to waste a part of the American gifts. No more was attempted.

In the meantime, the Soviets have directed their attack in a far more promising direction. Asia was chosen as the field for the offensive, with good reason. For here President Roosevelt had bountifully provided the geographical means for Communist expansion, making over to Soviet Russia the operational basis which Czarist Russia had formerly procured for itself with the selfsame intention of subjugating China. It is indeed ironical that Roosevelt should thus have returned to Soviet Russia those very means of aggression which the State Department and the Foreign Office 40 years before had been so anxious to wrest away from Czarist Russia—using Japan as their weapon for that purpose, at that time.

This time the Japanese makeweight had been conveniently removed by American arms, while Chiang Kai-shek's government was starved of American military help.

The Communist offensive in Asia was started on the southern tip of the Continent, farthest away from Russia. Thus it benefited from American incomprehension, indifference, and even sympathy with what was pictured as revolt against imperialism. Indochina, Indonesia, Burma, and Malaya successively flared up. The fatal misreading of Indochinese events by American opinion was a godsend to Soviet plans. Then China's efficient Red armies started their infiltration into the soft belly of Chiang's state.

Now Stalinism is from every angle seeping into the largest continent of the planet. A most desirable prey. For nowhere has Stalinism a better chance of being willingly received.

Marx thought of his doctrines as demanding for their understanding and execution a working class of the highest intellectual quality. England was his choice for the inception of the Socialist revolution, with Germany and France next in the running, but decidedly not Russia. Marx deeply distrusted that country and even his own disciples there, as he once wrote to Kuegelmann. Lenin himself shared these ideas of his master and regarded his victory in Russia primarily as providing in an unexpected manner means to spread the revolution to countries better prepared for socialism.

Stalin has changed all this. He has coarsened socialism to a Pharaonic system in the grand Asiatic tradition, with despotism, great public works, and the equal insecurity of all under the police. This doctrine is to Marxism as a tank is to a Rolls-Royce; it travels well over rough ground. It is eminently suitable to the Asiatic masses, who are used to arbitrary power anyhow and who in fact stand to gain when it is exerted to regiment them into some semblance of productive activity.

It may be argued that communism is more suitable to backward masses than representative government, which in such regions is only too prone to be corrupt and fraudulent.

Some say, remembering the fate of Japanese conquest, that Russian power will bog itself in the immensities of Asia. But Russian forces are scarcely employed at all. It is enough to send "advisers." The point is, not that the immense potentialities of the Asiatic masses may be used effectively against the west, but that the east may be close to the west, keeping the west away from its raw materials and throwing us back on Africa. Further, the installation of Stalinism in Asia cannot fail to have repercussions in the Middle East and to hasten the work which is already being done in Africa.

Can anyone fail to see the gradual realization of Stalin's solgan: Capitalist encirclement must be replaced by Socialist encirclement? That is, instead of Soviet Russia's being isolated, it is the west which will in time be isolated.

The countries where the love of freedom runs highest are the least susceptible to creeping conquest. There military occupation is a prerequisite to the installation of Stalinism. But the populations of these countries are in a small minority in the world. They can be encircled. More, they can be reduced to virtual starvation.

Is it not a fact that the standard of living of western Europe rests upon the imports of raw materials from the parts of the world most susceptible to Stalinist penetration? Will it not be lowered if we are bereft of rubber, oils, fats, tin, and petrol? And will that fail to cause unrest?

Is all this fanciful? Possibly. But these, I would wager, are the fancies which inspire Soviet politics.

No one should dabble in public affairs today who has not first achieved awareness of the major fact in twentieth century politics. That is: we are dealing with madmen. With earnest, systematic, highly scientific madmen. They may dandle little girls on their knee like Hitler or smile in a grandfatherly manner like Stalin, they may argue most reasonably and dispel the prejudices lurking in the Chamberlains and the Roosevelts. For all that, they are mad. They are in the grip of a titanic dream which drives them on.

As is the way with reasonable people, we of the West decline to think in terms of world destiny. Not so the Nazis or the Politburo. Hitler knew what was wrong with the world and was going to put it right. Stalin knows what shape the world will take and he is hastening the process. What was wrong with the world in Hitler's view was that "the best" were being drowned in the sea of mediocrity; the true Germans had lost their primacy in Germany. Germany had lost her primacy in Europe and Europe was losing its primacy in the world. Hitler's dream was to restore at all times and everywhere the primacy of those whom he held to be "the best"; his conception of "the best" was, as we know, disastrously crude.

Stalinians like to describe Hitler as having fought the "trend of history," which works for them. They call their purpose "to free the enslaved masses." The "enslaved masses" are all over the world: from China to South Africa, hundreds of millions of men have to be liberated from the thralldom of the colonialist, of the white capitalist, and of local oligarchies. Nor is it necessary to tell these masses much in order to arouse them. The first stage is to excite xenophobia—a primitive passion which the privileged classes, taught in western schools, can decorate with the more ornate concepts of nationalism and/or self determination. The second stage is to excite the masses against these elites in countries where there are no middle classes—an easy task.

The westerners can be indicted as the foreign conquerors and exploiters; "the foreign devils," as they were called in the Chinese Boxer rising of 1900. Where no other object is pursued, it is easy enough to stir up hatred. There is not today a single part of Asia or Africa where Moscow agitators are not at work. And they find grievances enough to feed their propaganda. If the European is no longer in control, the national leaders themselves can safely be taxed with incompetence and personal greed; that is the party line on Chiang Kai-shek.

This grand strategy was implicit in Lenin's teachings. Capitalism, he said, needs the overseas markets of undeveloped countries in order to dump there the surplus goods it cannot sell to its wage-earners, whom it refuses to pay properly. The argument is absurd, but from it was born the idea of "blockading" the west. It was then believed that the boycott of western goods was the proper means. Now it has been understood that the west needs to trade with these distant countries far less in order to sell than to procure its raw materials. And the idea is to cut the west off from these sources of supply.

Is it necessary to underline that, before the war, Continental Europe drew 8 percent of its imports from Asia, England 12 percent of hers, and the United States 22 percent of theirs? That, further, a great part of these American imports from Asia earned dollars for European countries and that the loss of these dollars together with the loss of their own supplies conspire to make Europe more dependent than ever upon United States bounty?

It is believed in Europe that efforts to maintain European positions in the whole of Southeast Asia, Indochina, Indonesia, Malaya, must be in vain if Chiang's state is allowed to collapse. Ill-disposed as American opinion is to colonialism of whatever nature, it is not to be expected that the United States will give to the colonial powers the active support which was withheld from the indigenous power of Chiang. It is recalled as characteristic that the Administrator of Foreign Aid denied France a paltry sum which was earmarked for Indochina, and this is held to be significant. In fact, short of very positive action by the United States in China, many will say, "Roll up the map of Asia."

The concept of cold war is coming in for a lot of criticism. What, in fact, is this cold war? It means that the United States is committed to arrest any and every offensive of the Soviets without striking back, to bolster up any sector of a world front which the Soviets, who have the monopoly of the offensive, may choose to attack, so that Moscow may plan and Washington may only improvise defenses. Can any war, cold or otherwise, be won under such a handicap? But that is not all. The enemy is given in the western camp every facility for information offered by a free press and every facility for propaganda offered by free institutions; there is not the slightest reciprocity. What outcome can any rational man expect?

The time has come, say some, when it is plainly necessary to make a bid for the support of the peoples behind the iron curtain. It is both immoral and impolitic never to refer to their liberation. Immoral, for it condones their oppression; and impolitic, for who will move without any promise of support? That the desire to move is there is attested by the history of proud peoples such as the Hungarians, the Poles, and the Balts. It is also attested by the news which

filters through along the various underground channels. But we should never forget that hope, however tenuous, is an indispensable condition of resistance. And no hope has been offered.

Worse, hope is expressly denied by authoritative voices which speak of two worlds, of a dividing line to be held between tyranny and freedom as if, east of the Elbe, tyranny did not matter.

The State of the Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a columnist writing under the byline of Sassafras Sam has written a most interesting article on the state of the Union. This article appeared in print before the President delivered his message to Congress on this subject, and it is believed that a careful reading of the Sassafras Sam article will give you a better understanding of the President's far-reaching proposals.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "The State of the Union" by Sassafras Sam of Texas, which appeared in the Mexia Daily News, Mexia, Tex., on December 30, 1948:

THE STATE OF THE UNION

As promised yesterday, I herewith submit my idea of the state of the Union from my viewpoint deep in the heart of Texas. Please do not get this confused with the official one that Mr. Truman will submit to the Eighty-first Congress in a few days.

Point 1: We as a Nation are doing all right; we've got more of everything than all the rest of the world together so we are in a unique position, virtually "sitting on top of the world" in that respect.

Point 2: So while we are doing so well in every way, let's sit steady in the boat, quit wrangling and quarreling among ourselves and try to hold fast to all these good things we have; don't be too free-hearted with all our natural resources that we are fastly exploiting and do not dump them overseas to a bunch of unappreciative and potential enemy nations. Give to these people more moderately and teach them to dig their own coal and raise their own corn and potatoes like we are obliged to do.

Point 3: Very little legislation is needed as just stated; we are getting along all right as our financial preponderance clearly indicates, so we shouldn't start passing a lot of laws and tax burdens on our citizens who, if left alone, are going to continue to work, but if persecuted with new tax burdens and restrictions are liable to become dissatisfied and join the Communists.

Point 4: The imposition of a civil rights program that would force race equality or a permanent FEPC on the Southern States at this time would only stir up strife and discord in the Union and would be one of the most disastrous things that has happened since the Proclamation of Emancipation that brought on the Civil War between the North and the South. Relations between the two races in the South was never more harmonious than at the present and to attempt to change the present "Jim Crow" laws in these States would be imposing on States' individual rights and would stir up a hornet's nest of trouble that would continue for generations to come. This idea should be entirely abandoned.

Point 5: The Federal Government, spending $40,000,000,000 a year, should be satisfied with this budget and not try to increase it and finance same by taking the tidelands away from the seashore States. These beaches and shallow waters belong to these individual States and to deprive them of this property would be like a big bully taking candy away from a child. It would be much better to practice a little more economy in the Federal Government by dispensing with some of the overlapping agencies and bureaus than to attempt to derive more revenue by raising taxes or hijacking individual States out of their tidelands.

Point 6: If any legislation is needed at all, one of the first laws passed should be one that would prevent one big, powerful labor leader from rising up and tying up all industry of the Nation by a big strike which could easily happen and which event could easily cause us to lose a war should we be engaged in war at the time. This is the most dangerous hazard that confronts us today.

Mr. Truman's speech on this subject will contain many more points than this one does and it will be quite different also, so don't fail to hear or read it in the next few days. Adios.

Your friend,
SASSAFRAS SAM of Texas.

Does Bevin Want War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Star of January 11, 1949, is not only essential but interesting reading for every Member of Congress.

We have extended ourselves to furnish aid under the Marshall plan. It seems as though Great Britain has abused the mandate of the American people as to the manner in which the aid given by us would be used by allocating a substantial part of it in its undeclared war against the State of Israel. The United Nations has arranged an armistice between the Israelis and the Egyptians looking toward peace. Bevin is doing all he can to prevent it. Bevin's blundering and disgraceful policies have created more than a Cabinet crisis.

There is even better ground for belief that we will not any longer countenance the Palestinian war. It has developed that, despite British pressure, advice from Washington to Egypt brought about the Egyptian appeal for an armistice and a cease fire under United Nations auspices. That note from the United States was delivered on December 30.

The United States has also announced that the State Department was not consulted by Great Britain in the movement of troops into Palestine.

It is probable that even more effective action may be required to block Foreign Minister Bevin's determination to continue his war.

Only the United States can take that action.

First, it must be absolutely clear that Israel's charges of deliberate violation by Great Britain of the United Nations Charter and even of the truce between Israel and Transjordan, imposed by the United Nations, are so solidly grounded on fact as to allow no possible defense.

The British by encouraging and supporting the Arabian defiance of the original United Nations decision clearly violated the Charter section prohibiting resort to force by any member; even more clearly her recent troop movements constitute the threat of force which is so absolutely barred by the United Nations Charter.

Bevin himself has publicly admitted, perhaps unintentionally to be sure, his determined violation of article 103 of the Charter, by citing as Britain's excuse for arming, training, leading, and now joining Egypt and Transjordan, her military treaties with those nations.

The United States, in support of Israel's charges before the Security Council, must demand a return to the Charter by Bevin, and a cessation of the British effort to reconquer Palestine by force.

If we merely stand on the sidelines and mutter our disapproval, or our dissent, Britain will succeed in prosecuting her war on Israel and will have demonstrated conclusively that the United Nations is dead.

Further, the most effective action remains, of course, for the United States to take unilaterally:

We could lift our arms embargo to Israel, cement our supporting friendship by extending de jure recognition, and approve the economic loans already being negotiated. But we can, and should, go a large step further. We should make it clear at once that our European recovery funds will be shut off at once to any nation, including Great Britain, that persists in financing a war of aggression.

If we falter now, the peace in Palestine and the hope of peace in the world will have been sacrificed to Ernest Bevin's bitter hatred of Israel and covetousness of the oil land of the Negeb.

The American people do not intend to finance a British war against Israel.

DOES BEVIN WANT WAR?

We can easily imagine the cries of outrage that would come from London and Washington—and rightly so—were Russia to stage such a show of military arrogance as the concentration of British warships and marines in the Mediterranean in an effort to inflict Foreign Secretary Bevin's version of a free Israel upon the world.

The naval concentration and the previous shenanigans of the British in and about the Rafah area near the Egyptian-Israeli border call for an immediate explanation to the United States Government, and to the United Nations Security Council. No such warlike gestures can be allowed to jeopardize our fundamental policy of peace not only for Israel, but for all the peoples of the Middle East. And certainly the UN can ill afford to continue to tolerate flouting of its decisions by any member, let alone one of its Big Four.

There are no well-defined boundary lines across vast stretches of desert between the Negeb of southern Israel and Egypt, the area in which five Royal Air Force planes were downed last week. It is therefore, not

too difficult for the British Government, for the moment, to stick by its story that its planes were shot down over Egypt, rather than inside the territory of Israel—as the Israeli Government maintains. But a more important question remains: What were RAF fighters doing over a battlefield in which, presumably, the British were not engaged? The Egyptian Foreign Office has reiterated that it has not asked Britain for assistance under the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty. Lt. Col. Moshe Perlman, Israeli military spokesman, has stated that the two British pilot prisoners who bailed out over Israel, had said their squadron was on its fourth mission of armed reconnaissance in the Rafah area. Since neither the Egyptians nor the Israelis want British interference, what legitimate reason can the British Foreign Office advance for the presence of British troops and planes?

Fortunately, strong voices are being raised in England against Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin's continuous and, now, not so silent war on the Jews. Sir Stafford Cripps, Herbert Morrison, and others in the British Cabinet realize that Bevin's policy can only lead to a complete misunderstanding with America and with the architect of its foreign policy, President Truman. If, for example, it should turn out to be true that British arms deliveries to Egypt in the last few months have amounted to around $200,000,000 and include jet fighters, naval vessels, heavy artillery tanks, heavy caliber shells, and aviation gasoline, this is bound to affect the Marshall plan itself. The American people do not intend to finance a British war against Israel. Furthermore, any extension of war in the Middle East, particularly by a major power, is an open invitation to Russia to intervene.

The United Nations has arranged an armistice between the Israelis and the Egyptians, looking toward peace. Similarly, Transjordan desires peace. The responsible elements in His Majesty's Labor Government should curb the warlike and intransigent behavior of Bevin. He is harming British prestige, and diminishing British honor. He is thwarting the will of the United Nations. He is playing cynical power politics in the Levant and destroying the remnant of integrity western civilization has in the eyes of middle eastern people. He is thereby giving aid and comfort to the detractors of that civilization.

President Truman has taken sufficient snide abuse from Mr. Bevin for the past 3 years, beginning with his remark about New York Jews. If Bevin wants war, then the United States and United Nations can and must put him in his place, lest he succeed in translating his warped views and ugly aims into action.

The Outlook for 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by Floyd B. Adlum, of New York City, one of the country's outstanding businessmen and financiers, a builder of business, industry, and employment, made on December 15, 1948, at the Town Hall dinner honoring Hon. Alben M. Barkley, Vice President-elect, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

While I have no opinion as yet on the main tax proposal contained in his address, any views expressed by Mr. Adlum are worthy of deep consideration of all persons, and particularly by my colleagues and those who will participate in the preparation of any new tax legislation.

THE OUTLOOK FOR 1949

I am a living example—said to be a rarity—of how to be a farmer, a Democrat, a glutton of privilege, and happy all at the same time.

I can remain happy even while contemplating the growing voice of labor for a little larger piece of the national pie. It's a very big pie. And I can remain a Democrat while still differing with some of the views of my good friend, Senator O'MAHONEY, with whom I worked in the newspaper field out in Colorado more than 30 years ago.

I have been carefully studying indicative national figures recently and I would like to generalize about some of them in what might be called headline fashion.

While employees today have slightly less of the national income percentagewise than they had last year or had on the average during the last 10 years, they have more in dollars than ever before. Neither of these statements tells the whole story, however, because the dollar which they are getting more of is inflated but, on the other hand, if corporate profits should go down to nothing as they did in 1932, the compensation of employees in percentage of the national income would go away up notwithstanding great unemployment and suffering. To draw a real conclusion as to fair division of the dollars of private business enterprises one must have a view as to the permanency of present levels of business profits.

Senator O'MAHONEY and others have expressed the view that through an excess-profits tax, through price reductions, and in other ways, corporate profits should be reduced. I affirm that both corporate employees and the United States Government have too great a stake in corporate profits to let them recede if recession can be avoided. A few facts will make this apparent.

If business is a gamble, then Uncle Sam is the greatest gambler in history, for he rakes in about 50 percent of everything that corporations have left after expense of operations. Uncle Sam gets part of this by direct corporate profits tax and part as a tax on shareholders when they receive their dividends.

Not only this, but nearly half of all that Uncle Sam gets to live on comes from the same corporations by way of these taxes on profits and dividends.

It is beyond argument that in these prosperous times the Government must have a surplus to apply to debt reduction. It is still debatable whether for the current and forthcoming fiscal years the Government will or will not need more taxes to accomplish this necessary result. I can tell you for sure, however, that this depends on whether corporate profits stay up. A 15-percent drop in corporate profits would mean a loss to the Government in tax revenues of more than $2,000,000,000 and would make a deficit a certainty. The Government had adopted a system of taxation that ties the Government's financial stability to a high level of corporate profits. If you are going to worry about the future of corporate profits, then also start worrying even more about the finances of your Government.

And if corporate profits are going to be reduced by drop in prices and rise in wages by, say, 25 percent, where is the Government going to make up the loss of about $4,000,000,000 in taxes?

The law of diminishing return tells me that the Government cannot get more out of the higher individual income brackets. That is one law that even Congress can't repeal. Every person's income in excess of, say, $50,000 could be confiscated and this would not begin to make up the difference.

The platform of the Democratic Party seems to tell me that the difference won't be made up by a higher rate on smaller incomes.

That leaves an increased tax on corporations as the probable alternative.

So I say get more taxes from earnings of corporations if greater Government revenues are necessary. Also avoid further inflation by all proper means, give employees their full, fair share of the national income, but let's for our own national sake do nothing to interfere with the soundness of health and the business activity of our corporate tax-collecting slaves.

I was always taught by my father that more flies can be caught with sugar than with vinegar. If I could show a way to get more Government revenues by actually reducing rather than raising taxes, it would be a neat trick, you must admit. I think I can do this and without the aid of illusion or mirrors. The magic unfolds itself in steps.

Common stocks are about the only thing that have not responded proportionately to the decreased value of the dollar, better known as inflation. Common stocks have gone down greatly since 1929 while everything else has gone up greatly. Common stocks are selling so low today in relation to either earnings or dividends that companies cannot afford to issue more stock to get the cash needed for capital requirements. In consequence, corporations are holding back earnings and using the same for plant additions. To the extent that earnings won't suffice, these corporations are to a large extent borrowing money. Why are common stocks selling at such a discount? In my opinion it is not because of fear of depression but because there is too little left for investors out of corporate earnings after all taxes are taken out to make the purchase of stocks worth while at anything short of a heavy discount. A corporation that is earning 20 percent on its invested capital before taxes is definitely on a prosperity basis. Yet, if that corporation should pay its taxes and declare out as dividends 40 percent of what is left, a recipient who is in the highest income brackets would have less than 1 percent left for himself as return on that portion of the company's capital that he has contributed. You can be sure that such a man will normally seek either a higher return by buying such a company's stock at 40 or 50 cents on the dollar, or a more sure return, or a tax-free income rather than take 1 percent. Even the man of middle income would have less than 3 percent left in the corporate example cited.

I now affirm that if stockholders were given a credit against taxes otherwise payable by them of some part of the dividends received so that even at worst a high income bracket stockholder would end up with more than obtainable by him from a tax-free municipal bond, the following would happen: Stocks would rise. Corporations would sell common stock to finance capital additions. Thus, earnings now retained would be freed for dividends. The Government, while not taking more than 70 or 80 percent of the dividend in any particular case, would get much more in aggregate dollars than it now gets from taxes on dividends.

If by such a sugar rather than vinegar process of catching golden flies, corporations could pay out 70 percent of earnings as they once did rather than less than 40 percent as they do now, the Government would get upward of $2,000,000,000 of additional income taxes. As I originally said, by tax rate reductions with no tax increases, in this way a budget surplus would be much more probable and everybody would be happy. Under

these circumstances, a further tax directly on corporate earnings might be avoided, thus making more certain for employees some further participation in national income with greater assurance of its stability when obtained.

It was Cardinal Richelieu, I believe, who told King Louis of France that the purpose of any tax measure was to get the most feathers with the least squawk. I think I have improved on the cardinal by actually growing more feathers. I have tried to remember my arithmetic which tells me that a lesser percent of more is oftentimes greater than a larger percent of less. And I am not unmindful of the reasonableness as applied to individual stockholders of the old saying in reverse, that is to say, if there is nothing to gain there will be nothing risked.

All people, including the economists of our Commerce Department, admit that more risk capital is necessary and the problem of raising it is important. I think if we are realistic about it, we can make 2 and 2 add up to 4 rather than to 3 as at present. In consequence, we should be able to see continued expansion and activity ahead.

Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from Mr. Elwood S. McKenney, a commissioner of the Fair Employment Practice Commission of the State of Massachusetts, a copy of the annual report made by that commission. This report is a summary of 2 years of operation of the fair employment practice law, and is, in my opinion, an extremely interesting document. For that reason, I am asking that it be reprinted in full in the RECORD. In particular, I wish to point out that even though the commission was possessed of strong powers, it, nevertheless, has attempted to accomplish its work by reason, instead of by force, and that its success in making settlements has been very noteworthy.

The report follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

INTRODUCTION

Two full years have now passed since the effective date of the fair employment practice law. The law declared that equal opportunity to work without discrimination because of race, religion, or origin is an express right and privilege of the people of Massachusetts. It authorized the establishment of a commission whose duties are to eliminate discriminatory employment practices and to foster good will and cooperation among all groups and elements of our population.

From the beginning, this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force. It has endeavored to deal fairly in every instance with complainants and respondents. It has appealed to the intelligence and sense of justice of employers and workers alike in each attempt to break down the barriers of racial and religious intolerance.

In short, the commission has not conceived of the fair employment practice law as an instrument of compulsion. Rather, it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out the ignorance and doubts and fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or national origin. Thus in its whole work, it has attempted to substitute understanding for intolerance.

The question is often asked, "Is FEPC really working out?" It can be frankly stated that because of FEPC, people of this Commonwealth of all races, creeds, and origins have today economic opportunities which they never had before. These people are sharing now the benefits of American citizenship along with its obligations. They have a growing faith in the American doctrine of equal opportunity.

Important are every single new job opportunity which is created by FEPC and each old barrier which is broken down among people of different races and religions. For every time that opportunity and recognition are granted to any individual for achievement regardless of race, color, or origin, the cause of our national ideal of equality of opportunity is advanced.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In 1948, the fair employment practice commission processed 142 complaints of economic discrimination and settled 135 of these after investigation and conference; indicating thereby that some discriminatory employment practice had been eliminated in each case. From the beginning of its administration in the fall of 1946 the commission has handled a total of 445 complaints, involving business organizations employing over 350,000 people, and has not yet had occasion to conduct a single formal hearing or have a matter which it has settled through conference brought into a court of law for further consideration.

In addition, it is true that the procedures which employers established to remove barriers against the employment of workers because of their color, religion, or national origin have had a marked effect in certain fields of employment. So it happens, that the settlement of one case in a given field has opened up scores of job opportunities to persons belonging to a group which has been the victim of racial or religious discrimination for years.

For example, employment opportunity in the railroad industry in Massachusetts, which gives work to over 75,000 people, has been shackled for years by the restrictive racial policies of the big brotherhoods. In 1948, the railroad carriers sat down with the Massachusetts FEPC and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and effected an agreement, in the matter of certain complaints, whereby Negroes have been employed as stewards and machinists and have been placed in other categories of employment from which they had been barred hitherto because of their color.

Again in 1948, as a result of a complaint, the Massachusetts FEPC conferred with representatives of the automobile industry in an atmosphere of respect and cordiality and worked out an agreement which resulted in the hiring of Negro workers in that field on the same basis as white workers.

More and more, captains of industry are becoming convinced, when agreements like these prove of benefit to the employer as well as to the worker, that there need be no real reason to fear friction among qualified American workers of different colors or religions.

Then there is the retail merchandising field. Some employers in this industry had been extremely skeptical about the employment of any but white people in selling jobs. In 1948, FEPC can point to many stores where, as a result of complaints, Negro salesgirls are employed in good number and are no longer a novelty. In these same stores, as a result of the successful experience of employers with Negro salesgirls, equal opportunity is now being given to men and women regardless of their color, religion, or origin, in clerical, operating, and supervisory positions. Some of the recent changes in this field have come about by agreement with FEPC, others have occurred through voluntary recognition of the spirit of equal opportunity before and after the fair employment practice law became effective.

In view of what is happening in Massachusetts, it is not at all surprising that the United States Department of Labor in 1948 pointed out that the cities which lead in the number of Negroes employed in white-collar, technical, and professional jobs in private enterprise are found in areas which have FEPC legislation.

Likewise, a recent Nation-wide survey by the National Community Relations Advisory Council disclosed that queries on religious affiliations by employers in Massachusetts (and in New York and New Jersey, which also have FEPC laws) have been occurring only one-sixth as often as in States not having FEPC laws.

Statistical report, Nov. 10, 1946–Nov. 30, 1948

Complaints:	
Initiated and received	445
Closed after investigation and conference	288
Closed for lack of probable cause	89
Closed for lack of jurisdiction	13
Withdrawn	11
Pending investigation and conference	45
Investigations without formal complaint:	
Initiated by the commission	60
Closed after investigation and conference	21
Closed for lack of probable cause	26
Transferred to complaint	3
Pending investigation and conference	10
Nature of complaints and investigations:	
Based upon alleged color discrimination	391
Based upon alleged religious discrimination	71
Based upon alleged discrimination because of national origin	39
Based upon alleged discrimination because of ancestry	4
Types of complaints:	
Against employers	313
Against employment agencies	30
Against labor unions	16
Against employees	2
Others	145

In noting the progress which has been made during the past 2 years in accomplishing the purposes of the fair-employment-practice law, attention should be called to the splendid cooperation which the commission has received from the daily and weekly newspapers which are published in the metropolitan areas of Massachusetts. Not only have they been fair and considerate in their reporting of the activities of this commission, but they also have been keenly alert to their own obligation under the law to eliminate help-wanted advertisements which specify or restrict color, religion, or ancestry of the applicant. For example, in December 1946, 104 violations of this type were noted in the help-wanted sections of Massachusetts newspapers. By November 1947 this figure had decreased to 14. A check of the newspapers in October 1948 revealed no advertisement at all of this sort.

In the summer of 1948 the staff of the commission conducted a survey of all cases which had been disposed of by May 1948 to ascertain

the extent of and reaction to compliance with the fair-employment-practice law. This survey revealed: (1) that there had been a considerable increase in the employment of workers belonging to groups which had been discriminated against in the past because of color, religion, or national origin; and (2) that the policy of giving equal opportunity to all people regardless of color, religion, or national origin had proved to be no burden upon employers with respect to either management-employee relationships or employer-customer relationships.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Investigations

Under the section of the statute which provides that the commission may study problems of discrimination in fields of human relationship outside of employment, 60 such investigations have been made in 2 years. Among these investigations, FEPC has looked into the matter of certain discriminatory practices which are alleged to exist in Massachusetts hospitals. Also, the commission was active in the summer of 1948 in eliminating discrimination against colored people by certain restaurants and other public places of recreation in the Cape Cod area. It has already taken the first steps to erase religious discrimination from the accommodation policies of certain inns and hotels in the resort areas of this Commonwealth. It should be noted with reference to these investigations that the commission has no power of enforcement but must rely solely upon educational methods.

Police departments

The executive secretary of the commission is contacting the various police departments in metropolitan Boston, which includes 39 cities and towns. A former member of the police force, he has done graduate work at Harvard in human relations. He is suggesting that any instances of tension between groups in the various communities be reported to the commission and is also available as a consultant in such matters. By invitation, he has addressed groups of policemen in different parts of the Commonwealth and has contacted the heads of police departments in many cities. As a result of this work, police officers and executive heads of police departments have taken steps to allay religious and racial tensions in certain areas and have assisted in enforcing the provisions of the act.

Councils

The statute authorizes the fair employment practice commission to establish councils throughout Massachusetts. It says:

"The commission may empower them to study the problems of discrimination in order to foster through community effort * * * good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth * * * and make recommendations to the commission for the development of policies * * * and for programs of formal and informal education which the commission may recommend to the appropriate State agency."

State council

Our State advisory council is made up of the following:

John J. Desmond, Jr., chairman, commissioner of education.

Willman E. Adams, former director, YMCA.

Rt. Rev. Robert P. Barry, LL. D., St. Clement's Church, trustee of Massachusetts General Hospital.

Thomas H. Carens, vice president in charge of public relations, Boston Edison Co.

Charles C. Dasey, former general manager, Cunard White Star, Ltd.

The Reverend David R. Hunter, executive secretary, department of Christian education, Episcopal Diocese of Massachusetts.

Judge Jacob J. Kaplan, former president, Boston Bar Association.

It has recently initiated a study of what the public school authorities are doing by way of developing democratic attitudes and behaviors. The findings of this study, as tabulated, reveal an encouraging increase of interest on the part of Massachusetts educators in one of democracy's most pressing problems.

Local councils

Two local councils have been organized. The first, in Springfield, has the following membership:

Roger L. Putnam, chairman, chairman of the board, Package Machinery Co.

Mrs. Richard B. Anderson, League of Women Voters.

Mr. Archie Burack, Springfield City Council.

Mr. Thomas G. Carr, president, Bay Path Secretarial School.

Mr. Maurice M. Chaffin, president, Bay State Thread Works.

Miss Alice L. Halligan, director, Bureau of Guidance Placement and Adult Education, Springfield School Department.

Mr. James F. Higgins, member, Springfield City Council.

Mr. Harry P. Hogan, carpenters' district council business agent, A. F. of L.

Dr. Gary deN. Hough, Jr.

Mr. Robert Hutton, Western Massachusetts Employers' Association.

Mrs. Thelma Keitlen, community consultant, western Massachusetts area, Anti-Defamation League.

Dr. Howard P. Kennedy.

Mr. Alexander B. Mapp, executive secretary, Dunbar Community League, Inc.

Mr. Raymond T. King, attorney for Springfield Shopping News.

Dr. Paul M. Limbert, president, Springfield College.

Mr. Frederick B. Robinson, director, Springfield Museum of Fine Arts.

Mrs. Albert G. Rivett, Parent-Teachers Association.

Mr. Charles Vivenzio, treasurer, Western Massachusetts CIO Council.

It has sponsored a study of employment in 24 industrial concerns in that neighborhood.

The greater Boston council has the following membership:

Harold D. Hodgkinson, chairman, vice president and general manager, William Filene's & Sons Co., president, Retail Trade Board of Boston.

Mr. Norman Abbott, director, Boston University Placement Service, former president, Eastern College Personnel Officers.

Mr. Noel S. Baker, second vice president, director of personnel, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Mr. J. William Belanger, secretary, Massachusetts State CIO, Industrial Union Council, State director, Textile Workers Union of America.

Mr. Robert G. Bleakney, vice president, personnel, New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Mr. Salvador Camelio, vice president, State CIO.

Mr. Norris G. Davis, funeral director.

Mr. Bradley Dewey, president, Dewey & Almy Chemical Co.

Mr. John I. Donovan, chairman, board of trustees, Eastern Massachusetts Street Railway Co.

Mr. Harry Grages, adviser to labor division, NAACP, secretary and business representative, Boston Central Labor Union.

Mr. Michael T. Kelleher, vice president, Marsh & McLennan, Inc.

Mr. Kenneth Kelley, secretary, Massachusetts A. F. of L., treasurer and legislative agent.

Mr. Thomas A. Pappas, president, Pappas Wholesale Liquor Co.

Col. Leonard T. Peters, Peters Employment Service.

Mr. F. Frank Vorenberg, president, Gilchrist Co., president, Greater Boston Community Council.

Mr. Clark Woodward, vice president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co.

It has conducted a similar study of 30 concerns in the greater Boston neighborhood.

A council is being organized in New Bedford. Its membership is as follows:

Walter S. MacPhail, chairman, Wamsutta Mills.

Judge Samuel Barnet.

Mr. Allan Barrows, treasurer, Gosnold Mills Corp.

Mr. W. Kenneth Burke, superintendent of schools.

Mr. George Carignan, director, New Bedford joint board, Textile Workers of America.

Miss Joy E. Colvin, executive director, YWCA.

Mr. Joseph Dawson, president, Knowles Loom Reed Works.

Miss Dorothy Deloid, American Federation of Teachers, A. F. of L.

Mr. Joseph W. Desouza, director, Adult Civic Education Department, New Bedford schools.

Mr. Joseph P. Duchaine, president, My Bread Baking Co.

Mr. Alfred J. Gomes, attorney.

Mr. Joseph J. Harney, general manager, Firestone Textiles.

Mr. Harold Hurwitz, attorney.

Mr. C. Dudley Onley, funeral director.

Miss Susan Shannon, director, Vocational Guidance and Placement, New Bedford schools..

Mr. Joseph A. Sylvia, city councilor.

Mr. Fred W. Steele, executive secretary, New Bedford Cotton Manufacturers Association.

Dr. Xenophon Thomas, president, NAACP.

Mrs. Francis S. Winsper, League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Anthony Zielinski, board of trustees, vocational school.

Mr. John S. Barreau, chairman, labor and industry committee, NAACP.

Other educational activities

1. A quarterly news letter Toward Racial and Religious Understanding was published containing contributions from 49 organizations, most of them private. Increasingly, this news letter is becoming a record of the various efforts to promote intergroup understanding, respect, and good will.

2. Among the educational materials distributed are a summary of the act and an explanatory pamphlet, entitled "What Is the Fair Employment Practice Law?" both of which have been widely read. The Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Technical and Commercial Employment Association, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and many other groups have helped greatly in the distribution of these materials.

3. The Scrapbook for Teachers, a cooperative undertaking of the commission and the Massachusetts Committee Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, contains book reviews and summaries of noteworthy magazine articles. It has been very popular with the general public as well as with teachers, for whom it was especially compiled.

4. Over 600 kits of material concerning the Fair Employment Practice Act have been sent to superintendents of public and parochial schools and to junior and senior high school principals throughout the State, together with a letter offering the services of the commission in furnishing speakers for assembly programs. The response to the letter has been enthusiastic, and a schedule of speaking engagements has been arranged with the schools.

5. In an effort to extend the work of the commission throughout the State, plans have been made for members of the staff to be located during 1 day or more in some of the larger cities for consultation concerning the purpose and functioning of the law and the taking of complaints.

6. The commissioners have welcomed opportunities to explain the philosophy and provisions of the act. Over 200 addresses

have been made by them, and about as many conferences have been held with widely varying groups in the offices of the commission.

The commission feels that its law-enforcing program, as well as its educational program, have been benefited by educational work preceding the passing of the fair employment practice law. Governmental groups and private organizations have worked hard and are still working hard to promote good will and fair play in Massachusetts. Their success has helped our commission, and their continued cooperation is earnestly desired.

The Remarkable Battle of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article, The Remarkable Battle of 1948, by C. W. Warren, of Mill Spring, Mo. This article taken from the Wayne County Journal-Banner of Piedmont, Mo., follows:

THE REMARKABLE BATTLE OF 1948

"And the winner, ladies and gentlemen, in the forty-eighth round by a knock-out is Harry S. Truman, of Missouri." Thus it was on Wednesday, November 3, that the radio announced to the American people that Governor Dewey and the overconfident supporters of the Republican Party was forced to bow in defeat for the fifth straight time to the Democrats under the leadership of the first Missourian ever to be nominated for President of the United States of America. The victory was a great personal triumph for President Truman, as his party was split three ways with Henry Wallace on the left and J. Strom Thurmond on the right and even the political chieftains of the Democrat Party gave President Truman only a slight chance for victory.

Two years previously the GOP had captured the House of Representatives and Senate and had set out to sell the people that President Truman was too small a man mentally to be elected President of the United States.

This program in fact was so successfully sold to the people that it no doubt proved a boomerang in favor of President Truman. When he took the stump and went direct to the common everyday man, he had the largest audiences ever to hear a candidate for office and his truthful and sincere battle for recognition gained momentum as the campaign progressed. Henry Clay said "I would rather be right than be President" and Harry Truman proved by his official record after succeeding Franklin D. Roosevelt that he would rather be right than succeed himself as President.

It is to the credit of the American people and to our democratic way of life that in this particular election they stood by their President and rebuked the politicians and hypocrites of both parties and it is to be hoped that in the future elections regardless of party that the candidates for the highest honor in our land will realize that they face an intelligent and discerning people who want facts not double talk, who want concrete examples not generalities, and who want a man who will be President of all the people and not the privileged few.

There are those in our land who profess to feel that democracy is waning and that totalitarianism is on the march. If in fact such folks do exist, I would refer them to the election of the Little Man from Missouri who started his march for the Presidency with one of the smaller States in the Union on his side and ended up as the victor in the most remarkable campaign in America's political annals.

C. W. WARREN.

MILL SPRING, MO.

Agriculture's Future Lies With Livestock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I desire to include an article by the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, which appeared in a recent issue of the Country Gentleman. This article, written by a distinguished career man in the Department of Agriculture and an able Secretary of Agriculture, contains some most worth while and thought-provoking information and I commend the reading of this article to the Members of Congress.

The article is as follows:

AGRICULTURE'S FUTURE LIES WITH LIVESTOCK

(By Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture)

Sometimes we have the good fortune to be in a position where the things we want to do are the things we ought to do. That's about the way it is now with agriculture. The major change we ought to make in our agricultural production pattern is to increase livestock numbers and the acreage of soil-conserving grasses and legumes to support them. That would be good for the land, good for consumers, and good for farmers.

In fact, the economic stability of a large part of American agriculture, before another decade ends, may depend upon a big enough increase in livestock numbers to eat what otherwise may be surplus grain, and enough dollars in the pockets of city consumers to buy the resulting increase of meat and dairy products. At the same time, increased emphasis on soil conservation will be necessary in order to make sure that production will be adequate in the more distant future.

The fear has frequently been expressed that population increases would outrun the ability to produce food. But for the United States the prospects still are that farmers, teaming with agricultural scientists, will keep ahead of population growth as far into the future as we can see, assuming that we continue an aggressive national policy of conserving and improving soil resources.

Since the beginning of the war, farmers have increased food production at a much more rapid rate than the increase in population growth. Food production has continued in recent years at the highest level in history—about one-third above prewar. Consequently, as the abnormal foreign demand declines, a higher level of food consumption than in prewar years in this country will be necessary to make full use of expanded production capacity. There is no better testimony to this necessity than the fact that farmers have been able to supply more people with a better diet than ever before even during the period when the Nation was fighting two wars simultaneously and supplying food to its allies.

If the people of this country are to consume all of the increase that farmers are likely to produce in the future, the diet of the average American will have to include more meat and dairy products. There is good evidence to indicate that it would be possible to consume the increase in the form of livestock products, with high consumer income and purchasing power.

The last 3 months of 1945 witnessed the all-time peak for meat consumption which was equivalent to an annual rate of more than 180 pounds per person. And apparently consumption would have been even higher if more had been available. Milk consumption during the last year of the war was nearly 30 percent above prewar. Egg consumption in 1945 reached the all-time high of more than an egg a day for every person in the country—a total of 397 per capita. Consumption of poultry meat reached a high of 33.3 pounds per person in 1945 compared to 20.5 pounds per person on the average during the years 1935–39.

Record food production and consumption have been made possible by the phenomenal increase in production efficiency, including greater knowledge of how to conserve the soil and build up its productivity.

Between 1800 and 1940 the number of man-hours required to produce 100 bushels of wheat dropped from 373 to 47. During the same period the number of man-hours required to produce a bale of cotton dropped from 601 to 191.

When the first settlements were started in the United States, nearly everyone had to work at food production to provide enough to eat. By 1820, 1 farm worker supplied himself and about 4½ other people. By 1930, 1 farm worker was able to feed himself and 11 other people. Now 1 farm worker is able to produce enough food for himself and 14½ other people—13 people in this country and 1½ people abroad. Modern agricultural science not only has increased our efficiency but has done so at an accelerated rate. So, even though population continues to increase rapidly, it can be expected that fewer and fewer people will produce the Nation's food supplies.

Regardless of increased efficiency and greater volume of food production, population increases require greater soil conservation efforts. The more the population grows, the narrower becomes the margin within which the Nation can take chances on the care of the land. To see how that margin is narrowing, it is only necessary to take a look at what has been happening to population numbers within the last few years.

Since 1940, the population of this country has increased by 14,000,000 to the present number of about 146,000,000. Since the war, the number of people in this country has been increasing at the average rate of about 2,000,000 a year, and the population experts expect that the average increase for a long time to come may not be less than 1,000,000 annually. By 1975 we are likely to be a Nation of around 175,000,000 people. To be always prepared for that kind of population growth will require a vigorous program of development and conservation of soil resources.

The ideal situation of balance between production and demand is not likely to happen frequently. Weather and consumer buying power are subject to wide fluctuation and science has a way of forging ahead in long jumps with new discoveries.

It will be fortunate for everyone concerned and for the future of the Nation's soil resources if consumer purchasing power is high enough to encourage increased livestock numbers. The peak of the foreign demand seems to have passed and already the carry-over of grain stocks is increasing. Livestock farming returns to the producer a larger precentage of the consumer's dollar

and employs more labor on the farm for the amount of food produced.

For 1947, the farmers' share was 71 cents of each dollar spent by consumers for meats and lard. In the same year, the farmers' share for grain going into bakery products and other cereals was 28 cents per dollar. Meat animals, of course, require less processing than is given grain before it reaches the consumer.

Production of livestock products in the past, while supplying only about half of the Nation's food nutrients, has taken nearly 90 percent of the land and 75 percent of the labor farmers have used to produce the food we consume. Increased consumption of livestock products would be good for the national diet, too. A large part of the population does not normally consume enough livestock products. Milk, meat, and eggs have a much greater concentration of protein, minerals, and vitamins in relation to energy than most food crops. In the past, livestock products have supplied about 40 percent of the food energy and 60 percent of the protein in the national diet.

Relatively small shifts to more livestock products in place of foods obtained directly from crops would readily absorb expanded food-production capacity. A study made by the Department of Agriculture in 1942 showed that diets of higher-income families contain much more livestock products along with greater quantities of fruits and vegetables than the diets of lower-income families. On the basis of the 1942 study, 50 percent more land and 70 percent more farm labor would have been required to produce the diet of families with incomes over $3,000 than to produce the diet of families with incomes of less than $500.

While consuming greater quantities of livestock products and fruits and vegetables, the high-income families consumed only slightly less of other foods. If all of the people in the country in 1942 had diets similar to the group with incomes over $3,000, approximately 30 percent more food would have been consumed.

At a time when agriculture continues to produce about a third more than before the war, a national income to finance eating habits that would require 30 percent more food consumption involving greatly increased livestock production would be good news for farmers.

We in America have come to take our efficient agriculture for granted. We often fail to appreciate fully the effects of science and technology. Depression buying power and eating habits now, in the face of our increased food-production capacity, would be much more serious than they were in the early 1930's.

If employment and incomes declined generally until demand fell to the level of the period just before the war, the food supply per person now being produced could not be sold except at much lower prices.

For the good of the land and of producers and consumers, there is need for a continued high level of consumer income and purchasing power and the necessary expansion in livestock production among other foods to satisfy it.

A Wise Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of January 8, 1949:

A WISE CHOICE

The resignations of Secretary of State George C. Marshall and Undersecretary Robert A. Lovett, both for reasons of ill health, and President Truman's selection of former Under Secretary of State Dean J. Acheson, considered from the standpoint of the Nation's foreign policy, yields assurance that there will be no drastic shift in what has become settled policy of stern opposition to Soviet expansion and active economic assistance to western Europe.

The departure from the President's official family of General Marshall is to be regretted. No finer, more sincere and dutiful citizen in several generations has occupied the top berth in the State Department. But, he is careworn and ill, exhausted by the labors of manning the bastions of the Nation's foreign policy against Soviet attacks. Dean Acheson now takes up the burden, and he is well equipped for the task.

It must be recalled that Mr. Acheson was one of the top-ranking individuals who could no longer afford to work for the Government because of the low salaries paid compared to those who in private employment could earn far greater compensation. He had served as Under Secretary of the Treasury and as Under Secretary of State when he resigned in May 1947 to return to his law practice.

Gifted with objective judgment and of such stalwart integrity that he broke with President Roosevelt and left the Government when he was Under Secretary of the Treasury because he disapproved of the gold-purchasing plan, Secretary of State Acheson is a capable successor of General Marshall.

He endeared himself to the proponents of consistent and sane foreign policy when he dismissed the vaporings of Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley, onetime Secretary of War, on a special mission to China, as "Messianic globaloney."

Secretary Acheson has previously served as Acting Secretary of State, and has an established reputation for negotiation and debate, and also can boast of the undying enmity of Foreign Commissar Molotov, of the Soviet Union. It is certain that they are not throwing their hats in the air at the Kremlin today.

It is with reluctance that General Marshall is permitted to pass from the stage of international affairs, but his replacement by Acheson brings back into Government one of the most able men of this generation. Foreign policy has moved into the field of economics and finance. Therefore, the choice of Dean Acheson, assisted by James E. Webb, the Director of the Budget, as Under Secretary, is the wise and statesmanlike act of the best man available.

Optics and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article as it appeared in the New Leader of January 8, 1949:

OPTICS AND POLITICS

(By Walter K. Lewis)

Every time a shutter on a 1948 model of Rolleiflex, Rolleicord, or a Zeiss camera snaps in the United States, Soviet economy nets some gain. By means of arrangement which, thus far, has been kept hush-hush by United States and British Military Government officials, lenses manufactured within the Soviet-occupied city of Jena have been imported into the joint occupation zones under the jurisdiction of the British and United States and there placed into the already exhorbitantly priced but popular Rollei class cameras. Without the lenses manufactured in the Soviet zone, the cameras would not have their present commercial value.

Also by special arrangement, one of the principal distributors in the United States of the Rolleiflex and Rolleicord cameras, Burleigh Brooks, of New York City, has the sole right to import the cameras into the United States. When the war ended, Brooks was able, through prewar contracts, to make a commercial monopolistic deal with the Heidicke company in the British occupation zone, manufacturers of the Rolleis, and the joint import-export agency in Frankfurt placed its stamp of approval on this deal, for the export of the cameras. At the manufacturers' level, the Rolleiflex camera is worth some $100, of which not less than half has been paid to the Soviet Government for the Zeiss lenses.

During the current period of the cold war, while an economic blockade is in effect between the Allied and Soviet zones, by an under-cover arrangement, lenses manufactured in the Soviet zone are paid for with American dollars, and exported into the American and British zones.

Attempts by former GI's to import the Rollei cameras have not met with full success or cooperation from military government and United States Commerce Department sources. By a curious ruling, the German manufacturer is permitted to do business only with the prewar American distributor of his wares. No attempts are being made to take the Zeiss patents now in our possession and to put them into competition with the Soviet-controlled lense works in Jena. The critical materials were ours for the asking when, during the last hours of the war, Gen. George S. Patton's tanks overshot their mark, and entered Jena, where the huge Zeiss lense works are located. Befor the American troops had to—because of military prearrangements—vacate Jena and relinquish the city to the Soviets, nothing was done to take the plants or the Zeiss technicians. The Soviets were wise enough to put both to work immediately.

Aerial lenses, which the Nazis were known to be working on before the war's end, the new prismatic lenses of which there are but a few in existence, and which promise to revolutionize the military and commercial photographic field, were being developed by the Nazis in Jena. We may find, in the event of an emergency that while lenses are not to be classified with quinine which could not be procured because the Japanese occupied its sources in the Pacific, or essential steel products cut off by Nazi cartelists, that their importance in the event of a military struggle in which optics are necessary, can be considerable.

Champion of Human Rights Wins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Sheboygan Press of November 3, 1948:

CHAMPION OF HUMAN RIGHTS WINS

Franklin D. Roosevelt was frequently referred to as the lone man in the White House as he fought for human-rights legislation.

President Truman, who succeeded Mr. Roosevelt upon his death, assumed an almost superhuman task in dealing with the problems of the war and the attempt to bring peace to the world.

When the polls opened yesterday he was regarded as the forgotten man—listed as not having a chance in the world. Today he is back in the White House with a popular vote overshadowing that of Mr. Dewey and with enough votes in the electoral college to make him president for the next 4 years.

Due credit for this goes to a fighting President. When he donned his fighting clothes at Philadelphia in July on that historic early morning, he expressed himself as confident of victory, despite the leaders in his own party who gave him little or no support. Even his own Cabinet was cold and distant to his campaign, but he had confidence in the American people. He came from common stock, a haberdasher so to speak, and he had given the people of the Nation the best kind of an administration that it was possible for him to give.

President Truman was outstanding in his denunciation of un-American tactics. He believed in equal rights for all. In that vein he waged his campaign and he awakened a sleeping America.

Mr. Truman's elimination of Henry Wallace brought both friends and foes, but it likewise brought to him the support of Americans who believe in our form of democracy. Even when the public opinion polls, and there won't be many such polls in the future, were all against him he was not in the least discouraged. As he traveled across the United States he drew tremendous crowds. He characterized the Eightieth Congress as a disgrace, and the voters took him at his word and eliminated a majority of those who had been obstructionists. He carried his message on conservation and flood control to the very hearts of the sections affected. He impressed upon the farmer the prosperous era in which he was living, and the farm vote responded. The farmers recalled all too well the hectic days of the early thirties.

Mr. Truman gave all he had and the voters of the Nation responded with an endorsement of his administration. Even with the Dixiecrats and the Russian-controlled Wallaceites opposing him he came through with flying colors.

We supported President Truman because we admired his courage and his fighting qualities. We supported him because no man ever assumed the reins of office under more serious handicaps and came through with a better record.

From the foreign press today, those who believe in a world at peace, editorials speak words of commendation and faith in our form of democracy and Mr. Truman.

This was a victory for the common people, a victory that cannot be discounted. Mr. Truman will go into the White House in January backed by a Congress in sympathy with his program. Many of those Republicans who fought him vigorously are on the outside looking in, so to speak. The voters have expressed their choice. For 4 years we will have a democratic administration under the leadership of Harry S. Truman. Honest and sincere in every word that he uttered during the campaign, he brought home those facts which made him a winner in yesterday's election. He came from a small State and a small city and he was a small-business man. Today he is the head of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth and everyone is assured that we have a man in the White House sympathetic to every heart throb of the Nation. It is a proud day when we can say these things of a man who followed the traditions of Lincoln, Wilson, and Roosevelt. He is a religious man, a patriotic man, and added to this, an ideal family man.

May we say in conclusion that this was not a democratic victory, but an American victory. Men of all political faiths, admiring his qualities, gave him their vote.

Captain Courageous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of October 27, 1948:

CAPTAIN COURAGEOUS

Boston, hub of New England, extends today to Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, a hearty, hospitable welcome. It is his first visit here since destiny made him the man to lead the Nation to a surpassing victory in the final furious hours of the greatest war that ever tortured mankind. In the welcome today the Boston Post not only joins. It espouses his cause. It urges votes for him next Tuesday.

The Post takes this stand after thoughtful consideration and not alone because it is New England's independent Democratic newspaper. It can find no outstanding reason to oppose and a heartening one why it should support him. Harry S. Truman—the ex-haberdasher—political detractors have undemocratically called him, is to our way of thinking as humbly honest, homespun, and doggedly determined to do what is best for America as Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln—the ex-rail splitter—also maligned, fought for great issues as fearlessly, regardless of his own fortunes. In common, between them, there is courage.

Let us look at the man. As a national guard captain to make men free he faced death in the Argonne. As a Senator from Missouri, the Truman committee was so efficient and effective that overnight, in the Nation, he became a statesman. When Franklin D. Roosevelt, zealous guardian of his prerogatives, sought a successor—knowing the end was near—he chose Mr. Truman, above all men, as the one to whom he could entrust his dreams and hopes for a better America and a finer world.

President Truman did not fail him. The same high courage which marked him as a Senator he brought to the White House. It was President Truman who dared to establish the bipartisan get-tough-with-Russia policy. It was President Truman who dared to halt the railroad strike which had stopped America in its tracks. And it was President Truman who dared to oppose a tax reduction, although vote-wise it was a blunder. And it was President Truman—alone—who, when others capitulated to the bold John L. Lewis, nevertheless—although politically minded he could have smugly withdrawn—dared to press the prosecution of the labor leader who had defied the United States.

Shall we go on? It was President Truman who dared to hold to rationing to keep prices down until GOP leaders and some of his own party aroused the country against him. He warned that prices would soar. They did. Was that a blunder? It was President Truman who dared to live up to his oath of office and stand foursquare for the unfulfilled command of our Government—that all men are as equal under our laws as they are in the eyes of God. Thereby he infuriated the South. Was that a blunder?

The man has courage—the courage to speak out—the courage to take a stand—the courage of the forthright citizen who, when faced with a problem, meets it head on, regardless of personal consequences. That courage to be a President instead of a politician has been responsible for a Nation prosperous, a world at peace, and communism halted at the crossroads of Europe. Or, again, were these blunders?

In standing by his party and its inherent principle of the greatest good for the greatest number, he has emulated other great Americans—Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Alfred E. Smith. Like them, in the words of the old song, he—

"Dared to be a Daniel,
Dared to stand alone,
Dared to hold a purpose firm,
And dared to make it known."

By that token he should win. America likes a fighter. In that respect and on the record, we urge votes for him, Harry S. Truman, captain courageous—the unflinching warrior.

Total Justice and Administrative Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with a bill I have introduced today, that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Total Justice and Administrative Procedure" delivered by me before the graduating class of Notre Dame Law School on Friday last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL JUSTICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

It is a privilege and an opportunity for me to join you here this evening at a function of the law school of this renowned institution of learning. You and I both attempt to follow the paths of the law. You study the past and the present, whereas in my business I am supposed to do not only that, but to keep an eye to the future as well. I dare say, however, that you, too, have some thoughts about the legal future. I know I can profitably exchange ideas with you here this evening.

For want of a better term, I should like to talk about what I call total justice. It will do no harm first to recall the different meanings and methods of law and justice. Then, I think, we shall have placed ourselves in a state of mind to explore a particular dark corner of the law today and to consider what may be done about it.

I

Except for the totalitarians, we all base our law and law making upon the premise that there is a difference between right and wrong, between justice and iniquity, between goodness and sin. Occasionally there is some attempt to make it appear that law is not necessarily right, nor just, nor good.

Some legal scholars have distinguished between law and morals. Other learned men have delighted in distinguishing between justice and mercy. Perhaps a man from Mars would be puzzled by these seeming contradictions. But we know that they represent shades of meaning rather than conflicts. They express our self criticism. They mean that man-made law and man-made justice have a natural difficulty keeping up with morals, mercy, and the Christian ideal of perfection.

A more tangible difficulty lies in the several very different legal methods which go to make up our legal system. Of these, presumably no factor is more disillusioning than the fact that law must be applied by mere men to inexorably concrete cases. Thus we have on the one hand a plea for an ideal "government of laws and not of men," although there never was and never can be such a government; and on the other hand we have cynical surrender to thinly veiled anarchy or to the dictatorship of officialdom. Those are not so much conflicting points of view as they are the usual contrast of the high, hard goal, on the one hand—never fully attainable but infinitely worth while—with the dark, easy, barbaric level on the other. On this continent we have chosen the hard ideal rather than the easy level.

Still a third mooted premise of our legal system is the statement, or writing down, of our law. In ancient times when men's minds and words were more brutal and blunt than they are today, the situation was a dramatic one. There was, for example, the classic struggle in republican Rome to see whether the law should remain a mystery in the hands of the pagan priesthood or be written down for all to see and know and rely upon. The victory which gave the people of Rome their crude 12 tables is one of the earliest historic landmarks of government under law. Not only is there an almost perennial struggle throughout subsequent history as to how far the law should be thus written, but the difference has been refined and complicated by the further questions whether it should be written by kings, by legislators, by judges, or by less well defined state functionaries.

Let us consider whether the law should be written by legislators or by judges. An example and contrast will perhaps shed more light than any argument of mine. In England the law is indisputably made by the legislature and, as a consequence, courts merely construe and apply the very detailed statutes, as written by Parliament, to the facts they find in particular cases. There is no significant talk of judge-made law there. The courts do not have an overriding constitution to construe and apply, and for that reason they are not concerned with broad economic questions de novo. Indeed, lawyers do not even file briefs with the English courts; instead, after only oral argument, the judgment is almost invariably announced forthwith from the bench.

But in the United States we have a legal tradition which favors either judge-made law or administrator-made law. Yet, so far as judge-made law is concerned, this tradition is now rather largely honored in the breach. Congress and the 48-State legislatures produce the greater weight of law, although I do not know that they surpass the courts in word count. This situation was not always with us. In the last century the subject was fiercely debated for a period of years by the noted lawyers, David Dudley Field and James Coolidge Carter, in New York, with the Nation's entire legal profession as the audience. Although Carter appeared to win most of his point in New York, Field's codes have been adopted in substantial part in nearly half the States of the Union, and his idea of periodic legislative codification and revision of the law has won avowed or tacit acceptance in every jurisdiction in America. It would therefore appear fair to say that our law in the nineteenth century tended to be judge-made, but in the twentieth century it is primarily legislature-made. The change simply evidences, far more than any words of mine could, our gradual conversion to the theory that the law should be stated in writing by the people's representatives so far as the latter find it feasible to do so.

But we have now in this country a new phase of the law, in which these old struggles in the development of our legal system are being reenacted. In the field of administrative law we are just reaching the question as to how far the legislature should go in prescribing the rules of the game. This is not because the legislatures have been dilatory, but because administrative law is new in its significant scope and impact. It is a sign of growth and virility of our legal system that it should rebuild itself around each new legal field. Nor will such readjustment smother the budding field of administrative law. It will strengthen it by giving it recognition in our legal system and the tools to perform its task. Administrative agencies will continue to receive delegated powers. They will continue to adjudicate cases and issue what might be termed "sublegislation." But the legal framework within which they operate will be perfected by a statutory accretion slowly designed in the light of experience, reason, and the needs of modern government. This inevitable development may be achieved in major part in our time.

On the foregoing general background I venture to draw the conclusion that our people demand that our law be written, adaptable, and understandable. To the extent that it falls short of that standard, it does not represent total justice. But of course this does not mean that there is not a place for sound discretion case by case, as well as a place for precise legal rules. The cry of history and of reason is that we write and revise our laws as precisely as we may, so that they shall be as understandable as possible to the millions whose lives and fortunes they govern.

II

This continent—and the globe itself—have been so shaken by domestic and international crises for nearly 20 years that we are apt to overlook what has been done here in our own land to improve the administration of justice. Undoubtedly it would surprise many people in other parts of the world to learn that, in addition to weathering depression and war, we had been able to make vast improvements in our legal system in the current generation. I should like to devote the second half of my remarks this evening to the achievements, and the future, of one such line of development which has already brought order out of chaos in a large segment of our Federal law.

You will recall that we were hardly out of the depths of the great depression when, by the Rules Act of 1934, Congress provided for the formulation and operation of one set of uniform and simplified rules of civil procedure for all the Federal trial courts. Not only was that effort successful, but it finally closed the breach between law and equity which had prevailed for some 200 years. The legal profession has now been enjoying that simplified system for over a decade, and not a single voice has been raised to demand a return to the old days.

Indeed, so successful has that bitterly fought reform proved to be, that in 1938 a similar project was proposed for the field of Federal criminal law. Accordingly, we now have uniformity of practice and procedure in such widely different fields as law, equity, admiralty, and criminal law. Variation and complexity have been reduced to an understandable system. A few rule books which any lawyer can obtain have replaced great sets of speculative discourses on the morass of Federal practice and procedure. Thus our law has developed in the direction of consolidating and simplifying and explaining. Not the least of our pride in this achievement should rest upon the fact that these simplified restatements of the law were formulated in the first instance by the voluntary and uncompensated labors of lawyers and scholars acting in an advisory capacity. It is perhaps not too much to venture to say that this achievement represents democracy at its best.

But I should regard myself as remiss if I were to remain content to point with just pride at what has been so splendidly done. For I know that our labors to maintain and improve justice are never finished. Moreover, there are today dark forces at work over most of the earth who preach not only against law and against order, but who insist that the appointed agents of the state are the sole and infallible masters of human destiny. For that reason I shudder to think that any responsible servant of democracy, be he Democrat or Republican or bureaucrat, would want to leave any stone unturned to prevent the development of a lawless administrative law in this country. Yet even our process of simplifying and unifying the rules of practice and procedure has stopped short of administrative agencies.

It is no answer to say that we are engaged in other more important works of postwar legal rehabilitation. The situation recalls the remark of that eloquent advocate of law reform, who, reminding his hearers of the boast that Augustus had found Rome a city of brick and left it a city of marble, noted how much greater would have been Caesar's glory if he could have said that he found "law dear, and left it cheap; found it a sealed book, left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence."

I venture to say that the same would be true here today, even though our dwellings remain scarce and of wood instead of brick, for what good will many mansions do us if the legal fiber of the modern democratic state is to weaken and give way little by little?

Indeed, I doubt that the modern administrative state has much further to go unless it first puts its administrative house in order. Our wartime experience alone demonstrates that there is a limit to the patience of our people, even in times of emergency. Unless better public relations can be achieved by our administrative agencies, there will be a lack of ability on the part of administration to meet new problems of society or to win the necessary acceptance of extended government. Consequently, in the matter of Federal legal procedure alone, we are in the position of having one weak link in the precious chain which holds together the whole mechanism for the administration of Federal justice.

This is not the place to go into further detail. It will suffice for the moment if I tell you that, after long study and consideration, I propose to introduce in Congress, immediately upon my return to Washington, a bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies. With essential differentiations, this bill is modeled after the statutes of 1934 and 1938 which implemented a similar purpose in the fields of civil and criminal procedure in Federal courts. It is my hope that by enactment of the legislation which I propose we shall demonstrate that we are capable of having total justice—that our determination to unify and simplify practice and procedure can be successfully applied throughout all our instrumentalities of justice, including the administrative agencies. But it will be no

simple task. It will test our best legal judgment and ingenuity. It will be a creative undertaking of high order.

Of course we shall have doubters and some opponents, as well as many who will be indifferent. They will be well-meaning folk, no doubt. But, in some part at least, they will consciously or unconsciously reflect various common attitudes against law, against congressional legislation if it does more than appropriate money or grant powers, against the idea of simplicity or uniformity, against anything which may limit administrative authority to operate as it chooses. There will be talk that we need more justice and less law, that the project will be too difficult or too expensive, or that it will place administrative agencies in a "strait-jacket." The answer to most of these arguments and fears is simply that all will depend on how well the job is done. Far more difficult undertakings have been proposed in Washington during the last 15 years, and none have been rejected because execution would pose serious problems. Indeed, what I propose is a minor challenge compared with the problems of administration in uniform minimum wages, registrations for security issues, maximum commodity prices, limited agricultural acreage, and so on.

But I did not come here to persuade you to support this latest project of mine for improving the administration of justice. Of course, if you have a vote in the Senate or House of Representatives, I shall be glad to have you vote for my bill. If you do, it will not be a vote for me but for the concept of justice—of total justice, as I call it, perhaps ineptly. In case you have no such vote and but little contact with your Congressman or Senators, I shall nevertheless welcome your consideration and your views. If what I have said causes you to think even a little bit about our legal system and the pulling and hauling which makes it grow, I shall feel well repaid for my travel and effort.

The objective end of all law is the rendition of justice, even to the most lowly human being. If law takes not its spirit from the fountain of all knowledge, then it, the law so-called, falls short of total justice. In no phase of the law is there more impingement with man in his every-day activity than in the operation of administrative law. Here we have human effort brought before the state to have its rights assured and its wrongs redressed. Thus we are confronted with the question of the care and accuracy which must precede judgment or conclusion.

The people must be assured of the righteousness of the arbiter and the uniformity of the rule applied. So you may appreciate our anxiety to set the law of administrative procedure down so that he who runs may read; and, reading, know the truth expressed by his eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, of happy memory, when he said, "The law is not the people, the people is not the law. The law is the spirit of justice governing the people, and its application to individuals, to associations, to every form of civil life, must be so hedged round with reverence and security that the civil courts in an hour of popular passion may protect all the people from the tyranny of what might be a lawless majority."

In this hour of social and political revolution, when law is loose and unstable, when individual human liberty is lightly dealt with, when property rights are precarious, when God, the source of life and law, is dared and denied, your Nation at the head of the nations of the world must hold high the torch that will shed light into the dark places of legal procedure, must meet the onslaught of lawlessness by assuring to the world and to our people the rights that God intended for those who bear his image and likeness.

Tribute to Vice President-Elect Barkley by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, among the well-deserved tributes paid to Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President-elect, at the Town Hall dinner in his honor at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City on December 15 was one by former Postmaster General James A. Farley. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I consider it a very great compliment to be invited to participate in this program of the Town Hall dinner honoring my good friend, Vice President-elect ALBEN W. BARKLEY, and I am delighted to see so many old friends and admirers of Senator BARKLEY's present this evening. I have known him intimately for over 25 years, and my affection and esteem for him have grown with the passing of the days.

He is one of the most able leaders ever developed by the Democratic Party, and he is one of our country's most faithful servants. For over a half century he has been in public life, serving his State and country. For 35 years of that period he has been in the Halls of Congress and in the United States Senate where he has demonstrated outstanding leadership in times of economic and military crises. In his roll as leader of his party in the Senate he has been a maker of history and a servant of the world. And, during all the years, while he has been at all times a great Democrat, he has been far beyond that, a great American.

Senator BARKLEY has always fought to advance freedom at home and abroad, and has steered his course by the principles of the party which was born with the country, and which will ever be a beacon light of liberty. I know of no man of this day or generation who has given greater devotion to his party and his country, and his love for both has been equaled only by his labors. It can be said, without fear of contradiction, that few men in the history of this country, and very few living today, have made any greater contribution to their party and country.

I was extremely happy when Senator BARKLEY was named by his party as their choice for Vice President, with President Harry S. Truman, and I was overjoyed when on last November 2 he was proved our country's choice for the second most important office in the world.

We are still living in a very perilous period of the world's history. The United States is recognized as the leading Nation of the world today. That leadership must be maintained if we are to have peace and order. President Truman is the world's leading Chief of State, and it is God's providence that his strong right arm in his courageous leadership will be this great American character, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, whose ability, integrity, and forthrightness are so enduring. At an age in life when most men would retire in ease and comfort around their firesides, this splendid American, full of vigor and vitality is ready to assume greater responsibilities than ever before in his long political career. Senator BARKLEY's optimistic point of view has always enabled him to cope with any problem and to proceed on the theory that diligent effort properly directed would lead us out of our difficulties both at home and abroad. He will measure up in every way.

Senator BARKLEY, I congratulate you, and from my heart I express my best wishes for your good health and happiness. I know of no man who is better equipped to express a viewpoint on the outlook for 1949.

The Jewish State in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I issued on last Saturday on the state of Israel at the present time, pointing out, as I see it, certain inconsistencies, incongruities, and injustices which are being perpetrated on the state of Israel by the British Government.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans of all faiths joined in the upsurge of thanksgiving that followed the United Nations resolution of November 29, 1947, sanctioning a Jewish state in Palestine. This resolution had followed exhaustive investigation by a special committee and a special session of the General Assembly, after Great Britain had abandoned its mandate under the League of Nations to facilitate the Jewish national home. The United Nations, the highest tribunal for peace and justice in the modern world, thus placed its seal of approval on the 2,000-year aspiration of dispersed Jewry for freedom and dignity in their own land. This was the first new state created by the United Nations, a great step forward in international statesmanship and brotherhood.

Every right-thinking person has cheered the tiny state of Israel as it established its governmental machinery and welcomed and made homes for thousands of new settlers, while fighting off the unprovoked aggression of five invading armies. Because the United Nations had no international force to back up its decision, that burden fell on the fledgling state and its people. By their heroism and blood, they well redeemed the birthright of their fathers and the mantle of statehood conferred by the United Nations. After more than a year of fighting and intensified diplomatic activity through the United Nations and otherwise, the last invader was driven from Israel's soil, and even Egypt, the most recalcitrant of the Arab states, had expressed willingness to enter into the armistice and peace talks so long sought by Israel and the United Nations mediators.

Great Britain chose this decisive moment, when the prospect of peace in the Middle East was brightest, to throw new military forces and aircraft into the troubled Palestine area. Peace-loving America stands aghast at this cynical move in the game of power politics. Israel has no designs whatever on the territory of any of its neighbors; it seeks only the vindication of its cherished right to rebuild a homeland for a great people, who are pouring into the country at the rate of 30,000 a month. Britain, on the other hand, after placing every obstacle in Israel's

path, now appears to have embarked on a well-planned provocative policy to accomplish by brute force what it has hitherto failed to do by other means. Such provocation is a direct threat to world peace. It is a denial of the principles of justice, fair dealing, and peaceful world reconstruction.

Britain's friends throughout the world cannot understand Britain's blind opposition to Israel, particularly in the face of the cordial friendship and understanding that evidently exists between Israel and leading members of the British Commonwealth, including Canada in the Western Hemisphere, and Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa in the region beyond Suez. As a stanch supporter of the loans to Britain and the European recovery program, financed by American taxpapers, I am utterly unable to square Britain's action with those programs to promote world peace and security in furtherance of UN objectives.

It is greatly to be hoped that Britain will bring its policy into line with the spirit and program projected in the resolutions of the United Nations, so that lasting peace may be established in the Holy Land for the good of all mankind.

Counting of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some facts which I have collected regarding Senate Joint Resolution 2, the proposal to amend the Constitution so that the electoral votes for President and Vice President will be counted in proportion to the popular vote.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

In this pamphlet you will find all the essential arguments on a proposition so vital that it actually underlies your whole system of government.

It is Senate Joint Resolution 2, which provides for a constitutional amendment so that the electoral vote for President and Vice President will be counted in proportion to the popular vote.

After many years of study, this proposition received favorable reports from both the Senate and the House Judiciary Committees during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. It has been reintroduced during the opening days of the Eighty-first Congress. In the House it is embodied in House Joint Resolution 2; in the Senate, it is Senate Joint Resolution 2.

In the Senate, this constitutional amendment has the bipartisan sponsorship of Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, together with Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada; Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; Senator HOEY, of North Carolina; Senator SPARKMAN, of Alabama; Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi; Senator NEELY, of West Virginia; Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; Senator SMITH of New Jersey; Senator MORSE, of Oregon; and Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont.

The 1948 Presidential elections are still fresh in our minds. We remember our feeling of worry and frustration on election night when it seemed possible that we would enter the year 1949 without an elected President—which would have been a grim reality had Governor Dewey carried any two of the States of California, Illinois, or Ohio. We recall how a shift of a few thousand votes in a few key States could have elected a President who had less popular votes than his opponent. We saw dramatized in at least one State (Alabama) how the obsolete and preposterous electoral college machinery can be legally maneuvered so as to prevent the voters from casting their ballots for a duly nominated candidate of a major political party. We saw how in one instance (Tennessee) a member of the electoral college can cast his vote for anybody he pleases, regardless of the popular vote. Many observers commented on how our present electoral machinery grossly magnifies the victory of the winner and exaggerates the defeat of the loser, giving the impression of a sweeping triumph in a fairly close race when measured by the results of the popular vote.

These lessons of the 1948 elections impress upon us all again the need for reform—a reform upon the merits of which every citizen has the chance to express his or her approval. By expressing your interest to your Senator and Representatives you have it in your power to make our Presidential electoral system thoroughly honest and thoroughly democratic.

SUMMARY

To summarize this proposition:

1. It provides that in electing the President and Vice President of the United States the electoral vote be counted in proportion to the popular vote. The electoral college is abolished. The office of Presidential elector is scrapped. The electoral vote is retained—purely as a counting device.

2. It offers protection against a source of real potential danger which stems from the present possibility that the candidate receiving a minority of the popular vote would receive a majority of the electoral vote. (This has already happened three times.)

3. It ends the present system whereby the winner in every State effectively gets credited with all the votes, including those which were cast against him.

4. It ends the present practice of concentrating Presidential politics on those States having the largest population and consequently on the voting minorities in those States.

5. It would, for that reason, be a deterrent to fraud and chicanery.

6. It means that the votes which a candidate receives in one State (even though they may be a minority in that State) will be added to the votes he receives in other States—instead of being all given to his opponent in every State where the opponent is ahead.

7. It spreads the Presidential campaign and any subsequent Presidential political activity into all the 48 States.

8. It tends, therefore, politically speaking, to break up so-called solid or one-party areas.

9. It preserves completely the rights of the small States (who still retain the two-vote credit for their two Senators.)

10. It recognizes that the electoral college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution. The so-called electoral college has become a rubber stamp—and an inaccurate rubber stamp at that.

11. It discourages the tendency to select Presidential nominees only from among the residents of those States having a large electoral vote.

12. It avoids the possibility (exercised in 91 cases) that State legislatures might intervene and deprive the people of their rightful voice in the selection of the President.

13. It eliminates the need for throwing a Presidential election into the House of Representatives where each State, regardless of size, has only one vote.

14. It dispells the illusion that a relatively close election was in fact a landslide.

15. It prevents individual electors from casting votes because of whim or impulse. Under our proposal the electoral vote is retained simply as a counting device.

16. It gives our citizens a legal voice in the the choice of their President instead of a mere expression of preference as under the present system.

17. It confers no partisan or sectional advantage.

HISTORY

1. The present system is neither fair, honest, accurate, certain, nor democratic. Let me give a few historic illustrations:

In 1912 Woodrow Wilson, with 42 percent of the popular vote, received 82 percent of the electoral vote. In 1936 Roosevelt, with 60 percent of the popular vote, received 98 percent of the electoral vote. In 1940 he received 54 percent of the popular vote and 84 percent of the electoral vote. In 1924 John W. Davis received 6,000,000 popular votes which brought him no electoral votes, while from 2,000,000 other popular votes he received 136 electoral votes. In 1932 Hoover received 15,800,000 popular votes, and over 13,600,000 of them brought him no electoral votes. In 1912 Wilson received one electoral vote for each 14,500 popular votes, while Taft received only one electoral vote for each 435,000 popular votes.

2. An undue influence is given to minorities by the present system.

In 1884, in the State of New York, Cleveland got 563,084 votes while Blaine got 562,001 popular votes. A bare 1,000-vote majority in popular votes gave Mr. Cleveland all of the electoral votes of the great State of New York. Thus, a change of 600 votes in New York would have elected Blaine President. Should a similar situation again arise, as well it might, the Communist Party in the State of New York alone could determine who was to be President of the United States.

3. Three Presidents have taken office who had a smaller popular vote than did their opponents—Adams in 1824, Hayes in 1876, and Harrison in 1888.

In 1824, 460,000 popular votes were cast. Andrew Jackson led his nearest opponent, John Quincy Adams, by about 50,000 votes, but because he lacked a majority over his three opponents, Jackson's election was thrown into the House of Representatives. As a result of the manipulations of Henry Clay, Adams—the minority choice—was elected over Jackson for President.

In 1876 there occurred the famous Hayes-Tilden contest. In that election, 8,336,888 popular votes were cast. Of these, Hayes polled 4,036,298 and Tilden 4,300,590. But because of the archaic electoral-college system, Hayes had a margin of one electoral vote which gave him the Presidency, even though he had received 264,292 less votes than Tilden. In this case, only wise counsel, to which Tilden patriotically contributed by his course of moderation, prevented uprising and possible violence.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland lost the Presidency in spite of the fact that he received more popular votes than Benjamin Harrison. In this election there were 12,000,000 popular votes cast. Cleveland received 5,556,543, while Harrison got 5,175,582. Again the minority candidate took office due entirely to the illogical operation of the electoral-college system.

OTHER ARGUMENTS

Few objections have been raised against this proposed amendment and most of them appear to rest on misconceptions. Because in discussing them one gains greater familiarity with this reform, the more frequently mentioned ones are listed herewith:

1. The proposed amendment, some have claimed, would impinge upon State political power.

In reply, it should be emphasized that Senate Joint Resolution 2 in no way disturbs the jurisdiction and authority of the States over the franchise and elections. The proposed amendment in no way meddles with State sovereignty or the right of the States to specify the qualifications of its voters or the manner in which they shall vote or have their votes counted. We leave the purity of the ballot box entirely within State control.

2. The argument has been made that the proposed amendment would encourage "splinter" parties and increase the influence of "pressure" groups.

It can be emphatically said that Senate Joint Resolution 2 would in no way disturb party organization, responsibility, or authority. The proponents of this reform are strong believers in the two-party system and are opposed to anything which would threaten us with a multiplicity of parties. Indeed, this constitutional amendment should greatly reduce the present weight of splinter parties and special pressure groups, for it deprives such groups of the bargaining power they now possess by virtue of their ability so often to swing all the electoral votes of key States to one or the other major candidates—as witness the 1948 elections in New York.

Furthermore, this reform would definitely encourage the two-party system in the so-called one-party sections of the country.

With the exception of the President and Vice President, we elect all our public officials by popular vote. If there has been no proliferation of splinter parties within the several States for local, State, and Federal offices under a direct popular vote system, there seems little likelihood that they would flourish on a national scale under the proposed amendment.

3. Some claim that Senate Joint Resolution 2 does not go far enough; not only should the electoral college be abolished, but we should also scrap the electoral vote system and elect the President and Vice President by Nationwide popular vote.

To this objection there are several answers. To do away with the electoral vote and substitute instead a direct popular vote would make national campaigns a matter of complete national control; it would obliterate State lines altogether in Presidential elections. For example, the State of Georgia has an 18-year voting age. All States, to be on a parity with Georgia, would have to reduce their voting age to 18 years under an absolute, direct, popular vote. Again, under such a system, sectionalism would be aggravated rather than ameliorated. In a sectional controversy it would become a contest of gathering up the greatest volume of votes in a particular area for the purpose of outvoting some other particular area. Furthermore, the direct popular vote would open up the small State-large State controversy. As a practical matter, no such amendment would ever secure ratification by the necessary number of States because relatively small or sparsely settled States far outnumber the others. These States would not give up the slight advantage they have through the number of electoral votes accorded them under the Constitution.

4. Some have questioned the provision of the proposed amendment which reads "The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President" because it does away with the present requirement that a majority (rather than a plurality) of electoral votes is necessary for election.

In meeting this argument, one must keep in mind the fact that election by plurality is the general rule for election in this country. We elect local officials, State legislatures, governors, Representatives, and Senators by plurality. Indeed, students of this subject have pointed out that in actuality we elect our President on a plurality basis, because a plurality of the people in any given State decide which candidate shall receive all that State's electoral votes. History shows that, in terms of the popular vote, elected Presidents were plurality—and not majority—choices in almost half (14) of the 32 elections for President held between 1824 and 1948. (In fact, the 1948 elections are a case in point. The official returns show that President Truman polled slightly less than half (49.5 percent) of the popular vote. He received 24,104,836 votes, while his opponents polled a total of 24,575,688.)

We must also remember that as we make the electoral vote more exactly reflect the popular vote, the margin of difference between the candidates—in electoral votes—will grow smaller. As a result, we must expect that few candidates will receive a clear majority of electoral votes under this proposed amendment. To insist upon a majority to elect would mean frequent and inconclusive elections. The only way this could be resolved would be (a) by a run-off election, which on a national scale would be expensive, delaying, confusing, and highly volatile, or (b) by an election in Congress—an almost universally condemned procedure.

5. It has been said that because the electoral college has been a part of the Constitution ever since its original adoption we should be most reluctant to abolish it.

The answer to this objection is in the history books. The electoral system we now have is based on the eighteenth-century idea that each of the States would name its outstanding citizens to join with similar leading citizens from the other States in selecting the President. The people were not trusted to choose their own President—hence it was to be done for them by the "electoral college." This obsolete and undemocratic conception has, of course, been in complete discard since the days of Andrew Jackson, but the machinery of that era continues in use. As a matter of fact, as far back as 1798 the former Massachusetts Senator George Cabot, writing to Timothy Pickering, said:

"MY DEAR SIR: I have been unable to comprehend the motives which influence the Federalists to neglect the infinitely important subject of electing the President and Vice President. The defect of the Constitution in this particular is so obvious, and the inconvenience and absurdity of it so much felt, that I should imagine a proposition to amend it could not fail of success."

If it could be said that the judgment of the electoral college was a particularly wise judgment, its frequent failure to conform to the popular will might be tolerated. But the fact is that the verdict of the electoral college does not reflect the opinion of a selected group of especially wise citizens. The members of the college in modern times are—and are meant to be—rubber stamps for the popular vote. If they are not accurate rubber stamps, there really is no use for their existence.

Federal Spending Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, is it possible that a few States have been singled out to bear the major burden of the boondoggling program of the New Deal? What States are to be raided to obtain the $41,900,000,000? Here they are:

California	$3,486,080,000
Illinois	3,301,720,000
New York	6,486,120,000
Ohio	2,442,770,000
Pennsylvania	3,251,440,000

Under leave to extend, I am inserting a statement which shows how the taxpayers of the 48 States will share the cost of the President's $41,900,000,000 spending budget for fiscal 1950. This does not reveal the extent to which the boondoggling program will be carried, especially when the pay-roll taxes creating trust funds for various groups are levied—did I say trust funds? I should say the funds that will be collected under that name, but which will flow into the Treasury to be spent in addition to the $41,900,000,000:

We know that there is no wealth to be taxed by the Federal Government that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. This fact was recognized and stated in those very words by the Indiana Legislature in January 1947 in its now famous Indiana resolution opposing the extension of Federal subsidies.

Every dollar of the record-breaking peacetime $41,900,000,000 Federal spending budget proposed by President Truman for the next fiscal year must be raised by direct and hidden taxes exacted from the people and businesses in the 48 States, District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii.

The tabulation which follows shows the proportionate share to be borne by the taxpayers of each State if Congress approves $41,900,000,000 of Government expenditures for next year.

In every State the Federal tax take will be found to exceed the total amount of taxes collected this year for the support of the State government and all its municipalities, counties, and school districts combined. In most instances Federal taxes will be two, three, or four times as much.

It must be borne in mind that the $41,900,000,000 spending budget which the President submitted to Congress on January 10 does not cover all the expenditures which the Government expects to make next year. The President has said he will make additional requests of Congress over the coming weeks which will add considerably more to the $41,900,000,000 total. The final figure may reach fourty-four billions or more.

So the figures in the attached table will represent the absolute minimum which the people of each State will pay for Government at Washington in the fiscal year beginning this July 1—unless they themselves urge their Senators and Representatives in Congress to act to reduce the amount of this all-time high Federal budget and call upon the executive branch to cut down on extravagant and wasteful spending.

What the proposed $41,900,000,000 Federal budget for 1949–50 will cost the taxpayers of each of the 48 States

(Allocation percentages are based on a 3-point formula comprising income and payroll tax collections by States (55.53 percent), income payments (23.70 percent), and 1947 Census Bureau population estimates (20.77 percent))

State	Percent allocable to each State	Amount allocable to each State
Alabama	1.14	$477,660,000
Arizona	.34	142,460,000
Arkansas	.64	268,160,000
California	8.32	3,486,080,000
Colorado	.81	339,390,000
Connecticut	1.73	724,870,000
Delaware	.40	167,600,000
Florida	1.29	540,510,000
Georgia	1.41	590,790,000
Idaho	.30	125,700,000
Illinois	7.88	3,301,720,000
Indiana	2.23	934,370,000
Iowa	1.48	620,120,000
Kansas	1.16	486,040,000
Kentucky	1.17	490,230,000
Louisiana	1.12	469,280,000
Maine	.45	188,550,000
Maryland	1.70	712,300,000
Massachusetts	3.57	1,495,830,000
Michigan	4.68	1,960,920,000
Minnesota	1.85	775,150,000
Mississippi	.65	272,350,000
Missouri	2.57	1,076,830,000
Montana	.32	134,080,000
Nebraska	.88	368,720,000
Nevada	.13	54,470,000
New Hampshire	.29	121,510,000
New Jersey	3.25	1,361,750,000
New Mexico	.26	108,940,000
New York	15.48	6,486,120,000
North Carolina	1.57	657,830,000
North Dakota	.34	142,460,000
Ohio	5.83	2,442,770,000
Oklahoma	1.07	448,330,000
Oregon	1.01	423,190,000
Pennsylvania	7.76	3,251,440,000
Rhode Island	.58	243,020,000
South Carolina	.72	301,680,000
South Dakota	.33	138,270,000
Tennessee	1.33	557,270,000
Texas	4.03	1,688,570,000
Utah	.33	138,270,000
Vermont	.18	75,420,000
Virginia	1.48	620,120,000
Washington	1.58	662,020,000
West Virginia	.86	360,340,000
Wisconsin	2.06	863,140,000
Wyoming	.16	67,040,000
District of Columbia, Hawaii and Alaska	1.28	536,320,000
Total	100.00	41,900,000,000

"Doughfaces" a Peril, Says Ex-Colonel—Pro-Europeans Are Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Tribune of January 2, 1949:

"DOUGHFACES" A PERIL, SAYS EX-COLONEL—PRO-EUROPEANS ARE ASSAILED

(Col. Charles L. Hall, son of an Army officer and author of the following article on modern doughfaces, was graduated from West Point in 1908. His entire service was with the Corps of Engineers. He served on the general staff in France in World War I, receiving the Distinguished Service Medal and the Purple Heart with oak leaf cluster. During World War II, he served as engineer for the Ohio River district. He retired for age in 1947, but remained on active duty until retired for disability in 1948. He was district engineer at Rock Island, Ill., from 1927 to 1930.)

(By Charles L. Hall, colonel, U. S. Army, retired)

In American history, a "doughface" was a northern man with southern principles. The doughfaces controlled both political parties from Harrison's death in 1841 to the break-up of the Whig Party in 1855. Six years later, at the outbreak of the Civil War, they vanished from public life. The modern doughfaces are American men with European principles. These men have controlled both American political parties since Hoover's defeat in 1932. The purpose of this article is to suggest their peaceful elimination from public life.

The policy of Great Britain since the time of Queen Elizabeth has been to prevent any integration of the continent of Europe. Such an integration was feared because the whole continent united would clearly not stand for Britannia's rule of the waves. The serious threats of Spain under Philip II and of France under Louis XIV and Napoleon were conclusively defeated.

UNABLE TO MEET 1914 THREAT

When a threat from Germany was made in World War I the British were unable to meet it, even with the assistance of half of Europe. With the best will in the world the American doughfaces of 1914 could not bring the American people into war on the argument that any loss of England's power would be dangerous to the United States.

A sufficient number of Americans felt certain that a reasonable degree of militarization would protect our country from any conceivable German menace at a smaller net cost than that of a bitter war in Europe. Accordingly the doctrine was proclaimed that a submarine attack on an enemy passenger vessel was unlawful if any single neutral was aboard it. This doctrine has since been laughed to scorn by writers on international law. Our Navy paid no attention to it in World War II. However, it was sufficient to enable our doughfaces to make the fuss about the *Lusitania* which led us into World War I.

During the interval between the two great wars democracy in continental Europe broke down. Three types of government took its place, except in France, the Low Countries, Switzerland, and Scandinavia. There was Fascist (Nazi) totalitarianism, communist totalitarianism, and rule by soldiers.

DIFFERENCES OF DOCTRINES

The principal differences between Fascist and Communist doctrine were that the latter had no racial rules and consequently had missionary influence, while the former did not necessarily involve the elimination of the existing educated classes and was consequently more efficient. The rule by soldiers had no ascertainable doctrine, though it governed all the countries on the frontier of Russia from Latvia to Rumania, as well as Yugoslavia and Greece.

The British finally decided that Fascist totalitarianism had a better chance of succeeding than communism. Accordingly, under standard British operating procedure, the Fascist states, as the most powerful, became prospective enemies.

Although the British and French between them had more people than Germany and controlled half the world outside Europe, they never dreamed of winning the war by themselves. They first tried to get the assistance of the Communist states, but without success. They did gather in such military dictatorships as were available. Indeed, an attack on one of these, Poland, was the formal excuse for the initiation of World War II. If there are any survivors of the Polish Government of 1939, one may perhaps be permitted to wonder what they think of the subsequent course of events.

LED BY ADMINISTRATION

Needless to say, the American doughfaces, this time led by the Administration, were right on the job from the opening day. It was perfectly evident to any student of modern military history that an all-out war would leave the vanquished crushed and the victors weak.

It was also clear to any student of general history that a balance of power without Germany could only be established with American aid. Consequently, unconditional surrender clearly meant either the rule of the strongest survivor (obviously Russia) or continuous American interference (at high cost) in purely European questions. While the majority of men in public life in our country were perhaps too stupid to see this, there were plenty who were bright enough. They were, however, as helpless as the northerners of 1850 who pointed out that the fugitive slave law could only be enforced if not too much fuss was made about it.

A great, complex national issue can only be fought out if the two parties collide on it. In 1939 as in 1850 the doughfaces controlled both parties, and the last thing they would tolerate was an objective study of the problem.

MADE FALSE CLAIMS

Since most of the doughfaces were sincere it is interesting to determine just what were the contents of their brains. They could point out that Great Britain, more or less unwillingly, had been a shield for the United States for about a century. They could also point out that if the Nazis won, Great Britain could no longer act as a shield by itself. They never were able to show why the United States, with all its population and resources, could not defend itself; and hence why repair and maintenance of the British shield was not a useless expense.

Since in the end we actually carried the whole alliance on our back economically, and carried the western half of it militarily as well, it is not surprising that the doughfaces could not prove their point. Indeed, using hindsight, it seems hard to believe now that they held any such opinions themselves.

However, whatever the war aims of the doughfaces, they were unable to bring our country into war on the ground of British necessity. In 1916 Wilson won an election on the plank that he had kept us out of a war, which we entered a few months later. In 1940 both parties promised, with equal insincerity, that our troops should not go abroad again.

FORCED WAR ISSUE

The lend-lease law, an obvious hostile act, could not bring us into war. But, in the Pacific, we had a genuine opponent whose expansionist aims collided with our ambitions. By a neutral policy in Europe we could, of course, have isolated the oriental problem. The scheme of the doughfaces was to combine the European and Asiatic difficulties into one package, force the issue, and thus get us into the European war through the back door. No responsible writer any longer denies that this was President Roosevelt's aim. The fact has been clearly indicated by his former Secretary of War, and has recently been established by the work of our country's foremost historian, C. A. Beard, now, unhappily, dead.

If the object of the war was to destroy the German menace, it was entirely successful.

If its object was to improve the international position of the United States, it was a hopeless failure. Three years after the end of hostilities we are threatened with a third world war. Almost all the aspects of this threat could have been foreseen by any serious student of history.

From the standpoint of this author, the important thing is to indicate the responsibility of the bipartisan policy, operated by doughfaces. The business of an opposition is to oppose. If it fails to do so, it cannot effectively criticize the subsequent course of events.

INTENDED TO DESTROY POWER

The opposition was given notice by the Casablanca statement (fight to unconditional surrender) that it was intended to destroy the balance of power in western Europe. It was given notice—though not very explicit notice—after Tehran and Yalta that—for the first time since the wars of religion—the vanquished were to lose their private property, and that about 7,000,000 people were to be expelled from lands they had occupied for eight centuries and squeezed into an already overcrowded rump Germany. They also were advised that prisoners of war might be retained indefinitely. Under the doughface bipartisan foreign policy, none of these decisions was subject to partisan attack.

It is incredible that the Americans should have so completely lost their regard for their own religious ideals and their own past that they would have accepted this set of horrors if they had understood them. But whether they would have accepted them or not it is certain that they would not have agreed to a foreign policy which meant that 3 years after a successful war we would have had to mobilize our money and some of our men to protect a wholly bankrupt western Europe from one of our allies. This is what we are doing now.

END WAS CERTAIN

Moreover, the end was certain from the day unconditional surrender was promised. The Germans would not surrender unconditionally until they were pulverized. If they were pulverized they would be useless customers. Without German customers, most of western Europe could not make a living. With a helpless Germany, there was nothing to prevent Russian control of western Europe except American strength.

All these things it was the business of an opposition to foresee. Moreover, if the members of the opposition could not have prevented it, they could at least have insured that the conduct of the government was clearly examined and that after its inevitable postwar failure, people who supported the policy would have had the same political standing that men who voted for the Kansas-Nebraska Act had in the North after 1861.

But now look at us. The doughfaces are not in the least apologetic. Having allowed a ridiculous arrangement to be made in Berlin, they now tell us that it must be supported at any expense, and that those who question it endanger national solidarity. Having destroyed the balance of power, we are now told that it is incumbent upon us to reestablish it regardles of expense. Having been led into this horrible mess by a foreign policy not properly criticized, we are now told that the bipartisan policy must be preserved. A small matter will illustrate this.

PAID FOR DISMANTLING

There could hardly be anything more inherently ridiculous than the destruction of German factories while efforts are being made to set Germany on its feet at American expense. When a Senator tried to stop this nonsense, he was jumped on from both sides of the aisle. The doughfaces explained that the existing arrangements could not be altered without upsetting our agreed foreign policy. So we continue to pay for the destruction of factories which we are later to pay for replacing.

And it does not look as if we would get any respite from doughfaces. It seems that a Republican doughface is already selected as our next Secretary of State. The writer is no isolationist. He is in favor of compulsory military service and a strong policy in the Pacific. But anything is better than what we are going through now. History, however, gives us one faint gleam of hope from the last century. When a very distinguished son of Michigan, Lewis Case, the most eminent of all the doughfaces then living resigned office in December 1860, he said:

"I have been governor of my home State when it was a Territory and again when it was a State. I have been a Member of both Houses of Congress. I have been a general officer in war. I have been Secretary of State. I have been my party's candidate for the Presidency. And now, if I wanted to be a hog reeve (an officer whose duty it is to impound stray hogs.—Webster) there is no community in Michigan which would not think itself disgraced by choosing me."

Preservation of American Private Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Preservation of the American System of Private Enterprise," delivered by me at a meeting of the Virginia Medical Society at Richmond, Va., on January 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESERVATION OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

In inviting me to address this group of distinguished doctors, I am sure that my good friend, Mr. Henry Johnson, did not know that my first and earliest ambition was to be a doctor. When I was a boy in Lynchburg, Dr. William B. Thornhill was our family physician. I loved and admired him so much that I desired to follow in his footsteps. But I loved and admired the grandfather for whom I am named even more, and when during my high school days he suggested that I should study law, that settled the issue for me. It is a source of satisfaction to me, however, that my youngest brother, Churchill, chose the medical profession.

Since many doctors in Virginia and elsewhere in the country are of the opinion that pending health proposals are calculated, either immediately or ultimately, to impinge upon private enterprise in the medical field, I have been asked to discuss for you today the preservation of the American system of private enterprise. One cannot do justice to such a subject in the time at my disposal. The discussion should include a definition of our system of private enterprise, an outline of the trends both here and abroad to other economic systems, and a comparison of the relative merits of capitalism, socialism, and communism. I cannot adequately cover such a broad field but I do hope that what I say today may stimulate your own thinking on the subject and possibly lay the foundation for a full and more detailed analysis of what I frankly regard as being one of the most critical issues of our day and generation.

It is critical because the so-called American standard of living is at stake, and it is critical because the successful functioning of our democracy will have a definite and vital bearing on whether or not the current conflict between capitalism and communism eventually results in another global war.

I must confess to you that by heredity, environment, and training, I am a fundamentalist. By that I do not mean I am wedded to the status quo. On the contrary, I always have believed that change is an immutable law of nature and that either we go forward or we go backward. But, as a fundamentalist in religion, I believe God decreed that men must work to provide the three essentials of life—food, clothing, and shelter. I also believe that the fewer impediments placed upon the individual's opportunity to work, the better he can produce.

And, as a fundamentalist in the realm of political science, I believe in the wisdom of our founding fathers, who at a convention in Philadelphia in 1787 drafted our Constitution, which the English statesman, Gladstone, said was the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man. I believe in the plan of government provided by that Constitution to implement the immortal Declaration previously framed by Thomas Jefferson, in which he declared that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were the inalienable rights of mankind.

Our Constitution deliberately provided for the protection and safeguarding of both human rights and property rights. The provision in that Constitution for the protection of property rights is known as the capitalistic system and one of the basic institutions of a capitalistic system is freedom of enterprise. So when we refer to "the American individual enterprise system" we indicate, as one writer has said, "that in our economic system the production and distribution of goods and services are characteristically performed by private individuals or privately owned organizations operating under rules and regulations designed to realize the basic ideals and objectives of the people." The term also stands for private ownership of what is produced, as well as the instrumentalities of production, and it emphasizes that the production and distribution of goods and services by Government are limited, as determined by individuals through their freely elected representatives, to those fields in which such Government activity is essential for the accomplishment of public policy.

In other words, when the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence it went on record for unfettered human beings in all their human relationships. And while the founding fathers placed in our Constitution a general-welfare clause to provide for future unseen contingencies, they stressed the fact that the burden of proof rests upon those who propose governmental restrictions that would limit individual initiative. Their intention to limit the power of the Federal Government was reemphasized when, at the insistence of Patrick Henry and others, the first session of the Congress adopted 10 amendments, including one which expressly reserves to the States or the people all powers not specifically conferred on the Federal Government by the Constitution.

Although our Government has been in existence less than two centuries, it is now older than the present form of government of any other nation in the world. It falls to the lot of this day and generation to face as grave a

crisis for its perpetuation as was faced by George Washington and his followers to initiate it. This crisis, involving a conflict between the Christian religion and materialism, individual liberty and state domination, was touched off by the effort of the German Kaiser in the second decade of this century to dominate Europe and ultimately to impose the so-called German kultur upon the world. A quarter of a century later a similar effort was made by Adolf Hitler. Democracy and the friends of freedom, at the price of blood, sweat, and tears, won both of those contests only to find that democracy now faces a third and perhaps more serious contest with the materialistic and anti-God ideology of communism.

Speaking in Moscow on the thirty-first anniversary last October of the Russian Revolution, Foreign Minister Molotov said: "The soil under the feet of capitalism is trembling and we live in an age when all roads lead to communism. The capitalistic system dooms those countries to instability and castastrophic slumps, to periodic shocks and revolutionary upheavals."

I now repeat what I said on a number of occasions last fall—that, barring some unforeseen incident, an immediate armed conflict with the forces of communism is not probable. But the words I have quoted from the speech of Molotov clearly indicate that the communistic leaders count on our capitalistic system being overthrown by instability, depression, and economic suffering that will lead to a revolutionary upheaval.

So, before there is a resort to force, we may expect an all-out communistic effort to wreck the democracies of the world financially. In Europe that effort takes the form of physical sabotage of economic rehabilitation. In this country it takes the form of creating discontent, stimulating demands for public spending which are extravagant even though they are not directly socialistic, and infiltrating our national life by Government action and competition which either is socialistic or which inevitably will hamper individual enterprise.

Without impugning the motives of many of those who are advocating so-called social legislation, therefore, I think it may be in order for us to examine the possible effect on our way of life of some current proposals.

On January 10 the President recommended to the Congress a budget total of $41,858,000,000. The President's message estimated that his recommended expenditures would exceed estimated revenue by the amount of $873,000,000. The President's estimate of revenue was predicated upon a continuation of the present volume of business until July 1950. Should that assumption prove erroneous, the deficit, of course, would be increased depending upon the extent of subsequent price readjustments and the decline in volume.

If confronted with a choice between a deficit and increased taxation, I would consider increased taxation the lesser of two evils, although fully aware of the fact that taxes can be raised to the point where they threaten our system of private enterprise. A preferable solution to our fiscal problem would be to balance the budget by keeping a close rein on expenditures and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I shall devote my best effort toward that end.

It is proposed to double the benefits provided by the Social Security Act of 1935 and add disability and health insurance. All economists are agreed that present pay-roll taxes will not, over a period of years, finance present benefits. The last report of the board of trustees of the social security trust fund estimated that the cost of present benefits in 1960 might total $2,100,000,000; the pay-roll tax in that year might be 3.7 percent, rising to a possible 5.2 percent 10 years later. During the past fiscal year, when applied to the largest number of industrial workers in our history and at the largest wages, receipts from the old-age tax amounted to $1,616,162,000. In addition, the tax paid by employers into the unemployment compensation fund in 1948 amounted to $1,215,265,000.

In his budget message the President proposed that the rate of the old-age and survivors insurance tax be increased and that it be extended to a higher bracket of income to bring receipts up to $2,420,000,000 in the next fiscal year.

It is self-evident that this expanded social-security program will involve a tremendous financial burden, whether paid by pay-roll taxes or from the Federal Treasury.

The President also proposed a new pay-roll tax, beginning at a nominal rate, to finance a health-insurance program. As indicated in my opening remarks, some doctors have termed that a program of socialized medicine. It would be more accurate to term it a further step toward socialized medicine since we have already taken several steps in that direction and as our Chinese friends say, "A journey of a thousand miles is commenced with one step." The Committee on the Reorganization of the Government, headed by ex-President Hoover, has already called attention to the waste and inefficiency resulting from the public-health activities of 44 Federal agencies. In the brief period of the past 8 years the amount spent by those Government agencies on medical service increased from $250,000,000 to $1,250,000,000 and coverage was extended to one out of every six persons in the United States.

In his recent report to the President on a 10-year program for the Nation's health, Oscar R. Ewing said the goal was "to provide that all people shall have access to such health and medical service as they require through a system of insurance covering the entire population."

The full extent of the program has not been agreed upon and even when it is, an estimate of the cost will be little better than a guess because, in order to forecast with any degree of accuracy what a program of this character will cost in the future, it is necessary to know how many persons will be employed, the rate of their wages, how many will get sick, and how long it will take them to get well.

The health bill introduced in this Congress, S. 5, is substantially the same as S. 1320 of the Eightieth Congress. It provides for prepaid personal health service, including medical, dental, hospital, home nursing, drugs, eye glasses, etc. for all wage earners, and persons receiving old-age and survivors benefits, or any of the various forms of public assistance. S. 5 authorizes appropriation from the Treasury of an amount equal to 3 percent of all wages estimated to be received on pay rolls up to $3,600. To this would be added an appropriation equal to the estimated cost of furnishing dental and home nursing services and any further sums required to meet expenditures under the program.

Thus, the estimated cost of the medical program as indicated by this bill, which Federal Security officials say may be amended but will be the basis for their plan, would be 4 percent of pay rolls or more when it gets in full operation.

Now, if the old-age and survivors insurance tax goes to the predicted 5.2 percent and the unemployed tax stays at 3 percent and a proposed disability insurance plan costs 3.5 as estimated by the Social Security Board, that amounts to a combined rate of nearly 16 percent on pay rolls. To that must be added the cost of whatever additional benefits are provided under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

The original Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, covering the entire program, provided for an additional pay-roll tax of 12 percent, one-half to be paid by the employer and one-half by the employee, plus a Federal contribution from general tax funds amounting to another 6 percent. But that tax was proposed before a national debt of $252,000,000,000 numbed our sensibilities concerning future liabilities.

At one hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the subject some economists placed a total of such pay-roll taxes at 20 percent.

If the tax should reach that rate, and with Mr. Ewing's proposal that the tax apply to incomes up to $4,800, the half paid by employees would go as high as $40 a month in addition to all other taxes.

The United States Social Security Mission sent to Japan in 1947 to study a social-security system for the Japanese estimated in their report, which has not yet been published, that the cost there would amount to a maximum of 32.5 percent of pay rolls.

One major consideration in any program, of course, must be whether or not we can pay for it. Before Congress could safely embark on any such program for this country it should determine whether or not the people of the Nation can finance it without ultimate socialization of our economy.

Increased taxes on business have been proposed on income as well as pay rolls. The imposition of pay-roll taxes have a three-way effect: (1) In adding to the costs of production they will reduce the level of profit when the present sellers' market turns to a buyers' market, as eventually it will; (2) they increase the cost of the finished item to the consumer and tend to nullify other efforts to reduce the high cost of living; (3) pay-roll taxes are charged as a cost of doing business and are deducted from gross income before computing the net taxable income and thus reduce the Government's income-tax revenue, each $1,000,000,000 of such taxes resulting in a loss of about $300,000,000 of income taxes.

I realize that there is in Virginia and in the Nation a shortage of hospital beds and that one does not have to be a member of the Foreign Legion to ascertain that there is "a dearth of woman's nursing and a lack of woman's tears." The need for improvement in medical care is clearly indicated but that the health of this Nation will be better served by a Government program than by a private program is by no means indicated.

The United Kingdom now owns a fifth of all industry in Great Britain. The British injection of socialism into its private enterprise system has recently been extended to the field of medical care. If it takes a British patient as long to get well in a government hospital as it does in this country, the plan is going to be expensive. Recent statistics in this country show that the average patient spends 30 days in a Federal hospital but only 7 days in a private hospital.

What effect socialized medicine in Great Britain will have upon the quality of service rendered remains to be seen. I feel that there is no reason to assume that the abolition of the private profit incentive will not be as harmful to medicine as it has been to the production of goods and services in general. Aside from communistic sabotage, our major handicap in the rehabilitation of western Europe through Marshall plan aid has been the socialism which has permeated all of those countries. While Marshall plan dollars have stimulated an increase in their production, I understand that the average is just now reaching prewar levels. Under our system of private enterprise and with no outside aid, our production in volume has increased 75 percent over prewar levels. In less than four decades, we have increased our supply of machine tools four and a half times and are now supplying the world. We have more than doubled the hourly output of industrial workers, and almost doubled the annual income per household, while cutting 18 hours from the average workweek. In

comparing our standard of living with that of Russia, ex-President Hoover recently called attention to the fact that the 12,000,000 Negroes in the United States own more automobiles than the 200,000,000 Russians. Our standard of living is unmatched by that of any nation in the world at any time in history, and needless to say, is the envy of the world. It is the fruit of a system of individual enterprise functioning in a representative democracy under a written constitution. Let it be remembered that those who provided for capitalism and a system of private enterprise in that Constitution were well aware of the fact that the settlers both in Virginia and Massachusetts had first tried communism and in both instances it had failed, the first in 2 years and the latter in 5. Let it be remembered that as much care and thought were devoted to preserve the type of enterprise that had been developed in the Thirteen States for a century and a half and which was not duplicated anywhere else on earth as to any provision inserted in that remarkable instrument. Let us, therefore, test all proposals alleged to promote our standard of living and general well being by the formula that has produced our success.

Jefferson was a liberal and a friend of the masses. It is one thing to interpret his political philosophy in terms of twentieth century conditions. It is another to repudiate it.

By the light of a pine knot, Abraham Lincoln, the great humanitarian, read the Bible. "Root hog or die" was his paraphrase of "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread."

They believed and I believe "the fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings." The record of our distinguished President, of our Chief Justice of the United States, of the overwhelming majority of those in all walks of life who have succeeded, is mute testimony to the glory of our system of individual enterprise.

I have been the beneficiary of that system and desire to preserve it for generations yet unborn.

Reduction of Federal Civilian Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very important survey made by the National Association of Manufacturers Government Spending Committee. It recommends the elimination of excess Government employees. I commend the reading of this document to those who are interested in reducing the expenditures of the Government. Inasmuch as I have been interested in the economic operation of this Government and have opposed every boondoggling proposal presented by the New Deal I feel that the taxpayers are entitled to some consideration when it comes to considering the budget proposed by the President.

Under unanimous consent, heretofore granted, to extend I am including this survey as a part of my remarks in the RECORD:

INTRODUCTION

The recommendations for elimination of excessive Federal civilian employees set forth herein, are based on information contained in reports and hearings of the congressional Appropriations Committee during the second session of the Eightieth Congress. In most instances the specific figures were obtained by relating the lowest estimate of a department or agency's salary and personnel requirements, as determined by an Appropriations Committee to the amount finally appropriated.

Since the congressional committees do not have before them information from which they could determine the full extent of Federal overstaffing, these recommendations necessarily represent no more than a starting point for pay-roll economy achievement. The survey discloses the employment of approximately 119,457 excess personnel. There is every reason to believe that intensification of the search for excess personnel by the appropriations committees will build a record of much more widespread over-employment than can now be documented. This is indicated by the estimate of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, that there are approximately 500,000 unnecessary Federal employees.

Senator BYRD's latest monthly statement on civilian employment in the executive branch placed the total at 2,107,244 in July 1948. This represents an increase of 111,856 since the first of the year, or an average daily rise of 525.

The attached specific recommendations, however, provide the association with a means of evidencing its support of the efforts of economy-minded Members of the Congress.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The section of Public Law 491, Eightieth Congress, prohibiting self-aggrandizement of civil-service employees in a supervisory capacity by the simple reason of increased numbers supervised, is a step in the right direction. However, many violations of its intent have been reported in Congress. The law, which now restricts the discretionary power of only the officers and employees of the Civil Service Commission who allocate or reallocate supervisory positions in the classified civil service should be broadened to cover the personnel officers in the various departments and agencies, because they initiate and develop the information upon which the Commission ultimately bases its decisions.

PERSONNEL EMPLOYEES

The number of Federal employees engaged in personnel work has increased from a ratio of 1 to 208 employees in all activities in 1938 to 1 to 85 in 1947. This compares with a range of 1 to 200 to 1 to 3,500 in leading business organizations. The House Civil Service Committee has recommended that the total Federal budget for personnel work be cut by $25,000,000 to $53,627,000, which would result in a reduction of approximatey 8,000 employees. The remaining total of 16,000 personnel workers would leave their ratio to Federal employees at approximately 1 to 130.

POST OFFICE

The sharpest increase in employees during July in any Government agency was reported by the Post Office Department, with a rise of 10,419 to an all-time peak of 508,834. The total is more amazing in view of the department's estimate submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee of average employment of 463,000 for fiscal year 1949 based on the present volume of mail. It is suggested that the number of employees be rolled back to approximately 463,000, which is in keeping with the original departmental figure.

Following is a table of post office employment and pay roll prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Month and year	Personnel	Pay
July 1945	384,249	$79,890,200
July 1946	493,014	95,534,738
June 1947	471,787	93,007,872
July 1947	474,459	96,513,298
August 1947	457,619	96,117,065
September 1947	457,175	96,436,069
October 1947	461,959	99,636,207
November 1947	463,582	98,666,115
December 1947	463,741	143,459,822
January 1948	465,048	100,346,240
February 1948	471,868	98,053,953
March 1948	481,612	102,046,953
April 1948	488,059	100,842,927
May 1948	490,596	100,900,398
June 1948	498,415	102,600,386
July 1948	508,834	121,622,000

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Department of the Army

The House Appropriations Committee found the present ratio of civilian employees to soldiers disproportionate. Prior to World War II there was one civilian to every four soldiers. The proposed 1949 ratio is one to two.

The House Appropriations Committee recommended a cut of 70,000 civilians from the pay roll, bringing the total down to 477,100 for a 1,250,000-man army. Its appropriation recommendation of $644,525,000 was subsequently raised to $674,525,000, pointing to the likelihood that there is still room for the elimination of 12,000 employees and a saving of $30,000,000.

This is no assurance that the remaining 58,000 employees have been, or will be, removed from the rolls. It is noteworthy that effort was made last year, through an appropriation reduction and careful cataloging of civilian personnel in each appropriate title, to remove 58,000 employees. Present information indicates that no such results were achieved.

Department of the Air Force

The budget request for $355,492,000 under "General expenses" for employment of 137,156 civilians was deemed excessive, and the committee recommended a cut of $25,000,000, eliminating approximately 11,500 employees. However, final action restored $5,000,000, indicating that 2,000 additional employees can be taken off the rolls. Restoration of a $500,000 cut recommended in the Office of Chief of Staff held another 140 civilians in their jobs.

Department of the Navy

Most disappointing feature here was the Navy's apparent inability to effect any personnel savings under so-called unification of the armed services. Rather, it requested increases for numerous activities which the House Appropriations Committee adjudged of questionable value. However, their recommended reduction of $5,000,000 in salaries, which would have cut civilian employment by about 2,000, was ignored.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The House Appropriations Committee brought to light many overlapping and duplicating services in this administration and held that if proper reorganization were effected, 30,000 employees could be dropped with a resulting saving of $90,000,000. The Administrator promised that a thorough survey would be conducted and its findings submitted to the next Congress.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

It was observed by the House Appropriations Committee in April 1948 that 20,000 persons in the Employment Service was "far in excess of the minimum essential in view of (1) prevailing conditions of high employment and (2) the promise, in 1946, that the return of the employment office to the States would result in more economical operation.

Instead of decreasing the Agency's employment rolls expanded from 31,825 in July

1946 to 34,660 at the time of the committee's report, in April 1948. Then, in the face of the economy recommendation, a further increase to 35,184 was experienced through July 1948.

The committee's recommended cut of $850,000 in salaries would eliminate approximately 300 employees at the average salary rate. Removal of the 524 added to the pay roll from April to July 1948 would save approximately $1,622,000 more.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Based on the Administrator's own recommendation in the process of liquidating the WAA, civilian employees should be cut to a total of 5,000 by June 30, 1949. This would represent a reduction of 10,981 from the 15,981 on the rolls as of July 1948 and would save $32,943,000 in salaries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Elimination of duplicating activities could produce a cut of 2,345 employees and a saving of $7,083,196, according to the findings of the House Appropriations Committee. The committee stated that the Extension Service with its soil-conservation employees and farm agents in the various localities could extend their services to the Indians. It is also pointed out that greater efficiency and considerable savings would result if the National Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Public Roads Administration took over the activities in their areas now performed by a division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bureau of Reclamation

A reduction in administrative personnel recommended by the committee would have produced a saving of $2,660,000 and eliminated approximately 900 employees.

Office of Solicitor

It was recommended that this Office's duties include supervision of all attorneys and adjudicators in the Interior Department. If this recommendation had been effected, their number would have been reduced from 251 to 201 at a salary saving of approximately $250,000.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Administrative consolidation in this Department, as outlined in House Report No. 1532, would produce a saving in salaries and expenses of $13,696,000. This, on the basis of average pay, would eliminate 3,000 employees.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Civilian employees in this Department have increased from an average of 9,540 in 1939 to 40,523 in July 1948. In view of duplication by many bureaus of activities already performed by the Department, the House Appropriations Committee has recommended that enabling legislation for these various bureaus be restudied with a view to clarifying and codifying their respective functions. Specific recommendations in Senate hearings, which were ignored, would have reduced personnel by 2,017 and saved $5,819,467.

STATE DEPARTMENT

It is not feasible to offer any specific reductions for this Department in view of the nature of recommendations made by the House Appropriations Committee. It suggested (1) elimination of all international organizations of the Department which have outlived their usefulness because of establishment of the UN, but failed to name specific organizations, (2) a review of large-scale increases in executive and high-grade administrative personnel in the Department since 1939, and (3) elimination of overlapping and duplicating activities both internally and in the field. It is perhaps worthy of note that 1,182 civilian employees were dropped from the Department's rolls in July 1948.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The House Appropriations Committee expressed the feeling among its membership that this Commission has taken advantage of its strategic position to indulge itself lavishly in administrative expenses. It reduced the original budget estimate of $550,000,000 by $48,150,000, of which $4,191,952 was intended for personal services and included provision for 761 additional employees. The Senate restored $20,000,000, which was reduced to $10,000,000 by the conference committee with the provision that no part was to be used for administrative expenses. It is hoped that Congress will see that none of the amount restored is used to employ additional personnel.

JUDICIARY

The House committee held that employment of court criers was unnecessary and eliminated a budget request for $501,900 which would remove the entire 200 from the pay rolls. However, this reduction was restored in the Senate.

Specific recommendations for reduction in civilian personnel in Government departments and agencies [1]

Establishment	Personnel as of July 1948	Recommended reduction	Estimated pay-roll saving
Post Office	508,834	45,000	$92,500,000
Veterans' Administration	207,179	30,000	90,000,000
Military Establishment	877,650	16,140	40,500,000
War Assets Administration	15,981	10,981	32,943,000
Interior Department	57,218	3,295	7,083,196
Treasury Department	87,395	3,000	13,696,000
Commerce Department	40,523	2,017	5,819,467
Federal Security Agency	35,184	824	2,472,000
Personnel employees (all departments and agencies)	24,288	8,000	25,000,000
Judiciary	4,211	200	360,000
Total	1,858,463	119,457	[2] 310,373,663

[1] With the exception of the Post Office Department the recommended reductions are based on recommendations made by congressional committees.

[2] This figure does not reflect the pay increase granted Federal civilian employees June 1948 amounting to $450 for postal employees, $360 for classified employees.

NOTE.—The recommended personnel reductions set forth in this table represent no more than a starting point for pay roll economy achievement. They are based on information contained in reports and hearings of congressional committees during the second session of the 80th Congress which admittedly do not document the full extent of Federal overstaffing. For example, while it has often been charged that the Agriculture Department, the Labor Department, and other specific Government agencies are overstaffed, these reports and hearings provide no definite information from which the extent of overstaffing can be measured.

Increasing Salaries of Government Officials

REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that by the time his present term expires he will have accepted $15,000 of tax-free income from the Government. Is he going to turn that back?

Mr. RICH. I did not vote for that tax exemption. I did not want it, and it should never have been granted. It is something that Congress gave to itself and should never have been permitted.

The British-Israeli Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Washington Times-Herald an article by George Sokolsky which deals with the British-Israeli situation. This article is full of factual material and contains very valuable observations which I commend to the Members of the Senate for their consideration. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

The British, it would seem to me, are risking too much in their direct intervention in the Palestine war. Already the Israeli guerrillas (and that is the most that they can be) have defeated all the Arab armies sent against them.

They have even defeated the Egyptian Army, which was supposed to amount to something. The British have used war planes to intimidate Israel, and the Israelis shot the planes down. Then the British mobilized their Mediterranean Fleet at Malta.

These Jews will fight for Palestine. Maybe in all the complexities of modern life the simplicity of unabashed nationalism may no longer be understood. But there it is.

Zionism is not a refugee movement; it is not retaliation for wrongs done; it is not an attempt to solve a current problem. It is one of those amazing historic movements which continues, with or without reason, to reassert itself in each generation.

Take, for instance, the case of the Maccabees. At this distance, this Hasmonean revolt against the full force of the post-Alexandrian Hellenic world does not seem practical. Yet they did fight and they did succeed in their mission.

Palestine might have remained a Jewish state during these thousands of years were it not that subsequent Hasmoneans became corrupt and even indecent.

The core of Israelish civilization is religious faith, a firm belief and acceptance of God's law; and when they desert their core, they cease to possess the strength to survive, which is true of all peoples.

It is interesting to recall that old Mattathias on his deathbed realized that Israel's mission is the law—that is, natural law, the law of God. He said to his victorious sons:

"Now, therefore, my sons, be ye zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers. Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall ye receive great honor and an everlasting name. Wherefore, ye, my sons, be valiant, and show yourselves men in the behalf of the law; for by it shall ye obtain glory."

The same spirit prevails in the new state of Israel and it is undoubtedly carrying them through a great travail. When Israel started to hold this small strip by military power very few believed that they could possibly succeed.

Certainly few believed that they could accomplish so much alone and unaided. The general assumption was that the combined power of the Arab states, armed by Great Britain, would reduce Israel to a memory of an abortive attempt at statehood.

But that did not happen. Instead, the small Israeli Army defeated all the Arabs. This was contrary to British plan and policy.

It needs to be noted that Israel, in this war, has had the physical assistance of no country and the good will of some only after prolonged debate. Arms were purchased wherever available and smuggled past the British blockade.

The British are taking on a force that cannot be measured in numbers. Men who dare to die cannot be defeated. That is what Japan, for instance, learned in China.

It is also what we learned in our war with Japan, which we won by a food blockade rather than in actual battle. It is only when a people substitute practical wisdom for spiritual courage that the moment comes when the calculations concerning the facts lead to surrender.

That happened to the Germans twice in two wars. But it will not happen to Israel. If practical considerations governed those who dwell in Israel, they would not be there at all.

What Great Britain risks is the conclusion that its policy is not only unwise but unfair. It risks the prospect of an antagonism among many people who would like to strengthen and support Great Britain.

It risks the prospect of the defeat of aid from this country. There seems to be neither logic nor flexibility in British policy in Palestine—only that same stubbornness over an error which has marked George Marshall's policy concerning China.

It seems to me that Great Britain is risking too much over nothing that can any longer matter to the Empire. Israel is a fact that will not down.

Red Mass Sermon by the Most Reverend John J. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HOWARD McGRATH
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most elevating address by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Boston, delivered at the annual red Mass Sunday, January 16, at the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Catholic University of America.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel. * * * He shall have glory everlasting. He that could have transgressed, and hath not transgressed; and could do evil things, but hath not done them."

I have taken these words from two places in the Book of Ecclesiasticus. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The trials of the so-called war criminals have been subjected to thoughtful criticism by a few commentators, legal philosophers, and historians. The opinion has been expressed that they may eventually cause our Nation and our allies very real embarrassment because the courts which conducted them functioned without previous written law and with the doubtful competence of conquerors. Quite possibly, too, apart from these considerations which favorably disposed historians may consider to be of secondary importance in the special circumstances of the trials, the cases of individual "war criminals" may have involved injustices or inequities because of passion or partisanship or misrepresentation.

Whatever of all this, there was one refreshing aspect to the determination to bring to trial the "war criminals" and to demand an accounting before some bar of justice from some of those who by deliberate plan and conscious choice brought about the appalling evil that was World War II. This determination constituted a dramatic affirmation before all the world and under the most solemn circumstances of a seriously neglected truth, the truth that political, social, and other moral disasters do not merely happen. They are not the blind results of inexorable fate. Even the most complex of these calamities are not the work of irresponsible, mechanical forces alone. Just as great movements forward in the social history of mankind may be accurately attributed to the honorable actions of upright men, so the moral disasters which overtake men and nations must be attributed to the unfortunate use by responsible men of that freedom in which God created mankind from the beginning.

In the rise and fall of societies, as in the personal salvation or damnation of individual men, the old truth enunciated by the sacred Scripture remains valid. It is a law of social history as well as a condition of individual salvation: "He shall have glory everlasting who was free to transgress, but did not; who was free to do evil things, but did not do them." This is the clue to a man's perfection: "Before man is life and death, good and evil, that which he shall choose shall be given him" (Ecclesiasticus 15: 18). "Behold I set forth in your sight this day a blessing and a curse: a blessing if you obey the commandments of the Lord your God, * * * a curse, if you obey not" (Deuteronomy 11: 26–28). This is the key to a nation's progress, its use of the freedom in which God made man from the beginning: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou who killest the prophets, and stonest those who are sent to thee. How often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathers her young under her wings, but thou wouldst not" (Matthew 23: 37).

The determination to bring to justice the so-called war criminals constitutes, I repeat, a dramatic reaffirmation of the reality of free will and of personal responsibility for the moral consequences of individual actions. I speak of a reaffirmation because the philosophy of responsibility had lost something of its appeal, certainly in social thinking and possibly in legal thinking, in the generation immediately preceding the war.

There had always been the temptation to shuffle off accountability for moral defect. Shakespeare described and refuted it: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that, when we are sick in fortune, often the surfeit of our own behavior, we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: as if we were villains by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence." But "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves, that we are underlings." (Lear and Julius Caesar.)

The philosophy of responsibility in modern times has further suffered from the impersonal, collectivist theories of society and of history which found favor during and since the last century. These linked human action more often to material forces and mass controls than to spiritual personality and individual responsibility. An earlier generation of devout and God-fearing people had recognized the challenge of some environments and the limitations imposed by heredities, but they still acknowledged that the generality of men remain free to make conscious choice between life and death, good and evil. But then social theory followed new lines along which it has attempted to lead legal theory and application. As against the old philosophy of responsibility there has grown up the theory that misconduct is always abnormal, that what the law calls crime and what conscience calls sin are to be explained largely in terms of causes beyond the control of the sinner or the criminal. The philosophy of responsibility has been replaced by the philosophy of excuse.

Under the newer concept, it is no longer a question of being able to transgress, but refusing to do so; it is more often a question of acting in accordance with the characters which, without our asking, we have received. The character itself is a product of circumstances, and delinquency and crime are simply other names for conflict and maladjustment. Criminals are sick people, like the insane. They should be dealt with as sick people and far from seeing in their criminal actions anything for which they are responsible, we must learn to recognize in criminality the existence of something for which society is responsible. Hence the familiar captions under pictures of young criminals, "Who is the real delinquent, this boy or society?" Hence, too, the frequent statements of sociologists and other experts who announce. "We believe in the responsibility of society, not of the individual."

Last month I listened to a broadcast over a national network of an extremely effective radio drama. It was clearly conceived by its author and presented by its broadcasters as setting forth a profound and cogent point. Its scene was the cell of a condemned murderer. Every device of skillful radio-theater drove home the idea of the play as stated by the players: "Tonight I am sitting on the edge of a prison cot in the cell of a condemned murderer. Between him and the rope which will break his neck and choke the breath from his throat are 9 hours of tortured darkness. Soon the collective hand of society will reach out and pull the lever that will spring the trap and send his feet kicking in mid-air in the death struggle. Perhaps the collective conscience of society will permit itself a slight qualm. As I write the murderer watches me. He is nothing more than a big-boned, hulking, somewhat dull kid who continually trembles. He will die in the first light of the morning. I shall write then about the court which should have tried him. It is a purely imaginary court—a court which sits in judgment on ordinary people who lead what might be called a blameless life. A court established by a law which reads in part: 'Whereas the state decrees that no one lacking 21 full years in age can now alone be held responsible for any murder, it is ordered that a minimum of six shall then be hanged if one such minor is condemned to die.' And so this court's been called to quickly find the necessary five—for the five additional nooses which await along with the one society has decreed for the young murderer."

The five extra nooses, as the play developed, were fashioned for the necks of the boy's school authorities, his parent, a political leader in his community, a representative of organized entertainment, and an average member of the general community. The broadcast was extremely effective. It undoubtedly left in the minds of millions the impression that thus responsibility was placed where it always belongs: not with the individual criminal, but with the total society—and therefore with no one. It was a dramatic example of the philosophy of excuse as opposed to the philosophy of responsibility.

Judge John Perkins, former justice of the Boston Juvenile Court, tells how one morn-

ing a probation officer came into his courtroom and said: "I went to the prison association dinner last night. The principal speaker made a moving address. At the end of it, after describing how a parolee had committed an atrocious murder, he burst into a dramatic peroration. Raising his eyes to the ceiling and with his voice trembling with emotion he esclaimed dramatically: 'Somehow, somewhere, someone of us failed this man!'" The judge remarked ironically: "You mustn't object to that argument. As a matter of fact, it is a wonderful idea for us, too. All these cases we have been worrying about, because they turned out badly, were not our fault. We never failed. Whenever we thought we had failed, someone else had always failed us."

This is the philosophy of excuse—the philosophy of ultimate irresponsibility. For more than a generation it has undermined the moral and legal and individual social responsibilities upon which the stability of society must repose.

The linking of misbehavior to maladjustments and to forces beyond the control of the individual offender may frequently be justified, but not so often as to warrant a general philosophy of law which loses sight of the normal facts of individual responsibility and of personal freedom. Misbehavior, whether sinful or criminal, always includes an element of maladjustment, but sometimes there are adjustments which the individual must make on the level of the spiritual in order to meet the test of the material and the trial of the evil.

We must ameliorate bad conditions. We must strive by social action to lighten the load where it is unjust or unsafe, but we must recognize that in all this adjustment there are adjustments expected of the individual as well. We have rationalized too many ruthless tyrants in terms of their adolescent frustrations. Too many maladjusted criminals have been explained in terms of the conflicts and tensions of potentially great artists who were forced to be obscure paperhangers in Austria; potentially great leaders of social movements who were destined to become gangsters and leaders of anti-social rackets which tore American communities apart. Too much gangsterism and sheer criminality on the obscure levels of the underworld and on the higher levels of international action and diplomacy have been encouraged by this philosophy of excuse in the realm of conscience and on the level of courts. The war crimes trials have caused to resound in our century some echo, at least, of that voice of responsibility which spoke centuries ago with accents divine: "This night do they require thy soul of thee." They have reminded public servants of that accountability which is imposed on every free agent: "How is it that I hear this of thee? Give an account of thy stewardship, for now thou canst be steward no longer."

It is good for civilization that the philosophy of responsibility should be reaffirmed and that the philosophy of excuse should be subordinated to it, cut down to size. Civilization was not achieved by any such philosophy as that of excuse, by vagueness about accountability. Mankind did not emerge from recurring periods of social decline and even savagery by any such formulae. Social progress has not been accomplished by swinging along with impersonal destinies, by riding the wave of the future, by the blind operation of uncontrolled biological, economic, or social forces. It has been achieved by the vision and determination, by the self-knowledge and self-discipline, of single individuals and of individuals in groups who have understood the meanings of the words: "I know. I will. I do."

"'Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.' And stretching forth His hands Jesus touched him saying: 'I will: be thou made clean.' And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." (Matthew 8: 1–4.)

"And returning to himself, he said: * * * 'I will arise, and will go to my father, and say to him: "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee. I am not worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy hired servants."'" (Luke 15: 17–19.)

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us: that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Gettysburg Address—Lincoln.)

"Poverty is the northwind that lashes men into Vikings. * * * What we call evils, as poverty, neglect, and suffering, are, if we are wise, opportunities for good. * * * If I am left alone, yet God and all the heroic dead are with me still. If a great city is my dwelling place, the superficial life of noise and haste shall teach me how blessed a thing it is to live within the company of true thought and high resolves. Whatever can help me to think and love, whatever can give me strength and patience, whatever can make me humble and serviceable, though it be a trifle light as air, is opportunity, whose whim it is to hide in unconsidered things, in chance acquaintances and casual speech, in the falling of an apple, in floating weeds, or the accidental explosion in a chemist's mortar." (Opportunity, John Lancaster Spalding.)

It is easy to satirize these valiant concepts of an age perhaps more rhetorical, but also more resourceful, more self-reliant, more imbued with the philosophy of responsibility, more contemptuous of the philosophy of excuse. But the whole history of human achievement gives meaning to that rhetoric and attests to the worth of those who indulged it, who taught their children and told their fellow citizens and trained themselves to recognize that they could do evil, but must not, that they could transgress, but would not.

So we in our legislation, in our law courts, and in our social theory must recognize and make allowance for the inadequate and the unfortunate, but we must not treat their condition as the normal condition of mankind and we must not spin our moral philosophy around ther deficiencies. In our sympathy we must not place emphasis on excuse rather than on responsibility and thus spread a demoralizing social philosophy. We must make responsibility the universal norm and excuse the challenged exception. We must state the rules rather than constantly find reasons why they do not apply. We might well return to a bit of the rhetoric that glorified heroism and achievement and tone down the rhetoric lavished on those who lack the moral wherewithal by which to try or who, having it, prefer to serve themselves and blame society rather than serve society and honor themselves. We must recognize how the philosophy of responsibility enabled boys with withered legs to become useful citizens, leaders of their community, but above all masters of themselves—while the philosophy of excuse has allowed men of real intelligence and potential parts to become the instruments of society's confusion and of their own damnation. Social stability and individual salvation still depend on the recognition of the central place of individual responsibility in whatever good may be accomplished or whatever evil must be suffered on the face of the earth over which God gave man dominion.

Specifically, it was the philosophy of responsibility that made America great. It is the basis of free self-government as free self-government in turn has been the basis of American greatness. Woodrow Wilson said some wise things about the relationship of self-government to the kind of character produced by the philosophy of responsibility. He said: "Self-government is not a mere form of institution, to be had when desired, if only the proper pains are taken. It is a form of character. It follows on the long discipline which gives a people self-possession, self-mastery, the habit of order and common counsel, and a reverence for law which will not fail when they themselves become the makers of law."

I offer this as a legitimate social and political conclusion from the moral philosophy of responsibility. If we are to acquire or keep the kind of character which Wilson said was essential for self-government, we must preserve the disciplines by which that character is built and the moral philosophy which dictates those disciplines. Church, state, and home must unite in happy understanding to teach each generation the "self-possession, self-mastery, the habit of order and peace and common counsel which will not fail them when they themselves become the makers of law." Thus will our citizenry become the men of glory who could transgress, but will not do so; who could do evil things, but will not do them; who use their freedom, fortified by God's grace, to do God's will on earth unto the temporal stability of their nation and the eternal salvation of their souls.

Wisconsin's Unemployment Insurance System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the January 8, 1949, edition of the Milwaukee Journal contained a very stimulating article regarding the Wisconsin system of unemployment insurance credit ratings and regarding efforts here in Washington to end such system and substitute a strictly federalized unemployment insurance set-up.

I think this editorial is a real contribution to our thinking on this vital subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW JOBLESS PAY MANEUVER

Unemployment Benefit Advisers, a private organization in the unemployment compensation field, reports that it has foreknowledge of a new dodge to force ultimate complete federalization of unemployment compensation.

The advisory council to the Senate Finance Committee, it says, will presently suggest two fundamental changes in the unemployment compensation set-up: (1) A recommendation that a 1.5 percent minimum be set for unemployment compensation taxation

all over the country; (2) a recommendation that half the tax be collected from the employed.

At present the average of the tax over the country is 1.4 percent but hundreds of thousands of employers, through experience rating, are paying much less than the average. At present the whole tax is paid by the employer.

The net effect of these changes would be to destroy experience rating as a part of the plan. After that, employers would no longer have much incentive to stabilize employment; they might soon cease to have any definite interest in how unemployment compensation was operated. A second effect would be to increase labor's influence on unemployment compensation legislation, due to the fact that workers would be financing half the cost.

There have long been two schools of thought in the basic philosophy of unemployment compensation. One school may be called the Wisconsin school, for it started here. The Wisconsin idea is that unemployment compensation should first of all be a plan for stabilizing employment and only secondarily a plan for indemnifying the worker who loses his job. The vital feature of this conception is experience rating—letting the individual employer with a good employment record have a cash benefit because of that record through a lower tax rate.

The other school, supported by the Federal Social Security Administration, views unemployment compensation entirely as a relief set-up, the whole purpose being to keep the covered unemployed off relief rolls. Proponents of this conception frown on experience rating and want to get rid of it. They feel that it is the chief stumbling block to the complete federalization which would give the Washington philosophy and the Washington bureaucracy full say.

Up to now the Federal Social Security Administration has had little support for its plan. The report of the advisory council is, therefore, of great importance, since it appears to come from a wholly unbiased source.

When the report is made public, every person interested in job stabilization should study it and measure its effects, both immediate and ultimate. One thing seems sure, it would end the Wisconsin system once and for all.

Economic High Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Economic High Lights," received from Mr. Dan B. Noble, of the Pacific Northwest Development Association, Portland, Oreg. This article, I feel, contains significant historical information which is related to our present-day foreign situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At extended intervals, Marshal Stalin has met and talked with foreign interviewers. Among the Americans so favored have been Roy Howard, Elliott Roosevelt, Harold Stassen, and Walter Duranty. In every case, Stalin's remarks for foreign publication have been of an amiable and conciliatory character. Their basic theme has been an expressed desire for peace, buttressed by the statement that communism and capitalism should be able to exist together in the world in harmony.

These interviews have always been happily received in this country and elsewhere. They seemed to contain grounds for an optimistic estimate of future world trends. Unfortunately, however, there is an amazing contradiction in what Stalin has said for foreign consumption, and what he has told the millions of Russians he rules at home.

That contradiction is the subject of a long article in Foreign Affairs, signed with the nom de plume Historicus. The magazine believes this is the first time a documented study has been made of the matter. In order to obtain his material, the writer examined everything published by Stalin since February 1919, which was in itself a heavy job of research. In this connection, it should be recognized that Stalin's writings are practically required reading in Russia. One of his books, History of the All-Union Communist Party has had a distribution of 31,000,000 copies. Another major work, Problems of Leninism, has been published in 11 editions, and the 1947 printing alone totaled 4,000,000 copies. It is extremely significant that none of his interviews with foreign reporters has been reprinted in his voluminous works in Russian.

A typical and much publicized Stalin interview was that given to Roy Howard. This was in 1936. He said that the Soviet Union never had plans for fostering revolutions in other countries because exporting revolution is nonsense. In 1943, in a letter to a Reuters correspondent, he stressed the alleged fact that the Comintern had been dissolved, and said that this "exposes the lie * * * that 'Moscow' intends to intervene in the life of other states and 'bolshevize' them." Numerous other statements made by him follow about the same line.

So much for what the marshal wishes the people beyond the iron curtain to believe. Historicus cites passage after passage from Stalin's published and enormously read works which show that a central feature of his theory of revolution is that the Soviet Union must be used as the base for the development of world revolution—and, if necessary, by armed force. This idea is repeated constantly, in various forms and phrasings.

Thus, in a passage which has been in print from 1924 to the present, Stalin says that "after organizing its own Socialist production" the victorious proletariat in one country should stand up "against the remaining capitalist world, attracting to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raising revolts in those countries against the capitalists and their governments." Certainly nothing could be plainer than that. It is a clear call to arms against capitalism. Of it, Historicus writes: "The supreme aim of world revolution is the logical outcome of Stalin's entire theoretical position, notably the thesis that capitalism is a single world system fatally torn by contradictions which can be cured only by a consciously directed Socialist revolution. Granted these assumptions, the determination to use the foothold won in the Soviet Union as a base for world revolution is elementary common sense."

Historicus states that one of Stalin's favorite passages was written by Lenin and goes as follows: "We live not only in a state but in a system of states, and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist state for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or the other will conquer. And until that end comes a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable." Stalin quoted this bit of prophecy in an article of his own and commented, "Clear, one would think."

The substance of Historicus' study is summed up in these words: "The ultimate resort to armed force is a logical development of the Leninist thesis that only consciously led revolution can drive the capitalists from the stage of history. The assumption that the world has been fundamentally divided into two camps since the October revolution runs through Stalin's writings from his early days and is grounded in his Marxist philosophy. In other words, he has never ceased preaching the hard gospel of Soviet-directed war and revolution to the Russian masses."

Historicus' article is important as a contribution to modern history. It is also important as a guide to the way this and other western nations should regard pronouncements of policy from Stalin and the other top Communists. The obvious fact is that Stalinist tactics call for building up hatred and distrust of the capitalist world at home, even as an attempt is made to quiet the fears and suspicions of the people in other lands.

Federal Aid for Education

REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, although most State treasuries are in better shape financially than is the Federal Treasury, there is no doubt but that in many States the demands, especially for education, call for more finances than the States are able to raise to provide needed buildings, maintenance, improved equipment, increases in teachers' salaries, and other items.

With the enormous increase in Federal expenditures over the past 16 years the Federal Government has tapped every possible source of tax revenue, with little consideration for the needs of State and municipal governments. The States are dependent almost entirely upon direct taxes on real estate and personal property, and sales taxes which fall heavily on persons of low income. In seeking new revenue they find other sources already drained by Federal taxation—income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, gift taxes, communications taxes, luxury taxes, transportation taxes, excise taxes, to name but a few. Enormous sums, billions of dollars annually, are siphoned out of the States in individual and corporate income taxes. The remaining revenue available to the States is inadequate to meet rising local costs of government and provide adequately for growing educational needs. By the Revenue Act of 1948 some $4,000,000,000 were left in the hands of the taxpayers of the Nation which, if allowed to stand, might have provided the cushion to take up the shock of increased cost of State and local government. This will not be possible with mounting Federal expenditures.

It is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw these huge sums from the States and then have funds trickle back under a so-called program of aid to education. Besides involving large overhead expenditures for administration, plans which have been proposed have at least two compelling objections: (1) The compulsory requirement that each State meet conditions imposed by law and regulations of the administering bureau to qualify for benefits; and (2) the opportunity which would be presented for the channeling of propaganda into the curriculums of the schools. The training of our youth throughout the Nation could some day be directed from one central bureau, and that bureau would be headed by someone appointed, and thus not responsible in any way to the taxpayers whose funds he was spending.

To easily, simply, cheaply, and efficiently provide the States with aid for meeting their needs for the improvement of their respective educational programs without building up a huge bureaucracy, without imposing fear of Federal controls, dictators, or propaganda, I am, by a joint resolution which I am today introducing, proposing a simple, direct, unrestricted plan for providing aid to the States and the Territories for meeting the educational demands within their respective borders.

Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, on admissions, on beverages, on communications, on gifts, on luxuries, on transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

Whereas at rates even approaching confiscation on property, the States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purposes; and

Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury; and

Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or dictation: Therefore, be it.

Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use for educational purposes only without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

SEC. 2. Collectors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal-revenue districts are situated at the end of each quarter an amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate income collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

SEC. 3. For purposes of information only, collectors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official.

Under this plan the handling of funds through Washington and back will be eliminated; the amounts available to each State will be determined by individual and corporate incomes within that State. The money will remain in the several States where it was collected. The total amount to be thus collected through Federal facilities for the States each year will automatically be geared to the national income for that year. There will be less danger of Federal control or dictation, and little opportunity for channelized propaganda from one central source. In most instances it will provide each State with a larger amount than would be available under other plans which have been proposed. There would not be a growing bureaucratic horde with insatiable hunger for power ready to consume ever-increasing amounts of taxes.

For example, in fiscal 1948 the Collector of Internal Revenue for Kansas collected in individual and corporate income taxes, $286,148,316.06. On this basis there would go to the State of Kansas under this plan, $2,861,483.16, every cent of which would be available for use within the State.

The immediate total amount returned to the States would be somewhat in excess of the amount suggested in S. 472, which passed in the Senate in the Eightieth Congress. Under that measure the estimated initial contribution to the Federal Treasury by Kansas to support the plan would be $2,552,000—only slightly less than the amount to be collected for the State under the plan here proposed. Under S. 472 Kansas would receive in return as aid to education $1,960,000—$900,000 less than under the plan here proposed.

Certainly under such a plan the States generally, by having this 1 percent of the individual and corporate income taxes paid by its citizens held for its use for educational purposes, would be much better able to cope with their educational problems than they would under a program directed from a Washington bureau.

This proposal will be a step toward retaining our Constitutional Republic and a move away from centralized government.

Such legislation will be in keeping with suggestions made by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, by keeping the control and responsibility local. He said:

When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this is the approach to statism.

Every advocate of aid to education to whom I have talked insists he wants no Federal control, no bureaucracy. This resolution will meet that desire, for it will not add a single person to the Federal pay roll and will certainly eliminate all possibility of Federal controls—even those found in former proposals before the Congress.

Figure this out for your own State and see if the logical appeal and the elimination of the danger of Federal bureaucratic controls under this plan would not enable your State to provide more adequately and more efficiently for the needed enlargement of educational facilities and the necessary increase in salaries of teachers.

This suggested approach is new. As here presented it may be subject to a question of its constitutionality. If that is so, the slower process of a Constitutional amendment would be in order. The proposal is offered for the serious consideration of the Congress.

Privation Among the Indians of North Dakota

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of this Congress two cases of near starvation among our citizen Indians. At the present time the snow is deep and the weather is extremely cold on the reservation in North Dakota. Let me advise you of the situation at the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, Rolette County, N. Dak., where the Chippewa Indians live:

At one time this tribe of Indians owned all the land from the Red River of the North half way across North Dakota, and from the Canadian line on the north to 75 miles south of that line. By the process of treaty making and congressional and Indian Bureau dodging, this great tribe of Indians have finally found themselves living on two townships of land, where about 2 percent of the soil is fit for cultivation. On these two barren townships 8,100 Indians are trying to survive. The old people and many of the young ones still remain on this barren pasture. Do you say they can survive on this sort of area? Do you say they are to blame for not having more, when this Government itself is responsible for taking away their good land? Land in the Red River Valley that we tricked them out of at 5 cents per acre, the garden spot of the United States, now in the hands of white men, sells at $150 an acre. This land is where 40-bushel wheat per acre is produced; this is where flax yields $100 per acre annually.

If what the Indian has left of land in the Turtle Mountains had been of any value we would have found some way to drive him off.

The situation this minute is that these people are desperately hungry, desperately in need of clothing and better housing. All available funds I am informed officially have been either expended or

earmarked for other purposes. If you as Members of Congress disapprove permitting these Indians to starve, get busy at once and make money available for relief. We can't wait for appropriations—as they usually go—we need funds now. Can this be done? It has been done. During the dust-bowl days, Governor Moses, of North Dakota, wired me that there were 3,800 more families in North Dakota who must be assisted and that the funds for relief had been exhausted. I acted at once. I saw the relief administration, the PWA, and the Works Progress Administration, and all the alphabetical outfits in Washington—not all, because I don't think I called on the APA. The same answer was given at each stop. No funds. This was December 20. No funds until Congress reconvened and held hearings on appropriations. I called on Speaker Joe Byrnes and he said there was one chance, and one only, and that was for me to see the President. He arranged a meeting and I saw the President. He listened to my story, and at the conclusion he says, "All right, BURDICK, you wire Governor Moses that the funds will be available in the morning." And they were.

There are a lot of loyal Democrats on the majority side who can see the President and explain the situation to him. If he has any of Franklin D. Roosevelt's tendencies to help those who need it, these Indians will get relief. There is no other way. The citizens of Rolette County and surrounding country are now giving them anything they can spare to assuage their suffering, but there are too many Indians to feed.

The same situation exists on the Fort Totten Reservation but in a lesser degree, for there are fewer Indians. It will require fully $250,000 to carry these Indians through the winter and the total combined fund of Federal and State funds adds up to $43,000. The situation has emergency written all over it.

Can Uncle Sam proudly pound his chest and say we are feeding the people of the entire world—we are giving them the four freedoms, while at the same time our own people are starving here at home? This starving condition of our own people has stripped me of any enthusiasm I might have had for the brilliant and costly inaugural which is about to be staged here at the Capitol.

[From the New York Times]

TWELVE HUNDRED INDIANS FACE COLD AND HUNGER—$43,950 WINTER AID GIVEN, BUT $213,348 IS NEEDED IN NORTH DAKOTA

BISMARCK, N. DAK., January 15.—On two North Dakota reservations, more than 1,200 Indians are struggling against cold and hunger to survive a winter that is only beginning to turn on its most frigid blasts.

Indian Agency and State welfare officials estimate that $213,348 will be needed to carry them through the winter, but so far only $43,950 in Federal and State emergency aid funds have been made available, and there is no sign of more.

The Indians are on the Turtle Mountain Reservation, where some 6,000 Chippewas are crowded on inhospitable land close to the Canadian border, and on the Fort Totten Reservation, larger but with a much smaller number of Sioux.

A joint agency with C. H. Beitzel as superintendent serves both reservations. Aid is channeled through his office at Belcourt, N. Dak., and through county welfare boards.

Urgent appeals for more relief money have been sent to the Office of Indian Affairs in Washington, but the Government has been slow in responding. Originally it allotted only $16,950. In November it sent another $6,000 and since then two more allotments totaling $9,000.

STATE PROVIDES $12,000

Meanwhile, the State public welfare board has stepped in with $12,000 to be used when Federal funds are exhausted. This was done almost over protest, as it were, because State funds are small and the Indian historically has been the ward of Federal Government. But Carlyle D. Onsurd, executive director of State public welfare board, sees the State's dilemma this way.

"It is distinct and immediate responsibility of the Federal Government to care for Indians, but we can't sit by and watch any citizens of North Dakota—and Indians are citizens—go miserably hungry just waiting for Uncle Sam to get busy and help them. We won't let any of our people starve as long as our money lasts."

Conditions are particularly desperate on Turtle Mountain Reservation. There population has grown from 2,838 enrolled Indians in 1913 to 8,900 in 1948, of whom about 6,000 are on the reservation.

Rolette County, in which the reservation is situated, has 25 townships of land. On 23 townships outside the reservation, 4,500 white people live. The 6,000 Chippewas are crowded on the two remaining townships, said to be the poorest land in the county. Only 5 percent of it is suitable for cultivation, the remainder being mostly brush or grazing land.

Chippewas are known as industrious, ambitious Indians, but welfare officials point out that under such circumstances not even the most able, hard-working farmer could make a decent living.

WORK IS SEASONAL

Such off-reservation work as is to be had is mostly on farms, and that is almost entirely seasonal. Years ago, Indians sold some cranberry bark and wood, and trapped for animal pelts during the winter, but these resources are now mostly gone. When winter comes, they are entirely without income.

The result is that most Indians require relief several months of every year. Last year, when starvation was even more imminent for Turtle Mountain Indians than it is now, $100,000 was subscribed by individuals and private relief organizations to tide them through. Then it was estimated that 600 of the 1,100 families there attempt to farm, but only 200 could be considered reasonably self-supporting.

On Fort Totten Reservation, one report stated that 141 of the 334 families get some income from agriculture, but for 102 of these it was less than $250 and for only two was it above $1,500 annually. Eighty percent of Fort Totten Indians depend on wages for support, and these averaged only $400 per year, the report stated. The Indian Office in Washington has said its relief funds are allocated or exhausted and that Congress must act before more are available. The last sum sent to Turtle Mountain, it said, scraped the bottom of the barrel.

To the Indian shivering in his draughty shack, explanations are no help. While the Indian Office explains and Congress organizes, he is still hungry and cold.

[From the Hillsboro Banner]

THE INDIAN AGAIN

Once again, the Indian food situation is serious. Newspaper reports indicate that there is not sufficient food to carry the Indians of North Dakota through the winter.

A year ago this community joined with scores of others in all parts of North Dakota to go to the rescue with donations of food and money. Before the drive had ended, a veritable deluge of food and provisions had swamped those in charge of the project.

Our Government, which is responsible for the care and welfare of the Indians, is not doing a good job if we have this problem recurring annually. Why can't enough funds be appropriated? Why must it become an annual calamity, this neglect of the Indian?

If the men who have the responsibility of administering to the wants and needs of the Indians cannot calculate their budgets accurately, we should replace them with others who can. And if Uncle Sam doesn't want to appropriate enough money to handle this budget, we are sure it can be raised in the Northwest. We over-subscribe every other plea for help, and there's no reason why we can't do the same in an Indian appeal.

Let's do this thing right, however. Set up a budget that will take care of the Indian. If Uncle Sam fails to do his duty, then we, as individuals, can step in with contributions. We are generous in donating food for European relief; we will be equally generous in meeting an appeal for our Indian friends.

Analysis of the American Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an article entitled "Analysis of the American Character," by Henry Steele Commager, published in the New York Times Magazine of January 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American is politically mature—a statement which will seem palpably mistaken to outsiders who are accustomed to regard American politics as childish. Superficially—and sometimes more than superficially—American politics are childish: the conventions, the campaigns, the antics of Congressmen, of State legislatures and governors.

Yet it is simply a historical fact that the American people have had longer experience in self-government than any other people. The American is the oldest Constitution, the oldest federal system, and the oldest democracy in the world. While people like the French, the Germans, the Italians, who pride themselves on their political wisdom, have gone through revolution after revolution, the Americans have never known a revolution, unless the Civil War be regarded as one, and American political history has been singularly peaceful and even placid.

In America, as in Britain, change has come through evolution, rather than through revolution, and on the whole it has kept pace with the will of the people. The American Congresses can hold their own with any other

legislative body in the world; American Presidents have been as able, on the average, as the Presidents or Prime Ministers of any other nation. In every crisis Americans have chosen courageous and bold leaders. There is no reason to suppose that this capacity for political maturity is on the wane.

Responsibility in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news column written by the distinguished newspaper columnist, Mr. Marquis Childs, which relates to the recent chartered airplane disaster in Seattle, Wash. The column appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, January 15. The column also contains a paragraph near the end, which has aroused some curiosity in that it links campaign contributions with a charge that an attempt is being made to eliminate the competition of nonscheduled air lines. I know nothing of the facts which might support such an assumption, but I strongly feel that any such rumor ought to be carefully examined by competent congressional authority.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING—RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AIR

(By Marquis Childs)

The way in which the continuing wave of the news closes over even a major disaster is well illustrated by the disappearance from the pages of the newspapers of the disaster in Seattle, Wash., that cost 16 lives, 13 of them students from Yale returning to college.

This is, of course, very convenient for the bureaucrats who are supposed to have regulatory responsibility over the air lines. They are grateful for the shortness of public memory which obscures each succeeding tragedy.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is still gathering data preparatory to a hearing in Seattle that opens next Tuesday. In time the board will write a long report phrased in Government gobbledygook with blame duly parceled out, including a share for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which sets up regulations.

But here, as anyone knows who read the accounts of the disaster, is a case where regulations were plainly inadequate. The pilot of the plane was cleared for a take-off by the control tower even though weather conditions were below the safe minimums. It was apparently "legal" to send 16 young men to their deaths.

This is no regulatory system, and an overhaul is long overdue. Nor have recent appointments to air regulatory bodies been such as to inspire confidence.

If it follows present intentions, the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government will recommend establishment of a Department of Transportation. Into that department under a Cabinet officer would go all Government agencies covering every form of transportation.

This recommendation represents a compromise among various factions urging specific action on air regulation. But for several reasons there is little likelihood that either the administration or the Congress will get behind such a sweeping proposal.

President Truman has already recommended a Department of Social Welfare, and that probably will receive congressional approval. It is very doubtful if Congress would add a second Cabinet post at the same time.

Such a move would be opposed by most of the transportation interests involved. Both railroads and air lines would feel that their claims would be submerged in a common agency. It appears, therefore, that no change is in prospect.

The answer of the Civil Aeronautics Board is a new regulation that would have the effect of eliminating irregular or nonscheduled air lines. The plane that crashed at Seattle was on charter from a company operating nonscheduled flights.

This, it seems to me, is not enough. Perhaps stricter regulation of nonscheduled flights is essential. Certainly, it would please the air lines. Senator OWEN BREWSTER, who has been such a kind friend of Pan American Airways, has long planned a move that would practically eliminate nonscheduled competition.

The safety regulations need to be tightened for all lines. Fortunately there has been no major disaster on scheduled lines in recent months. But it was in June of last year that the crash of a DC-6 in Pennsylvania killed 43 persons.

The competition offered by nonscheduled lines is quite another matter. Operating without the large overhead spent for publicity and lobbying that the scheduled lines incur, the little companies, many of them run by veterans, seem to make a go of it by charging rates well under those of scheduled lines.

This may be unfair competition or such competition may be justified within the framework of the American competitive system. A thorough congressional investigation into the air-line industry, with safety a major consideration—unbiased by the special prejudices of friendly Senators, if that is conceivable—should point the way to reforms.

There have been disturbing rumors lately of a major contribution last fall to the Truman campaign that was made through carefully concealed channels by a major air line. This is linked by rumor with the drive to eliminate the competition of the unscheduled lines.

More investigations and more reports are not the answer to disaster. They are part of the process by which tragedy is conveniently filed and forgotten until the next time the headlines spell out a new accident.

A Warning to the Spenders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a very timely statement by Virgil Jordan, president of the National Industrial Conference Board:

God is not mocked when men are seduced by falsehood or driven by delusion to make a greater god of government and to worship Caesar as the mightier Mammon of our time, nor when they can be bribed to accept the insidious bondage of dependence upon the benevolent state and barter their birthright of liberty for the modern mess of pottage which they call political power and social security. In these days of fear and confusion let us remember that the endless repetition of a lie or the multiplication of an empty promise does not make a truth. Truth is something more than the greatest common denominator of mass ignorance and greed. It is never determined or demonstrated by majorities or pluralities of popular error and appetite. Ultimately, with God's aid, it always emerges and finally prevails, supreme in its power over the destiny of mankind, and terrible in its retribution for those who deny, defy, or betray it.

VIRGIL JORDAN.

Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following remarks of my recent radio broadcast:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, the record of the Eightieth Congress was the major issue in the recent election.

President Truman did a great service to the cause of representative government by explaining how Congress works.

By turning the spotlight on the Senate and the House, he revealed, step by step, how the National Legislature solved, or failed to solve, those problems which affect the lives of all Americans.

This resulted in a political upheaval.

Those legislators who had blocked measures which the people wanted were defeated.

The Nation voted for an advance, and not a retreat.

Thus aroused, it is safe to predict that the people will keep in close touch with the Eighty-first Congress, and will make certain that it lives up to its promises.

With this in mind, I want to outline some of the stern challenges which this Congress is getting ready to face.

And may I suggest that you give earnest thought to these problems, for the good of our Nation and for the good of the western world which looks to us for leadership.

It was never intended that the citizen should fulfill his obligations to our Federal union by simply voting once in every 2 years.

The price of freedom places upon each man and each woman the responsibility of a continuing interest in that government which "derives its just powers from the consent of the governed."

The Congress is not an assembly of super men and women.

It needs your cooperation at all times.

Public opinion, based on free access to all the facts, and expressive in its decisions, is the life-blood of our society.

Our first job is to maintain security for our Nation, while we work toward the goal of world peace.

This requires vast expenditures for our Army, Navy, and Air Force.

To halt the spread of communism, we have appropriated billions of dollars for the economic recovery of nations which might otherwise surrender to the doctrine of despair.

It is probable in the near future that we shall be called upon to authorize more funds to see this program through.

I advise you to follow the hearings on this vital subject so that you may determine how far we can go without endangering our domestic security.

There are those of us who think that the Communists are provoking one crisis after another, short of war, with the sole purpose of forcing us into bankruptcy.

In the present state of world affairs, no one would recommend that we reduce our Military Establishment.

But, as the President has said, we cannot increase it without putting a strain upon our ability to pay for it.

Clearly, this armed truce cannot go on indefinitely.

The burden of it would weaken us at home.

War is not the way out of this stalemate. Peace is.

Therefore I look for a concerted effort, and soon, to get together with the Russians in an effort to find common ground for a world policy of live and let live.

This does not mean appeasement.

It does mean that both ourselves and the Communists must be prepared to make some concessions in the name of that peace which all the world hungers for.

This will not be easy.

It will call for a new, patient, and realistic approach.

The people expect redoubled efforts in that direction.

Here in the United States we are confronted by many domestic problems.

There have been mixed reactions to the President's State of the Union message.

But bear in mind the fact that the President, even with his party in control of the Senate and the House, does not have a rubber-stamp Congress.

There are Members who will go along with him on some issues and not on others.

There will be variations of opinion which will reshape his original proposals.

I feel sure that the net result will be a well-balanced legislative program which will largely succeed in promoting the general welfare.

One year ago our chief worry was the steady climb in the cost of living.

Today there are signs that supply is catching up with demand in some commodities, and this will take the steam out of inflation.

It may be, before the end of 1949, that we shall be faced with an opposite problem, that of deflation.

Therefore, any immediate measures to impose controls over prices and wages will be of a stand-by nature at best.

All of us want to maintain a high level of production, employment, consumption, earnings, and wages.

We differ only as to the means by which we can maintain and increase prosperity.

Business has a program, labor has a program, and open conflict between the two would only succeed in hurting the general public.

It is the function of government to regulate these differences when business and labor cannot reach voluntary agreements.

The last Congress penalized labor by enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, which discriminated against unions.

The reaction to this was vigorous and effective.

Labor campaigned as never before, and, winning much public support for its views, helped to unseat many Members of Congress who had voted for that law.

The majority in the Eighty-first Congress is pledged to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act.

It will be done.

Now business fears that it will be the target for one-sided legislation.

It is waiting to see what Congress will do on the proposal to saddle it with an excess-profits tax.

Business argues that such legislation would slow the wheels of industry and endanger the solvency of many corporations.

If business cooperates, it doesn't have to fear that it will be burdened with an excess-profits tax.

Once Congress is convinced that prices have passed the peak any thought of such legislation will be abandoned.

However, the Federal budget will edge upward, due to increased commitments abroad.

At the same time, to meet some long-delayed needs of our own people, we will need more revenue.

It is likely, therefore, that there will be higher corporation taxes (as distinct from the excess-profits tax) and higher levies on the upper income-tax brackets.

All over the world people are looking for security.

In Communist Russia this assumes an extreme form.

There the people have sacrificed every freedom to a master state for the mere promise of security.

Theirs is the security of a slave, without hope or incentive.

In the United States we are endeavoring to provide a minimum security without sacrifice of our basic freedoms.

We know that enterprise has made our country great.

We intend to keep that spirit alive.

The industries of our Nation will never be socialized.

However, we recognize that there are certain minor evils in our system against which our people must be protected.

Let me quote to you the words of a man who may be considered as a spokesman for free enterprise.

His name is Emil Schram, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

On December 14, 1948, speaking at a luncheon given by the New York insurance industry, he said: "Maybe we can resolve the problem of security and freedom, and, in the process, level off the extremes of boom and bust.

"While the rewards may not be as great as we should like in any one year, the average result will be more satisfactory.

"To summarize, let Government not ride roughshod because of its power and let business not take the attitude of the youngster who broke up the baseball game and went home with the ball because he was not permitted to be the pitcher."

Before 1935, there was no old-age insurance program, which would guarantee to Americans some economic security in their old age.

What people got was on a charity basis.

In January 1948, however, over 2,000,000 people received monthly benefits, for a total of $39,000,000 that month.

In 1947, almost one-half billion dollars was paid to people in such insurance benefits.

This included benefits for more than one-half million children of workers who had died.

It also meant insurance payments to retired workers and their wives, and aged parents.

By January 1, 1948, over 76,000,000 people had social-security accounts, and over 50,000,000 were active.

Now this is a fine beginning.

In the light of present-day prices, we find that the average individual benefit is hardly enough to keep body and soul together.

In other words, we have a program, but it is inadequate.

The new Congress will devote special attention to this need.

Old-age and survivors insurance benefits will be raised by at least 50 percent.

The eligibility age for women will be reduced from 65 to 60 years.

Old-age, survivors, and unemployment insurance will be extended to many workers not now covered by the law.

There will be some provision made to insure against loss of earnings due to illness or disability.

There will be improved public assistance for the needy.

Fundamental to our way of life is the right of every American child to obtain a good education.

Through depression and war, our educational system has suffered severely.

Teachers' salaries have failed to keep pace with our economic development.

School buildings and equipment are in sad disrepair.

Under the Constitution, the Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare.

By the same authority, the Federal Government has the right to dispense money to the States for purposes not within the constitutional power of the United States to control or regulate.

Education is included in this category.

During World War II, 1,750,000 young men fell short of the Army's minimum standard of a fourth-grade education.

This illiteracy was not a State or local problem.

It was a national one, and the cost of teaching grown men to read and write was a national expense.

Education is also the basis of our economic welfare.

Without it, men and women lose a great degree of their ability to be self-sufficient and may become burdens upon the community and the Nation.

Many State and local areas are unable to cope with the problem because they cannot foot the bill.

Therefore, I expect that the Congress will appropriate $300,000,000 as a beginning of Federal aid to the States, for education, to be administered by and under the control of the States.

The enactment of a national health program for expanded medical research, medical education, hospitals, and clinics is reasonably sure to pass.

Legislation to provide for national health insurance, however, will meet with stiff opposition from the medical profession.

There will be extensive hearings, during which this question will be explored from every angle.

As a consequence, I doubt whether such a measure will pass during the coming session.

Housing is still a critical need of the Nation.

A bill to provide a remedy for this situation was held up by a few men in the last Congress.

Public dissatisfaction with such delaying tactics was reflected in the election results.

In the Eighty-first Congress, a bill to encourage and stimulate the building of low-cost rental units will have top priority on the schedule, and a majority in its favor when it comes to a vote.

Agricultural problems, conservation, reclamation, and public power projects will receive more sympathetic attention from the new Congress.

The coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act will be extended.

The Department of Labor will be rebuilt and strengthened.

The yardstick of the minimum-wage law will be raised to provide 75 cents per hour in place of the present obsolete minimum of 40 cents an hour.

Civil rights, pensions for World War I veterans, revision of the Displaced Persons Act, and a reform of the procedures under which the Un-American Activities Commit-

tee operates—all of these will come in for a large measure of debate.

At this moment, it is difficult to predict what progress may develop on any one of these issues.

How to coordinate a program for domestic reform, world recovery, and peace, depend upon our present economic foundation—that is the central problem which must guide us in our approach to each separate bill.

Strengthened by the support of an alert public, the Eighty-first Congress is going to work with energy, and with confidence in the mandate it has received from the people.

Help it with your constant and constructive criticism, for the sake of ourselves, and the world.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting a pertinent excerpt from Dr. Edward H. Ochsner's book Social Security and recommend reading of the complete book:

SELECTIONS FROM PAGES 202 TO 210 OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Edward H. Ochsner, B. S., M. D., F. A. C. S.)

The whole social-insurance scheme is based on the ethically indefensible theory that individuals are entitled to things that they have not earned and on the politically unsound doctrine that society owes every citizen a comfortable living whether or not he repays society by doing his fair share of the world's work.

Under compulsory health insurance the individual who works only half-time is entitled to just as much free medical service and is likely to get much more in sickness benefits than he who works full time. Not only this; it actually encourages immorality and riotous living as the following well illustrates. As a young man, I worked 2 seasons in a lumber camp. The camp in which I lived comprised between 32 and 40 men. Of this number only 1 did not use intoxicating liquor; only 2 did not use tobacco.

A just and humane government protects the weak from oppression and exploitation by the strong and unscrupulous; but a just and wise government does not penalize the strong, industrious, clean-living, and thrifty and favor the weak, lazy, shiftless, and immoral.

Man has an inherent, inalienable right to life, liberty, and the fruits of his labors and the right to such contracts as will insure him the fruits of his labors. The Constitution specifically guarantees to every citizen these rights and assures every citizen that these shall not be taken away from him except by due process of law. From this it is evident that no human being or no association of human beings, such as the state, has any right to infringe upon any inherent right of another. The state has no legal right and certainly no moral right to take the result of one man's labors and give it to another and yet this is just exactly what every form of social insurance actually does.

We have all repeatedly heard the statement that the aged are entitled to a pension as a matter of elemental justice. Let us analyze this general claim critically. Many years ago the following incident occurred within my own personal knowledge. A man of 45 and a youth of 18 were working together in the month of July, 1886 for a large lumber company in the upper Mississippi valley, the elder man measuring the logs that were floated down the waters of the Eau Claire and Mississippi rivers and the youth acting as his bookkeeper.

The elder man received a salary of $75 per month and the other $30 per month. Both received board and lodging. The elder man was a high school graduate and had worked at approximately the same wage for about 20 years but had saved practically nothing during all these years. He told the young man on one occasion during the period they worked together that all he had in earthly possessions was a gold watch, his satchel full of clothing, the clothing on his back and less than 10 dollars in cash. The youth was trying to earn and save enough money to go to college.

One day the men were informed that the camp would shut down and all the men be discharged at the end of the week. The elder man asked the younger one what he intended to do when the work ended. The younger man said he would go into the back country and try to get a job on a farm in the harvest fields. The elder man said: "I will tramp, beg, yes, even steal before I will work on a farm." The younger man did get a job as a farm hand at $17.50 a month with room and board working from 5 a. m until 9 p. m., 6 days in the week and about 2 hours on Sunday, did go to college, and by the hardest kind of work during a period of 45 years acquired a competence.

The elder man was lost sight of, but unless he mended his ways before it was too late he probably ended in some county poorhouse. What right would a just government have had to compel the younger man to contribute to an old-age pension fund for the elder man? Would that be justice?

It would be better if the huge sums of money or the equivalent in service which are given to the shiftless and immoral in free medical and dental services and all sorts of pensions were spent in teaching the public in general how to spend its money wisely instead of wasting it on things that are not only of no real benefit to them but are actually often even harmful. It would not only be much better, but much fairer to encourage the frivolous and extravagant. When more money is being spent on tobacco and cosmetics every year than on medical fees the whole propaganda in favor of compulsory health insurance, so the poor may get medical services free, is not only ridiculous but childish to say the least.

Anything which makes easy money easier and encourages wasteful spending and which as an inevitable consequence will make well earned reward more difficult to procure and which will leave less money to the hard-working member of society for sensible expenditures should as a matter of common fairness and justice be unequivocally resisted by all right-minded persons.

Thomas Jefferson made the following observation: "The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live on. To take from one because it is thought his own industry and that of his father's has acquired too much, in order to share with others, who, or whose fathers, have not exercised equal industry and skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association, the guaranty to every one of a free exercise of his industry, and the fruits acquired by it."

Any law or system of government which ignores basic principles of justice as between man and man is not only wrong but will ultimately fail, for justice is the main purpose of government, and if it fails in accomplishing this, it cannot survive for long.

Probably the worst of all the bad features of social insurance is the fact that when this parasite once gets its suckers well fastened into the vitals of a nation nothing short of either national bankruptcy, a dictatorship, or a revolution will be able to loosen its hold.

There are many reasons why it is almost impossible to repeal the laws governing such practices. One reason is that executives and legislators do not want them repealed because it reduces the power which they derive through political patronage. The more patronage the individual in office has at his disposal, the more difficult it is to dislodge him. Even today it is very difficult to defeat a public officeholder with large political patronage, no matter how inefficient he may be, except by another who either already has large political patronage or who promises jobs to his supporters irrespective of their qualifications. Thus in many elections the voter is simply left to choose between two undesirable candidates. Already the number of payrollers has become so large and so politically active and influential that they wield great power in both political parties.

If we then add compulsory health insurance we will add further thousands to the lists of our civil employees. Those who are not in Government employ will be powerless to control Government and their only function will be to pay the taxes which others impose upon them. Instead of increasing the number of Government officials and employees, the ideal to be constantly kept in mind and striven for in this country is to permit the private citizen to perform all those functions that he can best perform, and that makes for independence, self-reliance, and strength of character; and to have the Government do only those things which the individual cannot do satisfactorily.

We maintain that centralization in government and paternalism have already gone much too far and that social insurance would simply be another step in the wrong direction.

The Nebraska Legislature Opposes National Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the early actions of the Nebraska State Legislature was the passage of the Legislative Resolution 2. This resolution takes a firm position against compulsory health insurance.

I wish to extend my remarks by including herein a copy of said resolution:

Legislative Resolution 2

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness insurance program

Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical care and the finest medical institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care, to the detriment of the health of the people: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:

1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully request the Congress

of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this nation any form of compulsory insurance, or any system of medical car designed for national bureaucratic control.

2. That Nebraska Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Clerk of the Legislature to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives and to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska.

CHARLES J. WARNER,
President of the Legislature.

Cheap Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, January 16, 1949:

CHEAP POWER NEEDED HERE—INDUSTRIES, LIKE ALUMINUM AND STEEL, DRIVEN AWAY BY LACK OF ENOUGH ELECTRICITY

(By Lester Allen)

In New England where highly skilled labor and industrial developments have struck a fine economic balance, making the region dependent upon other sections of the country for its food and materials to make its shelters, one survey for establishment of new industries succeeds another. But each survey winds up with the same inevitable conclusion—not enough cheap electric power.

New England might have had an aluminum industry, but there was not enough cheap electric energy available. New England might today have a specialized steel industry producing high grade steels from its own scrap and with cheap electric power in modern electric furnaces, but there was not enough cheap power.

There is a stringent shortage of aluminum in the United States, a shortage caused by expanding uses of the metal, by world demands for aluminum, by lack of capacity to produce aluminum. There is room somewhere for an aluminum industry producing 164,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year, which at the present price, 15 cents a pound, would mean a gross value of $24,620,000.

Bauxite deposits, from which aluminum is extracted, exist in generous proportions all over the world, but the most productive deposits are all within very cheap water transportation distances from any New England port. But there isn't electrical energy enough in cheap surplus in New England to make development of an aluminum industry here either economical or feasible.

SELDOM HEARD

All the opponents of increased electrical generating capacity, either hydroelectric or steam plant generation, hold to the theory that New England can't use any more power. But those who hold that the more and cheaper electrical energy produced, the more industries will seek to locate here, seldom are heard above a whisper.

Not long ago, the New England Council paid for a survey of the possibilities for establishing a steel industry in New England. The reasons presented why such an industry could not be established were many. The reasons why such an industry should be established here were soft-pedaled—and through no fault of the New England Council.

It was plain that New England could not and should not try to compete in mass tonnage of steel—general purpose steel. But scant attention was given to the fact that New England is an immense reservoir of high grade scrap from machine shops and other metal plants. This surplus of high-grade scrap goes into steel making, it is true, but it is hauled to Pittsburgh and Gary and Cleveland.

RATHER SENSELESS

Modern electric furnaces producing high-grade tool steel could place New England in direct competition with producers of high grade steels the world over—if—and this is the catch—if there were cheaper electrical energy available.

It seems rather senseless for New England to go on indefinitely playing the cautious game of seeking only sure-thing bets, while other sections take the risks and bring off real economic triumphs for their people and for their investors. In Brazil, for example, a short water haul from New England, there is a deposit for high-grade iron ore that makes the Mesabi Range look like a mud puddle. The ore is 200 miles from the sea and would require the building of a railroad to get it to tidewater.

Boston capital built thousands of miles of railroad, but that was almost 100 years ago, and the railroads built with Boston capital actually led to nowhere, if the then existing undeveloped West is considered.

GREATER ADVANTAGES

The best estimates of the cost of building a New England steel industry is $50,000,000. Not much when you say it quick—and, $50,000,000 is not now regarded as a prohibitive sum of money, when Members of Congress can calmly discuss billions without a rise in temperature.

The establishment of an aluminum industry in New England, which, during World War II, was discussed by the Government as a possibility, promises even greater advantages than a steel industry, because of the cheapness of sea-borne supplies of bauxite. There are deposits of bauxite in British Guinea and Dutch Guinea, in Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, in Canada, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic.

There's ample indication that the steel bottleneck, which has caused a 3-year steel shortage since the end of hostilities, may give industry a nudge that will compel more and more uses of aluminum.

Aluminum can be moulded, rolled, or hammered into plates, sheets, bars, rods, and even reduced to a foil so thin that 10 sheets would be required to make the thickness of one page of this newspaper. It can be drawn fine as a cobweb, blended with other metals to increase its tensile strength, hardness, or malleability. It is only a third as heavy as steel and resists rust, corrosion, and weathering.

DIVIDE BUSINESS

Three companies divide the aluminum business in the United States—and they all operate where there is cheap power. Alcoa has 50 percent of the present American capacity. Reynolds Metals has 30 percent, and Henry Kaiser's Permanente 20 percent.

Aluminum is the only metal in use today with a price that has gone down instead of up, due to cheaper processes of producing the ingots of aluminum. Industries in many fields are trying out its uses. It is even used to make heavy industrial equipment, buildings, machinery, and pipe lines.

Streamlined trains are being made of aluminum—at least 10 percent of the trains being constructed. Even freight cars may be made of aluminum, saving immense weight in hauling. The oil industry is experimenting with aluminum drilling rigs for operations from barges on the Continental Shelf. Chicago's transit system recently ordered aluminum cars for its elevated lines.

But it is in the aircraft industry that aluminum has made the greatest strides. Lightweight metals are essential for building planes—and nothing has yet been found, including magnesium, that matches the serviceability of aluminum.

POWER IS DRAW-BACK

Immense strides for industry are possible in New England—except for the almost fatal lack of generating capacity to produce cheap excess power to establish industries. Over and over again the industries that move away tell the same story—it is possible to buy cheaper power elsewhere.

New England opposition to the development of the St. Lawrence River and the development of Quaddy plus the failure to organize river-power and flood-control authorities stems chiefly from the fact that there is no assurance that the cheaper power thus produced would benefit New England.

Rural electrification in New England has made greater strides than in any other section of the country. It can be stated that rural electrification is virtually completed in New England, but cheap industrial power is not yet available in sufficient quantity to attract heavy electrical energy users.

The farms of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Oregon are 96 percent electrified, according to the figures of the electrical industry. Any future power developments must be concerned with large users of electrical energy, and not with expansion of service to domestic consumers. But the rude fact is that with cheaper electrical rates, electrification of New England homes could be carried out to the *n*th degree.

RATES BARRIER

The more power used the cheaper its cost per kilowatt-hour—except in New England. This was true of Commonwealth & Southern when it drove forward on electrification of a backward area under the spur of competition from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

There are too many communities in New England where only electric lighting is used and a minimum of appliances are owned by electric consumers. The barrier to the use of more appliances is high power rates.

In fairness, it must be considered that the power companies have immense investment in plant and transmission facilities, that they have overcome almost insurmountable obstacles to build and develop the New England power grid. The hydroelectric developments built at Government expense have thrust into areas where there was no similar installation.

If the public credit is to be used for expansion of power-generating capacity in New England, the capital outlay of the power companies must be considered. Yet the region cannot be hooked forever on the horns of this dilemma. Cheaper power produced at generating points built by Government outlay should, in New England, be transmitted over existing power grids at a predetermined charge per kilowatt-hour, which would permit both public and private power companies to remain in business at a profit.

ATOM PLANTS

The location of profitable industries today is not dictated by whim, but by the stern realities of the amount of cheap power available. No better proof of this is needed than the location of the atomic-energy plants. They were sited at their present locations only because cheap power was available in large quantities.

Steel and aluminum industries, and, indeed, a great many other industrial lines, develop, or are attracted to cheap power as iron filings whisk to a magnet. New England is a logical site for large-scale power development for industrial purposes, because, with its domestic electrification virtually completed—the needs of industry can be considered without any extraneous factors, or any diversion of power produced to other than industrial needs.

The Congress will consider various plans for public power projects, two of which, 'Quoddy and the St. Lawrence, are bound to affect New England. It is time that public opinion was shaped by realistic and factual discussion of all the aspects of the matter.

Political Medicine

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest analyses of the proposal to socialize medicine I have seen came to my attention when I received from the National Economic Council an article entitled "Political Medicine."

Realizing the importance of Members of Congress being fully advised as to the dangers of this proposal, I have requested unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein this article:

POLITICAL MEDICINE

American medicine—except for the licensing of physicians and nurses and certain restrictions on harmful drugs—has always been free from the meddling of government.

If a member of your family falls ill, you get a doctor. If hospitalization is required, you can get a free bed, if you cannot afford to pay; or you can get a private room if you can pay. The services of the best surgeons are available. If you are well-to-do, you pay a good fee for a serious operation. In most cases, if you are of moderate means, you get the same services for less. If you can't afford to pay anything, you can get them for nothing.

Many thousands of the finest men and women in the land give their services free as trustees of hospitals.

Roughly 160,000 physicians and surgeons are today taking care of the sick and injured in America and are rendering them better service than in any other country in the world.

We can remember 45 years ago, when Germany led the world in medical development, listening in Berlin to a well-informed German medical man explaining to several surprised medical colleagues that American medicine was offering great promise of improvement. Since then German medicine and surgery have gone down, and American practice has risen to its present high level.

American medicine thus gained ascendancy because American doctors have been capable, earnest, and ambitious, and have had a high sense of duty. It happened, too, because they were practicing medicine in a free country where as yet Government bureaus have been prevented from extending their tentacles over the care of the sick. Save in rare and isolated cases, government has had no part in, and can claim no credit for, its astounding development. In fact, the contrary is true: for in those countries where the medical profession has been placed under the dictation of the state, political control has been stultifying and disastrous.

Of course, American medicine and surgery have not been perfect—what human activity is? Of course, faults can here and there be found. Some neighborhoods are without enough capable practitioners or lack an adequate hospital. Some doctors are better than others. It is true, too, that those able to pay most often get the best services—though this advantage is tempered by the earnestness and high character and the desire of most doctors to minister to the sick whatever their economic status or station in life.

In all these respects, though further improvement is still to be accomplished, great advances have already been made.

America's supremacy in the field of medicine has been possible largely through two factors. Since nowhere else on earth have these factors existed in comparable measure, nowhere else on earth have the same good fruits appeared.

The first factor is the complete liberty our fathers won for us. Liberty places in human hands the power of choice—the power to excel, the will to excel. It is the mainspring of creative effort—the power that inspired a young race to conquer and people a virgin continent, to perfect communications, invent new ways of doing old tasks, and then, still unsatisfied, to dream new dreams and bring them to amazing fulfillment. Save for the dynamic energy released by the practice of liberty, little progress might have been made in the standard of life and living upon the American Continent.

The second factor is the profound impulse of Christian philanthropy. Often other peoples, usually the less successful, have condemned Americans as money getters and profiteers. Nothing could more clearly show the falsity of this charge than the lavish manner in which the fruits of American business have been poured out for humane causes. Wherever human needs have appeared, Americans have been warmhearted and generous, giving freely of the substance earned by foresight and industry. As in no other land on earth, the earnings of Americans have been given to erect hospitals, sanitaria, medical schools, and foundations for medical research. It is this profoundly Christian impulse, made possible by the economic freedom that alone implements the will to give, that has provided American medicine with the physical facilities necessary to its development.

The important fact is that the practice of medicine and the care of the sick have reached in the United States the highest level any country has ever seen. We may be sure continued effort along the same lines will bring ever greater improvement.

CLOUDS ARE GATHERING

But there is trouble on the horizon. Politicians, at the instance of Marxist schemers, have long had their eye on this whole business of the care of the sick. Great Britain has politicalized her medicine, which means simply that political bureaucrats have stepped in, and from now on will tell doctors, dentists, nurses, and patients what to do to the very last detail.

And the same political move threatens here and now in the United States. It will rise to full height during the coming session of Congress. A supreme effort is to be made to convert our magnificent system of caring for the sick into a Government-run machine of political medicine.

The fate of 160,000 doctors is at stake. But, more important still, is the stake of the 148,000,000 people to whom they minister.

If you, Mr. and Mrs. American, are willing to let Government bureaucrats tell you just how your sick and injured are to be cared for, then pay no attention to this letter. But if you are not willing, now is the time to do something about it.

It may shock many to be told that the incomparable fabric of American medicine has enemies, and that these enemies wish first to destroy it, and then replace it by something else under their own control.

Who are these enemies? They are certain groups now high in the Federal bureaucracy. And behind them, directing the fight, are sinister persons and forces of whom we shall speak presently.

What do they wish to do? They wish to destroy the freedom of American medicine by placing it under the political management and control of Government—that is, themselves. They wish to destroy the most successful medical system the world has ever seen, and substitute for it a system that has failed everywhere else.

The physicians of America, who are probably in a better position to see the disastrous consequences of political control than anyone else, are doing what they can to fight this evil thing. But they can devote little energy to it: they are out on the firing line every day in their battle against sickness and death. The whole burden of the fight to keep medicine free should not be left to them.

The National Economic Council does not enter this fight in the special interest of the medical profession. The politicians who seek to "muscle in," try to smear the medical profession by sneeringly accusing the doctors of being selfishly concerned with profits in opposing political control. That's just the old Marxist tripe. We believe there is no more unselfish profession, taken as a whole, than the medical profession, and that there is no more power-hungry, grasping type of person in the world than the political bureaucrat. Yet it is not to protect one group against the predatory spoliation of the other, that we raise our voice.

We are against political control of medicine because it will be disastrous to the American people. It will inevitably lower the standards and efficiency of medical care. It will in the long run cost every American family many hundreds of dollars more each year, for the offer of free medicine is only a sucker's come-on. It will, if adopted, destroy American freedom, not only as it relates to medicine, but as it relates to our whole life. It is the door to the police state.

In the last several sessions of Congress a bill for political control of medicine has regularly been introduced. With minor alterations it will be introduced into the forthcoming session of the Eighty-first Congress. In the last session it was called the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Powerful forces are arrayed behind it. The President will call for its adoption—he thoughtlessly promised it in the campaign, unquestionably at the instance of left-wingers at his elbow. Unless the American people rise, and rise now, to defend their liberties as they rose at Lexington and Bunker Hill, this measure will be fastened upon them.

WHAT THE SCHEME IS

Just what is proposed in this scheme to politicalize American medicine?

First of all, a National Social Insurance System would be set up. The Federal Security Agency would collect all security taxes. It would be closely integrated with the other security programs—for disability and old age. Vast sums of money would be required, both to support the horde of new officeholders necessary to run the system, and to build up reserve fund accounts in the Treasury. Perhaps for the first year or two, taxes would

be small. But that is just bait. Commissioner of Social Security Arthur J. Altmeyer, chief advocate of political medicine, who would probably administer the whole program, proposed to the Advisory Council of the Senate Finance Committee on December 4, 1947, that the pay-roll tax should be 6 percent on employees and 6 percent on employers on the first $4,800 of income.

To administer the proposed system the whole United States would have to be divided into administrative districts, each of about the population of a city police precinct. There would be many thousands of administrative offices, together with administrators, assistants, clerical help, and investigators to staff them. Before its return to the States in 1947, the United States Employment Service had over 3,000 employment offices in operation to take care of the needs of a few million unemployed.

The administration of political medicine would be infinitely more complex, for people consult doctors far more often than they change employment. And with 15 to 20 times the number of people to handle as were handled by USES at its peak, political medicine would probably require 100,000 field offices alone. It is likely that within 5 years of coming into operation, political medicine would have at least a million persons on its pay rolls.

Now the chief appeal of the advocates of political medicine is, that low-cost medical coverage will be supplied to all. But it hardly takes a wizard of finance to see that if you add a million more persons to the number who have to be paid to furnish medical coverage, the total cost to all the people will be not less but more. Some of it will be taken from pay-roll taxes, and the amounts will be more than the average family now spends in a year on medical fees. But part of the cost will be hidden in income taxes, which must inevitably be increased to pay for the mounting expenses of the ever-growing bureaucracy.

In New Zealand, where political medicine was set up less than 10 years ago, the expense today absorbs 40 percent of all revenues collected by government, and deficit financing has been resorted to in a desperate attempt to furnish the benefits promised. Forty percent of the comparable revenues of the United States would exceed $15,000,000,000 a year.

WOULD THE HIGHER COST BRING BETTER SERVICE?

But even if the cost were several times greater than the present cost of medical service to the American people, might it not be worth it if everybody got better medical care? Let's see.

In the first place, there is no magic in the mere spending of money. The Government cannot create more physicians or nurses by appropriating vast sums to bureaucrats for the control of physicians and nurses. Only medical schools and hospitals can produce such qualified practitioners, and no Federal funds can make the numbers who will graduate greater than they will be anyway.

In the second place, the history of political medicine in every country where it has ever been tried has presented one outstanding fact. Nothing is so dear to the heart of a bureaucrat as rules and regulations. There is no record in any department of any government telling of rules that have at first been long and complicated, and have then been made short and simple. It always works the other way.

The pioneer country in political medicine was Germany under Bismarck. There, the early rules were simple. Forty years later, they had become so complicated that no single mind in the land knew them all. Dr. Walter Sulzbach, a recognized authority on the subject, has said that in the 1920's "so many changes in laws on social insurance were made that the pertinent commentaries were no longer published in book form but in loose-leaf catalog form, so that any entry could quickly be replaced by another."

The story is the same everywhere. In England at first national health insurance covered only 20,000,000 people, yet within 30 years the rules and regulations required a volume of 1,300 pages to set them forth.

In the United States, less homogeneous, where there is greater variation in every way, and where 148,000,000 people would be affected, rules and regulations would pass beyond the power of any individual to understand and interpret. Physicians, dentists, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, and applicants for medical treatment would alike be overwhelmed by them. A vast policing system would have to be set up to enforce them. Such matters as the number and cost of all prescriptions issued by physicians and the prices the 80,000 pharmacists could charge the Government for every "free" prescription, would be among the many matters to be controlled. Every item of expense in every hospital would be subject to bureaucratic scrutiny. Such a system, in which physicians would have to spend hours daily writing out reports, would lead to deterioration of medical service, if not to downright disintegration.

One major respect in which political medicine would work adversely to the interest of the individual patient would be in the freedom of choice in selecting his physician.

Despite assurances that freedom of choice will be preserved, such freedom is impossible if the system is to work at all. Many advocates admit as much privately. It is generally agreed that a "capitation" system will be used in the beginning, though later it is probable that all physicians will be salaried Government employees. A capitation system means that each physician will be permitted to have so many patients sign up in advance to be treated by him, and when his quota, to be fixed by the bureaucrats, is filled, he may take on no more. He will be paid so much per person, or head, each year.

So, the only free choice the individual might have would be at the moment of signing up. If the physician were known to be a good one, his list would be quickly filled, and the patient would have to go looking for another whose quota had not yet been filled. If he still wanted to consult his favorite physician he would have to do it at his own expense (assuming the bureaucrats would permit it at all), and so pay twice—once in taxes and again in fees.

It is contemplated that, in time, all patients will have to visit the doctors in public health clinics. This is the plan followed in Great Britain. There, according to a noted actuary, Elizabeth W. Wilson, writing in the Christian Science Monitor for September 18, 1948, "Any Britisher can go to, and not—except under unusual circumstances—send for the physician of his choice. He waits possibly an hour or more in a queue for a visit which lasts, on the average, 4 to 6 minutes." Seventeen minutes has been considered the average necessary in America for diagnosis and adequate treatment.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE DEMAND FOR POLITICAL MEDICINE?

Only in Soviet Russia has political medicine been thoroughly carried out. If the United States of America adopts political medicine, as called for in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, it will have taken a long step toward state medicine as rigidly controlled as Russia's.

It is therefore no surprise to find that American Communists are working hard for political medicine. If political medicine comes, the eventual socialization of American business will be so much the easier. Conspicuous among Communist influences working for such a bill is the Morning Freiheit of New York, a Yiddish-language daily read by over 300,000 persons. Alexander Bittelman, notorious Communist now under deportation proceedings, is the moving spirit of this journal.

Louis F. Budenz, ex-Communist editor of the Daily Worker, has stated that in 1930 Manuilski, then secretary of the Communist International, told a gathering of American agents in Moscow, "In the United States * * * the Communists must launch a powerful movement for social insurance." Manuilski added that state medicine would be used to promote communism in the United States.

We have had occasion more than once to mention the ILO (International Labor Organization). The United States of America joined ILO in 1934, at the instance of Frances Perkins. And ever since that time ILO, directly and through numerous affiliates, has engaged heavily in propagandizing for social insurance, including political medicine. First fruits of its effort was the original Social Security Act. Since then it has worked for the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. Indeed, it is known that ILO publications furnished much of the material from which the bill was drafted, and there is more than a suspicion that the bill was drawn in collaboration with ILO personnel.

We pointed out in letter 200 that a pending convention of ILO, if ratified by the United States Senate, would mean the abdication by the American Government to an international body of all control over relations between American employers and employees. It is this same ILO that seems to be the author and prime mover in the present drive to fasten political medicine on the American people.

A powerful influence for the adoption of political medicine has come from within the Federal Government itself, notably from the Public Health Service and the Federal Security Agency, whose top directors have an incalculable amount of power to gain if the scheme is adopted. These persons have, in violation of the criminal statutes, been using the money of the taxpayers to influence legislation and enhance their own prestige, power, and emoluments. Conspicious among these are three officers of the Federal Security Administration: Arthur J. Altmeyer, Commissioner, Isidore S. Falk, Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics, and Wilbur J. Cohen, Falk's assistant.

Representative Harness, of Indiana, has exposed the so-called physicians forum, which has been advocating political medicine, under the chairmanship of Dr. Ernest P. Boas, of New York—identified by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as being a member of no less than eight Communist-front organizations.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

Against all the sinister forces working together for enactment of political medicine, those striving to defeat it have one chief reliance. That is in the innate good sense and love of liberty of the American people.

The American people do not have to have this scheme, fathered by communism, mothered by socialism, and wet-nursed by power-hungry bureaucracy, imposed upon them. It is not inevitable. Nothing that limits freedom is inevitable so long as enough free men and women have the courage to stand up and fight against it. The hour is late, but there is still time. There is still time if every American who reads this letter will order at least 10 copies and send them to 10 friends with a letter of his own asking them to do likewise, until all America is covered.

Let every man and woman who reads this letter and values his liberty do something about it. Let each write his Congressman and his two Senators and tell them what he thinks.

A million thoughtful letters to Members of the Eighty-first Congress can kill this evil measure.

Will you be one of the million?
Will you help to enlist others?
The time is short.

MERWIN K. HART,
President, National Economic Council, Inc.

Douglas Hartman and FTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Watertown (Wis.) Daily Times, one of the leading newspapers of my district, published under date of January 11, 1949, and headed "Douglas Hartman would be good selection for FTC."

Robert E. Freer, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, has resigned from the Commission. Chairman Freer came up through the ranks, and because he came up through the ranks he has been able to perform valuable services to our Government.

He should be replaced by someone who understands the Federal Trade Commission and who has a good workable knowledge of our Federal Government and its agencies. Mr. Freer should be replaced by a career man. A candidate for the appointment is Douglas Hartman, formerly of this city, who, with 26 years of experience behind him in Washington, would amply qualify for this important post. Hartman, an attorney, began his Washington career in the State Department, where he served as a clerk and trade-letter analyst from 1923 to 1928. For the next 5 years he was secretary to Representative George J. Schneider, and for the two years following served as secretary to Representative C. W. Henney, of Portage.

From 1935 on he has had a notable career in several different Federal agencies. He was an attorney for the Securities Exchange Commission from 1935 to 1941, and for the next 4 years was an attorney for the Federal Trade Commission. When he left this post, he became an attorney and trade conference officer for the Foreign Economic Administration. For a period after he left the FEA he was a trade conference officer and export-import specialist for the Department of Commerce. From April of 1947 until late last year, he was administrative assistant to Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine.

We have known Doug Hartman intimately during almost all of the 26 years he has been in Washington. We have had many visits with him during his annual trips to Watertown. He has always deeply impressed us as being a conscientious, capable, and honest public servant—one thoroughly interested in government service. His sincerity and earnestness are characteristics that always made a profound impression upon us. And his vast knowledge of the various phases of our Federal Government, and its activities, always made Doug Hartman a welcome visitor to our office.

We can't help but feel—and deeply so—that Doug Hartman would be an excellent selection for the Federal Trade Commission. And we feel that anyone who has followed Doug's career in Washington would feel the same way as we do. Hartman, with his long and varied career, possesses the background that a position of this importance calls for. President Truman would make no mistake in selecting this former Watertown resident to fill the vacancy.

An Iowa Judge Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter from our former colleague, Samuel B. Pettengill, reads as follows:

A JUDGE AND A MOB

This is about mob law and an Iowa judge—a real judge, of which there are many who are, unfortunately, too little known and appreciated.

A mob had taken possession of a packing plant. They resisted the police. They assaulted law-abiding workingmen and wrecked property. One man was killed. The rioting was similar to the recent wrecking of the Shakespeare factory, makers of fishing tackle, at Kalamazoo, Mich.

One of the Iowa rioters was indicted, tried, and convicted. In pronouncing sentence, Judge Shannon B. Charlton, of Waterloo, Iowa, said something to the defendant and to the community that deserves wide reading:

"Your forefathers and mine braved the perils of a wide, uncharted sea and a vast, unexplored continent that they might escape oppression. They knew first-hand that too much liberty in the hands of too few was productive of conditions akin to slavery. They knew from history that too much liberty in the hands of too many was productive of savagery or anarchy. They realized that true liberty carries with it a corresponding responsibility. Drawing upon centuries of human experience and endeavor, and mindful of the teachings of the Man from Galilee, they drafted a set of rules, a system of law, under which a new nation might operate upon the principle of a maximum of liberty with a minimum of interference with its people. To apply and to enforce such rules they established a system of courts as impersonal as it was possible to create any institution which must, of necessity, be administered by human beings.

"After a hundred and seventy-five years both the strength and the glory of that nation so conceived is the freedom of thought and action enjoyed by all its people."

These words, calmly spoken, are worthy of the American bench at its best. They are timely, today, for no week goes by without fresh evidence of labor-union gangsterism whether on the New York waterfront, or in smaller towns like Waterloo, Iowa, and Kalamazoo, Mich.

Certain judges on the United States Supreme Court could read this thoughtful utterance with profit. They, especially, for Federal judges are appointed for life, whereas a State judge elected by the people takes his official life in his hands when he upholds the law against gangsters. Federal judges have been too lenient with mob rule. They have drawn no sharp boundaries around what some of them piously call the permissible areas of industrial conflict.

America's greatest labor leader, Samuel Gompers, said no permanent good ever came from compulsion or violence. Gompers is dead.

Today, we witness the spread of private fascism, miniature Black Shirt armies using violence to attain their ends, committing mayhem, blocking streets, and telling public officials what food or milk they will permit a city to have, or what hospitals can stay open.

This movement will spread unless there are more Judge Charltons and more citizens who will see to it that those who stand for law and order are not driven from office in the next election.

A Federal judge in Oregon calls attention to mass picketing of courthouses. He says picketing of courts must stop. If such picketing is not contempt of court, nothing is.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

Character Is the Poor Man's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, regulation W is against the interest of many poor people. Character is worth as much as money. Many good people who have excellent reputations and good character in every respect cannot obtain needed automobiles and other durable goods because of regulation W.

On January 10, 1949, my home-town newspaper, the Texarkana Gazette, published by Mr. C. E. Palmer, contained an interesting editorial on longer credit on cars. It is as follows:

LONGER CREDIT ON CARS

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN says from Washington that longer credit terms should be allowed on the purchase of automobiles. He says the present 18-month payment limit is depriving millions of the chance to buy cars and carries the threat of a serious depression.

Although we doubt the threat of a serious depression, there is no doubt that the short-term credit on cars is working a hardship on many people.

Under the present 18-month payment limit, the minimum monthly payment on a new automobile runs at least $70 and most of them are from $80 to $90 a month. The ordinary salaried worker doesn't need but one look at his income and his family budget to decide that he can't possibly afford to own a new automobile.

Many salaried workers use automobiles in their work and to many other people an automobile has ceased to be a luxury but is now almost a necessity.

New automobiles are expected to become more plentiful as 1949 production shifts into high gear but that will mean little to the rank and file of the people if the credit terms are so severe they cannot purchase them.

This is not to say that long-term credit practiced generally is a good idea. In many instances, it tends to encourage unwise and thriftless people to overextend themselves. An automobile, however, and many household appliances can be considered in the realm of investment. Many people will make a monthly payment on an automobile and an electric refrigerator while at the same time they cannot or will not save the equivalent in cash money.

Prior to the establishment of Government controls, automobile dealers usually sought

an 18-month payment schedule but in some cases would extend the payments over 24 months.

It seems to us that Mr. Patman's suggestion of an extension of the 18-month limit to 24 months is a good one and should be put into effect.

After all, a dealer usually knows his prospects pretty well and should know the prospective buyer's ability to pay.

What Price Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I include an address I made at Norwich University on Navy Day, October 27 last, entitled "What Price Freedom?"

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

On Navy Day, which was selected and so designated as of October 27 because it marked the anniversary of the birth of that great friend of the Navy, former President Theodore Roosevelt, it is peculiarly appropriate that we discuss seriously some of the situations which today confront us both domestically and along the far-flung fronts which mark the boundaries but not the limits of our activities and responsibilities.

"If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom; and if it is comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that, too." It behooves us to think seriously on those words of W. Somerset Maugham.

In his work, Education in a Divided World, James Bryant Conant said:

"The stream of history is fed by many rivulets and springs; until the river disappears, each source can claim its share of credit for the mounting power. But it has been given to some people at certain times, as it were, to open a mighty sluiceway. The waters they have liberated soon lose their identity, but the sudden swirl of the new currents has become legendary with the course of time. So it was with the Greeks more than 20 centuries ago; so it is with the democratic nations of the world today, and above all with this Republic of free men. Our unique contribution is not in abstract thought nor in art nor poetry. It is rather in a demonstration that a certain type of society long dreamed of by idealists can be closely approached in reality—a free society in which the hopes and aspirations of a large fraction of the members find enduring satisfaction through outlets once reserved for only a small minority of mankind. To bring us still closer to this reality should be the aim of educators in the United States. To assist them in this undertaking, all thoughtful citizens might well rally to the support of public education. For only by their labors can this vast instrument of democracy be made responsive to the needs of a free nation in a divided world."

Freedom is the most precious heritage of America. Free government is the target of attack over a large part of the world. Here at home are those who would barter freedom for security. We can—we must—have both.

We must protect our form of government against those who would destroy it by force, from outside or inside, and those whose purpose it is to make it the primary function of government to guarantee support and social security for everybody, instead of affording everyone an equal opportunity and maximum freedom consistent with the same freedom for all others. Both groups and all other groups similarly minded are political termites which, unless eradicated or controlled, will topple the temple of freedom, justice, and equality for all, which is democracy as our founders established it.

Senator Ball, of Minnesota, hit the nail squarely on the head when he spoke at Minneapolis almost a year ago, and then said:

"The promises of those who told us that we must relinquish some freedom in return for security have been proven false again and again. But heedless of this plain lesson of history, millions of Americans seem to have forgotten that freedom and security are inseparable, that they must grow hand in hand. They listen to the siren promises of all the little political groups seeking power, who pay lip service to freedom, while at the same time advocating a whole series of measures, like socialized medicine, price control, planned production, and government subsidies, which are sure in the end to liquidate freedom."

There can be no question as to the correctness of his statement. We have seen it proven.

All these minority groups stem from that same philosophy under which and by reason of which we find ourselves where we are today exemplifying the fallacy of such a philosophy of government. Those who subscribe to such programs and doctrines, economic and political, want the Government to do everything for everybody; to guarantee jobs for all regardless of individual effort; to fix wages and prices; to decide what and how much of everything we should produce; and to provide food, shelter, and clothing for all regardless of individual effort, at the high standards the rest of us achieve only by sweat and toil.

TOO MANY PEOPLE SOCIALISTIC-MINDED

Any system of government that offers the same rewards to the man who loafs as to the man who works is going to kill the greatest force that has made the United States the country the whole world envies.

They want to change our social security system from its sound function of providing a minimum floor under living standards, which we are productive enough to afford, into a guaranty of high living standards for everyone, regardless of effort.

I am opposed to all attempts of those people who talk about what the Government should do. They undertake to regiment the people. They set up bureau after bureau, commission after commission. The agents of these bureaus tumble all over themselves as they duplicate effort and spread themselves all over the country at the taxpayer's expense.

There are already too many people in this country so socialistic-minded as to be glad to live in this country so long as they can live off it, that is off those who pay taxes. All revenue is derived from work. It is your money which is scattered in subsidies and grants too often to those who do not need them. We are the most wasteful Nation which ever existed under the sun. It is time to stop because there is bound to be that day of reckoning to which Communists and Socialists look forward with pleasant anticipation unless we put our house in order, and soon.

It is socialism—pure, simple, and undefiled—whether recognized as such or not. I am opposed to its continuation. Such planning and such philosophy does not fit the America we know and hope to protect against such efforts to socialize and to destroy thereby this country of ours. What the people should have is what they can get for themselves, plus such aid from others as their needs may demand from childhood to old age. That is a burden and a responsibility which rests on those who can do. Nobody is or should be entitled to live off his neighbor. Work is the genius of all accomplishment. We need no more planned economies and no more gratuities or subsidies. Who pays for them? You do. Why should you? Not unless there is a real reason.

We have 300,000 more Federal employees today than are necessary or can be used advantageously for the interest of all. These people who have been living off the Government—that is off you—should be set to work digging a Nicaragua Canal or doing something else where they can be useful instead of ornamental.

The program they have followed and would still follow offers dangerous ground on which to tread or on which to take the first step. I subscribe to the doctrine and political philosophy found in the life and policies and declarations of Calvin Coolidge. Do you recall what he said?

"The America which Washington founded does not mean we shall have everything done for us but that we shall have every opportunity to do everything for ourselves. Sovereignty, it is our belief, is vested in the individual, and we are going to protect the right of the individual."

And to the farmers he said: "No complicated scheme of relief, no plan for Government fixing of prices, no resort to the Public Treasury will be of any permanent value in establishing agriculture." He spoke, when he did talk, always with authority; he knew whereof he spoke. He was for economy and more of it, and for freedom and free enterprise; against socialism, fascism, and communism.

It is true that the greatest hoax of this century is the theory that socialism, straight or modified, is the alternative which will save us from communism. What these naive theorists overlook is that political dictatorship, whether Fascist or Communist, is simply the political counterpart of a socialistic economic system. One concentrates absolute power in the state, the other, absolute political power. That is the way it worked in Italy, Germany, and Russia. That is the way, unfortunately, it is working today in England.

ENTERPRISE AND INITIATIVE BRING HIGH PRODUCTION

We have a lot of people in this country who are Socialists but do not know it, nor do they realize the peril involved in their loose economic theories—always ready to pay out your money to help somebody who does not help himself.

The United States has achieved the greatest production and the highest standard of living of any people in the world because more than any other nation we have freed the individual initiative and enterprise of all the people. All the rest of the world, which has been experimenting for several decades with various socialistic and planned-economy schemes, is now looking to America with its free system to help feed and clothe their people.

It is supreme irony that, despite these facts, we have a substantial political group in this country urging us to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs by traveling down the same socialistic path to stagnation, privation, and dictation. That is the great challenge to freedom today.

Do you realize what and how much we have done for our friends in war and peace, despite the fact that the United States is caricatured as a "money grabber" and "imperialist"? Bernard Baruch of the War Mobilization Committee tells you that with 14,000,000 men and women mobilized we produced 60 percent of all allied munitions. We contributed $50,000,000,000 to our allies. The 5,800,000,000 barrels of oil pumped from

American earth for the conduct of the war would keep all the automobiles in the country running for 12 years.

For what went abroad we were paid virtually nothing, the bulk going to American forces or as gifts to allies. For what we imported we paid dollars. Our public debt jumped five times. In 1939 taxes took one of 13 dollars of our national income; today they exact one of every four dollars Americans earn. Still the American people have continued their giving into the war's aftermath with additional loans and gifts, so far, of $21,000,000,000 in UNRRA grants, the British loan, surplus-property credits, and ERP. To Europe alone, last year, individual Americans sent more than 23,000,000 parcels through the mails and CARE, plus an estimated $120,000,000 in remittances to relatives and friends, and another two hundred and fifty million of relief through private organizations.

One could search vainly mankind's whole history for comparable generosity. Yet, to some critics abroad and apologists at home, this is the record of a nation scheming to "exploit" and "enslave" the world.

Of our lend-lease aid, about a fourth—$11,000,000,000—went to the Soviet Union. Since the Soviet Government has chosen to dismiss this assistance as "incidental," these facts might be brought forth:

Our aid was concentrated upon filling Russia's most critical needs, such as night-fighter airplanes which the Soviets could not produce, and aviation gasoline, in which Russian output was woefully deficient. The 1981 locomotives and 3,786,000 tires we shipped the U. S. S. R. were more locomotives and tires than the Soviets had produced in any full prewar year. Soviet truck production before the war ran around 200,000 units a year; we sent 375,000. Nor should it be forgotten that we stimulated Russia's own productivity through nearly $500,000,0000 worth of American machine tools and another $2,500,000,000 of industrial materials, like armor plate, aluminum, copper, and zinc.

Without American trucks and locomotives and such items as 52,000 jeeps, 35,000 motorcycles, 415,000 telephone sets, 15,000,000 pairs of soldiers' boots, and 4,000,000 tons of food, the Red army never would have achieved the mobility which was one of its principal military advantages over the Germans.

"ONLY UNITED STATES FOUGHT GLOBAL WAR"—BARUCH

Mr. Baruch goes on to say:

"It does not lessen our appreciation of the incomparable courage and stamina of the Russian people in defense of their homeland to say they fought with one foot on home base, while our offensives had to leap two oceans. Nine days after we landed in Normandy, more than 3,000 miles from the United States, we were assaulting the Marianas, 6,000 miles from home. That we could undertake two such operations, at opposite ends of the world, at the same time, has never ceased to be a source of marvel to me. Of all the belligerents, only the United States fought a really global war.

"First, there was production. In every field we set new records. With fewer farmers, our output of food was lifted one third. Off the assembly lines of our arsenal of democracy during the five war years rolled nearly 300,000 airplanes, 319,000 pieces of field artillery, 64,500 landing craft, 52,000,000 tons of merchant shipping—three ships a day. The Navy grew from 1,900,000 tons to 13,600,000 tons, greater than all the other fleets of the world combined.

"The mainspring behind these actions is the American passion for freedom—that and the fact that war is the complete opposite of our normal ways.

"Only great dangers will cause us to accept the restraints on freedom which mobilization entails. When we go to war we do so to banish the danger which forced us to band together, so we can go back to our normally free, individualist habits. We fight not to implant ourselves on foreign shores, but to come home; not to impose our will upon others, but so we can continue governing ourselves as we wish.

"The American system hasn't produced perfection. But it has brought the people further along in their pursuit of happiness than any other system. More important than material benefits, the people still hold the power to change anything. They can revoke any law, fire any official, tax the rich, succor the poor. Under a police state, once imposed, the people lose all ability to determine their future.

"Equality before the law and change through the law are the two sides of the American coin. Americans can make no greater contribution to mankind than to demonstrate that these qualities will survive as the last best hope on earth."

UNITED NATIONS MUST HAVE FORCE

Careful and thoughtful students of history see us well on the road which 20 dead civilizations have traveled. Must history repeat itself? The struggle between the east and the west; what may be accomplished by the United Nations organization which has been described as a political machine for putting into effect the maximum possible amount of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union? (And in this connection the similarity between the United Nations organization and that set up by us after the Revolution is to be observed, in which the fear of a common enemy was the life belt which kept such a confederation afloat.)

These comparisons suggest that experience teaches that sooner or later such an organization as UN must either break up or become a genuine and effective federation; and if anybody can see how at this date any federation between us and Russia could be federated they know more than anybody who has ventured to discuss the possibility of the federation of these two states which has to be accomplished if Federal union is to save us from a third world war.

That the United Nations should be strengthened and furnished the necessary support to put into effect its decrees, by force if necessary, is a foregone conclusion.

The conflict which exists in the United Nations, now meeting in Paris, is not in its essence between Russia and the United States as such. It is a conflict between the majority of the UN members, acting in support of the Charter, and a group of governments who refuse to abide by its provisions or to recognize the overriding international obligation which the Charter constitutes.

We should deal with Soviet Russia, as with all other nations, frankly and forcefully as does become our powerful place among the nations. We should restore the respect of the Russians for us. Of course, we should deal with Russia in a spirit of fairness and friendship, but we should long since have made it perfectly plain to Joe Stalin that we do not propose to be bullied or bluffed.

Either we must find means to bring wisdom to those whose thoughts are today oriented solely to the pursuit of political greatness, in the form of world dominion, or, if we cannot do this, and if these people remain stubbornly unwise, then we must persuade them, in their own interest, to stand aside and to permit the other peoples of the world to proceed at last with this business of the development of international association for which the conditions of life in our time cry out so urgently and which have been so long delayed.

Above all other purposes we must labor by every peaceful means to build a world founded upon justice and righteousness. That kind of peace will be worth having. That is the crowning responsibility the people have laid upon us. That is the task to which we must dedicate ourselves.

Lest we forget we must remind ourselves over and over again that we were asleep when we might have entered to end a war, both in 1916 and again in 1939, had we been adequately prepared or had we appreciated the responsibilities of our greatness or the tremendous possibilities and potentialities of the dangers that threatened us. This is particularly true as to 1939 when we sought to avoid armed conflict and participation in the second war. We tried to be neutral. God hates neutrals. What has happened to us is a result of our stupidity.

What is going to happen? I think that nobody knows—but, if we are to learn anything from experience, while we speak softly yet firmly we should carry a big stick.

It is universally agreed that the economic situation, world-wide, is much worse than in 1939.

Since I wrote the foregoing I have seen a statement made by an eminent British historian, Prof. E. L. Woodward, of Oxford University, which bears repeating at length and will stand a lot of study on this side of the sea. He says:

"In the first place the economic situation is much worse than it was in 1939. The material damage done during the war is severe; the confusion resulting from the war is even greater and more difficult to repair. The maladjustment of the exchanges, in other words, the lopsided distribution of gold, sets a problem in psychology as well as in international trade; it is easier to rebuild a thousand bridges than to restore confidence in a shaky national currency.

"Thus, if the war had settled the political conflicts out of which it arose, it would still have left us with the most complicated task of economic recovery. Unfortunately the war has not even resolved this primary political conflict between totalitarianism and democracy. We do not yet know whether fascism in Germany and Italy has really been destroyed, and not merely defeated in battle. Most of the evidence from Germany is extremely disquieting. One would neither expect nor want the Germans to wallow in humiliation, but it is disturbing to find so few signs of a consciousness of collective responsibility for the suffering which the German people have brought upon the world. Obviously it would be a political mistake of the gravest kind to entrust the Germans—as a kind of short cut to European economic recovery—with the means of reconstructing the instruments of aggression which they know all too well how to employ.

"Elsewhere the ideological conflict is unresolved. Hitler is dead, Mussolini is dead, and yet over vast areas of Europe there is no more freedom than there was at the height of the German-Italian domination. In Asia, Japanese power of aggression has disappeared for years to come. There are no Japanese soldiers in China. Nevertheless in China also the area of political freedom—such as it was—is less than at the height of Japanese domination.

"The methods and materialist basis of Russian totalitarianism are unchanged. The danger still exists that this unresolved conflict between the police state and democracy will end in war. As in 1939, those who regard power as limited by justice and tempered by mercy are face to face with those whose philosophy has led them to consider power as the one real motive and mainspring of human action.

"One asks whether the democracies are more aware than in 1939 of the dangers in front of them. In most respects the answer is 'yes,' but there are still cross-currents of opinion which bewilder the average man, and especially the millions of average men whose standards of living have fallen and who see no way of regaining what they have lost unless there is some total change in the order of society. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the materialism which lends theoretical support to the Russian police state has been borrowed from western Europe, and that it had gained widespread support among sections of opinion in western Europe long before it became the new orthodoxy of the Soviet Union.

* * * * *

"On the political side the tendency toward closer international union is obvious. If Russia had not been able to block and distort the whole working of the United Nations, the movement for closer union might have developed where it was expected to develop—in the sessions of the Council and Assembly. As things are, this movement has manifested itself mainly outside the United Nations.

"It would be unwise to expect too much too quickly; nationalism is not wholly an unhealthy thing, and the complete disappearance of its historic expression in Europe would create more problems than it would solve. The significant fact is that the will toward western European cooperation exists to a much greater extent than in 1939.

"The greatest difference between 1939 and 1949, however, is that the American people are now aware of the paramount power of the United States, and that they have shown not only a high sense of responsibility over the use of their power but also a high degree of intellectual comprehension in the choice of ends and means. I speak as a European, and in case it should be thought that I am employing terms of polite flattery, let me add that I do not regard American policy as always wise and infallible.

"Nonetheless American policy, taken in the large, is deeply impressive to an Englishman. There is a certain magnificence about it, a sense of hope and idealism which, in the drab years following a cold victory, must strike hope in the hearts of other nations. Above all the full exercise of American power has regained the initiative for the democracies. The greatest political danger is that owing to domestic reasons the United States may be led even temporarily to abandon this initiative.

"It is possible that in the perspective of the humiliation of my own country in 1938, I exaggerate this danger. At all events if Americans remember that those who cherish the idea of right are living in an iron age—the fact is too obvious to be ignored on the European side of the Atlantic—the prospect in 1949, uncertain as it must be, is less sinister than it was a decade ago."

If we cannot federate, can two separate political worlds be carved out of the world situation which obtains? One under the hegemony of the United States, the other under the domination of the Soviet Union?

In the successful answer to these two questions is found the price of freedom, and the guaranty that our alleged civilization shall not be buried in the ashes of 20 others which have preceded us.

It is our solemn obligation and duty, yours and mine, to preserve here at home the sacred freedoms for which we have fought, the while we seek to procure freedom for all, by such means as the occasion and necessity may suggest and require.

We must be prepared to meet any emergency in order to fulfill our God-given destiny.

"They build too low who build beneath the stars."

Strong Efforts Being Made To Mislead and Deceive the People on the Basing-Point Question—It Is Old German Cartel System Used by Pittsburgh-Plus Method To Prevent New Industries, Destroy Competition, Fix Extortionate Profits, and Promote Monopoly—Supreme Court Decision Outlawing Such System When Wrongfully Used a God-send to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a copy of a speech delivered by Robert Elliott Freer, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, before the City Club, of Denver, Colo., December 28, 1948. I desire to invite attention to the following points brought out by Mr. Freer:

First. Mr. Freer delivered the speech 3 days before retiring from the Federal Trade Commission after 12 years of service.

Second. The Commission's decision on the basing point, which is the old Pittsburgh-plus system, does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices.

Third. The decision does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition.

Fourth. The recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

Fifth. The years of investigation and study, long public hearings, and the huge record of testimony.

Sixth. The Supreme Court of the United States sustained a decision of the Federal Trade Commission in 1948 in the Cement case.

Seventh. Soon after Cement decision, chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp. and chairman of the board of the National Steel Corp. commenced campaign to change the law.

Eighth. That "this whole controversy has been generated by the large producers in the steel and the cement industries for the openly announced purpose of persuading Congress to legalize their basing-point practices."

Ninth. An illustration of how the decision helps steel producers in Colorado.

Tenth. An illustration of how this system worked on consumers and its deadening effect upon the development of western industries consuming steel.

Eleventh. The answer to the fallacious argument that confusion has resulted in the Court's decision.

Twelfth. Preservation of the competitive system is in jeopardy if large concerns are permitted to return to the wrongful use of the basing-point system.

Discussion of basing-point question also appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A178.

THE BASING-POINT PRICING SYSTEM

(Remarks of Robert Elliott Freer, Chairman, the Federal Trade Commission, prepared for delivery before the City Club of Denver, Denver, Colo., Tuesday afternoon, December 28, 1948)

A little over a year ago I came to Denver and spoke to the Purchasing Agents' Association of Denver on the subject Markets—Managed or Free. In that talk I sought to explain some of the Commission's cases and decisions involving so-called basing-point pricing systems and other forms of price fixing by a geographical formula.

Since that time a great deal of water has flowed over the dam, and these activities of the Commission, which had very little public notice at the time I spoke, have become the center of a veritable storm of controversy in the press and in business circles. I have reread that 1947 Denver speech in the light of all the unkind things which have been said about the Federal Trade Commission since then, and would not change a word of it now.

I will be a member of the Federal Trade Commission for just three more days now, after which I will resume the private practice of law, a decision which was forced upon me by some 13 years of trying to live in Washington on a salary which was fixed at a not too munificent level back in 1914. Since this is my swan song as a member of the Commission, I want to speak as frankly and forthrightly on this question as I can, free from the fear that anything I say will be thrown back at me either in a congressional hearing or in the brief of some party before the Commission in a later case.

There is a great and burning question which has been posed to the small-business man and the general public in recent months and it is that sort of a question which supplies its own answer. The entire business community appears to have been blanketed by questionnaires from congressional committees and various trade organizations, either stating or implying that the Supreme Court and the Federal Trade Commission have now declared freight absorption to be illegal and have required that every businessman sell uniformly at f. o. b. prices and refrain from competitively meeting lower prices in distant areas. On the basis of this startling pronouncement businessmen are asked what the effect of this decision will be upon them; will competition be stimulated or will business be affected adversely?

During all of the time that this uproar has been going on officials of the Federal Trade Commission have been stating that the law does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, that the law does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition, and that the recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

I would like to tell you how this whole controversy started and explain some of the factors which may be behind the attempts to confuse the business community about the state of the law.

In 1937 the Federal Trade Commission, after several years of investigation and study, issued a complaint charging the entire portland cement industry with having engaged in a combination to fix prices and restrain competition. Public hearings were conducted for more than 3 years, the record consisting of some 50,000 pages of transcript of sworn testimony and about an equal number of pages of documentary evidence. The largest bulk of this record is that which was offered by the cement companies by way of defense to the charge of price fixing and discrimination. After an exhaustive study of

the record the Commission made detailed findings of fact, consisting of nearly 200 printed pages. The various overt acts so found to have been done by the industry clearly indicated that there existed a combination to fix prices, effectuated principally through cooperative employment of the basing-point system. Based upon these findings, the Commission entered an order requiring the industry to cease doing certain things pursuant to "any planned common course of action, understanding, agreement, combination, or conspiracy."

This case was litigated fully before the Commission, the circuit court of appeals, and finally before the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the spring of 1948 the Supreme Court handed down a decision affirming the Commission's order in the Cement case, the opinion agreeing wholeheartedly with the Commission's conclusion that the basing-point method had been employed in the industry pursuant to a combination and conspiracy and for the purpose of fixing prices. The same arguments were made to the Supreme Court that are now being made to the Capehart committee—that the Commission's order had the effect of preventing any freight absorption in individual situations and would require uniform f. o. b. mill selling. The opinion of the Supreme Court specifically pointed out that this was not the case and that the Commission's order only forbade acts done pursuant to the conspiracy and combination.

Shortly after the Supreme Court decision the Commission was sustained in a case against the producers of rigid steel conduit on review in the Circuit Court of Appeals. In this case it had entered an order against a well-defined conspiracy and combination to fix prices through the basing-point system, and the Commission's order forbade the future use of that basing-point system by each of the companies for the purpose of matching delivered prices and suppressing competition.

There is now pending before the Commission a similar proceeding involving the entire iron and steel industry on charges of a combination and conspiracy to fix and maintain prices through a basing-point system and other practices, and testimony therein still remains to be taken before a trial examiner.

Frankly, it was no surprise to me that the Commission's success in the Cement case in the Supreme Court generated so much heat in the business community. I was certain that success in this case would result in organized pressure on the public and on Congress for an amendment to the antitrust laws which would permit the practices of the cement industry. After the Cement decision, Mr. Irving S. Olds, the chairman of the board of United States Steel Corp., was quoted in the New York Journal of Commerce as announcing a drive for legislation to legalize basing point methods of pricing, and Mr. Benjamin Fairless, the president of United States Steel, announced on the same day not only that the steel company was abandoning the basing-point system, but also that one of the considerations motivating the abandonment was the plan to get immediate congressional action to legalize basing points.

The type of pressure that was immediately applied is typified by a letter which Mr. E. T. Weir, chairman of the board of National Steel Corp., dispatched to that company's customers at a time when steel was in extremely short supply and customers were fighting for favors. Mr. Weir's letter contained the following description of the basing-point system:

"The basing-point system permitted the buyer to secure required materials from any steel-producing plant at delivered prices competitive with the prices of the steel producer closest to the buyer's plant. This was possible, of course, because distant steel producers absorbed the excess in the cost of freight from their plants to the buyer's plant over the cost of freight from the plant of the closest steel producer.

"The Court decided that this could no longer be done. Instead, one f. o. b. price must now be established for each product at each point of production which each and every buyer must pay. The actual cost to the buyer, therefore, must be this price plus freight from the point of production to the buyer's plant, because, under the decision, there can be no systematic freight absorption on the part of the steel producer."

Of the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case, Mr. Weir stated:

"Now, with one stroke, the Supreme Court has wiped out these systems at the behest of bureaucrats and on a basis of theory which has never been proved by practical experience anywhere or at any time. In doing this, the Supreme Court has usurped legislative functions to establish a rule which Congress, the proper agency, explicitly refused to enact time and again, although strongly urged to do so by the bureaucrats of the Federal Trade Commission."

Mr. Weir then proceeded to give his solution for the problem in the following language:

"Congressmen, therefore, should be contacted promptly. All trade associations should be aroused to the seriousness of this situation and the necessity for constructive action. The public should be shown that this is not a mere legal action with limited effect of a technical nature, but a matter of vital importance to everyone.

"Your help is not only important; it is essential. You can communicate with your Congressmen and Senators to give them specific information regarding the effect of this Supreme Court decision on your business and, therefore, on your employees and community. You can keep in continuous touch with them at each step as this matter progresses to final legislative action. You can communicate with your trade associations to urge that they make legislative contact and public information on this subject a first order of business. You can talk with the editors of your community newspapers and give them information which will be the basis for editorials and articles which will educate the public as to the vital importance of this situation and the necessity for its correction."

The above instances, multiplied many times, have led me to the conclusion that a great deal of the so-called confusion about the state of the law has been deliberately created by parties who have been using the basing-point system as a price-fixing device, in the hope that some amendment can be written into the law which will legalize the basing-point system.

The industries from which the initial clamor has come are those which do not want competition and whose leaders have in the past expressed their idea that price competition is a ruinous process which must be systematically restrained and prevented. This type of thinking is completely foreign to the fundamental policy of the law of the land, and it is not at all surprising to see these persons in the front ranks of those who cry that the law is confused.

As an example of the confusion that exists on this subject, I have here the front page of the New York Journal of Commerce for December 8, 1948. Side by side on that front page there are two stories. One of them has a headline "FTC chief confusing issue, business says, in demand for clearer pricing rules." This story refers to a speech which I made in New York the day before and contains the following statement:

"Businessmen said in reply that they are not trying to obtain legalization of the basing-point system, as charged by Mr. Freer."

Exactly one-half inch away, in the next column, is the following statement:

"Two railroad-management officials and one labor leader urged the Senate Interstate Commerce Subcommittee investigating Federal Trade Commission pricing policies to preserve the use of free pricing systems in determining the cost of consumer goods by legalizing specifically the basing-point method in the coming session."

The real question in this controversy is not whether uniform f. o. b. mill selling is desirable; it is not whether freight equalization should be permitted; it is not whether one particular area has been benefited by the basing-point system or whether another has been hurt by it. The real question is whether the Federal Trade Commission and the courts are to remain free to examine the facts in each individual case and, on the basis of a public record of evidence taken and considered according to law, ascertain whether particular pricing systems have been used as cooperative price-fixing devices or whether discriminatory prices under the Clayton Act have had the effect of injuring or suppressing competition. Thus, while Senator CAPEHART and Mr. Simon, the general counsel of his committee, have repeatedly stated that they are against conspiracy to restrain trade and that they have no sympathy for the steel and cement industries and the basing-point practices that have been employed by them, the fact remains that this whole controversy has been generated by the large producers in the steel and the cement industries for the openly announced purpose of persuading Congress to legalize their basing-point practices.

The advisory council of the Capehart committee numbers among its members officials of nearly a dozen large corporations which are or have been party to price-fixing cases involving geographic price-fixing systems before the Commission, and the general counsel of the committee was, until the time of his employment by the committee, representing clients in price-fixing cases before the Commission.

I am giving you these facts, not to indicate any lack of good faith on the part of the members of the Capehart committee or of its staff or the witnesses who have appeared before it, but only to show that in some quarters at least there is more than meets the eye in the present cry of confusion.

As I mentioned, the question of whether the basing-point system penalizes or benefits any particular section of the country is really not a part of the controversy, but since so many statements have been made to the effect that elimination of the basing-point system would penalize the intermountain territory, I wish to point out some of the means by which, in my opinion, the basing-point system has held back the industrial development of the West.

The best illustration can be found in the basing-point system of the iron and steel industry. At Pueblo the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. maintains a plant with a present ingot capacity of more than 1,200,000 tons. During the late thirties, a study was made by the Temporary National Economic Committee of the operations of this company in relation to the industry, and the figures I shall cite are those to be found in its proceedings. The Temporary National Economic Committee, I might explain, was a nonpartisan agency consisting of representatives of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and of various Government departments which studied the whole question of pricing practices as they relate to our economic system just prior to the war. Among the committee's members whom I might mention were such leading

westerners as Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and such conservative Republicans as Representative Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, subsequently chairman of the Republican National Committee. This National Economic Committee recommended unanimously that the basing-point system be made illegal, per se. Such a law would go far beyond anything the Federal Trade Commission has ever required by any decision or order.

In 1938, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., which had been through the "wringer" just a few years before, had an ingot capacity of 888,000 tons and was operating at only 38 percent of this capacity. Its prices in the Western States were calculated on the base prices of the eastern producers at such points as Chicago, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Cleveland, with the addition of full rail freight to destination. The effect of this situation was that, although Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. was operating at only 38 percent of capacity, nearly half the steel sold in Colorado in 1938 originated with eastern producers who could realize fully as much for steel sold in Colorado as for steel sold in the eastern producing centers. While it was required to share the Colorado and inter-mountain market with eastern producers, Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp. found itself shut off from eastern markets since delivered prices went down sharply, with freight rates from Pittsburgh or Chicago, and in order to do business to the East, the company was required to quote a lower delivered price, and, on top of that, to further reduce its mill realization by the full amount of eastbound freight.

The net effect was to build a one-way westbound conveyor belt permitting eastern mills to penetrate freely and to share profitably the intermountain territory market, while preventing western producers from seeking business to the East without sacrifice of profit. Not the least of the effect was to require every Colorado consumer of steel to pay a large amount of so-called phantom freight, or freight charges included in the price over and above the actual freight charges involved in shipment.

As an illustration of how this system worked on consumers and its deadening effect upon the development of western industries consuming steel, I would like to cite to you the recent testimony before the Capehart committee of Miss Ann Olson, secretary-treasurer of Wire Specialties & Manufacturing Corp. of Denver, producers of wire coat hangers. Miss Olson traveled all the way from Denver to Washington to tell the Capehart committee of the effect of this so-called phantom freight on her company's competition with eastern competitors. She presented figures to show that her raw material and transportation cost in Denver, although using steel originating in Pueblo, was more than 25 percent greater than that of her Chicago competitors, while at the same time these Chicago competitors could lay down their finished products in Denver at raw material and transportation costs only 1 percent greater than hers. She stated:

"Denver cannot even ship to nearby towns in Colorado and be competitive with Chicago, even though the raw materials and finished products were shipped some 2,000 miles less distance."

She also stated that:

"If the old basing-point system with its 'ghost' freight is reinstated, we again will be handicapped or we will be forced to move into the large industrial centers where we can buy our raw products, now produced in Colorado, at the same prices our competitors pay."

Yet in the face of such testimony, it is proposed right here in Denver to support the drive for restoration of the basing-point pricing system—or its equivalent—in industries where it has been condemned as a monopolistic price-fixing device.

To share in or dictate the management policies of industry is not the function of the Federal Trade Commission, nor that of any other Government agency, under our present system of free competitive enterprise. Whatever I might think personally of the wisdom of any western steel company going along with the pricing methods of its eastern brethren, the law requires only that its methods of pricing shall not be the product of conspiracy with other producers and, furthermore, that the company shall not make unjustified discriminations in price which have the effect of suppressing competition in any line of commerce. In other words, the law sets down certain basic standards of fair play. And subject only to these basic standards, it is entirely up to the steel producers, or the cement producers, or any other producers, to determine how they shall make their prices and conduct their business.

The Capehart inquiry appears to have started off on the premise that the Commission's order in the Cement case would revolutionize American industry, and reasoning from there, along the line taken by some steel and cement producers, it would seem that its conclusion would be that it would wreck our economy. As more and more details of the nature of the price-fixing conspiracies which the Commission found to exist in the Cement and Rigid Steel Conduit cases have come to be understood, however, this premise largely appears to have been abandoned, and now no one seems to have anything good to say about the former practices in either the steel conduit or cement industries. The present premise appears to be that the law is so confused that the small-business men in other industries do not know whether, or to what extent, they can absorb freight or meet competition.

This question of confusion is nothing new. As early as 1912 there was a great wave of protest from many businessmen for amendment of the Sherman Act to make it certain just what a businessman could or could not do. The plea for certainty has been renewed periodically.

In no branch of American law is there an absolutely certain, hard and fast line that can be drawn which will inevitably separate violation of the law from full compliance with the law. In order to accomplish any such certainty, it would be necessary to sit down and draft a code of business law consisting of several volumes covering every situation or combination of circumstances which has been decided by the courts to be violative of the Federal Trade Commission, Clayton, or Sherman Acts in the past 50 years. In addition, it would be necessary to anticipate and specifically prohibit future practices use of which appeared likely to restrict and restrain competition and tend to make our machine of free enterprise break down. And when we got done, it still would not be simple. In fact, it would be, I fear, a great deal more complicated than the present situation.

While I am in complete sympathy with any honest effort to make the law clear and understandable to those who must be subject to it, we must recognize that certainty in complex legal matters is impossible to attain.

Mr. Justice Douglas of the Supreme Court recently made the following statement in a case wholly unrelated to this field:

"* * * But there are few areas of the law in black and white. The greys are dominant and even among them the shades are innumerable. For the eternal problem of the law is one of making accommodations between conflicting interests. This is why most legal problems end as questions of degree." (*Estin* v. *Estin*, decided June 7, 1948, 68 S. Ct. 1213, 1216.)

In an article in Fortune magazine for October 1948, there is a statement by Fowler Hamilton on this question of certainty:

"True, if he cannot have freedom, the businessman generally will settle for certainty. But the lawyer must frequently frustrate even this desire. The ifs and buts of legal opinion are inevitable results of the lawyer's awareness of the uncertainty of the law and of the even greater uncertainty of the future facts and forces upon which the legality of action may finally turn. Mr. Justice Brandeis, during his days of private practice, said to clients who insisted upon an unqualified opinion as to the legality of a proposed business program: 'I can tell you where the edge of the cliff is, but I cannot tell you how hard or in what direction the wind will be blowing when you pass by it.' "

This leads me to what I consider to be the crux of this whole problem—the extent to which the Government should interfere with the rights of the individual engaged in business. The Federal Trade Commission is not equipped to run the cement industry or the steel conduit industry—nor, for that matter, is any tight little group of men in or out of the Government. The basic principle of our system is freedom of enterprise, with the principal regulatory forces being those of the free market and real competition. It is regulation by forces other than those of competition in the free market which the Commission has proceeded against in some of our basic industries.

It is not enough, then, for us to say "keep the Government out of business." If we are to be successful in keeping the Government out of business, we must keep business free from monopolistic controls imposed by businessmen themselves. Monopolistic controls by private business have the sure and necessary effect of inviting Government regulation of all phases of business activity. If a little group of men is permitted to run the steel conduit industry or the cement industry pursuant to understanding and agreement among themselves and without regard to the forces of free competition in the market, then inevitably Government must control the action of the monopolists. When that day comes, our system of free enterprise will have disappeared and we will have embarked upon the same course of paternalistic Government controls that have marked such states as Germany, Russia, Italy, and Japan.

It is the principal characteristic of the American system that a man can still open up a retail store, a factory, or almost any other kind of business on his own responsibility and take his chances in the market. It is obvious that an integral part of this right is also the real risk of failure and bankruptcy through mismanagement, insufficient capital, or for any one of a hundred different reasons, so that if we are to have benefits of competition, we must endure also its temporary discomforts.

I feel very strongly that this problem of preserving our competitive system is the foremost domestic problem today and that the public must soon decide whether we honestly intend to try to obey the rules of the economic road we so far have traveled or whether we are willing to recognize that the alternative route is one of all-out Government regulation. Unfortunately, there seems to be no middle road in this situation. If we continue to give lip service to the competitive system and provide only token enforcement agencies under the antitrust laws; if we continue to cry against monopolies and at the same time refuse to provide the means of curbing them, we will continue to coast down hill without conscious resolution into a valley from which we must be towed because the spark of competition neither exists nor can be restored to its proper function in our economic motive power. When that point is reached we will have no choice but to acquiesce in a system of permanent peacetime Government control which will shift the responsibility of management to the Government.

I am not concerned at all about the possibility of any such system of Government control resulting if it were left as a matter of free choice to the American public today. My concern is that if there continues much longer the present trend of concentration of power in fewer and fewer hands and the present trend of sniping at the antitrust laws and seeking by every means to avoid competition, the power of choice between all-out Government regulation and a free competitive system will have been removed. Thus, we will have actually made a choice of all-out Government control of business through our very lack of appreciation of the problem and our consequent failure to do anything about it.

Preservation of the competitive system is the basic philosophy which has moved the Federal Trade Commission. The Commission is not an agency which is seeking power or control over industrial decision and discretion. It has been motivated by the principle that the coming of the day of Government regulation can be postponed or forestalled by prevention of those practices which operate to destroy the competitive system by depriving the individual businessman of his freedom.

In conclusion, let me express my opinion that the price of economic freedom, like that of political liberty, is eternal vigilance.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the arrest and imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government is causing a great deal of resentment toward that government by the people of my home State of Rhode Island.

I, therefore, submit as part of my remarks the following telegram which I have received from the Monsignor Peter E. Blessing Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in the city of Providence, R. I.:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *January 4, 1949.*
Hon. AIME FORAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is a resolution believed self-explanatory:

"Whereas the Christian world is angered and saddened by the flagrant disregard of the dignity of the human personality in the arrest and imprisonment of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Monsignor Peter E. Blessing Division of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in Providence, R. I., protests this latest outrage of Hungarian communism and asks that our Representatives in Congress direct the appropriate authorities to take immediate steps to register this country's formal protest and to exert the influence of the United States through its representatives in the United Nations to probe the charges leveled against this stalwart proponent of Christian ideals in Hungary and to secure his release if they are found false; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional Representatives of Rhode Island and to the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"Unanimously adopted by Msgr. Peter E. Blessing Division in meeting duly assembled this 3d day of January 1949."

JAMES F. SHIEL.
EUGENE F. COCHRAN.
PETER C. MORAN.

Geology in War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Carey Croneis, president, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., has rendered a real service to his country by calling attention to the importance of a study by our country of its petroleum resources. An excellent editorial appeared in the Beloit Daily News of January 10, 1949, and I am including it as part of my remarks:

An idea, like a seed, can germinate, grow, and then flower.

Almost 7 years ago now Dr. Carey Croneis, president of Beloit College, spoke before the American Association of Petroleum Geologists on Geology in War and Peace at its convention in Denver. That was in April of 1942, only a few months after the fateful day of December 7, 1941. He proposed that the various geological societies coordinate their knowledge and efforts in a central agency.

Dr. Croneis continued to stress this theme in addresses before other geological groups on the subject Geological Warfare. So much interest was created that all national and local scientific societies that had geology as a major interest were invited to send a representative to Fort Worth, Tex., for a meeting in April of 1943.

The Oil and Gas Journal, an authoritative and leading publication in the field of the petroleum industry, says:

"From that point on, considerable hard work has gone on in committees and with various proposals thrashed out among officers of 11 different professional societies. Six and a half years from the original suggestion of Croneis, all 11 of the national societies originally considered eligible have joined the new institute.

"The new institute makes the third such federated organization in which all societies of one science are joined. The Union of Biological Societies was founded nearly 29 years ago, and the American Institute of Physics is now in its eighteenth year.

"What will the new Geological Institute do? The original program listed nine possible objectives. Frankly, it seems likely that the first objectives will have to be tied into the preparedness program in the cold war against communism. Cold war calls for preliminary organizing in case shooting war should come. Modern war is total war. Total war means total organization and mobilization of scientific resources as well as manpower and material. That is what the authorities on total war tell us.

"One of the original tentative objectives was phrased this way: 'To serve as a single, unifying, and authoritative source for all branches of geologic sciences in relation with government, in military circles, and to the general public.' That sentence was written in 1944, but it sounds quite timely in 1948."

"The results will mean much in peace, even more should war arrive," Dr. Croneis, one of the Nation's leading geologists, says of the Geological Institute, which will have its headquarters in Washington and which will be able to provide interested departments of Government data on natural resources in this country as well as in many other countries of the world.

Thus an idea fathered in wartime will certainly be beneficial in peacetime and will be of incalculable value should this country be called upon to defend itself again in war.

The United States and Panama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Panama Star and Herald on December 13, 1948. The editorial is in English, translated from the original editorial, in Spanish, which was carried in La Estrella de Panama—The Star of Panama—on December 10. The Star and Herald is the English edition, and La Estrella de Panama, the Spanish, of the very influential daily published in Panama City, and now nearing its centenary mark. Through the years this newspaper has been the stout and effective advocate of good relations between the United States and Panama; and its present editorial, apropos of the tension recently arising between the two countries over the question of air bases to protect the Panama Canal, is written in a wise and helpful spirit, and should do much good. I believe it deserves a wide circulation in the United States, and to this end it is now inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[Translated from La Estrella de Panama of December 10]

OUR RELATIONS WITH THE CANAL ZONE

As a result of the negotiations which for some time were conducted between Washington and ourselves to reach an agreement on a convention for the lease of defense base sites in the national territory; and, more concretely, when our country rejected the formula proposed, a sector of the citizenry devoted itself fully to the task of hurling against North America the most violent accusations and of fomenting amongst us a sentiment of hostility toward the United States and this, naturally, had to produce regrettable results.

With an absurd concept of what should be the dignity and sovereignty of a country—because in order to defend a point of view or a position, it is not necessary to resort to insults or libel—some elements expressed their aversion to North America and the North Americans in such rude manner that many residents of the Canal Zone decided to abstain from visiting the interior and to come as seldom as possible into our terminal cities to so avoid the repetition of incidents which should never have occurred.

That campaign of hate and aversion toward the United States—continued tenaciously by those who still dare to brand that country

as imperialist, though they have no censure for Russia and preserve a malicious silence in the face of the crimes against humanity which Russia is committing to advance the insatiable ambitions of the Soviet—produced as a result of the prudent abstention decided on by the North Americans, the effects which we all can now perceive in our economy; because the Zonian has been for many years the main support and the principal client of a series of local businesses the fate of which, at present, is being reflected in the state of the national treasury.

Without any other protest than that of a few who, like ourselves, expressed inconformity with the anti-American campaign and were accused of disloyalty to our country; without any energetic public reaction from all those who were sincerely convinced of how unjust and prejudicial was that attitude of hostility to the United States, there was formed on the Canal Zone and in certain circles of North America the erroneous belief that the sentiments of aversion toward the Americans was generally shared in our Republic and, therefore, the logical attitude of the Zonian was that which we are now strenuously trying to rectify.

At present it seems that no one now dares to follow the erroneous course of vociferations and insults. The conviction that this attitude was unjustified and damaging seems now to be general and everywhere we see clear demonstrations of a sincere and fervent desire that Panamanian and North American shall once again live, as in the past, on a plane of harmony and mutual friendly understanding because destiny has united our countries in an indissoluble manner through the Canal. Nevertheless the damage has been done and rectifications are not always easy, especially as in the present case where there are many residents of the Zone who have formulated the determination to visit our cities and the interior as infrequently as possible and have organized their habitual way of life so as to eschew all that refers to our country.

When the proposed convention on defense base sites was rejected by Panama and when in view of said determination the United States proceeded to evacuate the defense bases which it had temporarily occupied, the North Americans continued to visit our terminal cities and the interior with all naturality, until they began to notice those manifestations of hostility toward their persons and toward their country to which we already have referred. Then, of course, on observing that their presence was non grata and on realizing that that which was .o ostensible, so apparent, and so manifest was really a sentiment of aversion, of hostility, of antipathy, they decided in great numbers to abstain from frequenting the Panamanian centers, with the regrettable results which now have led to the present campaign of attraction in which certain national institutions somewhat tardily are engaged.

With satisfaction must be received the news that at last we all are realizing that the United States not only is the best ally of our country, the best power on which we can most depend for the defense and protection of our vital interests, but also that the North American elements must be able to live together with the national elements on a plane of frank and fruitful friendship. However, had the errors indicated not been committed, if public opinion had reacted in the necessary manner against the minority manifestations of inflamed hostility toward the United States, when without cause or reason there was made evident in our midst the anti-American sentiments of a few groups, there would not have been lost the work of many years, and it would not be necessary now to hang our posters bearing phrases of friendship and welcome, nor to organize this or that "week" in an effort to again attract the Zonian element which hitherto had encountered in Panama a most friendly ambient.

We do not doubt that there will be a return to that cordiality so indispensable between the North Americans and us and that the plausible attitude of all those who are trying to again attract the North American to the path of friendship and concord will bring advantageous results. But it is time to reflect also as to where the real patriotism, the real devotion to Panama is to be found. Whether it lies with those who fomented misunderstanding and hostility toward a country whose characteristic is its essentially democratic organization and its impeccable international policy of respect for contractual obligations and so have caused grave damage to the general interests of the country, or if it resides among those who, like us, at all times have endeavored to maintain the bonds of friendship and mutual respect and understanding such as should exist in our inevitable relations with the United States.

Not a Large but a Steady Rate of Procurement of Aircraft, in Peacetime, Is the Key to a Stabilized Industry—An Air Industry That Is Expected To Produce 1,000 Planes One Day and a Dozen the Next Can't Stay Economically or Financially Sound—Steady Production Means Steady Jobs and Lowered Costs—That's True Whether You Make Peanut Bars or Pursuit Fighters

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an article abstracted from a brochure published by the Williamsport (Pa.) Community Trade Association, entitled "Air Power, Williamsport, and You":

Seldom do we stop to think how this old world of ours is shrinking. Not in actual size, of course, but in our ability to get around on it.

We have planes that fly faster than the speed of sound—hundreds of miles faster, the United States Air Force guardedly reports. Their rockets can now go 3,000 miles per hour—three times as fast as this globe upon which we live revolves.

Truly, we travel fast—And we travel far. One day a few weeks ago 50 United States Air Force B–29 bombers took off from their bases on the other side of the globe. Carrying pay loads of bombs, they landed within minutes of the planned target times—at cities in the United States scattered from Alabama to Minnesota and from New York to California.

Feats like these make us realize just how near—to each of us—is the modern way of waging war. No longer are tanks and battleships the prime military objective. Instead it is now the factory next door—the mill down the street—the men and the jobs and the resources that supply the military might. Cripple these, and divisions and fleets die like fruit on an uprooted vine.

Our national security demands that we have the air power in such strength as will enable us to stop such a thrust from abroad and then to strike back and destroy the enemies' ability to wage war. Air power, also, says the report of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, is the one thing "most likely to discourage an aggressor against attack upon this Nation."

Right after the war the United States Air Force shrank from 243 combat groups down to 2. Our aircraft industry, which had turned out 95,000 military planes in a single year, collapsed to an annual production of 1,300 planes.

The deliberative bodies, concerned with our survival in the air age, concluded that for peacetime security we must have an air power based on a minimum of 70 Air Force combat groups. Those bodies were the President's Air Policy Commission and the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board.

This recommended 70-group program would not enable us to win an aggressive war. It would give us hardly a third of our 1945 combat strength, only a fifth the number of the men, and less than one-sixteenth the 1944 aircraft production peak.

But it would enable us, however, to resist a major aggressor; moreover, it would provide us with the framework on which we could expand rapidly in an emergency.

Our Government, as a start toward building our strength to 70 groups, this year adopted a $3,000,000,000 measure for the procurement of aircraft.

In contrast, Russia is spending seven billion five hundred million—58 percent of its entire defense budget—on its air forces. The three billion would represent only 33 percent of our armed services' procurement budget. Note this well—even Britain—faced as it is with serious economic problems—is maintaining a more modern air force than we are.

What few people realize is that Congress hasn't authorized a 70-group air force—that it has merely provided funds for the first year of a 5-year program looking toward that objective. With those funds we have built our strength to 57 groups.

That is woefully short of the minimum air power recommended for our national security by the President's Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board—a 70-group air force, adequate National Guard and Air Reserve groups, an enlarged modernized naval air arm, and an aircraft industry producing 6,000 planes a year.

In this age of modern jet power and rocketing speeds it is a fact that today 95 percent of all Air Force planes are old, obsolete World War II types.

Why? Well, for one reason—you can't squeeze new-model aircraft out of plants like squeezing toothpaste out of a tube. It takes years to get a plane from the idea state to the production line.

The B–29, developed with top war priority, went into combat 7 years after the design was started—and that was when we really needed bombing planes.

As aviation progresses, aircraft become more and more complicated. A supersonic plane, for example, has to have refrigeration equal to 20 family-size ice boxes to keep the cockpit cool. It has to have complicated radar and electronic equipment, automatic guns and firing mechanisms, parts that must work either at 65 below or 160 above zero—machines such as these can't be rolled out like model T Ford cars.

An industry that is expected to produce a thousand planes one day and a dozen the next can't stay sound. Steady production means steady jobs and lowered costs. That's true whether you make peanut bars or pursuit fighters.

Not large, but steady, procurement of aircraft is the key to an industry capable of

sharing the research into such challenging fields as supersonic flight and atomic power, capable of producing the planes that will keep our air forces constantly modern, of holding together the core of men and equipment on which emergency expansion must be built.

The President's Commission and the Congressional Board recommended a minimum annual production vital to maintaining such an aircraft industry. That minimum is 6,000 planes. Yet this year's production will total less than half that amount.

Modern aviation's speed and reach was brought strikingly home to the public by an aerial demonstration given by the United States Air Force and the Pennsylvania Air National Guard at Williamsport, Pa., but a few weeks ago.

A huge B–36 flew up from Fort Worth, Tex., and returned—a trip of 3,200 miles. Jet planes dashed up from Washington in a scant 15 minutes at 600-mile-an-hour speeds. A flash from Bolling Field announcing the take-off of the jets from the Nation's Capital was broadcast over Williamsport's radio station WRAK. At the same time sirens and whistles at industrial plants and fire stations sounded.

School children marched from their classes to school grounds and offices and factories recessed work. Even the jail inmates were allowed to go from their cells into the courtyard. Hardly had this public alerting been completed when the jets made their first pass over the city. The B–36 and P–47's came over shortly afterward.

An estimated nine-tenths of the city's 50,000 population watched from streets, windows, and housetops.

Thousands also saw the ground exhibit set up on a roped-off downtown street. An average of 500 persons an hour visited the exhibit, which opened on Air Power Day and continued two additional days. They filed past a fuselage of a B–29 bomber, into which special windows had been cut, and they heard explanations of such modern missiles as a buzz bomb and a ROC—a radio-controlled flying weapon whose television-equipped nose enables its launcher to "see" the target as he guides the missile.

Civil leaders heard the story of air power at a luncheon December 2. Brig. Gen. Albert A. Kessler, Jr.. Director of Procurement and Industrial Planning, USAF, was the speaker. The 225 attending included members of the Kiwanis Club, the Air Reserve's local Five Hundred and Twentieth Composite Squadron, the Civil Air Patrol, the Williamsport Airport Authority, and other civic groups and individuals. They received a souvenir brochure explaining air power and Williamsport's part in it.

The program included publication of photographs, news stories, special articles, and editorials in the community's newspapers and promotional lines in local merchants' advertising. Altogether some 30 stories appeared, most of them in the final week of the campaign. Station WRAK carried spot announcements, items on daily newscasts, and mentions on a popular morning commentator's show. Special broadcasts were made of the luncheon address, a high school air power day program, the aerial demonstration, and an airport arrival interview with Brigadier General Kessler.

Tomorrow's citizens learned about air power through special programs in the schools. Thus did the Williamsport community of industries inaugurate Williamsport air power day—a city-wide program to educate civic leaders, the public, and school children to the meaning of air power.

On December 2, 1948, Williamsport, Pa., became the first community in the Nation to hold a city-wide program focusing public attention on the importance of air power to our national security. It was sponsored by the aviation committee of the Community Trade Association—the local chamber of commerce.

But why, you ask, did the aviation committee of the Williamsport Community Trade Association want to sponsor an air power day? What did Williamsport have to gain? The answer is simple. Williamsport has reason to know what a stable aircraft industry can mean. One of their factories makes power plants—engines for light planes.

When the aircraft industry shrinks, the effects are felt in Williamsport. Only half as many men work at that engine plant today as in the years before the war. A stabilized industry nationally would help provide steady jobs, a steady source of machines and technicians contributing to our air power.

But to talk about air power in terms of a single factory is a narrow viewpoint. There are a hundred other plants in Williamsport, grouped together into half a dozen or so broad classifications. What about them?

Well, look at the leather and rubber goods classification, for example.

Fighter planes need leather muzzle covers for wing cannon and cooler pads for machine guns. Bombsight cases have to have straps, and duffle bags have to have handles. Hydraulic packings, webbing, cot covers, shoe soles, grips—all are made from leather.

These items were produced in Williamsport during the war. They could be produced there again as part of the city's contribution to an Air Force adequate for security.

You wouldn't readily think of lumber and its remanufacture as a classification which would have anything to do with aircraft.

But Williamsport plants made aviation engine crates, radio-tube boxes, bunks, folding cots, and other items for the air forces. Those industrial contributions could well continue on a peacetime level.

The making of metal products is Williamsport's biggest single industry, with a current employment of 4,224.

Valves, shells, bomb fuzes, rocket grids, radar cabinets, stands, racks, carriers, generators, motors, condensers; what a list could be written of this group's wartime contributions.

The 19 plants in the classification range from large prime contractors to small subcontractors—the little shops that helped bigger factories by making such things as cables for flight control mechanisms, parts to go into machine guns, tools for radar tube sections or experimental items for jet motors.

Just as these plants could rise to meet wartime demands, so can they contribute to an air-power-secured peace.

Next to the metal-working industry in community importance comes textiles.

Williamsport's textile plants produced bomb parachutes, flare cloth, parachute tape, fragmentation cloth, neckwear, shirting, pajamas, cordages and tubulars and tapes, to mention only a few. Some of these things could be needed again in a sound air-power program. And the industry has 3,000 employees who could be called upon to do the job.

Radio tube cartons, food cartons, aircraft instrument panel lamp boxes—those are some of the things that Williamsport's paper and printing industry produced for World War II.

We can't have the minimum air strength needed for national security without similar things being produced again.

Even such classifications as chemical products or clay, glass, and stone were part of the team that won the industrial supply race against Germany and Japan.

Williamsport's mirror plant made mirrors for use in aircraft. One of its chemical plants made a coating for keeping leather articles at tropical air force bases from molding. A glass plant made radio tubes by the millions. Those products and the skills of the men who made them can be used again for keeping strong our place in the air.

The list could go on. There is hardly a plant in Williamsport that could not contribute, at least in some slight way, to a sound air-power program.

But of greatest importance is the fact that our community and our American way of life might be stricken if this Nation fails to build the air power we need. It must take the place of the buffer nations we once depended on to keep an aggressor from our shores.

We cannot start a war with our programed air power. But with it we can discourage an aggressor from attacking. Air power is peace power.

All of us have got to realize our stake in air power. We have got to want it. And we have got to see that we get it.

No one believes a next war will see us given time to build up our industrial might as we did against Germany and Japan. Nor will outlying spots like Pearl Harbor be the first target of attack.

If we are to be secure, we must add air power dominance to our accepted ideas of land and sea strength. Congress has approved the objective of a 70-group air force and provided funds for the first step toward it. Senator STYLES BRIDGES says the prime order of business of the new Congress should be actual authorization of that strength and adoption of a 5-year plane-production program.

Our peacetime security and world leadership among nations demands that minimum for a sound air commerce, a stable air industry, and a strong Air Force—put together, our air power.

Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to say that I have introduced H. R. 501, to exempt from the draft men who served in the merchant marine during the last war, and who had substantially 18 months' service, and I am calling this matter to the attention of the Members of the House, as I feel that, in all fairness and justice, these men who previously served in this hazardous branch of the service during World War II for substantially 18 months should not be called upon for further service at this time. Many of these men had ships shot from under them during their service of from 1 to 5 years, and it is my opinion that these men should not now be called upon to give further service at this time. Practically all of those with whom I have spoken tell me that, of course, if our country should go to war again that they will not wait to be called but will all volunteer to fight for their country again.

Mr. Speaker, I noted an article in the voice-of-the-people column in a local newspaper which, in my opinion, is a good argument for my bill, and I ask permission to include the same, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE

During the war everyone heard about the merchant marine and the wonderful job

they were doing for the war effort. First quite a bit was heard of practically unarmed ships being sunk with vital cargoes aboard. That ceased to be news, but men were still needed.

When the war was over they brought the boys home. Some of these ex-seamen had good enough jobs aboard ship that they could save sufficient funds to enter college for a year or two at most.

Others weren't able to finish high school, which they had left at 16 to man the ships. They didn't have a GI bill to help them. They didn't say much, just kept hoping for a better world to live in.

Today they have a new twist. It seems that the Eightieth Congress forgot them again when they passed the Draft Act. They didn't say one thing about the heroic men that sailed the ships that brought the supplies.

The Government worries about the merchant fleet. What about men to sail them in the next war, or are they going to be robot-driven ships with men that can't drown?

DON J. VERHURG.

Not as Painless as It Looks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of Wednesday, January 12, in relation to the President's budget to the Congress:

NOT AS PAINLESS AS IT LOOKS

The graphic arts can be quite an aid to budget-boosting. The Budget Bureau has used them well in picturing for the public where next year's United States Government dollar will come from and where it will go. With mounds of dollars, and then with typical ones cut in pie-like pieces, it shows how trifling is the spending that could possibly be regarded as "nonessential" and how relatively insignificant are the proposed new taxes (which, as the News has pointed out, will amount to approximately $6,500,000,000.)

Probably the most misleading of the graphic symbols, however, are the diamond ring and luxury luggage chosen to illustrate the 19-cent piece of the revenue dollar that comes from excise taxes. Actually, the total Federal take from all luggage (including handbags and wallets) will amount to but $82,000,000, out of the excise tax total of $7,800,000,000. The estimated tax on all jewelry (including the dime-store variety as well as expensive diamonds) totals $227,000,000.

Had the Budget Bureau wished to be realistic in illustrating the take from excise taxes, it would have pictured a bottle of beer and a cigarette. The tax yield from all the showy luxuries put together—jewelry, furs, cosmetics, luggage—doesn't make a drop in the bucket compared with the tax on liquor and tobacco.

Compared with the $82,000,000 on luggage, handbags, and wallets, for example, next year's budget puts the tax on liquor at $2,419,000,000, on tabacco at $1,363,000,000, on gasoline and oil at $616,000,000, on motor vehicles (new cars, parts, and tires) at $713,000,000; on local telephone service, etc., at $538,000,000; on theater and other admissions at $485,000,000; and on transportation of freight and passengers (such as commuters) at $617,000,000.

Many of these articles, to be sure, are properly taxable as luxuries. But they are things that everybody buys, whereas the Budget Bureau chose to illustrate the whole field of excise taxation with the most easily recognizable examples it could find of "rich men's luxuries." Surely it wouldn't want the public to get the impression that this $7,800,000,000 in excise taxation is all painlessly extracted from the conspicuous extravagance of the leisure class, if there be any left. Or would it?

Poor Old Farmer Has His Troubles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, my long time friend Dan T. Davis, a scholarly newspaperman and a man who thinks he is also a successful farmer, although I doubt that very much, has had his troubles with preparing his income-tax returns. He has employed his literary talents to give expression to his feelings. He is one of these fellows who can make his prose read like poetry. This is what he says:

PRESS PRATTLE

The melancholy days are come, the taxiest of the year; with dog tax due right over there, and income tax right here. Heaped in the hollows of our desk, my bank checks are a mess; I fail to find a single one that's filled with blessedness. And looking over last year's tax, dear Tom, I started so, to think how very much more I paid, than forty years ago.

The spring that bubbled 'neath the hill, has now a ram; it cost me just one hundred bucks, but now, I see, I swan, I've got to pay improvement tax, upon my hilly farm, and on that furnace that I bought to keep me nice and warm.

You ought to see the figures on the table where I set; I've filled three Copco tablets full and my work ain't finished yet. I plum forgot the price I got for those six yearling steers, you know, dear Tom, we didn't have to, back in former years.

My dog's a shemale and I hear, though she's a faithful hound, I'll have to pay three dollars else they'll put her in the pound. I'll never vote for Jake again, the auditor, you know, things ain't dear Tom, what they used to be, forty years ago.

Next time I see Tom Davis, the revenue man, you know, I'll wring his neck as sure as sin, and tell him where to go; for he's the guy that sent me all those letters which I got, to start the kitchen fire and that made the grate so hot. I didn't even look at them when I found them in the mail, I sort o' thought some feller'd like to get me by the tail, and wring some money out of me, but now I've learned indeed, not to ever fool with Uncle Sam, what he sends you better read. If the letter ain't a stamp on it, you better read it through, and hire a clever lawyer to tell you what to do.

I'm very sorry now, dear Tom, I ever sought for wealth, and nearly worked my fingers off to salt down a little pelf; for the fellers who were settin' round while I was broilin' in the sun, are still a settin' round with their hand toward Washington, and getting monthly just what you and I are sendin' in, tell you Tom, I think that that's just an aggravatin' sin. When it comes to penalizin' fellers for thrift and economy, it's high time stoppin' singin' My Country 'Tis of Thee.

I hate to kill old Queen, my hound, and lie about my tax, but that feller, late of Washington, taught us that, by Jacks, and it makes me mad to know that those in high authority, have made their millions offen' us, who've been busy as a bee.

I'd like to write you more, dear Tom, but the 15th's drawin' near, and I've got to get back to figures scattered there and here. I've added and subtracted, divided then again, but I can't see I'm any nearer the end than when I first began. I've carried back to page 1–B, then change to page 2–C and the pages look like thumbprints of one caught for robbery.

I'm longing for that happy time when I reach my sixty-five, so I'll have my double zemption, if I happen to be alive. I can thumb my nose and grin, at any deputy then, that comes a snoopin' round, tryin' to tax me again.

And when our time shall come, Tom, and we are called to go, I hope we'll reach that land like which we knew 40 years ago; when we walked to church and singin's, literaries, and spellin's gay, and bought "sen sen" for sweethearts as homeward we showed them the way. There was a heap of living' we were accustomed to you know, there's now a heap of travelin' among folks we do not know. But the friends we cherish most and the ones we love the best, are the friends we made in early years when living was a zest; when freedom was a heritage and from bondage we were free, asking nothing for ourselves except for a chance to be, free as the very air we breathed and to choose and permit to play, the way that sealed our destiny in our own untrammeled way.

The Battle of Cowpens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the Battle of Cowpens. The thriving town of Cowpens, situated in my district, is observing the day with a program designed to inspire greater interest in Revolutionary history.

The Battles of Cowpens and Kings Mountain turned the tide for the Revolutionary War. Attached hereto is an appropriate editorial from a Spartanburg, S. C., newspaper.

Too long have we delayed in establishing a suitable national park commemorating this significant battle which was fought so successfully toward winning the Revolutionary War.

THE BATTLE OF THE COWPENS

Tomorrow, January 17, is the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the Battle of Cowpens. The town of Cowpens is observing the day with a program of events designed to inspire greater interest in the Revolutionary history of this region.

Dr. D. D. Wallace, in his history of South Carolina, concludes his chapter on the Battle of Cowpens with this paragraph:

"King's Mountain called Cornwallis back from his first movement northward; Cowpens led him, in pursuing its victors, upon a course which ended 20 months later in his ruin.

"In the view of the English historian Stedman, 'the defeat of his Majesty's troops at the Cowpens formed a very principal link in the chain of circumstances which led to the independence of America.'"

It is now generally realized that King's Mountain and Cowpens represent turning points in the War of the Revolution. These came in this Piedmont country, about the base of the mountains. These hills and mountains have been termed the "Walls of Liberty."

So tomorrow the whole region should join with Cowpens in the observance of the one hundred and sixty-eighth anniversary of the surprising victory of the Americans under Gen. Daniel Morgan. In that battle the British lost, according to General Tarleton's report, 550 men. The American losses were 12 killed and 60 wounded.

The National Park surrounding the Cowpens monument the Cowpens Chapter of the Daughters of the Revolution are asking should be realized.

Indonesia—A Shocking Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a nation that has always taken great pride in doing the right thing, we must be shocked by the situation which exists in Indonesia. It is possible only because we have given to the Dutch the money and equipment to carry out a venture that the United Nations has protested against.

In the January 10 issue of Between the Lines a résumé of that situation is revealed and I am asking leave to insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks. Are we to be a party to the death of liberty and freedom in Indonesia?

DUTCH SHOWCASE

Behind the shocking news of the Dutch attack against the Indonesian Republic are some revealing and significant facts which are being suppressed. It is a showcase—exhibiting how war is made. News reports have touched lightly on the fact that the Dutch are using American-made weapons, that their bombs and planes are American made and many Dutch fliers were trained by the American Army Air Corps. But few American citizens realize that this brutal attack is also the result of manipulations in this country that are as traitorous as they are shocking. In spite of the face-washing in public on the part of our officials in Washington and the UN, hundreds of millions of people in Asia are beginning to hate America for our part in this uneven war. The loss to America's prestige and good will is incalculable.

One of the most powerful financial forces in America and in the world is the Dutch-British Shell Oil combine—with its many interlacing ties with other British and American oil corporations. Dutch and British tin cartels and the Dutch and British rubber monopolies are all closely knit together with Shell. These groups have powerful associations in Wall Street and Washington, which leads to the real mystery and betrayal of the American people in the Dutch war against the infant Indonesian Republic.

As early as 1945 and 1946 American press reports revealed that the Dutch were receiving new large shipments of American war materials—materials created and paid for by the American taxpayer for the defense of America. How did the Holland imperialists, who did little to help the American military forces rescue the Dutch colonial empire from the Japanese, get these military supplies diverted to them? That is a mystery that has never been cleared up and has been given the hush-hush every time inquiries are made. Then, long before the Marshall plan, almost before any postwar loans were being passed out, the Dutch received huge loans from our Government—loans that have become the backbone of the whole despicable scheme to restore empire plundering at the expense of the American people.

The shame-faced plea that the new Dutch attacks were necessitated by "terrorist action" must be viewed alongside the fact that George Washington was also considered a "terrorist," the Boston Tea Party was "sabotage." Terrorism there has been in Indonesia, but when "terrorism" was carried on by the Dutch against the Nazis, the Dutch were heroes.

What throws even more shame on this situation is the fact that the tiny Indonesian Republic had just been fighting Communist factions who had tried to gain control of the new government—when the Dutch struck. Who arranged this early diversion and perversion of American arms to the Dutch imperialists without the knowledge or consent of the American people; who promoted this financing of war against freedom, this treasonable betrayal of American ideals and money?

Our Government knows who these men are and where their offices are in New York. Some of our Congressmen are fuming and indignant over certain papers being passed out to Russia 10 years ago which contained so-called "secrets"—information that was known to every diplomat in the world at the time. If these Congressmen are really sincere in protecting the interest and ideals of America, why don't they do some investigating of those forces which have carried out a betrayal of the American people greatly exceeding any of the small-time Communist gum-shoeing that has been hysterically waved before the American people? But these Congressmen will do little, for it's not "good politics" to start investigations that lead to the threshold of certain stately doorways in New York.

A destruction of liberty is going on in Indonesia approaching anything the evil tyrants of Russia have ever perpetrated. The enormous propaganda weapons we have handed over to Russia as a result of this debacle are also incalculable. And the skillful manipulators of Moscow will not fail to use them to the utmost against America and American interests in the world.

This information service is dedicated to the revelation and removal of the causes of war. In these facts which are being so shamefully camouflaged in current press reports, plus the multitudinous double deals of Standard, Gulf, and other oil companies in the Near East grab, you are looking World War III square in the face.

Grain Storage Facilities

REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, during the recent campaign I discussed a great deal the corn-storage and wheat-storage problems. I have prepared a bill, which I am introducing today, to extend the amortization provisions of our wartime legislation for the construction of storage facilities for our crops. I hope it will receive favorable consideration by the Congress, because I am very, very much interested in helping our farmers meet the crop-storage emergency that will most certainly arise if we have a large or even a normal crop in 1949. In any such tax legislation we should also be fair to all who have helped to meet this need for storage facilities during the past year.

My bill will allow a farmer who buys or builds a bin or crib to deduct one-fifth the cost of it on his income-tax return each year for 5 years. For example, if his bin or crib costs him $1,000, he can deduct $200 on his income-tax return each year for 5 years.

Provisions were made during the national emergency immediately preceding World War II for amortization deduction for income-tax purposes of the cost of emergency facilities. This law authorized writing off the entire cost of certain facilities over a period of 5 years and the emergency period was limited to the period beginning January 1, 1940, and ending as of September 30, 1945. The huge crops of 1948 have given rise to a situation calling for all-out effort to encourage the construction of adequate storage facilities at the very time that costs are so excessive and taxes are so high as to retard the construction so seriously needed. This storage problem prevails all over the agricultural area of America.

Because of the all-time high production of corn, wheat, and other grains in the upper Mississippi Valley area and in the far West and the heavy cotton and tobacco production in the southern part of the United States in 1948, even a normal production in 1949 will greatly overtax farm and terminal storage facilities. In fairness to those who constructed storage facilities for the 1948 crops and in order to encourage the construction of adequate storage facilities for the 1949 crops, my bill, if enacted, will amend the Internal Revenue Code to authorize amortization deduction for farm storage facilities. It defines a "farm storage facility" as any farm corncrib, farm grain bin, terminal point warehouse, or country point warehouse acquired or completed on or after January 1, 1948, and in the case of projects started prior to that time but not yet completed on January 1, 1948, my bill provides for such amortization of the cost of construction done or acquisition made subsequent to that date. My bill provides that it shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1947.

I believe the record will show that there was a tremendous expansion of construction of elevators under the provisions of the old act, which has now expired. The storage emergency which now prevails in the agricultural sections and the prospective greater emergency arising from the harvest of the 1949 crops

creates an immediate need for the encouragement of individuals and of private industries generally to build storage facilities to prevent profligate waste of food and fiber throughout our land at the very time spoilage and destruction of these supplies may bring tragedy to our own people and to those people of other lands who are looking to us for help.

The bill I am introducing is not intended to take the place of any legislation Congress may consider for increasing the authority and funds available for the Commodity Credit Corporation in the matter of grain-storage facilities, but rather to supplement any action taken with respect to the work of CCC by encouraging private construction and ownership of greater storage facilities.

I hope the Eighty-first Congress gives my bill prompt consideration and approval.

Communist Activities in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Heston from the New York Times of January 16, 1949:

HIGH ESCAPED CZECH DEFICTS PRAGUE AS A SOVIET COLONY—FOREIGN OFFICE SECRETARY SAYS NATION'S RESOURCES ARE REBUILDING RUSSIA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—Arnost Heidrich, secretary general of the Czechoslovak Foreign Office and for 14 years legal and political adviser to the late Dr. Eduard Benes, has escaped from Prague and come to Washington with a detailed story of Communist activities and plans in eastern Europe.

M. Heidrich, a white-haired 59-year-old civil servant who is well known and trusted by the United States Government, was brought here by United States authorities and has made a full report of conditions in Czechoslovakia to the State Department.

That report has been repeated by M. Heidrich to this correspondent in a series of conversations during the past few days and his conclusions—or that part of them that can be published at this time—follow:

1. Czechoslovakia is now under the "complete domination" of Moscow. President Klement Gottwald is on the whole "a good Czech," but he is not the strongest man in the Government and he holds his post mainly because Premier Stalin likes him personally.

2. The real power in Prague is held not by the Communist cabinet that took over after the coup in February of 1948, but by the Communist Party itself, headed by Rudolf Slansky, party secretary general, and by a new personality who appeared after the coup—a German Communist sent to Prague by Moscow—"a man named Geminder." (The Czechoslovak Embassy here at first denied knowledge of such a man but later identified him as Bedrich Geminder.)

"Geminder is the real power," M. Heidrich said. "He was at one time a close collaborator of [Georgi] Dimitrov [Communist Premier of Bulgaria] and while his official job is Czechoslovak representative to the Cominform, he is actually Moscow's principal agent in Prague."

3. The activities of the Soviet-dominated Communists in Czechoslovakia and the day-to-day control exerted over Czechoslovak policy by Moscow do not suggest that the Soviet Union is at present preparing for an aggressive war on the West.

"I do not know what their preparations are inside the Soviet Union," M. Heidrich said, "but they seem to be developing Czechoslovakia primarily as a source of economic reconstruction in Russia, as a source of military supplies and as a strategic territory that must be denied to the Western powers rather than as a base for attack on the West."

4. Mr. Stalin is trying to build an eastern Ruhr in Czechoslovakia and Poland. As is known, he summoned the prime ministers of the eastern satellite states to Sochi in the Crimea last September 20. This meeting was attended by President Gottwald, his secretary, Mme. Koehler—described by M. Heidrich as a Communist of considerable power who was invited by Mr. Stalin to attend the formal proceedings of the Czechoslovak-Soviet discussions in Moscow over the Marshall plan—and Herr Geminder; Foreign Minister Ana Pauker for Rumania; Premier Dimitrov of Bulgaria; and Matyas Rakosi, Communist deputy premier of Hungary.

M. Heidrich said that the proceedings of this meeting had been carefully kept out of the Czechoslovak Foreign Office, but that orders had been given for the Communist Party organizations in the satellite countries—as distinguished from the governments—to prepare detailed plans for the economic integration of eastern Europe under the constant direction of Moscow.

For some reason not apparent to M. Heidrich, Poland evidently was not represented at the Sochi meeting, but plans were nevertheless laid to include not only Poland but eastern Germany in the Soviet economic sphere.

5. A plan of gradual economic sanctions against the Tito Government of Yugoslavia also was outlined at the Sochi meeting and has since been put into operation. The Czechoslovak Government, for example, was induced to stop all shipments of arms from the Skoda factories to Yugoslavia, and since October there has been a gradual strangulation of Marshal Tito's trade from Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, and Hungary.

Mr. Heidrich, who managed to get his wife and only child out of Czechoslovakia just before Christmas, was under constant surveillance in his home and at the Foreign Office by the Czechoslovak police, who in turn, M. Heidrich said, are now controlled at the top by agents of the Soviet secret police.

He got out, he explained, because he was convinced that service to the Prague Government was now "service to Moscow," and there was absolutely no hope, he said, in a policy of appeasement.

M. Heidrich has had some experience with foreign conquerors before. He entered the Czechoslovak foreign service in 1919. He was principal liaison officer between the Foreign Office and President Benes from 1935 to the outbreak of the war, and in that capacity served for a time as Dr. Benes' contact with the Runciman mission, which helped prepare the way for the Munich pact.

ONCE SENTENCED TO DEATH

He remained in Czechoslovakia during the war, was arrested by the Gestapo and sentenced to death, but avoided this fate through the intervention of the International Red Cross. His feeling now is that he can work for the best interests of his country by helping form a Czechoslovak liberation council in this country. A meeting to establish this council will be held here later this month.

M. Heidrich emphasized that the Soviet Government was determined to create a new form of mercantile colonialism in its relations with the states of eastern Europe. It is doing so, he felt, to bolster its own economic weakness at home and to counteract the influences of the Marshall plan.

At the present time, he reported, the Russians are getting some tanks and guns from Czechoslovakia, but are demanding shipments of these in a semifinished state so that they can finish them in secret and in accordance with their own specifications inside the Soviet Union.

It is obvious, he said, that they do not trust the Czechoslovak Army, and do not feel that they could fight a war against the west on Czechoslovak soil.

He added it was his opinion that if war did break out the Russians would not draw their lines at the western Czechoslovak frontier but build them inside the Soviet Union itself.

More than guns and tanks, however, he explained, what the Russians are seeking from Czechoslovakia is steel rails and rolling stock to help repair their battered transportation system. The same thing appears to be true elsewhere in Eastern Europe: The Russians are using every possible kind of pressure and police state tactics to gain control over the economic life of the whole Eastern European area with a view to rebuilding their own strength at the expense of others, Mr. Heidrich added.

Moreover, they are working, he emphasized, on long-range plans. The process of collectivizing the land is being pressed in an effort to create reforms that could not easily be changed. This was evidently discussed at the Sochi conference, he said, where instructions were given to press for the nationalization of retail trade and small farms.

M. Heidrich, who went to Moscow when the Czechoslovaks were summoned there for having agreed to participate in the Marshall plan, said that the Soviet thesis on this plan was extremely simple. The United States, Soviet officials explained, is getting into the most severe economic situation. The European recovery program is really nothing but a dramatic illustration of the desperate efforts capitalistic countries will adopt to avoid economic collapse. What former Secretary of State Marshall and President Truman are really doing, it was explained, is adopting a policy of imperialism to assure themselves of markets and no ally of the Soviet Union could be permitted to consider cooperation with such a plot.

SATELLITE POLITICS AVOIDED

Though every effort is being made by the Soviet Union to organize the "new mercantile colonialism" in Eastern Europe, few efforts are being made by the Moscow Government to help the satellites solve their political disputes, Mr. Heidrich said.

In both 1945 and 1946, he related, the Czechoslovak Foreign Office asked Moscow to try to arrange a settlement of the Czech-Polish dispute over Teschen, but got absolutely no cooperation.

The same, he added, was true of the Rumanian-Hungarian boundary questions and all other inter-satellite political relations: always Moscow preserved these disputes as bargaining points to obtain the economic assistance they wanted from Eastern Europe.

Turning to United States-Soviet relations, M. Heidrich said that the primary objective of Soviet policy was to get United States troops out of the Continent of Europe. He was told repeatedly by Communists, he said, that the United States was the one power that stood in the way of Communist plans

in Europe and that every effort must be made to induce the United States troops to withdraw.

For months, he asserted, the Soviet Union gradually has been preparing plans to reach a settlement in Austria under which the Western armies would pull out. If this were done, he observed (the State Department dissents on this point), the Soviet chances of communizing Austria would be good, and Russia not only would then be able to stir up agitation in Germany for withdrawal there but might be able to create a Communist Austria that could embarrass and surround Marshal Tito and open up a direct route through Communist held territory from the Soviet Union to the Italian frontier.

One of the remarkable things about Soviet officials, M. Heidrich said, is their confidence that in time they can achieve their aims not only in Europe but in the United States as well. They honestly and sincerely believe, he asserted, that they can win the minds not only of the Europeans but of the Americans as well.

"I stress it," M. Heidrich said. "They believe that if they can avoid inflaming American public opinion too much, if they can avoid a Pearl Harbor mentality from arising in the United States, they will gradually be able to prevent the American Government from winning public support here in this country."

There is resistance in Czechoslovakia the former Secretary General reported, by a plodding people who now know what they have lost—they are now working 6 days a week and getting a lower standard of living than before the coup—but that resistance is not likely, he added, to create another Tito situation in his country.

Only in Yugoslavia, he observed, was there sufficient strength at the end of the war to prevent the effective infiltration of the Moscow agents. Elsewhere—in Czechoslovakia, and even in Poland—the Communists were in control of the economic life of the country and of the means of terrorizing the population.

The resistance, however, was sullen and rested on the hope of steady opposition to Soviet policy by the United States. For Washington to abandon the firm policy, M. Heidrich said, would be a disaster.

"You would end the resistance to Soviet policy and in the end you would lose Europe," he added.

Other points made by M. Heidrich were these:

In 1946 President Benes might have been strong enough to oppose the Communist plans. He did oppose them when M. Gottwald attempted to make Zdenek Fierlinger, former Czechoslovakia Ambassador to Moscow, Foreign Minister. At that time, Dr. Benes told M. Gottwald that he would never approve the appointment.

But after two strokes, one in July and the other in September of 1947, Dr. Benes was in such poor physical condition that the least excitement unbalanced him and prevented him from making any decisions at all.

Jan Masaryk, son of Thomas G. Masaryk and former Czechoslovak Foreign Minister, committed suicide, without the slightest doubt. M. Heidrich saw him every day during the last few weeks of his life. M. Masaryk talked constantly, first of escaping to the west and then of suicide, and apparently chose the latter because there were times when he expressed the fear that he had gone too far in trying to placate both sides.

The Czechoslovak Government is arranging for the release of arms to Israel, partly because it is a good source of dollars and partly because Moscow is interested in creating an area of unrest in the Near East.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article written by Dorothy Thompson:

[From the New York Mirror of December 26, 1948]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

It seems certain we are going to take another step on the road to bureaucratic collectivism by the passage of a compulsory health insurance bill, to which President Truman is pledged.

The United States Public Health Service is for it, as every Government agency is always for extension. The labor unions and farmers' organizations are for it because it sounds good. Industry would like to saddle the Federal Government with the expense of workmen's compensation cases. Professional social workers foresee great opportunities for themselves. And a mere 150,000 physicians, 90 percent of whom are against it, cannot buck the trend. Besides, they are supposed to be prejudiced, on the current theory that those who know most about anything are not reliable witnesses.

Also, the opposition has not been intelligent. It has ranted against socialization as though the mere word had conjuring powers. Let this opponent, therefore, make herself clear. I am not against it because it is socialistic, but because it is the application of national socialism in the least appropriate field. Also, I have lived under such medical systems in England, Austria, and Germany. They were awful.

They cost the people far too much, provide inferior services at a high price, are incapable of dealing with really serious and complicated cases. They result in two sorts of medicine—good medicine for the well-to-do, and bad for the masses.

The great joker in all these schemes is that they are put forward as free—something for nothing. Let their proponents at least tell the truth. What is advocated is compulsory insurance.

Every worker in this country will have the cost subtracted from his pay envelope and added—by his employers—to the price of everything he buys. He will be paying for unused aspirins when he needs the money for oranges. He will be supporting innumerable filing clerks—a horrendous paper staff for 150,000,000 people. When and if he gets ill he will find himself as 1 of 50 patients—half of them hypochondriacs bent on getting service for their money—whom a physician must examine in an hour.

And if he really is ill—and finds that under the slap-happy methods of overworked doctors, whose fees are assured anyhow, he gets not better but worse—he finally will in desperation consult one of those private physicians who refuse to join the assembly line and, atop all he already has put up, week by week, pay a private fee.

How do I know this? Because I have experienced it.

Just why this most inventive country seems compelled blindly to copy social measures originating elsewhere is baffling. We need better health service. Granted. We need many, many more hospitals. The existing hospitals need public aid, since the sources of private support are increasingly drained off in taxes. And we need more genuinely free medicine for people in real jams.

But before Congress passes any bill for universal sickness insurance—falsely called health insurance—it owes it to the American people to tell them exactly what a person with, say, an income of from $2,000 to $3,000 a year is going to have to pay over a working life of 40 years to take care of his illnesses, and just what services the Government positively guarantees him in return for his money. Will it, for instance, sign on the dotted line that if his wife is in labor the Government guarantees a bed and a physician at the critical moment?

Don't make me laugh. I've lived under these schemes.

The St. Lawrence Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and opening of the Great Lakes to ocean navigation is the next great step in our national development. There is inserted herewith a memorandum received from the chairman of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference and my comments thereon:

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE
PROJECT CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1949.

MEMORANDUM

In recent weeks, a clamor has been set up by a certain group in the iron and steel industry, calling for construction of the long-proposed deep canal in the St. Lawrence River. They want it for the importation of iron ore from the Labrador-Quebec region. Their argument is the same that was told in the Senate a year ago.

The leader in this campaign is a firm—the only United States firm—engaged in the development of the Labrador-Quebec iron-ore field. It is reported that their project is now reaching the stage when large-scale financing will be required, and popular interest in it might be very helpful.

A very different story of the ore situation comes from some others in the industry. They see in the proposed canal an invitation to the entry of cheaply mined ores from outside the North American continent, and discouragement of the development of our own inexhaustible resources of taconite and other low-grade-iron ores.

This view is well stated in a letter recently written by Mr. Alex C. Brown, president of the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., a copy of which is attached. I am sure you will find it an important addition to the discussion of the St. Lawrence River question.

Very truly yours,
CARROLL B. HUNTRESS,
Chairman.

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Mr. CARROLL B. HUNTRESS,
Chairman, National St. Lawrence Project Conference,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUNTRESS: Making reference to your memoranda of January 11. There is in central North America surrounded by one of the richest agricultural zones and productive

areas on the globe, one of the extensive inland coast lines in the world—the shore line of the Great Lakes, a district in which is located many of the world's most progressive cities and productive industrial centers.

To any casual observer it is apparent that a relatively small investment in enlarging existing waterways to bring ocean navigation to the Great Lakes will extend the advantage of oceangoing transportation to central United States to stimulate the development of one of the most productive areas in the Nation.

As a citizen interested in the upbuilding of our country and advancement of our Nation, I am at a loss to understand the motive of any group or organization of people with the security of our industrial and armament production at heart that will oppose the simple plan to construct the St. Lawrence waterway and bring the multiple benefits of this development to the United States and central North America.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Regular Veterans Association Offers Strong Veterans Program Under New Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have become acquainted with the Regular Veterans' Association. They have been in the forefront fighting for proper legislation for veterans of the American regular army for many years past.

Late last year at the National Convention held in Denver, Colorado, a new national commander was elected. He is a veteran from New York City who has been active in veterans' affairs and veterans' organizations for many years. I refer to the Honorable H. David Frackman.

National Commander Frackman delivered a brief address over the Mutual network at 2:45 p. m. eastern standard time on January 16. I believe his remarks will be of interest to Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

His talk follows:

The legislative program submitted to the President and the Eighty-first Congress by the Regular Veterans Association seeks to protect the interests of the veteran and the servicemen alike. We will actively help them and their families to obtain benefits now denied them. For example, the married enlisted personnel of the armed forces who are below the rank of the first three top grades do not receive family subsistence or quarters. We believe this unfair. The high cost of living, and housing off military or naval reservations creates a real hardship for these men and their families. We have recommended that all married enlisted personnel, regardless of grade, be furnished with quarters and subsistence for their families or granted an equivalent allowance for quarters, if housing is not available on the reservation.

We urge every possible benefit be extended to disabled veterans whose disability was received by reason of service to their country. These men are entitled to effective rehabilitation programs and we insist that every effort be made to help them receive the care and comfort they have justly earned.

We believe in a strong, national military program; one which will insure safety and security for the United States and its people, and discourage any attempt on the part of others to precipitate war.

We stand squarely behind the President in his effort for a permanent and lasting peace. We urge all Americans to give full support to the organization of the United Nations. We firmly believe it can and will in time solve the differences which now exist between nations.

We believe it to be the solemn duty of veteran organizations to safeguard in time of peace the freedoms so valiantly defended in time of war. Our heroic war dead, if they could speak, would ask us to unite in a common effort to preserve the priceless freedom handed down to us by our forefathers. We must guard against these groups who seek from within and from without our borders to impair our democratic structure of government.

We, in the Regular Veterans' Association, are dedicated to the task of maintaining, advocating, and extending freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly; and to aid the abolition of ignorance, prejudice, and intolerance. These ideals are a mandate to us, specifically set forth in our certificate of incorporation. They form the integral part of our Americanism program.

We ask all veterans, veteran organizations, service men and women, and those who are or will shortly be members of our peacetime draft army, to join with us in perpetuating these ideals, to the end that we suffer no impairment of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed us by our American Bill of Rights.

As Americans we were united in war in the service of our country. Let us now in peace again unite to preserve our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker, also of interest to Members of Congress, the veterans of the country, and the general public as well, is a program for veterans including the legislative program for 1949.

It is given in a circular sent out from the national office of the Regular Veterans' Association, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., under the title of "You Should Join the Regular Veterans' Association and Support Our Legislative Program." It follows:

The voice of the RVA is your voice. You are the RVA. Support the RVA morally and financially and it will work for you, your family, your home, your country, your rights, and privileges as American citizens. The following program invites your support. We're going places. Why don't you come along?

1. We are fighting for reinstatement of the wartime tax exemption of $1,500 for all members of the armed forces.

2. We are for parity in pensions and disability compensation for all veterans and for equal treatment of their dependents.

3. We advocate equal allowances for quarters for all married enlisted personnel of the armed forces regardless of grade.

4. We are giving active cooperation in child welfare work. Reduced juvenile delinquency means better citizens. Better citizens mean a stronger America.

5. We are opposed to communism or any ideology that would undermine our American way of life.

6. We urge practical and reasonable rehabilitation of all veterans who have served or are serving our country either in war or peace and that their dependents be provided for accordingly.

7. We want liberalization of requirements for total and permanent disability of veterans regardless of service connection.

8. We urge universal military training for strengthening national security.

9. We are for support of the United Nations Organization in its endeavor to bring about world peace and understanding, to the extent that it is supported by our own country.

10. We will exert every effort in the Eighty-first Congress, and otherwise, to safeguard the rights and privileges of all Americans for adequate, low-cost housing. We stand for the principles of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for a long-range housing program and will give active support to its enactment.

11. We urge the use of surplus funds of the United States Soldiers' Home for additional and much needed housing on the reservation.

12. We urge a housing program for the personnel at Bethesda Naval Medical Center and other similar hospitals.

13. We will make every effort to exempt from taxation the retired pay of enlisted men of the armed forces.

14. We will work for increased medical attention, hospitalization, and compensation for tubercular veterans of both war and peace.

15. We will make every effort to protect employment preferences for veterans.

The Housing Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a resolution from the members of the First St. Louis County Chapter No. 39, American War Dads, which I heartily acknowledge and endorse:

Whereas there is at present an acute housing shortage in the United States, due primarily to the fact that during the recent war there was very little building on account of lack of material and diversion of labor to national requirements; and

Whereas due to the marriages of many thousands of young people, the majority of whom are veterans of the last war, the housing situation is daily becoming more aggravating since the cessation of hostilities; and

Whereas a great many people are thereby forced to live under undesirable, and certainly undeserved, conditions due to no fault of their own; and

Whereas a continuance of this will jeopardize the lives of a great many of our citizens because of unhealthy environments; and

Whereas the financial status of most of those affected by this situation does not permit the purchasing of homes for cash; and

Whereas in view of the above-mentioned prevailing conditions, there is apparently no early remedy or relief from this unpleasant situation: Be it

Resolved, That the members of the First St. Louis County Chapter No. 39, of the American War Dads, through their duly elected and authorized officers, solicit and implore their legislative representatives in State and national capacities to initiate, advocate, and support such legislation as will produce throughout this State and Nation low-priced housing, with small down pay-

ments upon terms which will not work a hardship on the purchasers; that because of the urgency of the situation they act promptly endeavoring to accomplish the enactment of the necessary legislation as quickly as possible.

WM. H. SANTEN,
President.

Attest: LEONARD P. ALBERS,
Acting Secretary.

Columbia Valley Authority Needed in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the severe shortage of electrical power in the Pacific Northwest, as well as in the entire Nation, demands a comprehensive and farsighted program for the maximum development of the power potential in our great rivers. In my section of the country, the power shortage is more than an emergency; it has become chronic. Since 1946 regional requirements have not been met. For the next 6 to 8 years, this power deficiency will continue under present schedules of dam construction. Emergency measures are being adopted to take care of the most pressing power needs, but the permanent economic welfare of the Pacific Northwest demands a permanent solution. The time has come to appraise and integrate the various plans for development of the great Columbia River and to translate them into a unified, effective operating program. This requires a Columbia Valley Authority.

Within the past year both the Reclamation Bureau in the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army have prepared comprehensive surveys of Columbia River development. The Bonneville Power Administration, which is the regional marketing agency for the Federal Government, emphasizes in its 1949 advance program report:

These plans clearly show the need for viewing the river and its tributaries as a whole from the mountains to the sea. The maximum benefits can be obtained only by a development which locates the various structures and facilities so that they are designed for coordinated operation. In the field of power this requires a major transmission network interconnecting the various plants and load centers. As the water from the upstream storage reservoirs flows through the series of downstream plants and is used over and over again, the power generated can move between the various areas according to water conditions and load requirements. The operation of water storage and release can be integrated so as to provide for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and power production.

The President in his budget message to the Congress points out that the magnitude of our investment in natural resources and its economic importance make it necessary to exercise careful surveillance of the programs in order to prevent waste and insure sound development. In this connection, specifically, he urges the application of TVA principles wherever they can insure the above objectives. For the Pacific Northwest, economy and sound development of natural resources require a Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday. A companion bill has been introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON of my State and Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize the importance of this measure for the continued strength and vitality of the democratic process. On November 2 of each election year, American citizens exercise the greatest privilege of a democracy—to decide by free and secret ballot who shall be their representatives to carry on the great affairs of government. In my opinion it is imperative that this day be set aside for the fullest exercise of the voting privilege.

The majority of the voting population is drawn from those who work for a living. The difficulties of getting to the polling booth before, after, or during work hours are well known to many of you. In my district, which includes the great cities of Seattle and Bremerton, the past election witnessed an excessive congestion of prospective voters at the polls. Many were unable to vote within the deadline, or they left because they simply could not afford to spend hours waiting at the polling booths. Thousands of workers were, in effect, denied the exercise of their franchise.

I recognize, of course, that the local authorities bear a responsibility to provide adequate voting facilities. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress can provide the framework for more orderly and efficient voting procedures and for maximum opportunities to cast the vote by passage of the bill which I have today introduced. I am sure that the voters who work for a living will be most grateful for the recognition by Congress of the practical problems which confront them on election day.

When Will We Awake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "When Will We Awake?" which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union on January 14, 1949:

WHEN WILL WE AWAKE?

If anyone has any doubt about the effects of a Communist conquest of China throughout the Far East, it should be removed by the report of Lindesay Parrott to the New York Times from Tokyo.

Japanese political experts, Mr. Parrott says, are reckoning that the Communist Party in Japan will more than double its vote of 2 years ago in the general election scheduled for January 23. In the last election, the Communist vote was 1,367,000, and if forecasts are correct, will be 2,700,000 this month. Whereas the Communists elected four members to the Diet 2 years ago, they are expected to elect between 12 and 20 this time.

How does Mr. Parrott explain this advance of communism under the American occupation? Better organization, and the switching of some Socialists to the Communist Party through disgust over the recent scandals in which the Socialist Party was implicated, are factors. But he finds the main reason in the Communist victory in the Chinese war, and the impotent policy of the United States toward China. The Communists in Japan have seized upon this incident as proof that communism will eventually triumph in Asia, and many Japanese voters are deciding that if this is so, they had better get on the bandwagon.

If this is happening in Japan under American occupation, what may we expect in Indochina, Malaya, and Indonesia, where there are large Chinese populations, and where discontent is fanned by political unrest. The Soviets are not blind to the advantages offered them in all these areas. They have already sowed the seeds of Communist agitation among the Chinese throughout southeast Asia and if they gain control of China, their plan of campaign will immediately be intensified in that area.

Do not have any doubt in this matter. That Communist control of China will lead to control of Asia is written out clearly for anyone who wants to read. In this connection, a recent statement by a Japanese publisher that publications on the American type of democracy are becoming less popular in Japan, while criticism of democracy with a few kind words for communism receive prompt public acceptance.

When will we awake to the disaster that we are sowing for ourselves in the Far East by a stupid policy that is handing China over to Soviet Russia? While we oppose communism in western Europe, we follow a sell-out policy in Asia that will make communism so strong that it will become invincible.

Brass Goods Plant Cuts Workweek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a clipping from the Waterbury (Conn.) American, edition of Friday, January 14, 1949, wherein it states that the Waterbury branch of the American Brass Co. will curtail its present working schedule starting tomorrow. This curtailment of operations to either a 24- to 32-hour week is necessitated because of the growing shortage of copper.

There is presently in operation Public Law 42, which was an enactment of a bill I introduced in February of 1947, to grant a 2-year suspension of the $8-per-ton copper import-excise tax. Authority for such suspension lapses on

March 31 of this year, and if not renewed, as is contemplated in H. R. 260, introduced by me on January 3, 1949, not only this factory but a great portion of our industry will be forced to curtail operations.

The industrial Northeast is, at the present time, facing a leveling off of employment which has deprived many skilled laborers of their economic security, and it would be shameful neglect on the part of this Congress if we were, by virtue of our lethargy, to be responsible for further lay-offs.

I call this matter to the attention of the House, at this time, so that appropriate and immediate action may be taken on H. R. 260 to assure continued production and employment in our most vital industries.

The article follows:

BRASS GOODS PLANT CUTS WORKWEEK—ABC WORKERS START TUESDAY ON 24- TO 32-HOUR SCHEDULE

Waterbury brass goods branch of the American Brass Co. will go on a 24- to 32-hour-a-week schedule starting next Tuesday. Fewer orders from customers is responsible for the condition that will drop part of the plant to 3 days of operations and the balance to 4 days.

The branch went on 4 days last fall but gradually returned to 40 hours under the impetus of a year-end business spurt.

Departments operating on the 3-day schedule will work Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. Those on 32 hours will run Tuesday through Friday.

Operations also have been curtailed to some extent in other branches of the company's Waterbury division. The casting shop and North rolling mill are said by CIO officials to have been affected by short time. Management spokesmen could not be reached for comment.

COPPER SHORTAGE AFFECTS OPERATIONS

Last month officials said operations have been touched by the growing shortage of copper. They expressed hope for speedy passage by Congress of the Patterson bill to extend the suspension of the 4-cents-a-pound excise tax on foreign-mined copper. The current act, which expires March 31, would be renewed for 2 years under the bill presented by Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON.

The slump in the brass goods division is due almost entirely to a decline in orders from other manufacturers served by this unit of the eyelet industry. About 75 laborers will be affected by the cut to 3 days and 325 skilled and semiskilled workers by the 4-day schedule.

The company resorted to curtailment of operations to spread the work and avert lay-offs, a spokesman said.

Bills Introduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include copies of the following bills and resolutions introduced by me in the Eighty-first Congress to date:

H. R. 83, introduced January 3, 1949, a bill to outlaw the Communist Party:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the first day of the third calendar month following the month in which this act is enacted it shall be unlawful for any individual knowingly and willfully to become or remain a member of the Communist Party. As used in this section, the term "Communist Party" means the political party now known as the Communist Party of the United States of America, whether or not any change is hereafter made in such name.

SEC. 2. Whoever violates any provision of the first section of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

H. R. 84, introduced January 3, 1949, a bill making appropriations for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sum of $7,000,000,000, to be expended, in order to carry out the functions and operations of the Department of the Air Force, of which sum of $7,000,000,000 the sum of $2,738,000,000 is hereby allocated for the procurement or purchase of aircraft; (a) by the Department of the Air Force and (b) by the Department of the Army for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force.

H. R. 85, introduced January 3, 1949, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sum of $7,000,000,000, to be expended by the Department of the Navy in carrying out its functions and operations, of which sum of $7,000,000,000 the sum of $2,346,000,000 is hereby allocated for the procurement or purchase of aircraft.

House Joint Resolution 36, introduced January 3, 1949, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Congress, to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members present in each House concur.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

House Concurrent Resolution 6, introduced January 3, 1949, to express the sense of Congress that the national interest demands that immediate and effective aid should be given the Republic of China:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the continued existence of the Republic of China is threatened, and that the national interest demands that prompt and forceful measures be taken by the Government of the United States to provide assistance to the Republic of China. Therefore, the President is respectfully requested to formulate a program to furnish assistance to the Republic of China in meeting its present crisis. In order that the assistance given the Republic of China shall be both immediate and effective, it is requested that the program so formulated include (1) provisions for the initial expenditure of $1,000,000,000, (2) provisions for the immediate dispatch of increased military missions to China to advise the Government of the Republic of China as to the conduct of its military operations, (3) provisions for the immediate mustering of sufficient transportation facilities, both surface and air, to insure that assistance to the Republic of China shall not be delayed for lack of such facilities, and (4) provisions for the immediate expenditure, without regard to the restrictions imposed under existing law, of such unexpended funds as have been heretofore appropriated for the aid of China. The President is further respectfully requested to submit to Congress as soon as possible the program so formulated, together with proposals for the legislation necessary to effectuate such program.

House Resolution 33, introduced January 6, 1949, creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the economic and political foreign policy of the United States:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 19 Members of the House of Representatives to conduct a thorough study of international relations and to carry out a searching investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Recognizing the concern of other committees whose areas of legislative jurisdiction cover matters of vital importance in the question of foreign policy, such a select committee should be composed of 19 members as follows: 7 members who are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 4 from the majority and 3 from the minority party, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; 3 members from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to be appointed by the chairmen of those committees.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of the world; such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan States, the Middle East, Central and South America; and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days; the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1951.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

House Resolution 34, introduced January 6, 1949, providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 33:

Resolved, That the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 33, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical and stenographic assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

House Concurrent Resolution 10, introduced January 6, 1949, expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy, including the following principles:

(1) Because this Republic was brought into being for the prime purpose of laying the foundations for a just and permanent peace, and because every true American is devoted to the achievement of this objective, the United States should firmly dedicate itself and all of its resources to the maintenance of its destiny-given position of leadership for world peace.

(2) Because it is desirable to give the Members of Congress a more potent voice in the development and in the implementation of foreign policy, there should be appointed immediately a select committee of the House to conduct a thorough study of international relations and to carry out a searching investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. Recognizing the concern of other committees whose areas of legislative jurisdiction cover matters of vital importance in the question of foreign policy, such a select committee should be composed of 19 members as follows: Seven members who are members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, four from the majority and three from the minority party, to be appointed by the chairman of the committee; three members from the Committee on Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to be appointed by the chairmen of those committees.

(3) Because the United States must continue to exercise leadership in the establishment and functioning of a real, workable, and effective world organization, we must recognize that Russia's failure to cooperate has made it impossible for the United Nations to operate as intended. The United Nations remains an infant organization whose impeded growth keeps it from exercising the mature functions of a peace-preserving agency for the world. It still has a promising vitality, and we should continue our efforts to eliminate its defects, chief of which is the veto. While its development remains halted by Soviet intransigeance it is obviously incapable of exercising many of the powers given it by the peace-loving nations that signed the Charter. We have reason to hope that someday the United Nations will be permitted to attain full effectiveness and serve mankind as intended. Until then, common sense leads us to seek security in defense agreements between truly peace-loving countries, such as the Rio Pact and the Atlantic Pact which is now in preliminary drafting stages. Such pacts or agreements have the virtue of keeping the spark of vitality in the structure created at San Francisco and at the same time bypassing the crippling effects of the Soviet attempts to prevent achievement of real security through their habitual misuse of the veto power.

(4) Because diplomatic appeasement, which has failed in the past, leads only to conflict, such appeasement of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should cease.

(5) As long as aid to free nations is effective in checking the advance of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and preventing the spread of communism, economic assistance to rehabilitate the economies of nations resisting Russian aggression and the spread of communism should be continued by the United States.

(6) If a democratic nation, threatened by a Communist minority which is either directly or indirectly aided, abetted, and controlled by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, asks aid of the United States, assistance should be extended, be it economic or military.

(7) The United States should (a) inform the world, and particularly the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, that it intends to use its force to stop aggression directed at strategic points such as the approaches to the Atlantic, Gibraltar, the nations of western Europe, the Dardanelles, Greece, Turkey, Iran, the Near East, the Persian Gulf area, China, and the islands of the Pacific; (b) state clearly that whenever there is an encroachment on these areas, or any other strategic positions, the integrity of which the United States deems essential to its security and survival, the nation making such encroachment will meet the immediate, sustained, and unrelenting resistance of the United States; and (c) for the self-interest of the United States and the peace of the world, establish a line beyond which an aggressor may not move without encountering the full force and power of the United States.

(8) Because the achievement and the maintenance of adequate preparedness on the sea, on the land, and more especially in the air, and because atomic supremacy and air supremacy by the United States must be realized at all costs, the funds required to keep it the strongest military nation should be appropriated, provision for full and adequate manpower for the armed services should be made, and the armed services should move efficiently and effectively to an early and full realization of this determined objective.

Committee on Un-American Activities Assignments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a political axiom that you can do anything you want to do when you have the votes.

That axiom has been obviously applied to me because I have exercised political independence in Washington and Louisiana, and as a result I have failed to be reassigned—or if you care to use the real term, I have been "purged"—to the Committee on Un-American Actitives for the Eighty-first Congress.

It would have been far more commendable and courageous of those responsible for this move if they had not resorted to subterfuge in the best Machiavellian technique to attain their end. Their position is directly in contrast to mine, which has always been straightforward, forthright, and to the point. My political integrity is not on the auction block. I am immune to political police thought, control, and action through fear of reprisal.

I know it displeased some individuals when I refused to play politics as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and instead always kept in mind the security of America as my first objective in preference to the machinations and wishes of partisan politicians. I was critical of the attitude of both Republicans and Democrats by refusing to participate in any plan or scheme which would either smear or whitewash individuals. I sought only the truth and attempted to bring some balance to a rather unsteady procedure. The reward for that contribution is the failure to reassign me to the Committee on Un-American Activities under the rather feeble and puny guise that only lawyers were to be selected on the committee. An artful device has been effectively employed.

In Louisiana, I supported and participated actively and openly in the States' rights movement, in which I believed and still believe. Apparently this was a mortal sin in the eyes of some individuals who would now have me seek forgiveness and absolution. I have no inclination nor desire to do either. I have nothing to apologize for. Election results do not change my principles.

It was and still is my intention to cooperate as far as consistently possible with President Truman's program, but I cannot and will not divorce myself from the principles with which I have lived for so many years. I was elected as a Democrat by the people of Louisiana and shall conduct myself according to their wishes and instructions. I am responsible to them and to them alone.

The denials of reprisal and punitive action are not convincing in view of the

facts. The inescapable truth of the matter is that a precedent was broken in failing to reassign me to the Committee on Un-American Activities solely because I openly espoused the principles of States' rights. They could not find a legitimate reason so they confected a flimsy excuse. They prefer to resort to indirect and subversive methods instead of direct and aboveboard admissions. Such methods do not command nor merit the respect of those who believe in fair play.

The practice of the political purge is not a new art. It has always been indulged as a means of liquidation by those who refuse to recognize the right of an individual to think and act for himself.

I shall continue to say what I think and do what I say.

Irregular Air Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter written to the Civil Aeronautics Board on the subject of irregular carriers by Mr. Jack F. Scavenius, president of Mount McKinley Airways, Inc.:

JANUARY 10, 1949.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

Re Economic Regulations Draft Release No. 33, dated December 10, 1948.

GENTLEMEN: The following are our thoughts and suggestions concerning proposed revision of section 292–1 of the Economic Regulations covering large irregular carriers.

With respect to this proposed regulation, it must be apparent to the Board that such contemplated action will result in complete elimination of all nonscheduled carriers in the United States and Alaska, with the exception of nonscheduled business conducted by so-called fixed-base operators in continental United States who might otherwise be prosperous enough to retain an airplane of the DC–3 type or larger for occasional charter or sightseeing trips and who could maybe at the same time utilize such an aircraft for instruction purposes.

I realize that the whole problem of the so-called nonscheduled operators is a serious one, and I also realize that a great many of the present nonscheduled operators are conducting their business in such a manner as to be detrimental to the public safety and also detrimental to the inspiration of the public of the desirability of air transportation. I do, however, believe that the nonscheduled business as it has developed after the war has a possibility of developing a new phase for the industry, and should, if possible, be fostered and encouraged by the Board.

In this respect, I would like to refer you to an editorial written by Charles Adams in the December 20, 1948, edition of Aviation Week. It pretty closely parallels my views on the subject.

It is obvious that had the Board inaugurated adequate safety regulations, and had the CAA followed through and enforced these regulations to the letter, we would not today be faced with this seemingly insurmountable problem. In the recent past there have been several serious or near-serious accidents on the part of the nonscheduled operators which could have been avoided had CAA, on the strength of past experience, clamped down on these operators who are manifestly nothing but outlaws and were known to the industry as completely disregarding not only the present safety regulations but even common sense. It has been very hard and extremely unfair for the few nonscheduled operators who are striving to comply with safety regulations, and operate in a decent and safe manner, to see CAA tolerate competition of the type just mentioned.

In numerous cases these outlaw practices by certain operators have for a long time been common knowledge to people in the industry and it has often been predicted that should these practices be allowed to continue disaster was bound to result. It is strange to understand why so little action has been taken by CAA to rectify conditions as prevalent and well known over a long period of time. In this combination I would like to point out that the local inspectors for CAA in the Alaska area have been conscientious and hard working, and it is my impression that they have been hampered by a lackadaisical attitude in Washington. At least, that is my own explanation, inasmuch as these people are known to me to be just as worried about the situation as I am myself.

Last fall the Board brought out a new proposed part 42 which was heartily endorsed by me in behalf of Mount McKinley Airways. Such a regulation would have solved the major part of the problem at hand, inasmuch as the majority of the operators would have had no intention to or would have been unable to operate under this rather strict regulation.

It is, however, obvious to my way of thinking that no operator, nonscheduled or otherwise, could possibly operate safely under requirements less exacting than those proposed by this regulation. Proof of which is that Mount McKinley Airways has, for all practical purposes, operated under self-imposed regulations very similar to those proposed in this new part 42.

In this respect, let me point out it is my considered opinion that it is economically impossible for any company to operate as infrequently as required by the Board and still operate with reasonable safety. We advocate a new part 42 with strictest possible safety regulations, including a requirement for extensive pilot training, etc., but on the other hand we realize that this is not economically possible unless the company is able to earn the necessary revenue to carry the cost. We would also respectfully point out that we in Alaska have all other avenues of revenue cut off inasmuch as we are not allowed to operate between points within the Territory.

We of Mount McKinley Airways believe that the solution to the whole problem would be a tremendous tightening both of the safety regulations themselves and of the enforcement of such regulations.

As an example of how leniency on the part of the CAA has caused a hardship on the more conscientious operators, I would like to mention the requirement pertaining to installation of fire-prevention equipment on DC–3's. CAA set the final deadline as of December 31, 1948, and Mount McKinley Airways at that time had this program completed at a cost of $7,000 per airplane. We find now that CAA has extended this deadline for practically everyone who has asked for it for an indefinite period of time. We naturally stop and wonder why we should have had to spend this considerable amount of money to comply with this regulation when we find that any number of operators who have had no intention of complying with this regulation are still allowed to operate, reaping the benefit of a considerable saving.

It is our contention that the frequency provisions in 292.1 should be flexible and each case should be considered separately and the Board's decision should be covered by the need for the service. We would like to see a new part 42, as previously proposed, in effect immediately. We would further suggest that the Board would allow any nonscheduled operator to operate irregularly but also as frequently as service may be needed under this regulation, but should further service be required of any carrier they should be required to operate under part 41. In other words, it should not be very difficult for the Board, in collaboration with the operators, to determine how many trips a week any one operator should be allowed to make between points before being required to operate under part 41 instead of part 42.

The present system of certificating carriers when and if needed has obviously not been satisfactory. In the Alaska case, for instance, additional service has been needed for well over 2 years or practically since the end of the war and still the decision in the United States-Alaska Service case cannot be expected to be forthcoming for several months. In other words, the Board in this respect has apparently been 3 years behind and by the time a decision is rendered this decision may very well be obsolete. In the meantime, the Territory of Alaska would have suffered untold hardships had it not been for the activities of the nonscheduled operators or large irregular carriers. In other words, the Territory of Alaska has had fairly adequate air transportation for the last 2½ years, not due to any action by the Board but in spite of the Board.

I am saying this with all due respect to the Board and realizing the tremendous difficulties under which the Board is operating but I do believe that, even under the present Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, as unsatisfactory as this act may be, the Board could find a solution to give temporary relief and still avoid the outlaw and cutthroat practices which have been so apparent on the part of the nonscheduled operators the last few years.

One particular point I would like to bring out is the restrictions on the use of ticket agencies by the irregular carriers. While I think that the proposed action is somewhat drastic I would like to refer you to a letter written by me to Chairman O'Connell, of the CAB, on July 21, 1948, in regard to travel agencies. As I pointed out in said letter there is no question in my mind that the so-called travel agencies, as seem to be flourishing today, to a large extent constitute a racket which is detrimental both to the public and to the decent operators. However, it seems to me that this could be eliminated by requiring travel agencies to be registered, provide bond, and by other means of regulation, but if this is not practical we of Mount McKinley Airways would rather see all travel agencies completely eliminated than have to tolerate present conditions.

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of January 1949.

MOUNT MCKINLEY AIRWAYS, INC.,
JACK F. SCAVENIUS, *President.*

The Right to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, more and more people are be-

ginning to question the policy which excuses assault and battery, organized violence, the destruction of personal property, malicious injury to real property, and the practice of keeping hundreds of employees from their jobs.

An editorial of December 3 from the Knoxville (Tenn.) Journal comments upon the situation as follows:

DEPEND UPON IT, UNION WILL ESCAPE PUNISHMENT IN WRECKING OF PLANTS

It would be too much to say that the country was shocked by the story from Kalamazoo, Mich., of the raid by 300 union goons on a strike-bound plant in that city.

Since 1937, when under the protection of Roosevelt and the then Governor, now Supreme Court Justice, Frank Murphy, this same CIO initiated a new reign of terrorism into union organization, it has been difficult to shock the country by any item of violence of this kind.

In this latest incident, 300 men swooped down on the plants at dawn in a caravan of cars. Windows were broken, parked automobiles smashed, milk trucks were overturned and thousands of dollars' worth of valuable equipment in the plants ruined past repair.

Significant in this situation was the failure of the Kalamazoo law enforcement agencies to raise a hand in defense of the attacked plants or of the men who were working in them at the time. Four or five determined, courageous policemen could have held the mob at bay. On the other hand, any such officers would have acted in the face of a psychology which has taken possession of most people in the course of the Roosevelt regime. That is to say, there are two kinds of crime. One is that committed by the ordinary citizen and the other is that committed under the sponsorship of a union. Extortion, assault, or the willful destruction of property, or occasionally murder, are all reasonably safe if they occur in the course of a labor dispute. The failure of law enforcement agencies to take the initiative in the arrest of persons for such crimes and of the courts to deal with them severely enough has created an atmosphere of immunity that is appalling.

The State administration of Michigan has promised action in the Kalamazoo case, but Governor Sigler is going out of office the first of the year. His successor, elected with the support of the labor vote in Michigan, is not likely to be excited about this latest outrage. As usual, union violence will go unpunished.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, the whole civilized world was shocked over the arrest of the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty, upon trumped-up charges of plotting to overthrow the Communist regime. I have today addressed a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives urging him to take the necessary course of action to protest this travesty on justice and all that is decent to the Hungarian Government, in the name of the people of the United States. In addition, I have received many telegrams, letters, and petitions from my constituents voicing their vehement protest to the unjust arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist Government of Hungary, condemning this as un-Christian and undemocratic, and a most shocking and disturbing desecration of the principles of freedom and justice. They call on the Government of the United States to exert all efforts to see that this terrible injustice is righted and to prevent a repetition of injustice similar to the Archbishop Stepinac incident. Our great country is the only hope of the oppressed peoples of the world and we must see that the authority of our country is thrown on the side of truth and justice. The imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty is not only a threat to religious freedom, but to all democratic freedoms throughout the world. In this respect, I wish to include in the RECORD the following letter written by the Most Reverend Edmund F. Gibbons, bishop of the Albany Catholic diocese, which includes a portion of the Thirty-first Congressional District. Said Bishop Gibbons:

The long-expected has come to pass. The Primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty has been arrested and imprisoned by the Communists. It is but the unfolding of the Marxist program for the destruction of all religion and the enslavement of all peoples. The pattern is always the same. The agents of Stalin throughout the world go along—venturing as much as they dare at the moment—emboldened by each new success which goes unpunished, though not unprotested—reaching even higher, assailing the exalted, smearing the sacred—until now his Hungarian minions have ventured unabashedly to profane a prince of the church.

Soon the old familiar farce will be reenacted. The theater and the cast will be new, but the play and the props are always the same—the trumped-up charges, the forged evidence, the distortions and the extortions—all so well rehearsed in past years on Cieplak, Stepinac, and lesser thousands. Rightly does Acting Secretary of State Lovett label it all a "sickening sham."

We shall not be deceived by these devices. We shall not fail to pierce the facade of righteousness and respectability behind which the Communists, with almost fanatic, scrupulosity, always seek to hide mummery, the mockery and chicanery of it all. The noble and majestic figure of the cardinal will shine forth—the true priest of God, whose only crime has been his championing of honesty against Communist deceit; the true shepherd, whose sole sin has been his insistence on feeding his flock truth, and not Communist lies.

"Why should I fear to return to Hungary," he said, a few years ago, when safe in this country. "That is where my flock is. Ultimately, all that my enemies can take from me is my life." What zeal for his people. What glorious Christian resignation. But while we admire his fortitude, let us not rest supine and inarticulate—members of the Mystical Body that we are. Let not the Christian masses be dumb in the face of his tormentors. If the cardinal is to be crucified, with the modern Communist brand of crucifixion, let us not fail to rally beneath his cross. Let not the crime be perpetrated, without stirring up a world-wide shout of protest, so tremendous and resounding that it will shake even the iron curtain, to disturb the smug security of those who there planned this and further crimes contemptuous of Christian sensibilities.

Numerous individuals of all faiths, pastors of churches, Catholic War Veterans posts, and the Slovak Catholic Federation of America have been among those who have protested the action of the Hungarian Government.

Shipments Under the Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from the Seafarers International Union of North America, Atlantic and Gulf district, signed by its secretary, Paul Hall, which contains much important factual data with reference to shipments under the Marshall plan.

I commend this information to the attention of every Member of this House.

The letter is as follows:

SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL
UNION OF NORTH AMERICA,
ATLANTIC AND GULF DISTRICT,
New York, N. Y., January 14, 1949.

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MULTER: I know that you, having demonstrated your interest in merchant seamen on several occasions, are aware that the proposal made by ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman to ship all Marshall plan bulk cargoes in foreign-flag ships would throw 10,000 or more American seamen out of work and virtually scuttle the American merchant marine.

This letter is written to call it to your attention that Hoffman has tried to justify his proposal by statements which, according to my information, simply do not fit the facts.

The facts as published in this union's weekly newspaper, the Seafarers Log, of January 7, 1949, are these: The American rate for carrying coal from the east coast to France is $10.85 a ton. This rate is set by the Maritime Commission. On foreign ships, the rate ranges from $8.50 a ton to about $9. Recently three operators of foreign-flag ships were asked to quote coal rates. Two of the operators quoted $8.50. The third wouldn't talk about any rate below $9 and seemed to prefer a higher one.

Thus, the actual differential turns out to be no more than $2.35 a ton at the most and only $1.85 or less in some cases. And the story doesn't end there, because the differential is just about wiped out later so far as American taxpayers are concerned. Coal is not the only bulk cargo, but the coal rate continues to be the root of the controversy.

Another facet of the Marshall plan shipping situation has been overlooked completely by Hoffman and his executive assistants. At least they have not mentioned it in their public statements.

It is no secret that representatives of French shipping interests recently told a member of the Maritime Commission that they deliberately depressed their rates in a maneuver to get a bigger slice of the melon. Later on, the Frenchmen continued, up would go the rates. The Americans would be hoodwinked.

Shipping men of other nations participating in the Marshall plan are reported to have said substantially the same thing, although they said it less bluntly than the Frenchmen.

Foreign rates already are rising as the foreign operators smack their lips in anticipation.

Foreign operators haven't been worrying about making or losing money for the present period. If they lose money they expect to be reimbursed directly or indirectly through the Marshall plan. This would mean American subsidization of European merchant fleets with low labor standards. And if they get the extra cargoes and raise the rates, too, their chances of losing money are very slight. Yet Hoffman said that to pay the American rates was to subsidize the American merchant marine and copies of that letter were sent to many trade unionists, Senators, and Congressmen who have taken up the cudgels in the SIU's fight to have the Hoffman order rescinded.

What of the rate differential that remains? Is it as devastating as Hoffman would have it sound? The answer is a resounding "No," after some of the elements in steamship financing are examined.

If a minimum of half of the bulk cargoes are to be carried under the American flag as the law now provides, despite Hoffman's peculiar interpretation, they will go for the most part in Liberties under bare-boat charter from the Maritime Commission.

When a company charters a Liberty from the Commission, it pays $7,500 a month in rent. If 150 Liberties should fail to operate because of the Hoffman order, it would mean a dead loss in revenue to the Government of $1,125,000 a month. The charter hire for Victory ships is $10,000 a month, and if any Victory should fail to operate because of the order the loss of revenue would be correspondingly greater.

Maritime Commission spokesmen point out that the money from chartering a ship is almost entirely profit to the Government. The loss to the Government is even greater, however, for a ship in the boneyard costs the Commission about $10,000 a year to maintain.

Then there is the matter of taxes. If a company charters a Liberty, the first 10 percent in gross profit on the capital invested in the operation of that ship is subject to normal corporate income taxes. When the profits go higher, the taxes spiral. After the 10 percent has been taxed separately, the Government divides additional gross profits by the number of days the company actually operated the ship.

The company is then taxed 50 percent of the first $100 a day profit, 75 percent of profit between $100 and $300 a day, and 90 percent of any profit above $300 a day. The steamship companies still pay substantial dividends while the Government gets millions and millions in taxes.

In short, if the Maritime Commission ships are in the boneyard, the Government loses: (1) millions of dollars in charter hire, (2) millions of dollars in maintenance charges, (3) millions of dollars in corporate taxes, (4) millions of dollars in unemployment benefits paid to seamen and others in the maritime industry.

Hoffman maintains that if all the bulk cargoes go on foreign-flag ships, this country will be able to ship more goods to Europe. This is a dubious argument at best, since shipping costs are only one item in the Marshall plan.

However, he might better insist that 60 or 70, or even 100 percent, of the bulk cargoes go in American ships. And he might ask that the extra taxes collected by the Government from the shipping industry be appropriated to purchase the goods that the people of the war-ravaged nations of Europe must have, despite chiseling in shipping and other matters by some of their businessmen.

Speaking for the membership of this union, I strongly hope that you take whatever action is necessary to block the Hoffman scheme by insuring that an absolute minimum of 50 percent of all Marshall-plan cargoes go in American vessels. Such action will save the jobs of thousands of loyal American workers.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL HALL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the foregoing represents a full and fair statement of the situation. The position of the Seafarers International Union is sound and should be supported by us.

South Carolina Leads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from my home-town newspaper, the Greenville News, is very revealing and encouraging. It is generally known that the trend of industry has been toward the South for some years. I hope with the recognition that our section has been discriminated against in the matter of freight rates and that adjustments are in the process of being made, we may look forward to even greater progress:

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS

The notable industrial growth of South Carolina in recent years has attracted much attention both in and outside of the State.

But perhaps it is not generally realized that the progress of this State in this respect has been greater than in any other southern State.

This striking fact is brought out in an article in the Manufacturers Record by Caldwell R. Walker, editor of the Blue Book of Southern Progress.

This article is a summary of southern economic progress and industrial development. It shows that in capturing an additional 5 percent of the national income the South has had to maintain a rate of growth 43 percent above that of the Nation as a whole. Incomes of 14 Southern States have grown at a swifter pace than that of the Nation and these States have also achieved a swifter rate of industrialization, showing the potency of industrialization as an income producing factor.

But South Carolina's showing is outstanding in this southern record. While the article says that Florida leads the 16 Southern States in rate of total income growth, a rate double that of the Nation, South Carolina has made the most outstanding gain in industrialization, and leads the South in percentage of income derived from manufacturers.

A statistical break-down of income gain from 1929 to 1947 shows that South Carolina's income from agriculture gained 158 percent, income from manufacture gained 390 percent; and its income gain from all sources was 248 percent.

Another table on manufacturing income shows that in 1929 South Carolina's income from that source was 24.7 percent, while in 1947 it was 24.8 percent; and the article says that South Carolina's tremendous growth of 10 percent in industrial percentage easily tops that of all the other 15 Southern States, and probably that of any other State."

This is a record that should be most gratifying to every South Carolina citizen. It can be fairly interpreted, we think, as evidence that the systematic and sustained efforts that have been made to promote the greater industrial development of the State have achieved very definite results. And the fact suggests that with continuation of these methods we can go much further in broadening the economic welfare of the State.

Indians in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, several Members have asked me for information which will assist them in answering a growing number of inquiries about the condition of the Indians of the United States. For their convenience, I have prepared the following statement summarizing some of the information I have gathered as chairman, during the Eightieth Congress, of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and as a resident of and Member of Congress for the State of Montana.

There are in the United States about 350,000 Indians, of varying degrees of Indian ancestry, and probably 32,000 Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians in Alaska. The percentage of full-bloods is declining. Indians live in every State, although the largest concentration is in the West. The estimated Indian population of the ten leading States is: Oklahoma, 111,000; Arizona, 56,000; New Mexico, 43,000; South Dakota 31,000; California, 24,000; Montana, 19,000; Washington, 15,000; Minnesota, 14,000; Wisconsin, 13,000; and North Dakota, 13,000. About 260,000 Indians live on reservations under the jurisdiction of the Office of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior. The relationships of the remainder with their tribal organizations vary widely. A large number of individuals of Indian ancestry have severed all connections with the Indian Service and are living and working as individuals in cities and towns throughout the country. Most of the remainder obtain some of their livelihood off the reservation.

The Office of Indian Affairs was established many years ago to administer the complex body of law and treaty which governs the relationship between the United States and the Indians. The Indian Bureau acts as trustee for tribal and individual funds and property, and operates reservations which have been set aside for the Indians. The Bureau's functions are many and varied. It operates approximately 400 day and boarding schools and supervises the education of Indians who attend public schools under contracts with State and local authorities. It operates a number of hospitals on reservations, provides a field health service, and arranges for the treatment of Indians in non-Indian facilities when necessary. Some 46,000,000 acres of forest and grazing lands on

Indian reservations are supervised by the Bureau. Its construction service builds and maintains roads, buildings, and other facilities required on reservations. Irrigation works also are constructed, and an extension service assists Indians in planning and management of their farms. A credit system is designed to help Indians increase and improve their farm and livestock operations. The Bureau is also responsible for maintaining law and order on reservations, enforcing the special laws which apply to Indians such as the statute which prohibits the sale or use of liquor. The Bureau has requested $59,001,520 to carry on these functions in fiscal year 1950.

Landownership within the reservations varies, and may be patent in fee, white ownership, allotments in trust, tribal owned property and lands set aside for special purposes. Land not actually patented is in varying degrees of trust status under the Secretary of the Interior. One of the problems needing immediate legislation has to do with Indian estates and what is called fractional heirship. That is trust land that has passed to succeeding generations until the fraction of ownership of any one heir is so small that it represents no real equity.

All Indians are citizens of the United States and have the right to vote. Any Indian is free to leave the reservation at any time and to sever all connections with his tribe and the Indian Bureau. In practice, only a few are able to do so since such a departure in most cases would mean the sacrifice of whatever advantages and special privileges accorded the Indian on the reservation. Many Indians leave the reservation for part of the year for work to supplement their incomes, returning during the winter.

A primary purpose of the Indian Bureau has been to raise the Indians to an economic and educational level which would permit them to be assimilated in the general society of this country without prejudice, on an even basis with all other citizens. Due in part to the peculiar ward status of the Indians, progress in the economic field and in individual initiative has been tragically slow. The resources of the lands included in reservations varies greatly, and the degree of the advancement of the Indian tribes follows to some extent the prosperity or lack of prosperity which the tribe has enjoyed.

The Osage Indians of Oklahoma have a high level of income because of the oil developments in their reservation. The Blackfeet in Montana have a similar development, although on a smaller scale. The Flathead tribe of Montana has a good income from the lease of a hydroelectric power site, and members of this tribe are generally quite as capable and as well educated as their white neighbors. The Klamath Indians of Oregon have a good income from their reservation, particularly from timber, and members of the tribe are well able to take an equal place in the world with other citizens. Other reservations, such as the Rocky Boy in Montana, were not as fortunate in the matter of national resources, and the result is shown in a lower level of income, a lower educational level, and a greater need for further assistance from the Federal Government. At the extreme are the Navajo and Hopi tribes of the Southwest. They have increased rapidly in numbers on reservations with very limited resources which are now able to support only about one-half the members of the tribes. Many of them do not speak English and have little conception of the American manner of living. Most of them are in dire poverty, and the problem of the Navajo needs immediate study and solution.

During the last session of Congress, it became apparent that a new start must be made toward ending Federal wardship of Indians and placing them, as individuals, upon an equal footing with other citizens. To keep them or to allow them to remain indefinitely in a wardship is a violation of our principles as a Nation of free and independent people.

It appeared that the Indian Bureau, in some instances, may have lost sight of this objective, and that its policies are tending to perpetuate the Indian in his wardship status rather than to prepare him for full participation in society. The Indian Affairs Committee determined to take a new look at the Indian problem, and to endeavor to hasten Indian rehabilitation. We realized, however, that the wide differences in the economic and educational advancement of the various tribes makes this a difficult and complicated problem. The committee recognized that the proposal that the Indian Bureau be abolished summarily does not take into account the many aged full-blood Indians who will need Federal protection as long as they live, nor the needs of the tribes whose economic situation is such that the States and local communities cannot assume the responsibility.

After a study of the problem, it appeared that at least four possible objectives could be set up, and legislation to implement them, in part, was introduced in the Eightieth Congress.

The first objective was to remove from Federal supervision the tribes which are well-advanced and able to manage their own affairs. The Klamath Tribe of Oregon and the Flathead of Montana are examples. They have reached a degree of economic welfare and a status of individual initiative where they could undertake to manage their own affairs as efficiently and successfully as they are now being managed by the Government.

The second objective was to give increased responsibility over Indian matters to the States. Legislation was introduced to give the States jurisdiction over criminal offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations, an area where the States are now forbidden to enter. This would make for better and more equitable law enforcement, and would solve very serious problems in some areas where county and State officials are helpless to cope with the criminal activities of some individual Indians. Another field where increased participation by State and local governments would result in generally improved conditions is that of road construction and maintenance. A third is the field of education. The greatest possible advantages are realized where Indian and white children of the neighborhood may attend the same public schools, schools which are under State supervision. Progress is being made in educational cooperation with the States.

A third objective was to make it possible for an individual Indian, on his own initiative, who had attained an educational and economic status that made it feasible, to assume the responsibilities that would come with the end of wardship and the severing of his connections with the Indian Bureau. Present Bureau regulations concerning trust land and money make it very difficult for an Indian to end his wardship without a very real sacrifice. Legislation was introduced in the last Congress to implement this objective in a manner that would not injure the interests of the tribe.

The fourth possible objective was to turn over to the States, in certain instances, the responsibility for the Indians within their borders. It is realized that this cannot be done at present except in unusual cases, but it is believed that States such as New York and California could well assume responsibility for the Indians within their borders, permitting the Federal Government to relinquish wardship of such Indians. In general the States have not been interested as they should be nor willing to assume proper responsibility for the welfare of their Indians.

Maintaining the Indian in continued wardship is an extremely costly matter for the citizens of the United States, and an unsatisfactory mode of life for the Indians. The new generation of Indians, including thousands who served in the recent war, will not be content with life on the reservation under present circumstances, and they should be encouraged and assisted in their efforts to improve their way of life and to attain economic, political, and social equality.

Our Citadel of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial entitled "Our Citadel of Freedom," by Harry H. Schlacht.

This editorial appeared in all Hearst newspapers from coast to coast and was published September 17, 1948.

The editorial is as follows:

OUR CITADEL OF FREEDOM

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Here we wrote the Bill of Rights—The path of human progress is lit with its lights. Here we wrote the Declaration with an eagle pinion quill—It circled round the world where force and hate stood still. Here we wrote the Constitution and codified the

page—That made our Republic the wonder of the age.

We salute today our Constitution. It is 161 years young. Its youthful veins are full of enterprise and courage. Its daily respiration is liberty and patriotism.

Our Constitution is the heart of our Nation. It is the citadel of our freedom. It is the bulwark of our security. It is the inspiration of our American way of life.

It is the charter of our fundamental laws. It is a vital human document with a soul and a spirit. America symbolizes "Vox populi; vox Dei." The voice of the people is the voice of God.

In our country the law is supreme. No man is so high as to be above the law. No officer of government may disregard it with impunity.

And when the highest law to which we pay homage is the Constitution of the United States, the history of the world has presented no such wonder of a prosperous and happy civil government.

We have been devoted to our Constitution. We know that wise men conceived it. We know that strong men administered it. We know that brave men fought for it. We know that heroic men died for it.

No greater contribution to civilization and world peace can be made than that we carry on unimpaired our traditional system of representative government.

We live and move in the light of a great tradition. We live under the law, and at the ballot box we wear the purple robes of power.

We are free to act, to go, and to think. We are subjects and yet sovereigns. We are citizens and yet princes. We are the freest people in all the world. We are Americans. This cavalcade of freedom did not come to us by idle chance.

It is the product of the vision and sacrifice of our forefathers.

They were pure patriots. They made every visible sacrifice for an invisible posterity.

And yet there are loose in this country today, demagogs and preachers of foreign ideologies who would scrap our Constitution and mobilize the unthinking and prejudiced to ride roughshod over our American institutions.

These traitors would convert our Nation into a laboratory for the practice of alien experiments that have no counterpart in our form of government, as prescribed by our Constitution.

There is not a government under the sun which gives to its people more opportunity, more humanity, and more freedom, than our system of constitutional government gives to us.

Shame on those who would retreat from the high state we have won for ourselves in this land. Shame on those who would destroy the freedom we enjoy. Shame on those who would supplant our democracy with the rule of a dictator. Shame on those who, being citizens of the United States, profess a love for a foreign land which seems to be greater than their love for America.

Shame on those parasites who enjoy the fruits of the struggles of our martyrs and patriots and worship at the godless shrine of communism.

Let us go forward to the fulfillment of our great destiny of justice and freedom. Let us reaffirm our faith in our Constitution. Let us vow to preserve and protect it. Let us guard it with eternal vigilance. Let us, in the words of William Randolph Hearst, set aside "A Constitution Day to give all American citizens an opportunity to make public declaration and demonstration of our reverence for the great document whose provisions protect our liberties and preserve our Republic."

Ours must be the American way. Ours must be the American tradition, with its love of liberty, with its ideals of equality, with its practice of human brotherhood.

Our fighters for freedom gave life to our Constitution and their lives for it on flaming battlefronts. Our Constitution will protect us if we protect our Constitution.

Tribute to Hon. Fred Marshall, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my admiration and high regards for that farmer-statesman and my very good friend, the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, and to welcome him to our councils where he now sits as Representative from Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District. I know that I express the sentiments of the entire Minnesota Democratic delegation when I say that we are immensely proud of FRED MARSHALL, and that it is a great honor to have him as a colleague and fellow worker in the fight for a legislative program of prosperity, social justice, and world peace.

The voters of Minnesota's Sixth District are indeed to be congratulated for their wise choice when they selected Mr. MARSHALL as their Congressman. He is a man of great ability, integrity, experience, and one with a deep devotion to liberal principles and the welfare of his country.

The Sixth District of Minnesota is largely an agricultural area, and Mr. MARSHALL is especially qualified to represent his district, and speak with authority on the needs and interests of his constituents. For he is a genuine "dirt" farmer—a gentleman and a farmer but not a gentleman farmer—one who has worked and managed the 400-acre farm in Meeker County, Minn., which has belonged to the Marshall family for four generations. As a practicing farmer by profession, FRED MARSHALL knows the common, everyday problems of the small family-sized farm and is therefore able to speak from first-hand experience on the needs of the vast majority of his constituents.

In addition, FRED MARSHALL comes to Congress with a background of 12 years of distinguished service with Federal farm programs, which has given him a full understanding of most of the practical problems of agricultural policy. As a former State AAA committeeman, he knows the technical aspects of price support, parity, and farm marketing problems. As a former State director of the Farm Security Administration, FRED MARSHALL is acquainted with the needs of the underprivileged one-third of our rural population. As a former Director of the Farmers Home Administration, a position which he resigned after his election to the Eighty-first Congress, Mr. MARSHALL can speak with authority on the question of farm finance and farm tenancy.

As one who has his roots deep in Minnesota's history, FRED MARSHALL has experienced the hopes and aspirations of her people, and his voice will express these hopes and aspirations. I am confident that he has a great legislative career ahead of him, and I know that my colleagues and friends in the House will enjoy working with him, and when they come to know him personally they will share my admiration and high regard for him.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a section of Drew Pearson's column, Washington Merry-Go-Round, which appeared in the January 12, 1949, edition of the St. Paul Dispatch, which discusses Minnesota's FRED MARSHALL:

Of all the new faces in the Eighty-first Congress, none is more welcome than a friendly, square-jawed countenance atop a 6-foot frame belonging to Congressman FRED MARSHALL, freshman Democrat from Minnesota.

In fact, it might be said that MARSHALL is the most welcome addition—period—because he replaces that all-American isolationist and reactionary, Harold Knutson, generally considered the most disagreeable man in Congress.

MARSHALL'S first mission in Washington, he says, is to explode the belief that most of the folks in my country are rabid isolationists "like my predecessor." The Minnesotan, unlike Knutson, doesn't talk much. However, he has been a champion of the Truman foreign policy and will support most of the liberal domestic reforms the President advocated. He knows the problems of the farmer from A to Z, having been one all his 42 years.

One of these problems, which MARSHALL hopes to see remedied, is insufficient low-cost, rural housing. MARSHALL got some first-hand pointers on this as Minnesota director of the Farmers Home Administration (formerly Farm Security Administration) before coming to Washington.

His oddest campaign experience happened in a small town shortly before election when he met a voter who insisted that he (MARSHALL) could not be a candidate for Congress. "Harold Knutson was just through here and told us he had no opposition," said the voter.

In the end, the voters of Minnesota's Sixth District decided otherwise, giving MARSHALL a majority of 4,200 out of 130,000 ballots.

Radio Broadcast by Eugene Lyons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Eugene Lyons:

KATYN CRIME

Ladies and gentlemen, I want to talk to you today about a very unpleasant subject. A hideous, an appalling, story of cold-blooded mass murder, one of the most frightful atrocities of the last war.

Frankly, I don't relish the job of reviving the ghastly memory. We've seen and heard so much horror in recent years that it seems unkind to exhibit some more at this late date. But it's a job that has to be done. It seems to me important—not only for Poles but for

Americans and for all mankind—that this particular atrocity be kept alive.

Why? Because the murderers are known. Only a deliberate conspiracy of silence has shielded them against exposure. The time is ripe to crack that conspiracy wide open, to pillory the guilty nation before world public opinion.

Some of you may recollect a grim piece of news nearly 6 years ago, back in April 1943. At that time it was a shocking sensation. The Germans announced that in a place called Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, in Soviet Russia, they had discovered a number of mass graves; in those graves—thousands of corpses fully clothed in cold-weather military uniforms.

Because of the chemical peculiarity of the soil, the bodies were still fairly well preserved. From personal objects in the pockets—such as letters, diaries, documents—the victims were easily identified as Polish officers, from generals down to noncommissioned grades.

The Germans charged flatly that the Poles had been massacred in April and May of 1940, when that territory was still in Soviet hands. As proof they cited impressive evidence. The dates on scraps of newspapers found on the bodies and in the graves, for instance. The fact that not one of the letters from relatives or unmailed outgoing letters carried a date later than April or May 1940. The fact that the diaries all ended abruptly on those dates, cut off by sudden death. These and a mass of other findings were established by a group of physicians and other scientific specialists from many of the countries then under German control.

Berlin accused the Russians of having slaughtered those officers. It was one of the most shocking atrocity charges of the whole war. But the world was too familiar with the cynical, lying German propaganda. Normally the whole story would have been dismissed as another piece of Dr. Goebbels' trickery.

But in this instance it could not be so easily brushed off. It happened that over 10,000 Polish officers, prisoners of war in Russia, had been mysteriously missing. There had been no trace of them. The Soviet authorities would not or could not explain their amazing disappearance. The German discovery was therefore the first clew to their grim fate, and it could not be treated lightly.

Let's go back a bit to the period when Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia were friends and allies, in the first 22 months of the war. When the Red armies marched into Poland, by prearrangement with the Germans, in September 1939, they took a lot of prisoners—over 180,000 by Moscow's own admission. Among them were some 11,000 officers.

Then, in June 1941, Hitler turned on his partner in the rape of Poland. He invaded Russia. Despite the Soviet stab in the back, the Polish exile government, headed by General Sikorski, made peace with Moscow for a common struggle against the Nazi beast.

Among other things, the Russian-Polish agreement provided for the immediate formation on Soviet territory of a Polish army, to be drawn from the Polish prisoners, who, of course, were all amnestied. General Anders, released from a Soviet torture cell to command the new force, counted on using those officer prisoners.

From concentration camps throughout Russia the amnestied Poles flocked to the colors. But a strange and alarming mystery developed. Of the 11,000 officers, only about 400 showed up. Weeks passed, months passed. But not a single one of the more than 10,000 missing officers appeared. Inquiries through the Polish underground among their families showed definitely that none of them had returned to Poland.

General Anders and the Polish Government pressed the Soviets for an explanation and got only an embarrassed shrugging of shoulders. General Sikorski took up the matter with Stalin in personal interviews. Stalin promised to inquire—but again nothing happened. This went on for nearly 2 years—until the sensational German announcement of the Katyn Forest discovery.

Though the Sikorski government distrusted the German enemy, the mass extermination of those officers—the flower of Polish manhood—could not be written off as an unsolved mystery. It suggested that a neutral investigation be undertaken by the International Red Cross.

To this suggestion Berlin agreed immediately. But Moscow said no. More than that, it denounced the Poles for making the proposal and used the episode as a pretext for breaking relations with their government. The rest is familiar history. The Kremlin proceeded to organize a Polish quisling committee, headed by Communists—the committee which in due time evolved into the present Red regime in Warsaw.

In the face of the German accusations, the Soviets, in April 1943, countered with a claim that the brutal massacres in Katyn Forest had been committed by the Germans themselves after they occupied the Smolensk area. All the Polish officers, the Moscow version declared, had been captured by the Germans when the Red Army retreated.

Now, stop to consider this version. For nearly 2 years the Russians, including Stalin himself, had been unable to give a plausible explanation for the missing 10,000. But, suddenly, after the bodies were found and identified, they trotted out a detailed story. If they were telling the truth, why hadn't they told those facts in the past? Instead of pretending to look for the missing men, they could have said, frankly, "Sorry, but your officers are unfortunately in the hands of the Germans."

After all, the loss of 10,000 prisoners—all of them officers and among them 14 generals—was not a trifle that would be overlooked by the Soviet military authorities. The normal Russian procedure was to evacuate prisoners to the rear as the invaders advanced. Ten thousand officers was too rich a prize to be simply "forgotten" and left to the enemy.

The whole Soviet version was a transparent lie—an attempt to pin their own frightful crime on the Germans. To bolster their belated claim they instituted an inquiry by their own Soviet scientists as soon as Smolensk was again in their control. Naturally it sustained the Soviet version.

The date of the massacre of Katyn Forest, according to the findings of this inquiry, was supposedly August of 1941. That was a sad blunder. Why would the victims have worn overcoats, woolen socks, fur gloves, and other winter clothes in August? Caught off guard, the Russians mumbled something about freak weather that year. A check-up of the facts, however, showed that it had been a normal hot summer month in that region.

And that brings us to the conspiracy of silence to which I alluded. Since Soviet Russia was an ally in the war against Germany, neither the United States nor Great Britain cared to look into the unsavory Katyn Forest facts. It was more convenient to accept the Moscow lies and forget the matter. The continuous demands by Polish representatives for a fair, objective study of the horrible affair went unheeded.

After the war, in preparing for the Nuremberg trial of German leaders, the conduct of the case insofar as atrocities in eastern Europe were concerned was left to the Soviet prosecutors. Not to mention the most publicized and most appalling of the war crimes would have been too obviously an evasion. The formal indictment therefore listed the Katyn Forest massacre among the charges against the Germans.

Some testimony was read into the Nuremberg record. But the witnesses were hand picked by the Russian prosecutors. Several of the scientists who had made the original investigation for the Germans were now living in liberated countries—one of them in Switzerland, another in Italy, a third in France. They were willing to testify. They have told the press that their study and report in 1943 had been made honestly and not under pressure. But the Soviet prosecutor was careful not to call them. Instead he called the one scientist who was living in Bulgaria, a Soviet satellite state—the one investigator, that is to say, who had to testify as the Russians wished, or else.

The proceedings, in short, were carefully manipulated to prevent the exposure of the real murderers. And yet, when the Nuremberg verdict was handed down by the Allied judges, lo and behold, not a word about the Katyn Forest accusation. Crimes that were trivial by comparison were adjudicated, but this one simply was not mentioned. The Soviet judges issued a minority report of their own, but even they avoided all mention of the Katyn massacre.

In effect therefore the Germans, though found guilty of endless other heinous crimes, were exonerated of this one. And if the Germans didn't do it, it means that the Soviet Russians did. Stalin's regime stands convicted of mass murder. But the conspiracy of silence continues. To appease the tyrant of the Kremlin, the democratic world tacitly agreed to close its eyes to the Polish blood on his hands. The policy of appeasement has been called off in other respects, yet it persists in relation to this foul massacre of innocents.

But the truth must be established. Pressure must be brought on our Government and on the United Nations to undertake a complete, impartial examination of the facts. It's up to you and me, to every man and woman who has a conscience, to expose the mass murderers. This we must do in justice to bleeding Poland whose best sons were killed in cold blood. This we must do in order that the whole world may see the true character of the despotism enthroned in the Kremlin.

TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward B. Smith, from the Knoxville News-Sentinel of January 5, 1949:

TENNESSEE NOTEBOOK—PAUL PETERS—REMEMBER HIM?—CROPS UP AGAIN IN NEWS AS ANTI-TVA CRUSADER

(By Edward B. Smith)

Plenty of signs appeared during the Presidential election campaign last fall that if the Republicans gained control of Congress, TVA and this region which it serves would be in for a very unhappy time.

Additional evidence, minor to some extent but still quite significant, has emerged since the election. It is in the form of a staff report to the House Committee on Small Business concerning TVA's fertilizer operations.

The report bears a publication date of December 1, but obviously had been written before the election under the impression that the GOP would be in control, that the House committee would remain intact, and that a full-scale attack on TVA would soon be launched.

But the committee is dead, and its chairman and another influential member, both Republicans, have been retired to private life.

The chairman was Representative Walter C. Ploeser, of Missouri, who took a leading part in killing the New Johnsonville steam plant; the other committeeman was Representative W. H. Stevenson, of Wisconsin.

Actually there is nothing new in that staff report; it is a rehash of most of the half-truths which TVA enemies, including some leaders in the commercial fertilizer industry, have been tossing around for years. But the press associations a few days ago discovered it, and reported on it briefly.

It is a dead report to a dead committee, and there is no reason to revive either. But just to show the nature of the report, it should be discussed briefly.

It declares that "by strict commercial standards TVA's chemical plant operations were operated at a loss of almost $4,000,000 in 1947." The report says that TVA's bookkeeping methods would not be countenanced in private industry.

It charges that the price of TVA fertilizer was, during the war, far out of line with that charged by the private fertilizer industry.

Finally, it accuses TVA of discrimination by distributing most of its fertilizer production through farm cooperatives.

The answers are rather simple.

TVA makes no pretense of operating its fertilizer program by commercial standards. The program is wholly experimental and is carried on for the purposes of developing better techniques and higher grade fertilizer, and in educating the farmers of this country to use more fertilizer and better fertilizer.

On two occasions, the last time being only last year, the General Accounting Office has given high praise to TVA bookkeeping procedures, and compared them to best procedures in well-managed private industry. Whenever GAO praises anything, it is rare and big news.

TVA fertilizer prices were high during the war because facilities were being used largely for production of nitrates for explosives. The unit price for fertilizer was, naturally, therefore, very high.

TVA cooperates with land-grant colleges and county agents in distributing fertilizer for supervised test purposes. It also ships large quantities to co-ops, which act as distribution agents and make sure that the farmer members who get this fertilizer use it properly and keep accurate reports. Last year TVA, in answer to that same complaint about "discrimination," asked the National Fertilizer Association to suggest a better distribution method. The association couldn't do it.

The most interesting thing about this staff report, however, is the identity of the man who did the research work and signed the report. He is Paul O. Peters.

The name should strike a responsive chord in local memories. The clock turns back to 1938. TVA was having hard going those days in the face of assaults from its own Chairman, Arthur E. Morgan; from Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; from Senator Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire, and Representative Knutson, of Minnesota. The private Power Trust, encouraged by these attacks, was hammering away at TVA.

At that time Paul Peters was on the Republican National Committee pay roll in Washington. He was writing some of those anti-TVA speeches for BRIDGES and Knutson.

He also turned out a series of press releases against TVA; a few newspapers, including the Chicago Tribune and the Knoxville Journal, printed them with a great flourish.

The News-Sentinel properly identified Mr. Peters in a small front-page item and it apparently embarrassed him. He sued for $30,000, alleging libel.

Nothing happened for more than a year. The case was set for trial on November 16, 1939. When the judge called it up, neither Mr. Peters nor his attorneys were present. That was the end of that.

Textbooks Favoring Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Forest Republican of Tionesta, Pa., for January 13, 1949:

Before the start of the current public school year we drew attention in these editorial columns to the problem of cleaning up leftist textbooks in Forest County schools.

We cited one instance which gave an untrue picture in favor of Communist Russia, its institutions and its economy.

It is hoped that action is being formulated to eliminate this and any other malignant school texts. In this connection we are privileged to quote an editorial from a recent issue of the Industrial News Review. This editorial reads as follows:

"Some time ago, in Chicago, an organization of educators, which claimed that it represented 2,000 colleges and schools, held a convention. One of the principal speakers was an author of textbooks—and his books have been thrown out of some 1,400 schools because civic and patriotic organizations found them excessively critical of American principles and traditions. Another personality on the program was the representative of a teacher's union which was expelled by the American Federation of Labor on charges of communism. A third prominent speaker had long been a writer for New Masses and the Daily Worker, and was named by a congressional committee 'as a professed card-holding member of the Communist Party and as a member of more than 80 so-called Communist-front groups.'

"These left-wingers in the ranks of American educators are the exceptions. Thousands upon thousands of teachers are doing a splendid job and are helping to fight the forces of darkness which wish to turn this country into a totalitarian police state. But the fact remain that a dangerous proportion of American teaching and textbooks is based on the theory that practically everything is wrong with the United States, that the economic system called free enterprise exists to exploit the people, that the founders of the country, from Washington down, were self-seeking and dubious characters, and that the hope of the world lies in communism or some kindred philosophy of life and government.

"What this kind of teaching does to unformed minds isn't hard to fathom. It dwarfs the achievements that created our greatest, and magnifies our defects. It avoids the fact that our kind of government and our kind of economic system has done far more, for far more people, than any other ever devised. It leaves the student with nothing to tie to, nothing constructive to believe.

"It is a healthy sign that there has been a remarkable upsurge of interest in the quality and content of American teaching and textbooks in the last year or two. Young men and women now in school will determine what sort of a country we will have in the future. Academic freedom must not be used to justify warped and subtle instruction which produces distrust of the American tradition, and praises, by direction or indirection, governments which exist only through the cruelest oppression and terrorism.

Health Care for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 17th of the month I had the honor to appear in the Alexandria Gazette as guest columnist for the distinguished columnist, Charles Parmer. The subject of the article which I wrote was The Need To Provide Good Health Care for Every American. In this article I supported the general health program of the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARMER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Charles Parmer)

(Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat of Florida, is Charles Parmer's guest-columnist today. Senator PEPPER writes on The Need To Provide Good Health Care for Every American. He is the leader of a Senate group sponsoring Federal health aid proposals which President Truman endorses. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat of Virginia, was Mr. Parmer's guest-columnist Saturday. He stated his objections to the President's proposed health program.)

(By CLAUDE PEPPER, U. S. Senate, Florida)

The quality of medical care in America is very high and our standards of medical education are probably unsurpassed. In spite of this, the health needs of the American people remain unmet to a great extent.

The Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education, of which I was chairman, in several of its reports revealed the gravity of the Nation's health problem. On the basis of selective-service experience at least 40 percent of our men of military age—between eight and nine million men—are unfit for military duty. On any one day, at least 7,000,000 people in the United States suffer some illness. As many as 23,000,000 persons have a chronic or disabling disease. Sickness and accidents cost the Nation at least $3,000,000 a year.

Our health services and facilities are wholly inadequate. Forty percent of our counties do not have even a full-time local public health officer. Hospitals are needed—areas of our country with an aggregate population of 15,000,000 people do not have a single recognized general hospital. Pure shortages of doctors, nurses, dentists, psychiatrists, and other trained health personnel are so great that many persons are forced to forego medical care. In 1944, 553 counties had less than one active physician per 3,000 population, the danger line. And numerous counties had no active doctor at all.

If we had adequate services available for mothers and children, we could prevent at least half of the deaths of mothers who die in childbirth, and one-third of the deaths of the young babies. Our State health agencies have, on their waiting lists, thousands of crippled children who require and cannot get proper attention because of the lack of facilities and personnel, and over half a million children with rheumatic fever fail to receive good medical care.

We should not fool ourselves into believing that the United States is the healthiest Nation in the world. Official charts and tables of international health organizations

show that many other countries have lower death rates at various ages, higher life expectancy rates, lower infant and maternal mortality rates, and smaller incidence rates for some of the major illnesses.

These deficiencies are understandable. Only a small part of our people are able to pay for comprehensive and adequate health care, because good medical care is expensive. Most American families cannot afford to pay for it out of current income or savings. In 1944, the average family reported an expenditure of $100 or 4.6 percent of its income for medical care. We also know that people with lower incomes have more sickness and need more medical care, yet they receive substantially less than those in the upper-income brackets.

When sickness does hit, it strikes hard. Wage losses and medical costs arising out of sickness have very often wiped out a family's savings and driven it into debt, irrespective of the level of income. Many Americans will not call a doctor until they are seriously ill, and many others are reluctant to accept medical attention on a charity basis.

We cannot continue to regard complete health care as a luxury, or as a dole to be exchanged for self-respect. The need for national health insurance, financed by required contributions to a health insurance fund has now become clear. Furthermore, a vast new public-health program is a must.

None of us is in favor of socialized medicine; all of us want to see our national health system continue to expand as an integral part of our system of free enterprise with the assistance and encouragement of our Federal, State, and local governments. We will see that this is done.

What we are trying to do now is to develop a comprehensive program so that all of our people may receive the full benefits from our fine medical profession. In response to the needs and wishes of the American people, President Truman and the Democratic Party will press for the enactment of legislation to provide for the building of additional hospitals; for the modernization of existing hospitals; for the establishment of new and the enlargement of existing medical and other schools of health for the training of additional doctors, dentists, psychiatrists; for a recruitment and training program for necessary nurses and other health workers; for a system of scholarships and loans to deserving and qualified young men and women to enter the health profession; for the expansion of our public health facilities, particularly in our small towns and rural areas; for the enlargement of research and training programs in cancer, heart, poliomyelitis, leprosy, dental, mental, and other serious illnesses; for the expansion of our maternal and child health and school health services; for vocational and other aid to our physically handicapped.

Above all, we will provide, step by step, for the formation of a national health insurance program to bring hospital, medical, dental, nursing, and clinical care within the reach of every American man, woman, and child upon the basis of the typical American principle of insurance, and not charity. We will provide and guarantee the free choice of doctors by patients. Doctors will be able to accept or reject patients who may apply to them.

In looking to the future of the United States we must not forget that we are a community of human beings. If the United States is to fulfill her great democratic role in the world of nations, the doctors, other members of the health profession, public officials, and all other citizens must work together to develop and maintain a national health program to take care of the physical and mental well-being of the American people. The most precious thing we cherish is good health.

Foolish Huddle in Omaha

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa Tribune of January 15, 1949:

FOOLISH HUDDLE IN OMAHA

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Philadelphia, who is the Republican national chairman, has summoned the national committee to meet in Omaha. He calls the committee into this Omaha huddle to labor for "numerous suggestions for outlining a Republican program and policy during 1949."

Why Omaha? It is central, but what can the national committee do? Resolutions, whatever they may be, are worthless. Only Republicans with legislative powers can put Republican principles into practice.

What does Mr. SCOTT think he can now accomplish in Omaha that was not accomplished last June in his own home town of Philadelphia? There something more than a national committee sat in conference. The Republican Party itself was there.

Tom Dewey, Governor of our greatest State, and Earl Warren, Governor of one of our greatest States, were chosen as the crusading leaders. But they didn't crusade. That's where the campaign went wrong.

Both Dewey and Warren rose to places of political power because they were great prosecutors. The Republican Party had every reason to believe that by selecting them they were elevating to leadership two great crusaders who would reveal to the American people the dangers of the dramatized hypocrisies that are leading us to ruin.

But what did Dewey and Warren do? They let the party down. That's the fact. They rolled over the country on their campaign trains delivering poetic platitudes that certainly did not prosecute corruptions.

Meanwhile, Mr. Truman dramatized fight. He announced that he was going out to "give them hell." The people apparently were in the mood for a little hell-raising. They got it, they asked for it and now they've got to pay for it.

Mr. Truman comes to the full term with the endorsement of less than a majority of the voters. But he accepts that minority vote as a mandate. Four times Franklin Roosevelt talked of a "mandate from the people." So Mr. Truman blows the mandate horn. And now he proposes to outdo Roosevelt in raids upon the people's treasury. He is going to tax and tax and tax.

The Republican Party can do nothing about this tax burden business at Omaha. To take some Republican politicians out on the west bank of the Missouri for a conference is just plain silly. And it's high time the Republican Party quit being silly.

The Truman program is totally illogical, costly, fraught with dangers to the survival of free government. If carried out, it is certain to destroy our free economy. There is but one place where the Republicans can effectively register protests and broadcast statements that will reveal the dangers that confront us. That place is Washington, not Omaha.

The Republican Party has great traditional principles. Those principles are voiced in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. There are 42 Republicans in the Senate of the United States. There are 174 Republicans in the House of Representatives. What those Republicans say and do will have some effect on the minds of the people, but Mr. SCOTT's huddle at Omaha will have none.

Where is the Republican in either House in Congress who is protesting this proposal of Truman's to increase our national debt to the incomprehensible altitude of more than $250,000,000,000? In the Senate of the United States there has been just one voice in vigorous protest to this infamy. And that comes not from a Republican, but from a Democrat, HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

In last summer's campaign Harry Truman gave an exhibition of a fighter. He was not the champion of any exalted cause. He was fighting for an office in the true Pendergast fashion. He was wholly reckless with the truth. But Dewey did not rise to the stature of the statesman who assails untruths.

If ever again the Republican Party is to enlist the confidence and the support of the American people it must be its old self as a crusader for efficiency and for economy in the people's business.

The Republican Party must speak from the floors of Congress now or forever hold its tongue. Running out to Omaha is just political comedy. The Republican Party must again be the champion of the rational progress that once gave it place and power. The truth is the Republican Party has abdicated its own record and its own history. It was a great Republican, James G. Blaine, of Maine, once the Republican Party's banner bearer, who first put forward the theory of reciprocal trade agreements. And it was this same Blaine, of Maine, who assailed the predatory privileges of high tariff by declaring in the Senate: "Such movements as this, if endorsed by the Republican Party, will speedily put the party in retirement."

It was a Republican President, William McKinley, who, the day before he was assassinated at Buffalo, declared: "Isolation is no longer possible or desirable. No nation can longer be 'ndifferent to any other. Reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not."

It was a Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, who first urged the reclamation of western arid land. It was he who 47 years ago put through the Newlands Act, which was the first of the great reservoir acts which has been copied at the Coolidge Dam, the Hoover Dam, and other great engineering enterprises. The New Dealers adopted that big Republican idea.

It was a Republican named Sherman who drafted the first antitrust laws. It was a Republican President named Harrison who signed those laws. It was the Republican Roosevelt who made trust-busting synonymous with his name. It was a Republican President named Taft who carried many of these far-reaching actions into office. It was the Republican Party that first firmly believed in the idea of cordial and helpful cooperation between management and labor. What has happened? The Republican Party has allowed its political opponent to brand it as opposed to all the largeness and the liberalism of Republican tradition.

Without a crusading leadership, the Republican Party last November received the endorsement of 22,000,000 American voters, while millions, confused and dissatisfied, did not even care to vote. These twenty-two millions and every one of the millions of confused and discontented can be captured by the Republican Party if and when the Republican Party again becomes the militant party that gave it a glorified place in the pages of American history. The Republican Party has been the liberal party. It has been the sustaining friend of the farmer without attempting to purchase the farmer's favor. It has been the friend of labor. Any review of labor legislation, including the rational

Taft-Hartley Act as opposed to the Wagner Act, is all political history that should again become the inspiration of a crusading, rational, aggressive, and progressive political party.

All the Republican Party needs now is a captain to call the signals. One rational, fearless, truth-telling, truth-seeking leader can liberate a people from bureaucratic boodle and bondage. It is the story of all great human triumphs. It can be story of the Republican Party now. But Omaha is no place to go to do it.

The Right To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are still some people in the United States of America who realize that, if we are to eat, wear clothing, have shelter, and a few other things that are not actually necessities, but which we all want, someone, somewhere must work. Some of us still believe in the good old-fashioned doctrine that if a man can get a job for pay which he considers adequate, there is not any reason why he should not be permitted to take it and earn something for himself and family.

Nevertheless, there are certain groups who seem to feel that the right to strike, as they call it, carries with it the right to keep other people from working. Unfortunately, altogether too many people until they were personally affected by being driven from their jobs, have gone along with the idea that while a man ordinarily had no right to beat you up on your way to work, if he was a picket he and other pickets could not only keep you from your job, but had a right to give you a beating.

An editorial of the December 6 issue of the Allegan Gazette, written by Leo W. Hoffman, calls attention to that situation. That editorial reads as follows:

THE KALAMAZOO RAID

Last Wednesday 300 men invaded Kalamazoo by auto, blocked streets in the vicinity of the strike-bound Shakespeare plant, tipped over workers' autos, burned a truck, surrounded Sheriff Buder and prevented him from performing his duty, assaulted and injured a policeman and 6 other persons, prevented the fire department from performing its duty, destroyed company property, and then quickly departed. Mr. Shane, State director of the CIO United Steelworkers, admitted that its members conducted the raid.

In other words, the CIO has, by violence, by openly defying the laws of the State of Michigan and the United States, attempted to win their strike by intimidation.

The men who planned the raid, the men who took part in the raid are criminals. They are guilty of assault and battery, felonious assault, obstruction of justice, disorderly conduct, and other innumerable crimes.

Ever since the New Deal took over the reins of Government, ever since Murphy permitted the sit-down strikers to remain in control of private property, we have had incidents such as this repeated time after time.

The United States Government has done nothing to discourage the unions from their acts of violence with the exception of the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. The State and local authorities have done very little to punish these offenders and nothing to prevent such incidents from occurring (with the exception of Prosecutor Killian and Sheriff Kubath from Berrien County).

With Truman and the New Deal again in power, and the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act promised, labor again feels that it can commit its crimes against the public without fear of punishment. With WILLIAMS elected, we can expect little aid from the State police (not that we have had very much). Local sheriffs and police, not equipped to handle rioting on a large scale, are intimidated. So we are again at the mercy of the labor goons, some Communists, others as bad as Communists.

By this deliberate, planned raid, labor has served notice on the employer and the individual workingman that their demands must be met or else the employers' property will be destroyed, and the individual will be beaten up. We are again due for an era of violence and lawlessness unless we knuckle under.

Where is that freedom to work guaranteed by the Constitution? Where is the law that protects the individual from lawless acts committed by his neighbor? The Constitution of our country has been superseded by the New Deal, and we must appease the hoodlums. It is an open season for crime. A majority of our citizens decided at the last election that they would rather be the dependent upon the State for charity than maintain their independence. They trade their freedom for a piddling sum of money. We are no longer the United States of America, we are the United Socialistic States of America.

L. W. H.

Foreign Air Bases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, ever since the start of America's foreign aid program—long before the war—I have suggested that foreign bases for ships and planes should be secured, so to speak, as collateral for the billions of dollars which America was pouring abroad.

Unfortunately, for a long time previous to the war, during the war, and after the war, this suggestion was not heeded, with the result that we gave our taxpayers' resources without ever securing very much tangible return in terms of the needs of our own people.

Along this line, the Hearst newspapers throughout the Nation, including the able newspaper in the largest city of my own State, the Milwaukee Sentinel, carried an editorial entitled "Air Bases Vital to Peace."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR BASES VITAL TO PEACE

Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, has offered the challenging suggestion that many European nations benefiting substantially from American assistance programs are in a position to reciprocate in a manner to increase the security of the United States, but have been neither required nor even requested to do so.

As an illustration he points out that some of the nations profiting most from the Marshall plan have island or territorial possessions in the Atlantic and Pacific strategic areas which will be of major aeronautical importance in the event of a future war involving the United States.

During the last war, as a matter of fact, the United States was permitted and actually urged to build air bases on many of these islands, and did so entirely at its own expense and at very great expense, and the ultimate victory was materially hastened by these operations.

But since the war, the United States has not retained military rights or even commercial privileges in the majority of these strategic areas, although the nations enjoying sovereignty over them do so only because the United States adequately strengthened them and successfully defended them.

With permanent military rights in these vital areas, the United States could be assured of victory in any future war, and in all probability prevent all future wars.

But in the hands of an enemy of the United States, the same areas could be utilized for the waging of aggressive warfare not only against the United States but against the whole civilized world, and might conceivably be the instruments for the enslavement of all mankind.

Why does not the Government of the United States, as Senator WILEY suggests, initiate negotiations with the various friendly powers thus concerned, with the object of preventing future war?

Particularly urgent in this respect, he emphasizes, is the subcontinent of Greenland, from which air defense could make America virtually impregnable in a future war, but from which an enemy air assault might also be of such proportions as to devastate and perhaps defeat the United States.

"Because of its overwhelming importance," Senator WILEY has written to Secretary of State Marshall, "may I suggest that our Government, if it has not already done so, enter into and follow up on negotiations with Denmark for some cooperative agreement whereby we can use Thule as a Greenland base for our air corps."

He reminds Secretary Marshall that the military aviation range from Greenland "would blanket some of the most important areas of production on the American Continent."

"It seems to me," his letter continued, "this Greenland air base is a sort of eastern anchor for our defense, just as Alaska is our western anchor, and every effort should be made to make it a bastion of United States defense instead of an air highway for invasion of the United States."

If the rehabilitation of European nations after a past war is so important to the United States, why is not the prevention of future war equally important?

Why, indeed, should not all possible contributions to American security be required of the rehabilitated nations as a condition of our assistance?

As Senator WILEY so earnestly observes:

"I feel that use of air facilities at Thule and negotiations for similar air rights on

many other ocean outposts belonging to foreign lands are certainly courtesies that America has a right to seek in return for the untold millions she has expended and will expend for European recovery."

Since permanent peace is the basic aspiration of most of the nations of the world, and American economic and military resources are the main support of peace, the relation between rehabilitation and the prevention of war is obvious and should be the keystone of American policy in the whole field of American assistance.

National Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the proposed national housing bill, which has been issued to the press by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The sponsors of the new comprehensive national housing bill in a joint statement today said that after careful consideration they had decided that the provision in the bill which would withdraw the tax exemption now accorded the obligations of States and their political subdivisions is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Commttees and should not be considered by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the housing legislation.

Senator MAYBANK, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, will move that the provision be struck from the bill when the committee takes the legislation up.

The Senators also stated that before hearings on the housing bill begin within the next couple of weeks they intend to introduce other legislation primarily in the form of amendments to existing legislation with respect to such matters as insurance of home mortgages by the FHA, secondary markets for FHA-insured or veteran-guaranteed loans, and provision for the middle-income families.

Manchuria, the Tinderbox of Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which was written by a great American commentator of the air, Mr. George Moorad, entitled "Manchuria, Still the Tinderbox of Asia."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian of January 8, 1949]

MANCHURIA, STILL THE TINDERBOX OF ASIA—ONCE AGAIN RUSSIA'S AGGRESSIVENESS, AS IT HAS FOR CENTURIES IN THE ORIENT, CREATES RESISTANCE BY WORLD POWERS

(By George Moorad)

Again the fuse is sputtering in the historic tinderbox of Asia. Time and again since the first Cossack freebooters swept down from Siberia in the sixteenth century Manchuria has proved the spark that lighted war between the various influences and powers scrambling over China's sprawling body. Time and again over the last half century Japan, America, Britain, China, France, and Germany have combined to stop the Russian drive for the commanding ice-free ports of Manchuria, and four times it has come eventually to war. From Peter the Great to Stalin there has been no fundamental change in Russian tactics, except that today the United States alone must challenge Russia's mastery of the Pacific.

This is not a matter where America's distaste for war or even a popular willingness to ignore the Russian challenge will in the end have any telling consequence. The same geopolitical influences which through the centuries have dictated Russian aggressiveness simultaneously create resistance on the other side, which, in this case, means America standing on her somewhat tenuous bulwark in Japan. A whole series of historic errors have been perpetrated which again has unloosed the Russian glacier and now makes this struggle quite inevitable. From Secretary of State John Hay down to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the principle of resistance remains unchanged by academic argument.

A dominating characteristic of this age-old struggle for Manchuria is the use of treachery to gain one's ends. Whether this is due to the oriental background of the participants is open to some question in view of the latter-day developments, yet it is true that the secret treaty, the bribe, the broken promise figure prominently in every chapter from the Treaty of Nerchinsk in 1689 to the Yalta agreement in February 1945.

In early times relations between China and Russia were casual and friendly until the seventeenth century, when land hunger or greed, furs, and gold drove the Cossacks from the Urals into rich Manchuria. A war of 30 years' duration ended in 1689, when the Russians were driven to the north bank of the Amur River, and not until 1728 were commercial relations between the two countries fully restored.

In 1858 China's swift decline before the onslaughts of the West set the Russian bear in motion. After first gaining the south bank of the Amur and the territory of Ussuri to the sea, which includes the port of Vladivostok, the Russians then portrayed themselves as friends of China and offered to mediate for the removal of French troops in Peking—for a price. Their mediation was unsuccessful, but China paid the broker's fee.

HOPES OF CZAR SET BACK BY JAPAN IN 1894

In 1894 Japan gave czarist hopes a rude set-back by defeating China and seizing, besides Formosa and the Loochoos, the Liaotung Peninsula which dominates Manchuria. Japan was forced to disgorge Liaotung chiefly because of pressure from America and Great Britain, but while signing the peace treaty of Shimoneseki with the Japanese, the Chinese Foreign Minister, the famous Viceroy Li Hung-chang, immediately proceeded to St. Petersburg where he signed a secret treaty of alliance with the Russians. Perhaps bribery played a part in Viceroy Li's decision, for he was much too clever for the naive explanation which he gave his government. In a telegram to Peking he said:

"Russia possesses enormous stretches of land, which are settled very sparsely. She will not, therefore, encroach upon one foot of soil owned by others, and as for China bonds of intimacy link her with that country. She has no motive for wishing to connect the railway in Manchuria except the prompt conveyance of troops, and that again is wanted in order to effectually come to China's aid if at any time we should be in straits."

Russia had promised China help in the event she was attacked, but at the same time the czar secretly promised to help Kaiser Wilhelm gain the port of Kiaochow (now Tsingtao) on the Shantung promontory. Only a year after her promise to the Chinese was signed, Russia combined with Germany to strike a staggering blow, the Germans taking Kiaochow and the Russians seizing the Liaotung Peninsula. Even the Russian Foreign Minister, M. deWitte, had been double-crossed by his Emperor. When the Chinese frantically appealed to M. deWitte for assistance against the Germans, deWitte promised to intervene only to be informed by Czar Nicholas that "our ships are proceeding with instructions to occupy Manchuria."

Japan was enraged by Russia's seizure of the strategic ports which Japan had been forced to surrender. Great Britain moved quickly to take the port of Weihaiwei, lying directly between the Russians in Manchuria and the Germans at Kiaochow. The dismemberment of China seemed imminent when the United States intervened with Secretary of State John Hay's famous notes upon the open door in 1899.

NOTES SENT BY JOHN HAY INSISTED ON RIGHTS

Although the principles of free trade and equal opportunities in China had been enunciated as early as 1843 by Daniel Webster, through the first American envoy to China, Caleb Cushing, Secretary Hay now sent a series of circular notes to London, Berlin, St. Petersburg, Tokyo, Rome, and Paris. His first note in September 1899, bluntly insisted that America would insist upon equality of opportunity in every part of Korea, Manchuria and China, and this was followed by a steady strengthening of our position until on January 13, 1905, John Hay informed the world that: "The United States is irrevocably committed to perpetuate the broad policy of maintaining the integrity of China and the 'open door' in the Orient."

The open-door notes served to clarify American interests in the Orient, to which the Czar reluctantly agreed, but already the Russians had gone too far. Through Mongolia and Manchuria, Russian policy was attempting to set up a Russo-Chinese alliance, while at the contiguous ports of Dalny (Dairen) and Port Arthur they had established the greatest naval base in the Pacific. This was a dagger at Japan's heart, and was scarcely less palatable to the United States and Great Britain, who carefully prepared the Japs for their swift and crushing attack upon Port Arthur. Britain assisted in building Japan's warships and training her crews, while the American bankers, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., actually financed the war.

Nearly all the circumstances of the Russo-Japanese war of 1904–5 have a familiar ring. American newspaper cartoons of that time picture Uncle Sam somewhat divided between

the pleasure of selling war supplies to either side, and the anxiety that war would spread.

Port Arthur to the Russians was what Pearl Harbor became to the United States 37 years later. The dispute about Korean ports and the Russian occupation of Manchuria had reached the stage where the Japanese consul at Chefoo was given permission to visit Port Arthur to evacuate Japanese nationals. A high Japanese naval officer traveled as a servant with the party, noted the positions of the mighty Russian Navy, and reported within a few hours to Fleet Admiral Togo in Japan.

As at Pearl Harbor, there was no declaration of war. Port Arthur on the night of February 8, 1904, says a contemporary observer:

"* * * thought uneasily of a war that might come, perhaps. Port Arthur's military and social leaders took the occasion to make merry. Bright lights flashed throughout the Russian port. Carriages rattled over its thoroughfares. The dreamy strains of the waltz and the martial note of the patriotic anthem echoed through the streets. Beautiful women in the height of fashion and brave men in the habiliments of social intercourse lent life to the gay scene. Wine and laughter, the unbounded hospitality of rich homes, the glitter, glamor, and noisy joyousness of the circus tent were the order of the hour. Naught suggested the war cloud hovering overhead save the fleet of warships lying at anchor in the harbor, bristling with guns.

"It was 11 o'clock," the story continues, "and the merriment was at its height. Then came the awful transition. Torpedoes that seemed to shake the very globe burst forth in uproar and flame. The hideous crash of warfare, the cries of the wounded and the groans of dying men smote the ear. As on the eve of Waterloo when the booming of cannon blasted the dance, so now a sudden sweep of violence terminated the festivities."

The Japanese on that February night in 1904 carried their swift attack exactly as they did their dash upon Pearl Harbor in 1941. Japanese torpedo ships, familiar with the Russian flashlight signals, penetrated the screening vessels until they were among the giant warships in the inner harbor. The Russian battleship *Pallada* was on the outside of the fleet on lookout duty when the Jap torpedo boats approached with full lights running. An artillery officer noticed them and informed the *Pallada's* captain that they were Japanese. The captain denied it and said they were built in Port Arthur, and when the artillery man persisted the captain informed him icily: "I am in command of this ship, sir." A moment later the first torpedo struck.

AMERICA THOUGHT JAP ATTACK ON RUSSIA WAS FAIR

Although Czar Nicholas protested to the world about this act of treachery, the American viewpoint at that time was that all's fair in war, and our cartoonists gleefully pictured the bearded Ivan protesting because the Japs had been smart enough to strike the first blow. It was still considered that eventually the superior Russian strength would win, but transport difficulties over the single-track trans-Siberian railway and the final shattering defeat of Admiral Rojestvensky's fleet by Togo made Russia willing enough to negotiate.

Peace upon extremely generous terms to the loser were arranged through President Theodore Roosevelt's strong-arm diplomacy. At the Portsmouth Naval Yard it was agreed that the territory of Manchuria should be evacuated by both armies, Russian treaty rights to Port Arthur and Dalny should pass to the Japanese, while both sides promised to maintain the open door. As peace treaties go, this document was unique, for Russia lost only the fruits of her illegal conquest and Japan made few imperial gains. The real victory was to President Theodore Roosevelt and the principle of the open door.

This period probably marked the most effective period in American diplomacy, which maintained neutrality without isolation, yet confined hostilities without the risk of intervention. The world response to the open-door notes, including the replies from Russia and Japan, so severely limited the potential fruits of victory that both sides were amenable to President Roosevelt's demand for truce.

It is interesting to note T. R.'s shrewd comment on the negotiations which culminated in the peace of Portsmouth. He wrote:

"I am bound to say that the Japanese have impressed me most favorably. * * * They have always told me the truth. They are a very secretive people and I speedily learned that I must never read into anything they said one word more than was actually down in black and white * * * but the Russians lied so to others that they finally got into the dangerous position of even lying to themselves."

President Theodore Roosevelt is so often pictured as a rather sophomoric devotee of the big stick that his accomplishments inside the range of traditional American neutrality tend to be overlooked. The wise and realistic judgments of this period also appear to scotch the argument that today's costly blunders are admissible because of American youth and inexperience with international affairs.

In subsequent years Manchuria has remained the bone of conflict in the Far East, and the United States has intervened repeatedly, though without wide public appreciation of the fact. In 1917-18 American, British, and other alllied troops were assigned to Siberia ostensibly to prevent the Russian revolution from slopping over into China, but also to prevent the Japanese from taking what they had hoped to get in 1905. In 1922 the liberal government of Japan was again persuaded by American pressure to quit Kiaochow, which they had taken from the Germans, and the balance was maintained until Japan struck again in the Mukden incident of September 1931.

Manchuria was obviously the beginning of World War II, the first step in a policy of appeasement and retreat which led inevitably to Pearl Harbor. It is argued that the fatal misstep was made by Britain's Foreign Secretary John Simon, who refused to join Secretary of State Henry Stimson in a demarche upon Japan. But Stimson was Secretary in the Hoover Cabinet, and the problems of the depression and a strong isolationist sentiment make it improbable that the United States would have acted with any courage adequate to the situation.

The puppet state of Manchukuo became a fait accompli which thoroughly destroyed the application of the open door. Only Russia remained to challenge Japanese expansion, which she did with several large-scale battles between 1937 and 1939. Then a 20-year friendship pact was concluded with the Japanese, which the Soviets destroyed in 1945 at the secret urging of the United States.

It is extremely difficult to explain the Yalta policy of February 1945, but at least it is consistent with the unhappy pattern of Manchuria. At the Cairo Conference in 1943 the foreign treaty ports of China were abolished and Manchuria was promised to the Chinese National Government. At Yalta, about 14 months later, Manchuria was secretly delivered to the Soviet Union and the principle of the treaty ports was reinstated exclusively for Russian benefit.

YALTA RESTORED SITUATION BEFORE RUSS-JAP WAR

Yalta restored the precise conditions which brought about the Russo-Japanese War, but this time without the stated safeguards of the open door. Equal opportunities are implied in the treaty which describes Dairen (or Dalny) as "a free port open to the trade and shipping of all nations," but actually no trade or shipping except Russian has entered the Manchurian ports since VJ-day. In 3 years of diplomatic secrecy and silence since Manchuria was occupied, Russia's exclusive possession has become a fait accompli.

The only public explanation ever offered for the secret Yalta promises is that of expedience caused by military miscalculation of Japan's remaining strength. This is plainly inadmissible. No amount of military ignorance can change the fact that Marshal Stalin voiced his positive interest in Manchuria to Secretary Cordell Hull 2 years before the Yalta conference and by mid-1944 Soviet troops were being ostentatiously routed through Moscow for Siberia.

Six months before Yalta the Soviets officially began their anti-Japanese propaganda campaign by issuing special stamps recalling the treachery of the Japanese attack in 1904, and a book called Port Arthur, which stated: "Every stone and piece of soil of Port Arthur is as dear to Russian hearts as are the stones and soil of Sebastopol." Ignorance of Soviet intentions in Manchuria was impossible no matter what the plight of United States military intelligence.

GAMBLE ON STALIN'S WORD SEEN IN AGREEMENT

It is rather possible that Yalta was entirely political, based upon the knowledge that Japanese and British influence had been destroyed and that, for better or worse, the United States and Russia stood face-to-face in Asia. The elements of the status quo had been destroyed by war and distributed as largesse at Cairo, so rather than take responsibility alone the United States chose this breath-taking gamble upon the word of Stalin.

The decisions of Yalta, one of the conferees explained to us in Moscow a few days later, were to become the foundation of Mr. Roosevelt's 50-year plan to win the trust and understanding of the Soviet Union.

Whether Stalin would have kept his word had Mr. Roosevelt lived, or whether the late President might have closed the floodgates at the last moment is a subject for fascinating but futile speculation. What has happened is that Russian imperialism is on the march again, has seized Manchuria and is cascading into China with an energy never equaled by the Cossacks or the Czars. Reluctantly facing her is the United States, our diplomatic weapon of the open door dissolved, yet pledged to the struggle by even deeper commitments than those which swayed our policy in 1943. The fuse is sputtering loudly in Manchuria, breeding ground of wars.

Increased Salary and Expense Allowance of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by

David Lawrence, dealing with the action of the Congress in connection with the increase in salary and expense allowances for the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House. This very able article points out to us the effect of what we have done by our recent action. It should be read by all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 17, 1949]

TAX-FREE ALLOWANCE VOTED BY SENATE SEEN PROBLEM FOR TRUMAN—PRESIDENT CANNOT KNOW WHETHER HE'S ENTITLED TO MONEY AS PAY UNDER BILL

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman can save future Presidents much embarrassment and set an example of forbearance and dignity by requesting the House of Representatives to amend the bill just passed by the Senate that gives him a $50,000 tax-free expense allowance. No President hereafter will ever be sure whether he can pocket that sum as a part of his income or whether he is under moral obligation to spend it only for a public purpose.

It isn't as if a President doesn't have his expenses paid by the Government. For out of the so-called budget for the White House of more than $1,000,000 a year, he gets the following things:

1. A house with plenty of bedrooms and baths, rent free, plus servants—not a dime of which expense he has to pay. All upkeep and repair expenses are paid by Uncle Sam. The maintenance amounts to about $260,000 a year.

2. All expenses for official entertainment.

3. A fleet of automobiles and chauffeurs for the personal use of himself and family. The Government pays for the upkeep and gasoline used.

GETS PRIVATE YACHT

4. A private yacht and crew that cost the Government a large sum annually to maintain.

5. A private airplane with luxury accommodations and maintenance crew that costs the Government quite a sum annually to maintain.

6. A $40,000 allowance for travel which can be used for political campaigning by the simple trick of calling the trips nonpolitical.

Now it is proposed to increase the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000. This item would be taxable and thus the President would be just like anybody else insofar as that sum is concerned. Last year he netted approximately $48,000 after taxes because of the split-income rates of husband and wife and under the proposed salary he would net $60,000 after taxes.

But when it comes to the $50,000 expense allowance, tax free, which the Senate has just voted to the President, no businessman has any such privilege. The Government scrutinizes closely expense accounts in business and disallows them if not spent for business purposes. Even so, when the item is ruled to be deductible, the Government bears only 38 percent, while the employer bears 62 percent of the cost of the expense item. There are no tax-free expense allowances in private business.

NO ACCOUNTING NECESSARY

The precedent in this case is also bad because the Senate voted that a President didn't have to make an accounting if he didn't want to do so. Does this mean he can add the $50,000 to personal income? Why put a President of the United States in the embarrassing position of having to decide whether a given expenditure is one that he would or would not have made if he had not been the Chief Executive?

If the House of Representatives wishes to put the matter of a President's salary on a realistic basis, it can increase the present amount to a total of $240,000 a year and make all of this taxable just as is any executive's salary, subject to the usual deductions. This means that at present rates his net sum after taxes would be about $110,000, or the equivalent of a $100,000 taxable salary and $50,000 tax-free allowance as the Senate has proposed.

No element of tax avoidance would then be involved and the precedent would be an honorable one, though to be sure many of the so-called "little people" who are supposed to have won the election for Mr. Truman will wonder since when does "a man of the people" need so much money for personal use the moment he wins an election?

A President who cannot save money on a $75,000 taxable salary when all his rent and servants and transportation are paid for by the Government is not setting a good example of economy or thrift. Likewise a President who accepts a tax-free allowance of any kind and asks the other citizens to pay taxes is not interpreting correctly the basic principles of Thomas Jefferson on which the Democratic Party was founded. Only kings and princes are treated on any other basis. It's a bad way to start off the Fair Deal.

Rights of Alaskan Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving the Indians," from the Alaska Weekly of January 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING THE INDIANS

Mr. James E. Curry, who saves Alaskan Indians at a profit, has broken into print again with the dire prediction that 7,000 Indians surviving in southeastern Alaska are due to die miserable deaths within a few years unless their land rights are defined before various schemes to populate the Territory with whites take effect. "The more whites there are in Alaska," said Mr. Curry, "the greater will be the encroachment on the Indian's right to live unless that right is legally defined."

We were blissfully unaware that an act of Congress was required in order to legally define the Indian's right to live. In our ignorance we had assumed that the Indian of Alaska, being an American citizen in full right, had certain constitutional guarantees concerning his right to live and his right to the pursuit of happiness.

This is not to say that the entire system of aboriginal rights and the Indian land claims in general should not be clarified by proper legislative action for the sake of all Alaska, whites and natives alike, but it is to express a certain measure of disgust with the professional native agitator.

As for example, in the same interview Mr. Curry passed out the following misinformation:

"Some time back Interior Secretary Krug was about to sign an order giving some Eskimos a reservation near Nome.

"A hill of jade was found in the center of the area, an Indian was thrown into jail for attempting to mine it, white mining interests began to show a great interest in developing the jade deposit, and the order has not been signed."

The easily ascertained fact is that this so-called mountain of jade had long been located and a certain amount of work toward its development had been accomplished long before Secretary Krug attempted to turn over this highly mineralized area to the Eskimos.

In common with all others interested in Alaska, the Alaska Weekly is interested in the welfare of all Alaskans, and that includes the natives of the Territory. It has been our observation that the Indian Service, the Territorial health department, and many other agencies have evidenced a paternalistic interest and a generosity toward the natives never accorded by any governmental agency to the whites pioneering the country nor capital seeking its development.

We feel that even without the paid services of Mr. Curry the natives are in small danger of mass starvation or dying a miserable death in the foreseeable future.

Trades Unionist and Hemispheric Air Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, few, if any, understand better than do the workers in the aircraft industry why continuity of production loads in aircraft factories constitutes a major factor in the defense strength of the United States. Production workers and skilled technicians in aircraft factories must be currently familiar with production models. If they are furloughed or become separated for extended periods that familiarity is largely lost. Furthermore, discontinuity of work discourages them with the industry and causes the skilled personnel to seek employment elsewhere—employment in industries where continuity of work, and, hence, income, is reasonably well assured. Such persons, because of their skill, command good wages, and at the same time are sought after by other industries. I speak not only of production workers in their many classifications, but, particularly, of the tool and die makers and the erectors and maintenance men on jigs and fixtures.

You cannot turn the aircraft industry off and on like a spigot. It takes time to organize and train a production team and it takes time to train workers in the specialized aspects of the skills needed in the industry.

In the past 5 years, by virtue of the demands of new designs for high-speed aircraft, the degree of skill required among the various trades employed in

the aircraft industry has mounted very high, indeed. For example, the construction of a wing designed for speeds approaching the sonic range requires a perfection of skill in construction so far beyond that required for the earlier World War II aircraft that it is not possible to employ workers in modern wing construction who are as relatively unskilled as were those who built the wings for the earliest type of aircraft. Continuity of employment and, hence, continuity in training to the new degrees of skill required is becoming a tremendously important factor, therefore, to the defense of our country.

On last December 11, in the Washington Trades Unionist, appears an article written by Mr. John Baer, formerly a Member of Congress and in recent years a familiar figure representing the A. F. of L. on Capitol Hill, entitled "Hemispheric Air Defense—The United States 70-Group Program." This article went out to over 1,000 A. F. of L. and farm papers and has been widely published. The article referred to is as follows:

HEMISPHERIC AIR DEFENSE—THE UNITED STATES 70-GROUP PROGRAM

With the termination of the war in Europe began a period of transition for the Army Air Force. This resulted in Air Force redeployment from the European to the Pacific theater of war for the final action against Japan. Within 90 days the Japanese capitulated to our Air Force bombings—and immediately came Nation-wide demand in this country to "get the boys back home."

From the effective combat force of VE- and VJ-days and within 12 months the enormous fighting force of 243 groups was reduced to but two effective groups. We have now begun the long trek back to the necessary 70 groups, which had long been determined was the minimum force necessary to the security of our national defense.

By virtue of the failure of the United States Senate to act on H. R. 6247, the 70-group bill, a vast part of that 70-group-force program, with its complementary groups in the National Guard and Air Reserves, now exists only on paper. It constitutes but a part of a ponderous governmental record, kept in the headquarters of the newly established United States Department of the Air Force.

With the dismemberment of the Air Force combat forces in 1945 and 1946 came the renegotiation and cancellation of 18,090 separate contracts, totaling more than $22,000,000,000. The cancellation of these contracts was reflected not alone by unemployment in airplane factories, but unemployment in practically every manufacturing center in the United States.

This almost complete liquidation, if not annihilation, of the American aircraft industry was described in the report of September 13, 1948, made by the Grand Lodge of International Machinists.

That report read, in part, as follows:

"The aircraft retrenchment program affected not only production of current types of planes, but involved lay-offs of hundreds of highly skilled technicians working on research and experimental projects. The airframe industry had a peak employment during the war of 1,250,000 workers, exclusive of companies manufacturing aircraft engines, propellers, and aircraft parts. Employment declined so that in March the Department of Commerce reported a total of only 148,000 employees in the air-frame manufacturing plants.

"The case of one company is typical of the industry's experience. Douglas Aircraft reached peak employment in August 1943 of 157,000 workers. * * * In January 1948 the company had only 16,000 employees, and * * * less than 5,000 were on the active recall list on that date. * * *

"Recently, at Lockheed, 80 tool and die makers were laid off for a period of approximately 3 months and at the end of the lay-off only 1 of the 80 returned to work. During that period the 79 had found employment at other jobs—in some cases at a lower rate of pay—and they chose to remain in their new jobs rather than to face the uncertain economic conditions in the aircraft industry.

"* * * Certain significant passages, typical of the stress placed on our national defense requirements, are quoted from the reports of President Truman's committee:

"'* * * The United States must have a double-barreled policy abroad. It must work to achieve world peace through support and development of the United Nations. At the same time it must prepare to defend itself for the possibility that war may come. * * * Reluctantly, this commission has come to the conclusion that relative security is to be found only in arming the United States so strongly that—

"'1. That other nations will hesitate to attack us, or our vital national interests, because of the violence of our counterattack they would have to face; and

"'2. That if we were attacked we will be able to smash the assault at the earliest possible moment.

"'This country, therefore, if it is to have even relative security, must be ready for war. Moreover, it must be ready for modern war.'

"The recommendations of the President's commission and the congressional committee strongly affirm the country's need for the prompt adoption of a program designed to give us air supremacy by 1953. That length of time is the time required to complete the over-all program based on an Air Force composed of 70 groups. Emphasis is placed on the need for a new approach to aircraft production. Rather than Congress providing funds on a year-to-year basis, a long-range program is urged which will give adequate consideration to all phases of the problem.

"* * * Supremacy in the air is the first requirement for maintaining peace, and of meeting an attack upon the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland by another country. The interests of our country require building and maintaining not only a strong but a stabilized aviation industry—working on a long-term production program that will afford and maintain for us supremacy in the air at the earliest possible date."

Address Before Alexander Hamilton Club of Tulsa, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Alexander Hamilton Club, Tulsa, Okla., January 15, 1949:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed refreshing that in the midst of a tangled and snarled mess of social, economic, and international problems we can assemble as Americans in this remarkable city of Tulsa and freely discuss our common interests. Stimulated and inspired by the collossal record of Alexander Hamilton, we gather tonight without fear, secure in the knowledge that despite the events of November 2, the spirit of republicanism still lives as a vital, virile force throughout the Nation. To those of faint heart, may I call your attention to the fact that nearly 22,000,000 people in these United States voted Republican, as against slightly in excess of 24,000,000 who voted Democratic. Can anyone say that 22,000,000 Americans are not a virile, vital force in the Nation? No, my friends, the Republican Party, which has survived victory and defeat down through the years, still lives, and under proper leadership and guidance will again command the intelligent support of those who believe in a fundamental concept of liberty and freedom for the individual and in a government of law under the Constitution.

The events of the recent past should serve as a warning to the 40,000,000 who failed to exercise their right of suffrage and should inspire them to active participation in the political affairs of the State and Nation, if we are to preserve our freedom and liberty and prevent an ultimate devastating collapse that may take us down the path to state socialism or communism.

I shall not attempt to explain the events that may have precipitated the defeat of our party on November 2. Those events are now history and reference to them is valuable only as a guide in attempting to interpret what is to come in the future. We are a Nation dedicated to the principle of two-party government. I pray the time may never come when we will have such a variety of splinter parties that none can successfully carry on the Government. The situation in France should be sufficient warning to cause all thinking Americans to pause. Our Nation has risen to its great eminence because we have always had a strong majority and minority party. I was in attendance at the last Republican Convention at Philadelphia, and out of the welter of confusion and heat a voice was heard that sounded a call that in my judgment will go down in history as one of the great historic statements of all time. Our only living ex-President spoke in part these words:

"Great as your problems are, they are no greater than Americans have met before your time. You are no less able or courageous than they were. Therefore I repeat, what you say and do here is of transcendent importance. If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope. If you produce no leadership here—no virile fighter for the right—you will have done nothing of historic significance. If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you are wasting your time and effort. If, on the other hand, as a mature and inspired political party, you face the truth that we are in a critical battle to safeguard our Nation and civilization which under God have brought to us a life of liberty, then you will be guided in every step to restore the foundations of faith, of morals and of right thinking. If you choose your leadership with full recognition that only those can lead who believe in your ideals, who seek not only victory but the opportunity to serve in the fight, then you will issue from this hall a clarion call in as pure a note—in as full a tone—as that call to arms which your political ancestors issued at Ripon, Wis., when this party was born to make all men free."

Never in the history of the Republic was a more inspiring statement ever made. In my humble opinion, the Presidential campaign of 1948 fell far short of those ideas and ideals. The Democrats were specific in their

promises. They left no room for doubt. They said they would repeal the Taft-Hartley law. Many Republicans were either "hush-hush" or divided on the issue. Some thought it might be amended; others said it would stand. The Democrats made specific promises to the farmer, to labor, to the aged, to the unfortunate, and to the housewife. The Republican leadership wrote most of the same promises in their platform but refrained at the highest level from slugging it out with the opposition. Many Americans grew sympathetic for the under dog. Many apparently were not impressed by appeals for unity and reaffirmation of the Golden Rule. The people apparently wanted some concrete definite expression from the Republican leadership; they received nothing from the top but generalizations. This ought to teach each and every one of us that the American people are hungry for truth and facts and it is the responsibility of every good Republican in America tonight to actively and militantly fight for those positive principles in which we believe. It will not do for us as Republicans to simply say: "We can do it better," since that is a mere presumptive conclusion. To say that Republicans are competent and the opposition are a lot of bunglers is a mere repetition of the same presumptive conclusion. We must be able to furnish concrete evidence to show how we could do it better and show in specific terms how we can improve the welfare of our Nation.

There is no use talking about reorganizing the Republican Party with this or that set of leaders, when our first procedure should be to organize the thought and purpose of the party in keeping with its record and history. It is my opinion that such a course will develop leaders who will stand staunchly on principles and policies for the ultimate welfare of and service to our people. Our people and the future of our country are not safe in the hands of men who think and speak of fear and who listen alone to the coercive threats of the so-called pressure groups. We must have leadership that will think first in terms of public service and of the wants and needs of the people. It should be clear by now that in all times and in all lands, leaders have earned their places by courageous stands and not by maneuvering or scheming to foreclose the lawful ambitions of others or by disregarding the wants of the people. Our determination to see our country forge ahead is just as great and our faith in our people is just as strong as ever, and I am certain that the Republican Party still has men who are courageous, dauntless fighters for the right, and that out of this conflict there will arise such leadership that will save our country from drifting and sinking into sheer, pure socialism.

On January 5 the President delivered his message on the state of the Union. You will recall that during the recent campaign the President repeatedly declared that the Eightieth Congress was the worst or the second worst Congress in the history of the Nation. He repeatedly gave the impression that the Nation was all but destroyed as a result of the action or inaction of the Eightieth Congress. How different was his initial approach in delivering his address on the state of the Nation:

"I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Nation is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness."

He further said: "Our private enterprise system has reached new heights of production. Since the boom year of 1929, while our population has increased by only 20 percent, our agricultural production has increased by 45 percent and our industrial production has increased by 75 percent. We are turning out far more goods and more wealth per worker than we have ever done before."

This, in the year 1948 while operating under the legislative leadership of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress—the greatest number of people employed, the highest national income, and the greatest production ever achieved in the history of the country in peacetime; and still it was contended that the Republican Eightieth Congress failed to meet its responsibilities to the people. I call attention to these facts merely to demonstrate how necessary it is for our people to think and to reason if we are to find the truth that must guide our actions as citizens.

The President has just submitted his proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, and ending June 30, 1950. It is the most collossal, intricate, and complicated budget ever submitted to a Congress of the United States. It consists of 1,429 pages of small print. It actually weighs 6½ pounds. It would take a lifetime of effort and study to comprehend all of its multitude of figures and details. I think it might be helpful to state the budget situation in terms of receipts and disbursements per fiscal year. In the fiscal year 1948, the Government actually collected as total receipts from the public from all sources $45,372,000,000. It spent $36,524,000,000, leaving a balance of $8,848,000,000 in the Treasury. This was the first year of Republican control of the Congress.

The fiscal year 1949 will not end until June 30. It is estimated that despite the tax reduction provided for by the Eightieth Congress, the Government receipts from all sources will amount to $42,923,000,000. Total expenditures were estimated at $40,133,000,000. It is anticipated that there will be a surplus above expenditures of $2,790,000,000. These are the President's own estimates as contained in his recent budget message. Thus for the fiscal years of Republican control of the Congress we will have operated for the first time in many years in the black with actual surpluses in each year in the Treasury.

We now turn to the estimates of the President for the fiscal year 1950. He estimates that total receipts from all sources of Government revenue will be $47,185,000,000. He estimates that disbursements from the Treasury will total $45,710,000,000, leaving a surplus at the end of fiscal year 1950 of $1,475,000,000. I must call your attention, however, to the fact that the President has recommended tax increases including increased pay-roll taxes that are estimated to bring into the Treasury an additional $5,950,000,000. We must understand that these are mere estimates and already proposals are being recommended in the form of a new lend-lease program for the purpose of arming certain unnamed free nations that will cost an additional $2,000,000,000. Thus it should be apparent to anyone that even in the face of the most optimistic estimates of income, we will have to embark upon a program of deficit finance before the end of the fiscal year 1950. This can mean one of two things—either increasing the national debt or further devaluation of the gold content of the dollar in order to create an artificial treasury balance. The situation is critical and frightens even the most casual student of government finance.

Many people clamoring for more and bigger public expenditures, for more and bigger Federal grant-in-aid programs of all kinds, have apparently been lulled into a false sense of security and utterly fail to realize that unless the Government provides for an orderly and constant amortization of our public debt as a definite part of our fiscal policy, we may in the future face a situation of the gravest consequences. In my humble opinion, orderly debt management and retirement is a positive necessity if we are to maintain the fiscal solvency of your Government and mine. How, then, can this be done? All indications point to a continuation of the Marshall plan and a continuous increase in the amount needed for our armies of occupation in foreign lands and for various and sundry programs of aid to the nations that are fighting Communist aggression. All indications point to increased rather than diminished appropriations for national defense. As things now stand in the present Congress, little or no reduction of appropriations requested for these proposals will be made. The chances are that they will be increased rather than cut. It is possible, however, to materially reduce our spending for internal peacetime functions and activities. I am one who believes that it is also possible to install practices of economy in our national-defense program and our foreign-aid program that will very materially reduce the sums alleged to be needed. It is high time that the people of America begin to realize that one of the greatest threats to our freedom and liberty in this country and the American way of life is to be found in the extravagant spending of the United States Government for internal peacetime functions and activities, oppressive taxation, and a dangerously high public debt. We all complain of the inflation that has cut away the purchasing power of our dollar, and yet many fail to realize that one of the largest items of expenditure made by the average individual is the taxes that he is forced to pay to Federal, State, and local governments. Federal spending in 1940 approximated $9,000,000,000. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, $36,524,000,000. Current annual Federal expenditures exceed the total national income in 1933.

It should be apparent to every thinking person, therefore, that one of the first obligations of the Eighty-first Congress is to keep the budget in balance and provide a surplus that will maintain a program for orderly debt retirement. The greatest care must be exercised that taxation does not reach the point of confiscation and dry up the sources upon which taxes are levied. The best way to acquire surplus funds for debt retirement is to reduce every Government expenditure not absolutely necessary for the maintenance and extension of necessary Government services. I trust that the Hoover Commission report will point the way to streamlining our giant Federal Government by consolidation of Federal agencies and elimination of duplicating and overlapping services and activities among the various departments of Government. There must be drastic curtailment in the Federal pay roll, and it would seem a matter of common sense that needed increases in compensation to Federal employees could best be accomplished by a reduction in personnel. There are literally hundreds of places in the Federal budget where considerable cuts can be made and in no way interfere with the orderly and necessary Government services. This has been demonstrated time and again. Citizens all over America must be aroused in some way to the delicate and critical fiscal situation facing your country and mine. We must no longer look to the Federal Government to support us. We should support, and eventually will be forced to support, the Government if we are to avoid complete disintegration of our American system of business as well as Government. Members of Congress should be encouraged by you people to resist selfish, special interest, pressure groups of any kind. The public are entitled to have the Congress place the national welfare above local needs and local pressures. Does this mean that we Republicans have no

interest in the welfare of the common man? I bitterly resent that charge. We want the real benefits of social security to be achieved for all of our people. We want the standard of living of our people raised. We want full employment. We want good wages. We want necessary internal improvements. We want the benefits of rural electrification extended. We want our waterways harnessed to prevent flood and disaster. We want our resources developed to provide much-needed electrical energy. We want erosion control and reclamation and good soil practices continued. But, my fellow Americans, unlike many of our Democratic friends, we must take account of the cost. We must know where the money is coming from. We must know how these vast sums that must be provided by taxation can be raised without breaking the back of the taxpayer. The President in his message expressed the hope that we could legislate all of his objectives into law and provide the money for their implementation into action without ruin to the capitalistic society that has brought us the best standard of living of any people on the face of the earth. I assure you, my fellow Americans, that the accomplishment of this objective is no simple assignment. I am one, however, who refuses to accept the philosophy that we are headed for ultimate collapse and ruin. I refuse to surrender my faith in the intelligence, the courage, the integrity, and the vision of our people. I am convinced if it can be marshalled and applied to the situation at hand, we will be able to ultimately solve our problems in the great public interest.

There are many of the proposals submitted by the President in his state of the Union message that any good American who believes in justice and human liberty can support. There are other suggestions so intimately associated with the Communist and Socialist attitude toward government that we who believe in the capitalistic system will be compelled to oppose.

As a Republican, I do not conceive it to be my responsibility to merely become a heckling, defeatist, and unintelligent opposition. I believe that we as a party have a golden opportunity to go to the people of America with a definite program of constructive legislation that will permit the accomplishment of many of the social objectives that the people of America demand and yet do so within the framework of our constitutional guaranties and within the framework of our established capitalistic system of government.

Isn't it queer that after 16 years of Democratic control, during all of which time the administration in power had complete control of the executive, the administrative, the legislative, and I may say the judicial branch of the Government, with the exception of two—is it not queer that with all this opportunity for the passage of legislation in the interests of the people that we should now hear it said that cartels and monopoly and Wall Street are in the saddle—that the people are still ill-housed, improperly clothed, and suffering from the pangs of hunger and malnutrition? What has this great party been doing all these years with the untold billions that it has had at its command, if it has permitted the development of the giant monopolistic influences of which it now complains? What has this Government been doing to protect the interests of the common man during the past 16 years, if one-third of our population is still ill-housed, poorly clothed, and ill-fed? It comes with poor grace, it seems to me, at this late hour, to attempt to assess Republican responsibility for the ills that beset mankind when you and I know, and every thinking person knows, that the party in power, while appealing constantly to the underprivileged, has utterly failed legislatively to provide the relief which they contend is so badly needed today.

I again say to you, my fellow Americans, that it is high time for us to think, and to think not in terms of our own peculiar selfish interests, but to think in terms of what is for the best interest of the whole people. Human avarice, selfishness, and greed are still found in the hearts of men. There must be developed in this country a great crusade for truth and for justice among all our people. We should determine here and now as Republicans to carry on the fight for freedom and for liberty. We must determine here and now to rededicate ourselves to the interests and welfare of our great country and by precept and example demonstrate to the people of the world that here in America, with liberty and freedom, tolerance and justice and the principles of democratic government still live.

Our Public Recreation Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, during the Eightieth Congress we have had as Chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives the distinguished gentleman from California, the Honorable RICHARD WELCH. I had the privilege of serving on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with the gentleman from California, and on the same subcommittee with him, and have a warm personal friendship for him.

When he came, by reason of the Reorganization Act and the change in parties, to the Public Lands Committee and became its chairman, it was my pleasure to serve with him 2 years, during which time I had the opportunity to observe his kindness, his fairness, and the ability with which he handled this great committee.

I am glad to pay tribute to the fine service which the distinguished gentleman from California rendered thereon. It was a real pleasure to again have the opportunity to serve with him.

In December of last year, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] chairman of the Public Lands Committee, delivered before the California State Chamber of Commerce a very fine address entitled "Our Public Recreation Lands." In view of the important matter contained therein and the fine presentation of the problem, I wish to include it in my remarks at this time. It follows:

OUR PUBLIC RECREATION LANDS

(By Hon. RICHARD WELCH, United States Representative from California)

1. INTRODUCTORY

I wish that I could come before you today with the statement that, here in California and in the other Western States where we have such bounteous recreation resources on the public lands, there is no recreation problem.

If recreation were there for the taking without any need for organized special services to the public, or any need for construction work, or maintenance, or other incidental jobs, I, as chairman of the Public Lands Committee, would be spared a great deal of trouble and expense.

But that is not the case. We have to make our great recreation resources accessible to people by building and maintaining facilities for public convenience, and by imposing reasonable measures of discipline in the various public use programs. We have to think ahead where our public lands are concerned because we have to guarantee those lands freedom from plundering and deterioration of the national park, national forest, and other public uses we have organized so carefully upon them.

Every time I go into a national park or national forest and see how the public, despite our earnest efforts at friendly discipline, is always on the verge of debasing the magnificence of our scenery, I realize how important the job has become.

The automobile load of perfectly fine Americans will gaze spellbound at the scenery from Washington Point in Yosemite National Park, and at the same time throw out lunch wrappers, beer cans, and all manner of trash to the four winds. You can go up there right now and see this condition; and it is repeated at a thousand places in California alone.

My point is that such an attitude is indicative of the public indifference we encounter all the time in trying to perpetuate in every way the high values of parks and forests and other recreation lands—to keep them free from simple spoliation and also from major invasion of nonconforming uses, such as overgrazing, overcutting of timber, and other enterprises that have little or no place in recreation land use.

We of the Government have tremendous watchdog responsibilities. That is why I cannot come before you saying that everything is all right. In the constant process of economic and social evolution nothing ever is ideal, apparently.

But I did not come here today to complain about the public. Far from it. For the most part the public is wonderfully responsive to what is right. I am more interested at the moment in telling you how facilities for the convenience of that public, at our recreation areas on the public lands, are rapidly going to pieces because of the lack of sufficient reconstruction and maintenance funds to keep them in good condition. We can't blame the public for this difficulty, although it is a public responsibility to see that the situation is corrected.

Taking only one situation among the several serious recreation problems—that of the western national park areas—I am very much disturbed by the general run-down condition of buildings, roads, trails, camp grounds, water and sewer systems, communications systems, and other structures.

I find that in a good many cases routine upkeep has not been possible for some years on anything like an adequate basis.

I am particularly concerned with this situation because, as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and as a citizen of the West, I deplore the way many costly park structures have depreciated to the point that they are beyond ordinary maintenance, and will require a great deal of reconstruction. The situation right now is an open invitation for even more serious conditions before betterment can be achieved, because it takes time to make corrections.

I take it that in such company as this there is no need for me to argue that recreation is one of life's essentials. All of you here today, I believe, are aware that the need to safeguard our natural recreation resources, and to make them available to people, is clearly a matter of duty in the business and social life of our phenomenally expansive West, along with the many other civic responsibilities.

However, I do feel that we have been taking the park maintenance problems for granted,

and letting it drift along without proper attention. The pleas of the National Park Service for aid apparently are not being heard clearly enough by the public, and by the public's Representatives in Congress where Federal funds are appropriated.

One writer on this subject has said that, until money can be provided for park maintenance, the Park Service would like to hang out a sign such as used to be seen in some western establishments, reading: "Don't shoot the piano player, he's doing the best he can." I know that we all have a great deal of sympathy for the Park Service, the Forest Service and our State Park people in this problem. They do not complain very loudly, and need assistance in getting their story told where it will do the most good.

The only way by which we are going to save ourselves from a great deal of additional trouble and expense is to take stock of the situation as individuals, and by organized civic means, in order to save our splendid natural recreation plant from further deterioration.

2. THE PROBLEM

During the war years the National Park Service, in common with some of the other non-war agencies, was asked to defer as much as possible of the national park program. The park service was trimmed down to a skeleton organization, and such matters as construction and maintenance of facilities were suspended almost entirely for the duration.

Buildings were not painted, roads missed their usual routine maintenance, clean-up was not done, trails were ignored almost entirely. In short, the entire park plant—and this goes also for forest service and State parks—began immediately to go to pieces. Because of war we had to stand by and watch that happen.

After the war everyone looked forward to readjustment and resumption of normal maintenance in the parks. But national and international complications have not been overcome to the point that we can settle down even yet to the arts of peace. The parks still are being operated on practically a starvation financial diet. We have not yet begun to refurbish the most neglected roads, some of our trails have disappeared almost entirely, campgrounds and picnic areas are neglected sadly, many of our buildings have not been painted or repaired for many years. Without adequate clean-up crews the park roadsides in numerous places have become so littered that they are a public disgrace. As I suggested at the outset, the general public might help a good deal in this particular problem—which is the most obviously discouraging of all. Paradoxically, during these past lean years in the parks, the problem has been aggravated by an amazing increase in use of the parks by the public.

You will be unusually interested at this point, I think, in a few figures which I requested of the Park Service. During the decade of the twenties there were 20,000,000 visits made by the public to the national park system throughout the country.

During the 1930's over 87,000,000 visits were made.

Thus far in the 1940's over 146,000,000 visits have been recorded. This is about equal to a visit from every person in the country.

During the four war years alone over 57,000,000 visits were made—almost two and one-half times the total number of visits during the entire decade of the 1920's.

Today our national population is 37,000,000 more than it was in 1920. Over 25,000,000 visits per year are being recorded at the national parks. I have visited the parks, observed the visitors, and studied their problems. I can say to you that people consider parks and recreation as necessities as much as they consider them luxuries.

The public will never give up the parks so long as our standard of living permits the individual to maintain that intense love of country which is so characteristic of every American; and which is inspired in no small measure in this age of wheels through the enlightenment of travel to the recreation places of our country.

We are thinking ahead these days in terms of thirty to fifty million visits per year, and this is a rather fearsome prospect for the Park Service in view of the present state of decay into which their facilities have fallen.

The task, of course, is to take care of park visitors adequately, in all respects. We must face squarely the fact that people need the parks, and that we are thinking today in wholesale terms by comparison with park needs of a few years ago when we still were in the retail epoch with only a few million visitors annually.

3. THE MEANS

Taking care of park visitors requires a complete plant at each area. We have to have administrative and protection forces and facilities, and construction and maintenance crews and facilities.

I have been a champion of the national parks, and recreation generally, throughout my life as a public servant which covers a period of 40 years, 23 of them in Congress. If in this championship I have emphasized any one particular thing it has been the principle of taking care of the conveniences which Congress has been able to provide in the parks.

Road work alone always looms high in the annual maintenance programs of the parks. In the 28 areas of the western national park region we have 437 miles of high standard primary roads, 1,306 miles of secondary roads, and 2,632 miles of trails.

During the present fiscal year the Park Service has only $248,400 for routine maintenance of those primary roads. That averages out at about $600 per mile per year for primary road maintenance, exclusive of snow removal or other unusually expensive operations which cost a great deal more than $600 per mile.

The fact is that with present-day costs we are trying to make road-maintenance money go three and four times as far as it is possible to stretch it. The fact that the Park Service had practically no road-maintenance money whatever during the war years, and has had very little thus far during the postwar period, means that in a good many instances road work has become a reconstruction job rather than a maintenance job. This is something which must be taken care of very soon if we are to escape costs of many thousands of dollars per mile for rebuilding before the roads again will be in good shape for maintenance at low costs. The same thing is true of minor roads and trails.

In the other departments where such developments as camp grounds, water and sewer systems, communications, and quarters are taken care of, the Park Service this year has only $437,000 for the western areas. This is about one-third of the amount needed.

I was astounded on my last trip into the Yosemite to learn that telephone-maintenance money this year was so meager that it barely sufficed to put the most important lines in service. The telephone line between Hetch Hetchy and the park headquarters had to be ignored. Yet when the 11,000-acre forest-fire catastrophe occurred at Hetch Hetchy last September, 24 hours were lost in getting adequate crews on the fire line because that telephone line was out of service. I have investigated this incident and know that a few hundreds of additional dollars would have made the difference. The fire is costing the taxpayers about $100,000.

There are many other examples of penny-wise pound foolishness. The question is: What are we going to do? I am doing all that I can to bring to the people at home, and to the authorities in Washington, an understanding that we cannot have people using our park and recreation areas of the West at the staggering rate of dozens of millions of visits per year without incurring a big bill. I can get many of the facts and tell the story. It is up to you people here at home to see to it that remedial measures are pressed vigorously until the situation is permanently corrected.

The Shenandoah Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Daily News-Record of Harrisonburg, Va., on Wednesday, January 5, 1949:

SHENANDOAH HISTORIC, TOO

Orval Hopkins, travel editor of the Washington Post, makes some amends for not giving at least a nod to the Shenandoah Valley's treasured history, and was so reminded by Kinsley McWhorter, Jr., office secretary of the Shenandoah Valley, Inc., and Mr. Hopkins then prominently displayed the following in his newspaper:

This quarter of the page led off last week with a headline reading "Williamsburg drips history" and went on in not too well chosen (it seems) words to talk about the Williamsburg-Jamestown-Yorktown triangle which had been laying claim to most of the history lying around loose. This temerity aroused verbs and adjectives in the breast of Kinsley McWhorter, Jr., office manager of Shenandoah Valley, Inc., Staunton, Va. McWhorter unlimbers and delivers as follows:

M'WHORTER'S LETTER

"DEAR MR. HOPKINS: Don't let those people down in Tidewater fool you. The historicitude of the Tidewater triangle is undeniable, but never let yourself be talked into believing that they are on the apex. Your column in Sunday's Post indicated you had been led to believe that Yorktown, Williamsburg, and Jamestown were it.

" 'Tain't so. Up here in the valley we originated the word history. We fathered the ancestors of Sam Houston, caught Daniel Boone on his way through, showed Woodrow Wilson the world and later let him visit the beauties at Mary Baldwin College (then Augusta Female Seminary), had T. J. Jackson teaching the youth, proved so beautiful to Matthew Fontaine Maury that he requested his casket be carried through Goshen Pass when the rhododendron were in bloom, we fathered the ancestors of half a continent, served as county seat for the West (Staunton itself did that), have the original deed to the Northwest Territory, fathered the Stovers who married the Eisenhowers who gave birth to General Ike, provided the battlefield for the most-studied campaign in military history, fed the Confederacy, invented the reaper, the sewing machine, and own the Seventh Wonder of the World."

VALLEY OF HISTORY

"If the triangle can top that, then we have the finest hotel in the East in the Hotel Roanoke; have eight major caverns whose history goes back some many millions of years; present the apple blossom festival: gave to the world Johnny Appleseed.

"This place reeks of so much history that it's becoming widely and popularly known as the valley of history. The Washington family came from and lived in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia; Gen. Muhlenberg, the preacher who got up in the pulpit and started enlisting men in the Eighth Virginia Regiment in 1776, lived in the valley; we've got Scotch, Irish, German, English, and Selim the Mohammedan in our history.

"Next time a triangler tyro tries to tell you he's tops, tip him off."

SOME MORE HISTORY

But Mr. McWhorter, even in his zeal in standing up for the Shenandoah Valley history didn't get near all of it. He might have mentioned that:

Governor Alexander Spotswood and his knights of the golden horseshoe first viewed the great valley of Virginia from Swift Run Gap in the Blue Ridge, and a monument now marks the spot. Governor Spotswood was so thrilled over what he saw in the valley that he recounted to no end the discoveries to the Williamsburg settlement.

Gen. John Sevier, noted Indian fighter, founder and first Governor of the State of Franklin and then 6 times Governor of the State of Tennessee to whose founding he contributed much, was born in the New Market Tenth Legion region.

President Abraham Lincoln's family lived in Rockingham County and the old Lincoln Homestead is still preserved on Linville Creek. The President's father, Thomas Lincoln, was born in Rockingham County and went to Kentucky with his parents.

The Lincoln and Sevier families, direct descendants of two of America's great men, still reside in Rockingham and northern Shenandoah County.

He could have mentioned that in the earliest days of the Nation, the pioneers in the Shenandoah Valley had fought and worked so hard in their battle to develop the region and protect their hard-gained liberties that the area was referred to by Thomas Jefferson as the tenth legion of democracy. It is from this expression that the village on the valley pike derived its name.

These are just a few contributions to history by the Shenandoah Valley.

The Voice of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, from time to time the question has arisen, in connection with our overseas broadcast programs, whether or not the programs are reaching the ears of those for whom they are intended. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from This Week Magazine of December 12, 1948, written by the capable director of the Voice of America broadcasts, Mr. George V. Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, which indicates the effectiveness of these broadcasts.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUSSIANS ARE LISTENING

(By George V. Allen)

The State Department's Office of International Information has stopped dueling and started slugging, not with name calling or vilification, but with hard, cold facts. With vigorous new American techniques, we are establishing the Voice of America as the voice of truth to a world-wide radio audience that has been confused, disturbed, and betrayed by destructive propaganda from other sources.

To win people for our side, the United States must be known for what it is. People everywhere must be armed swiftly and continuously with facts that will sustain the confidence they feel in us and resist the error and the completely inaccurate picture of the United States they are subjected to every day.

In this battle for men's minds, the Soviet Union itself is more important to us than any other country. No people are more jealously guarded or harder to reach, no other state has such absolute control over the information its citizens are permitted to receive.

Nevertheless, the Voice of America penetrates Soviet Russia every day on 13 radio beams and reaches a potential audience of 4,000,000 people. We calculate this figure on the conservative basis of 2 listeners to each of the 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 short-wave receivers we know to exist there.

We know that we are heard. The Russian press often discusses our broadcasts, and occasional interviews indicate that peasants and workers know what we are saying. Moscow radio itself is devoting precious transmitters to jamming us, which would be a waste of time if we were not invading the Marxian purity of the Russian mind.

Of course, it is one thing to be heard and another to be believed. What can we say to the Russian people that will earn their respect, their good will, even their friendship?

This is perhaps our most vital problem whether we are at peace or—God forbid—at war. For if, in these present tense times, the Russian people could obtain a true picture of Americans as peace-loving but determined devotees of liberty, their leaders would find it more difficult to continue their provocative acts in Berlin and elsewhere.

With this in mind, the Voice of America approaches its task as a fight for democracy and against aggression. The prime, paramount foreign-policy aim of the United States is the preservation of the democratic way of life wherever it exists in the world today—and the hope that eventually it will be extended to those areas which do not now enjoy it.

Our broadcasts appeal to the universal desire for freedom. It was this desire, we believe, that prompted the two Soviet airmen to desert to the American zone.

AFRAID TO SPEAK

The Voice of America broadcasts do not urge anyone to leave Russia or any other country in the Soviet bloc. Nevertheless, the action of the airmen suggests that there are many people like them behind the iron curtain—people who much prefer to think for themselves, who share the universal hopes for peace, cooperation, independence. Lieutenant Pirogov said 70 percent of his countrymen feel as he does, but are "afraid to speak."

Our programs are designed to tell the Russian people about our own form of government and the liberties which our people enjoy under it, in comparison with the regimentation, repression, and police control under which the Soviet citizen lives.

Our great emphasis, of course, is placed on information about how democracy operates in the United States and how our people live.

Our information techniques have been varied in order to provide the best framework for every idea or argument we wish to use.

Our newest—a device already familiar to American domestic radio audiences—is the personal interview.

This is generally the case history of a Russian who has fled from his homeland and whose welcome here is a testimonial to life in America. Whenever possible we encourage the individual to write and to read his own radio script.

In each case we have used plain, everyday people whose plain everyday experiences seem to us to have more impact than the views of a foreign dignitary. We can seldom use the big-name émigré, since it might lead our listeners to the wholly erroneous impression that the United States is supporting his particular political clique.

LIFE IN AMERICA

Our first personalized report was made by a talented young musician. He told how he had reached the United States from a DP camp in Germany and how he earned opportunities, first to teach, then to play in concert, and finally to join one of our symphony orchestras. No frills, no moralizing. Simply an account of how a man's basic skills enabled him to find his place in American society.

Vladimir Petrov, whose experiences in the slave-labor gold mines of Siberia are already known to This Week readers "[Stalin's Mountain of Gold"—July 11] prepared the second script. In it, he told how he got a factory job in America, reported on his wages, hours, and working conditions, explained train and subway transportation, installment buying, and eating in cafeterias. It would not have impressed American listeners; we are inclined to take these things for granted. But Russian listeners, who must always carry identity cards and whose freedom of movement and decision is extremely limited, undoubtedly got the point.

THE KASENKINA STORY

The third was a bedside interview with Mrs. Anna Kasenkina, the Russian schoolteacher who leaped from the window of the Soviet consulate in New York. The Moscow Radio went to extreme lengths to distort this event and we felt that Mrs. Kasenkina's own account of it was the best possible rebuttal.

Programs like these are hard to refute. These are not Trotzkyites, deviationists, or wreckers whom the Soviet regime can lambast on political grounds. These are plain Russian people speaking to their homeland of how they have fared in America.

We intend to expand this phase of our broadcasting. Right now we are discussing, with the University of North Carolina communications center and experimental radio station, plans for regional broadcasts which will add the voices of everyday Americans to out output. If translation proves feasible, we shall expand this idea to include sending to Russia the voices of Texas cattlemen, Northwest lumbermen, Minnesota farmers, San Francisco shippers, and New England manufacturers. Let the Russians decide for themselves who is unemployed, who is plundered, who is terrorized.

Another service we render to the Soviet citizen, whose news is so sharply censored, is to give him facts which his own government seeks to keep away from him. It was the Voice of America, for instance, which first told the Russian people of the widespread reports that the ruble was to be devalued—not the Soviet press or radio.

It was not presented as a scare story, but simply as an example of how poorly informed the Russian people were on the operations of their own government. Within a month some of the most nortorious Soviet poison penmen were screaming their heads off about the perfidity of the American radio and its "hysterical imperialist mouthpieces", etc.

THREATS WON'T WORK

While rumors of forcible Russian occupation of Berlin and even of all western Europe were popping, the Voice of America emphasized, day after day, our determination not to be driven out of anywhere by threats, bluster, or provocative incidents.

In September, the broadcasts of the American Government's white paper on the breakdown of negotiations between Russia and the western powers to end the Berlin blockade

were the only complete reports of the event available to Soviet citizens.

The depression line—the old Moscow favorite that America is on the brink of economic collapse—is met with employment and production statistics.

HERE'S THE ANSWER

When Hungary accused us of monopolizing penicillin, the Voice of America explained the rise in penicillin production, the drop in price and our success in setting up production, through UNRRA, in countries of eastern Europe.

When Austrians hear that America is planning immediate withdrawal from the country, when Germans hear that we are politicking in food supplies, there are answers to be given. When we heard that the rural faction of Hungary's small landowners party was meeting to protest a coalition with the Communists, the facts were broadcast. And when the dissidents met, the party president, a Communist collaborator, howled: "This meeting was called by the Voice of America."

We know we are heard. We know that in many places we are welcomed and believed. Inside Russia itself, we know we are making some headway. The Soviet press and the radio both devote considerable efforts to answering us—in very violent terms—particularly in matters relating to standards of living. Every one of our broadcasts which reports the possessions, working conditions, purchasing power, and personal liberties of the American citizen brings a swift and furious reply from the Soviets. For these are the facts which seem to hit closest to home. Totalitarianism does not produce for them what democracy produces for us, economically or socially.

The one sure way to keep sharp and clear these differences between democracy and the police state is to make the Voice of America the voice of the people. I am often asked if the "Voice" is not simply the voice of the United States Government. It is true that since the Government information program was placed in the State Department in 1945, our tie-in with the day-to-day policy requirements of the Department has grown steadily much closer, much more in the know.

GULF OF IGNORANCE

But I consider the "Voice" to be a good deal more than a subdivision of a Government agency. Foreign relations today have gone far beyond the narrow and restricted dealings of government with government, of diplomat with diplomat. Free peoples must now speak honestly to each other across national boundaries. The true Voice of America, speaking across a gulf of black ignorance to the people of Russia and the world, can be an atom bomb of moral force in guaranteeing our survival and bringing the world into an era of universal peace.

Resolution of General Assembly of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the resolution adopted by the South Carolina Legislature.

The State of South Carolina, under present rules and regulations established by the Stabilization Bureau of the Department of Agriculture requires farmers to tie their tobacco before presenting same to the warehouses for sale. The warehousemen will not accept tobacco in loose-leaf form on the grounds that the tobacco buyers for the different tobacco companies state that their redrying plant machinery is set up to handle tied tobacco. However, in certain other States they do purchase loose-leaf tobacco at almost the same price they give the farmers in the States where tobacco is sold in tied form.

Tobacco farmers in my State feel that the Stabilization Bureau should grant at least a 10-percent differential if it is necessary to continue to have their tobacco tied before they can market same. The high cost of labor and the loss in poundage by tying tobacco should require at least a 10-percent differential. The records show that the differential between tied and untied tobacco during the past season was only approximately 2 cents.

I expect to introduce a resolution calling on the Tobacco Stabilization Bureau to either grant the tobacco markets in all States permission to sell tobacco in loose-leaf form, if they so desire, or grant a 10-percent differential between the sale of loose-leaf and tied tobacco.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation equalizing the differential for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system

Whereas the tobacco markets in the State of South Carolina are losing approximately 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 pounds of tobacco each year by reason of the fact that the system of grading and tieing is required in this State, while in the adjoining State of Georgia tobacco is sold ungraded and untied; and

Whereas the differential of 4 cents per pound provided in this State is not sufficient to equalize the cost of labor and the loss of 5 to 10 percent in weight incurred in marketing tobacco under the grading and tieing system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America is memorialized to enact legislation which will either increase the differential provided for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system from 4 cents to 10 cents per pound, or require the acceptance of ungraded and untied tobacco by the flue-cured tobacco stabilization corporation in this State during the times in which the tobacco markets in the State of Georgia are open, to the end that the inequities accruing by the system of marketing tobacco in South Carolina under the grading and tieing system will be met; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States of America.

Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in Worldgram concerning the situation in Palestine:

Mess in Palestine continues to irritate and embarrass United States and British diplomats, military experts, strategists. Things haven't gone according to plan.

Embarrassment is that all the inside predictions, the confident forecasts as to how things would go in the Middle East have not panned out.

Irritation grows out of necessity to come up with new plans, new solutions, in a situation changing every day. Nobody is quite sure what to do next.

Prophecies of the military experts, in particular, have had to be revised.

Year ago, United States military men were saying—not for publication—that Jews might hold out for awhile, but that sooner or later Arabs would wipe them out. British military experts went further, prophesying privately that the Jews had almost no chance, that the Arabs would win quick control of Palestine.

Now, these official but private forecasters are in a state of confusion. The Jews keep making new gains, while the Arabs keep falling apart. Apparently, forecasting a war is almost as hazardous as forecasting an election.

What went wrong, it seems, was that the military experts guessed wrong on some of the intangibles. Tendency was to underestimate Israel's will to fight and her skill in military action. As for the Arabs, tendency was to overestimate their effective manpower, their will to fight, their ability to stick together.

At any rate, the notion that only intervention by the armed forces of the United Nations could save Israel turns out to have been a miscalculation.

Now, two or three things are clear that weren't before.

Israel, next to Turkey, dominates Middle East, shows most strength, unity.

Arab states, with the single exception of Transjordan, seethe with unrest, economic trouble, political turmoil. They are anything but stable, reliable.

United States and Britain, as a result, have to adjust their diplomacy, their military strategy to this fact of a strong Israel in the midst of Arab weakness.

For the British, especially, this is difficult to get used to.

There's not much secret about what the United States and Britain want in the Middle East.

Oil has top priority, especially for Europe, for European recovery.

Bases come a close second, especially for the air forces.

True, neither United States nor British strategists have much confidence that they could hold the Middle East against a full-scale invasion by the Russians, but the attempt would have to be made. In any case, air bases can serve as outposts, advance strong points for Britain's defense in depth farther south in Africa.

Problem for British and United States diplomats is to walk the tightrope between Arab-Jewish hostility, somehow mediate a peace, then wrap up the bases and the oil.

Prospects are a little brighter than they were a while ago. Israel, though winning battles, is feeling the economic pinch, needs help, needs United States dollars. That fact gives the United States and Britain their leverage, improves the chances for peace.

But diplomats in this area still have to work on a catch-as-catch-can basis, can't see far ahead. Forecasting, such as that a year ago, is out of style.

Much Willful Misinformation About Basing Point for Purpose of Deceiving People Into Believing That Customers a Distance Away From Basing Point Get Part of Their Freight Absorbed by Seller When in Fact the Buyer Always Pays Full Freight Under Any Basing Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every day we see in the daily press and hear over the radio that small manufacturers and fabricators at a distance from steel mills and other suppliers of their basic materials will be greatly handicapped under the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing point when wrongfully used.

The fact is—and let us get this straight—it cannot be denied the consumer or buyer under the basing point system must pay full freight to destination and the buyer does not absorb a part of the freight as alleged in heavy industries. There are some exceptions in a buyer's market when there is cross hauling but none in a seller's market where there is no cross hauling.

The executive secretary of the Texas Butane Dealers Association, is reported to have said last week in Texas that 300,000 tons of plate steel a year are needed annually in making butane tanks in the five Southwestern States. It is reported that he pointed out that a recent Supreme Court decision may pinch off the industry's source of supply. He need not have any such apprehension under this ruling.

Under the cement and steel basing point systems, small fabricators have been complaining in this seller's market that they could not get these basic materials where they were located a distance from the source of supply because customers nearer by where the freight rate was less had the advantage and there was not enough to go around. This is based on the theory that the seller pays the freight, which is not true. If it were true that the seller paid the freight, the outlawing of the basing point would help distant buyers because the seller would get the same free-on-board price from customers whether near or far.

DALLAS MANUFACTURER AT NO DISADVANTAGE

A butane-gas manufacturer at Dallas, Tex., is at no disadvantage under the Supreme Court decision. Even if it is necessary for him to buy his steel and pay freight on it from the mill at Pittsburgh, Pa., he is in a better position to serve his customers at Dallas, Tex., than a manufacturer of such tanks would be located at the steel mill at Pittsburgh. The reason is obvious. It costs less to ship raw materials by freight than finished products. The Dallas manufacturer would be compelled to pay freight on the raw steel to Dallas. He would manufacture it into butane-gas tanks and sell them in the Dallas area. The manufacturer of a similar product near the mill at Pittsburgh where the raw materials could be obtained without the payment of freight will be compelled to pay the price of the freight on the finished product to Dallas, Tex. Then the Pittsburgh manufacturer will be in competition with the Dallas manufacturer, who has the advantage because he has paid less freight on the raw material.

ALLOCATION OF STEEL PROPOSED

The following letter has been received by me from a prominent steel fabricator in Texas:

All of my problems originate with steel, that is, the complete lack of steel plate at any price other than the most exorbitant gray or black market price, which I cannot afford to pay and even anticipate any semblance of profit.

I have been supplying hundreds of dealers in the southwestern area with butane and propane tanks, as well as other steel pressure vessels since 1937. The allocation of steel for war purposes forced me to cease operations in 1942, which was more than agreeable with me, as all materials were so vitally needed for war products. For the next 2½ years my efforts were devoted to the sale of war bonds and installing the pay-roll-deduction plan in large manufacturing plants at my own expense.

Then in 1945 I got back into production and have had difficulty obtaining steel plate from the mills ever since. I have visited most of the steel mills, but have received no encouragement with reference to future shipments.

I have talked with many small steel fabricators like myself and I know of seven who have already been forced out of business due to the mills being on a voluntary allocation and seemingly are shipping most of their steel to the big concerns. Many of the small fabricators did a beautiful job in defense work and I think it would be disastrous to force the small-business man out of business with voluntary allocation, and in my opinion in fairness to the small-business man we should by all means go back to Government allocation, which would be fair for all.

The fact is that big steel companies are buying fabricating plants with their retained earnings. There is one case in Houston, Tex., where a fabricator has been in business a half century, I am told, and just recently his supply of steel was cut off. The reason was the big steel company furnishing him had purchased his competitor, and very soon thereafter customers of this old Houston fabricator began to receive circulars offering for sale by the subsidiary of the steel company the same type of tanks heretofore manufactured and sold by the old Houston concern.

There are other instances in the United States just as cruel as this one.

COSTLESS CAPITAL FOR BIG CONCERNS

Last year the large corporations had earnings amounting to over $35,000,000,000, or almost as much as our national budget. After the payment of taxes these earnings were over $20,000,000,000. Instead of distributing two-thirds of this money to stockholders, as was the practice before World War II, only one-third of it was distributed, or $7,000,000,000, in the form of dividends, and the other $13,000,000,000 plus were retained by the officers of these corporations, and much of it will be used to buy up nonrelated concerns and competitors.

One big food manufacturer admitted using $50,000,000 of earnings the past 4 years to buy up other manufacturers, including competitors.

How long can our private-enterprise system last when big concerns have such a monopoly in a seller's market that they can get their venture or risk capital from their customers? This is costless capital. It is paid by customers and not borrowed; therefore, no interest will have to be paid on it.

What chance has a small-business man in a business world where he must go into the market and borrow the money and pay interest on it and go into business in competition with a large concern that secures its capital from its customers in the form of high prices?

Does Joe Stalin Know This?—How Many Members of Congress Understand It?—The Chairman of the Board of the Chase National Bank Gives a Look at the Mechanics of Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the following extract is taken from a reprint of an address of Winthrop W. Aldrich, of the Chase National Bank, rerecently distributed to the Members of Congress:

Our monetary and fiscal authorities, too, have many means at their disposal to combat deflationary trends, if a recession should occur, before a situation develops which might lead to depression. We should take care not to have our psychological attitudes so conditioned by the events of the great depression that we are inhibited from making those constructive modifications in the interest rate structure which may be called for by future developments.

Concerning the idea that some sort of a commitment has been made by our monetary authorities, it is sufficient to point out that the authorities have no statutory power to make a contractual commitment to maintain the prices of marketable bonds at par. Those who declare that such a commitment has been given base their belief on current policy declarations of the Federal Open Market Committee and on qualified and often ambiguous statements of various Government officials. These declarations and statements obviously cannot constitute a commitment.

THE PROBLEM OF CREDIT CONTROL

The public debt underlies such a large part of the monetary and credit structure of the country that its management cannot be separated from the general problem of monetary and credit control. This circumstance makes essential a coordination of Treasury and Fed-

eral Reserve policy. The coordination should not be brought about, however, by the dominance of the one party or the other, but by a joint development of fiscal and monetary policy directed toward the long-run advantage of the economy.

Purchases of Government securities by the Reserve banks have peculiar and important monetary effects. These purchases are made with the Reserve banks' own credit—they are not conditional upon the antecedent receipt of funds from any outside source. The seller of securities is paid in effect with a check drawn by the Reserve bank on itself. Member bank reserves, therefore, rise whenever the Federal Reserve banks purchase securities, no matter whether the securities are purchased from commercial banks, insurance companies, savings banks, or individuals.

In order to maintain the level and structure of rates chosen for support, the Reserve banks have had to absorb large amounts of Government obligations from commercial banks, insurance companies, and others needing funds with which to accommodate private borrowers or seeking to hedge against the possibility of changes in the level of support prices. In an effort to prevent these purchases from inflating member bank reserves, the Reserve banks and the Treasury have undertaken three principal types of action.

First, they have applied a varying portion of the Treasury's cash operating surplus to the redemption of maturing securities held by the Reserve banks, particularly Treasury bills, thereby offsetting to a very large extent the increase in member bank reserves resulting from market support purchases. This use of the cash surplus is a necessary instrument of control as long as the Reserve banks are absorbing securities from the market. As an instrument of control, however, it depends not only upon the existence of such a cash surplus, but also upon the availability of that surplus when needed. To some extent, the availability of these funds can be controlled by means of the war loan depositary system. However, only a portion of the funds used for debt retirement are now channeled through these accounts.

In practice, neither tax revenues nor expenditures can always be controlled with sufficient precision to assure that a Treasury cash surplus will synchronize with the varying need to retire securities held by the Reserve banks.[1]

Second, the monetary authorities have endeavored to offset the effect of support purchases by the Reserve banks by upward adjustments in rates on short-term Government obligations. Increases in short-term rates were initiated in the middle of 1947 in order to discourage investors from selling Treasury bills to the Federal Reserve banks, which at that time had absorbed over 90 percent of the total outstanding. Later, increases in short-term rates were made to achieve a more viable rate level and, in consequence, to enable the Federal Reserve banks to shift some of their holdings of short-term Government securities to the private market. This became more and more necessary as the impending reduction of the Treasury surplus threatened to preclude further cash redemption of securities held by the Federal Reserve banks.

Raising the reserve requirements of member banks has been the third device for offsetting the inflationary results of support purchases. Within the past year required reserves have been increased by roughly $3,000,000,000. Increases in required reserves may actually complicate the problem of maintaining stable and orderly conditions in the Government securities market since they are imposed horizontally and without regard to the reserve positions of individual banks. In the case of the individual bank, if the increase in required reserves is greater than the amount necessary to sterilize the additional reserves created by support purchases, the bank in question will be forced to sell Government obligations to its Reserve bank. If the increase in required reserves is not large enough to bring about this result, the additional requirement will have little restraining effect. To the extent that individual banks are forced to sell Government obligations, the market in Government securities churns about, and, after it has settled down, the impact and burden of the increased reserve requirement come to rest on the shoulders of the commercial banks to the exclusion of all other classes of lenders.

A certain degree of success in controlling credit has been claimed for the combined use of these devices. Whatever success has been achieved so far by the program is to be attributed primarily to the use of the Treasury surplus in the retirement of securities held by the banking system. This surplus, a fortunate accident of circumstances, has been diminishing in amount and will probably disappear before long. Obviously, policies of monetary and credit control should not be left to the vicissitudes of our Federal budget.

[1] This is a roundabout method of debt retirement which is not without certain disadvantages and limitations. The choice of securities to be retired is in the discretion of the market. Consequently, the authorities are unable to give proper consideration of the longer range aspects of debt retirement such as the appropriate maturity structure of the debt and its ownership distribution.

Election of President and Vice President by the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, one of the principal features of Senate Joint Resolution 2 is that which prevents an election from being decided in the House of Representatives.

A penetrating analysis of this aspect of Senate Joint Resolution 2 by Mr. Arthur Krock appeared in the New York Times on January 14, 1949. It merits thoughtful reading. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as well as some facts which I have accumulated regarding the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those citizens who were closely following the returns of the 1948 Presidential election in the early hours of November 3, and especially those whose business it was to inform the public of the outcome, will not soon forget the wobbling count in Ohio and California through the night. For until it became certain that these two States were to give their electoral votes to President Truman he lacked the majority necessary for election. They could not have brought victory to Governor Dewey by going Republican. He would have needed Illinois, too. But by doing so they would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

Had that happened the House at this moment would probably still be balloting, with noon on January 20, 1949, drawing ever nearer, at which hour Mr. Truman's term as President expires by fiat of the twentieth amendment. The House would probably still be balloting because of the partisan compositions of the delegations from the 48 States that also were chosen on November 2. And if the deadlock had continued until noon on January 20, as well it might have, the country might have had a President whose title was not entirely clarified by the Constitution or the statute of Presidential succession.

The reasons are these:

1. When a national election is thrown into the House because no candidate has received an electoral majority—now 266—each State delegation is given 1 vote by the Constitution, and this vote is determined by the majority of its delegation. In the present House there are 21 delegations with a Democratic majority, 20 with a Republican majority, 3 that are evenly divided, and 4 which represent States carried by the Democratic States' Rights ticket.

2. The Constitution limits the House in such circumstances to make its choice from the three candidates who led in the national poll, and on November 2 these were President Truman, Governor Dewey, and Governor Thurmond. If each of the 45 delegations unevenly divided had obeyed the mandate of the voters in its State, none of the candidates would have had the required constitutional majority of 25 even if the 3 evenly divided delegations had contrived to vote.

3. Mr. Truman would have been obliged to swing 4 of the 7 delegations from the evenly divided States and those Democratic States in which he was defeated by Mr. Thurmond. Mr. Dewey would have required a shift of 5. Mr. Thurmond would have required a shift of 21. So a deadlock on the Presidency might now be afflicting the Nation.

4. As noon on January 20 drew nearer the pressures on these seven delegations would have produced violent emotions which can only be imagined by reading the history of similar situations in 1801, 1825, and 1877. Of the delegations from these seven States (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—carried by Mr. Thurmond, and Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana—evenly divided), Louisiana, Idaho, and Montana—conceivably might have yielded to the pressure for President Truman. But it is difficult to envisage the same shift in Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Connecticut. So Mr. Truman, with 24, would still be one short of the required majority.

5. Until or unless a member shifted in the Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana delegations these would have been unable to vote. This would have left 45 State delegations to produce a requisite majority of 23. But that would have been the same problem expressed in lower figures. Mr. Truman, Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Thurmond would then have needed shifts in 2, 3, and 19 delegations, respectively.

Suppose the deadlock had continued until close to noon on January 20. How could the United States have acquired a President. On this point the twelfth amendment, the twentieth amendment, and the statute of succession of 1947 are not wholly clear, but the destructive condition might have been resolved without successful legal challenge in one of the following ways:

1. The Senate is composed of 96 Members, of whom a majority of 49 can elect a Vice President; if no candidate for that office has an electoral majority, from the two who polled the highest number of votes—in this

case Senator BARKLEY and Governor Warren. There are 42 Republicans in this Senate, to whom for speculative purposes might be added the 8 from the 4 States carried by the Thurmond-Wright ticket, reducing the regular Democratic membership of 54 to 46, or 3 less than enough to choose Mr. BARKLEY. A shift of only three Senators from the Dixiecrat States would have made him Vice President, and in such circumstances this is more than conceivable. On the failure of the House to choose a President by noon on January 20 this Vice President would have become President for the full term, but once again there would have been no Vice President.

2. If both House and Senate had been deadlocked at noon on January 20, Public Law 199, the statute of succession, seems to provide that the Speaker (now SAM RAYBURN) would have become acting President.

This nightmare vision of a might-have-been furnishes another reason for such electoral reform as the Lodge-Gossett-Kefauver bill proposes.

EXAMPLES

Some ask what would have happened in past campaigns had this proposed amendment been in effect.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that while it is, of course, easy to apply the amendment retroactively—by adjusting the new rules to the old figures—it is useful to do so only as a means of illustrating how it would have worked mechanically. One cannot assume—as some have—that citizens would have voted identically or in the same volume under the terms of this proposed change as they actually did vote under the existing system. Indeed, had this amendment been in effect in the past, the whole composition of the popular vote would have been different. Candidates and issues might have been—and in some instances would certainly have been—different. Campaigning would have been carried all over the 48 States instead of being concentrated in a few key sections. Interest in the elections in the so-called one-party areas would have been greater.

Always remembering that the following figures are merely a mechanical application of the formula embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 2, the table below illustrates how the vote would have been divided and counted in the 1948 Presidential elections if the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 2 had been in effect and if the people had voted as they actually did vote in that year.

States	Popular vote		Electoral vote (under present system)		Electoral vote (under S. J. Res. 2)	
	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)	Truman (Democrat)	Dewey (Republican)
Alabama	(1)	40,930	(1)		(1)	2.0
Arizona	95,251	77,579	4		2.1	1.8
Arkansas	149,659	50,959	9		5.6	1.9
California	1,913,134	1,895,269	25		11.9	11.8
Colorado	267,288	239,714	6		3.1	2.8
Connecticut	423,297	437,754		8	3.9	4.0
Delaware	67,829	69,595		3	1.5	1.5
Florida	281,988	194,280	8		3.9	2.7
Georgia	254,646	76,691	12		7.3	2.2
Idaho	107,370	101,514	4		2.0	1.9
Illinois	1,994,715	1,961,103	28		14.0	13.8
Indiana	807,833	821,079		13	6.3	6.4
Iowa	522,380	494,018	10		5.0	4.8
Kansas	351,902	423,039		8	3.6	4.3
Kentucky	466,756	341,210	11		6.2	4.6
Louisiana	136,344	72,657			3.3	1.7
Maine	111,916	150,234		5	2.1	2.8
Maryland	286,521	294,814		8	3.8	4.0
Massachusetts	1,151,788	909,370	16		8.8	6.9
Michigan	1,003,448	1,038,595		19	9.0	9.3
Minnesota	692,966	483,617	11		6.3	4.4
Mississippi	18,848	5,466			.9	.3
Missouri	917,315	655,039	15		8.7	6.2
Montana	119,071	96,700	4		2.1	1.7
Nebraska	224,165	264,774		6	2.7	3.3
Nevada	31,291	29,357	3		1.5	1.4
New Hampshire	107,995	121,299		4	1.9	2.1
New Jersey	895,455	981,124		16	7.3	8.0
New Mexico	105,464	80,303	4		2.3	1.7
New York	2,780,204	2,841,163		47	21.2	21.6
North Carolina	459,070	258,572	14		8.1	4.6
North Dakota	95,812	115,139		4	1.7	2.1
Ohio	1,452,791	1,445,684	25		12.4	12.3
Oklahoma	452,782	268,817	10		6.3	3.7
Oregon	243,147	260,904		6	2.8	3.0
Pennsylvania	1,752,426	1,902,197		35	16.4	17.8
Rhode Island	188,476	134,880	4		2.3	1.7
South Carolina	34,423	5,386			1.9	.3
South Dakota	117,567	129,651		4	1.9	2.1
Tennessee	270,402	202,914	11		5.9	4.4
Texas	750,700	282,240	23		15.0	5.6
Utah	149,151	124,402	4		2.2	1.8
Vermont	45,447	75,926		3	1.1	1.8
Virginia	200,786	172,070	11		5.3	4.5
Washington	476,165	386,315	8		4.2	3.4
West Virginia	429,188	316,251	8		4.6	3.4
Wisconsin	647,310	590,959	12		6.1	5.6
Wyoming	52,354	47,947	3		1.5	1.4
Total	24,104,836	21,969,500	303	189	258.0	221.4

[1] Not on ballot.

NOTES

1. Governor Thurmond, States' Rights candidate, polled 1,169,312 popular votes and received 39 electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, he would have received 38.6 electoral votes.

2. Henry Wallace, Progressive candidate, polled 1,157,100 popular votes and received no electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, he would have received 9.4 electoral votes.

3. Other candidates (Socialist, etc.) polled 279,668 popular votes and received no electoral votes. Under S. J. Res. 2, they would have received 1.8 electoral votes.

4. Division of a State's electoral vote would be carried to 3 decimal points, or further, if necessary, for absolute accuracy.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a tribute to Max Abelman, secretary to the board of directors of the Jewish Hospital, of Brooklyn:

[From the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Eagle of August 8, 1948]

SPENDS FOUR DECADES AIDING WORTH-WHILE NEEDY CAUSES

(By Clarence Greenbaum)

Max Abelman's 40 years of activity in the service of Brooklyn have convinced him that this borough's many cultural and financial facets entitle it to be an independent city.

The secretary to the board of Jewish Hospital of Brooklyn, who is regarded in many quarters as Brooklyn's unofficial ambassador of good will, feels that our community suffers by reason of close proximity to Manhattan.

He points out that some of the greatest men in this country were born in Brooklyn, and adds that if we were to have a separate city status our cultural facilities, the hallmark of a great city, would increase tremendously.

"It is a disgrace," Mr. Abelman says, "that Brooklyn should not have its own opera house, symphonic orchestra, and repertoire theater, as well as its own art school."

AN AUTHORITY ON CHARITY

Mr. Abelman should know, for he counts among his friends the great and near-great, as well as the countless common folk whom he has aided by philanthropic endeavors down through the years. He has written books on the organization and finance of philanthropy which are considered authorities. Likewise, he has composed music and written plays, educational films, and other articles.

For four decades—he is 60—he has served as the unofficial public relations man for any worthy cause—even any worthy individual—that needs a hand. Through dinners, mass meetings, and drives, he has helped Brooklyn meet its quotas for war chests and war relief work in both world conflicts, as well as aiding philanthropic activities of many varieties. He helped expand the Big Sister and Big Brother movement, and raised $1,000,000 for the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Philanthropies at a single dinner in 1920.

A year earlier, under the auspices of 44 banks, he arranged a meeting at the academy of music and added $43,960,000 to Brooklyn's Fifth Liberty Loan quota.

F. D. R. AMONG HIS FRIENDS

His personal friendship with the important persons of two generations is attested to by the many autographed photographs on the wall of his office, as well as by the letters which jam his files, bearing the tributes of such personages as the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Chief of Staff Omar N. Bradley.

His favorite dinner of them all was one in 1942 at the Waldorf-Astoria in celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy as Roman Catholic bishop of the Diocese of Brooklyn. The high

point was the presentation of a portrait of Pope Pius XII, painted by Albert Cugat when the Pope, then Cardinal Pacelli, visited the United States. The dinner was attended by Catholics, Jews, and Protestants.

Mr. Abelman scorns denominational lines, stating that he is "particularly interested in living tolerance, not talking or attending mass meetings about it."

He is concerned primarily with trying to live up to the maxim that sums up his philosophy of life—"never living a day without doing a kind act for someone else."

CAME TO NEW YORK AS CHILD

Incidentally, Albert Cugat is the muralist whose talent Mr. Abelman enlisted for the decorating of 16 children's rooms with murals at the Jewish Hospital. The murals, something new in hospital technique, entertain young patients with scenes from Alice in Wonderland to Snow White.

Then, in typical Abelman fashion, he brought down many noted personages to autograph the murals—including Lord Halifax, the former British Ambassador to the United States, and the late Wendell L. Willkie.

Born in Romania, Mr. Abelman came to New York with his parents when he was 5. He arrived in Brooklyn in 1909 and immediately asked the late Abraham Abraham, the founder of Abraham & Straus, for a position with that organization. There was no suitable opening with A. & S. at the time, but Mr. Abraham sent him to see the late Nathan S. Jonas, president of what was then the Citizens Trust Co., since incorporated with the Manufacturers Trust Co.

Mr. Jonas explained that there was being organized the Brooklyn Federation of Jewish Charities, one of the first federated charity units in the country, and would not Mr. Abelman consider a temporary job with it? Max took a clerkship, was with the federation for 14 years, and he had begun a lasting friendship with Mr. Jonas. So much so, that Mr. Abelman's son and only child, Alan Nathan, a mechanical engineer, is named after Mr. Jonas.

BECAME EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

He rose to become executive director of the federation, and many of his most successful campaigns were waged in its behalf. Then, from 1922 to 1932, he served as assistant secretary and trust officer at the Manufacturers Trust Co.

In 1932, following repeated pleas by Mr. Jonas, he went to the Jewish Hospital as assistant to the president and secretary to the board. He is responsible in a large degree for the appellation Hospital With a Heart, which has been gained by the institution.

Max is married to the former Bessie Schwartz, whom he courted when she was 15 and whom he married when she was 18.

The Abelmans live at 35 Tennis Court, and have a summer place at 311 Beach One Hundred and Forty-eighth Street, Neponsit. They have been married since 1907.

Max's reading hobby is centered mainly on the Bible, Shakespeare, and autobiographies. In the latter field, he has compiled one of the finest collections extant, the volumes being spread over bookshelves in his home and in his office.

Max likes to make history, though, and is pretty well interested in everything that goes on. Witness his great work on a four-man committee responsible for the dedication of the S. Parkes Cadman Plaza, hard by the Brooklyn downtown area, as well as in drives in behalf of the Middlesex Medical School, Waltham, Mass., so that capable medical students would not be deprived of a chance of becoming great doctors. And—he has even written songs and acted in plays, and some day hopes to write a book, but no one article can sum up his varied accomplishments.

Society of Virginia Honors Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has produced many illustrious sons who have deeply touched the hearts of mankind. Among these was President Woodrow Wilson, who voiced the instinctive yearning of all peoples for peace. His ideas and achievements are recorded in the libraries of the world. His tomb at the National Cathedral at Mount St. Alban in Washington is a national shrine.

In view of the present crisis facing civilization, it is especially fitting that his memory be honored by his native State. On December 28, 1948, the Society of Virginia of the District of Columbia sponsored a birthday memorial service at his tomb. The service was attended by his widow, Mrs. Woodrow Wilson.

President J. W. Rixey Smith, of the society, placed a floral wreath on the tomb, and Mrs. Richard A. Allen read the following inspiring tribute by E. Y. Davidson, which I am submitting for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WOODROW WILSON

(By E. Y. Davidson)

The greatest American has fallen. In life's battles he was as grand as Achilles; in death he was sublime. He met every foe unflinchingly, panoplied with the sword of truth and the armor of righteousness. And when he entered into life's gloaming he was still unafraid. He was ready, and he lay down to peaceful sleep. He was not only the outstanding American of his generation. He was the greatest American. He rose to such heights of greatness that his influence was the most potent and the most dominant in the world. Through him, more than through any other man, empires crumbled, republics were established, and the yoke of oppression fell from the necks of millions of peoples, to whom was given a new birth of liberty. He was the first to suggest a practical formula for universal peace—a peace hoped for and sought for since the dawn of civilization.

His peace message, delivered before the Senate of the United States, is the most remarkable pronunciamento of human justice and human liberty of which history affords any record. It is a world-embracing message of righteousness.

To preserve our liberties and to save democracy for the world, he, Titan-like, led America into the World War, and tendered to the god of war all of America's dynamic and potential energy. After victory, he, Christ-like, devoted his great talents to the establishment of world peace and world brotherhood; and in the exercise of those talents he never wavered. With unflagging zeal and unremitting consecration he gave his all in pursuance of his high ideals and his high purpose. Rejected by his own, he never lost faith; reviled, he reviled not again. He was matchless; and his fame is imperishable.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 6, 1924.*

Displaced Persons Earn Our Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there are appended four articles from the New York Times by Robert L. Schiffer of that paper constituting a survey of the displaced persons situation since the passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 as it relates to the resettlement in the United States. Four conclusions emerge from these factual reports:

First. DP's are useful citizens needed in the United States based upon both their skill and character, and they integrate well into our country.

Second. The problem of displaced persons in the United States, British, and French occupied areas of Germany and Austria still remains a critical one.

Third. The present Displaced Persons Act is administratively impractical and substantially unjust and inadequate.

Fourth. To carry our fair share of a great moral responsibility, and to relieve ourselves of the heavy expense involved in maintaining DP camps and in contributions to the International Refugee Organization, the enactment of a better displaced-persons law as early as possible in this session is imperative:

[From the New York Times of January 5, 1949]

1949 IS YEAR OF HOPE FOR EUROPE'S DP'S—IRO OFFICIALS EXPECT 330,000 OF THE REMAINING 750,000 TO LEAVE CAMPS BEFORE 1950—SPEEDIER FLOW IS SOUGHT—FATE OF 184,000 NOT ELIGIBLE UNDER PRESENT PROGRAMS STILL A BIG PROBLEM

(By Robert L. Schiffer)

The new year 1949 is expected to bring to nearly 750,000 refugees in Europe their first real glimmer of hope for an end to the wandering and homelessness that have marked their lives since the upheaval of the war and its aftermath made them displaced persons—men, women, and children without a country.

Comprising one of the most complex of the many acute problems that must be dealt with on an international level in 1949, Europe's refugees, nevertheless, still have a long way to go before they begin a new year in new homes. An analysis of the situation as it exists at present, particularly in relationship to the new United States Displaced Persons Act that will admit 205,000 refugees to this country in the next 2 years, has been the subject of a survey for the New York Times.

The survey has shown that, if resettlement programs continue at their present rate, a minimum of 250,000 refugees will be in lands of permanent settlement at this time next year. Indications, however, point to an increase in this rate, which averaged more than 20,000 a month in the last quarter of 1948. Officials of the International Refugee Organization, the United Nations agency charged with the care and welfare of Europe's homeless, hope that the end of 1949 will have seen 380,000 DP's leave the vacuum of the camps.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN THOUSAND RESETTLED SO FAR

While agreeing that liquidation of the DP problem has been proceeding slowly—with only 315,000 resettled since VE-day—William Hallam Tuck, director general of the IRO, has

expressed confidence that this year would mark the turning point in the situation and that IRO would be able to complete the major part of its task by June 1950. According to Mr. Tuck, however, the success of these efforts depends in large part upon how quickly the United States, Canada, and Australia, which have announced plans to absorb up to 400,000 of the current DP's, get their programs functioning at top speed.

Once this is accomplished, Mr. Tuck says, a fleet of 30 ships and hundreds of trains and planes will keep a steady stream of refuge s flowing out of the more than 600 DP camps and assembly centers in Germany, Austria, and Italy where the bulk of Europe's homeless are now marking time.

Despite his optimism in regard to the solution of the problem, Mr. Tuck stresses the fact that there still is no answer in sight as to what will happen to the "hard core" of DP's estimated at 184,000, most of whom are not eligible under announced programs. This "hard core" consists of the aged, sick, and infirm. It also include 30,000 professionals—doctors, lawyers, professors. Without agreement on the part of receiving countries to make some provision for this group, Mr. Tuck holds that the DP problem cannot be liquidated in its entirety.

As 1949 begins, however, the picture in the camps is considerably different from what it was even a year ago. The feeling of despair that was so prevalent at that time has given way to a feeling of hope, in large part owing to the United States program. As camps close and the people slowly move out to the waiting trains, those who remain are beginning to see that the end of their homelessness is approaching.

The DP picture in Europe, as surveyed by the IRO, is as follows:

Out of a technically eligible group of more than 1,200,000 persons, IRO has nearly 750,000 men, women, and children on its assistance rolls for whom it is seeking immigration opportunities. Slightly fewer than 600,000 of these are living in the DP camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy and it is this group that forms IRO's major problems.

These 600,000 are mainly Poles, Ukrainians, Balts, Yugoslavs, with smaller numbers of Russian, Rumanian, Hungarian, and other origins. About 55 percent of the total are Catholics, 27 percent of Protestant denominations, and 18 percent Jewish.

The DP camps, for the most part, are former Army barracks or assembly centers. Here and there an apartment building has been requisitioned. But wooden huts are the most common homes; privacy is at a minimum, with cases of 10 or 20 people being forced to share a room not uncommon.

Wherever possible, the IRO, following in the footsteps of its predecessor organization, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, is trying to make life bearable for the people. But a limited budget of $155,000,000, the bulk of which must be devoted to resettling the homeless, makes extensive work of this nature impossible.

The burden of easing the hardships of the people in the camps, therefore, has fallen on the shoulders of American voluntary agencies, working in cooperation with the IRO. These agencies, such as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Joint Distribution Committee, the Church World Service, and the American Friends Service Committee, are doing what they can to supplement IRO care by adding to the basic food and clothing rations and by providing special care for children and aged people.

Some 2,500 refugee doctors and dentists, as well as 2,000 refugee nurses, look after the health of the DP's, under the direction of a small IRO medical staff, assisted by the private agencies. The health of the people is generally regarded as good today, with the physical condition of the 100,000 youngsters in the camps, where the birth rate is steadily increasing, said to be excellent. This is attributed to the special care devoted to the children since the end of the war.

SPECIAL SCHOOLS IN CAMPS

Special schools have been opened for the youngsters in the camps so that they will not fall behind in their studies and will be able to enter their proper grades when they finally settle in the communities that will take them. The older boys and girls get vocational training so that they will have no difficulty in finding jobs.

These vocational-training courses are also open to men and women who wish to prepare themselves for the new lives they hope to start. The private agencies have assumed the major burden of this training program and a survey of courses they are offering by the DP's shows that they run the gamut from opera singing to atomic physics.

In addition to participating in these vocational-training projects, 150,000 DP's are filling full- or part-time jobs, either in the camps or in various projects sponsored by the occupation powers. In general, though, according to the IRO, the refugees are not being absorbed into national economies for two major reasons: Many of the DP's, having suffered at the hands of the Germans and Austrians, now refuse to contribute anything to the economy of these countries; while in Italy, where they would like to work, poor economic conditions do not permit them to obtain jobs.

The camps are administered by the displaced persons themselves through democratically elected camp committees, which distribute the food, police the camps, run the schools, and organize work opportunities.

Basically, however, everything that the camps have to offer is makeshift—predicated on the hope that each tomorrow will mean the end of its need.

Adding to this hope is the increasing number of selection teams from various countries that today are passing upon the qualifications of those eligible to emigrate. Since the end of the war, DP's have made their way to 73 countries all over the world, either in mass emigration schemes or through individual effort.

In a 16-month analysis of the major receiving countries, IRO statistics show that through October 1948, the last month for which such a break-down was available, the United Kingdom took in 78,000 DP's; Australia, 12,000; Canada, 43,000; Belgium, 20,000; the United States nearly 20,000; Palestine nearly 30,000 (incomplete figures); France, 21,000; Argentina, 18,000; Venezuela, 10,000; and Brazil, 5,000.

GOALS FOR COUNTRIES SET

The total goals for these major receiving countries, in addition to the United States plan to admit 205,000, are: United Kingdom, 2,000 a week; Australia, 100,000; Canada, 100,000; Belgium, 58,000; Palestine, the majority of the remaining 125,000 Jewish DP's; France, 30,000 agricultural workers; Argentina, 35,000; Venezuela, 10,000 (virtually completed); and Brazil, 15,000.

The goals of some of the other countries are: New Zealand, unknown thousands; Netherlands, 7,000; Chile, 8,000; Colombia, 2,000; Guatemala, 50,000; and Peru, 5,000 to 8,000.

Doubt is expressed in IRO circles, however, as to whether some of the countries will meet their goals. It is not believed, for example, that Belgium or Great Britain will be able to take many more than they already have admitted, throwing an increased burden on other nations.

All the countries involved, with the exception of Palestine, which is taking in only Jewish refugees, are seeking the best skills the camps have to offer. IRO surveys have disclosed that the DP's possess a wide variety of these skills, a fact that has intensified interest in the refugees because it is felt that they constitute the last large group of skilled workers that Europe will be able to offer the world for generations to come. The last IRO survey showed in part that the camps contained the following skills: 75,964 agricultural workers, 25,000 clothing workers, 12,567 construction workers, 14,437 domestic workers, 30,437 professional workers.

These are the major classifications, but with exception of the professional group, they cover many key fields in which labor shortages exist in various countries.

In addition to finding new homes for the DP's, IRO is also trying to encourage as many of the people as possible to return to their old ones. This program has not been meeting with too much success. Nearly 60,000 have been repatriated thus far, but it is believed that the repatriation program will have run its limit after another 57,000 go home. The remaining DP's are said to be unwilling to return to eastern European countries for political or religious reasons.

"With very few exceptions," Mr. Tuck insists, "I feel that any nation that takes these DP's will be getting people of the highest caliber who will make wonderful contributions to the communities which offer them homes."

[From the New York Times of January 7, 1949]

DP SKILLS EXPECTED TO AID UNITED STATES INCOME—SURVEY SHOWS REFUGEES WILL HELP EASE LABOR SHORTAGE AND INCREASE PRODUCTION—MANY JOBS ARE AVAILABLE—30 STATE COMMITTEES TO HELP RESETTLEMENT LIKELY TO BE FUNCTIONING NEXT MONTH

(By Robert L. Schiffer)

The 205,000 refugees who will get a chance to leave the vacuum of Europe's displaced persons camps and enter the United States in the next 2 years will help ease a shortage of skilled labor in this country and at the same time add several hundred million dollars to the national income, according to a survey for the New York Times.

Indicating that the incoming DP's will have no difficulty in starting new lives for themselves and in being absorbed into the Nation's economy, the survey shows that throughout the country hundreds of thousands of jobs are open for Europe's refugees. Added to this is the estimate that tens of thousands of Americans will be able to obtain better positions as a result of DP's providing certain specialized skills, thereby making possible increased production and creating a demand for more workers in the industries involved.

These factors, it has been learned, will add to the national income at a rate estimated by Government officials at a minimum of $200,000,000 a year.

ONLY ABOUT 70,000 TO GET JOBS

Focusing attention on how the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 will affect the employment situation, members of the Displaced Persons Commission, immigration officials, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the United States Employment Service say that of the 205,000 persons to be admitted only about 60,000 to 70,000 will be able to get jobs, the rest being dependents, such as wives and minor children. Therefore, they assert, with hundreds of thousands of jobs now going begging, "an added labor force of 70,000 will hardly scratch the surface of work opportunities which Europe's displaced persons can fill."

As an illustration of the Nation's ability to absorb the refugees in large numbers, the Displaced Persons Commission, established under the act to supervise displaced-person immigration, presents the following picture:

The tailoring industry is suffering a serious shortage of skilled tailors, supplied previously from among eastern European immigrants. It is estimated that New York State alone could absorb 20,000, with 10,000 taking jobs in this city. The garment unions, as well as big tailoring concerns, have urged the Displaced Persons Commission to obtain the necessary workers. The Bond Clothing Co., for example, has told the Commission that it could absorb 3,000 skilled tailors, while the Hickey-Freeman Co. has said that, if it could obtain 300 to 400 good tailors from among the displaced persons, it would be in a position to hire 10 to 15 Americans to fill less skilled positions dependent upon each of the master tailors.

FARM WORKERS NEEDED

Agricultural vacancies throughout the country run above the hundred thousand figure. New York State alone has estimated that it could put 50,000 DP farmers to work immediately. The same situation has been noted in reports from the West. The Displaced Persons Commission says that communities with depreciating farm values because of inability to obtain necessary help are urgently petitioning it to send agricultural workers.

Thousands of cattlemen and sheepherders are needed for the West. States such as Colorado require miners for the nonferrous mines. California is said to be badly in need of citrus-fruit pickers. The construction trades throughout the country say they are handicapped because they lack sufficient specialists, such as stonecutters, while the hotel and restaurant industries report a shortage of chefs and waiters.

This is just a brief cross section of the jobs that can be filled by the DP's when they arrive in this country, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Native Americans, it is said, are not applying for these openings either because they are not interested or because they do not possess the skills, which, as in the cases of tailoring and stonecutting, require long years of apprenticeship.

Officials of the Employment Service and Bureau of Labor Statistics, as well as the Immigration and Naturalization Service, say, therefore, that in no cases would DP's be taking jobs away from American labor.

FOR PROFESSIONAL GROUPS

While skilled and unskilled workers, in general, probably will not have any difficulty after they arrive, the DP Commission anticipates some trouble with those in professional groups. Doctors and lawyers, for the most part, will have to conform with the existing laws of the States in which they settle, obtaining the required schooling and taking examinations before they are admitted to practice.

The Commission says that it is trying to solve this problem by encouraging professionals to take jobs in allied fields—a doctor as a laboratory assistant and a lawyer as a law clerk—until they meet the necessary qualifications. It has been learned that the Commission is trying to work out some arrangements on this problem with various professional organizations and societies.

Meanwhile the survey has shown that the DP program is gradually commanding growing interest throughout the Nation.

[From the New York Times of January 8, 1949]

THREE-YEAR DP THRONG FOUND DOING WELL—FEW IN 43,500 IMMIGRANTS HAVE NEEDED AID, NATIONAL SURVEY NOW DISCLOSES—20 PERCENT GO WEST—SALARIES SHOW $40 AVERAGE AND CHILDREN MAKE GOOD SCHOOL, COLLEGE RECORDS

(By Robert L. Schiffer)

Virtually all European refugees admitted to the United States under special immigration programs since the end of the war are self-sufficient today and independent of outside aid, the survey for the New York Times on displaced persons has disclosed.

Most of the refugees included in this phase of the survey entered the United States under a special directive issued by President Truman in December 1945, and which was in effect until June 1948. In this period, 41,000 DP's received a haven here. Only 2,500 have come in thus far under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and preliminary reports indicate that they also are successful in establishing themselves in this country.

The facts regarding all the DP's who have entered the United States since the end of the war are being studied by the Displaced Persons Commission, set up under the act to resettle the 205,000 men, women, and children who will be arriving from European DP camps in the next 2 years. The study also will be used as a guide in assisting the new immigrants.

So little difficulty has been encountered in the assimilation of the refugees that less than 100 of those able to work are in any need of assistance today. Reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and from private welfare agencies show that the refugees are now accepted members of their communities. It has been estimated that an average of 6 months was needed to get individuals or family groups settled and completely self-supporting.

NEED ONLY OPPORTUNITY

Agencies such as the Catholic Committee on Refugees, the United Service for New Americans, and Church World Service, which were among a score of private organizations bringing in large numbers of refugees under the Truman directive, say that in very few cases has anyone come back to request assistance. Most of the people, the agencies find, "are so grateful for the chance to make their own way after years of suffering and privation that they now ask only for the opportunity to stand on their own feet."

The survey shows that more than 50 percent of the immigrants have settled on the eastern seaboard. The rest went to virtually every State. At one point, nearly 70 percent had remained in the East, but later 20 percent shifted to the West and Midwest, reports say. These also point out that only a handful of those who first settled in the West moved back East. This is expected to offer encouragement to newly arriving immigrants to settle in western areas.

A majority of the 41,000 was found to have settled in cities of more than 100,000 because relatives and friends, along with greater job and educational opportunities, were there. The job categories covered by these former DP's touch nearly every classification.

Average salaries, according to one report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, have been in the neighborhood of $40, with many going much higher and a few lower.

Children, other reports say, have on the whole had the most success in becoming assimilated, making excellent school records. College-age boys and girls also are said to be doing well.

More than 1,300 unaccompanied boys and girls up to 18 years of age were brought into the country under the Truman program by the United States Committee for the Care of European Children. The committee reports that these youngsters have been placed in foster homes, nurseries, and children's homes in 30 States and 246 cities and towns. Some of the older boys and girls, the committee says, are working and many of the boys are already serving in the Army.

Of the 2,500 who have entered thus far under the terms of the Displaced Persons Act, the great majority is still in the East, with a concentration in New York City, main port of arrival. However, the three members of the Displaced Persons Commission—Ugo Carusi, Chairman, Edward O'Connor, and Harold N. Rosenfield—say there are indications that efforts to spread the newly arriving refugees over the country are having initial success.

Reports are now being received by the Commission from the first group who had entered by means of the act at the end of last October. There were only 800 men, women, and children in this group, but reports on them have come from 20 States and the District of Columbia. One, a Polish girl, was also reported to be en route to Alaska.

MORE LATVIANS WANTED

In the same vein, the Commission points to the resettlement of 84 Latvians, who now have homes and jobs in Senatobia, Miss. The groups, which will work on farms in the area, received what has been described as an encouraging reception. The Commission adds that these people have created such a good impression during the short space of time that they have been there that farmers for miles around are beginning to question Washington as to the possibility of obtaining additional DP's to settle in that area.

The agencies that assist refugees in coming to the United States and then make sure that they have homes and jobs and are not in need include the following, according to the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service:

War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, United Service for New Americans, Church World Service, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Unitarian Service Committee, International Rescue and Relief Committee, Society of Friends (Quakers), United Ukrainian Relief Society, American Association of International Institutes, National Lutheran Council, United Lithuanian Relief Committee, Tolstoy Foundation, United States Committee for the Care of European Children, Travelers Aid Society, and the National Social Welfare Assembly.

Resettlement committees are being set up meanwhile in every Catholic diocese throughout the country, while each Protestant church is being asked to "adopt" at least one DP family. Jewish groups also are helping through their synagogues and clubs. Civic groups as well as labor unions and industry are joining in the program, working with the welfare agencies and religious denominations.

The success of this combined operation is illustrated through many cases cited by the private welfare agencies. The United Service for New Americans, for example, tells of the experience of Ovsej Abelow and his family.

Until October 1948, Mr. Abelow had no future. His life had been shattered when the Germans deported him from his native Poland to the Dachau concentration camp. American soldiers saved him from execution near the end of the war. Then after that he lived in the Heidenheim Displaced Persons Camp in the American Zone of Occupation, Germany, where he met his wife and where his child was born.

The activation of the United States DP program finally gave him his first chance to leave the camp, and with the aid of the USNA he and his family were admitted to the United States 2 months ago. Two months, however, were all the Abelows needed to start life anew, because today they have their own home in Youngstown, Ohio, and Mr. Abelow is employed as a tailor, earning a weekly salary of $40.

The Abelows and all the other DP's, according to the Commission, are rapidly on their way to becoming good Americans.

[From the New York Times of January 10, 1949]

BETTER DP LAW HELD IMPERATIVE—COMMISSION TO TELL CONGRESS 1949 QUOTA OF 75,000 IS IMPOSSIBLE UNDER RULES—40,000 JOBS ARE WAITING—BUT RED TAPE WILL ALLOW ONLY 6,000 TO ENTER IN 3 MONTHS—DELAY IRKS EMPLOYERS

(By Robert L. Schiffer)

Far-reaching changes in the basic structure of the law admitting 205,000 refugees here during a 2-year period will be recommended to Congress by the Displaced Persons Commission in a special report that is expected to point out that the program has bogged down seriously because of current restrictions.

The Commission is making its first report to the President and Congress since it was set up 6 months ago by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. The report, it was learned yesterday, will say that without a radical change in the situation it will be virtually impossible to meet this year's goal of bringing in 75,000 refugees. This will be borne out by the fact that although the Commission has approved assurances for jobs and homes covering more than 40,000 persons, it is not believed that more than 6,000 DP's will arrive in the next 3 months, according to the displaced-persons survey for the New York Times.

As only 2,500 have already been admitted, this will make a total of 8,500 who will have gained admission by the end of March, 9 months after the passage of the act.

It is also expected that Congress will be told that compared to the $2,000,000 given the Commission to start the job of bringing in the 205,000 refugees, private welfare agencies are advancing funds at a rate that will cost them more than $25,000,000 to support the Federal program.

1945 YARDSTICK ASSAILED

Reviewing all phases of operation under the act in its first 6 months of life, the report will contain additional recommendations for altering what are considered to be its most troublesome features. These are said to include the provisions limiting the law to refugees admitted to the DP camps as of December 22, 1945—the section that has been attacked by President Truman as being discriminatory against Catholics and Jews because large numbers of them arrived after that date; the proposals relating to the necessity of having a job and home assured for the DP in advance of his arrival; and various priorities assigned to ethnic origins and certain skills such as agriculture.

The three members of the Commission, Ugo Carusi, Chairman; Harry N. Rosenfield; and Edward O'Connor, will, it is expected, emphasize the advisability of revising the act by pointing out that despite its limitations the DP program has many worth-while achievements to its credit, which could be added to through a more liberal law.

As the act stands now, one of the biggest stumbling blocks in the way of speeding up the flow of DP's to this country is that it takes a minimum of 6 weeks for one DP to be processed in Europe and to receive a visa. In the face of this and with a staff of only 64 persons on hand to supervise the vast amount of paper work and complex procedure involved, it is felt that it is noteworthy that as many as 2,000 DP's will arrive here during January.

It has been estimated, however, that it is necessary for 10,000 DP's to enter this country every month if the program is to meet its 2-year deadline.

RED TAPE OUTLINED

The difficulty in stepping-up the rate is attributed to the following set of circumstances:

After the Commission approves an assurance in Washington, it is sent to headquarters in Frankfort, Germany. There special care must be given to select the type of worker requested in the assurance. Once this is accomplished, the International Refugee Organization must examine the records of the individual involved and certify that he is eligible. Then, the prospective immigrant must be screened by the Army's Counterintelligence Corps to determine that he is not a former Nazi or Fascist or Communist.

After passing this test, the DP is called forward from the camp where he is living to one of the centrally located immigration assembly centers. There, he is interviewed again by a special board consisting of the Army, a United States consular official, a DP Commission analyst, and a public-health officer. Following a report by this board, the DP Commission analyst either certifies or rejects the candidate.

If approved, he must then be questioned separately by the United States consular official and must also undergo a medical test, and passing this, he returns to the consular official, who then checks to see whether the DP qualifies under regular United States immigration law. Following this approval, he can proceed either to Bremerhaven or Hamburg, the embarkation centers. But before he boards ship, he must undergo still another routine check by a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. After that he can sail, but he still faces the possibility that he may be turned back at Ellis Island for a number of technical reasons.

SPEED-UP HELD IMPOSSIBLE

The Commission, it is expected, will simply point out in its report the impossibility of attaining any real speed under this procedure.

It has been learned, meanwhile, that because of this lag in getting refugees to the United States, prospective employers who had pledged themselves to hire DP's are now notifying the Commission that it may not be possible for them to wait any longer. They are demanding that the Commission give them some promise as to when they can expect the DP's so that they can make proper plans. With the Commission unable to give any estimate as to how soon the people will arrive, many of those who have issued job assurances may cancel them, thereby also canceling a DP's right to enter the country.

This situation, it is said, is rapidly becoming one of the Commission's most serious problems.

The Commission hopes to solve this difficulty by eliminating the job assurance as well as the housing-assurance provisions entirely. As the act now stands, these assurances must be provided by relatives, employers, or private agencies before the DP's can even be selected.

Mr. Carusi contends that it is unnecessary to make such provisions in advance because experience has shown that the jobs and housing can be arranged after the DP's arrive in this country. He points out that none of these provisions was made for the DP's admitted under the terms of the Truman directive, but that all of the people are self-supporting today.

The Commission, it is also believed, will cite the fact that hundreds of thousands of jobs are available for DP's throughout the country and, therefore, there is no danger of any of the incoming refugees remaining unemployed.

On the aspect of what the private agencies are doing to promote the program, the Commission says that the Government owes them a huge debt for their cooperation and assistance in getting the DP program under way.

The agencies, listed in the third article of this survey, have been chiefly responsible for obtaining the great bulk of job and home assurances that have come in from all over the country.

In addition to obtaining assurances, these private organizations have established a pier service to meet every incoming ship. Whereas the DP Commission has only one representative on hand for each ship, the agencies have several hundred. They provide temporary shelter for the new arrivals and see to it that the people are fed and receive clothing wherever necessary.

In many cases the agencies provide rail fare and are also present at the final destination, checking to make sure that everything goes smoothly.

It is estimated that each DP thus cared for costs the private agency involved $200 for food, clothing, and train fare. While in some instances relatives repay this amount, in at least 60 percent of the cases, the cost is footed by such agencies as the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the United Service for New Americans, and the Church World Service.

This estimate does not include the funds expended by the private agencies while the DP's are still overseas or the funds that they advance to assist the people in meeting resettlement difficulties after they reach their new homes.

What has happened, therefore, according to representatives of the agencies, is that the Federal Government has instituted a program for which it is not paying, except for minor administrative costs. The International Refugee Organization pays for the trans-Atlantic voyage and the agencies assume the cost from the pier.

Despite the above-mentioned facts, the commissions, the private agencies, and Government officials connected with the program are confident that its potentialities will be realized as soon as current difficulties are ironed out. It is felt that the good record made by the DP's who have already entered this country point up the results that can be obtained and that these will be noted in various amendments and revisions to the Displaced Persons Act now being proposed in Congress that may extend the law to admit 400,000 refugees.

As an indication of the confidence it feels in the ultimate success of the program, the Displaced Persons Commission will soon announce that it is launching a comprehensive orientation program in the DP camps of Europe to prepare future Americans among the DP's for the life they will lead in this country.

This program will include lessons in English, general information about America, and specific information about the customs and habits of the particular communities to which the individual DP's will be going.

"We plan to give America's future citizens," the Commission says, "an advance foothold on their future."

Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Waynesboro News-Virginian of Wednesday, January 12, 1949:

IN THE OLD ARMCHAIR WITH LOUIS SPILMAN

There's much excitement in the United States today over proposals to "socialize"

medicine. We are inherently and instinctively opposed to the socialization of any profession or any business, but we likewise believe with all our mind, body, and soul that if a profession or business fails to meet the needs of society at large, then society must step in to regulate. This applies to professions as well as businesses.

Physicians, by virtue of the basic precepts of their calling, are pledged to aid suffering humanity. This does not mean physicians should be unpaid, poverty-stricken, neglected, and disregarded. It does mean, however, that every individual citizen, regardless of race, creed, financial status, or social level, should be insured adequate medical attention just as we would insure every individual citizen against starvation, freezing to death, or lack of burial in case of death.

In this day of specialization and scarcity of qualified physicians it has become difficult, in many rural communities, to secure medical aid. The tendency in the medical profession to concentrate in urban centers around huge medical centers has made the plight of many people in less populated areas, quite difficult. We offer no criticism; we simply recite a situation that merits solution primarily by the medical profession itself. If the medical profession is unable to solve the problem, then society must.

The physician's problem is keen. He is expected to answer the summons to an accident or a sick-bed at any time of day or night. Being human, it is physically impossible for any one physician to do so 24 hours a day, 7 days every week of the year. The physician, too, is entitled to compensation for his efforts. Yet a call for help must be answered else he is subjected to considerable criticism. Just how to meet this situation, it would seem, requires combined effort of the profession and of society.

Complete socialization of medicine is incompatible with democratic principles; is abhorrent to all who believe in individual freedom. But it is equally incompatible with democratic principles and abhorrent to individual freedom to have people suffer and die through lack of medical attention. So we must meet the problem courageously and intelligently and in harmony. No profession or business is above society; neither should society be permitted to enslave or intimidate any individual or group within it.

Address of Hon. Benjamin Franklin James, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES, of Pennsylvania, at the Franklin Monument, Washington, D. C., January 17, 1949:

I feel very highly privileged to be here today and to participate in these ceremonies commemorating the two hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, sometimes called the first American.

I value this privilege especially because many of my activities in life have, in a very small way, rather curiously followed those of Franklin's.

Being a printer, as was Franklin, I can greet with genuine affection the cosponsors of these ceremonies, my brothers in the Graphic Arts, and with equal affection I can greet the cosponsors who are representative of the International Firemen's Association. I have been the head of the printing company in Philadelphia which was founded by Franklin in 1728, and for the past 22 years I have been a fireman, a member of the volunteer fire company of my community.

Printing and fire fighting were very important activities in the life of the great man.

Like Franklin, I have served in the governing body of my community, and in the legislature of my State, and now finally I serve in the Congress of our Nation.

I want to interpolate here in connection with something that the Honorable Public Printer, Mr. Deviny, has said in connection with Franklin's success as a printer. I can assure all of you of the Graphic Arts that it is not possible to retire from the printing business at 40 years of age, in these days, with enough money to go the rest of life's distance, as did he.

Benjamin Franklin wrought diligently in many fields of human endeavor—in whatsoever field he labored he left the germinating seeds of his discoveries and his wisdom.

These seeds have been cultivated by succeeding generations and many rich harvests have been gathered that have benefited mankind enormously everywhere in this world.

Perhaps his finest achievement was in the field of philosophy—and in the management of the minds of the people of his time. For with his pen and his printing press he did far more than any other to mold the American character and awaken in our forefathers a national consciousness. Gathered here today in his honor, we can offer no better tribute to the memory of Franklin on this occasion than to resolve that we will, as individuals and Americans, sustain the American character he designed and to preserve an American national conscience, to the end that our country shall be and always remain a Republic, and that it shall stand as the noblest example of democratic government on the face of the earth.

There Is a Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all too often so-called conservative newspapers join some of the smear artists who over the last few years have taken delight in vilifying every individual who vigorously and with some small degree of success opposed the New Deal or its political allies. Then the editors of those same so-called conservative newspapers, which are in themselves illustrations of what is termed "free enterprise," sometimes complain why Members of Congress are not more courageous, more vigorous in opposing policies which are certain to minimize the profits which will accrue if we, as a nation, follow the principles laid down in our Constitution.

A recent illustration of what I am trying to show is the news story on the front page of the Grand Rapids Herald, Grand Rapids, Mich., which charges that a congressional committee's acts in holding a certain hearing to ascertain the facts in connection with a commando raid were illegal.

An editorial from the Allegan Gazette of December 23, written by Leo W. Hoffman, explains the fallacy of the Grand Rapids Herald's reasoning.

The editorial is as follows:

CIO PRESSURE SHOWS UP IN DAILY PAPER

In a news story on the front page of Wednesday's Grand Rapids Herald concerning the CIO's Phillip Murray and his refusal to testify in the investigation of CIO's raid on the Shakespeare plant at Kalamazoo, a headline reads "Hoffman's Acts Held Illegal."

Now the ordinary citizen, hurriedly scanning the morning paper over a cup of coffee, would immediately assume that some court or other properly constituted body or official had held that Congressman HOFFMAN had no authority to conduct the investigation. Careful reading of the news story's smaller print fails to show that any court or Government official had ever held illegal the investigation and the issuing of subpenas in the investigation. What the news story does tell is that Murray wrote HOFFMAN and advised him that his lawyers were of the opinion that the investigation was without authority.

We are willing to admit that Murray and the CIO are a powerful force in the United States, but we are not yet ready to admit that union lawyers can, without any hearing, "Hold a member of the labor committee's acts illegal."

The present-day tendency on the part of a great many daily papers is to play down any acts of violence and outrage committed by the unions and their flying goon squads, and play up any story that would put the labor bosses in a better light.

Perhaps some of these papers, being unionized themselves, are afraid of the unons, or perhaps just as a matter of political expediency, or commercial policy they are inclined in reporting the news to favor the unions.

Give the Grand Rapids Herald a story about Flying Discs, the Gray Ghosts, or the Galoshes Gang, and they will really go to town on it, but let a few hundred labor goons and bums from the other side of the State invade southwestern Michigan, destroy property, defy our local police, and the Grand Rapids Herald will devote most of its space to the union's claim that it is being improperly investigated.

Perhaps the attitude of the Herald is explained by the fact that politically the Herald is Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG's paper and doesn't wish to antagonize the labor vote.

Our conclusion is that the Herald, intentionally by its use of headlines and a choice of words, misrepresented the facts.

Perhaps union pressure will in time destroy the freedom of the press.

World Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address of Dr. Alexander Brin,

which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on December 16, 1948:

DR. BRIN CITES "BILL OF DUTIES"—EDUCATOR IN INSPIRING TALK AT SYNAGOGUE IN SWAMPSCOTT

A "bill of duties" defining a sturdy and intelligent American patriotism, to be put side by side with our hallowed Bill of Rights to make our citizens more conscious of their daily responsibilities as members of an evolving and ever-expanding pattern of peaceful living in a dynamic democracy, was advocated last evening by Dr. Alexander Brin at a community-wide meeting in Swampscott commemorating the 157th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights.

Dr. Brin, vice-chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Education and editor and publisher of the Jewish Advocate, spoke at a meeting sponsored by the brotherhood of Temple Israel of Swampscott and held at the synagogue. It was attended by representative citizens from all parts of the North Shore.

Appealing for the rededication and reconsecration to the safeguarding and to the translating into action of national characteristics which have made the United States the last great fortress of freedom and the world's leading laboratory for democratic living, Dr. Brin alluded to the adoption by the United Nations of an International Bill of Rights patterned after our own.

He said that it is an indication that the world has rediscovered America's living creed, which recognizes human dignity and the safety of the individual. This action, he said, is a glowing tribute to the magnitude and magnificence of America's heritage and the massive American advantages of free speech, free institutions, and freedom from the corroding fears and secrecies of any totalitarian society. These have challenged the admiration, gratitude, and imitation of the world, he added, and should give every American a new sense of dignity and greater pride in his citizenship, because the world bill of rights harbors the same seed which germinated into our own democracy when it was adopted 157 years ago.

Prefacing his address by remarks concerning the privilege of living in the United States with a résumé of conditions in European nations as he found them through personal observation and experience of a recent 2-month tour, which covered 25,000 miles of the European continent, Dr. Brin said he is convinced that the American spirit and the classic essentials of American democracy are gradually conquering many parts of the world.

Deploring the fact that too many Americans take their priceless privileges of American citizenship for granted, Dr. Brin said:

"It is depressing to note that only 48,000,000 out of a potential voting population of 93,000,000 exercised the privilege of franchise in the last national election. It is a sad commentary when we realize that 45,000,000 eligible voters failed to cast their ballots, a privilege for which millions of human beings have given their lives."

Advocating a greater need for knowledge and appreciation of our own form of government and the moral and spiritual values which make up the bulwarks indispensable to the preservation of the fundamental structure of American civilization, the speaker called for an educational crusade to indoctrinate our people with the ideals and principles of our form of government.

He called attention to surveys in recent years in American secondary schools and colleges that revealed the shocking fact that only one person in five knew that the American Bill of Rights consists of the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution; that these amendments protect the basic liberties of the individual citizen from encroachment, and that our Bill of Rights is the very heart and center and the wellspring of American democracy. He said:

"We were also appalled at the revelations of student ignorance of American history. Actually 25 percent of 7,000 undergraduates in 36 universities did not know that Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War; 30 percent did not know that Woodrow Wilson was President during the first World War. Eighty-four percent could not cite two of the contributions made by the architect of America's character, Thomas Jefferson. Many college men could not define the meaning of American democracy and haven't the haziest notion about the difference between democracy and other systems of life and government. The conclusion is inescapable that the teaching of American history has been neglected and ignored in our educational institutions. Our children and elders too, should be taught the ideals of America and the fundamental principles of American civilization. The best of American thought and American literature should feed the minds of young and old."

Dr. Brin said that the Marshall plan, aside from its probable far-reaching economic changes upon a sick and discouraged world, is destined to hasten the establishment of a United States of Europe, dedicated to high ideals and based upon the principles on which the American Republic was founded.

He pointed out that the salvation of all mankind depends on the ideal of a world family of nations, patterned after the 48 States of our country, living together under the rule of law and reason.

"Such a federation," he said, "would eventually pool their economic resources and release vast sums of money for human welfare and would strengthen the tendencies for international good will and universal peace.

"The United States of America, in this crisis of the hour," Dr. Brin continued, "should not renounce fundamental principles but must cultivate a greater faith in her own destiny as the last great fortress of freedom and the world's leading laboratory for democratic living, having confidence in her racial composition, her geographic position and destiny, and a mission guaranteeing world stability and enduring peace."

Dr. Brin maintained that there is a close anology between the problems of the Thirteen Colonies after the Revolution and before the adoption of the Constitution and the present nations of the world. He said that in the formative days of our Nation we faced every problem the world faces today and were on the point of being destroyed when great constructive statesmen adopted our Constitution and later our Bill of Rights.

The speaker asserted that the adoption of the international bill of rights is another bulwark against the impending danger of war. It is a challenge to the democratic-minded nations to prepare themselves for a new period of advance and is an incentive of new vision and new vitality to rekindle the lights of hope and brotherhood and justice and peace for all the downtrodden denizens of the earth.

"Time and tide of world movements have proven the strength and soundness of the structure of American democracy, which has bestowed upon this Nation the inestimable gifts of religious and civic freedom, free speech, and a free press, high standards of education and living, a tradition of fair play, fellowship, trial by jury, the right of habeas corpus, protection from unreasonable search and seizure, the right of assembly, the right to disagree, freedom to choose one's occupation and residence, and free elections. These are the characteristics of a society of free men and women as distinguished from conditions of mental slavery which prevail over large areas of the earth today.

"America is magnificent because for all our 4,000,000 square miles, for all the 147,000,000 people, and there is a unity of language and speech as well as opportunities for self-expression, initiative, and enterprise of the individual which nowhere finds its match.

"Now that the world has taken the greatest forward step in the emancipation of the common man in the new weapon against tyranny in the form of a World Bill of Rights, it should go a long way to capture our imagination and harness our enthusiasm for the American way of life. The welfare of the Nation demands that we unite all Americans, comprising all sorts of conditions and men, to understand our country, to love our institutions, to promote its safety and perpetuity. We can best help keep aloft the flame of liberalism and democracy by checking inflation, thus protecting our currency, building up our national defense, greater participation and interest by our citizens in governmental affairs, strengthening our schools and restoring the prestige of the teaching profession, making our youth conscious of its great heritage as Americans, uproot injustices and weaknesses in our system of life, produce trained minds and creative imagination, check bigotry and intolerance among the various groups of our population, freshen and reform our public life to attract able men to public service, improve our municipal, State, and National Government, and help bring about better human relations and international understanding.

"In our jubilation over the significant event we must be on guard against exaggeration of its meaning. Universal peace, international brotherhood, and world comity are not yet assured and safeguarded. But the first step has been taken for the consummation of the matchless dream of international peace. Upon this foundation the United Nations will erect the mechanics that will bless and benefit the whole of the human family, which is striving for real equality, economic justice, universal education, and peace."

Additional Federal Judge, District of Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced a bill, H. R. 970, to authorize an additional Federal judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Kansas.

The following news item in the Kansas City Kansan of January 13, 1949, graphically depicts the existing conditions and emphatically demonstrates the urgent need for an additional judge in the Kansas district in order to handle efficiently and expeditiously the growing court load.

FACTS SHOW THAT KANSAS NEEDS SECOND JUDGE

Kansas attorneys and laymen with knowledge of the great volume of business in the United States district court in this State were gratified by the recent recommendation of the judicial conference for an additional judgeship and introduction of a bill in Congress to create additional judgeships—in-

cluding one for Kansas. They now are looking confidently to Congress to take early action approving the bill.

Kansas is the only State having a population of more than 1,800,000 in the 1940 census—the last taken—which has but one district judge.

And all States with a 1940 population of 850,000 or more have two or more judges except Colorado, with 1,123,296 that year, and Kansas, which had 1,801,028.

Litigation in this State's Federal court, already heavily out of proportion in comparison with the case load for other district judges, is increasing. Thus there is a concerted effort to obtain at least one other judgeship for this State and relieve Judge Arthur J. Mellott of a part of the volume of work he is carrying.

SEES LESS DELAY

Judge Mellett will not admit he is overworked, even though his workday begins not later than 8:30 and continues to 5 and often 6 and 7 o'clock at night, with his workweek including Saturdays—customarily not included in the working days of judges.

But he is outspoken on the point that, through services of another judge, court hearings can be conducted so that the docket will be kept current and at the same time, submitted matters can be gone into thoroughly and ruled upon within a reasonable length of time without the undue delays which cannot be avoided when there is but one judge to handle all matters.

A Federal judge has before him from time to time grand juries which return indictments, or charges, against defendants alleged to have violated Federal laws; petit juries which act with the court in the trial of both criminal and civil cases; hears cases tried to the court, with jury waived; rules on motions involving various points; supervises trusteeships and receiverships; has general administrative duties, signs various orders, and appoints the various United States commissioners in the State.

OPERATING BUSINESSES

In one phase of work the court now is operating indirectly, through trustees and receiverships, a dozen or so big businesses. This duty requires numerous conferences at which the judge is called upon to make decisions affecting the future of those businesses, the investments of stockholders, and the claims of creditors.

A judge must have knowledge of business and finance and acquaint himself with the peculiar problems of such cases before him.

The human element demands his concern—the stake the individuals have in the outcome of civil matters, the greater one the defendant, and his family, have in a criminal action. In the latter the court also must delve deeply into the matter of rehabilitation possibilities for the accused.

He must keep abreast of all decisions of the courts. New questions constantly are arising in today's complex civilization. Congress passes new legislation, and some judge will face the responsibility of making a first decision on interpreting some phase of the law.

INTO EVERY QUESTION

Since the close of World War II many military prisoners have joined the ranks of others coming before the court seeking release on writs of habeas corpus. All such cases are in a category by themselves and claim special attention. In the case of the military prisoners, the judge is faced by a man who, in many instances, was fighting overseas for his country when he became involved in some difficulty which resulted in a sentence by a court martial.

In all cases of various types coming before him, the court must go into every question; every law point must be checked, each citation considered.

It thus is imperative that a judge have time for contemplation. There must be due consideration given every matter, however seemingly trivial, if justice is to be served.

MANY COURT SESSIONS

Indicative of the number of court days necessary to handle the case load of this State-wide district is the fact that of a possible total of 220 court days the past year—summer vacation, Saturdays, and Sundays being eliminated—formal court hearings were held in Kansas on 192 days. This includes formal court days of visiting judges, as well as those of Judge Mellott. This leaves but 28 days of the year to the judge for study of cases under submission, the writing of opinions, the disposition of uncontested litigation, and for handling the truly vast amount of administrative work necessary to the functioning of the court.

In an effort to keep the work as nearly current as possible, Judge Mellott has been almost constantly on the bench since the beginning of court sessions September 7. He was on the bench 65 out of a possible 75 days of court work in the last 4 months of 1948.

Judge Mellott spent 1 week in Kansas City, Kans., on habeas corpus matters, criminal and civil cases. Then he was 3 weeks at Wichita with both a grand jury and a petit jury in attendance. Some 100 persons were indicted by the grand jury.

Returning to Kansas City, Kans., he held a 5-week term, being on the bench virtually every day for trial of cases of all types—many to juries.

Next came 3 weeks at Fort Scott with a jury in attendance. Twenty-five criminal cases were disposed of and the court also handled 27 appeals by property owners whose land had been taken in connection with the Fall River project—a Government flood-protection development.

December 1, Judge Mellott had a special grand-jury session in Kansas City, Kans.; 46 persons were indicted. He also handled various court matters during that time. Then he was at Leavenworth for 5 days, disposing of some 30 criminal cases.

WORK ON INCREASE

He was 2 days at Topeka for naturalization work and habeas corpus hearings; then returned to Kansas City, Kans., to conduct court for 4 days.

Judge Mellott just has conducted a naturalization hearing in Kansas City, Kans., and 50 cases now are set for a Wichita term opening Monday.

As easily can be realized, submitted cases cannot be handled expeditiously and yet with proper deliberation when the judge is on the bench almost continuously.

Either the docket increases in size or there is delay in rulings on submitted matter.

And work of the court is on the increase. In Kansas during July, August, September, and October, 335 new cases were instituted.

For the 178 judges in the 84 districts in the United States, an average of 379 cases were filed per judge in the year ending June 30, 1948.

URGE JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

But for the one judge in Kansas, there were new cases filed 74 percent in excess of the average case load of all other Federal judges.

The pressure of work in the Kansas district as shown by those various comparisons is looked upon by the court as not being fair to litigants.

Persons close to the problem are of the opinion it would be better to have two—or more—judges in Kansas with joint responsibility than to create separate districts in the State. The latter would necessitate another court organization—with a district attorney, clerk, and marshal and their respective staffs. The desire in Kansas is for addition of judges rather than districts.

Judge Orie L. Phillips, Denver, presiding judge of the tenth circuit, recommended the creation of the second judgeship to the judicial conference at the recent meeting in Washington. The conference is composed of the presiding judges of all circuit courts of appeal with Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, of the United States Supreme Court, as head.

Mr. Speaker, it is the fervent hope of the people of Kansas that the Committee on the Judiciary and the Congress will take early and favorable action.

Regulation W by Federal Reserve Board Retarding Business and Making Character Loans Almost Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is more to regulation W as promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board than appears on the surface.

First, it places at a disadvantage the person who has real character and needs durable goods and whose credit is good but cannot obtain them because of an arbitrary regulation of the Federal Reserve Board. Something else is coming out about this regulation W that indicates it is a powerful weapon for monopolistic interests. For instance, the sale of an automobile, refrigerator, washing machine, or other durable goods, all private brands and provided by a manufacturer that has a finance company, has a great advantage over other durable goods that are not private brands and are not supported by a manufacturer's finance company.

It is reported in the news less than 2 days ago that installment rules promulgated by the Federal Reserve Board are being widely evaded; that goods sold on charge account are later switched to installment, which results in the installment period being lengthened. This is made possible by a manufacturer with a finance company. This same news item refers to the fact that installment credit rules, which require a high down payment of cash, are stirring up a lot of trouble among dealers in automobiles and home appliances because they claim a large percentage of their sales are being killed.

I have just received a telegram from Pueblo, Colo., as follows:

Please continue efforts to force amendment to Federal Reserve Board credit regulation W. Unless regulation is amended to permit new cars to be sold on 24 monthly payment terms, I believe Ford, General Motors, Chrysler, and entire industry will be working half time or less by July 1, 1949. This will force unemployment of millions in auto industry and all allied lines. Autocratic Federal Reserve Board either doesn't have brains enough to realize this or refuses to retreat

from their czaristic position. Thanks for your continued efforts to solve this vital problem.

In addition, I have also received a telegram from Lewis M. Evans, president, Elliott & Evans, Inc., and treasurer, National Small Businessmen's Association, Cleveland, Ohio, as follows:

The books of my firm are open for inspection. We are distributors of appliances in northern Ohio and since regulation W, September 20, 1948, our business has decreased 51 percent. The reasons are obvious. Eighty-five percent of our business is done through small merchants whose paper is handled by finance company because these merchants haven't the money to carry their own paper or give 30, 60, and 90 days open charge and then arrange for extended credit with their customers, consequently they are frozen out of the market and their customers are driven into stores that can carry accounts and that handle private brand merchandise and are both in the finance and merchandising business. It is time for Congress to awaken to the fact that restricted laws directed to just a part of the economy of our country will not work. Such laws will be broken or evaded because the people know what is fair and will not obey half slave and half free legislation.

Most sincerely yours.

This latter telegram discloses a trend calculated to be helpful to private brand merchandise and big concerns and discriminatory against others.

No Marshall Plan Money Should Be Granted to Nations Who Violate UN Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to urge the enactment of the amendment proposed to section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, so that it will provide that no Marshall plan money shall be granted, lent, or used to or for any country which violates any provision of the Charter of the United Nations or directly or indirectly engages in acts of aggression, so long as such acts continue, as determined by proclamation of the President of the United States of America or by the United Nations.

I supported a similar amendment when it was offered last year at the time the law was enacted. At that time the only aggressor nation that would have been affected was Great Britain because of her misconduct in fomenting hostilities in the Middle East. Since then the Netherlands, despite all the United Nations could do and all that we could do, has engaged in open warfare in an attempt to destroy the Republic of Indonesia. It does not require any stretch of the imagination to believe that the Netherlands would never have dared to open hostilities if she knew that as a result thereof she would lose the financial assistance of the United States.

That it is brutally wrong to give any assistance directly or indirectly to a violator of the United Nations Charter was recognized by our Government when it directed the suspension of further allocations to the Netherlands on behalf of Indonesia by the Economic Cooperation Administration. That does not go far enough. As long as the Netherlands has a single dollar of its own money to spend for armaments or troops to carry on hostilities it should not get a single dollar of ours no matter where the money is to go. The same holds true for Britain and for every other nation that looks to us for help.

I spent 3 weeks in the Middle East in September of last year. Despite the denials that were emanating from the British Foreign Office at that time, I saw on every side indications of the activities of the British in urging the Arabs to carry on open warfare against the new State of Israel. Evidence was replete that it was British armaments and British money that made it possible for the Arab States to carry on these hostilities. Egypt, Lebanon, and Transjordan, almost from the beginning, have showed an indication and a desire to live at peace with the new state. It is only the misconduct of Britain in following the devilish and iniquitous thinking of Bevin that has prevented it.

The sending of five British war planes across Egypt and over Israel was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as an antagonistic violation of the sovereignty of both Egypt and Israel. It was intended as a threat to Egypt in the event she carried on her promised negotiations for peace. For months she has been shipping armaments and troops into the Middle East. She fools nobody when she says that this is to protect her own military bases. The movement of these armaments and troops is intended as a threat against the Arab states as well as Israel. She has been attempting to make Israel believe that she is ready to enter the war against her. The threat against the Arab states is made in an attempt to make them believe that if they enter into peace treaties with Israel she will attempt to take over the Arab states. The Arab states desire to live at peace with their new neighbor, and will do so if Britain can be told to mind her own business and let them alone.

President Truman has been quoted as having told the British in no uncertain manner that American policy demands a peaceful Middle East, with the sovereign state of Israel prospering side by side with its neighbors.

The way for us to uphold the hand of the President is to withhold all aid from Britain, the Netherlands, and anyone else that dares to participate directly or indirectly in acts of aggression. I am sure that the British people feel as we do, and if they know that they can get money from us only for peaceful pursuits they will turn out of office the imperialistic war mongers, the leader of whom is the infamous Mr. Bevin.

Business Conditions in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address regarding business conditions in the United States, delivered by me in Philadelphia on January 11 last, at the annual dinner meeting of Tacony Manufacturers' Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I will not make any of the obvious comments about a Democratic Senator being invited to address a group of businessmen in Philadelphia's Union League Club. I am happy to have this opportunity to meet with you, and I'll let it go at that.

If we are to believe all of the things we read in the syndicated columns of the newspapers, then the audience I face here tonight—manufacturers and businessmen—must be very nervous and worried about their future. Are you?

Frankly, I don't think so. I think you gentlemen have all learned in the last 16 years of Democratic administrations that the Government, although in your hair often, has had no intention whatsoever of harming the essential features of the free-enterprise system. Oh, I know that every time any new administration proposal has been put forward in those 16 years, the cry went up that we were out to ruin business and destroy private enterprise and capitalism in America.

I have no intention of making a political speech here tonight. First of all, the election campaign is over. We are quite satisfied in my party with the result. Those who hoped for a different result do not seem to be too distressed over what happened, and the prophets of doom are rather quiet. The stock market doesn't act as if it thought the American economic system were through or that the Democrats were going to throw it out the window. It's a high tribute to the essential soundness of American democracy that all of our citizens are able to take what has been regarded as a political miracle in their easy stride—to have rolled with the punch, you might say—and everyone is now intent on new plans for industrial expansion and new plans for the better America which all of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, seem to be convinced is in the offing.

I am not here tonight as a Democrat speaking to a group of manufacturers who are presumed to be largely Republicans. I accepted your kind invitation because I know that, regardless of any party considerations, you and I are interested in exactly the same thing and that is a prosperous country, and fully employed country, a prosperous Philadelphia, a Philadelphia whose industries, whose very important industries, are assured an even break and a fair opportunity to compete with other industrial cities. Sometimes there are Republican formulas or Democratic formulas for accomplishing these goals, but there is no disagreement as to the desirability of achieving those goals.

I understand that I have achieved something of a label in the United States Senate as being provincial; of insisting on looking at legislation from the standpoint of what it does to my State and to the cities in my State and to industries in those cities. I

have tried to break down all major matters of legislation in those terms because I think they are the best standards to use. In Pennsylvania we have just about every kind of industry; we have a vast range of interests; we are typical, on the whole, as to population. I feel that because of this diversified industrial pattern and diversified human pattern in Pennsylvania, those things which are good for our State are, on the whole, likely to be in the best interests of the Nation. Similarly, I feel that any proposal which would seriously damage a segment of Pennsylvania must of necessity have similar repercussions on great areas of the country.

You people who are businessmen and manufacturers can be of great help to me in my task in the Senate in passing on these issues. If there is anything we in the legislative part of the Government need and need badly and need all the time, it is information from informed constituents who can tell us how a particular program of Government affects their industries or their jobs or their communities. We need specific information of this kind. If we don't get it, we have to play our hunches. There are very few of us in the Congress who prefer to be uninformed on an important issue. Yet, there are many times when we must act in what we know is an uninformed manner.

I want to emphasize strongly that, just as we don't like to play our own hunches to the exclusion of the facts, we don't get much assistance from the hunch playing of others, even businessmen.

I said earlier that the impression is widespread that every time business looks at Government, it shivers. Whether business actually does so or not, at least business seems to give the impressions that it does. It has encouraged that impression over a period of 16 years when business, as such, has been inclined to view with alarm and shock almost every progressive proposal made by the Federal Government. I am not scolding, I am merely recalling some history.

I remember the great trepidation with which business viewed the first social security law. All of us looking backward know the fears so violently expressed on behalf of business at that time were groundless. Businessmen who are active in community work such as hospital boards are among the most active supporters today of proposals to extend social security coverage to hospital workers and other employees of nonprofit community organizations who are now excluded. The recent recommendations for tremendous expansion for social security coverage generally and substantial increases in social security benefits came from an advisory committee headed by a former board chairman of the United States Steel Corp., a committee which included many prominent businessmen in its membership. So time has dulled what was once supposed to have been an aching fear of socialism in America, as represented by the 1936 reaction of business, as such, to social security.

Almost every program of the old New Deal, programs now so familiar and universally accepted in America, was greeted by spokesmen for business with similar fearful protest.

Now, obviously, those fears were unfounded. Obviously, the America of today, with our 60,000,000 jobs and our awe-inspiring volume of production, is on a sounder economic footing than it ever was, largely because we have made it our business to guarantee certain minimum standards of opportunity and of protection for those in the lowest level of our economic structure. We have learned that business benefits from guarantees against cut-throat competition of the most unsocial type, competition based not on initiative and enterprise and inventiveness and good management, but on the basis of which firm can pay the lowest wages and work its employees the longest hours, competition in human misery. I know that most businesses and businessmen want to be fair and decent in the operations of their businesses, but sometimes they have to struggle for survival with those who have no scruples and who would cut every corner.

All I am trying to say in this somewhat roundabout fashion is that when evaluating proposed future courses for Government, you look before you leap to conclusions, you analyze it in terms of what it does to your business, rather than in terms of generalities.

We are going to revise our labor legislation, that is sure. At the time the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Congress in 1947, I received three types of mail on it: First, the hundreds and thousands of form letters and form telegrams from labor union members denouncing any labor legislation as slave-labor proposals; second, the many hundreds of letters from management and from business spokesmen demanding passage of the Hartley bill, which had just passed the House, and which was a complete monstrosity, a vengeful, unconstitutional, irresponsible conglomeration of every antilabor prejudice written into law; third, the thoughtful letters from both sides and from the public which addressed themselves to specific points of the proposed bills in the House and Senate and which either approved or disapproved of those provisions, not on the basis of slogans or hunches or prejudices, but on the basis of facts and on the basis of the probable operation of those features in a specific shop or industry.

They were the only letters that were of any value whatsoever. Whether for good or for bad, and I am convinced it was for good, it was letters like that which kept out of the Taft-Hartley Act by the margin of one single Senate vote a provision which arbitrarily would have banned all industry-wide bargaining. Some of you gentlemen may be adversely affected from time to time by the industry-wide bargaining process; some of you may find it advantageous. By the narrow margin of one vote in the United States Senate, it was made possible for those industries which have adopted the industry-wide bargaining method to continue to do so. I was convinced, as was a very, very narrow majority of Senators, that this right of industry-wide bargaining should not be prohibited by Federal law.

I am on record for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and its replacement by legislation more in the spirit of the old Wagner Act. I am certainly convinced, however, that we should make some changes from the old Wagner Act.

But, on the whole, I think the new legislation will put the Federal Government once again in the position of affirmatively encouraging labor to organize on the theory that strong labor unions, imbued with a sense of responsibility, which was not entirely present in the earliest days of the Wagner Act, but which has certainly been developing over the years, are among the best assets and the best guaranties of strong democracy and of decency in national and international affairs.

It's usually presumed that all employers favor the Taft-Hartley Act and don't want it changed in any important respects. If I were more politic, perhaps I might engage in some double talk here tonight to give the impression that I secretly might be in accord with your idea, if that is your idea. I think, however, you prefer to have me be honest with you.

I say to you very sincerely that even though I am committed to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, I am anxious to have you and all businessmen in Pennsylvania who are affected by labor legislation write to me in detail on the specific operation of any feature of the act which you think is good and should be retained. I am anxious to have you write if you will do it on one condition, and that is that you will tell me how it worked out in your plant.

Certainly I am regarded as a New Dealer. In the 10 years I have served in the Congress, I have fought vigorously and often for various phases of the so-called New Deal. I fight for it because I believe in it. My father was a career employee in the post office here, and I know what it is to live on a modest, fixed income while living costs are soaring in inflation. It happened to our family right after the First World War. I had to work my way through school and through law school, and I am acutely conscious of what the so-called little fellow is up against. After 40 years in the postal service, my father retired on a pension of about $25 per week. That still is a lot more than anyone on social security receives today, but it wasn't much reward. These things are close and personal to me. There are many men in this room who can tell similar stories; as a matter of fact, it is a somewhat typical American story.

But New Dealer or no, consumer-conscious or no, I am doing my best in the Senate to try to look at these things which come before us from the standpoint of whether they will mean a more stable economy or a nervous, unstable economy, whether they are going to put industries in Philadelphia or anywhere else out of business, whether they are going to mean jobs or take away jobs, whether they are going to strengthen America or weaken America.

For instance, I am for rent control and I am introducing a bill to strengthen substantially the present rent-control law, but the last thing I would like to see in America is a permanent rent-control statute which strangles building construction and solidifies American housing at present levels. Rent control will never end the need for housing in America. Adequate housing on the other hand, can and will end the need for rent control.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards' spokesmen don't seem to want any tremendous upsurge in housing construction for the lower-income levels—at least they have done their very best to defeat it in the last 2 years—and they don't want any rent control, either. They tell us that if we end rent control, we will end our housing shortage; that we will have a tremendous upsurge of new construction and that people who are renting space that they don't need will be forced to get out and make room for those who do need the space.

As a matter of fact, we have not had controls on new construction for 2 years, and, although there is a lot of it, it is, in nearly all cases, at rental prices that most people can't afford. Many homes being built for purchase are standing idle and vacant because there aren't enough purchasers with $15,000 or $20,000 to purchase them. All we would do by ending rent control now would be to subject millions of Americans to sudden sharp increases in rents and force them either to cut down on their other purchases just at a time when industrial production in many consumer lines is starting to catch up with demand, or it would force them out in the street and back to mother-in-law, if they were fortunate enough to have a mother-in-law with whom they could live.

The attitude of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in the face of this tremendous housing shortage in America has been distressingly unrealistic and antisocial and, on the whole, harmful to the real-estate industry itself because it has taught the average American to look with suspicion and distrust and fear on an entire industry, many

of whose members privately oppose the official position of their organization.

Other business groups have similarly brought down public condemnation upon themselves and all their members by attitudes altogether out of date for the time and the need.

Regardless of politics, there are many problems that come before Congress on which New Dealers and anti-New Dealers can cooperate effectively if they know what they are talking about. Let's take, as one example, the Bulwinkle bill. This bill, as most of you no doubt know, guarantees to the railroads virtual immunity from the antitrust laws in the establishment of lawful uniform rates through rate-making bureaus which have been in operation for perhaps 50 years.

The Department of Justice several years ago took the position that the traditional method of rate making on the part of the railroads, subject at all times to Interstate Commerce Commission approval, constituted a violation of the antitrust laws.

New Deal Democrats are, on the whole, great friends of the Antitrust Section of the Department of Justice and of the anti-trust-law theory. Yet those of us who are regarded as New Dealers who are members of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction over this legislation, made it our business to study this bill carefully, and we supported it.

When the President vetoed it, we voted to override the veto.

I was closely associated with Senator REED of Kansas in the preparation of this legislation. CLYDE REED and I do not see eye to eye on many things, but on transportation we have cooperated very closely and there is a feeling there, I think I can say, of mutual respect. We have tried diligently to get at the facts and we have frequently found, on technical legislation of this sort, that there is no Republican or Democratic viewpoint. We have tried to find the facts and then let the facts dictate what we should do. Together we were able to work effectively to bring together the railroad, box-car builders, and steel interests in an informal meeting many months ago to work out a program for assuring adequate steel for the construction of sufficient box cars to end one of the greatest transportation crises we ever had in this country.

One of the biggest problems that will face the Eighty-first Congress from the standpoint of business, has to do with this very involved and complicated and technical issue of basing-point pricing. I have asked to be placed on the subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commitee which has been conducting an investigation into the effects on the economy generally of the Supreme Court decision against basing-point pricing in the cement industry.

I feel that whatever we do in this matter of legalizing basing-point pricing, we are going to be in bad with somebody. Business is divided on the issue. I would probably have been smarter to have stayed as far away from this issue as I could, but as the only Pennsylvania member of the committee, and with this issue having such a profound importance to the State of Pennsylvania, I believe the best politics is to try to find out what the facts are, rather than to duck a highly controversial hot potato.

Shortly after the Supreme Court decision was announced last year, the steel industry immediately converted to f. o. b. pricing—perhaps because it felt insecure in any other type of pricing and perhaps because this was a good time for them to pass freight costs on to the consumer in a seller's market, I don't know—businessmen from all over the State began to write me in great anguish over the issue. Reading that mail, I found a great deal of it was based on complete ignorance to the actual facts. Some of it was based on outright misinformation. Only a few businessmen in the whole State of Pennsylvania who took the trouble to write me on the issue had first taken the trouble to find out what they were talking about and then to phrase their letters in terms of what this meant to them and to their industry in some specific detail. Those letters were useful; the others were just a waste of everyone's time.

In your Senators and your Congressmen you have men whom you expect to decide issues involving billions of dollars, issues involving the very future and safety and security of our Nation, issues involving your very lives and health. You people know many things that we don't. A simple order from you dictated to your stenographer saying vote for this or that measure or vote against it—merely because you say I should—doesn't help us, however. Tell us why. Tell us how you happen to know something about the issues. Give us something that we can use in committee or on the floor in the way of evidence, evidence that will stand up to criticism and to analysis and to evaluation.

There is not any issue which can come before this Congress which I am not willing to decide on its merits and I think that is true for most Members of Congress. We have our own economic views. We have our economic prejudices. So do you. But any American who won't listen to facts—if they are facts—and to the evidence—if it is good evidence—doesn't belong in the Congress of the United States.

I heard the other day about a recent appearance of Congressman HALLECK in Philadelphia at which he said he was going to give a nonpolitical Republican speech. Perhaps what I have given you here is a nonpolitical Democratic speech. I hope you will realize, however, that when it comes to Philadelphia, to the betterment of Philadelphia, to the continuing progress of Philadelphia, to the protection of Philadelphia and her industries, I am a Philadelphian who loves this city, who treasures the friendships I have in this city, and who wants this city to regain all of the prestige it used to have as the birthplace of American freedom, as the leading cultural city in America, as a fine and decent place in which to live.

Count of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2, together with a letter from the Brookings Institution and newspaper comment.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Resolved, etc., That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the 10th day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

LETTER FROM THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1948.*

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Several members of our staff have examined carefully Senate Joint Resolution 200, proposing an amendment to

the Constitution of the United States for the election of the President and Vice President, together with the hearings, the committee report, and the other material you submitted.

We are in agreement that the Congress should give the States the opportunity to vote on this amendment and that its adoption by them would result in a material improvement in our political system.

We note with approval that the proposed amendment does not abolish the electoral vote for President and Vice President, but leaves each State with a number of electoral votes equaling the number of its Senators and Representatives in the Congress. It thus preserves the compromise between the large States and the small States that permitted of the adoption of the Constitution and the formation of a more perfect Union and leaves the States free to determine the qualifications for voters, which shall be the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

It provides, however, that the electoral votes of each State shall be apportioned among the several parties on the ballot of that State in accordance with the votes polled by those parties in the Presidential election. Thus, if one party polls 51 percent of the votes in a State and the other party polls 49, the electoral vote will go 51 percent to the leading party and 49 percent to the other party, instead of 100 percent to the leading party as at present.

The proposed system has great advantages over the existing system in that—

1. It will practically eliminate the chance that a President will receive a majority of electoral votes despite the fact that his opponent polled a majority of the popular vote.

2. It will eliminate the chance of the election of a President being thrown into the House of Representatives.

3. It will practically remove the chance that small minority groups can attain and exercise great power over Presidents, Presidential candidates, and political parties because they hold the balance of power in pivotal States. These minority groups will have no power beyond that justified by their number of voters in a Presidential election.

4. In the selection of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency the parties will be concerned with the capacity of the persons chosen to command the support of voters throughout the Nation and not upon their capacity to carry certain pivotal States or even big cities. Able men from small States will not be handicapped as they are at present.

5. Sure States will no longer be neglected as they are at present both in nominations and in campaigns because a substantial minority vote in those States will result in electoral votes for the candidate of their party. Voters opposed to the dominant party in their respective States will be encouraged to work and vote for their candidates, because their work and votes may actually affect the results. Their votes will be cast and counted for the candidates of their choice and not thrown away as under the present system.

Another reason for favoring the amendment is that it would eliminate an archaic provision from the Constitution. Article II, section 1, provides that "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

It has, of course, been years since any legislature has itself chosen the Presidential electors and has not submitted the choice to the voters, but the power to do so is still in the Constitution. This amendment would remove all possibility of a revival of appointment of electors by the legislature. It would also do away with the cumbersome device of the electoral college and the nomination of electors.

For these reasons we believe the proposed amendment should be submitted to the people.

Very sincerely yours,

LEWIS MERIAM,
Vice President.

NEWSPAPER COMMENT

Literally hundreds of newspapers all over the country have printed editorials during the past year commenting favorably on this proposed constitutional amendment.

Space permits including here only a few representative editorials and articles.

"IS THE COLLEGE NECESSARY?"

"(New York Times, January 7, 1949)

"There were no surprises yesterday when the House and Senate met jointly to watch the tellers count the vote of the electoral college. Or if there was a surprise it was that President Truman, who happened to be at the Capitol for lunch, broke precedent by being present during part of the counting. Mr. Truman and Senator BARKLEY got 303 votes and were elected. But this was a historic ceremony—and a nice day for it.

"Possibly this will be the last time it will be performed. The country may be growing a little tired of its meaninglessness and of the constant danger that the electoral-college system will throw an election into the House. What sense is there in giving all the votes of New York to Governor Dewey, who carried the State by 55,000 votes out of 5,000,000; or all the votes of Illinois to Mr. Truman, who won by the narrow squeak of 33,612 votes out of about 4,000,000 cast? One solution would be to take a Nation-wide vote, regardless of State lines. But this proposal would violate the principle by which the smaller States are at present a little overweighted in the college. They entered the Union with the understanding that they would have a minimum of one vote each for each Senator and each Representative. They would have good historical grounds for objecting if they were weighted purely by population.

"A more practicable plan is that of Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, who would assign the electoral votes according to the actual count in each State. Under this arrangement the 1948 electoral votes of New York and Illinois would have been split, but Mr. Truman would still have been elected. We hope the Lodge amendment will have consideration, even though the dear old college may thus be doomed."

"THE MACHINERY CREAKED

"(Christian Science Monitor, December 15, 1948)

"On December 13 Harry S. Truman was elected President. Legally, that is more correct than to say that he was elected on November 2. For under the Constitution and the controlling Federal statute it was only when 303 votes were cast in the electoral college on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December that the actual election took place.

"The ancient machinery creaked more audibly than usual. And more Americans were listening. For on the night of November 2 millions had been concerned lest their voting produce a stalemate in the electoral college and force an election by the House of Representatives. Happily, that invitation to political deals was bypassed.

"But there was still the prospect of a three-way split and much uncertainty about how many States' rights Democrats would keep their pledge to vote against Mr. Truman. In the end, all but one did so, and he came from a State whose popular vote went to the President. Another elector from the same State chose to keep his pledge rather than follow the vote.

"Citizens had fresh opportunity to see that the electoral college is anything but accurate and efficient. Governor Dewey got only 189 of the 531 votes, although receiving nearly half the popular total. And President Truman got none of New York's 47 electoral ballots although he ran only 60,000 behind Mr. Dewey in a vote of 6,000,000. Citizens learned again that under this unsystematic system they might choose a President at the polls and have him beaten in the electoral college.

"This time the antique college performed its function, but also pointed up faults which should put fresh steam behind proposals for reform. It is not necessary to throw out the apportionment of electoral votes which gives small States a bit of extra weight. But it would be helpful to give each candidate his fair proportion of electoral votes according to his popular vote in each State. The new Congress should adopt the plan to do this proposed as a constitutional amendment in the Lodge-Gossett resolution."

"ALL VOTES FOR PRESIDENT WOULD COUNT

"(Los Angeles Times, October 23, 1948)

"In the Presidential election of 1824 Andrew Jackson led John Quincy Adams by 50,000 votes but he did not have a clear majority over his three opponents. That threw the election into the House of Representatives, where the manipulations of Henry Clay won the Presidency for the No. 2 candidate, Adams.

"In 1876 the Democrat Samuel J. Tilden polled 4,300,590 votes; the Republican Rutherford B. Hayes, 4,036,298. The electoral votes were so distributed among the States as to give Hayes a majority of one—and he became President.

"In 1888 the Democrat Grover Cleveland got 5,556,543 popular votes; the Republican Benjamin Harrison, 5,175,582. But again the distribution of electoral votes gave the Presidency to the loser, Harrison.

"These were the only three instances in which the electoral college tricked the popular winner out of the Presidency, but there were several cases in which the vote in the electoral college grossly distorted the popular vote.

"The electoral system is a device of the founding fathers who did not conceive of the election of a national President as a popular affair. Universal suffrage was not an idea generally accepted. Moreover, the major problem of the Constitution writers was the welding of the States 'in order to form a more perfect Union.' It was natural that they would think of the election of a President as a function of the States. So they wrote:

" 'Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof shall direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.'

"And, according to amendment XII, ratified in 1804,

" 'The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice President * * * and transmit (the ballots) sealed to the seat of government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate.'

"Under State laws and traditions it has become practically impossible for electors of a State to be split among parties. The last split occurred in West Virginia in 1916.

Since then it has been law—or custom—for all the electors of a State to cast their ballots for the candidate with the largest popular vote in that State.

"Some of the pernicious possibilities of this system were exampled above. We can invent a simple example for ourselves. Take three States, A, B, and C. Let us say that A and B have a million voters each and C has 500,000. A and B have 10 electors each, C has 5. In State A 525,000 votes are cast for the Black Party, 475,000 for the White. In State B 400,000 are cast for Black, 600,000 for White; in State C 300,000 for Black, 200,000 for White. Totals, 1,225,000 Black; 1,275,000 White. But A's and C's electoral votes—totaling 15—go Black. Only B's electoral votes—totaling 10—go White. So White, with a popular majority of 50,000, gets only 40 percent of the electoral votes.

"A system that allows such things to happen ought to be changed, and there is some hope of its being changed before the next Presidential election in 1952. The Republican platform pledges a 'revision of the procedure for the election of the President and Vice President which will more exactly reflect the popular vote.' Senate Joint Resolution 200, introduced in the last regular session of Congress and sponsored by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, among others, provides for an amendment to the Constitution abolishing the electoral college but preserving the electoral votes of the States.

"The obvious question is, Why not abolish the electoral votes, too, and simply count the popular votes? The answer is that a constitutional amendment has to be approved by two-thirds of the States and the smaller States might not ratify a proposal that would deprive them of their slight bonus in the vote count. They have this bonus because they are entitled to an electoral vote for each of their Senators, and these, of course, have no relation to population."

"The proposed amendment makes this concession to State jealousy; otherwise it seems fair and desirable. Keeping its accustomed number of electoral votes, each State would divide them among the candidates according to the number of popular votes, with fractions less than .001 disregarded unless they would change the election result. In the example above, Black would get 5¼ electoral votes in State A to White's 4¾. In State B, Black would get 4 to White's 6; in C, Black 3, White 2. Total, Black 12¼, White 12¾. White's small majority would win under the new system where it loses under the old.

"There would be no more block voting by States. Thus such political adventures as that of the Dixiecrats would become impossible. And the new system would tend to break the Solid South, for a minority of Republican voters would be entitled to a fraction of the electoral votes. It would overthrow the tactic of concentrating campaigns in large key States where a simple majority now delivers a large number of electoral votes in a block.

"The amendment would democratize Presidential elections. It would be almost direct, as nearly so as we can hope for. The next Congress ought to get it to the States as soon as possible."

"NO PRESIDENT IN 1949?

"(This Week magazine, October 17, 1948)

"(By Kermit Roosevelt)

"It is entirely possible that our next President will be a man few Americans outside of South Carolina knew much about. It is also within the realm of possibility that we might be for weeks without any President, with the House of Representatives unable to choose among the three candidates before it.

"The first possibility would mean an administration with only insignificant congressional and national support. The second would threaten a complete break-down of administration. Either would be disastrous to the country, particularly in so critical a year as 1949 promises to be. Both are made possible by the present antiquated election system.

"There are signs that we're finally getting around to doing something about these anomalies—Congress is pondering a constitutional amendment. Until it's enacted, however, a number of time-honored peculiarities will characterize United States elections.

"Unless you live in the District of Columbia, for example, you probably think that the Constitution guarantees you the right of voting for the candidate of your choice.

"You are wrong.

"Unless you are a Republican in a State which always goes Democratic, or vice versa, you probably think that your vote will surely be counted in your candidate's favor.

"Wrong again

"You are wrong on that, too. Actually, it may even be counted against him.

"Perhaps you think the man receiving the greatest popular vote is always elected. Almost certainly you think that whoever receives the most electoral votes is bound to win.

"Both of these assumptions are wrong, too.

"The reason so many of us have such incorrect views is due to that institution known as the electoral college and to the provision that the slate receiving most votes in a given State is elected in toto.

"The Constitution does not guarantee you the right to vote for President. The fact is that our founding fathers took a dim view of the average citizen's voting qualifications. They provided instead that the Chief Executive should be chosen by electors, themselves to be selected by whatever method the State legislatures should decide. For years some legislatures decided to select the electors themselves without consulting the public.

"One third lost

"Moreover the electors were not (and still are not legally) bound to vote for any specific candidate. In fact, on one occasion three electors, chosen to vote for one man, cast their votes for another and thus swung the election (in 1796) from Jefferson to Adams.

"But as a practical matter, electors do vote for the candidate to which they are pledged. And, under the unit-vote system, all the electoral votes of a State go to the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular votes. This means that at least one-third of the votes cast in the Nation are not counted for the candidate for whom they were cast. If there are three candidates, and one gets 34 percent of the votes in a given State, while the others get 33 percent each, that one receives two electoral votes from those who opposed him for every one that he actually won himself. The number of electoral votes in each State, remember, corresponds to the number of Congressmen.

"That's not all. By another constitutional provision, if one candidate does not have an absolute majority of electoral votes, the House of Representatives is required to elect the President from among the three leaders.

"Opponents of the present system are hopeful that reform is at last in sight after generations of agitation. It is certain, however, that this election at least will be conducted under the old rules. And all sorts of things could happen.

"On election day it might develop that Dewey had won 265 electoral votes, which would be one less than a majority. Truman might have 211 votes and the Dixiecrat candidate, Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, having carried Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia, would have 55.

"The election would have to be referred to the House of Representatives. The House would make its choice from the three leading candidates, each State having one vote regardless of size. Now, let us go one step further and assume, as is perfectly possible, that while the Republicans have won a majority in the House, they have done so by carrying the biggest States, and that the Democrats actually represent more States.

"Then, as Dixiecrat spokesmen have already pointed out, they will hold the balance of power. They could say to the Truman supporters, 'You vote for our man or we'll vote for Dewey. Your man can't win. You have to choose between a Democrat and a Republican.'

"Thurmond could win

"It is then perfectly possible that Governor Thurmond would find himself President, although he would have received only a fraction of the electoral votes and even smaller fraction of the popular vote.

"Eleven times in our history, Presidents have been elected with a minority of popular votes (their opponents having together a total more than they). Three times the man gaining office has had fewer votes than did his leading opponent. It has happened before and it could happen again.

"If it doesn't happen soon, however, the chances are it never will. For Republicans and Democrats are united now in urging reform. Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE has introduced a resolution which provides that the candidates will receive from each State electoral votes in proportion to the popular votes they received in that State.

"A bare plurality needed

"It would no longer be possible then for a party to win the election by carrying a bare plurality in 12 States. As things stand, any party which wins California, Illinois, Michigan, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Wisconsin is in. Strategically placed, less than 24,000,000 votes could win against 60,000,000. The idea of electoral reform is to make that impossible.

"Representative ED GOSSETT has introduced the counterpart of LODGE's measure in the House. The Republican convention adopted a plank favoring revision of electoral procedure. A Democratic Congressman told me that 90 percent of his colleagues will vote for Gossett's resolution.

"The solid South, which might have been expected to oppose on the grounds that it will lose its solidarity, has given strong support. This is because many southerners are convinced that under present conditions, Republicans pay no attention to the South because they cannot hope to win electoral votes there, and Democrats pay no attention to it because they are sure to win there anyway.

"Northern politicians, on the other hand, from the pivotal States which have had disproportionate influence under the present system, are so eager to break up the solid South that they will sacrifice some advantages to do so.

"Thus, as sometimes happens when politicians are pursuing their own ends, they agree on something for contradictory reasons—and the people win. Meanwhile we have to take the cracked pitcher to the well once more. And we can only keep our fingers crossed and hope that it will not be once too often.

Senator Hill: Man of the Year in Service to Southern Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the announcement in the Progressive Farmer magazine of January 1949 of its selection of Senator Lister Hill as man of the year in service to southern agriculture.

Lister Hill was the unanimous choice of the editorial board of the Progressive Farmer, which has given this award each year since 1936 to those who have made enduring contributions to the welfare and progress of our farm people.

Dr. Clarence Poe, editor of the Progressive Farmer, declared that Senator HILL has done more than any other southerner to help farm people get hospitals.

The Birmingham News commented that the selection of Senator Hill as man of the year comes as no surprise to the farmers. The farmers know that he is a long-time champion of their interest—a coauthor of the TVA Act, a sponsor of the national soil fertility bill for soil conservation and high-grade, cheaper fertilizers, a pioneer supporter of REA, and author of the rural telephone bill to bring telephones to the farm people. He is one of the sponsors of the general housing bill with its provisions for farm and rural housing. The Public House Service bill introduced by him would help local health departments improve and expand their services, and one of the objectives of his library service demonstration bill is to bring books and educational materials to rural people.

Lister Hill has fought for the Thomas-Hill bill for Federal aid to education, for the school-lunch program, for good roads, and for the development of the country's water resources to provide electricity, water transportation, cheaper freight rates, and protection from floods. He has worked for aid to the aged, the blind, and for crippled and dependent children.

The farmers of America have no greater friend than Lister Hill—no man more active to give them and their families the opportunity for good health and a good education, for a fairer share of the benefits and blessings of American prosperity.

I also request the several brief newspaper comments on the same subject be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR HELPING RURAL AMERICA GET HOSPITALS SENATOR HILL IS OUR 1948 "MAN OF THE YEAR"

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer)

(Every year since 1936 the Progressive Farmer has recognized some great southern leader as the "Man of the Year in Service to Southern Agriculture." A truly great roll of honor of achievement and service, the complete list of awards is as follows: 1937, Dr. C. H. Herty, for successful research in making paper from pine; 1938, Dr. A. J. Pieters, "apostle of lespedeza"; 1939, Edward A. O'Neal, for farm organization leadership; 1940, Dr. H. A. Morgan, for agricultural education and research; 1941, Oscar Johnston, president, National Cotton Council; 1942, Dr. George W. Carver, foremost Negro agricultural scientist; 1943, D. M. Clements, southern leader of vo-ag teaching; 1944, Hugh H. Bennett, No. 1 American in soil conservation; 1945, David Lilienthal, Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority; 1946, Dr. Julian C. Miller, for developing new sweet potato varieties; 1947, Dean Paul W. Chapman, for Southwide promotion of new rural industries. This year we are delighted to add to this distinguished list Senator Lister Hill, coauthor of the Hill-Burton bill for Federal aid to hospital building all over rural America.)

The South's great need for more doctors, more hospitals, more insurance to serve our southern farm people was stressed on this page last month.

This month we honor as our "1948 Man of the Year in Service to Southern Agriculture" the man who has done more than any other southerner has yet done to help farm people get hospitals, Hon. Lister Hill, United States Senator from Alabama since 1938.

Was Senator Hill predestined to present and promote Federal aid for helping people get better medical care? One might easily think so. For almost the first paragraph we find in his biographical sketch reads as follows:

Lister Hill's father was Dr. Luther L. Hill, of Montgomery, Ala., one of the South's most noted surgeons. Before the birth of his son he had studied in England under the great Lord Joseph Lister, and was shortly to become famous for performing the first successful suture of the heart in the United States' medical history. Lister's father named him for Joseph Lister.

EARLY EXPERIENCES INFLUENCED HIM

Thus Lister Hill is the son of a famous southern doctor, and named for a famous English doctor. And when we asked Senator Hill to tell us something about his life, he said: "My earliest observations and experiences had to do with this matter of better medical care for rural people. For example, one of the first things I remember was a trip I made with my father. It was an emergency call. A farmer had been severely kicked in the chest by a mule. There was surgery, as well as bonesetting, to be done. Word of the accident came in the afternoon. It was night when we reached the man, after traveling over miles of muddy, rutted roads.

"On an old split-bottom chair I sat and watched my father operate. A kerosene lamp lighted the kitchen table where the patient lay. Steam rose from the kettle heated on a wood range as the farmer's wife poured hot water into a basin. The man moaned softly as my father's strong hands moved swiftly, skillfully—setting the bones, sewing and binding the wound.

"'Now, Jeff,' he said, 'just take it easy until I can come back Thursday.'

"'Yes, sir, Doctor, just like you say. Durn th .t mule anyhow.'"

BILLION-DOLLAR HOSPITAL-BUILDING PROGRAM

Such experiences early convinced Lister Hill of the hospital needs of our farmers. Fortunately, when he got into the United States Senate, he set out to do something about this situation, and, fortunately, too, he proceeded with the necessary tact and wisdom to insure success. Help was needed from both northern and southern Senators; also, from both Democratic and Republican Senators; and Hill found an able Ohio Republican Senator all ready to work with him—Senator H. H. Burton, now a member of the United States Supreme Court. The result of their action was the Hill-Burton bill, which, in its final form, provides $75,000,000 a year from the United States Treasury to cover one-third of the cost of building hospitals where need is greatest—which means, primarily, rural areas. The American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and National Farmers Union all supported the measure. Incidentally, among farm publications, the Progressive Farmer may claim to have done more than any other publication. The writer appeared before the Senate committee and later did some of the hardest lobbying of his life to help get the bill through the House. It finally became law in August 1946.

"Just what progress has been made up to date—in the Nation as a whole?" we asked Senator Hill the other day.

"If the States carry through their plans, a billion-dollar construction program will be under way by 1951," he answered. "Under the act the first year was devoted to fact finding and planning. Actual construction has been going on a little over a year, yet a Nation-wide hospital program costing nearly a third of a billion dollars is already under way. Of 540 projects under way, 418 are general hospitals, 70 are health centers. The remainder are nurses' homes or hospitals treating special diseases."

RURAL SOUTH WILL BENEFIT MOST

"And our southern rural people who have lagged furthest behind in hospital care are now fast taking advantage of the Federal Government's offer to provide one-third of the cost of hospital building," we suggested.

"Fifty-five percent of all projects now approved will be located in the Southern States, and almost 45 percent of Federal funds allocated are coming to the South," he answered. "The act is of special benefit to the South for two reasons: First, it gives preference to rural areas. Second, because Federal aid for the first time in any Federal legislation is allocated on the basis of need and per capita income. The South, largely rural, has a lower per capita income, fewer hospitals, more children, and a higher birth rate than any other section of the country.

"Recognizing these facts, the act gives the lion's share of the Federal funds to the low-income States. Two out of every three general hospitals and health centers already approved under the program will serve farmers and rural people in towns of less than 5,000 population. The act is making possible during 1948-49 construction of southern hospitals and health centers costing $195,000,000. By 1951 the program will have helped the South build more than 800 hospitals and health centers. The South will more than double the 20,000 hospital beds now serving farm and rural people. Furthermore, these new beds will be in modern hospitals with blood plasma, penicillin, and other new drugs, and with the most modern surgical instruments and medical equipment for protecting and healing the human body."

We honor Senator Hill—and all southern Senators and Representatives who worked with him—for what they have done. Through Federal appropriations, the rich States now help the poor States build hospitals. Now, every State should make State appropriations whereby rich counties will likewise help poor counties. Hospitals in rural counties will attract doctors to rural counties. The next great need is to have everybody carry hospital and medical insurance, so that hospital bills and doctor's bills may be most easily paid. So we move toward the time when farm people may have an equal chance with urban people in their inevitable battles with disease and death.

After describing the accomplishments of the Hill-Burton Act and its benefits to the farm people of the South, the Progressive Farmer had this to say about Senator Hill:

"LISTER HILL

"Alabamians who have previously received our 'Man of the Year' award include: M. J. Funchess, John H. Bankhead, P. O. Davis, L. N. Duncan, R. Y. Bailey, K. G. Baker, R. E. Cammack, Dr. Tom D. Spies, M. Hosmer Pearson, Ernest S. Morgan, Fred Stewart.

"When our editorial board early last fall unanimously voted to name Senator Hill 'Man of the Year for the South,' he automatically became also Alabama's man of the year.

"In according to Senator Hill its highest award for his contribution to better rural health, the Progressive Farmer was not overlooking his distinguished services to agriculture over a period of many years. For more than 20 years he has worked and fought in the United States Congress to advance the cause of human welfare, to develop and conserve the Nation's natural resources, and to bring justice to the American farmer.

"As coauthor of the TVA Act, Senator Hill was one of the first to foresee the blessings that development of the Tennessee Valley could bring to Alabama and the South. He was a pioneer supporter of REA.

"The Hill amendment to the Transportation Act of 1940 was a significant step in the South's fight to remove freight-rate discriminations.

"As coauthor of the GI Bill of Rights and a number of strengthening amendments, Senator Hill helped enact the original amendment which recognized on-the-farm training as full-time institutional training. He is coauthor of the bill providing $300,000,000 a year in Federal aid to education. The bill is likely to become law during the sessions of this Congress.

"He has always been in the thick of every fight for legislation to promote farm ownership and reduce tenancy; for credit adapted to farm needs; and for the many and varied types of legislation developed since 1933 to assure American farmers fair prices for their products and equality with all other groups in the American economy."

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE SELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATOR LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA, AS "MAN OF THE YEAR IN SERVICE TO SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE," BY THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER MAGAZINE:

Raleigh News and Observer: "The award is significant for two reasons. It emphasizes that real service is performed by actions rather than words and that the road to constructive service for the South usually lies along the route of intelligent cooperation with the Federal Government rather than in constant harping upon States' rights. * * * The South would not, and probably could not, have doubled its woefully meager hospital facilities for rural people without assistance from the Federal Government. The same situation exists in regard to public schools. Senator Hill is also coauthor of a bill providing for Federal assistance in that vital field."

San Antonio Express: "Senator Hill's interest in hospitals for farm residents dates back to boyhood. When he watched his father, Dr. Luther L. Hill, of Montgomery, lay a farmer, who had been kicked in the chest by a mule, on a kitchen table and operate on him by the light of a kerosene lamp, young Hill resolved to see that farmers had hospitals—some day. Senator Hill, with help from various sources, made good on that youthful resolve. One suspects that the Senator's interest in country-wide library extension—evidenced by his long-pending bill in Congress—likewise began with boyish book hunger."

Birmingham Post: "Senator Hill's record of service to southern agriculture extends back over almost his entire career in the Congress, but the work which brings this newest honor is that performed as coauthor of the Hill-Burton Act which provides Federal aid for the building of sorely needed hospitals all over rural America."

The Montgomery Examiner: "This herculean contribution to the welfare of the South by Senator Hill, which is only one of many, is the proper answer to those critics of his who, occasionally in the back room, attempt to smear him by insinuations that his liberal philosophy is somehow unsouthern. Senator Lister Hill has established himself as Alabama's—and probably the South's—outstanding statesman in the great liberal tradition. * * * The list of his direct legislative contributions and of his battles in just causes is a monument to him."

The Montgomery Advertiser: "When Senator Hill goes to the people in an election, he can remind them that he helped create the wondrous TVA, that he provided hospital bills, that he sponsored cheap fertilizer, that he helped put lights and telephones in their homes and terrace their farms and send books in rural bookmobiles for them to read."

The Chattanooga Times: "Give the South better health conditions and you will materially further its advancement economically, politically, and socially. This is the service Senator Hill has rendered the South in the Hill-Burton Act; this is the service the Progressive Farmer recognizes, along with his efforts on behalf of the TVA, the REA, and other programs of intense benefit to the southern farmer."

A Blueprint for 1949–52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Blueprint for 1949–52," from the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BLUEPRINT FOR 1949–52—PROSAIC TRUMAN TALK HAS PECULIAR POWER

Now that a second term for Harry S. Truman is assured, it behooves Americans of all political parties to read critically his speeches and pronunciamentos.

Taken together, they make an almost completely rounded program for political action, particularly on the domestic level.

Truman's style is what might be called passionately prosaic. It lacks entirely the warmth and humor and brilliance of F. D. R. It has none of the Shakespearian grandeur of Churchill at his best, none of the philosophical insight of a Jefferson or the humble majesty of a Lincoln.

Instead it has a quality which probably helped Truman win his surprising victory in November. It is composed from the vulgate of grass roots America. It is full of monosyllabic horse sense—hard-hitting, graceless, forthright prose. Completely lacking in classical allusions, whimsy, or forensic magic, it is, nevertheless, not without a certain power. Its very artlessness carries conviction.

From these unlettered pages emerges a man who is more truly dedicated to gradual social reform than one might imagine. Here is a citizen stubborn, persistent, and too often bitter against his enemies, who can be counted upon consistently to back his own convictions against hell, high water, Communists, Republicans, and Dixiecrats.

THE ROAD AHEAD

What can we expect from the future after reading this book?

That Truman will continue to sponsor his civil-rights program with the same disregard for political expediency that he showed during the campaign.

That he will continue to fight for price curbs, an excess-profits tax, and other measures which he believes may alleviate inflation.

That he will seek to raise the minimum wage level, extend social security, and fight for additional funds for education, public housing, and other social benefits.

That, like Wilson and F. D. R., he will continue to try to keep us out of war while giving all-out aid to our allies.

That he will back his loyalty probe and FBI check-ups on the Communists but will continue to heckle publicity-seeking congressional committees of the Thomas stripe.

That he will continue to try to balance the budget and whittle down the debt, if necessary, at the expense of the taxpayer.

That he will give at least lip service to trust-busting.

That he will satisfy his labor backers by continuing to attack the Taft-Hartley Act while awaiting new labor legislation.

That he will satisfy his agricultural backers by continuing to support farm prices, the commodity credit program, rural electrification, rural housing, and the cooperatives, while keeping a weather eye on soil conservation and the endangered national parks and forests.

That he will seek to soothe business by proclaiming his friendly interest in full production if not his wholehearted joy in zooming profits.

That, in short, he will seek to revive partially the spirit of the New Deal within the framework of the modified capitalism we now enjoy.

NOTHING DANGEROUS

While it is not certain that the new Congress, even with its additional Democrats, will rubber-stamp all of Truman's legislative proposals, we can probably expect some new curbs and new taxes. Not to be expected are brilliant improvisations, "dangerous" innovations, or excessive socialization.

Whether you voted for Harry S. Truman or not, you owe it to your own future to examine coolly and carefully this blueprint he has drawn for our future. It is the only road map you have for that dim highway 1949–52.—S. N.

Language Is Ordnance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. On December 25, 1948, there was published in the magazine called Armed Forces an article entitled "Language Is Ordnance." The article was prepared by Max Sherover, and I ask permission to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGUAGE IS ORDNANCE

(By Max Sherover)

In World War I, America—for the first time in its history—fought a major war in

association with allies of varying linguistic background, and fought enemies whose languages were equally foreign.

In World War II, the language pattern was even more diffused. It was truly a global war. In its wake came the realization that command of the ally's, as well as the enemy's, language was no less important than the modernity and superiority of our ordnance.

Even in postwar years, American statesmen and military government authorities are finding the dearth of language skills, natural among a people never called upon to develop such proficiency, a handicap in searching out the pathway to reconstruction, recovery, and peace.

Language poverty is a fact. Daily during the war this fact was impressed, particularly, upon military and naval intelligence officers who found themselves forced to rely upon only an inadequate handful of liaison interpreters as an unsteady crutch. We were veritable "language cripples" in the midst of a life-and-death struggle, trying to find safety, and restore order, in a world of panic. Where the script called for us to pursue, run, leap, and fly, we could barely creep for lack of linguistic communication with our allies; for inability to worm out the enemy's secrets even when we could listen in on his coded communications. The priceless understanding which could have been ours by mere understanding of captured prisoners was largely dissipated, except in the rare instances where this storehouse of intelligence finally filtered back to the language specialists.

Awareness of the risks and dangers inherent in the Nation's language deficiency quickly led officers in Army and Navy Intelligence, in the FBI, and in other key Government agencies to urge the widest diffusion of foreign-language training to personnel at all levels. The solution was less apparent. How could language training be given on a mass basis to Americans who had had neither the need nor the opportunity for such training in civilian life? How could it be done in haste, in the midst of a war with other priority demands upon available time for training?

Our enemies had never underestimated the importance of language preparedness. The Japanese Foreign Office would not appoint a man to a consular or diplomatic post unless he was thoroughly at home in the language of the country to which he was being sent. The qualification card for Japanese Army and Navy officers listed prominently the languages each knew, and each had to know at least one foreign language.

Many had a command of the various dialects of Chinese. Others knew Burmese, Tagalog, Visayan, Malayan, Korean, Spanish, Dutch, all the myriad languages of Asia and even the aboriginal speech of obscure islands in the Pacific. Some could converse as fluently in pidgin English as in the important conversational languages of Europe.

Those prewar tourists who marveled at the command shown by Japanese schoolboys of difficult English might have marveled even more had they realized that this linguistic proficiency in an Asiatic island empire was merely following the original and better pattern laid out by the Germans in generations of language training. For our chief European enemy had planned astutely through the years for the employment of languages as a weapon. Of our allies, only the British even approached, and they could not match, the linguistic skills of our enemies.

With the realization of our shortcoming in this aspect of warfare driven home emphatically, the problem of overcoming it was vast. It was determined that 40 languages were basic not that every man need know all forty, but that every man filling a position demanding linguistic competence must know at least one, or more if possible, of these 40 foreign tongues.

Time was precious. Carefully screened officers and men were assigned to special language schools, set up with the haste and compressed efficiency of a war crisis. Every language teacher and every language method was drafted into this mass education task.

Our own experience at linguaphone had convinced us that to learn a language by the traditional academic, grammatical approach is an outdated concept.

It makes language a mechanical task, not a medium of communication, and it destroys much of the psychological content.

Illustrative of the semantic difficulties of just translating an idiom into a foreign language are several phrases picked out at random. If a foreigner were to translate literally such an American idiom as "The play laid an egg," not only could the American connotation be completely lost on the translator, but, if he translated it literally into his own language, it would convey the very opposite meaning of what was intended. After all, a fowl laying an egg is an asset. It is only when the egg becomes antiquated that it is a liability—except in China.

Pages could be filled with illustrations of the semantic conflicts which plague the simplest translation. To know another language it is not sufficient to know just the grammar, nor the dictionary definition of a word. Rather, it is the feeling for the soul of the language, the subtleties, the play upon words, the literary illusions, usage, and context. To do otherwise is to emulate the parrot, which pronounces words without any concept of what the sounds he utters conveys to the listener.

It was this concept of grasping the feel and soul of a language which our organization carried into the mass language training which we were called upon to give, and we are especially proud of the fact that we were fully prepared, by virtue of our years of civilian training, to respond instantly, not only for the armed forces of the United States but for the Governments of Great Britain, Canada, Australia, the Philippines, Holland, Belgium, France, Russia, Greece, and others.

In preparation for the invasion of North Africa, we supplied courses in Arabic and French. In preparation for the launching of the American cross-channel landing in Europe, we carried out the greatest language-teaching project in the history of the world.

Individually and in study groups, tens of thousands of Americans were taught and drilled in speech fluency in French and German. Special language-teaching facilities were established at the leading universities and colleges throughout the country, at which thousands of GI's were coached in Japanese, Chinese, Burmese, Malay, as well as in the more widely used European tongues. Hundreds of thousands of American servicemen who before the war had considered the speaking of a foreign tongue as fantastic returned home with either a smattering or, in some cases, a thorough knowledge of a foreign language. Some even carried a determination to retain and improve upon what they had learned. The value and importance of language skills impressed upon the Veterans' Administration the utility of language courses in the educational facilities available to veterans under the GI bill of rights.

The ideal of a vast number of Americans becoming a master of at least one foreign language so that the Nation need no longer face a world with which it can communicate only through interpreters and translators is capable of realization. It is no longer a curiosity to find an American who can speak, read, or write a few foreign languages.

These persons are national assets, in that they can serve our Government in its world-wide activities, either in civilian or military fields. They are of value to American business as foreign representatives, travelers, teachers, diplomats, missionaries, engineers, or technicians. They can converse with, and act as host to, the foreign-language-speaking people who come to us, and look to us, in even greater numbers. They are no longer living behind the illusory security of a linguistic Maginot line. They are the advance guard in a new world, the better world that can be ours if each does his bit toward educational self-improvement.

World War II forced on us the lesson that language isolation is as great a liability as geographic or psychological isolation. Be it for good or ill, the two oceans now, and in the future, no longer offer a protective barrier against aggression. The vastness of the oceans has been shrunk to the few hours needed by a supersonic weapon to navigate their widths. The jet plane, the radio- and radar-guided missiles, and the atomic energy weapons now in being or under development force upon the United States the initiative:

1. In defense;
2. In counterattack, if attacked;
3. In taking the lead to insure an enduring world peace, if for no other reason than that to fail means the mass suicide of mankind.

In any of these three objectives the importance of linguistic fluency and communication is obvious.

(1) For the defense, and to anticipate and forestall aggression, we must know the language of the potential attacker or invader.

(2) For the counterattack we must know the language of any we may fight.

(3) For world peace and amity, we must know the language of our neighbors. In this cramped world, every nation is our neighbor.

Our educators are now aware of this urgent language need, and of our deficiency in it. Our military men have learned how dangerous is linguistic unpreparedness.

Reliance on interpreters, translators, and professional intelligence agents is outmoded by the modern demand for instantaneous understanding, and the urgency of on-the-spot decisions. The fate—not only of isolated individuals—but of a platoon, company, regiment, or even of a whole army, could hinge on linguistic adequacy or the proper understanding of a communication. The greater the average level of intelligence of an army, the wider the availability of language skills among its personnel, the better the assurance of the successful fulfillment of its mission. This is as true of nations as it is of armed forces.

The Situation in China—Retirement of Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Saturday last, January 22, the Washington News published an editorial relating to conditions in China and the withdrawal of President Chiang Kai-shek from the Chinese scene. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE LET DOWN A FRIEND

President Chiang Kai-shek's withdrawal from the Chinese scene is not likely to bring realization of his desperate hope that it will open the way for an amicable settlement of the civil war. The Communists want absolute control. Chiang's retirement has removed the chief obstacle to their goal.

Disintegration of the national forces probably will go on until the Reds dominate most of China. Meanwhile the rest of Asia will be open to attack.

For this tragic situation Washington is more to blame than Moscow.

With no outside assistance, the Generalissimo had defeated the Communist forces and driven them far back into the north by the time the Japanese invaded his country in 1937. When the Japanese forced him out of his capital at Nanking, Chiang and his government retreated to Hangkow, then to Chungking, "city of mud and courage." But he did not quit. He could have made an advantageous deal with the Japanese, but he chose the course of honor. Of his effort, Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, wartime commander of the American theater in China, said:

"The actual contribution that our Chinese allies made in the recent war has not, in my opinion, been properly evaluated or appreciated. * * * The steadfast determination of the Generalissimo as well as the Chinese people to fight on against overwhelming odds, saved countless American lives and accelerated final victory."

In appreciation of that contribution to the Allied cause, Chiang in 1943 was invited to Cairo, where China was formally recognized as a member of the Big Four, with Britain, Russia, and the United States. There President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill agreed that all the territories Japan had stolen from China, including Manchuria, should be restored to China.

After that high-water mark in Chiang's career, duplicity entered.

At Yalta, in February 1945, with China not represented, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill agreed with Stalin that Russia should be allowed to establish a naval base at Port Arthur, and to control the commercial facilities at Darian, Manchuria's greatest port.

We pressured Chiang into agreeing to these concessions and Darian was closed to Chinese shipping. When the Japanese in Manchuria surrendered to the Russians, Chiang was forced to use inadequate subsidiary ports or difficult overland detours in moving troops to the liberated areas. So the Communist forces got there first.

In March 1946, our Government embargoed munitions shipments to China until Chiang made peace with the Communists—which involved taking them into his government. Since the Reds could veto any peace proposal, our policy destroyed Chiang's bargaining power. Meanwhile, the Communists got war materials the Russians had captured from the Japanese.

Before the embargo was lifted in May 1947, initiative in the Chinese civil war had passed to the Communists.

Not until April 8, 1948, did our Congress approve an appropriation for military aid to Nationalist China. The first shipment of supplies bought under this act did not reach China until last month. Two more ships docked at Formosa, far from the fighting front, early this month, when the war was all but over. Most of the supplies contracted for probably will never reach China.

When we finally made up our minds that we did not want a Communist coalition in China, we got there with too little, much too late.

It is a record of which no American can be proud.

Arbitration and Mediation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an address by Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin to the National Academy of Arbitrators at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on Friday, January 14, 1949, entitled "Arbitration and Mediation":

I am very happy to have the privilege of addressing the National Academy of Arbitrators. This is a new organization concerned with implementing and raising the standards as well as the principles of labor arbitration.

Arbitration is not only a highly skilled craft, but is an important public service which is becoming an integral part of the collective bargaining process. You as arbitrators and we of the Department of Labor have a common interest. That end is labor peace based on good wages, good working conditions, and high productivity obtained through free collective bargaining.

The Department of Labor throughout its long history of 36 years has taken the position, and I believe you share this position, that Government assistance is in order only when collective bargaining has broken down. During this period the Department has acquired extensive experience in the methods of conciliation and mediation to assist the parties in the settlement of their disputes by peaceful means. Out of this experience has grown a conviction that the interested parties are best able to handle their own problems. However, it must be recognized that even men of good will may on occasion be unable to reach agreement. When that occurs, the Government must provide the facilities to assist them in resolving their differences.

There is a growing recognition by responsible labor and management representatives that their own self-interest as well as the public interest demands an orderly procedure for the settlement of their differences.

This does not mean compulsory arbitration, a procedure which has been rejected by both organized labor and organized management. On the contrary up to the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act with its provisions for suit for damages there was an ever increasing number of agreements containing voluntary arbitration provisions covering unsettled differences.

Although arbitration as a voluntary means of settling disputes is acquiring growing acceptance by labor and management, President Truman in his state of the Union message recommended to the Congress that arbitration be extended even further and said that "The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented."

Labor, management, and the Government must turn to men of your caliber to assist in the execution of such a program. Your organization, which has been established to maintain high professional standards in the field of arbitration, can do much toward the promotion of the arbitration process. I am confident that your organization will make a real contribution toward a greater recognition of arbitration processes as a part of our free industrial society.

It is not enough to pay lip service to the arbitration process. Labor and management when they use arbitration, whether by ad hoc or the permanent umpire system, must be willing to accept the decisions of arbitrators as a final method of settlement. The public has long recognized that decisions issued by our courts must be accepted without rancor and we do not call for a removal of the judge when we don't like his decision. Labor and management must accept this principle. The era of kill the umpire should come to an end.

In addition to appointing arbitrators another most important service that can be performed by the Federal Government is through the conciliation process. I feel very strongly that that process can best be carried out within the Department of Labor, where it functioned so successfully from 1913 to 1947. As Secretary of Labor I was proud to inherit that great record of effective conciliation. I look forward to carrying on that tradition when the Conciliation Service is returned to the Department of Labor.

During the years before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act hundreds of thousands of cases were handled by the Conciliation Service. In 9 out of every 10 cases in which the Service participated before a strike occurred, the dispute was settled without a stoppage of work.

Why then did Congress take the Conciliation Service out of the Department of Labor? Frankly it had no good reason. The very best that can be said for it is the old bogey man that a Conciliation Service cannot be impartial so long as it is within the Department of Labor. Such a notion is, of course, ridiculous on its face. It is contrary to the unanimous recommendation of the Labor-Management Conference of 1945, which, although it failed to agree on many things, did agree unanimously on the fairness and impartiality of the Conciliation Service, and unanimously recommended that it be retained and strengthened within the Department of Labor. As many of you know, I have taken issue with the NAM on frequent occasions during the recent campaign or what they might call the late unpleasantness. However, I am very happy to agree with the position of Mr. Ira Mosher, chairman of the executive committee of the NAM, when he testified during the hearings on the proposed Taft-Hartley Act. During those hearings Mr. Mosher, on behalf of the NAM, recommended that no new agency be created for handling conciliation and in referring to the role of the Conciliation Service in assisting the parties to achieve satisfactory agreements through collective bargaining said:

"During the past year, the Conciliation Service has made important strides in the direction of providing that kind of conciliation. The members of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee to the Conciliation Service have performed a useful and valuable function in achieving a better understanding between the Conciliation Service and labor and management. I would like to see that kind of service and cooperative relations extended and strengthened."

Mr. Raymond Smethurst, general counsel of the NAM, testified to the same effect before the Senate committee and said: "We seriously question the advisability of establishing any new Federal agency having responsibility for the settlement of labor disputes."

The Eightieth Congress apparently wanted to show that it could not be led around by the nose by the NAM and did not follow their recommendation. This was one bit of sound advice given by the NAM. The Eightieth Congress should have listened. I am sure that the Eighty-first Congress will listen.

I don't like to belabor this point of impartiality, but since it has been raised I think it should be answered. Many of you men

sitting here tonight have acted as arbitrators pursuant to appointments made by the Department of Labor. Has your ability to act impartially been affected in any way by the fact of your appointment by the Labor Department, the independent Conciliation Service, or the American Arbitration Association? Obviously not. The question of who appoints men of integrity and impartiality cannot affect their integrity or impartiality, and I believe similarly that conciliators carefully chosen for integrity and impartiality will be impartial no matter what department of Government they are in.

The question, then, is not one of impartiality, but rather of effective governmental administration. Under the Cabinet form of government, effective Government administration requires that the President be in a position to look to a single Cabinet head as the responsible officer in charge of the labor policy of the Government.

I think it might be helpful to cite an illustration of the kind of thing that can happen when labor agencies are allowed to continue independent and unattached with no direct responsibility to the President through a Cabinet officer.

You all recall, I am sure, that when our distinguished Secretary of State, General Marshall, returned from Europe, approximately 2 months ago, he made a report to the President and the full Cabinet on our foreign relations in Europe. The fact that such a report was made was reported in the press, but what happened at that meeting was, of course, confidential.

In the course of his report, Secretary Marshall could very well have commented that the Economic Cooperation Administration plan, which is popularly named after General Marshall as the Marshall plan, was working very well and that democratic forces in Europe had been strengthened materially against the Communist groups attempting to secure a foothold in the democratic countries of Europe.

General Marshall might very well have said that the success of the Marshall plan was being seriously jeopardized in the flow of goods to these democratic nations as a result of the longshore dispute. At this juncture, the President would most likely turn to me as Secretary of Labor and ask the status of the longshore dispute. I would, unfortunately, say: "Mr. President, I don't know. That's not in my hands. That matter is being handled by the independent Conciliation Service." As you know, the heads of independent agencies do not sit in the Cabinet.

I believe that when problems such as this occur, and this type of problem occurs very frequently, the President has the right to look to a Cabinet officer to determine the labor situation as it relates to the problem under discussion in the Cabinet meeting.

In brief summary I wish to tell you the program of the administration in the field of labor relations. The administration intends:

1. To do everything in its power to encourage the free collective-bargaining process which is the bulwark of a free democracy;

2. We will do everything in our power to encourage the use of voluntary arbitration for the settlement of disputes and we will do everything in our power to provide the best kind of conciliation service to assist labor and management in negotiating their differences;

3. We will seek to find methods for handling jurisdictional disputes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts; and

4. As President Truman stated in his State of the Union message, means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest without endangering our democratic freedom.

This is a program which the majority of the American people has endorsed. It is a program that I know that the great majority of you as arbitrators endorse. The Department of Labor is prepared to implement this program through its established facilities and through the United States Conciliation Service when it is returned to the Department of Labor in the near future.

The Ghost Is Laid by Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

THE GHOST IS LAID BY TRUMAN

Two weeks ago, the Nation hummed with uncertainty concerning Mr. Truman's foreign policy for the next 4 years. The people thought there was going to be a change, because General Marshall resigned in ill health. Even the Acheson appointment was spyglassed in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Truman was going to sweet-talk with the Russians and everybody knew the Soviet couldn't be trusted, so what else could happen but for Uncle Sam to lose his shirt?

That was the general feeling, and President Truman must have been aware of it, for yesterday in his inaugural address, he laid the ghost of appeasement.

He called his names and he named America's enemy.

He said:

"In the pursuit of these aims (a just and lasting peace), the United States and other like-minded nations find themselves directly opposed by a regime with contrary aims and a totally different concept of life.

"The regime adheres to a false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind. Misled by this philosophy, many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty and tyranny, are their reward.

"That false philosophy is communism."

Tracing then the differences in method of government, morality, laws, outlook, and philosophy, Mr. Truman gave in short and simple language a stirring indictment of communism and built up a strong case for the democratic way. He just placed them side by side for all to see.

It was a good address. There was not a phrase which sounded insincere. All the world can read that message and gain a quick review of America's position in the world today and why we are doing what we are doing.

Help to the world to recover is our aim. A lasting peace and a just peace for everyone is our aim. Our aim also is stability for the family of nations, limitation of armaments, and expanded world trade.

To the accusations of Communists that we are imperialistic, Mr. Truman answered plainly and logically:

"We have sought no territory and we have imposed our will on none. We have asked no privileges we have not extended to others."

No one can truthfully deny that. That is a statement which should be broadcast to all peoples of the world, for it is so. It is the position of a nation with integrity and purpose. It is what our country stands for, and every one of us ought to be proud of it.

America's position is unassailable, and President Truman deserves our thanks for putting in so few words a truth no nation can deny, and faint-hearted and suspicious lands as well as our courageous friends needed the telling of it again.

Address of Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a speech made at the State Labor Conference in Trenton, N. J., on January 15, 1949, by my colleague from West Virginia, the Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, fellow workers, on this all-important occasion in the history of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in New Jersey, I bring greetings from the new liberal Democratic administration in Washington, which I predict will usher in a new era in service to the great mass of American people.

Let me, at this time, extend my congratulations not only to the CIO and PAC groups, but to the united effort of all labor groups for the magnificent contribution in time, money, and votes made to our great victory on November 2. It was a victory for the common people.

Despite opposition by 90 percent of the newspapers, most radio broadcasters, and all of the pollsters, the American voter stood firm. This is the best thing that has happened in American public life in a generation. It is a notice to those who would mislead and exploit you that the time is past when our American birthright is for sale. If it had been for sale the Republican Grundy-Pugh machine of Pennsylvania would have bought it. Your heroic stand at the ballot box on election day restores one's faith in the traditions and ideals that have made America great—my hat is off to you.

As we gather to discuss problems facing both our Nation and the cause of organized labor, we are appalled by the growing lack of international harmony abroad and the loss of individual security here at home.

Not since we, in America, rejected Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations has the cause of world peace been so uncertain, and not since the gloomy days following the First World War has organized labor found itself in a life-and-death struggle for its very existence.

It is a matter of history the world over that the rights of the laboring class can be secure only in a government of free men and free institutions. The fate of organized labor, our democratic ideals, and civilization hang in the balance. Our own America—may God bless and preserve her—is the only bulwark strong enough to demand, and secure, a world at peace and safeguard the aspirations and hopes of all those who love liberty and justice.

Since the days of Thomas Jefferson, author of our Bill of Rights, we Americans have cherished liberty. We have taken for granted the hard-earned blessings of free speech, free press, free assembly, freedom of religion, and the right of a trial by jury of our peers. Ours may well be a false sense of security.

The need to make safe these liberties and to protect our sacred institutions and our American way of life is as urgent today as it was in 1941, when we were forced to make an all-out effort to roll back the forces of nazism, fascism, and communism that engulfed us.

In the hectic war years we vied with each other with deeds of patriotism and sacrifices. We pledged eternal loyalty to those who made our own way of life possible for future generations, but in three short years after the cease-fire order ended the world's greatest war, America has forgotten her sacred pledge to those who served so gallantly on the field of battle and those who labored so patriotically in our mills and mines to make possible and certain our victory.

When Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin launched their campaigns for world domination, their first overt act was to wipe out every vestige of trade unionism and organized labor. This was followed by suppression of the press, of free speech and assembly, and of religious freedom. Firing squads were substituted for trial by jury.

To those who love liberty, exalt justice, and cherish freedom, the thought is abhorrent that such tragedy could ever blight America, yet only a casual glance at the record of the Eightieth Congress caused the American voter on election day to stop, look, and listen.

No address, on an occasion such as this, would be complete unless the speaker dwelled at length on the sorry record of the Eightieth Congress and particularly the Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act. Here we had a horse and buggy Congress functioning in an atomic age. The horse evidently wore blinders. They could see the fat profits but not high prices; rich landlords but not poor tenants; big business but not the little people.

Like the rules drawn up to govern the early Carolina Colonists this Taft-Hartley bill provides for everything from the cut of a man's coat to the trimming of a woman's bonnet. It not only cut labor's coat and trimmed its bonnet, but it has left labor naked and defenseless before its enemies.

What, may I ask, has happened to the idea, so prevalent a few short years ago, that the right of labor to bargain collectively is necessary to the continuance of free enterprise? Why should a sane and sensible America want to destroy and degrade the very segment of her population on which she must depend for her very existence in the third great war, which seems inevitable?

A present-day definition of free enterprise would appear to mean the right of a privileged few to do as they d—— well please and to h—— with individual liberties and the American way of life as we understood them from the lips and life of our great war-time President—the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Time will not permit me to present a detailed picture of what this Taft-Hartley Act is doing to you. Briefly, it:

(a) Presents a dangerous encroachment on the individual rights of our citizens.

(b) It destroys the principle of free collective bargaining.

(c) It brings us once again face to face with that un-American idea of government by injunction.

(d) It strikes from the Federal statutes the Norris-LaGuardia Act which prevented the issuance of injunctions in strike cases.

(e) It drastically modified the Wagner National Labor Relations Act by imposing added restraints on labor groups.

When Congress, by legislation, says that a labor-owned and labor-controlled press cannot print the names of political candidates for public office either favorable or unfavorable to the cause of labor, it abridges the right of free persons.

When a labor group is forbidden to make contributions to political campaigns and candidates, and this same privilege is extended to industry and organized business groups, we have the rankest kind of discrimination.

When a union official is required to make oath as to the political affiliation of members of his group, we are reminded of the Force Act in the years following the Civil War. You can no more legislate loyalty and patriotism into the average citizen than you can legislate honesty into him. Both of these admirable qualities come from the heart, not the mouth, and from love of country, not legal documents.

When courts of law, by ex parte proceedings, are permitted to send men and women to prison for violating injunctions in labor cases, you see a great injustice facing the workingman who is denied the right to a trial by jury.

I see before me gray-haired men who will remember the period of the First World War and the infamous Eagle Glass Co. and the Hinchman Coal Co. cases, in which otherwise innocent men, by the score, went to prison because of alleged violations of an injunction of a United States district court. God forbid that we in America be forced to again exist half free and half slave. It is my thought that this Taft-Hartley Act not only enslaves labor but it returns to economic bondage more men and women than were freed by the Great Emancipator in Civil War days. In justice to the millions of organized workers it must be repealed. I shall work and vote for its repeal. I have already introduced legislation demanding it be wiped completely off our statute books.

The forthright liberal program outlined some days ago by President Truman in the Eighty-first Congress was well received all over the Nation and particularly by the people who were either forgotten or ignored by the reactionaries and economic royalists in the Eightieth Congress.

It is pleasing to note that labor and labor leaders have gotten away from their one-track policy of labor alone and are now thinking in terms of the general welfare. They see that if labor is to be happy and contented other segments of our population must also enjoy the benefits that come from steady jobs at good pay and working conditions and with the added assurance of a reasonable security in their declining years.

Your great and beloved leader, Philip Murray, has taken the lead in backing most of President Truman's liberal program, which means that labor is now interested in such national problems as better health and educational facilities, more liberal social-security coverage, better trade relations, price controls on basic articles of food and clothing, better housing, civil rights—all of which will go to make up a happier and more prosperous America.

The first step in carrying out these great liberal reforms came a few days ago when the House of Representatives, of which I have the honor of being a Member, took away from its Rules Committee the power to block legislation by pigeonholing liberal bills and refusing to allow them to come before the House for a vote.

The same fight for more liberal procedures is on now in the United States Senate, where filibuster tactics on the part of a few Senators block bringing to a vote legislation that they oppose. If Senate liberals win this fight, it will be possible to carry out most of the Democratic promises of the recent campaign.

Our magnificent victory in the last election demonstrates clearly what labor can do to shape the policies of our Government when it stands united. We have only made a beginning. The fight is still on. We must look to 1950 and 1952 and be prepared to further reduce in the Halls of Congress the number of those who take orders from the forces of reaction and greed.

If time would permit, this afternoon I would like to go ahead and preach you a sermon. I would take as my text a passage from the Scriptures that reads something like this, "Hold fast to the things that are good. Forsake and cast aside the things that are evil."

President Truman reported, "The state of the Nation is good." Sixteen years of liberal democracy has brought America the greatest prosperity ever enjoyed by any nation. That is good. We must hold on to these good times.

In conclusion, may I appeal to your common sense, not your prejudices. You will all agree that the halcyon days of the labor movement began with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. It was an emancipation day equal to Abe Lincoln's freeing the slaves. All the things you had hoped, prayed, and fought for were magically handed you overnight. You did not have to fight hard enough for some of these things. If so, you would not be so prone to forget.

As a candidate for reelection to Congress in the 1948 campaign, I made the statement that the American workingman, who was then enjoying the greatest period of prosperity in the Nation's history, would not change major political parties in the midst of all this prosperity. I said he would not rock the boat because he was satisfied with a good job, at good pay, and could educate his children and even save a little for a rainy day.

When will you learn that vigilance at the ballot box is still the price of economic freedom? When will you learn that your ballot is your greatest protection against those who would oppress you?

Never before has there been a time when labor needs to be more on guard. Mighty forces, both in and out of Congress, are anxious to throttle the labor movement. It is a time when labor should know its friends. A time when it should stand united, not only at a bargaining table, but at a ballot box.

Philippine Scouts—An Article by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin Favoring Retention and Comment Thereon by Vicente Villamin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert therein a timely article on the Philippine Scouts by Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, and the comment therein, published in that newspaper, by Mr. Vicente Villamin. They both propose the retention of the Philippine Scout organization, which is now a part of the American armed forces.

[From the New York Times]

FATE OF PHILIPPINE SCOUTS—FAMOUS UNIT, IN ARMY SINCE 1901, WILL BE DISBANDED BY JULY UNLESS CONGRESS ACTS

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The Philippine Scouts, famous in the old Army, will pass into the limbo of history by July 1, 1949, unless the next session of Congress takes preventive action.

At the very time when Communist victories in China are imperiling the United States strategic position in the Far East, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur is asking for more men in Japan, a force with proud traditions and a long history of usefulness is to be disbanded.

The disbandment, already started, is a by-product of Philippine independence. A United States Army spokesman has explained it as carrying out United States Government policy of not recruiting and using organized foreign troops as a part of the American Military Establishment.

"Since the Philippines became independent in 1946," the spokesman continued, "this policy applies to that nation in the same way as it does to any other foreign power."

A DISTINCTIVE PART

The Philippine Scouts have been a distinctive part of the United States Army (but with specialized and separate status) since 1901, and prior to the war formed a major part of the Philippine division. The Twenty-sixth Cavalry, Forty-fifth and Fifty-seventh Regiments and other units made history on Bataan, and most Army officers with Philippine experience agreed that these troops, when working with United States units and led by United States and Filipino officers—most of the latter graduates of West Point—made excellent soldiers. Most of the Scouts were professionals; they enlisted and reenlisted, and developed into competent, hard-working privates and noncoms and provided the sound cadre for a Philippine defense force.

After the war Congress passed Public Law 190—the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945—which authorized the Army to enlist 50,000 men in the Philippine Scouts for service in the Philippines and the Far East. Under this law, a maximum of some 39,000 men were recruited in 1945 and 1946 until Philippine independence halted recruiting.

These newly recruited men were called New Scouts, whereas veterans of the war—many of them prisoners of the Japanese—were called Old Scouts. The strength of the combined Old and New Scouts as of last August 31 was 27,100, and was declining steadily as enlistments expired. The Scouts, since the war, have served in the Philippines and in the Marianas.

Between 1,400 and 1,500 of them have acquired United States citizenship, and hence are eligible for enlistment—if they desire—in the United States Army. About 700 other Old Scouts, who had served for a number of years, are to receive an opportunity to enlist in the United States Army so that their long years of service might not be wasted and so that they might have the opportunity due to them to round out their military careers and take advantage of their eligibility for retirement pay. But these men will enlist as individuals—if they so desire; as an organization, the Philippine Scouts is dying.

The disbandment, now well started, is in strict accordance with the Government policy against enlistment of organized foreign troops in the United States Army.

This policy itself, however, should be challenged sharply by Congress, and the narrow interpretation of it that views the Philippines as a foreign power should be rejected completely.

A bill was sponsored by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., Republican, of Massachusetts, at the last session of Congress, which authorized the enlistment of aliens in the Army, but it was not passed. This bill, in modified form, supplemented by legislation that would perpetuate the Philippine Scouts and put the Philippines—in a military sense—in a most favorable nation position, should get immediate favorable attention by Congress.

There has been a strange reluctance by the Army to accept the service of aliens—at least in organized bodies. Yet that reluctance is now leading to the disbandment of what admittedly has been a most useful body of troops. This reluctance is, indeed, a reflection on the Army's own capabilities. For throughout history nearly every great power has utilized foreign and/or colonial troops to supplement its own manpower—where the leadership provided was good and understood the peculiar problems of these special troops, these contingents made good military material.

BRITONS IN INDIA CITED

The British situation in India is roughly comparable to our own in the Philippines. India is free, yet the British Army still utilizes Gurkha units—volunteers all—and these units have served and are serving with distinction in Malaya and elsewhere. Native troops like these are particularly useful in the environment, terrain, and climate to which they are accustomed, and the Filipinos, like the Gurkhas, could provide a major source of manpower for service under the United States flag in the Far East. Agreement with the Philippines to permit such voluntary enlistments probably could be achieved easily, as the perpetuation of the Philippine Scouts would be mutually advantageous to both countries.

Since the war, United States forces in the Philippines have been small—really token in nature. The importance of our bases there has diminished with Philippine independence and as the strategic focus shifted northward to Okinawa. But with eastern Asia threatened with communism, the Philippines again are assuming an increased strategic significance, and more military units under the United States flag clearly are needed in the Orient. Nor can we ever forget that we owe a moral commitment to the Philippines; their defense—in the last analysis—depends upon us. The Philippine Scouts must not be disbanded.

PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

WARM SPRINGS, VA., *December 26, 1948.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A Filipino citizen, I endorse the suggestion of Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin in his article in the Times of December 24 that the Filipino Scouts be not disbanded, thereby rescinding the American Government's decision to wind it up by July 1, 1949. This is a matter that cuts deep in the present relationship between the United States and the Philippines and their security in the western Pacific and beyond its perimeter.

As Mr. Baldwin says, the Scouts are some 29,000 Filipinos who have enlisted in the American Army since the war under the Recruitment Act of 1945 for service in the Philippines and other parts of the Far East. They are mostly those who were in the Filipino Scouts before the war, a body which was a part of the American armed forces in the Philippines, and other Filipinos who saw active service in the last war under Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In anticipation of Philippine independence on July 4, 1946, the pertinent provision of the Recruitment Act authorized the enlistment of 50,000 Filipino Scouts in the American Army. Their rights and privileges were defined in the Second Rescission Act of 1946. This law is not to be confused with the First Rescission Act of the same year which took away many of the benefits in the GI bill of rights which would have accrued to those Filipino veterans who were in the American armed forces in the last war and who are legalistically described as then being "in but not of" the American Army.

By common understanding, the Filipino Scouts would have at least four functions: (1) To be ready for any eventuality in post-war Japan or in former enemy islands; (2) to help garrison the military bases which the United States under a treaty plans to build in the Philippines; (3) to carry out America's moral commitment as given by the President and acquiesced in by the Congress that Philippine independence shall be helped and protected; and (4) to be an indirect adjunct in the scheme of American military aid that is being actually extended to the Philippines under the Military Assistance Act of 1946.

The presence of a part of the American armed forces in the Philippines is with the consent of the Philippine Government, and the recruitment of Filipinos in those forces is proof conclusive of the trust that the American Government places in their proven fidelity and efficiency.

The American expenditures for the Scouts constitute a substantial help to the economy of the Philippines and their stoppage would militate against its postwar rehabilitation and reconstruction which the American Government, conscious of its responsibility in the premises, is trying to advance.

There are three principal links that bind the United States to the Philippines today—links that the former does not have to an equal degree with any other foreign country. They are: (1) The sentimental, arising from the fact that the Philippines has been under benevolent American tutelage for half a century, culminating in the creation of the Filipino independent nation; (2) the Philippine-American Treaty under which the former agrees to the maintenance of American military bases on Philippine territory for 99 years for their mutual protection; and (3) a modified free trade for 28 years, plus a required provision in the Philippine Constitution granting Americans the same rights as Filipinos in the development of natural resources and the operation of public utilities.

These three elements, strengthened by the Filipinos' loyalty and cooperation during the last war, make the two countries interlinked economically and interlocked militarily. With American military establishments in the Philippines (21 strategic sites have been selected), the Philippine Republic would irresistibly be involved in any war which America might wage in the future in that part of the world. That is a tremendous concession on the part of the Philippines—a concession required of it by the Philippine Independence Act of March 24, 1934, rendered more comprehensive by the Joint Resolution 94 of the American Congress in 1943.

Mr. Baldwin states: "The importance of our bases there has diminished with Philippine independence and as the strategic focus shifted northward to Okinawa. But with eastern Asia threatened with communism, the Philippines again are assuming an increased strategic significance, and more military units under the United States flag clearly are needed in the Orient."

Philippine independence did not diminish the importance of the bases, for they were decided upon long before that event and in anticipation of it. With Formosa and the Pescadores Islands liable to fall under Communist control as an incident to China's expected debacle, the American strategic positions will be materially weakened in Japan proper, in Guam, in the Micronesian Islands, in Okinawa itself and other islands in the Ryukyus Archipelago, and eventually yonder in Hawaii, the Panama Canal Zone, in Alaska, and at last in the Pacific coast of the United States.

The Philippines, a country rich in natural resources, with its 18,000,000 people who are fundamentally and intelligently friendly to the United States, and maintaining the only real democratic government in the Orient, is obviously and decisively the most valuable base that America could have under any method of warfare in that section of the earth. Instead of disbanding the 29,000

Filipino scouts, plain logic demands that America should have at least 100,000 of them there. Each of them, at less expense but not with less effectiveness, will take the place of every American soldier that will be needed in the event of any international emergency. Mr. Baldwin is tremendously right when he says: "The Philippine scouts must not be disbanded."

Respectfully submitted.

VICENTE VILLAMIN.

British Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news letter of Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

BRITISH SOCIALISM

Britain's Minister of Health, Mr. Bevan, is amazed at the bad sight which his countrymen are developing. "The rush for spectacles is so great that it has overtaken production capacity."

Free false teeth are also in great demand. It is reported that dentists pull each other's teeth, which they formerly did as a pleasant, neighborly, mutual service, and then send bills to the Government for payment.

Such is the result of the politicians taking over medical care. Even Mr. Bevan protests at the stampede for free service. "Because things are free," he says, "is no reason why people should abuse their opportunities. This is a great test of the maturity of the British people, insofar as they have all the resources of the medical profession at their disposal without charge."

One may sympathize with the plight of the Minister of Health, but to describe the system as free or without charge is the mark of a dishonest mind. Of course, it is all paid for. Doctors, dentists, and nurses don't do their work for nothing, even in unmerrie England.

"Something for nothing" is vote grease de luxe. But when millions get something for nothing, other millions get nothing for something. The same sort of relief rackets are growing in this country and the cost goes up also. The American Municipal Association reports that the relief load has gone up 136 percent during the past 3 years. And this during the biggest boom and largest employment in history.

As the Gadarene swine rushed down a steep place to the sea to be drowned, voters and taxpayers also blindly join the stampede for "free." The voters in Oregon woke up the day after the election with a headache. They found that they had approved an old-age pension plan of $50 a month regardless of need. Treat 'em alike—pauper and millionaire. It's a free country, isn't it?

The Oregon joker was the disclosure that the cost of free pensions for all was three times as much as the present cost of the State government in all its branches. Bond companies about to buy an Oregon State bond issue immediately withdrew their bids.

Just another case of the maturity of the people which Mr. Bevan is wondering about. Today in England, whether they work or not, or pay for private medical insurance or not, or are British subjects or not, everybody can ask for a glass eye, wig, truss, operation, or ambulance, and no charge. Just pay your taxes, that's all.

The British air lines, Government owned and politically operated, lost $45,000,000 this past year. That is 5 percent more loss than the previous year, and it is expected that the losses will continue, if not increase still more next year. The European recovery plan, however, enables the British Socialists to recover their losses out of American pocketbooks—including Oregon's.

There is one ebb in the tide of this oncoming Socialist sea. The Australians went left long before England did. They have had a longer look at it than the Britishers. In an election last spring, the disillusioned down-unders overwhelmingly defeated a proposal to give their federal government permanent control over prices, rents, etc. Our own Federal Government wants what the Australians reject. What was it that Poor Richard said about "Experience is a dear school"?

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

"Encourage us to live above the common level. Make us to choose the harder right instead of the easier wrong, and never to be content with a half truth. Endow us with courage that is born of loyalty to all that is noble and worthy, that scorns to compromise with vice and injustice. Guard us against flippancy and irreverence in the sacred things. Help us to keep morally straight." (West Point cadet prayer.)

China's Fall Due to Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

CHINA'S FALL DUE TO YALTA AGREEMENT
(By Mark Sullivan)

Everywhere in America—St. Louis, Philadelphia, Grand Rapids, Dallas, any city or town or farm community anywhere—people must ask anxiously about the imminent fall of China to the Communists; what it means to us and to the world.

What is now coming to climax in China had its roots in agreements made by President Roosevelt with Premier Stalin of Russia at Yalta in February 1945. These agreements, with other steps by us and a policy followed by us, are the main cause of what is now taking place. We are responsible.

The Yalta agreements were secret at the time. They have since become public, and the accompanying circumstances have in large part come to light, partly through two books, both authoritative, both by intimates of Roosevelt. One is by James F. Byrnes, an official aide to Roosevelt at Yalta and later Secretary of State under Truman. The other book is based on diaries and notes of Harry Hopkins, likewise with Roosevelt at Yalta and at all times an intimate associate. The Hopkins material is edited and supplemented by Robert Sherwood, also a devoted asscciate of Roosevelt. (A third book, by a scholar, Dr. David J. Dellin, Soviet Russia and the East, containing authoritative and valuable information, has been consulted in the preparation of this article.)

Roosevelt went to Yalta to arrange for Stalin to take part in the war against Japan. Up to that time Russia had participated only in the war against Germany. Stalin brought to Yalta a set of demands, to be the price of helping to fight Japan. The price was an immense extension of Russian territory and power in eastern Asia, to be taken at the expense of China—some of it territory belonging to China, some of it territory which had been taken from China by Japan and which China expected to get back.

To Stalin's demands Roosevelt agreed. Stalin, cagy and firm, "insisted"—this word is used by Sherwood—that the agreements be put in writing: "The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unequivocally fulfilled after Japan has been defeated."

This, Sherwood wrote later, "was the most assailable point in the entire Yalta record * * *. For, if China had refused to agree to any of the Soviet claims, presumably the United States and Britain would have been compelled to join in enforcing them."

That was an appalling demand. But there was another more profoundly offensive to China; more shocking by what it put upon Roosevelt personally: "It is understood that the agreement * * * referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures * * * to establish this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin."

What Roosevelt had done at Yalta included this: He had made secret agreements with Stalin, some remaining secret until Secretary of State Byrnes inquired into them, saying, as he wrote later: "I wanted to know how many IOU's were outstanding." The agreements were at the expense of China; China was already fighting alongside us in the war against Japan, but China, by the agreements, had to yield territory and make other concessions as a price to get Russia to join in the fight against Japan. If China refused, then, under the agreement, Roosevelt would, on advice from Marshal Stalin, take measures to establish concurrences.

The territory and other acquisitions, including control of railroads, which Russia got through the demands Roosevelt agreed to, together with further advantages Russia got in the winding up of the war against Japan, including arms taken from Japan—these composed leverage and impetus by which the Communists were able to make the drive against China that has now reached the stage of imminent success.

Later we did more that furthered the drive. In 1946 General Marshall, sent to China by President Truman, publicly called on Chiang Kai-shek to take Chinese Communist leaders into a coalition government. Such a proposal coming officially from a country that was historically China's friend undermined Chiang Kai-shek's prestige, strengthened the Communists. About the same time we suspended for 18 months the shipment of arms to the Chiang Kai-shek government, which we had been carrying on during the war against Japan. This crippled Chiang Kai-shek's military strength and increased the momentum of the Communist drive.

It Is Unfair To Use American Taxpayers' Money To Buy Argentina Meat To Feed Our Troops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to a new Army

policy in the purchase of foreign meat requirements from Argentina. I am informed the program provides for the purchase of 100 percent of its boneless beef requirements from Argentina, for feeding the United States troops overseas. Of course, this new policy will play havoc in the livestock and meat packing industries.

It is well known that Argentina beef is not produced under strict inspection regulations that apply to American plants. Argentina is well known as one of the countries where foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent. In any event, if the Army insists on buying a cheaper quality of meat in South America it is bound to have a disastrous effect on the cattle and dressed beef markets in this country. It will also discourage the production and feeding of cattle.

It should be noted, too, that the price of beef cattle, as well as the price of wholesale beef, has dropped substantially the past few months. It is manifestly unfair that American taxpayers' money should be used to buy second-grade meat for the armed forces of our country.

As a part of my statement I am including a copy of a letter from Mr. E. F. Forbes, president of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., that further describes the situation. The letter is as follows:

WESTERN STATES MEAT PACKERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
San Francisco, Calif., January 18, 1949.

Hon. EDWARD H. REES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REES: A new Army policy is raising havoc in the livestock and meat packing industries.

Six months ago the Army started for the first time to buy part of its foreign meat requirements from Argentina. This program has expanded and the Army now plans to buy in Argentina up to 100 percent of its boneless beef requirements for feeding United States troops overseas.

This is lawful, and the Army can buy meat for less money in that country, about one-half less, but Argentine beef is not produced under the same strict meat inspection regulations that apply to federally inspected plants in the United States. In addition, Argentina is one of the countries where foot-and-mouth disease in cattle is prevalent at all times.

Furthermore, American cattle growers and packers cannot compete on a price basis with Argentina as wages paid in packing plants and cattle ranches in that country are only a fraction paid for similar work here.

Heavy steers produced in western feed lots were used in filling Army contracts until the Army recently stopped further purchases. Meanwhile, civilian demand for meat in the West has diminished and the demand for heavy beef carcasses by meat retailers has largely disappeared because of the size of the meat cuts. Beef of the proper type to produce the Army's three-way boneless beef is therefore a drug on the market. The resulting chaos in the cattle and dressed beef markets is causing both feeders and packers to suffer severe losses. This situation, if permitted to continue, will serve to discourage the production and feeding of cattle, which above all, is the one thing needed to produce a plentiful supply of beef at reasonable prices.

Cattlemen, farmers, and feeders who produce heavy cattle, and the packers who slaughter and process them, need the Army business to prevent disastrous market conditions from prevailing for the balance of this fiscal year.

We are not objecting to lower prices but we want to see them go down in an orderly manner and not drop so precipitously as to cause a bust and the ruination of many cattle feeders and packers. Wholesale beef prices have dropped very substantially during the past 2 months.

The Army intends to purchase from 15 to 18 million pounds of boneless beef from Argentina for far eastern troops during the balance of this fiscal year. We do not know the amount it intends to purchase for European needs. We understand that the Army also plans to buy lamb and mutton in Argentina, as well as beef, thereby affecting the sheep growers and lamb feeders.

Let me repeat that we cannot compete with Argentina on price, but after all, it is the taxpayers' money that is buying this meat, and if the cattle feeders and packers are ruined, our Government will not receive any taxes from them.

We respectfully ask that you protest to the Secretary of the Army, and to the President, the purchase of Argentina beef, lamb, and mutton for United States troops overseas.

Very cordially yours,

E. F. FORBES,
President, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc.

Saga of Notzo Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK FELLOWS
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following editorial from the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of January 12, 1949:

SAGA OF NOTZO SMART

He ought to have known better—he'd been warned often enough—but somehow it happened so gradually he wasn't aware it was actually happening until it was too late to do anything about it.

That's why Notzo Smart is dead.

Notzo—he got the name from baby mispronunciation—wasn't born with a silver spoon in his mouth. His best clothes consisted of a jumper and overalls, a shade cleaner and bluer than the ones he wore every day.

His grandfather had been a clam digger. So had his father. So was he. In fact, that was the only thing any of them knew how to do through as many generations as there had been Smarts.

It provided a pretty good living too. A bit backbreaking, but after a while you got used to it and didn't mind it so much.

Legend has it that one of the Smarts, possibly his great-grandfather, back long before Notzo was born, staked off a place on the flats and put a sign on one of the poles. In crude but legible letters he painted, "Danger—Quicksands." While the sign was on the pole everybody was frightened and avoided the area. But time obliterates lots of things. By and by the sign got weather-beaten and you couldn't read it any more. Then it disappeared.

The flats outside the stakes always yielded a good day's pay, but Notzo thought one day he'd like to try digging just over the edge of forbidden territory. Just why, he didn't know, because he'd always done well in the safety zone.

So he crossed over. He sank in up to his ankles. But he didn't mind that so much. In fact, the rubber boots and wool socks made his feet hot and he found the cool flats a bit soothing. Actually the yield was smaller. But forbidden territory made him imagine the clams were bigger and that he was filling his creel faster.

He had quite a time getting his feet out. The mud clung like glue. But safety was just a couple of feet away, and after getting one leg on the firm ground he dragged the other one out. Then he looked back at his tracks, which soon filled in, and wondered what he'd been scared about.

Next day he went a bit farther into the staked-off area. He'd covered the flats pretty well just a foot inside and would have to give the seedlings time to grow before digging there again.

This time he sank up to his knees. He tried to move. He wanted to dig in those squirt holes about 6 feet from where he was mired, but couldn't budge. He grunted a protest.

"Look sucker," a voice said, coming from nowhere. "It's your clam hoe and your clam creel. They're made to dig clams with. Now you do the digging—but I'll tell you where you can dig."

"Sez you!" shouted Notzo who'd always dug where he pleased.

"Sez me," repeated the voice in a tone of finality. So Notzo dug there, not knowing quite what to make of it.

He got out somehow, but still didn't know when he'd had enough.

Back the next day, he went out toward the center. He expected to sink to his knees—and did. In fact, the ooze came up beyond his hips. He struggled. The more he twisted about the deeper he sank.

There isn't even a stone to mark where he was swallowed up. They put one there, but that was sucked under, too.

The worst of it was, Notzo had seen a neighbor of his sucked under not so long before, but he hadn't been impressed. It couldn't happen to him because he was going to play just around the edge. The other guy had walked right into the center the first thing.

That's how Notzo Smart got pulled in over his head. In his simple reasoning—for he was not so smart—it didn't occur to him the vortex was just as deadly whether you plunged in all at once or got there by gradual stages. Besides, hadn't he won every battle against it?—that is, except the last one.

Back when the century was younger Eugene V. Debs advocated a system of government said to be of advantage to the many rather than to the few and providing for the control of the means of livelihood by the state or by groups of workers. Under this utopian plan, a graduate of medicine, who had planned to set up practice in Bangor, could be told he'd have to go to Ellsworth, where the proportion wasn't so great, or vice versa. The same with a teacher and other professionals and trades people.

It was called socialism, and when it was offered as a full course the American voters soundly repudiated all such nonsense. They didn't know much about Debs. He may have been, and very probably was, a fine gentleman. But they couldn't stomach what he had to offer.

In the 1930's the first course of the same menu—social security—was offered on a different plate, was tried out, and became an accepted dish.

Now go on with the story.

Chiang Kai-shek's Record of Help to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to the editor of the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin, written by Adm. Harry E. Yarnell, retired, who is the former commander in chief of the United States Asiatic Fleet, and one of our greatest naval strategists, the man who demonstrated in war games how Pearl Harbor could be successfully attacked. We did not learn but the Japanese did, to our disaster.

A still greater disaster is befalling us in China, because the administration failed to follow the advice of men like Admiral Yarnell, who have been so eminently right on the forces at work in the Pacific area.

DON'T ABANDON CHIANG

EDITOR:

An Associated Press dispatch of January 17 states that Representative SOL BLOOM, who becomes chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, has said that "Chiang Kai-shek and the gang with him will have to be kicked out before China can be defended against the Communists."

* * * * *

What Mr. BLOOM has forgotten is that the Nationalist Government of China under Chiang Kai-shek carried on a major war against Japan for 4½ years before Pearl Harbor. During that period the United States was supplying Japan with oil, scrap iron, and munitions of war.

The losses of China in manpower due to battle and devastation were exceedingly great. But so were the losses of the Japanese. It has been estimated that 1,000,000 Japanese troops were lost in the Chinese war as well as huge quantities of war munitions expended. Had all those troops and munitions been available to Japan, and no Chinese war on their hands, on December 7, 1941, we would probably be fighting in the Far East today, and untold thousands of American lives would have been sacrificed.

For this we have to thank Chiang Kai-shek, who never wavered in his determination to carry on the war until the last Japanese was out of China. There were a number of times when he could have arrived at a settlement with Japan but he refused all such opportunities.

Mr. BLOOM, by referring to the nationalist government as a "gang," evidently ignores, or is ignorant of the fact, that many of the ablest men in China are in government service and are laboring to rescue their country from the difficulties surrounding it.

There are, of course, grafters in the public service also. But that is not a situation peculiar to China. We have had them also, even in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLOOM infers that when Chiang Kai-shek and his "gang" are out, some settlement of the Chinese Communist situation can be reached. It would be interesting to know what plan he has in mind to attain that end. It certainly should not be the appeasement policy recommended by Mr. Marshall as a result of his visit to China.

Mr. BLOOM is evidently unaware that Chiank Kai-shek has been fighting communism in China for 21 years. In view of the recent vast expenditures to that end in Europe, he should have our commendation rather than our censure.

The nationalist government has many faults. So has every government. However, it represents more closely what we consider a democracy than any other that may succeed it. Had we supported this government consistently from the beginning of the Japanese invasion of Manchuria it would be firmly in the saddle today. To use Mr. Wilkie's expression we have had in the Chinese people a "vast reservoir of good will." That is in danger of being lost, through ignorance of the Far East and inept diplomacy. Some of it can be saved if we continue our recognition of the nationalist government, even if it is driven to Formosa or Canton, and refuse our recognition to any Chinese element which follows the dictates of Moscow.

As for Chiang Kai-shek, it is the custom of some to take a kick at the lion when down, but future impartial historians will properly evaluate his great services to the United States during the years of the Pacific war.

H. E. YARNELL,
Admiral, United States Navy, Retired.
NEWPORT.

President Truman Calls for Proposals on Columbia Valley Authority Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the White House today announced that President Truman had directed the various executive departments of Government to prepare recommendations on a unified administration of resource development in the Pacific Northwest through a Columbia Valley Authority. On January 12 and again today I have discussed proposed CVA legislation with the President and I am pleased to report his prompt recognition of the need for a CVA by instructing the executive departments to submit specific legislative proposals to be incorporated in CVA legislation.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a resolution from the Columbia Basin Commission, of Washington, relative to a proposed dam for storage of water above Grand Coulee Dam in Arrow Lakes, British Columbia.

Mr. Clarence C. Dill, a member of the Columbia Basin Commission and formerly an honored member of the House and Senate, in transmitting a copy of this resolution to me, wrote in part as follows:

The whole Pacific Northwest is caught in this power shortage. It will grow worse and worse during the next 3 or 4 years. The people need your help now. Storage of water above Grand Coulee Dam is the first necessity to assure more power for use in all parts of this area during the period between now and 1954.

Mr. Speaker, cities in my State and throughout the Pacific Northwest are now experiencing a partial brown-out because of the electrical power shortage. The Department of Public Utilities in the State of Washington has ordered electrical utilities in the State to work out a program for conserving power, which requires curtailment of power use wherever possible. We are losing new industrial opportunities and restricting established industries in the use of power. Aluminum production, despite its strategic importance to the national economy, has been virtually frozen to present levels, with no assurance of capacity operation, much less expansion.

Grand Coulee represents the only major source of additional Federal generating capacity in the next few years. It is contemplated that between April 1949, and October 1951 the remaining nine generators will be installed at Grand Coulee. In order to guarantee sufficient water flow to operate these generators, the Columbia Basin Commission has proposed the building of a water storage dam above Grand Coulee in Arrow Lakes, British Columbia. To approve and facilitate this action is the responsibility of the International Joint Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Columbia River is a great international stream which has its source in Canada, and drains, with its tributaries, an area of 259,000 square miles, mainly in the Northwestern section of the United States. The immediate necessity of studies by an international body to determine a feasible storage dam in the Canadian portion and so provide an assured water supply for Grand Coulee points up the still greater need of a comprehensive and long-range program of Columbia River development. The several existing plans for the Columbia anticipate that by 1957 there will be 20 Federal dams instead of 2 on the Columbia system, with peak generating capability of almost 6,000,000 kilowatts, but even then four-fifths of the potential hydro capacity in that system will await development. To insure that the great river basin of the Columbia, with its abundant natural resources, is developed for the maximum benefit of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation, we must provide administrative tools adequate to the task. Logic and experience both point to a Columbia Valley Authority as the means of achieving orderly, unified, and comprehensive development of the Columbia River Basin.

The resolution referred to follows:

STORAGE IN ARROW LAKES

Whereas the serious power shortage in the Pacific Northwest has created an electrical crisis which, despite the reduction of more than 80,000 kilowatts of power to the large aluminum plants, has caused overloaded generators to blow out on the Missouri and the Spokane Rivers and in British Columbia, and overloaded power lines to fail to function from time to time, resulting in complete black-outs for half an hour to an hour in many towns and communities, and the Northwest power pool to operate without any reserve power to meet such emergencies, and the Columbia Basin Commission recognizing these break-downs to be not signals of ordinary trouble in the operation of electric utilities, but rather red lights of danger flashing warnings of complete collapse of electrical power supply which too great demands will bring during the coming winters between now and 1954, the date when Hungry

Horse and McNary Dams will first provide large blocks of power, unless something is done to meet the imperative need for an additional 500,000 to 1,000,000 kilowatts at the earliest possible date; and

Whereas the quickest, most effective and lowest cost relief can be provided by storage of water above Grand Coulee Dam in Arrow Lakes in British Columbia to operate the nine additional generators now being installed in Grand Coulee Dam, all of which will otherwise stand idle until 1954, but the control of building a storage dam there is first under the jurisdiction of the International Joint Commission, and since the Government of British Columbia has no objection to having the Commission expedite its report on the amount of storage it will approve in Arrow Lakes, and because the desperate need of power in the Pacific Northwest threatens a kilowatt catastrophe to industry and employment and our way of life here: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Columbia Basin Commission, That it hereby requests the International Joint Commission to direct its international board of engineers to give priority to studies and report on the storage of water in Arrow Lakes, British Columbia, so that the Commission may decide the amount of storage it will approve there, and if such report be favorable, that the Bonneville Power Administration and the United States, and the proper governmental agency of British Columbia and Canada, then proceed to negotiate for an agreement or agreements for building a storage dam at the outlet of Arrow Lakes to impound 5,000,000 to 7,000,000 acre-feet of water, whereby British Columbia will receive an estimated annual revenue of $2,500,000 to $3,500,000 and the power plants at Grand Coulee Dam and Bonneville will be enabled to produce an additional 500,000 to 700,000 kilowatts of prime power during the winter months, so that said dam may be built at as early a date as feasible, possibly by the winter of 1951–1952; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commission urge the State legislature, the Members of Congress from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, the Governors of said States, and the President of the United States, to join in the above request to the American member of the International Joint Commission, and the Premier of British Columbia and the Prime Minister of Canada to join in the above request to the Canadian members of the International Joint Commission in the hope that the threatened electrical catastrophe to the Pacific Northwest during the next 5 years may be averted, and that, instead, both the United States and Canada may have increased development and prosperity and a stronger national defense.

FRANK A. STEWART,
Chairman.

Oleomargarine Tax Repeal Legislation Should Be Speedily Passed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture in the Eightieth Congress held lengthy hearings on bills which had for their purpose repealing the taxes on oleomargarine.

Witnesses representing farm organizations, jobbers, distributors, merchants, and the consumers came before the committee and practically all agreed that the taxes that had been imposed on margarine for many decades should be removed. The housewife is entitled to purchase colored margarine for her table without the imposition of restrictions and taxes which are most arbitrary and discriminatory.

Early action by the Congress is demanded by the American people to relieve the manufacturer, jobber, merchant, and the ultimate consumer of the taxes on this wholesome food commodity.

I trust that early and favorable action will be taken by the Committees on Agriculture as well as both Houses of Congress so that yellow margarine may be put on an equal footing with the competitive product which has enjoyed the benefits of legislation enacted many years ago.

I set forth below pertinent facts, which were forwarded to me by Mr. W. O. Reeves, of Blytheville, Ark., entitled "Margarine Fact Sheet":

MARGARINE FACT SHEET

Margarine is a pure-food spread and table fat. It is the nutritional equivalent of butter; 3,300 calories and 15,000 units of vitamin A per pound.

Margarine is vegetable fat; butter, animal fat. Otherwise, scientific tests have shown no difference.

Margarine is 80 percent fat, the rest mostly pasteurized skim milk. Margarine uses about 59 percent cottonseed oil, 37 percent soybean oil, and also peanut and corn oils. Margarine is the second largest market for soybean oil, exceeded only by shortenings.

Margarine is the only pure food arbitrarily restricted by Federal and State law in the interest of a competitor. The real purpose of antimargarine laws is to get a monopoly for butter. (Restrictions on renovated butter are not comparable to antimargarine laws.)

These laws tax or prohibit yellow margarine, although the United State Pure Food and Drug Administration authorizes use of color in margarine (and many other foods), although hundreds of foods use artificial color, and despite the fact that it is consumer demand which causes foods to be colored.

Butter is artificially colored most months of the year, and enjoys special exemption from labeling the fact. Butter is colored to suit consumer preferences; darker yellow in some areas, lighter in others.

The Federal antimargarine law: Taxes yellow margarine 10 cents a pound; white ¼ cent. Retailers' license fee, yellow margarine, $48 a year; white, $6. Wholesalers' license fee, yellow margarine, $480 a year; white $200. Manufacturers' license fee, $600.

There are also antimargarine laws in 26 States. Of these, 19 still prohibit yellow margarine. Since 1939 a trend toward repeal has abolished 10 State laws and modified 20 others. Federal repeal, almost accomplished in 1948, should be realized in 1949. Five States abolished their laws in 1948.

Only the butter interest seeks to restrict margarine. On the other hand, at congressional hearings in 1948, 37 consumer, farm labor, and business groups asked for repeal.

Margarine restrictions fall hardest on consumers and distributors alike. Because of the license fees, only 60 percent of food stores handle margarine. Millions of hours of work unnecessarily go into coloring margarine at home. The cost of living is increased, because the housewife is restricted from buying an economical pure food and is taxed to buy it in the yellow color she prefers it.

Butter cannot supply demand, yet seeks to restrict margarine. Butter production has slumped nearly a third since 1940. Today, there is a sixth less margarine-butter combined than before the war.

Farmers have found a great new milk market for whole-milk products. These give more profit than butterfat, conserve the nutrients thrown away when milk is used for butter and are expected to continue to take the greater part of the milk supply for the foreseeable future. No sharp production upturn in butter is in prospect.

Deliver the Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Representative from Indiana:

DELIVER THE MAIL

The stevedores' strike, tying up the commerce of two sea coasts, may be settled by the time this appears in print. But the problem of industry-wide strikes will remain. The area of industrial conflict must be limited.

As I write, 150,000 bags of United States mail to go abroad are piled up in the New York post office because of the stevedores' strike. This mail is in the custody of the United States Government. The postage has been paid. The ships are ready to carry it. The senders have the right to demand that the Government forward it; the addressees have the right to receive it.

Countless other thousands of bags of incoming mail are on ships in the harbor waiting to be unloaded. The Italian liner, *Saturnia,* returned to Italy with 1,621 bags of incoming mail that could not be unloaded because of the strike.

The United States Government does nothing about it except to press the shipowners to grant the strikers' demands. President Truman is quoted as saying "the Government he heads has exhausted its remedies and is practically helpless."

In other American harbors, more mail, cargoes under the Marshall plan, and supplies for United States soldiers overseas are also piling up. What does this do to the prestige of the United States Government in Europe and Asia?

It has been a proud tradition of the Post Office Department that neither sleet nor snow nor fire nor flood could stop the messenger of the post on his appointed rounds. But the stevedores, by an industry-wide strike, have stopped the mail from going through.

When Grover Cleveland was President, a railroad strike stopped the mails. Cleveland said, in effect, "If it takes the Army to deliver a postcard in Chicago, the postcard will be delivered." It was delivered. Cleveland did not sit on his thumbs, or ask somebody to pass a law. It was plain to his straight-thinking mind that it was his duty to execute the existing laws and functions of the Government. One of those functions was to deliver the mail. It was that simple.

When Coolidge was Governor of Massachusetts, there was a strike of the policemen

of Boston. Coolidge said: "There is no such thing as the right to strike against the public by anybody, for any reason, at any time." That statement made him Vice President, and later, President.

Employers and unions are both responsible. Instead of one union bargaining with one employer, a combination of unions bargain with a combination of employers. Employers go along because they know that each of their competitors will be subject to the same rise in costs. This makes it easier to shift the burden of union demands onto the shoulders of consumers. The result is to limit competition and promote monopoly. The joint combine becomes a private and invisible government in which the general public has no vote. Differentials of living costs, or small-town advantages are eliminated. Local self-government of unions by their members disappears. The development leads inevitably to the police state, which labor leaders denounce as fascism.

There need be no fascism. Remove the road blocks to freedom. End the special privilege immunity to the antitrust laws which unions now enjoy. When unions combine to substantially restrain commerce, they should be as subject to the Sherman Act as employers. Equal justice under law.

As the great liberal, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, said: "We gain nothing by exchanging the tyranny of capital for the tyranny of labor * * * Lawlessness must be put down at once and at any cost."

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

"No government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free, no one ever will. If virtuous, it need not fear the fair operation of attack and defense. Nature has given to man no other means of sifting out the truth, either in religion, law, or politics." (Thomas Jefferson.)

Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I have received from the Connecticut Chamber of Commerce:

THE CONNECTICUT CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., January 18, 1949.

The Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LODGE: We are reliably informed that Federal school aid bill S. 246 (THOMAS, et al.) will be reported out today or soon thereafter by the Senate Labor and Welfare Committee without hearings. Also the same Senate committee, as we understand, intends today to report out without hearings S. 247 (THOMAS, et al.), a national science foundation bill; and S. 248 (THOMAS, et al.), the minimum wage bill.

I realize that most of the members of the above committee have arrived at a decision on these issues, also that committee hearings on such legislation were probably held during the Eightieth Congress. However, if the present action of the committee is to set a precedent to be followed by other committees, it would appear that we are departing from our democratic way of handling legislation affecting all of our citizens. It might even be called high-handed and rubber stamping.

The Connecticut Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring a meeting today to review and discuss problems involved in the financing of public schools, at which interested Statewide organizations have been invited to attend and state their views. The meeting is strictly educational and we had hoped it would be possible for many of these State groups to inform the Connecticut delegation of their position in the matter before the bill was reported out of committee.

While we know that our Connecticut congressional delegation is not responsible for this committee procedure, we urge that they impress on their colleagues that citizens of Connecticut and other States be heard on vital issues.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Respectfully yours,
WAYNE R. DICKERSON,
Executive Vice President.

Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Malcolm W. Bingay from the Detroit Free Press of January 10, 1949:

MONDAY WASH LINE

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

The other day I commented on an essay by De Witt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, in which he told about the troubles of his small son and himself to find a definition of the expression free enterprise. I said that there was no such thing, that Mr. Emery was naive in thinking there was.

At the insistence of Harvey Campbell, executive secretary of the Detroit Board of Commerce, Mr. Emery has answered me. Mr. Campbell takes upon himself the task of proving that I am an enemy of business and that while I have a tremendous following, I am disliked among businessmen.

I will accept even a Gallup survey, on any popularity contest between myself and Harvey. We might both rate zero.

Mr. Emery's letter follows in part:

"DEAR MR. BINGAY: You take apart a piece of mine in which I told about trying to find a definition of free enterprise. Among other things, you say there isn't and never has been such a thing. You are wrong on this—dead wrong.

"Free enterprise is both the lifeblood and backbone of our economy, has been for more than 150 years and it will be a sorry day for this country and for the whole world if free enterprise ever disappears from the American scene.

"You are quite right in saying that free enterprise is not mentioned in the Constitution. It isn't mentioned in the body of the Constitution or in the Bill of Rights, but nevertheless, free enterprise is the very essence of both the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, neither of which would last 30 days without it."

(All I said was that it wasn't mentioned when you said it was.)

"Free enterprise, or freedom of enterprise, if you prefer, is a way of life, the American way of life; it's our way of living and working together. Free enterprise has produced more of everything for everyone than any other way of life known to mankind any place on the face of the earth since the beginning of recorded history.

"Detroit is what it is today because Henry Ford was free to try again and again to make a go of his enterprise. Under any other way of life he might not have had a chance to make another attempt after he had failed, and the development of the automobile industry might therefore have been set back nobody knows how many years.

"I may, as you say, be 'naive' because I believe in freedom of enterprise, but I wouldn't trade this belief for anything in the world.

DE WITT EMERY."

Answer:

"DEAR MR. EMERY: As your chum—and my dear friend, always, Harvey Campbell, says—we are seeking the same objectives. Harvey rather childishly intimates that we are quarreling about words and their meanings. I am not interested in semantics, as he seems to think, if he understands the meaning of the word.

"My protest against your article is that it is unadulterated flapdoodle, missing the vital needs of a proper approach to our national problems. You are trying to quarrel with me about words. For 40 years I have been fighting against the gobbledygook of demagogic politicians and soapbox Communists.

"And now in my old age, I will be darned if I am going to stand for the same line of bunk from those who say they represent American business.

"You knew when you wrote that article—or had your ghost write it for you—that the specious expression 'free enterprise' meant nothing.

"I am not going to defend American business if all it has to offer is a lot of fleabitten clichés and moth-eaten platitudes which conceal the facts of economic life like the old-fashioned Mother Hubbard wrappers cover up figures.

"It is time that American business quit trying to beat its enemies with catch phrases.

"Do not try to compete with the experts. It is time American business stopped this yelping about its constitutional rights and concentrated upon its constitutional responsibilities.

"If it had done that in the last election Harry Truman never could have been elected.

"The trouble with American business is that it has grown so satisfied with itself that it lets secretaries and takers of polls of opinion determine its course, rather than attempting to use the blessed privilege of private enterprise about which it likes to harp so much without knowing what it means.

"You can no more direct business by platitudes than you can run a board of commerce with wisecracks.

"I would suggest both to you and our dear friend Harvey Campbell that you read the newly published pamphlet by Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution—the one and only nonpolitical and altogether scientific economic society of its kind on earth. You will find therein all that I have said about free enterprise. Dr. Moulton says, for instance:

" 'Certain evils * * * of competition. * * * Unscrupulous, shortsighted, or hard-pressed enterprisers often followed practices * * * disruptive to legitimate business. * * * Cut-throat competition * * * involved such practices * * * Government aid was sought. * * *

" 'The principle is the same employed in the regulation of sports. * * * Experience showed that rules had to be laid down * * * that an umpire is necessary. * * * Such rules do not destroy competition * * *'

"I know Dr. Moulton is right. He and I talked it over for some hours the last time

he was in Detroit. I harped on it for years before that. Such a program requires thought far removed from immediate profits, platitudes, and comical stories.

"Contrary to Dear Harvey, I am not opposed to real business leaders. I am trying to give them a chance against the bromides of the claptrap artists who think that a platitude will solve any economic problem, and that Bob Hope and his after-dinner wisecracks mean more than the profound lifetime studies of such scholars as Dr. Moulton.

"The Moulton pamphlet is just a chapter out of the new book he is having published, Controlling Factors in Economic Development.

"I would suggest that you and Mr. Campbell read it. Better still, have someone explain it to Harvey."

Elements of Defense for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the Washington-Lewis Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, Fredericksburg, Va., Tuesday evening, January 18, 1949:

Officers, members, and friends of Washington-Lewis Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, we are highly honored to visit your historic city and to have this opportunity to speak to the members of your great patriotic organization. The Daughters of the American Revolution have a proud history, and there is no other organization for which Members of Congress have more respect and admiration. We always listen attentively to your views, for we know that they are based on the highest degree of patriotism, that each of you is motivated by a genuine desire to preserve and serve this great country of ours.

And I might add that our country continues to need your service. I have recently returned from a visit to Europe, where I saw at first hand many of the problems and conditions about which we read. I wish it were possible for every American citizen to go on a tour of Europe. It would be an enlightening experience. It is not right, of course, to take comfort in the misfortunes of others, but no American who visits present-day Europe can return to this country without breathing a silent prayer to the Almighty in grateful acknowledgment of the blessed peace and security that belongs almost exclusively to the United States of America.

As I visited the war-devastated nations, I thought of an article by the distinguished war correspondent Quentin Reynolds in which he said that "millions of Americans live and die without discovering the land of their birth; it remains as unknown to them as does the second stanza of the Star-Spangled Banner." Mr. Reynolds was speaking of his experiences in Europe as he watched the misery and lifelessness of the refugees of the continent—people in whose hearts hope had died. He stated bluntly that though the years were tragic, they were the happiest he ever knew because for the first time he felt the pride of a discoverer and realized anew the greatness of our country.

I think I know what Mr. Reynolds meant. For in looking at Europe I felt that I, too, was seeing America for the first time. It is rather ironic, is it not, that we must go abroad in order to discover our own land? So I say again, I wish it were possible for every American to go abroad and make that discovery.

A wise man once said that there is no greater truth than that man fails to appreciate what he already possesses. We seldom really appreciate things until we are about to lose them—or have lost them. We never think of the blessings of the use of an arm until it is gone. Few of us really appreciate the joy of sight. Only the blind can do that.

It is much the same with human liberty and human rights. Men have fought, sacrificed, and died to gain them. But once these things are won, and seemingly secured, they are left to the care of everyone in general and no one in particular.

This kind of an attitude causes no great harm as long as there is no enemy to menace. But today the scene has shifted. During recent months many of our hard-gotten gains have been swept away and many more are in danger of being swept away. Unless we in America maintain a watchful eye, we may find ourselves in the same unhappy situation that plagues so many of the nations of the world at this very moment. Freedom is everybody's business.

In the field of international relations, America's resources, and the moral force of our will for peace, have made us—whether we desire it or not—the greatest power in the world for the maintenance of peace. We cannot, in our own self-interest or before the moral judgment of mankind, avoid this responsibility.

There is one great threat to the security of America and to the peace of the world. That is the aggression of the Soviet Union. We have made every effort within the United Nations to reach agreement with Russia. We have been forced to take peaceful steps outside the United Nations to restrain this aggression. One of these steps is the European recovery program for the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe, so that they may be self-sufficient, with the strength to determine their own form of government, free from Russia's force. We have been required to build up our military facilities. This is unpleasant and unpopular, but it is better to spend $15,000,000,000 today and to give up for a time our sons in peaceful training than to pour $500,000,000,000 and the youth of the land into the useless sacrifice of war.

Unfortunately, there is a great military vacuum among the western powers in Europe. The entire issue has, of course, been brought to a head by the mounting crisis in Berlin. The western democracies do not now have either the arms or the capacity to make the arms to equip a force capable of halting an onslaught by the huge Red army. The best we can hope to accomplish at the present time would be a delaying action, and this knowledge of our helplessness is one of the reasons why Russia has been so boldly aggressive in Berlin.

There has been considerable speculation as to whether the change in State Department leadership will mean a change in American policy toward Russia. I am confident that our new Secretary of State will not be soft in dealing with the Soviet Union. And in passing, I feel that I must pay tribute to the retiring Secretary, George C. Marshall, who has performed a difficult service with skill and courage.

One of the best methods of keeping the peace of the world is by maintaining our defenses at home. National defense involves a multiplicity of elements. It involves men, material, diplomacy, food—and above all, level heads. The first thing we must develop is a proper attitude toward our world position. We must realize that what America does is of tremendous significance to people the world over. And conversely, the things they do profoundly affect us. We live in an age where a mountain village in Greece, an outpost in China, a railroad line into Berlin, a desert in the Near East, can strike sparks of grave danger to the peace of the world. We have come face to face with the truth that no nation can live alone—that the dangers as well as the hopes of the world are inseparable from our own.

National defense means that we must keep our home economy strong. A country with a weak economy is a sick country. And we must not tear ourselves to pieces fighting among ourselves. Let us hope that the present shameful bickering does not extend beyond Inauguration Day.

National defense involves resistance to communism at home as well as abroad. We must be increasingly diligent in uncovering evidence of subversion and making it impossible for home-grown traitors to jeopardize our national security. There is a continuing necessity for action and investigation in this field by the Congress as an aid and as a spur to the law-enforcement agencies of the Federal Government. As individual citizens, resistance to communism means learning more about it, and especially learning about the techniques and devices employed by its adherents. It means learning to distinguish between honest liberals and false liberals.

But national defense means more than a mere negative attitude toward communism. It means developing a positive faith in democratic ideals and procedures. It means giving consideration to some of the increasingly complex problems that we face today; a way of reconciling the conflict between individual and collective rights; a way of making the general welfare the joint responsibility of the people, of the Government, of business, labor, and agriculture; a way of distributing more equitably the products of our economic machine without destroying that machine. These and many other problems that I might allude to call for the attention of an enlightened citizenry.

We are told that this past war was a war of ideas. Through the mesmerism of state education, the German people had developed a creed, and totalitarian methods stamped that creed on the souls of the German people. We see much the same situation being repeated in Russia today. We have tried to make a distinction between the people who live under dictators and the dictators themselves, but we have come to learn that the people make common cause with their rulers, that totalitarian ideas make headway only when the people themselves are derelict in their citizenship and weak in fervor for self-government.

For most of our life here in America we have paid little or no attention to the development of the thing which we have twice been called upon to fight. Our citizenship has been peaceable. We have made little or no effort to understand the forces acting in other parts of the world. We have not yet won for ourselves a diploma with distinction in our course of international training.

Whether wars will cease or not I cannot presume to prophesy, but of this I am certain—we cannot have an enduring peace until we have true knowledge of the world conditions which underlie peace and war. We need also to know the truth about our neighbors, not to speak of the truth about ourselves. There is no room at the peace table or in the work of reconstruction for hypocrisy, narrowness, prejudice, or any form of intellectual immaturity. Only by recognizing fully and frankly what is worst and best in the policies of our neighbors—friendly or unfriendly—and what is worst and best in our own policies, can we contribute to worthier policies for all. We are bewildered over the peace because we are unenlightened in the causes of the war. When it broke out, we knew too little about

Germany and Russia and Italy, less about the Balkan states, and still less about Japan, China, India, and Palestine. Now we are face to face with problems, responsibilities, crises, which demand in us as a people the greatest mental and moral soundness. Mental and moral soundness does not admit of any chauvinism or the narrowness of ignorance which sees nothing but good in our allies and nothing but evil in our enemies. Our citizenship must be based on an enlightened and spiritualized public opinion, a public opinion developed by right education. We shall continue to be adolescents in international affairs if we persist in buying our opinions from the newsboy, and taking them ready-made from professional pollsters. Only straight thinking, made possible by growing knowledge and vitalized by a new conscience, a finer faith, a kinder heart, can work out a new era.

To bear the burdens of peace, we must have an internal discipline as exacting as the external discipline employed in the making of a good soldier. Our Nation is only as fine as the individual men and women who compose it.

Elihu Root once said: "The art of self-government does not come to men by nature. It has to be learned; facility in it has to be acquired by practice * * *. Men must be willing to sacrifice something of their own apparent individual interests for the larger interests of city, State, country; and without that willingness, successful popular government is impossible."

In short, the American citizen of today must think. He must make up his own mind on the momentous international as well as domestic problems facing our Nation. He must be ever alert to corrupting influences from within and without, and such alertness can be brought about only by an active and intelligent interest in knowing how the affairs of the Government are being administered.

Someone has said, "Democracy never dies; it perishes through neglect." And that is perhaps the most serious indictment which could be brought against any group of citizens in the United States. If we permit our Americanism to wane, if we forget how glorious it is to be an American citizen, and if we are lax in building our physical and spiritual defenses, our Nation may easily lose its position in the world, and with it will go our chance to bring peace to a stricken humanity.

But when I am troubled with doubts, I look to organizations like yours and gain a new confidence that the American people will guard their priceless heritage.

A. A. D. Rahn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the New York Times and a letter of my own concerning the recent passing of my very dear friend, "Andy" Rahn, who was for so many years such a vital and dynamic figure in Washington and national affairs. Past grand imperial potentate of the Shriners, successfull businessman, philanthropist, and gentleman, his loss is truly irreparable, and he is mourned by many throughout the Nation.

[From the New York Times]

A. A. D. RAHN DIES; HAD LED SHRINERS—MINNEAPOLIS LUMBERMAN, HEAD OF ORDER IN 1938—HELPED CAMPAIGN FOR HOSPITALS

MINNEAPOLIS, November 26.—Andrew A. D. Rahn, Minneapolis lumberman and former imperial potentate of the shrine of North America, died today at his home in Crystal Bay, Lake Minnetonka. He was 71 years old.

He had been active for years in Minnesota and National Republican politics, although he never sought or held office.

Mr. Rahn became a mason in 1906, a Knight Templar and a shriner a year later. Ill health forced his retirement from most of these activities several years ago.

He was named potentate of Zuhrah Temple of the shrine in 1922 and was made imperial captain of the guard by the shrine of North America at Toronto in 1930. Eight years later he was elevated to the highest rank within the gift of shriners. He became a 33d degree mason a year ago.

For a number of years he was a member of the national board of trustees of the shriners' hospitals for crippled children and a leader of the movement that established such a hospital in Minneapolis.

From 1934 to 1937 he served as chairman of the Northwest Shippers Advisory Board, a group which worked closely with the railroads in handling the annual grain movement.

At his death he was a vice president of Shevlin-McCloud Co., formerly the Shevlin-Carpenter-Clarke Co., the lumber firm with which he had been affiliated since 1905.

Mr. Rahn was a member of the National Press Club of Washington, the Columbia Country Club, Chevy Chase, Md., and the Union League Club of Chicago.

Born in Valparaiso, Ind., he was brought to Minneapolis by his parents 3 years later. He remained a resident of the city all his life, starting his business career as a newsboy and then going into the lumber business as a shipping clerk at the age of 13.

He married Anna Sophia Anderson in 1897. Mrs. Rahn died in 1945.

Surviving are three sons, Carl A. and Andrew A. D. Rahn, Jr., both of Billings, Mont., and Robert L. of Great Falls, Mont., and three brothers, Fred J. and William F. of Minneapolis, and Chris H. Rahn, of Coleharbor, N. Dak.

DECEMBER 10, 1948.

Mr. CARL A. RAHN,
Billings, Mont.

DEAR CARL: I deeply mourn the loss of my good friend of many years standing, your dear father.

He was in a class all by himself—robust character, clear thinker, sound able businessman, public-spirited citizen, eternally devoted to his family and friends.

Every time I met him I had reason to be astounded at his ability and knowledge. He was possessed of a very exceptional mind, penetrating and all-embracing. Few things ever escaped him. He had a heart of gold and was generous to a fault. Every good and worthy cause had his instant support. The appeal of a friend received his instant response, the call of his business or his lodge his ever-ready attention. When the Good Lord made him, He destroyed the model because there will never be another like him.

It was only natural that such an outstanding man possessing a kindly and benevolent spirit, such a warm-hearted and generous person, should have a host of friends. He had them in abundance in every station in life, among the rich and the poor and the lowly, among the humble and the great, and he enjoyed the high esteem of all.

A noble gentleman and a great American has gone to his eternal reward. A giant oak has fallen. A loving father and true friend has been summoned to the land from whose bourne no traveler ever returns.

I well know of the infinite devotion which he bore for you and the family, the affection which he felt for all of you, the admiration for you and the faith in you which always so profoundly moved him. If you can carry on in that faith and that tradition you will be fortunate indeed.

You have suffered an irreparable loss to be sure, but your loss is the loss of many. It is the loss of neighbors and friends, businessmen and statesmen, and just ordinary folk of the rank and file. His memory will linger long with us who knew him as a happy and gracious inspiration. His high example will continue to strengthen us and his warm-hearted friendship will continue to shed its serene rays upon us. We shall all be better men because of his life and his example and his friendship.

And through it all, may you and yours be strengthened and encouraged by the knowledge of his intrinsic goodness and worth, by devotion and faith to bear your sorrow with true Christian fortitude.

Please keep in touch with me,

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

The Aluminum Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including as a part of my remarks a statement by Samuel Moment, of the Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oreg., directing attention to the critical situation with regard to the shortage of aluminum in this country.

I deem it of sufficient importance to place it in the RECORD so the Members of Congress and others may be sure to read it.

The statement follows:

THE ALUMINUM SHORTAGE—HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

(This story deals with the current power shortage and it is important to aluminum users because, to a very great extent, any improvement in the supply picture hinges on more cheap power. The views expressed are those of the author and not of the Bonneville Power Administration. Mr. Moment helped draft the Government aluminum-plant-disposal program for the Surplus Property Board, was consultant for both the Senate Small Business Committee and the WAA, and works for the Bonneville Power Administration on industrial power problems. His views summarize the current problem and what must be done to get more power for aluminum.)

The aluminum shortage has now become so severe that it is threatening the existence of the smaller businesses. It is reported that nonferrous foundries can now obtain assurance of only 10 percent of the amount of primary metal supplied to them in 1947. Secondary smelters expect a sharp decline in the availability of old scrap. Some small manufacturers of aluminum products state that they may be forced out of business.

SUPPLY IS SHRINKING

The most disturbing aspect of the aluminum outlook is that for the smaller companies the outlook may become much worse, and sources of aluminum may dry up for a few years. For the three large producers of primary metal, the present outlook is to maintain primary production around present levels until the power bottleneck is broken—and nothing is being done now to break the bottleneck. For the country as a whole, and the national defense in particular, the picture is very disturbing. The primary industry now has half the capacity reached at the peak of World War II. Requirements for the military program are expanding and will cut sharply into the already restricted civilian supply—possibly taking one-sixth of it by 1952. If this country embarks on military lend-lease to western Europe, then the civilian supply will shrink even more.

NEED DOUBLE THE CAPACITY

Whatever metal can be obtained intermittently from Canada, or by paying premium prices to Switzerland, or by reopening German and Japanese aluminum plants will not solve the problem. We need a dependable domestic capacity for aluminum upon which our domestic industry can continuously expand and on which the whole country can rely in the event of war. For security purposes, informed opinion in Washington is that we need at least twice the dependable primary capacity we now have.

This expansion can take place only if new power facilities are built in the near future. These facilities would have to be built by the aluminum industry itself, or by private utilities, or by the Federal Government, or by some combination of these three.

THE BAROMETER: POWER

Thus far the aluminum industry itself has not been able to provide most of the kind of power it wants. The capital required is very great. A power plant equals the cost of building an associated aluminum reduction plant. The three aluminum producers do not have equal ability to finance such expansion. Alcoa will add seventy to one hundred million pounds of capacity in the next 2 years in Texas, burning natural gas in engines to generate power. This gain will be offest partly by the permanent shutdown next year of the Niagara plant with 40,000,000 pounds of capacity.

A really substantial power expansion for aluminum, using natural gas or petroleum, faces competition with other growing demands for gas and oil, and the probability of a long upward-cost trend, particularly as the wells closest to reduction plants become exhausted. Aluminum could pay more for power and sell at a higher price for a time, but the aluminum industry is concerned with restrictive effects of price increases on markets.

The private utilities can finance power expansion for aluminum, also at an increase in cost to the industry and with the effect of forcing aluminum prices higher. But the aluminum industry and the utilities have not worked out any program as yet. The expansion of some 18,000,000 kilowatts which the utilities are engaged in for the next 4 years does not include specific provision for the needs of the aluminum industry. Most of this expansion will produce power at much higher costs than the aluminum industry believes it can now afford to pay.

LOW COST IS ESSENTIAL

The aluminum industry favors the construction of more Federal hydro projects because these promise to offer the lowest alternative costs of power, even though such costs will be higher than in previous years. Nearly 95 percent of all of the power comes from Federal dams, either in the Tennessee Valley or in the Pacific Northwest. The costs of power from all hydro sources—those owned by Alcoa and by the Federal Government—have been heretofore between 1.5 and 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is the cost equivalent of 1.5 cents and 3.5 cents per pound of aluminum. Recent increases in construction costs may mean that the most economical new hydro will cost between 2.5 and 4 mills to the aluminum industry. If such power is available, other industries and other users will be entitled to a share as well as aluminum. But the cost of the power is the governing consideration. It is largely fixed when the hydro plant is built, and it does not face rising costs as does power using oil or gas which are exhaustible and in demand for many other uses.

Power from gas engines as used at the reduction plant at Jones Mills, Ark., during the war cost about 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, based on gas at 5.5 cents per thousand cubic feet. If gas goes to about 11 cents, the cost of power at that plant would increase to about 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Power from steam, using coal or oil, has cost large users around 3.5 mills per kilowatt-hour before the war, and would cost around 6 mills today. Therefore from the viewpoint of the aluminum industry hydro power is still the most economical choice and gas engine power a second choice.

RELIEF 5 YEARS AWAY

Today there is no Federal program to build more dams to help aluminum. In the Northwest, where the largest amount of undeveloped hydro power still awaits development, new dams are under construction, but not for aluminum. Needs of other users of power, particularly private and publicly owned untilities, are expected to take up the new power supplies as rapidly as they can be delivered in the next few years. If more power is wanted for aluminum, it will have to be taken from other users, or else more dams will have to be built. Since it takes 5 to 7 years to complete a big dam, the aluminum industry cannot look for such relief until at least 5 years from the time that Congress decides to go ahead with more Federal hydro. In order to avoid discrimination, any such program would also have to deal with demands from other industries producing electro products and needing large amounts of energy.

FOUR ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives can be summarized as follows:

1. A makeshift group of decisions can be made, such as paying premium prices for aluminum exports from Europe, reopening German and Japanese aluminum plants, and reopening some 100,000 tons of capacity in closed Government plants for which only very expensive power would be available. Such choices would not foster sound expansion of the domestic aluminum industry but could possibly give temporary relief to users who need metal and can afford to pay more for it.

2. Power can be rationed or allocated from other users for the aluminum industry. This alternative cannot be justified at a time when the entire country needs more power for all uses.

3. If a higher price level for aluminum is accepted, the aluminum industry alone, or in conjunction with the private utilities, can provide more power from fuel. This may require a rise in price of a few cents per pound of metal if coal or oil are used. Power from new steam plants could be provided in about 3 years' time. Manufacturing capacity for large steam turbines is filled until the second quarter of 1951, and delivery for aluminum power plants would start in 1953. Gas engines could be delivered sooner and apparently offer for the near future the most economical power alternative using fuel, provided the aluminum capacity is located near the gas fields. Over the longer term, gas may become more expensive.

4. If aluminum prices are to be maintained close to present levels, insofar as power costs can help, Federal hydro can be obtained. The power investment at these dams would, of course, be self-liquidating. This solution requires congressional authorization and appropriations for new dams. Initial power deliveries could be expected around 1956 from big multipurpose projects.

OUTLOOK

Obviously, there is no simple, quick solution to relieve the aluminum shortage in a sound manner. The shortage is probably here for some time. At least the safest guide for businessmen interested in aluminum is to allow for the high probability that aluminum will become scarcer for civilian uses as the military program expands. As for the longer term, that depends on the choice to be made by the aluminum industry and the Congress between gas, steam power, and hydro.

Why the Insurance Business Has Prospered in Connecticut and What It Has Done for the State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Jesse Randell, president of the Travelers Insurance Co., at the Hartford Rotary Club, Hartford, Conn.:

Strange as it may seem, Napoleon Bonaparte played a part in pushing Hartford into the insurance business.

England was engaged in a series of wars with Napoleon from the late seventeen hundreds to about 1815. And neither the French nor the English had much respect for the young American flag on the high seas. If one of our merchantmen encountered a French or British frigate, the American ship was almost certain to be out of luck. If she escaped being sunk, she was likely to be captured, and if by a British ship, her crew might be impressed into the British Navy.

The Napoleonic wars hit New England hard. The principal industry in New England at that time was shipping and trading—but soon our New England ships were all tied up at the docks for fear of capture. New England capital that had formerly flowed into shipbuilding and foreign trade began to pile up in idle hoards and its owners eagerly sought other profitable fields for its employment. In some New England towns these funds began to flow into the building of textile mills. In Hartford, some of this idle money found its way into the insurance business.

Insurance of a kind had been practiced in Hartford from the very earliest days of the colony. If one of the early settlers lost his home or his barn by fire, it was customary for his fellow townsmen to gather on his premises and help him rebuild. Later when money became more plentiful, it became the custom to contribute money rather than labor to help an unfortunate fellow townsman

to rebuild his burned home. But there were several objections to this voluntary insurance plan. In the first place, it was inequitable. Some people would contribute generously. Others would drop just a few pennies in the hat. Yet those who were the most stingy in their contributions would be highly indignant if others did not contribute generously, if they happened to suffer misfortune.

Finally it was decided to put these contributions on a businesslike basis to collect them before the fire rather than after, and to base them on the value of the property that each man wanted to have protected. The first fire-insurance policy was written in Hartford in 1794 and was underwritten by a group of men who called themselves the Hartford Fire Insurance Co. This was not an incorporated company and had no connection with the present Hartford Fire Insurance Co.

At about this same time, another group of Hartford citizens was engaging in underwriting the ships and cargoes that sailed out of Hartford, on much the same plan. It is quite possible that marine insurance could have become an important business in Hartford, had it not been for the Napoleonic wars. But when French and English commerce raiders tied up the ships in New England ports, it dealt a death blow to the infant marine-insurance business in Hartford, and Hartford men and Hartford money turned to insuring homes and business buildings on dry land.

Men of outstanding ability and character have been identified with the insurance business in Hartford since its earliest days. In my opinion, that was the reason why Hartford insurance companies grew and prospered while many companies in many other towns and cities sprang up like weeds and soon withered away.

The insurance business deals in promises, and a promise is only as good as the character of the men who give it. If they are prepared to back their promises with everything they own—as Hartford insurance men did on so many occasions—the insurance-buying public will have faith in their company, and it will grow, flourish, and endure. If, however, they are only fair-weather sailors, eager to take the profits when things are going well, but unwilling to stand the losses when they have made a miscalculation of risk, or luck is running against them; their company is very unlikely to live to celebrate its fiftieth or hundredth birthday, as so many of our Hartford companies have.

For example, the Hartford Fire Insurance Co., which was incorporated in 1810, and now ranks as the oldest stock insurance company in Connecticut, suffered a disastrous loss of $84,973.34 in the great fire in New York City in 1835. As a matter of fact, news of this loss came right after a dinner had been given by the management to celebrate the declaration of a dividend. Fortunately the dividend had only been declared and not yet paid; because soon the company found itself needing every dollar that it could find. Eliphalet Terry, who had become president of the company that year, pledged his own property to the Hartford Bank as security for drafts to be drawn, and started from Hartford to New York in a sleigh, with the mercury below zero, to deal with the situation in person. On arriving, he found most of the New York insurance companies bankrupt and the city in a state of panic. Property owners in the burned area were despondent, fearful that their losses would be paid at the rate of only a few cents on the dollar. Property owners outside the burned area had lost confidence in their insurance and felt that they were no longer protected.

Mr. Terry promised that he would pay in full all losses of the Hartford, and would also take new insurance. This promise, which was fulfilled to the last dollar, was the first note of cheer since the conflagration. And, as for his offer to take new insurance, that was eagerly accepted. Business poured in at very profitable rates and the deep gap in the company's assets was soon filled. Premiums rose from $19,260.15 for the 6 months ending April 1835 to $97,841.75 for the corresponding term the next year. Not only was the Hartford Fire saved by President Terry's courageous action, but its reputation was established and from that time on it became an increasingly important factor in the fire-insurance world.

The Aetna Fire, which was founded in 1819, escaped the New York conflagration of 1835, because it had not yet entered that city; but it was hit hard in the $6,000,000 New York City fire of 1845. When the news reached the Aetna that its losses in this fire would amount to about $115,000, President Thomas R. Brace called the directors together and told them that the calamity would probably exhaust the entire resources of the company. Going to the safe, he drew out the company's stocks and bonds and laid them on the table.

"What will we do?" someone asked.

"Do?" he replied, "Go to New York and pay our losses if it takes every dollar we have here—and my own fortune besides."

Mr. Brace did not have to draw on his own resources to meet these losses. When it became known that the Aetna was paying in full, it was flooded with new business and the drain on its assets caused by the New York conflagration was soon made good.

It would take hours to outline the histories of all of the Hartford companies and to touch on the many factors which contributed to their success. I have dealt with but one phase of the history of insurance in Hartford—the high character and outstanding ability of the men who directed the destinies of our Hartford companies. Perhaps I have attached undue importance to this one phase, but I do not think so. The only product that a pioneer insurance company had to offer was its promise to pay, under the conditions outlined in its policies. If the public had faith in these promises that company grew and flourished. These men who founded our Hartford companies and guided them through the trying days of their infancy had the wisdom and integrity to realize that if they wanted to build faith in their companies they must make good their promises to pay when other companies were unable to pay, even if it meant pledging their own fortunes to do so.

I have given you a little of the early history of the insurance business in Hartford. I have tried to explain the part that New England integrity played in the growth and prosperity of our local companies. Now I would like to say a few words about what the insurance business has done for Hartford and for the State of Connecticut.

There are some very obvious benefits that both Hartford and Connecticut has gained from having a score or more prosperous insurance companies domiciled in its midst. There are other benefits to both the city and the State that are not so obvious, but are just as important.

People who traveled extensively over the United States and Canada between the years 1929 and 1935 remarked that Hartford seemed to escape the ravages of the depression better than any other city they visited. I think this was true. And the reason for it was that never at any time during the depression were Hartford insurance companies closed down or working only part time. Insurance-company pay rolls were sustained on a remarkably high level during all those depression years—and Hartford's business and professional men benefited because Hartford people were still able to buy their goods or services. Insurance-company pay rolls furnish a solid backbone of buying power in times of prosperity—and a sustaining force in times of depression. Connecticut is known as the land of steady habits. It is much easier to maintain steady habits if you can depend on receiving your pay envelope in bad times as well as good. Thousands of Connecticut citizens who are employed in the Hartford insurance companies possess this comforting assurance.

Another very important service that the insurance business has afforded Hartford and its vicinity is that it has offered opportunities for our young people. This is very important. A town or city that offers few attractive opportunities for its young people is certain to lose many of them to other cities which can use their talents.

The insurance business offers a wide range of opportunities to the young people of Connecticut. If a boy has a good head for mathematics he can find use for his abilities in the actuarial department of one of our companies. If he is an artist or writer he may be able to fit into the advertising department. If he is an engineer, our Hartford companies employ hundreds of safety and fire-prevention engineers. If he possesses executive ability he has a good chance of rising to the top of one of the many underwriting departments. If his talents lie in the field or selling he has a wide range of jobs in the insurance field from which to choose.

Ordinarily a city of Hartford's size would suffer a big handicap from its proximity to a huge metropolis like New York. The metropolis would be like a magnet, drawing to it the most capable young people of the smaller city. But not only have the insurance companies helped Hartford to hold its own against the magnet of New York City, but they have also drawn into Hartford many outstanding men from all parts of the country. Yes, even from New York City itself.

One of the most important contributions made by the insurance business to the city of Hartford and the State of Connecticut is not obvious on the surface but it has been a very important factor in the prosperity of both the city and the State.

Nature was not generous when she laid out the State of Connecticut. She gave us no coal, no great deposits of iron, copper, lead, or other industrially important metals. We have no oil, and neither have we a sufficient acreage of level fertile soil to provide us with all the food we need. Successive ranges of hills running from north to south cut up the State and make it costly to haul heavy freight directly from the West.

It would not have been practical to establish a steel industry in Connecticut because all of the coal and ore would have had to be transported into the State and most of the finished products would have had to be shipped out. The automobile industry got its start within a radius of 30 miles of Hartford—but when it developed into a mass-production industry it moved closer to its supply of raw materials and more central to its market as a whole. The cotton-textile industry started in New England and flourished here for over a century; but in the past two or three decades it has been moving closer to its supply of raw materials. Connecticut as a State, and New England as an area, suffer a distinct disadvantage when it comes to many kinds of manufacturing. It is too far away from plentiful supplies of coal and raw material. It is too distant from the center of population in the United States.

But Connecticut must buy much of its food, all of its coal and oil, and many of its manufactured products from other parts of the United States if Connecticut people are to keep warm and well fed and to enjoy the comforts and luxuries of modern life. Connecticut money is continually flowing west across the Hudson River to pay for all these things we need. Unless an equal amount of money was not continually flowing east, across the Hudson River into Connecticut,

we would soon become a poverty-stricken corner of the United States. A State is no different from an individual, when it comes to money matters. If it continues to spend outside its borders more than it earns outside its borders it will soon find itself in trouble.

Here is where the insurance business has been of great help to the State of Connecticut. Insurance does not need large supplies of heavy raw materials such as coal and iron. Its raw materials are rock-ribbed integrity, of which we have always had a plentiful supply in New England; willingness to give prompt and friendly service—a characteristic which was well developed in Connecticut when the old Yankee tin peddlers started their rounds about 150 years ago; and the paper on which our policies are printed. The hilly contour of the State and our distance from the center of population are no handicap to us in the insurance business. Uncle Sam will carry one of our policies to anywhere in the country for a 3-cent stamp.

Insurance is bringing hundreds of millions of dollars every year into the city of Hartford. It is true that a substantial part of this huge sum flows out of Hartford each year in the form of claim pyaments, or is credited to policyholders' reserves under life insurance policies. But tens of millions are paid to Connecticut people in the form of salaries for the work they do in conducting the insurance business and millions are paid to Connecticut stockholders for the use of their money. All these millions of dollars that come from other parts of the country and are paid to Connecticut people by the insurance business help to counterbalance the many millions of dollars that Connecticut people must pay to those living in other States for the bread we eat, the coal that keeps us warm, for our automobiles, our gasoline, and the many other things we want and need that Connecticut cannot supply.

In recent years we have heard a lot about the difficult problem that Great Britain is facing because she must import so much of her food and other raw materials and because of her inability to produce sufficient exports to balance these necessary imports.

If it were not for the insurance business Connecticut might well find herself in the same difficult position as England is in today. So much of what she needs comes from out of the State. Connecticut manufacturers are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with those located closer to the supply of raw materials or closer to the center of their market. But, fortunately, distance is no handicap in the insurance business; the supply of New England integrity shows no evidence of running out and Connecticut Yankees have long possessed a sort of sixth sense which enables them to determine what people want and how they want to be treated; so I think it is safe to predict that the insurance business will long continue to be one of the mainstays of Connecticut's prosperity.

Credit Unions, the Poor Man's Friends, That Grant Credit Upon Character as Collateral, Oppose Regulation W

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Texas Credit Union League Bulletin for January 1949 contains an interesting resolution in opposition to regulation W. It is as follows:

VALLEY GROUP OPPOSES REGULATION W

In a move striking at regulation W, the Valley Federal Employees' FCU recently adopted the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That this committee go on record as being unalterably opposed to regulation W, which has again been imposed upon this credit union.

"Being mindful that the purpose of Regulation W is supposed to be an anti-inflation measure, yet in practice it imposes discriminatory restrictions on the lower income groups and is ineffectual in regard to members in the higher income brackets, this credit committee desires to condemn particularly that portion of regulation W which requires payments of not less than $70 a month when the loan is $1,000 or more.

"The average take-home pay of our average member is a little more than $200 a month. Therefore, he would be barred from making a loan, say, for an automobile, because of his inability to meet this harsh and unreasonable payment. This would leave the member in the higher bracket in a very preferential position.

"This committee believes that this regulation strikes at the very root of the purpose of credit unions—that of providing a place for not only saving money but for making loans 'for a reasonable need and a provident purpose' at a reasonable rate of interest.

"This committee, therefore, recommends to the board of directors that they forward a copy of this resolution to the proper place for the lodgment of such complaints, together with any additional remarks that they might see fit to add which might give additional weight."

The same bulletin contains an interesting article about credit unions being ignored in a recent popular publication. It is as follows:

CARNEGIE FAILED TO FORM A FRIENDSHIP

Taking issue with a statement of Dale (How To Make Friends) Carnegie, noted writer and lecturer, with reference to having a bank or a personal finance company as a sedative for worry, the Fort Worth chapter of credit unions recently framed a resolution which was forwarded to Carnegie and the publisher of his latest book, How to Stop Worrying and Start Living.

Feeling slighted that credit unions had been ignored irate members of Fort Worth credit unions let it be known:

"Whereas Mr. Dale Carnegie, in his recent book entitled 'How to Stop Worrying and Start Living,' published by Simon & Schuster, New York, 1948, in part 9, chapter 30, rule 5, advises: 'Try to build credit in the event you must borrow. If you are faced with an emergency and find that you must borrow, life insurance and United States Treasury bonds are literally money in your pocket'; and

"Whereas credit unions are available or may be organized to serve most people and require no collateral for loans other than character and character is the collateral everyone may have: Be it

"Resolved, That this Fort Worth Chapter of the Texas Credit Union League request Mr. Carnegie to acquaint himself with the credit-union movement, sponsored and supervised by State and Federal agencies.

"And furthermore, that both Mr. Carnegie and his publishers, Simon and Schuster, New York, be respectfully requested, in any future editions of Mr. Carnegie's book How to Stop Worrying and Start Living, to insert the words 'First determine if you are eligible for membership in a credit union and borrow from them' after the words 'If you are faced with an emergency and find you must borrow.' "

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a recent broadcast by W. H. Chamberlin over radio station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., entitled "Justice for Poland":

THE POLISH TRAGEDY

The fate of Poland is the greatest tragedy of the late war. From the very beginning of the war, Poland was overrun and subjected to savage tyranny and spoliation at the hands of its two totalitarian neighbors, Communist Russia and Nazi Germany. Poland lost a higher proportion of its population than any other belligerent power. Driven from Polish soil, its Government kept up the fight.

Hundreds of thousands of Poles fought for the United Nations' cause on land, at sea, and in the air. Polish troops distinguished themselves in campaigns in France, in Italy, in Germany. They stormed the difficult heights of Monte Cassino. But Poland as a free nation was erased from the map as a result of Soviet brutality and chicanery, aided and abetted by the fatal appeasement tactics of the American and British Governments. Its frontiers have been mutilated. It has been reduced in fact, if not in name, to the status of a Russian vassal province. Many members of its terrorist unrepresentative so-called government are not even Polish citizens in any proper sense of the term. They are men who have spent long periods of time in the Soviet Union, where they have become indoctrinated with communism and trained in Soviet methods of police tyranny and oppression.

Many of the details of Poland's tragedy escaped the attention of the American people in the excitement of the war. But the murder of a nation, like the murder of an individual, will out.

When Stanislaw Mikolajczyk escaped from impending legal murder or assassination in Poland a year ago there were two reasons for satisfaction. The first was that a courageous fighter for freedom had survived, perhaps to return to Poland after that country had been purged of its present totalitarian unrepresentative rulers. The second was that the full story of Poland's enslavement by Stalin with the contemptible acquiescence and even collaboration of the governments of the western democracies could and would be told.

Now Mikolajczyk has told this story in his new book, The Rape of Poland. The picture of the effort to appease Stalin at any cost in moral principle stands revealed in all its naked ugliness. Mikolajczyk was a prominent Peasant leader in Poland before the war. He was a member of the Polish government-in-exile until the death of General Sikorski in an airplane accident in July 1943. Then Mikolajczyk became Prime Minister, resigning this office toward the end of 1944.

Returning to Poland in the summer of 1945, he was the leader of the freedom forces in Poland so long as there was any prospect of achieving results by means of peaceful and legal opposition. He was an active participant in the Polish tragedy from the first act until the last.

The pattern of Soviet aggression, as unfolded in Mikolajczyk's pages, was subtle and varied, utterly inhuman and formidably successful, especially against the feeble and demoralized opposition which was encountered

in Washington and London. Some Soviet actions were so appalling in their mass cruelty and treachery that they could scarcely be believed if they were not confirmed by a vast amount of eyewitness testimony and circumstantial evidence.

Mikolajczyk makes out an unanswerable case for the guilt of the Soviet political police for the massacre of the thousands of Polish officers whose bodies were found in the Katyn Forest. There is, of course, no trace of pro-German, much less of pro-Nazi, psychology in Mikolajczyk's psychology. He often dwells on the horrible crimes committed by the Nazis in occupied Poland. But on the disputed question of who was guilty for the Katyn massacre he points an accusing finger at the Soviet Government, and musters convincing reasons for his viewpoint.

For example, the Soviet authorities, in reply to the searching questions of Polish diplomatic representatives in Russia, consistently lied about the fate of these officers, saying they had been released, suggesting such wildly improbable things as that they might turn up in Manchuria. Only after the bodies had been discovered by the Germans did the Soviet authorities invent the story that the prison camp in which the officers were confined had been abandoned to the Germans. There was no suggestion why, in such a case, not a single officer escaped. Moreover, diaries, newspapers, and unmailed letters found with the bodies fixed the time of the slaughter in April and May 1940, more than a year before the Germans invaded Russia.

Over a million people were dragged from their homes and deported from eastern Poland during the first Soviet occupation of that region. They were treated with such callous brutality both during the mass round-ups and deportations and in the slave-labor camps to which many were sent that probably a quarter perished of undernourishment and maltreatment. There is a vast amount of independent testimony to back up Mikolajczyk's strongest statements on this subject.

Finally there was the cruel cynicism of the Soviet attitude toward the heroic Warsaw uprising against the Germans in August and September 1944. The revolt was urged and incited by messages in Polish from a Moscow radio station. After it had broken out the Soviet Army stopped its advance on the very outskirts of Warsaw and waited until the Polish patriot forces had been exterminated in an unequal struggle with German tanks and artillery.

The motivation of this action, which was accompanied by refusal of permission to American and British planes to use nearby Russian bases in order to drop supplies to the insurgents, was only too obvious. It was to bring into the open and destroy the Polish nationalist forces which would otherwise have obstructed Soviet Communist domination of the country.

Soviet aggression against Poland also found expression in a climactic act of perfidy in the spring of 1945. It had been agreed at Yalta that the future Polish government should be composed of representative Polish leaders in Poland, along with members of the Soviet-sponsored provisional government and representatives of the Poles who had found political refuge abroad. Sixteen leading figures in the Polish underground movement which had kept up the struggle against the German occupation trusted the so-called word of honor of a Soviet political police officer that they would be assured safe conduct, came out of their hiding places, and presented themselves for negotiations.

These men were promptly arrested and the Soviet Government used the threat of executing them as a means of blackmailing other Poles into joining the new government on the terms laid down by Stalin. This was a direct slap in the face to the American and British Governments. The latter had even advised the Poles to open up negotiations. But even this crowning piece of Soviet brutality and bad faith failed to halt the appeasement policy or to lead to the logical consequence: Withholding of recognition from the Soviet-dominated Red quisling regime.

Along with these instances of mass cruelty and treachery, there was a subtler side to Soviet aggression. The outward forms of Polish independence were observed, although many high military and secret police officials in the new Poland understood Russian better than Polish and the leading members of the new Polish Government were Moscow-trained Communists, whose loyalty was to Stalin, not to their own country. Moreover, Stalin would periodically announce to the world that he favored a "strong independent Poland." And the unctuous voices of appeasement on the American and British radio networks would hasten to repeat this cheerful news to people who were pathetically anxious to believe the best about the Soviet Union and the worst about any nation it might be in process of devouring.

I think the most dramatic and revealing passage in Mikolajczyk's book is his account of the negotiations which he carried on in Moscow with Stalin and Molotov in October 1944. Churchill, Eden, and the American Ambassador, Averell Harriman, were also present. Mikolajczyk declared he could not accept the so-called Curzon Line as a boundary with Russia, since this would mean the loss of almost half of Poland's pre-war territory. Molotov suddenly remarked that Roosevelt had strongly endorsed the Curzon Line boundary at the Teheran Conference. Mikolajczyk had received a very different impression from Roosevelt during a visit to the White House months after the Teheran conference had been held. Then, as Mikolajczyk tells the story:

"I looked at Churchill and Harriman, silently begging them to call this damnable deal a lie. Harriman looked down at the rug. Churchill looked straight back at me. 'I confirm this,' he said."

As if this revelation of Roosevelt's deceit was not enough Mikolajczyk experienced disgraceful bullying at the hands of Churchill, who ought to be ashamed of the memory of this episode to his dying day. The climax was reached when Churchill, who had alternated between abuse and blandishments, assured Mikolajczyk that the British Ambassador would see to it that there was no Russian interference in what was left of Poland.

At this fatuous remark Mikolajczyk, usually a very patient man, burst out that he would rather die then and there fighting for the independence of his country than be hanged later by the Russians in full view of your British Ambassador. This, incidentally, is just about what did happen to such friends of the West as Petkov in Bulgaria and Mihailovich in Yugoslavia. Mikolajczyk would almost certainly have shared their fate if he had not escaped.

One finds in this book a specific first-hand account of the terrorist means by which Stalin's agents in Poland, Bierut, Berman, Gomulka, and others, wiped out all semblance of freedom in that unfortunate country. It is not only Americans of Polish origin who should become familiar with Mikolajczky's story. What happened in Poland has happened, with slight variations, in other countries behind the iron curtain.

It could happen anywhere, it could happen in America if there should be slackness and lack of vigilance against the aggressive threat of international communism, with its avowed aim of world conquest through world revolution.

It is high time that we should recognize, in the case of Poland, the generally accepted proposition that the world is interdependent. America will not be safe while Poland is not free. The liberation of Poland, of the other iron-curtain lands, of the oppressed peoples in the Soviet Union itself will make possible the realization of the fine ideal enunciated by Senator VANDENBERG when he called for an honorable peace in a free world of free men.

Our Foreign Policy—Europe Only?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on January 17 I spoke of the State Department's policy these last few years of concentrating our efforts on defeating Russia in Europe in a gigantic gamble that, if we succeed there, the problems presented by Communist aggression in other parts of the world will become readily soluble.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles by Edgar Ansel Mowrer further discussing the terrible risks involved in such a policy even if maintained firmly. And who can have the slightest assurance that the administration would not reverse the policy over-night in an equally shaky gamble on getting peace in our time by a deal with the Soviets—very possibly, judging from past experience, at the expense of some of our friends or allies?

QUICK-TRICK FOREIGN POLICY RUNS GAMBLER'S RISK OF TOTAL UNITED STATES FAILURE, SOVIET TRIUMPH

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If President Truman's policy of bringing the Soviet Union to terms in 2 to 3 years succeeds, he and Secretary of State George Marshall will go down in our history as very great men. Their plan to apply steady pressure on Russia along a narrow front, their stubborn concentration on this area to the neglect of all other issues, will be reckoned masterly statesmanship. But if the policy should be unsuccessful—if 2 or 3 or 4 years from now the Communist bloc is as strong and aggressive as ever—then we Americans can note sadly that President Truman's lost gamble was more disastrous than the one F. D. R. lost during World War II when he decided to trust Russia.

EFFECT ON GERMANY

Consider the consequences: first, in Germany. We are babying the Germans to keep them on our side, at least temporarily. Their civil rights have been partly restored. German labor is allowed to strike. German newspapers are relatively free. Denazification has been turned over to Germans—which means that it has become a joke. The same industrial and bank magnates who supported and financed Hitler are out of the dog house and are being restored to managerial posts.

Instead of being kept divided, western Germany is being put under a unitary administration. The level of industry is being raised—and will be raised higher as the pressure against Russia increases. In short, western Germany is being helped to regain the same economic supremacy that Hitler used to enslave Europe. Such a powerful Germany will be in a position to resume a position of balance between the east and the west whenever the occupying forces pull out. It will again become a danger for the world's peace.

Or take the Berlin airlift. This miracle of Anglo-American daring and technique can be maintained for a considerable time. Perhaps two years, maybe even three, provided the tonnage transported can be increased to take care of the Berlin industries. But if at the end of three years nothing has been accomplished, the American people will decide to quit wasting money and pull out. The collapse will be worse than if there had been no airlift to begin with.

EFFECT ON GREECE AND TURKEY

Or consider American economic and military aid to Greece and Turkey. Despite this aid, the Greek Government seems about as far as ever from suppressing the Communist rebellion. The Greek regular army has reached a point where the men who resisted Mussolini with such passionate heroism no longer fight with any zest. If our policy of applied pressure should fail, and American aid to Greece be stopped in a couple of years with no improvement in the Greek situation, the position of the Greek Government would be hopeless.

In Turkey too, despite American aid, there is already a grave question of how long that relatively poor nation can afford to maintain so many able-bodied men under arms.

EFFECT ON ERP

The European recovery scheme is a major example of the dangers of concentrating everything on an uncertain short-term objective. By 1952—if the major foreign policy succeeds—the Soviet Union will have made a settlement with the United States on the basis of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements. All of Europe will again be able to act, if it desires, as a unit.

In that case, American failure to achieve the unification of western Europe will not be tragic. But if there is no peace with Russia and if at the end of 1952 the nations of western Europe still constitute so many separate political and economic units, each with its customs lines and overlapping dwarf industries and national plans, then the entire recovery scheme, the nearly twenty billion American dollars will have bought nothing but a little time. A real solution will be as far off as ever.

EFFECT IN THE FAR EAST

In the Far East, the future can be catastrophic. Secretary Marshall has always viewed the communization of China with equanimity. Not so Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer and Chennault, whose combined wisdom may be as great as that of General Marshall. General MacArthur has informed the Pentagon that if China goes, he will need no less than 240,000 more Americans to keep Japan from following suit, and to protect it against Russia.

If China goes, Indochina, already half communized, is a push-over. Burma is wormy with Communists. Communist uprisings were recently suppressed by the British in Maylaya and by the Javanese in central Java. In India itself, communism tints the fine fertile soil of hopeless overpopulation.

If failure of the American policy should leave Russia in control of all Asia, the plight of the United States would be desperate.

EFFECT ON UN

Finally, what of the United Nations? The present quick-trick American policy treats the UN as a side issue, if not as an actual obstacle to the main purpose of pressuring Russia into coming to terms. If the short-term policy fails, the UN will be all that remains of the hope of peace. By that time it may be too discredited to bear the burden the peace-loving nations would wish to put upon it.

In short, in putting all our money on one card—quick victory—the American leaders are gambling with our very existence.

ACHESON COULD REMOVE SOME OF QUICK-TRICK POLICY RISKS BY PUSHING COLLECTIVE ACTION

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

In the world of power politics, no country can afford to bet all its money on one trick, one hand, one game, or one rubber. There must always be something left for another deal.

President Truman's present foreign policy of reaching real peace with Russia within a relatively short time is one that will attract Americans. But I submit that the risks are excessive and unnecessary. The United States could carry out the same policy without danger if it would stiffen its attitude on only one point, and grant aid exclusively on American terms.

The new Secretary of State will have an unequaled opportunity to take the bugs out of the present foreign policy. In contrast to Secretary Marshall and Under Secretary Lovett, Secretary Acheson is known as a champion of international cooperation. Originally one of the Roosevelt group which sought the friendship of the Soviet Union, Mr. Acheson has become greatly disillusioned. But he is still likely to favor a collective rather than a nationalistic American approach to stopping Russia, and he is no fanatic for preserving the fetish of national sovereignty.

So far, the administration has followed the venerable theory of full sovereign rights. This has commended our policy to the fuddy-duddies who dominate the American Senate, and, of course, to the foreign countries that have been receiving aid on their terms rather than on ours. It has prevented us from bringing about a world that will not fall supinely into the arms of Russia should the present quick-trick solution fail.

RESPECT FOR TRADITION OF SOVEREIGNTY COULD CAUSE FAILURE

Writers like Hanson Baldwin have been insisting that we quit fooling and extend aid solely on our own terms.

Obviously, as Professor Quincy Wright wrote in 1947, a system of shifting sovereign nations is "as obsolete as feudal baronies." Yet, the United States of America, in its policy of saving human freedom, has stuck resolutely to it.

Examples are many. Because of consideration for the sovereignty of western Europe we have given these countries billions without requiring them to unite and thereby become permanently solvent.

We return rights to beaten Germany long before we are sure that the Germans will exercise them properly.

We respect the sovereignty of Greece to the point where we permit the Greeks to maintain a political regime and economic practices which prevent permanent results from our aid.

In the Middle East, we back the British in buttering up anachronistic Arab regimes instead of squeezing the Arabs into accepting the highly developed Israeli as teachers.

We properly scold the Dutch for cracking down by arms on the unruly infant republic of Indonesia. But we do not compel both the Dutch and the Indonesians to follow a peaceful pattern. We disapprove the apparently futile French efforts to keep possession of Indo-China by force. We do not attempt to make French and Indo-Chinese understand that this is a world where the use of national violence must be prohibited.

As for China, our policy there, beginning with F. D. R.'s unhappy abandonment of the National Government, has been a monumental flop. We neither stopped the Chinese Communists ourselves—as the Russians stopped our non-Communist friends in Poland—nor did we insist on a Chinese regime that could command the allegiance of popular masses. Nor did we give the shop-worn regime of Chiang Kai-shek the military means to overcome the Chinese cohorts of Moscow.

Therefore, if we fail to stop the Soviet Union within the next few years, we may find ourselves in a world where Soviet communism is no longer stoppable by anything but a death struggle wherein American and human freedoms will perish. In short, out of a preference for a quick-trick policy respectful of national sovereignty, we are risking our own existence.

WE CAN WORK OUT OUR POLICY WITHIN UN

The solution is to begin using our strength and influence not only to confound the Soviet Union but also to build a viable twentieth century world wherein Soviet communism will look like the reactionary tyranny that it is.

Admittedly, in any attempt to impose a better pattern upon the world, the United States would become a target for charges of imperialism. There is, however, no reason why the United States should act so much on its own. We ought long since have sought like-minded partners in planning the new world. Plenty are available. Nothing, for instance, prevents us from making the coming North Atlantic combine an open regional agreement within the United Nations, instead of an old-fashioned military alliance.

Once it is recognized that Germany, the Middle East, southeastern Asia, and south China are at the same time vital to us and too weak to maintain independence without outside help, that help ought logically be given not by the United States alone, but collectively. The free nations of the world should unite to save what is left of world freedom. In western Europe they should unite to save themselves.

Here, in accepting for the world the same idea of collective intervention that we recently accepted for the Western Hemisphere, lies the true supplement both of the Truman doctrine and the Truman policy of a quick success over Russia. A supplement that a long-time internationalist such as Dean Acheson, though not the architect of the policy, may seize upon and use for the good of America and the world.

Not the South's Fight Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, there is and has been much said about the South and about other sections of our great Nation. It has long been the opinion of the thinking people of this country that what affects one part of our Nation affects the entire Nation. No issue wherein the rights of the people are involved can be applicable to one section.

Much has been said about the States' rights. Many interpretations have been placed on it. A very fine editorial was carried in the El Dorado Daily News, of my home town, El Dorado, Ark., on December 30, 1948, written by the publisher, Mr. Clyde E. Palmer. He has designated an appropriate title for this editorial "Not the South's Fight Alone."

In order that the Members may have the benefit of the views expressed in this editorial, I include it with my remarks:

NOT THE SOUTH'S FIGHT ALONE

The term States' rights means far more than the South's attitude toward the race question and opposition to the FEPC. States' rights is a fundamental in the American conception of government.

From the very beginning of the American Republic there was a jealous attitude on the part of the States for maintenance of their indisputable rights as distinguished from Federal Government control or any political authority that did not derive its power from the States themselves.

There is no reason why States of the Northeast, East, North, and West—in fact, each and every State in the Union—should not be as jealous of their commonwealth rights as the States of the South. The same fundamental principle is involved, peculiar to each and every one of them. And that fundamental is the right of the State to control its own affairs.

The trend toward centralization of Government in Washington has been gaining rapidly during the past two decades. The New Deal did very much to speed this trend. Santa Claus almost reduced the States to serfs or vassals of the Federal Government. And this tendency, while not as pronounced now as in New Deal days, still is of such character as to threaten the very existence of the States as political units in the American Union.

Enactment of a Federal FEPC law would be just as inimical to the State of Colorado, for example, as it would to the States of Arkansas and Texas. Federal control of education would be just as harmful to the State of Michigan as to the State of Mississippi. And an antilynching act enacted by the Federal Government would be just as repugnant to the State of New York or New Hampshire as to the State of South Carolina.

This is so because the very fundamental principle of the right of States to regulate and control their own internal affairs is involved, no matter what portion of the United States may be affected. State control of tideland oil is just as important to an inland State—say Kansas—as to Louisiana, because the States' rights principle is involved.

Concerted action by all the States should be taken to halt centralization of government in Washington and for repeal of such existing laws as encroach upon the sovereignty of the various States. The South alone should not have to bear the burden of this fight. Other sections and States are also menaced. And it is high time for the States to make known in unmistakable language their opposition and their demands that further centralization of power in Washington cease and that the States be permitted to exercise their fundamental rights without interference or coercion on the part of the Federal Government.

The People Themselves Must Save Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the men's club of the United Presbyterian Church in Whitinsville, Mass., December 15:

Most Americans are underestimating the influence of modern doctrinnaires whose radical teachings have widely and deeply impregnated the social thinking of this generation. So subtle and insidious are these influences that many loyal Americans have been unconsciously respective to and moved by very radical ideas concerning religious, social, economic, and political fundamentals.

Attribute it to the materialistic philosophy of the age, if you will; attribute it to the advance of applied science, the super-mechanization of modern life, or to the various programs of organized radicalism which are coloring and shaping American thought, the fact remains that many important and influential groups in the Nation are losing sight of the very elementary principles upon which representative government and economic and political freedom are based.

On the strictly political side, the activities of radical organizations have come out into the open. There are underground movements, of course, and various strategies are employed, but the demand for drastic social change in the shape of the overthrow of existing institutions and the establishment of the regimented police state is a definite reality of the current American political scene.

The real question facing us is whether we desire our democracy, our free-enterprise system, and our personal liberty enough to make real efforts and real sacrifices to preserve and protect them. We can lose these priceless blessings and everything that goes with them through apathy, inaction, and default just as easily as by direct frontal attack. Once we lose them, it will be too late to recapture them. That is an axiom of history.

First of all, we should recognize the fact that our prized institutions are being challenged on a world-wide and Nation-wide basis and that the challenge is real, distinct, tangible, and imminent. It is only through the reawakening of the great moral, spiritual forces within the minds and hearts of our people which were responsible for the upbuilding of America and with it the greatest, most productive, most bountiful productive system ever known that we will be able successfully to defend our way of life against the ravages of communism and socialism. If we are willing to learn from the plain lessons of history and the demonstrated facts of human experience throughout the ages, we will come to a true realization of the imminent dangers which so gravely threaten today the basic values, ideals, and institutions which make America the great Nation it is.

To keep our governmental system adjusted to the demands of human progress, responsive to the needs of our people in this fast-moving, rapidly changing world, to preserve that balance at home and abroad which will insure the retention of freedom, opportunity, social justice, and true democracy, is the task which will critically test the intrinsic powers of restraint, discipline, intelligence, and courage of every true citizen. If we do not want to follow the example of European nations and thus sink back, as they have, into the quicksands of collectivism, retrogression, and darkness, we must be prepared now not only to guard but to nourish and strengthen democratic ideology, democratic methods, democratic enterprise, and democratic government. If we fail to respond as a loyal and unified people to the definite needs of the present, to the cause of a soundly progressive and dynamic democracy, our future course will follow the same pattern which has brought so many great contemporary nations to deterioration and ruin.

The new Congress can do much to guide the destinies of America safely, sanely, and wisely. But it will need the support, the encouragement, and the sustaining strength of the entire American people aroused to current dangers and determined to protect their heritage, if we are to escape the same fate that has overtaken so many others in this disordered and power-crazed world.

Republicans, Attention—Are We the Party of Opposition?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Felix Morley, in Human Events of January 5, 1949, challenges the Republican Party and clearly analyzes the position that our party is in. He makes a strong plea that the Republican Party be the real party of opposition under our two-party system. Under leave to extend my remarks I am including this article by Mr. Morley:

POSITION AND OPPOSITION

(By Felix Morley)

From the viewpoint of its inescapable responsibilities, the Republican representation in the Eighty-first Congress got off to an inauspicious start. The split over the chairmanship of its Senate Policy Committee emphasizes the persistence of serious moral weakness in the GOP.

If there is one lesson which the Republican leadership should have learned by this time, it is that the duty of the opposition is to oppose. The position of the opposition must be opposite to the position of the party in power. It may seem childish to reduce political philosophy to such elementary terms. But we must face the fact that never before in American history has political thought sunk to a level as low as that which is accepted today.

In 1936, Governor Landon led a gallant but inexpert fight. In 1948, Governor Dewey was technically expert, as shown by the way he captured the nomination. But gallantry was lacking. The character of his campaign showed everybody that the Republican Party as a whole has ceased to oppose. The bitter truth of that assertion can be demonstrated by a mere summary of the four great issues of the past 12 years. In none of them has the Republican Party fulfilled its function as a fighting opposition.

1. Should the United States abandon the principles of a Federal republic to become a strongly centralized socialist state?

2. Did the United States permanently abandon the traditional principle of neutrality when it allied itself with one European dictatorship against another?

3. Should the United States, having made such an alliance, abide by its choice, or should it now seek to restore its former enemies as potential allies for another war, against its former ally?

4. If the choice is hostile to Soviet Russia, should the administration be permitted to play into Communist hands by destroying the free enterprise system, regarded by the Communists themselves as the only effective barrier to their ultimate world-wide victory?

In summary form, those are the four great issues of our day. Every public controversy of the past 12 years falls under one or other of those headings. Every bill on which Congress has voted, every proposition on which editorials have been written, can be card-indexed that simply, though cross-references will sometimes be desirable.

II

Of course there is, or has been, room for debate on all these issues. They would not be issues if that were not the case.

But there is no raison d'etre for a political party which is continuously satisfied with taking an equivocal position on fundamental issues. A party exists for the sole purpose of giving organization and voice to the political thought of a section of the people. When a political party ceases to be outspoken, when time and again it fails to voice any clear-cut principle but merely sings the tune of another party in falsetto, then, it has outlived its usefulness.

Even without the repeated endorsement of a majority of the voters it would be incontestable that the Democratic Party stands for certain definite principles of government. Its principles are not the less real because, since the New Deal, they are completely at variance with those for which the Democratic Party used to stand.

Although it still avoids the label, the Democratic Party is now consistently socialistic in its political philosophy. The party leaders maintain that more and more powers traditionally reserved to the States, or to the people, should be assumed by the Central Government.

The Democratic Party endorses progressive extension of the Executive authority and seeks to impose a solution of practically every domestic problem from Washington. Its leadership believes in a centrally planned economy and regards the principle of States' rights with open aversion and contempt.

In foreign policy the Democratic Party has demonstrated that it believes in intervention, permanent military alliances, and, as a natural corollary, peacetime conscription. Under the Roosevelt-Hull leadership the concept of neutrality was completely scrapped in favor of the United Nations. "So Esau despised his birthright." And the value of the mess of pottage received in return is demonstrated by the way we are now forming a military alliance within the United Nations, directed against our great Russian partner in that enterprise.

When events of this character are transpiring; when the fundamental principles of the Republic are undermined in favor of a policy which is not merely inept but also, in the minds of many, un-American, it is the simple duty of the opposition party to confront the issues for what they are. Instead we have the sham and mockery of a "bipartisan foreign policy" which merely serves to conceal the dangers as the country drifts toward a third world war.

III

The explanation seems to be that people have been so bemused with words as to be no longer able to discern when a fundamental principle of this republic is jeopardized. The abuse of language has now been carried to the stage where the advocate of authoritarian government is called a liberal, while any opponent of militaristic imperialism is likely to be defined as an isolationist. Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. Certainly the confused jargon which today passes for political thinking represents a collective departure from sanity.

Thus we have the spectacle of a group of Republican Senators attempting to oust Senator TAFT as chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Upper House. None of these young Turks, as the dissidents call themselves, made any criticism of TAFT's ability, integrity, or leadership qualifications. They merely agreed that the senior Senator from Ohio is too conservative; that, in the words of Senator IVES: "The party is not going forward under BOB." It would have been more accurate to put the period before the last two words.

There is an unconscious irony in the term "Young Turks," by which these self-styled Republican liberals describe themselves. For the actual young Turks had just one objective when they revolted in that country 40 years ago. It was to secure for Turkey control over Balkan peoples who were determined not to remain under any kind of Turkish rule. And history shows few failures more complete than that of the young Turks during the decade when they were in power.

So the Republican young Turks are aptly named. They seek to secure for the GOP the support of voters who have no intention of following any type of Republican leadership. And in chasing a political will-o'-the-wisp they are willing, like their prototypes in Turkey 40 years ago, to sacrifice their country for an opportunism which does not even have the merit of being intelligent.

IV

The function of an opposition party is to oppose. And if the Republican Party cannot find ground for intelligent opposition, in the muddled domestic and foreign policies of the present administration, then it had better make way for a real opposition, possessing at least the moral fortitude to take a stand on principle.

A little more of this young Turk business—of trying to outdeal the New Deal and of being more socialistic than the Socialists—and merciful extinction will bring an end to all Republican anxieties.

The country already has, in Henry Wallace, a political leader who has demonstrated willingness to oppose the Truman administration from the left. Mr. Wallace, like Senator IVES, calls himself a liberal and, thanks to the Communists, Mr. Wallace has the nucleus of a permanent, Nation-wide organization. If the Progressive Party continues it will certainly in time be taken over by the Communists who directed its 1948 campaign. But that is in any case the fate of a party more liberal than the Socialists. There is nothing to the left of the Socialists except Communism.

It is not enough to defeat incipient Republican movements designed to revitalize the party by making it more subservient than are the Democrats to well-organized pressure groups. Those Republicans who refuse to regard their party as anti-Socialist, who are unwilling to fight against the ceaseless subjection of the people to centralized dictation, should be expelled. HUGH SCOTT, the courageous party chairman, has again this week properly intimated as much. As Mr. SCOTT has good reason to realize, the people of the United States are no longer patient with the maneuvering of professional politicians for personal advantage. Too much is at stake. Americans who wish to retain the fundamental principles of the Republic are demanding a party which will fight for their ideals, instead of sabotaging them.

Thanks largely to Governor Thurmond, there is the nucleus of a strong States' Rights Party in the South. Its claim to Nation-wide consideration is not extinguished by the cheap jibe that racial prejudice is its only stock-in-trade. Thanks largely to Senator TAFT, there is also a nucleus of northern republicanism which takes a stand on principle. Its claim to consideration is not extinguished by Communist-inspired denunciations of the Taft-Hartley Act, parroted by people who have never even read the provisions of this law.

The crying need of the country now is for an opposition party which will really oppose. Republicans unwilling to do so should be encouraged to join with Mr. Truman or Mr. Wallace, depending on the degree of their liberalism. There are more than enough traditional Democrats, in Congress and out, to take the place of the faint-hearted who, for 12 years now, have chloroformed the Republican Party and made it a mere political encumbrance.

The Need for a Single Supply Catalog for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, to every soldier who served in the last war, to every taxpayer, the need for a single supply catalog for the use of the armed forces is clear. The enormous waste of critical materials, the waste of public funds, and the constant struggle to supply the men at the front with needed weapons, tools, clothing, and supplies were apparent to everyone.

H. R. 321 entitled "The National Defense Catalog Act" is the attempt by Congress to aid the armed services in this respect.

It is true that war is in itself a wasteful business; but great savings could have been achieved if there had been a general understanding of the effect of cataloging or supply operations. It has been estimated that many billions of dollars could have been saved if there had been a single supply catalog in use by the armed services at the time of Pearl Harbor. Perhaps the additional supplies that could have been made available by proper management could have shortened the war by speeding up the campaign timetables.

One aspect of the problem of supply cataloging is described in an article that appeared in the October 18, 1948, issue of Time magazine entitled "The Turn of the Screw." This article is so important that it is reproduced.

THE TURN OF THE SCREW

The United States and Britain are going to standardize screw threads. No great oratory attends this homely step, no military pageantry, yet it may be as important as half a dozen formal treaties.

The Americans will sacrifice their cherished Sellers screw thread profile in favor of a slightly modified British Whitworth profile, and the British will give up their 55° angle of thread in favor of the United States 60° angle. The agreement will eventually save millions of dollars, make cooperation in war and peace easier.

UNIVERSAL AND PERMANENT

Eli Whitney, an eighteenth century Massachusetts Yankee, went broke after his cotton-gin invention was widely pirated, and turned to making muskets. He got the idea of interchangeable parts. Before Whitney, each part of each factory product was different from its fellow on another product, even from the same shop. But every Whitney trigger fitted every Whitney gun. This principle of interchangeable parts became the basis of modern industry.

Obviously, it required exact and uniform standards of measurement. Lack of standard measurements messed up the trade between the American Colonies; though the United States Constitution directed Congress to fix the standards of weights and measures, Congress did nothing about it for 80 years. Congressmen were passionately interested in the subject, but they could not agree. Repeatedly Washington begged Congress to pass a standardization law; in 1795 he suggested that the United States adopt the new French

metric system. Jefferson thought he had a better idea; he wanted a system based on the length of a uniform cylindrical pendulum which, at 45° North latitude, would move at the rate of one beat a second. Congress did not go for that, either.

John Quincy Adams, as Secretary of State, in 1821 begged Congress to let him consult with foreign nations for the future and ultimate establishment of universal and permanent uniformity in measurements. No dice.

A decade later young Sam Colt ran away from home and, aboard a ship bound for India, whittled the wooden model of a pistol that was to become the great Colt revolver. Sam did not (by 200 years) invent the revolver, but when he got into production he extended Whitney's interchangeable-part system in the direction of the present-day assembly line.

In 1866 Congress finally got around to its duty on measurements: it backed into the subject by defining a meter in terms of inches, although it had never (and has not yet) defined an inch. Its definition of the meter was inaccurate in terms of the British inch, so when Thomas Corwin Mendenhall, head of the Office of Weights and Measures, defined in 1893 an inch as +.02540005 parts of a meter, the United States inch and the British inch came to differ by .000004. (This later got bargained out in an informal compromise.)

DO YOU REALIZE?

Meanwhile, more and more things (not including international relations) came to be held together by screws, bolts, and nuts. Their shape and kind were in chaos. In 1861 the Franklin Institute got together a group of engineers who adopted the design of William Sellers as the standard United States screw thread. Without it, the unified United States railway system could hardly have been built.

Britain standardized on the Whitworth thread. Sellers' thread is flat at the top, turns in toward the core of the bolt at a sharp angle, and goes through a flat valley at the bottom. Perhaps the less precipitous and more urbane British character accounts for the fact that the Whitworth thread is rounded, top and bottom. Anyhow, the two don't fit.

In World War I this was a source of great inconvenience. In World War II it was nearly a calamity. By 1943, 2,000,000 tons of United States steel was going into nuts, bolts, screws, and rivets. A B–29 has 225,000 bolts in addition to 250,000 rivets. If a nut fell off, it had to be replaced by one from the United States. All Birmingham and Sheffield could not make its twin.

William L. Batt, when he was in charge of international supply for the War Production Board, cried out: "Do you realize that in many cases British and American gun parts are not interchangeable even though the completed products are of identical design? Can you picture the vast stocks of duplicating parts we have been forced to maintain in the far-flung war theaters because our screws were different?"

Representatives of United States, British, and Canadian industry, meeting off and on since 1918, have finally hammered out a screw thread agreement in principle and expect to sign it next month.

Much is left to do before John Quincy Adams' dream of uniformity in measurements is achieved. The United States is still using the Queen Anne gallon, which the British abandoned long ago. Tons are different and so are bushels, and the Japanese picul (for measuring grain) means one thing in a seaport and something else inland. In these matters, as in other aspects of social integration, the world moves slowly.

Nevertheless, as Galileo did or did not mutter, it moves.

Another Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux City Journal of Sioux City, Iowa, on January 17, 1949:

ANOTHER VALLEY AUTHORITY

As was expected, the Missouri Valley Authority threat again is in the foreground or will be when Senator MURRAY, of Montana, is ready to offer his proposal which the people of the States involved do not want. And what makes it worse is that President Truman has voiced his support of the movement to abandon the present plans for the Missouri basin which have been approved by numerous organizations in cities and towns along the stream and which if carried out would provide flood control, power development, and irrigation.

Senator MURRAY and two other Democratic Senators, GUY GILLETTE, of Iowa, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, visited Mr. Truman at the White House and talked the thing over with him. The Senators said they were redrafting the old Missouri Valley Authority bill so as to leave the construction of dams and other facilities under the Army engineers and other existing Federal agencies rather than give it to a new authority. When the Murray bill is rewritten and presented a new name will be given the directing agency. It will be called the Missouri Valley Administration.

What was said about the rose under any other name smelling as sweet may be applied to this and it won't make much difference what the three Senators decide to call the proposed set-up, it still will be, in the eyes of the people in the valley, an authority and they assuredly will not like it. They never have liked the Murray idea of creating a Missouri Valley Authority and they repeatedly have said as much. And they will fight the new proposal and defeat it if they can, insisting that the Pick-Sloan plan is what they have wanted from the first and want now.

The Murray-Gillette-Humphrey proposal will be an effort to turn the Missouri Valley water-power projects over to the Federal Government under what is called a unified development. And if the proposal became law with an administration created, the agency would be an authority no less and the administrative work would be the same, no doubt. Senator MURRAY knows his original Missouri Valley Authority bill was unpopular with the people, who promptly resisted it. He cannot win their approval now by changing the word "Authority" to "Administration." The Montana Senator virtually admits this when he says "We want to get away from the use of the word "Authority" because of the kind of odium which has been attached to that name in connection with this proposed development." He and his fellow Democratic Senators may find that diction alone will not change the attitude of the people in the Missouri Basin.

The Pick-Sloan plan has stood approved for years by the people of the Missouri Valley. It is an intelligent and practical method of making use of the river for power development and irrigation. It is thorough in what it provides, dams for flood control, power development, and reclamation of arid and semiarid regions, and all that is needed to make it work is sufficient money appropriated by Congress to complete the projects under way.

Any intelligent person can see what would happen if a Missouri Valley Administration were set up. The personnel of that Administration simply would take over the Missouri River and in time would exert a dictatorial influence in handling the projects. Delay with new surveys and studies ordered would be suffered and Missouri River development and use would be postponed. Let the people of the Missouri Valley join in protesting against this new proposal and in demanding that the Pick-Sloan plan be carried forward.

Plenty of Money Should Be Available for Farm Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot use its credit in a better way than permitting farmers to buy their own homes. In this way the Government gets its money back with interest and we have a home-owner citizen instead of a tenant citizen. The Government is not running any risk. It is true that if Congress were to appropriate a huge amount for this purpose, it is possible that undue inflation would occur in land values. However, if Congress makes possible a large amount subject to the discretion of the President, then in the event of inflation in land prices, the President could withhold the amount for that purpose or it could even be withheld from a section where land values were unduly high. Too much cannot be said for this fine program. It is one of the best that Congress has ever adopted.

The following editorial appears in the February issue of the Progressive Farmer magazine concerning this program:

LET'S HAVE MORE MONEY FOR TENANT LOANS

During the current year, the office of the Farmers Home Administration serving Texas has loaned about $1,000,000 to tenants for the purchase of farms. During this period, 90 Texas farms have been purchased with FHA funds. The year is only about one-half gone. But FHA is out of loan money. No more loans will be made until another year starts on July 1, unless the new Congress meeting in January makes an emergency appropriation.

For the year, Congress put up only $15,000,000 for tenant purchase loans throughout the United States. The program is sound. The farms are being paid out far ahead of schedule. It is one of the few social programs on which the Government is getting its money back. There are still thousands of hard-working young farmers that need Government help to get farms of their own. It's a good investment for the Government, because it's an investment in better farming and more enjoyable farm life. Once Congress put as much as $50,000,000 a year into the program. It should come back to this amount. An appropriation of $15,000,000 seems just "piddling around" with a great national problem.

Second Annual Message by Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in these days of turmoil, frustration, and strife, we who have been designated to guide our great Nation and the world to the ways of a just and lasting peace need all of the guidance we can obtain. A few days ago—last Tuesday, to be exact—a great Governor of the State of New Jersey brought to his legislature an annual message from which we can profit much. It treats with many issues with which we shall be confronted at the national level in an extremely intelligent and masterly manner. To us it may be materially helpful in developing a better Federal-State relationship. Because this is so, I ask unanimous consent that it be recorded in the Appendix of the RECORD as a guide in our approach to some of the very important issues which will confront the Eighty-first Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent to include leading editorials praising the Governor's forthright position.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND ANNUAL MESSAGE OF ALFRED E. DRISCOLL, GOVERNOR OF NEW JERSEY, TO THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE OF NEW JERSEY, JANUARY 11, 1949

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the senate and general assembly, in my inaugural message to the legislature on January 21, 1947, you will find the statement that the watchword for the next 3 years would be work. I expressed the hope that our work together would be intelligent and productive.

Since that time we have moved forward on so many fronts that it is proper that we pause at the beginning of a new legislative year to survey the ground we have covered and the pathway that lies ahead.

Our concern has been the business of government—the strengthening of our democratic institutions in an age when our Republic is under strong attack from within as well as from without its borders.

We have sought together to restore confidence in government as the guardian of our rights and the servant of our citizens. In our recognition that most of our modern problems are social and economic rather than political, all of the members of the legislature and the executive have, to a degree unequaled in the history of this State, put aside petty partisan considerations in favor of the general public welfare.

We have worked shoulder to shoulder in our successful efforts to protect our civil liberties. We have sought to secure the inherent dignity of mankind by the elimination of discrimination because of race, creed, color, or sex. * * *

Your action and the fine work of the Constitutional Convention have set in motion forces that have extended far beyond the borders of this State. We have acted while others have talked and in our action we have brought new hope to countless numbers of our fellow citizens who live in an atmosphere created by a fertile economy and yet are denied the opportunities of full citizenship and suffer the shame of cruel discrimination.

Together we have helped to make our judicial structure a shining example that other States are now eager to follow. By your action we have fortified the heart of our Republic, placing a sure, swift, and friendly justice within the reach of all who need its protection. The legislative processes have been strengthened. The first phase of State administrative reorganization has been practically completed, and a solid structure has been established for the effective management of the executive branch of our Government.

Our social-security program has been broadened and strengthened, and some 1,600,000 of our citizens are now insured against crippling loss of wages due to sickness or accident. Our workmen's compensation law has also been liberalized.

In contrast to those States that chose to ban the closed shop and thereby restricted collective bargaining in private enterprise, New Jersey sought labor-management understanding through the medium of the conference table and the creation of the institute of management and labor relations established in 1947 at the State university. The legislation creating this institute and its subsequent work have been favorably cited by resolutions of national labor organizations, as well as by management, as a model to be followed by other States.

Our willingness to pioneer in legislation designed to protect the security of our citizens has been matched by an unwillingness to wait for a Federal hand-out before undertaking the State's obligation to support our school districts and municipalities in their efforts to provide an adequate education for our children and decent homes for our citizens.

We have recognized that, if we are to obtain and keep good teachers, we must be prepared to pay reasonable salaries. For two successive years the legislature has progressively increased the minimum salary for our teachers. At the same time, the State has substantially increased State aid to the school districts for education. There is budgeted for this purpose for the current fiscal year, $32,337,057.03, of which $6,966,290.35 is allocated to the teachers' pension and annuity fund. This represents an increase of over 74 percent in State aid for schools budgeted during the past 2 years. We have also made a beginning on a capital improvement program for our State teachers' colleges and university.

Few States surpass New Jersey in the percentage of citizens owning their own homes. What is more important, New Jersey presently leads the country in the production of rental housing units. Nonetheless, mindful of the need for truly low-cost rental housing for veterans, your State government, in a friendly partnership with our municipalities, is now completing a $50,000,000 veterans' housing program. In proportion to the number of veterans, this program is the largest among all the States. It is interesting to note that the American Legion, in its convention at Miami, urged its housing committee to review the various State housing plans and endorsed in principle the New Jersey plan, which appears to have much merit and would be adaptable on a national scale.

Vast programs for the improvement of the commerce of the State; the development of an adequate State highway system; better county and municipal highways supported by increased State aid; improved rail and air transportation facilities in north and south Jersey, as outlined in my message a year ago, have been undertaken. * * *

Many of our activities have been directed toward improved public health and recreation. Citizen groups, as well as those professionally engaged in public-health work, have commended the augmented services being rendered by the reorganized department of health. Our public recreational areas are being continuously enlarged and protected. New techniques of protecting our beaches against erosion have been developed during the past 2 years. Sportsmen, farmers, and commercial fishermen have been provided new opportunities for the conservation, increase, and control of fish and game for public recreation and food supply.

We have attacked the problem of law enforcement in many ways—the consolidation of all major State law enforcement agencies in a new department of law and public safety, the development of youth-guidance programs, crime-prevention activities, and traffic-safety conferences. Our law-enforcement agents, including local police, have been recognized and treated as members of an important profession.

* * * We have striven to bring the compensation of our loyal civil-service employees into line with the current economic situation. We will continue to do so.

In all of these endeavors we have sought to establish a relationship of trust and confidence between the Government and its citizens. Our new constitution, the most enduring and important of all of the achievements of the past 2 years, is itself the product of the relationship to which I refer. Notwithstanding these social and political achievements, much remains to be accomplished if we are to advance the hopes and aspirations of our society under the republican form of government guaranteed by our Federal and State Constitutions. We have had some hard fights and may have made some enemies. All of this is to be expected, for every program designed to take government out of the easy ruts of complacency and neglect is bound to develop opposition.

During the current year we will devote ourselves to the consolidation of our gains, the perfection of our administrative organization, painstakingly testing the new activities of government that have been undertaken, and the new procedures that we have adopted. * * * Beyond this, however, there are certain pressing obligations that must be met.

The thought-provoking report of April 22, 1948, of the Governor's committee on civil liberties, under the chairmanship of Dr. Wilbour Eddy Saunders, stated: "The keystone of our American heritage is the importance of the individual person." I concur wholeheartedly in the conclusions reached by the committee in its report and strongly recommend that within the framework of the executive branch of our Government, presently consisting of 14 principal departments, provision be made by legislation for the accomplishment of the objectives of the civil liberties committee. I am aware of the fact that last year, while there was general agreement on objectives, there was limited agreement as to method. I am confident that where there is agreement with respect to objectives, differences with respect to method can be reconciled.

* * * * *

Adequate housing for our citizens within a reasonable price and rental range must be speedily provided. We should courageously and at once attack one of the most serious threats to the welfare of our State, namely, the slum areas which exist in every major community in New Jersey, as well as throughout the Nation. The recommendations made in my previous messages are even more pertinent today than they were when made. I again urge that you consider and adopt those recommendations. With the lapse of time since the conclusion of the

war and with rising costs and accompanying disillusionment, conditions in those blight areas have grown worse, not better. Our citizens do not want explanations. They want adequate homes. We want to rehabilitate our blighted urban areas before it is too late. Those areas place heavy moral and financial burdens upon our society which are unnecessary.

We have made little progress in our efforts to secure the adoption by municipalities of modern building, plumbing, and safety codes. The lack of these codes and the present conflict between codes of neighboring communities has retarded the construction of homes and increased costs. The temporary committee on housing will provide a full review of the factors affecting progress in both public and private housing as a basis for new legislation.

I recommend: (1) The adoption of modern building and safety codes which will incorporate the recommendations of the housing committee; (2) the aggressive enforcement of all laws and ordinances presently applicable to substandard housing; and (3) the broadening of the State housing authority and the use by this authority, subject to appropriate restrictions, of the State's credit for a substantially self-liquidating low-rental-housing and slum-clearance program of up to $100,000,000. Our task is to stimulate the construction of low-cost rental homes by private enterprise where possible, and to the extent necessary in blighted areas to provide State and municipal encouragement and, as need be in these areas, to exercise the full authority of the State and local governments to accomplish our objectives.

My position with respect to rent control, as outlined in two previous messages to the legislature, remains unchanged. I believe, however, that before effective State action can be taken, national policies should be decided. If the Federal Government decides to withdraw from this activity, New Jersey will be prepared to protect its citizens.

When the economic outlook is rosy, when business is booming and profits and wages and employment are at record highs, we are not inclined to be very much concerned with economic security. The conditions of the day create an atmosphere of risk taking, of assurance of continued prosperity. It is in times like these, however, that we are free to take inventory of our provisions for economic security to meet our current needs and to plan for the future.

The adoption of the sickness-benefit program, a brand new protection that began January 1, was accompanied by a reduction in the pay-roll tax for unemployment compensation. This tax reduction made available approximately $26,000,000 annually to be channeled into private enterprise and the development of new job opportunities. Two additional areas of insecurity remain to be covered in our State programs. One is the full coverage of occupational diseases under our workmen's compensation act. An increasingly complicated industrial process furnishes us with persuasive reasons why workmen's-compensation coverage should be extended to include all occupational diseases occurring in industry. I recommend adoption of the bill introduced last year providing for full coverage of occupational diseases. The other involves discrimination between employees of firms employing four or more and those employing less than four. This discrimination should be terminated. Workmen's compensation applies to these smaller firms as should the entire security program.

Current economic conditions of high wages and high prices require an increase in the present maximum benefit rate of $22 for unemployment compensation. If we are to provide employment security benefits, let us have them at a level which accomplishes their objectives.

The work of the institute of management and labor relations has been sufficiently noteworthy to warrant expanded State support. The two principal objectives of the institute are to promote harmony and cooperation between management and labor and to promote a greater understanding of industrial labor relations on the part of the general public. The attainment of these objectives will promote unity and the general welfare of our people.

The right to organize and bargain collectively, guaranteed in our new constitution, should be augmented by a State labor relations law applicable to intrastate employees. Our present minimum-wage law should be made more comprehensive.

* * * * *

We shall continue to support programs designed to provide adequate treatment for those who suffer with mental illness and to restore these persons as quickly as possible to a productive place in society. The need for research into the causes and prevention of long-term and chronic illness, and the treatment, as well as the development of new techniques for the care of the increasing number of our citizens so afflicted, is apparent. These problems will require our continuing attention. We may confidently expect that the private and public agencies of our State, which have been in the forefront of the struggle to develop new techniques made necessary by an ever increasingly complex society will provide constructive guidance in this field.

* * * * *

There is no more important obligation of government than to provide adequate training for the youth of our State. We all recognize the importance of securing and retaining the New Jersey public school system the best available teachers. These teachers cannot adequately perform their duties if they are harassed by economic burdens, nor can we expect our teachers to be wholly enthusiastic exponents of our economic way of life in the absence of reasonable salary schedules, permitting them to participate in the benefits of the private enterprise system.

Accordingly, I recommend again that minimum teachers' salaries be further increased.

Mindful of its own financial limitations and the untapped resources of our municipalities and of economies yet to be achieved, the State will continue its State-aid program.

* * * * *

We have provided new impetus for the development and use of our natural resources; for the prevention and control of cattle diseases; and for the improvement and development of our water suppy facilities. Our departments of agriculture and health have been provided with new and broadened opportunities for the maintenance of adequate food standards and services to our farmers. We must continue to support and strengthen these, as well as our other agricultural and conservation programs.

A commission appointed last year has been engaged in a constructive study of beach erosion. It has been working upon the development of a program designed to minimize the dangers of erosion, and to protect one of our most prized assets that annually attracts millions of citizens to our seashore communities from all parts of the country. The report of this commission should receive your careful study and should become a basis for action.

Domestic tranquillity has been the objective of Government in this country from the days of the founding fathers. Now that we have integrated law-enforcement agencies, with minor exceptions, within the new department of law and public safety, it is my hope that we may expand the activities of our State police school to provide adequate training for all men engaged in law-enforcement activities in this State. While providing in-service training for men and women presently engaged in law-enforcement activities, we will seek to establish a program that will provide training for all men and women who in the future may enter law-enforcement work. * * * It is proposed to mobilize the resources of the law school of our State university and to secure the cooperation of other educational institutions in support of this program.

* * * * *

A detailed discussion of fiscal problems will be contained in my budget message. We find ourselves in a national environment, marked by a threatened $4,000,000,000, or more, tax increase on the part of the Federal Government. A substantial portion of this increase will be collected from New Jersey citizens, as will reported increases in taxes in neighboring States—such as the income tax in New York which will be paid by citizens of this State to the extent of approximately $6,000,000. It is apparent that the New Jersey financial structure and State services are, to a considerable degree, subject to variable forces far beyond our power of control.

In addition to the requested increase in Federal taxes, it should be noted that there is a strong likelihood that Federal programs may place new pressures upon the States to spend additional sums of money on a matched-fund basis. Until these contemplated programs are fully developed, it is very difficult for the State to plan for its own future financial requirements for education, housing, highways, social security, and public health. This is to mention but a few fields where the Federal Government, backed by unlimited power to tax and to determine the value of the dollar, is seeking to expand its activities.

Our fiscal problems may be difficult, but they are not unusual. As a State, I dare say we have done well through prudent management and a careful husbanding of our tax resources. For example, according to reports of the United States Bureau of the Census, the average increase in total State tax collections for all States between 1945 and 1948 was 56 percent. The comparable increase in New Jersey was 20 percent.

The story of our State finances, as compared with other States, is to be found in the following distribution of per capita expenditures (1947):

Item	New Jersey	All States average
State operating expenses	$15.51	$23.86
Capital expenditures	5.72	6.82
State aid and shared taxes	18.45	18.75
Contributions to pension funds and unemployment compensation	20.07	7.72
Debt retirement	1.27	1.05
Interest payments	.61	.45

Comparative figures, however, offer little solace when it comes to meeting State obligations on a pay-as-you-go basis. Despite contrary influences elsewhere, we shall seek to keep our fiscal program within a reasonable limit. Admittedly, we are going through a transitionary period. It is especially appropriate at this time that we restudy our entire tax structure and assessment procedures. Our new constitution affords a solid foundation upon which this study may now be made. I have accordingly asked the commission on State tax policy to undertake a comprehensive survey of our entire tax system. Pending the receipt of its report, we shall confine our attention to the immediate needs of the next fiscal year.

The task ahead of us, while difficult, is clear. As we apply to it sound judgment, courage, and willingness to place the public

interest ahead of partisan consideration, we will continue together to build a better government and a fuller way of life. Being close to the major achievements of yesterday, we should feel compelled to match those achievements tomorrow.

Under divine guidance we should strive to continue an intelligent and productive work.

Neither to Right Nor Left

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Justice William O. Douglas, of the United States Supreme Court, delivered an address at the Tenth Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Portland, Oreg., on November 24, 1948, that I urge my colleagues to read.

Justice Douglas has made great contributions to liberal thinking in America. He seeks to preserve and strengthen the philosophy in government based on the concept of the dignity of man.

His address entitled "Neither to Right Nor Left" follows:

NEITHER TO RIGHT NOR LEFT

Today labor stands astride a world fraught with fear. It occupies a strategic position in the affairs of nations. By reason of its new strength, it is wooed as it has never been wooed before.

The Communists seek by infiltration to pervert it to their ends.

The totalitarians of the right would like to control labor's power so as to destroy it.

The Democrats of the world look to labor to keep the middle way open. They look to labor with confidence and with hope. They know that in the world today there is no stronger citadel of democracy than the halls of labor.

Labor's opportunity is unique. It is an opportunity to preserve the value of democracy in a seething, troubled world.

Labor has marched a long way down the corridors of history. In this country it had no sooner thrown off the chains of a chattel slavery than it seemed destined to be held in a new industrial serfdom. That fate was avoided by the devoted efforts of two generations. From the days of Bryan and La Follette the tide of liberalism ebbed and flowed, until at last under Franklin Roosevelt it gathered a mighty momentum and swept away the remaining threats of an industrial serfdom.

NEW STANDARDS OF JUSTICE

Collective bargaining was established and became the accepted practice and tradition. A host of laws designed to protect the worker were written on the books. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness became a part of the philosophy of factory management. Human rights—not property rights alone—became standards of industrial justice.

The Nation's gains from the evolution that accompanied these reforms have been enormous. Although labor was the most obvious beneficiary of most of them, the victories were not narrow, class achievements. There was no appreciation from one class for the benefit of another.

The gains in a true sense were classless gains. They resulted in an increase in the standard of living that has vitalized the entire economy. They invigorated the whole body politic like a nutritious food in the blood stream. They strengthened the industrial system by removing sources of weakness. They created in the factories of America, largely through the institution of collective bargaining, a wholesome and friendly atmosphere for workers. Thus the rights even of the humblest worker are recognized. The ideals of justice are carried into the furnace rooms and machine shops of the Nation.

The human welfare state is the great political invention of the twentieth century. Labor was its prime promoter. It was the first group to feel most keenly the economic insecurity of the new industrial age. It was the first to acquire a mass consciousness of the ravages of the modern factory system and of the ruthless character of depressions. And so it moved for protection on various fronts—from workmen's compensation to unemployment insurance. But while labor was the prime promoter of the new human welfare state, all groups in society—farmers, business, and the professions—were its beneficiaries.

NEW PROBLEMS ARISE

It has been with those issues that labor has been largely preoccupied. And all those problems have not been solved. But they cannot be the sole concern of labor in the days ahead. New times have brought new and even greater challenges—challenges that should make labor an active participant in international affairs.

Labor is peculiarly qualified to bridge a gap that has been growing between the United States and Europe. It is from the lips of American labor that Europe can most readily learn how democracy and freedom can be peacefully achieved in a framework of government. There is a reason for this.

A new Europe is being born. New leaders have come to power in the countries of western Europe. In almost every case their political strength is in the labor movement. The political party with a labor base may be the Labor Party, the Socialist Party, the Social Democratic Party, or a party of some other name. The fact is that there has come out of the Nazi crucible of death a vigorous, alert and politically-minded labor party in every western European country.

The records of the Nuremburg trials show how well Hitler understood who his enemies were. In Germany and in every country overrun by the Nazi armies, labor leaders were the first to be gathered and shipped off to the concentration camps. Some miraculously survived; others escaped capture. New and hardened labor leaders have appeared.

They know only too well what happened to them and to their companions. They know why it happened. They are icily determined that it will never happen again.

These men learned, the hard way, the importance of government. They saw how easily governmental institutions in the hands of their enemies became the mechanism for their own destruction. They learned that politics was not a game to be played only by professionals. They discovered that politics at times is literally a matter of life and death.

MEN OF CAUTION

And so today they are cautious men. They are bitter, suspicious of all those who may be undisclosed agents of predatory interests. They fear the threat so frequently voiced in Soviet propaganda that an American imperialism may be extending its power into Europe through cartels, banks, and other powerful instruments of industry and finance. And they are less than ready to take a man's protestations of virtue and disinterest at face value.

They wish instead to know what he has done, what he has fought for, and what he had believed in during his entire lifetime. When they hear an American spokesman interpret the American way of life as some form of unbridled, unregulated, dog-eat-dog capitalism they want none of him. And they are powerful enough in their own nations to have none of him.

Out of this arises the importance of the fact that American labor carries good credentials to western Europe. Doors tightly closed to all others may open at its knock. Words from American labor promise to find quick acceptance.

The conventional diplomat will fail miserably in these revolutionary days unless he understands the rise of the labor governments of the world and can evaluate the factors that have created and maintained them. Only those who have insight into these forces, who share in heart as well as in mind an understanding of the labor struggle throughout the world, are equipped to interpret correctly and faithfully what they see.

Yet knowledge and understanding of both the American and the European labor movements is the one essential tool of modern diplomacy that is unfortunately missing from the equipment of our conventional diplomats.

It is in this precise respect that American labor can render a unique service, whether it represents the government in particular missions, or sits as an observer of the European scene, or acts as an educator of the rank and file of the people.

LABOR CAN HELP

American labor can help America understand that Europe under the political management of Socialists is not a continent turning Communist but a people struggling for things that are precious to men everywhere.

These labor governments of Europe are not to be scorned or feared. They seek to preserve the values of western civilization by holding the middle ground. They commonly have economic theories which are not wholly acceptable to a great many of our people. Yet on the fundamentals—the rights of man, his liberty, his dignity, his security—they are truly democratic. The spiritual values which they espouse make them our brothers. We have the same ideals of justice. We need them and they need us, if totalitarianism is not to rule the world. These are the things that American labor can help the American people to understand.

American labor has, moreover, tremendously significant messages for Europeans. It can prove by its own accomplishments that human welfare and progress can be achieved without class warfare. It can show that the successful struggle is indeed not along class lines.

We in this country will not understand the European labor movement unless we remember that it has to a considerable degree a class base. We are apt to underestimate the influence of the Socialist philosophers upon European thinking. The base of European labor is definitely not the perversion which Lenin and Stalin have made of the original Socialist theory. That is to say, European labor is not Communist. But history has woven the European fabric with a strange twist that has been omitted from our own.

CLASS SOCIETY CONCEPT

The development of the history and culture of western Europe has from feudal times been based on the concept of a class society. There were the lords and ladies of the castle. Then the hierarchy descended through the squires of the manor house, the artisans, and the peasants of the field. This was the historical condition which Marx—and those Socialist writers and thinkers who both preceded and followed him—observed. This then formed the base for their economic thought. To them the class society was the civilization within which men lived and within which they died.

These Socialist philosophers have profoundly influenced the thinking of the labor

movements of western Europe. For this reason when European labor has thought of replacing one government with another, or one set of government officials with another, it has thought largely of the substitution of one class for another.

The idea of class is foreign to us in this country. We are unable to function on a class basis for the simple reason that it is not part of our tradition.

Part of this attitude is due to our history. We did not build this country on class lines. Nor did we have to displace a class society when we cleared the forests and built our cities and highways. Consequently the notion of equality has always been open. And if it becomes closed we recognize the responsibility of government to reopen it. Man is born here not to class, but to opportunity. No feudal livery marks him. He stands on his own; there is no tradition that limits his potentialities.

This philosophy permeates our politics. While the aim of European political parties has been to draw men of different ideologies into separate disciplined groups, the aim of our parties has been to unite divergent groups into one. Our aim is for unity. That means compromise of various ideas and ideologies and the doctrinaire acceptance of none. It means the elimination of extremists—both right and left—and the development of middle-of-the-road policies.

FREE TO MAKE CHANGES

Our liberty is, indeed, the liberty to change from one dogma to another in a search for an equitable solution. For, as one distinguished jurist put it, the spirit of liberty as part of the American tradition is "the spirit which is not too sure that it is right."

This lack of class consciousness has other influences in our national life. It explains why we examine the man who stands for office not for his origin but for what he has done, for what he believes, for what his program is.

If we are satisfied with his character and philosophy, it is immaterial whether he comes from a mansion in Virginia, a log cabin in Illinois, a manor house in New York, or a farm in Missouri. That is why a goodly number of millionaires in public office today are widely recognized as active supporters of labor and exceedingly sympathetic to its hopes and causes. That is why many self-made men, who started from scratch and came to positions of power, have been repudiated because of their hostility to the great tide of liberalism that sweeps the world.

This attitude of ours is also due to the fact that we are a highly practical people. We are not beguiled and bewitched by theories. We have the knack of differentiating clearly the end from the means. We think in terms of results—hard, practical results. But we require that the means be fair to the individual.

It is for this reason that the American people, and primarily American labor, have not been captured by the propaganda of class warfare or a dictatorship of any class. They know that the promised substitution of one class for another in control of government or business is a highly theoretical proposal. It is merely a proposal for a different means to achieve public welfare. And that means, wherever it has been tried, has not only failed to provide a higher standard of living than we enjoy; it has meant a great sacrifice in liberty and freedom which men everywhere cherish.

ROAD TO DESTRUCTION

To American labor this invitation to class warfare is obviously a call to travel a side street which leads not to better living, but to destruction.

American labor much prefers to operate directly on its problems such as wages, hours, housing, and peace. It can do this at the bargaining table, at the polls, through organization, and through education and communication. These are the techniques that work; and they work immediately, directly, and fairly. They are not the complex brain-twisting, devious theories of communism. They are not the elaborate spinnings of the class-warfare conception. They are clean, hard-hitting, practical American ways to a wholesome result.

Our approach—the approach of American labor—is not to destroy. It is to pull and push and drive, with tremendous energy. American labor knows that it has a responsibility not only to its own members, but to the whole community. And American labor knows, too, that this obligation to respect the rights of others and to develop cooperative techniques in human relations is not merely a moral and patriotic duty. It is hard common sense. It is in that way and not by crushing all those who are outside of its own ranks that labor can secure a vigorous economy and a higher standard of living.

Labor's role in our national progress is unique and paramount. It is labor, organized and independent labor, that can supply much of the leadership, energy, and motive power which we need today.

American labor can do more than any other group to dissipate the notion that the fate of man is to pit class against class in a series of great blood lettings. It can help show Europe that it need not be the victim of the concept of a class society. The experience of European labor under Hitler proved that there was no safety in doctrinaire assumptions. The divisive influence of the Soviet—the pitting of each group against another—proves the same. American labor can help Europe understand these lessons.

WORKERS ARE FREE

American labor can show how a human welfare state creates health and stability throughout the whole economy, and works for the security and well-being of all classes. America has avoided the fate of the sweatshop. Our industrial plant today is one of the great strongholds of democracy. Our workers are freemen, free to vote, free to speak, and free to worship as they please. They are lashed to no one political party. Their unions are not puppets of a political clique. There is such a thing as industrial justice; and programs of social welfare and a rising standard of living for all go hand in hand.

These are things that American labor can show. It can also show that the world's path to peace and security is the one they took in escaping the industrial serfdom that threatened to ensnare them.

It can show how a human welfare state has managed to distribute in an increasingly equitable manner the dividends of modern technology; how the standard of living has more than doubled here about every 40 years. It can show how in that time the output per man-hour has more than doubled in manufacturing enterprises, with a decrease in the workweek of around 10 hours, while the purchasing power of the wages of the average factory worker has approximately doubled. It can show how almost two-thirds of the civilian labor force (agricultural labor excluded) are now covered by some form of unemployment insurance and over 98 percent by some form of old-age insurance.

Labor as a missionary of the American way of life can do more than this. It can help counter the Soviet propaganda that in the democratic nations of the world, war is the only device that government can design to give maximum production and full employment.

Those in labor circles know, as the distinguished President Philip Murray, of the CIO, has eloquently proclaimed, that real economic security lies only in maximum production and full employment.

DEPRESSIONS MAN-MADE

During the half century ending in the early 1940's the money earnings of the average worker in this country (agriculture excluded) rose over 250 percent. During that period the real earnings increased over 65 percent. But, nevertheless, the effect of the depression in the 30's was so severe that the real earnings at that time dropped practically to the level of 40 years earlier. One-fifth of our national labor force was idle. The dent in our national income was so great that it completely wiped out the gain in wage rates that had been painfully obtained since the early 1890's.

Violent swings in the business cycle are not as certain as death or taxes. Nor are they as inexorable as the law of gravity. They are man made; and being made by man, they can be controlled by man.

It is, indeed, cowardly to conclude that man is doomed to be the victim of his own business arrangements and that he is powerless to do anything about it.

It is, indeed, ironical and shocking to conclude that it is only through war that we can get maximum production and full employment.

We of the Democratic faith deny that there is any inevitability whatever in these predictions of despair. We believe that there are brains and character and ingenuity in this country and in the world adequate to substitute periods of production and employment for the man-made depressions we have suffered in the past.

The factors which bear on that problem are varied and complex. They touch all phases in the life of society. There is no easy or ready answer to the problem. It has many facets and angles. Labor knows this.

And so it is that labor has turned its attention to the interdependence of nations, to economics, to the relation of costs, profits, prices, to taxes, and to all the other factors that determine the prosperity and security of peoples and of nations.

MUST WORK PRODUCTIVELY

Labor is thus interested in the policy that determines what the level of production will be. Labor, management, and investors have a long-term solidarity of interests. Maximum production and full employment provide the only real security for all elements of our society. There is an overriding public interest that affects all business, including private enterprise. Production and employment are matters of great public concern. The basic security of the Nation itself depends on the ability of labor, management, and investors to work productively.

The Communists miss the point of history when they make class warfare the challenge of this age. That is not the challenge. The challenge is more subtle and more demanding. The challenge is to make the modern industrial plant operate smoothly and productively for the benefit of all.

This is not a job for one group alone. No one group has the technical competence, the know-how, the experience to go it all alone. It is, indeed, a joint responsibility of labor and management to see the modern industrial plant serves the needs of the public. The challenge is so fundamental that the survival of the democratic scheme of things may depend on the manner in which we respond.

The power labor has today constitutes a great leverage on our economy. The power it holds in the councils of nations will become increasingly great. Responsibility inevitably follows power. When the power is one over society and its welfare, the power is indeed a power in trust. So it is that labor, no less than management, has an obligation that transcends narrow, selfish interests. It is an obligation to turn its energies and resourcefulness not to protect vested interests, not to seek some temporary advantage, but to promote every known device which will lead

to maximum production and full employment.

WORLD-WIDE STRUGGLE

These are fateful days for all peoples of the world. Powerful ideological forces are pitted against each other. There is an increasing polarization to the left and to the right. But the great middle group in all nations are the democrats. They are the ones who have nourished freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of conscience. They have built systems of government under which diversity among men is encouraged and glorified. They have refused to cast and mold man into one ideological pattern. They have proclaimed the great spiritual values of the brotherhood of man. They believe that the dignity and freedom of man are the ultimate aims of society.

It is essential that the democrats of the world stand united. The polarization to the left and right must not continue. It derives from despair and discord—often minor in character, that prevents unity and undermines strength. It is as if religious sects, quarreling over minor differences in their faiths, overlooked the essential unity of their creeds, that One Being rules the whole universe.

American labor can contribute mightily to the fusion of the various democratic groups of the world into a harmonious whole. American labor can teach class-conscious groups the folly of class warfare. American labor can spread the faith in the American way that builds a classless society without exploitation of any group.

MUST UNDERSTAND WORLD

This requires that American labor understand the world of today. It can no longer take refuge in the slogans of bygone days. It cannot indulge the luxury of complete preoccupation with traditional trade-union activities. It must understand geography and economics and history. It must be versed in the causes which led to Hitler and to Mussolini, to Lenin and to Stalin. It must be able to detect the early manifestation of new malignant growths of a social and political character.

The values of the democratic system are at stake throughout the world. The time for action is now. The task is for us, not for our sons or our sons' sons.

We know from our own experiences that labor has the character and strength to rise to real greatness. It has achieved maturity and wisdom.

Today labor, better than any other element in our society, can weld the democrats of the world into a group within its power to guide Western civilization, neither to the right nor to the left, but down the broad middle highway to abundance, to security, and to peace.

President Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 19, I spoke over the Mutual Broadcasting System for 3 minutes on the topic of President Truman's Budget.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Federal Budget submitted by President Truman to the Congress in the light of the existing estimated debt of $251,569,000,000 is preposterous. The President is asking for a $41,900,000,000 peacetime budget. This means $282 per capita for Federal spending alone and does not include State, city, or local taxes.

This is the greatest peace-time budget ever submitted at any time by any country in all history. This means that a family of four must lay aside almost $100 a month for the Federal Government before they have one penny for themselves. In other words the average family of four must save $1,128 a year for the Federal Government alone, but such family of four must also save the additional sum to meet State, city, county, and local taxes.

Every time a man in the United States earns one dollar he must figure on saving 30 cents out of that dollar of income to pay his taxes, Federal, State and local. This leaves him 70 cents for himself and family of four. Then again this 70 cents he has left for himself and family has a purchasing power of 42 cents in terms of 1940 prices.

This means that the average family of four today has 42 cents in purchasing power for every dollar it takes in, if we measure purchasing power by the 1940 price level. In addition, the working people under covered employment in the Social Security plans are paying a gross income tax of about two billion dollars a year, which does not show in the Federal Budget as receipts. Nevertheless, the money in payroll taxes is received by the Government and is spent day by day in the operation of the Government.

All that is left in the so-called social-security trust fund is Government bonds, which the people themselves must redeem in cash before the trust fund can be spent for social-security benefits. This trust fund, so-called, now amounts to more than ten billion dollars in Government bonds. Every penny of it has been paid into the Treasury once in the form of payroll taxes, but the money has been spent by the Government for other purposes. This amount must be collected in cash once more before the OASI benefits may be paid.

This type of blue-sky financing will ultimately undermine the United States economy if we do not stop it. The time has come to put some old-fashioned common sense into the Federal management. The budget ought to be examined by the people in the light of what will ultimately happen to them in view of this type of left-wing financing.

Yellow Oleo: Prohibit Its Sale and Manufacture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, no publication in America speaks with more authority as the voice of the dairy industry than does Hoard's Dairyman, published at Fort Atkinson, in my district of Wisconsin. For a discussion of the forthcoming argument over the oleo-tax-repeal measure, Hoard's Dairyman, on January 10, 1949, published an excellent report on the dairy industry's views, written by Milo K. Swanton, of Madison, Wis. After graduating from the University of Wisconsin, Mr. Swanton did agricultural extension work for a time, is a practical farmer himself, and for the past 12 years has served as executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives. He was the organizer and first president of the Madison Milk Producers' Association and a director of the National Milk Producers' Association.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include Mr. Swanton's article in Hoard's Dairyman in today's issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Dairymen, they say, are now talking a new language when they discuss the oleo question. Some oleo propagandists are claiming dairymen are in retreat.

On November 11, in Portland, Oreg., no armistice was declared by the dairy farmers from 47 States attending the annual convention of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. There they reiterated their position that so long as the "butterleggers," as they called the yellow oleo makers, insist on the unfair trade practice of parading their product in imitation of butter's long accepted yellow color, there will be no armistice. The dairy farmers of this day are therefore sticking to their guns on the same basic issue of color on which they today, and their fathers before them, have fought.

November 11 dairymen attending the Milk Producers Federation annual meeting said in resolution:

"The crux of the situation, today as always, is the use of the color yellow by imitators of butter to produce, as nearly as possible, a butter substitute resembling genuine butter. Federal and State Governments should prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation and semblance of butter. If this is done the butter-oleo trade war will be ended. It will then be practical to abolish the taxes, licenses, and fees affecting oleomargarine."

NEW STAND NOT A RETREAT

Clearly then this is no retreat. It simply means that from here on we should not recognize nor legalize yellow oleo margarine as we have done since 1886 by the old system of taxation. This so-called "retreat" is anything but a retreat. It is a forthright and sensible demand that henceforth prohibition rather than legalization must be the answer.

Lest there be any further misunderstanding of today's position taken by the dairy industry, the new policy of prohibition applies not to oleo as such. It applies only to yellow oleo designed to confuse, to confound, and to deceive consumers. If people want oleomargarine they are entitled to have it, knowing what they are getting. If they ask for and pay for butter, they are entitled to get real butter, not an imitation.

Consumers, I am sure, will agree with these dairymen that deception is a factor to be discouraged in the world of food. The theory of nutritive equivalency as a criterion for legalizing consumer deception by complete imitation in foods of vastly different origin should never be recognized. As in the use of beef or horse meat, which might be equally nutritious, the consumer at all times has a right to know which she is getting.

PRESERVE CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHTS

In the Declaration of Independence, reference was lightly made to certain inalienable rights. Dairymen believe that among these rights are certain God-given senses with which all natural persons are endowed. In the market place and at the table, whether at home or in public eating places, we have a right to rely upon our personal senses of sight, taste, hearing, smell, and feeling to help us in our selections of food and fiber. To deliberately confuse and deceive, to deprive and take away the use of any or all of these God-given senses is a

crime against the natural and inalienable rights of consumers.

Prohibiting rather than legalizing through taxation, the production and sale of yellow oleo is in reality a magna carta for consumers. This approach makes oleomargarine just as available in an equally nutritive form. At the same time it would preserve the consumer's right to distinguish the product by sight of color at all times and in all places.

Prohibiting rather than legalizing by taxation is not only safer for consumers, but it is also fairer in the long run for the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of food products.

The dairy industry today has no quarrel with the old-timers who, seeing the need for control, thought of taxation as the only means then known to regulate the unfair trade practice of deception by color imitation. The most effective approach then known was the imposition of license fees and taxes.

MORE EFFECTIVE THAN TAXATION

In the new proposal dairymen show clearly that they are not interested in taxing food if there is a more effective way to protect the consuming public against deception and the dairy farmer against insidious, unfair competition. It is their desire that merchants be freed from the bothersome detail of tax accounting.

Naturally the question is asked, How can we, without using the power of taxation and relying upon tax records, feel any assurance of adequate control? With yellow oleo prohibited, enforcement officials as well as consumers would have a clearly and easily recognized product. If found yellow in public eating places or in commerce, it would be clearly in violation of the law.

By what means would violations be apprehended? Why does the dairy industry believe the new approach can be made effective? First of all, receding from the imposition of license fees and taxes is predicated on the stand that the first step must be prohibition of the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. The new proposal also demands prohibition of deceptive advertising. It would ban pictures showing the product as yellow and would ban the use of dairy farm and other dairy scenes which would tend to confuse consumer understanding.

Enforcement of the proposed oleo control and prohibition laws would be vested in the Federal Food and Drug Administration. This agency is best equipped to detect and to prosecute violators.

How will the new proposal meet enforcement within the several States? Remember a basic request of the new proposal is that State legislation also enforce prohibition against yellow oleo. Recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court have materially broadened the interpretation of the interstate-commerce clause. Those decisions have been important factors in leading to the policy of yellow oleo prohibition and elimination of taxation, because the effect of these court decisions has been to broaden the power of Federal control within the boundaries of individual States to a degree not previously considered possible.

CONGRESS HAS THE POWER

The power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce involving commodities which are conducive to confusion, deception, and substitution was reviewed by the United States Supreme Court in the filled milk cases. In *Carolene Products Company* v. *U. S.* (323 U. S. 15, 65 S. Ct. 1 (1944)), the Court referred to the fact that "when compounded and canned, whether enriched or not, they are indistinguishable by the ordinary consumer from processed natural milk, the consumers of these compounds do not get evaporated milk. * * * The prevention of such practices or dangers through control of shipments in interstate commerce is within the power of Congress. * * * Congress evidently determined that exclusion from commerce of filled milk compounds in the semblance of milk was an appropriate method to strike at evils which it desired to suppress."

The power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce has been further defined by the United States Supreme Court in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act in the case of *United States* v. *Rock Royal Cooperative* (307 U. S. 533, 59 S. Ct. 993).

In the Wrightwood Dairy Case, *United States* v. *Wrightwood Dairy Company* (315 U. S. 110, 62 S. Ct. 525), the Federal Court construed the act to apply to intrastate commerce because of competition with sales in interstate commerce.

In another Federal suit where the sale of drugs had passed through one intrastate exchange the Court held that the Federal act was designed to control the product all the way through its delivery to the ultimate consumer. These are but a few examples indicating such interpretations of Federal statutes as will permit Federal regulation of intrastate activities which affect the flow of goods in interstate commerce.

In their new approach the dairy industry is showing sound judgment and fairness. It is proof sufficient that the dairymen of this country are not basically desirous of taxing competitive foods. Their insistence on color differentiation shows that their basic interest is in consumer protection and honest competition.

The test of these new proposals will come when the Eighty-first Congress convenes. What the attitude of the oleomargarine industry may be, whether or not it will insist on taking away from American consumers their inalienable rights at the market place, remains to be seen. Color is the issue. Dairymen have indicated their willingness to meet the issue fairly and squarely in a way that will protect the rights of consumers.

And remember this stand of the dairy industry is a firmer stand—not a retreat. Their stand is for outright prohibition of color deception rather than legalization and recognition by taxation.

Teamwork in Using Knowledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am placing in the RECORD a practical and thought-provoking address by Rear Adm. T. A. Solberg, Chief of Naval Research, entitled "National Cooperation in Research and Development:"

NATIONAL COOPERATION IN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(Address by Rear Adm. T. A. Solberg, USN, Chief of Naval Research, before the American Council on Commercial Laboratories at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., November 3, 1948)

I welcome this opportunity to address this meeting of members of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories and their distinguished guests because your problems in industry are in many ways similar to ours in the Navy. We both are interested ultimately in production items for specific utilitarian purposes: we both are eminently practical in our point of view. Yet we both fully appreciate the importance of intelligent and imaginative progress, which makes us alert to every possibility in research and development, in management, and in cooperative effort.

All through the war, and particularly on VJ-day, all of us looked forward to the days of peace with the firm conviction that we would be able to follow our own individual pursuits and at somewhat relaxed and normal peacetime rate. Such, however, has not been the case. Everyone must feel the particular stress and uncertainty of present-day life.

Surely all of us have come to realize in this postwar period that we are forever faced with the possibility of wars even more total and more disastrous to the world than any previous conflict.

* * * For our own security as a nation it may be well that we are forcibly and continuously kept on the alert rather than to run the risk of going back to the complacent attitudes which controlled our national thinking after World War I.

* * * More thought is being placed on national economic and industrial strength, and on national security than ever before. Each is complementary to the other. Each is a necessity. Had this been realized between the last two wars, we would have been much better off today.

Consequently, in distinction to what happened after World War I, industry and government have kept closer together. But much more can and should be done to improve and perpetuate that bond.

One of the important factors in the promotion of national economic strength and national security is cooperation in research and development.

TIME LAG BETWEEN DISCOVERY AND USE

History records many instances where the lack of appreciation of the necessity for integrating scientific investigation with industrial development has cost many years in progress.

For instance, the basic discovery relating to electron emission from hot bodies probably goes back to German work in the 1870's. The existence of electrons was revealed through the work of Sir James J. Thompson, H. A. Lorentz, and their coworkers at about the turn of the century. However, it was not until some 15 years later that Lee DeForrest saw the practical possibilities in this field when he developed the radio amplifier tube. The story of the subsequent development of the almost fabulous electron industry is well-known to you all.

The significant point is that the interval from basic discovery to first practical application was about 40 years, and the interval from discovery to an established industry covered 60 years.

Again, in the case of Diesel engines it was about the time of World War I that Dr. Diesel brought forth the cycle named after him. But it was not until the middle thirties that the Navy obtained the high-speed Diesel engines required for our submarines. Perhaps some of you here do not realize that our streamliner trains are powered either by those same engines or modifications of them. The time lag was, again, appreciable.

The Navy was the first to support DeForrest in the practical application of electrons and also sponsored the development of the high-speed Diesel engines.

The Navy policy always has been to have its research and development come back to the man on the street whenever possible. This is one of the reasons why the Navy is particularly interested in fostering integration and cooperation on a Nation-wide basis in the fields of science and technical development.

COORDINATION OF KNOWLEDGE NEEDED

In the last war many lives were lost, large quantities of our natural resources were expended, our national debt was greatly increased—and much of this needlessly—because we were backward in military research and development. Our combined efforts toward national defense were not applied until the thick of battle had descended on us without warning.

Even then we were handicapped. First, because we had not done enough research on our own initiative, nor had we applied what we had properly and quickly. Second, we had not integrated governmental and industrial efforts in these fields.

And, lastly, we had not taken full advantage of all the available foreign scientific information which, if it had been applied and developed, could have covered, or answered at least in part, our own deficiencies.

Previously we have depended largely on foreign sources for scientific information and on our own industry for developments arising out of that research. This imposed a big handicap to smooth and rapid progress. It was partly responsible for the large gap between the time scientific information was available and the time when the improved materials, equipment, and weapons which stemmed from research came into use.

When hostilities became imminent, there was a frantic rush to put into useful end-products, every bit of usable scientific information.

Suddenly we became conscious of the fact that our allies also could help. Not only did they have their own fund of such information, but, in addition, through their intelligence agencies, and through intensive efforts to analyze enemy equipment and procedures, they had acquired much valuable scientific and engineering data previously undisclosed by our enemies.

I see in this audience several faces of those who visited and revisited in London for the specific purpose of picking up this information, bringing it home, and quickly translating it into our own useful war purposes.

Now conditions are changed. Foreign sources of new scientific knowledge are meager or nonexistent. We do, however, have access to much work which some of our former allies generously make available to us. Both they and we must break through the barriers and frontiers of science, which today are more challenging than ever before. The easy discoveries already have been made, and as we progress in science each step becomes more difficult and more costly. Research in nuclear physics, supersonic dynamics, and high-temperature metallurgy are typical examples of this.

It appears today that in research, and perhaps also in development, we have made at least a start on the road to becoming more self-reliant and more independent. During and since the last years of the war, industry has both expanded and added greatly to its research facilities. Industry, too, has wisely chosen the method of establishing nominally independent research departments under special management. The services also have recognized that they must be responsible for certain areas of research. But that is not enough.

CONGRESS SPONSORS RESEARCH

The Navy, speaking for my own service, was fortunate in that Congress established the Navy's position in research by creating the Office of Naval Research.

One of the chief functions of that Office is the planning, initiation, and support of basic research. About 75 percent of the funds go to universities and nonprofit institutions, and the balance is divided between industrial research laboratories and other Government agencies. The major portion is with academic institutions since there we find ample competent personnel to carry out our planned programs.

These programs, I should like to add, are designed to support in every possible way the development programs of the material bureaus. The results also are made available to the other services. This method of conducting our research not only gets the job done as far as funds permit, but also gives us the important byproduct of creating increased numbers of competent scientific personnel.

One university in one department has been able to double its output of doctorate students through support by the Office of Naval Research.

* * * * *

Looking at our past procedures in research and development, it appears that no comprehensive study has been made of methods of integrating scientific research and technical development. The lack of this has contributed to the large time gaps between the access of scientific data and the end products which come out of research. In fact one of the important problems of modern technology is that of streamlining this process.

As corollary to this, it does not appear that there has been, or that there is today, enough coordination and integration within the physical sciences themselves. There has been too much tendency for each individual scientific group to remain aloof from the others. To be sure, this is natural in view of the high degree of specialization required in modern science.

But today no one branch of science can be self-sufficient unto itself.

The compartmentation which exists in science today is disastrous to progress and to coordinated attack on any scientific barrier. The physicist needs the help of the chemist, and the chemist needs the physicist. The metallurgist needs the help of both. All need the help of the mathematician.

It is perhaps too early to determine what nuclear physics can contribute toward progress in the other branches of science. But it already is evident that its impact will be great, and therefore any effort in that direction can be expected to reap great benefits.

CONFERENCES TO EXCHANGE KNOWLEDGE

I personally am interested in seeing that the Office of Naval Research offers scientists in the same field of specialization every opportunity to confer with each other and with their colleagues in other sciences. I recently have made a point of discussing this with various directors of research among our contractors. We intend to continue our practice of calling conferences for discussion of highly important aspects of present-day research whenever it appears desirable.

Also, we intend to expand our work in conducting symposiums on subjects of interest to both industry and the services. Next week we have a large one on titanium. We are arranging jointly with the University of California for a symposium on research in the extreme low-temperature fields. In each case every effort is made to invite personnel from all interested agencies.

We feel that these efforts will contribute greatly toward promoting cooperation between Government, industry, and universities.

The above is only one aspect of the problem. Basic research also needs intimate integration with those who are responsible for applied research and development.

It will be in the interest of progress if the research scientist is made to realize the responsibilities and problems of the development engineer or technician.

The development engineer, by the same token, must be made to acquire a keen appreciation and understanding of the sciences underlying his interests. At some stage in the research process, definitely not at the end, they should collaborate. Only in this way can inordinately large gaps and delays between research and development be avoided.

Too often the applied scientist and the process and development engineer get their first information from a wrapped-up package of completed research.

The above ideas apply equally well between the development and production stages. However, there is a broader field where integration and coordination are necessary. That field lies in the industrial and governmental agencies which separately are striving for industrial progress and national security. In many respects they are complementary, and in many cases their aims are the same.

Are their efforts being integrated and coordinated so that both objectives are being attained to the maximum possible? I fear not.

To me, it is such an important point in our lives today that it merits much consideration and study by both industry and government. It will require the talents of many leaders in these fields on a continuing basis to insure that for all time to come our progress in industrial and national preparedness never lags but continuously advances.

A great portion of their efforts must be applied solely toward this problem of integrating and coordinating the efforts of all who are concerned with research and development.

THREE PROBLEMS IN COORDINATION

In this meeting sponsored by the American Council of Commercial Laboratories I feel that there is no more important message I can bring to you than to invite your attention to the topic of my address, "National Cooperation in Research and Development." In this respect, I believe we are confronted with at least three problems: (1) Collaboration between scientists not only in special fields but also in related fields; (2) cooperation between universities, industry, and the military; and (3) integration of research, development, and production.

Collaboration on the part of scientists will speed new discoveries and not only build up our store of knowledge, but will provide the means for more rapid progress. Less duplication will result. Time will be saved.

Neither the universities nor industry could long exist one without the other. Without them the military would be relegated to the scrap heap. The Navy recognizes that most major developments, either military or civilian, have always been shouldered by industry. On the other hand, in these days of turmoil and fear and suspicion it is self-evident that without the military of this country freedom of thought and industrial enterprise could not long exist. Certainly their cooperation is justified.

In order to progress, whether in military or civilian activities, we must apply basic knowledge to get the end products. Our rate of progress depends on our ability to rapidly understand and assimilate nature's phenomena. This calls for real teamwork in science and technology.

Your perspective naturally is broad and, therefore, can be very helpful, since you are interested in research, development, and also in the testing of the end results. Because of your varied and important coverage in so many fields of interest to the military establishment, your experience should be of great value in suggesting and working out the ways and means of such cooperation.

What can be done about these problems?

We must disseminate and exchange information. Without this exchange, time will be lost. There are, of course, confidential

areas both in the services and in industry which require special treatment. I believe it is of the greatest importance that these particular areas be integrated as soon as practicable and that there be direct, even though limited, exchange between industry and the military agency concerned.

My office has already laid before industry, through the Navy Industrial Association, a comprehensive picture of the Navy's research and development program. It is hoped that their interest will serve as a starting point for progress.

The Office of Naval Research sponsors a science and technology project with the Library of Congress, where all unclassified work is abstracted, indexed, and distributed not only to Government agencies, but also to industry qualified to receive such information because of work on a naval contract. It is our hope that this work will stimulate and increase the exchange and dissemination of information on a broader basis.

From our experience it is evident that support of basic research in universities and other technical institutions could be increased twofold. There are no doubt many who would oppose the use of academic institutions by industry. However, there are many advantages in using such facilities for basic research.

I firmly believe that, if selected basic work were so placed under well-controlled conditions, not only industry and the colleges would profit but also our national resources in science would be strengthened.

Another means of establishing good working cooperation is by the exchange of personnel.

It is believed that opportunities can be found here and there whereby research workers may be selected for an exchange tour of duty. If such exchanges can be made, without affecting the position and tenure of the individual concerned, there are many advantages to be gained both to the individual and to his establishment, whether it be industrial, academic, or government. My office already has such a policy in effect in its relations with universities.

Cooperative enterprise is one of the national assets of which we may justly feel proud. During the years 1940 through 1945 this shoulder-to-shoulder teamwork reached its peak, and we demonstrated to the world what a country of free individuals can accomplish.

Now, following conversion to peacetime status, we appreciate that the problems of peace are likewise proving to be grave. Furthermore, gradually the sinister fact becomes increasingly evident that we are not yet free to assume a world without the possibility of modern total war, and it becomes the paramount obligation of all of us to see that our magnificent and essential power of coordination is retained. This is surely possible and desirable in the broad field of research and development.

Effective cooperation is never achieved by words and intentions alone. Effective cooperation can only take place when the leaders of the country's efforts in industry, government, and academic life keep the goal constantly in mind and insure that the procedures are established and continuously improved to that end. The greatest and speediest improvement might well be accomplished by the action work of a selected group studying the problems involved.

It is my earnest hope, therefore, that we may each and all give much thought and effort toward improving our present procedures and our present position with regard to Nation-wide cooperation in research and development.

And, finally, that eventually there can be devised a program of national cooperation in research and development.

Nebraska State Association of Soil Conservation Districts Conducts a Fine Program

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the State of Nebraska are very much interested in soil conservation. I am indebted to Mr. Everett M. Barr, president of the Nebraska State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, for a copy of the resolutions that passed at their recent meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my remarks by including a copy of the said resolutions:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEBRASKA STATE ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

I

Be it resolved by the Nebraska State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, That the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture be commended for the high quality technical assistance being rendered to the soil conservation districts; and be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen and Senators be informed of the further need for this technical assistance commensurate with the increasing demand by farmers for help in planning and application of conservation to the farms and ranches of the State and Nation.

II

Be it resolved by the Nebraska State Association of Soil Conservation District Supervisors, That the Nebraska congressional delegation be urged to give full support to a land policy which would coordinate the efforts of Federal agencies now dedicated to proper land use.

III

Whereas the conservation of our soil and water resources is a joint responsibility of the community, State, and Nation; and

Whereas (1) the communities of Nebraska, to fulfill this responsibility, have organized 83 soil-conservation districts, including 98 percent of the farms and ranches of the State.

(2) The State is making available to these districts the results of scientific research, surveys, educational services, and other necessary support.

(3) The Federal Government, through its Soil Conservation Service, is furnishing qualified technicians to assist in the operation program of the district.

Whereas we now have a coordinated program of Federal, State, and community action on soil and water conservation, operating through soil-conservation districts under Federal and State law, in accordance with long-established agreements and understandings between the agencies involved, which program is bringing the services of the State and Federal agencies such as the experiment stations, Agriculture Extension Service, Conservation and Surveys Division, United States Soil Conservation Service, and other State and Federal services, into effective, correlated conservation action on the land.

Whereas soil-conservation legislation has been enacted in all the States and working agreements and understandings similar to those described above have been, or are, being established in all States and are now serving effectively in an action program: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the supervisors of soil-conservation districts, representing 83 such districts and 98 percent of the farms and ranches of the State of Nebraska, do recommend:

(1) That action be taken to continue and strengthen this coordinated technical conservation program;

(2) That the technical services of the USDA be continued as at present through the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the States and districts, and strengthened as necessary to meet the increasing demand for this service by farmers until such a time as a more comprehensive land policy be adopted;

(3) That necessary action be taken and appropriations made to furnish assistance to soil-conservation districts through the Soil Conservation Service of the USDA to carry out an aggressive program of flood-control action on agricultural land as now defined by law;

(4) That the Secretary of Agriculture and/or Congress maintain the USDA program of technical assistance separate and distinct from its program of economic assistance and guidance;

(5) That the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress so define and delineate the functions and responsibilities of the agencies of the USDA involved so that—

(a) The Soil Conservation Service, or a new and more comprehensive technical agency, will definitely have the responsibility for all technical assistance furnished by the USDA in soil and water conservation, and so that such assistance will continue to be made available in and through the soil-conservation districts.

(b) That any other type of assistance furnished to farmers by the USDA relating to agricultural conservation be furnished with due recognition of the technical responsibility of soil-conservation districts.

(c) That all services furnished by the USDA be so defined that conflict in service and duplication of activities will be prevented and coordinated effort will be established.

IV

Whereas the State soil-conservation committee of the State of Nebraska has rendered an invaluable service to the people of the State over the past 11 years through their devotion to the advancement of a comprehensive soil- and water-conservation program throughout the State under the principles of true American democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, That we commend the members of said committee, both past and present, for their effective service in the program of soil and water conservation now in operation in the State. To the retired members of this committee, Mr. W. W. Burr and Mr. W. R. Brokaw we extend sincere thanks and deep gratitude. To the new members of this committee, Dean W. V. Lambert and Director H. C. Gould, we extend welcome and we pledge to them and to Dean G. E. Condra our continued full cooperation and active assistance.

V

Whereas the Honorable Val Peterson, Governor of our State, has so admirably demonstrated his intense interest and active support of the soil- and water-conservation program of the soil-conservation districts of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, That this body extend to the Governor its sincere appreciation and deep gratitude for his valued interest and splendid support of the soil-conservation districts of the State. To him, we pledge

our continued active cooperation in the conservation program of this State.

VI

Whereas the Nebraska Association of Soil Conservation Districts realize the new responsibilities which Gov. Val Peterson has assumed as chairman of the Missouri River States Committee of the Missouri Basin; and

Whereas they realize the importance to the whole economy of the people of the basin that this program be successfully developed; and

Whereas they realize the great importance of the authorized United States Department of Agriculture flood-control program in the proper development of the economy of the basin; and

Whereas the Nebraska Association of Soil Conservation Districts realize this program can never be fully developed without the understanding and full cooperation of all soil-conservation districts in the basin States, and realizing the added responsibility placed on the soil-conservation districts in the development of watershed protection in conjunction with the authorized flood-control program of the United States Department of Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we pledge our complete cooperation to the Governor in his efforts to bring about the Missouri Basin development and in advising the people of our districts of its importance and their responsibility; be it

Resolved by the Nebraska Association of Soil Conservation Districts, That this be an expression of appreciation by the soil-conservation district supervisors to:

1. The Omaha World-Herald, and in particular Mr. Henry Doorly, publisher, as well as Mr. T. W. Summers, promotion manager, and Mr. Max Coffey, farm editor, for their generous and their outstanding interest and support in sponsoring the soil-conservation recognition program in districts throughout Nebraska and part of Iowa.

2. The Sioux City Journal Tribune publications and Sioux City Chamber of Commerce for their leadership and active interest and support in sponsoring the permanent agriculture program throughout 14 counties of northeast Nebraska and surrounding Sioux City trade territory within adjoining States.

3. To the newspapers and farm papers, both daily and weekly, and to the radio stations which have publicized extensive information regularly on the need for conservation, what people are doing in this endeavor, and the results they have received from such accomplishments.

4. To the many chambers of commerce, commercial clubs and other civic organizations, religious groups, and school officials, bankers, merchants, and other individuals who have contributed financially and with labor for their splendid support in pushing the soil- and water-conservation program more rapidly and extensively throughout the communities within the State.

5. To the many industries and in particular the farm equipment companies, who have been generous in their support financially and otherwise for the expansion of the complete soil- and water-conservation program.

Where Is the Voice of America's Conscience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Alfred Kohlberg entitled "We Will Still Have To Live With Ourselves." It is a thought-provoking and challenging article and I am sure it will be of interest to Members of this House:

As long as our Republic lasts—no matter how much the people of the world may hate, revile, and distrust us, justly or unjustly—we must live with ourselves. Under our system of freedom—economic, political, educational, and religious—we have developed between two oceans a continent of individual human freedom and physical and economic well-being never before approached in the long history of mankind. As a result, but without conscious intention, we have developed a power—economic, military, and political—that makes us decisive in the world's affairs. But what of our educational, moral, and religious strength? Have we stood and do we now stand for the application of those moral and religious principles in the world's affairs which we so loudly profess? Have we professed our principles to the world, had them accepted by the world; have we and our allies fought for these principles and won in their name, only, on the day of victory, to meanly, secretly, and lyingly abandon them? While professing God, have we secretly served the devil? Have we played the part of Judas? Have we deceived our coworkers in the vineyard of the Lord, our allies for the right, as we and they saw the right, and while so deceiving them have we betrayed them into the tyranny and slavery of the latter-day devil, even though without receiving our pieces of silver? And if we did so, did we do it with evil intent; or were we slothful and so neglectful of our duty to our fellow men that we permitted our faithless servants to do this evil in our name?

Let us observe ourselves and our sins of commission and omission, dispassionately and objectively.

Three weeks after Pearl Harbor we gathered our allies against the Axis in Washington, and there, in the first meeting of the United Nations, we wrote down and proclaimed the principles for which we were fighting World War II. This was our solemn pledge to our allies and to the people of the world, allied, neutral, and enemy alike. It was likewise our allies' solemn pledge to us.

Among other statements we pledged: Our "countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other." "Second, they desire to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." "Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." These, and more, were the solemn pledges of the Big Three, Russia, Britain, and the United States of America.

Those were the solemn pledges to the Poles who fought in the underground, and in the air over Britain; to the million Poles, who streamed out of the forced-labor camps of the Soviet Union, to the Poles who fought in north Africa, at Cassino, and in France. Those were the pledges for which 250,000 Poles died in the Warsaw uprising called for by the Soviet radio.

These were the solemn pledges that induced the Chinese to struggle and die by the millions for another 3½ years after Pearl Harbor, refusing all Japanese offers for a favorable peace and finally turning over 1,500,000 POW's to our General Wedemeyer—1,500,000 whom our boys didn't have to face in the Pacific islands.

These were the solemn pledges to our Yugoslav and Czechoslovak allies, to our Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Greek allies and also to our German, Austrian, Italian, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, and Japanese enemies.

These pledges were made specific in special agreements, pacts, and declarations from time to time. For example, at Cairo in December 1943 in a public document signed by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek we proclaimed:

"All the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

Meantime, at the Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam and Moscow conferences and elsewhere, deals, some secret and some public, were made; sometimes in plain language and sometimes in weasel words. In these deals we gave Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, northern Korea, and Manchuria to the Soviets in violation of all pledges. In peace treaties we turned over Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria to the tender mercies of the Soviets. Most of Austria and eastern Germany were sold into the same slavery. In China we immobilized the armies of the Republic by truce after truce until the Russians could arm the farm boys conscripted by the Communist dictators to overthrow our loyal ally, our only friend in the Far East except for the Philippines.

We dishonored our pledges. We betrayed 235,000,000 of our friends and allies to whom we had pledged the right "to choose the form of government under which they shall live." And we betrayed 90,000,000 of our enemies to whom we made the same pledges.

These betrayals were made by our appointed and elected servants, from Presidents to Secretaries of State and their advisers. We not only did not resist these infamies but actually approved them ostensibly because we feared the Soviet Union would desert us and make a separate peace, or because we didn't know the evil character of the dictator in the Kremlin, or because it may have saved some American lives over Japan, or because the President was ill and tired and his secret advisers pressed him to agree, or, as Elliott Roosevelt wrote, because they drank too much, or because, very simply, we were, and are, frightened by secret threats by Soviet diplomats.

Yet, even now, 4 years later, as we hear the cries of anguish from the slaves we traded into bondage in Czechoslovakia, from those few who escape from the Baltic countries in small boats to our shores, from the millions of Chinese who flee the terror of the Communist advance, and from the broken men who trickle back to Japan, Germany, Austria, and Italy from the slave camps of Russia, no American voices rise to say, "We are our brothers' keeper." We say, instead, of those Iranians and Greeks and Koreans and Chinese who hold back the Red tide of godless iniquity that threatens to break its bounds and overwhelm the world, that they must be corrupt and inefficient and maybe not quite democratic.

When we face the broken refugees from the nations we have sold into slavery, do we say, "Forgive us, for we knew not what we did?" or do we wear a mantle of false self-righteousness?

After observing the fate of China, of Poland, of Yugoslavia, and our other allies and fellow members of the original United Nations as organized January 1, 1942, who dares trust us? Even the Stalinist dictatorship has not stooped so low. However ruthless it has been to the allies who stood by its side in the terrible years of 1941 and 1942—China, Poland, Yugoslavia, Britain, and ourselves—it has kept the faith with that small minority of Communist agents who comprise its fifth column in every country in the world. It has observed its pledged official promise to destroy every free or capitalist government. If we did not know or did not believe those promises, that was only another factor in our mental and moral breakdown.

When do we awake to our infamy; when do we confess the sins committed against

our fellow men; when do we do penance for our past and seek to undo that evil—at least in part; or do we continue to meet with the slave master of the Kremlin and appease him with more millions of hapless humans while we talk of peace and justice?

Where is the voice of America's conscience? Why is it stilled? Even if we do not value the respect of the free men of the world, do we no longer value our own self-respect?

Where are the voices of Americans who can rouse us to disown the faithless servants who signed the documents that bound 300,000,000 people into a state slavery worse than the human slavery in our antebellum South? Where are the Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrisons of twentieth-century America?

Pennsylvania Grange News Tells of Hawaii's Great Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose an article from the November 1948 issue of the Pennsylvania Grange News, entitled "Hawaii, U. S. A., the Garden Spot of the Pacific," by Otto G. Janssen.

The article follows:

Shortly before Pearl Harbor, a writer from Hawaii traveling in the South stopped at the campus of his old alma mater to pay a visit to one of his favorite professors.

A colored gardener told him the professor was away for the summer.

"That's too bad," the writer said. "I wonder if you'd tell him his student from Hawaii called."

"From where?" the gardener asked.

"From Hawaii—way out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean."

"My, my!" the gardener exclaimed. "Way out in the middle of the Mississippi Ocean!"

Today, Hawaii isn't the geographical abstraction it seemed a few years ago. Thousands of farm boys who were stationed there during the war know more about the islands than they do many of the States. Postwar air travel has made Honolulu closer to Washington, D. C., than were most American cities just a few decades ago. The movement to make Hawaii a State has made the mid-Pacific Territory a topic of discussion in every home and classroom throughout the land.

Yet, there are many things about this typically American community that are not familiar to the average person.

For example, many people have little notion about the size of the place. It may come as a surprise that Hawaii is more populous than six of the States—Nevada, Wyoming, Delaware, Vermont, Montana, and Idaho. Official statistics for 1948 show a population for Hawaii of 540,500, nearly 90 percent of whom are American citizens. The city of Honolulu, with a population of 273,021, is comparable in size to Akron, Ohio, or Long Beach, California. Although, like the United States, Hawaii is a melting pot of many races, the majority of her citizens are Caucasians.

Hawaii is small in area, but it is larger than three of the States—Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island. In fact, it is larger than the latter two combined.

The war emphasized Hawaii's importance as an agricultural producer, but few realize the high degree of technological progress her two main industries—sugar and pineapple—have attained. They are among the most highly mechanized and integrated agricultural producers in the world.

Ingenious machines harvest and lift the cane from the fields; mammoth trucks, railway cars, and elevated flumes transport it to the mills; crushers, centrifugals, and other machines convert it to raw sugar, ready for shipment to the mainland. A large percentage of Hawaiian sugar is now "bulk-loaded" instead of being bagged, thereby saving considerable time and expense. One out of every seven pounds of sugar consumed in the United States comes from Hawaii.

Comparable processes exist in the pineapple industry. Endless belts carry the fruit from field to portable bins; four-wheeled "go-devils" load trailer units for transport to Hawaii's nine canneries. Inside the canneries Ginaca machines, invented and developed in Hawaii, shell and core fruit in one operation, at the rate of 90 a minute. Ninety percent of the world's supply—18,000,000 cases annually—bears the "Made in Hawaii" label.

There are many other intriguing facts about these two industries. Hawaii's sugar farm workers are the best paid in the world on an annual basis. Both industries have developed at their own expense experiment stations that have won world recognition for their plant research and insect and plant disease control and irrigation projects.

To meet Hawaii's special conditions of terrain, much of the machinery and equipment is blueprinted and manufactured in the industries' own drafting rooms and machine shops.

Although sugar and pineapple constitute the backbone of Hawaii's economy, there are some 4,000 farms producing other products such as livestock, papayas, mangoes, coffee, macadamia nuts, rice, honey and vegetables.

The Parker Ranch on the Island of Hawaii is the second largest ranch in the United States, covering more than half a million acres.

Farmers of Hawaii are quick to take advantage of modern improvements. For example, "fresh" cows are flown to Honolulu and "dry" ones taken to the grasslands by air freight. Growers of orchids and other exotic flowers are doing a bustling trade in air shipment of blooms to mainland cities.

Although Hawaii is about 2,000 miles from the mainland, a lot of people do not realize that modern means of communication such as the airplane, radio, and teletype have kept Hawaii apace with the rest of the United States. The newsboy at the corner of Hotel and Alakea Streets in Honolulu shouts the same headlines as the vendor on the corner of Broad and High Streets in Columbus.

Recently, a motorist driving along a New York street in his convertible picked up his auto telephone and passed the time of day with a chap riding down Kaneohe Boulevard in Honolulu. A housewife shopping in a supermarket in Waikiki probably fills her basket with the same brand of catsup, soap, breakfast cereals, and frozen peas as her counterpart in Gary, Ind. Her husband most likely rides to work in the same make of bus as does the average mainland wage earner. Her youngsters shriek just as excitedly at "Roy Rogers" at Saturday matinees, and await the next issue of Superman comics with the same enthusiasm as the young people do in the States.

Hawaii has nine radio stations which feature all the major national network programs. The Lone Ranger, Portia Faces Life, and Bing Crosby programs are just as much a part of the evening's entertainment for the family in Hawaii as they are for millions of continental homes.

In addition to the national magazines to be found on every newsstand, Hawaii also has a good assortment of publications of its own. Fourteen newspapers are published in the Territory, including two dailies in Honolulu with circulations around 150,000 each. Magazines include the well-known Paradise of the Pacific, which recently celebrated its sixtieth year of publication, and Farm and Home, which is widely read by Hawaii's farm families.

Recently, Hawaii's Delegate to Congress, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, who introduced the Hawaiian statehood bill in the last Congress, was asked whether the people of Hawaii realized that they would have to pay taxes if Hawaii became a State. The fact is, of course, that the people of Hawaii have been struggling over the same income-tax blanks as the mainlanders. Last year they poured $107,000,000 into the Federal Treasury, more than was paid by 12 of the States.

As on the mainland, the church spire is a familiar landmark wherever one goes in the Territory. There are some 300 churches throughout the islands, representing all the major Christian denominations. Christianity was introduced to the islands by the New England missionaries a century and a quarter ago.

People going to Hawaii from the mainland sometimes inquire whether there are any American schools to which they can send their children. They are usually surprised to learn that the American pattern of education was established in Hawaii more than 100 years ago when the islands were still under a monarchy. English became the official language in the schools long before annexation. Back in the days of the California gold rush, many of the forty-niners sent their children to Hawaii to be educated. The sea voyage to the islands was faster and safer than the overland journey to the East.

Hawaii's public-school system ranks well above the standard in most American communities. There are 185 schools, with an enrollment of more than 80,000 and a teaching staff of 3,500. The University of Hawaii is a land-grant college like many other State universities with an enrollment of close to 4,000. In addition, there are 152 private schools and colleges. Although Hawaii's school children are of many racial stocks, more than 99 percent of them are American citizens. It is no wonder that a child in Hawaii of Chinese ancestry speaks quite naturally of our pilgrim forefathers.

Design for Election

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sioux City Journal of Sioux City, Iowa, on January 20, 1949:

DESIGN FOR ELECTION

Representative CHARLES B. HOEVEN of the Eighth Iowa District has called attention to the socialistic trend of the Truman fair deal and has expressed his own doubts and fears about the future if the heavy spending and burdensome taxation contemplated to pay for sweeping reforms got the approval of the Congress. He sees Mr. Truman as left of center. He thinks the President is recommending that America embark on a course of spending and redistribution of property which has many of the earmarks of a program of state socialism such as weakened Great Britain and caused the economic disintegration of Europe.

Mr. Hoeven is a Member of the House of Representatives and a stanch Republican. He is a sound thinker, a good observer, a man who is blessed with practical common sense and one who believes in the free-enterprise system. He has not indicated at any time that he has any of the characteristics of the reactionary in politics. Instead, he has kept in step with the times, believing in evolution for a political party and recognizing that it must make adjustments according to changing social and economic conditions. He must be aware of what the Democratic administration is doing right now as it launches its so-called Fair Deal. Indeed there will be few persons failing to recognize it as a design for election, as a means to retain power.

It is not the first illustration of an election design. Franklin D. Roosevelt practiced it throughout his administrations. He catered to the "forgotten man" back in the New Deal days. He went farther than that, made a bold bid for labor's support by putting through legislation drafted to give it an unfair advantage over industry. And he went still further as he courted the subversive groups and rewarded them with Federal employment. All this was a design for election and reelection. It was much more political than eleemosynary; it was more a bid for support at the polls than an outpouring from a compassionate heart.

Mr. Truman has sensed just as Mr. Roosevelt did that vast numbers of the American people are susceptible to overtures from the Federal Government and that they eagerly respond when Uncle Sam dons a Santa Claus suit and insists upon its being Christmas from year's end to year's end. That is the incentive in the Truman proposals for widespread reform, for pouring out funds raised by heavier taxation and giving them in one form or another as largess to persons who thus have their own initiative, their own self-reliance, and their own dependability weakened and undermined. Indeed, if Uncle Sam is to stand ready at all times to succor the improvident, the waster, the ne'er-do-well, the unreliable, he will have more of them year by year accepting his gratuities.

This appeal to the cupidity of the American people may be politically clever, but it won't keep America great. We have been standing on our own feet as a people throughout our existence as a nation and we ought to stand like that ready to seize or create our opportunities and develop in character as we exploit our human and material resources. We shall be distressingly unfortunate if most of us permit this design for election to deceive us and forfeit in the process our birthright, political freedom as well as economic independence and social liberty. May a kind fate save us from becoming willing mendicants accepting hand-outs from any political party.

Extravagance in Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I prepared on extravagant Government spending, entitled "Where To Swing the Ax," and which appeared in the December issue of American magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE TO SWING THE AX

(By STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator from New Hampshire)

The great responsibility that faces our national administration in America, I believe, is to put our Federal house in order. At present it is in fantastic and expensive disorder.

For 16 years the vines of bureaucracy have been spreading and intertwining themselves around our Nation's Capital. Today they are literally threatening to choke out our democratic way of life. There is a desperate need to prune and retrain this growth. But, believe me, it will be no easy or popular job.

I have spent most of the past 2 years grappling with the vines in this luxuriant wilderness. They are unbelievably tough and hard to get at. My committee cut away billions of dollars' worth of growth, only to find new vines shooting out in many other directions. To our dismay we found that despite our strenuous efforts, the Federal civilian pay roll will still increase by almost 150,000 officeholders this year.

Frankly, the rampant growth of our Federal Government frightens me. And my New England sense of thrift is outraged when I consider that my State of New Hampshire can be run for 8 years on what it takes to run our Federal Government for a single day.

Since the early thirties the executive branch of our Government has been growing like Jack's beanstalk. In 16 years the number of bureaus and agencies has shot up from 521 to 1,816. Federal expenditures to pay for these offshoots have increased 817 percent.

Our founding fathers, I suspect, would be appalled by the overwhelming power of entrenched, administrative bureaucracy in Washington today. As you may recall, they set up three equal branches of government—the Congress, the courts, and the administration, to serve as checks on one another. Today the administration has grown 49 times as big as Congress and the courts combined.

Perhaps you can comprehend now why it has been no simple matter for Congress to force economy and efficiency upon the administration. Sometimes in the past we have felt like Jack talking tough to the Giant.

What is most disturbing is that our Government has gotten so gigantic and so far into debt that we find ourselves up in a wild blue yonder where bureaucrats solemnly propose outlandish projects and talk casually in billions. Once I was arguing with an administrator about the necessity for a $8,000,000 project he was promoting. When he ran out of logical justifications, he hinted that he thought I was making an awfully big fuss over just "a little $8,000,000 item." Bureaucrats have a favorite wisecrack for referring to such picayune amounts of money: They are "only a drop in the budget."

In such a giddy atmosphere it is sometimes hard to realize that we have history's biggest mortgage hanging over our heads—$252,000,000,000. If that mortgage and the tax cost of our Federal Government cannot soon be reduced I believe we are heading into a national crisis. Already our tax rate is draining the fundamental savings of the American people into the United States Treasury, and is drying up the sources of venture capital, which supports our free enterprise system.

You may wonder how we got into this mess. It started, of course, when the New Deal decided that the solution to the depression was paternalism and pump-priming. In pump-priming, the theory is that it doesn't make much difference how you spend the money—just spend it. Then came the war, with its urgent requirements and its philosophy that money's no object!" More hundreds of new bureaus, piled helter-skelter.

Now we have peace and unparalleled prosperity, but we are still saddled with practically all of those emergency New Deal and wartime bureaus. Only the labels on the doors are different. We are finding there is nothing so permanent as a temporary bureaucrat. Of all the hundreds of wartime bureaus we have fully eliminated only one: the Office of Censorship.

At last we are beginning to appreciate the superb resourcefulness of the entrenched bureaucrat. Only a bureaucrat, for example, would think of camouflaging an unneeded photographer by keeping him on the books as a visual presentation information specialist.

Most of our Washington bureaucrats have a good deal of latent WPA-type evangelism in their souls and keep looking for new worlds to conquer. We call them empire builders. If they have gathered all the statistics that can conceivably be collected about funeral directors, they turn to producing vital statistics on the United States production of wheelbarrows, windmills, or glue. A Cabinet officer once expressed the conviction that if we let the military bureaucrats in the Pentagon have free rein, they would soon be literally trying to fortify the moon.

If one bureaucrat finds that a rival has acquired an outer office, two secretaries, and a red rug, he will—in monkey-see, monkey-do fashion—not be content till he has them, too.

Furthermore, the civil service (a hotbed of bureaucrats) encourages empire building by basing a bureaucrat's pay, among other things, on the number of underlings he can contrive to keep on his staff, rather than on the quality and efficiency of his work.

Congress has made a start in coping with these expensive swivel-chair imperialists. This past year we succeeded, for the first time in 17 years, in bringing the budget into balance, even though at a very high level.

It is high time for us to take a long, hard look at our Federal Government. What practices should be overhauled and what functions and services might well be abandoned or sharply curtailed? I will try to touch what I consider to be some high spots.

Consider first the lavish, unbusinesslike use the Federal Government makes of its manpower. In the past few years, for example, our bureaucrats have gone personnel crazy. They have hired 24,288 personnel specialists, who make an elaborate ritual of hiring the other help. While private industry gets along nicely with 1 personnel worker for every 226 employees, the Federal Government feels it needs 1 personnel specialist for every 83 employees. Congressional investigators concluded recently that the administration could save taxpayers $25,000,000 a year merely by making more efficient use of its personnel experts.

Or consider a few of the lavish ways the bureaucrats throw your money around on Alice-in-Wonderland boondoggling projects.

I'm thinking, for example, of the 124 steel filing cabinets that are unavailable for urgent projects because they are filled with 150,000 photographs taken at a cost of $750,000 by the Farm Security Administration and the OWI. The pictures bear such provocative captions as "Men Picking Their Teeth," "Oil Cans at the Side of a Filling Station," and "Fat Man Dozing." I believe we all can think of more effective ways for the Government to spend $750,000—and to use 124 steel cabinets.

That's a minor item, however, compared with the $55,000,000 spent each year just to bind and print the 41,000 books, booklets, reports, etc., that our bureaucrats deem to be deathless prose. (Among its other activities the United States Government is the world's No. 1 publisher.)

These United States Government publications have so aroused my curiosity that I

have been making an exhaustive study of them. Here are some samples that I picked up at random a few minutes ago from my collection: Mist Netting for Birds in Japan; Tales from Korea, by Y. T. Pyun; The Peruvian Fisheries; How To Talk on the Radio; Bat-Proofing of Buildings; Habits, Food, and Economic Status of the Band-Tailed Pigeon.

The publication on bat-proofing a building goes into considerable detail, but, as I gather it, the trick is simply this: You open a door of your building early in the evening to let the bats out. Then, when they leave, you close the door. That's bat-proofing a building.

These publications are typically printed up in lots of tens and hundreds of thousands, though it is hard to conceive of more than an extremely limited number of people being interested in them.

The Government Printing Office will testify to the profound lack of public interest in most of these publications. This is a sore point with GPO officials, because their storage rooms are jammed to the ceiling with hundreds of tons of dead, undistributed brainstorm publications that can't even be given away. I would suggest that the Government save the taxpayer $25,000,000 or so a year by confining the literary enthusiasm of its bureaucrats to obviously justifiable projects.

Let me mention a few other examples of the monumental lack of concern bureau chiefs often show for the taxpayers' pocketbook. We discovered last year an interesting $26,000,000 item buried in a mountain of justifications. The Air Force wanted to switch to a new-style uniform even though it still had available a huge backlog of the present-style uniform. The request was denied.

During hearings on interim aid to Europe, State Department officials proposed to buy more than a million tons of wheat at $125 a ton. We pointed out to them that just around the corner the Government's own Commodity Credit Corporation was selling wheat for $117. Why didn't they buy there? They did, at a saving to the taxpayer of $12,000,000.

We learned of another example of costly carelessness too late to prevent it. The Army tore down a multimillion-dollar camp in Alaska and sent the lumber to Seattle. There the Interior Department bought the lumber and shipped it right back to a point in Alaska within 10 miles from where the Army had shipped it.

Such follies do not even surprise anyone at all familiar with the interworkings of our Government with its jerry-built, feebly coordinated bureaus. There is continual duplication and working at cross-purposes. I earnestly hope we can bring the multitude of agencies into a tighter organizational structure and eliminate costly duplications of effort.

One consolidation might be made by bringing the 45 different offices or agencies concerned with housing, often unknown to one another, together. Most of these could be consolidated into one or two central housing agencies. The beauty of this, to the taxpayer, would be that a large number of agency heads would be reduced to bureau chiefs, at great savings in salary and the paraphernalia that goes with high office in Washington.

Here are three other logical consolidations that might be made: The numerous agencies gathering statistics (now often contradictory) might be brought into one large reporting outfit. * * * The 20-odd lending agencies might be consolidated. * * * And the many different transport agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Administration, etc., might be consolidated into a brand-new Department of Transportation.

Some of the vines of our Federal bureaucracy can be retained by consolidation. But there are others, I believe, that are begging to be pruned. No two students of government will agree which vines are most urgently in need of pruning, but from my work on various committees I personally would single out these eight for special consideration. They are all multimillion- or multibillion-dollar agencies.

Civil Service Commission: This contented, top-heavy Commission, by its policies, encourages bureaucratic empire-building and inefficient use of manpower, while falling down on its primary function of swiftly supplying the right employee for the right job. It should be overhauled or sharply curtailed.

Veterans' Administration: Because it clings blindly to inefficient, antiquated procedures, it wastes literally many millions of dollars each year in administering benefits to veterans. Its administrative costs are appallingly high per dollar distributed. If it tightened its administrative practices it would have more money left for veterans' benefits.

Bureau of the Budget: This Bureau has swollen faster than the budget. It now has more than 500 experts. Perhaps it is a coincidence, but as the Bureau has grown, the national administration has become more, instead of less, extravagant.

Maritime Commission: This is the Government's problem child, one of the most inefficient and arrogant outfits I have ever dealt with. The five commissioners are in a continual state of armed truce and have never gotten around to accounting for millions of dollars turned over to the Commission.

Bureau of Indian Affairs: Under the law the Indian Bureau is supposed to be trying to get the Indians on a self-sustaining basis. But year after year we are asked to appropriate more and more money for the Indian Bureau. Its pay roll has grown to 10,994 people, which I'm sure the Indians would agree is heap plenty bureaucrats.

Office of the Solicitor, Department of Agriculture: No one has been able to explain satisfactorily to me why the Department of Agriculture needs 400 on its legal staff.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: This was a brain child of Henry Wallace, and its export-control office has in the past been dominated by the "let's export a lot to Russia" crowd. This Bureau should reorganize its agencies for better service at less cost to the American people. It should aim its programs at protecting the commerce and industry of the men and women in America who must pay, through their taxes, the cost of government.

Tennessee Valley Authority: The administrators of this project, we have found, are continually trying to expand into socialistic experiments far afield from the original idea of conservation and power development. It also sinks money into huge parks, new manufacturing processes, and town planning.

Those are just eight of many dozens of Federal bureaus and agencies which, to my mind, need to be called to book on their extravagances, wool gathering, or inefficiency.

From your viewpoint as a taxpayer, however, these extravagances of agencies should not be your main concern. They cost you only millions. If you want to see where your billions are disappearing, then you should examine some of the broad, benevolent services the Federal Government renders its citizens.

These have made the United States Treasury the great national grab bag, and they raise the question whether the Federal Government—in promoting itself as the great white father in Washington—has not wandered far afield from the proper functioning of a Federal Government.

Consider this fact: The total hand-outs this year merely for subsidies to individual Americans and for grants-in-aid to local and State governments will total $5,500,000,000.

What are some of these services which might be considered as dubious projects for a Federal Government? On the surface, many of them may seem to be worthy causes, but take into account the bill for them that you must pay in taxes—and the pattern they are setting for Federal paternalism. Then ask yourself whether it would be advisable to either abandon or curtail them.

Airport aid: The Federal Government this year will chip in $40,000,000 to help plan and build local airfields. Requests on file for such aid indicate the ultimate cost may total $500,000,000. We have got to consider seriously how far we can go in this airport program and shape our policy toward the ultimate objective we wish to obtain through State and Federal cooperation.

Statistics for businessmen: The Bureau of the Census will spend $5,100,000 this year digging up facts about retail, service, wholesale businesses, and related data. If you are a businessman, are these facts worth that much to you? Or do you feel that private trade associations can make more of such surveys for themselves and take some of the load off the Federal Government?

Farm price support: In the coming year, because of bumper crops, this program may run into astronomical figures. You can get one clue to the probable cost to you by considering how much the United States taxpayer paid this past year to keep the price of one surplus crop—potatoes—at a high level: $44,000,000. Even the farmers of America who directly benefit from these programs are beginning to feel that the Government must take a more realistic approach to the support of farm prices.

Agriculture must be prosperous, and I am not suggesting that all farm-support programs be abandoned or slashed. Agriculture must be kept in sound condition in America, and our way to assure this is to provide farmers with some incentives to produce, but I do think they should be realistically scrutinized in view of present conditions and put on a more realistic long-term basis.

Rivers, harbors, flood control, and reclamation. In the coming year this program will cost you $775,000,000, the highest in history. Some of these projects are of immediate necessity, but in total they are justifiably known as the pork barrel. The wonderful opportunities for grab provided by Federal appropriations for local improvement have long been recognized.

But each year the grabs get bigger. It is well understood by local boosters that the best way to get their own pet project included is to trade support with other States. Thus, the 1949 program includes huge chunks for practically every State. I personally campaigned in vain to cut the civil-functions measure by at least $200,000,000. Our hearings were swamped with local boosters parading past us with open hands. During hearings on this bill, representatives of more than 20 State, county, and local chambers of commerce made pleas on behalf of various local projects. At the very same time many chambers of commerce were passing resolutions demanding more economy in the Federal Government.

In another case a corporation president was beating his chest around the country talking government economy, while his own subordinate was writing a protest to the Government for curtailing the Government's reporting of business statistics involving his particular commodity.

In Washington we call them the "I'm for economy—but" boys. During our hearings on the rivers, harbors, etc., bill, 400 people appealed to us on behalf of projects involved, and only one person appeared against the bill on the ground of economy. He represented the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce. His argument was that we cannot have our cake and eat it too. But he accurately referred to his testimony as "a still, small voice here in Washington."

Millions of Americans complain about high taxes and clamor for economy, but if we eliminate any services to which they have become accustomed they raise a storm of protests. Every year we add another billion or so to the services the Federal Government offers its citizens. And the American public leans more and more heavily on some sort of support from Washington. It is getting so that almost every citizen who runs into trouble in his career or in his business expects the Federal Government to bail him out.

I am a firm believer in adequate government service, and my record proves it. But I say that at present we are building up to an extremely dangerous situation, both economically and morally. We are inviting higher taxes and more socialization. But, more ominous, we are undermining the self-reliance of the individual citizen. The spirit of do-it-yourself is gradually being crushed in America by an omnipotent, monolithic Federal Government.

It is highly appropriate, I believe, that we reexamine the proper functions of government, and try to get back to efficient, economical bedrock operations.

What Population Growth Is Doing to Pacific Coast States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal growth of population in the Pactific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington which began during the war has continued in the postwar period, and shows no signs of reaching its peak in the near future. The West coast has met the challenge of the huge influx of persons immigrating from other parts of the Nation, and expanding industry has provided jobs for the horde of new workers. But the West coast has also found many new and acute problems growing out of its new population, problems of housing, public utilities, traffic, education, and medical care.

A recent article by Mr. Van Beuren Stanbery, western representative for area development, Office of Field Service, United States Department of Commerce, describes the population rise on the West coast and its effect on our Pacific Coast States, and points out the need for hastening economic development to keep pace with the population growth. I recommend this article to the attention of my colleagues in the House because Mr. Stanbery has presented an excellent survey of the situation on the West coast and its immediate needs:

WHAT POPULATION GROWTH IS DOING TO THE PACIFIC COAST STATES

(By Van Beuren Stanbery)

The war is over, but population is still growing rapidly on the west coast. From all parts of the country people are continuing to move to the snow-free lands of the Pacific slope. Why has this postwar growth occurred and what is it doing to the far West States?

Everyone knows that a huge influx of war production workers and wives and children of men in the armed forces poured into California, Oregon, and Washington during the war. Many observers thought the wartime migrants would leave when the war was over. But most of them stayed, as the California State Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission predicted they would back in 1944.

Since VJ-day the population tide has been running high everywhere. More babies, 3,750,000 of them, were born in the United States in 1947 than in any previous year. A rise of birth rates after the end of the war was expected by population students because that has been the historical trend. As in other wars, from Napoleon's day to this, there has been a sharp rise in births at the beginning of hostilities, a leveling off or even a decline while the war lasted, and then a postwar rise when the soldiers came home. The same thing happened at the end of World War I.

The postwar jump in birth rates is more closely related than one would think to migration to the Pacific Coast. When birth rates are high and the Nation's population growth is soaring, more people move West than when birth rates are low and our national growth has slowed down to a walk. The new infants do not pick up their swaddling clothes and hop into Fords and tourist pullmans, but many of their fathers and mothers, uncles and aunts, and friends of the family do, because business is generally good everywhere when there are lots of births.

The business cycle is an excellent population barometer for the far West States. When production indexes are climbing, their birth rates will rise and people east of the Rockies will take more chances on a new location than when pay rolls are shrinking and times are getting hard.

Contrary to popular belief, the so-called dust bowl migration of the 1930's to California, Oregon, and Washington was not nearly as large as earlier migrations. Approximately a million persons moved into California during the 1930 decade. But during the booming 1920's, about 2,000,000 came from other parts of the country, and for the 1940's, net migration into the State probably will exceed 2,500,000.

One thing is certain—the populations of the Pacific Coast States and of Arizona and Nevada as well have been for a long time and still are growing much faster than the national population.

The population gains of the far West States have been truly phenomenal. From April 1940 to July 1947 the Nation's population (excluding armed forces overseas) increased about 9 percent. But the Census Bureau estimates that for the same period population increased 43 percent in California; 39 percent in Oregon; 32 percent in Arizona; 29 percent in Washington; and 27 percent in Nevada. Florida was the only other State which showed anywhere near as high a rate of population growth.

Although no one knows just how fast people are now moving to the Pacific coast, the westward movement certainly is continuing. Using Census Bureau estimates as a guide, we see that California alone has (July 1948) some 800,000 more civilian residents than on VJ-day, not counting the return of veterans who had previously been Californians. About one-half of this postwar growth was from natural increase, the rest from net migration. The populations of Oregon and Washington are still continuing to grow, although at a slower rate than during the wartime and immediate postwar years.

What has this rapid growth done to the population pattern of the Pacific coast? For one thing, it has temporarily retarded the inevitable aging of the west coast population. Without the recent wave of births and newcomers from other States, the proportion of middle-aged and elderly people would have increased rapidly during the 1940's. But because the great majority of the migrants to the west coast were under 45 years of age (as they always have been in the past) and because births were so numerous, the percentages of the middle aged and elderly are still about the same as before the war. The average age of California's estimated 10,000,000 or more residents in 1948 is apparently even less than that of its 7,000,000 population in 1940.

Another general misconception is that California, especially southern California, is more heavily weighted with old folks than any other part of the country. Actually, eight other States had higher percentages of persons aged 65 and over when the last census was taken. And San Francisco had a slightly higher proportion of people aged 60 and over than lived in Los Angeles at that time.

As elsewhere, recent population growth has been concentrated in and around the cities. The big metropolitan districts of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco-Oakland, and Los Angeles grew about as fast as their respective States (an unusual occurrence), while many of the medium-sized communities up and down the coast grew even faster. The farming regions also gained population but their growth was relatively much slower than in the urban areas. Although generally looked upon as an agricultural State, California has become laterally a "State of cities." Only New York, and possibly Pennsylvania, have more urban residents and more cities of 10,000 population and over than are now in California.

How about jobs for all this horde of new workers? The expansion of the far West economy since 1940 has been even bigger than the most optimistic forecasts. Employment of all kinds is now approximately 60 percent higher in the three Pacific Coast States than in 1940. More people are now employed in California than at the peak of the war effort. At the same time, there is relatively more unemployment on the coast than in the Nation as a whole, although the proportion is not large in comparison to the labor force.

As had been predicted, the distribution of employment among agriculture, manufacturing, construction, distribution, and services activities has reverted to the prewar pattern. In April 1940 about 65 percent of all California employment was in distribution and services, the highest proportion of any State. Only about 35 percent was in the production of tangible commodities (agriculture, mining, construction, and manufacturing). The huge expansion of aircraft manufacture and shipbuilding during the war distorted this pattern, but after Japan was defeated the State's traditional distribution of employment was quickly restored. Although employment in all major activities is much larger than before the war, the biggest percentage gains have been in construction, Government work, and manufacturing.

The war pushed the Pacific coast's long awaited industrial boom over the threshold into reality. Manufacturers have rushed to take advantage of the suddenly expanded western markets and buying power. In addition, the mammoth steel plants at Geneva, Utah, and Fontana, Calif., and the new aluminum plants in Oregon and Washington are expediting industrial development by providing basic metals close at hand for fabrication in western factories.

According to Herbert F. Ormsby, research director for the California State Chamber of Commerce, approximately 3,000 new factories and 2,800 expansions of existing plants have been built or started in California alone during the last 3½ years. This capital investment totals over $950,000,000. Hundreds of new factories and plant expansions have also been built in Oregon and Washington. California now has 70,000 more retail trade establishments than at the prewar peak in 1941.

Along with these and other economic blessings, the rapid massing of people around west coast cities was bound to create many problems. From Seattle to San Diego there are long lists of home seekers, jam-packed streetcars and busses, people waiting in line at restaurants, railroad ticket windows, grocery stores, and doctors' offices.

Most acute are the shortages of housing and schools. Highways are crowded and need widening. Lack of adequate sewage disposal facilities causes trouble. State penal and medical institutions and public hospitals are overcrowded, some to the danger point.

In northern California there was not enough electric power in the spring of 1948, and some factories had to close down during a temporary "brown out." Californians are beginning to worry about whether they will have enough water and power for their future population, agriculture, and industries. The Pacific Northwest also will soon face a critical power shortage unless dam building is speeded up.

It is anyone's guess how long it will take to catch up on homes, schools, mass transportation, and other public facilities, water and power supplies in the far West.

The California State Office of Planning and Research reports that 105,000 housing units were built in California in 1946 and about 170,000 in 1947, each more than 20 percent of the corresponding national totals. But continuing population growth together with the fact that the number of families keeps on increasing faster than the number of people (as it always does nearly everywhere) will tend to prolong the housing shortage on the Pacific coast.

Local public officials are striving to catch up on their most urgent public-works projects in the face of material shortages and high prices. The State of California has embarked on a 10-year program of highway construction and institution building totaling a billion dollars. Oregon and Washington are also planning expanded public-works programs.

School-bond issues are being voted right and left, but schools cost a great deal more now than they did before the war. Moreover, the schoolroom problem differs from the housing problem in that the foreseeable peak of total elementary enrollment may be over by 1960. Many school boards are reluctant to go into debt to build additional rooms for the oncoming wave of young pupils which may subside, despite further inmigration, when birth rates drop again.

Farmers, industrialists, and businessmen generally are expanding their operations to meet the ever-growing west-coast demands. West-coast offices of the United States Department of Commerce are busy supplying economic data and technical advice to business firms and development organizations. Federal construction agencies, such as the Reclamation Bureau and Army engineers, have studied Pacific coast needs for water and land development and have come up with plans and schedules for the storage dams, irrigation, hydroelectric power, and flood-control projects that are essential for economic growth.

From the long-range point of view, the Pacific Coast has plenty of water and hydroelectric power resources to support a vastly increased population. The problem is one of economics rather than of engineering. Water and power become more costly as dams, conduits, and transmission lines become larger or more expensive to build. If irrigation water costs too much per acre, California farmers may not be able to compete with those in other areas. Industrial managers of California chambers of commerce are concerned now about the cost of water for future industrial users, who cannot afford to pay as high water rates as home dwellers. The Colorado River and other sources can supply southern California with enough water to support twelve to fourteen million people in that part of the State alone, but heavy industries and farmers may have difficulty in meeting the price. Proposals have been made for separating out industrial and storm water sewage and treating it for reuse by industrial plants.

Another proposal is that the Pacific Northwest electric power grid be connected with the California power grid to permit transmission of surplus power that could be generated on the Columbia River for irrigation pumping and other uses in California. With its year-round flow, the Columbia River might ease power shortages in California from its excess of falling water that otherwise would go out to sea without producing a kilowatt of useful energy.

The need for hastening economic development in order to keep pace with population growth is highlighted by what has happened to the per capita income of the Pacific Coast States in comparison with that of the Nation. From 1940 to 1946 the Nation's per capita income increased 109 perent, while that of the three coast States together increased more slowly, 95 percent, despite the relatively much greater economic expansion in the Pacific region. It takes time to build the dams, irrigation works, factories, warehouses, and stores required to create a hundred thousand or more new jobs each year. Accelerated development of its economic resources is urgent if the region is to maintain its relatively high per capita income.

Throughout the West, however, public and private organizations are adding their steam to the drive for economic expansion.

At its meeting last April in Sacramento, the western governors' conference asked the State commissions on interstate cooperation of the 11 Western States to determine a joint program for advancing industrial expansion of the West.

The Western States Council, composed of top chamber of commerce men, is encouraging increased activity on the part of industrial managers of State and local chambers.

The Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations, an unofficial organization which is gaining prestige by ironing out administrative problems among Federal, State, and local officials, is sponsoring an extensive economic survey of the coast States to determine types of government action that would aid in expanding their economies.

One of the few metropolitan regional development organizations in the country, the San Francisco Bay area council, is mobilizing the efforts of official agencies, businessmen, and the public generally for intensified development of the nine-counties Bay area.

Because of their suddenly expanded growth, the far West States have been lifted to a larger and more important position in the national economy. The contributions they are currently making to national production are far greater than in prewar years. With the reasonable certainty of continued increase of population, manpower, agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the development of natural resources that will follow population growth, the far West States will further increase their contributions to the national economy and national security.

These States are more than merely the western edge of the Nation, they are the American rim of the Pacific—the corridor to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Orient. It is as important for national security that the economy of the Pacific seaboard be developed and strengthened as is continued development on the eastern seaboard. The increased population and more industrialized economy of the Pacific Coast States are bulwarks for national safety and for peace in the Pacific.

Dewey Voter Lauds Truman When He Blasts Reds, Aspires To Rescue World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column from the Brooklyn Eagle of January 23, 1949, in my opinion expresses the thoughts of a large segment of that part of our citizenry, which voted with the minority on election day last:

ONE MAN SAYS

(By Robert M. Grannis)

DEWEY VOTER LAUDS TRUMAN WHEN HE BLASTS REDS, ASPIRES TO RESCUE WORLD

I'll never forget that day long ago when my personal fortunes were at a low ebb. I was tired and cold and tomorrow was a big question mark. Then over a radio I listened to the late President Roosevelt's mellow voice saying we have nothing to fear but fear itself. I'm not a Roosevelt fan but the memory of that moment has meant a great deal to me. It was a light in the darkness, a clue to the solution of many problems.

And now I think I'll supplant that memory with one that is nearer and closer. President Truman's inaugural address came as an emotional lift in a period of world history when uncertainty blankets the hearts and minds of so many people all over the world. Here was something spoken not as eloquently as F. D. R. would have said it. Nor as dramatic. But behind the homespun Missouri tang was a magic appeal whose meaning no man could miss. The speech was as American as a day at Coney Island. As understandable as the voice of an announcer droning off the batteries for any day's game at Ebbets Field.

Half-truths omitted

Diplomatic half-truths were dispensed with for once and partisan politics took a back seat. One could listen and forget the tinsel and party exultations that marked the occasion.

Mr. Truman called the turn on communism, branded the Moscow conspiracy as the enemy of decency, and pledged America to the defense of freedom. He didn't reach into our pockets this time so much as he reached into our hearts and he dared to say that the American heart and conscience should be dedicated to the betterment of world conditions. For a moment—just for a moment—until I studied the text I was inclined to feel that perhaps we were about to embark on a new venture in reckless philanthropy. But that was not what he had in mind at all.

He merely asked that we divert some of our technical skill, some of our inexhaustible supply of know-how to undeveloped places where people know a yearning for something better but lack the method of accomplishment.

So here I am, a Dewey voter, going all out for the Democratic Party's standard bearer because I feel the color of his words is the American color and what he wants to do is the only right thing to do.

His task just beginning

But Mr. Truman's task is just beginning. He must make it clear that his speech does not mean we are about to make another and bigger hand-out. He needs to be specific for the benefit of anxious taxpayers

and for the benefit of broken people who have come to look upon the U. S. A. as a dollar sign. His speech meant nothing like that unless I'm terribly wrong. It meant that private resources and native brains must join in the task that Government started when it inaugurated the Marshall plan. It must do so for more than the hope of ultimate return on an investment. Both elements must act in the name of humanity.

We can't kill communism with bullets alone. But we can dull its impact on the lives of the miserable who reach for any straw, real or imaginary, by giving them the kind of cooperation that will make them full partners in the fight for freedom. And while we are advancing this cause we need to make it plain that there is no thought of diluting our strength so that we will become weak and an easy target for aggression.

We must help him

Those who think we can live alone, self-sufficient and with our backs turned to the hungry and distressed, are already dead. And those who think that communism is an unimportant comic strip in the newspapers of the world can say farewell to their freedom. I think we'd better take the advice of Mr. Truman and hope that time and experience will give him new wisdom to think as straight on the home front as he does when he looks across the world. It is our job to help him—Democrats and Republicans. This is no time to be concerned with party symbols—except the symbol of our greatest threat—the Moscow-made hammer and sickle.

Mr. Speaker, it is because our country can divide before election day and regardless of the result on election day consolidate its forces with the majority that we will continue to make progress—the kind of progress that will advance democracy and prevent the spread of communism.

Chester H. Rowell, Great American and Californian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the great jurists of our State, Justice Homer R. Spence, of our supreme court, delivered a short eulogy on Mr. Rowell at the meeting of the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco last April, and so did Mr. Ward, its secretary. At the time I read them I was under the impression that the Commonwealth Club did not permit reproduction of any of its publications. However, last fall when in California, I learned that reproduction of speeches, such as those mentioned herein, is permissible under the club rules. Consequently, under leave to extend my remarks, I am asking unanimous consent to have printed as a part of these remarks, the speeches of Justice Spence and Mr. Ward.

What impressed me most about Mr. Rowell, despite all his attainments in various fields of learning and activity, was the fact that he had a forward-looking mind until the day when illness overtook him. Several years ago I had the pleasure of having a short talk with him, and he told me that he had laid out work that would keep him busy for the next 20 years. Many men, as they grow older, begin to look backward and reminisce over the past. They also seem to feel that the outlook for the future, as their knowledge of the world becomes more realistic, is very dismal and pessimistic. Not so with Chester Rowell. He had an active, restless, and inquiring mind. He saw the bright side of the future. By his writing and speaking he analyzed public problems and outlined how they might be solved in the new world in which we live. His influence will be felt for a long time.

Justice Spence's and Mr. Ward's speeches follow, in that order:

ADDRESS OF JUSTICE SPENCE

As we open this meeting today, it is difficult for us to realize that the voice of another great leader in our club activities—a voice that was so often raised for our enlightenment—has been stilled and will be heard no more upon this earthly sphere. I refer to the voice of our esteemed member Chester H. Rowell, who recently departed from our midst.

As we think of the breadth of knowledge and of the diversity of activity of this man during his very full life covering more than eight decades, we are at once impressed with the futility of attempting, on this occasion, to make any extended reference to his many fine attributes and outstanding accomplishments. Fortunately, he was well known to, and was highly esteemed by, many people throughout the State, throughout the Nation, and in fact throughout the world; and it is therefore but natural that his fellow members of the press should have covered his life and work in well-merited eulogies which have been heretofore widely published. We nevertheless deem it appropriate, here and now, to pay our simple tribute, more particularly in appreciation of his contributions to the work of the Commonwealth Club of California.

Chester H. Rowell was truly a leader of men and a molder of public opinion. No problem, national or international, was to him so complex as to cause him to despair in attempting its solution, and no minor local problem was to him so insignificant as to escape his notice and consideration. We knew him as a thorough scholar, a gifted linguist, a penetrating analyst, a brilliant lecturer, a talented writer, a fearless publisher, an able and courageous political scientist, and a great humanitarian. We knew him as a man who had received countless honors, and who had served with distinction in various activities, public and private, looking toward the improvement of the social, economic, and political welfare of mankind. But we knew him best as one whose unquenchable thirst for knowledge was exceeded only by his unlimited ability to absorb that knowledge, and to apply it in a very practical manner toward the solution of every problem that arose. It seems to us that he lived by the motto voiced by our founder, Father Adams—"Get the Facts"—and his life seems to have been dedicated to the same purpose as that expressed in the constitution of our club, "To investigate and discuss problems affecting the welfare of the Commonwealth and to aid in their solution." In truth it may fairly be said that he personified the cherished ideals and traditions of this great organization.

Chester H. Rowell joined the Commonwealth Club in 1908 and was one of its most loyal and active members for a period of 40 years. Our records reveal that he was the speaker at our Friday luncheons on 40 separate occasions, and that he addressed our other club and section meetings at innumerable times. He served in 1928 as our quarterly luncheon chairman, and also served as a member of our board of governors from 1935 to 1939. Continuously from its inception in 1927, he acted as a member of our research advisory council. He was ever ready to answer the club's call to service, and it will be remembered that on more than one occasion, when some emergency prevented the appearance of our scheduled speaker, he would arise upon our last-minute request, and, without any apparent oportunity for preparation, would deliver a most thoughtful, informative, and entertaining address. Realizing his many significant contributions to the work of the club, the board of governors, in 1941, elected him to honorary membership, an honor which has been bestowed upon but few men during the 45 years of the club's existence. He held the unique distinction, for some time prior to his passing, of being our only living honorary member.

We shall miss our distinguished leader—his smiling countenance, his friendly handclasp, his sparkling wit, his dynamic personality, and his sage advice and counsel in the affairs of our club. Untold thousands of others, in organizations in which he led the way, will likewise miss his presence—groups striving for better international understanding and goood will, groups attempting to improve our own governmental processes in order to demonstrate their virtues in governing the affairs of men, and groups seeking to ameliorate the conditions of the less fortunate of the human race wherever they may be found. We fear that our search to find another to fill his place will be in vain, for nature, in its inscrutable way, seems seldom to create a man of the caliber of Chester H. Rowell. This noble citizen of the world was a scintillating star in our firmament, and we know that the light of that star will shine brightly in our memories, and that it will ever serve to guide and to inspire us throughout all the years of our lives.

Speaking on behalf of all the members of the Commonwealth Club, I extend our most sincere sympathy to his devoted family; and, in token of our high regard and affection, when we adjourn this meeting today, we shall adjourn out of respect to the memory of our esteemed honorary member, Chester H. Rowell.

ADDRESS OF MR. WARD

The man who never said "No" to a request to serve the Commonwealth Club of California has passed on.

Chester Rowell literally fulfilled Kipling's immortal precept, "He walked with kings—yet never lost the common touch."

It would be easier to reflect in words on paper the multiple facets of a diamond than to set down adequately what Chester Rowell meant to this club, his city, his State, his Nation, his world—or to you or me.

He was never a president of the Commonwealth Club, though he could have been if he wanted to. He held no elective public office—he had served in many such modest posts as elections committee clerk in the house of representatives and member of the State railroad commission—but he knew more practical and theoretical politics than any man we can think of.

Chester Rowell, boyishly happy in being a specialist in a score of foreign languages, and supermaster of his own, instead of parading that knowledge, rarely used words of more than three syllables—only two, where possible—and spoke vividly and forcefully without using a dozen adjectives per hour. His "Rowell-ese" summations of men and events of the day impressed and charmed our Friday audiences year after year. His ability to find humor, irony, and just plain fun amidst

the clash of armed ideas was typical of his capacity to be of the battle, yet far above it.

During the past decades there sometimes circulated from the lairs of the few who nursed grudges against Mr. Rowell because of his fairly earned victories over them, the wishful thought that Chester Rowell was "through." The huge audiences that continued to greet his every appearance on this club's platform and on every other important forum of this Nation, as well as abroad, again and again testified that he was still the revered sage of tens of thousands of his fellows.

Chester Rowell will never be "through" so long as the multitudes who have heard or read his millions of trenchant words continue to live; nor so long as there remains even one of the younger—and middle—generation of writers and workers for human betterment whose efforts he so generously encouraged with no possibility of personal advantage.

Already it seems strange to realize that the young newcomer to San Francisco seeking counsel or guidance cannot be told: "Go see Chester Rowell."

Highly Paid Propagandists Are Not Fooling the People With Their Arguments That the Basing-Point Pricing System Should Be Legalized Even in Cases of Conspiracy and Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a legal opinion of a prominent law firm in Washington, D. C., Williams, Myers, & Quiggle, to the National Food Brokers Association, concerning the Robinson-Patman Act and a decision of the United States Supreme Court on the basing-point system. These prominent lawyers point out the following:

First. That all delivered price systems are not threatened by the Supreme Court's invalidation of the basing-point system in the Cement and other cases.

Second. A discussion of the unfair discriminations caused in certain industries against independent business under the basing-point system.

Third. Cautioning interstate sellers to read and understand the Corn Products, Staley, and Cement cases very carefully before joining in plans to avoid the law.

Fourth. An illustration of the kind of price discriminations properly outlawed by the Supreme Court in the cases mentioned.

Fifth. "We believe that the great majority of interstate sellers (and buyers) in the food industry will enjoy benefits rather than suffer burdens from the prohibitions of the Robinson-Patman Act which are enforced in these decisions."

The matter referred to follows:

Increasing discussion of the Corn Products, Staley, and Cement cases in the press and before committees of Congress, conveys an impression that the Supreme Court's invalidation of the basing-point systems of delivered prices in the glucose and cement industries, under the Robinson-Patman Act, threatens all delivered price systems and is creating such uncertainty and chaos in the pricing of goods as to make it imperative that Congress amend the antitrust laws, including the Robinson-Patman Act, so as to legalize delivered price systems generally. Some of the discussion has made reference to the delivered price system in the food industry, and we therefore believe we should supplement the views given you in our memorandum of July 19, 1948.

We believe the Supreme Court made it perfectly clear that the Robinson-Patman Act was not intended by Congress to prohibit any system of uniform delivered prices, such as basing point systems, zonal delivered price systems, etc. In the Corn Products case, the Court observed in the legislative history that one provision of the Robinson-Patman bill would have had the practical effect of requiring that the prices of all commodities sold in interstate commerce be computed on an f. o. b. factory basis, and would have prohibited any system of uniform delivered prices as well as any basing point system of delivered prices. The Supreme Court observed that such a drastic change in existing pricing systems engendered opposition which finally led to the withdrawal of the provision by the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Supreme Court then stated:

"We think this legislative history indicates only that Congress was unwilling to require f. o. b. factory pricing, and thus to make all uniform delivered price systems and all basing point systems illegal per se. On the contrary, we think that it left the legality of such systems to be determined accordingly as they might be within the reach of section 2 (a), as enacted, and its more restricted prohibitions of discriminations in delivered prices."

The actual price differences cited in the Corn Products and Staley cases indicate that one purchaser from a seller paid anywhere from 2 percent to 19 percent more for his goods than his competitor paid, and that the seller's net return from sales to such favored purchaser was anywhere from 4 percent to 38 percent less than the net return from sales to the purchaser who was discriminated against. It was such differences in price that the Supreme Court held were unwarranted price discriminations; and finding that such unwarranted price discriminations were systematc and necessarily resulted from the basing-point systems in the glucose and cement industries, when the basing point selected by the seller was distant from his point of production, the Supreme Court forbade the use of such basing-point systems.

It being our view that interstate sellers should read and understand these cases very carefully before joining in plans to avoid the law, which may prove ill-advised, we wish to set forth an illustration of the kind of price discriminations resulting from the basing-point systems condemned by the Supreme Court in these cases, in order that sellers may intelligently judge whether it is the law or such pricing systems which should be changed.

Seller S produces an unfinished product at his plant in Kansas City. One of his purchasers (A) is located next door to his plant in Kansas City; another purchaser (B) is located in Chicago. A and B use S's product in their manufacture of finished products which they sell in competition with one another all over the country. S, in Kansas City, charges A, in Kansas City, a Chicago base price of $2.09 per 100 pounds, plus 40 cents freight from Chicago to Kansas City notwithstanding there is no such freight haul, A being situated next door to S's producing plant in Kansas City. On the other hand, S, in Kansas City, charges B, in Chicago, the Chicago base price of $2.09, without any additional charge for freight, notwithstanding S must ship the goods from Kansas City to Chicago and actually pay 40 cents freight. A and B are competing in the sale of their finished products, and B has a distinct advantage over A insofar as B pays $2.09 while A must pay $2.49 per 100 pounds for the unfinished product that goes into their finished products. Thus, A has been denied the natural advantage of proximity to S's plant, the unfinished goods-purchase price advantage to which he is entitled to expect over purchasers at a distance. A has not only been denied the advantage, but he is arbitrarily required actually to pay more, 40 cents or 19 percent more, for the goods than B who is located at a distance. S netted $2.49 from A, including the 40 cents phantom freight paid by A, but only netted $1.69 from B since S absorbed the actual freight to Chicago. The discrimination in favor of Chicago and against Kansas City was 80 cents or 38 percent of the base price. This difference in price is utterly unrelated to any actual cost difference in S's sale or delivery of the goods. The FTC found and the Supreme Court affirmed in the Corn Products and Staley cases, that such a discrimination injures or diminishes competition between S's purchasers, A and B; and in the Cement case, that the discrimination substantially lessened competition between S and its competitors; and that the discriminations were therefore unwarranted under the Robinson-Patman Act.

We understand these Supreme Court decisions to mean, in essence, that systematic price discriminations are necessarily involved where the price basing point is distant from the point of production, as illustrated above. We do not understand that the Robinson-Patman Act forbids a uniform delivered price system (national or zonal). The Supreme Court said in the Staley case:

"But it does not follow that respondents may never absorb freight when their factory price plus actual freight is higher than their competitors' price, or that sellers, by so doing, may not maintain a uniform delivered price at all points of delivery, for in that event there is no discrimination in price."

If a finished-product producer in Wisconsin wants to sell his product at the uniform price of $3 per case all over the United States (familiarly known as the postage stamp delivered price), we think, generally speaking, that he is free to do so even though he must absorb substantial costs of freight to the distant points of shipment. It may be argued that it is unfair for buyers in Wisconsin to be required to pay the same price as California buyers, namely, $3 per case delivered; but however unfair this may be from an economic (or some other legal) standpoint, the Robinson-Patman Act does not prevent a seller individually (without collusion or collaboration with other sellers) from selling on such a delivered price system so long as it does not result in discriminations among his purchasers which substantially lessens competition with the sellor or injures competition among his purchasers or their customers. It may be that, as a general rule, it is unlikely that competition will be substantially lessened or injured if all purchasers of a seller have the same cost of goods, namely, the delivered price of $3 per case. In contrast, in the illustration set forth above fn this memorandum the cost of goods of purchaser A at Kansas City was 40 cents higher than the cost of goods of the purchaser B located in Chicago, a discrimination which seems utterly indefensible when it is shown that the seller charged A 40 cents freight which never occurred but did not charge his competitor B the 40 cents freight which actually occurred.

In conclusion, we believe that the great majority of interstate sellers (and buyers) in the food industry will enjoy benefits rather

than suffer burdens from the prohibitions of the Robinson-Patman Act which are enforced in these decisions. Only those sellers who have reason to believe that their delivered price system has an injurious effect on competition have a burden under these decisions to study their own competitive situations as well as the competitive situations of their customers and to take other reasonable precautions to eliminate discriminations, if any, of the magnitude and character found in these cases.

Address of Hon. Melvin Price, Member of Congress, at Jackson Day Dinner, Broadview Hotel, East St. Louis, Ill., January 15, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an address delivered by me at the Jackson Day dinner sponsored by the Democrats of St. Clair County, Ill., and held at the Broadview Hotel, East St. Louis, on Saturday night, January 15, 1949:

JEFFERSON TO TRUMAN

At this time of the year Democrats throughout the land have traditionally honored the memories of two of the great leaders of our party—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

It is a very great pleasure for me tonight to have the honor of participating in the revival of the custom here in our own section of the country. Years ago when democracy was ascending in St. Clair County we were filled with life and party fervor, and we sponsored several large gatherings of this sort. For a period there was a lull.

Something happened on November 2, 1948, that seemed to give the old Democratic mule a "shot in the arm", and so here we are today, well and happy, and eager to reconsecrate ourselves in the principles of Jefferson and Jackson that have been the real guiding force of the Democratic Party from its beginning. And I have great pride in the fact that the party as a whole does more than pay idle lip service to these principles. Under great modern leaders—Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Harry Truman—our party has given ample, positive proof that it truly is the party of the people that Jefferson and Jackson desired it forever should be.

As a party we can pay no greater honor to those two stalwart pillars of democracy than by applying the lessons they taught us to the present and the future.

The democracy which Thomas Jefferson fathered was an inspiration not only of the plain, freedom-loving people of our own Nation, but of the freedom-loving peoples of every land.

When we were drifting away from the principles of Jefferson and toward the government by privilege—which was the theory of Alexander Hamilton—Andrew Jackson was the hard bitten, fighting man of the people who gave the Government back to the people.

Jackson pioneered two frontiers.

One was the frontier of land as we developed the West. The other was a frontier of government, the broadening of the Government to let the plain people of the country enjoy the right to vote.

And neither Jefferson nor Jackson had an easy time fighting for their ideals—no easier than Roosevelt and Truman of the present era.

Always we have moved in the direction set by Jefferson and Jackson—a democratic government based on the broad participation of all of our people in the conduct of our Government—and in the benefits of our free enterprise system of economy.

And always other nations have looked to us for leadership by example.

Today our American belief in government by the people and in a free enterprise system of economy is under a dual challenge.

We hope that last November may have eased one challenge—the next few months may tell. But there has been a challenge at home from those who seek to tear down the strong national economy built by Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Democratic Party, to abandon the reforms which have pushed our national productive level to a record high, and to return to the futile system of government by privilege which had our private enterprise economy prostrate in 1932.

Those who seek to sabotage our private enterprise economy by catering to lobbies and pressure groups and seek to give the reins of government to the hands of the privileged few are the menace at home to our democratic government and to our free enterprise economy.

I said there was a dual challenge to our American way of life.

The second challenge comes from overseas. It challenges first all freedom-loving peoples in the path of its greedy expansion and ultimately—make no mistake—it challenges us.

This challenge comes from a hostile conception of government.

Where we have ideals—this other government has ideologies.

Where we have freedom—this other government has repression.

Where we seek to free people—this other government seeks to enslave them.

This other government bears the name of communism and claims that it is the true democracy.

It asserts that our free government of free peoples in a free economy is a government of capitalistic slavery.

It asserts that we are on the verge of economic collapse.

That is the second challenge to our American way of life.

Last November 2 also set back that challenge—counting heavily on the propaganda usages for a Truman defeat, the Soviet took a severe set-back when their guess was as bad as Dr. Gallup's. All through Europe those who are fighting hardest against Communist aggression see in the Truman victory an inspiration to carry on in their battle to spread real democracy through the unhappy nations of the Old World.

From the dawn of America the peoples of Europe have turned to us for inspiration.

Their eyes are upon us today.

They seek material help from us—true.

But they also seek assurance from watching our society that our way of life is a better way of life than the Communist regimentation which creeps closer to their borders.

We have witnessed funerals of freedom in several countries of Europe—some of them the homelands of many of you here tonight, or of your father or mother—and there are trouble spots in China and Greece, where the lamps of liberty are mighty dim.

All these upheavals abroad and uncertainties at home mean that our domestic policy and our foreign policy are completely interdependent.

More so than you might think. Like a vulture, the Kremlin awaits an economic collapse in the United States to prove the failure of the capitalistic system. That's the reason our domestic policy should be as nonpartisan in the months ahead as our foreign policy.

Americans of all political faiths should give their full support to President Truman in his efforts to preserve our domestic economy and in his efforts to lead the nations of the world to a peaceful settlement of their problems.

President Truman made a soul-stirring appeal to the new Congress for cooperation, and I have the feeling he will receive the cooperation he seeks. The partisan domestic policy brought on by the Eightieth Congress' refusal to cooperate with the President must disappear if we are to ward off the danger of economic collapse.

If an effective bipartisan foreign policy is to continue, sniping on the part of Republican headline hunters will not help. There was much of it in recent months.

And both at home and in our foreign affairs we have been endangered by isolationism.

There still exists the isolationism of the prewar variety, the blindness of those who think we can live as a peaceful and prosperous island while the rest of the world is torn by strife and chaos.

There also still exists the isolationism which holds that we can have a successful economy as long as big business makes big profits, regardless of the welfare of small businessmen, professional people, farmers and workers.

This I call domestic isolationism.

So as we enter the new year and a new Democratic administration in Washington, and in the State of Illinois, we find we are sorely beset with desperate problems at home and abroad.

Successful candidates of last November today are starting a tour of duty through which they should ever be mindful of their obligation to the people who registered their confidence in them at the ballot box. It is not enough to verbally thank the voter and tell him you appreciate his vote. From the moment an elected official of the Federal Government, State or county takes his oath of office he should start to deliver on behalf of his people.

People appreciate good, honest, and faithful public service. They appreciate hard work on the part of their public servant. Prove your good intentions as public officials and you will always have public support.

Illinois has had few Democratic governors—but we as Democrats can point with pride to the records of those we have had. Altgeld, Dunne, and Horner, have been the only elected Democratic governors since the Civil War. We haven't had quantity, but no one will deny that the Democratic Party has sent quality to the Governor's chair in Springfield.

And now we can add the name of Adlai Stevenson. At the start of his administration we have the confidence that he, too, will merit a position of honor alongside Altgeld, Dunne, and Horner.

While Adlai Stevenson is taking good care of the business of the State of Illinois, President Truman will be fighting in Washington to keep our national economy strong and to dispel the fear of a recession at home and the spread of communism abroad. We have learned that you can't sit back and let these matters take care of themselves. The Eightieth Congress somehow had the idea you could. The people wisely disagreed with the Republican Congress and agreed with President Truman.

We would certainly be unwise to sit idly by and watch Russia draw the iron curtain around country after country in which once men were free. If we did, it would be only a question of time before we would face the same peril—alone.

It doesn't take too much imagination to believe, as the Soviets press on, that we hear the muffled death rattle of freedom.

And what of our domestic economy as we creep toward a decision of our world responsibilities?

The inflation boiler is near the bursting point.

There may be a few pennies relief here and there but in the over-all picture prices and profits are out of balance with the rest of the economy. President Truman realized this in 1948 as he pleaded for action from a noncooperative Congress. He realizes it now as he asks for remedial measures from a Congress composed by majorities from his own party. It is for Congress to follow the leadership of the President in solving this problem—and it is not necessary that the Congress be a rubber stamp in so doing. If Congress has a better way of meeting the situation than those that come in the President's proposals, the President would work with the Congress. It is a matter of cooperation and there is no reason why, with the executive and legislative branches of Government working together, the issue can't be squarely met. I feel that it will be.

There are too many Members of this new Democratic Congress who remember the collapse of 1932—the bread lines, the apple peddlers, the long lines of the bank runs, the despair that enshrouded our Nation. Those were the days of misery and despair—and economic blizzards—the result of the reaction and inaction of the Republican Party.

Make no mistake, if Franklin Roosevelt had not corrected the abuses of a Republican administration and put our free-enterprise economy back on its feet, we might well today have some other form of government than the free American democracy all love so dearly—the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson, of Wilson, of Roosevelt, and of Harry Truman.

The Eightieth Congress road-block threatened to send us into depression and economic chaos by letting inflation rage unchecked. The Republicans pursued a philosophy of defeatism, expecting us to live on a left-over economy in the atomic era. In 1948 as in 1920 they wanted to go back to normalcy, forgetting that you can't turn backward and progress at the same time. We must go forward.

This has always been the Democratic philosophy since the days of Jefferson and Jackson.

It is still the Democratic philosophy today.

The goals of the Democratic Party stand unchanged by time or events.

They are based on the granite of honest conviction.

And the goals are the goals of the people.

The people want peace.

Peace among ourselves at home.

Peace among nations in the world.

The people want to govern themselves with fairness to all and with injustice to none.

They do not want to be governed by the few for the few.

The people want America to continue to be a land of equal opportunity.

In a courageous state of the Union message President Truman set forth to the Eighty-first Congress the goals of the people. He outlined a simple, common-sense program to carry us toward those goals, in orderly progress.

His proposals were not new. Many times since he took up the burdens of his great office he had appealed to Congress to act on them. Congress heeded not—some Members attacked them violently—they were distorted and twisted—some sneered that they were strictly political.

Let us examine these proposals.

Not in the heat of political passion but in the light of reason.

The President proposes that we go forward with a program.

Not drift into confusion and chaos with a program. Who is so fearful as to say that this is wrong?

The President said that we must secure fully the human rights of our citizens.

Are Americans against such a program?

The President said that we must develop our human resources—he said we should give more economic security to the people.

He said we must raise our standards of education.

He said we should get rid of our festering slums and build decent houses at fair prices.

Are there still some who oppose good schools and good housing?

The President said that agriculture, business, and labor must move forward together.

Are there some who would limit this progress to big business?

The President asks for more industrial expansion to get more production—Are there some who would prefer the economy of scarcity to the economy of plenty?

Truman said that our gains in national income should be shared by those of low income.

Who will openly say this is wrong?

The President said that we must achieve world peace based on principles of freedom and justice and the equality of all nations.

President Truman continues to express faith in the United Nations. He said we should continue to help friendly and freedom-loving nations to rebuild their war-torn economies.

These are steps that lead to peace—not to war.

But nowhere is a parallel of the conflict between Jefferson and Hamilton more closely drawn than in the long fight the President has had with Congress to legislate to curb inflation. Through the Eightieth Congress there was a dispute between those who served the interests of all the people and those who served the interest of a selfish few. Let us hope that the valiant battle which President Truman waged and won last fall, will have its influence on the new Congress. There are indications that it will.

Since 1933 great gains have been made for our people—for all of our people—under the principles of Jefferson and Jackson followed by Democratic administrations.

As Democrats we may be justly proud of our party's past achievements.

But our performance of the present and in the future are of far greater importance to the Nation.

What of the present?

And what of the future?

Today we fight and tomorrow we will fight the battle of every American citizen to make our Nation a place for all of its citizens to live in peace and decency.

We must make more of the good things of life and share them fairly.

We must show the world that our democracy and our free-enterprise system offer more than any form of despotic totalitarianism.

We must profit by the lessons which cycles of war and depression have taught us.

We have learned that true democracy is the best form of democracy.

We have learned that freedom is a greater source of energy than expression and regimentation.

We have learned that our own Nation cannot prosper in a climate of internal economic isolationism.

We have learned that the manufacturer cannot prosper if the farmer is bankrupt.

We have learned that the interests of management and labor are mutual and that neither can be strong and prosperous unless the other is equally healthy from an economic viewpoint.

We have learned that the Nation is no stronger than its weakest citizens or its scarcest resources.

We have learned that it is sound government and sound business to say, "Yes, I am my brother's keeper."

These things we have learned and proved in our domestic history.

But what of the world?

I believe that we have learned that no nation can isolate itself from the rest of the world any more than one segment of our society can isolate itself from another.

We know that a healthy interchange of goods and raw materials, of ideas and information between nations is a requisite of a healthy world society.

From our domestic history we know that a healthy economy and a healthy government go hand in hand.

Now we seek through the United Nations to build a world political organization that will enable the men of good will of this world to secure a lasting peace.

I have said that there are political struggles within this world organization between those who believe in the American form of democracy and those who have distorted the meaning of democracy to cover a government imposed upon the people in their name from above but without giving these people the actual right to govern themselves.

There is also an economic struggle between these two forms of government.

For a free economy is just as much a part of our way of life as a slave economy is a part of the regimented way of life.

If our way prevails we can raise the economic level of the rest of the world to our own.

If the opposing way prevails it will drag the rest of the world and ultimately us down to its level.

When we seek to raise the world to our level, instead of letting it drag itself and us down to the other level, we are seeking a prize worth while.

And that is the crux of the economic warfare that we wage as a part of the cold war.

Just as we reject this backward economic pull, so we reject efforts to retreat in the field of governments.

We resist this at home.

We resist it abroad.

We believe that the peoples of the world should have the opportunity to work out their own destinies in a democratic manner.

From the lesson of our domestic history we seek to show them the way.

We have learned from our own past that a sound economy and a sound government are necessary for domestic tranquility.

To achieve international tranquility we seek to follow the same formula.

We are embarked upon a course of unselfish moral leadership.

Our belief that a sound world economy is a requisite of a sound world political organization to preserve our peace has led us to offer to share some of our resources with other nations of good will whose economies have been smashed by the war.

In the European recovery program we are striving to put steel girders into the structure for peace that we are building in the United Nations.

This economic and political program is the only way in which we can secure the sound peace that all men of good will dream of and desire above all else in these days of cold warfare and cold terror.

Our great stake in curing Europe of her economic ills is the long-range benefits the whole world will receive when the Red menace is overcome. The threat of Soviet domination must be halted in Europe before it engulfs all the world.

Without economic recovery the chances of success for the United Nations are slim.

In our hands we hold the lamp of liberty and true democracy.

To free peoples we offer the tools with which they can become as strong and free as we.

We offer them the chance to shape their own destiny through their own efforts.

Not all nations wish to join us in these efforts.

Some prefer first to impose their political authority upon the peoples to whom they promise help, and they refuse to cooperate in a plan which respects the human rights of those it seeks to aid.

The bleak darkness where once glowed the lights of freedom in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary tell us that all too plainly.

The course taken by our Government will determine whether we find a lasting peace of free nations or whether we move toward the indescribable terror of atomic war—and that might well mean the end of civilization. There will be no road back from an atomic world war III.

These are the problems the present-day successor of Jefferson and Jackson faces. Harry Truman has no easy task. Today the mantle of world leadership rests upon our shoulders as Americans. We had that leadership once before, after World War I—and we failed.

President Truman, supported by the people, enters into a new administration dedicating it to the cause of world peace and determined to travel on a road that will lead all nations to an understanding and good will.

God grant to this humble man from Missouri, who so appealed to the hearts of his people that against the heaviest of odds he retained his leadership of the Nation—the wisdom, the vision, and the strength necessary to attain his one overpowering ambition—to lead us to lasting peace.

World peace is America's challenge.

It has long been our dream.

Let us make it our destiny.

American and British Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are now told by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancelor of the Exchequer, that Great Britain leads the world in the tax load when compared with the United States. Well, what of it? We carry our own tax load and also carry a goodly part of the British socialistic tax load. Perhaps we can do more if Argentina can be prevailed upon to clothe more of our needy children.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article which appeared in the New York Tribune, Thursday, January 20, 1949:

CRIPPS SAYS BRITAIN LEADS IN TAX LOAD—$276 A PERSON, COMPARED WITH $264 IN UNITED STATES

LONDON, January 19.—Great Britain leads the world in the burden of taxation placed upon its people, according to figures submitted to the House of Commons today by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

He reported that Britain will have imposed taxes equal to $276 for each man, woman, and child in the United Kingdom in the current fiscal year ending March 31. This was broken down into $156 direct taxation and $120 indirect.

The United States in the same period will have imposed per capita taxes of $264, of which $208 will be direct and $56 indirect, he said.

He listed Canada third, with $104 direct and $84 indirect taxes for a per capita total of $188.

The Common Sense of a Fighting Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a Marine Corps general, now Director of Reserve Training, Maj. Gen. W. T. (Johnny) Clement, pointed out in down-to-earth language at the All Services Review recently held in Rochester, N. Y., the necessity for complete team work if our defense establishment is to be fully effective.

No doubt the present unification legislation can be improved but no law can force the true spirit of cooperation which arises from the heart and will to work together for a common objective.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, quoting from the splendid address delivered by General Clement:

NOT SEPARATE

The Air Force is the country's first line of defense; therefore service in it is attractive to young men who understand why the country's defense must be both strong and alert, and who wish to be in the first line.

But the Air Force cannot exist or work or fight by itself. It will be effective only as it is conceived to be part of the whole defense organization. That its most intelligent leaders and the most intelligent leaders of all defense services know.

In Rochester last Friday took place an impressive demonstration of the willingness of all services to cooperate. It was perhaps the first time in any American city that high representatives of all services took part in ceremonies focused on over-all defense.

The meaning of this cooperation was well expressed by Maj. Gen. W. T. Clement, Marine Corps Reserve director, when he said:

"May I counsel against entering into contentious arguments about the relative importance of any arm of the service that is charged with the defense of our Nation. No single arm of any service ever won a major battle, let alone a war. Battles are won by teams trained in the specialty of their particular service and welded into a superteam. Every championship football team must have a man who can hit the line, a man who can run the ends, and one who can take to the air with passes. A winning military team must have all phases and types of attack ready for use if it expects to win."

That from a marine whose outfit's conspicuous fighting in the Pacific won it new laurels; but which from the beginning of the corps' history has believed and known how to cooperate effectively with other service branches.

Coordination of the services needs further implementation on the highest level. The helps to closer coordination that Defense Secretary Forrestal is urging should be granted by Congress. But it is important that the common sense, the vital necessity, of coordination be imbued all through the personnel of the services.

This Friday's all-services review emphasized, and it is further emphasized in the invitation of Herbert W. Cruickshank, of the Gannett newspapers, to head not just an Air Force procurement committee locally, but a committee which has the cumbersome but meaningful title of Military and Naval Civilian Component Personnel Procurement Committee. This committee has been developed by the National Guard, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Reserve, and the Army and Air Force Reserves.

We say in our pledge of allegiance that we have "one Nation, indivisible; with liberty and justice for all." Such a Nation needs one defense, indivisible into separate service loyalties, but each charged and alert to do its special part in the whole team's work.

More About the St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, since inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum concerning the proposed construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and my comments thereon, I am in receipt of a letter from Chairman Huntress of the National St. Lawrence Project Conference calling attention to the fact that the letter from President Brown of the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co. had been omitted from my presentation in the RECORD. In fairness to both Chairman Huntress and President Brown there is inserted herewith Mr. Huntress' letter of transmittal and the communication in question:

NATIONAL ST. LAWRENCE
PROJECT CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1949.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of the 17th. I notice that you inserted in the RECORD a memorandum which I sent you calling attention to a letter from Mr. Alex C. Brown, president of the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Co., bearing upon the newly found Labrador-Quebec ore.

Inasmuch as the memorandum is pointless without a copy of Mr. Brown's letter, I am wondering if you won't be good enough to insert it. I am enclosing another copy.

Incidentally, while in earlier stages of the St. Lawrence controversy it was contended the project would be a great boon to the area of which you speak, the moving argument for it now is to throw Lake Superior ore industry to the mercy of the foreign ores. This would hardly be helpful to the area of which you speak.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL B. HUNTRESS.

THE CLEVELAND-CLIFFS IRON CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1948.

Mr. CARROLL B. HUNTRESS,
Chairman, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUNTRESS: You have asked me to clarify certain portions of my letter to you of December 23, 1948, regarding the proposed St. Lawrence waterway, which I am very glad to do. Perhaps the simplest way is to summarize my letter something as follows:

Wide publicity as to large ore reserves in Labrador and Quebec has been used to renew public interest in the waterway.

I presented my opposition views to the committee of the House in 1941 and to the committee of the Senate in 1947.

My opposition and my reasons are still unchanged.

National security does not require the importation of foreign ores through the waterway to make up for depletion of the Lake Superior district ore reserves.

Approximately 2,000,000,000 tons of ore constitute these reserves besides an almost unlimited tonnage of taconite and jasper capable of being concentrated into high grade ore.

The development of these concentrating processes is promptly proceeding with a view of providing in ample time an adequate supply of ore.

This development program, highly important to national security, should not be delayed or discouraged by agitation for a St. Lawrence waterway which would admit cheap foreign ores in foreign bottoms manned by cheaply-paid foreign labor.

Upon the successful culmination of this taconite program, the self-sufficiency of this country on this vital raw material may depend.

To allow our steel industry to become dependent on foreign ore is unthinkable.

To make the Labrador and Quebec ore available to the midwest steel industry would not be a threat to the taconite program because neither would the tonnages be great enough nor the cost low enough to seriously affect the normal development of this program.

As far as Labrador and Quebec ores are concerned, the above is true whether or not there is a St. Lawrence waterway.

But the threat to national security arises from admitting through the St. Lawrence cheap ocean-borne iron ore.

The resultant discouragement of the taconite program, the demoralization of Great Lakes shipping, and the increasing dependence of Midwest steel plants upon a foreign ocean-borne ore supply is a serious threat to national security.

Perhaps it might not be amiss for me to add that it is my view that the public interest aroused in the Labrador-Quebec ore deposits is being used as a smoke screen by the proponents of the St. Lawrence waterway to blind the public to this obvious threat to national security of making an important part of the steel industry become dependent upon a foreign ocean-borne ore supply, made doubly uncertain by the insecurity of exceedingly long open shipping routes.

Very truly yours,

ALEX. C. BROWN.

It appears the opposition to the construction and use of the St. Lawrence seaway goes to the protectionist theory and not to the expansion of the industrial utilization of miles and miles of inland shore line around the Great Lakes with increased security to our shipbuilding and defense industries with the advantage of accessibility to sea-borne transportation.

In considering this advocated protectioned policy, implemented in the most part with tariff on imports designed in the first place to protect United States labor from the competition of cheap foreign goods produced by cheap foreign labor, a policy intended to restrict importation of manufactured goods and agricultural commodities rather than raw materials to supply the factories of this country.

SUPPLEMENTING THE TARIFF PLAN

To restrict competition from foreign countries we find that many devices have been resorted to effectuate a limitation on imports but this is the first instance that has come to attention where it is seriously contended that a physical barrier should be maintained to impede the importation of raw material as a source of supply to our manufacturing industries, a barrier that now obstructs seaborne commerce from access to the vast shore line of the Great Lakes with opportunities for added security for our industrial shipping and defense manufacturing plants.

Britain's Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle of January 14, entitled "Britain's Cold War":

BRITAIN'S COLD WAR

Bevin is determined to prevent settlement of the Palestine crises even at the risk of wrecking the United Nations and robbing the people of the world of the shaky peace which they have been enjoying since the end of the war.

Ever since the Palestine question has been thrown into the laps of the United Nations, he has been conspiring to wreck all efforts toward a peaceful settlement either through direct negotiations or international intervention. Though it was through the request of the British Cabinet that settlement of the Palestine issue was placed before the international organization, he has persistently been taking the position that the UN settlement must be predicated on his own solution only, thus impudently telling the United Nations that it has no independent status as a judge in an international dispute. With a trigger in his hand, he has been telling that body "you either decide in my favor or else I'll begin shooting."

While pressing for his own solution he has not only violated all the rules of diplomatic decency, but also defied the United Nations directive against giving aid and comfort to combatants. His moral indignation was in a complete hibernating process when the Arab states began war in defiance of the United Nations, and when they attempted to overrun a country in violation of an international edict. His conscience awakened only when the Arab aggressors were being beaten back by fist and gun. He had no troubled conscience, of course, when Arab maneuvers and scheming were threatening to undermine the United Nations.

It has often been said by people familiar with Mr. Bevin's methods and mentality, that when the Palestine situation reaches the point of saturation, he would deliberately create an incident with a view to upsetting the possible peace. It now appears that those people were not talking idly. Even before Egypt indicated peace willingness, Mr. Bevin attempted to shock the world with the peril of Israeli penetration into Egypt. And even though Egypt never tried to invoke the so-called mutual defense pact with Britain—a pact which Egypt attempted to invalidate on the ground that it was of a dangerously unilateral character—Bevin extended a hand of generosity and offered to save the land of the Pharaohs from the hand of the Jews.

Now that Egypt has manifested a desire for peace, and when UN machinery has been set into motion for an Israeli-Egyptian settlement, Mr. Bevin has decided to use the claws of the British lion to keep the parties involved from signing an agreement of peace. His motive is simple. His aim is clear. His display of power was intended as a suggestion to the Arabs not to make peace with Israel because he would see to it that Britain fights the battles for the Arabs.

Israel is too small to cope with the British lion. Nor has it any intention to fight. All it wants is peace. All it wants is what has been granted it by the United Nations. All it has done was to protect itself against aggressors. Britain, under Bevin, seems to be determined not only to undo Israel's victories, but to liquidate Israel, if possible.

Understanding Taft-Hartley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of January 24, 1949:

UNDERSTANDING TAFT-HARTLEY

"A lasting national labor policy," says Secretary of Labor Tobin, "can be founded only upon understanding and justice." Correct.

Therefore, Mr. Tobin says, it will not be enough to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and restore the Wagner Act with improvements suggested by President Truman. Congress and the people must understand what was wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act and why it needed to be repealed, so that no future Congress will enact a similar law.

Well, just exactly what is wrong with the Taft-Hartley Act? In what specific ways has it injured, or could it injure, the country's workers? Mr. Tobin should explain that to Congress and the people, if he can.

Twelve years of hard experience created wide understanding of what was wrong with the Wagner Act. As written and administered, it strayed far from justice. Under it, the Government fostered the growth of labor organizations, gave unions and their leaders tremendous power, but did not hold them accountable for how the power was used. So, inevitably, the power often was abused at the expense of workers, employers, and the public.

As an effort to provide fairer balance in national labor policy the Taft-Hartley Act may go too far in some respects. Yet in 17 months under it union membership has grown and union wages have risen, while strikes and strike costs—in earnings lost by striking workers, in production lost to the country—have declined.

If there are actual reasons the Taft-Hartley Act needs to be repealed, Congress first should find out and let the people know what those reasons are. Secretary Tobin, union leaders, and other advocates of repeal should be required to submit proof in public hearings instead of merely offering assertions.

All can agree that the Taft-Hartley Act is not perfect. But the record provides no better basis for Mr. Tobin's sweeping charge that most of it is unfair, unworkable, or unnecessary than for the union leaders' cry that it is a slavery law.

What Congress and the people need to understand is the truth about the Taft-Hartley Act. The truth could prove to be that it needs amendment and improvement, but not repeal. The truth certainly is that a return to conditions under which Government helped unions and union leaders to gain power without responsibility would not be justice and could not be the foundation of a lasting national labor policy.

The Dairy Industry Is at the Legislative Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been too much said and written about the oleo-butter controversy, but I wish to state that the real question to be faced is not butter against oleo. The big question in the controversy is whether or not ersatz dairy products are to be made legislatively equal to dairy products. The farmer pays for inspecting his crops that are shipped interstate. If the Eighty-first Congress, after all of its criticism of corporations, wishes to relieve the 28 big oleo corporations of paying one-fourth cent per pound tax or inspection fee, that is its responsibility. The dairy industry objects to using skim milk and a vegetable oil to make a product, coloring it, and make it look like a dairy product. Then inject a vitamin and acids to make it have some of the properties of a 100 percent dairy product. And then give it a shower bath of skim milk to make it smell like a dairy product.

The threats to the dairy business are the oleo versus butter, filled cheese, where butterfat is wholly or partially replaced by vegetable oils; filled evaporated milk; filled cream, filled ice cream; and the greatest threat of all the Magic Mix. Less than 20 percent of the milk produced in the United States is made into creamery butter, while 50 percent of the milk produced is marketed as fluid milk. The Magic Mix is made by incorporating 3½ percent vegetable oil in skim milk and selling it as bottle milk. If oleo equals butter then the Magic Mix equals bottled natural milk. This Magic Mix can be made up for 5 cents per quart at this time. If the Eighty-first Congress makes oleo legislatively equal to butter and does not protect the color of the dairy product, they may be called upon to legalize these other ersatz products, including the Magic Mix. Of course I contend that oleo is not equal to butter nor is Magic Mix equal to natural fluid milk.

What is really disturbing about this controversy is that many good people have been deceived by the oleo promoters, and here are a few facts that no one has yet successfully refuted:

First. No one, including scientists, has yet proven by experiment that a vegetable oil is nutritionally equal to an animal fat;

Second. No experiment has been conducted to prove that vegetable oil equals butterfat without the use of at least two dairy products in the experiment.

Third. The Chicago orphanage experiment was phony as the children had butterfat in whole milk to drink.

If oleo, with 80 percent vegetable oil and 15 percent skim milk, is nutritionally equal to a 100-percent dairy product, butter, then Magic Mix, with 3½ percent vegetable oil and 96½ percent skim milk, is most assuredly equal to natural milk.

Why wreck the dairy industry? Why the antibutterfat attitude of this administration? If this road is to be followed, then skim milk, which as yet has no substitute, will be more and more of importance. The importance of the high test cow will diminish in the picture, and the skim milk cow will be substituted as the cow of the hour.

Two and one-half million people in the United States produce milk, and over 10,000,000 people are employed in the dairy industry. The dairy industry rightfully represents 25 percent of the national farm income. Do you wish to add millions to the list of unemployed? It might be well to stop, look, and listen before wrecking the butter industry. Already there is a movement on foot to publicize and dramatize the use of bottle milk of lower butterfat content. During this week there are to be hearings held on the proposal to further reduce the duty on butter and American cheese, although the present duty on butter and American cheese is now the lowest duty on butterfat of any of the dairy products imported.

The dairy cow that produces 40 percent of the beef and veal of the Nation is surely face to face with the would-be destroyers of the greatest single food product ever known to man; yes, the most important protective food. The per capita production of milk in the United States in 1948 was the lowest per capita production since records have been kept, being only 783 pounds.

The old adage, "Don't kill the goose that lays the golden egg" can now be revamped to read, "Don't kill the cow that produces the golden product."

Immediate Release of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include copy of New York State Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, introduced by Hon. Benjamin F. Feinberg, of Plattsburg, N. Y., the majority leader of the New York State Senate. The resolution was adopted both in the New York Senate and in the Assembly on January 10, 1949, condemning the acts of the Hungarian Government for the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and urging the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Members of Congress from the State of New York to do everything in their power to bring about his immediate release:

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God, regardless of race, creed, or denomination, have been profoundly shocked by the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef, Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist Government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for this arrest and imprisonment but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas every right-minded person in this country must desire with all his heart to do something to bring about the release of this great churchman: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of New York express its utter condemnation of the act of the Hungarian Government and be it further resolved that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of the Congress from this State be urged to do everything in their power and to use every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from New York State and to the Hungarian legation in Washington.

Aid for Distressed Blizzard Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the northern and western half of Nebraska has in the past 2 months, suffered with several severe blizzards that have brought real catastrophe to this area.

I have had many telephone calls, wires, and letters relative to the suffering and expected loss of livestock due to these blizzards. I do want to report that the American Red Cross has been rendering an excellent service to this stricken area. When I notified them of the dire distress their wheels of relief were started within the hour. They are still working and bringing much relief to distressed families. The Fifth Army Command, with headquarters in Chicago, and the Sixth Army from Lowry Field, Denver, Colo., have also cooperated in bringing relief to man and beast. But this help is but a drop in the bucket as compared to what is needed.

I have had conversations with Governor Peterson, of Nebraska, and he has requested aid through the Air Force Rescue Command. I have joined with Congressman CASE in asking the Federal Works Agency to make money available to South Dakota and Nebraska. These funds, of which more than $300,000 remains available, are from the President's emergency appropriations. This can be funneled through the Governor's emergency program in the State. They are available now. These areas need help at once. A few days delay may increase the loss of livestock to 75 percent or more.

I note that legislation has been introduced which will set up a special Government agency with funds for future emergencies. This is good, but I must remind you and Members of Congress that this

stricken area needs relief now, and not in 3 or 4 months. It may well take several months to get appropriations through the Congress and operating in a Federal agency.

This blizzard is bringing untold suffering to human beings. There has been loss of life. It is a catastrophe that cannot be overstated. The loss of livestock will be felt in the food baskets of you in the East. I cannot emphasize too strongly how terrible this catastrophe is to the people involved. The need in this stricken area may continue for 90 days or more. I have urged the Red Cross, the Army Air Force and the Federal Works Agency to cooperate and work with the State to continue relief work as long as it is needed. Local communities have nearly exhausted their resources. The deep drifts and continued snow, with subzero weather, have been more than the individual or local communities can meet.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we ought to make preparations now for the floods which will certainly follow when this snow begins to melt in the spring. This must be included in the legislation. The amount of water in this unusual snow could well cause another flood disaster in which we will need all of the facilities of the Federal and local governments to prevent serious loss of life and property.

Italy's Former African Colonies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called the attention of this House to the fact that the basic principles of fairness and justice require that Italy be granted United Nations trusteeship of her former African colonies. The Italian people should not have to suffer some 46,000,000 inhabitants crowded into an area about the size of Arizona or New Mexico.

I am in receipt of a copy of an appealing editorial on this subject written by my friend Generoso Pope, publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano, addressed to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to every Member of Congress. Under the permission heretofore granted me, I include it with these remarks:

To the President of the United States:
To the Secretary of State:
To every Member of Congress:

What the Eighty-first Congress will do in the realm of domestic policies and foreign affairs will vitally affect the present and future not only of our own citizenry but also of all mankind. As I think of the enormity of the problems before you, I recall a section of President Lincoln's annual message to Congress in 1862:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We say we are for the Union. The world will not forget that we say this. We know how to save the Union. The world knows we do know how to save it. We, even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility—we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope on earth."

How timely and appropriate in this historic appeal. What a stirring and striking parallel. The world is menaced by economic disruption and social chaos fanatically fostered and determinedly directed by the zealots of the totalitarian Communist slave state. More than ever before in its history, is our country the hope and protector of human decency and freedom, the dynamic and decisive force for world reconstruction and lasting international harmony.

Thanks to the generosity of our people and their vibrant idealism and strong sense of responsibility, the world still has a chance to come through—free and able to make solid progress in the peaceful advancement of the ideals of western civilization and human well-being. I continue hopeful, despite the debacle in China, the grave difficulties in Palestine, the barbarous blockade of Berlin, and the rise of Communist terror regimes in Europe. My faith in America is boundless. It is with a full realization of the conditions at hand that I now appeal to you to consider anew the situation in the highly strategic Mediterranean area. Once again this sector of the globe is pivotal in the fortunes and fate of peoples and civilizations. I refer to the plight of the talented Mediterranean people—the Italian people—with whom our Nation has a great spiritual and physical kinship.

The new Italy is democratic to the core. It has successfully resisted and beaten back the craftiest and most lavishly financed Communist assaults. Today, Italy occupies the most strategically important position in the Mediterranean area. Democratic Italy is one of the few nations which now enjoys the friendship and trust of the Arab world as well as Israel. It is in the best interests of our country to strengthen Italy's international role as a force for freedom, world reconstruction, stability, and peace.

For some time the world has been waiting for a just and sound settlement of the Italian colonial question. To hand over, under one guise or another, any of these colonies as war loot to Britain or any other colonial power would be simply a return to the fatal folly of imperialist colonialism. That would be disastrous especially because of the Dutch aggression in Indonesia. What is needed today is an entirely new approach—a breath of fresh clean air in this sphere of international relations. Here our own country, which never resorted to colonial domination, can and must give world leadership.

In April the question of the disposal of Italy's African possessions will come before the United Nations for a final decision. I urgently appeal to you to do everything in your power to have our Government take the initiative towards having the UN assume the trusteeship of the Italian colonies and assign Italy as the trustee of these territories.

To date, about $1,000,000,000 of Italian money has been invested in improving these African lands. Hundreds of thousands of Italians have had administrative and agricultural experience in these areas. Italy alone of all the democratic nations has the necessary available manpower, the vitally important geographical proximity, and the adequate technical skills and intellectual capacities to serve as the UN trustee, improve the material conditions of the natives, and systematically prepare them for their eventual national independence. By giving democratic Italy an opportunity to discharge this great humane responsibility, we will be strengthening her prestige and prowess as a force for international security. The contemplated Atlantic alliance would be useless if strategically placed Italy were kept out or kept weak. America alone cannot defend the entire free world. We need help from our friends. Our friends should be strengthened. To pursue any policy in Africa, Europe, or elsewhere which would weaken any of our friends would mean simply piling more heavy burdens on the American people. Our national welfare and security demand a different course.

Moreover, we will also thereby help Italy ease the terrific pressure of her surplus population. Impoverished Italy has a population density of 140 to the square kilometer—almost double that of the naturally wealthy France, which has only 76. Through granting Italy this outlet in Africa for her surplus population, we will be strengthening her economy by thus reducing the number of unemployed. Otherwise, our entire economic aid program to Italy will tend to be a policy of patching leaks and scurrying for pans in order to catch the dangerous and continuous drip caused by the heavy excess of population.

I earnestly plead with you to do your all to have the full weight of our Nation's moral prestige and material prowess placed on the side of justice for the talented, industrious, and peace-loving people of Italy. The greatness and strength of our country can and must assure democratic Italy the UN trusteeship of her former African possessions.

GENEROSO POPE.

Truman Plan To Help Improve Living Standards Is Practical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of January 23, 1949, is an excellent exposition of that part of President Truman's inaugural address dealing with the Far East and Middle East:

TRUMAN PLAN TO HELP IMPROVE LIVING STANDARDS IS PRACTICAL

(By Ernest Lindley)

The fourth course of action outlined by President Truman in his inaugural address—the cooperative development of backward areas of the earth—is not a new idea. It was current after the First World War. There was talk then, some of it at the highest official levels, of cooperative development programs under the League of Nations. But little came of it.

During the recent war, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, among others, saw the importance of raising the living standards of the people of the Middle East and Far East. Willkie had much to say about this in his book One World. Roosevelt hit the theme repeatedly, especially in his conversations with representatives of middle eastern nations.

During the Casablanca conference at the end of 1942, shortly after the Allied invasion of northwest Africa, Roosevelt talked with the Sultan of Morocco about the development of the resources of Morocco. He drew a sharp distinction between the old methods of colonial development, under which wealth was drawn off for the benefit of the exploiting

power, and a cooperative development which would raise the living standards of the native peoples.

On his return from the Teheran Conference of 1943 and the Yalta Conference of 1945 he talked in the same vein. One of the specific problems which engaged his attention was watering the Saudi Arabian Desert. He explored at some length the possibility of drilling more wells. He even took up the matter with King Ibn Saud.

Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor, in her book The Roosevelt I Knew, records some of F. D. R.'s comments on the poverty of the Near East:

"When I get through being President of the United States and this damn war is over, I think Eleanor and I will go to the Near East and see if we can manage to put over an operation like the Tennessee Valley system that will really make something of that country. I would love to do it."

The idea of a big near eastern development program has been discussed repeatedly in the State Department and other agencies of the Government. It has been talked about a great deal also in British circles. In both countries, persons familiar with the Near and Middle East have realized that the best long-run answer to communism in that part of the world would be a rise in the standard of living of the people. The long-run answer is the same in the areas still farther east. This is fully realized also by the leaders of the new nations in the Indian Ocean area.

Most of Asia has thrown off the yoke of old-fashioned imperialism. It does not want, and will not accept, economic or financial imperialism. But it does want technical and scientific aid from the west and some financial help in developing its natural resources and industries.

President Truman took this idea of long standing and made it for the first time one of the guiding principles or courses of action of American policy. He did it in a way expertly devised to obtain a favorable response from the peoples of Asia and other economically backward areas.

Almost certainly, if Roosevelt had lived, this course of action would have been outlined in much the same terms—perhaps before this. But it could hardly have been done better than Mr. Truman did it.

The idea, moreover, is thoroughly practical. It need involve no great drain on our resources. It will provide some outlets for American-made machinery—probably some contracts for American construction firms. But it calls, most of all, for the services of American technicians in many fields. It does not mean feeding or clothing the rest of the world, but helping economically backward peoples to learn how to feed and clothe themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing reechoes my own sentiments as expressed on the floor of this House on several occasions. I hope that before this session closes we will see that type of program activated.

National Health Plan Rates High With Britain's Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include two significant items. The first is a letter published in the Washington Star on December 24, 1948, effectively answering the vicious and roundabout attack made by Columnist Dorothy Thompson on the proposed national health-insurance legislation and inserted in the RECORD January 17. The second item is one of the most recent appraisals of the operation of the British system of national health service.

I think my colleagues and the American people as a whole are entitled to have the facts regarding the popularity and effectiveness with which national health insurance is operating abroad and to have some better appreciation of what an American system of health insurance would mean to our own people. Mr. Edelman's letter serves to shed some light and to counter Miss Thompson's distorted view of the situation.

Judging from the statistics that follow, the British people seem to feel that their system of health insurance is a pretty satisfactory one and is serving to meet a basic national health need.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 24, 1948]

HEALTH INSURANCE DEFENDED

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Dorothy Thompson's column on health insurance, published on December 20, struck me as being utterly smug and altogether lacking in understanding of the basic medical-care problem confronting most American families today.

"All our analyses of the problem of health have brought us again and again up against a single stone-wall barrier—the inability of millions of the people to meet the costs of health services," says the report of the National Health Assembly, which met in Washington in May 1948.

In another section of the report this statement was made: "* * * at a maximum, only about half the families in the United States can afford even a moderately comprehensive health-insurance plan on a voluntary basis. The net result then would be to leave without adequate protection the very groups—those with incomes below $3,000—whose plight the Nation needs most to remedy in order to raise the country's level of health."

Miss Thompson boasts of the fact that in Europe, rather than wait her turn to see a doctor serving people under health insurance, she chose to pay extra in order to patronize what was the equivalent of a black-market physician. Like the propagandists for the AMA, Miss Thompson infers, but presents no facts to prove, that the so-called panel patients in England or elsewhere are treated less capably and with less feeling than the same individuals would be treated if they came to the doctors as private patients at a higher fee.

Miss Thompson's article reflects the petulant attitude of the economically well-padded few who, being able to pay thousands for an operation or to have their hands held or their neuroses pampered, scorn taking their turn under a system that meets first needs first. Nevertheless the tens of thousands of people in Sweden, Denmark, Holland, France, and England who voted time and again for health insurance have shown that they know it to be a system under which doctors first serve those who need medical care and only later look after the frustrated females. If anything further is needed to refute Miss Thompson and prove that health insurance is socially desirable and economically sound, the most recent survey conducted by the British Institute of Public Opinion can be cited (the Institute forecast the election of the Labor government in 1945 with an error of only 1 percentage point).

That survey shows that the people of Great Britain have acclaimed the British Government's national health insurance program as the most popular of all its activities. Furthermore, the survey indicates that the vast majority of those treated said that they were satisfied with the care they got and had no criticisms.

In Britain, as in other countries, national health insurance has been tried, has worked, and is approved. Should not America, whose dollars now help to rebuild devastated Europe, also have the benefits of national health insurance for its people? I, for one, vote "Yes."

JOHN W. EDELMAN,
Washington Representative, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

[From Public Opinion News Service]

NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN RATES HIGH WITH BRITAIN'S VOTERS—PROGRAM FAR MORE POPULAR THAN ANY OTHER LABOR GOVERNMENT MEASURE, SURVEY SHOWS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., December 17.—The powerful political appeal of national health insurance, a program which President Truman has repeatedly urged Congress to adopt, is evident in one nation which recently put such a program into effect—Britain.

British voters in a nation-wide survey have voted the national health scheme the best thing which the Atlee government has done since coming to office more than 3 years ago. It far outranked any other measure in popularity.

The British program went into effect July 1, just about the time when Democratic Party leaders were preparing the 1948 Democratic platform, which pledged a national health program for "adequate medical care." President Truman reiterated his support of the idea in many campaign speeches and Washington observers believe that it may be one of the President's "pet measures" for action in the Eighty-first Congress.

The British survey was conducted by the British Institute of Public Opinion, which forecast the election of the Labor government in 1945 with an error of only one percentage point.

BRITISH POLL

"What would you say is the best thing this Government has done since it came to office in 1945?"

	Percent
National health scheme	35
Increased pensions, looked after old people	12
Nationalization of industry	7
Kept rationing, kept food prices down	4
Wage increases, holidays with pay	4
School meals, raising school leaving age	2
Improved housing	2
Prevented unemployment	2
Stood firm against Russia	1
Miscellaneous and no answer	21
Done nothing good	10

When the British health program went into effect, Britishers flocked to doctors, dentists, clinics, and hospitals by the scores of thousands to take advantage of the free medical services provided under the plan.

In fact, more than a third of the adult population used the services of the plan during its first 3 months of operation, according to another survey by the British Institute. More women were treated than men.

In October the British Institute asked voters:

"Have you had occasion to use any of the services of the national health scheme during its first 3 months of operation?"

The results:

	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*
National	38	62
Men	33	67
Women	43	57

The vast majority of those treated said they were satisfied with the care they got, and had no criticism.

"Were you satisfied with the treatment that you received or did you have any criticism?"

	Percent
Satisfied	35
Dissatisfied	3
Total treated	38

In this country a number of proposals for national health legislation have been considered in the past 2 or 3 years. Extensive hearings were held last year on a proposed National Health Insurance and Public Health Act, sponsored by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, and other Senators.

Under this bill people covered by the insurance would receive preventive, diagnostic, and curative services by their family physicians, with the service of specialists as required. They would also receive hospital care, laboratory and X-ray services, unusually expensive medicines, and special appliances. Dental care and home nursing would be provided to a limited degree.

Employees would pay 1½ percent of their earnings up to $3,600 and their employers would contribute a like sum. If self-employed, the person would pay the entire 3 percent up to $3,600 of his earnings.

"Operation Hay"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the second of January, there swung into western South Dakota, along with other portions of the West, the most severe snowstorm on record. The wind blew at hurricane speeds from Sunday afternoon of January 2 until Wednesday, January 5. The actual snowfall was difficult to estimate because measuring equipment was buried as the snow was whipped into drifts of such heights that the true fall on the level could not be measured.

In some States, snow of several feet was reported. The actual fall in the Black Hills of South Dakota might have been measured in feet; out on the prairies to the east it was probably not more than 15 to 30 inches, but the winds created drifts on highways and in railroad cuts of from 20 to 35 feet. The storm has been followed by at least two storms of almost equal intensity but of less duration, alternating between some sunny days and many nights of subzero temperatures.

The result has been severe upon both the human and livestock population. State and local agencies have been doing what they could to meet emergency calls for food, fuel, and medicines. The Red Cross has operated on a disaster basis and has been of unforgettable and invaluable assistance.

Among the emergency steps taken to rescue or save some of the livestock was what is now coming to be called a hay lift, a name coined, I suppose by mental association with the Berlin air lift.

On the afternoon of Saturday, January 8, as the first reports began to trickle into my office from an area without trains and without newspapers for the week, I received a telephone call from Kirk T. Mears, county agent in Pennington County, one of the large countie in western South Dakota, and of which Rapid City is the county seat.

Mears said that stockgrowers were beginning to get out on to the ranges and were finding an appalling situation. Cattle had traveled with the storm and while hundreds undoubtedly were buried in cuts and drifts, scattered bunches were seen from the air stranded far from feed and water. He said that it had been suggested that concentrated feed in the way of cake or cubes might be dropped to these bands by plane if some way could be found to provide temporary financing of the purchase of the livestock food.

It so happened that only the day before I had discussed with Mr. Dillard Lasseter, director of the Farmers Home Administration, the status of the remnant collections on the old rural rehabilitation emergency feed and seed loans which had been allocated to the several States. I knew that ther were some unloaned balances in those trust funds and it occurred to me that loans now for this purpose would be in keeping with the original purpose of the funds.

Although it was Saturday afternoon, with the cooperation of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], I located Mr. Lasseter who was on Capitol Hill, and discussed the situation with him. He grasped it quickly and acted promptly.

What followed has been most interestingly told in a radio interview between R. F. Mauser, a county supervisor for the Farmers Home Administration, and Announcer Scott, of station KOTA, Rapid City. In order that the Members of the House may know how a hay lift operates and how the Air Force turned some of its training activities into a practical and realistic operation with benefits to sufferers in this disaster as well as to the crews, I have asked permission to place a transcript of their interview in the RECORD. The date of the broadcast was January 13, 1949:

Mr. MAUSER. Most of us have just dug out from the storm; I am speaking principally of those of us who are fortunate enough to live where facilities were available to help us dig out. Not so fortunate are some of the farmers and ranchers whose only contact with the outside world has been the radio—the recent blizzard was something for the farmers and ranchers to cope with and some of them still have to use emergency facilities such as airplanes in order to get desperately needed supplies.

Miss SCOTT. I have been among the isolated, so to speak, and I know that I would have certainly welcomed the radio messages I have been hearing, if I had livestock that needed feed.

Mr. MAUSER. My apologies for not introducing you this morning, Theda Nelle, but it seems so natural to have you on a radio program with me that I forgot, Miss Scott, home agent from Huron, has been here on an extended Christmas vacation.

Miss SCOTT. I wonder if you will tell me something about the emergency feed program, I have sort of lost track of things so to speak, and I have been very interested in the emergency feed program.

Mr. MAUSER. Representative FRANCIS CASE, upon hearing desperate circumstances some of our farmers and ranchers found themselves in after the storm, contacted Mr. Dillard B. Lasseter, National Administrator for the Farmers Home Administration, to find out if there was some means by which the Farmers Home Administration could be of assistance. Mr. Lasseter immediately contacted our state director, E. R. Arneson, by telephone and authorized him to take whatever steps were necessary to aid distressed farmers and ranchers.

Miss SCOTT. If I remember correctly, this isn't the first time that the FHA has been called upon to assist in emergencies. What kind of a program was worked out?

Mr. MAUSER. Mr. Arneson immediately called me by telephone, and asked me to cooperate with County Agent Mears, who had also been contacted by Mr. CASE, to set up a ranchers' emergency feed committee. The committee selected was Emmet Horgan, president of the South Dakota Stock Growers' Association; Ed Denslow, farmer editor of our Station KOTA; and Eddie McMahon, rancher committeeman for the Farmers Home Administration.

Miss SCOTT. For the benefit of someone who might be listening who has not heard about the distress signals worked out by this committee, why wouldn't this be a good time to give these people the information so that they could use them if they are in need of feed?

Mr. MAUSER. I will be glad to—we finally got the committeemen together, and, with the assistance of County Agent Mears and myself, a program was worked out whereby the Army Air Force would fly feed to distressed ranchers who had notified us or the committee of their needs, if they had communications available, or, if not, to use the old fox and geese signal in the snow where they wished this feed to be dropped. If more than a hundred cattle needed feed, an extra spoke was to be put in the wheel.

Miss SCOTT. Let me see; did I get this right? Suppose I am now in need of feed, can I stamp out a fox and geese circle?

Mr. MAUSER. Yes; that's right.

Miss SCOTT. This circle should be at least 50 feet or so in diameter, or outlined with hay to be plainly visible to the pilots, should it not?

Mr. MAUSER. That's right. And it should be placed where the feed is to be dropped, or as near to the livestock as possible.

Miss SCOTT. I understand the Farmers Home Administration is the loaning agency. How are they going to get repaid?

Mr. MAUSER. The committee took this into consideration, too. It was determined that the Farmers Home Administration would buy the feed, or authorize its purchase, together with the cost of transporting it to the Rapid City Air Force base. This cost would have to be borne by the farmer or rancher getting the feed; and if he was not in a position to pay for it immediately, the Farmers Home Administration would accept a promissory note for a reasonable length of time, bearing 5 percent interest. The committee felt that any farmer or rancher in need of this type of assistance would certainly be more than glad to repay the Government for the cost of feed and transportation to the base.

Miss SCOTT. That certainly sounds reasonable and would be a great accommodation to a farm or ranch family who were isolated in the blizzard.

Mr. MAUSER. Representative FRANCIS CASE arranged with the Army Air Force to fly this feed to distressed farmers and ranchers at no cost to them.

Miss SCOTT. It seems to me I heard the Air Force speak of this as operation hay and that a near miss on this kind of bombing run was considered a good score—sounds rather an interesting version of the bombing practices we have all seen out here.

Mr. MAUSER. Yes; and after watching these boys from a vantage point of a C–47, which still had a lot of the equipment in it from war days, they haven't lost their bomb-dropping eye yet. Lts. Clarence Hall and Lorimer Peterson were the pilots of operation hay and Sgts. C. King and A. Martin were the bombardiers on the run. As we were ready to take off, one of the pilots jokingly remarked, "If the cows have horns, they would hang a bale of hay on each horn," and after watching them Tuesday I'm not so sure that they couldn't have done it.

Miss SCOTT. You say as we were ready to take off—who did that include?

Mr. MAUSER. The Air Force boys I mentioned, Kirk Mears, and myself carried out the first flight on operation hay. Tuesday was the earliest that air base personnel could get planes in readiness after the storm. They had a lot of digging out to do, too. We had two requests for feed at the time we took off—one from S. E. Swanson, from east of Caputa, and one from Carl McDonald, east of Underwood. After the plane had been taxied out on the runway, 1½ tons of hay and 1,200 pounds of cubes were loaded into the C–47. The Army calls this plane the "flying boxcar," and it is truly named. We got this feed into the plane with room to spare. After it was loaded, we taxied out to the end of the runway and took to the air. The navigator had consulted with Mr. Mears and myself regarding the route to be flown and they had this mapped out like they were on a bombing run with the targets marked on the map.

Miss SCOTT. This all sounds very fascinating and yet rather frightening to me; was it hard to find the so-called targets?

Mr. MAUSER. We had, or thought we had, quite an accurate description of the so-called targets, but when you get into the air things look a lot alike, especially with all the snow on the ground, and we had some difficulty in locating the first target.

Miss SCOTT. In other words, cattle, fence rows, and hills all look much alike from the air, especially if landmarks are covered with snow.

Mr. MAUSER. We certainly found that out when we got into the air. That is why I say that any future requests for dropping feed should be identified by the fox-and-geese circle that we suggested so that it will eliminate the possibility of error. We had no difficulty in locating the second target and about 10 bombing runs were made over this target to get the feed unloaded. The cargo door was left off the plane when we took off, to make it easier to unload, but even so, you don't get a chance to kick out too many bales of hay on a limited space traveling 150 miles an hour.

Miss SCOTT. I imagine a mercy run, bombing starving livestock with hay was much more satisfying than the bombing with the intent of destruction, even though it was in defense.

Mr. MAUSER. After working with these boys it was easy to see that they enjoyed these missions.

Miss SCOTT. I'm a curious soul, and I think it would be interesting to find out more about how these hay bombing missions were carried out—how did you heave the hay?

Mr. MAUSER. The hay was stacked in the plane and anchored and we loosened about four bales at a time and shoved them in front of the door, ready to shove them on out. The door was just large enough to let one bale out at a time, and we didn't dare stack them for fear that one of the bales might hit the tail. After the target was sighted, the pilot got ready for the run, lowered the plane to a couple of hundred feet above the ground and then used the same signals that were used when they were dropping paratroops. When the plane reached a point above the target, a green light would go on next to the door, then we would start heaving bales and keep on heaving until a red light indicated that the target was passed. Then the pilot would again gain altitude, make a big circle, and make the run again.

Miss SCOTT. How many runs were needed to unload the hay?

Mr. MAUSER. This same bombing run was made until we got all the hay out. I think we made about 10 runs. We got more skilled at each run; on the first run we only got three bales out, and on the last run we got six. When we really got good we were out of hay.

Miss SCOTT. Sounds rather dangerous to be up there with the door off; was there a great deal of hazard connected with it?

Mr. MAUSER. Yes; there was some danger, but the Air Force took care of that. The floor of the plane was, of course, very smooth metal, and after loading the hay which was mixed with some snow, the floor was as slick as ice. To avoid any accidents, the bombardiers tied themselves to the opposite side of the plane with rope so that any lurch of the plane would not throw them out. Everyone was, of course, equipped with a parachute, but at low altitudes this would not be much good.

Miss SCOTT. After you finished these bombing runs what did you do?

Mr. MAUSER. We asked Captain Richardson, who was in charge of operations at the base, if it would be possible to take a look at the blizzard area after the mission was completed in order to spot other distress signals and he readily agreed, and as we had heard rumors of a distress area north of Philip, we took off for that section and made quite a thorough search of the area without sighting any other distress signals. We saw a large number of ranch homes where there was no evidence of anyone having been in or out of the building site. We also spotted a number of bunches of cattle that appeared to be isolated several miles from any visible feed supply although they appeared to be making attempts to graze. That section of the country appeared to have the heaviest snow because from the air it looked like one huge white blanket had been spread over everything, with just a few ranch buildings and clumps of trees showing through.

Miss SCOTT. That sounds like it might have been quite a sight, though I am sure a person would feel that lonesomeness and the disaster that lay in the drifts of snow. Did you return to the base then?

Mr. MAUSER. After circling the area north of Philip awhile, we headed north-northwest, as the pilot would say it, until we reached Faith and then headed southwest toward the Rapid City Air Base. The country looked pretty much alike, lots of snow, heavily drifted, except that the country around Faith and west of there didn't appear to have quite as much snow as the territory further south, as it appeared that some of the ridges had less snow on them.

Miss SCOTT. I know that this is going to be a hard question to ask, and a painful one, but would you care to venture any statement on the apparent stock loss in this blizzard?

Mr. MAUSER. Just what the stock loss will be is anybody's guess at this time. Until farmers and ranchers are able to get a complete count on their stock, no guess is going to come anywhere near the actual loss. I do know this: that the area we covered by plane on Tuesday should have contained a lot more cattle than we were able to see from the air. Lack of feed isn't the only problem. All water holes and creeks are buried in snow. While stock will be able to subsist on snow for awhile, they are going to have to get to water soon if they are to survive. That's one thing we cannot fly to them in a C–47.

Miss SCOTT. Yes, that's right—and I know that there will be a lot of heartbreak and labor for the farmers and ranchers to get livestock to water—and to feed. The thought of livestock suffering from lack of feed or water will certainly be one of deep concern to our farmers and ranchers. I certainly do feel for them, and I am really deeply concerned and I hope that as reports come in from the many families I know, they will not have many losses.

Mr. MAUSER. This emergency feed program set up by the Farmers Home Administration is for the purpose of getting feed to farmers and ranchers in extreme emergencies. We want to be of help to every farmer and rancher who had no other means of saving his livestock from starvation. It is hoped that no one will make unnecessary demands upon this service, but we will make an effort to help those who call on us, or put out the fox-and-geese signal indicating the need of feed for starving livestock. We have just received authorization to use this emergency fund for loans in cases where the road may be opened somewhere near a ranch home, but the rancher is unable to get to his feed; this of course is also an emergency measure and should only be used where absolutely necessary.

Miss SCOTT. As of this morning, then, this service would still be available to a farmer or rancher in desperate circumstances, who sends word, or marks his ranch with the distress signal?

Mr. MAUSER. The Marshall flying service and individual flyers who are covering the West River area—and they are doing a fine job of it—are reporting any distress signals of this nature that they see to County Agent Mears.

Miss SCOTT. Since I am more acquainted with Pennington County, my thinking would quite naturally be concerned to a large extent with Pennington County, but what about ranchers in other counties?

Mr. MAUSER. This service is available in the entire West River section of South Dakota—in other words, the blizzard area—however, all requests should be reported to Rapid City since if feed is to be flown, it will have to be transported to the Rapid City Air Base for loading. I would like to ask that any farmer or rancher who has received feed through this emergency feed program, as soon as he is able, contact the county FHA supervisor in the county where his ranch is located, and arrange for the payment of this feed, or the signing of a note. This is important and should be taken care of at the earliest possible date. We will maintain a record of where and how much feed was delivered at each location.

Miss SCOTT. Because I know so many of the farm and ranch families, as I said before, I have been concerned about the after effects of the blizzard, and I, for one, think that the program of emergency feeding for snowbound livestock is a very fine thing. With several organizations concerned in such a program, and the details that had to be worked out, I am very glad that I have had this opportunity to talk with you about the first runs that were made to carry feed to the livestock.

Mr. MAUSER. I want to thank you, Theda Nelle, for helping me with this broadcast this morning. I almost became a casualty of "operation hay" as part of a bale of hay came back into the plane and hit me in the eye, so your assistance on this program this morning is doubly appreciated, as it would have been rather difficult for me to read all of this script with this one good eye.

Miss SCOTT. I am very glad to be here again, I always enjoyed these broadcasts.

Mr. MAUSER. The Air Force base personnel, especially Captain Richardson, who was in charge of operations, are to be commended for the fine cooperation they have shown in this emergency. The interest of Representative FRANCIS CASE, though he was in Washington, is evidenced that he has the interest of the West River people foremost in his mind even though he was busy with the opening of the Eighty-first Congress. We sincerely hope that the present good weather conditions continue and that "operation hay" will no longer be necessary.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the good weather of the day of the broadcast has not continued steadily. "Operation hay" is continuing and additional measures are now being undertaken to break open the trails and roads so that the stock can be moved to water as well as hay and fodder.

The Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is from the January 17 Wisconsin Tribune, of Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., which is located in a county in my district where industry, business, and agriculture are of near equal importance. The editorial indicates our responsibility is to, first, eliminate unnecessary functions of government; second, reduce waste and extravagance in government; third, discourage people in high places from making statements that result in increased unemployment; fourth, make the powers that be realize that factory pay rolls and national farm income are handmaidens and that the national income is seven times the amount of factory pay rolls and seven times the national farm income.

The editorial:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Accustomed though he is to talk in terms of billions of dollars where Federal finances are concerned, Mr. John Q. Citizen may be pardoned for finding it difficult to comprehend the record $41,858,000,000 peacetime budget which President Truman has submitted to Congress for the 1949–50 fiscal year.

A better understanding of what these astronomical figures mean may be had by analyzing them in terms of their local impact. For example, Wood County taxpayers will be called upon to pay $16,082,000 in direct and hidden taxes as their share of the new Federal budget, according to an analysis just made by the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce.

The same study shows that Wisconsin taxpayers will be required to divvy up $863,140,000 as this State's share of the Federal spending burden in the next fiscal year. This amount is five times the total amount of State and local general property taxes levied in 1947 and collected in 1948 for all purposes. It is also four times the total amount spent by the State government in 1948 for all operating costs, including all school, highway, and welfare aids, all the money collected by the State and returned to local governments, all State trunk highway and bridge construction and maintenance outlays, and all other operating and maintenance costs of the State government.

Wood County's share of proposed Federal spending for the coming year amounts to almost 6½ times the total of all taxes on real and personal property collected in this county in 1948, according to State chamber of commerce analysis.

The Truman budget anticipates that outgo will exceed income by $873,000,000, which deficit would boost the Federal debt to $251,925,000,000 at the close of the 1949–50 fiscal year. Some rough figuring with pencil and paper indicates that this debt represents somewhere in the neighborhood of $130 per acre of area in the continental United States. Narrowing it down to the 1,142,817,821 acres of our 6,000,000 farms, it comes to around $220 an acre. Going a step further, the debt figures out to be a mortgage of approximately 175 percent of the 1940 valuation of the 48 States and the District of Columbia, which amounted to $144,631,431,000.

After reading these figures, Mr. John Q. Citizen may still be a bit hazy about the full meaning of the $41,858,000,000 budget and the $251,925,000,000 Federal debt estimate. But he should have some idea, at least, of how they are going to affect his pocketbook. What is spent in Washington comes from all of us, to greater or lesser degree. They haven't yet found money growing on trees.

Situation in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a copy of an interview with Mr. Jack Beall on the program Headline Edition, over the ABC network, at 7 p. m., Friday, January 21, 1949:

Mr. BEALL. What is the situation in China as a result of President Chiang's leaving the Government?

Mr. JUDD. Doubtless Chiang Kai-shek is leaving because he knows that the Communists do not want genuine peace now any more than they have previously. What they want is conquest. But there are some in China who hope that if the generalissimo is out of the picture the Communists may be willing to negotiate. The Chinese Constitution provides that in the absence of the president, the vice president, General Li Tsung-jen, shall exercise all of his functions. So the generalissimo, in line with the complete devotion to his country which has marked his whole career, is voluntarily absenting himself in order to let others try.

Mr. BEALL. Can the acting president, General Li, make peace?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Beall, it has never yet been possible to make an honorable peace with Communists anywhere. Usually the Communists set up an arrangement called a coalition which looks like peace, or even democracy, but which leads without exception to complete subjugation. For weeks our papers have talked about war or peace for China. Those were never the alternatives. The real alternatives were and are resistance or enslavement. The President of China, knowing for more than 20 years the facts of life with respect to world communism—the facts which the President of the United States announced to Americans only yesterday in his inaugural address—will not be party to a surrender that will make China a complete satellite of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BEALL. What is likely to happen now?

Mr. JUDD. Should the new Chinese Government refuse to yield to Communist enslavement and decide to fight on, with or without Chiang, and if necessary as a government in exile, there still would he hope, if America would change her policy from moral lectures plus some relief to one of real assistance. China's cause is hardly less hopeless than Harry Truman's appeared only 4 months ago. Nearly everyone said he had wholly lost the support of the people and even of his own party. But Truman's victory brought back morale to the Democrats as if by magic.

A statement by the United States of genuine support of the Government of China would bolster morale there almost as rapidly.

But if the United States persists in its blind policy of virtual abandonment of a loyal ally, then today's events in China will mean that those, there and here, who have fought Chiang all these years have won. China will go behind the iron curtain. Her long-suffering people will have peace—the peace of enslavement. After the appropriate period of good behavior and pretended democracy, any Chinese who dares to disagree with the Communists will go the way of Masaryk and Petkov. They will have the peace of the grave.

World communism will have won its greatest victory since it seized Russia in 1917. The United States will have an avowed enemy instead of a proved friend on the western shore of the Pacific.

Our country will have suffered a terrible defeat—a disaster for which we and our children will be paying, I fear, for many years to come.

In All Ways Rabbi Halpern Gets Close to His People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, each week the Brooklyn Eagle selects an outstanding citizen of our community as the "man of the week," and in its Sunday edition presents his record to the people.

I am very proud that the "man of the week" of January 23, 1949, is Harry Halpern, rabbi of the East Midwood Jewish Center, with which I am very proud to be associated. The following is the item which appeared about him in the Brooklyn Sunday Eagle:

IN ALL WAYS RABBI HALPERN GETS CLOSE TO HIS PEOPLE

(By Violet Brown)

Religion at the bustling East Midwood Jewish Center is as homely as a fresh-baked loaf of Sabbath bread.

Six hundred religious school kids approach the story of the Maccabees with as much gusto as if those ancient heroes were Superman or the paratroopers of Bastogne; the women of the sisterhood argue over Ibsen; and tired businessmen flock to the Sunday night sermons.

There is a bubbling liveliness, at the center of which sits the rabbi, Harry Halpern of the twinkling eye and ever-present cigar, a latter-day Micah whose approach to the-

ology seems based on that simplest of Biblical advices: "And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

His small office is right off the entrance of the big center at 1625 Ocean Avenue, jam packed, unadorned, as physically close to the people walking outside as is the rabbi's spirit. When the center nursery school closes for a holiday, there is never any question about what to do with the current goldfish or turtles. They are boarded in the rabbi's office—and they get fed on time, too.

Everyone walks in on the rabbi, the troubled mother, the paroled convict, the big manufacturer, the chastised small boy.

A CASE IN POINT

They all get a hearing, but the rabbi is apt to put himself out most for the boy.

There was, for instance, the 9-year-old ordered to bring his father to school to hear the details of his crime. This was too dreadful to contemplate, so the youngster went instead to a place where he was sure a man would be understood.

"Please, rabbi," he begged, "please come to school and tell the teacher you're my father."

Halpern was a bachelor at the time—and knew the teacher—but he went, straight-faced, introduced himself, and won clemency for the sinner.

He is still interceding for young people. The center will celebrate the twentieth year of his coming to the congregation and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the congregation itself this spring by completing the fund-raising for the $500,000 religious school and youth center which will be built behind the synagogue on East Twenty-first Street.

"It's not going to be a ballroom for us, or a big marble building we can talk about," says Halpern. "It's going to belong to the kids."

Two things led Halpern to the ministry, he says lightly—"an affliction (I love to make speeches) and a desire to be a social worker (I like people and I like to help them)."

HIS FIRST SPEECH

His affliction manifested itself early.

The hard-working elder Halperns, who had met on the ship bringing them to America, lived on the lower East Side in the first years of their marriage.

In the evening Papa Halpern liked to take a stroll with his eldest. One evening he stopped to listen to a political speech and when father and son returned home the mother asked the 5-year-old boy what the speaker had said. She meant it jocularly, but Harry told her—with gestures. The Halperns, their son says, were "extremely quiet people," and this unexpected vein of oratory charmed them. With more pride than modern psychology, they used to say, "Make the speech, Harry," whenever visitors appeared after that, and he did.

By the time the boy was 12 the Halperns lived in Williamsburg, and Harry was acting as boy rabbi for the wise old rabbi he now considers his mentor, Rabbi Samuel Rabinowitz, who shared his religion with the children as much as with their elders. Thanks to Rabbi Rabinowitz, Halpern early was able to give an affirmative answer to the two questions he puts to doubters these days—"Will religion help a person when he's down in the dumps?" and "Will it help give him a basis for a good life?"

GOT TWO LAW DEGREES

Still speaking, Halpern whizzed through Eastern District High School, winning a city-wide extemporaneous speaking contest, and City College, getting his degree in 2½ years. He went to the orthodox seminary now known as Yeshiva University and was ordained at the Jewish Theological Seminary.

In between, he got his master's degree at Columbia, taught and preached at the Jewish Communal Center of Flatbush, and tested his chosen course by taking time out to get a bachelor of laws degree, cum laude, and a doctor of jurisprudence degree, also cum laude. (Having tried it, he left the law to his brother Isidor, a Court Street trial attorney. Another brother, Peretz, followed Harry's steps into the ministry, and the fourth brother, Louis, became an advertising man.)

Halpern's enthusiasms also include teaching, and his parishioners have heard him lecture on the modern drama, the modern interpretation of the Bible, and Jewish literature. Knowing this pleasure of his, they gave him a thank-you note 2 years ago by establishing a $50,000 fellowship in Talmud at the Jewish Theological Seminary in his honor.

Nine years ago, he married an attractive social worker and school teacher named Mollie Singer. They have a pretty blond 4-year-old daughter, Deborah, who is, as might be expected, the apple of her father's eye.

WORK IN ZIONISM

In terms of achievement he probably values most the work he did on behalf of zionism, undertaken at a time when it was an uphill job. He helped found the Flatbush Zionist Region and was president of the Brooklyn Zionist Region, largest membership unit of any Jewish organization in the United States. It was a solemn day for him when the State of Israel, for which we've been waiting for 1,900 years, finally was proclaimed.

"We do not come bearing a sword," he commented then. "We want only to live in peace and security, to dwell with our neighbors without fear."

It was a victory for the spirit he had expressed one night at an ordinary Friday evening service, many years before.

"It is not in slavish surrender or in cowardly retreat that we shall find salvation," he said, "but in a courageous and dignified preservation of the ideals and traditions of our people and in a heroic, even militant, defense of them in the face of those who attack us. Let it not be forgotten that in so doing we are not fighting for ourselves alone. We are the shock troops in a battle which threatens the extermination of all minorities. * * * We dare not abdicate our place as the defenders of justice and truth. It is heroic Jewish fighters and not Jewish appeasers who will win the day for our sorely tried people."

As the people of the East Midwood congregation will tell you, Ocean Avenue has its prophets, too.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the people of Brooklyn in this salute to one of its outstanding citizens.

Fifty Years of Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago last September forestry began in the national forests of the United States. Case No. 1, for the first sale of timber under supervised cutting, took place in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

The anniversary was appropriately commemorated at Nemo, S. Dak., September 19, 1948, with a program which ranged from the chopping of trees by veteran log-cutters to the dropping of trained fire-fighters by parachute.

Two outstanding addresses were given, one by Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the United States Forest Service, and the other by Guy N. Bjorge, general manager of the Homestake mine, largest private timber operator in the area, with an outstanding record for cooperation in sound timber management.

Because the wise use of our timber resources is so vital to our national economy I am placing these addresses in the RECORD with the permission of the House.

FIFTY YEARS OF FORESTRY

(Address by Lyle F. Watts, Chief, U. S. Forest Service, at program in observance of fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the Black Hills National Forest, Nemo, S. Dak., September 19, 1948)

We are gathered here today within sight of the spot where real forestry first began in the national forests of the United States. Here, half a century ago, was made the Government's first timber sales under supervised cutting—the first attempt at scientific timber management in the national forests. It was "case No. 1" in the records of Government forestry.

I doubt if that first timber sale here in the Black Hills caused the news wires to hum all the way across the country, or that it made any big headlines in the great metropolitan newspapers. But it was an event of historical importance. Its effects were far greater than many of the other events that made the now forgotten headlines of that day. It started something that is still growing. It was an important first step in the movement for conservation of natural resources—a movement that may well determine whether our Nation, or indeed the human race, is to survive and prosper on this earth.

Today we celebrate the accomplishments of 50 years of forestry in the Black Hills.

From the 1870's, when the Black Hills were first settled, until the national forest was established, there had been unrestricted cutting of timber, and no effort was made to stop forest fires. Even before the area was settled there had been many bad fires.

The town of Deadwood, as you know, got its name from the tangle of fire-killed timber that the earliest settlers found in the gulch.

Fire and wasteful cutting were playing such havoc that back in the nineties local people began to realize that the timber supply was diminishing at an alarming rate, and that something should be done about it. The mining industry, especially, was worried about the supply of mine timbers. The movement that started then resulted in the creation of the Black Hills Forest Reserve—the area that now comprises the Black Hills and the Harney National Forests.

The first sale of timber was made about a year after the forest reserve was established—in 1898. It was in some ways a rather elementary attempt at scientific timber cutting. Some mistakes were made at the start. But essentially it was a sound undertaking. It proved out.

HOMESTAKE BOUGHT FIRST SALE

The case No. 1 sale was made to the Homestake Mining Co. It was the first to make application to purchase timber from the forest reserve. In passing from the period when all timber-cutting was unregulated to the start of supervised cutting and the requirement to pay for the timber cut, the company experienced many difficulties.

Plans for the sale had been drawn up by the Bureau of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture, but the men in charge of the forest reserve at the beginning were General Land Office appointees who knew little about forestry, and most of them probably cared less.

To its everlasting credit, however, the Homestake Mining Co. played fair with the forestry movement from the start. It gave this first attempt at forest management its full support. Eventually it put its own timberlands under management and now practices forestry that is on a par with that of the Forest Service.

The Black Hills Forest Reserve became a national forest in 1905, when the United States Forest Service was established and placed in charge of the reserves. In 1911, part of the original reserve was made a separate national forest—the Harney.

AS MUCH AS HAS BEEN CUT

It has been estimated that a billion and a half board feet of timber was used in the early mining days of the Black Hills, from 1876 to 1898.

From the time of the case No. 1 sale up to now, nearly another 1,333,333,333 was cut, or a grand total of about 2,800,000,000 to date. At the same time, the forests, under management as a renewable resource, have continued their growth.

It is estimated that there is now in the national forests of the Black Hills, a total 2,300,000,000 board-feet of standing saw timber—nearly as much as all that was taken from the forests since the first settlers arrived.

You might call that a case of eating your cake and having it too.

THIRTY-SEVEN MILLION FOR CUTTING ANNUALLY

The development of the two national forests has contributed greatly to the economic development of the whole Black Hills area. Today these national forests are managed for permanent production—for what foresters call a sustained yield.

They are growing enough timber so that each year they can supply 37,000,000 board-feet of live saw timber, plus several million feet of additional material that can be removed by thinning young stands and cleaning out dead or defective trees.

The two national forests provide range for 25,000 head of cattle and 20,000 head of sheep. The forests are used by something like half a million people each year for recreation purposes. There is a large deer population which assures the sportsman a good chance to bag his deer each year.

The forests protect the watersheds on which originate Rapid and Spearfish Creeks and several other headwater tributaries of the Cheyenne and Missouri Rivers. They protect the sources of water supply used for domestic purposes by Lead, Deadwood, Spearfish, Rapid City, and other towns; water used for hydroelectric power purposes and for irrigating a substantial acreage of farm lands.

The utilization of the national forest resources provides employment for many people. Enough timber is coming along to sustain a sawmill industry that not only can supply local needs, but also ships out Black Hills products to help supply the needs of other less fortunate States.

FEW FORESTS EQUAL THESE

Very few of our national forests anywhere in the United States are in as good condition as the two in the Black Hills area. In many places here, you can see seedlings, saplings, pole-sized trees, intermediates, and mature trees all in the same stand.

That means that under good forest management you can keep cutting mature timber and always have plenty more coming along. The timber crop is being well managed, and the local people strongly support the management policies. Most of the grazing lands on the forests are in good shape, and those that are not can be improved in a short time.

The cash receipts of the national forests are steadily going up; and, since 25 percent of all the receipts go to the local counties, that means that more money is coming along each year to help improve county roads and support local schools.

The going has not always been easy. We have had some heart-breaking set-backs. Tornadoes have laid down long stretches of timber across the forest. Fire has been a constant menace. The Rochford fire of 1931 and the McVey fire of 1939 each burned over nearly a township of forest land. There were other bad ones, too.

At the beginning of the century, one of the worst outbreaks of pine beetles in history occurred in the Black Hills and caused a heavy loss of timber. This year we have been going through a similar situation, but with emergency funds made available by Congress, we believe we shall succeed in controlling the insect attack this time.

But in spite of bugs and fire and wind and high water, we have made a lot of progress. The trees even managed to grow under both Democratic and Republican administrations.

PUBLIC HAS COOPERATED

The progress made has been possible largely because the people here believed in these forests, and in what they stood for, from the very beginning. I want to compliment the people of the Black Hills region on this splendid support and cooperation they are giving the Forest Service in the protection and development of the national forests. They have been especially alert to the need for fire prevention, and when fires do occur they turn out promptly to help put them out.

There is a cordial partnership here. When we fight fires, we are protecting both Government property and private homes. It is the best kind of cooperation; it works both ways.

It is most gratifying to the Forest Service to know that you folks here in the Black Hills are keenly interested in what goes on in the national forests. You think of them as your forests, and that is exactly what they are.

These are public forests. They belong to the people. The Forest Service is your agent, charged with managing them in your interests.

The basic principle under which our national forests are administered is the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. The Forest Service holds steadfastly to that principle. It is endeavoring to administer and develop these forests for maximum, permanent service to the communities, the State, and the Nation.

SUSTAINED YIELD, MULTIPLE USE

In line with that objective of the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run, we have two major administrative policies.

One of these is the policy of sustained yield, which I have already mentioned. It applies not only to timber, but to range forage for grazing, to game and fish, to recreational facilities, and to water supplies.

The other major policy we call multiple use. You can see how that works right here in the Black Hills. The national forests are managed not only to grow timber and to protect watersheds, but to furnish grazing for livestock, to provide a home for wildlife, to maintain scenic values, to provide opportunities for recreation, to support local industries and employment, and many other services.

All of these uses and services are coordinated in over-all, multiple-purpose management plans. Such multiple-use management brings the highest total of public benefits and services from a forest area.

The past half century, as I said, has seen some very encouraging progress in the Black Hills forests. But we aren't done yet. There is a lot more to accomplish, a lot more improvement and development work to be done.

During the thirties we made some rapid strides with the help of several Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the Black Hills and Harney Forests. These young men of the CCC built many miles of roads, developed recreational areas, look-outs and other fire improvements, and ranger stations. They did timber-stand improvement work, which will make possible better and faster timber growth on 240,000 acres. When the war came along, it was not possible to go ahead with this kind of improvement work, nor even to maintain many of the improvements we had.

For effective fire protection we still need more roads and more communication facilities. We need more timber-stand improvement, more recreation facilities, and a lot of other improvements. We are going ahead with the program of improvement and development just as fast as funds become available.

NOT SO GOOD ALL OVER

The need for forest restoration and improvement and development is not confined to the Black Hills alone. In fact, with its two fine public forests as going concerns, the Black Hills are comparatively well off.

Nation-wide, our forest resource is dwindling. We are taking timber from the forests of the United States faster than it is growing back.

The total volume of standing saw timber in the forests of the United States today is probably only about half of what it was 50 years ago.

One-sixth of all the commercial forest land in the country has been so depleted by fires or by destructive cutting that it is now producing little or nothing. A good share of the rest is growing only a fraction of what it could. The increasing scarcity of good, easily accessible timber stands is reflected in the high prices people have to pay for a few boards to mend the back steps or for most other forest products today.

Our national forests and most other public forests are being managed for a sustained yield. That case No. 1 sale here in the Black Hills involved something like 15,000,000 board feet of timber, plus some cord wood, for about $15,000.

From that small start just 50 years ago the timber-sale business on the national forests of America has grown to nearly 4,000,000,000 feet, valued at more than $20,000,000, in the past fiscal year.

With adequate funds for access roads to open up remote areas and with adequate funds to prepare plans and administer timber cutting, the amount cut from the national forests could be increased in a few years to more than 6,000,000,000 feet a year. Both the forests and the Nation would benefit thereby.

But the public forests comprise only about one-fourth of our commercial forest area.

Three-fourths of our commercial forest land is privately owned; and the private forest land is by and large the best forest land, from which the bulk of the Nation's timber supply must come. But a recent survey showed that only 8 percent of all timber cutting on private lands could be classed as good from the standpoint of keeping the forest land in full production.

Sixty-four percent of all cutting was poor to destructive.

NEED FOR ENERGETIC MEASURES

If our country is to stop the downward trend of our forest resources and get on the road to timber abundance, we shall have to take strong and energetic measures to build up timber growth for future needs. We shall have to put idle forest lands back to work. We shall have to see to it that good management is applied to all forest lands, public and private.

Our Black Hills forests are helping to point the way. They have demonstrated that forests are a renewable resource, that forests can be managed for permanent production. Already the area here where scientific timber

cutting was first attempted in the national forests has produced another crop of timber. Second cuttings have already been made on parts of the area.

The essence of the plan on which that case No. 1 timber sale was based was to cut carefully and clean up the logging slash, and to leave seed trees and young trees to grow for the future. It sounds pretty simple now, doesn't it? But it was a revolutionary idea at that time—just 50 years ago. And it hasn't gotten around any too widely yet. As I indicated a moment ago, even that simple, elementary type of forest practice has yet to be applied to 64 percent of all private forest lands.

But the development in sound forestry practice that started with case No. 1 here in the Black Hills is still going forward. Research and experience have brought many improvements in forest management and cutting practice since that first attempt. Different methods have been worked out for different forest types. Scientific forestry is now standard practice throughout all the national forests. It is gaining ever wider acceptance on other forest lands.

And I am confident that the developments in forest conservation that started here with case No. 1 will go on until permanent timber abundance for the whole country is achieved, until forest conservation is a Nation-wide reality, and the forests of the United States will be contributing their full values and benefits toward the prosperity and welfare of our people.

Industrial Side of Forestry

(Address by Guy N. Bjorge, general manager of the Homestake Mining Co., at the fiftieth anniversary of forestry, observed at Nemo, in the Black Hills of South Dakota)

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Watts, Mr. Case, Mr. Mundt, and other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for us in the Black Hills to have the Chief of the Forest Service and the many other distinguished guests with us on this occasion.

I deem it a privilege to represent and speak for the industrial side of forest management here today.

Fifty years ago today the Black Hills National Forest was established by proclamation of President William McKinley. Prior to that, the Homestake Mining Co. owned and operated the Black Hills and Fort Pierre Railroad, a narrow-gage railroad, from Lead to Piedmont by way of Englewood, Woodville, Robaix, and down Elk Creek. In 1897 construction of a branch line to Nemo and Este was started. A circular-rig sawmill at Este was completed in 1898.

A NATURAL SELF-SEEDING AREA

Those who operated mines in the Black Hills beginning in 1876 needed timber for mining and wood to feed the boilers for power. They thought of their stay here as temporary and so had no thought of the future. They, therefore, cut all of the timber—the large for mine timbers and the small for cordwood, for fuel. It was then common practice to cut timber indiscriminately on any unclaimed land and to cut clean. Today we would not tolerate such forest practice, but we cannot criticize those early pioneers for their methods for, had we been among them, we would doubtless have done just as they did.

Fortunately for us and for posterity, this Black Hills area is one of the best natural self-seeding areas in the world, and all of the areas that were almost completely denuded 50 to 70 years ago are now beautiful forests, which in some years will be ready for another harvest, but this time by other standards.

Pursuant to act of Congress of March 3, 1891, President Cleveland had set apart as a forest reserve certain tracts of land in the Black Hills of South Dakota in the vicinity of the mines by a proclamation dated February 22, 1897. But the effect of this proclamation had been suspended by the act of Congress of June 4, 1897, until March 1, 1898, and that act had provided that the Secretary of the Interior might make rules and regulations for the sale for use in the States where they were situated of so much of the dead, mature, or large growth of trees upon the forest reserves as might be compatible with the utilization of the forests.

In April 1898 the Homestake Mining Co. made application to the Secretary of the Interior to purchase wood and timber upon the Black Hills Forest Reserve even before the final establishment of that reserve by proclamation of President McKinley. As a result of that application, a sale was made, and that was the first timber sale of the United States Forest Service.

HARVEST AND USE WISELY

With that sale began the improvements in cutting practice which have progressed to today's standards of forest management and sustained-yield cutting. Many forest sentimentalists have advocated the philosophy expressed in George Pope Morris' poem:

"Woodman, spare that tree!
Touch not a single bough!"

But that philosophy is not the basis for the right policy of forest management. Today the recognized policy is—

First. To harvest the forest crop for the benefit of mankind in such a way as to improve the forest and to provide a steady and continued yield of forest products; and

Second. To make the most complete utilization possible of the trees that are cut.

The three great natural resource industries are agriculture, the forest industry, and the mineral industry. To these might also be added the development of power. The lure of gold brought the pioneers to the Black Hills.

The mining industry needed timber and power, and so with the development of logging and lumbering and of hydroelectric power we—and I now speak of Homestake—are engaged in three of these industries.

As I have stated, the pioneer miners were wasteful of the forest resources. But not so today. We have for many years cooperated wholeheartedly with the Forest Service in our forest management. We have worked with them to determine the proper cutting for sustained yield and operate entirely on that basis.

COOPERATION WITH FOREST SERVICE

We have also cooperated fully with the Forest Service in the prevention and suppression of fires in the forest. In nearly 40 years of logging and lumbering in this Nemo area only one dwelling in Nemo and one small house at one of the camps was destroyed by fire and there was not one major forest fire. We have aided materially in the suppression of every major fire in the northern part of the Black Hills.

In the recent infestation by the Black Hills beetle we worked with the Forest Service in eradication in several areas on our land, on other private lands, and on the forest reserve.

We are glad to join in paying tribute to the excellent work of the Forest Service and to express our appreciation for the friendly cooperation of its personnel.

Now for the other part of forest-management—utilization.

In mining we use a great deal of timber. At full-scale operation we have used upward of a million feet of timber a month. We have striven to improve methods so as to reduce timber needs and in this progress has been made.

The primary purpose of our logging and lumbering operation is to produce mine timber. But there are many logs from which mine timbers cannot be made. From these and from side cuts lumber is made.

By making all grades of lumber, grain doors, molding, various short-length material, building lath and snow fence lath, maximum utilization is attained. There is, of necessity, much waste material from a sawmill, but most of this is used for fuel.

Transportation of earlier days restricted operations of one sawmill to a radius of about 15 miles. So, small and rather crude mills were built in the forest to serve areas of approximately this size. Such were our mills at Nemo, Camp 5, and Moskee. With the development of fast truck and trailer haulage for logs the possible radius of operation increased to 50 miles or more.

We, therefore, began study of the possibility of an improved mill to serve a larger area. This resulted in the location of our new modern sawmill at Spearfish. This location was selected, first, because it was out of the forest and so free of the forest-fire hazard; and second, in order that the sawmill employees might have the benefits of schools and social life provided by such a pleasant community as Spearfish.

Although we are in the business of logging, of harvesting the forest crop, we are endeavoring to do so in such a way as to maintain a perpetual yield and also to preserve the forest as the perfect recreational area and playground that it is.

In closing I shall express our feeling for the forest by quoting from Joyce Kilmer's poem Trees:

"I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree.
A tree whose hungry mouth is prest
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;
A tree that looks at God all day
And lifts her leafy arms to pray;
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair;
Upon whose bosom snow has lain;
Who intimately lives with rain.
Poems are made by fools like me,
But only God can make a tree."

Inaugural Address of Gov. Chester Bowles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the inaugural address of His Excellency, the Governor of the State of Connecticut, Chester Bowles:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Connecticut General Assembly, by law and by tradition, we are gathered here today to consider how we may best carry out the responsibilities which the people of Connecticut placed in our hands on November 2. During the next few months, we shall be working closely together in the development of our legislative program. What we do, or what we fail to do, will affect, for good or ill, the life of every Connecticut citizen.

In this inaugural message, I shall touch but briefly on my specific recommendations for legislative action. This is not because my recommendations are lacking in urgency, but because I believe that our success will be determined by our ability to develop a common ground of understanding and respect; and that the first step in the development of such understanding is a full and frank discussion of principles.

Let me say at the outset that I do not believe we can afford the luxury of narrow-minded partisanship. Political parties are instruments by which we make our democracy responsible and effective, not weapons to harass and stultify the orderly development of government. They cannot be allowed to become ends in themselves.

In times past, we in Connecticut have been accustomed to lead the search for new methods to refine and improve the democratic process. An early Connecticut citizen, Thomas Hooker, gave the world its first written constitution. Connecticut abolished slavery 80 years before the Civil War. In the 1800's, Connecticut took a prominent part in Jefferson's fight for political democracy and Jackson's fight for increased economic democracy.

Connecticut was one of the first States to establish public schools and hospitals for the mentally ill, the deaf, and other handicapped persons. In the present century, Connecticut, by its support of the reforms of Republican Theodore Roosevelt and Democrats Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, has continued in the forefront of enlightened governments.

Contrary to the dire prophecies of the conservatives, the legislative reforms of the past have not ruined industry and trade, corrupted the poor, or led to socialism. Instead, industry and trade have developed hand in hand with social progress, and Connecticut has become one of the wealthiest States in the Union.

RESPONSIBILITY

It is our responsibility at this session of the legislature to reaffirm the liberal tradition of our State; to push forward the frontiers of security, freedom, and opportunity for every Connecticut citizen.

Our task will not be an easy one. We are living in a period which breeds sharp controversy and in which unhealthy and dangerous signs of extremism are all too apparent. As public problems become more complicated, many of us are tempted to reduce issues to political clichés and to wrap our own ideas and those with which we disagree into separate vacuum-packed containers, labeled, respectively, "good" and "evil."

In our complex and often frustrating world, this kind of reaction is understandably human. But if we expect our efforts during the next few months to be effective, we must strive constantly to minimize our conflicts, and to broaden, wherever possible, our areas of agreement.

In a philosophical sense, we divide broadly into four political patterns. At one extreme are the reactionaries who make no bones about their preference for the past over the present, much less the future. At the opposite fringe are the radicals who dislike our economic, political, and social structure so intensely that they can see only one solution, and that is to blow the whole works sky high. Between the extremes of right and left are the conservatives and the liberals.

At least 90 percent of us fit more or less generally into these two middle groups. So let us disregard the extremists and examine the difference between those of us who consider ourselves liberals and those who consider themselves conservatives.

The fact that conservatives and liberals have traditionally disagreed is basically healthy. That is the way our democratic society learns and progresses—the way it backs out of blind alleys and pushes ahead once more toward our goals of security, opportunity, and freedom for us all.

Since colonial times conservatives have continued to be conservative, but the reforms which their fathers opposed have become the established institutions which the sons upheld as sound and desirable.

Liberals have continued to be liberal, but they are learning that idealistic dreams and brilliant schemes are not enough; that public programs must be worked out the hard and careful way and made to fit—not just the views of a handful of theorists, but the complicated needs of all of our people.

The pulling and hauling of the liberals and conservatives, while healthy and desirable, is often an uncomfortable process. In the heat of controversy, liberals are sometimes inclined to class all conservatives as "reactionaries," or even "Fascists," plotting to set up a Wall Street dictatorship. Conservatives, similarly, are sometimes inclined to class all liberals as "radicals," or even "Communists," determined to destroy our Constitution, enslave our people, and wreck our private-enterprise system. Against this kind of political hysteria, let me repeat, we must all be everlastingly on guard. In this explosive world it is more than just unhealthy. It is dangerous.

LIBERALS AND CONSERVATIVES

Now let us examine the liberals and conservatives a little more closely. Those of us who consider ourselves liberals feel a justified sense of pride in the accomplishments of the American liberal tradition. Since the days of Jefferson and Jackson we have been in the forefront of the struggle to achieve an increasing measure of economic, social, and political democracy for all of our people.

We who consider ourselves liberals, however, have no right to be smug. Although Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal achieved many great things for the American people, it never did solve the problem of unemployment. In 1939, 6 years after Herbert Hoover left the White House, there were still 70,000 men and women walking Connecticut streets in search of jobs.

At the risk of establishing myself as a heretic, let me add that I am not certain that we liberals have the final answer to unemployment today. Full production and full employment have been established in the postwar years, not because we have finally developed the basis for a permanent balance between wages, prices, and profits, but largely because of our vast military expenditures and the program of Marshall plan aid to Europe. In a sense, our employment problem has been solved, not through our own economic and political wisdom but by the intransigence of Marshal Joseph Stalin.

We who consider ourselves liberals have a bad habit, too, of skipping lightly over some of the more boring details of governmental operations. We are great hands at writing eloquent declarations. But we sometimes fail to consider the administrative problems involved in putting our policies into effect. Frequently, in our impatience for a better life for all of our people, we have underestimated the hard realities of budget and finance.

The goal we liberals must set for ourselves is to make Connecticut a proving ground of competent liberalism. Good government must display a healthy respect for other people's money. Sound government requires the fullest application of our energy toward practical ends. Intelligent government should be as economical and diligent an operation as we are accustomed to associate with Yankee enterprise.

I have been frank in analyzing the shortcomings of those of us who call ourselves liberals. Perhaps those of you who consider yourselves conservatives may feel that I am entitled now to suggest a few of your own handicaps.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM

If I may say so, I believe that your fundamental problem lies, not in any lack of humanity and good will, but in your failure to recognize the urgency of many of the needs of our people; in your tendency to feel that public problems, if left alone, will eventually solve themselves; in your reluctance to use governmental powers to meet issues which clearly cannot be handled in any other way.

You are right when you say that too much government is dangerous. But sometimes you overlook the fact that if we refuse to employ enough government in the face of problems which only government can solve, then we may eventually end up with more government than otherwise might have been needed.

The challenge which you conservatives must meet is to make conservatism in Connecticut adaptable to our ever-changing social needs. You regard centralized power with justified suspicion. But remember that whatever success we may have in solving our problems here in Connecticut will ease the pressure to pass those problems on to Federal jurisdiction. Local institutions that are strong and effective are the best insurance that we can have against the arbitrary use of centralized authority.

We liberals and conservatives will continue to disagree. Undoubtedly, we will disagree at some points in the Connecticut legislative session of 1949. But let us strive to see that our disagreement, if it comes, is an honest disagreement of principles and procedure, and not a disagreement born of the political clichés and the blind prejudices which make constructive thinking impossible.

EDUCATION AND SCHOOLS

I have a feeling that the extent of our real differences is often exaggerated. As an example, consider the development of our educational system.

A little more than 100 years ago there did exist a tremendous controversy throughout Connecticut and much of America on the subject of education. The liberals proposed that free public schools should be established and that every child, regardless of the income of his parents, should be taught at least to read and write. The conservatives of that day felt that education for the so-called masses was fraught with revolutionary dangers, and the fight raged hot and heavy for more than a generation.

Since then, liberals and conservatives have worked side by side in all of our 169 towns and cities to develop our Connecticut schools. Today, thanks to these joint efforts, we are providing most of our children with a reasonably good education.

I wonder, however, if our present educational standards are really as good as they should be? The average Connecticut boy and girl drops out of school at the end of the second year of high school. This is no better than the national average. Only one out of seven Connecticut boys and girls goes on to college. Again, this is no better than the national average, which includes low-income States, such as Mississippi, Louisiana, and Tennessee. This means that we are lagging behind many other States.

Is there any real disagreement between us when I say that our Connecticut school system should be improved and strengthened in every practical way?

The future of our civilization depends on the ability of liberals and conservatives together to solve through democratic action the complicated problems which surround us. These problems are certain to grow in complexity as the years go on. They represent an ever-growing challenge to our educational institutions. We cannot build a future which will safeguard the children. But we can build children which will safeguard the future.

We need better schools. We also need more schools, and quickly. If we don't take action soon—bold, forthright action—our school system, instead of growing stronger, will begin to come apart at the seams.

The problem is clear. The number of births in Connecticut in 1948 was more than double the number in 1939. Unless we build new schools in a hurry, instead of 25 children in a classroom, we will soon have 40 to 50; and, as a result, substantially lower educational standards. Our cities and towns

cannot finance the building of the necessary schools without State aid. Surely most of us—conservatives as well as liberals—will agree that such aid on a generous basis must be forthcoming at this legislative session.

We will need many new teachers, too, 50 percent more at least—if we expect to maintain our prewar standards of education. I am sure that both conservatives and liberals in this assembly will vote together again to expand our facilities so that the necessary teachers can be trained in the next few years.

We must remember, too, that the crisis in education extends beyond our primary and secondary schools. There is a growing agreement among us that every qualified boy or girl is entitled to an opportunity to go to college, regardless of the income of his parents. We must work toward that ideal as rapidly as possible. Connecticut University is badly overcrowded. A continuation of the building program there is essential.

LABOR LAWS

Our labor laws, no less than our ideas on education, offer us an opportunity for nailing down the fiction that conservatives and liberals are doomed to perpetual disagreement. When unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, and social security were first proposed, many conservatives disagreed. But in the last few years, in their speeches and political platforms, they have accepted these programs as essential factors in our increasing economic democracy.

Can't we agree now to bring these programs up to date? If unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation are right in principle, why should we continue to limit their coverage to employees of firms employing more than four or five workers? Why don't we give every Connecticut worker the right to this basic protection? Other States have already taken this step. Why should we in Connecticut lag behind?

Here's another point. In theory at least, we have accepted the principle that workers should be protected against loss of employment for reasons beyond their control. Thus, a worker receives compensation if he receives an injury on the job. He gets compensation if the plant shuts down for lack of orders and throws him out of work.

But what happens if he is unable to work because of illness; or because he breaks an ankle playing baseball with his youngsters? Should he be denied reasonable compensation? I don't think so, and I hope that a majority of you—conservatives as well as liberals—will agree.

Here's still another point on labor legislation. In some Connecticut factories, men and women, working side by side with equal skill at identical work, receive different rates of pay. Why not stop this obvious discrimination?

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Let's take old-age assistance. Today there is a $50 limitation on the aid, exclusive of medical care, which the State can give to a needy old person. In many cases this is insufficient to provide a decent minimum of food, clothing, and shelter. The only limitation on old-age assistance should be the actual need in each individual case; need established by expert social workers and based on the current cost of living. I am sure that we can agree on that.

Some of the eligibility requirements—the so-called pauper clauses—in our Old Age Assistance Act are clearly wrong. They destroy the purposes of the act and take away something of the dignity to which our old people are entitled. Let us act together in the next few months—conservatives and liberals—to put our old-age assistance program on a decent human basis.

HOUSING

Let's move on to the question of housing. Our lack of modern housing at fair prices is undermining our society at its very foundation. When adequate housing is lacking families are broken and torn, children are brought up in squalor and bitterness, and the sense of security which can develop only in decent homes becomes impossible.

Our tragic lack of housing is a problem which concerns every individual in our State—conservatives, liberals, all of us—regardless of our incomes. Democracy can easily lose its meaning to those who are forced to double up in slum tenements.

The housing crisis did not develop overnight. Even before the war, one-third of our people were inadequately housed. Since then, tens of thousands of Connecticut homes and tenements which were scarcely fit for minimum living in 1939 have deteriorated still further. Our population has increased substantially. Home building has been held down, first by the war and then by scarcities and high prices. As a result, the shortage has grown steadily more critical.

Today, as everyone knows, even the most efficient of private builders cannot build homes to rent for less than $85 a month. That's exactly three times the average rental that Connecticut families are paying today. It's more than twice as much as most families can afford. The gap between the kind of rentals which our people need and the new rentals which private industry can now build at a profit is staggering.

If we expect to build homes at rentals that the majority of people can afford to pay, we must provide some kind of Government help. This fact must be clear to all of us—conservatives as well as liberals. So let us move boldly ahead together to meet our crucial housing problem. Let us authorize an all-out building program for the coming biennium—with rentals in reach of the average Connecticut family.

Here is another point on the housing crisis. The critical shortage of housing and the gradual emasculation of our Federal rent control program has led to an epidemic of evictions, which I am sure must disturb all of you—regardless of your political viewpoint.

The Eviction Act passed by the special session last August has certain basic defects which make it almost ineffective. I hope that an eviction law with some real teeth in it will be passed by this session of the assembly.

We also need a standby rent-control act to take the place of the monstrosity which passed the last assembly. I defy anyone—conservative or liberal—to explain how this act could possibly be made to work without turning rent control into the most sordid kind of political football. Read it some time and see if you don't agree with me.

MENTAL HOSPITALS

Another problem on which action is urgently needed has been referred to as the "shame of the States," not just the conservative States or the liberal States, but all the States. I am referring to mental hospitals. If any of you doubt the urgency of the situation in Connecticut, I suggest that you visit any one of our State hospitals during the next few weeks.

The legislatures of several States are now taking vigorous action to correct this long-neglected problem. Will we in Connecticut refuse to accept the challenge? I do not believe so.

Here's another question, minimum wages. When a Federal 40-cent minimum wage was established in 1938, many of you conservatives viewed this step with sincere alarm. Since then, most of you have accepted it as reasonable and fair.

The 40 cents an hour minimum wage of 1938 has now lost half its purchasing power. I propose that we establish an over-all minimum wage here in Connecticut that will take into account the increase in the cost of living, in other words, 75 cents an hour. I hope that there is no disagreement on this.

Our limit on savings bank insurance policies should also be brought in line with living cost increases. I suggest an increase from $3,000 to $5,000.

EQUAL RIGHTS

One last question. Conservatives and liberals alike believe in equal rights for every citizen, regardless of race, creed, or color. And yet, today, January 5, 1949, nearly 100 years after the Civil War, it is still impossible for a Negro citizen to volunteer for our National Guard. The reason for this lies in the traditional Army regulations. You alone can correct this shameful discrimination in the State of Connecticut.

These, then, are the main features of the economic and social program on which I hope you will take action in the coming session. As men of good will, I am confident that we can reach agreement on them. I shall offer you more detailed recommendations on each in the next few days. In the meantime, let us add them all up.

Could this program, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered extreme? Not unless you are prepared to repudiate a basic tradition of New England—the tradition of social responsibility.

In our smaller towns, rural areas, and city neighborhoods the principle of the friendly neighbor has been accepted and firmly established since Colonial days. When your neighbor's barn burns down or a falling tree crushes in a section of his roof, you pitch in with hammer and saw. If he becomes sick, you call a doctor and see that his children are taken care of after school. In the traditional New England community, the slogan, in other words, has rarely been "live and let live," but rather "live and help live."

GOOD-NEIGHBOR PROGRAM

The legislative economic and social program which I have outlined briefly adds up, it seems to me, to a Connecticut good-neighbor program on a State-wide scale. If we agree on it, we will have taken a bold step together toward our democratic goal of a high minimum level of security plus maximum opportunity and freedom for every Connecticut citizen.

But effective modern government calls for more than a willingness to apply the principle of the friendly neighbor to the problems of our State. In addition to warmth and human understanding, our Government should possess a high degree of administrative efficiency.

Our Yankee forefathers gave us the principle of social responsibility in human relations. They also taught us to despise waste, inefficiency, and lost motion in any form. Government today, faced with complicated new problems in a complicated new world, is necessarily big government. But the fact that government is big does not mean that it must be clumsy.

Since election day I have been almost continually occupied in a detailed study of the finances, budget, and operation of our State government. With the aid of an able group of assistants, I have probed deeply into the workings of our governmental machinery. I have personally interviewed most of our 108 State departments and commissions.

The task has been a big one and the time has been short. I do not pretend to know all the answers. But I do know this: If we are going to make our Connecticut State government really efficient, we have a big job ahead of us.

MODERNIZING STATE GOVERNMENT

Our long overdue effort to modernize our State government can easily bog down in political bickering. To avoid this, I propose the appointment of a temporary nonpartisan commission with a mandate to study our State government with the utmost care and to report as soon as practicable its full recommendations. This commission

should be set up at once so that there can be no delay in tackling this essential job.

Part of the responsibility of this temporary Commission on Organization should be a reclassification study of our State wage scales. In the meantime, I urge you immediately to establish the $180–$240 increase of 1946 and the 10 percent increase of last winter as a permanent part of our basic salary structure. This represents simple justice to the 16,000 men and women who work for our State government.

There are several other emergency actions which we must take promptly in the interest of increased efficiency in our State administration.

All of us—conservatives as well as liberals—agree that we must do everything within our power to bring labor and management together and to reduce the differences which lead to strikes. This will require a completely new kind of department of mediation and arbitration. We need legislation on this.

We must also establish a new department to handle housing. Our present housing administration was developed before the nature of the housing crisis became clear. When I say that it is wholly inadequate to our present urgent needs, I do not mean to cast any reflection on the caliber and integrity of the men now in charge. But if we expect to get homes in a hurry, we must have the tools to handle the job.

PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

Another urgent administrative problem involves our public works program. As I have already pointed out, most of our schools, buildings, hospitals, and institutions, were well below standard in 1939. For many reasons—some good and some not so good—very little has been done since then to expand, improve, or even to repair them. The situation today has passed the point where we can temporize, delay, or postpone.

Our long deferred building needs are so vast that we cannot possibly meet them all in the next 2, 4, or even 6 years. Obviously, we must tackle first things first. For this reason, I have requested all departments, including the highway department, to prepare their building recommendations on a 10-year basis, with a clear statement of priorities. This will enable us to move ahead with the greatest possible efficiency and economy.

On a 10-year basis, our building program will clearly become more manageable. More than that, a long-range program of this kind will provide a bulwark against unemployment and recession here in Connecticut. By planning our public works in advance, we will be in a position to speed up our building program if hard times threaten, and thus take up any slack which occurs in private employment. Such foresight here would also enable us to get our full share of Federal funds as quickly as such funds are made available.

The size and importance of our building program calls for the establishment of an independent department of public works headed by the most competent staff we can find.

There are several other administrative problems on which I hope you will also take action. We should revise the system of payment for our probate judges, many of whom are now paid more than the members of our State supreme court of errors. We should require State attorneys to give full time to their work. We should rewrite our election laws. We should provide recourse to State primaries so that our political parties will be more directly responsible to the rank and file membership. Liberals and conservatives who are sincerely interested in better government should find no difficulty in agreeing on these questions.

BUDGET

Let me now discuss briefly some of the more important questions on the development of our budget for the next biennium.

There is nothing to be gained by refusing to face up to the fact that Connecticut is confronted with a difficult economic problem. The figures presented to me by the various State agencies in making their budget requests for the next biennium totaled $400,000,000, which is $160,000,000 more than these same agencies will spend for the current biennium. These estimates, delivered to me on November 15, in accordance with the law, were drawn up before election day—in other words, before anyone knew whether the next budget would be presented to you by a Republican or Democratic Governor.

Some of the requests for additional funds were the direct result of price increases in the last 2 years. Food and clothing for our institutions and welfare services are up nearly 40 percent. Building repairs and upkeep is substantially more expensive. Most of these price increases will necessarily be reflected in our budget for the next biennium.

Some of the requests for additional funds were based on recommendations for expanded services, many of them highly desirable. The most urgent of these will appear in my budget recommendations. The others must be canceled or postponed.

Fortunately, the new housing program and the increase in old-age assistance will require only $4,000,000 for the coming biennium, which is less than 2 percent of our present total expenditures.

The total addition to our 1949–51 budget due to increased costs of essential services, increases in present services, and for new programs will be manageable without undue increases in our total tax income. The difficulty lies not so much in the cost of current programs but in the cost of the badly needed new buildings and long-postponed major repairs, which make up the bulk of the $160,000,000 increase which has been requested.

Some of these requests are, I believe, unnecessary, but a major part of them are not only justified but long overdue and must be included in our 10-year building program. The most urgent needs should be scheduled for the coming biennium.

The question of financing this long-postponed building program is crucial. In any well-run business such a program would be paid for out of capital reserves accumulated in the period when building was impossible. That is the way American corporations have financed the tremendous capital expansion which has been in progress since 1946, an expansion running into billions of dollars.

Every well-run State government has followed the same procedure. California, Michigan, and New York, and many other States have been able to handle most of their postwar building through reserves which were prudently built up during the war years. New York State alone put aside a postwar building fund of $540,000,000. California's fund totals $476,000,000.

Our postwar needs here in Connecticut, as in other States, have been obvious for many years. It is unfortunate that we lacked the simple foresight to put aside the necessary funds to handle them. Our inadequate $16,000,000 postwar building fund has long since vanished—most of it into the general fund—to pay for current operating expenses.

As a result, we must now start from scratch in tackling the problem of financing this long-term building program—a program which was, from the start, an obvious postwar necessity. A bond issue of some kind seems inevitable.

One final word about the budget which I shall present to you on February 1. In past years, the budget has been presented on a piecemeal basis. The separation of expenditures and income into special funds and budgets has made an over-all understanding of the State's financial situation difficult.

The new budget for the coming biennium will be a complete, comprehensive statement of Connecticut's needs, resources, income, and commitments. It will give you not only my best judgment of the total minimum program required, but also a statement of our total income needs and the sources through which I recommend these needs should be met.

I sincerely hope that the consolidated budget which I shall present to you on February 1 will help you in the general assembly to a clearer understanding of the over-all financial problem of our State, and encourage you to tackle my budget recommendations, not piecemeal but as integrated parts of an over-all program.

INFLATED PRICES

There is one final subject on which I shall comment briefly. Rising prices have threatened the stability of our economy and the security of our people for the last 2½ years. They have added substantially to the cost of our State and local governments. These inflated prices have been unnecessary as well as dangerous.

There is at least some indication that the price problem may begin to ease in the next few months. The November and December cost-of-living statements of the Department of Labor clearly show some slight downward trend.

I am confident that the newly elected government in Washington will, if necessary, use all the power of the Federal authorities to see that the upward rush of prices is not resumed. We here in Connecticut should continue to watch developments carefully. Needless to say, I shall use whatever practical means I can to ease the cost-of-living problem in our own State wherever that may be possible.

URGES COOPERATION

I have outlined the tremendous task that lies before us. I have stressed, not the difference which may divide some of us, but the areas in which all of us, conservatives as well as liberals, can surely work constructively and effectively together.

The legislatures which have met here before you have frequently touched greatness. Others have bogged down in mediocrity under the pressure of petty politics and of selfish interests.

Similar pressures will be brought to bear on you in the months that lie ahead. I urge you, in all earnestness, to reject them, and to listen instead to the voice of our Connecticut people. These are trying times; and for those who believe as we do in the dynamic future of our American democracy, there is urgency in the air.

Let us pray then that God may give to all of us the vision to see the possibilities that lie before us; the tolerance to work with one another on the basis of understanding and respect; the humanity never to turn our faces from the needs of our people; the courage to move forward toward a tomorrow without fear.

The Late Thomas M. Owen, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Thomas M. Owen, Jr., one of Alabama's beloved

sons, died at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center on December 5, 1948. Mr. Owen was a member of one of Alabama's most distinguished families. He had a long record of outstanding service with the National Archives here in Washington. On the occasion of his death Mr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, wrote a letter to all the employees of the National Archives paying a justly deserved tribute to Mr. Owen. I appreciate this recognition of the service of this notable Alabamian, and include herewith the letter with my remarks:

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES,
December 9, 1948.

To All Employees:

The death of Thomas M. Owen, Jr., a retired member of the staff of the National Archives, occurred at the Bethesda Naval Medical Center on December 5, 1948, after several months of illness.

In point of service, Mr. Owen was one of the oldest employees of the National Archives. He was appointed Chief of the Division of Accessions on May 14, 1935. When the Division of Veterans' Administration Records was created in June of 1938, Mr. Owen became its Chief. Although changes subsequently occurred in the name of that Division, Mr. Owen continued to serve as its Chief until March 1948, when he was compelled by his physical condition to give up active work. He retired because of physical disability on August 20, 1948.

Mr. Owen was a graduate of the University of Alabama. He served as an officer in the field artillery during World War I and thereafter was active in organizing the American Legion in Alabama. For some years prior to joining the National Archives staff he served as assistant director of the department of archives and history of the State of Alabama. In 1933 Mr. Owen was elected national historian of the American Legion, and he served in that capacity until his death.

As a veteran himself and as a national officer of the American Legion, Mr. Owen was intensely interested in the welfare of veterans and particularly in the preservation and administration of veterans' records in a manner that would facilitate their use for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. Because of this interest and by reason of his previous archival experience, Mr. Owen, during the decade in which he had charge of the noncurrent pension records of our Government, contributed immensely to the work of the National Archives by providing for the adequate preservation of these valuable records and by making them, year by year, more and more readily available for use by veterans and their dependents and by others.

Tom Owen was not only a capable and faithful employee, but he was a kind, friendly, and considerate man who had an abiding faith in his fellow men. He loved people and was genuinely interested in them, their problems, and their successes. The welfare of employees under his supervision was a matter of real and continuing concern to him. He will be missed by a wide circle of friends.

The National Archives is grateful for the faithful and efficient manner in which Tom Owen performed his duties and is glad that it had on its staff a man of such outstanding good will.

WAYNE C. GROVER,
Archivist of the United States.

Let's Talk About Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith some most interesting information about the great State of Iowa, compiled by the Iowa Development Commission:

1948 IN IOWA IN REVIEW

Iowa commerce during 1948 unfurled a banner of wealth which flew from some standards at heights rarer than at any other time in its history.

A generally higher level of postwar prosperity was indicated in a highlight review of business and industry during 1948 by the market and research division of the Iowa Development Commission.

The State's industrial economy was expanded and agricultural production bid fair to equal the record crops of 1947. New records in wages and employment were established. Retail sales reached an all-time high while banks reported a high level of business activity. Iowa continued as a leading consumer market in the Nation.

AGRICULTURE

Preliminary estimates show that Iowa farmers ended 1948 with farm records of production and income approaching an all-time high. Cash farm receipts for Iowa led the Nation, with every indication that 1948 farm recipts would equal the 1947 record of $2,410,111,000.

Corn production was the greatest in Iowa's history. The 1948 harvest yielded 666,730,000 bushels, more than double the 1947 crop. The average yield per acre of 61 bushels was another record, beating a previous high of 60 bushels in 1942, and dwarfing the 30.5 bushel yield in 1947.

Total tonnage of feed grains, hay, and forage crops produced in Iowa exceeded any other year. Harvest of oat, soybean, and popcorn crops was greatly increased over 1947.

Iowa continued to produce 10 percent of the Nation's food supply. The State led the Nation in the production of beef cattle, hogs, eggs and poultry products, and honey.

The per farm income was expected to easily reach $11,500.

Iowa's agriculture in 1948 outranked the Nation in value of farms and buildings ($3,611,139,829), percentage of farms owning automobiles (253,993 cars), value of farm machinery ($354,263,259), number of tractors (200,043), rural telephone development (85-percent ownership), rural electrification (80 percent of farms), and 90 percent of Iowa's farmers own radios.

INDUSTRY

Industry continued to steadily expand during 1948, showing a significant increase in production and earnings. Value of manufactured products last year was estimated at $1,815,000,000, a 10-percent increase over 1947. Forty-eight new manufacturing industries were known to have established operating plants, with the reported investment set at $7,502,000. Four major expansion programs were started. Only the $5,000,000 Maytag expansion program at Newton was reported, making a conservative grand total of $12,502,000 in new industrial investment in 1948. These new 1948 industries created 2,778 jobs.

Around 300 new industries have been established in Iowa since the end of the war which have created approximately 20,000 jobs.

Another conservative report places industrial investment in Iowa since the war's termination at $100,000,000, which in turn has returned $3,000,000 in new property tax revenue, excluding sales and income taxes, to Iowa cities and towns. In addition, the 20,000 jobs, based on an annual average income of $2,400, has added $48,000,000 in new pay rolls.

Meat packing, food processing, manufacture of farm machinery, and printing and publishing continued in that order as Iowa's top-ranking categories of industry.

EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES

Rate of employment reached record proportions and unemployment continued at a negligible level. Manufacturing employment was reported at 153,750 workers. The overall pay roll last year increased 15 percent, while the average industrial weekly wage was $53.04, both records. The weekly wage average represented a 9.7-percent increase over 1947.

Increased pay rolls and wage scales improved per capita income and buying power. Since 1940 per capita income in Iowa has increased 136 percent. Retail and service trades hired steadily and professional services were in constant demand.

SALES AND TAXES

Retail sales climbed to a new all-time high estimated at $2,374,712,000 as compared to $2,051,923,650 in 1947.

Iowans paid nearly a half billion dollars in Federal taxes, a new peak.

Revenue from 8 of Iowa's 13 special taxes—those which reflect aggregate sales—was more than ever before. The following table compares the 8 taxes collected through 11 months, showing 1948 increases, and one decrease:

Tax	1947	1948	Percent of increase
Sales	$40,840,314.68	$47,631,163.08	16.63
Use	5,045,690.85	7,236,771.65	43.42
Individual income	10,388,887.15	16,443,387.82	58.28
Corporation income	2,243,158.65	2,690,255.69	19.93
Cigarette	4,076,725.05	4,426,199.52	8.57
Beer	2,540,492.15	3,071,263.43	20.89
Inheritance	2,497,306.87	3,160,875.08	26.57
Chain store	30,839.12	30,705.06	−1.43
Total	67,663,414.52	84,690,621.33	
Decrease (chain store)		−134.06	
Net increase in 1948		17,027,206.81	

Federal Scholarship Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have been preparing legislation to incorporate the details of a plan that, for convenience, I am terming the "Federal scholarship plan."

The aim of the Federal scholarship plan is to enable at least 5,000 high-school students a year to complete a college education when in the absence of

the Federal scholarship plan they would be unable to do so. The plan also serves the same purpose for at least 500 college students a year to continue through postgraduate work.

For the sake of brevity, I will refer only to college and postgraduate higher education, although actually the plan is intended to include students who will continue their education after high school, whether it be in a college or some other institution of learning. The figures used in the appended chart are based on a college period of 4 years or a postgraduate period of 4 years. Since many courses would not take that length of time, it is probable that the Federal scholarship plan would benefit 7,000 or 8,000 students a year, rather than the figure of 5,500 on which the plan is based. And, of course, there would necessarily be some corresponding minor adjustments to be made in the financial figures.

The benefits of the Federal scholarship plan are intended to be furnished at no actual cost to the Federal Government. The Federal Government does provide money in the initial period of operation of the plan, but this money is not provided in the form of the usual appropriation. It is with this understanding that I say that the benefits are made possible by the Federal Government, but still at no actual cost to the Federal Government.

The Federal scholarship plan is based on two major premises: First, no qualified high school or college student should be deprived of a higher education because of financial inability to pay for it; and, second, in its present financial condition, the country is unable to provide that education free of charge.

I hope that eventually the time will come when this country can offer higher education to scholastically qualified students at absolutely no expense to the student. Post high school education should be free to those of our students who want and are qualified to continue higher education.

The country has not yet reached the stage where it feels able to provide higher education free of charge. Until that times comes, I advocate the expedient of what I am terming the Federal scholarship plan.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the country suffers in losing the potential qualities that have not been brought to fruition simply because thousands of individuals have been deprived of educations to fit their individual abilities. It is a public problem directly affecting the welfare of the community, State, Nation, and world. It is for that reason that I am introducing legislation to inaugurate what I have termed the Federal scholarship plan.

The Federal scholarship plan provides for a method of advancing money to a limited number of qualified students by appropriation of Federal funds for that purpose. The money so advanced is to be repaid by the students at stated intervals over a period of 10 years beginning after the educational period.

The plan calls for the cooperation of the States in two ways: First, some financial assistance; and second, selection of students.

The total yearly number of high-school students who will receive money for higher education is set at 5,000. The number of college students who are eligible for Federal assistance to continue postgraduate studies is set at 500. Incidentally, the ratio of these figures can be adjusted to meet the educational needs of the country if a survey shows that the greater need is for postgraduate students.

The amount of money to be advanced to those students continuing on from high school to college studies is fixed at a maximum of $1,000 per year. College students who are going on to postgraduate schools will receive a maximum of $1,500 a year.

The maximum time period for either group is 4 years of college studies for high-school students; or 4 years of postgraduate work for college students.

On the basis of a 4-year term, those granted aid for college or post-high-school studies will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 4 years and $500 a year for the next 6 years. Postgraduate students will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 2 years, $500 a year for the next 2 years, and $750 a year for the next 6 years. Repayments do not begin until the first year after the study period is completed.

In the year after such payments have been completed so that the entire loan has been repaid to the Federal Government the student will make a "gratuity payment" equal to 10 percent of the total amount advanced to him by the Federal Government. For students who have accepted aid for less than the 4-year basis, the amount of repayment is determined proportionately so as to be fully repaid at the expiration of 10 years from the time of completing their institutional studies.

On the above basis, the Federal Government would "appropriate" about $167,000,000 over a period of 14 years or a little less than $12,000,000 a year for the Federal scholarship plan. Fourteen years after the commencement of the Federal scholarship plan it is unnecessary for the Federal Government to make further "appropriations" because the plan has then become a self-sustaining revolving fund that finances itself. The Federal Government does not get back its "appropriations" for the initial 14-year period until 10 years after the Federal scholarship plan is ended, whenever that may be. The necessary "appropriations" for the first 14 years for the Federal scholarship plan are shown chronologically in the appended chart under "Appropriations."

In addition to the above Federal appropriations, those States that accept the terms of the Federal scholarship plan will contribute at the ratio of $100 for every $1,000 advanced by the Federal Government. The total yearly contribution of all the States is shown on the appended chart under "States." After the first 14 years of operation of the Federal scholarship plan the total expense to the States is figured at $1,150,000 a year or $50 for every $1,000 loaned to the student. The amount per State of course depends upon the population of the State—the students being apportioned among the States by population. The yearly contribution of an average State would be about $48,000 for the first 14 years and about $24,000 thereafter.

The contribution of the States differs from that of the Federal Government in that the Federal Government's contribution is simply a loan, whereas that of the States is an outright gift.

The money advanced by the Federal Government to the students is repaid by the students over a 10-year period in the amounts indicated on the chart under "Student repayments." The amounts in that column of the chart are figured after deducting an estimated 10 percent loss on loans not repaid by students because of death, poor risks, and so forth. By the fourteenth year, the yearly repayments of students comes to $20,700,000. In addition to that amount, the student also makes a gratuity payment to the Federal Government of 10 percent of the total amount of aid received by him. The total amount of this gratuity payment is $2,300,000, or, again deducting the estimated 10 percent loss, $2,070,000. That gratuity payment is made the year after the student has repaid his entire loan. That amount is shown on the chart under the column headed "10 percent gratuity."

The estimated expenses of administration of the Federal scholarship plan are shown on the chart under "Administration." Beginning with the fifteenth year, and continuing at that yearly figure after that time, the yearly administration expenses are estimated at a maximum of $500,000.

A summary of the plan, as shown on the chart, indicates that when the plan gets under way a total of $23,000,000 a year is being given to approximately 20,000 college students and 2,000 postgraduate students. During the first 14 years the Federal Government has appropriated an average of $12,000,000 a year to make the plan possible. Beginning with the fifteenth year, the Federal scholarship plan is self-sustaining in that the yearly expenses of aid to students and administrative costs run to $23,500,000 a year and the Federal Government is taking in approximately $23,920,000 a year, which consists of student repayments in the amount of $20,700,000 a year—after 10 percent bad-debt reduction—and $2,070,000 a year gratuity repayment—after 10 percent bad-debt reduction—and $1,150,000 per year from the States. That leaves a balance of approximately $420,000 a year which would be available to the Federal Government either to reduce the amount of the States' contribution or to cover an error in the estimated administrative expenses or bad-debt losses.

The Federal scholarship plan must be considered beginning with the fifteenth year after its inauguration, which is when it becomes a revolving, self-sustaining fund. Beginning that year, the Federal Government makes no further appropriation but simply carries the total $167,000,000 appropriation during the in-

itial 14-year period as an accounts receivable, which will be repaid in full 10 years after the completion of the Federal scholarship plan, whenever that may be.

The Federal scholarship plan is not financed by one single appropriation in the true sense of the word. The money advanced by the Federal Government is not an appropriation, but is simply a loan, a continuing loan.

If this continuing loan be interpreted as an appropriation, it is important to note that the appropriations by the Federal Government are simply made for the initial period of the Federal scholarship plan. After the first 14 years the Federal scholarship plan is self-financed and the Federal Government makes no further appropriations.

I will not at this time outline in detail the method of selection of students or the type of administration necessary. Briefly, the number of students allotted to each State would be in proportion to the population of the State. As far as possible, the selection of students would be a function of the individual State, subject only to the restriction that there be no discrimination based on race, creed, or color. As far as possible, the student himself would select the institution in which he wished to continue his higher education. The Federal Government's administrative duties and expenses would simply be ir connection with supervising the entire Federal scholarship plan to see that all students were given a fair opportunity to compete within the State and that there was no discrimination based on race, creed, or color. I have felt that the students should be apportioned on a State rather than a National basis, so that students of those States on a lower educational level would not be foreclosed from the plan. If students are not apportioned among the States, the result of national competition might see students from the more highly educated States being the only beneficiaries of the Federal scholarship plan.

The Federal scholarship plan does not interfere in any way with the curriculum of any institution of learning. It does not put the Federal Government into the field of education. Using the same educational system that we now have, it simply enables worthy students to continue their education, where, in the absence of the Federal scholarship plan, they would be financially unable to do so.

The Federal scholarship plan is intended to help only those students who meet two qualifications: (1) Their high school work established beyond question that they are good material for post high school study; and (2) they are unable financially to pay for higher education. The Federal scholarship plan has suitable safeguards to see that those two requirements are not evaded.

Let me emphasize that the Federal scholarship plan is in no way associated with and is not intended in any way to interfere with any Federal aid to education program. Whatever is done to put the Federal scholarship plan into effect is not to be at the expense of Federal aid to education. Any Federal Government money used in the Federal scholarship plan is not to come from any Federal aid to education appropriation.

There may be some who will feel that the Federal scholarship plan will not function because the students will not repay the loan. That is a possibility. I, for one, am willing to risk that possibility. I will have some statistics to present when the legislation comes up that I believe will warrant my stand. The Federal scholarship plan may perhaps be an answer to that part of the President's budget message—page 146, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 10, 1949—that read as follows:

It has become increasingly obvious that the national welfare demands that higher education be made available to more of our talented young people. We should now determine the soundest and most practical means of providing additional opportunities for capable young people who could not otherwise afford a college or university education.

I respectfully submit my proposed Federal scholarship plan for the consideration of Members of the Congress.

Federal scholarship plan

[Basis of 5,000 college and 500 postgraduate students a year; college students $1,000 a year, postgraduates $1,500 a year. Repayments over 10-year period beginning after education completed]

Year	Expenditures			Total expenses	Receipts			Total receipts [1]	Appropriation
	To college	To postgraduate	Administration		From States	Student repayments [1]	10-percent gratuity [1]		
1	$5,000,000	$750,000	$150,000	$5,900,000	$575,000	0	0	$575,000	$5,325,000
2	10,000,000	1,500,000	175,000	11,675,000	1,150,000	0	0	1,150,000	10,525,000
3	15,000,000	2,250,000	200,000	17,450,000	1,725,000	0	0	1,725,000	15,725,000
4	20,000,000	3,000,000	225,000	23,225,000	2,300,000	0	0	2,300,000	20,925,000
5	20,000,000	3,000,000	250,000	23,250,000	2,300,000	1,237,500	0	3,537,500	20,712,500
6	20,000,000	3,000,000	275,000	23,275,000	2,300,000	2,475,000	0	4,775,000	18,500,000
7	20,000,000	3,000,000	300,000	23,300,000	2,300,000	3,825,000	0	6,125,000	17,175,000
8	20,000,000	3,000,000	325,000	23,325,000	2,300,000	5,175,000	0	7,475,000	15,850,000
9	20,000,000	3,000,000	350,000	23,350,000	2,300,000	7,762,500	0	10,062,500	13,287,500
10	20,000,000	3,000,000	375,000	23,375,000	2,300,000	10,575,000	0	12,875,000	10,500,000
11	20,000,000	3,000,000	400,000	23,400,000	2,300,000	12,037,500	0	14,337,500	9,062,500
12	20,000,000	3,000,000	425,000	23,425,000	2,300,000	15,525,000	0	17,825,000	5,600,000
13	20,000,000	3,000,000	450,000	23,450,000	2,300,000	18,112,500	0	20,412,500	3,037,500
14	20,000,000	3,000,000	475,000	23,475,000	2,300,000	20,700,000	0	23,000,000	475,000
15	20,000,000	3,000,000	500,000	[2] 23,500,000	1,150,000	20,700,000	2,070,000	[2] 23,920,000	[3] 0

[1] After 10-percent deduction for "bad debts."
[2] After fourteenth year, figures are constant.
[3] Surplus $420,000.

The Nebraska Blizzard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, several Members of Congress have called attention to the terrific storms prevailing in Nebraska, South Dakota, and the Mountain States. These storms are so devastating that it is impossible to estimate just how much damage may eventually occur. Snow up to 60 inches, with drifts from 10 to 20 feet high have so blocked roads that the people in the storm area are unable to get food for themselves or their livestock. This is an emergency of such proportions that it is essential that all Government agencies work together in order to meet the catastrophe which has come to these good people. It will be impossible to estimate the number of livestock lost, or the damage to the economic structure of this area. In western Nebraska alone 13 lives to date have been lost due to the blizzard. It is estimated that livestock losses will run from 40 to 75 or even 100 percent.

With the tremendous amount of snow in this area, there is no question but floods such as this territory has never seen before will come, when the snow begins to melt and the spring rains come. The Nebraska delegation is introducing legislation to provide emergency funds, which can be made available through the Governor of the State, to meet these anticipated floods. It is absolutely necessary to be prepared. The floods may well be more than the communities themselves can stand. I am hoping that the legislation will be given prompt and favorable action. The telegram from Governor Peterson reads as follows:

Disaster prevails over one-half of Nebraska due to up to 60 inches of snow and a continuous series of high winds and blizzards extending over several weeks. No relief in sight. Bureau of Reclamation today turned over to us for emergency use Government-owned equipment and all contractors' equipment being used on its job with operators. Bureau is making no charge for this assistance. Request that Corps of Engineers be ordered to do the same thing on all projects in which it is engaged in the Missouri Basin with authority to shift equipment where needed. Many human lives lost. Property damage terrific and every indication that it will be worse in next 60 days.

VAL PETERSON,
Governor of Nebraska.

Information on Profits, General Foods Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended a summary of the testimony of Clarence Francis, chairman of the

board of directors of General Foods Corp., before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. This information gives such vital statistics on the profits of one of our great food-purveying companies as to be of interest to every Member in the current debate about the social implications of high corporate profits and their effect on our price structure:

TESTIMONY OF CLARENCE FRANCIS BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

It is an honor as a citizen, and a responsibility as a businessman, to appear before you. Your inquiry into the nature, extent and human consequences of an industrial system based on profit can be a monument for the world to see. It can be a token of the fact that democratic capitalism has the strength and vitality to turn its analytical facilities critically upon itself.

I. TABULATION OF COMPANY DATA

A. Profits

1. Related to units of output: Frankly, there is no common standard whereby we may add up the unit output of all of our factories and use such a figure as basis for comparison with earnings.

2. Related to invested capital: Our invested capital is $324,000,000. We earned 5.6 percent on invested capital in 1940, 6.1 percent in 1947, and estimate our earnings to be 8.1 percent in 1948.

3. Related to net worth: The technical concept of net worth omits the factors of real value which have been paid by the company in acquiring some of its branded products. The percentage of profit indicated on this basis fluctuates from 18.8 percent in 1939 to 12.9 percent in 1947, and on the basis of the current profit estimates will be 17 percent in 1948.

4. Related to sales: In 1938, 1939, and 1940, we earned 10 to 11 percent on net sales. But this rate had fallen to a range of 4½ to 6½ percent in 1945, 1946, and 1947, and the "guesstimate" for 1948 is 6 percent.

5. Related to employees: In the past 10 years this has varied between a high of about $1,500 in 1946 and a low of about $1,000 in 1945.

B. Disposition of profit

In 1938 retained earnings were $2,500,000. This represents about 20 percent of the total amount of earnings that year. In 1946 General Foods had its biggest retention, $10,000,000, or about 48 percent of all net profits.

C. The disposition of retained earnings as between debt retirement and new investment

During the period 1938 to 1947, there was no over-all debt retirement by General Foods. In 1944 an issue of preferred stock was retired but an even larger issue of preferred stock was issued in 1947.

In the 10 years 1938 through 1947 about $50,000,000 has been retained in our business out of earnings. This is an average of about 32 percent of all profits.

D. For new investments give types of assets

Our principal source of funds was the retained earnings of $50,000,000, plus additional sums of $32,000,000 for stock, $27,000,000 in notes, and about $22,000,000 representing an increase in payables, mostly current accounts payable; $70,000,000, by far the largest share of this new money, has gone into inventories. Fixed assets of plant and equipment have absorbed $30,000,000 (this figure is net after depreciation and retirements), our current receivables $17,000,000, and our current cash position has increased by $14,000,000.

II. SPECIAL RESERVES

General Foods has not set aside any such special allowances or reserves. In no cases have any reserves or allowances been made which would not be allowed for tax purposes.

III. PRICING POLICIES

A. What pricing policy did you follow for 1948?

We have priced to maintain a sound franchise for volume production over the long run at levels which will achieve stabilized consumption, stabilized employment, and some incentive for ownership of General Foods stock. In direct answer as to 1948 prices, we did all three things mentioned on your questionnaire. Some we have reduced, others we have raised, others have been kept unchanged.

B. How are prices fixed; what factors are taken into account?

On the basis of all known or probable costs and on more or less reasonable assumptions about the decisions which competitors will make on their prices or their promotion or their new products.

The cost of the raw materials in our business is the prime factor, however, of price determination, with labor as the second most important item. Thus, our prices are determined in the main by farmers, by governmental support prices, by barriers to world trade, and other such factors.

C. Discuss the factors outside your control which have influenced the profits in your company, e. g., money supply

Some of the factors outside our control which have influenced our cost, and hence our profits, have been the whims of nature, domestic and foreign governmental policies as they affect agricultural production and prices, and the changes in prices and availability of raw materials.

D. To what degree do you consider your own costs in fixing prices to meet competitive conditions?

In the highly competitive food business, a sales-minded company will do everything to avoid creating a price advantage for a competitor or a price advantage to a substitute product. We have already indicated that our long-range purpose is the establishment of stable and expanding franchises.

E. What profit level do you expect to achieve when prices are determined?

That question implies that we set a profit rate, and, having determined what the profit will be, then set a price to achieve it. This is not what happens with us. We set a price within the range permitted by competition and by our costs and then we have to live within the profit which the product can achieve under these conditions.

F. Could you have charged more for your product and thereby realized greater total profit?

We certainly could have charged more for some of our products and realized greater total profits.

IV. LEVEL OF PROFIT

Adequate profits for our company are those which will assure financial soundness and continuity of policy as well as operations. That profit has at least three major jobs to do.

First, profit must pay a sufficiently attractive return to the man who has saved his money to turn that money into risk capital. Second, out of that profit must come enough capital to provide for part of the needs of a growing business. The third positive function of profits is to keep General Foods in a good working-capital position to enable it to have on hand the inventories it needs to meet its customers' wants and to handle the increased receivables that come from a growing business.

In your second question, you ask if we would agree that profits are ever too high. Economically, profits can be too high in periods of scarcity. The situation can only be solved fundamentally by increased production. Are profits ever too high socially? They perhaps might be if the investor was unduly rewarded at the expense of other classes in the community, or if profit contributed unduly to the cost of living.

We believe that inflated prices where they exist, and inflated profits where they exist, are directly related, and will not be solved until some semblance of peace and stability descends upon the earth.

V. SOURCES OF CAPITAL

A. Why have you not paid out a larger portion of earnings and raised equity funds by sales of stock?

The simplest answer, I suppose, is that capital raised by reinvesting earnings in the business is costless capital. We have raised in the domestic market since the war, through the issuance of securities, about $35,000,000 net in new capital. In the past 4 years we have raised nearly $34,000,000 through earnings retained in the business. Thus the net amount raised in the security market since the beginning of 1945 is almost identical with the amount secured through retained earnings.

CONCLUSION

We in our business feel most keenly the need for balance in administering our three-way responsibility to the American consumer, to our associates in this business, and to the 68,000 men and women whose faith has been shown by their investment in General Foods. We who are charged with administering this company would serve its interests badly by shifting the fruits of the enterprise too heavily toward any one of these groups.

Congress Should Probe Trade Pact Between Indonesia and United States Promoter

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Star of January 18, 1949:

CONGRESS SHOULD PROBE TRADE PACT BETWEEN INDONESIA AND UNITED STATES PROMOTER

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Inasmuch as the American Government has committed itself to support the Indonesian Republic and a considerable part of the American press and radio are attacking the Dutch as exploiters of the riches of the Indonesian states, it is well to inquire whether all Americans are disinterested.

In this connection, Congress should investigate a trade agreement allegedly made in Habana last January between the Republic of Indonesia, as represented by the Indonesian trade commissioner in New York, Dr. D. Soemitro and three ministers of the Republic—A. K. Gani, A. Maramis, and H. Laoh—and a New York City promoter.

Whether this agreement ever was ratified by the national convention of the Indonesian Government is unknown to me. But the agreement, which I have seen, is perhaps the most scandalous proposition ever made by an up-and-ooming promoter to a supposedly sovereign state. If carried out, it practically would put the whole economy of Indonesia into the hands of an American corporation, under conditions whereby the

risk would be carried by the Indonesian Republic and a straight 7½ percent profit guaranteed the corporation. This would be on every single transaction within a total and exclusive monopoly over import and export trade between the United States and the Indonesian Republic—not barring other incalculable profits.

SOLE AND EXCLUSIVE AGENT

It would make the corporation for 15 years the sole and exclusive agent of the Republic in negotiating with American interests regarding all developmental enterprises owned and operated by the Government—including negotiations for loans and other government projects (communications, hydroelectric, etc.) which might require American financial, technical, and other aid, with the corporation, of course, entitled to additional compensation for its services.

Furthermore, in this remarkable agreement the Republic would abdicate many sovereign powers—guaranteeing the corporation against excessive taxation, restrictions on transfers of funds, etc., and issuing it a blank check to form subsidiaries with, in effect, extraterritorial rights.

Under the stock arrangement the corporation would have 51 percent of the voting stock—while the employment of Indonesians in the executive staff would be limited to a minority. Inasmuch as the effectiveness of the contract concerning developmental enterprises demands that the Government retain mineral and other subsurface rights and resources, the Government is required to pledge the retention of socialization in behalf of an American exploiter-corporation.

Whoever drew up this contract understood, as well as the Russians, how socialization of enterprises may be turned to the profit of foreigners.

PREAMBLE OF AGREEMENT

In the agreement's preamble, the Indonesian Government, recognizing that the dispute between the Netherlands Government and the Republic has resulted in cutting off foreign supplies, finds it urgent to approach farsighted and sympathetic American businessmen. And lo! One is there to lay hands on one of the world's richest raw-materials sources, of course in the name of the rights of man and for the purpose of giving the Indonesians, for the first time, the promise of a prosperous economy.

Presumably, individual Indonesians, party to the agreement, would participate in preferred and nonvoting stock, retailing for a bagatelle, with the entire American import-export trade as a guarantee of profits.

Congress, I think should investigate what has happened to this agreement, and who its American associates were or are.

Such a contract, furthermore, would exact a commission to the corporation not only on all purchases and sales between the Indonesian Republic and the United States by other American or foreign importers and exporters, but also extort a commission on purchases made for stock-piling purposes by the United States Government itself. It is, therefore, clearly within the field of legitimate Government investigation.

The Rough Riders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War, and the special Washington representative of the Arizona Daily Sun, has written a tribute in verse, to the Rough Riders, and dedicated it to the Fiftieth Anniversary Roosevelt Rough Riders Association.

This timely and appropriate tribute appears in the November-December 1948 issue of American Poetry magazine, official organ of the American Literary Association, and reads as follows:

THE ROUGH RIDERS

Charge, charge of San Juan Hill, charge, charge again,
Resounds as half a century enshrines
The memory of deeds of supermen,
Whose dauntless valor swept the Spanish lines.
Roosevelt and Wood, for whom life's peak was fame,
O'Neill and Capron, for whom scorn mocked at death,
Men white and red, of every rank and name—
All thrilled with a devotion dear as breath.
True warriors they were, first volunteers,
From mountains and from plains of the broad west,
Virile, bold, and peerless pioneers,
Exploring in a new horizon's quest.
They stormed the heights of glory with white fire;
Forever shall their hearts inspire.

Walter Gieseking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed, in the past few days, an exhibition of unparalleled administrative inconsistency and ineptitude.

Walter Gieseking, concert pianist, has been the principal in this not so funny comedy of errors by our Government. Gieseking intended to enter this country and embark on an extended concert tour commencing last evening in Carnegie Hall in New York and continuing to Waterbury, Conn., and other communities thereafter. Considerable speculation had been raised as to Gieseking's affiliations with the Nazi regime in Germany by several patriotic American organizations. These groups protested vehemently against his appearance in this country.

On December 13, 1948, I inquired of the Department of Justice the status of Gieseking, and requested information relative to his affiliations and actions under the Nazis. On January 14, I was apprised by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, under Commissioner Watson B. Miller's signature, that an investigation had been undertaken which had revealed no information that would dispel rumors of Gieseking's activities on behalf of the Nazis. The communication further informed me that as of July 16, 1948, the Department of State advised that a world-wide look-out was placed to forestall the granting of an immigration visa for entry into the United States.

That is the background of the outrageous performance by agencies of our Government.

Gieseking had been cleared by the military government of Germany in 1947, considered as unfit for entry to this country by both the State and Justice Departments, granted a visa by the State Department, held for a hearing by the Immigration and Naturalization Service upon his entry last Saturday, and given permission to leave the country voluntarily this morning.

This is not solely a question of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing; it seems that sections of one agency do not know what other sections of that same agency are doing.

A world-wide look-out had been instituted last July by the Department of State, yet metropolitan newspapers in New York and Waterbury had carried reports of Gieseking's prospective appearance in those cities for the past 2 months. What are the facts relevant to Gieseking's blacklisting by the American military government in the fall of 1945 and his reinstatement in February 1947? What liaison is in effect between the Department of State in Washington and the consular offices throughout the world?

These are questions which must be answered to the satisfaction of the American people. I know not Gieseking's complete record, and cannot pass on his qualifications for entry; but it is not asking too much for our governmental agencies, charged with the admission of immigrants, to assure that no person of questionable character shall be permitted to enter this country.

Florida Likes Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 23 Orlando Morning Sentinel:

FLORIDA LIKES MARGARINE

Floridians should begin to realize that the margarine battle current in Congress to the extent of half a dozen bills and some rather vitriolic discussion is an issue, the outcome of which will have a direct bearing on the cost of living in Florida and on several phases of the State's economy.

The several bills now before Congress have as their objective the removal of Federal taxes on the sale of colored margarine—10 cents per pound—and reduction of the Federal retail, wholesale, and manufacturing licenses imposed.

Most casual observers, while recognizing in the issue a struggle for position in the marketing of butter as opposed to margarine, have generally failed to bring the subject close to home in their consciousness, feeling that it had no close application to local conditions here in Florida.

Quite to the contrary, however, Florida and its people have a big stake in the controversy, as is demonstrated by the fact that

this State has the highest per capita consumption of margarine in the United States. Added to this is the fact that 95 percent of the fats and oils consumed in margarine come from the cottonseed, soybean, peanut, and corn farms of the South, a large proportion of which are located in Florida.

Therefore it is not only the consumer in Florida who should be vitally interested in getting his margarine at a lesser price, but the producer as well who will profit from the production of soybeans, peanuts, and corn in a greater amount if margarine, sans high taxes and licenses, can be produced in larger amounts.

It seems that there is general agreement that the tax on colored margarine and the high licensing fees required to sell, wholesale, and manufacture are not only discriminatory and unfair, but are definitely detrimental to the South and to the production of cottonseed and soybean oils. The margarine interests have pointed out that the regulations, as at present constituted, are unfair to the poor man and help keep up the cost of living, since they add an artificial pricing element to the cost of margarine.

Federal regulations now impose a tax of 10 cents a pound on colored margarine, $48 annually for a retail license to sell it, $480 a year for wholesale license and $600 a year for a manufacturer's license. The proposed bills in Congress ask for elimination of the 10 cents tax per pound, and reduction of the license rates.

Proponents favoring lifting the margarine restrictions claim that reduction of butter consumption in the Nation has not been due to margarine competition, but to the fact that there is an insufficient supply of both butter and margarine to meet actual needs of the growing American population. Though milk production has increased tremendously, dairy farmers find it to their advantage to sell their products as whole milk, ice cream, cheese, or canned milk. Fluid milk is by far the most profitable market for the dairy farmer, netting the producer almost twice as much as when sold for making butter. It is estimated today that 5,800,000 additional dairy cows would be needed to meet the Nation's milk needs.

That Florida housewives are taking more and more interest in the possibility of buying margarine at lesser price is indicated by the large numbers of Florida letters on the subject now found in the mail bags of Florida legislators in Washington.

Hokum Arguments for Right To Illegally Use Basing-Point System Disseminated Over Entire Nation for Purpose of Misleading People—It Has Been Said a Lie Has No Legs and Cannot Stand but Has Wings and Can Fly Far and Wide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I receive letters every day from small businessmen complaining about the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing point; it is contended that their supply of steel or cement has been cut off and cannot be restored until Congress legalizes the basing point. The big and powerful lobby—the biggest in the Nation's Capital, listed as receiving $11,000 a month and all expenses—is responsible for this false propaganda. Of course, I receive a lot of letters every day from small businessmen who are not deceived by this propaganda praising the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing point when used illegally and protesting against Congress making any change.

One thing is certain about the illegal use of the basing point and that is it destroys the private-enterprise system and creates a monopoly. Did it just happen that no one wanted to go into the cement business the last 20 years? No; a lot of people with venture capital would have been glad to go into the cement business and they had available huge quantities of limestone for that purpose, but they would not dare enter that field when the big established cement plants could put them out of business by the use of the basing-point system. So, in 20 years only two new mills have been constructed; one for export business in Pennsylvania and one to furnish the cement for the Mount Shasta Dam on the Pacific coast.

ARGUMENT THAT BIG COMPANIES ABSORB FREIGHT TO DISTANT CUSTOMERS IS ABSOLUTELY FALSE

Under the Pittsburgh-plus basing-point price system a customer near a steel mill in Indiana or Illinois would have to pay the regular price for steel that was paid at Pittsburgh and in addition would have to pay an amount equal to the freight rate from Pittsburgh, although the steel was delivered at the mill where produced and not shipped at all. That is called phantom freight. Birmingham, Ala., became a steel-making center. If a fabricator of steel in Chicago offered to purchase from a Birmingham mill he would be quoted a price the same as the price at Pittsburgh with freight from Pittsburgh, not Birmingham. It being several times as far from Birmingham to Chicago than it is from Pittsburgh to Chicago and the rate is higher in proportion such sales are not normally made; if so, the Birmingham mill would have to absorb the extra freight on what is called the cross haul—a haul into a territory where it would be more economical to serve with products from local mills. In a sellers' market like we have had for many years there has been practically no cross hauling and practically no absorption of freight. That argument presented in the case of cement and steel is phony. But there has been a lot of phantom freight paid.

CUSTOMER ALWAYS PAYS THE FREIGHT

A contractor near Fort Worth in Texas complained to me about the outlawing of the basing point, contending he used a lot of cement and since that decision he had to pay a lot more for his cement because the cement mills had quit absorbing a part of the freight charges. He will doubtless learn as many others have that he is being misled.

HOW THE BASING POINT PRICING SYSTEM WORKS AGAINST PUBLIC INTEREST

Let us assume that a purchaser of cement has his place of business and wants the cement delivered at Fort Worth, Tex.

We will assume too that there is a cement-manufacturing plant at Fort Worth. Instead of one basing point as in the old Pittsburgh-plus steel case there are a number of basing points for cement. Since the location of the basing points are determined by the Cement Institute it is presumed that they are established at points that will give the cement manufacturers the maximum benefits. Therefore the purchaser at Fort Worth will be required to pay railroad freight charges from the nearest basing point, although the cement is delivered right there in Fort Worth. If in this case the basing point is El Paso, 500 miles away, and the railroad freight rate from El Paso to Fort Worth is $1 per barrel on cement, this $1 extra charge will be added to the cost of each barrel purchased at Fort Worth and is not shipped on the railroad at all. This goes on all over the country and the amount of phantom freight collected in this manner exceeds by several hundred percent the small amount of freight that is absorbed by a cement mill when a shipment is made over into another basing-point territory.

COURTS MOVE SLOWLY

The courts have taken more than 20 years making it plain to lawyers and litigants the meaning of certain anti-trust laws and what can and what cannot be done under certain laws. Now, after 20 years of litigation and when the courts have finally determined how these laws should be interpreted the big cement and big steel trusts want Congress to write new laws, using new phrases, words, and definitions which would enable them to stay in the courts 20 more years getting them interpreted.

Such a change would not be on the side of the people; it would be on the side of monopoly and greed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE COURTS HAVE DONE THEIR DUTY—WILL CONGRESS UNDO WHAT THEY HAVE DONE IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST?

The basing-point pricing system has been used to stop competition, to crush competition, to prevent new industries, to fix prices against the public interest, and to create monopoly. The cement trust and the steel trust have been caught red handed—in the act. It took 20 years to prove conclusively that they were guilty. It cost millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. During this time they were continuing to exact extortionate profits from the helpless people. I cannot believe that Congress will fall for the fallacious arguments of the highly paid lobbyists and lawyers of these convicted trusts that they cannot understand what the law means and therefore the law should be written over and much plainer. What they want is a law that will legalize what they have been doing. That is the only kind of law they will be able to understand.

Membership of Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, the eminent columnist,

yesterday expressed sentiments which are universal.

Since I was "purged" from the Committee on Un-American Activities because I had exercised the right of freedom of expression and thought in accordance with my appreciation of American constitutional government, I have been deluged with letters of protest from every section of the country.

It is my belief that the Members of this Congress should be appraised of the universal resentment which has arisen in this country against such procedures by those who are supposed to believe in the principles of freedom of thought and self-government.

For this reason, I have obtained permission to bring Mr. Lawrence's timely article to the attention of the House as an example of what fair-minded people are thinking and saying. It follows:

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS SEEN EARNING REPUTATION AS MOST INTOLERANT—METHODS OF DEMOCRATS IN FILLING COMMITTEE POSTS ARE CRITICIZED

(By David Lawrence)

The Eightieth Congress may have been the worst Congress from some viewpoints, because it refused to spend more of the public's money for social-welfare projects, but the Democratic majority in the Eighty-first Congress is starting off to earn the title of the "most intolerant."

The Democrats already are talking of forbidding any public hearings whatsoever on new legislation to replace the Taft-Hartley Act. The House of Representatives is talking of allowing only a day to consider minimum-wage legislation and to steam-roller a new bill through without hearings, thus depriving the citizens of an opportunity to be heard.

But the most amazing example of a denial of the rights of the people is the capricious way the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House has decided on certain committee assignments.

MEMBERS MUST BE LAWYERS

Only lawyers, for instance, are to be permitted to serve as members of the Democratic majority on the House committee investigating un-American activities. This is but a subterfuge to get rid of Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, who did not support Mr. Truman in the last election but voted for Gov. Strom Thurmond.

The specious argument that only lawyers can serve on the Un-Amercian Activities Committee can rise to plague the Democrats. For it can lead to demands for discrimination in choosing the members of other committees. Perhaps the Democratic chiefs will be asked to decide next that only Members who once held cards in labor unions are eligible for membership on the House Labor Committee or that only persons who have once been farmers can serve on the Agriculture Committee.

It would be in line for Members with banking experience to insist that they should have precedence in selections for the Banking and Currency Committee, which could mean that men of one viewpoint could dominate such a committee.

The hypocrisy of the action taken by the Democratic leaders becomes immediately apparent when it is noted that the rule about lawyers only is not to be applied to the House Judiciary Committee, which has charge really of all legal matters and problems relating to the Federal judiciary and the judicial code.

BASIS OF ELECTION

The people of America do not choose their representatives in Congress on the basis of their experience in certain professions or occupations. The people of all districts have a right to representation on important committees because of the all-around ability of the men or women elected.

To say that Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, Democrat, who already has had experience on the House Un-American Activities Committee and is generally regarded as fair and impartial in his handling of witnesses, is now to be unseated because he doesn't happen to have been a lawyer is to give an example of arbitrariness and intolerance which certainly doesn't come under the head of either fair deal or liberalism.

Even lawyers can be headline hunters. Also the theory that lawyers make the best jurors has often been disputed. Certainly not all lawyers are judicial-minded. Many of them are prosecution-minded. There is, therefore, no real logic or consistency in the new rule. It can only mean that the Truman administration is back of the purge and that, sooner or later, if the author of the red-herring phrase has his way, the Un-American Activities Committee will be stripped of its powers and perhaps abolished—and all Communists will then have a right to rejoice.

Were this the only issue involved, it would be serious enough, but a trend toward squelching an opposition viewpoint is dangerous. In a communistic regime the one-party system flourishes, but in a democracy opposition, even within a political party, has always been considered healthy.

National Capital Proposed for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Aubert Edgar Bruce, 328 West Twelfth Street, Claremont, Calif., which contains a very interesting suggestion. It is thought-provoking and should receive consideration. It is as follows:

CLAREMONT, CALIF., *January 14, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In connection with any scheme for taking up the slack in labor during periods of depression, may I offer the following:

Why not secure the appointment of a commission to investigate the feasibility of erecting a new capital city for the Nation, to be located somewhere in the eastern Rocky Mountain region, perhaps 200 miles or so southeast of Denver, where the waters of the Arkansas River would be available for use?

Some obvious reasons:

1. Many of the Government buildings in the present location are obsolete and cannot be remodeled or enlarged. I refer especially to the Capitol, Treasury, and White House, among many others.

2. Washington is vulnerable to attack by sea, land, and air; let us have a capital more difficult to reach by land and air and impossible to reach by sea.

3. Washington has two climates, bad and worse. The efficiency of every Government employee would be increased definitely by the climate of the region mentioned.

4. Traffic conditions in Washington are intolerable and cannot be improved. Lay out a new capital city in keeping with our place as the greatest Nation in the world, with streets and boulevards at right angles, ample parkways and parking spaces, adequate railroad and airport facilities, and, in general, a city that we could be proud of and that would be sufficient for the next 500 years or more.

5. The center of population is moving westward and the center of activity for the next 1,000 years will be the Pacific basin. Put the capital city where it will be nearer the center.

Other valid arguments might be presented. My idea is to appoint a commission, nonpartisan, composed of geologists, civil and sanitary engineers, city planners, architects, and so forth, to search for a suitable location, perhaps near the conjunction of Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico, somewhere north of Amarillo, and at an elevation of 4,000 to 5,000 feet above sea level. The construction of such a city would afford employment for thousands of artisans of all kinds over a period of years. It is doubtful if all the Government buildings in Washington are worth more than a billion dollars and many of them should long ago have been charged off and now be valued at $1. A billion dollars appropriation would start the plan and other sums could be alloted to it from year to year.

I commend this suggestion to your careful consideration.

Respectfully,

A. E. BRUCE.

Speaking of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, many prominent and distinguished citizens reside in the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, which I have the honor to represent. Not least among them is Mr. J. Keller Kirn, Sr., a retired banker and authority on monetary matters.

Mr. Kirn resides in Lancaster, Ohio, and recently wrote an article dealing with monetary problems which was printed in the Ohio State Journal. It affords me much pleasure to extend Mr. Kirn's remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I feel certain that they will not only prove interesting but enlightening to all who might read them. The article follows:

PRINTING-PRESS MONEY

Germany's new order adopted printing-press money, and Germans, like many of our citizens before election said "We never before received such high wages, nor such high prices for farm products and livestock, nor had as much money in our hands, pockets, and banks. All our factories are busy and we have no unemployment." Their fool's paradise turned into hell when they baled their printing-press money because they could get more for it as waste paper, as shown on page 27 of the November 22, 1941, Saturday Evening Post. They, like many of us, thought it can't happen here.

High prices do not reflect greater values but printing-press, cheaper dollars. Prices and wages had been so high during the time of paper money that the Greenback Party was organized in 1874 to oppose the resumption of specie payments. This legal tender paper, after being in use 17 years, during which it was below the value of gold coin (it requiring at one time $2.85 of paper money to equal $1 in gold), was redeemed

beginning January 1, 1879, under "an act to provide for the resumption of specie payments" passed in 1875 and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem, in coin, the United States legal-tender notes then outstanding on their presentation for redemption. Have we their wisdom and courage?

Roosevelt repudiated the "redeemable in gold" clause on our bonds, took all our gold coins and currency redeemable in gold, and forced us to take printing-press money, with which Uncle Sam has become the largest bloated bond holder to keep bonds from selling for less than their face value. Perhaps the Redeal will improve on the New Deal by printing more money to pay our national debt. Why tax?

Roosevelt reduced the gold content of our dollar from 25.8 to 15.238 grains and thereby reduced our dollar to 59.06 cents. Reducing the standard of a yard from 36 to 18 inches will produce more yards but not more material.

Roosevelt raised the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. Gold mine owners were very grateful to the poor man's champion for $14.33 more per ounce.

Roosevelt adopted Bryan's 16-to-1 policy by dividing the price of gold $20.67 per ounce by 16 to fix the price of silver at $1.29 per ounce. Then he sent his silver-purchase program as a must measure to Congress. At that time the market price of silver was 32 cents per ounce. It had been 24.5 cents per ounce before he announced his silver-purchase program and his intention to fix the price of silver at $1.29 per ounce. This withdrew silver from all other countries and forced China to adopt printing-press money. The poor man's champion benefited only silver-mine owners. China outlawed opium; England forced continued sales. China's tragedy is an English-Ruinusvelt-Russian tragedy. If we allow Russia to have the exclusive right to use her printing-press money in Berlin to lift her blockade, Russia will control not only Berlin but also all of Europe. Protest now.

Peace and prosperity are possible if we emulate Switzerland, the only country on the gold standard, and the only country enjoying peace and real prosperity. Herbert Hoover tried to emulate Switzerland. Time writes history.

House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of a letter addressed to me by the Louis K. Juden Post, No. 63, of the American Legion, of Cape Girardeau, Mo. The letter follows:

The Louis K. Juden Post, No. 63, the American Legion, Cape Girardeau, Mo., under meeting date of January 5, 1949, passed the below listed motion:

"By motion duly made and carried, the adjutant was directed to convey to the Congressman from the Tenth Congressional District of Missouri, the sentiments of this post to the effect that the House Committee on Un-American Activities should be continued with adequate funds for its business but in view of some criticisms and apparent injustices on account of treatment of witnesses before it and the investigation of matters about to come before it, that certain restrictions should be made as to the conduct of the investigators to the end that the witnesses may be protected and given fair opportunity and also that certain regulations should be had preventing advance publicity and comment during the investigation by members of the committee and committee investigators."

Your earliest attention in expressing the sentiments of this post will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

SANFORD G. JONES,
Adjutant.

Listen for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the January 12 issue of the Pathfinder includes an interesting article by Wheeler McMillen entitled "Listen for Democracy." This article is worthy of attention because it spotlights one of the most vicious and insidious methods used by the Communists to betray the American way of life and undermine our Republic. The continued misuse of the word "democracy" to mislead the average citizen to believe that the United States is in fact a pure democracy with a democratic system of government is one of the Communists' main lines of attack. The United States has a representative form of government, and so long as we continue to be governed by elected representatives and officials, so long will we continue to have a republican or representative form of government. In its true political meaning, the term "democracy" represents a worthy aspiration. In its use by the Communists, it represents a synonym for communism and should be so recognized.

The article follows:

LISTEN FOR DEMOCRACY

Those who would weaken the United States from within have quietly launched a new drive. The alert patriot will have little trouble to discover it. He will have to do no more than to observe as he reads and listens.

This new foray follows an oft-repeated pattern. First the high Communist command decides the party line. Instantly all party members zealously adopt it. The soft-minded, easy-mark fellow travelers take it up. Then thousands of perfectly good Americans innocently let themselves follow along.

The innocents fall in with the party line because the idea looks good on the surface. Communist technique calls for using just such devices.

The new drive proposes merely a stronger effort to put over an old item in the party line. The idea itself looks almost too simple.

What is it these enemies now want us to do?

To get out of our heads the idea that the United States is a republic; they want us to call our country a democracy.

Once they convince us that we are a democracy, they can then assail whatever may characterize a republic as undemocratic.

Those who promote this attack realize that a government that approaches pure democracy holds weaknesses equaled by no other form except pure despotism. They expect that as long as Americans are allowed to go through the motions of voting, the deluded people will be satisfied without the actual power which they do hold in a representative, decentralized republic.

Russia is a democracy so far as voting goes, but the voter exercises no power. The Communist idea of a democracy is a country where everbody votes while a few elite at the top command all the power. Democracy has become essentially a Communist word.

The framers of this Government took equal pains to avert the evils of autocracy and the perils of democracy.

They adopted the representative plan which made the United States a true republic. To the Federal Government they permitted only a few powers and put limits upon those. They carefully balanced the powers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

All other powers were reserved to the States and to the people. Thus the United States became a republic of free people. The free people proceeded within 16 decades to produce the most glorious well-being for themselves that human beings ever enjoyed.

The Communists know all this. They realize that to take over a productive, prosperous America would be a tough, almost impossible job.

They figure that a good long depression would give them a chance. That's why they support big Government spending for everything, why they favor work stoppages, and any sort of disruption. They believe that their chances for taking over will be helped by substituting a democracy for a free republic. They think the next step is now to get us to call our republic a democracy.

In its social aspect, democracy is a worthy aspiration. In its true political meaning democracy is not a bad word; nor, when people are prepared to bear its full responsibility, is democracy a bad thing.

But, as we are, the Republic feeds our strength and protects our freedom. The powers of government are delegated. The uses of power are filtered. No one clique can seize or hold them. A democracy would make that possible.

The American Republic! Let's keep it!

"Forgotten Man" Gets Hit Far the Hardest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 14, 1949:

"FORGOTTEN MAN" GETS HIT FAR THE HARDEST—TRUMAN WOULD DOUBLE HIS SECURITY TAXES AND USE THE INCREASE ($2,279,000,000) TO HELP BALANCE THE BUDGET

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Speaking of demogogy, in the President's annual message, in his economic message, and now in his budget, it is made to appear that the Chief Executive is asking for only $4,000,000,000 in additional revenue from increased taxes and that most of this, if not all, is to come from corporations and individuals in the higher income brackets. The little fellow, "the forgotten man," is to go scot free.

A cursory reading of all three of these messages would give that impression, and many commentators have swallowed it.

FAR FROM TRUTH

But, as a matter of fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. If the President's recommendations are followed by Congress the little fellow, the man with an income of only $1,000 or $2,000 a year, will be relatively harder hit than the richest man in the United States. The forgotten man hasn't been forgotten in the budget.

The reason why the President and his budget advisers have been able to make it appear that the citizens in the smaller income brackets has been favored is that most people apparently still do not understand how the social-security fund operates.

There is still a widely held and erroneous notion that revenues collected through social-security taxes go into a special fund and are used for the payment of old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and the like, and for nothing else.

That, however, is not the way it works. Revenues collected through social-security taxes go into the general fund of the Treasury and are paid out in cash for current expenditures. All that the social-security fund gets is an I O U from the Treasury.

IN SIMPLIFIED FORM

Here is the way it works in simplified form: If Joe Doakes makes a salary of $3,000 a year he pays $30—or 1 percent of his gross income—in social-security tax. That $30 in cash is turned over by the tax collector or to the Treasury and it goes into the general fund. The Treasury then gives the Social Security Board an I O U which states that the Treasury owes the Social Security Board the sum of $30 on which it will pay interest at the rate of approximately 3 percent, more or less, also payable in I O U's. Then it takes the $30 cash and spends it on national defense, flood control, or to pay the President's salary.

Now, if Joe decides to retire and asks for his old-age pension the Social Security Board pays it to him and bills the Treasury for the proper amount which the Treasury then procures by collecting some more taxes from Joe and others.

Now, the point of all this is that the Treasury is collecting a great deal more money from social-security taxes than it needs to pay social-security benefits. And the difference between what social security costs and what the Government collects from social-security taxes is what the little taxpayer—for nearly all social-security taxes are paid by the small taxpayers—contributes to the current upkeep of the Federal Government.

Let's see what this contribution amounts to now and what the President proposes that it shall.

And it should be borne in mind that the social-security tax is an income tax on gross income, not net income. There are no exemptions. You pay the tax on every dollar you earn up to $3,000. If you earn more than $3,000 you don't pay anything on that.

Under current tax rates the Government this year will collect $2,610,000,000. It will spend $1,963,000,000. The difference is $647,000,000, which is the amount of money the social-security taxpayers are contribting to the ordinary current expenses of Government.

PILING IT ON

Now, Mr. Truman proposes that next year the present social-security tax rate be increased from the present 1 percent on employees to 1½ percent. In addition to this he would levy an additional one-half percent for health insurance. And on top of this he would raise the amount of income on which taxes are collected from $3,000 to $4,800. In other words the tax on Joe Doakes, who makes $3,000, would be increased 100 percent. In the case of the man who makes $4,800 the increase would be more than 100 percent, which is considerably more than the tax increase which the President proposes for corporations or for taxpayers in the high brackets.

This increase in the tax rates would bring in total revenue, according to the President's estimate, in the amount of $5,284,000,000. That is $2,674,000,000 more than is being collected from these same little taxpayers this year.

But does the President propose to increase social-security benefits by this amount? He does not.

For all social-security purposes the President proposes to spend next year the amount of $2,358,000,000. That is $395,000,000 more than will be spent this year. But he proposes to collect $2,674,000,000 more in taxes. The difference, $2,279,000,000 is what the little taxpayer is being asked by the President to contribute to the ordinary expenses of Government. It is considerably more than the $1,700,000,000 by which the President's total budget for next year exceeds that for this year. In other words the President plans to take care of his entire budgetary increase and more by the simple expedient of doubling that tax paid by a worker who makes $3,000 or less and by more than doubling it if he makes $4,800.

The Forgotten Man is remembered.

Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted and recommended by the Michigan State Council, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor:

Resolution 3

Social-Security Program

Whereas President Truman has consistently urged the immediate extension of the social-security program; and

Whereas these recommendations are in substantial agreement with those of the Federal Social Security Board, and the program of the American Federation of Labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Michigan State Council, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, go on record, this 12th day of December 1948, as wholeheartedly endorsing the following proposals:

1. Substantial increase in old-age and survivors' benefits.

2. Permit pensioners to earn up to $40 monthly, without loss of benefits.

3. Extend coverage to farm and domestic workers, self-employed, and others—not now employed.

4. Extend unemployment insurance coverage to employees of small firms, public employees, and others not now covered with increased jobless benefits.

5. Enact disability insurance to protect workers from loss of earnings caused by sickness and injury.

6. Increase Federal benefits to match State aid for dependent children, needy, aged, and blind.

7. Make eligibility for old-age benefits at the age of 55 years, and minimum benefit $100 per month.

8. Increase grants to States—taking financial resources of States into account more completely; and be it further

Resolved, That the Michigan State Council, United Automobile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, go on record (this 12th day of December, 1948) as urging that in the financing of the program (as recommended by President Truman), the American Federation of Labor emphasize its opposition to financing the major portion of increased costs out of higher pay-roll taxes—particularly on wages and salaries of those in lower-income groups; but that it urge an increased emphasis on financing the broadened social-security program out of general tax funds levied principally on the basis of ability to pay.

Make the Mails Pay Their Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook of January 13, 1949:

MAKE THE MAILS PAY THEIR WAY

The recent substantial increases in postage rates, designed to meet higher operating costs, will still leave an estimated $470,000,000 postal deficit this fiscal year. They raise the question whether the Post Office Department should not be required and allowed to pay its own way altogether. With the President asking for an added $4,000,000,000 in taxes to support "big" Government, is it too much to suggest that such an established and income-producing branch as the Post Office Department be placed on a paying basis?

Main reason for the deficit is that the Department is not allowed by Congress to operate in the black or even as a business enterprise. As a totally dependent arm of the Government, it receives its expenses by detailed appropriations from Congress and turns its postal revenues into the Treasury. Unlike any successful business, therefore, it cannot meet its expenditure with its own income. In addition, it has no hand in fixing the amount of that income and expenditure. Postage rates are set by Congress, railroad carrying charges by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and payments to air lines by the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Thus the Post Office Department's operation is subject to all sorts of governmental interference, with the balancing of its budget regarded as the least important consideration. If the United States wants to subsidize steamship lines to its Pacific islands in the interests of national defense, it is the Post Office Department which bears the burden through high steamer rates for mail carrying.

Under these conditions, it is meaningless to say that the Department does not pay for itself. Given enough independence to balance its own budget, it should be able to prove that it can stay out of the red and still maintain some of the Government-rate subsidies. According to the Hoover Commission, whose job it is to find means of streamlining the Government, postal expenses could be reduced $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 a year by

operating the Department as a business independent of Congress. With political considerations out of the way, postage rates could be adjusted to actual income needs.

First-class mail is already carried at a healthy profit—enough to allow, in the interests of American aviation and education, a continued loss in air-mail and second-class matter. But third- and fourth-class rates for circulars, catalogs, and packages are maintained at an unnecessary yearly loss of $160,000,000, of which the mail-order houses are the principal beneficiaries. The merchant who contributes to his community through wages, taxes, and property improvement is undersold by these houses, whose only local overhead is the mailing charges which are kept low by Government subsidy. When the Postmaster General can raise such rates as these to conform with expenses rather than with the devices of Congress, then we may rightfully inquire whether the Post Office Department is operating on a paying basis.

Our Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a lyric poem, dedicated to the National Military Establishment, entitled "Our Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen," which, in my judgment, should stir the blood of freedom-loving people all over the world and, so far as the citizens of these United States of America are concerned, might well be regarded as a modernized Battle Hymn of the Republic. The author is my friend of many years, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia Bar, a captain in the American expeditionary forces during the First World War, and the special Washington representative of the Arizona Daily Sun, of Flagstaff, Ariz., where he lived as a youth while overcoming tuberculosis. Captain McGovern is an active member of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, which published his widely read Poems of World War II in 1945. It is my understanding that the Conservatory of Music of the Peabody Institute of Baltimore has placed his lyrics for the song Our Soldiers, Sailors, and Airmen in the hands of one of its distinguished composers for a setting worthy of their exalted sentiments. The poem is set forth as follows:

OUR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND AIRMEN

We are stalwart many millions
With the spirit of the West;
Our State has rock foundations
Of faith which God has blessed;
We have built our mighty riches
With justice fortified;
Our hearts have most loved freedom,
Forever true when tried—
Forever true when tried.

(Refrain)

Our land was won by freemen,
And free it must remain;
Hail to soldiers, sailors, and airmen,
Our country in freedom shall reign.

We never have known slavery,
And swear we never will;
Our hearts for friends are peaceful,
For foes—well, blood may spill;
We don't like atom bombing,
We lions are not cruel;
But if our foes are savage,
Hard lessons are our rule—
Hard lessons are our rule.

(Refrain)

Our land was won by freemen,
And free it must remain;
Hail to soldiers, sailors, and airmen,
Our country in freedom shall reign.

We are the sons of fathers
Who loved their liberty;
We are the sons of mothers
Whose freedom braved the sea;
We are the faithful brothers
Sworn to protect our land;
And we will be new fathers
To make it ageless stand—
To make it ageless stand.

(Refrain)

Our land was won by freemen,
And free it must remain;
Hail to soldiers, sailors, and airmen,
Our country in freedom shall reign.

St. Mary's Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address in observance of the one hundredth anniversary of St. Mary's Parish in the city of Lawrence, Mass., by the Very Reverend Joseph M. Dougherty, O. S. A., prior of Villanova College:

"Remember the days of old. Think upon every generation and ask thy Father and He will declare to thy elders and they will tell thee." (Deuteronomy 32: 7.)

We come here this morning to cherish the precious memories of the days that are gone and to offer a prayer of thanksgiving for God's providence in the past and in the spirit of those stimulating emotions to set our faces resolutely toward the days that lie ahead.

We gather this morning to render fond tribute to our ancestors in the faith, who during the turbulent nineteenth century, brought the religion of Jesus Christ to the valley of the swift-flowing Merrimack. No wealth or earthly prestige was theirs for despoiled of their lands, oppressed by unjust taxation they excited only the ridicule and derision of the so-called native Americans. Ah, yes, just 100 years ago one of the worst calamities of modern times, the man-made famine of 1848 drove the builders, the first St. Mary's, from holy Ireland. In that dire period literally millions of the Irish people in the unscrutable designs of divine providence were scattered to the four corners of the earth. But with them in spite of persecution and want, they brought an unconquerable love for the Madonna and the Child. It is just and fitting on this the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of St. Mary's that we render our praise for these hardy pioneers who braved insults, ridicule, and persecution. Well may we commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of St. Mary's parish for the parish is the common denominator of the living church of Jesus Christ. In the parish church the individual is brought into contact with the saving sacraments of our holy faith.

Although each parish has a definite territory it has buildings and other physical property. The teaching commission and the driving force of a parish depends on the spiritual authority of the Pope, the vicar of Jesus Christ. No priest may stand in any Catholic pulpit, nor may he administer the sacraments unless he be approved by the authority of his bishop. The bishop in turn is in direct communication with the Pope. Indeed he is required periodically to make his ad limina visit to the feet of the holy father. Whenever a priest offers the holy sacrifice he is obliged to pray for his bishop and the Pope. The Catholic Church has been well named the Christo-centric church. All of our ceremonies, our devotions, our architecture bespeak the power of the Divine Christ and this power is made available for the individual through the administrations of the parish clergy. The teaching authority of the vicar of Christ which we love and cherish furnished the understanding of the antiquity and solidarity of the Catholic Church, a condition which the enemies of the church regard with hatred but a fact which they cannot ignore.

There are two incidents from the New Testament which dramatically prove the divine character of Peter's mission and indicate to all believers the power of the Catholic Church. Peter was no coward. Indeed he was a brave man. However when he relied solely on his own strength he failed and failed miserably. "You will all be scandalized in Me this night for it is written I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered." But Peter said to Him, "Even though all be scandalized yet not I." Jesus said to him, "Before the cock crows twice thou shall deny Me thrice." But he went on speaking more vehemently, "Even if I should die with Thee I will not deny Thee." (Mark 14: 27–31.)

And while Peter was in the courtyard there came one of the maidservants of the high priest, and seeing Peter warming himself she looked closely at him and said: "Thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth." But he denied it, saying: "I neither know or understand what thou art saying."

Contrast this miserable denial of St. Peter with the zeal with which he preached for Our Saviour when he was inspired by the Holy Ghost. "Men of Israel why do you marvel at this or why do you stare at us as though by any power of our own we made this man walk. The God of Abraham, the God of Jacob, the God of our Fathers has glorified His son, Jesus." Cited before the Sanhedrin St. Peter persisted in his fearless declaration of the divinity of Jesus Christ, so that they had a mind to slay St. Peter. Then there stood up in the Sanhedrin one Gamaliel, a teacher of the law, respected by all who heard this historic judgment. "Now I say to you keep away from these men. Let them alone for if this work is from men it will be overthrown but if it is from God you cannot overthrow it." The judgment of Gamaliel has been sustained by 19 centuries of opposition and frequent bloody humiliations. And with all the vicissitudes and humiliations heaped upon her with the rise of empire, with the boast of material power, the voice of the white-robed figure who sits on the fisherman's throne is a factor to be reckoned with in the affairs of men. The historic fact of the Catholic church is portrayed most graphically by the English writer MacCauler. "The Catholic church saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, when the Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when the idols were still worshiped in the temple of Mecca.

"And she may still exist in undiminished vigor when some traveler from New Zealand in the midst of a vast solitude takes his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul."

Even in our day in the vigor of our holy faith we can discern the fulfillment of those prophetic words of our divine Saviour in answer to Peter's declaration of faith: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." We rejoice today therefor because there have been completed a hundred years of administration of the sacraments of Jesus Christ in this unit of His Church, St. Mary's of Lawrence.

We hail that long line of zealous priests and devoted laity of St. Mary's Parish.

Oh who shall fathom the depth of that mysterious, that abiding love binding our Catholic people so closely to the priest. To them who grasp the genius of our holy faith the explanation of this love is clear because the priest brings to the faithful the power of the divine Christ. When he ministers he imparts the infinite merits of the Saviour. When he sacrifices he holds in his hands the body and blood of Jesus Christ. That deep affection for the priesthood so characteristic of the Catholic laity has an additional foundation in the history of the trials and privations of the people of Lawrence. When puritanical bigotry tried to crush the initiative of Catholics, when our people were deprived of employment with notices that "No Catholics need apply," the priest was there to uphold their rights and to speak out boldly in their defense. When the pinch of want caused hunger there was always a sainted priest like Father Tate who collected money and doled out food even at the expense of his own health.

CHAMPIONED RIGHTS OF PEOPLE

When greedy mill owners treated their workers like cattle, when men, women, and children labored 12 and 14 hours for a mere pittance, without any protection from whirring machines, the priest was the sole champion of their rights. Anyone who has even a casual acquaintance with the history of industrial New England has a deep appreciation of the respect and love accorded to the priests of the Merrimack Valley. Little wonder then that the people of Lawrence cherish their priest and they, like the Israelites of old sustaining the aims of Moses whilst the battle raged, they have always appreciated the zeal of their priests.

It is a difficult task, indeed, to do justice to the long line of priests who have labored in St. Mary's parish. The stories, the incidents, the trials and sorrows, the celebrations and demonstrations of faith comprising the rich history are so varied and numerous that it would take hours to give them merely passing reference. I shall confine my remarks to a brief outline which will recount some of the high lights of the long and fruitful years of St. Mary's.

OUTLINES HISTORY OF PARISH

Father James O'Donnell, the founder of St. Mary's parish, said the first mass in Merrimack Hall, then located at Jackson and Common Streets, on Christmas Eve, 1948. The following year he completed a wooden structure which served as a church until the building of a stone church in 1852. Father O'Donnell died in 1861 and was succeeded by Father Mullen, who remained until the end of 1865, when he was returned to reopen Villanova College, closed by the Civil War. Father Edge held the pastorate of St. Mary's from 1865 to 1870. It was the vision of Father Edge that planned the new St. Mary's, this present structure, whose cornerstone was laid in August 1866.

On that occasion, Dr. Moriarty, renowned for his oratory, was the speaker. In an eloquent sermon, Father Moriarty predicted that "the good people of this parish would soon complete their work by raising the cross of Christ on the high pinnacle of St. Mary's, where the first beams of the rising sun would shine upon it, forecasting the long generations of Catholic faith in the city of Lawrence."

Father Edge was succeeded in the pastorate of St. Mary's by Father Galberry, who subsequently was consecrated bishop of Hartford, Conn. Under the leadership of Father Galberry, the present church was completed and the old St. Mary's renovated for school purposes. From 1872 until 1886, the parish was administered successively by Father Gilmore, Father Daniel Regan, and Father McEvoy. Father James T. O'Reilly was pastor of St. Mary's parish from 1886 until his death in 1925, a period of some 40 years. Father O'Reilly, in 1912, when the forces of atheistic socialism sought to entrench themselves in this city because of labor unrest, became a national figure. In the parish calendar, which he founded in 1896, he waged a ceaseless and effective campaign against the propaganda of this dangerous foe. When, in February 1912, this Godless group paraded through the city leading the misguided worker who bore red flags and placards with the phrase, "No God. No Master," Father O'Reilly fearlessly and singly denounced this malicious organization. His zeal and his efforts for the beloved country and our holy faith culminated in a magnificent parade of 30,000 on Columbus Day, waving American flags and brandishing thousands of copies of Father O'Reilly's slogan for God and country, "The Red flag never! The Stars and Stripes forever!"

This effective demonstration projected by Father O'Reilly proved him to be a generation ahead of his time. Today we salute the memory of Father James T. O'Reilly, a great priest and a great American.

In 1925 Father Michael Sullivan was appointed rector of St. Mary's. He was succeeded by Father James McDonald, who endeared himself as a young priest by organizing his famous cadet corps, among whose members was the present pastor of St. Mary's, Father Martin. Father McDonald was succeeded in 1935 by Father Patrick Campbell. Father Daniel Driscoll was appointed to St. Mary's in 1941, and he was succeeded by Father John Martin. I feel that the priests and laity recognize the magnitude of my obligations on this historic occasion, and I know they will understand that the limitations of time and memory preclude the possibility of rendering an adequate tribute to all who have labored so well at St. Mary's. The records show that over 100 Augustinian priests have been assigned to St. Mary's.

BLESSING FROM FATHER O'MAHONEY

I feel that there is one priest who symbolizes in a striking way the outstanding affection of the people of St. Mary's. This morning I bring you a blessing from Father O'Mahoney. Father Dan, as you all so affectionately call him, is well past the three score and 10. He is in his ninety-third year. His steps are faltering now and when I left him at Villanova, he said: "Good-by, Father dear, and give my blessing to all my loved ones in Lawrence."

An event of great significance for St. Mary's parish occurred in 1859. At that time the sainted Father Edge prevailed upon the Sisters of Notre Dame to teach the pupils of his newly founded school. To the many sainted women of the Sisters of Notre Dame who have labored so well for Christ in St. Mary's parish for the past 90 years, we render thanks to Almighty God.

The genuine regard and high esteem accorded to these sisters by the good people of St. Mary's parish is only a slight measure of the magnitude of their contribution to the catholicity of this city. Their real worth is known to God alone who will reward them for their innumerable deeds of heroic self-sacrifice in this parish.

We are honored this morning with the presence of our beloved archbishop. Your excellency, in the name of our Very Rev. Father Provincial, in behalf of Father Martin and all the Augustinian Fathers, I thank you for your graciousness and your never-failing kindness to our order. In a comparatively few years you have, by your zeal and gentle kindness, won the hearts of the Catholic of the great archdiocese of Boston and you have particularly endeared yourself to the people of Lawrence. Our archbishop is a prelate of zeal and vision.

Already the walls of a Catholic hospital are arising in Lawrence. With a clear understanding of the need for Catholic education and with a burning zeal for souls, Archbishop Cushing, you have summoned the Augustinians and commissioned them to establish a college for men and women in the Merrimack Valley. Through the inspiration of your characteristic energy, our Father Provincial has established this institution, Merrimack College, under the able guidance of the learned Dr. McQuade. In the short space of 2 years two buildings have been constructed, another acquired, and a student body of 400 has been enrolled.

Our Very Rev. Father Provincial, I know, is deeply moved this morning in the recollection of many dear memories of his youth in old St. Mary's. I know that Father Sullivan is not well disposed to flattery. However, the occasion warrants that due recognition be accorded him as the superior of our order. He has accomplished much for the salvation of souls, the advancement of our order, and the glory of Holy Mother Church.

LISTS EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS

So, in the spirit of this historic occasion, let us look at the record, in the words of a famous American statesman. During the more than a decade of years Father Sullivan has completed the following projects in the educational field alone:

At Villanova, more than $2,000,000 has been expended for improvements and building, including a new monastery, a large library housing 500,000 volumes, a naval science building regarded by the Navy as the model for all such buildings and the first such structure to be built by any college in the United States, and a chemical engineering building of the latest construction.

In Cuba, the Pearl of the Antilles, under Father Sullivan's direction, the Catholic University of Habana has been established with two buildings complete and a third undergoing construction. In our high schools in far-off California, Father Sullivan has expended over $200,000.

Requested by the archbishop of Boston to erect a Catholic college in the Merrimack valley, Father Sullivan immediately directed that suitable land should be acquired, and construction was started immediately. On the occasion of a visit of inspection to the new college site, he directed that more land be acquired. A total of 160 acres now forms the campus of Merrimack college. The prophetic statement of Father Moriarty, the founder of Villanova, made at the cornerstone laying at this church, August 1866, has been fulfilled. Father Moriarty foretold that the parishioners would complete St. Mary's Church, and on its highest pinnacle they would place the cross of Christ, where the first rays of the rising sun would shine upon it, forecasting the long generations of Catholic faith in the city of Lawrence.

Father Sullivan, in founding the first Catholic college in the Merrimack Valley, has admirably substantiated the prophecy of Father Moriarty. In the dim vista of the future already we can see the thousands of our Catholic boys and girls who will be the beneficiaries of our Father Provincial's foresight.

The Augustinian Fathers have every reason to believe that the people of the Merrimack valley will support them in this great educational project of our order. Our Father

Provincial has already committed us to an expenditure of over $1,000,000 for Merrimack College. This represents an enormous outlay of money, an outlay in addition to other expenditures of our order. I am sure that the descendants of the founders of old St. Mary's will not fail us in this emergency. We have the tradition of 10 decades of our Catholic people who have sustained their Augustinian priests in every possible emergency. And on this historic occasion, with the memory of your loved ones fresh in your minds, I ask you to match the generosity of our Father Provincial in the construction of Merrimack College.

Let each family of St. Mary's pledge today at least $100 toward this worthy project as a symbol of love and devotion to Archbishop Cushing. This sum need not be paid today, but let each family of old St. Mary's accept this challenge to its loyalty as a sacred trust, as a vow to be fulfilled over the years. Let it be a symbol of confidence in Father Sullivan, our provincial, who has so generously expended the resources of the Augustinian order with faith and vision toward another hundred years of Catholic progress in the Merrimack Valley.

Contributions to Volunteer Fire Companies Should Be Tax Exempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, during the past year it has been my privilege and my pleasure to become very closely associated with various volunteer fire companies and their members. Among other things, that association has been highly educational. As a result, I have today the greatest respect and a much fuller recognition of the value and importance of volunteer fire companies to our way of life in this great Nation.

At the same time I have learned of many of the problems with which these volunteer fire companies are confronted. Perhaps their greatest problem is that of acquiring sufficient funds to enable them to perform their unselfish duties as fully and satisfactorily as they wish to carry them out. To a very large extent these volunteer fire associations are dependent upon contributions from individual citizens and grateful business enterprises. I have learned, however, that the size of many of these contributions is restricted because under our present tax laws such donations may not be deducted for income-tax purposes. This is a situation, Mr. Speaker, which in my opinion merits and needs correction at the earliest possible date.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced into the House of Representatives a bill to which I urge all the Members of the Congress to give full and sympathetic consideration. This bill provides for an amendment to our present tax laws by which contributions to volunteer fire companies will become deductible for income-tax purposes. I wish to point out, however, that this bill does not in any manner alter the present total limits on the amounts of individual or corporate incomes which are deductible for tax purposes.

Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the Members of the House of Representatives, some of the reasons why this bill should be acted upon favorably and enacted into law.

From the best information available to me, I learn that there are only about 900 full-time professional fire departments in the United States. On the other hand, I am told that there are more than 14,000 volunteer fire companies. In this connection I wish to point out that the paid fire companies are maintained through local taxation. And the taxes paid by individuals and business enterprises for this purpose and for their own protection are deductible in determining the amount of Federal income tax to be paid. In justice and in fairness to those who support volunteer fire companies, it seems wholly clear to me that payments for the same purposes in rural communities should likewise be tax-exempt.

Let me point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that our Federal Government has a direct obligation to these volunteer fire associations. In nearly all of the communities throughout the Nation served by volunteer fire companies, our Federal Government has post offices and other public buildings and properties of tremendous value. For the protection of these public buildings from destruction by fire, our Government is wholly dependent upon the unselfish services of the volunteer firemen. I am not suggesting that these firemen be paid or that they receive any Federal subsidy, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that we should enable these companies to raise larger sums of money by reason of tax exemption to donors so that our own public property may be more adequately protected.

Volunteer fire companies are to a very large extent educational organizations. For many years in thousands of communities they have conducted campaigns to educate the public in fire prevention. The number of lives and the property values saved from the ravages of preventable fires cannot be ascertained in dollars.

In that connection I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that new methods for preventing and fighting fires are constantly being developed. The volunteer fire companies conduct classes at which their members are trained to become skilled in these new methods. But new methods require new equipment and new materials, and I am sure that there are many volunteer fire companies in the country today who are fully cognizant of better and improved fire prevention and fire-fighting methods, who solely for lack of adequate funds cannot apply these methods. Certainly by the enactment of this bill we should help to enable them to do so.

That volunteer fire companies are at least quasi-public organizations is a fact already widely recognized. This is evidenced by the fact that State and municipal governments in many cases are making direct contributions to America's volunteer fire associations. With such being the case, I again say that certainly we should enable these companies to supplement their available funds by enabling grateful citizens and corporations to make tax-exempt donations.

Everyone who has ever lived in a rural community also knows that the very existence of a volunteer fire company in that community represents an actual annual dollar savings to him by reason of reduced fire-insurance rates. Our Federal Government is enjoying the same saving on the insurance on its public buildings.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize the great value of the unselfish citizens who comprise our volunteer fire companies in time of local or national emergency. Their training and their skill and their knowledge can always be counted upon to counter the effects of an emergency of any scope.

In view of the foregoing and much more that could be said, I again urge that this proposed legislation be acted upon favorably by the Members of this Congress.

Address of Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a speech delivered January 21 by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, at the banquet in St. Joseph, Mo., honoring the 10 outstanding young men of 1948. This speech was carried over the facilities of the American Broadcasting Co. I believe the speech will be of intense interest to every Member of the Congress for its patriotic expression of the liberal and progressive ideals which are today motivating the young men and women of America.

The speech follows:

This is a unique experience for me. With three growing children at my house, I enjoy frequently the "breakfast of champions," but this is the first time I have addressed a "dinner of champions."

In the field of politics, some of us get to be champions in devious ways. For example, back when I was a student at the University of Tennessee, I tried for the football team and was a pretty fair substitute. A few years latter, as a candidate for Congress, I became a star player. Still later, when I was running for the Senate, I noticed I had become a member of the all-southern team. So, 6 years from now if I seek reelection, you can receive the news that I was an all-American with complete understanding of how a politician gets to be a champion.

These champions we salute tonight are most unusual. All of them are young—none older than 36. They represent all phases of our national life: a mayor, a governor, a

Member of Congress, a baseball player and manager, a labor leader, an executive of a cosmetic manufacturing company, a dean of law, a public relations expert who overcame blindness, a newspaper reporter, and an instructor in surgery. So you will see that youth is moving up in many fields of human endeavor.

This is quite a contrast to the picture of 1915, when young men were taught to be seen and not heard—to wait until they reached middle age to take part in the business, professional, civic, and governmental affairs that affected them.

The movement we know as the "Jaycees" had its origin right here in Missouri, when a bond issue to provide funds for a parkway in St. Louis was being proposed. A young man by the name of Henry Giessenbier had an idea, and he built a foundation under his dream. Thirty-two young men of St. Louis met in an attic on October 13, 1915, and formed what later became the first junior chamber of commerce in the world. From this humble and inauspicious beginning, the organization has spread to the extent that every State—with the exception of Vermont, which again became a notable exception in 1936—has Jaycee organizations. Too, Jaycees are international in scope, having chapters in nearly 50 foreign nations.

This is the thirteenth year that the distinguished awards have been made, and it is altogether fitting that the anniversary should be held in Missouri, the place of Jaycee nativity.

To these 10 outstanding young men I offer profound and sincere congratulations on your attainments. It is remarkable that you should have achieved a place of leadership in your respective fields so early in life. Only in America, of all the nations, is such a situation possible; for it is here that we enjoy the equality of opportunity that limits our people only to their diligence, their abilities, and their willingness to work hard.

This should be a strong indication to the peoples of the world that our democracy has something to offer any people anywhere, and it is a timely indication. You and I are witnessing a struggle of ideologies at this time between our democratic way of living and the way of life advanced by the Soviet Union.

It is an ever-increasing struggle in which each side seeks to propagandize its own assets and the weaknesses of the other system. When an unfortunate incident, such as a lynching, occurs, the official Russian newspaper, Pravda, and other Soviet media of communication play it up as a weakness in the democratic system, rather than as an exceptional departure from the true democratic method.

In this element of the cold war we would do well to appreciate the effectiveness of our own system—of the power of our freedom, so aptly pointed up by Dr. Max Ascoli in his new book of the same name. We need urgently to grasp the idea that our democratic way of life has a great potential of influence on the course of events in the world today. We can hardly sell the rest of the world on the merits of our mode of living—our system of government—unless we, ourselves, have a deep and abiding comprehension of its validity.

It is never necessary to apologize for the position we assume under the democratic system. Sometimes we are ashamed that a few of our citizens, failing to recognize the principles of democracy, commit acts that are not in keeping with our mode of life; but such is not a reflection on the principles for which we stand, rather, only an indication that we have not yet reached the point of perfection. An un-American activity no more changes the basic principles of our system than a man jumping out of the twentieth-story window changes the law of gravity. The basic fundamentals of our way of life are sound, and, I repeat for emphasis, we need have no apology for them.

If the great masses of the people in Russia and other communistic states ever gain an understanding of the rightness of democracy, I fear not their decision as to whether they will accept it for themselves. After all, we followed in a voluntary manner the course that we did when our Government was formed. We might have selected another form, yet the choice of our founding fathers was democracy, because democracy is more akin to the principles on which the very universe is operated.

If there is one single thing that our young people can take the lead in, at this moment, it is the task of selling democracy to all people everywhere, in America and ou*.

We are proud of the economic success of our system of government—a system that has provided greater production and better distribution for more people than any other nation has yet approximated. Some of us are constrained, unfortunately, to think that we should content ourselves with helping the war-torn nations of the world from an economic standpoint only. That, in my opinion, is a drastic mistake. Europe and Asia need these material aids, of course, but they also need the succor our fundamental freedoms can provide even more.

Our democracy has its weaknesses. The President pointed out some of these to the Congress 2 weeks ago in his message on the state of the Union. We need to correct these weaknesses as rapidly as we can with efficiency. We need better low-cost housing, and we need it urgently. We need to establish better educational advantages. We need to develop further our natural resources, and a score of things can be done to enhance the economic opportunities of our people. But there are other requirements which are not within the realm of the material.

Our great need, and one that our young people can do a great deal about, is to dispel the notion, expressed by too many, that another depression is more to be feared than another war. I say our youth should take the lead in this matter, because the youth of our land will do the sacrificing if we enter a third world war. It doesn't matter much how many dollars you have in your pocket if you are trying to protect your family from an atomic bomb, or a guided missile, or some other weapon of war that may be perfected.

Don't think for a minute that you are powerless to do something about another war. You are here from all over the United States, and you are the ones who formulate public opinion. Public opinion influences your lawmakers and your administrators. We had a lucid example of the ability of the ordinary citizen to make himself heard in the recent elections. All the influences in the Nation were agreed on the election of Governor Dewey, except one, the opinion of the great masses of the people. After all, that was the only important one. It isn't often that the people speak, but when they do, it is in an effective voice. What I am saying to you is this: You have great influence, and all you need to do is to use it. Speak out for democracy; speak out for world peace. No law is stronger than its interpretation; no theory is stronger than its practice. Democracy means what you and I make it mean.

There is another weakness in our system that the youth of our land can do much to overcome, and that is the tendency to rely too strongly on traditions and time-honored customs. I favor traditions when they are good traditions; I am all for customs when they are right. But nothing is right just because it is old. Most of our traditions are honored because they are good in the first place. When a tradition, or a custom, or a law is bad, regardless of how old or how new it may be, I say we should replace it with something better.

Our electoral college system is a good example of a tradition and a custom that has outlived its usefulness and should give way to a plan that is in keeping with our present-day demands. I am not one to want to wait until a President is again elected on the basis of a majority of the electoral votes though his adversary received the most popular votes, before doing something about it. I say we should change the system before a national calamity results.

There is another matter that should gain the attention of our youth. We have had too many mergers and trusts and monopolies. There was a time in our national history when this type of business operation could have been condoned. That time has long since passed. The young man who desires to enter business and make his own way cannot succeed if big business is permitted to stifle the competition he provides.

We have made some progress in dissipating monopolies, but the task is not yet complete. Big business has large staffs of competent legal minds, and these alert lawyers and executives have discovered loopholes in the law through which big business is able to evade the intent of Congress in preventing monopolistic mergers. Unless we put our finger in the leak and plug the loophole, all the good intentions we hold will be but naught as the great wave of monopolistic control sweeps the struggling small-business man out to sea.

The leak can be plugged, but it will never be if small-business men sit idly by while monopoly business operates its lobby in Washington. Here again, the voice of the masses will be heeded if it is heard. We can save the dike if you, the young businessmen of America, will see to it that we get help in strengthening our antitrust laws.

I am not fearful that you of the Jaycees will be complacent about critical issues. Your record of working for the civic betterment and the community good dispels any fear that I might conceivably entertain on this score. I would inspire you to continue and expand your efforts regardless of the possibility of criticism. Anyone who does anything is criticized. Sometimes the criticism is justified, but more often the contrary is true.

My father gave me a rule one time that I have tried to follow implicitly since. The rule is: "Be sure you're right; then go ahead." The occasion arises frequently when we experience difficulty in recognizing just what is right; but, by being honest yourself and proceeding with an open mind, somehow or other you can always determine right from wrong. When this ultimate is reached, nothing should deter you from reaching the goal for which you strive. The only time to worry about this matter of criticism is when you find that nobody is criticizing you. Inactivity is about the only condition that results in the cessation of criticism.

There is strong motivation for these several matters I have brought for your consideration. There is the motivation of achieving for yourselves the standard that our honored guests have reached. There is the motivation of being able to look back on a job well done. There is the motivation of doing our part to make our democracy work better so that it will become a reality rather than a beacon of hope for other people. There is the motivation, finally, of bridging the gaps for those who must pass this way after us.

Paraphrasing the words of the poet, we should not become weary in building the bridge after we have passed over, because others must come this way, and we are privileged to build for them.

Brief Report of My European Trip to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of my brief report on my European trip:

A BRIEF REPORT ON MY EUROPEAN TRIP TO MY CONSTITUENTS OF THE TWENTY-NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, DELIVERED TO THE WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN FEDERATION OF CLUBS OF ORANGE COUNTY ON JANUARY 14, 1949

After my reelection, I accompanied by husband to England.

I felt this would be a great opportunity for me to see and study conditions in Europe and to report back to you.

The voters of the Twenty-ninth Congressional District have always been deeply interested and concerned with foreign policy, and, of course, now, with the possibility of World War III in the future, this interest is greater and more intense than ever.

I traveled as a private citizen—that is, I was not on any congressional committee—and I paid my own way. This enabled me to see the things that I wanted to see and that I felt would be of vital interest to you.

Of course, when I went into Germany, which is a conquered and occupied country, I was in the care of the United States Army, who helped me in every way and showed me every kindness and courtesy as your Representative.

First, we will talk about England, because England, through language and the common law that we have inherited from her, influences our thinking and our future more than any other nation.

England is greatly changed since the war. She is now a highly socialized state, with nationalization going on apace. I heard part of the final debate on the nationalization of the steel industry in the House of Commons. Here again one cannot help but be impressed by the similarity of the Labor government and our present New Deal administration, and the arguments of the opposition are very much the same as those of the Republicans in Congress.

The strength and weaknesses of both are the same. The Labor government has established firm control on industry and commodities. It has thereby brought life to a dead level, but it has given the majority of the people security. Everything is provided from womb to tomb, and security is the cry of the majority everywhere in our time.

True, the young and the ambitious are leaving England and you see the familiar ad flashed on the screen in the movies and other theaters, "Emigrate to Canada by air," and many are taking the advice.

The conservative forces are trying to champion free enterprise, but always with reservations. This, of course, is a great weakness and one that is shared by the Republican Party. It is the reason neither party wins elections.

Mr. Morrison in speaking for the nationalization of the steel industry made this point abundantly clear when he said: and this quotation is only from memory, "the opposition is constantly posing as the champion of free enterprise, but always with reservations. We, on the contrary, are for Government ownership with no reservations." That is the story in a nutshell. It is the positive against the negative approach and the positive always has, and always will, win out in the end.

Food in England is sufficient but dull. It is of course far better in the country, near the farms than in the cities. This is true all over Europe.

Government regulation and regimentation in England have already broken down the traditional English respect for law and the so-called Stanley inquiry and trials put many government employees and secretaries in a very dubious light. This is something new to England and they are not very proud of it. It is probably the only thing that might cause the defeat of the Labor government in the next general election.

What of England's future? Quite frankly, I think her future is overseas in those great dominions where the high tradition of English law, patriotism, and culture will continue, with some modifications surely, but where they will still be preserved practically intact. I believe the wave of national socialism which started in Germany in the 1840's and which has now swept over England will have a very great influence on the United States. If you study the program of the present administration dispassionately and with an eye on what has already happened in Europe you cannot fail to see that the program is the same, that the appeal is the same and that it has come out of the terror and fear of modern war which has made the peoples of the world want only one thing with all its drabness and dullness—security.

France in many ways appears more unchanged than one would expect. True the black markets flourish openly and impudently. True the French, as usual, are the great individualists of Europe. They refuse to be regimented and they never will be because they simply will not obey the laws that would achieve this end.

Food in France for the average citizen is way below prewar standards, but the hotels and restaurants in Paris are as good as ever due to the black markets. This is an unhealthy condition and one that is fraught with danger to the government and the nation.

Here again people can live far better in the country districts and the farmer, here as in the whole of Europe, is monarch of all he surveys.

The French people have turned away from communism. In the last election 80 percent of the Communists lost their seats, which is a pretty conclusive defeat.

The French people are not temperamentally fitted for communism. They are too independent. Their good taste and their sense of beauty also preclude their adoption of such a philosophy.

After seeing Paris, still the same, although greatly in need of some fresh paint, one cannot but feel that this people will survive as they always have. It is hard to explain the reason, but as the French have aptly said: "There are some things that cannot be explained by reason." One of those things is beauty and patriotism, and France still has both and they will survive with her, with the indomitable spirit of her peasants and the leadership of her women, who have kept the French family intact through the centuries. France will perhaps be invaded again but she will "bow before the blast in silent deep disdain" and after the conquerors have passed on she will still be there a little battered perhaps, but still fundamentally unchanged.

From Paris I went to Frankfort, an overnight train ride. On my arrival I was met by Lieutenant Nicholson, of the WAC, who stayed with me all through my German trip and arranged for me to see everything I asked to be shown during my brief visit.

I had not seen Germany since 1936, and that was practically the high tide of the Nazi regime. It was the year of the Olympics and Germany was full of tourists, many young boys and girls from the colleges and universities of the United States. They were all filled with admiration for the efficiency, courtesy, and cleanliness of the country. You heard many such remarks as: "Gosh, I think we fought the wrong guys in 1917."

The Germans may have believed some of this very superficial talk and again repeated the mistake of thinking that if they went to war the United States would not come in against them.

Whatever the cause, the Germans showed the most unbelievable stupidity in going to war in 1939. They have always had a curious habit of committing suicide and this time they encompassed the suicide of Germany herself.

At the present time Germany is a cancer in the center of Europe. The situation there must and does have repercussions all over Europe and the United States. For this reason it is well, if possible, to see Germany and at least to study and read up on conditions there.

As I have said earlier Germany is a conquered and an occupied country. Peace does not exist there or in Austria as yet; this should never be forgotten. We talk of peace, but as yet there is no peace in Europe.

The first thing I saw was the devastation of Frankfort. The destruction is about 70 percent. Imagine a city like Buffalo destroyed 70 percent. The living conditions are, of course, terrible, the overcrowding is a problem that breaks down morale and morals. You see both in Frankfort and Berlin, masses of rubble with a small stove pipe sticking out at a strange angle, and you realize that human beings are living there and have lived that way for 3½ years. No domestic animal could survive these conditions.

The German food ration is 1,800 calories a day with some slight increases for men doing heavy physical labor and pregnant women, but in no case is it satisfying. The average daily diet is black bread, ersatz coffee or thin cocoa in the morning, a thin soup and more bread at noon, and some vegetables, cocoa, and again bread at night. The children get about the same. The amazing thing is that they look as well as they do, especially the children.

Of course, there is a great deal of tuberculosis and many diseases caused by malnutrition among the children and you see no fat people and very few old ones. But still there are 45,000,000 Germans in bizonia and 20,000,000 in the Russian zone at the present time.

My next visit was to two DP camps outside of Frankfort. There are now 269,810 DP's left in Germany; of these 265,872 are living in camps.

The Baltic camp, where the Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and Poles are, near Frankfort, has 6,100 people living in barracks. The camp is self-governed under the supervision of the United States Army. There the people live off the German economy; that is, their rations are the same and come from the same sources. They have their own hosiptal and school, they work with and for the Germans and they also make and sell things in the camp itself. They have to pay 70 marks per head a month for their subsistence to the German economy.

These people have, of course, suffered intensely, they were driven from thier homes, torn from their families and their possessions. They have lived in camps, many of them, for 3½ years in very overcrowded conditions. I went into the rooms and saw many about 20 by 40 feet long, with narrow windows at one end. In these rooms four or five families would be living with partitions made by curtains or sacking. They eat their mid-day meal from a community kitchen and during the day the women sit

in the windows sewing and making what things they can, for sale.

The courage and patience of these people is admirable and a lesson to anyone who sees them. The chlidren were coming out of the various schoolrooms during my visit. Each nationality has it's own school conducted in it's own language. The children were just like school children the world over, noisy and to all intents and purposes happy.

About 50 percent of the Balts want to go to Canada, and many are waiting and hoping that they can get to the United States—in spite of all they have been through, they still hope.

The Jewish DP camp is differently set up, in that it is a village within a village, more like the ghettos. Here the people were living in small houses overcrowded but not as much as in the barracks. Here again self-government under army supervision prevailed. There are still 76,432 Jewish DP's in Germany. They do not work with or for the Germans, quite naturally, so that there are many idle in their camps. For that reason they are even more anxious to get away from Germany, a land they hate and that has nothing but the most horrible memories for them.

Many of those that I saw were planning to go to Palestine, but a considerable number wanted to come to America where so many of them have relations.

I visited the school where the children were being taught Hebrew and where we greeted each other with the salutation "shalom."

These Jews are very jealous and tenacious of their language and traditions for which they have suffered so much, as is testified to by the books containing the lists of their martyrs at Dachau. For this reason many of them want to go to Palestine and live in their own way among their own people.

One thing impressed me very much all over Europe and that is the intense national consciousness of all people. They are more jealous of their national traditions and culture than ever before in the world's history and in many instances this same jealousy poses a barrier to understanding, that is going to be hard to bridge.

The American women in Frankfort, wives of Army officers and members of the WAC are doing a fine piece of work to try and help the women and children and the many orphans that are in need. I visited the shelter in the Frankfort station that they run, and also a large orphanage in which they are interested; where babies from 1 day to 3 years are being cared for. Many of these infants are illegitimate and their future is not a bright one. But our American women in the occupied zone are once more giving voluntarily of their time and substance to help the unfortunate.

It will be a sad day for the world and for America when the volunteer who gives a cup of water in the name of Christ is replaced by the professional do-gooder who earns his or her living by caring for the widows and orphans of the world.

Before going to Berlin on the Air Lift, I went to Wiesbaden for a briefing on the operation from General McLean.

The general pointed out that the Army Air Corps could carry on the air lift, or "operation vittles," indefinitely.

There are 5,000 men, all Army Air Corps, working on this operation. There are also WAC and civilian employees. General Cannon, the commanding officer is at Wiesbaden, from which field many of the planes operate. By far the greater number, however, operate from Rhein-Main Field at Frankfort. This field is the largest in Germany or the Continent, having an area of 2,000 acres.

Our war planes are based near Munich, this is unfortunate, because if you look at your map you will see that these planes are in a pocket in the southern part of Germany, that in case of invasion from the east, and we all know that is where the invasion will come from, they will have to fly northwest in order to be in position to repel the attack on the Rhine.

The ideal position for basing these 150 fighter planes would be on the west bank of the Rhine, in France. So far the French have been unwilling to give us these bases, although they would certainly expect our fighter planes to come to their defense in case of attack. This is only one more case of misguided nationalism that is holding up progress in western Europe.

Plans are now being drawn for an airfield in Vienna, the present one being in the Russian zone, so that if Russia decides to cut off Vienna, as she has Berlin, it would be impossible to operate an air lift to that city.

We are allowed by the Russians, to send one plane a week to Warsaw with supplies for our Embassy, but the plane cannot remain there and must make the return trip immediately to its United States base.

It is a humiliating situation to an American to hear of these many petty insults given our Nation and our nationals by our so-called ally.

It is humiliating to be told by our Army officers that when they come face to face with three Russians on the sidewalks of Vienna, they have to decide quickly whether they will go into a shop or walk down another street, because they know that these same Russians, always armed with tommy guns, will push them off the sidewalk.

Lieutenant Nicholson and I started off on the air lift on December 7. We put on slacks, as we were told we must be prepared to put on parachutes and jump if necessary. These planes are all C–54's, equipped with Pratt & Whitney engines. They take off 5 minutes apart, 24 hours a day, except when the fog is what is called soup. They fly in heavy fog, and are able to do so on account of their mastery of instrument flying.

Each plane carries a load of 10 tons. Our plane carried coal in sacks, as it is usually handled in Europe.

We sat up in the cockpit with the pilot, copilot, and engineer, this is the crew all air-lift planes must carry. The crew check all equipment and instruments and are then ready for the take-off. We took off in fairly heavy fog and the pilot let me listen to the directions being given from the ground as we did so.

The plane in front of us was 300 yards away on the ground and the one behind us the same distance.

Everything is run off to a split second and the orders are that if a plane is 1 or 2 minutes late on arrival in Berlin it does not land but turns back to it's base, as it would throw the whole convoy out.

The air-lift crews are young and come from all parts of our country. They are doing a difficult job quietly and efficiently. They do not look upon themselves as heroes, and yet they well might, because they have done more for our country's prestige and for the discomfiture of the Russians than any of our two-by-four politicians, who posing as statesman got us into this absurd and humiliating position. It is indeed a case of: "Their's not to reason why, their's but to do and die."

True the air lift is not the answer. True the air lift ought not to be necessary. But through the blunders of our civilian leaders it has had to be. It is magnificent, romantic, supremely quixotic if you will.

Here is a conquered and blockaded city, reduced to rubble, 80 percent of it completely destroyed, and we had a great hand in this destruction.

And now our young men are there 24 hours a day bringing loads of food and fuel out of the sky to this beleaguered city, flying in through a graveyard to the field, and nothing could be a more appropriate approach to Berlin.

They are the knights in shining armor of our modern mechanical world. And when you wake up in the night in Berlin and hear the droning of the planes overhead, you thank God for them, and you say a prayer for the spirit for which they stand. For youth, for courage, for forgiveness not only of the enemy abroad, but forgiveness for the foolish little men at home that made all this necessary.

After our take-off and after getting over the Taunus Mountains the weather cleared and we were able to see the ground below. This, of course, was the Russian zone. Not a creature seemed to be stirring, the big Auto Bahn, which is comparable to one of our express highways, linking Frankfort and Berlin, was plainly visible in both my air-lift trips, I never saw but one automobile on it. Smoke came from some of the factories, but on the whole the stillness was impressive and melancholy. The Russians are destroying the forests at a rapid rate and most unscientifically. Germans are leaving the eastern zone whenever they can sneak out, although this, of course, is a highly dangerous proceeding.

On arrival in Berlin we were met by General Hodges and his aides who drove us around Berlin so that I could see the devastation. Having known the city in the past it was, of course, a surprise and shock to see the almost complete destruction, and it was, and still is, a mystery as to where the population live in this mass of rubble. Power and light are only on in Berlin for 2 hours out of 24 for the German population. Food and heat not more than adequate, and one must bear in mind that many of these conditions have been going on for 3½ years. Americans here at home must disabuse themselves of the idea that there is peace in Europe. There is no peace and the center or heart of Europe, as far as economic recovery is concerned, is still affecting the whole recovery program.

I visited Ambassador Murphy and General Clay twice, both answered my questions generously and helped me to find out things I wanted to know. I asked General Clay whether he thought that there was danger of a return of the Nazi regime and philosophy in Germany; he pointed out a most interesting historical fact, namely, that the Germans never go back to a discredited or beaten regime, they simply wipe it off the slate forever. They did this with the Hohenzollerns and have now done it with the Nazis. Some new form of government will emerge, but it will be different and a new group will take over. At the present time there are 6,000,000 more women in Germany than men and they are going to have a big influence in the future. The mayor of our zone of Berlin, when I was there, was a woman and she conducted herself with great courage and dignity during these very difficult times.

General Clay is doing a fine piece of work in Berlin. The German people have great respect and admiration for the military, and I am very sure that they will respond better and with less friction to military government than to any other.

General Clay is a man of great personal and mental courage. He is willing to take risks that he would not ask anyone under his command to take. He has the unbounded admiration and respect of the men and women serving under him, and that is something that cannot be bought and that is above price.

General Clay and Ambassador Murphy are both agreed that the German hatred of communism and therefore the Russians, that personify it, is unbounded and deep in their consciousness. They suffered too deeply at their hands ever to forget; this is especially true of the women. For proof of this the general and ambassador both pointed to the Berlin elections that had just been held in our zone. These elections were simply a protest against communism and Russia.

These people, half starved and cold, in a fog that made it impossible to see one's hand before one's face went out 88 percent of them and cast their votes and recorded themselves against communism and Russia.

They did this in the full knowledge that if the western Allies were to pull out of Berlin their punishment would be swift and terrible.

Most of our political leaders in the past have been taken in by the Russians. With our usual naive belief that everyone loves us and that we can charm the birds off the trees, Roosevelt, Winant, and to a certain extent General Eisenhower started to charm and make friends of Stalin, Grusev, and Marshal Zukov. Of course these friendships amounted to nothing and are now buried. They probably amused the Russian officials for the little while that they were supposed to be in effect. In vulgar parlance these Russians played our people for suckers and the Soviet Republic continued her war on the capitalist nations of the world.

Stalin and the Politburo are still as powerful as ever and they do not and never have allowed personal friendships with Americans to influence their thinking or their national policy.

I next interviewed our economic adviser, Mr. Hawkins. He feels that the picture of German recovery in the west is a bright one. This is almost entirely due to the currency reform that took place in June.

Production is now 73 percent of the 1936 level, the peak year of the Nazi regime, as compared with only 47 percent in May.

Coal is now being produced at the rate of 300,000 tons per day; this has been done by giving the miners extra rations, cigarettes, and other comforts if they achieve the targets set for them.

In 1936, coal production was 450,000 tons per day.

The miners' union at their last election voted to throw the four Communists, who held positions as union officers, out of the union entirely.

There are no more reparations due the United States. Our dismantling program has been completed. This is not true of the French and English and they are afraid we will take little or no interest in helping them now. The French are, of course, terrified of a revived Germany, the British fear them as competitors.

Our economic experts feel that our dismantling program was fair and reasonable. I do not think this is so true of the British and it is quite untrue of the French and the U. S. S. R.

According to the agreements the U. S. S. R. is entitled to 25 percent of the reparations in our zone. Forty percent of this is free and 60 percent is to be paid for in kind, mostly foodstuffs from the eastern zone.

When a plant is put up for dismantling, it goes to one of the 16 nations who are entitled to bid for it. It is then written off against their total reparation claims. One thousand five hundred and fifty plants were scheduled for dismantling in 1947 but only 682 actually have been. In bizonia 496 plants have gone to Great Britain and 186 to the United States. One hundred and seventeen are in category I. That is war plants and 69 are classified as peace plants. Out of our total, three were soap plants.

There has been much criticism in Congress and in our country generally over the dismantling of these soap plants, which on first thought would appear to be a harmless and necessary part of the German economy. The explanation given me was that the plants could not function because of the world shortage of fats, which is especially acute in Germany. For this reason these plants were removed, one actually as far as Pakistan.

The French are most jealous of their rights under the dismantling program. General de Gaulle has stated that if the United States intends to hamper the French program in any way, he would rather see France forego all Marshall-plan aid.

The British fear the competition of the German steel industry and are trying to keep the production down for that reason.

The bizonal steel production is now about half the prewar high.

Our economic experts believe that western Germany will have a balanced budget in 1952.

Bizonal exports this year will be $630,000,000 as against none in 1946, and $225,000,000 in 1947, so that Mr. Hawkins' optimism seems well founded.

ERP has contributed $414,000,000 to bizonia for the recovery program.

Mr. Panuch, General Clay's economic adviser, was very frank in stating that the real test of the new currency will occur in the spring. The new Reichsmark is based on the 1938 rates and should be worth 45 cents, this valuation is based on the cost of bread and fertilizer. After the currency reform most controls were removed but the new mark has already begun to slip and is now 20 to the dollar. This is dangerous.

When the mark was revalued in June, every German was given 40 new marks. This was a total of 3,000,000,000 marks for the whole western zone. All bank deposits were converted, wiping out all incomes of 10,000 and under completely.

It is now felt that the new currency must be upheld in order to maintain a sound economy.

Production is still too low for Germany to be self-supporting, but it's rise has already been phenomenal.

The only people in Germany today who have anything but a hand-to-mouth existence are the farmers and landowners. The middle class is wiped out and the wage earner lives on his daily wage and has nothing beyond it.

Now what is the answer to the situation in Germany and, incidentally, the European situation on which Germany must always have a paramount influence?

First, we know and our civilian and military authorities are committed to the fact that a bankrupt, starving, demoralized population of 66,000,000 people in the heart of Europe will be a burden to the American taxpayer and a constant menace to the peace of the world.

Secondly, we must realize that our politicians, both here and in England, who permitted the Russians to capture Berlin and push on to the Elbe are largely to blame for the necessity of having the air lift, which, though a magnificent gesture, can never be the answer to the problem.

Thirdly, we must face the fact that our Army has had to come in and try to clean up the mess made by our political leaders and State Department, that they are doing as good a job as possible, and that they are getting more respect and cooperation from the German population than the civilians can ever expect to obtain.

For these reasons I believe our Government would be well advised to consult with our commanding general in Germany, and others on his staff, as to what should be done to restore normal relations between east and west and to end the blockade of Berlin.

Until this is done we are at war, even if many of us at home do not recognize the fact.

I can assure you those boys on the air lift and their families know that this is war, and when they read of a lot of our high officials in Washington going to the Soviet Embassy to be entertained with vodka and the indelicacies of the season, they are deeply and quite properly resentful.

There is only one way of establishing lasting peace in Europe and that is for all of western Europe to weld itself into a United States for purposes of trade, defense, and currency. These states should, to be effective, include England, Germany, Spain, and the Scandinavian block.

This should be our goal, and we can also hope that by degrees various states from behind the iron curtain will break their chains and join this league.

The obstacles to this objective are tremendous. As a result of the two World Wars nationalism and pride of face are stronger than ever in Europe today.

We talk of isolationism and do not know the meaning of the word. In Europe today the nations are isolated by currency barriers that prevent the free interchange of goods, services, and ideas. The isolation of Russia and her satellites can only be compared to the isolation of China in the days of the great wall. It is impenetrable and complete.

We must overcome this nationalism and this isolationism in Europe if she is to emerge as a confederacy of coequal states, able to prosper and maintain peace in the years ahead.

For this we need understanding and patience. We must learn to understand these nations so that we can reconcile them one to another.

That should be our aim, and to attain it we must approach Europe, not trying to convert and change but in a spirit of understanding and humility.

Europe has a long way to go before this end is achieved, and we, too, have a long way to go and much to learn if we are to play our part in this great achievement.

After seeing the occupation of Germany, the outstanding achievement is the air lift. It is one of the few things that, as an American, one can feel deep and abiding pride in. Pride in those boys who are unsung heroes, pride in their modesty, their courage, and their efficiency.

As you go through the devastation of war, there is very little that is cheering or in which a thoughtful man or woman can take much pride.

But the air lift restores our faith in human nature and our pride in America. It is the one bright spot on a very dark canvas, a canvas on which are written the words that will always come to my mind when I think of Europe: "Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord. I will repay."

Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., on January 20, 1949:

SMOOTH SAILING, MR. PRESIDENT

Harry S. Truman, the man who couldn't possibly be elected, today began his first full term as President of the United States, duly elected by the voters themselves.

The moment he repeated the solemn oath of office at noon today President Truman became Chief Executive of the greatest Nation on earth in his own right and not as a creature of circumstances. When he succeeded President Roosevelt upon the latter's death, he was totally unprepared, psychologically, for the task, and he was the first to confess that the immensity of the office so suddenly thrust upon him left him somewhat bewildered.

In addition, he felt that since he had been part and parcel of the Roosevelt administration, he was under some sort of moral and ethical compulsion to carry out F. D. R.'s policies.

Today, however, Harry Truman no longer need feel bound or restricted by those policies. He has won the approbation of his fellow citizens. He has grown in personal stature. He exudes a confidence and assurance in marked contrast to his attitude on the April afternoon Mr. Roosevelt died.

We did not support Mr. Truman in last year's campaign, for reasons we believed were sound. However, the people thought otherwise; and on his inauguration day we wish Mr. Truman strength, divine guidance, and the sincere cooperation of his countrymen in meeting the tremendous problems, both at home and on the international front, which the next 4 years are certain to bring.

We Must Learn To Live Together or Die Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree that one of the most important and fundamental problems in the world is peace. Recently, Mr. Fred Burdick, editor of the Capitol Gist, interviewed a large number of Washington ambassadors on the subject What Is Most Needed To Insure World Peace?

These interviews, featured in a recent issue of the Gist, are recommended as reading for Members of Congress. The ideas of these ambassadors are constructive and so soon as they are put into practice by world leaders everywhere will, without doubt, bring to this war-ravaged planet the tranquillity everybody seeks and usher in a new era of peace, progress, and plenty.

I commend Mr. Fred Burdick, whom I have known favorably for 6 years, for his foresight, sincerity, and diligence in getting interviews with more than 25 ambassadors on this all-important subject of world peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including some of these interviews with ambassadors and an editorial in the Gist entitled "We Must Learn To Live Together or Die Together":

"Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. (UNESCO.)

"WE MUST LEARN TO LIVE TOGETHER OR DIE TOGETHER"

(Editorial based on ideas obtained principally from United States Congressmen, Ambassadors to Washington, and research on new scientific warfare, etc.)

Analysis of chief addresses before the United Nations General Assembly and interviews with Washington Ambassadors and Congressmen featured in this Gist shows that the main cause of international tensions is fear and suspicion. Each side sees sinister motives in programs for training soldiers in occupied zones and building close air bases. Yet both sides declare they prepare solely for defense.

Certain it is that virtually all people in every land ardently want and pray for peace. Truman, Dewey, Bevin, Stalin, and other world leaders repeatedly declare they desire and strive for peace.

Warns General Eisenhower: "The stake in this (peace) campaign is civilization, and it rapidly is becoming humanity's existence." (New York Times, May 28, 1947.) Cautions Dr. G. Brock Chisholm, secretary general, World Health Organization: "Any number of millions—all the people on a continent—can be killed in a few hours by the aftermath of such (bacteriological warfare) methods now available."

With such dire warnings by top authorities, intelligent self-interest for all nations must dictate that peace is imperative.

As all want peace, it logically follows that the principal danger to peace is wrong thinking. Hence, the task ahead is to overcome wrong thinking with right thinking, to overcome fear with confidence, hatred with love, resentment with forgiveness. Right thinking will cause right acting.

Impractical? Who can deny that the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule constitute the most practical peace program ever promulgated? Who can truthfully say, after practicing in personal affairs the Golden Rule of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us, that it does not work? For quarreling nations to put into practice the teachings of the Prince of Peace will assuredly save the people of the world from the catastrophe pictured by General Eisenhower and Dr. Chisholm.

Were world leaders to eliminate all thoughts of suspicion, fear, hatred, and resentment from their minds and hold thoughts of good will, tolerance, and forgiveness, and keep cognizant of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the crucial problems that beset mankind would be solved expeditiously and satisfactorily.

With establishment of better general international relations, progress would be made toward solution of pressing economic and political difficulties. The United Nations possesses ample machinery established specifically to solve such problems amicably.

As the history of national legislation is one of reasonable and fair compromise, the same spirit of give and take should prevail in the United Nations. For any country to expect to have exactly its own way is contrary to the letter and spirit of the UN Charter. There must be genuine desire to reach agreement and a will for peace. Actions must conform with words.

An urgent need to save the world from the madness of scientific warfare is for man's moral and spiritual growth to catch up with the phenomenal development of physical science and invention. As Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, stated in a Gist interview, "We must learn to live together or die together."

Faith in the power of God and the prayers without ceasing of literally hundreds of millions of little children, women, and men of all lands for a world united in peace brightens the outlook for peace.

It is hoped that soon all United Nations sessions will open with a moment of silent prayer so that delegates of all faiths can join in humbly beseeching divine guidance for the task of ending war, woe, and want and substituting peace, progress, and plenty. (Fred Burdick.)

Views of Ambassadors on What Is Most Needed to Insure World Peace?

Henrik Kauffmann, Ambassador from Denmark: "A dangerous discrepancy has been growing steadily between the world's progress in the technical field and that of human and social relations, including the international. The rapid progress in science and our increasing ability to make use of mechanical power have perhaps deflected our thoughts from progress in the no less important field of the relations between human beings as such, whether between individuals or between nations.

"Never has this discrepancy been greater or more dangerous than today. In spite of the postwar difficulties and in spite of the political tension of the present moment, I feel that if clear thinking, vision and a feeling of comradeship for all our fellow human beings are strong enough to conquer our various narrow concepts, a bright future for humanity is ahead. Will we be clear-minded and warmhearted enough to conquer the ingrown old concepts, outmoded today in the year 3 of the atomic age? All I can say is that—for the sake of all of us—I hope for the best."

Don Augusto Dillon, Ambassador from Ecuador: "No one gets any good from war and it should be as outmoded as a means of solving international difficulties as dueling as a method of settling disputes and quarrels between individuals. Killing doesn't solve problems. Scientific warfare likely would bring the end of civilization.

"It would be a good investment for governments to make possible very cheap airplane travel of their citizens to foreign lands. Instead of carrying bombs the planes could convey people who would build goodwill and better international understanding—both important factors for world peace. The cost would be slight compared with the dollar cost of war. People of all countries should know each other better."

Wilhelm M. DeMorgenstierne, Ambassador from Norway: "A great need is for more international cooperation in a spirit of goodwill."

Mr. M. A. H. Ispahani, Ambassador from Pakistan: "As present atomic bombs would make the one that fell at Hiroshima seem like a damp firecracker, another world war would be catastrophic. No one can be expected to have very much faith in the United Nations unless its members prove by their acts and not merely by professions that right stands above might and that every question considered by them will be tested on the touchstone of justice and not of expediency."

Dr. K. T. Jutila, Ambassador from Finland: "The Berlin air lift has demonstrated that greatly increased, low-priced international travel by planes is possible and would enable people to spread good will.

"Vast progress is ahead when billions now spent for the purpose of destroying humanity and wealth are expended instead for construction—better homes, schools, recreation centers, roads, bridges, etc.

"So much food can be produced by bringing vast uncultivated areas under irrigation by construction of dams that all the needs of greatly increased world population can be met.

"The immediate task is to build better international understanding, good will, unity, and cooperation—important methods in creating world peace. In this task the radio, motion pictures, and press can help materially. We need peace propaganda, not war propaganda.

"Great patience is required right now in preserving peace. Rome was not built in a day; neither can the UN reach maturity overnight."

Mr. Joseph D. Charles, Minister from Haiti: "To insure world peace we need true application of the great law: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.' Hate cannot create anything but fear, suspicion, greed, tyranny—all sources of war. Love brings mutual understanding, confidence, tolerance, material support—conditions for real freedom and peace. We need to cure the heart of mankind."

Ras S. Imru, Minister from Ethiopia: "Many threats to world peace arise out of selfishness. Economic problems require solution. Timetables for evolutionary, not

revolutionary, changes are needed. It is essential to have sincere desire to obtain international cooperation."

Alfredo Ferreyros, Ambassador from Peru: "The most important thing to insure world peace is for members to stick to the United Nations. The UN should give more consideration to small nations, which have as much at stake as the big powers in preserving peace.

"Discussing international problems openly before the UN forum of world public opinion is helping maintain peace. It is a healthy situation. It helps to let off steam, as it does in national parliaments or congresses. The press, radio, and schools should be encouraged to get more vital UN facts and peace education to all peoples."

Our Socialistic Trend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the best discussions of present trends appeared in the editorial columns of the Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye Gazette for Saturday, January 8, 1949, in the form of a letter to the editor by Mr. Samuel M. Brooks, R. F. D. 2, Mediapolis, Iowa.

I have requested permission of Mr. Brooks and of Mr. Clarence Moody, editor of the Hawkeye Gazette, to place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the Members of Congress throughout the entire Nation can have the privilege of reading it.

The letter follows:

OPINIONS OF OTHERS

OUR SOCIALISTIC TREND

The Hawk-Eye Gazette: As most of us now know the content of President Truman's state of the Union message we can be certain that he and many of his colleagues intend socializing our country, even to a greater extent than it is at present. Mr. Truman has made a big hit with us in the past because most of us have been enjoying prosperity. It is taken for granted that the majority of voting farmers voted for Mr. Truman because of this and also due to his apparent sincere interest in the farmer. His talk of support prices sounds good to a great many of us. This is supposed to make our careers as farmers more secure. However, he does not want us to be too prosperous for in his scheme to raise an extra $4,000,000,000, he figures those with an income over $5,000 per year may have to pay more taxes.

In the first place, any prosperity we have enjoyed since the war has not been the making of the New Deal and Mr. Truman unless you want to give them credit for getting us into war. We as farmers have benefited from scarcities and the fact that the Government has been doing a lot of buying in our domestic market for overseas shipment.

The latter is one of the reasons we still continue to pay wartime taxes and will till the day we die. As this terrific demand tapers off, our prosperity will diminish to smaller proportions. Mr. Truman cannot alter this eventuality. The ability of the Government to pay us support prices is the ability of us and the rest of the American taxpayers to raise this money. It is not dug up from the ground or plucked from a tree. We and our neighbors pay this. Personally I subscribe to the survival-of-the-fittest philosophy. During the last depression many farmers went out of business. Other farmers came on to take their places. The farmers who were businessmen survived and pulled through. The less capable fell by the wayside. Farming is no longer merely a mode of life. It is a business and a big one. Those who are good at it will always be good at it. They don't worry about support prices and politics.

To tax the strong to carry the weak is socialistic. We live in a country that, when formed, was free. The weak were taken care of by charity, not by the Government. This gives the weak the incentive to be strong and the strong the incentive to rise to greater heights. When this incentive is destroyed or gradually whittled away, as is being done at this writing, our country will slide downward into mediocrity and will cease to be a land of plenty and also a land that can feed and help the world. Why should I take the financial risk to run 100 sows, work and sweat to raise their 500 or 600 offspring, if my earnings or the greater portion of them are to be taken from me and divided among those who don't care to take the risk, put out the labor, or assume that much responsibility? If this system persists or even grows worse, we will find ourselves merely raising enough to subsist on, for that will be sufficient.

We as farmers in America should be able to look forward and see what is coming. As active citizens who form the backbone of our capitalistic system, we should not let this socialistic trend run wild, though at the outset it may put a little extra change in our pockets. We must be far-sighted and recognize that it destroys initiative, the will to get ahead, and produce in large quantity. Although it may have some good points, it tends to try and make everyone share equally when people are not equal and never will be. Even though we have enjoyed prosperity and the best times in the history of American farming, let us not cease to be cognizant of the real reasons for this and allow the present administration to run wild in their lawmaking during the next 2 years. Be a good citizen and write your Congressman and tell him what you believe. That is his only way of finding out. Let's be certain we preserve our American way.

SAMUEL M. BROOKS,
R. F. D. 2, Mediapolis, Iowa.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Seldom have we read a more honest and forthright statement than this. We commend its reading not only to all farmers but also to all classes engaged in productive endeavor.)

Letter From Gen. H. L. Peckham, Commanding General, American Graves Registration Command, Paris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include herein a portion of a letter which I have received under date of December 14, 1948, from Gen. H. L. Peckham, commanding general, American Graves Registration Command, of Paris. This letter was received shortly after a group of us comprising members of Committee on Armed Services visited Army installations throughout Europe. I quote as follows:

I am sure that you will be interested to know that we completed the disinterment of our 147,240 remains last Friday. We are already making permanent reinterments in 9 of the 10 cemeteries which are to be permanent and approximately 20,000 have been buried over here already while about 60,000 have thus far been sent back to the United States. I hope you will have a further opportunity to visit Paris while I am here.

I am certain that the above information is welcome to every Member of Congress, and that the splendid record which has been compiled by General Peckham, as well as the entire graves registration organization within the Department of the Army is known to the American people. I can state with authority that I know of no branch of our armed forces which has done a more commendable job than that of the Graves Registration Command. They have had to work in Europe particularly, under the hostile and uncooperative eye of Russia, and in other countries under the iron curtain where our soldiers have fallen. Despite this and other terrific handicaps and impediments this splendid organization has come forward in the tangent pursuit of its unpleasant task of rendering a service to the families of these fallen heroes. I congratulate General Peckham and others in a similar patriotic pursuit, and I know the Congress and the American people generally share this feeling of admiration for the American Graves Registration Command.

Local Government and World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, these are days of grave moment when problems present themselves at all levels of government. Dorothy McCullough Lee, now mayor of Portland, Oreg., presented to the Herald Tribune Forum last fall some of the difficulties that face most of the cities of America. Under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein the following portion of her New York address:

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND WORLD AFFAIRS

(By Dorothy McCullough Lee, mayor-elect, Portland, Oreg.)

Tonight I plead for faith, a faith which is a higher faculty than reason. I plead, in a period of crisis unparalleled in America's history.

Tonight I plead for faith because America faces her greatest turning point. Whether we like it or not, whether it was forced upon us, or we chose it—America has been designated for a new role of world leadership. It is our inevitable lot.

Not the least of our motives for accepting this assignment, is self-preservation, certainly, reason enough.

Tonight, I plead for faith—faith in our heritage of democracy—in order that we may

have the internal strength to lead the world in the paths of peace, and sanity, rather than to permit the world to be led in a path of destruction.

I say that our ability to meet the challenge of world leadership depends upon our internal strength. I do not underestimate the value of, nor the necessity for, diplomacy, intelligent foreign policy, and armament. But the strength of which I speak, transcends all of these. In the final analysis, our internal strength—the validity of our democracy—depends upon your faith and mine. That trust that you and I place in America's greatest resource—our form of government and the way it functions—that trust is the foundation of the strength upon which we can accept our new mandate.

This democracy we cherish is the sum total of all our government—national, State, and local. At any level a lack of faith can impair our world stature. America's confidence cannot be nurtured by hoax. Confidence springs from our belief in the integrity of our government and its adequacy to do the job.

Our country holds the promise of all the things the common men of the world have held dear—life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness. If we can fulfill these promises, in even greater measure, we can remain internally strong, and if we are internally strong we will be able to lead.

This involves acknowledging our weaknesses and doing the best we can to cure them. It has been often said that one of the weaknesses of American Government was the way our cities are run. In the minds of many Americans a large number of our cities are on trial. This is especially important, because an increasing number of Americans live in cities.

Critics say that our cities are not competent to cope with the staggering problems which arise when great numbers of people crowd together in a small area. They site the economic loss and personal inconvenience caused by traffic congestion and inadequate transportation. They point out that millions of Americans, many of them former GI's, have no homes worthy of the name. They sneer at the comparative ease with which many city governments have been dominated by those seeking special privilege and who profit by the violation of the law, rather than by its enforcement. * * *

For 15 years I was a member of the Legislature of the State of Oregon. From that experience, * * * I observed two factors, contributing to the difficulty of making our system of government work on the local level. And the remedies lie in hands other than those of city dwellers and their officials.

First. Our large communities are not adequately represented in most of our State legislatures. Numerically, these delegations fall far short of having proportional representation. This is a manifestation of failure on the part of our State lawmaking bodies, to reflect the transition from a rural to a largely urban country. The result is a lack of adequate knowledge and appreciation of the problems of our cities in our legislative halls. When we realize that cities are creatures of the State, which cannot move in directions other than those sanctioned by the State, their predicament is obvious.

The second factor contributing to the plight of our cities is the trend to take from local government both revenue and authority, which the cities once had, and to lodge them in some higher level of government. The result is that many of our cities are so inadequately financed that they might well be described as being on their uppers. When we take cognizance of the large increases in population, and the insistence on new and more efficient services, we begin to appreciate the difficulties encountered in a quest for solutions, when hampered by insufficient budgets. Certainly the time has come to reexamine the entire municipal picture. The picture, as it relates to proper representation of urban centers in State legislatures, and the preservation, by the State, of local authority, and enough sources of revenue to enable cities to get the wherewithal to do the staggering job with which they are charged. * * *

This is a time when we should scrutinize the machinery under which our local government operates. We must do this if we expect efficient administration. City business today is big business, and, consistent with our democratic concepts, our cities should have the benefit of every skill, every economy, and every efficiency that is available to private enterprise. Too many cities are still jogging along on some time-worn pattern of government which was inadequate even to meet its relatively simple problems in a previous generation.

We must make a bold and positive attack on those problems which threaten the very life of our cities. The fact that it is often difficult and discouraging to try to disturb the status quo is not an excuse for lack of action. Those charged with leadership must follow a constructive, progressive path, in spite of these deterrents. Calling for dynamic leadership are the daily problems of traffic congestion, mass transportation, inadequate housing and recreational facilities, and law enforcement. The proper protection of the lives and property of our people and the preservation of high standards of civic decency is a concept inherent in our way of life.

Actually, the protection of the individual is one of the basic reasons for the institution of government. But this may be assured only when law-enforcing agencies operate in the public interest, without obligation or protection for those who would violate the laws.

Most cities have actually stretched beyond their legal boundaries. Today thousands of their citizens live in the suburbs, but earn their living within the corporate limits of municipalities. This condition has increased the financial headache, since urban services must be enlarged and augmented to meet the needs of non-tax-paying suburbanites. Some communities are finding their revenue answers by the creation of "authorities" which transcend city boundaries in their ability to tax.

The proper protection of the liberties of our people is as much an obligation of local government as it is of government of any of the higher levels. Ordinances which abridge the right of free speech, through the written or spoken word, have no proper place in a free America. The protection and responsible exercise of liberty in our cities should always be preserved by city authorities. In every city minority groups exist and city leadership must seek to dispel any resulting tension, by fostering a better and more enlightened understanding, among all its people.

Good labor-management relations is an asset of the highest value to any community. It is an asset that can best be nurtured in cities where a dynamic leadership seeks to promote mutual appreciation of the problems of both capital and labor. * * *

In large part, the unraveling of our difficulties lies in a better and more realistic understanding of them on the part of all our people. Needed reforms will be accomplished only when instigated by an enlightened public opinion. The civic leader cannot put a sound, progressive program into effect, unless the people themselves understand the need for it, and give their support.

I have an abiding faith that every problem now facing the cities of the United States can ultimately be solved. They will all yield to bold, intelligent attack. Actually making our system of government work on the local level, in a way that effectively meets the problems of the contemporary world in which we live, will go far to give us the faith that will mold the destiny of our country. A virile faith in the integrity and adequacy of our democracy is America's greatest resource. Supported by this faith, America will lead the world to peace and sanity.

Why Taft-Hartley Must Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Why Taft-Hartley Must Be Repealed," by the Reverend Benjamin L. Masse, which appeared in the columns of America, national Catholic weekly, last December 11, as I believe it has special pertinence now that the Committee on Education and Labor has set a date for hearings:

WHY TAFT-HARTLEY MUST BE REPEALED

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

If the goal of labor legislation in this country is the encouragement of collective bargaining, and ultimately, through labor-management collaboration, industrial peace, the Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed. Any other conclusion is unrealistic.

So long as the act was thought to be acceptable to American workers, it was possible to ignore the fulminations of labor leaders and hope that with the passing of time the new law would become a part of the American way of life. That hope no longer exists. It lost a good deal of its substance when the workers, in one National Labor Relations Board poll after another, voted overwhelmingly for the union shop. It was utterly destroyed by the election results on November 2. After the heavy labor vote cast for President Truman, who ran on a platform pledged to Taft-Hartley repeal, one must conclude that the labor movement as a whole, as an organized economic interest, is bitterly and irreconcilably opposed to the act. It is not only the labor leaders who regard it as a slave-labor act; the rank and file dues payers look upon it, too, as a symbol of oppression and a threat to their survival.

Therefore the law must be repealed. So long as it remains on the books, it will continue to be what it is today, a prolific source of suspicion and discontent, a divisive factor in industrial relations and a goal to intensified political activity aimed at its destruction.

It is beside the point to argue that the act is intrinsically a good law, that it holds an even balance between labor and management and protects the general public, that it has not yet been fairly tested, that if time should disclose defects in it, these can be corrected by amendments. All this may be true. Some neutral experts would agree that it is true; though more, I believe, would disagree. Which group is right makes little difference, since in the framework of our political democracy the intrinsic goodness or badness of restrictive laws is not the only factor which lawmakers must always bear in mind in writing them, or even, perhaps, the chief one. An all-important consideration is whether or not the minority a law aims to check is willing to accept it. If a law passes this pragmatic test, it is a good—that is, a workable—law; if not, it is bad.

AMERICAN TRADITION OF COMPROMISE

This is not the same thing as saying that positive law need not be conformed to the natural law—the law which God has impressed on our natures and which the human mind can recognize as such. All positive law, if it be true law, explains or applies the natural law and is always in harmony with it. But in our political tradition a restrictive law, unless it deal with clearly criminal practices, must be acceptable to the groups it disciplines as well as just in itself. Otherwise it will not work. For this vast country of ours, with its great variety of peoples, its regional rivalries, its potential class and racial conflicts, was born of compromise. It has, with one tragic exception, lived by compromise. And it probably can only endure by compromise.

While insisting, then, that positive law must be related to a moral standard, we Americans do not take toward legislation a predominantly ideological approach. By an unwritten rule we agree that no significant sectional, or social, or economic interest will be forced to obey a law which is unacceptable to it. Each of these groups, in effect, has a veto power over legislation restricting it. The system works, and does not degenerate into anarchy, because each group tacitly agrees not to abuse its right to veto. If the activities of any group endanger the interests of other groups, or become a menace to the general welfare, it will agree to compromise: it will suffer restriction and bear with restraint. But the compromise must always be acceptable to it.

This is the reason why American elections are such relatively peaceful affairs. The winners, not being bound to some dogmatic ideology, make no effort to exterminate the losers. And the losers, confident that no matter what changes are introduced, their vital interests will be protected, send congratulatory telegrams to the victors instead of attempting a coup d'état.

The system, of course, has its weaknesses, and those who live under it stumble, not run, along the road which leads to social improvement. Especially to idealists and reformers the process of halting, step-by-step advance through compromise seems frustrating and exasperating. But over most other political systems contemporary with it, the American set-up has three enormous advantages: it works; it contributes to human happiness; it leaves the people who live under it relatively free.

Now if we approach the Tafty-Hartley Act in the spirit of this unwritten law of American political life, we see at once why it must be repealed. One of the groups at which it is aimed—organized labor—refuses absolutely to accept it. Rightly or wrongly, it is convinced that the law endangers interests it considers vital, and that in passing such legislation other groups did not play the American game. Therefore, it will submit to it only because coerced to do so; and it will submit only so long as it lacks the power to destroy it.

One might plausibly argue that the unions were at fault in 1947 in denying any need for restrictive legislation. They accordingly abused their veto power. If they were forced to take a totally unacceptable law, that happened solely because they refused to accept any law at all.

Even if this reasoning is correct, it can be used to justify retention of the Taft-Hartley Act only on the assumption that two wrongs do, after all, make a right. Similar logic broke down with respect to the Wagner Act, only in that case the shoe was on the other foot. Powerful employer interests opposed that law. In the hearings before the act was passed, some of them, with an astuteness Machiavelli might have admired, tried to have innocent-looking provisions inserted that would have made the law certainly unconstitutional. After the act became law, so many employers refused on constitutional grounds to obey it that it was 2 years before it was fully operative. The result was that those who supported the law and benefited from it refused to agree to any changes at all. They took the position that employers were getting only what they had coming to them.

Maybe they were, but most employers could not see it that way. For a decade, with every means at their disposal, they fought to amend the Wagner Act. In the Eightieth Congress they won their fight.

If the Congress should now deprive labor of the fruits of its victory, we can be certain at least of this: labor will continue and expand its political activity until the Taft-Hartley Act is abolished.

REASONS FOR PAST FAILURES

If legislative efforts to promote industrial peace through collective bargaining have so far led to no acceptable code of law, the chief reason for the failure lies in the neglect by both labor and management of the unwritten rule of American politics. They have not made prudent use of their veto power—they have stubbornly refused to compromise. The results are plain enough for anybody to see. First management was saddled with a law—the Wagner Act—which it could not accept; then labor was curbed by the Taft-Hartley Act, which is no less repugnant to labor than was the Wagner Act to employers. The country is right back where it was 15 years ago, before the Wagner Act was passed.

Granted the validity of this analysis, the course which labor and management ought to pursue in the Eighty-first Congress is obvious. Both sides must abandon their hitherto intransigent positions, concede one another's vital interests, and go on from there. For management this means agreeing that the Taft-Hartley Act must be repealed. For labor, this means admitting that the Wagner Act is not enough. Any other approach is certain to prolong a struggle which with every passing year becomes more dangerous to our political institutions. We might as well look this fact straight in the eye, no matter how unpalatable it may be. Organized labor and organized management have transferred their warfare from the marketplace to the seats of political power. They are fighting now, with scarcely any disguise, not for wages, hours, and working conditions, but for control of the Government of these United States. Should the one or the other be successful, the noble experiment begun in compromise a century and one-half ago will be over. It will have failed; and the reason for that failure wise men will trace to the leaders of labor and management who for the art of compromise substituted ideological intransigence. Refusing to give up anything, they lost all.

CHANCES FOR PEACE

What are the prospects that labor and management will quit the dead-end street they are traveling and strike off on another road? What are the chances that they will reach an agreement in the Eighty-first Congress which will take some of the edge off their struggle and keep it within the limits of our traditional political framework?

On the labor side there are encouraging indications that both the CIO and A. F. of L., once agreement is reached on repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, are prepared to negotiate a compromise. The CIO, according to Philip Murray, would support the President's proposal for a Government conference of labor and management leaders to discuss improvements if the Taft-Hartley Act were first repealed and the Wagner Act reinstated. That the CIO would insist on this timetable—repeal of Taft-Hartley, reenactment of the Wagner Act, amendments to that act—to the point of jeopardizing a workable agreement is very unlikely. Delegates to the Portland convention were impressed by the able addresses of Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin and Senator WAYNE MORSE. The fact that both men, though friendly to the legitimate aspirations of labor, stressed the need of readying an adequate substitute before the present law is repealed should have a sobering effect.

At its Cincinnati convention the A. F. of L. adopted a frankly conciliatory position. The resolution on labor legislation did demand, of course, Taft-Hartley repeal, but it also recognized that for every right labor enjoys there exists a corresponding responsibility, and that in labor-management relations the public welfare is paramount. Referring to a substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act, the resolution said:

"We realize that legislation recommended as a substitute for the unreasonable, destructive and offensive Taft-Hartley Act is necessary, and that such legislation, to be beneficial to the wage earner, to management and the general public, must be definitely designed to make collective bargaining between management and labor work effectively on a voluntary basis, and with due consideration for the necessities and the welfare of the general public."

From statements made by various influential delegates, it is clear that the A. F. of L. is prepared to accept amendments to the Wagner Act. "We believe," said Joseph D. Keenan, director of the League for Political Action, "that the Taft-Hartley law went too far against organized labor, but we might as well admit that the Wagner Act went too far in our favor." And the president of the boilermakers' union, Charles J. MacGowan, added: "Labor should use restraint in pressing substitute legislation to the Taft-Hartley Act and should be alert to the excesses committed by certain segments of labor that put all of labor in the public dog house."

That is not the language of intransigence.

Up till now employers have been understandably chary about committing themselves on labor legislation. Having supported the Taft-Hartley Act, as most of them did, they cannot be expected to shift their position until they have had time to recover from the shock of the election and assimilate its meaning. The annual convention of the National Association of Manufacturers, which will be in session in New York about the time this article goes to press, may give some clue to the attitude which industry may be expected to adopt.

Meanwhile one top-flight industrialist has taken what might fairly be called an extreme position. In an interview with the press on November 17, Henry Ford 2d vigorously defended the Taft-Hartley Act, arguing that in the automobile industry it had been both workable and sound. It should receive, he contended, a fair and lengthy trial before it is changed.

On the other hand, Business Week magazine, which is a good barometer of alert business thinking, has taken the stand that the Taft-Hartley Act will either be repealed or considerably watered down. Typical of its post-election thinking was this comment which appeared in its issue of November 13:

"The 1949 New Deal will mean the end of the Taft-Hartley Act. That will be labor's pay-off for playing a leading role in the Democratic victory. * * * Next year's labor law will be the Wagner Act—plus. The technique will be to add provisions from Taft-Hartley. It's easier that way; besides, it fulfills the letter of the Democratic platform."

The New York Times, reflecting on most domestic issues an enlightened conservative viewpoint, rejoiced editorially on November 24 because both the A. F. of L. and the CIO had adopted a cooperative attitude toward new labor legislation. Such an editorial stand is tantamount to accepting either the repeal or the modification of the Taft-Hartley Act as inevitable.

If these editorial comments, which in neither case reflect the opinion of the writers on the intrinsic merits of the Taft-Hartley Act, are indicative of management thinking generally, the possibility of a workable labor law becomes very real. Between now and the time the new Congress convenes, it is to be hoped that progressive businessmen will do some intense missionary work among their more stuffy brethren. With the business community still sobered by the election results, this is the best chance the liberal wing of industry has yet had to make its conciliatory viewpoint prevail.

The general public ought to exert some friendly pressure on both groups. These are dangerous days in which we are living, and if the United States is to play on the world stage the tremendous role in which history has cast it, there must be a reasonable degree of unity and collaboration between labor and management. What the public wants is a law that will dampen old feuds and rivalries, not one that will cast fresh fuel on the industrial bonfire.

"Strategic" Air Plan Called Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, January 23, 1949:

"STRATEGIC" AIR PLAN CALLED DANGEROUS

(By Marshall Andrews)

Since publication of the proposed 1950 budget, the Air Force has permitted to leak out a plan to use its funds to build up a strategic force at the expense of other elements of air power.

This scheme, as published, provides for doubling the number of B–36 bomber groups while curtailing fighter, troop-carrier, medium-bomber, reconnaissance, and service units. It is apparent that the Air Force has taken this action independently and without regard for the needs of the other services or of the national security as a whole.

There are two possible explanations of this move:

1. An effort to win the sympathy of the country and of Congress so as to obtain additional funds for other aircraft without sacrificing the strategic bombers it is determined to have.

2. A stubborn insistence on going ahead with its own private concepts of warfare and be damned to everyone else.

In either event, the Air Force has revealed a degree of irresponsibility toward its obligations to the other services which renders its motives suspect and calls for careful examination of all of its future proposals. One immediate countermeasure suggests itself to offset the threat of this irresponsibility to the combat effectiveness of the ground arm.

The Secretary of Defense should take advantage promptly of his authority under section 208 (e) of the National Security Act of 1947 to transfer to the Army all tactical combat, reconnaissance and transport aircraft, personnel and facilities, of the Air Force. The necessity for this move, in view of the Air Force's relegation to second place of air support of ground forces, should be obvious.

The National Security Act provides that the Army be "organized, trained, and equipped primarily for prompt and sustained combat incident to operations on land." Now, it is beyond question that no army can prosecute "prompt and sustained" combat on land without at least local air superiority and without the close support of combat aviation.

SECURITY ACT CITED

Furthermore, air transport and supply of ground troops has become an essential part of land operations and a major role of air power. The Air Force has clearly revealed its intention of discounting these vital obligations unless it is given what it wants as a "strategic" arm.

The National Security Act provides that the Army shall include whatever aviation "may be organic therein," which needs no stretching to apply to the aviation necessary for its survival and ultimate success. To afford it less would be to jeopardize not only the lives of the men in its ranks but the security of the Nation itself.

That the Air Force can bulldoze from Congress the funds it wants at the expense of the other services was demonstrated last year. The Air Force presents a romantic appeal to the popular imagination and has conducted a none-too-subtle propaganda of terror for a long time. Most important, it seems to fulfill the perfectly natural desire of the people to win a war without fighting.

Yet there is nothing in past experience or present circumstances to support the belief that it can do anything of the sort. In lives, resources, and time, strategic air power was costly out of all proportion to its achievements in the last war, while tactical air power was decisive in all theaters.

Even tactical air support actually retarded operations in the European theater as long as it was under the exclusive direction of air experts. Until ground commanders turned it into proper channels, tactical air was employed according to the strategic theory of wholesale obliteration. The result was that advancing troops were repeatedly and often fatally delayed by streets choked with impassable rubble, bomb-cratered roads, and bridges destroyed for the enemy by American aircraft.

Furthermore, German armament production rose under powerful and sustained strategic bombing until in mid-1944 it was more than three times what it was in 1942. This production began declining shortly after June 1944, when German rail and canal transport was disrupted by tactical bombing in support of the invasion of France and industrial essentials bogged down in shattered yards.

In the Pacific theater, troops which took the islands from which the Air Force flew its strategic bombing missions against Japan were supported almost entirely by Navy and Marine aircraft. The reason for this was twofold: the Air Force was so absorbed with its strategic theory that it had no more concern for tactical support than it now displays; and it had no means of conveying its fighters and fighter-bombers within range of land operations.

SEABORNE CONQUESTS

Thus, the very bases without which there could have been no strategic bombing of Japan were seized for the Air Force by land power conveyed to the scene of operations by sea and supported by carrier aircraft. Until these seaborne conquests by ground forces succeeded at the cost of bloody fighting, strategic air power was grounded, immobile and helpless.

Even so, before strategic air power was boosted within range of Japan by land and sea power, the economic and military strangulation of the enemy homeland was complete. This had been accomplished by destruction of the Japanese fleet, to which land-based aircraft contributed less than 1 percent, and destruction of its merchant shipping, to which the Air Force contributed 19.5 percent.

It is important to note that in neither Europe nor the Pacific did strategic bombing begin to return even meager dividends until air supremacy had been achieved. This, in turn, followed elimination of enemy air power, accomplished by the fighter aircraft which the Air Force wishes to curtail in favor of a theory against whose realization the preponderance of all evidence now rests.

In the broader view, the military effectiveness of the strategic air war theory is open to serious question and it should be questioned thoroughly before the Nation is fully committed to it.

War is an instrument of national policy, resorted to when the economic and diplomatic instruments have failed. If war succeeds in accomplishing the aims of policy, it has performed its function; if it does not accomplish those aims, it has failed, even though an ostensible military victory results.

Whatever the objectives of policy may be, they certainly are defeated when war results in the necessity for supporting an erstwhile enemy for a generation while he recovers from the effects of their attainment. And the aims of policy are lost altogether when the victorious nation itself suffers economic and spiritual damage from which it might never recover.

Yet the air war presupposes just such an outcome, as the physical and moral destruction of Germany and Japan bear witness. The air war is warfare of obliteration, with defeat of the policy for which it was undertaken assured from the beginning.

You can crack a nut with a 12-pound sledge just as surely as you can by tapping it with a light hammer with reasonable force at the proper point. But smashing it with a sledge results in its total destruction, so that the meat for which it was cracked in the first place must be discarded with the fragments of shell. Air warfare, by its very nature, is nut cracking with the sledge.

TROOPS HAVE TO BE DEFEATED

The great strength of the present putative enemy lies in ground troops supported by tactical aviation. It would be ingenuous to assume that this land army could be defeated by bombarding the cities of its homeland, especially since it would occupy territory outside those cities and draw its sustenance from outside industries. It must eventually be met on land under the most favorable conditions that seapower plus tactical air support can obtain for it.

The Air Force appears determined to commit the United States to a policy of mutual devastation, under which it and its enemy would trade incredibly destructive blows with victory going to the combatant which could longer endure them. In such a war cities rather than military installations would be the targets and civilians the victims.

There is nothing to indicate that, once this stupid destruction had gone its limit, it would not still be necessary to make a seaborne assault on the enemy's army. It should be seriously considered whether that would be possible after the prodigal expenditure of resources in obliteration of the enemy's cities and in sustaining obliteration of one's own.

Asia Is a Fact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following

editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of January 23, 1949:

ASIA IS A FACT

During most of the last century the vast continent of Asia was important to the west merely as a kind of jeweled background against which its own rivalries and aspirations were projected. The millions of assorted peoples who inhabited the lands between the Bosporus and the outer islands of Japan were subjects for exploitation or uplift (usually both) in the occidental mode, and virtually the only recognition of Asia as an entity, with characteristic culture patterns and an individual destiny which already had been pursued through millennia, was in the crass form of the "yellow peril."

Yet today Asia has reemerged upon the world stage in its own right. Twenty-one nations of Asia and of the islands of the western Pacific, plus two from Africa, have met to consider the problem of Indonesia in a conference which may have momentous consequences in shaping the future of the world, consequences which would go far beyond the immediate question under discussion. This is not the "yellow peril" that troubled the dreams of race-conscious westerners; it is not organized on racial lines at all. Australians and New Zealanders, Malays, Hindus, Afghans, Ghurkas, Arabs—representatives of nearly all the multitudinous creeds and bloodlines that contest the vast Asiatic mainland and the islands that comprise its economic empire—have asserted their common interest in solving a problem which is common to them all.

The solutions they propose may not be the best solutions. The ferment in Asia contains a good deal of rampant nationalism of a kind which is intolerant and often irrational; which overlooks the practical values of orderly transition—when all are agreed on the need for transition and upon the goals toward which to work—and turns to root-and-branch revolution. Moreover, the complexity of the political, social, and economic systems represented in Asia today makes it easier for the conference to declare against something—colonialism, for example, which is a word which embraces a good many subtle distinctions—than to work constructively for something.

Nevertheless, Asia is an indubitable fact, and its pronouncements, its emotions, cannot be ignored. The task of the West is to come to terms with this fact and to adjust its actions and its thinking to a new situation. Communism, which already possesses great areas of northern Asia, and which is presently victorious in China, is bidding for the support of the rest of the continent. To meet the threat arms alone are not sufficient, nor, for that matter, is unarmed good will. Independent Asia has thus far rejected both communism and colonialism. It stands, as Communists have pointed out, as a new third force in the East. It must be accepted as such and dealt with as a sovereign power—liable to error, capable of being persuaded to correct mistakes, but impossible to coerce or to dismiss.

The Quagmire of Too Much Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the West Hollywood Tribune:

THE QUAGMIRE OF TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT

One of the most difficult things to do in today's world is to separate causes from effects—to find the roots of the terrible problems the nations have brought upon themselves. It is the old story of being unable to see the forest because of the trees. Ever since the war ended, we have lived through one crisis after another, domestic and international. We have been plagued by fear one day and picked up by new hope the next. The whole world might be likened to mercury in a tube, shifting violently at any disturbance, and never attaining stability.

A thousand books could be written about the difficulties we are in, without touching more than the surface of the material. But, looking at the world from the best perspective we can now find, it seems clear that the basic problem, which underlies in one way or another all other problems, is this: The trouble with the world is that it has too much government, too much absolute authority.

This is not a new situation, unique to our age. The whole history of civilization has been a conflict between the individual and those who wished to enslave him. That conflict has caused innumerable wars, revolutions, economic upheavals, all manner of disaster. But in the present world the technique of enslavement has been perfected. In some cases government maintains its power with the whip and the gun. In other cases it is far subtler—it increases and solidifies its authority through due process of law. But the end result is the same—a nation where all men have less and less freedom of action and decision, and where the political rulers determine more and more what we shall think and do.

Usually, we surrender rights to government for political promises of material gain. Government will give us wealth. Government will build us houses. Government will pay for our crops. Government will provide goods and services cheaper. Government will protect our health, and support us in old age. Government will deal with almost every obstacle that confronts us from the cradle to the grave. But before government can even attempt to give us these things, it must have the power to control the human and material resources of the Nation, and take the savings of the people through taxes. And that is how dictatorships are built.

It seems, however, that government never delivers promised material benefits. The standard of living of any people goes down in ration to the growth in power of those who rule. But, once government becomes strong enough, there is no recourse for the people short of revolution. The whole machinery of the state is used to keep the people in line, to destroy dissent, to make individuality a crime.

In today's world, the United States is in a position without precedent. The most obvious fact is that we are a mighty power from the material standpoint. We are making an effort which has no parallel in history to rehabilitate a score of devastated nations, and to save them from hunger and disease and despair.

This is vitally important, but it is not the end of the matter by a long shot. If American leadership proves to be purely material, it will be doomed to eventual failure—some of the police states are also rich in resources. What America must offer the world, along with her flood of goods, is the supreme example of the fact that a free people, with a free economic system and a representative government of their own choosing, can outdo the police states. Everything we have done or may do at home to weaken our tradition of individual freedom, to glorify government above the people who elect it, weakens our physical security and our chance for survival.

This is a matter of spiritual values. We have no statistics with which to measure them, no production figures to make other peoples gasp in envy. But it is spiritual values which will turn the scales, one way or the other, in the long run. The real meaning of America is in the hearts of her people, and in the freedom and the dignity of all men.

That, then, is what we have to offer at a time when the world is divided into two camps without a common meeting ground. We cannot offer more. We must not offer less. We must check our own drift toward the totalitarian state where the government becomes supreme and where individual thrift, opportunity, industry, saving, and freedom are lost.

An Appeal for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 21, 1949:

AN APPEAL FOR PEACE

The President of the United States spoke yesterday to an audience which reaches around the world.

It was a wholly admirable address. Harry S. Truman won the right to this term in the White House after a campaign which was geared primarily to national or sectional issues and which was designed to squeeze the last drop of partisan advantage from domestic discontents. But there was nothing of the partisan politician about the man who delivered his message of faith and hope to a waiting world yesterday afternoon.

President Truman spoke as one who has looked into the future and who is undismayed by what he sees there. "It may be our lot," he said, "to experience, and in large measure to bring about, a major turning point in the long history of the human race." In other words, the next 4 years will be decisive years. That brief span of time will determine whether mankind can move forward peacefully or whether the world must endure the incalculable disaster of another great war. This decision, however, must not be left to the coercive influence of drifting events. For that in all probability would lead first to chaos and then to war. If there is to be peace in the world it must come from a willingness on the part of the people of this country to exert in timely fashion the great influence which they and they alone are capable of bringing to bear. This is a responsibility which cannot be passed along to others. For we, and only we, have the power and the necessary means. We must understand that the decision for peace or war will turn very largely upon what we do or fail to do in the years that lie immediately ahead.

The President, to be sure, appealed for the support, moral as well as physical, of "the millions who hunger and thirst after righteousness." These potential allies are to be found in every country of the world, and as an inducement to them Mr. Truman put forward a program filled with promise of better times. This is important as a counter to the propaganda of communism, which promises much but delivers little.

We should not delude ourselves, however, with the notion that promises on our part, without substantial fulfillment, will be enough. Nor should we ever lose sight of the central fact that promises will remain promises unless and until we do the things that must be done to translate them into material benefits. As Mr. Truman said, we have slowly but surely been weaving a world fabric of international security and growing prosperity. At best this will continue to be a slow and costly process. For there is no quick or cheap or easy road to peace. But whatever the price which has to be paid, it will be incomparably less than the cost of another all-engulfing war.

No one should suppose that we will be able to sustain our political life at the high level reached in the inaugural address. Before many weeks have passed the inevitable conflicts inherent in domestic issues will be upon us, and men in both parties will be grabbing for political advantage. But this need not and must not divert us from the really important fact of life in our time. However may go the political battle on the domestic front, the overriding issue of peace or war will remain constantly with us. And, this being so, good Americans of both parties will refuse to let partisan recriminations drown out the message of faith and hope, the appeal and the program for a decent peace, which the President has put before a sorely troubled world.

Problems Facing the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Problems Facing the American People, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley, before the twenty-fourth annual midwinter meeting of the New York State Bankers' Association on January 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS FACING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

It is an old human habit to greet every new year as a milestone in human progress. We cast up our accounts and we make fundamental decisions. Sometimes we make resolutions, which most of us promptly forget.

But if we look back at the beginnings of other years and compare them with the present, we shall learn an essential truth—that in general our decisions follow similar lines from year to year. And each year we renew our decisions of other years. We merely stop on the highway of life for psychological gas and oil. Our general direction remains the same and our objective the same.

And we flatter ourselves to call this progress.

However, there are years when we not only want to take on new fuel but when we ought to get out our road maps and reconsider our course. For nothing in the political or in the economic world is so certain as change.

One of the most certain factors in life is the fact that while our thinking may follow the same lines, the facts all about us do change. And our habits, plans and ideas fall behind the world in which we live.

The hand is quicker than the eye. But the facts, especially the economic facts, are quicker than the mind. It is this big gap between the facts and what we do about the facts that makes for so many of our difficulties.

I am especially impressed by this thought as we enter the year 1949. It is, beyond any year since the end of the war, a year of changeable economic weather. In the political world a great decision has been made—a decision, I may add, that very few people anticipated.

In some years in the past, when I was more actively in politics, I occasionally made predictions, some of which were far from wrong. This year, I made no predictions—I perhaps have a certain advantage over some other people I might name. But all joking aside, the election of Harry S. Truman was evidence of a fundamental decision on the part of the American people—a decision which we all as believers in free government must consider with great care. In any event, the decision has been made, and circumstances will have to shape themselves in line with it.

In my judgment, that decision which reelected a Democratic administration after 16 years of continuous power meant that the country has determined that government must, to an ever-increasing extent, bring its services to all the people.

And that national decision was reflected in the votes of many States for governors and local officers. That mandate is now reflected in the messages and recommendations of many State governors. Everywhere there is a demand for more service by government. These demands will not all be granted. They cannot be granted. But the sum total of them all, in States and in the Nation, makes a gigantic total.

This faces us with a grave question. Can we afford all this? Can we set aside an increasing part of our incomes, profits, and in some cases our capital for taxes? Can we afford all we want in public service?

We may have differences of opinion among ourselves as to the forms and amounts of such service. We may believe that government should help the farmer and at the same time not believe that it should socialize medicine. We may believe that foreign commerce ought to be stimulated by government while domestic commerce should be left to natural economic laws. But in general this country has long since given up the notion that all that can be expected of government is the maintenance of an Army and Navy, a post office department, and a diplomatic service.

Undoubtedly there are many of you, and I think I share your views on this subject, who fear that in the multiplication of services we shall load down our Government and taxpayers with financial obligations that will ultimately destroy our way of life. There is a place, economists tell us, where taxation not only yields a diminishing return but also stifles the productive activities that in the long run support the Government. I do not know exactly where that point may be in this economy. I do not even know whether we have approached it at the present time. But I do know that there must be ever-increasing caution, lest we do reach that point without anticipating it. Therefore, we face, as a nation, the serious dilemma of a demand for increasing governmental services on the one hand and the danger of excessive taxation on the other. As a businessman I am keenly aware of the second of these circumstances and as a former member of the Government I am keenly aware of what the public expects. It is about this dilemma that I want to talk with you today.

When a man in his private affairs is faced by a necessity of supporting a large and expensive family and his income is barely able to meet increasing costs, he has to make one of three decisions: First, he has to consider whether he can eliminate some of his financial responsibilities; second, he has to consider the possibility of working harder and earning more; and third, and most important, he must consider whether without earning more and without dropping any of his responsibilities he can make his dollars serve their purpose with greater efficiency.

In our Federal Government we have reached the point where we must meet this problem by one of these three decisions. The first, which is the elimination of direct services to the people, will be difficult if not impossible to adopt. The November election largely settled that. The question of greater productivity is, of course, a concern of every American and every American business, and much can be done in that direction. But we cannot hope for anything except a steady but rather relatively small increase in what we produce as a nation. We must, I believe, in this situation come to the third of these decisions. We must get more public service for every dollar that Government collects from the taxpayer. And that means greater efficiency in government.

This is not a partisan issue. I know a great many Republicans and a great many Democrats. I am frank to say that I find no difference of opinion about the fundamental desire of both Republicans and Democrats to increase the efficiency of our Government.

This is well shown by the fact that a Republican Congress and a Democratic President created a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the purpose of which was to inquire into the efficiency of our Federal Government. It is a significant indication of the nonpartisan nature of this that a former Republican President and, I might add, a great American, Herbert Hoover, was chosen to head this study. It is also significant that he has had the wholehearted cooperation of a Democratic President—Harry S. Truman. The findings of this Commission are now beginning to appear, and every American owes it to himself and to his country to consider these findings and to join the effort to have the major recommendations of this report enacted into law and into administrative practice.

I served in government long enough to realize that neither Congress nor the President is solely responsible for waste and extravagance in the Federal Government. In some instances Congress is to blame; in some instances the Executive is to blame. But in more instances the fact is that neither is directly to blame. What has happened is that activities and services continue on from year to year without any periodic reconsideration of the need for them or for the adequacy of the ways they are carried on. We like to believe that government is a science, but I hardly think that is an adequate description. Government is more in the nature of a habit. People engaged in public office are in general able to see only the activities with which they are directly concerned. They are unable to appreciate their own particular part in the picture in its relation to the whole picture. For that reason they acquire a distorted view of the value of what they are doing.

And yet it is essential from time to time to consider the underlying conditions which have given rise to an institution and to ask whether it is still essential. A very good example of this is in a great institution created under the Hoover administration and carried on under succeeding Roosevelt administrations—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was created in a time when credit was very tight indeed, at a time when millions of people were walking the streets looking for work and in a time when great businesses and financial institutions were desperately in need of help. It met this situation with wonderful success. During the war it had a new usefulness. Since the war, however, conditions have changed. None of the underlying economic circumstances are the same as they were in 1932. It is therefore appropriate to consider the

activities of such an institution in the light of these changed conditions—in short, should it not be made merely a stand-by agency held in readiness for a depression that we hope will never come?

I could multiply examples of institutions that were created under conditions which were essentially different from conditions that now exist.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was likewise created in a time of stress and strain. It has collected a great deal of money from the banks to provide insurance against failure and loss. I am not sufficiently expert in financial matters to say exactly how much this institution should hold as backing for its guaranties, but I do believe that it is appropriate from time to time to measure the probability of losses against the amounts set aside as a guaranty against those losses. And if the accumulated reserve is too large, ways should be considered to reduce our contributions to it. The situation might be handled by having the law amended so that assessments would temporarily cease until such time as the fund was reduced to let us say, $500,000,000—and then the assessments as now paid automatically restored by law.

I merely mention these two examples to illustrate my point. There are many more examples of the necessity of a careful reconsideration of our Federal structure.

We are all, of course, determined that this country will be sufficiently strong in a military way to meet any possible emergency in a dangerous world. We are not going to complain about the dollars properly spent to protect our Nation against the menace of foreign aggression. But in the section of the Hoover report recently issued on the subject of military expenditures some very arresting facts were presented. These facts point out that our methods of accounting and of budgeting in our Military Establishment are seriously in need of improvement. Neither Congress nor the administration is to blame for this. We simply have a great establishment that grew so rapidly in a war that had to be fought, without consideration of cost, that some of the habits of wartime have carried over into peace. I must confess that from all I know or have learned from my conversations and from careful reading of the newspapers I do not know whether we need fifteen billion or twenty billion or twenty-five billion. But I do know that our system of government ought to be sufficiently competent to make these essential needs more clear.

A former Secretary of War has said that, no doubt, if we could get greater efficiency, we could get for $12,500,000,000 the amount of defense for which we are now budgeting fifteen billion. If we should apply this rule to all Government expenditures we could see a way to make a real reduction in our outlay for government. Our task is to find ways to do that. The task will not be easy, but we can make a start. And we should make a start before our costs exceed our resources.

There is a side to our problem of government that I feel needs careful reconsideration. That is the question of recruiting personnel. I take it for granted that our Governments—Federal, State, and city—are committed to the principle of civil service. We have long since given up the idea that political considerations alone should dictate the appointment of public officials. It is perfectly clear that thousands of jobs require such essential technical skill, experience, and security of tenure that they cannot be used as the spoils of politics. And yet in our effort to protect employees of the Government through civil service we have actually gone so far as to impede the efficient administration of government.

I speak from experience when I say that due to excessive protections imposed by civil service, it has become almost impossible for a department head in Washington to get rid of incompetents and to replace them with competent people. The Federal service has grown so large that no one civil-service rule can be adequate to cover all employees. I understand that the Hoover Commission is giving serious consideration to this. I believe they will find that what is needed is a decentralization of civil-service authority, with greater opportunity on the part of department heads to conduct their own examinations, to make apppointments and to rid themselves of incompetent and wasteful employees. There is altogether too great a turn-over in the Federal service. I am told that this turn-over runs to almost half a million employees a year. That means vast sums expended in breaking in and training new people.

I am not competent to judge whether this is due to inadequate pay or unsatisfactory working conditions. I simply say that no private business with which I am familiar could afford to operate under the conditions that prevail in most Government departments. It is better to pay a little more and employ fewer people and keep these people on the job, not through artificial civil-service protections but through the assurance of support so long as efficient work is performed.

In another field of Federal activity there is an enormous need of improvement which, again, I assume the Hoover Commission will point up. The auditing and accounting functions in government have become so immensely complicated that millions and millions of dollars are spent on unnecessary paper shuffling and record keeping. Tons and tons of vouchers are hauled about from one department to another for purposes of accounting and auditing which might be done more expeditiously and just as safely under a more rationally decentralized system. It ought to be the function of each department and of the Treasury to be responsible for accounting. Auditing might then be the function of the Comptroller General, who is responsible to the Congress and holds office for a long term. He has, however, become so absorbed in accounting, as distinguished from auditing, that the original purpose of his office has been entirely obscured.

I could multiply examples of Government overlapping and waste almost without end. I merely want to point out that we are entitled to more service in every department of the Government from the money that is being spent.

I do not want to be an alarmist, but I merely want to point out that we cannot expect permanently and without interruption the volume of business that we have enjoyed in the years since the war. I do not anticipate a depression or even a serious recession in business. There are too many factors supporting our economic system that are sound which were not present back in the twenties, to justify pessimism. But we cannot expect that our national income can always continue at the rate established last year. We must remember that in part our income was the result of inflated prices in many lines and, with increased productions, inflation will gradually subside.

On the other side, there are certain inflationary forces which we may confidently expect will continue. There will probably be some increase in wages; there will certainly be greater expenditures for armament, and a continuation at a somewhat slower pace of grants in foreign aid. There will also be more imports not equalized by export surplus of gold or gold currency. These are inflationary forces.

On the other hand, there are deflationary elements. There may be a somewhat lower rate of exports. There may be, and there is now, somewhat less investment by business for new plant construction. There will certainly be an increase in production in many essential lines.

There will be a lower rate of expenditures by farmers. Agriculture has been blessed with a very high income since the war. Many farmers are now in the higher brackets upon which present and possibly future higher taxes will fall. The great storms in the past month in the middle and far West have meant severe losses in crops and domestic animals. Farmers enjoying high prosperity have already renewed much outworn equipment. There have been many new automobiles, tractors, and other equipment, building, household furnishings, and clothing. There will be a narrower farm market for such items. In short, the farmer will need less and have less to buy with.

All these are deflationary factors.

If we balance the billions involved in inflationary forces against the billions that are accounted for in these deflationary factors, the balance, according to good economists, is somewhat on the side of deflation. This brings us into a phase that may be called a restabilization.

Again I say this does not involve a serious reduction in employment, but it does involve a sufficient slowing down of our presently accelerated rate to produce a serious warning both to government and to business. This prospect for the coming year makes it all the more important that Congress and the President consider carefully the implications of our rate of spending.

On this point, I am told by economists, a definite rule operates. When the national income is rising by inflationary forces, as it has in the past few years, the return of tax receipts rises not only as fast as the national income but relatively faster. That is largely due to the movement of individual and business incomes into higher brackets. That is why the President's early estimates for receipts in the past 3 years have been shown later to be too low.

But when the trend of national income is reversed, even by a relatively small percentage, tax receipts fall at a considerably larger rate.

We must, therefore, be prepared for such a situation in the coming year. Raising tax rates will not help much to keep us in the black because the return will be falling. We cannot safely assume that our national income is stable. It never has been stable, and it will not be in the future.

It is time to look and listen, although it is, of course, no time to stop. Stopping is not an American habit. We are entering a period of readjustment. And stabilization should be the common purpose of all of us.

In foreign affairs we have put our hands to the plow. We cannot look back to the old, seductive days of isolation. We have raised the expectations of the world, and we cannot be false to our promises.

But we can expect and we should demand that our Marshall plan expenditures decline. Western Europe is recovering. It can with wise administration of our aid and with the help of the countries themselves attain a higher and higher rate of recovery. We must forever put away the foolish idea of destroying Germany's capacity to sustain itself. We must seek to push back the tide of communism by winning border countries to our way of life and recovery. We must strengthen the elements of democracy—real democracy—in all European countries. But we must not destroy that self-reliance—which is the heart of democracy—by too lavish lending and giving. Our patients must be induced to throw away their crutches at the earliest possible moment.

Wherever I have gone in my travels through the world—and I do a lot of traveling in my business—I have found one great asset to America and two great fears about America.

The asset is good will, the gratitude and the admiration of people everywhere for what we are and what we have done. That

good will has its future material value as well as its spiritual value. We must preserve it as a cherished asset.

The two fears about America we must, with all our will and intelligence, defeat and dissipate.

The first of these fears is that this time, as in the years after the First World War, we shall lose ourselves in our own concerns and forget our responsibility for world leadership. We must, as good Americans and good neighbors, carry high that banner of leadership. We have no other choice if the democratic world is to survive.

The other fear is that history might repeat itself and that by our own mistakes and excuses we shall fall into another depression. That is what every follower of Marx everywhere hopes and believes. Such a disaster here would set the forces of communism on the march everywhere. We must frustrate that hope of our enemies.

To fulfill our own hopes and to fight those fears we must be strong and stable at home. Our Government must be efficiently organized and less repressive on the spirit of enterprise. Our relations between business and government must be friendly and mutually helpful. Our business community must be prudent but progressive. Our people must not expect unending miracles of generosity from government. We must in industrial relations seek mutual respect and cooperation.

A strong America is the hope of the world. Providence has given us the tools. We must use them well.

Tribute to the Late Senator John H. Overton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute paid to the memory of the late Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana, on October 4, 1948, by Judge Gaston L. Porterie, of the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, before the Supreme Court of Louisiana, under the auspices of the Louisiana State Bar Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN HOLMES OVERTON, THE STATESMAN

John Holmes Overton had the mind of a logician and the heart of the lover of humanity. He was greatly gifted and endowed.

"If a man can play the true logician, and have judgment as well as invention, he may do great matters."—Bacon.

He had the good fortune of coming from distinguished ancestry. On his maternal side, he was a Waddill; they were exceedingly bright and witty. On the paternal side, he was an Overton; they were serious and ambitious.

The town of Marksville, his birthplace, had very fine people of both French and English extraction. He was English in blood; but he seemed to have absorbed some of the subtle and charming qualities of the French. The town was a small place and it was an asset to him that all of his childhood and early youth were spent there in the close union that life gives in small communities.

His parents were greatly interested in him and he was trained and tutored at home from the very earliest in the English classics. He would practice and recite them with ease in private and in public and soon there was no function, public or private, but that young John Overton was sought to adorn it.

Of fine physical appearance, with a voice of melody and charm, yet vibrant of masculine force, he always delivered what would be termed the formal classical address—the Roman ideal, with points in logical sequence leading to the build-up of masterful emotion in a moving climax. He ever remained the trained orator—his evident restraint from total abandonment to the emotions was the proof of the real depths of his feeling.

It was at the relatively late age of 56, after he had moved from his birthplace at the age of 23 to the city of Alexandria where he had actively and profitably, and with particular distinction, practiced law for a period of 33 years, that his real great trait—his love for humanity—had occasion to come into public play.

Huey Long, the great and unrivaled liberal, was in trouble. He was facing the Senate of the State of Louisiana under charges of impeachment. The logician lost no time in evaluating the points of the charges pro and con, and in arriving to the definite conclusion of Long's innocence. Then the lover of humanity took control and Overton gave his services in the successful defense of Huey Long.

He returned to his law practice in Alexandria. He was a marked man, however, for soon thereafter the seat in the House of Representatives in Overton's district became vacant through death. A mass impulse immediately arose over the congressional district to make use of this fine mind which had come, moved by love of all, to defend a great liberal for the public good. Overton could do nothing else but respond and he went to the lower House of the Congress.

At the very next election the people promptly promoted him to the Senate, where he remained until his untimely death. At the end of his second term in the Senate, he announced that he did not desire reelection. Whereupon a petition of 52 of his Democratic colleagues—the whole party membership except for a few being out of town—and with numerous Republicans offering to sign, urged the people of Louisiana to compel his return—a unique gesture. The Shreveport Times, owned and managed by Mr. John D. Ewing, one of the leading newspapers of the State, immediately and successfully sponsored a crusade to return Overton for the good of the State and Nation.

His heart told him at once which phase of legislation he should particularly study and improve. The section in which he was born and the section to which he had moved and where he had so well achieved in his profession were both subject to overflow from the floodwaters of the internal rivers of the United States of America. He had seen the keen sufferings of his people during the great 1927 flood. And so, to the protection of the Nation from floods he immediately devoted himself.

"More helpful than all wisdom is one draught of simple human pity that will not forsake us."—George Eliot.

And, after 15 years of attention given the subject, here are the thoughts of no less an expert on the subject than Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, USA, expressed as late as in the year 1947:

"It was natural that, in addition to serving the national interests in numerous fields, John Overton, as a Representative of his State in the National Congress, should become particularly active in working for those Federal projects which expand the usefulness of our great rivers and other waterways, and at the same time, tame their natural tendencies to destroy our wealth and our lives through recurring floods. Our country has been the gainer for his knowledge and his activities.

"A stanch believer in the homely virtues that have made this Nation great—and in the democratic processes wisely prescribed by the Congress for achieving Federal waterway and flood-control projects—Senator Overton has kept his sights focused steadily on the realization of sound measures. His objectives have not been preconceived solutions. He has kept his mind and his opinions open to progressive changes in plans and programs to meet the existing needs, whether these plans called for dams, reservoirs, levees, flood walls, diversion channels, canals, dredging, regulating works, or some other construction found to be the most practicable. He has been at the forefront of those who have fought for flood control and navigation improvements in the Red River Valley. He has been a warm and active supporter of Federal projects for the proper development and control of the Mississippi.

"In a real sense, John Overton has been the worthy and honored ambassador of the whole Mississippi Valley.

"He has been a tower of strength to the forces that have sought improved waterway facilities for the greate gateway of the valley—the port of New Orleans. He has been the friend of all our great river cities, ever striving to induce the growth and prosperity of their regions through better inland waterway terminal facilities. He has worked indefatigably for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, which provides a protected water route along the Gulf of Mexico from Florida to Corpus Christi, Tex. He was one of the prime movers behind the progressive—and sorely needed—legislation which established flood control as a responsibility of the Federal Government. In the broad influences of his busy life, he has been a part of all sound actions directed toward making our extensive waterways at all times the servants of the American people, and at no time their masters.

"If our rivers could talk, they would tell many stories—stories of Indians and explorers; of brave settlers, and of courageous planters and industrialists who established farms and homes and great enterprises on their banks; stores of husky river boatmen who matched their muscles against the strong currents, and of shipbuilders who devised constantly improved means of traversing the flowing streams; stores of civilian and Army engineers whose genius helped to harness and bridge and control the waters.

"But I venture that they would speak of no one more affectionately than of John Overton, whose voice has risen from this valley to express the needs and desires of the people—not of his own locality alone, but of all the land—and who has worked unceasingly for those projects that are now being woven into the history of our growth as a Nation.

"Wherever vessels are better enabled to navigate our numerous rivers and linking waterways; wherever homes and lives are protected from potential floods; wherever farmers give thanks for the rapid drainage of unwanted water from their lands, and conversely, give thanks for water brought to their arid acres; wherever the varied other Federal benefits from our water resources are being enjoyed by American people and American enterprise, there will be found the rich harvest of results sown by such public-spirited citizens as John Overton."

He took interest in naval affairs and soon he was the head of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in charge of naval appropriations. Listen to him as he speaks to the American people as a patriotic prophet for the benefit of the generations to come, at the time that he presented

for adoption the largest naval appropriation bill in the history of our Nation:

"Mr. President, I should like in conclusion to make several concisely phrased observations.

"It would, in my humble judgment, be an egregious blunder on the part of our Nation if after the conclusion of hostilities we did not retain the combatant force of the mighty Navy that will have accomplished so much, starting with so little, in bringing, under divine guidance, victory to American arms in the west and the east. I fervently hope that international arrangements that will insure the peace and tranquillity of the world will be agreed to and lived up to. But, Mr. President, if they are not, or if they fail to their sublime purpose, we shall have to rely in the future upon the strength of our naval and air forces, as well as upon a mighty reserve force trained and equipped to spring to arms upon the sounding of the tocsin of war. To the consummation of this cardinal prerequisite to national safety we should embark upon a program of compulsory military service.

"Mr. President, we shall have largely wrought, fought, and won in vain, if we do not retain under our own control and ownership the strategic islands in the Pacific and Southwest Pacific which we have captured from the Japanese Empire through the blood and sacrifice of thousands upon thousands of young Americans, and which are ours by the right of conquest and of occupancy."

"Hail, Columbia! happy land!
Hail, ye heroes! heaven born band!
Who fought and bled in freedom's cause.
* * * * * *
"And when the storm of war was gone,
Enjoyed the peace your valor won.
Let independence be our boast,
Even mindful what it cost;
Even grateful for the prize,
Let its altar reach the skies!"

—*Joseph Hopkinson.*

So, in debate, on the floor of the Senate, he was the master of the discussion—first the logician who meticulously developed the details of the measure, the necessity of its many provisions; then the lover of humanity who generalized it all together, in a wide compass, adjusted to the needs of a great Nation.

Besides the subjects in which he was generally accepted as a national authority, his labors in the Senate were vast and varied. He took a leading part in the discussions of the following subjects: Appropriations, lend-lease, rivers and harbors, antilynching, FEPC, farm relief, St. Lawrence waterway, manufacturers' sales tax, labor strikes, soldiers bonus, sugar tariff, allotment to schools, rice tariff, Natural Gas Act, poll tax, war profiteers. In all these subjects he gave much of his rare genius.

Two of his prominent colleagues, one from each major party, said of him this:

Senator ROBERT TAFT, of Ohio, said:

"John Overton's death comes as a shock to all of those who have served with him in the Senate. He was able, and had a complete grasp of the problems with which we have dealt during the past 10 years. He had good judgment, and was untiring in this work. The Senate and the State of Louisiana have lost an outstanding public servant."

Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland, said:

"John Overton was a rugged adversary and a rugged advocate. He asked no quarter and gave no quarter. He was always fair. There was always that charm and affection that made you love him even though he was fighting you. Such men are rare. * * * The name of John Overton will live long in the United States Senate. Louisiana is in sorrow and a large part of this Nation is in sorrow."

Kind and gentle to all, devoid of even the slightest shade of arrogance, patient and attentive to every worthy plea, innately urbane and ever courteous, Overton was the ideal American gentleman.

His friends and relatives are assembled here in this courtroom where his voice has been heard before. His spirit is here with us. We should conclude with the words he chose in delivering at this very place the general eulogy at the memorial exercises, held on Monday, October 5, 1925, under the auspices of the Louisiana Bar Association:

"Washington Irving has truly said that 'pathos expires beneath the slow labor of the chisel' and 'that there is something more affecting in the spontaneous offerings of nature than in the most costly monuments of art.'

'Can storied urn or animated bust
Back to its mansion call the fleeting breath?
Can honor's voice provoke the silent dust
Or flattery soothe the dull cold ear of death?'

"And it seems to me, your honors, that when our souls will have winged their flight to the heaven of our faith, if, by some divine favor we might look back through the portals of eternity upon this goodly earth spreading below, we would rather witness a scene like this where true friends gather bearing their offerings of memories sweet and dear; we would rather observe some flower that the hand of love has rested upon the green sod that covers our last earthly abode though that flower should wither and die on the morrow; we would rather note some tear softly stealing from the eye of true affection though it vanish in the moment; we would rather catch the passing tribute of a sigh from the breast of some fond friend though it be blown away in the instant by the vagrant zephyrs of the air—than to behold towering above our lifeless clay some costly monument that the cold art of man has devised."

His honesty, public or private, was never questioned; his family life was exemplary; in this man we find none of the discounting shortcomings.

Overton in our public life is without peer or superior. He was of great and lasting benefit to the Nation. Indeed, he was a statesman.

And with Shakespeare we shall say:

"Praising what is lost,
Makes the remembrance dear."

The American Forum of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on January 18 it was my privilege to participate in the weekly program of the American Forum of the Air. January 18 was the twenty-first anniversary of this the oldest forum of the air.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD some brief remarks which I made on that historic occasion.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOHNSON. I am delighted, ladies and gentlemen, to see the oldest forum of the air on this, its twenty-first anniversary, using the new medium of television. My heartiest congratulations and good wishes to the American Forum of the Air and to Theodore Granik, its founder and moderator. And I know the public is grateful to Morris Forgash, president of the Universal Carloading and Distributing Co., the far-sighted sponsors of this program over many of these Mutual stations.

The American Forum provides a unique stimulation to the people of the Nation, bringing as it does the opinion and views of men in Government to every corner of the land. It is one of the best examples of democracy at work that we have. The millions of Americans who listen each week keep better informed and thereby become better citizens. In no other country and under no other system can both sides of vital issues be debated so freely and so fearlessly as here. Many of my congressional colleagues think of the American Forum of the Air as practically a quasi-congressional activity. Scores of distinguished Members of the House and the Senate join with me in paying tribute to the fairness, the impartiality, and the importance of the forum, which is founded on the principle of free and open discussion of all sides of all issues.

President Truman himself has paid tribute in these words: "For his splendid public service in conducting these programs, the American people and the many Members of Congress who have participated on the forum owe Mr. Granik a debt of gratitude. The radio industry can be proud of this pioneer in the field of public-service programs."

A happy birthday to you, Teddy, and to your American Forum of the Air.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator JOHNSON; thank you ever so much. On behalf of my patient and hard-working staff, we are deeply grateful to you.

And now to the subject of the evening. We are going to handle a red-hot issue. Should the House Un-American Activities Committee be abolished? Here to discuss it are two old friends of the American Forum of the Air, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, on my left, Republican, of South Dakota, who was recently elected to the United States Senate after years of service in the House of Representatives, where he was acting chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the all-powerful House Judiciary Committee, who was a speaker on our very first forum 21 years ago. It originated over WOR, Mutual's affiliate in New York, in 1928, and now in 1949 we are having our television debut over WOR's subsidiary here in Washington, WOIC.

And now, gentlemen, on with our discussion. Someone very kindly has provided us with a pumpkin. I don't find any microfilm in it, but here is a leading question for you, Senator MUNDT. What is un-American?

Federal Aid to Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Aid to Housing," delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America and the Graduate School of Business Administration of

New York University, at New York City, on January 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO HOUSING

I appreciate very much the invitation of the Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University and the Mortgage Bankers Association of America to speak to your conference on the subject of Federal aid to housing. The Mortgage Bankers Association, of course, is deeply interested in the subject from the point of view of financing and investment in housing. Millions of families are concerned because of the difficulty they find in securing satisfactory housing accommodations. It is a burning issue in politics.

I have been interested in the subject since long before I came to the Senate. In 1943 I was chairman of a subcommittee of a Senate Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning to consider the housing problem. I have participated in the drafting of most of the bills that have been passed, and in the public-housing bills which have twice passed the Senate but failed in the House. Unfortunately, the housing problem is so complicated in itself, it has been approached from so many angles and with so many panaceas for solution, it has created such violent prejudices, that it is hard for anyone to feel confident of the wisdom of his views.

THE EMERGENCY SITUATION

Regardless of all the measures taken, one thing is certain: we have not solved the housing problem. On top of the permanent problem, we have now an emergency situation arising out of the very low construction in the thirties, and the inadequate construction during the war. Undoubtedly, this temporary situation will cure itself in a few years. It takes nearly half a million units a year to provide for new families. Last year we provided 800,000 units and this year about a million units, all through private industry and with little slum elimination, so there has been a net gain of some 700,000 units. In many locations we seem to have caught up; in others, there is a shortage.

But we ought not to be led into unsound permanent remedies simply because of the emergency situation. I believe private industry, with the assistance of the FHA and Federal home-loan banks, can get us back to the normal situation which existed before the war. During the past 2 years we have supplemented the powers of the FHA and the Federal home-loan banks, so that I believe there is every facility for the construction of new homes and the rehabilitation of old homes for every family which is able to pay a rental commensurate with present costs. We should do something further in the field of providing a secondary market for GI loans, since the legal restrictions today are hard to meet, but I believe that the stringency is due to the unwillingness to raise the rate of interest rather than to any lack of available funds.

I believe very strongly that families able to pay their rent should not be subsidized, and that they should pay for the capital investment at current rates of interest. The FHA has done a good job in bringing about a large reduction in the cost of financing homes. If industry and labor had done the same job, we would be a long way on the solution to our difficulties.

DIRECT GOVERNMENT LOANS UNNECESSARY

There are some rather dangerous proposals today that the Government lend anybody the money to build reasonably cheap houses at a very low rate of interest and a long term of amortization. That would be subsidy in a field where no subsidy is justified. It would put the Government into the mortgage business with all the expense and collections of a mortgage service organization. This is a field where our problem ought to be solved within the principles of free enterprise. Your association, perhaps, can join with others to insist on such a solution.

RENTAL HOUSING

There is one field in which Government programs have largely failed, apart from the low-income family, that of encouraging rental housing for middle-income groups. Nearly everyone who wants a home is forced to buy it, although many would prefer to rent. We have gone about as far as we can with FHA financing for rental housing of this character, although no doubt experience with the laws recently passed will show how they can be improved. I believe, however, that the difficulty is not so much with housing as it is a fundamental failure in securing investment in enterprises involving a degree of risk. Manufacturers and utilities find difficulty in getting people to invest their money in stocks and equities. Tax rates are so high that wealthier people have little interest in putting their money into a risk enterprise, and would rather buy Government bonds and get 2½ percent for certain. One of the things which Congress is studying today is some change in the tax laws or other laws which will make it more attractive to invest money in productive enterprise.

THE SLUM PROBLEM

But the good work done by FHA and the Federal home loan banks has not solved the slum problem, or the problem of the lowest income families. When we have solved the emergency problem, I see no reason to think that we will have any better situation than was normal before the war, and that normal situation was wholly unsatisfactory. It was a problem of high cost and low income. Incomes today are permanently higher than they were, but the cost of homes is also permanently higher. The relative position of cost and income probably will not be greatly different, and so we face the same problem as in 1940.

In 1940, according to the census, there were 29,000,000 urban and rural nonfarm-residential units. Of these, nearly 4,000,000 are listed as needing major repairs and are, therefore, in bad physical condition. Of those in good repair, over 3,000,000, have no running water of any kind. Two million four hundred thousand more have no private toilets or baths. Perhaps a majority of the homes without water are in rural areas where they are entirely satisfactory, but many of them are in cities where the failure to have running water certainly indicates a very low standard of sanitary living conditions. Many of the homes which do not meet a minimum standard of decency are in city slums where the bad quality of the residence is accentuated by the bad surroundings. It is possible that improvements have been made during the war which reduced the defects in plumbing and other conditions, but we have no direct evidence of this and our Committee concluded that about 6,000,000 homes in 1940 were below a proper minimum standard. Many can be improved. For others there is no solution, except their destruction and replacement.

The difficulty with the housing problem as compared to food, clothing, medicine, and the like is that shelter is absolutely essential for every family, and yet the cost is out of line with the income of most of the population. Only about half the families in the United States can afford to buy a new house, even of the simplest type. The other half can only buy or live in second-hand houses. Of course, many of these houses are just as good as the new ones, but on the other hand the reduction in rent is not much unless the house or the surroundings have deteriorated. But as these houses are handed down to families with still less income, they get older and older and finally reach families which can only pay a minimum rent. In 1940, the 6,000,000 substandard homes were rented by 6,000,000 low-income families at rent averaging less than $15 a month. The rent paid is not sufficient to keep the houses in good condition, and they deteriorate further.

It is quite true that some kind of shelter is provided at our present system at rents which can be paid, but the lowest income group has necessarily gravitated to the substandard housing, for the most part in city slums. No one is saying that the private builders are to blame for the present situation, but it seems to be the inevitable result of present conditions. While I am a great believer in the system of free enterprise, this happens to be a field where it has failed to find a solution.

Even if a city tears down the slum dwellings and a private industry builds a similar number of new houses, other slums will appear because of the low rents which can be obtained from the lowest income groups. In other words, the so-called hand-me-down theory works, but it works to provide highly undesirable housing for those who get it on the last hand down. Of course, many of the houses renting for low rents are satisfactory. Some owners and tenants will keep any kind of a house in good condition. Other houses are saved by their location, even though the condition is poor. But under private industry left to itself, the slum condition has continued without improvement. If we could reduce the cost of housing so that perhaps 75 percent of all the families could afford a new home, we could eliminate slums much more quickly at the bottom. All of the second- and third-hand houses would be newer and probably in better condition, even if there remain the same proportion of lower income families. So perhaps the basic remedy is a reduction in cost.

Through the FHA we have, in effect, reduced the cost of housing by reducing the rate of interest and lengthening the term. But neither contractors nor material men have made any similar reductions. The current bills all provide for research to stimulate new methods and new materials. That, of course, cannot be neglected, but we cannot be certain of its success. We do know that in 1926 we reached the height of home building in the construction of 900,000 houses, but that long before the depression this number had declined rapidly because the market for new homes was exhausted. It is almost certain that the same condition is likely to recur in a very short time. Houses again are pricing themselves out of the market.

PUBLIC HOUSING THE ONLY SOLUTION

Until the cost is reduced, therefore, I see no way in which to cure the situation, except by some direct Government action at the lowest income levels to replace slum dwellings with public housing, thereby supplementing efforts to get more new houses built by private builders for those with adequate income.

(a) Not socialism

Many have denounced public housing as a communistic or socialistic enterprise. Of course, to a certain extent it is true that it is socialistic in nature. But this question of socialism is a relative matter. We have long socialized our public education in the primary and secondary schools. We have socialized medical care to the extent that we provide medical care to the poor through public hospitals. But this does not mean that we have socialized medical care as a whole, or the medical profession. The public-housing program is in no sense a socialization of the building industry, or of the housing industry. It is intended to reach only those whose income is so low as to prevent

their renting the minimum of decent housing. We have long recognized government's obligation to give food and clothing relief to families unable to pay for them. We have long recognized government's obligation to give free medical care and hospital service to those unable to pay for it. We have long recognized the obligation to educate children, no matter how poor their parents. Shelter is one of the necessities of life, perhaps the greatest after food. It is quite true that local government has not often undertaken the job of providing minimum shelter as it has that of clothing, food, and medicine, but the reasons are just as strong in favor of providing this necessity of life as the others.

(b) *Justification for Federal action*

Of course, in Congress we are faced with the further question whether the Federal Government has any function in this program. Housing, like food, relief, medicine, is primarily the obligation of the States and local governments. Even if these programs are the proper function of government, it is said that under our Constitution they do not fall primarily within the duties or powers of the Federal Government. It is a little late, however, for us to argue the place of the Federal Government in the picture. Under President Hoover we set up the Federal Home Loan Bank System to assist building-and-loan associations to finance housing more adequately. Under President Roosevelt we established the Federal Housing Administration which, by mortgage insurance, has revolutionized the financing of homes. The public-housing program has been in force for more than 8 years. As part of the Federal Government, we in Congress cannot avoid the responsibility of considering the whole problem.

(c) *Minimum floor for essential services*

Furthermore, I believe that the Federal Government does have a responsibility for preventing the suffering and hardship resulting from extreme poverty at any point in the United States. I believe the Federal Government has an interest in seeing that every child in every State has substantially equal opportunity, regardless how poor his parents may be. Under American principles of freedom, we have built up the highest standard of living in the history of the world—on the average. But its success is based on adequate reward for those who are more intelligent, better workmen, more diligent, or superior in other ways. Some must necessarily fall behind, either from misfortune or lack of ability or their own fault.

The philosophy of socialism is to raise all to the average, which necessarily will bring all others down to the same dead level and take all life and progress out of the system. There might be more equality under socialism, but I am certain there would be much lower standards of living for the great majority of workmen.

The extreme philosophy the other way is to "let the devil take the hindmost" and let those who are unable to keep up suffer poverty and hardship on the theory that in the end general progress will be faster. Without arguing the economics of this theory, it is enough to say that it offends every humane sense, and that Americans are humane people.

I believe that the American people feel that with the high production of which we are now capable there is enough left over to prevent extreme hardship and maintain a minimum standard floor under subsistence, education, medical care, and housing to give to all a minimum standard of decent living and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life. But if we accept this theory it is obvious that a large number of the States do not enjoy the high production or the high resulting income which will enable them to maintain such a standard. The Federal Government comes into the picture, because there is a great difference of financial ability among our various States. The average income in Connecticut is more than twice the average income in Mississippi. We saw how in extreme cases, like the unemployment crisis of 1934, the cost of an adequate and necessary program was far beyond the resources even of the wealthier States. It is beyond the resources of many other States today. States do not have the taxing power which the Federal Government has, because they cannot reach the most lucrative sources of income or maintain tax rates materially higher than the surrounding States without driving wealth away from the State.

(d) *Necessary conditions of Federal aid*

If we adopt this theory, however, and wish to avoid a complete centralization of authority in Washington, there must be certain definite limitations, and we must adhere to the basic doctrine that the role of the Federal Government is only one of financial assistance.

First, the Federal Government must not take over the administration of these various welfare services, but must leave it with the States and localities so that the communities themselves may work out their own solutions. Second, the minimum floor which we provide must not be so high as to destroy the incentive to improve one's conditions through one's own efforts. The man who is aided must not be better off than the man who earns his own way. Third, the cost must not be so great as to bear too heavily on the other four-fifths who have to work harder to pay the bill. Fourth, of course aid should be extended only to those who need it.

It is said that once we establish a minimum standard, and once the Federal Government gives aid, the standard will be steadily raised and the cost to the Federal Government will rapidly increase. Of course, that is a danger, but it is a danger I would rather face than refuse all assistance and leave the entire matter to the States. I feel quite certain that the suffering and hardship in many sections would lead to a general distrust in our whole economic system, certainly a demand that the Federal Government take over completely the administration of these activities.

Of course, the program does deprive the lowest income group of incentive and freedom, but most of the incentive and leadership in the Nation will be found in any event in the other four-fifths. Allowing for all this, I believe the Federal Government must assist the States to meet these social problems.

(e) *Objections to public housing*

The public housing program is intended to deal only with those who cannot reasonably be expected to pay the rentals in decent private housing. It is not intended to deal with transients or helpless individuals, but with those families receiving some steady income at the lowest range of the income scale. The most helpless group will have to be taken care of in public institutions or through rent certificates. One of the objections to public housing is the claim that it competes with private renters by admitting families able to live in privately owned homes. This condition arose out of the war when it was impossible to move the families of war workers, no matter how much they earned. The present bill requires a constant survey to see that families remotely able to rent good private housing shall not remain in the public housing projects.

It is objected that the whole program is socialistic and contemplates a socialistic community. The cause of public housing has been injured by some of its vociferous supporters, because unquestionably there are among those supporters many who want all housing to be socialized, and want all workers housed at government expense. The radical character of some of the personnel of the Public Housing Authority has also justified criticism. But after all, this support does not to my mind give any argument against public housing if there are sound arguments for it.

Public housing is criticized as being too expensive. It does seem to me that the limits in the Ellender bill which would permit the expenditure of about $12,500 per housing unit are very high indeed. Four room homes can be built for $7,500, perhaps $6,500. Some public housing projects perhaps have to be fireproof and involve greater expense. But if this program is to avoid public criticism, it must be carried out in most places at far below the Ellender bill limits. We ought not to give a man who is admittedly unable to earn anything like an average wage, better housing than the man who works hard and builds his own home.

It is contended that the financial participation required from the State and local authorities is too small a percentage. Again, I think the criticism is justified, but we must remember that housing is a new Government activity, and that State and local authorities have found little place in their budget for housing subsidy, and that their tax revenues are very difficult to increase. If we are to maintain the local interest and effective control essential to a Federal-aid system, the community ought to provide some part of the necessary funds.

The bill provides that no housing can be done, except upon the express request of the local governing body. If that body believes that its city requires public housing, it ought to be prepared to put up some contribution, either in the way of tax exemption or direct cash subsidy. On reason that the public housing program was so unpopular in so many sections of the country was that it was imposed by the Federal Government officials without any real interest or decision from the people of the community. Its success has been greatest in a city like New York where public housing was undertaken before the Federal Government came into the picture.

(f) *Scope of the program*

Our original report recommend 125,000 units a year for 4 years, and that was the provision of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The Administration this year substantially raised the ante to a total of 1,050,000 units at the rate of 250,000 a year. To my mind, this changed the whole character of the program. Two hundred fifty thousand units would be 25 percent of the 1948 construction. Some materials and labor are still short, and the materials and labor to construct this amount of public housing would cut down the number of private housing units which could be built. I have always said that the program should not exceed 10 percent of available housing. As a matter of fact, I doubt if more than 125,000 units could be efficiently built for several years to come. This is no time to force up the price of materials by excessive building. In short, I believe that many of the objections of the private builders are completely unsound as to a reasonable program clearly within the necessities of the situation; but they would be sound against a program which seems to look toward the socialization of all housing.

It is said that if we once admit the principle of public housing, we will have to build a total of from three to six million homes. This I certainly do not admit. As I have said, the reduction of costs might make all public housing unnecessary. Other methods of dealing with the housing situation may be developed. Many low-income families have found homes at low cost or low rental which are satisfactory for their children, particularly in the environs of cities since the automobile has spread the population over a wide area.

My belief is that if we take the edge off the problem at the bottom, destroy many of the existing slums and set an example in many neighborhoods, it will not be necessary to extend the public housing program beyond a total of perhaps a million homes in the course of the next 10 years. I have seen public housing projects in Cleveland, and elsewhere, which have changed the whole character of the neighborhood. Private owners have come in and improved all the homes in the neighboring section, new stores have been built and a standard established extending far beyond the number of homes covered by public housing.

(g) No practical alternatives

The opposition to public housing has proposed from time to time a number of alternative remedies. A great many suggestions try to reduce the interest rate and cost of financing, usually through an indirect subsidy from the Government. When these plans are analyzed, they never get the rent down to the point where they will take care of really low income families.

Many other plans recognize that a direct subsidy of some kind is necessary. Some have proposed that the low-income problem be dealt with by the issuance of rent certificates to be used by the holders to pay all or part of their rents. As an emergency method of dealing with a few relief cases, this is satisfactory, but rent certificates will not eliminate slums. No man will invest his money in new buildings on the chance that rent certificates will continue to be issued for the next 20 years. Rent certificates will not stimulate private building, and the most we could hope is that they might lead private owners of slums to spend somewhat more on maintenance.

Our committees have considered many other forms of subsidy. There might be a direct subsidy for every home built to reduce its cost, but even a $500 subsidy would have cost at least $500,000,000 in 1948, and I doubt if it would have accomplished any real purpose. It is hard to see how you could prevent the builder or the owner from adding this amount to his profits by reselling the house unless we have a complete system of fixing prices on homes.

We considered various methods of subsidy to private apartment owners and builders and, of course, something of this sort has been done in the way of tax exemption in several States to provide for middle-income families. None of these subsidies, however, has been big enough to secure really low rents such as are furnished by public housing.

To accomplish that they would have to be larger than direct Federal subsidies, because the money borrowed is necessarily taxable and it is not always possible to get tax exemption for the property itself. In general, few people are interested in building apartment projects under a subsidy agreement, because they have to submit to complete regulation by the Government of the rentals which they charge, the accommodations which they provide, and the character of tenants whom they accept. Practically only institutions of a charitable nature could be led to build under such an arrangement.

I have found no alternative to public housing as a method of providing low income rentals to those at the bottom of the income scale. Public housing is still experimental and the experiment has been very much confused by the intervening of the Second World War and the large amount of war housing constructed directly or indirectly by the Government. Many of the complaints against the public-housing system relate to this war housing. Few cities have been able to give the public-housing program a proper trial, and many cities require the urban redevelopment assistance provided in the Ellender bill in order to handle the slum question properly.

CONCLUSION

Those of you who are at this meeting are largely interested in private housing. There is no reason why the public-housing program should compete with or interfere in any way with the private-housing industry, any more than general hospitals interfere with the practice of the private physician. I know of no one who does not feel that the major problem of providing shelter can only be solved by private industry.

I believe that those who are opposed to public housing have done their own industry a disservice by their indiscriminate and unreasoning opposition. They should promote the plan and spend their energy and their funds in confining it to its proper scope in making it more of a local enterprise clearly devoted to the lower-income problem. They have invited more radical housing measures and have assisted the critics of free enterprise in the United States. The American people, in my opinion, are determined to adopt a housing plan which will substantially provide for every child who is born in the United States decent home surroundings, so that he may actually enjoy the freedom and equality of opportunity to secure which our forefathers came to America.

Does the Republican Party Have a Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post an excellent article entitled "Does the Republican Party Have a Future?" written by our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I am sure that Democratic Members of the Senate will want to peruse this fine article, and I know that Republican Members should peruse it. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAVE A FUTURE?

(By HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., United States Senator from Massachusetts)

The present feeling of despair in the ranks of the Republican Party emphasizes the immediate need for a sound understanding of our two-party system and a confidence in that system. I, for one, have that confidence and believe that by realizing our shortcomings, by developing an understanding of the trends of the world in which we live, and by a wholehearted acceptance of new ideas, the Republican Party can become once more a party of leadership in America.

I recall with vividness my initiation to the United States Senate in 1937 in the wake of a Roosevelt tidal wave that engulfed the entire country with the exception of Maine and Vermont. There were then but 17 Senators sitting on the Republican side of the aisle. Contrast this with the 42 Republican Senators now sitting in Washington, and you are impelled to the conclusion that the Republicans still have intrinsic strength, vitality, and a sound basis for hope. In the last election we got 2,000,000 fewer votes than the other fellow, out of some 47,000,000 votes. That is not a result which calls for coroners.

But it does call for soul searching and for a realization that success can be achieved only if the party will root out its shortcomings. The epic set-back of November may well be a blessing in disguise to Republicans. They now have an opportunity to clean house, to discard archaic concepts, and to mold the party to greater conformity with the will and aspirations of the American people. As Henry Ward Beecher once said, "It is in defeat that bone turns to flint; it is in defeat that gristle turns to muscle." It is in defeat that the Republican Party will become a modern party and take its proper place in our political system.

We must recognize that those policy considerations which are no more than survivals of the Paleozoic era of American politics have no place in the Republican Party of tomorrow. The party must build its future on the proud traditions which it has built up in the field of human values and on the inspiring qualities of its enlightened leaders.

The GOP has been presented to the public as a rich man's club and as a haven for reactionaries. This is only true in that there have been some Republicans—and, for that matter, many Democrats as well—who have fought every piece of New Deal reform legislation with uncompromising and myopic fury. But to say that these Republicans represent the rank and file of the party is, in my view, a gross untruth. Certain it is however, that the Republican Party must broaden the scope of its appeal so that there can be no doubt that it is a party for all elements of the people, young and old, rich and poor.

It is little short of astounding to find the Democrats, with so large a segment of their membership composed of avowed opponents of civil rights, making their claims to the title of being the sole party of progress. The temporary glow from the victory of the Democratic Party cannot obscure the fact that it still suffers from many serious ailments. Its irreconcilable sectionalism, its burden of unwieldy and top-heavy bureaucracy that has grown helter-skelter through the years, its feudal dictatorships in the South, and its city patronage machines elsewhere are not the foundation that will support an enduring edifice of constructive liberalism.

The American people are fortunate in having a two-party system which is sufficiently flexible to permit resolution of their problems without resort to violence and to enable them to remain united in a troubled world. We need a strong Republican Party. We need a strong Democratic Party. We will have both.

The political words "left," "right," and "center," however applicable they may be to the politics of the old class-cursed nations of Europe, apply only very infrequently to modern American politics. Our two major political parties more nearly resemble political service stations which aim to give the people the service which they demand from their Government. They vie with each other as to which can translate the aspirations of the people more effectively into action, and there certainly need not be much argument or mystery nowadays as to what these aims are.

The two-party system exists in America in order to perform the following functions: To give the people the kind of government the people want; to enable the people to fix the responsibility for the way their government is conducted; to enable the voter, whether he be Democrat, Republican, or independent, to exercise maximum influence on the conduct of the Government; to enable the minority party to serve as an effective check on the party in control; and to hold together the wide variety of climates, occupations, races, and creeds which make up America—and make up the so-called blocs which cut

across both parties' lines. Insofar as unity is concerned, let it be said that unity emphatically does not mean reaction or resistance to change. The successful American party unites and goes ahead. It is in this respect the very reverse of European parties, whose purpose is constantly to separate the sheep from the goats and to sharpen class warfare—even to the point of Communist or Fascist violence.

These, then, are the functions of our two-party system—which never have been those of the usual European cluster of ideological parties. So much are these things taken for granted that we not only never praise our parties for doing them; many Americans are quite unaware of the function which our parties perform.

It is hard to understand those who see something shameful or mysterious or, at the very least, faintly roguish in this desire of our two major parties to get everyone in under one tent. Actually to build such a tent is one sure mark of statesmanship. It also insures protection to minorities from selfish majorities.

The Wall Street Journal recently printed a letter expressing a point of view with which I cannot agree. It said: "As matters stand today, we have in this country two major political parties whose philosophies of government are becoming more and more identical with each succeeding campaign, which strive to outdo each other. * * * If the two-party system is to remain virile and effective, the Republican Party must abandon its present chameleonlike attitude and return to a position of unmistakable conservatism, dedicating itself to a determination not to compromise with New Dealism."

This opinion, in my view, is tenaciously anchored to a dead past; it expresses a philosophy with which the overwhelming mass of everyday registered Republicans violently disagree; it conflicts flagrantly with the spirit which gave birth to the Republican Party; and adoption of this policy would condemn the party to certain defeat. There is far more hope for America and a basis for rejuvenating the party, if the words of Abraham Lincoln are heeded: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

It is certainly valueless to have a party in America which stands for an abstract philosophy or dogma—be it conservatism, liberalism, socialism, or radicalism. There is no useful place for it in our system. What is wanted is a party which, by finding a common meeting ground among our myriad separatist influences, develops a practical and imaginative program; a party which enables the two-party system to work, and thereby enables the citizen to get the kind of government he wants, fix the responsibility for political action and exert his greatest possible amount of influence on the conduct of government.

Both parties have a constant tug of war between their conservative and radical wings, which has the effect of prodding the do-nothing and moderating the extremist. Now that the Republicans are suffering from the reputation of being the party of the big shots, let us recall the Republican Party's beginnings in the freeing of the slaves, and let us remember the inspired radicalism of Lincoln. History is also studded with the results of later Republican action. The anti-trust laws, the regulatory and rate-making bodies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the conservation laws were all largely the result of Republican action and inspiration. It was Senator VANDENBERG who, almost singlehanded, achieved the passage of the law for Federal insurance of bank deposits—surely a useful governmental prop to what is in so many respects misnamed as our free-enterprise system.

If the Republican Party is to return to a position of greatest national usefulness, it must take inspiration from this progressive past. Also, it must certainly make a vigorous, sincere, and successful effort to win the confidence of labor. The fate of the Whig Party in 1852 shows what can happen when a major element in the country utterly refuses even to consider a political party. The Whig Party completely lost the confidence of practically everyone who was interested in the slavery question. Its intellectual bankruptcy with regard to this issue is revealed by the extraordinary spectacle in 1852 of this major political party giving, in its convention, to the northern Whigs the naming of the Presidential candidate and to the southern Whigs the writing of the party platform. The inability of the Whigs to deal with the slavery issue must not be matched by the inability of the Republicans to deal with labor problems. There is no place in the Republican Party—or in any American political organization—for reactionaries—as distinguished from conservatives—who, like royalists in European republics or like the Whigs in America in 1852, refuse to accept changes which are here to stay.

The Republicans have made very considerable progress in some States and have also advanced nationally. If you study the figures of the 1948 election and compare them with the past four Presidential contests, you come to the conclusion that the American people, in effect, said to the Republicans last November 2:

"You have made some real progress in liberalizing yourselves and in making yourselves a forward-looking instrument of the popular will, but you have not yet progressed far enough. We are still afraid that you may backslide. We are still not sure that you are aware of the trends of modern life. Go out and try again."

I have faith that we will make a liberal record, that we will try again and that the people will again use us as their servants. But we must make the decision that we want to be a popular party. On that basis only can the Republican Party have a future.

Once we have made this decision, we can, at the right time, offer a program of legislation and a promise of competent, unselfish, imaginative, and courageous administration which will receive public support. This emphatically does not mean "me too." We are not at all on the triple horns of a dilemma which compels us either to imitate the Democrats, or to indulge in the Mother Hubbard type of appeal which covers everything and touches nothing, or to attack everything the Democrats have ever done. There is a fourth way; to propose a program of our own—better and more effective measures to lead the country toward some real measure of prosperity and toward that peace without which no form of prosperity is possible. The American people are definitely not interested in self-adulation or in recriminations against the rival party. That is as out of date as the horse and buggy. They want to get the answer to the question: "Where do we go from here?" The new Republicans should be able to give the answer.

This is obviously not the time—immediately after an election in which we have been defeated—to propose a program. Both parties have initially the same job—to unite and to go ahead, and then to watch and vie with each other for better service to the public. Our first challenge as Republicans is to convince the people that we can do the job best—that the gas, oil, water, and windshield cleaning which we offer at our service station is better than the other party's. We are, of course, not at present in a position to propose a program and put it into effect. The specific challenge of forthcoming legislation and of actual events will develop the new program of the future. But the new Congress does give us the chance to show that we are definitely forward-looking and affirmative; that we have corrected our mistakes. For the immediate future, therefore, we Republicans must show by our acts in Congress that we thoroughly desire to be a popular and a useful "vital organ" of our two-party system. So great is the need for a living two-party system, so priceless are its benefits, and so tragic are the consequences of not having it, that I have both faith and hope that we shall, in Lincoln's words, "rise with the occasion."

The Rules Committee Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the powers of the House Rules Committee have been clipped, and the responsibilities of that committee have been greatly reduced. Is this good or bad, a step forward or a step backward?

The House Rules Committee, with its powers and its responsibilities, is the product of 160 years of legislative experience. The committee is indispensable for the expeditious and orderly transaction of the business of the House. It acts as a traffic policeman who operates a stop and go sign. The committee takes its instructions from the majority leadership of the House, who are responsible for all legislation that is given clearance by the Rules Committee. Not once that I know of has the Rules Comittee failed to clear legislation that the majority leaders wanted cleared.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee during the last two years, under the chairmanship of Congressman LEO ALLEN, bottled up legislation that would have authorized over $21,000,000,000 of expenditures, because the majority leaders in the House wanted them bottled up. The following are some of the legislative authorizations that were bottled up by the Rules Committee:

First. Universal military training, costing between two and three billion dollars per year.

Second. Miscellaneous veteran's benefits, costing $11,000,000,000.

Third. Public housing (T-E-W bill), costing $8,750,000,000. Authorizations amounting to over $21,000,000,000 were prevented from becoming law. Was that good or bad for the taxpayers of the nation?

Mr. Speaker, the so-called liberals of today, in order to speed up the process of socialization, have quite successfully sold the general public on the idea that the Rules Committee stood in the way of progress and therefore had to be shackled. Instead of the stop and go sign being operated by 12 men, it will from now on be operated by the Speaker of the House—1 man instead of 12 men. Is that progress or reaction, more democracy or more dictatorship?

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter directed to the Editor, New York Times, on the Rules Committee by the Honorable John J. O'Connor, a former Member of this

House and a former chairman of the House Rules Committee.

THE RULES COMMITTEE

JANUARY 5, 1949.

EDITOR, NEW YORK TIMES:

In his column, appearing in the Times, of January 4, your Mr. Arthur Krock, in discussing the Rules Committee of the United States House of Representatives, made reference to me, as follows:

"What happened was that the cozy House dictatorship was broken up by a combination on the Rules Committee that got out of hand, from the viewpoint of a strictly administration speaker. The resistance began when John J. O'Connor of New York City became chairman by seniority and opposed certain legislative plans which were favored by the late President Roosevelt. This obstacle was cleared by purging Mr. O'Connor, the only victim of Mr. Roosevelt's efforts to this end in 1938."

The ascription is exact, only as to the purging and the date.

More important, however, once again the Rules Committee—indispensable to the expeditious transaction of the country's legislative business—becomes the whipping boy of the so-called liberal of yesterday, who becomes the totalitarian of today.

In substitution for the deliberate consideration of 12 or more (it was 14 in my term, as chairman) duly elected representatives of the people, autocratic power is now, substantially, lodged in the hands of one Representative, the Speaker.

Shades of Tom Reed and Joe Cannon! History not only repeats itself, but the hands of the clock, called progress, are once more turned back, and again by the self-labeled progressive, rather than by the untouchable conservative.

As to the factual statements, however, in Mr. Krock's nostalgic reference to me, history, when, and if, ever impartially recorded—some day when our country gets its heads out of the fabricated clouds of fuzzy-wuzzy liberalism—a familiar term on the Volga—and back to good, old-fashioned Americanism, which today is interpreted as intolerance, that record will disclose that the Rules Committee—of which I was a member for 16 years—under the 4 years of my chairmanship, or under its last chairman, Mr. LEO E. ALLEN, of Illinois, and very rarely otherwise, ever refused to cooperate with the other leadership of the House, in carrying out the will of the majority party, which is another way of saying the people. Contrary to deliberately confounded popular confusion, neither that committee, or any part of the legislative body, is an instrumentality of the President. The duly elected representatives, even of the President's party, owe their allegiance to the electors, in their respective districts, and to the country, generally. Our people will need considerable time to recuperate from this concocted confusion of the past 15 years, relating to the fundamentals of our Government.

Until this January 3, 1949, reversion to cannonism, the chairman of the Rules Committee was one of the recognized three leaders of the House. The only remaining step to a complete return to the good old days of boss, Uncle Joe, would be to again permit the Speaker to name the members of the Rules Committee, and to designate himself as chairman. It could happen, in the present day smoky thinking of the still extant New Deal set, and the apathy of the public, generally, when a President claims a mandate from the people when he is elected by less than a majority of the people voting, which sum total is less than a majority of all the citizens eligible to vote, which net vote, so received, by the winner, is about 14 percent of our entire population. It is only here that such an infinitesimal minority could be said to receive a mandate from "all the peepul" and go rampant, from there on.

As to Mr. Krock's factual statements, in reference to me, it is true that the then President, and, betimes, his First Lady, were refused—usually politely—some of the unique legislation they fathered and mothered. Moreoften, however, what the then President loudly proclaimed as legislation, denied by the autocratic Rules Committee, were the particular bills, which he praised publicly, but damned privately, and which he begged the leadership of the House not to let the damn things come to me. Exhibits—the Frazier-Lemke farm mortgage inflation bill, championed by Father Coughlin, the amendments to the Walsh-Healey bill, and other labor proposals, such as minimum-wage bill, which he likewise beseeched the Rules Committee to block, steadfast, behind the closed doors of its star chamber.

Now the Chief Executive will have to do this doubling on the Speaker.

As to the purging, the same tomes of reliable documentation of that event will divulge that that high compliment, which was paid me, resulted, in fact, from my open opposition to the President's Supreme Court packing bill, and his dictatorial reorganization bill, under which, among other ambitions of a czar, he even demanded the right to change the title of his office, as Caesar did thrice. Add, my bringing into the House the resolution creating the committee to investigate Un-American activities. Mr. Krock could have added another compliment to me, that in its annual convention, assembled in Madison Square Garden, in June 1938, the Communist National Party branded me as its No. 1 enemy.

Nor will exact history credit the then President with having accomplished that purging single-handed. That would be a denial of proper recognition to his legion of Communists and nondescripts, under the command of such engineers as Hopkins, Niles, Corcoran, John L. Lewis, Earl Browder, Ickes, and, in addition, substantially each and every individual who has just recently been exposed as a Russian spy and their fellow travelers. Hardley a name has appeared in the current press, of those belonging to this cell, who were not openly named by me, and others, more than 10 years ago, as enemies of our country, and its way of life. They all participated, at the behest of the President, in the purge of 1938. And, moreover, under the aegis of the then President, and with his full knowledge, these subversives were permitted to continue, thereafter, to keep boring from within. They have not all been flitted out, either. Weakening the prerogatives of the Rules Committee is another obeisance to their kind.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. O'CONNOR.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Republican Know-How?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, to admit a weakness is to evidence strength only if the admission is followed by constructive action.

At this particular time the opportunity is right for the Republican Party to take steps in rendering to the Nation an obligation that is essential to national strength and welfare. And I would admonish the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle not to revel in the state of the Republican Party at this time, but to consider seriously the fact that at the turn of the century the situation was reversed and the Democratic Party was in a similar condition.

The important point is not that one party is in power, and the other suffering from the effects of numerous defeats, but that something greater, and far more important and essential to the welfare of our country, is at stake. It is the continued existence of the two-party system on which our Nation has grown to its position of world and power prominence.

We cannot, and should not, hide the fact that the Republican Party, in the wallow of defeat, is torn with internal strife. We should openly admit it, and herald from the roof tops that we intend to work out our difficulties, not for the sole purpose of becoming the party in power but with the primary goal of offering to the American people a program to which they can anchor a faith in the continuation of a healthy and proven political ideology—the American two-party system.

In this connection, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I recommend to the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle a reading of the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of Tuesday, January 25, 1949:

REPUBLICAN KNOW-HOW?

The current squabble over the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee is a fair example of the weakness of the Republican Party that has now for the better part of 20 years kept it from success.

Faced with the job of performing its duty as the opposition party to a strongly entrenched Democratc administration, it is still aimlessly flopping around with the idea of sticking up for its twice-defeated candidate, Tom Dewey, and ruining thereby any chance for a come-back.

Such a come-back is possible—but only if the Republicans can draw up a solid national and international policy the people of the country can understand when they are called upon to vote.

The aimless state of the GOP right now reminds us of the plight the Democrats were in back at the turn of the century. They had one candidate and not much else.

His name was William Jennings Bryan. He ran for the Presidency three times. And he was defeated each time.

As a delegate to the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1896, Bryan made the famous cross-of-gold address and won himself the Presidential nomination.

He campaigned like mad, making 600 speeches in 27 States. His Republican opponent, William McKinley, won the election. Four years later, the Democrats nominated Bryan again. McKinley gave him another trouncing.

Not to be downhearted, his party put him up against William Howard Taft in 1908 and again he was defeated.

The present troubles of the Republican Party date back to 1940 when Wendell Willkie was selected to run against Franklin D. Roosevelt. Willkie made a perfect sparring partner for F. D. R., and was knocked cold in the election ring.

Willkie's idiotic performance of "me too" and "we can do it better" generated the confusion among Republicans that prevails today. Nobody has ever been able to find out what the Republicans stand for in either foreign or domestic affairs, since Willkie.

In 1944, the Republicans changed candidates but not tactics and Dewey shadowboxed with the New Deal without landing a real blow. He had the pants beaten off him.

And in the 1948 election it happened again.

Without bringing out one clear-cut issue which the voters could fasten on as a basis for decision, the Republican Party slid into another defeat and one from which it will be a long, hard time recovering.

It will get the Republicans nothing to tab Mr. Truman as a "minority" President. First of all he won and, second, in a number of States he ran behind the Democratic candidates for Congress and State offices.

Undoubtedly the record shows the Democrats, as a party, have more energy and vitality than the Republicans. The Republicans haven't come up with a new idea in many years and they have been afraid to stand up for the ones they inherited from the more vigorous leaders of bygone days.

In the June convention in Philadelphia last year, their only hope for a candidate who would make the campaign a battle was Senator TAFT. He was the only one to offer a clear-cut platform on both the domestic and foreign front. Among the leaders in his party who are now crying the loudest over their defeat are many who ran out on TAFT at that convention.

And now there are rumblings that Dewey is girding himself to run again in 1952. Our Mr. Tris Coffin reports in his column on this page today that Dewey plans to grab Senator WAGNER'S seat in the Senate and try a comeback from that vantage point. The action of Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, national committee chairman, in naming a new executive committee packed with Dewey supporters seems to bear this out.

Instead of tolerating any more such palace politics among the defeated and discredited, the Republican Party ought to go out and find from the voters what kind of a popular party policy should be drawn up. Get it clearly set and then bang away.

We aren't making any suggestions to the Republicans as to just what this program should be, for right now we don't know what the party could offer that would do any particular good. But regardless of what they come up with we hope they get to work. The two-party system is essential to the welfare and the growth of this country. And a strong opposition is a necessary safeguard today with the majority party armed to the teeth with what it takes to ride high, wide, and handsome.

Thirty-second President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Herald, Wednesday, January 19, 1949:

TRUMAN, WITH JACKSON AS MODEL, MAY YET BE LISTED AMONG "GREAT"

(By Duke Shoop)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—What will the historians of the future say about President Truman? Into what category will the Missourian be placed? Will he be included in the bracket of great Presidents, or will the one-time farm boy be listed as "near great," "average," "below average," or as a failure?

The approaching inauguration of Harry Truman as President in his own right and his succeeding years will be watched closely by the historians. Last fall 55 outstanding historians were invited by Harvard's Arthur M. Schlesinger to rate the Presidents of the United States in five categories.

Three men were omitted from consideration: William Henry Harrison, who died within a month of taking office; Garfield, shot 4 months after his inauguration, and Truman, whose record is not yet complete.

ANALYZED RESULTS

Schlesinger himself then analyzed the results of this provocative rating, which placed the Chief Executives in the following brackets:

Great: Lincoln, Washington, F. D. Roosevelt, Wilson, Jefferson, and Jackson.

Near great: T. Roosevelt, Cleveland, John Adams, and Polk.

Average: John Quincy Adams, Monroe, Hayes, Madison, Van Buren, Taft, Arthur, McKinley, Johnson, Hoover, and Benjamin Harrison.

Below average: Tyler, Coolidge, Fillmore, Taylor, Buchanan, and Pierce.

Failures: Grant and Harding.

Andrew Jackson is believed Harry Truman's patron saint and the man the Missourian would like most to emulate in his conduct of the presidency. There is no question that the appeal of President Truman to the rank and file more nearly parallels the appeal of Jackson than any other former Chief Executive.

In his inaugural address from the front steps of the stately Capitol Building Thursday President Truman will chart a course which he will attempt to follow during the next 4 years. Andy Jackson finally won the Presidency after stirring public imagination. He had helped defeat the British and was quick to capitalize on the new nationalistic spirit. Jackson dedicated himself to expanding America and opening new frontiers. Then, too, he brought popular suffrage into being.

Those who know Truman best and scan the pages of history to find a new niche for the Missourian believe his best chance for a high place in history would be for him to carry on for American territorial expansion and for a new concept of American nationalism.

BOLD STEP POSSIBLE

He already has proposed statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Thursday he might declare his wholehearted support for measures first conceived by Jackson more than a hundred years ago, and list on his legislative calendar, statehood for Hawaii and Alaska as must measures.

Harry Truman's surprising election already places the Missourian in a class by himself among Presidents in at least one fashion—the average-man, common touch he gives to his way of life. This sincere, homespun manner may be the trait that will attract historians and mark Harry Truman for the hall of fame.

Early Presidents were for the most patricians. Army officers who succeeded to the Presidency were used to rank, held themselves aloof and reserved. Teddy Roosevelt was an exception. Woodrow Wilson's appeal was that of a cold intellectual.

While Franklin D. Roosevelt, a great President in any historian's list, was the first to appeal directly to the "forgotten man," labor, and the many minority groups, no one would classify the late F. D. R. as having much in common with Andy Jackson or Harry Truman. Roosevelt was a synthetic commoner, born to the purple, educated at Groton and Harvard and in a traveling language school in Europe when Harry Truman was attending grade school in Independence.

Mr. Truman enjoys rare equipment for the camaraderie he feels for the man on the street. He came up the hard way and there are many Republicans today who now realize this rare appeal of the man from Missouri had much to do with his victory over Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. Already he has overcome obstacles his critics said couldn't be done—remain loyal to the end to the corrupt boss who gave him his political start and stand firm in the face of ridicule and leaders of his own party saying publicly he had no chance of victory.

Practical observers of the Washington scene know without suggestions from professional historians that President Truman takes office in his own right at one of the most critical times in American history.

The peace of the world for which we fought Germany and Japan is far from a reality. Half of our total Federal appropriations go for defense and to keep communism from spreading among the free nations of the world. The issues on the home front, with the voters asking more and more of a paternalistic government, are enough to keep the man in the White House busy if everything was peaceful and harmonious in the outside world.

To one who has known him and watched him since he first came to Washington 14 years ago, the remarkable thing is not how much Harry Truman has changed, but how little. The modest freshman Senator who sat in the back row of the Senate and in his good-humored way made friends with other freshmen is the same Harry Truman.

Critics of the Missourian say he is too easily swayed by friendships and this loyalty should be held in check for a cold, calculated approach to important decisions. Yet it is Truman's loyalty that has always characterized his life and may yet high light his political career.

The man who raises his hand Thursday and takes the oath of President is innately American. The man he succeeded never took his eye off what history might say about him. By being himself, Harry Truman's name may someday be alongside Andy Jackson's in the list of great Presidents.

It's Time for Serious Business at the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Ann Arbor (Mich.) News. This short editorial expresses the views of a majority of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. It reads as follows:

IT'S TIME FOR SERIOUS BUSINESS AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Now to business, in Washington.

The victory celebrations are over. The excitement and glamor of the inaugural hoopla are dying. The speech making, so far as the Chief Executive is concerned, can be dispensed with for a while.

There is a lot of work to be done.

President Truman has made numerous promises to the people, in groups and in general. He has made threats, too, though they were not intended as such. He has asked for

so many billions of dollars to be expended hither and yon, for such a variety of purposes, that he must have additional sources of revenue; so he proposes new taxes.

The groups to be benefited by the spending may be expected to approve the proposed outlays. The men and women who must dig down to provide the funds feel less cheerful about the prospect.

The people do not want more taxes. They are paying at wartime emergency rates already. Not only are they threatened with more taxation coming from Washington, but there are also plans underway for additional levies in various commonwealths, including Michigan.

It is not fun, for a great many people, to try to fill the outstretched hands of governments for more funds and at the same time to try to meet personal financial obligations including acquiring sufficient food for their families at high prices.

Surely, no government, or no President or governor, intends deliberately to force large numbers of Americans into bankruptcy by such heavy demands on their incomes.

Social legislation, including socialized medicine, is on the tentative program for congressional action in Washington. New levies on pay rolls are proposed to finance the so-called reforms.

It is serious business that the President and Congress must take up.

Regardless of Democratic control of both Houses, opposition to many details of the Truman program seems almost inevitable.

Members of the Houses may line up according to partisan affiliation on some issues, but possibly not on others. Together, the Dixiecrats and Republicans can exert tremendous power. They should not do this merely for the sake of displaying it. But all legislators owe it to the people to scrutinize carefully and debate all executive proposals extensively and earnestly before getting down to a vote. This is true especially of all social legislation and all demands for more taxes.

The citizens of the Republic have a right to expect that their interests will be safeguarded that they really get justice for themselves instead of being required to pay the shot for favors to special groups.

It's a business proposition now—without music, without flag waving, without ostentation. A lot of brains and sincerity will be needed.

Columbia Valley Authority Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I sent to President Truman Monday and a subsequent news article and editorial in the Washington Post relative to the legislative program for a Columbia Valley Authority:

JANUARY 24, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your instruction to the several interested agencies of government to submit specific legislative recommendations for a Columbia Valley Authority is indeed welcome news for the Pacific Northwest. We, who have labored long for this vital legislation, are greatly pleased that such prompt action followed your messages to the Eighty-first Congress in which you stressed the importance of extending without delay the valley authority principle for the maximum and unified development of regional resources.

You know from first hand observation that devastating floods and acute shortages of electrical power have, more than ever, impressed upon our people in the Northwest the need for a more efficient and greatly enlarged program of Columbia River development. Logic and experience both point to the CVA as the means of realizing the required program.

As indicated in our pleasant meetings, I have been reviewing the CVA bill which I sponsored previously in the Senate, and will be most happy to assist in every way possible the attainment of this great legislative objective for the Pacific Northwest.

With warmest personal regards, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

HUGH B. MITCHELL,
Member of Congress.

[From the Washington Post of January 25, 1949]

TRUMAN CALLS FOR COLUMBIA VALLEY PROJECT

President Truman yesterday announced that Government agencies have been directed to prepare legislation immediately for a Columbia Valley Authority, patterned after, but probably differing considerably from, the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The agencies concerned are the Army engineers, Interior Department, Agriculture Department, Commerce Department, Budget Bureau, Federal Power Commission, and the Council of Economic Advisers.

Although experts in all these agencies have given considerable attention to this study in recent years, White House Press Secretary Charles G. Ross predicted it might be several weeks before any legislation will be ready.

VARIED REACTION

The White House announcement was greeted in the Pacific Northwest in varied ways. Business leaders, generally opposed to a valley development program, cautiously withheld comment pending presentation of legislation. Labor leaders unanimously approved it, and a bitter fight is promised.

Kennard Jones, president of the Spokane Pacific Northwest Development Association, called a CVA socialistic and said the plan would give political appointees dictatorial powers.

Albert Leslie, secretary of the Spokane Central Labor Council, said: "You can expect to hear cries of socialism from the people who will be against a CVA. You always hear such cries when anything for the people is proposed."

Oregon's Republican Governor, Douglas McKay, asked: "What's the matter with the way we're doing it now? We don't need to delegate authority to a board or a commission to regulate the economy of the Northwest."

J. D. McDonald, of the Oregon State Federation of Labor, expressed pleasure with Mr. Truman's action, as did Stanley Earl, of the CIO. The Oregon State Grange, which urged such action only 2 days ago, echoed the labor-union's praise.

The Interior Department prepared a voluminous report on the Columbia River Basin about a year ago. Copies were sent to Agriculture and Commerce for comment. Recently the Army engineers prepared another long report, known as the 308 report, which reached the other offices a short time ago.

The agencies addressed by President Truman on the subject make up an interagency group known as the National Resources Development Committee, which has been carrying on a continuing study of valley resources development for several years. Another regional group, the Columbia Basin Development, has been making a study restricted to the Columbia Basin in the Northwest.

DIVISION OF WORK

The division of work on the program will be:

Interior Department: Reclamation, power, administration.

Army: Engineering plans, flood control, navigation, and power.

Agriculture Department: Agriculture, forestry, soil conservation, etc.

Another agency called in for advice and aid in matters concerning water pollution is the Public Health Service.

When the agencies have prepared the bill, Mr. Truman will send it to the Capitol backed by a special message, White House officials said.

One of the problems that must be settled by the planners is the extent of the area of the authority. Some plans have limited the basin to the political boundaries of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and a part of Wyoming. Other plans have taken in all the natural basin, which would add a small part of Nevada, Utah, and Montana. The source of the Columbia is in Canada.

The Authority may include several basins in the Northwest. Among these are the Puget Sound Basin, the Snake and the Klamath Rivers, as well as many smaller streams.

Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL (Democrat, Washington) would add a twist to the CVA not included in the TVA. That would provide for an advisory council, appointed by the governors of the States involved in the Authority, which would make periodic reports on the progress.

In his letter to the agencies, Mr. Truman said, "it is most important that concrete legislative proposals for such an Authority in the Columbia Basin be developed on a sound basis, taking into account characteristics and needs of the region, the interests of all parts of the executive branch, and the lessons of our prior experience with the kinds of operations which will be involved."

LONG-TIME ADVOCATE

Mr. Truman long has been an advocate of authority development for great river basins. He reaffirmed that stand in his opening message to the new Congress. He long ago endorsed a Missouri Valley Authority, which has encountered opposition from all 10 States in the region.

After a recent White House visit, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY (Democrat, Montana) reported Mr. Truman is still strong for an MVA. MURRAY is the chief proponent of the huge Missouri River project in Congress.

President Truman named Charles F. Murphy, administrative assistant, as coordinator of the work of the various agencies. Interior Secretary Krug appointed Assistant Secretary C. Girard Davidson, former counsel for the Bonneville Power Administration, to work with Murphy. The Bonneville project would be a part of any CVA. Davidson also formerly was an attorney for TVA.

[From the Washington Post of January 27, 1949]

COLUMBIA VALLEY

President Truman feels that the election gave him a green light to go ahead with the development of the Columbia River Valley on a broad regional basis. Aside from the diehard opponents of public power in the Pacific Northwest, there seems to be considerable agreement on the general objective of regional development. There is a great deal of dispute, however, over techniques. Any Federal program must contrive to reconcile two fundamentally conflicting factors; the pronounced distrust of Federal control, and the compelling need for some sort of top-level integration to eliminate duplications among the various agencies participating in the project.

It is fortunate, respecting the first point, that the President has avoided calling for a

mere repetition of the Tennessee Valley Authority. TVA is a unique achievement which, despite certain defects in such matters as soil conservation, has contributed materially to the welfare of the people. There is a wealth of experience in TVA to guide similar developments elsewhere. But to advocate a Columbia project in the TVA image, as some planners have done, would be to say that all regions of the United States are the same, which is a patent absurdity.

Nowhere, are individual and regional traits more pronounced than in the Pacific Northwest. This stems in part from the pioneering tradition of self-reliance. In some ways the ingrained fears of Government domination are irrational; for example, there seems to be little hesitation in the Northwest over accepting the benefits of federally directed reclamation and flood control. At the same time there is no denying that to allow these fears to predominate would be to thwart any effective unified plan to make use of all the valley's resources.

Lack of coordination is reflected in the disparate and often wasteful efforts of the Federal agencies now in the field—the Army Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bonneville Power Administration. There is a very real danger that any program that does not include integration of these projects will result in a mere superficial alliance such as the boondoggle now going on in the Missouri Valley under the Pick-Sloan plan.

The same may be said for the various efforts now under way within the region itself. These contemplate local direction of the development through compact between the four principal States involved—Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Local direction has a great deal to commend it, but the question is whether any such program could be sufficiently insulated from political pressure groups to assure the extension of the project to all sections of the Columbia Valley. Moreover, Federal funds would still be required. It seems to us highly debatable whether the Federal Government should enter any such operation in which it did not have control over the objectives and efficiency of the operation on which money was to be spent.

What is necessary, in our opinion, is a reasonable compromise between the two extremes, retaining the principle of Federal responsibility for integration of the broad plan, but recognizing the importance of local representation and decentralized authority. Such a compromise could well make use of the device suggested by Representative HUGH MITCHELL of an advisory council to be appointed by State governors, as well as other means of bringing in the maximum of participation by residents of the valley. No sensible program can be evolved by yielding to the hyperthyroid cries of "socialism" that have already started. Neither can it come about through mere desk planning in Washington. This neglects the essential fact that for any project to succeed it must be solidly grounded in support of the people it encompasses.

Democracy at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the Jersey Journal on Monday, January 10, 1949.

This editorial, entitled "Boys' Town in Italy Shows Democracy at Work," is a clear indication of the spirit of democracy which moves Italy. Despite the many handicaps and despite the adversities, the people of Italy are democratic to the core. Its people have successfully resisted and beaten back the craftiest and most lavishly financed Communist assaults.

Italy has shown its willingness and its great desire to discharge its responsibility to the democratic nations of the world.

The following article speaks for itself:

BOYS' TOWN IN ITALY SHOWS DEMOCRACY AT WORK

Among criticisms which have been voiced of American relief efforts in Europe, one has been an apparent failure to sell democracy and democratic methods to people who have been left cynical and mistrustful, as well as homeless and hungry, by the ravages of war.

One of the encouraging signs of success comes from Italy, which, significantly, handed the Communists a sound trouncing in their bid for control of the government last year.

That success has been achieved in the establishment of Boys' Town (modeled largely after the famous Nebraska community founded by the late Monsignor Edward Flanagan), which is helping to provide for the thousands of street urchins left to make their own way, all too often by criminal endeavors, when the war deprived them of parents and homes.

Seven such Boys' Towns already have been built with American aid, and moves are under way to set up still others. The projects are sponsored by American Relief for Italy, which not only sets up the communities, but supplies them with food, clothing, medicine, and maintenance funds.

These towns take the boys off the streets, teach them to run their own communities in democratic fashion, and provide trade training which will enable them to carry out their part in the reconstruction of their country.

Conceived by Father Don Rivolta, a Milanese priest, the first such community was founded in 1944 at Santa Marinella, north of Rome, and has grown into five towns, combined into a republic. It is to serve as a model for others, with the ultimate goal of ARI a town in each of the 96 provinces in Italy.

A movement now is under way in various parts of the United States to raise funds for the establishment of such boys' towns. It costs about $150,000 to establish one. This sum, contributed here, is matched by the Italians through contributions of land, labor, and materials.

Such campaigns are to begin shortly in Philadelphia and in Vineland, N. J., in addition to a national campaign for $1,000,000 by the American food industry. Later a drive will be launched in Chicago to provide for a Chicago Boys' Town.

Whatever the results elsewhere, it would seem that American money is going toward an eminently worth-while cause in serving the orphaned children of Italy. Judge Juvenal Marchisio, of New York, director of ARI, sums up the significance of the youth communities thus:

"These towns, bearing American names, will be permanent memorials to our ideals and our way of life. The boys who grow up in them will always remember that America is a friend of Italy."

This country could find no better way of selling democracy where it will really count.

A Ship Without a Compass or a Rudder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress, who have been called reactionaries by some self-styled liberals, for the past 10 years have been endeavoring to get the Republican Party to adopt and aggressively follow a policy designed to promote the welfare of the Nation—protect the citizen's liberty.

We have gotten nowhere because the "me-tooers," who could only hear the acclaims of their political enemies and the pleas of representatives of foreign governments, seem to feel someone anointed them to sit on the lid whenever an aggressive move looking toward the retention of the people's freedom and the security of the Republic, but with which they did not agree, was made.

Some of us have been trying over the years to say what the editor of the Omaha World Herald, last night quoted by Fulton Lewis, Jr., so effectively wrote. Here it is:

God hates a coward.

That's gospel truth. If any witness were needed to attest it the Republican Party of 1936–48 would more than suffice.

For 12 years the Republican Party has been a coward: The worst kind of coward—a moral coward. In consequence it begins to take on the appearance of something the cat dragged in.

It is hard to define as an entity the Republican Party or any other large group of people, since however closely banded together, all cannot think alike in all respects. But, speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the insurance state, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly disguised, and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the flesh pots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty to stand up for the free republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Due to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional glorious creed. And it finds the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling.

The fact is known of all men.

Here, too, in our own America, the state is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting freemen into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a great white father—a father corrupted and corrupting, since

great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction, but out of cowardice.

It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and to make it known. Its plea for votes has been the shameful one; give us the offices, the power, and we'll give you as much of what we believe to be wrong as will the Democrats themselves.

Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls and trails its flag.

What a wonderful thing it would be if the Republican National Committee meeting here in Omaha, if other constituted Republican leaders, could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party—how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it. A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition. Opposition not alone to a misguided and recreant Democratic Party here at home, but opposition tenacious and resolute, brave and unyielding, to all the monstrous wrong and error that today menaces freedom, self-reliance, the courage to adventure, human dignity, in every land and every clime.

How joyously, with what reborn hope, men and women of the ancient faith of this Republic would rally about such a standard. Proud of it they would be in victory, no less proud in defeat.

Surely, surely, it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day, that when the black flag of absolutism was raised back in the twentieth century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion, the wisdom, the loyalty to God who made men free, to challenge that foul intruder and to dedicate their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor, to driving him back into the Dark Ages whence he emerged.

Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today in the ears of the Republican Party. Never, for men and women of courage, of character, of conviction, has there been afforded such an occasion for rising to the heights of human devotion to imperishable ideals.

The Republican Party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging, or it can rise out of the dust of four merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that free men prize.

Courage or cowardice? Loyalty or recreancy? Conviction or time serving? It is as simple as that, ladies and gentlemen of the Republican National Committee.

An Immigration Quota for the State of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a free election was held in the newborn state of Israel. France has this week indicated her intention to recognize the existing government. Great Britain gives evidence of some modification of her hitherto intransigent attitude.

It is to be hoped that de jure recognition by our own country will shortly follow, now that the new state has clearly demonstrated her capabilities of self-government.

As a step along the path of world-wide recognition of the dignity and significance of this courageously founded nation, our Government should establish an immigration quota for the state of Israel.

There is now a token quota for the British mandate of Palestine with Transjordan, established by Presidential proclamation in 1938. Now that the mandate has been abandoned, this designation of the area becomes meaningless.

Today I have introduced a bill to provide that this quota shall be made available to natives of the State of Israel and that it shall be known as the quota for Israel.

It may be said that there is no need for such a quota, since the flow of population is entirely in the other direction. Naturally, indeed, that movement will now be accelerated, in view of the most recent demonstration of democratic inclinations on the part of the new nation. Nevertheless, even though there is not a single application for a visa under the terms of this measure, its passage will furnish concrete and continuing evidence that our country is accepting this brave young democracy as a full partner in the family of nations.

This legislation in no way increases the actual number of immigrants to this country, but simply alters existing law in the interests of realism and the betterment of international relations with a sister state whose beginnings are closely akin to the struggle of our forefathers to establish our own great Nation.

The Crisis in the Production of Strategic and Critical Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, last year I supported the Russell bill designed to stimulate production and exploration of critical and strategic metals and minerals. Due to the then opposition of the Interior Department and the veto by the President the year before of a measure for the same purpose, that bill did not reach the floor of the House and was not voted on.

This year I have introduced a new bill similar to the Russell bill to provide substantially the same thing. A considerable amount of work was done on the redrafting of this bill which has resulted in marked improvement. The principal new features are that payments must be based upon efficiency, and that the provisions for covering exploration payments are written in some detail, including special features for small mines.

In the President's budget message he requested an appropriation to provide for exploration subsidies. I am now reliably informed that the President is favorably disposed to production subsidies and considers that his budget message leaves open to Congress the desirability of providing production subsidies on critical and strategic materials. Within the past week there has been much talk in official circles regarding the Russian refusal to ship any more manganese to the United States. Such an embargo on manganese shipments will seriously cripple our steel industry as approximately 45 percent of our present manganese requirements recently has been coming from Russia. Every ton of steel requires approximately 12 pounds of manganese, and there is no other source immediately available. Steel production would have to be cut back as manganese proportionately is lacking and domestic production of this material must be expanded.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this measure is most important for two reasons. First, for national defense. With the improvement in submarine warfare which has been given so much publicity recently, we cannot afford to rely upon water-borne materials in our essential needs. Secondly, in our broad view of economic and foreign policy, we cannot afford to rely too heavily upon foreign sources for materials absolutely necessary to keep our industrial machine functioning. Our basic wealth, meaning our factories and our productive capacity, has rested upon the development of domestic national resources. If we cease to keep our industrial machine in smooth operation—which, in turn, means avoiding a depression—we must have available a satisfactory, unceasing flow of raw minerals and metals. If we cease to obtain these materials domestically, then we shall become a processing nation as distinguished from a producing nation. We shall become another England compelled to be the policeman of the world, to enter into every armed conflict to force, if necessary, other countries to furnish us raw materials and force their purchasing our fabricated goods. Such a course will compel us to have the biggest armed forces in the world and inevitably lead to a quicker clash with Russia.

I therefore think it is vital to the future of America that we do everything to find new domestic sources of strategic and critical metals and minerals so that we may be independent and may continue our present American way. The best way to find new mines is to foster an active, healthy mining industry. By putting a large number of small mines into operation, it is inevitable that some should yield new rich ore bodies, and in such discovery lies our future prosperity and peace.

Interest in Statehood for Hawaii Widespread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorials.

The Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald on January 12 said:

HAWAII'S STATEHOOD AMBITIONS

As the new Congress begins work the Hawaiians are making a strong bid for statehood, and it may prove successful. They are in a race with the Alaskans for the honor of having the forty-ninth star in the flag.

* * * * *

President Truman has long been in favor of bringing in Hawaii and the current Democratic platform has a statehood plank in it. More than a score of national and more than 60 local organizations have endorsed statehood for the Territory. In view of this, the present Congress would be justified in acting favorably, but some Members have not visited Hawaii and they may wish to postpone action until they can be sent there at Government expense to look it over.

The Territory will not become a full-fledged State overnight if Congress acts. It will have to draw up and adopt a constitution and elect State officials. More than a year can be expended in this process.

The McKeesport (Pa.) News on January 10 said:

THE FORTY-NINTH STATE?

Two fears so far have kept Hawaii from the realization of its great ambition to become the forty-ninth State in the American Union.

The first was its large number of Japanese residents who, despite all professions of loyalty, were considered dangerous in the years when we saw the possibilities of a Pacific war.

Now the fear is of the Communists, who have infiltrated Hawaiian trade unions and come, at times, to play a heavy hand in the affairs of the islands since VJ-day.

Despite the Reds, the request of Hawaii for statehood appears high on the agenda of the Eighty-first Congress with chances good for its fulfillment because the Congressmen are being advised that Hawaii has met and bested its communistic problem.

It has done so with the same technique by which the House Committee on un-American Activities sought to break the back of the Red movement here—the technique of exposure. The Hawaiian Government, by public hearings, has made clear to its people the nature of the Red plot, its machinations and its purposes.

Because the geographical limits of Hawaii make possible a pin-pointing of public attention, there are few, if any, literate people in the islands who do not understand the menace, perhaps better than we do generally. So, on the principle that an enlightened public is the first requisite for statehood, Hawaii qualifies in this age of crisis and should be admitted, graciously.

The East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on January 3 said:

HAWAII STILL WAITING

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii are issues certain to come before the Eighty-first Congress. Hawaii was almost admitted in the Eightieth Congress only to be halted for another congressional inquiry as to fitness. This sixth investigation was carried out with hearings in Honolulu by Senator HUGH BUTLER.

It would seem that after six investigations there would be little left to determine whether Hawaii should be one of the United States. Yet there is the fact that Senator BUTLER (Republican, Nebraska) conducted the last hearing as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the November election removes him from that position in a Senate controlled by Democrats. The Democrats may want to make an investigating trip to Hawaii.

The Senate committee voted 7 to 5 to delay consideration of the statehood bill after the House had passed it. The reported reason for the committee decision for delay was a threat of a Communist movement in the islands.

What Senator BUTLER will report to the committee has not been announced. In Honolulu he heard witnesses pro and con on the situation. It will be up to the committee to decide Hawaii's immediate future. There apparently is no racial issue to delay statehood. If Senator BUTLER did not find evidence that communism is in control, and apparently he did not, there should be little delay in making Hawaii the forty-ninth State.

The Messenger of Fort Dodge, Iowa, on January 12 said:

HAWAII'S FIGHT FOR STATEHOOD

Hawaii will determinedly renew its efforts for statehood in the new Congress and with great hopes for success.

The Territory's optimism stems from the following developments:

1. The Democratic Party, now in control of both houses of Congress, carried a plank in its national platform calling for "immediate statehood" for the territory.

2. President Truman has twice recommended its immediate admittance in messages to Congress and has frequently reiterated his support of Hawaii's statehood efforts.

3. Recommendation that Hawaii be granted statehood and active support of the cause by the Department of the Interior which has jurisdiction over territories.

4. Strong public support of Hawaii's statehood bill by the Nation's press, national organizations, veterans' groups, educational bodies and State governors.

5. Progress of Hawaii statehood legislation during the last Congress. The House overwhelmingly passed the bill and sent it to the Senate. There a subcommittee of the Senate Committee of the Interior and Insular Affairs after an investigation in Hawaii recommended immediate favorable action by the Senate. However, the full committee by a 7–5 vote, deferred action until more of its Members could make a trip or trips to Hawaii. The legislation expired with the last Congress.

Along with this fight in Congress, Hawaii is planning a 1949 battle for statehood on another front, which might prove more effective than present legislative action in Washington.

Plans are under way in Honolulu to have the Territorial legislature call a constitutional convention sometime this year regardless of what happens to the Hawaii statehood bill in Congress.

Under the plan the Territory would elect delegates to the convention and draw up a state constitution. The constitution would then be presented to Congress for ratification and if ratified Hawaii would enter the Union as a State.

The procedure would eliminate expensive and time-taking congressional investigations which have been held in the Territory year after year. The history of Hawaii's statehood fight shows that congressional committee after committee has visited the Territory and reported Hawaii ready for statehood. None has ever recommended against it.

Because the political complexion of Congress changes, and new Members named to committees to study the legislation have deemed trips to the islands necessary for further study, Hawaii has experienced delay after delay in its quest.

The University of Hawaii's legislative reference bureau reports that there is plenty of precedent for the new approach.

Their studies show that 14 of the 48 States drafted constitutions before any statehood enabling act passed Congress.

The States so listed are Arkansas, California, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, Texas, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

They also point out that California, a republic for a short time, petitioned Congress to be organized as a Territory and when Congress adjourned without taking action, California went ahead and adopted a State constitution and elected representatives to Congress.

When Congress met again it ratified the action and admitted California to statehood.

Socialized Medicine's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a recent editorial from the Everett (Mass.) Evening News-Gazette:

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE'S RECORD

Dr. A. Lexington Jones, of Christ Church, New Zealand, recently spoke at length on the experience with government medicine in that country. In the course of it, he posed and answered three practical questions which provide a test of the kind of service socialized medicine provides.

First, are the people getting their money's worth? His answer was an emphatic "No"—largely for the reason a cumbersome and costly bureaucracy administers the plan.

Second, has the system improved medical service? Again the answer is "No." Too many people are consulting doctors unnecessarily, on the grounds that they must pay a tax for medical attention and so may as well get it whether they need or not. As a result, overworked doctors simply don't have the time to give each patient the consideration he should have.

Third, has the system reduced the incidence of disease? Once more the answer is "No." Little of the money collected by the Government for the medical scheme is used for reseach work. And individual physicians have little time or incentive for reading, investigation, and advanced study.

There are many other arguments against Government domination of medicine. These are simply three of the most important from the people's point of view. Wherever tried, it has resulted in a deterioration of standards—and a sharp upsurge in Government costs. Exactly the same thing would happen if we were so foolish as to adopt compulsory Government health insurance here.

Six Fatal Blunders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Six Fatal Blunders," published in Human Events of the issue of January 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX FATAL BLUNDERS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The First World War produced a peace settlement, although one that was full of seeds of future wars. World War II has produced no settlement at all. The appointment of Dean Acheson, as the third Secretary of State to hold that office since the last war, makes it appropriate to examine the net accomplishment of our bipartisan foreign policy.

A person who had gone into a Rip Van Winkle sleep on January 19, 1939, waking up today, would have a curious feeling of: "This is where I came in." He would again sense a mood of nervous waiting for the next move of an aggressive dictatorship. Only the location of the dictatorship, not the nature of the moves, would have changed.

The expansionist initiative that formerly belonged to Berlin and Tokyo is now concentrated in Moscow. The constant threat to world peace and stability is at least as serious. Admittedly, the Soviet Union is less efficient technically than Germany was. The many peoples who live under Soviet rule are less united in devotion to their system than were the Japanese. There was no equivalent either in Germany or in Japan for the mass surrenders of millions of troops which took place at the very beginning of the war in Russia, nor for the voluntary enlistment of hundreds of thousands of bitterly discontented Soviet subjects in the German armed forces.

On the other hand, Stalin possesses the advantages of a vast territorial base, the Heartland of which the British geo-politician Mackinder wrote. Stalin also commands a huge population and a much larger international fifth column than Hitler, Mussolini, or the Japanese militarists ever controlled. Winston Churchill, who bears no small share of the responsibility for "bringing Asia to the Elbe," to use his own vivid phrase, recently admitted that the policy of appeasing Stalin had failed even before the end of the war. To quote Mr. Churchill:

"The gulf which was opening between Asiatic Communist Russia and the western democracies, large and small, was already brutally obvious to the victorious war cabinet of the national coalition even before Hitler was destroyed and the Germans laid down their arms."

Churchill suggests that the United States and Britain should not have dispersed their armies so quickly, that British troops should have entered Berlin and American troops should have occupied Prague. But the blunders that lost the peace go farther back than these missed opportunities. One can recognize six conspicuous errors which in the aggregate produced a condition that is neither war nor peace.

II

These blunders, listed chronologically, were as follows:

(1) The guaranty of "all support in their power" which the British Government gave to Poland "in the event of any action which clearly threatened Polish independence." This guaranty proved impossible to implement. It was of no practical aid to the Poles in their unequal struggle against the German invasion. It was not even regarded as applicable against Russia in the case of the Soviet invasion of Poland which was launched in full understanding and complicity with Hitler.

What the guaranty accomplished was to put Britain and France into war with Germany on an issue in which the Western Powers could not win. Even after the United States and the Soviet Union entered the war and Hitler was crushed, Poland was not liberated, but was subjected to totalitarian tyranny directed from Moscow. There is no proof and little probability that Hitler would have attacked the west if he had not been challenged on the Polish issue. The course of history would have been different, and much less favorable to communism, if the first shock of Hitler's attack had fallen not on the west but on the Soviet Union; if the Western Powers, not the Soviet Union, had played the role of spectators during the first two years of the war.

How far American pressure was responsible for the British guaranty to Poland is hard to determine. There is fragmentary but interesting information in a German white paper, based on material captured in Warsaw, indicating that American diplomacy was playing an active role behind the scenes, urging the British and French to assume a burden that was beyond their strength.

(2) The second major blunder was the unconditional surrender slogan tossed off by Roosevelt in a moment of casual improvisation at Casablanca, in January 1942. This slogan was a godsend to Goebbels and was used over and over again in Nazi propaganda. As we know from the diary of Capt. Harry C. Butcher, General Eisenhower's naval aide, Eisenhower and his military associates felt that this blankly negative slogan increased the human losses and intensified their difficulties.

"Unconditional surrender" was a tremendous damper on the German underground groups which were working against Hitler. As Allen W. Dulles comments in his book, The German Underground:

"It sometimes seemed that those who determined policy in America and England were making the military task as difficult as possible by uniting all Germans to resist to the bitter end."

III

(3) We find the third blunder in the policy of getting along with Stalin on a basis of all-out appeasement, giving everything that was asked and asking nothing in return, not even an honest implementation of the Atlantic Charter, to the terms of which Stalin was a cosignatory, in regard to Poland and the Baltic States. This appeasement was a continuous, undeviating process, from the time when Hopkins first went to Moscow in the summer of 1941 until the same Presidential emissary made his last trip to the Soviet capital in June 1945, and meekly swallowed the final insult: the treacherous arrest of 15 Polish underground leaders.

As a result of this appeasement, which reached its high point at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, our professed war aims, the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, became a laughingstock. One wartime ally, Poland, was reduced to the status of an outlying Soviet province. Chinese vital interests in Manchuria were sacrificed, without any consultation with China. The result there is now apparent to everyone, as the Soviet moves to take over all that Japan lost.

We were the givers, the Russians the recipients of lend-lease aid. Yet the following candid excerpts from a report by Gen. John R. Deane, head of the American military mission to Moscow, to General Marshall, might almost suggest that the reverse was the case:

"After the banquets we send the Soviets another 1,000 airplanes, and they approve a visa that has been hanging fire for months. We then scratch our heads to see what other gifts we can send, and they scratch theirs to see what else they can ask for. * * * In short we are in the position of being at the same time the givers and the supplicants. This is neither dignified nor healthy for United States prestige."

(4) The fourth egregious blunder was adoption by the United States and British Governments of the incredible Morgenthau plan for the economic destruction of Germany. This was officially announced at the second Quebec Conference in September 1944, where a communiqué was issued calling for the destruction of industries in the Ruhr and the Saar and the conversion of Germany, one of the most densely populated areas in Europe into "a country primarily agricultural and pastoral in character."

While the full insanity of the Morgenthau plan (which called for the destruction of all mines in Germany) was never put into effect, enough of its vindictive spirit got into the Potsdam Agreement and the general functioning of American Military Government to work incalculable harm to American national interests and to European recovery. A belated effort to redeem something from this disaster is now under way.

IV

(5) The curious miscalculation of the situation in the Far East was the fifth major blunder. In 1945 this found expression in overestimation of Japan's continued power of resistance and underestimation of the political undesirability of Soviet entrance into Manchuria and Korea. Captain E. M. Zacharias, naval language expert on Japan, who made effective broadcasts to that country in the last months of the war, expresses this opinion in his book Secret Missions:

"If the detailed interpretations of the unconditional surrender formula had been forthcoming in June rather than the end of July, the war would have ended without Soviet participation and before the dropping of the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki."

(6) Last, but perhaps not least, was the hasty improvisation, amid much exaggerated ballyhoo, of the United Nations, without giving that organization either effective power to mediate and adjudicate in disputes between the major powers, or a definite peace settlement to sustain. The result has been much like what would be expected if an architect should create an elaborate second story of a building, complete with balconies, while neglecting to construct a firm foundation.

These, I think, are proved blunders which no subsequent historical revelations and discoveries can explain away. No doubt there will be such revelations and discoveries, which may lead to a shifting judgment about some individual responsibilities. And it is easy to think of subsidiary causes which help to account for a political and diplomatic defeat of unexampled proportions, in spite of complete military victory.

President Roosevelt's mental and physical debility in the last year of his life was a far

more serious handicap than is as yet generally realized. A strong, independent Secretary of State might have remedied this weakness. But in the last months of 1944 and the first months of 1945 the occupants of this office were the invalid Hull and the amateur Stettinius.

News and radio commentators during the war also bear a heavy responsibility for feeding the American people misleading information. The full story of Communist infiltration into policy-making and opinion-forming agencies of the Government has not yet been told. But the roots of our "defeat in victory", to use the apt phrase of Polish Ambassador Ciechanowski, are to be found in the blunders summarized above.

Correspondence Relating to the Special Small Business Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some correspondence which has recently passed between Mr. George J. Burger, director in charge, Washington Office, National Federation of Small Business, Inc., and the junior Senator from Washington. Each member of the Banking and Currency Committee received a similar telegram from Mr. Burger. In his telegram Mr. Burger challenges, unintentionally I think, the sincerity and good faith of the action which the Banking and Currency Committee recently took in creating a Small Business Subcommittee. For the reason that the Senate Special Small Business Committee is scheduled to expire on January 31, 1949, and because I believe that my response to Mr. Burger reasonably represents the views of Chairman MAYBANK and other members of the Banking Committee, the telegram and letter in question may be of substantial interest to other Senators and to those concerned with the affairs and problems of small business throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 18, 1949.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building:

The action of your committee, Banking and Currency, in voting "No" to continuing the Senate Small Business Committee in the Eighty-first Congress reaches us with considerable alarm. In fact, it is very serious. We have personally appeared before both Democratic and Republican platform committees at their annual conventions recommending two major actions to protect small business at the local level:

1. Vigorous antitrust law enforcement.
2. Continuance of small business committees.

The Senate Small Business Committee exclusively handling the problems of small business has done a commendable job for the past 8 years. We believe it is as important for the problems of small business to be handled through it's own committee as well as the problems of agriculture, finance, education, and labor, etc., are handled in their own committees. The interest of the Federation is exclusively devoted to the basic problems of small business. How are we going to explain your committee's action to our 100,000 or more membership throughout the Nation in our official publication The Mandate, which goes to press within a few days? Please, it is urgent, that we receive a message from you as to your vote so that we may correctly inform our Nation-wide membership. We are holding release of The Mandate awaiting your answer.

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Director in Charge, Washington Office, National Federation of Small Business, Inc.

JANUARY 19, 1949

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Director in Charge, Washington Office, National Federation of Small Business, Inc., Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BERGER: Your telegram of yesterday is entitled to a full and prompt response and I am anxious to give it both. I told you this during our telephone conversation of yesterday afternoon.

What puzzled me about your telegram was its evidence that in your official capacity you are seemingly unaware of what you ought to be rather familiar with. I say this in friendly fashion and in hope that I shall be given an opportunity to know more of you and the fine organization which you represent.

Let me discuss and answer your telegram in some detail.

You ought to have known that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee didn't vote "No" to continuing the Special Senate Small Business Committee in the Eighty-first Congress. What the committee did, and its action was given wide publicity in the press, was to vote unanimously to create a small business subcommittee within the standing committee. This subcommittee is to consist of nine members, five Democrats and four Republicans. Because of the recognized importance of the small business subcommittee it will have as its chairman the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. MAYBANK of South Carolina.

Over the telephone you told me that you had been following small business considerations within the Congress for years. This can only mean to me that you are a close student of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that you attend most public hearings on small business committees, and that you are in rather constant attendance during the small business debates which take place on the floors of both Houses. If these assumptions are correct it means that you ought to understand every reason which encouraged and even required the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to take its recent action.

You know full well that the Reorganization Act intended to make the continuance of special committees both unnecessary and undesirable. You must remember that when the Special Senate Small Business Committee was authorized by the Eightieth Congress the understanding on both sides of the aisle was that the work of the committee would be assumed at the earliest practicable date by the Banking and Currency Committee and that the expiration date of the special committee was to be January 31, 1949. During the debates on the subject in both Sessions of the Eightieth Congress these understandings were made clear and agreed to by almost every Senator.

By way of concrete compliment to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee it has undertaken to anticipate an important requirement. There is no intelligent reason to assume that the Senate will authorize the Special Small Business Committee to continue beyond its coming expiration date. There is every logical reason to assume that it won't be continued. In recognition of this perfectly reasonable assumption the Banking and Currency Committee has signified its willingness and desire to undertake a large and imperatively important responsibility. The committee has not only created a subcommittee but it has introduced a Senate resolution which applies for funds adequate to the intended work. It has further made clear in the resolution that it is prepared to accept, on January 31, the files of the Special Small Business Committee.

I have been a member of the Special Committee on Small Business for 2 years. In my opinion that committee has been of considerable and material assistance to the needs of small business. Against this background of approval and support for what the special committee has accomplished I am firmly of the considered opinion that the needs of small business will receive an even greater consideration from the recently created Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. This latter committee can take legislative action on those recommendations which are to be made by the subcommittee. The outstanding weakness of the Special Small Business Committee was that it had, as you well know, no legislative authority of any character. It seems to me that small-business men everywhere ought to be encouraged by that action which has recently been taken by the Banking and Currency Committee. It ought to suggest to them that the Senate is determined to give continuing and permanent consideration to the problems of small business throughout our Nation.

I hope the substance of my reply has cleared away your uncertainty and that it, together with assurances you will surely receive from other committee members, will be made available to your membership.

Perhaps an attempt will be made to continue the Special Senate Small Business Committee. Should the Senate decide to continue the special committee there will be no need for a standing committee's subcommittee on small business. If the special committee is not continued the Banking and Currency Committee will be prepared to render good service.

This has been a frank letter and it has constructively criticized your lack of understanding concerning the action which has recently been approved by the banking committee. I hope to work closely in the future with you and your associates but I shall continue to insist that you understand what we mean to undertake and do. When you have questions in the future I would encourage you to visit with me personally or to call me by phone. This relationship will make it unnecessary for you to send me telegrams which are obviously subject to various interpretations.

With kind personal regards, I beg to remain
Very sincerely yours,

HARRY P. CAIN

Britain's Social Experiment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, with consent of the House, under the privilege of extending my remarks, I insert an edi-

torial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, issue of January 24, 1949:

BRITAIN'S SOCIAL EXPERIMENT

A recent Associated Press dispatch from London said "Britain's national health service—the world's largest experiment in socialized medicine—is undergoing a strain." That strain, in the view of Health Minister Bevin, results from the fact that "too many are demanding too much." In other words, people are working on the theory that they may as well visit the doctor whether they are sick or not, because free medical service is coming to them. This situation has reached so extreme a point that Mr. Bevin issued a public statement in which he said: "Don't let us become a nation of hypochondriacs. I ask the public to use their doctors wisely and only when they really need them."

It is also evident that the cost of providing free health service for all is approaching a critical point. The Government's original forecast was that the bill would run to £150,000,000 a year. But the actual cost will exceed £200,000,000.

The most important thing, of course, is just what Britain's socialistic experiment is doing to the standards of medical care. Lord Horder, physician ordinary to the royal family, has this to say: "Medicine in Britain has become a branch of the civil service. We are no longer medical experts; we sit and sign forms. We have no time to diagnose our patients' diseases; but pass them on to other persons and institutions, knowing full well that they cannot dispense the health benefits which may or may not be needed." The socialized medicine seems to have resulted in overworked doctors, soaring costs, poorer treatment, with bureaucracy rampant. We had better take stock before we go all out like Britain has done.

Message of Pius XII to Spanish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch by Arnaldo Cortesi, published in the New York Times on December 13, 1948. The dispatch has reference to a message addressed to the Spanish people by His Holiness, Pope Pius XII.

In drawing the attention of my colleagues and of my fellow countrymen to this splendid statement of His Holiness, Pius XII, I wish to emphasize that the Pope's view coincides exactly with the principles and the facts and the judgments that have been upheld throughout the world by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs. During the past 12 years, when few voices were raised on behalf of the peoples of the Iberian Peninsula, Dr. Thorning, with intelligence and valor, has presented the truth about the victory which Spain and her Government scored over the Soviet Union. Fortunately, his efforts and his patriotic services in the other American Republics are bearing fruit. An exchange of Ambassadors between Washington and Madrid is a measure essential to our own security.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, sent his affectionate blessing to Generalissimo Francisco Franco and to the Spanish Government at the same time that he sent it to the Spanish people today upon receiving the new Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See, Joaquin Ruiz Jimenez Cortes.

His Holiness expressed the hope that the world might concede to the Spanish people "that esteem which the many services rendered to the cause of religion and civilization give them the right to expect."

Amid the many troubles that disturb him, said the Pope, one of his greatest consolations is to know that he is at all times supported and assisted by the love and prayers of his beloved sons throughout the world, among whom are the Spanish people.

"How could we, therefore," he added, "withhold our affectionate blessing from them and from the head of the Spanish state and his Government? May the God of mercy and truth always protect the Spanish Nation—a land fecund of saints—so that above all dangers and thanks to the heroic zeal of its worthiest sons, it may always remain faithful to its noble Christian vocation."

Speaking of the world situation, His Holiness said:

"There is no lack today of upright spirits who, with sincerity, seek light for themselves, fraternity for those who live side by side within the same frontier, and understanding and peace in relations between nations.

"But it has happened more than once that their efforts have lost themselves between the mirages of apparent truths behind the preconceived dogmatisms of false conceptions or in an intricate maze of desires of the exigencies of the moment. Sometimes they seemed to consider only their own advantage or to be content to reach temporary compromises.

"It looks as though the great ethical rules, the eternal principles, do not exist for them and that their efforts, therefore, are doomed to sterility."

Compensation of American Prisoners of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner of December 1, 1948, entitled "An Unjust Delay."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNJUST DELAY

There has been an inexcusable and utterly cruel delay in the fulfillment of the intention of the last Congress for the payment of compensation to American citizens who were prisoners of enemy nations during the last war.

Although Congress passed a measure acknowledging such compensation to be an obligation upon the country, and President Truman signed the bill, nothing has been done to carry out the laudable purpose.

The explanation is to be found in the bitter conflict of political interests that prevailed between Congress and the President during last session.

While the Congress authorized the appointment of a war claims commission by the President and proposed that funds for its activities be provided by existing Federal agencies, Mr. Truman insisted that the failure to provide a specific appropriation for the commission nullified the measure.

So he refused to appoint the commission, and the Congress adjourned without meeting his conditions.

In the meantime, the more than 115,000 former prisoners and dependents, including both civilians and military personnel incarcerated during the war, many of them for as long as 3 years and all of them under unspeakable conditions of hardship and suffering, have been neglected.

A considerable number of the former prisoners have died during this interval of their neglect, the great majority of the survivors are in ill health in consequence of their ordeal, and their physical and mental as well as economic rehabilitation has been impossible.

Whatever the merits of the conflicting positions of Congress and the President on the implementation of the War Claims Act, it is a great shame and a grim tragedy that the most unfortunate victims of the war should be made to suffer while these cross purposes are pursued.

The American Government has been prompt and generous and even profligate in providing for the rehabilitation of the war victims of other nations, including many who were our enemies.

Why is it that only the American victims of the war, permanently impaired in health in many cases and frankly destitute in some cases, are pilloried upon the insistence of Congress that their rehabilitation be accomplished one way and that of the President that it be done another way?

It is not to the credit of either Congress or the President that a mere difference of opinion has exacted the grim penalty of continued suffering from so many Americans.

It will continue to be a matter of national discredit as long as a paramount and acknowledged obligation of the Government of the United States has scant attention, with an outpouring of the limited and dwindling resources of the country into the international ratholes which are reducing America to the economic levels of mendicant nations and may eventually pauperize the American people.

The Congress and the President were in agreement upon the principle of compensation for American war prisoners at a time when they were able to find agreement on very little else.

Now that the Congress and the President are of the same political party, it is to be hoped they will make it one of their first objectives to bring an end to the interval of unjust and cruel discrimination against the thousands of Americans who gave and suffered so much for their country in time of war and have found no surcease from their anguish in more than 3 years of peace.

Count of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

Appendix of the RECORD certain newspaper editorials and articles dealing with the constitutional amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of October 5, 1948]

ELECTORAL SHENANIGANS

Georgia's response to the demand for a free expression of the public will in the Presidential election ought to set many citizens to thinking seriously about our outmoded electoral machinery. Called into special session by Governor Thompson, the Georgia Legislature refused to require that the candidates for elector in that State be pledged to any Presidential candidate. It is said that the Democratic executive committee will name electors favorable to President Truman. But the situation is such that many voters will doubtless have to cast their ballots without knowing for whom they are likely to be counted.

Over in Louisiana the legislature voted to permit the names of President Truman and his running mate on the ballot, but they cannot be officially identified as Democrats. It is true, of course, that they are not the choice of the Democratic organization in Louisiana but thousands of voters will regard them as the regular Democratic candidates. The fact that they cannot be so listed is certain to lead to confusion and might result in frustration of the public will. The only favorable aspect of the situation is that it brings starkly to public attention the obsolescence of our century-and-a-half-old electoral system.

Senator LODGE is sponsoring an admirable amendment to the Constitution that would have the effect of abolishing the office of elector and dividing the electoral votes of the States among the Presidential candidates in proportion to the popular vote cast for each candidate. That reform is long overdue. The shenanigans of some of the Southern States this year raise a question, however, as to whether it goes far enough. The electoral system we now have is based on the eighteenth-century idea that each of the States would name its outstanding statesmen to join with similar statesmen from other States in selecting the President. Actually the President has been chosen by the people since the days of Andrew Jackson, but the machinery that we continue to use is that left over from the era when the people were not trusted to choose their own President.

By eliminating the dummy electors who stand between the people and the Presidency Senator LODGE'S amendment would go a long way toward preventing political manipulations in Presidential elections. Still, it would leave the electoral machinery entirely in the hands of the States. Presumably a disgruntled State legislature could continue to vote the candidates of either of the national parties off the ballot. The operation of our national election machinery would still be at the mercy of 48 different law-making bodies having no national responsibility. We do not think the filling of the great office of President should hang by such slender threads.

The present issue is not, of course, whether Democratic votes in the South shall be cast for Mr. Truman. Rather, it is whether the people shall have a chance to make their wishes known through the ballot box. Perhaps it will be necessary to give Congress authority to require that the names of the candidates of the major parties be printed on the ballots of every State, under the party designation. That would not prevent the rise of splinter parties. But it would prevent local politicians in control of State machinery from denying a free expression of the public will.

The real question is whether the Nation should control its own electoral machinery in this vital operation of choosing a President. This country is no longer a mere aggregation of States held together by tenuous bonds. Having become a great Federal Nation, which is now playing a leading role in world affairs, the United States ought to leave open no chance that the fair election of its Chief Executive might be fouled up by a State legislature playing politics with election statutes.

[From the New York Times of November 21, 1948]

LODGE ELECTORAL PLAN PROTECTS SMALL STATES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, November 20—The move for reform of the system by which Presidents and Vice Presidents are chosen through the agency of the electoral college will doubtless be strengthened by the analyses of the returns of November 2 which emphasize that the Nation had a narrow escape from the projection of the contest into the House of Representatives for decision.

That would have been solely the consequence of the constitutional provision whereby all the electors of a State are awarded to the candidates for President and Vice President who have in that State a plurality of the popular vote, however small; and it would have blocked the national choice. The amendment proposed by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., of Massachusetts, would alter this method by dividing a State electoral bloc in proportion to the votes received by the several candidates, and this is the proposal which is expected to receive the bulk of whatever consideration Congress may give to the subject. The chief effects of this amendment, if submitted to the States and approved by three-fourths of them, would be to assure that (1) the party ticket getting the largest popular vote would be certified as elected; (2) a plurality instead of a majority of the electors would suffice, and (3) the choice would never devolve on the House of Representatives.

WOULD END COLLEGE ITSELF

Senator LODGE would do away with the electoral college as such but retain the electoral units of each State as provided in the Constitution—one for each Senator and Representative in Congress to which the State is entitled. Since these electors would always reflect the plurality choice of the voters, however, this question is being asked:

"What's the need of all this machinery?"

The effective answer is that most of the 20 small States, perhaps all of them, would never approve a constitutional amendment that deprives them of the two electors which they are allotted for their two Senators on an equality with the large States. And before an amendment can be adopted 36 of the 48 States of the Union must give their approval. These concessions to the small States by and large were the price of the Constitution itself; it would not otherwise have been adopted. The smaller Colonies served notice that, if they were not given equal representation in the Senate and the same number of electors per Senator, they would not join the Union.

THE CASE FOR UNIT SYSTEM

But it may be asked, granting all this, since the election under the Lodge proposal would go to the ticket with a national plurality of the popular vote, and the division of each State's electors would be in proportion to the votes received therein, what part of this concession in the Constitution would the small States lose? The clearest and most definite answer was made some years ago to a House committee by Representative Clarence F. Lea, of California. He gave these principal reasons for the retaining of the units of electors and his statistics still generally apply:

1. Nine States have over half the population of the country. These have 18 Senators and 18 electoral votes for those Senators. Thirty-nine States have the other half of the population, with 78 Senators and 78 electoral votes for those Senators. This represents the compromise by which the Constitution was adopted.

2. In the election of 1932 each elector chosen represented a national average of 231,000 voters. In 20 States, however, the electors were chosen by a local voting average 10 percent and more below the national average. If their votes were made part of a national pool and so counted, without first translating them into electors, these States would lose 10 percent and more of their power to determine the national result. So they would not vote for direct popular choice.

HOW "EVIL" IS MINIMIZED

3. But this "evil," implicit in the Constitution, is minimized by the fact that the 20 States are scattered over the map of the Union. They are in every section. Since most bitter political controversies in this country have been sectional, this distribution forecloses the probability that all would support one candidate.

4. Under the Constitution there is no universal law of suffrage. Each State has the power to determine the qualifications of its voters, and no amendment withdrawing that power could be approved. The result is that a much larger percentage of voting eligibles exists in one State than another. Hence the influence on a national election of States with stronger limits on the privilege of suffrage would be greatly reduced if the units of electors are done away with and choice made directly by an over-all popular plurality. This is another reason why more than 12 States would decline to approve such an amendment.

For example, in 1932 in Indiana 43 voted of every 100 qualified, but in other States only 6 in 100 went to the polls. In 1920—when Indiana and California were almost equal in population—43 of every 100 voted in Indiana, but in California only 27. In a direct popular voting pool this would have given Indiana 50 percent more influence proportionately than California. But by retaining the units of electors this is prevented.

LODGE'S PRACTICAL FACTORS

It was with these practical factors in mind that Senator LODGE, while providing for abolition of the electoral college and the requirement of Presidential choice by its majority, retained the State units of electors and the constitutional formula by which the number for each State is fixed. But under this plan no longer could a small pressure group, in a State closely divided between the major parties, have the power to swing all its electors to the party that promised it the most. They would be divided according to the number of votes each party ticket received out of the total cast.

Thus, in Ohio this year, which Mr. Truman carried by something less than 7,000, instead of getting all its 25 electors he would get a little more than half of them. And so forth.

The belief that reform in the system of Presidential choice is needed, as much as three-fourths of the States are willing to accept, is supported by one group of voting statistics in particular. This shows that the effect of awarding an entire State bloc for a plurality is to disfranchise millions of voters.

In 1912 Wilson got 1 elector for every 14,500 votes, and Taft got 1 for every 435,000. In 1928 a Hoover elector represented 48,180 popular votes; a Smith elector, 172,602. In 1932 a Hoover elector came with every 267,149 votes, a Roosevelt elector with every 48,351. And in 1948, on the basis of the present re-

turns, the score was—1 Truman elector, 78,123 votes; 1 Dewey elector, 113,990.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of October 23, 1948]

IF YOU ASK ME

The inquiring reporter asks 10 men and women this question: "Are you in favor of revising the Presidential election system by constitutional amendment as proposed by Senator LODGE?"

Richard E. McGlew, Prospect Street, West Newbury; bookkeeper in Haverhill: "I should think LODGE's proposal would bring about a more fair system. I'd rather see it that way than the way it is now. The new way would be more democratic."

Miss Katherine Gramenelles, 97 Auburn Street; cashier: "I think it would be a good idea, but it's a thing I don't know too much about. It seems it would be more fair to change the system. A man who gets the highest popular vote should certainly be elected."

Haig Shalvarian, 68 Cedar Street; Western Electric technician: "I like the idea. It would be a more fair way of electing a President certainly. It would be more representative of what the people want. I think if LODGE's proposal was on the ballot, the people would approve it."

John Magras, 2 Orchard Street; engineer: "I should think it would be a good idea. It doesn't sound as if it would call for a great change, just some small revision. That's all that's needed."

Raymond LeBlond, 9 Beacon Street; shoe worker: "I think it would be good for the Nation. I'm for anything that's fair and for the improvement of the country. The idea sounds as if it would be more democratic."

Joseph Gouthier, 80 Blossom Street; truck driver: "The actual electing of the President should be done by the public. After all, the people put him there. If 60 percent of the voters in Haverhill favor Truman, that's the way the votes should go."

Anthony Palermo, 161 How Street, Methuen; auto glass installer: "LODGE's way would be more fair. It sounds more democratic. I think a man should get electoral votes in proportion to the popular vote. That seems the only right way to do it."

William Friend, Kingston, N. H.; plumber and electrician: "Yes, I think the electoral college is a waste of time and money and effort anyway. I think the whole thing could be done by popular vote, for that matter. Why not?"

Miss Lorraine Hamel, 16 Powow Street, Amesbury; senior, St. James High School: "I like the idea very much. It would place the vote more in the hands of the people. The electoral system may be all right, but the people should have a more direct say."

Edward Caron, 86 Pecker Street; shoe worker: "Yes; each individual should be permitted to make his own choice in voting and have it count. If it's possible for a man who gets the highest vote to lose out, the system should be changed."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of October 11, 1948]

A NEW ELECTION LAW?

A long-overdue piece of legislation got lost in the shuffle attending the end of the last session of Congress, but it is to be hoped that another try will win.

It is the bill by Republican Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Democratic Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, and it would amend our national-election laws so that every candidate would be credited with electoral votes in exactly the percentage he scored in the popular vote. Should a candidate carry New York by only 1,000 votes, he would not be credited with New York's 47 electoral votes, but only with a small fraction more than half. The final total would be carried out to three decimal points.

The most striking result of the amendment, of course, would be to eliminate the possibility of a candidate being named President though he may have got fewer popular votes than an opponent, something which has happened three times in our Presidential history. But there would be other important effects.

Presidential candidates could show more independence in their preelection dealings with influential men in key States. The new relationship would not become utopian, as long as populous States breed local machines, but there could evolve a considerable change in degree; there obviously could be a substantial difference in the attitude of a candidate who might win 40 percent of a large State without conceding everything to the State boss, as against losing the whole electoral vote should he fail to carry the State, as the law is now.

The amended law would make it very much worth while for Republicans to campaign in the South and Democrats to campaign in rock-ribbed Republican States, since all the fractional vote would count. By the same token, it should bring out more voters who now do not bother if they feel sure to be outvoted in their State.

The amendment should tend to diminish the nuisance value of small parties, which exists now out of all proportion. It would no longer be possible for a small party holding a key position in a key State to swing the national election.

It should tend to lessen the present necessity of choosing candidates from key States, and thus broaden the field of eligibles for the most important post in the world.

The innovation will be resisted by State bosses and many professional politicians who find the present system more manageable. But a Congress sincerely desirous of perfecting our democracy will some day pass this measure, which political scientists have unanimously recommended for years.

Comprehensive Housing Bill Introduced by Republican Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a summary of the comprehensive housing bill containing titles for urban development, redevelopment, and slum clearance, low-rent public housing, housing research, farm housing, privately owned housing for families of lower income, and amendments to existing aids to privately finance housing, introduced by the following Republican Members today: Representatives FRANCES P. BOLTON, Ohio; CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey; GORDON CANFIELD, New Jersey; T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey; JACOB K. JAVITS, New York; KENNETH B. KEATING, New York; JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Connecticut; WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, New York; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; and THOR TOLLEFSON, Washington. A summary of the bill follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Establishes a national housing policy with the ultimate goal of a decent home for every American family.

TITLE I. URBAN DEVELOPMENT, REDEVELOPMENT, AND SLUM CLEARANCE

Loans are provided communities to assist them in clearing blighted areas by assembly, clearance, preparation, and sale or lease of land for redevelopment. A total of loans of $1,000,000,000 is authorized over 5 years. Capital grants totaling $500,000,000 over 5 years are also authorized to enable the communities to make redeveloped land available at its fair value by absorbing some of the costs of redevelopment. The Federal grant can amount to a maximum of two-thirds of the project's cost to the community; the community supplying at least one-third of the cost. In order to participate in this program communities must demonstrate that they have made an active effort to modernize building codes.

TITLE II. LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Provision is made for the construction by State, county, or local housing authorities of a total of 800,000 public low-rent housing units to be built over 6 years. The annual construction rate of 135,000 units may be increased to 200,000 or decreased to 0, upon a determination by the President with the advice of the Council of Economic Advisers that conditions in the building industry justify such an increase or decrease.

Occupancy is restricted to families whose incomes are at least 20 percent below the minimum necessary to live in private housing. The bonds issued by the local authorities participating in the program remain tax exempt. Contributions of $80,000,000 are authorized for the first year and increased by $80,000,000 for 3 years to the annual rate of $320,000,000 maximum annual contributions for 40 years.

TITLE III. HOUSING RESEARCH

Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administration to undertake a program of research to develop and promote the use of new techniques and materials to achieve lower building costs. Authorizes grants to educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations for research.

TITLE IV. FARM HOUSING

Permits loans to adequate farms with earning capacity to carry interest and amortization charges but unable to get private financing to construct, improve, or repair housing. For farms which through improvement are potentially self-sustaining, a program of loans and grants is provided. This title is administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

TITLE V. PRIVATELY OWNED HOUSING FOR FAMILIES OF LOWER INCOME

Provides a program of direct Government loans to cooperatives, limited dividend and redevelopment companies and nonprofit corporations for constructing low-rent housing units for families with incomes too low to afford private housing and too high to occupy public housing. Lower rents would be achieved through use of the going Federal interest rate and an extended period of amortization. Five hundred million dollars of loan funds are authorized for each of 6 years to build an estimated total of 360,000 units.

TITLE VI. AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING AIDS TO PRIVATELY FINANCED HOUSING

Liberalizes the provisions of title II and title VI of the National Housing Act by permitting increased maximum mortgage limits, increased percentage guaranty, and extended amortization period. Title VI is extended until March 31, 1950.

A comparison between the administration bill, the Senate bill and the House bill introduced today follows:

	Administration bill	Senate bill	House bill
Number of public housing units	1,050,000	600,000	810,000
Rate of construction..per year	150,000	100,000	135,000
Maximum accelerated construction..per year	250,000	150,000	200,000
Length of program....years	7	6	6
Cost (maximum contribution after 4 years)	$445,000,000	$240,000,000	$320,000,000
Amortization years	40	45	45
Tax exemption for local housing bonds	Taxable	Exempt	Exempt
Slum clearance	Identical	Identical	Identical
Farm housing	(1)	(1)	(1)
Housing research	(2)	(2)	(2)
Direct loans for lower middle-income family housing	(3)	(3)	(4)
Changes to FHA	None	None	(5)

[1] Loans to adequate farms are provided for all bills. Loans to potentially adequate farms are provided for all bills. Loans to farms of no economic value are provided in administration bill.
[2] Largely identical for all bills.
[3] No provision.
[4] Provision for 60,000 units a year over 6 years.
[5] Substantial improvements to aid private financing of housing construction.

The Servicemen's Readjustment Act is also amended to permit loans for 30 years. The 50 percent limit on sale of mortgages on the secondary market imposed by the Housing Act of 1948 is lifted. New limitations are to be set by regulation of the RFC.

TITLE VII. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

This title provides for a census of housing in conjunction with the regular decennial censuses. It also permits conversion of State low-rent or veterans' housing projects to assistance provided by title II. In addition, there are the regular provisions, on separability.

The American Ambassador to Argentina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Dr. Lovelace Acclaims United States Argentine Emissary," written by Wayne L. Scott and published in the December 28, 1948, issue of the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. LOVELACE ACCLAIMS UNITED STATES ARGENTINE EMISSARY

(By Wayne L. Scott)

The United States could do much toward solving its problems with Latin-American countries by turning the job over to James Bruce, United States Ambassador to Argentina, and United States Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, in the opinion of Dr. W. R. Lovelace.

Dr. Lovelace returned Sunday night from South America, where he spent more than 2 weeks visiting several countries with Senator and Mrs. Chavez. He was the guest while in Argentina of Ambassador Bruce. He went to South America to aid in arranging for the meeting of the International College of Surgeons to be held in Buenos Aires, probably in April. He is first vice president of the United States chapter of the organization.

CHAVEZ WELCOMED

Senator CHAVEZ, the doctor reported, "was given a most hearty welcome at every stop we made, and made a big impression with the people, particularly the high Government officials. He can speak their language."

Ambassador Bruce, Dr. Lovelace said, "has done a remarkable job," and has done much to end the bad feeling which has prevailed between this country and Latin-American countries. He said all Argentina officials with whom he talked, including President Juan Peron, complimented Bruce highly.

"I am convinced we could solve our problems with South America by turning the job over to Bruce and Senator CHAVEZ, or men like them," Dr. Lovelace said.

Dr. Lovelace also returned with a different impression of Eva Peron, wife of President Peron, than that presented by some of this Nation's magazines. Mrs. Peron, he said, is tremendously popular with Argentina citizens and personally distributes much of the welfare aid given needy residents of Buenos Aires. After a recent tragedy which killed 43 persons, Mrs. Peron personally ordered the best of medical care for survivors and directed names of dependents of those killed be furnished her so she could arrange for them to receive aid.

NEEDS UNITED STATES DOLLARS

Argentina, which had a gold stock equal to $1,176,000,000 only 3 years ago has spent it so rapidly it now badly needs American dollars, Dr. Lovelace said. Argentina pesos have a normal rate of 5 for 1 American dollar, but are being exchanged on the black market at the rate of 8½ to 1, he said. That country is still better off than Chile, however, whose peso, normally valued at 30 to 1 American dollar, is now exchanged on the black market at the rate of 60 to 1, Dr. Lovelace said.

Dr. Lovelace said he favored adjustment of this country's import and export taxes to enable other countries to sell us more goods so they can replenish their stocks of dollars. "The sooner world trade becomes normal, the sooner the United States will be relieved of being a Santa Claus," he declared.

Dr. Lovelace termed Buenos Aires "The Paris of South America," and said it is "one of the cleanest cities I have ever seen."

"The subways are as clean as the average public building here, and much cleaner than the subways of New York," he declared.

The city has made unusual plans for well-being of its children and there are parks, playgrounds, lakes, golf and tennis courts everywhere, he said.

CLEAN CHILDREN

"In all our travels over the city we didn't see a single dirty-faced child," Dr. Lovelace said. "The children were all clean, well clothed, and well nourished. There was none who gave any sign of tuberculosis or malnutrition."

Dr. Lovelace traveled 15,000 miles on his trip—all of it by air. He joined Senator and Mrs. Chavez, who had gone there by boat, in Buenos Aires. They were guests at the American Embasy there, and were given use of the Ambassador's plane in flying to Ascension, Paraguay. Here they spent 24 hours, and Dr. Lovelace visited hospitals and the leper colony. He was impressed with the way spreading of the disease has been slowed by segregation of those afflicted. Children of patients are housed separately.

From Paraguay, the Chavezes and Dr. Lovelace went to Santiago, Chile, where they were guests of the Chilean Government. They were honored there by a banquet attended by President Gonzales Videra and his staff.

FLY IN PERON'S PLANE

The party then flew to Mendoza, Argentina, where the group left the Ambassador's plane and flew to Cordova, in the private plane of President Peron. At Cordova, Senator CHAVEZ laid a wreath before the statue of San Martin, who led the country in its fight for independence. The party then returned to Buenos Aires, where President and Mrs. Peron honored them with a dinner.

Dr. Lovelace flew back, but Senator and Mrs. Chavez are returning by boat and should arrive in New York about January 12.

Dr. Lovelace, the Senator's personal physician, said CHAVEZ' condition is "greatly improved." The Senator underwent a serious abdominal operation here several months ago.

Dutch Aggression in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Americans, and the peoples of Europe and Asia, were shocked at Dutch aggression against the Indonesian Republic this past December. This attack violated previous Security Council recommendations; it flouted the United Nations Committee of Good Offices, of which the United States is a member.

Since the establishment of the Indonesian Republic in 1945, the 70,000,000 people of Indonesia have tried to work out a peaceful settlement with the Netherlands. Holland has ignored democratic expression of the aspirations of Indonesia, twice broken its international commitments to the Indonesian Republic, and has resorted to armed intervention and economic blockade to crush Indonesian independence. The Security Council has been discussing the Indonesian crisis actively since July 1947 as a threat to world peace.

This aggressor nation, the Netherlands, dares defy the world because it has funds, arms, and powerful defenders in the Security Council. American lend-lease material is the foundation of Dutch military power. American loans and grants, totaling almost a billion dollars, have been used by the Dutch, not for re-

construction of their war-devastated nation, but for a war of conquest in Indonesia. At the very moment that the American Delegation to the Security Council criticized Holland's invasion of the Indonesian Republic, $270,000,000 of Economic Cooperation Administration funds were released to the Netherlands. To denounce Dutch aggression while providing funds which are used for that aggression is hypocrisy.

EFFECTIVE PROGRAM OUTLINED

The recent 19-nation Asian conference which denounced Dutch aggression and called upon the Security Council to take prompt action to remove Dutch troops from Indonesia, demonstrates growing international concern over this vital issue. The American delegation's position in Security Council discussions of this issue has been to criticize the Dutch action in words while refusing to advocate or support effective measures against it. The present so-called compromise resolution, initiated by the United States, meets the demands of the colonial-minded British and French delegations which are determined to prevent Malaya and Indochina from achieving independence. Can the Asian countries and other peoples interpret the American position as other than support of the aggressor and abandonment of the victim? Such a policy will not bring peace to Indonesia, it will not restore American prestige in Asia, nor strengthen the United Nations.

Many prominent Americans in public life—the clergy, business, and labor—have urged that the United States disassociate itself from the Dutch policy of aggression by cutting off all loans and grants to Holland until the Dutch stop their war in Indonesia. The world will weigh American words against American guns and funds in the Indonesian crisis. I wish respectfully to urge that consideration be given to the following recommendations as being essential steps in facilitating peace in Indonesia, and building American-Indonesian amity:

First. To condemn the Netherlands as an aggressor nation.

Second. To stop all financial aid to Holland.

Third. To press for immediate United Nations diplomatic and economic sanctions against the Netherlands.

Fourth. To call for an 11-nation United Nations Security Council commission to supervise immediate withdrawal of Dutch troops from Indonesia.

Fifth. To support the Indonesian people's fight for independence.

LETTER TO PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker, I am embodying the main thesis of these remarks in letters to the Secretary of State and to the President; but I do want to say that I have been pleased and heartened by the attitude of disapprobation of the Dutch which has been expressed by the administration and by the American delegation to the United Nations, even if it has been less than I advocate here.

To make our ideals effective, to make the "four freedoms" meaningful, the United States must take the lead in resisting aggression and international bad faith. It is especially appropriate now that we should bear in mind the late President Roosevelt's effective hatred of tyranny.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members will feel moved to express their views to the administration in similar vein.

Situation in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
December 22, 1948.

Following is the text of a statement by the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, United States representative before the Security Council at Paris today:

"My Government took the initiative in requesting an emergency meeting of the Security Council so the Council might take prompt and forthright action in dealing with the dangerous situation which has developed in Indonesia.

"At the outset, Mr. President, I consider it necessary to state that my Government's position in this matter is basically what it was in July and August of 1947 when the Council was previously confronted with an outbreak of hostilities in Indonesia.

"After the outbreak of hostilities in July 1947, the Security Council adopted on August 1, 1947, the following resolution:

" 'The Security Council, noting with concern the hostilities in progress between the armed forces of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia, calls upon the parties (A) to cease hostilities forthwith; and (B) to settle their disputes by arbitration or by other peaceful means and keep the Security Council informed about the progress of the settlement.'

"At the one hundred and ninety-third meeting of the Security Council on August 22, 1947, the United States representative stated, and I quote:

" 'My Government believes that the Security Council acted properly and in entire conformity with the Charter in calling upon the parties to cease hostilities. We consider that paragraph (A) of the Council's resolution of August 1, 1947, so far as the Charter is concerned, is a provisional measure under article 40. This decision, in our view, was properly taken, without prejudice to the contentions of the parties, in respect to whether the Indonesian Republic is an independent state under international law.

" 'In our view, the Council's jurisdiction rested in the fact that large-scale hostilities were being carried on in Indonesia, the repercussions of which were so serious that they amounted to a threat to international peace and security.

" 'In the view of the United States, the Security Council has ample power to observe, if necessary, its own cease-fire order and to make certain that new hostilities do not break out which would threaten international peace and security.

" 'It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize the seriousness with which my Government would view a failure by the parties to comply with the Council's cease-fire order. Of course, in such an event, the Council would, under article 40, have to take such failure into account in considering further action.'

"The United States Government considers that the Council today is faced with at least as grave a situation as that of August 1947 and we believe that the Council must act accordingly.

"This is not a situation, Mr. President, where there can be any uncertainty as to whether there has been a break-down of a truce agreement. Indeed, the Government of the Netherlands has quite formally and officially announced that it has renounced the truce agreement it signed with the Government of the Republic of Indonesia on January 17, 1948. The armed forces of the Netherlands have in fact crossed the status quo line established under the truce agreement and are at this very moment carrying out military operations within republican controlled territory. It follows from this that the Council need not and should not await a further report from its agency on the spot, the Good Offices Committee, before deciding to order both parties to cease hostilities immediately.

"In the above connection I invite the attention of the members of the Security Council to the telegram, dated December 19, 1948, from members of the Good Offices Committee in Batavia. Paragraph 10 of the telegram reads as follows: 'The Good Offices Committee calls upon the Security Council to consider, on a basis of the utmost urgency, the outbreak of hostilities in Indonesia in violation of the Renville truce agreement signed by the Governments of the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia on the 17th of January 1948.'

"The outbreak of hostilities in Indonesia follows more than a year's attempt on the part of the Council's agency, the Good Offices Committee, to assist the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia to reach a negotiated settlement of their dispute.

"It is clear from the Committee's fourth interim report and its subsequent telegraphic reports, that the Committee has tried again and again to bring the parties together. Indeed, the efforts of the representatives on the Committee, acting both singly and collectively, even in the face of what has recently appeared to be an almost hopeless task, are, I am sure, fully appreciated by all the members of the Security Council.

"Following the adoption of the Council's cease-fire resolution of the 1st of August 1947, the efforts of the parties to settle their dispute between themselves met with no success. Accordingly, on August 25, 1947, the Council tendered its own good offices to the parties through the Committee of three members of the Council. Each party selected one, the third member was designated by the two so selected.

"The Council's Committee went to Indonesia in October 1947 to assist the parties directly and on the spot to reach a formal truce agreement, and also to assist them in reaching a settlement of their political differences.

"On January 17, 1948, the Governments of the Netherlands and of the Republic of Indonesia signed the Renville agreements, which established a formal truce and which laid down 18 principles as a basis for the negotiation of a final settlement of their political dispute under the auspices of the Good Offices Committee.

"After various delays, negotiations for a political settlement were finally begun under the Committee's auspices in March of this year.

"The Council will recall that these negotiations were suspended last June by the Netherlands, following the presentation of a plan for settling the dispute suggested by the representatives of Australia and the United States on the Committee. Later that month the Netherlands indicated its willingness to resume negotiations. However, as the Committee made clear in its fourth interim report to the Council, there have been no political negotiations under the auspices of the Committee since the end of May 1948. The introduction of that report emphasized that the long-continued delay in achieving a political settlement had had serious economic effects, had intensified both political difficulties within the Republic and political tension between the parties and had resulted in an increasing strain on the truce with the ever-present possibility of a general breakdown.

"That break-down has now occurred. In a telegram dated December 12, the Committee reported to the Council in part as follows:

" 'The setting up of an interim federal government by decree of the Government of the Netherlands, which is apparently to occur before January 1, 1949, will contribute further to the opinion of the Republic that the Netherlands Government has been proceeding unilaterally to establish ultimately a United States of Indonesia on its own terms and without the Republic. The formation of an interim federal government now without the Republic will greatly complicate a negotiated settlement of the Indonesian dispute and could create serious unrest in Indonesia.

" 'In the light of the statements made by the Netherlands delgation that "negotiations under the auspices of the Committee at this stage are futile," and that there are "irreconcilable" positions of the parties on certain issues, the Committee does not foresee the possibility of its bringing the parties together in bona fide negotiations.

" 'The Committee has no confidence that even the presently unsatisfactory level of truce enforcement can be maintained as the possibility of political agreement becomes more remote. The Committee can see in the present situation only intensification of the factors already making for further economic deterioration, general unrest, and social upheaval. Widespread hostilities involving the conflict of organized armed groups on a large scale might be the outcome.'

"In a telegram dated December 18, the Committee forwarded a letter from the United States representative on the Committee to the Acting Chairman of the Netherlands delegation which read in part as follows:

" 'In the 4½ months that I have been present in Indonesia as the United States representative on the Committee of Good Offices, neither I nor any other members of the Committee have had an opportunity to participate in, or to observe a discussion of any of these issues in the Committee of Good Offices or in the conference of the parties. Nor have we been given an opportunity to examine in any detail or in full context the opposing positions of the parties in the recent direct talks except as presented sketchily in the statements made by the two parties which are appended to the special report of the Committee of Good Offices to the Security Council of December 12.'

"In the light of the above record and in view of the recent events in Indonesia, my Government is unable to conclude that the Netherlands has either consistently or conscientiously endeavored to exhaust all possibilities of resuming negotiations under the Committee's auspices. This appears to us to be particularly true in the light of the fact that the truce agreement itself was, from all objective accounts, satisfactorily implemented in the beginning. As the Committee pointed out on November 26 in the introduction to its fourth interim report, however, 'at the time of the signing of the truce agreement, it was expected that a political settlement would follow within a short time. The truce has now been in force for 10 months. This is an extremely long period for any truce to remain effective and, in this case, the regrettable lack of progress toward a political settlement and the deterioration in the economic conditions within the republic have subjected the truce to an ever-increasing strain. The rising number of infringements of the truce agreement during this period is testimony to the relationship between the maintenance of the truce and successful progress in political negotiations.'

"After carefully studying the material thus far made available by the Committee, my Government fails to find any justification for renewal of military operations in Indonesia. This is particularly true in light of the fact that there has been a resort to force following a period of 7 months in which the resources of the Committee of Good Offices have not been utilized. If, as is alleged, violations of the truce agreement by the republic have been so extensive and so persistent over a period of time, then it seems to me that the Netherlands Government should have reported these violations directly to the Security Council before renouncing the truce agreement and resorting to military action by land, sea and air against the republic. This is especially noteworthy in view of the assurances offered the Council by the Netherlands representative the last time the Indonesian question was before the Council, and in view of more recent assurances offered the governments represented on the Committee of Good Offices.

"On the other hand, let us examine the circumstances under which the Netherlands Government has seen fit to abandon the truce. These are reported to you, Mr. President, in document S/1129/Add:1, dated December 20, 1948. The Good Offices Committee was physically separated on December 18. The chairman of the week, the Australian representative, and the Belgian representative were at Kallurang, the republican capital, and the United States representative was at Batavia some 3 hours distant by air. In the middle of the night on December 18, the Netherlands delegation handed a letter to the United States representative addressed to the chairman of the Committee. The letter stated that the truce agreement would be terminated in less than an hour's time. It went on to say that the republican government had been notified accordingly. But in the course of the night on which this letter was delivered to the United States representative in Batavia, telegraphic communications were cut off and permission for the Good Offices Committee aircraft to fly to the republican capital was denied. Thus no notice of the repudiation reached the Committee as a whole and as far as known, according to this document none reached the republic in Jogjakarta.

"Article 10 of the truce agreement reads: 'This agreement shall be considered binding unless one party notifies the Good Offices Committee and the other party that it considers the truce regulations are not being observed by the other party and that this agreement should therefore be terminated.'

"The Netherlands Government by the letter handed to the United States representative on the Committee purported thus to notify the Committee of its abandonment of the truce a matter of minutes later with no communications available. Similarly, the republican authorities in Batavia could not communicate with their capital and according to this report they were arrested less than 2 hours after receiving the notification.

"This then is the notification which the Netherlands asserts it gave the Good Offices Committee and Republic of termination of the truce. The United States representative and the Australian deputy thus concluded in their message to you, Mr. President, that 'the Netherlands have not fulfilled the requirements of article 10.'

"It is my understanding that the president of the Council has telegraphed the Committee to report to us fully on the most recent developments in Java and Sumatra. That report, together with the reports already received from the Committee will be of considerable value to the Council in estimating the causes of the present situation in Indonesia. I believe, however, that we should expressly instruct the Committee to prepare a report for us which will enable us to assess ultimate responsibility for the failure of the Committee's efforts to effect a peaceful solution. I think the members of the Council have a right to know, fully and in detail, why it is that from May until December the Netherlands and the Republic did not resume negotiations under the Committee's auspices. I think we should call on the Committee expressly to assess responsibility, as between the parties, for the failure to reach a negotiated settlement. Both parties solemnly accepted the Council's tender of Good Offices and I think the time has now come for the Council to know how it is that this particular method of settlement which seemed admirably suited to the circumstances, failed to produce the desired results.

"Under the present circumstances in Indonesia it will doubtless take the Committee some little while to prepare a report of this nature. Meanwhile, armed conflict is taking place there. The simple, massive fact is that the Council's own order of August 1, 1947, has been contravened. This is a matter with which the Security Council must deal immediately and without awaiting any further reports from the Committee. As I said earlier, this is not a situation in which there can be any uncertainty as to whether there has in fact been an outbreak of hostilities. It seems to me that the Council is obligated under the Charter at this stage of its deliberations immediately to order a cessation of hostilities in Indonesia and to require the armed forces of both parties immediately to withdraw to their own sides of the demilitarized zones which are delineated in detail in the truce agreement of January 17, 1948. I must reiterate my Government's view that the Council's cease-fire order of the 1st of August 1947 continues to be binding on both parties and that it has been violated by the recent armed action taken by the Netherlands authorities in Indonesia.

"It is hardly necessary for me to emphasize the seriousness with which my Government views a failure, by either party, to comply with the Council's cease-fire order. It is our considered view that the renewed outbreak of hostilities in Indonesia may prove to be a grave threat to international peace. Accordingly, in concert with Colombia and Syria the United States has submitted a draft resolution to the Council today. I hope it will adopt it with a minimum of delay.

"It will be noted that the final paragraph of the draft resolution calls upon the Good Offices Committee to make further reports, including an assessment of responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities. It may seem to some members of the Council that this paragraph is unnecessary in view of the very excellent reports which have already reached the Council, including one which has just been distributed as Document S/1138. Nevertheless, since members of the Committee have informed us that it has not yet been

possible for the full Committee to meet together and since the Council has not yet formally requested reports of this nature, I believe that it would be helpful to the Committee to have the Council record its desires as expressed in this last paragraph."

Comments on the Early State Constitutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the United States Constitution is under fire from so many angles and at a time when so many efforts are being made to bring within the framework of that great document legislation of a border-line nature and even foreign to the intents and purpose of that document, it might be appropriate to consider some of the early State constitutions. To that end, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a very learned treatise on the subject of our early State constitutions by a very learned member of the bar of my own great State of Mississippi, Judge D. M. Graham, of Gulfport, Miss. Judge Graham is one of the outstanding members of the Mississippi State Bar. He has practiced law in south Mississippi for more than 40 years. He presided over the Circuit Court of the Second Judicial District of Mississippi for some 10 years. In addition to being a great constitutional lawyer, he enjoys the confidence and respect of all who know him.

The following address was delivered some time ago before the Mississippi State Bar Association at its annual meeting at Laurel, Miss., and was subsequently published in the Constitutional Review. The address follows:

THE EARLY STATE CONSTITUTIONS

Mr. President and members of the Mississippi State Bar Association: if I should say anything of interest it would not be because it is new, but because it is old; for I am to comment on the early State constitutions—i. e., the first, the oldest constitutions framed by independent sovereign States on republican principles known to the modern world. Reference to these early documents will necessarily be scant for all of 14 original States, except Rhode Island and Connecticut, framed organic laws and set up State governments thereunder prior to the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and manifestly 12 separate documents cannot be discussed in detail at one time. The statement that there were 14 original States perhaps calls for an explanation since the general impression is that there were only thirteen, and there were only 13 original States recognized as such, but the little State of Vermont, as early as 1771 declared her independence, not only from Great Britain, but also from New York and the other States which claimed her territory, and erected a written constitution on republican principles, claiming to be a free and independent State, and under this constitution her people lived and fought through the Revolutionary War, and under this constitution, with slight amendments, was admitted to the Union in 1791. There is a bit of interesting history connected with this little State, but time forbids discussion of it at this time. Of the 12 State constitutions referred to, 5 were adopted prior to the formal Declaration of Independence, New Hampshire leading the way with the first written constitution on this continent; the methods pursued in the drawing up of the various documents under consideration were, of course, irregular and revolutionary, and in only 2, that of Delaware and Massachusetts were they framed by regularly organized conventions summoned for this purpose; but they were generally approved by the people and no point was ever made on the regularity or validity of their adoption.

It is far from the truth to state that these documents were framed out of nothing because their authors drew heavily from their experience in colonial days, and it would not be the truth to state that any of them were perfect frames of government, but, taking them as a whole, I believe it can be safely said that there is not a fundamental principle of republican government contained in subsequent constitutions that cannot be found in one or the other of them. The historian, Beard, is authority for the statement that these "Documents prepared by plain citizens were translated into French and widely circulated in Europe, and served as a guide and inspiration to generations of constitution makers in the Old World."

These 12 early State constitutions were not similar in all respects, but they had many things in common concerning the essentials. In the first place, they were all framed upon the grand idea, then new, that all governmental powers were vested in and consequently derived from the people, and most of them contained expressed provisions to that effect. In all of them the general idea of the separation of governmental powers into the three departments of legislative, executive, and judicial was prevalent. For instance, we quote the following from the Maryland Constitution of 1776: "The legislative, executive, and judicial powers of government ought to be forever separate and distinct from each other"; and from the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 the following: "In the government of this Commonwealth the legislative department shall never exercise the executive and judicial powers, or either of them; the executive shall never exercise the legislative and judicial powers, or either of them; the judicial shall never exercise the legislative and executive powers, or either of them, to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men." Incidentally, this is the first appearance in print of that much-quoted expression, sometimes erroneously attributed to Chief Justice Marshall: "This is a government of law and not of men."

This general idea of division of governmental powers, which Mr. Bryce calls a dogma of the American people, had been in the forming for many years prior to the days about which I am writing, and at that time was fairly well rooted in the minds of the people. It is apparent, though, that the idea of independence of the departments was not so well understood as it is today, as you will observe as we proceed.

It is manifest from a mere cursory examination of these early constitutions that the legislative department was preeminent in the minds of the people of those days; this department was considered the grand depository of all democratic principles. The legislature was, in all the 12 States except Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, divided into two branches; the names given to these branches were not uniform in the various States—the upper house was styled the senate in most of them; the lower or popular branch of the legislature was designated by different names, as, in Maryland, the house of delegates; in Georgia, the house of assembly; and in New Hampshire, the house of representatives. New Hampshire, therefore, was not only the first State to form a written constitution, but was the first to name the popular branch of the legislature, the house of representatives. The members of the legislature were, of course, elected by the people, but suffrage was limited in those days to property holders, and only a small percent were qualified to vote. The term of members of the popular branch of the legislature in all of them, except South Carolina, was for 1 year. The upper house or senate was, as a rule, elected for a longer term and was always a smaller body. Each house elected its own officers and provision was made in most of the constitutions that each house should be judge of the return, elections, and the qualifications of its members, and that the proceedings should be made public, and that the yeas and nays upon all questions should be entered upon the journal; that neither house could adjourn without the consent of the other, except for short intervals, etc.

In most of these documents a provision was made that all bills for raising revenue should originate in the popular branch of the legislature, and in some of them the senate was without power to amend, but had either to accept the bill or reject it in toto; in others, revenue bills could originate in the lower house only, but the upper house could propose or concur with amendments as in other bills; this seems to have been considered of some importance by the early constitution builders, the idea, of course, coming from the British Parliament. But this is not considered of so much importance today, because the senate or upper branch of the legislature, is quite as responsive to public opinion as the lower house. This provision was in the first and second constitutions of our own State, but there is no such provision in our present constitution, nor was it in the constitution of 1868. The provision on this subject in the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780 was copied verbatim into the Federal Constitution. In most of the constitutions under consideration the lower house of the legislature was given the power to impeach all civil officers for misconduct in office, and trial of them was provided for by the senate, and punishment of removal from office only was stipulated, just as we find in the present-day constitution.

A census was provided for in several of the constitutions so that representations would be apportioned according to population.

Several of the States, and this is interesting, provided a classification of the senators; for instance, New York, the constitution of 1777 provided that immediately after the first election the senators should be divided by lots of four classes—No. 1, 2, 3, and 4—so that the seats of the members of each class would be vacated at different intervals, to the end that the fourth part of the senate might be chosen annually; others contained similar provisions.

We find an interesting provision in the Constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776, which would be entirely unnecessary today, to this effect—"The house of representatives of the free men of this Commonwealth shall consist of persons most noted for wisdom and virtue."

THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

In most of the States the executive powers were vested in a governor and executive council, although in three of the States, New

Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, the chief executive officer was called the president. As already indicated, the constitution builders in those days had an abiding faith in the legislative department, and we, consequently, find the powers of the executive department curtailed. This was, of course, the result of the experience of the people during colonial days with the tyranny of royal governors; in fact, the governors, or the presidents, had very little power except in conjunction with the executive council; a study of these executive councils in the various States and in the colonies, is of absorbing interest for the reason that in them we find the United States Senate in embryo. To illustrate how the executive acted under the early constitutions, we quote from the Constitution of Georgia of 1777, "The governor shall, with the advice of the executive council, exercise the executive powers of government according to the laws of the State and the constitution thereof, save only in the case of pardons, which he shall in no instance grant, but may reprieve until the sitting of the legislature." And again, "the governor, with the advice of the executive council, shall have power to call the house of assembly together upon any emergency, etc." In and through all of these constitutions you find the governor or the president acting only with the "advice and consent of the executive council," just as the President of the United States makes treaties, appoints judges and ambassadors, "With the advice and consent of the Senate." Mr. Bryce has said that the United States Senate is the masterpiece of our Federal Constitution and, as already indicated, it is the lineal descendant from these early executive councils. In the early days of our Government the Senate of the United States was considered almost exclusively an executive body to advise with the executive; and for 5 years after the organization of the Federal Government its sessions were held in secret, but in the course of time, as everyone knows, the character of this body has changed from executive to legislative in character; the idea of advising the President, as originally was done, has long since been abandoned, but this important part of the machinery of our Government is still able to exert some of its old-time executive power if a President attempts to appoint to an important office a man objectionable to the country at large; as for instance, the rejection of Mr. Warren as Attorney-General of the United States.

In only three States, that of Massachusetts, New York, and New Hampshire, were the executives elected by the people; in all the others the executives were elected by the legislature. As already stated, in most cases impeachment trials were held by the senate, but in Pennsylvania, and perhaps two or three other States, the executive, with the executive council, was authorized to try impeachment cases, taking the advice of the justices of the supreme court.

In the State of New York it was the duty of the governor under the constitution of 1777 to inform the legislature at every session of the condition of the State, and to recommend such matters to their consideration as shall appear to him to concern its good government, welfare, and prosperity.

In Massachusetts alone the veto power was given to the governor, a copy of which was inserted almost literally into the Federal Constitution and, indeed, every State in the Union has followed this form.

The pardoning power was, as a rule, vested in the executive "with the advice of counsel," although in a few this power was vested in the legislature. The executive was the commander in chief of the army, but it was provided in most of the States that he was not to command in person without the advice of the executive council. Contrary to the original idea, the public today likes a strong executive.

THE JUDICIARY

The judiciary erected by these early State constitutions were modeled very much after colonial judiciary which had for many years administered the statutory law of the colonies, and the common law of England, but they were new in this; they were placed, not under the executive nor legislative but alongside of them, upon a footing of perfect equality with them. Mr. Hamilton in No. 81 of the Federalist, arguing for the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the States, and answering those who contended that the Federal judiciary was a new and untried experiment, has this to say in regard to the early State constitutions on the subject of the judiciary:

"The considerations teach us to applaud the wisdom of those States who have committed the judicial power in the last resort, not to be a part of the legislature, but two distinct and independent bodies of men. Contrary to the supposition of those who have represented the plan of the Convention in this respect as novel and unprecedented, it is but a copy of the Constitutions of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, and the preference which has been given these models is to be highly reccommended."

None of these constitutions conferred express authority upon the courts to declare an act of the legislature in conflict with the constitution and, therefore, void: But several of the State courts, before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, decided they had the power to pass upon the validity of laws and to declare them void if they contravened the State constitutions.

In 1782 the Court of Appeals of Virginia, in what is said to be the first case in the United States where the question relative to the nullity of an unconstitutional law was ever discussed before a judicial tribunal, decided an act to be unconstitutional which took from the chief executive of the State the power which the constitution of the State conferred upon him; and the firmness of the judges, particularly of Mr. Wythe, was highly honored and will always be applauded, it having incidentally fixed a precedent whereon a general practice, which the people of this country think essential to their rights and liberties has been established.

In 1784 the Mayor's Court of New York held a statute of that State void and, as a result, a public meeting was called and the decision denounced. In 1786 the Superior Court of Rhode Island decided that an act of legislature of that State was void. In 1787 the Supreme Court of North Carolina held an act void, which deprived a person of a jury trial when property rights were involved.

The decision in each of these cases created great excitement in the respective States, and the judges were severely condemned. In the Rhode Island case, mentioned above, the judges were impeached as criminals and, although they were not removed on account of their impeachment, they were not reelected at the expiration of their terms.

We mention these early decisions of the State courts for the reason that most of us, I believe, give credit to Chief Justice Marshall for announcing the doctrine of the right of the court to declare a legislative act unconstitutional and void; and this great judge did, in the famous case of *Marbury* v. *Madison*, without citing authority, declare an act of Congress void because in violation of the Constitution, but he was by no means the first to announce this distinctly American doctrine. We do not cite these early State cases with the view of lessening the admiration which every lawyer has for this great jurist; he was not only a great judge, but he had at least one quality of a great lawyer. In arguing before the Virginia State Convention, of which he was a member, for the ratification of the Federal Constitution, he took the position that the court had the power to declare a law unconstitutional; but in his argument of the case of *Ware* v. *Hilton* (3 Dallas 211) he challenged the power of the court to pass upon the validity of legislation, contending that judicial authority should have no right to question the validity of a law unless such a jurisdiction is expressly given by the Constitution. Seven years following this argument he delivered the opinion in the *Marbury* v. *Madison* case to the effect that the authority of the court to declare an act of Congress void was unquestionable, without mentioning his former arguments.

I dwell upon the question because of its importance, and because it is peculiarly an American doctrine. The English courts do not possess the right to pass upon the validity of legislative acts, and it is asserted in Black's constitutional law that there is not a European court that has the authority to declare legislation void because it violates the constitution of the country; but in England a committee of eminent lawyers, called the committee of revision, examines all bills submitted to Parliament. If the committee approves the bill and it passes, its constitutionality is not questioned by the court.

As stated, this power was not expressly given in any of the early State constitutions, nor was it inserted in the Federal Constitution, and no attempt was made to secure the insertion of language in the Federal Constitution which would confer such powers upon the courts. In the Randolph plan, however, there was submitted to the Federal Convention the following: "That the executive and a convenient number of the national judiciary ought to compose a council of revision, with authority to examine every act of the National Legislature before it shall operate, and every act of a particular Legislature before a negative thereon shall be final, etc." This idea was rejected and the reason given in opposition thereto was that the judiciary had the power to declare an act of the Legislature void if it contravened the Constitution.

Incidentally, this proposal in the Randolph plan, in substance, was the same as the provision in the Constitution of New York of 1777, providing for a council of revision, consisting of the governor, chancellor, and the judges of the supreme court, to which all bills were submitted. And incidentally, also, this is the basis of the suggestion of Mr. James M. Beck, Solicitor General of the United States, who stated a short time ago that if Congress should be dubious about the constitutionality of an act pending before it, it might request an opinion from the Supreme Court of the United States as to the validity of such legislation.

The judges were appointed, as a rule, during good behavior in some States by the executive, with advice of the council, as in New Hampshire and Massachusetts; in others, as in Virginia, they were appointed by the legislature.

Having mentioned briefly some of the provisions and characteristics of these early documents, in reference to the three departments of government, I take the liberty to mention a few other things which I have found of interest, and then I close.

Pennsylvania and Vermont had provisions creating a council of censors whose duty it was to inquire whether the constitution had been preserved inviolate in every part; and whether the legislative and executive branches of the government have performed their duties as guardians of the people, or assumed to themselves, or exercised other or greater powers than they were entitled to by the constitution, giving such council the right to publicly censure and order impeachments of any officers violating their duties, and to call a convention to amend the constitution, etc.

The newspapers of today really occupy the position of censors of the public officials who control the government.

Each one of the early constitutions contained a bill of rights as full and complete as any that can be found in any constitution of today, in which is declared the right for freedom of speech and debate, the liberty of the press, the right to keep and bear arms for the common defense, the right to peacefully assemble and consult upon the common good, and to petition for redress of wrongs, the right of trial by jury, the right to have recurrence to the laws for injury or wrongs to his person, character, or property without denial or delay, the right of religious freedom, the right of protection against unreasonable searches and seizures, etc.

I would like to read all the provisions on searches and seizures in these documents, since the subject is of interest today, but I have selected as a sample the provisions in the Massachusetts Constitution, which is as follows: "Every subject has his right to be secure from all unreasonable searches and seizures of his person, his house, his papers, and all his possessions. All warrants, therefore, are contrary to this right if the cause or foundation of them be not previously supported by oath or affirmation, and if the order in the warrant to a civil officer, to make search in a suspected place, or to arrest one or more suspected persons, or to seize their property, be not accompanied with a special designation of the persons or objects of search, arrest, or seizure; and no warrants ought to be issued but in cases and with the formality prescribed by the laws."

The right of trial by jury was cherished by our forebears more than we seem to cherish it today; to illustrate their belief in this ancient institution I quote the following from the New Hampshire Constitution of 1784:

"In order to reap the fullest advantage of the inestimable privilege of the trial by jury, great care ought to be taken that none but qualified persons shall be appointed to serve; and such ought to be fully compensated for their travel, time, and attendance."

Ladies and gentlemen, if you demand an excuse for this paper, I offer the following from the Vermont Constitution, which is identical with that of Pennsylvania as follows: Frequent recurrence to fundamental principles (of Government) and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and keep the government free."

The Blockade of Berlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "The Blockade of Berlin," published by the American Association for a Democratic Germany:

THE BLOCKADE OF BERLIN

"We fight not only for Berlin and Germany, we fight for a better, peaceful, democratic world." (Franz Neumann, chairman of the Berlin Social Democratic Party, at a mass meeting held July 15, 1948, to protest the Russian blockade.)

The 3-year battle for Berlin reached its climax when, late in June 1948, the Russians stopped all land and water traffic between that city and western Germany and all deliveries from their occupation zone to the American, British, and French sectors of Berlin. Some 2,000,000 inhabitants of these sectors were threatened with starvation, and the position of the western powers in the city—an isolated outpost in the eastern part of the Soviet zone—seemed untenable. But a fortnight later American and British cargo planes appeared likely to defeat the Soviet effort to conquer Berlin by starvation.

Originally, the Russians had been sole rulers of the city by virtue of General Eisenhower's action in halting American troops 60 miles away to give the Red Army the honor of conquering Berlin. While quadripartite control of the former German capital was discussed earlier, the actual arrangements for it followed a bargain by which the Russians received Saxony and Thuringia.

Food for Berlin had normally come primarily from the surrounding area. But the Russians now insisted that the western powers take the entire responsibility for supplying their sectors. A compromise was eventually reached by which all four powers helped to supply the entire city. The Russians also agreed to give the western powers full facilities for bringing in supplies from their zones. These facilities turned out to consist of one single track railway line and an auxiliary line for the return of freight trains to the west, one Autobahn (these, however, remaining under Russian control), and the use of some canals. A number of incidents arose as a result of Russian searches of British and American trains, until armed guards were placed on these with instructions to bar any Russian troops. But there was a general tendency to assume that practical problems would all be ironed out in the spirit of Big Three harmony.

It was not long, however, before rifts in the harmony began to appear. Unintentionally and even against their will, the Western Powers found themselves competing with the Soviet Union for the allegiance of the German people. In this they were hampered by the negative and punitive spirit which dominated American occupation policy under Joint Chiefs of Staff Directive 1067. But they were aided by the behavior of the Russian army. In Berlin, where the majority of the people had at first been ready to welcome the Red Army with enthusiasm, the Western Powers were greeted as liberators after 9 weeks of Russian occupation.

BERLIN CHOOSES FREEDOM

In an attempt to recoup the political losses which the Communists had suffered through association with them, the Soviet authorities demanded the formation of a single workers' party by a merger of Communists and Social Democrats. In the Soviet zone proper they were able to accomplish this by a combination of terrorism and bribery. In Berlin, although a majority of the Social Democratic Executive Committee capitulated, a rank and file revolt preserved the independence of the Social Democratic Party. While this revolt could not have succeeded without the presence of the Western Powers, the latter only gave it grudging support at the last minute, regarding Berlin as a part of the Soviet sphere where the triumph of "Eastern Democracy" was inevitable.

This attitude began to change as the Berlin Social Democrats showed their capacity for resistance and as world-wide relations between East and West began to deteriorate. Although their aid to the Social Democrats was negligible compared to the assistance Soviet authorities gave the Communists, the Western Powers did see to it that the democratic parties had some opportunity to present their point of view in Berlin. And their presence made possible the free municipal elections of October 20, 1946, in that city. These resulted in a victory for the Social Democrats, who received 48.6 percent of the vote, against only 19.8 percent for the Communist-controlled Socialist Unity Party.

These elections were a major setback for the Soviet Union in its efforts to win the allegiance of the German people. At the same time, they were a signal triumph for the western democracies—albeit one which they had achieved almost in spite of themselves.

But in large part the social democratic victory was a hollow one, despite its political importance. In their short period of sole control, the Russians had placed Communists in most of the key positions of the municipal administration. Now, by means of their veto in the Kommandatura, they blocked the efforts of the anti-Communist majority in the municipal assembly to reorganize the city government. The most spectacular case in point was their refusal to permit the installation of Berlin's elected mayor, the Social Democrat Ernst Reuter. But perhaps even more important was the continued Communist control of the police, reinforced by the not infrequent action of the Soviet authorities in kidnapping anti-Communist Berliners and deporting them.

THE PARTITION OF GERMANY

Meanwhile it became clear that the unity of Germany, provided for in the Potsdam Agreement, was not in fact being realized. The Soviet zone was being incorporated, politically and economically, into the Russian sphere. Hence the Western Powers began to think seriously about organizing western Germany as a going concern. But this required an acceptance of the Germans as partners.

At Stuttgart on September 6, 1946, Secretary of State Byrnes called for the formation of a provisional German Government with primary responsibility for the conduct of German affairs and proposed the return of some of the eastern territories occupied by Poland. These two proposals made the Stuttgart speech the most effective anti-Communist campaign document in the Berlin elections of the following month. But more important in its practical consequences for the German economy was Byrnes' declaration that if German economic unity could not be obtained, the United States would join its zone with any other. For the moment, he said, only the British had accepted the offer.

A nominal economic merger of the two zones—which it was emphasized had no political implications—took place on January 1, 1947. Russian and Communist quarters immediately charged that it was a violation of the Potsdam agreement and a partitioning of Germany which might destroy the function of the Allied Control Council and the basis for the presence of the Western Powers in Berlin.

But for the moment no real crisis occurred. The Russians still hoped for German unification on a basis which would give them a share in the control of the Ruhr, as well as its production, and a dominant influence on the central German government. This hope faded in the face of increasing evidence that the Western Powers were not willing to pay again—at least on such exorbitant terms—for a German unity which they thought they had already bought at Potsdam. In August 1947 the British and Americans adopted a revised Level of Industry Agreement, designed to let their zones eventually become self-supporting. And with the promulgation of the Marshall plan, steps were initiated for the economic integration of western Germany with western Europe.

LONDON AND AFTER

At this point the Russians apparently decided the western plans were a serious challenge to their position. Largely on their initiative, a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers was called for November in

London. In preparation for this conference the Soviet occupation authorities and the German Communists launched a tremendous propaganda campaign around the theme of German unity. In Berlin the Communist-controlled Socialist Unity Party (SED) called for the evacuation of Germany by troops of all four powers and the immediate election of a central government. It did not, however, explain how these proposals could be realized, in view of the existing dictatorial regime in the Soviet zone. But it proposed the holding of a plebiscite to determine whether the German people wanted unity.

The identification of the SED with the Soviet military authorities made it a somewhat ineffective instrument for this type of propaganda. It therefore attempted to set up an all-party German people's congress, to submit German proposals for a peace treaty. At first, several prominent members of the non-Communist parties signed the call for the Congress. But they were quickly repudiated by their parties in Berlin and the west.

Perhaps even more devastating in its effect was the refusal of Jakob Kaiser, leader of the Christian Democratic Union in Berlin and the Soviet zone, to participate. After an unsuccessful attempt to induce Kaiser to resign "voluntarily," the Russians ordered his removal as leader of the CDU in the Eastern zone, despite a surprising demonstration of support for him by the local CDU organizations. The Berlin CDU remained solidly in back of Kaiser and refused to recognize the Russian-dominated CDU of the eastern zone. And in the Liberal Democratic Party, where the zonal leader Wilhelm Kuelz had been completely subservient to the Soviet authorities, the Berlin organization now declared its independence. The People's Congress was now clearly nothing more than a front for the Socialist Unity Party.

With the break-down of the London conference, the Western Powers could no longer delay plans for the integration of their zones. But inevitably, if two-thirds of Germany were united—and particularly if this unity were accompanied by significant economic improvement—the Soviet zone would be subjected to powerful pressure. As a countermeasure, the Russians found it more important than ever to emphasize the idea of a united Germany. But to set up a government in their zone which could claim authority over all of Germany, they needed sole control of Berlin.

Demands for the departure of the Western Powers from Berlin and hints of action to enforce it began to appear almost daily in the Russian-controlled German press, in Moscow newspapers and over the Russian radio, and in the speeches and statements of Soviet Military Government officials and German Communists.

In March, on the hundredth anniversary of the revolution of 1848, which had sought as its twin goals democracy and the unification of Germany, the People's Congress reassembled. It elected a People's Council, which it was generally assumed was intended as the nucleus of a new Russian-sponsored German government. It also launched a petition asserting Germany's unity in phrases from the Weimar Constitution.

It was the purpose of the Communists to present themselves as the only legitimate heirs of all Germany's democratic traditions, as well as of the striving for national unity, which had occupied so central a position in German political life for over a century. In this they were aided by the traditional desire of France for a weak and divided Germany, as well as by the "States' rights" approach which characterized American military government in the first 2 years of the occupation. In their appeals to the working class they also made use of the efforts of some American officials to block socialization.

THE BATTLE FOR LABOR

Yet the Communists made little headway with the workers, either in Berlin or in western Germany. It was the Social Democrats and the bulk of the trade-unionists, indeed, whose loyalty to the principles of democracy formed the firmest obstacle to Communist penetration. The significance of this becomes clear when we realize that in every country in which a Communist coup has been successful, control of the organized workers has been decisive.

In the western zones, the unions had never been Communist-led. In Berlin, however, the Russians had entrusted the formation of unions to the Communists as soon as they entered the city. When, at the beginning of 1947, elections for a new leadership were finally held, the self-appointed Communist leaders manipulated the election machinery so as to preserve their control, although outvoted in most major factories.

But in the succeeding year the anti-Communists in the Berlin unions organized themselves as the Independent Trade Union Opposition (Unabhaengige Gewerkschafts-Opposition, or UGO). New elections in the Berlin unions took place from March to May of 1948. In the western-occupied sectors of Berlin the UGO was overwhelmingly victorious. Nevertheless, the Communists held control of the electoral machinery, and attempted to bar a number of the anti-Communist delegates from the city convention at which a new executive was to be chosen. The result was a split in the trade-union movement of Berlin, with both the Communists and anti-Communists claiming to be its legitimate leaders. In the Soviet sector, of course, only the Communist leadership was recognized. The western powers, for their part, weighed the claims of both groups for 2 months, and in July finally accorded recognition to the anti-Communist leaders. A joint delegation from the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations also visited Berlin shortly after the split and gave its support to the UGO.

THE BLOCKADE BEGINS

But Berlin was too important a prize for the Russians to surrender it merely because they had failed to win the support of its people. If increasing Soviet pressure met with ever-increasing resistance on the part of the Berliners, it was equally true that the more Berlin resisted, the greater the pressure the Russian authorities applied. And one of their most potent weapons was the threat that, whenever the Western Powers left Berlin, those in that city who had been responsible for thwarting the U. S. S. R. would pay for their rash obstinacy.

It was therefore the purpose of the Soviet authorities to make the position of the Western representatives in Berlin untenable at least in appearance and if possible in fact. Russia's control of all surface communication between Berlin and western Germany furnished a ready-made instrument for this purpose. And at the end of March it was put to use, when the Soviet authorities demanded the right to search all military transport of the Western Powers. The latter refused to submit to the new regulations, and for some days no British or American military trains went through. The United States began to use planes to meet the needs of its forces in Berlin. Then, as suddenly as they had been introduced, the new regulations were withdrawn early in April.

The March attack on Western channels of communication with Berlin was still a part of the war of nerves, rather than an all-out attempt to force a western withdrawal. As long as the Russians did not hinder the "German" trains which brought in supplies for the people of Berlin, it was easy enough to fly in the needs of the Western garrisons.

But if the Soviet authorities could block official military trains, they could stop all trains. And they also had other weapons with which to speed the parting West. At the end of March, the Russians had broken up the Allied Control Council. If they also broke up the four-power Kommandatura which governed Berlin, that city would be split into four occupation sectors. But Berlin had not been planned as four cities, but as one, and its various parts were interdependent. Most of the electricity and water for the British, French, and American sectors came from sources under Russian control. What happened in March seemed only too likely to be a mere foretaste of troubles to come.

"THIS IS NOT PRAGUE"

In June, the troubles came. As a first step in the rehabilitation of western Germany agreed on by the Western Powers at London in that month, a currency reform was decreed for the three western zones. The Russians replied by independently introducing a new currency in their zone. All four occupying powers had long agreed on the need for all-German currency reform, and there had been hope that it might be possible in spite of the division of the country's economy. This finally foundered over the question of whether currency was to be printed only in Berlin under four-power control, or also at Leipzig in the Soviet zone.

But separate currency reforms for eastern and western Germany threatened to divide Berlin. The Russians immediately announced that Berlin belonged to their zone, and only its currency would be valid for the city. The Western Powers were willing to agree either to the simultaneous use of both currencies, or to the sole use of the Soviet zone's—provided that its introduction in Berlin was under four-power supervision.

When the Russians rejected both proposals, the Berlin City Assembly voted to reject any unilateral Soviet orders. The assembly's defiance was particularly courageous, in view of the fact that it met in the Russian sector and in the presence of a Communist mob of several hundred. These Communist demonstrators, brought to the scene in Red Army vehicles, had held up the beginning of the assembly session until its president, Dr. Otto Suhr, had threatened to transfer the meeting to the American sector. And after the assembly adjourned, many members were physically attacked by the mob while the Communist-controlled police stood by. One of the Social Democratic leaders, Jeanette Wolff (a survivor of the Auschwitz extermination camp), was jeered at as an "old Jewess." The next day, after receiving a great spontaneous ovation from a crowd of 60,000 at a protest rally, she declared: "This is not Prague, this is Berlin. We shall not bend till freedom is secure!"

The Berlin Communists could assemble mobs. But they lacked the popular support which would have made them an effective instrument of Russian policy. Thus, they did not dare to call a general strike against the introduction of West German currency in Berlin, because they knew the workers would not respond. Hence the Russians had to act directly.

This they did by clamping down a complete blockade on all land and water transport from the west to Berlin. At first, their pretext was that it was necessary to prevent the smuggling into the Soviet zone of German money made worthless by the western currency reform. Later they declared that "technical difficulties" made the road, railroad, and canals all unusable. Of course, this simultaneous break-down of all means of transport under Soviet control fooled no one. (The newspaper Abend, published in the American sector of Berlin, suggested that the air lanes might have to be closed because United States and British planes were using up all the oxygen in the Soviet zone so that its inhabitants were gasping for breath.) But it did afford the Russians a possible avenue

of retreat, if allied resistance became too strong, since they could then assert that repairs had been completed.

Instead of withdrawing from Berlin, as some inspired rumors indicated they might in the face of a Russian blockade, the Western Powers met the Soviet challenge by bringing in supplies by air. So far, they have been able to keep up food stocks in this manner, although coal and other necessary goods are falling short. But the air lift can be and is being expanded, so that while there is no possibility of its serving as an adequate substitute for other forms of transport, it can almost certainly permit the importation of essential minimum supplies for an indefinite period.

Berlin's resistance to Soviet pressure has, in the words of its elected but uninstalled Mayor Ernst Reuter, "set a frontier to the Russian power." It has also made it impossible for the Western Powers to withdraw from that city, short of war, without hopelessly compromising their position in the eyes of these democratic forces which have rallied to them not only in Germany, but elsewhere.

Restoring German Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to solve the many problems of the armed forces in restoring the government of the German people, there have been suggestions of town hall meetings, and I am calling attention to meetings between city and rural groups which have been long fostered in the United States under the plan called rural-urban coordination, by C. S. Hunsinger, of Flat Rock, Ohio, which I am including herewith:

RURAL-URBAN COORDINATION

(By C. S. Hunsinger)

FOREWORD

This booklet has been written by one who has lived in a rural community for almost 50 years, and after more than 30 years' practical experience in community work. It is therefore a description of actual accomplishment.

Always interested in improving the community life, the author found the need for some simple, practical organization in order to get projects accomplished. This led to the organization of the Flat Rock Public Committee for the unincorporated village, then the Thompson Township Council and later the Four-Township Council, which represented all of the rural districts around the local shopping-center city of Bellevue, Ohio. The Rural-Urban Coordinating Council is the latest development and is recommended as the most practical and efficient organization of all for the mutual interests of both the city and country. With these organizations, more than 100 public projects have been accomplished, all of which are typical of the needs of the average rural communities of America. It is a rural plan that has been worked out by the rural people themselves.

The author wishes to take this opportunity to express his deep appreciation to all the public-spirited people in both the city of Bellevue and the five surrounding townships, for their patience and cooperation throughout the years.

C. S. HUNSINGER.

ACCOMPLISHING RURAL COMMUNITY WORK

Life in the country can be made either rich or poor. It all depends upon the extent that the people make use of the advantages which are available for rural communities.

The majority of the comforts, conveniences, and blessings of the cities can be secured if the rural people really want them. And the next generation of country folks will have these modern conveniences, because the young people of today, who will be the farmers of the future, will want them.

Each year, more and more city people are moving to the suburbs. This is indeed very complimentary and should make the rural people feel that we have a good place in which to live, after all. However, the suburban folks have brought with them the best things from the cities and have combined them with the good things of the country. Should this not be a splendid example for the villagers and farmers to do the same and thus make their homes happy and content?

Perhaps the first question will be: "Yes, but that takes money," so it will be the purpose of this book to show that the majority of these improvements which are desired and needed in rural communities, are possible of attainment through a new cooperative, community effort—for have not most of the conveniences of the cities been made available through the principle of cooperation?

What are the advantages of rural life?

A most happy and successful life can be lived in a progressive rural community when the following advantages are considered:

The restful atmosphere, which is quieting to the nerves, permitting complete relaxation.

Wholesome food, fresh, and of the best quality.

The privilege of dressing comfortably.

Complete home-life with all the family present.

Beautiful natural scenery—for "only God can make a tree."

Proper exercise and recreation, out-of-doors in the clear air and direct sunshine, next to the earth.

Privileges of owning homes and land. Reasonable prices make them available for the average family.

Real economy, for a dollar goes so much farther in the country.

City conveniences are generally available: Electricity, telephones, newspapers, mail delivery, public libraries, hospitals, etc.

Spare-time for everybody to enjoy pets, hobbies, and the companionship of friends.

Healthful children. The average country child lives from 6 to 7 years longer than the city child.

The privilege of working with nature in the flower and vegetable gardens, as well as in the fields.

What are some of the disadvantages?

Let's face them frankly, for they are generally overrated.

The lack in some communities of conveniences and services—but most are possible. Lack of popular entertainment and opportunities to earn money; isolation and lonely life; hard labor; lack of sanitation, health facilities, etc.; weather conditions; lack of tools.

How shall the standard of living be measured?

Everything depends upon viewpoint.

Everybody judges other people from their own personal standards; do they not?

The cultured judge others by their education. Attractive folks look for beauty. The bank accounts appeal to the wealthy. The religious are attracted by character. The good dresser judges other people by their clothes. The owner of a beautiful home looks at the property of others. The owners of Packards ask what automobile is driven. The large landowner considers the size of other people's farms, etc.

But what are the real standards for a rural community?

The real standards of living should not be measured by outside show, but the general appearance of farms and homes, as to neatness and good taste, is usually a good index.

However, a look at the inside of homes gives a much better impression.

After all, isn't it the character of people that counts for most? Their integrity, industry, religion, and public spirit? Therefore the church attendance, the school program, the home life and care, recreation and social activities, the public conveniences, etc., are of most value in ascertaining the real standards of a community. And, of course, the community will be known by the children they raise—"by their fruits ye shall know them."

What is the most practical way of raising these standards?

In order to raise the standards of a community, a practical, definite and extensive program is necessary—one that will reach into every home in a helpful way. The following viewpoints should be considered: Give people high ideals and discourage low standards.

Help people to earn money and to spend it wisely.

Influence the home life of the people and assist in raising the best kind of boys and girls.

Encourage proper social activities and the use of leisure.

Develop the cultural side of the people.

Secure the very best governmental service.

Arrange cooperative services and public conveniences.

And, foremost of all, cooperate with the churches of the community, for a real faith in God and belief in Jesus Christ will help the people more than in any other way.

Possibilities of raising the rural standards

When the people of a rural community unite in a definite program, with a list of definite projects to be accomplished by definite individuals, it is surprising what can be done.

Give the people the viewpoint that it is possible to get what they want. Give them a vision, an ambition, a definite aim, and their time, talents, and funds will be found available.

Such a definite program is the object of this book. It is possible because it has already been tried out and found successful in a typical rural community.

Specimen of yardstick form used by our council—What do the people want?

Every citizen of this community has in years past undoubtedly said, "We ought to have (this or that)" or "Somebody ought to do (this or that)" but perhaps these things have not yet been accomplished.

The Rural-Urban Council has been organized in order to secure some of the comforts, conveniences and services that the people want, and this letter invites every citizen to send in a list of the projects which they desire.

Community needs can usually be grouped into the 12 classes shown below. Will you please list your ideas and suggestions under these various projects and give your advice on how each of these community needs could be improved?

These requests will be the basis of the council program and your advice will be very much appreciated.

In your opinion, how can each of the following public services be improved:

1. Protection: Fire, police, elimination of dangers, etc.

2. Public utility services: Electricity, telephone, newspapers, transportation facilities, etc.

3. Governmental services: Township, county, State and National.

4. Educational advantages: Schools, library service, adult programs, etc.

5. Religious and charitable services: Church service, Christian influences, nonsectarian programs.

6. Economic advantages: Markets, buying and selling, credit, taxation, local resources, etc.

7. Leisure time program: Recrcational facilities for all age groups.

8. Business and professional services: Efficient markets, reasonable prices, etc.

9. Health program: Cooperative hospitalization, Red Cross services, health programs.

10. Social program: Wholesome, interesting, and helpful.

11. Cooperative services: Community auction sales, machinery exchanges, etc.

12. A general plan for the community using the above projects as a basis.

What general plan for community development would you advise, or what would you like to have in your township 10 years hence?

Please list any special ideas or suggestions of your own, which are not covered by above subjects.

A YARDSTICK FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES

What constitutes the ideal rural community? Where everybody is wealthy, healthy, happy, wise, honest, industrious, moral, etc.—"a heaven on earth, utopia"?

If there would be such a perfect community in the United States, what a constant job it would be with the influx from other communities until they too would be "idealized." Therefore, the ideal standards of a rural community will be given as goals to be worked toward—just as Christians should not be expected to be perfect, but credit should be given them for their real attempt.

Twelve definite goals will be suggested for the average rural community to adopt as their program—general objects which are generally needed in every community. And, if the people will adopt this program, through a centralized organization, they will certainly have the opportunity to get them accomplished.

By keeping such a definite program constantly before the people, they will unconsciously learn to expect and want the improvements and will not be satisfied until they are made available. It must also be borne in mind that it usually takes much time and effort to entirely complete the usual public project and generally needs the backing of individuals and organizations with an abundance of patience and public spirit.

Protection

Rural communities are as much entitled to fire and police protection as are the cities, and it is possible to secure it. First-aid appliances and service should be encouraged, but the local officials should provide really adequate fire equipment and service so it will be available for use by any citizen in need. Such service is a real necessity in the average rural community.

Public utility services

If the community is lacking any of the modern public conveniences or services, such as telephones, electricity, railroad, bus or truck delivery service, they can usually be supplied if the people will really use it. Public demand is a powerful appeal and if it is concentrated through a strong, public organization, it will usually receive the utmost consideration.

Complete Government services

The local township trustees, village officials, boards of education, etc., have exceptional advantages to serve their communities. If they are progressive and if a public-spirited organization cooperates with them tactfully, many public projects can be readily accomplished.

The county officials can also serve in a remarkable way if they are consulted and cooperated with closely, also if they are given proper credit for their projects and service.

And what a wonderful service the State and National Governments have available for the asking, through a local contact person as will be suggested later.

Educational advantages

A comparison of the present local school system with the facilities offered in other communities in the State is undoubtedly the best method of checking the local advantages and disadvantages. Cooperate with the local school authorities on this project and give them the opportunity to first secure the advantages or correct the disadvantages before appealing to the public. Public library service and similar educational projects should be included in this program.

Religious and charitable work

The fundamental values of farm life are mainly spiritual and the life of the people of every rural community will be enriched immeasurably with sincere religious services.

The church should work closely with the schools, library, and other organizations, and the pastors made members of a central organization to assist in the general community program. It should be emphasized that, after all, the very best way to help people is to assist them to get a better faith in God and Jesus Christ.

Economic conditions

A rural community that sponsors projects which will increase the income of the people, and provide ways and means for them to spend it wisely, is performing a vital service. An organization similar to a chamber of commerce would be profitable in sponsoring a better handling of the local crops and products, making a study of local taxation, etc. A definite economic program would aid communities in a remarkable way.

Leisure-time program

Leisure time is becoming more and more important, and a definite program will certainly be a good investment. However, it should be planned for all ages instead of for just the children and a public organization sponsoring such a project will reap rich dividends for any rural community. Close cooperation with the local services, the schools, churches, clubs, lodges, etc., demands a central organization on this project as suggested in a later chapter of this book.

Business and professional services

The business and professional people conduct a valuable service for communities. True, they make a profit out of it, but their goods and services are absolutely necessary. They are usually large contributors to local projects and their personal community work is usually progressive and valuable. Their contacts can add much to the economic life. This section should also include the local newspapers.

Health and sanitation

Are there unhealthful conditions in your community? Undoubtedly, many people have said, "Somebody ought to get that cleaned up," but no individual is willing to brave the battle. An organization elected by and representing all the people such as will be suggested later, can easily tackle such ticklish jobs and get them done. There is an abundance of material available for health projects—all waiting to be requested and distributed.

Social program

There are usually sufficient social programs in rural communities. What is needed mostly is a general plan in order to avoid overlapping and all the public organizations joined together in one group will overcome this feature. The young people of all ages—the most wonderful "crop" of every community—is the group mostly affected, so their viewpoints should be considered and a wholesome program provided.

Cooperative services

There are so many cooperative services available for rural communities that a special section should be donated to them. Cooperative agreements between farmers for the use of special machinery can be worked out easily. Cooperative markets and agencies for the purchase of necessities should be included. The national cooperative societies have wonderful services and plans to send to progressive communities. However, the local businessman should receive careful consideration in such a program.

Community plannings

Secure the viewpoints of the people on the subject What Kind of a Community Would I Like to Live in 10 Years Hence. This might well be the subject of a prize essay contest among the local high-school students, because 10 years hence the majority of these students will be married and raising families of their own. What more could be asked than for them to be willing to settle down in the local community and thus reap the benefit of their suggestions? If a committee would study a general plan of this kind for 6 months or more, then work out a definite and practical program, your community would have an ideal project—not socialistic, but really practical. A central committee, representing everybody in the community, on this project can handle it most satisfactorily.

THE GENERAL NEEDS OF RURAL COMMUNITIES

What is the reason that the majority of rural communities still lack some of the public services and conveniences that the cities have enjoyed for years?

There are several reasons: Perhaps the most applicable is the lack of a central organization which is capable of handling any of the various public projects which have been needed.

True, each rural community has its regularly elected board of trustees and other officials, but these bodies are limited to governmental projects and cannot sponsor public needs, such as: Telephone, newspaper, health, recreation, moral, and similar projects.

The boards of education attend to the needs of the schools, but usually leave the clubs, lodges, churches, and other groups or individuals to attempt the social, economic, and other community problems.

Each public organization sponsors the improvements in their particular line of endeavor, but do not feel adapted to attempt a general program of community work, and, of course, no individual would feel authorized to go ahead. All these organizations are undoubtedly doing splendid work, but how much more they would be able to do, if they could secure the cooperation of all the other constructive forces and secure the backing and support of the people?

And the public-spirited individuals who have the best interests of the community at heart—how they would welcome a central organization in the community, to which they could submit their ideas and have the hope of getting them considered by the people.

A wonderful community spirit could be developed if all the people could get together and pool their ideas and talk over their local problems in a give-and-take relationship, similar to the New England town meetings where all citizens gathered in the town hall on election day. Here, each had the opportunity of proposing for consideration anything he believed to be for the general good. Each man had a right to be heard and after a full discussion a vote was taken. All had equal rights and there was the utmost freedom of speech.

What profitable projects could be accomplished in such a frank, open-and-above-board relationship.

If some special group of citizens could be appointed to make a definite study of the needs of the community; the educational, social, moral, economic, etc., and submit a general plan of progress for the community for a period of perhaps 5 years and if they would be asked to approve this definite program—what a worth-while goal it would be.

Perhaps one of the most common excuses in rural communities is the small number of people affected by each project, so small that the community leaders feel, "Oh, What's the use; there are so few people that will be affected," etc. And thus so many worthwhile projects are left undone. They seem to underestimate the quality of the small quantity—for even if just a few young people are helped to make the world better by some local project, it does become worth-while.

For the encouragement of community workers the following facts are given with the hope that it will help them overcome an inferiority complex:

"It is practically impossible to get 50 percent of the ordinary population to do any given thing, no matter how important. To get as many as a hundred out of any miscellaneous thousand to make any response whatever to any offer is unusual. To get fifty people per thousand is doing well and 1 percent is not bad."

The organization that is recommended in the next chapter represents the entire township or district instead of a single section or community and thus represents more people—thereby giving a crowd after all.

If there is a ticklish problem that has remained unsolved for perhaps years, or one that has been holding back the community because no single organization or individual has felt willing to undertake it, it shows the need of a central organization to handle it. Is such an organization possible? Yes; and it is the object of this book to describe it.

A community automobile

Nearly everything seems to be done successfully with machines these days, so why not build a community automobile to get your rural community work accomplished?

All the constructive forces in the average village or township can be readily assembled and function as efficiently as a modern auto.

A motorized organization of this kind has since 1935 been tried out in a northern Ohio community, and it actually gets things done, easily and efficiently. There are a number of plans of this character throughout the country, but this one is different because it "just grew," step by step, out of the common needs of a typical rural community. It is a down-to-earth program.

After 25 years of community work, the inventor of this community automobile, as it is sometimes called, became impatient with the delays in securing public improvements in his home town. A public meeting had been called to discuss fire protection, and finally a committee was appointed to continue the discussion, which usually meant delay and death to the project, so he asked the people to try something different. And the township council organization is the result.

The plan is a very simple one. It is not just another organization, but an organization of all the other organizations in a community. All the constructive forces; the schools, churches, local government, lodges, granges, the women and young people's societies—all united into a single group that functions like a modern automobile.

It is named a township council and as it is authorized by a public vote of the citizens it is free to discuss any community needs and take action on them. It is nonpolitical and nonsectarian. The permanent personnel consists of the presiding officers and representatives of the organizations and groups named below:

Board of township trustees, township board of education, superintendent of public schools, the pastor of each church, president of the farmers' institute, chairman of farm bureau, director of vocational agriculture, president of parent-teacher association, superintendent of each Sunday school, president of Future Farmers of America or 4–H, president of Future Home Makers of America (giving the boys and girls a representation), a representative farmer, a representative businessman, a representative housewife, a representative young woman, a representative young man.

Perhaps the following illustration of a typical township council compared with a modern automobile will better show what a really practical plan it is and can easily become. It is compared in this way to emphasize the fact that if all the parts or all the public-service organizations unite, that the body will really function as a unit and thus be able to accomplish projects that would ordinarily be impossible.

In practically every community it seems there are some public projects that the people have been talking about accomplishing for years. What improvements have they meant when saying:

"Somebody ought to take that up. It should be done," etc. Do they mean adequate fire protection, public library service, more efficient telephone service, lower power rates, more shade trees or playground equipment? Have the people been waiting to "let George do it"? A real George organization, patient, capable, and efficient, is found in a township council of this kind, so if there are community problems which need action, simply organize a council and "let George do it."

Perhaps the chief advantage of a council of this kind is the simplicity of organization for practically everything, members and all, are always available and it only requires the leadership of a few public-spirited men or women to arrange for it.

The established organizations in a community; the schools, lodges, churches, granges, etc., are entirely capable of taking care of the community work in their own line of endeavor, but there are always a number of projects needed in every township which are too general in scope for some one group to handle successfully. This is where a council can succeed because it is officially authorized by a public vote, as will be shown later, and can also secure the cooperation of the other organizations.

A meeting of all these leaders of a community is most impressive, and unconsciously gives the members and people a new enthusiasm, confidence, and ambition to get things done. And it is an organization that grows in power and influence—one that will last for years. It breaks down the spirit of rivalry and substitutes a real cooperative feeling which is an asset to every community.

It eliminates the overlapping of activities and the duplication of work. It provides a definite program instead of haphazard efforts and uncompleted tasks. It is capable of accomplishing jobs that no other single organization would attempt.

The expenses of such an organization are very, very low and even these can easily be met in connection with the various projects.

Another advantage is the opportunity it gives the women and young people of the community. Their enthusiasm, willingness, and ability is well known and a council gives these groups a voice and vote for community betterment. Perhaps the men have had the community work under control to a larger extent than they realize and this will give the women a "break" and the young folks an opportunity to tell what they want. Even the boys and girls are represented in a council of this kind. After all, aren't these three groups the ones that the men really live and work for?

This organization gives the community workers, those who have been working for public spirit alone and not for salaries, the opportunity to control public problems that have perhaps been holding back some community project for years. These public-spirited men and women, leaders in all the constructive forces, are generally the very best type of citizens and a council of this kind gives them the opportunity to really build a better community. In some cases, the regularly elected public officials: the board of trustees, board of education, etc., will resent the organization of a council, thinking that it infringes upon their rights and duties, but after they work with this plan they will soon realize it to be a wonderful asset. It relieves them of the "kicks" and selfish demands of individuals which is the worry of all boards of this kind, and acts as a clearinghouse for public opinion. The council is organized for the benefit of the entire community and on public questions can easily ascertain for the public officials just what the majority of the people want. These boards are seldom willing to initiate public projects and will welcome the services of a council in arousing public sentiment for them. It acts as a buffer between them and the taxpayers. County and State officials also welcome such an unselfish public-spirited organization, for they realize it is concerned about the best interests of all the people and favors no special section or group.

A council provides a channel of contact between the community and the nearby cities, the county, State, and National Government departments and the hundreds of foundations and service departments throughout the country which are more than willing to assist progressive communities.

A township council will at once attract public attention and advertise the community as wide-awake and progressive. The projects that it accomplishes will really increase the value of the farms and make a better place for the entire families in which to live.

Are you the public-spirited citizen who is willing to act as the starter of this community automobile? Then, simply show this plan to some of the other leaders in your community and talk it over with them informally. Also discuss the various public projects that are most needed in your local community, for a council provides the opportunity to accomplish them if anything can.

(A complete procedure showing how easily a township council can be organized will be given in a later chapter.)

Your _____ township council automobile is now ready to go. If the people will fill the gas tank with enthusiasm, the board of trustees adjust their carburetor, telephone company check the wiring, electric company turn on the headlights, parents pump up the tires to support the children's wheels, the churches have their oil ready to make the machine run smoothly—pull out the businessmen's choke, turn on the council's switch key, step on your starter, and the council automobile is running. By stepping on the accelerator and leaving in the optimistic clutch, asking your local newspaper to blow the horn, your truckload of public projects is on its way to accomplishment.

The following suggestive list of public projects have actually been completed with a council automobile. Select those that fit your local needs and you will be surprised at the speed and efficiency of your program:

Community survey of needs, adequate fire protection, township library service, sponsorship of township industries, farm-naming campaign, Red Cross emergency service, township address system, study of local taxation, services of national Government agencies, general 10-year plan of improvements, lone Boy Scout program, a farm machinery repair shop, securing cooperation of county officials, cooperation with local churches, local government services, cooperation of the

home-town newspaper, township communication, naming of rural roads, care of aged, invalids, and neglected, encouragement of local talent, adult educational classes, township employment bureau, a community hobby show, township nature and garden club, reforestation program, highway beautification, electricity available for all, community health program, group travel trips, shipping facilities, general township improvement fund, community exchange, transportation facilities, running water in every home campaign, rural gas services, rural beautification campaign, a year 'round recreation program, a national cooperative agency, cooperative service outfits, general children's program, township soil survey, history of the community, community homecoming service, local police protection, National Bureau of Standards service, cooperative purchasing agency, county and State extension service, community bulletin board service, community and school playgrounds, cooperation with school program, township publicity program, community calendar of activities.

How to organize a township council

The public-spirited citizen who wishes to organize a township council will find it to be a most interesting project and one that will receive an enthusiastic reception.

Simply describe to some of the other leaders in the community the general plan of having all the heads of the various public service organizations and groups, united in a special body, comparing the assembly with a modern automobile, as illustrated in another chapter. Also talk over the possible projects which such a council might well attempt in your community.

After several weeks of personal discussion and consideration, interview these men and women again and if they are willing to cooperate simply write to the Rural-Urban Coordinating Council, at Flat Rock, Ohio, for complete plans and counsel.

Then arrange for a meeting of all the logical members of such a council to discuss the organization. Also invite other influential citizens and have the meeting open to everyone.

At this public gathering, arrange for a community-builder, in whom the people have confidence, to give a detailed description of the council and include a general discussion of the popular projects that are needed in the district. The community council automobile will assist in dramatizing this program.

After the proposition has been thoroughly presented, ask for a rising vote to decide if a public vote should be arranged for or not, explaining that a ballot similar to the one shown herewith should be voted upon by all the citizens. If this public meeting approves this procedure, request that a temporary committee of three be appointed to arrange for the proper wording, distribution, and method of voting. Also decide at this meeting upon the list of organizations to be invited to participate and secure the nominations of three citizens to represent the businessmen, farmers, housewives, young men and young women, and the boys and girls, whose names are to appear on the ballot, one of which is to be elected to represent each group. However, if the citizens wish, they can vote to have the council organized without taking the public vote.

If the election shows approval of the council, the temporary committee will call a meeting to officially organize, elect a president, vice president, secretary-treasurer, and an executive committee of five. At this meeting the officers should take charge and arrange for the initial projects to be sponsored. It is well to appoint a director to take charge of each project with full authority to proceed and report to the council meeting. These directors should also become members of the council. This plan of appointing one individual instead of a committee will be found very satisfactory.

A suitable constitution and bylaws, specimen of which is suggested herewith, should be adopted. It should also be decided if the local newspaper or a special printed council bulletin, similar to the specimen shown herewith, should be used. If the bulletin idea is decided upon, simply request the county farm agent or auditor for a complete mailing list of the township, and with this complete coverage it will be an easy matter to solicit sufficient advertising to cover the costs of printing and mailing of each issue, and for suitable stationery, which should also be provided out of this advertising fund, for it will aid much in the further work of the council. Specimens of letterheads, survey forms, notification slips, etc., are shown herewith.

Your township council automobile is now loaded with the initial projects, the machinery running smoothly. Gradually leave in the optimistic clutch, step on the accelerator, enthusiasm, and act as if it is impossible to fail. Success to you.

COUNCIL PLAN FOR SMALL INCORPORATED TOWNS

In the majority of rural districts there are some incorporated towns and so many of them really need a council organization of this kind to get things done. This township plan has therefore been changed to fit this condition. Practically the same constitution and method of organization can be used as in rural districts, but some changes in the personnel are necessary, which are indicated below.

The manufacturers should represent the engine.

The city council the carburetor.
The gas company the fuel pump.
The service director the radiator.
The professional men the fan.
The YMCA, Boy Scouts, etc., the bumper.
The hospital the muffler.

Attention is also directed to the council plan for the unincorporated villages in rural districts, shown as a supplement in the form of a public committee instead of council. So we have now suggested a practical organization for all the classes of rural communities.

Ballot

Shall we have a _____ township council?

It is proposed that the presiding officers of all the following organizations: (list names) be organized as a _____ township council in order to unite these constructive forces for community betterment. It shall be nonpolitical and nonsectarian and organized for the sole purpose of accomplishing public projects similar to the following: (names of popular projects). Each citizen of voting age is requested to indicate their wishes below and bring or send this ballot to the sealed box at the (centralized school or other public building) not later than _____.

☐ I approve of the above council organization.

☐ I do not approve of the above organization.

(Sign if you wish) _____

Constitution

Article I. Name: The name of this organization shall be the _____ township council of _____ county, _____ State.

Article II. Object: This council is an organization of all the constructive forces in the township, so they may be brought together for cooperative discussion and action.

Article III. Authority: This council has been authorized by a public vote of the citizens of _____ township on _____ (date). The council will consider itself free to discuss any community need and to take action either directly as a community organization or through the cooperating forces in the council. The council shall be nonpolitical and nonsectarian.

Article IV. Membership: The permanent personnel of the council shall consist of the presiding officers of the following organizations and representatives of groups: (list).

Article V. Duties of members: Each member will represent in the council the interests of his or her organization or group and shall enlist their cooperation in council projects. Each member shall vote as directed by the organization represented.

Article VI. Officers: The officers shall be a president, vice president, secretary-treasurer, and an executive committee of five members. The president of the township board or trustees and township board of education shall be permanent members of the executive committee, also the president of the council. Officers shall be elected at the first meeting of the calendar year by a majority vote of the members present.

Article VII. Meetings: Meetings will be held at the call of the president or upon written request of five members. The presiding officer may consider any number of persons a quorum. The meetings shall be conducted according to Roberts' Parliamentary Rules of Order, and will be open to the public.

Article VIII, Amendments: The constitution and bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership.

Bylaws

Section I. Officers: Any officer of the council who is not reelected as presiding officer of his or her organization shall complete the term of office in the council.

Council projects

If the council will follow the suggestions given in the yardstick for rural communities and other chapters of this booklet, a complete general program will be available for the year's work, comprising the real needs of the community. If a pithy description of each of the projects is published throughout the year, the public will have their attention called to them so often that almost unconsciously they will begin to want them accomplished and will not be satisfied until they are completed.

If a special committee is appointed to handle each of these projects, the members will be able to shift the responsibility to the others. The following procedure is therefore recommended to eliminate this complaint: Let the council appoint one individual as a director of each different project, to serve until it is either completed or until he or she resigns. The names of the directors should be published beneath the name of each project, so the people will know who is responsible and can give the encouragement and credit for all the good work they accomplish, or the opposite.

This plan will save time in holding committee meetings, arguing, etc., and will get things done. Try it.

Supplementary material available

A special supplement covering the detailed handling of rural community projects will be made available in a size to fit this book, so that additional helps can be included from time to time.

A complete bibliography service will also be maintained, covering the helps available on each project. National associations, agencies, governmental departments, periodicals, etc., are constantly extending valuable assistance and all of this material is filed in a project scrapbook by the National Township Council, for the use of township councils, or any rural organizations. Any of the supplementary booklets will be forwarded upon receipt of 5 cents each to cover postage and mailing expenses.

Specimen council bulletin, Rural-Urban Coordinating Council of the City of Bellevue and Surrounding Townships

Rural council

Rural coordinator: C. S. Hunsinger, Flat Rock, Ohio.

Government: Lyme Township, Joseph Lawler, chairman; township officers and county officials.

Education: Thompson Township, W. C. Garland, chairman; all superintendents of schools; presidents, board of education, library and PTA associations.

Religion: Sherman Township, Reverend Taunero, chairman; Flat Rock Public Committee, Rev. O. W. Matzke, all pastors, Sunday school superintendents, and heads of Christian groups.

Economics: Groton Township, Harlow Stahl, chairman; heads of all farm bureaus and cooperatives, farm groups, and public utilities.

Social: York Township, H. L. Seaman, chairman; heads of all granges, 4-H clubs, and social groups.

City council

Bellevue coordinator: H. B. Wright, Bellevue, Ohio.

Government: Mayor J. F. Shannon, chairman; service director, State patrol, Red Cross, hospital.

Education: Superintendent of Schools S. D. Swigert, chairman; president, board of education, PTA association, librarian.

Religion: Ministerial association, Reverend Euler, president; all Sunday school superintendents and heads of Christian groups.

Economics: Booster club, W. M. LaSalle, chairman; and heads of all labor organizations, industries, public utilties, and newspapers.

Social: YMCA secretary, John Slater, chairman; heads of all clubs and lodges and social organizations.

Publicity: Paul M. Callaghan, chairman.

Projects accomplished: The following projects of interest to our rural people have been completed through our organization. Most of them were accomplished with the cooperation of the Bellevue Coordinating Council and it is very much appreciated.

Adequate fire protection now available

The initial public project which really started our community council organization is now entirely completed with the purchase of the two new fire apparatus trucks recently provided by the city of Bellevue.

The township trustees of Lyme, Groton, York and Thompson have all signed contracts with the city of Bellevue making their city fire department services available to everyone. The Sherman Township trustees are now negotiating with the city council for similar protection.

Bellevue library service

All of the rural people surrounding Bellevue except those living in Groton Township can now enjoy all the privileges of the Bellevue Public Library free of charge and we hope to soon include Groton Township in a contract. Over twenty thousand books are available, and rural people are invited to enjoy the reading rooms whenever in Bellevue and also take out books.

Baseball game

For a number of years the Bellevue Booster Club have taken their city boys to a league baseball game in Cleveland. Last summer they presented our council with one hundred tickets and three busloads of our farm boys had a good time.

Community picnic

The Bellevue Boosters gave a special invitation to our folks living in "Greater Bellevue" to attend their annual community picnic at Cedar Point and many of our people enjoyed it.

Fireside telephone service

For many years the people living near Fireside have had to pay tolls in order to telephone to Bellevue. This was one of the original projects of our council, and we are glad to announce that the Ohio Public Utilities Commission has recently approved the sale of the Ohio State Telephone Co. to the Northern Ohio Co., which will give free service to and from this area. The value of this project will be more and more appreciated in coming years, as it makes 2,152 additional telephones available for our rural subscribers.

Local community fairs

Community fairs in our various township centralized schools have become problems for a number of years. This council therefore called a meeting of all the interested groups and made plans for the future which we trust will be of mutual benefit.

City playgrounds made available

The Bellevue Boosters interceded on our behalf and made arrangements with the city council and schools for our country boys and girls to be welcome at the city's playgrounds. The Girl Scouts, YMCA, and other social organizations have also extended invitations, so our young people have clean places of amusement available for them when they go to town.

YMCA rural campaign

It has been the program of this council to make all the public services of the city of Bellevue available to our rural people. This winter the five chairmen of our organization were invited to participate in the annual YMCA campaign, and quite a number of our rural young men are now members. Swimming teams are now being organized in each township, so we won't have to use the 'ole swimmin' hole any longer.

Special rural-urban edition of the Bellevue Gazette

Our council was especially honored last August with a 24-page special rural-urban edition of our home-town newspaper. The business and professional men of Bellevue generously supported this movement, and we now feel that we must make good in some way.

Fire-extinguisher service

All soda-acid fire extinguishers should be recharged at least once each year. Arrangements have therefore been made for the Bellevue Fire Department to render this service to our rural people at actual cost of materials. Simply take your extinguisher in on one of your shopping trips each year.

State highway signs

This community, located at the extreme corner of four counties, has always been somewhat neglected in many projects. Our council has therefore requested the State highway department to erect a number of signs to meet local needs and they have been very willing to do so.

United States mail service

When railroad service was abundant many years ago, the United States Post Office Department arranged RFD service according to the railroad schedule at that time. As everyone knows, most of these trains have since been abandoned, and some of the small surrounding towns have very inadequate service available which causes serious delays to the mail of these rural people.

The city of Bellevue has six trains and four star routes in and out each day and many of our rural people have asked us to secure Bellevue mail service for them.

The United States Post Office Department has advised us that they will consider such rerouting if the people want it.

A separate letter will therefore be included with this circular to all residents who receive their mail from other than the Bellevue postoffice and we will be glad to receive your decisions and take the matter up with the postal authorities.

Collection of taxes in Bellevue

For many years the people of Thompson, Reed, and Adams Townships, also Groton, Lyme, and Sherman have had to send or take their taxes to their respective county seats. Our council has made this service available for these taxpayers through the cooperation of the Union Bank & Savings Co. The taxpayers of York Township may pay their taxes at the First National Bank at the prescribed dates.

State zoning law available

An organization such as our council provides many contacts with State and National projects which would otherwise be lost. We have been interested in removing the eyesores in our townships, and when a State zoning law was introduced this council put a lot of pressure on our State officials. We at least helped to have it passed and all our county commissioners will now appoint a zoning board with whom we can cooperate.

Railroad-crossing protection

When Editor Meiers, of the Gazette, introduces his public-spirited projects from time to time he requests the cooperation of various organizations and we were glad to back him up in the project of securing signal flashers at the Nickel Plate Railroad crossing on Route 4 east of Bellevue. They are now installed and will undoubtedly save lives.

Employment

The officials of the General Electric Co. requested our council to recommend young women from the country for employment in their factory. Just at this time we will recommend an additional list. If interested, get in touch with your township council chairman.

Township chairmen: Groton township, Harlow Stahl; Lyme Township, Joseph Lawler; York Township, H. L. Seaman; Sherman Township, Rev. Taunero (co-chairman, Albert Geiger).

Our yardstick

What other projects do you want accomplished? List them under these suggestive headings: Protection, public utility services, complete government services, educational advantages, religious and charitable work, economic conditions, leisure-time program, business and professional services, health and sanitation, social program, cooperative services, and community planning.

Sample list of public services made available by a rural-urban council

The Bellevue Public Library: The residents of all townships except Groton are now entitled to the services of this library free. Over 20,000 books are available. Simply ask for your library card.

State highway patrol station: These patrolmen are authorized by State law to make arrests for trespassing on farms or rural property. Simply call phone 90 for such protection.

The Bellevue Hospital: An efficient, progressive hospital service, made convenient for the emergencies of all rural people.

Fire protection: The services of the Bellevue Fire Department are now available for rural calls on a contract.

Telephone services: Over 2,000 homes of friends and relatives, business and professional firms are connected—ready for calls at any minute. Rural people are only a minute away from Bellevue with a telephone.

Newspaper service: Keep acquainted with each other through our home-town newspaper. It is our common meeting place for community news.

YMCA., Girl Scouts, etc.: Rural young people are welcomed to join these organizations.

Electricity: Prompt, efficient and reasonable service made available.

Rural-mail services: Efficient mail services are available out of Bellevue.

Profitable markets: If other towns pay more, please advise. Bellevue is favorably located for disposing of produce and grains.

Clubs, lodges and other organizations: Memberships are always welcomed from rural residents.

Transportation: Efficient railroad, express, truck and bus lines.

RURAL-URBAN COORDINATING COUNCIL

This rural-urban coordinating council presents the most complete and efficient organization that has actually been tried out and found practical in a typical community.

This unique development is not a city plan, but was initiated by the rural people themselves in order to secure fire protection, library services, and other public conveniences. Instead of the individual rural communities endeavoring to take care of themselves, it was found best with this plan to group all the rural districts or townships around their natural shopping-center town. This provides an efficient contact with all the constructive forces of the city as illustrated in the accompanying letterhead.

As will be noticed, this organization unites all the government agencies, schools, churches, business and social organizations of the entire trade area and provides a definite contact with the corresponding organizations in the city where all of these rural people transact business and enjoy the various public services. The cities and rural districts need each other to their mutual advantage and this plan provides such a contact.

Rural sociologists claim that the real problem of rural communities is lack of leadership. This plan not only develops leaders by giving the country people the inspiration and confidence of working with the city organizations, but by grouping all the country districts surrounding the city, it gives the enthusiasm of numbers and naturally provides a spirit of competition in securing more and better public services.

Every rural community has public problems of some kind awaiting solution such as: Unsanitary conditions, inadequate fire or police protection, public-utility services, library, playgrounds, etc. But so many of the rural people have an inferiority complex and lack the real desire for improved conditions because they are used to doing without. They do not seem to realize that they are as much entitled to the blessings and conveniences of life as are the city folks.

Single township or small village communities are too narrow in scope for efficient effort. They need the contact and enthusiasm of larger numbers of people in the adjoining communities as well as the constructive forces of their trading-center towns. Such a contact will help the small communities to get out of their ruts and will give them new vision, new ambition and enthusiasm.

The most public-spirited citizens of the cities are usually members of the chambers of commerce and other service clubs, and, being business and professional men, they are naturally more than glad for the opportunity to extend their public work and projects to their rural patrons as well as to their customers in the city—providing an effective contact can be arranged and this is exactly what this rural-urban coordinating council plan does, easily and efficiently.

A rural council should always be under the leadership of rural men but the city club may well give them the information concerning the plan, which will bring new life to all the surrounding rural communities. It will also give these rural leaders positions of prestige in both the city and country, and the backing of the service or commercial clubs insures real success.

After these rural leaders have carefully studied the plan and have found a number of local public projects that are needed they simply invite to a public meeting the following rural people from all the trading area of the natural shopping-center town: Presidents of all the township boards of trustees, each superintendent of schools, each rural minister, the master of any granges, chairmen of farm bureaus, presidents of parent-teacher associations, presidents of the FFA and FHA and 4–H clubs (giving the boys and girls a chance), and a representative farmer, businessman, and housewife (giving the women a voice), young man and young woman from each township—usually making about a dozen citizens from each community or between fifty and seventy-five of the most public-spirited rural people of the entire trading area. Representatives of the city service and commercial clubs should also be invited. At this meeting the rural-urban coordinating council plan can be described and thoroughly discussed in connection with the suggestive list of possible projects, but a vote on the organization should not be made because rural people should not be rushed. Simply ask them to go home and talk the matter over in their respective groups and organizations.

Several weeks later another public meeting should be called to vote on the organization. All of the groups and organizations should be especially requested to have their representatives present at this meeting. If the council is approved, regular officers should be elected for each separate township council, because the township lines should be maintained for the purpose of handling projects peculiar to local conditions. Then an executive committee, composed of the president of each of the individual township councils, should be created to serve as the officers of the rural-urban coordinating council, who should then appoint the necessary general committees as suggested by the accompanying letterhead.

After the rural council is completed, the executive committee can well approach the chamber of commerce or other dominating service or commercial club in their trading-center town and request a similar contact organization of all the constructive forces in the city. The set-up shown in the letterhead shown herewith suggests a comprehensive, yet simple and practical contact. By grouping all these organizations into the five general committees it will be found very effective, although each city will have some civic organizations not found in others and it will of course be necessary to adapt the idea to the conditions. Perhaps it will be necessary to enlarge the urban council or consolidate still further, but our specimen list of organizations will provide a suitable contact needed for an effective rural-urban coordinating council. The dominating city organization can tactfully appoint such a city council by simply inviting all the city organizations to cooperate and it will be found to the advantage of all to be included in such a cooperative program.

Although this urban council was requested in order to provide a suitable contact for the rural councils, it has also proven to be a great boon to the city itself because such an organization of all the constructive forces of the city is powerful, enthusiastic, and efficient. The members do not vote as individuals (like politicians) but as representatives of their respective organizations and this gives them both the ambition and confidence to get things done. Such an organization of public spirit would be a power for good in any city.

It will be noticed in the letterhead that the five general committees: Government, education, religion, economics, and social, group both the rural and urban organizations so they can work directly or through the general meetings of the council. Both the city and rural councils elect their own coordinator, through whom all contacts are made. This enables them to efficiently coordinate the projects as has been found in the handling of the extensive list of public projects in our specimen program. The power of such a council can be visualized when one realizes that every constructive force in the city and country is united together into one coordinating body. Even the most ticklish of public problems can be attempted with such a public-spirited organization. When such a coordinating council meets together, selfish viewpoints disappear and there arises a feeling of sincerity and enthusiasm for the common good. At first the politicians may resent such a set-up but after working with such a group they usually find it to be a powerful asset as a buffer between them and the public.

The council is such a versatile organization and capable of adjustment to meet local conditions. It will also fit the individual methods of the leaders, whether they like to do the work in public meetings, through committees or by individual effort. Each council will undoubtedly be somewhat different, but the basic idea of getting the heads of all constructive forces of the community to work together with those of the city will be found practical. It is a streamlined organization that really works.

There is practically no expense to the operation of such an organization and causes no disruption of existing groups, but simply unites them. It builds public spirit by enlarging the size of the community and provides spirited but friendly competition among the various organizations of the surrounding townships. It inspires the various township trustees to provide equal public services to each township and gives them opportunities to cooperate in purchasing machinery and other material.

The farm people living in the outlying sections of each trade center are really the forgotten people of the rural communities and are most in need of the public services that are available. This rural-urban council idea reaches these folks because they live in the competitive trade territory—a fact that the urban business and professional men will instantly recognize. This also makes the city civic leaders conscious of their duty and opportunity to their rural customers.

A rural community map and rural address system, shown herewith, makes a splendid initial public project for a rural-urban council as it not only provides a picture of the community but gives a definite address for every farmer, who is usually so hard to locate. It also gives an opportunity for a council to raise a fund of several hundred dollars for some public project. The business and professional men will welcome such an address system as it will enable them to locate their customers for the sales and service calls, also for physicians, police, fire departments and other public utilities. Instructions for making such a map can be secured from the author.

The printed stationery of such a council gets attention and results from city, county, State, and national organizations and it is surprising how much help there is available for the asking. Public spirit in rural communities is not dead, but it is apparently dormant in most of them. These councils awaken this spirit which can transform the community to new life, enthusiasm, and ambition. It is a permanent organization. Once started the membership is always available. Like a fire department, it is always ready for emergencies of all kinds.

Just one public-spirited man in each rural community can readily start such a progressive movement which will transform the community life. It will also prove to be an unusual opportunity for such a man to gain a position of prestige and influence, as a rural coordinator, in his community.

Rural council

Government: Lyme Township, Joseph Lawler, chairman; township officers and county officials.

Education: Thompson Township, W. C. Garland, chairman; all superintendents of schools, presidents, boards of education, library, and parent-teacher associations.

Religion: Sherman Township, Reverend Taunero, chairman; Flat Rock Public Committee, Rev. O. W. Matzke, all pastors, Sunday-school superintendents, and heads of Christian groups.

Economics: Groton Township, Harlow Stahl, chairman; heads of all farm bureaus and cooperatives, farm groups, and public utilities.

Social: York Township, H. L. Seaman, chairman; heads of all granges, 4–H clubs, and social groups.

City council committees

Government: Mayor J. F. Shannon, chairman; service director, State patrol, Red Cross, hospital.

Education: Superintendent of Schools S. D. Swigert, chairman; president, board of education, parent-teacher association, librarian.

Religion: Ministerial sssociation, Reverend Gillette, president; all Sunday-school superintendents, and heads of Christian groups.

Economics: Booster club, William Nyerges, chairman; heads of all labor organizations, industries, public utilities, and newspaper.

Social: Y. M. C. A. secretary, Herbert Lorenz, chairman; heads of all clubs and lodges, and social organizations.

The Rural-Urban Coordinating Council of the City of Bellevue and Surrounding Townships: Rural coordinator, C. S. Hunsinger, Flat Rock, Ohio; Bellevue coordinator, J. F. Shannon, Bellevue, Ohio.

Specimen of letterhead which gets action on projects.

A SUBURBAN COORDINATING COUNCIL

Suburban communities usually built around various institutions, industries, airports, country clubs, etc., invariably have many public problems. And it is not commonly recognized how many outlying communities surround the average city until a definite survey is made.

Many city people are building beautiful, modern homes in the country and have all the comforts and conveniences possible, yet become distracted with various public problems because they are compelled to deal with township trustees and other rural officials. Annexation with the city sometimes becomes a temptation in order to secure the public services to which these people are accustomed.

However, in order to retain the assets of country living and minimize the liabilities of living outside the city limits, a happy medium presents the best solution—that of a suburban coordinating council.

Such an organization provides a definite contact between the public services of both the city and country in a simple, practical, and effective manner. Instead of a single suburban district attempting this connection it will be found much better to secure the representation of all the suburban areas surrounding the city, because it will then become really powerful.

The suburban coordinating council is practically the same as the rural-urban council which is fully described in another part of this booklet. The only difference is the change in boundaries which would be necessary in each different suburban district. In organizing a suburban council it will be well to consider the advisability of including the entire rural trading area, and then use the name rural-urban coordinating council. This will not only give more prestige to your group but will enlist the cooperation of the various rural organizations and in turn secure for them the public services which are accomplished.

Suburban readers of this booklet who are interested in these community projects therefore have three suggestions to consider: The organization of a public committee for his individual community as described elsewhere in this booklet, a suburban coordinating council for all the suburban districts surrounding the city and a rural-urban coordinating council for the entire suburban and rural trading areas of the city. The directions given for the organization of the rural-urban council will also apply for a suburban coordinating council.

A public committee plan for unincorporated villages

There are thousands of small towns and villages in America that are unincorporated and thus do not have a really satisfactory local government. There is a general need for some public organization of these people which will enable them to cooperate with the township trustees or district supervisors, in a simple, practical, and efficient manner.

After more than 25 years' experience in rural community work, the author has found two solutions to this problem. One is the organization of a public committee for the smaller, individual communities, and the other a suburban or rural-urban coordinating council. The latter is best for entire suburban areas or all the rural areas surrounding the shopping-center cities.

The organization of a public committee for the individual communities is very easily accomplished and becomes very effective because it is operated by public spirit. Members receive no compensation of any kind and can therefore feel free to vote on projects as they deem best.

In order to start this committee, a public meeting of all the adults of the community should be held to discuss it, inviting both men and women. A publicity campaign in the local newspaper will arouse interest, and the leaders should prepare to include several public projects that are certain to be popular.

If a decision is made at this public meeting to organize a public committee, ballots should then be distributed for the nomination of at least 25 citizens to appear on a general ballot for the election of 12 members to serve as the public committee. This plan has been found to be entirely fair and satisfactory.

These 12 members should be elected to serve for 1 year each and an annual election held thereafter. They elect their own officers and meet monthly or at the call of the chairman or at least three members. It should also be understood that all meetings be open to the public.

FIFTY RURAL-URBAN PUBLIC PROJECTS

The 50 projects described in the following pages are not theories because all of them have actually been accomplished by the author or under his supervision in his home community.

Practically all of them represent typical needs in the average rural areas of America. They are common grass-root needs, many of which are overlooked by national agencies. Some of them may appear to be small but they are vital to the enrichment of rural life.

The author has been active in rural community life for more than 30 years, first in his own neighborhood, then in the township and eventually in the entire trading area, where he found that it was much easier to accomplish local community projects by including all the rural area instead of just a small neighborhood. It was also found to be much easier to get things done when the cooperation of the constructive forces in the city were available.

These suggestive projects are therefore written from the viewpoint of chambers of commerce, service clubs and other civic organizations of cities because they are always interested in including their trade areas with their public projects. The author recommends the organization of a rural-urban coordinating council (which is described in his book Rural-Urban Coordination) to accomplish these projects because it provides such a close contact with the rural area, but any of them can easily be handled by any public service group.

All of these projects will be found to be splendid good will builders and it will be surprising to find that most of them can be accomplished with little or no cost whatsoever. This is possible because it is only necessary for the organization to make contacts for the rural areas, with various public service agencies.

The author is available for further assistance in the handling of these projects or in the organization of a rural-urban coordinating council.

Public library service

The same sort of free library service should be available for rural people as is provided for the city people, and if Andrew Carnegie were alive today, he would undoubtedly be willing to extend the services of the public city libraries to the country districts as well.

In most States the laws provide for the township trustees or boards of education to arrange for library service of some kind if there is a public demand for it. Would it not be a worthy endeavor for some service club to ascertain the local needs and possibilities along this line and report the matter to some organization or council to put through.

It is suggested that the services of the city library be made available to the residents of the trade area. Sometimes county boundaries deprive rural people of this service so arrangements must be made with the county authorities. The very best type of library service is for the rural folks to be able to borrow books from the city library when they come to town for their groceries and to enjoy the reading rooms while waiting for the other members of the family.

Detailed instructions on how to accomplish this library project are available from the Rural-Urban Coordination Service, Flat Rock, Ohio.

Newspapers

The success of many campaigns and projects depends upon the publicity given by editors and publishers, and they will usually be found more than willing to use their space for projects of value to the community.

Anything that keeps people interested in each other is valuable and the home-town newspaper is an ideal channel for this work. If some local individual accomplishes something really worthwhile he certainly deserves the public commendation, and if he does something dishonorable he should accept the disapproval from his friends and neighbors. The home-town newspaper provides the opportunity to keep the standard of the local community high.

The people of the township should be urged to subscribe to the home-town paper so the local community may be cemented closely together. When practically everyone in the community reads the home-town newspaper, the announcements of the local organizations, the news of public projects, the marriages, births, deaths—joys and sorrows of life will be known to the friends and neighbors whose sympathy, appreciation, and encouragement mean so much.

It is suggested that the complete mailing list of the township be secured from the county authorities and offered to the local newspapers with the understanding that sample copies will be sent to everyone on the list. The sponsoring organization will be doing a service, if it publicly recommends that everyone in the community subscribe. It is also suggested that the issue which is mailed as sample copies to the complete mailing list contains articles in regard to some of the current rural-urban public projects.

Fire protection

Every farmer is just as much entitled to adequate fire protection as the businessman of the cities, for every farmer has just as much invested as the average storekeeper. Every rural resident should first be urged to maintain the best possible fire equipment and to keep his premises as fireproof as possible. He should then be assured of immediate service from the city fire equipment in case of fire. It is one of the chief duties of the township trustees to provide adequate fire protection. It is just as important as their road-building programs.

If there is no definite fire protection program arranged for in your community, it would be a very worthy task for council to take it up as the initial project. There is an abundance of material available from the various fire protection agencies, Government bureaus, and State officials. Appoint a committee to start such a project and you will be providing a very popular program. (Write the author for detailed instructions covering this project.)

Recreation projects

Yes, "all work and no play, makes Jack a dull boy"—so, a year 'round recreation program is a fine thing for every community and for everyone in the community. Young and old. Are you using the natural recreation facilities in your countryside? Are you providing the sort of entertainment that will keep young folks at home and older folks from becoming stale?

Playgrounds

Blessed be the individual or organization in any community whose hobby is playgrounds. They seem to be needed everywhere. Yet there are vacant lots galore—growing up in weeds—which might better be used to grow boys and girls instead. Would it not challenge the members of some lodge or other organization in your community if some individual would present the local needs to them. Let someone try it.

The board of education should have the cooperation of the people in providing ample equipment for the school playground and in boosting athletic activities in every way possible. If there are any small towns in the township a public playground would make a good hobby for some service club.

Let someone buy a carload of sand and then offer to sell it out in small sand-pile lots at cost and the kids in town will wear a path to the door with their little red wagons. Write to the Recreation Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York City, for their wonderful bulletin on home-made playground apparatus.

Will your club, lodge or other organization be willing to sponsor a definite program? Cities have playgrounds and our country children should also. If not possible to build them in the country arrange for the rural children to be made welcome at all the recreational facilities in the city.

Communication projects

It is good for the people of each community to have contact with each other and with the world in general. Anything that can be done to improve these facilities in a community will be a good work.

Telephone service

Perhaps the local telephone service is the most important. If a survey shows a lack of telephones in the community, the efforts of the local company in soliciting should be encouraged through newspaper items and public mention. Surely the company will profit, but if a larger number of neighbors and friends have phones it will add greatly to community unity. It should be pointed out that the value of a telephone should not only be measured by the number of outgoing calls but also by the number of times your friends and business associates call you.

If there happens to be several different telephone systems in your community which require a toll charge, efforts should be made to get local companies to cooperate in making their services more available. If this has no effect, you are now at liberty to take the matter up with the State public utilities commission. If sufficient pressure is shown by the people to warrant a formal protest, the commission will undoubtedly do all they possibly can to adjust the condition.

Telegraph service

Is it generally known in your community that telegraph messages can be sent, received and settled for over the telephone lines? A rural map showing where everyone lives should be filed with the local telegraph company so all your people can feel that they can be reached promptly through their nearest neighbors, by anyone in the world.

Radio

Anything that can be done to encourage your people to tune in radio programs which are really the most helpful would be a fine piece of work for some special committee. The suggestions could be published in the local newspaper or through some other channel.

Elimination of danger spots

Some safety-conscious man can perform a worth-while service to the trade area by conducting a campaign, preferably through the local newspapers, for the elimination of public danger spots. Simply request the public to submit their own observations of such conditions and after investigation they can be turned over to the responsible authorities for action.

A special study might be made of the dangerous railroad crossings in the area, enlisting the cooperation of the State public utility commission.

Prompt snow removal

Are the rural people in your trade area or community assured of the prompt removal of snow from the roads? If not, the pressure of the rural-urban coordinating council can be brought upon the county, State, and township authorities for the adoption of an efficient, coordinated program so there will be no delays or passing-the-buck excuses. Rural people are entitled to this service.

Community-chest campaigns

Are the rural people in the surrounding trade areas included in the various public campaigns for funds for the city hospitals, YMCA, recreational agencies, etc.? They enjoy these services and will be glad to contribute when included in the campaigns, by appointing rural leaders to solicit.

Rural address system

There are several methods of arranging a convenient address system in rural area but undoubtedly the best is described below:

The author has patented a rural-urban zone address system which provides a convenient, easily located address for all the rural people in the trade area and suburbs. This makes one of the very best initial projects for a rural-urban coordinating council as it makes the rural people feel that they belong to the city. This feature is especially valuable for the farmers living in the competing trade areas of surrounding cities. Write to the Rural-Urban Coordination Service at Flat Rock, Ohio, for a detailed description of this zone-address system.

Such a map should be furnished the fire department, ambulances, physicians, and other businessmen, together with an alphabetical list of residents and their addresses by zone numbers. It will also be handy in arranging for contact persons throughout the township. Simply appoint one person in each section as the representative with a chairman of the surrounding sections. When some campaign is on it will only be necessary to get in touch with the chairman of each of these sections, who can in turn conveniently contact the representatives in each of his adjoining sections, as they will be his neighbors.

Home-improvement projects

Country homes can now be just as modern as those on First Street—the only thing necessary is the willingness to invest some money in the home, where people will get more for their money than anywhere else.

The closer the rural-urban contacts, the more improvements and conveniences will be found in the rural homes. If the local merchants will cooperate in a display of modern fixtures showing how city conveniences can be made available to farm homes, it will be found to be a splendid good-will-building project.

Calendar of activities

School superintendents, ministers, and organization workers will appreciate a community calendar as it will aid their work greatly. Simply ask all the organizations to present their regular schedules of times of meetings throughout the year and publish this calendar periodically, after the conflicting dates have been adjusted between organizations. A calendar of this kind might also be printed together with a yearly pad, telephone list, and other local information so the people would be encouraged to post them in their homes for ready reference. This makes a splendid good-will-building proposal.

Bulletin boards

Several large, well-painted bulletin boards placed at popular places in the township will make a splendid place for community events to be advertised. A portion of the boards should be painted black so such notices can be lettered in chalk; another portion should be made available for posters and handbills of the public organizations of the township. You might even use a portion at the bottom as a for sale, wanted, and to exchange department and make a charge of 10 cents per item per week in order to pay some individual for the bother to maintain the bulletin board. In order to secure the original money for this project, space might be sold to a few permanent advertisers.

The county and township officials should be consulted as they can assist in providing suitable signboards and authorize their setting. Have them as well made and attractive as possible.

Publicity program

Cities have their chambers of commerce, and rural communities also need something of the kind in order to advertise their assets and to get outlets for their products. A careful survey of your area will show any wide-awake man the possibilities of attracting some profitable industry or the raising of some special crop for which the areas might become noted and then advertise, advertise, advertise—both in nearby newspapers and locally with handsome signs along the highways entering the township.

Let some progressive businessman handle this project.

Homecomings

Former residents are always glad for the opportunity to come back home if they can be assured of meeting their old-time friends. This can be arranged through a homecoming celebration. If one of the larger organizations in the community were to sponsor a homecoming day it should be able to earn a nice sum for some public project. In addition to the meeting of friends, there would be many benefits of the community from such a homecoming. It would advertise the township, give an opportunity to secure the interest of former citizens in projects, and would arouse residents to take more pride in the upkeep of their homes, etc.

Publicity projects

A history of the community: In practically every community there is some gifted person who is well-fitted to write up a history of the local area and who would be glad to do so. Why not take advantage of such talent and request each organization to furnish this person access to their old records, addresses of members, and so on.

Such a history could be printed in booklet form under the auspices of the council and sufficient advertising solicited to pay all publishing costs. This book might well be prepared in connection with a homecoming program and the program included with it. Those who attend would gladly pay a small sum for such a booklet, especially if it contained pictures of scenes familiar in their youth. Such a history would be the best kind of publicity for your community.

Government agencies

If a letter is written to all of the State and National Government departments asking for a list of the services and help they have available for your citizens, everyone will be surprised to find what wonderful services are available. Do not forget to ask your Senator and Congressman. After all this material is received, arrange for a public display of it and let it be the start of a reference library.

Many people, for example, do not realize what a wonderful service the Bureau of Standards in Washington gives. A letter of inquiry to this department will bring sufficient information to make some local person enthusiastic enough to apply their service to the local people. Before purchasing material for local projects, write to this Bureau for their specifications and recommendations and it will enable your committees to get real values.

The churches

All the fire protection, telephone, electricity, library, recreation, and other services which can be provided for a people will not help them as much as will a real faith in God. It surely pays to try to cooperate with God instead of trying to fight Him. Therefore, everyone should be urged and encouraged to cooperate with the local church programs. The churches are the most valuable, constructive force in the community.

A council should be strictly nonsectarian—let the people themselves decide for themselves which church to attend—but it should cooperate in getting them to go somewhere. If favorite denominations are not located in the country, let them be made welcome in the city churches of their choice.

Adult classes

There are ambitious men and women in every community who are eager to learn new things, new methods of doing their work, etc. The centralized school gives an opportunity for evening classes of all kinds. The vocational teachers in the schools will be glad to cooperate, also the extension departments of the agricultural college in holding cooking schools, sewing schools, etc., for the ladies, and farmers' institutes for the men. The field and opportunities are unlimited.

Encouragement of talent

How many boys and girls or older folks in your community who have a real talent along some line which should be encouraged You should find out, for talent many times dies because of the lack of encouragement locally, and the world loses something worth while. What a worthy work it would be for some community worker to become a real talent scout, making your gifted known to the community and perhaps to the world. And if it's done through something like the amateur hours on the radio, it will provide real entertainment for all.

Extension services

Is your community taking advantage of the wonderful service available through the extension departments of the State and National Departments of Agriculture? It will keep one man busy in his spare time to keep informed on all the help that is available entirely free of charge. Have a display of all this material made in some store or other public agency.

Cooperation with the schools

Every teacher feels the need of a closer cooperation between the home and school and would welcome a real spirit along this line—not just the visiting wind of interest but an active personal interest. The parent-teacher association seems to be the most logical agency for obtaining and distributing the wealth of literature available on this subject. It is a real job to be president of this association and takes more than just arranging the monthly programs—it needs the spare time of the officers throughout the school months. A cooperative, united rural-urban school program would be a splendid goodwill building project.

Children's program

The children of a community are the most important group as all parents well realize. Therefore, why not spend some time on them and provide the best things possible for them? Arrange for some progressive mother to head a group of women in the task of building a definite program of assistance to children, including prenatal care, baby clinics, preschool examinations, nurseries, playgrounds, boy and girl scouting, and all other activities for the benefit of the citizens of the future—those who will take over the public work when we retire.

Community service projects

Taking care of our own: In practically every community there are folks in need and it is the time-honored custom of rural folks to look out for their neighbor's welfare. Let us help retain this grand reputation by appointing some individual to maintain a list of all the aged, invalids, and neglected folks in the township, then enlist the cooperation of the churches, lodges, and other organizations to make certain that the needs are supplied. This project might well be inaugurated on Christmas, Mother's Day, or some other special occasion by sending baskets or flowers to everyone on the list. Such would be a wonderful work for some individual in every township but he would need some funds, so let the club arrange for it so that your community will be known as one that takes care of its own.

Employment bureau: A complete list of those who are jobless or available should be maintained. It should give their names, how they can be reached and notes about their experiences and aptitudes. The chairman of this project can contact the nearest office of the United States Employment Service and cooperate with them in their wonderful work of matching jobs and men and women, which is done at no cost to the employer or employee.

Cooperative purchasing agency

When there is some special need for articles which will benefit everyone in your community, such as home fire extinguishers, lightning rods, paint, shade trees, running-water systems, etc., appoint some businessman to secure the lowest possible quotations on these articles in quantities and then, in order to induce his customers to make these improvements, offer them these special prices.

There are many ways to cooperate in order to get worth-while things accomplished. One noteworthy task for communities would be the cooperative purchase of machinery such as spraying outfits, heavy machinery for repair shops, cooperative refrigerator plants, etc.

Naming of farms

Every farm is really a business and is entitled to be named. If only a few farmers have their names painted on their barns and mail boxes perhaps some may criticize but if a farm-naming campaign is conducted this criticism will be overcome. The people will take much pride in selecting suitable names. Displaying these names will likely lead to a general sprucing up.

The person who is interested in promoting this effect can start an article in the paper suggesting a long list of names. If a man doesn't care for a general name, urge him to name his farm after himself. Such names as "The Royer Farm," "The Smith Farmstead," "The Matz Stock Farm," are always good. Remind him that a farm is a real industry and should be named.

The services of a good sign painter might be secured on a cooperative basis. Or the use of a stencil machine or outline alphabets might be offered.

Garden clubs

There is an opportunity in every community it seems for a common gardener's club or a "dirt" gardener's club, with practically no dues except the willingness to cooperate with the other folks who love flowers. One of the requirements should be that each be willing to share the beauty of their own garden with the other members and be made to feel welcome to visit the displays in the gardens of other members. The club might sponsor an annual flower show, and its gardens would make your community more beautiful.

Nature clubs

There are undoubtedly many nature lovers in your community who would enjoy getting together for study and field trips. Some of the things they might foster are a bird sanctuary (established by cooperating with the Audubon Society), a humane society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, a dog show, nature trails, and trips, etc.

Boy and Girl Scouting

Many country boys and girls do not seem to be aware of the fact they can become real members of the Boy or Girl Scout organization which every ambitious youngster seems to want to join. They can become Lone Scouts in these noteworthy organizations and the ones who go through all the classes as Lone Scouts will get much more out of it than the city boys and girls.

Any boy 12 years old or older can become a Lone Scout and any farm boy from 9 to 12 a Lone Cub, by writing to the Rural Scouting Service of the Boy Scouts of America, 2 Park Avenue, New York City. And girls can write to the Girl Scout Headquarters, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York City.

Both of these organizations offer men and women who like to work with boys and girls, the opportunity to become counsellors and to organize Lone Scout Tribes and become real scoutmasters.

Highway beautification

Perhaps it is not generally known, but on national highway projects, one-tenth of 1 percent of general road contracts is supposed to be used for highway beautification. So, if there are national highways in your

communities you should be able to get some nice plantings. If the club takes the matter up with the county and township road authorities, they will undoubtedly be glad to cooperate on worthy beautification projects.

An antibillboard and antisign campaign might also be waged to make the highways more attractive. Ask county officials to give a list of the eyesores they eliminate each year and write them up to publish in the local newspapers.

Reforestation program

Everyone dislikes to see the trees of the community disappear as rapidly as they have in most districts. If the people could be made tree-conscious for a few years they could be interested in planting trees in every available spot.

The State and National Departments of Agriculture are always glad for the opportunity to cooperate in such a program and will in many cases furnish seedlings to anyone who will promise to care for them. This work would make a wonderful hobby for some interested person. He would become the Johnny Appleseed of your community. The program might also include the planting of fruit trees and local nurserymen would be glad to quote low prices on quantity orders.

Beautification projects

Public eye: Are there any eyesores in your township? If there are old buildings, make a proposition with some man to purchase and tear down these old structures. He can resell the large timbers for the framework of new buildings and old boards for sheeting of roofs, etc. He can afford to pay well for the eyesore and resell the timbers, etc., for a profit. Ask any building wrecker about this.

If there is rubbish that spoils the landscape in your community, make arrangements with the owner of some abandoned quarry, sinkhole, basement, or depression of some kind and announce a clean-up week for the public to fill the hole. Arrange for some boy or man to haul rubbish for a reasonable amount and you will have made a bargain for everyone.

Write your Senator or Congressman for copies of the Government bulletins Landscaping Farm Homes, etc., distribute to everybody.

Also advise your township trustees that the council will publish a list of all the eyesores which they eliminate during the year from the township highways, and they will be glad to cooperate for this publicity.

First aid and health

The American Red Cross has arranged for a rural emergency service that every rural community should take advantage of. Interview your local Red Cross chapter for information and you will find them willing to equip an emergency station in their usual thorough fashion. The only provision is that two persons take the Red Cross course in first-aid care so that one or the other may be available for duty at all times.

Government cooperation

County officials: There are many services that county officials are able to render the people that many do not know about. A splendid project for a council is to invite all the county officials to attend a public meeting in the community house, giving each one a 10- or 15-minute period in which to tell of his work, problems, plans and needs. A period of questions and answers should also be allowed. Such a program would acquaint the county men with the needs of the local people and would enable them to give better service. (Try to arrange for this meeting after the elections in order to get away from politics.)

Police protection: Rural districts are in need of better police protection and some informed man should be placed in charge of this project to report all possibilities to the council which could then request the county or township authorities to arrange for the improvement recommended. The township constable should have a telephone so he will be available at all times. Deputies should also be appointed whenever necessary. The State highway patrol requested for cooperation and the county sheriff consulted.

It is sometimes possible to provide the police protection of the city by arranging for the establishment of a protection district, similar to a fire protection or water service district. Write the author for details.

Contact persons: In order to put over some projects it is necessary to secure signatures to petitions, etc., or to get word to every citizen in the township. Some townships have appointed the most public-spirited resident in each mile-square section who has a telephone to act as contact person for the other residents in his section. Such a service will be found useful in many ways.

United States mail service: Each council can secure a complete mailing list from the county authorities of every citizen in the township. This list will represent a complete coverage, and businessmen will find it a good advertising medium so they can be appealed to for advertising space in council bulletins to promote the various public projects. Such revenue will pay for the costs of printing and mailing.

Local government agencies

There are a number of township, county, State, and National Government services and agencies which should be made more convenient for rural people.

A local collection agency for tax collection will save many taxpayers trips to the county seat. This might be made available by requesting the county officials to mail statements showing the amounts of taxes so that everyone could mail checks or money orders.

Auto tags should also be obtainable in each local community. If a local citizen were authorized to distribute them it would give him some revenue. Such a system would group the numbers by townships for identification purposes and save the people trips to other cities. Auto drivers' licenses might also be handled in the same manner.

Hunting, fishing, dog licenses, etc., notary public, justice of the peace, constable, and the various inspection services should be made convenient.

Better business projects

Rural industries: Appoint several progressive men and women to act as the chamber of commerce in your rural community. By making a study of the local advantages they will undoubtedly be able to find some new business opportunities. To advertise your community, they might urge everyone possible to make a specialty of raising some certain crop.

Hobby clubs

There's no more satisfying recreation than hobbying. Why not promote a hobby club for the whole community? And once a year you can have a big community hobby show in the centralized school building. Hobbies are so varied that everyone in the community will find something to interest him.

A general plan

To build a better rural community, a general plan of action is necessary. Month-by-month plans are better than none at all, and a yearly plan is splendid; but if all the leaders in a community would get together in planning for the kind of a community in which their children would like to live 10 years hence, would that not be still better?

Such a movement would take months of careful study, investigation of the good things that other townships have, close cooperation with the township trustees and county commissioners, but the results would be worth it. One of the first essentials would be to get all the public organizations in the township started in listing the things they would like to have accomplished some years hence. With their ideas expressed, naturally, their ambitions would be aroused in order to achieve them.

Let the churches, schools, lodges, farm organizations, township trustees, and all cooperate, and sufficient work and needs would thus be found to really arouse the community. One splendid plan would be to request all the pupils in high school to write competitive essays—make a contest out of it—on the subject The Kind of Community in Which I Would Like To Live Ten Years Hence, because parents are more interested in building a future for their children than in anything else and would like to have them settle down nearby. The township trustees and county commissioners could be asked to present a 10-year road-building and other service program.

Too idealistic? Just try it, and you will not only be surprised but enthusiastic about the prospects.

Community health program

There are so many ways of helping people with their health, and it would be a real job for some individual or organization to take up this work and devote spare time to it throughout the year.

Local physicians, hospitals, the Red Cross, foundation, and other organizations have an abundance of material on many diseases which is available for the asking. Consult your local physicians, and they will usually be glad to help conduct clinics, programs, etc. Examination of school children by township health authorities, prenatal information, preschool examinations, lectures on various diseases, inoculation campaigns, etc. Let this be a professional service.

Transportation projects, railroads

During the past 10 years the services of the railroads have generally been curtailed in the smaller communities, but now they are very anxious to give every service possible. Their new delivery arrangements, c. o. d. privileges and prompt shipments are commendable. If there is proper service still lacking in your community, a letter from your council to the management will receive every consideration. Ascertain the amount of local taxes paid by your railroads and it will generally be surprising. Railroads are township assets.

Express

The express companies are now managed by the railroads and the services extended in many ways. Rates have been lowered on many farm products and the opportunities are presented to market direct to customers in the cities. Request the local express office to describe the services which are available. Also the post office.

Bus routes

Most rural people have their own cars but at times several members of the family need to go places at the same time. If there is a bus route established through your township, but without a station, an appeal to the bus company, showing the need of a central station in your township, will receive every consideration.

Shipping facilities

Rural folks need prompt and efficient shipping facilities. Some individual or company should be encouraged to offer a complete trucking service, equipped to haul all kinds of products, livestock, etc., and make regular scheduled trips or provide central station facilities for trips to the nearest market. Possibly a cooperative proposition might be worked out to advantage.

If there is a special need in your community, such as the handling of a special crop, a letter to the commercial departments of the local railroads, express companies, or the Post Office Department will bring real cooperation. These departments will even

use their facilities to find a market for your products, entirely free of charge.

City conveniences

Running water: In order to have a thoroughly modern township every home should be encouraged to have a running-water system. Your council should let the community know that for the same amount of money people living in the city pay for water rent over a period of 5 years, it is possible for the average country home to have a running-water system installed. There are modern systems available at such reasonable cost that people living in the country can have running water for the same amount of money or less than city people and have soft water in the bargain.

To further this campaign, a cooperative buying agency might be arranged in order to secure large discounts on quantity orders. What housewife would not be interested in a bargain announced something like "Running water—hot and cold—installed in your home for only $10 per year?"

Gas service: Rural housewives can now have gas service which is the equal of that in the cities. There are several types of plants available that are really satisfactory. A special service campaign on this subject will be a good-will building project.

Nonpolitical projects

Local taxation: Has anyone ever made a careful study of your local taxation? If not, it would be an interesting and profitable study. Let this chairman go to the county seat and get all the local information and statistics along this line for some years past. These statistics will be available upon request of some community organization such as a township council and a complete report of this survey will be very profitable.

Surveys and plans

Survey: Before starting projects, it is well to have an authentic survey of the township or community made in order to ascertain the real needs. This is a project in itself since practically every public organization will be able to use this information to advantage, so the survey should be very thorough.

How many homes in your community have running water? How many have electricity? How many live on unimproved roads?—First you'll want to go over such questions as these to find out just what statistics are needed for the local work, then make a simple form to fill out. And you'll get a better return on your questionnaire if personal visits are made.

The results of such a survey will be of special value to the business and professional men of the trading center.

A rural soil survey

Your State department of agriculture may have made a soil survey of your township which is available. If not, request this service and apply the results for use among your farmers. There are so many such services of the Government which can be used by the farmers and it would be a worthy job for some man to look after this work.

Marking rural roads

When strangers visit the people in your township, do they find a convenient system of road signs or do they have to stop at various farm homes to inquire their way?

Cities have their streets marked and it is a good plan to have the rural roads named or numbered conveniently. This is easily possible if someone will make a study of the complete map of the township and arrange a system which will help strangers to easily find their way in your township. Request the township or county offices to install these signs.

Group travel trips

In order to arouse interest in certain projects which are needed in communities, it is often a wise plan to simply show your people what other communities have done. This can be arranged by staging a demonstration trip. Either charter a bus, with a low rate for each passenger, or engage a number of local autos to make the trip together—as an excursion, planning for eats, entertainment, etc.

There are so many interesting and profitable things to see in America and in each State, that it is a shame that more do not see them. Couldn't your organization arrange travel trips to these places?

As soon as the places are decided upon, an inquiry to the local railroads or bus lines will give all the necessary information and cooperation. You will be surprised what low rates will be possible under the group plan. Several trips of this kind might be arranged for each year.

Farm machinery repair shop

If there are some of the old one-room school buildings standing in the various parts of the township or other unused buildings, some might well be put to good use by all farmers in each section cooperating in installing hoists, lathes, forges, etc., for the general repair of farm machinery

Public roads

So many of the local roads are built according to the number and "weight" of complaints and the plans of township trustees are many times changed by the individuals who do the most kicking. In order to overcome this condition it is suggested that the council appoint a special committee of progressive yet consistent men and request that they arrange for a meeting of the township trustees, county commissioners, and perhaps the State highway department and sponsor a 5-year road-building program after a careful survey and study is made by all concerned. Such a plan would be welcomed by township trustees because it would eliminate one of their chief troubles. The township would then be assured of the best roads possible.

Legislative Program of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the most important of our basic industries. One of the greatest farm organizations of our country—the National Grange—has recently met in a national convention and adopted a legislative program which it is my privilege to submit for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR 1949 OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

(Summarized by J. T. Sanders, legislative counsel)

1. THE GRANGE PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

Principles underlying Grange programs

A few principles are basic to the formulation of nearly all Grange programs. A brief statement of these fundamental principles will, therefore, contribute to full understanding of our policies and programs.

The American family-type farm is far more important to the preservation of our democracy than most people think. Farmers constitute about 20 percent of our people but receive a net income that varies from only 5 to 10 percent of our national net income. They use a total capital value of land, buildings, and equipment of around $103,000,000,000, or more than the combined capital structure of all major manufacturing industries in the United States. American farmers operate the largest private business in the world.

Our faith in the permanency of the family type farm is unshaken, since increased mechanization has strengthened it, rather than weakened it, by increasing the percentage of all needed labor that is supplied by the farm family. The family farm is the very foundation of all Grange policies and programs, and we believe it is our Nation's strongest bulwark of freedom and democracy.

The average family farm, which produces the great bulk of our raw products, operates with around 75 percent fixed costs, including the family and operator's labor. In depressions these fixed costs cannot be reduced by reducing output. The average American industrial concern operates almost entirely with hired labor and with only 25 percent total fixed costs, or 75 percent of variable costs, which can be greatly reduced in a depression. In like circumstances managers of industry reduce costs by cutting their hired-labor force and other variable costs, thus greatly reducing their output in contrast to the behavior of farm managers.

In depression industry operates on a scarcity of output principle and agriculture on an abundant output basis. In short, the family farm is in reality the only truly continuously abundantly producing portion of our economy.

This unfailing abundant production of the farm has saved democracy from utter wreck time after time. Had farmers reduced their total output by a half in the early thirties, as did all industries on an average, and had urban workers been reduced to both an unemployed and starvation status, no power could have prevented revolution.

The heart of the farm problem

The Grange believes that the so-called farm problem is in the main a result of the failure of industry to keep its output in balance with the abundant output of farms and the failure of prices of agricultural products to remain in proper balance with the prices of goods and services of other groups. This over-all unbalance is caused by reduction in industrial output and not by changes in farm output. A permanent solution of the farm problem will not be found in restricted output from our farms but in large part from reasonably full stabilized production and employment in industry, and in the establishment of a program of equitable and equalized values of goods produced and services rendered by all groups in our national economy. Based on these beliefs we subscribe wholeheartedly to the following three Grange guide posts:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of Government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

Objectives of the Grange farm program

The objectives we seek for agriculture are:

1. A stable, abundant production of farm commodities at prices which are fair to both producers and consumers.

2. The preservation and strengthening of the family-owned and operated farm unit.

3. The conservation and most efficient use of our basic soil, water, forestry, and mineral resources.

4. A constantly rising standard of living for all farm families.

5. The opportunity for youth to climb rapidly the ladder to farm ownership and security.

6. A marketing and parity price structure that will maintain agriculture on a satisfactory, self-sustaining, and stable basis.

7. Maximum advisory participation of farmers in all programs designed to aid agriculture.

To achieve these objectives farmers on their part must assume the responsibility of efficient operation of their farms but must be able to maintain productivity of their soils, and must have permanent and dependable markets and fair prices.

A well-balanced, complete, and permanent farm program will provide four major lines of attack:

1. Adequate conservation of land and water resources.

2. Adequate income support based on a sound parity formula.

3. Sound production and consumption adjustment.

4. Maximum advisory participation by farmers in all farm programs.

Conservation program on farms

Conservation is essential if we are to maintain an adequate diet and produce those products that may be required by domestic industry and export trade. Adequate conservation will be attained if we:

1. Maintain and expand the Soil Conservation Service as an independent and separate governmental agency within the Department of Agriculture, with sole responsibility to develop soil-conservation programs.

2. Provide adequate educational and technical assistance to farmers.

3. Recognize that conservation on a farm benefits not only the farm land but other property values at lower levels in the drainage area and apportion conservation costs between the farmer on the farm and the public on the basis of benefits of each.

4. Encourage sound land use and conservation in leasing contracts.

5. Assure farmers adequate credit to enable them to carry out sound soil-conservation work.

6. Include public lands, public highways and public utility lands in the coordinated soil-conservation programs.

7. Provide land-use regulations to protect resources when approved by a two-thirds majority of the landowners in soil conservation districts with local control of policies of imposing regulations and taxes for conservation.

8. Continue the Reclamation Service program with greater stress on storage of water as near its source as possible with emphasis on early completion of flood-control projects.

A sound forestry conservation program

We should supplement farm conservation by strong and effective conservation of our forestry resources to safeguard watersheds, and increase timber growth by including the following measures:

1. Technical advice and assistance to private owners in establishing and managing farm forests and in utilizing, harvesting, and marketing forest products.

2. Public aid for protection against fire, insects, and disease for owners.

3. Adequate credit on terms and conditions suitable for forestry purposes.

4. Cooperative associations for achieving good forest management.

5. Adequate forestry research.

6. Tax laws that encourage the growing and selective cutting of timber.

7. Adequate reforesting, reseeding, and conservation programs on public lands.

Coordination of soil conservation, flood control, and watershed development

A complete conservation program requires a thorough job of coordinating the work of all agencies, such as the Army Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture and State agencies, engaged in soil and water conservation and flood control at the Federal and watershed levels. To accomplish this, we recommend:

1. Effective democratic means for coordinating the soil and water resources work of the various Federal and State agencies engaged in this work, established for major watershed areas and at the national level.

2. Limiting measures or projects to those where a sound appraisal of all the benefits shows benefits in excess of all costs.

3. That any agency of the Federal Government to effectuate and administer coordinated resources development be required to use only the professional, technical, and engineering staffs of presently constituted Federal or State agencies qualified to do watershed development work.

4. That Federal and State watershed programs be coordinated.

Parity income for farmers

To deal with the domestic farm price and income disparity problem the Grange has three lines of defense. The first is to make full and effective use of our present marketing facilities by pushing the sale of products in surplus supply and sparing those in short supply. The second line of defense is a flexible price support to be lowered or raised sufficiently to induce necessary adjustments in production. The third defense is a stop loss or disaster prevention floor price below which prices would not be permitted to fall.

In the case of those crops, of which we normally produce a surplus for export, means must be available for moving the surplus through international commodity agreements or a multiple-price program.

The parity formula

The Agricultural Act of 1948 contains almost the exact modernized parity formula which the Grange has advocated for several years. Although this formula will go a long way toward eliminating many inequities that were in the old parity formula, we reiterate our belief that further improvement is possible through use of an income parity formula that gives prime consideration to the full output–full employment nature of agriculture.

We believe that a modernized formula for calculating income parity price, implemented by flexible floors, would be responsive to changes in costs and to technical improvements and trends in demand, and this would make necessary a minimum of adjustments in farm production by other governmental means.

Provisions of a sound farm-income program

There is no simple solution to the farm-income and price-support problem. The farm income program must be broad enough to enable the producers of any commodity to develop a plan and set up the machinery for handling the specific problems of the commodity.

There are available and needed a number of means of paying the individual farmer market prices and parity income; which means are self-financing and do not interfere with the individual farmer's independence of judgment and operations. We will support the following programs:

1. With proper legal sanction, organized marketing efforts of distributors, processors, and producers, can sell many seasonal surpluses of farm products without serious losses to producers and to the advantage of consumers.

2. We favor strengthening cooperative marketing and purchasing associations.

3. We favor the use of a dual or multiple price system as means of facilitating price support. We favor the use of any practical two-price or multiple-price device such as the export debenture plan, equalization fees, or a parity support certificate plan as means of price support. These should be supplemented by safeguards which would protect domestic producers from imports that would destroy the American market.

4. We favor making section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act applicable to any farm product for which price-support programs are authorized. This section gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to prevent the imports of a farm product if such imports tend to destroy the effects of a price-support program on domestic prices. We also favor setting aside all funds received from duties on imported farm commodities under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act for use by the Secretary of Agriculture in implementing any authorized support program.

5. We favor the use of flexible price supports under farm prices, between a "stop loss" level and parity, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture or an agricultural commission. We also favor a "stop loss" or disaster floor price below which farm prices would not be allowed to fall. A flexible floor support system for export crops and for domestic crops will need variable rates. Also the flexible scale may need to vary as between perishable and storable crops.

6. We favor an expanded use of marketing agreements for all commodities on which they can be effectively used.

7. Crop insurance must be considered as a necessary part of a well-rounded program to promote agricultural stabilization, and to protect farmers against the hazards of weather and other conditions beyond their control.

8. We oppose subsidies on food products to keep price ceilings intact. Such subsidies benefit the consumer, but the stigma of drawing money out of the Treasury attaches to the farmers. They also operate to increase the amount of our national debt and are in themselves inflationary.

9. We favor the improvement of our international trade relations whereby commerce can flow between nations without serious injury to any important segment of American business, labor, or agriculture. We favor the use of international agreements for individual commodities to help bring this about.

10. We favor the creation of a Federal Farm Commission clothed with ample powers to administer provisions of laws dealing with price supports and surplus removal of farm products.

11. We recognize that any proposed parity formula may not apply equitably to some of the highly specialized minor crops. We favor parity adjustments for such minor crops when these adjustments are necessary to establish an equitable price.

12. In case of urgent need we sanction the use of marketing quotas, when need is indicated by public hearings, and when approved by two-thirds of the growers voting in a referendum.

Policies and programs for adjusting consumption and production

1. We recommend to the Congress adequate appropriations for the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. We believe that in making full use of the authority of this Act the Department of Agriculture should coordinate work by private and commercial agencies with Federal and State agencies to the end that better marketing services may be established: First, by improving private marketing system and, second, by the development of new and expanded uses for agricultural products.

2. We favor the expansion of consumption and use of farm products in order to bring relatively high standards of living and health to all American people.

We favor the school-lunch program, the food stamp, as a practical relief plan, encouragement of industrial uses for farm commodities, direct distribution, intensified

educational campaign to improve our food habits, and technological improvements in our marketing processes such as quick freezing and prepackaging.

3. The dislocations caused by war render it necessary that we should produce domestically various commodities which we normally import. We favor appropriations to develop new crops to meet existing and probably future strategical needs.

4. We favor Federal and State guidance and assistance in the development of sound long-range adjustment programs for areas where changes in agricultural production have created serious social and economic problems.

Farmer participation in programs at State and local levels

1. We favor the establishment of farmer-elected county advisory committees composed of at least five members who shall be elected for staggered terms. The duties of these committees should be to keep themselves informed on all Federal and State agricultural matters in the county; to advise with all agencies relative to conflicts or lack of coordination in programs; and to suggest means of elimination of duplication and conflicts and ways to establish needed coordination. All agencies and their advisory boards should be required to advise with these committees. When these committees fail to get satisfactory results from county agencies their views should be carried to the State advisory council as set up below.

2. We favor the establishment of State councils of agriculture of not less than five members, elected for 5-year staggered terms by members of the county committees, with provision for the appointment of an executive officer by the council. The duties of this council should be to advise and assist in the coordination of the work of the Federal, State, and local programs of the agencies within the State. The head of the State department of agriculture and the dean of the State College of Agriculture should be members of the council by virtue of their offices.

3. We favor housing all agricultural agencies as far as practicable at one location in each county.

TVA fertilizer distribution

The present method of distribution of fertilizer by TVA should be investigated and any changes that will insure distribution without discrimination against or in favor of any farm organization or group should be made.

Expansion of Market News Service

We favor improvement of the Market News Service, both local and national, and that appropriations be increased as needed to give farmers this improved service.

Reclamation acreage limitation

We believe the recreation-acreage-limitation provision gives protection to the home-owning type of farmer and reaffirm our support of it.

Lumbering rights on Forest Service lands

We oppose contracts between the United States Forest Service and large lumber companies which will exclude smaller timber operators from acquiring lumbering rights covered by such contracts.

Bailer twine

We favor elimination of the 15-percent import duty on bailer twine.

Commodity exchange control

We endorse the general principle of control of farm commodity exchange market margins by the Secretary of Agriculture, and other practical means of curbing excessive and damaging speculation in grain and other farm commodities.

II. POLICIES AND PROGRAMS ON PUBLIC LANDS AND RESOURCES

Public power policies

Electric service in the farm home and in farm operation has proved to be of inestimable benefit to farm families and farms. It should be supplied at the lowest possible economically sound cost and, this service should be extended and supplied at the lowest rate as rapidly as possible to every area where such service can be placed on a sound economic basis.

We reiterate our previous stand that all natural power sites should be retained in public ownership; that the power resources of such sites be developed under Federal appropriations; and that such power development should be fully coordinated with the best and soundest practical use of the water for power, irrigation, industrial, navigational, and other uses, and with the most effective and sound flood damage prevention on the entire drainage area.

Revenues from power on a public project should be considered as a source of income which may be applied as partial payment for any portions of the project except navigation, flood control, recreational, and other public benefit aspects.

We will support, when justified by fiscal feasibility, adequate Federal appropriations for the building of all economically sound facilities for power generation; for the transmission of publicly generated power to load centers of the region at a uniform rate which will encourage the widest possible use, with preference to be given to cooperatives and public bodies; also we will support adequate appropriations to develop sound irrigation and flood-control measures; to assist in soil-conservation work through public funds; and to provide for other works and facilities that are an essential part of a coordinated development of a drainage basin. We are opposed to building any privately owned power plant on a dam owned by the Federal Government.

We believe that a majority of the members of each administrative board established to coordinate the development of a major drainage area should be composed of residents of the area and the remainder should be representatives of the principal Federal agencies responsible for development work in the drainage area.

We are opposed to elimination of the preferential clause for cooperatives, public utility districts, and cities in purchase of power from Federal projects, and provisions that would provide for delivery of power from Federal projects at the bus bar only.

Tideland resources

We believe the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which declared all oil in the tidelands of the United States and all oil in what is known as the Continental Shelf, to be the property of the Federal Government, was wise and sound; and we are opposed to legislation proposed in the Eightieth Congress to turn these lands over to States. We insist that the Congress pass no law to set aside the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

National parks boundary adjustment

The present boundaries of some of the National Parks appear to include lands chiefly valuable for agricultural purposes and lands of little park value. We ask Congress to provide for the readjustment of such National Park boundaries by a disinterested, scientific commission with due regard to the best use of all lands in such parks for park purposes, for timber culture, agricultural possibilities and preservation of the rights of people residing in the area.

Interstate river rights

We favor legislation that will make it possible for the United States Supreme Court to adjudicate disputes on water rights between States.

St. Lawrence seaway and power project

We have for several years endorsed the St. Lawrence seaway and power project as a self-liquidating undertaking. And we request that there be no further delay in appropriating Federal funds to begin construction of this important strategical joint Canadian-United States project.

Payments in lieu of taxes on Federally owned lands

We favor requiring the Federal Government to make payments, in lieu of taxes, to local governments equal to, but not in excess of, the taxes lost from the Government ownership of the land.

Antiquities Act of Federal memorial parks

The Grange urges the repeal of the Antiquities Act which permits of setting aside areas as memorial parks by Executive orders. We oppose the establishment of Federal memorial parks unless by specific act of Congress and if the area is not largely in its natural state, does not contain expensive privately owned productive pasture or crop land, and is not favored by the government of the State in which it is located.

Releveling land that has been strip-mined

We favor legislation to provide for releveling of land after strip-mining and gold-dredging operations to restore productiveness of the soil.

III. POLICIES AND PROGRAMS ON COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES

Taxation of cooperatives

We oppose the taxation of patronage refunds of cooperatives. We agree that reserves which reflect and increase in equity should be taxed either as income of the farmer or as income of the cooperative.

Investigation of NTEA and NAB Inc.

We are in favor of requesting Congress to investigate the organization and financing of the National Tax Equality Association, The National Association of Businessmen Inc., and other organized groups fighting cooperatives.

Rural electrification

REA service should be extended to districts wherever the extension of lines is economically sound, and adequate funds should be provided for this purpose.

We favor liberalizing the regulations of REA so as to permit cooperatives to employ competent engineering bids or permit construction by force account under regulations designed to be adequate.

Cooperative telephones

We favor legislation giving REA authority to put up self-supporting telephone systems in conjunction with REA power, or as separate systems, and favor an energetic program by private or cooperative telephone systems to extend telephone service and to make available the latest inventions in telephone communications, particularly those inventions utilizing power lines for the circuit.

Farm Credit Administration

We favor the administration of the farm credit agencies under an independent farm credit board; and maintaining the independence of Federal land banks to market their own bonds, and are opposed to requiring them to get their funds from the United States Treasury.

We favor retirement of all Government capital from credit agencies without impairment of their functioning as soon as practical.

We favor setting up a retirement system for all employees of the farm credit agencies and a discontinuance of the Federal civil-service retirement system in such a manner that no employee loses any value in his retirement account.

Farmers Home Administration

We pledge our support of adequate appropriations for sound credit for the Farmers Home Administration where such credit is not available elsewhere for assisting capable farm youth and tenants to become owners.

IV. TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Freight-rate increases

No additional blanket increases in freight rates should be granted without extensive and complete hearings by the ICC showing the full effects of such raises on business and agriculture in the Nation.

Railroads

We favor extensive consolidation of railroads designed to effect economies in operation and assure adequate rail service to all areas on a sound basis.

Study of all transportation agencies

We favor a thorough study of all means of transportation under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 on the following phases: (a) rail rates, (b) working conditions, (c) methods of taxation. (d) influence of transportation policies on agriculture and general welfare and (e) effects of Bulwinkle bill.

Auto and truck transportation

1. We favor uniform motor vehicle laws in all States, these laws to conform to the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code.

2. We favor uniform size and weight laws for commercial vehicles for all States.

3. We are opposed to all diversion of State motor vehicle fees and State gasoline taxes to nonhighway purposes, and recommend the adoption in all States of amendments to State constitutions guaranteeing dedication of highway user taxes to highway purposes only.

4. We oppose the use of Federal funds for the construction of toll superhighways and further recommend that all public roads be built free of tolls.

5. We are opposed to the integration of the various types of transportation and recommend that competition and private ownership should be maintained.

Farm-to-market roads

We recommend:

1. That a careful examination of the roads specifications set-up by the Bureau of Public Roads be made and that such revision be made that will permit the use of the farm-to-market road funds where they were intended to be used—on feeder roads and not on main or principal secondary roads.

2. That provisions be written in the law which will require that State highway departments cooperating with county highway officials set up preliminary 5-year plans for building farm-to-market or feeder highways in each county.

3. That these preliminary plans be published and public hearings be scheduled and held after ample public notice.

4. That preliminary plans be revised on the basis of these hearings and that expenditures of Federal funds be based on the revised plans for the current year.

5. That these 5-year plans be revised annually as outlined above and serve as guides for expenditure of each annual road appropriation.

6. That an extensive research on the cost of various types of roads and their value and influence on the social and economic aspects of agriculture be made by appropriate Federal and State agencies.

Postal service

We will vigorously support appropriations for the expansion of highway post office service wherever needed to replace the lost or crippled railway mail post office service resulting from the abandonment of branch railroads and the curtailment of railway operations.

Radio clear channels

We reiterate our previous demand that there be no further break-down in the number of clear-channel radio stations; and we oppose any legislative measure which would take the authority to control the power under which radio stations operate away from the Federal Communications Commission.

V. LABOR-MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL-SECURITY POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Conference of labor, management, and agriculture on a balanced economy

We believe that the establishment and preservation of a balanced economy are essential if our free competitive enterprise system is to be preserved. We recommend that the representatives of the great economic groups, business, labor, and agriculture, get together for the purpose of trying to develop price, wage, and profit policies that will reduce friction to a minimum and stimulate a greater spirit of cooperation and understanding among all of our people.

Grange policy on labor-management relations

We present the following as our statement of basic labor-management relations policy. We believe:

1. That free enterprise and democracy depend upon an economy of reasonably full production, and freedom from monopolistic practices for labor, industry, and agriculture alike; and that there is a sound social, moral, and economic basis for these views.

2. That management of industry should place a policy of high output and reasonably full employment above high prices and profits; and should be prohibited from using coercion and intimidation in its relationship with labor.

3. That labor unions have a useful place in the Nation in order that the combined economic strength of industrial and professional workers may offset the power of organized or big industry and finance.

4. That organized labor has most to gain by adopting as its primary objective the maintenance of reasonably full employment and an economy of full production, a principle which applies equally to all economic groups and can be made a basis for cooperation between all groups.

5. That we uphold the right of labor to strike and to organize on an industry-wide basis, especially in industries dominated by a few large units.

6. That when a strike, or threatened strike, becomes a serious menace to public health, safety, and the general welfare, the use of the injunction and compulsory arbitration is justified.

7. That the Grange does not condone such restrictive practices as the secondary boycott, sympathetic and jurisdictional strike, slow-downs, any unjustified reduction of the work week, and feather-bedding by labor.

8. That mass picketing which results in intimidation is unfair, but that all workers of a struck plant should be protected in their right to picket peaceably.

9. That a majority of the workers in a plant must vote favorably by secret ballot before giving union-shop privileges to any labor organization; and that we oppose the closed shop.

10. That we recommend to organized labor the adoption of a parity wage automatically adjusted semiannually to the cost of living. By this we do not mean to preclude labor from bargaining collectively through representatives of its own choosing to improve its working and living standards or obtain an increased share of the national income.

Taft-Hartley Act

We believe the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act has had a corrective effect on labor and management disputes. We favor such modifications in the act as may be necessary to correct abuses or weaknesses that are shown to exist.

Unemployment compensation

The Grange opposes any increase in unemployment compensation until means are made effective to minimize existing abuses.

Social security

Social security should be extended to include the farmer and farm worker, insofar as it applies to old age and retirement benefits, and other benefits should be extended to farm operators if and when a practical means can be found to make it work.

VI. TAXATION AND FISCAL AFFAIRS

Principles and policies of taxation

We set forth the following statements of principles determining the Grange's tax policies:

1. The tax load should be distributed on a broad base of taxpayers.

2. The tax load should be levied on ability to pay and benefits derived, and should fall equally on all persons of like circumstances.

3. Receipts from taxes levied upon property values should be equalized on local or State levels; and from income derived from property on State and National levels.

4. The tax system should impose the least necessary restriction upon production and employment and the launching of new private enterprises.

5. Taxes should be adequate to meet the cost of Government and maintain confidence in the public credit.

6. Losses on agricultural operations should be deductible only from income derived from agricultural operations.

7. Most of the reduction in income taxes should come from a reduction in the tax rate of the lower- and middle-income groups, and not in increased exemptions.

8. Every possible effort should be made to gain economy and efficiency in Government and eliminate useless and unnecessary agencies and projects.

9. Foreign aid should be held to a minimum, consistent with recovery and humanitarian considerations, and should be contingent upon the country's making a maximum effort to help itself.

10. We strongly urge repeal of all Federal automotive and related excise taxes.

11. We urge adequate Federal payments in lieu of taxes lost where high proportion Federal ownership of land exists.

12. Double taxation of the same income by any taxing unit should be eliminated.

13. Taxes should not be levied primarily as a means of social reform.

14. We favor a policy of retirement of the public debt from tax receipts during periods of high employment and income; and we oppose any increase in exemptions or lowering of rates in the lower brackets while present high levels of income prevail.

15. Since certain soil and water conservation practices are of definite value to society but often do not return their cost to the landowner through income, we believe that such costs should be made deductible expenses in computing net income from agricultural operations for tax purposes.

Oleomargarine Tax

We favor the removal of all the taxes on oleomargarine if and when effective means are taken to prevent its sale in imitation of butter.

Inflation

To curb inflation we recommend: (a) maximum production; (b) maintaining strong Federal tax program and sharp reductions of national debt while we have large national income; (c) encourage savings and investments in Government securities; (d) credit restrictions to divert expenditures to productive purposes.

The inflationary effect of foreign aid is recognized on our national economy but such aid is justified as a means of curbing world-wide inflation by making increased production possible.

Monetary commission

We urge the oppointment of a congressional monetary commission adequately financed, with agriculture represented on it, to conduct a searching investigation of and report on the ways in which the management of currency, bank credit, installment buying, speculation, and Government fiscal policy affect the economic cycle.

VII. NATIONAL SECURITY, PEACE, AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

National security

In a world that is still unsettled and without an effective and positive peace maintenance machinery, we reaffirm the following national security measures:

1. America must do everything in its power to avoid war, but not at the cost of our traditional freedom and way of life.

2. Recognizing that totalitarianism is a threat to the peace of the world, and that war may come in spite of our own peaceful purposes, we approach the problem of national security with an open mind, determined only to do that which we believe is best for our country.

3. We recognize the necessity at this time particularly, both for our own safety and as a contribution to world peace, of maintaining adequate armed services, and backing them up with a strong National Guard and civilian reserves.

4. We believe that if certain reforms are carried out, such forces can be raised through voluntary enlistment, and that in time of peace such a system is preferable to conscription as a means of providing for our military requirements.

5. We agree that our national security must rest fundamentally on: (1) a strong, educated, healthy population; (2) increased emphasis on scientific research; (3) faith in and vigorous support of the United Nations.

6. We believe that, in addition to taking all necessary and reasonable precautiohs for our own national safety, our best defense lies finally in an effective demonstration of what a free people can do in helping others while remaining strong at home.

Equalizing war burdens

The National Grange believes, that any Federal legislation requiring the service of individuals, should also set up controls of prices and wages and impose the highest practical personal income tax on individuals and profit taxes on business to prevent inflationary prices and hold profits to the lowest possible minimum.

Federalized militia

We oppose federalization of the National Guard or any of its component parts during peacetime, and insist that it be continued as State militia with the governor of each State as the commander in chief.

Communism

We need to be constantly on guard, against the paid propagandists and saboteurs who seek to create confusion, chaos, and destruction in order to promote and spread this insidious doctrine. We recommend that the agencies of our Government take the necessary steps to deal effectively with those persons who seek to destroy our Government and its free institutions.

The Marshall plan

We endorse the principles of the Marshall plan based upon the following conditions:

1. That aid to a needy country be given only when the recipient shows willingness to help himself.

2. That the standards of performance in terms of production be set up and that the price of aid be the reasonable attainment of these goals.

3. That the limitations of our own resources and our own needs be considered in granting aid.

4. That proper publicity be given to the people of aided nations relative to the source of aid received.

The United Nations

We are convinced that our policy should be one of wholehearted support of the United Nations and that we should do everything in our power to build it and strengthen it as an instrument of peace. A strengthened United Nations would undoubtedly provide a legislative body to enact laws related to world peace, with some practical and equitable system of weighted representation, a world court to interpret the law, and a world police force to enforce it. We recommend:

1. That the United States take the lead in securing such revision of the United Nations Charter as may be necessary to give it strength commensurate with its task.

2. That the veto be modified so as to limit it to actions which clearly relate to the internal affairs and sovereignty of nations.

3. That consideration be given to making the General Assembly of the United Nations a legislative body provided that some practical and equitable system of weighted representation can be developed.

4. That consideration be given to establishing a world judiciary system with compulsory jurisdiction, applying laws to individuals found to be violating the program of the United Nations, with due regard to protecting the sovereignty of nations.

5. That an international police force be established with a program of armament limitation subject to international inspection and commensurate in any country with the preservation of world order.

6. That until we have solved the problem of maintaining the peace, the authority of the United Nations be limited to those matters related to world peace and security.

Control of Atomic Energy

We favor permanent civilian control of atomic energy by the United States Atomic Energy Commission in the interest of humanitarian causes, and approve the international control of the atom bomb along the lines recommended by our own Government.

Refugees and displaced persons

We recognize the seriousness of the displaced-person problem and need for action. We recommend:

1. That all of the countries of the world cooperate in providing settlement opportunities and greater fianancial backing for resettlement purposes.

2. That the resettlement of family groups be considered in all recruitment plans, and that training or retraining of displaced persons be related to their ultimate destination.

3. That international sanctuaries for the sick and elderly be set up under an international organization.

4. That displaced persons be allowed to return to the countries of their origin when that is their desire.

5. That industrial level of European countries including Germany be increased in order to support their populations and for the sake of European recovery.

International exchange of students

The exchange of students between nations is one of the best methods known to promote friendship among all peoples. The National Grange goes on record as favoring the exchange of students in agriculture and other subjects as means of promoting better international relations.

IFAP

We support the International Federation of Agriculture Producers, now having as members independent farm organizations in 21 nations.

We believe that the organization of farmers throughout the world will give them a voice in world affairs and enable them to work out trade programs in the interest of both producers and consumers.

Headquarters for FAO and IFAP

We urge that Washington, D. C., be selected as the permanent location of the FAO and the IFAP and that Congress take such steps as may be necessary to assure satisfactory sites and adequate housing facilities for offices of the FAO.

Foreign policy

We recommend that the legislative and executive branches of our Government develop a practical working arrangement which will recognize both the need for prompt decisions and the safeguard of congressional approval in all foreign policy actions.

Reciprocal trade agreements

We will support an extension of reciprocal trade treaties under the following conditions:

1. That Congress establish a definite policy on tariff based primarily upon the difference in economic costs of production between home and abroad.

2. That the administration of the tariff policy be definitely determined by the Congress and the administrators stay within the policy thus established.

3. That before any proposed tariff rate changes or any reciprocal trade agreements become effective, they should be submitted to the Congress where they should lie for 30 days. If the Congress should not disapprove of the treaty within 30 days, it would become effective.

VIII. NATIONAL EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND MISCELLANEOUS

Federal aid to education

We approve Federal aid for education on elementary and secondary levels on the following conditions:

1. States receiving Federal aid would be required to meet certain minimum standards such as are now required in the case of Federal aid for teaching of vocational agriculture.

2. That all Federal funds for any State shall be expended as determined by State or local school officials without interference by control by Federal agencies or officials.

3. We favor the use of the equalization principle between the States in the allocation of Federal aid funds for schools.

Library services in rural areas

We approve and will support the extension of library service to all rural areas.

Separation of extension from all farm organizations

We approve the findings of the Joint Investigation Committee for the Land Grant College and United States Department of Agriculture recommending prompt divorcement of the Extension Service from all farm organization control. We insist that the Extension Service be separated from any and all farm organizations and that this Service be supported entirely by public funds.

Hospitalization and health

We recommend that:

1. The principle of contributory health insurance be the basic method of financing medical care for the large majority of the American people, accompanied by such use of tax funds as may be required to (a) furnish services which are public responsibilities; (b) supplement health insurance as necessary to provide adequate services for the whole population.

2. Voluntary prepayment group health plans be organized on a community or collective-bargaining level, embodying group practice and providing comprehensive service by every practical means.

3. The removal of legal restrictions upon voluntary insurance plans on a cooperative basis such as now exist in a number of States.

4. People with comprehensive voluntary health service be exempted from any plan for compulsory health insurance should such a health program be established.

5. The use of public or private funds to supplement family funds where the rural people cannot afford to pay the total cost of adequate medical care.

6. Prepaid nonprofit hospitalization, medical care, and the development of cooperative hospitals.

7. The establishment of adequate public health program and services in every rural section to improve sanitation, prevent and control disease, and promote good health, and the expansion of medical and dental research programs at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Liquor and temperance

We favor local option for control of liquor, State and local research programs on alcoholism, State monopolies where sale is legalized, a comprehensive temperance educational program, and Federal legislation banning liquor advertisements from interstate commerce.

Movies

The Grange takes a strong stand in opposition to immoral and questionable movies, recommending:

1. Continued efforts to get producers to clean up the movies, and if this fails, will support Federal censorship.

2. Elimination of block booking by the industry and if this fails, consideration to Federal prohibition should be given.

3. Granting certificates of merit to producers of high-grade films.

Term of President

We endorse the proposed constitutional amendment that Congress has submitted to the States for ratification which would limit the President and Vice President to two terms of office.

Election of President and Vice President

We favor a constitutional amendment allocating the presidential and vice presidential vote of each State in proportion to the popular votes cast for each candidate, but retaining the present method of determining the number of electoral votes for each State as equal to its number of Senators and Congressmen.

Daylight saving

We urge the early strengthening of the Federal Standard Time Act so as to make standard time mandatory in each time zone in the United States for all times during the year.

Radio Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize the Bureau of Census to include radio and television sets in its decennial enumeration. This great and new industry would be served, and so would the whole American people, by authorizing this counting of radio sets. I hope the bill will receive careful and favorable consideration by the committee to which it is referred; and subsequently by the Congress.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter sent me recently by Mr. Samuel Rothschild, president of G. Levor & Co., Inc., Gloversville, N. Y., one of the largest tanning concerns in the country. Mr. Rothschild is a personal friend of mine and I believe the membership of the House will be interested in the contents of his letter, as follows:

G. LEVOR & CO., INC.,
Gloversville, N. Y., January 6, 1949.

Congressman BERNARD W. KEARNEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAT: I want to get a few of my thoughts to you, as regards the welfare of business, which in turn means that of our workers, the local community, and the Nation as a whole.

I am an advocate of the Marshall plan, but I must confess that it is now with reservations. It requires checks and balances which heretofore has been overlooked and creates a boomerang. You are familiar with what happened in aluminum. We gave foreign countries money to help their economy so they bought the metal for $25 and resold it to us for $45. This may be considered smart and shrewd but made suckers out of us.

Now in our particular line of business, we, under the Marshall plan, give them our money and having no confidence in their own, they go all over the world and buy all the raw skins they can lay their hands on and pay a premium, again with our money, so that we are compelled to meet these high inflationary prices, which our economy does not permit. Some countries buy almost a year's supply again with our money and we can't obtain 4 months' to keep going. This thing is getting serious. They should be held down to a few months' supply and not disturb world markets and make them more inflationary. The President in his message dwelt largely on inflation and he and Congress are responsible to the extent that they do not come out and limit the price competition of Marshall-plan recipients and this requires at once action.

Now all this attack on profits of big business can have terrible repercussions. Do they want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs? The Government gets its substantial take, business needs a cushion for future operations. We just completed a new power plant that cost as much as the original mill and are adding a new three-story addition. That means more and steady employment at high wages. If they go haywire on business taxes, people will naturally take less risks and they will be inviting a recession or worse. If profits recede by virtue of business attacks, the Treasury will get much less in spite of increased rates and labor will not be as steadily employed. It requires a lot of sound judgment in the Eighty-first Congress and that's what I mean by the goose that lays the golden eggs.

Kind regards to you and Lill.

Yours sincerely,
SAMUEL ROTHSCHILD.

Mr. Speaker, further bearing on this subject, I wish also to include the following newspaper clipping date-lined January 13 from Toronto, Canada:

TORONTO, ONT., January 13.—Hide supply is at best adequate, Harold Connett, president of the Surpass Leather Co., Philadelphia,, said in his address at a luncheon meeting of the third annual convention of the Canadian Shoe Retailers Association held in the Royal York Hotel here this week.

He blamed misguided governmental control in those countries normally big exporters of this commodity for present shortages. The ultimate scurce of Government restrictions, he said, is the lack of balance of currencies and the gray market exchange. He expressed hope the Marshall plan would solve the problem by creating confidence in the basic currencies of the nations involved.

Tanners in the United States, though backing the Marshall plan, are unhappy seeing ERP dollars buying the world hides and skins at higher prices than United States manufacturers can pay. Regarding the general trade conditions, Mr. Connett said that though postwar inflation was to be expected, the period of readjustment is definitely here, and further inflation will have serious repercussions on the trade as a whole.

President Truman's Inaugural Address Urges World Front Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, various appraisals have been made of all and of parts of the inaugural address of President Harry S. Truman, but I have seen no written comment about the portion of his speech which related to the European recovery program and to his emphasis upon the fact that our American way of life is based upon the proven experience that individual man has an inalienable right to govern himself and be governed with reason and justice than that which appeared in the editorial of the Long Beach Press-Telegram, of Long Beach, Calif., January 21, 1949. It also appraises the President's appropriate remarks about communism. The Long Beach Press-Telegram is one of the two daily newspapers published in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., and I take pleasure in commending this editorial to the reading of every Member of Congress and to every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS URGES WORLD FRONT AGAINST COMMUNISM

Perhaps because he had explored at length the country's internal problems in his state-of-the-Union message, his annual economic report and his budget message, President Truman devoted his inaugural address to world affairs. It probably is the most extreme statement of international cooperation ever to be made by a responsible American statesman. It also contains blunt notice to the Soviet Union that it will not be permitted to dominate mankind.

The inaugural address does not even argue against the isolationist point of view. Isolationism is assumed by the President, at the beginning of his term as the Nation's elected Chief Executive, to be dead. However, it may not be out of place to remark that the death of isolationism in the United States was accomplished by the bipartisan policy of United States participation in international cooperation. A strict observance of

the bipartisan policy is the best insurance against a resurrection of isolationism.

Mr. Truman probably has the earnest approval of nine-tenths of his fellow countrymen of all parties when he says: "We will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and we will continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness."

The President likewise pledges that "we will continue our programs for world economic recovery. * * * We must keep our full weight behind the European recovery program."

The so-called Marshall plan will be continued.

"We will strengthen freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression," President Truman said, with specific mention of the north Atlantic security pact and the similar Western Hemispheric defense pact embodied in the treaty of Rio de Janeiro.

All of this is notice to the American people of heavy loads to be borne. They expect to carry the burdens for relief of needy nations and building up their strength to stand against totalitarian aggression. What they ask is that something like 100 cents of value be obtained for each dollar spent.

The most striking section of the President's address is that in which he, with a series of deadly parallels, compares communism and democracy. "Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice.

"Communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, punishment without trial, and forced labor as the chattel of the state. It decrees what information he shall receive, what art he shall produce, what leaders he shall follow, and what thoughts he will think."

There is no choice for an American. As the President's inaugural address makes clear, the duty of the United States is to hold its place as leader of the nations upholding, at any and every cost, human freedom.

Mr. Truman's words are sufficient refutation of those who thought that his choice of a successor to General Marshall as Secretary of State might indicate a weakening of the American attitude toward the Soviet Union. There is no sign of appeasement. There is determination for the United States to be equal to any emergency. Yet, the President seeks peace. In spite of the Communists' belief in inevitable war between communism and what they call capitalism, President Truman declares in his inaugural:

"In due time, as our stability becomes manifest, as more and more nations come to know the benefits of democracy and to participate in growing abundance, I believe that those countries which now oppose us will abandon their delusions and join with the free nations of the world in a just settlement of international differences."

Roosevelt Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would make January 30 a legal holiday dedicated to human freedom and dignity and to be known hereafter as Roosevelt Day.

I believe that the great heart of the world will be deeply enthusiastic about this measure.

I believe that its observance will spread to all parts of the world, wherever those ideals of human freedom and dignity which animated our great and fallen leader are held dear.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born on January 30. For many years past his birthday has been fittingly observed as a time of fund raising for the benefit of other victims of polio. During his lifetime propriety forbade any more formal recognition of his natal day.

However, the time has come to mark this day each year as a time of dedication to that noble spirit which animated the founding fathers, which breathed life and fire into the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, which inspired the Monroe Doctrine and the Emancipation Proclamation, which made possible the United Nations and the "four freedoms" and a bloodless revolution in American politics.

I am myself a Roosevelt Democrat, an unreconstructed New Dealer, with profound faith in the democratic processes of self-government. I recognize in Franklin D. Roosevelt the authentic tradition of American progress. He was not by any means the only true prophet of American democracy; perhaps he was not, in the wide sweep of history, the greatest; but he certainly was the greatest exponent of democracy in our time.

The holiday I propose to mark his birthdate is small tribute indeed from a grateful people.

I know that this proposal is not new to many Roosevelt admirers; I cannot consider myself unique, though I have long planned this bill. Therefore, under leave, I wish to include in my remarks two editorials from the current issue of the Machinist, the weekly publication of the International Association of Machinists, expressing a vigorous plea for Roosevelt Day.

In the three terms that Franklin Roosevelt served as President of our country, more was accomplished on behalf of the plain people than in any other time in our history. Next Sunday, January 30, would have been Mr. Roosevelt's sixty-seventh birthday. On that day every sincere trade-union member will pause to pay homage to that great American whose unflagging faith in the majority will forever inspire our struggle for freedom and justice. (Harvey W. Brown.)

WHY NOT A NATIONAL HOLIDAY TO HONOR F. D. R.?

Today Franklin Roosevelt occupies a place in our history beside George Washington and Abraham Lincoln as a leader who came to the American people in a time of great crisis and led them through.

We observe the birthday of Washington in every State and that of Lincoln in 31 States. Roosevelt's birthday, January 30, should be added to those two.

Most of us are not too young to remember the stark fear that faced this Nation in 1933. The United States was in the throes of a crisis unprecedented in time of peace. Most of all, we needed something to restore our confidence. Franklin Roosevelt did that, and more. He pulled us out of the crisis by main force. As one historian has written, "The 99-day session of the Seventy-third Congress that began on March 9, 1933, witnessed the most daring Presidential leadership in American history."

He followed in the middle thirties with a program of social legislation—social security, labor relations, home loans, bank deposit insurance, rural electrification, minimum wages—to name a few of the great New Deal laws. Roosevelt gave the common people of America the chance for security and self-respect.

During the second half of his administration, when we were plunged into the worst war in our history, Roosevelt led us to victory.

The "Forgotten Men" whom Roosevelt fought for can lead the way in making his birthway a national day of remembrance. National holidays can only be suggested by Congress. They must be officially proclaimed by State governors and local mayors. Any group of citizens has the right to petition a governor or mayor to proclaim a holiday.

Observance of Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays came slowly. Three months after Washington's death in 1799, Congress adopted a resolution urging a public noting of February 22. A few cities followed the suggestion in succeeding years, but it was not until the one hundreth anniversary of Washington's birth in 1832 that the entire country made the day a holiday.

Almost the same held true in Lincoln's case. In 1866, a year after his assassination, Congress adopted a resolution urging observance of Lincoln's birthday. The idea grew but again it was not until 1909, the one hundredth anniversary of the great emancipator's birth, that the observance became a national custom.

For 10 years we have been observing Roosevelt's birthday as National Infantile Paralysis Day. But his birthday must be remembered far more than the great personal handicap which he overcame. Working men and women will gladly honor him on his birthday as one of the greatest friends they ever had. For more than that we must remember him. Roosevelt was one of America's beloved leaders. His ideals deserve to be remembered by every American this year and every year.

Here Are Some Interesting Facts About the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, everyone is interested in the new Eighty-first Congress and wants to have information about it and know how it compares with previous Congresses. The following excellent digest of facts and figures appeared recently in the Congressional Quarterly and answers many of the questions that are being asked about the Eighty-first Congress:

THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS CONVENING IN JANUARY 1949

It will be the Eighty-first. The First Congress served 1789–91, during the first administration of George Washington (65 House, 26 Senate Members).

It will be the tenth Democratic-controlled Congress elected this century, the seventh elected in the past 16 years. Since 1900, 13 Republican-controlled Congresses have been elected; two Congresses have been split, with opposing parties in control of House and Senate.

It will be the same size, in both House (435 Members) and Senate (96 Members), as all Congresses since March 1913 (62d Congress, 1911–13, had 92 Senate, 391 House Members).

It will have the largest Democratic majority in the House (263) of any Congress since the Seventy-seventh, of 1941–43 (267).

Largest Democratic House majority in any Congress was in Roosevelt era Seventy-fifth, of 1937–39 (333). Smallest Democratic House membership in any Congress since start of the Civil War was in the Thirty-seventh, of 1861–63 (42).

It will have the smallest Republican House minority (171) since the Roosevelt Seventy-seventh Congress (162).

Smallest GOP House minority since Civil War was in Fifty-second Congress, 1891–93 (88). Largest GOP House majority in history was in Sixty-seventh Congress, of 1921–23 (300).

It will have nine more Democratic Senators than Eightieth Congress, but three fewer than in Seventy-ninth Congress.

Largest Democratic Senate majority in history was in Seventy-fifth Congress (75). Smallest Democratic Senate minority since outbreak of Civil War was in Thirty-ninth Congress of 1865–67 (10).

It will have nine fewer GOP Senators than in the Eightieth Congress, but four more than in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Smallest GOP Senate minority since start of Civil War was in Seventy-fifth Congress (17). Largest Republican Senate majorities in history were in Sixtieth Congress, of 1907–9, and Forty-first Congress, of 1869–71 (both 61).

It will also have 9 women Members—1 less than the record (10) in the second half of the Seventy-ninth Congress, but the same as for all other Congresses since the Seventieth, of 1927–29.

It will have 301 lawyers (in both Houses). This is the largest vocational category. The number is 6 less than that for the Eightieth Congress.

It will have a total of 27 ex-governors—26 in the Senate, 1 in the House.

It will have 26 former House Members in the Senate.

It will have two ex-Senators (HUGH MITCHELL, Washington; JAMES W. WADSWORTH, New York) in the House.

It will be 1 year older (in average age of Members) than the Eightieth Congress. The average age for both Houses will be 53.8.

VOCATIONS

Sixty-six percent of the Senate Members, 54 percent of the House Members will be lawyers. The ratio will be:

Vocation percentages

	Senate	House
	Percent	*Percent*
Agriculture	6	6
Banking	2	3
Business or insurance	12	14
Medicine or dentistry	1	2
Politics or civil service	6	7
Journalism or publishing	4	7
Law	66	54
Teaching	3	7

OLDEST, YOUNGEST

Five oldest Members of the Congress will be:

1. Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, 84, Democrat, of North Carolina.

2. Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH, 82, Democrat, of Illinois.

3. Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, 81, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

4. Representative CHARLES A. EATON, 80, Republican, of New Jersey.

5. Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, 79, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Five youngest Members of the Congress will be:

1. Representative LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR., 27, Democrat, of Texas.

2. Representative HUGO S. SIMS, 27, Democrat, of South Carolina.

3. Representative JOHN C. DAVIES, 28, Democrat, of New York.

4. Representative JAMES E. NOLAND, 28, Democrat, of Indiana.

5. Representative JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, 29, Democrat, of Mississippi.

Youngest Senator will be RUSSELL LONG, Louisiana (he was 30, the minimum age, on November 3, 1 day after the elections).

The ranking Republicans, in period of service, will be ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan, in the Senate; DANIEL A. REED, New York, in the House.

The ranking Democrats will be KENNETH MCKELLAR, Tennessee, in the Senate; ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois, in the House.

SABATH, his service dating from March 4, 1907, will have the longest service record of any Member of the Eighty-first Congress.

CONGRESSWOMEN

Feminine representation in the Congress will consist of one Senator and eight House Members. Five are incumbents who will continue in office. The Senator will be an ex-Representative. One of the new House Members served a previous term—in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Two are new to Capitol Hill.

Women in Congress

	Total (both Houses)
81st Cong	9
80th Cong	9
79th Cong	10
78th Cong	9
77th Cong	9
76th Cong	9
75th Cong	9
74th Cong	8
73d Cong	9
72d Cong	8
71st Cong	9
70th Cong	5
69th Cong	3
68th Cong	1
67th Cong	4
66th Cong	0
65th (1917–19)	1

First woman ever to become Member of Congress was Miss Jeanette Rankin (Republican, Montana), elected to the Sixty-fifth Congress House in 1916. She served one term and was elected again in 1940 to the Seventy-seventh Congress.

WOMEN MEMBERS, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH (Republican, Maine) will be the only woman Senator. She is a veteran of 9 years in national politics. Former teacher and businesswoman, she was a Member of the House in the Seventy-sixth to Eightieth Congresses, representing the Second Maine District.

Newcomer to the national scene, Representative REVA BECK BOSONE, Democrat, of Utah, is no freshman in politics. Municipal Court Judge of Salt Lake City and a former member of the Utah State Legislature, she defeated William A. Dawson, incumbent Republican.

A Republican national committeewoman long active in Indiana politics, Mrs. CECIL M. HARDEN, Republican, of Indiana, will be new in Congress. She replaces Representative Noble J. Johnson, resigned.

When Mrs. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, Democrat, of California, won election to Congress in 1944, she was already in the national limelight as a Hollywood actress. She was reelected to the Eightieth Congress and again to the Eighty-first Congress by a 2-to-1 margin over her Republican opponent, Wallace Braden.

Mrs. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Democrat, of Connecticut, served previously in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican, of Massachusetts, and Mrs. MARY T. NORTON, Democrat, of New Jersey, have been members of the House since the Sixty-ninth Congress.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio, was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress to fill the unexpired term of her husband, CHESTER C. BOLTON, and since has been repeatedly returned to office.

Wealthy businesswoman of stylish Tuxedo Park, N. Y., Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, a Republican, was reelected this year to serve her second term in the House.

End of Oriental Exclusion?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Far Eastern Survey, written by Robert M. Cullum, who was area supervisor under the War Relocation Authority, with direct responsibility for resettlement of Japanese Americans in a number of States. The article discusses my bill to remove all discrimination on a basis of race from our immigration and naturalization laws.

END OF ORIENTAL EXCLUSION?

(By Robert M. Cullum)

Mr. Cullum was area supervisor under the War Relocation Authority, with direct responsibility for resettlement of Japanese Americans in a number of States.

Under the pressure of the exigencies of war the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States breached the long-standing policy of oriental exclusion by granting the privilege of citizenship to persons of Chinese descent and by placing immigration from China on a quota basis. The Seventy-ninth Congress followed in 1946 by granting essentially the same privileges to persons indigenous to India and to Filipinos. While the Eightieth Congress passed no major legislation of this sort, it permitted American soldiers to return with Japanese brides, if marriage took place within a narrow time limit. It also removed racial criteria in the consideration of deportation, a change which accrued with greatest benefit to Japanese treaty merchants left stranded by abrogation of the treaty of 1911. Finally, it began serious consideration of the Judd bill (introduced by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, of H. R. 5004 in the 80th Cong. and reintroduced as H. R. 199 in the 81st Cong.), a measure which would end all racial discrimination in American laws pertaining to naturalized citizenship and would place immigration from all parts of the world on a quota basis. There are sound reasons for believing that, prior to adjournment of the Eighty-first Congress, the Judd bill, or a measure of similar import, will become law.

The importance of this measure as a means of removing the stigma of second class from resident Asiatic aliens and their children cannot be exaggerated. Before looking at the content of the Judd bill and outlining the specific problems it seeks to meet, an examination of evidence supporting this belief will be worth while.

PRESENT RESTRICTIONS AND ATTITUDES

Present American law permits the naturalization, and in consequence the quota immigration, of persons tracing their ancestry to China, the Philippines, and India, which together account for fully three-fourths of the billion and a quarter inhabitants of Asia. In addition to those of the Asian colonies of the great powers, the peoples of 12 geographical and political entities in Asia and the Pacific Ocean area remain barred from naturalization and hence fall under the exclusionary provisions of the 1924 Immigration Act. Of these areas the largest is Japan. Similarly, of the 87,942 persons resident in the United States and enumerated in the 1940 census as ineligible to citizenship, 84,653, or nearly 97 percent, were of Japanese origin, the remainder, except for 145 Polynesians and other Asians, being Korean.

The first reason, then, for optimism that there will be an early termination of oriental exclusion is the fact that no new policy is involved—only the extension to all Asian and Pacific peoples of a policy already enunciated, an extension which has been progressively implemented by each succeeding Congress.

A second and most important factor, since persons of Japanese descent form so large a part of those permanent residents of the United States who are barred from citizenship, is a demonstrable conviction that Americans of Japanese descent most abundantly proved their right to full status in America by their contribution to victory in World War II. Not only citizens, but many aliens of Japanese descent, participated directly. Simple justice requires removal of bars to citizenship for those who have so long and so honorably lived here.

Evidence of the acceptance of this view is the passage of H. R. 3999, which sets up machinery in the Department of Justice to meet claims arising from the wartime west coast evacuation. In September 1948 the California department of the American Legion, in convention, approved elimination of racial restrictions to naturalization.

During public hearings on the Judd bill before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House Committee on the Judiciary, testimony to this effect was legion. Impressive, and certainly startling to those thinking in old patterns, was direct evidence of a change of sentiment on the west coast, for so long the incubator of antiorientalism in general and of anti-Japanese feeling in particular. Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass the Judd bill came from the boards of county supervisors of both Los Angeles and San Francisco. California Representatives GEORGE P. MILLER, a Democrat, and BERTRAND W. GEARHART, a Republican, urged adoption.

The third reason for optimism about the bill lies in United States international relations, and is not unrelated to the contest between the United States and Russia to win friends and influence peoples.

Thus W. Walton Butterworth, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs in the Department of State, giving the hearty endorsement of the Department of State to the original Judd bill, testified that "for many years the maintenance of normal and friendly relations between the United States and oriental countries has been impeded by the racial discrimination present in our immigration and naturalization laws. The provisions which excluded Asiatics from admission into the United States * * * were highly offensive to the peoples of Asia and the Pacific and were the basis of much foreign propaganda against the United States. * * *

"Mr. JUDD's bill has the hearty endorsement of the Department of State. It very much hopes that Congress will act promptly so that it may be passed at this session, for it is of key importance to our relations with the great peoples of the Orient."

Former United States Ambassador to Japan Joseph C. Grew strongly supported this view:

"It is my considered opinion that American relationships in the part of the world this bill defines as the Asia-Pacific triangle can never be expected to become entirely sound until this country eliminates the humiliation inflicted by our exclusion laws.

"The present is a time of great movements among these [far eastern] people, of realinement and choosing of friends. Burma is newly independent; Indonesia is seeking a new status; everywhere there is receptivity to new ideas. Nowhere is this more evident than in Japan, where a new leadership is emerging under our tutelage.

"It seems to me to be the height of folly to ask the support of democratic elements in these countries, yet at the very point where our democracy comes to test, to back away. If we want to hold our friends, we must support them. The ending of exclusion now would provide concrete proof of American good faith at a time when it is most important that new leadership be oriented in our direction. The matter of Japan warrants particular attention.

"There can be no question whatsoever that the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 undercut the position of liberal Japanese statesmen whose policy was based on friendship for America. And I knew many of them myself in the old days—men who were giving up everything they had to develop good relations with our country, to stem the tide of militarism, who risked imprisonment—doing everything they could. Those are the people who need our support.

"In the sense that friends of this country were weakened, while the extremists were given a potent weapon with which to exacerbate Japanese-American relations, the policy of exclusion contributed largely to the final crisis."

* * * * *

EVOLVING THE JUDD BILL

The phrasing of the Judd bill presented a major technical problem, one, indeed, which many had thought to be insoluble.

By the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924, the direction of American immigration policy was established; that direction was severely restrictionist. In addition, there is without question a general aversion to any large-scale immigration by Asian peoples, to "competition from cheap labor," and to large-scale settlement by peoples whose social backgrounds differ from the European cultural origins of the great majority of our people. Whether this latter is a practical consideration is immaterial; it is part of our body of opinion.

To be successful, a measure seeking equality in naturalization and immigration must recognize these basic facts in public—and congressional—opinion. Because of wartime experience and the Chinese, Indian, and Filipino precedents, the question of removing racial bars to citizenship is largely outside the realm of controversy. Immigration is another matter.

Three possible lines of approach were explored. That of placing all Asian peoples on a par with European and African immigrants, which might result in their large-scale immigration, had already been rejected by Congress when the Chinese Immigration Act was passed. The basic problem is posed not by those persons who continue to reside in an independent country of birth but by the children of those who have immigrated—to South America, for example—and of those who were born in the colonies of the great powers. Thus, if chargeable to the country of birth, persons of Japanese descent born in Brazil might enter the United States quota free, and a Chinese person born in Hong Kong would enter under the British quota. Without doubt the potential of Asian immigration would be very large under such an arrangement.

At the opposite pole, a bill which dealt only with racial bars to citizenship would inevitably reemphasize and call new attention to the vestiges of our oriental exclusion policy, a prospect which the Department of State could not face with equanimity.

The third course, chosen by Congress in 1943 when writing the Chinese Act, eliminates all restrictions upon citizenship and permits use of normally computed national-origins quotas, but is more restrictive than the regular quota law since determination of the quota to which an individual is chargeable is made on the basis of ancestry rather than of country of birth. Thus a Chinese born in England who immigrates to the United States is charged to the quota of China. * * *

Within this framework there remained the problem of finding a suitable description of the peoples to be covered. This was solved by devising an Asia-Pacific triangle, within the boundaries of which are to be found all peoples indigenous to the geographical area "situate wholly east of the meridian 60° east of Greenwich, wholly west of the meridian 165° west, and wholly north of the parallel 25° south latitude." Put another way, this area includes all peoples who, prior to rescission of Chinese exclusion, were racially ineligible to citizenship, and includes no other peoples, with the incidental exception of those from Afghanistan. The latter, it may be noted, has never contributed largely to the stream of immigrants to the United States and present no real problem. Fourteen persons born in Afghanistan entered the United States in the decade 1938–47.

THE BILL'S PROVISIONS

Under the Judd bill, peoples of all ancestral lines born within this triangle are chargeable to the country of birth; those of Asian ancestry born in a colony are chargeable to a special Asia-Pacific quota of 100. An immigrant "who is attributable by as much as one-half of his ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to" the Asia-Pacific triangle, but who was born outside the triangle, is chargeable to the country of ancestral origin or, if of colonial or mixed Asian derivation, to the special triangle quota.

Total annual immigration of persons of Asian ancestry now authorized under law amounts to 505 if Pakistan is included (China, 105; Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines, each 100). The Judd bill would add authorized quotas usable by indigenous peoples in the number of 985 (Japan 185, Butan, Nauru, Nepal, New Guinea, Pacific Trust Territory, Siam, western Samoa, and the special Asia-Pacific triangle quota, each 100), with the probability of an additional 400 at such time as quotas are proclaimed for Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia, and Korea. The total thus may come to 1,890 quota authorizations, nearly half of which would be established for remote areas from which immigration is hardly to be expected. Actual Asian immigration of less than 1,000 a year is a very safe estimate if the Judd bill is enacted.

The above provisions, plus repeal of all racial restrictions on naturalized citizenship, form the heart of this measure. In the course of its legislative history, a number of additions were made to it.

The first of these, desired by the Department of State, changes the general basis for computing quotas from the present national-origins ratio, which works out to 0.-001675854857 of the persons of the various national origins enumerated in the census of 1920, to a straight one-sixth of 1 percent. This will result in an over-all annual reduction of quotas by 635 numbers. By way of

comparison, the British quota of 65,721 will be reduced to 65,361, the Greek quota of 307 to 305. Another interpolated provision of the bill restricts immigration from non-Asian colonies to 100 per year under mother-country quotas.

In the course of the hearings, the fear was expressed that political fragmentation of the Far East might result in a great multiplication of minimum quotas, which are uniformly set at 100. India might break up into 600 sovereign entities, this argument ran, and thus receive total quotas of 60,000 annually. This problem was met by providing that the total of all minimum quotas shall not exceed 5,000, with a progressive diminution of the size of minimum quotas as the number of minimum-quota areas exceeds 50. In terms of the present world political situation, this provision may best be described as arising from an abundance of caution, with no foreseeable practical effect.

Another series of changes is of more serious import. Under present law, Chinese wives of American citizens may enter the United States as nonquota immigrants. Filipinos not only have this privilege but their children may come in on a nonquota basis as well—indeed the Filipino is on a complete par with Europeans in American immigration law.

The original Judd bill preserved these privileges, and extended nonquota immigrant status to husbands, wives, and children of American citizens born anywhere within the Asia-Pacific triangle. This provision was struck out in committee, and in addition, in the interest of uniformity, the present bill now places Filipinos in the same status as other Asians and requires that Chinese wives of American citizens enter on a quota basis. This the bill accomplishes without racial discrimination, since it provides that the section of the Immigration Act of 1924 providing nonquota status for the husband, wife, and child category shall not apply to any area having a quota less than 200. The list of 41 minimum-quota areas, too long to enumerate here, includes Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

The Judd bill as it now stands is highly restrictive in the field of immigration. In several particulars the bill might be improved by returning to the original version, but as it stands it is a bill that can be passed. It solves the larger issues brought about through an indefensible total-exclusion policy. It provides complete equality in naturalization, and ensures that, without regard to race, any individual who is qualified under general immigration laws may, on securing a quota number, enter the United States as an immigrant.

Taxes on Transportation and Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced 2 bills in the House, one to remove the excise tax on transportation of goods and passengers; the other to remove excise taxes on communications. Both these taxes are wartime taxes. At the time they were enacted there was an implied promise to the American people that they would be repealed 6 months after the close of the shooting war. The shooting war has now been over for nearly 4 years, and yet these taxes which are a drag and hindrance to American business, remain on the statute books.

These taxes, contrary to the ideas of some people, are not paid by the transportation or communications companies. They are paid by the public. They are a burden upon the pocketbook of every American. These taxes are part of the cost of living. They impede the free exchange of goods commodities all over this country. Especially do they have a heavy import upon the remote parts of our country, parts far from the sea coasts and from water transport. They impede interstate commerce. They should be repealed.

Reciprocal Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made today before the Ways and Means Committee of the House when that body was sitting in a hearing on reciprocal trade treaty proposals:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not opposed to the theory of reciprocal trade treaties. Reciprocal trade treaties should be negotiated by our State Department where it is clearly shown that such treaties will stimulate world recovery or be advantageous to our American economy.

However, I would like to warn that reciprocity can be carried too far, and in going too far, bring ruin to some American industries and unemployment and misery to the thousands of the workers employed in those industries. Therefore, it is my considered opinion, that no reciprocal trade treaties should be entered into without the State Department first putting itself in possession of the fullest information about industries likely to be adversely affected by such treaties. Also, no such treaties should be entered into without the management and workers in industries likely to be harmed by such treaties being provided the greatest possible opportunity to be fully heard at public hearings.

I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the committee three industries on the Pacific coast that might be irreparably damaged by the negotiation of reciprocal treaties, affecting their products. These are the crab fishing industry, the plywood manufacturing industry and the filbert nut raising industry. The facts concerning these industries are:

Crab fishing—Prior to December 7, 1941, the Japanese sold 85 percent of all the canned crab marketed in the United States. Most of this crab was caught by the Japanese in waters off the American coast and canned aboard cannery ships operating off our shores. The Japanese dumped this crab almost duty free into American ports. American fishermen and American cannery workers could not compete with the low wages paid Japanese fishermen and Japanese cannery workers. Although our American coastal waters were stocked with enormous quantities of crab few Americans could afford to fish them.

For example, in the years preceeding Pearl Harbor, American crab fishermen seldom landed more than 20,000 dozen crabs a year at the fishing port of Grays Harbor, Wash. Last year, the Grays Harbor crab landings totaled more than 360,000 dozen for which the fishermen were paid more than $1,000,000. Because of the removal, after Pearl Harbor, of the low-wage Japanese competition our Grays Harbor crab-fishing industry volume expanded eighteenfold or increased 1,800 percent.

The same was true in other Pacific coast crab-fishing ports.

If, under reciprocal trade treaties, Japan should be permitted to recapture the American canned crab market our Pacific coast crab industry will be knocked into a cocked hat, and the investment of millions of dollars which American fishermen have made in fishing boats and which food processors have put into canneries and canning equipment would become largely worthless.

Plywood manufacturing: During the past year, large eastern building material jobbing houses, hoping to profit by becoming agents for Canadian and Mexican concerns, have made a strenous effort to persuade Congress to remove the present tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood.

Were this plywood tariff to be reduced, more than 13,000 American plywood workers who are employed in 43 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and California would be the principal sufferers.

The wage rates paid by Canadian plywood manufacturers are about 60 percent lower than those prevailing on the American side of the line. Also, log prices in Canada are much lower than in the United States. The differential between Mexican labor and American labor is even greater than that which exists between Canadian and United States labor.

If tariffs on plywood should be reduced, more foreign plywood will invade the American market, our American plants will be forced to curtail operations, or our American plywood workers eventually will have to accept lower wages in order to meet this foreign competition.

None of these eventualities should be permitted to happen. Our American plywood industry has been doing a good job in increasing production—in meeting building-material demands.

In 1945 the production of fir plywood in the United States was 1,200,000,000 square feet; in 1946 it was 1,400,000,000 square feet; in 1947 it was 1,600,000,000 square feet; and in 1948 it was an estimated 2,000,000,000 square feet. It is now contemplated that the plywood output for 1949 will be 2,700,000,000 square feet, or about two and one-half times the production of 4 years ago. Certainly, with such a record, the plywood industry has done a good job.

The plywood-industry's management and workers should not be penalized by the adoption of new tariff policies in plywood—certainly not without giving the industry and its workers the fullest opportunity to be heard.

Filbert-nut industry: For the last half century the western halves of Oregon and Washington have been a one-industry region, dependent almost solely on one industry—forest products. This dependency upon one industry frequently has led to severe booms and busts. To overcome this disadvantage, our people have sought with vigor and intelligence to diversify their economic structure. Among the new diversified industries which have been developed are

cranberry raising, bulb growing, and filbert raising.

Within recent years 850 filbert orchards have come into bearing in western Washington alone and more orchards, of later planting, are reaching year by year the bearing stage. These filbert orchards have progressed so far toward meeting the domestic demand for these nuts that the price on filberts, which was 27.5 cents a pound to growers in 1945, by 1948 had declined to 13.5 cents a pound, or less than half the price of 4 years ago.

If, under reciprocal trade treaties, the duty on filberts or other nuts sold in competition to them were to be lowered, many of these orchards would be cut down and the trees, which required years of cultivation to reach a productive stage, would be converted into fuel, with tremendous financial loss to the orchardists and unemployment for their employees.

This brief statement on the problems confronting these three Pacific coast industries makes it crystal clear, I believe, that no reciprocal tariff treaty should be entered into without the most careful and searching inquiry for all the facts involved.

Every change in tariff-making policies of the Government must be weighed and analyzed with the greatest of care to safeguard against possible economic dislocations that might result in curtailed working hours, unemployment, or reduced earnings for our American workers.

I therefore strongly urge that we maintain the Tariff Commission as an investigatory agency, to study the probable effect of any reciprocal treaties upon specific industries, to the end that our American industries and our American workers will be given maximum protection against being sold down the river to low-wage, low-living, standard foreign competitors.

Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herman A. Lowe, from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 22, 1949:

AT LAST A PENNSYLVANIAN NEAR THE TOP IN THE HOUSE

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—They inaugurated President Truman for his second hitch at the Presidency yesterday. But he isn't the only man to whom the laurel wreaths were being tossed this week and last.

In the House of Representatives, a lean, gray, sad-looking citizen of Easton, Pa., was practically labeled "Mr. Pennsylvania of 1949." He is FRANCIS E. (better known as TAD) WALTER, a smart sober-sided lawyer, highly respected and trusted by his Democratic and Republican colleagues.

After 16 years of coming up the congressional ladder the hard way, the guy tried on Cinderella's glass slipper last week and the darned thing was a perfect fit. He couldn't have done better if he had guessed the mystery tune on Stop the Music.

In a matter of a few days, Easton's perennial gift to Washington was elected chairman of the Democratic caucus, and appointed chairman of the House Democratic Patronage Committee. Then he was selected by Speaker SAM RAYBURN for the delicate task of keeping the Un-American Activities Committee's nose clean. Underlying all these honors, of course, is his position as ranking Democrat of the important House Judiciary Committee; thus he would become chairman in the event EMANUEL CELLER is elevated to the Federal bench.

WALTER's weakness is that he is one of the unspectacular people of the world. Unlike some Members of Congress, he doesn't know how to do small things with a flourish of trumpets nor large ones with a 21-gun salute, massing of the colors, and calliope music.

So Pennsylvania has given him less recognition than he deserves. But now the Commonwealth should know the man who, during the Eighty-first Congress, will be carrying the ball for it in the House.

As chairman of the Democratic caucus, WALTER has become one of the two elected party officials in the lower chamber, the other being the majority leader. He will preside over all the behind-closed-doors sessions of the party legislators, and will also be one of the little group of men from Capitol Hill who confer with President Truman on policy matters.

Chairmanship of the patronage committee, although an honor, means plenty of headaches. It is the job of cutting up slightly more than 200 House jobs among 262 Democratic Congressmen. The fact that Speaker RAYBURN picked him for the job means WALTER is regarded as a man of tact and judgment who can keep the party's legislators happy, even while turning them away empty handed.

Most ticklish of all is WALTER's position on the Un-American Activities Committee. The House leadership believes there is a need for a sane, balanced committee to dig out subversives. But, if the committee were not lifted out of the morass of disrepute into which it has been sinking, there is a real chance it would be abolished.

So TAD WALTER was the man chosen to make with the cleanser, to scrape off the barnacles and turn the committee into something shiny and spotless. Quite a chore, but they say he can do it.

Finally, he will head subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee, the subcommittee in charge of antitrust legislation and the creation of new judgeships. His subcommittee probably will also handle all measures dealing with corporate reorganization. And WALTER will be a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Because of his inability to beat the big drum, there is little realization of the amount of legislation he has fathered and pushed through to become law. The quantity is very substantial.

And although he is an administration stalwart, he has shown surprising independence at times.

For instance, during the war when the powerful administrative agencies were making the word "bureaucracy" a stench by their imperious and even despotic rulings against individuals and businesses, WALTER shoved a bill through Congress providing a fair code of operation for the agencies. It included the right to appeal to the courts. The administration was against it, and Franklin D. Roosevelt vetoed it.

A couple of years later WALTER tried again. This time the bill became law. The American Bar Association gave him an award in 1946 for what he had accomplished.

In this connection, it is an interesting coincidence that he is now saddled with the chore of creating a fair-practice code for the Un-American Activities Committee.

They say TAD will do it, too. He is efficient.

Relaxing the Antitrust Laws and Overruling Decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement Case Neither Necessary Nor Desirable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently several statements have been made on the floor of both the House and the Senate concerning the basing-point decision made by the Supreme Court and the effect of the continuance of the basing-point practice of pricing as this system affects the public and the continuance of delivered-price system in possible violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and other legislation. In this connection, the Honorable Ewin L. Davis, former Member of Congress and presently member of the Federal Trade Commission, made a statement before the Subcommittee on Trade Practices of the Senate with respect to the decision of the Supreme Court and the practice of industries engaged in interstate commerce employing the so-called basing-point system of pricing. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement of Judge Davis which was made in this connection be printed in the RECORD, and I commend the reading of this statement to the Members of Congress and others interested in this question as an authoritative statement for those seeking information on this matter.

The statement of Commissioner Davis is as follows:

STATEMENT OF EWIN L. DAVIS, COMMISSIONER, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE POLICIES, MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1949

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, I am appearing before you today in response to an invitation from the chairman. I am glad at any time to discuss with your committee or the members thereof any pertinent questions relative to the Federal Trade Commission or its enforcement of the acts of Congress in respect to those matters over which the Commission has jurisdiction.

In order that the members of the committee may be informed as to my background and experience I shall state for the record that after practicing law in my home State of Tennessee I served as judge of the Seventh Judicial Circuit of Tennessee for 8 years. I later was a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress for 14 years and served for 2 years as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. I have been a member of the Federal Trade Commission for almost 16 years.

I am confident that all the members of the committee will agree that our political and economic systems are based on the premise of a competitive economy which of necessity is based on competitive pricing of commodities or services. To state it simply the primary purpose of the antitrust laws was and is to provide a system of regulation by Government so that a buyer and purchaser alike

may have the benefits of competitive pricing. This system of regulation to be effective must be constantly nourished by an awareness of the public interest and changing economic conditions by those charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws. The members of the Federal Trade Commission must not view the problems of enforcement solely in the light of the special interests of any geographic or economic group, large or small. The antitrust laws are general regulatory statutes for the benefit and protection of all and not for the special benefit of particular groups. The measure of the success of the antitrust laws is the extent of their contribution to the public interest and the general welfare. In my opinion that contribution has been substantial.

Since the enactment by the Congress of the Sherman Act in 1890, with only one dissenting vote, there have been recurring discussions as to the necessity of amending the antitrust laws. Except for certain exemptions as to specific groups, the considered judgment of various Congresses however has been that the antitrust laws as generally applied should be strengthened—not weakened. For illustration, the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts were passed in 1914 and the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936. Notwithstanding the enactment of these laws, the tendencies toward monopolies in business have increased due mainly to certain loopholes in these laws and to the shortage of funds for enforcement. The Federal Trade Commission has devoted its best efforts with the resources and tools at its command to the fostering of competition in our economy and to the prevention of monopoly and other restraints of trade. Because of its limited personnel and funds, the Commission might be criticized by adversely affected parties for not proceeding against all violations of the law which it administers. However, any criticism that the Commission has proceeded too far in too many cases is to say the least not a realistic view of the true situation at this time.

I recognize of course that after the decision in the Cement case (*FTC* v. *Cement Institute et al.* (333 U. S. 683), last April, widespread misapprehensions developed as to the implications of that decision and of other recent decisions. Many businessmen were sincerely confused and their confusion was intensified by the fact that some interests who were directly affected by those decisions were advocating modification of the antitrust laws. However, this confusion has already begun to abate, and if Congress should determine that the laws are not to be changed at this time, much of the confusion which remains will in my judgment disappear. In testimony before this subcommittee at the last session of Congress four members of the Commission indicated that they regard the basing-point cases as merely aspects of the Commission's frontal attack upon price-fixing conspiracies and devices which eliminate competition. On October 12, 1948, the majority of the Commission released to the public a policy statement addressed to its staff in which the legal implications of geographic pricing practices were discussed at length. On January 12 of this year, less than 2 weeks ago, the majority of the Commission approved and made public a letter by its secretary which contains answers to various questions submitted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York as to the meaning and implications of the above described October 12 statement. I believe that these various statements have in large measure explained the views of the law by the majority of the Commission and have dissipated substantially the earlier confusion. If in the future it appears that any significant points are still obscure the Commission will consider issuing an additional public statement. However, there is obviously a limit beyond which the Commission should not go in issuing in its quasi-judicial capacity interpretations of the laws which it administers apart from its decisions in litigated cases. The question presented in these cases is whether or not the effects of certain pricing practices are injurious to competition. It required thousands of pages of testimony and other evidence in the Cement case to determine the facts as to the pricing policy in that industry and the effects on competition of that policy. It is for that reason that while the Commission may, when the public interest requires, make a general statement as to its interpretation of the law, it should not give ex-parte opinions on a given statement of alleged facts.

Much of the public discussion relative to the recent cases decided by the Commission has been in reference to the basing-point system of pricing and the resulting practice of freight absorption by the concerns parties to that system. The Commission acting pursuant to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act has challenged basing-point systems when these systems have been used by groups in an industry to establish identical prices at each point of delivery, These are just another and perhaps more complex variety of the familiar collusive price-fixing cases. They constitute violations of the Sherman Act as well as the Federal Trade Commission Act. In these cases the basing-point system was an instrumentality used by concerns to fix prices. When the Commission challenged the fixing of prices by means of the basing-point system it did not necessarily challenge the use of the basing-point method of pricing. The Commission has not in a single case challenged the use of the basing-point method of pricing per se separate and apart from collusion. The Commission has not challenged freight absorption per se. The Commission has not required f. o. b. mill pricing. The Commission has not challenged the legality of the use of uniform delivered prices by an individual concern.

It should be emphasized that the Commission does not see a violation of the law in every basing point pricing case which comes before it. Positive and irrefutable proof of this is contained in the fact that the Commission has closed without prejudice matters under consideration in which the facts revealed unmistakably the existence of basing point pricing which, however, was not accompanied by evidence of collusion in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act or competitively injurious discrimination in violation of the Clayton Act.

For example, in two specific cases the Commission investigated charges that a basing point type of pricing was being followed and that it resulted in a violation of the law. In these cases the facts after investigation revealed unmistakably that a basing-point method of pricing actually was being followed. Investigation also however failed to disclose sufficient evidences of collusion or discrimination to constitute violations of the law. Consequently, the Commission closed without prejudice each of these cases and no complaint was issued despite, and I repeat despite, the fact that basing-point systems of pricing were followed. These cases reveal that the mere existence of basing-point pricing in and of itself does not constitute in the opinion of the Commission a violation of any of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

The Commission has not required any concern to use any particular method or methods of pricing. Each seller may choose his own method of pricing, provided that he does not conspire or agree with his competitors and provided that he does not discriminate in price in the manner prohibited by law and thereby injure competition or tend to create a monopoly. A seller may absorb freight or absorb part of his manufacturing costs or any other costs in order to in good faith meet an equally low price of a competitor. This price, however, must be a competitive price, not one fixed by agreement, express or implied, from all of the facts, and it must not injure or prevent competition among his customers. The United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit stated in its opinion (*Milk and Ice Cream Can Institute* v. *F. T. C.* 152 F (2d) 478, 481) upholding the Commission's order against respondents using a so-called freight-equalization system, as follows:

"It is argued, perhaps correctly, that such a freight system had long been employed by industry so that members thereof might deliver their product at the same price. In fact, the Commission recognizes that this freight-equalization plan was used by petitioners prior to the organization of the institute. Such being the case, the fact still remains that it was employed by petitioners for the purpose of fixing the delivered price of their product, and by such use price competition was eliminated or, at any rate, seriously impaired. On the face of the situation, it taxes our credulity to believe, as argued, that petitioners employed this system without any agreement or plan among themselves. Any doubt in this respect, however, is removed by reference to the minutes of the institute and other evidence found in the record."

The basic philosophy and dominating purpose of the antitrust laws is to keep our commerce free from restraints of trade, and thereby to promote and foster competition in industry.

The present law is purposely general and flexible. Conditions change. New practices arise.

When the Clayton and Sherman Acts and the Federal Trade Commission Act were enacted, the single unit enterprise was typical of industry in the United States. When I was elected to Congress in 1918 this condition prevailed.

During the 14 years I served in Congress and the almost 16 years I have been a member of the Federal Trade Commission I have watched and applauded the productive growth of industry. No man appreciates more than I the Herculean task performed by industry in making this country the arsenal of democracy.

I have lived long in intimate contact with these matters. I have observed sometimes with apprehension the giant, complex, ramified enterprise structures which now permeate much of our industrial system. To my way of thinking collusive devices, such as those which have been frequently found to exist in basing-point systems and other restraints of trade, have as their practical effect the achievement and perpetuation of control over prices by monopolistic corporations.

I yield to no one in my desire to see a free competitive economy in the United States survive and to preserve to industry and our people the prosperity and freedom we have achieved under the capitalistic system. Free competitive enterprise is the foundation of our capitalistic system. Whatever weakens that foundation weakens the lifeblood of industry and the capitalistic system.

In a free competitive atmosphere new enterprises arise, grow, and expand production, compete and better their commodities, invent new commodities, and reduce prices. Both management and labor prosper.

Since the establishment of the Federal Trade Commission it has sought court interpretation of points of law in disagreement. The Federal Trade Commission is an independent executive agency set up by the Congress to administer the Federal Trade Commission Act and portions of the Clayton Act. It is the duty of the Commission to seek the interpretation of important legal points at issue and to promote and foster competition in industry.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the subcommittee, it is my considered opinion that amendatory legislation along the line of S. 236 is neither necessary nor desirable.

The Council of Economic Advisers in its third annual report to the President in December 1948 in discussing competitive enterprise and the administered price problem stated in part as follows:

"The extensive consideration which has been given by official commissions and by congressional committees to the problems resulting from the increasing size of business units has not yet led to any clear judgment about the proper national policy.

* * * * *

"Study of the problem must continue, toward the end of creating competitive conditions throughout industry and thereby removing the need for those positive controls which alone could protect the public if it cannot be protected by restored competition.

* * * * *

"As we give further thought to the subject, the business world itself has the opportunity to influence the final decision. Restraint in price policy, courage in expanding facilities to meet the expanding needs of the people, and the display of social responsibility in supporting programs of stabilization in the interest of maximum production and employment, will go far toward adjusting the relations of business and government. This may offer a better solution of the administered-price problem than can be found in legislation."

I am in accord with these views of the council.

In making the above remarks I am speaking only for myself as an individual member of the Federal Trade Commission.

I thank the chairman and gentlemen of the committee for your invitation to appear before you.

Summary of Legislative Recommendations Contained in Economic Report of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a summary of legislative recommendations contained in the economic report of the President.

President Truman, in his economic report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946, submitted, on January 7, 1949, certain legislative recommendations which have much significance for maintaining maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and which required the immediate attention of the Congress. Herein is a summary of some 31 legislative recommendations in the economic report of the President:

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT TRANSMITTED TO THE CONGRESS JANUARY 7, 1949

1. Increase the Government revenue from taxation by $4,000,000,000 a year. Principal source should be additional taxes upon corporate profits; another source of additional revenue should be the tax upon estates and gifts; study should be directed to increasing the rates of individual taxes in the upper and middle brackets; some excise taxes, particularly on oleomargarine, should be repealed.

2. Increase in social security contributions under existing and extended social insurance programs.

3. Continue maintenance of stability in the Government bond market (no specific legislative recommendation).

4. Provide continuing authority to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to require banks to hold supplemental reserves up to 10 percent against demand deposits, and 4 percent against time deposits; such authority to be applicable to all banks insured by the FDIC.

5. Continue authority for the regulation of consumer installment credit beyond June 30, 1949.

6. Provide the funds to make a careful survey of future supply and productive capacity in certain critical areas.

7. Temporary extension of the law under which voluntary agreements for allocation of materials in short supply are now permitted, and authorize the use of mandatory allocation powers which may be employed on a selective basis where they prove needed.

8. Continue the priorities and allocation authority in the field of transportation.

9. Selective price control authority should be promptly made available to the Government.

10. Price control authority should be supplemented with a provision permitting the Government to order the withholding of price advances while public inquiry into their justification is being made.

11. Authority (as requested in July 1948) to limit wage adjustments which would force a break in a price ceiling, except where wage adjustments are essential to remedy hardship, to correct inequities, or to prevent an actual lowering of living standards.

12. Continue rent control for at least 2 years, and strengthen its enforcement.

13. Extend existing powers of control over exports, and strengthen the machinery for enforcement.

14. Grant more specific and more adequate authority to prevent excessive speculation or the manipulation of prices of agricultural commodities.

15. Increase benefits under the old-age and survivors' insurance substantially.

16. Broaden the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

17. Increase minimum wage from present 40 cents per hour to at least 75 cents an hour.

18. Improve public assistance program for relief.

19. It is essential that public power programs be expanded this year, even where this requires use of scarce materials for construction of dams and generators.

20. A start on the St. Lawrence River waterway and power project should be made immediately.

21. Programs in the improvement of river basins should be examined and action taken where needed to provide coordinated development plans.

22. Reexamine existing and proposed farm legislation in the light of the objective:

a. To fit a prosperous and equitably treated agriculture consistently into an economy seeking to operate continuously at maximum levels.

b. To move toward the goal of farm living standards comparable to the rest of the population.

c. To more abundant farm production to supply the industrial and consumer needs of a full employment economy.

d. To encourage shifts in the composition of farm output adjusted to domestic and export needs.

e. To provide adequate storage facilities, the improvement of distribution, and adequate credit facilities.

23. Continue European recovery program.

24. Restore the Trade Agreements Act to full effectiveness, and extend it for 3 years.

25. Immediate passage of the unenacted portions of the comprehensive housing bill with the quota of low-rent housing increased to provide for 1,000,000 units within 7 years, and including substantial Federal aid to the States and localities to enable more rapid progress in clearing slums and in assembling land for balanced redevelopment.

26. Initiate Federal program for aid to elementary and secondary education.

27. Make plans to expand opportunities for higher education through cooperation between the Federal Government and public agencies and private institutions, including a system of general scholarships and fellowships.

28. Initiate a study to determine authoritatively our national needs for educational facilities and the most feasible methods of providing them.

29. Enactment of a program of national health insurance with Federal grants in support of hospital construction, and take steps to overcome the present serious national shortage of medical personnel.

30. Widen the coverage and make benefits more adequate under old age and unemployment insurance systems.

31. Inaugurate a system of insurance against loss of income through temporary or permanent disability.

Vested Interests Major Benefactors of Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress will have before it in the near future legislation for the authorization of the central Arizona project. It is interesting to note that this legislation is financially supported by the vested interests because they will be the major benefactors.

Arizona power companies, public utilities, and banks are contributing thousands of dollars to promote a reclamation scheme that would cost the Nation's taxpayers an irrecoverable billion dollars.

This is the scheme:

The State of Arizona is asking Congress to appropriate the billion dollars for an irrigation and power project to "rescue" a few thousand acres of land in Central Arizona.

This is not public land. It is privately owned land.

It is not new land that has never been irrigated. It is land that once was irrigated and is now dry because of wanton waste of water, exploitation and indifferent over-development.

The owners of this land that is to be "saved" want the United States Treasury to restore their investments by donating a billion dollars, which the owners do not intend to repay.

To carry out the scheme, Arizona interests organized the Central Arizona Project Association to lobby their bills through Congress.

Who are the contributors to this association?

Here are the names of some of them and the amounts each has contributed:

Central Arizona Light & Power Co., $2,500.

Phelps Dodge Corp., $5,000.

Natural Gas Service Co., Phoenix, $500.

Phoenix Title & Trust Co., $1,000.

Phoenix Clearing House, $5,000.

First Federal Savings & Loan Association, $500.

Republic and Gazette, newspapers, Phoenix, $1,000.

Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., $1,500.

Valley National Bank, Phoenix, $1,000.

Inspiration Consolidated Copper Co., $1,000.

Last year—1948—Arizona interests of all types contributed approximately $73,000 to the project lobby.

Of this amount, 27 private contributors, including those named above, donated approximately $30,000.

Six so-called public contributors—water-users groups and organized irrigation districts—supplied approximately $22,000.

Who contributed the balance of more than $20,000? This remains a mystery as far as records filed with Congress show. I presume this balance also came from private groups or individuals. Thus, a total of $52,000 of the $73,000 came from private contributors.

Why are these utilities, mining companies, and banks supplying this money? If they own land that would be saved by the proposed project, or hold mortgages on it, they would make millions of dollars by investing a few thousand.

Much of this privately owned land is now worthless, because water once available in Arizona has been wantonly wasted through avaricious over-development. It would cost the United States Treasury, using tax money, up to $2,500 an acre to put water back on it through the proposed project.

But if Congress can be hornswoggled into passing the Arizona project bill, the owners of the land will have their investments restored, will make millions of dollars, and will let the people of all the States pay the bill.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all of the Members of Congress from New York State received copies of the resolution unanimously adopted by the New York State Assembly and Senate condemning the acts of the Hungarian Government in arresting and imprisoning His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and urging that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of Congress use every legitimate means to bring about the immediate release of the Cardinal.

On January 24, 1949, I asked and obtained unanimous consent to include that resolution in my remarks as part of the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased to note that my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. KILBURN had previously obtained leave to accomplish the same purpose.

I am in entire accord with the sentiments expressed in that resolution and direct it to the attention of this body because I believe that my colleagues are also in sympathy with those sentiments and trust that a similar resolution condemning the conduct of the Hungarian Government will be adopted here.

The Voice of Freedom and Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the Essex County (N. J.) Federation of Holy Name Societies on January 22, 1949.

This resolution condemns the injustice and cruel detention of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. It is the purpose of this resolution to arouse public sentiment against this atrocious crime and to seek the release of Cardinal Mindszenty.

The free people of the world and all peoples who believe in the basic right of freedom speak with one voice in impassioned denunciation against the cruel and vicious acts of the inquisitors of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

President Truman in his inaugural address stated that "we believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and expression and that the American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation, and that we will not be moved from this faith."

I am sure that those who read the newspapers of the day, that these same inquisitors from the Government of Hungary, in defiance of the provisions of the United Nations Charter, respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms, have deprived the same Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of this fundamental human right, by his arrest and imprisonment—and that their further deliberate persecutions by methods which are entirely undemocratic and inhumane—will say this is a travesty on justice and offensive to democratic ideals of freedom and fair play.

And that, further, it is a glaring example of how communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, and punishment without trial.

The people of the earth who desire free expression, must surely be shocked and incensed at this treatment, and if the Government of Hungary fails to undo this great wrong, fails to rectify this injustice, then it must surely stand the disapproval of the free peoples of the world.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the religious minded people of the world have been shocked by the imprisonment of His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, by the Soviet dictators of his native land; and

Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty's career has been distinguished by his untiring and heroic fight against irreligion as manifested in the atheistic philosophies both of the Nazis and the Communists; and

Whereas the Nazis in their scourge of Europe attempted to silence him by imprisonment; and

Whereas he, who was described as having the last free voice left in Hungary, has now been incarcerated by the tyrannical, atheistic, and Communistic government of that country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Essex County division of the Federation of Holy Name Societies condemn the unjust and cruel detention of Cardinal Mindszenty and announce to all God-fearing people our condemnation of his imprisonment; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of State at Washington, D. C., our Senators and Representatives, asking them to exert their influence in obtaining the release of Cardinal Mindszenty; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the various newspapers and periodicals which would be desirous of being informed and which would exercise their editorial good will in this cause, which cries out to the world for rectification.

No Mandate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is an editorial from the Melrose (Mass.) Leader of January 20, 1949, on the subject of compulsory health insurance which I am including with these remarks under leave to extend.

The editorial follows:

NO MANDATE

According to some of the eager beavers in the Government, the election was a mandate for congressional approval of Federal compulsory health insurance. It is to the credit of Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, that he said frankly that no mandate is involved. Mr. Ewing supports the scheme; but, as he pointed out in a speech, too many issues played a part in deciding the election to say that any one was the big factor.

The Christian Science Monitor elaborated on this when it said editorially: "The farm vote which helped to elect Mr. Truman was certainly not motivated by an urge for this compulsory program. Farm sentiment generally runs strongly in opposition. The two leading farm organizations have gone on record against socialized medicine. While organized labor formally favors the plan, it did not rank as a campaign issue nor arouse any driving enthusiasm in the rank and file of the workers."

The truth is that this "people's mandate" business is being overworked by every mi-

nority pressure group in the country. According to these groups, the public is red hot for more and more socialism, more and more Government debt, more and more taxation to pay for the experiments—and, by implication, less and less freedom and independence. Compulsory health insurance is just one example of this. There is absolutely no evidence to make it appear that a large segment of the voters want any part of it.

Return African Colonies to Italian Trusteeship Under United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Generoso Pope, editor, Il Progresso Italo-Americano:

NEW YORK, *January 24, 1949.*

Mr. GENEROSO POPE,
Editor, Il Progresso Italo-Americano,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR FRIEND: I applaud your campaign to prevent the African colonies, formerly controlled by Italy, from being turned over to Great Britain in whole or in part. A sound solution of the disposition of the former Italian colonies would be the return of these possessions to the Republic of Italy. The allocation of these colonies to imperialist Britain would be similar to that of a fool returning to his folly. Britain has been guilty of the foulest aggression in the Middle East—particularly against Israel. Its designs upon Egypt and other countries in that backward and troubled area of the world are far from honorable. Surrendering the Italian colonies to British manipulation would only serve to bolster the imperialistic ambitions of the Empire, which two world wars have sought to erase.

Significantly, Great Britain has failed to join in the chorus of protests against the Dutch aggression in Indonesia. In my opinion, she has refrained for the good and sufficient reason, for her, that she is planning similar excursions.

It is to be firmly hoped, therefore, that when the question of the disposition of Italy's former African colonies appears on the agenda of the United Nations, that the United States Government will take firm measures to have the United Nations assume trusteeship over these colonies and that Italy shall be designated as trustee thereof. Now, more than ever, Italy is suffering from overpopulation. Some economic solution must be provided for the surplus and inasmuch as Italy does not have the material resources or the financial strength to support her many millions, an outlet in the nature of emigration to these colonies would prove most helpful. Under the circumstances, I believe many Italian nationals would be willing and eager to go to these African colonies, relieving the density of population and lessening unemployment.

Furthermore, the purposes of the Marshall plan would be that much more strengthened, as I believe those Italians who do go to these African colonies could become self-supporting in a short period. Much Italian money has been poured into this area previously and it may be possible to salvage quite a number of projects.

I think the Italian people and their administrators have learned many lessons. The evils of fascism have been underscored for the Italian people innumerable times. I am confident that they will never embrace such a devastating dictatorship again and that they will never permit the reimposition of such tyranny upon themselves or any other people with whom they may be associated. I believe they will take every means to insure democratic treatment for the natives in the African colonies and that they will not countenance a revival of fascism or imperialism in this colonial situation. There must be and I am sure there will be developed a political climate favorable to the freedom of these colonials.

I shall be glad to cooperate with you in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

The Weakness in Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Peter Edson that appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 25, 1949:

THE WEAKNESS IN GREECE

(By Peter Edson)

Mrs. Cornelia Bryce Pinchot, widow of Pennsylvania's great progressive Republican Governor and conservationist, has just returned from her second trip through Greece with a report that things there have gone from bad to worse.

She does not minimize the facts that docks have been repaired, roads built, fields fertilized, malaria swamps sprayed, people fed, Communist seizure of the government staved off, the Russians kept from possible occupation of the Suez Canal.

Where the Greek experiment has bogged down, the able-minded and vigorous Mrs. Pinchot declares, is politically. She holds American interference partly responsible.

The inference here is plain. American engineers, doctors, and relief workers know their jobs and are doing them. American political advisers do not have the same degree of competence in their field that the technical people have in theirs.

American political and military advisers sent to Greece will no doubt maintain that they have leaned over backwards in trying not to interfere with the Greek Government. They insisted on Greek army command in the field. They insisted on democratically held elections in 1946. These elections were supervised by United Nations observation teams and were pronounced free and fair.

A parliamentary government was elected and set up.

But under the Greek constitution, as under the American Constitution, members of the cabinet do not have to be elected members of the law-making branch of government. And in picking the Greek cabinet and many lesser officials, the American advisers have interfered plenty.

Loy W. Henderson, then director of the State Department's Office of Near Eastern Affairs, went to Greece in 1947 and personally selected the aged Themistocles Sophoulis as prime minister to head a coalition government. He seemed to be the best man available.

Sophoulis refused the job several times. His reason was that he did not think the coalition would work because as prime minister he was to be given responsibility without the executive power to enforce his decisions. That power was left in the other ministries. And the men chosen to be ministers of foreign affairs, interior, finance, war, information, and labor were all rightists reactionaries opposed to every liberal reform.

Sophoulis finally took the job because he was led to believe that if he did not, American aid might be refused. But the recent downfall of his cabinet is proof of his contention that the coalition government would not work unless the prime minister were given more power.

Sophoulis has again been persuaded to remain as prime minister at the head of a new cabinet. If the new Sophoulis government falls, the next step now being considered is the creation of a nonparliamentary government. This probably means letting the King send Parliament home, then appointing a small super- or supra-parliamentary group to do the lawmaking. The danger here is that the men appointed to this group would become a violently repressive government.

What Greece needs most are certain basic reforms of good government, says Mrs. Pinchot. It needs not a Communist revolution, but a Roosevelt New Deal kind of revolution that will take care of the needs of the Greek common people.

There are many fine young Greeks with real ability to carry out these reforms, Mrs. Pinchot found. The fact that these reforms are not being carried out is what is sending many non-Communist Greeks to the hills in opposition to the Athens government.

As Mrs. Pinchot puts it, the United States has now "invested" $400,000,000 in Greece. But in making this investment, the United States has not always backed the best political elements.

If the American missions in Greece aren't smart enough to give the Greek people the new deal that they deserve, the $400,000,000 we have invested will go down the drain.

United States plans and specifications for a new Greece are good, says Mrs. Pinchot. But in the first 18 months of operations they have not been carried out.

Statement on the New Housing Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a brief statement made yesterday by myself and eight colleagues with respect to the housing bills filed in the House and the Senate by certain Republican Members.

The statement follows:

We believe that the housing bills being filed today in the House and the Senate by Republican Members are a constructive approach to an urgent but highly complex problem. We believe that they offer a better base for final legislation than does the administration proposal. We endorse this move on the part of our colleagues while at

the same time reserving our rights with respect to some of the details pending further consideration of both measures.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; HAL HOLMES, Washington; JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey; JOHN W. HESELTON, Massachusetts; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; CHAS. A. WOLVERTON, New Jersey; EDGAR A. JONAS, Illinois.

Battle for Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Independent for January 19, 1949, which is one of the two daily newspapers printed in my home city of Long Beach in Los Angeles County, Calif., printed an editorial on the subject of Margarine. I take pleasure in calling this analytical editorial to the attention of all the Members of Congress and to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Eighteenth Congressional District of California—which I now again have the honor to represent, having also represented it in this House during the Seventy-ninth Congress—is one of the most important dairy sections of our great country. Recently representatives of large dairying interests of national extent have informed me that the dairy interests had withdrawn their objection to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine, but that they wanted margarine prohibited from being colored so as to "imitate the color of butter." Many dozens of letters have come to me prior to the date of this editorial, and almost all of them have protested the Federal tax on margarine.

I feel the reading of the following editorial will prove of value to all concerned:

BATTLE FOR MARGARINE

One major battle in the new Congress will be waged by two powerful forces. It will be the battle waged by the great dairy interests to continue the tax and restrictions on the sale of margarine. The opponents will be manufacturers of margarine, farm groups which raise the soybean from which margarine is made, and consumer groups who resent paying a tax on the product.

The Eightieth Congress repealed the tax and restrictions in the House by a two-thirds vote, only to have the Senate pigeonhole the measure. That was the result of the dairy lobby working on Senators from the Middle West and other dairy States. The fight must now start all over in the Eighty-first Congress now in session. It will be a battle of propaganda and lobbyists. Consumers who wish to express themselves should write direct to Congressman CLYDE DOYLE and Senators KNOWLAND and DOWNEY.

It takes courage for Congressmen to vote against the dairy interests. This is especially true if they have large dairy interests among their constituents. In the Eightieth Congress, Congressman Bradley was faced with this decision and voted to repeal the tax on margarine. He had very large dairy interests in his district. It will now be the problem of his successor, CLYDE DOYLE.

The issue is that there is a Federal tax of 10 cents a pound on yellow margarine. Natural margarine is a pure white color. Thus the tax is on artificially colored margarine. However, most of the butter used is artificially colored to make it a uniform yellow. The issue therefore is why consumers should have to color their own margarine or pay a 10-cent tax to have it colored for them.

There is sound argument for the nutritional qualities of margarine. The council on foods and nutrition of the American Medical Association says: "When margarine is fortified with vitamin A the investigations that have been made lead to the conclusion that it can be substituted for butter in the ordinary diet without any nutritional disadvantage."

Since it is estimated 99 percent of all margarine is fortified with vitamin A, it is probably more regulated nutritionally than is butter, which is dependent upon seasons and feeding of the cows that produce the milk from which it is made. Since margarine sells for a much lower price, it is an important factor in the cost of living of lower-income groups.

Many States have excessive tax laws on margarine in addition to the Federal tax. It is therefore important that California, which is one of these States, also repeal the restriction on sale of margarine. The taxes and restrictions are part of monopoly laws enacted to protect dairy interests from this kind of competition. They are discriminatory laws that should be repealed. It is up to the people to demand of their State and Federal legislators that they take such action if that is the will of the people.—(L. A. C.)

Address of Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., dinner meeting, New England Area Council, Boys Clubs of America, Hotel Sheraton, January 13, 1949:

I am very happy to be present at an occasion on which Mr. Frederic Church and his associates are honored for their work in behalf of the Boys' Clubs. Typical of the others, Mr. Church is one of that small and worthy group of citizens in the community who patterns his life on the principle that no man can live for himself alone. He has demonstrated for many years and in a most constructive fashion his recognition that, even as the community owes us many things, so each of us owes much to the community. Mr. Church has discharged his debt to the community in different ways, but particularly by his work in behalf of the Boys' Clubs. I am very happy to bespeak the admiration of my part of the community for the work which he and his associates have done.

I should like to speak to you this evening about certain tendencies abroad in the land which may easily constitute a future problem for programs like that of the Boys' Clubs and of other privately administered, independently operating organizations. Perhaps I had best introduce my thought by a little parable, since some of my suggestions this evening may strike a note unpopular at the moment among some of the public. The public likes to be pleased and it never likes to learn that things which sound pleasing may sometimes bring with them very unpleasant results.

A story is told of an oriental despot who grew worried about his own future health and life expectancy. He told one of his chamberlains to summon the most gifted soothsayers in the land so that he might discover whether the years ahead were to bring him joy or misery. One of the oldest and most accurate of all the prophets in his realm was brought into the presence of the king. He gazed into a crystal ball and lifted his hands in horror. "O King," he cried, "what great sorrow lies before you, what grief. All of your kinsmen shall die and you shall be left alone in your old age, the last and saddest of your family." The despot was indignant at this unfortunate fate and declared that the lamentable series of deaths might well begin with that of the foreteller of such unpleasant news. Whereupon the aged soothsayer was put to death.

Another, younger and more adroit prophet was introduced and he looked into the precise same crystal as had the prophet of disaster. His eyes danced with delight as he rejoiced the despot wtih this prediction: "Be glad, O King. Thy years shall be multiplied and by the favor of the gods thou shalt outlive all lesser men, thine own kinsmen included, and shall reign unto lengths of days when all others have gone their worthless way." The young soothsayer was rewarded with rounds of applause, a fair share of the king's land, and the hand of his daughter in marriage. They lived happily ever after and the king died when he would have anyway, bereaved of all his relatives but delighted with his own longevity.

In our day the public occupies pretty much the place of the classic despot. It must be pleased at all costs and all unpleasantness must be presented to it by those who depend on its favor in the most attractive possible terms. But whatever names we may put on things or however we may phrase them the realities are pretty much the same—and there are certain realities in the trends of the times which bode ill for traditional independent social programs, realities which are sometimes presented, however, in a very attractive form.

Unless a miracle intervenes or some other extraordinary factor reverses the situation in eastern Europe and Asia, our generation must face the fact that several great nations are doomed to Marxist Socialist regimes. The basic Christian objection to Marxist socialism is, of course, its declared atheism and its complete contempt for all social or personal spiritual values, with a consequent deification of the state and suppression of the person. But Christianity also shares democracy's objections to Marxist socialism. One of these is the objection which free people have always had to any system which destroys private initiative on every level and which tolerates no independent organized action of any kind within the community and apart from the state.

In the totalitarian concept of Marxist socialism all independent works such as those of the boys' clubs are out of the question. They speedily become as illegal as the organized religious action, independent of state controls, of which I am a representative in our community. In Marxist Hungary work like that done by Mr. Church and his associates wolud be eliminated as ruthlessly as the work done by Cardinal Mindszenty so long as it sought to carry on independent of political controls and organized in a private fashion to serve ends and purposes wider than those which free people attribute to the political state. Independently organized social-service works are not merely theoreti-

cally inconsistent with Marxist socialism; they become practically impossible in the regimented life of the totalitarian state. They are ruthlessly eliminated from the life of the unhappy nations presently under the heel of the Red Fascist.

It seems unlikely that this crude atheistic socialism will prevail in western nations like our own. Our political institutions are rooted in social theories permeated by Christian idealism. Our democracy has been nourished by religious and cultural values which have had more free opportunity to disseminate themselves in western Europe, Britain, and here in our own hemisphere, than they may have had elsewhere. So long as state socialism takes any of its color from our moral, political, and social climate, it must necessarily be influenced by spiritual and therefore humane values. It cannot include atheism in its theory and therefore it cannot offend conscience in its practice. It may not always acknowledge God, but it cannot despise Him—and while it may exalt the state, it cannot destroy the dignity of the individual or totally eliminate the person.

But all state socialism, however mild, sooner or later creates serious problems for independent, private interests. It becomes impossible for programs supported by what is sometimes called the charity dollar, the dollar freely given by private persons to support independent organizations, to compete with the so-called tax dollar, the dollar raised by taxation and spent by federal or other state agencies for organized social service agencies, for hospital programs, or for education schemes which are state-supported and state-controlled. The charity dollar cannot long compete with the tax dollar once the tax dollar becomes a weapon in the hands of a Socialist state. In the first place, it is very easy to collect tax dollars. All the prestige and the police power of the state is behind their collection. It is always harder to collect charity dollars—and it becomes increasingly hard, almost to the point of impossible, to collect charity dollars in a Socialist state when so many tax dollars are being collected from the same people to finance increasing state-subsidized and state-controlled community works which, as they multiply, require yet more taxation.

It is a simple, cold mathematical fact which has nothing to do with religious theory or social philosophy; expanding federal support of educational, recreational, social service, and health programs means increased state competition with all private activity in the same fields. Private activity must speedily fall behind in competition with the omnipotent state. It also means enormously increased taxation of every conceivable kind in order to feed the insatiable hunger for support of the Goliath that is the Socialist state. Here, too, private action in the field of youth work and other community services are bound to suffer since the charity dollar, freely given, must lose out to the tax dollar, legally required, and, if need be, taken by force.

I submit that there are certain tendencies in the present social and political thinking of the community which may yet lead to very serious embarrassment for independent institutions and programs, religious or other. I further submit that such difficulties will be difficulties for the American way of life and will constitute a problem for the preservation not merely of free institutions, but of freedom of every kind. Ideas are contagious and they jump from areas of thought and action where they are accepted to other areas where they are least of all expected. If private education, private hospitals, private social service action of every kind suffers from the impossible competition and the mounting costs of state programs, and if socialism, however refined, dominates future planning in these fields, then I and other religious leaders have many and critical problems to face. So have you—and so have all other Americans interested in organization like the boys' clubs. Indeed, there are already signs that many people, even many good people, feel that your works and some of mine should be coordinated or integrated or otherwise brought into line with other like or even unlike projects within a more centralized interlocking community set-up.

I am told, for example, that a recent local survey of recreation services has ventured the suggestion that both tax-supported and voluntary youth programs should be brought together in cooperative youth centers, preferably in tax-supported facilities and operating under leadership described as democratic. The recommendation seems further to say that this coordination should be under the leadership of a specific organization which is definitely sectarian and which is for many reasons nonrepresentative. I think the leaders of the boys' clubs would be well advised to study this survey very carefully and to be on their guard against the threat to their independence of action and their special service which is contained in some of its proposals. Unless you are very vigilant about the keys of your own house these days you are going to wake up some morning and discover that some very strange tenants have moved in to use your silver, open your mail, and bring up your children for you.

It is my understanding that some of your leaders are already familiar with the threat of semi-Socialist concepts to the boys' club work and to like so-called "voluntary" as opposed to tax-supported programs. The word "voluntary," by the way, means "free." It is always better, in the interests of clear thinking on these matters, to use short, familiar Anglo-Saxon words instead of technical jargon. When some one tells you that "tax-supported agencies" are going to "coordinate" the programs of "voluntary agencies" he is simply using technical jargon to tell you that "state agencies," subject to political control, are about to put "free agencies," subject to your control, out of business. You may word it any way you choose, but that is what it means.

I hope you will be alert to the dangers of proposals which would in any way threaten the nonpartisan, nonsectarian nature of boys' club work in our community. It should be clearly understood that any integration of private youth work or tax-supported youth work under the general supervision of the YMCA or the YWCA, such as has been proposed in a recent survey, would be profoundly resented by whole areas of this community. Such recommendations are unrealistic and impracticable.

I think we may go further and say that such proposals, to the extent that they strengthen the hand of tax-supported agencies at the expense of free agencies have within them the seeds of that "integration," another word for which might be "collectivism," which is the heart of state socialism and the complete contradiction of American ways.

I like to think that if the independence of the institutions of my people were threatened, your spokesmen would rally in our behalf. In any case, I am very glad to speak up in behalf of your program because I believe that it deserves the grateful respect of the Boston community which it has well served. This is not the first occasion I have taken to declare my own admiration for the present works of the boys' clubs of Boston. Mr. Church and his associates in the work of the boys' clubs are serving the present and future interests of the community on the level where service is most needed and most effective.

All are agreed that our young people are the most important people in the world. With due regard for the rights and privileges of the aged, the mature and the others of older generations, it remains true that first place should be given in the plans of the community and in the prayers of the church to those who are just starting out—to the young people of the flock. The reason, I repeat, is that our young people are the most important assets we have in the world. The state thinks so when it is looking for citizens to defend it. The community thinks so when it is looking for fresh blood to revitalize it. The church thinks so all the time. So do I. So do you.

Here in America youth traditionally have had a privileged place. The youth of America are the envy of the world. Whatever their racial or religious background, our young people are in a more favorable position than their cousins in any part of the Old World. They are in this favorable position not because of any special merits of their own, not because of something that America has traditionally done for them. America has been a blessed land for the young; with all our mistakes, with all our irregularities, with all our unsolved social problems—I still think it safe to say that no nation on earth has ever given its young people so prominent a place in its social scheme of things and such abundant opportunities to enjoy that place.

And America has been richly rewarded for this wise and generous attitude toward the young. Other nations view their coming generations with fear and misgiving because of the disillusionments and the difficulties which woefully mistaken national policies have created for the young. They fear the forms which resentment may take among young people who are without patriotic faith, material hopes, or social charity because of the utter defeat of political and military schemes which were concocted by an older generation without reference to the interests of the young people who would come after them in their respective nations.

But here in America our young people are the joyful hope of our future. The hope of America is only temporarily in diplomats and in generals. Its permanent plans for security are in the young. That is why the boys' clubs movement here in Boston is doing such an important job for America and doing it in such a typically American way. That is why I am anxious to help as best I can the work of the boys' clubs and why I hope that others will be willing to do the same.

The boys' clubs are a principal channel for bringing to our youngsters the typical advantages that America has to offer. They have none of the regimentation which, as I said, has been the death of youth's dreams in the Old World. They operate in an atmosphere of friendliness and a decent regard for the dignity and the rights of the other fellow. They represent democracy at its best, working through youth and in behalf of youth.

We hear much talk in our day about making democracy a force in the world community. We all have a responsibility as well as an interest in this great problem. But when all is said and done, there is very little the average individual can do on a world scale to promote democracy or anything else. The local community is the normal sphere of influence. And we best serve world interest by promoting community interest close to home.

That is another powerful argument for interest in the boys' clubs. They do right here at home the job for democracy that people tell us must be done in the international order. They teach our young people to work, play, and live together, united on a community basis despite whatever legitimate difficulties may divide them.

We cannot aspire in our lifetime to teach the whole world how to live as one. We cannot even hope to unite all at once the entire United States. But in a city like Boston, where many nationalities, races, and

traditions live, work, and play side by side, we have a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate to all the world the power of American idealism to forge a single, healthy, united community out of groups which would otherwise be in constant conflict. The boys' clubs are trying to do that.

I ask God's blessing on all who help.

Praises Work of House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, every day the importance of the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is becoming more apparent. This committee, which has been attacked and smeared by Communists, Communist sympathizers, radicals, and fellow-travelers from one end of the country to the other, has nevertheless proceeded with its task of acquainting the people of America with the dangers of subversive activities in our country, in our institutions, and in our Government.

Notwithstanding the smear efforts of those whom the House Committee on Un-American Activities have brought into the light of day, and notwithstanding the smear activities of the friends and sympathizers of those exposed, the real people of America—the sound-thinking, patriotic people of America—know the good work which the Committee on Un-American Activities has done, and are sincerely interested in preserving this committee. I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. T. Earle Stribling, of Atlanta, Ga., who is State second vice regent, and national defense chairman of the Daughters of American Revolution, dated January 10, 1949, which I have asked and received permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this letter herewith:

ATLANTA, GA., *January 10, 1949.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Bulding,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE DAVIS: I do not feel that it is necessary to urge you to work for the continuance of the House Un-American Activities Committee. You have always supported such measures for the protection and assurance of our American way of life.

Our national society has indicated its approval of the work of this committee and as State chairman of national defense, I have brought to the attention of every DAR in Georgia the part they can play as individuals in protecting our system of government.

Institutions and governments do not preserve themselves. They can be preserved only by the vigilance of those to whom their guardianship has been committed.

We in Georgia feel confident that you will do all in your power to prevent the critics from dissolving this committee. Your support and encouragement are deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
SUZANNE F. STRIBLING.

Rules Committee Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Mr. Herman A. Lowe, one of our outstanding columnists, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on January 15, 1949:

PROSPECTS NOT ALL ROSY IN RULES COMMITTEE CURB

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—There was dancing in the streets and the joyous beating of cymbals in the land, the other day, because the House of Representatives had terminated the power of its Rules Committee to pigeonhole legislation wanted by the people.

The hosannas were heard even on Capitol Hill among liberal legislators who regarded the classic smacking down of the autocratic Rules Committee as a long step toward injecting more democracy in the legislative processes. Now, if the Rules Committee should balk at giving the green light to a bill, the chairman of the appropriate legislative committee may go to the floor after 21 legislative days and request the House itself to bring the measure up for action.

All this is to the good, but here and there heads are shaking and comments are whispered that maybe the boys were a little hasty in delivering the solar plexus blow. For the first time there are candid admissions that the Rules Committee might not be pure, stygian evil, and that the change in the House rules might bring its quota of headaches.

For example:

In his budget message of last Monday, President Truman anticipated that, despite the enormous Federal revenue, the Nation would run $600,000,000 in the red for the current fiscal year (terminating June 30, 1949).

But just think how much in debt we should be operating this year if it had not been for the Rules Committee. It is estimated that this cold-blooded committee tucked away in cold storage bills which might have cost the taxpayers in the neighborhood of another $25,000,000,000. Yes, billions, not millions.

Consider the Taft-Ellender-Wagner low cost housing bill which, by the way, is back again this session. The purpose of this bill is indeed worthy, but it has been estimated that its cost for the first year or two would run anywhere from $9,000,000,000 to $13,500,000,000, depending upon whose estimate you listen to.

Then there was the Veterans Homestead Act, to provide funds for veterans to buy homes, farms, etc. The cost of this bill in grants and loans is a little vague, but the best available estimates set the tab in the vicinity of $8,750,000,000.

There were such small items as the one for $80,000,000 to subsidize production of critical and semicritical materials. There were even items about whose cost no one had the slightest idea.

One man's research last week brought out that on 18 bills alone shelved by the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress, the cost would have been between $22,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000 if they had become law.

Often House legislative committees have approved bills which would cost the people a lot of money but which make members of those committees big shots among a lot of voters back home. The committees have voted so generously, knowing full well that the Rules Committee would kill the bills.

One of the interesting places to watch this session will be the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, whose chairman is JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi. The powerful veterans' lobby concentrates upon this committee, and the committee generally obliges by reporting out the desired bills. Many of these measures have died in the Rules Committee which has borne the full onus for its action.

RANKIN, a leading Dixiecrat, has no use for the administration and is roaring mad at being stripped of his place on the Un-American Activities Committee. The guessing here is that he will push some expensive, elaborate veterans' legislation through his committee and toss it into the lap of the Rules Committee. If the Rules Committee should refuse to O. K. it, RANKIN can take to the floor after 21 legislative days and call upon the House to act anyway.

Few legislators have the desire or the courage to vote against benefits for veterans, so it is figured RANKIN will get his bills through.

Well, you may say, there is always the Senate. The Senate will block any extravagant spending.

In case you don't know it, many Members of the House say sneeringly that "they call the Senate the upper chamber because they always up appropriations there."

The Rules Committee in the past has been an adjunct of the Speaker's office, killing legislation he did not want and which Members of the House did not wish to stand up and be counted on.

It looks as though those days are over. And it looks as though it will cost money.

Forked Snag in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1949, as follows:

FORKED SNAG IN JAPAN

Americans who have looked on postwar Japan as their pet democratic preserve have had a rude lesson. The resounding victory of the extreme right wing in this week's election, though not unexpected, is not reassuring. The surprise gain of the Communists from 4 to 35 seats in the Diet is even more shocking to sensibilities conditioned to accept a reactionary but not a revolutionary Japan.

It is the moderate middle which has taken the real beating—and, with it, American prestige. For, by and large, the occupation found the well-intentioned though inexperienced party of the center the most useful instrument for projected reforms. Toyohiko Kagawa, the famous Japanese Christian leader, has listed the earlier emergence of the middle-road Social Democratic Party, as one of the greatest achievements of the postwar democratic revolution. Now the party is tainted with a too willing collaboration with the Americans, and the public wants none of it.

The twin aims of American policy in Japan have been social reform and economic

revival, with the emphasis increasingly on the latter. The reforms have not been sufficient nor deep enough to satisfy the acutely dissatisfied, who are now apparently more impressed by Communist promises. The revival has put power back into the hands of the prewar conservatives, who know how to run business—and elections—in the tried and tough Japanese fashion.

If Americans learn from this that they can't buy democracy cheap in the Far East, they may be willing to listen more carefully to what their Pacific allies have to say about Japan.

Reds Delay Crisis in West in Order To Concentrate on Orient in Plan of World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an extraordinarily illuminating and alarming article on the inside actions and plans of the Kremlin and its world operations. It is one of a series appearing in the Toronto Evening Telegram, written by Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, until recently Soviet jet and air research expert who carried out secret tasks for the Politburo and was privy to the innermost counsels of the Kremlin. Disillusioned and dismayed, he fled his country to find freedom in Britain. He is rendering an invaluable service to the United States of America and to humanity by telling us the truth about Communist machinations around the world. They are concentrated in China just now—as a step toward the next victims. When will we begin to heed the warnings?

REDS DELAY CRISIS IN WEST IN ORDER TO CONCENTRATE ON ORIENT IN PLAN OF WORLD CONQUEST

(By Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev)

The most important fact about the U. S. S. R. that you of the west must get into your heads is that Stalin means business. By business I mean world domination by any means, including war. There would in all probability already have been war, or at least a red-rod incident, over Berlin, but for three facts:

1. American monopoly of the atomic bomb.
2. Anglo-American air superiority.
3. Widespread discontent inside the USSR, not only in the armed forces and the population, but also in the ruling circles.

The last fact was perhaps the most important of all, and needs a little explanation. The Politburo made a number of promises to the population during the war, but immediately the urgent need for popular backing was past, it became evident that these promises would not be kept.

QUIETED BY LIQUIDATION

The immediate reaction of the Politburo to the widespread discontent which became manifest was a large-scale purge in all the spheres of Soviet life, and in particular a thorough purge of the intelligentsia under the personal supervision of the late Zhadanov, one of the most hated of Soviet leaders.

The ultimate aim of Soviet policy is the creation, by armed conflict if necessary, of a universal Soviet Union. The argument is stated repeatedly in primer-clear language in all the principal works of bolshevism—and no more forcefully than by Stalin himself. Stalin said: "The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a specifically Russian theory but a theory compulsory for all countries." The temptation in the west is to put down bolshevism's fantastic ambitions as sheer claptrap, but the Soviet Union is rearming as fast as the Politburo can drive the exhausted, disenchanted, and unhappy people in its power.

TEMPO IS FEVERISH

Preparations for the struggle proceed at a feverish tempo in every branch of Soviet life.

No single event since the revolution itself—not even the sudden German onslaught in 1939—ever caused more consternation among the members of the Politburo than the dropping of the first atom bomb on Hiroshima. The realization that the most powerful of the capitalist countries had come into possession of a weapon which at a stroke had outmoded all the war machines of Communist politics was a stunning blow.

CHANGE IN STRATEGY

Since 1945, by Stalin's specific orders, Soviet strategy started to be completely overhauled to accord with the potentialities of the so-called American experiment. For 3½ years Soviet science has been striving to solve the atom problem in a practical way. Everything connected with the problem commands super top priority. Great numbers of workmen and the brains of the leading physicists and technologists are concentrated upon this single objective. If all goes as at present, a practical, as distinct from an experimental, atomic bomb will not be in possession of the Soviet Union before 1951–53.

DATES STILL HELD

Those dates were still the basic planning dates in Soviet policy when I left Soviet service some months ago. Since a war with the United States on anything like equal terms was unthinkable without the atomic bomb, the Politburo was compelled to take a number of strategic and tactical steps in order to avoid a direct hot war. The outstanding example of one of these steps is the war now being waged in southeast Asia. I do not say that war will necessarily come in 3 to 5 years, but I warn you that Stalin will be ready then. Stalin is the same old Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt failed to charm him, and Mr. Churchill to move him. The fantastic burgeoning of western power has temporarily puzzled and frustrated him. But as a Marxist dialectician he will undoubtedly take any chance which may present itself in any future crisis and/or upheavals in the capitalist world provided the atom-bomb problem is solved.

POLITBURO POLICY

The next question is: Where is Soviet policy headed right now? There is no such thing as Soviet foreign policy. There is only a politburo policy. The 13 men who stand at the summit of power inside the Soviet Union conduct its foreign affairs. Looking out from Moscow, Stalin and company visualize the Soviet revolutionary destiny in terms of two immense tasks. Task 1 is Europe generally, beginning with Germany, task 2—Asia, beginning with China. For obvious reasons, Europe was in the beginning, and still remains, task 1.

The collapse of Germany, leaving an apparent vacuum in Europe, presented the Politburo with an incredible opportunity. It concentrated at once on task one, confident that in a matter of a few years, possibly by the end of 1950, it would be master of the European Continent. However, many things went wrong.

DRIVES FAILED

The failure of Communist drives in Italy, France, and Germany; the inherent anti-Communist cast of British labor; the defection of Tita; the fact that western Communists exposed themselves as closely linked with the Kremlin; the return of United States power to Europe in the form of the Marshall plan—all these combined to bring the drive westward to a temporary standstill. These difficulties compelled a reappraisal of strategy. It was conceded by the Politburo that the struggle for Europe would prove much harder than had been assumed, and it would be dangerous to attempt to pursue it to conclusion so long as task two remained unmastered. Therefore the Politburo decided to shift its attention to Asia—with consequences now plain to everybody.

MASTERING CHINA

They have so far failed in Europe, but they are on the verge of mastering China. The Politburo has achieved in China success on a scale that the west has not yet even begun to realize. There is a popular theory that the next world war will start over China. No matter what happens elsewhere, the Politburo is basing its strategy upon the assumption that the war will be decided in Europe. As soon as task two approaches completion—perhaps in the next few months, perhaps in another year—then the Politburo will return, with whetted appetite and confidence, to Europe. Therein lies the true significance of China's collapse. From the Soviet strategic point of view, the fact that Mao Tse-tung has finally all but brought Chiang Kai-shek down after two decades of incessant struggle is only of incidental importance.

REAR IS PROTECTED

The great thing is that the ever vulnerable rear of the Soviet Union is in the process of being secured; China's open door is closing against the west which first pried it ajar. The collapse of China has advanced with a speed which must have surprised even the most optimistic Soviet military experts. Two mistakes have obviously helped to bring on the avalanche. The lackadaisical attitude of the West to the Soviet grip on outer Mongolia, which has since become the main Soviet arsenal in Asia, is the first and most outstanding reason for the present collapse of China. The second mistake was that through General Marshall's efforts to impose a coalition government, the United States, in effect, championed the Chinese Communists as true agrarian liberals and contributed to the undermining of the established government. The attempts of General Marshall to reconcile Chiang Kai-shek with Mao Tse-tung proved that the Americans have not yet clearly understood the basic principles of communism; that is, the fact that never, under any conditions, would Communists accept loyal collaboration with non-Communists.

SOVIET AMAZED

Inside the Soviet Union, Marshall's strange efforts to divide Chiang Kai-shek's power with Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime were followed with incredulous satisfaction. For one intoxicating moment it almost appeared that the distinguished American would actually succeed where even Vanming, a member of the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party, an outstanding Comintern personality and a close friend of Stalin's, had failed. Though Marshall's coalition scheme finally broke upon the rock of Chiang's opposition, his withdrawal from China, accompanied by a virtual cessation of all United States aid to the Chiang Kai-shek government in effect represented a strategic victory for Fao against Chiang. It cleared the way for the current Communist offensive. With Chiang left to his fate, the way was open for a Soviet thrust into Asia at practically no risk. Soviet arms and military might flowed into the vacuum, and Chiang's unsupported armies were brushed aside. It would seem now that another mistake is to be added to the previous ones.

WOULD AID REDS

Mr. Hoffman, of the Economic Cooperation Administration, has been quoted as saying in Shanghai that even in the event of the Communists coming into control of the government, United States economic aid to China would continue. Is it possible that the western diplomats have not yet understood that any kind of compromise with the Communists is a danger to world peace?

There is a myth, fostered with consummate skill and assiduity by Soviet propagandists, that the Chinese Communists, far from owing allegiance to theoretical Marxism or the Cominform, are only simple oriental agrarians hungry for land and democracy.

I have also heard the hope expressed by otherwise intelligent people in the West that Mao Tse-tung, though a self-avowed Communist, is really an agrarian nationalist, who, if pressed hard by the Kremlin, would rebel as Tito has done.

Concerning the Chinese masses enlisted under the Red banner, it can be confidently stated that their views will have no more influence upon Mao's decisions than is the case under other Communist dictatorships.

A TRUE BELIEVER

Mao himself is a dedicated Communist—a true believer. He has never deviated from the party line and was the first of the non-Soviet proconsuls to denounce Tito's heresy.

If his victories continue he will certainly go down in Asiatic history as the Lenin of China.

Chu-teh C-in-C of the Chinese Communist armies is a talented military leader. A highly placed Soviet general described him in the following terms: "He could without any further training be put in command of any Soviet front, and would carry out his duties as well as any Soviet marshal."

Chu-teh is not only a revolutionary Communist but also an officer who went through the "correspondence course" of the Soviet general staff academy.

He is supported by good Soviet staff officers, the greater part of whom are the Chinese nationality.

I saw him for the first time in Moscow in or about 1934, but I know that he visited the USSR quite often, and I also know that he commands unbounded authority among the Soviet military leaders.

WORKS WITH SOVIET

I could name a number of Soviet officers of all ranks who have been working under him for the past 10 to 15 years.

The adroitness with which Chu-teh has maneuvered his armies during the past years suggests a special aptitude for managing mass armies.

He and Mao complement each other. They form a powerful combination, the most dangerous pair now tramping the Asiatic stage, and are the revolutionary barometer in Asia.

But to assume that they have produced these colossal results themselves as many do, is to miss the whole point of the struggle for Asia.

I myself never went to China for the Soviet Government, but I have served with officers who knew the situation well, and I have also studied the question thoroughly.

The Chinese Communist army is some 2,300,000 strong. (The Chinese Communist party has 2,800,000 members.)

The higher staff posts are held by Soviet officers of Chinese, Korean, and Mongolian nationalities. Many of these were recently serving in the Soviet army, went through the Soviet military academies and colleges, or else commanded Soviet military formations in the east.

EASILY OBTAINED

No one can estimate the number of Soviet officers now holding high-ranking commands or staff posts in Chu-teh's and Mao Tse-tung's armies. One thing is certain. There are many more of them than is realized in the west.

One must also remember that there are a great many Chinese, Koreans, and Mongolians in the U. S. S. R.

Finally, one should also bear in mind the existence of the Mongolian People's Republic under Choi Bolsan.

The basis of the higher political personnel in the Chinese Communist Army was made up of graduates from the Communist University of the Workers of the East (KUTV) in Moscow, and also from the Institute of the Peoples of the East in Leningrad, plus various workers' faculties, institutes, and universities in the U. S. S. R.

The largest political training centers are at Vladivostok and Khabarovsk. The political schools of the Northern Shensi are staffed by Chinese, Mongolians, Buryatts, and Koreans, as well as Russians from the U. S. S. R.

PLENTY OF WEAPONS

The Soviet areas of China now possess their own armament factories, most of which were built under Soviet direction. But there are not enough of them for the needs of the Chinese Communist Army.

After the defeat of Japan the Chinese Communists received masses of Japanese arms from the Soviet; in addition they are getting great quantities of arms of Soviet manufacture, but stamped with foreign markings.

These include automatic weapons, artillery, machine guns, grenades, pistols, mortars, etc.

The Chinese Communist Army has a large number of Soviet aircraft, mostly obsolescent. Radio equipment is practically wholly Soviet, except for that captured from Chiang Kai-shek, which is American.

Paper used by Chinese Communists is practically all from the Soviet Union.

An odd fact is that, according to a treaty of June 1945, the Soviet Government agreed to supply Chiang Kai-shek's government with arms. (This agreement was the biggest and stupidest mistake Chiang ever made.) The arms never reached Chiang. Mao Tse-tung's forces intercepted most of them on the way from the Soviet Union to Nanking.

CALLED WAR BOOTY

In this way the Chinese Communists could always claim that arms of Soviet origin in their possession were not actually supplied by the U. S. S. R. but came under the heading of "War booty." They thus saved any diplomatic embarrassment which might have arisen. The hidden source of power of Chinese communism is Outer Mongolia, now the so-called Mongolian People's Republic. This is the Soviet fortress. It maintains a very large, well-equipped national army which in the higher echelons is almost entirely Soviet-officered. Besides this, a purely Soviet formation, comprising all types of arms—air force, artillery, tanks, infantry, etc.—is quartered in Outer Mongolia. Soviet formations are being sent there quite openly for duty as they are sent to any other part of the Soviet Union. There was no demobilization of this force after the war—a significant fact.

CHIANG'S NEEDS

Chiang has been discredited as a military leader, but he still retains some political influence. What Chiang always lacked was a clean-cut, progressive policy and slogans which would rouse the people to his support in a struggle. In order to remedy the present situation, special attention should be paid to what I have just said. Chiang also needs strong military advisers capable of appreciating the present serious situation. But all this will not be sufficient if Chiang does not get immediate support in arms, supplies, and technical equipment. If he falls and China passes under Mao's control, the rest of the Asiatic pot, now simmering, will boil over. The unexpected opportunities for mischief now opening to the Politburo in Asia are almost unlimited. Rehearsals have already taken place in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, and the Netherlands East Indies, and the Politburo has a stern picture of the situation there. The Politburo will now do everything possible and even strive to do the impossible in order to make the western powers disperse their armed forces in all the corners of the world—thus striking a mighty strategical blow. It is vital to the West to understand this. Stalin would then consider task 2 as under control. He could then turn to task 1 (Europe) with relatively free hands. If the West fails to challenge and check him in the East, the inevitable show-down in the West will almost certainly come much more quickly and under conditions increasingly to Stalin's advantage.

The Truman Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following article by Columnist John M. Cummings, which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on January 18, 1949:

HOW DID IT ALL HAPPEN—JUST ASK H. S. T. HIMSELF

(By John M. Cummings)

The proof of the pudding is in the eating; and the proof of a Presidential election is in the inauguration.

It is true, as all citizens are aware, that long ago, as far back, in fact, as the early hours of November 3, the country knew Harry S. Truman had been elected President. It is also true that Mr. Truman's victory came as a surprise to a large segment of our people, Democrats as well as Republicans.

The visible proof of the victory we shall see at noon Thursday when the Man from Missouri takes the oath for a full term in ceremonies at the National Capital.

Behind that victory there must be a reason or a whole series of reasons. Certain it is that in the course of a few weeks Mr. Truman emerged from the shadow of the eight ball to enter the bright light as a triumphant political gladiator.

Senator FRANK J. MYERS knows the reason for the Truman victory. The pundits may argue and the barroom debaters may disagree, but to Senator MYERS the answer is simple: The Truman campaign speeches.

To this desk, from the Public Affairs Press in Washington and through the courtesy of the Democratic city committee, has come a compilation of the Truman speeches and his message to Congress. In this volume you find everything from the warning against ingratitude on the part of labor and the farmers, which was uttered in his acceptance speech, to the final sentence of the Democratic platform which the candidate accepted to the last nail.

The foreword to the book is by Senator MYERS. Therein he concludes the answer to "How did he do it?" is to be found in the speeches in which was set forth the Truman program. In fact, that's the title of the book, "The Truman Program."

Senator MYERS was a good choice to write the foreword. He was one of the few Democratic faithful who pinned their hopes on Mr. Truman long before the convention. While the Hagues and the Roosevelts and

the O'Dwyers and the Arveys and the Phil Murrays were hoping against hope that a man on a white horse would appear, the little group that included MYERS stood steadfastly by the President.

Maybe some felt in their bones they were enlisted in a lost cause. No matter. They'd go down fighting, knowing that in honorable combat there is glory even for the loser.

"What the experts failed to recognize was the fact, now clear, that the American people have reached a new level of political maturity," says Senator MYERS in his foreword. "They demonstrated in the 1948 election that they were determined to keep liberal progressive government in America in the Roosevelt New Deal tradition.

"Mr. Truman convinced them in his campaign and in his record that he was indeed the true inheritor of the Roosevelt mantle of liberalism. And that is why, although lacking the glamor of Roosevelt, plain-spoken Harry Truman was elected."

Certain members of the Roosevelt clan might take objection to some of the Senator's conclusions. And the labor leaders may feel let down because the Senator did not go out of his way to give them credit for the victory.

On our own part we are disposed to agree with the Senator that Harry did it all by his little self. The book, of course, was compiled long before the recent state of the Nation speech. Naturally there is no comment in the foreword on the Truman suggestion that the Government might find it advisable to go into the steel business. This is getting to be quite a topic and already it has generated within the administration enough heat to operate a blast furnace.

Senator MYERS is the majority whip. He is second in command on the Senate floor. He is close to the administration. It is interesting, therefore, to note what he expects the administration to accomplish.

"The Truman administration," he says, "will restore the reciprocal trade agreements to the full vigor of the Cordell Hull dream; it will launch a colossal home-building plan which will renew and expand the slum-clearance and low-rent program initiated by Franklin D. Roosevelt; it will remove the specter of ruin in the midst of abundant harvests for agriculture; it will curb inflation and bring sanity back to the American economy; it will translate prosperity into terms of decent living standards for all of our people; it will replace the repressive Taft-Hartley Act with legislation in the spirit of the Wagner Act; it will support the Marshall plan out of conviction rather than mere political expediency; and it will continue patient and determined efforts to make the United Nations effective in preventing wars and in eliminating the frictions which lead to war. * * *

"Moreover, the President's courageous civil-rights program, fundamentally a geographic rather than a political issue, will become the law of the land if Republican Members in Congress, particularly in the Senate, are sincere in their party pledges of full support for the goal."

Well, there it is. Paste it in your hat for future reference.

Resolutions of Georgia Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Hon. George D. Stewart, secretary of the Senate of the State of Georgia has forwarded to me two resolutions adopted by that body. Under leave previously granted, I insert these resolutions herewith:

Senate Resolution 16

Whereas there has been pending in the Congress of the United States a threat to invade the sovereign rights of the several States under the guise of a so-called civil-rights program; and

Whereas were such a program adopted it would tend to break down every traditional law and custom of the State and tend to destroy the constitutional rights preserved for the States; and

Whereas for many months a courageous and successful opposition to these measures has been tirelessly and relentlessly waged by southern Congressmen and Senators under the leadership of our own United States Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL. In this fight he has been greatly aided to the fullest extent by our United States Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, and by every member of the Georgia congressional delegation in the National Congress; and

Whereas we believe that our Senators and Congressmen have the wholehearted endorsement and backing of the great majority of the people of this State in this great fight against such overwhelming odds: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia (the house of representatives concurring), That it be the sense of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia that United States Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, and our entire congressional delegation be extended the thanks and gratitude of the people of the State of Georgia through their duly elected representatives in the general assembly for the courageous spirit that they have exemplified in presenting our fight against this program; be it further

Resolved, That through this resolution we commend them and encourage them to carry on this fight in the name of the people of the State of Georgia and in the name of the sovereign rights of our State, assuring them of our constant and wholehearted confidence in them and adherence to this cause; be it further

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution a copy of the same, under the signatures of the officers of both houses, be immediately transmitted to both United States Senators and to each member of our congressional delegation.

Read and adopted January 18, 1949.

S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
President of Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of Senate.
FRED HAND,
Speaker of House of Representatives.
JOE BOONE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Senate Resolution 19

Whereas Georgia is predominantly an agricultural State and two-thirds of our population are on the farm, dependent directly or indirectly upon success of farming as their livelihood; and

Whereas the products produced by our farmers must be sold at a profit in order that our farmers earn their livelihood, which in turn means the success of all other business and Government support in this State that is dependent upon our agriculture; and

Whereas Hon. Tom Linder, Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Georgia, is the only elected official in this State charged with the duty and authority to speak for, represent, and disseminate information on behalf of our farmers, to look after their interest, and to aid them in every way in securing such prices for their products that will assure them of a living profit; and

Whereas Hon. Tom Linder has made a good commissioner of agriculture and has not shirked the duty imposed upon him to speak and work for higher prices for the products of the farmer and that in carrying out this duty imposed upon him by the laws of the State of Georgia he has been persecuted; and

Whereas realizing the need of representation to speak for our farmers in Georgia and in Washington: Be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Georgia requesting that their support is hereby requested to back up our commissioner of agriculture in his fight for higher prices for the farmers.

Read and adopted January 20, 1949.

S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.

What's Ahead for the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HAND: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the privilege of including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Capt. Willis W. Bradley before the Baltimore Rotary Club, entitled "What's Ahead for the Merchant Marine." Captain Bradley's distinguished service in the American Navy is well known. His life-long familiarity with maritime problems, emphasized by his service in this House on the Merchant Marine Committee, gives weight to whatever he chooses to say on the subject of maritime affairs.

The address follows:

Prediction of what's ahead for the merchant marine may be somewhat presumptuous, yet I shall undertake it in some small degree in the feeling that a fair knowledge of the past, plus recent participation in legislative matters pertaining to the merchant marine, will make my observation worth while.

Hindsight in merchant-marine problems is valuable in that it high lights certain seeming facts which must be kept in mind if we are to keep our ships sailing the seas. Let me state some of my own conclusions.

The American people are not a maritime nation in the same sense as the Norwegian, the British, the Portuguese, the Dutch, and other European and Asiatic races. Americans do not need to suffer the hardships of the sea to earn a living.

Americans do not like discipline, whereas foreigners are accustomed to a large degree of it. Reasonable discipline is one of the fundamentals of any successful ship. Without good discipline, neither passengers, nor crew, nor the ship itself, can be secure.

Americans are not ship-minded—that is, they have not been vividly impressed with the necessity of American-flag shipping. We have a vast country; only a few know they are vitally concerned with the movement of goods in American bottoms; the rest realize vaguely that the world's cargoes do move and that satisfies them.

Almost everything in America is protected from too much foreign competition—protected by tariffs, by quotas, by support prices,

by subsidies. American-flag ships in foreign trade must meet the passenger and freight rates offered by cheap-labor foreign competitors. This simply can't be done except in a few isolated instances without Government aid while paying officers and crew on a scale demanded by the American standard of living.

The American Government as a whole is not merchant-marine minded. Some agencies strive mightily to build up the merchant fleet. Others seem to be bent on its destruction. This is well illustrated by current efforts of the ECA to circumvent the 50-percent carrying provision of the European Recovery Act passed by the Eightieth Congress.

These, then, are some of the conclusions logically reached after reviewing the history of our merchant marine, yet we know that we must have an adequate fleet of merchant vessels available immediately in the event of war or national emergency. The problem is: How are we to get this fleet and how are we to keep it in being under the American flag?

I have come to the conclusion that we must revise our conception of the merchant marine as being concerned primarily with the carrying of commercial cargoes. We must place primary emphasis on the merchant marine as an integral part of the national defense set-up. I do not indicate that the merchant marine should become an adjunct of the Department of Defense or that the Government should take over and operate the merchant fleet, but rather that the whole should be so enmeshed with other components of the national security establishment that the ships needed at the outbreak of hostilities, for trade, for overseas military transport, and for naval auxiliaries, will be built in accordance with specifications suitable for the purpose for which they are intended in event of mobilization, and that they will be kept in active operation so as to be ready for service. This would cost the Treasury some money but it would seem to be money well spent—money which would provide a substantial return to the nation in employment, both ashore and afloat, while maintaining a powerful factor in the security of the state.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936, now the law of the land, was framed with something of this conception in mind. It is a good law but needs some modernization to include consideration of happenings of the past decade. It should be amended so as to bring some additional phases of the domestic water-borne trade within its legislative provisions, for these segments of the industry—reasonably alive when the law was enacted—are just about extinct. The mere fact that they have died within the lifespan of the Act of 1936, indicates that they cannot operate unaided in this current industrial era.

Now accepting the premise that the merchant fleet must be tied to the national defense if it is to continue in sufficient strength and readiness to safeguard the nation, it becomes pertinent to ask—How many merchant ships and what types of such ships does the United States need? I shall not attempt to answer that question for I do not know the answer. Rather, I shall state that the answers should be obtained through a study of the requirements of merchant vessels for the Department of Defense, the capabilities of vessel types, the practicability of commercial employment in times of peace, the capacity of building yards to construct new ships rapidly, and the repair and conversion facilities available to the industry. Such a study should be more or less continuous in order that marked changes in world conditions or in naval architecture will be kept in the foreground. I have no doubt but that the Department of Defense, assisted by the Maritime Commission and by industry representatives, is now doing just about what is here suggested.

The minimum merchant ship tonnage for immediate national defense requirements is around twelve millions dead weight. This includes both tanker and dry-cargo categories.

With our ever-expanding tanker fleet (largely owned by the petroleum industry) the problem of sufficient tonnage in that category is relatively minor. Just now, the Government's main problem in tankers is to see that new construction embodies national defense features such as high speed, long-cruising radius, additional structural strength for gun-mount foundations, etc. This is being accomplished under current laws.

When we consider passenger and dry-cargo ships we are in a field where it is recognized generally that those in foreign trade must have Government aid both for construction and operation. Our laws now provide for such aid on a rather restricted basis. However, the domestic services which do not enjoy aid for either construction or operation have, in the past, been a most valuable source of ships in emergency. They have been the reservoirs from which the whole number of ships engaged therein has been available in a matter of only a few days, without the probability of loss through enemy action or of internment in foreign ports. These reservoirs are now practically empty and they are not being replenished due to high construction costs, difficulties with labor, high wages, and other factors with which you gentlemen are very familiar.

Yet it seems essential to the national security that a reasonable number of merchant vessels be available in home waters at all times. I believe that conditions which will permit private industry to build and operate such vessels must be provided, or that the Government must soon step in and build the minimum required for its safety. I know that certain interests oppose any governmental aid to ships not engaged in the offshore trade, and I say candidly that I believe they are being short-sighted even for their own best prospects. Rather than oppose any help for domestic shipping, these interests should give intelligent consideration to what is necessary for minimum national security requirements and should then make efforts to keep that minimum in the hands of private operators. A course of blind opposition is likely to lead to Government ownership and operation.

The act of 1936 provides for both a construction subsidy and an operating subsidy, under certain circumstances, for vessels in the foreign trade. Let me show the justification for these subsidies.

First, consider the construction picture. The law provides that a construction-differential subsidy may be granted to offset higher cost of construction in American shipyards as compared with foreign yards. It is not easy to get accurate figures on foreign construction costs, but I give you figures, in round numbers, which I have just obtained from the Chairman of the Maritime Commission and which cover recent investigations made in connection with contracts for building two American export passenger-cargo ships for the North Atlantic-Mediterranean service, and three American President passenger-cargo ships for the round-the-world trade.

The low bid on the American Export ships was $23,116,000 each, conditional on being awarded the contract for building both ships. The Commission estimated that equivalent construction abroad would cost 55 percent of the low American bid, that is, that the cost per ship abroad would be $12,713,800. Thus the cost for construction in America exceeds that abroad by $10,402,200 for each ship or $20,804,400 for the two vessels.

The low bid on the American President ships, smaller and slower than those for the American Export, was $10,671,000 each. The Commission's estimate for equivalent construction abroad was 55.95 percent of the American bid, or $5,970,424 for each vessel. The cost, then to build these three ships in America will be $14,101,726 more than if built in a foreign yard.

I think these figures should demolish thoroughly any argument that construction subsidies are not justified. Certainly an American operator could not stay in free-for-all world trade with a capital investment for ship costs some 45 percent greater than his competitors. Fortunately the Maritime Commission has recognized this fact and is meeting the issue fairly and squarely.

Now let's glance at the operating end of our foreign trade. Comparison of American and foreign costs is difficult because foreign costs vary widely. They have one outstanding thing in common; that is, they are all far below our own. Also, one cannot say that present-day comparisons will be good next year. The fact is they are not likely to be good then, for the position of the foreigners should improve in the near future as more stores and materials become available in their own ports.

The following comparison was furnished to me by the President of the National Federation of American Shipping. It is accurate within reasonable limits. Considering American and French Liberty type vessels in the North Atlantic coal trade, between United States ports and France, on a 50-day turnaround, we have total costs for the American $95,571, for the Frenchmen $63,675. This means $31,896 more for the American every 50 days. No American operator could stand such competition without Government aid. For the voyage mentioned, American wages are $24,201, as against French $8,253. It may be simpler to note that French wages were only 34.1 percent of American for the same service.

Wages of other foreigners vary somewhat. The best paid among seagoing foreigners appear to be the Greeks, with 43.3 percent of the American scale—the lowest in European brackets, the Italians with 22.3 percent.

Right here seems an excellent place for me to give my views on the pay of shipboard labor—both licensed and unlicensed. I believe in good pay for seagoing personnel. I believe they should receive pay commensurate with that paid for the same grade of labor ashore. I cannot understand why some should expect Americans to go to sea for little pay just because our foreign commerce is in direct competition with ships having low wage scales. If the ships must be operated by Americans (and I, for one, am convinced that the national security demands they be so operated), then Americans going to sea should be treated on the basis of equality with those in industry ashore, and the Federal Government should make up the differential in wages, charging it off to the national defense.

I have stated that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is a good law but that it needs some modernization. In general, the major cause of the postwar setback of the American merchant marine has been lack of implementation of the act of 1936 through failure to supply the Maritime Commission with sufficient funds, and through certain restrictive administrative regulations imposed on the Commission by superior authority. You who are familiar with present legislative processes understand that the President controls governmental affairs largely through his Bureau of the Budget. Funds required by the Maritime Commission are provided by the Congress, but, in such matters, the Congress does not usually go beyond the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and the budget is a creature of the President. It is my hope that the President will ask sufficient funds to implement the present law to its fullest extent, and that restriction on the Commission's freedom of action will be removed.

I mentioned previously that some agencies of the Government seem bent on the destruction of the merchant marine. I do not want to leave you with the impression that these agencies do anything deliberately to sabotage American shipping, but rather with the thought that in any tremendous set-up such as ours there are a thousand and one ideas on almost every subject, and that personnel vitally interested in one phase of government seldom gives sufficient consideration to the possible repercussions of their acts on other phases.

Let me give you some examples of how this works insofar as the merchant marine is concerned.

Time after time, during the Eightieth Congress, I remarked on the attitude of the State Department in connection with the merchant marine. It seemed to me that officials of the State Department with whom I came in contact always considered the foreigner more deserving than the American—that they were more interested in restoring foreign fleets than in keeping American ships on the high seas. In fact, I came to the conclusion that our own State Department is one of our greatest obstacles in the way of building and maintaining a strong American merchant marine. I think very definite evidence of this came in the proposed European recovery plan legislation wherein the State Department proposed the gift of an additional 200 ships to foreigners and the bareboat chartering of 300 more to these same foreigners. You gentlemen who follow shipping will recall the congressional battle which eliminated these provisions and thus saved our merchant fleet from a near mortal blow. I do not believe that individuals in the State Department are in themselves enemies of American shipping. I think they are just so wrapped up in their own concepts of what seems best to advance their own particular objectives that they brush other things aside—and the merchant marine is always one of those other things.

Now at the same time the Congress struck the ship-transfer provisions from ERP legislation, I had the pleasure of offering an amendment in the House to require 50 percent of the goods bought in the United States with ERP money be shipped abroad in American vessels. This amendment, which had been previously accepted by the Senate, was approved by the House and written into law. It seems entirely fair to me to give our own ships and our own seamen a 50-percent break in this export traffic. After all, we are paying for the whole program; workers ashore are getting the benefit of high wages; the factory owner is receiving substantial orders; railroads and trucks are hauling the goods to the seaboard and receiving good rates for their services. Why then should Americans who own ships and Americans who sail ships be pushed completely out into the cold just to give more benefits to foreigners? But just recently, we were treated to the interesting ECA argument that the Congress didn't realize what it was doing when it passed this amendment. Therefore, ECA, taking advantage of a legal opinion based on a proviso in the law, determined that the amendment should not be enforced after January 1. Fortunately, however, a sufficient hubbub arose so as to cause ECA to postpone this action until February 1 to give the new Congress an opportunity to express itself.

Then we have the Panama Canal tolls picture. Costs of Canal operation have gone up tremendously—largely because of improved working conditions, expansion of social services, etc. So in 1948 the Department of the Army asked that tolls be increased to the maximum allowed of $1 per ton, regardless of the fact that commercial traffic is more than paying its way. The President issued a proclamation making this increase effective early in 1949. Protests were sufficiently effective to get the date postponed for 6 months so that Congress can look into the matter. Tolls should not be increased as the cost of the Canal should have been written off the books years ago as a national-security investment. Commercial shipping should not be forced to pay for what was basically a means of getting warships from one ocean to the other.

And right here I want to invite your attention to current efforts to get the Congress to authorize a sea-level canal at Panama. I believe the ultimate cost of such a project, with defenses, would be in the neighborhood of $5,000,000,000. If it should happen, shipping will likely find itself compelled to pay sharply increased tolls to offset a part of this great expenditure.

I am regarded as an arch enemy of the sea-level canal project. That is wrong. I am not an enemy of the sea-level canal; I am only an arch enemy of spending all these billions of the people's money unless the sea-level canal can be shown to be absolutely essential to the national safety. This has not yet been shown.

But regardless of what action may be taken by the Eighty-first Congress, I think these incidents bring out clearly the point I wish to make, which is, that Government agencies seem quite willing to sacrifice American shipping when they believe they can advance the interests of their own particular activities thereby.

One frequent criticism of the shipping industry is that methods of handling cargo are still the same as in the days of our grandfathers—that stevedores, whips, and winches still prevail, whereas, other industries have made revolutionary changes in ancient practices and have thus cut costs materially. It is not a simple task to work out any method better than the conventionalized boom hoist, except in specialized traffic. The best of talent has struggled with this problem for years and has come forth with self-loaders and unloaders for bulk cargoes such as coal, iron ore, and grain; with conveyors for bananas, boxed goods, and parcels; with sea trains for transporting loaded railroad cars from port to port. Now the truck and trailer age has given birth to another development—the handling of loaded trailers by fast ships operating between terminals several hundred miles apart. This development has great promise and should receive enthusiastic support from shippers, truckers, and the users of our main highways, for it proposes to take hundreds of heavy trucks and trailers off the highways and deliver them at some distant ports for less than operating expenses over the road. It is expected that the first real test of this system will be made on the California coast between the great metropolitan centers of Los Angeles-Long Beach and the San Francisco Bay cities. If successful, this service might well be the first stone in rebuilding in part at least, the coastwise commerce of the United States.

Now in closing, let me give you a few predictions of what I believe is ahead for the American merchant marine.

By 1952 profitable operation in freely competitive foreign-trade areas will not be practicable except for subsidized vessels, those serving specific industries (such as United Fruit or Standard Oil), or those sailing to the account of subsidized operators in excess of authorized voyages.

The number of subsidized ships under the American flag will be increased materially.

The tie-in between the Navy Department and the Maritime Commission will be strengthened considerably so military influence on the merchant marine, while not marked on the surface, will be an important factor in both design and operation.

An operating fleet will be maintained approaching as near as practicable the immediate requirements of the Navy Department in event of emergency. If this fleet can't be built and operated by private industry, with reasonable Government aid, then it will be built and operated by the Federal Government itself, even though such a move would be a distinct step on the road toward nationalization. In this connection I invite your attention to proposed legislation just announced to establish Government owned and operated service between our northwestern States and Alaska. We have been struggling for over 3 years to establish satisfactory steamship service, privately owned, between Seattle and Alaskan ports. We have not been successful.

The domestic steamship services must be revived for these are the best sources from which to obtain ships immediately in event of national emergency.

Specialization in ships—novel methods of cargo handling such as sea-train and trailer-carriers—will be pushed to reduce Government costs in the maintenance of an adequate merchant fleet.

Minor forms of Government aid, such as reduced interest rates, accelerated depreciation, etc., will be extended to domestic shipping.

The American merchant marine, our shipbuilding yards and our repair establishments, are not going to fold up—but neither are they going to enjoy wartime activity or find themselves in a position to pay excess profits taxes.

The American merchant marine and its allied industries must achieve and maintain reasonably harmonious relations among their various components, and they must exercise American ingenuity in solving the problems which confront them.

Yesterday the American merchant marine was on all the maritime battle fronts of the world. Today, it is a major factor in our industrial life and in the national security. Tomorrow, it must be ready once more to defend the principles which Americans hold sacred for the survival of freedom of mankind.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of our late beloved President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, brought great sorrow throughout the world. Many fine tributes were paid to the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt after his death.

I have just had called to my attention one of the finest tributes and editorials written at the time of President Roosevelt's death by Miss Mary O'Brien, now Sister Mary Colombiere, a professed novice of the Dominican Order at Sinsinawa, Mich., and now a sister-teacher at St. Patrick's School, Rockford, Ill.

The editorial appeared in the April 23, 1945, issue of The Journal, the official newspaper of St. Joseph's Academy High School of Saint Paul, Minn. It follows:

REQUIESCAT IN PACE

(By Mary O'Brien)

The passing of our great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, is so tragic that as yet we cannot properly evaluate the effect of his death on this Nation and the world.

Coming into power in one of America's blackest hours, he addressed his countrymen with the words, "There is nothing to fear but fear itself." Whereupon, hearts frozen with anxiety for tomorrow took courage.

As the Nation emerged slowly from the shadow of depression, it was faced with another disaster—the most appalling war in the history of man.

When America was attacked, President Roosevelt united his people by the forcefulness of his personality. He welded the ideals of peace-loving nations into a solid bulwark of Christian principles.

Carrying this tremendous burden for 12 years was more than the human body could stand. With the goal of victory in sight, but with the mighty task of planning the peace only begun, he quietly "slept away."

President Roosevelt is dead, but his soul, his indomitable spirit still lives. His great love and human kindness, his understanding of the little people, his trust in God are as imperishable as time itself.

Generations yet unborn will revere his courage and the ideals for which he stood.

Civil Functions of Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the Members of Congress who served in the old Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives and I am now the ranking Democrat of the Armed Services Committee of the House. Both of these committees have had jurisdiction of the Army and consequently of the Corps of Army Engineers. These committees have had full opportunity to study the manner in which the Army has been run and the work of the Army engineers.

I think it will be a serious blow to national defense to consolidate the civil functions of Army engineers with those of any other department of Government. The civil defense work provides experience and training for our young engineer officers. It gives these officials in time of peace an opportunity to train themselves in the work of handling a large organization, the work of using great machines such as bulldozers, drag lines, cranes, and other heavy dirt-moving equipment, which machines are needed in both peace and war. It is true that the Army engineers have the normal military construction work of the Army Department in times of peace. At the same time, if we take from the Corps of Army Engineers its civil functions authority, we will strip this great organization in the Army Department of its best opportunity for training and experience in time of peace for emergencies which lie ahead.

I know from official experience on the battle front how urgently important it is to have a skilled, well-trained Corps of Army Engineers. It means a saving of countless lives, much precious time, and huge amounts of wealth and I, for one, do not want to see this country make a serious defense mistake, especially at a time when our foreign affairs are so uncertain and so chaotic.

Even our people at home sense the situation and, Mr. Speaker, I am presenting here in the RECORD telegrams from numerous organizations and individuals, all protesting any reorganization plans by this Congress which include the Corps of Army Engineers. I join wholeheartedly in these active protests.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

McClellan bill now being heard by House Executive Expenditures Committee provides the President with blanket authority to exercise any and all parts included in the Hoover Commission report. Respectfully suggest your favorable consideration of an amendment thereto exempting the United States Corps of Engineers from being divorced from flood-control matters and all other civil functions so long and so ably handled by the Army engineers.

J. LESTER WHITE,
Director, Department of Public Works.

TALLULAH, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Congressman OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building:

Our people are very much perturbed over the reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions. We respectfully request you use your best efforts in amending the bill leaving the Army engineers in status quo.

A. T. SHIELDS,
President, Board of Commissioners, Fifth Louisiana Levee District.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

As a parish which borders Mississippi River St. Bernard vitally interested in Mississippi River flood control and opposes reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions because to take authority from United States engineers over Mississippi River flood control might mean disaster to the entire Mississippi River Valley area.

THOMAS W. SERPAS,
President, St. Bernard Parish Police Jury.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The Plaquemines Parish police jury, in behalf of citizens and propertyholders of Plaquemines Parish, are deeply interested in protection from Mississippi River floods. Army engineers have done excellent job in flood control work. Oppose reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions.

EMILE MARTIN, Jr.,
President, Plaquemines Parish Police Jury.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

United States Army engineers have always handled Mississippi River flood control expertly and efficiently. To take away flood control from them and to give it to some new bureau without previous experience would endanger the lives and property of the people of the entire Mississippi Valley area. Therefore, strenuously oppose reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions.

MARINE GERICA,
President, Grand Prairie Levee Board.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of Commissioners of Buras Levee District realizing the cooperation and efficiency of the United States engineers in the many years in which they have had authority over Mississippi flood control strongly oppose the proposed reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions which would take away control by Army engineers and give same to some inefficient and inexperienced bureau.

PHILIP WARREN,
President, Buras Levee Board.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Lake Borgne Basin levee district, comprising the entire Parish of St. Bernard and part of Plaquemines Parish east of the river is very much concerned with Mississippi River flood-control problems and realizes the efficiency and expertness with which the Army engineers have always handled flood-control problems in the past. Therefore to enact into law reorganization bill of 1949 now before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which would eliminate the Corps of Engineers from civil functions might mean disaster to the people of this area as well as all of the people of the Mississippi Valley.

ADAM NUNEZ,
President,
ROLAND BERGERON,
Secretary.
Lake Borgne Basin Levee District.

RAYVILLE, LA., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge that bill be amended to exempt United States Corps of Engineers from being divorced from flood-control matters and all other civil functions so long and so ably handled by the Army engineers.

T. E. HICKS,
President, Board of Commissioners of the Tensas Basin Levee District.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *January 27, 1949.*

The Honorable OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We insist that the civil-functions activities of the Corps of Engineers in the Government's national program of flood control and rivers and harbors work be exempted from any and all contemplated reorganization plans such as Senate bill 526 and H. R. 1569. It is our firm opinion that any change in the Nation's policy in this respect would be disastrous and foolhardy for the Nation's security. The Corps of Engineers having served the country over 100 years in this vital work are held by the people as a brilliant example of efficiency, ability, and integrity.

HOMER H. HARRIS, Sr.,
President, Red River Valley Association.

SHREVEPORT, LA., *January 26, 1949.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request that McClelland bill be amended to prevent United States Corps of Engineers being divorced from flood-control matters which they have handled so efficiently in the past, and have the training and experience to carry on flood control with a greater degree of success than any other agency.

W. E. GLASSELL,
President, Board of Commissioners, Caddo Levee District.

DONALDSONVILLE, LA., *January 26, 1949.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

You are urgently requested to give your aid in amending the McClelland bill now before committee to exempt United States Corps of Engineers from being divorced from flood-control matters and all other civil functions so long and so ably handled by the Army engineers.

LAFOURCHE BASIN LEVEE DISTRICT,
E. C. HANSON, *Secretary.*

ALEXANDRIA, LA., *January 26, 1949.*
Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We respectfully urge that McClelland bill now being heard by House committee be amended to exempt United States Corps of Engineers from being divorced from flood control and other civil functions. The importance of the United States engineers particularly with respect to flood-control matters here in Louisiana cannot be overemphasized. In every crisis of this nature our first thought is to turn to United States engineers. The whole-hearted cooperation of the Corps of Engineers with the various levee boards of our State has been very gratifying indeed and has redounded to the incalculable benefit of all of the people of our State.

Respectfully,
E. LEROY CHANDLER,
President, Board of Commissioners of the Red River Atchafalaya and Bayou Boeuf Levee District.

Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in joining with a group of House Republicans in introducing this housing bill, I do so with the conviction that only Federal assistance can bring about the erection of homes for our low-income groups. No private builder could possibly afford to build homes that must house those whose living costs have to be reduced to such low minimums, the present cost of both material and labor preventing. The congestion, unsanitary and shocking in its effect upon both adults and children, cannot be permitted to continue. This is no reflection upon our builders but it is a challenge to every American.

In drafting this bill we have tried to present a balanced program for all elements in the community. The administration's program deals almost entirely with public housing and slum clearance. This bill sets up a limited public housing program which should not touch the field in which the private housing industry functions. In addition it contains certain extension of FHA which should very materially increase the possibilities for this industry. It also provides loans to cooperatives and limited dividend corporations which will give those in the lower middle-income group opportunity to build.

It is not an attack upon free enterprise, rather is it a method to meet the needs of our least fortunate in an American way.

1948 Business High Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal achievement of American business and industry under our system of free enterprise continues to be the central beacon of light in a world still ridden in too many parts by false ideologies which preach the destruction of individual freedom and the rights of property in favor of the modern Frankenstein which rose in the wake of the chaos and confusion of the First World War under the banner of Communism.

In our Nation industry and labor have united in 1948 to smash many production records of 1947. This was accomplished in the face of continued shortages of materials in many fields and without compulsory Government rationing controls. It was accomplished under free enterprise. No nation where the people have become the slaves of government under communism can equal the production records of the United States where the government is created by the people as a servant of the people.

The following figures released by the United Press present an informative survey of American achievement in production for the year 1948:

Aircraft: 1948 total production 9,970 planes, against 17,707 in 1947, of which 2,300 were military planes in 1948 and 7,670 civilian. In 1947 military plane output was 2,102 and civilian, 15,605.

Anthracite: 53,250,000 tons produced in 1948, against 54,176,000 in 1947.

Automobile: 1948 production of cars and trucks a record of 5,250,000 in U. S., plus 263,000 units in Canada, for an over-all total of 5,513,000 cars and trucks against 5,045,835 in 1947.

Bank clearings: 1948 estimated total $711,500,000,000 against $667,603,000,000 in 1947.

Bituminous coal: 1948 estimated output 585,000,000 tons, against 563,000,000 in 1947.

Cigarettes: Estimated 1948 volume 353,795,505,746 units, up approximately 12,000,000,000 from 1947.

Commodity prices: United Press-Dun & Bradstreet Index (1930-32 equals 100) hit record high at 308.82 on January 16 and dropped to a low of 269.45 on November 1, compared with 1947 close of 304.62. The 1948 close was slightly above the low for the year.

Commercial, industrial, agriculture, and consumer loans: Reached a record high on November 15 of $15,583,000,000.

Construction: 1948 total of $18,750,000,000, up 5 percent from the 1947 level of $17,800,000,000.

Currency circulation: Dropped to around $28,000,000,000 from $29,111,000,000 in 1947. The all-time high was $29,163,000,000 in 1946.

Dividend payments: Record $6,000,000,000 against $5,338,000,000 in 1947. In 1929 the total was $5,823,000,000.

Electricity: Production f 1948 estimated at a record high of 336,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours against 307,000,000,000 in 1947.

Employment: Reached a record high of 61,615,000 in July 1948, before declining to 59,400,000 at end of year.

Failures: 5,161 in 1948 against 3,476 in 1947.

Food index: Dun & Bradstreet wholesale index of 31 foods touched record high on July 13, 1948, at $7.36 but declined sharply as year waned, falling below $6.50. The 1947 close was $7.24.

Foreign trade: 1948 exports $17,400,000,000 and imports $10,000,000,000 against $19,600,000,000 and $8,300,000,000, respectively, in 1947.

Gasoline: Production in 1948 estimated at 890,165,000 barrels, against 814,841,000 in 1947.

Gold: Stocks at year-end exceed $24,000,000,000, record high, compared with $22,764,000,000 at the end of 1947.

Insurance: Ordinary life insurance in force at end of 1948 was a record $130,400,000,000, against $123,021,705,000 in 1947.

Inventories: $46,443,000,000 at end of 1948, against $53,491,000,000 at close of 1947.

Labor: Estimated 2,000,000 workers involved in 3,200 strikes that lost 34,000,000 man-days. Record was 116,000,000 man-days lost by 4,600,000 workers involved in 4,895 strikes in 1946.

Lumber: Production 38,000,000,000 board feet in 1948, up 5 percent over 1947.

Petroleum: Production in 1948 rose to 2,017,274,000 barrels from 1,856,107,000 in 1947.

Railroads: Net profit in 1948 was $694,800,000; carloadings, an estimated 43,000,000, against 44,503,000 in 1947.

Retail trade: A record in 1948 at $130,000,000,000, against $118,500,000,000 in 1947.

Shoes: Production for 1948 approximately 468,000,000 pairs, against about the same output in 1947.

Steel: Production in 1948 a peacetime record 88,300,000 tons, against 84,894,071 in 1947. Wartime peak in 1944 was 89,641,600 tons.

Wholesale trade: An estimated $98,000,000,000, against $87,646,000,000 in 1947.

GI Housing Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Advertiser, Huntington, W. Va., of January 22, 1949, one of the leading newspapers of my State. I have discussed this

bill—H. R. 841—with national representatives of the largest veterans' organizations of this country, and they enthusiastically approve it. I feel sure that this House is vitally interested in improving housing conditions generally and in particular for veterans. Having worked for a number of years with these younger veterans and having been called upon to give them advice in regard to their problems, I have personal knowledge of the need for improvement in their housing. I have discussed with them domestic difficulties arising out of their forced sharing of quarters with other families. I hope that this bill will bring about better domestic tranquility.

The editorial follows:

GI HOUSING PLAN

H. R. 841, a bill introduced the first day of the Eighty-first Congress, by Representative E. H. HEDRICK, of West Virginia's Sixth District, incorporates what has come to be known as the West Virginia plan to expedite housing for war veterans.

This plan received the endorsement of the American Legion in its national convention in New York in August 1947 and the West Virginia Bankers Association meeting in Wheeling, October 26, 1947.

Briefly, it puts loans guaranteed by the Federal Government for housing for GI's on a par with loans the Government guarantees under the FHA plan. It provides the same maturity period and the same rate of interest now provided for FHA loans. The West Virginia plan also provides a guarantee of 100 percent of the loan as is the case with an FHA loan.

The GI loan at present is handicapped by the smaller percentage of the loan the Government guarantees, compared to an FHA loan, also a lower rate of interest allowable. Obviously, FHA loan carries a greater appeal to lenders. It sells easily and quickly, whereas many GI loans go begging.

Already in operation in a number of States the West Virginia plan has worked satisfactorily. In justice to our veterans, for whom we have done a shabby job of housing, Mr. HEDRICK's bill should be enacted and the loan paper of the GI's put on an equality with FHA commitments of the Government.

Communist Tyranny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following radio address by Reuben H. Markham, member of the editorial staff of the Christian Science Monitor, recently broadcast over radio station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., as one of a series of such speeches sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

As I speak to you now, memories of the Christmas season press upon me. And I am sure they press upon you, too.

Undoubtedly you have had pleasant experiences—you have been happy to be with your families, to share greetings with old friends, to hear the beautiful Christmas message.

And I am sure that many of you also have been very sad. You were made sad by thoughts of eastern Europe, of Poland, and of other countries there. You felt sad as you looked beyond the soft glitter of Christmas trees and the benign glow of church lights to the black cloud of tyranny that has settled upon a large part of the earth.

And I know, ladies and gentlemen, that the expressions black cloud and tyranny are not mere words to you. I am certain you have friends and relatives across the sea who are personally suffering from this tyranny. During recent months you have undoubtedly received letters from them or heard personal reports regarding them, or at least read articles describing the regimes under which they live.

You know personally that this was the saddest Christmas which many of them ever experienced. Indeed, it was one of the saddest Christmases in modern European history.

I know that personally. I have many friends over there especially in southeast Europe. Though born in the State of Kansas, I have spent most of my adult life in Europe. Consequently many people there are almost as close to me as my own family. I often receive letters or reports bringing me intimate news about them. I got many such reports during the Christmas season. And here is one of the things I learned:

A very dear friend of mine with his wife and two children were arrested by the Communist police during December and sent into exile. I know about this tragedy as intimately as though it had happened to the family with four little girls that lives next door to me in Boston.

Police came to the home of my Balkan friends on a recent cold morning and ordered them to leave town forever. They were given time to pack a few clothes and gather a number of meager belongings, after which they were taken away under police escort to a distant wretched village.

They have no jobs, no money, no source of income, no place to live, almost no hope. They are as Hagar who was sent into the wilderness to perish. They have been marked for destruction. A so-called people's government is liquidating them. Such is the system.

I could tell you of another friend of mine in another city whom I have known since his childhood. He is now the father of three small children. Though within 10 miles of a mine they have no coal in the house and no prospects of getting any. They haven't had butter or cheese or meat or lard for many, many months. They live largely on corn bread, though in an agricultural land.

Their property has been stolen by the Communists. Their clothes are in patches and no more are available. Their shoes are worn out. There is not an overcoat left in the family. The regime is slowly extirpating them.

These condemned friends of mine have taken no part in politics, they are free from every crime or misdemeanor. Their only fault is that they are not Communists. They believe in democracy. They have a high regard for the American way of life, therefore they are being murdered—father, mother, and little children.

They typify eastern Europe. They are victims of a system of Bolshevik tyranny that is oppressing 100,000,000 men and women who 10 years ago were free.

A gigantic conspiracy is directed against them all. A small network of plotters centering about the Kremlin is deliberately wiping out my friends along with hundreds of thousands of others. These conspirators are robbing scores of millions more and planning to bring them all into a state of bondage.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am solemnly telling you of things about which I know personally. I can vouch for what I say with just as much assurance as you could tell me of the postman bringing Christmas mail to your doors.

The year 1949 will be the saddest that Europe has seen for centuries. All churches in the Communist-ruled lands there are being terrorized, reduced to base subservience, or closed. Protestant, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Eastern Orthodox clergymen who were personal friends of mine passed this Christmas season in prison. As you rejoiced about your well-lighted trees, they sat in cold, dark cells. In Romania, a whole Christian denomination, as large, for example, as the Congregational Church in the United States, was wiped out; its property was confiscated. And all by a simple Communist decree.

As you know, the head of the largest church in Hungary, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty has been arrested by Communist dictators and this moment is in jail. Also in jail near him is the head of the Lutheran Church in Hungary. All Sunday schools and religious youth organizations have been liquidated in a number of countries. Practically every religious publication in central and southeast Europe that has not been stopped is under strict Communist control. All clergymen in those countries which do not actively serve the regime are in danger of arrest. Church-supported schools in most of those lands have been liquidated.

I must also add, ladies and gentlemen, that minorities in most of those countries are being more bitterly repressed than for many decades. Security laws have been decreed which threaten dire punishment to anyone who would so much as report how many sandals were being made at a shoe factory or how many potatoes are shipped on the railroad.

In addition to all this, Communist governments there have announced that during 1949 they are going to destroy the independent peasants, take away land from scores of millions of others, and force them all into cooperative farms resembling medieval feudalism.

Every kind of thought expression through schools or papers or books or meetings is being more rigidly controlled than at any time for centuries.

Such are some of the aspects of the new year which is beginning in eastern Europe.

However, ladies and gentlemen, there are also reasons for hopefulness. I can sincerely assure you that there is good news. It is that men and women throughout the whole world are awakening, especially in America, the last great fortress of freedom and the last great source of light.

Our mighty Nation is being aroused. It has begun to see what Communist tyranny means. American Christians in every State and in every church are renewing their faith and devotion.

Workers are throwing out Communist leaders. Teachers are receiving a new vision of what freedom means. American youth in many places are rejecting totalitarian aberrations.

The American press throughout the whole country is displaying a higher devotion to the ideals that keep men free. American women's organizations, service clubs, the whole vast network of societies that covers our country are laying aside complacency; they are boldly studying ways to do their duty in the present mighty struggle.

America, the mightiest nation in the world, is visibly reconsecrating itself to government of the people, by the people, for the people. I assure you, American friends, that we are receiving a new baptism of freedom.

As we enter the most momentous year in our history I take the liberty of urging you all to renew your faith, to increase your de-

votion, to make every sacrifice for the preservation of the heritage which we have received. I feel certain if we all do this, we shall not only preserve our own light but shall rekindle lights that have gone out in parts of the world, very dear to us all.

State Control of the National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1949, Alderman L. O. Moseley, of the City Council of the City of Atlanta, introduced a resolution declaring the opposition of the mayor and the General Council of the City of Atlanta to federalization of the National Guard of this country which would remove the same from the control of the States. This resolution was adopted by the general council and approved by the mayor of the city of Atlanta on January 19, 1949. It presents facts and statements which I am sure will be of much interest to the Members of Congress, and under leave previously granted, I am inserting this resolution herewith for the information of Members:

Whereas the National Guard is a constitutional organization authorized and provided by the Constitution of the United States to protect and serve the States of the Nation during times of peace under direction of their respective commanders in chief, being the governors of the various States and Territories of the United States; and

Whereas the National Guard of the State of Georgia has long been an outstanding well organized and trained component of the armed forces of the United States and has rendered the State of Georgia and many cities thereof much-needed and valuable service in time of trouble and disaster; and

Whereas the various local units of the National Guard are manned and commanded by capable and competent local personnel of the many communities in which National Guard units are authorized and activated throughout the State of Georgia providing much desired training and equipment in the interest of national defense and security of the State of Georgia; and

Whereas the National Guard of Georgia has a long and interesting record of service and accomplishments for which the citizens and members thereof are proud. The States and the guard have given the Nation a great force in being. The country may be assured that the guard of today, if properly equipped and supported, will give in peace and war the same great service which the guard of World War I and World War II rendered; and

Whereas it has come to the attention of the mayor and General Council of the City of Atlanta that an effort is being made to federalize the National Guard thereby taking away States' rights and privilege to maintain the same as in the past; and

Whereas we do hereby oppose the federalization of the National Guard which would remove the same from control of the States: Therefore, the premises being considered, be it

Resolved by the mayor and General Council of the City of Atlanta, That the Senators and Congressmen in the United States Senate and Congress representing this district be furnished a copy hereof by the clerk of council and that they be used to oppose any legislation in the United States Congress that would federalize the National Guard of the United States, more particularly, the National Guard of the State of Georgia.

Approved by the mayor, January 19, 1949.

CHAS. M. FORD, Jr.,
Clerk of Council.

The Year 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of January 3, 1949.

THE YEAR 1949

The year 1949 is now under way. It is bound to be an important, perhaps a decisive, year in determining the future of the American people.

We are in the one hundred and seventy-third year since American independence was declared, the one hundred and sixtieth year since the American Republic was created by the Constitution, the eighty-fourth year since the Civil War made us one Nation rather than a cluster of States, and the twentieth year since the world-wide depression shook the American people's faith in their basic institutions.

A great deal of American history focuses on the next hundred-day period.

THE ISSUES

Our National Government is coming to grips with incredibly important issues. What we do about them, especially in the early stages of the present session of Congress, will have inconceivably great bearing on the lives, prosperity, opportunities, happiness, and liberty of many generations to come.

Three major issues are at the critical stage. Whereas in the past we have had freedom of choice, we have had a chance to correct mistakes after they have been made, henceforward we stand to be bound by our course, with no second-guessing possible. Any turning-back time is about over.

These three great issues revolve around the following:

A. Inflation.
B. The future of the cold war.
C. Free government.

If we are to conquer inflation before it conquers us, certainly now is the time to do so. The build-up is for one more round of pump-priming before we become realistic about inflation.

Just as definitely as one can commit himself to a policy without calling it by name, President Truman has committed himself to continued inflation as the basis of his forthcoming administration.

He has promised bigger Government spending, higher taxes, larger subsidies, increased wages, and controls which will merely accelerate the speed of the inflationary cycle.

He emphatically has not promised to stabilize our watered currency, to protect Government credit, to discourage the top-heavy growth of private credit, to end the fantastic waste of Government spending, or to do anything else which would strike at the roots of inflation.

One more dose of pump priming and we will be fully committed to the boom-and-bust credit and currency inflationary cycle which has wrecked so many nations in the past.

COMMUNISM

Inflation has greatly accelerated by the cold-war maneuvers which the Truman government has been conducting in foreign fields. The cost of these has been growing by leaps and bounds; they have risen to somewhere between a third and a half of Uncle Sam's spending.

What have we to show for them? Peace is further off than ever. We have established no meeting point with Russian ideology. Our European allies frankly admit they are going along with us solely for what they get out of it. Virtually all of our spending on the European Continent is to build up socialistic governments which are followers of concepts essentially hostile to our own—concepts identical with those which created the dictatorships of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

In the Pacific area Russia appears about ready to pick up and walk off with the biggest single piece of booty in the world—the vast nation of China, with its millions of population, its incalculable natural resources, and its dominant position at the crossroads of two oceans.

The Truman administration, which lost the peace, is now steadily losing the cold war, yet it proposes to continue this war as a sort of rear-guard action and thereby risk losing also the home-front war against inflation.

The Truman administration has been losing another war, this in the field of ideology; it has been losing the war against communistic infiltration, spying, propaganda, and sabotage within our National Government. The Red fifth columnists at Washington are in their strongest position yet as a result of the Truman reelection.

FREE GOVERNMENT

This Nation was created as a representative republic. That is the one form of government which has consistently kept its citizenry free—so long as they have vigilantly guarded their liberties.

The essence of our Government is the existence of three independent branches, each with its own powers and its own duties. These three branches are executive, legislative, and judicial.

The manner in which republics in the past have broken down, and drifted into dictatorship, has been generally the same; a strong executive branch would seize the powers of the other two branches. This already has happened in this Nation with regard to the judicial branch. The Federal judiciary and the United States Department of Justice now has been packed with political partisans who openly decline to stand up for the constitutional rights of the American citizens, as opposed to the wishes of the executive branch.

Constitutional guaranties becomes a joke when those who should enforce them either voluntarily or involuntarily become unable to do so, and thus give the Government dictatorial power over the citizen.

Mr. Truman is the first President in American history to be elected on the proposition that Congress should be stripped of its law-making and tax-assessing powers; and that it should be what Hitler made of the Reichstag (before he abolished it entirely) a body with no functions other than to approve whatever the chief executive recommends.

Congress was created by the Constitution as the people's own branch of the Government—superior even to the President, in a show-down; since Congress has power to impeach and remove a President, whereas a President cannot under ordinary circumstances even adjourn Congress, let alone abolish it or remove it from office.

If Congress is defeated in its fight to uphold its constitutional powers, or if it voluntarily surrenders, then this Nation will no longer be a representative republic—regardless of whatever the Constitution may say on the subject.

More to the point, the American people will thereupon have lost the one agency through which they can ever hope to keep control of their National Government—their representatives in Congress. Popular sovereignty will be dead, and with it, of course, free government.

WHERE DO YOU STAND?

It is appalling that the American people seem to be unaware or indifferent to the dangers in the present situation.

Their government is flirting with bankruptcy. It is gambling with atomic warfare that could wreck civilization. It is steadily whittling down both the liberties and the future of the American citizens. Yet everywhere "business as usual" is the watchword, "take it easy" is the slogan.

The two greatest political prizes of all times are the national credit of the United States and the industrial plants built by private ownership in this Nation. There is no constitutional limit on the amount which can be borrowed against public credit by whatever band of political plunderers gets in power in Washington. Already political adventurers have borrowed on public credit far more than the total of all American assets—and spent the bulk of it to stay in power.

The next target here is the one now under fire in England—the looting of private industry to satisfy political greed.

The present generation inherited what its predecessors had built up—a system of free government, a national economy that was both strongest and largest in all the world, and the biggest, most generous industrial structure ever put together.

All these three American institutions are being raided and destroyed before the American people's eyes. Their inheritance is being squandered. Within their lifetimes, what is happening to them was done to the Germans by Hitler, to the Italians by Mussolini, to the Russians by Stalin, and is being done at this moment to the Britons by their Labor-Socialist government.

Yet with all these examples under their noses, thus far there has come no mass protest from the American people against being herded down the dark alley of socialism.

Principle or Expediency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, whether we here in America shall retain a form of government which has given the individual the greatest degree of liberty, of prosperity and happiness known to any people at any time or anywhere, made the Nation the richest, most powerful of any known to history, depends upon whether the individual citizen and those who are in a position to speak the truth have the courage to make known the facts, preach adherence to our constitutional form of government. While we are spending billions of dollars and dissipating our natural resources to fight communism abroad, we have been coddling it here at home. While we fight communism abroad, we furnish the money to maintain a socialistic government in England—and that is the next thing to communism—and swallow, without inspection, socialistic ideas which ignore the principles, disregard the processes, which have given our citizens prosperity and happiness, guaranteed our national security.

We have been so blessed that we have come to assume that no matter what we do, how foolish, how extravagant, how indolent we become, we cannot lose our precious heritage but "pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." "Pride and weakness are Siamese twins." It is always earier to follow the broad and easy way than to follow the hard and rocky road but human experience has demonstrated the truth of St. Matthew's statement that "wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."

Today the easy way to popular approval is to ignore truth, principle, natural laws—to disregard the warning to "beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

Work, thrift, frugality are old-fashioned we are told and the Government, State or Federal, can give to us without cost, the things our forefathers were accustomed to earn for themselves.

This country today needs more individuals, more editors in the little weekly and daily papers, scattered throughout the country, who have the mental integrity to recognize and the courage to condemn false doctrines which in the end can but destroy the liberty of the citizen, the security of the Nation.

There are many such editors in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan and from the Editors' Notebook of the January 13, 1949, issue of the Allegan Gazette, let me quote an editorial written by Leo W. Hoffman whose integrity of thought and courage, I take pleasure in commending:

THE GAZETTE STANDS UP TO BE COUNTED

In his message to Congress last Wednesday Truman fufilled the direst predictions of last Monday's Gazette.

He demands $4,000,000,000 more in taxes to launch his plan to eventually put every man, woman, and child on the dole. He states that the increased levies should be aimed at business and the middle class, and in the same breath pleads with business to expand and increase its capital investment. He asks Congress for "stand-by control," in brief, he wants the power of a dictator over our economic life.

He calls his program a redeal and confidently expects that Congress will again become a rubber stamp.

Already people are beginning to compare him with his predecessor, but there is a difference. Never during Roosevelt's tenure in office did he ever propose such legislation to Congress without first excusing himself on the ground that it was necessary because of an emergency. After 18 years of teaching the people of this country to become dependent upon Government subsidies, and doles, Truman no longer feels that it is necessary to save his face by any such pretext. The dole system operates as a drug. At first the recipient is a little ashamed and must have an excuse, but after a time he accepts it as a matter of course, and in fact cannot live without it. Now that many of us have become dependent upon Government charity, some because they are shiftless, others because of misfortune, and still others because, under the present tax system, they cannot save against adversity, it is much easier to convince the people that they have a right to Government charity.

You can call it by any fancy name you choose, but it's dole and socialism, and every time you get a dollar from the Government you give up to the Government some of your freedom and independence and, what is worse, you force others who wish to remain independent to become dependent because it is so much of his money you are taking from him.

If the ordinary average citizen could save his income tax against the future he would in the end be further ahead, both financially and spiritually. But the Government no longer will permit the free, independent citizen to handle his own money. They take an ever-increasing part away from him and throw it into a common pot. Out of that common pot the State first pays the vast horde of Government parasites who handle our money and then with what is left and what the State must borrow they pay the subsidies and doles.

If the Democrats, both in Congress and in this State, put into effect the program proposed by Truman and copied by Williams, we will have become a socialistic country.

So that all may know where we stand we add that this is a reactionary, conservative Republican paper. We will henceforth regard any renegade Republican called liberal by his fellow Democratic New Dealers as betraying his trust. We add that any attempt on the part of so-called Republicans to effect any kind of a bipartisan policy as repudiation of his oath of office and will treat him as a renegade.

The people that believe in this policy of tax, spend, and give, remind us of the village idiot who, for 20 years, polished the cannon in the village square.

Each Saturday he would meet with the council and collect his pay. Finally he handed in his resignation and when asked why, told the council that he had saved his money and was going into business for himself. When one inquisitive councilman asked him what he was going to do, he replied: "Gentlemen, I am going to buy my own cannon."

We are due for a vicious fight in this country and the time has come to stand up and be counted.

Are you for our constitutional form of government or are you for socialism?

L. W. H.

The boy is practicing his profession, but for some—to me—unknown reason, is disposed to speak his mind; hence, the above.

German Giant Revived—Report on Ruhr Industrial Gains Gives United States Opportunity To Recast Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 20, 1949:

GERMAN GIANT REVIVED—REPORT ON RUHR INDUSTRIAL GAINS GIVES UNITED STATES OPPORTUNITY TO RECAST POLICY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The German industrial giant, meaning the Ruhr, is alive and kicking again. Production is back to three-quarters of what it was before the war when it was the arsenal of Nazi aggression. Some German industrial figures and interests identified with the Nazi war program are back in places of influence and intrigue.

New dispatches relating all this and more, based on first-hand surveys by American correspondents in Germany, come simultaneously with new pressure on President Truman to take a second look at the revived German giant.

The pattern of restored German dominance in Western Europe may be too well fixed already so that nothing can be done now but watch it closely and control it. Control of it now is in a figurative handful of American and British officials and entirely inadequate, according to the consensus of on-the-scene reports, both press and private. This control is to be transferred eventually to the new international Ruhr Authority recently authorized. It will have a formidable task.

FORESEEN BY DEVELOPMENTS

What has happened may have been foreseen from successive developments, beginning immediately after the war with the setting up of technical committees to plan for Germany. Those were infiltrated with representative of big American finance and industry whose connections with prewar German industry and finance were spelled out at the time. Their influence continued in the organization that was transposed to Germany. Some had little apparent sympathy with our Government's policy of breaking up the German cartels, one of our pledged war aims, and that has virtually been abandoned.

Big business influence has continued in development of ECA plans for Germany. A striking example was in the commission appointed by Paul G. Hoffman, ECA administrator, to investigate the reparations problem. Represented on that are interests that were formerly involved in the German economy.

The chairman is George Humphrey, president, Mark Hanna Co. of Cleveland, which has connections with the heavy steel and machine tool industry in the United States. The other members are Charles E. Wilson, president, General Motors, which owned the Auto Opel Works in Germany; John L. McCaffrey, president, International Harvester, which also has a large subsidiary in Germany; G. A. Price, vice president, Westinghouse Electric, which had tie-ups with German concerns, and Frederick V. Geier, director of Proctor & Gamble.

The Commission's report, submitted to the State Department, was awaiting action from Under Secretary Robert A. Lovett when he resigned recently. It recommends removal from the reparations list of still more steel plants and restoring them for production to Germany, which would still further expand Germany's steel capacity. The level already has been lifted from 10,000,000 to 14,000,000 tons. Now it is being proposed to lift the ceiling entirely.

OFFERS POLICY OPPORTUNITY

The Humphrey report offers President Truman an opportunity to denote a new direction on German policy. Though not a great many plants proportionately are involved, he is being urged to reject it. Both Britain and France are growing anxious about the scope of German rebuilding, which is of concern to them, both from the standpoint of defense and economically in their own struggles for recovery.

This would seem to be a good time, before it is too late, to review and, if necessary, recast our German policy so that a program to make Germany self-sufficient and helpful to the general European economy does not run wild into something dangerous. Advocates of a "strong Germany," who have been most effective, have been assisted by other developments that also have conveniently diverted public attention.

Foremost, of course, is Russia. Her tactics have given ammunition to those who would rebuild Germany as a bulwark against Russia, as was done after World War I, but with no guarantee that a revived Germany will be on the side of the western powers, her traditional enemies. A diverting factor is the argument that building up Germany "will take her off the American taxpayer's back" which sounds fine until you consider what the American taxpayer might get on his back in exchange, a restored Germany again ready for war. Also the squabbling among the war allies has been capitalized cleverly by Germany to play them off against each other to her gain.

Menace of Communism in China to Freedom and to Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, those who set out years ago to destroy the Government of China and bring that great section of the world and of humanity under the Kremlin's control are encouraging continuation of the myth that Chinese Communists are interested primarily in land, peace, and food for the downtrodden, are merely democratic heroes struggling for freedom for all, not anti-religious, in fact not really Communists.

This fantastic myth, this opiate which has lulled so many Americans to sleep, is exposed as the dangerous falsehood it is in the following authoritative address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston, given on January 9, 1949, at the communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of St. Brigid's Parish, South Boston:

I think it appropriate to select this time and place to direct your thoughts to the Far East and to beg your prayers for China. There is something very strange about the general moral paralysis and ominous silence in the fact of what is happening in China. The apparent moral paralysis is preventing any effective action in behalf of the free Chinese people and their legitimate Government. The ominous silence bids fair to prevent public discussion of one of the most cynical, sinister, and dangerous developments in the march of Red imperialism across the prostrate forms of liberty-loving nations. Both the moral paralysis and the disturbing silence about what is happening in China flow from a dangerous form of defeatism, a defeatism on the part of our leadership which will cost China dearly in the next few months and for which America herself will have to pay an appalling price both at home and abroad before the final chapter of Red fascism has been written.

I think I should take a little of your time this morning to talk to you about China. I am not speaking for any particular Chinese regime so long as it be truly Chinese. I am not pleading for any particular Chinese leader so long as he be genuinely acceptable to free Chinese. In one sense, in speaking up for China as against the Red Fascist Imperialists, I am not speaking for China alone; I am speaking for free people everywhere and I am speaking for America.

It must be perfectly clear by now that the destruction of freedom and the overriding of decency in any part of the world are simply the preludes to like crimes on a universal scale. Twenty years ago some of the people who are now keeping silent about China professed to understand that perfectly well in the case of Europe. Some of the people who are now keeping silent about Yugoslavia and Poland and Lithuania and Hungary 10 years ago were very clear that when the bell tolls because of the murder of freedom anywhere it is sounding the death knell of freedow everywhere. The world has become so compact, so close-knit, so much "one world" that an explosion of anarchy in one corner of the globe today sets off a chain reaction which speedily brings anarchy to every corner of the world tomorrow. Yesterday it was eastern Europe and everyone said Red fascism will end there. Today it is China and everyone says: "Sit tight. Don't get excited. Wait and see. Red fascism may overrun China but it can never beat China down." Tomorrow it may be here.

You and I still do not know to what extent it already is here. We still do not know to what extent Red fascism has entrenched itself in government bureaus, in channels of popular education and information, in front organizations of one kind and another throughout the United States. The very little we do know is more than enough to put sober men on the alert and to arouse their righteous indignation against all qualified loyalty and obscure conduct in posts of public trust. The little we do know about what has been going on right here at home makes us even more uneasy about what is happening abroad—and about the inaction and silence concerning China.

There are several reasons why I should speak to you about China here at this particular meeting. First of all, as I have said, you and I are citizens of a free nation and in a world where evil travels so quickly and corrupts so totally, when we hear that freedom is under fire anywhere we should lift up our voices the minute we hear it and begin the battle against it at the very spot on which we find ourselves. When Red fascism gains a point in Budapest we should build another rampart against it in Boston. When Red Fascists defame a man in Zagreb his name should be proclaimed and his virtues honored in every city and town of free nations wherever they may be. When Red Fascists are on the march along the shores of the China Sea, Massachusetts Bay and all our communities the menaced.

You and I should think about China this morning because we are Catholic Christians, met for purposes of worship, meditation, and the preservation of the Kingdom of God on earth. That kingdom is under attack in China and Catholic Christians will be among the first victims of a Red Fascist victory over free China. I don't know whether you realize how many Catholic Christians there are in China. Perhaps I can put it to you this way: There are more Catholics in China than there are in Ireland. Moreover, over and above the four and one-half million Catholic Chinese there are several million other Chinese Christians. In the total population of China, these may not seem like many, but they are a valiant people

and they occupy a place of no little prestige in Chinese life and affairs. The Chinese constitution, a remarkable document of authentic democracy was adopted a very few years ago on Christmas day in part, at least, as a tribute to the ideals of the Prince of Peace. I need not tell you what will happen to that constitution or to those ideals if and when the Red Fascists achieve their murderous designs on both. Faith and freedom in China will be martyred together when the commissars of Red fascism take over.

As Catholic Christians you have an obligation to know what your interests in China are. The church there is your church. The faith which it professes is the faith which you profess. Its sacraments are the sacraments which you received this morning. Its cardinal archbishop is a member of the Sacred College which elects your Pope. Many of you saw him when he came to Boston as a cardinal 2 years ago. Its other archbishops, bishops, and priests are in one sense as fully your fathers in Christ as are the priests and prelates of the church in America. Its schools and colleges are staffed by the same religious who teach your children, who preach missions in your parishes, who serve the church in your community. The great Catholic University of Peking, threatened with extinction if the Reds gain the day, was established by American Benedictines, just such men as teach at Saint Anselm's here at home; in later years it has been staffed by the Fathers of the Divine Word whose retreat house and seminary at Miramar, here in the Archdiocese of Boston, are so well known to you all. Hospitals, orphanages, schools, social centers of every kind, as well as places of worship, are staffed and served by nuns like those whom you know and love here in Boston. I shall mention only the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, adorers at our Eucharistic Shrine of St. Clement's in the Back Bay, religious beloved by the Chinese people wherever the Sisters have had foundations in free China.

You have a right to know what is happening to your religion in China. You have a right to know what is being done in its behalf. As a matter of fact, you have a special right to ask me particularly to lift my voice against the rape of China by Red fascism and the abandonment of China by the free nations of the world. I happen to have sent some of your sons and daughters and many of your neighbors to China and like places to work for your church. During a quarter century I have taken from you and from others in the archdiocese of Boston, but particularly from people like yourselves, literally millions of dollars—millions of American dollars—given in Christian charity in behalf of Catholic works in China. If I kept silent about the destruction of those works, if I fell victim to the general shivering and fear in the face of the enemies of those works, if I failed to speak up for you in protest against the treatment of your missionaries and of the good people among whom they are working—you would have every right to ask me by what title I presume to recruit your sons and daughters and friends, by what title I ask the support of your money and prayers. By what title, you might ask me, if I do not think enough of them to cry out in their defense when everything for which they stand is being desecrated by the Red Fascists in China today.

So, I owe it to you to speak to you about China and to speak up for China before you. I have a missionary's love for China. I have never been there but I can say without undue pride that I have had a lot to do with others going there and with much of the good done there. Over many Chinese altars chalices are raised which you helped me pay for, as you also helped pay for the altars themselves and the churches in which they are found and the education of the priests who pray at them. I have a missionary's love for China. Every now and again this season you hear over the radio or hear the youngsters singing a popular song which is called Far Away Places. It's a simple little ballad about the romance and the fascination of distant places; about the appeal of China or maybe Siam to the imaginations of dreamers and of all whose fancy turns to far-away places. Well, you and I have had a missionary love for far-away places for as long as we have known one another and we have sacrificed for years to make our dreams for the far-away places come true.

China has always had a top place in our missionary dreams and in the love of our missionary hearts. When we were youngsters in school our first little sacrifices for the propagation of the faith were placed in mite boxes by means of which we hoped to save up our pennies to ransom Chinese babies. That was the earliest form of our love for China. Then as we grew older we learned a little bit about the Christian history of China and that made us aspire even more for her conversion to Catholicism and for her entrance into the world order of Christendom. Some of us perhaps became fascinated by examples of Chinese Christian art that came to the States in the last decade or two. Others thought they saw a kind of kinship of character between the Chinese people and the Irish temperaments which we share. I remember that when Cardinal Tien officiated in the cathedral a number of people were struck with resemblances of temperamental and other kinds which brought back Irish and Irish-American associations.

In any case, with a missionary's love for China as somehow the most promising of far away places for the propagation of the faith, we all rejoiced when the church in China reached its maturity by producing its own hierarchy, its own cardinal, its own universities, its own hospitals. Now that it is producing its own martyrs, I think we should speak up for them. Now that the seeds we helped plant, the tender vines we helped nourish, are threatened with being uprooted and violently destroyed by Red fascism, I think that, both as Catholics and as Americans, we should lift our voices and cry out in protest—demanding clear commitments, honest reports, and realistic action with regard to faith and freedom in China.

Our people are constantly being asked to suffer privations and pour forth their best blood for threats to other people's freedom. I have never known them to refuse a just cause. Our people are entitled to know whether it is really true that nothing can be done for faith and freedom in a land which means so much to them. They are entitled to know why everyone is so silent about the spread of despotism in China. Christian missions will be among the worst casualties of the collapse of China under Red Fascist aggression. If the Red Fascists presume to violate conscience and run roughshod over Christian values as they do in old Catholic nations like Croatia, Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, and the Ukraine, what control on their cruelty or brake on their brutality can you expect in China where Christianity is young and relatively defenseless?

If I had come here this morning to provoke your wrath or to upset your emotions, I could stand here all day and enrage you with accounts of what they have already done to our nuns, our priests, and our brothers and sisters in the faith wherever the Red Fascists have taken over China. I could tell you of a priest, personally known to close friends of mine, one of the most beloved teachers in a Chinese school. I could relate to you how the Red Fascists made him kneel in the mud between two of their soldiers in front of the school which he had served for years, and caused all his pupils, children who venerate him as their father in Christ, to file behind him requiring each, under threat of torture, to beat him with rods. I could tell you of the cynical way that the Red Fascist designs on religion work out in China elsewhere. I could report to you the recently revealed secret instructions for the total elimination of religion from Chinese life and I could document the things that have already been done toward the fulfillment of those instructions.

But such is not my purpose. My purpose is simply to lift my voice here this morning for China, not for any particular political party or for any particular political leader, but for an honest policy on the part of free nations toward free China, an honest policy which will encourage China in her resistance against any Communist encroachments on the independence of her Government. An honest policy will be based on a realistic recognition that any compromise with Communists amounts to actual defeat by communism; any coalition with Communists, the world now has learned the hard way, is a compact with death. Wherever you find a Communist in a free nation you find a spy and wherever you have a spy you have a traitor. We cannot ask with straight faces that any nation invite known traitors and avowed spies into their government as the price of retaining the loyalty and the support of their friends.

An honest policy toward China should be the more easy in view of the fact that there are still no final reasons why our policy should be devious, defeatist, or half-hearted. Only the friends of the Red Fascists want us to believe that a free China is no longer possible. Three-fourths of China, outside of Manchuria, is still in the hands of free China. Badgered and embarrassed as the present Chinese Government may be, it is the same government that our leaders were told would collapse first in 1937, then in 1942, and again in 1944. The prophets of disaster proved mistaken or malicious then. What better reason have we to believe them now?

Before we accept the prophecies concerning China uttered by those who befriend or who fear Red fascism, we had best understand what America stands to lose the day that China loses her freedom. The simple fact is that we shall lose the friendship of the heartland of Asia if we let Chinese freedom go by default. The further fact is that it would be much cheaper to prevent the enslavement of China than it will ever be to liberate China enslaved. A final fact is that western democracies, both Anglo-Saxon and American, have not so many friends left in Asia that we can afford to walk out on the Chinese and give them and their children and their children's children any reason to attach to our Nation that name of "perfidious" which has made it so difficult for other nations to make and to keep friends in their hour of need. So long as Red fascism is a fact in the sixth of the globe directly subject to the Soviet, America cannot afford to throw away friends in Asia by leaving the Chinese naked to their enemies and abandoned to ours.

So pray for China and pray for our own leaders that God may enlighten and strengthen them. Our leaders are good men. Like all of us they sometimes make mistakes. Like all of us they are sometimes betrayed by people whom they trust—but it is becoming more easy now to spot the traitors and to remove trust from them. Like all of us our leaders need prayer. Pray for them every day, and, during this present crisis, when you pray for them include a prayer that they may devise a means of helping China. Pray for the venerable church brutally persecuted in Hungary and eastern Europe. But don't forget to pray for the infant church whose life is threatened in China and elsewhere in

Asia. That is my first recommendation: Pray.

Next, don't believe the lies about China of certain liberals and other friends of Red fascism. When you are told propaganda stories about the political or other leaders of free China, remember that these stories may be true but that for the moment free China should be given the benefit of every possible doubt. It is by creating confusion and spreading doubts by half-truth and whole lies that the Red Fascists justify their excesses. They have justified for years their total enslavement of religion in Russia by repeating regularly to the unthinking a specious argument that the orthodox church under the Czars was corrupt. They have justified the total destruction of national cultures in eastern Europe by exploiting for the sake of uninformed distorted stories of class conflicts within those cultures. You are all familiar with the technique by which they are bewildering the world as they bludgeon religion in Hungary. Don't let them fool you about China.

Finally, take a lesson for America from the things that are happening in China. That lesson is not difficult to learn. I have already mentioned it this morning. Never allow any argument about civil liberties or freedom of speech to make you an accomplice in the destruction of all liberty and of every freedom. Never allow alleged reasons of democracy to make you accept in silence the appointment of Communists or Communist sympathizers to posts where they will be protected by democracy in their unrelenting war against democracy. Every Communist is a spy and every spy a traitor. Applaud the efforts of men in public and private life to spot spies or sympathizers with systems alien to ours. In that way you will be doing a great service to both faith and freedom. These two ideas are bound up one with another. These two ideas are very close to your hearts both as Catholics and as Americans. Pray that they will survive their test in China. Work so that they will never have to meet a bloody test here in America.

How Much Is $42,000,000,000?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article written by Wheeler McMillen, which appeared in a recent issue of the Pathfinder:

Have Americans completely lost the capacity to be shocked by billions? Even by the forty-two billions which President Truman asks Congress to spend this next year?

Divide $42,000,000,000 by your own 1948 income. How many years would you have to work to pay for 1 year of Government?

That sounds like a foolish question. You don't support the Government by yourself, nor will you live eight or ten million years.

Every week, however, nearly every working American will spend all day every Monday working for the Government. Uncle Sam takes the first 20 percent—one day out of five. A great many citizens work some or all of Tuesday, too, and even into Wednesday before they can keep a penny of their earnings for themselves.

That's what spending big billions has done to people. To the extent that one-fifth or more of earnings cannot be spent as they choose, people are slaves to government now and for the rest of their lives. They can choose where to work, and at what they will work. They have no choice about what to do with Monday's pay.

Not new, but worth repeating, is the best description of a billion dollars anyone has so far offered.

If one had been born in the year A. D. 1, and from birth had been paid one dollar a minute, had never spent a cent, and was now living, he would about now, 1949 years later, have accumulated $1,000,000,000.

This is not to argue the good or the ill in the President's program. The $252,000,000,000 national debt stands, too, as a grim, unchangeable fact, a claim equal to more than $6,200 of future earnings from every American household. Every billion, every million, every dollar of new appropriations increase the amount of that claim. And the claim will be collected, one way or another, at some time or other.

Why do so many millions of people appear not to be concerned? Why do so few men in public life appeal for economy? How many men are elected to office these days by promising to spend more, and how many are elected by promising economy?

Maybe we all have become completely benumbed by the staggering blows of taxes and public debt. The figures and facts may just have passed beyond comprehension. Certainly too many have been deceived into believing that it is all right because other people or future generations will pay. If that is so, a moral sense has been blunted.

On another occasion this column may discuss the newly offered spending program. Here I am merely trying to work off some long-accumulated amazement. A citizen expects to pay enough taxes to support his government, local, State, and National. For most of America's life he could accomplish that easily and early on Monday morning. He might work a day or so a year on the road to pay his road tax. It was never foreseen that all employed citizens would have to give up all they earned for the early part of every week.

How come resentment has faded to such faintness? Why aren't the people mad about seeing others spend their money?

And, can the United States stand to have the Federal and State governments continue year after year to spend more and more? Shall we spend on to destruction?

America's Glorious Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, of all the fine ministers of the various faiths and creeds in and about the city of Washington there is none closer to and more highly regarded by Members of Congress than Evangelist Dale Crowley. This uncompromising Christian minister has endeared himself to Representatives from all parts of our great country. Through the facilities of the radio, press, and personal appearances, he is always doing good and helping someone.

As a part of my remarks, I insert herewith a copy of a radio address delivered by Mr. Crowley on Inauguration Day, January 20, which is most timely. It follows:

AMERICA'S GLORIOUS HERITAGE

"Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord" (Psalms 33: 12).

On this momentous day—January 20, 1949—when Harry S. Truman lays his hand upon the Holy Bible, taking the solemn oath as administered by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, he will that very minute be declared President of the greatest Nation the world has ever known—the United States of America.

In the minds of millions around the world the question will be asked, "Wherein lies the greatness of America?" And the answer is both simple and eloquent: The secret of America's greatness lies in the influence of that very Book on which our President takes his oath of office. For America, unique in all the world, is a Nation founded on the teachings of the Bible, and made powerful through the influence of Christianity.

Officially, the highest court in our land has ruled that we are a Christian Nation. In 1893, in the famous Holy Trinity Church case, the Supreme Court declared "This is a Christian Nation." Much earlier still, in an equally famous case which was pleaded by Daniel Webster, the Supreme Court decreed that, "Christianity is the common law of the land."

And this was the design and pattern of our Pilgrim Fathers. It was with a singular purpose of heart that our early American forebears were prompted to leave their native soil of Europe, their homes, and their citizenships. They determined, by the help of God, to establish a Christian community, where every citizen of the new commonwealth would be free to worship God, and to obey the holy Scriptures without molestation. To accomplish this, they were compelled to suffer unspeakable hardships.

In that celebrated document, the Mayflower Compact, the Pilgrim Fathers acknowledged and proclaimed the sovereignty of God, in the opening pronouncement of the preamble, in these historic words, "In the name of God. Amen."

In the year 1644 the colony of Rhode Island became the first community in the history of the world to guarantee absolute religious freedom to all faiths. This they did under the courageous leadership of Roger Williams, one of the stalwarts of the Christian faith.

So firmly rooted in the Christian faith was the colony of Maryland that, in the year 1649, the great Toleration Act was passed, which act provided the death penalty for those who should blaspheme against the Trinity. That historic political document also provided that, "no person professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall from henceforth be troubled or molested for, or in respect to his, or her religion."

During all those golden pioneer days of our beloved country, the Lord's Day was a hallowed institution, religiously observed by all citizens. Thanksgiving Day, as an American institution, was conceived and designated by the Pilgrim Fathers as a day to give thanks to Almighty God for His beneficent provisions and unfailing protection.

Before the Liberty Bell was hung in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, in the year 1753, our Christian statesmen of that pre-Revolutionary day directed that this Scripture, from Leviticus 25: 10, should be inscribed thereon: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." Those inspired words have served not only to impress millions of Americans, but have also challenged all the nations of the world.

In framing the Declaration of Independence, the faith in God of our infant Nation was proclaimed, in these words: "With a

firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The sturdy quality of our early American leadership was born of prayer and fellowship with God. The strong faith of George Washington, at a time when the American cause was in great jeopardy, inspired him to kneel in the snows at Valley Forge, and pray earnestly for divine intervention against the enemy.

American history books are replete with the testimonials of our famous statesmen concerning their faith in God and the Bible. It was Benjamin Franklin who said, "God governs the affairs of men and nations." It was Patrick Henry who said, "There is a just God who presides over the destiny of nations." It was William Penn who said, "We will either be governed by God, or ruled by tyrants."

It was the intrepid Daniel Webster who warned the people of youthful America to faithfully stick to the Bible. He said: "If we abide by the principles taught in the Bible, our country will go on prospering, and to prosper; but if we and our posterity neglect its instructions and authority, no man can tell how sudden a catastrophe may overwhelm us, and bury our glory in profound obscurity."

On that historic occasion when the Constitutional Convention was grappling with almost insurmountable obstacles, at the suggestion of that peerless Christian statesman, Benjamin Franklin, those great men knelt and prayed for God's guidance and blessing. Quoting the Scripture, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it," the founders of our Republic went forward in that Convention under the guidance of God.

In sundry ways our Nation bears witness to the sovereignty of God and the authority of the Bible. Every President-elect takes his oath of office with hand reverently resting on the Word of God, and he does not become President until he does.

The Supreme Court of the United States witnesses to our Nation's faith in God, as every appointee must take his oath on the Bible before he becomes a Justice in our highest tribunal.

Both Houses of Congress bear witness to our Nation's faith in God in that no session of our National Legislature can convene without the prayer of the congressional Chaplains.

Every legal document of America testifies concerning our Christian faith in that every such document is dated by our Christian calendar: "Anno Domini"—"In the year of our Lord."

Our national currency carries the witness of our Nation's faith in God in the words "In God we trust."

Our National Anthem bears witness to our faith in God by the lines "In this be our motto, 'In God is our trust'."

The faith of our country in God is borne in the famous patriotic song, America, the first to be learned by the school children of our land, by the prayer in the closing lines: "Protect us by Thy might, Great God our King."

The faith of our Nation is echoed in the Battle Hymn of the Republic in the militant words, "His truth is marching on."

In a thousand ways, every day, we are impressed with the indisputable fact that the truly great men and women of our Nation's history laid the foundations of our Republic on the teachings of the Bible, and nurtured them by their prayers. Even as President Woodrow Wilson has so eloquently said, "There lies at the foundation of all our schooling and all our thought the incomparable and unimpeachable Word of God." The illustrious John Adams, second President of the United States said, "The destiny of America is to carry the Gospel of Jesus Christ to all men, everywhere."

But, alas, we have not fulfilled such a royal destiny. We have slipped from our moorings, forgetting the God who gave us our liberty, and have gone adrift on the sea of materialism, and are shrouded by the fog of unbelief and infidelity.

Today we rejoice in our glorious heritage, but unless we take seriously the matter of our stewardship we shall prove ourselves unworthy of the glory that our fathers have known.

Today we say, with David, "Blessed is that nation whose God is the Lord," but we must never forget that he also said, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God."

Today let us remember that "Righteousness exalteth a nation," but let us not forget that "Sin is a reproach to any people."

Let us, as a nation, heed the counsel of the Lord, in 2 Chronicles 7: 14: "If my people which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land."

William A. Jump

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the death of William A. Jump on January 15, 1949, brings deep personal sorrow to those of us who had the high privilege of knowing him and being associated with him in the Government service. His was a remarkable career. He entered the Federal service 42 years ago as a messenger and at the time of his retirement occasioned a few weeks ago by ill health, he was the Director of Budget and Finance for the Department of Agriculture. In this position, he had demonstrated extraordinary ability and devotion to the public service. Hon. Charles Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, said of him, "He was one of the finest men I have ever known and one of the finest public servants I have ever worked with." Jerry Kluttz of the Washington Post is authority for the statement that Mr. Jump once turned down an offer to be the Under Secretary of Agriculture, preferring to continue in his civil-service position. Mr. Kluttz reproduced excerpts from Mr. Jump's inspiring message of farewell, issued at the time of his retirement:

There is no finer place in America than the Department of Agriculture in which to grow up and spend a lifetime, as I have done. I feel that I have been most fortunate in having had that privilege.

Not a week passes that I am not stimulated by some fresh evidence of the spirit of true public service that is the strong foundation of the Department. Somehow and in some way the fact that from the beginning the Department has existed for the sole purpose of making life in America a better, richer, and fuller experience has resulted in an honest, vigorous, and intensely realistic public-service concept on the part of the staff of the Department, high and low, that is truly remarkable.

This makes the Department a most stimulating and inspiring place to work. A member of the Department does not have the feeling that he is just helping to turn the wheels that make a large organization work; he feels he is a partner in a great enterprise.

This institutional appreciation is a priceless asset. It could not be created by the use of money or by any of the modern methods of building a so-called esprit de corps, as important and desirable as that may be.

I would be the first one to admit or even assert that the Department is not perfect. There is no danger of this; but if it ever gets to be perfect, it will become so self-centered as to be of little use as a public-service institution.

Heads of the department, bureau heads, and the personnel-at-large come and go. Even bureaus come and go as the cycle of organization and reorganization keeps in motion. It is noteworthy that regardless of the scope and degree of such changes and the strain they sometimes impose, the traditions and ideals of the department are kept alive by recognition by the officers and personnel generally of these great intangibles among our institutional assets and determination and eternal vigilance to keep it so from generation to generation.

That is why I feel compelled to mention the traditions and public service ideals of the department as one of the outstanding impressions I have at the close of a lifetime of sharing in this good and wholesome atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jump's example should be an inspiration to every employee of the United States Government. His standards of public service were of the highest type. His personal qualities of courtesy and friendliness and his spirit of self-effacement endeared him to a multitude of Federal workers. As a former member of the Department of Agriculture staff, I join in the tributes to him. The great traditions of our agricultural service have been made stronger by his contribution and I am confident that the significant results of his remarkable career brought to him and his family the most satisfying human rewards.

UNESCO in Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce for the reading of all the Members of Congress the following editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Daily News, January 20, 1949.

While a Member of this House during the Seventy-ninth Congress, I thought it my privilege and duty to, in every manner submitted to the House, support the United Nations and UNESCO; and, as I return to this House membership again from the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, I desire to again be as helpful as possible in strengthening the sinews of "peace building." Between the period of the Seventy-ninth Congress

and the convening of this, the Eighty-first Congress, it was my pleasure to clearly speak out on many occasions in support of the United Nations and not least of all of the UNESCO portion of that splendid and necessary world peace building program.

As this splendid editorial emphasizes, the local responsibilities of peace building, I am especially pleased to call it to the attention of the Members of Congress as well as all the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Not only do I urge the reading thereof, but I urge the application of its timely admonishment to those who sincerely and understandingly are engaged in peace building. Likewise, I urge that increasingly the forces of peace building shall be conscious of encouragement at the local levels. It being manifestly true that peace in the world will be what peace is to each individual in the world, it, therefore, results in being true that the attitude of the individual in the civilized world is determinative of world peace. To the extent to which peace building is consciously a part of the individuals in America, is the extent to which peace building through the United Nations will be an actual achievement in the lifetime of the individuals in America now alive. Therefore, it behooves the individuals who make up communities to activate in every manner possible an individual consciousness of responsibility for the peace building of the world. Individuals, as well as committees and groups, either make or neglect to make a definite contribution to UNESCO; and as UNESCO is an important part and parcel of the United Nations Charter—those of us who refuse or neglect to accept our local responsibilities in this field of peace-building endeavor refuse to accept responsibility for peace building in the world.

UNESCO IN LOS ANGELES

The new realism of peace-building stipulates that international discord can't be eliminated by vague do-gooder appeals. Peace is pursued by objectives defined in terms of reality.

Where UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization—fits these objectives the local community is beginning to understand. Starting today and continuing through Saturday the southern California council for UNESCO is holding a series of meetings to determine how community resources may be mobilized to advance UNESCO's aims.

UNESCO has both short-term and long-term aims. But they all boil down to the one encompassing aim of pursuing peace through understanding.

Since its constitution was drafted in London in 1946 UNESCO has been working to implement a world-wide program designed to bring about an eventual intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

This is a grandiose project. It involves, above all else, the continuous development of ourselves, our neighbors, and our institutions. It is a vast undertaking in the relations of peoples. UNESCO's hope is that by mobilizing the educational, scientific, and cultural resources of each of its 45 member states we may some day create an international republic of letters in which, as has been said, "knowledge and the arts are the expression and the sign of a flourishing world community."

In southern California UNESCO would do well to spread the word that today's cold war can only be won and a hot war averted if the people of great western communities such as the Los Angeles area work hard at the job of inspiring the confidence of other peoples of far-off communities—communities which have not as yet swung into the Soviet orbit.

In southern Korea, for example, university students and educated leaders look to America for help in educational reconstruction. All over the world, destroyed facilities in education, science, and culture await rebuilding either in the image of freedom or totalitarianism. The image in which these facilities are rebuilt will in large measure determine whether we shall have a world capable of peace.

Because it is a peoples' agency—because it is a means of peoples speaking to peoples—UNESCO is one of the strongest arms of the United Nations. UNESCO can well be the principal instrument through which we can secure the progressive elimination of political and cultural barriers now blocking international understanding.

But a word of friendly criticism is in order. The lofty ideals of UNESCO should not cause it to lift its feet too far off the ground.

Because it is also a verbalizing organization, this tendency to walk on clouds and spout the jargon of the intellectual is endemic to UNESCO. If it is to become a dynamic force for peace it must formulate principles and carry out concrete accomplishments not only mutually understandable but mutually acceptable among the many-tongued millions it hopes to reach.

Some of these principles were outlined at UNESCO's recent international conference in Beirut. And already UNESCO has been remarkably successful in bringing together experts, the Government, and the rank-and-file of citizens in working relations.

This should be UNESCO's principal aim for southern California. There is no end of projects to build the peace which UNESCO can further locally. These projects include teaching about the United Nations in our schools, mobilizing the community to assist in educational reconstruction in other lands, and most of all, restoring the faith of the people themselves in their ability to make the future bring what all of us wish it to bring.

This faith springs from and is given sustenance by the responses we give to the daily demands of our own communities and neighborhoods—the demands of today's living world for tolerance and understanding and friendship reaching beyond racial, cultural or religious barriers.

American Policy Toward Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. John B. Doran, graduate student in the school of public law and government at Columbia University. He holds, in substance, that the United Nations resolution of 1946 about withdrawing chiefs of diplomatic mission from Madrid was invalid because it violated article 2, paragraph 7, of the UN Charter. This should be considered in connection with the analysis of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas, and World Affairs, who pointed out in the New York Times on June 21, 1948, that the UN 1946 resolution was canceled out by the 1947 vote in the United Nations, refusing to pass the identical resolution of 1946, when the latter was presented, "according to the rules" of the United Nations. In a Nation-wide radio program of the Columbia Broadcasting Co.'s Peoples Platform, Dr. Thorning reiterated his position and reinforced it with the opinion of Dr. Edwin Borchard, professor of international law in Yale University. It is the view of Mr. Doran, Dr. Thorning, and Professor Borchard that the 1946 resolution, adopted only under Soviet pressure, is now obsolete and invalid and therefore, nugatory.

The article Bypassing UN on Spain was published in the Catholic World in February 1949, and is as follows:

BYPASSING THE UN ON SPAIN

(By John Doran)

There is a tendency among the less-informed to rest upon the judgment of the UN in international affairs. For instance, you will hear it said that the American policy toward Spain must be right because it coincides with that of the UN. Yet, on close study it can be seen that the condemnation of the Spanish Government by the international body was based on very false assumptions.

On February 9, 1946, an agreement was adopted at the UN Assembly meeting upon M. Spaak's proposal. One of the pertinent sentences was this: "During the long struggle of the United Nations against Hitler and Mussolini, Franco, despite continued Allied protests, gave very substantial aid to the enemy powers." This is utterly false and absolutely contrary to fact. In Dr. Carlton Hayes' Wartime Mission in Spain you will find references to 16 patently "unneutral acts" that gave the lie to the UN allegations. I might mention the permission given to volunteer soldiers, mostly French, to pass through Spain for service with our forces in north Africa: the blacklisting of firms doing business with the Axis; toleration, even to the point of helping, our espionage services; internment of Italian warships. For these contributions to the allied cause we should be grateful to Spain, as Churchill was, but the State Department and the UN did not have the courtesy to follow his example.

Spain's attitude toward us constituted at the very least, a benevolent neutrality. Most of the acts cited by Dr. Hayes were violations of the neutrality law in our favor. Had Spain been as rigid with us as he was with the Axis Powers, he would have certainly refused these concessions. His reward from America was a miserable white paper on Spain, a masterpiece of understatement and suppression of the truth published by our State Department.

Another sentence in the erroneous UN agreement was this: "The Franco Fascist Government of Spain was imposed by force upon the Spanish people and by its continued control is making impossible participation by the Spanish people in international affairs." I have no intention of fighting the Civil War all over again to prove to the UN that the Spanish Government, be it good or bad for the Spanish people, came to power in the manner of most existing governments of the world. Suffice it to say that the United States, together with 43 responsible governments of the world considered it legitimate and accorded it official recognition for 8 years before the UN came on the scene. It is less dictatorial now than it was then, and it has done nothing since to merit nonrecognition by the same powers.

The recent vote which was so overwhelmingly in favor of the regime belies the UN charges of tyranny. The same results were turned in at the time of the elections on July 6, 1947. At that time the Soviet observers were dumfounded and committed all sorts of blunders in their attempts to explain away Spain's success. American papers admitted that the balloting was done without fraud or duress. The Associated Press in a dispatch to the New York Post (July 7, 1947) said: "So far as could be observed, the voting itself was secret and free. Many of those who voted against the succession had no hesitancy in saying so." The New York Times grudgingly admitted that the referendum was a reasonable indication of the Spanish Cabinet's popularizing the country, but then it backtracked and disparaged the accuracy of the returns. The Liberal correspondent of Diario de la Marina, Senor F. Larcegui, took the Times to task on August 16, 1947. He writes: "What the New York Times correspondent has written is entirely false about the rights of citizenship being denied anyone for not voting. As proof of his lack of veracity about the Referendum, it is sufficient to say that he believes 'that nonvoters would be denied marriage licenses.' In Spain these licenses have never existed, nor do they exist today."

The astute observer, Alice Moats, while holding that most Spaniards are not satisfied with the Franco regime beyond prospect of change writes: "The most egregious piece of thinking I find current in America is the belief that all Spaniards except the Falange and a clique around Franco ardently desire a return of the Republic. The opposition is many-sided, contradictory, and by no means all Republican. It is safe to predict that whatever changes are made will be brought about by the Spaniards themselves. What is more, it is unlikely that refugee Spaniards will play any decisive role. The Republicans are * * * bitter toward the leaders who escaped, not only with their freedom, but also with several millions in money."

Ross Hoffman sums up the matter very well when he says, "All whom I met in Spain were at once loyal to the regime and at the same time critical of it." The magazine Time (December 20, 1948) admits that the criticism is not directed at the dictatorship but at corruption among the lesser officials of the bureaucracy. The UN is definitely in error in saying that Franco rules in spite of the opposition of the people.

How could the UN ever arrive at such a conclusion contrary to fact? The simple answer is: Soviet pressure. The Russians worked not only directly to influence the thought of the UN, but indirectly insofar as other nations capitulated on the Spanish affair, hoping to win Soviet cooperation in other matters. This is evident from the nature of the debates that characterized the passing of the Spanish resolution in the UN.

It is the sentiment of the UN that the Spanish Government constitutes a "threat to the peace of the world." Rather, I should say, "potential threat." The absolute charge of the earlier sessions has been softened by the addition of the word "potential." This charge scarcely merits refutation, for every country in the world is a potential threat to peace. The Soviet Union charges that America threatens the peace of the world because of her possession of the atom bomb. That is a less absurd claim than the one against Spain with its pitiful navy and antiquated equipment. Dr. Carlton Hayes has affirmed that the Spaniards, left to themselves, "are no menace to their neighbor or to the peace of the world."

William Bullitt in the Great Globe Itself asserts that the Soviet Union is the only totalitarianism that threatens war today. It is interesting to compare the record of "war-like" Spain with that of Russia. What territories has Franco grabbed since the end of the civil war? Is there the slightest indication of Spanish military aggression in Europe or elsewhere? As the editorial in the China Monthly says: "As far as Dictator Franco is concerned, our advice is: Let him alone in Spain as long as he does not interfere in other people's business. So far he has not, and the UN could well take a page out of his book" (December 1947).

If the State Department continues its present policy of conforming to the UN resolution, it will continue to violate article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter. This article, by the way, is a restatement of article 3 of the Atlantic Charter. The pertinent sentence is this: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." According to international law, states are juridically equal among themselves and no state should intervene directly or indirectly in the internal affairs of another state.

The demand for a new and acceptable government as recommended in the UN certainly constitutes intervention in the internal affairs of Spain, contrary to article 2 of the Charter. When Senator CONNALLY, during the debate on the resolution, asked that "the agreement of the UN should be limited to an appeal to the Spanish people to modify the political organization of the national regime," more than half the delegates rose and protested against what they termed "dangerous interventionism." The Communist-inspired proposal for an economic blockade of Spain was defeated for that reason.

The vote on the formula demanding a new and acceptable government was significant. Only 23 nations out of the 54 voted for the demand; 31 refused to vote. Thus it was passed. It is quite evident, therefore, that the majority of nations present considered it intervention. The New York Times editorial (Nov. 11, 1946) reflected the prevailing opinion on the extraordinary action of the UN. It pointed out that the UN must not interfere with Spain's domestic affairs and also must accord to Spain the same treatment it metes to other nations.

Dr. Carlton Hayes, in expressing himself on this matter of intervention in his wartime mission in Spain says, "Noninterference in the internal affairs of foreign countries is not merely a personal opinion of mine. It is a long-standing American public policy. * * * This was the policy that President Roosevelt reaffirmed in specific pledges to Spain, and the policy in accordance with which our wartime mission in Spain was discharged. I do not believe it should be lightly changed. Frankly, I would leave Spain to the Spaniards. * * * Spain and the Spanish people can be, regardless of their form of government, very serviceable to American interests now and in the future."

The UN is interfering also insofar as it gives moral support to the Spanish Government in exile. The latter was allowed to plead its case, at least unofficially, at the San Francisco Conference and at the UN Asemblies, while the Spanish Government has been refused all opportunity to reply. A memorandum from the Spanish Government in exile was admitted at the San Francisco Conference, debated upon and a resolution was drawn up excluding Spain from the UN. Is that justice and fair play as practiced in the UN?

Perhaps it might be alleged that our State Department's white paper on Spain fully justified the exclusion of Spain and the condemnation of the Spanish Government. This document, published in 1946, should be called a yellow paper rather than a white paper. It is a contemptible compilation unworthy of our State Department. Weak, flimsy, insincere, it consists of 15 documents supposed to justify our Spanish foreign policy. The first 13 documents deal with incidents happening before America entered the war. They cannot, therefore, be quoted to justify our policy at a time we considered friendly relations with Spain the correct procedure. To make them the basis of an attack on Spain is to play a crooked game.

The fourteenth document, elaborately labeled "Secret Protocol between the German and Spanish Governments," proves to be nothing more than a guarantee that Spain would not allow the arms she was buying from Germany to be diverted to the use of Germany's enemies. The fifteenth document records bitter German complaints against Spanish concessions to the Allies. This "White Paper" deliberately omitted all documents proving Spain's benevolent neutrality.

A white paper is not supposed to suppress the truth. Why were not all the facts made known to the American people? Clearly because the State Department did not wish to admit the presence of Communist influence within its own sanctuary. Those responsible for this paper have since departed. The policy toward Spain still remains however. Let the UN shelve the Spanish question as it pleases: it is up to us Americans to disregard Soviet opinion and to change our Spanish policy in conformity with the facts. For the sake of justice and our own self-preservation, we must be friendly with the first great European nation to stand up against the march of the Reds.

Relief for the Persons Suffering by Reason of the January 1949 Blizzards in the Midwest and West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make the following observations and thereafter to include certain storm news as reported by the newspaper Custer County Chief, published at Broken Bow, Nebr., on Monday, January 24, 1949:

Almost everyone in America who reads the newspapers has been advised about the weather conditions which have been prevailing over the Middle West and West since early in January of this year, but no newspaper item or magazine article could really portray the ravaging extent and effect of this terrible series of storms.

I have been informed by people of Nebraska that the effects of the blizzard of 1888 was as nothing compared to the almost unbelievable destruction caused by the past six successive storms during this month of January.

I was advised by telephone today that a seventh snowstorm is now spreading over the Nebraska area. Undoubtedly, the damage done by this series of storms will be the greatest in Midwest and Western recollection, and the losses to those owning livestock and to business

and people of the Nation generally will reach a gigantic total.

Human life also has been greatly imperiled, and perhaps many already have been maimed or have lost their lives by reason of these storms.

I received the following in a letter from Attorney Arthur A. Weber, of Bassett, Rock County, Nebr.:

As you know, recent blizzard conditions have paralyzed transportation in this county, not only on the highways, but also on the lesser roads and on the farms and ranches.

We live in a territory where the farms and ranches are a great distance apart, and in some instances people live from 5 to 10 miles from their nearest neighbor or from a telephone. Many of our citizens have been isolated for weeks and it is impossible to know or to estimate the extent of suffering to humans and to livestock. That information can only be ascertained when the roads are opened.

I am told that railroad companies in the storm-swept areas and other public utilities are willing to exert their best efforts to give prompt help during this emergency to relieve the people who find themselves and their livestock imperiled.

However, the lack of proper equipment with which to open up badly blocked roads so as to aid people in the storm-stricken area does not seem to be readily available.

I have been told that prompt action must be taken to get the necessary equipment and manpower and know-how working, and it is the hope and wish of many people in the storm-stricken area that this emergency relief matter be placed by Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming under the control of Gen. Lewis Pick of the Army engineers, who is stationed in Omaha, Nebr., because General Pick, by reason of his operation in carrying out the Pick-Sloan plan, has a better knowledge of the territory to be relieved, and furthermore, has knowledge of the equipment which is now in the Midwest, which could be used for opening up feeder roads and digging this vast area out of the snow. He could probably get together more proper equipment in a shorter time than anyone in the area, and in view of the fact that these contemplated operations are in the Pick-Sloan plan area he would be the most logical and best equipped man to be in charge of this relief work, which must be done now by someone who has the real know-how.

The news articles follow:

FEAR HEAVY LIVESTOCK LOSSES IN WESTERN NEBRASKA UNLESS RELIEF PLEAS ANSWERED SOON—GOVERNOR VAL PETERSON CALLS BLIZZARD AND COLD SPELL THE STATE'S GREATEST CATASTROPHE, ATTENTION TO APPEALS FOR HELP PROMISED—QUICK RELIEF MUST BE GIVEN RANCHERS IN SANDHILLS—RANCHERS PLIGHT SERIOUS AT PURDUM, ELSMERE—SUPPLIES RUNNING LOW AND VERY DIFFICULT TO FEED CATTLE

High winds and some additional snow Saturday night and Sunday brought complete distress to the sandhills ranch country. Fortunately, telephone lines were still operating from here to Brewster, Purdum, and Elsmere.

Howard Fink, of Broken Bow, was in touch with his brother at Elsmere and a number of other ranchers in that area yesterday and this morning.

Jack Moody, of Purdum, reported that Sunday's blow had left the area in the worst shape it has been in during the entire winter. Cattle were suffering, roads were impassable, and hay was inaccessible.

The Keys ranch reported it had only a 2-day coal supply and only enough tractor fuel on hand for cattle feeding work for 2 days.

The Giles ranch, equipped with liquid gas for heating and cooking, was completely out of fuel and great difficulties were experienced in keeping the house warm and preparing food.

Efforts were being made at Broken Bow to get snow-plow equipment to Halsey to open a road for trucks to take supplies at least as far as Purdum and if possible on to Elsmere Tuesday or Wednesday.

Dr. Don Walker and Claire Coffman, who made an aerial survey of the country a few days ago, reported that calls were coming in from friends telling of the difficulties in feeding cattle and obtaining supplies. The little stores at Purdum and Elsmere were reported to be running out of many food necessities for ranch patrons.

The Knoell Bros. took their caterpillar bulldozers to Dunning this morning to open a trail for supplies to the Rowan and Erickson ranches up the Dismal River. The Knoell outfit was to continue on to the Walter Gibbons ranch land to the southwest. Gibbons has a large herd of cattle there that is running low on supplement cake feed. Gibbons had to abandon his pick-up in a snowdrift several days ago while hauling feed from the Hoagland rail siding to his ranch.

GOVERNOR WARNS LEGISLATURE OF SERIOUS CONDITIONS—APPEALS FOR HELP GET EARLIEST POSSIBLE ATTENTION, GOVERNOR SAYS

LINCOLN, January 24.—Describing the 1949 blizzard and cold spell as the greatest catastrophe ever to hit Nebraska, Gov. Val Peterson told members of the Nebraska unicameral at Lincoln this morning that the legislature might be called upon to appropriate a half million dollars for blizzard-relief work.

The Governor prefaced his annual budget message with a description of the seriousness of the situation in the State. "We've already lost several human lives, and we may lose 40 to 50 percent of all the cattle in one of the greatest producing regions in the world," the Governor warned.

"The serious thing is that we not only have 40 to 60 inches of snow on the ground," the Governor said, "we may get more than that. This may go on for 30 to 60 days. What we need is a 10-day January thaw."

The Governor said appeals for help were coming into his office from many sections of the State. I can only promise the "earliest possible" attention, Peterson said. Appeals for help in opening roads so that feed supplies can be uncovered and moved to starving livestock have come from Broken Bow, Hyannis, O'Neill, Randolph, and Ragan. "They are still coming in from the Chadron and Alliance areas," he said.

Most requests are for bulldozers and other heavy equipment to open roads to feed supplies.

SNOW STALLS BURLINGTON TRAINS AGAIN SUNDAY —NO PASSENGER TRAINS HERE FOR PAST TWO DAYS

The Burlington line through Broken Bow was snow clogged again Sunday and no passenger service has moved over the line since Saturday evening.

COMMITTEE MEETS TO PLAN RELIEF

A special committee of the Broken Bow Chamber of Commerce was called by Mark Young, president, this morning to take action to bring relief to livestock ranches west and northwest of here.

The committee instructed Don Porter, secretary, to contact Governor Val Peterson in an effort to get equipment of any kind into the ranch territory to open roads and assist ranchers in getting their cattle fed.

The committee's discussions continued at the chamber luncheon. Dr. Don Walker volunteered to take his plane this afternoon to make a reconnaissance of the ranch country around Dunning, Brewster, Purdum, and Elsmere. He was to report to the group this evening after which a definite plan of aid will be formulated.

The committee was at work at noon today to secure transportation for one caterpillar snow plow. The plow owned by the Wing Construction Co., of Litchfield, was available. It had to be transported to Halsey, however, before it could go into action on the drifted roads.

It is probable that the committee will be able to secure other equipment in the next day or so to go into the Brewster and Purdum area.

RANCHERS APPEAL FOR STATE AND FEDERAL HELP

Appeals for immediate help for the ranch country of Nebraska were made Sunday in telegrams to Gov. Val Peterson, Senators WHERRY and BUTLER and Congressman MILLER, by a number of ranchers connected with the Broken Bow Production Credit Association. Dick Whitman, secretary of the association, stated that a number of these men viewed the situation as extremely grave and felt that any available Army or other Government equipment should be sent into the sandhills area to open roads and avert a major catastrophe for the State.

Army cargo planes have been pressed into service at Denver to carry and drop hay to herds of cattle and sheep in Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

While it was not contemplated that an airlift would be put into operation in this territory, ranchers feel that unused Army equipment could be rushed here to fight the battle with the snow and enable ranchers to get feed to their cattle herds.

ICE PLAGUES EASTERN NEBRASKA LINES AND HIGHWAYS—SUNDAY ICY CONDITIONS KNOCK OUT TELEPHONES, STOP BUSSES

While high winds, added snow and bitter cold pounded away at the sandhills country and western Nebraska, southern and eastern Nebraska had their tribulations Sunday with icy highways and disrupted communication and service.

Six towns in the area north of Lincoln were without electric service when icy wires broke circuits. The break near Brainard left the towns without electricity for several hours.

Dozens of towns in the eastern area were without telephone service as a result of line breaks.

Ice conditions were so bad in Omaha that the schools did not open today.

Ice on highways in some sections of the State had reached a thickness of over 2 inches and radio warnings advised motorists to stay at home. Bus lines ceased all traffic out of Omaha and Lincoln Sunday.

Bus traffic was being resumed slowly this morning with many schedules canceled for the day.

EIGHT-DAY COLD WAVE CONTINUES, INCREASES HARDSHIP—REPORT 35 INCHES OF SNOW AT BROKEN BOW THIS SEASON

Severely cold weather has been added to the hardships of snow-blocked transportation to make this one of the worst winters in many years for a large part of Nebraska.

A. A. Spradling, Government weather observer at the Burlington depot here, has recorded 17 daily readings below zero thus far this winter. The record:

December 23: −8°.
December 27: −3°.
December 30: −10°.
January 4: −3°.
January 5: −2°.
January 9: −3°.
January 10: −1°.
January 11: −3°.
January 12: −1°.
January 17: −11°.
January 18: −13°.
January 19: −13°.
January 20: −15°.
January 21: −21°.
January 22: −24°.
January 23: −2°.
January 24: −8°.

Lower temperatures have been recorded in the northern and western part of the State.

Thus far this winter snowfall has been recorded at 34.77 inches at Broken Bow. The record shows 7.85 inches in November, 14.87 in December, 12.05 in January to date.

January moisture in terms of snow reduced to water is 0.74 inch to date as compared to 0.30 for the full month last January.

Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, to Independent Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on January 28 last it was my privilege to speak to a group of independent broadcasters at a luncheon in the Palmer House in Chicago. Since I dealt with some very pertinent controversial problems which might be of interest to the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent to insert this address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT OF MONOPOLY

It is a pleasure to meet with you independent broadcasters to discuss briefly a particular phase of radio which should be of great interest to you and which is of vital concern to the country. It is gratifying to know that many radio station owners and managers, unable for one reason or another, to be here are so completely sold on collective action that they have signified their intention to join you and to support actively and to the fullest a strong, cohesive organization which will truly represent the middleman and the little man in radio in order to fight effectively for the interests of the listening audience whom they serve. It is well that this spirit prevails when one contemplates the disasters which threaten the very existence of that major part of this great industry which you operate. The state of the Union in radio is not good. Intelligent hard-hitting action obviously is imperative now.

Today we live in an organized world. Every group is organized to the hilt. That is, every group except the independent radio operators. Farmers, lawyers, doctors, athletes, laborers, musicians, merchants, manufacturers, chambers of commerce and the clear channel group have well-greased organizations to fight collectively for their interests. The independent radio operators are the orphans of the storm.

To me, superpower and clear channels is the most important issue in AM radio today. It is important to broadcasters from an economic standpoint. If and when 24 stations in this country are authorized to operate with 750,000 watts of power, 2,000 stations are going to wither on the vine. Twenty-four stations times 750,000 watts is 18,000,000 watts, while 2,000 stations times 5,000 watts is but 10,000,000 watts. I regard this glaring situation as alarming not only because the radio tail will wag the radio dog but because superpower means domination of the air waves—domination of programing—domination by a few powerful corporations of what the citizens of America must hear. There will be no middle class of broadcasters. Either radio will be big and powerful or small and strictly local. Superpower plus clear channels plus four networks plus a slower momentum in business spells disaster to your group.

You should be exercised about this vital phase of broadcasting, because as a licensee to influence public opinion you have the legal responsibility of representing the Federal Government and a duty to be concerned about monopoly, and a right to be disturbed about absentee control of radio.

It is hardly necessary to review here the background of this superpower-clear channel battle. All of you should be familiar with the repeated efforts that have been made over the past 15 years to secure FCC authority for superpower operation of the 24 clear-channel stations. Superpower and clear-channel operation and monopolistic control by the networks are closely linked together; its proponents realize that once they are granted superpower, they have established the permanency of nonduplication of clear channels and a convenient and blanket coverage for a handful of networks at minimum cost to them.

Back in 1934 the Commission granted what it called an experimental license for 500,000-watt operation of Station WLW. We know what this superpower station was doing to many smaller broadcasters, until Burton K. Wheeler, a former chairman of the committee which I now have the honor to head, secured passage of a Senate resolution expressing disapproval of superpower. The Commission then rescinded WLW's license, but the clear-channel broadcasters continued their fight—a shrewd, carefully calculated, well financed fight—to worm out of the Commission a favorable decision. You know of their testimony before the Commission—testimony which I am bound to suggest was not effectively countered and met by the independent broadcasters as it might have been. The clear channels are still pressing with all their might for a favorable decision from the Commission. They might win unless you block them.

Last year on the eve of an anticipated decision by the Commission, after a plea from Gene O'Fallon of Denver, I introduced a bill (S. 2231) to restrict power of AM stations to 50,000 watts and to permit duplication of clear channels. Extensive hearings followed, hearings which attracted a great deal of attention. They served to give you time to mobilize your forces.

There is an important lesson for all of you independent broadcasters in that hearing. While 70 witnesses appeared in person, a large percentage were representatives of those who favored clear channel operation and superpower. Remember, please, that only 24 stations in this country are on that side of the fence with 2,000 stations on your side, and yet they had most of the witnesses and put on most of the testimony. They had engineers and lawyers and elaborate and expensive charts and tables and maps. Congressmen and Senators who have not followed this conflict carefully would think from their well-oiled demonstration that the great majority of the radio industry in this country was on the side of the clear channel group. Mr. Caldwell summoned a bare-footed girl from Tennessee, a goat farmer from Texas and an employee from the Weather Bureau in California to prove his fantastic arguments. Do not misunderstand me; I am not minimizing the wonderful job that was done by many of you. You gave liberally of your time and resources to fight this issue. More than 700 independent broadcasters wrote the members of the Senate committee supporting the Johnson bill; many of you contacted your own Senators and Congressmen or sent them copies of the letter you sent the committee. That was an important and effective thing to do. It was constructive. In the very nature of things most Senators and Congressmen are opposed to monopoly. They are opposed to oppression by the high and mighty. They respond favorably to appeals from the underdog.

But I say in all kindness that you have not yet gotten over to Congress the fact that the overwhelming majority of the radio stations in this country oppose superpower and clear-channel operation. The majority of radio stations regard clear channels as an economic and political threat; even more important, the majority definitely believe it to be contrary to the clear intent of the Communications Act; that it would defeat the purposes of the law; that it would lead to monopoly control of radio and definitely restrict freedom of speech and expression in this great democracy. You obviously have not brought the issue home to the people in your own communities and States; you have failed to make them understand what absentee ownership of a radio station means; what the situation would be for them if they had to depend on a station 1,000 miles away for programs which could not and would not serve local interest and need; and you have failed to make them realize that this is important enough for all of them to get into this fight with you for the good of the country and for their own self-interest.

The introduction of my bill last February and the letter that the Senate committee sent to the Commission requesting it to hold up a decision until we were able to consider action had the effect of suspending and delaying a final decision by the Commission. A few weeks ago, informed that a decision was about to be announced, I again discussed with Chairman Coy this whole problem and I made clear to him that I would regard it as unfortunate if the Commission were to render a decision prior to the North American Regional Broadcast Conference, scheduled for next fall.

It is my considered view that this question of superpower operation of clear channel stations is a basic, fundamental policy question of paramount importance not only to the United States broadcasting industry but actually to all of the people of the United States. I hold that it transcends and is far above a mere engineering determination of what degree of power should be used to operate a few radio stations. I hold that any such fundamental policy question can legally and properly be settled only by the Congress and not by the quasi judicial arm, the FCC, which Congress created to administer radio policies and radio law. I hold, in fact, that when the three vital sections of the law are considered together—the public interest section, the section which requires competition in radio broadcasting,

and the equitable allocation of frequencies section—the Commission does not have the legal right under the law to make a decision granting power above 50,000 watts. I make this statement fully realizing that the Commission is given authority to determine power under section 303. I insist the Commission was correct, and that it was functioning in accordance with the law when for years it followed the principle of duplicating clear channels. I assert that the Commission has reversed itself on the policy of duplicating clear channels and that should it grant any power in excess of 50,000 watts it would act without due regard for the welfare of the listening public. To the contrary it would be acting in the interests of special privilege and monopoly and in violation of the clear intent of the law.

I hold that a regulatory arm of the Congress has no legal right to render a decision in a private case which would determine broad policy designed to bind this country in dealing with the other North American countries concerning mutual problems on the very eve of a radio conference. I insist that the Commission cannot and must not commit the United States to a policy affecting all of North America a few months previous to the next NARBA conference where it is hoped we may work out an agreement among all of the signatory countries with respect to the operation of the domestic radio stations in each. I believe that this country's position at the approaching NARBA conference should be that no AM radio station in any North American country be operated with more than 50,000 watts of power to the end that we do not interfere with them and they do not interfere with us as is the case today with Mexican and Cuban stations. I believe that after the NARBA agreement has been reached and if basic legislation is then required to implement the principles agreed upon there, the Commission should recommend to the Congress whatever legislation is indicated.

Once upon a time, and not so long ago, the Commission apparently agreed with my position. As proof I quote from a Commission press release, dated January 24, 1938. Just listen to this:

"The factor involved in the use of superpower is that a small group of licensees operating on frequencies which have been assigned to them by the Federal Government would have control of radio facilities capable of reaching the entire Nation. Unless care were exercised in the regulation of these licensees, the possibility exists of having granted to a few people, from natural resources of the Federal Government, the control of a system of mass communications having untold potentialities of being utilized to influence public opinion. * * * We firmly believe that any enlargement of the differential between the highest power station class and the lowest power station class should not be encouraged unless, after full consideration of the effects on the lower power class of stations, it can be shown conclusively that a super-high-power station is necessary and that beyond doubt it will be in the public interest. We also feel that considerable caution is required in granting such powerful media."

That is a quotation from a press release, entitled "The Social and Economic Aspects of Radio Broadcasting," a study of facts presented at the informal engineering hearing on the subject of Possible Allocation Improvements in the Standard Broadcast Band.

That was a policy expressed within the Commission when the Congress had more cause to have confidence in the manner in which the Commission was administering the law. Unfortunately, we haven't heard that kind of viewpoint expressed by Commissioners in recent years. Today they seem terribly impressed by a few theoretic white spots where radio service is reported to be inadequate. They do not seem concerned at all with the threatened monopoly and oppression by a few big stations on the air waves—the air waves which belong to the people and over which Congress has given the FCC limited jurisdiction.

I have reintroduced my bill to make it crystal clear that in this Congress, as in the last, I stand firmly for the principle of limiting power to 50,000 watts and duplicating clear channels. Many in Congress agree with me but we cannot win this battle alone. I believe you have a duty, not alone to yourselves as radio-station operators, but a duty and responsibility as American citizens and licensees of the Federal Government operating under a specific law, to get out and fight for what is right and fair and in accord with the American system of free enterprise and better radio service for everyone.

It is not my province to tell you how to make that fight, but I must warn you that you are fighting a well-entrenched, well-financed, well-staffed group who are determined to have radio control in the United States. Apparently you cannot depend upon existing radio trade organizations to fight your battle. I remember all too well that the National Association of Broadcasters did not desire to testify for you in the hearings on the Johnson bill. You must depend on yourselves alone, and remember that you do comprise the overwhelming majority of the radio stations in this country. This is a country where the majority is supposed to rule; certainly from every standard of measurement you are the majority. Is there no way that you can convince every small independent operator that this is not the time to sit back and let "George do it;" cannot he be made to understand that his silence and his inaction is the certain way of putting himself out of business?

I have been told that some independent broadcasters would be willing to see a limited number of superpower stations authorized under certain conditions. As I understand it, those limitations would include:

1. A reallocation of clear channels so that they would be located only in the so-called unserved white areas;
2. A complete duplication of all other clear channels;
3. Limit the number of high-power clear channels to possibly three or four;
4. Limit the power of such clear channels to not more than 100,000 watts;
5. Deny ownership of any superpower clear-channel station to every network and deny such stations the right to broadcast network programs;
6. Require such a station to do its own programing.

But let me say for the record that I am firmly and unequivocally opposed to this or any other compromise on this question. I maintain there is no sound legal basis upon which the Commission may authorize superpower operation of standard broadcast stations. If and when the Commission does so, it is violating the basic law which requires in clear and unmistakable terms that the public interest must be served first; that there must be competition in radio broadcasting; and there must be equitable allocation of frequencies.

I warn you that if you presume that the Commission has the authority to make such authorizations of power, even ringed around with the conditions I have outlined, you must also presume that the Commission next month, or next year, or 2 years from now, can again reverse itself. One by one, the FCC can drop the restrictions and finally you will face exactly what you face today—the domination of standard AM broadcasting by a few powerful interior stations. I don't want to see that happen and you and the American people should not let it happen. If you do not want to get burned, do not play with fire. Place your faith in the law, not in the whims of men.

In that view I am strongly fortified by a report of a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, submitted only this week. Some of you, I believe, already have read that report. I have brought some copies with me. Let me emphasize first that this report was prepared by two eminent Members of the Senate, Senators TOBEY and MCFARLAND, the latter an extremely able lawyer. Note what they say. I quote:

"We believe that the clear channel-superpower question is a fundamental policy issue of tremendous national import to be determined by the lawmaking body and not a technical engineering problem to be decided by a regulatory agency."

Let me quote further from their recommendation on this point:

"(a) That since the question of increasing power for operation of AM radio stations above the present limit of 50,000 watts involves a basic, fundamental policy of the highest national importance concerned with the economic and political health of the United States, it is a question which can legally be determined only by the Congress through the enactment of legislation."

I also understand that some of the independent broadcasters believe that this fight doesn't make much difference since television is going to destroy all of you, anyway. Don't you believe it. None of the clear channels is planning on suspending because of television. If there is a place for them, there is a place for you. Television is a great development; people like it, and it is bound to grow. But it will be many, many years before a television program will be available in every town and hamlet and farm and ranch house in this country. For years there will be room for radio, as we know it today. But conceding that television is the coming thing, isn't it clear that if you quit now you will have taken a big step toward barring yourselves from television as it improves and expands? The defeatist viewpoint echoed by some of the independent broadcasters is exactly the viewpoint that the big stations and networks want you to have. They want you to quietly fold up your AM and FM operations so that when they are ready they, and only they, will be in position to take over television.

There is no need to worry today about the fact that it costs large sums to get into television; that it is not an operation for the little fellow. That will change, too, as improvements take place and costs drop. Just look back 20 years at radio. Stay in this business, remain abreast of technological advances, keep it alive, keep it competitive, keep serving the people you live with, and you'll find that you'll remain a part of the industry, regardless of the scientific changes and progress that it makes. Today video channels are not available for all radio stations which desire to get into television. The most equitable and stabilizing thing that could be done for the radio industry in this period of conversion from aural radio to a combination of aural and video is to assure AM and FM licensees that they will not be denied the opportunity to get in on the ground floor when additional video channels are made available by new scientific developments already well past the initial stage.

The main thing to do now is to get together, stick together, have clear-cut objectives, develop some good strategy, plan an intelligent campaign, get it going fast, keep fighting hard, and you won't lose out, and neither will the American people lose out.

Forestry Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter from Paul H. Gerrard, forest supervisor of the Ozark National Forest.

The Ozark National Forest lies partly in the district which I represent as does the Sylamore National Forest.

We are beginning a forestry program in north Arkansas more or less along the lines of training for forestry to encourage individual owners of land outside the national forest to care for their own timber by setting the proper examples in the national forests themselves. Mr. Gerrard is doing a great work in Arkansas in cooperation with the State forestry service in this development.

I would like also to insert his statement covering some of the most important forestry activities for the benefit of the membership of the House.

The letter and statement follow:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE, OZARK NATIONAL FOREST,
Russellville, Ark., January 28, 1949.

Hon. JIM TRIMBLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: In accordance with your request in December when we were discussing general forestry matters, I am herewith outlining some of the more important needs as I see them. It is, however, realized that, due to the size of the Federal budget, consideration cannot be given to every deserving item, but some of them are very important to Arkansas and to the South.

Very sincerely yours,

PAUL H. GERRARD,
Forest Supervisor.

STATEMENT COVERING SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FORESTRY ACTIVITIES

PRIVATE FORESTRY ASSISTANCE

Perhaps the most important item of all, as well as the weakest, is the lack of technical assistance to small owners of forest land in order to build back and prevent further depletion of forest resources in the South. The proposed bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), is especially important to the entire South. This bill, in brief, will:

(a) Increase the authorization for cooperative fire control in the various States.

(b) Increase the authorization and permit the furnishing of forest tree seeds or plants to any timberland owner instead of being limited only to farmers, as at present.

(c) Increase the authorization for education and demonstrational activities of the land-grant colleges or universities (Extension Service).

(d) Broaden the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain service and facilities for furnishing technical guidance and assistance in regard to the proper management of privately owned forest land. It contemplates such service would be handled largely through State forest agencies and raises the authorization for this purpose.

The amending and broadening of this act would eventually assure the protection of all forest lands from fire, and provide technical advisory assistance where it is most needed among the small landowners. Seventy-five percent of the Nation's timberland is owned by 4,500,000 of the small landowners and only 4 percent of them are following good, or better, cutting practices. Here in the South we find only 2 percent of them following good or better practices and only 1 percent in Arkansas. The Nation cannot meet its forest needs unless a major portion of these small owners adopt good cutting practices. There are only about 50 farm foresters employed in the South to provide the forest advisory services needed on over 100,000,000 acres of forest land. It is estimated that 200 farm foresters can be used to advantage in the South alone. The foregoing is of especially vital importance to the State of Arkansas and to its 206,000 small landowners who own some 68 percent of the State's forest land. Unless forest practices are improved, the large hardwood areas in north Arkansas will produce little more than their annual tax, while in south Arkansas, management practices among small owners have improved somewhat. However, they are still far from satisfactory.

RECREATION USE

There has been a large increase in the number of recreation visitors in spite of the fact that considerable rehabilitation work is needed on most of the recreation areas. As a result of requests by several communities that these facilities be maintained to a higher standard, a statement was prepared regarding the status of the recreation facilities for the entire forest, a copy of which is attached. The total is not quite comparable with the national debt but it does indicate a need for additional maintenance funds whenever conditions become such that they can be provided.

WILDLIFE

The Bureau of the Budget did not set up any funds under this item but it will soon be necessary to begin to handle this activity on a plan-wise and managed basis in order to take care of the hunters and protect the forest from damage through an increasing number of deer. This matter was covered in a letter last year. The situation is about the same, namely, that the number of game and hunters is increasing each year and funds are needed to carry on the work necessary to provide management plans to serve as a basis for cooperation with the State game department.

ACQUISITION

There still remains over 300,000 acres of purchased land within the forest. It is impossible to take care of all of the offers for the sale of land. Acquisition for consolidation of the forest is one of the urgent needs from an administrative viewpoint.

TIMBER SALES

Timber sales on the forest are going along at a high rate of about 29,000,000 board feet per year. Receipts will be in the neighborhood of $330,000. This is a little bigger cut than actually planned. A 30,000,000 foot sale of white oak to extend over a 5- or 6-year period is planned for the near future. This will provide employment for about 350 men, 150 of whom would be employed in a stave finishing plant. Lack of adequate timber sale funds this fiscal year as a result of having to meet a portion of the pay act increase will probably delay the starting of this operation for 3 or 4 months unless additional funds can be provided to get the job started. Present sales require the full services of all available personnel.

GENERAL

Budget estimates for the Forest Service show a reduction in all items except timber and range use. Fire control, forest and range research, forest survey, research in products, etc., are also important but farm and private forestry assistance is considered the most urgent need from a national welfare standpoint.

STATUS OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Ozark National Forest

The Ozark National Forest has 12 recreation areas which vary from a picnic spot with a few tables and fireplaces to a 160-acre lake with adjacent developments and, also, to a 26-room lodge with 18 cabins. During the war years, practically no money at all was spent on maintenance. Since the war, insufficient funds have been received to rehabilitate them to their original state; also there were a few projects which were only partially completed at the start of the war and which have not as yet been completed.

Recreational use is increasing on the forest. For instance, we had 183,700 recreation visitors in 1947 and about 345,000 in 1948. About one-half of this increase is due to more carefully prepared estimates and the remaining 50 percent is the actual increase which has occurred in spite of the fact that our recreation areas have not been maintained to the extent that we should honestly publicize them to encourage additional usage. Last year there was a general increase in recreation visitors throughout northwest Arkansas. This tourist business can be tremendously increased when recreational facilities are once placed in condition to attract and hold visitors. These areas have as potential customers the population of the States south, east, and west to draw from. For instance, there are approximately 20,000,000 people within a radius of 200 miles from the State of Arkansas. Extending this to a little larger area, say, 500 miles, we find 56,000,000 people living within this radius.

The national forest, with its conservation program, its development of game, recreation and scenic areas, timber, and the numerous forest roads, offers an unusual combination of attractions not ordinarily found elsewhere. It offers a quiet retreat in natural forest conditions in an area of exceptional scenic values. Its high elevations provide the first opportunity for relief from the heat of the lowlands to the South such as Louisiana, Texas, and parts of Oklahoma as well as most of the State of Arkansas.

Mount Magazine (Logan County)

The area set aside to provide recreation covers an area of nearly 2,000 acres. Facilities consist of a 26-room lodge, 18 cottages, and a small concession building, all of which are a part of the resort area. In addition, there are picnic areas at Brown Springs, Dripping Springs, West End, East End, Cameron Bluff, and the Green Field place. Cameron Bluff has been developed somewhat more intensively and includes an amphitheater, a number of picnic tables, toilets, etc. A summer home site area has also been designated as a part of the development.

The original investment for this mountain area totaled $108,323 of which $85,822 was the cost of the resort area and $22,501 the cost of the picnic areas. It is estimated that $40,000 would be required to rehabilitate the facilities in first-class condition.

The resort area has never attracted many people in spite of its high elevations and unusual scenic attractions due to the lack of a paved road. The cost of such a road on the 21 miles within the forest from Havana to Paris would be in the neighborhood of $180,000 to $200,000, including road bank stabilization. With a paved road it would be possible to increase the tourist business perhaps as much as 10 to 15 times over that of the present. It would also extend the season from the present 2 to 3 months to 6 to 8 months of the year.

Cove Lake (Logan County)

Cove Lake recreational area covers an area of about 600 acres. It includes a 160-acre lake, bathhouse, picnic facilities, etc. Of the original investment of $184,735, the dam cost $156,729 and the other facilities $28,006. The biggest job at this area is the completion of the spillway of the dam, which is estimated to cost in the neighborhood of $80,000. This is urgently needed in order that the lake level may be maintained at the planned elevation and permit full usage of the lake. The cost of maintaining and replacing picnic facilities, additional water, shelters, as well as some very simple overnight cabins and an eating place would amount to about $51,100, or a total of $131,100 for this area.

The contemplated 20 overnight cabins, eating place, bathhouse, and latrines are to provide inexpensive recreational facilities for local people as well as tourists. It is contemplated that a sleeping cabin with a picnic table and fireplace outside could be rented in the neighborhood of $12 to $15 per week and retire the investment over a period of time. Improvement and development of fishing by making a small charge and using the money to improve the lake is another contemplated self-maintained proposed development.

Spring Lake (Yell County)

Spring Lake recreational area covers approximately 420 acres including an 80-acre lake, bathhouse, picnic facilities, and a caretaker's residence. The total investment is $253,540, of which $183,565 is the cost of the dam, and $69,975 represents other facilities. A cabin development similar to that of Cove Lake is planned here which, together with the necessary maintenance work to rehabilitate the area and facilities, would cost in the neighborhood of $45,600.

Lee's Creek (Crawford County)

A small picnic area with swimming facilities at Lee's Creek with an original investment cost of $2,500 requires almost complete rehabilitation which would cost in the neighborhood of $2,500.

Cherry Bend (Franklin County)

This is a small roadside area on Highway 23 in need of complete rehabilitation for picnic tables, toilets, and water at a cost in the neighborhood of about $1,200.

Gray's Forest Camp (Franklin County)

Gray's Forest camp is a small picnic area containing a number of fireplaces, tables, shelters, and toilets, and will require about $1,100 to place it in first-class condition.

White Rock recreational area (Franklin County)

This area covers about 600 acres, including a number of picnic tables, fireplaces, toilets, three shelters, a concession building, three cabins, as well as a water supply, all of which originally cost $76,585. To put this place in good condition would require about $6,100.

Shores Lake (Franklin County)

This covers an area of approximately 700 acres. It was designed to provide an 80-acre lake, organization camp, picnicking, camping, and a summer home site area. The dam is about one-half completed and the organization camp is practically completed except for water and some additional construction. Investment to date on the dam is listed on our books as $448,882 and investment in the organization camp and grounds as $35,085. It is estimated that it will require about $200,000 to complete the dam; $15,000 to complete the organization camp, which has a capacity of 125–150 people; about $25,000 to provide diving docks, toilets, picnic areas, shelters, etc.; $6,000 for landscaping; and about $19,500 to provide water and sewage facilities for the entire area. Entrance road signs and miscellaneous would amount to another $5,000, or a total of about $270,500. The organization camp will be operated on a somewhat make-shift basis by a local group this coming season.

This area when developed and completed will be one of the most attractive and popular areas within the Ozark National Forest. Its development will increase the usage of the concession building and cabins on White Rock Mountain and make them a going concern.

Bayou Bluff recreational area (Pope County)

This contains an area of about 200 acres with toilet facilities, bathhouse, picnicking, and three small overnight cabins and an undeveloped swimming pool on Illinois Bayou Creek. The investment in this area to date is $13,611. To rehabilitate this area, provide drinking water, and construct a low dam, it is estimated it would cost in the neighborhood of $6,500.

Barkshed Forest Camp (Stone County)

This is a small picnic spot on Barkshed Creek with facilities for swimming, picnic tables, shelters, and toilets. The investment to date on this is $6,196. To rehabilitate this area, it would cost in the neighborhood of $4,900.

Blanchard Springs recreational area (Stone County)

This unusually attractive area consists of a shelter, picnicking facilities, toilets, etc. The parking area was never completed. To rehabilitate the area and provide a parking area, it would amount to $8,700.

Blanchard Springs organization camp (Stone County)

This organization camp with a capacity of 125–150 people is completed except for water supply, completion of bathhouse and latrines, and miscellaneous work on the grounds such as signs, fences, etc. It is estimated that $32,000 will be required to complete this camp to where it could be put into use.

SUMMARY

The estimated cost to rehabilitate all the area on the forest is summarized below:

Mount Magazine:	
Rehabilitation of recreational facilities	$40,000
Road to Mount Magazine within the forest from Paris to Havana	180,000
	220,000
Cove Lake:	
Completion of spillway	80,000
Completion of rehabilitation and additional facilities	51,000
	131,000
Spring Lake:	
Rehabilitation and additional facilities	45,600
Lee's Creek:	
Rehabilitation of area	2,500
Cherry Bend:	
Rehabilitation of area	1,200
Gray's Forest Camp:	
Rehabilitation	1,100
White Rock:	
Rehabilitation	6,100
Shores Lake Dam:	
Completion	200,000
Completion organization camp, swimming and picnicking facilities	70,500
	270,500
Bayou Bluff:	
Rehabilitation	$6,500
Barkshed:	
Rehabilitation	4,900
Blanchard Springs recreational area:	
Rehabilitation and parking lot	8,700
Blanchard Springs organization camp:	
Additional construction and rehabilitation	32,000
Total	730,100

The above outline has been prepared to give an idea as to the amount of investment in recreational facilities and the amount needed to rehabilitate and complete them in accordance with original plans. It is not expected that any such sum could be made available at the present time or even for a considerable time in the future, considering the national debt and the present necessary expenditures. However, if the areas are to be made attractive to visitors and capitalize on these developments, an addition to the present amount of maintenance money will be needed over a period of years to permit their rehabilitation.

Procedures have now been worked out whereby the operator of a concession is required to do a certain amount of maintenance work. This will help us to some extent in the future, but still will not be sufficient to rehabilitate the areas.

The proposed cabin developments at Spring and Cove Lakes would not only provide a highly needed recreational facility, but would provide an operation which would attract and justify a concessionaire on a business basis, at the same time reducing the necessity of providing a recreation guard for policing, cleaning up, etc., as this would be made a part of the concessionaire's job.

Consideration is also being given to setting a small charge, say 25–50 cents per car for the use of picnic tables and facilities on the areas. While such charges will of necessity be limited to the larger areas where the amount of usage and the facilities for collecting the charge would justify the expenditure such as Spring Lake, Cove Lake, White Rock, and perhaps Blanchard Springs areas, this would be the introduction of a new practice and its adoption will have to be handled very carefully until local people became accustomed to it. This is mentioned primarily as a means which we plan to adopt in order to place the areas a little more on a self-sustaining basis.

In regard to priority, each area serves a specific locality and all deserve consideration. The most immediate returns perhaps would result from completion of Cove Lake spillway followed by Mount Magazine Road. Then those areas having possibilities of heavy usage and being handled and largely maintained by concessionaires such as Cove Lake recreational area should receive consideration.

Government Research in Heart and Rheumatic Diseases

REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the remarks that have been made by several Members, Mr. PRIEST,

Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. KEEFE, on the resolution introduced by them to establish an institute to assist in research on arthritis and rheumatic diseases, I would like to call attention to a resolution—House Joint Resolution 105—which I introduced last year and which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and I introduced again this year asking that the President designate each year the week of February 14, Valentine Day, as National Heart Week. That week is being sponsored for that purpose by the American Heart Association and it should be made official. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that a combination of Government and private agencies working together is the best way to make most progress in research in the cause and management of obscure and widespread diseases.

If, during that week, we can focus attention throughout the country on the fact that heart disease, which is the serious end product of rheumatic fever, is the single greatest killer we have today, causes more unemployment and affects more persons than any other disease, we will be able to develop public sentiment and support for maximum effort, in cooperation with Government, against this great menace to all.

One American's Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter received from a citizen of the congressional district in Michigan which I have the honor to represent.

In rather pointed language, this taxpayer sets forth his ideas of cutting down public spending and waste.

The letter follows:

PLYMOUTH, MICH., *January 15, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having read through the fantastic figures offered by the President of the United States, the President of all (?) the people, even the poor little devil who has to foot the bill for the 1949 budget, I would like to submit my own figures on the matter. You can save nearly 50 percent for the taxpayer by adopting them.

The national defense figure is too damn much. Who are we fighting anyway, except the high cost of living?

The veterans' service could help some on the budget cut, though not nearly so proportionate as the rest of the items.

The international affairs are in a muddle now. Why make 'em worse?

Social welfare is some more of this paternalistic grafting in the guise of good doers.

Community facilities are nuts. Let the rugged individualists stand on their own feet instead of running all the time to Uncle Sammy for money.

Education now is way ahead of the country's spiritual welfare. Less brains for a while and more fearing of the Omnipotent.

Agriculture and more agriculture deserve a 75-percent cut, both of them. They are the guys who wanted to plow under the little pigs. And see what we pay now for pork.

Let Government bigwigs spend more time at home and not so much running over the earth minding other people's business. They won't need so much transportation money.

Labor believes nothing else is right but striking. So why pay them to do it besides?

General Government deserves only half of what it's asking for. When they deserve it, let's pay them for it.

Interest on the debt that 15 years of misrule made, unfortunately, has to be paid.

But why pay a nickel for contingencies? What are the legislatures getting their salaries for but to avoid them?

That then sums up the taxpayer's idea of cutting down on all the pork-barrel craziness down in Washington. I can hardly get my own bills paid as it is.

Sincerely,

E. FLETCHER CAMPBELL.

Cloture in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Republicans in Senate Seen Making Mistake in Favoring Cloture," written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS IN SENATE SEEN MAKING MISTAKE IN FAVORING CLOTURE—ACTION TO LIMIT DEBATE WOULD DEPRIVE MINORITY OF RIGHT TO BE HEARD

(By David Lawrence)

The Republicans in the Senate are about to make a mistake which will rise to plague them for years to come and may make such a fundamental change in congressional government as to bring forth a demand for a single instead of a two-house system.

The Republicans have lined up behind a move which will permit a majority to shut off debate. Some Republicans favor a simple majority and others favor two-thirds to apply cloture on those procedural points not covered by the present rule whereby debate is limited in part. But in either event, it would be possible for the minority to be deprived of its right to be heard.

For decades the United States Senate has been the one place in the world of free governments where the minority could not be shouted down and its chance taken away to be heard fully and comprehensively.

Now it is asserted that even the present rule which applies cloture in certain instances but does not really prevent extended debate if Members choose to make use of the procedures available to them has been rarely invoked. But if all motions and procedures are to be covered by a two-thirds cloture, it would be a simple matter later on to change it to a majority of those present. The Senate then would become almost identical in its procedure with the House of Representatives, thus making it logical to call for a unicameral or single-House system. Such a plan would place the Western States and others with a small population at a serious disadvantage and would abolish the sovereignty of the States for all practical purposes.

ENCOURAGES TYRANNY

The real objection to the adoption of any absolute rule to cut off debate is that it encourages the formation of arbitrary and intolerate majorities which can become tyrannical.

The argument that recourse can be had at the polls against such a majority falls to the ground, because two-thirds of the Senate Members do not come up for election each congressional year and it is possible for a majority of two-thirds to invoke cloture and not be held accountable for as many as 4 years.

If cloture is adopted, then logically the people must have some quicker means of redress than they have today. In the democracy of Canada and other English-speaking governments, the people can overrule their national legislative body at any time. An election can be held to determine whether a majority misinterpreted or correctly interpreted the will of the people.

In the sense that the adoption of cloture may hasten the day when a constitutional amendment is adopted calling for the removal of a President when he fails by a two-thirds vote to retain the confidence of both Houses of Congress and calling for replacement of Members when they have lost the confidence of the people, the step can be welcomed. But to adopt cloture without at the same time giving the people an instantaneous check on an arbitrary majority is illogical and inconsistent.

The Republicans are playing bad politics when they join with the northern Democrats to change the rules governing debate. Already this week they have an example of how an intolerant majority functions when it wishes to cut off hearings in an important committee considering labor-management legislation of far-reaching importance to the people.

HYPOCRITICAL MANEUVER

To find the Republicans anxious to make political capital out of the discomfiture of the Democrats who are divided on the civil-rights issue is regrettable, because on its face the maneuver is hypocritical. The sponsors of civil rights for Negroes presumably are not yet ready to support a measure to protect the civil rights of the white man.

There are more instances each year of violence on the picket line in labor disputes, more instances of cars overturned as workers seek to get into factory parking lots and more instances of intimidation in the homes of workers by strong-arm men than there have been lynchings in the last 10 years. The proposal to put the police power of the Federal Government behind the civil rights of Negroes would be widely acclaimed if it were broadened to include all manner of violence in which citizens have not been given protection by the local authorities. If any Republican or any southern Democrat sought the passage of any such all-inclusive law, the northern Democrats would never support it and would back away from the issue.

The antifilibuster movement is really tied up with a movement by the Republicans to win the Negro vote in the North, though, to be sure, a large part of it has gone Democratic for several years notwithstanding the fact that the late President Roosevelt never attempted to force the members of his own party from the South to give up their right to unlimited debate and to jam through Congress any civil-rights legislation.

The Republicans are the minority party in Congress and filibustering is a weapon of the minority. That's why it seems strange that the Republican leaders are willing to give up the one method left in congressional procedure by which the arbitrariness of any majority in either party can be held in check.

Four Million Homes Added

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article taken from a recent issue of the Wall Street Journal.

Every man, woman, and child in the United States has a stake in this public-housing problem, and, before it is too late, let us take inventory and see what the building industry has already done to rehouse America. There are too many necessary demands on the taxpayer's dollar to launch on an $18,000,000,000 subsidized housing program, which is the first step on the road to complete state socialism.

The article follows:

HIDDEN HOUSES—UNITED STATES EXPERTS RECOUNT; DECIDE THEY MISSED 4,000,000 ADDED HOMES—RENOVATION WAS ONE FACTOR FORGOTTEN; ITS DISCOVERY COULD CUT PUBLIC HOUSING—STATISTICAL DEBATE CONTINUES

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—America has some 4,000,000 hidden dwellings. They are helping to take the sharp edge off housing demand. And their discovery may well have an important effect on future Government housing policy.

Evidence of these forgotten houses has been dug out of statistics by some of President Truman's top economic advisers. These economists were searching for an explanation of why demand for housing this fall and winter has softened somewhat at a time when nearly everyone, in Washington, at least, expected continued high pressure.

They think one answer lies in their findings that since the census of April 1940, there have been close to 4,000,000 more habitable dwellings added to the available nonfarm housing supply than official Government figures have led people to believe. These aren't new units, they're quick to point out, but they are serving to house many families who were believed to be out looking for some place to live.

The count and conclusions of these experts are not universally accepted by all other administration housing specialists. But the findings are being studied seriously and much weight is being given to them. Some lawmakers who will pass on housing legislation in the Eighty-first Congress are tempering their enthusiasm for public housing in the light of these studies. Thus, the theories of Mr. Truman's own economists may actually be used to pare down the President's demand for a 7-year program to build 1,000,000 federally subsidized, low-rent housing uints.

REFIGURE FUTURE NEED

If the recount of the housing supply is accepted, it will mean trimming by three to five million the previous estimates of how many new homes should be built in 1960. These figures on "need" have ranged from 12,000,000 to 14,000,000 new dwellings between now and 1960.

The basic premise of the "hidden houses" counters is this: Practically all judgments of the Nation's housing needs have been based on Bureau of Labor Statistics figures on new nonfarm dwellings started. These figures are quite accurate as far as they go, the theory runs, but they ignore these big factors:

Between April 1940 and April 1947 about 2,240,000 housing units were taken out of the substandard category and put into the habitable class. This was done, for example, by families with war-earned money to spend, putting in plumbing and toilets, fixing walls and roofs, and making other needed repairs. This fixing up has continued at a fast pace since 1947, although probably not as fast as in the war years.

All of this means that better than two-and-a-quarter million dwellings, which public-housing advocates had counted out because they were substandard and needed replacement, have by now been brought back into the housing supply.

Another net gain of 1,117,00 to 1,367,000 dwellings, likewise not counted by BLS, came in these ways: Switching nonresidential property into housing, breaking large homes into several smaller apartments, and using former farm dwellings as shelter for folk who aren't farmers.

During this 1940–47 period, BLS reported only 3,293,000 new houses started to augment the Nation's housing supply. But now the housing economists, taking their hidden sources into account, claim the gain for the period was really somewhere between 6,650,000 and 6,900,000 dwellings—roughly, 3,350,000 to 3,600,00 more than the BLS reports show. Bringing these calculations up to date by estimates, these specialists maintain the discrepancy is now nearly 4,000,000.

HALF RIGHT

In some war years, these economists believe, the BLS figures showed only half the habitable dwellings added.

Their conclusion: First, the backlog of demand isn't as great as was thought; second, estimates of future need should be revised so home building won't go ahead too fast and build up the vacancy rate. They fear prices would then be forced sharply down, scaring builders out of the housing field.

Finally, to slow the pace, Government aids to home building for the middle-income groups should be held steady—certainly not increased. This assistance is chiefly in financing. Veterans' labor, and other groups advocate proposals for direct Government loans to ex-GI's for houses, for more liberal terms on loans to cooperatives, and for increasing the amount and type of mortgages that can be sold to the Government's secondary mortgage market, thus making more cash available for lending.

These statistics also will be used in Congress to oppose the ambitious public-housing program outlined by President Truman in his state of the Union message. The President's advisers don't think their findings really argue against the need for some federally subsidized housing, but they fear Mr. Truman may have asked for too much.

They contend a public housing program is needed to provide dwellings at rents which can be afforded by low-income groups. They say it will take 3 or 4 years of filling the backlog and building up vacancies before enough higher-income families will move out of older, cheaper dwellings, making these available for people earning less. Until cheap private housing does trickle down, these administration experts contend, the Nation needs a short—perhaps 4- or 5-year—public low-rent housing program.

STATISTICAL SOURCE

The President's advisers arrived at their new arithmetical beliefs by checking the comprehensive April 1940 census of population, which included a housing count, against a sampling census report on housing made in April 1947. The figures showed a far greater increase in available units than the BLS statistics could account for and indicated where the extra units came from.

The calculators admit that the April 1947 census sampling might contain some errors—that's why they allow a range of estimates. They also checked sampling home counts made in April 1948 against the 1947 figures.

They are certain that since April 1947, there've been at least 300,000 dwellings added to the supply that weren't counted by BLS—bringing the total of hidden houses since 1940 up close to the 4,000,000 mark.

For example they calculate that during the calendar year 1947, when BLS reported 849,000 new dwellings, there were actually about 1,250,000 units added to the "habitable" housing supply.

During 1948, BLS estimates about 925,000 new dwellings; the economists think net additions will be well over a million. For 1949 BLS expects around 875,000 new houses; the new theory puts the count at slightly over a million added dwellings.

MATTER OF DISPUTE

Some other housing experts dispute the size of these projections. They claim the conversion possibility is nearly at an end; that more dwelling units are going into commercial use than the other way 'round and that the farm-to-factory trend is reversing. But they concede some validity to the new housing count.

The President's advisers add one more thought: Not only is there more housing than believed, but it's better housing. In 1940, they point out, 18.7 percent of the dwellings had four rooms or more. By 1947, 20.2 percent were of this size. In 1940, 19.8 perceent had five rooms against 21.6 percent in 1947. "Habitable" units are in better condition, too; there are more sanitary facilities, better paint jobs, and more insulation.

Government estimates have up to now counted on completely replacing about 5.2 million, "substandard" units before 1960. Now the experts think many of these will be fixed up.

Furthermore, "doubled-up" families can't all be counted as adding to the housing demand, they figure. Of some 2,500,000 families living together, only about 1,000,000 are involuntary—the others want to live that way and will continue to do so, even if housing is available.

Some key officials now say that adding about a million units a year—from all sources, not just new homes—will catch up with demand quickly enough without overbuilding the market. This increase yearly for 10 years would do this:

Take care of 500,000 families coming into the housing market each year.

Replace about 3,000,000 substandard units. Give homes for the million involuntarily doubled-up families.

Create a Nation-wide vacancy of about 1,000,000 units, which would give a "healthy" vacancy ratio of about 3 to 4 percent. A "good" vacancy rate encourages people to tear down obsolete units, but if the rate got too high it might discourage new building.

Postal Workers Should Have Same Annual and Sick Leave Privileges as Other Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, for some time a discrepancy has existed between the annual and sick leave to which a

postal employee is entitled and that applicable to other Federal employees. The latter are entitled to 26 days annual leave and 15 days sick leave, whereas, a postal employee receives 15 days annual and 10 days sick leave.

There seems to be no reason for this discrimination against a group of Federal workers who certainly in diligence, faithfulness, and devotion to duty are second to none in the Federal service.

In order to remedy this inequity, I have today introduced a bill to equalize the provisions relating to all Federal employees. If it is enacted into law, postal employees will hereafter be granted 26 days leave of absence with pay (exclusive of Saturday, Sunday, and holidays) and sick leave with pay at the rate of 15 days a year. This leave is cumulative.

Also classified substitute employees under such regulations as the Postmaster General may subscribe are given the same right and benefits with respect to annual and sick leave which accrue to regular employees.

Since this measure represents only simple justice to the postal workers, it is hoped that it may have early and favorable consideration both in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and in the House.

High Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of January 10, 1949:

HOW HIGH ARE THOSE PRICES?

We've enjoyed complaining, as loudly as anybody, about prices which we've had to pay for food and other necessities, the past few years. Many of these high price tags, we have noted, were brought about deliberately by our New Deal masters, in accordance with their standing policy of fattening up the voting-age farmer, at the expense of the average American consumer and taxpayer.

Our good housewives have had considerable to say also in recent years about politicians who plow under good food and kerosene grade-A potatoes, and we've applauded every indignant girlish yelp.

Nevertheless, we're now wondering about prices in general. Many of them were needlessly high, of course. But were they, even in record-smashing 1948, so high as to be completely out line with our American economy?

As it happens, some of the country's leading economists have been busying themselves with just that question.

One of the best recent round-ups on prices has just been completed by the economists and statisticians of the National Industrial Conference Board, and we'll try to boil down a few of their points to fit this space.

YARDSTICK FOR PRICES

First of all, these experts say, we shouldn't think of prices in terms of mere dollars. Dollars have a tricky habit of changing their own value in times of inflation and depression. In the United States today, for instance, $5 would be much too high a price for a one-passenger steak. But in China, using inflated Chinese money, the same grub would be a bargain, maybe, at $5,000,000.

The only scientific way to measure prices, the economists say, is by comparing whatever you want to buy with the hours you'd have to work to earn it.

Using that yardstick, you'd probably consider an egg cheap if you could get it by working for say, just one minute. But if you were to be charged a whole hour's labor for that one egg you'd probably switch to spinach.

Employing this system of comparison, NICB statisticians have gone back for a third of a century, checking scores of United States food prices against the average wages per hour of that particular year. And most of their answers seem to prove that today's groceries, despite the high dollar price tags, are even cheaper than they were in the good old days of, say, 1914.

Back in 1914, they found, if you were an average wage earner with an average-sized and average-hungry family, you had to spend 30 hours on the job to buy a week's supply of food for your household.

In 1948, you were doing considerably better by comparison. That same family-sized basket of food costs you quite a few more dollars than it would have in 1914. But you earn it by only 12 hours' work, instead of 30.

CHICKEN ON THE TABLE

Take the 5-pound roasting chicken. In 1914, a factory worker would have had to labor for more than 4 hours to get the bird. The same weight roaster costs a 1949 worker just a bit more than 1½ hours on the job.

It's the same story with other modern consumer commodities, especially foods. The price of round steak, as any housewife knows, is away up there in dollars and cents. In fact, round steak in 1948 was a whopping 370 percent higher than it was in 1914. But hourly wages have gone up even more. In terms of work-hours, that piece of round is now down approximately 40 percent.

So that's the economists' story about some prices today, and we think their way of reckoning is not only cheerful but sound. By improving his efficiency, and letting machinery do as much of his work as possible, the average American has achieved the world's highest real living standard—no matter what the price tags say.

In other lands that's not the story. In Pal Joe's workers' utopia, for instance, Ivan still sweats 70 minutes to get the loaf of bread an American earns in 7½. And Ivan works 10½ hours for a pound of butter, which is worth half an hour's labor here.

Maybe, before we let out our next yelps about those outrageous pork-chop prices or whatever, we'd better try figuring out the bill by the price-wage system.

Don't Cheer Yet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we should have learned in the thirties that there is no prosperity unless the farmers prosper, too. The rapid decline in farm commodities prices will cause our entire national economy to suffer. The following editorial is from the January 22 issue of the Marshfield News-Herald, Marshfield, Wis., which is also known as the cheese center of the United States:

DON'T CHEER YET

The downward trend in the price of cheese is bad news to Wisconsin farmers and to those who trade with them, for it means a decrease in the number of improvements farmers can make in their living conditions and a consequent reduction in trade for those who serve them.

Dairymen are not alone in this respect—prices of meat animals are falling too, and that affects western beef growers and the pork producers of the Corn Belt. Just how serious the downward trend is, no one can say with real assurance at this time. Many farmers agree that prices have been too high for stability, but if they decline too rapidly the entire national economy will suffer.

Consumers who hail declining prices with joy will do well to remember that the downward trend may not be an unmixed blessing. Curtailment of farm purchasing power is quickly felt in merchandising and industrial circles, so it may be wise to ask not for whom the bell tolls. Labor leaders, preparing to seek another round of wage increases, had better keep an eye on farm conditions before becoming too insistent upon their demands. We should have learned well in the thirties that there is no permanent prosperity unless farmers prosper too.

Limitation of Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by me on January 28, 1949, on the subject of limitation of debate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, twice within a generation this Nation has been forced to the use of armed might in order to protect its democratic freedoms. It seems incongruous to me that in view of two such mortal struggles within our lifetime we should now be forced to come here to protect those same freedoms in this body. Doesn't it seem out of keeping, Mr. Chairman, that while we seek to assure the various freedoms to all the world, we should have to pause in our deliberations of pressing legislation to protect freedom of speech in the Senate.

The Chamber of the United States Senate is the only remaining legislative body in the entire world where unrestricted debate may be held freely and openly. I am deeply concerned over this move which is designed to restrict this freedom of speech.

It may appear at times that this freedom of speech is being abused. On such occasions the common name for this device is called filibustering. Call it what you will, Sir, the name is unimportant. It remains the right of a representative of the people of this country to make their wishes and desires known in this center of Government through his voice. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that under the rules of the Senate filibuster is possible. It is also true that filibustering will recur again and again in the future, just

as it has throughout the long history of the United States Senate.

Filibusters are possible in this body because we enjoy the privilege of unlimited debate. This privilege is one which I consider one of the most sacred rights guaranteed to every Member of this body. Without this right any minority would be helpless and defenseless. They would be always, and under all circumstances, subject to the will of the majority. They would be left with not even a single weapon with which to fight in the defense of the sovereign States represented here in the Senate.

It is often said, Mr. Chairman, that the majority should always have its way. I think there is ample reason for denying the steadfastness of such a rule. I think we would point out a number of instances in which the majority was not always right. As a matter of fact, I suspect some of our Republican friends might point out a very recent instance on which they would refute the old rule. The throttling of debate is something which must never be allowed to come about in the Senate of the United States. For all practicable purposes it would be the bitter end to this, not only the greatest but the only remaining open, legislative forum in the world—the only sounding board for the voice of free people where free and unlimited speech is an inherent right. The Members of this body have the right to outvote and defeat a Senator in his contentions, but they cannot and must not be allowed to do it as long as the Senator can and will speak. That is the basic doctrine of the filibuster.

It is my contention that sudden and frequent changes in the policy of the Government are harmful to all the interests in this country. I believe that hasty and imperfectly considered legislation is dangerous to the rights of the States and the people. What we do here in this body is of intense personal interest, not only to more than 150,000,000 people in this country, but to a large segment of the entire population of the world. Our actions here should reflect mature, deliberate, and sober second thought. Our deliberations should reflect the well-considered will of the people.

Absolute freedom of debate may be and undoubtedly is sometimes abused. But, Mr. Chairman, are there any privileges enjoyed by human beings that are not subject to abuse at one time or another? It is like the workings of democracy. For all of our great democratic policies and practices, there are still certain privileges for which we pay dearly. Mr. Chairman, I say we can better afford to submit to some abuse to the right of free speech than we can afford to allow the passage of legislation without full, mature, and deliberate consideration. When we act here, we are creating laws which reach into the homes and business of the people who sent us here. Their welfare must never be taken lightly.

One of the greatest evils that can possibly result from the abuse of the right of unlimited debate is the postponement of legislation to another Congress. However, I am confident that when such legislation is demanded by popular interest the people of our States may be relied upon to send men to Congress who will enact it into law. It would be far better if we made haste slowly than it would be if we disposed of great questions quickly but without the fullest, most mature and deliberate consideration.

I cannot speak for other Senators, Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for myself and reflect to you the wishes of the people of my State. It would be a betrayal of their confidence in me if I were ever to lend my approval or support to any rule that would limit the right of free speech in the Senate of the United States. I would not jeopardize, in their eyes, the dignity of the Senate and civil liberty. In this body the right to free speech must necessarily be the rule. Every measure must be open to full discussion without restraint.

It is entirely unnecessary that I intrude on your graciousness by reviewing the long history of filibustering in the Senate. I do feel, however, that a brief reminder of the success and failure of this record is pertinent at this point.

Rule 22 was amended in 1917. An analysis of the 19 cloture votes since that amendment indicates that only four petitions have received the required two-thirds majority. On only seven instances did a majority of the entire membership of the Senate vote in the affirmative for cloture. On 12 occasions a majority was obtained on the part of those present and voting. Six cloture petitions obtained a minority of those present and voting, and one resulted in a tie.

The conference committee, composed of five Democrats and five Republicans, which drafted the cloture rule of 1917 stated that its purpose was to formulate a rule that would terminate successful filibuster. As to the degree of success with which this cloture rule has terminated successful filibuster, I again invite your attention to the record. It has failed to achieve its purpose in 15 out of 19 times. The record also shows that a majority cloture rule would have failed on 12 out of the 19 times. The record further shows that even a simple majority cloture would have failed to stop succesful filibuster in almost one-third of the cases in which cloture has been invoked since 1917.

At various times in the past many remedies have been proposed for so-called obstruction to legislation in the Senate. I cannot help but note the repetition of the same basic suggestions for more than a century. They boil down to four proposals: (1) Majority cloture; (2) the previous question; (3) a rule of relevancy; and (4) more effective enforcement of existing rules.

If changes would be made in the present rules, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest that we first review some rules of the Senate already in effect. We have a rule requiring a speaker to remain standing and not sit or walk about.

We have a rule which would take a Senator off his feet for using unparliamentary language.

We have another rule which states that "No Senator shall speak more than twice upon any one question in debate on the same date without leave of the Senate, which shall be determined without debate."

We have a provision in Jefferson's manual that "No one is to speak impertinently or beside the question, superfluously or tediously."

Those are some of the rules which are already in effect, Mr. Chairman. Undoubtedly there are others.

It does seem out of order that the Senate could limit duration of debate on bills by special orders as the House does. It is done frequently by unanimous consent even now. There have been many instances where debate has been limited by setting a specific time for a vote on a given measure. But I would remind you, Mr. Chairman, that this device is always achieved by unanimous consent.

It has been rightly stated that filibusters have killed more bad bills than good ones. I do not know of any important measure which has been defeated by filibuster and then enacted at a later date. Practically every proposal defeated by filibuster has been regretted by the country and only rarely readvocated by its supporters. The only recurring bills which come to my mind are the antilynch bill and the anti-poll-tax bill. Antilynch bills were filibustered in 1922, 1935, and the Congress of 1937-38. Anti-poll-tax bills were filibustered in 1942, 1944, 1946, and in the special session of 1948. It is still my hope that the anti-poll-tax bill will be left to the several States in the form of a constitutional amendment. That is the way it should be handled.

In speaking of the freedom of speech and unlimited debate, we cannot afford to overlook our governmental system of separate powers. It is the unique function of the Senate to act as a check upon the Executive. This responsibility alone could not be performed without full freedom of debate. Unrestricted debate in the Senate is the only check against bitter autocracy.

It would seem to me that any of our rules in the Senate are intentionally designed to guarantee this freedom. The Constitution's requirement for recording the yeas and nays is a protection of dilatory tactics. The provision of the Constitution which requires the yeas and nays to be recorded in the journal at the desire of only one-fifth of the Members present is an intentional safeguard. Here is an example of constitutional protection of a minority in allowing a delay in proceedings. The House of Representatives allows 5 minutes for a Congressman to address himself to a particular measure. Majority cloture in the Senate would simply destroy its deliberative function and make it an annex of the House.

The term filbuster may be considered somewhat modern, Mr. Chairman. But the use of filibustering tactics is by no means a new legislative practice. The method was used in the Roman Senate and it was long known to the British Parliament. It was even practiced in some of the legislatures of the Thirteen Original Colonies. As a matter of fact the very ratification of the Federal Constitution resulted in a famous but unsuccessful filibuster in the Pensylvania one-house legislature. Under our Constitution the filibuster found a place in the First Congress. Congress was meeting in New York when a wrangle occurred which would certainly be termed a filibuster.

To hear some people talk, Mr. Chairman, Senators have done nothing but waste time since the very beginning of our Government. It seems to me that what they consider to be a waste of time is more often a service and to the best interest of the country in the long run. It is not inconceivable that at some future time some southern Senator may introduce a bill which would be considered most obnoxious to the residents of some other section of our country. I am sure that the people of that section would be glad to know that their own Senators would have the legal right to fight with every conceivable parliamentary device in order to delay and ultimately kill such a bill. It may not seem so now but the time may come when Senators from other States may delight in using the various devices of unlimited debate which some of us are now accused of abusing.

During the early days of Congress the procedure known as "previous question" was a method by which debate could be limited in the Senate. That rule was abolished in 1807 and there were no other rules adopted by which debate could be limited until the so-called cloture rule was adopted in 1917. In other words, from 1789 until 1807 there was the "previous question" device which cut off all debate. That procedure was so disastrous and so ineffective in effecting legislation that in 1807 it was done away with. Until 1917, for 110 years, there was no rule, no method or regulation by which the discussion of a subject on the floor of the Senate could be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in free and unlimited debate. We do not know what is going to happen in this country in the future. The right of open debate has long been cherished in this body. The right of unlimited speech is a powerful weapon but it is a safeguard necessary to the preservation of the liberty upon which this Nation was founded.

Members of the Senate, to my mind, are ambassadors. We are ambassadors representing the sovereign States from which we are elected. We are sent here to uphold the sovereignty of our States. The privilege of unlimited debate gives us a method by which those rights may be protected from destruction. So long as this right remains no majority may force its views upon a minority when the minority is on guard.

Mr. Chairman, there is no place where the absolute freedom of speech is more essential to the best interests of the people and to civil liberty itself than right here in the United States Senate. This is especially true when we remember that the Senate is the only legislative body where freedom of debate is permitted.

Look at the propositions, Mr. Chairman, and consider their implication. Suppose we allow the iron claw of the Federal Government to take control of the elections in the States. Suppose we cut off the freedom of debate in the Senate. Mr. Chairman, as I think of the consequence of such moves I shudder at the very thought of the monster we would have created. Why, we would have created a despotism under which self-government would be but a name. The four freedoms would be nothing more than a faint memory of earlier days when we lived under the concept of government of, by, and for the people.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that the rules of this Senate are founded deep in human experience. They are the result of centuries of tireless effort to preserve the rights and liberties for which our forefathers, our fathers, our sons, and our brothers have bled and died. Is it not true that, by its own rules, the Senate fixes the limits of its own powers? By these very rules, throughout its history, the Senate has sought to preserve without restraint two essentials of wise legislation and of good government—the right of amendment and of debate. In my judgment, it would seem that far greater evils would result from hasty legislation than from a delay which follows full discussion and deliberation.

The freedom of debate is something which I have always thought to be a cherished possession of the Members of the Senate. The record on cloture votes which I mentioned earlier seem to bear this out. Senators, by the record, have always been reluctant to invoke the rule which has been on the books since 1917. Cloture is a gag rule. It shuts off debate. It forces all free and open discussion to come to an end.

The intent of the framers of the Constitution certainly seems clear on this point. There was a pointed and realistic attempt made to create an upper Chamber of the Congress which would represent a different point of view than that of the House. Senators were given a longer term. They are required to be of more advanced age. Their body is smaller in number and each State is given equal representation.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on at great length and point out objections to any rule which would limit or cut off debate in the United States Senate. However, I realize that you have heard a number of Senators already and will still hear more after I have finished. Some of them will call for the preservation of unlimited debate in far more eloquent terms than I am able to use. But, Mr. Chairman, none of them will be more sincere in their plea that we maintain this bulwark against any future despots who would impose an unjust will on any minority. When this happens in the United States Senate, a fatal blow will have been dealt to our liberties. You will have broken down the greatest weapon against wrong and oppression within the reach of the Members of this body. As long as I remain a Member of this body—an ambassador sent by the people of the State of South Carolina to the upper Chamber of the Federal Government—I shall stand against any rule which denies free and unlimited debate to each and every Member.

Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement upon natural resources, which I made this morning at the opening of a hearing before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is appropriate in opening this hearing to say that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is in search of an improved policy for the conservation, development, and administration of the natural resources of the United States.

It was these resources, utilized by the skill and industry of millions of our people, that made this country the industrial leader of the world, and enabled us in two world wars to turn the scale against arbitrary military power. These same resources, if intelligently utilized now to raise and stabilize the living standards of all the people, can be the means of winning a permanent basis for world peace.

Modern warfare is an appallingly wasteful and destructive method of applying industrial and scientific skills to the gifts of nature. A fraction of the energy and ability which we exercised under the spur of war would, if intelligently applied to the constructive aims of peace, make wars impossible. Our Nation is launched now on an effort to put an end to war for all time by promoting economic rehabilitation of free peoples everywhere. To succeed in this, however, as President Truman said in his inaugural address, it is necessary to keep America strong:

"If we are to succeed in carrying out these policies," the President said, "it is clear that we must have continued prosperity in this country, and we must keep ourselves strong."

It is to keep ourselves strong that Government policy must first be directed, for unless we remain strong, our peace effort is bound to fail. Unless we are sound, the world movement for peace which depends upon us cannot succeed. The noncooperation of the dictators of the Kremlin in the rehabilitation of Europe has been inspired by their conviction that we would weaken, that the system of individual economic and political freedom would be unequal to the strain, and that by withdrawing from the struggle to maintain the economic basis of the peace, we would create the world vacuum into which dictatorial communism with its denial of basic human freedom would inevitably pour.

So we have invited Secretary J. A. Krug, Under Secretary Chapman, Assistant Secretaries Davidson and Warne, and the various bureau chiefs, to appear at this public hearing to describe the responsibilities which have been imposed by law upon the Department of the Interior, to explain administrative problems and difficulties, and to make such suggestions for legislation as may be prompted by their experience and outlook.

Before calling upon the Secretary, however, I should like to point out that we are dealing here with national and not merely sectional or regional problems. The proper handling of our natural resources is of concern to every citizen of the entire country. Our water resources, our resources of timber, the resources of the continental shelf beneath the sea bordering the United States, jurisdiction over which was promulgated for the National Government by Presidential proclamation and sustained by the recent Supreme Court decisions, and our mineral resources, belong to all the people of the whole country.

Our mineral heritage, for example, is not for the West alone—it is for the whole country. The Bureau of Mines serves all 48 States and the Territories as well. So does the Geological Survey, and in any catalog of possible sources of new mineral supply it is important for the whole country to know that, to date, scarcely 10 percent of our land area has been topographically and geographically mapped. The National Treasury expended considerably more than $2,000,000,000 during the war for the importation of important minerals. Complete geographical mapping of the whole Nation might easily reveal new sources of previously unsuspected deposits. We have been accustomed to think that foreign deposits of bauxite were the only sources from which to draw the raw material for the manufacture of aluminum. We know now that in several States of the Union, not all of them in the West, there are valuable deposits of alumina clay.

Mineral production to date has come from large accessible deposits uncovered by natural erosion. Explorers for petroleum within the past 2 years have found new productive horizons by the use of new techniques of exploration and drilling. What has been done in one field may be accomplished in another. The work of the Bureau of Mines has already demonstrated that we have vast sources for the manufacture of unmeasured quantities of liquid fuel in our deposits of coal and of oil shale.

Every discovery of a new mineral deposit, of a new use for an old mineral, of a new technique to refine or process a known deposit, every discovery of a substitute material that can take the place of one that is perhaps near exhaustion, is a national and international benefit, for it will aid us to raise and stabilize the standard of living of our own people, and by example show the people of the world what they can do by their own efforts with their own mineral resources. We can demonstrate that freedom produces a higher level of prosperity and a greater degree of individual and national security than any other status in which man can live.

In the simple economy of a century ago, it was not necessary for the people to call upon government to the extent to which they are now obliged to do. Most of the early water projects, the furnishing of community supplies, the reclamation of land, were easily and inexpensively constructed, and until comparatively recently the size and scope of such projects were well within the revenue of private capital or of local governments. It takes the financial resources of the Federal Government to harness a river like the Colorado, to build a Hoover Dam, or a Grand Coulee project. The great hydroelectric power resources on the large rivers of the United States encompassing most of the potential water resources of the Nation have been left undeveloped until recently, because only recently has Government undertaken the task. Yet it is clear now that the full development of the hydroelectric potential of our rivers would provide the country with electrical generating capacities double

that of all existing steam generating plants, thereby creating new opportunities for business, new profits for industry, new revenue for government at every level.

In the course of 300 years, chiefly during the last century, we have used or destroyed most of our original timber heritage, plus much of what has grown in the meantime. We now have only 1,600,000,000,000 board feet, or one-fifth of our original virgin stand of 8,000,000,000,000 board feet.

Current saw-timber harvest far exceeds new growth. More than one-third of the approximately 500,000,000 acres of commercial forest land is denuded or poorly stocked. Only a portion of the rest is under sustained-yield management. The quality of timber is declining, the impact of continued high-level demand on a diminishing supply has induced a stratospheric rise in stumpage prices, thus naturally increasing the cost of housing for all our people.

In Alaska and in the continental United States on the unreserved public domain, the Department of the Interior has jurisdiction of substantial national timber resources. Experts tell us that the restoration of timber abundance is possible of achievement, but only after a long period of reforestation under a program which can be administered only by the authority of the Federal Government.

These are but some of the considerations which the committee and the Congress, as well as the executive branch of the Government, must bear in mind in considering the intelligent conservation and utilization of our natural resources to make possible a world in which men may live together in peace.

Proposed Denial of Marshall-Plan Aid to the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news article headed "Missions parley urges ERP to cut off Dutch," published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1949. This news article, which is an Associated Press dispatch, should be of interest to all Senators in view of the fact that the organization calling for strong measures against the Dutch invaders of the Indonesian Republic is the largest Protestant agency in North America.

The Foreign Missions Conference, subject of the article, represents 108 Protestant foreign-mission boards in 61 denominations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSIONS PARLEY URGES ERP TO CUT OFF DUTCH—PROTESTANT AGENCY BACKS UNITED STATES INDONESIAN POLICY, WANTS IT STRENGTHENED

BUCK HILL FALLS, PA., January 7.—The largest Protestant agency in North America called on the United States today to cut off Marshall-plan aid to the Netherlands until that country withdraws from Indonesia.

Leaders of the Foreign Missions Conference commended the United States Government for its stated policy during the present emergency in Indonesia and added: "We respectfully urge that the United States continue unwaveringly in this attitude, even though it may have to stand alone among the great powers in refusing to buttress colonialism in Indonesia."

The resolution, passed by the Protestant missionary leaders at the final session of a 4-day meeting, also urged that the United States representative in the United Nations Security Council be instructed by his Government to continue to demand withdrawal of the Dutch Army to its lines of December 19, 1948, and the release of leaders of the republic; to press for renewed negotiation through the UN Good Offices Committee until a conciliation or arbitration commission has been established; and to insist on due respect for basic legal and human rights of all persons who have been involved in the struggle, whatever the convictions to which they gave support.

The Middle Class Is Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, Wausau, Wis., on January 22, 1949, and shows a common reaction to the President's income-tax proposal in my district in Wisconsin. We cannot forget the middle class, as they are the big producer and also the big consumer in the American market.

The editorial:

"MIDDLE CLASS" IS DEFINED

Since November 2 quite a lot of people have said that they voted for Mr. Truman because they knew just where he stood on every issue. The President's forthrightness didn't end with his victory, either. For now he has told the people where he stands on the subject of the middle class.

We're obliged for the information, because it has always been hard to recognize the dividing lines in our classless society. We've heard a lot about the common man from Henry Wallace. But just who is he? How many of him are there? Where do they live and work? How much money do they make? We've never found out.

We've had the same difficulty with the same questions about the middle class. This term, unlike the term common man, is not largely one man's property. What it means depends on who uses it.

We've heard about the great middle class when the speaker obviously meant that it was the slightly conservative backbone of the Nation and of the private enterprise system. We've heard others use the term when they were clearly thinking of the middle class as a mass of statistical anonymity.

Mr. Truman hasn't answered all the questions about this segment of our society. But at least he has put it in its economic place. For where would the middle class belong except in the middle income-tax bracket? Thanks to the President, we now know that the middle bracket includes those who make from $6,000 to $25,000 or $30,000 a year.

We would have guessed that the middle-class income began at a slightly lower figure. But that is because we are still inclined to think in terms of the not-too-distant past when $6,000 was quite a respectable annual income. In those days, you had quite a bit of that six thousand left even after the butcher, the grocer, and the collector of internal revenue had got through with you. Why, you could even buy a pretty good house for $6,000.

But now we know better. We also know, however incredible it may seem, that in this happy income bracket there is still some skimmable cream which the tax man will go to work on, if Mr. Truman has his way.

Since we know this much, we may assume that below the $6,000 figure lies Henry Wallace's realm of the common man. Perhaps the $5,900-a-year man can lay claim to membership in the petite bourgeoisie, but the rest seem definitely proletariat.

Whether the heights above $25,000 to $30,000 are occupied chiefly by gluttons of special privilege is another matter. At least they seem to be down to financial skim milk, for the proposed tax boost passes them by. And the President declined to second the suggestion, once made by Mr. Roosevelt, that all net incomes be limited to $25,000 a year.

Mr. Truman almost had to pass that one, if only out of gratitude. For on the same day that he was putting the right class in the right bracket, the Senate was voting him a $75,000-a-year raise—with two-thirds of it tax exempt.

Need of Incentives to Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very splendid article dealing with the need of incentives to investment. Many articles have been written on this subject by industrialists and economists, and by those in the field of public service. However, I do not believe that any clearer, finer statement has been made than is contained in a recent article by Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt. She has expressed the matter so clearly and understandingly, that I think everyone interested in maintaining our American economic system ought to read this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is essential to a high level of employment that it be profitable for capital to be invested not just in safe enterprise, but in new and untried enterprises.

MUST BE INCENTIVE

There must be incentive for this, particularly in times of peace. In times of war, when many men are risking their lives at the battlefronts, many others are willing to risk their money to do whatever is necessary for the well-being of the country. However, in times of peace there is not the same patriotic motive with which to prod capital into productive enterprise and, therefore, incentives must be found.

Some of our biggest investors—such as trust companies, banks, and insurance companies—are limited by law in their investments in order to safeguard those whose money they are using. Therefore, if we expect to develop new enterprises, to employ more people, and to have more buying power, there must always be available capital from the individual investors. This is getting harder and harder to find today.

It is of vital interest, of course, to the farmer and the wage earner that the things they have to buy keep on increasing in cost because, even though wages go up and farm prices go up, they never seem quite to cover the increased cost of living brought about by inflation and the passing on to the public of whatever costs have been imposed on the manufacturer.

Therefore, it is going to be necessary, it seems to me, to examine everything not only with an eye to what we would like to do, but with the constant thought before us of what the essentials are that must be done.

PRESERVATION OF CREDIT

The preservation of the credit of our Government is of vital importance to us and to the world as a whole, and while I believe there are many things in our program, as outlined by the President, that are essential and will help to bring us prosperity, I think even the best of them should be weighed with the viewpoint of their essentiality in attaining the objectives that we have before us. These objectives are rehabilitation in the world at large and stability and strength in our own economic system at home.

These ends should never be forgotten and their importance should be explained to the people as each step is taken in this carefully balanced program which alone will see us through the difficulties of the next few years.

Integration of Countries of Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on Saturday night, the members of the Maryland State Bar Association were privileged to hear a most scholarly address by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], with regard to urgent domestic and international matters now before the Congress for decision.

Because of the generally excellent impression made by the Senator from Massachusetts in his presentation, and because my own high valuation of the sentiments voiced were echoed generally by the leaders of the Maryland bench and bar there present, I am confident that there will be widespread interest in the address, and I, therefore, request unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an accepted bipartisan American policy to favor the integration of the countries of western Europe—those countries in which the individual is considered to be worth while and to be the master rather than the servant of the state. We favor this integration by economic, by military, and by political means. This means, for example, that we encourage the elimination of tariff barriers in Europe, that we speak favorably of the setting up of a unified European armed force, and that we dream of a United States of Europe. The order in which these three steps are stated represents, I think, the order in which they will come. Certainly the political integration epitomized by a United States of Europe is far in the future. But recent steps have been taken looking toward economic and military integration.

Why do we support this movement toward integration? I believe it is because we think it is best for the nations of Europe, best for us, and, in the long run, best for the world. If there arises a so-called third force of approximately equal population and strength with the two great world powers of today—the United States and Soviet Russia—such a third force would contribute greatly to world stability. This would be a good thing for everybody. Moreover, the alternative—of having a Balkanized Europe—is certain poverty and misery for the Europeans and the likelihood of war. As separate little countries, they are at the mercy of the invader; united, they would be a prosperous and a powerful organization of human beings.

The whole policy of our country is directed toward avoiding war. We must continue our efforts for peace and never give up hope. But if war should come, it is only natural and proper for us to hope that we will have some friends—some allies—who will be fighting on our side. We know that we shall make our fullest effort; the enactment of our peacetime draft bill is proof of our willingness to do so. We shall not shirk our duty or evade the obligation of giving everything we have to any future conflict; but we simply have not the manpower to carry the whole burden of a future war alone.

I can therefore conceive that we in Congress may be asked to help in the setting up of a western European armed force and I can see that it might be strongly in the interests of the United States and of world stability generally for us under the proper conditions to give help to such a force. What are the proper conditions? What are the questions to which clear-cut and satisfactory answers must be obtained?

First is the question of whether or not the proposed pact is modeled on the old-fashioned European alliance, which was in essence a device to spread the war disease as fast as possible by providing that if one country gets into a war it automatically pulls all the other nations in with it. This is not an attractive prospect and I cannot conceive of such a proposal being entered into by the United States Government or being submitted to the Senate.

Second is the question of whether the proposed pact is enthusiastically vouched for by one or more of our American military leaders who actually commanded foreign troops in combat in World War II and therefore knows from experience the realities of coalition warfare. The endorsement of staff officers, however brilliant they may be and however necessary their approval is, would not be enough. There must be approval by a former combat leader based on intimate personal knowledge of the provisions of the pact.

Third is the question of whether the reaction to such a pact in nonparticipating countries has been thoroughly anticipated and whether we are ready to meet such reaction.

Fourth is the question of whether there is a supreme commander on whom all the member nations agree and who really has got the power to command the western European armed force. What is needed is not a chairman of the board but a real general, so that there is an unquestioned single authority.

Fifth, there must be a comprehensive, strategic, and tactical plan in which definite assignments are given to all the military units which are members of this western European armed force. This is absolutely essential if we are to avoid the typical western European catastrophe in which the invader swoops down from the east and the western nations start a long debate as to who is to do what.

Sixth, the nations of western Europe must be in a position to supply their own maintenance and parts for the equipment which we might send them. There is not much use in giving a nation a tank if that nation has neither the skill nor the parts to service the tank and keep it rolling. You know how important it is to have service for your automobile. The same applies to military equipment.

Seventh, we must be sure that the governments involved in setting up this western European armed force be free from Communists because it is obviously unthinkable for top secret military matters to be discussed among nations if these secrets are to leak right away to those who have hostile intentions toward us.

Eighth, the governments of the nations concerned must be strong enough to provide the foundation of civil power which is essential to the existence of a healthy military organization.

Ninth, there must be complete proof that the strategic plan for the defense of western Europe is one which the nations of Europe are actually prepared to carry out insofar as pledging their manpower in regularly organized military units is concerned. Unless they are willing to pledge their manpower as we have pledged ours, and unless the men are presently and actually integrated into units, there is no use in our even beginning to send equipment.

Tenth, we must know how much we can afford to send abroad in relation to our own military establishment and our own solvency.

If favorable answers can be had to all these questions, then we can have faith that the young soldier in Europe sees some hope and would therefore be willing to fight. Having had intimate contact with soldiers of foreign armies during the war, I can say that a soldier in the army of a small or medium-sized European country is generally intelligent enough to realize that his country's army can be gobbled up quite easily and is therefore going to be a very cautious soldier indeed. If, on the other hand, he feels that he is part of a huge unified western European armed force, the aggregate population of which runs into the hundreds of millions and that he has that whole complex of peoples at his back, he will be bold and brave and will put up a good fight.

The factor which is at the bottom of every good military organization is the will to fight of the individual soldier. In Europe this will to fight depends fundamentally on the extent to which Europe unifies itself.

It is for that reason that it is disheartening to read European statesmen saying that they will cooperate with the Marshall plan provided the Marshall plan does not run counter to the vital interests of their country. They should realize that we in America consider the Marshall plan as one of our vital interests and that we hope that the nations receiving aid under the terms of the Marshall plan will regard it as one of their vital interests. Unless there is unity in Europe there is nothing, and any help we may send will, in the long run, be wasted. To the 10 questions I have listed must therefore be added:

The eleventh, and over-riding, question, to wit: "Is there enough unity in Europe to give confidence and fighting spirit to the individual European soldier?"

The National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I have received from Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, together with a statement which I have prepared descriptive of the matters contained in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

In common with many other Senators, I have for a number of years been deeply interested in trying to find the most intelligent and effective way that the power of government could be used to improve the Nation's health. In fact, 9 years ago, I introduced a bill on that subject which I still believe solves an important part, although not all, of the health problem. The idea held by some groups that Government must sit back and do absolutely nothing has always been to me as distasteful as the notion that we must embark on half-baked and destructive policies which will destroy all the great good that has already been accomplished in the medical field. I have always thought that we were not on the horns of the dilemma of either doing nothing on the one hand or doing the wrong thing on the other. The challenge here in Congress is to do that which is intelligent.

It was with this thought in mind that I read recently the Nation's Health, a 10-Year Program, by Oscar Ewing, Federal Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

In the acknowledgment printed at the beginning of this report there was listed the name of Dr. Paul R. Hawley, who is now the chief executive officer of the Blue Cross and whose address is Associated Medical Care Plans, Chicago, Ill. I am sure that I do not need to tell the Members of the Senate of the life of this remarkable statesman in the field of medical affairs. Dr. Hawley was a major general during the war and was the chief medical officer for General Bradley in the European Theater of Operations. At the end of the war it was he who set up the new and improved medical service in the Veterans' Administration. He is definitely a man who disagrees with those of his colleagues who think that nothing should be done. But he equally disagrees with those who favor policies which will lower the standards of the medical profession, deprive the patient of the choice of his doctor, and generally nullify the great advances which have been made in medicine in the past century.

I asked Dr. Hawley for his reaction to Mr. Ewing's report in view of Mr. Ewing's mention of his name. He wrote me a letter so full of wisdom and courage that I feel it should be made available to the Members of the Senate for their careful perusal. It is frank in its statements and meets all the issues unequivocally:

ASSOCIATED MEDICAL CARE PLANS,
Chicago, Ill., January 14, 1949.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In planning for the National Health Assembly, held in Washington May 1–4, 1948, the Federal Security Administrator invited some 40 people to serve upon an executive committee to assist in the arrangements. These committee members were selected from all kinds of interested groups, and represented all shades of opinion upon the issues to be discussed. The gamut of the thinking in this committee extended from the most extreme left, as represented by social welfare people connected with organized labor, to the far right, as represented by officials of the American Medical Association. I seemed to fit near the center—that is, recognizing elements of weakness in medical care which should be corrected without delay but strongly opposing their correction by radical, socialistic methods which would demoralize the present organization of medical care to the point of producing complete chaos. While the political control of the American Medical Association remains in the hands of ultraconservatives, my association with the rank and file of the medical profession throughout the country has convinced me that the majority of physicians—certainly the majority of the better ones—think about as I do.

Mr. Ewing made it plain to the executive committee from the start that he would be bound neither by the committee nor the National Health Assembly in making his report to the President. It was quite clear that he had decided upon the substance of his report before convening the National Health Assembly, and that the latter was to serve merely as a sounding board or amplifier—to be switched on or off depending upon the direction the discussions took.

Furthermore, it was evident that the so-called executive committee was no executive committee at all. It had no voice in the arrangements nor in drafting the report of the assembly—not to speak of Mr. Ewing's report to the President. Quite a number of the members of the executive committee considered resigning on this account, but most of them—I, for one—decided against this in the thin hope that we could do more from within than from without; and we did not want to be accused of refusing to play if we did not get our own way.

I do feel very strongly, however, that the way the names of the executive committee were used in The Nation's Health bordered upon sharp practice. While it is true that, if one searches closely enough, one will find the statement that "There was no agreement on the question of national health insurance and my recommendation of such a program must be clearly understood as in no way expressing the views of the assembly," this disclaimer is hidden without a paragraph wholly removed from the listing of the executive committee and is easily overlooked. Even if read it is not at once clear that a very large segment of the executive committee opposed this principle.

Unfortunately, The Nation's Health is one of the best prepared documents I have ever read. The large part of its contents is true; and this tends to obscure the downright lies with which it is interlarded at strategic places. For example, the following are stated as facts:

1. "Every year 325,000 people die whom we have the knowledge and skills to save." Well removed from this positive statement is the hedge that this is but a guess. It may well be true, but it is not true that this is due to want of medical care. Every physician has seen many patients die of conditions that are easily curable in other patients, and is at a loss to explain why such patients have refused to respond to methods of proved effectiveness. But Mr. Ewing's inference is that they die because they are unable to obtain proper medical care—which is false.

2. The old myth of the 5,000,000 rejections for physical unfitness during the late war. This has been completely exploded long since. This was not due to any lack of medical care but to conditions which modern medicine by our own armed forces. Any other army cannot yet prevent and to an inordinately severe set of physical standards insisted upon in the world would have been delighted to accept 3,000,000 of this 5,000,000.

I could, without any great compromise, accept all of the goals of Mr. Ewing's program except that of compulsory health insurance.

I am interested in only one issue—that of preserving the medical advances thus far achieved and of stimulating still further progress. I have only one goal—that of a good quality medical care. I am not interested in the slightest in the economic security of physicians except as it is an incentive to practice better medicine.

I am not in sympathy with the position of the American Medical Association. I feel that their resistance to all suggestions has only muddied the waters, and has weakened the position taken by those of us who are thinking only of the good of the people.

But I am firmly convinced that compulsory health insurance will inevitably lower the quality of medical practice in this country. This will be a thousand times worse for our people than a distribution of medical care which may not be all that we want it to be. I think it far more important that 80 percent of our people obtain medical care of the highest quality than that 100 percent get only low-quality medical care. With other measures far less socialistic than compulsory health insurance we can extend high-quality care to all of our people. But compulsory health insurance will force a lowering of quality that can never again be raised.

The Philadelphia Bulletin has invited me to debate this question on March 22 with Mr. Ewing over a national radio net. I am now collecting facts and figures which certainly convince me; but I have little hope of convincing Mr. Ewing.

It was most nice to hear from you, and you may be assured that I follow your public career with the greatest interest and admiration.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL R. HAWLEY, M. D.,
Chief Executive Officer, Blue Cross-Blue Shield Commissions.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, at Kansas Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Kansas Day dinner at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Republicans, 88 years ago Kansas was admitted to the Union as a free State determined to help preserve the Republic at a time when forces were already at work attempting to destroy it.

Lincoln clearly pointed out that this Nation could not continue half slave and half free. The passage of time and the force of events raise the question on a broader scale as to whether or not in this age of the airplane and the atom a passive democracy can survive in the same world with an aggressive totalitarianism, be it Communist or Nazi.

Are the nations of the world forever to be in the position of surrendering one by one to some Hitler, Tojo, or Stalin, whose policy is based on brute force? Must civilization quake in its collective boots at the prospect of a twentieth century Genghis Khan using techniques of this era to destroy what it has taken centuries for free men in a free world to build?

Peace requires the combined efforts of several nations while war may start by the unilateral decisions of one. Our western world politically and economically functions in a goldfish bowl. Our shortcomings as well as our successes are available for all to see. A free press, freedom of speech, and free elections make the governments of the western world responsive to public opinion. Such is not the case in Russia or her satellite powers. The great question, if peace is to be preserved, is how to penetrate through the iron curtain to establish contact with the people despite the barriers erected by their governments.

I firmly believe that it is essential to our national security that western civilization remain outside of the iron curtain. No less do I believe that it is not in our national interests to permit 400,000,000 people of China to become Communist dominated.

At Yalta, secretly and without the approval of either the American Congress or the American people, President Roosevelt made a deal with Dictator Stalin at the expense of our traditional friends, the Chinese. History may record it as a betrayal of greater magnitude than Chamberlain's and Daladier's sacrifice of Czechoslovakia at Munich. Time will tell how much special significance should be given to the fact that sitting in with our high Government officials at Yalta was a State Department official named Alger Hiss.

No longer can or should the American people tolerate any administration violating our concepts of equity and fair play. What was promised to Stalin at Yalta the President had no moral right to promise. What was taken from China without her knowledge or consent was a foul blow to a stout ally. Much of China's present difficulty stems from the Yalta agreements. Our officials were sitting as trustees of the interests of the free world. With a power of attorney they signed a blank note in China's name and gave it to Stalin to collect at a later date. Communism is now collecting. This betrayal was no part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

Both Berlin and Vienna are administrative islands in a Soviet-controlled area. If a county board of supervisors would purchase a gravel pit without assuring the essential rights of way, they would be considered incompetent to transact the public's business.

Yet our Federal Government did worse than that. Any school child should have known that the German and Austrian zones of demarcation to which we agreed left us subject to Soviet pressure and the most drastic type of international blackmail in Berlin.

It should not have been agreed to in the first place, and President Truman at Potsdam should have taken the necessary steps to have corrected the tragic error which has already cost the lives of 26 American airmen in overcoming the Soviet blockade. The agreements which put us in such a vulnerable position were no part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

As one who strongly believes that we should have continuity for an American foreign policy, I wish to strongly emphasize that bipartisan cooperation must be a two-way street. The opposition party must be informed before and not after the event. It must be given a chance to help formulate the policy before final decisions are made. No longer will the administration be able to give the cloak of bipartisan foreign policy respectability to actions which were, in fact, Democratic administration unilateral decisions. Nor does calling minority leaders as a matter of courtesy, just before information is given to the press, constitute bipartisan consultation.

Today the forces of international communism realize that as long as hope exists in the hearts of once-free men, their police-state structures will not be resting on solid ground. The United States of America is the great citadel of freedom to those who still maintain their independence and to those who have lost it. If our Nation should have an economic or political collapse, it would likely be most difficult to maintain free institutions anywhere in the world. We would not be realistic, in the approach to the problems we face, if we closed our eyes to the heavy responsibilities resting upon us.

If the world had paid more attention to Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf it might have been possible to block his ruthless aggression before he overwhelmed most of Europe.

Recently, I have re-read Problems of Leninism by Joseph Stalin. I call your attention to the following paragraphs from this book published in this country in 1934:

"Replying to those who confuse the dictatorship of the proletariat with 'popular,' 'elected,' and 'nonclass' government, Lenin states: 'The class which has seized political power has done so conscious of the fact that it has seized power alone. This is implicit in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This concept has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive either itself or others by talk about popular elected government, sanctified by the whole people.'

"Pointing to one of the most important aims of the dictatorship, namely, the suppression of the exploiters, Lenin states: 'The scientific concept, dictatorship, means nothing more nor less than power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules.'"

The final quotation from this book that I intend to read today is found on page 66, in which Stalin repeats the statement of Lenin on the inevitability of conflict with non-Soviet states: "We are living," Lenin writes, "not merely in a state, but in a system of states: and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable. This means that if the proletariat, as the ruling class, wants to and will rule, it must prove it also by military organization."

Aggressor nations will never be persuaded to preserve the peace through world public opinion alone. To the imperial Germany of 1914 the agreement to preserve the neutrality of Belgium was just a scrap of paper.

To Hitler's Germany neither the pledge at Munich that he would seek no further territorial expansion in Europe, nor the various peace pacts, were any restraint whatever when it served his purpose to attack. The more recent road from Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam is lined with broken promises by the Soviet Union. To refuse to face these realities is worse than folly.

The long panorama of history makes clear that until and unless the law-abiding nations of the world are willing to do more than give lip service to international law and order, there can be no effective curb upon aggressor powers whenever and wherever they appear.

I have re-read the clippings year by year—between World Wars I and II—of the views that were expressed by presidents, kings, soldiers, churchmen, and civilians that Armistice Day 1918 represented the last day of the last great world struggle. Yet, within 21 years of the ending of World War I, the armies of Hitler's Germany were marching through Poland and World War II was loosed upon a world which had poorly made use of the time intervening.

It might be well to review briefly the 1918 to 1939 period to see wherein civilization failed in its mission to preserve the peace. All nations must assume a share of that responsibility, our own included.

When 1918 passed into history, America turned her back for a time on international responsibilities. The League of Nations struggled to exist when the one nation that might have made success obtainable failed to participate in its deliberations.

In Europe, national hatreds prevented the breaking down of economic and political barriers that might have enabled a sound economic development to have given new hope to a war-weary populace. The result was economic collapse and the birth of strange new ideologies. A failure to face realities led the democratic powers to do too little too late when they might have checked Nazi Germany in its early stages and the same inertia left them helpless in the leadership and military strength to block the Hitler demands at Munich. Prior thereto, the apparent helplessness and hopelessness of the League of Nations had been demonstrated at the time of the 1931 Manchurian and the 1935 Ethiopian crises.

At some point between the Manchurian and the Munich developments it might have been possible to save the peace. After Munich the western powers could only surrender to ever-increasing demands—or fight. The failure cannot be laid to government alone. The people themselves did a lot of wishful thinking and in some quarters they cheered the appeasement at Munich as guaranteeing peace in our time.

On August 14, 1945, the firing ceased in the Pacific, bringing to a close World War II. Yet, no thoughtful person claims that it brought the peace in any real sense.

Nor is it an easy task we face in finding it now. It cannot be achieved without courage and without risk. We must be willing to face realities. Wherever we withdraw, a vacuum will be created that Communist Russia will rapidly fill. Today, the maintenance of a free world of freemen hangs in the balance.

We have arrived at the place in history when we must face up to the fact that peace is indivisible. Aggression or the threat of the same anywhere in the world is of vital concern to law-abiding nations everywhere in the world.

The United States of America is an active member of the United Nations. If this organization for collective security means anything it surely means that its members will not sit idly by while an aggressor power overtly attacks its neighbors.

Within the framework of the United Nations Charter there is provision for regional security pacts. Our Nation has already become a signatory to one embracing the Western Hemisphere. Both historical background and geographic proximity make the prospective North Atlantic pact of equal importance to this Nation. With the degree of collective security such a pact will furnish, it may be possible for the free nations of western Europe to move on to the constructive settlement of their economic problems.

In a real sense, there can be no neutrals in the struggle to establish a free world of freemen whose peace will be secure under a collective-security system based on international law and justice.

No member of the world community can sit this one out. It is a common responsibility and no nation has the moral right to be a drone while its neighbors take all the risks. The Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway, all of which were able to be neutrals in World War I, found that the choice was not

theirs to make in World War II. Others should take judicial notice of this fact.

In extending a helping hand for the rehabilitation of the war-torn and dislocated western nations, we make no request that they pattern their economic or political life on ours. We do have an interest in making sure that the people have and retain a free choice.

The nations we assist have a responsibility to recognize that our aid is primarily of the pump-priming recovery type. The amount and continuance of future recovery funds will depend upon their own initiative in helping to work out their own problems and the productivity they demonstrate in meeting their collective basic needs. Certainly trade and currency obstacles should have been removed by action and not just talked about. An American Secretary of the Treasury once aptly pointed out that "the way to resume specie payments is to resume."

In dealing with what some call the cold war we are facing new techniques that require different counter measures from some the world has used in the past. To an extent we have been developing them. Since communism thrives on economic collapse and chaos, anything we do in Europe to assist the rehabilitation of those war-torn economies helps to establish a climate in which free institutions can be nourished and grow to full strength.

This is the basis of our support of the European recovery program and the reason for communism's aggressive fight to undermine it. The blockade of Berlin, Communist-inspired work stoppages in France, and concerted turmoil in the far Pacific are all part and parcel of their over-all strategy.

The Soviet gamble is that even as rich and powerful a nation as the United States of America may be bled to death if the natural forces of recovery can be undermined so that American economic aid, instead of priming the pump, merely goes into a bottomless sinkhole.

It is now apparent that Europe cannot have a full measure of economic recovery while the constant danger of being dragged behind the iron curtain is facing most, if not all, of the Continent.

Just as a Maginot Line psychology is fatal in a fighting war, so is a defensive position during present conditions. We must realize that if we sit back and permit the undermining of free institutions without any effective affirmative program, the odds will be against us for any long-term success. On the other hand, if we mobilize the full forces of the free world of freemen we can continue to make a better showing than the followers of Marx and by the aggressive use of all the information media available we can penetrate deeper and deeper into the consciousness of those whose domestic sources of factual information no longer exists.

It is this problem that is practical and not theoretical that must receive our attention if peace with honor is to be preserved for ourselves and our children.

A year ago in Europe in conversations with those who believe in a free way of life I was constantly met with the statement, "We understand that your country is on the verge of an imminent economic collapse." This was and is the Communist line which is daily fed by the controlled press and radio of Russia and her satellites to the people already encompassed and to those who are yet free.

In a very real sense a strong America is "the last best hope of earth." Our basic obligation then is to keep America strong. This requires a sound national economy, a solvent government and a constantly adequate national defense in the air, on the land, and on the sea. It requires a development of our human resources as well as our natural resources.

We must not be wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. We should strive for a dynamic, productive economy with a social conscience.

The period through which we are now passing furnishes problems of no less importance to the future of our Nation than did the active phase of the war which came to an end on VJ-day.

We must demonstrate to the world that here in America we have a sound economy. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

If we are to meet and solve the problems we confront by constitutional means through the legislative process, the two Houses of Congress must be able to function. In the Senate where one Senator or a small group can block the entire legislative process through the use of the filibuster, the rules must be amended to prevent such abuse or power. Senate Republicans are vigorously supporting an effective cloture rule.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life, as an inmate of a State prison.

We should not be complacent about our progress to date, as great as it has been in contrast to other sections of the world, while children in any section of America lack educational opportunities and while the great challenges of health and housing are still not adequately met.

While we are looked upon as a nation of great natural resources few people appreciate the tremendous depletion that has taken place as a result of two great world wars. We need to more completely explore and conserve the potential resources of our Nation.

Recently it was estimated by qualified experts that our known commercial reserves were approximately as follows: Tungsten, 2 years; manganese, 4 years; vanadium, 8 years; lead, 10 years; petroleum, 15 years; copper, 19 years; zinc, 20 years; bauxite, 23 years. It is essential that we stock-pile these and other basic requirements from domestic and foreign sources. Our failure to do so will threaten the security and economic productivity of our Nation in the event we were cut off from overseas supplies.

We need to carry on with the cooperation of private industry and Government a program to reforest our depleted timber areas from the point of view of future building supplies as well as flood control and soil conservation.

The basis for an expanding standard of living for our people rests upon labor and management pulling together and not apart. It also depends upon a square deal for the farmer as well as for the urban dweller. It requires a full realization that when any part of our economy is in distress the chain reaction that takes place will soon react on all other segments.

The farm-support program is based on the recognition of the fact that without an equitable rural economic base there cannot be a sustained national prosperity. The farmer is the best customer of American industry, which in turn assures sustained employment. No city dweller should lose sight of this. When World War I terminated and the demand for farm products at home and abroad greatly diminished, the American farmer was caught holding the bag. He had been encouraged to expand his acreage and his productivity beyond the point that prudent judgment would have deemed wise for the purpose of helping to win the war.

With the coming of World War II the farmer was again urged to go all out to produce food for our armed services, our civilian population, and to help feed the hungry war-torn world. In the light of prior experience it was only reasonable to assume that he should have some protection against a possible postwar economic collapse.

A sound agricultural policy should provide for the efficient production of necessary food, fiber, and forest products at a level of income to farmers that will result in their remaining as stable users of goods and services furnished by other segments of our economy.

It should not be such as to encourage the enlarged production of items already in oversupply. I feel certain that the overwhelming majority of the producing farmers of the Nation look with disfavor upon any malfunctioning of the program which leads to the destruction of foodstuffs.

No program should become so dominated by Federal controls that the farmer only becomes a statistic in a Washington office. His initiative and common sense have contributed greatly to the building of this American system of ours and controls that will so enmesh him that he cannot properly function will neither be good for him nor the Nation.

The time has come, I believe, when labor and management, with the help of Government, must get down to the nugget of what is really needed in America. The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low-unit costs.

Both of these conditions—high wages and maximum production—must be achieved. Neither, without the other, will be sufficient for a sustained prosperous America under present-day world conditions. The way to get them both, stated simply, is to link them together at the source. This can be done by broad adoption of a system of paying fair, guaranteed wages for average production, and extra-high wages for extra-high production.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

A free economy can better bring about a higher standard of living for our people than any permanent regimented economy of domestic origin or foreign import.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business have the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans and by so doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes. More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a national

labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

It is neither a constructive nor realistic approach to the problem for Congress to be asked to repeal the 1947 Labor-Management Relations Act and reenact the old Wagner Act. Threats to defeat Members who refuse to go along for outright repeal is an attempt to legislate by intimidation. This is not the American way. While some well-thought-out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our factories and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

Our Federal Government is now so large that prudent officials and citizens must examine new proposals which would increase costs to see if they will endanger its functioning or impair its solvency. We must find ways of eliminating duplication and waste so that we may better meet essential needs.

In a period of 20 years the number of civilian employees has increased from 570,000 to 2,100,000. Federal expenditures have increased from $8,852,000,000 in fiscal year 1939 to $40,180,000,000 in 1949.

The Federal debt, which in 1939 amounted to $40,439,000,000, now stands at over $252,000,000,000 or 6 times as large. Interest alone is now greater than the total cost of the Federal Government in 1930.

For the one fiscal year of 1950 the President has requested a budget of almost $42,000,000,000, which is greater than the total Federal debt in 1938.

Our Federal receipts, amounting to an estimated $40,985,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, are almost double the 1943 war year receipts of $22,201,000,000. Yet on top of this, the President is asking for $4,000,000,000 more in new taxes or an amount which in itself is greater than the total cost of the entire Federal Government in 1930.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary, whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense. Government spending has been a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Federal finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We should keep our Federal budget balanced and pay each year on the national debt no less than $2,500,000,000. This can be done by wise economy rather than by disruptive new taxes.

The problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "this last best hope of earth." Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

While I would not have our people become complacent about our progress to date nor ignore those places in our history when we have been subject to legitimate criticism, I do get fed up with those who are constantly trying to make a case for what is wrong with America. Let us unite in showing the world what is right with America.

Where in the history of Soviet Russia that pounced upon Finland, violently absorbed Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, grabbed the eastern part of Poland, and holds an iron hand upon half a dozen so-called independent satellites, does one find comparable actions to those of the United States of America in establishing a free and independent Cuba and a free and independent Philippine Republic?

I might also add, where in the history of the Russian Empire of the Czar or Stalin does one find a comparable act to that of the Government of Great Britain in establishing the independent nations of India and Pakistan?

While Russia uses her blockade to starve into submission a large part of the civilian population of Berlin, our Air Force, Army, and Navy unite to bring food and fuel to that beleaguered place.

If we do our job properly, if we use all the media available to the free world to get the meaning of all this and more, behind the iron curtain, to men and women who were once free, there will spring anew hope in the oppressed. Then, with time, with the free world out-producing the Communist-dominated world, the inevitable pressures will crack the iron curtain wide open. Given the instruments with which to work, men who love freedom will know how to use them. For they, more than others perhaps, will realize that it is better to die on your feet, as a freeman, than to live on your knees as a slave.

There is a basis upon which a just and lasting peace can be built. Let Soviet troops be withdrawn from all the satellite powers and when they have gone let free elections under supervision of the United Nations be held to determine a government of the peoples' choice. Then let all the members of the United Nations guarantee the territorial integrity of all the countries of Europe against any aggressor power. In Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria a great new incentive to work and build for Europe would take place. Confidence would replace fear. When this had been successfully accomplished, the western powers and Russia could jointly withdraw their troops from Austria and Germany, leaving a joint commission to see that the terms of the armistice were carried out.

But there can be no real peace through a temporary patchwork expedient to solve the Berlin problem if a month from now we are to be faced with the same pressure tactics in Vienna or in Korea. Any satisfactory settlement must be global in character and backed by adequate guaranties.

Yes, America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. * * * The fiery trail through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility. * * * In giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

I am convinced that Americans all over this great land of ours are determined that we shall not lose this last best hope of earth. With the same courage and common sense that fortified the founders of our Republic and those who have fought to preserve it ever since, we shall meet the challenges of this generation.

Count of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain newspaper editorials commenting on the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N. Y.) Daily News of October 17, 1948]

YOUR VOTE ISN'T WASTED, BUT—

A reader by the name of Earl Parker writes us:

"Will somebody enlighten me on this subject? I have registered and am waiting to vote. Now I'm told it won't mean a thing in the coming election. I'm all confused about electoral and popular votes. If my vote won't help elect a President, why should I waste time going to the polls?"

Mr. Parker is being misinformed by persons who either are misinformed themselves or are trying to kid voters to stay home on election day.

Your vote is not wasted in an American election. But the reasons for Mr. Parker's and many other people's confusion about popular and electoral votes are interesting and important. Here's the explanation.

The so-called electoral college was created by the Constitution when that document was adopted in 1789. In most States you vote for members of this body, not for the Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates by name. Each State has as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives—47 for New York, 35 for Pennsylvania, and so on. In each State the popular-majority winners take all the electoral votes.

The electors, several weeks after being chosen by popular ballot on the Tuesday following the first Monday in November, cast their votes for the candidates to whom they are pledged. These votes are then certified from the State capitals to the President of the United States Senate. Early in January a joint congressional session supervises the counting of the electoral ballots.

If no candidate gets a majority of all the electoral college votes, the House of Representatives must pick a President. Currently there are 531 votes in the electoral college, so 266 are needed to win.

ELECTORAL MISFIRES

The system has been faulty from the start. It fails to reflect the popular vote correctly. Three times it has permitted a candidate who got the minority of popular votes to win an electoral college majority, and thus to become President.

In 1824, Andrew Jackson led John Quincy Adams by 50,000 but missed a straight majority over his three opponents. That threw the election into the House, where Henry Clay managed to maneuver the Presidency to Adams.

In 1876 Samuel J. Tilden (Democrat) polled 4,300,590 votes to Rutherford B. Hayes' (Republican) 4,036,298. But the electoral votes were so distributed as to give Hayes a majority of 1, and Rutherford was in.

When Grover Cleveland ran in 1888 against Benjamin Harrison, Cleveland got 5,556,543 popular votes, and Harrison trailed with

5,175,582. But again the electoral college misfired, and Harrison copped.

There have been several cases of highly inaccurate electoral reflection of the popular vote, though the candidates with popular pluralities got to the White House.

For examples: In 1912, Woodrow Wilson polled 42 percent of the popular vote, but took 82 percent in the electoral college; in 1936, F. D. Roosevelt had 60 percent, popular, 98-percent electoral; in 1940, Roosevelt took 54-percent popular and 84-percent electoral.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 200

It is now proposed to change all this and make United States Presidential elections correctly register the voters' majority and minority wishes. The thing would be done by an amendment to the United States Constitution.

The proposed measure bears the easily remembered title of Senate Joint Resolution 200, and is sponsored by, among others, Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts, grandson of the noted World War I Senator of the same name and brother of Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Republican, of Connecticut.

Resolution 200 would abolish the electoral college. Each State would keep its accustomed number of electoral votes. These would be divided according to the number of popular votes between the majority and minority candidates, with fractions of less than one one-thousandth disregarded unless they would change the election result. Suppose a 3,000,000-vote State had 30 electoral votes, and the winner got 1,550,000 to the loser's 1,450,000 popular ballots. The winner would get 15½ electoral votes, the loser 14½.

The candidate getting a Nation-wide majority of electoral votes would be declared President. If two or more were tied electorally, the holder of the most popular votes would take the prize. Same as to the Vice President.

This seems a far better system than the present one, and we hope something of the sort may go into operation in time for the 1952 election.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe of December 8, 1948]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE AGAIN

The Supreme Court of the United States has written finis to an attempt by the Governor of Alabama to compel electors of that State to deposit ballots at the electoral college for Mr. Truman. It is just as well that this issue is settled once for all. The Constitution, as the Court points out, permits an elector to vote freely for whomsoever he pleases. To put him under constraint in the matter would violate our fundamental law as it is written.

In Alabama, moreover, all the electors were pledged beforehand to vote for Governor Thurmond, the Dixiecrat candidate, if he carried the State, which he did. Thus, the Governor's effort would have made the electors twice foresworn.

This whole episode lends further strength to Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE'S endeavors to make the electoral college's role conform with modern realities. The college should be given a constitutional redefinition of function and responsibilities, as he suggests. Or it should be abolished. Arbitrary efforts to maneuver it, while the Constitution remains unchanged, are extremely unwise as well as illegal.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of December 1, 1948]

OUT WITH THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

If further proof of the dangerous obsolescence of our electoral-college system were needed, the recent election provided it in several shades and sizes. As it turned out, Mr. Truman's popular plurality was approximately 2,000,000, his electoral-college majority 38 more than the bare 266 needed. But because of the archaic electoral system, look what a switch of a few thousand votes (out of a total of 47,000,000 plus) might have done:

If 5,000 voters in Ohio and 17,000 in either California or Illinois had voted for Dewey instead of Truman, no candidate would have an electoral majority. The Presidency then would have been thrown into the new House, with each State delegation there voting as a unit until one of the top three contenders had a majority (25 States).

Republicans will have a majority in 20 State delegations in the new House, Democrats in 25, and 3 will be evenly divided. But the Democratic States include four whose electoral votes were pledged to the Dixiecrat candidate, J. Strom Thurmond. Thus, neither Truman nor Dewey could have counted on a majority of the State delegations in the House, and we would today be in one of the worst political messes of our constitutional history—wondering what sort of crass deal one party or the other might be making with the Dixiecrat balance-of-power group.

That they would hold the balance was, of course, the Dixiecrats' main hope. Yet having been formed with that in mind, they now don't seem to know what to do with the 38 electoral votes they have. The people voted for these electors on the understanding they would vote for Thurmond, but now there is talk (which Mr. Truman welcomes) of swinging to Truman after all. Thus, the very States that voted against the President (or thought they had) may end up with their votes recorded in his column, since there is nothing but their own sense of propriety to keep these electors from voting for whomever they wish. This is but further proof of the inadequacy of the present electoral system.

Now suppose that the nip-and-tuck balance had been tipped to Dewey in all three of the States he lost by a whisker (California, Ohio, and Illinois). That would have given him a bare electoral majority without materially changing his popular vote. Both Houses of Congress would be decisively arrayed against him, and he would be serving, not as the popular choice, but as one who got in on a fluke despite the fact that a substantial plurality of the people had voted for his opponent. How could any semblance of responsible party government have resulted from such an impasse?

Yet this is the penalty we came close to paying for an archaic voting system we have simply been too inert to change. In a democratic republic, the legitimacy of any regime founded on anything less than a popular plurality is always in question, and the party that benefits temporarily may be sure it will lose more than it gains in the long run.

The question is how the system should be changed, and the answer is fortunately available, in a proposed constitutional amendment that already has strong bipartisan backing in Congress as well as the tacit approval of this year's Republican Party platform. This amendment, by Senator LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, would divide each State's electoral votes in exact proportion to the popular vote. It would thus preserve the relative weight of the small as against the more populous States, an essential compromise without which no amendment would have much chance of winning ratification. This year's election is not the first time we have barely escaped a constitutional crisis as a result of the electoral college system, but it offers the most conclusive proof yet that we dare not procrastinate any longer. The Lodge-Gossett amendment commends itself for prompt adoption.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of November 19, 1948]

FOR A NEW PLAN OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

The extraordinary shenanigans resorted to during the recent Presidential campaign apropos of the electoral college, and the manner in which efforts were made, especially in the South, to distort the electoral process almost beyond recognition, make a change in the method of choosing the President of the United States more than ever desirable. The Times-Dispatch has been advocating such a change for 5 years.

Specifically, the electoral college should be abolished, but the number of votes which each State now has in that college should be retained, and they should be divided among the candidates in proportion to the popular vote cast for each in the respective States. This is provided in identical resolutions to amend the Constitution sponsored by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, and Representative ED GOSSETT, of Texas. These resolutions have received the unanimous approval of the House Judiciary Committee and the approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Under the existing system electors not only enjoy freedom to vote for anybody they wish for President and Vice President (and this is the chief source of the abuses referred to above), but the electoral vote of each State goes entirely to the candidate who carries that State, even though he may carry it by only one vote. Both these provisions of the law are objectionable.

In the first place, it is not desirable that electors should be threatening to thwart the will of the people, as has happened at various times, notably in the last two Presidential contests. In one or more Southern States in 1944 certain anti-Roosevelt politicians hatched a plot whereby even if the State in question went for Roosevelt, the electors would vote for somebody else. Similar jugglery was resorted to in the campaign just ended, and in Virginia last winter a fantastically bad plan to withhold this State's Democratic electoral vote from Mr. Truman was proposed. This sort of thing should be made impossible, under the Constitution, and it will be very nearly so if the proposed resolution is adopted by Congress and ratified by the States.

Americans have grown accustomed, under the existing system, to having the entire electoral vote of a given State go to the candidate who gets a bare plurality in that State. New York's 47 votes went to Dewey in the recent election, for example, even though Dewey got less than half the votes there, and his excess over Truman was only a few thousand votes. Similarly, Truman got Ohio's entire bloc of 25, although his majority there over Dewey was slight.

Under the proposed plan, each State's electoral vote would be divided among the candidates in proportion to the popular vote polled there. In other words, if Dewey got 50 percent of the New York vote, Truman 45 percent, and Wallace 5 percent, the State's electoral vote of 47 would be divided in those precise ratios among the three candidates. Thus each candidate would get a portion of New York's vote, whereas under the existing dispensation the entire bloc of 47 goes to the contestant who polls a plurality over his opponents.

The new plan would not only be fairer, but it might be expected to have several other highly beneficial effects:

1. It would greatly reduce, if not eliminate, the incentive which now exists for candidates to appeal to minority groups of voters in the big States. Such groups often hold the balance of power, and they are furiously wooed by the various parties and nominees, whereas States which are almost sure to go lopsidedly

for one party or the other, receive little attention. Minorities would be whittled down to their true dimensions under the proposed plan, for 400,000 voters, say, in New York States would have no disproportionate weight in the final reckoning, whereas now they can make the difference between 47 electoral votes and none at all for a given candidate.

2. Creation of two-party systems in States which do not now have them would be definitely promoted by the new plan. In Virginia, for example, the Republicans usually know that in a Presidential election they will get none of the State's electoral votes, since Virginia is so strongly Democratic, but under the proposed arrangement there would be a definite incentive to the Republicans to vote as heavily as possible. The more votes they cast, the larger the proportion of Virginia's bloc of 11 they would receive. If they polled one-third of the ballots, they would get one-third of 11 electoral votes, and the Democrats would get the other two-thirds, with perhaps a fraction of a vote going to Henry Wallace, or any third candidate who happened to be running.

3. Such a system should win much more political attention for the South, since it would make this region fighting ground for both parties in all Presidential contests, and would greatly reduce the importance of the huge populous States which today produce so preponderant a percentage of the nominees. A candidate who carried New York by a slim margin, under the plan, would get about 24 electoral votes to 23 for his opponent, instead of the 47 he now gets. It would be almost as advantageous for the candidate to carry Virginia by a slim margin, and thus to win 6 electoral votes to 5 for the opposition. In each case the winner would get only one more electoral vote than the loser.

Are there any "bugs" in this plan? It has the formal endorsement of the Brookings Institution, of Washington, and there seems to be little opposition to it in Congress. A few critics prefer election of the President and Vice President by direct popular vote with the two candidates who get the biggest total from the country as a whole declared elected. But this has several disadvantages. For one thing, it doesn't preserve the system under which the electoral votes are now apportioned, i. e., one for each Member of the House from a given State, plus the two Senators. The latter provision gives the smaller and less populous States slightly more weight in the scales than they would otherwise have, and is in accordance with the desires of the founding fathers. Another objection is that it would apparently make necessary uniform voting requirements throughout the Union, and, for example, might force reduction of the voting age everywhere to 18, since Georgia has that limit.

[From the New York (N. Y.) World-Telegram of November 5, 1948]

A Too Narrow Escape

The will of that largest group of American voters which wanted to keep President Truman in the White House came dangerously near to being defeated in Tuesday's election.

A switch of fewer than 100,000 votes in five States could have done the job.

Mr. Truman carried Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Nevada by narrow margins.

Suppose a comparative handful of Truman voters in each of those States, ranging downward from less than 35,000 in Wisconsin to 1,000 or so in Nevada, had cast their ballots instead for Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. And suppose all other States had voted just as they actually did.

Mr. Dewey would have been elected. His total in the electoral college would have been 267 votes, one more than enough.

Yet in the country as a whole, Mr. Truman still would have had around two and a half million more popular votes than Mr. Dewey.

Or suppose about 65,000 people in only two States—Illinois and Wisconsin—had voted Republican instead of Democratic. Because of the 38 electoral votes won by Dixiecrat J. Strom Thurmond, neither Mr. Truman nor Mr. Dewey would have had a majority in the electoral college. The Presidential choice would have been thrown into the House of Representatives. While the House probably would have given Mr. Truman eventual victory, the country would have been in for many weeks of harmful uncertainty and controversy.

We're not trying to prove, for our own cold comfort, that the candidate we supported wasn't badly beaten. Since the next Congress is to be under Democratic control, we're glad Mr. Truman was elected.

But we do say, again, that before the next Presidential election Congress and the States should change the old system which gives the entire electoral vote of each State to the candidate who carries that State by even a bare majority or plurality of popular votes.

The new system needed would be provided by a proposed constitutional amendment proposed by Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, and Democratic Representative Ed. Gossett, of Texas. Under it, the electoral votes of each State would be divided among the various Presidential candidates in ratio to their shares of that State's popular votes. The next Congress should submit this amendment to the States for prompt ratification.

Then the combined electoral votes of all States will reflect accurately the whole country's popular vote. And the danger of splinter-party candidates keeping any major-party nomineee from a majority in the electoral college will be reduced to a minimum.

Address on Atomic Energy by Hon. Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], who served during the Eightieth Congress as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, delivered an address earlier this month in Baltimore, before the Association of Commerce, on the developments in, and the importance to the American people of, atomic energy.

Because of the profound impression created by the address of the Senator from Iowa, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the monthly magazine Baltimore concerning the address and the very excellent reaction to it on the part of the members of the association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Many people have asked me, "Do the Russians have the atomic bomb?" I will say to you that I don't know. I don't believe that they have.

Thus spoke Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, before a gathering of over 400 businessmen in the Lord Baltimore Hotel on January 6. The luncheon membership meeting was sponsored by the association to provide members with authoritative information on progress being made in the field of atomic energy. Charles S. Garland, president of the association, presided.

The Senator from Iowa, who took a leading part in drafting the legislation which established the United States Atomic Energy Commission, began his talk with a frank admission that he was talking about atomic energy from the standpoint of the layman only.

"There are many fields of it that I cannot discuss intelligently with you," he said. He is regarded as one of the best informed persons on this subject in the United States.

The Senator emphasized that it was American genius and industry that were responsible, in the main, for the production of the bomb.

"But we have not yet found answers to two great questions," he said. "These are, first, What are we going to do to make atomic energy work for the benefit of mankind; and, second, How can we stuff this genie back in the bottle to control its destructive force forever?"

Senator Hickenlooper pointed out that we were successful in producing the bomb, that it served its purpose in bringing a speedy end to World War II. Throughout his speech, however, he both inferred and openly expressed his hope that the people of this country and the world will realize what a fearful weapon the bomb is in the hands of those who are in a position to use it against a nation in war.

It has the equivalent explosive force of 20,000 tons of TNT, he revealed. "It is considered to be the most practical instrument of warfare heretofore developed," the Senator noted.

Tracing the history of the bomb's development and use, the Iowa Senator explained that our initial intention was to build a bomb that would blow up.

"In the course of this development," he said, "all kinds of interesting fields of cosmic research were opened up, but laid aside before the more important job of ending the war. After the war, when we settled down to a period of relaxation and rest, we began to wonder what we could do."

The Senator explained briefly the birth and provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. He called this act the most revolutionary and startling assumption of powers by the Federal Government that has ever been undertaken in this country. But he explained that there was no other course except that the Government take over its control. He added that the Atomic Energy Commission operates subject to regular and complete checks by his congressional committee and that it is the intention of all concerned, and the act itself, to turn over activity in this field for investigation and handling to private enterprise as soon as is practicable.

"The whole reason for this monopolistic control, even to the preemption of metals underground and patents and patent rights in business, is the presence in this new field of this unbelievably destructive force and all its fearful portents. This is the only, but a sufficient, justification for the control system we have set up," the Senator declared.

Turning to a discussion of the potentialities of atomic energy, Senator Hickenlooper emphasized that the one big field is still atomic weapons. "This is the field that is utilizable and practical," he added.

He pointed out that many of the current ideas and rumors concerning the uses of

atomic energy in the near future for such things as curing human ailments and driving battleships "should be taken with a grain of salt."

"We must not delude ourselves into thinking that these physical results will come soon. They may not come in our lifetime," said the Senator.

Speaking of this country's present position in the atomic energy field, the Senator declared that, "I cannot say how many bombs we have but we have not been asleep at the switch. We are strongly situated in the atomic field and in the weapons field, but I hope that we may never have to use it against any nation or group that may attack us."

Returning to a discussion of the potentials of atomic energy, the Senator stated that "we have opened up the most highly technical and dangerous law of cosmos that has ever been revealed, a power as strong as the sun itself and a subject the surface of which man has not yet even scratched. We have not yet begun to see the dawning of the rising sun that future generations will know."

And near the conclusion of his address, Senator HICKENLOOPER sounded the somber note that was the undertone of his entire talk. Of his personal feelings toward the changes for permanent control of atomic energy in the hands of those whose motives were humanitarian, he said:

"There have been times when I was hopeful that leaders of nations would be ruled by humanitarian ideals. There have been times when I was without hope."

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered recently by Lucius E. Burch, Jr., a leading member of the Memphis, Tenn., bar. Mr. Burch gives a viewpoint that should be considered by Members of Congress considering labor-management legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am a corporation lawyer. The larger part of my livelihood is derived from the representation of corporations and not a small part of my time is spent in connection with the legal matters arising from labor disputes and grievances. I hope you will not think that such a damaging admission as to discredit me entirely, for I believe myself to be a true friend of labor and I think I can say that without disloyalty to any of my clients, for the truth is that I do not believe that there is any fundamental difference in interest between employers and employees.

On the surface of things it seems strange that there should be much tension in the field of labor relations at this time. Corporate profits are at an all-time high and industrial wages are higher than they have ever been. Notwithstanding this apparently happy state of things, there persists strong distrust between some employers and employees, and my purpose is to explore the background of that feeling to see what can be done to remove and prevent it.

In the past there have been serious shortcomings on the part of both capital and labor and the labor movement has such a brief history in this country that those abuses are vividly remembered by men who are still active in forming the policies of labor unions and employing companies.

I suppose that there are many men in this room who have worked 50 or 60 hours a week at straight time and for low pay. All of you remember that it was only 15 years ago that the right of collective bargaining was guaranteed by law. Many of you older men have known friends who were discharged, disciplined, or discriminated against for activities in behalf of labor, and I suspect that some of you have had experiences with imported scabs and strikebreakers.

On the other hand there are many men who have much to do with formulating the labor policies of companies, who have had bitter experiences with jurisdictional strikes, secondary boycotts, sit-down strikes, violence on the picket lines, and have seen shattered windows and machines damaged by emery dust. Those things are hard to forget, but they must be forgotten and ancient differences and old wrongs must not be kept alive and warmed over.

If labor and capital could obliterate from their memories these old wrongs and walk together hand in hand, with the idea of mutually examining the conditions that affect them both, what would they see?

Capital would realize that the most efficient plants are so much junk unless they are in production, and production depends on purchasing power. The best insurance that capital can have for continued prosperity is an abundant purchasing power on the part of labor. Any intelligent employer would realize that he is creating customers for his product when he pays the highest wage that his industry is capable of paying. He would know that, as man does not live by bread alone, labor seeks and is entitled to diginity and security; and to this end is clearly entitled to the right of collective bargaining and to those safeguards of collective bargaining, including the union shop, union maintenance, and decent and fair grievance procedure. Such a fair-minded employer would know that, as men are more valuable than machines, they should not be required or permitted to work under conditions that adversely affect their health and safety. These are some of the things that any intelligent employer should know and respect.

Now let us see how capital would appear from the viewpoint of a fair and sympathetic employee. Such an employee would realize that human muscle and intelligence unassisted is not highly productive. The reason we are a wealthy nation is because we are a productive nation, and we are productive because we have the tools for production. We are producing 35 times more goods than we did in 1850, although we have only 9 times as many workers, and they work an average of only 43 hours a week, instead of 70 hours a week, as they did when they were producing only one thirty-fifth of the goods that are now being produced. The reason for this is found in the great amount of mechanical horsepower that is supplied to each worker and that requires tremendous capital investment. On the Illinois Central Railroad it requires an expenditure of $17,500 to provide a job for one worker. Capital does not grow on trees, nor can it be plucked from the thin air, and if we are to grow wealthier, we can do so only by increasing production, which is going to require greater and greater capitalization. The only way that this capital can be secured is by investment, and investment results when people put their money in a venture with the hope of some profitable return from it. Capital will not flow into any industry that is not profitable, and it is to the selfish interest of every employee to see that his employer is engaged in a profitable operation. Any employee who asks for a wage greater than can be paid without making the business profitable is damaging the ability of the employer to pay any wage at all. Employers, too, are entitled to security and fair dealing, and it is simply not fair for any employer to have his plant tied up by work stoppage over any dispute that does not exist between him and his employees, and it is just as wrong and just as reprehensible for a labor union to violate its contract as it is for an employer to violate his.

I have spoken of ancient distrust that exists between capital and labor as being a major cause of misunderstanding. There is another fundamental cause, and that is ignorance—ignorance on the part of most employers of the true status of labor and ignorance on the part of labor of the problems and conditions of capital.

Many employers look at the high money wages of labor without ever realizing the difference between money wages and real wages, and there are too few employers who follow the cost-of-living index and know just how little goods and services the money wage will buy.

The average employee is just as ignorant about conditions affecting capital. He points to high profits and says that the companies are getting rich, without thinking about high replacement costs and accelerated depreciation. I think most of you would be shocked to know just how little capital is making, just as most employers would be shocked to realize how little your wages will buy. Let me give you an illustration to exemplify this.

Let us suppose that you have accumulated savings to the extent of $5,000. You can loan this money out at interest on good sound security, such as a mortgage on real estate, and get a return of 5 percent a year; but let us suppose that you are not satisfied with such an investment and that you want to invest that money in a business, thereby providing jobs and increasing the production of wealth, but at the same time taking the risk of losing your investment by reason of more efficient competition, fluctuation of business conditions, casualty, or any of the numerous things that can ruin a business. What would you think was a fair return on such an investment? I think none of you would feel that a return of 10 percent to compensate for such risk would be unfair or excessive.

Last year one of the largest labor unions in the country employed an outstanding economist, Robert Nathan, to report on the earnings of business. Mr. Nathan reported that in the years 1936–39 corporate earnings were only 3.2 percent of sales and only 2.9 percent of net worth. In the boom year of 1946 corporate earnings were only 5.5 percent on sales and 7.6 percent on invested net worth. You can see right there that business is not such a fat turkey as some people think. Furthermore, those figures do not tell the whole story. The earnings of business are not all distributed to the investor. A large part of earnings must be put back into a business and just as the laboring man has his deducts, the investor has his. The dividend check which is the investor's take-home pay was considerably less than half of net corporate earnings, so you can see from that that the investors who are providing the tools of production are not getting enough return to stimulate increased capital investment to provide those magnificent but expensive new tools which in turn will result in greater wealth through production and more leisure for all of us.

More than anything else, capital and labor need to arrive at a common understanding of each other's problems. This can be reached only by a forgiving and forgetting of old differences and by a better knowledge of each other's problems. We need more union officials as directors of large companies. More employees should be stockholders of the companies for which they work, and they should be interested in annual reports and the condition of business which affects their

employer. When a man works his way up through the ranks, as practically all of our corporate officers do, they should not tear up their union cards but should remain interested in the union, its activities and its problems. We need to see more corporate officers and union leaders having lunch, playing golf, hunting and fishing together, and they should do these things naturally and without any pious feeling of being broadminded, as is now too frequently the case on both sides.

My solution to the problem is that of Senator Lamar who, during the days of bitter feeling after the Civil War, made such an outstanding attempt to bind up the Nation's wounds. In a great speech made on the floor of the Senate he addressed his colleagues of the North and of the South, saying: "My brothers, you must come to know one another and then you will come to love one another." That is a good prescription for all of us.

Memorial Address on Franklin Delano Roosevelt by Senator Kefauver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] last Friday night at the annual memorial dinner for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to join in this tribute to the memory of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I am certain that we who are gathered here are witnesses to the inauguration of a ceremony which will shortly become a Nation-wide annual institution.

The greatest homage we can render to the ideals of Franklin Roosevelt is to work for our country in that spirit of broadness and humaneness which he brought to public affairs.

ADA, at its founding 2 years ago, was dedicated to those ideals, and since that time it has been working steadily for them.

Tonight is, in a sense, a victory celebration—a celebration of the victory of those principles which, for many years, were symbolized in the person of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

All the glitter and glamour of the recent inaugural ceremonies are passed; yet, the people of America are still thrilled at the obstacles overcome in the triumph of President Truman and Vice President Barkley.

This is more so in the minds of us who have learned the vicissitudes of politics the hard way.

President Truman accomplished the most startling political upset of our time.

While he deserves the fullest credit, I feel his grand accomplishment was due in no small measure to the zeal and forthrightness with which he championed the basic tenets of his great predecessor's political philosophies.

I believe, too, that the public felt this kinship and similarity of fundamental purposes between these two Presidents.

The other day—during the splendid and impressive inaugural ceremonies—my mind's eye had a vision of President Roosevelt participating in the festivities. There he was, off to one side, with his head tossed back jauntily; his jaw protruding defiantly; and his face alight with his contagious smile as he enjoyed the victory of his way of government to the full extent of his tremendous capacity.

This was only a mental picture, of course; but, in truth, the slow-moving parade down the long avenue was led by the indomitable spirit of the man whom we honor tonight.

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

The fireside chat.

The New Deal.

A three-horse team pulling together to plow the field.

"I love a good fight."

The Tennessee Valley Authority.

"One-third of a Nation ill-clothed, ill-housed, ill-fed."

I could go on and on.

Who of you within sound of my voice will ever forget these and many other ideas and expressions released from the lips and the heart of our gallant leader, the great humanitarian, Franklin Delano Roosevelt?

Three years nine months and sixteen days have passed into the realm of history since that familiar voice, known to billions throughout the world, was silenced. And yet we still hear it admonishing us to win completely the peace as we won the military victory; reminding us to be concerned with the well-being of our fellowmen; charging us with the responsibility of being fair and just in all walks of life. And so it will ever be.

He was one of the many war casualties, but he will continue to lead; not only to lead men, but men's thoughts; continue to release the highest and noblest which is lodged in our inner selves.

He has left us, true; but he will never die.

This man of vivid vision was able to see beyond the horizons which limit the minds of most men.

He met the weight and complexity of our problems for 12 eventful years.

He was the master of the microphone, and he utilized his pleasing personality to soothe and allay our fearfulness; to suggest remedies and compound cures for our economic ailments.

He was at once the "Aaron," interpreting into words the ideals of the less articulate; and the "Moses," leading his people out of the wilderness.

But, even as Moses, who was privileged to lead his people to very threshold of the Promised Land, this fearless foe of fascism was also denied the privilege of entering the modern promised land of permanent peace, and plentiful prosperity.

Franklin Roosevelt was ambitious for all men—particularly, the little man.

He coveted for all his fellow Americans—for all men everywhere—the complete freedom for which he believed all men were destined by the great Creator.

This honored regent of reform yearned that every person should have a decent home, a decent education, and a decent later life.

Because of this ambition—this yearning—he was the best-loved and the most-hated statesman the world has yet produced.

Throughout history, when men have emphasized the dignity of man rather than the rights of property, the criticism has been embittered.

Experience is proving to us a rule of the universe: in every period of crisis, fate and destiny call to leadership one who is equal to the task. Certainly, Franklin Roosevelt was a case-in-point.

He was in public life for many years—as Governor of our largest State; as Under Secretary of the Navy in time of war; and in 1920, he was nominated as Vice President of the United States.

But, his moment of service was not then at hand, in the mysterious manner of moves, which surpasses our understanding, he tasted defeat—and, thereby—he was saved for the higher and nobler task which lay ahead.

Thirteen years later, he answered, and successfully, the call to the cause of democracy. His chance to leave the world a little better than he found it came to him, as it invariable does, in one way or another, to every one of us.

He was equal to the momentous task, and rendered unremitting service to his people in time of sorest need.

You recall the situation; I need not recount it here. He found the greatest Nation civilization has produced in a state of chaos and catastrophe; in a state of near revolt.

Something had to be done. And it had to be done hurriedly, effectively, and sensibly.

There were—and are—some who termed his measures "radical," but time has proven them sound.

His genius for leadership during this period remains unmatched.

Our banks were saved.

Our gold was recovered.

Mortgage foreclosures were halted.

Unemployment was diminished.

Business improved.

Confidence was restored.

The night of doubt and fear was over.

There was, probably, no man in all America who agreed in every particular with everything President Roosevelt did.

He was making his way on untrodden paths in almost everything he did.

It could not be expected—in reason—that the dramatic innovations included in the New Deal would meet the approval of all.

But, on mature reflection, we, in this great democracy, are learning to minimize our differences and accentuate our positives.

But, even in doubting the wisdom of his principles or policies, few ever really doubted his genuine sincerity of purpose.

So much good emanated from his fertile mind that we are constrained to consider his errors—if he was wrong—as microscopic in comparison with the alleviation of human suffering and human fears for which he was so largely responsible.

Errors of the mind are much easier forgiven than errors of the heart.

Even in the perplexing confusion he applied well his special gifts of wisdom and understanding to the problems of the world.

As we are removed, progressively, from the proximity of prejudices related to anyone's personality—regardless of the good qualities in it—and begin to consider the man as a whole, history is recording Franklin Roosevelt as one of America's all-time great. (Greatness has a way of growing in proportion to the quality of the subject.)

As it has been so aptly put by the Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY: "Franklin Delano Roosevelt held to the belief that—

"All men are created equal—not in physical power, not in intellectual endowments, not in moral fiber, but, regardless of differences of one kind of another, equal—in the right and opportunity to enjoy the blessings of freedom under a system which undertakes to guarantee—so far as human institutions can do so—the equal enjoyment of every right which a government ought to guarantee to those who support and defend it."

When we pause to remember that Franklin Roosevelt was born to wealth it is the more remarkable that he should have busied himself so raptly in advancing the dignity of the common man.

It is unusual, but commendable, that he found himself discontent to be idly rich and

content to devote his energies to those whose names never appear in print; who dwell in the shadows rather than on the mountain top.

These little people—and I refer to them as little only in comparison to the great and the affluent—found in Franklin Roosevelt a symbol and spokesman of all the better things of which mortal man is capable of visualizing.

All the magnitude of his ideals; all of his dramatic performances; all his incredible accomplishments; the sum of his global influence, belonged to them.

They held—and hold—him in high respect—almost reverence.

In their name he lashed out at social injustice; advanced a wholesome and heartful economy; dared to venture to the far regions of political frontiers.

He was the champion of their individual freedom.

Because he gained the confidence of the great masses of the American people, President Roosevelt was able to arouse us to the imminence of danger—and to organize us for the victory.

Our course could have been different if the burden had rested on less competent shoulders.

If—with justification—one can draw a line of demarcation anywhere, the South—more than any other section of our country, or segment of our economy—needed and profited by the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt.

Many had exploited the plight of the South for political favor in the past, but the stainless character of Franklin Roosevelt excluded political prostitution.

He gave us more than mere lip service.

He promised, and then he performed.

From the planning board he transformed the invaluable Tennessee Valley Authority into a sprawling system of hydroelectric dams. He converted eroded gullies into productive fields.

He held back the flood waters that had ravaged our lowlands of fertile soil; he taught us to conserve that precious top soil.

He made possible navigation from the headwaters of the Tennessee River to the Ohio and Mississippi.

The scientific fertilizers flowing from TVA experimental plants enhanced the value of our crops.

Because of his dream, our homes are lighted with cheap electricity; our farms can use power machinery; and we in the South are being lifted from the role of economic problem No. 1, to a potential Ruhr Valley of America.

His program saved our farmers; salvaged our small businessmen; lessened the freight-rate discrimination against our section; and, restored our dignity.

Franklin Roosevelt gave us a new lease on life; a glimpse of the potential the future held in store; and inspired us to lend ourselves and our resources to the betterment of all mankind.

As a result, we have a necessary feeling of belonging; no longer do we consider our section the stepchild of America.

Had Franklin Roosevelt not believed and practiced the principle of the dignity of the individual, the South would have remained America's stepchild.

WHAT IF NO FUTURE

President Truman—in his inaugural address this month—reaffirmed to the world America's devotion to this principle. He asked that we improve the undeveloped areas of the world.

Our task here in America is under way, and we must turn our efforts in the direction of our friends.

This is the political thinking advanced by Franklin Roosevelt.

This is the political thinking required to preserve our way of life in this terribly unsettled world.

Ours is a proud heritage.

The concept of a strong, vital, democratic society, interested in the welfare of its citizens, and capable of assuring a better life for itself, and the whole world, is—in no small measure—the heritage which Franklin Delano Roosevelt has bequeathed to us.

Address by Renah F. Camalier to Graduating Class of Anacostia High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 26, Renah F. Camalier, a distinguished citizen of Washington, delivered an address to the graduating class of Anacostia High School in Washington. The address is very illuminating, and I feel that it can be read with profit by all Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. Corkery, Mr. Lee, guests of the graduating class, and young ladies and gentlemen of the graduating class, please sit back and relax. This idea of a speaker appearing before the graduating class is an old American custom, and must be endured.

I look at the fathers and mothers here, with their beaming countenances, then at the wide-eyed, wondering graduates. And the picture reminds me of the youngster who was being chided for his low grades in school. As an alibi, the young boy said:

"Well, all the other boys, they got C's and D's, too," but, quizzical and doubting, dad said: "How about little Johnny Jones, he received high marks?" "Oh, yeah, dad, but he's different; he has two bright parents, and I only have mother."

This beautiful setting carries me back many years. One of the milestones in the life of a boy and a girl is his or her birthday. Graduation day is another.

In the one, you seem to travel alone, except for fond parents, beaming grandparents, cynical brothers and sisters, and doting relatives.

In the other you do not travel alone. You are not only surrounded by your parents, grandparents, brothers and sisters, and doting relatives but you have standing with you many other boys and girls with whom you have been associating daily over the passing years.

Such associations, if founded upon good principles, good habits, and high ideals, will always be a blessing, and will, on that basis, ripen into friendships sufficiently strong and desirable to stand the test of time and adversity.

Young ladies and gentlemen, you are facing a most remarkable and even-to-be-desired era. May I dwell, for just a moment, on the life with which we have been endowed.

I will not be so bold or boring as to attempt to tell you what constitutes life, but from my own experience I can tell you it is a wonderful thing just to live, and that is the subject of my talk.

What I might develop here is directed primarily at the young men, who must face the trials of the professional and business worlds. The young ladies are so beautiful and attractive, I am convinced they will but face the trials of the home, the wives of the young men of their choice, and that is a marvelous career.

Young men, face your trials with your head erect and your shoulders straight back, with the proud consciousness that you are an American boy.

If you will look about you through your eyes of eagerness and expectation, you will see life everywhere. But this life is a very practical thing, and it is very unwise to contemplate it simply as a thing of beauty. It has its problems and its opportunities, its benefits, and its burdens. In plain words, it's a great life if you can take it.

Tonight we stand in the foreglow of your new years of hope and promise. Down through the ages it has been the task of man, through tireless efforts, the expenditure of money and energy to a fabulous degree, to attempt to anticipate, to unravel, and to reveal the future. You might as well try to stop the sun.

This is now your today. It is your gateway to that dark, foreboding, and uncertain yet welcome future; but as we face it we stand with renewed hope and high anticipation, girded on every side by modern concepts of cooperation and brotherly aid. Boundaries which have circumscribed peoples and nations in the past have disappeared. But the concepts are no longer obscured and present efforts indicate the prospect of success in every honest endeavor. Therefore life is worth while and enchanting.

Personally, I am an irrepressible optimist, and no matter how burdensome life becomes at times, I have always managed to come up smiling. I heard the whole thing summed up in a remark by a little 3-year-old child last Sunday, when she said, "Unka Willie, I always say 'Hello, Mr. Sun,' in the morning."

Young men and women, live while you may, live today, but live wisely and well, never too rapidly, and always with a purpose. Never be satisfied with yourself, for it has truly been said that there is no hope for a satisfied man. And, that is an irrefutable statement.

Do you know how to take this life? Possibly it will help you, if I give the approach outlined by one of the greatest teachers and philosophers of modern times, a man who was considered also the finest humorist in America. What does Mark Twain say in this regard:

"How to take life? Take it just as though it was—as it is—an earnest, vital, and important affair. Take it as though you were born to the task of performing a merry part of it—as though the world awaited your coming. Take it as though it was a grand opportunity to do and achieve, to carry forward great and good schemes, to help and cheer a suffering, weary, and it may be, a heart-broken world."

Mark Twain knew his life. And he knew how to take it.

There are two things which should be guarded by every one, with ceaseless care. One is character, the other reputation. And if you think those two things are old-fashioned, just go out and look for a job without them.

Character is what a man really is; reputation is what he would have you think he is—two vastly different ideals.

The first, character, is something which gold cannot purchase, but history records many instances, each sad, humiliating, and final, when gold has caused the sale of a man's character.

And a man, having sold that priceless possession, immediately has three strikes on him. He is out before he leaves the home plate. He has destroyed that which he has received from God. It is the final put-out.

In this day, and in the days which you are now facing, you will do well to remember this one word of mine, without character you will have no real or fancied chance in life.

The second is reputation. It takes years to build a good reputation, and it can be lost overnight, never to be fully regained. It is something born of man, and must be consistently maintained if any steady progress in life is to be expected.

Without character and a good reputation you might as well quit right now.

This is 1949—almost the half-way mark in the twentieth century—and history is violently in the making.

I am reminded of the chemistry student. The professor asked: "Just what does HNO_3 signify?" The student hesitated, "Sorry, sir; ah, it is right here on the tip of my tongue." "Well you had better spit it out. It's nitric acid."

The old world still trembles for momentous happenings, and great changes are taking place. It is like nitric acid.

We are living in a wonderful age, and it behooves us to keep abreast of the times or else drop by the wayside. Not one of us can afford to get out of step or lose heart, or confidence, or determination; and, above all, not one of us can afford to allow ourselves to be swept by passion or prejudice, indifference or intolerance, for if we do it is a safe bet we will drop by the wayside.

And will the world stand still and wait? Not so. If you have contributed anything toward the betterment of conditions, the world will feel your absence from the line of march, but just as surely as the sun creeps over the horizon tomorrow morning, that same old world, which applauded you yesterday and today, will shake itself from the shackles and press on to the ultimate goal, leaving you still by the wayside. Who will be the loser? Only you.

Do not fool yourselves, young people, but be as understanding as the old colored man who read the inscription on the tombstone: "He is not dead, but sleepeth," to which he remarked sagely, "Boss, he ain't foolin' nobody but hisself."

And you, also, will fool only yourselves if you are like the boy in the class when the teacher slapped a half dollar on the desk and asked, "What is that?" To which the bright young wit replied, "Tails." Oh, no, fellows, you will do better to get passing marks, and not be so qualified in such questionable pursuits of entertainment or possible gain.

You have been through the courses set down here for your physical and moral advancement. You have gained much knowledge. You have acquired much education.

But this knowledge which has been gained and acquired is history; what you have learned is in the same category. It is yours to be sure, it is in your minds and hearts, and it has become the foundation of your intellect, but it treats of yesterday.

Now, education is something different. Education treats of today, and tomorrow, and every day. You will never cease to acquire education in some form or another. Life itself will see to that, but there you must also be careful that you do not acquire education along the lines which will make you something akin to an outcast.

Don't be like little Tommy, who came home proudly from his first day at school:

"What did you learn in school?" asked his mother.

"Nothing," said Tommy, then, seeing the look of disappointment on her face, he added, "But I learned a lot during recess."

That boy was wise beyond his years.

Keep your hearts and minds clean; otherwise your education will never pay dividends in this exacting world.

Personally, I have seen many young persons boastfully satisfied and content with their apparent progress and achievement in education. You have seen them. They are the boys and girls who always act as if they have the world by the tail. What a fallacy.

Just look a little further, and see what history shows. The best way for me to express it is to say that these little "big shots" always find themselves thrown for a heavy loss by the very world which they feel they have conquered, and are holding by the tail.

Anacostia High School is an American institution, a part of our American system of public schools, the melting pot for millions of boys and girls, pointing the way to those things upon which this Nation was founded and builded nearly 200 years ago.

Those of us who are a little older are passing on to you a priceless heritage, that of freedom.

There are in the world peoples and organizations who would deprive you of that heritage, but, before you relinquish it, be sure you put upon your shoulder the equipment necessary to fight and die for its preservation, for it is upon the preservation of that heritage that this great land of ours must ever depend for its glory and its perpetuity. Guard it well, zealously and ceaselessly.

America is proud of its public-school system, and many of the things which its enemies proclaim never exist; and this is true not only of the schools, but of other American institutions against which charges without foundation have been hurled since the cornerstone of the Nation was laid.

Too much, in my opinion, has been said about juvenile delinquency arising from institutions.

Rather, let us look into our private homes, and there urge that the basic principles of Americanism be instilled in the hearts and minds of children.

Let them be taught the rudiments of common politeness, good manners, and consideration for the acts and feelings of others. No greater contribution to the welfare of our people can be made by the parents of our oncoming generation.

Let there be instilled in their minds respect for public authority, thus bringing to an end the all-too-prevalent idea that the office of President, or Senator, or Representative, or minister, or priest, or rabbi, or public-school official, or any other loyal American official, is necessarily subject to criticism and ridicule.

If that were done, less criticism would be leveled at our institutions, both public and private, and at their directing heads.

The growing tendency in American life to condemn, ridicule, and vilify those in authority is productive only of harm, and the breaking down of respect for that authority throughout the country. It can be stopped by proper instruction in the home.

As an adjunct to this teaching by parents, all schools could well afford to make it compulsory before graduation that boys and girls be grounded in the ethics of life, and so far as our public schools are involved, I heartily suggest, Mr. Lee, that the Board of Education join in any definite movement to increase respect for public and private rights and properties, or inaugurate such a movement itself.

I firmly believe civic and other organizations throughout this city are vitally interested in bringing about a deeper respect and reverence for law and order, and will be glad to join in such an endeavor.

Good luck, young men and women, in this your world of promise, and hope, and opportunity, and may you progress year by year, and may that progress lead you along paths which will insure that each and every one will be a fine, upstanding citizen and leader of this, or any other community, ever ready and qualified to tackle the problems of your day.

And then, when the passage of time causes you to give way to the boys and girls who will graduate in the years to come, you will be able to sit back and live, live in the happy reflections of a well-spent life.

Good luck.

Peter Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 25, we received word that Peter Marshall, our Senate Chaplain, had died. All of us who knew him were shocked and grieved.

During the 2 years Peter Marshall served as Chaplain of the Senate each of us came to know, respect, and revere him. From his words we drew counsel and guidance.

Peter Marshall's influence in the United States Senate extended to the Press and Radio Galleries.

Mr. Tris Coffin devoted his column of January 28 to an appreciation of Peter Marshall. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD Tris Coffin's column, The Daybook. Further I recommend that each Senator and member of the galleries read this tribute to Peter Marshall.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of January 28, 1949]

THE DAYBOOK

(By Tris Coffin)

The clear voice with the faint Scotch burr sounded across the dim and gloomy Chamber, "* * * May Thy will be done here and Thy program be carried out above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world."

The Senators sat quietly, a little humbled as they always were by the sincerity of the young Chaplain. These were the last words spoken by Peter Marshall in the United States Senate. He died the next morning, a man who had lived a full and rewarding life, at 46.

Dr. Marshall, a Scotch Presbyterian, was the conscience of the Senate. His voice was soft and gentle, but his words cut cleanly through the pompousness and demagogery on Capitol Hill. He told this correspondent wistfully one morning, "The Senators may not want me long for their chaplain, but I must speak out."

One of his admirers, Senator HARLEY KILGORE, of West Virginia, spoke of him in awe: "Peter Marshall expresses more feeling and says more in his short prayers than all the Senators put together the rest of the day."

Dr. Marshall's belief in human rights was a passion so deep it glowed in his face and burned in his words. Yet he was a soft-spoken man who had no use for cheap dramatics. He spoke honestly of what was on his mind, and that was all. He died at 46 because he devoted all his energies to helping others.

Everything Peter Marshall did, he did with great care. In his small, old-fashioned office in the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Dr. Marshall worked for hours over his short daily prayer in the Senate.

One of the great documents of recent times was Peter Marshall's Fourth of July sermon 2 years ago. It was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Fifty thousand copies were mailed out on request.

The young pastor said: "The freedom that was purchased 171 years ago was not paid for in one down payment. Installments have

been kept up for more than two lifetimes, for this is one possession that exacts a perpetual price. There is a danger in your sitting back smugly applauding when the flag is thrown upon the movie screen, puffing yourself up with pride, as you boast of America. For you were free-born.

"Unless you have lived in other lands, unless you have known hunger and persecution, unless you have come as an immigrant to this good land, you have no idea how good it is. Nor can you truly be grateful, since you have no conception of what it means to be without all the things you take for granted.

"You have never known anything else. It is because they who went before you were willing to stake their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, that you have what you now enjoy. But you forget how bitterly it was won.

"The story of the waste of this country's resources is a sad story of greed and selfishness. The wildlife of this Nation has long been exploited to satisfy the greed and so-called sporting instinct of free Americans. That same kind of greed was shown in our treatment of the land.

"It was good land, but we were greedy. We wanted money crops, and the slogan was, 'Plow and plant, plow and plant.' We moved on when the land gave out. Our reckless stripping away of the vegetable cover of the soil has driven out the animals and invited erosion.

"The same wanton waste and disregard for the future is to be seen in the almost criminal waste of oil; in the deforestation of our country, when the slogan seemed to be, 'Cut and sell, cut and sell.' Surely freedom does not mean that people can do as they like with the country's resources. The natural resources of America are the heritage of the whole Nation, and should be conserved and utilized for the benefit of all people.

"It is time we put the Bible back into our Government; time that our statesmen began to make their decisions on all moral questions on the basis of the authority of God's holy word. It is only by applying Christ's solutions to the problems that plague us, it is only by living under His blessing and guidance, that we can ever hope to add any new glory to Old Glory."

A National Prosperity Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "For a National Prosperity Budget," published in the magazine section of the New York Times of January 9, 1949. The article is written by Mr. Leon H. Keyserling, vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET—TO MEET OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC PROBLEMS A NEW KIND OF VOLUNTARY PLAN IS PROPOSED

(By Leon H. Keyserling)

WASHINGTON.—The debates preceding the national election made it clear that people of all shades of opinion look upon the stability of the American economy as our domestic problem No. 1. The best sign of the spirit in which that problem will now be faced resides in the legislative and executive record of those who have molded national policy in peace and war since the end of the great depression 15 years ago.

That record contains both successes and mistakes. But viewing the record as a whole, it would take more than a few weeks of speculative flurry on the stock market to lead any thoughtful citizen to suspect that our economic future has been clouded by the recent popular reaffirmation of principles and programs which, up to the present moment, have been accompanied by the highest business prosperity and standards of living ever achieved.

Clearly nothing in this record should cause any group now to suspect any punitive, inconsiderate, or reckless action. All men of good will can work together to make our economy even more stable, more prosperous, and more just under the leadership of a President whose dedication to that purpose is, I believe, felt by all.

Cooperation in human affairs is founded upon a commonly accepted definition of where we now stand and a commonly held aspiration for the years ahead. This article proposes a national prosperity budget, to stress the great things that hold us together rather than the little things that tear us apart, and thus to give us one big objective to strive for together instead of leaving us only with many smaller issues about which to contend.

Before discussing this prosperity-budget idea, however, it is necessary to take a fresh look at the current economic situation. With the cost of living and wholesale prices other than for farm and food products now near their all-time peaks, it is a bit premature to assert that inflation has ended because the cost of living has dropped 1.3 percent in 3 months, after 5 consecutive months of upswing and 12 months of upswing out of the last 18. Many people, including the Federal Reserve Board presidents in New York and Chicago, have recently pointed out that inflationary problems may continue or even augment during the next year, and that, whether prices in future seek much higher levels or hover near their present levels, the results of past inflation and the potentials for further inflation require substantial efforts to promote long-range economic stability.

But far more important than forecasting whether inflation will continue or subside is the task of defining precisely what we mean by inflation so that we may deal with it sensibly. Our economy since VJ-day has been characterized in the main by these three conditions: (1) Full employment straining against the labor force, high production straining against available materials, and high incomes and spending straining against output; (2) highly organized business, labor, and agriculture straining to protect their real or fancied interests and to get as large a share as they can of the Nation's income, coupled with a people organized through their Government to perform functions and services of immense range; and (3) prices and costs generally rising with variations in timing and speed.

Never before the war were all three of these conditions, particularly the second, so abundantly apparent. Their combination creates an economy so fundamentally different from prewar as to call for a drastic readjustment in traditional economic thinking.

To be sure, inflation could be overcome by getting rid of all three of these conditions. But the first condition, though few yet admit it, is really a permanent characteristic of a full-employment economy, to the preservation of which we are committed by national law, by popular sentiment, and by every imperative of world conditions. Nobody can propose any democratic way of getting rid of the second condition, even if anyone wanted to. The problem, therefore, is to get rid of the third condition while maintaining the first and accepting the second.

Or more exactly, we want to modify the third condition of rising prices and costs, not because it is inseparably connected with the other two conditions, but rather because it threatens the first condition of full employment, especially where the second condition of highly organized groups prevents the automatic adjustments of which Adam Smith dreamed.

Why is high-level prosperity threatened by rising prices and costs? Certainly not because they are bad per se. We had a falling price level after 1929 and the country was in the doldrums. We had a rising price level after 1932 with increasing employment and production. We had a fairly stable price level in the later 1920's and yet something must have been wrong in view of what ensued.

The vital point is not the absolute levels or trends of prices, wages, and other incomes, but rather the relationships among them. When these relationships inflict needless hardships upon millions of individuals, or when they create distortions in our pattern of production, consumption, or national income which may make it impossible to sustain maximum employment, productive investment, and business confidence, then we are in for trouble.

For these reasons, a mere leveling off of prices, while hailed by some, may not be a happy omen. It may be instead the traditional link in the chain of circumstances by which our economy passes from an unhealthy boom to a recession. A cycle, if it is big enough, looks flat when we are standing at the top. Further, an apparent leveling off of prices, when it is merely the average of some prices moving upward while others are moving downward, may generate distortions in the economy which threaten lasting prosperity even more than when all prices are moving upward.

The dangers generated by post-war inflation, in short, are not just that prices and income have moved up; the remedy cannot lie just in moving them down. They have moved up in an uneven manner which has created or aggravated certain specific maladjustments in the whole price-income structure.

The first serious maladjustment relates to family standards of living.

During the accelerated price rises since mid-1946, a majority of families in the middle-income and upper-income brackets have received increases in money incomes as the cost of living has advanced. But a majority in the lowest income brackets have received no such increases or have suffered decreases. By 1947 about 50 percent of all families had incomes below the $3,200 a year estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to be required to maintain an urban family of four at a reasonably satisfactory standard of living; and a quarter to a third of all families had incomes below $2,000. By early 1948 about 28 percent of all families had no liquid assets.

This serious maldistribution of income, in the long run, could lead to the oversaving or underconsumption which drives employment and production downward. And even in the short run, it is unsettling because it necessarily produces intense pressure drives to change the price-income structure so long as people are alert and organized for the protection of their interests.

The second threat to economic stability arises out of the pronounced downward trend of farm prices and incomes, during a year when national income and production as a whole have been increasing. The problem of agricultural adjustment will soon be with

us again, not in terms of relief from the excessively high farm prices of 1947, but rather in terms of preventing that relative weakness in the farm sector of the economy which did us no good in the 1920's. The economy can be healthy only if the farm population moves toward parity with the rest of us in basic opportunities and standards of living.

A fair treatment of high retail food costs must recognize and not neglect this fact. It is essential to reduce the spread between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets, to lift agricultural output to meet postwar standards of consumption at full employment, and to improve farm efficiency so that somewhat lower prices may result without general reductions in farm income. We do not yet have an adequate program to do this.

The third threat to economic stability is that some important industrial prices have moved higher than can permanently be sustained. This has happened in areas where the postwar demand has been extraordinarily high, fed by the business reconversion and equipment boom, the cumulative shortage of housing, the special requirements of the preparedness program and the foreign-aid program—all of which are somewhat temporary factors.

For example, the country needs for at least 10 years an annual volume of housing output as large as, or considerably larger than, the level of house construction since the war. But when the relatively thin market of those who can buy high-priced or luxury housing is saturated, and when the residential construction industry is faced with the task of supplying the mass market for those who need far more moderately priced housing, there is likely to be a collapse in the postwar building boom analogous to that which took place after 1925, unless costs are substantially lowered and other measures adopted. Since the spring of 1948, housing starts have declined alarmingly.

Industrial prices are in large areas administered—or at least partially administered prices, which do not respond so rapidly or so sensitively as farm prices to changes in the composition of demand. Hence, the unpalatable outlook is that the industrial price situation will cumulate eventually in substantial unemployment and cut-backs in production if prices move further above levels which can be permanently maintained or which are essential to provide adequate incentives and funds for optimum business expansion.

This growing unbalance in the economy, semiconcealed so long as inflation lasts, may be appreciated most fully by examining the composition of national expenditures and incomes. The expenditures of consumers dropped from 74.7 percent of the total national output figure in 1939 to 69 percent in the fourth quarter of 1948. Contrasting the same two periods, business investment (and net foreign investment) rose from 11 percent to 15.6 percent. This reflects industry's postwar reconversion boom and does not in itself reveal anything undesirable.

However, to achieve a workable balance between production and consumption in a more normal peacetime economy, consumer expenditures will need to assume a relatively larger role. And the preliminary indications are that the changing structure of national income does not bode well for this orderly transition. Compensation of employees has dropped from 65.9 percent of the national income total in 1939 to 61.6 percent in the fourth quarter of 1948, while corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustments have risen from 8 percent to 14.7 percent.

One traditional answer to this problem is that consumer income is now more than adequate to take the supply of goods available for consumer use, and that when more goods become available their production in itself will create the income to absorb them. But our economic system does not react wholly in this way. The more typical reaction to dwindling market prospects is not to decrease prices or increase wages, but, rather, to resort to curtailment of employment and production. This is already occurring in a few areas, and when such a trend becomes generalized and leads to erratic or panicky price reductions a recession or depression is under way.

No such general trends seem likely in the very short run. I share the view of many others who believe that high-level production and employment may continue for some time. But the essence of sound national policy is to treat the time still granted us as a precious asset for the development and application of corrective measures before the eleventh hour.

Viewing the several aspects of the problem of stability, there are no quick and easy overall solutions.

We cannot increase production very much in the short run, under existing conditions of full employment, shortages of some materials and almost full utilization of resources. Moreover, the chief threat to sustained production and gradual expansion by technological advance, improved productivity, better management, and removal of bottlenecks are the maladjustments already portrayed. To put the horse before the cart, we should attend to these maladjustments and then production in the main will proceed smoothly.

Nor is the reduction of total demand a sure cure, although it is frequently hailed as such. While control of consumer credit can curb the demand of some who now obtain too large a share of available goods, it cannot help the primary victims of inflation who now obtain too few goods, and should not be used against them. Control of bank reserves can be used to abate some loans and activities. But other activities which should now be curtailed are not sufficiently dependent upon new credit to be affected, while still others which should now be stimulated might be impaired by tightened credit. While taxes should be high enough to maintain a budgetary surplus and reduce the national debt, the use of taxes to achieve all the needed adjustments in the production-price-cost structure could not be sufficiently selective without becoming unwieldy and appearing highly discriminatory.

It is true that fiscal measures—such as credit restriction and high taxation—could end inflation if carried so far that total production declined and unemployment rose. But this would worsen the position of the people who have already been hurt most. Nor has anyone proposed a plan for drastic contraction which would bring relationships into better balance instead of worse, or prevent our highly sensitive economy from rolling into the valley of depression if we deliberately started it down the mountainside. The idea that we can protect production and employment by reducing them a little bit is about as safe as the ancient remedy of bloodletting.

The moral is that these fiscal measures can be most effective only if supplementary to adjustments in the private policies which affect production, prices, wages, and national income. This is true not only because these private policies can be applied more selectively, but also because they bulk much larger in the operation of the economic system.

Any effort to limit the free play of these private policies by selective governmental control of allocations or prices or wages is justifiable only in a situation requiring remedial action before management, labor, and agriculture can acquire the Nation-wide perspectives to forage voluntary adjustments in the interest of the whole economy. What selective controls the new Congress will authorize will depend in part upon how successfully voluntary price adjustments proceed, and in part upon the evolving economic situation. But in any event, temporary controls would provide only a short-run necessary breathing spell. In the long run, it should be our fixed purpose that workable relationships among prices, wages, and other incomes be developed and applied not primarily by Government, but rather by the prime movers in our voluntary economic system.

By definition, however, the development of the Nation-wide perspectives required for this task cannot rest exclusively with any individual or group. Consistent with our traditions of freedom, I believe appropriate governmental sources should therefore encourage the preparation of the national prosperity budget to which I earlier referred, focused upon the working of the economy as a whole and the interdependence of its parts.

This budget, by estimating for a few years ahead the maximum output that our resources and skills can achieve without the forced draft of a war economy, and what this would mean in profits and general well-being, would challenge the enterprise and imagination of every element in our economic system. By defining some of the key requirements for this volume of output—such as the amount of steel, transport, and agricultural production—it would shed light instead of heat upon some of the most vexatious problems now confronting us.

By objective analysis of the relationships among profits, wages, and other incomes which would provide both the capital funds and the incentives for this expansion and the purchasing power to absorb it, the prosperity budget would distinguish the long-run welfare of all from the short-run gains of contending groups, and thus provide a surer foundation for the mutual adjustment of industry, agriculture, and labor through voluntary action.

By looking at the economy as a whole, it would also offer a better test of governmental policies, such as farm-price supports, taxation, minimum-wage legislation, and public works, all of which promote adjustment or aggravate maladjustment depending upon how well they are attuned to the whole situation.

Most important of all, by implanting everywhere the conviction that reasonable stability is attainable, it would dispel the fears that cause restrictionist practices by industry and labor, and provide the quickening impulse for clear affirmative action.

The preparation and popularization of such a national prosperity budget, and its annual revision, should draw continuously upon the resources and thinking of many individuals and groups. Instruments of consultation and cooperation should be established, subject always to the purifying influence of constructive public criticism. The budget would not be forced upon any one. It might be ignored or followed just as the weather reports, depending upon its demonstration of utility. Being essentially an informational device, it might gradually become more authoritative; but it would not become authoritarian. By furnishing major economic groups with a comprehensive market survey, so to speak, to complement the more limited surveys of individual concerns and industries, it would tend to identify particularistic interests with the common good.

The core of this proposal is already implanted in the Employment Act of 1946. The next step might be the encouragement of conferences among industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, and Government—at regional or national levels—to discuss the elements of a stability program and to appraise its worth. This would serve to emphasize the primary aspirations that hold us together instead of the secondary differences that divide. Above all, a forthright and unified effort to maintain our economic stability would provide a heartening demon-

stration that our Nation intends to do something about inflation before inflation does a great deal to us. This alone, in a democracy, would be a gain of inestimable value.

The problem of economic stability poses one of the supreme issues of our generation, which is a moral issue in its core implications. Will our democracy make manifest its innate sense of justice, which rebels against hardships for so many people even in the presence of prosperity? Will our democracy make manifest the strength and the unity to act before the ultimate crisis appears, just as we have made manifest the strength and the unity to act upon the event of crises—especially when we know that some of these crises would never have appeared if we had acted in time?

Record of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "God Hates a Coward," published in the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of January 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOD HATES A COWARD

That's gospel truth. If any witness were needed to attest it the Republican Party of 1936–48 would more than suffice.

For 12 years the Republican Party has been a coward; the worst kind of coward, a moral coward. In consequence it begins to take on the appearance of something the cat dragged in.

It is hard to define as an entity the Republican Party or any other large group of people, since, however closely banded together, all cannot think alike in all respects. But, speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the insurance state, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly disguised, and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the flesh pots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty, to stand up for the free Republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Due to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional, glorious creed. And it finds the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling.

The fact is known of all men.

Here, too, in our own America, the state is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting freemen into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a great white father—a father corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction but out of cowardice. It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and to make it known. Its plea for votes has been the shameful one: Give us the offices, the power, and we'll give you as much of what we believe to be wrong as will the Democrats themselves.

Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls—and trails its flag.

What a wonderful thing it would be if the Republican National Committee meeting here in Omaha, if other constituted Republican leaders, could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party—how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it. A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition. Opposition not alone to a misguided and recreant Democratic Party here at home, but opposition tenacious and resolute, brave and unyielding, to all the monstrous wrong and error that today menaces freedom, self-reliance, the courage to adventure, human dignity, in every land and every clime.

How joyously, with what reborn hope, men and women of the ancient faith of this Republic would rally about such a standard. Proud of it they would be in victory. No less proud in defeat.

Surely, surely, it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day that when the black flag of absolutism was raised back in the twentieth century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion, the wisdom, the loyalty to God who made men free, to challenge that foul intruder and to dedicate their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor, to driving him back into the dark ages whence he emerged.

Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today in the ears of the Republican Party. Never, for men and women of courage, of character, of conviction, has there been afforded such an occasion for rising to the heights of human devotion to imperishable ideals.

The Republican Party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging. Or it can rise out of the dust of four merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that free men prize.

Courage or cowardice? Loyalty or recreancy? Conviction or time serving?

It is as simple as that, ladies and gentlemen of the Republican National Committee.

Post-Office Deficits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial on the subject of post-office deficits from the Trenton Evening Times under date of January 14. I think the editorial is a very fine one and should be read by every Member of this body. I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOOD SUGGESTION

There isn't any reason why newspapers, magazines, and advertising circulars shouldn't pay their fair share of the post-office deficit. President Truman has suggested in his budget message that second- and third-class mail rates be increased. He points out that the post-office deficit is $400,000,000. First-class mail pays its own way and there is no reason why newspapers, magazines, and circulars should be subsidized.

In the past, newspapers and magazines have been treated with kid gloves by Congress and the post office when it came to postal rates. Perhaps Government officials were wary of being attacked by the press. But the simple fact is that the press should not be given this subsidy. The press can and should stand on its own feet, maintain its independence, and be indebted to no officeholders. Mr. Truman is absolutely right. The extremely low rates on second- and third-class mail ought to be raised.

International Fisheries Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONS PULL TOGETHER SO EVERYBODY'S HAPPY

The recent conference here of fishermen and fishing-vessel owners with the International Fisheries Commission provided new reminder of one of the world's outstanding instances of international cooperation. Representing the United States and the Dominion of Canada, the Commission's purpose is to conserve halibut resources of Canadian and American waters of the North Pacific Ocean.

For years, the Commission has administered these halibut fisheries on a scientific basis, through mutual agreements between the two countries, so that the fishing industry might prosper and make a nutritious sea food available for public consumption, without depleting the halibut run of this ocean area. It is safe to say that no cooperative effort between two nations has been more productive of good will or more successful in fulfilling its purpose.

The Commission's work has also been a striking instance of cooperation within an industry. All the elements of the fishing fleet of this State, British Columbia, and Alaska have participated in the program, to their mutual advantage. The results have been outstanding. A fishery resource that once was threatened with extinction has been restored and preserved for the utilization of generations to come. The waters of

the North Pacific Ocean now produce three-fourths of the world's entire supply of halibut.

Seattle can take much pride in the fact that two Seattle men have been foremost in furthering this movement. Miller Freeman, Seattle publisher, was one of its first supporters, and an early chairman of the Commission. His work has been carried on by Edward W. Allen, Seattle attorney, also a former Commission chairman. This community, as well as the fishing industry, owes these two leading spirits and their associates in the Commission's activities a great debt of appreciation.

Trial of Communist Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Vivian Meik, dealing with the New York trial of Communist leaders. Vivian Meik is a former well-known English editorial writer, now writing for the Deseret Evening News of Salt Lake City. These articles were published on January 18 and 19 of this year.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS REPORTS ON NEW YORK TRIAL ARE HISTORIC

(By Vivian Meik)

For the next few weeks you will be reading reports which, even though you may not think so, will be covering one of the most important phases of the history of America.

I speak of the trial which opened Monday of the 12 leading Communists in this country—the Politburo of a land which is giving them safety and sanctuary, tolerance, and even personal sympathy to a degree they would have received nowhere else, least of all in that Russia whose orders they are taking to "bite the hand that feeds them."

This trial is going on to cause a vast surge of emotion. It will create violent discussions. It will be the instrument by which interested parties will try to tear the real issue to shreds so as to open a way along which everything else can drive fast except truth.

It is well then to get the fundamentals, the basic facts, the very core of the whole business straight, here and now.

The indictment against these 12 men is not that they are Communists, it is not that they are not entitled to be Communists if they desire, it is not that they cannot exercise the right of free speech or free thinking in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

The indictment against them is that they have used this freedom under the Constitution in a way that has transformed that honest liberty into dishonest license, in a way that has exploited that freedom so as to work to destroy that Constitution by force or other forms of violence under the direct orders of Moscow—Moscow, the synonym of an ideology that is pledged to destroy the American way of life.

That, and that alone, is the indictment against these 12 chiefs of the Communist Party in America.

Even at this stage anyone with experience of such matters can tell you that you will see every trick of law and technicality brought in to cloud the issue.

ATTRACT FROM TRUTH

You will see demonstrations, and especially propaganda, designed to take your attention away from the truth of the whole case. You will be told that if this case doesn't end in acquittal it will be a threat to your personal liberties—that you will not be allowed to think or say or do what you like according to your idea of freedom.

Already many columnists, including myself, have received cunning appeals to consider how our liberties are being threatened by this trial. Many of us have also received threats that if we write as we do it is going to be just too bad for us.

That is as it may be, but, in the meantime, what there is no doubt about is that in this trial there will come to light an exposure of the ruthless, cynical, and cruel determination of our enemies to destroy all that we hold most dear.

And that means your way of life, especially your freedom to bring up your children in love of home and family.

In the next 2 or 3 days demonstrations are planned by Communist Party members in Washington itself to try to intimidate the Government into calling off the trial. Every argument will be used by the Communists to hide the truth. It is well, therefore, that each one of us always keep the truth before us in its true perspective.

OUT TO DESTROY

Communism, as has been so ably proved, is out to destroy us—nothing else or nothing less.

Their agents, well organized and well directed, with unlimited funds at their disposal, cannot yet do this by force. But they can keep on trying by other methods to rot us away from within.

If we let them get away with it by allowing ourselves to be bluffed into a sense of false security, we have only ourselves to blame, but I believe I am one who speaks for many millions of good Americans who cannot see why all that our fathers have striven for should be taken away from us in order that we should be reduced to the slavery of those already under the Communist heel.

I believe that by far the great majority of Americans think like this—only till now they have had no time or facilities to hear the truth.

That truth—or much of it—will come out at this trial.

Let us all then study it closely and keep it in the front of our individual intelligence till communism, as an evil, treacherous force, is thrown out once and for all of this great free country of ours.

REDS' THREAT TO EVERYONE IS INSIDIOUS

(By Vivian Meik)

Since my article Tuesday about the real significance of the trial of the Communist leaders in this country I have been asked—indeed, I have been challenged—to show how and why we have the right to indict free American citizens, even if their Communist views are actually what they are supposed to be.

I propose not only to take up the challenge but to ask my challengers (whom I suspect gave me assumed names) to disprove any single statement I make.

From the very beginning I have said that I am not concerned merely with Communist views held by freemen. As far as I am concerned, any man is entitled to believe he is the greatest being in the world. It is only when he tries to impose that belief on others by demanding tribute to his self-imposed greatness that I object. If he is free to think himself so great, I am equally free to regard the fruits of my own labors as my own right and to refuse to hand them over on demand because of his views.

My case, therefore, against these Communist leaders and others of the ilk is not against their views but against their methods of implementing those views.

I think I cannot do better than to contrast a little of the way of life of those who think as I do and those who have allowed themselves to pay tribute as required by Communist practitioners.

There is no need to go into detail about our way of life, but you might find it interesting if I describe in simple terms the way of life in Communist countries.

In Russia it is a criminal offense for a man to express himself in any form against Communist policy. It is as much as his life is worth to proclaim that he would like to see the formation of any political party other than communism.

THE CONCENTRATION CAMP

No person in Russia may be an active Republican, or Democrat, or anything else. He must be a Communist or nothing. In fact, at the most, he may only be a negative non-Communist Party man provided he accepts Communist Party ruling without demur. Otherwise the concentration camp.

At this point I could, perhaps, mention that when I use the phrase "criminal offense," I also mean that the resultant sentence generally alternates between death and long terms in the prison camps.

Under communism, no workingman has the right to bargain collectively through his union. Strikes are criminal offenses.

I go further and can tell you categorically that it is a serious matter for a worker even to be late for his job. And as if that were not enough, no working man or woman may change his occupation without special permission. Labor is directed and there is no appeal from a decision of party bosses.

But that is only one phase of actual day-to-day living under the Moscow regime.

Under communism, every child goes through a system of education from its earliest years which is specifically designed not only to deny the existence of God and the eternal verities such as, for instance, the ideal of mother love, but also to throw religion in any shape or form into a permanent discard.

It is a prerequisite of communism that no party member can believe in God or any form of religion.

In the day-to-day life of people, because human nature is what it is, there are always some who transgress against the law. There is no such thing in Russia as pleading not guilty, because an arrest by a Communist secret police agent is regarded as the result of infallibility and it then resolves itself merely into a matter of passing sentence by another Communist agent.

In other words, any accused is simply kept in prison until he admits he is guilty. It is unnecessary for me to explain why some people admit guilt quickly.

NO HUMAN RIGHTS

I have space only for these few random examples of the system imposed by the brute force of the secret police and communism.

If these people who are now being tried and who squeal and squawk for protection under our Constitution were ever to get into power in America, that same Constitution which safeguards you would be entirely destroyed because in no other way could communism survive in power for an instant. We would have neither free speech, constitutional guaranties, nor indeed, any human rights at all.

This trial is one of the efforts we are making as a free people to prevent that fate from overtaking us.

Operations of Farm Credit Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the Farm Credit Administration of Spokane, Wash.; also a letter signed by its nine directors to the editors of Life magazine regarding an article printed in Life on December 6, 1948, in which there is apparently a great deal of misunderstanding regarding who makes United States loans within the Farm Credit Administration. This statement is explanatory of the article.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION
OF SPOKANE,
Spokane, Wash., January 21, 1949.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: At the direction of the Farm Credit Board of the Spokane district, I enclose copy of a letter its seven members have written to the editors of Life regarding an article appearing in the issue of that magazine dated December 6, 1948. Because of the prominence of this magazine, the article referred to has in all probability come to your attention; and since it relates to matters concerning which the Congress may perhaps take action, the Board feels that the true facts should be called to your attention.

Cordially yours,
DANA E. BRINCK,
General Agent.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION
OF SPOKANE,
Spokane, Wash., December 22, 1948.

EDITORS OF LIFE,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: The members of the Farm Credit Board of the Twelfth Farm Credit District, comprising Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, at their monthly meeting now being held at Spokane, Wash., have given serious consideration to the article appearing at pages 74–78 of the issue of Life of December 6, 1948, and to the effect upon the public of its including in the list of All These Make United States Loans, on page 76, the national farm-loan associations, the production-credit associations, and the Farm Credit Administration. The inference from this article is that the institutions mentioned loan Government money. Because of the almost universal circulation of Life magazine and the great respect in which it is held by the public, it is felt by us that these inferences, uncorrected, may result in substantial harm to the institutions mentioned.

It is true that national farm loan associations and production credit associations are supervised by the Government, through the instrumentality of the Farm Credit Administration, but it is not true that either of such associations loan Government funds.

The national farm loan associations merely assist the Federal land banks in making loans to the association members, and these are made exclusively from funds obtained by the banks by selling their bonds to private investors in the open money market. Not a cent of Government money is loaned by the banks or by such associations; and the association members own all of the stock of the associations, and the associations in turn own all of the stock of the Federal land banks. Pursuant to acts of Congress, such banks reimburse the Treasury of the United States for the entire cost to the Farm Credit Administration of their supervision and operation.

Likewise, the production credit associations do not loan any Government funds. Most of the funds which they loan are derived by discounting with or borrowing from the Federal intermediate credit banks, which in turn obtain all of their money so furnished the associations from the sale of their debentures to private investors in the open money market. All of the earnings of that bank accrue to the Government.

There are some 300,000 farmer-members of national farm loan associations and 430,000 farmer-members of production credit associations. Both classes of associations are purely cooperative and mutual.

This letter is signed by all of the members of the Farm Credit Board above mentioned.

Respectfully,
R. E. BROWN,
Bozeman, Mont.
WM. J. HOLMAN,
Boise, Idaho.
E. A. MCCORNACK,
Eugene, Oreg.
WALTER J. ROBINSON,
Pomeroy, Wash.
WM. A. SCHOENFELD,
Corvallis, Oreg.
H. R. SHOULTES,
Chehalis, Wash.
JOHN A. WILSON,
Lewistown, Mont.

Educational Freedom Unharmed by University of Washington Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, of Gary, Ind., Post-Tribune, contains sound logic on the problem of communism in our universities:

EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM UNHARMED BY UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON DECISION

The growing opposition of the country to communism is well illustrated by the firing of three Communist professors and the placing on probation of three ex-Communist professors by the University of Washington. The men were given a fair hearing and no one has risen thus far to charge that academic freedom has been murdered. Indeed there seems to be general satisfaction that the trial and the decision were in the best tradition of American freedom.

What most Americans would like to know is how these six individuals got on the faculty of the university and, indeed, how men possessed of minds and characters university professors are supposed to have could have joined the Communist Party or remained in it after joining. Of course it is the nature of a student to judge events and ideas critically but why has so much effort been given to tearing down our own society simply because it is not perfect?

Certainly even the devotees of communism do not claim perfection for it, the weaknesses and imperfections being so clearly evident. But they do see it as the coming millennium, at least some do. Some others, no doubt, are simply led from one thing to another until they find themselves enmeshed by the serpent. The fact that three of the professors are ex-Communists indicates that even professors can learn.

The trial at the university was a long one and every phase of communism and academic freedom must have been explored. A complete report of the proceedings and findings should be prepared for the education of the American public. Communism is one of our greatest problems and all of its implications should be spelled out so there can be no question about its purpose.

That can be done by telling this story. This is not so much to educate people about the need of keeping the teaching of communism out of our schools, but to teach them precisely how communism acts and what it teaches. Too often the term Communist is used to designate someone with whom we disagree rather than the individual who is trying to subvert our Government and society.

The problem of the schools and universities is not in firing known Communists, but in keeping minds which cannot distinguish between fact and fiction out of all teaching faculties. How do such people get appointed? Surely teaching is not so theoretical and so lacking in facts as to lead balanced minds to accept the vaporings and lunacies of prejudiced and often debased saviours.

We have no doubt that our educational system has considerable responsibility for the spread of such an idiocy as communism. Some brilliant heads, being supported by feet that tread air, never learn how we really live. Some ideas generated by these heads may be of value to society, but our educational system will have to learn that it has some responsibilities other than merely turning ideas loose.

Indeed, it seems to us that one of the first duties of any educational system is to see that the education offered is neither phony nor unpatriotic. At times judgment in this respect may be difficult but we now possess one criterion about which there can be no question—communism. Any member of the Communist Party should be summarily fired and short shrift should be given to any advocate of communism.

Someone in authority must decide something. It would be a curious educational system which hired teachers indiscriminately and let them teach whatever they wished. Of course we must preserve freedom to teach about communism and to discuss it and all other isms. That is the way we learn, and the only way. Academic freedom can be preserved without turning our educational system over to those who want to tear it down.

Who Pays the Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Just Who Does Pay the Taxes?" published in the Miles City, Mont., Daily Star of January 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUST WHO DOES PAY THE TAXES?

Mr. Truman proposes that Congress saddle some more taxes on the backs of already overloaded taxpayers. When asked where the increases on individuals should

begin, he opined that those earning from about $6,000 per annum should start to bear the brunt. Of course he quickly swung over to the old theory of "soaking the rich" by saying that the great bulk of increased taxes should be laid on the corporations "who were making too much money."

Well, the New Deal, out of which Mr. Truman's super New Deal is an outgrowth, has been peddling the bunk about "soaking the rich" to benefit the lower-income classes for 16 years. They have certainly had every device at their command to "soak the rich" and "redistribute the wealth," for they have been in complete control of all branches of the Federal Government during those 16 years, with the exception of the 2 years Congress came under control of the Republican Party, and in those 2 years the only reduction ever accomplished, which took some 17,000,000 people from income-tax rolls, was affected.

But after stopping the little fellow from going through the tax wringer, what do we find? The answer is the New Deal boys have been deluding the public all of those 16 years. It is true, they have been soaking the rich all right enough. But along with them they have been soaking everybody else, including the poor. And just now they had the effrontery and unmitigated gall to want the Federal amusement tax knocked off all tickets sold by the hawkers and squawkers in Washington who were trying to cash in on President Truman's inauguration. Only a combination of Republicans and upstanding southern Democrats prevented that first-hand raid on your right to go to your own picture show without being discriminated against. You even have to pay to give a charity, such as an infantile paralysis dance. But the Democratic hangers-on, and a lot of Democratic Congressmen wanted to chisel, while shaking down the public who went to Washington to see a President inaugurated.

As to who pays the taxes—Federal taxes—even now, after 16 years of New Deal blessings and soak the rich, an undisputed Washington authority gives these figures:

Forty-three percent comes out of the hides of individuals (via income tax);

Nineteen percent more comes out of the same hides through hidden excise taxes (taxes on your telegrams, telephones, electric-light globes, show tickets, drugs, and hundreds of other things used every day);

Twenty-eight percent from corporations (these are the "filthy" rich who are supposed to have been paying the taxes all the time—these 16 years);

Ten percent from customs and miscellaneous taxes (many of which probably have been passed on to the individual again).

You can bet your bottom dollar that the super New Dealers will again have their hand in the pocket of every small wage earner, one way or another, unless they have the hand sawed off by a combination of Republicans and conservative Democrats. Truman is already shouting for $8,000,000,000 for questionable socialistic schemes. Where is that coming from?

There is only one answer: Out of the financial hides of those who are already paying more than 62 percent of all Federal taxes collected (individual income taxes and hidden excise taxes).

When one views the colossal waste of the Federal Government all over the Nation, from highly liveried porters leisurely distributing linen hand towels throughout the marble palaces of offices in Washington, to the thousands and thousands of Government-owned-and-operated cars that literally crowd you off your own highways nowadays, the question of some economy in government arises in one's mind.

Is economy the forgotten word of the administration that was to be the savior of the forgotten man? It seems so.

All Americans, Everywhere, Share in the Justifiable Pride That the Honorable Stuart Symington, Our Great, Young, Dynamic Secretary of the United States Air Force, Expressed When He Recently Declared: "We Have Learned That We Can Fly Anything, Anywhere, Anytime—Climate, Mountains, Oceans, Weather, They Cannot Stop the United States Air Force"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, in common with all Members of Congress, I received a copy of the first annual report of the Secretary of the newly created Department of the Air Force.

Needless to tell you all that, in consequence of a very busy inaugural week, I was compelled to limit my reading to the most important of my correspondence and such of the local papers from my district as I had a chance to scan.

Several days ago in the cloak room my attention was directed to an editorial carried in the Washington Daily News entitled "A Report That Doesn't Report."

The editorial in question was hypercritical of the type of the report for the year 1948 issued by one of our great armed services. While I do not of necessity agree with a great deal of the sentiment expressed by one of my colleagues, it did appear that there was such a paucity of fact alleged to have been contained in that document, I determined to inform myself more fully with respect to the subject report discussed in the editorial by comparing the several reports under discussion—one with the other.

Because of that determination, I assembled and carried from my office to my hotel copies of all three departmental reports discussed by the writer of the editorial—the one issued by Secretary of Defense Forrestal, that of Secretary of the Air Force Symington, and the one of the Secretary of Navy Sullivan.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning—as is my custom—I arose at my usual waking hour of 4 o'clock and began to peruse these three documents.

Not alone did I quickly learn what gave rise to the caustic comments made by the editorial writer of the Daily News, but, moreover, I can well see why in evaluating their several merits—he paid glowing tribute to the Report That Did Report, the activities of the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me to point out that for more than a century past our country has been well and justifiably proud of the great tradition and accomplishments of the United States Navy, greater today in power and in personnel than ever before in the history of the Nation.

We are equally proud of the long record of the heroic achievements of our great United States Army, of our Marine Corps and of our Nurses Corps, of our SPARS, our WAVES, our WACs, and their components in every woman's auxiliary of our armed services.

Mr. Speaker, we now have another great arm of our National Defense Establishment, that of the newly created Department of the United States Air Force, the invincible might of which was recognized by our people long before that newly created branch of our armed services was established by the Congress a short 16 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that our Air Force is invincible, I am reminded of a statement made by Gen. Jimmie Doolittle, who led the intrepid Eighth Air Force, after conducting the never-to-be-forgotten raid over Tokyo and subsequently thereto fought in every theater of war then raging on the European Continent.

In one of his pithy and descriptive speeches, General Doolittle, in discussing the invincible might of the United States air power, told of the tremendous organized strength of the Mikado's forces that were amassed in Japan to defend the Japanese homeland against the invasion of the armed forces of our United States.

General Doolittle summed the situation, as it then existed, in language somewhat like this: "There," he said, "stood the mighty and all-powerful United States Navy, with every last modern nautical weapon of war at its command, ready to make a successful, though a bloody and costly landing on the shores of Japan. There, also," he said, "stood the United States Army, with scores of divisions of the finest soldiers in the world, many of them veterans from the European war, ready to make a bloody and costly invasion and occupancy of that country; but there," he said, "was also the invincible air forces of the United States, which made the expenditure of human life which would have followed that bloody and costly invasion of Japan unnecessary."

Mr. Speaker, with that prophetic statement impinged on my mind and with all that I have heard with respect to the interdepartmental battle that is said to be going on in the Pentagon among the several armed services over the appropriations for the coming year, you can readily understand why these reports were of such great interest to me.

After spending 2½ hours reading all three reports and after rereading the summation of the report of the Secretary of the Air Force, I must say it is little wonder that the Washington Daily News spoke so glowingly of the completeness of that document.

It is indeed no happenstance that that clear, concise, factual report rendered by Mr. Symington is just such a statement as one would expect a modern business executive in private industry to make to the stockholders at the annual meeting of his concern—and I need not remind you all that Stuart Symington is one of

America's young, outstanding businessmen and executives.

Neither need I tell you that he is a man of great administrative abilities—a creative builder of business—one whom the Nation is indeed fortunate to have heading the great Department of our Air Force. He is a man of ability and capabilities. He is a realist and one who poses every problem and faces every fact.

Mr. Speaker, I was heartened to at long last come upon a departmental report that stressed two facts: (1) The huge expenditure of funds that is involved; and (2) the patent need to produce the maximum of security at a minimum of cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, when Stuart Symington became head of the newly created United States Air Force, he availed himself of every advantage arising from the fact that he had inherited no musty, old, hoary departmental traditions. He, therefore, started from scratch to create—what we in Congress had long talked about—a modern, streamlined business administration within the structure of the Federal Government.

For the first time, to my knowledge, the funds which we appropriated are budgeted and all allocations therefrom are now being made for the exact work that is to be done rather than that of following the long-practiced, inefficient, and wasteful method of making appropriations for "organizational divisions."

All Air Force procurement has been streamlined and procedures instituted to place the buying process on a modern business basis.

To the Department of the Air Force Mr. Symington associated the Honorable Arthur S. Barrows, past president of Sears, Roebuck & Co., who now is in charge of all Air Force procurement programs. Thus, we find now working for our Government one of the greatest, if not the greatest and most experienced, purchasing agents that the Nation has ever known.

Efficiency and economy were established as the watchwords of the United States Air Force.

To show in part what has been achieved, let me quote just a few paragraphs from Secretary Symington's report:

A comptroller organization was established in Air Force Headquarters as well as in all major commands of the Air Force. Modern business-management-training courses were instituted through an established educational system. Priority emphasis was placed on management control through cost control, thereby stimulating cost consciousness throughout the Air Force.

Businessmen of proved ability were placed in key positions, to the end that managerial ability and accomplishment now constitute the standards by which Air Force officers are evaluated.

The Air Force developed a new budget structure, predicated on allocation of funds according to functions and programs rather than according to organizational divisions. This structure, among other things, permits a more realistic appraisal of the effects which changes in budget allowances have on specific Air Force activities and projects.

Initial steps were also taken toward developing improved methods of budgetary reporting and control.

Procedures have been instituted to place the buying process on a modern business basis. Every effort is being made to purchase highest-quality equipment at the lowest possible cost.

Comparable to the Nation's largest private procurement organization, a system of specialized buying has been placed into effect, in order to provide individual treatment for each type of commodity procured.

Procurement operation within the three services is now governed by a single set of regulations. Similar work in the direction of cataloging and specifications should further increase both operating efficiency and economy.

Other economies will result from the initiation of interservice cross-training in various schools, consolidation of aerial ports of embarkation, and consolidation of procurement facilities.

With the cooperation of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Air Force reorganized and strengthened its inspection and investigative system. An FBI-trained investigator of proved ability, having been commissioned in the Air Reserve, was then called to duty as Air Force Director of Special Investigations. Although he works under the Inspector General of the Air Force, by agreement this Director has access at all times to both the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

This revised organizational structure and procedure combines three previously separate investigation units—the Criminal Investigation Division (CID), the Counter Intelligence Corps (CIC), and the investigative elements of the Air Inspector's Office—into one centrally directed agency. This agency furnishes a single investigative service to all commands of the Air Force.

This system insures competent and thorough investigation of matters either initiated within the Air Force, or brought to its attention by outside agencies or individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of Congress would take time out to read that splendid, concise, candid summation comprehended in the first 18 pages of the annual report of the Secretary of the Air Force for the fiscal year 1948.

Therein they will find in detail, not alone the economies and increased efficiency that have been achieved to date with respect to securing our Nation against foreign enemies, but they will find an equally frank and candid report under the heading of "Unsatisfactory progress" pointed out and pictorializing to this House the things that we in this Congress might do to further increase the national security and do so with a minimum of expenditure of the taxpayers' dollars.

How many of this Congress realize that in the last 12 months the modern aircraft of the United States Air Force has penetrated the sonic barriers, not alone with guided missiles, but with piloted aircraft which travel faster than the speed of sound—at a speed of something less than 1,000 miles per hour?

How many of my colleagues realize that our Air Force has sent sounding missiles into the upper atmosphere to a height exceeding 20 miles, or that the Air Force is now completing the second year of an unbroken daily all-weather flying operation over a test route between Wilmington, Ohio, and Andrews Field, here near the District of Columbia.

I want all of my colleagues to ponder on the fact that on September 18 passed an occasion that I am sure was not appreciated by many Members of this House, for on that day 50 United States Air Force B–29 bombers took off from various bases on different fields on the other side of the world, carrying payloads of bombs, and landed within minutes of their estimated time of arrival at cities throughout the United States from Alabama to Minnesota and from New York to California.

The saga of the Air Force's operation of the Berlin airlift, which now is maintaining our rightful place on the European Continent in the midst of cold war, has become the sole effective weapon of America's peacetime diplomacy.

In addition thereto, and of extreme importance to all of us, and especially to my colleagues from Western States, is the "operation haylift," which at this very moment is saving thousands of head of livestock in snow-locked range lands of the West, through relief provided by House Joint Resolution 112.

Mr. Speaker, it is feats like these that make us realize how near to each of us is the modern method of waging warfare.

Just a few weeks ago B–50 bombers were refueled from aerial tankers, carried a pay load of bombs and, dropping them at an imaginary target, returned to home base after a continuous flight of 9,400 miles.

Almost identical with that time one of our great modern United States Air Force B–36's, herself so tremendous in size that it could readily accommodate two Washington streetcars within its fuselage, with a loaded weight of 278,000 pounds, equal to that of a modern Diesel locomotive, shot off the earth from its base and after cruising more than 4,700 miles across the Pacific, dropped its equivalent pay load of bombs, and returned 4,700 miles to its home base in a nonstop flight.

I know that every Member of this House shares the pride of Stuart Symington, that great, young, dynamic Secretary of our Air Force, when he recently declared:

We have learned we can fly anything, anywhere, anytime—climate, mountains, oceans, weather—they cannot stop the United States Air Force. We have learned that the future of military air transport, and inevitably of commercial air cargo transport, is in big aircraft. We have learned that American-built planes will stand up and take a beating day after day, moving the full loads and frequent take-offs and landings, on a schedule that keeps them actually in the air 10, 12, and even 14 hours out of every 24.

Mr. Speaker, do you wonder at the personal pride I myself feel in the United States Air Force, when I say that my own son is a veteran of that great service?

From my home in Mobile, Ala., I can hear the drone of the aircraft as I stand in the shadows of the great oceangoing air transports that make regular scheduled trips from off the runways of our great Brookley Field to practically all parts of the globe.

Brookley Field, or more properly called Brookley Air Force Base, is one of the most active and the largest installations of its kind operated by the United States Air Force.

Situated on the mouth of both the Alabama and Tombigbee Rivers, which I trust will soon be connected with the Tennessee to supply such points as Oak

Ridge in Tennessee and provide slack water for boats returning to Cairo from New Orleans, Brookley Field stands ready in case of emergency to become one of the most important defense posts of our continental borders. It will be ready to launch fighter, bomber, and supply planes in any direction. Tied in with the radar stations in the Southeast, this base would be the control point for defensive measures for the whole Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean, and South American area.

Moreover, it is one of the seven largest bases of the Air Force Matériel Command in the continental United States. Brookley Air Force Base is responsible for the receipt, storage, distribution, salvage, and disposal of practically all the supplies and equipment used in Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, and parts of west Florida. In addition thereto, Brookley Field is charged with all supply activities for the entire Caribbean and South American air operations as well as for the supply of a great number of specialized material and equipment used on a world-wide basis for the United States Air Force.

In addition to furnishing all supplies, Brookley Field takes care of the maintenance of all aircraft, vehicles, and other specialized equipment of the Air Force which cannot be handled at other bases within this huge area. It is responsible, also, for the maintenance and storage of all Air Force rescue boats and marine equipment of the San Antonio, Oklahoma City, and Macon air matériel area as well as the maintenance and repair of all aircraft and automotive tires of all Air Force bases east of the Mississippi River.

Mr. Speaker, now one of the most important activities at Brookley Field is that conducted by the Sixteen Hundred and First Air Transport Group, which maintains the aerial port of embarkation for scheduled and feeder-line supply flights to the outlying bases in the Caribbean and South America.

Operating from that headquarters, the huge Globemasters—C–74 transport planes—take off on scheduled flights every Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday for Berlin, Germany, as a part of Operation Vittles.

In addition thereto, Military Air Transport Service makes 11 flights monthly from Brookley Field into the Caribbean area, while other scheduled flights leave Brookley for the Panama Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, and Rio de Janeiro.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, Maj. Gen. R. K. Taylor, is currently in charge of the Mobile air materiel area. His headquarters are at Brookley Field. I have been knowing Maj. Gen. Bob Taylor for a long time and America has neither a more distinguished gentleman nor a more capable and qualified officer in any of its armed services. The people of Mobile and of Alabama in general are proud of the United States Air Force and of the work that General Taylor is doing at Brookley Field.

I am authoritatively informed that, for one thing, the percentage of aircraft out of commission at Brookley Field ranges far below the national average.

Low supply costs have consistently placed Brookley Field either in first or second place through the maintenance of an efficiency rate which averages below the national standing.

The same picture holds true with respect to the Supply Division's Administrative, Property Accounting Branches and in the cost per ton of supplies handled at Brookley.

Last, but not least among Air Force operations, is the daily contribution which the men at Brookley Field are making to the successful operation of the Berlin lift. A vast majority of all aircraft engines, engine and other parts, together with a veritable catalog of other supplies are constantly being ferried out of that great Air Force base at Mobile, Ala., to support Operation Vittles.

This is the project by which we contribute all things necessitous to the life of more than 2,000,000 beleaguered and imprisoned people in the western sector of the city of Berlin, by far the greatest weapon being used in the cold war now raging in Europe, and, certainly, by far the greatest air transportation project ever conducted.

Only last week Brookley achieved another accomplishment. A dispatch from the Mobile Register tells of the new record flight made from Brookley Field to the airlift and back.

That news article reads as follows:

An Air Force Globemaster carrying 38,000 pounds of cargo today completed a round trip between Mobile and Frankfurt, Germany, in 42 hours and 35 minutes flying time.

Military air-transport service officers said the flight set a new record for the southern crossing to and from Europe by the giant C–74 transports.

The Globemasters are used to carry high-priority cargo and parts in support of the Berlin airlift. They make four flights a week between Mobile and Rhein-Main air base at Frankfurt by way of Bermuda and the Azores.

Mr. Speaker, while I cannot too highly recommend the great work that is being done by the United States Air Force—and by its great Secretary, Stuart Symington—I cannot emphasize enough the importance of the contributions made to that service by this typical base down on the Gulf coast to the over-all efforts of the United States Air Force in particular and the National Defense Establishment in general.

Yesterday's Tools and Tomorrow's Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

JONES & LAUGHLIN STEEL CORP.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., January 25, 1949.

YESTERDAY'S TOOLS AND TOMORROW'S BUSINESS

To Our Shareholders and Our Employees:

Our company has a problem that will interest you.

Eight years of war and reconversion to peace have strained the steel-producing equipment of the Nation. And still there is a call for more steel. Americans want to live better. They want more refrigerators, more cars, more of countless other useful articles made from steel. "To have more we must produce more." And to do this we need more and better machines, more and better equipment. We can't use yesterday's tools for today's work and be in business tomorrow.

But to replace tools costs money—great quantities of money. And, for all the apparent prosperity we have today, industries that are keeping pace with America are caught short of cash. One big reason for this is a tax system which doesn't take account of the rising price of equipment.

A STORY OF BREAD AND TAXES

Let me tell you a story of a small bakery business. It will show you what, on a much larger scale, has happened to our company.

Suppose it is 1938. You and I have saved $10,000 and are able to borrow $10,000 more. We buy a small bakery for $10,000. Another $5,000 goes for a new oven. That leaves $5,000, enough to buy flour, sugar, coal, and other supplies, and to cover our pay roll and customers' unpaid bills.

During the next 10 years business is good. We pay the high taxes of the war years and still make a profit. We are able to save a little to pay off some of our debt. When prices shoot up at the war's end, it costs us more and more to buy flour and pay our helpers. But we are able to raise our own prices and cover these higher costs. Repairs around the shop and bakery are up too. But we can deduct these day-to-day charges from our income before figuring our taxes. And we are able to show a cash profit after paying our taxes.

But by 1948 we are in trouble. Our oven is ten years old and worn out. In 1938 it cost $5,000. We charged this amount off against our taxable income over the 10 years. In other words, the oven has been fully depreciated. But the new oven costs $10,000. This is just twice as much as the tax law allowed us to lay aside out of our income to buy a new oven.

The tax law allowed us to deduct the higher cost of flour and wages. But it didn't provide us with the help we need now for the higher cost of the oven. Still we need the oven just as much as we need flour to run our bakery business.

SOURCES OF CASH

How can we get the cash to meet the added cost of the new oven over the old? Here are three possible sources:

1. We can borrow the money from a bank if the bank is willing.

2. We can seek others willing to invest more money in the business—in other words, sell stock.

3. We can take the money out of profits which would otherwise go to you and me, owners of the bakery, for food, clothes, education of children, etc.

When the time comes to pay our taxes, we will be sharply aware of our need for cash. What a help it would be if we could write off, say, half the cost of the new oven against this year's profits.

This would save us money on taxes at a time we are making what looks like a good profit but need more cash. Still it would mean no loss to Uncle Sam in the long run. He would pick up the taxes in years to come because larger property write-offs now would leave that much less to take in later years.

HOW THIS STORY APPLIES TO STEEL

Now let us go back and see how this story of the bakery business applies to the present situation of our company.

To begin with, we understand these two facts:

1. An ample steel supply is as important to our Nation as bread. This is true in both

peace and war. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. is doing its full share to build new plants to meet the Nation's need.

2. The steel industry requires far heavier equipment than most industries. And that equipment is much more costly today than it was yesterday.[1] During the last 3 years we have spent $104,000,000 to replace and improve our plants. During the next 4 years we are already committed to spend an added $106,000,000. In addition, we plan to spend $50,000,000 more in these 4 years. All this totals $260,000,000.

Now what have we done to prepare for the replacement and improvement of our expensive equipment?

In the first place, we have done what we could in recent years to lay aside money. During the last 8 years we have paid less than 45 percent of our profit in dividends to our shareholders. In the 1947–48 period we paid still less—only 26 percent. But of what we have been able to lay aside from earnings during the last 8 years only $13,000,000[2] remains for the large expenditures still ahead of us. And part of this is needed in the till as working capital because of the rise in cost of material and labor.

WHAT WE HAVE BORROWED

Just as in the bakery business, we have not been able to lay aside nearly enough money to meet the swollen cost of new equipment. So we have had to go to the other sources for cash.

We have borrowed. Since the war's end we have borrowed $60,000,000. About half this was used to pay off other debts we already had. Then, during the past year, we have arranged for borrowing another $40,000,000 on a temporary basis through a bank credit agreement. But we can't go on borrowing indefinitely. Borrowed money must be paid back sometime.

WHAT ABOUT SELLING STOCK?

We can consider the sale of stock. But there is a difficulty. Even though our dollar profits look larger than ever before, our common stock sells at less than 40 cents on the dollar of investment or asset value.

And why is this? It is because investors, who keep a sharp eye on business, see the need of huge outlays of money in the steel business. They know steel companies have had a hard time paying adequate dividends to shareholders. Thus our common stock now sells at about $32 per share—far less than its asset value of $89 per share. So, although our profits appear good, the present dividend of 65 cents per quarter per share is less than an annual return of 3 percent on this asset value.

WHAT WE HAVE TAKEN OUT OF PROFITS

As for paying for new equipment out of profit, we have gone as far as we can go in that direction. In 1947 and 1948 we earned a net profit of $50,447,000, but we paid dividends of only $13,213,000, or about a fourth. During the 2 years we spent for equipment $83,500,000, or $33,053,000 more than the total net profit before paying dividends.

We do not seek to have our cake and eat it too. We do not believe we are entitled to profits big enough to pay big dividends and meet the costs of expansion as well. We do believe a shareholder is entitled to two things: First, a fair return on his investment; and second, to have enough money plowed back into the business to keep it in shape. If he is willing to forego a fair return now, a shareholder is entitled to expect the money to be used to bring him greater returns later.

WHERE WILL THE COST COME FROM?

So we return to the original problem. Our company will need more cash. Be assured the problem is not ours alone. It is shared by every company keeping pace with the needs of America today and tomorrow. And where is the cash to come from?

A PROPOSAL

My proposal is a simple one and a fair one for government and business alike.

At present, companies write off the cost of equipment over the period of its useful life. This we call depreciation. I suggest a change in the Federal tax law to allow them to write off the cost in shorter time. This we call amortization.

I propose that companies be allowed to write off up to one-half of equipment costs within 1 to 5 years, as they choose, and that they be allowed to deduct this amortization from taxable income.

There should be a limit on the amortization deducted in any one year. I propose it be set at one-half the taxable income for that year before the amortization is deducted.

Perhaps such a change should be considered a temporary measure to cover only the present period of need.

THE EFFECT IT WOULD HAVE

What would be the effect of this change in the tax laws?

Here's what would have resulted for our company in 1948:

	Present basis	Proposed basis
Income after deducting depreciation of $16,131,000 but before amortization and income taxes	$50,172,000	$50,172,000
Amortization—complete in 1 year (50 percent of $48,000,000 capital expenditures for plant and equipment)		24,000,000
Taxable income	50,172,000	26,172,000
Federal income taxes	18,950,000	9,830,000
Balance for profit	31,222,000	16,342,000

Our taxes for the year would be reduced from $18,950,000 to $9,830,000, but this cut would be only one-fifth of what we spent on plant in the year.

Our profit would be cut $14,880,000. But out total cash would increase by the amount of the cut in taxes, or $9,120,000.

AND WHAT WOULD BE THE RESULT FOR THE NATION?

The Government would not lose tax money in the long run. Reductions during this period would be no more than a deferment of payment. If a company used up its tax deduction for write-off of plant now, it could deduct less from taxable income in future years. Uncle Sam would not lose. He would, in fact, gain because the Nation's industry will be able to produce more and thus be able to pay more taxes.

The Nation as a whole would gain in stronger industries which would have a chance to build for emergencies. And stronger industries will assure protection of employment, production, and shareholders' investments.

If you agree with the proposal I have made, I suggest you write to those who represent you in Congress and urge them to support it.

BEN MOREELL,
Chairman of the Board of Directors and President.

[1] We know only too well how the worth of the dollar has slumped. The estimated cost of a 900,000 cubic foot per minute turbo blower for a blast furnace installed complete in 1939 was $401,000. At the present time, this same item costs $798,000—an increase of almost 100 percent. Another instance is the cost to reline a large blast furnace which in 1939 was $653,000 and today is $1,375,000—an increase of about 110 percent. The almighty dollar is worth no more than it will buy.

[2] The total resources generated from our business in the last 8 years, from net income and depreciation, depletion, and amortization amounted to about $226,000,000. During the same time $49,000,000 has been paid out in dividends and $164,000,000 for plant—a total of $213,000,000. The difference is $13,000,000.

National Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, National Brotherhood Week, first proposed in 1934 by a Catholic priest, the late Right Reverend Monsignor Hugh McMennamin, of Denver, Colo., is to be observed this year from February 20 to 27, and, in accordance with established practice, will be so proclaimed by the President of the United States, Governors of the States and Territories, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. This noble custom is actively supported by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and, in fact, by all others who think—and act—in terms of true human relations. In furtherance of such brotherhood spirit, and pursuant to unanimous consent, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the 1948 statement of the Catholic bishops of the United States, entitled "The Christian in Action," and copy of letter on that subject, addressed, under date of December 31, 1948, to His Excellency the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., D. D., archbishop of Cincinnati, chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, by James Patrick McGovern, of Washington, D. C., who is well known in his private and public career as a citizen, soldier, lawyer, poet, and historian:

THE CHRISTIAN IN ACTION

(Statement of the bishops of the United States, 1948)

Human life centers in God. The failure to center life in God is secularism—which, as we pointed out last year, is the most deadly menace to our Christian and American way of living. We shall not successfully combat this evil merely by defining and condemning it. Constructive effort is called for to counteract this corrosive influence in every phase of life where individual attitudes are a determining factor—in the home, in the school, at work, and in civil polity. For as man is, so ultimately are all the institutions of human society.

To combat secularism, the individual Christian must get the full vision of Christian truth. It is not divisible. One cannot pick and choose from it. Either it is accepted as a whole or it counts for little in real life. When the Christian does get this full vision, he becomes enthusiastic in trying to share it with the world about him. It is a wonderful vision which gives new meaning to human life and an impelling urge to selfless action. The sorry fact is that many, very many Christians, see this vision only dimly and

vaguely and miss its impact on reality. They hold themselves to be Christians and are accepted as Christians, but they have never been thrilled by the glory of the truth of Christ in action. By their apathy they actually abet those who work for destruction and chaos. They criticize and even deplore the decay of morality and the spread of corruption in public life, but they feel no obligation to do anything about it. They simply do not realize that the great wonder of divine love is that it brings the Divine into human life and that godliness in living is giving self to God. The great Christian paradox is that to find you must lose, to get you must give. Much of the confusion and chaos about us is attributable more directly to the inaction of Christians than to the effectiveness of the feverish efforts of the destroyers. The destroyers are definitely a minority, and yet the work of destruction goes on. The crisis is at hand. Today every Christian must face the full Christian vision and with no thought of compromise must seek vigorously to live it. Every day he must ask himself: What am I doing to build a Christian world? No matter what his condition or state, there is much that he can do. The reconstruction must start with the individual. He must be vigorously Christian in thought and in action—in the home, in the training of his children, in his office or workshop, and in his community.

RELIGION IN THE HOME

In the full Christian vision there is the divine ideal of the home—the basic social institution. It is not enough to profess the Christian truths of the stability and sanctity of the marriage bond and to keep in mind the purposes of marriage. The Christian must make his home holy. It remained for modern history to record the first experiment in secularizing the home, an experiment which is at the root of so many of our greatest social evils. The Christian home must realize the Christian ideal. The whole atmosphere of the home must be impregnated with genuine Christian living. The domestic virtues must be practiced, and family prayer made a daily exercise. It is in the home that the children learn their responsibility to God and in this responsibility their duty to others. The home is the child's first school, in which he is taught to make the vision of Christian truth the inspiration of all living. We strongly commend organized effort to make the home more truly Christian. Our Catholic Family Life Bureau plans and offers programs which make for a veritable apostolate of the Catholic home. It is gratifying to see the use that is being made of these programs by our Catholic lay organizations and the spread of this work in our dioceses. These activities serve as a powerful antidote to the venom of secularism and withstand its withering effect on piety and virtue in the American home. All of us are familiar with the problems which the family faces in our complex and maladjusted society. In trying to solve these problems we must not compromise our Christian principles. The solution of these problems is only a part of the solution of the wider social problems of our day. To do their part our homes must be thoroughly Christian and must let the glory of the full vision of Christian truth illuminate them.

RELIGION IN EDUCATION

We know the sacrifices made by our people to educate their children in schools in which the "superabundant wisdom" is the gospel of Christ. Catholic parents closely associate their schools with their Christian homes, because they know that human living must center in God. Year after year we are making wider provisions for the education of our Catholic youth. At a time when secularism has captured the minds of very many leaders in education, it is heartening that Catholic parents are becoming more insistent in their demand for schools in which the best standards of instruction and training are integrated in the teaching of religion. It behooves us to see that we enable our schools to work out fully the Christian educational ideal. The field of higher education in particular demands a wider and more active interest. Our institutions of higher learning are the natural training grounds for Christian leadership. The ranks of Christian leadership will draw recruits largely from the undergraduate schools, but these ranks will not be filled without the Christian scholars who are formed in graduate schools. Perhaps much of the success of the secularist is due to the fact that the number of excellent Christian scholars is inadequate for the needs of our times. We ask a deeper appreciation of the contribution our institutions of higher learning are making to a Christian reconstruction of society, and we urge a more generous support of their work. For if we as Christians are to do our part in restoring order to a chaotic world, Christ must be the master in our classrooms and lecture halls and the director of our research projects.

RELIGION AND ECONOMIC LIFE

Christian principles should be put into action in economic life. It is not enough to find fault with the way our economic system is working. Positive constructive thought and action are needed.

The secularist solutions proposed by eighteenth century individualism or twentieth century statism issue either in perpetual conflict or deadening repression. Christian social principles, rooted in the moral law, call insistently for cooperation, not conflict, for freedom, not repression, in the development of economic activity. Cooperation must be organized—organized for the common good: freedom must be ordered—ordered for the common good. Today we have labor partly organized, but chiefly for its own interests. We have capital or management organized, possibly on a larger scale, but again chiefly for its own interests. What we urgently need, in the Christian view of social order, is the free organization of capital and labor in permanent agencies of cooperation for the common good. To insure that this organization does not lose sight of the common good, government as the responsible custodian of the public interest should have a part in it. But its part should be to stimulate, to guide, to restrain, not to dominate. This is perfectly in line with our Federal Constitution, which empowers government not only to establish justice but also to promote the general welfare.

Catholic social philosophy has a constructive program for this organic development of economic life. Pope Pius XI, rounding out the social principles formulated by Leo XIII, laid down the broad outlines of this program 17 years ago. In line with that constructive program we advocate freely organized cooperation between the accredited representatives of capital and labor in each industry and in the economy as a whole, under the supervision but not the control of government. The agencies of this freely organized cooperation have been called by various names: Occupational groups, vocational groups, or more recently industry councils. American Catholic students of the social encyclicals have expressed their preference for the name "Industry Councils" to designate the basic organs of a Christian and American type of economic democracy into which they would like to see our economic system progressively evolve. This evolution can come only as the fruit of painstaking study and effort to safeguard, in justice and charity, the rightful interests of property and the rightful interests of labor in the pursuit of the dominant interest of all, which is the common good.

Such a constructive program of social order seems to us to be the answer to the questionings of high-minded leaders of industry and to the explicit proposals of sound and responsible leaders of organized labor. We bespeak for it in these critical times dispassionate consideration and calm, open discussion in an atmosphere of good will, and in a disposition to seek solutions by agreement rather than by force, whether political or economic. We call upon men of religious faith and principle, both in management and labor, to take the lead in working out and applying, gradually if need be, a constructive social program of this type. For the moral and social ideals which it would realize are their heritage.

RELIGION AND CITIZENSHIP

The inroads of secularism in civil life are a challenge to the Christian citizen—and indeed to every citizen with definite religious convictions. The essential connection between religion and good citizenship is deep in our American tradition. Those who took the lead in establishing our independence and framing our Constitution were firm and explicit in the conviction that religion and morality are the strong supports of national well-being, that national morality cannot long prevail in the absence of religious principle, and that impartial encouragement of religious influence on its citizens is a proper and practical function of good government. This American tradition clearly envisioned the school as the meeting place of these helpful interacting influences. The third article of the Northwest Ordinance passed by Congress in 1787, reenacted in 1790, and included in the constitutions of many States enjoins: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good citizenship and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This is our authentic American tradition on the philosophy of education for citizenship.

In the field of law our history reveals the same fundamental connection between religion and citizenship. It is through law that government exercises control over its citizens for the common good and establishes a balance between their rights and duties. The American concept of government and law started with the recognition that man's inalienable rights—which it is the function of government to protect—derive from God, his Creator. It thus bases human law, which deals with man's rights and their correlative duties in society, on foundations that are definitely religious, on principles that emerge from the definite view of man as a creature of God. This view of man anchors human law to the natural law, which is the moral law of God made clear to us through the judgments of human reason and the dictates of conscience. The natural law, as an outstanding modern legal commentator has written, is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this. Thus human law is essentially an ordinance of reason, not merely a dictate of will on the part of the state. In our authentic American tradition this is the accepted philosophy of law.

On this basically religious tradition concerning the preparation of the citizen through education and the direction of the citizen through law, secularism has in the past century exercised a corrosive influence. It has banned religion from tax-supported education and is now bent on destroying all cooperation between government and organized religion in the training of our future citizens. It has undermined the religious foundations of law in the minds of many men in the legal profession and has predisposed them to accept the legalistic tyranny of the omnipotent state. It has cleverly exploited, to the detriment of religion and good citizenship, the delicate problem of cooperation between church and state in a country of divided religious allegiance. That con-

crete problem, delicate as it is, can, without sacrifice of principle, be solved in a particular way when good will and a spirit of fairness prevail.

Authoritative Catholic teaching on the relations between church and state, as set forth in papal encyclicals and in the treatises of recognized writers on ecclesiastical law, not only state clearly what these relations should normally be under ideal conditions, but also indicates to what extent the Catholic Church can adapt herself to the particular conditions that may obtain in different countries. Examining, in the full perspective of that teaching, the position which those who founded our Nation and framed its basic law took on the problem of church-state relations in our own country, we find that the first amendment to our Constitution solved that problem in a way that was typically American in its practical recognition of existing conditions and its evident desire to be fair to all citizens of whatever religious faith. To one who knows something of history and law, the meaning of the first amendment is clear enough from its own words: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or forbidding the free exercise thereof." The meaning is even clearer in the records of the Congress that enacted it. Then, and throughout English and colonial history, an "establishment of religion" meant the setting up by law of an official church which would receive from the Government favors not equally accorded to others in the cooperation between government and religion—which was simply taken for granted in our country at that time and has, in many ways, continued to this day. Under the first amendment, the Federal Government could not extend this type of preferential treatment to one religion as against another, nor could it compel or forbid any State to do so. If this practical policy be described by the loose metaphor "a wall of separation between church and state," that term must be understood in a definite and typically American sense. It would be an utter distortion of American history and law to make that practical policy involve the indifference to religion and the exclusion of cooperation between religion and government implied in the term "separation of church and state" as it has become the shibboleth of doctrinaire secularism.

Within the past 2 years secularism has scored unprecedented victories in its opposition to governmental encouragement of religious and moral training, even where no preferential treatment of one religion over another is involved. In two recent cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has adopted an entirely novel and ominously extensive interpretation of the "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment. This interpretation would bar any cooperation between government and organized religion which would aid religion, even where no discrimination between religious bodies is in question. This reading of the first amendment, as a group of non-Catholic religious leaders recently noted, will endanger "forms of cooperation between church and state which have been taken for granted by the American people," and "greatly accelerate the trend toward the secularization of our culture."

Reluctant as we are to criticize our supreme judicial tribunal, we cannot but observe that when the members of that tribunal write long and varying opinions in handing down a decision, they must expect that intelligent citizens of a democracy will study and appraise these opinions. The Journal of the American Bar Association, in a critical analysis of one of the cases in question, pertinently remarks: "The traditionally religious sanctions of our law, life, and government are challenged by a judicial propensity which deserves the careful thought and study of lawyers and people."

Lawyers trained in the American tradition of law will be amazed to find that in the McCollum case the majority opinions pay scant attention to logic, history, or accepted norms of legal interpretation. Logic would demand that what is less clear be defined by what is more clear. In the present instance we find just the reverse. The carefully chiseled phrases of the first amendment are defined by the misleading metaphor "the wall of separation between church and state." This metaphor of Jefferson specifies nothing except that there shall be no "established church"—no state religion. All the rest of its content depends on the letter of the law that sets it up and can in the concrete imply anything from the impartial cooperation between Government and free religious bodies (as in Holland and traditionally in our own country) all the way down to bitter persecution of religion (as in France at the turn of the century). As was pointedly remarked in a dissenting opinion: "A rule of law cannot be drawn from a metaphor."

A glance at the histroy of Jefferson's own life and work would have served as a warning against the broad and devastating application of his "wall of separation" metaphor that we find in this case. The expression first appears in a letter written by Jefferson in 1802 and, significantly enough, in a context that makes it refer to the "free exercise of religion" clause rather than to the "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment. Twenty years later Jefferson clearly showed in action that his concept of "separation of church and state" was far different from the concept of those who now appeal to his metaphor as a norm of interpretation. As the rector of the State University of Virginia, Jefferson proposed a system of cooperation between the various religious groups and the university which goes far beyond anything under consideration in the case at hand, and Mr. Madison, who had proposed the first amendment and who led in carrying it through to enactment by Congress, was one of the visitors of the University of Virginia who approved Jefferson's plan.

Even one who is not a lawyer would expect to find in the opinion of the Court some discussion of what was in the mind of the Members of Congress when they framed and adopted the first amendment. For it would seem that the intent of the legislator should be of capital importance in interpreting any law when a doubt is raised as to the objective meaning of the words in which it is framed. In regard to the "establishment of religion" clause, there is no doubt of the intent of the legislator. It is clear in the record of the Congress that framed it and of the State legislatures that ratified it. To them it meant no official church for the country as a whole, no preferment of one religion over another by the Federal Government—and at the same time no interference by the Federal Government in the church-state relations of the individual States.

The opinion of the Court advances no reason for disregarding the mind of the legislator. But that reason is discernible in a concurring opinion adhered to by four of the nine judges. There we see clearly the determining influence of secularist theories of public education—and possibly of law. One cannot but remark that if this secularist influence is to prevail in our Government and its institutions, such a result should in candor and logic and law be achieved by legislation adopted after full popular discussion, and not by the judicial procedure of an ideological interpretation of our Constitution.

We, therefore, hope and pray that the novel interpretation of the first amendment recently adopted by the Supreme Court will in due process be revised. To that end we shall peacefully, patiently, and perseveringly work. We feel with deep conviction that for the sake of both good citizenship and religion there should be a reaffirmation of our original American tradition of free cooperation between government and religious bodies—cooperation involving no special privilege to any group and no restriction on the religious liberty of any citizen. We solmenly disclaim any intent or desire to alter this prudent and fair American policy of government in dealing with the delicate problems that have their source in the divided religious allegiance of our citizen. We call upon our Catholic people to seek in their faith an inspiration and a guide in making an informed contribution to good citizenship. We urge members of the legal profession in particular to develop and apply their special competence in this field. We stand ready to cooperate in fairness and charity with all who believe in God and are devoted to freedom under God to avert the impending danger of a judicial establishment of secularism that would ban God from public life. For secularism is threatening the religious foundations of our national life and preparing the way for the advent of the omnipotent state.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 31, 1948.*

To His Grace the Most Reverend JOHN T. MCNICHOLAS, OP, DD,
Chairman Administrative Board, NCWC, Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR ARCHBISHOP MCNICHOLAS: The Christian in Action, 1948 statement of the bishops of the United States, is before me.

Living today more and more in the shadow of laws and regulations of the state, we are losing our freedom and personality in proportion to our increasing efforts to retain them. While our study of sociology, economics, and government receive special emphasis, our social relations, economics, and politics recede to new ebbs in selfishness and rivalries. Likewise our arts are so governed by fashions and propaganda that they scarcely make any pretense to inspiration and to fidelity to the universal in man and nature. Our efforts should turn from the outer to the inner, from society to the individual, from the material to the moral and spiritual. If we have wise and high-minded citizens, society will naturally and inevitably take care of itself. We need most of all to cultivate the character of our youth, in whose development parents, schools, and spiritual education should more responsibly have primary parts. A nation of honest and intelligent men is in the last analysis a greater force for peace and happiness than millions of soldiers and atomic bombs. It is in such a spirit I humbly submit the following lines:

JEOPARDY

Men of America, in jeopardy
Stand the traditions of our country's soul;
Less and less the Nation's glorious role,
Gemmed with starry truth's white majesty,
Lives in our flag, long-famed in peace and war.
False gods of justice, virtue, beauty spurn
The wisdom of our fathers and unlearn
The human heart and simple nature's lore.
The fashions, rivalries, fanfare and din
Serve private ends and not the commonweal;
The billions of our riches, gold and steel,
Grow Frankensteins, gross idols, public sin.
Have we no Christians now who live and die,
With truth their cross, to challenge every lie?

Sincerely yours in Christ,

JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN.

Expansion Estimates to 1960 for Pacific Northwest Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ivan Bloch, from Western Industry for January 1949:

EXPANSION ESTIMATES TO 1960 FOR PACIFIC NORTHWEST INDUSTRIES

(By Ivan Bloch, Ivan Bloch and Associates, Portland, Oreg.[1])

If electric-power consumption is an index of industrial activity, then the Pacific Northwest can expect a four-to-about-sixfold expansion in major industrial enterprises by 1960. This is the indicated forecast contained in the Review Report of the Columbia River Tributaries, the completion of which has just been announced by the United States Corps of Engineers.

This monumental report was authorized in a resolution of the United States Senate Commerce Committee in 1943, which requested the Corps of Engineers of the United States Department of the Army to prepare a review of its past plans for the comprehensive development of the Columbia River. The task was made the responsibility of the North Pacific division, headquartered in Portland, Oreg., under the direction of Col. Theron B. Weaver, division engineer.

In order to arrive at a rational appraisal of the needs for additional development of the Columbia, the division engineer secured the staff assistance of numerous other Federal and State agencies. Each prepared exhaustive analyses of the physical, economic, and technical aspects of the future growth of the region comprising the drainage of the Columbia: Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, portions of Wyoming, and of British Columbia.

Thus the corps prepared for preliminary public hearing purposes a bold yet realistic plan of action for the construction of numerous river control works including seven main dams on the Columbia River and its tributaries for flood control, navigation, power, irrigation, and other purposes. These major structures will provide a direly needed additional 6,000,000 kilowatts of generating capacity which would bring the total in the region to some 10,000,000 to 11,000,000 kilowatts by 1960.

The four appendixes to the main report, on power markets and developments in the Pacific Northwest, represent the summary of over 2 years of continuous work by the former industrial staff of the United States Bonneville Power Administration, aided by selected staff members of the United States Forest Service and the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The supporting reports, several inches thick, are encyclopedic in the scope and detail of their analyses of raw materials, production costs, and markets of important industrial segments of the future economic pattern of the Pacific Northwest. It is not likely that such an exhaustive study has ever been attempted and completed in any other area of the world.

To accomplish the task of appraising future industrial growth in the Pacific Northwest, the former staff of the Division of Industrial and Resources Development of the Bonneville Administration was divided into teams of economists, chemists, and metallurgists to analyze each major industrial group; production processes and costs, producers and production statistics, markets (world, national, west coast, and Pacific Northwest).

From these analyses, summary forecasts were then derived for plant capacities and power requirements. Upon completion of the analyses of each industrial group, and the condensation of bulky memoranda into summary reports, each report was submitted to an extensive number of industrial corporations throughout the United States for critical review. The final reports, as utilized by the Corps of Engineers, embody the many practical suggestions of major industrial concerns.

Because of time and fund limitations, greatest attention was given to major power-consuming industries. These included:

Light metals industries: aluminum and magnesium.

Ferrous metals and related industries: rolled steel and stainless steel, iron and steel castings, ferroalloys, electrolytic iron and manganese.

Nonferrous metals: zinc, lead, copper, and antimony.

Nonmetallic industries: cement, artificial abrasives.

Electrochemical industries: phosphorus, phosphoric acid, phosphates, and phosphate fertilizer, sulfuric acid, calcium carbides and derivatives, such as acetylene, acetic acid, acetic anhydride, chlorine, caustic soda, chlorates and perchlorates; carbon disulphide; rayon.

Forest and forest products industries.

Agriculture and food processing.

Many other industries, however, were not covered, such as for the production of rare earths and rare metals, and numerous electrochemicals such as hydrogen peroxide and synthetic fuels.

RANGE OF ESTIMATES

In order to reduce the hazards of appraising the extent of possible industrial expansion over a period of some 15 years in the future—the trends of which would be complicated by the inability of the most expert to anticipate technological changes—two ranges of estimates were selected. The minimum expectable range was that obtainable from the continuation of current trends and the known plans of individual industries. The maximum expectable range generally was set to reflect feasible power requirements, assuming that the policies of the Federal Government and industry will encourage the most rapid development of power resources and industry in the Pacific Northwest.

A basic assumption adhered to within other limiting factors was that the Pacific Northwest should prepare itself to have enough power capacity to provide for continuous industrial production. It was felt that, inasmuch as electric power is an essential tool of production, the extent of its availability should never be permitted to be a limiting factor upon the expansion of potential industrial production capability. Had such a basic and essential policy been adopted by appropriate agencies of government since the end of World War II, the Pacific Northwest and the west coast generally would not be faced with existing critical power shortages and resulting slow-down in industrial expansion.

The total estimated demands for firm energy in the Pacific Northwest by the year 1960 were thus developed. The truly fabulous total industry range of 3,641,450 to 5,384,100 kilowatts was arrived at for 1960. The extent of this anticipated growth is demonstrated by comparison to the 1945 requirements of 977,000 kilowatts—a percentage increase of between 275 to 450 percent. The details of these forecasts are shown in table 1, Summary Table—Estimated 1960 Range of Production and Power Requirements for Selected Pacific Northwest Industries.

Most startling of the estimates are those relating to light metals and particularly aluminum. The percentage Pacific Northwest production increase—1946–60—for aluminum alone is indicated at 778–1116 percent, representing a production capacity of between 1,300,000–1,800,000 tons as against current primary reduction capacity of about 300,000 tons, and a current national total of 680,000 tons.

The analyses on aluminum, probably the most extensive of the entire report, are carefully bulwarked with appraisals of markets and production cost trends. Extensive contact with both consuming and producing segments of national industry resulted in a rational estimate of national requirements for aluminum. These are summarized in table 2, United States Outlook for Feasible Markets for Aluminum, 1960.

Because of the industry's imperative requirements for large blocks of firm and low-cost electric power, and the enormous potentials of this type of power in the Pacific Northwest, it is concluded that a large portion of future total national aluminum production capacity will become established in that area. Recognition is given in this appraisal to the possibilities of atomic-energy production in areas favorably situated in relation to sources of bauxite and alumina. In this respect, allowance is made for the establishment of alumina plants in the Pacific Northwest to be supplied by imported bauxite and supplemented in time with nonbauxitic materials for which it is assumed advanced technology will provide ultimate opportunity of utilization.

The allocation of power capacity for the Pacific Northwest aluminum industry expected to be established in 1960 is shown in table 3, Pacific Northwest Power Use for Aluminum, 1960. The related levels of employment which would result are summarized in table 4, Pacific Northwest Employment in Aluminum, 1960. Although considerable attention was given during the preparation of the report to the potentials of Pacific Northwest aluminum fabricating industries—foil, extrusions, castings, and so on—the difficulties of specifically appraising markets and technological advances in these fields coupled with time limitations for required studies made it desirable to eliminate forecasts at that time.

Determination of magnesium potentials provided considerable difficulties. The state of flux in the fabricating portion of the industry, reflecting into uncertainties as to the national outlook for primary production, made it necessary to exercise considerably more diffidence in forecasts than for almost any other industrial group. However, it seemed justified to provide for the ultimate 1960 Pacific Northwest production of between 6,000 to 25,000 tons of the primary metal, entailing power capacity requirements on the order of 15,000 to 55,000 kilowatts. The report concludes that the greatest obstacle to the large-scale production and use of magnesium is the cost of fabrication. It observes the paradox that lower costs await large-scale production while the larger market awaits the development of lower costs.

[1] Until the end of 1947 the author was Chief of the Division of Industrial and Resources Development of the U. S. Bonneville Power Administration and special consultant to Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug on western and Alaskan industrial development. It was under his direction that the staff of the Division of Industrial and Resources Development, during 1945–47, prepared the voluminous industrial appendices to the U. S. Corps of Engineers' Review Report on Columbia River and Tributaries.

The report's general conclusions on ferrous metals and related industries may prove somewhat disappointing to those expecting very large expansion in the Pacific Northwest. However, the analyses reflect a realistic appraisal of the effect of recently increased ferrous metals' capacity in California and Utah, as well as the limitations of raw materials available in and to the Pacific Northwest for the establishment of large basic production. However, as shown in summary table 1, Estimated 1960 Range of Production and Power Requirements for Selected Pacific Northwest Industries, percentage increases for various segments of the industry are by no means insignificant.

Notable for forecasted expansion are the ferroalloys and electrolytic iron, both of which are highly dependent on abundant quantities of low-cost firm electrical energy. Relative to electrolytic iron production, the report observes that if current production of high-quality iron powder on a somewhat small scale in the Pacific Northwest were to demonstrate the feasibility of low-cost production, the large market for this product would assure substantial development of this industry in the region. Tables 5 and 6 reveal some details of the market appraisals for steel ingot, rolled steel, cast iron pipe and fittings as estimated for 1960.

With respect to nonferrous metals—copper, lead, and zinc—the report's forecasts rest in large measure on the raw material factors for these industries. The favorable position of the Pacific Northwest in its ore reserves of all three metals is described at some length particularly with respect to the renewed attention and interest in such mining districts as those of northern Idaho and eastern Washington for both zinc and lead, and of Butte for copper. The steady trend to electrolytic refining in zinc, for example, coupled to the nature of the raw material reserves from which the industry must draw its major supplies provides production estimates for 1960 which are shown in tabular form in table 7, Estimates of Production of Zinc Concentrates and Zinc Slab in the Pacific Northwest, and Power Requirements, 1960. A similar tabulation is shown for lead in table 8.

Establishment of additional cement production capacity is discussed in the report's section on nonmetallic industries and summarized in table 9, Estimates of Portland Cement Production and Power Requirements in the Pacific Northwest, 1960. The report observes that the consumption of cement in the region has been higher than the national per capita use because construction and related developments are proceeding at a high rate in the area. It further observes that this is to be expected because of the very large growth of population, and the consequent rising demands for highways, dams, residential and commercial building and the like, all of which require increased tonnages of cement.

The current construction of one of the nation's largest artificial abrasive plants in Vancouver, Wash., serves to highlight the report's appraisal of this industry's future in the Northwest. The demands—domestic and export—for fused alumina, silicon carbide, and other artificial abrasives, translated into the high power requirements per unit of material produced, provide an estimate of between 13,000 and 22,000 kilowatts by 1960. This would correspond to the production of between 8,000 to 12,000 tons of silicon carbide per year, and 10,000 to 20,000 tons of fused alumina.

As indicated in summary table 1, one of the largest increases in Pacific Northwest industrial capacity is expected in the field of phosphorus and related chemicals. The report's forecast, derived in 1947, already appears to be conservative in view of increasing interest in western phosphate deposits and current plant construction in southern Idaho and Utah.

It may be observed that the national demands for phosphatic fertilizer and for the large variety of phosphorus chemicals are running headlong into Pacific Northwest power stringencies. If it were not for the lack of adequate firm supplies, the phosphorus industry would undoubtedly be moving into high gear in the vicinity of the phosphate deposits in Montana, Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming. Table 10, Estimates for Phosphate Industry in the Pacific Northwest, 1960, tabulates the requirements for various phosphorus-consuming industries.

One of the report's conclusions, developed by intensive studies for several years, relates to the need for the production of high concentration phosphatic fertilizers so as to reduce the cost of contained plant food to the ultimate farm consumer. The report also details at length the rapidly growing needs of soils west of the Mississippi for phosphatic plant food, the supply of which will be derived from plants in the West and especially in the Northwest.

Relative to the demands for phosphorus chemicals other than fertilizer, the report indicates that past national production of calcium, sodium, and ammonium phosphates for soaps, cleansers, and food industries has been concentrated in the East. It further states that western demands for these essential products and the availability of 60 percent of the Nation's phosphate reserves in the West assure the expansion of the industry in the West.

Although not a large consumer of power, but because it is essential to the growth of industry, sulfuric acid draws a major share of attention in the report. The anticipated size of consumer demands for the acid are tabulated in table 11, Estimated Market in 1960 for Sulfuric Acid in the Pacific Northwest, Exclusive of Southern Idaho and Utah. Among these estimates, those for rayon production account for the greatest potential amount.

Calcium carbide, the western production of which was unknown prior to the war, is given considerable attention. A heavy power consumer, that industry is expected to grow considerably, as shown in table 12, Estimated Market for Calcium Carbide Accessible to the Pacific Northwest. Its importance, discussed at length, lies in the development of numerous industrial substances for which acetylene is a base. These include acetic acid, acetic anhydride, tetrachloroethane, vinyl acetate, and vinyl acetylene.

Particular attention is drawn to the requirements of the synthetic-rubber industry for acetylene, and of the rayon industry for acetic acid and acetic anhydride. The latter two are regarded as most important to the development of cellulose-using industries in the region, and to the greater utilization of its timber resources. Because calcium-carbide production requires large quantities of power, it is estimated that between 27,000 and 54,000 kilowatts will have to be provided for this industry in the Northwest by 1960.

The Pacific Northwest is already a major producer of chlorine, caustic soda, and related chlorine chemicals. The major outlet for Northwest production has been in the pulp and paper industry, and it is the report's conclusions that these will continue to furnish major markets. These are shown in table 13, Estimated Market for Chlorine Accessible to Pacific Northwest Producers, 1960. Inasmuch as the production of chlorine and caustic soda ranks at the top of power consumers, between 46,000 to 66,000 kilowatts will be required to service that industry.

Carbon disulphide, important to the manufacture of viscose rayon, is discussed in the report for that reason. Although it is admitted that the bulk of national production of this chemical has been accomplished in externally fired retorts, it is believed that Pacific Northwest factors will favor electric-furnace methods. The report estimates the need for some 135,000,000 to 150,000,000 pounds of carbon disulphide in the region by 1960, with power requirements in the vicinity of 3,000 to 4,000 kilowatts.

One of the constant hopes of the Northwest has been for the establishment of rayon manufacture. It seems clearly uneconomic for the region to ship its dissolving cellulose pulps to eastern rayon plants, with return shipments of finished rayon products to the Pacific Northwest. The report concludes that the rapid growth of western population and particularly the expansion of its garment and textile industry, and of its tire manufactures, should make it possible for the establishment of several rayon plants in the Northwest.

Thus, provisions for the establishment of several plants are made in the report's summary power requirements for a total of between 54,000 to 71,000 kilowatts of which 10,500 to 15,000 kilowatts would be purchased, the remainder self-generated from byproduct steam. The capacity of the anticipated Pacific Northwest rayon industry is estimated at from 135,000,000 to 175,000,000 pounds per year by 1960.

Numerous other chapters in the engineers' report deal with forest and agricultural product industries. With respect to timber products, the report notes the trend to greater manufacture of finished products even though the basic industry may adjust itself downward toward a drain on the timber resources more compatible to sustained yield principles. Reflecting increased manufacturing, and hence greater power utilization, the summary conclusion is that the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest will require on the order of 700,000 to over 1,000,000 kilowatts by 1960.

Agricultural production is anticipated to achieve increasing diversity, with great emphasis on local processing particularly in the production of frozen fruits and vegetables. Sugar beet production in 1960 is estimated to double estimates available for 1940–44. Thus, the report estimates that total power requirements for agricultural processing industries will require well over a half million kilowatts of capacity.

Other chapters deal with railroad electrification and power demands in the home, the farm, commercial and small industrial establishments. Their compounded requirements together with those of industry reach the impressive total of almost 12,000,000 kilowatts.

TABLE 1.—*Summary table—Estimated 1960 range of production and power requirements for selected Pacific Northwest industries*

Industrial product	Estimated 1960 Pacific Northwest production	Estimated 1960 Pacific Northwest power demand	Production, 1946 to 1960 increase
	Tons	*Kilowatts*	*Percent*
Primary aluminum	1,300,000–1,800,000	2,865,000–4,135,000	778–1,116
Primary magnesium	6,000– 25,000	13,000– 55,000	
Rolled steel	400,000– 480,000		38– 66
Rolled stainless steel	6,000– 20,000		
Steel castings	40,000– 50,000		85– 130
Iron castings (including cast iron pipe)	150,000– 190,000	131,100– 252,800	101– 154
Malleable iron castings	6,000– 8,000		
Ferro alloys	55,000– 100,000		83– 233
Electrolytic iron	5,400– 36,000		500–3,900
Electrolytic manganese	7,000– 15,000		

TABLE 1.—*Summary table—Estimated 1960 range of production and power requirements for selected Pacific Northwest industries*—Continued

Industrial product	Estimated 1960 Pacific Northwest production	Estimated 1960 Pacific Northwest power demand	Production, 1946 to 1960 increase
	Tons	*Kilowatts*	*Percent*
Primary slab zinc	265,000– 340,000	250,000– 327,000	25– 60
Primary refined lead	130,000– 180,000		86– 157
Primary refined copper	125,000– 175,000		67– 133
Primary antimony	3,000– 5,000		25– 108
Cement	1,500,000–1,700,000	50,000– 62,500	62– 83
Artificial abrasives	18,000– 32,000		
Phosphorus	100,800– 186,000		
Phosphoric acid	400,000– 625,000		535– 892
Phosphates	30,000– 40,000		
Triple superphosphates	350,000– 550,000		843– 817
Sulfuric acid	226,000– 380,000		277– 533
Calcium carbide	70,000– 140,000	331,750– 561,800	159– 419
Chlorine	85,000– 122,000		112– 212
Caustic soda	109,000– 158,000		137– 243
Chlorates and perchlorates	4,600– 7,000		2– 56
Carbon disulfide	25,000– 27,000		
Rayon	67,500– 87,500		

TABLE 2.—*United States outlook for feasible markets for aluminum, 1960*

Feasible markets	Estimated aluminum requirement (million pounds)	
	Minimum	Maximum
Building products	350	700
Automobiles	285	1,380
Displacement of copper [1]	250	450
Wire and cable	175	300
Other uses	75	150
Trucks	211	968
Light	3	9
Medium	175	810
Heavy	18	81
Trailers	15	68
Busses	40	56
Railroad cars	51	88
Aircraft	51	109
Displacement of zinc die castings [1]	34	52
All other uses	2,500	2,500
Total	[1] 3,772	[1] 6,303

[1] There is some duplication of figures representing displacement of copper and zinc because of the use of these metals in automobiles, trucks, and busses for which aluminum estimates were made without an analysis of metals displaced.

TABLE 3.—*Pacific Northwest power use for aluminum, 1960*

Power use for aluminum	Thousands of kilowatts	
	Minimum	Maximum
For reduction capacity as of 1947	650	650
For rolling capacity as of 1947	50	50
For aluminum needed for Alcoa, 1947 capacity	15	25
For additional reduction capacity by 1960	2,000	3,000
For additional alumina capacity by 1960	150	400
Total	2,865	4,125

TABLE 4.—*Pacific Northwest employment in aluminum, 1960*

Plant	Productive capacity (thousands of tons)		Employment	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Alumina	1,900	2,900	5,000	7,000
Aluminum reduction	1,300	1,800	15,000	21,000
Aluminum rolling	150	150	5,000	5,000
Total			25,000	33,000

TABLE 5.—*Estimated annual power requirements in the production of steel ingots and rolled steel in the Pacific Northwest, 1960*

Item	Kilowatt demand	
	Minimum	Maximum
Total	42,000	71,000
Existing rolling mills:		
Portland, Oreg	15,000	20,000
Seattle, Wash	20,000	30,000
Mills to be constructed, Seattle, Wash	7,000	15,000
Conversion of open hearth ingot capacity to electric-furnace ingot capacity, Seattle		6,000

TABLE 6.—*Pacific Northwest accessible markets for cast-iron pipe and fittings, 1960*

Accessible market	Minimum net tons	Maximum net tons
Pacific Northwest States	53,000	70,000
Alaska and Hawaii	2,000	3,000
Western Canada	3,000	4,000
Other foreign countries	2,000	3,000
Total	60,000	80,000

TABLE 7.—*Estimates of production of zinc concentrates and zinc slab in the Pacific Northwest and power requirements, 1960*

Item	Annual power requirements (kilowatt demand)		Annual production of concentrates and zinc slabs (net tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Total			150,000	194,000
Zinc mining and concentrating, total	300,000	380,000	24,000	32,000
Northeastern Washington	60,000	80,000	5,000	7,000
Southern Idaho	25,000	40,000	2,000	3,000
Northern Idaho	140,000	160,000	11,000	14,000
Western Montana	75,000	100,000	6,000	8,000
Zinc slab, total	265,000	340,000	126,000	162,000
Tidewater [1]	60,000	80,000	30,000	38,000
Southern Idaho		30,000		14,000
Northern Idaho	45,000	60,000	21,000	30,000
Western Montana [1]	160,000	170,000	75,000	80,000

[1] In the event tidewater plants are not established by 1960, it is expected that imported concentrates would continue to be processed in Montana. Consequently, the total power would remain unchanged.

TABLE 8.—*Estimates of production of lead concentrates and primary lead slab in the Pacific Northwest and power requirements, 1960*

Item	Annual power requirements (kilowatt demand)		Annual production of concentrates and pig lead (net tons)	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Total			32,000	45,000
Lead mining and concentrating, total	[1] 160,000	[1] 200,000	15,000	19,000
Northeastern Washington	15,000	25,000	1,500	2,500
Northern Idaho	110,000	125,000	10,000	11,000
Southern Idaho	15,000	25,000	1,500	2,500
Western Montana	20,000	25,000	2,000	3,000
Pig lead, total	130,000	180,000	17,000	26,000
Tidewater (smelting and refining)	20,000	30,000	3,000	5,000
Northern Idaho (smelting and refining)	75,000	90,000	12,000	15,000
Southern Idaho (smelting and refining)		20,000		3,000
Western Montana (smelting)	35,000	40,000	2,000	3,000

[1] Lead content approximately 75 percent, or 120,000 and 150,000 tons.

TABLE 9.—*Estimates of portland cement production and power requirements in the Pacific Northwest, 1960*

	Annual production of portland cement (barrels)		Annual power requirements (kilowatt demand)	
	Minimum	Maximum	Minimum	Maximum
Total	8,135,000	9,000,000	37,000	41,000
Southwestern Oregon	680,000	760,000	3,100	3,500
Northeastern Oregon	375,000	420,000	1,900	3,100
Lower Columbia River area	790,000	840,000	3,300	3,700
Eastern Washington	1,400,000	1,470,000	8,100	9,100
Puget Sound area	4,550,000	5,130,000	19,200	21,000
Southern Idaho	340,000	380,000	1,400	1,500

TABLE 10.—*Estimates for phosphate industry in the Pacific Northwest, 1960*

Consuming industry	Annual kilowatt demand	
	Minimum	Maximum
Total	194,900	355,800
Phosphate rock mining—total	9,000	15,000
Phosphoric acid	[1]	[1]
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	8,000	13,000
Electric furnace operations—total	165,500	306,000
Phosphoric acid	1,500	3,000
Phosphates	24,000	73,000
Phosphate fertilizer	140,000	230,000
Other operations—total	20,400	34,800
Phosphoric acid	[1]	[1]
Phosphates	1,000	2,000
Phosphate fertilizer	19,400	32,800

[1] Small amount is included in electric furnace operations.

TABLE 11.—*Estimated market in 1960 for sulfuric acid in the Pacific Northwest, exclusive of southern Idaho and Utah*

[Tons 100 percent acid basis]

Use	Minimum	Maximum
Total	226,000	380,000
For superphosphate fertilizer—total	74,000	109,000
In northern Idaho	12,000	28,000
In western Montana	50,000	57,000
Along Pacific Northwest Coast	12,000	24,000
For ammonium sulfate fertilizer at Salem	----------	61,000
For rayon manufacture at Tidewater	100,000	124,000
For sugar refining	----------	7,000
For alcohol by wood waste process	5,000	8,000
For chlorine and caustic soda manufacture	2,000	3,000
For aluminum sulfate manufacture	11,000	14,000
For explosive manufacture	12,000	15,000
For other uses	22,000	39,000

TABLE 12.—*Estimated market for calcium carbide accessible to the Pacific Northwest, 1960*

[Tons]

Use	Minimum	Maximum
Total	70,000	140,000
Total, cutting and welding of metals	48,000	60,000
Bottled acetylene, Pacific Northwest	9,000	11,000
Acetylene, shop-generated, Pacific Northwest	7,000	10,000
Bottled and shop-generated acetylene, other Western States	32,000	39,000
Total, synthetic chemicals	18,000	75,000
Pacific Northwest	18,000	50,000
California	----------	25,000
Exports	4,000	5,000

TABLE 13.—*Estimated market for chlorine accessible to Pacific Northwest producers in 1960*

[Tons]

Use	On minimum basis	On maximum basis
Total	85,000	122,000
For pulp bleaching	62,000	85,000
In Pacific Northwest	45,000	60,000
In British Columbia	15,000	20,000
In Alaska	2,000	5,000
For chlorinated solvents and other chemical manufactures	20,000	30,000
For water treatment and sanitation	2,000	5,000
For liquid bleach	1,000	2,000

FEPC Versus Constitutional Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with my full approval and with leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the remarks of Mr. Charles S. Dudley, executive vice president of the Associated Industries of Georgia, entitled "In the Court of Public Opinion, United States of America—Petition of John Q. Citizen in the Matter of FEPC Versus Constitutional Liberty, Pending":

IN THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FEPC VERSUS CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY, PENDING

To "We the People," the Honorable Judges of Said Court:

The petition of John Q. Citizen, respectfully shows and alleges:

1. That your petitioner is a citizen of, and a stockholder in the United States of America.

That as such citizen and stockholder he has organized his activities and staked his future on the guaranties of his government that he is "endowed with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

That upon the establishment of his government by "we the people" he was guaranteed by the Constitution and its amendments, that the foregoing inalienable rights will, to him, be held inviolate.

That the United States is a Government with powers limited to those specifically enumerated in the Constitution, and only within the enumerated powers shall it be the supreme law of the land.

That the limited powers granted to the Congress are spelled out in section 8, of article I, of the Constitution, and that the powers denied to the Congress are set forth in section 9, of article I, of the Constitution.

Your petitioner would show that we the people drafted and enacted into law, for the purpose of safeguarding and preserving our inalienable rights, 10 amendments to our Constitution, which we call our Bill of Rights.

The first of these amendments says "Congress shall make no laws," etc. It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the amendments are limitations upon the powers of Congress, and that they are not binding upon the States.

And, recognizing further, that the inherent rights of human beings are so varied and so numerous that they cannot be specified, and to the end that, forever, all of such rights may be preserved from governmental interference, we the people declared in the ninth amendment, that—

"The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

Your petitioner would further show that in a superabundance of caution, "we the people," through the tenth amendment, fairly shouted to our Government that—

"The powers not delegated to the United States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

Your petitioner respectfully insists that his personal and sovereign rights as first set forth in the Declaration of Independence, later incorporated in the Constitution, and finally spelled out in detail in the Bill of Rights, are a part of the fundamental law—the supreme law of the land, and as such are removed for all time beyond interference by his Government.

"The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are parts of one consistent whole, founded upon one and the same theory of government—that the people are the only legitimate source of power, and that all just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed."—John Quincy Adams.

That neither the President, chairman of the board, nor the Congress, board of directors, has any authority whatsoever to enact a law, or issue a decree altering any of the inherent rights of your petitioner as confirmed in the Constitution and its amendments, is too clear to require debate.

Justice Brandeis, a great liberal of our Supreme Court, recognized this when he said:

"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. * * * They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure, and satisfaction of life are to be found in material things.

"They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions, and their sensations. They conferred as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men."

Your petitioner would show that "we the people" provided and spelled out in article 5, of the Constitution, the only methods by which changes may be made in our fundamental law:

1. By ratifying in three-fourths of the legislatures of our States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, an amendment proposed by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress; or

2. When by application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, Congress shall call a convention for proposing amendments, and when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as Congress may direct.

Further would your petitioner show this honorable Court, that the "officers and directors" of his Government, namely the President, the Vice President, and the Members of both Houses of Congress have, by their oaths as required in article 6, of the Constitution, avowed that they will support the Constitution.

INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF YOUR PETITIONER NOW THREATENED

2. Your petitioner now respectfully shows and alleges that, notwithstanding the guaranties of his Government to hold inviolate to him his inalienable rights, which include his right to be the architect of his own fortune; to engage in the business of his choice, where and when he pleases; to associate with, and employ in his business, such individuals as in his best judgment will contribute to the success and prosperity of his business; and/or to freely exercise his religion by employing associates of like faith.

He is now being threatened with the enactment of a national act against discrimination in employment which will strike down and deprive him of those sacred and inalienable rights guaranteed to him by his Government.

Your petitioner would show that the proposed legislation aforesaid, and which is more commonly referred to as FEPC, is a vicious invasion of the rights of the individual, and that its enactment into law will crucify him on the cross of "social engineering" constitutional liberty as guaranteed to "we the people."

The findings and declaration of policy as set forth in section 2 (a) of the proposed act states merely a conclusion of its authors "that the practice of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and equality of opportunity, is compatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States; and

(c) That the right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

Your petitioner respectfully shows to this honorable court that this proposed act while purporting to be in the interest of domestic tranquillity is in reality a tyrannical method by which one segment of our citizenry can, and will, be subjected to involuntary servitude. A condition outlawed and prohibited

by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution.

Two wrongs do not make a right. And while it may be urged that it is not right to deny a job to a man because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, by the same token how can it be urged that an individual employing people must employ those he does not wish to employ, and thereby be required to invest his labors and his talents in behalf of those who to him are wholly incompatible. Be it remembered that an employer is also a worker. Does this not force him into involuntary servitude? Is this the promotion of domestic tranquillity as sought by the Constitution?

Your petitioner recognizes that a more abundant life for all is a goal for which we should ever strive, but a more abundant life for all is not to be obtained by any law, act, or decree which strikes down the liberty of one for the benefit of another. Any and all such measures strike at the very heart of constitutional liberty.

"It will be a sad day for society," said Woodrow Wilson, "when sentimentalists are encouraged to suggest all of the measures that shall be taken for the betterment of the human race."

Among the several indictments charged in the Declaration of Independence, the following are noted:

"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation."

"For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury."

To rectify the foregoing abuses of individual liberty, note the guaranties written into the Constitution:

"Every State of the Union is guaranteed a republican form of government which may not be altered either by the President or Congress.

"The trial of all crimes except in case of impeachment, shall be by jury."

Section 7 (i) of the proposed act provides that if the Commission shall find that the person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue the cause to be served on such persons requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the act.

Your petitioner respectfully insists that the foregoing provisions violate the right of individual contract and set up a condition unacknowledged by our laws. Further, that the provisions are in violation of the sixth amendment, which guarantees the right of trial by jury. To require of an employer the payment of back pay to an individual with whom he has had no dealings, and, further, to require such payment in the nature of a fine for infraction of an alleged duty to the Government does, indeed, set up a theory of human relationships in our organized society wholly unacknowledged by our laws.

Under section 10 of the act the President is granted power to make and establish rules and regulations governing persons who make a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States, to prevent such persons from committing or continuing any unlawful employment practice.

Your petitioner respectfully shows that the granting of such power to the President is wholly unacknowledged by our laws and that it is the equivalent of granting to the Chief Executive the right to exercise legislative power, which power is specifically denied to him in section 1 of article 1 of the Constitution.

Section 9 authorizes the Commission or any of its agents to enter private places of business when a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission that any person subject to the act has engaged in any unlawful practice. Here the act is strangely silent as relating to the probable cause and seeks to grant authority to a superduper snooper to invade the privacy of the person being investigated.

Your petitioner would show to this honorable court that the foregoing is a gross violation of the fourth amendment, which guarantees to the people that they are to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, and that no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

Your petitioner respectfully submits that we the people are opposed to Russia's form of government, and/or to the establishment of a Federal gestapo.

Section 6, subdivision g (4), of the proposed act seeks to empower the Commission with the power to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

Your petitioner makes bold to inquire of this honorable court wherein our fundamental law lends any approval or encouragement to the creation of nongovernmental agencies whose sole objective and purpose would be to stir up strife between the several segments of our citizenry.

ARGUMENT AND CONCLUSIONS

Shall we discard the American credo that the individual is endowed with certain inalienable rights and substitute therefor an act which by its very terms and provisions will hand out only such rights as may be decreed by Executive order, administrative government, a bureaucratic agency, or by Congress bypassing the constitutional guaranties of freedom to the individual?

Since when has it come to pass that a job is a civil right? Does not the right to employment mean more than qualifications? Is it not the individual right of one having employment to offer, to refuse employment because of bow-legs, a bald head, or crossed eyes?

If we are to have a free society is not employment a matter of contract or agreement between individuals?

Since when did it become the prerogative of the Federal Government to force upon the States and upon citizens of the States its own political views as to what constitutes civil rights?

"A law which would discriminate injuriously against one portion of the citizens, abridging equal civil or political privileges, or which would afford less protection to life, liberty, or property, to one class than another, would clearly violate these amendments. Equality of rights, privileges, and capacities is the condition of all citizens, established by these organic laws. Special privileges can be conferred upon none, nor can exceptional burdens or restrictions be put upon any." (10 American Jurisprudence, 896, citing numerous cases.) "The fourteenth amendment has relation to a State action exclusively. It was, in other words, designed as a protection against acts of the States and not the acts of persons, and has, therefore, no bearing upon acts of discrimination by one individual against another." (10 American Jurisprudence, 899, citing numerous cases.)

"Discrimination by private individuals is not a violation of the fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, as that amendment is simply prohibitory of State legislation and State action." (10 American Jurisprudence, 909, cases cited.)

"The basis of our political system is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit act of the whole people is sacredly obligatory upon all."—George Washington.

Is it not in order to now suggest that Members of Congress should, in good conscience, pause and seriously reflect upon their solemn oaths that they will support the Constitution. Madison said:

"It certainly is very material that the true doctrine of liberty as exemplified in our political system should be inculcated upon those who are to sustain and administer it."

"The Constitution is a written instrument. As such its meaning does not alter. That which it meant when adopted it means now * * *. Those things which were within its grants of power as those grants were understood when made are still within them; and those things not within them remain still excluded." (*South Carolina* v. *United States* (199 U. S. 437).)

Said the Court in *Hodges* v. *The United States* (203 U. S. 1):

"With these decisions, and many others that might be cited, before us, it is vain to contend that the Federal Constitution secures a citizen of the United States the right to work at a given occupation or particular calling free from injury, oppression, or interference by individual citizens. Even though such right be a natural and inalienable right, the duty of protecting the citizen in the enjoyment of such right, free from individual interference, rests alone with the State."

SUMMATION

The tenth amendment reserves to the States and to the people all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States. Section 2 (b) of the proposed measure violates this amendment.

The fifth amendment protects the persons and their property. Any attempted interference with this right by government violates the liberty of contract which is a sacred individual right in the pursuit of happiness.

Forcing an individual to employ persons who to him are incompatible, by reason of their religion, violates the first amendment which assures to the individual free exercise of religion. Furthermore it is in violation of the fifth amendment, which guarantees to the individual that he shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, and wherein he is also guaranteed equal protection of the laws.

The thirteenth amendment abolished involuntary servitude, but provisions of the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act place employers in a condition of involuntary servitude when they are forced to work for employees and associates against their will.

The sixth amendment guarantees trial by jury. The provisions of section 7 (i) of the proposed Fair Employment Practice Act set up a system of criminal prosecution without a trial by jury, in gross violation of the sixth amendment.

Your petitioner respectfully submits that in the light of all the foregoing, the Congress of the United States is without the power to enact legislation governing the rights of individuals as applying between themselves in the relationship of employer and employee, whereby an employer is subjected to whims and caprices of autocratic government, and/or the social views and opinions of a bureaucratic agency.

Wherefore, your petitioner respectfully prays that there be entered upon the docket of this honorable court of public opinion a judgment and order of permanent injunction against enactment into law by our representatives in the Congress of a measure such as the national act against discrimina-

tion in employment which will have for its effect absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of free men. A condition which Madison said exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority.

JOHN Q. CITIZEN,
Petitioner.

The Future of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on January 28, 1949, I delivered an address at the McKinley Memorial at Niles, Ohio, on the subject the Future of the Republican Party. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a real pleasure for me to return to Ohio and speak again at this meeting held annually in memory of the great Republican President, William McKinley. The Republican Party was founded in 1854 as a party determined to restore the actual practice of liberty in this country in accordance with the theory of liberty which had brought about the founding of the Republic. It enjoyed a long lease of power from 1860 to 1884, but for 20 years prior to 1896, it was a weak party, living on its Civil War reputation and hardly ever commanding the support of a majority of the people. Then, in 1896, it had a new birth, because in that campaign it presented fairly and frankly and effectively its conservative philosophy. It pointed out to the workingman that the full dinner pail depended on sound fiscal principles and the free economy so necessary for progress. An interesting article in Fortune magazine for January describes the real Mark Hanna as opposed to the caricature created by the cartoonists, and describes Hanna's sincere interest in the American workingmen and American prosperity. It was that interest, and his ability to convince the people of his sincerity and that of McKinley, which won an overwhelming victory for the Republican Party and gave to it 16 years of power.

Some Republicans are discouraged today, because for five elections now the Republican Party has met defeat. But its defeats have been due more to its failure in presenting its principles to the people than in those principles. It has lost by narrow margins in 1940, 1944, and 1948. Let us remember that nearly half the people voted for it in the recent election, and that its organization is still strong in many localities throughout the Nation. Political parties have a strong will to live. The only political parties which have died are those which have forgotten or abandoned the principles on which they were founded.

A party can only live if it does represent a great principle or a set of great principles. The two-party system is based on the theory that a large number of men who think differently on many subjects unite in the belief that certain principles are vital to the welfare of their country, and that differences on less important questions must be reconciled or forgotten in the common effort to secure those basic principles. A political party is not just an organization in which men of completely different points of view join because their parents or their friends belonged to that party, or because they became members through youthful and forgotten prejudices.

The Republican Party will continue to live and will prevail if it dedicates itself again to the principles for which it was founded, and if it presents those principles to the people in the forceful and aggressive manner in which McKinley and Hanna presented them in 1896.

1. HUMAN LIBERTY

What is the Republican philosophy? First, and before all, it is the same philosophy of human liberty which created the United States of America. Every American today still pays lip service to the term "liberty." But he does not feel it as he did for a hundred years, when the idea of liberty inspired all Americans and they boasted of it until it became tiresome to every visiting foreigner. The example of America and of France spread the idea throughout the world, and the philosophy of free government was accepted in nearly all sections of the globe, even where the thing itself did not really exist. But today, many Americans and most people throughout the world have forgotten what it means. The limitations on liberty have grown until in many totalitarian states the substance of liberty has completely disappeared. The totalitarian theory that government must plan and direct and control dominates the thinking of today throughout the world, and has made great headway here in the United States without a realization of the fact that it means the end of individual liberty.

What is liberty? It is freedom of speech and of the press, as the President said in his inaugural—but it is much more. It is the freedom of the individual to choose his own work and his life occupation, to spend his earnings as he desires to spend them, to choose the place where he desires to live, to take the job that fits him whether some union official is willing that he get it or not. It is the freedom of the local community to work out its own salvation when it has the power to do so. It is the freedom of cities, of counties, of school districts; the freedom of educating one's own children as he thinks best. It is the freedom of thought and experiments in academic institutions. It is the freedom of men engaged in industry to run their business as they think best as long as they do not interfere with the rights of others to do the same. Certainly, there are limitations which must be imposed by the state to protect the liberty of others more and more as our economy becomes complex. But a party which believes in liberty will see that such limitations are only imposed to the extent it is absolutely necessary.

As we look back through history, we see brief periods in which liberty has prevailed, but in the major part of historical time it has been suppressed by emperors and kings, by oligarchies, by plutocracies, by so-called democracies, and proletarian majorities. It is hard to gain and easy to lose unless it is kept alive by an aggressive determination that it shall not perish from the earth. Today the battle between liberty and totalitarian government permeates every problem of life. It lies at the base of our battle with fascism and nazism and communism. The American people believe in liberty, but the totalitarian creed which we face abroad dominates today the philosophy of the CIO and therefore of the Democratic Party and if it prevails it must ultimately destroy liberty here at home.

It is strange indeed that our people in recent elections have tended to support the theory that the Government should be the source of all planning, of all control, and of bread and circuses for the multitude. It is strange, because at this very moment we see the magnificent success of a system of liberty in the United States as contrasted with the comparative poverty and dissatisfaction of many foreign nations. Liberty has succeeded in the United States in developing original thinking, original methods, and new ideas. It has succeeded in giving a wide distribution of property and income to our people. It has succeeded in building up a tremendous production of material things and a standard of living higher than has ever been seen before in the history of the world. A man from Mars who studied the world today could only come to the conclusion that only the free can solve the problems of production.

There are many other aims besides liberty to be sought by political policy and party principle, but every policy must be justified either as an affirmative policy to secure liberty, or as a policy of human progress making no sacrifice to the god of the totalitarian state.

There may be many differences among Republicans as to the application of the principle of liberty to different situations, and certainly I do not assume to speak in any way for the Republican Party. Tonight I intend only to express my own beliefs with which I hope the Republican Party may agree. Because of my belief in the vital need of liberty, I am opposed to price control and wage control and allocation control in time of peace. I was opposed to the OPA and the WPB after the war ended because they attempted to substitute a detailed control of business for the freedom of competition and the freedom of enterprise. I am opposed to socialized medicine because it takes from the people the right to buy the kind of medical service they wish to obtain, and takes their earnings in taxes to be returned in the form of Government medical care under a long series of bureaucratic regulations. I am opposed to a tremendous burden of taxation, because it takes from the people the right to spend the money which they have earned in the sweat of their brows, and spends it for something which the Government thinks is good for them, whether they want it or not. I have been opposed to universal military training, among other reasons, because it takes from a boy and his family the right to choose and pursue his own education and occupation and imposes a year of training and indoctrination determined by so-called experts in Washington.

2. EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW

The second ideal of the Republican Party is another one which is universally accepted in inaugural addresses and widely disregarded in practice, the ideal of equal justice under law. It is a necessary corollary of liberty. There can be no liberty if the life and property of men are subject to the arbitrary will of other men. Those who would destroy freedom in any country must make the courts a tool of the Government as they are in Russia. Modern totalitarian government cannot admit the right of any court to balk its policies. Of course the Communists go further. They do not admit that such a thing as real justice can exist, or that any tribunal can be truly impartial or decide cases on their merits. My objection to the Nuremberg trials was that, while clothed with the forms of jutsice, they were in fact an instrument of government policy, determined months before at Tehran and Yalta. Those who wrote the United Nations Charter at Dumbarton Oaks completely forgot the ideal of justice, and even today the charter is subject to serious criticism because it gives the Security Council power to act on grounds of expediency unrestrained by justice. Fortunately, when the issue is clearly presented, the American people feel deeply that we must have free and impartial courts. They reacted violently to the New Deal attempt to swamp the Supreme Court. We must oppose the powerful forces which today are still attempting to take from the courts the power to interpret the Constitution.

The New Deal and the present administration still seek the solution of every problem by the creation of boards and commissions, with power to make regulations having the force of law, with power to file prosecutions, try the alleged culprits and condemn them, practically without recourse to the courts. Of course, in our complicated modern system, there must be some control by administrative law, as in the fields of radio and air traffic, but it should be imposed in such a way as to preserve the maximum amount of freedom for those regulated, and subject the boards in enforcing it to the definite principles laid down by Congress on which an appeal can be taken to the courts.

Perhaps the greatest miscarriages of justice which have ever occurred in the United States occurred under the National Labor Relations Board interpreting the Wagner Act. Yet, today, President Truman is trying to restore the unlimited and unrestrained power of that Board. The Republican Party should stand today as it has stood in the past, for a rule of law instead of the rule of arbitrary men.

3. EQUALITY NO SPECIAL PRIVILEGE

In our defense of liberty, while today the primary threat is from totalitarian government seeking arbitrary power, we are equally determined to protect the individual from the oppression of private privilege and private power.

The Republican Party enacted the Sherman Act to prevent the economic power of monopoly. People often say that it is ineffective. My judgment is that it has an effect on all business thinking in the United States, and has done more to maintain freedom in the economic field than any other measure ever enacted. The contrast today between conditions here and those brought about in Europe by the cartel system is striking and conclusive.

Last year we passed the Taft-Hartley law for the parallel purpose of restraining the arbitrary power of labor-union leaders. Under previous laws their power had grown until they were able to dominate every private employer, except the largest ones, and to defy the public interest.

We have favored the increase of the minimum wage to protect the unorganized worker against the oppression of employers unrestrained by the proper power of labor unions.

Liberty may be ended by the tyranny of a majority of the people as well as by the tyranny of special groups. We are concerned that minorities shall receive fair treatment, the same rights to vote, to work, and to live their own lives as the majority. We are concerned that the economic system does not work to the unfair disadvantage of any group, either large or small, that the small-business man shall be able to prosper if he deserves it, that the general level of farm prices and farmers' income be not out of line with the level of industrial prices, that taxation fall with substantial equality on all the people in accordance with their ability to pay. Therefore, we enacted last year a bill directing the Government to maintain the price of farm products in reasonable relation to other prices, the concept of parity. We enacted a fair tax-reduction bill removing 7,000,000 of the lowest-income taxpayers from the income-tax rolls. We have sought repeatedly to enact anti-poll-tax and antilynching laws.

In all this kind of legislation, from the Sherman Act to the antilynching laws, the exact form of the statute must be such as to infringe as little as possible on the freedom of the individual and the local community. We should inject Federal power only where absolutely necessary and subject any action which may be authorized to review by impartial courts.

4. PEACE

Fourth. The Republican Party believes in peace. Republican Presidents have regarded war as evidence of the failure of their foreign policy. They have felt that there can be no greater tragedy than war and the limitation of liberty itself, even for the victorious nation; war, with its death and destruction, and perhaps the destruction of the very liberty it is designed to preserve. Horrible as war has been in the past, it will be still worse in the future. It can only be justified as absolutely essential to protect the liberty of our people. But today we have quietly adopted a tendency to interfere in the affairs of other nations, to assume that we are a kind of demigod and Santa Claus to solve the problems of the world, and that attitude is more and more likely to involve us in disputes where our liberty is not in fact concerned. It is easy to slip into an attitude of imperialism where war becomes an instrument of public policy rather than its last resort.

We must assist many nations to restore their economies from the disruption arising from the war because the spread of communism will encourage Russia to end the peace and threaten the freedom of America. We can well give economic assistance to underdeveloped areas of the world to relieve human misery which may lead to war. But let us do it in the spirit of humility. Let's not use our economic power to assume political power. Let's not promise a millennium which can only be reached by a people's own efforts and ability and character, and which we cannot deliver.

Of course, to preserve liberty, we must maintain armed forces sufficient to deter any attack upon us, but even that policy should not be carried to an extent in which the whole Nation is militarized and all our resources devoted to military purposes. We must not permit our over-all military policy to be determined by other than civilian administrators, or we would soon find that civilian life must be regulated as in time of war, and the very liberty which we are seeking to protect from foreign attack is destroyed at home.

5. HIGHER STANDARDS OF LIVING

And so we come to policies which will maintain full production, full employment, and a higher standard of living. In recent years, the American people, or perhaps only the politicians, have sometimes forgotten the essential principles of life in their search for more material welfare. Fortunately for us, liberty itself has proved to be the most active agent to bring about increased prosperity. It is unquestionably due to our system of a free economy that we have become the most productive country in the world, to which all other countries look for assistance and support. We have come where we are because the American has still the right to keep the proceeds of his efforts. There has been a constant incentive to redouble those efforts because of the reward given in material welfare. The Socialists overlook the tremendous importance of that incentive—the fact that most men do not like to work unless there is something to be gained. Lethargy has been the greatest enemy of progress.

We are concerned that the Government keep the economic machine running at a high rate of speed with as little friction and intermission as possible. We believe this can be brought about by sound fiscal policies, by balancing the budget, by a sound currency and proper control of credit. We believe in more of the same incentive and reward for workmen for good work done, such as that our system gives to the man who risks his time and money in new enterprise. Government action should be confined to keeping competition alive and preventing the destruction of freedom and should not be used to kill incentive. I am opposed to price control and wage control, to the prohibition of strikes even if collective bargaining has failed, to allocation controls; and, in general, to all attempts to substitute Government planning for the normal forces of competition.

I was in Europe in December. Every European country is hamstrung by government controls, by black markets, by the planners who forget human nature. Every country with controls is looking to the United States to share some part of the products of its liberty with those to whom liberty is denied.

I favor lower Government expenses because of the tremendous burden of taxation on the economic machine to which we look for production in taxes themselves. Already taxation is taking more than 25 percent of our national income. Already it is discouraging the development of private industry in some fields. Already the choking effect of the tax burden on productive activity is discouraging the very energy which produces the taxes, and once a buyer's market prevents the passing on of so much of the tax burden to the consumer it will be infinitely worse.

6. TO PREVENT HARDSHIP AND POVERTY

Finally we are interested, as every man concerned in government must be interested, in promoting better education, better health, better housing, better security for our people, and equality of opportunity, particularly for the children. These tasks are primarily the job of our States and local governments, and while Federal aid is often necessary in order that they may be properly done, particularly in the poorer States, there should be no Federal control or concentration of power in Washington. I believe the American people are convinced that with the tremendous productivity of our free country, we can prevent extreme hardship and poverty in the United States today, that we can maintain a minimum floor under education, health, housing, and food. We have recognized that obligation in the past, but the job has not been systematically done. With Federal aid it can be done, but there are plenty of pitfalls and dangers to liberty in the way in which it is done.

There are many respects in which we can promote efforts in behalf of the whole population, but our efforts should not include direct or indirect subsidy to the bulk of the people, or give men something for nothing, except where we do face problems of extreme hardship and poverty. Nothing can so quickly kill the incentive and the production of the people as to encourage them to look to Government as their benefactor and supporter.

Aid to those in the lowest income class is not dangerous because little of the energy and incentive is found there in any event. But a policy of Government hand-outs to all would impose an intolerable tax burden, would sap at the energy and liberty of the people and would destroy the American character.

Furthermore, no people as a whole can get something for nothing. They can only be fooled into such a hope. The idea that people can get their medical care from the Government without paying even a greater price than they pay today is fantastic. To the extent that we do support those at the very lowest end of the income field by aid or subsidy, they can only be supported by the other four-fifths of the population; and the burden must not be so great as to discourage that four-fifths from the magnificent job they are doing today.

I favor Federal aid to the States and local governments to enable them to extend medical care to all those who are unable to pay for it, but I am strenuously opposed to the system of socialized and nationalized medicine outlined in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill. Organized charity or Government welfare service to the whole population can destroy the freedom and also the character of the people to whom it is extended. It can increase the power of the Central Government in Washington until Washington bureaus govern the daily lives of every family

in the United States. Incentive and initiative can be paralyzed. We will be ruled by people who take no personal risks and create no jobs. The people will be taxed without realizing it through a deduction from pay roll, and perhaps get some part of those taxes back in the form of Government services and activity which they may or may not want. There is real danger to liberty in the welfare state.

But like Federal aid to medical care, I believe that Federal aid should be extended to enable local communities to provide decent public housing for those unable to pay the rents charged by privately owned homes of decent character. I favor the extension of Federal aid to States, particularly the poorer States so that they may provide adequate primary and secondary education for children no matter how poor the State or community in which they live. I favor the extension of the old-age-pension plan to all those employees not now included. There are other fields of social welfare in which the Federal Government can be of assistance if the safeguards are properly observed.

I have tried to outline what I conceive as the basic principles of the Republican Party. There was a time when these were the principles of all American parties, while they differed on less consequential matters. Even today the Democratic Party gives lip service to many of the varied principles which its policies are certain to destroy. The Republican Party has not done a very good job of publicizing its principles or the principles of American history and government. They are the principles in which the great majority of the American people still believe today. When their liberties have been directly affected by regulation, as the farmers in 1938 and the housewives in 1946, they have risen up with indignation against the party of Government controls. But they have not always realized the steady reduction of liberty by the steady advance of totalitarian government, nor the further threat involved in the program which is now presented by the Democratic Party. The Republican Party will survive and prevail, because it is in fact the party of American principle.

Need for Retrenchment in Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the January 26, 1949, issue of the Christian Century. The editorial is entitled "What Are We Promising?"

This editorial has been sent me by Rev. Bernard A. McIlhany, D. D., minister of the First Presbyterian Church at Fulton, Mo. In his letter of transmittal, Dr. McIlhany makes this very pertinent observation:

Some of us are terribly alarmed by the rising costs of government and signs which have recently appeared of decreasing employment. A day of judgment, we feel, cannot be far off, economically speaking. For that reason we are convinced that the time has come for some in authority to take a most courageous stand in favor of retrenchment in our Federal expenditures. If this is not done, then we cannot but believe that ill may be in the offing for us in our Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ARE WE PROMISING?

By this time every literate American presumably knows that the $41,858,000,000 budget for the fiscal year starting July 1, which President Truman has asked Congress to endorse, is the largest in the Nation's peacetime history. Presumably, most Americans also know that more than 75 percent of this huge sum is to pay for the Nation's defense establishment, its aid to foreign nations, its veterans' benefits, and its interest on the national debt—in other words, to pay for past wars or to prepare for future ones. The peacetime budget thus goes up another $1,658,000,000 over last year (it would be almost $4,000,000,000 higher if the President had stuck to the same bookkeeping used in previous years) and is more than $8,000,000,000 above the budget of 2 years ago. It is no wonder that Mr. Truman, finding that the Government will wind up slightly in the red this year and calling for these increased expenditures next, wants an additional $6,000,000,000 in taxes.

I

It has become trite to say that figures of this size have no real meaning for most of us. We know that they will push taxes up, and with approximately a quarter of the entire national income now going for taxes—Federal, State, and local—we ask ourselves in a vague grumble where this process is going to end. That mythical but mighty American, Joseph P. Doakes, can quickly estimate that a Federal budget of almost $42,000,000,000 means a tax of $284 for every inhabitant. In other words, if Joe is the sort of American who has a wife and three children, it means that the Federal tax for his family, if levied on a per capita basis, would be $1,420—which is as much as the total cash income of almost 40 percent of all the Joe Doakes' families in the United States.

Really, however, the only way to get any idea of what such figures mean is to compare them with something. Take, for example, the post-World War I national budgets. The peak year of Government costs in that war was 1918–19, when the figure, then regarded as stupendous, reached $18,522,000,000. After that it dropped steadily to $3,697,000,000, 4 years after the war—where we are today in relation to World War II—of which only $700,000,000, about 5 percent of the last war year's budget, went for defense. This 1923–24 total was, note, less than 18 percent of the 1918–19 high. Today our budget, in comparison with the $100,397,000,000 peak in 1945–46, is 41 percent of the wartime top, and more than a third is directly ticketed for defense, to say nothing of the additional sums to put other countries in shape to fight again.

Only a quarter of the President's budget is earmarked for all costs of Government at home, aside from the military costs already named, and for all the social-service expansions which made up the core of the President's policy message. Nevertheless, the tendency of the press has been to accept the military costs as beyond amendment—unless they are to be amended upward—and to hold that if the staggering cost of Government is to be reduced anywhere, it must be in the civil items. Thus, the conservative New York Times, while remarking that the Nation wants to get its money's worth for what it pours into the defense establishment, specifically points to the items for social welfare, agriculture, natural resources, transport, and communications as the places where Congress can best wield its pruning knife. Congressmen talk in the same vein.

II

Yet one of the most important facts about the budget message was that the President stated that the $21,000,000,000 he asked for defense and for foreign aid was not all that he would ask. More requests of the same sort, he said, are certainly coming, and still more are probable. Among the "probables," he spoke of "furnishing military supplies to certain countries"—the countries being unspecified but not including the Greece, Turkey, China, and Korea we are already supplying. Among the "certainties" will be the cost of the arms lend-lease program which is the heart of what Mr. Truman spoke of as "the prospective North Atlantic arrangements." What this will add to the military expenses to be loaded on the United States taxpayer, no authoritative source has revealed, but it will run into 10 digits at the very least.

The President thus used the occasion of his budget message to put himself behind the magnification of the Truman doctrine into the North Atlantic Defence Alliance, and he did it in such a way as to tell Congress that he assumes the Senate will ratify the alliance. Will it? The Washington correspondents take it for granted that it will. The press, so far as it mentions the proposal, rarely opposes. Labor, farm, educational, and church organizations on this issue are lying low and saying little. But we still believe that before a measure of such permanent consequence, in such defiance of the Nation's history and previous policy, can slip through Congress, the Senate is oath-bound to subject it to searching scrutiny and debate. If it does, the first question that should be settled is, To what does this military alliance commit the United States in the way of promises?

III

On the day President Truman plumped for the alliance, James Reston, the superb correspondent who covers the State Department for the New York Times, had an apparently officially inspired dispatch in that paper saying that the constitutional difficulties in the way of pledging United States military support to the proposed five European allies (see the Christian Century for December 22) had been ironed out. The pending treaty of alliance, according to Mr. Reston, now leaves the United States Congress with its constitutional right to declare war, but it still safeguards England, France, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg by making these three promises:

1. It accepts the principle that an armed attack on any one of the signatories is an attack on all.

2. Each signatory would agree to "assist" any other attacked, although the nature of this assistance is not defined as sending troops.

3. The signatories would also be bound to consult together (if requested by one of the signatories) "on any threat to the peace anywhere in the world."

The five European signatories, Mr. Reston believes, will be unhappy about the obvious loophole in the second of these three promises. They will look at the contrasting hard-and-fast promise of all-out military support in the Brussels pact and say that is what they thought they were to get when they started into this North Atlantic scheme. For that reason, Mr. Reston suggests, the alliance may be fought in the Senate because it does not go far enough.

It could not go any farther and leave unaltered article I of the Constitution of the United States. And viewed in the light of political actualities, the loophole is more verbal than real. With the promise that the United States will regard any attack on another signatory as an attack on itself, with the staffs of the United States defense branches interlocked and continuously working as part of the staffs of the other allies, with the United States economy increasingly geared to and dependent on the revived lend-lease, and with United States Army units

scattered in all the occupation posts of Europe, there is no possibility that in case of an overt Russian attack on any of the five European signatories the United States would refuse to assist in military terms.

But how much more do the generalized provisions outlined by Mr. Reston promise? What are the specific implications of the blanket commitments? That is what the Senate needs to find out. Take, for instance, the question of colonies. Britain, France, Holland, and Belgium are not simply nations in western Europe; they are nations with vast colonial holdings in Asia and Africa and in the island world. French rule in Indochina and Dutch rule in Indonesia are under attack today, and there is every chance that British rule in Malaya will be tomorrow. In every instance, if the French and Dutch precedents hold good, attacks on these colonial holdings will be pictured as Communist aggression, Moscow-inspired if not Moscow-financed and led. Before many years pass, the colonial empires of the Belgians and the others in Africa may come under the same sort of attack. So may the British, French, and Dutch regimes in the island colonies which lie athwart the world's ocean trade routes.

To what does this proposed North Atlantic Defense Alliance commit the United States in regard to the ability of our intended European allies to hang onto these colonies? During the recent war, the Japanese drove the colonial governments out of all the colonies in Asia and the Pacific. They would not be back there today if the United States had not put them back. Is this alliance a promise that, having put them back, we will keep them there? Asians, in particular, as well as the people of the United States, need to know.

Or take the case of a Communist aggression against some state not a member of the alliance. For purposes of illustration, let us say Italy. In that event, we are told, the alliance pledges that its signatories will consult. That may look innocuous on the surface. But under such circumstances the United Nations are also pledged to consult. This consultation by the members of the alliance must therefore be either a new method by which to by-pass the UN or a different kind of consultation. Or it may be both. It may be a way of ignoring the UN while the seven allies meet within the framework of their military alliance, under the direction of their military staffs, with a view to joint military action—not only in Italy but anywhere in the world.

If these are the sort of promises which are implied in the military alliance for which President Truman is presently to ask more billions, then the possibilities of involvement stretch out far beyond anything of which the American people have dreamed. Indeed, one strange and disquieting fact about this whole alliance proposal is that up to the present the American people have been kept almost totally ignorant of it, and are therefore so widely indifferent concerning it. There is a real danger that, unless this blanket of silence in which the subject is now muffled can be lifted, the alliance may be slipped through the Senate before any large part of the American public knows what is going on.

Here is a responsibility which church commissions and committees formed to deal with international affairs should not continue to evade. Even more, if there are Members of Congress who intend to be something more than rubber stamps of the Pentagon on matters of foreign policy and military commitments, it is time for them to drag the text of the proposed treaty of alliance into the open and to require of President Truman and the generals a chapter-and-verse definition and explanation of exactly what this Nation is promising.

Foreword to the Memoirs of Gen. Claire Lee Chennault

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the foreword to the memoirs of Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, which is entitled "Way of a Fighter." This book is just being published, and this foreword contains information about the tragic Chinese situation, which this Government is largely responsible for through our official policy toward China. It is worth the reading of every American citizen.

Notwithstanding an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that it will cost $248.50 to print the foreword, it has such merit and value that I request its printing.

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The United States is losing the Pacific war.

Three years after VJ-day this country is facing the loss of everything it won during the four bloody years it took to defeat Japan.

Here are the facts:

Gen. George C. Marshall told Congress in the spring of 1948 that if Manchuria were lost to the Chinese Communists, the United States position in southern Korea would be untenable.

Manchuria has been lost to the Chinese Communists.

General Marshall also told Congress that if the Chinese Communists controlled north China the United States position in Japan would be extremely serious.

North China has been lost to the Chinese Communists.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur warned the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the fall of 1948 that if the Chinese Communists take the lower Yangtze Valley and Shanghai the American military bastion on Okinawa will be outflanked and his position in Japan will be as exposed and untenable as it was in the Philippines during 1941.

As this is written, the Chinese Communists are fighting toward the Yangtze at Nanking. They are aiming to force a Yangtze crossing and sweep to Shanghai.

A complete Communist victory in China will channelize the undercurrents of native unrest already swirling through Burma, India, Malaya, and Indonesia into another rising tide of Communist victories. The ring of Red bases can be stretched from Siberia to Saigon. Then the stage will be set for the unannounced explosion of world war III.

I have completed a decade of observing and administering American policy in Asia. I am convinced that this policy is plunging us into a disastrous repetition of the errors that dragged us into World War II. I can hear the time fuze of a third world war sputtering in China as it burns toward the final powder keg, and I cannot stand idly by without making every effort in my power to snuff it out.

It was not an easy decision for me to publish this book. I have had my share of heartbreaks and have always felt it best to keep my peace. I have no taste for muckraking as a pastime, and I believe it is important for a people to have confidence in its leaders.

However, it is axiomatic that in periods of crisis a nation must have the very best of its leadership if it is to survive. The last war seared Russia to its heart. In the bloody catastrophes of the early war years the Russian leadership was pared to the hard, competent core that engineered Soviet survival. It is leadership of the very best the Russians can offer that we face today.

I am not so sure the United States has shaken down to its very best leadership. Even now the lingering fog of wartime military censorship obscures the sharp edge of disaster on which we teetered in the spring of 1942 when Japan swept the southern seas. In the flush of final military victory it was only human to forget the lessons of the mistakes that led us into jeopardy. In the relief of the slaughter's end it is all too easy to weary of the battle to keep the peace that follows every war.

Many of the things in this book have been set down with genuine regret. I realize that much written here may be painful for some of the personalities discussed and that the countercriticism that is sure to come may be personally distasteful to me. But I can remain silent no longer. The stakes are now too high. I must take the long chance that by offering my evidence on the last decade in the Orient I may contribute something to an accurate estimate of the problems we now face and the direction in which we are drifting. Nothing less than our national survival depends on how well we understand this drift and navigate a new course.

China is the key to the Pacific. Politics are variable, but geography is a constant. It is the geography of China that makes that unhappy land so important. Whatever sentimental appeal there may be in the American aid for China, the United States attitude toward China should be based on a thoroughly realistic appraisal of China's value to the United States.

This country is now engaged in a worldwide struggle with Russia over organization of the world. The problem is whether war with Russia is inevitable or whether the world can be organized as a cooperative venture. The in-peace decision depends entirely on the shifting balance of strength between the positions of the United States and Russia.

There is a growing accumulation of intelligence to indicate that Soviet leaders already consider their Asiatic victories of sufficient strategic importance to tip the world balance of power decisively in favor of Russia.

The Russians understand the role of China in this balance well. Since the beginning of the Chinese Revolution in the early 1920's Russians have been active in bending China to their purpose. After they lost their first chance to gain control of China in 1927, the Soviet leaders vigorously aided any cause that might weaken the Japanese program to hitch China to its imperialistic chariot. Now, with Japan defeated, Russia is again shrewdly exploiting the weakness of American policy in China to make her most determined bid for domination of that vast, strategic area.

The Russians seem to learn something from history. They have watched their German neighbors go down to shattering defeat twice in a two-front war. There is considerable evidence that the Soviet leaders are determined to avoid that pitfall. While Germany was a prewar menace on the western flank, Russia carefully avoided war with Japan despite ample provocation by the Japanese. Pitched battles using airplanes and tanks were fought on the Manchurian frontier in 1932 and 1936 between the Russians and Japanese, but the Russians refused to be

baited into a full-scale war. Russia was also wary of taking on even a badly mauled Japan in 1945 until the Soviet victory over Germany was complete.

I seriously question that Russia will make anything more than probing skirmishes in Europe until her Asiatic flank is secure. The flurries of Russian activity in Europe are largely tests of American policy and smoke screens to divert attention from the fact that Russia is acquiring vast natural resources, strategic bases, and securing its most vulnerable flank in the Orient.

The Russians are well aware, even if most Americans are not, of the strategic implications of China. North China and Manchuria were the industrial bases that furnished more than one-third of all Japanese war production. From air bases built for the Americans during the last war at Chengtu, Sian, and Lanchow in northwest China, all of the vast Russian industry east of the Ural Mountains is open to air attack. From these same bases and dozens of others in north China the slender thread of Russian communications between eastern and western Siberia could be snapped by even a small air force. With north China controlled by a government friendly to the United States, Russia's only access to these fields would be across a thousand miles of Turkestan desert. As a result of the Communist sweep in China many of these vital fields are already in the hands of Chinese Communists. From Okinawa, Japan, and the Philippines, American air power can only peck away at the perimeter of Russia's vitals. From north and central China the same force could strike deeply into Russia's industrial heart.

These, then, are the stakes for which we are playing in China. If China remains friendly to the United States, the Russians will dare not move deeper into Europe leaving their vitals exposed on the Asiatic flank. If the Asiatic flank is secured and American air power is pushed out beyond a critical range, then the way will be open for new and more powerful ventures in Europe.

It is now obvious that the United States played its prewar hand in Asia badly. Initial Japanese aggression in Manchuria during 1931 and 1932 was the tip-off to the potential aggressors that the world would not be organized on a basis of collective security. It showed clearly that the Western Powers would not stick together to keep the peace. It is the answer to precisely this same question that the Russians are probing for today. On this answer will depend their future plans. Our record in China so far has provided them with the same answer as in 1931. If our China policy continues along its present course the Russians will probably be justified in concluding that our determination to preserve the peace is no stronger now than that of the western nations in 1931–32. In that case, their decision will favor further aggression that can only lead to war.

After Japanese attacks on China in 1937 the United States failed to enforce its open-door policy in China and allowed Japan to exclude us from the Yangtze and China's coastal ports. At the same time the United States sold enormous quantities of scrap iron, oil, and aviation supplies to Japan. We were wakened from that fool's dream one Sunday morning by the sound of Japanese bombs blasting Pearl Harbor.

Our wartime policy in China failed to retrieve our prewar losses. Primarily because of the leadership of Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, we failed to achieve either the military or the political objectives desired in China. Not until Stilwell was succeeded by Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer did American policy in China bear any resemblance to that of two allies fighting a common foe.

Immediately after the war, Wedemeyer continued to execute a firm and constructive policy. Already he had regained much of the ground lost by Stilwell and had promising prospects of complete success. Collapse of Japan found the Generalissimo's armies still in south and west China far from the vital ports and industrial centers held by the Japanese. Chinese Communist armies, in contrast, lay along the lower Yangtze Valley and near all the major centers of north China. But in this race to relieve the Japanese, the United States provided air lift that enabled the Generalissimo's armies to leapfrog Communist forces in their path and occupy the key cities. Navy transports later moved other Chinese divisions to Manchurian ports to begin occupation of the vital area.

To his everlasting credit, Wedemeyer diagnosed the situation accurately and acted with promptness and decision to avert this initial Communist crisis and prevent the Chinese Communists from taking over control of China's key areas from the Japanese. Later Wedemeyer made a thorough study of China's postwar problems and blueprinted a detailed plan for the type and quantity of American aid required to help the Chinese effectively reorganize their shattered country. The recommendations of this report were not only ignored but the report itself was ruthlessly suppressed, and the American people and their Congress have been deprived of the testimony of a man who is perhaps our best authority on postwar China. Even at this late date the Wedemeyer report on China should be made public.

After a summer of diplomatic maneuvering between the Generalissimo and Chinese Communist leaders, the civil war broke out into the open again in October 1945. The Generalissimo's armies still had their American-supplied equipment. Well equipped with trucks, artillery, machine guns, and mortars they began a systematic mop-up of Communist troops wherever they could be found. The Generalissimo's offensive was well under way and progressing successfully when Gen. George C. Marshall reached China in November 1945 as a special emissary. Marshall has now retired in poor health after devoting a life-time of great service to his country. He carries with him the respect of all those, including myself, who worked with him during the war and of all who shared his labors during the trying postwar years.

It was unfortunate that his assignment in China was to carry out a policy set for him by the State Department that was utterly impossible to execute. The failure of Marshall's China mission had its roots in these faulty orders. Under normal circumstances it would seem less than fair not to ignore this episode in the career of a man who has done so much for his country. However, a full discussion of this period in our China policy is absolutely essential to understand what is going on in Asia and why our national survival is at stake. Here in Shanghai, with China crumbling before my eyes, I have no choice but to discuss the Marshall mission frankly.

Marshall was a rigidly disciplined "spit and polish" soldier of the "Black Jack" Pershing school, and he came to China fresh from five years as the head of the most powerful military organization in the world. Marshall was used to conducting his business through direct orders promptly executed without question. By the time Marshall reached China that country was reduced to a state of disorganization where getting things accomplished by the Chinese Government required rare tact, flexibility, and judgment. Only 4 years of a far less brutal enemy occupation reduced France to a position where it is still impossible to organize a responsible government. China suffered 8 years of occupation interlarded with intermittent civil war that left economic chaos and political turbulence so violent it was impossible for an occidental to understand it at first glance. Marshall's judgment of China by his strict soldier's standards and tight concept of organization could hardly have aided his understanding of the Chinese problems he came to solve.

Marshall also came to China with a set of orders utterly impossible to carry out. They were given to him by a State Department that was the source of a Russian policy now admitted to have been a grievous error. Marshall did not originate that policy, and, when he became Secretary of State, he was the leader in the fight to change it. However, in his China mission he was saddled with these State Department orders; good soldier that he was, he strove to carry them out to the letter despite all obstacles and regardless of how hopeless he himself may have thought the task set for him.

Marshall's orders were to bring an end to the Chinese civil war and stimulate a coalition government in China by taking the Chinese Communists into the existing government headed by the Generalissimo. These orders were the product of the Yalta-Potsdam political climate that based American policy on the assumption that it was both possible and necessary to cooperate with the Russians. During the period when this utterly mistaken notion guided American policy, it was China that suffered the most serious consequences.

To guide him in this complex and difficult role, Marshall had the conflicting testimony of two of his close personal friends—Stilwell and Wedemeyer. Unfortunately, he accepted Stilwell's version of China and Chinese leadership almost at face value. This could not help but complicate his task.

Net result of Marshall's 15-month mission to China was much the same as Stilwell's earlier experience. The trend of a gradually stronger Central Government was reversed and the military balance shifted again in favor of the Chinese Communists.

Stripped to its essentials, here is what the Marshall mission did to China. It forced a truce to the Chinese civil war at a time when the Central Government forces were winning. When the Generalissimo naturally balked at endorsing a policy that meant military disaster for his forces, Marshall applied pressure in the Stilwell manner by shutting off the flow of all American military aid to China, including war surplus bought and paid for by the Chinese. This arms embargo lasted for nearly a year. He also summarily scuttled a Sino-American agreement made in September 1945 whereby the United States agreed to supply China with planes and equipment for an eight and one-third group air force, including four-engine bombers. Marshall also extracted a promise from the Generalissimo not to use the Chinese Air Force already in China against the Communists on the grounds that this would constitute offensive action. Restricting the Chinese Air Force deprived the Generalissimo of his most potent weapon. It was also implied that discussions regarding a $500,000,000 loan to China could not be resumed until a truce was effected in the civil war. Marshall did not know then that the most effective Washington opposition to the Chinese loan was coming from Henry Wallace, a man whose position on Russia has since become quite clear.

The truce sponsored and pushed by Marshall, with all the diplomatic resources of the United States at his disposal, forced the Generalissimo to halt his anti-Communist offensive at a time when it was on the verge of wiping out large bodies of Chinese Communist troops. Some 50 truce teams each were dispatched to trouble spots all over China. Each was headed by an elderly American colonel specially picked for his white hair to impress the Chinese. Here are some specific examples of what they accomplished.

North of Hankow some 200,000 Government troops had surrounded 70,000 Communist troops and were beginning a methodical job of extermination. The Communists appealed to Marshall on the basis of

his truce proposal, and arrangements were made for the fighting to cease while the Communists marched out of the trap and on to Shantung Province, where a large Communist offensive began about a year later. On the East River near Canton some 100,000 Communist troops were trapped by Government forces. The truce teams effected their release and allowed the Communists to march unmolested to Bias Bay, where they boarded junks and sailed to Shantung.

The worst fiasco was at Kalgan Pass. This gap in the north China mountains is a historic gateway between China and Manchuria. At the end of the war there were no organized Communists in Manchuria. Chinese Communists flocked from their base in Northwest China through the Kalgan Pass to join the Russian troops in Manchuria. When the Chinese Government troops occupied Manchuria they found the great industrial centers stripped bare of machinery and the tremendous arsenals of the famed Japanese Kwantung Army empty. There was no trace of either the Kwantung Army or its equipment.

Early in 1946 a government offensive captured Kalgan and sealed off the pass, trapping nearly a million Chinese Communists in northwest China who were moving toward Manchuria. The Communists complained that they were merely returning to their prewar homes in Manchuria. Marshall made strenuous efforts to get the Generalissimo to open the Kalgan Pass for these Communists. Eventually the Generalissimo yielded, withdrew his troops in June 1946, and the Communist horde poured into Manchuria. The Communists then broke the truce by fortifying Kalgan Pass. A year later Chinese Government armies had to fight a bloody campaign to recapture the pass they voluntarily evacuated under the truce.

In January 1947 the mystery of what happened to the Japanese Kwantung Army equipment was solved. The poorly armed Chinese Communists who marched north the year before now swarmed south from Manchuria armed with Japanese rifles, machine guns, mortars, tanks, and artillery. They even had Japanese aircraft, but no gas or pilots to operate them. The Russians had simply turned over the Japanese equipment to the Chinese Communists and thus endowed them with a rich military legacy.

Conservative estimates of the Japanese military stock pile in Manchuria seized by the Russians appraise it as sufficient matériel to supply a million men for 10 years of fighting. By using Japanese munitions the Russians avoided the necessity of investing their own resources and are able to claim that no Russian arms were sent to China. The Manchurian booty represents the total investment the Russians can afford in China at present. They lack the industry in eastern Siberia to supply a sustained war effort even for themselves. Transportation facilities across Siberia are too meager to supply China from the Russian Ural industrial area.

It was these troops who marched under a safe conduct of the American-sponsored truce through Kalgan Pass and returned with Japanese arms that won the decisive battles in Manchuria in the summer of 1947. They were opposed by the Government's American-trained divisions. While the Communists were being rearmed by the Russians, the Government divisions had their supplies cut off by what Marshall freely admits was a 10-month embargo on American military supplies to China. Since these Chinese divisions had been equipped in the spring and summer of 1945 their arms, ammunition, and trucks badly needed replacement. Two years of hard campaigning had worn their rifle barrels smooth, exhausted their ammunition, and battered the trucks they relied on for transport and supply. All of their equipment was American and without American replacements, spare parts, and ammunition it was virtually useless.

It did not take long for the well-armed Communists to chew up the Government divisions, armed only with the worn remnants of 2-year-old American equipment and minus an effective air force. The Chinese armies that Stilwell and Wedemeyer trained in India and west China perished early in 1947 on the frozen Manchurian plains. The stage was set for the final mop-up of Manchuria in the summer of 1948 and the Communist offensive into north China that at this writing has swept almost to the north bank of the Yangtze and gravely threatens Nanking and Shanghai.

Marshall also sought, as part of his orders, to force the Generalissimo into a variety of political changes, including formation of a coalition government with Communists in the cabinet.

At the time of the Marshall mission the Chinese Communists' terms for entering the Chinese National Government were one-third of the cabinet members, including the war minister, retention of a Communist army of 48 divisions, and the governorships of all provinces where the Communist troops then claimed occupation of a majority of the area. The fate of Czechoslovakia has since proved how fatal this would have been to the existing Government of China. Inclusion of Communists in a coalition front is a standard preliminary tactical maneuver in a Communist seizure of power. It is a technique that may well be attempted again in China if the Communists feel that an attempt to gain complete military victory may cost more than they can afford.

The Generalissimo had been dealing with Communists inside and outside the Chinese Government for more than 20 years. He got part of his education in Moscow's Communist academies. He thoroughly understood the Communist motives and techniques and knew that a Communist minority in a coalition government would actually result in complete Communist domination of China.

Marshall was then just beginning his political dealings with the Communists. It is obvious he has learned a good deal about their tactics since then. Marshall's orders in China did not permit him to act as though the struggle between the Communists and Chinese Government were anything more than minor maneuvering between rival political factions. He was not able then to view it as the basic struggle that it certainly is wherever that issue is drawn. Marshall had to persist in professing the idea that including Communists in a coalition government was no more serious than adding a few Republicans to a Democratic cabinet. Too many Americans tend to interpret the life and death struggles of foreign politics in the same light as the bitter, but by no means fatal, rivalry of American politics. There is a vast difference.

When his coalition plans collapsed and fighting flared again, Marshall finally gave up his China venture. He returned to the United States with a "plague on both your houses" speech that was a remarkable confession that his early profession of faith in the integrity of the Communists was not justified by their subsequent actions. Marshall's disillusionment over the prospect of working with Communists on a basis of mutual trust was symptomatic of the general shift in American policy toward Russia that occurred during roughly the same period. American policy in Europe was adjusted to this realistic appraisal of the Communists and their intentions. Our China policy never changed.

While Marshall has done a good job of applying the lessons of his Chinese political education to Europe, he has been reluctant to undertake the fundamental reappraisal of his China policy required by subsequent events. Current American aid to China is largely food relief because of the State Department's insistence that military aid cannot be effective until the Chinese Government inaugurates sweeping political and economic reforms.

In this policy I believe the State Department has the cart before the horse. Military aid should have top priority. Without a military decision there can never be the internal stability required for any effective reforms. Last March, when the Marshall plan for China was presented to Congress, I was appalled to note that only one-sixth of the program was devoted to the military aid so desperately needed.

At the request of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, then headed by Representative CHARLES EATON, of New Jersey, I flew from Shanghai to Washington to plead for a more realistic approach to China's problems and a more intelligent understanding of the United States stake in Asia. My 51-hour flight on a Great Circle course from Shanghai to Washington via Northwest Airlines offered dramatic evidence of how the Pacific world had shrunk when compared with my initial 14-day steamship trip to China in 1937.

I told Congress last March that unless effective military aid was immediately forthcoming for China, the Chinese Communists would overrun Manchuria and be well on their way to taking all of North China within 6 months. Congress authorized military aid of $125,000,000 to China, but the summer was spent in endless dickering with the State Department and National Military Establishment over details of that aid, and not until October of 1948 did these munitions begin to flow to China. By then, 7 months after my gloomy prophecy, the Communists had all of Manchuria and most of North China, and were marching toward Nanking.

The situation is now deteriorating so rapidly in China that I cannot venture further prophecy on its outcome. However, there are two salient facts of which I am sure. First is that the United States needs a new and effective policy in China. This will require a thorough reexamination of our present policy and our capacity to support any changes. But there is an acute danger that we may no longer have time for such consideration and that the Communists may win complete victory in China before a new American policy can be formed. Reliable reports indicate that the Communist generals are planning to force a Yangtze crossing early in the spring of 1949. Russians are now reported to be training a Chinese Communist air force near Mukden to provide the air cover without which a crossing of the Yangtze might be impossible. Captured Japanese planes and Russian second-line fighters are being turned over to the Chinese Communist air center.

In view of this situation the immediate goal of the United States must be some sort of holding action that will prevent a decisive Communist victory while our China policy is being debated. This action requires neither vast monetary nor military outlays. Its principal requirement is swift action lest we lose our chance forever. The recent history of China is studded with examples of how small technically well-equipped forces can exert decisive influence in China out of all proportion to their size.

This holding action in China to prevent the Communists from organizing the great Chinese land mass against us is imperative if we are to gain the time required for a searching analysis of our world-wide foreign policy and the development of a sound method of working with the Chinese to replace our present policy of sticking a finger in the European dike while the Asiatic dam bursts.

My second certainty is that the price of peace in the Pacific world is going up at an

astronomical rate, and we shall eventually have to pay that bill in full. Looking back over the last decade, we can easily trace the soaring cost of an effective American policy in China.

During the war, cost of such a program would have been negligible. The twin goals of defeating Japan and establishing a strong, friendly Chinese regime were orginally inseparable segments of a common goal. Stilwell's failure to recognize this fact lost that opportunity and helped set off the chain reaction that brought us to the brink of the current crisis.

Immediately after the war the cost of China aid rose only slightly. Thanks to the good work done by Wedemeyer and his staff and the availability of a vast stock of war surplus in the Pacific bases, the Chinese Government could have been given the military power to withstand aggression and turn to the pressing problems of internal reform with little additional cost to the American taxpayer. Marshall's arms embargo on China squandered that opportunity and gave the Chinese Communists the breathing spell they needed to refurbish their ragged hordes at the captured Japanese stock piles in Manchuria.

By the spring of 1948 official estimates of the cost of China aid had risen to a billion and a half dollars, plus establishment of a large American military mission in China. That opportunity, too, was lost largely as a result of the State Department's insistence on economic aid that did little but waste American dollars, instead of the military aid required. How high the cost will eventually go or how many further opportunities we will allow to pass without action I cannot guess. I am only sure that eventually we shall have to pay it in full just as we had to pay the long-deferred bill for a decade's indifference to the Orient that Japan presented at Pearl Harbor just 7 years ago.

We face essentially the same choice the British faced in 1938 in Munich. I am well aware of the dangers of bleeding American economy white through a vast arms program and foreign aid. That could be as disastrous as military defeat. But we must face up to our present problem as the British failed to do at Munich. Then they were appalled at the possible price for resisting German aggression. They felt they could not afford that cost. Yet that choice only boosted the final bill to the fantastic total they had to pay. When the bill was finally presented they had no choice but to pay it or accept the end of their nation. The failure to pay the price at Munich eventually cost the British five grinding years of war that eroded their national economy to a bare sustenance level and lost the bulk of their Empire. The United States must not make the same mistake simply because we shrink from facing facts.

Many people now admit the validity of this thesis. Few, however, believe there is anything we can do about it. Can we really do anything? We most emphatically can. First we can throw in small, carefully selected military aid tailored to meet the specific problem of the moment in China—a holding action to defend the lower Yangtze Valley and Shanghai. If Shanghai can be held, it will prevent the Communists from organizing the north bank of the Yangtze well enough to support a military thrust across the river into South China.

Along with this aid we must send technically skilled and imaginative leaders who can improvise to meet rapidly changing situations and who can gain the confidence of the Chinese with whom they work. The Chinese may not understand the workings of an internal combustion engine, but they can see through a man and tell what makes him tick in an instant. They have been evaluating human nature for thousands of years and are experts. Naturally the Chinese will not work effectively with foreigners unless they feel these foreigners are genuinely sympathetic to their cause and country.

We must recognize that the Orient is a primary field of American interest and must stop allowing our affairs in this area to be conducted by second-rate men. We are only now beginning to develop some China experts in the field who show real promise, but policy in Washington is still formulated by incompetent scrubs in the State Department, not deemed fit to play in the European game, while men of Wedemeyer's caliber and ability sit on the side lines.

Many of our so-called China experts contend that things are so bad in China now that it is impossible to do anything to change them. This is sheer nonsense. This is the same type of thinking that said it was impossible for China to resist Japan in 1937. Yet it was Japan who suffered the final defeat.

The experts said the American volunteer group wouldn't last 3 weeks in combat, yet with 250 men and $8,000,000 we smashed the Japanese air force over China and kept bombs off Chinese cities for the first time in 3 years.

The experts wrote off China as finished again when the Japanese took Burma and cut the last land line of supply. They said the air lift across the "hump" was impractical and impossible. The airmen of the air transport command and China National Aviation Corp. did the impossible by flying more than a million tons across the "hump" and kept China going on airborne supply for as long as was necessary. The military experts said the Japanese Army would run the Fourteenth Air Force out of East China, but again a handful of good men with good airplanes refused to be licked. In the spring of 1945 it was the starving Japanese Army that was getting out of East China as fast as its underfed legs could carry it, and not the Fourteenth Air Force.

Again after the war I was assured by the experts that it would be impossible for me to organize a new air line in China. Today that air line is flying 4,000,000 ton-miles a month. I have been working with Americans and Chinese for so long now who have been doing the alleged impossible for many years that I have no patience with the critics who are experts only at inventing reasons for doing nothing. I think it is high time we scuttled them in favor of leaders who have the imagination, energy, and intelligence to accomplish the so-called impossible. That is certainly the type of leadership that has made the United States a great Nation.

It is not yet too late for effective action in China. The Chinese Communist armies are operating off lines of supply that are badly stretched. Their present position is similar to that of the Japanese at the end of their initial push into east China in 1944 when they were vulnerable to the stranglehold of airpower. The Communists are now moving into territory that has not been politically organized in their favor as well as the northern provinces. The Communists, like the Japanese before them, do not—as yet—have the air umbrella necessary to protect their ground offensives against sustained air attacks. It is certainly not impossible for a small force of stout men who know the terrain to apply the best of modern equipment against critical Communist weak spots and halt the advance in its tracks. This would save the lower Yangtze Valley and south and west China as a base in which Chinese nationalism could reorganize, and after learning the lessons of its defeat, political and military, set out again under its own steam to liberate the rest of China.

Whatever happens in China's immediate future, if it is considered United States policy to prevent Communist organization of that country, it is necessary to maintain this base and maintain some form of non-Communist central government in China. If the territory not yet conquered by the Chinese Communists is allowed to revert to the domination of provincial war lords, it will eventually be divided, defeated, and absorbed by the Communists piecemeal just like the small separate states of eastern Europe.

The creation and preservation of a central government has been the historic role of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in modern China. He has been the driving will that has held together a country of loose political organization and primitive communications in even a semblance of national unity. It is significant that leaders of all the divergent political elements in China except the Communists have appreciated the necessity of Chinese unity. For this reason they have supported the Generalissimo on broad national issues regardless of their disagreements with him on internal policy. It is for this reason that I, too, have loyally supported the Generalissimo during my long residence in China. It was the Generalissimo who stood between China and surrender to Japan, and it was the Generalissimo who stood between China and complete chaos after the war.

Whatever the future may hold, it will be necessary to have some centralizing force to preserve the independent spirit of China and prevent its domination by foreign powers.

Despite a decade of American bungling in China this country still has a vast reservoir of good will among the Chinese people. The Chinese Government now has little faith in us because of the long record of broken American promises and action that only served to strengthen the Communist opposition. In the coastal ports most Chinese look on the Americans as successors to the British and French economic imperialists whose only aim is to exploit China for personal profit. But in the vast hinterland there are millions of Chinese who still look on the United States as the only hope in establishing a peaceful and independent China and still remember the American airmen as the reason Japanese bombs stopped falling.

It would not take much concrete effective aid to capitalize on this sentiment. Many Chinese are now accepting the Communists only because they feel the United States has abandoned China to its fate. At the first real sign of American interest in China these marginal millions would abandon the Communists.

As a practicing warrior for many years, I am convinced of the complete futility of war. It settles only problems of the past and creates the new problems of the future. There is no place in the world today for the narrow, competitive nationalism that sparks the tinder of war. My long experience as an airman has taught me the folly of the artificial borders of political states. The ease with which the airman passes them by with his load of peaceful commerce or atomic destruction should have served notice long since that they are no longer necessary.

I am convinced that the people of this planet must ultimately and inevitably move toward a single form of world government if civilization is to survive. But it is our immediate task to see that this world government comes as a mutual federation of free peoples rather than through the ruthless domination of a master state enslaving all the others. In this struggle there are still many battles that cannot be avoided. The most critical of these now is to prevent the Communists from organizing the vast and rich land mass of China under their whip and turning its weight against us and the other free peoples of the world.

CLAIRE LEE CHENNAULT.

SHANGHAI, CHINA, *January 1949.*

News Letter to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I am including my semimonthly news letter to my constituents:

JANUARY 25, 1949.

IN THE MILL AT WASHINGTON

(By Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH)

INAUGURAL DAY, JANUARY 20, 1949

The weather favored Harry Truman on his great day. It was midwinter, of course, and for 2 days before weather reports said: "A blizzard is sweeping across the Plains States." We did not see how it could miss Washington. The city was in a gala mood, a carnival atmosphere prevailed with bleacher seats along the entire parade route. In anticipation of bad weather, snow-removal machinery was on hand from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Maryland, and Virginia. But the day was beautiful—clear and crisp. The next day it rained steadily. Harry Truman's luck held out. One Republican said: "How can you beat him when the Lord is on his side?"

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS

As he spoke to more than 25,000 people in front of the Capitol, he was a confident individual. He was not hampered by the shadow of Roosevelt. This time he was on his own, it was his day. He made the most of it. The crowd was in a serious mood.

His speech was a declaration to the world of his aims for the United States. Peace was his central theme. But he lashed out against communism; Russia was the target and the Soviet ambassador who was present refused to comment. Truman's four points covered the United Nations, support for world economic recovery, military agreements for security with freedom-loving nations, and, finally, said he, "We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas." This means a world WPA and its objective is to cushion a recession, now on the way. New Deal strategy.

His program is an ambitious one. It will not be achieved in the next 4 years. Much of it is controversial. The country is united in the desire to prevent the spread of communism. Is it not strange, however, that he did not refer to communism in the United States? While he was uttering his condemnation of communism abroad, ten Communist leaders were on trial in New York for subversive activities. Yet the President has said that this is only a "red herring."

He spoke of liberty and freedom for all peoples everywhere—yet while he did so the Red Communists in China were taking over. And our own foreign policy is responsible for this disaster. Roosevelt, at Yalta, put the skids under China in exchange for a promise by Stalin that Russia would enter the war against Japan. All our efforts and sacrifices in the Pacific have now gone down the drain. Russia commands China and Manchuria, so how can we prevent Japan, the Philippines, Australia, India, and all of the Pacific from going communistic? Here are planted the seeds for world war III. It is Mr. Truman's problem and responsibility.

MILITARY FASCISM IN SOUTH AMERICA

How can we reconcile his statements about the necessity for freedom, when, as he spoke, the State Department was giving full recognition to military dictatorships in South America? Civilian authorities, duly elected by the people, have been overthrown by the military groups in Peru, Venezuela, and El Salvador. Yet his administration affirms and supports such conduct. Is this in the spirit of liberty and freedom? This is unadulterated fascism. Where are these so-called liberals who rave and rant about Fascists? Our foreign policy is a mess. The story is a longer and sadder one and someday it will be told.

A RICH MAN'S TAX BILL?

That's what Mr. Truman said of the tax bill passed by the Eightieth Congress during the last campaign. But since his election he has made no mention of it. He has said that taxes should be raised only on the middle and upper bracket incomes which he defines as starting at $6,000.

Now let us take a look at that tax bill and see what it did. (1) It removed about 7,000,000 taxpayers in the lower brackets off the tax rolls giving them a tax saving of 100 percent. (2) A married couple with two children and $2,500 income got a tax reduction from $95 to $16.60 or an 82 percent cut; with an income of $3,000, the reduction was from $190 to $99.60—a 47 percent cut; an income of $4,000, the tax was reduced from $380 to $265.60—a 30 percent cut. (3) Of all the revenue lost to the Government by this "rich man's tax bill," 71 percent went to families or individuals with incomes of $5,000 and under. Obviously, the charge of "rich man's tax bill" was just campaign oratory and Harry Truman knows it. Incidentally, the day before his inauguration he signed a bill giving himself a tax exemption on $90,000 of income. These are facts the people should know and understand.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

It is not unfair to say that the President's proposed budget for 1950 offers a comprehensive blueprint for a new tidal wave of Federal Government expansion into State-local fields, into industrial enterprise, and into social welfare and military services new to the American scene. Spending innovations in the proposed budget reflect a new doctrine enunciated in a single sentence in the President's economic report of January 1949, which reads: "We want the greatest amount of economic freedom that is consistent with the security and welfare of the people; but we do not want to sacrifice that security and welfare because of narrow and selfish concepts as to the acceptable limits of Government action."

Please note his reference to "narrow and selfish concepts." For 160 years our American system has proceeded on a philosophy which is exactly the reverse of what appears to be the sense of the President's statement. Until now our people have been presumed to want the greatest amount of economic security consistent with the retention of their personal freedom; and they have possessed very definite concepts as to how far big Government should be permitted to dominate their lives.

PRICE SLUMPS

The cost of living is going down. This is good news for every consumer. This slump is in response to the operation of the law of supply and demand, not of arbitrary governmental controls. The advocates of consumer controls are strangely silent. Farm prices generally are going down. The farm leaders are concerned about it and this will raise the whole question of farm subsidies. These leaders are not in agreement on the support program. City people must never forget that the farmer is the most important economic factor in their lives. He produces 90 percent of our food. And that's important, isn't it?

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT REPEAL

The labor bosses in Washington are furious. They have demanded repeal of Taft-Hartley Act—pronto. But on the Senate side they have been advised to take it easy. Labor, taking credit for the Truman victory, insists that the strategy must be to repeal that law and substitute the old Wagner Act, then (2) consider a new bill. In the House this view will prevail, but not in the Senate. Chairman THOMAS, Democrat, plans to hold hearings on the repeal legislation which will take about 6 weeks. We are advised by those who are administering the present law that it is a good one even though it is not perfect. Some day the average union member will acknowledge that it is working for his benefit.

Please note: Promptly advise change in your address.

The Truman Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editoral from the Wall Street Journal:

THE TRUMAN PROGRAM

(Reprinted by special permission of the Wall Street Journal)

There is a rather general inclination to believe that the program which President Truman has offered to Congress in his three separate messages—state of the union, budget and economic report—is made up of things which the errant political breezes blew in through the window.

The idea is by no means wholly incorrect. Certainly in his bid for reelection Mr. Truman stole some of Henry Wallace's thunder. Some of his bids for labor and farm support conform to no logical economic program.

But the judgment that there is no element of cohesion in what Mr. Truman proposes seems to us faulty; to accept it is likely to weaken the case of those who oppose or question many of its phases.

When the experience of the late 1920's and early 1930's turned attention to means of leveling off the so-called "boom-and-bust" cycle we began to hear about something called the "compensatory budget" or sometimes the "compensatory economy."

The bare bones of this idea was that the Federal Government could, by use of its taxing and spending functions, keep things on an even keel. If industry and trade lagged, they could be stimulated by Government fiscal action; if they threatened to run away, there could be retarding action.

The sponsors of the idea said that it was unnecessary for the Government to set up and exercise the controls involved in the managed economy. The function of Government was to create the climate in which private enterprises would act to bring about a desired result.

The idea was experimental and rather nebulously so. Furthermore it involved some knowledge of things which the man who runs as he reads—which is the bulk of us—did not have.

But presently something new was added to this idea. That something was the slogan "full employment." People understood that. If the Government by the exercise of a few controls remote from the everyday affairs of most people could bring about a condition by which all people who wanted a job could have one, let's be about the matter.

So soon after the end of the war there came up in Congress a bill which eventually was passed and which became known as the Employment Act of 1946.

During his career in the Senate, President Truman had taken an interest in this bill and while he was not formally one of its sponsors, he had been sympathetic to it.

In its original form the bill was sweeping. It made jobs for everybody who wanted to work the responsibility of the Federal Government. It made the purpose of full employment the touchstone of Government policy.

Before the bill finally was passed, it was considerably modified. The language was made less sweeping. Very sensibly also, it was recognized that production and not merely employment was the criterion of prosperity or the lack thereof. But the bill did become law and under its provisions the President named his council of three economic advisers.

The advisers, presumably with the agreement of Mr. Truman, have given the bill a rather broad interpretation. Sometimes it seems that they have forgotten that it was amended and like to believe that it was passed in the form originally proposed.

It seems to us that this Employment Act of 1946 furnishes some key to the objective which Mr. Truman has in mind.

While his program has some elements of chaos, some measures which seem to work at cross purposes—high farm prices and low food costs, for instance—it is not wholly without some conscious objective.

Neither can it be charged with being avowedly and immediately socialistic. It might end up at that destination, but we doubt if Mr. Truman wants it to or thinks it will.

It is overstating the case against Mr. Truman's program to say that he contemplates the planned state or the socialistic state. It is also said that he contemplates the welfare state. That is right, so far as it goes. The more accurate description seems to us the full-employment state.

We doubt that what President Truman appears to have in mind is practical, if we are to retain a Government of divided powers.

The idea that industry and trade can be stimulated and retarded by Government turning on a spigot now and turning it off later surely envisages a power which can make the adjustments at the proper time.

If the one who is to do the turning must stay his hand while 531 Members of Congress debate the matter, the timing that is necessary would be thrown off. So if the plan is workable, it is only workable by a central authority which has the power of action.

Then, again, under this scheme someone in authority attempts to set the economic climate which will stimulate or retard growth.

Suppose the economy, or some part thereof, insists it is cold when the authority has decreed that the thermometer shall register 72. What do you do in such a case? The answer is not difficult.

Many people in Washington think the present climate is right for the steel industry to expand. But it does not expand as fast as they would like. This, they apparently conclude, must be due to studied recalcitrance of steel men. So they propose to build Government plants.

When the Government undertakes to rule the economy or guide the economy and when its initial measures do not work, then it must seek other and more direct measures. And once that process is started there is no end short of complete control.

However, that is not at this time the greatest force pushing us in the direction of the compulsory state.

President Truman may envisage one kind of a State. His opponents say he is carrying us toward another kind.

It is a good deal more than possible that they are all wrong and that we are already in the kind of a State that none of them want; furthermore that we don't quite know where we are or how we got there.

Considerable could be said to prove that we are in the "military" or the "garrison" state.

Preoccupation with rearmament furnishes an important element of the full employment state. It gives the Government an unanswerable and constant justification for taxes and spending.

That assistance is transitory, however. Military expenditures are for things mostly nonproductive and it is only by constantly increasing the facilities of production that full production with full employment can be assured.

So far as President Truman's program has developed, his request for direct controls—allocation, price fixing, rationing, etc.—are traceable to the situation caused by military expenditures, including in that category the European recovery funds.

It is possible that if the military necessity was not present, President Truman would still eventually be driven to these devices as the rather remote Government controls failed to perform as directed.

We think that would happen. President Truman's economic advisers apparently do not think it would.

We can only hope that before Congress grants extraordinary powers, it go into the reasons for them, that it make clear their purpose and that it limit them as to time.

We have a situation where the man who came to put out the fire may settle down and join the family.

Protest Influx of Lawless Elements of Other Sections of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the various posts of the American Legion in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia, which I represent, are aware of the menace which confronts our country because of the influx of lawless elements from other sections of the world. While all immigrants are not undesirables, nevertheless, there are many undesirable and dangerous aliens in our country, and they continue to come. For our preservation, it is necessary to deport from time to time dangerous and undesirable aliens. Present deportation laws need strengthening, and we need stronger laws to provide for the detention of undesirable aliens who have been apprehended, pending completion of arrangements for deportation.

Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, on January 3, introduced House bill H. R. 10, the purpose of which is to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, and to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens, whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated, because of reasons beyond the control of the United States.

On January 25 at a meeting of Asa Warren Candler Post, No. 65, of the American Legion, at Brookhaven, Ga., a resolution was adopted supporting House bill 10, and Commander George Willis, of that post, has sent a telegram to me informing me of the passage of that resolution.

For the information of Members, under leave previously granted, I insert Commander Willis' telegram herewith.

JANUARY 26, 1949.

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Meeting of Asa Warren Candler Post, No. 65, American Legion, Brookhaven, Ga., passed a resolution requesting your support of House bill 10.

GEORGE WILLIS, *Commander.*

An American Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Hamilton Fish, long a Member of the House, was ever an outspoken enemy of communism. After the long-continued efforts of the Communists, friends of the Communists, and those whom Mr. Fish had antagonized by his outspoken Americanism, his enemies were finally joined by Governor Dewey and they succeeded in defeating him.

Congressman Fish, in spite of the campaign of vilification which was waged against him by New Deal and left-wing columnists and radio commentators, had the confidence of the people of his district—the home district of President Roosevelt. Unfortunately for the country, when the Communists, their sympathizers, President Roosevelt and his friends, Governor Dewey and his political allies all joined in the opposition to Fish, he lost the general election, being defeated by a Democrat who was supported by Governor Dewey. It is possible that a few Republicans who might have voted for Dewey, remembering his opposition to Fish, did not vote at all last November.

His return to Congress was prevented but that fact did not silence him and he is still speaking out for the Republican Party, for America.

I commend to your attention a letter received from him on January 26, and which reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 25, 1949.*

DEAR CLARE: The Republican Party is confronted with a definite crisis. It must face the vital issues squarely, and not continue to dodge and squirm as it did in the recent disastrous Presidential campaign.

The Republican Preidential nominee threw away certain victory by conducting an inept and evasive campaign. He fiddled a "me too" motif to most of the New Deal foreign and domestic policies, or, just as ruinous, failed to present any constructive ones. He declined to uphold the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress, and thereby contributed to the defeat of the Republican majorities in the Senate and House. He even side-stepped the long record of Democratic appeasement of communism at home and abroad for fear of losing the votes of New Deal supporters of F. D. R. which he never could have gotten anyhow.

We permitted China to be sacrificed to the Communists because of the whims and prejudices of the left-wingers in the State Department, without a word of protest for fear of undermining a mythical bipartisan foreign policy, from which President Truman received credit for what was good, and successfully tied the hands and sealed the mouths of the Republicans on the miserable failures in China, Greece, and Germany.

It would be unfair to blame the members of the Republican National Committee for the inefficient management of the campaign because they were practically ignored by the Republican standard-bearer who would have lost New York State by 45,000 votes if it had not been for the big vote cast in that State for Henry Wallace.

What can the Republican National Committee do?

1. It can serve definite notice that no twice-defeated Republican candidate for President has any justifiable claim, in law or in fact, to titular leadership of the party. It is a myth that must be exploded immediately, or else we will suffer the consequences of the 1948 fiasco for the next four years.

2. It can render a real service by calling a "grass-roots" Nation-wide conference next summer or fall to give the fullest opportunity to all Republicans to discuss future policies and promote the welfare of the party and the country.

3. If Representative SCOTT is unable to give his entire time to being a year-round chairman, it can select a full time chairman or director with a salary of $15,000 and an expense and traveling allowance of $10,000, preferably from the Middle West.

4. It can insist on affirmative and courageous leadership along constructive and progressive lines, and put an end to the "me-too, no-but" variety that spells the disintegration of the party.

It should be the aim of the Republican Party to unite all conservatives, true liberals and progressives against the New Dealers, radicals, Socialists, and Communists who have thrown economy out of the window and are urging further regimentation of our people through bureaucratic statism, vast increases in Federal spending, virtual confiscation by taxation, the socialization of our industries and the extension of political and economic totalitarianism in our own country similar to national socialism which we helped to destroy in Germany.

Yours for party success and the preservation of our American form of government.

Respectfully submitted.

HAMILTON FISH.

The Nebraska Legislature Opposed Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nebraska Legislature has forwarded to me their Legislative Resolution 5 setting forth strong opposition to Federal aid to education.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of said resolution:

Legislative Resolution 5

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat Federal aid to education

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, Senate File No. 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States;

Whereas should this bill be enacted into law, there is reason to believe that it will lead inevitably to Federal control and supervision of the public schools of the Nation, thereby taking control out of the hands of the local districts;

Whereas the several States are now able through their own taxing powers to make ample provision for their elementary and secondary schools without Federal aid; and

Whereas the Federal Government is already burdened with a staggering debt of more than $250,000,000,000, calling for retrenchment if the solvency of the United States is to be preserved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:

1. That Senate File No. 246, or any similar legislation, now before the Congress of the United States be defeated.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska.

CHARLES WARNER,
President of the Legislature.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

PILING UP OF SPENDING BY GOVERNMENT SEEN BY RITCHIE IN 1936—LATE MARYLAND GOVERNOR FORETOLD TREASURY RAIDS FOR POLITICAL ADVANTAGE

(By Frank R. Kent)

Back in 1936, when the so-called New Deal had sufficiently developed to make its purposes clear, the late Governor Ritchie expressed the conviction that something had been started in this country which could not be stopped. The current Truman program, with its supporting forces in and out of Congress, attest the truth of that statement.

What the Maryland Governor meant was that once a national administration, instead of standing in the path of radical and unreasoning elements, organized and led them, opening wide the Treasury doors, casting aside moderation and restraint, buying political support with the people's money, then the direction could not be reversed. Once we gained impetus on the "tax, tax, spend, spend, elect, elect" track, we could not go back—we had to go forward.

It seems impossible for thoughtful men to look at the present situation without concluding that we are headed for economic disaster. From the White House has come a score of recommendations for spending more money for new experiments and at the same time expanding the old ones in size and cost. If only a part of these are approved, the dangerous lopsidedness of the whole Federal fiscal structure will be greatly enhanced.

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, who knows this situation better than anyone else, predicts a $10,000,000,000 deficit for the year 1950–51. From the groups with which the administration is politically linked—particularly the labor bosses—there is great pressure to go far beyond the President's proposals in the way of social-security extension, compulsory health insurance, wage increases, food subsidies, etc.

RECKLESS PROMISES

Let the Administration indicate a desire to proceed along these lines (in accord with its reckless campaign promises) and it is almost irresistibly urged to leap and run, instead of walking and looking. An example is in the suggestion, inserted in the President's message, it is said on the advice of Leon Keyserling, one of his economic advisers, that the Government examine the possibilities of increasing steel production through the use of Government funds. Immediately a bill sponsored by three left-wing Democratic Senators is presented to appropriate $14,000,000,000 for this purpose. Another example—the President's request for an increase in the minimum hourly wage—is followed by a Senate proposal for a guaranteed minimum annual wage.

So it goes all down the line, and not the least significant thing is that Republicans are pressing hard for such proposals as well as the Democrats. Obviously the Republican theory is that they have been regularly defeated because these great voting groups have been taken over by the Democrats; that this is due to the favors with which the Democrats have bought their support; that the only way for the Republicans to share in this support is to pay as high or higher price for it. Accordingly they insist that the Republicans must make the party "virile" by standing for "liberal constructive and progressive" policies. So far no one has thought of any such which does not appeal to one or more of these voting groups and does not increase the cost of Government and the cost of doing business.

From neither the Administration nor the "modern" Republicans is there more than a perfunctory word about economy. It is interesting that neither any longer favors taxing any one except the well-to-do; that the old idea once accepted by all as sound, that while the rich should always carry the load, every citizen, according to his means, should pay something toward the support of government in order that the Nation as a whole should be tax conscious and economy minded, is now in the discard.

FEW CARRY ON FIGHT

There are, of course, a few in both parties who still hold to these notions and are not afraid either to voice or fight for them, but they have not been able to get far—certainly not far enough to reverse the direction—or even slow down the spending forces. Denouncing these men as reactionaries, small minded, backward looking, penny pinchers, concerned only with property rights, disdainful of human rights, not aware that anything has happened in the world since the Hoover administration, etc., is the favorite—in fact, the only—answer to their insistence that unless some real effort to put on the brakes and recover control of Federal finances is made at this session, it will be too late.

Clearly, if we do not regain this control, all we can do is wait for the big bump which may or may not bring us back to our senses but certainly will be attended by great pain for us all.

Such is the view of many members of Congress and most of the better grade men in the Administration, none of whom, however, is doing—or intends to do—anything about it. The reasons are clear—both parties have gone overboard for the spending policies and the pressure groups in the belief that only through them can elections be won. Considering what they can contribute in the way of votes, there seems no political nourishment in the advocacy of economy, reduction, reason and restraint. No man will

grow popular these days doing that. Apparently, that is the way to make enemies and lose friends. Apparently, it now takes more character and courage for a public man to face the facts and tell the truth than most of them possess.

Only a few, like Senator BYRD, ever try it. James A. Farley got close to doing so in a New York speech a few days ago. Yet it is difficult to believe that if the men in both parties who think alike on this vital business were bold enough to put the national interests above their personal interests, they not only could arouse the country but influence their parties and get a response that would profit them politically as well.

A Neutral European Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have received from a constituent a communication and excerpts from newspapers outlining his views on the proper affiliation between our country and the nations of Europe. Mr. Hoogendyk suggests a neutral European federation as an alternative to the contemplated military alliance being designed at present.

I believe his views to be pertinent and meritorious enough to warrant the serious consideration of the Members of Congress.

SHARON, CONN., *January 17, 1949.*

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Some time ago I received your letter containing your report to fifth district constituents.

At present $3 out of every $4 of the present budget are to be spent on either preparation for war or on debts incurred by previous wars. Never before has the future of this country depended as much on our foreign relations.

In a very brief paragraph of your report you refer to our hope that by our present efforts we may bring about a more rapid and complete recovery of European countries.

You are undoubtedly aware that our present policy of containment of Russian Communist expansion is springing already some very bad leaks. On the whole, Washington is not very optimistic about the ultimate results even of the Marshall plan. One thing already appears certain—that unless the European nations will be able to unite in their efforts for recovery and unless the Marshall plan be extended over a longer period than anticipated, there will be in Europe a return to economic chaos.

The proposed Atlantic military pact will provoke for a great many reasons a great deal of opposition in the Senate. There is furthermore tremendous opposition in some European countries against any military alliances, which will ultimately lead to another war. Without going into any of the details involved, I nevertheless feel that you might be interested in my proposal for a neutral federation of the states of continental Europe with multipower guarantee.

An ever increasing number of prominent Americans with distinguished records in foreign affairs are interested in my proposal and all feel that it merits the most careful consideration and study by the Department of State.

The Department of State is already fully acquainted with all details of the plan and so are our delegates to the United Nations and many other officials.

The enclosed copies of clippings will give you a general idea of the proposal. Trusting that this information may be of interest to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

F. VANROSSEN HOOGENDYK.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of August 10, 1948]

A NEUTRAL EUROPEAN FEDERATION—UNION OF CONTINENTAL STATES, NOT WESTERN GROUP, PROPOSED

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In the blockade of Berlin, Russia again holds the offensive. It is she that once more has chosen the moment at which to embarrass her former allies—this time by forcing them to improvise hurriedly a counterproposal more suitable than that for a separate west German state.

We have had ample opportunity to acquaint ourselves with the Soviet viewpoint. Russia is in urgent need of recovery and for that reason most likely would prefer to cut her cost of armaments. But notwithstanding the fact that we have allowed her to expand beyond reason, she still feels insecure. The very reason for this stems partially from our bitterness over these unnecessary and preposterous concessions made to her—unnecessary because they were made at a time when our military might in Europe was at its all-time high and Russia's badly sapped by the German armies.

The creation of a west German state, unless war is being considered a mathematical certainty, which we may assume it is not, would be an irreparable blunder, because it would mean acquiescence in the absorption of eastern Germany by Russia and the lasting division of the continent in two opposing blocs, openly two military alliances directed against each other. Obviously such an arrangement cannot ever be a permanent solution of either the German or the European problem. It would be solely a makeshift and a dangerous one at that.

Having observed our continued lack of acumen in foreign affairs during the postwar period and having suggested a concrete proposal for the over-all solution of Europe's problems, may I once more point out the grim danger and likelihood of defeat of our European policy to date. If and when the German people decide for themselves that of two evils a Russian alliance will, for them, be by far the least costly, then we may well consider ourselves defeated, unless at this last hour we can table an acceptable proposal, protecting and favoring all contestants in like manner, one therefore that will lead straight toward economic recovery of all Europe and Russia.

The creation with our approval of a western European union including an independent west Germany, plainly directed against the Soviets, foreshadows to the German people another war, in which Germans will kill Germans and in which what remains of their country will be further ground down. Not only Germany but also France is alert to this danger, as she has repeatedly shown. This fear is a strong argument used by Communists all over Europe.

Russia from her viewpoint is justified in encouraging German nationalism and demand for a unified Germany in opposition to our present encouragement of a west German state within a western union. In doing so she has a fair chance of winning the Germans ultimately to her side. The latter realize that 10 years hence Russia will still be right on their doorstep, while not a single American soldier will be left on the Continent. The Germans will not thank us any more than Hitler for having helped to bring about this situation, but may have to accept the facts.

We may assume that the Kremlin and our State Department both fully realize that Europe can never recover economically nor attain permanent peace under two competitive recovery programs. In this respect Russia is, of course, even more concerned than the United States. Every European economist knows that the free flow of trade between western and eastern Europe is the prerequisite of European recovery. Hence, for example, the prompt objection only the other day by the government spokesman of one of the Benelux countries to our blocking all rail traffic from the west into the Soviet zone, as a reprisal against the Russian blockade of Berlin.

My proposal for the establishment within the framework of the United Nations, as provided for in the Charter, of a neutral federation of the states of continental Europe, with a federal constitution that would make all foreign military alliances unconstitutional and the neutrality of which would be guaranteed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States, would meet all requirements for general recovery and the peaceful solution of Europe's problems, including the negotiation of German and Austrian peace treaties, as well as of ample security for the guarantors themselves.

Certainly within such a neutral federation would be found the guaranty that Germany would never again be able to assert herself as a military power. Germany did actually have an unsolved problem in her expanding economy hampered by trade barriers, but within a neutral continental federation such trade barriers should ultimately disappear as they are gradually within the Benelux countries. Moreover the other European countries would have proportionate access to German coal, steel, foodstuffs, etc., and vice versa through federal allocation commissions.

The federation as a whole would benefit by the ability of some noted satesman of the smaller nations. Both the wisdom and integrity of these men are sorely needed, but because they do not represent one of the superstates, their contributions are mostly lost to the world at large today. Free elections could be supervised by federal commissions, as could the control of the manufacture of armaments.

The proposal would eliminate once and for all the military superiority and inferiority complexes of all European countries, large and small. Both the Ruhr and the Skoda works, instead of again making armaments for two opposing worlds, would be working in a joint effort to rebuild European economy. Trade would again flow freely between the states within the federation and between them and the rest of the world.

We have it within our power not only to propose such a permanent solution but also we can exert considerable pressure to bring it about. In due time Russia might well agree to this proposal which instead of being directed against her gives her full security against attack from the west and aims directly at the natural and certain recovery of Europe as well as of Russia herself. Furthermore, it would allow early withdrawal of all non-European armies of occupation, substituting them with a federal police force if necessary. Automatically it would abolish the competitive character of American and Russian relief. It would bring about at least partial disarmament by the great powers and last but not least its immediate effect would be to relieve the present state of world tension and the restoration of self-respect everywhere. By this proposal all pending problems would be lifted on a common plane from which they would be far less apt, as

they are now, to sink back into the mire the moment they come up for discussion with the Soviets.

F. VAN ROSSEN HOOGENDYK.
SHARON, CONN., *August 7, 1948.*

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times of May 26, 1948]

FEDERATING EUROPE FOR PEACE—WRITER PROPOSES A NEUTRAL FEDERATION OF CONTINENTAL POWERS

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A weakness in pleading with the peoples of Europe our case against Russia has been their justified claim that our plans in their regard are subject to continual changes. Insofar as these are due to our particular kind of democratic Government, it is hard to effect amelioration. There is, however, one aspect in regard to this complaint which admittedly constitutes one of our greatest handicaps: that of the lack of an enduring American foreign policy.

To our steadily deteriorating relations with Russia there is no immediate solution. They are the outcome of events and actions which cannot now be made retroactive.

Although it is apparent that we can expect the present Russian Government today to oppose any plan advanced in good faith by the United States, the following, which I have advocated for Europe for many years, is, I believe, the only one that offers any chance at all for ultimate agreement. Meanwhile, and this I hold as of the greatest importance, it would at once command the respect of all European peoples and eventually even of the Russian people.

Once in effect, it would not eliminate our differences with Russia elsewhere in the world. But since it would establish permanent peace on the continent of Europe, it would greatly reduce the chances of armed conflict between Russia and ourselves.

GUARANTY OF NEUTRALITY

The plan is for a federation, within the framework of the United Nations organization, as provided for in the Charter, of the states of continental Europe with a federal constitution that, like the Swiss, would make any foreign military alliances unconstitutional. The neutrality of the federation to be guaranteed by the U. S. S. R., the British Commonwealth and the United States in the same manner as the Powers of the Congress of Vienna and the Treaty of Paris of November 20, 1815, guaranteed the perpetual neutrality of the Swiss Federation.

If this plan would be firmly established as part of our foreign policy, it would irrevocably put the United States on record with an enduring, positive, constructive and on our part unselfish policy for permanent peace and freedom for Europe. It offers protection, moreover, to both Britain and Russia, as well as ourselves.

The present pact between the Benelux countries, France and Britain, is primarily a military alliance, necessitated by present circumstances. However, we can propose that it be transformed into a neutral federation of continental powers only, when and if Russia and Britain agree. Should Britain retain any military alliances on the continent, then approval by Russia would obviously become illusionary. Moreover, Britain and the British Commonwealth will always remain our natural allies, and will always be considered so by Russia.

To Britain as well as ourselves the advantages would be enormous, for Europe, federated and neutralized, would get on its feet sooner and with less assistance. The proposed plan, when it should finally be effected, would hold out further the promise of partial and increasing possibilities for disarmament and the hope that, if once we should have arrived at a working agreement with Russia in respect to Europe, we might accomplish more.

It is being fully realized that we have every reason to distrust Russia as a direct neighbor to such a neutral and militarily weak federation. However, whatever we decide upon, Russia will retain this geographical advantage over us.

TO IMPLEMENT AID

While nothing could have created a more favorable effect on the European situation than the ERP, nothing in turn would bolster its effect as much as its implementation by an enduring all-round beneficial European policy on our part, holding out not only a promise, but a guaranty for permanent peace and freedom.

The proposed plan concerns regional integration. As such it has by its nature limited objectives. It has many ramifications, and many difficult economic and political problems will have to be worked out and overcome before it could go into effect. Yet it appears that all other proposals offer more difficulties, greater danger, and far less chance of eventual agreement.

Our present show of military strength to counter Russian expansion could be and must be maintained until the proposed federation of the continental states of Europe would be consummated. Meanwhile, a clear formulation of the plan as part of our foreign policy would disarm Russian propaganda of the argument that our policy of containment is solely aimed at jockeying for position in the war we allegedly intend waging against her, using the European states as pawns.

F. VAN ROSSEN HOOGENDYK.
SHARON, CONN., *May 24, 1948.*

Science, Religion, Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, one of the greatest news stories in many generations appeared in this morning's press. I refer to the article entitled "Bible's Story of Creation Supported by Science Study." There has never been too much conflict between science and religion, and I sincerely trust that this present study may serve to lessen the distance still more.

It is difficult in this age of skepticism to take by faith some of the man-made suggestions which are being presented to us. However, it should not require unlimited faith to accept the Biblical teachings, and I sincerely believe that if we were willing to accept the divine word by faith and follow those divine teachings that they would go far toward helping us solve some of our perplexing problems.

The first sentence of Genesis says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." Up until now science had held to the belief that the earth was created much later than the heavens were created. The article uses the words that "the earth was a very late comer." My humble opinion is that science is the late comer in not having accepted by faith the handiwork of God rather than trying to solve His mysteries.

China Falls—Truman's Responsibility—Now the Russians Can Afford To Offer Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fall of China to the Chinese reds is a tragedy of great importance to the United States. The people of this country do not fully realize this fact. It is a responsibility that President Truman and the Democratic Party cannot avoid, nor can they laugh it off.

It is no mere coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that Stalin has just offered to talk peace terms with Mr. Truman. Russia now has China under its control, it has gained its objective in the Far East without firing a shot. And the basis for the double cross occurred at Yalta when Roosevelt dealt our ally China out of the game. The Yalta Conference will go down in history as a "black day," even worse than Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by that prominent writer Mr. Mark Sullivan, as it appeared in the Washington Post for January 29, 1949:

REPUBLICAN HOPES

(By Mark Sullivan)

IMPLICATIONS OF CHINA'S FALL

The meeting of the Republican National Committee at Omaha this week dealt almost wholly with a not very vital matter of intraparty organization, a controversy over choosing a chairman of the national committee. In what went out through news channels, there was little to impress the public with much beyond lack of party morale and self-confidence.

This is an epitome of the Republican situation ever since the November election, nothing very important to the public taking place within the party, and the public not giving much thought to it. It is the opposition party, but not an opposition party eagerly on its toes for fray ahead—in this case the congressional elections next year and the Presidential one in 1952. It has had the downcast appearance of a party that had been 14 years out of power, that had made a strong start back in the congressional elections of 1946, that confidently expected to complete the comeback in the Presidential election last November—but instead got such a blow as has rarely if ever been experienced before by either party. The Republicans have been dazed, not so much by the degree of their defeat, which was really not great, as by the utter unexpectedness of it.

In this condition—confused uncertainty within the party, indifference to it on the part of the public, and elated confidence on the part of the party in power—there took place an event which must drastically change the political picture. When the fall of China to communism is fully grasped; when there is understanding of its causes and its consequences, especially to us in our relation to Russia and communism; when it is seen as the climax of a long course of policy and action by our own Government, our people are likely to be deeply moved and to express themselves politically. Such political consequences as follow cannot

avoid being detrimental to the party that was in power when the fall of China and the events leading up to it took place.

During some 2 years, beginning after late 1946, the United States under the Truman administration has become the spearhead of resistance to the attempt of Russia and communism at world domination, the head and front of one side in a world conflict. This has had the complete approval of our people, including support by the opposition party for a bipartisan policy. Our people have not merely seen the only safety for our own Nation to lie in resisting Russian and Communist aggression, they have taken pride in our role of head contender against communism throughout the world, have given heart to the fight and vast amounts of goods and money to carry it on.

In the world conflict we have now suffered an extreme reverse. We have seen further that we have ourselves been a large cause of the reverse. Preceding the period of resistance to Russia, there was a prior period, reaching back into the Roosevelt administration, in which our policy was one of strong friendliness to Russia. During that period President Roosevelt, at the Yalta Conference in early 1945, made agreements with Stalin by which Russia at the end of the war got territory and other advantages at the expense of China. From that territory and with these advantages came impetus and headway for the Communist drive that has now gone on to overthrow of the Chinese Government.

In most countries, when serious reverse is suffered in a conflict having in any serious degree an aspect of war, actual or potential, the tendency is to reject the party in power at the next ensuing election. Another tendency is to turn out the party in power at the first election following a war, as in the English defeat of Churchill and the Conservatives at the end of the recent war, and our country's defeat of the Democrats following the First World War.

By this tendency of peoples and these precedents, the Democrats and President Truman should have been defeated last November. The many predictions of defeat were sound enough as an interpretation of history. In any thorough examination of the reasons Mr. Truman was not defeated, it is not merely a loose "if" to suggest that if the fall of China had taken place last September the outcome of the election might have been different. By the same token, the fall of China that has now taken place is a foreboding omen to the party in power in the congressional elections next year.

Problem of Displaced Persons in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast by Harold H. Hodgkinson:

Twenty-four hundred new Americans will enter the port of Boston during the month of January, according to the latest plans for the arrival of pilgrims to this country under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. They will go to various parts of the United States as did the arrivals of last November, the first to enter through New England.

The Massachusetts Displaced Persons Commission, a voluntary group, is planning suitable greeting and reception for these new Americans, and a Greater Boston Committee, including all types of organizations, both governmental and voluntary, will see that they are looked after on the pier efficiently and properly started on their journeys to their final places of employment.

The Massachusetts commission, appointed by the Governor, is now engaged in the organization of a policy of operation, including the definition of its exact responsibilities. It has assumed the responsibility for the official welcoming reception at the pier on the arrival of the ships. It is conducting a survey of the needs of the Commonwealth for new Americans and is helping to develop a publicity program which will keep the people of the State informed as to when, how, and where they can apply for and receive new Americans.

As the Massachusetts commission, under the Governor's directive, is advisory it has assumed the above responsibilities under the authority of the United States commission at the request of Chairman Carusi, who is in general charge of the work in the United States under the congressional act of 1948.

In order that the present operation of the entry of new Americans will be understood more clearly, I should like to indicate the present lines of authority. Application blanks for the entry of new pilgrims can be obtained from any one of the following agencies:

The United States Displaced Persons Commission, Washington, D. C.; National Catholic Welfare Conference, 45 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.; Church World Service, 248 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.; United Service for New Americans, 72 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.; Polish-American Congress, 231 Springfield Street, Chicopee, Mass.; Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, 41 Tremont Street, Boston, Mass.; International Rescue and Relief Committee, 72 Gardner Street, Allston, Mass.

In addition, it is planned to have a local branch of the United States commission, which will have headquarters in Boston within a short time where the latest information and details pertaining to the entry of displaced persons can be secured.

Many questions have been asked which indicate that it is not clearly understood just who is a displaced person. It is our understanding that those eligible for entry into this country under the act must have been in DP camps in Germany, Austria, and Italy before December 22, 1945, and were still in these camps on January 1, 1948. They must be guaranteed employment without displacing anyone from work, have the assurance that they will not become public charges, and have housing that does not displace some other person from such housing.

After the application blanks are secured, they are forwarded to representatives of the United States Displaced Persons Commission in Europe, who select the new Americans. The new Americans are transported to this country on United States Army transports paid for and in charge of the International Refugee Organization. They are looked after in Boston on the pier by the Greater Boston Committee. The national voluntary agencies are responsible for arranging their transportation to their final destinations.

Only two ships have arrived in this country so far. On the first ship arriving in Boston the largest single nationality group was Polish, with 347. The occupations of the group included medical workers, clothing workers, students, farmers, and others. In all, 80 different skills were represented. The religious break-down of these new Americans was 275 Roman Catholics, 118 Greek Catholics, 275 Jews, 96 Protestants, 46 Orthodox, and 3 whose religion was not listed. The pilgrims on the ship went to 27 States, but only a very small number were destined for Massachusetts. Every person should review the needs in their locality and make sure that proper applications be made immediately, since the offers of employment in Massachusetts seem to be lagging although housing is available.

Incidentally on a world-wide program there will be more than 25 ships of the International Refugee Organization moving new citizens to 73 different receiving countries, of which the United States is one, with over 200,000 to be received before June 30, 1950.

At this point I should like to thank the Polish-American Congress for their kindness in inviting me to speak and to help spread the information regarding the displaced persons' activities.

The Massachusetts Displaced Persons' Commission consists of a chairman, 3 vice chairmen, and 12 members. An extremely valuable service is being rendered by these ladies and gentlemen. In the western part of the State the members of the commission are Miss Alice Halligan, of Springfield, and Mr. John Chandler, of Sterling, who are untiring in their efforts toward helping with the arrival and placement of new Americans.

Your speaker had the honor of presiding at the reception of the new Americans on the arrival of the first transport in Boston. As the great ship *General Bundy* nosed into Commonwealth pier, the rails were lined with pilgrims seeing for the first time the shores of New England, where another kind of pilgrim landed in 1620. As the first mooring lines touched the deck the fine band of the United States Navy played the Star-Spangled Banner. The fireboats of the city of Boston drew alongside the Army ship with giant streams of water playing in the air as a symbol of welcome.

The first voice heard over the loud speaker was that of Dr. Frank Jennings delivering an invocation. Then the sincerity of welcome of the Commonwealth and the depth of feeling of the Bay State were expressed in a speech delivered by Governor Bradford. Then there were more words of greeting from Msgr. Augustin Hickey, vicar general of the Catholic archdiocese of Boston, and a 'glad to be here" message from the representative of the President of the United States, Ugo Carusi, Chairman of the United States Displaced Persons Commission, himself a New Englander by birth.

The giant ocean liner was now snugly tied alongside the dock and the initial reception program closed with a benediction from Rabbi Dudley Weinberg.

Your speaker today personally saw the arrangements on the pier, which were most adequate and most effective, talked with the engineer of the 14-car train which was drawn upon the lower level of the pier to take the new arrivals to their destinations; he walked from stem to stern and main truck to keel of the ship and is proud to tell you that no finer reception or greeting or care could have been offered them than that given at Commonwealth Pier on the arrival of the *General Bundy* and during the voyage.

Assisting in the work of sponsoring and receiving 205,000 new Americans to our country is a pleasant and exciting task because the desire to help comes from our hearts and our consciences. The work of the governor's commission has been made very easy because of the magnificent work being done by all the social and religious agencies. They really deserve the major part of the credit for the smooth operation of the act up to the present time.

My own father came down a gangplank from the old world to these shores not so many years ago, so there is a special tug at my heartstrings when I have the honor and privilege of speaking to so many new Americans who will arrive in this country for the

first time and to speak over the air today to so many Americans who have exactly the same history of arriving from a foreign land as in my own case.

I am reminded constantly that it is only chance that finds me in wonderful America and not in a displaced-persons camp in Europe awaiting passage to a land of opportunity. I am sure that everyone in this Commonwealth should be lifted up with new faith, courage, and nobility by our Government's program for new Americans. I am both proud and happy to do all I can to have a small part in helping this great work.

Private Power Lobby Opposes CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, when President Truman instructed members of his Cabinet and staff to promptly draw up legislative recommendations for a Columbia Valley Authority, this announcement was greeted with a howl of criticism by the private utility lobby. As reported in the New York Times of January 25, the proposed creation of a Columbia Valley Authority "has aroused the private utility industry to a degree of opposition unequaled since passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority bill in 1935."

P. L. Smith, president of the National Association of Electric Companies and the highest-paid lobbyist in Washington, has declared that there is no need for a CVA. Mr. Speaker, this spokesman for financial and private utility interests is hardly qualified, I dare say, to determine what is needed to promote the development and welfare of the Pacific Northwest.

Lobbyist Smith also stated on January 28 that there is no need for a TVA steam generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tennessee. Residents of the Tennessee Valley area will not accept lobbyist Smith's definition of their welfare any more than we in the Pacific Northwest.

Leaders of Northwest farmer-labor organizations, representing more than a million members, are unanimous in their support of a CVA. These groups include the Washington and Oregon State Granges, the Oregon, Washington, and Idaho State Federations of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Oregon, Idaho, and Montana Farmers' Unions. Added to these are many other citizens, comprising, in my considered judgment, the great majority in the Pacific Northwest, who heavily endorse the CVA program for the region.

Opposition on the part of the private power lobby is not something new. In the past it has been directed against great Federal projects like Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. Those two plants now produce more than half of the power consumed in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana. The time has come to coordinate the various Federal activities in the region for a more efficient, comprehensive program to overcome the acute power shortage, to control floods, to irrigate farm land and to develop the vast resources of the region. That is the object of the proposed CVA.

In contrast with the selfish and intemperate opposition to CVA by the private power lobby, I wish to cite the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 27, entitled "The Valley Programs":

THE VALLEY PROGRAMS

President Truman has asked members of his Cabinet to draft a bill setting up a Columbia Valley Authority. Within hours the National Association of Electric Companies, the registered lobby for private power interests, issued a statement condemning the action as the first step "to create a superstate."

In this directive and this reaction there is epitomized an issue likely to remain before the American people for a good many years to come. It is an issue in which, as is so often true, the generally accepted bulk is sometimes completely befogged by dust kicked up from an exceedingly controversial fraction. It is a very sizable bundle of questions, also, which needs to be looked at in the round before it is safe to assume that reprints of TVA necessarily would provide all the answers, or before it is sensible to be stampeded by the extravagant alarms set up by the power lobby.

There are practically no informed doubts that the United States must energetically conserve certain of its resources and develop others if it is to remain great. Nor is there much questioning that the tasks group themselves naturally around great river systems.

And as to conservation, only extreme devotees of laissez faire, perhaps, would deny that it is a Federal Government job. No lesser sovereignty has the power or should have the power to coordinate and integrate programs of flood control, navigation, reforestation, soil restoration, and irrigation as demanded by the diverse needs of vast valleys which simply blanket State boundaries.

There is argument over what agencies should be entrusted with the undertaking—whether semiautonomous authorities, such as TVA, or teams from the regular departments, such as the Reclamation Service and the Army Corps of Engineers. But the biggest and hottest controversy centers about what is at once a development of underexploited resources and a logical by-product of rehabilitating the overexploited.

Whether the primary task be to control floods and build soil, or to irrigate dry lands, or to deepen channels to aid navigation, the chief devices are dams—big dams and little dams. Dams can produce power—electric power. And this electric power offers to the Government and the taxpayer one of the few means of getting direct return on a mountain of bread cast upon the waters. To residents of the valleys it represents, also, a boon to homes and farms and an incentive to industry. From the average citizen's standpoint it is at least reasonable to ask whether power thus produced from public-owned rivers and public-built facilities should be sold back to the people for private profit.

But to the power companies even to ask such a question suggests an entering wedge to nationalization of their industry. Although they are fighting it on every front, the real controversy appears to boil down to whether Government or private enterprise shall distribute this power direct to consumers. And that dispute is hot.

Nevertheless, it should not be allowed to obscure the broad purposes of husbanding and developing the Nation's vital resources in soil and water, or overshadow other important questions bearing on how and when these purposes can best be carried out.

International Military Tribunal—Was It Established To Insure Justice or for Political Punishment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in our zeal to fix the guilt for German war atrocities, justice, in many instances, has miscarried. The Nuremberg trials have mocked justice and the mischief that has been done there will eventually rise to haunt us. Already the Chinese Communists are demanding that the Nationalist Government surrender Chiang Kai-shek as a war criminal.

Mr. Speaker, you can bet that Stalin and the Politburo has prepared its list of American war criminals. If it has, then Truman, Marshall, Byrnes, General Clay, Admiral Leahey, and other top-flight civilian and military leaders are on the purge list. Let us not forget that we have established and participated in this unheard-of ex post facto punishment; we have shown dictators and tyrants the way to punish the innocent. There is nothing in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence to match this precedent.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include an article by George Sokolsky apropos this subject which appeared in the Times-Herald for January 25, 1949:

Some of the judges on the International Military Tribunal had a difficult time reconciling justice with political punishment. The idea that an entire nation is guilty for a war and that each individual in it is liable to punishment is certainly not American.

Our view is better expressed by the draft; that is, Congress once having decided upon war, each citizen is expected to do his duty.

In a decision involving I. G. Farben, Judges Curtis G. Shake, of Indiana, and James Morris, of North Dakota, Judge Paul M. Hebert, of Louisiana, concurring, wrote a decision which today is buried in the archives of the Tribunal but which may some day become important should international law and morality ever be resurrected. The judges said:

"To depart from the concept that only major war criminals—that is, those persons in the political, military, and industrial fields, for example, who were responsible for the formulation and execution of politics—may be held liable for waging wars of aggression would lead far afield."

"Under such circumstances there could be no practical limitation on criminal responsibility that would not include, on principle, the private soldier on the battlefield, the farmer who increased his production of foodstuffs to sustain the armed forces, or the housewife who conserved fats for the making of munitions."

And, of course, what is said of Germany is now true of Japan, and may some day be true of the United States, should we ever fight a losing war. For therein lies the danger in all this.

As long as we are victors we can enforce our will, but what we have actually done at Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals has been to lay down the precedent that the victor alone determines what is to be done to the conquered people.

Judges Shake and Morris make this point:

"It is, of course, unthinkable that the majority of Germans should be condemned as guilty of committing crimes against peace. This would amount to a determination of collective guilt to which the corollary of mass punishment is the logical result for which there is no precedent in international law and no justification in human relations.

"We cannot say that a private citizen shall be placed in the position of being compelled to determine in the heat of war whether his government is right or wrong, or, if it starts right, when it turns wrong.

"We would not require the citizen, at the risk of becoming a criminal under the rules of international justice, to decide that his country has become an aggressor and that he must lay aside his patriotism, the loyalty to his homeland, and the defense of his own fireside at the risk of being adjudged guilty of crimes against peace on the one hand, or of becoming a traitor to his country on the other, if he makes an erroneous decision based upon facts of which he has but vague knowledge."

Under such a rule of life, only the traitor, the coward, the quisling, the bribed agent, would be right and everyone else wrong.

Many in the United States today hold that view when applied to some other country. They would, of course, deny an American citizen the right to betray his country in time of war, although they expect every citizen of every other country to do it at their convenience.

Those who forced the Chicago Symphony Orchestra to cancel the contract of the conductor Wilhelm Furtwaengler, were of the opinion that he should not have conducted in Germany during the Nazi regime and when his country was at war with ours.

And it is a pity that those who control the Chicago Symphony Orchestra permitted themselves to be coerced into an acceptance of this outrageous view.

Undoubtedly their reasoning was that the anti-Furtwaengler pressure group was more vociferous than the unorganized majority of Americans who fight a war not against individuals but against countries.

How silly to spend billions on the Berlin airlift yet to practice vengeance on an orchestra conductor or a soprano. At any rate, one is proud of the fact that some of our American judges believe in justice and tell the truth.

Council of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of January 30, 1949:

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Two virtually simultaneous official pronouncements highlight the antithetical trends within Europe today. The first of these is an announcement by the five powers forming the western union under the Brussels pact that they have agreed to create a council of Europe. The second is a blast from Moscow which not only assails the projected North Atlantic defense pact but likewise attacks the western union and the Marshall plan as being parts of a warmongering plot by the ruling circles of the Anglo-American bloc, bypassing the United Nations in an openly aggressive course of policy, the final purpose of which is establishment by force of Anglo-American world domination.

The reason for Moscow's ire at the drawing together of the western democracies in defensive arrangements against potential aggression from the totalitarian East is understandable. If effectively implemented, those arrangements will constitnute a dependable equipoise to the power of the Soviet bloc, perhaps permanently checkmating Moscow's avowed scheme for world domination. Certainly, the "council of Europe" just agreed upon in principle represents a major step toward that integration of the European Continent which has been the dream of idealists and statesmen for centuries. It may be recalled that this was the aim of the "grand design" formulated by King Henry IV of France around the year 1600, while the concept of a "United States of Europe" has been vigorously advocated by eminent leaders like Aristide Briand and Winston Churchill.

The council formulated by the five Brussels pact nations (Britain, France, and the Benelux trio) is twofold. There will be a rudimentary executive composed of government ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions. This might mean an actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body. Alongside this ministerial committee there will be an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments of the constituent members, which will meet in public and hold open discussions. That is tantamount to a rudimentary European legislature.

Although the agreement is as yet confined to the five members of the western union, it is specifically intended to be broadened so as to include all democratically minded European nations. Indeed, an invitation is understood to be on its way to the Government of Italy, which is ardently receptive. As Italian Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza says: "European union is born, and Italy will be one of the founding states. Italy will give all her efforts with full loyalty to the creation of the council of Europe." Other ground-floor invitations are expected to be sent to Portugal and the Scandinavian countries, though the latters' attitude may be influenced by hostile Soviet pressure, especially as applied to Sweden.

The Displaced Persons Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

THE DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

The executive committee of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, meeting in Washington on January 26, 1949, released the following statement:

The National Catholic Resettlement Council, in general assembly, has formulated the following proposals as practical applications of the basic principles which guide its policy, and which might be considered in the present effort to bring about an impartial and effective administration of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948:

1. That in order to avoid discrimination in favor of or against the race, religion, or national origin of any displaced person, visas issued be made available to each group and element of the DP's in the proportion each bears to the over-all total of displaced persons.

2. That the present eligibility date of December 22, 1945, be extended to the effective date of the act, as amended, or in any case not prior to December 31, 1948.

3. That up to 400,000 immigration visas be made available without regard to quota limitations for a period of four fiscal years following July 1, 1948. That particular emphasis be placed upon the family groups.

4. That the provisions for persons of German ethnic origin, so called, under section 12 of the Displaced Persons Act, be retained, and that the numbers now provided for be doubled and extended over a period ending June 30, 1952. It is hoped that special preference will be given to orphan children in this group.

5. That in order to assure the most general distribution of displaced persons, to areas best suited to resettlement, funds be provided to cover costs incidental to the transportation of such displaced persons from ports of entry to points of destination in the respective States and Territories.

The National Catholic Resettlement Council is the official organization of the Catholic church in the United States, established for the purpose of resettling displaced persons in the United States in accordance with provisions under the law established by Congress. This council is composed of the following organizations: National Conference of Catholic Charities, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, National Council of Catholic Men, National Council of Catholic Women, and 11 major national groups; American Relief for Poland, United Lithuanian Fund of America, Slovak Catholic Federation of America, Catholic Hungarian League, Latvian Relief, Inc., American Aid Societies, Croatian Refugee Committee, Slovak Catholic Federation of America, National Alliance of Czech Catholics, Polish Immigration Committee, World Association of Estonians.

The Task of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial, the Task of the South, which appeared in a recent issue of the Raleigh News and Observer.

This editorial came from the brilliant mind of Jonathan Daniels, editor of this outstanding southern newspaper. Of further interest is the fact that Mr. Daniels during the past week received first-place award in the best-editorial division of the North Carolina Newspaper Institute for this editorial, the Task of the South.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniels rendered not only a great service to the South but to the Nation and this Congress in coming to grips with a subject that must be honestly and courageously faced.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of November 19, 1948]

THE TASK OF THE SOUTH

In the southernmost city of the United States, on Tuesday, President Truman made it clear that he will urge in his state of the

Union message to the Congress in January the enactment of his civil-rights proposals.

There is nothing strange about that. Indeed, one certain thing is that Harry Truman means what he says. He believes that the poll tax which keeps thousands of southerners from the polls should be eliminated. He believes that there should be Federal legislation to deal with the crime of lynching. He believes that legislation is necessary to prevent racial discrimination in economic opportunity. He believes that where the Supreme Court has ruled against Jim Crow laws in interstate transportation that the ruling of the Court should be enforced.

That is the sum total of his recommendations, so far as the South is concerned. That is also the irreducible minimum of the President's purpose. In the past campaign no issues aroused such high feeling. It was on the ground of civil rights that some southerners withdrew into the Dixiecrat camp. It is true, of course, that some of those who led them into that abortive revolt were much more interested in the States' rights of tideland oil and economic privilege than the States' rights of anything else. The certain thing is that they reduced the old business of southern threats and fulminations to ultimate impotence. Fortunately, the great majority of the southern people declined to be a party to a movement which was phony to begin with and ludicrously futile at the end, and the southern people today do not wish any other actors in the Congress or anywhere else to use Dixiecrat methods in presenting and defending the customs and opinions of the South.

This does not mean that the election of Truman showed that the South has changed its mind upon the basic idea that both races in the South will best be served by the fair and orderly separation of the races in the South. No such idea entered the mind of the thousands of white Democrats who carried all but four of the Southern States to the standard of the Truman victory. The South still holds its ancient faith in the separate but equal doctrine. But fair-minded southerners in increasing number recognize that southern honor depends upon fulfillment of the South's own promise. They know quite as well as President Truman does that in the field of racial relations in the South—and particularly in those States which went Dixiecrat—there is a job to be done in honesty, in generosity, in warm-heartedness to give all people a better chance.

And now is the time for the expression of that true southern spirit in the coming debate upon this national issue. If the South has only the angry debate of filibuster to offer, this election showed that the South can count upon an increasing tide of impatience with its threatening. But if the South has wisdom to bring out of experience with a difficult problem, there will be national readiness to meet and receive any really creative counsel which the South brings to a difficult and an emotional question. Fury will not serve the South, but good sense and good manners from the South could serve the Nation, too.

It is time the South faced the civil rights one by one and faced them squarely. Here they are:

The poll tax. Nothing is so clear as that the poll tax as a prerequisite to the right to vote is a device to limit and deny democracy to poor white men and Negroes. It was long ago rejected in such a southern State as North Carolina and no southerner can suggest that the results here have disturbed either racial relationships or the equality of government provided. Indeed, this State has today not a single law which denies the right of suffrage to any man or woman on racial grounds. It is time for all southerners to recognize the right of every man and woman to the full rights of citizenship regardless of color or economic position.

The poll tax should go. It might be better if this anachronism in democracy were removed by the States which still make it a barrier between the citizen and the ballot. If they will not act, many would prefer to see it eliminated by constitutional amendment. But certainly if a law can be passed which would meet the test of constitutionality, it should be passed. The thing is bad and does not become any better because of long arguments about States' rights.

The antilynching law. There is much to be said for the southern argument that no such law is necessary. There has not been a lynching in nearly 2 years. The number of lynchings in recent years has been steadily reduced almost to the vanishing point. All the same, if a law is framed to suppress extralegal violence in all the States, the South should not ask exemption or act as if it needed exemption. If an antilynching law can be passed which meets the test of constitutionality, let it be passed. The South has no special interest in preventing a law which is designed to end such crime. It should not act as if it did.

FEPC (the fair employment practices law). Many southerners and northerners, too, believe that this legislation would do more harm than good. It is an attempt to end discrimination in employment by law. As such it would be a sort of prohibition law against prejudice in the economic field. It is by all odds the most objectionable bill proposed in the civil-rights package.

Yet it certainly touches the most serious question in this whole field. Lynching is disappearing. The number of poll-tax States declines. But the need for increasing economic opportunities for more and more trained and educated Negroes remains. Nowhere is it more necessary to improve the economic status of the Negro than in the South itself. Obviously, this region cannot be permanently prosperous so long as a fourth of its people are permanently poor. This situation has been greatly improved by present conditions of prosperity. There is even today, however, much room for creative southern thinking on the long-term provision of a better chance for more Negroes with education and training to get better jobs.

Segregation in interstate transportation. This involves not a proposal of the President's but a decision of the Supreme Court. That Court held in effect that no State could impose local Jim Crow laws on travelers on interstate trains, air lines, busses, etc. The President has only insisted that the decision of the Supreme Court should be enforced, as every decision of that Court should be.

Nobody, North or South, should suggest that these four questions present simple problems. They are complex and emotional. They are rooted in old faiths and old freedoms. They involve old fears and new ones too. But the very difficult and emotional quality of these questions should mean that they receive the best intelligence which the South and the Nation together contain. Neither the South nor the Nation will be served by any Dixiecrat gyrations in the coming Congress. But both the South and the Nation, the President and the Congress need a creative and intelligent approach to this matter. The South needs it most of all. It will do the South no good to win a filibuster and win the increasing impatience of the people of good will in the country as a whole.

Today the Dixiecrats have only succeeded in making themselves look contemptible. Their furies in retrospect look comic by the disclosure of their lack of power even in the South. Fortunately, the South of good sense and good will was not captured by them. And it does not wish to be represented by any men of their spirit. In the coming Congress Southern Senators and Representatives have a responsibility to bring to these questions which concern their countrymen not anger and inflexibility but intelligence and wisdom.

It is not the Southern task today to defend indefensible positions. Its task is the persuasion of a Nation upon the basis of progressive programs for the betterment of all its people, who include so many of the black and the poor. As the region in which democracy had its American beginning, its leaders must be at work for democracy's fulfilment. As the section which has suffered so many discriminations, its representatives must be seeking fair and equal treatment for men.

The South has a task today greater than any which ever confronted it. It will be secure at home in its customs and its culture only as it succeeds in demonstrating not bitter reaction but generous progress in a Nation which is determined to defend and demonstrate true democracy in the world.

A Worried "Grassrooter"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, typical of many letters from Republican voters and from some who never voted the Republican ticket, is the following letter:

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Have been watching as much of your case at the Capitol, as much of it as has gotten publicity. I notice in this morning's Chicago Tribune regarding your being kept off the Un-American Activities Committee, if those in control keep on that committee will in deed and truth be an un-American committee.

Saw an article signed by you in the Voice of the People column of the Tribune a short while back, wherein you likened the actions of the Republican Party as to an athletic team. I agree with you fully, there is nothing so demoralizing to teamwork as to have the leaders of a team keep sending those reputed-to-be world-beaters to the fore and have them fail utterly time after time, while those of the team who have done all the supporting work are kept on the bench and never given a chance to show what they could do individually. If Dewey were on a basketball team he would demand he be permitted to do all the shooting.

Now, Mr. HOFFMAN, just what are we of the rank and file going to do about this whole matter? Just sit and take it on the chin and smile about it? My personal feelings are that the Democratic Party died when John Nance Garner and his ilk passed out of the Washington scenery, and unless the Republicans do something very drastic in the next very few months to reinstate the conservative or nationalistic, yes, even the isolationist elements, it too will be as dead as possible. This is a two-party Nation. The New Dealers are internationalists-liberals. There is only one stand for the opposition to take, conservative-nationalism, "me-too-only-betterism," is not the solution. Literally millions of voters went to the polls last fall feeling they only had a choice between two evils; they wanted neither. Many other millions stayed away from the polls because they did

not care which side won. When the Republican Convention nominated Dewey, New Dealism just sat back and smiled, saying "Go ahead, dog eat dog, and may the biggest liar win." And he did. So, I ask, what are we going to do? I am a Republican at heart, but not hide-bound on the subject, most positively not a New Deal Republican. Unless nationalism returns to the leaders, I am ready to join or help organize a new party that will come out square for honest constitutional Americanism. I can accept such men from the the South as BYRD, TYDINGS, GEORGE, or DOUGHTON. I have heard many Republicans say they would be glad to get a chance to vote for BYRD. I am confident such a party would break up the one-party South, and could be a fine thing for the Nation.

The Republican Party is silly to try to appease labor in any way. We should expose the hypocrisy of the so-called civil-rights issue. An honest civil-rights policy is what our Constitution calls for; it means more than merely the rights of southern Negroes to vote. The right of any American citizen to work for whom he pleases, and for an employer to hire or fire anyone he pleases, and all down the line in such matters is just as much a civil-rights matter as southern racial questions. I feel the same on States' rights.

The Eightieth Congress was the first Congress in 20 years that honestly tried to carry out the expressed will of the Nation at the last previous election. It would have gotten the approval of the Nation again had there been as much as one major speech made explaining the situation to the Nation. The Nation got tired waiting for some defense to be made by the two wonderful prosecuting attorneys heading the Republican ticket, and if that campaign had run 2 weeks longer, the Democrats would have carried every State. Our prosecutors never tried to prosecute. "If you tell a lie long enough, big and strong enough, it will eventually be accepted for truth." When he took for his theme song, "That awful Eightieth Congress" and nobody disputed it, only one result could possibly be expected. The campaign was lost in the last 6 weeks.

I wish someone could tell me when our Nation was ever as well off, and as happy, as it was when those two arch conservatives Joe Cannon of the Republicans and Champ Clark of the Democrats were at the wheels. We started slipping when "Do-Gooders" took over. In the name of progressivism our Nation has been going backward ever since Wilson took over.

The Republican Party does not need to copy the New Deal to get issues to attract the young voters. There are many old traditions of our Nation that made us really great that could be expounded, and they are new questions now. Dewey acted as though he was ashamed of his party and his Nation.

Keep fighting, it's the only way out.

Sincerely.

A New Day for Health and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am inserting the following address which I delivered before the American Social Hygiene Association today on the occasion of my acceptance of the William F. Snow award:

ACCEPTANCE OF WILLIAM F. SNOW AWARD BY CONGRESSWOMAN FRANCES P. BOLTON

Mr. Chairman, I accept this William F. Snow award with a glow in my heart, for does it not bind me close within the wondrous circle of those who, like myself, have been privileged to catch a spot of the light shed across the world by the radiant spirit of the man whose name it bears?

I count it among the greatest privileges of a privileged life to have been one of the workers in his vineyard.

I do thank those who considered me worthy, but most of all do I thank you, Dr. Snow, for the joys of my work with you and for the inspiration that flows from you into all the world.

A NEW DAY FOR HEALTH AND WELFARE

(Address of Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Member of Congress, at the National Social Hygiene Day observance of the American Social Hygiene Association and the Social Hygiene Society of the District of Columbia)

Whatever may be one's concept of health and welfare for one's self and for the Nation, from whatever angle one may view the many proposals for securing these assets, this would seem the moment when every effort could and should be made to expose all citizens to opportunity to achieve a maximum of health and a higher minimum of wholesome living.

We have a goal here in America—a vision, which, though often dimmed perhaps, still lives in our minds and hearts. We see before us, ever beckoning, this land of our dreams, our desires, our hopes and our determined efforts: a land where children will be born with fine strong bodies, keen minds and understanding hearts into homes where love and kindness dwell; a land in which each may have the education and training best suited to his capacity and work adequate for his need—a land where there may be in addition a bit of laughter, and time to enjoy the beauty of God's world. Such, surely, is the dream of every one of us; such is the goal toward which we have set our feet.

That we have traveled but a part of the way need not discourage us, for we have progressed.

Look back over the centuries. Certainly the world as a whole is a little better than it was say in the Middle Ages, or in the days of ancient Rome when captives built the great temples and forums and walls, even as in Egypt. Look back when you grow downhearted over our today and without any possible doubt you will see that man for man there is less unhappiness, more joy, in our day than could then have been dreamed of.

True it still is that no one has arisen to tell us the vivid tale of suffering India that all the world would know its truth. Nor has anyone come amongst us to sing of the sorrows of the millions that for thousands of years have been spawned into the great enigma that is China. And who sings the song of the Russia that is filled with sorrow and anguish, agony and despair. And what of Ceylon and Indonesia and all that great East? Who comes to bring light and sane leadership to Africa? But even though we have begun to be aware of these great tragic symphonies we know that man for man there is more chance for joy now than in the days of Tamerlane, of Nero, of Rameses the Great.

Let us rejoice that this is so, and having glanced backward in time let us look with clear eyes upon today that we may set out with fearlessness and faith upon tomorrow's road, uncharted though it be.

As a nation we cannot go far except we have health of body, keenness of mind, clarity of understanding. Two wars have shown us what could be a very frightening health picture were we just to stand before it immovable, aghast. But we have never done that, have we? We have always faced up to unpleasant things when we had to and then have set about doing something about them.

The fact that diseases of death-dealing virulence take heavy tolls annually right here in the United States as well as across the world brings into high relief the efforts of this first half of the twentieth century to establish a better standard of health. And amazing have been the results! Think of the serums and vaccines that can control epidemics of today. Only a year ago cholera began to spread like wildfire over Egypt. What happened? Why, all the countries of the world that had cholera serum sent what they had by plane to Cairo! How could that be? Because men have begun to learn that none can live to himself alone and have brought the World Health Organization into being.

In this day of shrinking distances health and its tragic darker brother, disease, have world-wide significance. Only through intelligent cooperation can we hope to bring about even the first faint vestiges of our dream. Health—that is our goal. What do we mean by the term—just absence of disease? Perhaps that is your concept, but I confess it is not mine. To me health can best be described as a state of ecstasy, a merging with the Great Stream of joyous, unconquerable Life. But for practical purposes I accept the definition given by the World Health Organization constitution: "complete physical, mental and social well-being, not merely the absence of disease and infirmity," for the acceptance of this definition has started a concerted world-wide attack upon three of man's most terrible enemies: malaria, tuberculosis and venereal disease. Hundreds of millions of people all over the world are victims of malaria; tuberculosis has attacked the weakened peoples of the war-torn lands with a renewed and hideous fury; and the venereals have stolen into the very center of our civilization, reaching beyond today into a darkened tomorrow.

Dr. Scheele, our alert, new Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is to speak rather particularly about the actual stamping out of this scourge, which has been the special field in which the American Social Hygiene Association, of which I have long had the rare privilege of serving as vice president under Dr. Wilbur and Mr. Mather, has worked. I shall not intrude into his areas though I share with him the hope that the recent and somewhat spectacular gains in scientific discovery and practical application may speed the day when we shall be free of this bondage.

But in this battle against venereals, science alone cannot win. In no other field of preventive medicine is it more vital to carry on simultaneously correlative activities in education, recreation, social protection and law enforcement. Even these are not enough, for no complete victory will be achieved until each child is brought to a deep and unshakable understanding that the body is, indeed, the temple of the Holy Spirit, to be understood, to be used as an instrument by which the indwelling soul may find its way to God.

Immense gains have been made since I first learned at firsthand something of the national and international problems and shared with scientists and laymen the thrill of a fresh courage to persevere that came with the identification of the spirochete, the development of the Wassermann test, the

final release by Professor Ehrlich of the now long famous arsenic compound "606," which began the long march of science and clinical medicine through successive improvements of therapy to the great benefits of penicillin, which, at the moment, is such a "wonder drug" for the treatment of both syphilis and gonorrhea.

There are high lights along the way—pioneers such as Prince Morrow, Charles W. Eliot, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Jane Addams, Grace Dodge, Joseph Lee, whose advocacy of the changing attitudes was substantiated by Abram Flexner's epochal book on Prostitution in America, by Raymond Fosdick's studies of police systems, findings of the vice commissions appointed in our leading cities, and the many case studies of patients in clinics and private practice.

My own direct contacts with the problem of venereal disease itself and the means being used to educate both professionals and laymen brought me the conviction that all groups must share the responsibility for the eradication of this scourge and that all professional groups must work shoulder to shoulder in full partnership. So to me the public health nurse became an important factor in the whole picture, and as I have been able, I have joined with the many others of like minds to see that she was equipped with knowledge and then freed to make the intimate often very difficult educational contribution in the homes of our people.

To all of us of the American Social Hygiene Association it has been of great satisfaction that our people were ready to play a vital role when the exigencies of World War II brought the country face to face with the need for integration of all these constructive forces, for trained personnel and facilities, and for essential administration for a dramatic health conservation program which not only helped win the war but demonstrated that its continuance and adaptation to peacetime conditions can put human life conservation on a plane with our programs for conservation of all our natural resources without which our world leadership cannot continue.

As many of you know, our people, our trained personnel, because of their experience and ability, are again serving Government as such in the camp areas. There is a probability that with the enlarged plans for health as a part of the program of the administration we shall be called upon to enlarge our horizons. That we are ready and equipped to do.

But what of the all-important educational field? What of the factor of morals which can be made vital only by a greater recognition of spiritual responsibilities? The American Social Hygiene Society has long known what the Lord Chancelor's Committee of the British Government puts concisely in a recently issued report on family stability and marriage guidance, namely: "The basic causes of marriage failure are to be found in false ideas and unsound emotional attitudes developed before marriage, in youth and even in childhood. The right time to correct those ideas and attitudes is before marriage."

We of the ASHA are ready to contribute in practical ways to whatever methods may be tried in honest efforts to bring a more wholesome way of life to all our children. Much is being done along lines of youth and marriage counseling, as well as advocating the development of practical ways and means of making early marriage possible. In this field the District of Columbia's Social Hygiene Society, of which I had the privilege of being a charter member when it was organized in 1918, can be commended on all counts. Its work is an example of what social hygiene societies everywhere could do.

The quick response of the United Service Organization and the American Social Hygiene Association to specific requests of the Secretary of National Defense for aid in securing nationwide civilian cooperation is most encouraging. Your panel discussion this morning on "The Mutual Responsibility of the Community, the Armed Forces, and the Serviceman," was both interesting and informative. The joint participation of such distinguished military and civilian leaders not only on the national, but also on the regional, State, and local levels, meetings in connection with the Social Hygiene Day programs in all parts of the United States, forecasts a year of great progress in this most difficult sector of social hygiene.

The present policy and programs of our armed forces as outlined in recent announcements and orders attest the validity and importance of securing vigorous national, State and local activity to combat not only commercialized sexual promiscuity, but also the far more difficult problem of what a recent writer has called "girls on the loose," a little emphasized or understood tragedy of today.

It is significant that both the military and civilian groups now recognize that spiritual values, moral responsibility, and self-discipline are just as vitally important to the civilian as to the soldier on leave or furlough as well as during tours of duty.

It is quite possible that Congress may again consider some form of Federal social protection legislation. The nation's experience during the two world wars produced ample evidence of the serious need of Federal cooperation with the States in this matter, and of the concrete benefits of such cooperation when carried out effectively by trained personnel. The arguments and supporting data for continuing similar activities adapted to peacetime conditions are clear and convincing; and only minor details of ways and means are lacking. The public as well as Congress should be giving earnest and early thought to such legislation, especially in this year when most of the State legislatures are also holding sessions.

Whatever the Congress may or may not do, those who have the responsibility for ways and means should envision the fact that in the field of social hygiene the dramatic appeals of wartime for support of specific education, social protection, and training of the boy to be efficient, self-reliant, courageous and ready to sacrifice everything for victory, must somehow be translated into an equally practical and dramatic peacetime appeal in behalf of both boys and girls for these same qualities and training for a successful peacetime career and for marriage and family living. Our generation cannot escape the responsibility for incorporating this objective in our moral, religious and civic preparation of youth, if we believe in Article 16 of the Declaration of Human Rights, adopted December 10, 1948, by the United Nations Assembly, the final paragraph of which reads: "The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of Society and is entitled to protection by Society and the State."

Because of my many years of interested membership in our national body, which grew out of the federation of existing State and local societies in 1914, I trust I may be pardoned if I take a moment or two to remind you that in the American Social Hygiene Association we do, indeed, have a fitting clearinghouse for all its member agencies and affiliates, as well as a means of participation in world-wide action through its membership in the several international unions concerned which have official relations status with the World Health Organization and other specialized agencies of the United Nations. A splendid demonstration of this which has received especial commendation has been the operation, since 1946, of a Regional Office for the Americas of the International Union Against the Venereal Diseases. This has had an important influence in promoting teamwork and correlation of governmental and non-governmental agencies, and public support of the broad concept of this field of health and welfare. What lies ahead for the Society has been so well expressed by our skillful and devoted president, Philip R. Mather, in the summing up in his annual message printed in the January 1949 Journal and News that I hope you will agree with me that they warrant repetition at this time. "It seems clear," he said, "if the gains so far made are to be held, that the American Social Hygiene Association must provide for the immediate future:

"(1) Redoubled drive, by public education and community cooperation, to finish up the job of stamping out VD. VD infections still remain the nation's greatest problem in communicable disease control—still bring tragedy to far too many thousand American homes.

"(2) Constant alertness to the danger of a resurgence of commercialized prostitution, with prompt action when needed. ASHA field studies for 1948 show 38 percent of communities with bad prostitution conditions, as compared with 19 percent a year ago, and 4 percent at the beginning of 1946.

"(3) Expanded activities to utilize the growing eagerness of the public and of special groups, to join in the program for family life education. Each new generation calls for new and up-to-date materials and methods for this purpose, while standard, well proved publications and projects must be continuously made more widely known and used.

"(4) No let-up in the year-round campaign to keep the public informed of all these developments, and working as citizen leaders alongside professional social hygiene workers in well-planned, effective community programs. Every State, every community, needs a rounded, balanced social hygiene program for satisfactory progress in health and welfare."

It has been a pleasure to serve as vice president of the Association and to work with you all for so many years in our attacks upon this important group of problems. In that capacity I feel very deeply that we who are members of this Society, we who are so vividly cognizant of the need America has for better mores, for more wholesome living, for broader recognition of the spiritual foundation stones that must be set upon a rock if our way of life is to prevail, we must find means by which to renew in the hearts and minds of every man and woman, every boy and girl, the flaming certainty that the individual is important to the evolution of God's universe because each is an infinitesimal part of the essence of His Being, and that freedom for the individual and for the Nation and ultimately for the world can be had and retained only through discipline and self-restraint.

To do our part in making the individual a constructive member of a free society, we must renew our ancient faiths and use, with the utmost intelligence and consecration, such scientific secrets as the Infinite Intelligence permits us to uncover, that our children's children may indeed rejoice in sound bodies, clear minds and understanding hearts.

Where do you think we are all going?
I will tell you!
Toward happiness that is beyond dreams;
Toward truth that surpasses thought;
Toward realization of something that is
both within and beyond you;
Toward freedom, peace and love.

With the memories of our yesterdays fresh in our thoughts, the grim facts of today challenging us at every turn and Tomorrow beckoning, we can look forward confidently to a New Day for Health and Welfare in which the American Social Hygiene Association will have full recognition and support commensurate with the public need for its great services.

House Construction Is Falling Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the housing plight of many American families is dramatized by the mass evictions which started in Tulsa, Okla. Housing is a basic necessity in short supply. The deliberate withholding of shelter at this time is like denying bread to a starving man. This housing strike of landlords is a most reprehensible thing.

Less noticeable, but more important than the brutal drama of mass evictions, are some significant and disquieting facts about the current housing situation. I call the attention of the Members to a publication recently issued by the Housing and Home Finance Agency entitled "Housing Statistics." Therein it will be found that the number of construction starts of new permanent nonfarm dwelling units, privately and publicly financed, has declined each month since May of 1948. The 64,000 units started in November 1948—the last month tabulated—were 9.7 percent less than in October and 34.6 less than in May of the same year.

Mr. Speaker, although the aggregate number of housing units started in 1948 may show up well in comparison with the low levels of previous years, the significant thing is that housing construction is steadily falling off. We are losing instead of gaining in the housing field.

Rental housing, the need for which has been so repeatedly stressed, is not holding its own. In the first 7 months of 1948, rental-type units accounted for 102,000 or 18 percent of new units started. Although this was a substantial increase over the number of rental-type units for the corresponding period of 1947, the added fact is that the proportion of rental-type units to all units has been decreasing since early 1948. In July, the latest month for which data are given, the proportion of rental-type units—15.2 percent of all units started—reached its lowest point for the year.

The reduced rate of home-building and disproportionate decline in rental housing are not the only matters to cause concern. Rents are steadily climbing upward. The residential rent index compiled by the United States Department of Labor shows that rents which were stabilized around 108 for the war years—1935–39 equals 100—began to creep upward early in 1947, reaching 118.8 by November of 1948.

Members who have protested the diversion of materials and construction activity from housing to less essential uses will not be surprised to learn that the value of non-residential building has remained constant over the period in which home-building has dropped. For the latter part of 1948, the percentage of all non-farm-building construction put in place which is accounted for by residential building declined from 62.1 in August to 61.3 in September, 59.9 in October, and 58.1 in November.

Mr. Speaker, a few more facts in the afore-mentioned publication of the Housing and Home Finance Agency are worthy of note. In October of 1948 construction costs, as measured by the Department of Commerce composite index, experienced a slight though noticeable decline. This was the first month since May 1943 that the index has shown a decline over the preceding month. Even though average hourly earnings in private building construction reached a new all-time high of $1.92 in October, construction costs as a whole were not thereby increased but began to go down for the first time in years.

Veterans and servicemen constitute an increasing percentage of the occupants in public-housing units. These groups in June 1948 occupied 62.8 percent, or 457,750 units, under the jurisdiction of the Public Housing Administration, as compared to 57.8 percent, or 433,510 units, in June 1947.

While veterans of low incomes are forced to seek public-housing aid, there has been a precipitate reduction in the number of home loans to veterans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. The 24,153 loans guaranteed in November 1948 represent a 48-percent decline from November 1947. The total number for the first 11 months of 1948 was down 34 percent from the same months of 1947.

The Increasing Trend Toward Acquisition of Tax-Exempt Real Estate by the Federal Government Throws an Unfair Burden on Many Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this Congress I introduced H. R. 445, to provide for taxation by States and other political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States or one of the Government agencies.

As the Federal Government has expanded its functions and activities, and in part as the result of wartime necessities, the title to more and more real property has been vested in the United States, thereby acquiring immunity from local taxation and throwing a correspondingly greater burden upon all other taxpayers in the community affected.

According to reports which have been brought to me, not only has the administration done nothing to check this tendency and alleviate the hardship on municipalities resulting from the trend, but actually has actively contributed to the creation of an increasingly intolerable situation by having title taken in the name of the United States or one of the tax-exempt agencies rather than in the name of a Federal corporation which is by statute liable for local taxes.

Thus, we have the spectacle of our Government, which is quick, and properly so, to crack down upon those who use all and sundry devices to avoid Federal taxation, attempting by a legalized contrivance to deprive local taxing authorities of their just dues. The result is that the few in a particular locality pay for a benefit conferred upon the many throughout the country.

What possible justification can there be for a large building owned by the United States and leased for manufacturing purposes or for storage warehouse purposes to be exempt from local taxation?

The measure which I have submitted provides that the United States or the Federal agency owning such a property shall make payment to the local taxing authority of an amount equivalent to the taxes which would be levied if the property were privately owned, with the proviso, however, that if it can be shown that the property does not receive some particular local service, the cost of such service may be deducted from the amount of the payment. A statement of the sum due must be sent by the municipality to the Federal agency involved, after which payment must be made or appropriate steps taken to review any alleged erroneous determination of liability on the part of the local authorities.

As to school taxes, a special provision is included in this bill creating a Federal liability only when officers, agents, or employees of the United States reside on the Government-owned property. In that case the United States must pay to the local school taxing authorities an amount equivalent to the fair tuition charge as determined by the United States Commissioner of Education, for the pupils of school age residing on this property.

Concededly there are many, in fact most, types of uses of Federal property which probably should be excluded from such taxation. It would be a rather startling suggestion, for example, to tax post offices and courthouses, which might be said to serve peculiarly the interests of the people in a local area in the same manner as the buildings which house the administrative or governmental functions of the State, county, or city. Also Federal office buildings and installations employing and bringing to the community large numbers of

people are usually the subject of vigorous competition between various localities, since they normally enhance local values, increase business and substantially improve the appearance of the municipality. There seems to be no adequate reason why in such cases the locality which is enjoying such incidental benefits should receive the additional and unexpected windfall of payments in lieu of taxes.

In the case of Army and Navy posts, camps, and stations which ordinarily receive little, if any, local benefits or services furnished by the municipality other than educational facilities, these are separately treated in this bill. They usually provide their own fire and police protection, their own roads and sewers, and they are normally located in rural or semirural areas. It would seem inequitable to require them to pay an ad valorem tax on the high valuation of their real-estate development.

It is therefore provided in this legislation that Federal office buildings, courthouses, mints, assay offices, customhouses, laboratories, experimental grounds or buildings, testing stations, jails, penitentiaries, reformatories, detention farms, hospitals, cemeteries, national parks or monuments, or Army and Navy posts, camps, garrisons, stations, or yards are exempt from the provisions of this new taxing statute.

The conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, as well as many other groups throughout the Nation, have taken official action petitioning the Federal Government to provide substantial payments to local governments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property.

I was very much interested recently to receive a detailed letter from the executive secretary of the American National Livestock Association, with headquarters in Denver, Colo., expressing support for legislation to relieve local and State governments of the burdens resulting from the continued acquisition of real property by the Federal Government.

Accompanying this letter was a map which is most enlightening. It shows that between 24 and 25 percent of the total land area of the United States is now under Federal ownership and that in certain localities, notably the far West, individual State percentages run as high as 86 percent in Nevada and 73 percent in Arizona. All but two of the States show an increase between 1937 and 1947. In the State of New York, for instance, the Federal holdings have nearly doubled in this 10-year period.

A complete comparative percentage table, by States, follows:

State	Percentage of Federal holdings in—	
	1937	1947
Nevada	82.67	86.77
Arizona	63.05	73.41
Utah	60.45	72.07
Idaho	58.07	63.75
Oregon	46.29	53.92
Wyoming	42.72	51.51
California	39.46	45.55
New Mexico	35.32	43.73
Colorado	33.34	38.16
Montana	33.95	35.23
Washington	32.28	35.03
District of Columbia	23.43	23.65
South Dakota	16.13	17.99
New Hampshire	11.22	11.58
Arkansas	6.87	8.44
Virginia	5.22	8.43
Oklahoma	6.31	7.73
Michigan	4.59	6.99
Minnesota	6.52	6.89
Florida	3.93	6.74
West Virginia	5.48	6.03
Wisconsin	5.11	5.95
Tennessee	3.68	5.82
North Dakota	3.84	5.53
North Carolina	4.12	5.49
Mississippi	3.47	4.77
Georgia	3.73	4.64
South Carolina	3.40	4.54
Alabama	5.94	[1] 3.64
Louisiana	2.09	3.61
Missouri	2.17	3.29
Kentucky	1.88	3.50
Vermont	2.51	2.97
Rhode Island	.32	2.89
Maryland	1.82	2.02
Pennsylvania	2.07	[1] 2.02
Nebraska	.92	1.86
Delaware	1.36	1.77
Texas	.43	1.43
Indiana	.32	1.28
New Jersey	.50	1.11
Illinois	.34	.99
New York	.53	.90
Ohio	.21	.68
Maine	.40	.70
Kansas	.17	.54
Massachusetts	.25	.50
Connecticut	.22	.44
Iowa	.10	.17

[1] Decline.

The alarming feature about this subject is the ever increasing trend of expansion, resulting in additional inequities and abuses which should be promptly ended. Either H. R. 445 or some other measure to meet this problem should be enacted in order to effect equity and fairness to all property owners.

Equality in Naturalization and Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a memorandum fully explaining the aims and implications of important legislation pending now before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

I am referring to five identical bills introduced in the Eighty-first Congress. The basic purpose of this legislation is to wipe out the remaining racial restrictions of our immigration and naturalization statutes.

I may add that this is definitely a nonpartisan matter. The legislation first originated in the Eightieth Congress when the Representative from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER H. JUDD, introduced H. R. 4824 and later H. R. 5004, which was rewritten into H. R. 6809 and unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary in the Eightieth Congress. On the other hand, the President's Committee on Civil Rights stressed the necessity of amending our immigration and naturalization laws so as not to deny the privilege to become a citizen of the United States to people who qualify in every other way except for their ancestry.

The memorandum follows:

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE EQUALITY IN NATURALIZATION AND IMMIGRATION

LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE

"The real objective of the bill(s)—stated in a few words—is to eliminate all racial barriers in existing naturalization laws and to make it possible for Asian and Pacific peoples to enter the United States as quota immigrants; and, yet, from a practical standpoint, to keep within a reasonable number those persons who may come to the United States." (From Department of State analysis of this legislation.)

BILLS BEFORE THE HOUSE—EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Identical bills have been introduced as follows: H. R. 90, GEORGE P. MILLER, Democrat, California; H. R. 199, WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, Minnesota; H. R. 308, FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, Pennsylvania; H. R. 1214, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Republican, Hawaii; H. R. 1444, SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The main outline of these bills was worked into legislative form late in the first session of the Eightieth Congress (H. R. 4824). Early in the second session, upon the advice and suggestion of the Departments of State and Justice, a tighter and somewhat expanded version was developed (H. R. 5004). Both Departments were vigorous in their support of this legislation. The Department of National Defense found the bill outside its area of responsibility, but specifically offered no objection.

This latter bill (H. R. 5004) was the basis for comprehensive open hearings held April 19 and 21, 1948. Following these hearings, H. R. 5004 was further worked upon by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House Judiciary Committee (Messrs. FRANK FELLOWS, Maine, LOUIS E. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania, J. CALEB BOGGS, Delaware, Republicans; and EMANUEL CELLER, New York, Frank L. CHELF, Kentucky, and ED GOSSETT, Texas, Democrats), primarily in the direction of tightening the provisions relating to immigration. The perfected bill was introduced as H. R. 6809.

UNANIMOUS SUBCOMMITTEE APPROVAL

H. R. 6809 was unanimously approved by the subcommittee, late in the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

FINAL CONSIDERATION DELAYED

Action by the full Judiciary Committee and by the House was not taken primarily because of two considerations: The obvious fact that the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, under the chairmanship of Senator Chapman Revercomb, of West Virginia, would not be able to take action before adjournment, and secondly, the early date of adjournment.

PERFECTED LEGISLATION

The purpose of the present bills was widely discussed and strongly supported in comprehensive open hearings. With very minor technical revision they are identical with H. R. 6809 as perfected and approved by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigra-

tion and Naturalization of the Eighteth Congress.

HEARINGS ON H. R. 5004, APRIL 19 AND 21, 1948

Basis of favorable testimony: Testimony, overwhelmingly in favor of enactment, was based on three broad considerations:

1. As an act of justice of immediate value to American moral leadership in the Far East while that area of the world is yet in a state of political flux.

2. As an act of justice to long resident Asian immigrants who have made a positive contribution to America (96 percent Japanese immigrants here 30 to 50 years).

3. No new policy is involved, but rather extension of the policy developed by the Congress by enactment of the act of December 17, 1943, ending Chinese exclusion and of July 2, 1946, granting the privilege of naturalization and immigration to the people of India and the Philippines.

Far-eastern relations, State Department: Mr. W. Walton Butterworth, Director, Office of Far Eastern Affairs, Department of State:

"For many years the maintenance of normal friendly relations between the United States and oriental countries has been impeded by racial discrimination present in our immigration and naturalization laws. * * * This * * * bill has the hearty endorsement of the Department of State."

Far-eastern relations, Joseph C. Grew, former Ambassador to Japan: "From the standpoint of our relations in the Far East * * * the question is one of principle, of recognition of the innate equality of peoples, of giving force to our own democratic beliefs.

"I believe the present to be an exceptionally favorable time to take a step of this nature * * * since it is a time of great movement among these peoples, of realinement and choosing of friends. Burma is newly independent, Indonesia is seeking a new status—everywhere there is receptivity to new ideas.

"Nowhere is this more evident than in Japan, where a new leadership is emerging under our tutelage.

"It seems to me to be the height of folly to ask the support of democratic elements in these countries, yet at the very point where our democracy comes to test, to back away. If we want to hold our friends, we must support them.

"The ending of exclusion now would provide concrete proof of American good faith at a time when it is most important that new leadership be oriented in our direction."

Naturalization on the basis of individual qualification: Concerning the privilege of naturalization, Mr. Grew summed up a basic attitude when he said:

"It seems (to me) there can be little room for disagreement that any immigrant who is allowed to remain permanently in the United States should not only be permitted to seek citizenship, but should be encouraged to do so. * * * It is wholly in keeping with American tradition that in so deeply important a matter as citizenship, admission or denial be made only on grounds of individual behavior and qualification."

Naturalization, John J. McCloy, wartime Under Secretary of War: "I believe legislation such as this, at least as it affects the interests of the Japanese Americans, is only an appropriate form of recognition for the loyalty which Japanese Americans as a whole evidenced to this country during the war."

Naturalization, Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, Pacific theater: "I have first-hand, intimate knowledge of the service rendered by the Nisei in General MacArthur's headquarters during operations against the Japanese. The loyalty of the Nisei was absolute, and their willingness to go to the front where capture, even their presence, meant risk of their lives. I have the highest regard for the Nisei and feel the United States owes them a debt of gratitude for the magnificent service which they rendered in the Pacific."

Naturalization, Gen. Mark W. Clark: "The supreme test of citizenship is the willingness of a man to risk his life so that our country may live.

"Under my command in Italy the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Regiment and the One Hundredth Infantry Batallion, composed of Nisei, fought the Nazi combat forces with the valor and skill characteristic of the young Americans that they are.

"The parents of these heroic Nisei should have the privileges of the democracy their sons helped to preserve."

Naturalization, Mike Masaoka, veteran, All-Nisei Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team: "I am very full on this subject. I could go and talk on and on, because I know these people (the noncitizen parents of the Nisei), as I say, and I wish I had the opportunity to tell you more about them. I am sure that no one can deny one fundamental fact. These people are Americans by every standard of conduct that you can think of except that of technically belonging.

"I, as an American soldier, fought, with the thousands, millions, of other American soldiers, for the right of all people to be recognized as individuals, and that is all we are asking, not to be judged or classified on the basis of race.

"On the field of war, on the field of battle, when race and nationality count for nothing and the worth of a man counts for everything, I think we children of these people who are ineligible for citizenship proved that we belonged. We now want our parents to belong."

NOTES CONCERNING PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Source: The testimony of the Committee for Equality in Naturalization (pp. 96–110 of hearings) discusses the characteristics of persons of Japanese ancestry in detail. The findings demonstrate a suitability for citizenship. A very brief summary follows:

Length of residence: Aliens ineligible to citizenship: Three-fourths have lived here for 30 years; nearly half for 40 years or more.

Numbers: Aliens ineligible to citizenship: According to the 1940 census—37,353 in Hawaii; 48,158 in the United States.

Age and sex: Average of immigrant generation: About 50 years. There are eight males to every five females.

Birth rate: In 1940 (U. S. Census figures) lower in California, Oregon, and Washington than the general birth rate.

Relief and unemployment: Negligible.

Education: Average to above average.

Crime: According to the FBI uniform crime reports, their crime rate was about one-half the national average.

SUPPORTING TESTIMONY

Congressional: Supporting testimony included the following: Hon. Walter H. Judd,[1] Representative from Minnesota; Hon. George P. Miller, Representative from California; Hon. Bertrand W. Gearhart,[1] Representative from California; Hon. Joseph R. Farrington,[1] Delegate from Hawaii.

Administrative: Hon. W. Walton Butterworth,[1] director, Office of Far Eastern Affairs, State Department; Hon. Watson B. Miller,[1] Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service; Mr. Samuel W. Boggs,[1] special adviser on geography, Department of State.

[1] Denotes personal appearance.

Private individuals and representatives of organizations: Hon. Joseph C. Grew,[1] former United States Ambassador to Japan; Mr. John J. McCloy, president, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Gen. Mark W. Clark; Gen. Bonner Fellers; Mr. Dillon S. Myer, president, Institute of Inter-American Affairs, former director, War Relocation Authority; Mr. Richard J. Walsh, president, John Day Publishing Co.; Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Mr. C. Lloyd Bailey, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Mr. Edward J. Ennis,[1] chairman, Committee for Equality in Naturalization; Mr. Robert M. Cullum,[1] secretary, Committee for Equality in Naturalization; Mr. Mike Masaoka,[1] national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League, Antidiscrimination Committee; Mr. Sanford H. Bolz,[1] Washington representative, American Jewish Congress; Mr. Walter Jhung, Korean Immigration and Naturalization Committee.

Resolutions: San Francisco Board of Supervisors; Los Angeles Board of Supervisors; executive committee, Federal Council of Churches; National YWCA.

Editorial comment: St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch, April 12, 1948; Washington (D. C.) Post, April 21, 1948; Lewiston (Mont.) Democrat News, September 12, 1947; Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, January 14, 1948; Palo Alto (Calif.) Times, February 17, 1948; Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, March 29, 1948; New York (N. Y.) Post, March 29, 1948; Denver (Colo.) Post, April 10, 1948; Pacific Citizen, Salt Lake City, Utah, April 10, 1948; San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, April 27, 1948; Stockton (Calif.) Record, April 29, 1948.

OPPOSING TESTIMONY

Organizations: Mr. John B. Taylor, American Coalition; Mr. Harry V. Hayden, Jr.,[1] national legislative representative, the American Legion.

FAVORABLE ACTION NOT RECORDED IN HEARING

California American Legion: On September 5, 1948, the California Department of the American Legion passed the following resolution:

"That our naturalization laws should be broadened to enable all who can legally qualify to become American citizens, without regard to race or national origin; and

"That the Department of California, American Legion, requests further concurrence by the national convention of the American Legion."

National American Legion: In the 1948 Miami convention, the national American Legion adopted a resolution favoring extension of the privilege of naturalization to all parents of servicemen, present or honorably discharged.

Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce: "Provided that the numerical quotas are maintained in conformity with the national origins quota principle established by the Immigration Act of 1924; we endorse the principle that the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race; and we endorse the principle of permitting the native or indigenous people of each country to utilize their respective quotas.

"Provided that the total of all minimum quotas does not exceed 5,000 per year, irrespective of changes in territorial limits or sovereignty."

TECHNICAL EFFECT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Naturalization: All racial discrimination in American nationality law will be eliminated. In 1940 (last available census figures) there were 48,158 persons in the United States and 39,784 in Hawaii who were ineligible to citizenship solely because of race. A few of these

[1] Denotes personal appearance.

are Koreans, Polynesians, and other Asian peoples, but more than 96 percent are of Japanese origin. All have been in the United States and Hawaii for at least 25 years; their sons, 35,000 strong, contributed to the victory of American arms in World War II. These are the men and women who will be given the privilege of applying for naturalization, subject to all the usual requirements of individual examination.

Immigration: National origins quotas, strictly computed, will replace the discredited policy of Oriental exclusion. By so doing, the national policy which granted naturalization and quota immigration to the Chinese, East Indians, and Filipinos will be brought to completion.

Asia-Pacific triangle: To accomplish this end, the legislation creates an "Asia-Pacific triangle, comprising all quota areas and all colonies and other dependent areas situate wholly east of the meridian 60° east of Greenwich, wholly west of the meridian 165° west, and wholly north of the parallel 25° south latitude." This includes all of Asia Major and western Pacific Oceania. Persons of ancestry indigenous to this Asia triangle, when immigrating to the United States, will be chargeable to the quota of the country of their ancestry rather than country of birth. This follows the general formula developed by Congress when the Chinese exclusion laws were lifted.

Exact computation of quotas: The number of far eastern peoples who will be eligible to immigrate to the United States for permanent residence in any one year may be exactly computed, since, under the proposed bill, all persons of one-half or more Asian ancestry, wherever born, must enter under the quota of the country of their ancestry or under the small (100) Asia-Pacific quota. (This special Asia-Pacific quota was specifically designed to be used by persons of Asian ancestry born in colonies of the great powers, and to eliminate the confusion which now exists in the laws relating to chargeability of persons of mixed Asian ancestry.)

Thus, under this legislation, persons of Asian ancestry born in North or South America would be charged to the country of ancestral origin; those born in colonies of the great powers (Hong Kong, for example) will be charged to the special Asia-Pacific quota. Furthermore, since all quotas for Asian countries are less than 200, all members of a family must come in under quota.

Total annual authorizations for all Asian and Pacific island quota areas will be 1,890.

Number made eligible: Actual immigration of less than 1,000 Asian peoples in any one year is a safe estimate, since many of the countries covered are remote, and unlikely to use even a small part of their authorized quotas. (During the 10 years, 1938–47, Afghanistan used about 14 out of 1,000 available quota numbers. Nauru, with a standard minimum quota of 100, is an island of but a few square miles in extent, with a total population of 3,500. Bhutan, Nepal, New Guinea, Samoa, and the Pacific Island Territories, each with a minimum quota of 100, are similar areas, entirely unlikely to contribute any sizable number of immigrants to the United States.)

Stay on deportation and joining of families: Moreover, 50 percent of the largest of these quotas, that for Japan (185), will be exhausted for many years under section 19 (c) of the 1917 Immigration Act providing for change of entry status in meritorious cases. Much of the remaining 50 percent of the Japanese quota will undoubtedly be filled by members of families of American citizens, thus simplifying the problems of immigrant adjustment.

No flood of Asian immigrants; restrictions on multiplication of minimum quotas: Under the provisions of this bill, there is no possibility of a flood of Asian immigration. A proportionate decrease in the size of minimum quotas is provided if changes in territorial limits or sovereignty should increase the number of minimum quota countries to more than 50; total immigration from minimum quota countries may never exceed 5,000. Thus, possible fragmentation of the Far East into an increased number of sovereignties would have no appreciable effect on immigration from that part of the world. Of the 41 minimum quotas now in force, 29, using 2,900 quota numbers, go to non-Asian countries.

Limitation on non-Asian colonial immigrants: A separate but generally related provision of the legislation limits non-Asian immigrants from colonial powers to 100 from any one colony in 1 year.

Mechanical simplification: Mechanical simplification of quota computation, provided by these bills, will reduce over-all quotas by 635—from 153,929 to 153,294.

Specific quotas for Asian countries: Specific Asian quotas are set forth on the following page. It may be noted that minimum quotas of 100 are now in force for most of these countries, but that the use of such quotas is limited to persons eligible to naturalization, i. e., Caucasians, Negroes, and American Indians born in these countries. By eliminating racial barriers to naturalization, this legislation enables persons indigenous to these countries to enter the United States as quota immigrants.

Except for the special Asia-Pacific quota described above, these bills do not create new quotas beyond those now provided by law, and increases only one, that for Japan, from 100 to 185, as required by national origins computations.

ASIAN QUOTAS

For convenience in analysis, Asian quotas shown below are divided into five groups. For each group, the first column shows quotas authorized by present law; of these only those in group I may now be used by people indigenous to the countries named. The second column shows quotas authorized by this legislation, all of which may be used by indigenous peoples.

	Present law	Proposed bill	Comment concerning group
Group I:			
Afghanistan	100	100	Neither these quotas nor the persons eligible to use them will be affected by the proposed legislation.
Chinese quota [1]	105	105	
India	100	100	
Philippine Islands	100	100	
Group II:			
Japan	100	185	Minimum quotas for these countries are now in force. Under the bill, only the quota for Japan is raised by use of national-origins computations.
Siam	100	100	
Group III:			
Bhutan	100	100	These remote areas are entirely unlikely to contribute any sizable number of immigrants to the United States. Minimum quotas for these areas are now in force.
Nauru (trust territory)	100	100	
Nepal	100	100	
New Guinea (trust territory)	100	100	
Samoa (trust territory)	100	100	
Pacific Islands (former Japanese mandate).	100	100	
Group IV:			
Burma	100	100	These countries, newly independent, are not now included in the quota proclamation, but undoubtedly would be carried in any new proclamation under present law.
Ceylon	100	100	
Indonesia	100	100	
Korea	100	100	
Pakistan [2]	100	100	
Group V: Asia-Pacific quota	----------	100	This new quota is designed to simplify present unworkable procedure for allocating persons of mixed Asian ancestry to a proper quota. Persons born in Asian Colonies of the Great Powers will also be charged to this quota.
Total Asian quotas	1,705	1,890	

[1] A separate minimum quota for China, usable only by Caucasians, Negroes, and American Indians born in China, will be unaffected by the proposed bill.

[2] Under the law of July 2, 1946, Pakistanians appear to be eligible to naturalization and to immigrate to the United States, but must be charged to the quota for India. This ambiguity would be cleared by passage of the proposed bill.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert copy of a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee relative to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

The development of this seaway is most important to the interests of the State of Wisconsin.

The resolution follows:

Whereas President Truman, in his state of the Union message and in his annual economic report to the Congress, strongly urged upon the Congress immediate development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, to alleviate power shortages and to furnish necessary expansion of our national transportation facilities; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project will extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Great Lakes area; will permit Milwaukee industries to import essential raw materials at low cost and, through the advantage of direct ocean service, to reach new foreign markets and to expand greatly the foreign trade of this area; and

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will provide vast quantities of low-cost hydroelectric energy now running wastefully into the sea, and, in general, will enhance the economic prosperity, the industrial strength and the well-being of the entire Nation and our friendly neighbor, Canada; and

Whereas the events of World War II demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe interior location for national defense industries, for storage of strategic

materials, and for construction of naval and merchant vessels—considerations which have been certified to the Congress by our most eminent military authorities; and

Whereas the constant growth of population and industry necessitates intelligent utilization of all of our national resources and reasonable expansion of our national transportation plant; and our new international responsibilities require this Nation to rise above sectional considerations and to develop its full potential strength in the interest of national security and world peace, which national objectives can be appreciably enhanced by the added industrial and military potential of the St. Lawrence seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we hereby reaffirm the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee, and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds such vast potentialities for the future welfare, prosperity, and security of this Nation and the entire world; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge His Honor, the mayor and the board of harbor commissioners to continue the official effort of the city of Milwaukee to bring this great project to realization; that we urge all civic groups, labor organizations and industrial enterprises to lend their full support to this great cause; and that we urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to exert their best efforts in the Congress to assure authorization of the seaway project at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, and Senators TAFT and BRICKER.

Racial Relations in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith a letter which I received from a prominent citizen, Rev. C. A. Schultz, of Forest, Miss. It relates a human-interest story which occurred in that little south Mississippi town. At a time when racial controversy is raging and politicians are fanning the flames of racial misunderstanding, this letter might prove of interest. Particularly, should it prove interesting to that large class of unbiased citizens of that section generally referred to as the North. Many of this class of people have never been south and are, therefore, unfamiliar with the true conditions in that section of our great and beloved common country. Incidents, such as that referred to in Reverend Schultz' letter are not uncommon in the South, but the flannel-mouthed politicians, who, for personal political advancement, are continuously harping upon the alleged abuse of the Negroes of my section, would have you believe otherwise.

I wish it were possible for this substantial unbiased and otherwise intelligent class of our citizens, north of the Mason and Dixon's line, to visit the South and learn first-hand the true harmonious racial conditions which exist there.

Reverend Schultz' letter was accompanied by a photograph showing both white and colored children clinging to ole' Santa's costume—a picture of happy, harmonious, racial relations in the South. This, incidentally, is nothing new. It is substantiated by the Joe Louis story which appeared in Life magazine, recently. It will be recalled that Joe Louis stated in that article, when asked about race relations in Alabama, when he was a small boy there, that, in effect, he was not conscious of any racial discrimination.

Reverend Schultz' letter follows:

FOREST, MISS., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. WILLIAM COLMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Enclosed herewith is a photograph. There is an interesting true story connected with this photograph, which I thought possibly you would like to know about.

During Christmas week the citizens of Forest erected a large Christmas tree on the courthouse square, decorating it with the usual trimmings. The Merchants Association, Lions, and Rotary Club were the main sponsors; however, some 500 citizens, both colored and white, were in attendance and took part in the program. The high-school band led the parade, this group was followed by an automobile decorated suitably to the occasion, in which sat the former mayor, present mayor, and mayor-elect. Immediately followed a car in which Santa Claus was riding and it was filled to the overflowing with fruits and candies, and many other things which were distributed to Negro and white children alike. On a large platform a Negro quartet sang three numbers of Christmas carols, after which Dr. Joe Lee Smith, present mayor, took over as master of ceremonies. I was called on to give the invocation. Then presents were given to all the children present. Santa Claus was indeed the man of the hour, Negro and white children clinging to his garments to tell him what they wanted him to bring them on Christmas eve night. At this time the enclosed photograph was taken.

The above enjoyable occasion took place in the deep South, the grand old State of Mississippi, where both races believe in the practice of segregation, and whose citizenry voted 85 percent for States' rights. You can't help loving a people like this.

Sincerely,

Rev. C. A. SCHULTZ.

Voluntary Controls and Allocations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, insofar as my opponent in the campaign of last November was one of the majority party which supported this measure, H. R. 1660, in the Eightieth Congress, and insofar as his failure to support controls was an issue in the campaign, I feel obliged to include these remarks in the RECORD in justification of my support and my party's support of this measure today, at least to the extent of extending it for 7 months. The passage of the voluntary measure in the Eightieth Congress implied an admission that those in control of major industries, producing or distributing essential materials and goods, were not acting in the public good. The measure calling for voluntary action on their part was to serve as a warning, to be followed by positive control if necessary. The need for such control did arise, but the Eightieth Congress failed to act. Now the conditions of our economy are different. Profiteering has all but exhausted the savings which the advocates of price and material controls sought to save. Proper prices and allocations now become almost a matter of economic necessity. I see a great similarity between the situation and one relating to bounties on predatory animals. The time to put a bounty on foxes is the time at which the farmers do have chickens which the foxes are preying upon. The fox does not respond to voluntary controls. After the chickens have all been eaten there is little need for a bounty on foxes to the end of protecting the farmer's chickens.

Potential Capacity To Quickly Mobilize for Total War Is Best Interim Peace Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, from the last two wars we have learned that any future war will be total war. The entire resources of our Nation, military, industrial, and agricultural will be harnessed together to repel any assault, in the event we are attacked, and bring the victory that will permit us to survive.

To understand how total war is becoming more total, all we need to do is make a comparison between the war of 1917–18 and the Second World War. By every yardstick, we can see how tremendously increased in intensity and how much more modern war affects the civilian persons and economy. The debt in the first war was roughly $25,000,000,000; in the second war it was over $250,000,000,000. The first war did touch the civilian economy, but not to a very great degree. In the Second World War, war activities penetrated every county in the United States in some way, via agriculture, industry, transportation, communications, science, and so forth. Practically every human activity was directly affected by the second war.

Bearing this in mind, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a very interesting article by Maj. Gen. A. W.

Vanaman, on the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. General Vanaman is the commandant of this school. He has had a varied experience as an Air Force officer, having served as a military attaché, been commandant of McClellan Field, a large technical Air Force installation in Sacramento, and in various other assignments. He served in both world wars. His duty is to train military and civilian personnel how to harness the industrial forces of the Nation rapidly in the event of an emergency. The course would be profitable to every Member of Congress, if we had the time to pursue it.

I have not consulted him, but I am sure that he feels as I do, that this is a very essential activity in our prodigious effort toward a peaceful world. To show that we are prepared for any emergency, not only on land, on sea, and in the air, but in the factory and the farm, and the shop and the laboratory, will make any potential aggressor pause before he decides to attack us. The symbol of might evidenced by a prepared nation that can quickly and effectively throw its full power into a state of war, in my opinion, is the best interim peace insurance that we can have. During that peaceful period, perhaps we can lay solid foundations for the eternal peace that all of us are hoping and praying for. Following is the article taken from the Army and Navy journal, which was prepared by General Vanaman:

THE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

(By Maj. Gen. A. W. Vanaman, USAF, commandant)

In his classic On War, Clausewitz pointed out that the conduct of war is, of necessity, removed from the realm of exact theory and based upon a calculation of probabilities. For a generation, the history of our troubled world has been a living embodiment of the truth of this assertion. Historically each of the great nations has its characteristic sources of military strength and weakness which, under various circumstances, may bring victory or defeat. Germany, traditionally strong in its disciplined masses of well equipped troops, its efficient general staff, and its arms factories in the Ruhr, has faced the liability of two-front attack and possesses manpower reserves much smaller than those of the nations almost certain to oppose Germanic aggression. England has long possessed the advantages of great sea power, the moat formed by the English Channel, and the resources of a vast empire to supplement its own efforts. At the same time England has suffered from its lack of manpower and the extremely vulnerable nature of its far-flung supply lines. The United States, industrially the colossus among nations, and with a huge reservoir of manpower, has proved itself to be the most powerful of military nations, but under circumstances in which its weaknesses were minimized. The Achilles' heel of American military power is time. Napoleon said, Ask me for anything but time. In World War I and World War II the required time was bought by the blood and sacrifice of our allies. Should an aggressor again destroy the peace of the world the margin of available time may be far briefer.

Since the conclusion of World War I, intelligent Americans have realized the importance of this time element. It was clear to them that, unless means could be devised to reduce the time required to mobilize the American economy for war, it would be necessary for the Nation to maintain constantly a vast military organization. Since the American tradition has always favored dependence on the citizen soldier supplied with material produced by converted civilian industry, unceasing effort has been devoted, not only by the armed forces but by many segments of the public, to the development of effective measures for a prompt economic mobilization. For 25 years the industrial college has operated as the only institution in the world dedicated entirely to the problems of economic mobilization, procurement, and procurement planning. On September 3, 1948, the college was reconstituted under the direction of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and assigned the mission of preparing selected senior officers of the armed forces for important command, staff, and planning assignments in the National Military Establishment, and preparing selected civilians for important industrial mobilization planning assignments in any Government agency. This mission requires the presentation of specialized courses in all phases of the national economy with emphasis on the interrelationship of economic factors with the political, military, and psychological factors. Instruction in all aspects of joint logistic planning and the interrelation of such planning with general strategic planning and national policy planning is contemplated. Finally, the mission provides for the conducting of courses relating to peacetime and potential wartime governmental organizations and the determination of the most effective wartime controls.

The economic mobilization course of the industrial college requires 10 months, and deals with such subjects as the economic potential of the United States and other nations, American and world progress in science and technology related to military needs, the computation of requirements for the military and civilian sectors of our economy during war or a national emergency, and problems of production to meet military and civilian demands under emergency conditions, the procurement of supplies for the armed forces, the factors that contribute indirectly to the arming of the Nation (transportation, communications, fuel, power, distribution, and civil defense), manpower, and the mobilization of the Government for efficient functioning under war or emergency conditions.

The instructional methods of the college have, through an evolutionary process, come to include a balanced combination of lectures by staff members and leading authorities in the various fields relating to the mission of the college, case problems, seminars and round-table discussions, committee studies, oral presentations, and individual and group written reports and staff memoranda. In addition to the theoretical and classroom work at the college, the students make field trips to military installations and industrial establishments, observing at first hand the actual organizations and operations which will form the backbone of American economic mobilization.

The facilities of the industrial college limit classes to approximately 120 officers and civilians. Since it is obvious that the tremendous requirements of economic mobilization in the United States call for a far larger group of trained men than the college can graduate in any reasonable period of time, the industrial college has established an economic mobilization course for Reserve officers. Acting under the concept that many of the men most likely to occupy responsible positions in any future economic mobilization could not be released from their civilian pursuits to attend a course in Washington, the college decided to take its courses directly to leading American industrial centers. Thus, under this program, some 23 major cities have been visited by the instructional teams of the industrial college in the academic years 1947–48 and 1948–49. In each city a condensed course in economic mobilization of 2 weeks' duration has been held. The classes in attendance at these courses are composed of Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps; officers of the National Guard; and selected civilians, and have averaged about 250 members.

In the world today there is nothing but change—change in the political relationships of nations, change in the weapons of war, change in the technologies of production, change in the material and manpower requirements of national defense, and change in the body of scientific knowledge upon which all military and industrial technology must rest. The Nation, the economy, or the Military Establishment which does not accept this condition of change and adjust itself accordingly is destined for oblivion. It is the determination of the industrial college that, in its own modest sector of responsibility, it will meet change with adjustment, and always guide itself by the facts of the current situation.

On its twenty-fifth anniversary, the industrial college feels that it has made a very definite contribution not only to the national security, but also toward the solution of that most difficult problem—the combining of an adequate system of military preparedness with the traditional American concepts of personal freedom and free enterprise economy.

The President Pays a Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 31, 1949. It is a clear and concise statement of the provisions of the President's new labor bill, drafted by union lawyers. It could not be expected to be of service to the Nation.

It is worse than a hollow mockery for the President to speak about the terror of world communism in other lands and then disarm his own country from legal authority to cope with communism at home.

No attempt is made to equalize the rights of employer and employee under his bill. We shall go back to conditions of confusion and industrial war under the Wagner Act, if the President's bill becomes law.

I urge every Member of the House to read this clear-cut statement from the Evening Star. It is an awakening by that great paper to the danger with which our country is threatened.

The editorial follows:

MR. TRUMAN PAYS A DEBT

The President's version of a new labor law, drafted in consultation with union lawyers, reveals a distressing willingness to bow to the demands of the labor bosses.

This bill makes a mockery of any rights which employers might be supposed to have. Except in one tiny area, it gives the green light to unions to take whatever they can get by the use of economic force, and, finally, it does not protect the public against strikes designed to attain a union objective by depriving the Nation of some essential commodity or service. Small wonder that the

administration men in the Senate are trying to railroad the bill through without adequate hearings, for it is not a measure which can meet the test of full and honest scrutiny.

The Taft-Hartley Act which has been condemned in emotional terms because it cannot be substantially discredited by any factual showing, tried to bring about some balance between unions and industry. It sought to equalize the one-sided relationship that grew out of the original Wagner Act. This new bill repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and revives the Wagner Act in an amended form which promises to be more unjust to industry than was the original law. The Taft-Hartley Act assumed that employers and employees were entitled to equality under the law. The President's bill clearly repudiates that assumption, and stands on the premise that unions should have special and favored treatment. As an illustration, the President would lift all restraints on political spending by his union political allies. But the ban on political contributions by corporations and banks would be continued in effect.

The President's bill recognizes only two improper union practices. These are certain types of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts designed to maintain a proscribed jurisdictional strike. And even in this drastically limited area the remedies proposed are so time-consuming that, for practical purposes, they are apt to prove ineffective.

On the larger issue of strikes which threaten the life of the Nation, the President's bill is deplorably inadequate. In this respect the Taft-Hartley law offered little enough—at best, an 80-day stay of a crippling strike through resort to the injunction process. The President's bill knocks out any appeal to the courts. It provides only that when a dispute threatens the national health or safety, the President may issue a proclamation calling upon the parties to stay on the job for 30 days. It says that the parties shall observe this proclamation, but there is nothing which requires them to do so. It is further provided that the President appoint a fact-finding board which would investigate the dispute and make recommendations for settlement. The bill does not require either party to accept the recommendations.

In practical effect this would mean that the White House would be back in the business of mediating major labor disputes. We have had unhappy experience with that procedure in the past, and if this bill becomes law, we will have more unhappy experiences in the future. Presumably the Government could bring enough pressure to bear to compel an employer to accept a fact-finding body's recommendation. But it has been amply demonstrated that the Government, without the aid of the Federal courts, cannot similarly coerce a strong union. So as a practical matter what Mr. Truman proposes is that the Government be disarmed as the representative of all the people when their welfare is threatened by a strike.

There are a variety of other things wrong with the President's bill. Among these are the devices to return the Conciliation Service to the Labor Department, to knock out State bans on the closed shop, to cut down the general counsel of the Labor Board, and to lift the curbs on Communist domination of unions. Fortunately, however, the bill cannot be fastened on the country without Senate approval. As it stands, it represents a handsome payment by the President of his political debt to organized labor. But the Members of the Senate are not under the same political obligation. They are free to examine all of the provisions of the measure and to debate them fully. This will be done, and that debate will be one which the people of this country would be well advised to follow with close attention.

Federal Grants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about Federal aid and Federal grants to the several States. Many of our newspapers are looking at this program and wondering if the tendency should not be slowed down a little. Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose a well-written editorial from the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier of January 31, 1949, which reads as follows:

FEDERAL GRANTS

Many Federal and State government leaders don't like the steady increase in grants of Federal money to the States. They say the grants-in-aid gradually subtract from the independence of the States.

The joint conference of State governors and Congressmen, in Chicago several months ago, resolved that the grants should be cut at least 20 percent in the 1950 fiscal year. However, President Truman has proposed in his 1950 budget substantial raises, rather than reductions, in the total of grants.

Even without the new programs, the 1950 total of grants was bound to go higher, says Clarke Beach in an AP story from Washington. James E. Webb, then Budget Director and now Under Secretary of State, said in a speech in December that the Federal Government is already committed to supply increased funds in grants, in accordance with past acts of Congress.

The practice of giving the States grants-in-aid is as old as the Nation, but only in recent years has it taken on major importance. The big boom came in the 1930's when the States and cities were unable to cope with the need for work projects and other relief for the unemployed. The peak came in 1939, when $2,908,999,000 was spent in Federal grants.

Since 1946 they have been rising again: $1,622,068,338 in 1948; $1,941,784,566 estimated for 1949; and $2,458,202,454 in 1950 if the President's proposed new legislation is approved. This would not include $100,000,000 in contract authorizations for the new housing program which Mr. Truman has recommended as another grant measure.

The general idea behind grants is that the Federal Government should pay part of the bill to enable the States to conduct certain programs in the interest of the Nation as a whole. The States administer the grants. The programs chiefly concern health, education, and social welfare.

Grants are supposed to do two things: First, to stimulate the States to conduct programs they might not undertake if they had to depend entirely on their own funds. The Federal Government dangles large sums of money in front of them. It is theirs to use if they match it, usually putting up from about 25 to 50 percent of the total sum to be spent.

Secondly, the grants are supposed to equalize the burden between the rich and poor States. That's where the critics begin to differ with the advocates of the grants. They claim there is very little equalization of the burden. Some experts in the Federal Budget Bureau agree with them.

In fact, the critics declare, the grants discriminate against the poor States. To get the large sums of Federal money, they obligate themselves to put up matching funds, which leave holes in their small treasuries. To engage in the Federal program they have to neglect some local cases which might be more important to them.

The Federal Government moreover, must necessarily establish certain minimum standards for the programs it helps to finance. This means a measure of control over local administration. Representatives of the Council of State Governments feel that the whole program tends to violate the well-accepted political principle that the unit of government which spends money should be responsible for collecting it.

Neither the council nor the governors, however, want the grants program abandoned. They only want it minimized. They want the Federal Government to withdraw from tax collections in certain fields where States can step in and raise money to conduct their own social welfare programs. But the Federal experts, and even the council representatives, admit that this probably would not be the answer. Localities hate to tax their own people, and States try to keep down their taxes because of interstate competition—the effort to provide tax havens.

The programs now financed by grants-in-aid might lag or be abandoned. Even if States and localities impose taxes as heavy as their people can afford, the States in poorer financial condition will end up with revenue which is inadequate for such purposes as those now in effect.

None of the critics seem seriously to expect any development except a gradually expanded program of grants-in-aid.

Mass Picketing of Federal Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 25, 1949.*

It having been brought to the attention of the board of governors of the Louisiana State Bar Association that several instances of mass picketing of Federal district and/or circuit courts in New York City, San Francisco, and Los Angeles have recently taken place, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That the board of governors of the Louisiana State Bar Association, condemns the picketing of courts, Federal and State, as an interference with and obstruction of the administration of justice, the purpose of which can only be to influence, intimidate, and coerce the courts in connection with matters, prospective or pending, before them.

"That ours is a nation of laws and not of men, and that in the orderly administration of justice it is necessary that our courts be impartial and independent in the application and construction of the laws and thus free from any interference or acts which will result in a disrespect for law and constitutional government under law; that such picketing constitutes a clear and present danger as well as a major threat to the integrity and independence of the judiciary and our form of government.

"That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mr. Henry P. Chandler, Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, with the request that this matter be brought to the attention of the Judicial Conference of the United States; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the

Representatives of this State in Congress so that should additional legislation become necessary in order to protect the integrity of our Federal courts such Representatives will know the attitude of the bar of Louisiana with respect thereto."

I, the undersigned assistant secretary of the Louisiana State Bar Association, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the board of governors of the association on January 25, 1949.

In witness whereof I have hereto affixed my signature and the seal of said association on this the 28th day of January 1949.

[SEAL] STEPHEN A. MASCARO,
Assistant Secretary.

Gen. Courtney H. Hodges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in New York City on last Monday, January 31, the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard, and the citizens of New York joined together to pay homage to Gen. Courtney H. Hodges on his retirement from active duty with the Army of the United States—a tribute to a great soldier and to a great leader on our team for national defense.

When General Hodges departed from First Army headquarters at Fort Jay, Governor's Island, N. Y., there were representative units from each of our armed services to pay tribute as a gun salute was given from a Navy destroyer in the harbor. Here we saw a cooperation between the services indicative not only of their mutual admiration for this great leader, but beyond this, a splendid example of the existing interservice harmony leading toward true unification which he has so wholeheartedly supported.

Despite the snow, sleet, and slush downtown Broadway was lined with people as General Hodges was escorted to the City Hall. Mayor O'Dwyer presented a special medal and a scroll to General Hodges and proclaimed him an honorary citizen of New York City. Here was a heartwarming indication of the good relations and mutual understanding between the citizens and their Army—a condition which General Hodges so earnestly endeavored to promote and maintain.

General Hodges was the man who commanded during World War II the largest Army ever to be organized in American history. He ends today 43 years of outstanding service to his country as a soldier of the United States Army. He terminates his active service with the Army today under the operation of regulations governing age of general officers and thus closes a career that began in 1906 as a private in the United States Army. He rose through all the ranks to the highest position in the Army, except for the World War II created rank of General of the Armies.

The story behind the achievement of the four stars General Hodges wears is one of the stirring and exemplary pages of American military history. Spanning an almost unprecedented 43 years of Army life, the general has filled a variety of assignments from 3 years of enlisted service to commissioned assignments with Gen. John J. Pershing in Mexico to regimental commander in Lorraine, the Meuse Argonne and the St. Mihiel offensives in World War I. For his performance of duty in the First World War he won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

After the war he was given assignments calculated to further develop his extraordinary abilities. He instructed in tactics at West Point, studied at the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, was a member of the Infantry Board, and spent 2 years on the General Staff of the Philippine Department.

Later, as commandant of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., he laid the foundation for the infantry training and instruction of officers and men which was followed through the rapid wartime expansion of the school. In 1941, as a brigadier general, he was made Acting Chief, then Chief of Infantry of the Army.

The climax of this distinguished soldier's career came with the advent of World War II. First as deputy commander to General Omar N. Bradley, then as commanding general of the First Army, from the time of its training period in England through the extraordinary exploits of this organization to the conclusion of the Army, General Hodges displayed with increasing spectacularism and effect the brilliant qualities of a fighting soldier of the greatest stature.

As long as such names as Normandy D-day, Huertgen Forest, the Battle of the Bulge, Remagen Bridge, and the Ruhr claim meaning in the history of America, so will the name of the man who contributed so significantly to the victory of the American armies be respected.

In December of 1944, the beginning of the great march of the allied armies of the Rhine, there were, in the First United States Army, under the command of General Hodges, 19 divisions, totaling a force unequaled in size in the history of United States armies.

The statistics of this unparalleled organization are breath taking, even to those unschooled in military operations. At various times, through the European war, First Army controlled a total of 40 divisions. It experienced 337 days of continental operation on an average front of 102 miles. At one time, in April of 1945, the front extended to 287 miles—the maximum front attained during the war. In ground covered, the First Army advanced 866 miles in 337 days, from Utah Beach across the Cherbourg Peninsula, north to Cherbourg, and then from Omaha Beach across the Continent to Grimma, on the Mulde River.

The greatest advance of any corps under First Army during the amphibious assault on the Omaha beachhead was made by the V Corps on the 9th and 10th of June 1944. First Army bore the brunt of the severe fighting in the attack on the Normandy beaches, behind which General Hodges landed while the fighting was fiercest and success still in doubt.

During the entire European operation, First Army was on the defense for only 2 weeks. This was in the terrible days of December 1944 when the Germans launched their counteroffensive in the Ardennes. At this crucial time General Hodges delayed moving his headquarters until the last possible minute so that he could exercise control during the withdrawal stage, and to prevent, if possible, the capture of a main gasoline dump to his rear. Capture of this dump would have been invaluable to the Germans in supplying fuel to maintain their mighty offensive. Both the orderly withdrawal and saving of the gas dump were accomplished, but so close was the enemy that General Hodges had to use the headquarters guard to repulse advancing enemy patrols driving in toward the dump. The dump was successfully moved and only then did the general begin the withdrawal of his own headquarters.

As General Hodges took leave of the Army that had become so completely identified with him, he might well have remembered his intelligence summary to the field on May 7, 1945:

> For the first time in 11 months there is no contact with the enemy. The victory which was won on Omaha and Utah Beaches has reached its climax. Today belongs to the men of this Army who fought and conquered the enemy from Normandy to the Elbe. There is no enemy situation to report, for there is no longer an enemy to defeat.

May the general have many years of health and happiness.

Educational Privileges of Veterans of World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Veterans' Report of February 1949, and letters from readers referring to the same subject.

These all refer to a plan for passing on the educational privileges of veterans of World War II to their children. Unbeknownst to the editors and evidently the readers of Veterans' Report, legislation on this subject is already before Congress.

During the second session of the Eightieth Congress, I introduced H. R. 5043, which received no committee consideration. This bill has been reintroduced this session, and now bears the number H. R. 1556.

Spontaneous interest in legislation of this type is now evident among greater numbers of ex-service men and women.

It is my hope that the Veterans' Affairs Committee will consider the merits of this proposition in the near future.

The matter follows:

OUR CHILDREN

A recent proposal by a Veterans' Report reader has captured the imagination of many others, and with good reason; for it is concerned with the schooling of our young. Mr. William Kyzer urged that the vet who did not make use of his educational privileges under the GI bill of rights should be allowed to pass those privileges on to his children.

Certainly the additional expense which such a program would incur must be considered in these days when so many monetary pressures are being asserted upon the Federal income. But the justice of the proposal is beyond argument.

Some vets could not avail themselves of the educational rights because the subsistence payments were inadequate; other ex-GIs, with college degrees, do not have great need for the privileges. But, having earned the right to the free higher education, the vet should be permitted to pass on that right—just as he may, if he wishes, pass on the monetary results of the GI loans—to his offspring.

SUPPORT KYZER

To the EDITOR:

I have been getting your Veterans' Report for about 3 months, and like it very much. But I sure have some real gripes, such as that fellow who signed his name, "A Veteran, a Republican, and above all an American."

It seems to me like the fellow is a little scared to sign his name or is very much ashamed of himself for writing such a silly article and daring an editor to print it.

I don't care who pays for the printing of the Veterans' Report, because I think it is a damn good up-to-date paper on veterans' affairs.

I think William K. Kyzer has a very good point to send our children to college and help them get an education from our GI bill. I also think, if a vet takes a course under the GI bill from 6 months to a year and has a total of 3 years or more coming, it would be nice if our children could take the remaining years or time for a trade or schooling. Good luck to the Veterans' Report in the coming year.

GERALD P. DUFT.

SPOKANE, WASH.

SANE PLAN

To the EDITOR:

This is the first time I have ever been compelled to write a letter to such a column as this, but after reading the note by William K. Kyzer, of Gaffney, S. C., I feel I have to put in my 2 cents worth.

I believe his is the most sane, sound, and reasonable proposition yet. There are many, including myself, who for some reason or another are unable to take advantage of the educational benefits, or any other GI benefits. Under such conditions, why shouldn't the benefits be passed on to the children of the veterans. Even heaping honors, money, and benefits on me couldn't please me more than knowing my child could take advantage of what I missed.

I hope a real storm is raised on this subject.

HERMAN G. MILLER.

HARLAN, KY.

APPRECIATE OPPORTUNITY

To the EDITOR:

I'd like to commend William K. Kyzer, of Gaffney, S. C., on his suggestion in Sound Off to give the veteran's child the education he himself was entitled to and did not use.

I'm sure the great majority of veterans, if not all, would more than appreciate the opportunity of being able to give their beloved offspring what they would find ordinarily impossible—that is, the kind of education a father would want to give his child.

MRS. MORRIS ACKERMAN.

BRONX, N. Y.

IN AGREEMENT

To the EDITOR:

I, too, am one of the thousands who are eligible for education under the GI bill and will not be able to take advantage of it because the subsistence allowance would not be sufficient income.

I am very much in agreement with Mr. William K. Kyzer.

WESLEY A. RICE.

HOUSTON, TEX.

Council of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of January 31, 1948:

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The project for a Council of Europe, agreed upon last week by the foreign ministers of five west European nations, is hailed in London dispatches as a major step toward a full-fledged western European union. The governments committed to it are those of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The three last named have been working closely together under the Benelux customs union established January 1, 1948. That pact was preceded by a customs union between Belgium and Luxemburg which came into existence in May 1922. These earlier experiments with federation have conditioned all three for the broader federation now projected. The enlistment of Britain and France after months of study and negotiation strengthens the plan enormously. Foreign Minister Sforza of Italy announces that country's readiness to join as one of the founding states.

Thus the centuries-old dream of European federation, whose postwar revival was forced by Communist aggression and intrigue, has a better prospect of realization than ever before. But it cannot yet be taken for granted.

Under the new five-nation agreement as outlined from London, the Council will be composed of a committee of ministers representing the member governments, which will meet in secret and be vested with power to make binding decisions, and an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments, which will hold public meetings. Many of the details, we read, remain secret and others have still to be worked out. Meanwhile other European nations will be invited to become members.

Correctly termed a "major step toward full-fledged European union," there are, of course, many other steps that must be taken and the outcome of this brave new venture remains uncertain. Doubtless it will be as strongly opposed by Moscow as the Marshall plan and every other postwar effort to restore European economy on the democratic basis is opposed by the Politburo. At first, and probably for long to come, it will have to function as a council of non-Communist European states and under the Communist curse launched by the Kremlin. The nations invited to join must accordingly overcome their fears of Communist reprisal and some part of their selfish nationalistic aims and traditions before they accept.

But the imperative need of their cooperation and cohesion for their common good grows plainer every day. The immediate assurance that Italy is willing to come in at once invites hope that enlistments may be prompt and the set-up of a fully representative Council of Western Europe be accomplished within the year.

Excise Taxes on Clocks and Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to excise taxes on watches and clocks. The purport of the bill is the repeal of all excises on clocks, and on watches selling for less than $65.

There currently exists a serious inequity, in that clocks selling for more than $5, and watches retailing for more than $65 are subject to 20-percent taxation as compared to 10 percent for those selling under the above figures.

Excise taxes were originally levied against consumer goods considered to be luxuries. These were doubled during the war to counteract inflation during a shortage of durable consumer necessities.

Congress originally erred in considering watches and clocks in the category of luxuries. They are a necessary item in our everyday life. The Internal Revenue Code lists these products under the jewelry classification when, in effect, they bear but faint resemblance to any definition of jewelry. Ninety percent of sales of clocks and clock-type watches are made in establishments other than jewelry stores.

The report of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Expenditures states "that the Federal Government should reduce Federal excise taxes as soon as practicable." There is no valid objection raised by any source to this reasoning.

The Treasury Department, in 1947, concluded a study of Federal retail excise taxes, and stated:

> The tax may have adverse competitive effect on producers in certain price areas. This is especially noticeable in the case of clocks and watches, since the tax rate for alarm clocks selling for over $5 and watches selling for over $65 is twice as high as the tax on articles selling below these prices. A larger proportion of domestic than imported watches probably sells for over $65, and the differential tax, therefore, tends to discriminate against the domestic producer.

More pertinent, however, than any or all of the preceding arguments for repeal is the present situation of our domestic watch and clock industry. Bufeted in the postwar years by rising costs

and absorption of the market by Swiss imports, this most necessary industry is threatened with extinction by Federal fiat. Swiss watches, through favorable tariff imports, have captured approximately 80 percent of the market potential here in America. The added imposition of excise taxes has almost priced our domestic products out of the market. Curtailed production and, consequently, curtailed employment have been the twin results of these actions. The Waltham Watch Co. in Massachusetts is tottering on the edge of bankruptcy; Connecticut factories are facing a crisis in this same respect. The President is unwilling to invoke the section of the reciprocal-trade agreement referring to protection of domestic industry, so the remedy is incumbent upon Congress. Having lost our authority in tariff matters, we must take economic measures to safeguard the continued employment of our citizens.

The industry which contributed so materially to war production through the period of 1942–46 must be maintained. Practically every type of timing device used by our military forces was supplied by the watch and clock industry. Should the threat of war become more intense there will be even greater need for the products and services of this skilled labor force.

Congress can, by its speedy actions, demonstrate its concern for the continuance of the watch and clock industry in the United States.

Protection and Development of Alluvial Valley Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me under date of January 29, 1949, by the St. Francis Levee District of Missouri, at Caruthersville:

MY DEAR SIR: We people along the Mississippi River are alarmed at that part of the administration plan to reorganize the various departments of our National Government that will eliminate the United States engineers from the planning and construction of the necessary works to protect and develop the alluvial valley lands.

Army engineers have been active in planning and constructing the protective work of our great rivers for a hundred years. No more capable men can be found. The engineers are a select top 10 percent of the annually graduating classes from the West Point Military Academy. The schooling and training of these men is done at the expense of our National Government, and after graduation are salaried men of the Army, a Government function.

For all this time they have had charge of our rivers and harbors, and it is only fair to say these engineers have done a wonderfully good job. It is also pertinent to admit and say that carrying on such work has proven to be splendid practical experience for these young engineers during peacetime, preparing them for emergencies arising when war overtakes us. Time and time again these engineering military graduates, trained in construction and management of peacetime projects, have shown remarkable ability to meet emergency requirements of military action and procedure.

Last of all, why should we change a policy of the Government that has proven so satisfactory for more than a century? Why should our Government abandon the method of educating and giving practical experience to men it is paying a salary in order to place the management of certain public works under a civil-works department, when it has been done for all these years so satisfactorily by the War Department, producing such men as Generals Summerville, Noce, Reybold, Donald, Connolly, Hcgue, Tyler, Crawford, and Lee, who did inestimable service during World War II in the present decade, all of whom have been in the Memphis United States engineers' district, guiding the work along the river.

Handling the Mississippi and the necessary improving works of the same is in a way actual war experience; the fighting of the floods of the Mississippi is actual war with inanimate forces, continually wearing away the banks of the stream on its meandering way to the Gulf, which forces us to continually build new levees to replace those caving into the river, and which at times during the winter and spring reaches heights of from 5 to 30 feet overbank flow.

At present a committee of the House is giving earnest consideration to the Hoover report on general reorganization of our Government's activities, with the idea of omitting or removing overlapping functions. We understand that this report proposes a Department of Public Works to take over the work being done on harbors and rivers of the United States by the United States engineers.

We, along these rivers, are actively opposed to taking river improvement away from the United States engineers, who have cooperated with us for 70 or more years to protect and build our levees. Ninety-odd years ago, soon after they started to make studies of the Mississippi River for the protection of the settlers on its alluvial lands, which have been rapidly improved under the excellent protections now afforded, to 600,000 people living on 3,500,000 acres of drained swampland between Cape Girardeau, Mo., and Helena, Ark., that is being done by the United States engineers building levees along the banks of the Mississippi River.

We are asking you to endeavor to get an amendment to the report of the Commission as outlined in two editorials in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, which outlines what is desired by people of the valley, including cities on the high land adjacent to the reclaimed area. Attached are the two editorials.

We, a million people living in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River between Cape Girardeau, Mo., and Helena, Ark., are begging you to take necessary steps to have the management of this levee-protected area all along the lower Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico left in the hands of the United States engineers. These engineers are noted over the world for their intelligence, ability, credibility, and trustworthiness. Over all these years of origination and supervision of improvements costing billions of dollars, never has any scandal arisen in the management of these expenditures.

We, of the St. Francis Levee District of Missouri, are asking you, our Missouri Senators and Congressmen, to step in and help to so amend the reorganization plan by excluding its application to the United States engineers.

In the reorganization bill of 1945, a clause exempted the United States engineers specifically from this plan. We are including the exempting paragraph to use in the present reorganization report.

Respectfully submitted.

St. Francis Levee District of Missouri; C. F. Bloker, President; T. P. Russell, Vice President; S. C. Reynolds, Wayne DeLisle, T. A. Haggard, Board of Supervisors; S. P. Reynolds, Chief Engineer; George T. Glozier, Assistant Engineer.

EXEMPTING PARAGRAPH

"(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil functions of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps of Engineers or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any organization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection."

Chinese Communists Exploding Hope They'd Seek Favor of West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown:

CHINESE COMMUNISTS EXPLODING HOPE THEY'D SEEK FAVOR OF WEST

(By Constantine Brown)

Some wishful thinkers both in and out of the administration, who believed that the Chinese Communists would pay lip service, at least, to the western democracies for a few months after Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's defeat, now are being disillusioned.

The blunt statement last Friday by Mao Tse-tung, Moscow's puppet, accusing the Nanking government of selling out to the United States, has dispelled their hopes.

The Chinese Nationalist forces now have disintegrated. There is hardly an army left which is loyal either to General Chiang or the Kuomintang. Within the organization itself there have been many defections. Members are running for cover, either getting on Mao's bandwagon as quickly as possible or, if they have funds in the Hong Kong banks, fleeing to temporarily safe areas.

NOT MUCH TO DO

Some of General Chiang's generals who still command organized forces are thinking of establishing themselves as local war lords in areas not yet affected by the civil war. The disintegration of China is more nearly complete than it was a few weeks ago.

Some high officials in Washington who realize that this disaster soon will affect the security of the United States and who deplore our short-sighted policy toward the Nationalists since 1946, agree that there is not much we can do at the present time.

American "do nothing" advocates, who claimed in the past that the Chinese Communists were not Moscow's satellites but only agrarian reformers, anxious to establish a real democratic government, used to explain that after Mao and his followers took over from the Kuomintang they would be anxious to preserve normal relations with the United States. The lure of the Marshall plan's billions could not be overlooked, even by hard-boiled Communists, they said.

American businessmen in Shanghai and other Chinese centers seemed to share this

belief, too. They pointed out that after General Chiang disappeared from the political stage the new rulers, although directed politically from Moscow, would have to seek supplies from the United States, which now has become the world's provider. They scoffed at the idea that a Communist regime would rather see its subjects starve than make any kind of compromise with America.

SEVERE STAND SEEN

Mao's severe indictment of the Chiang regime should dispel any illusions that he is considering following any amicable policies toward this country. In his demand for what amounts to unconditional surrender of the Nanking government, Mao accuses it of having "betrayed national rights wholesale to the American Government" and having obtained several billion dollars in loans from Washington.

Mao, of course, overlooks the fact that most of these billions were loaned to China at a time when she was at war with Japan and he himself benefited to some extent from the American bonanza.

Mao further accuses General Chiang of having "concluded treaties of betrayal with the American Government and accepted the American military advisory group's participation in the civil war." Mao also announced that these betrayal treaties would be abrogated, although he did not mention the treaties he himself had signed with Moscow turning over Manchuria to the U. S. S. R.

These formal statements by Mao are taken lightly by some old China hands, who say that there is a great deal of difference between what a Chinese says and what he actually does. This may have been true in the past, when the Chinese were their own masters. But today, when every one of Mao's moves is dictated from Moscow and supervised by Moscow's agents, his words of antagonism toward the United States are as good as coming from the Kremlin.

In spite of these obvious facts, some officials in Washington are advising their supervisors to continue the flow of Marshall plan goods to China, in the belief that we must keep a toehold in the country and help the Communists organize their newly acquired possessions.

This theory is advanced by those who firmly believed that by continuing UNRRA support to the countries behind the iron curtain we eventually would be able to detach them from their Moscow masters.

Olympic National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from a recent edition of the Yakima (Wash.) Republic regarding the Olympia National Park.

Since the area represented by this paper is primarily agricultural, I feel that their views on the subject matter will be of interest to the Members of Congress.

The editorial follows:

HELPFUL MOVE

It is pleasing to note that three sterling Democrats with seats in the State house of representatives have joined Senator HARRY CAIN and Congressman RUSSELL MACK in calling for a new deal on the Olympic National Park.

The action of the three lends a bipartisan aspect to the hitherto Republican efforts to cut the park to reasonable size so that some of the big timber stands in the people's playground may be excluded and sold to the mills. The State legislators, who are residents of the Olympic Peninsula, appreciate as well as do the hard-headed Republicans, CAIN and MACK, the importance of utilizing some of the sequestered timber instead of leaving it to decay. Their joint memorial asking the Federal Government to designate a disinterested and qualified board to make a survey of the park and hold hearings on the question of boundary revision is in line with the Cain-Mack resolution for the authorizing of a survey and the holding of hearings by a congressional committee.

As stated in the memorial offered by the State representatives, the inclusion of certain lands valuable only for timber culture is detrimental to the timber and agricultural industries and is depriving certain municipalities and school districts of vital tax revenue.

Russia Plans To Secure American Dollars and Scarce American Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 4, 1949, edition of the United States News and World Report:

RUSSIA'S SECRET SOURCE OF DOLLARS

(Reported from Vienna)

Russia is siphoning millions of American dollars and tons of critical materials out of western Europe through pipe lines of underground trade. Deals are small but numerous. Net result is to give Russia a steady flow of things the United States is trying to keep out of Russian hands.

Headquarters of the Russian combine directing these operations is in Vienna, where the Russians sit at the head of a corporation that cannot be touched by Austrian law. They have agents throughout the non-Communist world. They use trading methods that involve smuggling, hijacking, and gangster tactics.

So far, American trade experts are blocking Russian efforts to execute big deals through underground channels. But the Soviet combine is expanding its activities. Small leaks of dollars and goods from the west are likely to go to Russia through Vienna as long as the Soviet traders guarantee big profits. This is how the Russians operate, as traced by a staff correspondent of United States News and World Report in Vienna:

Underground trade, Russian style, starts with orders from Moscow to Soviet trade experts in Vienna. They are told to get, for example, American high-frequency melting equipment, Italian machine tools, western German ball bearings, Dutch optical instruments, or Malayan rubber. American agents in Europe are trying to keep all these things out of Russian hands.

The front for the Russians in Vienna is a corporation called USIA, a name formed of initials that in Russian stand for Administration of Soviet Enterprises in Austria. In reality, the corporation is a trade combine of Russia and satellite states, a combine staffed by Russians working for the Soviet Government.

Inside Austria, the Russian traders enjoy extraterritorial rights, Austria's non-Communist government, lacking a peace treaty, cannot control Russian business within Austria as it controls Austrian business. As a result, the Russian traders are able to ignore Austrian customs and trade regulations and to engage in all sorts of underground deals with traders in western Europe.

Go-betweens for the Russians in western Europe, traders willing to risk under-the-counter deals for big profits, are advised promptly from Vienna of the things Russia needs. Sometimes they know that the Russians are the buyers, sometimes the orders are placed through independent firms in Austria. Each intermediary trader is asked to get only small quantities of the items desired. Large orders of strategic materials and machinery are checked carefully by United States officials in Europe.

Russian agents in the west work directly with manufacturers. The agent puts up the cash, supplied by Russia, the manufacturer puts his request through the legal channels for such materials as Russia wants but states he needs them to produce goods vital to western Europe's economy. The order may go directly to the United States or to the western European exporter; it may also be routed through two or three other traders who have no way of knowing that the Russians are involved.

Agents for the Russians sometimes approach a western manufacturer directly, offering to put up the dollars to buy machinery he needs if he doubles his order, giving half to the Russians. The Soviet combine has obtained ball bearings from western Germany by this method.

Industrial black markets in western Europe are a main source of Russian purchases. In Italy there is a black market in machine tools. Dutch optical instruments can be bought under the counters in Antwerp and in Paris. Malayan rubber, sold by the British to French importers, is reaching the Russians in Vienna through French black markets.

An underground railway, set up by the Russians in Vienna to get goods through western-border controls, is operating smoothly. Railway workers who are members of the Communist parties of western Europe help by switching way bills in transit. Machinery made in Germany and sold to Italian buyers acting for the Russians never reaches Italy. It leaves Germany as transit trade for Italy, but leaves Switzerland at the Austrian frontier marked as transit trade for Vienna.

Hijackers sometimes cut into the operations for the Russian combine. In Austria, for example, hijackers recently seized a number of truckloads of American cigarettes smuggled into Austria on Russia's orders. But the Russians also use strong-arm methods to seize the goods they want. Gun battles between truckers and hijackers are frequent in Austria.

From Vienna, however, goods are simply sent to Moscow by rail. Precision instruments, and sometimes packets of United States currency purchased on the French black market, are dispatched by air from Vienna to Moscow by Russian planes.

Payment for Russian purchases in the west is no problem for the Soviet combine. Satellite countries in the Russian sphere pay most of the bill.

United States dollars, the currency preferred by all traders in Europe, are obtained by the combine in many ways. Russians in

Vienna act as agents for the satellite countries, selling Polish coke, Czechoslovakian beet sugar, Rumanian oil, Hungarian pigs and Bulgarian tobacco to western Europe for dollars, taking a big commission. In addition, Russia sells steel scrap seized by the Soviet Army in Austria after World War II, selling to the West only for dollars. The Austrian Government also is forced to give the combine American dollars for the oil from wells in eastern Austria that were taken over by the Russians as German assets.

Banking and clearing arrangements to finance underground trade deals are centered in Switzerland. There, both the Soviet combine in Vienna and the western traders engaged in such trade maintain hidden dollar accounts in Swiss banks. Dollars are simply transferred from one account to the other inside Switzerland.

Russia also finances its combine in Vienna by handling deals between the countries of eastern Europe. All the satellite countries have trade agreements with one another, many of them signed on Russia's orders. But sellers refuse to deliver on the prices fixed by treaty and sell through the Russians in Vienna for higher prices. Buyers must pay or do without; the Russians get commissions.

Profits for the Russians are large—300 percent in the case of American cigarettes smuggled into Austria by the Hungarian Communist Party at the rate of 25,000 cartons a day. The Soviet combine doubled its money by handling the sale of paper to an Argentine buyer for an Austrian exporter who thus avoided Austrian currency controls. Such profits are not unusual in underground trade.

Nobody but the Russians know just how high the Russian dollar profits run, or how much rubber, chemicals, tools, precision instruments, machinery, and other scarce or strategic commodities from the west go through Vienna to Moscow.

Loss to the west, however, is considerable. Dollars sent by the United States to aid western European recovery are going into Russian bank accounts; materials and goods needed to help European countries to defend themselves against Russian expansion are leaking into Soviet hands.

United States policy, set in Washington, is to police American aid to Europe straight down to the ultimate consumer wherever possible. American experts in Vienna, however, admit that it is virtually impossible to shut off all underground trade between the Russians in Vienna and the west. Direct trade with the Russian sphere is vital to the economy of western Europe. And the United States is not prepared to halt Russian shipments through Austria by dividing the little country as Germany is divided.

Outlook, thus, is for continued leaks of American dollars and scarce goods into Russia's underground trade net. Countries receiving United States aid will be asked by the United States Government to clamp down on the illegal practices of their own traders. Otherwise the United States can do little to stop the Russians from getting the things they want from the west through Vienna.

Mr. Speaker, I think this article ought to be called to the attention of the Members of the House. I further believe that if this practice is not stopped more vital scarce goods may reach Russia, and our aid to Europe may cause more harm than good.

While this article states that the United States has not been able to completely solve this problem, it is my belief that there is enough wisdom and ingenuity in this great country to stop Russia from obtaining any appreciable amount of our scarce goods or our money. I recommend the article to each Member of the House and to the administrators of our aid to Europe program. It is my opinion that we ought to demand and receive of every European country that we aid their full wholehearted cooperation to stop the leaks that enable Russia to get our dollars and goods.

Work for the UN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the January 30, 1949, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times relative to the need for strengthening the United Nations. I think this is a most timely article, and merits reading by the entire membership.

The article follows:

WORK FOR THE UN

In proposing a bold new program to build up underdeveloped areas of the world, President Truman took pains in his inaugural address to distinguish his concept from old-line imperialism.

The technical and scientific aid which Mr. Truman urged for backward regions should be, he said, "a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies wherever practicable."

The extent to which our Government finds it practicable to work through the UN may go far to determine the success and scope of this new program.

We did not find it practicable to guarantee the security of Greece and Turkey through the UN. We did not find it practicable to sponsor European economic recovery within the UN. We did not find it practicable to continue relief through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Now Mr. Truman ranks foremost among the aims of our foreign policy the support and strengthening of the UN. If he is to achieve that aim, his administration must bend every effort to use the UN agencies as they were meant to be used—as instruments of international cooperation, not weapons of national competition.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in a press conference last week, said the bold new program is not intended to endow all the world with modern plumbing. But our Government wants to do all it can, he said, to help people raise their living standards in the backward areas of the Far East, southeast Asia, Africa, and South America.

We intend to make available our scientific and industrial skills in order to create the conditions under which capital—not necessarily Government capital—may flow into those countries.

At home and abroad, said Secretary Acheson, our purpose is "to enable the individual to attain the freedom and dignity and fullness of life which should be the purpose of all government."

As one way of achieving that purpose, we propose to work with other countries—"with every country that wishes to really enter into a cooperative system"—to increase the general prosperity of the world. Secretary Acheson went on:

"It is not that we believe that other people need or wish things for their own purpose merely to have these material things. It is not that material objects in and of themselves make a better or fuller life. But they are the means by which people can obtain freedom—not only freedom from the pressure of those other human beings who would restrict their freedom, but help in the ancient struggle of man to earn his living and get his bread from the soil.

"That is the purpose; that is the objective of this program."

This was an eloquent statement of goals. As we seek to translate them into practical achievement, we must keep in mind that all past ventures in colonial or imperial development have also claimed noble and humanitarian objectives.

Too often, however, the development of backward areas for the natives' own good turned out to be exploitation for somebody else's good. The natives of the world are getting a little tired of that.

If Mr. Truman's bold, new program is to work, if it is to command wide support and cooperation, it must, as he says, break cleanly with the imperialism of the past. The best way to make sure of that is to divorce it from national ambitions by developing it under the United Nations.

We must offer the underdeveloped areas our aid, not on condition that they adopt our way of life, but in the faith that increased material prosperity will buttress their freedom. We must remember that the goal is not to Americanize the world, but to give the world a chance for freedom.

According to James Reston, writing in the New York Times, UN officials believe the organization can gain much and can contribute much to Mr. Truman's program—but only if technical aid to underdeveloped areas is kept strictly nonpolitical, strictly divorced from the East-West propaganda duel.

Britain offered technical aid to Burma, but Burma preferred to get it from the UN in order to avoid contracting obligations to London. Many nations would hesitate to take such aid from the United States if it meant involvement in the cold war.

When the UN was founded, great hopes were placed in its Economic and Social Council. Even if political disputes embroiled the other agencies, it was felt, here was one field where nations might work together and so gradually build up a spirit of world unity.

Unfortunately ECOSOC has become as involved as the other organs in the East-West struggle. Mr. Truman's plan offers a chance for a fresh start. Putting aside past disappointments, we should strive to strengthen the UN by giving it work to do.

Excerpts From Report of Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations on Benefits for Supervisors, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Administrative Im-

provements, and Financial Accountability. The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

BENEFITS FOR SUPERVISORS

The withdrawal of the Government's encouragement of organization of supervisory personnel has served to promote the establishment by employers of plans creating many new benefits for supervisory employees. The prediction that this class of employees would strike for recognition and bargaining rights for their unions has utterly failed to materialize.

By redefining the term "employee" to exclude any individual employed as a supervisor, and defining the term "supervisor" to include only employees who actually supervise work of other employees, the act withdrew the Government's encouragement of organizations of supervisory personnel. This was a highly controversial provision and the prediction was frequently made that it would encourage strife. The committee has closely followed court and Board tests of the provision and its practical effects to date.

The committee has observed a growing trend of employer attempts to make their foremen a part of management. In many of the plants visited we found new programs designed to give more responsibilities to the lower ranks of supervision and to acquaint them not only with the policies of management but the reasons therefor. Not only has the exclusion of supervisory employees from the benefits of the act failed to produce the work stoppages predicted by opponents of the provision, but it has served to promote the establishment by employers of plans creating many new benefits for supervisory employees.

It was also predicted that many employers would deny the benefits of the act to rank-and-file employees by designating them as minor supervisory personnel. A check of the Board decisions indicates that such practices cannot be carried out. The Board has in all cases examined closely the actual status of the employee alleged to be a supervisor. It has been the employee's duties rather than his title that the Board has looked to in deciding supervisory status.

Labor organizations which have confined their membership to supervisory employees have continued to urge an amendment which would give the act's protection to the organization of supervisory employees by labor organizations which do not accept rank-and-file employees to membership. The labor committees of both Houses of Congress gave exhaustive consideration to such suggestions and concluded that as a practical matter such a labor organization could never be truly independent. The committee has discovered no evidence to indicate that the exclusion was not a wise one, both as a matter of public policy and in the interest of the individual supervisory employee.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

The new status of the Mediation and Conciliation Service as an independent agency has enabled its conciliators to gain and maintain the confidence of both parties to a dispute and greatly enhanced their effectiveness in the prevention and settlement of strikes. Further, this has been accomplished with a personnel and an overall budget smaller than this agency had when a part of the Department of Labor.

Great credit should be given to the Service for its efforts in bringing about the settlement of strikes and threatened strikes which assumed national importance. Director Ching has personally intervened in all of the disputes in which the national emergency sections of the act were invoked. His efforts had much to do with the early settlement of the 1948 east-coast shipping strike as well as in the prevention of the strikes in atomic energy plants and the nationwide operations of Western Union Telegraph Co.

It has been the policy of the Service to stay out of disputes which do not affect the public interest or substantially affect interstate commerce. It has declined to conciliate any representation question, acting on the concept that determination of bargaining representatives has been given exclusively to the NLRB. There has been an increasing delegation of responsibility and discretion to the regional offices by the Washington office of the Service. The committee believes that in each of these policies the Service has carried out the congressional intent of the act.

The committee has noted some expression of opinion for the return of the Service to the Department of Labor. We have evaluated the reasons given for such a move and have been unable to discover any merit in the suggestion. The Service has operated as an independent agency with less personnel than it maintained when a part of the Labor Department. During 1946 its over-all personnel was 488 employees; in 1947, 449 employees; in 1948, 442 employees; and in 1949 its program calls for 388 employees. Nor has its budget been increased as an independent agency.

The Department of Labor is required by its organic act to foster the interests of labor. It has come to be regarded as the driving political arm of the labor-union movement. The Secretary recently expressed that concept in his address to the National Conference on State Labor Legislation, when he stated, "I want a Department in which all Federal labor laws are administered. I want a Department that will be what Sam Gompers wanted it to be—'labor's voice in the President's council.' "

The Department of Labor is obliged to issue orders and spearhead programs which necessarily are opposed by and alienate a large portion of the employer group. Its Assistant Secretaries are drawn directly from the ranks of organized labor. It has thus disqualified itself for the impartial attitude so necessary for the successful mediation of labor-management disputes. All agree that the greatest asset of the successful conciliator is his ability to gain and maintain the confidence of both parties to a dispute. It is idle to argue that the Service actually operated on an impartial basis while a part of the Department of Labor. Many employers regarded it as not impartial, and complaints of partiality were frequent. The committee has heard no complaints of bias applied to the new independent agency by either labor or employer groups. Its return now to its former position as an arm of the Labor Department would destroy much of that new-found confidence of the employer group, and would completely close the doors of many employers to its efforts to conciliate disputes.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

The separation of the prosecution and judicial functions of the NLRB has promoted more public confidence in that agency and enabled it to carry out its duties with greater cooperation from the litigants who appear before it.

The committee has found that the separation of the prosecution and judicial functions of the Board has accomplished many desirable results. Under the Wagner Act the Board had delegated general supervision over field offices and their nonlegal personnel to its director of the field division. Field attorneys were directed by a regional attorney who reported to the general counsel, who also had general supervision over attorneys in the Washington office. This divided line of authority was frequently a source of friction, both in the field offices and in the higher levels of Washington supervision. The placing of all such personnel under one directing head, the general counsel, has eliminated the possibility of the divided loyalties that the old system produced.

The good results of the separation are the most noticeable in the field offices. Almost without exception, the field office personnel have expressed unqualified satisfaction with the status given them by the act. Their contact with the union representatives, employers, and the general public, is a daily one. Most of them served the agency under the Wagner Act, when all of their activities were in the behalf of labor organizations. They investigated and processed cases knowing that if they incurred the disfavor of the unions in their region they might expect a transfer. In the eyes of most employers, some union representatives and a large part of the general public, NLRB employees operated as an adjunct of the labor-union movement; servants of an agency which was grand jury, prosecutor, and judge of an employer's relations with his employees.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act they serve on the staff of the general counsel investigating and prosecuting a case against an employer on behalf of a union one day, while the next day may find them just as actively processing a case against that same union on behalf of an employer or an employee. They have found that they can do so without incurring the enmity of either group. They are now public servants.

FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The filing of financial statements of labor unions covering receipts and expenditures, reserves, and other data has been productive of improved and standardized practice in accounting for such funds and put added emphasis on the responsibility of union officers for their safekeeping.

As a condition precedent to its use of the services of the National Labor Relations Board, a labor organization and its parent international must file the financial and other information concerning the conduct of its affairs required by section 9 (f) of the act. The Secretary of Labor, with whom such information is required to be filed, has established a new office within the Department of Labor known as the Office for the Registration of Labor Organizations.

As of February 1, 1948, a total of 10,796 labor organizations had filed the required statements. On November 12, 1948, a total of 18,614 labor organizations had filed the required information with the Department of Labor. Seventy-two percent of the unions filing on the latter date are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, 14 percent with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and 14 percent are independent unions.

There are 105 national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and of these, 81 have registered; 32 of the 39 internationals affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations have registered, as have 32 independent national and international unions.

Unquestionably the filing of financial statements of labor unions with the Secretary of Labor, covering receipts and expenditures, reserves, and other sums of the unions, has been productive of improved and standardized practices in accounting for such funds and put added emphasis on the responsibility of union officers for their safekeeping. The statements as filed with the Secretary of Labor, must set forth the manner in which the accounting is made known to the membership of the union.

Union members are now certain to know how the funds of their union are being spent.

Work Stoppages Prior to and Since the Effective Date of the Labor-Management Relations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board to Hon. RALPH W. GWINN, and excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations on wage gains under Taft-Hartley, injunctions, and anti-Communist affidavits:

JANUARY 11, 1949.

Hon. RALPH W. GWINN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GWINN: I am enclosing a copy of the material which I furnished to Senator WILEY and which you have requested in your letter of January 7, 1949. I hope it serves its purpose.

If there is anything further you would like to have from my office or me personally, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

ROBERT N. DENHAM,
General Counsel.

WORK STOPPAGES PRIOR TO AND SINCE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

The Labor-Management Relations Act became effective on August 22, 1947. The latest figures on work stoppages are for October 1948. Thus, there has been a 14-month period (September 1947 to October 1948, inclusive) during which the act has been effective. This period can be compared with the 14 months prior to the effective date, to wit, July 1946 to August 1947, inclusive.[1]

The upper half of the attached table covers the pre-Labor-Management Relations Act period, while the lower half covers the Labor-Management Relations Act period to October 1948. The averages and total figures for each half make for a quick comparison which can be summarized as follows:

1. Average number of stoppages in effect per month: Pre-Labor-Management Relations Act, 683; post-Labor-Management Relations Act, 394.

2. Average number of workers involved in stoppages in effect per month: Pre-Labor-Management Relations Act, 452,500; post-Labor-Management Relations Act, 252,064.

3. Average number of man-days idle per month: Pre-Labor-Management Relations Act, 4,033,571; post-Labor-Management Relations Act, 2,524,571.

4. Total number of man-days idle: Pre-Labor-Management Relations Act, 56,470,000; post-Labor-Management Relations Act, 35,344,000.

5. Percent of estimated working time idle per month: Pre-Labor-Management Relations Act, 0.58; post-Labor-Management Relations Act, 0.34.

Thus, comparing the 14 months prior to the Labor-Management Relations Act with the 14 months since the Labor-Management Relations Act, there was a 42-percent reduction in average number of stoppages in effect per month, a 44-percent reduction in average number of workers involved in stoppages in effect per month, a 37-percent reduction in average number of man-days idle per month, a 37-percent reduction in total number of man-days idle, and a 41-percent reduction in percent of estimated working time idle per month.

[1] Since figures are collected only on a monthly basis, the whole of August 1947 has been put in the pre-Labor-Management Relations Act period.

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

WAGE GAINS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

Wages, either in average hourly earnings or in over-all take-home pay, have not suffered through operation of any of the law's provisions. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reveals that average hourly earnings of all industrial workers increased in monthly progression from $1.236 in August 1947 to $1.363 in September 1948. Increase in union membership since passage of the act has also been constant with unions other than those of the left-wing group whose officers have not made the non-Communist affidavit.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has supplied the following figures showing the average hourly earnings of industrial employees for 1947 and the first 9 months of 1948:

	Rate
1947:	
January	$1.161
February	1.170
March	1.180
April	1.186
May	1.207
June	1.226
July	1.230
August	1.236
September	1.249
October	1.258
November	1.268
December	1.279
1948:	
January	1.285
February	1.287
March	1.289
April	1.292
May	1.301
June	1.316
July	1.333
August	1.349
September	1.363

INJUNCTIONS

The injunction remedy has been rarely used and then only when the public health or safety was threatened, the public welfare vitally affected, or when an employer's business was about to be ruined by a secondary boycott. The Board has obtained two injunctions against labor organizations and one against an employer under the discretionary power given it by section 10 (j). The President has used the national emergency injunction to prevent or stop six strikes vitally affecting health and safety. Fifteen strikes in support of secondary boycotts have been enjoined. In each instance the injunction has issued upon the application of the Attorney General or the General Counsel of the NLRB after full and impartial investigation of the facts. The act makes no provision for injunctions on the application of private parties.

If the era of government by injunction is being revived in labor disputes, the committee would be among the first to do something about it, for we are unanimous in not wanting to return to that period of our history which preceded the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932. Since such statement has frequently been made by labor leaders, was made in a minority report of this committee last March, and has been asserted by officials of the executive department, we have painstakingly reviewed every case in which an injunction has been sought.

Injunctions may be issued pursuant to three different provisions of the statute. Section 10 (j) gives the Board discretionary power to seek appropriate temporary relief, or a restraining order, upon its issuance of a complaint charging that any person has committed an unfair labor practice. Under the Wagner Act, the Board had such power only after it had petitioned the United States courts of appeals for enforcement of its order. The new section merely accelerated the time in which such relief might be sought.

Section 10 (l) requires the Board to seek injunctive relief in secondary boycott cases when there is reasonable cause to believe the charge is true and that a complaint will issue.

Section 208 (national emergencies) authorizes such relief upon the petition of the Attorney General when a strike or lock-out is one which affects an entire industry or substantial part thereof, and if permitted to continue will imperil the national health or safety.

The record on injunctions sought and obtained completely refutes the statement that the era of government by injunction has been revived in labor disputes. Injunctions have been granted in 3 cases pursuant to section 10 (j), in 15 cases pursuant to section 10 (l), and in 6 cases pursuant to section 208.

ANTI-COMMUNIST AFFIDAVITS

Elimination of Communist partisans and adherents from official posts and positions of responsibility in both national and local unions is one of the most pronounced and significant effects of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947. There are still unions, in a steadily declining number, however, whose officials have not filed non-Communist affidavits in compliance with the law. A number of unions have fully met this provision with the ouster of officials who have failed to meet this statutory requirement. It has been demonstrated that the American workingman will take steps to rid his union of communistic leadership when the character of that leadership has been identified to his satisfaction.

On September 27, 1948, the Atomic Energy Commission directed one of its contractors, the General Electric Co., not to recognize the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, UE–CIO, as the bargaining representative of its employees at the New Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Schenectady, N. Y. The Commission justified its action upon information concerning alleged Communist affiliation or association of various officers of UE, and the failure of such officers to file non-Communist affidavits under the act.

On the same date, the Atomic Energy Commission also directed the University of Chicago to refrain from recognition of the United Public Workers of America, CIO, at the Argonne National Laboratory in Chicago. Again the Commission justified its action upon general information and failure of the union officers to make the non-Communist oath. The Commission stated that some of the suspected officers were in positions where they exercise administrative, negotiating, or disciplinary authority over the local union active at the contractor's plant. The committee commends the action of the Atomic Energy Commission. In an industry so vital to our national security, it is imperative that every precaution be taken, not only that the employees themselves be loyal beyond reasonable doubt but also that they not be subject to the disciplinary authority of men whose loyalty may be seriously questioned. Union membership does and should involve a close association between the rank-and-file member and the leaders of his union.

The National Labor Relations Board reported that, as of November 1, 1948, 176 international and national unions had com-

plied with the non-Communist affidavit requirement. Included among these were 95 of the AFL's 105 internationals, and 31 of the CIO's 39 international or national organizations. In addition, there were 50 unaffiliated labor organizations which had complied.

The committee is pleased to note that there has been an increase in the number of international and national unions in compliance since our March 15 report, and hopes that all labor organizations in the United States will take all steps necessary to avail themselves of the benefits and peaceful procedures offered by the law.

Excerpts From Report of Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the report of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations on the following: Compilations of collective bargaining agreements, jurisdictional disputes, damage suits under Taft-Hartley, and unfair labor-practices complaints:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

COMPILATIONS OF COLLECTIVE-BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

The compilation and assembly of labor-management contracts in a central agency in the Department of Labor has already demonstrated its value and merit. As it has been developed and expanded, this collection of contracts affords a beneficial and well worth-while service for labor organizations, employers, and the public.

Under the terms of section 211 of the act, the Bureau of Labor Statistics is directed to maintain copies of all available collective-bargaining agreements, to make such file open to public inspection, and to furnish upon request "all available data and factual information which may aid in the settlement of any labor dispute."

During 1948 the Bureau received, on the average, over 1,000 new agreements each month. The total number of agreements on file at the year's end approximated 15,000, all of which were in effect during all or part of 1948. These agreements, although representing but a fraction of the 100,000 or more agreements estimated to be in existence in the United States, nevertheless, included from the standpoint of coverage the great majority of all workers employed under the terms of labor-management contracts.

The agreements constitute a basic source of much of the data compiled by the Bureau in the field of industrial relations. Their various provisions are analyzed and coded in detail for use in connection with reports on collective-bargaining trends and practices.

Each new agreement is examined, for example, for provisions relating to the establishment of health, welfare, and retirement programs. Thousands of sample clauses have been selected from agreements for analysis in the Bureau's published series, Collective Bargaining Provisions.

The committee is persuaded that the compilation and assembly of labor-management contracts in a central agency in the Department of Labor, as provided for in the act, has demonstrated its value and merit. As it has been developed and expanded, this collection of contracts affords a beneficial and well worth-while service for labor organizations, employers, and the public.

As an authoritative source of information, the contracts on file may be consulted in the interests of standardizing the scope and provisions of wage contracts and of bringing into general usage provisions and procedures that are deemed desirable.

JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES

Jurisdictional disputes which have plagued the building and construction industry for years are being settled without strikes and consequent losses to the workers involved and the general public. The act's restrictions were the impetus for the assumption of the responsibility for the adjustment of the disputes by the parent unions involved, and are necessary to insure the continuation of such assumption of responsibility. Such cases are now being determined, without recourse to the NLRB, by the joint board for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes created by the building-trades unions and various contractor associations for their final and binding settlement.

The committee is happy to report that the history of this section during its 17 months' existence has not been one of Board hearings and orders. The Board has yet to decide a jurisdictional dispute.

The absence of Board cases does not mean that jurisdictional disputes have ceased to occur in the construction industry. They are being settled without strikes and without Board intervention pursuant to an agreement creating a national joint board for settlement of jurisdictional disputes. The law's restrictions were the impetus for this action wherein the labor organizations agreed to a plan to decide their own disputes.

The agreement entered into on May 1, 1948, by the building and construction trades department of the AFL, the Associated General Contractors of America, and various employer associations creates a board of trustees and a joint board with the unions and the employers accorded equal representation on each. Jurisdictional disputes may be referred to the joint board by any of the unions involved in the dispute, the employer directly affected, or by the organization representing that employer.

On September 1, 1948, the joint board informed the committee that it had received some 40 disputes and had disposed of approximately 50 percent of them. The committee commends the building-trades unions and the contractor associations for their efforts, which have already been well rewarded. They have demonstrated that in the field of labor-management relations it is the function of the law to define the boundaries and the responsibility of the parties to reach agreement within those boundaries.

DAMAGE SUITS UNDER TAFT-HARTLEY

The number and disposition of the suits brought by and against labor organizations under the act demonstrate that neither unions nor employers desire to recover money damages from the other, but that the availability of the remedy has encouraged each to act with a deeper sense of responsibility. In 37 cases employers have been plaintiffs against unions, and labor organizations have brought 19 actions against employers. It has been general practice for these suits to be dismissed by agreement of the parties after agreement has been reached in contract negotiation or strike settlement. In no case to date has either obtained a judgment for damages against the other.

It should be pointed out that labor organizations might sue and be sued as an entity in many State courts. In others each individual member of the union must be named and made a party to the suit. There has been little uniformity among the various States in the procedure for collection of a judgment once it is rendered. The act merely opened the Federal courts to permit uniformity in the enforcement of collective-bargaining agreements.

Because it was frequently predicted that these sections would subject labor organizations to a multiplicity of suits with resultant drains on their treasuries, the committee has made a painstaking effort to keep itself informed on all pending litigation. We have communicated from time to time with the clerks of all the United States district courts, requested copies of all formal papers of the litigants, and studied all reported court decisions. Our findings refute all of the unfavorable predictions.

Since the effective date of the act a total of approximately 57 suits has been brought under sections 301 and 303 in all of the United States; 37 were brought by employers against unions, 19 by unions against employers, and 1 by an employee against an employer.

We have discovered no case to date in which either an employer or a union recovered damages from the other.

Whether instituted by employers or unions, the great majority of these suits have been brought under section 301, seeking damages for breaches of collective-bargaining agreements. In many cases a strike has been involved. In the typical case the strike is settled and the suit is dismissed by agreement of the parties. The committee believes that the suits reported to date show that neither party desires to recover money damages from the other, but that the very presence of this remedy has encouraged employees and the unions alike to act with a deeper sense of responsibility. In support of this, statistics of the Ford Motor Co. show that man-days lost at its plants because of wildcat stoppages dropped 90 percent during the first 8 months of 1948, as compared to the same period in 1947.

Charges of secondary boycotts or other violations of section 303 figured in only 12 of the 57 cases reported. Many of these were settled by agreement of the parties, and in none did the plaintiff recover damages. The small number of these cases plus the relatively small number of complaints filed with the NLRB charging violations of corresponding section 8 (b) (4) indicate that the most pronounced effect of the two sections has been restraint.

UNFAIR LABOR PRACTICES COMPLAINTS

Unfair labor practices complaints against employers filed with NLRB under the Labor-Management Act are still far in excess of similar complaints filed against unions. In the first 15 months of the law's operation 4,136 charges of this nature were filed against employers, 1,188 charges against unions; 660 of the charges against unions were filed by employers, the remainder being filed by individuals and other unions.

Much publicity has been given to the act's restrictions on unfair labor practices of unions. Little attention has been paid to the fact that the Wagner Act's prohibitions still apply to the employer in his relation with his employees. Employers must bargain in good faith with the union which is the choice of the majority of his employees in an appropriate unit; he may not discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee for the purpose of discouraging or encouraging membership in a union; he may not form or dominate a union of his employees; and he is prohibited from restraining or coercing his employees in their right to freely choose their representative.

Board statistics on complaint cases filed since the passage of the act demonstrate clearly that the majority of its time will continue to be spent in preventing employer

unfair labor practices. Board records on unfair labor practices charges filed since the effective date of the act show:

	Charges filed against employers	Charges filed against unions
1947—September	336	73
October	351	91
November	197	59
December	180	61
1948—January	252	71
February	232	71
March	322	95
April	246	69
May	194	79
June	243	80
July	241	80
August	276	97
September	[1] 453	108
October	297	76
November	316	78
15-month total	4,136	1,188

[1] Includes 210 cases filed by a single individual against insurance companies.

Will a Minimum-Wage Law Decrease Unemployment?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

WILL A MINIMUM-WAGE LAW DECREASE UNEMPLOYMENT?

(By Thomas Nixon Carver, emeritus professor of political economy in Harvard University)

It will not. If the legal minimum wage is the same as the actual wage would otherwise be, the minimum wage law will have no effect. If the legal minimum wage is higher than the actual wage would otherwise be, it will decrease employment and increase unemployment. It will be a good thing for those workers who are fortunate enough to get jobs, but not for those who fail to get jobs. Every minimum-wage law and every other attempt to force higher wages should therefore be accompanied by adequate provision for those whom it forces into unemployment.

Every employer who knows his own interest will increase the number of his employees up to the point where additional workers will fail to add to his product as much as they add to his cost. If, by taking on a few more workers, the total value produced in his establishment would increase more than the total cost of running it would increase, he would be foolish not to employ them. If, for example, an additional hired man would cost a farmer $1,000 a year but would add $1,100 to the cash value of his crop, the farmer would make $100 less if he did not hire the extra man than he might make if he did hire him. If an extra clerk would cost a merchant $2,000 a year but would enable the store to earn $2,100 more, the merchant would lose a hundred dollars by not hiring an extra clerk. Repeat the illustration with respect to the manufacturer and you get the same result.

If, however, a minimum wage law, or any other form of coercion, compelled that farmer to pay each hired man $1,200 a year, that farmer would not hire an extra hand even if the labor of that hand would add $1,100 to the total crop. He would even get along with one less hand if, by firing one, the total value of the crop were reduced by less than $1,200. He would save $1,200 in wages and lose less than $1,200 in the value of the crop. If a minimum wage law, or any coercive regulation, compelled the merchant to pay each clerk $2,400 per year, that merchant would not take on an extra clerk, even if an extra clerk would enable the store to earn $2,300 more. He would even fire one clerk if it would reduce the earning of the store by less than the minimum wage of $2,400. The manufacturer would do the same under the same circumstances. The same is true of the builder, the restaurateur, the barber, the publisher, and everyone else who hires workers.

Even a cooperative creamery, store, shoe factory, or fruit-packing establishment will act on the same principle. Suppose that a cooperative creamery is handling the milk for a large group of farmers. The cooperating farmers hire workers to operate the creamery for them, paying salaries or wages to those who work in the establishment. The cooperating farmers will have to decide how many workers to hire. They will try to hire as many as it will pay them to hire and no more. Suppose they have been operating with a force of 20 workers. They figure that an additional worker, making a total of 21, would cost them $2,000 a year and would add $2,100 to the earnings of the creamery. The creamery would then, operating with 21 workers, return to the cooperating farmers a hundred dollars net over what it would return when operating with 20 workers. It would pay the cooperators to hire the extra man.

But suppose a minimum-wage law, or any form of coercion, compelled the cooperative creamery to pay a minimum of $2,400. The cooperating farmers would, if they knew their own interests, refuse to hire the extra man. They would even fire one man and get along with a force of 19 if they figured that it would reduce the earnings by less than $2,400. They would save $2,400 in total labor cost and lose something less than $2,400 in earnings. This would leave more for the cooperating farmers than they would get if they continued to operate with a force of 20 workers.

This principle will apply to cooperative stores, shoe factories, fruit-packing establishments, or any other form of voluntary cooperation. It is not peculiar to capitalism or to the profit system. Everywhere the results are the same. The higher you try to force wages by minimum-wage laws or any other form of coercion the more people you will force into unemployment. This principle applies to farms as well as factories, to small as well as to large factories, to cooperative establishments as well as to privately owned establishments, to monopolies as well as to competing establishments.

Take the case of a monopoly operating with a force of 10,000 workers. If the management figures that an addition of a hundred workers to the total force will add $200,000 to the total cost of operation and $201,000 to the total market value of the products, it would add $1,000 to its profits by hiring the extra men. The management would probably hire them. But if a minimum-wage law raised the cost of those extra men to $240,000, the management would certainly not hire them. It might even fire 100 men if it figured that by so doing it would save $240,000 on the total cost of operation and reduce the market value of the product by something less than $240,000.

It is argued, however, that a minimum-wage law would "promote business recovery by increasing labor's purchasing power and the demand for goods." There is, however, no reason whatever for believing that it would increase labor's purchasing power in any degree. It might, it is true, increase the purchasing power of those workers who were fortunate to get or retain jobs, though that is not certain. It would definitely decrease the purchasing power of those who were forced into unemployment by the minimum-wage law. The higher labor cost of all products would necessitate a rise in many prices. Even the workers who held jobs at the increased money wages might not be able to purchase any more goods than before. The vast majority of consumers whose incomes are not increased by the minimum-wage law would purchase less. The net result would be a decrease rather than an increase in the total ability to purchase products.

A minimum wage law, or any attempt to force wages above the market rate, may be supported on various other grounds, but not on the ground that it would decrease unemployment. It will do the exact opposite.

The way to raise wages is to improve the market for labor. The way to improve the market for labor is, first to increase the demand for labor and, second, to decrease the supply of it.

The way to increase the demand for labor is to encourage enterprise and invention. The enterprisers and inventors, working together, will find ways of producing new things to satisfy new desires. The way to decrease the supply of labor is, first, to stop importing it, and, second, train the rising generations for those occupations in which workers are scarce. This will relieve the congested occupations.

The enemies of labor are those who discourage enterprise and invention on the one hand, and, on the other, fight against the exclusion of immigrant workers, against universal education, and against any other humane method of decreasing the supply of unskilled labor.

Deflation in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Economic Trend Line Studies of December 27, 1948:

DEFLATION IN BRITAIN

Since the beginning of 1948, the postwar inflation in Britain has shown signs of subsiding. This inflation had caused wages and prices to increase faster than during the war itself. Many factors contributed to a great excess of demand in the immediate postwar period—backlog of physical demand, wartime savings, postwar gratuities, restricted imports and boosted exports. The supply of goods was also retarded by a demobilization from the armed forces that was much slower than in the United States of America, owing to Britain's commitments at that time in India, Palestine, the former Italian colonies, Germany, and the traditional Empire garrisons. In addition, the first Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labor Government elected in 1945, Dr. Hugh Dalton, was an academic economist with a prejudice in favor of very cheap money.

His successor, Sir Stafford Cripps, has now been in office for a year, and his policies

have transformed the economic scene. His record has earned him in the country a stature second only to Mr. Churchill's. Though he has the reputation, and certainly the past, of a doctrinaire Socialist, his achievement in office has brought him the respect of much of the business community.

The first step that he took was to allow the interest rate on Government long-term securities to rise from 2½ percent to 3 percent or slightly above. At the same time, he showed himself fully aware that Britain's two fundamental economic problems were, first, the balance of external trade and, second, the availability on the domestic market of an adequate quantity of goods to match demand.

The British economy, as it emerged from the war, was in a condition inherently inflationary. The pressure was held in check only by an elaborate and expensive mechanism of allocation and price control, and then only partially. Cripps' experience in the trade ministry since 1945 seems to have convinced him, in spite of his Socialist intellectual background, that a resolute policy of disinflation, making possible a reduction in controls, was essential for the country; and he has pursued this against the suspicions of many of his colleagues and supporters, particularly those in the trade union movement. His methods have been of two kinds—budgetary and the general exertion of government powers on controls and propaganda.

As far as budgetary policy has been concerned, Cripps has aimed to produce a considerable budget surplus. On capital and revenue account put together, his budget of last spring planned to collect £318,000,000 more than was to be spent. Very high taxation rates were already in force and their crippling effects upon incentive were certainly underrated. Cripps gave some reliefs but offset them by new taxation in order to withdraw a substantial amount of purchasing power from the public.

Apart from this budgetary policy, Cripps has tried, partly by government regulation and partly by persuasion, to freeze prices, wages, and profits, and also to arrive at a better distribution of manpower so that key industries—coal, textile, agriculture, for example—will receive more labor.

These policies have had only a limited measure of success. On the budgetary side, the half-yearly figures show that revenue will probably be up to the original plan, but there is likely to be higher expenditure than was originally intended. Profits have been voluntarily and almost universally frozen—very few dividend rates have been higher than in 1947. On the other hand, prices in general have not held at all well. High taxation itself has contributed to this: Both in the fall of 1947 and the spring of 1948, purchase tax upon several types of goods was increased. Both imported raw materials and domestic coal have risen in price and these increases have been passed on to finished products. Wages, too, have not held by any means completely, but it is probably true that Cripps' policy exercised a good deal of restraint upon the unions in this respect. Prices are currently rising faster than wages, and this must mean that inflationary pressure is being reduced.

Certainly the policy, as a whole, has not been by any means a complete failure. Prices of some goods have been checked and even lowered. There has been extremely little industrial strife. Above all, there is a state in the market of consumers' goods which may justly be described as inflation come to a halt.

The public is spending its money with new care and discrimination. Shops are offering to it a wider variety and increased supply of goods. The passage from shortage to glut has been extremely rapid in many lines. It was first felt in certain household goods—ironmongery and radios, for example, which became heavy on the market last fall. Quite suddenly, householders appeared to have filled up their wartime accumulated shortages in these goods and held off.

The position in clothing has changed radically in the last few months. Until June the British public was living on a small clothing ration—a man, for example, had sufficient coupons in 1 year for a suit of clothes, but very little beyond that for shirts, socks, shoes, etc. In the spring of this year large stocks began to build up. The black market, both in clothes and in coupons, developed to a greater size than ever before. Early in June more coupons were issued to the public, and, at the same time, the number of coupons to be given up for many types of clothing was reduced. Important lines, including shoes, were taken off rationing altogether.

The public's response was extremely mild. It became immediately clear that it had not the money for substantial purchases of clothing. Stores which had stocked up soon began to hold sales to get rid of slow-moving goods and these sales themselves were a comparative failure.

Shopping has assumed a changed aspect in a matter of months. The stores have had to adopt competitive methods—price reductions, services, etc.—and the public has become far more sensitive both to price and to quality. It is turning from higher-class stores, where it used to obtain expensive but longer-lasting clothes and household goods, to cheaper stores which are now better stocked. The supply of clothes which are cheap in style but of sound material is not nearly meeting public demand at the same time as there are ample higher-priced, higher-taxed lines which are selling very slowly.

What is true of clothes also applies to many other goods. There is far more confidence in the buying public that the goods are there. It is not nearly so necessary as it has been for years to queue or to search. The public is buying with a deliberation which comes of scarcer money and an ampler stock of things to buy.

There are many other signs of shortage of cash. Theaters and concerts are slumping after several easy years. Restaurant sales are falling off in spite of the lack of improvement in the domestic food ration. Hairdressers have been taking considerably less custom. Railway passenger traffic receipts have fallen off to more than 10 percent below last year's. The value of real estate is also declining. There has been, over-all, a falling stock market for more than 12 months. At the beginning of the year there was a reduction in bank circulation of £150,000,000. Check clearings, after allowing for higher prices, are lower than a year ago. Against this, a fall in bank deposits, which seemed likely during the middle of 1948, has not materialized.

The modest amount of deflation that has so far been accomplished by Cripps' policy has been beneficial to the British economy. In several industries, competition is becoming far tougher, a good thing for the consumer and for efficiency. In the inflation of the war and postwar years, many companies had to resort to huge bank loans, mortgages, etc., in order to cover the increasing money value of their stock and work in progress. A few firms have recently had to cut their activities severely and one or two have found themselves in serious difficulties.

Britain needs a further turn of the deflationary screw. At present, the process of freeing labor by the failure of less essential and less efficient firms has begun but not gone nearly far enough. Unemployment is still at an insignificant rate. It is a situation not merely of full employment but of overemployment. Further deflation is required to shift more labor to the key industries. The need is generally admitted, but progress toward it has so far been insignificant.

Some more deflation would also drive home to management and workers the need for competitive efficiency. For years, inefficiency has been little handicapped. There are astonishing variations of efficiency between firms within single industries. Price-controls, allocations of raw materials, and very high taxation of profits deny the efficient their due reward, and prevent them from expanding and displacing less competent rivals. The Labor Government has, under Cripps' influence, made admirable efforts to increase production and, above all, exports—and these were recently warmly praised by ECA Administrator Hoffman—but it has not done nearly enough to lower costs and to prepare for a buyers' market in the world.

Unfortunately, there is little prospect of the further deflation which is required. Cripps is aware of the need for it and he will probably have at least another year in office. But his main instrument—a budget surplus—is already weakening. The expense of higher food subsidies to meet increased prices of nondollar food, the unforeseen costs of the revolt in Malay, of the Berlin airlift, of lengthened periods of compulsory military service and, above all, of rearmament—all these are likely to use up much of the budget surplus and only a magic termination of the cold war would make substantial budget surpluses possible in the immediate future. In addition, large-scale capital expenditure—amounting to about one-fifth of the national income—is proceeding all the time both on industrial re-equipment and upon housing. The first is a vital need for the country's economy so long starved of technical equipment, but it has a pronounced inflationary effect.

The British are certainly realizing that their condition is unlikely to improve for 4 or 5 years at least. Though they may next year export 50 percent above the 1938 level, besides receiving Marshall aid, imports will remain 20 percent below the 1938 level, which means that imported supplies of food, newsprint, gasoline, and other scarce goods will not improve. The continuing struggle to balance overseas payments is likely to last for many years. It will compel the Government, whatever party is in power, to control a great deal of economic life.

But, for the time being, every measure of deflation makes possible a new stage of economic liberation both for the consumer and for business. Unfortunately, the main instrument of deflation, which is at hand, is that of taxation, and that is already at such a high level that the least increase of it would have a serious effect upon incentive, and therefore upon output. It might well even turn out to be inflationary by diminishing the amount of goods to be bought further than the amount of money with which to buy them.

But the chief obstacles to further deflation are not technical; they are political. However much good it may be doing to the economy, deflation is difficult to make popular. The complaints against it in Britain are increasing. They come, in different forms, from many sources, and are often very plausible. Some call for reduced taxation; others cite the rising cost of living while wage rates are stabilized; the public clamor for more, and subsidized, houses will be insatiable for years; management and workers alike in unessential occupations are doing their utmost to resist the needed diversion of effort to key industries. All these have their political weight, particularly as an election is expected in little over a year.

Inflation in Britain has received a wholesome check, but it is far from fully dispelled.

Indonesia—United States Has a Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Indonesia deserves our attention. If we fail in our duty to this Republic, we shall witness its fall to the Communists.

Mr. Garland Evans Hopkins, associate secretary for the division of foreign missions of the Methodist Church, is well acquainted with the situation in Indonesia. In the October issue of the Christian Century appeared an article by him entitled "Last Chance in Indonesia."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article in question, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, representing 102 Protestant denominations, at Buck Hill Falls, Pa., January 4–7, 1949:

[From the Christian Century of October 13, 1948]

LAST CHANCE IN INDONESIA

(By Garland Evans Hopkins)

I have just come from an interview with Derk Strikker, the Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, and I am discouraged over the prospects in Indonesia. "We will make no concessions that will strengthen the Communists," said Mr. Stikker to a small group composed largely of newsmen. "Premier Hatta's government will have to cope with the new Communist threat to the Republic. If it does not, other measures will have to be taken." But when Mr. Stikker was asked if the concessions about which he was speaking included measures aimed at strengthening the hand of the republican government as it attempts to deal with the Communists, he evaded the questions.

I came away from the conference convinced that the new government in Holland is no more in earnest in its protestations favoring a sovereign Indonesia united under the Dutch Crown than have been previous Dutch Governments. It would prefer that the Communists, now starting military action, should defeat the Republic, thereby giving the Dutch long-sought grounds for military conquest of republican areas. The test of Dutch sincerity will be whether or not the present air-naval blockade is lifted. In no other way can the Republic obtain the arms and ammunition necessary if its forces are to defeat the coup which Musso, a Russian-trained Indonesian, is attempting.

WHAT IS UNITED STATES POLICY?

The course which the Dutch Government will follow in connection with this new crisis in Indonesia is not hard to predict. More important to the cause of Indonesian independence just now, but not so easily predictable, is the course which the United States will pursue. In my February 18, 1948, article in these columns I pointed out that step by step in its struggle for independence Indonesia had encountered a hostile, or at best unhelpful, attitude on the part of the United States Government. At that time the American postwar policy of buttressing colonial powers had just resulted in the Renville Agreement, which Indonesia had accepted at the behest of Frank Porter Graham, a recognized liberal and this country's representative on the good offices committee established by the United Nations. No one has doubted Graham's sincerity, the general belief being that his hands were tied by his State Department advisers.

In the months since then there have been indications that the United States was at long last ready to line up behind Dutch liberals like Queen Wilhelmina rather than behind the Netherlands Indies administration. Graham's successor in Indonesia, Coert duBois, joined with his fellow committeeman from Australia, Thomas Critchley, in genuine attempts to give the United Nations the full truth of the Indonesian situation and to encourage amicable settlement between the disputants. DuBois' recent recall raised questions which the State Department quieted by announcing that his return had nothing to do with his attitude concerning the Indonesian situation, but was for reasons of health. It began to look as though the United States, even if at the eleventh hour, had decided on a more constructive policy toward Indonesia and that there was hope for settlement in the not too distant future.

CHRISTIAN PREMIER SWINGS TO COMMUNISTS

I would not for 1 minute minimize the gravity of the situation in Indonesia today. When the former premier, Batak Christian Sjarifoeddin, turned to the Communists he delivered a serious blow not only to Indonesian nationalists but to the Christian movement. Sjarifoeddin has long been a devout Christian and he had just been nominated to represent the Batak Christian League of Sumatra at the World Council of Churches. He and Soetan Sjahrir have been considered the leading Indonesian liberals, though their prestige has been in eclipse since their failure to obtain western cooperation in attaining freedom and economic stability. Disillusioned by the attitude of the Christian west, Sjarifoeddin has announced that he now turns to Russia as the only hope for Indonesian independence. Some dispatches state that he claims membership in the Communist Party dating from as early as 1935. On the other hand, an Associated Press dispatch from Batavia on September 19 quoted John Coast, British adviser to the Republic's Foreign Office, as saying that Sjarifoeddin told him at the time he went over to the Communists: "I am still a left-wing Socialist, not a Communist. But I do not think the Americans have any intention of supporting a just solution [of the Dutch-Indonesian controversy]. The Russians are our only hope." The same dispatch quoted Mr. Coast as saying that the upsurge of communism in Indonesia is the result of popular disillusionment with United States policy toward the Republic.

Conditions in Indonesia have rapidly deteriorated since the signing of the Renville Agreement. In accepting the agreement the Indonesians compromised as much as possible without surrendering every semblance of control over their territory. Sjarifoeddin's government fell because of these compromises, but the new government organized by Mohammed Hatta accepted the agreement and took every step toward its implementation. The Dutch, on the other hand, have consistently failed to carry out either the letter or the spirit of the agreement despite its bias in their favor.

DUTCH SABOTAGE AGREEMENTS

One clause of the agreement provided that plebiscites should be held in the disputed areas not less than 6 months and not more than 1 year after the final political settlement which would come with the formation of the United States of Indonesia. Hardly had the Renville Agreement been signed when the Dutch sponsored a plebiscite in Madoera and shortly thereafter proclaimed the creation of a new state for inclusion in the United States of Indonesia. When the Dutch asserted that the voting had shown a 90-percent antirepublican attitude in Madoera, the Republic answered that not one-half of the qualified voters had taken part. It is a matter of record that 2 months later 30 of the 40 members of the Madoera council were prorepublicans.

Shortly after the Madoera plebiscite the Dutch called a West Java conference from which, after several sessions, there emerged a sort of political organization for a West Java state. Later the state of East Sumatra was established. The pattern of Dutch tactics in the political battle for the control of Indonesia became obvious—the Republic was being "cut down to size."

At the same time that the Republic was being subjected to this type of political attack it was also suffering from an economic blockade. The Dutch have thrown a naval-air blockade around the Republic despite the de facto authority invested in the Republic by the Linggadjati agreement. This blockade cuts off completely any foreign trade with the Republic, thereby causing extreme suffering for want of necessary medical and health supplies as well as of certain items of food and clothing usually imported. The purpose seems to be to stir up discontent with the republican administration among the people by making their living conditions as bad as possible.

WILL BLOCKADE BE LIFTED?

The blockade assumes greater significance in the light of the present Communist uprising. If it is continued, the Indonesians will find it impossible to import supplies and arms with which to put down the uprising. If the Dutch truly desired a union with Indonesia and if they honestly wanted to see communism wiped out, they would now lift the blockade and allow the Indonesians to demonstrate whether or not a southeast Asian country upon its own responsibility can and will handle the Communist threat. Should the Republic then find itself unable to cope with the situation, it would undoubtedly ask the Dutch to assist. The present untenable position of the Dutch not only embarrasses the republican government but plays directly into the hands of the Communists.

Do the Dutch really want to make it possible for the Indonesian Republic to settle the Communist uprising? One prominently placed Indonesian leader has expressed grave doubts. Dr. Mohammed Roem, Minister of the Interior, was quoted in August 30 dispatches from Batavia to the Washington Post as stating that "the Dutch cooperate with the ultraleftist groups in the Republic" to bring about the downfall of the Hatta cabinet.

Indonesia has also objected to the ex parte blue-printing of the new United States of Indonesia. The Republic rejects the idea that there can be "a free and sovereign United States of Indonesia on an equal footing with the Netherlands" on the basis of plans drawn up by the Dutch Cabinet. Indonesians appreciate the Dutch decision that they are to be "free to realize their own interests independently" but they are wary of the Dutch dominated planning conferences which have been taking place in the Indies.

PART PLAYED BY UNITED NATIONS

It has previously been said in these columns that Indonesia offers the best opportunity for the United Nations to demonstrate to the world that it can function successfully in the settling of disputes between nations. This is particularly true because both the Dutch and the Indonesians profess to have the same end in view. The Dutch are historically a peace-loving people and, on a comparative basis, have done a good job in colonial administration. They have always been strong supporters of international organization and peaceful settlement. Indo-

nesia, too, has shown a desire for peace rather than war. Its Government appealed for Security Council intervention in the present dispute and it has never questioned the Council's jurisdiction, accepting all suggestions of the good offices committee, even to the distasteful Renville Agreement.

The good offices committee, composed of Australia, Belgium, and the United States, has provided able representatives to observe the Indonesian situation and to make reports to the United Nations. Their reports have been full and they have been quick to assess blame impartially. While they have blamed the Indonesians for minor infractions and incidents, their factual reporting has shown the Dutch at fault in every major contention brought before the Security Council by Christian Lambertus Palar, the Indonesian delegate. They confirmed that the Dutch were conducting a blockade, although the Dutch representative at an earlier session had called that term a mere propaganda slogan of the Republic. They confirmed the establishment of the puppet states.

LATEST REPORT TO SECURITY COUNCIL

The committee members have finally been forced to report to the Security Council that further United Nations conciliation efforts must await "substantial concessions by one side or the other." Since the only concession remaining for the Republic is to give up all claims to sovereignty and to allow the Dutch to proceed as they desire in the formation of a United States of Indonesia without nationalist participation, it would seem that the last chance for peace in Indonesia depends on the United Nations persuading the Dutch that the next concessions must be made by them.

The hard reality of the situation, however, is that Lake Success is impotent to act until Washington changes its policy. So long as the United States continues to support colonial powers in their suppression of the freedom of indigenous peoples, there is little that the UN can do. The temptation, now that the Communist angle has entered the Indonesian situation, will be for the United States to back away from what had seemed its promising favorable trend toward Indonesian aspirations and to return to issuing meaningless statements of policy in an attempt to please Indonesia without alienating the Netherlands.

Our last official statement of policy was outlined on June 26, 1948, by H. Merrell Benninghoff, of the State Department. He said that first and foremost, the United States is determined to do everything it can to bring peace, prosperity, and the freedoms of the democratic system to the peoples of Indonesia; further, that it will seek to assist the Indonesians and Dutch to rediscover their dependence on each other because the world desperately needs what the two of them working together can provide; and, finally, that the United States is determined that the efforts of totalitarianism to defeat these purposes shall not succeed. This is double talk of the first order. It is the type of statement our Government has been making for 3 years. It would better have been left unsaid, especially in view of continued loans to the Dutch Government, without which they would be unable to raise the more than $1,000,000 a day which it costs to maintain their military establishment in Indonesia. Such words ring hollow against a background of whistling American-made bullets and exploding American-made bombs.

There is no question that the Communist threat in southeast Asia is growing. In Indonesia it can be met and defeated by indigenous democrats, but only if the Dutch and the United States are willing realistically to face facts. The Republic may fall; the Dutch may be able for a time to continue their colonial rule; but it is a fair prediction that within 10 years the Indonesians will be their own masters. Dutch sovereignty is no longer the question. The question is whether Indonesia shall be a stronghold of democracy in southeastern Asia or a stepping stone in Moscow's onward march to control Asia and the Pacific. The decision now in the making in Washington may well be democracy's last chance in Indonesia.

RESOLUTION OF THE FOREIGN MISSIONS CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA CONCERNING THE NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT'S ACTION IN INDONESIA

All peoples have become geographical, economic, and spiritual neighbors, and their interests are inseparable. The eyes of Asia are particularly directed to the policy of the United States. It is, therefore, urgent that American citizens and Christian agencies strive to understand the major problems and pressures faced by nations emerging from long periods of imperialistic colonialism and foreign domination. Such understanding is necessary if democratic and Christian principles are to be applied in world relations.

The present situation in Indonesia involves more than success or failure of the Indonesian Republic. A European nation of democratic traditions and outstanding devotion to the Christian faith has, by sudden attack upon the Indonesian Republic and imprisonment of its leaders, violated the letter and the spirit both of its profession in these matters and of directives of the United Nations. This unjustifiable resort to arms is a denial of human brotherhood and of the basic Christian principles that men everywhere have the right of self-determination.

These acts have already met with the disapproval, publicly expressed, of many Christian leaders in the Netherlands. Leaders of government in free nations of Asia have been alarmed and resentful because of this unwarranted invasion which has only served to create disunity among nations and tends to foster an Asian bloc in world affairs.

Furthermore, with the Netherlands Government benefiting from European recovery program aid on the one hand, while pursuing a policy of aggression in Indonesia on the other, the basic purposes of the European recovery program are in effect defeated: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. That the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, representing 102 Protestant boards and agencies, commend the Government of the United States for its stated policy during the period of the present emergency in Indonesia. We respectfully urge that the United States continue unwaveringly in this attitude even though it may have to stand alone among the great powers in refusing to buttress colonialism in Indonesia;

2. That we specifically urge the United States representative in the Security Council be instructed by the United States Government:

(a) To continue to demand withdrawal of the Netherlands Army to its lines as of December 19, 1948, and the release of the leaders of the Republic, without reservation or restriction, to take up again the governing of their territory;

(b) To press for renewed negotiations through the good offices committee until such time as a conciliation or arbitration commission may be established, with insistence upon due respect for basic legal and human rights of all persons who have been involved in the struggle, whatever may have been the convictions to which they gave support; and

3. That we call upon the United States Government to hold in abeyance any further European recovery program aid to the Netherlands Government until the latter fully complies with all demands made by the Security Council.

The Third Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, herewith is an eloquent historical survey and forecast of the spiritual potentials of progressive Judaism in the evolving life of the third commonwealth—the new state of Israel. It was delivered by Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, chairman, American section of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, before the delegates to the fortieth biennial assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Boston, Mass. Other principal speakers were Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of the Catholic archdiocese of Boston, and Charles P. Taft, president of the Federal Council of Churches. A beautiful message from our President, Harry S. Truman, was read at the opening of the convention.

I commend the following to the attention of my colleagues:

LIBERAL JUDAISM AND ISRAEL

(By Dr. Abba Hillel Silver)

The establishment of the state of Israel is bound to have an effect upon the future course of the Jewish people throughout the world, and upon Judaism resembling analogous events in the history of our people in the past.

The destruction and the restoration of the state in the sixth century before the Common Era, and again the destruction in the year 70 of the Common Era, are milestones in Jewish history as well as turning points. They forced political, social, and spiritual adjustments on the people, and framed a new way of life for them. The reestablishment of the Jewish state is destined to become just such a milestone and turning point.

The year 1948 will take its place among the three or four most important dates in Jewish history. We are too close to the event to evaluate it properly, but we can begin to discern some of its vast implications.

The first is a psychological one. After 19 centuries the Jewish people have regained national status. It has rebuilt its national center in its ancestral home. The reconstruction of the state of Israel has received the sanction of the United Nations. Its Government has been recognized by many countries, including the two most powerful—the United States and the Soviet Union. While its exact boundaries are still under dispute, the fact of its independent and sovereign existence is generally acknowledged, and its own military prowess has fortified it. The third commonwealth of the Jewish nation is thus an accomplished fact. The state of Israel exists.

JEWS NO LONGER IN EXILE

As a result, the concept of the wandering Jew is bound eventually to disappear along with the term galut—exile. When people can of their own free will return to their ancestral home, they are not in exile. Only compulsory banishment spells exile. All nations send forth immigrants to all parts of the world. People are continually moving from one country to another, and change their citizenship, but they are not regarded as exiles.

This fact alone—the end of national exile for the Jewish people, as such—is destined to affect favorably the psyche of the Jew throughout the world. It will endow the Jew, wherever he lives, with a self-respect and a

sense of security, a normal tone, long wanting in Jewish experience. For the curse of Cain, the curse of being an outcast and a wanderer over the face of the earth, has been removed. Whatever the Jew is destined to create anywhere in art or in literature will, I believe, come to reflect this new attitude of dignity and confidence.

There will be much less of the strain and the tension in his creative work, less of the spirit of dejection or of rebellion. There will be less obsession with anti-Semitism and with apologetics. This is not to suggest that, as a member of a minority group, the Jew will no longer be subject to those discriminations which, to varying degrees, are visited upon most minority groups in most parts of the world. But in this regard he will share an identical but not a unique or aggravated lot. It was always the double liability of his predicament—that of being a minority group everywhere and possessed of a national center nowhere, which doubly exacerbated his position.

He will fight for his full and equal rights everywhere, more confidently and more resolutely, enheartened by the fact of the new status and dignity which have come to his people through the re-creation of the State of Israel.

FORESEES MILLIONS IN ISRAEL

Another important consequence of the epochal event which has taken place so recently is the emergence of a major Jewish population center in the east and the regrouping of the world Jewish population. It is quite possible that if the present rate of immigration continues, the Jewish population of Israel by 1960 will be 2,000,000 or more. It might substantially increase in subsequent years. Three to four million is not an excessive figure. So that, outside of the United States and the Soviet Union, the population of Israel will be the largest Jewish population in the world.

Thus, a great concentration of our people will again take place in the east, the cradle of our people and of our faith, and the east rather than the west will again become the decisive cultural milieu of the creative Jewish life of tomorrow. An interesting blending of the east and the west will take place in that corner of the world which time and again has served both as an entrepot and crucible of cultures and religions. An imposing new synthesis might conceivably result when Jews bring into that land which in the past was the natural home of seers, prophets, and mystics the science, technology, and the political and economic conceptions of the west.

Jews will come to Israel from all parts of the world just as peoples have come to the United States from all parts of the world, and just as this country became a melting-pot of peoples, so Israel is destined to become a melting-pot of world Jewry. In a sense, it is that already. American life richly profited from the manifold gifts and talents which many peoples brought to it, so Israel is likewise destined to profit from the skills, cultures, and enthusiasms which Jews the world over will bring to it.

The dynamism, the amazing outpouring of creative energy which is already in evidence in Israel, will increase in the years to come. Life in Israel will be characterized, I believe, by that same energy, initiative, and inventiveness which have characterized American life. So that a very exciting and promising new chapter in Jewish history is beginning.

NO DUAL ALLEGIANCE

Two questions present themselves, among others, as we study the possible implications of what has taken place. What effect will the establishment of the state of Israel have on the Jews throughout the world, and what effect will it have on Judaism?

One important fact must be borne in mind. The majority of the Jewish people will live outside of Israel. The idea of the ultimate disappearance of the Diaspora may be theoretically held or even justified. It is not practically valid. Assuming that Israel will, in the course of time, come to contain three or four million Jews, the majority of the Jewish people will nevertheless still reside outside its borders.

This was the case also during the Second Commonwealth, especially in the centuries immediately preceding the destruction in 70. It has been estimated that in the closing centuries of the Second Commonwealth about two and one-half million Jews lived in Palestine and about five and one-half million lived outside. There was a considerable dispersion of our people in the six centuries before the Common Era which extended from the borders of Persia in the east to Spain in the west, and from Ethiopia clear to the Black Sea.

Important centers of Jewish life existed, simultaneously, with the Jewish state, in Babylon, Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor, in the islands of the Mediterranean, in Greece and in Italy. It has been estimated that every tenth person living in the Roman Empire in the first century of the Common Era was a Jew, and every fifth person living in the eastern Mediterranean world was a Jew. The great dispersion was not always the result of expulsions. It was not always involuntary. Jews emigrated from Palestine for reasons also of trade and commerce, of economic opportunities elsewhere, perhaps also because of crowded conditions in the homeland.

What was the relationship of the Jews who lived outside of Palestine to the Jewish state? They owed no political allegiance to the Jewish state, and the Jewish state exercised no political control over them. We have the testimony of the Jewish philosopher, Philo, who lived in Egypt in the first century, who writes:

"No one country can contain the whole Jewish nation, by reason of its populousness; on which account they frequent all the most prosperous and fertile countries of Europe and Asia, whether islands or continents, looking indeed upon the holy city as their metropolis in which is erected the sacred temple of the most high God, but accounting those regions which have been occupied by their fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers and still more remote ancestors, in which they have been born and brought up, as their country."

The country in which they lived was their country. The existence of a Jewish state did not diminish by an iota their loyalty to the countries in which they lived and in which they and their children were born. Theirs was no dual allegiance. Dual allegiance was never a fact in Jewish experience. It is the frightened and the insecure Jew, the one who is generally unhappy about his Jewish lineage who tries to curry favor with the non-Jewish world on the basis of self-effacement and spreads the charge of dual allegiance against those fellow Jews who are not so frightened and servile.

PALESTINE WAS UNIFYING CENTER

The Jews who lived outside of Palestine in those days nevertheless recognized Palestine as the nonpolitical center of world Jewry, especially because it was the center of their religion. It was the holy land. In Jerusalem was the Temple dedicated to the God of Israel. They were mindful of the prophecy: "Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." Palestine was their ancestral home and the center of Jewish religious worship. They made frequent pilgrimages to Palestine. On the festivals of the pilgrimage, thousands of Jews from all parts of the world poured into Jerusalem.

It was a revered custom of Jews everywhere to contribute annually a half-shekel which at stated periods was collected and carried to Jerusalem as their voluntary contribution toward the maintenance of their central religious institutions. They helped the nation to defend itself when Rome attacked it, and they supported the rebellion of Bar Kochba against Rome in the second century when the Jews of Palestine attempted to regain their independence. They wanted the Jewish state to survive.

Even after the destruction of the Temple, they continued to recognize the authority of the religious and spiritual leaders of Palestine, of the Sanhedrin and of the great religious academies, and to send their self-imposed tax for the support of the office of the Nasi and of scholars. The Jewish communities in other parts of the world, which later on established their own academies and produced their own illustrious religious leaders, nevertheless accepted the superior authority of the religious leaders and centers in Palestine.

The authority of the partriarchate which existed to the fifth century and of the Palestinian academies and their prerogatives in such matters as the fixing of the calendar for world Jewry and the ordination of rabbis was, with but occasional exceptions, accepted by all. The Jews fully understood the importance of maintaining a center, a unifying and organizing center of Jewish life, especially after the destruction both of the state and the Temple. They felt the need of some visible authority to hold them together against the forces which threatened to disintegrate them. They knew themselves to be, and they wished to remain, one people, one historic community, united by common sympathies, inspired by common memories, sharing many likenesses, and cooperating with each other for common purposes and against common enemies.

Rome destroyed Carthage. It destroyed also the Carthaginian nation. Rome destroyed Judea. It could not destroy the Jewish nation. It only disrupted its political center and added to the dispersion of the people.

To sum up: there persisted throughout the centuries the liveliest interaction between Palestine and the Jews of the Diaspora which was a boon to both and which safeguarded the integrity of the people and the character of its faith. When the center in Palestine had become totally disrupted, and the Jews of the Diaspora were forced to turn to other centers for spiritual guidance—to Babylonia, northern Africa, Spain, and elsewhere—they nevertheless kept alive in their strong Messianic faith the hope of the return of the nation to Palestine and the restoration of its religious center there.

AMERICAN JEWS REMAIN CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES

If history is any guide, the Jews of today who will continue to live in other lands will, by and large, maintain the same attitude toward the state of Israel as their forefathers did. Theirs will be a most sympathetic relationship toward that land. They will materially help it to absorb as many Jews as will wish to go there or may have to go there. They will help to build up its cultural, scientific, and spiritual institutions, as well as its economic life so that it may become a land of which Jews everywhere can be proud. For the eyes of the world will be on the land of Israel to see what Jews, as a people, can accomplish on their own.

Israel will come to be again the nonpolitical center of world Jewry. Pilgrims will go there as of old—and not merely the pious. There will be a free flow of manifold communications, of mutual stimulation, of give and take. Israel will again come to exercise a unifying and sustaining influence in Jewish life everywhere.

We shall remain one people, one historic community, as of old. But the Jews of Israel will be Israeli citizens and the Jews of the United States will be citizens of the United States, and similarly with Jews in other lands.

They will owe undivided allegiance to their respective countries and they will discharge loyally their full duties as citizens, as Jews have always done. But they will retain a special attachment to the land of Israel which will in no way interfere with their duties and obligations as citizens of their respective countries.

It was Voltaire who said that every cultured man should have two fatherlands—his own and France. In an even more profound sense, but equally nonpolitical, it may be applied to the Jew and Israel. Israel will be the Sabbath in the life of our people when, according to a beautiful tradition, an additional soul is vouchsafed unto man.

The more Orthodox may seek to establish again a central religious authority in Israel as in the days of old, with the chief rabbinate of Israel at its head, in the same manner as the international Catholic community has its religious center in Rome. If such a center is ever reestablished, it will, of course, have authority only over those who will voluntarily recognize its authority, either in Israel or outside.

Israel will not be a theocratic state, but for all Jews—that is, for all those who wish to remain Jews—Israel will continue to be the land of treasured memories as well as of unfolding social and cultural realities, which, if nobly conceived and achieved, will be eagerly welcomed as stimulating influences in their lives. Is not this expressed in the ancient prayer of our people: "Oh, cause Thou a new light to shine over Zion, and may we all be worthy to enjoy its light speedily."

FOR SHEATHING OF SWORDS

One of the welcome byproducts of the establishment of the state of Israel will be the end of that long debate which has for generations now filled the household of Israel with clamor and confusion—the debate between Zionists and anti-Zionists. The long contention may now cease. The swords may be sheathed. The argument is over. Life has finally composed our quarrel. The state of Israel is here.

The anti-Zionist, if he persists in his agitation, will no longer be fighting an idea or a movement, but an established state. He will be endangering the security of a legally constituted state which is recognized by his own country. His obsession with hyphenated loyalties is a confession of insecurity and, if publicly charged against fellow Jews, is a libel against loyal and patriotic citizens, one which plays directly into the hands of anti-Semites to whom all Jews, including the superpatriots, are anathema.

The right of Jews everywhere to have a share in the upbuilding of Palestine was clearly acknowledged in the Balfour Declaration and in the Palestine mandate and is implied in the recognition which the United Nations gave to the reconstitution of the Jewish State. No free and democratic state wishes to monopolize all the loyalties of its citizens.

Liberal Judaism has slowly disentangled itself from the meshes of an antinationalist dogma in which it was caught in the early years of its development and which was never really an essential part of its teaching any more than the materialist conception of history is an essential part of socialism, though it looms large in its Marxian formulation. Both borrowed doctrines from the philosophic climate of their day (in the case of Reform Judaism, also from the political climate) and wedded them to their basic ideas. Subsequent generations and new conceptions in philosophy and government have revealed their accidental connection.

It became clear that liberal Judaism has a mission to perform in Jewish religious life whether a Jewish state exists or not. Accordingly, some years before the establishment of the Jewish state and while the Zionist-anti-Zionist debate was still raging, the central bodies of American Reform Judaism declared that they discern no essential incompatibility between Reform Judaism and Zionism, no reason why those of their members who give allegiance to Zionism should not have the right to regard themselves as fully within the spirit and purpose of Reform Judaism.

The great debate having been ended by a fiat of history, all erstwhile antagonists may now join in amity in the common and interfused task to make Israel secure to defend Jewish rights everywhere and to make Judaism strong and vital in the world.

FEAR OF "NEW LOOK"

What effect will the establishment of the state of Israel have on Judaism—on liberal Judaism? I have heard voices prophesying doom. The establishment of the state, it is argued, will be seized upon by many Jews as an excuse to assimilate, now that they can no longer be accused or need no longer to accuse themselves of cowardice in running away from a homeless and persecuted people. Since the Jewish nation is now secure in Israel, they no longer need to remain Jews in the Diaspora. Some fear that this is likely to be the "new look" in assimilationist apologetics.

I choose to go back to history again to gain some insight into the probable reaction of our people. What was the status of the religious life of our people in the Diaspora in olden times, at the time when the Jewish state existed? The Jews who lived outside of Palestine were loyal to their faith and quite active religiously—not everywhere to the same degree nor equally among all sections of the population.

There were Jews in those days, too, who were religiously indifferent, who practiced a minimal Judaic ritual or none at all. There were also those who abandoned their faith altogether.

Wealth in the Alexandrian Jewish community (writes Professor Wolfson) was derived from the non-Jewish environment through contacts with heathens. Such contacts with heathens thus became financial assets, and financial assets naturally became marks of a delusive social distinction, and the delusion of social distinction, in turn, led to snobbishness, obsequiousness, self-effacement, aping, simulation, pretense, and ultimately to a begging for permission to join whatever one had to join in order to become a heathen. This, we imagine, was the progressive pilgrimage of certain Alexandrian Jews from a seat in the front row of the synagogue to a place at the tail end of the mystery processions of the heathen.

PROSELYTIZING OF YORE

All this has a very contemporary ring. But these apostates and assimilationists were the exception. Overwhelmingly the Jews remained warmly loyal to the religious traditions of their people. Sometimes, and especially in the centuries following the Maccabean victory, they carried on a vigorous proselytizing activity to convert the heathen world to Judaism, and with considerable success. They were not always the anvil for other cultural influences. In matters of religion and ethics they were often the strong hammer.

There is abundant evidence in pagan writings and a considerable Jewish propaganda literature to testify to the zeal and effectiveness of the proselytizing efforts of the Jews. They were not aware of any irreconcilable conflict between their ethnic allegiance, their love and reverence for Palestine, their Pharisaic religious discipline, and the universal, missionary aspirations of Judaism which they sought to realize. "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees," we read in the unfriendly source of Matthew, "ye scour land and sea to make one convert."

The intellectual development of the ancient world had far outdistanced its polytheism, mythology, and idolatry. It was ripe for a new religion, and the Jews of the Diaspora, the covenanted people of a pure monotheistic faith and an exalted code of morality which had challenged and defied the polytheism and immorality of the heathen world for a thousand years, were eager to bring their faith to the Gentile world and to convert it to the Kingdom of God. This missionary activity reached large proportions, provoked strong opposition and, at times, violent persecution. But it testifies to the religious vitality of the Jewish communities outside of Palestine.

The degree of their vitality reflected their cultural environment. In the Hellenistic cultural complex they were less creative and less original than, say, in Babylonia. The Jews of Babylon produced the Babylonian Talmud and established great rabbinic academies such as Sura, Nehardia, and Pumbeditha, just as centuries before they had created the synagogue. We find no corresponding achievements among the Jews in the Græco-Roman world.

RELIGION CITADEL OF STRENGTH

But the Jewish people amply demonstrated that they and their faith could survive almost everywhere in the Diaspora. They were undoubtedly strengthened by the influences which came to them from Palestine, but the greatest source of their strength was their own religion: the divine Torah which was the common possession of Jews the world over, and which was a tree of life to them; the precious and beloved institution of the synagogue, which was their spiritual home and which existed in every town and village; and all the dear traditions of a proud and spiritually contented people.

They wanted to remain Jews and to live the Jewish way of life. They were not unacquainted with periodic persecutions and virulent anti-Jewish propaganda. They were also subjected to the disruptive influences and blandishments of pagan society and attractive alien cultures and philosophies. They were not isolated or ghettotized. They could assimilate if they wished to, much easier than in our day, and the rewards were inviting.

But overwhelmingly they chose to remain Jews. Presumably many fell away. Many fell away throughout the centuries of our dispersion both in times of persecution and in times of freedom and enlightenment. But many more did not. Those who did not are responsible for our survival, and those who do not make up the strength of the Jewish people today. Their kind will constitute the strength of the Jewish people tomorrow. The existence of a Jewish state can only add strength to their strength, and confidence and dignity to their lives. It cannot undermine their Jewish faith and allegiance.

Whenever I am confronted with the question: Will Judaism survive in the Diaspora? I am tempted to counter with another question: Will democracy survive? Who can say? When we believe in and defend democracy it is not because we are sure that it will survive, but because it presently satisfies our deepest needs, and, therefore, notwithstanding its patent shortcomings and the many serious set-backs which it has received, and is receiving, in many parts of the world, it still remains for us the desirable way of life. The American people have lived with it for 150 years and they are satisfied to carry on the same way into the indefinite and uncertain future.

It is so with Judaism. We believe in it and wish to transmit it, not because we are sure that it will survive but because it presently satisfies our deepest spiritual needs, as it did those of our ancestors in the long past. We are satisfied to carry on the same way into an indefinite and uncertain future, despite apparent difficulties and evidences here and there of falling away and collapse.

The quality of our devotion to Judaism today and the means which we will employ to strengthen it may make that future less indefinite and less uncertain.

RIPE FOR NATIVE SPIRITUAL MOVEMENT

There will be need for a vital liberal Judaism within the state of Israel itself. One should bear in mind that most of the great prophets of Israel preached religion—God and the law of God—in Palestine and to the Jews of Palestine at a time when they were not lacking a land, a language, and a government of their own. Clearly, these by themselves were not enough.

In the days of the Maccabees a violent religious reformation had to be launched in Palestine to save the Jews of Palestine from the corruptive spiritual influences of a brilliant but decadent pseudo-Hellenic culture to which they had succumbed. At the time of the first restoration in the sixth century it was fully grasped by the great rebuilders of the state that political and physical restoration was not enough.

Nehemiah, therefore, set himself the task of rebuilding the state physically. Ezra set himself the task of rebuilding the faith of Israel. All the prophets of the restoration linked up the national regeneration of the people with moral and spiritual regeneration, and with the regeneration of the whole of mankind. At the beginning of the second restoration Theodor Herzl declared that a return to Judaism must precede a return to the Jewish land. Three months before he died he wrote: "In Zionism, as I understand it, there is not only the striving for a legally secured soil for our poor people; there is the striving for moral and spiritual perfection."

The Jews of Israel will require religion just as the Jews outside of Israel. The youth in Israel, which at the moment finds spiritual discipline and challenge in the struggle to build the new state and defend it, will be in need, after this period has passed, of a sustaining spiritual morale which can only come from religion.

Liberal Judaism, in an Israeli not a Germanic setting, will appeal to them, I believe. Palestine Jewry generally is seeking new forms for its religious life. I believe that it is ripe for a great new spiritual movement which will be native to the soil, responsive to the demands of modern life; one which will lay emphasis not so much upon ritual and tradition as upon the prophetic, social, and spiritual ideals of Judaism.

JUDAISM WILL FLOURISH IN ISRAEL

I am inclined to believe that even Orthodox Judaism in Israel will undergo a considerable change. Jewish religious law in its creative periods was always evolutionary. The law was always adapted to the needs of the times through a carefully elaborated system of interpretation which preserved the spirit of the law while the law itself was adjusted to new circumstances and times. The destruction of the state, to quote Chief Rabbi Herzog, "checked the process of natural growth and development inherent in Israel's legal system." In a renascent Jewish state, Jewish religious law will again have the opportunity to develop organically.

Judaism will survive and flourish in Israel. It will survive and flourish also in the Diaspora, if the faithful and devoted among us will nurture and replenish it. The time will soon come when we shall be free to divert our energies largely to our synagogues, our schools, and our academies, whereas for a very long time now our energies and resources have been dedicated largely to the compelling emergencies of life saving and state building. We shall soon be able to put the emphasis in Jewish community life upon religion—if we wish it. We should most earnestly wish it if we desire to give significance, content, and dignity to our own lives and the lives of our children.

The United States, with the largest Jewish population in the world, and one which is basically loyal and generously responsive to Jewish needs and aspirations, can become a great creative center of Jewish spiritual life. "Can," I say; not "will" or "must." We are constrained to acknowledge that the thin wafer, the melba-toast type of Jewish education which our children receive in our Sunday schools, is not the kind of a spiritual and cultural diet which can nourish and sustain a vigorous Jewish life, and is one which does not promise well for the future.

LIBERAL-MISSION IDEAL VALID

Some 10 years ago I had occasion to write: "To the thoughtful Jews it is becoming increasingly clear that there are no substitutes in Jewish life for religion. Neither philanthropy nor culture nor nationalism is adequate for the stress and challenge of our lives. All these interests can and must find their rightful place within the general pattern of Judaism. But the pattern must be Judaism, the Judaism of the Torah, the synagogue and the prayer book; the Judaism of the priest, the prophet, the saint, the mystic, and the rabbi; the Judaism which speaks of God, and the worship of God, and the commandments of God and the quest of God.

"There have been many false prophets of ersatz Judaism in our midst who have frequently misled our people. There were professional social workers, for example, who announced that a full complement of scientifically administered hospitals and orphanages and other social agencies was a sufficient vade mecum for the Jewish people, and that the synagogue and religious schools were quite unnecessary. At best, they were to be tolerated only as a concession to those who still take such things seriously, and in order not to create unpleasant friction in the community.

"There were certain educators who resented the intrusion of religion in their ultrascientific curricula. Judaism, they said, was not a religion, but a way of life—that is to say, their way of life, which, of course, was nonreligious or antireligious. Jewish education should, according to them, not be religious at all, only nationalistic and linguistic. At best, the religious note might be smuggled in, but only as a concession to old-timers and cranks who do not know any better.

"There were those Jewish spokesmen who offered Jewish nationalism as a substitute for Judaism, forgetting that nationalism as such, unredeemed by a moral vision and responsibility, had sadly fragmentized our world, provincialized its peoples, and is driving nations madly from one disaster to another; forgetting, further, that there is a widely felt and widely answered need for religion and religious institutions even among peoples whose national life is already fully established, who are in their own lands, and who are possessed of a rich national culture.

"The upbuilding of a Jewish national home in Palestine is one great, urgent, and historically inescapable task of Jewry. The upbuilding of Jewish religious life in America and elsewhere throughout the world, inclusive of Palestine, is another. One is no substitute for the other. One is not opposed to the other."

Whether Jews will live as citizens of Israel or as citizens of the United States or of other lands, they should not evade the great mandate of their prophetic religion and their history, which is to serve God and man, to strive for the establishment of His Kingdom, and, by the practice and the propaganda of their faith, to be a light unto the nations. The mission ideal which liberal Judaism has stressed is historically valid. It is of the very warp and woof of prophetic Judasim. It is valid today. It is the burden of our destiny. God has permitted us to renew our days as of old. Let us, in gratitude, renew our faith as of old.

Losing Our Independence, Says Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the Allegan Gazette of January 27, 1949, published at Allegan, Mich., comes an expression of confidence in the sound thinking of the average American, which is encouraging to many a vote-hungry Congressman who wishes to follow a course which he is thoroughly convinced will promote the national welfare and preserve the independence of the average citizen.

The editor may be right in his contention that the overwhelming number of citizens desire to be independent and have the Congress always, when legislation is up, adopt that which will best promote the Nation's good.

But, if he would sit in a Congressman's office for a few weeks, he would discover that, whatever the people as a whole might want, they are strangely silent, and that it is the special interest groups which put on the heat for this, that, and the other.

Perhaps the failure of the average citizen to write his Congressman is due to the fact that he has confidence in his chosen representative. But Mr. Average Citizen should remember that his Congressman is just an average citizen too and that, when incessantly pounded by first one group and then another and finally, if he refuses to go along with extravagant spending schemes for first this group, then that, soon becomes known as a reactionary, as one who has no regard for the misfortune of others; a mossback who is not willing to go along with modern-day progress—a progress and a program which completely ignore natural and economic laws.

The Gazette editorial gives some of the reasons why a Congressman, when pressed to vote for a gratuity to a class, should think of his duty to the Nation, to all the people of his district, as well as to the one who at the moment is making a plea for preferential consideration.

The editorial reads as follows:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—NOT OUR VIEWS

In Monday's Gazette we printed an article entitled, "Government Economy No Longer Popular." This article quoted a State official as saying that "The people want more spending for Government benefits. Economy is no longer popular. I don't believe a man could be elected dog catcher today on a platform of thrift in Government." The article closes by saying that "To oppose this trend (Government spending for social reforms) is to invite the label of being a 'reactionary,' one who is opposed to social progress."

We hasten to say that the views of the State official who evidently desires to remain unnamed are not our views.

The voters of this country have not had the opportunity to vote for economy in Government. There have been no candidates either on the Democratic or Republican ticket who are willing to make an honest ef-

fort to debunk the so-called social progress. The taxpayers have never been represented by any organization or lobby. The issue has never been properly presented. Office seekers have been persuaded by minority groups, each with their pet scheme.

The term "social progress" is much misused.

Social progress as outlined by Truman and Williams means that the individual's work, his earnings and his time, and indeed his very life, no longer belong to him, but belong to the Government. From every dollar that he earns the Government plans to take anywhere from 20 to 28 cents. The more the Government takes, the less he will have to support himself and his family. He will no longer be able to pay for his own medical bills, his own insurance; the education of his children, or to save for old age, but will be forced to rely upon Government charity.

Before he can receive any Government charity, whether it is unemployment compensation or social security, or medical benefits, he will have to satisfy some local bureaucrat that he is entitled to them. If he is honest he may not get them; if he is dishonest he probably will. Truman's social progress places a premium on not working. It takes all the incentive out of working and saving. It is not social progress but pure socialism. If being opposed to this social progress is being reactionary, then we are reactionary.

We believe that the average American family wants to be independent. The head of a family wants merely the opportunity to work, make his own way in life, and handle his own money. He does not want to be forced to give his money to the Government and then to depend upon Government charity in the end for his bread and butter. The average American does not want the Government to be his father, his mother, and his school teacher. He doesn't want his standard of living reduced. He is tired of being taxed for the benefit of someone else. If he is ever given the opportunity to vote for someone who advocates a return to pre-New Deal government—a thrifty government, a government that preserves and protects individual liberty, a government that permits each individual to work and save without bureaucratic interference, then Truman's social progress wouldn't have a chance.

The individual should be permitted to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, he should not be forced to become a ward of the state.

Those in public office had better wake up and realize that you can't tax the American market out of existence and still expect to collect taxes to support every dependent in the United States. By the very act of taxing in the hope of increasing Government revenue you decrease Government revenue. New and higher taxes threaten to unbalance the budget of every family in this country, and when the ordinary citizen can't balance his own budget, then you have wrecked the economic life of this country.

We advise every legislator to think it over before he casts his vote for the so-called social program.

L. W. H.

An Answer to the "Gimme" People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald under date of January 26, 1949. I believe that my constituent has sounded a clarion call that it might be well for the New Deal internationalist, interventionist, and the generous-minded persons who wish to give away the taxpayers' money should heed and take to heart.

The editorial follows:

We have received a communication from a woman reader who lives in a community within easy reach of Olean.

"Now I've written this," she says as a footnote, "I'm in doubt if I should mail it.

"But I feel so much better after I have exploded, I'm going to, anyway.

"No doubt you wouldn't dare to print it; but if you should please don't put my name on it, as I wouldn't want my neighbors to know how I feel about second-hand dresses I am so lucky to receive.

"I feel though that there must be a lot of people who are feeling the same as I do, and wondering how in the world one is going to pay bills and get the children's teeth and eyes taken care of.

"I've needed my glasses changed for three years, and can't get enough money to have them fixed. But maybe we are a lot better off than some families; but which ones I can't think of right now."

And why wouldn't we dare to print your letter, lady? Do you think we're afraid of the big, bad wolf—or anything or anybody else?

Here's your letter; it's "down to earth," and we know our readers in general will be interested in reading it.

"I'm tired of helping feed and clothe the world.

"All I want to do is to be able to feed my own family of six. As I sit here trying to keep warm, I wonder if the President realizes that here in our country there is a class of people who have a yearly income of less than $3,000?

"Newspapers print the budget of an English middle-class man with a wife and two children. Why don't they print one of an American family of six on the same wages of about $50 per week?

"The Englishman was lucky. He could go to the movies once a week and take a week's vacation at the seashore. I can't even manage the movies.

"I'm so tired of hearing the figures the Government is always coming out with when I know some of them are taking food and clothing away from my family.

"It's getting so I can't even read the figures any more.

"It's taxes, taxes, and more taxes every time a Government official speaks. I wish each of us could get Congress to vote us a tax-free gift of money. Maybe I could buy some warm clothing for my children.

"I myself haven't had a new dress in 5 years. I wonder if any Government officials have had to wear second-hand clothes for 4 or 5 years while someone higher up thought up ways to steal their money with new taxes.

"The only way I can see that a person can have any security is to get on the Government pay roll. Once there, you're set, for I don't believe a person is ever fired from a position—just transferred to another department.

"The American people are slaves to the world—not just to America.

"The country was started because our people were tired of taxation. Now we can't buy anything that doesn't have a hidden tax that we don't know what it's for. Did the Federal or State Government ask the people if they wanted it? I have never been asked; have you? I'm disgusted with it all, and I imagine hundreds of thousands more are.

"The Englishman I was referring to earlier couldn't have a glass of sherry before dinner.

"All I want is good food, not liquor, that will keep my family healthy and that will let me serve meals that mean a balanced diet.

"It must be nice to have enough money to buy brand-new clothes, a dress, coat, undies (and don't forget a hat), or a warm coat for my husband who works outdoors in all kinds of weather, and new clothes for the children. How they would love some new snow suits—and how they need them.

"But who has money to buy them with? Not I; I'm paying taxes to keep Europe warm and well fed."

Well, there it is, friends and neighbors.

And make your own comment. What, for instance, is your idea of a solution to such a situation—a situation in which a man earning $50 a week in this land of prosperity can barely keep himself and his family "above water."

We would just express a wonderment as to how many people in this country are beginning to think along the lines of this harassed mother.

Hon. Edwin J. Kyle, Former Ambassador to Guatemala

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America has been very ably represented in Guatemala for the past few years by Dean Edwin J. Kyle, our Ambassador, who has recently resigned to enjoy a well-earned retirement. Texans will long remember Dean Kyle for his accomplishments in the School of Agriculture at Texas A. & M. College; the people of Guatemala will remember him for his work in their country which has brought them improved agricultural methods and techniques.

Dean Kyle will go to Guatemala for a visit in February, at which time he will receive that country's highest decoration, the Order of Quetzal. We are proud of his accomplishments there and wish him good health and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter received by Dean Kyle from the President of Guatemala, Juan Jose Arevalo:

DR. EDWIN J. KYLE,

Guatemala.

MY DEAR AND ILLUSTRIOUS FRIEND: On the occasion of the termination of your diplomatic mission in Guatemala and your departure from the country I am happy to send you these lines of farewell.

I have always said, and I repeat now, that you were in reality the first United States Ambassador to Guatemala. All virtues which characterize the North American people are represented in your high, righteous personality. The Guatemalan people had never known what an ambassador from the United States really was, and your arrival in the country 3 years ago was a complete revelation. Your ever-present Rooseveltian spirit, the delicacy and decency in your treatment of Guatemalans, your wise counsel and friendly stimulus to our emerging democracy, the creation of new economic bonds between

Guatemala and the United States—these are only a few of your superior personal endowments which have left in our diplomatic circle an imprint of a lofty, fraternal spirit. The Government and the people, therefore, have availed themselves of this spirit to receive with the highest esteem Dr. Kyle and his incomparable wife as genuine representatives of a great friendly people.

Since you have chosen to terminate your diplomatic mission we shall feel closely bound in the future by the most intimate friendship.

I assure you, Dr. Kyle, and your most excellent wife, that whenever you return to Guatemala you will find that the friendship of the Guatemalans toward yourself is unchanging and profound. As the political representative of this affectionate people I assure you both that everyone here hopes you will return to make your home with us. If that is not possible, we hope at least that you will visit Guatemala at every possible opportunity. Mrs. Arevalo shares with me these ideas and sentiments, and includes in this letter her personal affection toward you and Mrs. Kyle, with all best wishes for your future happiness.

With sincere renewed esteem I bid you and your wife this temporary farewell.

JUAN JOSE AREVALO,
President of Republic of Guatemala.

The United States and China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, if we are to act wisely and promptly in this critical period, we must understand the real nature of the relations between the United States and China and between Russia and China. One reason for the unique friendship between our country and China is that so many Chinese Nationalist leaders have been educated in America. Such a leader is Chen Chih-mai, who received his bachelor of arts degree at Ohio State University in 1929, where he was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, and his doctor of philosophy degree at Columbia University in 1932. He was a professor of government and a government official in China. He was a member of the Chinese delegation at the San Francisco Conference in 1945, has served in many important posts, and is counselor of the Chinese Embassy in Washington. He spoke at a luncheon of the Ohio State Alumni Club of Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1949, at the Sheraton Hotel. His speech points out fundamental facts we should all consider:

Mr. Chairman, Congressman VORYS, fellow alumni, ladies and gentlemen, the relations between the United States and China have always been close and cordial. This is by no means a historical accident.

China and the United States were allies both in the First and the Second World Wars.

While European and Asiatic powers were engaged in imperialist wars of aggression against China, the United States, through the proclamation of the open-door doctrine in 1899, sought to maintain the territorial and administrative integrity of China. Since then, the United States has time and again helped China to arrest those forces seeking to dismember or to dominate China. The substantial aid which you have extended to us was deeply appreciated and acknowledged with thanks. It has helped to win the war and to alleviate the sufferings of millions of people. Among the powers of the world, the United States alone has never entertained any aggressive or imperialist designs upon us.

American missionaries have gone to China, not only to preach the gospel, but also to help us in modern medicine, modern education, rural welfare, and industrial and agricultural development.

During the past decades, thousands of Chinese young men and women, like myself, have come to these shores to receive training in American colleges and institutions of learning.

At the present time, 2,500 Chinese young men and women are enrolled in American institutions of learning, the second largest national group besides the Canadians.

The present government of China is composed of a large number of these American-educated leaders. The Prime Minister was a graduate student at Columbia. His predecessors are products of Oberlin, Yale, and Harvard. So are many others of our leaders.

I have no doubt that you have heard of the severe criticisms of this Government. One journalist recently stated that "the Chinese Government today is the worst government in modern times, one of the worst in the world today." Were such a blanket condemnation true, would it not be proper to say that the United States, through opening the doors of American colleges to Chinese youths, has rendered a disservice to the Chinese people?

I have no doubt that you have also heard of unqualified praise being showered upon the leaders of the Communist Party in China. They are said to be the liberals, progressives, and democrats as contrasted with the Fascists and reactionaries who make up the Chinese Government. And yet, it is a well-known fact that, among the leaders of the Communists in China, let us say, the members of the Politburo, not one single person has been educated in American schools. Very many of them were trained in the Sun Yat-sen University in Moscow, established for the express purpose of training party workers for the Far East, or in the Marx-Lenin Institute. They are the masters of the dialectic, and the technique of insurrection and revolution, one basic tenet of which is the motto "the end justifies the means."

It is of the utmost importance, I submit, that we should labor hard fully to understand the basic meaning of the challenge of world communism to the free world. Almost exactly 100 years ago, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels proclaimed the Communist Manifesto, which concluded with this slogan: "Workers of the world unite." (Parenthetically, the Communist Manifesto, I recall, was assigned reading material at Ohio State, as it was in all American universities, in courses on the social sciences. It would be amazing if one found a copy of the Declaration of Independence in the libraries of the Communist-ruled countries.)

The Communist movement, as Marx and Engels so clearly pointed out, is a world movement. It transcends all national boundaries. It is interesting to note that, in all official Communist documents, the party in China is always known as the Communist Party in China, rather than the Chinese Communist Party. The Communist movement operates on the theory of a global class war, the world proletariat insurrecting against and expropriating the capitalists in all lands.

As such, the Communist movement is global in concept and manifestation. The class war is conducted on a world front. The issue of communism has split all nations into rival camps, the Communists owing allegiance to one single shrine of power—the Communist Internationale or the Cominform.

This is the case in China as it is in any other country of the world.

Some months ago, I read in a Communist newspaper an article written by the leading theoreticians of the Communist Party in China, what they call "collectivist ideological creation," meaning creative writing by groups instead of individuals. The writers pointed out that the coming Communist struggle for power would not assume the form of international wars or conflicts, like the two world wars, which they characterized as "imperialist wars" until the Soviet Union was attacked. They stated in no unmistakable terms that the Communist fight for world domination would henceforth assume the form of a chain of civil wars in many lands, in succession or simultaneously. Each one of these civil wars, however, was to be a link of the whole chain of a global class struggle, which they regarded as "inevitable" and in which the proletariat was sure to come out on top.

It will be seen that this concept is highly important in our attempt to appraise the present situation in China and in many other parts of the world. Technically, these are civil wars, and therefore it would be improper for any outsider to intervene. Since civil wars are domestic affairs the United Nations, according to its Charter, would have no jurisdiction. So the civil wars would be allowed to go on and nothing will be done about them. This is the value of this novel concept to those who foment these civil wars in various parts of the world.

At the close of the First World War, there were a number of such civil wars in the defeated countries, in Germany, Austria, Hungary, etc. Also in the 1920's, Communist-fomented civil war began in China. The Communist revolts in the 1920's were thwarted by the Chinese Government, under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang remains today the Communists' public enemy No. 1. They are determined to bring about his complete collapse.

Later on, in the 1930's, there was civil war in Spain. Following the chaos and misery of the Second World War, civil wars broke out again in China and also in Greece. In many other lands, they are fomenting political strikes and creating civic disorders. The form may be different in different lands. The essence, however, remains everywhere the same. The 3 years following the Second World War find the international Communists attaining more ideological and material power than ever before.

The Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan, in effect, are measures of their success in Europe. At the present time, they are engulfing China, and Communist infiltration is evident in southeast Asia, in India, Pakistan, Siam, Burma, Indonesia, Ceylon, Malaya, Japan, Korea, the Philippines. One billion people in Asia, half of the human race, are now threatened with Communist conquest, not to mention the countries already behind the iron curtain in eastern Europe.

The technique of the chain of interlocking civil wars is a new concept, at least to many of us. Like the terms "democracy," "liberalism," and "peace," the term "civil war" has also acquired a new meaning when it is employed with reference to current developments.

The struggle in China today, as it has been for many years, is not a civil strife like the War Between the States in America. It is a phase of a world-wide movement, an aspect of a universal class war.

The Chinese people are highly individualist by tradition and nature. Although our historical heritages are almost entirely different, the Chinese and the American peoples share a fierce dislike of totalitarian regimentation. We were taught to love our neighbors, not to hate them. We were taught to respect the sanctity of the family, and we do not destroy our fathers and brothers, or husbands and wives, on the basis of ideological differences.

And yet the Communists in China today are teaching us precisely this. In the areas in which the Communists win control, rigid regimentation and mass trials are imposed, in which every party member is ordered to help the process of liquidation, by spying on the members of your families, or those with whom you are associated. Thirty-three million refugees fled from this form of life.

Time and again in the past, the Chinese Government has attempted to resolve the issue by political and peaceful means. For the sake of national unity, agreement with the Communists was sought after with complete sincerity and at great sacrifices. For 13 months General Marshall was in China trying to work out some sort of compromise.

When I first revisited the United States in 1944 I told my friends here that the importance of the Chinese Communist problem was exaggerated. I still hold that that view, stated at the time, was essentially correct. What makes the Communists in China strong today, as compared to 1944, is due to two lines of development, which, of course, I was unable to foresee.

One factor is the Soviet participation in the Japanese war in Manchuria a few days before the Japanese collapse. On VJ-day there were no Communists in the vast and rich area of Manchuria. When the Soviet Army evacuated several months later, the area was completely under Communist control, fully armed with the products of Japanese arsenals. The Yalta agreement and the Chinese-Soviet treaty of 1945 gave them a great advantage, which they have exploited to the fullest.

Another factor is the lull of cease-fire orders in 1946-47, under the protection of which the Communists very substantially augmented their fighting power. At the time of the Japanese surrender, the Communists were in control of 60 out of 2,000 counties of China. By the time the mediation effort was given up, early in 1947, they were in control of 300 counties, an increase of five times. In January 1946 the Communists themselves admitted that the ratio between their army and that of the Government was 1 to 6. Now, they are outnumbering the Government forces at points, even as much as 2 to 1.

This is the price which the Chinese people are called upon to pay for believing that the Communists in China are not real Communists, but a group of peaceful agrarian reformers, in spite of the emphatic protests of the Communists themselves. The alarming Communist expansion today is the result of our repeated refusal to treat them as international conspirators, but to attribute to them nothing but the best of intentions, and our persistence that someway, somehow, we can come to a meeting of minds with them. We thought we could seek agreement with them, and that they, like us, would observe the agreement which we have so painfully concluded. The tragedy of our ignorance is indeed colossal, and the hour is very late.

I cannot help feeling that this situation is as much of concern to you as it is to us.

One aspect of the question is of special significance—the anti-American and anti-foreign policy of the Chinese Communists.

As far back as 1928, the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International decreed that the Communist Party in China, after its seizure of power, would start the expulsion of the foreign imperialists and the confiscation of their property. It went on to state that the fundamental slogans with which the party must seek to win over the masses were, among others, overthrow of imperialist domination, confiscation of foreign enterprises and banks, and alliance with the U. S. S. R. and the world proletarian movement.

On November 18, 1945, Mr. William Z. Foster, the head of the Communist Party in America, enjoined his followers in these words:

"We must, as Lenin taught us, seize the key links which will enable us to move the whole chain. On the domestic field * * * the key problem * * * is the fight for wage increases * * * On the internanional scale, the key task * * * is to stop American intervention in China * * * The war in China is the key of all problems on the international front and it is here, above all else, where we have to deal the hardest blow to reaction."

A few days ago, the Communist radio broadcast a statement by the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung, in which he specifically stated that one of their political principles is the abolition of treaties of betrayal concluded by the Chinese Government which enslave the Chinese people.

It will be recalled that, on November 4, 1946, our two Governments concluded a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation. It was a treaty based upon mutuality and reciprocity. A few days after its conclusion, the Communist Party in China issued a directive calling upon all party members to denounce the treaty. Among other things, it was said that "the treaty will make the Chinese financial system a satellite of America, and, within 3 to 5 years, the Chinese people will all become the slaves of American capitalists." The purpose of the United States in making this treaty with China was to use China as a base to foment a third world war. The Communist high command designated November 4, the date of the signing of the treaty, as a National Humiliation Day, to be observed in mourning Parades were organized denouncing it. In November 1948 the United States ratified the treaty and President Truman signed it.

All these are by way of illustration to show the tremendous gulf between the Communists and ourselves, and how utterly futile and senseless it is to expect to do business as usual if and when the Communists assume power in China.

Your revolutionary struggle to free yourselves from outside domination, your pride in your own way of life, your disdain of alien ideologies, your spirit of democratic government, and your remarkable achievements in industries and agriculture, have always been a source of inspiration to us. We would like to continue to learn from you, and we hope that you will continue to give us the benefit of your seasoned experience. The Chinese people are fundamentally friendly to America. You have a truly rich reservoir of good will among us. Let us only hope that we may be given the wisdom and courage to build upon this foundation, and to combine our efforts to combat those forces which seek to make of our people the enemies of what they choose to call the American imperialists. Let us at least guard ourselves against the Communist propaganda directed at the American people which General Marshall characterized as being "without regard for the truth, without any regard whatsoever for the facts, and has given plain evidence of a determined purpose to mislead the Chinese people and the world and to arouse a bitter hatred of Americans." The cause of Sino-American friendship will be nobly served when we take adequate precautions against such vicious propaganda.

Keep Corps of Engineers Intact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the proposed change which would take all civil-functions work of the Federal Government from the Army engineers and place it under the jurisdiction of a new Cabinet officer, to be called the Secretary of Department of Public Works, has aroused much protest where knowledge of this proposal has been received. I have received a number of letters and telegrams objecting to this proposal. These protests come from people who want these important functions to remain free from politics and from political influence of any kind.

In the Atlanta Constitution for Monday, January 31, 1949, appears an article by Wellington Wright on this subject. It contains valuable facts and information, and, under leave previously granted, I am inserting this article herewith for the information of Members:

KEEP CORPS OF UNITED STATES ENGINEERS INTACT, IS PLEA HERE OF RIVERS-HARBORS OFFICIAL

(By Wellington Wright)

In an effort to prevent the disruption of the Corps of Engineers by the executive reorganization bill now pending in Congress, James W. Woodruff, Sr., of Columbus, vice president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, yesterday undertook to organize the Southeast against this proposed change.

Woodruff said that national interest, both in war and in peace, requires that the Corps of Engineers be specifically exempted from the scope of the proposed reorganization. This is the same exemption which Congress put into the reorganization bill of 1945.

Under the present plan, the result of one of the recommendations of the Hoover committee, all civil-function work of the Federal Government would be vested in a new Cabinet officer, the Secretary of the Department of Public Works. For the past 176 years, the Corps of Engineers has performed this type of work for the Federal Government.

In a statement issued here yesterday, Woodruff stressed that it is not to the interest of the Southeast to take the civil-function work away from the Corps of Engineers and vest it in the hands of "a politically minded Cabinet officer." He said:

"In our area alone, the Corps of Engineers, through its plans for the development of our inland waterways, has under way a $250,000,000 program. This program meets a great public need, and the type of reorganization now proposed would certainly delay the completion of this program. The program has already been delayed too long, and further delay which this reorganization would inevitably cause would be had for the economic future of our area."

Woodruff stressed that the Corps of Engineers is a nonpolitical arm of the Government with an unbroken record of honesty and efficiency. To carry out the proposed reorganization plan as it affects civil functions, Woodruff insists, would completely disrupt the Corps of Engineers.

"George Washington first assigned civil functions to the Corps of Engineers," continued Woodruff. "As a result of its work in

peacetime, this is the one agency of the Government that is always ready in case of national emergency. It would be a tremendous loss to national defense to have these civil functions taken away from the Corps of Engineers. And, in view of the efficient record of the corps, it is hardly likely that reorganization in the manner proposed would save the Federal Government a single penny."

Hearings on this bill will go on before the Senate Committee on Expenditures on Tuesday. Woodruff asks that the people of the Southeast send telegrams and air-mail letters to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the committee, to urge the exemption of the Corps of Engineers from the operation of the proposed bill. MCCLELLAN'S address is the Senate Office Building, Washington.

Lester Moody, secretary of the Augusta Chamber of Commerce, and Carl Pearson, executive director of the Chattahoochee Valley Chamber of Commerce, have joined Woodruff in his fight to save the Corps of Engineers.

Young Republican National Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Fairfield County, Conn., to the Convention of the Westchester County Young Republicans at White Plains, N. Y., January 29, 1949:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Westchester County Young Men's Republican Clubs, ladies and gentlemen: This is my first opportunity since the election last November to address a gathering of Young Republicans. It is an opportunity which I welcome. I am delighted to be here with you all this afternoon. I know what a splendid job the Young Republican National Federation has done. Its participation in the formulation of policies and programs should be commensurate with its ever growing strength.

During the weeks preceding election day I spent much of my time with the Young Republicans of my district. It seemed to me urgent and vital that young men and women should come into the Republican Party in large numbers and that they should be induced to play a significant part in Republican activities. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that unless the Republican Party continues to receive substantial infusions of young blood, it cannot survive. It is important not only to the Republicans but also to the Democrats that the Republican Party should survive. It is important to the Nation. It is important for the survival of our two-party system.

In order for the Republican Party to remain an effective political instrumentality, it is imperative that it should, at the next presidential election, gain control of the executive branch of our government. We have endured and survived 5 successive defeats. A Republican victory in 1952 is not only essential to our national political health, it is also vital to the effective functioning of the two-party system.

How is this to be done?

Surely the last election has convinced us that no one individual or group of individuals is wise enough to know exactly what plan and what program will receive the support of the electorate. Perhaps this is just as well. It means that our elections are so fraught with imponderables that the pollsters and professional prognosticators cannot make a cut-and-dried affair out of this great expression of the American franchise. Furthermore, it engenders a spirit of healthy and vital political competition, which is one of the greatest safeguards that our free institutions will endure.

No one can outline a sure-fire blueprint for an electoral victory. But there is always room for aggressive and sustained political action. There is always need for the expression of deep convictions based on tested principles.

It is important, I think, to bear in mind that the United States is becoming increasingly a country of independent voters. More and more Americans feel less and less bound by party affiliations. The main problem then is to secure the support of this large mass of independent electors.

Although it is futile to cry over spilled milk, it is useful to examine the results of the past election in order to attempt to assess the reasons for our defeat and take action to eliminate these errors in the future.

Historians will for many years attempt to evaluate the reasons for the Republican defeat in 1948. Although the election is, at the present writing, a matter of recent history, we have nevertheless enough perspective to come to some tentative conclusions.

While the Presidential election was very close from the point of view of the electoral vote, and while it was not a landslide from the point of view of the popular vote, the election for Senators and Congressmen certainly indicated a decided trend. In the Senate 8 Republican Senators and 1 Republican candidate were defeated, and in the House 69 Republican Congressmen and 8 Republican candidates for Congress were defeated. These are facts. They are food for thought.

On the other hand, it must be remembered that the fortunes of the Republican Party have been far lower than they are now. In 1936 there were only 17 Republican Senators and 89 Republican Congressmen. Furthermore, Thomas E. Dewey, the Republican standard bearer, did poll nearly 22,000,000 votes, as against slightly more than 24,000,000 who voted Democrat. This indicates that there are substantial divisions of thought among the people of our country. It indicates that the Republican Party has a numerous and forceful following.

It is important that differences of opinion among the American people should be reflected in the platforms and in the actions of the Republican and Democratic Parties. The American people want a choice. They want to be faced with constructive, with feasible alternatives. This does not mean disagreement for the sake of disagreement. It does mean, however, that what has been referred to as the "me-too" policy is apt to reduce the Republican Party to innocuous desuetude. The role of the Republican Party must be to seek to represent the basic needs and aspirations of the people and to convince the people that they are able to translate these needs and aspirations into effective action.

That the Eightieth Congress made a good record is corroborated by the remarks of President Truman in his state of the union message early this month. President Truman, having repeatedly declared in the heat of the campaign, that the Eightieth Congress was the worst Congress in history, announced to the Eighty-first Congress: "I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Nation is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness."

Could this be true if, as President Truman implied, the Eightieth Congress all but destroyed the fabric of our country? Could this be true if the Eightieth Congress was the worst Congress in history?

The President also said: "Our private enterprise system has reached new heights of production. Since the boom year of 1929, while our population has increased by only 20 percent, our agricultural production has increased by 45 percent and our industrial production has increased by 75 percent. We are turning out far more goods and more wealth per worker than we have ever done before."

Is not this in itself a great tribute to the essential wisdom of much of the legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress? Is it proper to censure the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress in such brutal terms when, according to the testimony of none other than the President of the United States, the American people are enjoying the greatest peacetime production ever achieved and the highest national income? Is it responsible so to attack the representatives of the people when we know that in 1948 there were more people employed in the United States than ever before in our history?

When the President addressed the joint session of the Eightieth Congress last July he stated that his entire program could be enacted in 15 days. Yet the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress has now been in session for 4 weeks and the only laws which have been passed have been the law raising the President's salary and the law giving the Federal employees in Washington a four-day holiday during the inaugural festivities.

Oh, I could give you a list of criticisms of the Eightieth Congress. I could tell you of many pieces of legislation which I think could have been improved. I could mention laws which I wish had been passed and others which might better have been dropped overboard. It is very rare, indeed, that a Congressman finds before him a bill which he approves in its entirety. Our system of government, our political concept, rests upon the science of compromise. It is the art of alternatives. There were occasions when I strayed from the fold and voted differently from the majority of the members of my party.

And yet I say to you that it is not primarily in the actual record of the Eightieth Congress that we can look for the principal cause of our defeat. It is rather in our failure to explain that record and to expose it to public view; it is in our failure to make a stand on principle; it is in our failure to state in contagious and forceful terms a Republican program based upon the forward-looking platform adopted in Philadelphia; it is in our failure to confront the people with a constructive choice.

The Republican Party has been as inept, as faltering in conveying its message to the people of our land, as we Americans have been in carrying the message of freedom to those parts of the world where we are fighting with the agents of Communist tyranny in a grim battle for men's minds.

Furthermore, although the record of the Republican Party contains errors of action as well as of inaction, there is no question that this record has been, to a considerable extent, misrepresented by its detractors. Many Americans are unfamiliar with the facts of Republican accomplishments.

As I have said, our mission must be to provide the American people with a choice and to indicate by our actions in Congress and in the other political offices which we hold that the Republican Party has understood the principles which brought it to life 95 years ago at Ripon, Wisconsin.

The Republican Party was founded in 1854 to fight intolerance and slavery. The great-

est American of us all was its greatest statesman and prime inspiration. Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we shall soon celebrate, believed profoundly in the dignity of the individual man, in the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. Above all else, he believed in freedom. In freedom, not merely of workers, or farmers, or managers, but in the freedom of the individual. He believed that the individual is the complex heart of society.

To that individual must be given two things: The greatest possible degree of political and economic freedom consistent with the freedoms of other individuals, and equality of opportunity for every individual before fate and before law. Lincoln believed in the human soul.

Those are the principles upon which the Republican Party was founded and those are the principles upon which it has always acted in its moments of greatness. Under Lincoln, it fought and saved the Nation and gave a new birth of freedom to an enslaved people. Under the rallying cry of freedom, it made the Nation a kindly refuge for hundreds of peoples of many foreign lands. Under Theodore Roosevelt, it curbed the excesses of powerful men who threatened to destroy the freedom of the people. Under its great Chief Justices, it evolved a system of law designed to safeguard those freedoms.

It has been the fashion for some years now to forget these achievements of the Republican Party. It is fashionable to picture the elephant as a corpulent old gentleman with a cigar in his mouth and a roll of bills protruding out of his hip pocket.

Fully as important as our failure to familiarize the American people with the record of the Eightieth Congress and with the principles and objectives of the Republican Party was the impression created in certain quarters that the Republican Party is the party of special interests. There are some who apparently visualize Republican Congressmen as receiving voting instructions by long-distance telephone from the big business interests, which, according to the Democrats, are still in the saddle in spite of 16 years of Democrat rule.

The fact of the matter is that if Wall Street and cartels and monoply interests are sitting astride of the American people, as the Democrats say they are, surely it must be the fault of the Democrats since they have had complete control of the executive, the administrative, and the legislative branches, and virtual control of the judicial branch, of the government for a great many years. Surely one is entitled to wonder at the wide gap which separates Democratic protestations of concern for the common man and the appalling conditions which the Democrats decry and for which they must assume responsibility.

If the people in this country are still ill-housed, ill-fed, and improperly clothed, this can hardly be blamed on the Republicans. The fact of the matter is that while the Democrats have been talking loud and fast about the underprivileged, they failed in the 14 years preceding the Eightieth Congress to provide the very legislation for which they have made such an outcry.

Actually then, the Republican Party, being the party of freedom, has been, and is today, the party of the people in their eternal fight against vested interest, whether that interest be centered in business, finance, or government. It has no room in it for anyone who will put the welfare of any organized group, no matter how large or powerful, ahead of the welfare of the people. The Republican Party has no place for complacent reactionaries, for purveyors of intolerance, for sowers of confusion and discord. The Republican Party is the party of insurgents, of liberals; it is the party of progress, of intellectual ferment—the party of Lincoln; the party of freedom.

The true definition of a liberal, it seems to me, is that a liberal believes with Lincoln in freedom for the individual. That, I know, is what the Republican Party does, and will, stand for.

One result of being a liberal is that you must be constantly on guard against tyranny and authoritarianism wherever they show their heads. There is no compromise in the age-old struggle between tyranny and human freedom.

It is not an easy fight. The individual, being without spokesmen, often seems at a loss in the face of the howling propaganda enthusiastically hurled by the proprietors of vested interest. It is difficult to fight the battle for the individual. It is even difficult sometimes to see wherein his freedom lies. It is often easier to listen to the blandishments of the propaganda Lorelei.

We must penetrate through the web of vested interest to the freedom of the individual. We must be steadfast in our adherence to the principles of Lincoln. We must not lose contact with the human soul.

Let us bear in mind the words of lofty counsel which were uttered by our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, when he spoke at the Republican Convention in Philadelphia last summer. I remember well my feeling of elation when, out of the oppressive heat, the glare, and the noise of the convention, Mr. Hoover approached the microphone.

Here was a man who had been assailed as violently as any President in our country's history and who somehow had found the resourcefulness to grow in stature and wisdom under these attacks. He said in part:

"Great as your problems are, they are no greater than Americans have met before your time. You are no less able or courageous than they were. Therefore, I repeat, what you say and do here is of transcendent importance. If you produce nothing but improvised platitudes, you will give no hope. If you produce no leadership here—no virile fighter for the right—you will have done nothing of historic significance. If you follow the counsel of those who believe that politics is only a game to be played for personal advantage, you are wasting your time and effort. If here, or in this campaign, you calculate what will please this or that little segment of our population, and satisfy this or that pressure group or sectional interest, you will be betraying your opportunity, and tragically missing the call of your time. If, on the other hand, in this campaign, as a mature and inspired political party, you face the truth that we are in a critical battle to safeguard our Nation and civilization, which under God have brought to us a life of liberty, then you will be guided step by step to restore the foundations of right thinking, or morals, and of faith. If you choose your leadership with full recognition that only those can lead you who believe in your ideals, who seek not only victory but the opportunity to serve in this fight, then you will issue from this hall a clarion call in as pure a note—in as full a tone—as that call to arms which your political ancestors issued at Ripon, Wisconsin, when this party was born to make all men free."

This historic statement can serve us well. Let us take it to heart. Our mission is not to be slick political tacticians attempting to attract votes by sly maneuvers and cynical tricks and trades. Our mission is to place the national welfare above special interests and local pressures. Let us shun the calm, shallow, tepid waters of evasion and opportunism and instead sail boldly out to the deep ocean where great gusts of action can truly test our political mettle. Let us, indeed, sound the clarion call of which Herbert Hoover spoke. Let us tell the truth about the Republican Party. Let us base our objectives upon the timeless traditions which brought it into being. Let us tell the truth about the dangers which beset us on every side while America is lulled into a false sense of security by demagogic appeals to our love of comfort and peace. Let us conduct a mighty crusade for these tested tenets of our faith. Let us tell the truth passionately, persistently. Then, at least, if we fail, we shall go down fighting—fighting for what we believe is right. Then, at least, the issue will have been drawn, the alternatives underscored, the choice crystal clear, the challenge unmistakable.

What is the choice? What is the challenge?

Is it merely that it is time for a change; that bureaucrats get tired and lazy and should be given a rest? This would, of course, be healthy for the country. But this is not the main challenge.

Is it that we can do the same things better? Are we just "me-too" boys? No; although we must furnish impressive evidence that a new administration could execute more effectively the programs on which there is no partisan disagreement.

Is it that we Republicans are old-fashioned, stuffy reactionaries, hide-bound Tories, bloated plutocrats, bourbons, princes of privilege, economic royalists, labor-baiters, and all the other raucous and abusive epithets which have been hurled at us by certain reckless demagogs in their insane desire for the privileges and prerogatives, the perquisites and the power, of public office? No; yet even in this field we must be quick with effective rebuttal.

Is it that we are followers of Adam Smith, that we believe in unrestricted private enterprise, in laissez faire? No. There are fresh vital elements in the Republican Party who understand that we must be modern-minded, that there are accommodations which government can and must make to the needs of our time, accommodations which do not alter the essential structure of our free institutions, accommodations which result in quantitative rather than in qualitative changes. I believe that there are many instances where the government should step in, not in order to take possession, but in order to regulate. I believe that the government must in certain instances fill in the chinks where our private property system does not reach; I believe that the less fortunate in our community should be assisted by the more fortunate. The government can run the traffic signals without operating the automobiles. I believe that there are many instances where the public interest is clear.

We can be guided by the precept of Abraham Lincoln: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

This is the traditional Republican attitude and it is timely. Indeed, it is timeless in its validity.

There is a large middle ground for effective action, for needed reform, and for constructive opposition.

The essential choice, the basic challenge, the fundamental issue, is whether our Government is to remain the servant of the people; whether individual freedom is to remain the cornerstone of the American political philosophy; whether America is to remain the land of opportunity; whether Americans are to exchange the freedom, the dignity, and the high standard of living, which have brought us so far in our pursuit of happiness, for an adventure in statism which has behind it only a record of frustration and failure.

The basic challenge is whether the American people are still ready, willing, and anxious to assume the duties and risks of being free, to discharge the responsibilities which are inseparable from freedom.

I believe that they are. I believe that that is the issue which the Republican Party must bring before the people in concrete understandable terms.

While the health of our Nation and the education of its citizens, old-age pensions and social security, minimum wages and unemployment compensation, large-scale production and full employment, rural electrification and flood control, are all desirable objectives and all involve the people's welfare, the ultimate, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free system. These legislative goals require money. Our problem is to achieve these worthy objectives without raising the cost of living by taxation which is almost confiscatory, without obliterating the very sources which produce the taxes. These objectives will lose their validity; they will become purely illusory, if, in our efforts to reach them, we destroy the free society which is the source of our greatest strength. There lies the basic public interest. It is there that the Republican Party must make a stand. It is there that it must provide effective and constructive opposition.

The Republican Party is the only political force standing between the American people and one-party government.

This is a formidable challenge; it is a challenge worthy of our mettle.

This is a good time to be alive—to be a Republican—to be an American.

The Show-Down on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the weirdest piece of economics ever brought to my attention is now before the Congress in the form of H. R. 934. This bill calls for a billion-dollar reclamation project that is totally infeasible and would have to be paid for by the taxpayers of the entire United States.

In connection with my opposition to this measure, I wish to introduce here the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of January 27, 1949, which clearly sets forth the dangers of this proposed raid on the Treasury of this country:

THE SHOW-DOWN ON THE COLORADO

Precisely as forecast in the recent Colorado River series in the Times, Arizona is attempting today to rush through Congress a bill authorizing a fantastic billion-dollar water project for which the taxpayers of the United States would have to pay.

The bill seeks to take water from the Colorado to which California claims title. It seeks to lift the water 1,000 feet, at enormous expenditure of electrical energy, and then run it 235 miles by canal to the Phoenix region. It means that the water delivered to the acreage in central Arizona would cost 10 times or more what the farmers could pay for it and stay in business; so it is proposed that the cost be saddled onto the unlucky American taxpayer.

This undoubtedly is one of the boldest attempts ever made to disguise an uneconomic and discredited irrigation vision as a feasible engineering project.

It is made doubly dangerous by the fact that it seeks to evade the fundamental issue of who owns the water which it is proposed to divert and use. For 26 years, either by refusing to enter the compact signed by the other States, or by declining to join in judicial proceedings for a settlement, Arizona has balked a fair determination of the perplexing questions surrounding Colorado River water. Now, apparently, she is seeking from a Congress reputed to be politically friendly to her and hostile to California a hand-out based solely on political opportunism.

The pressing practical need at the moment from California's standpoint is to acquaint eastern Congressmen with the truth of the situation. The simple truth is all that is needed. It is inconceivable that Senators and Representatives from Middle Western, Eastern, and Southern States, no matter what party label they wear, will toss overboard every business principle which hitherto has guided reclamation projects and put upon the taxpayers of the country $1,000,000,000 in taxes merely because Arizona bears a grudge against California. It should be hammered home that this is no ordinary reclamation project which Arizona seeks. It is not to be guaranteed and underwritten by the beneficiaries as has been the policy so far. It is not similar to the Hoover Dam project, for which southern California is paying in full, within a reasonable time, with interest.

Instead, Arizona seeks a free ride on a $250,000,000 dam with a $700,000,000 (or more) water project attached. There is not even any pretense that central Arizona users could even begin to defray the cost.

All this should be pointed out, in detail, by southern Californians in letters back home to residents of other States all over the Nation.

Arizona, of course, is seeking by sympathy for her farmers who have been the victims of drought, to put over a scheme which cannot be defended on grounds of reason or economics.

All California asks is that the disputed issues be submitted to the one recognized American agency qualified to make a final decision—the United States Supreme Court. After a decision in the Court as to the ownership of the water, California, of course, is willing that Arizona shall utilize its legal share of the water in any way the Congress determines is sound and reasonable. But until the ownership of the water is decided, California insists that no further diversions be authorized.

California is even anxious to go ahead with the $250,000,000 Bridge Canyon Dam project for power, divorced from the extravagant and unsound Parker Lift and central Arizona riders. Bridge Canyon Dam and Glen Canyon Dam, farther upstream, both are needed immediately not only for power but for silt control in Lake Mead. Both can be underwritten in southern California on the same sound business principles which were used in the construction and payment on Hoover Dam.

Why not proceed at once in Congress to build these two dams, with the taxpayers of the United States receiving interest on the investment, as is proper and justified, and while they are building, let the Supreme Court decide the water issues.

Why, instead, demand that the taxpayers fork over a billion dollars as a gift to Arizona to proceed on a bad debt basis, with water to which title is in dispute?

The issue is clear and simple.

The problem is to present it to the American people quickly.

An Epic of American Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1949

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, you and other Members of this House have, in days gone by, been an eyewitness to life as so entrancingly described by E. M. Biggers, of Houston, Tex., in a letter which he forwarded to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]. In the early days of Texas and in the formative period of that great State which was once an independent republic, great individuals were produced. The very pressure of life, with all of its responsibilities, forced men to rely upon themselves as an individual. In those days there were few, if any, collectivist approaches thought of by our people. From Mr. Biggers' letter it would appear that he is a firm believer in the philosophy to the effect that you "cannot protect all people against all the ups and downs of life without undermining their moral strength and independence." Collectivism for the so-called protection of the individual from the cradle to the grave—whether emanating from Moscow or from Washington—will eventually have its disastrous effect on our people. The more the Federal Government promises, the less thrift will be exercised by the masses of our people. The more the individual depends upon Government and the flow of checks from the Federal Treasury, the more the tax burdens will increase, the less goods will be produced, and the greater will be the unfilled wants of the people. Government cannot distribute until it first takes away from the people that which is to be distributed. Placing more and more stress on the "equal distribution of that which is now" will lead to less production in the future and eventually force the citizen to be substantially satisfied with that which the Government hands to the citizen. By permission of the House, I submit for the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Biggers:

HOUSTON, TEX., *October 16, 1948.*

Mr. W. M. COX,
Lebanon, Ga.

DEAR SIR: Back in May, this year, I received a letter rather critical from you, and have wanted to reply, but more important things prevented earlier attention.

Usually I pay no attention to such letters, most of them being anonymous and very obscene, abusive, and threatening. It was a relief to get your signed letter, and in a more courteous manner.

In the first paragraph you refer to me as "one who never had a hard time" and "do not know what it is to be up against it." I hope you will pardon me for writing in such a personal way, but that statement requires a very personal answer.

First, Mr. Cox, I was born on a farm. Never left one until I was 16, then got a job in a printing office. I had no schooling, did get out of the first grade and attended only one session. No boy ever had a harder time. I know every part of every farm implement or harness, from nose bag to crupper, Georgia stock, bull tongue, middle buster, soldshut,

single and double tree, bellyband, hamestring, clevis, trace chain—you just can't stump me.

I have split rails, using home-made mauls and wooden wedges; cut cordwood at 50 cents a cord, trimming and burning tops. Picked cotton at 38 cents and keep. Then we weighed it on the old stilliards, hung in the end of the wagon tongue, which was propped up by the breast yoke. We always hung the peg in the hook so as to keep the stilliards pointing up. If you are an old-timer, these things will be familiar to you.

I am not yet sure that hard times—yes, even a bit of poverty—is not a blessing in many ways. At least it helps us to appreciate what we have, and someone asked, "If you can't appreciate what you got now, how can you appreciate more?"

In those days farmers believed in God. Though they were poor, every night after supper we gathered around the table, verse from the Bible was read, and then a prayer was offered for the blessings we had. Our light was a tallow dip, later a small brass lamp with a round wick and no chimney, and do you remember the paper lighters that were kept by the fireplace, because we had no matches?

It was good for those who could take it, and I think those trying times made for more happy homes, brought more families closer together, and did more for real Christian religion than wealth and luxury have ever done. Yes, I am proud of what I went through, though I do not want others to be forced through the same.

The first cultivator I used was a walking one, and at night we cut a supply of wooden pegs to fill the bag carried on the handle. Next day when the plow hit a stump, and there were many of them, it would break the peg. Later we had the riding cultivators with the spring which allowed the plow to trip. I rode cultivators when my tiny legs were too short to reach the stirrups.

My mother died when I was 4, the youngest child, leaving father with four to bring up. We scattered out, living with anyone willing to take us. Two years later, father rented a small place, borrowed a yoke of oxen, and assembled his little brood. With a sister, then 15 years old, as our housekeeper, he tried to make a home for us. I was too small to do much of the field work, but I did cut sprouts and hoe. My main job was to provide meat. This I did by trapping quail and rabbits. In those days we ate the rabbits, rather than just pulling them out of a hat for exhibition purposes, as the New Deal became so proficient in later.

We had neither flour nor meal, our bread being made from grated sweet potatoes, and it was good and wholesome, too. In addition to a bountiful supply of game, our food was black-eyed peas, sow belly, and the sweetpotato bread. Any sugar we had was from evaporated sorghum. It was very dark, but it was sweet, and we gulped it down. Dad's coffee was parched corn.

Before a year, sister died. She was not only our housekeeper, but a mother to the two younger brothers. She was buried out in the woods under a large tree near Ranger, Tex. Today, if I could have just one wish fulfilled, it would be to locate where that little girl lies, so that I could erect to her memory a monument she so deserves.

My father was a carpenter (and I recall there was once another poor but honest character who was both a carpenter and a shepherd). Father made her coffin out in the back yard. I can see him working on it this very minute. It impressed my young mind. After cutting the boards correct length, he sawed several cuts for the bends on each side, then poured hot water on them, which caused them to bend properly without breaking. I had never seen such a beautiful thing as that coffin with its black plush covering and shiny brass tacks. That's what I saw then. In later years, and after father passed on, I saw the tragedy and the suffering he went through to bury his only little girl.

Please, Mr. Cox, do not say I am a stranger to hard times, for I have lived them. Never had a real home until I was married, but bummed all over the Nation, acquiring a self-confidence and a faith that has stood me well in later life; faith in my ability to take care of myself, and not look to the Government for a dole, as is so popular of late.

Blessed with a healthy body and devoid of laziness, I have by hard work (and I am 71 and working hard) managed to accumulate something for the rainy days I was brought up to believe surely come to all.

E. M. BIGGERS.

A Living War Memorial to Our Honored Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in Tuolumne County, Calif., the great sugar pines and sequoias still stand in their natural state, a forest primeval. But these giant trees, among the last of their kind in the Nation, are already marked for early felling by the woodsman's ax unless immediate steps are taken to prevent their destruction.

Civic and patriotic organizations throughout the State of California have been aroused by this imminent and irreparable loss to our Nation, and under the leadership of John B. Elliott, chairman of the Organization Committee of the California War Memorial Park Association, are working for the preservation of these trees, among which are some of the world's finest sugar pines and sequoias, and have proposed that the trees in Tuolumne County be preserved as a living memorial in honor of those who sacrificed their lives in the last great war in the cause of human freedom.

If steps are not taken to save this magnificent stand of timber, the Nation will lose a forest that has taken nature 600 to 800 years to produce.

No memorial could be more fitting than this living tribute to the men and women who perished in the defense of this country. The War Memorial Park would stand a permanent reminder to all who visit it and marvel at its scenic wonders of the courage and patriotic devotion of those who died to preserve our Nation.

The following is a resolution adopted by the American Legion Executive Council, Department of California, on January 16, at Marysville, Calif., urging the integration of the primeval forests of big trees and Beaver Creek, Tuolumne County, into a memorial park dedicated to those who gave their lives for us in the world wars:

Whereas the giant Sequoias and sugar pine trees of Calaveras and Toulumne Counties, in California, comprise one of the oldest and most sublime forests in the entire world; and

Whereas the preservation of this great primeval area, particularly in the regions of Big Trees Creek and Beaver Creek, is a matter of real concern to present and future generations; and

Whereas inconceivable as it may seem, there presently exists a real and immediate danger of the complete destruction of hundreds of these age-old trees through commercial logging by a private lumber corporation; and

Whereas all State conservation groups and such nationally known authorities as Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, Mr. Williard G. Van Name, curator emeritus of the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, and, when Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, among others, have urged the preservation of these trees by official act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we deeply deplore the threatened wholesale cutting of these great virgin forests for any purpose whatsoever.

And that we extend our unqualified endorsement of the activities of the California War Memorial Park Association, Save-the-Redwoods League, Sierra Club, Izaak Walton League, and other public and private organizations and individuals seeking to save these irreplaceable trees, hundreds of years of age and of great height and beauty, to be established as a permanent recreational area and lasting memorial to our veterans of the world wars to whom those of us living owe so much.

Tobacco Growers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Tobacco Growers Know Their Business Best," which appeared in the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., under date of January 29, 1949:

TOBACCO GROWERS KNOW THEIR BUSINESS BEST

Kentucky tobacco growers have won a high degree of independence for themselves and stability for their crop. They did it by learning from bitter experience the benefits of working together. Cooperative associations of both burley and dark tobacco growers, diligent and efficient, have come of age, and are helpful in keeping tobacco in the hands of those who really known tobacco best.

Because of all this, tobacco growers and their representatives have a right to be startled by a move in the Production and Marketing Association to take over the tobacco loan program. They see this proposal as threatening a backward step, not to speak of its unworkability and expense.

The most charitable among them see the new idea as a result of ignorance of the problems of tobacco culture. Those who are disposed to let their indignation have its head would say that it is a fine example of the bureaucratic mind at work. To be sure, the protest which will go to Congress from the Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, which met here Thursday, will be more temperate than that. But it doubtless will express the same thought, even if only roughly.

The objectionable proposal seeks to make loans, as a basis for price supports, direct to growers and not to cooperative associations.

It came out of a meeting of PMA representatives in St. Louis last December to talk over a new farm program. The thought was advanced there that since the direct-loan plan was working as to crops like corn and wheat, it ought to work for tobacco. The aim seemed to be uniformity.

But what was missed is that tobacco is not a crop like corn or wheat. The preparation of the product is a complicated business. As any tobacco grower might have informed the experts, it involves something more than simple storage. It calls for steps like redrying after it leaves the auction, then first careful assortment and afterward commingling. It calls for care and knowledge in handling, both of which are applied under the present system by persons who know what they are doing.

Thus the cooperative association serves both the grower and the trade. It performs a number of indispensable functions and technical services. And for these to be taken over by Government agencies, as the PMA plan would require, means that an intricate, costly, remote organization of Government would be needed. The PMA could be biting off more than it can chew.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am making the following letter from our President, Harry S. Truman, a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because in my opinion it constitutes one of the great historical documents of our time:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 9, 1948.

Mr. JACOB ARONSON,
Chairman, Executive Board,
Union of American Hebrew
Congregations, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ARONSON: The commemoration of the founding of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations 75 years ago by the late Dr. Isaac M. Wise is a happy event for all Americans, be they Christian or Jew. The vision that led Dr. Wise to found your great organization, a pioneer national Jewish religious organization in the United States, has borne rich fruits. American Jewry, like all other segments of the American population, has played its important role in the growth and development of this great country of ours.

No one, I am sure, will dispute the fact that the American formula of religious liberty and freedom for persons of all faiths has been a contributing factor in the development of the American way of life that we call democracy. Separation of church and state on the one hand, and the encouragement and support of religious organizations by individuals on the other hand, has successfully answered a problem that in other countries, and in other times, has plagued humanity.

Strong, voluntary religious organizations, such as the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, are a distinctive aspect of American life. I am happy, through you, to convey my congratulations and best wishes to the delegates attending your convention, the representatives of a large and influential section of American Jewry.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Whither Are We Drifting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a small weekly newspaper in my native State of Wisconsin, the Vilas County News-Review, Eagle River, Wis. The article appeared in the issue of January 20, 1949:

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

The fact that some people read this column was brought home to the writer when several letters were received commenting on the final line of a recent column, "Are we Americans or are we mice?"

Most of the writers were pleased to have one voice lifted against the present administration's attempt to reduce all Americans to a common level, take their money away from them, and kill all their initiative by making it almost criminal to earn more than $6,000 a year.

One letter, however, asked, "How do you know socialism is so dangerous? How does it happen you are so sure that this trend is a bad thing? Personally, I do not think it too bad to have a government that will take care of me and give me things. I don't mind the Government telling me where I have to work, or for how much. However, I would not like to be separated from my family."

A mouse, if there ever was one.

How do we know this trend is dangerous? By a very plain example, the example of what has happened to people in England. They are having a very dim time of it, and they are having it under a socialistic government. They have sacrificed their freedom for two ounces of butter a week.

This is the austerity program, and it certainly is austere. The tight little island is a beautiful one, but the people of England will never see the beauties of their countryside and the loveliness of their lakes district. They can't get gasoline.

I once heard a man talk about how a government could enslave its people by taking away wheels. The British, under their labor government, which is definitely socialistic, have voted for a government which has made it impossible to drive a motorcar. If you are driving one, you are practically a criminal and will have a tough time explaining why you are out in your own car unless you have a series of permits.

With this socialistic government has come a swarm of bureaus. With the bureaus there has descended upon the British a horde of snobbish, important, small-minded bureaucrats who, aware of their own inferiority, take a sadistic pleasure in lording it over the poor people who have to come to them for practically everything.

Of course there's rationing. No one knows why there is still rationing, for everyone agrees the necessity for it is all over. The British are lost in a snarl of red tape that strangles them when they want to get food or clothing.

Imagine an American willing to fill out blanks to get food when there is no necessity for this supervision. Imagine an American willing to limit his clothing allowance to coupons and wearing what the government says he can wear. Imagine an American sitting at home while his car is stored in a garage and he is not allowed to use it to run to the corner store, dash off to play golf, take his family for a ride in the country, or whirl off on a 2 weeks' vacation that means a tour of several States.

Of course, Americans wouldn't stand for such enslavement, but this enslavement doesn't come all at once.

First, there's the sales talk. The people are sold the many benefits of a certain type of government. Then they are bribed or lulled into a feeling of security by a government that promises them protection from the cradle to the grave.

In England a man can't repair his home or change it, can't sell it, can't buy anything from another country to improve it, nor can he send anything to another country without a license. If he leaves his home for a summer at the lakes, the government can take his home, pay him a nominal rent, and he can't get it back.

Under the present socialistic form of government, where the government takes care of everything, the Briton is a slave. He must stay at home, or keep someone in it so the government won't take it. He can't use his car. He has to beg for food and clothing. He has to run to the government for everything. He is even put on an allowance and can't spend any more than a certain sum.

Can you imagine an independent, liberty-loving American submitting to that kind of government?

In England, under the socialistic government, the people are prisoners of the government, unable to move without a government permit. This may kill the spirit of the English and make them dull, disinterested clods. All this will happen, unless the British free themselves from the slavery now foisted upon them. And if they don't they'll not win another war, for wars are won by men who have a country for which they are willing to fight and die.

And in America? We are gayly dancing down the road to socialism, willing to accept without question a message filled with socialistic theories, from a man who has somehow become a national hero because he won an election. We seem unaware of the terrible darkness that lies ahead of us.

Why Not Federal Breakfast in Bed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 18, 1949:

WHY NOT FEDERAL BREAKFAST IN BED?

In bygone years politicians invariably were against sin, waste, and corruption; they were for right living, efficiency, and economy. The modern lexicon of the politician has taken on new terms, however, and he finds himself forced to take a stand on such nebulous issues as social gains, health insurance, and social security. Quite often these general terms, so praiseworthy in obvious intent, cover a multitude of sins.

There can be little quarrel with the principle of social security as undertaken in the last decade. Its net effect has been beneficial, despite the loafing it has encouraged among some individuals and the general attitude of Government paternalism it has fostered. But in any program which seeks to guarantee benefits to a great mass of people, somewhere a point is reached at which

the expense and bureaucratic administration begin to weigh too heavily for the benefits secured.

It would be quite practicable to set up an agency of the Federal Government to serve everyone breakfast in bed every morning. In fact, a very persuasive case could be made in behalf of a new Federal agency to do just that. It could be cited that the physical energy of most of us is at a very low ebb upon awakening. If our breakfast were served in bed, it would enable us to face the day nourished, with our awakening energy conserved for the tasks ahead. We don't doubt that a good orator could show that in a few years' time the general health level of the Nation would be increased immeasurably.

But, naturally, it would cost something for us to be fed in bed. It would cost frightfully. And even if we attempted to restrict the number of citizens to be fed in bed each morning merely to those who signed a statement saying that they didn't feel well when they got up and ate or fixed their own breakfast, there still would be countless millions of people who would avail themselves of this free service. Only, of course, it wouldn't be free. We don't know what percentage would have to be added to the worker's and employer's taxes to take care of this new social-health service, but it would be a sizable sum.

And then, mind you, this breakfasting in bed would have to conform with certain rules and regulations of the "Federal Bed Breakfast Administration." There would have to be a standard menu. It would have to be served at the convenience of the Federal agency—in some instances as early as 5:30 a. m. and in others as late as 11:30 a. m. The times would not be fixed to suit the convenience of the beneficiaries but, rather, the bureau's.

Your imagination can take you on from there. The point is that a certain amount of social security can be a very desirable thing. But when political temptation is yielded to, it can be expanded into very monstrous proportions—with results not agreeable to any of us except possibly the folk who want everything done for them anyhow.

Tariffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement which I delivered before the Ways and Means Committee on Thursday, January 27, 1949, in connection with hearings before that committee on H. R. 1211, to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act:

Chairman DOUGHTON and members of the House Ways and Means Committee; Greater Lawrence in Massachusetts is the nerve center of our Nation's woolen and worsted industry.

It may be paralyzed beyond recovery if this committee approves of rush legislation without fully considering the harmful effect on our own economy.

We are here to protest against any concessions which would sacrifice American textiles in the name of free trade.

This is the bread-and-butter industry of New England. Once it was among the lowest-paid groups in the Nation. Thanks to the fine understanding between labor and management, wage-scales have steadily improved and the industry has prospered.

After meeting war needs, and then the pent-up consumer backlog, woolens and worsteds are now under highly competitive pressures. They could not survive if low tariffs permit an influx of foreign textiles produced at slave-labor wages.

Think of this fact. The present Congress will undoubtedly raise the minimum wage of American workers from 40 cents per hour up to 70 or 75 cents per hour. Most of us will heartily support such a move. As President Truman said, as early as September 6, 1945, and I quote: "I believe that the goal of a 40-cent minimum was inadequate when established. It has now become obsolete. Increases in the cost of living since 1938 and changes in our national wage structure require an immediate and upward revision of this minimum."

But what is going to happen to American business, which provides jobs for our people, if it must pay wages far higher than foreign competitors whose goods are allowed to come into this country and undersell American producers?

I tell you, gentlemen, that our woolen and worsted industry cannot stand up to this unfair competition without the compensation of tariff protection.

There are those who say that we must help other nations to get on their feet again by providing them with an American market for their goods. But shall this be done at the expense of an existing American industry which manufactures the same type of goods? The inevitable result of such a policy would be to force our own wage rates downward to save such an industry from bankruptcy. Is there anyone in this room who would advocate such a betrayal of American industry and labor? Hardly.

Or, to put the situation in another perspective, must we forfeit all our gains and move our economy backward just to be on even terms with depressed nations which are trying to improve their standard of living?

It seems to me, gentlemen, that we are doing quite enough for the world at large. It would serve no useful purpose to ourselves or to others if, as the center of world stability we overextend ourselves. If we jeopardize our own domestic security, all will be lost.

Certainly there are goods which we need from them and they need from us without undercutting United States products for foreign imports in the same category.

Average hourly earnings of $1.32 in the United States compare with a real wage cost of 42 cents an hour in England. The disparity is even greater with other European countries which seek to market their woolen and worsted fabrics in this country.

Even before this threat develops, we are troubled by the recession which has hit our textile industry.

Bear in mind that this is January and not the last few days preceding the Federal income-tax dead line of March 15. Already long lines are forming before the office of the Department of Internal Revenue in Lawrence. This is because so many people are out of work and are filing their returns earlier than usual in order to get their refunds from the Government as soon as they can. Those same lines then move onto the employment-security office to sign up for unemployment-compensation checks.

In an area where 120,000 people live nearly 10,000 are out of work. Normally, 25,000 are employed in the woolen and worsted mills which comprise the dominant industry of greater Lawrence. Similar conditions prevail throughout New England.

The present schedules of United States tariffs impose double penalties on this enterprise. Not only are foreign goods permitted to enter at prices which are dangerously low, but the American manufacturer is obliged to pay high prices for the raw materials he needs.

To protect the domestic grower of fine wool, who cannot produce in quality and in quantity for our textile manufacturers, a heavy duty is placed on the import of raw wool.

The American producer must therefore pay high prices for wool in the face of a world shortage plus a duty of 25 cents a pound to pass customs.

Also inflating the cost of raw wool to the American processor, is the handicap suffered by our buyers in the South African and Australian markets.

We pay at the exchange rate of $4.03 to the English pound. All other countries get convertible sterling at rates ranging from $3 to $3.80. This is because we recognize the exchange value of the pound at $4.03 which is considerably above its real value.

This combination of a high import duty on raw wool and the false exchange rate puts our manufacturers under a decided disadvantage even before we consider the wage differential between United States and foreign producers of finished fabrics.

The present tariff offers no genuine protection. The fixed rate of 37½ cents on each pound of finished cloth merely cancels out the duty which the American manufacturer pays on grease wool at 25 cents a pound. This is because the shrinkage on scouring raises the duty to 37½ cents on the raw imported wool.

This ad valorum rate of 25 percent is figured on the foreign price and does not afford sufficient protection to make up the 90 cents to $1 difference in labor costs.

Should England revalue the pound at a realistic figure of $3, her finished fabrics would cost 35 percent less. Under these circumstances, and with full production, she could undersell every American mill right here in the domestic market. This would completely ruin our woolen and worsted industry.

These are the dangers which loom in the immediate future, aided and abetted not only by appeasement tariffs but by another aspect of our foreign policy.

The British Board of Trade states that shipments of worsted piece goods to the United States in 1948, were 2½ times the volume of 1947. Furthermore, England confidently announces that she expects to up these exports in 1949 by 60 to 80 percent.

How is this possible in a country whose plant and equipment were severely damaged by the Nazi blitz? The answer lies in the Marshall plan, which has provided them with the funds to buy the finest of new machinery, much better in fact than the machinery now used in many American mills.

And this competition is being subsidized with American dollars, collected from American manufacturers and American textile workers. Now I believe in the broad objectives of the Marshall plan, but not to the point where it would sell out our own industries in our home markets. Just because we buy Australian wool is no reason why we should start playing with a boomerang. The effects can be disastrous. It is well to put certain nations on their feet again; but not at our throats, competitively speaking.

France has asked for $1,500,000 from Marshall-plan funds for the most modern wool-textile machinery. An Italian mission has just visited this country for the same purpose. The Japanese wool textile industry is being rehabilitated with our help, and Japanese worsted products have been offered in this country. These countries pay even lower wages than the manufacturers in England. We are happy to put them in a position where they can produce for their own needs and for a share of the trade in those areas of the world which need textile products, but let's stop them from invading the

United States and turning American mill cities into ghost towns.

The skill and ability of our textile workers cannot offset the burden placed upon them by their own Government.

But these workers, side by side with management, do vigorously protest against any reenactment of the old Trade Agreement Act, under which the State Department would have a free hand in negotiating reciprocal-trade arrangements. The present act, due to expire on June 30, is a far better approach. It gives to the Tariff Commission the power to review the duties imposed on imports to this country. Under the present law the Tariff Commission is required to hold public hearings and to determine the peril points below which contemplated tariff reductions under the reciprocal trade program should not go. Under Public Law 792, it must submit its recommendations to the Chief Executive. The President, if he disregards such recommendations, must tell Congress his reasons.

We submit that this is a more democratic and practical procedure. Rather than leave such matters without recourse to the State Department we must have a flexible system that will provide protection whenever any industry is threatened in the home market.

The peril point in the woolen and worsted industry is a fact. It is here.

Representatives from New England insist that this peril be removed by an amendment which will raise the tariff on imports of woolens and worsteds.

Before that can be done, however, the new legislation being considered by this committee, and which seeks to eliminate the peril point reporting function, should be rejected.

If not, our textile industry is doomed.

We are here to see that this does not happen.

Gentlemen, don't sell our woolen and worsted industry down the river of free trade.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Senators and Representatives from New Jersey received copies of the resolution adopted by the Essex County division of the Federation of Holy Name Societies, condemning the acts of the Hungarian Government in arresting and imprisoning His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and urging that the United States Government exert every effort to obtain the cardinal's release.

On January 27, 1949, I asked and obtained unanimous consent to include that resolution in my remarks as part of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am pleased to note that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] also obtained leave that date to accomplish the same purpose.

I wish to state that I am in complete agreement with the sentiments expressed in the resolution, and I earnestly hope and pray that the cardinal's release can be secured.

The Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include two brief editorials, both of which emphasize the importance of the Freedom Train.

Our majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, on January 10, 1949, introduced House Joint Resolution 84, to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States. I hope that the resolution may be considered by the House at an early date, to the end that this very worthwhile and history-making enterprise may be continued.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of January 21, 1949]

SAVING THE FREEDOM TRAIN

The Freedom Train, back in Washington after visiting 325 cities in 48 States, has been inspected by hundreds of citizens of the Nation's Capital and its environs. Still other crowds will make pilgrimage to it before 11 p. m. tomorrow. Then, unless present decisions are altered, it will be disassembled, its documents dispersed, its personnel disbanded.

But the purpose of the Freedom Train cannot be said to have been fulfilled completely. True, more than 3,500,000 people have passed through its cars and briefly viewed its displays. This number, however, is small in comparison with that of the Americans who have not been aboard and therefore have not seen the exhibition of its assembled historical material.

Meanwhile, need for effective dramatization of the grand traditions of the United States has grown rather than diminished. If the Freedom Train was called for 13 months ago, it certainly is wanted now.

Possibly there is some compelling reason why the Freedom Train must cease to exist as an instrument of embattled democracy. If so, it is a matter of regret; if not, there certainly will be many Americans of every class, creed, and condition who will rejoice to learn that it has been decided to carry on, to make another tour of the Nation, to stay on the job as long as prevailing turmoil in the world continues.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 23, 1949]

UNFINISHED TOUR

The Freedom Train came to the end of its tour last night. Originally brought together as a 1-year exhibit, this traveling shrine for documents recording the birth and growth of our liberties has been on the road 16 months. It has visited 324 cities and towns, a few of them twice. Hundreds of towns have asked in vain for it to come their way. In its more than 400 days on display, over 3,500,000 men, women, and children have reverently and excitedly seen with their own eyes the cornerstone writings of American freedom. Ten times as many have been turned away because the crowds were too great. Millions of Americans have not had a chance to grasp their heritage, as it were, in the close and tangible way the Freedom Train permits.

They never will have the chance—unless further tours of the Freedom Train can be arranged. The American Heritage Foundation, whose magnificent service it has been to assemble the Freedom Train and keep it going until now, is a private organization. The country owes to its sponsors—and to the railroads—a considerable debt of gratitude for the effort and money they have put into this project. But they cannot be asked to carry the load indefinitely. Fortunately, bipartisan resolutions have been introduced in both Houses of Congress providing for the Government to acquire and operate the Freedom Train. The cost is roughly estimated at $2,500,000. We can think of few if any projects where so small an expenditure of public funds would pay such great dividends in citizenship education. The unsatisfied desire of people all over the country to visit the exhibit is a measure of what remains to be done before the Freedom Train's tour is really finished and its purpose adequately accomplished. We urge Congress to consider the question with due promptness and hope the train and its contents can be held undismantled until Congress can act.

United States Coast Guard Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by me at the annual convention of the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, held in the Hotel Astor on Sunday, January 30, 1949, which I believe may be of interest to my colleagues. The convention was presided over by Commodore William A. Smith, and among the guests were Admiral Edward H. Smith, commandant of the Third Coast Guard District, Capt. Chester A. A. Anderson, chief of the Reserve and Auxiliary Division, and Lt. Comdr. Keith W. Thompson, district director of the Reserve and Auxiliary Division:

Commodore Smith, Admiral Smith, officers of the Coast Guard, officers of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and fellow auxiliarists: Never before was the saying brought home so forcefully to me that "but for the grace of God there go I." Little did I dream when I signed up with the Coast Guard during the war as seaman second class that some day I would outrank an admiral. By the simple expedient of an American election here I am as your guest of honor. I remember well how you and I worried about the promotion exams and how proud we were when we received those promotion certificates.

I often think that the Japanese spy system must have bogged down terribly. I am sure that if they knew that some of us like myself were climbing the ladder so fast they would never have thrown in the sponge.

I do appreciate the honor you have accorded me in inviting me to talk to you today.

Without in any way detracting from the importance or the dignity of the Reserve Corps of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, I venture the opinion that the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary is the most effective civilian organization affiliated with any branch of our Government.

Primarily our armed services perform police duty and their Reserve corps are intended to keep always ready a reservoir from which

can be quickly recruited men prepared to serve the Nation in that capacity. Our National Guard units are maintained for the same purpose, plus that of a more localized nature, that is, as a State militia which can be called upon to maintain order in times of emergency or civil commotion.

The Coast Guard Auxiliary does all of that and more.

I am pleased to convey to you the personal greetings of Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and to assure you for him that he is deeply and sincerely interested in the expansion and improvement of the auxiliary. He, like all who know about you, appreciates your splendid peacetime record made more resplendent by your unexcelled recent wartime record.

The auxiliary is unique in many respects. It is an active civilian adjunct of a full-time military service. Few people realize that long before we had any agitation to combine the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force into a single unit, our country had a unified military service which at all times constituted a branch of the land, naval, and air forces of the Nation.

By virtue of law, the Coast Guard has been just that since 1915. In peacetime it acts under the sole jurisdiction of the Treasury Department. As you know, the Treasury Department is outranked only by the State Department. You may, therefore, proudly assert that your service outranks the Army and the Navy.

Let me take a moment to give you the evidence to sustain my statement about the tremendous importance of your service.

Capt. Chester A. Anderson, chief of the Auxiliary of the United States Coast Guard, summarizes your activities as authorized by law as follows:

"The Coast Guard Auxiliary is a civilian organization composed of boats, radio stations, and airplanes, and sponsored by the Coast Guard. It is organized to (1) promote safety and to effect rescues on and over the high seas and on navigable waters; (2) to promote efficiency in the operation of motorboats and yachts; (3) to foster a wider knowledge of, and better compliance with, the laws, rules, and regulations governing the operation of motorboats and yachts; and (4) to facilitate other operations of the Coast Guard."

You men will always exercise your best efforts to accomplish those high purposes.

You devote yourselves to constant year-round training programs in order to educate yourselves not solely for your own benefit but so that you may disseminate this information on a wide scale. You are not satisfied merely to better learn navigation, piloting, and the more important features of good seamanship for the sake of knowing these things. You equip yourselves so as to be better able to teach these things to others and so as to facilitate the maximum of cooperation with the Coast Guard.

The service you render by practicing and teaching efficiency and safety on the sea by your courtesy inspections is invaluable. The number of lives saved, the bodily harm lessened, and the property damage prevented will never be known. Nevertheless, the satisfaction is yours in knowing that your contribution of time, energy, and intelligent application is responsible for incalculable good.

There is no other group that can be called upon in time of emergent flood, hurricane, or marine disaster to come to the rescue in a manner that will be helpful. Only you can properly complement the Coast Guard in its work.

The communications group in this district are doing excellent work in training personnel in actual field exercises for these purposes. In connection with its work the auxiliary has had and will continue to have the need for boats and men to assist in the patrol of marine regattas such as the gold cup race, the national sweepstakes, the Albany-New York outboard races, the around-Manhattan Island race, and others. Some flotillas are doing fine work on safety patrol during the boating season, using either a boat acquired for that purpose or that of a member. Regular patrol areas are set up expediting assistance when needed. That is indeed a significant program, challenging the best in every person interested in pleasure boating, adding to his hobby, a high and important purpose.

There is another vast group who should be induced to join the auxiliary. They are the boat owners who can be made to recognize that the only civilian boating symbol that stands for everything worth while on the water is the auxiliary flag, the blue ensign. All the others, about which I know anything, merely signify membership in an organization. They have no meaning except to identify the owner with that organization.

The blue ensign goes far beyond any such meaning. The owner cannot fly it until he has demonstrated that he is a "well-found" boatman and that his boat has passed a rigorous annual inspection as to its condition and equipment. The owner therefore has a right to be justifiably proud of the privilege of flying the blue ensign. He is identified with an organization which not only proclaims but which actually maintains through self-regulation the very high standards of which its flag is the visible symbol. Although it is desirable, it is not necessary that he take an active part in the operation or administration of his flotilla. His fulfillment of his obligation as an auxiliarist enhances our capacity to serve. That is why it is incumbent upon all of you to try to enroll an ever increasing percentage of the more than 400,000 motorboat owners in the United States in order to assist the Coast Guard in its effort to raise the standard of boating.

I am hopeful that the Eighty-first Congress will be more responsive to your needs and desires. You have a responsible and a favorably disposed echelon of command. They have urged upon a reluctant Eightieth Congress the granting of permission to various governmental agencies to make available to the auxiliary, without cost to it, vessels and other equipment which can be used by it for training and for patrol. I am confident that the same recommendations will be made to the Eighty-first Congress. I intend to introduce legislation to that effect. At this time I can do no more than to assure you that I will enlist as much support as possible to bring about its enactment.

I list as one of my proudest accomplishments admission to membership in the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary. I will always cherish it. In the days ahead I hope to find more time for it.

One final word. You and I are interested in this work because of a deep-seated desire to do good. That desire, in turn, is borne of our religion. Religious tenets and practices, in monotheism, regardless of any distinctions or differences in the various sects thereof, are the fountain of all good. One of the major derelictions of our Congress is its failure to erect a chapel as a part of the United States Coast Guard Academy. It has, however, in a moment of graciousness, permitted the raising of private funds to construct that piece of Government property.

A universal belief in God hurdles all obstacles. You and I, as individuals, will give our own funds and get more from our friends in order to erect as a part of the academy a house of worship, of interdenominational worship. It will be a memorial in honor of the Coast Guard dead. It will consecrate them by teaching the living the word of God. It will bring together under one roof, Christians and Jews, who each in his own way, will pray God for guidance along the paths of peace.

Let Us Take Serious and Sober Thought of the Future—Mr. Manchester Boddy Sounds a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, shutting our eyes as a nation to hard, cold facts, and trying to carry out a foreign program of staggering proportions without understanding exactly what we can expect to accomplish by such a global program and how long our efforts must be directed toward financial and material aid to most of the countries of the world can only lead to confusion, misunderstanding, and bitterness at home.

Manchester Boddy, editor and publisher of the Los Angeles Daily News, has recognized the essential need for a true appraisal of our role in world affairs, and the need for a clarification of our aims and motives for our own good. His recent editorial on this subject which appeared in the January 26 edition of the Los Angeles Daily News follows:

(By Manchester Boddy)

Many who read the facts and figures about how world population has zoomed in the course of a little more than three generations to a point where there is not half enough food being produced to support it, write: "I don't know enough to argue against the logical case you present, so I conclude that the Creator has made a terrible mistake."

There is no justification for such a conclusion. No one can pass sound judgment on "the scheme of things entire" until he knows what the scheme is.

You and I live for a fleeting instant. We know not whence came our life or whither it goes. If there were a beginning—and an end—and we could understand both and all that happens in between, then and only then could we presume to pass judgment.

Suppose we were to judge man—as a mechanical and mental being—by what we see in the form of a 2-year-old child. The defects would be glaring indeed. His mind, his muscles, his teeth, his bones—all would seem inadequate to meet the demands of life. But we would not judge him as a mature man. We would judge him for what he is—a child of 2. We would not say the Creator had made a terrible mistake.

I do not know the age of humanity. I do not know what it will be like 10,000 or 1,000,000 years hence. Perhaps humanity as we see it today is the 2-year-old child. Perhaps it is much older—or even younger.

My concern with the current problem of overpopulation in a limited world is exceedingly realistic, practical, and down-to-earth. I don't want our readers to assume that aid to China, to the tune of a hundred million tons of food will solve the Chinese problem. I want to correct the notion that India's freedom from Great Britain means the end of trouble in India; that Marshall plan aid and ERP in general mean a peaceful, rehabilitated Europe.

What I am trying to point out is that world problems as they exist today are fundamental. They have their origin in a special set of facts and figures that are utterly different from the so-called facts and figures

sometimes used as a basis for popularizing our foreign policy.

Science may know how to deal with the world population-hunger problem. There may, indeed, very shortly be some exciting and interesting news on this very subject in the Daily News.

As of this moment, however, our foreign policy and, in turn, our domestic policy, is being sold to the American public on the false assumption that world stability, peace and security can be achieved if what we are doing is carried on to a conclusion.

Suppose we were engaged in carrying water from the ocean and dumping it in a river, which, in the course of its meanderings emptied into the same ocean from which we carried the water. Would I be justified in saying that if we stuck to our job—determined at all costs to reduce the content of the ocean by a tenth or a third or a half—we would reach our objective?

There may be some special reason for doing the work involved in carrying the water. If the reason were a good one, I would not quarrel with it. But I would state the reason, and I would not try to justify the operation on the grounds that we could reduce the size of the ocean.

That is how I feel about our current efforts at saving the world. I think there are good and substantial reasons why we do what we are doing. But we are not going to solve the basic problems of Europe and/or Asia.

If that is true, it means we are going to have a continuation of world problems; insofar as our generation is concerned, such problems will be standard equipment for a long time.

We are dealing, I think, not with the threat of another over-all world war, but with a continuous succession of local rebellions, famines, civil wars, massacres, and pestilences.

Our foreign policy should be geared to an open acknowledgment of that fact and not to the wishy-washy but lovely belief that the Four Freedoms are just around the corner—and will be reached as soon as man throws off his oppressor and becomes free or democratic.

Veterans of Foreign Wars Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of World War II and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I am very interested in the welfare of our former service personnel and their dependents. It is my belief that we are now enjoying the benefits of our great form of government because this way of life was fought for and defended, and to those who did not return from battle we owe a tremendous obligation to their dependents as well as to those who carry the scars of battle.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which has been presented to the Veterans' Affairs Committee by Omar B. Ketchum, director of the VFW national legislative service:

STATEMENT OF OMAR B. KETCHUM, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE SERVICE, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, JANUARY 27, 1949

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the privilege and opportunity to appear before this committee as the legislative spokesman for the Veterans of Foreign Wars in presenting our current legislative program based on the resolution adopted at the forty-ninth national convention held on August 29, 1948.

This presentation of our 1949 program is a significant one in that this year marks our golden jubilee. The Veterans of Foreign Wars was founded in 1899 by a group of young men recently returned from foreign service in the Spanish-American War. We are proud of our record of 50 years of service to the disabled veteran and the widows and orphans of our honored dead, and the millions of young men who suffered the dislocation of war.

The membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is composed of men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters in the armed forces during some war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged and for which service a campaign medal or ribbon has been authorized. The membership records at the close of the 1948 calendar year reveal that approximately one million and one-half men are bona fide members. Of this total membership approximately one million three hundred thousand are overseas veterans of World War II.

The legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which I am presenting to you this morning, is not the program of one person or a few persons purporting to speak for millions. Nor is it a program of a few persons seeking to identify the veterans' needs and problems with a particular ideology. This program had its inception in the thousands of posts in the cities and towns of this Nation and is adopted through democratic procedure of thousands of duly elected delegates at our national convention.

At the close of this statement I have listed that part of the VFW legislative program which has been referred to this committee. It is by no means our complete program. We are concerned, as we have a right to be concerned, in matters such as housing, national security, the welfare of the personnel of our armed services, the integrity of our immigration and naturalization laws, the strengthening of the concept of Americanism, Federal aid to education, etc. However, I would like to take the opportunity of discussing briefly a few of the major objectives of our organization which are now in legislative form pending before this committee.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Our organization is seeking from the Eighty-first Congress a 25-percent increase in disability compensation and pensions payable to World War I and World War II veterans pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The Congress has been generous in the past in the matter of adjusting these rates but, unfortunately, this generosity has not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. For example, in 1939 a veteran totally disabled, service-connected, received $100 per month. Today he receives $138 per month. But the totally disabled veteran does not have the same dollar purchasing power that he enjoyed in 1939. In order to provide a purchasing power for today's totally disabled veteran equal to 1939 dollars the compensation for total disability should be approximately $160. We are asking for a 25-percent increase which would bring the rate for a 100-percent disabled veteran, service-connected, to $172. We believe the $12 differential to be justified by the insufficiency of the basic rates which we believe were never sufficient to provide a totally disabled veteran the standard of living enjoyed by the average American. It is our hope that some day the Congress will reconsider the soundness of the basic disability rates formulated in 1933 on which percentage increases have been based for several years. We would like the Congress to put the totally disabled veteran in such a position as to afford him a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by the citizen making an average wage in industry today. However, we are content at this time to ask the Congress for this second round of postwar increases in disability compensation and pensions by 25 percent over existing rates.

REVISION OF INCOME LIMITATIONS

The members who served on the committee in the last Congress recall the extensive hearings devoted to this question. This matter has been presented by the Veterans of Foreign Wars for several years and we were pleased that this committee last year favorably reported the bill. Unfortunately, it failed of further consideration by the Congress.

Existing income limitations governing eligibility for the veterans' part III non-service-connected disability pension and widows non-service-connected death pension, are $1,000 where the veteran or the widow has no dependents, and $2,500 where the widow or veteran has dependents. These income limitations were written into the law in 1934 and the figures applied were those used for personal exemption for income-tax purposes. The original law provided that eligibility would be based on whether or not a veteran had paid income tax during the preceding year. When the personal exemptions were lowered this criterion for pension eligibility was retained and the figures were written into the law.

Fourteen years have elapsed since the fixing of these limitations and for the past several years they have become very arbitrary and lost their meaning. We believe, as this committee did last year, that these figures should be increased in order for the law governing eligibility for these pensions to have the same meaning that they had in 1934. We ask this committee to again consider this matter and to increase the limitations to $2,000 for the veteran and widow without dependents, and $3,000 for the veteran and widow with dependents.

SERVICE PENSION PROGRAM

Since 1939 the national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been mandated by our national conventions to seek legislation which would provide for World War I veterans a service pension in the same amounts and on the same basis as provided veterans of the Spanish-American War. For many years our organization has sought this objective, and our last national convention reiterated its endorsement of such service-pension legislation.

The service pension for veterans of our Nation's wars is a tradition in this country. Approximately 20 to 25 years after each war the Congress has enacted a service-pension law for the veterans of that war. And so the veterans of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, down through the Spanish-American War were remembered in their declining years by a grateful Congress. The last service-pension law enacted was in 1921 for the benefit of the veterans of the Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion. Thirty years have now elapsed since the close of World War I and the average age of the World War I veteran is approximately 55 years. We strongly feel that the Congress should write into the law this traditional service pension. And

we feel that it should be worded so that the service pension would apply not only to veterans of World War I but to veterans of World War II when they meet the requirements of age or disability.

I urge this committee to give serious consideration to the holding of early hearings on this vital measure and that such legislation be expedited through the Congress. We must not permit for too long a situation whereby we make fish of one group of veterans and fowl of another.

ADJUSTED-SERVICE COMPENSATION

Since the close of World War II the national conventions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have adopted resolutions calling upon the Congress to enact adjusted-service-compensation legislation which would tend to alleviate the economic disparity as between the young man who spent the war years in the military or naval services and the young man who remained at home as part of the civilian war effort. Such legislation in the form of readjustment insurance was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and in this Congress by your chairman at the request of our organization. This legislation is so framed as to provide this adjusted-service compensation in the form of readjustment insurance so that this committee could take jurisdiction. We feel that this legislation is essentially a veterans' measure and should not be considered by some other committee because of any relation such legislation might have to the subjects normally considered by that committee.

Another objective of this legislation would be to place the veteran who, because of age, family commitments, or economic reasons, was unable to participate substantially in any of the benefits of the GI bill of rights on a par with the veteran who did participate in the benefits of that bill. We do not believe, for example, that the veteran who had to go out and make a living for his family should be denied a benefit comparable to those received by veterans drawing readjustment allowances or who were able to go to school for several years. I am not in any way attempting to disparage the GI bill of rights. Our organization played a prominent role in the development and subsequent enactment of that worthy legislation. However, we strongly feel that provision must be made for this other group of veterans. Accordingly, in the legislation we seek we are asking the Congress to deduct from this readjustment insurance the tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran through the operation of the GI bill of rights.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I am presenting for insertion in the RECORD at this point a list of the legislative objectives of our organization which would normally be referred to this committee.

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE VETERANS' COMMITTEE, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, JANUARY 27, 1949

1. To increase disability compensation and pensions for World War I and World War II veterans and widows and orphans by 25 percent. (Res. 54. H. R. 908, by Mr. RANKIN.)

2. To enact legislation which would provide service pensions for veterans of all wars, including World War I, on the same basis and in the same amounts as those now accorded veterans of the Spanish-American War. (Res. 440. H. R. 897, by Mr. RANKIN; H R. 8, by Mr. VAN ZANDT.)

3. To increase the income limitations governing eligibility for widows' and veterans' non-service-connected death pension to $2,000 for those with no children, and $3,000 for those with children. (Res. 400. H. R. 921, by Mrs. ROGERS.)

4. To enact legislation which would provide an equitable adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II of $3 per day for home service (maximum $3,500), $4 per day for overseas service (maximum $4,500), plus an additional $500 for a wound or wounds received in combat; and that all tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, be deducted from such adjusted service pay. (Resolution 444—H. R. 914 by Mr. RANKIN.)

5. To enact legislation amending part III, Veterans Regulation 1 (a) to provide:

(a) That constitutional defects and developmental abnormalities shall be treated as disabilities for this purpose;

(b) That the existing age requirements be reduced to 55, 60, and 65 years, respectively;

(c) That the disability percentages now in effect be reduced to 50, 30, and 60 percent, respectively;

(d) That present income limitations be increased to $2,000 and $3,000, respectively;

(e) That the rates of pension therein be increased to $90 per month for permanent and total disability and $120 per month for the need of the regular aid and attendance of another person. (Resolution 495—H. R. 899 by Mr. RANKIN.)

6. To enact legislation extending to orphans of World War II veterans educational benefits under the GI bill of rights to which the deceased serviceman would have been ensitled. (Resolution 76—H. R. 148 by Mr. BECKWORTH.)

7. To provide minimum ratings for arrested tuberculosis, service-connected, for World War I and World War II veterans. (H. R. 923 by Mr. TEAGUE.)

8. To enact legislation providing that all honorably discharged veterans who have served in any and all past armed expeditions on foreign soil and in which the United States took part, be entitled to receive the same medical aid and hospitalization as is extended to veterans of war service. (Resolution 278.)

9. To permit a disabled veteran (amputee) to obtain an automobile costing in excess of $1,600 and to pay the difference out of his own funds. (Resolution 53—H. R. 1435 by Mr. TEAGUE.)

10. To provide automobiles for disabled veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of an arm. (Resolution 463—H. R. 283 by Mrs. ROGERS.)

11. To enact legislation providing for stenographic assistance to accredited representatives of congressionally chartered organizations on duty facilities of the Veterans' Administration. (Resolution 493—H. R. 912 by Mr. RANKIN.)

12. To enact legislation which would provide pension and disability compensation benefits in cases now disallowed as misconduct, which are meritorious and in which injury or disease was caused. (Resolution 38—H. R. 1157 by Mr. RANKIN.)

13. That Congress enact legislation awarding World War II veterans the same statutory award for loss of a lung or a generative organ that is now restricted to World War I veterans. (Resolution 133.)

14. To amend Public Law 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, by providing that no pension or compensation shall be apportioned to the wife of the veteran unless there was continuous cohabitation with the veteran from date of marriage except if the separation was due to the misconduct of the veteran. (Resolution 201—H. R. 1776 by Mr. RANKIN.)

15. To amend the World War Veterans Act of 1924, so as to permit the payment for total disability as of the dates such disability in fact existed. (Resolution 246—H. R. 896 by Mr. RANKIN.)

16. To amend Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, to allow payment of all accrued compensation due the veteran at the time of death even though recovery would exceed 1 year and that such payments be made to the widow if living, otherwise to the estate of the said veteran. (Resolution 248.)

17. To amend existing laws and regulations so that all reasonable doubt be resolved in favor of the veteran when the veteran submits competent medical evidence based upon the clinical and physical findings by medical specialists and that rating be assigned upon such diagnosis of the physician even though the latter is not connected with the Veterans' Administration. (Resolution 252.)

18. To enact legislation providing veterans of the Cuban Pacification all of the rights and privileges now enjoyed by the veterans of the Spanish-American War. (Resolution 279.)

19. To enact legislation providing for a rating of total disability for any veteran who suffered the loss of one eye and one extremity. (Resolution 420—H. R. 899 by Mr. RANKIN.)

20. To enact legislation extending the presumptive period of both T. B. and neuropsychiatric disorders to 5 years after discharge or the end of the war, whichever is the later date. (Resolution 421—H. R. 1248 by Mr. PATTERSON.)

21. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available where the service person incurred permanent disability in line of duty, notwithstanding the fact that death during the same contract of service was not in line of duty. (Resolution 496.)

22. To amend Public Law 439, Seventy-eighth Congress, so as to provide that death compensation or pension shall not be denied because at the time of death the service person was under sentence of a civil or military court for an offense which ordinarily would not result in a dishonorable discharge. (Resolution 499.)

23. To amend existing law making applicable to Indian war veterans the regulations with respect to fraudulent enlistment by reason of minority, now applicable in determining benefits for the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II veterans. (Resolution 536.)

24. To provide Spanish-American War benefits to veterans who participated in hostilities against the Moros in the Philippines prior to January 1, 1913. (H. R. 1652 by Mr. LESINSKI.)

25. To enact legislation recognizing osteopathic and chiropractic treatment in VA hospitals by registered doctors of osteopathy and chiropractic. (Resolution 537—H. R. 1513 by Mr. HUBER.)

26. To enact legislation authorizing the transfer of a veteran's educational benefits under the GI Bill of Rights to his child or children to the extent of the veteran's entitlement. (Resolution 158—H. R. 287 by Mrs. ROGERS.)

27. To enact legislation which would protect the pension rights of widows and orphans in those cases where the veteran's death, although due to misconduct, is such misconduct as would not have resulted in a dishonorable discharge. (Resolution 253.)

28. To enact legislation granting equal privileges to the dependents of deceased World War II veterans, to wit: that the widows and/or children of deceased veterans of World War II be given the same benefits presently enjoyed by dependents of deceased veterans of World War I upon the death of the said veteran whether or not the deceased veteran would have been entitled to draw pension, compensation, or retirement pay because of service-connected disability. (Resolution 453—H. R. 295 by Mrs. ROGERS; H. R. 567 by Mr. WHITTEN.)

29. To enact legislation to provide lump sum settlement to NSLI beneficiaries of all men killed in World War II. (Resolution 172—H. R. 60 by Mr. FULTON.)

30. To amend section 602 (m) (2) of the NSLI Act of 1940 by adding the words "or forfeited" after the word "lapsed" in order that the insurance of those veterans killed or totally disabled in combat after being restored to duty following a conviction for desertion may not be forfeited as required under section 612. (Resolution 472.)

31. To amend section 602 (d) (2) (C) of the NSLI Act of 1940 by striking the word "dependent" in order that parents of deceased veterans may be spared the embarrassment incident to the establishment of dependency on the date of death of their son. (Resolution 473.)

32. To amend section 602 (v) (1) of the NSLI Act of 1940 by striking out the words "an actually service incurred", delete the comma after the word "injury" and add the words "for which compensation is payable", following the word "disability." (Resolution 474.)

33. To amend section 602 (c) (2) of the NSLI Act of 1940 by striking the words "resulting from or aggravated by such active service" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "for which compensation is payable." This amendment will nullify VA TB9–44, which holds that disability must have been actually service incurred to be waived in applications for reinstatement or new insurance prior to January 1, 1950. (Resolution 475.)

34. To amend section 602 (m) (2) (C) of the NSLI Act of 1940 to be further amended by adding the words "became permanently and totally disabled" following the comma after the word "combat" in order that those totally disabled as well as those killed in combat will not be deprived of insurance benefits. (Resolution 476.)

35. To amend section 602 (n) of the NSLI Act of 1940 as provided in H. R. 4160, Eightieth Congress, liberalizing requirements for waiver of premiums in the event of continuous total disability. (Resolution 534.)

Small Companies Feel Export Curb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a clipping from the New York Times of January 24, 1949, which was brought to my attention by the firm of Coolig & Gottlieb, Inc., importers and exporters, Gloversville, N. Y., who, as a small-business firm are experiencing the same difficulties as brought out in the clipping:

SMALL COMPANIES FEEL EXPORT CURB—CHICAGO FOREIGN TRADERS SAY 50 TO 60 PERCENT OF SUCH CONCERNS WILL BE FORCED TO CLOSE—BUREAUCRACY IS BLAMED—OIT TAKES 6 WEEKS TO 90 DAYS TO ISSUE LICENSE, MEANWHILE BUYER ORDERS ELSEWHERE

CHICAGO, January 23.—Executives of two import-export companies in Chicago charged today that small firms engaged in foreign trade were being ruined by Washington bureaucracy coupled with an allegedly obvious inclination on the part of Marshall plan officials to favor big business.

They asserted that 50 to 60 percent of the smaller import-export houses which have sprung up throughout the United States since the war soon will be forced to close unless the Truman administration abandons its "unfair attitude" toward their activities. Many such concerns are operated by war veterans, a survey shows.

The condemnations of Washington policy were made by Christopher G. Janus, president of the General Works Corporation, 141 West Jackson Boulevard, and Richard M. Jordan, president of Jordan-Benson & Co., 68 West Washington Street.

Mr. Janus charged that small firms such as his are being "controlled out of business."

"To export practically anything to a foreign buyer I must apply to the Commerce Department's Office of International Trade for an export license," he explained. "In my application I must give the name of the foreign buyer, the price at which I bought the goods, the price at which I am going to sell them, and finally the use to which they will be put.

SIX-WEEK WAIT FOLLOWS

"After this comes a wait of 6 weeks to 90 days," he said. "Then, generally, the OIT notifies me tersely that instead of the 500 tons I wanted to export, I will be allowed to ship only 20 tons. It's just like operating under socialism."

Mr. Jordan said many of his foreign trade contracts had fallen through because of the Government's harsh and unwieldy licensing policy.

"When I get a request for, say, steel wire from a foreign buyer, my first step must be to obtain a written commitment from a wire manufacturer here that he will make the wire available to me," Mr. Jordan said. "Such a commitment usually is good for only 30 days. It takes 60 to 90 days to get a license, so more often than not my seller's commitment is no good by the time I am able to buy and export the wire."

Large companies can afford to buy goods for export outright before obtaining the license, Mr. Jordan explained, but small ones such as his own find it difficult to have their funds tied up awaiting OIT action.

Another annoyance is the OIT scarce-item list of products in short supply in the United States, which are subject to severe export limitations.

SCARCE LISTING LAGS

Mr. Jordan asserted the list lagged 3 to 4 months behind actual conditions in American markets and exporters often were prevented from shipping articles which are plentiful here.

"For example, it is almost impossible to obtain a license to export nails today," he said. "The market is jammed with them, but because they have not been removed from a list prepared months ago, when they were scarce, OIT still is tough about an export license."

Both Mr. Janus and Mr. Jordan said such intermediary companies as theirs had been shut out completely from any business created by Marshall plan spending because of the Economic Cooperation Administration's policy of urging foreign governments to deal directly with American manufacturers and big brokerage houses.

Our Reparations Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at Potsdam we agreed on a reparation program whereby Germany would compensate our allies for the terrific destruction that she inflicted upon their industries by giving up a small portion of her factories. This program of reparations was not at all compensatory for the damage and destruction that Germany had committed, and it was so planned that it would not seriously hurt Germany's industrial program. Since that time we have heard many grunts, squeals, and protests, and the program of reparations has been successfully sabotaged.

In this connection, I wish to include a most interesting and illuminating article that appeared in the January publication of the Society for the Prevention of World War III. The article follows:

OUR REPARATIONS EXPERTS

The American people may well ask Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, ECA Administrator, why out of 147,000,000 people he chose Mr. George Humphrey of the Mark Hanna Co. and four other prominent industrialists to study the German reparations program. Just why these men are best qualified for the task is something which remains unanswered. We know of many individuals who are well acquainted with the economics of Germany, who could do a very good job and render a real service to the security and future well-being of our country. This does not mean, of course, that the 5 members who compose the Humphrey Committee are not good Americans, but is it not logical to assume that the tie-ups of their businesses with German industry reduce the possibilities of objectivity on their part?

Mr. George Humphrey, who is the chairman of the commission, is the president of the Mark Hanna Co., of Cleveland. The Mark Hanna Co. has very close connections with the heavy steel industry and the machine tool industry of the United States. It is also fair to assume that Mr. Humphrey would follow closely the reasoning of the United States Steel Co. Moreover, the Mark Hanna Co. is reportedly connected with the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey—I. G. Farben's old partner.

Another gentleman on this important committee is Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors. The history of General Motors' activities in Germany is indeed a book in itself. We do not intend to go into all of its ramifications, but as far back as 1945, when the Foreign Economic Administration was working on the problem of Germany, the man who fought most vigorously on behalf of the German industrialists was Graeme Howard, General Motors representative in Germany during the Hitler regime.

Most Americans are not aware of Howard's pro-German activities, but the FEA was, and it was only through constant pressure on the White House and the Army that Mr. Howard was finally relieved of his position. General Motors, however, has more than nine lives and immediately after the war, Howard's closest collaborator in Germany during the Nazi regime, Peter Hoagland, another General Motors executive, was sent to Germany ostensibly as an American military government official.

After the downfall of Germany, Hoagland joined company with General Draper of Dillon, Read & Co., Calvin Hoover, Don Humphrey, Maurice Scharff, and Clifford Strike to defeat Joint Concurrent Resolution 1067. This Government directive called for adequate economic controls over German industrial capacity. Hoagland and others had no use for it. The scheme to allow Germany a level of industry exceeding her peacetime requirements was credited to Peter Hoagland. Mr. Hoagland never ceased his activities on behalf of those who want to see the preservation of Germany's industrial preponderance regardless of its consequences.

Hoagland's activities are relevant to this article because he was an outstanding opponent of the original reparations program. He called it unrealistic. As early as July 1945, he came out flatly against the reparations program, alleging that Germany needed all her machine tools and steel capacity. Mr. Hoagland's spade work apparently has been paying dividends.

Incidentally, Hoagland's closest collaborator in those days was Clifford Strike, a top official of the McGraw Engineering Co. Strike, as deputy director of the Reparations Commission, did everything possible to undermine the Washington directives on reparations. After having performed a hatchet job on the reparations program in Germany, Strike's engineering outfit, together with some others, were paid $650,000 by the Department of the Army to go to Japan, where they emasculated the Japanese reparations program which had been previously agreed to by all members of the Far East Commission.

Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, may have been ignorant of Mr. Hoagland's activities, but this pro-German orientation of General Motors executives was not unusual. One of their former vice presidents, James D. Mooney, was an active collaborator of top Nazis before the war, including Goering and Schacht. Mooney was a close friend of Gerhardt Westrick, Hitler's chief spy in the United States, and it was Mooney who introduced Westrick to powerful business leaders upon his arrival here in 1940. Mooney left no stone unturned prior to Pearl Harbor to convince important groups and individuals in this country that the America First Committee had the right idea about Germany. He tried to prove to the American people that Hitler loved the United States and that he had no intention of attacking us. Mooney advocated these policies in a series of articles which he wrote for the Saturday Evening Post.

This is the record of some of the executives of General Motors. But General Motors has good reason to be interested in maintaining German power. Its interests in Germany are extensive. Way back in 1929, General Motors purchased the Auto Opel Works. The reported price of this huge automobile plant was $30,000,000 in cold cash. The Opel factories were supposed to produce Hitler's much advertised people's car. Actually very little of that kind of production was done. But the Opel Works was right up in front when it came to producing the tanks for the German rearmament program.

In 1941, General Motors reported the value of the Opel Works at $52,000,000. German rearmament was paying off. In addition to the Opel Works, General Motors is reported as controlling the following companies:

1. Frigidaire G. m. b. H.
2. Gemeinnuetzige Opel-Wohnbau G. m. b. H.
3. General Motors G. m. b. H.
4. Opel automobile Versicherungs AG.

However, it is not known, nor did General Motors state, how much these companies were worth.

It can be seen from these vast interests of General Motors that they would be opposed to any limitations of German industrial potential. The original level-of-industry plan of 1946, for instance, granted Germany an annual production of 40,000 cars and trucks to be produced by Ford and General Motors. Through such men as Peter Hoagland, General Motors was able to raise the quota of automobile production in Germany to 160,000 cars annually. General Motors' subsidiary got the right to manufacture 80,000 cars instead of 20,000.

To obtain this increase, the general level of industry in Germany has to be raised first. That is why, since the end of the war, General Motors has performed yeoman work to scuttle the level-of-industry plan of 1946, of which the reparations program was a part. One and a half years ago General Motors came out with sharp criticism against military interference with economic affairs in Germany. According to General Motors, the true function of the military occupation should be that of policing the occupied country. General Motors resented military interference in economic problems. It was at that time that General Motors also attacked the decartelization policies for Germany. The company pointed out that this cartel policy was faulty because it would affect the operations of its Opel Co., which was producing 53 percent of Germany's automobiles and trucks before the war.

In an effort to scuttle reparations and decartelization, the company made a strong appeal to the American taxpayers. They cited the Opel case wherein General Motors deducted no less than $35,000,000 from its taxes in 1941 to compensate for alleged war losses in Germany. Then the company announced that it was very anxious to help the American taxpayers, that it would be willing to pay its taxes for 1941 provided that it would be given a chance to recover its losses. Thus, decartelization and reparations would have to go by the board, so that General Motors could resume full operations. The result—Germany got a higher level of industry and the cartel policy was abolished.

Another very important member of the Commission is John L. McCaffrey, president of International Harvester Co. in Chicago. International Harvester also has a large subsidiary in Germany which produced a huge quantity of farm machinery for Germany in the prewar years. The total value of this subsidiary, as of 1941, was $15,000,000. Needless to say, it did not produce many plowshares during the war.

The fourth member of the Commission is Mr. Frederick V. Geier, who is a director of Procter & Gamble. It has been reported that Procter & Gamble in turn had an interest in the I. G. Farben-Standard Oil synthetic fat development. Thus, one might be justified in stating that Procter & Gamble would be concerned regarding the future of I. G. Farben.

The fifth member of this Commission is Mr. Price of the American electrical firm, Westinghouse. It has extensive cartel tieups with German concerns, particularly the electric trust.

This is a brief outline of the backgrounds of the men who were appointed to investigate the German reparations program. Could they be expected to be objective in their findings? We will let the reader form his own conclusions.

Praise for President Truman on Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, everyone applauds a man who keeps his word. President Truman has kept his campaign pledge on Israel and is entitled to unstinted praise for de jure recognition.

The loan and expressed determination that Israel's boundaries will not be changed without Israel's consent. Our national self-interest requires closest relations and ties with Israel. Future possibilities for trade are enormous.

Israel is the spark plug in the Near and Middle East machinery and will revitalize an area which civilization has too long passed by and forgotten.

The new State of Israel has succeeded in its election, held under trying conditions, in again proving its democratic maturity to the world. Arab women, for the first time in history voted. The democratic balloting was a gain for all democratic people everywhere. Happily here is another ally dedicated to the principle of political freedom.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very interesting letter sent by Eugene Bertram Willard to the editor of the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on January 31, 1949. I offer this letter to Members of Congress for study and consideration since I personally feel it is a very worthwhile suggestion:

ADVOCATES FEDERAL OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE FOR ELDERLY PEOPLE

EDITOR, CHELSEA RECORD:

Within recent weeks there was published a very interesting article relating to the rise and progress of old-age assistance in the Commonwealth with special reference to the work being done by the Chelsea Bureau of Old Age Assistance. It gave the people of the community a clearer understanding of OAA.

Of more than 750 OAA cases in the local case files less than 10 percent are entitled to Federal old-age and survivors insurance by having worked in covered employment prior to being placed on the old-age assistance rolls. Of course, there is a difference between Federal old-age and survivors insurance and OAA; the former is granted as a right whereas the applicant for OAA has to undergo a means test with all its embarrassing requirements. This is a very good reason why many elderly persons in actual need hesitate to ask for OAA which demands that an applicant be on the verge of actual pauperism before granting the small assistance allowed by the commonwealth and most of this assistance is made possible by taxes on racing, liquor, and other things a lot of elderly folks frown upon. When a man or woman retires from covered employment at age 65 he or she can have $50,000 in the bank and even a regular income and still be eligible for Federal old-age and survivors insurance. No case workers snoop around the homes of the beneficiaries as is the case with OAA.

Regardless of the fact that the Chelsea Bureau of Old-Age Assistance is staffed by kindly workers it still holds true that many old timers hesitate to ask for OAA because of the feeling in every community that there is a sort of stigma to receiving such aid. Only a habitual "souse" ever brags about being on OAA and as the Chelsea Record article already referred to pointed out, the records are kept confidential and even a nosy politician does not have access to the information locked in the files at city hall. However, we are not so sure that it is always possible to keep such information from the prying eyes and inquisitive minds of at least our so-called "big-shot pols." Politicians generally find a way to learn what they want to know.

We want to reemphasize what we have said before; namely, that this country needs a system of old-age pensions paid out of the Treasury at Washington. This would be what the old folks are entitled to and now that the country has billions for reclaiming the backward peoples of the universe and seemingly plenty of money to admit hordes of so-called DP's to grab up housing and jobs so badly needed by our own displaced Americans, granting funds for a national old-age pension should not be too much to expect. Charity begins at home, so they tell us, but we have little evidence of it in America today. Instead of weakening communism abroad, this country is making it stronger by spending billions abroad most of which probably falls into the hands of the Commies, anyway.

Underlying this whole issue of old age in America is the screwball idea that we must make Europe strong while making America weaker; of strengthening damnable communism at the expense of the needs of our own neglected Americans, especially those in life's sunset who are not wanted by industry any longer; so, why not a dignified national old-age pension in place of the meager OAA allowance made possible by racing and booze? Under a national old-age pension, when a Chelsean sits down at a restaurant table to enjoy a substantial meal, it will not be with the thought that he is helping support some old fogey with a meal tax. Let America put this aid to our aged fellow Americans on a dignified basis through a national old-age pension and if certain politicians still feel that aliens should have OAA, then these can be cared for by the present State system, which is good enough for these foreigners, but certainly not truly American enough for worthy American oldsters who helped to make this country the great and prosperous land it is today.

EUGENE BERTRAM WILLARD.

Red Reasoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, like the great majority of my colleagues, I say a hearty "Amen" to the recent tribute paid by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] to the president of the University of Washington for firing three professors who are purported to be members of the Communist Party. I join the gentleman from Louisiana in the hope that this action on the part of this great State university may be a beacon light upon the highways of this country to pursue further the intrigues and infiltration of communism into the universities of America.

This hope has been eloquently echoed in the Fredonia (Kans.) Daily Herald, whose editor, Ben S. Hudson, has a Statewide reputation for pungently reflecting the grass-roots viewpoint.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Hudson's comments so that my colleagues may have the privilege of reading them:

RED REASONING

Three professors of Washington State University have been dismissed due to Communist membership, or activity, within that party. The three have protested their dismissals as a grotesque infringement on "academic freedom and civil rights."

Now get those words, "freedom and rights."

In the first place, it is fundamental in communism that there shall be no academic freedom, and no civil rights, and no freedom of thought, or speech, or worship, or of the family, or the individual. The individual in communism is purely a creature of the state, a slave of its dictates, of its laws, forbidden to express an opinion, forbidden to say, or to act, in any way except according to what the Reds glibly speak of as the party line.

The party line is issued by a small group, more powerful in its actions than was Napoleon, or Nero, or Ivan the Terrible, or any ruler who has trod this globe in history. The members of this group eat the best, sleep the best, ride the best, dress the best, and enjoy every privilege except that of transgression from the line of thought prescribed by the group itself. To transgress is to invite instant liquidation.

Of its members the party makes mental and physical slaves. The party says that American democracy shall be destroyed, that America shall be governed, as well as the rest of the world by this small group of Slavic degenerates in Moscow.

Those who adhere to communism agree. They are directed and they agree to follow directions to use every means, every wile, every method to further the teachings of Lenin and Stalin in our schools, among our people, that freedom, as we know it, shall be destroyed from the face of the earth.

When a professor admits he is a Communist, do you think he should be discharged, or given a raise in salary?

Washington University action was not taken without long investigation. The proofs were conclusive, there was no defense by the three, nor was any offered except that denying a man the right to exploit the teachings of a foreign power that would destroy all of us, is an infringement on academic freedom and civil rights.

And the university in Washington is not the only institution of learning in which there is a tinge of communism. We Kansans might start sniffing the odor here at home.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the New York Post of Monday, January 31, 1949, is indicative of the fact that there is much that this country must do in every nook and cranny thereof to improve our democratic way of life:

AMERICANS ALL

(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

I am an American citizen belonging to one of the great majority groups. If I really believe in the equality of all men before God and that the real worth of a man is not determined by color or speech or religion but by his character and actions, I should express my faith by practicing it.

Years ago I knew a preacher who was eloquent and dramatic in describing the streets of the New Jerusalem and the perfections of heaven, but he never got down to the streets and imperfections of his own community. But there is compensation and great delight in demonstrating equal rights at home and in your own office where you have direct responsibility. I know.

Here is an example in kind: Paul Genge, a 35-year-old Air Force veteran, was making a hurried search for an apartment. His wife, Jeanne, was expecting their first child, and then he found a house, only to lose it—a modern $65-a-month dwelling in an 8,000-unit veterans' project near Hempstead, Long Island.

Why? Because he discovered in the lease "an attempt to prohibit the use of the premises by any persons other than members of the Caucasian race." Paul Genge believes that the clause is illegal, but in the meantime, even in dire necessity, he refused to enter an open door that was slammed in the face of his buddy, who is of another color and racial strain. It should be noted that this incident occurred not in the South but in the North. Always it is easier to produce piety and virtue for export than for home consumption.

Catholics and UN Palestine Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in America, national Catholic weekly, entitled "Catholics and UN Palestine Relief":

CATHOLICS AND UN PALESTINE RELIEF

Winter has come to Palestine, but very little aid to the 550,000 Arab refugees from the Israeli-Arab battlegrounds. As long ago as November 19, 1948, the UN General Assembly recommended that $29,500,000 be spent for their relief from December 1, 1948, to August 31, 1949, and that an additional $2,500,000 be allocated for administration and local operational expenses.

With commendable promptness, President Truman announced on December 7, 1948, that he would ask Congress for $16,000,000 "in the earnest hope that other countries will meet the remainder of the total required." The British have promised $5,000,000. The President's recommendation is now being considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Voluntary agencies, principally Catholic, Quaker, and Lutheran, are meanwhile bearing the brunt of the burden of feeding, clothing, and resettling the refugees. His Holiness Pope Pius XII has sent hundreds of thousands of dollars. United States Catholics have sent other hundreds of thousands to support the relief work of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association and War Relief Services-NCWC. A Belgian Catholic mission has been providing 6,000 meals a day.

But the most valuable Catholic contribution has been the devoted service of more than 2,000 priests, brothers, sisters, and lay workers. A first-hand account of their heroic charity has just reached this country from Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, United States national secretary of the CNEWA, who has been surveying the refugee situation for the past 2 months. Reports Monsignor McMahon through the NC News Service January 24, 1949:

"Since the program of the UN has not yet been completely organized, the hundreds of religious institutions packed with refugees and the thousands of priests and sisters who

serve them must continue our own program of feeding and clothing and sheltering all who come to us in their misery, without question as to their religion * * * With the money made available by the American bishops, I have been able to bring relief to whole groups of refugees who hitherto had been entirely neglected * * * Even the mission funds given during the past year by American Catholics for these Near East missions have been enlisted in this campaign of mercy, for the religious who needed them so badly have impoverished and deprived themselves in order to help these poor people.

The vision of those priests and religious using their precious mission funds for the refugees and serving them gratis, regardless of their race or religion, raises an interesting question. On December 9, 1948 Stanton Griffis, United States Ambassador to Egypt and head of the UN relief for Palestine, announced that he had made arrangements for distribution of supplies on the spot through four international organizations, the Friends Society, the League of Red Cross Societies, the Council of the International Red Cross, and the Children's Fund, to avoid the necessity of establishing his own machinery.

Our question: Will the same four organizations be given exclusive control of the $16,000,000 which our Congress may confidently be expected to appropriate?

Will the Congress be content to have one-sixth of its appropriation drained off for administrative and local operational expenses?

There is an international organization very much on the spot—the charitable arm of the Catholic Church, which would use any share of funds directly allotted to it entirely for the refugees, and none for salaries and other administrative and operational expenses. It might be good business for the Congress to look into the matter before turning over the taxpayers' money to the UN with no strings attached.

A Plea for Tenants—Concerning Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, why does this ever-expanding all-powerful Central Government propose to extend rent-control laws for an additional 27 months? That is a longer period than ever proposed in wartime. Rent control was a wartime measure. We are in the fifth year of peace. Yet Government proposes to extend rent controls even further than last year. Is that because the shortage of rental housing is growing worse under rent control? We are reminded that price control did make beef and butter scarce and that black markets flourished. There must be a compelling reason in logic and morals, or else the representatives of the American people cannot support these proposals for rent control even to benefit tenants any more than they could extend OPA in 1947 to benefit consumers.

It has been alleged that Congress favors the tenants because there are more tenants than home owners. This accusation is very questionable on two counts: First, it implies that Members of Congress put partisan politics and exploitation of owners of private property in favor of tenants above personal honor and the welfare of the country. Our method of representative government has not degenerated into a fraud upon one group in favor of another; secondly, even if a Congressman were inclined to favor either the tenants or the home owners for political reasons, he would have to flip a coin to make his decision. This is because, contrary to belief, the number of home owners and tenants in America is almost equally divided. Thus, Congressmen are free from the temptation of any political expediency.

The very first question is—what causes the present shortage of rental properties? If the cause can be abolished, the present shortage of apartments and houses for rent will cease.

A survey made in 1947 by the Bureau of Census covered the rental situation in 34 of our large metropolitan districts. First, the number of dwelling units occupied by tenants in 1940 was determined. Then the same procedure was used for 1947. The resulting comparison is almost unbelievable. In every case total housing units had increased, but the total number of dwelling units for rent had steadily declined in spite of an unprecedented demand for rentals. The most thought-provoking picture was found in the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area. During this same period, there was a 15-percent decrease in population in that section. Yet the shortage of dwelling units for rent in the Scranton-Wilkes Barre area seems to be generally as acute as in most of the other metropolitan districts surveyed by the Bureau of Census. Thus there must be a truly vicious conspiracy in operation where, in spite of an increase in total dwelling units, there is a decrease in dwellings for rent in a city where the population is substantially decreasing, and where the demand for rentals is now greater than ever. Clearly, there is no housing shortage in the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area. Likewise, there is no real shortage anywhere. What we have is an artificial, bad Government-created housing-for-rent shortage in this country. The proof of this is most dramatically illustrated by comparing the real-estate advertisements found in our newspapers in 1940 and 1948. There was a surplus of housing in 1940. Vacancies ran about 7 percent. There was an alleged shortage in 1948. Thus one would expect to find many for-sale advertisements in 1940, and practically none in 1948. Here are the facts: In August 1940, the New York Times carried 6,322 advertisements of houses, apartments, and apartment houses for sale in its classified section; in August 1948, it carried 23,036. The Chicago Tribune went up from 11,303 to 32,045 in the same period. The Los Angeles Times showed an increase from 18,930 to 78,925. This fantastic increase in houses, apartment, and apartment buildings for sale was found in the Pittsburgh Press, the Atlanta Journal, the Cleveland Press, the San Francisco Examiner, the Baltimore Sun, and almost any other newspaper that you may wish to consult.

Now how can there be a housing shortage when a person has hundreds of thousands of desirable dwellings to choose from? They are not offered to him. They are literally thrown on the market at low prices compared to costs. Can it truthfully be claimed that there is a housing shortage when there are more houses, according to the census, than ever before; when the newspapers are doing a land-office business in selling houses but not in renting them?

No; there is no shortage of houses—only a shortage of dwellings for rent. The dwelling units that were formerly found in the for-rent columns are now found in the for-sale columns. That is not because people want to sell but they are forced to sell rather than rent for less than costs. In other words, they are being liquidated—American style.

What evil act or law is driving the landowners to dump their property? Why do people want to sell and become renters themselves? What makes home owners want to sell at a sacrifice instead of rent below cost? What diabolical conspiracy in restraint of trade is forcing persons to buy homes when they much prefer to rent them? Is it the evil inherent in free men, their selfishness and greed, or is it the obvious and inevitable result that comes from all Government schemes of price controls?

The Bureau of Census furnishes more evidence of the cause of this shortage in rental units. In April 1940 the Federal census showed that 7 percent of all urban housing units were vacant. Additional units were vacated by persons going into service. In November 1945 the United States Census again surveyed the field. For all practical purposes, there were no vacancies in rental properties. It showed a 30-percent increase in the number of dwelling units occupied by only one person. Prior to 1940 they were occupied by two persons or more. There was a 22-percent increase in the number of units occupied by two persons. Prior to 1940 they were occupied by three or more occupants. At the same time, the dwelling units occupied by seven, six, and five persons rapidly decreased. In other words, tenants in all categories were spreading out and using much more room than ever before. Under rent control, if the husband or wife dies, the survivor stays on. If children marry or leave home for school or work, parents stay in possession of the unneeded and unused space vacated by them. Space is cheap. Those outside get no vacancies that would have normally appeared in a free economy. Besides, nobody can move because all space is artificially frozen, making no vacancies possible. The October 1 moving date for all manner of adjustments to needs and pocketbook is prohibited by law.

Now, why is this so? Why are people being forced to buy houses when they prefer to rent them? Why are tenants complaining about a shortage of rental space even while they are now occupying more space per person than they have ever occupied before?

One would ordinarily expect to find persons in these times buying less rental space instead of more—when the value

of the dollar has dropped to about 50 cents. This drop in the purchasing power of the dollar holds true for all goods and services except one. This one major exception is dwelling units under rent control. There our present inflated dollar is still worth almost its prewar value to the tenants. Thus, rental properties under rent control are the best bargains in America today for persons who wish to rent instead of to buy or to build. Since most people know a good bargain when they see one, this demand for rental space at about half its real value has increased abnormally. It is still increasing.

That is the reason why tenants are spreading out and demanding more space per person than ever before. That is the reason why the number of apartments occupied by one or two persons has increased so rapidly. That is the reason why the number of rental houses occupied by six or seven persons has decreased. That is the reason why home owners had rather sell their homes than to rent them. That is the reason why there is a shortage of units for rent. That is the reason why people must purchase houses that they would rather rent. Thus it can be accurately stated that rent control itself is the sole reason why prospective tenants cannot find apartments and houses for rent. And the longer that this restriction on freedom—rent control—is continued, the worse this shortage will become.

Now it is claimed that most tenants would not be able to pay the increased rents that would result if we returned to freedom. It is charged that there would be mass evictions and millions of homeless people. These are utterly false and irresponsible statements for this reason. In the first place it is obvious that homeowners could not charge more than the tenants could afford to pay. More than they might wish to pay—yes—but not more than they could pay. If the homeowners tried it, their rental units would be vacant. Does anyone claim that homeowners would deliberately keep their rentals vacant in a free market? Did they do it before rent controls? The price for free-market rent will always automatically be within the means of the tenants. It is admitted that legal rents on most dwellings now under Government price controls would rise if Congress returned control of these buildings to the homeowners. But it is doubtful that rents would rise as much as prices have increased for food, clothing, fuel, and all the other necessary goods and services that are referred to as essential for living. Since the space is available if made available for rent our experience should be better than that after removing OPA from food. OPA had created a serious actual shortage of food that kept prices high until a free market produced more.

It is further admitted that the abolition of special privileges in housing would inconvenience many persons who are now occupying apartments that are underpriced by Government decree. Many of these tenants might find it necessary to seek smaller and lower-priced quarters. Many of the persons who now live alone might find it necessary to share their apartments—or to give up the apartments for rooms—in order to pay the increased rents. The trend toward expansion under controlled rents would stop. As a result, the persons who could afford only $40 quarters would move there instead of staying in their present $65 quarters that they are appropriating for $40. The persons who could afford the more desirable—and higher priced—locations would then move into them.

Is there anything unjust or un-American in this arrangement? Is this not the same principle of freedom that we follow in determining all other human wants and desires? If housing is not to be distributed in the same manner as food, clothing, and cigarettes, how is it to be distributed according to peoples' needs? By special privilege and political favoritism? Does anyone dare call that method American?

Now let us see how a return to freedom—the abolition of political special privileges and discrimination—will increase rental space and end the present alleged housing shortage. First of all, for every tenant who may find it financially necessary to double up under private control of housing, an extra rental unit will thereby become available for another tenant who is now seeking such a place. This will automatically result in housing for more tenants. In addition, many of the dwelling units now for sale will return to the rental market. There will be far more dwellings for rent—and far more tenants—under private control than under Government control. Can this result accurately be called bad for tenants as a whole?

Conversely, if Government control of housing continues to increase, this present demand for rental units at a price below their true value will multiply. The shortage will increase because tenants can afford to buy more space at this bargain rate. In fact, many present homeowners will sell their homes and try to become tenants at the bargain prices arbitrarily set by Government. They have stopped building for rent. Tenants in presently free-market-rental properties will soon insist that in all fairness Government should also reduce their comparatively high rents. And indeed if it is fair for the one group of tenants, why is it not also fair for the other group of tenants? As all Congressmen know, that question is being asked by an increasing number of persons. So far, a satisfactory answer has not been advanced.

Because of rent controls, prospective tenants are no longer free to get an apartment that they want at a price that they are able and willing to pay. They are out of luck unless they can find a dead tenant.

Rent control stops tenants from advancing to new jobs in other cities. If you doubt this, read the apartment-for-exchange columns in the New York Times or any other metropolitan newspaper. Many thousands of tenants wish to move to new locations for various reasons. The reason may be a new and better job. It may be a desire for larger quarters or a change in scenery or new neighbors or any other good and valid reason. But unfortunately for the tenants, they are caught in the trap of rent controls. They are well aware that they cannot hope to duplicate their Government rents in a free market. So they advertise in a pitiful—and usually unsuccessful—effort to find someone else under Government control who also wishes to move. Then the Government-controlled tenants usually forget the new job, the larger quarters, and the better opportunities. They remain rooted in their Government-controlled dwellings to continue their bitter arguments with the homeowners about needed painting, repairs, and services. Does any Congressman honestly believe that a continuation of this situation is in the best interests of the tenants? Does any Congressman dare use the word "American" to describe this degrading favoritism?

Probably the most unfortunate result of rent control is the resulting discrimination against would-be tenants with children. Now there have always been apartments reserved for persons without children. This is because the tenants themselves demand it. But before rent controls were imposed upon the home owners and the tenants, there were always plenty of desirable rentals available for persons with children, any number of children. The home owners provided facilities for children and made them welcome. Under freedom, most home owners with dwellings for rent had to do this in order to keep their buildings occupied. But all of this changed when the Government moved in. Under Government-imposed rents, the single persons and the childless couples had an advantage in bargaining for the space usually reserved for families. And usually they took advantage of the opportunity. Similarly, the home owners felt that they could make up a part of their lost rent by decreasing the number of occupants per unit. They felt obliged to try to balance their increased fuel, service, and repair bills by avoiding the increased fuel, service, depreciation, and repair bills that come with children. And as the Government tightens its control over the price of rent, this discrimination against children will increase. Thus the persons who own property for rent—and 80 percent of all rents collected go to home owners whose incomes are less than $5,000 a year—use one of the few legal methods left to them whereby they can attempt to balance their depressed rental incomes against their inflated costs.

Now, Congress can condemn the home owners and the tenants by passing another law against them. This law could take the form of the recent French decree that forbids each person from occupying more than the Government-decreed amount of rental space. Or Congress might decree that hereafter no person may sell a dwelling unit above 60 percent of value. That would make more rental units by making the loss on sales about the same as the loss on rentals. Does any sane American advocate that solution? The only permanent solution to this desperate situation is for Congress to reject these rent-control

laws that are directly responsible for denying many of our citizens the freedom and responsibility to which they are entitled. A return to freedom would mean that rental space, prices, number of occupants, location, and services would, in a matter of weeks, adjust themselves to the relative needs, desires, and abilities of all concerned. This is the American way. It can work only to the extent that the Government leaves the people free to handle their own problems as responsible persons.

It is noted that this proposed rent-control measure has a time limit of 27 months. As was to be expected by any student of the history of rent control in other countries, this time limit is longer than the limits set in the previous extensions. And it can be safely predicted that the next extension will have a still longer time limit. The same thing happened in England, France, Austria, Germany and all other countries that tried rent control. They too kept temporary rent controls after World War I for exactly the same reasons that we have kept rent controls after World War II. They too extended those measures temporarily from time to time. They too once removed rent controls from new construction in order to induce persons to build new dwellings for rent. Finally the clamor of the tenants in those newer and higher-priced units caused the governments to bring them also under government control—temporarily, of course. Next the word temporary was dropped forever from the rent-control laws. Now those tenants are necessarily forced to remain permanently in their rapidly deteriorating government-controlled dwelling units. Those are the lucky tenants who have apartments. The would-be tenants cannot find a vacant house for rent at a legal price. There just are not any. Yet, both the tenants and the would-be tenants in all European countries look to their governments to remedy this situation through more government controls. They are unable to grasp the hard fact that the rent-control laws imposed on them by their governments are solely responsible for reducing their housing to its present low and shoddy level. In spite of the destruction that rent control has brought to housing in these European countries, the tenants and the government officials still seem to believe in the myth that government rent controls were and are in the best interest of the tenants.

We Americans are following this same path. So far, we have not deviated in any respect from the European pattern of government-controlled housing after World War I. It is as though we had taken their blueprint for the destruction of housing and decided to follow it line by line. This present proposed extension of rent controls in America is in exact agreement with the old European timetable. The proposal to bring certain presently uncontrolled housing back under Government control fits the pattern perfectly. The reasons offered are the same. The time and extent are identical. And the inevitable results cannot vary in any respect. We too are approaching the place where the greatest fear is freedom.

Yes, each Congressman is morally and legally obligated to vote his honest convictions on this rent-control measure. If any Congressman sincerely believes that Government control of housing is in the best interests of the tenants and the home owners, then indeed he is justified in voting for a continuation of rent controls. But if he believes that Government control of housing is contrary to freedom, to justice, to progress, and to the best interests of the American people, including tenants, then he must summarily reject this monstrous evil of rent control while it is still possible; before it grows into a vested interest that will forever defeat a return to freedom.

An Appeal to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an appeal addressed to the President of the United States, by the Society for the Prevention of World War III. This article appeared in the January publication of this organization, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

For the past 4 years a clique of willful men has betrayed our hopes for peace and security. With cunning and deceit they thwarted your efforts to create stability in a war-torn world. They are brimming over with solicitude and love for Germany and the Nazi industrialists. They want no real peace, but a weak and helpless Europe in vassalage to a powerful Germany. Their profession of loyalty to you is a smoke screen, hiding this conspiracy.

They have constantly reassured you that all was well in Germany. They have tried to impress you with the urgency of a "Germany first" policy, as though this were the key to a lasting peace. Their efforts will result in separating you and the American people from our wartime friends—the victims of German aggression. The bitter fruits of their plans are becoming more evident every day.

Mr. President, there is no peace. Our wartime friendships are being squandered. America is being accused of consorting with the former enemy at the expense of her victims.

Building up Germany has been imposed on the American people as an obligation, while the Germans are permitted to sabotage and hoard their coal and food production. Germany is rising again—like the monster of Frankenstein—and is already outproducing her neighbors.

This was never your program. This was not the American people's program. This is the German program fo ra quick come-back to dominate Europe again—as advocated in the Halls of Congress and by some key officials.

The Eightieth Congress was a sounding board for some of these gentlemen. They distorted the facts about the real situation in Germany. They vied with each other in their indecent bidding for the friendship (sic) of the former enemy. But they were not alone. They received their support and inspiration from high Government officials who pretend that they carry out your program.

Mr. President, how long will you permit these same men and same ideas, which gave German militarism new life after World War I, to gamble once more with the security of our people? How long will you permit these men to undermine your policies worked out at Potsdam? You have publicly declared your opposition to the German cartels, but those cartels are thriving under the protection of these willful men; they made a farce out of denazification and the war crimes trials; they put back into power Germany's industrial war lords and Hitler supporters; they protect Germany's industrial war potential; they sabotage the reparations program so essential to European recovery. These are some of the death-breeding facts which the Germany-Firsters conceal from you and the American people. They fear exposure lest their nefarious activities be terminated once and for all.

Some months ago you stated that you would rather have peace than be President. The people answered your courageous challenge at the polls. You now have the grand opportunity to put an end to the betrayal of the peace and to reestablish the prestige and influence of our country throughout the world. We were the arsenal of democracy against the aggressive designs of German militarism. We must now be the spearhead for peace and security.

Mr. President, house cleaning is the order of the day. We call upon you to remove from positions of influence all individuals who have had business or sentimental ties with the former enemy. Our policy on Germany can only be carried out successfully by objective and realistic Americans, faithful to the principles for which we fought.

We call upon you to request that the Eighty-first Congress cooperate in a full dress reexamination of our German policy. This would herald the rebirth of the principles which guided Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his fight against war and tyranny.

By launching such a crusade to revitalize your original program for Germany, you, Mr. President, will have earned the gratitude of all simple folk who yearn for a just and lasting peace.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III.

Publicity Concerning Certain Phases of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address I delivered before the Economic Club of Detroit on Monday, January 31, 1949, on what I regard as a very important subject concerning the publication of certain information pertaining to atomic energy. There has been some misrepresentation—I am sure not purposeful—of the position that I have taken in this address, and I think it would be well if it were printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can think of no better place than before this thoughtful audience to discuss a problem which has weighed heavily on my mind for many months. This problem, I believe, may well cause the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy more anxious concern than any other. I cannot suggest an answer to the problem, for I have not yet arrived at a conclusion myself. I only know that the issue is tremendously important both from the viewpoint of democratic government and from the viewpoint of national defense.

I refer to the question of whether or not the American people and the world should be told how many atomic bombs and atomic weapons we possess and how fast we are producing them.

Make no mistake. I am not talking about the design of an atomic bomb or the way it is made or how it works. No patriotic American would so much as dream of permitting that information to be made public.

By the same token, no patriotic American would so much as dream of permitting the exact design of a B–36 very heavy bomber to be made public. But the number of B–36's we are building today has, in fact, been disclosed in the newspapers.

Those of you who are familiar with my record as a Senator know that I believe we live in an era of danger—an era in which national safety yields precedence to no other consideration. The act which I had the honor of sponsoring for the domestic control of atomic energy subjects our entire policy in this field "to the paramount objective of securing the common defense and security."

Perhaps our military needs absolutely dictate that atomic production figures be kept secret.

But if such is the case—as it may be—we are taking a calculated risk. We are risking the tested, traditional principles of free and constitutional government. In my opinion, we must be sure that the risk really is calculated, that we take the risk with our eyes open.

The Constitution of the United States vests in Congress the power to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. In other words, it is the solemn duty and responsibility of the people's congressional representatives to arrange for our military security.

But in the case of atomic energy, Congress has purchased a defense package sight unseen. Congress has only a most general idea of what the atomic package contains.

This package may be equivalent to a huge army or a huge navy; or it may be equivalent only to a small army or a small navy. Congress, whose constitutional business it is to raise armies and navies, does not know which. So far as atomic energy is concerned, Congress simply lacks sufficient knowledge upon which to discharge its own constitutional duties.

Do we possess 5 bombs, or 50 bombs, or 500 bombs? Are we strong or weak in the field of atomic weapons? Only the Atomic Energy Commissioners, high-ranking military men, and a few others know the correct answer to these vital questions. Though I have been a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception, and though I have just been elected its chairman, I do not myself know how many bombs we possess or how rapidly we are making new ones.

The American people, who elect and ultimately control Congress, have entered the atomic energy business. They have invested more than three thousand million dollars on atomic weapons. What returns are the American people receiving from this huge defense investment? What have the gigantic plants at Hanford and Oak Ridge accomplished? The American people do not know, and the Congress does not know.

Here is an extraordinary state of affairs.

Of course, I hardly need say that the split atom is itself extraordinary—so extraordinary as perhaps to justify the iron veil of secrecy which covers production figures. But let me mention several more of the paradoxes which this secrecy creates in our democratic society.

The 1949 defense budget calls for the expenditure of $15,600,000,000 on the armed forces. It may be that even this staggering sum is too small. I favor spending whatever amount is necessary to bring reasonable security.

But regardless of the sum decided upon, can we accept it on blind faith? How can Congress and the American people judge American defense needs unless they know the size of our atomic stock pile? Perhaps, if that stock pile is large, we do not need to spend as much as we had supposed. On the other hand, if that stock pile is small, we may need to spend more than we had supposed.

Today we are like a general who must train his troops without knowing how many rounds of ammunition they will be issued.

When we debate the necessity of a 65,000-ton aircraft carrier or a 70-group air force, or universal military training, I fear that we quite literally do not know what we are talking about. We do not know how many atomic weapons we possess, and therefore, I fear that we lack perspective to pass upon any major defense issue.

Consider, too, the question of taxes. It may be that we must raise additional taxes in order to provide the funds needed for our Army, Navy, and Air Force. But this step might not impress us as necessary if we knew for a fact that we are strong in atomic weapons. Do we dare either raise taxes or leave them where they stand—without knowledge of the atomic production figures upon which these decisions may hinge?

The problem of reconciling democratic government with the secrecy which covers bomb production comes to a head in the joint committee of which I am chairman. The law of the land requires this committee to make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The law of the land further states that the Atomic Energy Commission "shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities."

We all know that the Commission devotes itself, in large measure, to making weapons. If weapons is the heart of its activity, how can the Senators and Representatives on my committee decide whether the Commission is doing a good job—unless they know how many weapons have actually been produced? How can my committee serve as the eyes and ears of Congress and the American people, as the law intends, so long as atomic production data are kept hidden?

How can the public decide whether I am doing a good job in helping to keep tabs on the Commission—unless they know the number of atomic weapons being manufactured? How can the Commissioners themselves, able and patriotic as I believe them to be, reach sound decisions without the benefit of advice, comment, and criticism from the public? And how can the public praise or condemn without knowing the key production facts on which to base a judgment?

Consider still another aspect of the existing secrecy. We have gone before the United Nations and earnestly proposed an effective plan for the international control of atomic energy. Our diplomats ask that every country yield sufficient sovereignty so that one and all may be safe from the awful threat of surprise atomic attack. We hold that the alternative to atomic peace may be annihilation.

But how can we expect mankind to believe us unless all the world knows that atomic weapons are capable of being produced in quantity? Perhaps the world thinks that we only possess a handful of bombs. Perhaps the world thinks that if we only possess a few bombs, no other country could make more than a few bombs. Perhaps the world concludes that the peril may not be so great after all.

Are we not obligated to tell mankind just what this elemental force means—in terms of production facts and figures?

Then, too, you and I are naturally curious to know whether we and our children live in mortal danger from atomic weapons. If, with our tremendous project, we only produce the merest trickle of bombs, we might reasonably hope and expect that no other country could produce a greater number. But if our output is large, then we must fear that the output of other countries may also become large some day. How can we begin to estimate the potential capacity of foreign powers unless we know our own capacity?

It is interesting to note that concealment of atomic production rates is secrecy of a scope which has never been attempted before during peacetime in the United States.

The most valuable type of secret is the fact that a weapon exists at all. If a potential enemy does not even suspect that a certain weapon has come into being, he may never try to make a like weapon himself. But we have already lost this kind of secret as regards the atomic bomb. The entire world knows that the bomb does exist.

A less valuable class of secret is the specifications and the exact design of a weapon. Of course, as regards the specifications and exact design of the atomic bomb, I need not repeat that we must unquestionably preserve the most complete and absolute secrecy.

But the number of bombs we possess is not even distantly connected with the accepted and time-honored secret categories. Concealment of production figures extends secrecy over a vast and unprecedented area.

Jim Parker's industrial advisory committee was asked to write a report on business and the atom. His committee faced the problem of disclosure as it affects a democratic economic system. After a year of hard thinking the industrial advisory committee came out with the conclusion that more information should be revealed.

I am raising the problem of disclosure as it affects a democratic political system. I have not yet formed an opinion, as I say, whether this problem should be answered in the same way as Jim Parker's group answered a somewhat similar problem.

But if the Industrial Advisory Committee felt that businessmen have been denied the knowledge necessary to encourage their entry into the atomic-energy field, consider how the poor Congressmen feel. How can Congressmen who lack essential information make wise decisions regarding defense and taxes and foreign policy?

But so far, I have only tried to present a few thoughts on one side of the case. Do not think for a moment that the opposite side of the case is weak.

If bomb production data were made public, for instance, other nations would gain a clearer idea of the money, men, and resources which they must pour into their own atomic projects in order to rival our American progress.

If the world knew how many bombs we possess, the world would also gain valuable insight into our over-all military strength, our potentialities, and capabilities. Likewise, if the catastrophe of another war should ever overtake us, the enemy would know about how much atomic punishment to anticipate from us. A known quantity,

no matter how terrible, would be psychologically and militarily easier for the enemy to face than an unknown quantity.

It could be argued that until and unless a bomb stock pile of such prodigious proportions is achieved as to be capable of destroying every resource of any possible opponent, no divulgement should be made. Persons holding this view might claim that divulgement of any lesser number would encourage a state bent on aggression.

But there is an opposing possibility to be considered. Perhaps our rivals underestimate the destructive power of the atomic weapons we possess. Perhaps they will miscalculate and precipitate a disastrous war, believing us to be weak in the atomic-energy field, when actually we are strong. Perhaps if we disclosed the facts, we would prevent a disastrous war started because of the aggressor's mistaken estimate as to our atomic status.

I might add that we publicly debated the wisdom of a 70-group air force—data of great value to foreign powers. The world knows that we possess around 20 aircraft carriers ready for active service and that about 1,400,000 Americans serve in our armed forces. The world knows that we plan building a new 65,000-ton carrier and that we expect to own about 90 B–36's by the end of 1950. All this information has great value to foreign powers.

But neither the world nor the American people knows how many atomic weapons we possess.

Of course, you may say, "The Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy should be informed of production data, but the information should not be circulated outside this committee." If you made such an argument, I might reply as follows:

True, the joint committee is indisputably entitled to know bomb figures under the law. But how would it materially help the committee members to have the information unless they could use it in reporting to Congress as a whole and to the people?

If the information means that we need smaller armed forces or bigger armed forces; if the information means that we can afford to leave taxes as they are or that we must raise taxes; if the information means any of these things, could Congress as a whole and could the American people rely solely on the judgment of the few committee members entrusted with production figures?

Take the two distinguished Senators from your own State of Michigan as an example. Senator VANDENBERG is a member of the joint committee; Senator FERGUSON is not a member. Do you think that Senator FERGUSON would be justified in voting to raise or lower taxes, to increase or decrease the size of our armed forces, or to censure or praise the Atomic Energy Commission—do you think that Senator FERGUSON would be justified in doing these things purely on the say-so of Senator VANDENBERG, who is a member of the joint committee? Would not Senator FERGUSON be obligated to arrive at an independent judgment of his own? If so, how could he arrive at such a judgment unless he also knew atomic production data?

Furthermore, if we assume that this information must be kept a supreme secret, should even the 18 members of the joint committee ask to be told? I am proud to say that, to date, there never has been a security leak from the committee. But obviously the chance that production figures would become publicly known increases with each additional individual who is given the facts.

This much we do know—the question propounded here goes to the very heart of our democratic system of government. It goes to the very heart of national defense and to the future security and existence of the United States.

There is a natural inclination in all of us, in Congress as well as out, to shy away from the implications of this problem. No individual willingly assumes the responsibility which it entails. But no matter how awesome the responsibility, we are not justified in evading it.

The experience of a century and a half has demonstrated that our system of free government functions best when the maximum degree of information is made available to our people. In fact, free and candid discussion of vexing problems is the bedrock of democracy and it may be our surest safeguard for peace.

At least, we know that the question will never be solved by ignoring it. If a policy of drift and evasion brings the world to the brink of ultimate disaster, we should condemn such a policy as reckless folly and the American people may rightly hold responsible its representatives in Congress for neglect of a fundamental duty.

I can only end this discussion at the place it began—by saying that I have not yet arrived at a conclusion in my own mind. In the final analysis, the American Congress and the American people will settle the issue. May they decide wisely and well. They could hardly face a more momentous decision.

Olympic National Park and Olympic National Forest, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two related impartial reports I made recently to the citizens of the State of Washington on the Olympic National Park and the Olympic National Forest. Because a resolution is pending before the Congress in connection with the park, I think Members of the Congress will be interested in these studies of the Nation's most magnificent wilderness area.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT RAIN FORESTS OF WASHINGTON STATE

One of the great natural wonders of the world and the Nation's most spectacular wilderness empire—located in Washington State—will receive attention in the National Congress this year.

This natural wonder of unspoiled primeval wilderness is the Olympic National Park.

It is probably the most magnificent forest of its kind in the world.

There are many persons, even in Washington State, who do not realize the magnitude of this forest park, or know that, with the exception of the trees on the Olympic Peninsula, virgin timber in such large quantities has almost disappeared in the United States.

The Olympic National Park's outstanding features consist of a unique mountain mass of rugged, snow-capped peaks and ridges, with many glaciers and trout-filled streams, as well as a vast expanse of meadows, small azure lakes, alpine forests, and many types of wildlife.

Among the wildlife found on the Olympic Peninsula, inside this national park, are herds of Olympic or Roosevelt elk, native to that area only.

Most important of all is the unusual forest of big trees, likewise native to the Pacific Northwest, especially Douglas fir, red cedar, Sitka spruce and hemlock, western white pine, and white fir.

Many persons are confused by the two separate and distinct Government-owned areas on the Olympic Peninsula.

The Olympic National Park itself is roughly surrounded by the Olympic National Forest.

The forest and park are separate and distinct as to administration.

The national forest is governed by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

The national park is run by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

The colossal forests on the Olympic Peninsula have no counterpart anywhere in the world. There are trees 300 feet in height, and 10 feet or more in diameter. There you will find the tallest evergreens anywhere on earth. Some of the trees were there at the time Jesus Christ was born.

A single tree on the Olympic Peninsula often contains 40,000 board feet of lumber—about the same amount of lumber cut from 3 acres of so-called forests in the Eastern States.

The Olympic National Park comprises more than 848,000 acres, of which more than 700,000 acres are in forest. There is enough commercial timber in the park to build 2,000,000 two-bedroom homes.

The Olympic National Forest contains 705,000 acres, and together the Olympic National Park and Forest total more than a million and a half acres, or 2,440 square miles, in our State of Washington.

This forest-park is twice the size of the entire State of Rhode Island.

Although this is a large amount of land in the evergreen State, Washingtonians must remember that this forest-park belongs to all the people of the Nation, not just to us, even though it seems to me that we should have a more natural particular interest and say so in matters affecting this area than do others in the Nation.

The Congress is being called upon to adopt a resolution to appoint a committee of Senators and Congressmen to determine whether or not part of the forests in the national park should be transferred to the jurisdiction of the national forest.

For many years this has been the subject of a controversy because nothing can be touched in the national park, whereas in a national forest the Department of Agriculture can allow its timber to be cut under a highly selective logging program.

In any event, land in the Olympic National Park, or Forest, would remain the property of the United States Government. The question is whether some of the forest locked up in the park can be cut and sold, the money going to the National Treasury and county governments, and the timber cut into the construction of homes and industry.

I myself, as a Senator, take no stand on the matter except that the controversy should be settled by a Nation-wide board of representatives of the people—because the citizens of the entire Nation own the area. In another weekly report I hope to give both sides of the argument in a nonpartisan manner.

The chief economic values of the Olympic Forest are its enormous stand of commercial saw timber and its timber-growing possibilities.

The standing timber of commercial size in the forest alone is estimated to be around 25,000,000,000 board feet, or close to 10 percent of all the commercial timber in the State. Even more timber is untouched in the Olympic Park.

Nature has taken advantage of the temperate climate in the lower valleys of this forest to create what are known as the rain forests of Washington State. There is nothing else like it anywhere on the face of the earth.

Rain falls almost entirely during the winter months, averaging 142 inches a year,

and the soil is favorable to produce these unique stands of timber. They are almost tropical in luxuriance, with an undergrowth of vine maple, big-leaf maple, ferns, and other junglelike foliage.

Mosses drape the branches and trunks of trees in fantastic patterns. Seedlings, in ancient succession, take root on fallen tree trunks, which through the centuries rot away, furnishing food for new trees that in turn become forest monarchs.

The ground is carpeted with moss in many places 3 to 6 inches deep.

The heavy rainfall on the western slopes is the result of warm Pacific air currents striking against the Olympic Mountains, which soar nearly 8,000 feet above the sea. This high country affords a paradise for the hiker, mountaineer, or casual vacationer.

The high peaks are decorated by numerous glaciers, some of which are several miles long.

All of this provides a proper setting for a distinctive community of animals, the peer of which is the Olympic elk. These roam during the summer along the river bars and in the high, open country, particularly on the western slopes. There are also cougar, coyote, black-tailed deer, black bear, squirrels, raccoons, marmots, mink, otter, beaver, mountain goats, and many birds—including eagles, ravens, and grouse.

The Olympic Peninsula and its mountains are generally believed to have been discovered in 1774 by a Spanish sea captain named Juan Perez.

In 1788 the British Capt. John Meares named the peak of the mountains, Mount Olympus, after the mountain in Macedonia called Olympus by the ancient Greeks. The name Olympus means heavenly, or celestial.

The first expedition to cross the Olympic Mountains—from Port Angeles to Quinault, via the Low Divide, was financed by a Seattle newspaper, the Seattle Press. This was in the winter of 1889–90.

Exactly who climbed Mount Olympus first is the subject of controversy, but in 1899 a survey party reached the top and left a Shelton newspaper under a rock as proof. This newspaper was found by another party in 1907. Since then, many mountaineers and others have explored the high country of the Olympics, but even today there are areas in the national forest and national park that have never been visited, much less explored, and some parts of the park have never yet been surveyed.

In 1890, the Olympic Peninsula was declared by Government officials to be the greatest area still unexplored in the United States. In 1896, President Cleveland, by proclamation on George Washington's birthday, created the Olympic Forest Reserve, or National Forest, and in 1938, the Olympic National Park was created. Since that time there have been arguments over whether or not too much timber was being preserved and its benefits withheld from the people. And, it is because of this, that legislation to create a board to settle the issue has been presented to the Congress.

BOTH SIDES OF THE QUESTION ON WHAT THE SIZE OF THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK SHOULD BE

As we promised you recently in a report on the great Olympic National Park and National Forest in our State, where trees a thousand years old and 300 feet tall still stand, we will conduct a one-person debate on arguments for and against changing the boundaries of the Olympic National Park.

Acting first as the moderator, we caution everyone to bear in mind that the Olympic National Park and the Olympic National Forest are separate and distinct areas. The park is run by the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior; the forest is operated by the National Forest Service under the Department of Agriculture.

The national park itself cannot now be touched—it is for beauty and pleasure only; the national forest has been and is being used carefully and scientifically for commercial purposes under strict Government supervision.

Both the national forest and the national park are located on the Olympic Peninsula. Combined, their areas are twice the size of the State of Rhode Island. The national forest, roughly, encompasses the national park.

For the past 25 years many forms of legislation have been introduced in the Congress relating to the park and forest. Some persons believe the park, which contains millions of board feet of timber, should be preserved and never touched, no matter what happens. Others believe a part, but by no means all, of the park should be transferred to the national forest so the timber can be thinned out, cut, and used. It is estimated that there is enough timber in the park to build 2,000,000 two-bedroom houses.

But remember that, no matter what happens in the Congress, the land and forest would always remain in Government hands.

Because the Olympic National Park and Forest are national in scope they are owned by all the people of the Nation, not just the citizens of Washington State, although we have a great deal more interest in them than persons, say, living in New Hampshire.

The legislation recently introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives is an attempt to settle the matter once and for all. The legislation merely calls for the setting up of a board of Senators and Representatives to investigate and recommend what, if anything, should be done.

In the debate my personal opinion will not enter into the discussion. I propose to give each side about the same time for argument.

There is one comment, however, that I would like to make:

It appears to me that the controversy over the boundaries of the Olympic National Park is not a question of whether the park is too big, or too little, but whether or not the park encompasses more of the economic resource than is necessary for park purposes.

If more of the economic resource is within the park than is justified in the interests of the people of the United States for park purposes, then the boundaries might be adjusted accordingly; otherwise, let the park alone.

So with that, let's get started.

The question is: Should we change the boundaries of the Olympic National Park. We'll call on those in favor of the proposition.

Those in favor of changing the boundaries, argue that, first.

The area of the park is a mature forest and if no cutting is permitted, the only result will be a gradual deterioration of the forest itself. If some of the park were transferred to the forest, selective cutting would preserve the forest and permit better development, while at the same time producing a sustained yield of good timber, thus benefiting local industry.

Those in favor of this change also declare that natural growth would be improved by selective cutting. Lumber of high grade is urgently needed at the present time, particularly by the housing industry. There will be no net loss to the Nation if this timber is cut. Normal growth of a healthy forest will soon replace the two to three million board feet which some authorities have suggested be cut in the area.

Another strong argument is that the area is not serving any useful purpose at present, and that correction of the boundaries of the national park would eliminate considerable private-land holdings which interfere with proper administration and protection. A very difficult road-maintenance situation likewise would be improved and much cut-over land would be eliminated.

While these eliminations are of assistance to better administration, it is fortunate that the particular lands involved contain considerable merchantable timber.

In the past, legislation proposing transfer to the national forest of certain areas of the park has had the approval of the National Park Service, which has declared that the park's scenic values would not be destroyed if careful selection was made of the land that might be transferred.

Nearly 100,000 persons are dependent upon the forests of the Olympic Peninsula for a livelihood. Their homes, businesses, and property all depend on maintaining a steady and perpetual supply of timber. Their case—according to proponents of this transfer plan—is worthy of consideration, especially because a relatively small forest area out of the whole would greatly assist them in solving their problems.

The present area of the national park is far greater than that contemplated by reports of various Washington State agencies and by studies of the National Park Service preceding the establishment of the national park in 1938. These studies contemplated no more than a park area of 509,000 acres, instead of the more than 800,000 acres of today.

And, finally, too much of one of the Nation's great natural resources—timber—is locked up in public ownership. The lumber industry cannot continue cutting at the present rate on privately owned lands, except with a constantly decreasing amount of raw material.

Release of some of these public lands to orderly, sustained-yield methods of cutting will ensure for a long time, a healthy lumber industry. The proposed elimination areas have only a minor value for recreational purposes. Most of the timber is on benches and slopes, difficult to traverse, and is visited by few, if any, persons. On the other hand, opening of this area to logging, under Government control, would give permanent employment to from twelve to fifteen thousand workers.

That completes the general argument for those who favor curtailing acreage in the Olympic National Park.

Now, we turn around and argue the negative side of the issue which is: Why we should not transfer any forest land from the Olympic National Park to the Olympic National Forest.

First, those against the plan maintain that the decision of Congress in creating the Olympic National Park in 1938 is evidence of the desire of the people to preserve the unique rain forests of the peninsula as they are. Full expression of opinion was had on both sides of the question at that time and the result was the considered judgment of Congress.

The second argument, often used by opponents of the plan, is that lumber interests, exerting the pressure to transfer this land to the national forest, in order to secure the timber, would not be satisfied after they did get part of the forest. When that area was exhausted, so the argument goes, they would demand more and more land to be released. In the end the result would be utter exhaustion of some of the last remaining stands of virgin timber in the Nation. The amount of timber cut, also it is argued, would have little effect on the lumber industry.

Some of the forest area under consideration is not duplicated anywhere in the world. It would be a shame to spoil this wilderness for the sake of a small amount of merchantable timber.

In addition, the hazard of fire damage to the remaining portions of the park would be tremendous, due to the great amount of slashings which would remain after cutting. Another point often made is that the nature of the terrain and the size of the trees make selective cutting impossible.

Another strong point is that the areas in the park do not consist of over-ripe forests, but virgin forests, and to permit selective logging bypasses the main point of national-park philosophy: that in a national park—a natural spectacle—in this case superla-

tively beautiful virgin forest—is by law held inviolate for the enjoyment and inspiration of future generations. Cutting down to any extent will upset the delicate balance that exists among all the elements of the forest.

Cutting-off of these areas will create a new problem, it is maintained by those on this side of the argument.

Since selective cutting in forests of this type is impossible, according to opponents of the idea, the resulting clear cutting will remove ground cover which protects the watershed of the streams in that area. Soil erosion will be an inevitable result and the natural reseeding would be largely in alder, maple, and other types, not fir, which would completely change the character of the region.

And last, those on this side of the debate maintain that parks are big business and that the whole area benefits from the fact of the existence of a park nearby and that decreasing the size of a park, even one of this gigantic size, would not attract the vast number of visitors who wish to see the rain forests of the Pacific Northwest.

This report has been an experiment to briefly present, in a nonpartisan manner, both sides of a public question for the benefit of everyone listening. I, myself, have taken no part in the argument; I am satisfied to leave it in the hands of a competent congressional committee composed of representatives of all the people, to hear, discuss, and investigate, in order that the controversy can be settled for all time to come. But I would be delighted to hear from you—the judges—at any time, and what you think will be passed along to those in the Congress who must decide the question: How large should the Olympic National Park be in the future?

Address by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning Before the International Relations Club of Hood College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the address delivered by my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, before the International Relations Club of Hood College. In this connection, it is important to note that, for 20 years, Dr. Thorning, a devoted apostle of the good-neighbor policy, has dedicated himself to a study of Iberian culture. Not only was he an eyewitness of events in the Iberian Peninsula; he also studied the principles of international law which should govern our conduct of foreign affairs. From the ethical and moral point of view what Dr. Thorning holds is right and noble.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prior to the last meeting of the United Nations General Assembly in Paris, the chief delegates of 15 American Republics entreated the Honorable George C. Marshall, at that time the United States Secretary of State, to use his good offices with Secretary Ernest Bevin, of the United Kingdom, and Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, of France, in order to pave the way for the entrance of Spain into the United Nations. Furthermore, these representatives of our good neighbors in Central and South America made clear their conviction that full, normal diplomatic relations with Spain would be a benefit for the people of the world. An overwhelming majority of the American Republics want to have chiefs of diplomatic mission in Madrid, just as they welcome Ambassadors or Ministers of Spain to their own capitals. This represents the sentiment in Lima, Peru; in La Paz, Bolivia; in Asuncion, Paraguay; in Buenos Aires, Argentina; in San Jose, Costa Rica; in Managua, Nicaragua; in Ciudad Trujillio, the Dominican Republic; and in San Salvador, El Salvador. Moreover, it is an open secret that, at the earliest possible moment, Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador, Cuba, and Venezuela will do everything to arrange an exchange of chiefs of mission with Madrid. In other words, the ties of culture, language, blood, and religion are factors which exert a profound spiritual influence between the other American Republics and the mother country. People of the Hispanic-American world cherish their traditions; they love the art and the literature of the Iberian Peninsula. Although completely sovereign and independent, the countries of South and Central America respect the genius of Portugal and Spain. Throughout the Western Hemisphere, in universities and colleges, a sense of appreciation is growing with respect to the role Francisco de Vitoria and Francisco Suarez, two Spaniards, played in the origin and development of international law. Long before Hugo Grotius, Vitoria, and Suarez, at the Universities of Salamanca and Coimbra, outlined the legal principles which established the prime distinctions with respect to the natural law, the law of nations, and the positive civil law. Moreover, these two Iberian scholars provided the ground work for a true society of states. In short, Vitoria and Suarez, taking the best elements of our Judaeo-Christian heritage, produced the juridical image of the United Nations, or one world. Their vision was as broad as humanity. And the modern world, more than ever, needs the nobility of outlook as well as the ethical ethos of contemporaneous Iberia.

The United Nations need the inter-American system, while the good-neighbor policy depends upon most cordial friendship and economic collaboration with the mother countries. Every worker for the cause of hemisphere unity should be an advocate of sincere friendship with Spain, just as every supporter of the United Nations should appreciate the value of the Hispanic contribution to world order.

For those who wish to make a more extensive study of this subject I can recommend The Spanish Origin of International Law, a book written by Dr. James Brown Scott and published by the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

The Inauguration of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the minutes of the municipal court of Philadelphia, Judge Adrian Bonnelly presiding, as of 12 o'clock noon, January 20, 1949.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF PHILADELPHIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 20, 1949, BEFORE HON. ADRIAN BONNELLY, J.

The COURT. As I look at the clock on the wall, and at my calendar, I see it is 12 o'clock, on the 20th of January 1949, and in the Nation's Capitol a new President of the United States is taking his oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and to defend it against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and to so conduct himself in office as to merit the approbation and commendation of the entire Nation.

We are divided during a campaign in this country. Some people follow one ideology, or principle, and some another. Because we have that difference of opinion, we are misunderstood by other people in other hemispheres. Those who have for centuries warred with each other cannot understand how, we, in America, can differ in our opinions, ideals, and philosophies, and yet at the end, when the vote is counted, shake hands and congratulate the winner.

I don't know how many of you voted for President Truman, but I do know every person in America who prides himself in being a true American today will pray to Almighty God to give our President the wisdom, the understanding, and the strength to lead us that peace may reign for us and all humanity throughout the world.

Now, therefore, let us pause for a few moments and, in our own way, offer a prayer to Almighty God for the safety and good health of our President.

A Taft-Hartley Mandate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter entitled "A Taft-Hartley Mandate?" written by Thomas W. Parry to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and reprinted from that newspaper.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TAFT-HARTLEY MANDATE?

Do results of the national election constitute a mandate by the people for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, as labor leaders are claiming? I think not. Let's take a look at the record:

1. Although the race was close—for President, Senators, and Representatives—the fact remains that those elected received a majority, however small, of votes cast. Any majority must be recognized as a mandate by a majority of the American people.

2. In considering results of the election, too many persons—labor leaders particularly—are inclined to consider only the Presidential contest. Results of contests for the Senate and House of Representatives are perhaps even more valid criteria in terms of a mandate.

3. While the Democratic platform on which President Truman was elected contained a plank advocating repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, this was but one of the many recommendations in that platform. It is reasonable to assume that many persons who voted for President Truman favor the fundamental principle of the Taft-Hartley law and that many others are opposed to it.

It must be agreed, then, by labor and management alike, that results of the national election constitute a mandate by the people, but that election results must reasonably be viewed in terms of contests for all three major offices—President, Senate, and House of Representatives.

Results of both the Senate and House are overwhelmingly in favor of the Taft-Hartley law, according to figures released by the Bureau of National Affairs.

1. Eight Senators (or Congressmen who were running for the Senate) who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act were defeated. Labor has made a great point of this.

2. Labor overlooks the fact that 15 Senators (or Congressmen who were running for the Senate) who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act were reelected or elected. Actually two of the new Senators—Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, and VIRGIL CHAPMAN, Democrat, of Kentucky—were supported by the CIO Political Action Committee. When they were Representatives in the House, however, they voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act.

3. In the House, 227 Representatives who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act were reelected, while 66 who voted against the act were defeated. Only 73 who voted against the act were reelected while 135 who were elected either had not served before or had not voted either way on the act.

The score, as indicated by the people's mandate in the national election:

Senate: Virtually 2 to 1 in favor of the Taft-Hartley law.

House: 227 to 139 in favor of the law, a majority of 88. (The figure 139 is computed by adding the 66 Representatives who voted for the act and were defeated, to the 73 who voted against the act and were reelected. The 227, of course, are Representatives who voted for the act and who were reelected).

President Truman, his advisers, and the Members of Congress will represent the will of the people if they seriously consider this mandate in their deliberations on the Taft-Hartley law.

Clearly, the people want the principles set forth in the Taft-Hartley law. Just as unquestionably, some provisions of the law should be extended or altered. Management should be—and undoubtedly is—quite willing, for example, to extend the "no-Communist" affidavit to include the executive heads of industry as well as the leaders of unions which represent their employees.

THOMAS W. PARRY.

A Landlord Lock-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Landlord Lock-Out," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LANDLORD LOCK-OUT

A group of Tulsa, Okla., property owners have struck a blow for tyranny by threatening to evict some 600 families in protest to pending rent-control bills. Apart from shocking the Nation with a novel lock-out, their rash action could undermine that right to private ownership of property which is the fountainhead of all our personal liberties.

Of course, they don't see it that way. In fact, one of their leaders, Rev. Wallace J. Murphy—incredibly enough, a retired minister—declared: "We don't intend to serve under a slavery (rent curbs) which would take away our right to control our property." Reverend Murphy's organization, the National Association of Property Owners, is asking landlords in other cities to follow the Tulsa example.

There's nothing illegal in such action, as the stunned Federal rent director, Tighe E. Woods, has already pointed out. But it is certainly impractical, and dramatically self-defeating. Tenants vastly outnumber landlords. Even if local courts upheld mass evictions, which is highly unlikely, an attempted Nation-wide lock-out by landlords would simply result in a Nation-wide sit-down strike by tenants. And, for the duration, the right to own rental property would in effect no longer be recognized by society, the final source of individual rights.

We admit the landlords have some reason to complain that, unlike other elements in our economy, they are still under wartime regulations. Unfortunately, though, they happen to be dealing in a short-supply commodity which is susceptible to effective control and which cannot yet be restored to a free market. It's just impossible to condemn families to go roofless while supply and demand work themselves into balance.

The new Congress, we think, intends to solve this problem in the most sensible way. It will undertake a broad public housing program in order to relieve the emergency for the lowest income group. At the same time, it will control rents until the worst of the shortage has been met.

The rent laws have always provided for rent increases in cases where landlords can prove hardship, although many property owners complain that these provisions are meaningless. If that is true, they should prove their case to Congress and the public so that such injustices may be remedied in the new control bill being drafted. It is to these reasonable ends that the Tulsa landlords should direct their energies instead of vainly striking against the whole of society—and imperiling all property rights in the bargain.

Israel Is No Theocracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, so much misunderstanding concerning alleged theocracy in Israel exists in this country that the editor of the National Jewish Monthly asked an outstanding Israeli author to give the plain, unvarnished facts. Prof. Joseph Patai was born in Hungary, where he was reared in a Jewish literary environment. A graduate of Budapest University, where he taught Hungarian and German literature, he founded the Zionist monthly, Past and Future, which he edited for 33 years. Since 1924 he had made annual visits to Palestine, and finally setled there, becoming a guest lecturer at the Hebrew University. He is the author of many books in Hungarian and Hebrew, for which he received the Nordau and Jerusalem literary prizes. His volume, Star Over Jordan, an English translation of his life of Herzl, was recently published in the United States.

The following article written by Dr. Patai, which appeared in the January, 1949 issue of the National Jewish Monthly, is an excellent exposition of the subject:

ISRAEL IS NO THEOCRACY—CHURCH AND STATE STRICTLY SEPARATED; MINISTRY OF RELIGION PERFORMS MANY FUNCTIONS REQUIRED BY CIRCUMSTANCES

(By Dr. Joseph Patai)

JERUSALEM.—The establishment of a Ministry of Religion—headed by Rabbi J. L. Fishman—in the Israeli Government has stirred world-wide discussion on the subject of whether the new state, forged and fashioned on democratic principles, will ultimately pattern itself along the lines of theocratic government so common in lands of the Middle East. In Israel, this problem is less real in fact than in theory. Debates crop up from time to time in letters to the press, and the topic of the division of church and state seems to provide good mental food. However, perhaps because the public is so immersed in the war and in the establishment of the state, concern on this subject is not generally felt. Maybe because most Jews in Israel are products of the education of the Western World, the general approach to the subject is that no matter how good the law of a religion is, though its jurisprudence be permeated with right and justice, its place lies in the realm of conscience and not in civil law. This does not mean that religious principles which inspired the world will be ignored in the making of Israel's laws.

GROUPS DIFFER WIDELY

Apart from this general attitude, there are important sections of the population who take firm and opposing stands on this issue. There are some irreligious people in the country whose opposition to religious law, even in the matter of personal status such as marriage and divorce (for which there was no lay law under the Mandatory regime) drove them to common-law marriages without benefit of clergy. This, in fact, was very common in the collective settlements until recent years, when it was largely abandoned because it offended the rest of the community.

On the other hand, there are extremely devout sections of the population to whom no law in Israel would be acceptable if it in any way conflicted with the 613 duties which centuries of compiled Jewish law have imposed upon the true follower. Chief among these is the Agudath Israel, a religious body so extreme as to have made political Zionism itself a heresy. Between these extremes are those of much or little faith, but whose religion or lack thereof is a personal concern which in no way affects community life.

SOME INTERNAL PROBLEMS

The internal Jewish question is but one aspect of the problem of religion in Israel. What other country, except the Holy Land, gives rise to so much religious fervor, gave birth to so many religions and sects? Even during the British Mandatory regime, differences constantly arose concerning the Holy Places. The haggling over a window pane or a foot of holy earth, if not authoritatively handled, grew into quarrels that shook Rome and Mecca and caused riots in Jerusalem. No other land has these problems and no other land therefore requires a competent authority to deal with them. No other democratic land therefore has the equivalent of our Ministry of Religion. Yet the establishment of this obviously necessary office has conjured up the bogey man. Hardly a press conference passes without this question being raised.

On the other hand, there are reports abroad which sound surprising if not alarming to people in Israel who know better. One of

these, for instance, was that because of the religious prohibition concerning the dissection of corpses, there is today no medical school in Israel! As a matter of fact the Hebrew University has been working toward this goal for many years and the medical school—all plans now having been completed—will probably open within the next year or two, on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem.

Another fear—though pure stuff and nonsense—which is expressed in some circles abroad is that one's citizenship is endangered if one does not observe Orthodox Jewish law. Perhaps assurance to these doubters can be given through a matter of far less importance: the Government's Food Control Department, while making every effort to obtain kosher products, has not hesitated also to import nonkosher frozen beef and poultry in large quantities to alleviate the protein shortage and bring down the cost of living in Israel at one stroke.

Democratic rule and the division of church and state are such accepted facts in Israel, and so subject to doubt in some quarters abroad, that I determined to interview the Minister of Religion, other ministers, and leading rabbis to discover to what extent these fears were based on reality and to hear them refuted or defended.

Rabbi Fishman, veteran Zionist who was imprisoned by the Turks during World War I for being pro-British, and jailed again by the English just after World War II for being anti-British, is a fighting rabbi with an unusually calm and moderate manner. He was probably neither pro- nor anti-British from his point of view, but his approach was actuated by Zionist welfare. Though he has battled foreign tyranny in Palestine, he has worked for the creation of the state in close cooperation with all Zionist factions since his youth. Having fought for liberty most of his life, his personal history itself is a negation of the very dangers feared in the establishment of a theocratic state. True, Rabbi Fishman would be overjoyed to see all his people faithfully in the religious fold, and he may be counted upon to do his utmost to foster this through persuasion and education. He can equally be relied upon not to force his faith upon the Jewish nonconformists.

WANT SURVIVAL OF JUDAISM

His interview left me more with a feeling that Judaism, far from being on the offensive for the creation of a theocratic state, was on the defensive to maintain its rightful place in Israel. With true rabbinical flavor he outlined this place in Jewish history and thought, in the return to Zion, and its place in a practical modern democratic state. Rabbi Fishman drew my attention to the statement which he had made to UNSCOP over a year ago. He had then emphasized the eternal tie between the people of Israel, the land of Israel, and the Torah of Israel, which were inseparable and had withstood the vicissitudes of centuries. Since the days of Joshua—3,300 years ago—the Jewish spirit had been bound to the land ordained by God. Since the Babylonian exile—2,300 years ago—Jews have prayed with their faces turned toward the light of hope that was Jerusalem. Today, with the nation on the threshold of national revival, Jewry longs for independence and liberty, free of outside pressure, within a framework of natural Jewish life and Jewish spirit. Theodore Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, though himself an assimilationist, appreciated this great religious force and put great faith in it. The Mizrachi (Orthodox Zionist) Party, which was later established, has always fully cooperated with the other parties of the Zionist organization for the achievement of the Jewish state based on traditions of high ideals.

Said Rabbi Fishman: "I wish to make it clear that there is nothing in our religion which strives to impose theocratic rule on the state of Israel. There is nothing to justify any fear of casuistry. Our scholars have always explained the duty to safeguard independent thought by the maxim—

> "Though my brother sin
> Still he is a Jew.
> Though he sin
> Yet is he a man in Israel."

I was indeed glad to hear the minister express himself in this way and thus to still the doubts which have arisen abroad.

"There is no ground whatsoever for these fears," he repeated. We will not rule the state with the power of religion, but we will use the spirit of religion to uplift our people and our land and to raise its place as a moral force among the nations of the world. We will not force our way into the private life of the individual, either by religious law or religious taxation; but we do want to see to it that the taxpayers' money will not be used against religion, or against its guardians, or keep those who so wish from fulfilling their religious duties. Our religion is replete with examples of how our fathers stood guard over the spirit of freedom, liberalism, and tolerance in every sense. What other ancient law gives a bastard full inheritance rights with legal offspring? What law places the worth of the scholar above that of kings? Even the stupid claim, bruited about abroad, that the irreligious in Israel would be deprived of citizenship has its reply in the Gemara itself, wherein it says that even if a Jew changes his religion he still remains a man of Israel."

SEEK MODERN HEBREW LAW

The minister recalled his recent statement before the state council that there was no intention to interfere with the individual but that there was definitely a wish that the state bear the character of Jewish tradition.

"We do not seek the imposition of the 613 commandants," he said; "we request that only three be recognized. The first of these is that the state shall not oblige a person to break religious law against his will, such as he might be forced to do in maintaining public services. Are not observant Jews taxpayers, too, and are they not therefore fully entitled to their freedom of conscience? Above all, therefore, we demand that the Sabbath be the official day of rest for the Jewish people in Israel. English law defines Sunday as a day of rest in 30 paragraphs. We have defined our day of rest in 10, guided by the injunction that the Sabbath law may be lifted if it involves the saving of life.

"When we demand kashrut we do not intend to snoop into the housewife's kitchen, but we do feel that state institutions should consider the feelings of the observant Jew, so that he may sit at the table, too.

"The third point concerns Jewish jurisprudence. Every nation has its typical law and we too have ours—a body of righteous and just law, compiled for us through the study of many generations. For 2,000 years we have prayed, 'Return our judges to us as in former days.' Why, then, must we now particularly hanker for British or French law? Hebrew law possesses the greatest wealth of literature in the world: over 2,000 questions and answers lay down the basis for everlasting honest judgment. Why, then, should we now follow a path paved by foreigners? I do not recommend the rejection of international law, but the source of our jurisprudence should derive from Jewish law."

It may be pertinent to remark here that the law in effect today in Israel is chiefly British law, with religious law which varies for the different religious communities applicable for personal status. While the feeling that new civil law should be based on the spirit of wise Jewish law has much to recommend it, there is considerable question of the practicability of applying laws created for needs so long ago, to conditions today. For instance, the rights of women in personal status before such law are not equal to those of men. Women's emancipation movements in Israel have long clamored for reform along these lines and undoubtedly civil laws will be enacted to give woman the equality promised in Israel's declaration of independence, so that she will enjoy rights which were not hers under the British regime in Palestine.

The Minister of the Interior, Mr. Yitzhak Greenbaum, said to me on the point of ancient law and modern needs: "Indeed, Israel's sages have always interpreted the letter of the law to the spirit of the times and to conditions prevailing in their day." As an example, he mentioned the interpretation of the injunction: "This is the Torah which men shall observe, and live because of doing so." The phrase "Live by doing so" was explained as "Will not die by doing so." In other words, life must be preserved above the observance of the law. Therefore in time of danger (illness, war, etc.) the Sabbath (or other relevant) laws may be dispensed with.

The declaration of independence of Israel stated, inter alia: "The state of Israel shall be based on the principles of liberty, justice, and peace, as conceived by the prophets of Israel; it will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of religion, race, or sex; it will guarantee freedom of religion, conscience, language, education, and culture.

To this official program must be added the proposal forwarded to the Constitutional Committee of the Provisional State Council, which contains the following five paragraphs: "(a) there shall be one law for all citizens of Israel; no discrimination on grounds of race, sex, religion, or language will be allowed; (b) civil rights and equal political rights shall be given to all Israel citizens; no Israel citizens shall be discriminated against with regard to appointments to a public office or promotion; (c) the Sabbath and the Jewish festivals shall be official days of rest; the festivals of the other communities shall be recognized as days of rest for the members of the community concerned; (d) the state shall enable Jew and Arab to receive elementary and secondary instruction, each group in its own tongue and culture; no community will be impeded in its right to establish its own schools, in accordance with the general instruction regarding education which will be issued by the state."

WHAT RELIGION MINISTRY DOES

What are the present tasks of the Ministry of Religion? Three of its subdepartments deal with religious affairs within Israel; one deals with maintaining contact with Jewish religious communities abroad; two with religious affairs of the non-Jewish communities—Moslem, Christian, etc.—in Israel.

Sabbath and Jewish festivals are already the official days of rest; the feasts of other religions are already observed in Jewish occupied territory. Indeed, in Jaffa, Arabs employed by the Jewish Government enjoy two days of rest—Friday, the Moslem day, and Saturday, the official rest day.

The Ministry of Religion at present deals with the affairs of personal status such as marriages, divorce, guardianship, and inheritance, and with the reform of the laws of the Jewish community, in accordance with the moral and traditional precepts of Judaism. It sees to it that religious observance is not impaired by public services. It is engaged in giving guidance with regard to the observation of the Sabbath, the supervision of the Holy Places, the establishment of buildings for religious institutions, and it even takes an interest in liturgical music. Its tasks will be to direct and to reprove in the name of ethics, truth, and justice, and to prevent vain hatred such as caused the destruction of the Second Temple.

I called upon the Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv and district, Rabbi A. J. Untermann, who expressed views similar to those of the Minister of Religion. "In creating new conceptions and in safeguarding the values of our Nation," he said, "it is unthinkable that the religious commandments of Israel would be imposed upon those of other faiths." And among those of other faiths Rabbi Untermann included Jewish atheists.

The Chief Rabbi of the Sephardic (oriental) community in Tel Aviv and district, took the same line of argument, pointing out also that in the affairs of his community no differentiation is made between the religious and nonreligious, both of whom lend support and give respect to their rabbi, scholars, and leaders.

Freedom of conscience, as guaranteed in the state of Israel, by its very nature obviates the possibility of a theocracy.

"The future of the Jewish people," said Mr. David Ben Burion, Prime Minister and Minister of Defense, in addressing a gathering of young army officers, "will not be based upon strength of arms, but upon development and work. We must look to the vision of our prophets of Israel, the vision of righteousness and peace, of brotherhood and brotherly love—of loving one's neighbor as oneself—for this is the precious inheritance left us by thousands of years of Jewish culture. * * * Our secret weapon is the lofty spirit of our people."

It is in that spirit that the modern democratic state of Israel has been reborn, and will grow.

Bevin Beats a Strategic Retreat on Palestine Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bevin Beats a Strategic Retreat on Palestine Issue," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEVIN BEATS A STRATEGIC RETREAT ON PALESTINE ISSUE

In his softly worded talk on the Palestine situation in Parliament on Tuesday, Foreign Secretary Bevin was engaging in what looks like a strategic retreat to prepare new positions for his anti-Israel policy.

Dispatches from London remarked upon Mr. Bevin's conciliatory attitude toward Israel and virtually had him holding out olive branches.

But his mildness may have been caused, not by any change in sentiment toward the new state, but by a desire to escape a bitter heckling from members, including many from his own party, who disagree with his Palestine policy.

Mr. Bevin adroitly averted a full-dress debate on Palestine, which probably would have caused him a great deal of embarrassment. Yet his so-called conciliatory statements were made up mostly of double talk and vague hints.

He gave the impression that British recognition of Israel was under serious discussion, but when pinned down by Winston Churchill he quickly took refuge in evasion.

What may have been a feeler in this connection was the report, denied both by Acting Secretary of State Lovett and the British Embassy in Washington, that British recognition would be tied to a new plan calling for joint United States-British policing of Palestine to guarantee agreed-upon borders.

Under such an arrangement, Britain, purporting to act impartially, would continue to be linked by treaty to the Arab states, tying our hands. Britain would be in the position of a cashier acting also as his own auditor.

The most helpful development on Palestine is not to be found in Bevin's strategic maneuvers to gain time, but in the day-to-day negotiations which the Israelis are carrying on individually with Egypt, Lebanon, and Transjordan.

The most disturbing factor, despite Mr. Bevin's polite words, remains the anti-Israeli position of the British Government, reflected in the massing of British military forces at Israel's borders at a time when peaceable agreement between Jews and Arabs, if left to themselves, seems closer than ever.

Meeting of American and Russian Officials Appears Inevitable—United States Has Muffed Chances To Negotiate End of Cold War, Says Writer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by David Lawrence that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 2, 1949:

MEETING OF AMERICAN AND RUSSIAN OFFICIALS APPEARS INEVITABLE—UNITED STATES HAS MUFFED CHANCES TO NEGOTIATE END OF COLD WAR, SAYS WRITER

(By David Lawrence)

Russia wants a peace negotiation; America cannot be placed in the position before the world of refusing to talk peace. A meeting between representatives of the Soviet and American Governments at or near the top level appears inevitable.

The United States Government has muffed several opportunities to negotiate an end of the cold war, mostly because of suspicion of bad faith or propaganda tricks. The fact that a Presidential campaign was in the offing or in progress prevented any definitive conferences from being held in 1948, though President Truman did reveal his desire in that direction—namely, to get together in a conference with Stalin—when the suggestion was made that Chief Justice Vinson be sent to Moscow on a special mission.

As pointed out in these dispatches at the time, the idea was logical but the moment inopportune.

Now, however, that Mr. Truman has been elected and has a majority in both houses of Congress, the Russians know there is nobody else to deal with for another 4 years and that they had better indicate their desire for an over-all settlement before lines become further drawn and cleavages intensified to the point where negotiation to retrace already accomplished steps would be impracticable.

CUSTOMARY LINE

Those officials here and abroad or their spokesmen who put out suggestions that Russia is merely bluffing and that the Soviets do not really intend to do anything but talk are already falling back on the customary line—concrete action must be taken by Russia first to indicate a change of heart before there is a conference.

This is not only unrealistic but reveals the very blindness that has preceded the outbreak of wars in history. It ignores entirely that inside each nation there is a pride of nationalism. Under the law of nations, there is no rule requiring a sovereign power to retreat or offer a concession before entering into a negotiation.

Stalin has brought into the open the real question at issue for several months. It really never was the Berlin blockade or the currency problem. All this was simply a phase of Russian reprisal against the determination of the Western Allies, with their three-zone economy, to go ahead without waiting for Russia to come to an over-all agreement on major problems with them.

Now Stalin says everything can be settled amicably and the blockade lifted if the Western Powers will agree to a big conference looking toward an over-all settlement of the whole German problem. This, of course, is not enough. There must be a settlement of issues in the Far East, too, and an assurance of cooperation in working out the many residual problems growing out of the war and which may take many years to solve.

It would be oversimplifying the situation to assume that a mere talk by the two heads of state would settle everything. Stalin knows this as well as do those Americans who discount the value of a meeting. A conference between Stalin and Mr. Truman would merely be window dressing for a real negotiation by their respective subordinates, but it's window dressing of the highest importance.

If Russia really wants to make progress toward a settlement, the thing to do is to set a date 6 months hence for a Truman-Stalin meeting, with Russia authorizing her deputies and ambassadors or special envoys to meet with similar representatives from the United States, Great Britain, and France to do the exploratory and preparatory work so that clear-cut statements of the respective positions can be drawn up in the meantime.

COULD CONFER IN ALASKA

By July the weather in the north Pacific will be pleasant. A conference somewhere in Alaska could be the mutually acceptable place to which Stalin referred in his published statement this week. Stalin could come to the edge of Siberia and Truman to the edge of Alaska. Huge airplanes could transport the participants and their staffs back and forth to their respective bases, and some conferences could be held on Russian soil and some on American territory.

There would then be no humiliation or appearance of overstepping the amenities such as is supposed to have blocked a meeting heretofore. Mr. Truman has said he would meet Stalin in Washington. Presumably he would be agreeable to meeting the Russian Premier anywhere in United States territory, and Alaska happens to be near enough to Russian territory to eliminate false issues of pride.

If the north Pacific isn't agreeable, Mr. Truman could invite Premier Stalin to meet with him in the Persian Gulf on a United States battleship or aircraft carrier. This would still be United States territory. The American people would not regard such a journey by Mr. Truman to far-off waters as too big an inconvenience if there were really a chance to make an over-all peace settlement. But such a meeting should follow

rather than precede exploratory conferences so that the world will not witness again a mere statement of principles with hopes expressed in high-sounding phrases and with details that are major questions still to be resolved.

Russia has taken the initiative. America should not hesitate to answer in kind and endeavor to bring about a meeting of minds.

Private Power Companies Seek To Control Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of aiding farmers, the utility companies of Arizona are lobbying to raise the rates of all new low-cost public power to the rate level for privately produced power.

These private companies are contributing money to promote a fantastic billion-dollar Arizona reclamation and power scheme. This is the proposed central Arizona irrigation project. It would provide water for a few thousand acres of privately owned land at a cost to the Nation of $1,400 to $2,500 an acre.

In addition to enormous pump lifts, dams, reservoirs, and hundreds of miles of tunnels and canals costing three-quarters of a billion dollars, the proposed project calls for construction of Bridge Canyon Dam, on the Colorado River, several hundred miles from the land to be irrigated, at a cost of more than $265,000,000.

This dam would produce power for commercial sale, mostly in southern California, and for pumping water over mountains to the Arizona project. It would be strictly a power dam, and without its revenues the entire project would be totally infeasible under Federal reclamation laws.

The proposed Arizona project would drain off one-third of Bridge Dam power, which would be vitally needed for national defense and domestic and industrial use. This third of Bridge power would be used to pump water into Arizona and is equivalent to 2,500,000 barrels of oil annually, or 8,000 tank cars a year.

Under the scheme of the Arizona power companies, by raising the rates for Bridge power to private power rates the following would be accomplished:

First. Additional revenues would be secured, and these revenues would be used to pay the irrigation costs of the Arizona project;

Second. Arizona private power companies would live comfortably, undisturbed by competition with public power. Any cooperative or municipal power system buying Bridge power would have to pay the higher rate, which would ease competition for the private companies;

Third. Arizona water users would have a great project at little cost to them, a project they could never have paid for themselves.

The Arizona scheme is shrewdly designed. Arizona power companies have urged Interior Secretary J. A. Krug to base rates for power produced by new Federal projects on the market value of the power at the distribution center. That means, at the private power rate in the area in which the public power is to be consumed.

The following private power companies signed a petition to Krug in support of the scheme: Arizona Edison Co.; Central Arizona Light & Power; the Arizona Power Co.; the Tucson Gas, Electric Light & Power Co.

The latest scheme of these private Arizona companies was advanced in connection with the pending assignment of power from the new Davis Dam, now being built by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Colorado River. But the plan reaches far beyond Davis Dam and embraces all new public projects now building or proposed.

This is what the Arizona power companies wrote to Krug:

> In order to assist the users of water in securing authorization for future irrigation projects, the costs of which are beyond the ability of the water users to pay, we urge you to adopt a schedule of rates which will be based upon the market value of the power at the distribution center. The difference between the value of the power and its cost as computed under the basic reclamation law could be used to apply upon the irrigation and other portions of the project cost.

The Arizona power companies quote from the 1947 annual report of the Interior Department as follows:

> There are few, if any, irrigation projects remaining to be developed in which the water users will be able to pay the full irrigation costs. The irrigation costs in excess of the water users' payments must be paid in power.

This is what Secretary Krug once termed "a sales tax on power." The legality of such a sales tax is another matter.

Referring to the above quote, the Arizona power companies wrote Krug:

> With this we are in full accord. However, we do believe that power should be sold at the distribution center at a price equivalent to its market value. * * * Such a policy would result in the Government securing revenues in excess of those which it would secure if the price of the power was determined by its cost computed according to the formula in the basic reclamation law. Under this procedure the difference in price between value and cost could be applied to the irrigation portions of the project.

That is the heart of the scheme by which the private power companies hope to live comfortably at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The proposed central Arizona project, which the Arizona power companies are supporting, would take enormous amounts of Colorado River water that California and Nevada now claim under contracts with the Federal Government. Thus, a serious controversy exists between the States, and until that controversy is settled by the United States Supreme Court, there can be no assured water supply for the project.

Yet, in the face of this situation, and in opposiltion to the Federal Power Commission, the Arizona power companies are supporting a scheme to have the United States invest a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money in the proposed project.

The scheme is consistent with Arizona's past performances. For more than a quarter century the Arizona party line has been to charge for Colorado River power all the traffic will bear, and to make California pay the freight.

California, as a public power State, has fought to bring power to all the people of the West at the lowest cost consistent with sound business principles.

For years Arizona power companies have sought to gain at least indirect control over power produced on public projects.

Arizona fought for higher rates on power produced by Hoover Dam, the pioneer in the public power field.

As far back as 1923 a bill was introduced in the Arizona Legislature requiring the payment of $5 to the State for every horsepower produced by any public project on the Colorado River, the greatest source of hydroelectric power in the Southwest.

This bill was aimed at Boulder—now Hoover—Dam, not then built; and it was intended to make the measure a part of the historic Colorado River compact. The bill called for the $5 payment in perpetuity. It would have brought Arizona more than $9,000,000 annually, which would have been saddled on the people of California who contracted to pay, and are paying, for Hoover Dam. Arizona paid nothing for the construction of Hoover Dam, but demanded an immense revenue.

Both the Arizona House and Senate passed bills, but differences in them could not be reconciled. The result was that Arizona did not adopt the Colorado River compact at this time, although the six other Colorado River Basin States had ratified the compact. Arizona held out for a dog-in-the-manger royalty until 1944, and did what it could to halt development on the river.

Without Bridge Canyon Dam, for which the public must pay, the proposed central Arizona project could not be built.

Without using money derived from the commercial sale of Bridge Dam power, the project could not be built. Not only must Bridge power pay for dams and power plants, but it must pay the entire cost of the 320-mile aqueduct to the Arizona project. The people in Arizona who will get the water pay for none of this.

Here is what Nelson Lee Smith, chairman of the Federal Power Commission, told the Bureau of Reclamation about Bridge Dam:

> The commission staff * * * points out that the Bridge Canyon project and its two auxiliaries, Bluff and Coconino Reservoirs, have no essential physical relationship with the central Arizona diversion project. These reservoirs are not needed to regulate the flow for the central Arizona diversion, nor would the Bridge Canyon power plant necessarily be the only source of power available for pumping (for the proposed project).
>
> The only relationship between the three reservoirs as a group and the diversion project appears to be the assumed financial relation in order to provide means for repayment of a large percentage of the reimbursable costs of the diversion project chargeable to irrigation.

Chips Piled on Table—Diplomatic Gun Game Can't Continue—United States Should Hear Russian Peace Offer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes that appeared in the Washington Evening Star of February 2, 1949:

CHIPS PILED ON TABLE—DIPLOMATIC GUN GAME CAN'T CONTINUE—UNITED STATES SHOULD HEAR RUSSIAN PEACE OFFER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

We very likely have the only atom bombs in the world, and we certainly have the biggest ones, according to the Atomic Energy Commission's annual report to Congress, which also reveals that we are producing more and bigger ones all the time.

In short, we are well-stocked on bombs.

For a day or two we read about that in the newspapers and heard it over the radio. But that was just one item. When you stop to consider it, the American newspaper reader and radio listener today lives in a veritable din about implements of war, faster and faster war planes, rocket ships, and the like. Generals and admirals make speeches and give out interviews about the need of more and bigger of everything, and about high strategy to meet this or that possible thrust of the enemy.

DRIFT FROM COMMON SENSE

It's news, and that's the frightening part of it. We are letting ourselves drift into a dangerous state of mind almost without being aware of it. A fellow takes a chance to raise a whisper about peace.

It is, for instance, considered very naive in some quarters, if not actually that now horrid thing appeasement, to suggest that our Government should take up seriously the last of several overtures in the last few months from Prime Minister Josef Stalin, of Russia, for negotiation of our many differences.

That shows how far we've wandered from American common sense.

It is, we are told, just another move in the Russian game to trick us and deceive us, and maybe it is. But we've both been playing a vast poker game for some time now. Russia shoves in Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Berlin crises, and we push forward with Greece and Turkey and the Marshall plan and now the Atlantic Pact, and, between times, set off a bomb or two in the Pacific just to see how good we are getting at that.

The chips are stacked up high on the table, and so is the pile of guns underneath our respective chairs—ready for the quick draw.

That game can't go on forever.

It is said that the latest peace offer of Premier Stalin is aimed at the projected Atlantic Pact, that thereby he hopes to stop that. That diagnosis may be correct. That proposed alliance of western powers, coupled with military supplies from us, probably looks no nicer from the other side of the iron curtain than Russia's moves look to us on this side. But her previous moves have not stopped us. We don't have to give up that or anything else to sit down and talk.

It might possibly be that our persistence finally has had its effect in high places in Russia, and now they are willing to talk business.

WE LEAD FROM STRENGTH

It is said that you can't trust Russia. That has been said over and over so much that it gives the impression at least that we don't think we are clever enough to sit down and negotiate, that we really don't trust ourselves. That can't be true. Constantly cited are other conferences, Yalta and Potsdam among them, in which it is said glibly that we were badly outsmarted. It is difficult now to place ourselves back in situations in the midst of war and make any true judgment.

We have plenty of good diplomatic brains. And we lead from strength, for we are the strongest nation in the world today. We are so strong that we can afford to make the simple gesture of accepting the invitation for negotiations, either at the highest level or lower, whichever is most practical. In fact we are so strong that we cannot afford to refuse, for the stake is the peace of the world.

It is a matter of pride at least to this newspaperman that the way has been opened by newspapermen, for this latest interview procured by Kingsbury Smith, of International News Service, follows another similar one last year that was secured by Eddy Gilmore, of the Associated Press, both of whom are well known among Washington newspaper correspondents.

Newspapers and press associations consider it quite a feat to interview someone like Joseph Stalin, but these are more than newspaper feats in their significance. They represent newspaper enterprise in the best sense of public service in that they truly symbolize the desire of the people of the whole world for a just and honorable peace.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from a highly esteemed friend of mine, and a veteran of World War I, Mr. T. W. Iiams, of Sidney, Iowa. I feel the suggestions which Mr. Iiams makes in this letter deserve full and serious consideration by the proper committee of Congress, and every Member of Congress, in order that plain justice may be done.

SIDNEY, IOWA, *January 27, 1949.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Seventh Iowa District, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BEN: I see that hearings have begun on the pension bill and this reminds me that I have slant on this question which, to my knowledge, has never been adequately considered by those who drafted veterans' legislation.

In these latter years the veterans of World War I (there are a great many of age 60 or over) are having as their chief difficulty the matter of sufficient employment. Even though a few of these men are still fairly healthy and really able to hold a position or a job, nobody seems to want them. In the case of the larger majority of them, they are not able to obtain and keep sufficient employment (day labor is all they know) to give them more than the barest kind of an existence, which could not be called living, and in many cases not that much, if they did not have the support and help of younger and more fortunate relatives.

I saw active combat service with the Texas-Oklahoma, or Ninetieth Division, in World War I. Have seven gunshot wounds but draw no compensation. As a member of the American Legion, I have never been one to differentiate between those members of the Legion who saw battle service and those who did not, but—

In regard to the matter of pensions for veterans of any war, it is my opinion that there should be a differentiation in the ages at which the veteran becomes eligible for pension. I base this opinion on the fact that for the past 30 years I have been actively associated with veterans' claims and their many troubles and difficulties. As a service officer of the American Legion since 1919—and putting in full time at it—I have gleaned a lot of experience and a thorough knowledge of the average veteran's personal problems through actual contact with them and in knowing them and their circumstances first hand. From all this, I gather that if a man saw combat service, even if for only a day or two, it is very possible that this actual battle service shortened his natural life by at least 5 years. If the age for pension eligibility is set at, say, 60 years of age, the veteran who saw combat service should be set at 5 years less, or at age 55. I think this phase of the pension question is of paramount importance and that it has never been adequately considered. Records will show that all too many men of World War I have died or will die without benefit of pension to smooth their last years unless some legislation for this relief is passed—and quickly.

If one consults the figures put out by the Veterans' Administration, it is found that the combat serviceman has always been given the "short end." A smaller percentage of those men who saw combat service draw compensation than of those who saw none; also, the man who saw combat service is drawing, on the average, less compensation than one who saw no combat service. Many of us have seen this working out in our daily life, but few of them are in a position to make their needs known in quarters where it would help, and it is the purpose of this letter, in speaking for them, to say that we would like to see some changes made which would give the combat veteran a better break than he is getting now, even according to the Veterans' Administration's own figures.

The matter of setting the ages at which a veteran becomes eligible for pension is one way of equalizing the present disadvantage of him who really "has borne the battle."

I am aware of the argument advanced by some that the combat veteran and the noncombat veteran both served in obedience to orders from the Government. That neither had anything to say about where he was to serve and therefore they should all be treated alike. As far as the American Legion membership eligibility is concerned, I have always agreed, and still do—but I also believe that if a government order sent a man to the post of excessive hardship, as well as constant danger—that man deserves a little more consideration from his government in the matter both of a disability compensation and pension than he is now getting.

I hope that your future efforts will be forcibly directed to the correction of this status quo to the end that the combat veteran will get the better break which he has so long deserved but which he has never

had. Thanking you for your interest in matters of veterans' legislation in the name of many whom I have served, I am,

Yours sincerely,

T. W. IIAMS,
Adjutant, American Legion, Sidney, Iowa.

Resolutions of Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. WOOD
OF GECRGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 25, ADOPTED JANUARY 29, 1949
COMMENDATION OF CONGRESS

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense commend the action of Congress in citing for contempt the script and scenario writers who refused to answer questions of the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities as to whether they were or had ever been members of the Communist Party.

RESOLUTION 20, ADOPTED JANUARY 29, 1949
REQUEST FOR UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE REPRINTS

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense request the Congress of the United States to print 1,000,000 copies of the following six booklets:

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the U. S. A.
One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.
One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.
One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor.
One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Government.
The Communist Party of the United States as Agents of a Foreign Power.

RESOLUTION 24, ADOPTED JANUARY 29, 1949
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Whereas recent events have demonstrated that national security requires full cooperation from the Chief Executive and the Attorney General in releasing information (other than top military secrets) to congressional committees:

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense petition the House to retain and strengthen the House Un-American Activities Committee and grant the committee ample funds to carry on its important work in exposing the obstructionists and enemies within our ranks; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and to both Houses of Congress.

RESOLUTION 22, ADOPTED JANUARY 29, 1949
OUTLAW THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Whereas the spread of communism is increasing throughout the world and is becoming more evident in our own country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urges Congress to enact legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

Michigan Veterans' Organizations Oppose Veterans' Administration's Program for Abandoning Plans To Erect Hospitals in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving hundreds of letters from Michigan organizations protesting the recent action of the Veterans' Administration in abandoning plans for the construction of needed hospitals in the Michigan area. The Veterans' Administration is now insisting on sending Michigan veterans hundreds of miles from home for hospitalization and medical care. This is unfair to both the sick veteran and to his family. Most of these families cannot afford to travel hundreds of miles from their home State to visit their sick sons or husbands. Hospitals should be constructed within a reasonable distance from the homes of the veterans and their families. Because of the greed and logrolling tactics practiced in the past, some hospitals have been built away out in the sticks where it is both difficult and inconvenient to obtain doctors and hospital attendants, and now the Veterans' Administration is trying to penalize the heavily populated areas by abandoning those projects which were previously scheduled for construction and is insisting that these out-of-State hospitals be occupied.

I believe that all the Congressmen from the Middle West, regardless of party, will unite in opposition to this unfair and discriminatory program of abandonment that has been recently announced by the Veterans' Administration. Many Michigan veterans are being compelled to forego hospitalization and medical attention because they cannot obtain admission to a veterans' hospital near their homes.

I wish to include a resolution that was passed by the Allied Veterans Council. The council is made up of representatives of the following veterans' organizations: United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Red Arrow, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Canadian Legion of Wayne County, Yankee Division Veterans Association, Canadian Corps Association, Polish Army Veterans Association, Marine Corps League, Regular Veterans, Polar Bears Association, Rainbow Division, AMVETS, Catholic War Veterans, Army of the Philippines:

Because of numerous complaints being made to the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans on the lack of beds in the Veterans' Administration hospitals located in various parts of the country, it has been established that there is an immediate need for additional VA hospitals.

The delay in their building is bringing pain, misery, and death to hundreds if not thousands of American veterans. So-called nonservice-connected veterans of World War II with far-advanced, active TB are on the waiting lists. Medical authorities have admitted that undoubtedly many of them will be dead before a bed in a Veterans' Administration hospital is available to them.

Many of these young veterans have splendid war records with history of combat with the enemy and months or years of exposure in both the European and South Pacific theaters of war.

In one great city known to the national headquarters of the Disabled American Veterans, it is a crime to have TB and not be hospitalized and under medical care. There are no beds available for the non-service-connected active TB in the Veterans' Administration hospitals in this city or in the State or county institutions, so some of America's war heroes have been placed in the workhouse under lock and key like common ordinary lawbreakers or bums.

Following World War I, many of our war disabled were in similar situations. Hospitals not being available, disabled veterans were placed in buildings that had previously been condemned. These buildings were not fit for occupancy of healthy people but were used by the war disabled.

Is this condition about to be reenacted? There is a desired and established need for additional beds in the Michigan area. The VA's latest program that called for the abandoning of the plans to erect hospitals and provide additional beds in the Michigan area is tragic. A veteran of World War II contacting TB in Michigan must be hospitalized in other States because no VA facilities are available.

Michigan has over 600,000 World War II veterans and a large number of these men were disabled. The plans for a tubercular hospital in the city of Detroit were hailed by the organized veterans as recognition by the Government of a long overdue hospital for this type of patient.

The VA hospital in Grand Rapids was likewise recognized as a very essential feature of the VA hospital building program. Now plans for the erection of these two hospitals are to be discontinued.

The vast majority of veterans believe in the Marshall plan. As a matter of fact it has been stated that the Marshall plan began with the ordinary GI sailor or marine passing out food from his own mess kit to the starving kids in his area and no questions were asked whether they were friend or enemy.

The Marshall plan will undoubtedly continue to receive the support of all Americans who need no instruction in the principles of brotherly love and human kindness, charity, and American fair play, when it comes to our treatment of friend or enemy.

But what the average American veteran cannot understand is why the milk of human kindness is extracted from the reports and findings of so-called American institutions and boards that appear to be interested in the welfare and future of America, including the veterans of America's war, to whom this Nation owes so much. Were it not for the courage and sacrifice of the American veterans, including those seriously ill and who cannot obtain admission to a veterans' hospital, it might be a far different group studying

and planning the economic restoration of what was once the United States of America.

The organized veterans are pleading for their disabled buddies who were once able defenders of our country in time of war, and urge that the same spirit of human kindness and Christian charity that permeates the Marshall plan be extended to them. Because of the above conditions: Be it

Resolved, That the Allied Veterans' Council, Inc., of Wayne County, urge our Congressmen and Senators to exert their best efforts in restoring the plan for the erection of the Tubercular Veterans' Hospital in Detroit and the General Veterans' Hospital at Grand Rapids; and be it further

Resolved, That our Congressmen and Senators be urged to vigorously oppose any reduction in the number of beds originally planned by the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen and Senators for their information and action.

Protect Our Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address I delivered on WMEX, Boston, Mass., on February 3, 1949:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, during the 1920's we pillaged our own natural resources.

In the 1930's we neglected them.

In World War II we spent them with a lavish hand to help our allies as well as ourselves.

The time has come for us to take stock of our depleted reserves, so that our children will not fall heir to an empty heritage.

The true wealth of the United States consists of its human and natural resources.

By human, we mean the energy, spirit and brain of our people, released in full by the freedoms we enjoy.

By natural resources, we mean the 6 inches of fertile topsoil, the vast mineral resources deep underground, the dense stands of lofty timber, the surging power of our turbulent rivers.

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago, when the first settlers stepped ashore at Plymouth, Mass., a great and virgin continent stretched before them.

The handful of colonists has grown to a mighty nation of one-hundred-and-forty-odd-million people.

The pace of our development has been so rapid that we have counted only the gains and not the losses.

But, like the prodigal son, we can overspend and wake up some day to find that we have nothing.

At the beginning, this Nation was blessed with resources which seemed to be without end.

And so, Americans cut timber without replanting it, farmed the land without replenishing its fertility, and dug minerals from the earth wastefully.

With the prospect of new lands, new forests, and new mineral reserves to the west, the pioneer applied the ax, the pick, the saw, and the match to priceless resources.

When he had taken everything that he could, he moved on a little further to the West, repeating the process, and never thinking of the despoiled land he had left behind.

Finally, he reached the Pacific Ocean.

The days of take-and-move were over.

He had to settle down and learn the tasks of good husbandry.

He had to give to nature as well as take from it.

Facing the facts, as he must do today, he perceives the ruin which has accompanied his growth.

Outside of the great and imposing cities and flanking highways is the price he has paid.

America has used up 80 percent of its virgin timber reserves, has lost one-third of its life-giving topsoil which is the equivalent of 140,000,000 acres of tillable land.

We have dug up the cream of our mineral resources and must go deeper and deeper into the earth to supply our needs.

Mineral reserves, especially those of a strategic nature in time of war, have been disappearing at an alarming rate.

This process was speeded up during the all-out efforts of World War II.

We passed our peak as a mineral producer in 1943.

To counteract this dangerous trend, we need to discover new mineral fields through a Nation-wide geological survey, and by improving our methods of extraction.

In this way, we can use minerals from fields which it doesn't pay to mine under present conditions.

We must search out new uses for neglected minerals and develop substitutes for minerals which are in short supply.

Unless we learn to conserve and bring back blighted areas into production, we may face the future of a China; a sprawling land without soil enough to properly feed its people; a nation plagued by destructive floods and civil strife born of its man-made poverty.

In the United States, the destruction of the cover crop allows the rains to wash off into the rivers.

Meeting with other swollen streams, they rage down river valleys, destroying people and property in their path.

Once we associated freshets with the spring.

Now they threaten us—even in January.

Every one of our major rivers has been in flood during the past 20 years, and many are flooded more than once each year.

Two million acres were flooded in the Ohio in 1937.

Five million acres were flooded in the Missouri Valley in 1947.

The loss in crop and property value in this last flood was one-half the total cost of the Tennessee Valley Authority which, among other advantages, has removed the danger of such disasters in the TVA region.

Since 1903 floods have taken more than 5,500 American lives.

But the real cost cannot be measured in terms of property damage and lost lives alone.

The real danger is in the destruction of the basis for future life.

The Columbia River flood of last year swept enough soil into the sea every day to cover 44 farms, each 80 acres in size, to a depth of 6 inches.

Millions of tons of this precious topsoil, which is the basis of our food production, are swept away every year.

Even in Massachusetts, which up to a few years ago considered itself immune to such dangers, the flood problem has become acute.

Gov. Paul Dever, with commendable foresight, is asking the legislature for a $2,000,000 appropriation to save the homes and factories in the western part of the State from a repetition of the December floods which caused so much damage.

While recognizing that this is an interstate matter which comes under the Federal Flood Control Act, he feels that this is also an emergency situation about which Massachusetts must do something without delay to protect the property and lives of its citizens.

And the pity is that this same waterpower which tears our topsoil away from the land is the same force which, if harnessed to a network of giant dams, could provide the energy to bring better life to all Americans.

Almost every section of our country is face to face with a power shortage.

This is a temporary roadblock in the way of an expanding America.

It is almost impossible for a private power company to assume the complete development of a river running through two States.

The cost is too much, and there are other aspects of river development, such as flood control, reclamation, and control of pollution, which are the proper concern of government.

But the private power companies stubbornly oppose our efforts to utilize the complete hydroelectric possibilities of our waterways.

Neither they nor their investors should fear such progress.

As one who sponsored the bill calling for a Merrimack Valley Authority, among other such projects, I assure you that public power and private power can work together as a team for the general welfare.

Our legislation clearly provides that electricity from Government-built dams will be sold to existing power companies on the same terms as to the State, municipal, and rural electrification authorities.

Private power companies, with their extensive and interlocked transmission systems, are able to distribute and sell electricity more efficiently and cheaply than any Government agency.

Their facilities for so doing are already in existence.

The point is, however, that they will be able to give the people more power at less cost if they can buy such power from the Government.

The Government can manufacture it more cheaply than they can, as part of its over-all river-basin program.

Such cooperation can save the migration of industries from Lawrence, Lowell, and other manufacturing centers to those sections of the Nation which now provide low-cost power in sufficient quantity.

Since 1920 the use of electricity has doubled three times.

With the number of new users mounting rapidly, and use per capita rising just as fast, we face the prospect of brown-outs in many areas.

Any increase in energy resources must come from hydroelectric generators.

It is a fact that other primary sources of power, like oil and coal, are rising in cost and are frequently in short supply.

Hydroelectric power, on the other hand, is almost limitless.

As long as we have sun and air and rain, our rivers can provide constant sources of energy to do the work of man.

We cannot take pride in the fact that we allow our great rivers to continue as instruments of destruction instead of servants of the people.

In short, we need a sound policy for our river basins.

Such a program will protect the cover crops which nature provides to cushion the falling rain, to store this rain in reservoirs, and then send it over parched lands before allowing it to escape to the sea.

We must control the flow of our rivers to prevent floods, and direct this water through turbo-generators over and over again to extract the last measure of horsepower from it.

Look at the worn-out and abandoned farm land in New England.

Then consider the steady increase in our population.

Since it requires 3 acres of crop land to sustain each American at present living standards, it requires 3,000,000 additional acres brought under cultivation each year if we are to maintain this standard.

Instead of which, we are destroying—Nation-wide—500,000 acres every year.

Thus, the net marginal loss of crop-land resources over population demands is 3,500,000 acres every year.

Consider, also, the rising living standard of the American people.

Each of us is eating one-fifth more meat, one-third more eggs, and one-fourth more milk than before the war.

There are similar increases in other health-producing foods.

This is desirable and it is also proof of the soundness of the American way of life.

But, in the absence of a proper conservation of our natural resources, this progress will be endangered.

Recognizing the problem, President Roosevelt introduced on a regional scale the integrated approach to resource management.

Called the valley-authority approach, it established a Federal coordinating agency.

This controls water use through many-purpose projects, planned along lines of natural economic units, namely, the great river basins.

The TVA became a fact.

Here, in this once blighted area, many thousands of acres of wasted land have been brought back to fertility.

The raging waters have been controlled, harnessed, and hydroelectric power has been developed on a scale never dreamed of by private enterprise.

This power has been put to use for man at the lowest price in the history of the region.

The health, wealth, and the happiness of the people of the valley have reached an all-time high.

TVA increased the use of electricity in its area from far below the national average to 60 percent above the national average.

From 1945–47, 20,000 small business enterprises were established in the valley, even while New England was losing some of its manufacturing units

TVA has bettered the health of the region.

Its anti-malaria program has dropped the rate from 10 percent to less than one percent.

TVA has bettered the school system by research grants to local colleges.

The TVA has been hailed as the outstanding achievement of any government at any time.

Its principles have been adopted by countries throughout the world.

Investigations are developing plans for a Yellow River Authority in China, a Danube Valley Authority in Southeastern Europe, and many other regions hope to apply the lessons of America's outstanding experiment in river control and use.

That is, all except New England.

Take the Merrimack River.

I have spoken to you before concerning its undeveloped power possibilities.

Tonight I want to speak briefly about another and sinister phase—its pollution.

Last fall, the voters of those cities and towns which are drained by the river—rejected a State referendum designed to assess these communities for the purpose of financing a river-cleanup program.

The voters were right, for the cost was prohibitive . . . and the plan would only clean up part of the river.

But the problem remains, and it is a serious one.

In the city of Lawrence, for instance, where the accumulation of industrial and human waste almost reaches the saturation point, textile and paper mills line the banks of the river.

And yet, according to a report of the National Resources Board, the industries which are greatly bothered by serious water pollution include textiles, pulp and paper, etc.

The health of many communities is endangered during periods of low stream flow.

The river is always fed by murderous chemicals from sewers and factories.

Are we taking proper care of our natural resources?

Look at the river which runs through your industrial city and ask, isn't it time we did something about this danger?

And the inescapable answer is that only an over-all integrated program with Federal help can control a river basin in the public interest.

For flood control, for reclamation, for hydro-electric development, for every sound economic reason, and for our health and our lives.

National Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended editorial comment by Brooks Atkinson, of the New York Times, on the proposal contained in House Joint Resolution 104, for the information of the Members:

[From the New York Times of January 30, 1949]

(By Brooks Atkinson)

Sooner or later the theater people of the United States may have to decide just exactly what a national theater is. Representative JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, has filed a bill that puts the responsibility of devising a national theater, opera, and ballet on the shoulders of professional practitioners of these arts. Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York is sponsoring the same bill in the Senate.

Although we Americans are constantly taking bows for our wealth, enterprise, and virtue, we are the only first-class nation that does not recognize art as an integral part of national life. England has been scraping the bottom of the barrel of its resources for some time, but the British Government helps to support the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells and helps to subsidize the National Arts Council, which stimulates and assists artistic projects in Great Britain. Only the other day Parliament gave a second reading to a bill to provide $4,000,000 toward building a national theater structure in London. Parliament fights about nearly everything, but the proposal to build a national theater is one thing that nearly every member of every political group approves.

GOVERNMENT IN ART

Apart from the Federal Theater, which was an emergency relief project, we have never regarded the support of art as a legitimate function of government. Ever since colonial times we as a people have been suspicious of a central government and contemptuous of its group intelligence. Culturally we have never completely outgrown the latter day nineteenth century attitude of regarding art as a respectable and harmless diversion that rich people magnanimously patronize, thereby acquiring some good marks redeemable in heaven. Art has not yet been absorbed into the democratic way of life.

The attitude is medieval. But it is also embarrassing in our participation in UNESCO, which is an international organization set up on the assumption that every nation has official cultural representatives competent to take part in international projects. One of UNESCO's subprojects is the International Theatre Institute, designed to promote the exchange of plays and companies and to apply to the theater the enlightened point of view already accepted in science and trade.

Although our theater is one of the most stimulating in the world, we are the only first-class nation without a Government agency qualified to send an official theater delegation to a meeting of the ITI. Last summer the State Department got around the dilemma by sending Rosamond Gilder and Warren Caro to Prague as observers.

It costs less than $10,000 a year to maintain an American branch of the ITI. But there is no Government agency authorized to accept responsibility for this cog in the international machinery; and ANTA, a good-will organization so poverty-stricken that it cannot afford to pay the rent on its own headquarters, has saved the Government's face by agreeing to finance the branch of ITI here. In politics, science, and trade we are one of the most powerful nations of the world. In the sphere of cultural relations we rank with Monaco.

PROPOSED CONVENTION

These matters of international prestige are not of first importance. But theater, opera, ballet, and the public arts of performance vitally affect the culture of our people, who certainly ought to have as convenient access to the arts as the Russian people have. Representative JAVITS' bill proposes that, at the expense of the Government, the President call a convention of theater, opera, and ballet people to draw up plans for national institutions of their respective arts.

The theater panel would include representatives from Equity, Dramatists Guild, League of New York Theaters, the craft unions, ANTA, National Theater Conference, American Educational Association, Drama League, and all groups of people working at theater in the United States. Their first job would be to plan a national theater free of bureaucratic control and designed according to democratic principles. The next step would be for Congress to review the plan, accept it if it turns out to be satisfactory, and vote the authority and funds to sustain it. Opera and ballet panels would work in the same fashion.

If Representative JAVITS' bill is passed by Congress, the thousands of people working at theater all over the country will have to make up their minds as to what a practicable national theater is, and this is a very neat problem in itself. For the theater in every part of the country, including the commercial theater of Broadway, needs help; but the commercial, regional, university, community, and independent theaters have very little in common, have different problems and points of view, different kinds of audiences and different standards.

TOURING COMPANIES

No doubt there should be a theater building in Washington, where there is none today—another instance of our cultural backwardness. But a building is the least essential part of a theater, which is an organization of actors and artists working together for the performance of plays. And the basic problem would be how to make such organizations available to the entire country at prices low enough to suit the pocketbooks of the great mass of the people.

Before the war Robert Sherwood had a plan for establishing a national theater by sending about five touring companies around

the country to 1-night stands with a balanced annual program of classics, musical plays, current plays, and revivals. That was an excellent and enlightened plan—practical and comprehensive, but it became one of the first casualties of the war.

As a matter of fact, there is the nucleus of a national theater already in existence—the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA), chartered by Congress in 1935 but never seduced by the appropriation of funds. Considering its poverty and the generalized comprehensiveness of its plans, ANTA has made heartening progress in the last 3 years. It has become a central clearing house for information and services for theaters throughout the country, and it is the only thing approaching a general theater center in New York.

ANTA'S PLANS

What ANTA is doing now with quiet desperation on nickels and dimes ought to be one of the essential services of a publicly endowed national theater. But ANTA's main plan is one of subsidizing regional professional theaters throughout the country, using as a nucleus those already in existence, but helping local groups everywhere to establish others. This is obviously a sensible approach to the problem. But it has the disadvantage of being diffuse and general. It would be prohibitively expensive for a privately supported institution and would require a powerful central organization with authority to maintain artistic standards. For a national theater must represent first-rate professional work.

From the point of view of the country as a whole, ANTA's plan is the best one in existence at the moment. Since ANTA is chartered by Congress, it is legally the American National Theater right now and would be the logical organization to take charge of the machinery of a constitutional convention in consultation with other interested groups. Reorganized with a much broader base among working theater people, it could serve ultimately as the working headquarters of a national theater. By force of circumstances it does not have that much practical authority now. But Representative JAVITS' bill leaves the question wide open. What is a national theater?

The Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include House Resolution 17 of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, adopted January 25, 1949, a photostat copy of which was submitted to me by Hon. Edward J. Barrett, secretary of state for the State of Illinois:

House Resolution 17

Whereas no segment of the American people has made a greater contribution, in peace and in war, to the welfare of our Nation than have the working men and women of America; and

Whereas this magnificent contribution was made possible through the long struggle of organized labor to secure for the workingman recognition of certain fundamental rights; and

Whereas Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress, otherwise known as the Taft-Hartley Act, attempts to abridge labor's fundamental rights and to set the cause of the workingman back a generation; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act not only adversely affects organized labor but jeopardizes the peace and prosperity of the entire country, because whatever hurts labor hurts the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take immediate steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to restore to the working men and women of America the rights to which they are entitled and the respect they so richly deserve; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, January 25, 1949.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

CHAS. F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

EDWARD J. BARRETT,
Secretary of State.

Federal Power Policy Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on the closing day of the Eightieth Congress, there was transmitted to me, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, from the Committee on Appropriations, a study entitled "Federal Power Policy Study." Mr. A. B. Roberts, a consulting engineer, of Cleveland, Ohio, directed the study and Mr. W. H. Sigersen, C. P. A., assisted in the accounting phases of the study. Both of these men are outstanding authorities in their respective fields.

The report consists of 130 pages of highly informative data on electric power. Unfortunately the document, as yet, has not been printed so as to make it available to the public generally. It is, of necessity, technical in nature, but may be summarized in brief, as follows:

First. The Federal Government should cooperate with its citizens in the development of hydroelectric power, irrigation, and water-supply projects, and avoid competition with existing adequate facilities.

Second. The area of competition between federally owned power and citizen-owned power companies usually begins at the bus bar of Federal projects. In many multipurpose projects this competition does not include construction and operation of the dams themselves. The Federal construction of transmission lines to power markets frequently duplicates and tends to threaten existing and prospective private investments which do and could further serve the public adequately and as full taxpayers.

Third. Federal construction of transmission lines from dams on streams of erratic flow is particularly wasteful, unnecessary, and destructively competitive. Such projects require large storage reservoirs to equalize or regulate the flow. For many such projects the dam height and storage space is necessarily limited by the terrain, with the result that the full name-plate rating of the generators can be available only a few hours per day with remaining hours reserved for storage of water. This kind of power is of highest value only for absorption into integrated nearby systems during periods of daily peak demand. In such cases Federal investment in transmission lines not only is competitive with private investment but wasteful of Federal funds.

Fourth. In general, Federal power is not cheap but is made to appear so by allocating substantial portions of the investment and annual expenses to features other than power. For example, a reexamination of the allocation of TVA's investment in flood control, navigation, and power is now under way by the Federal Power Commission and the Corps of Engineers, which may substantially increase the capital base upon which TVA's rates are presently fixed. An adjustment of all Federal power rates is indicated.

Fifth. There should be full public disclosure of the subsidies involved at the projects now in operation and those proposed.

Sixth. Present conflicting procedures should be standardized and fully developed for:

(a) The determination of economic feasibility.

(b) Accounting and rate-making.

Seventh. Consideration should be given to the treatment of a Federal hydroelectric project in the same manner as for a licensee under the Federal Power Act. The standards of the Federal Power Act, if observed and applied in determining the economic feasibility of projects which include power, would make some radical changes in the investment allocations heretofore adopted.

Eighth. Studies should be made by competent authorities on the economic justification of all projects, whether complete, under construction, authorized or proposed, with a view to determining the effect of present price levels, rising costs, and changed economics of the Nation on the ability of such projects to repay funds advanced by the United States Treasury within a 50-year period, with interest. Those completed should be reviewed to ascertain if actual economic results obtained justify the actual investment and to determine whether any changes in practices need be made.

Ninth. Rates for power should be sufficient to meet all operation and maintenance expense, adequate provision for depreciation, payments in lieu of local, State and Federal taxes, full interest on the Federal investment in power, together with provision for repayment of such investment within a 50-year period on a straight-line basis. Federal investment in power should include interest during construction.

Tenth. The rights of States and their public utility commissions should be recognized at all times.

Eleventh. As a rule, the better hydroelectric sites of the United States have

already been developed, and the remaining sites have been preempted by Federal Government planning for later development. As the less attractive hydroelectric sites are constructed, they will tend to show an increase in cost and a diminishment of economic feasibility. The total cost of projects now proposed for power, flood control, navigation, and irrigation will exceed $40,000,000,000.

Twelfth. The Southwestern Power Administration serves no useful purpose and should be liquidated.

Thirteenth. At present the Bureau of Reclamation includes in electric rates an annual interest component of 3 percent of the investment allocated to power, which is later applied as a reduction of the investment chargeable to irrigation. This practice should be stopped and the interest component returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Fourteenth. Soil conservation methods should be vigorously extended to provide substantial flood prevention and reduce the need of large, costly, and numerous downstream reservoirs to be used for flood control.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Eightieth Congress is to be commended for the thorough manner in which its investigation staff, under the able direction of Mr. Robert E. Lee, Chief of Staff, handled its study of Federal power operations and comparison with the private electric utility industry. This complete report should be made available to the general public as soon as possible.

Friendship Train and Merci Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest means for showing the bond of personal friendship between peoples was initiated by Mr. Drew Pearson in the Friendship Train. Our allies in France have now responded with the Merci Train. Its contents are described in the appended editorial from the New York Times. Its contents in terms of human warmth and appreciation will find a response in the heart of every American.

GRATITUDE TRAIN

As one means of breaking down the barriers between the peoples of the many nations, a Friendship Train was organized last year by Drew Pearson and thousands of tons of foodstuffs were sent to Europe, a beau geste from us who have so much to others who had little. Today that bread of friendship cast upon the waters has come back to us from the French people in the form of a 49-car trainload of gifts to the American people.

The gifts that cram the outdated little French two-purpose railway cars—40 men or 8 horses—are as varied as the homes from which they came. One of Lafayette's descendants sent his ancestor's walking stick and a catalog of his books. One man contributed his grandfather's bicycle. President Auriol sent 49 rare Sévres vases, 1 for each of the 48 States and the District of Columbia. There is one of Napoleon's innumerable hats, a Louis XV carriage, a sedan chair. All were objects prized highly by the givers.

There is no taint of commercialism about the venture, any more than there was about the food that filled the original Friendship Train. These are gifts that the heart dictated. They are received as such. Undoubtedly many of them will be given honored places in the various State museums to which they should be assigned after they have been shown in their original setting aboard the Gratitude Train. In the same spirit in which they were given, the American people gratefully receive them.

American Relations With Russia, and Military Preparedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the February 1949 issue of the magazine The Reserve Officer, published by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, contains an article which I have prepared in connection with National Security Week, being celebrated beginning February 12. The article is entitled "Myths That May Mean Mass Suicide." I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYTHS THAT MAY MEAN MASS SUICIDE

EVERYONE IS SUBJECT TO BECOME A VICTIM OF SOME HOKUM AT ONE TIME OR ANOTHER; HOWEVER, WHEN IT CONCERNS OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE, IT BECOMES NOT A LAUGHING MATTER BUT RATHER A DEADLY PERIL TO OUR EXISTENCE

(By Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

In the life of a nation, belief in a myth may be as suicidal as an hallucination or a delusion in the life of an individual.

In the history of a people, a myth may be so powerful as to drug that people into paralysis, immobilize them into unpreparedness. Myths can be mightier than machines, more deadly than the deadliest poison gas.

Do you remember the myth back in the days of 1940 and 1941 to the effect that the United States could, if war came with Japan, lick the Nipponese within 30 to 60 days.

Do you remember the myth that paralyzed France in the early days of the Second World War to the effect that this was a phony war and that there would be no intensive fighting, but only an eventual negotiated peace?

These and other myths can be found throughout the pages of history, and often their consequences have been tragic.

At this time, I should like to ask the question (and I believe that all Reserve officers who read this article might like to ask the question): Are there myths today in our national thinking which might do us similar damage? Certainly no group in our Nation is as deeply concerned with ridding myths from our national consciousness than are Reserve officers. You men are, after all, the minute men of America's defense, the leaders who have sprung to the ramparts as the vanguard of our citizen army, navy, and air force whenever this blessed Republic has been endangered. Your eyes are clearly open to the realities of world politics and the world military situation. Myths are as obnoxious to you as poor arithmetic is unthinkable for a mathematician.

I believe that there are, indeed, many myths today which are doing us harm, and I should like to submit a few thoughts on some of them. Undoubtedly, my readers could add many more items to the list of myths which will follow. However long your list or mine may be, our aim is the same, to debunk the myths by the truth which sets men free.

Of course, different groups of our people tend to develop different myths. For that matter, every one of us, including myself, is subject to become a possible victim of some hokum at one time or another. When, however, hokum concerns our national defense, it becomes not a laughing matter or something to be tolerated, but a deadly peril to national existence.

Myths regarding Russia

The deadliest myths of all in our national thinking concern America's relations with the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. It is obvious that these relations constitute the single most important subject in the world of today, for there are only two great powers today—the United States and the U. S. S. R., with a host of subsidiary powers.

We have unfortunately built our own mental iron curtain in many respects—an iron curtain of self-delusions about Russia. It is essential that we have a clear understanding of these delusions so that we can eliminate them.

Factors causing delusions

There are certain contributing factors which help cause many of our delusions regarding Russia. Among those factors are these:

1. The insidious efforts by Communist and fellow-traveler groups in our midst to deceive us regarding Russia's intentions and to mask Russia's true imperialist character.

2. Another factor accounting for our self-deluding beliefs about Russia is that the U. S. S. R. represents a land whose traditions, whose entire approach is different from that of the western powers. We constantly interpret Russian actions, therefore, in the light of western morality and western precedents, whereas actually the thinking and the deeds of the leaders of Russia are based more upon the unscrupulous Asiatic precepts of Genghis Khan, than they are upon any western historical precedents.

3. A third factor accounting for our self-delusions regarding Russia is that we Americans are so peace loving in our approach, so tired and disgusted with the results of two world wars, that we tend to substitute wishful thinking in order to deceive ourselves about the possibility of a third world war, and in order mentally to minimize that possibility.

Specific myths

Well, what then are the specific myths?

1. Perhaps the basic myth of all is that a crisis may some day slowly loom in our relations with Russia, at which time we will see quite clearly that war is in the offing and that we must prepare against war. You might call this "the myth of adequate time" for preparedness. It is a myth that in the event of a third world war we will have a considerable amount of surplus time in which to step up our conscription program, remobilize industry, decentralize key Government agencies, and leisurely prepare for hostilities.

It is quite obvious, however, from an analysis of the facts in this atomic age that time, like the dimension of space, has been virtually annihilated by the ingenious developments of split-second offensive warfare. We definitely will not have time to do any of the leisurely things that we had sufficient time to do in the First and Second World Wars. It is quite essential, therefore, that

we do as many of the things which are possible now as we would do in the event that a deepened crisis of United States-Russian relations looms. Clearly we cannot now do everything that we would do if war appeared a matter of days off; ours is, after all, a peaceful economy of free men and women. We cannot keep our national budget, our industry, and our Government on a perpetual semiwar footing. But any expert observer knows that even in our present peaceful economy we are not now doing the minimum that we could do (e. g., in the field of stock piling) for adequate preparation against a potential conflict.

Inadequate decentralization

Take the field of Government decentralization, which I discussed in my article in the February 1948 issue of The Reserve Officer magazine. In this article I pointed out that one atomic bomb smashing Washington could quite obviously knock out the very heart and brains, so to speak, of our entire military defense set-up. I am very grateful for the wonderful response which this article met, particularly from the alert members of the Reserve Officer Association, throughout our country. But what has happened since that article appeared and since other individuals have explained the danger of an atomic bomb hitting the Pentagon Building in Arlington, Va.?

Well, judging at least from outward appearances, you could put all of the Federal decentralization preparations made since then in a single Reserve officer's hat. There has been hemming and hawing. There have been excuses and alibis. There have been promises about something being done in the nebulous future, but there has actually been more centralization in Washington than decentralization in recent months.

I have hopes that the results of the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government may serve to speed Government decentralization. However, it is quite clear that this Commission's efforts alone will not fill the need, but that some of the specific suggestions which others have recommended and which I recommended in my article last February must be taken. Decentralization however, is but one part of the vast mosaic of defense preparations which are essential, when once we clearly recognize that we will not have sufficient time to gird our loins in a third world war.

Now, obviously, there are many defense preparations being made necessarily secretly by our defense officials. Neither I nor any other layman would presume to ask that these confidential preparations be announced openly; on the contrary, secrecy in many instances is essential for national security. But it is clear, too, that our public could rightly be let in on a lot more details than the public is now permitted to have, especially as regards decentralization efforts of the National Security Resources Board, efforts to disperse our industry and Government against the possibility of war.

Wishful thinking about Russia

2. Well, will there be war at all? Every thinking person prays that war may never again come. This is especially true of every person who has seen the horrors of the First and Second World Wars and who knows that wars accomplish very little that is constructive and settle very few, if any, problems. It is our prayer—yours and mine—that the United Nations will find the basis for a just and lasting peace. But some people feel that the common folks of all the world are actually so sick and disgusted with war, that there could not possibly be a third world conflict. Thus, there is the specific myth that the peoples of the U. S. S. R., who suffered so much in the Second World War, would not allow themselves to be precipitated into a new global conflict. Nothing could be further from the truth. It obviously matters very little to the 6,000,000 Communists at the absolute helm of the Soviet Union what the people of the Soviet Union want or do not want. It obviously matters very little to these cold-blooded leaders that the Russian people have suffered grievously in the Second World War, that their loss in life was staggering, not to mention their loss in national resources and property.

It is quite clear that when and if the leaders of Russia believe that they could win a third world war, either by superior weapons, the element of surprise, or by any other means, and when and if they believe that a hot war would be preferable to infiltration in the cold war, they would engage us in a very hot war. It is principally their fear of losing that proves the deterrent to the Red leaders from precipitating another conflict.

The masters of the Soviet Union are the coldest, shrewdest, calculating bunch of racketeers at the helm of a state that human history has ever seen. Their decisions are based not upon national sentiment or desire, but upon the cold calculations of a few individuals steering the Russian ship (or submarine) of state.

Myth of Russian compromises

3. Another myth in our relations with Soviet Russia is that there have been many occasions when the Russians have been "easier to get along with" than on other occasions. Some folks seem to believe that oftentimes, we have been close to a "permanent" settlement with the Russians, only to have that basis bungled by some element of diplomacy. This, too, is obviously far from objective fact.

It is quite clear that the Russians since the end of the Second World War and for that matter, long before that, have been playing a "cat and mouse" game with American and other diplomats. This is a game in which the Russian poker players appear alternately tough and alternately soft, alternately willing to make so-called concessions and alternately unwilling to make the slightest compromise. By foisting this notion, the Russians have constantly thrown us off balance. Repeatedly, they have built up phony "peace movements" in the cold war, and then have shocked us by a successive series of disappointments which have so frustrated us that there have been many who have said, "Oh, well, perhaps it's not worth dealing with them at all, and perhaps we might just as well give them Berlin" or give them something else they want.

We must not be fooled by phony "peace" movements. Russian strategy is a long-range strategy. The Russians may change their tactics now and then; they may want to give the appearance of halting their imperialism, but we can take it for granted that, so long as Marxist materialism and Communist fanaticism rule the Soviet state, we will be in a continuous state of siege.

Myth of Russia's peaceful growth

4. Another myth is one insidiously foisted by Communists in the U. S. A. to the effect that Russia is a peacefully growing nation, anxious to keep her own prosperity, her industry, and her agriculture peacefully improving and she is therefore undesirous of waging war. This myth, too, is readily debunked by the apparently confirmed reports that Russia is far from a peacefully growing and stable state, eager to rebuild. Rather, she is having serious internal troubles of her own.

The Russian leaders well remember the old formula that when a nation is having internal troubles, a suitable means for eliminating them is by precipitating external troubles and perhaps war. Russia, with her diverse nationalities and tongues, has always reacted to war by further amalgamating herself. Hitler's legions obviously furthered this amalgamation process, and perhaps a third world war which would bind the Russian people still closer together, by atomic bombs falling on her cities, could still further advance this process.

It may seem unthinkable to us Americans that a nation would precipitate a war as a means, among other things, of securing greater national unity. But nothing is beyond the shrewd calculations of the Soviet leaders. They are well aware, too, that war between Russia and the United States, just as war between any major powers, would inevitably bring more chaos in its aftermath—chaos in which totalitarianism could readily breed.

Myths about future warfare

5. Then, too, there are myths concerning the exact type of warfare which may come. On the one hand, we have certain civilians who mistakenly believe that the next war will be a 100-percent "push-button affair," in which a few technicians sitting at instrument boards will hurl guided missiles into space—missiles containing atomic war heads and bacteriological capsules, and that this will constitute the entire extent of the war, with practically no human beings being involved, except in terms of becoming the victims of the war.

At the opposite extreme of these "push-button warfare" enthusiasts, are some of the military and naval brass hats who, in the traditional way, have been thinking of fighting the next war with the outdated instruments of the last war. These are the men who are thinking in terms of mass armies on land, or giant battleship armadas on sea. It is against this type of rut-bound brass-hat thinking that (as I recalled last February) another Wisconsin man, Gen. Billy Mitchell, so long warned us.

Obviously, we must avoid both extremes—the extreme of falling a victim to the hoax about a 100-percent push-button war, and the other extreme of being a chump and accepting the fool notion that we will have the parallel of World War I trench warfare or World War II type warfare in the advent of a third conflict.

Myth about war's inevitability

6. Perhaps the worst myth of all is the myth about the inevitability of war. In many quarters there is, unfortunately, a complete fatalism about the alleged inescapability of a third world war. Now, everyone recognizes that our military men must intelligently plan against the possibility of a new war breaking out. But it is one thing to keep optimistic about the chances of peace but to plan to win a dreaded war if it comes; it is another thing to capitulate psychologically beforehand and to fall into despondency and brooding about the so-called inevitability of war. None of us—reservists, members of the Regular Military Establishment, legislators, diplomats, citizens—should ever abandon hope that, somehow, we will find the means to perpetuate a just and lasting peace, particularly if we remain preeminent in all types of defense and offensive preparations.

These, then, are some of the myths of our times. All of my readers may not agree that all of the above are myths. It would, of course, be dangerous to label arbitrarily any viewpoint conflicting with our own as a myth.

I believe, however, that there is ample objective basis for terming the above beliefs as myths.

Conclusion

You and I recognize the realities of this atomic age. We recognize the aggressive expansionism of Russia, her intention to use every possible means to accomplish her ends, her cat-and-mouse diplomatic game, her fear of our way of life. Yet we feel that the genius of America which won victories on battlefields at staggering cost in life—the genius of America which has always been adequate to meet emergencies—this genius will not let us down in the diplomatic fight for peace.

Eternal vigilance which is the creed of every Reserve officer, must be the creed of every American. Eternal vigilance of heart and mind, a clear perception of the "truth which sets men free"—these must be ou goals.

Each of my readers, undoubtedly, in addition to his membership in the ROA, is a member of a lodge, a church group, a business group, a civic or other group. It is up to each of us to help in our own sphere of activity, antidote some of the false notions, some of the really cockeyed beliefs which might do our beloved Nation so much damage, and which already have done us so much damage.

When once the American people get an understanding of the true facts, the true realization of the present m 'litary and political situation, there is nothing that can stop them from acting calmly, constructively, and ably. History has proven this time and again. "Give the people the facts, and they will take the appropriate action." I am certain that the ROA will continue to do its magnificent job in giving the people the facts, in helping to give the Congress the facts, so that in our external vigilance, we may never lose our precious birthright of liberty.

Hawaii Found the Most Democratic Place on Earth by President of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter addressed to the local presidents of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers in the National Congress Bulletin of January 1949 by Mrs. Mabel W. Hughes, president of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, on her recent visit to Hawaii.

I believe Mrs. Hughes' impressions of Hawaii merit particular attention as she was given an unusual opportunity over a period of several weeks to study conditions at first hand in the islands, particularly those relating to the educational system.

She noted an exceptional interest in Hawaii in education and points out in her letter that the percentage of increase in the membership of parent-teacher organizations in the Territory during the past year was higher in Hawaii than in any other part of the country.

The parents and teachers organization of Hawaii, as well as the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, is on record as strongly favoring immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The text of Mrs. Hughes' letter follows:

DEAR LOCAL PRESIDENTS: As I think back over my recent trip to Hawaii, I feel I must share with you some of my impressions of that beautiful cluster of islands and its gracious people.

Like every visitor to Hawaii, I was impressed by the way the people of those islands live and practice democracy. I found the Territory of Hawaii the most democratic place on earth. There all races live together in harmony, attend the same schools, and enjoy the same opportunities for advancement. Hawaiians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos, Portuguese, Puerto Ricans, Samoans—all are important components of the population. These people all are practicing the democracy that the rest of the world is wistfully talking about. There has never been a racial riot in all the history of the islands. How much easier the task of the United Nations would be if only the other nations of the world were as enlightened as is Hawaii.

Among the outstanding memories I brought home with me are pictures of the many schools I visited. They were of all types, from the largest high schools in Honolulu to the two-room rural schools on several of the islands. Although all the schools are not new and all do not meet the standards of the progressive educators and parents of Hawaii, some of them are very beautiful and all of them are freshly painted and clean. They have up-to-date teaching aids, good libraries, fine pictures, and choice pieces of sculpture and porcelains. And everywhere one finds the most beautiful fresh flowers arranged daily by the pupils themselves. In fact, I found several classes working on courses in the art of flower arrangement. Needless to say, accomplished musicians, singers, and dancers are to be found in all Hawaiian communities, and it follows naturally that the children should be well instructed in all these refining arts.

When the missionaries came to Hawaii from New England in 1820 one of their first acts was to establish schools. Lahainaluna, on the island of Maui, is today the oldest school west of the Rocky Mountains. Punahou School in Honolulu was established a short time later, in 1841. It was my great pleasure to visit both these schools, Lahainaluna and Punahou. At the latter I spent nearly an entire day as the guest of the faculty at luncheon, viewing programs by two departments of the school, and in the afternoon attending a parent-teacher meeting. It was at Punahou that the first parent-teacher association in Hawaii was organized in 1915.

During my stay I likewise met with the Honolulu school principals and also with the rural Oahu principals. From both gatherings I learned much of lasting value. Similarly, I spent a most enjoyable two hours with a group of about 30 officials of the department of public instruction.

I cannot conclude this all-too-brief summary of my visits to the schools of Hawaii without mention of the University of Hawaii. There, during the first week of my visit, I had the pleasure of conferring with Dr. Bruce White, dean of education and teacher training, with regard to a course to be given at the university on the parent-teacher movement. I also visited the nursery and kindergarten schools of the university's training school. Before I left for home I returned for luncheon with a group of the faculty. It is the hope of Kilmer O. Moe, president of the Hawaii Congress, and my own hope that the University of Hawaii may serve in time as a training center in parent-teacher leadership for the entire Pacific area—Samoa, Guam, the Philippines, and perhaps even Japan—much as Northwestern University is now serving the national congress in continental United States.

Everywhere in educational circles the question most frequently discussed was Federal aid for education and what share in such funds Hawaii would receive when the proposed legislation is finally enacted. Teaching standards in the islands are high, requiring 5 years of college work. The salary for beginniners is $177 a month, plus a bonus of $45, for 12 months in the year. Teachers in town and rural communities alike work according to the same salary scale.

Wherever I went I encountered great courtesy and a warm, alert interest in the purposes of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. In the brief course of my visit I made more than 50 speeches to more than 8,000 persons. The meetings were held mainly in school buildings where groups of parents ranged in size from 25 to 250 persons. My talks were completely informal and were followed by lively discussions in which members of the audience took part. Besides attending meetings of the State board of managers and the State executive committee, I had the opportunity of participating in district, council, and local parent-teacher meetings.

Throughout Hawaii, but especially in the outer islands, I found great interest and enthusiasm for the parent-teacher movement. People who have to be up by 5 o'clock next morning to work on the sugar and pineapple plantations will drive from 10 to 20 miles in the evening to the nearest schoolhouse for a parent-teacher meeting. Under the splendid leadership of their president, membership is booming. Last year the congress was able to proudly report a gain of 28.4 percent, or the greatest percentage increase in the whole of the national congress.

It was with deep regret that I said my last "aloha" to the kind Hawaiian friends who had extended to me, as your national president, the unrivaled hospitality of their lovely homeland.

Faithfully yours,

MABEL W. HUGHES,
President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Save the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to extend my remarks to include an open letter written by Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, one of the leading Republican women of the country. Her letter is as follows:

SAVE THE REPUBLIC BEFORE THE SYMBOLS DISAPPEAR

DEAR REPUBLICANS: Will you join me in a personal campaign to save the Republic and the symbols which represent our American heritage? We are face to face with every conceivable method, means, propaganda, and sabotage to undermine the faith of the people in our form of government. Although the military and psychological battle lines are evident and the UN seems impotent to deal with major problems, we Americans have been negligent regarding our greatest contribution to the continuation of the American way. We are unwittingly letting the symbols of the Republic disappear from our national, local, educational, and individual life. Can we save the Republic without the symbols which blazed the trail to American freedom and liberty?

A few examples will suffice to prove the point. Since its inception the General Federation of Women's Clubs have had a committee called American citizenship; why did they delete the word "American"? (Another symbol disappears.) Who was responsible for the inscription over the Constitution on the Freedom Train, which reads: "Here, Democratic Government Was Established"? Who is responsible for the lack of patriotic symbols, exercises, pictures, and songs in the schools? You see we have been very busy with foreign affairs and experiments in social progress and while we kept our heads in the clouds of Utopian perfection, the enemy came and sowed the tares of patriotic disintegration right in our own homes, schools, churches, and clubs. That's why the great remedial work must be done

by the folks back home, and we must stop the spread of communism, socialism, New Dealism, and all "isms" which destroy the symbols, the vocabulary, and the faith of our fathers which made and kept us a nation.

You will remember Mr. Woodrow Wilson once started a slogan, Make the world safe for democracy. Now, it hasn't been safe for anybody since, but he started something which has almost obliterated the original concept of the Republic. In fact, the Republic and the republican form of government have been doing the disappearing act ever since, because of the planned reaction to the social and political connotation and use of the word "democracy." They have been so successful in interpreting the word to mean Democratic Party that today even mentioning the words "Republic" or "Republican" puts the one on the defensive team. Most all writers, educators, speakers, and one-worlders think the word "democracy" is the only medium through which to define America.

Recently I attended a national educational conference in St. Louis. During a whole week of study and talks with leading educators I did not hear the words "American," "Republic," or "our form of government" mentioned. The theme of the conference (which included delegates from all States and 15 foreign countries) was—please note carefully—"Democratic education, the hope of the world." The extent to which this menace has gone is shown in the final statement to the teachers by a leading Columbia professor: "You, the teachers of America, hold the future of the world in your hands; you have two choices; you will either teach children to be despots or democrats." For heaven's sake, let's be realistic and face facts. When the youth of America are indoctrinated from kindergarten through college with foreign ideologies under the guise of social progress and under the name of democratic education, can we, at the voting level, change the vocabulary, their resulting philosophy, and their actions to an understanding of and love for the republican form of government? No; it is too late. How gullible we have been.

Let every Republican resolve to become a committee of one to reestablish the name of the Republic in the hearts and minds of the people, and refrain from using the word democracy, because we are thus aiding and abetting the New Dealers and left-wing educators in their planned campaign to change our philosophy by changing our vocabulary and textbooks. "We have given you a Republic, if you can keep it."

Yes, Mr. Franklin, the Republican Party will keep it.

This is a republic. The founders, the Constitution, and the pledge say so.

Yours for victory,

Mrs. S. WYATT PAYNE,
President, West Virginia Federation of Republican Women's Clubs, Huntington, W. Va.

National Associations Adopting Resolutions Supporting Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following list of national associations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii:

National associations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii

Association	Convention held	Date
1. American Legion	San Francisco, Calif.	February 1946.
2. American Veterans Committee	National convention, Des Moines, Iowa.	June 14-16, 1948.
	Cleveland, Ohio	Nov. 25-28, 1948.
3. American Water Works Association	National convention, New York	June 1948.
4. Association of State and Territorial Health Officers		April 1946.
5. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Board of Directors.	Annual meeting	Nov. 22, 1946; Apr. 28, 1948.
6. Committee for Maritime Unity		
7. Congress of the National Society of Delta Sigma Rho	National convention, Chicago, Ill.	Apr. 10-12, 1947.
8. Disabled American Veterans	Convention held at Las Vegas, Nev.	Aug. 17-23, 1947.
	New York	Aug. 15-21, 1948.
9. General Conference, Methodist Church	Boston, Mass.	May 10, 1948.
10. Governors' National Conference	Salt Lake City, Utah	July 17, 1947.
11. International Association for Identification	Rochester, N. Y.	July 18, 1946.
	Denver, Colo.	Sept. 30, 1948.
12. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.	Seventh biennial convention, San Francisco, Calif.	Apr. 7-11, 1947.
13. Lions International	Philadelphia, Pa.	July 20, 1946.
	New York City, N. Y.	July 29, 1948.
14. National Association of Real Estate Boards	Atlantic City, N. J.	Nov. 15, 1946.
15. Kiwanis Club	Los Angeles, Calif.	June 6-10, 1948.
16. National Association of Sanitarians	Fourteenth annual convention, Salt Lake City, Utah.	Sept. 15-17, 1947.
17. National Education Association	Convention held at Buffalo, N. Y.	July 1946.
18. National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs	Convention held at Chicago, Ill.	March 1947.
19. National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.	Fifty-fifth Continental Congress, Atlantic City, N. J.	May 20-23, 1946.
20. Republican National Committee	Washington, D. C.	April 1946.
21. Soroptomists Clubs		
22. United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, board of directors.	Tulsa, Okla.	Aug. 21, 1947.
23. Veterans of Foreign Wars		September 1946.
	St. Louis, Mo.	Aug. 29-Sept. 3, 1948.
24. World Trade Committee		February 1947
25. Young Women's Christian Association		
26. Zonta Clubs of America	Swampscott, Mass.	June 1946.
27. American National Livestock Association	Boise, Idaho	Jan. 13-15, 1948.

Council of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New Orleans States of January 29, 1949, and the New Orleans Item of January 31, 1949:

[From the New Orleans (La.) States of January 29, 1949]

DREAM OF STATESMEN REALIZED WITH AGREEMENT FOR A COUNCIL OF EUROPE

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, January 29.—The western union powers had agreed today to create a Council of Europe and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means real delegation of sovereign powers to a European body. Alongside this committee will be an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments of Europe which will meet in public.

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting in the Prime Minister's room in the House of Commons to approve these momentous decisions which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

Only the details remain to be filled in. They are to be worked out by the permanent commission of the Brussels powers, which meets weekly in London. It is composed of the ambassadors of the four continental countries, plus Gladwyn Jebb, of Foreign Office, who represents Britain.

In comparison with this news, the further announcement that the Brussels powers had agreed, as expected, to grant de facto recognition of Israel came as an anticlimax. France has already recognized Israel and it was known that Britain and the others were going to do so in the next few days.

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, came out at the end of their 2-day conference they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history. They had taken the first important practical step toward the goal that has beckoned European statesmen from Sully's seventeenth century "grand design" to Briand's "United States of Europe."

Here is the relevant passage of the communique:

"After considering the most valuable preparatory work accomplished in Paris by the Committee for the Study of European Unity, the council (consultative council of the Brussels powers) agreed that there should be established a Council of Europe consisting of a ministerial committee meeting in private and a consultative body meeting in public. The permanent commission was instructed to study the detailed application of decisions of principle taken by the council. The council decided to invite other European countries to take part in negotiations for establishment of the Council of Europe."

Although many of the proposed details remain secret and others are still to be worked out it is possible to add some flesh to these bare bones.

It was agreed that the appointment of delegates to the consultative body and their voting powers shall be left to the discretion of each country which can satisfy its own constitutional practices.

France, for instance, can elect her delegates by majority vote of Parliament and thus exclude Communists. Britain could appoint delegates from the Labor Party or all three parties.

This is one of the compromises reached during the past 2 days. Because the French wanted delegates to the European Assembly to be elected and Britain wanted them nominated by the governments.

Britain originally wanted voting in assembly on the consultative body, as it is now called, to be compulsory bloc-voting by nations. Mr. Bevin as expected yielded on this point and decisions will be taken by majority vote of all delegates, voting individually and not as national groups.

A British compromise proposal whereby the ministers' council would control the agenda of the consultative body was accepted. Subjects for discussion by the consultative body can be determined on the initiative of either organization but ultimate control of the agenda, which is to say power of the veto, will rest with the ministerial committee.

The principle on which voting will take place in both organizations has been decided but it is being kept secret. Guessing is that it will be by two-thirds vote in the ministerial committee and a majority in the assembly. This would reflect the fact that the latter body is merely advisory whereas the former has executive powers.

Nothing is being said either about the weighting of representation, but it is presumed that the greater powers will have a proportionately heavy vote in the ministerial committee while each individual delegate will have equal weight in the consultative body.

[From the New Orleans (La.) Item of January 31, 1944]

A TURNING POINT IN HISTORY

Formation of a Council of Europe was proclaimed in London at the week's end. This is a momentous development in the continuing drama of current history. Its potentials dwarf most of the day's more spectacular chronicles of Congressional bickerings over Taft-Hartley repeal, the Kuomintang's defeat in China, and all the rest.

Within a year or two, these will be little more than individual dates in the chronology of 1949, remembered as we today recall repeal of the Smoot-Hawley tariff or the signing of the Hay-Pouncefote treaty. But the fact that a Council of Europe has come into being may well be a major turning point in the history of mankind.

The difference between a Council of Europe and a parliament of Europe is one of degree, not of kind. Implicit in the creation of such a council is profound reorientation of continental thinking. Compared to such a change, the further shift from council to parliament is comparatively slight. The situation is very much like that of man seeking entry to a desirable home the door of which is locked and barred. The big problem is to get the portal open. Once that is accomplished, stepping across the threshold is a simple matter.

The nations of Europe have been excluded from political and economic unity—from a United States of Europe—by the barriers of ancient custom, national jealousy, and the ingrained tribal thinking of 2,000 years. Temporary holy alliances here or triple ententes there have constituted the only thrusts toward voluntary cooperation. Not even military conquests could fuse them into real entity on such a relatively small scale as that of Austro-Hungary. The instant the Hapsburg dynasty was shorn of military might, fission split the empire into Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria proper, and parts of Yugoslavia and Poland. The worst error of the four old men at Versailles in 1919 probably was that instead of seeking to forge a union of Europe, they split that continent into still smaller—and therefore weaker—national components of a debile world league.

Global war, and the devastation that accompanied it, have sharpened European understanding of the old adage that in union there is strength. For a time after the guns fell silent, national jealousies were revived as jingoes prated with resounding but otherwise empty phrases against any surrender of sovereignty. But the omen of peril from the East was growing, as one small nation after another was swallowed up by the Soviet colossus.

When finally the Marshall plan was formulated, its basic meaning was clear. "We," said the United States, "can't make each one of you individually strong enough, either economically or militarily, to resist aggression. But if you unite, if you pool your productive capacity and resources, if you forget the outworn tariff barriers and border guards you maintain, your combined might can be assisted to keep you economically self-sufficient and militarily secure."

It wasn't accomplished overnight. But patience and firmness—and the growing menace behind the iron curtain that sealed off eastern Europe—overcame bit by bit the political thought-pattern fixed by centuries of habit. Three small nations—Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—formed the economic Benelux federation which ultimately entered with Britain and France into the pact of Brussels.

At the week end, the five Brussels partners took two steps of enormous significance. France had already accorded de facto recognition to Israel. Saturday the other four signatories took the same step simultaneously. The announcements were made individually at London, Brussels, The Haugue, and Luxemburg. Nevertheless, for the first time a European economic and military confederation thereby took political action that was united in all but name.

On the heels of this, came announcement that agreement had been reached to create a Council of Europe on which the five partners of the Brussels Pact would be charter representatives, and into which other European countries would be invited. A bicameral organization has already been agreed upon, with a Council of Ministers for one chamber and a Consultative Assembly for the other.

This is clearly recognizable as the democratic parliamentary pattern of political federation. The loose economic union which was begun under the Marshall plan thus paved the way for joint political action. Only a much shorter and much easier step is now needed to go from that point to formal political federation. Beyond the threshold of a doorway whose locks and bars are down, and which now stands invitingly open, the Council of Europe can become a Parliament, the central assembly of the United States of Europe, a potent force for peace and abundance in tomorrow's brave new world.

"A Promise Made Is a Debt Unpaid"—Adequate Veterans' Hospital Facilities Must Be Provided

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, from the volumes of words spoken in this House there comes now and then a ringing call for action in behalf of those whose service in the cause of freedom has preserved for us and our people the privileges we enjoy here. Demands are made upon us and our Government in behalf of many worthy causes, impossible of fulfillment in their entirety because of their multiplicity and scope. Even America cannot do all that it would for its people and its neighbors.

But we have tried to be ever conscious of our supreme obligation to the men and women who gave of their time and their very lives in service to their flag and country in time of war. By our actions we have shown to the world our determination that the pledges made by a grateful Nation to its fighting men and women shall be redeemed in full measure.

Many things we said we would do for our war veterans, and most of them have been done. But above all we said that we would provide medical care and hospitalization—if that be necessary—for our sons and daughters who wore the uniform in time of war. In all the sordid history of war, there stands out boldly one saving grace—the proper care of those wounded and maimed in service to their flag. Certainly, the history of America has reflected a consciousness of this obligation to our war veterans.

Mr. Speaker, as a war veteran myself and as one who fought through the years for facilities adequate to properly care for the veterans of that earlier war, I felt proud indeed when Congress and the administration charted a course which would leave no veteran of the recent war in want and in need of care. This time it was not an implied promise, for we reduced to law our intention that provision would be made in full measure of the need. A promise made is a debt unpaid, and this debt goes deeper even than national honor. It goes to the very heart of America.

It was my privilege to serve on the Veterans' Committee of the House when plans were under way for the construction of additional veterans' hospital facilities. There was no division of opinion as to the merits of the undertaking. And so was the beginning of the greatest hospital-building program ever undertaken by any people—and never for a more worthy purpose was any program launched.

Mr. Speaker, there are some 350,000 veterans in Oklahoma. Certainly there was never an intention that these men and women should be denied medical care and hospital facilities. Certainly no thinking person would consider penalizing the great patriotism of these men and women of Oklahoma by denying them even the minimum of care.

Many of our veterans have suffered in silence. Countless have been unable to obtain the medical care and hospitalization they so desperately needed because the facilities were not there. Still others were sent to facilities in neighboring States, there to suffer once more the despair of loneliness far from their loved ones. Mothers and wives and children traveled great distances to visit their veteran kin in hospitals far from home.

And they complained not unduly, for had not their Government announced plans for the construction of additional hospital facilities in Oklahoma?

But the axe fell the other day, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs said that plans for hospital construction in Oklahoma would be partially abandoned. Refusing to believe that our people were to be so discriminated against, we asked the Administrator for a clarification of the matter. His spokesman told the Oklahoma congressional delegation that 24 of the contemplated 90 new hospitals had been stricken to comply with the requirements of President Truman for a reduced budget. This spokesman said that where construction had begun, the work would be finished; that where construction had not been started, the axe would necessarily fall. It was his judgment that had they known this would happen, they perhaps would have abandoned other sites now under construction in favor of our hospitals. But that is poor solace to our suffering veterans.

Further representations have been made, and we expect to carry the fight further. How paradoxical that we should have to fight for the fulfillment of a promise so freely made to those most deserving of our aid.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the people of the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma. Their sons have been in the front ranks in our wars, and I can do no less than my best in their behalf. Among my people I have particularly enjoyed the writings and the wisdom of one who edits the Muskogee County News. By unanimous consent, I include in my remarks a recent editorial by Mr. Robin Hood, editor of the News. This editorial is most timely and I hope that the Members as well as those in authority in the Veteran's Administration will give it the careful consideration it deserves.

BETWEEN YOU AND ME

(By Robin Hood)

COMPLETE THE HOSPITAL

If the Federal Government must economize in its plans for the hospitalization of veterans, there is no better place to begin than in Muskogee, by completing the existing overcrowded facility.

When the Veterans' Administration laid its postwar program for hospitals to serve millions of additional ex-soldiers and ex-sailors, it bypassed Muskogee and asked Congress to provide billions for gigantic new buildings. These were to be located in or near large cities; the excuse was that new construction should be close to medical schools. One new hospital was to be located in Oklahoma City, with capacity for 1,000 beds. Another was to be built at Norman for psychoneurotic cases.

But these plans went to the wayside a week ago when President Truman directed that the hospitalization program be cut in half, part of his effort to bring Government income and Government expenses close enough together to be on speaking terms with each other. The Veterans' Administration now has reconciled itself to getting along with no hospital at Norman but asks for construction of a 500-bed hospital at Oklahoma City.

But with a relatively small expenditure the Government can add 336 beds to the unit out on Agency Hill. Its present capacity is 386 beds.

The present hospital was designed with the definite purpose of adding a fourth floor to one of the wings, adding three stories to the existing connecting links, and constructing a fourth wing. So complete was the designing that the foundations under and roofs over the wide runways were laid down for four floors; the roofs were laid to be the floors for the second stories. Ground space is ready for the fourth wing; no land is necessary.

The entire new construction can be devoted to beds with the exception of usual ward office space for nurses. The existing kitchens, dining room, assembly hall, library, engineering facilities, staff offices, and other administrative facilities were constructed to handle the additional bed capacity.

The need in Oklahoma is critical. The Sooner State's only veteran hospital other than the one in Muskogee is located in temporary buildings at Will Rogers Field, where there are 220 beds. A large proportion of Oklahoma cases are necessarily sent to surrounding States. Standard procedure is to route veterans from the northern tier of counties into Kansas and from the southern tier of counties into Texas, where similar crowding exists. Veterans' Administration files show that it is not unusual for veterans in need of hospitalization to wait 4 to 6 months for admission.

With a view to eliminating some of the overcrowding, Congress appropriated $465,000 just before the war to enlarge the hospital so as to provide office space for the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration, which at that time was occupying space required for hospital beds. Before work could start the emergency was on, construction materials became critical, the task was postponed, the ear-marked funds were returned to the general treasury. Later the administrative offices were moved uptown, to the Railway Exchange building, which the citizens of Muskogee bought and presented to the Veterans' Administration as a gift.

Such assistance from the city should mean something to the Veterans' Administration. In such a city can be found the generous help and cooperative spirit that will ease many of the problems of an enlarged hospital. The community asks no special favors from the Government. Yet in view of the fact that probably nowhere in the United States can a 336-bed capacity be built and administered so economically, it seems like a bit of ingratitude on the Government's part to brush aside the Muskogee project with the thin excuse that there is no medical school here.

Without criticizing the magnitude of the proposals for hospitalization, it seems self-evident that existing facilities should first be developed to their economical capacity.

The plea of local veteran groups, backed by physicians of all eastern Oklahoma, for completion of this modern, beautifully located hospital plant is indeed a just one.

Civil-Rights Program—FEPC in New York—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Communists all over the world are gloating because of my being left off of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

They seem to think that they have won a great victory.

But I serve notice on them now that I will carry on my fight from the floor of the House, to expose these enemies within our gates as long as I am a Member of this body.

The Committee on Un-American Activities rendered the greatest service of any agency of this Government in exposing those enemies, those traitors, who were here plotting the overthrow of this Government at a time when our boys were dying by the thousands on every battle front in the world.

These subversive forces are still with us, and are endeavoring to force through Congress the so-called civil-rights program, including the FEPC—one of the most vicious pieces of communistic legislation ever proposed in a civilized country.

This alien minority was largely responsible for placing this vicious measure on the statute books of the State of New York.

The Republican members of the legislature were brow beaten into voting for it when they did not want it. Governor Dewey signed it "with 22 pens." When he did, "all the perfumes of Arabia" would not have sweetened "his little hand."

Wherever the American people found out what that vicious measure meant, and understood that it was written by Joe Stalin in 1920, it simply meant the defeat of Dewey.

This vicious measure has been defeated everywhere the people have had a chance to vote on it; and if this Congress forces it onto the American people now, you will see the greatest house cleaning Congress has experienced in many a day, just as soon as the people get a chance to vote on their nominations next year.

They will not wait for the general election, but will begin with the primaries.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fighting this communistic program for a long time. At this point I am inserting a speech which I made on this floor on this proposition on July 29, 1948, in which I included one delivered on February 13, 1947, and one delivered on June 12, 1945.

I hope every Member of this House will take the time to read what I had to say, and to examine the quotations and statistics which I inserted.

Then they will see what a dangerous program these Reds, their stooges, and fellow-travelers are trying to force through Congress at this time.

Here is what I said on this floor on July 29, 1948:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, at the other end of the Capitol we are witnessing a spectacle that forcibly reminds us of the old example of Nero fiddling while Rome burned.

Instead of amending the Federal Reserve Act to check inflation and save the country from the disaster of another deflation, such as we had in 1921 and again in 1929, they take up this communistic civil-rights program, beginning with the anti-poll-tax bill.

I wonder if Members of the House and of the Senate think that the object of this Congress is to persecute the white people of the Southern States in order to save the faces of certain candidates for President on this crazy civil-rights program, which they have endorsed.

Is that the reward our servicemen from the South are to get for their sacrifices in the recent conflict?

Is that the reward the white people of the South are to get for sending a larger proportion of their sons to that war than any other group in America?

The Government based each southern State's quota on the entire population and then took a preponderance of the white boys to do the fighting.

That was especially true in Mississippi, which furnished the largest proportion of her young white men to the service than probably any other State in the Union.

Remember that this civil-rights program is not only directed at the white people of the South, but it is directed at white Americans everywhere. It is a Communist-inspired movement, fostered by an alien minority that has flooded in here from Russia in recent years.

They are simply using the Negro as a smoke screen to cover up their nefarious designs to wreck the country, and destroy the white man's civilization throughout the world.

Let me warn you that we people of the South do not have to submit to this kind of persecution. In the words of Henry W. Grady:

"We wrested the South from the rule of the Negroes, the carpetbaggers, and the scallawags when Federal drumbeats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer about the ballot boxes of the South than they ever will again in this free Republic."

If these attempts to force this communistic program onto the American people succeeds, it may well mean the end of this Republic and of our American way of life. It may mean communistic regimentation of the American people, North and South.

Why all this persecution of the white people of the South?

Why all this persecution of white Americans through this FEPC that has been foisted upon the people of New York by Governor Dewey and his cohorts, that has driven the American businessmen in that State underground and forced them to resort to subterfuge in their employment in order to stay in business at all?

No intelligent businessman would go to New York now to start a new enterprise. In fact, many are thinking of closing out or leaving the State.

Why all these attempts to wipe out segregation in the South and force Negroes into our public schools through this so-called civil-rights program?

It is simply carrying out the chief plank in the Communist platform.

It is not doing the Negroes of the South any good. But it is doing them immeasurable harm. It is depriving them of a home. Today we have developed two servants to take their places, electricity and gasoline; and the unfortunate Negroes in the South who are enjoying more peace, more happiness, more prosperity, more protection, and more security than they have ever enjoyed anywhere else on the face of the earth, are finding themselves without homes as a result of this agitation that has been carried on by the communistic left-wing elements of both major political parties.

They are crowding into your large cities of the North, where they are killed by the hundreds, or thousands, whenever the Reds are able to stir up a race riot.

It is time to get back to American principles. You are not going to force Negroes into our white schools. They know that, and we know it. You are not going to destroy our election machinery. This attack on the poll tax is a subterfuge. That is the only tax many people pay, white and black, for education in the South.

Are you going to pass an antilynching law without making it apply to mob violence? In your antilynching bill, you propose to insure the life of every Negro rapist for $20,000, to be paid by the taxpayers of the county where a lynching occurs, but you exempt mobs and race riots. It ought to be called a bill to encourage rape.

Are you afraid if you make it apply to mobs and riots that it will break some of your northern counties?

In the race riot in Chicago back in 1920 they killed 2,200 Negroes—to say nothing of the white people who were killed. At $20,000 apiece, the cost would have been $44,000,000 for the Negroes alone.

The race riot in Detroit, Mich., on June 1, 1943, would have cost the people of that county $14,000,000—while only one lynching took place in the Southern States last year.

As I said, this whole civil-rights program, including the FEPC, seems to be taken from the Communist platform. Everyone knows that the Communists are out to wreck this Government, destroy our American way of life, and wipe Christianity from the face of the earth.

These Reds hate me because I have fought them and exposed them at every opportunity.

It was my amendment to the rules of the House at the opening of the last Congress that created the Committee on Un-American Activities, which has done more to expose these Reds, these Communists, these enemies within our gates, than any other agency of this Government.

That is the reason for all these attacks on me. That is the reason for these petitions the Communists have been circulating among the Negroes of the North asking that I be expelled from Congress.

Why do they want me expelled? What crime have I committed?

They want me expelled because of my fight against this communistic program called civil rights, which includes the anti-poll-tax bill, the antilynching bill, the anti-segregation bill, and the FEPC bill.

They want me expelled from Congress because of my stand for white supremacy. They even induced a gang of Negro bishops to pass a resolution asking that I be expelled from Congress because of my stand for white supremacy, for segregation in our schools, hotels, trains, etc., in the South, and for my fight against the other vicious provisions of their so-called civil-rights program.

The Communists had a Negro man and an alleged white woman picketing the Democratic Convention at Philadelphia with a large placard reading "Oust RANKIN" in capital letters large enough to be seen and read two blocks away.

Our committee exposed these Communists that were indicted in New York more than 2 years ago.

Here is a statement which the head of the Communist Party in this country, William Z. Foster, admitted on oath, in response to my questioning, that he made in a speech accepting the leadership of his party in this country. Here is what he said:

"No Communist, no matter how many votes he should secure in a national election, could, even if he would, become President of the present Government. When a Communist heads the Government of the United States—and that day will come just as surely as the sun rises—the Government will not be a capitalist government but a soviet government, and behind this government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

No wonder he and his gang want me out of Congress. They know that I am one of the worst enemies communism has, in Congress or elsewhere, that I know how to fight them, and that I have the courage to expose them.

This is the gang that is stirring up race trouble in the South. They do not care anything about the Negroes; they just want to stir up trouble preparatory to their planned revolution.

FEPC IN NEW YORK

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is a speech which I made on February 13, 1947, on Governor Dewey's FEPC law in New York.

I said then that he had got his mustache in the wringer, and that, in my opinion, he never would get it out. That prediction was borne out in the recent election.

In the speech referred to I said:

Mr. Speaker, I arose to discuss this so-called civil-rights program, and especially the vicious FEPC law which Governor Dewey has imposed on the people of New York, and which he would undoubtedly impose on the entire Nation if he had his way.

For the information of the House and the country, I am going to insert as a part of these remarks two speeches I made in the House on this subject, in which I set out the regulations adopted under the Dewey law in New York, as well as the set-up under the one established by Mr. Roosevelt's Executive order.

Read them carefully and you will realize the extreme viciousness of any such program.

If the New York law were on the Federal statute books, with the same regulations in effect that have been imposed on the people of that State, then Communist Russia could pack her spies into every defense plant and every business establishment in this country.

If you doubt that, read those regulations which I have included in the following address:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I arose to discuss a measure introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] for the recreation of the now defunct FEPC, or the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee.

I believe Mr. Dirksen made a speech for such a measure in the last Congress.

It would certainly take a genius to reconcile that speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and this FEPC bill he has introduced with his recent speech against communism, especially since that FEPC is the chief plank in the Communist platform.

It is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened in all its history. I am going to show what it would do to the people of Illinois by pointing out what it is doing to the people of New York, where this vicious measure was written into the laws of that State without consulting the people who are suffering under it.

All these bills contain the same old bunk about making it a crime to discriminate in employment because of 'race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry,' and so forth.

Before Mr. Dirksen attempts to ram this monstrosity down the throats of the people of Illinois, and all the other States, I suggest he do as they did in California, let the people of Illinois vote on it. That is what they did in California in the last election, and it was defeated by a majority in every single individual county in California.

Now let us see what such a measure is doing to the people of the State of New York.

A man from New York said to me this morning, "You know this measure is being operated in New York simply by failure to operate it." The other night there were two men from New York in a taxicab here in Washington driven by a man who works here on the Hill. They got into an argument. One of them said, "I told you this FEPC would ruin the State of New York if they ever put it on the statute books." The other one said, "I did not think so. I thought it was a humanitarian measure. But I now see my mistake."

Then the other man said, "Here is what it has done to me. I own a good home," I believe he sa l, "out on Riverside Drive, and I also own a house next to it which I bought for my own protection. I had a friend living in the other house, but his business took him to another section of the country and he had to vacate. Like a fool, I put up a sign 'for rent,' thinking that someone in the community whom I could afford to rent it to would apply. Somebody put a colored fellow up to come and apply for it and the court now says I must let him have it."

I bring this to you for what it is worth. I understand the Communists in New York are demanding that the same rule be applied to rooms or apartments for rent.

But I want to read to you some of the regulations that are now being imposed upon the people of the State of New York under this vicious law. Businessmen from New York tell me that the way they are getting around this measure is by operating through employment agencies, because no intelligent businessman would go to a State with that kind of law on its statute books and attempt to establish a new business or a new enterprise, especially with the regulations or rulings under it which I am now going to read to you.

Remember they put this measure on the ticket in California and the people voted on it in the last election; and it lost in every single individual county in California. It was beaten in the entire State by about 3 to 1.

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent, law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:

"State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next unlawful practice:

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make "inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature, you cannot even give him that information, under this law, which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays, e. g., Decoration Day and Fourth of July, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship.

You cannot inquire into these questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers.

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin.

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him, "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died, because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment.

It is an unlawful practice to make inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment.

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment.

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment.

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make inquiry into the whereabouts of an

applicant for employment during the First World War; i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919.

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

Inquiry into the organization of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members.

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

But Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest betrayals of white Americans ever known was the setting up by Executive order of the so-called FEPC here in Washington, which I helped to kill by knocking out the appropriations to finance it.

On July 12, 1945, I made a speech in which I analyzed that vicious program. That speech reads as follows:

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the Crucifixion.

When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and has been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination "when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than they ever will again in this Republic."

But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left to vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten on these rolls is a white Gentile American.

Here is the official list:

Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

You will note that in this office of the Chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Here is the Division of Field Operations:

Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every Congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that "I am a Republican" or "I am a Democrat."

More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

Here is the list:

Review and analysis division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of 6 Negroes and 2 white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

LEGAL DIVISION

But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

You will note that this so-called legal division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

INFORMATION DIVISION

Now we come to the information division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this division:

Information division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

Budget and administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk.	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

Mail and files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Clerk-stenographer.		1,800

DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K.	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Schultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D.	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

Regional Office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Marzen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

It is a battle to save America for Americans.

Mr. Speaker, our country is at stake; our civilization is at stake; our American way of life is at stake; Christianity itself is at stake.

I call upon all patriotic Americans to join me in this fight to turn back the tide of communistic fanaticism and save our country, our civilization, and our way of life from destruction at the hands of our enemies at home and abroad.

God save America.

Letter of Wisconsin Farmers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and reply thereto:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND
COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., January 26, 1949.
Congressman GLENN R. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you about a problem that is rapidly bankrupting our dairy farmers and milk plants in Wisconsin.

The Eightieth Congress destroyed the old farm program and the appropriations to put sufficient floor under agricultural prices to keep farmers from going broke.

The Hope-Aiken bill is a monstrosity. It is the only bill designed to benefit a certain group with cheap grain and the dairy deficiency producing areas with our milk at 60 to 90 percent of parity. Just how do you suppose a farmer can live on 60 to 90 percent of parity or cost of production and pay 180 percent of parity for the things he buys?

This is sure showing up out here now. Milk is down to about $2.75 per hundredweight on a basis of around $4 cost. Our milk plants and our farmers are rapidly going broke. They are hot under the collar.

There are no funds available to support prices until prices drop still further. There are no funds in the Department of Agriculture to support powdered milk or other products so the trade is taking advantage of this fact.

Farm purchases of industrial goods are at a standstill and will become serious unless a deficiency appropriation is made at once so the Department of Agriculture can step into the market.

We sincerely hope that you will support the repeal of the Hope-Aiken bill and support the Farmers Union program of full parity for all farmers. If a dairy farmer isn't entitled to full parity, then just why is industry entitled to 180 percent of parity? Unless rapid action is taken on this matter there will no doubt be a delegation of dairy farmers descending on their Congressmen and Senators. This situation is desperate.

We also endorse the prohibition of the sale of oleo sold as an imitation of butter. Unless this is done we demand that our present legislation remain intact.

As soon as we have our State convention we will, no doubt, be forwarding you our stand on many other matters.

Sincerely yours,
WISCONSIN FARMERS UNION,
K. W. HONES, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1949.
Mr. KENNETH W. HONES,
President, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Chippewa Falls, Wis.

DEAR MR. HONES: This is by way of acknowledgment and reply to yours of the 26th.

I want to assist in every way I can toward the development of a sound support program. That goal can best be achieved if all of us who are vitally concerned with the future of agriculture are candid and fair, and avoid misstatements and unfounded recriminations.

The Hope-Aiken bill was the Truman administration's program, submitted and supported by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and other farm leaders in and out of the administration. It was approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee, and as a compromise, by the House Agriculture Committee. I mention the word compromise because, as you are well aware, the bill was adopted to be effective as of January 1, 1950. That is the status of the law as of this date. In other words, the sliding scale of parity is not now in use, and certainly could not be responsible for the situation of dairy farmers in Wisconsin today.

You are further aware that parity prices are determined, in part, by the current prices of the products the farmer buys. Your use of the figures 60–90 percent of parity or cost of production and 180 percent of parity for the things he buys is expressive of a current disparity in agricultural and industrial prices, but actually doesn't give any assistance to Congressmen who are daily seeking the answers to these conditions.

The old farm program you write of still exists, and will exist for 11 more months. Under that program, the Department of Agriculture has had, and does have, the responsibility for announcing and supporting the price of milk. This has not been done at any time under the Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, or Eighty-first Congresses. How then can you point the finger at the Eightieth Congress?

Referring to the oleo question, you can depend on Wisconsin's eight Republican Congressmen to support the position your organization has taken. I do not know what attitude the two Democrats from Milwaukee will take, although if they follow their party's platform, they will be compelled to vote to repeal the existing legislation.

I shall always welcome facts or opinions on Wisconsin agriculture which will be helpful in legislating on national agricultural programs.

Very truly yours,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Member of Congress.

The Farmers Should Keep an Eye on What Is Going on in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the American Government, officeholders and individuals seeking office have repeatedly stated that the welfare of the Nation depends upon the welfare of the American farmer. Is that just a political saying? Is it something to be said merely to please the farm voters? The answer is that it is a basic fact. The prosperity of the Nation does depend upon the prosperity of agriculture. About the worst calamity that could happen to America internally would be an agricultural depression. That is why I have repeatedly and consistently supported the support price program and all farm legislation, even though at times there may have been some details of the legislation that I would rather have had changed.

If the 6,520,000 farm families of America prosper, the manufacturing and commerce of the Nation will hum with activity. There are two reasons why this is true. In the first place, the farmer spends the money that he receives for the things that the city folks make and sell. Farmers are large buyers not only of food, clothing, and other supplies that they need from day to day, but they buy automobiles, trucks, farm machinery, lumber, fencing, electrical equipment, and everything that our American economy produces. It has been reliably determined that for every dollar of farm income this Nation enjoys seven dollars in total national income because of the turn-over.

So much for the spending side of the farmer's part in our economy. The second principle is that the farmer produces new wealth. From the good earth and the products thereof he produces wheat, corn, cotton, potatoes, hogs, cattle, and the like. When these products are sold and delivered to market, they set in motion a lengthy chain of activity—transportation, manufacturing, processing, wholesaling and retailing, advertising, and activity in every line of endeavor. All of these activities mean financial transactions and money turn-over.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a table prepared by Mr. Carl H. Wilken, of Sioux City, Iowa, which was presented before our Committee on Ways and Means. The table is as follows:

Year	Gross farm income	Percent gross farm income of national	National income
	Billions		*Billions*
1929	$13.0	14.8	$87.3
1930	10.5	14.0	75.0
1931	7.6	13.9	58.8
1932	5.7	13.6	41.7
1933	6.4	16.2	39.6
1934	7.8	16.0	48.6
1935	9.0	15.8	56.8
1936	10.0	14.9	66.9
1937	10.6	14.4	73.6
1938	9.4	13.9	67.3
1939	9.9	13.6	72.5
1940	10.3	12.7	81.3
1941	13.1	12.6	103.8
1942	17.7	13.0	136.4
1943	23.0	13.6	168.2
1944	23.6	12.9	182.2
1945	24.0	13.1	182.8
1946	27.1	15.2	178.3
1947	33.0	16.2	202.5
1948 [1]	32.4	14.4	225.0

[1] Estimated for 1948.

NOTE.—Gross farm income is total farm production sold, plus farm produces used on the farm. Total average percentage of gross farm income to national income 14.3 percent or approximately $1 of gross farm production to $7 of national income.

President Truman has submitted a budget to the Congress for Federal expenditures for the coming fiscal year for about $42,000,000,000. What will happen to that budget and to the financial structure of our Government, and to our Government bonds, if farm prices are permitted to slip back to what they were prior to the war? By referring to the above table, it can be seen that in 1939 our farm income was only $9,900,000,000, and as a result we enjoyed a national income of only $72,500,000,000, or, taking the last year before we were drawn into the war—1941—the total farm income was $13,100,000,000, and the total national income was $103,800,000,000.

From a total national income of only $103,800,000,000 the Federal Government cannot take $42,000,000,000, or any figure near it, out in taxes. Now, more than ever before, the economic well-being of our entire country depends upon the economic well-being of our farmers.

Some farm prices have already gone too low. There is a bad situation with respect to fats and oils, both edible and inedible. The Truman administration has restricted the export of these fats and oils to Europe at a time when that Continent is literally begging for them. The lard market is greatly depressed. In turn, there is a drop in the price of hogs that should not be. The price of inedible fats has fallen so low that it is doubtful that the commercial renderers can afford to pick up carcasses of the dead animals resulting from the recent blizzards and snowstorms that have swept over several agricultural States.

We must realize that fats and oils represent almost 10 percent of our gross cash value of all farm products sold. We can see that this affects the entire agricultural economy. In the last 12 months, lard has dropped from 28 cents a pound to 14½ cents, cottonseed oil from 30 cents to 15 cents, and tallow from 26 cents a pound to 7 cents a pound. The Truman administration not only has retained the export controls and prevented our own fats and oils from reaching Europe, but during that same time it has permitted the importation of about 470 million pounds of fats and oils into the United States. This has greatly affected the hog market.

Mr. Speaker, the farm situation should be dealt with fairly and honestly by the Government of the United States. It demands something more than glibly promising farmers high prices, at the same time the individual is promising consumers lower prices for farm products. The farmers themselves and the farm organizations should keep an eye on what is going on in Washington and see to it that they are dealt with honestly. Propaganda and falsehoods have confused the agricultural picture and made it difficult to legislate. Last fall it was repeated throughout the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, that I opposed certain farm measures, including the 90 percent parity support price. Those charges were totally false. As a matter of fact, I introduced one of the bills that would make possible the extension of the then existing parity program. It was also stated that I voted against the International Wheat Agreement. Of course, the facts are that this agreement is in the form of a treaty, and it does not come before the House of Representatives for a vote. This statement, like countless other statements, was totally false. Again I say that the farm program in America is an economic one. It demands the best attention from both the Government and our farm leaders, and it certainly should not be a subject for playing politics. The individual who misrepresents the facts is in no sense a friend of the farmer.

If the present plans of the Truman administration and the Democratic controlled Eighty-first Congress in regard to labor legislation are carried through, it will be to the economic disadvantage of the farmers of America. Their goal is the establishment of a minimum wage of $1 an hour. Their proposals for placing more and more of the workers of the United States directly under Federal control and for repealing the Taft-Hartley law are going to mean higher costs for everything the farmer buys. It is more important than ever that Congress makes sure that the farmer gets his just share of the national income.

Our farm support price program should be geared to maintaining a high farm income. The import-export situation should have attention. We should not enact legislation that would make it possible for the President to reimpose price control. Such a thing would depress farm prices at once. The Department of Agriculture should faithfully enforce all support price laws. Necessary equipment to do profitable farming should be made available to our farmers, and this includes the things that are needed to expand rural electrification. Electricity is a necessity on our farms and they should be reached with that service. Our soil should be conserved and our water resources utilized and irrigation should be extended. We need a prosperous agriculture in America.

Chemical Associations Oppose H. R. 1211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent request heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

Although there is no normal peacetime basis upon which to judge the effects of international trade, as production expands and increases in the countries which are the beneficiaries of United States tariff concessions, the unequal conditions under which domestic production will be required to compete with foreign exports presents the threat of undermining the economic structure which has carried us forward in peace and prepared us for national emergency. This fact assumes added emphasis in the light of current proposals to remove those safeguards incorporated in the 1948 Trade Agreements Extension Act (Public Law 792), under which the United States Tariff Commission was authorized to determine, with respect to articles considered for possible modification, imposition, or continuance of duty, the peril point beyond which modifications or reductions could not be made without injury to domestic industry.

Accordingly, we strongly urge that these economic factors be seriously weighed in consideration of proposed legislation to restore and extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its original form.

Respectfully submitted.

M. F. CRASS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc.

Since the enactment of this (the 1948) bill, the Tariff Commission has promulgated regulations in accordance with law to carry out this policy and by its orderly procedure has justified the confidence placed in it by Congress.

But one set of negotiations has been announced since the act of 1948. In the preparation for these negotiations it has been our experience and through contact with other industries we learn that the United States Tariff Commission has canvassed industry, agriculture, and labor in its attempt to compile facts which would assist our State Department in negotiating with foreign countries and which would insure trading upon an intelligent basis so as not to jeopardize any branch of our domestic economy.

The provision for the participation by the Tariff Commission, we feel, was a wise one and it has been welcomed by labor and industry in this country.

The economic condition of the world has not yet settled to a normal peacetime basis where it would be safe to establish permanently the degree of protection needed in the case of the great majority of products and commodities which compete with our production. We feel, however, that the function performed by the United States Tariff Commission is essential to the well-being of our labor, agriculture, and industry, in that it provides competent findings determined by economic fact.

We, therefore, respectfully urge that the purpose of H. R. 1211 be changed and the bill be so amended as to retain the provisions of the act of 1948, printed as addenda to this brief, which provide for participation by the United States Tariff Commission.

Respectfully submitted.

SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
S. STEWART GRAFF, *Secretary.*

Statehood for Hawaii, Important Step in Pacific Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, Saturday, January 27, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

We of this country are today principally responsible for the peace, progress, and prosperity of the peoples of the Pacific area. Our policies and our influence will determine their future happiness.

The United States is today completely responsible for the islands of the North Pacific. A myriad of islands and atolls, they constitute a bridge that extends all the way from Hawaii to the continent of Asia. No longer is their status and development shrouded in mystery. No longer are they in the hands of a potential enemy. They are ours.

Excepting only Guam, all of these islands, the Marshalls, the Carolines, and Marianas, were part of the Empire of Japan prior to the conclusion of World War II. Now they are ours under a United Nations trusteeship.

South of the equator is Samoa. It has been under our flag for 50 years. The many other

islands that constitute Polynesia and Melanesia are with few exceptions under the control of European powers, Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and others. But they recognize frankly that to a degree unequaled in any other large area in the world the responsibility for peace is particularly that of the United States. And by no means the least are our good and brave friends, the freedom-loving people of Australia and New Zealand. No American can know these people and their record in the last war without feeling a deep sense of obligation to them.

BRAVE FRIENDS TO THE WEST

And so also, we have good and brave friends to the west. When the United States redeemed its promise to make the people of the Philippines free at the conclusion of World War II, it insured for us the lasting friendship and loyalty of these courageous people, now numbering close to 20,000,000, and instilled new confidence among all Pacific peoples in our promises and purposes.

Turning now to the northwest, we find ourselves responsible for the future of Japan at probably the most critical period in the history of these people. And then to the north is our own Alaska. To all of these people who live within and on the perimeter of the Pacific, we owe a great responsibility. Whatever we do in the development of Pacific policy will be of profound importance to them.

This is particularly true in view of what is going on today in southwestern Asia, the Dutch East Indies, and in China. It is sufficient to say for the purposes of this talk that a state of turmoil prevails. It is one which we properly regard with the utmost concern; one whose outcome may be attended with far-reaching consequences for all of us—particularly those of us who call some spot in the broad Pacific home.

QUESTION OF STATEHOOD

I believe the question of statehood for Hawaii should be considered against the background of what is happening in the Pacific.

I believe that it constitutes a vital and important part of any well-rounded Pacific policy.

It will establish beyond question our intentions to remain the dominant influence in the Pacific.

It will show that we intend to meet in full our obligations to preserve the peace and, if you please, the rights of Pacific peoples.

It will be a dramatic exemplification of our belief in the principles of democracy.

It will demonstrate to the peoples of the Pacific that whenever and wherever they come under the American flag they will be treated with equality in accordance with the traditions and basic principles of this country.

It will prove again to the people of the world that this country keeps its promises.

HAWAIIAN PEOPLE FREE

Hawaii constitutes one of the few groups of islands in the Pacific that have not at one time or another been under the control of some European power.

Our people have always been free and were completely self-governing up to the time Hawaii was annexed by this country. This was accomplished voluntarily. We asked for it, believing no better means could be found to secure our rights in the future, and it is an interesting footnote to history to recall that annexation of Hawaii was bitterly fought by the isolationists of 50 years ago. Annexation was only accomplished by joint resolution.

We, of Hawaii, feel that we have been promised statehood. We believe this promise is inherent in the territorial form of government which provides a system of training and tutelage for the responsibilities of state government.

BEAR FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF A STATE

For a period of almost 50 years, we have borne all the financial responsibility of a State. Normally, our total contribution to the Federal Treasury exceeds that of twelve to fourteen and at times sixteen States. On a per capita basis, our contribution in Federal taxes individually is well in excess of that of more than half the States.

We point this out not by way of complaint. In fact, we are proud of what we have done to discharge our duties as American citizens. We point this out rather by way of showing that we are financially capable of meeting the responsibilities of State government. We have met all the requirements of statehood.

SIX INVESTIGATIONS OF STATEHOOD

Our qualifications for statehood have been the object now of six separate investigations by committees of Congress. Two of these, taking place in 1935 and 1937, preceded the World War II. The last, conducted by a Joint Committee of the Senate and House, found that we had then—more than 10 years ago—met all the requirements of a State government.

It recommended postponement only because of the uncertainties of the international situation—uncertainties which stemmed from the prospect of war with Japan and uncertainties which certainly have now disappeared. Since the conclusion of the war the question of statehood has been under almost continuous investigation by committees of Congress.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946 recommended immediate consideration of statehood legislation. After an exhaustive investigation, this committee found Hawaii met all the requirements for statehood and its admission to the Union was in the national interest.

ACTION IN EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

In the spring of 1947, the Committee on Public Lands of the Eightieth Congress, after extensive hearings, reported a bill providing statehood for Hawaii to the House by unanimous vote. It will be interesting to you of this conference that Admiral Chester W. Nimitz was one of the witnesses presented by the friends of statehood. He fought the war in the Pacific, for the most part from his headquarters at Pearl Harbor. He said the record made by the people of Hawaii during the war was outstanding, that it removed any doubts concerning their patriotism and that they were entitled to the kind of government they wanted.

Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron, retired, who was in command of the Hawaiian Department just prior to the war, in an even stronger statement, supported Hawaii's aspirations to statehood. Both the War and Navy Departments submitted letters saying that from the standpoint of national defense, there was no objection to statehood for Hawaii.

HOUSE PASSED BILL

On June 30, 1947 the House of Representatives by a vote of 196 to 133 passed the bill to enable Hawaii to become a State, but the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate to whom it was referred refused to act without further investigation.

Senator GUY CORDON, of Oregon, went to Hawaii as a one-man subcommittee and conducted another extensive investigation, this time directing his inquiry particularly to current conditions. In March of 1948 he recommended immediate enactment of the statehood bill passed by the House.

The whole Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted 7 to 5 in May to defer action on this legislation until all other members of the committee who desired to do so could visit the islands. This vote killed statehood for Hawaii in the Eightieth Congress.

In the development of Pacific policy, we of Hawaii believe we have an important contribution to make. We believe this can only be made by giving us the stature of a State and providing us with the representation in Congress, two Members of the Senate and, in our case, two Members of the House, such as a State is entitled to. We believe that our long experience in dealing with Pacific problems and Pacific peoples holds much of unusual value to the consideration of Pacific problems, the full strength of which cannot be realized until we are made a State.

STRATEGICALLY SITUATED LAND AREA

Hawaii constitutes probably the most strategically situated land area in the world today. If you will look at a map of the air and steamer routes of the Pacific you will see that they come to a focal point in Hawaii. The islands are situated about one-third of the way across the Pacific.

Hawaii is the gateway to the South Pacific and the Far East. It is where east meets west. Hawaii today constitutes naturally the western border of this country. It is inconceivable that control of Hawaii pass into the control of any other country.

For more than a century American influence has been predominant in Hawaii. Even as far back as 1864 Abraham Lincoln said of the Hawaiian people, then governed by a constitutional monarchy: "Its people are free, and its laws, language, and religion are largely the fruit of our own teaching and example."

BONDS CLOSE

We of Hawaii are bound closely to the States by ties of tradition, loyalty, and trade, but these bonds should be drawn even closer, as they only can be by the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

The land area of the Hawaiian Islands is greater than that of three States, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Connecticut, but this does not really begin to measure their size. The islands of Hawaii extend over a distance of 350 miles, the same distance as from Washington, D. C., to Cleveland. They have a greater seacoast than all but two States, California and Florida. And the ocean waters that separate the islands do not constitute a liability or barrier. They constitute one of Hawaii's greatest assets. They have long been one of the principal sources of food and of recreation.

Today the population of Hawaii is greater than that of four States. With 540,000 people, Hawaii has a population greater than any other State at the time of its admission to the Union except Oklahoma.

POPULATION 540,000

Our population of 540,000 brings us within the same general bracket as a total of 13 States—more than a quarter of all the States in the Union. This is the number of States whose population entitles them to two or less Representatives in the House. We are thus within approximately the same range of population as 7 out of the 11 Western States; North Dakota, South Dakota in the Middle West; and Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Delaware in the East.

Our population, moreover, is growing very rapidly. It reflects the movement of people to the West that is making California one of our most populous States. Many of the veterans who saw service in the Pacific in the last war have settled in Hawaii; many more would come if the proper opportunity to do so presented itself.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT MARKED

As indicated by the heavy taxes paid the Federal Government, our industrial development has been quite a remarkable one.

Hawaii produces about one-quarter of all the sugar produced under the American flag. Our sugar industry brings us about $100,000,000 a year. It pays the highest wages of any sugar industry in the world and has achieved the highest rate of production per acre known anywhere. It is conducted on a highly scientific and modern basis.

We of Hawaii are responsible for the development of the pineapple industry. This fruit was practically unknown to the American people until it was introduced to the market by Hawaii. Today Hawaii produces 90 percent of the pineapple consumed in this country.

The development of air transportation brings Hawaii within close and easy access to the Pacific coast and promises rapid expansion of the tourist industry.

Now we have become the base of a program of research into the fish resources of the Pacific that constitutes the greatest undertaking of its kind ever known to this industry. We hope out of this will come knowledge that will provide the base for a fish industry in the Central and South Pacific that will equal or exceed that of the salmon industry of Alaska.

NINETY PERCENT AMERICAN CITIZENS

Ninety percent of our people are American citizens today. They have been drawn from all the principal races of the Pacific. We of Hawaii are proud of the friendliness and understanding that marks the relationship of our people. Coming to the islands during the course of a period well over 100 years, they have thrived and prospered in the American traditions of life and government.

Our people share an intense pride in our great American heritage without regard to racial ancestry. The record of the war can leave no question about our loyalty. We want statehood so that we will be secure in our political and economic rights.

We want statehood because it is only by this means that we will realize the equality, the freedom of action in the management of our own affairs, that every American expects and that liberty-loving people yearn for everywhere.

We want statehood so that we will participate automatically, not only in the responsibilities, but in the privileges of the Federal Government.

In as far as we bear all of the financial responsibilities of a State government, we feel we should benefit also from all the benefits of Federal appropriations. Without statehood we do not participate in that great myriad of Federal-aid laws, unless specific provision is made for us to do so.

We want statehood because we believe that it will bring better government. It is local self-government in the best traditions of our country.

We believe that the entire country stands to benefit by statehood for Hawaii. Like nothing else, it will dramatize the significance and objectives of our new role in the Pacific.

Statehood for Hawaii will move our western border 2,400 miles out into the Pacific, the plains of the twentieth century. It will be a new manifestation of the American pioneering spirit as well as the logical conclusion of a policy now 50 years in the making.

It will show the Pacific peoples, who are coming under our influence and guidance, that our system of government offers every promise of the liberty to which all free men aspire.

It is a fundamental step in the development of a new Pacific policy that we should not be too slow in making.

It needs to be made right now.

How Much Do People Know?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mansfield (Pa.) Advertiser of January 26, 1949:

HOW MUCH DO PEOPLE KNOW?

We wonder sometimes just how many people know about the things they talk about or the things that are happening. Do they inform themselves, or make any effort to find out the truth, or do they just mouth the slick propaganda that is handed to them?

For example, take the propaganda that was sent out from Washington last summer that there would be a shortage of gasoline before the summer was over and they might have to ration it. What became of that shortage? Did you see it or feel it? We are under the impression that we published something to the effect that we doubted the shortage because we had been reading information sent out by the oil industry that there would be enough gasoline to go around.

Just now people are talking about the Taft-Hartley law, which the labor leaders and President Truman seem to think should be repealed. How much do people know about that law? Who remembers why the law was passed? Do you remember the very serious time just before the Taft-Hartley law was introduced in Congress when the railroad leaders were going to call the members of their unions out on strike and thus tie up all the railroads in the country? Do you recall that President Truman spoke very strongly on the subject and that the people admired him for it? That he even asked Congress for a very stringent labor law that would have given Truman almost absolute power over the union members? And that the House of Representatives voted for the law that afternoon and passed it? And that sober-minded persons in the Senate got together and decided that not even the President should have as strong a law as that to hold over railroad workers or any others, even if we are all mad at them? And President Truman's law was not passed; so he asked them to make their own labor law, and the Taft-Hartley law finally came through as the best compromise they could arrange among the 435 Members of the House of Representatives and the 96 Members of the Senate.

And remember how one of the union presidents said that he would spend a million dollars of the money the railroad men had paid in dues to defeat President Truman. There are other incidents of that time that are amusing as we look back on them, but we have not the space for them now.

Do you believe that labor leaders should have the right to call strikes which endanger national health and safety?

Do you believe the labor leaders should have the right to engage in unfair labor practices?

Do you believe the labor leaders and strikers should have the right to damage the cars of other people, to beat up and intimidate workers who do not want to strike?

Do you believe the labor unions and their leaders should have the right to do all kinds of damage and yet not be fined for it?

Do you believe the members of the unions should have the right to know how the money they pay in dues and assessments is being spent?

Well, these are only a few of the things in the Taft-Hartley law.

It is admitted that the Taft-Hartley law should be amended. Even Senator TAFT and Congressman HARTLEY admit that, and will work for such amendment. But if you listen to the propaganda sent out by the labor leaders you do not know these things.

Another that might be mentioned is the so-called health insurance law. How many people know anything about it? Not even those who propose the law can tell you how much it will cost and how many people it will cover, and for what? One group says it will cost only $4,000,000,000, but they do not say that under the bill the people in the country would not be covered. And so it is with other phases of the matter, but so many people seem to be hypnotized by the words "health insurance" that they do not bother to learn anything about it. They will not try to learn if they could not buy health insurance from responsible agencies of today for less than it would cost them under any Government scheme.

It is not lack of education that causes people to accept propaganda so easily, because the educated are just as careless as the uneducated. It is merely a sort of easy gullibility that makes so many people fall for nice-sounding phrases without stopping to look into the matter.

A Reactionary Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Washington Daily News entitled "A Reactionary Labor Bill":

The Truman administration's labor bill, now before Congress, seems to us a dangerously reactionary measure.

It is in almost all respects worse than the Taft-Hartley Act, which it would repeal, and in many respects even more unfair than the one-sided Wagner Act, which it proposes to restore and improve.

Its enactment would promote industrial strife, encourage abuses of organized labor's power, and deprive workers, employers, and the public of protection for their rights.

Congress would do the country a grave disservice if, yielding to pressure from union leaders and the administration, it hurried this bill to passage after brief, inadequate hearings.

President Truman's State-of-the-Union message urged restoration of the Wagner Act with certain improvements. These, he said, should prohibit jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts, prevent strikes over interpretation of contracts, and provide means for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

It is far from clear that the administration's bill would do any of these things.

But it is very clear that the bill would do many other things which, in our opinion, a great majority of the American people do not want done.

It would legalize the closed shop, thus enabling unions to bar workers from jobs they are capable of performing. (The Taft-Hartley Act, while forbidding the closed shop, permits the fairer union shop, under which

workers can be employed, whether or not they are union members, although they must join unions and pay dues after they are employed.)

It would permit union officers to spend for political purposes unlimited funds raised by compulsory assessments on union members, including members not in sympathy with the purposes for which the money would be used.

It would abolish the requirement that officials of unions which want the benefits of Government aid and protection must sign affidavits that they are not Communists, and so weaken the power of union members to rescue their organizations from Communist domination.

It would relieve union officials of any legal obligation to report to members and the public on their conduct of union financial affairs.

It would deprive employees of the right to be free from union coercion.

It would permit mass picketing to bar workers who want to work from their places of employment.

It would end the Taft-Hartley ban on strikes by Federal employees, thus encouraging a false belief that Government workers have a right to strike.

It would remove the requirement that unions, as well as employers, must bargain in good faith.

It would deprive employers of the right to discuss union matters with their employees.

It would undermine the effectiveness of the Government's now independent mediation service by making it subordinate to a strongly partisan Secretary of Labor.

Those are only a few of the things the administration's reactionary labor bill would do.

The bill, as a whole, represents an abject attempt to please union officials who want the Government to help them attain enormous power but leave them free from public responsibility for its proper use.

Legislation inspired by and shaped for that purpose can never be the foundation of a just and enduring national labor policy.

Minimum Wage and Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

GERALD FORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: I would like to get your views on raising the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents per hour. Just who all will this include legally? I think I am against any minimum wage law. If we have a depression and a person, or a party, has some work to do, but can't afford to pay 75 cents per hour to have it done but could pay less and I am out of work and can't get any work, I might be tickled to death to do this work for what he or they could afford to pay to have it done. It might mean the difference between my family and I earning our livelihood and going on welfare. But if this 75-cent minimum wage law is passed, I would have no choice. A man should have the right to pay what the job will afford and labor should have the right to work for that wage if he wishes rather than to go on welfare. I think we have far too damn many laws and this might be one of them. I, too, realize you Republicans can do a lot of thinking, arguing, fighting, etc., and in the end have nothing to say but keep a stiff upper lip and figure on the Dixiecrats for some support.

Now a word on rent control. I sometimes wonder if Federal rent control isn't a weapon of the Communists and does cause unrest, discontentment, dissatisfaction, and chaos because people cannot find and have houses to rent. This is what the Commies try to produce. In our papers there is talk of the Democrats going to try to pass a new law which will impose a rigid rent control on all housing for rent based on 1942 levels. This is the most asinine, ridiculous, and absurd thing I ever heard of. It is comparable with asking a baker to sell his baked goods on today's market at 1942 prices. Compare the price of his flour, lard, milk, labor, fuel, and other items that go into baked goods today with 1942 prices. This same thing applies to rent today. Compare the cost of building and maintaining a house for rent today with the cost of building and maintenance of a house in 1942 and you won't build any houses to rent—and there aren't any houses being built for rent, and won't be as long as there is any form of rent control or talk of rent control. Abolish rent control and all talk of it and you will have houses for rent. Of course, rent will go up at first but when it goes up it will induce people to build galore for rent and rent will soon drop. Everybody will have a place to live, be happy, and contented and the Commies will be out in the cold. The Commies like rotten controls over all the people and then they claim democracy won't work. To me this is the only solution.

Rent control will only make all of us pay higher taxes to put the Government in the business of building high-priced houses at rent that poor people still can't pay.

I am not writing you this to criticize the past administration nor tell you what to do. These are just my ideas and if I am wrong, give me your ideas. I have an open mind and it can be changed.

If there is anything I can do or any information I can furnish you that will help you make your decisions, write me; nothing will be too much trouble.

Yours truly,

D. H. S. RYMER.

SPRING LAKE.

Jewish Theological Seminary of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter from our President, so that all interested may read it:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 9, 1948.

Dr. SIMON GREENBERG,
The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, New York, N. Y.

DEAR DR. GREENBERG: I have great pleasure in sending hearty congratulations and cordial greetings to all who gather for the dedication of the west coast branch of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America at Los Angeles.

By integrating the great tradition of Israel into the framework of our democratic life the seminary has long been a major factor in broadening public understanding of the Jewish faith and the Jewish people. In signalizing the founding of the west coast branch of the seminary, it is important to note that this institution has made another forward stride in the development of a great university of Judaism in America.

May God speed the achievement of your high ideal.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor, the Nation's Greatest Fishing Port

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my home city is Long Beach, Calif., and it is the largest city in the Eighteenth Congressional District in California, which I have the honor to represent in this House of Representatives. Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County, and the Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor areas are contiguous; the Los Angeles Harbor portion of the twin harbor of Long Beach-Los Angeles being represented in this Congress by the Honorable CECIL KING.

Realizing that it is little known or realized that a portion of the coast line in California which I have the honor to represent is included in the portion where there is the greatest shipment of sea food bought and handled, I feel it valuable to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the information that has been contained in two news articles, one in each of the Long Beach daily newspapers, dated January 25, 1949.

The first appears in the Long Beach Independent.

The second appears in the Long Beach Press-Telegram.

BATTLE CRY OF FISHING SOUNDS IN LONG BEACH

"Skiff!"

That's the battle cry of the Nation's mightiest fishing port—Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor.

Ringing down from the crow's nest, the cry of the lookout speeds into action the men of California's fourth largest industry.

Skiff means that a school of tuna has been sighted off the coast of Mexico and it signals sardines off the California shores.

When the call comes bellowing down to the crew, out runs the bulky skiff carried in the stern of the typical commercial fishing boat. The craft carries one end of the half-mile long, $20,000 purse seine net. The purse seiner itself, which may cost $500,000, swiftly runs the other end of the net in a giant circle back to the skiff, enclosing the school of fish.

Loaded aboard the fishing boat, the catch goes to the canneries of Southern California, to Long Beach and San Diego.

Outproducing all of the New England States combined, the Long Beach-Los Angeles fleet combs Pacific waters from the Equator to northern California for tuna, sardines, and mackerel.

High meat prices are tossing a booming trade to the fishing industry. Canned fish involves no waste, is ready for the table when purchased.

But while consumers are aware of the advantages of fish, few realize the close connection between fishing and farming. Fish meal and oil are vital adjuncts to feed for poultry and livestock.

Fish meal is rated the most complete source of amino acids, in both quantity and quality. Additionally, it is a powerful source of an unidentified substance required for strong growth in young fowls and for the fertility of eggs.

Last year California produced nearly 40,000 tons of fish meal, more than half the output of the entire Pacific coast.

California sardines provide human consumers with important supplies of iron, calcium, iodine, and other health-guarding minerals.

Sardine oil, higher than cod liver oil in vitamin D content, is also a valuable source of vitamin A.

The California fishing industry is the largest natural vitamin source in the world. It produced more than 75 percent of the 90,000,000,000 units of natural vitamin A and 70,000,000 units of vitamin D in the United States last year.

LOCAL FISHING FLEET AGAIN NO. 1 IN UNITED STATES

Long Beach - Los Angeles Harbor during 1948 retained its position as the Nation's greatest fishing center, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service said today.

In spite of a slack sardine season, which was the worst in the modern history of the port, 460,000,000 pounds of fish, mostly for canning, was delivered here during the past year.

This catch brought fishermen $30,000,000, which is one-tenth of the value of all the fish caught in the United States and Alaska.

Gloucester, Mass., was 210,000,000 pounds short of the catch brought to Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor, having accounted for 250,000,000 pounds, valued at $11,000,000.

San Diego and Boston each received about 200,000,000 pounds of fish during 1948. The combined San Diego-Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor catch, therefore, was 660,000,000 pounds. The local and San Diego industries are closely related. Tuna and sardines account for most of the catch.

The beginning of 1949 finds the industry here and at San Diego in an unprecedented upheaval. The record price of $340 a ton for yellow-fin tuna, chief variety landed by Southern California boats, lately failed to hold with the industry. Only two concerns are now paying that figure and others decline to pay $340 or even guarantee a price. The result is a virtual strike by fishermen.

The Spirit of Nationalist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include two editorials from the Panama Star and Herald, published in English and Spanish in Panama City:

[From the Panama City (Panama) Star and Herald of December 23, 1948]

A LETTER WE ARE PROUD TO RECEIVE

Last night we experienced deep satisfaction as we received and read the following letter from E. Wallace Chadwick, Representative to the United States Congress from the State of Pennsylvania, commenting on our editorial of December 21, dealing with the situation in China:

CRISTOBAL, C. Z., *December 21, 1948.*

STAR AND HERALD,

Panama City, Republic of Panama.

(Attention: A. V. McGeachy.)

DEAR MR. MCGEACHY: I am so much impressed with your leading editorial this morning—The Spirit of Nationalist China—that I venture to say so to you. Being out of touch with home newspapers, I do not know what their reaction to the current Chinese situation has been, but I do not believe that even the New York Times will accomplish a more searching or understanding editorial appraisal than yours.

So far as I know, there is only one person in America (at least among those in official position) who has from the first comprehended the more vital aspects of our problems in China. Our great Secretary of State may have overemphasized in his thinking the inefficiencies of the military efforts of the Central Government. But Dr. WALTER JUDD, a Member of the House from Minnesota, gave his colleagues the same picture 2 years ago that your editorial now portrays.

Sincerely yours,

E. WALLACE CHADWICK.

This letter is one which we are really proud of and we are truly grateful to Representative Chadwick for such a gratifying reaction to our comments on the Chinese situation and the plight of the war-weary Nationalist forces. It suggests also that in Representative Chadwick, the cause of China, which deserves a little more patience and understanding, can hope to find a sympathetic advocate.

A CRIPPLING BLOW

The Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration, returns to the United States from China to announce that all ECA aid to China has been suspended until the situation there clears.

If the intention behind that conditional phrase is to accelerate the wrecking of the present regime, its expression could not have been better timed. It is indeed a crippling blow to Nationalist prestige in a land where face-saving is everything.

Mr. Hoffman surely kicked some vital props from under the Nationalist regime in China, a regime that deserves some credit for having kept a firm and steady hand on the helm of the Chinese ship of state as it plowed its way through the stormy seas into which it was launched in 1911.

Had it not been for the persistence of the Nationalists of the Kuomintang Party, China might years ago have collapsed into the arms of Japan, and this would have contributed immensely toward enhancing Japan's power in the last war. China's almost inexhaustible manpower, vast mineral resources, and agricultural and industrial potential plus Japan's organizing ability could have created a mighty war machine, discounting, of course, any demoralizing effects which the atomic bomb could have produced.

But the Chinese Nationalists, the people of whom Chiang Kai-shek was then and still is the leader, spurned all Japan's offers and fought every bit of Japanese chicanery and outright attacks. Thus Japan had to be satisfied with such crumbs as she could nibble away from China. Judging from the good use she made of these crumbs—until the atom bomb fell—it is appalling to speculate on what she could have accomplished had she been able to dominate all of China with the willing concourse of the Chinese people.

Thanks to the Chinese Nationalists, however, to the people whose regime has been indicted as wasteful and corrupt, Japan got only crumbs and even these were bitterly disputed by the forces of Chiang Kai-shek.

Today the permanence of this regime is endangered as Russia adopts the tactics of Japan. The latter fought the champions of the nascent Republic—the Nationalists—by inciting, encouraging and supporting the war lords or provincial tuchuns to revolt against Sun Yat-sen's new order. Today, Russia backs the so-called Communists, and sees to it that they move on from victory to victory, using arms and military supplies which Japan had amassed in Manchuria for the day when she hoped to match strength and skill in arms with Russia.

Today the west, toward which Nationalist China had turned hopefully for aid in the pacification of the country and the elimination of the threats of external aggression, turns its back on the Nationalists, who therefore, as is inevitable among the people of the Orient, must lose face in the eyes of the people, and the loss of face in the Orient is fatal.

It would not be surprising now to hear of desertions en masse from the ranks of the Nationalist armies to the Communists, because the west has abandoned the Nationalists to the Communists, whom Russia firmly and unhesitatingly supports.

In all its tumultuous history since 1911, the Nationalist cause, which is the cause of republicanism, never had received so serious a blow as that now administered through the fateful words of ECA's Administrator Paul Hoffman. Not even Japan, at the height of her power, was ever able to administer so vital a blow.

The cause of Communism has been heartened in the Orient even as the cause of democracy suffers a perhaps fatal blow.

Will this decision by the ECA Administrator mean the loss of China to democracy?

Mr. Speaker, the editorial from the Star and Herald of December 21, 1948, follows. Nowhere have I seen a better analysis of the basic factors that have led to the sore plight of those brave spirits in China who have struggled so long and valiantly and against almost incomparable odds to make their country free, only to be denounced now by those whom they trusted as their best friends.

THE SPIRIT OF NATIONALIST CHINA

Prime Minister Sun Fo, son of the founder of the Chinese Republic, Dr. Sun Yat-sen, has declared that China—meaning Nationalist China—will fight on until an honorable peace can be secured.

In an interview with news correspondents after announcing that he had formed a new cabinet, the Premier added, "I can assure you that we will not surrender outright to the Communists." And when asked if this meant that there might be a compromise with the Communists, he answered: "It takes two sides to reach a compromise. This cabinet is not a cabinet of surrender."

These are brave words spoken by a determined but perhaps tiring man, despite the fact China virtually has been abandoned to her own devices by the Western World.

The leaders of the Kuomintang are finding out today that, though the spirit remains strong and indomitable and in spite of its determination to march onward, the flesh, the physical being, is becoming the victim of fatigue, because it has been driven too hard, because it has been sorely undernourished—the fate of the great majority of the Chinese people.

The Western World complains of and criticizes what it describes as the waste and the corruption that have made it difficult effectively to help China back to economic stability. This is the Occident's reason for the abandonment of China to her fate and possibly to capture by communism. But there is much more to China's difficulties than waste and corruption. There is the tragic

history of 8 years of war against Japan's efforts to take over China or at least to get her under the Mikado's imperial thumb. Its enervating effects on life in China cannot, should not, be overlooked in passing judgment.

The waste and corruption pointed out in China are evident also in countries which, before the war, had been vastly better organized than China. These conditions, no doubt, are the results of the economic dislocations of the war which brought scarcities in the war-infested lands and shattered all sense of values when outrageous sums had to be paid even for a loaf of bread. It was this free spending to meet and overcome emergencies that eventually injured the moral sense of this hitherto thrifty people, because wild, unorganized spending soon became a habit. As it happened elsewhere in the world, so it happened in China.

It is evident that in passing judgment on China, the West failed to consider or to weigh and appraise the effects on the entire Chinese population of the 8 years of warfare waged against the military might of prewar Japan.

During those trying 8 years it was only the indomitable spirit of the Chinese Nationalist Government, led by Chiang Kai-shek and his Kuomintang supporters, that kept China on her feet. She stood alone fighting off Japan's determined bid for domination in east Asia. Thus China had no opportunity during that period to devote any time or any part of her funds to any organized development of the Nation's agricultural or industrial potential along modern lines. She had to plod along with such little help as her armies could get from primitive farming methods. Industry, of course, was out of the question except such undertakings as could be carried out in caves or scattered about in the form of piecework.

That struggle with Japan merged into the Second World War, which found Japan on an all-out war footing in China, whose strategic importance, because of Japan's role in Hitler's war for world domination, had been greatly enhanced.

The Chinese Nationalist regime, during the pre-Pearl Harbor period, stood fast against the blandishments of those who sought her favorable concourse to strengthen their position in the Orient. Japan and Russia were her constant wooers, but her eyes were ever turned toward America, the land from which she has hitherto received the best deal.

Had corruption been the cherished goal of the Chinese National leaders they could have nicely feathered their nests with the price of the highest bidder for their favor. But the Chinese leaders—the men of the Kuomintang—preferred to remain faithful to the ideal of a Chinese Republic free, independent, and thriving under the Chinese themselves.

The spirit of China was strong and unyielding in those trying days. But almost a decade of incessant fighting and nerve-wracking anxieties has exacted a heavy price. The flesh is tiring and the need for a rest is pressing. Therefore we hear from the lips of Sun Fo such words as: "We will not surrender outright to the Communists," but will continue to "fight on until an honorable peace can be secured."

Less than a lustrum ago such thoughts would never have arisen in the mind of Dr. Sun Yat-sen's son, and certainly they never would have been voiced by him or any of the leaders of the Kuomintang. But Russia's help to the Chinese Communists has been so great and consistent that the Reds, who were on the run but 2 or 3 years ago, have built up since then towering strength with the aid of the Kremlin's strategists.

Eight years of war against Japan in the heyday of that nation's imperial might was no picnic. Those years exacted a terrific price from the Chinese people, permitting no respite in which to consolidate the Republic they created in 1911.

The Nationalists have been fighting ever since the overthrow of the Manchu Dynasty in 1911. But the end of the Imperial regime marked the beginning of a veritable Via Crucis for the followers of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the Father of the Republic. It marked the beginning of the submission of the war lords for the unification of China under one single republican leadership, with representative government as its goal. One by one, the war lords were beaten down on the battlefields, or came to terms without much fighting.

No sooner had the struggle with the war lords ended than the struggle against Japan's schemings started. It was the goal of Japan to keep China crippled as long as possible, and this could be achieved only through turmoil and unrest. There being no more war lords to goad into rebellion against the young Government, Japan came out into the open with demands which had they been accepted, would have meant the end of free government in China.

Eventually, Japan chopped Manchuria away from China and established a puppet regime with the young heir to the Chinese imperial throne as Emperor of Manchukuo (Manchuria). While Japan consolidated this steal, her modernly equipped armies kept Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces more or less on the run throughout the length and breadth of China, until the Nationalists were virtually pinned against the wall in far away Chungking.

Yet these people, who never had a chance to consolidate and stabilize their republican institutions, have been accused, judged, found guilty, and condemned to fall under the boot of the Red totalitarians who have carefully organized the malcontent elements of China into a formidable force pitted against the democratic elements.

There must be bitter disappointment and disillusionment in China today, as those who were accustomed to run indiscriminately with the hares and the hounds smirkingly remind those who stuck to the republican principles, "I told you so."

It would be a calamity were China to be lost to democracy. Perhaps the present situation the world faces makes it expedient that China play the role of pawn in the great game that is developing on the world's chessboard. Perhaps, in due course of time, the Western World will again turn to China and rescue her from the vile contamination of the Reds. Perhaps. Let us hope.

Proposed Meeting Between President Truman and Premier Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the New Orleans States of February 1, 1949, and the Washington Post of February 1, 1949:

[From the New Orleans States of February 1, 1947]

STALIN AND PEACE

It is difficult to tell how often the American reporters at Moscow send in a questionnaire to Marshal Stalin, but it is not hard to figure out that he answers them as, if, and when it suits his purposes.

The chief of the Soviets was asked if the USSR would be prepared to consider issuance of a joint declaration with the United States that neither has any intention of resorting to war with one another.

Would he? Of course, he would.

He was asked would the U. S. S. R. be prepared to implement such a peaceful declaration by gradual disarmament.

Would he? Naturally.

He was asked if he would be willing to call off the Berlin blockade if the Western Powers agreed to postpone establishment of a separate German state.

Why, surely. If the Western Allies also lifted trade and transportation restrictions.

Would he be willing to talk all this over with President Truman?

Natch.

All of which is nothing but grist for the Soviet propaganda mill, for it gives Stalin a chance to pose feeding the doves of peace. And all of which action Stalin has had time to engage in through the United Nations Security Council; through the Baruch plan for outlaying the atom bomb; and through agreement to peace treaties for Germany and Austria.

There is no trusting Stalin, and the sooner we learn it the better off we'll be.

[From the Washington Post of February 3, 1949]

ACHESON ANALYSIS OF STALIN PROPOSAL TO MEET TRUMAN

(Following is a partial text of Secretary of State Acheson's statement on Premier Stalin's replies to a correspondent's questionnaire.)

I suppose except for the preservation of our Nation and of our liberties, there is no matter more fundamental to the American people than the preservation of peace. I say this because it is a matter not only fundamental but sacred in America, and neither our people nor any of our representatives would play international politics with a matter of this importance.

The hopes of hundreds of millions of people throughout the world are pinned on the preservation of peace. No man of conscience would tamper with those hopes or use the raising or lowering of them as a pawn in a maneuver.

Now, with those observations, I wish to talk about these questions and answers quite candidly but quite realistically.

(Here Acheson read the correspondent's first question and Stalin's reply indicating he would be prepared to consider a joint Russian-United States declaration denying the intention to make war.)

Now, I confess I find this answer puzzling. Both the Soviet Union and the United States and all other members of the United Nations are pledged by the most solemn treaty commitments not to engage in war against one another. * * *

The President of the United States in his inaugural address stated that it was the position of his administration and of the people of the United States to give unfaltering support to the United Nations. He did not say that he was prepared to consider making that statement. He made it. So, as I say, this answer is a puzzling one. So far as commitment is concerned, so far as the most solemnly pledged word is concerned, I had thought that we had long passed the point at which this answer seems to stick.

(Here Acheson read the second question and Stalin's reply that Russia naturally would cooperate toward disarmament.)

Now, "naturally" means, "in the nature of things" and the nature of things in the past 3 years since the end of hostilities has not been such as to encourage the expectation of the cooperation which is indicated in this answer. The United States * * * led the way by a demobilization after the last war which was not gradual but was

precipitant. This country disbanded the greatest assemblage of armed force which had ever been put together in the world before. Not only is this true but this Government, together with all the other governments represented upon the Security Council, with the unhappy exception of the Soviet Union, did their best to implement those paragraphs and articles of the Charter which, first of all, were designed for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and, secondly, for the provision of an international armed force which would give authority to the United Nations.

The use of the veto has frustrated the first effort. Obstruction of the U. S. S. R. in the military committees has frustrated the second effort. The United States went still further.

In the atomic energy commission of the United Nations, it led the way in an attempt to put under international control the most destructive weapon and the most destructive force which man has yet devised. Here again these efforts of many nations were frustrated by Soviet action. * * *

Now, I mention these points, not to score in a debate in which I have no interest, but to point out that in the nature of things, the other nations have not received and have little reason to expect the cooperation which is indicated in that answer. * * *

Now I should like to take up out of order the fourth question because it relates to the first two.

(Here Acheson read the fourth question and Stalin's reply that he had no objection to a peace meeting with President Truman.)

Now you will notice that the purpose of the meeting has to do with the arrangements of which I have already spoken; that is, considering issuing a declaration regarding a matter which is already the subject of solemn treaty commitment. The White House spokesman reminded you, in answer to questions, of the fact that President Truman has on numerous occasions stated that he would be pleased to have Premier Stalin visit the United States and visit the President in Washington.

Now in this connection * * * the Government of the United States would not discuss with any nation any matter which was of direct interest to other nations without the participation of the representatives of those other nations. This is not a new or startling doctrine. There have been many statements of it.

This morning we have still a further development. There has been a new question and answer. We gather from that exchange that Premier Stalin is unhappily prevented by the condition of his health from coming to Washington, because he cannot travel either by sea or air. He thus seems to be effectively grounded. The implication of this answer, perhaps, is that the President of the United States for the fourth time should travel half-way around the world to meet Premier Stalin and on this occasion to do so for the purpose of talking with him on a matter so tenuous that it defies specific statement. I think that concludes the comment on that question and answer.

(Here Acheson read the third question and Stalin's reply that he saw no objection to lifting the Berlin blockade on condition the Western Powers postpone organization of western Germany and end their counterblockade of the Soviet zone. He then reviewed the situation in Berlin and the numerous efforts to reach an understanding.)

During all of this time the reasons which were given by the Soviet Government were first of all that there were technical difficulties which interrupted transport. Then the reason was given that the blockade was necessary to protect the economy of the Soviet zone against the results of a monetary reform in the western zone. * * *

During all of these months the three Western Powers have tried patiently and persistently to solve the difficulties which have been put forward by the Soviet Government as the reasons for the blockade.

As to the second point in this answer made by Premier Stalin, that he would expect that if Soviet restrictions were lifted the western restrictions would be lifted; that point has been made clear from the start. The western governments have always stated that if the Soviet Government permits normal communications with and within Berlin their countermeasures will, of course, be lifted.

There are many ways in which a serious proposal by the Soviet Government to restore normal interzonal communications and communications with and within Berlin could be made. All channels are open for any suggestions to that end. The United States, together with the other western occupying powers, would, of course, consider carefully any proposal made to solve the Berlin problem consistent with their rights, their duties, their obligations as occupying powers.

As I say, all of the normal channels are open. I hope you will not take it amiss if I point out that if I on my part were seeking to give assurance of seriousness of purpose I would choose some other channel than the channel of a press interview.

May I end this statement as I began it, by stating that the interest of the United States and of all the hundreds of millions of people throughout the world in peace is so fundamental that the matter of peace cannot be tampered with and cannot be used as an instrument in any international political maneuver. It will not be so used by the United States.

Foreign Aid and Domestic Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, a message to the American taxpayers on the use of their Federal taxes may not be heartening but it is timely inasmuch as the 15th of March approaches, so under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, here is the message:

MORE WORLD AID

"We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of undeveloped areas." (From the inaugural address of President Harry S. Truman.)

What bold new program does President Truman have in mind? Republicans sniffed the political air; smelled an international WPA financed by United States dollars. Administration supporters lauded the vague proposal as a desirable extension of the good-neighbor policy to the whole of the democratic world.

Fact is that while proposal may be bold, it is not new. On his trip home from Yalta, just a few weeks before his death, Franklin D. Roosevelt asked his pilot to fly over the Saudi Arabian desert. He inquired of one of the Army engineers accompanying him: "How far does the water table lay beneath the surface?" Replied the engineer: "Only about 50 feet." Mr. Roosevelt then suggested to Saudi Arabia's King Ibn Saud that American companies could bring water to the desert. Former Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, in her book The Roosevelt I Knew, quoted F. D. R. as saying on his return: "When I get through being President of the United States and this damn war is over, I think Eleanor and I will go to the Near East and see if we can manage to put over an operation like the Tennessee Valley system that will really make something of that country." Various Government agencies and officials shared Mr. Roosevelt's dream. Today Mr. Truman is out to make it come true on an even broader scale.

Those close to the President say his bold program does not contemplate the expenditure of billions of public funds; nor would this Government itself undertake the irrigation of deserts, dam building, dredging of waterways, etc. Program will undoubtedly emphasize use of private capital with some form of Government guaranty. Financiers would not be permitted to exploit the areas they develop. Corporations participating would have to provide schools, medical aid, housing, recreational facilities, hospitals.

Presidential aides agree that one major obstacle to success of plan is world-wide shortage of scientists and technicians. Following last war several countries, including India and Lebanon, wanted American technical assistance. Few technicians were interested; they preferred private jobs here at home. Government couldn't loan its own men; the law wouldn't allow it. Industry in United States wouldn't send some of its technical men on loan to foreign governments or foreign companies. Result: At end of 1946 it was estimated that fewer than 500 United States technicians were working on foreign projects—largely in Afghanistan, Egypt, Iran, and Latin America. Recently enacted Smith-Mundt Act permits loan of Government specialists to foreign countries, but new budget provides no funds for sending United States "know-how" abroad.

Heretofore United States capital to finance undeveloped areas abroad has been scarce; American businessmen regard such ventures as extremely risky. Export-Import Bank and the World Bank have felt same way until recently. World Bank is now making some development loans. ECA is helping; is permitting limited use of local currencies set aside by ECA participating nations for developing backward areas, particularly for locating and producing strategic materials. Italy and the Netherlands have already embarked upon a program of soil conservation and land reclamation. Britain is engaged in costly job developing her colonies. If Mr. Truman's plan is translated into action, the world's baby nation—Israel—is expected to be the first real beneficiary.

Resolution of Farmers Cooperative Association of Frederick, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Farmers Cooperative Association, Inc., Frederick, Md. This organization is composed of 1,500 farmer members of Frederick, Montgomery, Carroll, and Howard Counties, Md.

Whereas the Congress of the United States is considering two major farm plans, i. e., 90 percent or fixed parity and 60 to 90 percent or the sliding-scale plan; and

Whereas, the 90-percent plan has demonstrated a tendency to encourage overproduction; and

Whereas overproduction of farm products under fixed parity will either deplete the Treasury of the United States or be an invitation to socialistic controls of farm practices, and the beginning of the end to free enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of Farmers Cooperative Association, Inc., in annual meeting assembled this 29th day of January, 1949, That we recommend the adoption of a sliding scale of parity payments since we are unalterably opposed to any governmental controls of agriculture; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators TYDINGS and O'CONOR and Representative BEALL.

Future of the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is much public and private discussion concerning what course the Republican Party is to take in the immediate future. Mrs. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W. Va., who is prominent in the councils of the Republican women of the Nation, has given much consideration to the question of what is in the future for the Republican Party. The following article appeared in the public press recently:

THE SHIP OF STATE IS AFLOAT ON THE SEA OF COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM—WHY?—WHY?—WHY?

To the Members of the Republican National Committee:

Letters have been received from State and National leaders asking for suggestions from the field. I am addressing my personal views to you who have the responsibility for shaping the destiny of the party and selecting those candidates and leaders who will either make it or break it. Please accept the suggestions with the assurance that I am your friend, saying out loud what seems so obvious to lay Republicans working at the grass roots. So, please don't shoot until you check my record as a regular.

Some will call the views expressed isolationism, riding in a surrey with the fringe on the top, others will say they are just plain horse sense. Somewhere between the two groups we must find a common ground of sensible adjustment, on the basis of streamlining the mechanics and techniques without changing the American philosophy. We modernize our churches, put in sound systems and hearing aids, but when we start streamlining the Ten Commandments we get into trouble. Let's look in the mirror and see what happened to us.

The Republican Party is the victim mainly of propaganda—very bad propaganda—which was not countered in time or in fact. The first telling blow made us fearful that our glorious record of sound government, based on the Constitution, would not stand up under the barrage of New Deal lies and Communist propaganda. We soft-pedaled the Republican basic principles until the people forgot both their wisdom and practice. We sat by and let the New Deal-Communist propaganda pin very destructive tags on the party, and they made them stick too, as every campaign since has shown. Let's be specific to prove the point.

1. The Hoover depression: When Charlie Michaelson did the "masterpiece" of propaganda on this great and good American, what did we do to counteract it? Nothing. Mr. Hoover was advised by friends that it would defeat him and many felt that Senator Borah or some outstanding leader should refute the falsehoods, show how we were "coming back" with sound policies, even phenomenally reducing the national debt, and tell the people then what caused the depression. This would have removed from succeeding campaigns the most devastating weapon against us. The advice was not heeded and we are plagued with the results at every turn.

2. The battle of words—liberal versus conservative. Needless to say, we lost it. Instead of thanking the opposition for the compliment and taking our position on the right, proving that conservative principles, whether in family, business, or government relations, are sound, safe, successful, and basically and realistically progressive, we tried to outliberal the liberals and got lost in the labyrinth of "Who cares who was first."

Both parties are the same (very successful propaganda, not countered). People reasoned if we say what they say, and do what they do, why not "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's" and they did—four times. Our party must make the difference clear.

Isolationists: Here again, their vicious propaganda paid big dividends because our facts were not explained immediately in the light of truth, that our great system of free enterprise (made possible because of Republican protective tariffs) had made it possible to help people all over the world during every crisis including famine and war. Furthermore, that the Republican Party was ready and willing to help the world help itself, but we would not promise to permanently underwrite the peace, economic security, food bill, rearmament, and clashing ideologies of nations all over the earth, for the obvious reason that it is financially impossible without wrecking our own economy. And as for the wars, except for their propaganda and our gullibility they would not have been our wars, anyway. We believe in the wisdom of our forefathers who warned of political alliances with foreign powers and we must protect the United States first. Any sane American looking at the facts today—our commitments, our national debt, our responsibility for the failure or success of world peace—knows that we have been played for big stakes both at home and abroad and are well on the road to serfdom because we lost the vision and the boundaries of the Republic and became international saps.

Democracy: Disregarding history which shows that democracies are the units of government most likely to turn to dictatorship and the further fact that we are a Republic, we somehow let them put this one over too. Enclosed article gives further information on this.

Our great chance went by default: The challenge and the vital issue in the recent election was Americanism versus communism. Every other factor, local, national, or international, depends on our realization of the aims and purposes of this menace and the removal of its godless philosophy from every avenue of American life. The exposé in Washington, the recent factual information on its inroads into the schools, churches, unions, and Government had conditioned the people for an American campaign. Why didn't we meet this challenge?

What of the people: The Government primes its pump with our money and pretends things are rosy but what and who is priming the spirit of the people? We are living on a false economy made up of promises, subsidies, and doles; we are caught in a maze of confusion, red tape, reports, dead-lines, threats of war and impossible taxation, without hope in the future for further opportunity to receive the experience or benefits of the basic elements of American success; namely, creative initiative and reward for work well done. We are beginning to crack up, mentally and physically, under such constant pressures on our daily lives. When will we wake up? What party will have the moral courage and patriotism to tell this story as it really is? Certainly our party has every right to that great service to the Nation because basically it is sound. If we have any future either before of after a depression it will be because we accept the challenge at face value and go forward under God armed with the breastplate of principle, courage, and truth.

What the people (a big majority) will vote for: The opportunity to live again in a free America. In my travels all over the country, speaking and checking the indoctrination of Communist and Socialist philosophy in the schools and churches, I have talked with and to thousands of people in all brackets. I am convinced they will vote for the American way as interpreted by the Republican Party if and when and not until we have a candidate and leaders who will stand—in the face of all opposition—for the American principles which made and kept us as a Nation as enunciated and practiced by our party when we dared to be Republican and won victories. We will not win with "Me Too" and "Dodge the Issue" platforms or candidates. Our party believes in certain basic and time-tested principles, which, when practiced, bring "The greatest number" of people ever experienced in any land, but we go through campaign after campaign without even mentioning them. For instance, when did the workers last hear that their work-opportunity was the result of the American system of free enterprise and protection and not the gift of some visionary person, or scheme, in Washington? That's true. Why don't we say so. Small wonder that we have a generation of new voters who know nothing of our party except what the New Deal-Communist propaganda says about it.

The solution: Begin now to defeat the New Deal-Communist combine with the only weapon that will ever defeat it. "Know the truth and the truth will make you free." Begin now, using every possible medium to reinstate and reinterpret real Republicanism in the mind and hearts of the people through good propaganda. Take the tags off by proving they were fabricated to fool the people and get votes. Show every American—with press and their own horse-sense—the stark realism of the results in every country where dictatorships rule the people and prove by thousands of comparisons that our present situation is exactly the same, and that we must put the Government back in the hands of the people who most certainly are paying the bill and the consequent loss of all that we hold dear. Do all of this now. Every day. And do it down where the people can get it. Then, groom several men for candidates who have proven that they believe in the unadulterated American philosophy, first, last, and always. Men who believe in helping the world, but know that our greatest contribution to the world is to keep the light of liberty and freedom burning in America! Then, see that one of these men survives the convention and we will win!

In a nutshell: Before good intentions or wrong leadership forces our great party to fold its tent like the Arabs and silently steal away into political oblivion, may I suggest—in deference to the founding fathers—the two-party system, the great Americans of both parties and the millions of present-day

Americans praying for such leadership that you in authority and we in the field are honor bound to wage one more real Republican campaign.

Faithfully and loyally yours,

MRS. E. WYATT PAYNE.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Industry Favors Retention of Tariff Commission's Peril Points Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

The Trade Agreements Act has not improved the living standards of workers in the nations which produce the fresh vegetables and tropical fruits shipped to the American markets. Farm workers in Mexican vegetable areas, according to most recent USDA figures, average $1.20 per day. In Cuba the official wage minimum for farm workers is $2.88 per day, but this appears to be rarely observed.

* * * * *

This association further states that it has found no evidence that the amendments adopted by the Eightieth Congress have hampered the negotiation or consummation of any trade agreement. The basic principle behind these amendments was—in the words of President Wilson—"open agreements, openly arrived at."

* * * * *

The 1948 act further provides for factual study by the Tariff Commission to determine the maximum tariff rate that would unduly restrict imports, and the minimum rate below which the domestic industry would be unfairly imperiled. There is a strong suspicion in our area that prior to 1948 trade agreements were negotiated almost entirely on expedient political factors, with little regard to the impact on the domestic industry and economy. Certainly all facts should be available to those who negotiate a trade agreement. (Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Orlando, Fla.)

We all well remember the repeated assurances we had from Mr. Hull and Mr. Clayton that no tariff reductions would be agreed to that would injure any established United States industry. We did, for a while, have a faint hope they were being honest with us. This, they long ago destroyed. However, it is hard to believe they and their successors would so openly prove their insincerity as they did by opposing last year the inclusion in the present act of the provision that the Tariff Commission should determine the peril points in tariff rates; reductions beyond which would jeopardize certain domestic industries. And now to emphasize the fact that they expect to make concessions which will do just that, their No. 1 demand is that that part of the present bill shall be repealed.

The great rush in pushing through this new bill can only be because they are afraid the peril points determined by the Tariff Commission on the tariff covering commodities that will be up in the forthcoming Geneva negotiations will be above the new rates they expect to establish on those commodities.

If there was a single grain of truth in their assurances they would make no concessions that would injure any domestic industry, then surely they would be happy to receive the determination by a neutral body of just how far they could go.

It is completely beyond the comprehension of management and labor in these affected industries who our State Department is so desperately determined to close our factories, put our people on the streets; and inevitably lower the American standard of living. There can be no other possible result if they are permitted to reach their goal through additional tariff-lowering trade treaties, through the ratification of the International Trade Organization charter, or continued negotiations under the general agreement on tariff and trade.

Surely the handwriting on the wall must be clear to anyone who realizes that the country, which now has the highest wage rates in the world, has the lowest tariff.

* * * * *

Our very last hope of anything approaching a square deal from our own Government, supported by our taxes, is that a nonpartisan Tariff Commission will establish minimum tariff rates on the important commodities, below which we hope even the State Department do-gooders will hesitate to go when they know it means unemployment to large numbers of our citizens.

(Brief of the United States Potters Association, presented by J. M. Wells, secretary-treasurer of the Homer Laughlin China Co., Newell, W. Va.)

The Tariff Commission has had but one opportunity to exercise the jurisdiction conferred upon it—the pending schedule of items upon which a new trade agreement is to be negotiated. In the preparation for these negotiations, it has been our experience, and through contact with other industries we learn, that the Tariff Commission has canvassed industry, agriculture, and labor in its attempt to compile facts which would assist our State Department in negotiating with foreign countries upon an intelligent basis so as not to disrupt any branch of our domestic economy.

The provision for the participation by the Tariff Commission, we feel, was a wise one, and one which should be welcomed by those Government agencies charged with the negotiations, as it has been welcomed by labor and industry in this country.

Economic conditions of the world are still so unsettled as to afford no normal basis where it will be safe to establish permanently the protection needed in the case of the great majority of products and commodities which compete with our production. We feel, however, that the function performed by the United States Tariff Commission is essential to the maintenance of our labor, agriculture, and industry.

We respectfully urge that if it is the intent of Congress to continue the trade-agreement policy the provisions of the act of 1948 conferring jurisdiction on the United States Tariff Commission to determine peril points should be reinstated in H. R. 1211. (Respectfully submitted. Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, Inc., by Horatio D. Clark.)

A continuation of impartial investigation on the part of the Tariff Commission should not interfere with the policies or activities of other United States Government departments such as the Executive and State Departments, which seem on the surface to wish to do an honest job. Certainly the unrestrained procedures which have been promulgated by the administration all these years should have produced a better world situation than we have now reached if the free-trading theories are correct. We have gone through World War II and this free-trade policy has not improved matters either before or after the war. How can it be expected to avoid further conflicts when a great part of the world is under the dictatorship of the Communists, with whom no agreements can be made and kept? Therefore our own welfare should come first in order to protect our capacity for war production if for nothing else. As a last straw to grasp for the protection of our people we respectfully request that the Tariff Commission be continued as a fact-finding body to help steer our ship of state away from the rocks of further broken agreements and world animosity. There seems no other hope of a sensible attitude toward world commerce than to utilize the long and valued experience of the Tariff Commission created by the Congress for the very purpose of these checks and balances. The Commission's ability as a fact-finding Government agency far exceeds the ability of any ITO dictatorship which our present administration seems bent upon foisting on our people. Other nations with whom we have made trade agreements do not hesitate to protect their industries through adequate barriers when the need arises—why can't we do likewise?

We earnestly petition that you consider these matters seriously and conclude in your deliberations to retain the functions of the United States Tariff Commission in the matter of all future trade agreements or supplemental foreign trade agreements. (Respectfully submitted. Fatty Acid Producers Association, Inc., Collapsible Tube Manufacturers Association, Candle Manufacturers Association, Beeswax Bleaching and Refining Industry, by Lester B. Platt, New York, N. Y.)

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column which appeared in the New York Post on January 31, 1949, directs the attention of Congress to a matter of grave importance. I am sure that the new Small Business Committee, as soon as it is organized, will inquire into these matters and propose appropriate legislation to aid in a solution of the problem.

YOUR OWN STORE

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

Have you a dream of starting a little business of your own? Are you, like so many others, praying for the day when you can stop working for someone else, can strike out for yourself, put your own name on the door? If so, read on—and read well.

For this column is dedicated to you.

Once upon a time, you could start that little business in America on a shoestring. But not any more, not any more.

Today, you need an initial stake of at least $5,000 to go into your own business. And that's the absolute minimum.

Once upon a time, your dream, your ambition, your courage, and your willingness to work could carry you much of the way and you could set up shop with little or no capital. And in the thirties, lots of Americans managed it just that way. But no longer.

Today, you need several thousands in personal savings or a sufficiently good credit rating to permit you to borrow those thousands from the savings of others. And if you have only the minimum, you risk being toppled over and destroyed by the first chilly business breeze.

The Department of Commerce and the Institute of Life Insurance have just analyzed more than 1,000 new wholesale and retail firms with one or more employees established since 1945. Over the week end, the institute released a compilation of the figures with the comment:

"The decline in the dollar's buying power has had as pronounced an impact on the cost and finances of starting and running a business, whatever its size, as on the everyday family budget."

Which is true, of course—as far as it goes.

But the figures shout about much more than that to me. They say, for instance, that:

It's harder and harder to become and stay a small-business man in this land that once was made up almost entirely of small-business men.

Despite all our talkie-talkie about the virtues of the small firm and the curse of monopolies, the small firm is fighting an increasingly tough battle, the monopolies are flourishing under our eyes.

Yet, America's greatness rests on its small businesses. We are what we are because a little man with a big dream could try to become a big man with an even bigger dream.

What is it—your business dream? Is it starting a little restaurant of your own with, maybe, a bar, too? For a "hole in the wall," you need an initial stake of $6,900. For a larger place with a chance of a larger intake, you need $66,300 to start.

Is it starting a food shop? For a small one, your stake must be $7,200; a larger one, $19,900.

Is it an apparel store? Here, figure $7,200 to $34,800.

Or a filling station perhaps? For this, the Commerce Department allows the minimum of $5,000.

And if you're interested in the wholesale area, the stakes skyrocket to many, many times the totals I've written here.

Business deaths are soaring. Last year, they reached the highest mark since 1942 and bankruptcies involved the most money since 1935. And without doubt, one major factor for the failures was the lack of adequate capital, the inability of the firms to withstand the harsher winds that blew over such fields as liquor, restaurants, foods, apparel.

Business births at the same time are leveling off. And without doubt, a prime factor in the slow-down is the fact that would-be businessmen haven't the savings or credit to finance their projects.

Look hard at this, you folks who dream the great American dream of being your own boss. For these are facts you must face.

Look even harder at it, you men and women who represent us in Congress who will vote on our antitrust and tax laws this year. For you're looking at a dangerous flaw in the foundations of America.

include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

AN INCREDIBLE LABOR BILL

The administration's labor bill is not merely a straight political pay-off to the union leaders who supported Mr. Truman last November, but it is a pay-off reckoned at time-and-a-half rates. If enacted, this legislation would promote even more of the industrial anarchy which brought on the Taft-Hartley Act.

The measure would regulate only a very narrow area of labor activities, and even here with such a timidity as to be almost ineffective. In no case is this more apparent than in the provision regarding strikes which imperil national health and safety. The 80-day injunctive power given the Government under Taft-Hartley—a power that Mr. Truman himself has used to good effect at least half a dozen times—would be ended.

Instead, for disputes which the President held to jeopardize the general welfare this bill would substitute a 30-day cooling-off period and a Government fact-finding procedure. The sole compulsion, either to stop such a walk-out or enforce the fact-finding decision, would be moral suasion. Just how worthless moral suasion can be was bitterly shown some years ago when President Roosevelt, for all his labor support and despite an America at war, could not morally dissuade John L. Lewis from striking.

Of the many union practices branded as unfair in Taft-Hartley only two remain in this bill—jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts (though even some of the latter are permitted). Here again, enforcement is weak. The Government could no longer seek an injunction to stop an unfair labor practice until the NLRB had ruled thereon. Thus, the illegal act could continue while the law took its slow course—during which time an employer might well have caved in. To seal his doom further, the administration's proposal would forbid the employer to sue a union for damages arising out of unfair labor practices.

Gone in this bill are the curbs on mass picketing, on feather-bedding, on the unions' imposing excessive initiation fees, and on union political spending (though banks and corporations, to be sure, are specifically limited in this matter). Not only would the closed shop be legalized, but State closed-shop bans, recently upheld by the Supreme Court, would be nullified for businesses engaged in interstate commerce. Nor would unions any longer have to file financial reports.

These are by no means all the injustices in the measure. For in some respects it actually gives more unchecked power to union bosses than did the Wagner Act, which it is supposed to "improve." It seems incredible that an administration dedicated to a "fair deal" for all would seriously propose it. Certainly, we trust that responsible Congressmen of both parties will not surrender to one special interest, the labor leaders, the tyrannical powers this bill would give them over individual workers and the rest of American society.

tofore granted I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

The trouble with the administration of the Reciprocal Trade Act is that there is no one whom the American people can hold responsible for its administration. I have seen enough of the way bureaucracy works in municipal, State, or Federal Govrenment to know that someone must be charged with the responsibility of administration, or there is not going to be good administration.

THE CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF THE AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY IS VITAL TO THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

The contributions of the three American jeweled watch companies to the war effort were recognized, during the war, as essential. It is also essential, for national defense, to have available an adequate source of skilled labor, trained in the making of fine watches.

The following letter was sent to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman, Board of Directors, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by F. C. Denebrink, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director for Procurement, Manpower and Utilities, in behalf of the Munitions Board:

"DEAR MR. HISE: Reference is made to Mr. Carpenter's letter to you of November 18 regarding the importance of the Waltham Watch Co. in the field of national defense.

"In Mr. Carpenter's last paragraph he mentioned that the highly skilled labor employed by the Waltham Watch Co. is a valuable, intangible resource for national defense. Mr. Carpenter has asked me to write to you to give additional information as to this important factor. The information given has been reported to us and is believed to be reliable.

"There are now 8,000 people in the American jeweled watch industry; 40 percent of these people require from 2 to 10 years to train. Of this 40 percent at least 1,000 require 5 to 10 years to train; 60 percent of the 8,000 people are women, 40 percent are men. These figures establish the fact that there is a large nucleus of personnel now in the industry which would be almost impossible to replace in a mobilization period.

"The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. were employed to 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945. During this period they manufactured jewel bearings, chronometers, fire control watches, time fuzes, aircraft instruments, and other essential products. Most of these items could not then nor could they now be produced by other domestic watch companies.

"It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved.

"Sincerely yours,

"F. C. DENEBRINK,

"Rear Admiral, United States Navy, Director for Procurement, Manpower and Utilities."

(By Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president, American Watch Workers Union.)

An Incredible Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. WOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

H. R. 1211 Imperils National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request here-

Wool

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the

following statement that I have received from Mr. John G. Wright, president, Boston Wool Trade Association, Boston, Mass.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE—STOCK-PILING STRATEGIC MATERIALS

The world's demand for wools since the war has resulted in the consumption of the current clips plus about 7,500,000 bales of the J. O. stocks out of the 10,000,000 accumulated during the war. While this demand would normally result in higher prices your executive committee feels that the high prices in dollars is partly the result of cross-rate exchange transactions which are natural developments of artificially fixed currency rates.

As you know, the Australian Government has for some time been trying to prevent any wools from being shipped from Australia to this country except at the official exchange rate of $4.03\frac{5}{16}$ for British sterling. It appears that they have been quite successful in stopping any indirect shipments to this country.

Probably more important to this country has been the inflationary effect on wool prices in Australia of European countries within the sterling area being able to exchange dollars for sterling in the free market with which to purchase wool. The discount on the official rate has been considerable, probably about 20 percent for the average exchange in the last 3 or 4 months.

While we approve of the theory of the Marshall plan and while it is undoubtedly helping to rehabilitate Europe, the method of administration of wool leaves this country at a most unfair disadvantage. As we understand it, dollars are allocated or loaned to certain European countries for the purchase of wool in the primary markets. These dollars are paid for at the official rate of the currency of the country though the actual value of the currency may be depreciated and far below the official rate in the free market. These countries may buy the wool in the primary markets at this discount, manufacture the wool and ship the products to the United States for dollars.

Your executive committee has been fully cognizant of these facts and has protested through official channels and is trying to secure results more equitable to all. Government officials are sympathetic and are giving these matters their preferred attention. It is a tremendous problem of vital importance to our whole trade, but until we have free markets for the world currencies, it seems almost inevitable that these problems will be with us. It is like trying to dam up a running stream—if you stop the water in one place, it runs over in another. If any members of the trade have suggestions or information which they think would be useful to the executive committee, I am sure the committee would welcome them.

The wool trade was well represented at the Wool Textile Section meeting of the Munitions Board. It was recommended by this committee to the Munitions Board that wool be moved up from class 2 to 1A in the form of a 4-month supply of uniforms for the men expected to be drafted in an emergency and an additional 4-month supply of cloth and knitting yarns, and, beyond that, wool as deemed necessary after the first two requirements were filled. This recommendation was based on the feeling that if there were an emergency it would be a sudden one and that the uniforms should be available immediately, also that uniforms and cloth stock pile with less deterioration than wool or tops. This recommendation has to go through several committees, and it may take 6 months to arrive for acceptance or rejection by the Munitions Board.

JOHN G. WRIGHT, *President.*

President Truman's Inaugural Address Stresses Partnership and Not Imperialism—It Is Cooperation and Not Exploitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 2, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, of all of the various and many editorials printed in the newspapers of the Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent in this Congress, the following article appears to me to be especially strengthening of the sinews of the American way of life. Likewise, it is an important treatment of the inaugural address of the President of the United States by a newspaper whose editorials are a generally accepted Republican philosophy of government.

I take pleasure in commending to all the Members of Congress a thorough reading and digest of this article as it appeared in the Long Beach Press-Telegram as of January 28, 1949:

BUSINESS MINDS AT WORK ON PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF ALL LANDS

President Truman has said or done nothing to make clear exactly what he had in mind when, in his inaugural address, he advocated American assistance to undeveloped countries around the globe. He apparently contemplated a plan of cooperation by the United States, both the Government and private investors, with backward countries to increase industrial production and raise the living standards in other countries.

Although the President has not filled in with practical details the outline of his idea for global economic cooperation, others have been busy developing plans to carry the idea into execution. One of them is Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America and former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. In an address to the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, he spoke for creation of a world economic development corporation to promote industrialization through partnership of American capital, technique, and know-how with the capital and manpower of foreign countries.

A Government fund would protect American investors in foreign lands against loss from nationalization of business and confiscation of property, but the investors would take the normal business risks.

Mr. Johnston disclaimed the idealistic, do-good point of view. He talked economics. He explained that, without sales abroad, the American economy would suffer. He likewise showed that foreign exports from the United States now are paid for with American money. America lends the money, then the foreigners use what they borrow to buy goods in the United States. It is a system that cannot continue forever. The time will come when the United States either must be paid for what it exports, or it will stop exporting. What then? The same thing happened after the First World War. The principal factor in the depression beginning in 1929 and running through the 1930's was the collapse of foreign trade when the foreigners no longer could obtain American credit with which to purchase American products.

As a matter of business, Mr. Johnston proposes that the United States develop profitable markets abroad for surplus American goods. He said: "This program is partnership and not imperialism; it is cooperation and not exploitation."

This is the view of the situation taken by others who believe that the United States is destined to succeed to the role of Great Britain in global economic development, but without acquiring territory as the British did. There are reports that machinery to carry out this policy already is being set by agencies of government. If that be true, President Truman obviously has gone much further with the plan than he divulged in his inaugural address.

Africa and Indonesia are said to be areas upon which the American planners have their eyes. Private capital from the United States already has gone into Arabia in great amounts in quest of oil. As one result, Arabia, a long slumbering country, is taking on modern ways.

Over a long period of time it was truly said that the sun never sets on the British Empire. That great example of imperialism has been dissolved. In its place, the United States, without any territorial expansion, may lead in a world project to make every country economically successful and therefore a market for the surplus products of other lands.

Emphasis on Alcohol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a fine, Christian mother of my personal acquaintance, and who resides in the Second District of Wisconsin, has written to me to protest the emphasis on alcohol in the officers' clubs of our present-day Army.

Mother of three veterans of World War II, this lady has called my attention to an editorial in the December 1948 issue of the Christian Herald, which I take this means of bringing to the attention of my colleagues:

MORALS

An Army officer's wife sends us a schedule of social events planned for 1 month at the officer's club and mess, on one Army post. She's worried about it. Maybe you will be, too, when your son is drafted. We quote from this schedule:

"Sunday: Juke-box dancing. Monday: Bar is open. Come out and relax. Also Monday: Let's rest in our cocktail bar. Tuesday: Women's club. Meet the wife for cocktails and family (!) dinner. Wednesday: Bingo tonight. Bring the kids to this one. Also Wednesday: Bar open from 7 to 11. Come on out. It's like heaven. Thursday: Maid's night out. Bring your husband here. Friday: Pay-day night. Come out and drink it over. Also Friday: Bridge party, 25 cents per seat. Winner takes all. Whisky for booby prize. Saturday: Conte Carlo free champagne, 8 to 9. Juke-box dance, 9. Also Saturday: Steeplechase—horses, beautiful girls for jockies. Regular pari-mutuels. Also Saturday: Have a private party in our cocktail lounge; think of all the people you owe a party. Halloween party, $15 first prize, whisky second. Let's really get behind this one!"

We read, further, that the non-coms club has the same schedule. For the love of heaven, is this what we're sending our youngsters into?

Fisheries Favor Amendment to H. R. 1211

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous-consent request heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

The fishing industry is the oldest commercial industry in the United States and is vitally important to the economy of the country. Furthermore, it provides a very valuable supply of one of the dietary essentials—animal proteins. On the other hand, it may be considered small by some when compared, for example, to the automobile industry or the steel industry.

* * * * *

Section 2 of H. R. 1211 repeals the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Public Law 792, 80th Cong.). Section 5 of H. R. 1211 amends section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended, to strike from the statute certain provisions added to it by Public Law 792, Eightieth Congress, which provisions the California Fish Canners Association considers beneficial and which the association urges be inserted in H. R. 1211. We refer to the requirement of section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Public Law 792, 80th Cong.), that the United States Tariff Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each article to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions as to the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles, and to report whether increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry.

When the fish-canning industry found that the foregoing provision had been made a part of the statutory restriction on the negotiation of trade agreements last year, it felt that it had finally been afforded some measure of protection; that at last it could not be offered on the sacrificial altar of international trade to promote and benefit some other industry, as has seemed to be its fate in the past.

The fish-canning industry fails to see why there should be any objection to the inclusion of this provision.

* * * * *

We strongly urge upon your committee, therefore, that you continue the attempt to protect industry before the damage is done; that you permit an impartial bipartisan body, experienced in tariff matters, to determine just how much surgery the patient can stand without fatal results, rather than to place scalpels in the hands of medical students who, while operating, will be praying constantly that the skilled surgeon will be able to correct their mistakes in time.

(California Fish Canners Association, Inc., 15 members, 20 plants: California Marine Curing & Packing Co., Terminal Island, Calif.; California Marine Packing Co., Newport Beach, Calif.; Coast Fishing Co., Wilmington, Calif.; Franco-Italian Packing Co., Terminal Island, Calif.; French Sardine Co., Terminal Island, Calif.; High Seas Tuna Packing Co., Point Loma, San Diego, Calif.; Southern California Fish Corp., Terminal Island, Calif.; South Coast Fisheries, Terminal Island, Calif.; South Pacific Canning Co., Long Beach, Calif.; Terminal Island Seafoods, Ltd., Terminal Island, Calif.; Van Camp Seafood Co., Terminal Island, Calif.; West Coast Packing Corp., Long Beach, Calif.; Westgate Sea Products Co., San Diego, Calif.; Western Canners Co., Newport Beach, Calif.; Pan Pacific Fisheries, Inc., Terminal Island, Calif.)

Union of American Hebrew Congregations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Catholic community of Boston made a unique contribution to the fortieth biennial convention and observance of the diamond jubilee of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations in Boston. For the first time, so far as I know, in this country a Catholic prelate addressed a Jewish religious assembly.

Asserting that there is nothing in Catholic doctrine to prejudice the attitude of Christians toward Jews, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of Boston, said that any such statements are lies meant to divide us. The archbishop further declared:

I ask you not to believe those things. No man can have my faith concerning Christ, His life and death, without desiring to serve, to help, to befriend all men without exception: white, black, gentile, Jew. Always remember that a Catholic bishop took time from a busy day to come and tell you that. I would not send a scholar to prove that our doctrines do not make us your enemies. I come to pledge my personal affection and officially to declare there is nothing in my faith to make us enemies of you. It is all the other way. I can and do pledge to you the friendship of my people.

Judging by the amount of anti-Catholic literature and talk loose in this land, judging by the movements of various kinds organized against Jews, Negroes, and others, a staggering percentage of people in even this privileged country still hate millions of their fellow men.

Questioning the efficacy of interfaith parleys and like ventures, he averred that—

in the last analysis, people will learn morality best within the household of their own spiritual families. They will give most sincere attention only to those who speak for God as they understand God. Hence, the great need for moral education on the bases of mutual respect and brotherly charity, education to be given by our own to our own within our own traditions.

Archbishop Cushing declared there must be more and more religion, which he called the—

foundation stone of every independence to which you, as free men, lay claim. It underlies all our human dignity, our political democracy, our hopes for faith and freedom. * * * If the American concept of the sources of our dignity and freedom be true, then the atheist, the man who denies God in theory or in practice, is as much the enemy of the American way of life as is the totalitarian, black, brown, or red. * * * Those who love liberty, therefore, as you love liberty, will protect their liberties and those of their nation by the means that you have chosen: by religious means, by an increasing faith in and love for God.

Role of Tariff Commission Favored by Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under a unanimous-consent request heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

Although the opinion of the Commission is merely advisory and not controlling, the amendment, in our opinion, was the only step taken by the Congress since the inception of the program to provide a significant standard to guide the State Department in the exercise of the great power which the Congress had delegated to the President and to make effective the assurance given by President Roosevelt "that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed" and that "the adjustment of our foreign-trade relations must rest on the premise of undertaking to benefit and not to injure such interests."

The amendments of 1948 enlarging the power of the Commission marked a great advance in the administration of the act, because, in our opinion, the program as developed by the State Department had forsaken the premises laid down by the President and had been primarily motivated by international political considerations. It relegated to second place the pledge to benefit and not to injure and put foremost as the object to be gained a persistent and ever-widening reduction of import duties. (Statement of C. T. Murchison, president, the Cotton-Textile Institute, Inc., New York, N. Y.)

The present act, due to expire on June 30, is a far better approach. It gives to the Tariff Commission the power to review the duties imposed on imports to this country. Under the present law, the Tariff Commission is required to hold public hearings and to determine the peril points below which contemplated tariff reductions under the reciprocal trade program should not go. Under Public Law 792, it must submit its recommendations to the Chief Executive. The President, if he disregards such recommendations, must tell Congress his reasons.

We submit that this is a more democratic and practical procedure. Rather than leave such matters without recourse to the State Department, we must have a flexible system that will provide protection whenever any industry is threatened in the home market.

The peril point in the woolen and worsted industry is a fact. It is here, right at the present time.

Representatives from New England insist that this peril be removed by an amendment which will raise the tariff on imports of woolens and worsteds.

Before that can be done, however, the new legislation being considered by this committee, and which seeks to eliminate the peril point reporting function, should be rejected.

If not, our textile industry is doomed. We are here to see that this does not happen.

Gentlemen, don't sell our woolen and worsted industry down the river of free trade. (Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, representing the textile industry.)

OVERSEERS' ASSOCIATION,
PACIFIC MILLS, WORSTED DIVISION,
Lawrence, Mass., January 21, 1949.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The overseers at Pacific Mills, Worsted Division, Lawrence, Mass., have gone on record opposing bill H. R. 1211. This bill is to have open hearings before House Ways and Means Committee beginning Monday, January 24.

We believe the Trade Agreements Act should be governed by the Tariff Commission so that, with proper hearings and balance arrived at through these hearings, no reductions will be advised that will injure the domestic industry involved. Also, from time to time, people as well as industry can have a point of appeal to help correct any inequality that may arise.

Although we may be considered part of management, let us assure you that we are very close to the employees of our industry, and we can assure you that they are adverse to any legislative enactment that will deprive them of at least regular employment, or any wage that might lower their income through competition with unequal standards of wage ratio in countries entering into these reciprocal trade agreements.

Therefore, we ask you to appear at these hearings and oppose bill H. R. 1211, and recommend the further continuance of the Tariff Commission.

Very truly yours,
PACIFIC MILLS OVERSEERS' ASSOCIATION,
THOMAS R. BEE, *President.*
A. W. SILLOWAY, *Secretary.*
TOM PEEL,
JAMES L. BATTS,
CHARLES POLLARD,
HENRY FREDETTE,
Directors.

We do not think it is necessary for Congress to abdicate completely to the State Department all power over international trade agreements in order to promote international trade. Nor do we believe that the broad general principle of promoting international trade should be used as a subterfuge by the State Department to commit the United States to international trade organizations without the approval of Congress. We do not think the State Department in administering the Trade Agreements Act has given reasonable consideration to the welfare of the American textile industry, the American farmer, or the American textile worker.

If it is the wisdom of Congress to extend the Trade Agreements Act, we urge its extension without change from its present form. It is vital that the Tariff Commission or some analogous independent agency be entrusted with the responsibility of fact finding, in accordance with economic criteria established by the Congress. (By C. A. Cannon, chairman, legislative committee, American Cotton Manufacturers Association.)

We were, therefore, very encouraged last year to see that Congress had voted to give the Tariff Commission a clearer, more authoritative status in respect to future agreements; but we are now equally discouraged to find that Congress is being asked, in H. R. 1211, to reverse its position and not only repeal the Trade Agreements Act of 1948, but also to eliminate even the slight consideration given in the original 1934 act that before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

From this proposal we infer that the President now desires to eliminate from fact-finding those agencies, except the State Department, most experienced in presenting facts. It is the State Department which has acted as the President's agent in all of these negotiations. It is the State Department, primarily experienced in questions of political expediency and not economic considerations, which assumes the role of leader in all negotiations.

The Tariff Commission, on the other hand, has demonstrated many times its ability to gather detailed data and analyze it impartially. It is only since the Tariff Commission has made public its studies of various industries of the United States and their history in world trade that we have had available to us data which would even serve as a basis for discussion. In our own industry, the Commission's Trade Agreement Digests, published in 1946, on both rayon and silk were an immeasurable help in reviewing industry conditions, even though the Commission has itself been hampered by lack of information on foreign costs of production in postwar years. The Summary of Tariff Information series, published this year, still further adds to the enlightenment of those who wish to know what facts are being considered in negotiating trade treaties.

We believe that the President, his advisers, Congress and all others participating in what is a relatively new international experience for the United States, the trade agreement negotiation, cannot in good faith permit the representatives of this country to sit down with the more experienced negotiators of other countries with no provision for the preparation of adequate information as to the economic effects of such proposals; nor permit the actual negotiation to go into effect without even the relatively light rein over the results which Congress gave itself in providing that the Tariff Commission's advice must be heeded, as stipulated in the present Public Law 792. We also believe that Congress will find that other countries, despite their extensive experience in such matters, do not presume to effect such negotiations without the active advice and attendance of adequately informed industry representatives. Such countries know full well that trade agreements are primarily economic in their impact on the nationals of their respective countries; and the economic effect is studied and considered.

Perhaps the very complexity of the foreign system of quota controls, currency controls, special intra-country taxes, etc., is evidence that a truly well thought out trade agreement is not a simple matter of cutting periodic slices of 50 percent from a single rate of duty as seems to be the present system of our negotiating representatives.

We earnestly ask for deeper consideration by the members of your Committee of the far-reaching effects of such a change as that now proposed in H. R. 1211. On the eve of the returning industrial efficiency of such long-time chief competitors as Germany and Japan in the international textile picture, and the daily accounts of purchases of the latest type of textile equipment by other countries, much of it from the United States, there is more vital need than ever before to take no backward steps in providing for the widest possible fact finding and open consideration of all matters affecting international trade in textiles. The United States Tariff Commission, a Government body of nonpartisan character, as appointed by Congress, should be the chief agency for such fact finding in foreign trade negotiations. If Congress wishes to delegate to others the power to change its trade treaties, then that delegation should be given only to those whose public duty it is to factually consider the effect of such proposals in the American industries involved.

We, therefore, respectfully urge that H. R. 211 be revised as follows:

Sec. 2: This should be changed to read: "The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Public Law 792, 80th Cong.) is hereby extended for a further period of 2 years from June 12, 1949."

Sec. 3: This section should be eliminated.

Sec. 5: This section should be eliminated.

Respectfully submitted: Tariff Committee of the National Federation of Textiles, Inc.: Chairman Paul Whitin, Paul Whitin Manufacturing Co. of Northbridge, Mass., West Warwick, R. I., and Gilbertville, Mass.; Gardiner Hawkins, United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc., of Jewett City, Conn., Clearwater, S. C., Bath, S. C., Elberton, Ga., Fall River, Mass., Wilmington, Del., and Old Fort, N. C.; Alan B. Sibley, Deering, Milliken & Co., Inc. of Abbeville, S. C., Greenville, S. C., Laurens, S. C., Spartanburg, S. C.; Irene Blunt, Secretary, New York, N. Y.; John J. Goldsmith, Hess, Goldsmith & Co., Inc., of Kingston, Pa., Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Plymouth, Pa., and Pomona, Calif.; H. D. Ruhm, Jr., Bates Manufacturing Co., of Lewiston, Augusta, and Saco, Maine.

Communism Versus Christianity—A Pattern of Action by Communists Who Aim To Destroy Christianity

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a poem written by Langston Hughes, a member of the American section of Moscow's International Union of Revolutionary Writers. It does not seem possible that such an organization can exist in this country. The anti-American propaganda goes back a long way and its philosophy has been permitted to permeate the social and economic life of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Christian people of this country are on notice that communism has as its objective the complete destruction of the Christian way of life. Can those of us who profess it sit idly by, inarticulate and inert? Communism is a cancerous condition in our body politic and it is time we did something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I include an excerpt as part of my remarks, and call special attention to the poem entitled "Good-by Christ":

Attention, Christians! Be sure to attend the book and author luncheon at Vista del Arroyo Hotel, Pasadena, Calif., Friday, November 15, 1940, at 12:15 promptly. Hear the distinguished young Negro poet, Langston Hughes, author of the following poem, and member of the American section of Moscow's International Union of Revolutionary Writers.

"GOOD-BY, CHRIST

"Listen, Christ,
You did all right in your day, I reckon—
But that day's gone now.
They ghosted you up a swell story, too,
Called it Bible—
But it's dead now.
The popes and preachers 've
Made too much money from it.
They've sold you to too many.

"Kings, generals, robbers and killers—
Even to the Czar and the Cossacks,
Even to Rockefeller's church,
Even to the Saturday Evening Post.
You ain't no good no more.
They've pawned you
Till you've done wore out.

"Good-by,
Christ Jesus Lord God Jehovah,
Beat it on away from here now.
Make way for a new guy with no religion at all—
A real guy named
Marx, Communist; Lenin, peasant; Stalin, worker;
Me—I said, me!

"Go ahead on now,
You're getting in the way of things, Lord.
And please take Saint Gandhi with you when you go.
And Saint Pope Pius,
And Saint Aimie McPherson,
And big, black Saint Becton
Of the consecrated dime.

"And step on the gas, Christ.
The world is mine from now on—
Move!
Don't be so slow about movin'!
And nobody's gonna sell me
To a king, or a general, or a millionaire."

Attend the luncheon, Christians, and hear George Palmer Putnam introduce the author of the above "poem"—Langston Hughes, distinguished young Negro poet—and eat, if you can.

Control in Far East Slipping From United States to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report by Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., on the alarming import for this country of what is happening in China and Asia. Admiral Cooke was responsible for much of the brilliantly successful strategy of our naval forces in the last war. Some say he is our greatest naval strategist since Mahan.

On his retirement last November, following 2 years as commander in chief of our Asiatic Fleet, almost his first act was to issue this sober statement of warning to his fellow Americans. He knows the incredible folly of our Government's failure to have a forthright policy of support for the Government of China in its efforts to resist subjugation by the Communists. He knows what ought to be and can be done in China, even at this late date. He knows what will happen to our interests and security in the Pacific if we do not do it.

Are we to blunder into a second world war in a decade because of failure to appreciate how imperative it is for our security and for peace in the Pacific that China be free and independent and under a government friendly to ourselves, rather than under an avowed enemy, whether Japanese militarists or Soviet satellites?

VISIONS CONTROL OF ORIENT SLIPPING FROM UNITED STATES TO REDS

(By Frank H. Bartholomew)

SONOMA, CALIF., November 22.—"Control in the western Pacific-east Asia is now passing to the Communists," Admiral Charles M. Cooke, Jr., told the United Press yesterday in an exclusive interview.

The four-star admiral recently retired after 2 years as commander of United States naval forces, western Pacific. As head of the American combatant forces in China his headquarters were at Tsingtao, to which port 1,250 additional Marines were recently ordered.

"Control of the western Pacific-east Asia area was dominantly Japanese in recent decades," the admiral said. "Japanese abuse of this domination had world-wide disastrous consequences. With VJ-day, control passed to the United States after a bloody march across the Pacific. It is now passing to Soviet Russia.

"Russia's position in the western Pacific before the war was not strong. Rather it was a position of vulnerability which tended to weaken strategically the Soviet world status. The incorporation and organization of Manchuria, north Korea, and north China in the Communist sphere of the maritime provinces of eastern Siberia is bringing about a shift of economic and military superiority from the United States to Russia.

"No one should be fooled by statements that Chinese Communists are not in the Communist fold."

Cooke was asked if in his opinion it is too late for the United States to retrieve its position.

"Before we try to retrieve it we had better know specifically what it is we want to accomplish," he replied, speaking with the judicial care which won him the nickname "Savvy" at the Naval Academy.

"Two points must be decided. What are our objectives in the Orient? How compelling are they; how far will we go to support them?

"We have got to know. The United States has need of a clean-cut objective in China. There have been extensive periods when we did nothing, followed by periods when we did substantial things.

"I was out there for 2 years and, while knowing our policy, I was not advised as to the objectives our policy was supposed to bring about.

"What are these objectives? Are we trying to check the spread of communism in China or are we not?

"If we think communism is not best for China, is not best for our own position in the western Pacific, and is not best for the world, presumably, we want to do something about it.

"We don't accept the communization of Europe, and we are doing something about that—to the extent of billions of dollars—in support of a definite objective.

"Americans cannot help but be aware of the section of thought in the country and in the National Capital representing a so-called liberal philosophy and taking the position that communism may be all right for China and that we ought to stay out of a fratricidal war anyhow. If that line of thinking is to guide us, we should not continue to pour millions of dollars into Nationalist China only with the certainty of further offending the expected victors.

"We cannot well have two policies in China—one of them seeking the reestablishment of prosperity under the Nationalist Government and simultaneously checking the spread of communism, and at the same time an opposite policy of letting the Communists drive ahead unrestricted, with the assistance of Moscow—a Moscow which incidentally is committed by treaty to support the Chinese Nationalist Government.

"The effect of this sort of thing is exemplified by congressional action last spring in appropriating a large sum of money for Chinese relief in which a certain section was made available for aid to the Nationalist army—yet I very recently read, whether correct I don't know, that a ship left Seattle with the first arms and ammunition to go forward to Chiang Kai-shek as a result of this legislation.

"Is it too late to do anything effective? Let me put the answer this way—if it is not too late to continue sending money and supplies to China, it is not too late to take a supporting action designed to accomplish whatever objective we may adopt. If our country has concluded that the Nationalist cause is lost, then the expenditure of our wealth is useless in sending out relief to support that cause.

"We cannot wash our hands of direct as well as moral responsibility for China and say that, since it is the Chinese fighting the Chinese, let's stand clear. We cannot forget that we had much to do with putting the Russians into Manchuria, north China, north Korea, and the Kuriles, and that we spent a year and a half trying to get the Nationalist leaders to accept the Communists into their government. In Europe at the present time we have decided that we don't like the ruthless aggression of the Communists and that they are inimical to our national interests; are we then, having contributed much in implanting them on the Chinese, now to turn our backs and say over our shoulders to our erstwhile ally, Chiang Kai-shek, 'You have an inefficient and corrupt government and we cannot help you?'

"That might be too bad for us too—because, in addition to introducing the Communists into China and helping to develop a situation which neither we nor the established Government of China can control, as things now stand, we are, by the loss of Manchuria to the Communists, already in process of being replaced by an unfriendly nation as the dominant power in the western Pacific."

"Would a Communist victory in China mean Communist domination of the entire Orient?" the admiral, now living on his 160-acre Hillwood ranch overlooking San Francisco Bay to the south, was asked.

"No one has the answer to that one," he replied. "Certainly there are Communist movements in Indonesia, the Malay States, and the Netherlands East Indies. Whether they could be welded together I don't know.

"The danger that Japan will be forced into the Communist sphere increases. How is this augmented danger to be countered? Is it to be a permanent charge on United States military power? Is it to be a responsibility to be assumed by the United Nations? Is it to be met by the reconstitution of Japanese

military strength? Or, is it to be defaulted by the democratic world?

"As a specific formula I have this to suggest, and I base it upon direct experience with the Chinese people, military forces, and Government:

"Let us send at once to China, assuming Chinese concurrence, a strong commission to guide United States action. The action we have taken in the past has proven ineffective, if not unwise. If this ineffective action has resulted from the advice of the representatives and commission heretofore in China, they should be either replaced or superseded. If our course has disregarded the advice of such agencies then we need more authoritative representation.

"Utilizing the well-considered advice of such a high-powered agency, we should fix our objective strongly and clearly, and support it forcefully."

Labor Favors Tariff Commission's Peril Points Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent request heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks examples from testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee:

Lastly, we hope that the Congress will in no case prevent the Tariff Commission from carrying out its full function in the present round of trade agreements. We believe that we have an opportunity to test the capacity of the Commission to perform its function as a guide, keeping in mind that its present staff is approximately 30 percent below its normal strength. To deny this test would appear to us to represent an unwillingness to accept a trial of a procedure that many believe to be superior to previous procedure. It would, moreover, call off the test when it had already progressed more than halfway to its goal.

To sum up, our request to this committee, and through it to the Congress, is for a procedure in tariff adjustment that will afford the best prospect for establishing rates of duty that will reflect the realities of foreign competition in its varied impact upon different branches of domestic production. This calls for more specific information than has been relied upon in the past and greater concern in measuring the probable effects of changes in duty rates. We have in mind rates of duty, and now this is stating just a general principle, that will permit the average American producer, not the least efficient, to sell his output in the domestic market in competition with imports at prices that will return a reasonable profit after paying fair wages and in other respects meeting the labor standards required by law. We think that such rates can be approximated by a Commission that is empowered to find the facts and to interpret them impartially. We see no other way of accomplishing the same end.

On this proposition we take our stand, in the belief that it will appeal to the minds of reasonable men.

* * * * *

We think that the Tariff Commission is the agency most appropriate for this function. It is a bipartisan agency capable of weighing the facts impartially. This is the body that has the commodity experts and the personnel that is competent in judging the competitive factors. If it is not now properly staffed, any deficiency should be remedied. We are suggesting the formula that in our view would give the best results. We believe it to be sound, practical, and reasonable. (Statement of O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary, America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.)

We are aware, of course, that the Commission has supplied statistical material to the Trade Agreements Committee, which, we understand, advises the State Department; but we do not believe that this meets our objections. The State Department can then go ahead and ignore the Tariff Commission. The latter becomes a more statistical collection agency. The value of its expertness in reaching conclusions about how high duty rates should be is lost or greatly depreciated.

Let us say, for example, that the Tariff Commission should find upon proper investigation that the duty on engraved ornamental glassware should not be reduced or should be reduced not more than 20 percent if the American producer is not to suffer serious injury. It would supply the Committee on Trade Agreements with the supporting data. The latter would no doubt give consideration to the data thus supplied by the Commission; but it could disregard the information or give to it such interpretation as it saw fit and advise the State Department that the duty could be reduced the full 50 percent allowed by law.

We do not believe that it is crippling the trade-agreements program to require that the word of the Tariff Commission should carry greater weight. Does anyone suggest that the process of railway rate regulation is crippled by the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is composed of experts in the field of transportation, makes final and binding decisions with respect to rates? Does anyone suggest that the regulation of public utility rates is crippled by the fact that the Federal Power Commission, after adequate hearings and fact finding, determines what the rates should be? (Statement of Harry H. Cook, president of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union, Toledo, Ohio.)

Statement of George J. Burger Before the Trade Policies Subcommittee of Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made on December 6, 1948, by George J. Burger, director in charge, Washington office of the National Federation of Small Business, before the Trade Policies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is considering proposed basing point legislation. The statement represents the viewpoint of many small businesses and regardless of the ideas which may be entertained as to the necessity for this character of legislation, the address of Mr. Burger merits the careful attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am George J. Burger, director in charge of the Washington, D. C., offices of the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., 715 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

The National Federation of Small Business, Inc., is an organization composed of, and representative of, small independent businessmen and professional men over the Nation. It is the largest independent business organization, in point of numbers of individual actively supporting members, of any business organization in the United States.

Our interest in the activity of this Trade Policies Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee springs directly from the active interest demonstrated repeatedly, by direct individually voted ballots, by our members in all Federal antitrust laws—in their integrity, their strengthening where necessary, and their full enforcement.

A federation spokesman appeared before the Resolutions Committees of both the National Republican and National Democratic Parties at Philadelphia, early last summer, to urge that both groups officially commit themselves to a policy of full utilization and enforcement of our present antitrust laws. I am happy to report that both political parties adopted small-business planks incorporating this suggestion.

Specifically, the Republican Party pledged itself to a program of aggressive antimonopoly action. Specifically, the Democratic Party pledged itself as follows: "We pledge an intensive enforcement of the antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations. We advocate the strengthening of existing antitrust laws by closing the gaps which experience has shown have been used to promote the concentration of economic power."

Gentlemen, at this point let us make it clear that we of the federation are well pleased with your determination to evaluate the compact of recent Supreme Court antitrust law decisions on our economy. It is our feeling, in fact it has been the philosophy on which we have based our entire operations, that the more Congress knows about the affairs of our business system the more wisely it will be able to conduct its affairs and the affairs of the Nation.

Here let me make one important point crystal clear. We of the federation have not the slightest objection to the employment by any individual manufacturer in bona fide competition with others in his line of business of any pricing system—basing point, delivered price, zone price, or f. o. b.

Let me illustrate in the case of one industry with which I am very familiar: In saying what I have said above I mean there is no objection to a tire manufacturer located, say, in Washington, D. C., selling a 6.00 by 16 tire at a delivered price of $9 to a dealer in this city, and selling a similar tire to a dealer at San Francisco, Calif., for $9. I want it understood that in saying this I fully understand that freight absorption is involved—that it costs more to ship to California than it does to lay an article down at the point of manufacture.

On the other hand, we of the federation have serious objection to any agreement between manufacturers or suppliers to use any pricing system in collusion to achieve fixed prices and do away with competition. Then, too, we have serious objection to individual manufacturer use of any pricing system where the effect of that pricing system is to discriminate unfairly between various of his customers.

Let me illustrate, again in connection with the industry previously mentioned: In saying what I have said above I mean there is serious objection to any possible agreement—express or implied—among various rubber manufacturers involving joint use of any pricing system where the effect is to set identical, noncompetitive, prices for similar products throughout the various markets over the Nation. I mean, too, that there is serious objection to any manufacturer selling his products to one buyer at delivered prices involving freight absorption in one case and to other buyers on an f. o. b. basis in another.

Here let me offer my own layman comment that, so far as I know, there is nothing in any antitrust statute that will prevent any manufacturer or supplier from using whatever pricing system he desires, so long as he does it individually and in such manner so as not to discriminate unfairly between various of his customers. My knowledge of the Robinson-Patman law, my experience with it, commenced the year it was enacted. My knowledge of the trade malpractices it sought, and still seeks, to correct springs from long and sometimes very bitter experience as an independent retailer and wholesaler of tires and tubes and auto accessories in general from 1910 to approximately 1935, and from constant representation based on intimate knowledge of, and connection with, independent business interests from that date to present.

We say this because we only too keenly realize that there are at work in our Nation today powerful forces that, even though perhaps unconsciously, are working away from our traditional system of free, competitive enterprise which is safeguarded by our present antitrust laws. Again, quite frankly, we feel that an attempt is being made to use your good, honest offices for this purpose.

Let us look at the matter this way. The point proximately at issue before your groups is the effect of the Supreme Court Cement case decision on the basing-poing pricing system per se—or, the individual manufacturer's right to absorb freight charges.

The point ultimately at issue may in reality—when all the sugarcoating and frothy lace of verbiage is removed—be well the status of the antitrust laws themselves—of the Sherman Act, or the Clayton Act and its amending Robinson-Patman Act, or all three.

Following the Court's decision on this case, there rose from various segments of industry complaints that the Court had either written or interpreted antitrust law in such manner as to effectively declare illegal such pricing. It was argued that the effect of this decision therefore was to force all industry on an f. o. b. pricing basis. On top of this were heaped charges that the effect of this decision would splinter efficient large producing units, that it would create "local or area monopolies," that it would discriminate against the small producer in favor of the giant multi-unit chain producer, that it would drive price levels up.

By way of furnishing a concrete example of the impact of this decision, cement firms reverted almost at once to f. o. b.-pricing basis. Steel firms, then and now under shadow of Federal Trade Commission antitrust prosecution for alleged concerted use of basing-point pricing system, followed suit.

In response to these alarms and excursions, the Congress agreed to establish your subcommittee "to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the impact upon the consumers of goods and upon small and large business in the United States of the decision of the United States Supreme Court rendered on April 26, 1948, in the case of the *Federal Trade Commission, petitioner,* v. *the Cement Institute and Others,* and of other recent decisions of such Court and the lower Federal courts construing Federal statutes relating to the regulations of trade practices in interstate and foreign commerce." It ordered and authorized your committee to "report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than March 15, 1949."

All this occurred following the Supreme Court decision, despite the fact that the Court expressly confined its decision to concerted use of the basing-point system, despite the fact that the Court very pointedly excluded questions of the validity of the basing-point system itself, system of pricing from the scope of its strictures.

We believe that this is a most significant point. We believe further that many businessmen, and perhaps some Congressmen, have been deceived by this mistaken clamor originating in certain segments of United States industry. We believe that at the base of it all you will find, on close study, that there is somewhere a strong desire that you recommend to Congress that it legalize either the pricing system that was condemned by the Court in the Cement Industry case or some similar basing-point pricing system involving concerted action as a necessary ingredient. So much has not been said in so many words—but from the facts available there is no other conclusion possible.

Just as firmly, we believe that when it comes time to tally the final score you will find that your group is faced with only two alternative courses of action. First, to recommend that Congress take no action on the matter. Or second, to recommend that Congress legislate effectively in renunciation of the principle that competition is an essential factor in our system of economic endeavor.

In handing down its decision on this Rigid Steel Conduit case, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals declared: "We think there was direct proof of conspiracy, but whether there was or not, in determining if such finding is supported, it is not necessary that there be direct proof of an agreement. * * * The record clearly establishes the fact that conduit manufacturers controlling 93 percent of the industry use a system under which they quote only delivered prices, which are determined in accordance with a formula consisting of a base price at Pittsburgh or Chicago plus rail freight, depending upon which basing-point price controls at any particular destination or in any particular section of the United States; that as a result of using that formula the conduit purchasers were enabled to match their delivered-price quotations, and purchasers everywhere were unable to find price advantage anywhere; and that the purchasers at or near a place of production could not buy more cheaply from their nearby producer than from producers located at greater distances, and producers located a great distance from any given purchaser quoted as low a delivered price as that quoted by the nearest producer. * * * Our study of this record and of the applicable law has convinced us that the Commission was justified in drawing the inference that the petitioners acted in concert in a price-fixing conspiracy."

Note well that the element of concerted action appears prominently in the Rigid Steel Conduit case, a case which is used to illustrate the contention that the Cement case decision has produced law which banned individual use of the basing-point system (the basing-point system itself).

In this connection the United States Chamber of Commerce asserts that: "The court (the Seventh Circuit Court in the Rigid Steel Conduit case) apparently took the position that these circumstances (wherein one seller knows that each of the other sellers is using the basing-point formula, knows that by using it he will be able to quote identical delivered prices and thus present a condition of matched prices under which purchasers are isolated and deprived of choice among sellers so far as price advantage is concerned) were sufficient basis for the Commission's conclusion that the basing-point pricing method of competition has a tendency to hinder competition and create monopoly, and, hence, is an unfair method of competition, in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Inasmuch as these circumstances are present in varying degree wherever any delivered-price method is used, this decision can conceivably be said to foreshadow reliance on the Cement case as a basis for holding all delivered-price methods to be unlawful."

Now, it may be, as has been charged, that in the Rigid Steel Conduit case the Seventh Circuit Court's decision was based on Cement-case law, which outlaws individual use of the basing-point decision. But at the same time it is extremely significant that people who would have Congress override the court do regard the practices in the Rigid Steel Conduit case as individual, when the Seventh Circuit Court itself clearly states that evidences of conspiracy were plain; that, therefore, the people involved in this case were using the basing-point system in violation of antitrust law.

It seems very significant to us that this circuit court decision is used to illustrate the alleged effect of the Supreme Court Cement-case decision on the basing-point pricing system as such, especially in view of the fact that the circuit court clearly states that evidences of conspiracy were plain.

In fact, all this, taken in conjunction with earlier portions of this testimony, leads us to the conviction, previously expressed, that the real point at issue in these hearings, the motivating force behind these discussions and studies, is not the legality or illegality of the basing-point pricing system itself, that rather it is the future legality or illegality of concerted use of this system of pricing.

Much strength is lent to this conviction by an Associated Press dispatch of September 4, which appeared in the New York Times, reporting that Mr. Ernest T. Weir, chairman of the board of the National Steel Co., was arming his salesmen with personal letters to customers in which he urged the steel buyers to induce Congress to pass legislation permitting a return to the basing-point method of selling steel.

Let me repeat and emphasize one significant sentence from this dispatch: "But the Supreme Court of the United States declared that method of selling goods was illegal in a decision affecting the cement industry but applying to all industries."

Here, gentlemen, let me call your attention to one fact that must not be overlooked. In the event you do recommend, one way or the other, that Congress legalize the basing-point system as it was used in the cement industry, you must necessarily legalize the practices in which the industry engaged in order to keep its pricing system in effective operation.

I repeat, gentlemen, "If this does not happen, there is a reason. * * *" I suggest that this reason is found in the charges of specific trade practices used by the cement firms and in other but similar practices employed in other industries.

I repeat also that if it is decided to recommend that Congress legalize the basing-point system as used heretofore in the cement field it must resign itself to legalizing joint agreements to—

1. Boycott dealers who prefer to exercise independent action.

2. Discharge so-called uncooperative employees.

3. Engage in organized opposition to construction of additional manufacturing plants (possible plants that might be located near Mr. Edwards' periphery).

4. Engage in punitive selling in price cutters' territories at prices lower than those profitable to force price cutters back into line.

5. Cease all sales competition on the basis of comparative qualities.

If this is done, it will constitute an effective recommendation that Congress abandon present antitrust laws. If it is done it will run directly contrary to the solemn platform declarations of both the Republican and Democratic Parties on the subject of antitrust-law enforcement.

Passing from this to another phase of the problem, let's consider the possible practical effects of this decision on the Nation's small-business men.

First, let us note that in a recent communication to your committee, the United Cement and Gypsum workers emphasized that the Supreme Court Cement decision would force decentralization on the industry. For years, gentlemen, as Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY so ably pointed out to you, small, independent enterprise has been increasingly endangered by rapidly increasing concentration of business. For as many years it has been pointed out that decentralization—by which we mean the breaking up of giant industrial concentrations, not of merely large size, efficient producers—is needed if free enterprise is to continue successfully in these United States. This subject is covered thoroughly in Mr. Thomas Hewes' magnificent study, Decentralize for Liberty, commented on so favorably by the Saturday Evening Post.

Next, let us note that the Supreme Court Cement case decision forbids maintenance of a pricing system through specific restraints, one of which is the boycott of uncooperative dealers. Simply stated this boycott is but one form of coercion, preempting by one person the rights of another. How this coercion is today affecting small-business men in the tire, appliance, auto, gasoline, and other fields is well known to many of you who have given particularly close study to the problems of small business.

Third, let us note that the Court's cement order forbids organized opposition to the construction of additional manufacturing plants in support of the pricing system as used in the industry. Organized opposition to the construction of additional manufacturing plants—mark that well. And let me make just this comment: In the tire industry alone today there are many small, independent dealers who are being sorely discriminated against by their manufacturer suppliers. They have but two alternatives—either to give up the tire business or to sit by and suffer. Why? Because over the years the number of independently owned and operated manufacturing facilities has dropped from over 300 to about 21 or 22. Thus, these dealers have all but entirely lost their freedom of choice as to suppliers; for them there is no alternative of relief through any possibly better deal—there is only the deal that they have.

Let me point out here, gentlemen, that we of the federation do not deny that changes away from concerted use of the basing-point pricing system may well involve some, perhaps many, inconveniences and sacrifices to large as well as small business. If these happen, then we say they are to be expected. Note well we do not make this statement heedlessly, callously; we deeply sympathize with innocent people who may suffer harm in this conversion. But, as we see it, over the years we, as a Nation, have allowed ourselves to be wound up into a tight pattern of monopolistic controls. And those inconveniences and sacrifices we must be prepared to pay for what the former United States Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Justice Department Antitrust Division Wendell Berge has characterized as the "35 or 40 years we paid lip service to the ideals of the Sherman Act, and we, in practice, brought a few suits as a token to those ideals"—if we wish to continue our Nation on a really free, competitive-enterprise basis.

We repeat, as far as we can determine there are only two alternative courses of action open to your committee—either you can recommend that Congress take no action on this matter, which will represent a ringing affirmation of your belief in free, competitive enterprise and freedom of opportunity, or you can recommend that Congress legalize this so-called individual use of the basing-point system, which will represent disavowal of our antitrust laws and a solid step away from free, competitive enterprise and freedom of opportunity.

In conclusion may we recommend that you keep the following principle in mind all through your consideration on this matter—that small, independent business is actually no more than the practical expression of a free, competitive-enterprise system in healthy operation, that free, competitive enterprise cannot flourish in the absence of freedom of economic opportunity, and finally that experience has shown freedom of opportunity of which this Nation is capable will not long remain in the absence of present antitrust-law protection.

For whatever it is worth to us as a nation, we may safely, I imagine, assume poses before the world. But let us always be sure we recognize ourselves for what we are. Without freedom of enterprise we cannot be a nation of freedom of opportunity. It is as true as ever that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

Eat Crow, America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, we won World War I and lost the peace. We won World War II, and have bungled our victory so that we are again in danger of losing the peace, not only that but of promoting world war III.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Col. Charles L. Hall, a graduate from West Point in 1908, and who served in France on the general staff in World War I, and has received the Distinguished Service Medal with the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster. He remained on active duty until retired for disability in 1948. Here is Colonel Hall's article, which appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune on January 30, 1949:

EAT CROW, AMERICA

(By Charles L. Hall, colonel, U. S. Army, retired)

There is probably no subject upon which the American people are so confused as the organization of Europe. This confusion is shared by practically every thinking citizen. Our political leaders are no better off than the rest of us. If a military man were called on to face a problem of this complexity, he would start work on an estimate of the situation. If any realistic estimate of the present international situation has been prepared, the public has not heard of it. It might be helpful if such a document were presented.

All estimates are based on a general situation. Ours must be based on the present situation of the world. In order to use the estimate as a guide for future action, we must also make some assumptions. The most natural assumptions are that Washington and Moscow will remain the most important centers of power in the world; that the Washington center will continue to demand the preservation of western civilization over as large a part of the world as possible; and that the Moscow center seeks an entirely different form of civilization, bolshevist in political aspect and pro-Russian in feeling. These are the only assumptions made in this study.

ARMED TO DESTROY GERMANY

The official policy which governed military operations from January 1943 to VE-day provided for the unconditional surrender of Germany. The negotiations between the allies laid down a scheme for exploiting this unconditional surrender which provided for the destruction of Germany as a source of military and economic power, and for the reduction of the German people to a state of semislavery. While the so-called Morgenthau plan was never officially adopted—owing to some remants of common sense in the British Government—its general features were copied in the Potsdam decisions. The scheme was not carried out because the Allies were unable to agree on a method of implementation, but there is no evidence that failure to execute it was due to any one's discovery that it was intrinsically unsound.

Indeed the official attitude—by all the great powers—is that the Potsdam decision was wise, and that it failed not because of its lack of wisdom, but because one or the other of the Allies tried to stretch the agreement for his own selfish benefit. We will get nowhere unless we frankly recognize that the complete execution of the Potsdam decrees would have left us in just as bad a situation as we now are.

ALL RESOURCES FOR VICTORS

The Potsdam terms provided essentially that all the resources of Germany and of all Germans abroad should be employed entirely for the benefit of the victors for an indefinite period. In order to prevent the commercial strengthening of Germany which would have followed the exploitation of German resources in situ, the level of German industry was to be fixed at an amount which would provide just enough food to keep Germans alive.

Any excess production by this mass slave labor would obviously be required for the support of the overseers needed to manage it, and for their military protectors; since the allies were apparently to pay all the expenses of their armies not payable in German currency. Water transportation of German exports and imports was presumably to be handled in Allied ships.

BOUGHT FOOD WITH STEEL

Suppose this wonderful plan really had been carried out by the three (or four) Allied Governments involved. Since about 1880 German food has been purchased through the exportation of manufactured steel. Export steel was to be abolished. The actual needs in import food, even for semi-starved German paupers, were to be greater than before the war; because the north German farm lands were to be confiscated and Germans from outside the Reich were to be driven back to it. Hence manufactured consumer goods would have had to replace steel.

To gain sufficient markets to dispose of these consumed goods, the Germans would have had to provide, among other exports, practically all the textiles used in Europe and in the European colonies. Of course, those friendly consuming states which had previously manufactured textiles would have struck. Then the occupying powers would have had to take their choice between (1) operating a slave economy with insufficient food to maintain production or (2) importing extra food at their own expense.

THAT IS PRESENT CHOICE

This is exactly the choice we have at present. The bankruptcy is now worse because we are doing both, but the collapse of the Potsdam system would have occurred no matter how well the occupying powers might have agreed. It was really the policy which was crazy, not the failure to implement it.

The revised Anglo-American policy, now in effect, is a modification of the Potsdam policy. It provides for a slave economy for an indefinite period, but does not demand that any particular class of exports be absolutely prohibited. Admittedly the best this scheme can accomplish is enough exportation to provide a minimum subsistence level for the population. Nobody pretends that it could provide the occupying armies with any goods except a few locally procurable ones. All the clothing and equipment of the troops, all the imported food, all the pay and separation allowances they do not spend in Germany, and all the home overhead of the increased military establishment remain charges on the home state.

STILL FACE DEFICIT FOREVER

Of course, we are a long way from reaching even that point yet. But here we are adopting a policy which—if perfectly successful—will still leave us facing a deficit forever. Public opinion will sometimes stand a slave policy at a profit. No public opinion that ever existed in this world will approve the indefinite continuance of a slave policy at a loss.

The reason that the public has not revolted is simply because we are scared of the Russians. Our leaders have decided that the balance of power must be reestablished. Otherwise they think that the whole of continental Europe will become a Russian fief. Obviously they are right. The total force available in Europe for resisting bolshevism, with Germany a vacuum, is less than the Russian force which can be applied against western Europe. This is true whether the word "force" is used to include all the economic, military, psychological, and financial power available, or is restricted to armed forces. Either way Russia is greater than western Europe minus Germany.

Moreover Russia plus Germany is probably greater than western Europe plus the United States, allowing for the inevitable difficulties of applying our force overseas. We are not even certain that the United States plus western Europe is greater than Russia, with Germany a vacuum, unless our force is fully applied and western Europe is a firm ally. In other words we have to be prepared for war.

HINGES ON ECONOMIC BALANCE

Whether western Europe will be a firm ally depends, in the final analysis, on whether an economic balance can be established. The west European states which count are Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, and Holland. The last-named state has functioned as a middleman between the German economy and the Dutch East Indies. You obviously cannot make a living as a middleman between a vacuum and a revolution. Italy never did function very well, and certainly cannot if it is shut out from the Balkans by force and from Germany because that state has no excess exports.

Great Britain has depended on coal and its position across trade routes. It has no extra coal; and there is no trade on any trade routes it lies across, and cannot be as long as Germany is prostrate. France could, perhaps, get along if it were politically stable, but it isn't. Belgium is a food-deficit state surrounded by hungry peoples, but is better off than any of our other prospective allies. Our new balance of power against Russia requires our economic aid for an indefinite period, or else its supporting states will starve. We are creating an unstable equilibrium based on pauperism.

NOW COMES HOOVER POLICY

Some common sense on the subject has become evident in a new theory, which might be called the Hoover policy. This frankly recognizes that western Europe cannot function if Germany is an economic vacuum. The policy also recognizes that a slave economy can never produce a prosperous community. So the economic shackles are to be stricken off. Germany is to be turned loose, as soon as a reasonable supply of food is assured, to make and sell what it can. If it becomes reasonably prosperous, Great Britain and Holland will automatically get their share of that prosperity.

The trouble with this policy is that it totally overlooks the eventual attitude of the people affected. Mr. Hoover openly looks forward to an indefinite Allied military occupation. Slaves can be kept down by force; but a commercially prosperous people can make the position of an occupying army impossible. The occupying power is faced with three alternatives. If it demands full financial support for the occupying power, the taxes—partially in foreign currency—have such a bad effect on the budget that economic prosperity will vanish. If the army is reruced to the point that its financial load becomes unappreciable, the inhabitants can throw off the burden with sticks and stones; and the threat of such disorder will prevent necessary capital development anyway. If the occupying army is completely supported by its home state, so that it becomes a source of indirect income to the Germans, the taxpayers at home will revolt at a type of tourist expenditure which no nation ever stood for.

BREAK-DOWN HELD CERTAIN

In the long run the scheme will break down for purely military reasons. Russia will eventually recover from the internal effects of World War II. With supposedly balanced forces confronting each other, each side will want all the assistance it can obtain. Everybody will compete for the control of Germany, and the souls of the Germans will be one of the elements in German control. The best way to obtain German souls will be to take the people into partnership. In fact, if present tendencies continue, we are pretty sure to see some day two sets of German forces, with neither ally at all sure of the reliability of his own foreign legion.

Moreover, no coalition has ever been able to afford two enemies who could be separated. More accurately, perhaps, a coalition which indulges in that luxury is defeated. That is what happened to the Austro-German alliance in 1914, after 10 years of challenging the by no means indissolubly wedded British fleet and Russo-French armies at the same time. If we are going to establish a balance of power in western Europe which will be an asset (or a less conspicuous liability), we are crazy to rely on Greeks in preference to Germans.

MAIN OBSTACLE PSYCHOLOGICAL

The main obstacle to this revolutionary change in policy is psychological. The bipartisan group now in control of our foreign policy was the firmest supporter of unconditional surrender and the consequent reduction of Germany to the status of a power vacuum. There is no way of eliminating them from control except by the sort of political revolution which destroyed the Whig Party in 1856 and split the Democratic Party in 1860. But to reestablish German power, these leaders must eat a lot of crow. A German army worth having would need its surviving prewar leaders. German soldiers worth having must not be taught that they were villains in 1940. German industry worth having will need all its managerial skill, regardless of previous Nazi affiliations. For all practical purposes, the reestablishment of German strength large enough to assist in the new balance of power requires the spiritual destruction of the scaffolds of Nuremberg.

And this is not all the crow the politicians will have to eat. Because somebody is sure to point out that all we try to do under this plan of German control could have been accomplished had we made a compromise peace after the fall of Paris. The inescapable corollary is that the 50,000 dead of the last phase of the war died in vain, and that the 50,000 maimed were handicapped for life to no purpose.

BITTER DISH FOR POLITICIANS

Not only will the dish be boiled crow to the politicians—it will be particularly bitter boiled crow. Of course, the politicians can—and probably will—think of that procession of 50,000 bereaved mothers and 50,000 maimed youths, and postpone making any real decision. But the longer they put it off, the worse shape they will be in. Just now most of them can say they were unfortunate victims of war propaganda. But the men who waved the bloody shirt could not say that when they finally agreed to the withdrawal of Union troops from the South in 1877. In fact, they had contributed to the propaganda. As long as any of them were active, nobody in the South really trusted the Federal Government. Our country was fortunate enough to be able to get along for over a generation with a huge discontented segment. But the coalition against Russia will have a hard time whatever it does. It will not be able to write off a huge segment of available potential power on the untrue ground that it is not actually required.

Our electorate will never be able to replace the present bipartisan group by other persons equally desirous of international action but not required, for lack of political records to the contrary, to eat crow individually. No ordinary election can shake the group now in power, because practically all political leaders—on both sides—belong to it. They are in the fortunate position of the southern supporters in 1852. Neither party could then attack the bipartisan proslavery policy, because every one of importance had assented to it.

The only men who now have clear political records on the subjugation of Germany are the complete isolationists, and they cannot abandon isolation at this hour, and thus consent to international action. The isolationists correspond politically to the abolitionist wing of the coalition which formed the Republican Party in 1856, and were prevented by their records from any form of compromise on the eve of the Civil War.

We have three choices. We can pursue the present modified Morgenthau policy, or its ineffectual successor, the Hoover policy, and find it necessary to eat crow in the end anyhow—with the probable result that the progress of the isolationists will then permit a complete bipartisan political overturn. Anyhow, by then it will be too late to do any good anyway. Or we can eat crow right now and perhaps get away with it, before Russia has recovered from its wounds. Or we can revert to isolation, with a third world war postponed—perhaps—for a generation. There are no other choices.

Of course, the Nation is injured whatever we do. We gave a blank check to a genius, who indorsed it at Yalta just before he died; and now we have to meet the payments. Eat crow, America.

Butter Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the backbone of our Nation's economy. The 2,500,000 dairy-farm families plus the 40,000 small dairy plants which furnish milk, other dairy products, and meat to the people of the United States comprise the dominant food-producing

group in American agriculture. And, taking into consideration the fact that normally more than one-fourth of all the milk produced by our dairy farmers is churned into butter, it is not an overstatement to say that butter is the balance wheel of the dairy industry.

It follows, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that any legislation that is harmful to our butter producers is harmful to our Nation's economy.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent statement issued by the Iowa Creameries Association with reference to several items of pending legislation in which dairymen are deeply interested:

EXPRESSIONS OF THE IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION

To Iowa Senators and Congressmen:

The Iowa Creameries Association is vitally concerned with a number of issues reportedly before Congress or reported soon to be introduced. We are herewith presenting our position on these issues and our reasons:

I. OLEOMARGARINE LEGISLATION

The Iowa Creameries Association as a member of the National Creameries Association supports the stand taken by the three dairy groups, namely, the National Creameries Association, the American Butter Institute, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association. This was the banning of the manufacturing and sale of margarine colored in the semblance of butter.

II. THE NEED OF A PARITY PRICE OF MANUFACTURING MILK AND ITS PRODUCTS

Iowa ranks fourth as a dairy State—Iowa's geographical location is rather distant from our large consuming centers. The total farm income for dairy products for 1947 in Iowa was $176,734,000. In addition the farmers received approximately $33,000,000 from dairy cattle sold for slaughter.

The 1947 creamery butter production was 209,145,000 pounds. Approximately 75 percent of the butter production was sold outside Iowa.

Most of the prices paid for Iowa's butter is based on either the New York or Chicago mercantile exchanges' prices even though the butter is delivered to other points.

Relative small volumes of butter traded on the exchanges sets the price for the vast amount of butter which bypasses the two exchanges. Also many other dairy products are based on butter prices.

Under marketing agreements and orders, fluid milk in some areas is established at prices out of line with other areas. When surplus milk occurs in these higher price areas, the butterfat from the surplus milk is made into butter.

The impact of this situation on the dairy industry of Iowa is this: A relative small increasing amount of butter offered on the exchanges reflects in a depressed market and lower prices. Consequently, the large butter-producing areas of the Midwest are handicapped by a prices-supporting system that works to the advantage of one area and disadvantage of another. Any Federal assistance to a marketing or price support based on a parity should give the same relative values to all areas.

III. TARIFF REDUCTIONS ON BUTTER IMPORTS

Tariff reductions on butter under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act will have a depressing influence on the Midwest butter industry. This is largely because any arrival of relatively small shipments creates lower prices on the mercantile exchanges.

Also butter imports should be required to meet the same high production and manufacturing standard as those required for domestic production. During 1948 Iowa creameries spent from three to five hundred thousand dollars for greater dairy quality improvements.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration demands rigid and exacting standards for all dairy products shipped interstate. Imported dairy products should be required to meet the same inspections and exacting standards.

IV. WAGE AND HOUR

Evidence appears that the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division is to recommend a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour and the removal of overtime exemptions of workers engaged in the first processing of farm products.

The Iowa Creameries Association is strongly opposed to the removal of overtime exemptions for workers engaged in the first processing of agricultural products. Local creamery operations are far different than those of the assembly line. For example, unfavorable road conditions can delay the cream and milk haulers many hours. Oftentimes, creamery employees are required to work late at night to handle the late cream arrivals, for the cream must be cared for on arrival. Adjustments are made by the creamery management for these irregular hours. Under wage and hour liability, and with regulations that only few can decipher, the creameries will be at the mercy of inspectors if exemptions are lifted.

Under the existing regulations, there are changes that should be made. A number of our creameries have milk-drying units. If skim milk is dried, the operator is exempt for that is construed as first processing. If buttermilk is dried, the operators are not exempt and must be paid extra for overtime over 40 hours worked per week. Drying buttermilk is not construed as first processing.

The Iowa Creameries Association urges you to do all in your power to prevent the removal of overtime exemptions for agricultural workers and those engaged in the first processing of agricultural products. In fact, the interpretation of first processing should be more liberal and clarified.

Senate bill 546, introduced by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, proposing mandatory payments of not less than minimum wage for not less than 40 workweeks or not less than 30 hours per week by all concerns selling $10,000 of goods, materials, etc., to the Government would be a hardship to a number of Iowa creameries. It would mean that oftentimes a creamery would be unable to meet the annual employment requirement and thereby lose the opportunity of making a sale to the Government.

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
JULIUS BRUNNER,
President, Osage, Iowa.
J. S. QUIST,
Executive Secretary, Ames, Iowa.

A Vested Interest in Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by me before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense at the Hotel Statler on January 28, 1949:

Madam Chairman, I want to talk to you this morning on the subject of freedom. Your combined organizations are here for the purpose of considering our national defense. What does national defense relate to as you begin your sessions? What are you proposing to defend? I assume that your concept of defense relates to the kind of life we enjoy in this country. I therefore assume further that the specific thing you want to defend is the freedom which we have inherited from our forefathers and in which we have, or had, a vested right.

The lawyer, when considering vested rights, thinks in terms of something of value. It is an interest in something tangible—a valued right, if you please. I believe that we can all agree that we have been enjoying the blessings of liberty and freedom without giving serious thought as to the obligations we assumed as these rights have become manifest under a system of free government.

Some of us may differ as to what is meant by freedom. Jefferson expressed it by writing into the Declaration of Independence the philosophy of freedom as we understand it. You will recall he said:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men * * *. We * * * solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States * * * and for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Down through the years since that declaration was drafted we have grown from a few Colonial States to a great Nation, which is today the leader in world affairs—and I say that in all humility—but we have progressed under a system of free government. Yet the Declaration of Independence was merely a statement of principle, and at that time there was still to be written the Constitution. You will recall that even after the Constitution was written, there was an insistence upon an admendment to that document, and several years after, in 1791, 10 amendments to the Constitution were adopted. These amendments were incorporated and known as the Bill of Rights. Recently, the New York Daily Mirror featured an article on the Bill of Rights. It is not long and I want to read it to you because it is so pertinent to this matter of freedom and brings to us a clearer concept of the meaning of those amendments:

"I AM YOUR BILL OF RIGHTS

"I am the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. Until I was written in the Constitution that document was like a body without a soul.

"I am your Bill of Rights.

"Don't take me for granted. Like all mortal creations, I can be killed.

"The giant shadow of totalitarian-state slavery moves over the world. Wherever that shadow falls, I am obliterated. That shadow has fallen over the United States.

"Three men—Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and George Mason—fathered me. As men brought me to life, I can be slain by men—and will be slain unless you and you and you traditionalist Yankee Doodle Americans organize to defend me.

"I am the Bill of Rights.

"I am freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly. I am the privacy and sanctity of your home. I am your guaranty of trial by jury, as I am the policeman who guards your property rights.

"Cruel and unusual punishment and excessive fines and bail cannot be visited upon you so long as I am alive. I order that all rights not specifically mentioned in the Constitution shall be retained by you—the people. I am the rights of the States against engulfing centralized power.

"I am the Bill of Rights—your signed lease to spiritual, mental, and physical freedom.

I ask you to meditate on all my 10 clauses. Memorize them. Engrave them on your hearts.

"My existence depends on your vigilance—on how vigilantly you watch your rulers. And my eternal enemies, known as dictators, are abroad in the world and here in the United States.

"Personal unlimited power has destroyed the liberties of many peoples in ancient and modern times. It can happen to you, and maybe, subtly and unknowingly to you, it is happening.

"Put every law that is proposed in Washington and elsewhere into the crucible of my 10 commandments. Your question must always be: Not what does a law give me, but what does it take away from me?

"I am the Bill of Rights.

"When I am violated a part of you dies.

"I am 155 years old. Will I reach my two hundredth year? That depends on you and your children."

Where does freedom come from? Government? No. Freedom, as Jefferson said, is an inalienable right. It is not the creation of government. Freedom sets up government to be its servant and so defines its organization and limitations, that government may be the instrument of freedom in moving toward the accomplishment of its high aims. You may wonder why I have chosen this subject. I can tell you frankly that I am concerned about our ability to retain freedom as the motivating force in our society. There are many things that are apparent in Washington today which lead one to believe that we may be on the road to state socialism, and possibly totalitarianism.

"Liberty is the man at the lathe—the secretary in the office—the man in late afternoon at work in his garden and swapping stories with his neighbor over the fence.

"Liberty is the man with his family who drives along the country highway on a summer afternoon viewing the country and watching nature grow—it is the family at the beach or in the park with their lunch baskets.

"It is the young men and young women who are looking over plans for a new home and trying to visualize their own family in the years ahead. This is freedom and liberty which does not come from government, but is the inalienable right of all people. A right that comes from God."

Let us bring to bear the witnesses of great men in this matter of government and liberty.

GOVERNMENT AND LIBERTY

"The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not an increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power we are resisting the process of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties" (Woodrow Wilson).

"Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves are the only safe depositories" (Thomas Jefferson).

"Let not more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution" (Thomas Jefferson).

"Wherever there is an interest and power to do wrong, wrong will generally be done, and not less readily by a powerful and interested party than by a powerful and interested prince" (James Madison).

"The accumulation of all powers—legislative, executive, and judicial—in some hands may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny" (Federalist Papers).

"God grants liberty only to those who love it and are always ready to defend it" (Daniel Webster).

We fought two wars. We have spent untold treasure in property and sacrificed young lives in the interest of maintaining freedom. We know today that we did not win either war. You must be convinced, as I am, that the winning of wars does not bring peace. Never has mankind been so confused as it is today. You wonder as you sit in your homes, far from the seat of Government, about the problems that confront us. We in Washington are a bit closer to the machinery but we are as confused as you are.

I think it can be said without contradiction that there is less peace and less freedom in the world today than there was before we entered the war in 1941. The struggle is between two ideologies—one, in the freedom of a ruthless dictatorship; the other, maintaining the concept of liberty and freedom for the people. Yet while we profess to lead the world toward liberty and freedom, in the actual doing our record is not too good.

Let us observe ourselves and our sins of commission and omission, dispassionately and objectively. Soul searching is a healthy practice.

Three weeks after Pearl Harbor we gathered our allies against the Axis in Washington—and there is the first meeting of the United Nations—we wrote down and proclaimed the principles for which we were fighting World War II. This was our solemn pledge to our allies and to the people of the world, allied, neutral, and enemy alike. It was likewise our allies' pledge to us.

Among other statements, we pledged: Our countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other. Second, they desire to seek no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them. These, and more, were the solemn pledges of the big three, Russia, Britain, and the United States.

These were the solemn pledges of the Poles who fought in the underground and in the air over Britain; to the million Poles who streamed out of the forced-labor camps of the Soviet Union; to the Poles who fought in north Africa, at Cassino, and in France. These were the pledges for which 250,000 Poles died in the Warsaw uprising called for by the Soviet radio. A dirty double-cross.

These were the solemn pledges that induced the Chinese to struggle and die by the millions for another 3½ years after Pearl Harbor, refusing all Japanese offers for a favorable peace, and finally turning over to General Wedemeyer 1,500,000 prisoners of war—1,500,000 Japs our boys did not have to face in the Pacific. These were the solemn pledges to our Yugoslav and Czechoslovak allies, to our Estonian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Greek allies.

These pledges were made specific in special agreements, pacts, and declarations from time to time. For example, at Cairo in December 1943 in a public document signed by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek we proclaimed:

"All the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

Meantime, at the Tehran, Yalta, Potsdam, and Moscow conferences and elsewhere deals, some secret and some public, were made; sometimes in plain language and sometimes in weasel words. In these deals we gave Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, Northern Korea, and Manchuria to the Soviets in violation of all pledges. In peace treaties we turned over Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria to the tender mercies of the Soviets. Most of Austria and eastern Germany were sold into the same slavery. In China we immobilized the armies of the Republic by truce after truce until the Russians could arm the farm boys conscripted by the Communist dictators to overthrow our loyal ally, our only friend in the Far East except for the Philippines.

We dishonored our pledges. We betrayed 235,000,000 of our friends and allies to whom we had pledged the right to choose the form of government under which they shall live. And we betrayed 90,000,000 of our enemies to whom we made the same pledges.

Where is the voice of America's conscience? Why is it stilled? Even if we do not value the respect of the freeman of the world, do we no longer value our own self respect?

If our voices are stilled, if we lack the courage to speak out against those practices which ultimately will destroy freedom—one of the reasons, perhaps not all, is the effort by Government propaganda to lull our people into a false sense of security. We have been, and are today, trusting souls; we have sought security in the fairy tale that government can do no wrong.

Do you know that in 1946 various Government agencies spent public funds for propaganda purposes the sum of $74,829,467?, and that a total of 42,000 Federal employees were engaged in propaganda work? For what purpose? (1) To discredit Congress, and (2) to influence legislation. Congress is the one department which still stands against despotism in government.

Here is a specific example of what a House committee discovered. A tremendous drive had been organized within government to stimulate pressure for socialized medicine. At least six agencies were using Government funds illegally for this purpose. This campaign was carried on through the medium of health workshops. These health workshops were financed with Federal funds and a program was planned and conducted by a key group on the Government pay roll, who used this device to generate public sentiment in favor of socialized medicine. Officials of the United States Public Health Service, Children's Bureau, Office of Education, Department of Agriculture, and Social Security Board were found to have been involved.

Now the merits of the socialized-medicine program are not involved in the point I am making. I say that this effort on the part of government to promote it raises directly a principle involved in freedom. If the Government can impose this program upon the medical profession, cannot it do so upon the lawyers, the teachers, and the ministers, the engineers—and, yes, every organized union man? The principle goes deep into our social and economic life; it is a direct challenge to liberty and freedom.

Many more instances of Federal propaganda could be cited. I shall not pursue the point, but here is what the House committee had to say, in part:

"The more than 2,000,000 employees on the Federal pay roll, strategically assigned throughout the 48 States and Territories, comprise a very effective field army for the urging of campaigns to influence popular opinion and to bring pressure upon Congress in specific issues. It is proper to assume that these vast numbers of employees are loyal to the national administration and to their employing agencies and that they are motivated by the same desire for increased power and appropriation which inspire the propaganda campaigns at the national level.

"In sheer weight of numbers alone, this vast Federal army effectively influences public thinking. Directly or indirectly it touches the daily life of every citizen. The average citizen also assumes his Federal Government to be objective, impartial, and fair in its information services. He ordinarily accepts as authoritative that information which comes from Government through official channels. Whereas the individual might reject propaganda coming to him from other sources, he is more likely to be receptive to it when it is offered in the guise of information which comes through official channels.

"Federal propaganda is cleverly designed for the greatest possible effectiveness. It appeals to the special interests of groups and

individuals by seeming to promote their special advantage. If instinctive fear of increasing power of Government intrudes to make the individual wary, he is soothed with the assurance that controls and restrictions will fall upon him lightly, if at all, and is encouraged to believe that other areas of our national life need a little more controlling, anyway. The Federal propaganda of the moment carefully avoids telling the group or the individual under pressure that vigorous campaigns are conducted in other areas which, if successful, will increase their tax burdens and throw added restrictions upon their liberties.

"Your committee intends no reflection upon the public intelligence. It does believe, however, that the American people are unaware of this new technique of influencing public opinion. American citizens have not learned how cleverly facts may be distorted and information may be colored to mislead them. They have not yet realized how their faith in Federal Government can be abused for the purpose of conditioning national thinking.

"Unless proper checks are devised and enforced, the inevitable result will be a further concentration of power in the Federal Government, higher taxes and less freedom for the individual."

Loyalty's Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a wave of hysteria against other nationals and against our own people whose ideas do not happen to conform identically with a majority public opinion view, has followed every major war.

We have been experiencing such a wave since VJ-day 1945. Character assassination, spy hunts, and disloyalty charges have been the order of the day.

Happily a wave of sanity is replacing the hate hysteria of the past 3 years and a calm is following the storm. This, in my opinion, will be beneficial to the Nation because it will clarify the real issues and give us judgment free from prejudice in pointing out real instead of fancied threats to our security. A thought-provoking editorial on this subject was printed in the Washington Post of February 6, 1949.

Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial printed with my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOYALTY'S REWARD

Like a certain well-advertised soap, Government employees now have been found to be 99-plus percent pure, politically speaking. The FBI reports that of 2,387,253 persons checked for loyalty, 2,378,763 have been cleared. Full investigations have been ordered in only 7,996 cases, and it is a reasonable assumption that some of these persons have been absolved of disloyalty. Investigations are now on a current basis covering new employees. In view of this heart-warming testimonial to the allegiance of Federal workers, we suggest that the time has come to call off the dogs—to abolish the elaborate loyalty check procedure and return such screening as still may be desirable to the Civil Service Commission operating under redefined standards of procedure.

The very size of the percentage of employees to whom no suspicion has attached is in itself reason to ask what all the shooting has been about. For inevitably the mass loyalty investigations have brought with them an atmospehere of inquisition and near hysteria that has done profound damage to the morale and efficiency of the Federal service. This is the sort of atmosphere, aided and abetted by irresponsible charges from Capitol Hill, that has led to such abuses as the smearing of a highly trusted Commerce employee because his estranged daughter worked for a Russian news agency. The smears and hounding attending the loyalty program have had a stultifying effect on initiative; they have made Federal workers wary about saying anything that even a casual bystander might suspect. The whole tendency has been to make Government employment unattractive, to persons of independent mind and independent convictions.

This atmosphere has developed despite the sincere efforts of many officials connected with the loyalty program to be fair. No matter how scrupulous the investigations, the system has put a premium on tattle, spite talk, hearsay, and informerism. It has made the lives of thousands of Federal employees miserable. It has held above their heads a constantly suspended sword of Damocles. Charges often have been of the vaguest sort, and the burden of proof has been, not on the accusers, but on the accused. Indeed, congressional and public pressures have made it almost impossible for loyalty boards to exercise discretion in cases of reasonable doubt. Too often the line of questioning has revolved around conformity with prevailing mores in personal habits and personal opinion. Defendants and witnesses have been asked questions with little or no bearing on loyalty—for example, what the person charged thinks of the segregation of blood in blood banks, whether he has any sympathy for the underprivileged, whether he has intelligent and clever associates, what he thinks of conscription, or even of the loyalty program itself.

Some of the loyalty investigations have been grossly unjust on their face. For instance, an American civilian employee in Japan was charged with disloyalty because of a statement he made at a conference on agricultural products and ways of eliminating the black market. He advocated that in return for fertilizer being given to farmers they be required to turn in a certain portion of their produce to the Government for distribution. An Army officer retorted: "That sounds like Communist doctrine," and on that basis the employee was charged. A woman employee was accused of disloyalty because, at the time of siege of Stalingrad, she collected money for Russian war relief (she also collected money for British and French relief). In yet another case the basis for a charge of disloyalty was that an associate had heard that the defendant's mother-in-law was pro-Russian.

A charge of disloyalty is perhaps the only crime in the United States in which the defendant cannot confront his accusers. In cases ranging from treason to purse snatching, this is an elementary right under the American juridical system. Jurisdiction over loyalty, however, is outside the judiciary, and persons given a broad set of charges against which to defend themselves are told that it is impossible to bring their accusers to light because of the necessity of protecting the FBI's sources. The result of this process often is to punish a man, not for his acts but for what he conceivably might do. This process, moreover, has given rise to the nebulous and frightening term "security risk" under which persons are discharged or denied employment without reference to actual loyalty.

Even if one accepts the thesis that no one has a right to a Government job, it is impossible to condone practices that result in proscribing a person for both public and most private employment with either the implication or charge of disloyalty based on evidence that would not stand up in court. If some sort of screening for Federal jobs is to be continued under the Civil Service Commission, we think there ought to be a complete study of standards by some eminent and disinterested figure. Basic to any new set of standards in our opinion, should be a requirement that the evidence be of a nature acceptable in a court, for certainly the charges are just as serious as any made in court.

Furthermore, we believe there ought to be a complete redefinition of what constitutes sensitive jobs, for it is these that are the primary concern of loyalty investigations. It would be pertinent to know just how many of the two-million-odd cases investigated by the FBI were related to positions actually important to national security, for the cost of the loyalty program has been extravagant in terms of both money and morale. No American can afford to close his eyes to the subversive designs of the Communists. The question is whether these cannot be met by methods that do not generate division, suspicion, alarm, and confusion that themselves play directly into the hands of the Kremlin.

Our Economic Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks an editorial in the Denver Post of January 28, 1949, entitled "Will Depression Be the Truman Legacy?" and also a guest editorial on the subject entitled "Economic Suicide?"

Mr. Speaker, there are many indications on the horizon at the present moment that are quite disturbing regarding our economic future. This is no time to rock the boat. Pessimism has no place in our thinking when we face periods of recession. Mental attitudes have much to do with the spirit in which we tackle our difficult economic problems. These two editorials are worthy of careful reading and study. They picture in graphic terms some of the conditions which we should strive to avoid, and I am sure we can if we meet our problems with the proper approach.

The articles follow:

WILL DEPRESSION BE THE TRUMAN LEGACY?

President Truman, if he will look at certain dark omens on the economic horizon, can ask himself a disturbing question today. It is this: Will the Truman legacy, by which history will know him, be not the "fair deal" but "the depression of 1949"?

As Congress explores Mr. Truman's recommendations for $4,000,000,000 additional revenue, principally from corporate taxes, it cannot ignore the warning letters written large on the wall. The danger of an economic slow-down, which would be gravely heightened by unwise tax policies, is spelled out in a thoughtful and disturbing analysis of business trends in this month's Fortune magazine. The Fortune article is summarized in today's guest editorial.

Fortune, which maintains one of the ablest economic staffs in private business, cites

three disquieting signs: Rising unemployment, softening prices, and decline in the rate of investment. It is the third omen—the drop-off in investment—which is the most dangerous, for reasons which should be apparent to everyone, whether worker or entrepreneur, who understands the functioning of capital enterprise.

Fortune sees 1949 investment as "aimed at a point lower by $9,000,000,000 than where it stood in 1948." If this should occur "and the drop is not offset," the analysts warn, "there probably will be 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 unemployed by next July."

This is a warning for Americans—who as consumers would greet a general drop in the price level—to look at themselves also as producers. In our role as consumers, our continued enjoyment depends upon maintaining a high level of employment, and this, in turn, depends upon a dynamically expanding economy.

In short, our continuing prosperity rests upon capital investment. And it is this economic impulse, the heart of our business life, which is in jeopardy through the current Truman-CIO campaign against profits.

The Marxian Socialists are correct in their appreciation of our basic dependence upon expanding production and marketing. They argue, however, that we reach a point in this expansion where we can continue only through war and imperialism—either that, or depression. This we must deny.

Our economy can expand through invention, improvement, and promotion on the one hand, and through a rising standard of living brought about by increased returns to labor on the other hand.

But the key to this expansion—the nuclear energy of our economy, so to speak—is capital investment. As Mrs. Roosevelt, certainly no economic buccaneer, commented earlier this week:

"It is essential to a high level of employment that it be profitable for capital to be invested not just in safe enterprise but in new and untried enterprises * * *."

A tax policy which chokes the rewards of enterprise will destroy our prosperity. It is this fact, on which the warning letters are already written large, that should make Congress go slow in new taxation. Our present level of taxation should be left as it is, neither raised nor cut. To juggle the structure further holds promise of economic disaster.

ECONOMIC SUICIDE?—HEAVIER CORPORATION TAXES MAY BRING UNITED STATES DEPRESSION

The following guest editorial, from the editors of Fortune magazine, is a summary of an article on taxation in the current issue of the magazine.

"NEW YORK.—More than any other single thing, a rise in corporate tax rates now will make 1949 a depression year.

"If the present downward trend to investment continues and is not offset, it may mean an over-all drop in investment this year or nearly 25 percent below 1948 ($30,000,000,000 as compared to $39,000,000,000), and unemployment may reach four or five million by midsummer.

" 'Profit expectations for 1949 are lower than the actualities of 1948,' Fortune points out. 'If a tax increase reduces these expectations still further, the result is predictable by economic axiom: Less and less new investment, more and more unemployed.'

"Signs of a change in the business cycle have been mounting since September.

" 'Of these signs, the first and most painful is the rise in unemployment. The over-all figure—still under 2,000,000—is healthily small, but its trend is up for the first time since postwar reconversion began. Most significant, there has been a sharp shift toward part-time work.

" 'Second, and least painful, of these signs is the decline in prices. Rubber has dropped from 25 to 19 cents a pound since August. Fuel-oil prices have been cut twice. Gray markets have vanished in lead and copper and are disappearing in steel. The price of standing houses is being shaded. It took real price selling to put Christmas department-store sales over the 1947 top, and it will take more and more from now on.

" 'The third sign, and the most critical, is the rate of investment. Total investment in the United States last year was $39,000,000,000, a peacetime record, but the year-end rate was down. The key ingredients of investment are residential housing, which began dropping last summer; inventories, which have stopped rising, and business plant and equipment, which accounted for nearly half of last year's investment—$19,000,000,000, a record.

" 'This latter figure, according to estimates of the Investors Bankers Association, will be 10 percent smaller in 1949. Many large corporations started their postwar expansion programs in 1945 and have now finished them.

" 'All in all, 1949 investment in plant and equipment, in housing, in inventories, seems now aimed at a point lower by $9,000,000,000 than where it stood in 1948. If that happens, and the drop is not offset, there will probably be four or five million unemployed by next July.

" 'It may be that the downward trend is already too strong for the Government to stop. We have yet to see whether the use of countercyclical fiscal tools developed since the thirties can ever be timed just right.

" 'But tax policy is the most powerful of all fiscal tools. If we are serious about trying to master the business cycle, the least we can do is to refrain from using this tool in ways to make the cycle worse. A tax increase now will do just that.' "

Address by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, of Florida, to the Baltimore Real Estate Board

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on Saturday evening the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] addressed the members of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore and their guests at the organization's thirty-third annual banquet.

The Baltimore Sunday Sun of February 6 carried a full account of the address, which was delivered in the distinguished Senator's usual forceful style.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the address as contained in the Baltimore Sun be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLAND PRAISES LABOR-LAW AIMS—SENATOR TELLS REALTORS HE WILL FIGHT FOR ACT'S OBJECTIVES

Major objectives of the Taft-Hartley Act "should be retained, and I will fight for their continuance," Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND (Democrat, Florida) told more than 850 members of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore and their guests last night.

Speaking at the organization's thirty-third annual banquet at the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Senator HOLLAND said that "I supported enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act and I still feel that each of the major objects is important, yet I realize the act is not anything like perfect.

"When the act was drawn and became law we were deprived of the constructive suggestions from leaders of labor organizations which would have thrown light on many problems," he continued.

ASKS CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS

"I hope for constructive suggestions from the people who know most of the unfair provisions in the bill, and if we get that help, we will be able to effect amendments without liquidating the act or cutting off the great good in it."

Of first importance in the act, Senator HOLLAND asserted, is the provision for an 80-day injunction in connection with the stopping of strikes in national basic industries.

"That 80-day period has been used seven times," he said, "and six times it has been sufficient to allow time for a solution. In only one case was the argument unsettled at the end of 80 days.

"That provision must remain. Without it the Nation would be left at the mercy of people who have shown their unwillingness to consider the interests of the people, even the interests of the working people themselves. My feeling is that people who work with their hands are the first hurt when there is a shutdown in a great national industry.

Another major provision that should be retained, according to Senator HOLLAND, is that which gives validity to State laws. Seventeen States have adopted anti-closed-shop laws, he added.

Also "provisions against jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts should be retained," he continued.

"Neither the Senate nor the House is trying to destroy labor or questions the value of labor's great contributions," he said.

"GOOD SCRAP" FORECAST

"We're going to see a good scrap over there. We are putting the interests of the general public first and asking people of all points of view to come in and help."

Discussing income taxation, Senator HOLLAND predicted that two important provisions of the 1948 bill would be retained regardless of whether additional taxes have to be required.

These were:

1. The provision for split income, in which married couples in 33 States, including Maryland, were given equality and parity of treatment with couples in the 13 States having the community principle, and

2. The provision in which a beginning was made in restoring personal exemptions and exemptions and credits for dependents which were cut during the war.

EIGHTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS SAVING SEEN

"There is no indication that any person now thinks either of these values can be lost," he said.

Senator HOLLAND stated that the 1948 income-tax bill saved the people of Maryland $81,000,000, of which $15,000,000 was saved by the split-income provision.

Regarding the question of regional education, Senator HOLLAND said that "there is no question of race whatever" in the plan.

"It is the desire of the governors of 15 States to pledge their mutual resources to build better schools and establish additional school" for the benefit of both white and Negro youth."

CITES NEED OF DOCTORS

"We feel that the South badly needs better education in many fields," particularly medi-

cine, dentistry, and the veterinary field, according to the speaker. "There is a complete absence of training in many important fields, such as petroleum engineering and metallurgy."

He spoke also of deficiency in graduate training.

Senator HOLLAND declared that the South affords the Negro better educational opportunities than the rest of the Nation, and he cited Library of Congress figures that the South was far below other sections of the Nation in deaths caused by racial violence.

He said that "in all medical schools outside the South, only 86 students were registered and studying last year," while there were 1,100 Negro students in the two Negro schools in Washington and Nashville.

NEGRO'S OPPORTUNITY IN SOUTH

In the field of education, Senator HOLLAND said that in the South "7 out of every 1,000 Negroes are professional educators, whereas in the Negro population of the rest of the Nation, only 1 out of every 1,000 Negroes is a professional educator."

In the South, he continued, "there is no limit to the place to which they can rise. They can become college presidents. And there is no limit to their field of service, for we allow them to work in the field they want to serve. It is my observation that these young people want to devote their lives to serving their race."

David M. Nichols, president of the real estate board, presided. Howard W. Jackson, former mayor, served as toastmaster. Senator O'CONOR introduced the speaker; Mayor D'Alesandro also spoke.

OTHERS AT SPEAKER'S TABLES

Other guests at the speaker's tables included:

Congressmen Fallon, Bolton, and Garmatz; Maj. Gen. Milton A. Reckord, adjutant general of Maryland; C. Markland Kelly, president of the city council; Christian H. Kahl, president of the board of Baltimore County commissioners.

W. David Tilghman, vice president of the real estate board; Robert A. Bready, president of the Home Builders Association of Maryland; C. Philip Pitt, secretary of the real estate board; Thomas N. Biddison, city solicitor; Nathan L. Smith, director of public works, Baltimore County; Paul L. Holland, director of public works, and J. Neil McCardell, city comptroller.

TVA and the Government Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject TVA and the Government Power Program, recently delivered by me before the seventh annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at the Hotel Commodore, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AND THE GOVERNMENT POWER PROGRAM

I have been asked to discuss the power policy of the Federal Government, and I am going to do so in terms of the expression of that policy in the TVA Act. I do so, first, because the TVA Act embraces practically all the major elements of public power policy; second, because I am familiar with TVA and what it has achieved; and, third, because the experience of the TVA as an expression of Federal power policy will be helpful to you as you consider the development of your own areas.

From the vigor and volume of the debates going on today, one might think that the formulation of a Federal power policy was just in its initial stages, something new under the sun. This is particularly true since much of the debate is embroidered with such catch phrases as "socialism," "American way of life," and "our system of free enterprise." Yet the fact is that the Congress and the people it represents have been concerned with the problem for a long time, and in the course of nearly half a century they have hammered out and put into effect some pretty clear principles. They have determined that the people of the country have the right to develop the power they own in public streams and dispose of that power through public and cooperative systems at low rates and in ways which will encourage abundant use. Like all public policies in a democracy, these principles have been debated and adopted step by step and incorporated in congressional acts, usually dealing with specific projects or programs. There are a considerable number of such acts, but the principles which they developed are, for the most part, incorporated in the TVA Act of 1933, as amended.

FEDERAL POWER LEGISLATION

Some of you may not realize how long ago the power policy of this country had its beginnings. It can be dated back 45 years ago, to the days of President Teddy Roosevelt. In 1903 he vetoed a congressional act which would have authorized the development by private interests of the power site at Muscle Shoals, Ala., on the Tennessee River. In his veto message, the President declared:

"The recent development of the application of water power to the production of electricity available for use at considerable distances has revealed an element of substantial value in streams which the Government is or is likely to be called upon to improve for the purposes of navigation, and this value, in my judgment, should be properly utilized to defray the cost of the improvement. Wherever the Government constructs a dam and lock for the purpose of navigation, there is a waterfall of great value."

Three years later, while Roosevelt was still President, the Reclamation Act of 1906, dealing with western irrigation projects, provided for the development of power to supply the power needed for irrigation purposes. But it also went further and provided that power could be developed when opportunity afforded, even though not necessarily related to irrigation uses.

That policy has been expanded from time to time during the intervening years. An act in 1912 dealing with navigation developments provided for power development. In 1913, there was the Raker Act, dealing with the use of national park land by the city of San Francisco for storing water for domestic purposes and for developing power. In 1918, the Government commenced the construction of Wilson Dam, at Muscle Shoals, in connection with the nitrate plants. A steam plant was also built. While these projects were commenced under the National Defense Act of 1916, their peacetime usefulness was recognized. The Federal Water Power Act of 1920 dealt with the licensing of projects on navigable waters. In 1928, the Boulder Canyon Act provided for the construction and operation of what is now Hoover Dam.

The past 15 years saw a number of acts dealing with power policy. There was the TVA Act in 1933. There was the REA Act in 1936, authorizing loans by the Federal Government for rural electrification. There was the Bonneville Act the next year, providing for the disposition of power from Bonneville Dam built for navigation purposes. In 1938 there was the Fort Peck Act, dealing with the construction and operation of Fort Peck Dam. The Flood Control Acts of 1938, 1944, and 1945 included expressions of power policy, and so did the Reclamation Act of 1939, dealing with irrigation projects.

Thus the Congress has expressed in many acts the power policy of the Federal Government. The acts are not uniform, of course; they have a diversity of provisions on power policy, as no doubt they should. In a country as large and varied as ours, it would be folly to insist upon rigid adherence to a formula. Many factors, differing from region to region, can dictate variations to fit particular circumstances. Yet they all hew generally to the principle that the power in public streams belongs to the public and should be developed for their benefit. Briefly, the major elements of power policy can be summarized as follows:

1. That Federal dams, where feasible, shall include facilities for generating electrical energy.

2. That preference in the sale of power shall be given to public agencies and cooperatives.

3. That power shall be disposed of in such a way as to give benefits to domestic and rural consumers.

4. That power shall be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with paying all the power costs.

5. That power shall be disposed of in a way that will encourage widespread use and forestall monopoly by limited groups.

GENESIS OF TVA ACT

All of these principles, as I have said, appear in the TVA Act. And they were placed there advisedly. Rarely has an act of the Congress been debated so long, so bitterly, and in so much detail. Many of you will recall, I am sure, the beginning of that debate in the years immediately following World War I, when Wilson Dam was still in its early construction stages. It was dramatized by the offer of Henry Ford to take over the nitrate plants built by the Government at Muscle Shoals and lease Wilson Dam for a hundred years. There were many other proposals for disposition of the Government properties at Muscle Shoals. All during the 1920's, the debate continued in each session of the Congress.

On two occasions, the Congress passed bills by the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, providing for public operation of the Government's Muscle Shoals properties, but both were vetoed by the Presidents then in office. As the debate continued, the issues and the possibilities became clearer. They culminated in the passage of the TVA Act in 1933, wherein the Congress recognized the opportunities inherent in the orderly and unified development of an entire river system and the basin and territory adjoining it. It involved the provision of flood-control and navigation facilities, agricultural and industrial development, forest development and conservation, and other benefits which could flow from an orderly development by the Federal Government which could assist the people of a region in getting the most from their resources.

In the broad picture, power development had an important—in fact, indispensable—role. The TVA Act recognized that, as Gordon R. Clapp, chairman of the TVA Board, has aptly put it, "Electricity is not a mere commodity in the modern world; it is a force—a mobile, manageable source of energy to lift a load of labor from men and women."

He said further, "Abundant electricity at low rates can set in train a whole course of economic activity bringing benefits to country and town alike. The farmer, using electricity to make his farming operations more profitable, becomes a better customer for the goods and services available in the towns. At the same time, the increased demand for goods and services brings about increased business activity, for the expansion of trade and commerce."

Mr. Clapp concluded: "The opportunities for the application of electricity are almost limitless, if only we recognize and seize the opportunities to put it to work. Because of its fluidity, the ease with which it is widely dispersed, it opens the way to decentralization of industry."

The specifications underlying this broad use of electricity were spelled out in the TVA Act in terms of the major elements of Federal power policy. The act provided that, after the primary objectives of flood control and navigation improvement had been met, power should be produced and sold so far as consistent with such purposes. It directed TVA to give preference in the sale of power to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens and farmers. It said the projects shall be considered primarily for the benefit of the people of the section as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom power can economically be made available. It authorized sales to industry to secure a sufficiently high load factor and revenue returns which will permit domestic and rural use at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity. The act provided that the power facilities, as distinguished from the navigation and flood control facilities, should be self-supporting and self-liquidating. It envisioned the cooperation of TVA with existing institutions in the region for the application of electric power to the fuller and better balanced development of the resources of the region.

This was a charter that recognized that abundant low-cost power, produced in connection with the over-all development of public streams, could be a vital force in the development of a whole region. Where the Congress had been groping for 30 years, the long and detailed debate of the twenties culminated in the crystallization of these policies in the TVA act. In the 15 years since that time, those policies have been tested and retested in the crucible of experience. And they have stood the test of time and the courts. The record in the Tennessee Valley is witness to the fact.

As the TVA dams were being constructed, many complaints were received that good farm land would be inundated and thereby rendered unproductive. However, statistics have proved that such inundated areas produce a yield of fish far greater in value than that of any crops that could have been grown in the same area before inundation. And I'd rather fish for my food than plow for it any day.

INCREASED USE OF POWER

The use of power has grown enormously under the policies directing low rates and widespread use. Power production in the valley today is 10 times the production in the same area in 1933. (Nearly 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.) Today TVA sells power to 143 municipalities and cooperatives which serve more than 900,000 customers. Of the total consumers, nearly 800,000 are the residential and farm consumers whose interests were made paramount in the act. That is a tremendous increase over the 225,000 rural and domestic consumers in the region in 1933.

Average use per customer has risen from 600 to 2,600 kilowatt-hours annually, as compared with the national average of about 1,560 kilowatt-hours per customer.

Rural electrification also has made great strides. In 1933, only about 3 percent of the farms in the present TVA region had electric service. Today, nearly 60 percent of the farms have service, and it is expanding rapidly. The municipal and cooperative electric systems which have assumed responsibility for distribution of TVA power have been expanding service by 1 percent a month through the extension of lines into new rural areas. Although the region has long been behind the rest of the country in rural electrification, it is rapidly catching up.

In the light of this vast expansion in the production and use of power, the cries against "endangering the system of free enterprise," "socialism," and so on appear rather silly. For the fact is that the availability of abundant supplies of power has vastly widened the scope of private initiative and enterprise in the valley. The private business of farming has been helped to become more prosperous. Manufacturing, by which the people of the region convert their raw resources into higher value goods, has been spurred. The number of jobs has increased. Incomes have risen, the people of the region have more money to spend, and they provide a better market for the products of other regions as well as their own. In short, the greatest beneficiary of public power is private enterprise itself.

The widespread use of power has been encouraged through the TVA policy which established a uniform wholesale rate schedule which gives power to a municipality or a cooperative a hundred miles from a dam at the same rate as one located near a power plant. It is an area rate, sometimes referred to as a "postage stamp" rate, which spreads the benefits derived from power development in the river over a wider region. Widespread use has also been encouraged by the fact that the TVA Act provided for the construction and acquisition of transmission lines by which its power could be transmitted to the areas that wanted it. At the present time, TVA operates a transmission system of 6,700 miles carrying power from the generating plants to the substations which serve the municipalities and cooperatives. By such means, the power of the Tennessee River is being distributed (on a basis of equality, in both rates and service) over an area of 80,000 square miles.

That provision for the acquisition and construction of transmission lines is at the very heart of the problem of securing equitable distribution of power and a reasonable price for the power developed at the TVA projects. Lacking it, the only customers which TVA would have had would have been private utilities in a position to build transmission lines to the plants—and they would be able to dictate pretty much their own price for power.

Finally, there is the question of cost. As President "Teddy" Roosevelt foresaw 45 years ago, the cost of Federal developments on the streams of the Nation can be minimized by the use of the power that is generally developed from them. When a dam is built, power is developed—in his words, "there is a waterfall of great value." The only question which remains is, "Shall that power be harnessed and used?" And of course the fact is that the harnessing of power thus created makes many a Federal project feasible for construction where the other purposes of water control—navigation, flood control, irrigation—might not sustain it.

This is exemplified in the Tennessee Valley, where today the Federal Government is obtaining flood control and navigation benefits at far less cost than they could have been obtained by single purpose developments. For example, it is estimated that a navigation channel comparable to that now existing on the Tennessee would cost $225,000,000; in the multiple-purpose system of TVA, the cost was about $149,000,000. A comparable flood-control system would have cost $227,000,000; the multiple-purpose system provided it for an investment of $153,000,000. These costs compare very favorably with the costs of navigation and flood control projects provided by single-purpose projects on other streams.

With navigation and flood control being furnished at bargain rates, the power investment in the TVA multiple-purpose system (60 percent of the total investment in flood control, navigation, and power facilities) is proving a paying one.

I want to make it very clear at this point that TVA only generates and transmits power, selling it, under the terms of the TVA Act, to public and cooperative agencies, industries, and utilities, at wholesale rates. The revenues it receives from these rates exceed the requirement of the TVA Act that the power projects be self-supporting and self-liquidating. Over the entire period of TVA existence, including the period when power operations were hampered and hamstrung by power company litigation, power has provided sufficient revenue not only to cover the costs of operation, maintenance, and depreciation, but to earn a return on the average net investment amounting to 3¾ percent. Over the past 9 years, the return has averaged more than 4 percent. That is a clear and unmistakable reply to the charge sometimes heard that TVA power is subsidized.

As for the municipal and cooperative systems, they have been averaging 10 percent return on their net investment. These are the agencies which distribute the power to consumers at retail, under what is commonly meant by the term, TVA rates.

Although the power policies of the Government would appear to be well established, they are still subjected to a great deal of opposition. This stems chiefly from privately owned public-utility organizations which detest the demonstration that power can be put into the hands of people abundantly and at low cost and still on sound business principles. Of course, the kind of opposition has changed. Once the private utilities opposed the construction of power facilities at Government dams. Now they support such projects, but they insist that the power from them be sold to the private utilities at the bus bar, that is, at the power plant to be distributed by them over their systems and at their rates. Of course, they promise to pass along the savings made by purchase of Government power, but fail to mention that the savings which can be made in the generation of power are small compared to the cost the household or farm consumer usually has to pay for it.

For the demonstration in the Valley has shown that the real profit, the gravy of the electricity business, is in the distribution of power, rather than in generation. The financial statements of the TVA, kept separately, show that the TVA's operations are economically sound. They show also that the cost of generating power is relatively small and that the opportunity for savings to consumers in this area of operations is small

The books of the municipal and cooperative customers, which buy power at wholesale from TVA, show the costs of distributing power. And they reveal that it is possible to distribute power abundantly and at low rates and still cover all costs by a substantial margin. They depend upon a large volume

of sales to obtain their revenues, rather than limited sales at high rates. And in so doing, they demonstrate that the opportunities for savings to consumers through public projects lie not in generation of power but in the distribution of power under enlightened, low-rate policies which stimulate demand.

So it is easy to see why the private utilities seek to destroy or discredit TVA and other public power developments. In order to do this, and to get the power from Government dams cheaply for themselves to be resold at a large profit, they oppose the construction of transmission lines and of generating plants by REA. Today they are waging a bitter fight against the proposal of TVA to construct a large steam plant at New Johnsonville to help firm up its hydropower and produce energy to meet the power needs of the region. They oppose the construction of other steam plants which would firm up the hydropower of other Government projects and make it more useful and valuable.

NEW JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

The opposition to the New Johnsonville steam plant of the TVA is particularly bitter, and it is easy to see why. In the Tennessee Valley region, by the action of Congress in authorizing the purchase of private-utility systems and providing for issuance of bonds to finance such purchases, TVA has become the sole supplier of power for the area it now serves. It has entered into long-term contracts with municipal and cooperative systems in the valley to supply them with power, and these agencies have invested their own funds, borrowed from REA, and sold bonds to the public on faith that the TVA would be able to meet their power demands, which are growing rapidly. The precedent for using steam plants has already been well established by the acts of Congress. The TVA Act authorized the construction and operation of steam plants, and in 1933 TVA was given custody of a large steam plant at Muscle Shoals. In 1939, TVA purchased several steam plants from private utilities and has operated them ever since. In 1940, the Congress authorized the construction of the Watts Bar steam plant by the TVA. Although the immediate reason for this was the need for power for national defense, the peacetime value of the plant was recognized.

Now, in connection with the New Johnsonville project, the private utilities seek to have the Congress reverse its policy. They do so in the hope that, by making it impossible for TVA to meet the power needs of its service area, they can discredit TVA's operations and deal a crippling blow to public power projects everywhere.

As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch put it:

"What the power lobby objects to is a public operation that is likely to work well—as it knows TVA does—instead of one that might not work so well. Its intent, as the National Popular Government League succinctly says, is 'to impair the efficient operation of TVA.'"

The fight is bitter. If the private utilities succeed in their aim, they will have made a big step toward discrediting a demonstration of power economics which throws a revealing light on their demands for purchase at the dams of power from the Federal Government projects.

You compose the only national organization fighting for the Government's power and rural electrification programs. I am glad you have endorsed the proposed TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville. Your active support will enhance our chances of success.

I believe that the present attempt to hamstring public power will fail. As I have shown, the power policies of the Federal Government developed over a long period and with adequate consideration of all the issues. They are already well established. I am confident that the Congress won't change these.

Christianity and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Nation's Business for February 1949:

THE STATE OF THE NATION
(By Felix Morley)

Shortly before the outbreak of World War II a very notable book, entitled "The Idea of a Christian Society," was written by T. S. Eliot, the famous poet who was recently awarded the Nobel prize for literature.

Eliot is often referred to as anglo-American. Though born and educated in this country, he has for many years made his home in England, where certain intangible values mean more to him than our far greater material advantages.

Three centuries ago, Europeans were leaving the relative comfort of that continent to confront appalling physical hardship in what was then the raw New World. They sought—and found—spiritual freedom. Now we see a contrary phenomenon. Some Americans find the abundance on this side of the Atlantic unsatisfactory. Throughout Europe there is a shortage of commodities of every kind. There is a plethora of rationing and controls and governmental regimentation. But there is also something which is attractive to men in whom the spiritual quality is pronounced.

In the book to which reference is made, this poet suggests one reason for his personal, voluntary expatriation. "The idea of a Christian society," he says, "is one which we can accept or reject; but if we are to accept it, we must treat Christianity with a great deal more intellectual respect than is our wont; we must treat it as being for the individual a matter primarily of thought and not of feeling."

If one reflects on this assertion it comes uncomfortably to mind that, in the United States today, Christianity is not treated with intellectual respect. We simply do not give to religious matters the careful consideration which is lavished on the design and production of an automobile; the development of a new type of airplane, or the merchandising of goods. If we are honest with ourselves we will probably admit that very little thought goes into our spiritual inventories.

And yet the threat of spiritual bankruptcy is a far more serious danger than those commercial failures which we regard as a barometer to test the condition of our national health.

This is not to say that Americans have become, for the most part, an irreligious people. The churches are well filled; money is generally available to repair the old, or construct new, places of worship; the ministerial profession is respected.

But the spiritual substance behind this surface display is open to serious question. We know perfectly well that most of us put no real effort into our religious observances. If the openly atheistic minority is small, so also is the number of those who feel any deep concern. As a generality, the average American attitude toward religion may even be defined as slightly contemptuous. The real "he man" does not go in for that sort of thing.

For superficial success, and for the acquisition of negotiable property, the religious quality actually is not necessary. It may indeed be a handicap, as Jesus warned when he drew the sharp alternative between the service of God and that of Mammon. He never argued, however, that material prosperity would be denied to those who make its attainment their supreme objective in life. The lesson of the New Testament, in this connection, is merely that the greater the emphasis on ephemeral values, the less the chance of happiness.

This was well understood by the men who declared that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are unalienable rights of mankind, and who established this Republic to make good their Declaration of Independence. The basic principles of the American form of government have heretofore made it relatively easy for hard-working men to make a living. But the founders did not believe that men would lose sight of fundamental principles in the effort.

Indeed great care was taken to insure that this disastrous blunder should not be made. In the famous farewell address, George Washington asserted that: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness." And then, with a warning more urgent today than when he voiced it: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

Even though it was affirmed so strongly by George Washington, the thought that there is a direct connection between religion and "political prosperity" is now probably novel to most Americans. We are accustomed to thinking that a man's religion, or the lack of it, is a purely personal matter. How then can it also be political, meaning everybody's business?

It is curious that people who ask this question, in all sincerity, are also frequently those who argue that many lesser idiosyncrasies are properly matters of general political concern.

Any community will rise indignantly against a person who habitually pollutes its water supply. It is increasingly maintained that illiteracy must be eliminated, even though the individual resentment to compulsory schooling is a deeply personal matter. But there is not the same feeling about people who are unsanitary or illiterate in the spiritual field.

In fact we now have Government agencies like the Federal Communications Commission actually ruling that "freedom of belief necessarily carries with it freedom to disbelieve."

In spite of Washington's warning to the contrary, many of his countrymen have come to maintain that Government should encourage public health and public education, but should be wholly neutral, if not actually opposed, to the development of religious thought. The state today certainly indulges "the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion."

More and more we tend to act on the assumption that the individual should be physically and mentally, but not spiritually, trained. And since it is difficult to reconcile this argument with the teachings of Christ, it is also difficult to reconcile it with Christianity.

Here we have an illustration of what T. S. Eliot means when he tells us that, if we want to be a Christian people—and it is by no means certain that we do—the doctrines of Christianity must be treated "with a great deal more intellectual respect" than is customary. And here we have an explanation of why, at a recent meeting of that strange United Nations' offshoot called UNESCO, Eliot was denounced by the Soviet delegate as a "hyena," a "jackal," a purveyor of "disgusting filth," and other Communist endearments.

The Soviet Union makes no bones about being not merely anti-Christian, but also definitely anti-God. It is a wholly logical official policy, for communism cannot triumph unless the function of the human conscience is obliterated. Conscience, as the word itself tells us, is "knowing with." It is that intangible organ whereby we "know with" God. If conscience could be cut out, like the appendix, we may be sure that mass operations to this end would be ordered by Soviet boards of medicine. Since conscience evades the surgeon's knife, the next best prophylactic—in Communist eyes—is to eliminate God himself. Then that which "knows with" God also dies.

To most Americans this a repugnant, even a horrible, philosophy. But we are unsure as to how it can be met. We have the atom bomb; we have peacetime conscription; we have great factories and marvelous technical skills and many more dollars than Stalin can command. Still, communism marches on. If blocked in Europe, it runs like a consuming flood through Asia.

We are not winning the struggle against communism. And we shall probably continue to lose as long as we endeavor to oppose a diabolical force with purely material agencies. The tragedy here is not so much our faith in the material. The tragedy lies in our lack of faith in anything which is more than material.

It is only a half-belief which we oppose to the calculating conviction of the Kremlin. To believe in Christianity, or any other form of positive religion, a people must be willing to pay it the tribute of earnest intellectual respect.

Granite Industry Most Optimistic Trade in Vermont

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement appearing in the Barre Daily Times of Barre, Vt., of date January 17, 1949, which reads as follows:

GRANITE INDUSTRY MOST OPTIMISTIC TRADE IN VERMONT—FURNITURE, DRUGS, AND CHEMICAL TRADES REPORT HIGHER PAY ROLLS IN 1948—LUMBER OUTPUT EXPANDS, STATE REPORT DECLARES

Of 24 industries summarized in the biennial report of the department of industrial relations, all but two, the furniture and drugs and chemicals trades, reported higher pay rolls in 1948 than in 1947.

The granite industry report is the most optimistic of the brief summaries of business conditions.

"Business appears to be excellent for this industry and good labor-management relations exist at this time," the report states. "Many new employees have been added particularly apprentices, who are mostly veterans."

"The war caused almost complete suspension of operations in the slate industry. During the past 2 years some of the quarries opened up again, but, production still is on a smaller scale than before the war. Labor costs, small-scale operations, inefficient methods increasing the cost of the finished product, all retard expansion of this industry."

There is no comment on conditions in the woolen industry. Woolen company officials last fall admitted that the outlook was uncertain even though the mills were operating at full capacity.

MANY WORKERS OFF

Regarding the machine-tool industry, where several lay-offs occurred in late fall, the report states, "Plants in this classification were at maximum production strength during the war years. Since the end of the war, employee totals have decreased to a considerable degree."

During the past 2 years some woodworking plants have expanded and a few new small concerns have commenced operations.

"This past biennial period has been a period of expanded output by the lumber industry," according to the report. "Heavy demands for lumber caused good employment and some new small mills opened up."

There has been a general increase in the number of employees in retail and wholesale businesses, but at the close of the biennial period employment opportunities were not so plentiful, the report stated.

Figures given in the summary follow. The first figure is the number of units or concerns reporting; the second, total pay roll; the third, male employees; fourth, female employees; and fifth, value of output. The words "unit," "plant," "quarry," or "concern" apply to separate employers and one unit might cover several branches in different locations:

Granite, 1947: 110, $5,940,000, 2,195, 173, $12,164,000; 1948: 113, $6,290,000, 2,248, 170, $12,731,500.

Marble, 1947: 4, $1,790,625, 794, 77, $2,348,000; 1948: 4, $1,860,220, 819, 79, $2,460,360.

Slate, 1947: 8, $488,350, 281, 13, $1,724,375; 1948: 10, $501,408, 316, 15, $1,796,200.

OTHER STONE

Other stone: Talc, copper, lime, asbestos, and brick, 1947: 13, $1,335,610, 818, 48, $2,861,340; 1948: 14, $1,510,525, 831, 41, $3,186,350.

Woolen and cotton goods, 1947: 45, $10,981,720, 3,660, 3,417, $41,711,231; 1948: 47, $11,362,412, 3,746, 3,540, $42,110,625.

Knit goods, 1947: 5, $1,616,760, 460, 536, $6,510,760; 1948: 5, $1,740,000, 435, 520, $6,690,395.

Rubber, leather, canvas goods, and plastics, 1947—13, $3,184,680, 844, 910, $8,379,830; 1948, 14, $3,095,310, 820, 883, $8,463,264.

Machines and machine tools, 1947—46, $23,361,780, 7,425, 1,329, $63,790,500; 1948, 45, $24,176,842, 7,310, 1,286, $64,816,450.

Farm tools and equipment, 1947—9, $468,250, 251, 39, $1,509,610; 1948, 8, $482,814, 273, 42, $1,610,385.

Woodworking, 1947—96, $5,356,195, 3,116, 802, $15,897,364; 1948, 98, $5,510,300, 3,052, 841, $16,695,720.

Lumber, 1947—104, $2,317,496, 1,480, 61, $8,237,640; 1948, 109, $2,446,517, 1,503, 63, $8,310,556.

Furniture and furnishings, 1947—20, $2,186,930, 1,102, 291, $5,418,300; 1948, 20, $2,306,100, 1,165, 312, $5,392,807.

Household utensils, 1947—11, $1,267,480, 525, 160, $2,341,618; 1948, 11, $1,330,265, 549, 181, $2,616,513.

Paper and paper products, 1947—19, $3,585,618, 1,316, 790, $18,814,050; 1948, 19, $3,710,940, 1,282, 779, $19,201,565.

Chemicals and drugs, 1947—10, $1,082,648, 420, 225, $5,636,714; 1948, 9, $993,843, 389, 247, $5,158,330.

Miscellaneous manufacturing: Milling, dairy and poultry feeds, manufacturing concrete blocks, fertilizers, hides, canned corn, frozen foods, cereals, optical lenses, sanitary tampons, fish rods, packing meat and canning chicken, 1947—41, $3,516,370, 1,460, 472, $40,787,311; 1948, 39, $3,429,713, 1,388, 412, $39,826,125.

Printing and publishing, 1947—26, $1,518,870, 553, 268, $2,569,435; 1948, 25, $1,540,376, 540, 251, $2,446,100.

Dairy products, 1947—52, $2,265,693, 1,364, 220, $54,603,260; 1948, 54 $2,477,525, 1,402, 211, $55,164,300.

The following industries do not list the value of output. The figures refer to number of units, total pay roll, male employees and female employees, in that order.

Public utilities, manufacturing: Electric energy and gas plants, 1947—16, $1,910,648, 812, 202; 1948, 16, $2,096,470, 833, 199.

Public utilities, non-manufacturing: Railroads, trucking concerns, bus companies, 1947—27, $10,135,150, 4,186, 885; 1948, 28, $10,341,600, 4,064, 891.

Service: Hotels, garages, restaurants, laundries and dry cleanings establishments, 1947—208, $4,520,560, 1,643, 1,776; 1948, 214, $4,641,306, 1,708, 1,752.

Retail and wholesale: Stores and wholesale establishments, 1947—79, $5,680,500, 1,855, 2,210; 1948, 83, $5,876,225, 1,886, 2,303.

Miscellaneous nonmanufacturing: Contractor, bowling alleys, etc., 1947—32, $896,945, 481, 40; 1948, 33, $961,415, 507, 42.

Institutions: Hospitals and educational units, 1947—25,, $2,240,610, 588, 954; 1948, 26, $2,365,530, 597, 973.

Britain's Socialism and the ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, last week at a breakfast meeting I had the opportunity to hear a Mr. Sheffington-Lodge, a member of the British Parliament. This gentleman was defending the Labor Government and telling about the rapid progress it was making, notwithstanding the adverse reports. He gave as an example the fact that he was quite a substantial stockholder in the British Transportation Co., and that the Labor Government, in taking over this company, had made a very substantial payment for the stock, much more than he would have realized out of it had it continued in private ownership. At this point in his talk one of our colleagues questioned him as to whether or not the money which he received was the money which the British Government had received from the United States under the Marshall plan, or ECA. He admitted it was.

So this is a concrete example of how we are financing socialism in the British Isles. This would not have been so significant to me had not I, upon returning to my office that very morning, received a letter from a friend of mine in New York, telling me how some of his friends, and in particular a small chemical manufacturer, were being run out of business by this ECA administration's latest move of shunning private enterprise in this country and setting up a governmental organization to bypass our private industry.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following clipping taken from the Journal of Commerce which very clearly explains this situation:

FOREIGN TRADERS, BANKERS PROTEST NEW ECA MOVE TO SHUN PRIVATE CHANNELS—EXPORTERS EMPHATIC IN OPPOSING PLAN TO SET UP OWN CREDIT MACHINERY AT RESERVE BANK HERE—DETAILS NOW BEING AWAITED

ECA's latest move to bypass private business channels set off strong protests yester-

day from not only the commercial bankers—who are primarily affected—but from leading foreign-trade executives.

Foreign traders—whose opposition to the move caused surprise in some quarters—were more outspoken in their criticism of ECA than were the bankers, who, for the most part, preferred to await further clarification.

AIMED AT ECA ANNOUNCEMENT

The protests were aimed at the ECA announcement which outlined a system of government-to-government financing through the New York Federal Reserve Bank of ECA business whereby the commercial banks would be relegated to the sidelines in some of the transactions in which they now issued letters of credit and performed other services.

Bankers said that they had spent considerable money in legal and financial work to handle ECA shipments.

Foreign traders expressed a preference to continue to handle ECA business through known and established financial channels where they get services which they feel will not be available when financing is handled direct between governments. Furthermore, they felt that since this is the second step to cut out private business in ECA dealings they, themselves, might be the next casualty. (Last November ECA barred private grain exporters from sending grain to Europe.)

ECA MOVE CALLED LOGICAL

Spokesmen for both groups said that the ECA's latest move is perfectly logical, but only if one accepts the philosophy that ECA business should be conducted on a government-to-government basis to the exclusion of private enterprise in this country. They said, however, that they did not feel such was the intent of Congress, which had directed that private trade channels be used to the maximum practicable extent.

The big point in connection with congressional intent, however, it was pointed out, is not so much what the last Congress intended but rather how the whole matter is viewed by the present Congress. President Truman, it was emphasized, was directly responsible for the exclusion of private grain traders from the ECA picture and that after repeated assurances from Administrator Hoffman that the CCC's part in the grain picture would become smaller instead of larger.

Following are banking and foreign-trade viewpoints:

BANKERS' VIEWS

New York bankers, still unable to get any clarifying details on ECA's plan to establish credits at the Federal Reserve bank in the name of recipient European countries, voiced concern yesterday over the implication that the move would divert foreign trade from private to governmental channels.

Opposition to the move ranged from cautious criticism to forthright indignation. Some held it would be well to wait for actions to demonstrate how far ECA wished to go in financing transactions by means of direct drafts on the Federal Reserve. Others were openly critical of the move as backsliding from the intent of Congress in authorizing that European aid be handled through private trade channels as far as possible.

Small part financed

Bankers pointed out that they have financed only a small proportion of total ECA commitments, the rest being direct government-to-government deals. Now this is further whittled down.

It was noted that the banks had made a considerable investment in legal and financial work in order to handle ECA shipments that they had worked over many months with ECA in order to streamline the necessarily complex documentation and procedure, and that they had thought the procedure was now operating successfully.

A day of busy inquiring both here and in Washington produced little clarification. It is recognized that one of the chief questions will be the size of the transactions to be paid for by the drafts of the Reserve bank.

One report suggested that in deals involving more than $500,000 the normal letter of commitment and letter of credit will continue to be used, and that drafts would not be used in offshore purchases.

Another report had it that the ECA will issue a more complete explanation of the plan today, detailing when the American exporter is to receive the draft, who is to provide documents and who is to review and approve them.

It became clear that the Federal Reserve bank is not going to examine documentation, but merely act as paying agent for the foreign and American governments. This problem is considered to be a major one. At present large New York City banks maintain sizable staffs specially trained to examine the numerous authorizations, confirmations, bills of lading, insurance policies, and so on.

Underlying fear

According to the meager details made public in Washington, it would appear that the drafts will be issued and paid before the documentation is examined, presumably by ECA, which has heretofore had little experience with this paper work.

The underlying fear of some bankers is not the immediate loss of business that may follow use of the new draft machinery, but the ultimate effects of diverting their customers to direct dealing with Government agencies.

EXPORTERS' VIEWS

Few advantages and many disadvantages were seen here yesterday by foreign traders in the Economic Cooperation Administration's plan to use the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as a fiscal agent for a large part of the shipments under the foreign-aid program, thereby bypassing commercial banks.

Representative traders not only expressed the opinion that few exporters would avail themselves of the new ECA payments plan but also questioned its necessity and criticized the thinking which they said probably lies behind the proposal.

Favor letters of credit

Under the present set-up in which ECA issues letters of commitments to private commercial banks who in turn issue letters of credit to cover individual transactions, exporters said they know where they stand. They have an instrument with which they are familiar and most appeared to prefer the confirmation of a New York bank to a foreign government's draft on the Federal Reserve bank, although others could see no difference between the two as offering security to the suppliers.

On the other hand, exporters said that they would lose the advantages of dealing through commercial banks with whom they have regular contracts, and who are in a position to give them such confidential information and perform services of great but intangible value.

Generally, exporters interpreted the Washington announcement as implying that they could continue to ask for letters of credit if they so desired and the opinion was that most shippers here would continue to do so. Others felt that they would have no choice but to accept the drafts.

The savings which the plan might offer to foreign governments was held to be so small as to be negligible. Few of the ECA-recipient countries, it was said, are so short of dollar exchange that they cannot afford to finance temporarily their orders under the ECA program while bank charges for letters of credit were also said to be an insignificant item.

Some exporters also questioned whether the Federal Reserve bank is set up to handle the drafts which, under the ECA plan, foreign governments would draw from special accounts at the bank.

Fear bypassing of traders

The chief condemnation of the plan was however based on fears on the part of foreign traders that this latest move by ECA is another step to bypass normal commercial practices which, if continued, might eventually hit private foreign traders in an even tenderer spot.

Some argued that if the role of private banks might be partially eliminated, there was no reason why ECA could not also seek to eliminate foreign freight forwarders, merchant exporters, and other interests who are established in the traditional pattern of foreign trade and are now largely dependent on ECA business for their survival.

They pointed out that ECA had originally pledged itself to use normal trade channels to the greatest extent possible. The present plan is seen as a move directly contrary to this philosophy.

Volume inconsiderable

To the argument that the new plan by making it no longer necessary for foreign governments to provide temporary financing for their ECA purchases would make it easier for them to finance non-ECA purchases, exporters answered that the present volume of such shipments is too inconsiderable to warrant any such drastic alteration of accepted trade practices as is contemplated in the new proposal.

Some traders asserted that the plan had been drafted to meet criticisms of banks outside of the larger cities who are obtaining no share of the ECA letter-of-credit business, 90 percent of which is going to the large New York banks who naturally are better known abroad.

Socialized Medicine in Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Richmond (Ind.) Palladium-Item:

NEVER SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

Further evidence of the trouble Great Britain is having with its program of socialized medicine comes from the British Journal of Medicine.

It carries an appeal to ailing Britishers to leave England's hospitals sooner. Apparently the patients are staying longer than necessary. As a result Britain's hospitals are badly overcrowded.

Britain's difficulties and the warnings of our own medical authorities should be enough to block the Truman administration's socialistic plan for national health insurance.

Dr. A. P. Hauss, of New Albany, president of the Indiana State Medical Association, blasts the Government's proposal as posing the biggest threat of socialization ever to face the country.

Citizens are being fooled, he said, into believing they will be getting something for nothing. The truth, he added, is that such a program will take another chunk out of all incomes in taxes.

An estimate of Dr. Joseph F. Lawrence, of the American Medical Association, is that

a combination of national health insurance and social security, as proposed, would cost workers 10 percent of their pay checks.

Our taxpayers should know by now that nothing they get from the Government ever is free. Sooner of later they themselves foot the bill. And this will be true of national health insurance.

The Government has no business in this field. Britain's muddling around should be evidence enough.

Religious Faith of Our Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio message by Evangelist Dale Crowley:

THE FAITH OF OUR AMERICAN PRESIDENTS

"He that ruleth over man must be just, ruling in the fear of God" (2 Samuel 23: 3).

Most of our American Presidents have been men of great faith in God, and have believed in the divine authority of the Bible. Chosen by the people to represent them in the administration of government, our Presidents have been aware of our Christian heritage as a Nation, and have also proved themselves aware of the great trusteeship committed to them. Most of them have been loyal to this sacred trust, accepting it as a stewardship from God.

Many of our Presidents have not only issued eloquent tributes concerning the book of books, but have read it, and studied it for themselves, and have sought to walk in the light of its precepts.

Fervently religious long before he became our first President, Gen. George Washington prayed his way through all the obstacles, trusting in the God of America for victory, and was free to acknowledge God's guidance and blessings when finally the cause of freedom had been won. Being one of the true architects of American political foundations, President Washington said, "It is impossible to rightly govern the world without God and the Bible," for, said he, "True religion affords government its surest support."

So ardent in his devotion to Christ was our second President, Mr. John Adams, that he believed it to be the God-ordained mission of our Nation to give the Christian message to the world. Said he, "The destiny of America is to carry the gospel of Jesus Christ to all men, everywhere."

That conviction was echoed more than a century later when President Woodrow Wilson said, "America was born a Christian nation for the purpose of exemplifying to the nations of the world the principles of righteousness found in the word of God."

Early in our American history, when the very life of our Nation was in jeopardy through the vigorous assaults of the British on July 9, 1812, President James Madison recognized the fact that only God could save the cause of the Republic, and therefore issued a national proclamation, calling on the people to repent of their sins, acknowledge their transgressions, and seek God's merciful forgiveness. This was done, and the war was soon won.

President Thomas Jefferson was an earnest student of the Scriptures. During his residence in the White House, he caused portions of the Bible to be translated in three different languages. Concerning the study of the Bible, President Jefferson stated: "I have always said that the studious perusal of the Sacred Volume will make better citizens, better fathers, and better husbands.

Similarly, President Andrew Jackson paid high tribute to the word of God in these words: "The Bible is the rock on which our Republic rests."

President John Quincy Adams followed the Bible as his family guide book. Said he, "So great is my veneration of the Bible that * * * the earlier my children begin to read it, the more confident will be my hopes that they will prove useful citizens of their country, and respectable members of society."

Various utterances of praise for the Bible came from the lips of President Abraham Lincoln. On one occasion he said, "All the good from the Saviour of the world is communicated through this book * * * all the things desirable to man are contained in it."

Earnest words of counsel to his Nation were issued from the lips of President Ulysses S. Grant. He warned, "Hold fast to the Bible as the sheet-rock of our liberties. Write its precepts on your heart and practice them in your lives."

President William McKinley, in describing the relation between Bible study and citizenship, said, "The more profoundly we study this wonderful book, the better citizens will we become, and the higher will be our destiny as a nation."

Eloquent was the challenge issued by President Woodrow Wilson, to prove the inspiration of the Bible by studying it. Great scholar that he was, he said: "You will know the Bible is the word of God when you read it: For in it you will find the key to your own heart, your own happiness, and your success. I beg of you that you read it, and find this out for yourselves."

President Warren G. Harding's faith in the Bible was put in these positive words. He said, "I have always believed in the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, whereby they have become the expression to man of the word and will of God."

Recognizing the need of God's presence and power in the life of our Nation, President Calvin Coolidge issued this penetrating statement: We do not need more material development; we need more spiritual development. We do not need more physical power, we need more moral power. We do not need more brains; we need more character. We do not need more of the things which are seen; we need more of the things which are not seen."

A significant utterance respecting the power of God's word in our national life was made by President Herbert Hoover. Said Mr. Hoover: "We are indebted to the book of books for our national ideals and institutions. Their preservation rests in adhering to its principles."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, on the flyleaf of 10,000,000 Gideon Testaments, commended the reading of the Bible to all members of the Nation's armed forces.

President Harry S. Truman, in a White House conference, in the presence of your speaker, exclaimed, "The Bible is the moral code of our Nation and of civilization." And to this group of visitors he proudly displayed a cherished possession—his lamented mother's tear-stained Bible.

Today at Mount Vernon, Va., there stands the famous tomb of the Father of Our Country, on which is inscribed a verse from Holy Writ which speaks so eloquently, not alone of the faith of our first President, but also of the faith of our American Presidents in the saviour of the world, for that inscription is the victorious declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ, in these words, "I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."

Liberalism—There Can Be Such a Thing as American Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable William Curran, former attorney general of Maryland, before the Baltimore chapter of the International Association of Torch Clubs, February 3, 1949, entitled "Liberalism—There Can Be Such a Thing as American Communism":

LIBERALISM—THERE CAN BE SUCH A THING AS AMERICAN COMMUNISM

Liberalism is a tricky word, but an attractive one—made attractive through its association with many noble causes. Occasionally it has been in bad favor, when associated with extremists. In the early years of our history, because of what was happening in France, many Americans cherished neither the name of liberals nor the name of democrats.

On the whole, however, throughout our history, "liberal" has been a good name. People like to be called liberals. Just as a good name helps an individual, so a good name for a party or cause is an advantage. It adds strength. Consequently, there is rivalry over the right to appropriate any particular good name.

We see the opposite in the readiness to tag a bad name to an opposition party or program. Communist is not a good name in current American politics. Opponents of a group or program feel that they weaken it by tagging it as communistic, in the same fashion that a newspaper tags a man a politician.

Instead of quibbling over who is entitled to call himself a liberal, it might serve to see who in the past were liberals and what they stood for. Do the assertive liberals of today agree with those of the past? If they differ, then in what respects?

In the early days of the Republic, Jefferson was a liberal. Washington, too, was a liberal, but not in the sense in which Jefferson was one. Today, Jefferson might not qualify as a liberal. Washington certainly would not. When we think back to our Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, it is important to keep in mind that our revolution was not a revolution. In the main it was but a change of sovereignty, with some added limitations on the power of the new sovereign over the people.

Before our revolution, we had been colonies of England. After it, we became an independent sovereignty. Except that we disposed with an hereditary king, and restricted the power of the government over the citizen, our laws and customs remained much as they had been. Moreover, laws and customs developed in England and America roughly along parallel lines.

Political equality, freedom of speech, the habeas corpus writ, trial by jury, limitation of Government power, the rights of the States and their citizens as opposed to the rights of the National Government, were to the time of the Civil War the issues that concerned the early liberals.

To them the best government was the one that governed least. Laissez faire—leave things uncontrolled and unregulated—was their ideal for industry, trade and commerce. Down to the late 1800's, the liberal called for a minimum of government. Let Government

devote its talents and energies to maintaining peace and quiet among the citizens. Leave the people to themselves to work out their problems. Mistakes, they would make, but they would find a cure for them and be bettered by the experience. In any event, the citizens left to their own devices, can do a better job for themselves than can be done for them through laws and Government officials. These were the beliefs of the early liberals.

In those days there were those who viewed with alarm, honest alarm, the fate of the country. The wisdom of placing Government in the control of the average citizen and leaving the citizen pretty well freed of Government control was not accepted by all as self-evident. Many felt that the experiment could not work; that it would wind up in the chaos and the bloody dictatorship that had come to France in the wake of its liberalism.

Well, the American experiment did work. Time proved its soundness. Popular government did achieve a workable success. The liberals of England and America had proven their case. Political equality and laissez faire were doing a good job. That was the story of our first hundred years.

The second century of American history opened with a different kind of economy than had obtained in the first century. As the years go on, our original economy is becoming even more and more different. An agrarian nation of small unmechanized farms and with relatively few commercial and industrial enterprises has become a highly industrialized Nation. Employed management has taken the place of ownership management. In the place of many competing individualized farms, mines, factories, consolidation of many into one has become the order of our day.

As industrialization waxed strong the gospel of the old liberals began to give way in the face of the manifest injustices becoming more and more the lot of the average man. The citizen was politically free, but he was seen as fast becoming an economic slave. Boom and bust, child-labor, factory disease, undernourishment, the work-day of 12 or more hours, the poorhouse for the crippled and aged, strong-armed repression of labor unions—these characterized a considerable part of our enlarging industrialism.

The people were politically free. Naturally enough, there arose widespread popular demands for relief. What kind of relief? Who could provide the relief? The conviction grew that only the Government was powerful enough to go to the mat with big business and provide the relief. Those who led the fight called themselves liberals and progressives.

Thus began a schism in the liberal doctrine. Individualism may work in the political field, said the then new liberals, but individualism cannot be left unchecked in the economic field. Up to the time of the First World War, among those later-day liberals were Bryan, the first Roosevelt, Wilson. They tackled the problem of concentrated wealth and economic inequality by attacking the abuses that had grown into or out of our economic system. They accepted the private enterprise system as sound, but wanted it to be policed and regulated where it was abusing its power.

Factory-inspection laws, sweatshop laws, child-labor laws, workmen's compensation laws, unreasonable combinations in restraint of trade, Government control of bank credit, were the issues that concerned the liberals of those days.

For centuries back, an interference with free competition was thought to be an evil thing. So if we look at what these predepression liberals were striving for, we find that they were striking at what were the immoralities, the cruelties in our economic system. Competition had to be free in fact is what they argued; health of the citizen was a concern of the Government. So we see that these liberals were conducting a sort of moral crusade against evil doers. The economic system itself was not seriously questioned; only its abuses were to be eradicated. The earlier liberalism, that of Jefferson and the nineteenth century English liberals, was left fairly well intact. Still the citizen and not the Government was to remain the controlling factor. Again, as in the earlier generation there were those who viewed with alarm the radicalism of Bryan, Roosevelt, and Wilson.

Now we come down to our day. What is present day liberalism? As I have pointed out, the word has an appeal to American ears. Advocates of international communism for instance, prefer being called liberals to being called Communists. That's understandable enough. The word "liberal" doesn't conjure up the tyrannies and blood purges of Soviet Russia. These liberals of international connections, I pass over—they may be citizens, but they are not Americans.

I want to confine myself to the present-day, sincerely American liberals. This American group is a very numerous group. They claim, of course, a superior right to call themselves liberals. For the most part, they are well intentioned and sincere in their political judgments. Their doctrine may be sound, but its basic philosophy is completely at variance with liberalism as we have hitherto known it. The new liberal asserts that the Government owes every citizen security from the cradle to the grave—that all citizens must not only be politically free and equal but also economically equal or entitled to be helped by the Government to approximate economic equality. That's the philosophy of those who today insist on calling themselves liberals. It's a new kind of liberalism. It's contrary to the accepted liberalism of former years.

What the new doctrine is called or named is not the important consideration. What should concern us is whether in our everyday world the doctrine of the new liberals is true or false, wise or unwise. And, is it workable, if the citizen is to remain politically free?

The argument of the new liberals is that individual enterprise, if left uncontrolled and uninfluenced must by its nature result in great wealth for the few and poverty for the many. The Government must therefore step into the picture to keep the economic world in balance for the good of the many. The Government must do the job if social justice is to be realized. The task is beyond the power of the church or of men of good will.

Humanitarianism must be legislated into the operation of our capitalistic system. Government not only may, but must interfere with the free play of economic forces by subsidizing the weak and weighing down the strong. The race for economic gain must be a handicap race. The old liberals did not want the Government to interfere except to secure equal opportunity to all with special privileges to none. They were content to let the race go to the swift.

To the old liberals, all men are born free and equal, and therefore a struggle or race for economic position would logically tend to be fair and equal. Yet, they had to admit that the facts did not turn out exactly as logic had indicated. In many respects, the economic struggle had not been a fair race.

The answer may be that though all men are created free and equal, they will progress in proportion to their respective efforts. It may be that the Creator decreed that for men to improve their breed and advance humankind it is best for them to compete and struggle one with another with the prize going to him who wins or earns it.

The new liberal does not question the dictum that all men are born free and equal. He accepts it, but insists that the Government be humanitarian. He concerns himself little with costs and ancient principles. The ideas of the new liberals are taking hold today in America. In the last campaign, both President Truman and Mr. Dewey accepted in very large measure the ideas of the new liberalism.

The stated objectives of the new teaching are certainly in accord with the basic principles of our Christian heritage. The new idea is that the State must make the Christian conception of man's duty to man, a matter of law. The old law had it that a corporation has no soul. Say the new liberals—let the law create a soul for the corporation and for all others in business; compel them to do what they otherwise would freely do, if they did have souls.

This, for us is a new conception of government. I like to believe that no enlightened person would want to find fault with the objectives—a civilized life for every citizen, economic security from want and care for all.

The first question is: Can the abundant life be had for all? Unquestionably, technocracy has given greatly increased volumes of needed material things. Science, through the machine is showing the way, with a lessening of human labor greatly to increase the volume of commodities. With all the criticisms that were leveled against the doctrines of the old liberals, the fact still remains that the standard of living for the masses of our people was relatively high and was on the rise.

President Truman, in his inaugural address, spoke of the American people having reached a position of preeminence among the people of the world in the development of industrial techniques. The old liberal will agree with the President, but he will remind him that it was liberalism as heretofore practiced that brought us to our happy state.

The question for us is, Will accepting the new principles result in reaching the goal of a more abundant life more speedily and with more certainty than adherence to the old principles?

What concrete Government action do the new liberals propose? Broadly, on questions concerning economic values and prices, the judgments of Government boards, responding to the demands of social justice, must prevail in the place and stead of the impersonal judgments of a free market operating under the law of supply and demand. In the field of taxation, a new liberal is not shocked at a proposal to tax away from him who has to give to him who has not; if there be a need for a tax, impose the tax though it destroy the profit motive; the discouragement of thrift and work may result, but this ought not to stand in the way of a tax or a subsidy that is otherwise thought needed.

The next question is, Can private enterprise survive under these new principles? It seems obvious enough to me that capitalism must die if denied the profit motive. That's in the nature of the beast. When Government policy hamstrings private enterprise and stagnation sets in, of necessity, the Government, particularly when following the heart rather than the head, must step in to fill the void. The goods needed for the abundant life must be produced, if not by private enterprise, then by the Government. The Government will be impelled to embark on a progressive control, regulation, and ownership of what was formerly private business. Once on foot, the process will feed on itself, for it lacks any self-arresting apparatus. With each step in the progression the Government becomes more expansive and more inclusive; fewer and fewer citizens remain free of Government influence and domination. None remains to stay the encroachments of Government.

The modern liberal, whether of the right or left, seems to see the problem of providing an abundant life for all as one of distribution.

Production in the needed volume is apparently taken for granted. If private enterprise fails to produce in necessary volume because venturesome capital is taxed to death or to flight, they will urge that the Government take over in place of private enterprise. Goverment to have the needed goods to distribute will be forced into the production field.

That's a march toward communism, though it be conducted peacefully and under the name of liberalism. Communism can come to signify many things, but as an economic theory it means nothing more than State-controlled production and distribution for the use of the people, and not for profit. People may easily be misled in their approach into communism by assuming that because there is no force, no violence, no denial of personal freedom nothing drastic is happening. What is overlooked is that it is only when the economic theory on which communism is based begins to break down that force and restraint and the denial of personal freedom appear.

Right here it's quite important to bear in mind that the new liberals are very much divided among themselves in their thinking. Some want to reform the present system; others to destroy it. The taxing power, if used reasonably, may work desirable reform in our present order. Yet the taxing power under the guise of taxing to reform may be used, wittingly or unwittingly, to destroy the private-enterprise system. Unfortunately, many of those who are loudest in their condemnation of communism are the very ones who clamor for the kind of legislation that is most desired by those liberals who hope for out-and-out socialism or communism. Each of the two groups are one in their methods, but worlds apart in their ultimate objectives. In the course of the world's history, the best intentioned reformers have on occasions wrought the greatest havoc.

Mrs. Roosevelt was here the other day arguing for the principles of the new liberalism. Such principles, she says, will save America from dreaded Russian communism. Infiltration aside, I agree that there need be little genuine fear of Russian communism. There can be, however, such a thing as American communism. If communism comes to America, it will before long have the same full need for a police state that Russia has.

Let me sum up by taking a concrete problem and considering the respective approaches of the new and the old liberals to its solution. The problem: Who is entitled and in what proportion to that increase in the productivity of labor that results from the use of the machine? How, in other words, should the benefits of technocracy be shared? Should all of the added production go to the owner of the machine; to the laborer who operates it; or to the public that purchases the product. If not all to any one, then in what proportion to each?

The problem can be extremely perplexing, that is perplexing to anyone who cares about the killing of the goose that lays the golden egg. The old liberal would say: "Leave the problem to the law of supply and demand operating in a free market." As an example of his thinking he would urge that labor can be served by falling prices as well as by increasing wages. A free market works in his view toward an abundance for all. The advanced new liberal would say: "No, leave the problem to Government agencies with authority to assist or supplant the market in order that the division be in accordance with the dictates of social justice." Oddly enough, many who pant after social justice, see no injustice in meddling with the laws of economics, though the meddling cuts in half the value of a thrifty workman's life's savings invested in a bank account or an insurance policy.

Between the two extremes lies the progressive liberal. He will know that in the field of government experience is a better teacher than logic. Consequently, he will not get panicky if some reasonable experimentation is indulged in. He will, however, want to feel the ground under his feet as he moves along, and he will want a free people and not a bureaucracy to determine the results and extent of the experimentation. He will want to be able to retrace his steps, if the going gets rough.

Notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, as a Democrat I want to believe that President Truman and the present Congress will settle down to the course of the progressively minded liberal. They will want to experiment and they may tend to be idealistic, yet they will be realists enough to come to feel that danger lies in too much experimentation.

The men who wrote into the Declaration of Independence that all men are born free and equal hedged a good bit when they came to write the paper that actually set up the practical machinery of government—the Constitution of the United States.

I leave this thought with you. Citizens in groups like yours have the duty to inform themselves of the meaning of the issues being debated in Washington: May I say: "Equip yourselves to form intelligent opinions and then not hesitate to let your Senators and Congressman know what you are thinking. This is no time for citizens like you to be passive onlookers. Don't leave the public opinion of America to be formed by the wishful thinking of bureaucrats. Ours is a democracy. It won't, it can't, run to your liking unless you do your part in the running of it.

Tennessee Valley Steam Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Denver Post:

NO SALE, MR. SMITH

We are in receipt of a two-page telegram (prepaid) from Purcell L. Smith, lobbyist for the National Association of Electric Companies, urging newspapers to get behind an economy drive in Congress.

The guileless Mr. Smith suggests the way for Congress to begin saving money would be to disapprove an appropriation for a new steam-coal electric generating plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

We share Mr. Smith's desire for economy. However, the most economical hydroelectric systems, according to competent engineers, have 25 percent of their power capacity in steam plants, to be used when water supplies are low, and 75 percent in hydro plants. TVA needs nearly twice as much steam capacity as it now has to reach that operating ratio.

We can't agree with Mr. Smith that it would be economy to fail to build the steam plants that TVA must have if it is to sell the bulk of its electric output at "firm" rates.

It would be penny-wise and pound-foolish not to protect the public's $400,000,000 investment in existing TVA power plants.

Mr. Smith says the proposed steam plants would be the first ever constructed by the Federal Government "any time, any place for commercial purposes." "If built, the Federal Government assumes a new function and will be in the electric business outright," his telegram says. "Proposed steam plant no different from proposed Government-constructed steel plant."

For a highly paid propagandist, Mr. Smith is surprisingly weak on his facts. The TVA, under congressional authority, has built and bought steam facilities before and is operating them. For Mr. Smith's information, the Government through the TVA, the Reclamation Bureau, and the Bonneville project already is in the electric business now, with the approval of Congress and the courts.

And an important difference between power business and the steel business is that the former can operate only if it uses public streets and roads for its electric lines and consequently is semipublic in its nature, no matter how you look at it.

There is a great danger to the Rocky Mountain region and the Missouri Valley in the philosophy which Mr. Smith is peddling. Steam plants eventually will be necessary to "firm up" much of the power which the Reclamation Bureau is developing in this region—power for new industries, power for farm machinery, power for more comfortable living in our cities.

The Missouri Valley Development Association, of Omaha, a group formed to fight the MVA idea and promote development by the Pick-Sloan plan, certainly is no socialistic organization. Yet the association, through its manager, John B. Quinn, is on record for TVA steam plants—not because Mr. Quinn has any use for TVA, but he sees that if the Missouri Valley is to have the growth and prosperity to be expected it will have to have electric power, lots of it, and firm power, above all.

Illinois House of Representatives Urges Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois:

(House Resolution 17)

Whereas no segment of the American people has made a greater contribution, in peace and in war, to the welfare of our Nation than have the working men and women of America; and

Whereas this magnificent contribution was made possible through the long struggle of organized labor to secure for the working man recognition of certain fundamental rights; and

Whereas Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress, otherwise known as the Taft-Hartley Act, attempts to abridge labor's fundamental rights and to set the cause of the working man back a generation; and

Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act not only adversely affects organized labor but jeopardizes the peace and prosperity of the entire country, because whatever hurts labor hurts the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take immediate steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to restore to the working men and women of America the rights to which they are entitled and the respect they so richly deserve; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, January 25, 1949.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CHARLES F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Military Courts Martial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the last war and immediately following this conflict the committee then known as the Military Affairs Committee began a study of the problems of military justice.

We were surprised to find the limitations and inadequacies of our military justice system. It was graphically portrayed to the public and Members of Congress during these hearings by many service men and women, lawyers and laymen alike, who had had first-hand experience with the operation of such systems, and found that resemblance between them and the courts which they knew as civilians was largely coincidental. It was very disturbing to find that the same official was empowered to accuse, to draft and direct the charges, to select the prosecutor and defense of the court, to review and alter their decision, and to change any sentence imposed. The public was shocked to learn that an offense committed by an officer was subject to different treatment and punishment than the identical offense committed by an enlisted man. We found that many of the judges, prosecutors, and defense counsel participating in courts martial were neither lawyers nor trained in the law, and that, in the naval services, there was not even the minimum requirement that a single law member be on a court.

The Eightieth Congress made some improvements in the code, but in my opinion further improvements should be carried out in order to protect the rights of those subject to the code without impairing the performance of military functions.

I am enclosing an article which appeared in the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N. C., a few days ago which gives the first instance of an enlisted man sitting on a military court:

ENLISTED MEN SIT ON MILITARY COURT

FORT BRAGG, February 3.—Four veteran sergeants sat on the general court martial of another GI here today, in the first reported airing of the new look in Army justice.

Army authorities believed it was the first time in the United States that an enlisted man has been tried with other enlisted men making up part of the court.

The sergeants and five officers constituted the court hearing testimony against a 19-year-old recruit accused of escaping from confinement. They handed him a stiff 6-month, hard-labor sentence and fined him $50 a month for 6 months.

The new Army system of justice giving enlisted men the right to ask for trial by other enlisted men as well as officers went into effect Tuesday. Recruit Rudy F. Johnson was the first man known to be tried under the new-look court, authorities said.

The board for his trial was picked from some 150 officers and enlisted men who attended a judge-advocate's school here and qualified to sit on courts martial.

The GI's who judged Johnson were Master Sgt. Herbert B. Adams, of Worcester, Mass., a 28-year veteran; Master Sgt. Calvin Jones, of Portland, Oreg., 12 years in service; Master Sgt. Rufus Flanders, of Beddington, Vt., 21 years in service; and Sgt. 1c Earl G. Price, of Seven Springs, N. C., 9 years in service.

The board found Johnson guilty by a two-thirds vote in a secret ballot. Another ballot fixed the sentence and fine. However, the new system provides that the penalty is subject to higher approval before taking effect.

Problems and Pay of State Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Richard L. Neuberger, well-known writer and now a member of the Oregon State Legislature, published in This Week magazine of January 30, 1949. Mr. Neuberger tells of the need of reorganization of State legislatures in line with the effort made by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My ears still burn from the scolding given me by a prominent constituent who visited the capital of our State on urgent business and could not find the senator from his district at any of the leading hotels. He wondered sarcastically where I had been keeping myself in Salem.

When I told him my wife and I had to live in a small auto court on the edge of town because my pay as a State senator averaged only $5 a day, he was flabbergasted.

Millions of other citizens of the United States, I have concluded, must be similarly uninformed. Otherwise, would they let the people who set policy for their schools, highways, courts, and welfare institutions work for lower pay than a baby sitter or a caddie on a golf course?

I belong to the most neglected lawmaking body on earth—an American State legislature.

Nor is my State, Oregon, out of line with the national pattern. In New England, for example, Connecticut pays its legislators $600 for a 2-year term. The most recent session went on for 145 days, giving the senators and representatives a daily wage of $4.13. Vermont pays the framers of its laws $750 for one term of office. At the last session this meant $6.88 a day. And New Hampshire doles out just $200 to its legislators every 2 years. The 1947 session lasted 182 days, making the salary of New Hampshire senators and representatives $1.09 daily, the lowest in the Nation.

It's pretty much the same everywhere. The most recent Missouri Legislature worked 6 months—which made its daily pay $9.41. West Virginia legislators get $500 a year. Texas pays $10 for the first 120 days, $5 thereafter. Utah musters yearly pay of $300. Tennessee's scale is $4 a day, a wage which vanishes after the seventy-fifth day of a session.

LUCKY HANDFUL

In evaluating these wages, remember that the legislators have to leave their homes and live at the capital. A few States—notably Alabama, Arkansas, Washington, Kansas, and Arizona—add modest maintenance allowances to meet the hotel expenses of legislators. But the majority of States still require their lawmakers to eat and sleep in a distant city on wages that the most unskilled laborer would spurn.

As a friend of mine in the Montana Legislature says, "I appreciate the privilege, but I don't know how long I can afford it."

Only a handful of States pay salaries to their legislators which total more than $100 a month for an entire year. These generally are the States which pay an annual salary. New York leads the list with $5,000 a year. New Jersey and Illinois are next with $3,000. Following them are Massachusetts with $2,750, Michigan with $2,400, and Ohio with $2,600. Pennsylvania and Maryland are the only other States above $1,200.

Over-all, the average annual pay of each legislator in the Nation is about $900.

The other night my wife and I totaled up how much it will nick our savings to have me serve as an Oregon State senator. In addition to losing my normal income as a writer and journalist for nearly 3 months, we are behind at least $5 a day. And we economize by pooling our groceries and cooking with the family of a young senator in an adjacent auto court. We have a car pool, too. (We get 10 cents a mile expense money, but only for one round trip from home to the capital.)

SECRETARIES DO BETTER

There is one economy I have not yet practiced. Almost half our members try to struggle along financially by listing their wives as their secretaries. The wife then goes on the pay roll at $7 a day (a new bill may raise it to $8). This, combined with the members' 5 or 6 dollars (he gets paid less than the secretary) just about enables these senators and representatives to break even.

Wives of most legislators are not trained stenographers and the business of the State is not exactly expedited by their efforts. As I write this, a senator at a nearby desk is attempting to dictate a proposed statute to his wife. The wife cannot take shorthand. The senator must linger several seconds over each phrase; later the wife will diligently hunt for the right keys on the typewriter for an hour or two. A bill which may change educational policy for Oregon's 250,000 school children might wind up with a typographical error that will put the State Supreme Court to work for weeks.

THE CITY GETS A LAUGH

The economies forced upon members of the legislature often give the capital city a chuckle. More than one dignified senator has been sternly reprimanded for preparing breakfast on a hot plate smuggled into his hotel room. And virtually every member picks up a few extra dollars at the end of the session by selling his set of the State's legal code to a bookstore or law library.

"I ought to keep these books," a young businessman in the Senate confided, "so I'll know exactly what laws we passed or amended, but, by golly, I'm so far behind I've got to have that extra $50."

It may all sound slightly comic, but there is an aspect to it which rubs away the

humor. There are 90 members in our legislature, and for every senator and representative a half-dozen lobbyists crowd the capitol cloakrooms and hotel corridors. Armed with liberal expense accounts, they like nothing better than to pick up a legislator's dinner check, provide him with a bottle of liquor or a baked ham, or furnish him with a car and driver. It's gotten to the point where if you're a good lobbyist you can sometimes swing a vote for a steak dinner.

The lower the pay of a senator or representative, the less well he is equipped to resist such blandishments. A man who would never think of accepting a bribe will let a lobbyist take care of some of his meal checks. It all seems perfectly innocent. But when the time comes for the lobbyist to ask a favor, the member is hard put to turn him down.

The lobbyist's request may be trifling and perfectly proper; he may use his friendship with lawmakers merely to hasten passage of a harmless bill. But then again, the request may relate to exploitation of the State's natural resources. A lumber company may hope to cut timber on school lands without competitive bids. A State may suffer a loss in millions because it is unwilling to authorize the few thousands in legislative pay which would make its senators and representatives self-supporting. It's the old story of "penny wise, pound foolish."

I know a man who lobbies at State capitals all along the Pacific coast. He admits frankly that it is "easier and cheaper" to bring his influence to bear in Oregon than in California, where members are paid $1,200 a year plus expenses.

DIME-STORE LOBBYING

"The Oregon legislators are just as honest but less independent," confides this lobbyist. "Their measly pay makes them susceptible to what I call 'dime-store lobbying.' You can get a key committee member indebted to you for the price of eggs and bacon."

In some States reports frequently hint of some senator or representative allowing his hotel bill to be paid by the local utility company. How much independence can be expected of a lawmaker under such circumstances?

In our own legislature I notice an increasing number of members who are openly on retainers from corporations or trade unions. They do not have to live within their pittance from the State. They are company lawyers or labor officials. But how will the interest of the public fare when it conflicts with that of the private organizations on whose pay rolls these men serve at the same time that they enact the State's laws?

Stunted legislative salaries work adversely in another manner. Members are under intense personal pressure to adjourn speedily and go home. They see their bank accounts melting away.

Put yourself in the place of a young electrical contractor I know, for example, who not only has to pay his living costs in the capital and support his household at home, but also hire a skilled man to carry on his business while he's gone.

FAST WORK

Yet the State's business must be transacted. Taxes must be levied and policies decided. When I served in the Oregon House of Representatives before the war, we rushed through bills in the closing days that not more than two or three of us had read. And they affected such vital matters as Columbia River water power and the commitment of insane persons.

What is the solution? The Council of State Governments, a national organization, recommends that legislators in all 48 States be paid an annual salary in keeping with their responsibilities. This would enable them to spend time on State problems all the year around, rather than only while the legislature is in session. As it is now, many men and women go to our State capitals wholly uninformed on the great issues they must settle.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

In 24 States the pay of legislators is fixed by the State constitutions. Some of these constitutions were written in pioneer times when a hotel room was 50 cents a night and a chicken-liver breakfast cost a quarter. The Council of State Governments believes legislative salaries should be set by statute so they may be varied with economic changes as they occur.

But, basically, the long-range answer is for the average citizen to take a more immediate interest in the government closest to him and his family, the government of his State. Not only the pay of legislators needs correcting. Seven dollars for a secretary fails to compete with the far higher wages she can receive from the Federal Government. I couldn't get a competent stenographer to go to the legislature until a family friend volunteered to do it "for the experience." Like her boss she is losing money living at the capital.

Furthermore, virtually all State legislative districts in America require reapportionment. But the citizen, with his eyes on distant Washington, D. C., has failed to see that this is done. Our legislature has not been reapportioned since 1910. As a result, although the State constitution requires that all senators represent equal numbers of people, I have 78,170 constituents, while a member a few rows away has 7,268.

PREP SCHOOL FOR PRESIDENTS

We neglect our legislatures, yet we expect them to furnish our national leaders of the future. Washington and Jefferson were members of the colonial Legislature of Virginia. Abraham Lincoln served in the Illinois State Legislature for 7 years. Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt graduated from the New York Legislature at Albany. Mention a prominent United States Senator and the chances are he began his career as a State legislator.

Lately Congress has been occupied with raising the pay of the President and other National Government officials, in line with the rise in salaries in private business. But there's been little talk about the far more overdue pay raises for State legislators. A notable exception is Michigan, where legislative salaries have been increased from $3 a day to $2,400 a year. Let's hope this is a straw in the wind.

We often speak glibly of "State's rights" when we want to express alarm over the encroachment of the Federal Government on local authority. Too often we forget that "State's responsibilities" are a partner of this slogan.

TVA and the Proposed CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD two reports which I recently made to the citizens of my State regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority and the proposed Columbia Valley Authority. I made these studies in as nonpartisan a manner as possible in order to give my constituents as fair a chance as possible, regardless of my opinion, to see both sides of the controversy which surrounds both TVA and a proposed CVA. Because the Congress probably will be called upon this session to take a look at another CVA proposal, I believe some value might be obtained by my colleagues from these reports.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TVA—AN OBJECTIVE REPORT

One of the most dominant issues—and probably the leading factor in the life and economy of the Pacific Northwest—is electric power, its control and use, its production and the irrigation of land. This irrigation is to be accomplished by using public power to pump the water on to the land that is now arid.

The Columbia River is probably the greatest single source of potential electric power in the world.

The time has come when all the people of the United States, through their Congress, will have to reexamine our Columbia Basin project. I shall do my best in this, the first of two closely related reports, to give you the background and a fair, impartial, disinterested account of this entire power and reclamation problem. This will mean that I must relate to you the background of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its relationship to the Columbia Basin project.

The establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority has been advocated by some people ever since the first days of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Belief in the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority has encouraged some to advocate extension of the so-called valley authority methods to the Columbia River Basin, while others, equally convinced of the failure of the TVA—or, believing other methods to be better solutions—have opposed such an extension.

At the outset, it should be noted with great care, by all sides concerned, that the impartial Library of Congress experts state that the application of "the TVA Act without change to the Columbia Basin would not guarantee comparable results in the Columbia Valley."

Problems to be solved in the two valleys, the Tennessee and Columbia, while basically the result of their relationship to the drainage basin of a great river, may differ markedly in detail and every degree.

For instance, in the Columbia River area, irrigation is of primary importance, while in the Tennessee Valley there is no irrigation.

Whereas in the Tennessee Valley electric power is of fair importance, in the Columbia Valley hydroelectric power is potentially of such great importance as to overshadow most of the other problems.

In general, the question of whether a Columbia Valley Authority is the proper solution hinges largely on whether one believes better results will be attained under the aegis of a single, unified, decentralized control, largely independent of Washington, D. C., or under an extension of present methods, improved, I hope, and enlarged in scope, of development by specialized Federal agencies, each concerned with only one phase of the development problem.

Some persons will agree that there is at present a growing feeling of the need for a more unified approach to the over-all problems of a river basin. This has been recognized in the base of the Missouri River where there has been formed an inter-agency committee on which all agencies of the Federal and State Governments concerned with water resources, and related fields, are represented. This may be one solution. These agencies in the Missouri Basin meet at specified times and discuss their problems and attempt to reach an agreement on a coordinated, cohesive plan.

The Tennessee Valley covers an area of over 40,000 square miles, and includes portions of 7 States—Tennessee, Alabama, North Carolina, Virginia, Georgia, Kentucky, and Mississippi. It is approximately 1,000 miles long, with a maximum width of 150 miles.

The rainfall in the valley is the heaviest in eastern America, and the flow of the river varies greatly from season to season and year to year. Water is the valley's major resource.

In 1933, when the TVA was established, the valley was a very poor region, in which economic pressure and ignorance had led to untold destruction of soil and forest resources. In that year the gross value of the farm production was $154 per capita, compared to $362 for the Nation.

Agriculture was the occupation of 77 percent of the population, compared with 44 percent of the Nation as a whole. Education facilities were almost primitive, the standard of nutrition was extremely low, and incidence of disease was high. In most respects it was a backward area, this Tennessee Valley in the South.

During the First World War the Federal Government had built a nitrate fixation plant at now famous Muscle Shoals, utilizing hydroelectric power generated by the Tennessee River. This plant was not finished in time to be of any assistance in our war effort.

It was during the controversy over disposition of this Muscle Shoals plant that the idea of the Tennessee Valley Authority was evolved.

The act establishing the TVA was approved May 18, 1933. It was described in the title as being an act "to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes."

The powers allotted to the new agency by terms of the act were enumerated. The Authority was empowered to construct dams and reservoirs to provide for a 9-foot channel in the river, to promote navigation and control destructive floods in the Tennessee and Mississippi Rivers; to provide and operate, consistent with the control and regulation of stream flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods, facilities for the generation of electric energy; to sell and distribute electric power; to manufacture fertilizers and demonstrate their uses; and to furnish nitrogen for national defense.

In addition the act grants the power to plan by authorizing the making of surveys and the preparation of plans for the purpose of aiding further "the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River Drainage Basin" and "providing for the general welfare of the citizens of said area."

In article 23 of the act the six general objectives of TVA are summarized as:

1. The maximum amount of flood control.
2. The maximum development of the river for navigational purposes.
3. The maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation.
4. The proper use of marginal lands.
5. The proper method of reforestation of all lands in the drainage basin suitable for reforestation.
6. The economic and social well-being of the people living in the river basin.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is managed by three directors, who are appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate.

It has its offices in the region, with headquarters in Knoxville, Tenn.

The Authority is entirely independent of any existing Federal department or bureau. The act was designed to permit the Authority to make its own decisions, requiring it only to report annually to Congress and to secure congressional approval for its major projects and the necessary funds for their construction.

Although TVA was established 15 years ago there is still no objective comprehensive study of its experience.

It is particularly difficult to determine—even where results of its operations are clearly apparent—just what is due to the type of organization and what is due to other circumstances.

The problems met with in the Tennessee River Valley are most complex, and the legislation dealing with them was, of necessity, very broad.

The real origin of the TVA—and this is important—lies in the inability of the Federal governmental structure to adapt itself to the requirements of river-basin development.

Piecemeal, single-purpose development was getting nowhere, while it was apparent that maximum benefits were attainable only through basin-wide planning and development on a comprehensive, multiple-purpose basis.

The plan adopted, which resulted in the TVA's charter, gave it a number of significant advantages in comparison with the old-line Federal agencies.

Among these were the mandate to develop the entire basin in a manner to provide maximum benefits, all purposes supposedly to be taken into consideration.

There were few restrictions placed upon this direction; no set goals were imposed.

TVA was not obliged to share its responsibilities or leadership.

TVA could initiate and carry out its own plans, either alone or with the cooperation of other agencies.

As the organization's own philosophy developed over the years this cooperation has been emphasized and made somewhat easier by the fact that the administration is physically present in the area itself. Thus it has been able to avoid much of the complication and delay with which old-line agencies of the Federal Government must deal.

TVA maintains it places great emphasis on the grass-roots character of its administration.

The corporate status of TVA and its relative independence of Washington has given the Authority a great measure of flexibility with respect to financing, personnel matters, and accounting not enjoyed by other Government agencies. In many, many matters it accounts only to itself.

There are certain physical results apparent in the TVA which may be mentioned briefly.

The TVA has acquired 10 and built 16 dams and reservoirs since 1933, integrating them into one system providing more than 13,500,000 acre-feet of storage, of which 11,000,000 are available for flood control, as contrasted with none in 1933.

It is claimed by the TVA that this storage space may be operated to reduce floods by as much as 4 feet in the Mississippi River at Cairo, Ill. This has been disputed by some engineers.

These reservoirs are also operated in such a manner as to provide a continuous 9-foot channel for navigation through the lower 630 miles of the Tennessee River. At the same time these dams and reservoirs produced 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy in the year 1947. It is said that some 400 new industries have located in the region. The power available was of inestimable value to the Nation during the recent war. Vast amounts of aluminum were made available through use of this power and the atomic bomb program was in great part dependent upon the same source of power.

Incidence of disease in the area has been lowered considerably, due in large part to the successful program of malaria and pollution control instituted by the TVA in cooperation with local authorities.

River traffic (exclusive of sand and gravel) in the first 6 months of 1947 amounted to 153,000,000 ton-miles. Much of this traffic originated and terminated in areas outside the valley, whereas in 1933 such commerce was practically impossible and there was little or no through river traffic.

The TVA itself, and in cooperation with local authorities as well as private enterprise, has provided good terminal facilities in addition to recreational facilities throughout.

It is generally agreed that, as an organization for dam construction, power generation and distribution, and fertilizer production, TVA has done an effective job, no matter at what expense.

As to the broader responsibility for improving the economic and social well-being of the people of the valley the Authority can point to some improvements.

Just how much of this improved living standard, increased income, wider use of electricity, and the like is due to the impact of the great construction program of the corporation, what share is due to the effect of the war in increasing industrial development of the region, or what is due to the foresight with which the program was planned, and the excellence of the methods used in carrying out the program, cannot be determined until a detailed objective study and evaluation is available and as yet it has not been made.

This is, briefly and to the point, as reasonable a presentation of the TVA as I can give the people of my State. This report was necessary because of the obvious effect the TVA has had on the Columbia Basin controversy, and because the President has urged the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority for the land in which you live. In my next report I shall endeavor to define some of the reasons in opposition to, and some of the reasons in support of, the President's proposal. In this way I hope I can be of assistance in an objective way to the citizens of Washington.

THE PROPOSED CVA—A NONPARTISAN STUDY

The first major development in connection with the Columbia Valley was the Bonneville project, which was built by the Army Corps of Engineers to improve navigation, and for the additional purpose of generating electric power on the Columbia.

Sale of this electric power was placed under an administrator appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Bonneville Act was followed by the Grand Coulee Dam or Columbia Basin Project Act, authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Department of the Interior, to construct Grand Coulee Dam.

The sale of Grand Coulee electric power was also placed under the administrator of the Bonneville project.

It was in 1940 that the first of what was to be a steady stream of legislative proposals were introduced in the Congress. At that time, in the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, Senator Bone and Congressmen Hill and Leavy, all of Washington State, introduced bills which would have set up a Columbia power administration. In the same Congress, Congressman Smith, of Washington, introduced a similar bill. No action was taken on any of them. In the following year, the same bills were reintroduced.

Senator Bone and Congressmen Hill and Smith then introduced bills which were entitled the Columbia Power Act of 1941. Two years later, thinking on this subject was marked by a broadened basis, and more of the so-called valley authority type bills were introduced for the Columbia River, even one by Congressman RANKIN. His bill was followed by the introduction of the Columbia Valley Authority Act, which would have created the authority, a Columbia Valley advisory council, and a national river

basin development board. Later the same bill was reintroduced but with still a different version. The bills died in committee.

Congressman WALT HORAN, of Wenatchee, after long study and consideration, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill called the Columbia Valley Authority Act. It created a cooperative authority headed by a board of five directors and a Columbia Valley advisory council consisting of the regional governors.

The authority was to formulate and present proposals to the President and Congress after submitting them to the advisory council for review. The proposals were to be effective unless affirmatively disapproved by Congress, by joint resolution within four legislative months. The rest of the provisions were, in the main, similar to the Columbia Valley Authority Act, but this bill also died, although more seriously considered than the others. Mr. HORAN presently has another proposal which merits close study as he has lived all his life in the area involved.

The opening days of the last Congress saw the reintroduction by Congressman RANKIN of the Conservation Authorities Act of 1945, providing for the establishment of eight conservation authorities, including one in the Columbia Valley. The bill received no action. This bill was followed further along in the first session by the Columbia Valley Authority Act, and was introduced by Senator GLEN TAYLOR, of Idaho. The Senate Committee on Public Works submitted this bill to various Government departments, such as the Treasury, War, Agriculture, and so forth. Most of the departments suggested amendments; some were critical; the Federal Works Agency made a favorable report.

And now, here are the two sides to the controversy over extending the Valley Authority idea to the Columbia River Basin.

There are 11 general reasons in favor, and 11 reasons against, the establishment of a valley authority in the Columbia Basin.

1. We will take the side of the proponents of a Columbia Valley Authority. They contend, first, that a regional authority, such as a CVA or TVA, has all the flexibility of action of a private corporation, and that such an authority is centralized and less subject to red-tape and bureaucratic delay.

2. Plans for a development of the Columbia Basin under a valley authority possess the virtue of unity and every phase of development can be planned in its proper relation to the whole. Such planning is apt to be more balanced and unencumbered by traditional and possibly hampering procedures. Instead of a dozen agencies concerned with fragments of the problem, one agency, supposedly responsible to the people, can do a better total job.

3. Offices of the authority would be located in the area itself with all of the advantages which flow from that fact. Among these are more familiarity with the immediate circumstances of the problem, ability to render decisions on the spot and fix responsibility and better cooperation with local agencies.

4. Nothing is lost of the valuable assistance available from other Government agencies, as most of the bills to create a Columbia Valley Authority provide that the Authority may call on other Federal agencies for any information they may possess and for technical assistance.

5. The TVA has been successful in accomplishing its original purpose. Why should not other regions have the benefit of experience there?

6. Those in favor of a CVA say that any authority established by Congress is still subject to its control. It is no absolutist, all-powerful agency, but subject to any checks Congress may see fit to impose.

7. In using the corporate form, more businesslike management is possible with a probable actual money savings.

8. Development of the Columbia Valley in the past, by the many different Government agencies, has not been as successful or beneficial as it might have been under a coordinated system such as has been so successful in the TVA region, it is argued by those who favor a CVA.

9. An authority will have the power to engage in activities essential to a full development of the resources of a region which are not now the concern of any agency at all. Among these are soil-erosion control, topsoil rebuilding, provision of terminal facilities, development of new industries, and the like.

10. Someone must decide the present conflict of interests between navigation and irrigation as well as power. An authority such as TVA can make these decisions for the benefit of the region as a whole.

And last: A Columbia Valley Authority might be self-liquidating. Power revenues might be sufficient to finance an entire comprehensive program, and, based on experience in the TVA, there might be no loss of tax revenue. Payments in lieu of taxes, it is claimed, are provided for in all bills thus far introduced.

Those who think that the establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority will hurt our State, the Nation, and its citizens have strong arguments. They argue like this:

1. It is contended that local governments stand to lose a large proportion of tax revenues as a result of any valley authority which withdraws from taxation large areas of land within the subdivision. The land already owned by the Federal Government in the Pacific Northwest, especially in Washington State, is alarming. Thirty-four percent of our State's total land area is presently owned by the Federal Government and controlled in Washington, D. C.

2. Those against a CVA strongly contend that federally controlled river basins, such as the Columbia and its tributaries, would divide the entire Nation into many valley and other regional authorities, and then would render the State of Washington, and other States, as such, nearly obsolete. In other words, the Constitution would be circumvented and the rights of individual States would soon cease to exist and a point be reached where States existed in name only.

3. Benefits to which the State of Washington is entitled, and benefits of other States, might be taken away and water and power transmitted in great quantities to California or elsewhere, while we in the Pacific Northwest, already faced with a shortage of power for years, might be made to suffer because of political power exerted through a valley authority to send the electricity elsewhere.

No. 4, advanced by opponents of a CVA, is that experience with the TVA would seem to justify the accusation such authorities engage in activities which are in direct competition with private business and industry. Government in business is not a constitutional activity of the Federal Government.

5. Accent upon power revenues leads to the suspicion that regional authorities, based upon water resources, are only an excuse for the Federal Government to take over the power industry of the Nation through subterfuge.

6. Long-established Government agencies with fine records of achievement and specialized techniques can do a better job than new and inexperienced special authorities. A prime example of recognized good work is that of the Army Corps of Engineers.

7. Regional authorities constitute a new element in the structure of American Government. The Constitution provides only for a National Government and constituent States. If new elements are to be added it should be done through constitutional amendment. This is such an important consideration that it should not be determined indirectly by creating individual authorities by legislation.

8. Valley authorities' powers are constitutionally limited to the Federal Government's powers, which in turn rest on the constitutional power to regulate commerce and navigation. Any powers beyond these are assumed at the expense of the States, and such assumption is unconstitutional.

9. A Columbia Valley Authority might well become a superagency—above control by anyone. The act creating such an authority would need to be carefully drawn lest the only check on its power be solely that of approval or disapproval of an already accomplished fact. Most of the bills so far introduced to establish valley authorities provide for a minimum of control by Congress.

No. 10 in the list of general reasons against a CVA is that neither the TVA plan nor any existing proposals for valley authorities have provided for fusion of Federal and State powers, nor for the means by which the powers of the State, and certain laws of the Nation, are to be exercised over such an authority.

And last and No. 11: Plans for a Columbia Valley Authority possess the essence of state management and are so extreme that they border on communism.

Right or wrong, these are the arguments, both for and against, used in the controversy over establishment of a Columbia Valley Authority in the State of Washington.

I have presented both sides of this very interesting and absorbing story in an effort to inform you and have refrained from taking a position at this time on the issue. The position of your State congressional delegation will be made clear after legislative proposals are all in and when, and if, debate begins, either in congressional committees or before the House and Senate.

Conditions in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] regarding conditions in China.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With regard to China, the United States faces a decision which may determine its position in the world of the future. We cannot defer this decision, for to accept delay is to decide against action. It is time to stop drifting on a sea of rhetoric and good intentions, and examine the facts.

We must decide anew whether our system of free institutions, free enterprise, and the dignity of the individual human being is going to accept the challenge of communism in its announced determination to destroy all that we and our forebears have builded. If we reaffirm our decision to accept that challenge, we cannot stand still; we either go forward or we retreat. We must face the issue squarely.

These issues are not confined by European boundaries; they are world-wide. Make no mistake about it, the fire of communism rages almost unchecked in Asia today. We believe we have stemmed the

tide in Europe. We cannot allow ourselves to be engulfed from the rear.

China is the key to Asia. Japan recognized this and, beginning with the invasion of Manchuria in 1931, attempted the conquest of China by outright military operations. Ultimately, we fought a great war to prevent Japan from dominating the Orient. Today Russia recognizes the importance of China in Asia, and attempts to succeed where Japan failed; and Russia seeks to avoid the mistakes made by Japan, and moves more cautiously, cloaking her movements under the guise of civil war. But her purpose is clear.

Recognizing these facts, I propose that the United States extend to China the aid necessary to insure her independence and administrative integrity.

This aid can and should be given on a realistic basis; a loan basis, properly supervised as to use. In our cold war with communism, we are pouring billions into Europe with no hope of recovering anything except indirect benefits in return. But the Chinese Government, given a period of relative stability, can fully repay us for the aid we may extend under the plan which I advocate.

Specifically, my loan proposal is that we extend to the Government of China a credit of approximately $1,500,000,000 as a sort of revolving fund to be used as follows: $600,000,000 to $700,000,000 for direct military purposes, including arms, ammunition, matériel, and supplies; $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 to buy commodities needed to meet civilian import requirements during the first year of the program; the balance to be used as a stabilization fund and drawn on from time to time to purchase silver from the Treasury of the United States to be used for monetary purposes in stabilizing the currency of China.

This loan authority should be subject to periodic review by the Congress over a period of several years, and the loans should be amortized over a period of approximately 30 years.

One of the conditions of this program should be that the Chinese Nationalist Army accept American military supervision, from the top level down to such lower echelons as our Military Establishment should deem advisable, to insure a coordinated and successful operation. This will involve assignment of 600 to 700 American officers, mostly of field grade and above. But let it be clearly understood this proposal does not contemplate sending an American expeditionary force to China.

As further assurance that our assistance will be effective, the Chinese Government should institute and continue a tax assessment and collection operation guided by a joint commission of Chinese and American tax experts, and all tax collections should be subjected to an annual audit by this commission.

As a final condition, the revenues of the major ports of Central and South China, such as Shanghai, Hangchow, Ningpo, Foochow, Amoy, Swatow, and the ports of Taiwan (Formosa), should be, in effect, pledged as collateral until the entire debt has been paid; and, during this period of pledge, the operation of these ports should be under a joint commission of Chinese and Americans, with customs control and collections administered solely by an American board.

This is a new proposal, different from any plan previously advanced, and it is recognized that such a program as here proposed would be a far-reaching step. Undoubtedly the proposal will be attacked, and if it is adopted, our motives in adopting it will be attacked. But we are already under attack. Read what the Communist press says about us in Europe, in Greece, or anywhere we go advocating the real freedom of mankind.

The important consideration is that such a program as I have outlined can succeed in saving the Government of China from disaster and dissolution, and ultimately in restoring Chinese independence.

Such over-all supervision as this program contemplates is necessary in a country now almost totally disorganized, and only recently emerging from feudalism. No one need fear that we have an imperialistic aim in China. This Nation's past record, particularly in the Philippines, is evidence that our objective is only to preserve the independent right of a people to freely exercise their choice of government. The proposed supervision is only a reasonable step to see that the wealth and production of America which is made available for assistance to China is constructively used, and that the loan we make is adequately secured.

The present budget of the Chinese Government is approximately one billion United States dollars, although its receipts are only about 250 million dollars. But there is ample evidence that less than 25 percent of the tax collections ever reach the coffers of the Chinese national treasury. If reform in tax assessment and collection is provided, so that collections approximate the sums due, and reach the national treasury without depletion, it is obvious that the Chinese Government could finance her own way and, over a period of years, could easily repay us for the loan which I propose we should make.

Now, what are some of the points we must consider in connection with this proposal?

One consideration, and a most practical one, concerns Asia as a future market for the goods produced in this country, and in Europe.

We have embarked on a program for spending approximately $20,000,000,000 to reconstruct and rehabilitate Europe, particularly her industrial machine; but we have given no substantial thought to the question of providing markets for Europe's industrial products. It is a poor businessman who invests his money in plant expansion without also providing for an outlet for his production. With our present and prospective investment in European recovery, common sense dictates that we spend something for insuring future markets. The continent of Asia can, if it is free to trade, provide the market for European production and for much of our own surplus production; but it will not be a market for Europe's goods, or ours, if the Communists control it.

It was the United States that opened the door of Asia by opening the door of China. From that day to this, China has been a friendly nation so far as the United States is concerned, and the Chinese people have been friendly to our people. The Chinese, as a people, are not communistically inclined; they do not even understand Communist doctrine as such. They do not embrace communism except where starvation, unrest, and the tricks of a Communist conqueror force that system upon them.

If the iron curtain goes down on the east coast of Asia, we shall no longer be able to regard China as a friendly nation, and we can then have little hope to aid either China or any other part of Asia for a long time to come, or to take any substantially effective action in Asia against the growth and spread of Communist power. The iron curtain will go down as surely over all Asia as it has in central Europe if the armies of communism finally succeed in engulfing China.

Another factor merits consideration. History teaches us that great Asiatic conquerors, headed west, time after time have been forced to turn back because of trouble in Asia. Until her position in China is secure, Russia will be hampered in her westward movement into Europe.

By shortening its lines, and withdrawing to a tenable defensive position, the Chinese Government will be greatly strengthened from a military standpoint.

In giving attention to military factors, we must not overlook the great importance of "face" in the Orient. We have aided and supported the Nationalist Government in China. We have cast our lot with that Government. If that Government goes under, the United States will lose face. If the Nationalist Government of China is preserved, through our efforts; if we can restore that Government to economic and monetary soundness, even though it withdraws to the port cities and temporarily abandons the offensive, we shall have gained face rather than losing it.

The Communists today have a psychological hold on a large segment of the people of China. The Communist psychological offensive has one main theme. It plays upon the basic desire of the Chinese peasant for peace, for an opportunity to work his farm or go about his business under conditions at least fairly well stabilized. The Communists in China have been preaching that the reason the Chinese peasant does not have peace and prosperity is because the Nationalist Government wills it otherwise, and that the United States is supporting the Nationalist Government, therefore is an enemy to peace and prosperity. If the Nationalist Government withdraws to an area firmly held, and rehabilitates the currency and the economy of that area, this Communist propaganda line becomes immediately ineffective. The Communists must then find some new hold over the minds of the Chinese people; and they have nothing to offer in the way of material advantages.

Russia cannot supply the needs of China. Her production is not great enough and supply lines do not exist which would permit an adequate flow of goods from Russian centers of production to all China, even if the goods were available.

The traditional channels of commerce in China are up and down the great rivers. Commerce will continue to flow in those channels, if the port cities have goods to trade, and a medium of exchange which is not constantly depreciating in value. The Communists dare not attempt to interfere with the flow of commerce on the rivers of China, for to do so would be to take up openly the role of oppressor.

During the recent war, while the Japanese held Shanghai, it was a capital offense to bring rice into that city. Yet rice came into Shanghai by the ton every month, sewed into the clothes of Chinese peasants, 30, 40, 50 pounds at a time. If a Chinese was caught bringing rice into Shanghai, he got no trial; they just stood him up and shot him. But the rice continued to come in.

Today there is no penalty for bringing rice into Shanghai; but the rice is not coming in. The reason is that there are no goods in the city for which the peasant can exchange his rice; and if he takes currency for it, the depreciation is so rapid that when he returns later on, his money is virtually worthless.

In a substantial sense, my proposal is a scheme for buying time. We should not seek to mount a large-scale military offensive in China; the drain on our resources would be too great. What is here proposed is not that we seek sweeping victory in a short space of time, but that we bring about what would amount to a stalemate, which, with time working on our side, can be turned into ultimate victory.

Once establish a stable Chinese Government concentrated in the port cities of China, with a sound money that the Chinese understand, and the Communists will find the problem of pacifying and satisfying the population of the rest of China extremely difficult. Time will then be working for us and not against us.

The Communists want a coalition government in China, which will relieve them from

the necessity of trying to govern the whole country, and which will give them someone to blame for whatever goes wrong. By keeping the Nationalist Government intact, such a coalition can be prevented, and the Communists will be forced to face the consequences of their own acts and the inevitable adverse effects—for them—of their inability to improve conditions in the interior of China. We should then have a sharp contrast between the stability and prosperity of those areas still under the control of the Chinese Government, and the instability and poverty of the areas under Communist domination. Such an object lesson could not fail to speed the disintegration of the Communist hold on China.

It will be said that the present Chinese Government has not brought to China the real democracy, and the full consideration of the wishes and needs of the Chinese people, that we would desire. The Chinese Nationalist Government has been charged with corruption and incompetence. In that regard, I may have more to say later about the record of the Chinese Government in repaying loans previously made by the United States. It is a good record. But even assuming these charges against the present Chinese Government are true, how does that change the picture? What is the alternative to aiding and supporting that Government? The only alternative is to allow the Communists to take over. Where does the record of the Communists indicate more consideration for the people? Are the Communists so incorruptible? Shall we let the godless regimentation of Communist statism win our support on the plea that it is the only possible efficient government?

Let us not delude ourselves into believing that the lot of the Chinese people will be improved by the Communists. For that matter, let us not delude ourselves with the belief that our primary objective in this matter is to aid the people of China. Our primary objective is self-preservation and the defeat of the Communist drive for world domination.

I see but one choice: to aid the present Chinese Government, and to demand of it, as a condition of our aid, reforms which will increase efficiency, decrease corruption, and constitute a move toward true democracy.

We cannot afford to debate and delay this decision. While we bemoan the failures and shortcomings of our former ally across the Pacific, our enemies are taking over China and laughing at our efforts to straddle the fence. The time is here for us to take our position against communism in Asia, as we have in Europe. One world is a fine aspiration, but Russia has decided on two worlds. Let us make ours the largest and most forceful, the most dynamic, and the future will hold no cause for fear.

National Dental Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release from my office relative to the bill introduced today by me, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to provide Federal assistance to the States in developing and maintaining dental health programs.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS PEPPER, MURRAY, AND AIKEN INTRODUCE BILL TO PROVIDE NATIONAL DENTAL-CARE PROGRAM

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida; Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana; and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, introduced in the Senate today a bill to provide Federal assistance to the States in developing and maintaining dental-health programs. The program under the bill would be administered by the Surgeon General on consultation with a national dental health council. The dental health council, consisting of six members, appointed by the Surgeon General, the majority of whom must be outstanding dental experts, would have authority to review State projects on the treatment and prevention and control of dental diseases. These State programs would include dental-care programs for children, the training of personnel for State and local dental-health work and grants to States, local agencies, and nonprofit institutions to study and investigate methods of diagnosing, treating, and preventing dental diseases.

The Senators emphasized the need for augmenting and extending dental-health services in the United States. Dental diseases are among the most prevalent of human ailments, they said. At the age of 6, more than 9 out of 10 children have 1 or more decayed teeth. By the age of 18, a boy or girl on the average has 9 decayed teeth and several extractions. The results of dental neglect are not only pain, but also the cause or aggravation of many other bodily ailments.

During the early years of selective service, 1 out of every 12 men examined were rejected because of serious dental defects. Because of the need for manpower, our armed forces were required to eliminate practically all dental-health standards. The result was that the armed services had to induct over 20,000 dental officers and undertake a large-scale program of dental rehabilitation for over a million men at a tremendous cost to our people. The stake of the Nation in the dental health of its citizens is demonstrated most forcefully by this experience.

Report on Nitrogenous Fertilizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the subject of nitrogenous fertilizer, made by John Pillsbury, staff member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NITROGENOUS FERTILIZER—LEGISLATION OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The Eightieth Congress adopted the following legislation restricting the distribution of nitrogenous fertilizer materials produced by the Army:

In Public Law 606 (continuing the powers of the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 through June 30, 1949) and Public Law 793 (making appropriation for foreign aid in 1949), it was provided that the Department of the Army should furnish from its production 50 percent of the export requirements of nitrogenous fertilizer materials for nonoccupied areas.

In Public Law 793, it was further provided that 10 percent of the total anhydrous ammonia produced in Army plants should be diverted to domestic use.

(The pertinent sections of each law are appended.)

The intent of the Congress in these laws was to earmark part of the Army production for use outside of the occupied areas of Germany, Japan, Ryukyus, and Korea. At the time these provisions were enacted, a shortage of nitrogenous fertilizer materials existed both in the United States and in the international situation. The Army was applying its entire production to its occupied areas without regard to domestic and world shortages.

The action of the Congress diverted approximately 30,000 tons (nitrogen content) to domestic use in the 10-percent program and approximately 30,000 tons for export in the 50-percent program.

Since the enactment of the law, two major changes have occurred which may make it advisable to discontinue the provisions of Public Laws 606 and 793.

1. The Army has increased its production.

2. The needs of the Army for its occupied areas will be reduced sharply. The decreased demand will result in major part from the change in status of Korea. Korea will cease to be an occupied territory after January 1, 1949, when the appropriation made to Government and Relief in Occupied Areas will be transferred to the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Because of these two factors, Army production will greatly exceed Army demands for the occupied areas. Without Government regulation, the production of the Army plants which is not required for the occupied areas will move into normal commercial channels. No new legislation will be required to release a sizeable portion of Army production to relieve domestic-fertilizer shortages or to meet export requirements for the nonoccupied areas.

ARMY PRODUCTION

Ammonia (NH_3), basic in the production of nitrogenous fertilizers, is produced for the Army at three plants. Operation of a fourth plant will begin July 1, 1949.

Two plants, the Morgantown (Morgantown, W. Va.) and Ohio River (West Henderson, Ky.) ordnance works, are operated directly for the Army.

A third plant, the Cactus ordnance works (Etter, Tex.) is under lease to the Phillips Petroleum Co. with provision that the Army may acquire any or all of its production to meet fertilizer requirements for 4 years.

The fourth plant will operate as the San Jacinto ordnance works. It comes into operation through the removal of two inoperative fertilizer trains removed from the Missouri ordnance works at Louisiana, Mo.

The forecast for production of these plants for 1949, given in terms of NH_3, is 360,400 short tons. An increase to 462,800 short tons in 1950 is predicted on the following production schedule:

	Short tons, NH_3
Cactus	147,700
Morgantown	227,200
Ohio River	65,500
San Jacinto	22,400
Total	462,800

The production and end use of nitrogenous fertilizer material from Army ordnance

plants, given both in terms of NH_3 and contained nitrogen, is estimated for 1949:

	NH_3	Contained nitrogen
Anhydrous ammonia production	360,400	296,609
10 percent of ammonia to domestic fertilizer producers	36,040	29,661
10 percent of exports to nonoccupied areas	40,310	30,644
Production for occupied areas	284,050	233,733

DISTRIBUTION TO THE OCCUPIED AREAS

The distribution of nitrogenous fertilizer, in terms of nitrogen content, for the year 1949 will be:

Germany, 40,491 short tons, nitrogen content.

Japan and Ryukyus, 88,577 short tons, contained nitrogen.

Korea, 89,344 short tons, contained nitrogen.

Total, 218,412 short tons, contained nitrogen.

Confidential estimates (to be released with the 1950 budget message) show a demand next year for nitrogenous fertilizer material in Germany that is approximately half of the 1949 requirement. Requirements for Japan will increase by approximately one-third. Korea, however, ceases to be an occupied territory for planning purposes after January 1, 1949. Accordingly, the total demand for the occupied areas in 1950 will require approximately 150,000 short tons of contained nitrogen out of total Army production of approximately 381,000 tons of contained nitrogen.

After the Army meets the needs of the occupied areas in fiscal 1950, the amount of nitrogen remaining for diversion to domestic use or export will be substantially greater than existed this year. No legislation similar to that found in Public Laws 606 and 793 is required to make this surplus available to United States and foreign agriculture.

THE 10-PERCENT PROGRAM

There exists adequate cause for the immediate elimination of the 10-percent program established in Public Law 793. In accordance with the terms of the law, 10 percent of the Army production, or approximately 30,000 tons of NH_3, has been allocated to relieve domestic shortages which last spring threatened the shut-down of certain key plants in the Northwest which manufactured fertilizer.

The 30,000 tons of ammonia allocated has proved more than adequate to cover the statutory preferences of the law.

The allocation of ammonia in the 10-percent program was entrusted to the Department of Commerce. The Department reports that allocations have been made with difficulty and have not given the over-all relief intended by the Congress to reduce fertilizer shortages throughout the Nation. Officials of the Department recommend the abandonment of the 10-percent program.

The provisions of Public Law 793 restrict the allocation of the 10-percent program to certain plants which were producing ammonium sulfate during the 6 months preceding enactment of the law or which were facing imminent shut-down. In practice, these restrictions may become a deterrent to full fertilizer production. Already, certain sulfate plants to which allocations of ammonia have been made are unable to handle the full amount of their allocation. The result may be that the production of ammonia for the Army at the Cactus ordnance works will be curtailed for lack of storage space unless some means are found to turn the Cactus production to other plants than those named in Commerce Department orders.

THE 50-PERCENT EXPORT PROGRAM

The export program has worked reasonably well but the production and demand relationship is so much improved that abandonment of the 50-percent program would work no harm.

Approximately 30,000 tons of contained nitrogen have been diverted from Army production to meet the requirements of this program. The production in Army-controlled plants in 1950 and 1951 will be so increased, however, that the Army can meet the full demands of the occupied areas and still supply substantial quantities to move in export without requiring direct legislation.

The cooperating nations of the European recovery plan, which are the largest claimants of United States fertilizer exports, have procured nitrogenous fertilizer through normal commercial channels. If such a program of procurement is continued, the Army best can serve the program by releasing to domestic fertilizer plants the production of anhydrous ammonia not required for the occupied areas. The needs of Korea will be met, it is presumed, by commercial procurement subject to International Emergency Food Committee allocation so long as IEFC control of nitrogen continues in world trade.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The ammonia required for the 10-percent and the 50-percent programs has been released by the Army from the Cactus ordnance works. This plant, in accordance with congressional directive, was leased by the Army in the spring of 1948. Since then, its production has been increased substantially. The Army holds a 4-year option on Cactus production and has exercised its option in 1949. If the Army can meet its requirements for the occupied areas from the Morgantown and Ohio River ordnance works in 1950, it should permit the production of Cactus to move into normal trade channels to relieve the domestic situation and meet export requirements, in accordance with the terms of the lease. In addition, it is recommended that the fertilizer trains which are in process of transfer to San Jacinto be leased as soon as practicable on terms similar to those made at Cactus.

JOHN PILLSBURY, *Staff Member.*

Edward W. Allen, Fisheries Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Seattle Times of Sunday, January 30, 1949, concerning the work of one of the Nation's outstanding fisheries authorities, Mr. Edward W. Allen. The only compensation a United States member of the International Fisheries Commission receives is the pleasure of the work, the satisfaction from success, and occasionally a kind word. It is my opinion that this fine tribute to Mr. Allen, written by a well-known Seattle newspaperman, Mr. Victor B. Westphal, is also typical of the work of all the Commission members who have given their time and energy so freely.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISHERIES STATESMAN

(By Victor B. Westphal)

If you come in contact continually with any distinctive phase of your chosen work and like it, you specialize in it and ultimately become an expert in it.

That is how Edward Weber Allen, Seattle attorney and author, has developed during the past generation into the Pacific Northwest's outstanding authority on Pacific fisheries and activities. He is a member of two international commissions which handle these problems and has been called in consultation on similar questions elsewhere. Because of his interest in the North Pacific, he began collecting early publications and maps and, as a result, now has one of the most complete Alaskana collections in this part of the world.

When Allen started out in school and then went to the University of Chicago, he probably had no thought of becoming a fisheries expert. In 1907 he transferred to the University of Washington, was graduated in law in 1909 and admitted to the bar. His first job was as office boy for the law firm of Wright & Kelleher, obtained through the efforts of Dean Herbert Condon, of the university, who substituted for a member of the firm during the latter's absence.

Wright & Kelleher had some Alaskan business, representing Norwegian interests in the Territory. This was Allen's first contact with this phase of his work, which was to develop during his professional career until it reached its present important place.

After he had clerked for some time in the law office, his employers felt he should acquire experience in handling trial cases, so he went to South Bend, in Pacific County, where he later became deputy prosecuting attorney. There he again came in contact with fisheries cases which grew out of the fishing industry in the Columbia River. He took an increasing interest in these and when, in 1914, he became assistant State attorney general, the Fisheries Department was one of his charges. He handled all the fisheries cases in which the State was interested and recalls that he used to cruise around Puget Sound in the State's "navy," a small, cutter-type craft.

Two and a half years later Allen returned to his firm as a junior member, took over all of its fisheries work and expanded it. In connection with this phase of his legal activities, he made his first trip to Alaska in 1919. During the next 22 years he missed going north only one year.

Because of his increasing knowledge of fisheries problems, Allen was appointed a member of the International Fisheries Commission by President Hoover in 1932. This body, consisting of two American and two Canadian members, devotes its attention to regulation and conservation of the halibut fisheries.

In 1937 Allen was elected Chairman of that Commission and in the same year President Roosevelt appointed him to the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, which consists of three American and three Canadian members and handles salmon problems exclusively.

Tenure of the American members of these Commissions is subject to the pleasure of the President. Their duties require considerable work and responsibility as well as expense, for no salaries are paid. His compensation, says Allen, is in the satisfaction he receives in carrying forth the activities to the best of his ability. Because of his fisheries knowledge, he has been called on for advice and participation in other fisheries activities, both on the east coast and in the Pacific. Among them is the Pacific Fisheries Conference, which includes all elements of

the fishing industries from Alaska to San Diego. He also has been called into consultation by United Nations groups which deal with fisheries problems.

Allen admits to an interest in sport fishing, although his duties do not permit him to participate in it often. He feels that he works for the best interests of the sport fishermen by his membership on the Salmon Fisheries Commission, as its regulation of the commercial industry also has served to assure fish for the sportsmen.

It was in 1921, when Allen visited Lituya Bay in Alaska, that he became interested in Alaskana and North Pacific maps and in writing about the far north. He has shelf upon shelf of books, pamphlets, and newspapers about Alaska and the North Pacific, written in a number of languages. Some of these tell of the voyages of Vitus Bering, the Danish naval officer who discovered Bering Sea and Bering Strait in 1728 and the main body of Alaska in 1741. Others tell of the Russian voyages to the North Pacific in the mideighteenth century, while still others recount Captain Cook's voyages around the world. From later years there are writings by John Burroughs and John Muir, down through Rockwell Kent's gorgeously illustrated volumes.

The oldest map in Allen's collection of more than 300 is dated 1511. It is the first printed map of North America, showing just a part of Labrador. His chronological arrangement then follows the growing knowledge of the features of the North Pacific coast and Alaska. The maps all are originals and many are ornate in design and richly colored. They have been displayed at a number of exhibitions here.

As a writer, Allen has been very prolific for a person who has so many other activities. His first book, North Pacific, was published in 1936 after 18 years of taking notes, 14 trips to Alaska, and 5 years in the writing. In it there is the inherent romance of the sea, the drama of ocean fishing, rich humor, stirring adventure, photographs, and unusual maps.

North Pacific, in recounting how Japanese fishermen first invaded the field of the Russian fisheries, then entered Alaskan waters to threaten the basic fisheries of Canada and the United States, virtually forecast conflict between the United States and Japan, saying: "They (our so-called diplomats) were ignorant of Japan's modern method of declaring war—speaking sweet words of peace while she launches a surprise attack."

Allen's second book was on LaPerouse, who commanded the first French expedition to Alaska and led the first party of any nationality, other than Spanish, to visit Spanish settlements in California in 1786. Allen has made a hobby of collecting a library built around this picturesque early French explorer.

In addition, Allen has written scores of magazine articles on fisheries, trade, and legal matters.

One would think that in carrying on these activities, Allen must have had his time pretty well occupied and he'd not have much left for anything else. But not so. A record of his professional and civic participation reads like a page out of Who's Who. As an attorney he has held offices and headed committees in the State and national bar associations, has served as secretary of the State board of park commissioners, has been a member of the Seattle Public Library Board, for which he drafted a 10-year program, and the municipal league, Seattle Art Museum, and the chamber of commerce.

Allen also has been prominent in University of Washington alumni activities and in 1947 received the Alumnus Summa Laude award presented annually to an outstanding university graduate by the alumni association. This award had an amusing sidelight for Allen, as he was expelled from the university in his junior year for being mixed up, innocently, in the publication of the Siwash Chief, a comic magazine which ridiculed the faculty. When the fall quarter rolled around, however, everything was smoothed over and Allen completed his course.

Allen is married and has a grown son and daughter. There is a touch of the military in his family tree. He is the son of a Civil War hero, he spent 8 years in intelligence work during the Second World War, and his son was a naval officer. His brother, Henry, a well-known engineer, holds the rank of colonel.

Allen is senior member of the law firm of Allen, Froude, Hilen & DeGarmo. Among his club activities is membership in the famous Explorers Club of New York.

Despite his many and diverse interests, Allen enjoys them all and finds his reward in the personal satisfaction of a job well done.

School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release from my office today relative to an amendment submitted by me and my colleague [Mr. HOLLAND] to the National School Lunch Act appropriation.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER (Democrat of Florida) and Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND (Democrat of Florida) introduced in the Senate today an amendment to the National School Lunch Act appropriation which would provide a direct appropriation from the Treasury of $150,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act during the year ending June 30, 1950. In addition to providing more funds for the school lunch program, the proposed amendment would change the form of the appropriation as passed by the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress in two respects: (1) It provides for a direct appropriation from the Treasury instead of taking the money out of section 32 funds, thus releasing section 32 funds for authorized programs to assist distressed agricultural commodities in surplus, and (2) it makes available about $10,000,000 for nonfood assistance, such as kitchen equipment and the like, under the school lunch program.

Senator PEPPER and Senator HOLLAND said that they are trying to make it possible for every school child in America to get at least one good meal a day. If the Congress approves our amendment, it will mean that not only will our children be provided with at least one nutritious meal a day, but it will also be possible for the Federal Government to purchase more of our Florida citrus products for distribution under the program. Under the present school lunch program we are reaching only 22 percent of our schools and we know that we could easily use at least $5,000,000 more in citrus purchases under the school lunch program in addition to the $2,000,000 in citrus purchases already made during the current fiscal year. We will be promoting good health for our children and at the same time, providing a means to assist Florida's citrus industry."

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) to the bill (H. R. ——) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, viz:

On page —, lines —, strike out the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), there is hereby made available of the funds appropriated for the current fiscal year 1950 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance wtih the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act." And substitute therefore the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $150,000,000.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in his usual scholarly fashion the reverend Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, discussed with his congregation of the Foundry Methodist Chuch yesterday, according to reports in the press, the recent trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Dr. Harris went directly to the point of the whole controversy, I am sure, when he said:

The cardinal is really on trial for defending the things which every Christian steadfastly believes.

Because the report of Dr. Harris' address in today's Washington Post is one that will have a profound impression on all who read it, I ask unanmious consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

With further reference to the same much-publicized matter, the New York Times of Sunday, February 6, in an editorial depicts the implications of the trial which has just been completed.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 7, 1949]

HARRIS SEES SOVIET AT WAR WITH CHRIST

The Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, declared yesterday that the so-called trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is the signal for a war to the hilt between communism and Catholicism.

He told the congregation of Foundry Methodist Church, of which he is pastor, that the trial is also the signal for war between an anti-Christian colossus and any church which refuses to submit to its supremacy and regimentation.

"This trial," he continued, "is only the first in a series of onslaughts that may be expected. In this fear-haunted world the

battle is drawn between Christ and anti-Christ."

TRIAL OF CHRISTIANITY

"The cardinal is really on trial for defending the things which every Christian steadfastly believes. The plain fact is that he is simply anti-Communistic and that is the unpardonable sin with the present masters of the Kremlin and the puppet police states which they control," Dr. Harris declared.

Dr. Harris said the trial has been "following the usual Soviet pattern," in which the victim confesses, "at least partial guilt."

"One shudders to think of what diabolical torture rings such false admissions from human lips which before have spoken so uncompromisingly," he continued.

NEW DAY OF TERROR

"So-called Christian churches who will agree to let politics alone," he continued, "will not be molested. Silence and acquiescence may buy temporary safety. But to defy communism and its godless implications is to court martyrdom in the new days of terror," Dr. Harris declared.

"Every Christian minister who has eyes to see the sinister significance of the cardinal's trial stands with him and for him as he sits in the prisoner's dock before the modern Pilates. With him in the dock is Christendom.

"This fight is not just between Roman Catholicism and communism. It is between a godless communism and any type of Christianity worthy of the name," he concluded.

[From the New York Times of February 6, 1949]

JUSTICE EAST OF THE ELBE

Two significant remarks were made in a Budapest courtroom yesterday as the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and his fellow-defendants dragged toward its expected close. Judge Vilmos Olthys, who rose to his present position from former membership in the Hungarian Nazi party, took note of both of them. The cardinal's attorney in a weak and apologetic defense of his client said: "I remind you that all of you in this courtroom will likely be mentioned in world history and your deeds will be judged through the next century." We do not dispute this sentiment. The prosecutor, asking for a hard sentence, charged that the newspapers of the Western World want to prove that justice in the people's democracies is in the hands of the police and is not really justice. This second statement is inaccurate. Most of us would be glad if communism showed a change of heart by returning to the ancient tradition of fair trial for all persons charged with crimes.

The difficulty is that the Budapest trial follows exactly the familiar script of all such trials under Communist regimes. The best judgment of those whose business it is to study such things is that arrests and trials are completely political. Cardinal Mindszenty admitted in court that he was guilty in principle and in detail of most of the accusations made. Yet some of the charges were palpably false. We have to fall back on the belief that as in former and similar trials the accused persons were subjected to physical or mental torture or were otherwise induced to confess crimes they never committed. Yet Cardinal Mindszenty was basically guilty of one crime against the kind of people's democracy that has subjugated Hungary. He believed in the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, and in the dignity and value of the individual human life. And these beliefs are treason now in eastern Europe.

As the Budapest tragedy was drawing to its close, news came from Warsaw and from Prague. In Warsaw leaders of the Home Army, who rose in insurrection against the Nazis in 1944 and who came out of hiding 3 years ago on promise of amnesty by the present Polish Government, have been arrested on charges of conspiring against the lives of government officials. Security Minister Stanislaw Radkiewicz went so far as to say that reaction in Poland has been reduced to an intelligence service agency in the pay of the most aggressive and imperialistic power—the United States. We can guess what will happen to these Polish patriots. No doubt they will confess. In Prague the Czechoslovak Army has been purged without mercy, and trials of the arrested men will soon be held. One could almost write the story of those trials without any further news from Prague.

In this country a group of Communists are on trial on charges of conspiring to do illegal things. The outstanding news of that trial has been the manner in which the defense attorneys have used their privileges. We cannot predict the outcome. Indeed, in this country outcomes of trials are not predictable until the jury brings in the verdict. But we can say that the defendants are enjoying and will enjoy every right mentioned in our fundamental law and that they will not be treated as guilty until and unless they are proved guilty. The difference between justice in the people's democracies of eastern Europe and justice as it has developed over the centuries with the broadening down of freedom in the free countries does not need to be enlarged upon.

Bootlegging Menace Spreads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, February 4, 1949, written by Roscoe Drummond, chief of its Washington bureau, entitled "Bootlegging Menace Spreads."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOTLEGGING MENACE SPREADS

(By Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington bureau, the Christian Science Monitor)

A recent newspaper headline reads: "T-men crack down on stepped-up bootlegging."

Bootlegging? Stepped-up bootlegging? Arrests going up? Federal revenue agents busier? Gangsterism?

Yes; these are the facts as objectively and grimly reported by the Treasury Department of the United States Government. They are facts which will be startling to all who remain taken in by the soporific apologists of the liquor industry. It was they who blacked out the thinking of many people with the propaganda that the repeal of the eighteenth amendment automatically would repeal all the serious crime which they, the liquor spokesmen, attributed to it.

Neither throughout the country, where I have traveled a good deal, nor here in Washington do I see a disposition to do anything practical to deal with the social and criminal consequences of the licensed liquor traffic. One reason for this political indifference is that the public has not yet freed itself from the propaganda of the liquor industry, that it is uninformed on how bad conditions have become under repeal, and is unaware that these crime conditions are continuing to get worse, not better.

The basic fact which stands out from the Treasury's unemotional statistics is that today we not only have unlimited legal liquor but also a mounting volume of illegal liquor, bootlegging, crime, and tax evasion. Some of the supporting evidence for this statement is as follows:

Treasury agents are capturing more stills, with great capacity, and more bootleg liquor and mash than at any time since 1942.

The Treasury's alcohol tax unit from July 1 to November 1, 1948, seized illegal stills with a daily producing capacity of 70,466 gallons—50 percent greater than in the same period the preceding year.

The Treasury estimates that if the full daily capacity of these newly discovered stills had been sold illicitly, it meant revenue losses of $635,000 a day.

Although, primarily because of the shortage of sugar, bootlegging fell off during the war, it is now steadily on the upgrade. During the 1947–48 fiscal year 6,757 illicit stills were seized, compared to the 6,053 captured the previous year. Much of the postwar increase in bootlegging has taken place in the South, but recently Federal agents have broken up new rings in northern metropolitan cities. Just as examples: A 750-gallon still was captured on Long Island, with 2,750 gallons of mash ready to run; near Philadelphia, agents uncovered a still with a 2,000-gallon capacity and brought in four trucks, two trailers, two passenger cars, and nine prisoners.

During the first 4 months of the last fiscal year Treasury agents made 2,824 arrests for bootlegging, against 2,349 arrests during the same period the previous year.

All this adds up to the conservative but disturbing conclusion that no one really knows how much the Government is losing from postwar bootlegging; that the presence of unlimited legal liquor does not mean the absence of illegal liquor; that more of the one is bringing more of the other in its wake; that effective Treasury enforcement is discovering more and more bootlegging, and that it is begetting more crime and gangsterism which, contrary to the beguiling propaganda of the 1930's, do not at all seem to be the special attributes of prohibition.

Obviously the public will not be ready to cope with these problems until it is more fully aware of them. Even then, any political action dealing with the liquor traffic will have to gain widespread public acceptance and prove its workability. I am inclined to believe that the best approach is to try to begin modestly.

Can there be a valid argument advanced by any detached person why all liquor advertising in all media, magazines, newspapers, radio, should not be banned by Federal action? It may be fairly argued that the liquor industry has been licensed to meet an admitted demand for drink. But it has not been licensed in order to increase that demand.

Shouldn't the liquor industry be prevented from trying to increase the demand and from trying to plant the desire for alcohol with young people, as it now does by the most lavish, subtle, bland, and alluring advertising? To ban liquor advertising would be a good place to begin to check, to some degree, the crime now getting worse under repeal.

Portrait of Benito Juarez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Pan-American Round Table of El Paso had

a good good-neighbor idea. It is discussed in an article in the Albuquerque Tribune for February 2, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, together with a biography of Benito (Pablo) Juarez, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTRAIT OF BENITO JUAREZ

The Pan-American Round Table of El Paso had a good good-neighbor idea.

They discovered there was no adequate portrait in Washington of the almost legendary Mexican hero, Benito Juarez, the man who gave his name to the Mexican city just across the Rio Grande from El Paso.

So, they raised the money and commissioned Tom Lea, the famous Texas artist to paint a portrait of the "Liberator." Lea studied every available picture and daguerrotype of Juarez, went to Mexico City, read biographies.

His striking portrait this week was presented to the Government and accepted by it for permanent placement in Blair-Lee House, where distinguished foreign visitors are lodged.

Juarez was to the Republic of Mexico much what Abraham Lincoln was to our country.

It is fitting that his portrait should hang in one of our most famous public buildings.

The fact that it will, by virtue of the El Paso Round Table's efforts, underscores our good neighborliness.

BENITO (PABLO) JUAREZ

Juarez, Benito (Pablo) (1806–72), was born at Gelatao, near the city of Oaxaca, Mexico, March 21, 1806, of full-blooded Zapotec parents. He was educated for the church by a charitable merchant of Oaxaca, but in 1827 entered the Institute of Arts and Sciences to study law. In 1832 he received his degree of bachelor of law, and 2 years later was appointed advocate of the supreme court of the republic. He was governor of Oaxaca, 1847–52, and in this post showed himself so ardent a partisan of liberal ideas that, when Santa Anna seized the Government in 1853 he was imprisoned. Escaping to New Orleans, he returned to Mexico in 1855 to assist in a successful revolt against Santa Anna led by Alvarez and Comonfort, and held the portfolio of justice in Comonfort's government. In this capacity he issued the first of his great reform measures restricting the privileges of the military and the clergy (1855, 1856, 1857), which, culminating in the famous anticlerical constitution of 1857, caused a nation-wide rebellion and precipitated the War of the Reform. In January 1858 Comonfort fled the country, and Zuloaga, supported by the clericals and the army, declared himself de facto president and seized the capital. Juarez, as constitutional successor to Comonfort, declared himself the de jure head of the nation and was recognized by the United States (in April 1859), and in July he felt himself strong enough to issue the reform laws of 1859, which completely nationalized and secularized the church. By the beginning of 1861 the clericals had been everywhere defeated, and on January 11, 1861, Juarez entered Mexico City, and was constitutionally elected president. But his government was without funds, foreign creditors were clamoring for satisfaction, and the country, after 5 years of civil war, was in a state of economic chaos; so that in July 1861 he issued a decree suspending for 2 years payment on the national debt. This embroiled him immediately in a new conflict. Napoleon III, who had for some time been contemplating intervention in Mexico, promptly seized upon Juarez's decree as a pretext, and induced England and Spain (Convention of London, October 1861) to join him in the ostensible purpose of enforcing the payment of foreign creditors. Armed forces appeared at Veracruz in December 1861. Juarez showed himself conciliatory, and in February 1862 commissioners of the four Governments ratified the Peace Treaty of La Soledad. In March, General Lorencez landed with large French reinforcements; the English and Spanish commissioners withdrew their cooperation, and on April 12, 1862, Juarez declared war upon France. In June 1863 General Bazaine entered Mexico City, and on July 8 declared a monarchy. Maximilian arrived on May 28, 1864, and was crowned in the capital in July. By the spring of 1865 there were 30,000 French soldiers in the country, Juarez had been driven northward to the Paso del Norte, almost to the United States border, his armies were shattered, his government almost penniless. But he refused to relinquish his stand as constitutional president. The end of the year saw a great change. Maximilian was bankrupt; Napoleon saw the futility of his imperial project, and the United States, now that the Civil War was over, insistently demanded the withdrawal of the French troops. In February 1867 the last French troops sailed from Veracruz. Maximilian was captured at Queretaro on May 15 and executed on June 19, and on July 15 Juarez returned to Mexico City. He was reelected president in August. But his genius was not equal to the appalling problem of reconstruction which confronted him. Insurrections and revolts harassed his entire term. In the election of 1870 Porfirio Diaz and Lerdo de Tejada appeared as rival candidates, and Diaz, when Congress announced that Juarez had been again reelected, immediately headed a revolt. The movement failed, but in the midst of it, on July 18, 1872, Juarez died of apoplexy in Mexico City. With his death ends one stage of Mexican history. He did not, as Diaz was to do, wholly dominate his epoch, but during the most momentous period of Mexico's history he was the guiding genius, and is by many called Mexico's national hero.

Source: Encyclopaedia Britannica, volume 13, pages 161–162.

Federal Assistance for Rural Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement relative to Senate bill 244, which was introduced by the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself. I ask that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a table and a copy of Senate bill 244.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Government has been engaged in an extensive program of assistance to the States in highway construction. The Federal-aid program has provided the funds for a major portion of our great roads of today, and has provided the incentive for additional construction on the part of our States and local political subdivisions.

In 1948 Congress authorized the continuance of this program at the annual rate of $450,000,000, for the next 3 years. The funds thus provided on a matching basis, will be used to build primary, secondary, and urban road projects. There is a great need for the program that has been accentuated by the recent expansion of motor-vehicle traffic all over the Nation.

When provisions for assistance to secondary-road projects were first incorporated into the Federal-highway program, there was much talk of farm-to-market roads that would provide long-needed services for the farmers of the country. The roads that have been built under the secondary program have all been extremely useful, but they are actually secondary highways instead of rural roads.

NEW PROGRAM NEEDED

Too many of our rural people in every part of the Nation are still in the mud and dust. This condition is likely to remain until an active rural-road program is instituted by the Federal Government. To meet this need, S. 244 has been introduced.

Senator YOUNG and myself ask that $100,000,000 be added annually to our highway assistance program, to provide assistance to local governmental subdivisions in the construction and maintenance of rural roads. S. 244 is not intended as a substitute for rural-road programs within the individual States. The funds it would provide on a matching basis would supplement local programs, and provide an incentive for more active local programs.

The sum of $100,000,000 was agreed upon because that figure is approximately the difference in the amount of gasoline and motor-oil taxes collected by the Federal Government and the sum expended for highway aid. During the 1949 fiscal year, collections in this field totaled approximately $559,000,000.

The road-using public which pays the Federal gas and oil tax assumes that the money is returned to the States in highway aid. The money should be returned in as practicable a manner as possible, and its use for rural roads seems the most-needed solution. The farmers have been paying the gas tax for many years, yet the greatest portion of them are still without all-weather roads to get to town, to church, to school, to visit their neighbors.

The records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue make it clear that income from the gas and motor-oil tax is likely to continue to increase during the next few years. The following table lists the revenue for the postwar period:

Fiscal year:	*Lubricating oils*	*Gasoline*
1946__	$74,601,712.78	$405,694,550.72
1947__	82,014,668.57	433,675,867.82
1948__	80,886,921.61	478,637,625.15

The rural-road bill which has been submitted to the Congress eliminates the necessity for most of the very detailed specifications which are a part of all construction under the regular Federal-aid program. These specifications may be necessary for primary and secondary highways, but they produce a building cost per mile far beyond the practical purposes of normal rural roads. The rural roads which would receive assistance under this bill could be adequately surfaced at a cost of perhaps one-fifth of the present cost per mile of primary highways.

The Rural Roads Division in the Public Roads Administration that would be established under S. 244 would exist primarily to coordinate the activities of the various local programs and provide the proper technical information and assistance. Nothing is envisioned that would give this Administration the power to establish specifications which would price out of all possibility any adequate rural-road action.

The terms of S. 244 are not offered as being the ultimate perfection in this program. The sponsors are willing to accept any revision that would better achieve the purpose of establishing the road program.

PRESENT CONDITIONS

More than half of our rural roads are not of an all-weather variety. More than one-third are ungraded, undrained paths that should be called trails instead of roads.

Farmers own 30 percent of the trucks and 20 percent of the passenger cars in the Nation. They are entitled to a fair share of the roads, and a Federal rural-road program should be established and continued until every farm in the Nation has access to an all-weather road outlet.

Roads mean more than just convenience in the production and marketing of our food and fiber. They mean better mail service, better medical care, better educational opportunity, a chance to develop the social and cultural potentiality of our rural communities.

APPENDIX I

Apportionment of annual authorization for rural roads under S. 244

[Prepared by Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress]

Alabama	$2,512,139
Arizona	1,496,522
Arkansas	2,075,424
California	3,448,008
Colorado	1,809,686
Connnecticut	511,014
Delaware	487,500
Florida	1,454,787
Georgia	2,877,404
Idaho	1,300,526
Illinois	3,150,588
Indiana	2,396,214
Iowa	2,638,472
Kansas	2,621,265
Kentucky	2,285,515
Louisiana	1,703,389
Maine	930,851
Maryland	783,353
Massachusetts	524,370
Michigan	2,749,273
Minnesota	21,769,198
Mississippi	2,251,932
Missouri	3,037,580
Montana	2,075,587
Nebraska	2,095,004
Nevada	1,289,649
New Hampshire	487,500
New Jersey	695,623
New Mexico	1,679,940
New York	2,842,807
North Carolina	2,989,042
North Dakota	1,596,648
Ohio	3,077,285
Oklahoma	2,472,312
Oregon	1,705,111
Pennsylvania	3,511,528
Rhode Island	487,500
South Carolina	1,685,623
South Dakota	1,664,064
Tennessee	2,460,220
Texas	6,701,390
Utah	1,128,966
Vermont	487,500
Virginia	2,128,671
Washington	1,597,981
West Virginia	1,393,551
Wisconsin	2,441,130
Wyoming	1,259,905
Hawaii	487,500
District of Columbia	487,500
Puerto Rico	755,355
Total	[1] 97,500,000

[1] This figure excludes the administrative allowance (2½ percent) from the annual authorization. It is not the exact total of all the State items due to rounding.

APPENDIX II

[S. 244, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to cooperate with the States and their various local political subdivisions in the construction of rural local roads. The Commissioner and the constituent local governmental agencies shall agree as hereinafter provided upon the roads to be constructed within the various local political subdivisions: *Provided*, That all determinations with respect to specifications and standards of construction shall be made in each of the several States by joint agreement between the State highway department and the local political subdivisions of such State: *Provided further*, That all roads constructed under this act shall be of all-weather type of construction: *And provided further*, That such roads shall be free from tolls of all kinds.

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "rural local roads" means all roads (except roads located on Federal-aid highway systems or within incorporated municipalities) which are and normally have been the jurisdictional responsibility of county or local governments, including rural-free-delivery mail routes, public-school bus routes, farm-to-market and mine-to-market roads, and all other local roads that serve as feeder and connecting roads for service to agriculture, forestry, mining, and the general uses of rural occupation and habitation.

(b) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Public Roads.

(c) The term "State highway department" means the official department, commission, or board of any State, created and empowered to act in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.

(d) The terms "local political authority" or "local board" mean the constitutional and duly authorized taxing district, agency, board, commission, court, municipality, or police jury of any political subdivision of a State, having adequate powers to administer the highway system within its jurisdiction, and suitably equipped and organized to discharge to the satisfaction of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency the duties herein required.

(e) The terms "road" or "highway" shall include rights-of-way, bridges, drainage structures, signs, guardrails, and protective structures in connection with highways.

(f) The term "construction" shall mean the supervising, inspection, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway, including locating, surveying and mapping, costs of rights-of-way, and the elimination of hazards at railway grade crossings.

(g) The term "maintenance" shall mean the constant making of needed repairs to preserve a smooth-surfaced highway and to insure the continuing economy of its service.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created within the Public Roads Administration a division to be known as the Rural Roads Division. Such Division shall be organized immediately upon the enactment of this act. Such Division shall be in the charge of a Deputy Commissioner of Public Roads, who shall be a member of a recognized national engineering society, shall have had at least 5 years' experience in an administrative or engineering capacity in one or more county highway agencies, and shall be familiar with agricultural problems and economic conditions in rural areas. The Commissioner is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this act to the Deputy Commissioner. The Commissioner shall have authority to deal with State highway agencies and, through such agencies, with county highway agencies, town highway agencies, township highway agencies, or any other local governmental highway agency within a State in administering the provisions of this act.

(b) In the selection of personnel for the Rural Roads Division, technical and policy-forming members of its staff shall be chosen from men experienced in rural-road problems, needs, and construction. For the better administration of the provisions of this act the Rural Roads Division shall maintain a representative or representatives in each of the several States participating in this road program.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the sum of $100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Funds appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act shall be in addition to those appropriated for secondary roads under the Federal-aid highway system.

SEC. 5. That so much, not to exceed 2½ percent, of the appropriation for any fiscal year made under this act as the Commissioner may estimate to be necessary for administering the provisions of this act and for carrying on necessary research and investigational studies independently or in cooperation with the State highway departments and other research agencies, and for publishing the results thereof, shall be deducted for that purpose, and shall remain available until expended, except that within 60 days after the close of each fiscal year the Federal Works Administrator shall determine what part, if any, of the sums theretofore deducted for administering the provisions of this act will not be needed for that purpose and apportion such part, if any, for the fiscal year then current and certify it to the Secretary of the Treasury, the State highway departments, and the local boards, to be apportioned among all the States for the current fiscal year in the same manner as other amounts authorized by this act.

SEC. 6. (a) The appropriations provided under this act shall be apportioned among the States in the following manner: One-third in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the rural population of each State bears to the total rural population of all the States, as shown by the most recent Federal census; and one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural delivery and star routes in each State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States.

(b) The sum allotted to each State under the above apportionment shall be apportioned among the several counties, or other local political subdivisions within such State in such manner as the legislature of such State shall provide: *Provided*, That in any case in which the legislature of a State shall not have made provision for such apportionment the Governor thereof, acting in consultation with the highway department of the State, is authorized to provide for such apportionment until the legislature makes such provision.

SEC. 7. The Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under this act shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof plus a percentage of the remaining 50 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands, other Federal lands, and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area.

SEC. 8. The funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be expended on systems of rural local roads selected, after consultation with the Commissioner by agreement between the State highway departments and the local boards: *Provided*, That specific projects may be undertaken prior to such selection if it may reasonably be anticipated that such projects will become a part of such system when finally adopted.

SEC. 9. The State highway departments in consultation with local boards and the Commissioner shall formulate policies governing design, plans, and construction standards which will be consistent with the service

expectancy, cost, and requirements of economical maintenance for the character of roads contemplated in this Act.

SEC. 10. All construction projects exceeding $10,000 in amount for which Federal aid is allocated under the terms of this act shall be subject to competitive bidding and each such contract shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder: *Provided*, That any local political authority as defined herein may submit a competitive bid for any of its own road projects provided for in this act.

Extension of Federal Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Camel's Nose," dealing with the extension of Federal activities, published in the February 1949 issue of the Bulletin of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAMEL'S NOSE

Another crossroads is before America. A bill or several bills will be introduced in the Eighty-first Congress for the Federal Government to enter new fields in the support of education. Education in America, supported by the local and State governments and by voluntary agencies, has grown to a greater extent than in any other country. There is still a greater development needed, but that does not mean the Federal Government must be asked to extend its activities in this field.

The extension of Federal activities in fields which can be handled by the States and private citizens is dangerous to our independence and liberty. In America we should seek to keep government with the people where they live. We should question carefully every suggested extension of control by the Federal Government over the affairs of life. What we have seen in recent years of totalitarian government and centralized power should make us resist every move in this direction.

Such proposals are also dangerous to the ultimate financial stability of our country. Too many of those who want to improve the educational or other phases of general welfare think it is easier to secure funds from the Federal Government than to get action in all the States. This growing tendency to look to the Federal Government for financial aid in matters that should be the responsibility of government at the State level is in danger of taking such a large percentage of the national income that our economic system will eventually break under the load. The Federal Government was not meant to be an agency for appropriating money for all sorts of things. It was meant to regulate where regulation is necessary at the national level.

Trying to advance human welfare by seeking action and financial support from the Federal Government in matters that properly are of local and State concern is the method of impatient people with an inclination toward arbitrary force where education and persuasion should prevail. Genuine improvement in human welfare, and in education especially, will come only as the people are led to desire it and are willing to pay the cost in money and in personal effort. This is the way of a free people and it requires no Federal action or appropriation. It requires persistent effort on the local and State level.

Since serious talk of Federal aid to education started some years ago most of the States have taken action to improve their educational systems. There has also come a widespread prosperity in our country with more employed workers than ever before. Without undue sacrifice every State can take care of its own education in an adequate way. Those institutions of higher education which depend on voluntary gifts to a large extent will be able to live if the Federal Government enacts tax laws which make voluntary giving possible; whereas every added burden on the Federal budget requires higher taxes which lessen the possibility of voluntary support of education and other causes and tends to throw the work of these agencies back on the Government.

Everyone has heard dozens of stories of Federal waste. The closer to home we handle our affairs the less waste we will have. Everything that the Federal Government undertakes will cost more than it would cost if done directly by those who have to put up the money. The public attitude toward Federal funds is unfortunately different than toward their personal funds. Too many people look at public funds as they look at a grab bag or goods spilled from a wreck. If only they can get something out for themselves they are willing to ignore the cost and the waste. This irresponsible attitude holds extreme danger for the financial stability of our country.

Our freedom is threatened by every extension of Federal activity. With the camel's nose of Federal-aid-to-education in the tent, there may at first be little or no interference with the freedom of the schools, but there can be no doubt that in the end control will rest with the source of support.

In higher education now we have 1,700 institutions. Each is free to experiment and develop in its own way. Altogether they have produced the best educational system in the world. If Federal aid in the field of general education is once started, there can be no doubt that control will grow, and ultimately will come the loss of freedom and initiative in our school system. Central government control of education in Germany as practiced to the *n*th degree under Hitler made possible the education of a generation of fanatical youth that all but brought destruction to our civilization. Let us not think it cannot happen here.

The Christian religion has always emphasized the worth of the individual. The great eternal values are to be developed in individuals, not in states. They are attributes of individuals, not of states. States will be secure only as they provide for the development of strong, responsible, enterprising individuals; they will not be secure by taking unto themselves the control of life that should be left with individuals. We do not want a big Federal Government and little men—men who are born, educated, and die as wards of the Federal Government.

Education has had a steady growth in America and the end is not here yet. We are going to have to spend more money than ever before for education. For a given amount of money we will get better results if we raise it at home and leave the Federal Government out. Our State tax-supported colleges and universities should be supplied with the funds they need to do a first-class job. Our private institutions need the voluntary gifts of individuals and corporations so that they can continue to carry their load of nearly one-half of higher education.

Privately supported colleges and universities are happy to go on under the present methods of support. The fact must be faced, however, that the demand for education is rising and it must be met. Likewise the cost per student is rising. If those who should support the private institutions do not, this load of higher education must fall back on the taxpayers, doubling the cost. If our citizens do not assume their load, both as taxpayers for State-supported schools and as contributors to privately supported schools, the public will call upon the Federal Government to assume it. Our present method of handling education is the best for us as free individuals and for the good of our country. There is a great deal that is right about the traditional American way of handling things. The way we have built up for handling education is good. Now as the needs increase, voluntary giving, on the one hand, and State aid for tax-supported schools on the other will have to measure up to the need. Let us keep the Federal Government out of the field of general education.

Those of us who believe in private enterprise and the development of individual initiative as it exists under our system of government, should actively oppose bills introduced in the Federal Congress providing for Federal aid to general education. The education of its youth is the duty of the individual States and no State has yet exhausted its own ability to provide the full cost. Keep in mind that if the proposed bills to provide Federal aid to general education in this country become law, the money to cover the cost of this Federal aid will come from the taxpayers of the States and in nearly every instance the Federal Government will take out of each State more money in support of Federal aid than it will return to the State.

CHARLES J. LYNN,
President, the Trustees of Hanover College.

Inaugural Address by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and instructive inaugural address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, before a joint session of the General Assembly of Illinois at Springfield, on January 10, 1949.

I have had made an estimate of cost of printing this address. The cost is estimated to be $195.25.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly, Governor and Mrs. Green and fellow citizens: Every Governor of Illinois has tried, I suppose, to make his inaugural address brief. Few have succeeded. I, too, have tried, and failed, even though I have reserved for future comment many subjects deserving discussion.

I cannot fail, however, to note the significance and perhaps the historical opportunity for you and me in this hour when Illinois is passing from one epoch to another exactly as it did 100 years ago.

Historians say that 1848 was a transition year in the history of Illinois. A steel plow to cut the tough sod had, at last, been invented. The reaper had come to our prairies.

Plank roads had begun to lift Illinois out of the mud. The Germans and the Irish were coming. With 25,000 souls, Chicago was struggling out of the swamps. A railroad was creeping westward. Illinois was emerging from the log cabin frontier era and was taking its place in the new industrial day that was breaking upon the Union.

Illinois was to meet the test of a century ago. It was to become a pillar of strength and a progressive leader in the sisterhood of States. Behind vast barriers of sea and land, Illinois grew to maturity relatively remote and aloof from world affairs.

Today, Illinois stands at the threshold of another era—an era in which almost any event in any part of the world can have immediate and profound impact upon us. Barriers of time and space no longer isolate or protect us. And to a degree hitherto undreamed, events in America have prompt repercussions around the globe. Many watch us intently. Our mistakes, our failures, all are quickly exploited by those who watch with malice. But more watch with prayers.

Two convulsive conflicts have made our revolutionary generation the bloodiest in the history of man. And now with the post war period of gay optimism ending, the world settles down to a long trial of strength between individualism and collectivism—a trial of strength not limited to military and economic potentials but to moral and spiritual actualities.

Will Illinois in this new era take the leadership that it took in the materialistic era of the past hundred years? We can if we will it. We who meet here in Springfield today can take a long step toward making our Government a model, a precept in the best tradition of self-government. The forces of progress are at hand. In the century that stretches back to the log cabin door, nature, agriculture, industry, learning, and an energetic, diverse population have combined to bless us, enrich us, enlighten us. Nothing can stop us unless it be our own moral inadequacy, greed, selfishness, prejudice, excessive partisanship.

We are here, chosen by the people, not as party agents but as the peoples' agents. A common concern for the future unites us. A common desire to serve the State unites us. Political parties and party principles are essential to our system of government, but economic and social principles upon which a healthy electorate divides, diminish in importance as government descends from the national to the local level. Basic divisions between Democrats and Republicans on national issues have little bearing upon State or municipal problems. Mere partisan struggle for advantage will serve neither party nor State, because where you, as legislators of Illinois, and I as Governor of Illinois, now stand, it is only performance that will count.

I would not be misunderstood as to the role that Illinois can take in this titanic struggle for the future that plagues the world. What Illinois can and must do is to make itself the strongest link in that mighty chain which we call the United States.

We can set our own house in order. We can hearten our countrymen; we can demonstrate for all to see that representative government is healthy, vigorous, enterprising; that representative government is the best government. We can show the world what a government consecrated to plain talk, hard work and prairie horse-sense can do.

In accordance with the Constitution and tradition I shall today make a few suggestions calculated, I think, to put our house in order.

STATE AND LOCAL FINANCES

Let's assess first our basic problem. With the many new services which modern civilization demands of Government, revenue is the basic problem, because the amount of money available to do a given job determines how the job is done.

We must bear in mind that the period of manpower and material shortage of the war years when many services and expenditures of Government were necessarily curtailed is now over. Instead of an opportunity to accumulate excess revenues we now have an accumulation of imperative demands for capital improvements and services at greatly increased cost.

The State's taxing system is today producing revenue at the unprecedented rate of approximately $450,000,000 a year. But some of the major taxes are earmarked for special expenditure programs. Federal grants add about $75,000,000 a year, but these grants are also earmarked. As my predecessor, Governor Green, said to you last week, we have an unencumbered balance of about $100,000,000 in the State Treasury after allowing for anticipated deficiency appropriations and all legal or moral commitments.

On the other side of the ledger our bonded debt is $466,000,000, the second largest of any State in the Union. Moreover, to operate those State functions which are not financed from earmarked sources, we are now spending at a rate in excess of our income. Recent estimates show that expenditures of non-reserved funds in this fiscal year will exceed revenues by some $40,000,000.

This is the background against which we must assess the obligations of our State to its citizens. Many school units are hard-pressed despite increased property taxes. Many face increasing enrollments with inadequate buildings. Low salaries make it difficult to recruit and retain the best teachers. Likewise municipalities quite generally face grave difficulties in maintaining their essential services.

The people are impatient with bickering between the State and local governments over the division of duties and revenues. They look only for efficient and responsible government by whatever agency is best fitted. As taxpayers, they are entitled to a governmental structure both State and local which will insure the most economical administration of all government services. There is no justification for preserving the frills and extravagances of one government when the functions of other governments within the boundaries of the same State have been reduced beyond the minimums of common welfare. The citizens of the towns and school districts of this State are also the citizens of the State. We want no feast within our borders when there is also famine.

The problems of all governments in Illinois are the concern, indeed the major concern, of the State. Consistent with maintaining the State's credit and discharging its own prior responsibilities for the general welfare, our greatest single challenge lies in finding the means for better financing of schools, roads, and local services. To shoulder this heavier responsibility certainly is our obligation to squeeze the water and the waste out of governments at every level. Before imposing additional State taxes, certainly it is our obligation to enforce completely and effectively those we already have.

A greater participation in the financing of local government requires that the State demand economical and efficient local government. I do not think that State funds should be used to perpetuate structures that cannot do an economical and effective job of administration. But for well-organized local units the State should relax restrictions for its aid so as to insure the maximum of local initiative and responsibility in the management of local affairs.

The able revenue commission appointed by the sixty-fifth general assembly, of which Senator Merritt J. Little is chairman, will shortly make detailed recommendations to you concerning these basic problems of revenue and State aid. I anticipate that its conclusions will reflect its concern for our best interests and will be made with a vision which transcends fleeting political considerations.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Directly related to the problem of revenue, and to other road blocks to better government is, of course, the constitution of 1870.

I cannot now describe in detail all of its impediments. But everyone knows that uniformity of taxation of property, commanded in 1870 when land was the principal form of wealth, is impossible today. We avoid compliance by individual and official evasion and subterfuge. The price we pay is an inequitable taxing system with real estate carrying a disproportionate share of the burden, and a serious break-down in respect for law. Irreverence for constitutions threatens the foundations of constitutional government itself.

The flat constitutional command of legislative reapportionment every 10 years has not been complied with since 1901. Realistically, I apprehend that it is not going to be complied with so long as reapportionment would give control of both houses of the general assembly to Cook County, as it would under the present constitution. And in the meantime there is practical disenfranchisement of a very large number of citizens.

The present constitutional limitation on municipal indebtedness has resulted in a proliferation of local governments which increases costs, diffuses responsibility, and hampers effective control of government by the people.

The rigid constitutional pattern for the administration of the State's justice has resulted in a complex, unbusinesslike judicial establishment.

The hands of the legislature are tied in many respects by detailed unnecessary constitutional legislation. To use Governor Lowden's words of 32 years ago: "To withhold necessary power from a public official because he may abuse it, is to confess the failure of our form of government."

Experience has demonstrated virtual impossibility of revising the constitution by the process of piecemeal amendment. The need, therefore, is to assemble a constitutional convention to deal with the problems, promptly and comprehensively.

Accordingly, I request the general assembly to adopt a joint resolution submitting to a referendum the question whether a constitutional convention shall be called. I am confident that the general assembly will afford our people the opportunity to express themselves on this important question.

But legislative action alone is not enough. We must overcome those obstacles which have combined to defeat so many past efforts to revise our constitution.

The fear so frequently expressed that a new constitution will permit a graduated income tax or turn over to Cook County domination of the legislature is probably the best assurance that the convention will refrain from doing so.

I know of no large number of our people who favor a State income tax. I know a great many who oppose it. Rather than risk the rejection of a new constitution because of this apprehension I would urge the convention to leave the income tax problem precisely where it stands at present.

I do not believe that Cook County wants legislative dominance in both houses. Even if Cook County wanted that domination it could not get it in a constitutional convention, for there the distribution of voting strength as between Cook County and downstate would be precisely the same as in the General Assembly. The problem of achieving a balance of legislative power is neither novel nor complex. It was solved in our Federal system and it has been solved in the constitutions of other States.

Other objections will be raised to a constitutional convention. Some will oppose it

because of the ensuing uncertainties of interpretation, or because of the fear that hard-won gains and advantages will be lost. At best this is going far afield to borrow trouble; at worst it is according the convenience of the few precedence over the welfare of the many.

In the past political parties in Illinois have laid aside partisan differences in the consideration of basic constitutional issues. A vigorous nonpartisan effort is again imperative. The support of interested groups must be enlisted. And I hope you will change our election laws and restore to political parties the responsibility for constitutional issues which the men who wrote the Constitution of 1870 contemplated they should have.

I firmly believe that if we approach the task of revising our constitution in the manner I have outlined, our people will not fear or mistrust a constitutional convention and that such a convention, when assembled, will approach its responsibilities in the solemn spirit of retaining all that is of proven value while adapting our fundamental law to the needs of the present day.

PERSONNEL

Government, however good the laws, will not rise above the quality of the men that comprise it. Administration will be no better than the administrators. Revitalizing public service can't be achieved with good intentions and elocution about good government. The conditions of good morale are a sense of mission, self-respect and dignity.

The problem of personnel administration in a business spending half a billion dollars a year merits the closest attention of you, the board of directors, and of us, your executive officers. It will have mine, I assure you.

Meanwhile let me comment on three aspects of the personnel problem. In the first place, responsibilities of this magnitude demand highly competent and scrupulous men at the top. It is obvious to all that many of the senior positions in the state's service do not pay enough to support, let alone attract the quality of management and leadership these positions demand and the people deserve, except upon a basis of unselfish sacrifice. And too often, as many have noted, the reward for sacrifice in public service is not gratitude in lieu of dollars, but abuse, criticism, and ingratitude. Government cannot, will not, and should not attempt to match the salary scales of private business. But government can and must, if it is to be good government, pay salaries which are not an invitation to carelessness, indolence or even worse—corruption. And in good government, good men will find their supplementary reward in personal satisfaction, public esteem, and respect.

I will propose, therefore, while you are considering general salary levels, substantial increases in the salaries of key positions.

In the second place, competent and incorruptible men at the top are not enough. It is the men and women in the ranks who translate legislation and executive policy into action, who give government its meaning and character. In a real sense they are the government. And its quality depends not on the majestic buildings symbolic of the power and dignity of government but upon the spirit and competence of these people who are the government.

These employees of the State are not employees of a political party. They must not be so considered.

Today the major emphasis in civil-service administration is on recruiting, training, and promoting the best possible body of men and women to administer the public business. I have carefully considered whether, in view of our lack of progress in this most important field, I should urge you to consider the adoption of a more modern system of personnel administration to secure the necessary emphasis upon recruitment and training aspects of a genuine merit system.

I have concluded, however, that a sincere effort must first be made to achieve progress under our present machinery. One significant legislative change is essential, however. The function of position classification is an integral part of personnel administration, and I urge the general assembly to restore that function to the civil service commission, where it belongs.

In the third place, the modern goal of government is career service. Too large a segment of our employees are political transients rather than career servants. Ideally a change of administration should mean a change in policy-making personnel only. Hard, practical considerations point to the same goal. Current appropriations for personnel service are some $100,000,000 a year. The prudent expenditure of such a sum for the best possible public service imposes a grave responsibility upon the general assembly and the governor.

I have no illusions that progress in this field will be easy. But I know that the patronage system of the past is inefficient because effective administration is impossible when employees owe their allegiance and responsibility not to their supervisors but to their political sponsors. And I know that the system is even of diminishing political value as the electorate finds it more and more distasteful. Witness the last election in Illinois.

I believe sincerely that we are sufficiently mature to encourage the policy of career service and an expanding merit system in Illinois.

Incidentally the phrase "the government of Illinois belongs to the people of Illinois" has too often been abused by empty lip service. A healthy antidote to pay-roll padding and familiar political practices would be to invite constant public scrutiny of pay-roll facts and figures. The policy of my administration will be to require as complete and current pay-roll information as is feasible and looking to the future I urge the adoption of legislation expressing that policy.

PUBLIC WELFARE AND ASSISTANCE

Public welfare is perhaps our most moving and urgent problem. During the early stages when we were setting up assistance programs for dependent children, the aged, and the handicapped, we developed a two-headed organization to provide welfare services and assistance, frequently at the same time to the same people. It duplicates procedures and costs, and provide a double standard which affects salaries and methods of operation.

We have now had a broad experience in this field. I believe that by integrating the related services of the Illinois Public Aid Commission and the department of public welfare into a single unit, we shall achieve not only economies and increased efficiency but better service to the citizen who does not want two, three, or four agencies visiting his home. I urge that legislation effecting this integration be adopted.

I also recommend for the director of this much-enlarged department a strong advisory and policy-approving board.

Our dependent children, our old people, our handicapped and mentally ill whose welfare would be entrusted to this single department will in the future, as in the past, merit our first attention on humane grounds and also because such a large segment of the State's dollar will be allocated to their care.

I assume the general assembly will wish to proceed promptly by emergency legislation to increase aid to those for whom the last Congress made additional provision. The old-age pensioners, and the blind are in need of this additional aid which will increase maximum payments under old-age assistance to at least $55 a month.

In this connection I believe the legislature should also give consideration to providing pension payments for the aged and blind solely on basis of need and without arbitrary maximum. Ceilings other than the need of the recipients have been eliminated for old age pensions in one-fourth of the States and made subject to administrative change in an equal number of jurisdictions.

The population of our mental institutions is growing at an alarming rate. The deficiencies in their accommodations, care and treatment are well known. So is the appalling cost of new building on a scale to meet the demand. So also is the dearth of competent trained personnel to properly staff existing facilities, let alone large additional facilities.

Humanity, prudence and good sense compel us to attack this problem all along the line. Fire hazards, structural and sanitary deficiencies endanger the well-being and even the lives of too many of our wards and must be eliminated. The building program to enlarge our capacity and reduce pitiful overcrowding in some of our hospitals and to replace obsolete units cannot be deferred. Moreover the population of our mental institutions which now exceeds 40,000 can and should, I think, be reduced. Many of these patients are merely aged and infirm or senile. They do not need elaborate psychiatric and nursing care. Segregation with proper custodial facilities and care should both cost less and provide more humane care. Others could be discharged and maintained in their own or foster homes with the aid of old-age pensions. Still other patients could be discharged and maintained at home, treated and cared for through local agencies under the supervision of the State.

And to arrest the rapid increase in the mental hospital population we must also find ways and means of providing that treatment before hospitalization is necessary. With proper early treatment in their own communities many tragic souls could have remained in their homes and lived useful lives.

Too often the easiest way has been to commit people to institutions. Added to the human tragedy of hurrying merely distressing cases off to institutions is the ever-mounting long-term cost of institutional care, whereas these same people would get along better in their own communities and with proper treatment many would recover.

So I am suggesting a shift of emphasis from State hospitalization to home care. This will require time and the assistance of the ablest authorities in the fields of health and welfare. It will require the mobilization of all our public and private resources. It will involve a change in our philosophy and attitude toward these victims of troubled minds in a troubled world, with less emphasis on institutional care and more on prevention and clinical treatment.

This is but the pattern of a beginning, but a beginning must be made to conserve useful human life and control the cost of institutional care.

In the service of helpless people we have a special responsibility for the careful selection of personnel. To attract doctors, nurses, social workers, and skilled attendants we will have to give unmistakable proof of our determination to establish an attractive career service in public welfare in Illinois for those who have a sincere urge to help the less fortunate.

LABOR

Our position as one of the leading industrial regions of the world underscores our responsibility for enlightened leadership in protecting the welfare of labor. That the role of a State in labor legislation is less dramatic than the role of the National Government, makes it no less important. In fact the foundation of the safety and welfare of the worker rests on State legislation. The gains already made must not be impaired, and the foundation requires constant reexamination to insure its adequacy.

Accordingly, it is necessary that you review again the adequacy of workmen's com-

pensation awards in the light of the increased living costs of the injured workman. And it is imperative that I insure scrupulous and disinterested administration of a law which is of such critical importance to the workman and his employer.

The maximum benefits payable under our unemployment compensation act were last adjusted in 1944. The purpose of this legislation is to enable the unemployed worker to continue to purchase the necessities of life. Increases in wage scales and living costs since 1944 have obliterated the correlation between earnings and unemployment benefits which are now insufficient to cover nonpostponable necessities.

Our statute extends the benefits of unemployment compensation only to workers in establishments which employ more than six employees. Twenty-seven States, employing more than 60 percent of all the workers covered by unemployment compensation have extended their coverage to establishments employing less than six, without, apparently, encountering serious administrative difficulties. I urge you to consider this matter with other legislative adjustments in the field of unemployment compensation.

Here too, there are problems for the executive as well as for the legislature. The importance of security to workers, the heavy cost to employers, the volume of claims presented—all combine to demand the utmost administrative care to protect our unemployment compensation system against abuse by officials as well as undeserving claimants.

When the employment service was restored to the State at the end of the war, Illinois separated the related functions of unemployment compensation and the free employment service. Experience has shown that this separation impedes efficient service and I recommend corrective legislation to permit close coordination of these functions.

While I think weekly benefits payable to unemployed workers should be raised, consideration should also be given to a reduction of employer contribution rates taking into account the present size of the fund and the potential need for funds in the foreseeable future.

I trust that when the legislature is considering unemployment compensation it will also explore the related question of temporary disability insurance.

I also ask you to consider the advisability of enacting legislation to enable the State to take an affirmative role in the settlement of labor disputes. The Federal Government has, of course, its Mediation and Conciliation Service which participates in most labor disputes. Many States have such agencies, some successful and some unsuccessful. While I do not expect spectacular achievements from a State agency operating in this field, there may be a useful place for a State agency, operating on a modest budget with the cooperation of industry and labor, to render useful public service. I believe the possibility should be explored.

I should like to urge your consideration of a subject which, while it is connected with labor, has even broader implications. I refer to fair employment practices legislation. The ideals we so proudly proclaim cannot be reconciled with economic discrimination upon racial or religious grounds. To fall short of our professed ideals today, and in this field, has implications of hypocrisy and insincerity we dare not disregard. The eyes of the world are riveted upon our democracy. Prejudices can no longer find safe refuge in rationalizations. How we deal with this subject is intimately related to the world-wide conflict of ideologies which is the battle for tomorrow.

Moreover it is obvious that only as new opportunities for employment are opened will those now at a disadvantage be able to help themselves. I earnestly bespeak your thoughtful consideration of legislation to that end and toward the solution of one of our most difficult problems.

HIGHWAYS

I have mentioned the formidable needs of our schools, of the distressed local governments and of our welfare institutions. Governor Green said to you last week: "One of the principal functions of modern State government is the maintenance and improvement of highways." And I might add that it is also one of the most expensive. But good highways, country roads, and city streets are no longer a luxury or a convenience—they have become essential to our agricultural and industrial economy.

We already have an enormous investment in our highway system. We face an even larger investment to conserve what we have already invested and to improve and reconstruct our highways. Consistent with other urgent demands for capital improvements, and with an eye to the timing of public construction work in prosperity and depression, we must have the courage to adopt and initiate a long-range program suitable to our needs.

The sixty-fifth general assembly created a commission to study the whole problem of highway traffic, construction, and financing with a view to recommending a long-range highway program. Its report will be submitted to you by March 1.

If it is based, as I think it will be, on truth rather than conjecture, on demonstrable need rather than expediency; if it meets conflicts between political practice and public interest with courage and realism, I confidently believe that we will unite on its adoption. And I assure you that this administration will strive to execute it with honesty, nonpartisanship, and relentless determination to accomplish the maximum improvement of our highway system within the desire and ability of the people to finance.

AGRICULTURE

It must be the vigilant duty of the general assembly and the executive, working hand in hand, to foster the agricultural eminence of our prairie State, to cooperate with the Federal Government in control of floods and erosion, and in kindred problems. We must support the University of Illinois in its extension to the farmer of improved agricultural methods, but over and beyond all else we must think of the farm in terms of a living—a way of living and a place to live. Life on the farm in this age can and should be as attractive as urban life. I think we can well afford to give more thought to the amenities of life on the farm if we are to maintain the proud position of our basic industry, agriculture.

HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

The outstanding paradox of our advanced age is the persistence of an acute shortage of one of the most elemental requirements of mankind—shelter—in the Nation which beyond all others is the wealthiest, most productive, and most resourceful.

It is not necessary to present statistics depicting the cope of the problem. It affects almost every community in the State, large or small. We know now that rural areas have their slums as well as do our larger urban centers. And we know the major part of the price we pay for our acute housing shortage is measured in the intangible but cruelly real terms of broken homes, moral deterioration, juvenile delinquency, cynicism, and despair.

I have no magic formula to offer. I wish I did. It is clear that the problem is inherently one for private enterprise. And it is also clear that it cannot do the job at rentals or costs within the reach of those most in need. The combined resources of National, State, and local governments are necessary for the solution of this problem. Presumably this Congress will enact legislation along the lines of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill which will provide the basis for an enlarged attack upon the problem. We must be receptive to new ideas and prepared to support the Federal program with such legislation as is necessary.

However, there is one specific legislative change I would suggest. It is not a panacea, but legislation permitting more rapid acquisition of land for slum clearance and housing purposes should accelerate solution of the problem. Other States have had such legislation for many years. Ample provision can be made for the protection of property owners, and I urge you to consider legislation to this end.

One phase of the problem—the acute shortage of rental housing—requires a further word. Not only in Chicago, but throughout the State abnormal conditions prevail in the rental housing market. The continued existence of Federal rent control has substantially alleviated the potential hardships. One important deficiency in Federal rent control is its failure to provide for control of accommodations for nontransient occupants of hotels. The result has been that thousands of permanent residents of hotels have suffered rapid and often unwarranted rent increases.

The legislation enacted by the Sixty-fifth General Assembly did not meet this problem. By its language no local controls can become effective until all Federal control ceases. Hence local action to control this situation is impossible. But as the existing Federal control terminates March 31, 1949, and an extension is probable, I presume you will wish to defer any action to remedy this situation pending determination of the Federal course.

MINES AND MINERALS

The time has come, I believe, for you to give attention to the State's agency for discharging its responsibilities to those engaged in the mining and petroleum industries. The elements of good government are power and strict accountability for its exercise. I believe that in this light the organization of the Department of Mines and Minerals requires reexamination. In due course I will submit to you concrete proposals for its reorganization.

As there seems to be some ambiguity at present, I will also urge you to extend the civil service to include most of the employees of this department. Moreover, our mining laws contain much that is obsolete, and I strongly urge that they be rewritten in their entirety. Agencies are at hand to assist in this work and I shall have more to say to you in this connection at a later date.

CONSERVATION

Our natural resources of forest and wildlife are presently administered by an executive department headed by a director appointed by the Governor. Some 27 States have adopted the nonpolitical commission form of administration of their comparable services. None of them has reverted to the method which we retain. I think Illinois in its quest for more efficient and economical public administration could well take the same progressive step.

STATE POLICE

Another highly specialized field of the State service which should be removed from political control is the highway maintenance police. A public service charged not only with fearless and equal enforcement of the law but with the protection of human life itself demands character, discipline, and undiluted loyalty. The men who undertake this responsible and exacting work are entitled to a merit system which insures them protection and recognition for their service

without fear or favor. It has been done in other States and it can and should be done in Illinois if our first interest is the quality of our Government.

PUBLIC-UTILITY REGULATION

I invite your attention to the Illinois Commerce Commission. It is regulating public utilities whose rates and charges now exceed $2,000,000,000 a year. The five men who comprise the Commission have vast power, authority, and responsibility. Because of the enormous volume of its work, the technical character of its proceedings, and the tremendous importance of its decisions, the qualifications of the men who serve as commissioners are not alone the concern of a Governor but of the public and the utility companies alike.

Under existing legislation the men who are charged with these responsibilities are appointed by the Governor to serve for a 2-year term. Their annual compensation is $7,500. In earlier years under the administrations of Governors Dunne and Lowden the approach toward this important agency was somewhat different. In those days members of what was then more aptly called the public-utility commission received $10,000 a year and served for a term of 6 years. The terms of the commissioners were staggered to insure continuity and independence.

The importance of the work of the Commission has not declined in the intervening years; rather it has increased. Yet the system in Illinois is hardly conducive to indifference to the caprices of political fortune, nor is the compensation compatible with the responsibilities of the office.

I believe that the public will be better served by a commission whose independence and continuity is increased by lengthened and staggered terms of office. And I further believe that to attract to this vital public service the character of men it deserves, the compensation must more adequately reflect its responsibility.

CONCLUSION

In an effort to limit my remarks severely I have omitted any reference to many other matters of grave concern—the veteran, higher education, public health. I will have something more to say to you later about these and other subjects, and doubtless you will have still more to say to me.

In conclusion, I hope I have made it clear that the State of Illinois appears to me to be well off financially at present, but that with just demands increasing rapidly, and with matching revenue at best doubtful, in the next biennium if not this one, we may well face acute difficulties.

I hope I have made it clear that we should anticipate the future now, that I will have no reluctance to break boldly with the complacent, quiet past; that to match the relentless demands of these searching times for thrifty, efficient, honest government is the only desire of my colleagues and myself who have been so signally honored by our fellow citizens.

I hope I have made it clear that with sincere purpose, if limited talents, I want to execute your will, and serve my only ambition—to help to make of Illinois an example of the best in our democratic tradition, a leader in a noble future as it was in a noble past.

We Americans are proud that we were born of revolutionaries with a passionate faith in freedom and human worth.

We Illinoisans are proud that our State was born of simple folk who believed in an ever-better future.

This is our inheritance. To preserve it, to enrich it in the great age that lies ahead we ask that God, in His infinite power for good, help us make of Illinois a land where justice, honesty, and progress abound.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of telegrams which I have received in protest to the shameful trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Communist Government. I also ask to include the text of the sermon of Cardinal Spellman, delivered Sunday, February 6, 1949, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the telegrams and sermon were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DULUTH, MINN., *February, 7, 1949.*
Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Request that you immediately ask the President to lodge a vigorous protest with Hungary in respect to their treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty.

John Moriarity, Ernest Brassard, Gerald Heaney, Patrick Burke, Earl Bester, Mrs. Walter Dacey, E. L. Slaughter, Clara Sarvela, Merle McKeown, Joseph Daoust, Casper Visnia, Delbert Poppenberg, Dan Sullivan, Willard Beaudin, Paul Miller.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 7, 1949.*
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Won't you please encourage the taking of some drastic steps to check Stalin and his brutal work of destruction, in the name of God and Cardinal Mindszenty?

Mrs. R. S. SHEPARD.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 6, 1949.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please consider positive statement protesting action of foreign country persecuting Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince of the Catholic Church.

HOWARD F. HOENE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *February 3, 1949.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.:

In the name of justice do whatever you can to bring strong protest against the Hungarian Communist Government for carrying on the shameful trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

CHARLES A. BIRD.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 6, 1949.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We feel that our country is not taking sufficient forceful measures to free Cardinal Mindszenty. Please bring pressure on our Government to take drastic action immediately to prevent this terrible torture.

DILLON FLAHERTY AND FAMILY.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 7, 1949.*
HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please try to do something effective in Mindszenty case. If the defenders of freedom are killed in all parts of the world how long will our freedom last. Catholics will be very grateful to you for this.

Rev. JOSEPH A. CASHIN.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 6, 1949.*
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We feel that our country is not taking sufficient forceful measures to free Cardinal Mindszenty. Please bring pressure on our Government to take drastic action immediately to prevent this terrible torture.

Mr. and Mrs. J. J. WILLE.

DULUTH, MINN., *February 6, 1949.*
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Catholic citizens of this district are looking to you for leadership and initiative in the protest to Communist Hungary over the unfair trial and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. What are you gentlemen of the United States Senate doing about this matter?

Mr. and Mrs. R. J. RECKTENWALD.

TEXT OF SPELLMAN PLEA ON MINDSZENTY

(The text of the sermon of Cardinal Spellman delivered yesterday at St. Patrick's Cathedral follows:)

"A new god has come to you, my people. His fiery eyes do not flash through clouds of incense or from altar candles. They do not gleam from gold-framed darkened pictures of saints. This new god is not a stone statue worn smooth by the kisses of the faithful—he was not born in heaven. He is not far away, nor is he hidden from us. The new god is born from earth and blood—he strides ahead, and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west. This is the red god. The Seine shudders at his impact and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House. Hosanna! New god!"

My dear friends, you know these words are not mine. They are words of a Hungarian Communist, words that echo the thoughts of men depraved and deranged—men who do not know truth, love, justice, or faith; men who as their gods know only Satan and Stalin. Yes, these lines come from the pen of a Satan-bred man and are taught to the youth of red-enshackled lands—lands where everybody is afraid of everybody else, where even a son fears his father and fathers fear their own blood-sons, as all become serfs and victims of the relentless god of Baal.

Yes, the blasphemous lines I have just quoted to you are wild words, but they are wild words of warning and, unless we listen well and realize that we must counteract them by concerted, constant prayer and action, then these words but foretell America's and the whole world's doom.

CHARGE TORTURE OF CARDINAL

May 8, 1945—VE-day: On that day I delivered from this pulpit a prayer of thanksgiving for the victory of the hour, begging peace with justice, beseeching that as victors we do not offend God by sinning against His mercy. The peace that came was not God's peace, and because in the ensuing postwar years men's hearts have not been won back to God, I must this day as a protest against the crucifixion of humanity entreat your prayers for persecuted, tortured, victimized Cardinal Mindszenty.

This is Cardinal Mindszenty Day—a day of prayer and of protest. Prayer for what? Protest against what? There is no use to try to save Cardinal Mindszenty's life, for from the very hour he was taken away in the black

of night from his home, his flock, his aged mother, Cardinal Mindszenty became the victim of torturings and druggings that put him beyond the reach or realm of human help. It was he himself who said to me when he was the honored guest here less than 2 years ago, "My enemies can take from me no more than my life and that has already been given to God."

No; the physical Cardinal Mindszenty can no longer be saved. It is the spiritual Cardinal Mindszenty in his martyrdom of mind and body that we can fortify by our prayers, that in his soul he may know that in another part of the world other men are holding high God's torch of justice for Hungary's anguished peoples and the enslaved peoples of every land. And in our own dear land each free man and woman must protect and fight to keep his own integrity of conscience, his own God-given freedoms, and exert every effort to save America and the rest of the democratic, God-loving world from trickery, torturings, disasters, and defeat. For if we fail to learn a lesson from Cardinal Mindszenty's martyrdom, we shall fail ourselves, and ourselves face Communist conquest and annihilation!

MINDSZENTY'S CAREER PRAISED

When first Cardinal Mindszenty answered the call of Christ, "Come, follow Me," to that day when only 2 years ago, with 30 other priests and myself, he was received into the Sacred College of Cardinals, he has lived a life full and priestly. Then we rededicated our hearts, our souls, our lives to God, the propagation of the blessings of our faith and the perpetuation of Christ's church. And only 2 days ago Cardinal Mindszenty, priest of a people who love, honor, trust, and revere him, was brought to mock trial for his life, even though his life had already been signed away by the lords of communism—men among whom there is no honor, love, nor trust, either for one another, for their neighbor, or their God. Thus has the symbolic red of his cardinal's robes literally become the blood red of martyrdom!

Had I a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, a voice of iron, I could not compass all the crimes of the "men of sin" as they wage war against the "Man of Sorrows"; neither can I recount the miseries perpetrated by these slave-men, crimes which it is neither in my personal power to relieve or prevent. Nevertheless, so long as my heart beats and breath lingers in my body, I shall never cease to pray and labor to protect America, and warn and work against communism and all the evils growing from out its rotted roots, for I believe that "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God."

While a whole world waged war and tragically talked of peace, I witnessed the sufferings of men in a world trapped by fear, famine, and madness called communism. It was then that I resolved to try to pour into the minds of every American a sense of great gratitude to God for our freedom, our liberties, our opportunities, and instill within those minds the realization of the imminent dangers of atheistic communism to America.

And I avow that unless the whole American people, without further ostrich-like actions and pretenses, unite to stop the Communist floodings of our own land, our sons, for the third and last time, shall be summoned from the comforts, tranquillity, and love of their own homes and families to bear arms against those who would desecrate and destroy them. Yea, it is full time that a strong and vigilant America unite in prayer and protest against wasting the youth of her own Nation, and try to help save civilization from the world's most fiendish, ghoulish men of slaughter, lest the anguished spending of a million lives will end again in war's beginning!

Therefore, I beg you, my beloved people, let us not confuse prudence with lack of vision, unity, courage, and strength, as we watch nation after nation fall victim to communism, for prudence is often but an excuse for silence, procrastination, and compromise. Even today as we read newspaper releases from the Communist-controlled press of Budapest that tells us contradictory stories about a cardinal-priest who, so little time ago, we took unto our own hearts and homes, millions of Americans refuse to recognize that we ourselves are faced with these same merciless dangers.

You have all seen pictures of Cardinal Mindszenty in the newspapers at his mock-trial in his own country. And all of you saw pictures of Cardinal Mindszenty when, a free man, he sat kindly, willingly for his picture here in America. Can you fail to see here a man tortured and drugged—even though the Communist press dares to print that he "denies duress"? The Communists believe the American public is still easy to fool, willing to be "drugged" into believing whatever leaves them their own comforts, their own freedoms.

But are we, the American people, the tools and the fools for which the Communists take us? Are we always to endure the insults and wounds they inflict upon our American honor and decency as they enslave countries and persecute peoples, as they inflict wounds and beatings upon decent, God-loving men and patriots like Cardinal Mindszenty; for when the cardinal confessed to treason against the present Communist Government in Hungary he but professed his loyalty to his country. If this be treason to deny allegiance to an atheistic Communist government—then thank God Cardinal Mindszenty confessed to treason, as would I, if this free land of America were ever conquered by the demoniac people now using every foul means to overthrow our republic.

How long are we, free-minded, fair-minded, freedom-loving Americans, going to allow these same fiendish Communists to drug us with their propaganda and our own apathy? When will the American Government, the American public, the leaders in all phases of American life, religious, educational, political, labor, industrial, communications, yes, and entertainment, when will all free men raise their voices as one and cry out against and work against Satan-inspired Communist crimes? How long—O my God—shall we stand by and see Thy peoples who love Thee reviled, persecuted, and murdered by atheistic Communists who deny Thee and hate Thee even as again and again they crucify Thee upon Thy cross?

Cardinal Mindszenty's jailers gave him drugs—perhaps without his knowledge. They did not want another hero like Archbishop Stepinac. No, not another martyr would they have in Cardinal Mindszenty. They would break his will and show him to his people broken, weak, and faithless. That is why they took Cardinal Mindszenty away in the night because the first time he was arrested by the Nazis he walked through the streets with his captors, daring to bless his peoples with the sign of the Cross as they lined the streets to pray for him and beg his prayers for themselves who would, they knew, also be persecuted, abused, and slain.

PRAYS FOR CARDINAL'S MOTHER

Yet we should not grieve at the death of Cardinal Mindszenty, for man is not completely born until he dies to live in God. No, let us not be sorrowful nor tearful for him, but rather for one whom I pray God to take unto Himself ere her heart be more deeply pierced by anguish for her saintly son. I speak of Cardinal Mindszenty's 85-year-old mother. Like unto Mary, our own Blessed Mother, who was witness to the passion of her only Son, this mother's cross is far heavier than her son's. I pray that God shall raise this gentle mother into the arms of her own Mother Mary, there to be pressed close to the Sacred Heart of Christ, her Son, there at last to find peace.

In closing my plea for your prayers and protests on behalf of Cardinal Mindszenty, let me tell you a story that will, I believe, touch your hearts just as it touched a spark within my own when first I heard it. It is a story that I heard told by an American of another faith, a Jewish gentleman whose parents emigrated from a country which was then, as now it is again, held in bondage.

"My parents came to these shores about 70 years ago," this gentleman said. "They left behind them an old world filled with bitter hatreds and ruled by despotism. Here they found a new world filled with wondrous things—freedom, justice, opportunity, kindliness. Not things you could touch or eat, but, when you've never had them before, things that are more real than a pair of shoes or even a loaf of bread. As long as they lived they never stopped wondering at the glory of America. They were two of the best Americans I've ever known.

"Seventy years ago they came here with nothing but the clothes on their backs and great courage. Today their boy," this gentleman continued, "is speaking before a gathering of the leaders of America. In one generation our family moved from steerage to distinction. That's not one man's story," he added, "it is the American story. Multiply it a million times or more for every race, creed, and color and you begin to sense the miracle of America."

And this, my friends, is the America I beg Americans to save.

The Two Voices of Soviet Russian Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress and the country an analysis of the various and diverse views expressed by Premier Stalin with relationship to the motives and designs of the Soviet empire.

The analysis was prepared by Dr. Julius Epstein, of New York City, and appeared in the New York Daily Sun. It is my hope that it may prove helpful to Americans endeavoring to assay and evaluate the statements emanating from Russia with regard to Soviet foreign policy and peace proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TWO VOICES OF SOVIET RUSSIAN POLICY—COMPARISON OF PREMIER STALIN'S VIEWS EMPHASIZES THE FACT THAT COMMUNISTS' AIMS ARE PLAINLY ON RECORD

To the EDITOR OF THE SUN:

SIR: In his speech before the United Nations General Assembly's Political Committee last November Mr. Vishinsky referred to the interview Stalin granted the American correspondent Roy Howard on March 4, 1936 (not, as Mr. Vishinsky said, on March 1, 1935), with the following words:

"I should, however, like to remind you of a talk that occurred between Generalissimo Stalin and Mr. Howard * * * when Mr. Howard asked this direct question: 'Does this plan of yours mean that the Soviet Union to

any extent has given up its intention of carrying out the world revolution?'

"Stalin replied: 'We never had any such intention.'

"Howard went on to remark: 'It seems to me, Mr. Stalin, that the whole world has a much different impression.'

"Mr. Stalin answered: 'It is the result of a misunderstanding—a tragic misunderstanding.'"

What is astonishing is not the fact that Messrs. Stalin and Vishinsky are still trying to convince a world which already knows better of the peaceful aims of Soviet policy, but the fact that they still pretend to believe that they can do it by quoting those utterances Stalin made during the last years to innocent Britons and Americans.

I have especially in mind those interviews Stalin granted to: Roy Howard (March 4, 1936); Eddy Gilmore (March 22, 1946; Alexander Werth (September 24, 1946); Hugh Baillie (October 28, 1946); Elliott Roosevelt (December 21, 1946); Harold Stassen (April 9, 1947).

All those interviewers, without any exception, asked Stalin whether he believes that the Soviet Union can live in peace with the capitalist world or whether the Soviet Union wants to incite world revolution.

YES AND NO

As stereotyped as these questions were, so were Stalin's answers. When he was asked if he believed in the possibility of a lasting peace between the U. S. S. R. and the outer world, he said "Yes," and to the question whether the Soviet Union would incite revolutionary struggles abroad, he answered "No."

Unfortunately not one of those six interviewers was willing or able to confront Stalin with his own writings, or with appropriate quotations from the works of Lenin.

Since Stalin and his agents do not get sick and tired of repeating ad nauseam the same lies, it seems to be our duty not to get sick and tired of repeating the truth.

Let us deal only with the statement Stalin made to Mr. Howard, as quoted by Vishinsky in his recent speech, according to which it is a "misunderstanding, a tragic misunderstanding," to think that the Soviet leaders ever had the slightest intention to bring about world revolution.

The truth is, of course, the exact opposite. Since the day the Soviet Government came into being it has never ceased to try to bring about civil strife in foreign countries with the aim of world revolution. It has time and again forced the Communists in foreign countries to start civil wars, even when the native Communists did not consider the situation ripe for revolution. After the inevitable defeat the Soviets always put the blame on the leaders of the foreign Communist Parties.

REVOLUTION IN VIEW

If we study the Bolshevist literature from 1915 on we cannot discover a single sentence by Lenin or Stalin indicating restraint concerning the bringing about of world revolution, referred to by Stalin in his various interviews with rather innocent Americans and others, as quoted by Vishinsky in his speech of November 13, 1948.

But there are hundreds of passages which prove the opposite, namely, the deep conviction that: (1) The Soviet Union can never be safe as long as it is surrounded by capitalist countries, and that, therefore, bourgeois rule in all those countries must be broken, if need be, by pure violence and with any help the Soviet Union can render. (2) A series of terrible wars between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world is inevitable.

No Soviet writer, certainly neither Lenin nor Stalin, ever earnestly suggested to the world that the wars prerequisite to a universal victory of communism could be averted, or that it would not be the most sacred duty of the Soviet people to further any revolutionary struggle, and even to incite struggle whenever Moscow deems it appropriate.

On August 23, 1915, Lenin published an article entitled "The United States of Europe Slogan" in his Swiss periodical Social Democrat. In this article, quoted by Stalin in his Problems of Leninism (American edition, 1934, p. 69), Lenin says:

"Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence the victory of socialism is possible, first in a few or even in one single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own Socialist production, would rise against the rest of the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise revolts among them against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity come out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states."

On January 26, 1924, 5 days after Lenin's death, Stalin delivered a speech at the second congress of Soviets of the U. S. S. R. This appears in Stalin's work under the title "The Lenin Heritage." He said:

"Lenin never regarded the republic of Soviets as an end in itself. He always regarded it as a necessary link for strengthening the revolutionary movements in the lands of the West and the East, as a necessary link for facilitating the victory of the toilers of the whole world over capital. Lenin knew that only such an interpretation is the correct one, not only from the international point of view, but also from the point of view of preserving the republic of Soviets itself. Lenin knew that only in this way is it possible to inflame the hearts of the toilers of all countries for the decisive battles for emancipation. That is why this genius among the great leaders of the proletarian dictatorship laid the foundation of the workers' international. That is why he never tired of expanding and consolidating the union of the toilers of the whole world, the Communist International."

THIRD STAGE

During April 1924, Stalin delivered a series of lectures at the Sverdlov University in Moscow. These have been published as a book under the title "Foundations of Leninism." The American edition appeared in 1939. I quote from page 91 of this edition:

"The third stage of our revolution commenced after the October revolution. Objective: to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. The revolution is spreading beyond the confines of one country; the period of world revolution has commenced. The main forces of the revolution: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries. Main reserves: the semiproletarian and small-peasant masses in the developed countries, the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries. Direction of the main blow: isolation of the petty-bourgeois democrats, isolation of the parties of the Second International, which constitute the main support of the policy of compromise with imperialism. Plan for the disposition of forces: alliance of the proletarian revolution with the liberation movement in the colonies and the dependent countries."

When Roy Howard asked Stalin whether "this plan of yours means that the Soviet Union to any extent has given up its intention of carrying out the world revolution?" Stalin replied: "We never had any such intention." And when Mr. Howard pointed out that the whole world "has a much different impression" Stalin called it "the result of a misunderstanding—a tragic misunderstanding."

We have seen what kind of misunderstanding it is.

I venture to suggest that the next time an American statesman or journalist interviews Mr. Stalin he had better have some of the pertaining quotations in his pocket.

JULIUS EPSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

E Pluribus Unum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the February 1946 issue of the Reminder of Our National Heritage. The article was written by a distinguished scholar, Mr. Jesse B. Hornung, of Portland, Oreg. It is a thesis on the motto of the United States of America, E Pluribus Unum, and I feel will be of interest to many who will have access to it through the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MANY ARE ONE—MULTAE SUNT UNA—POLLAI EISI MIA—VIELE SIND EINS

(By Jesse B. Hornung)

The motto of the United States of America is E pluribus unum. As we are about to discuss this motto, let us have a formal definition. Webster says, "e pluribus unum. (L.) One out of many; one composed of many—the motto of the United States, as being one government formed by uniting many States." Webster further says, "Also motto of Michigan." It is the purpose of this writing to discuss this motto as the motto of the United States, and any reference to its being the motto of Michigan, though pertinent, to the case, will be incidental.

It is needless to say that the Latin motto most certainly does mean one out of many and that the accepted interpretation of the phrase is one composed of many, and that what the Latin phrase actually means, though used as the motto of the United States, is what it actually means used as the motto of Michigan. All this having been said, one might think that there is little or nothing left to discuss; but let us proceed.

It seems to be a sensible idea that what a phrase means when it is used as a motto should be the same as when it is not used as a motto. There does not seem to be any sufficiently good reason for a phrase having a meaning because it is a motto that it would not have if not a motto.

There is the word "egregious." It means exceptional. The "e" with which egregious begins is exactly the same as the "e" with which E pluribus unum begins. It means out of. The rest of the word "egregious" is derived from a Latin word meaning flock. One, or even some more, picked out of a flock on any basis of selection would be exceptional. If, in reading Latin, there occurs the phrase, "e pluribus unum," without anything to alter its natural meaning, the phrase would mean one out of many and the meaning of the phrase would be of the one being an exception.

In Latin, unus is masculine, unia is feminine, and unum is neuter. If Ovid, or any other, wrote "e pluribus una" and without anything to alter the natural meaning, the

meaning would be that she of whom he wrote was designated as exceptional. To many who have written or who have not written there is one who was exceptional; and una can be used as and is used as a proper name; not merely proper in the formal grammatical sense, but exceedingly appropriate as a designation for her who is to him who writes the exceptional one: to him she is one out of many, e pluribus una. Una is the name of a lovely lady in Spenser's Faerie Queene. Unum being neuter, e pluribus unum is one thing out of or selected from many things. The fact is that many by union became one. To interpret the motto as meaning one composed of many is unnatural, very artificial, and can be considered to be really erroneous. There is, however, a wonderful solution.

The one valuable feature of E pluribus unum as being the motto for the United States is that it is composed of 13 letters. The 13 letters uniting to form one motto is a perfect symbol of 13 States uniting to form one nation. From the moment of the union, it has continuously been that the many are one. There is beauty in symbols, especially when they are perfect. Nevertheless, they are less than useless when what they symbolize no longer in any wise remains; for, at best, symbols are only symbols and can become sources of error when realities are no longer visible; but, as long as realities are seen, symbols have their proper place, and they are better when they are perfect. Repeated coincidence that far exceeds probability can suggest origination from some higher power.

Michigan became a State in 1837. Florida became a State in 1845. Both States are very much surrounded by water. Besides what islands she has, Michigan is thought of as made up of the Upper Peninsula and the Lower Peninsula. Michigan had quite a time of it in becoming a State. Historically speaking, let us say it was the Lower Peninsula and the Upper Peninsula. The idea of peninsula is very prominent in Michigan. At the time the Great Seal of Michigan was made, the State may have been thinking only of the Lower Peninsula and that she was the only peninsular State. From 1837 to 1845 is 8 years. If in 1837 Michigan, in any respect, thought of herself as being the only one, she had a right to take E pluribus unum as her motto and the Latin phrase would mean for her exactly what it means in Latin—one out of or selected from many. As e pluribus una, the motto would have been perfect.

A city, a State, or a nation, or an ideal or an aspiration, when personified should be in the feminine. The large statue at New York should not be named as the statue of it, and is not so named; nor is it the statue of Apollo or of Hercules.

Territorially and to a certain extent administratively, the counties of a State have a relationship to the State similar to the relationship of the States to the Nation; but the counties of Michigan did not, by uniting with each other, form the State of Michigan as did the Thirteen Original States unite to form the Nation. Thirteen is of very great significance as to the forming of the Nation, but 13 is of no significance whatever as to the forming of the State of Michigan; nor has 13 any significance to Michigan as one selected from many, for then there were more than 13 as the many. It, therefore, follows that "e pluribus una" is a proper motto for Michigan, although it has only 12 letters. It also follows that though unum, being neuter, is not the proper designation for the Nation; yet, because of the symbolism, a total of 13 letters in the motto for the United States should be preserved, which symbolism, as here discussed, has no relationship whatever to any notion of bad luck or good luck nor is it related to any system of mystic numbers either as of one number or as of computation. The symbolism here discussed is the intentional symbolism that 13 symbolizes the Thirteen Original States. If any other symbolism for 13 as pertaining to the United States be proposed, let that also be founded on fact.

It is customary for a nation to have a flag. The United States flag of June 14, 1777, had 13 stars and 13 stripes. Vermont became a State in 1791. Kentucky became a State in 1792. The flag of 1795 had 15 stars and 15 stripes. Reducing the stripes back to 13 and increasing the stars according to the number of States, the flag, in time, became one of 13 stripes and 48 stars. It is obvious that the 13 stars and 13 stripes in the flag of 1777 was symbolism for the Thirteen Original States, and was intentional. Nothing mysterious about it. Fifteen stars and 15 stripes was a temporary solution for the problem caused by the admission of two new States. That such a temporary solution was employed when there was the possibility of more States than 15 indicates that, at the time, there was little or no idea of how great the United States was to become. The next change was a great improvement. It went back to the valid symbolism of 13 stripes for the Thirteen Original States, and permitted additional stars to represent additional States. If space for stars holds out, this looks like the final answer. This, concerning the flag, shows the persistence of the symbolism of 13 in our national affairs. There may be other examples of which the reader may know or can discover, but the emphasis given by the flag to 13 is very evident. Not only is it evident, but, in memory of the heroism of the Thirteen Original States, the symbolism of 13 should be forever preserved.

At the beginning, 13 was many. It was more than two or three. To begin a new nation was a heroic thing to attempt, a wonderful thing to accomplish. The basic idea was that they being many as States were to be one as a nation. States have individuality. A nation has individuality. Though uniting and forming a nation, the individuality of States was to be preserved. In uniting, they could then say as we can say now: The many are one.

After some time, the many was a much larger number than 13. It may be that at first each and every State thought that, as she had joined the Union of her own free will, she could leave the Union of her own free will. This emphasis of individualism at the expense of unity is contrary to "the many are one"; for, if they are one, the Union is indissoluble. There came a time when the attempt was made; but, though assisted, the attempt failed of success. The separation never was made. Through it all and continuously to the present, it has been that the many are one.

On the basis of the theme here discussed, there have been in the history of the United States only two events: the formation of the many are one and the preservation of the many are one. Because of these two events, two great personalities, secure possessors of enduring fame, continue in memory—glorious and heroic, not only in themselves, but, also, worthy as representative of those who were with them and who in spirit were the same as they. It is appreciated that this concerning them makes its first public appearance in an issue that is of the month of their nativity.

At the present time, 13 can seem to be a rather small number, as much as 3 less than one-third; but individualism should still be preserved: both of the States as composing the Nation and of the Nation as remaining true to her own ideals: the many should not lose their individuality because of the power of the one, nor should the one lose her individuality among the many nations of all the earth. On the basis of high and higher ideals, it should continue to be that the many are one and such a one as can refuse to be the same as any other. There is no good reason to change our national ideals for those ideas the others have to offer.

The phrase, "the many are one," contains 13 letters. In English, many can be masculine, feminine, or neuter. Latin has different forms of a word for masculine, feminine, and neuter. Latin has no the. Many in Latin feminine nominative plural is multae. Are in Latin is sunt. One in Latin feminine nominative singular (of course) is una. "The many are one" in English is "multae sunt una" in Latin, with multae (the States) feminine nominative plural and una (the Nation) feminine nominative singular. Multae sunt una contains 13 letters and is perfect both in itself and as for a motto. Greek has different forms of a word for masculine, feminine, and neuter. Putting the Latin phrase word for word into Greek, "multae sunt una" becomes "pollai eisi mia," using our letters for Greek letters as does Webster. Pollai is feminine nominative plural for multae. Eisi is sunt. Mia is feminine nominative singular (of course) for una. Pollai eisi mia contains 13 letters. Putting the Latin phrase word for word into German, "multae sunt una" becomes "viele sind eins," using our letters for German letters as does Webster. Viele is multae. Sind is sunt. Eins is una. Viele sind eins contains 13 letters.

The four languages used are English, Latin, Greek, German.

Instead of saying more that could be said, it is enough to say that English is the language of the United States.

Latin was the language of organization and still is.

Greek was the language of a supreme culture and still is to those who share in it.

To those whose knowledge may touch the surface of but does not penetrate into the past and who are surprised at the mention of German, the advice is extended to consult Webster; and, under Indo-European languages, discover that English is an item of the Teutonic or Germanic subfamily of the western division. The language of Luther, Kant, Schiller, and Goethe, and a host of others was and still is—and, there was Victoria, queen of glorious reign, of the royal house of Hanover, by natural descent succeeded by the royal line of Saxe-Coburg which was—and in reality still is—for war and policy do not really change the royal line when succession by natural descent remains the same.

It, therefore, can again be said that the four languages used are English, Latin, Greek, and German.

The last 4 months of the year have names derived from the names of numbers, the names of the months being derived from the names of numbers two less than the numbers of these months in the year. December is the last month in the year. It is No. 12 in the months of the year. The name "December" is derived from a name or word for 10. Ten is 2 less than 12. Similarly, with the other 3 of the last 4 months of the year. There is no intention or desire to suggest a change in the calendar, but with December being No. 10, February would be No. 12, and the end of February the end of the year. March would begin the year and September, October, November, and December would be Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10 according to the Latin of the words. This is not desired. Ten is a good place to stop. The words for 11 and 12 are not so good. It can be said, however, that March is the

natural month and the logical month to begin the year, being the first month of spring; and that spring is the natural season for beginning. With March the first, February would be the last. Commencing the distribution of the days with March, February, being last in line, got the days that were left and not as many as the others. Getting what was left also gave February the extra day that shows up a little less than once every 4 years. Getting what was left including the extra day is evidence that February was last in line.

February, being the shortest month, the mathematical probability that a specified nativity will occur in February is less than 1 in 12. The probability that the only two specified nativities occur in February is something less than 1 in 144. In the matter we are discussing the two nativities are the two nativities to which reference has already been made. Anything further and of the future can wait until in the future it is disclosed. We now have too many days of celebration. Let Memorial Day continue and include and so reduce the excess of special and distinctly minor days. February's 2 days are very important.

February was the month of the feast of purification. Before going into what was really the natural new year with its beginning of the seasons, there was the feast of purification. It may be that the ancient Romans did not have as much of the smugness of self-righteousness as is in the world today. Before going on into the new, getting rid of the foulness of the old was a right thing to do. They were under no compulsion to say or to believe that all that had been done was absolutely right. Very likely, there had been war. They were frank about it. His gates or doors of the preceding month were seldom closed. Reasons for war have stayed about the same. As a matter of fact, and he who knows the facts knows full well that this is a world of contest. The reason for contest is greater now than ever before. The two great Americans to whom I have referred had their careers in times of contest. The result of the first contest was that "the many are one" came into existence. The result of the second contest was that "the many are one" continued in existence. They knew why they were fighting. It did not have to be tediously and subsequently explained. It has been through contest that we move on to other and to greater things; and, also, it is through contest that we keep the goals to which we have attained. War for ideals can be glorious, though unattended by success. War, without ideals, can be ignominious even in success. War for worthy ideals with success is glorious and triumphant.

The feast of purification in the last month of the natural year did not mean that it was the end of all things. It was appropriate for a new beginning. The succession of witnesses for righteousness from Abel to Zacharias and then to him than whom there had been no greater and who also was slain did not mean that John was at the end of all things; but, as last of the previous, his was the voice to announce the coming age. Farewell seems like the end; but, in an address of farewell, there can be calm, discreet advice for the future; and, in an address distinctly related to the past, there can be the thought of rededication for the future.

It seems that in almost any condition that can be imagined individual heroism is possible; but war itself, however great the exhibition of power, when devoid of ideals is not heroic. A worthy purpose is required for it to be truly great, something more than material consideration. It is still true that it is the altar that sanctifies the gift rather than the gift that sanctifies the altar; but, where there is no altar, for there is no sacrifice, and where there is no gift, for it is a loan to be repaid with increase, there it is altogether different. Of all the forms of power this world has ever known where heroism is possible, wealth—be it in the large or be it in the small—wealth is the least heroic of them all.

The celebration of Independence Day has become altogether too feeble. It is not a good sign. Of the days of celebration that should be retained, Christmas is not known as the 25th and New Year's Day is not known as the 1st. Hearing and seeing the word, independence in the phrase, Independence Day, might help some to realize why and how this Nation came into existence. Being amenable to authority is part of life as we know it. A definition of Americanism is in order. Americanism is that doctrine which does not permit any citizen of the United States to acknowledge any political authority arising outside the American people.

The Thirteen Original States had had enough of the colonial. They united to become national, and did become national. Their political ideal was a free and independent Nation. They did not unite to be colonial either then or later. Their heroic success in devotion to a political ideal has never been excelled.

It seems that at the beginning and for some time later the Nation had no idea of the material greatness to which she was destined to attain. Naturally and properly enough, the thought at first was on the manner of origination. Thirteen seemed like many, and was; but is not now; but, both then and now—the many are one. There is ample literary precedent for saying the many are one, and to the effect that individuality of participants is preserved when union is made, as when of a certain relationship it is said that the two are one; or of another relationship when it is said that the three are one; or of an indefinite number as that they all may be one. In all these cases, individuality of participants is preserved. On the other hand, a cake is made out of several ingredients, one of them being flour. What was flour has become cake. It is no longer flour. Its individuality as flour has been lost. Every State is just as much a State as it ever was. Every State is just as much a State as is any other State. Individuality has been preserved. In the case of one, an original State, when there no longer was only one individuality—the result was two States. Greater population in large areas of present small population may result in more States.

The individuality of the Nation among the nations of the world should also be preserved. To acknowledge any political authority arising outside the American people is not Americanism. This means that we should not enter into any agreement by which anything or any one of the outside can direct our action or influence our ideals. We are not here to acquire ideals from those whose ideals are less than ours. It is appreciated that this writing makes its first public appearance in a publication that customarily carries the caption: Jesus Christ is a national question today. The United States is a Christian Nation. Whatever else may be tolerated, it still remains that the United States of America in her ideals is a Christian Nation. Before the Nation was formed, Christianity was the prevailing ideal, and is the prevailing ideal today.

Christianity is the prevailing ideal of the various States, original or however and whenever later acquired. Greater than any union of material consideration, there is a union of the highest significance in which it was and now is and may it continue to be that the many are one—multae sunt una.

Preservation of Woodlawn Estate as Historical Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me and other matter relative to the preservation as a historical shrine of the Woodlawn estate on the Potomac River.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

PUBLIC SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO SAVING OF WOODLAWN ESTATE AS HISTORICAL SHRINE

I would like to say just a few words regarding a very important project being undertaken by civic and partiotic groups in the Old Dominion State of Virginia for the preservation of a great historical shrine. These groups have banded together to solicit public support of the Woodlawn estate along the Potomac River, which was built by our first President, George Washington, for his adopted daughter, Nellie Custis. The estate, which is adjacent to Mount Vernon, was given to Nellie Custis and her husband by Washington as a wedding present. It is essential that public support be quickly mobilized lest this historic estate be lost forever for all succeeding generations.

There is a Woodlawn Public Foundation at 511 Tenth Street NW., here in Washington, which is securing funds which will be matched by $2 for every $1 collected by the Old Dominion Foundation.

We Americans have been negligent in preserving many shrines which could well have been utilized to inculcate true patriotism and devotion among our school children and among all succeeding generations. I am hopeful that through the wide support which this splendid project is receiving and will receive we will make sure that Woodlawn will be carried on for all future generations to cherish and behold.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader of December 18, 1948]

CHIEF ADORNMENT OF ROUTE 1

"Woodlawn?" the gentleman will ask frigidly when asked to contribute to the preservation of that old mansion almost opposite the side road from Route 1 to Mount Vernon, "why acquire Woodlawn?" He may elaborate: "Nothing of importance ever happened there; it was not the home of any eminent American. I can understand why you want Mount Vernon and Monticello and Stratford preserved and hope some day that Montpelier will pass to the public, but Woodlawn—why save that?"

Here is the reason: The average educated American who motors up and down U. S. Route 1 is aware that he is traveling over one of the most historic highways of the United States. As that road now runs from Falmouth on the Rappahannock, opposite Fredericksburg, to Alexandria on the Potomac, it follows substantially the line of travel used by George Washington, by George Mason, and by all the Southerners who contributed to the creation of this Nation from

the time of the First Continental Congress of 1774 to the Philadelphia convention of 1787 that drafted the Constitution of the United States.

During the years that highway was the only link by land of North and South, it was adorned with many splendid homes. On almost every point where tidal estuaries join the Potomac, there stood houses from which there went out men of ability and station to build a new republic. It was a unique society that contributed immensely to the wisdom of our basic law. That society probably was decaying economically by the time the American Revolution began, but its houses stood and its plantations flourished in 1775.

In the century and three-quarters that have passed since then, nearly all those memorials of a great social order have vanished. Fire, war, land exhaustion, and the neglect of hungry years have destroyed about four-fifths of the distinguished buildings. One may turn off the highway to the old house lanes, may follow the cedar-lined drive and come at length to some noble house-site where there remains scarcely a stone to indicate that a man who was an architect of American life labored there. South of the Potomac, on the main highway or close to it, three only of the estates of the first magnitude retain their old houses—Gunston Hall, Woodlawn, and Mount Vernon. All the others have yielded to time. If that is the dark harvest of less than 200 years, what may be expected for the future? How long will these three escape destruction, demolition, or, in the case of Woodlawn, restoration that might be as bad as ruin? We look forward in America to a long, long national life, during which every relic of the cradle days will be increasingly precious. How can we afford to let one-third of the surviving inheritance of that historic highway pass to private hands? Woodlawn must be acquired, not as a memorial of a family, but as a monument of a glorious era.

URGENT—TO SAVE WOODLAWN FOR THE AMERICAN NATION

OUR HERITAGE

"A good man leaveth an inheritance to his children's children." (Proverbs 13: 22.)

George Washington, Nellie Custis, Lawrence Lewis, William Thornton, Mount Vernon, Woodlawn. These are part of the heritage of all of us, the American people. They are the heritage of our children's children. We must preserve them. Woodlawn is a monument and symbol of that heritage. This property was once a part of Mount Vernon plantation.

George Washington himself sketched the rough plans for the historic dwelling shown on these pages. He selected the site; he arranged for the landscaping. Nellie Custis was his beloved adopted daughter. She married his favored nephew, Maj. Lawrence Lewis. The general gave them the property for a wedding present.

Dr. William Thornton, architect of the National Capitol, inspired by the site for the Woodlawn mansion and its exciting views of the Potomac, finished the general's plans. The result of Washington's vision and Thornton's genius was Woodlawn, one of the Nation's fine specimens of Georgian architecture.

THE OPPORTUNITY

Recently Woodlawn was about to be sold through the Circuit Court of Fairfax County, Va., for uses which would preclude its dedication to the public. A rare opportunity would be lost. The sale was on the verge of completion when Woodlawn Public Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, was formed to raise funds, buy the property, and devote it to the interest of the American Nation. The Woodlawn Foundation petitioned the court for time within which to buy the property.

Through the gracious cooperation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Mission Society, Inc.—the scheduled buyer—and the guardians of the Underwood estate—selling the property—the petition was granted. In consideration of the Woodlawn Foundation's deposit of $5,000 in cash, the Foundation will have until February 22, 1949, to raise the funds and complete the purchase for public use.

The purchase price is $170,000. We hope to raise that sum by popular patriotic subscription. If we fail, the sale to the Mission will go through. This is the opportunity presented to all of us.

It is now or never.

THE STORY OF WOODLAWN

On February 22, 1799, Nellie Custis married Maj. Lawrence Lewis at Mount Vernon. The bride was the famous beauty. (See her portraits by Gilbert Stuart and John Trumbull.) She was the daughter of John Parke Custis (son of Martha Custis Washington) and Eleanor Calvert, of Mount Airy, Md. The groom, an officer in the United States Army, was the son of Fielding and Betty Washington Lewis, of Kenmore, and was George Washington's nephew and aide.

The wedding was on the last birthday Washington was ever to see. Although urged by Nellie to dress in a new and resplendent uniform, he appeared at the candlelight ceremony in the worn buff and blue of his campaigns. Thus garbed, he gave the bride away. This gift, however, did not mean her departure from the Mount Vernon scene—there was Woodlawn.

In his historic letter of September 20, 1799, to Lawrence Lewis, the general confirmed his intention to give the acreage on which Woodlawn stands to Nellie and Lawrence jointly. He told the young man that the property would be devised to them in the general's will. He urged the major and his bride to start building their home at once. Washington described the lands which he himself had surveyed that very day, in these terms: "Few better sites for a house than Gray's Hill, and that range, are to be found in this country or elsewhere."

It is recorded that Washington "had made some rough plans and had shown them to Dr. William Thornton." On one of Thornton's frequent visits to Mount Vernon, the general suggested that they all inspect the site on which the Lewises were to build. "The famous architect was delighted with the wooded hill with its magnificent view of the Potomac and the country round about. Back in his office in Washington he made plans for the house and sent them to Mount Vernon.[1]

Nellie and Lawrence Lewis lived in Woodlawn 35 happy years.[2] With Woodlawn's nearness to Mount Vernon, Arlington (the Custis home), Gunston Hall (George Mason's home), and Belvoir (the Fairfax seat), and its charming mistress and attractive master, the new home became the center of a brilliant social life. Early guests included the Marquis de Lafayette and other European notables.[3] Woodlawn has been the home of many men and women prominent in the Nation's life. It has been a hospitable home, symbolic of American culture and living at their best.

THE IMPORTANCE

Dedication of Woodlawn as an active patriotic shrine is a timely project. The place, so charming in itself, is physical evidence of a great tradition. In a sense it is a part of George Washington. He saw it in his mind's eye. He thought of it as a home where two people whom he most deeply loved would carry on his traditions, his ideals, his standards. The stature of no individual in the founding of this Nation exceeds that of George Washington. Truly, he was the Father of his Country, our national ancestor.

American civilization, as we have inherited it and wish to pass it on, will not perpetuate itself automatically. We go forward more wisely and confidently when we are continuingly kept aware of our past. An informed America is a strong America. Woodlawn is an instrument for education and inspiration.

The time limitation on the purchase, for the people, of this symbolic estate will not permit of the usual processes of solicitation; hence, this direct appeal.

This is a project which has caught the imagination, warmed the hearts, and is opening the purses of men and women who would cherish, protect, and pass on to future generations a part of America's heritage. We pray that you are one of us.

You—firm in the belief of maintaining American tradition—can preserve an old landmark for your children and their children's children.

Woodlawn Public Foundation, Inc., 511 Tenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., Executive 7652.

Trustees: George Maurice Morris, president; Armistead B. Rood, secretary; Taylor Burke, treasurer; Alvin V. Baird; Robert Woods Bliss; Hon. Harry F. Byrd; Hon. Tom C. Clark; Mrs. Dwight F. Davis, executive vice president, National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings; David E. Finley, president, American Association of Museums and director, National Gallery of Art; Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, biographer of George Washington; Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant 3d, chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Commission; Mrs. George L. Harrison; Miss Genevieve Hendricks; Wilbur La Roe, Jr.; Col. Bryce Metcalf, president general, the Society of the Cincinnati; Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Byrne, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Miss Gabriella Page, president, Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities; Mrs. T. I. Hare Powell, regent, the Mount Vernon Ladies Association of the Union; Elwood H. Seal; J. W. Rixey Smith.

[1] Nellie Custis, Daughter of Mount Vernon, Rose M. E. MacDonald, New York, 1937, p. 165.

[2] Nellie wrote, in January 1802, to Mrs. Pinckney: "On Thursday I dined in company with my sister and Mr. Lewis, at Woodlawn, our new house, and it is so novel for me to preside in a house, that I spent a very happy day. It is nearly ready for us and I hope next summer we shall be favored with the company of yourself and General Pinckney there." Family Life of George Washington, Charles Moore, Boston, 1926, p. 166.

[3] "The carved bands around the fireplaces in two of the downstairs rooms were his (Lafayette's) gift to Nellie Custis for her home." Potomac Interlude, Dorothy Troth Muir, Washington, 1943, p. 32.

Unlike Mr. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial which appeared in last Saturday's Washington Evening Star:

UNLIKE MR. TRUMAN

The more one reflects on the extraordinary claim of power which has been made by the President, the more desirable it seems to meet the challenge implicit in his statement, and to meet it now.

It would be ridiculous to discuss this matter on the basis of an assumption that Mr. Truman has dictatorial aspirations. He is not that kind of a President. But there will be other days and other Presidents, and it is because of this that vague claims to vague powers, inherent or implied, are not to be lightly passed over.

The President cannot be directly quoted in his press-conference remarks. But he said in substance that the inherent and implied powers of the President are sufficient to enable him to break paralyzing strikes without any statutory authority to seek court injunctions. And he added that in time of emergency he felt that the President had immense power to do what was right for the country.

When a President uses language like this there is no room for complacency. Who is to determine what is right for the country? If that is a privilege of the President, one need only recall that this country might have had Henry Wallace as its President. Would Mr. Truman have been willing, as a Senator, to let Mr. Wallace decide what was right for the country, and use that immense power of which Mr. Truman speaks to impose the Wallace concept of right on the Nation? It is in a setting like this that one ought to appraise Senator TAFT'S assertion that "the very suggestion that such a power exists is a threat to the people of the United States." Most certainly, it is a suggestion which ought not to go unchallenged.

The Star believes that the President ought to have power to act, through the courts, to protect the Nation against strikes or any situation which would bring the country to its knees. But it also believes that such power should be conferred by act of Congress through a statute which would define the power with care and incorporate safeguards against its abuse.

Mr. Truman seems to oppose this, and certainly it is opposed by those who have been representing him before the Senate Labor Committee. But in case of need the President probably intends to seek injunctions, in the absence of statutory authority, by invoking what he regards as his implied powers. At any rate, in vetoing a labor bill in June 1946, he had this to say: "Injunctions requested by the Government itself, and designed to restrain strikes against the Government in cases where refusal to work for the Government has produced a condition of national emergency, are, to my mind, an essential element of Government authority."

If that power was essential in 1946, it is essential now. But there is this difference: In 1946, under the Smith-Connally Act, the Government had authority to seize struck plants. It has no such authority today, unless it may be that the President thinks he can seize under the inherent and implied powers to which he refers. It is significant that in the 1946 veto message the President declared: "Men cannot be forced in a peacetime democracy to work for a private employer under compulsion." If that is true, as it certainly is, then it follows that when a strike threatens the life of the Nation there must be some way for the Government to step in and take over the function of a private employer. The question is whether this should be done by authority of statute or under the undefined, unknown and probably inadequate implied powers of the President.

There are other interesting passages in the 1946 veto message. For instance, Mr. Truman, on that occasion, said: "Where excesses have developed on the part of labor leaders or management, such excesses should be corrected—not in order to injure either party—but to bring about as great an equality as possible between the bargaining positions of labor and management. Neither should be permitted to become too powerful as against the public interest as a whole."

That was wise and temperate counsel. Watching the current anything-but-admirable administration effort to discredit the Taft-Hartley Act, which tried to bring about an equality between labor and management, and to revive the one-sided Wagner Act, it is easy to wish that President Truman felt now as he felt in 1946.

Things Could Happen To Upset Impressive List of Bills Facing Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, February 5, 1949:

ODDS FAVOR PASSAGE OF TRUMAN PROGRAM, BUT RIFT IS POSSIBLE—THINGS COULD HAPPEN TO UPSET IMPRESSIVE LIST OF BILLS FACING CONGRESS

(By Frank R. Kent)

Apparently the literary artists who wrote Mr. Truman's state of the Union message for him put in everything they could think of. Certainly it bulged bigger with recommendations and proposals than any that can be recalled. But that was natural enough, for Mr. Truman, in his campaign, promised more things to more people than any presidential candidate ever heard of.

The question now is: How many of these pledges is he really going to try to redeem and how fully? Perhaps they are wrong, but the belief is strong among those close to him that most of his so-called program will be adopted about as he wants it. It will not be, informed men say, 100 percent. No President ever achieves 100 percent, but it will not be too far off. They also think it is going to be done swiftly.

They base these convictions upon the following: (1) His unexpected victory plus the fact that he will be President in his own right, for 4 years, gives him a political prestige and power in Congress he utterly lacked before; (2) the Democrats have the votes in both House and Senate; (3) the committee chairmen are nearly all administration men eager to aid; (4) the Democratic leaders are far more closely in tune with the White House than before; (5) Vice President BARKLEY, as the presiding officer of the Senate, and the President's close and able friend, Leslie Biffle, its secretary, are an extraordinarily effective and potent pair; (6) the Republicans are not entirely united; (7) resistance to the spending, involved in most of the Truman proposals, has weakened; (8) on nearly everything, the labor and farm lobbies will cooperate and support.

LIST IS IMPRESSIVE

Undoubtedly this is an impressive list. It would seem to mean that in a fairly short time the Taft-Hartley Act will be replaced by an utterly inadequate substitute which gives no protection to the national interests and removes all curbs to labor abuses; the civil rights program jammed through, despite the furiously protesting South; the Social Security System vastly expanded; the first steps taken in the socialization of medicine; Federal housing and Federal education bills enacted. That is the prospect, but, as the late Lew Dockstader used to say, "It just ain't necessarily so." There are a good many things that can happen to make this array of reasons less formidable. Calculations in regard to legislation, such as are above presented, often have a way of falling apart.

For example, already there appears a slight rift in the harmony between the President and the CIO bosses, who though they violently opposed his nomination and bitterly disparaged him personally, now assume all the credit for his election. There is reason to believe they have been demanding a little too much of Mr. Truman, pressing him a little too hard. And it is encouraging to note that Mr. Truman is showing some slight signs of resentment. There is a possibility here of a break in the administration phalanx that would affect results on more than one issue. And, human nature being what it is, there are other possibilities.

ODDS FAVOR PROGRAM

However, it must be admitted the odds favor the program and among the Presidential strategists confidence in their ability to drive it through is firm. In this connection it is interesting to note that no plan exists for giving reality to the two most sensational suggestions in the Truman message: First, that the Government put itself in position to engage in the steel business "in event of emergency"; second, the so-called bold new plan for developing the "backward areas" of the world. The first of these emanated from Leon Keyserling, left-wing member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. It does not have the endorsement of Dr. Edward Nourse, president of the council, but was startling in that it seemed a sudden move in the direction of the nationalization of industry. It now seems that there was no force behind this suggestion; that it was intended, perhaps, to frighten the United States Steel Co. and please the CIO's Mr. Murray, but otherwise is to be allowed to lapse.

As for the bold new plan, full credit for that noble notion is given Clark Clifford, close Missouri friend of Mr. Truman and counsel to the President. According to sympathetic "liberal columnists, the bold new plan just seemed a good thing to propose at the time and it did reap considerable favorable publicity. But, it is said, nothing will come of it—and nothing was meant to. Even the elegant and eloquent explanations of Secretary of State Acheson leave the idea in an extremely nebulous state. It is not unusual for Presidents to throw out in messages and addresses grandiose and impractical ideas about which they have no serious intention or convictions. However, it is somewhat unique to have two such ideas in the same document.

We Could Slip Into Socialism While Hating It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a question before the people of the United States. This is the question of what the people voted for on November 2. Observe I did not say whom the people voted for. I said what. There is a growing feeling, and many signs to support the feeling, that the United States, like other nations, is moving toward national socialism.

Our constituents at home say that they did not vote for national socialism. President Truman says that he does not want national socialism. The people of the United States could be compared

with the crowd which lined Pennsylvania Avenue on the afternoon of January 20. They saw a very distinguished gentleman, complete with top hat and a friendly smile, headed west toward the White House. Suppose this same gentleman had insisted that under no circumstances was he going to the White House, but that he intended to keep driving east, just as he had been driving 2 hours before, and would shortly cross the Anacostia Bridge into Maryland. What would the people be inclined to believe; what he said or what they saw?

Is not this the situation in the United States at this moment in its history? We say we do not want national socialism. Yet the direction in which the country is moving is toward policies of government under which the dignity of the individual, together with the rights and freedoms which are his under the American Constitution, are exchanged for mass benefits and planned controls and the tempting shibboleth of security. The end is weakness and eventual dissolution.

The situation has been ably discussed in a recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, in the issue of February 5. It makes provocative reading. I have asked unanimous consent today that this editorial, together with my comments, may be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorial follows:

WE COULD SLIP INTO SOCIALISM WHILE HATING IT

After the election returns were in the Post raised the question, "Did we buy socialism with Truman?" Some readers are still bending our ear with complaints that we were unfair, not only to President Truman but to the American people. Of course, these optimists assert, neither Mr. Truman nor the American people want socialism, and we were practically indecent to say such a thing. What we said was that, although neither the President nor those who voted for him want socialism, the essence of socialism is what we are very likely to get. Now we have the President's state of the Union message, the so-called Economic Report, and the inaugural address. The defense rests.

According to Mr. Truman, Americans have "abandoned the 'trickle-down' concept of national prosperity * * * (and) believe that wealth should be created for the benefit of all." What this seems to mean is that, instead of the benefits of a dynamic, imaginative free-enterprise system "trickling down" to all classes, including the laziest man on the street, the ordinary man is now to get his trickle from the Government, which, according to the President, "must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance." Since the only way the Government can see that one man gets his "fair share" is to take something away from another man, it is obvious that $6,000,000,000 in new taxes will be cheap in comparison with what will have to be taken from Peter if Paul is to get what he thinks is his fair share.

Apparently foreseeing that, when the Truman New Deal gets to rolling, there won't be much to trickle down from American industry, the President is ready with a recommendation that whenever the steel industry doesn't produce enough to satisfy the bureaucrats' ideas of ample production, the Government shall finance or actually build competing plants. Having all but crippled the industry's sources of new capital needed for improvements and expansion, the Government, under the whip of the CIO "economists," threatens to mow down free enterprise with subsidized competition.

The costs of medical care and social security are to be raised to new heights, on the theory that American medical care, the best in the world, can be improved if it is made as much as possible like medical care in France and England, where it is terrible. "Building costs must be lowered," but apparently by charging them up to Uncle Sam rather than by insisting on modifications of the make-work, slow-down and stand-in practices of the building-trade unions, which have raised wages enormously and reduced production per man to new lows. The proportion of rental housing must be increased, and to tempt private enterprise into this field, rent control must be extended and strengthened. To keep everybody in line, the Government must exercise control over the allocation of materials.

Despite all the lip service to private enterprise, the President's program leads straight to socialism as must any program which rests on the assumption that the Government is responsible for the economic welfare of every citizen, that the Government must give him federalized medical care and subsidized housing, underwrite farm prices and dictate the minimum which people may accept as wages and how much they shall be permitted to retain as profit, in the unlikely event that the concept of profit can survive such a hodgepodge of mothering. The people didn't vote for socialism; they voted for Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman probably doesn't want socialism, but he has allowed a lot of CIO planners to talk him into a scheme of things which, if permitted to run its course, adds up to socialism, however the poor misbegotten thing is christened.

Detroit Common Council Urges Restoration of RFC as a Secondary Mortgage Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the Detroit Common Council, requesting legislation to provide for establishment by the Government of a permanent secondary mortgage market. The action by the Republicans in the last Congress in abolishing the RFC as a secondary market has practically destroyed the whole building program. I strongly opposed that action in the last Congress and at that time I pointed out what the results would be. The building program in the city of Detroit is at a complete standstill because construction money and mortgage money is not available. You cannot build houses without financing, and private lending agencies and the big banks of the country have deliberately sabotaged the building program. There is only one way out, and that is to reinstate the RFC as a permanent secondary mortgage market.

The resolution follows:

Whereas builders and citizens are experiencing considerable difficulty in the financing of mortgages on homes; and

Whereas the construction and financing of homes, at a price the ordinary citizen can afford to pay is of vital importance to the city of Detroit as well as to the country generally; and

Whereas it is reported to this common council that the establishment by the Government of a permanent secondary mortgage market would make immediately available home financing, and would enable private builders to plan their home-building programs for the coming year, thereby producing a great many much-needed homes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested and urged to enact legislation to provide for a permanent secondary market for the purchase of real-estate mortgages, which organization will insure to investors that mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration and/or the Veterans' Administration will be purchased at par, with a further request that the legislation provide for a reduced rate of interest on Government-insured mortgages; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Michigan.

Adopted as follows: Yeas: Councilmen Comstock, Connor, Edgecomb, Garlick, Miriani, Oakman, Smith, and the president, eight. Nays: None.

Central Arizona Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, a communication has come from the Executive Department of our Nation which is of vital importance not only to California, but to all of the other States in the Colorado River Basin. I refer to a letter dated February 4, 1949, written by the Honorable Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Bureau of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Interior.

The letter reports the Executive attitude on the Central Arizona project, which is estimated to cost three-fourths of a billion dollars with large governmental subsidies, and which was designed to use waters of the Colorado River claimed by California under Federal contracts made in the early thirties in reliance upon which California has expended a vast sum of money to provide a water supply for its citizens. The letter is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In Director Webb's letter of September 16, 1948, concerning your report on the central Arizona project, he pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget had not completed its review and analysis but agreed with your suggestion that the report should be forwarded to the Congress. I am now able to advise you that the Bureau of the Budget has completed its study of the report and a determination has been made of the relationship of the proposed project to the program of the President.

The report proposes the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and power plant, a pumping plant at Lake Havasu, and an aqueduct from there to Granite Reef Dam in

central Arizona, together with other appurtenant works for the purpose of providing supplemental water to irrigation areas in central Arizona and hydroelectric power in the Arizona-southern California area. The total estimated cost of the project as of January 1948 is $738,408,000, of which (based on existing law) $420,000,000 would be allocated to irrigation, $291,000,000 to electric power, $18,000,000 to municipal water supply, $6,000,000 to flood control, and about $3,000,000 to fish and wildlife. It is proposed to install 750,000 kilowatt capacity of power generation at Bridge Canyon Dam, with about 2 percent additional generation at smaller dams on the project.

The report calls for an ultimate annual diversion of 1,200,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River at Lake Havasu (Parker Dam) with a pump lift of 985 feet to the Granite Reef aqueduct through which it would be conveyed for a distance of 241 miles to the Phoenix area of Arizona as a supplemental supply of irrigation water. The use of such supplemental water would be (1) to replace the overdraft on the groundwater basins, (2) to permit the drainage of excess salts out of the area and maintain a salt balance, (3) to provide a supplemental supply to lands now in production but not adequately irrigated, (4) to increase the water supply for the city of Tucson, and (5) to maintain irrigation of 73,500 acres of land formerly irrigated but now idle for lack of water. It is proposed to charge the district $4.50 per acre-foot of water. The duty of water varies between projects and between surface and pumped water. However, diversion demand of surface water at district headgate is given as an average of something about 5 acre-feet per acre. The rate for power would be (under existing law) 6.22 mills.

It is the opinion of the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation that the "project has engineering feasibility in the sense that there are no physical obstacles * * * that could not be overcome." He states, however, that "financial feasibility of the project is more difficult to determine," and further in his report to the Commissioner of Reclamation he raises the question of adequacy of the water supply for this project.

It is pointed out in the report that the project as proposed is economically infeasible under existing reclamation laws, and that it is essentially a "rescue" project designed to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Modifications in these laws are therefore proposed in the report to extend the repayment period for the entire project, including power, to 78 years, and to use one-fifth of the interest component on the commercial power investment to aid in the repayment of irrigation features.

The State of Arizona says that under the Colorado River compact, other agreements, and California's self-limitation act, Arizona has allocated to its use 3,670,000 acre-feet of water per year. It states that it is now using from the main stream of the Colorado and its tributaries in Arizona a grand total of 1,408,000 acre-feet of water per year, thus leaving 2,262,000 acre-feet for additional consumption which cannot be lawfully used elsewhere than in Arizona. It estimates the (consumptive) use for the central Arizona project at 1,077,000 acre-feet, which, together with the other planned uses, will still leave in the main stream, according to the State's estimate, a balance of 619,000 acre-feet apportioned to Arizona for future use and for reservoir losses. Arizona bases its case for diversion of water from the Colorado River upon these figures, and proposes to use such water as a supplemental supply for lands now inadequately irrigated. It states further that the irrigation of lands in central Arizona has been expanded beyond the water supply of central Arizona, and that this is resulting in an exhaustion of their underground supply with insufficient surface stream flow to maintain production in the lands now irrigated. To avoid the danger to the entire economy of the State, it considers it essential that the central Arizona project be expedited.

The Commissioner of Reclamation states that assurance of a water supply is an extremely important element of the plan yet to be resolved; that the showing in the report of there being a substantial quantity of Colorado River water for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes is based upon the assumption that claims of the State of Arizona to this water are valid. He states that the State of California challenges the validity of Arizona's claim and that if the contentions of the State of California are correct, there will be no dependable water supply from the Colorado River for this diversion. He further states that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior cannot authoritatively resolve this conflict between States and that it can be resolved only by agreement among the States, by court action, or by an agency having proper jurisdiction.

The comments of the several affected State governments and interested Federal agencies with respect to his report contain a number of objections and reservations with respect to the proposed project. Specifically, the Department of Agriculture questions whether the benefits actually exceed costs. It questions, as it has on numerous other occasions in commenting on proposed reclamation projects, the use of the gross rather than the net crop return method of computing benefits. The Department further says, "The actual relation of benefits to costs is still further obscured by what appears to be a failure to use the market value of power in estimating for evaluation purposes, the cost of pumping the water supply. Market value must be used in economic evaluation because the power has alternative uses." Commenting further on benefits, the Secretary of Agriculture states "while it is necessary that benefits exceed costs of a project is to be considered economically justified, this alone is not sufficient. Sound economics and common sense required: First, the consideration of possible alternatives; and, second, the choice of that alternative yielding the largest return on the investment." The comments of the Department of Agriculture go even further and state, "At least in the respects mentioned above, the benefits used in testing the economic soundness of the project are in error. We would recommend, therefore, that further and more careful consideration be given to the economic evaluation of the proposed project."

The Federal Power Commission points out that there is no essential physical relationship between the Bridge Canyon power project and the central Arizona diversion project but that the two are linked together in the report because of the need for subsidies from electric power income to help finance the irrigation improvement. It also indicates that the burden of the irrigation costs are considerable and that the proposed charges for electric power consequently approach a level where such power cannot be classed as low-cost in this region. The Federal Power Commission also suggests that further studies are required before the proper installed capacity at Bridge Canyon power plant can be finally determined and that it could probably be considerably more than the 750,000 kilowatts proposed.

The State of Nevada says, "There is a grave question regarding the availability of water to Arizona to supply the project. * * * Studies have been made by California and Nevada engineers which show there will be little or no water for the central Arizona project. * * * Investigations and reports should be held up or be only preliminary in character where there is a question as to availability of water." The State of Nevada further says that some engineers have expressed an opinion that the Bridge Canyon Dam and Reservoir cannot be utilized properly and to its full extent as a power project because of the limited storage behind the dam which in a few years would fill with silt and power service would depend on natural fluctuating river flow. They raise questions as to whether it would not be desirable to construct Glen Canyon, which would provide much additional storage capacity, at the same time as Bridge Canyon.

The State of Nevada, in commenting on the economic justification of the project, computes the net irrigation construction costs on the acreage which will be salvaged by the project at $1,469 per acre and questions the justification of such costs in the face of an estimated farm land value with irrigation of $300 per acre.

The State of California says that a controversy has existed between California and Arizona for many years as to their respective claims to Colorado River water and that conferences held on this subject throughout have not brought a solution. The State further says that until there is a final settlement of the water rights, the aggregate of Arizona and California claims to Colorado River water will exceed the amount of water available to the lower basin States under the Colorado River Compact and relevant statutes and decisions. It states that as long as the present unsettled situation exists, each State in the lower basin must, of necessity, interest itself in the others' projects which would overlap its claims. Accordingly, the State of California submits the following conclusions: (a) The plan for construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed project is not financially feasible under existing Federal reclamation law and the modifications thereof considered in the report; (b) consideration of an authorization for the central Arizona project should be withheld until a determination has been made of the respective rights of the lower basin States to the waters of the Colorado River system; and (c) extensive and detailed studies and investigations should be made by the Bureau of Reclamation of local water supply and use in order to determine accurately the amount of supplemental water needed for existing irrigated lands in the Salt River and Middle Gila River Valleys and to formulate plans for additional conservation of local water supplies.

With reference to the controversy that exists between the claims of the States of the lower basin, it is concluded that the situation has not changed since your interim report of July 14, 1947, on the status of your investigations of potential water resource developments in the Colorado River Basin. In the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation, approved by you, it is stated "that further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by lack of a determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system."

On July 23, 1947, Director Webb replied to your letter of July 19, 1947, as follows:

"Acting under authority of the President's directive of July 2, 1946, I am able to advise you that there would be no objection to submission of the proposed interim report to the Congress, but that the authorization of any of the projects inventoried in your report should not be considered to be in accord with the program of the President until a determination is made of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system."

From an examination of the report, of the comments of the affected States, and of the remarks of other interested Federal agencies, it is apparent that there are a number of important questions and unresolved issues connected with the proposed central Arizona project. The provision of adequate water supply, if found to be available, is admittedly

a high-cost venture which is justified in the report essentially on the basis of an urgent need to eliminate the threat of a serious disruption of the area's economy. Even so, the life of certain major parts of the project is appreciably less than the recommended 78-year pay-out period. The work could be authorized only with a modification of existing law or as an exception thereto. Furthermore, there is no assurance that there will exist the "extremely important element" of a substantial quantity of Colorado River water available for diversion to central Arizona for irrigation and other purposes.

The foregoing summary and the project report have been reviewed by the President. He has instructed me to advise you that authorization of the improvement is not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water rights controversy.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR., *Director.*

Especial attention is invited to the closing lines in the above-quoted letter:

That measures be taken to bring about a prompt settlement of the water-rights controversy.

Here is the President's expression not only that the central Arizona project, the authorization of which is sought by H. R. 934, introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is not feasible and should not be constructed at this time, but also by his plain statement the controversy over the use of the waters of the lower Colorado River which has extended for so many years should now be settled.

I have authored House Joint Resolution 73, which is designed to grant the consent of Congress to the joinder of the United States in a suit to be brought in the United States Supreme Court to settle this matter of vital importance to the entire Southwest. I cannot refrain from now inviting my colleagues in the House to support that resolution and speed the way—the American way—to a settlement of this grave interstate controversy by the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest court in our land.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to add a few brief statements to join in the protests of millions of others in denouncing the despotic rulers of Hungary in the arrest, imprisonment, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, who is loved, honored, and trusted by his own people and has always been held in the highest esteem by the rest of the world.

I wish to speak not only for myself, but also for the few thousands of my constituents in the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania who have sent me letters and telegrams protesting the unjust treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty. The Reverend John W. Keogh, pastor of St. Gabriel's Church, Twenty-ninth and Dickinson Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., has also vigorously protested the persecution and prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. Even before these events reached their present heights of concern to the public, Father Keogh was not only calling his own congregation to prayer but was also pleading for intervention on high levels.

Our words and prayers may not save the life of Cardinal Mindszenty, but we hope that they will arouse the United Nations into taking action to prevent the sacrifice of additional martyrs to the cause of liberty and justice. The world must know that the freedom-loving peoples of the United States and the rest of the world will not tolerate such demoniac actions.

These actions against Cardinal Mindszenty have not, as his accusers state, exposed his crimes, but rather have served to awaken the world to the existing threat to religious freedom. The tortures inflicted upon Cardinal Mindszenty are the greatest travesty of justice since the martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc. The millions of politically and economically enslaved people of eastern Europe undoubtedly have many tales of similar injustices imposed by their unscrupulous leaders who dominate them, but we are unable to hear their cries for mercy and help because of the barriers which encompass them. As citizens of the mightiest Nation of the world we should join forces, regardless of sect, and raise our voices in protest so thunderous that no barrier will prevent these anguished peoples from hearing us. We must let them know that the humiliation of Cardinal Mindszenty, and consequently the belittling of the Catholic Church and the nations permitting freedom of worship, will not go unheeded and is not without our sympathy. We must also declare our intention to exert every effort to relieve them from their suffering.

In this tragic hour we must rededicate ourselves to taking every precaution against the penetration of such unbelievers into our country lest they deprive our citizens of their cherished liberties of worship, education, expression and occupation.

The fact that the various other nations throughout the world have also recognized this latest crime as a declaration of war on the Christian world should make us realize that we can no longer afford to be apathetic toward similar threats in the United States to the security of the freedoms enjoyed by our citizens. The time has certainly arrived when democracy, in the true, American sense of the word, must become as universal as the Catholic Church so that there will be no possibility of recurring instances such as the mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac.

I wish to reiterate my plea that this entire matter be taken up by the United Nations without delay and to further request that the United States issue a formal note of protest to the Hungarian Government on diplomatic levels.

Amend the Displaced-Persons Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an editorial from the New York Times of today showing the complete breakdown of the displaced-persons law of 1948. In the first 3 months of the operation of the act only 2,499 DP's actually were admitted out of an expected 50,000. The people have spoken through the Congress to the effect that they want to help the displaced persons. They thought they were doing this when Congress passed the displaced-persons law of 1948. Those of us who opposed that law knew that it would not do the job. The facts are now plain for all to read. Congress should immediately amend this law so that it will carry out the people's intention.

REPORT ON THE DP'S

It has long been known that the "emergency" DP legislation of 1948 would meet no DP emergency at all—that, on the contrary, as President Truman warned when he reluctantly signed the bill, it would prove impractical and in general "form a pattern of discrimination and intolerance wholly inconsistent with the American sense of justice."

Now evidence of the full and shocking extent of how this law keeps the DP's out rather than admits them is before Congress. The Displaced Persons Commission, created to make the law operate, has just declared in its first semi-annual report that the act is "all but unworkable." Of 50,000 DP's expected to be admitted during the first quarter—the act would admit 205,000 in a 2-year period—only 2,499 persons have actually entered the country, the Commission points out. Because of legalisms and preferences which unrealistically set the worth of one DP group above another, the present law is a virtual betrayal of honest plans to move DP's out to new homes and new lives.

To put the law on a democratic basis, the Commission has recommended nine major changes. The country is clearly eager to have Congress make amends for this clumsy, eleventh-hour legislation that has hampered the DP program. Governors' commissions, civic groups, labor groups have shown that their communities want and need the contributions of the DP's. And good men in both houses of the present Congress, of both parties, are striving to overcome the defection of the last Congress with bills that will throw out the injustices spotlighted by the Displaced Persons Commission. The will exists. The time to act is now.

"Bald-Faced" Move Seen by Truman on Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, which

appeared in the Washington Star, Saturday, February 5, 1949:

"BALD-FACED" MOVE SEEN BY TRUMAN ON LABOR BILL—PUBLIC ALARMED AT IDEA OF ENDING LEGAL POWERS TO MEET STRIKE

(By Gould Lincoln)

When is an injunction not an injunction?

Answer: Apparently when it is asked by the Attorney General on order of President Truman. The bald-face attempt of the administration to placate and satisfy the public, alarmed at the idea of doing away with legal powers to meet a strike that might paralyze the country, and at the same time to satisfy the labor leaders who are demanding the elimination from the proposed new labor law of all reference to injunction, looks like an act of political desperation.

Further, the claim by the Attorney General that the President has inherent powers—seemingly acquiesced in by Mr. Truman himself—has a strange sound in American ears. Almost it is like the sound of those powers which were claimed by kings under so-called divine right. These inherent powers to halt a devastating strike which Attorney General Clark is now claiming for his chief must have been sadly lacking a couple of years ago—when Mr. Truman rushed to the Capitol and asked a joint session of Congress to put through a law empowering him to draft railroad workers into the armed forces when a Nation-wide tie-up of the roads was threatened.

EMBARRASSING POSITION

The administration has been in an embarrassing position ever since it tackled the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act—its major promise during the recent Presidential campaign. Bringing to the Senate Labor Committee a bill which repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and reenacts the Wagner Act with certain minor amendments favored by the President, Secretary of Labor Tobin has had a tough time. Under the probing questions of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and other members of the committee, it has been difficult for him to sustain objection to certain provisions of the law he seeks to repeal. And as for the elimination of that provision of the law which enables the Government to act in national emergencies (caused by strikes or threat of strikes), Mr. Tobin has had to rely on the dictum of the Attorney General—a pretty poor reliance.

The opponents of the Taft-Hartley law have charged that "the era of government by injunction" is being revived in labor disputes, as a result of the Taft-Hartley Act. A glance at the record of the operation of the law for the first 16 months of its operation gives this charge the lie direct. The statute authorizes the use of the injunctive process under three provisions. First, the National Labor Relations Board may seek a temporary restraining order (an injunction) on its issuance of a complaint charging that any person has committed an unfair labor practice. Second, the board is required to seek injunctive relief in secondary-boycott cases when there is reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true and that a complaint will issue. Third, the act authorizes such relief on petition of the Attorney General when a strike or lockout is one which affects an entire industry or a substantial part thereof, and if continued will imperil the national health or safety.

WRIT RECORD RECALLED

Under the first provision mentioned, injunctions were sought in only 6 cases; under the second provision, in 29 cases, and under the last, in 6 cases. It is interesting to note, too, that injunctions were granted in 3 cases only under the first provision; in 15 under the second, and in 6 cases under the last. It is the last category of cases and injunctions which is involved in the controversy between the Attorney General and the President on the one hand, and Mr. TAFT and other members on the committee on the other. Those actions involved serious situations and problems for the country, among them a coal strike and a longshoremen's strike.

The Taft-Hartley Act is direct. It gives the necessary authority by law, to move in strikes or lockouts which may affect public safety; it specifies that the Government act to halt such strikes by injunction, but only for a period of 80 days during which every avenue for settlement may be explored.

Mr. Clark, on the other hand, would leave out of the law this specific power—and yet make use of the injunctive process under so-called inherent powers of the President. Mr. Truman, pressed at a press conference, said he had no particular objection to including in the new law the injunctive power, but insisted such action was not necessary. He, too, apparently, is relying on these inherent powers.

Two world wars, during which the President, by law, was given great powers, have tended to magnify the Presidential power—even though war is over. It's a dangerous trend.

Housing Problems in Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution passed by the Common Council of Milwaukee relative to mass tenant eviction and rental inequities and an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of January 29 entitled "If Property Owners Are Wise":

Resolution opposing mass eviction move of Milwaukee Property Owners' Association

Whereas there is a tremendous housing shortage, not only in Milwaukee but throughout the Nation; and

Whereas in a recent survey conducted locally, it was shown that housing was considered number one on Milwaukee's list of needs; and

Whereas governmental agencies and others are spending much time, money and effort in seeking more housing; and

Whereas in all these efforts the greater emphasis is being put on rental housing as against housing for sale; and

Whereas a movement has started on the part of landlords elsewhere in the United States to begin serving eviction notices wholesale in defiance of Federal controls; and

Whereas this movement for mass evictions is being taken up in this area by an organization known as the Milwaukee Property Owners' Association: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Common Council go on record as being unalterably opposed to this move or to any other program designed to take housing out of the rental market at this critical time; and be it further

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Common Council take immediate steps to inform the proper rent control authorities of the Federal Government of the inequalities of present rental controls both to tenants and to owners and the immediate necessity for correction thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the officers and directors of the Milwaukee Property Owners' Association, and members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 29, 1949]

IF PROPERTY OWNERS ARE WISE—

Owners of rental property who are now toying with the foolish idea of withdrawing their units from the market through mass evictions have a case if they are wise enough to use it.

The total economic picture can be assembled to show clearly that these property owners in general are entitled to an increase. Taxes have gone up, operating expenses have advanced, everything that goes into the owner's costs are higher. He has been held down unduly while others were free to adjust themselves to the inflation that took place.

There had to be rent controls, and there still have to be. The rental market is too limited to allow a free flow of bargaining. But that control should be held strictly to the prevention of abuses and practices that would force an intolerable situation.

If all this were made crystal clear through the presentation of convincing facts, we believe that Congress would be forced to take notice. But the property owners will never achieve relief by trying to throw people, en masse, into the street. The property owners would lose their case right there.

Federal Tort Claims Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended are excerpts from an address made by Irving Payson Zinbarg, Esq., a member of the New York bar and one of my constituents, on the subject of the Federal Tort Claims Act. Without expressing my agreement or disagreement with the views expressed in this address they involve the point of view of the practicing lawyer in cases affected by this act and should prove of interest to the Members on how this type of legislation is working out in practice:

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

I have been asked to talk tonight about negligence cases and more particularly about the Federal Tort Claims Act which is fairly new, yet is old enough for us to have formed some opinion as to whether or not we like it.

You know, as I do, that none of us may, for a wrong done us by it, sue a government, be it municipal, State, or Federal, without the consent of that government.

Our city of New York has given blanket consent for such lawsuits and during my work at the trial bar, I have also brought many actions against the city for injuries or wrongful death resulting from negligence. There is no limitation on how much one may sue for, nor does the city say how large the attorneys' fees shall be.

The State of New York consents to the bringing of suits against it for its negligence and it has set up the court of claims for decision by a judge, without a jury, of such cases. No restriction is placed on the size of the attorneys' fees.

On August 2, 1946, the Congress of the United States made into law the Federal Tort Claims Act which provides that the United States like the city or State of New York, now is treated as any other tort feasor, and is liable for damages resulting from the negligence of any employee of the Government, while acting within the scope of his

employment, in accordance with the law of the place where the tort occurred.

The act, among other things, gives the Federal court jurisdiction in such cases, and provides that the district judge take testimony and determine the issues without a jury.

Although it is now more than 2 years since the Federal Tort Claims Act became law, and although I am admitted to practice in the United States district courts, the United States circuit court of appeals, and the United States Supreme Court, I have been consistently declining retainers in tort actions brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Why? Because in enacting this law the Congress on the one hand seemingly helped injured persons, or the widows and orphans of men killed, to speak up for payment for the wrongs done them, but the Congress on the other hand, or rather with the same helping hand, gagged the mouths of these maimed, or widows, or orphans, by providing no adequate means for these citizens obtaining experienced counsel to present their claims. They fixed the attorneys' fees at 10 percent under some circumstances, and at not exceeding 20 percent under any circumstances. Since the net fees of trial lawyers like myself are usually about 25 percent of the recovery, after remitting the share of the attorneys who forwarded the claims to us, neither we, nor the general law practitioner, nor legal specialist in other fields can afford to accept retainers under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the niggardly payments provided therein. Remember, I invest my work, my staff's work, my overhead and all of our energies on the assumption that I will obtain a judgment, settlement, or verdict for the claimant. I take the risk that if I do not succeed in getting the client any money, I've lost all.

But, you ask, why should good, capable, experienced, well-equipped attorneys like yourselves refer tort actions at all? Why should a tort action differ from an action for breach of contract? After all, in either action the plaintiff has the burden of proving what he claims, and in either action the plaintiff bears the burden of proving his damages. In either action the defendant must, by cross-examination or by his own witnesses either attempt to defeat the claim or, at least, mitigate the extent of the damages. Why should attorneys' fees in tort actions be measured by a different yardstick than fees in contract actions? Why is the provision for payment of attorneys' fees as contained in the Federal Tort Claims Act so inadequate—so unjust?

In tort actions, the parties are usually strangers to each other, and since one party knows nothing about the other party to the lawsuit, or about his background, or his employees who may have committed the tort, neither can furnish his attorney with any information wherewith to attack the other party. Therein lies your first difference between tort and contract. In the contract action there has been some dealing with, some research into background of, the other party, either before or during the business venture. You know some weak or vulnerable spot in the other side.

In the tort action, it is for you to dig up motor vehicle reports, driving records, autopsies, hospital records, medical records, police records, military records, Workmen's Compensation reports, weather reports and any number and type of reports or records which may be used for or against your client. Such items of personal history are usually irrelevant in contract actions.

In tort, as contrasted with contract, actions, the exhibits and photographs are for you to obtain and the witness is usually for you to find and interview. The witness may be a businessman, professional man, policeman, laborer, mechanic or tramp—all strangers to you, to your client, to the opposition. Immediately, this involves going yourself, sending an assistant, or having available an honest, reliable, ethical investigator to go to the scene, to find the witnesses, if any, and bring back their statements to you. If, as many necessary witnesses, the principal eyewitness is unwilling to give statements of what he saw, or unwilling to go to court, the investigator must be clever, educated, experienced or persuasive enough, to be able to point out that the last kernel of hope for justice for your client will be shattered unless the witness treats your client as he would like to be treated were he in the same predicament.

While you, your assistant, or the investigator, as your wallet may dictate, is busy at the scene, interviewing witnesses and having appropriate photographs taken, you, or an assistant, must be writing for, or obtaining, the records to which I previously referred. In addition to these, you or an assistant, must talk with the doctors, scientists, chemists, technicians, experts to get their views. You must know how, and prepare to meet these experts on their own battlefields. This may not seem to differ greatly from getting the views of the expert, and knowing how to examine, in a contract action involving, let us say, the manufacture of a scaffold, but it is really different. Let me illustrate that! Assume you are retained in a personal injury and death action in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, against not the employer, but a third party, who is alleged to have negligently hung a scaffold on a building. You must know the mechanics of a scaffold, its manufacture or composition, as well as the proper manner of rigging it and, possibly, the nature, durability or composition of a parapet wall, masonry, a smoke stack, black iron, sheet metal, a block and tackle, whether wire cable or sisal, hemp, flax or jute rope is proper, State and municipal safety rules, labor laws, penal law, ordinances, etc. All this goes far beyond your contract action concerning the scaffold manufacture.

You must be far more expert in a tort action than in a contract action, to examine the expert. In addition to that you must be versed, somewhat, in medicine, to examine the medical technicians and experts in your negligence case.

In a motor-vehicle case, should some witness say he was driving the vehicle at a rate of 10 miles an hour, you must know that arithmetically he covered 14.666 feet in 1 second, thereby proving, by his lips, that the pedestrian or other vehicle was either hit or not as is claimed.

These, then, are only some of the essential materials and tools which go into the crucible wherein your tort action is prepared for trial.

But, how in the world can claimants and their attorneys afford to retain experienced tort-trial counsel under the Federal Tort Claims Act? Who will pay for all the necessary work and expenses connected with properly presenting the claim if the Congress has said to the district trial judge, "Pay the attorneys 10 to 20 percent for their services, and those of any help they may require"? How can the average Federal Tort Claims Act claimant ever succeed in obtaining experienced tort-trial counsel to get him as good results as he would likely get if he were not a Federal claimant, but instead were fortunate enough to be a litigant in a State court. Write or ask your Congressman for the answer. Maybe he can show you the justice of it.

Sour Fruits of Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a radio address recently delivered by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin. This speech, entitled "Sour Fruits of Yalta," was made as part of the Justice for Poland radio program emanating from Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., and sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. Chamberlin was a foreign correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor for 18 years, is a well-known author, and is presently associate editor of the New Leader.

His radio address follows:

Yalta, the Crimean resort where the so-called Big Three, Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill, met to remake the map of the postwar world, is famous in normal times for its grapes, apples, and other fruits. But the diplomatic fruits of this conference were sour and bitter for the American people. Yalta represented the highwater mark in a policy of trying to appease the Soviet dictatorship which was both morally wrong and politically stupid.

This policy was morally wrong because it involved the sacrifice of faithful allies, Poland and China, and the abandonment of the just war aims which were set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms." It was politically stupid because an aggressive dictator like Stalin cannot be appeased, any more than Hitler could be appeased. We did not win Stalin's friendship by our tactics at Yalta. We only won his contempt, his assurance that he could commit any act of lawless violence with impunity.

The parallel between the Munich conference of September 1938 and the Yalta meeting in February 1945 is appallingly close. Any differences between the two are to the disadvantage of Yalta.

Stalin at Yalta was the complete equivalent of Hitler at Munich. Roosevelt and Churchill played the ignoble roles of Daladier and Chamberlain at the earlier conference. Poland was the victim of Yalta, as Czechoslovakia was the victim of Munich. There were two factors that made the Yalta betrayal less excusable than the yielding to Hitler's demands at Munich.

First, there had been the previous experience which should have proved the futility of appeasement. Second, there was a bond of common suffering and sacrifice between Poland and the western powers which did not exist between Czechoslovakia, France, and Britain.

The war had been started on the issue of Poland's independence and territorial integrity. Britain had given a solemn guaranty of both. One wonders what the world reaction and the Polish reaction would have been if the British Government, in March 1939, had specified that, while guaranteeing Poland against German aggression, it was offering no assurance that Russia would not seize eastern provinces of Poland, amounting to almost one-half of the national territory.

The United States was morally bound to uphold Poland's territorial integrity because of its repeated expression of devotion to the

principles of the Atlantic Charter. These principles had been written into several international statements, and both the Soviet and the British Government had subscribed to them several times. The first three clauses of the Atlantic Charter are worth recalling. They read as follows:

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

The procedure at Yalta was a cynical negation of these sound principles of international law and morals from beginning to end. Poland was treated not as an ally but as a conquered power, without the right to be consulted about its own fate. The conferees at Yalta discussed the most vital questions of Poland's national existence, the composition of its government and the location of its frontiers, without the participation of a single person qualified to speak for the Polish people.

The upshot of these deliberations was to tear away from Poland almost half of its territory, including vital sources of oil and foodstuffs and such historic Polish cities as Wilno and Lwow without any pretense of a fair plebiscite. When the Soviet Union occupied eastern Poland, in criminal agreement with Hitler, in the autumn of 1939, a completely farcical so-called vote was taken without any safeguards for secrecy of the ballot or freedom of speech and press. It took place in an atmposhere of error and mass deportations of Poles to slave labor in Russia. No fair-minded observer could regard this as a serious consultation of the will of the people in eastern Poland. Yet without any further ceremony eastern Poland was handed over to the Soviet Union.

The legitimate representative government of Poland which existed in London, and which was recognized by the Polish troops fighting on many fronts and by the underground patriots in Poland was thrown over without a word of explanation. The made-in-Moscow Communist-dominated provisional government, set up in Poland by the bayonets of the Red army, was granted preliminary international recognition, with the face-saving provision, which proved worthless in practice, that it should be enlarged by the inclusion of Poles abroad and in Poland.

The treatment of Poland at Yalta was one of the most cynical deals recorded in the history of power politics. It was truly brazen hypocrisy to assert, as the participants in the conference did assert, that they were acting according to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Poland was not the only ally wronged at Yalta. Serious, although not such mortal injury was inflicted upon the territorial integrity and national interests of China. Roosevelt asked Stalin, at China's expense and without China's knowledge, to do something which was against America's best interests: To take part in the Far Eastern war. Japan was already on its last legs militarily. Even without the invention of the atomic bomb Japan could have been blockaded and bombed into surrender.

By entering the war a few days before Japan's surrender the Soviet Union staked out footholds in Manchuria and Korea which are profoundly detrimental to the American interest in maintaining the open door and self-determination for the peoples of China and Korea. Under the terms of the Yalta secret deal the Soviet Government was to receive, as the price of its entrance into the war against Japan, a joint share in the operation of the Manchurian railway system, a naval base at Port Arthur, at the southern tip of the Manchurian peninsula and a preferential position in the chief Manchurian port, Dairen.

The Soviet Government, on its side, was supposed to recognize and support only the legal Chinese Government. But, as always, when it was given an inch it took a yard. It kept the Chinese nationalist forces out of Dairen. It used its control of the Manchurian railways to enable large Communist forces to move into that strategic province. It only withdrew its own troops (apart from those still maintained in Port Arthur and Dairen) after it had supplied the incoming Chinese Communists with vast quantities of Japanese arms and after it had looted all the more valuable Manchurian factory equipment.

During recent weeks the visible threat of a China ruled by Communists who are themselves completely subordinate to Moscow has shocked and alarmed American public opinion. This threat would probably never have arisen if it had not been for the fatally mistaken decision at Yalta to induce the Soviet Union to move into Manchuria and thereby lay the foundation for Communist rule in that province.

In the same way the crisis in Berlin, with its threat of war, would never have arisen if a government friendly to America and to the West had been maintained in Poland, if there had been no surrender to Stalin at Yalta. As usually happens what was wrong and indefensible morally has proved highly inexpedient politically.

No defense of Yalta on moral grounds is possible. There is sometimes an attempt to defend this ill-fated agreement on grounds of military necessity. We were so dependent on Stalin, so this argument runs, that we had to sign on the dotted line as the Soviet dictator prescribed. These last ditch defenders of Yalta sometimes ask what critics of the agreement would have done had the responsibility for action been theirs.

The answer to this question is not so difficult as is sometimes presumed. For it is a false reading of the wartime military and political situation to consider that America and Britain needed Russia more than Russia needed the western powers. The Soviet armies rolled westward with the aid of American trucks, American telephone lines, with a substantial part of their rations provided from this country.

The fear that Stalin might make a separate peace with Hitler could have been safely ruled out. The Soviet dictator would not have been likely to make a second deal with Hitler which might have ended in a new Nazi attack on war-ravaged Russia.

The United States could and should have stood firmly for the Atlantic charter, which Stalin had repeatedly pledged himself to observe. It could and should have rejected deals that were in flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter. Even after America and Great Britain had recognized the Soviet stooge government in Warsaw there was a long period of guerrilla warfare, carried on by Polish underground patriots.

Had the United States and British Governments, before Yalta and at Yalta, pursued an inflexible policy of refusing to admit any change in the legitimate Polish eastern frontier or the validity of any government not freely chosen by the Polish people, Stalin would probably have yielded. It is easy to imagine what a tremendous advantage a friendly Polish government would have created for the United States in the present European crisis.

Suppose Stalin had not yielded, had occupied Poland by the military force of the Red Army and installed his Red quislings in power. Without the acquiescence of the western nations the naked lawlessness of such action would have been clear to the Polish people and to the public opinion of the entire civilized world. Resistance in Poland would have been fiercer and more prolonged. The inevitable showdown between eastern totalitarian barbarism and western Christian civilization would have taken place on an issue so plain that there could be no question as to which side right was on.

Yalta was a moral crime and a grave political blunder. There is only one way to atone for the crime, to repair the blunder. This is to declare Yalta invalid, so far as the United States is concerned. The Soviet Government has broken its Yalta engagements a score of times and more. A contract violated by one partner is not binding on another. Let us formally denounce Yalta and announce that we will accept nothing short of the Atlantic Charter, which means full restoration of Poland within its legitimate frontiers, as a basis of European peace settlement.

The Hall Survey Reveals That People Still Want Good Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, if our country is worth anything, it is certainly worth the opinions of the rank and file of our citizens. Our form of Government is based on the theory of being of the people, by the people, and for the people.

This always having been my conviction, I recently sent a direct letter to every voter of my district, regardless of party, creed, or race, and asked six questions, which have to do with leading important issues before the Nation today.

The overwhelming response I received indicates to me that people are more interested in their Government than some of our so-called leaders want to admit. They do have minds of their own and they are thinking about the welfare of America.

They have expressed themselves to me without fear and without hesitation. As the result, I feel myself on firmer ground than at any time in the past 10 years. I have been given the benefit of views from a tremendous number of people I represent. Such knowledge arms me with new strength, new confidence.

Yes, the folks back home dared the displeasure of the few stuffed shirts who frown on all communication between the common man and his elected representative. To commune with the people is below their dignity.

It will be easy for me to vote on the issues which come before this Congress because I have a good idea of what the people want after the survey I conducted.

A few branded my scheme a dangerous thing. They say it is unwise to consult the rank and file. They must think we are living behind the iron curtain where only the handful in control do any thinking and never allow the masses to do anything but suffer.

I suppose there are some even here who set themselves so high above the common herd they consider their own judgment infallible. My idea would not, of course,

appeal to them, because they believe the final word is for them alone to give.

However, the letters I received from voters in my district assure me they are well pleased at being asked for their opinions by the person they elect to high office. "We are glad to have a man as Representative," someone wrote me, "who thinks enough of us to ask what we want done in Washington."

This is the only policy I would ever use and it is about as near what the Constitution prescribes as anything I know of. We in Congress are supposed to represent all the people, not just a favored few who happen to be on the inside.

Knowing the results of the Hall survey will be of interest to the entire House, I am making them a matter of public record.

While I realize the questions may be answered differently by a majority in some sections, I am pretty certain the picture I am presenting is accurate for the Thirty-seventh Congressional District. Everybody was given the same chance to participate and the response has been amazing.

The questions I listed may differ, also, from what various other Members would prefer. I took only six fundamental subjects, those which haunted me in the last campaign and some which are of particular local interest. They are widely diversified and suggest still more which could be asked if there were space and time.

However, by the time my staff and I had counted and tabulated for nearly a month the many thousands of ballots, we thought I had listed enough questions as well as lined up enough extra correspondence to last the rest of the year. But I have been well repaid for the extra work. I feel so much better equipped than I could possibly have been without the survey.

The six questions were asked in a straightforward manner, with no desire on my part to confuse the issues or to cloak an answer to my own liking. I wanted a simple, clear, direct response, so I asked a simple, direct question. Anything more involved would have defeated my purpose, as I value the truth more than deception.

By the same token, I took the tabulations as they came. A doctored poll, the kind which the overzealous, overly confident candidate likes to see flashed in headlines the week before election with which he hopes to tip the scales in his favor, would be of no value to me. In order to know what the folks at home want me to do, it is absolutely necessary for me to gage my district accurately. I assume in this I am no different from almost every other Member of this House.

Those who examine the tabulations which I will submit during the next few days will observe that I am telling the story in percentages, not numbers. I have a good reason for doing so.

If I were to give numbers, the soreheads, who resent my consulting with the people, would challenge the accuracy of my survey, no matter how many answered. Even though I showed returns amounting to 99 percent of the total number of questionnaires mailed out, they would shout to high heaven that my poll is inaccurate because I didn't hear from 100 percent.

No; I am wise to that trick, and so I give only percentages of the actual ballots received in their relationship to the questions, not the over-all totals. But I heard from enough to make me certain the results are accurate and in line with how the people in my district feel. Let us say I heard from the majority, and that's as it should be.

Let us get back to the questions. You will be interested in the form likewise, so here they are, just as they were mailed to every family in the Thirty-seventh Congressional District at the beginning of this session, early in January.

The questionnaire reads as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: For the past 10 years some Triple Cities newspapers have criticized my votes in Congress. Because I don't see eye to eye with them they ridicule and malign me every time I vote for you.

I don't care what they want. I'm interested in what you want. Therefore, I ask you to tell me how you want me to vote.

1. Do you want me to vote for or against the Taft-Hartley Act? ------
2. Do you want me to vote for or against price control? ------
3. Do you want me to vote for or against price supports for the farmers? ------
4. Do you want me to vote for or against the tax on oleomargarine? ------
5. Do you want me to vote for or against a Federal sales tax? ------
6. Do you want me to vote for or against a national bonus for World War II veterans? ------

Mark your answers after each one of these questions.

You will be helping me do a better job for you here in Washington. Let me hear from you.

Your Congressman,

EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Mr. Speaker, on future occasions I will take each one of these subjects, submit the result in percentages, and comment on the issue in question. If the stand I took has been vindicated by the way the people I represent voted on these questions, I expect to point it out. I am glad to inform you that I was in step with almost all these expressions of opinion.

Disabled American Veterans Protest Cancellation of Hospital Building Program in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a resolution that was adopted and passed by the Joseph D. Rankin Chapter 5, Disabled American Veterans of Detroit. The hospital situation in Michigan, particularly as it affects the tuberculosis and mental patients, is very desperate. There is no tuberculosis hospital in Michigan for veterans, and the Mental Hospital at Fort Custer is filled to capacity with a long waiting list. The same situation prevails at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Dearborn. These facts certainly are well known to the Veterans' Administration, and the abandonment of the hospital building program for the State of Michigan is disgraceful and inhuman. I have been flooded with protests from sick veterans and veterans' organizations.

I herewith submit the resolution passed by the Disabled American Veterans:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING RECOMMENDATION TO CONGRESS OF A ONE-AND-ONE-THIRD-BILLION-DOLLAR CUT IN VETERANS' BUDGET

Whereas President Harry Truman, in his budget message to Congress of January 10, 1949, recommended a decrease in Government spending on veterans for next year in the amount of $1,300,000,000; and further proposed that Congress wipe out more than one-fourth of the veterans' 90-hospital building program, blueprinted during and just after the war ended; and

Whereas this proposal not only affects veterans all over the United States, but particularly in Michigan, because of the cancellation of the proposed 500-bed tuberculosis hospital for veterans at Detroit and a 200-bed general hospital at Grand Rapids and a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Toledo, Ohio, where it was felt about one-fourth of the beds would be allotted to Michigan mental and nervous cases. Michigan has no Veterans' Administration tuberculosis hospital, and there are long waiting lists at general medical, surgical, and mental hospitals; and

Whereas it is believed that the Government should make economies wherever possible, but not at the expense of sick and disabled veterans in need of hospitalization; and

Whereas this has all the earmarks of a beginning new "economy act" at the expense of those who made great sacrifices for their country, while expenditures of untold millions are going forward for the relief of people in foreign countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That President Truman be immediately contacted condemning his proposed reduction of much-needed hospitals and other vital services to veterans; and further

That each Congressman in the State of Michigan as well as President Truman also be sent a copy of this resolution and copies also be released to all metropolitan daily newspapers in Detroit.

Approved by Joseph D. Rankin Chapter, No. 5, Disabled American Veterans.

Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, Distinguished American, Speaks for the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a statement recently made by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. General Wainwright is a distinguished American who has served our country with great honor, and as a disabled veteran himself and national commander of this splendid veterans' organization, has presented a thoughtful program on behalf

of the disabled veterans which is deserving of sympathetic consideration by the Members of the Congress.

The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am appearing here today on behalf of the Disabled American Veterans to present our legislative program to your committee. Since its inception, your committee has compiled an enviable record in protecting and extending aid to the wartime service-connected disabled veteran and to the survivors of deceased veterans. The DAV is grateful for the attentive, intelligent approach your committee has taken regarding problems of the disabled, their widows and orphans, and problems brought on them as the result of service to their country in time of national emergency.

It is my purpose to bring to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a résumé of the mandates adopted at our twenty-seventh national convention held in New York City in August of last year. The DAV, like other veterans' organizations, operates in a democratic fashion. Our local chapters and departments in business sessions adopt and forward to the national convention each year recommendations for measures essential to the well-being of the service-connected disabled veteran, his wife, children, widow, or dependent parents. These resolutions are screened by the appropriate committee at the national convention and then either adopted or rejected by majority vote of the delegates there assembled. It then becomes the task of our legislative department to bring to the attention of the Congress for its consideration the resolutions which comprise our legislative program.

When I accepted the position of national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, I told the delegates who elected me that my program for the coming year would consist of these four points:

1. To bring about as nearly as possible a complete reconstruction for those veterans who can possibly recover with proper hospital and medical care;

2. To continue the care of those who can never recover from war wounds and illness;

3. To provide ample compensation for those veterans, wholly or partially disabled, in order that they may support themselves and their families under present high-cost-of-living conditions; and

4. To improve the housing conditions of all veterans, especially the disabled.

Our first objective will be to do all we can to urge the Congress to make possible a cost-of-living increase of at least 25 percent in all compensation awarded to disabled veterans and in pensions payable to the survivors of deceased veterans. We will also seek an amendment to the Dependency Allowance Act which now grants additional compensation for dependents of veterans rated 60-percent disabled or higher. Our proposed amendment would grant an allowance to all veterans with dependents, regardless of the degree of their disability. We are hopeful that consideration will be given to raising the income limitations affecting eligibility for part III benefits. In keeping with our proposed objectives during the coming year, we will ask Congress to stimulate the construction of low-cost rental units for compensated service-connected disabled veterans.

The DAV is vitally interested in the recent proposed reduction of the hospital construction program. At all times we have urged that the Veterans' Administration provide sufficient beds for the hospitalization of service-connected disabled veterans. We have studied the President's proposals in this respect as set forth in his message to the Congress, as well as the press release of General Gray. Immediately following the publication of the reduction of the hospital construction program we initiated a nation-wide survey to determine the true factual status of bed requirements presently prevailing and the situation which may reasonably be expected to prevail in the future. At this time we do not have sufficient facts to take a position on the proposed reduction in the hospital construction program; however, as soon as the results of this survey have been assembled and digested we expect to discuss these matters with the members of this committee as well as with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

In conclusion, I want to state that the DAV is primarily a single-purpose organization dedicated to serving the service-connected disabled veteran. As such, our organization has never taken a position on the subject of general pensions. However, our legislative program does include such matters as housing, the protection of benefits accruing under the Veterans' Preference Act, adequate national defense, and other matters over which this committee does not exercise jurisdiction.

It is my hope that the new Congress will give the highest priority to this much-needed legislation for the welfare of the disabled and their dependents.

Labor-Management Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two editorials from the Christian Science Monitor for February 4, 1949:

THE PARTNERS

On Capitol Hill, down in Washington, a Senate committee is busy hammering out legislation to replace or revise the Taft-Hartley Act. This is important work. All social relationships need some framework of law within which to operate, and this legislation has to do with a social relationship of considerable scope.

But it is useful to remember that to provide the framework is about all law can do. The rest of the relationship—by far the greater part—consists, as in other human institutions, of an agglomeration of understandings and ways of doing things, some informal, some pretty definitely set up by custom. Without this dynamic portion, the thou-shalts and shalt-nots of law would be no more than an empty shell.

For this reason we are presenting in an adjoining column excerpts from the report of the Twentieth Century Fund's labor committee, "Partners in production." The purpose of this committee's broadly representative membership has been to discover objectives already shared by management and labor and, where objectives are divergent, to find how both may be guided toward common ground.

More of this sort of thing goes on than the public is aware of. Strikes and battles over laws preempt the headlines. But it is the total of unspectacular cooperative projects such as this one, and of the thousands of problems quietly settled in thousands of plants day by day, that is the chief builder of labor peace.

PARTNERS IN PRODUCTION

(Excerpts from a report adopted unanimously by the Labor Committee of the Twentieth Century Fund: Chairman, William H. Davis, former chairman War Labor Board; James A. Brownlaw, secretary-treasurer Metal Trades Department, A. F. of L.; William L. Chenery, publisher Collier's Weekly; Howard Coonly, past president National Association of Manufacturers; Herbert W. Payne, vice president Textile Workers Union, CIO; Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University; Herman W. Steinkraus, president Bridgeport Brass Co.; Prof. Edwin E. Witte, University of Wisconsin, former member NWLB.)

The evidence points to a growing sense of responsibility toward the mutual problems which confront labor and management. * * * A will to learn how to work together is building up. It may not be long before it breaks through into solid achievement.

The organization of labor is here to stay; the unions' fivefold growth since 1932 to more than 15,000,000 members appears to be real and lasting. Collective bargaining is not only the law of the land, it has become something more permanent: the customary way of doing things. Seven out of 10 production workers in manufacturing, and nearly one-half of all workers in all industries in which unions normally seek contracts, are now working under collective bargaining agreements.

Responsibility toward the collective bargaining contract is a mutual goal of labor and management, despite surface evidence to the contrary. The surface evidences are mainly the growing pains of the relationship in the case of relatively young unions.

The conflict does not arise because labor wants to take over the job of management. Overwhelming evidence shows that it has no such desire. Workers want an efficient management because they want a prosperous company.

Those unions that feel the employer is out to destroy or weaken them are going to try their best to discredit the management and win the strong support of the worker. Those employers who are convinced that the union is reaching for things that will wreck the enterprise are bound to try to weaken the union. A struggle over loyalty is no more than a symptom of unsuccessful labor-management relations. The conflict disappears wherever labor and management have learned to live together.

The basic conflict over labor's demand for human treatment is this: Management interest and thinking in the past have been centered on the machine, which it looked upon as the chief source of production, efficiency and profits and its most effective weapon in the war of competition; the worker's attention is necessarily focused on himself, his human needs, aspirations, and dislikes. * * * A possible compromise which protects the principal interest of each party is an agreement which permits the employer to use as few men as may be needed on the machine, but contains an agreement that no one will be laid off as a result of the introduction of the machine or that persons laid off will be paid a dismissal wage.

There is no conflict between management and labor over the question of giving some dignity to the worker and his job; there is only ignorance about how to do it. * * * Every industrial enterprise by nature must be a cooperative enterprise. That its members—particularly the workers—do not act as if they understood this is because the shops in which they do their daily stint have not been organized to give them a sense of participation or responsibility.

Management's chief goal—a profitable and efficient enterprise—is no more completely satisfying to labor than the worker's goal of security is to his employer. At best, both leave the other somewhat apathetic. The profit system is not primarily a system for personal gain of the management and the workers, as so many workers have learned to believe from interpreting their own experience. It is a highly effective system for producing and distributing goods. The social value of profit lies, not in its use as a reward for individuals, but in its objective

yardstick. This yardstick measures (not always perfectly, it is true) whether the goods and services produced are what people want, and also whether the work of producing them is being done efficiently.

The drive for job security is a protective and therefore an essentially negative one. This is why it often runs afoul of corporate purpose. There are many ways, however, in which the drive can be satisfied without adding to the cost of running the business. High among the protections demanded by workers, for instance, is that of an accepted union. This not only may cost nothing, it is an objective with which progressive management is in agreement. Another is a seniority system that eliminates favoritism and protects the worker with a long service record. Management would accept this, provided unions were willing to make reasonable exceptions in the interests of efficiency, particularly in regard to promotions.

[The committee recommends:] That the leaders of American industry and labor now jointly direct their attention, through the processes of intelligent self-government, to an agreed statement of economic principles which will afford a basis for a constructive advance in understanding the wage-price-profit relationship in a democratic system of competitive private enterprise.

That in all plants in which there is union representation management and organized labor assume responsibility for the integration of the union into the plant organization as an effective channel of two-way communication from managers to workers and from workers to managers.

Montana Needs Yellowtail Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD memorials from the Montana Legislature urging that sufficient appropriations be allowed for the immediate construction of the Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County, Mont. I want to join with my colleagues in Montana and urge the Appropriations Committee to appropriate the necessary funds to start this project which means so much to the economic development of southeastern Montana.

The memorials follow:

House Memorial 1

House memorial to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; Senator James E. Murray, Senator Zales N. Ecton, Congressmen Mike Mansfield and Wesley D'Ewart; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands; Julius Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and Michael Straus, commissioner of Reclamation; Requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located in Big Horn County in southern Montana.

Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural dam site of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission-line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flow control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low-cost power is prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail power plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

Whereas power generating facilities to be constructed at the dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. The said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residents of the area; and

Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system. Retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow, will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the Secretary of State of the State of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN—to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, and the presiding officers of both Houses of the Wyoming State Legislature; and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming.

LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

Senate Memorial 2

Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake-recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp, and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flood control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low cost power is a prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail Power Plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

Whereas power-generating facilities to be constructed at the dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually, the said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system

constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residences of the area; and

Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system, retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the National Congress, ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN, to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Houses of the Wyoming State Legislature; and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming.

Attest:

PAUL CONNOR,
President of the Senate.
LOU E. BRETZKE,
Acting Secretary of the Senate.

Rural Telephones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to address some 3,500 delegates to the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in New York on the subject of rural telephones. Believing that the problem is one of general interest, I insert that speech in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, the REA was established to help in our efforts to bring a higher standard of living to rural people. Measured by this yardstick, it has been an outstanding success. Its loans have directly financed more than 2,500,000 connections. The effect of the competition which the REA-financed electric cooperatives have provided in the field of rural service has made it possible for at least another 1,500,000 rural customers to get service from private power companies who could not have otherwise secured it. On July 24, 1935, the spokesman of the private power companies told the Congress that "there are very few farms requiring electricity for major farm operations that are not now served."

In 1935 the relatively few farms who actually had electricity paid such exorbitant rates and charges that it was beyond the reach of thousands of average farmers even though the power lines were in front of their doors.

REA has shown that it is possible to take electricity to rural homes and to provide it at a fair price if the sincere desire exists to get it there. Today not less than 4,000,000 rural customers enjoy the blessings of electric lights and power either directly over REA-financed lines or over lines built by private interests because of competition, where less than 15 years ago the private power companies said it was economically impossible.

Many years before REA was established, this country was fairly well covered with rural telephone lines. When I was a boy out in west Texas, I lived 30 miles from the nearest railroad. We got our mail on a star route 7 miles from the house, but we had a telephone. Our lines, like most rural lines of the period were constructed and owned by the subscribers themselves. There was very little capital invested. The census shows that as early as 1912 there were 32,233 telephone systems or lines in this country. Actually only about 1 system in 20 operated a switchboard. In the main, these figures simply show farmer groups that had built a few miles of line. By 1922 there were 57,253 such lines, but shortly after World War I, the Bell Companies began to take over the more profitable territories, and by 1932 there were only 55,378 such lines. From that time on the number of separate lines or systems dropped very rapidly, but of even more significance is the fact that the actual number of rural phones dropped from 2,498,493 in 1920 to 1,526,959, 20 years later.

I would not be so bold as to say that this entire drop was due to the destruction of competition, but it is true that during this period the Bell companies took over most of the larger independent operations and established almost complete control over city switchboard as well as long-distance service. The smaller rural operations were left with their antiquated lines and instruments but with no opportunity to talk even to the county site, much less long distance, except on Bell's terms. Many of the small operators could not exist under these conditions. In 1920 independent companies served about 40 percent of the telephones in use. By 1940 they served less than 20 percent.

The tremendous loss in the number of rural telephones from 1920 to 1940, amounting to approximately a million connections, or around 40 percent of all the rural phones in operation in 1920, can in large part be accounted for by the rate policy of the Bell System which was exactly that of the private power companies of the same period. In a public speech delivered in 1922 Mr. E. K. Hall, then vice president of the A. T. & T., stated:

"There is only one mistake that the public service commissions can make about rates, only one—and that is by keeping these rates too low. They never can make a mistake by making them too high."

I don't know what Mr. Hall would say about that principle if he were here today, but I do know that it forced a million farm homes in these United States to disconnect their telephones, and it has probably made it impossible for another million farm homes to enjoy telephones since that time. The Bell system not only believed in high rates for themselves, but they believed in high rates for all the little companies, and they actively undertook to get the independents to raise their rates. In fact, Mr. Hall's remarks, which I have quoted, were made before the United States Independent Telephone Association.

At first the independents, and especially the rural-telephone cooperatives, resisted the push for higher rates, but the Bell system guided the independents into the high-rate psychology in diverse ways. In the preparation of rate cases, Bell companies assisted the connecting companies without charge. It was probably not too hard to convince most of the commercial or stock companies to raise rates. Only the very small, completely farmer-owned, cooperatives or mutuals tried to keep rates down, but it is at least open to grave doubt whether this program benefited anyone. This much is clear: With the progressive decline in farm income from 1924 to 1937, it became more and more impossible for a large number of farmers to continue the use of telephones under the prevailing high rates. Under a low-rate policy commensurate with the decline in farm income, the use of farm telephones would doubtless have increased just as the use of electricity in rural areas did increase during the same period.

I recite this history not for the purpose of condemning the Bell system, but rather for the purpose of warning them against a repetition of the policy. I fear that we are today facing a period of reduced farm income. In fact, we all know we have entered such a period, and we can only hope that our farm program of support prices under farm commodities and our export program will be able to prevent a disastrous drop in farm income. At the same time I think that I perceive a disposition on the part of the Bell companies who now so completely monopolize the more-profitable segments of the telephone business to repeat its high-price policy. If they do, I fear that it will kill the goose that is about to lay the golden egg.

The high-rate policy of the Bell system (or possibly I should say of all semimonopolies) not only resulted in a loss of probably 2,000,000 rural telephone connections, it left another great group of rural lines or systems with no feasible switchboard connections and therefore with no ability to provide anything like reasonable service. The farmer-owned mutual systems that had previously enjoyed a switching arrangement with an independent system in the local trading center found that independent either taken over directly by the Bell systems or completely accepting the Bell-sponsored program of high rates. In any event, the farmers found that they could no longer pay for the needed connections and maintain their low-rate program. Most of the farmers' mutual owned lines and exchanges tried to hold their subscribers by holding down rates, but they could not give the needed exchange or long-distance service. They lost the more profitable business. They were left with only the least lucrative areas. Naturally, their service, which was never too good, suffered.

For a quarter of a century there has been practically no replacement or improvement on these smaller systems, and very little maintenance. Today most of the small mutual and privately owned rural telephone systems need a complete rehabilitation. Practically none of them have any funds with which to make the needed improvements.

Nor would I want to leave the impression that all of the inadequate service is on the lines of small local concerns. Where the Bell System has no competition, its rural service has often fallen to inexcusably low levels. This is particularly true in the South, where less than 10 percent of the farm homes had telephones in 1940. In Georgia and South Carolina not 1 farm in 25 had a telephone. In my own district the rural service offered over the Bell lines was so bad, before I first introduced telephone legislation, that it was often quicker to get in a car and go talk with a farmer than to try to reach him by phone, even though he was paying for telephone service. Maybe it has had nothing to do with it, but since I introduced my first bill on the subject there has not only been a marked improvement of the rural service in our area, but the Bell people have been most active in extending their lines to new subscribers. They have connected hundreds of rural sub-

scribers while at the same time they have refused to accept new city connections. Their present attitude in central Texas should result in a vast improvement in the rural situation if they don't take away the opportunity by an arbitrary increase in rates just at a time when farmers will be unable to pay them.

The rate situation is certainly not hopeless. There has never been a time when we have enjoyed greater opportunity to effect real and substantial economies in the field of rural telephone service than we do today. It is a time that the whole price level is high, but we can surely assume that as farm prices settle down to the floors supported by the Government, there will be a gradual decline in the cost of telephone construction and equipment. Notice I said "cost—not price" I realize that as long as there remains a monopoly in the manufacture of telephone equipment, there will be little, if any, reduction in price until we provide competition. Only then will we get the benefit of any decline in cost.

I am thinking of the fact that roughly one-half—ofttimes a good deal more—of the cost of any rural telephone system must be allocated to lines, and a substantial part of the operating costs must go to maintenance of those lines. Today a great part of the country is covered with rural electric lines which are owned either by local cooperatives or by private utilities. In either event, they can be used to take telephone service to rural areas. In many instances a very substantial saving can be effected by simply placing closed metallic telephone circuits on the existing poles. In other cases, particularly where the density of subscribers is less it will be cheaper to use the well known and fully proven carrier system and transmit telephone conversation over hot wires. In either event, there is a very significant saving in the capital investment necessary to connect the farm home with the switchboard. A similar saving is effected in maintenance of the lines. Surely any electric cooperative or private utility could profitably maintain telephone wires on their electric lines at far less than the cost to the telephone company would be if the telephone company were doing it separately. The rural people of America are paying for the electric systems which own the existing lines whether they are the lines of cooperatives or the lines of private power companies. The rural people will inevitably pay for any telephone service that is provided for them. I think it is reasonable for them to demand that there be a maximum of coordination between the two programs in order that the sum total of the bill that the rural people must ultimately pay may be as small as possible. I think that our farm people have a right to expect their Congress to set up the machinery needed to secure this coordination. I think they have a right to ask their Government to provide the credit needed—especially in view of their splendid record of meeting similar obligations through their local electric cooperatives. That is what the pending telephone bill (H. R. 113) does—it makes Government loans available through the REA for the purpose of financing the improvement, expansion, construction, acquisition, and operation of rural telephone facilities.

I would not contend that all of the problems of rural telephones can be solved by the coordination of the facilities which provide electricity with those which are needed to provide phones. I recognize that the trading centers to which farmers want telephone connections are not necessarily the centers of their rural electric systems. I realize that the existing electric lines are not laid out so as to give maximum efficiency for a telephone system. I realize that there are many miles of existing telephone lines in the same areas with rural power lines and ofttimes it will be more practical to keep these telephone lines in use, and surely it will be necessary to build a great many outright telephone lines to secure proper connections for all the homes in an area with the desired switchboard. At the same time the outstanding fact remains: a tremendous expense and unnecessary duplication of lines can be avoided by proper coordination of facilities.

The Bell system will protest that they have offered such coordination. Let it be pointed out that in addition to the question of a fair division of the savings as between the power system and the telephone system, there have been repeated differences between the Bell systems and the local cooperatives over Bell's refusal to give full coverage even within a limited area. I recognize that almost every electric cooperative will serve patrons who will want service from more than one switchboard. I realize that a telephone company (Bell or independent) will often be in a position to contract only relative to that portion of the area served by one switchboard, but within that area I feel that it is the duty of the REA-financed cooperatives to insist that if a telephone company is to use the coop facilities that it (the telephone company) should agree to give complete area coverage—that is to give service to every member of the cooperative in the area who wants it.

When a local cooperative allows a telephone company to use a part of its facilities and does not require it to give service to all of its members within the area, the cooperative becomes a party to a practice which will in the long run condemn some of its own members to go without phone service. We all know what happened to the hard-to-reach homes when the power companies (and some cooperatives) ran their lines down the highways and skimmed the cream of the business. Many of these homes are still without lights. Let us not make the same mistake with telephones. Let us insist that when a territory is opened to telephones that everybody be served.

There are many areas where the electric co-ops will not be called upon to play a part in supplying telephones. There are hundreds of farmer-owned mutual systems over the country that simply need a source of credit at reasonable rates to enable them to enlarge and improve their facilities to give adequate service at reasonable rates. These mutual exchanges are particularly numerous and well organized in the Middle Western States. Some of them will want to merge their facilities, both to reduce overhead and to render a greater service. Most of them need new capital to make these mergers practicable.

The most effective argument the Bell companies are able to present to public-utility commissions in States where they exist, or to the public itself where the companies are trying to secure public or official approval of rate increases, is evidence that their revenues do not meet their expenses. One of the major items of expense is interest on capital funds. Most, if not all, of the Bell companies finance their expansion not by the sale of stock to the public or by the sale of bonds on the open market, but through stock sales and borrowings from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. These borrowings are not at a uniform rate, but they are all well above the rates charged by the REA. Surely if 2-percent money were available through REA loans the companies could hardly use loans or self-enriching stock transactions as a justification for imposing exorbitant rates on the farmer.

H. R. 113, therefore, provides that the REA shall give preference in making telephone loans "to public bodies, cooperatives, nonprofit, limited dividend, mutual associations, and persons operating existing telephone lines, facilities, or systems through which telephone service is furnished in rural areas." Thus, every rural telephone system, whether owned by a farmers' mutual, a local operator, or a Bell company can borrow at the same low rate, and at the same time the door is open to electric cooperatives who may want to provide some telephone service or to newly organized telephone cooperatives.

As I see the picture, we will actually want to use a number of different instrumentalities and combinations of different operations. In some areas the existing telephone operators, whether Bell or independent, will want to extend and improve their service. In some areas, especially in the South, there will be new systems established—probably cooperatives but possibly privately owned. In some cases existing local electric cooperatives will want to borrow money and equip their lines either with metallic telephone circuits or with carrier equipment. More often I expect a part of the members of an existing electric cooperative will want to establish a completely separate telephone cooperative and contract with the electric cooperatives for the use and maintenance of its lines. In most cases, except in those which involve only the expansion and improvement of existing facilities, it will be desirable to contract not only with existing electric systems for the use of poles, but also with the operators of existing switchboards for switching facilities and connections with town or city subscribers. I feel there will be relatively few cases where it will be desirable to install new switchboards, but by all means I think the authority should exist, for if there is one thing I have learned in our dealings with the private power companies, it is that the people can get consideration only in both rates and service in exact proportion to their ability to provide for their needs from other sources.

Assuming that we have legislation which convinces the Bell companies that it will be possible for the farmers to get switchboard service for themselves if necessary, then I can see where it would be to the decided advantage both of the Bell and of the independent operators to provide that service. Let me give an example. Suppose we have an REA-financed electric co-op with 2,500 members. Possibly the headquarters of this co-op are in X county. Some 500 of its members trade at Yville. These people want a telephone service that will enable them to talk to the doctor, the grocer, and the repairshop at Yville, and for that matter to the 500 citizens of that town who are now served by a local telephone exchange.

The Yville telephone system does not have the capital to build lines to the rural people who want connections, and if it did, the maintenance overhead would be too great. In many cases it will develop that the Yville operator can just about keep up his city lines and his switchboard, but he could give switchboard service to 500 new customers without any material increase in his expenses. Would it not make sense for those rural people to organize a telephone cooperative, borrow their capital from REA at 2 percent. Contract with the X County electric cooperative to furnish and maintain lines that can be used for telephone purposes, and probably to erect and maintain such new telephone connection lines as would be needed; install telephone instruments and then contract with the Yville telephone company to connect them with its switchboard thus enabling them to talk not only to their neighbors, but also to friends and businessmen in town? It would add to the value of the service the Yville exchange had to sell in town. It would keep the capital investment to a minimum. It would give the X County electric cooperative some income. It would substantially increase the income, and even more greatly increase the profits, of the Yville telephone exchange. It would create new long-distance calls on which the Bell systems would inevitably take their profit. Frankly, I can't see who could possibly be hurt unless we accept the Bell-system psychology of 1923 that rates should be kept

high, and if we accept this, we might as well forget about any expansion of rural telephones.

Of course, there could be any number of variations of the example I have given. The Yville telephone exchange might contract direct with the X County electric cooperative and eliminate the necessity of a new telephone cooperative. In rare cases the Yville exchange might be sold to the new telephone cooperative, and in very unusual cases the cooperative might find it necessary to erect its own switchboard. H. R. 113 confers powers on REA broad enough to care for any of these contingencies, but there is no doubt that everyone would profit most by complete cooperation between the farmers who want telephones, the switchboard operators who need more customers, and the electric distributors who have an investment in lines.

Many of the savings I have suggested would be impossible should the Bell System use its monopolistic position to deny them. The A. T. & T. could refuse to make modern equipment from its Western Electric subsidiary available to telephone cooperatives. Of course, the Attorney General is even now trying to break that monopoly, but I have more confidence in competition. Most of you have heard me repeat my belief that competition is always more effective than regulations when dealing with monopoly. So I would prefer to look to the technical staff of REA for aid in this instance. In the early days of the development of your great rural electric program the utilities very nearly controlled the sources of supply of transformers, meters, switches, etc. You will recall that REA engineers designed even better adapted equipment and interested dozens of smaller manufacturers in its fabrication. I would hope for cooperation, but I have no doubt that should Western Electric assume a hostile attitude, it would be entirely possible to follow a similar course with telephonic equipment. REA has a fine staff of technicians. If your local electric distributing systems are able to get the needed material, and if we in Congress are able to get the needed funds for three more years, the new construction work on REA-financed electric lines will begin to fall off. The job will not have been completed but it will definitely require progressively less in the way of material, money, and men. It seems to me that this is an auspicious time to direct the talents of the REA organization toward an expanding program.

I first introduced a telephone bill 4 years ago. Senator LISTER HILL and I have each introduced similar bills each session of Congress since. In the past we have had no direct success. However, I think that the very pendency of such legislation has caused the telephone companies to connect hundreds of thousands of rural families who would never have otherwise received phones, but neither the Senate nor the House has ever passed any bill on the telephone subject. I believe that we have at last reached a point where we can expect serious consideration, and I hope, favorable action by the Congress. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to which committee my bill has been referred, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, on yesterday, assigned the bill to the subcommittee of which I am chairman. I am here and now announcing hearings on the measure beginning on February 14. My bill is not identical with the bill sponsored in the Senate by Senator HILL (naturally I think it is a better bill than the Senate bill), but in event of the passage of either bill by either House, the subject matter would go to the other House so both measures are sure to be considered in any measure that might become law, and Senator HILL and I are working in full cooperation.

The American farmer is now in a position to listen to everyone else. He now has or soon will have lights by which to read his daily paper. He can listen to every commentator over his radio, but he cannot express himself to the rest of the world except through a written message over RFD. I want him to have a chance to talk back. I want every farm home to have a chance at every convenience that is available to a city home. A telephone may not materially increase the earning capacity of every farm, but I know from experience that it make a farm a more pleasant place to live, and I know of no comparable convenience that can be had so cheaply if we will but use the proven methods that are available to us.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles Abrams, A Violent and Mistaken Challenge to Rent Control, which appeared in the New York Post, January 31, 1949:

A VIOLENT AND MISTAKEN CHALLENGE TO RENT CONTROL

(By Charles Abrams)

I have been barraged with pamphlets and reprints of an article on rent control in France called No Vacancies, by a Monsieur Bertrand de Jouvenel. The article, issued in pamphlet form by the Foundation for Economic Education, has received the praise of News Week economist Henry Hazlitt, and in condensed form now appears in the February Reader's Digest, which has undertaken a mass distribution of reprints.

Since release of the article has been timed with the bill to extend rent controls in the United States, its facts and conclusions may be expected to play an important part in the forthcoming congressional debate.

In brief, says de Jouvenel, rent for a Paris worker is only a dollar or two a month, equivalent to 6 to 11 packages of cheap cigarettes and about 2 percent of a worker's income. Owners therefore neglect their houses, and as a result 19 percent of Paris' dwellings are slums.

Confusing cause and effect, he blames the dearth of building on rent control instead of ascribing rent control to the dearth of building. The builders, he says, would have to charge $166 to $200 a year for a worker's apartment now costing $13 to $16. It therefore makes it psychologically impossible to find customers, says he, hence construction will not be undertaken.

M. de Jouvenel deplores the fear of a sudden return to liberty, by which he means release of rent control, and he cautions his friends across the sea against the dire things that have happened to France.

I am no believer in rent control as a cure for housing shortage. It invites administrative headaches, might retard some building, and is unfair to owners. But I won't go along with a reckless abolition of controls which would not only spiral building costs but invite social havoc. If controls are to be abolished, and I believe they can be, every means must first be employed to build as much housing as possible and this must include a public-building program comprehensive enough to eliminate the shortage.

What puzzles me, however, is that the very groups who oppose rent control also oppose public building. This includes our real-estate lobby, our anti-Government-intervention-of-any-kind economists, and some of our press and periodicals.

What stops private building is not rent control—with rent controls in effect we built housing last year almost equaling the record year 1925. Nor did rent control destroy the building boom in New York City in the 1920's or materially affect building activities elsewhere. The main cause of building stoppage is its high cost in relation to the rent-paying capacity of people; since building labor both on site and in materials manufacture represents 72 percent of home cost, release of controls must inevitably spiral building costs and zoom rents of new dwellings even further.

High building costs in France are due to the inflationary price spiral and the backwardness of the building industry. If an automobile in America now costing $1,714 were put up like a house with 1910 tools, its estimated cost would be $60,000.

The inability of workers to pay current building costs, as well as slums and overcrowding, are not solely a peculiarity of France, but are world phenomena, true of countries with rent control and without it.

The negligible nature of France's public building program has had more to do with protracting the housing shortage and rent controls than any other factor. Mortgage funds for construction are at a premium in France, amortization periods are short, and only about 50 percent of building cost is offered the private builder. These terms are hardly conducive to private building.

De Jouvenel says that 82 percent of Parisians lack bathtubs or showers, 20 percent have no running water, 54 percent no private toilets. I have seen new buildings put up in Europe without bathtubs and no one blames it on rent control. Even in 1940, before rent control in this country, 11.2 of our own nonfarm houses lacked running water and plumbing, 13 percent lacked private baths and private flush toilets. This, too, has nothing to do with rent control.

M. de Jouvenel, who the Reader's Digest describes as "a distinguished Frenchman," would have rendered a more distinguished service had he given us the correct and complete story on which to base a solution. As it stands his article is just another addition to the welter of worthless propaganda which does nothing to guide and much to confuse.

The Power of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended the review from the New York Herald-Tribune, of a provocative book with the title of this insertion written by a distinguished contemporary teacher and scholar, Prof. Max Ascoli.

Professor Ascoli, says the reviewer, believes the ultimate sanction of all political rights to be that they place within the reach of living men the possibility of recreating the freedom won through historical experience. This is the very job every legislator is elected to perform, and this book is a real contribution to the art of political thought and action.

Professor Ascoli is an Italian exile from the tyranny of Mussolini. He was jailed in his student days in 1928, as anti-Fascist. In 1931, through the intermediation of the Rockefeller Foundation, he was released, came to the United States, and engaged in a distinguished career of writing and research especially in the field of American democracy.

In 1933 he joined the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research—the "university in exile—where he has been dean since 1939, the same year in which he became a United States citizen. During the war he proselytized Latin America for the State Department in the cause of democracy and against nazism and fascism. There he became convinced that Communism can be decisively defeated if people have not only enough to eat but a chance to work.

He is now engaged in launching a new magazine, the Reporter, cosponsored with his wife, Marian Rosenwald, which he will edit and publish, its goal being to strengthen the institutions of freedom in every country of the world.

[From the New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review of January 30, 1949]

OUR LIBERTY IS STRENGTH IN WORLD CRISIS

(The Power of Freedom, by Max Ascoli, 173 pp., New York: Farrar, Straus & Co., $2.75.)

(Reviewed by August Heckscher, author of A Pattern of Politics.)

The concept of freedom for which America stands, says Mr. Max Ascoli, "must be restated in all its aggressiveness as the necessary weapon for the political struggle in which we are now engaged." The United States cannot divest itself of this primary responsibility either by withdrawing from the world or by hiding its light under the bushel of an international organization. It stands preeminently as a partisan leader in the world civil war. Having kept competition as an ideal, it must now recognize that in Russia it has at last the one thing that is big enough to compete with America itself.

Mr. Ascoli's attempt to restate this concept of freedom takes the form of a relatively short book, free of scholarly encumbrances or historical digressions. In style it is gnomic, didactic, sometimes repetitious and obscure, yet lit by keen insights and haunting phrases. I am not sure, for example, that I understand precisely what Mr. Ascoli means when he says that "Civilization has been made by people who wormed their way through the resistance of physical or human nature and who of the secrets they conquered made the experience of the race." Yet in proportion as I do understand such a sentence I have the feeling that I get to the heart of Mr. Ascoli's thought and into the deep places of life itself. This is perhaps the way of the best and wisest teachers: they cast out generous hints, the full meaning of which become clear only in the course of experience or at some crisis of our journey.

The author's intellectual affinities, he tells us in a foreword, are with Aristotle rather than Plato, with Burke rather than Rousseau; above all with his own countrymen, Vico and Croce. He sees freedom, not as an abstract state achieved apart from society, but as the product of man's fruitful relations with his work, with the institutions that surround him, and with his fellow beings. Everywhere in the book there is a feeling for roots, for solid attachments and enlarging loyalties. The aim of politics, Mr. Ascoli says, is "not to build a house in which all men would feel lost;" he speaks in another place of "measurable institutions and circumscribed ideas, related to the peculiarities and limitations" of individuals. The most fearful fate that can overcome modern man is to be lost in "the undifferentiated vagueness of the search for a job." Property is defended as something "limited and physical to which the citizen can hold and which gives him a measure of himself."

On the basis of these insights and predilections Mr. Ascoli builds a theory of political rights. Without going into detail, it may be said that these rights are not abstract and logical, but are the result of the specific experience of a nation in its search for freedom; they are achieved by long exertions toward particular goals, and can be maintained only at the cost of constant renewal and multiplication of that exertion. Their ultimate sanction is that they place within the reach of living men the possibility of recreating the freedom won through historical experience.

This philosophy, stated in a contemporary idiom and applied to modern conditions, is certainly seductive, but it can scarcely be said to express the characteristic American idea. Our traditional democratic theory has exalted precisely the kind of freedom that Mr. Ascoli abhors—boundless, shapeless, and disembodied. The typical Yankee, instead of finding fulfillment in work has found it in leisure; like Thoreau, he wanted to work only as much as was necessary to satisfy his economic wants. Yet if Mr. Ascoli has cultivated a minority tradition it is one, it seems to me, which needs to be rediscovered and affirmed at this time. In the kind of political thinking which he expresses there are the seeds of a really intelligent and enlightened conservatism for this country. Indeed if the more philosophic of our Republican leaders could digest this little book, could unravel all its insights and master its suggestiveness, they would have the beginnings of a program which would be positive, popular, and constructive without being a mere imitation of Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal.

Dr. James Lewald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a distinct loss in the death last Friday of Dr. James Lewald; the District of Columbia and the Nation suffered a real loss.

There are those who pass our way and humbly and quietly serve their fellowmen. Dr. Lewald, head of the School for the Feeble Minded in the District of Columbia, was such a man. He served and brightened the lives of the feeble-minded. Too seldom we realize the high percentage of our society who, through no fault of their own, are ushered into this human realm with intellects under par. Christianity denies that we ignore them. It is our duty to help them if we can. Dr. Lewald did that well. From the time that he graduated from medical school, his heart was in that work. Within the small circle of those who understood the problem of the feeble-minded, Dr. Lewald was a national figure. His life was dedicated to the purposes of assisting those intellectually subnormal to rise to places of usefulness and often of importance in this society. The record of his accomplishments, of course, lies behind the screen of anonymity. Yet it exists. It is a proud record. In the decade or two that he served the District of Columbia as head of its school for the feeble-minded, there are actual cases where men have been so far rehabilitated that they were able to accept and assume positions of management. That is remarkable.

Dr. Lewald's death is a definite loss to society and I take this time to point out the great importance of humble men who are lost to the headlines because they must function where publicity must not be. And today, as the headlines continue to publicize the differences, the friction, the violence, the hate, the distrust, that make our society so sensitive to the differences in people, it is indeed time that we pause to recognize those who try to make people equal to each other.

I met and became acquainted with Dr. Lewald's work while in a position of responsibility connected with the business of the Nation's Capital. I am happy that I had a part in persuading this House of Representatives of the Congress to provide, 2 years ago, an assistant to Dr. Lewald—one who could take over the routine matters of business connected with the training school so that he could apply himself to the specific work of serving those who were intellectually underprivileged. That was where his heart was.

The District and the Nation is the loser but his work will be carried on by those who have benefited by his acquaintance, his studies, his contributions, and his life.

Letter From Cortlandt W. Schepeler, of Brooklyn, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress receive literally thousands of letters. This morning's mail brings me a letter from Mr. Cortlandt W. Schepeler, a constituent of Brooklyn, Mich., which is logical and understandable, and I believe the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in this letter, which reads as follows:

Please accept this letter as a means for me to weight that portion of your enormous correspondence with which I agree. As your constituent I am proud of your congressional record in wrestling the unrelenting problems at home and abroad. I do not doubt your integrity to analyze any specific condition, I am writing solely to amplify what I hope are two mutual concerns:

1. I espouse capitalism and distrust the current trend of lawmakers to overemphasize security. I do not like to see poverty or be a part of it, but too much security (and Federal controls) is not a worthy price for individual and corporate freedom. In other

words, I fear this trend to be a forerunner to socialism which must undermine our capitalistic free enterprise system.

2. I oppose the political patronage about to be bestowed upon the trade unions by the Democratic majority of the Eighty-first Congress. The mandate of the people on November 2, I am sure, was not to disrupt the near balance between labor and management by pulling teeth from the Taft-Hartley Act. Trade labor unions are now girding for an expansion movement at the expense of corporate management by such inexpedient tactics as slow-down, secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, mass demonstrations which are Government-sponsored indecencies against the liberty of corporate management. I agree that labor's antagonistic practices are a byproduct of corporation cupidity of a decade ago, or before. But the time for hostility is past.

Management has been brought to heel to—and respect—collective unionism. These two factions by natural process would necessarily unify their objectives. If Federal legislation must intercede between these factions, let it regulate both with an impartial desire to foster the free-enterprise system. Not to give unionism the bigger club to impede the competitive productivity essential to both. The union as a protector and agent of employees must have the same objective as management—high production and competitive vitality.

The union as a political leviathan seeking national power and prestige has objectives which smack of socialism at the eventual exploitation of the beguiled union member. Socialism as the antithesis of capitalism should have few sincere adherents in this country.

Thanks for lending an ear to this philosophical concern.

Stalin's Invitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended is an editorial from the New York Times today on the subject of the Soviet's intentions. All of us fervently desire peace, yet the arts of conference and negotiation to be successful must be based on mutual confidence. The Soviet Union has a great opportunity to reinspire the confidence of the democracies by consummating an Austrian peace treaty which will secure the national integrity of Austria and carry out the three-power declaration of Moscow proclaimed November 1, 1943.

The editorial follows:

A TEST OF SOVIET INTENT

The first test as to whether the latest Soviet peace offensive that was climaxed by Mr. Stalin's bid for a meeting with President Truman behind the iron curtain is a genuine bid for peace or merely another international political maneuver will come this week, when the Big Four Powers meet in London in another attempt to reach agreement on a peace treaty for Austria. This meeting—the seventh of its kind—has been convoked at the request of the Austrian Government, which joins the Austrian people in what has become a national prayer for liberation from the liberators. But it is also in keeping with the stand of all the Western Powers that if Russia really desires to end the cold war and engage in genuine peace negotiations it must do so, not through propaganda, but through the constituted bodies and official channels, and that it must prove its good faith, not by words which in Mr. Stalin's lexicon are merely a diplomatic mask, but by deeds.

On both these counts, the meeting of the deputies of the Foreign Ministers Council on Austria should prove especially revealing because, of all the outstanding postwar problems, that of Austria is most easily solved. According to the Three Power Declaration of Moscow, proclaimed November 1, 1943, Austria was to be treated, not as an enemy, but as a liberated country, and was to be reestablished as a free and independent nation. Yet, while such former enemy countries as Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria have long since been living under formal peace treaties, Austria, which the Moscow Declaration held to be the first free country to fall victim to Hitlerite aggression, is still being treated on a par with, and in some respects even worse than, Germany.

It has the advantage of having its own government, but that government is subject to the orders of the four occupying powers. For the rest, like Germany, it is still divided into four occupation zones. The western zones participate in the European recovery program and are recovering, but the Soviet zone, which is the most important part of Austria, is subject to Russian oppression and exploitation equal to that of Soviet Germany. According to Austrian figures, Russia has kidnaped some 135,000 Austrian men and women who have disappeared, and has seized 20 percent of Austrian agricultural land and the same percentage of Austrian industrial production. Yet, in contrast to our policy in Germany, there has been scarcely a western protest against this Soviet spoliation.

What the Western Powers have been trying to do is to speed an Austrian peace treaty which would get the Russians out of the country. The Austrian Government is willing to pay almost any price for this boon. But all previous efforts have been wrecked on the rock of Russian obstruction, attributed primarily to two reasons. One is that Russia quite obviously has been in no hurry to conclude a treaty because, while milking Austria, it was also entitled to maintain Soviet troops in Hungary and Rumania to guard its communication lines, which enabled it to rivet Communist regimes on these countries. Another is that, having failed to foist a Communist regime on Austria, Russia has been holding out for a treaty which would perpetuate its economic domination and exploitation of that country.

For this purpose Russia has been using two main pretexts which the Western Powers have rejected. The first was a demand for a cession of Austrian Carinthia to Yugoslavia—a demand already precluded by the Moscow Declaration. The second, based on a typically Russian interpretation of the Potsdam reparation agreement, was a demand for all "German assets" in Austria, in which Russia includes all Austrian property seized by the Nazis. It is possible that in view of Marshal Tito's defection from the Cominform, Russia is now willing to drop the first demand. But the second, advanced in lieu of a demand for Austrian reparations which Mr. Stalin personally renounced, is crucial. For while Russia has declared itself willing to settle some of its claims for $150,000,000, it also demands permanent economic concessions in Austria under a virtually extraterritorial status which would put all Austrian economy at its mercy and might pave the way for the incorporation of Austria into the Communist eastern bloc.

It goes without saying that the Western Powers cannot agree to the later conditions without participating in a super-Yalta which would sell out Austria and further imperil their own position. Any further Russian insistence on them would not only demonstrate a continuing policy of Soviet expansion but would also make a mockery of the Russian peace professions to which Mr. Stalin has now lent his voice.

Do We Deserve Democracy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a sermon delivered on January 23, 1949, entitled "Do We Deserve Democracy?" The sermon was preached on the Sunday following the inauguration of Harry S. Truman as President of the United States of America, in the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

This sermon deserves our most careful and prayerful perusal.

It follows:

DO WE DESERVE DEMOCRACY?

(By the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D. D.)

"Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." (Psalm 33: 12.)

I

Last Thursday, in one of the most colorful episodes in modern times, the President of the United States of America assumed the duties of his office. The eyes and ears of the world were attentive as he took the oath of office in this era of profound soul-sickness and and universal longing for real peace and a better life. Appropriately the President noted the anxiety about the uneasy armistice, the "cold war," the conflicting ideologies, the hopelessness and nihilism in vast areas.

In the promotion of a better world President Truman wisely said the initiative is ours. If that is true we must have something worthy of exportation to the rest of the world. The President took occasion to enumerate some time-honored American principles. He drew apt contrasts between our kind of democracy and secular Communism. He saw Communism sprawling across the world, spawning on despair and frustration, with many devotees of its philosophy deceived but powerless. With its militant atheism, Communism subordinates the individual to serve the ends of the state. Democracy, rooted in personal religion, elevates the individual and proclaims the supreme worth of man, whose interests the state itself must serve. It is at this point that our Christian faith must be clearly recognized as the determining factor in the present crisis of the world. For Protestants this should be a time of evangelical zeal. Here the truths of our faith become vitally relevant. In the last analysis the world's responsibility is the responsibility of individuals. Like a wall made of bricks, where the single brick gives way, the wall collapses; if men decay, the Nation crumbles. Yet individual man has given way to mass man.

The whole trend of modern life has been to relieve the individual of responsibility. Secular psychologists assure us we were "conditioned" in childhood to be what we are. We are comforted with the assurance we are not sinners but victims. The economist tells us our misfortunes are not due to lack of individual responsibility but to the economic system. The sociologist contends we are

victims of environment and redemption will come by programs of social amelioration. Meanwhile, the Church has been the one institution insisting upon individual responsibility. Perhaps this accounts for the unpopularity of the Church among some people. The Church insists upon proclaiming the sinfulness of man and his need of redemption. There can be no sustained improvement and no hope of avoiding tragedy unless individuals are willing to accept responsibility for their own lives and a stewardship concern for the society to which they belong. Because so-called individualism sometimes has meant defending the status quo or pure selfishness, we need not be blinded to the fact that life in a democracy for good or ill turns on the character of its people. It is the crisis in the character of people that is the concern of our age.

II

The issues of our times turn not so much on economic forces or social philosophies as on the quality of the people. Good philosophies cannot be effective with defective people. Reputable statesmen point out that one obstacle to making peace is the untrustworthiness of some who are commissioned to make it. The collapse of character is the concern of the age.

The events in recent years suggest that France collapsed early in the late war, not as some suppose because she had a liberal program—but because it was a godless program, because France had lost her mooring in God. France had a good army but not good enough motivation. It was because it was materialistic or secular and not spiritual that France gave way. There were about 2,000,000 Protestants and about 5,000,000 practicing Roman Catholics in a total population of 40,000,000—the rest of the population was pagan or secular. Dr. John Mackay declared, "France is the culminating proof that a democracy is done without Christianity." And France is still groping.

Democracy will die where Christianity is stultified or is dead. Democracy is possible only where a large part of the people believe in and act under responsibility to God. For to be successful, democracy depends upon men who can be trusted with their own destinies.

Over the portals of true democracy is written, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." We need then to look to our sources. While there were some other forces at work at the beginning the primary source of our democracy is the Hebrew-Christian tradition. It got its chief impetus from the Reformation movement within the church.

I have read again recently some sections of The Institutes of John Calvin. What he envisioned, as St. Augustine before him, was a theocracy not precisely like that of the ancient Hebrews, but a theocracy by the spirit of the Lord in the common man. Such an order presupposed a society wherein a high percentage of the people lived in faith in God, as the sovereign ruler of a moral universe, to whom both men and nations are responsible. Ranke, the German historian, says, "John Calvin is the practical founder of America." In 1927, Andre Siegfried, French student of American life, said that America is "not only Protestant but essentially Calvinistic in her religion and social development." At the time of the War for Independence there were only 22,000 Roman Catholics in a total Colonial population of 4,000,000. The Reformed Faith was the dominating religious and social force at the founding of our Nation.

It is therefore a fearful responsibility we have. For if ever democracy is eclipsed in the United States, it will be because Protestant Christians have not lived up to the highest expressions and worthiest concepts of their faith. Of the 77,376,000 (November 1948) church members in the United States, 25,268,000 are Roman Catholics, including all baptized persons. Adding to this 4,641,000 Jews and the remaining smaller groups, there is a total non-Protestant population of 31,185,000. The Protestant population of 46,191,000 includes only confirmed members according to the reporting practices of most Protestant Churches. Since the Protestant Churches represent ecclesiastical democracy in contrast with ecclesiastical totalitarianism, Protestants bear a terrific responsibility for contributing to the democratic structure of our Nation. Let us note again some of the salient features of our democracy.

1. Democracy is a high faith in the capacity of the common man, which means most of us; in his spiritual capacity to discern truth; to see and accept and live by ideals. Where does that come from?—Out of the Hebrew-Christian tradition. Specifically from the Reformation.

2. Democracy is belief in freedom of speech and assembly and of press, recognizing that perhaps many untrue and foolish things may be said—and it is quite possible we may say some of them.

Where does that come from?—Emphatically, that privilege emerged from the Reformation. Under neither political nor ecclesiastical totalitarianism is such possible. Under political totalitarianism the State defines what you read and hear. Under ecclesiastical totalitarianism you are forbidden to worship with others or to read unapproved literature.

3. Democracy is belief that individuals have a high moral dignity because of their relation to their Creator, and as His sons their personalities are of highest value. What hurts personality is wrong. What enriches is good. What is the source of that? Emphatically, the Christian religion.

4. Democracy believes that man with such splendid spiritual origins and capacities can be inspired and led to put the general good above his own selfish interests and ambition—and that he finds his true happiness in service. Where do we get that? Out of the Christian faith and primarily out of the Reformation.

Democracy, as we know it, is so much a child of the Christian religion that there is no reason to suppose that where Christ has ceased to grip and inspire men the foundation of democracy can be maintained.

How much we need to realize the importance of personal loyalty to our faith. Is it not true that the man who neglects his faith, who absents himself from his Church, who fails to read his Bible, to maintain his personal devotions, who does not pray, who does not seek to discover the will of God for his life—is it not true that every such person who is becoming a cultured and refined and respected and well-educated pagan—is he not, even though unaware of it, a menace to democracy? On the other hand, is not every citizen who cultivates his inner life, who worships God Almighty, who is disciplined by prayer and Christian fellowship, who is taught and who teaches Christian morality, and maintains a Christian home, and takes seriously his responsibility to society—is he not, however humbly, building the foundation on which our democracy is built?

Let us be forthright. Democracy depends upon religion. Our kind depends upon the Christian religion. Its ideas are religious ideas, its standards are religious standards, its goals are religious goals. Allow religion to languish and democracy begins to disintegrate.

If democracy should ever vanish, it will be because we are not sufficiently Christian. We cannot play at religion and trifle with our inheritance and keep the American way. We deserve it only in proportion as we cultivate the qualities of character worthy of it.

President Monroe in his inaugural address emphasized the importance of an intelligent appreciation of our magnificent social ideal which we call true Americanism when he said, "It is only when the people become ignorant and greedy, when they degenerate into a populace, that they are incapable of exercising their sovereignty." We must not thus degenerate.

Dr. Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University, has studiously indicated what he calls the American canon—comparable in secular literature to the Canon of the Bible. He says the American canon is composed of seven documents:

1. The Genesis is the Mayflower Compact, which began "In the name of God, Amen."

2. The Exodus is the Declaration of Independence—the going out into the promised land of liberty and self-government.

3. The Book of Law is the Constitution and Bill of Rights. "Thou shalt not" is spoken not to individuals but to their government.

4. There are many Major and Minor Prophecies, but the best of these is Washington's Farewell Address.

5. Our national Psalm—The Star-Spangled Banner.

6. The Gospel was spoken by the Savior of the Nation, Abraham Lincoln, in his second inaugural address. It was and is still "good news."

7. The Epistles are many, but the best is Woodrow Wilson's last article, The Road Away From Revolution. That memorable address concludes:

"The sum of the whole matter is this, that our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead.

"Here is the final challenge to our churches, to our political organizations, and to our capitalists—to everyone who fears God or loves his country. Shall we not all earnestly cooperate to bring in the new day?"

All of these documents begin, continue, and end in God. Do we deserve democracy? That nation deserves democracy "whose God is the Lord." Democracy is only possible where the people are committed to its principles of belief in the value of human personality, mutual trust, and have an invincible faith in the presiding providence of God. Only where a large section of the people are dedicated to Christ and His church can our kind of democracy succeed.

III

Do we deserve democracy? If we take seriously our responsibility to pray, to think, to work for the Kingdom of God; if we can really have faith in individuals as did our fathers; if we are the kind of characters to be trusted with our own destiny; if we have the courage to establish economic well-being and social justice; if we contribute to the making of a moral peace between nations; if we cultivate day by day those interior resources which make us Christians indeed; if the church is really the church—the redeemed of the Lord—"the salt of the earth," "a colony of heaven." One of the most patriotic things a man can do is to join a church and work at his religion.

I shall never forget an experience which I had one summer day before the war in a well-known city in southern Russia. Early in the morning I left my modest hotel at daybreak and wandered unescorted through the streets of the ancient city—past the scaffolding of partially completed buildings and shops yet unvisited, intermittently meeting only a forlorn dog or a solitary peasant, until I came to a great church. Approaching the massive structure I was confronted at the main entrance by two guards with rifles and fixed bayonets. Since I was obviously not a thief and promptly produced

my "Intourist" identification book, I was permitted within. Inside the altar and ornamented screen were gone. Tapestry and tinsel were no longer visible. The gaudy accouterments of worship familiar in the Eastern Church had been desecrated and a musty smell had displaced the aroma of incense and candlewax. Only the shell of a house of worship remained.

Instead of functioning as a church the entire building had become a granary. A pile of threshed wheat was heaped in the form of an inverted cone, its base covering the entire cathedral floor and its point reaching far up into the dome. The early morning sun poured through the stained-glass windows and the multicolored lights played weirdly on the grains of wheat. Figures of saints and martyrs flashed in the remnants of the windows. Around the interior of the dome was a dim but beautiful mural of our Lord breaking bread with his disciples on the night which was the night of the institution and also of betrayal.

Alone with my thoughts, I could understand how often our Lord must have looked down upon that church—remote from the people, aloof from man's common need, unresponsive to the forces about it—that church's identity with an insensitive and inept monarchy giving tacit consent to its tyranny. That church had lost its spiritual vitality; its compassion and its mercy had gone and the judgment of God was upon it. Although it had forsaken its Lord, it was still being judged by the Lord.

What a warning? A church no longer relevant to life is crushed. But the church which is faithful in its witness and relevant to the life about it will live and lift the culture in which it is set. Every crucifixion will be followed by a resurrection. When true to its Lord, neither secularism, nor materialism, nor the gates of hell itself can prevail against it.

Today, I implore you—look to the sources of your life! Stand by the church and the church's Lord will stand by you. "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord"—Lord of our churches, Lord of our homes, Lord of our schools, Lord of our colleges, Lord of our ballot boxes, Lord of our Government. Let us affirm, by our lives that we are "a Nation whose God is the Lord."

GI's On Courts-Martial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald, which appeared February 5, 1949.

This editorial reflects the best thinking on the future course and conduct of courts-martial. The inclusion of enlisted men on the boards will provide justice and fair dealing. It is a forward step in equity of military law.

GI's ON COURTS MARTIAL

It took a long time to break the officer monopoly on court martial for enlisted men in the Army, but at last the reform was accomplished by an Executive order from President Truman, effective Tuesday of this week.

From now on till further notice, an enlisted man facing a court-martial trial may request in writing that some of his fellow GI's sit on the court. When such a request is made, at least one-third of the tribunal's membership must be enlisted men. Verdicts are by secret ballot.

SO FAR SO GOOD

The first three trials under the new system ended on Thursday—on Governors Island, N. Y.; at Heidelberg, Germany; and at Fort Bragg, N. C. The New York case concerned a private charged with petty thefts and going a. w. o. l. In Heidelberg, it was a matter of two privates first class charged with killing a German in a New Year's Eve brawl. At Bragg, the GI defendant had snuck out of the guardhouse.

In all three cases, the boys were convicted. No obstructions of justice were observed as results of GI's serving on the military bench. The cases seem to have been open-and-shut, and the convicted soldiers apparently drew exactly the same sentences that would have been dealt out to them by all-officer courts.

These are only the first cases under the new arrangement. True, they are not enough to prove conclusively that the change will be 100 percent to the good.

But they do indicate that no grave consequences need be feared; that Army justice will probably proceed from here on as it has in the past, but perhaps with fewer mistakes or overharsh sentences.

And certainly the effect of the new rule on soldier morale should be excellent. As long as this system prevails, the enlisted man will have the satisfaction of knowing that he can demand the court-martial services of some of his military equals if he ever comes up for trial. It's hard to see how any soldier in his right mind can gripe about that.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention today to insert in the RECORD the text of the sermon of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, delivered yesterday in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, on the trial and persecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. However, in deference to my friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN ROONEY, of New York, I am withholding the extension of this historical document so that he may have the honor and privilege of making it a part of public record.

Cardinal Spellman has denounced the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Budapest, behind the iron curtain, as the crucifixion of humanity, and free men in every part of the world agree with the American cardinal.

Cardinal Mindszenty is doomed for defending the things which every Christian steadfastly believes. His unpardonable sin is that he is anti-Communistic, and for that the Kremlin has called for his destruction. His trial has followed the usual Soviet pattern.

Definance of Communism and its godless implications may bring martyrdom to Cardinal Mindszenty, but his sacrifice may lead the world to greater resistance of this terrible atheistic doctrine.

Some weeks ago I forwarded to our Department of State a telegram which I received from Rev. Louis F. Ell, spiritual director of the Holy Name Societies of the diocese of Belleville, Ill., dispatched in the name of the most reverend bishop of the diocese of Belleville, the reverend clergy, as well as 10,000 Catholic men of the Holy Name chapters, protesting the criminal arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty. I joined in these protests and urged the Department to officially protest to the Hungarian regime.

Our State Department in the meantime had taken cognizance of the Cardinal's case through a statement issued at a press conference on December 29, 1948, by the then Acting Secretary, when he denounced "as a sickening sham the arrest by Hungarian authorities of Cardinal Mindszenty."

At that time the Acting Secretary declared that the arrest was based on patently false charges and was the culmination of a long series of oppressive acts by the Hungarian Government against personal and religious freedom. Pointing out that the behavior of the Hungarian Government was typical of what was going on in countries behind the iron curtain, he remarked further that such action continued to make the achievement of peace an aspiration rather than a reality. He concluded that it was all that was needed to complete the unhappy chain of events in Hungary and to indicate what the attitude of the present Hungarian Government was toward the liberties to which the rest of the world attached the greatest importance.

The persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty calls to mind that since the beginning of Christianity no martyr died because he was a Christian—officially. Even the ancient persecutors of the church found other official reasons to persecute and condemn those who spread the doctrine of Christianity. Officially, Cardinal Mindszenty may not be condemned by the Soviet-dominated Hungarian regime because of his stand against atheistic communism, but the whole world will know that he made a martyr's sacrifice because of his religious belief and teachings.

The Meaning of Mindszenty—How To Jail a Cardinal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following two articles from the national Catholic weekly, America, entitled "The Meaning of Mindszenty," the first of which appeared in the December 11, 1948, issue, and the second in the January 8, 1949, issue; and a third article entitled "How To Jail a Cardinal," which appeared in the January 22, 1949, issue. These arti-

cles describe the usual Soviet pattern of persecution of religion. The so-called trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has followed the pattern.

[From America of December 11, 1948]

THE MEANING OF MINDSZENTY

The General Assembly of UN is authorized to "make recommendations" for the purpose of "assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Religious persecution clearly falls within its scope. There is persecution of religion going on behind the iron curtain which merits the immediate attention of UN.

Take the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. Some weeks ago America protested the imprisonment of the head of the Lutheran Church in Hungary, Bishop Louis Ordass, on a trumped-up currency charge. We then observed that the sentence was obviously an ominous warning given Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, archbishop of Budapest. Undaunted by threats from the Communist-dominated Cabinet, the heroic primate has watched the storm gather about him. His arrest as an agent of "foreign imperialism" or his expulsion as "a traitor to his country" may be expected any day.

Both of the above-mentioned accusations, it should be remembered, were made in telegrams dispatched to the Communist-controlled government by Communist-promoted "protest meetings" held recently in nine Hungarian cities. The arrest of the cardinal's secretary, Dr. Louis Zacker, will probably produce a "confession," extorted under torture, implicating the cardinal. It is a successful technique. The arrest of the secretary of Premier Ferenc Nàgy was similarly used as an excuse to overthrow the democratically elected majority party and install the present Communist regime.

The cardinal cannot complain that he has not been given ample notice; Erno Geroe, generally believed to be the "strong man" of the party, gave the signal. "The liquidation of clerical reaction is now the order of the day," he declared in a speech that termed the cardinal "the head of reaction." The Budapest Communist daily, Szabad Nep, called the statement of solidarity of the Catholic hierarchy most inopportune, coming "at the very moment when the Government, a few days ago, declared irrevocably that the glass was going to run over. * * * This answer will be given soon." Matyras Rakosi, who returned from Moscow to become Deputy Premier and general secretary of the party, assured the central committee of the Communist Workers Party in a broadcast: "We have come to the end of our policy of toleration. We must settle once and for all with this band, and above all with their chiefs."

Six hundred Catholic and Protestant clerygymen are now in Hungarian prisons. The cardinal primate seems destined to follow soon. Protests from the World Council of Churches against the imprisonment of Bishop Ordass won scarcely the attention of an acknowledgment from the Hungarian Government.

The persecution in Hungary is exceeded in violence by the persecution in Bulgaria and Rumania, where the Holy See has granted the extraordinary privilege of allowing Mass to be offered by a priest in street clothes, using a common drinking-glass for a chalice. It anticipates the persecution getting under way in Czechoslovakia in accordance with the lines laid down in secret official instructions sent to district action committees last July, published in the Episcopal weekly, the Living Church, for November 21.

Religion is persecuted everywhere behind the iron curtain because religion engenders resistance to tyranny. Persecution is directed chiefly against Catholicism in Hungary and is currently centered on the figure of Cardinal Mindszenty, because defense of the sanctity of the things that are not Caesar's must be crushed if tyranny is to prevail.

Returning from the Nuremberg trials, Justice Robert H. Jackson declared that the "disruptive effect on the international order" of the persecution of minorities "is so direct that tyranny on a sizable scale anywhere is a matter of international concern."

The persecution of religion in Hungary—to name one country—is on a larger than sizable scale. The UN was created to cope with matters of international concern. Well, isn't this such?

[From America of January 8, 1949]

THE MEANING OF MINDSZENTY

(By Edward Duff)

("There are two things the people of Hungary can do. They may escape from their country, or they can lie flat in the moors and give up entirely," said the exiled Hungarian leader Pfeiffer. A heroic Hungarian priest thought there was a third and a mandatory choice.)

The politician should always possess prudence. In November 1947, at the same time that Deputy Premier Stanislaw Mikolajszyk was spirited to safety out of Poland, Zoltan Pfeiffer, leader of the Hungarian Independence Party, secretly fled from Budapest with a broken head. He had been set upon by a crowd of Communist storm troopers who broke up a meeting of his party in the town of Csongrad, belaboring him with bicycle pumps and shovels. Arriving in New York, the fourth leader of a political party to make his escape from Hungary, Mr. Pfeiffer declared: "There are two things the people of Hungary can do. One, they may escape from their country; or, two, they can lie flat in the moors and give up entirely. That is the choice."

An intense, austere, middle-aged Hungarian priest thought there was a third and a mandatory choice. You could defy tyranny and trumpet the truth. Until—if and when it pleased God—you would be killed.

The priest—whose name is Josef Mindszenty—happens to be primate of that unhappy land and a prince of the church. Mindszenty means, significantly enough, all saints. The cardinal is a striking symbol of the 600 Hungarian Catholic and Protestant clergymen imprisoned as victims of a systematic and implacable persecution of religion.

As America predicted last month (December 11, 1948, p. 255), the agents of the political police arrived at the primate's residence in Esztergom and hurried him off to their dread examination headquarters at 60 Andrassy Utca, Budapest, where confessions are extorted. The charge is suspicion of plotting against the government, spying, treason, and black-market dealings. It was 8 o'clock on the night of December 26, the Feast of St. Stephen, the first martyr, murdered because his enemies were no match for his wisdom and for the spirit which gave him utterance. Throughout the world, journalists were writing copy on the Christmas Eve message of the Holy Father and finding a new context for his assertion:

"In all those countries where to profess the Catholic faith really means to suffer persecution there have been, and there are still, thousands of valiant men and women who, undismayed by sacrifices, proscriptions, and torture, and fearless in the face of prison and death, do not bow the knee before the Baal of might and power."

Arrest is no new experience for Cardinal Mindszenty. Under the Nazi occupation he was a center and symbol of resistance, and when they marched him off to prison he went dressed in his episcopal robes, attended by his clergy, whom he blessed with his manacled hands at the gates of the jail. Those were the days—have they been forgotten now?—when the Hungarian hierarchy saved some 200,000 Jews.

They were followed by the days when the Red Army liberated eastern Hungary and set up a provisional government at Debrecen. The Hungarian department of the supposedly "dissolved" Comintern arrived with the Russian tanks and, in hypocritical obeisance to Yalta's expectation of broadly based governments, summoned the politicians of other parties. Zoltan Tildy, a Presbyterian minister; Bela Varga, a Catholic priest; Bela Kovacs and Ferenc Nágy, peasant leaders, joined the coalition. To the astonishment of the Russians, the Smallholders Party won 57 percent of the vote in the election of November 4, 1945, just 50 percent more than the Communists polled. It was the last free election for that part of the world. With Matyas Rakosi, a Russian citizen and a brigadier general of the Soviet Army, as Deputy Premier, the Communists proceed to undermine the results of the elections and place the country completely under Soviet control. It took almost 2 years and the direct intervention of the Red army to remove by death or threats Tildy, Kovacs, Varga, and Nágy, and purge the Smallholders Party into obsequious docility. False accusations, the weak compromising of Tildy and Nágy, who surrendered their friends to be garrotted, and the menacing presence of the Red occupation troops all contributed to the shock official Washington got May 30, 1947. By a coup, later to be repeated in Czechoslovakia, the Communists had taken over. The Kremlin had given its answer to the announcement of the Truman Doctrine.

Cardinal Mindszenty in a New Year's message for 1946 revealed that in Budapest during the month of November there were 2,188 still-born babies as against 822 born alive. That was the trouble with the prelate: He insisted on speaking out, and his voice carried. The force of religion, the Communist masters determined, must be smothered.

Catholic youth groups were banned in July 1946; Catholic priests were arrested; Bishop Stephen Zadavecz, who had opposed the Bela Kun uprising in 1919, was deported; processions were prohibited and publications refused permission to operate. Catholics were defranchised in the 1947 elections for reasons which the United States State Department found to "border on the grotesque." "Insanity" was a frequent reason for canceling the suffrage: indeed, anyone brave enough to vote against the Communists might well be considered insane. Against the names of nuns was written in one electoral register: "She, or the husband with whom she cohabits, has been under police surveillance for immoral occupation."

Undaunted by the Soviet steamroller, Cardinal Mindszenty was appealing to world opinion. He protested the brutal deportation of Hungarian families from Slovakia and was censured by the Government for his interference. In July 1946 the Review of World Affairs acknowledged: "He is accepted as resistance leader by both Catholics and Protestants," and described him as "living on almost nothing, rising three times every night for prayer, working 18 hours every day, devoid of oratorical gifts but of immense character." His oratorical gifts cannot be negligible, for the same reporter—Kenneth De Courcy—records that 240,000 men gathered at Maria Remete, a 2½-hour walk from Budapest, to hear him speak on the problem of education. When he invited the women to come the next Sunday, 400,000 were there.

Efforts to divide the hierarchy by spreading reports that Archbishop Czapik, of Eger, and Bishop Banas, of Veszprem, were devoted to democracy and approved the regime failed. On September 12, 1946, an official statement was issued by the episcopacy declaring that "every individual member of the bench of bishops wholeheartedly supports the courageous attitude of the cardinal primate in defense of the church."

The squat, bald, ex-clothing-store clerk, Rakosi, known in Budapest as "Potato Head," decided that religion was superfluous in education, that Hungary's schools should be nationalized.

Moscow-trained, he had found the means of smothering religion. And he had found the issue that would force the cardinal into irretrievable opposition to the regime. He would break the organization of the church by forcing out its national leader. He would undermine the loyalty Hungarians feel for their clergy by centering all attacks on ecclesiastical leaders. He would not attack religions openly but would make "enemies of the people's democracy" of the clergy. On January 10, 1948, he declared: "The task of democracy this year is to settle the relationship between the church and the republic. It cannot continue that a majority of the enemies of the people should hide behind the cloak of the churches, especially the Catholic Church."

In the spring the Government announced that education would become a state monopoly. In a series of pastoral letters—since the radio and the press were denied him—the cardinal asserted the inalienable right of parents to decide the education of their children, a right recognized last month in the international declaration of human rights adopted by the Social Committee of the United Nations General Assembly. "It is in the exercise of this fundamental right that German parents felt themselves injured when the Hitlerian state seized their schools by force," the cardinal declared in his pastoral of May 16. The world was reminded of the ringing defense of human liberties by August von Galen, "the Lion of Muenster," raised to the cardinalate with Mindszenty in February 1946.

It was no academic debate of priority of rights, no idle insistence on protocol. Mindszenty foresaw the de-Christianization of youth, the sovietization of Hungary. In June church schools were sequestered and the docile parliament, refusing an appeal to the people on the issue, peremptorily nationalized 4,813 Catholic schools, about half the schools in the country. The results were soon manifest. The cardinal had warned: "After the introduction of a state monopoly in the field of education there would be nothing to prevent the schools from sinking to a level of hotbeds of party policy and materialism."

"There are no nonpolitical educationists," announced the Secretary of State in the Ministry of Public Information:

"Teachers must find in all questions, even in those which are apparently nonpolitical, the point of view under which they can deal with them as aspects of the great problem of the people's democracy advancing toward socialism."

Such "an aspect of the great problem" will be revealed in the answer to question No. 21, posed to those hoping to join the staff of the "people's colleges" springing up all over Hungary: "Why did the Pope support the capitalists and not the poor workers at the time of the Italian elections?"

Unfortunately the non-Catholic groups bowed to the pressure. The Reformed Church, urged by the Swiss theologian Karl Barth to cooperate, rid itself of the leaders the Communist regime found objectionable. The Unitarians insist they have nothing to complain about. The Lutherans, after the arrest of Bishop Louis Ordass (America, October 30, 1948, p. 88), decided to sign an agreement with the Government—as did the Jewish community. Undismayed by Rakosi's angry cry that he was "losing patience"—Hitler's menacing phrase—with the Catholic Church, that "democracy's fist" would immediately strike anyone violating its will, the Hungarian hierarchy resolutely supported the cardinal in his defiance.

The persecution of the church increases in intensity. Twenty-one thousand nuns and priests who had been teaching in the schools have resigned. All articles must be submitted for censorship before printing in the two little weeklies allowed for 7,000,000 Catholics. Bishops are forbidden even to mimeograph letters for correspondence with their clergy. The radio and press are filled with antireligious propaganda with no facilities for denial. Bribes are held out to induce apostasy. Believers have been removed from teaching posts, the army, the police. Processions are broken up by the police; pilgrimages thwarted by refusing railroad tickets; quarantining villages; closing roads. Concentration camps are filling with priests and laymen. Worst of all, perhaps, a half million Christian children are having a Stalinist education forced on them. All of these charges have been submitted to the United Nations.

As the center of resistance to this monstrous program, Cardinal Mindszenty has borne the abuse and calumnies of the illegal Government. The attacks upon him grew to a crescendo of violence last month (America, December 11, 1948, p. 255), with the Court of Summary Jurisdiction requesting the Budapest People's Court to try him for subversive activities and the new Premier using the occasion of his first address to Parliament as the opportunity of an attack. The correspondent of the London Times found the speech evidence that: "The only surviving center of opposition is the Catholic Church under the leadership of the Primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty."

The cardinal chose not to answer the attacks. In preparation for the Feast of Christ the King he ordered a triduum held in all the churches and was gratified to learn that more than 1,500,000 of the faithful of Budapest received Holy Communion. Night adoration in all the parishes on November 1 was followed by a pilgrimage of 30,000 that he led in person to the shrine of Our Lady at Palosszentut, where the pilgrims fasted for 2 days on bread and water to demonstrate that "here in southeast Europe the Hungarians are a praying people who confess their faith."

Soon after, his secretary was arrested and questioned to obtain the inevitable confession involving the primate. But Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty kept to his home, like Thomas à Becket at Canterbury, awaiting the agents of the tyrant.

They came for him last week, providing their cynical reply to the indictment of the Pope's Christmas Eve message. In their arrogance they did something the reckless Hitler never dared: they arrested a prince of the church. And in their limitless insolence they published to a dumfounded world monstrous fables of intrigue, climaxed by a fatuous account of exchange dealings with NCWC-War Relief Services whose food they had seized.

It is a familiar story: Caesar proclaiming himself master of all areas of human life, determined to destroy all who would question his total dominion. Speaking to the celebrated St. Stephen Society in Budapest on November 15, 1946, Cardinal Mindszenty stated:

"The rights of men and of the church are generally violated simultaneously. The church has her own aims which are not part of the aims of the state. Neither the church nor the state is directly subordinate to each other. The church defends the rights and the liberties of the state because the name of God and the moral order are the chief guaranty of the state."

Caesar's answer was expressed last year by Rakosi's comrade in the Comintern, Rumanian Premier Groza: "The [Orthodox] church is a part of the state itself, keeping pace with the spirit of the times."

But the ultimate meaning of Mindszenty transcends even the everlasting struggle for human liberty. In his final pastoral, suppressed by the Communists but broadcast by the Voice of America to helpless Hungary, the priest-prelate who was to be arrested on St. Stephen's day declared: "I stand for God, church, and my country. * * * I pray for the world of justice and brotherly love; I pray for those who, in the words of my Master, know not what they are doing. I forgive them with all my heart."

[From America of January 22, 1949]

HOW TO JAIL A CARDINAL

(By John O'Connor)

(The following is a series of excerpts from broadcasts made by the various commentators on radio stations behind the iron curtain. How the statements arrived in this country must remain undisclosed at this time for reasons of security.—John O'Connor.)

The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty was indirectly forecast months ago on the various radio stations controlled by the Communist quislings throughout eastern Europe. On October 12, 1948, the Prague radio station carried a digest of an article from the New Times (Moscow). Written by a Soviet commentator, Minyaev, it stated in part:

"United States diplomats * * * organized subversive activities in the countries of southeastern Europe * * *. A certain United States consular employee in Czechoslovakia, when dissatisfied with the work of his agents, undertook himself to photograph military objectives in the border region. Similar instances were reported from Hungary."

Four or five days later another mild dose of preparation was administered. Radio Budapest quoted the then Premier of Hungary as saying to the Red-controlled trade unions: "* * * The Hungarian trade unions are proud of being in the vanguard of the great internal struggle, in the course of which was eliminated from Hungary's political life the enemies of the people's democracy, of the workers and of the country."

On October 14 the Hungarian regime received the guaranty of its incumbency when Rudé Pravo, organ of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, was quoted at length over the Prague radio as saying in part: "We shall assure political, cultural, and citizens' rights to Hungarians. * * * The people of Czechoslovakia may rest assured that chauvinism will never be revived in Hungary. In Hungary the progressive forces have come to power."

That evening Moscow's European service, broadcasting in Serbo-Croat, defended the Hungarian regime against the chauvinism exhibited by Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia.

In Budapest on October 15, Eric Geroe, Hungarian Minister of Communications, said: "We strive to adapt the economic science of Marx, Engels, and Stalin and Lenin to specific Hungarian conditions." Later in the month, theory disappeared and the smear began. On the Budapest radio there was a summary of the Hungarian Trade Union Council's convention. Mihaly Horvath, organizational secretary, told a prepared union group:

"The Congress declared in the name of 1,600,000 organized workers that it is for complete freedom of worship and freedom for the churches, but it urges the Government, and indeed demands of it, that it put an end to the anti-democratic machinations of Joszef Mindszenty, the present cardinal."

On October 26, the Democratic Women's World Federation, representing 100,000,000 women, came to Budapest. Among the fragrant flowers who represented the women of their countries were Nina Porkov, a member of the Supreme Soviet; La Pasionaria, the great Spanish republican leader; Ana Pauker, Rumanian Foreign Minister. It is

not hard to guess what these representative women from 35 nations were told about the cardinal for home consumption.

Two days later, Premier Dinnyes, addressing the Smallholders Conference, stated:

"We take particularly into account the relationship of the dependency between certain Hungarian Catholic circles and big American capital, but we cannot tolerate the forcing into the same dependency of the Hungarian masses, desirous of following their religious convictions and not the agents of imperialism. * * * We shall remain unflinchingly alined with our powerful Soviet friend."

The attack shifts. Now the radio stations in Budapest strike from another angle: the example of the cooperation of Protestant churches as contrasted with the intransigence of the Catholic Church. (By this time one Lutheran bishop had been jailed.)

Broadcasting in English to the world, radio Budapest stated:

"In the course of the Protestant Week in Hungary, a meeting took place in the great hall of the Academy of Music in Budapest to celebrate the Reformation. The leaders of the Protestant churches were there to hear Bishop Albert Bereczky make a speech. Speaking in general terms of Cardinal Mindszenty, the bishop said there were people today who tried, some by abuse, some by ingratiation, to draw the Protestant churches into a political struggle."

Bishop Bereczky is then quoted as follows:

"We Protestants want to serve our people by the healing and constructive power of the gospel, but if anyone were to thwart us in this constructive work and in serving the gospel for worldly ends, we will, despite their abuse, lies, and accusations, say: 'Hands off the teachings of the gospel, even if those hands have a cardinal's ring on them.'"

The forces were being lined up. On November 13 the Hungarian domestic radio reported: "The fifth national Army conference of the Hungarian Workers' Party began today in the Honved House." Mihaly Farkas, Minister of Defense, touched upon the reactionary clandestine activities of Cardinal Mindszenty and his associates. He pointed out that the broad strata of the Hungarian population have had enough of the political incitement hiding behind the cloak of the church. "I am convinced," said Farkas, "that the Government, to satisfy the protests which come from all strata of Hungarian workers, will not wait long to grant these just demands."

On November 15 the same station reported that "the trade-union leaders at the meeting took a stand against the antinationalist activities of Cardinal Mindszenty, demanding the Government to forbid the activities of clerical reaction. At a meeting of the administrative committee of the Budapest municipality, on behalf of the Peasant Party, János Keri condemned the antidemocratic attitude of Mindszenty." He stated that "Mindszenty is not a bishop any more but the arch-politician of reaction, the sole commander in chief of every reactionary, antirevolutionary, and Fascist force. Mindszenty wants war because he hopes for political and economic restoration from it."

The pace and the pitch are increasing. On November 20 the Budapest radio quoted from an article in Haladas, entitled "The Clergy's Declaration of War":

"It could have been predicted without any prophetic foresight that there would come within a short time a decisive battle between the Hungarian Catholic hierarchy and the Hungarian state. In the irresponsible cultural struggle initiated by the clergy, it is the duty of the state to protect the new order against any disturbing attempts. According to indications, the Government will soon abandon its restraint and avert the attack with effective defenses."

That same day another periodical, Igaz Szo (Fighters for Freedom), stated:

"In letters and telegrams, resolutions, and proposals, the whole country is protesting against the incitement, the focal point of which is the residence of the Cardinal of Estergom, and whose hedgehog position can be found duplicated in the see of every bishop. The working people will not tolerate that their work should be undermined by others.

"Each Sunday Cardinal Mindszenty has lowered the pulpit to the level of a soap box and incited and instigated against everything which is in the interest of the people and, not in the last place, of the Catholics themselves. This soap box, however, is distasteful to the Hungarian people. Let everybody be sure that we will have the strength to force the present chief agent of American imperialism in Hungary down from the soap box."

The following day (November 21) Sandor Barcs, vice president of the Smallholders Party, told his listeners that the opposition (Barankovics Party) have members who "are mostly covertly, but often openly, visiting one village after another as the agents of Cardinal Mindszenty. We cannot tolerate that civil rights should be granted to such people, who are attempting, not as an opposition but as a raging Mindszentyite enemy, to mislead, to incite the Hungarian peasants, and to hoodwink them against their own interests."

The Hungarian Workers Party was the next to hear about the "iniquities" of the cardinal. Matyas Rakosi, Deputy Premier, real leader of the Communist tyranny and long a friend of Joseph Stalin, told the group during a long speech a day later:

"The comrades know that we have succeeded in reaching an agreement with the Protestant churches."

"Through mutual concessions and understanding we regulated these church relations to the state. To our greatest regret, we have hitherto been unable to reach a similar agreement with the Roman Catholic Church, but not because Hungarian democracy did not try to."

"On the contrary, reproach is being leveled against us by the Protestant Church for excessive patience, and the enemies of democracy in the church have exploited this patience, which they have interpreted as a sign of weakness. * * * Now we are hearing similar voices from the Catholic side, too. The movement, which from thousands of villages and organizations now spontaneously demands a change in our policy toward the Catholic Church reactionaries, is a warning which must be heeded. * * * The religious-minded workers, and above all the peasants, begin to realize that reaction was exploiting their religious feelings."

Rakosi next repeated the old charges of the "cassock or the cardinal's cloak" hiding Fascists. Then, holding up a Government agreement with the small Protestant groups, he said:

"It is thus incompatible that an organized troop of reaction like that lining up behind Mindszenty should disturb our reconstruction and stabilization. * * * The fact that we were able to come to an agreement with the Protestant churches and that with Mindszenty we were not makes all well-meaning people realize that the question here is not one of persecuting religion but a justified and inevitable self-defense of democracy. This change of policy will be even better understood by those many thousands of Catholic democrats who demanded that they should be protected against the excesses of reaction in an ecclesiastical cloak."

The same day the Bratislava radio in Czechoslovakia threw its piece of silver upon the scale with a searing attack upon all the bishops of Central Europe. On Nov. 28 Fueggetelen Magyarorszag announced that the young Catholics in the county of Czanad have asked the bishop of the county not to have Mindszenty's political letter read in the churches.

On December 6, the Budapest radio carried another attack. In this, the Cardinal ceased to be an individual and became a symbol. The protests eliminated the man and dwelt on Mindszentism. The same broadcast praised the National Federation of Landowners for demanding the liquidation of Mindszentism and the elimination of Mindszenty from public life.

Eight days later the new Hungarian Premier, addressing the legislature, reviewed the charges of the previous weeks, and at great length. Concluding, he said:

"The Government is receiving by the thousands telegrams and letters, many of them from Catholic priests, Catholic congregations, and Catholic professors and students in universities, in which the demand is not forward to take strong action against Mindszenty. In this respect, the will of the people cannot be disregarded."

The clamor grew. On December 17 it was reported that nine leading Catholics had written to Cardinal Mindszenty and said, in part:

"As a result of your attitude, the Hungarian Catholic Church has in the past years become an illegal political party under the cover of which the forces of counter revolution are gathering. Your Eminence has split the spiritual unity of the working Catholic masses who remain loyal to their faith."

On December 19, Deputy Laszlo Orban, of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Workers Party, told 1,500 lawyers in Budapest:

"It is indispensable that Marxism-Leninism should permeate our legal practice. The legislature and the jurisdiction of the U. S. S. R. must be studied more thoroughly than hitherto because the U. S. S. R. is juridically the most advanced state in the world."

On December 27, the press department of the Ministry of the Interior reported that the police authorities "have taken into custody Josef Mindszenty, archbishop of Estergom, under suspicion of high treason, crimes aimed at the overthrow of the Republic, espionage, and illegal dealings in foreign exchange."

The broadcast was in Hungarian. Later it was repeated in Serbo-Croat. Then broadcasting in English to all the world, the Budapest radio cited the Archbishop Laud case in 1640 in England and stated that Mindszenty, like Laud, had worked with "Jesuits and papists, bishops and that corrupt part of the clergy." It continued: "Every word that stands against Laud stands in triple measure against Mindszenty in Hungary today. The English people beheaded Archbishop Laud. Why do their rulers now protest at the arrest of a man who did much worse?"

That same day the Czech radio in Prague supported the stand of a group, citing letters from Catholic priests demanding "the speedy expulsion of the Roman Catholic priests who * * * are * * * undermining our regime and causing unrest. * * * We are awaiting a reply from the bishops."

The pattern was complete. On December 29, 2 days after the arrest of the cardinal had been announced, "telegrams" from small towns began "to pour in," praising the Government's "energetic measure" in putting an end to the "criminal activities of Josef Mindszenty." The next day it was announced on the radio that delegations of workers and peasants came "in long lines" to praise the Premier for acting against the cardinal.

On New Year's Day, with the cardinal somewhere in a cell, President Szakasits announced: "The Hungarian Government and the Hungarian people have no other object * * * than to return the Roman

Catholic Church to its original vocation." Two hours later, in an English broadcast, United States Under Secretary of State Robert Lovett was attacked. The following afternoon it was announced in both Hungarian and English that "more and more" priests are "taking a stand against Mindszenty." On January 4, usual news programs were dropped to make place for long, detailed statements against the cardinal. And on January 5 he was called "the greatest enemy the Hungarian people have ever had."

Meanwhile, the frame is being set for the next picture. Perhaps a "rising tide of public resentment" will take place. Perhaps the Government will have to "save" the church from its betrayers.

Twenty easy lessons in how to jail a cardinal. Twenty easy lessons in the lexicon of hell.

Navajo Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a former Member of Congress, Will Rogers, Jr., for the wonderful work he is doing in behalf of the Indians of the United States, as head of the National Congress of American Indians.

This group is composed of public-spirited Americans throughout the country who are trying to present a program covering the real needs of the Indians on a long-range basis. In the past we have heard startling stories of the suffering of the Indians and various groups of American people have made spasmodic, philanthropic gestures, but they are only temporary and short-lived. In other words, they are like the desert flower that blooms in beautiful colors and in a few days fades away and dies.

President Truman in his inaugural speech talked of attempting to raise the standards of living throughout the world and I for one believe that it should be started right here at home, and the Indians should be the No. 1 beneficiaries.

I commend Mr. Rogers for this work and want to assure him that I am not only supporting the program but feel that we should not discuss limitations, especially since we are not doing that in our foreign-aid program.

Herewith I submit a memorandum prepared by Mr. Rogers on the Navajo situation, in which he has brought out some very pertinent questions which must be answered by this new Congress:

MEMO ON THE NAVAJO

I think that one of the first tasks of the Secretary of the Interior's new Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs should be to start still another report and investigation on the Navajo.

To be sure, making reports on the Navajo is rather like doodling. It is a harmless pastime that gives practically no result. But these reports are of academic interest to whites, they furnish employment to white printers, and I think another could well be added to the pile.

All these other reports, the Sanchez, the Charles Collier, the Navajo Service, all quite properly stress the need for schools, roads, and water. But in addition to this (mostly a matter of getting Federal appropriations), there is an accompanying need for an overall review of basic policy—a review that would consider the following questions:

We have an area of 25,000 square miles, and 60,000 people, a miniature State; what is the future of this State?

What do we hope the Navajo Reservation and its people will be like 50 years from now?

1. WHAT IS TO BE THE EVENTUAL POLITICAL DISPOSITION OF THIS STATE?

The forty-ninth? Either the Navajo is to be the forty-ninth State or it is not. If not, is the northern tip of the reservation going to eventually become a part of San Juan County, Utah, with its schools to be handled the same way as other Utah State schools; its roads to be handled like other roads of San Juan County; the land eventually to go to individual ownership, and taxes on it to be paid to San Juan County? If crimes are committed, are we to look forward to the day when the San Juan sheriff will come in to make the arrests? Years in the future, when the Glen Canyon Dam goes through, when roads will be paved to Rainbow Bridge, and the possibility of a little town develops—is that town to be treated like any other town in Utah?

City government: The west is growing rapidly. The reservation population is already denser than the surrounding area—which does have towns. It is not improbable that settlements will grow up on the reservation. Are they to be treated politically as other American towns, with mayors, councilmen, judges, city ordinances? Are they to be subject to the jurisdiction of State and county? Or is all this to be done in a very special fashion, and if so, what are these special political regulations which are to apply to the Navajo, but nowhere else in the United States? Or should the present policy be continued so there will never be at any time any towns developed on the reservation?

Transition of power: Is the power of the Federal Government to wither away, and be supplanted by the Tribal Council, which will, in turn, wither away and be replaced by the States? Is the Navajo capital to remain at Window Rock, where the whites are, or is it to be moved to Shiprock, where the Indians are, or should there be any Navajo capital at all? Unfortunately, government power does not "wither away." Unless there is some program with timetables, Navajo political assimilation will continue to lag in the future as it has in the past.

The vote: The Navajo now has the vote. They will soon be voting for county officers of the county in which they live. But these officers will have nothing to do with them. The Navajos might vote for a crook for county sheriff, secure in the knowledge he can only steal from the whites. The sheriff they have elected will be unable to come on to their reservation. In some counties it is quite possible the Navajos outnumber the whites. No county can allow the largest block of its voters to name their officers and judges, and not have to serve under the officers and judges they have named. The full effect of the Navajo having the vote has not yet been studied. It has greatly increased the need for some statement of permanent policy as to what is going to be the political disposition of this State.

2. WHAT IS TO BE THE EVENTUAL ECONOMIC DISPOSITION OF THIS STATE?

The land: Is the reservation ever to be split up, divided, and sold? If so, by whom, and who gets the money for what part? If not, how are we going to keep intact the largest Indian land mass in the United States? Are we going to keep it intact under tribal ownership? Who are the tribe? Is my son, Clem Rogers, full-blooded Navajo, a part owner of the land of the reservation? Is ownership of this land to follow racial blood lines? If his children are of mixed blood, do they have a full share, or a mixed share? Is share in the Navajo tribal land to be infinitely divisible, so that 50 years from now we shall have several hundred thousand fractional owners of this State scattered all over the world?

Can any part of this land ever be fairly allotted? If so, what is the method? On the other hand, can this vast tract of land be kept as one block legally? Already other, more educated, Indians have sued the Federal Government and received allotments. Can we expect the Navajo educational program to continue as much a failure over the next 50 years as it has over the last 50, and that no Navajo will, in the visible future, be sufficiently educated to go to a court of law and sue for an allotment?

Today the Navajo is a cohesive group, a vast illiterate lump, with only 1 lawyer for 61,000 people. The median age of the tribe is 17, the youngest of almost any group in the world. Should, by some miracle, adequate health facilities ever be installed on the reservation, the population would rapidly increase. Fifty years from now, there may well be over 150,000 Navajos, scattered all over the world. And some of them may become lawyers. Should not some land policy be set up now to avoid one of the greatest legal land-tangles of history?

The economy: On the Navajo there are 24,000 square miles, practically untouched by human hand. Surrounding it, there are towns and farms and factories and ranches producing a rapidly expanding standard of living. Are those 24,000 square miles to be left forever undeveloped? If not, where is the capital for development coming from?

From the Government?—which in the last 80 years has not even spent enough money to give the schooling it solemnly promised to give. From the Navajos?—who have no capital nor any prospects of any. From the tribal fund?—whose income of a few hundred thousand a year would be unnoticeable in a land that needs 20 times that amount. From private capital?—if so, how is it going to be attracted? And how are the Navajos to be protected?

The future economic life of the reservation has never been imagined. Therefore, no two sources have worked together. The Federal Government (only capital source in the past) has spent its money with aimless relation to other developments. Thus Window Rock was built miles away from Fort Defiance, so that the two negate each other as far as developing any community services, and Shiprock school is being built miles from town, making two awkwardly distant outposts instead of creating one unified settlement.

As for the tribal-council fund, it is not being spent as a pump primer but as the total capital resource of each development planned. Thus in building housing, the fund cannot be used as a normal political subdivision would use it—to build the sewers, the water mains, the roads, sidewalks, etc., and let Government or private capital do the rest. The tribal fund must finance everything—and pay cash.

Is this to be the pattern of economic development forever? Because the land is tribally owned, is there to be no effort made somehow to use the credit and business techniques we have found so essential in building up the rest of the country? By the device of long-term leases is there not some way of protecting the Navajo, and at the same time make it possible for the FHA to build homes for him? Is the Navajo always to be limited to Indian Bureau facilities? Is

he never to get the advantage of the sweeping bills which, we hope, will continue to be passed so as to build up the white population of this country?

Granted tribal ownership of the land, is it still not possible to sign 5-, 10-, or 20-year leases—leases that would attract to the larger centers, like Tuba City, Kayenta, Shiprock, essential community enterprises?

The clauses of these leases would assure that the construction is to be done by Navajo labor and the employment of these enterprises is to be Navajo.

Granted that it would be ideal for the Navajos to own, as well as work at, these new community enterprises, how are they going to get the capital? Is the development of the reservation to be kept in a state of stagnation, awaiting the time when the Navajos have the necessary education and finances to operate reservation business? By the use of carefully drawn leases is it not possible to both attract venture capital and protect the Navajo?

Already several large Los Angeles clothing concerns have written concerning the possibility of needlework-trade factories on the reservation. Is all this to be dismissed as utopian? Admittedly, a factory involves housing, leases, schooling, water, etc. Should not some study be given as to just what these Los Angeles requests involve, and how they could, or could not, fit into the pattern of economic development on the Navajo?

WILL ROGERS, Jr.

Don't Tamper With Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit splendid editorials from two leading newspapers of north Louisiana. They both deal with the work of the Corps of Army Engineers and I hope these editorials are read by everyone:

[From the Shreveport Times of January 28, 1949]

DON'T TAMPER WITH ENGINEERS

The Red River Valley Association and various organizations of the area of the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries, have protested vigorously to Congress against plans to place the flood control and other waterway work of the United States Army engineers under a civilian—which means a political—Federal agency as yet to be named.

This would come about through passage of the Truman administration's proposed Government reorganization bill, which is meant to be the instrument of putting into effect, chiefly by the President, of various recommendations of the Hoover reports on streamlining Government operation toward greater efficiency and greater economy.

The Times already has endorsed the principles of several of the Hoover commission reports thus far made public. At that time, however, we specifically stated that we could not and would not agree with any plan for congressional or Presidential tampering with present duties, activities, and prerogatives of the United States Army engineers in connection with flood-control and inland-waterway development. The particular committee of the Hoover commission working on this angle of Government organization is known, however, to have decided already to recommend consolidation of the Army's civil functions, its inland engineering work, and a group of various other governmental activities—such as the Reclamation Agency in the Department of Interior—into a single unit.

That the Times definitely opposes. We join with the Red River Valley Association, the Delta Council, the levee and drainage district boards making up the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, the Memphis Chamber of Commerce, and various other organizations up and down the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Red, and their tributaries in opposition to any such step.

If there is any consolidation of agencies, bureaus, etc., involving work in which the United States Army engineers are now a part, we suggest it would be far more logical to place other agencies under the engineers than to place the engineers under civilian-political authority. The engineers have been active in Mississippi Valley flood control (and understand, the Mississippi Valley includes the lower Red River Valley) for more than 100 years and they have been in complete charge of all flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley for 70 years. They have never been concerned with political log rolling, with political trades, with what this politician or that politician would like for his district.

Just two basic factors have entered into all decisions by the engineers during these decades: Whether a project was needed, desirable, beneficial to the general area from the standpoint of public good; whether it was feasible, both from the engineering and the economical angles.

Under such operation by the engineers came such projects in this area as the Denison, Wallace Lake, and Bodcau Dams (the latter now nearing completion) and various other activities on tributaries of the Red to harness the ravages of this stream and add tens of millions of dollars in assets to the territory it traverses. Also, there came the bank revetment work above and below Shreveport giving permanent protection to the local municipal airport, authorization for the Overton canal, and various other projects. New Orleans is a city safe from floods today because of work of the engineers.

These projects were recommended by the engineers because they had genuine value to large and small areas. They were authorized by Congress, and money appropriated for them, because everyone accepted the word of the engineers—accepted their integrity, their knowledge, their independence of political factors.

No one knows what would have been the result had civilian-political agencies had the top authority in these and thousands of other similar projects around the Nation.

There must be quick action if disintegration of the authority and responsibility of the United States Army engineers is to be prevented. There must be protests to Congress—from every civic organization, from every prominent business and civic leader to amend the reorganization bill to exempt the engineers. That was done in a similar bill in 1945. It should be done again now.

[From the Shreveport Journal of February 1, 1949]

ARMY ENGINEERS EARN PRAISE

Reports from Washington convey the impression that the retention of flood control, inland waterway improvement, and kindred projects and service as the privilege and responsibility of the United States Army engineers is being threatened. The threat, which appears dangerous, is contained in the Government reorganization plan of the national administration. The proposed divorcement of authority now held by the Army engineers would be unwise especially because it would place the work under a civilian agency, which obviously would have political handicap. Such handicap now is not in existence. The Army engineers do their work without regard to politics but with the idea of planning and accomplishing bank protection, flood control, and other such tasks from which the people will gain the largest measure of benefits. These engineers, as shown by their long period of successful performance of duty, meet their responsibilities as soldiers in combat against military foes. They accept their assignments, and loyally strive to fulfill them.

Recently we had the privilege of hearing an informal talk by one of the Army engineers of this district, during which he mentioned various projects developed, under way, and planned for the territory, including all of Louisiana. Millions have been expended on these projects, resulting in untold benefits to the public. The engineers have met their responsibility satisfactorily. There has been nothing political involved. Every citizen having the facts given in that talk would oppose plans to put others in charge.

Among the many groups protesting against the national administration's plan to transfer this service from the Army engineers to a civilian authority is the Red River Valley Improvement Association, through which much of the waterway improvements hereabouts have come about and been promised. Members of this organization, many of them Shreveport citizens, realize the potential hazards resulting from political authority in determining projects, how they are to be built, and other operations now having the capable, unhampered attention of Army engineers, men of proved ability and reputation, who do their duty as they see it, regardless of what this or that political representative may say or wish to say.

Had the plan now being urged at Washington been in effect some of the projects serving this territory would probably not have been authorized. The proposed transfer from the Army group to those under civilian direction would offer abundant reason for speculation and doubt. By all means, the existing set-up, with the Army engineers continuing inland waterways service they have been in charge of for many decades, should go unchanged.

The Red River Valley Improvement Association and other protestants are doing a thoughtful service to this section and others in the great river valleys in trying to prevent the materialization of the national administration's plan to order cessation of the Army engineers' control.

Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by my colleague from Pennsylvania, Hon. FRANKLIN H. LICHTENWALTER:

My reason for opposing the bill to revive the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to its status prior to changes made in 1948 is due to several observations and study of this subject.

1. I feel that the hearings were inadequate to allow everyone to be heard on this subject and present fully all views either for or against this bill. I approve of the removal of trade barriers to the extent that such action is possible without imperiling the existence of present efficiently managed industries, the expansion of such industries,

and the development of new enterprises, and particularly without imperiling the jobs of our working people and the preservation of the American standard of living. It seems to me that the whole issue here is whether reasonable protection of American labor, industry, and agriculture is to be or not to be one of the basic principles in our future tariff. If this bill is passed as it now reads the inescapable conclusion must be that such reasonable protection is deliberately abandoned. Over the years during which the Tariff Commission has been in existence under both Democratic and Republican administrations it has accumulated at considerable expense to the taxpayers a vast store of information on which to base judgment of tariff rates.

2. As I see it, section 3 of the 1948 act does not limit the President in any way. He now has authority to reduce rates below the peril point if he wishes. Testimony reveals that many of our industries which employ thousands of workers have been adversely affected through unfair competition brought about by agreements made under the act which we are asked to restore in the bill before the House.

3. As stated before, I am not against foreign trade and a reciprocal trade act; in fact, it should be encouraged and developed wherever possible, but not at the expense of the American working man and woman and business. I feel that the legislation passed in 1948 is fair and gives adequate power to the President to deal satisfactorily with this problem.

Stalin's Poor Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger on Thursday, February 3, 1949.

It is a rather enlightening editorial. I believe the editor has drawn a very apt comparison between the characteristics of a leader of democracy and a leader of a totalitarian state. The leaders of democracy have been willing to make personal sacrifices for the sake of peace. It is enough to point out that our late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, sacrificed his health to insure a healthy and peaceful world. It seems to me that Mr. Stalin is concerned more with his own state of health than the state of health of the world. Is this not characteristic?

The editorial follows:

STALIN'S POOR HEALTH

The International News Service (of which this newspaper is a client) seems to be in the unique position of a super-UN conducting diplomatic relations between the world's two great estranged powers, Soviet Russia and the United States. Associated Press and United Press (of which this newspaper is also in the position of a member-client) had their turns at this super-diplomatic role, but Uncle Joe Stalin seems to prefer INS at the moment.

While we continue to maintain embassies in each other's capital, Stalin obviously prefers the good offices of INS reporter Kingsbury Smith, to whom he has just explained why he is unwilling to come to Washington for a meeting with President Truman, much as he would love to see the sights and shake the hand of the man who got quite a few more votes than Henry Wallace.

WHY NOT IN UNITED STATES?

It is, it seems, a matter of health. The doctors have told Stalin that there are five cities where he could confer with our President without endangering his health, all five being on the Soviet side of the Iron Curtain. A trip to Washington would, on the other hand, strain his health dangerously.

Since the State Department and the Russian foreign minister have been superseded in these negotiations in favor of newspapermen, we may be entitled to get our own 2 cents' worth into the discussion. It seems to us that if Stalin's health is too delicate to withstand a trip to Washington via extremely comfortable accommodations, he ought to resign his job as dictator and give a younger comrade a chance.

We had a President who had delicate health, having been a victim of infantile paralysis. Throughout his incumbency in the White House, his health was the subject of anxious discussion, and was an open issue in his campaign for a fourth term. Our President never permitted considerations of health to stand in the way of urgent business. He traveled abroad again and again, on a number of occasions to convenience Stalin. These trips no doubt hastened his death, but he understood that he had no moral right to hold on to his position without meeting its enormous obligations.

Does Stalin want to live forever?

Problems Facing the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remaks, I am quoting copy of the letter written to the President of the United States by the editor of one of the outstanding rural papers of my district. This letter is written by Mr. F. J. Neely, owner and publisher of the Johnstown Independent, Johnstown, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Neely's letter to the President sets forth clear thinking and views which I hope the President will give definite consideration.

The letter is as follows:

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

PRESIDENT TRUMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The great inaugural festivities are over and the din of the shouting is silenced by the oncoming days and nights.

Certainly the people of the United States have honored you very highly both at the polls and at the recent inauguration.

Methinks that upon your shoulders, or should we say upon your heart, are very weighty problems that will have to be met by you and your assistants in governmental affairs. The old ship of state will have to be guided properly or it may be wrecked by various enemies of our country.

First, Mr. President, is the communistic element. Certainly, every effort should be put forth to oust this faction in our beloved country.

The Russian problem is still hanging in the balance, and we cannot afford to be caught napping. Preparedness is the word. Old Glory should not be torn down and the Red flag raised. Think deeply, Mr. President, et al.

The labor problem is a harrowing one. The T-H law, you said in the 1948 campaign, should be repealed. Will it be repealed? Don't you think, Mr. President, that the Government has enough chores to take care of without trying to pass laws that will satisfy labor? We tried the NRA, the Wagner wage-and-hour law before the T-H law, and all have been flops. Labor was not satisfied and kept up an uproar. Remember the sit-down strikes in many of the plants in the cities? Strikes abounded throughout our Nation.

Now President Truman your greatest problem, as we see it, is to decide whether you are going to run again for President. Having completed President Roosevelt's unexpired term you might decide to run again, on the pretext of only having served one term. Please Mr. President decide not to run again. Take off your gloves and throw them in the corner and really give the people an honest-to-goodness administration.

Pare down the officeholders, save a little here and a little there, thus in a hundred years we may get out of debt.

Morphine methods cannot continue to exist as they are not the methods that were practiced in building our country. Subsidies for one class and not for another is class legislation.

Bickering around in Washington about how many hours one can work, 75 cents an hour as a minimum wage, whether we can eat oleomargarine are dull-like questions as compared with the cold war problems and hundreds of others.

Possibly you have read in the Bible where Jesus Christ went into the temple and made a scourge and chased out the money-changers. Let's love our country and flag way above peanut politics.

You have the reins, Mr. President, let's not twaddle and let our way of life be changed by some foreign potentate.

F. J. NEELY.

P. S.—I am still a Jeffersonian Democrat.

Reorganization of Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the bill to authorize the President to effect a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government has my full-hearted support.

The need for such is long overdue. There is no excuse for a continuation of the present sprawling system of bureaucracies that now exist. The duplication of activities under numerous and varied departments, divisions, bureaus, and agencies has reached a point that it can aptly be described as a disgrace. It results in waste, extravagance, and increased cost of Government. The taxpayers have to pay the bill. They are already overburdened. They are entitled to relief.

There were only about 350 of these agencies 20 years ago, and that was too many even then. Today there are upward of 1,800 bureaus, commissions, divisions, departments, and administra-

tions. The object of this legislation is to reduce the number and remove the overlapping jurisdictions so that there may be real efficiency and a saving of expense of operation.

For instance, as pointed out by the Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, there are 30 agencies engaged in lending money, making guaranties or insurance activities. There are 23 agencies engaged in construction activities competing with each other for labor and materials, and scattered over 11 departments or agencies. There are 10 agencies dealing with transportation questions—not including regulatory functions—scattered throughout 8 departments and independent agencies.

A wise reorganization can bring an appreciable decrease in the cost of Government. It can be done without destroying effectiveness and would promote efficiency.

Of course, if the proposed reorganization results only in reshuffling of departments or bureaus without any elimination of useless and wasteful practices and activities, the good that is contemplated will not result. If worth-while results are to be attained it will necessitate an operation of major propositions. The proposed bill will give the President an opportunity to do a real job.

Truman's Fair Deal in Effect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Truman's Fair Deal in Effect." This article was published in the Federation News of the Chicago Federation of Labor on January 29, 1949. The article is an excellent example of harmonious labor-management relationship. It follows:

TRUMAN'S FAIR DEAL IN EFFECT

Memo to Congress, which has before it a Presidential message calling for legislation designed to correct the present wage-price imbalance:

Wages can be increased, and at the same time, prices can be reduced.

How? To get the answer, the Federation News investigated a union-management program which has attained that goal. The keymen in that program are Samuel Laderman, president of Local 241 of the International Chemical Workers' Union, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, and Herbert Buchsbaum, president of S. Buchsbaum & Co., plastic products manufacturers. They revealed that during the last year:

1. Wages, excluding bonuses, were increased 25 percent. Including bonuses, they have gone up 35 percent.
2. Prices on many products were reduced as much as 40 percent.
3. Production expanded, and is continuing to expand, almost daily.
4. The unit labor cost was reduced 50 percent.
5. Sales increased 33 percent.
6. Company profits doubled.

"All this was possible," Laderman pointed out, "because mutual trust and cooperation prevailed between the union and the management."

"Without the union, none of these achievements would have been realized," Buchsbaum declared.

"The union and the management—because of this cooperative spirit—were able to accept discipline as a joint responsibility," Laderman explained. "Usually, this is a problem which rests with management alone. But the dismissal of a worker, whether just or unjust, is a body blow to the working force as a whole, because it represents a decision handed down from on high. Under the system we have been able to develop at Buchsbaum's, disciplinary action is not taken until the union is consulted. This makes whatever action that is taken the joint decision of the employees and the employer alike. It eliminates top-level decisions, and means that the case of the individual worker has been decided by his peers; that justice, as we know it in the United States, has been established. It is at once a boon to the morale of the working force. I am not suggesting joint acceptance of discipline as a responsibility of unions and employers everywhere. Unfortunately, mutual trust and cooperation between unions and management is not yet universal. But I am suggesting it as a goal toward which all labor and all management can work."

Laderman stressed that, while production expanded and prices were lowered, the quality of the merchandise did not suffer.

"The union has established quality merchandise committees, which meet management representatives at regular intervals," he told the Federation News. "These committees suggest improvements and eliminate any imperfections that might develop. While this is a responsibility which also ordinarily rests with management alone, our union is interested in quality merchandise because we know that if quality is maintained and improved, sales likewise will be maintained and improved and our members will, consequently, have greater employed security."

Laderman and Buchsbaum were asked about the wage increase which had taken place.

"I think I can speak for both the union and the management when I say that we did not want the cost of that wage increase to be passed on to the public in the form of higher prices," Laderman answered. "So, our union recommended an industrial engineer to the management. New production techniques were introduced, with the quality merchandise committees being utilized for this purpose also. Changes in operations were suggested which reduced the number of workers required for those operations.

"Incidentally, these changes did not result in any loss of employment," Buchsbaum commented. "In such instances, the workers are shifted to other positions, suitable to them, within the plant."

Production was speeded without any additional burden upon the workers. In fact, it became easier for them to perform their jobs.

A uniform, group bonus plan is being instituted, and is based upon a production standard approved by the union and the management.

"As a rule, bonuses vary," Laderman said. "This has a tendency to breed favoritism and, as a result, worker morale is lowered and production slackens. Under our bonus system, everyone is treated equally. Workers who are not engaged directly in production, such as foremen, and for whom it would otherwise be impossible to establish a bonus, now receive such payments. Instead of vying with each other for higher bonuses, the employees work together to lift plant production as a whole. They know that if one member of the team fails to do his best, the earnings of all will suffer."

The fair employment policy, inaugurated with the advent of the union at Buchsbaums 8 years ago, when Negroes and other minority-group members were hired for the first time, is continuing. No matter what their creed, nationality, or race happens to be, the policy of the union is to accord all workers equal treatment. Employees are judged only according to their ability and skill. Brotherhood has become a reality. Thus, there has been no friction between the various racial, religious, and nationality groups to slow production, and sources of employment which discrimination would leave untapped have become available to the management.

What about the future?

Buchsbaums said that the "company hopes to begin building a new plant this year."

"This will be our fifth plant," he added. "When the employees of Buchsbaums were first unionized we had but one factory, and jewelry was our only product. Today, jewelry is one of many products. We have 750 workers, and expect to employ in the neighborhood of 1,200 workers by the end of this year. With President Truman's 'Fair Deal' already in effect at our factories, we have a waiting list of applicants for employment.

"I repeat, without the union, we would have been lost. With the coming of the union, management's relations with the employees were stabilized. Labor turn-over has been reduced 90 percent. Because we now understand each other, it hasn't been necessary for the union to strike, as it once did to gain recognition.

"I was bitterly opposed to organized labor up until the time the first union agreement was signed. I have since been converted to the union cause. If it were not for the union we would be unable to plan for the future."

Laderman emphasized that "because continued cooperation with management has been possible—despite the Taft-Hartley Act—our organization has been able to go forward."

"The continued success of unions and management in 1949 is contingent upon repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act," he asserted.

"That act would render impossible the cooperation between labor and management which has been developing in industry over the years under the American system of free enterprise. In fact, enactment of the act constitutes a reversal of that trend.

"The full impact of the Taft-Hartley Act has not been felt. That's why its repeal is imperative. Our organization and all of organized labor is desirous of continuing the march of progress which began with the passage of the Wagner Labor Relations Act."

St. Louis Browns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days the citizens of the city of St. Louis, which I am honored to represent in Congress, have witnessed a remarkably pleasing business transaction. Two native-born St. Louis boys, Charlie and Bill De Witt, climaxed long and fruitful careers by jointly purchasing the St.

Louis American League baseball club known as the Browns.

Because of my long personal association and friendship with the De Witt brothers, their purchase of this baseball club has unusual significance to me. It has been some time since a finer example of American business ingenuity and enterprise has been demonstrated. Their move proves once again that America is the land of free enterprise and opportunity for all.

Born in north St. Louis to parents of modest means, circumstances required that the De Witt brothers start earning their living at a very tender age. Charlie was 10 years old and Bill was 8 when they started, almost 40 years ago, selling peanuts in the stands of Sportsman's Park, which they now own.

Bill De Witt has served in many capacities in organized baseball. For many years he was a trusted lieutenant of Branch Rickey, who is one of the finest men that American sports or business have produced. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Rickey, Bill De Witt was appointed vice president and general manager of the Browns ball club in 1938 by Mr. Don Barnes with whom I was associated. He has since progressed in the baseball world to the point where he is now respected as one of the game's shrewdest executives.

Charlie De Witt has had a varied career wherein he has been a baseball scout as well as a successful businessman. Even today he has several independent businesses established which he operates in addition to his duties with the Browns.

The type of enterprise demonstrated by the De Witt brothers in their long struggle to the top reveals the finest characteristics of our American system. I am sure that the Members of the House will join with me in wishing the De Witt brothers God speed in their new enterprise.

The Machine-Tool Industry and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles O. Herb, from Machinery for January 1949:

THE MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

That machine tools and other metal-working equipment constitute the first line of national defense on the production front is acknowledged by military men and industrialists alike. Machine tools are necessary to produce ordnance matériel, aircraft, submarines, military tanks, and all other implements of modern warfare. Without a large reservoir of modern machine tools, adequate military defense would be impossible in the event of a national emergency.

To provide against such a contingency, the National Security Resources Board has set up a Production Equipment Division under its Industrial Mobilization Plan. The function of this division is to plan specifically for the prompt supplying of machine tools and other metal-working production equipment by manufacturers in the event a rift in international relations appeared imminent. Phantom orders to a total value of $750,000,000 have been issued to machine tool companies alone, and these companies are supposed to hold themselves in readiness to start volume production of the orders at any moment that industrial mobilization becomes necessary. At such a time, the phantom orders would be translated into "pool" orders, which would be expected to meet both military and civilian needs.

Early completion of the large orders that have been planned would be possible only if the machine-tool industry were operating at a high rate at the time the orders were actually released. As Alexander G. Bryant, former president of the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, recently pointed out, the machine-tool industry has found it necessary to reduce its capacity to one-third of the wartime peak. Machine-tool builders have had to let their working forces dwindle, and there are no available reserves of skilled workmen that could be tapped at a moment's notice for rebuilding working shifts to a high-production level.

The time to make certain that firms are in a position to handle heavy pool orders is before an emergency threatens. It is the well-considered opinion of men who are vitally interested in this matter, from the military and the economic standpoint, that machine-tool plants would soon be operating on a high-production basis if the Government made a single change in our tax laws.

This change would be to permit a more rapid amortization of production equipment. Manufacturers of consumer goods could then be induced to replace obsolete equipment with the latest types of machine tools and other metal-working machinery. Consumers would benefit from the lower commodity prices made possible through more efficient manufacture. But more important from a national-security standpoint, the machine-tool industry would be operated on an active basis, and without any cost to the taxpayers. Even Hitler had the foresight to realize the benefits to German industry of rapid amortization of capital equipment. Only because of complete industrial mobilization was Germany able to fight practically the entire civilized world.

Certainly a democratic nation could afford to tear that one leaf from history.

CHARLES O. HERB,
Editor.

Giver With Gift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today the people of my State of New Jersey will witness a beautiful sight. New Jersey's car of the Merci Train will be accepted with formal exercises. Though they are humble gifts of gratitude, they are matchless in their eloquence.

The Friendship Train organized by Mr. Drew Pearson last year did more than just bring food from a prosperous to a needy people. It carried a message of warm friendship and won hearts that were still sorrowful from the ravages of war. And it created a greater understanding of the meaning of democracy and the spirit which moves America.

These humble gifts from the people of France should be a source of reassurance to the people of America who have doubted the wisdom of the Marshall plan in its effort to rehabilitate the distressed people of Europe. For in a great sense, this Merci Train with its matchless gifts, says eloquently that the false prophets of Europe are losing ground in their cold war against democracy. We are being rewarded by rebuilding a spirit of gratitude.

And, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News of February 2, 1949, which is entitled "Giver With Gift."

GIVER WITH GIFT

Merci, America. Those two words bespeak the gratitude of the French people as individuals for the food they received late in 1947 and again last year from the American Friendship Train and the Abraham Lincoln Friendship Train with its more than 220 cars carrying grain and other foods. This food was the gift of Americans, collected from every section of the country. It was a voluntary outpouring in a land of prosperity for the needy abroad. It was a brilliant idea, ably and expeditiously carried out.

Today witnessed the arrival at Weehawken on the cargo ship *Magellan* of the "Thanks, America" train of 49 cars—one for each State in the Union and one for Hawaii—and a reception and parade in New York in its honor. The train brings to the United States, from a people still in distress and eager for rehabilitation under the Marshall plan, luxuries like wines, perfumes, and silks these people are willing to go without, 48 French dolls in latest fashionable attire, and thousands upon thousands of humble gifts, the patient handiwork of men and women whose skies were lightened when American food arrived. They are in the same type of French boxcars—40 hommes, 8 chevaux—that transported American troops in two world wars.

New Jersey's car of the gratitude train will be accepted at Trenton Monday with formal exercises by a committee headed by Leonard Dreyfuss, who was chairman of the State's Freedom Train committee last year.

It is reported that the value of each carload is 3,000,000 debilitated French francs. The gift is fully as welcome as though it represented 100 times that amount. For the "Thanks, America" train exemplifies a full understanding of the bitter lesson Sir Launfal had to learn, that the gift without the giver is bare. About every item, however humble, hovers the gratitude of the giver. It is in recognition of that that each should be prized.

A Great and Able Missourian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD IRVING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, so many of us have overlooked the fine and capable chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CLARENCE CANNON], my colleague from Missouri, because of the quiet, efficient, and trustworthy manner in which he has discharged the tremen-

dous responsibilities that important committee places on his shoulders, that I am prompted to call your attention to the splendid compliment paid him in the column, These Charming People, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on January 27, 1949. The column stated the following about Mr. CANNON:

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Austine)

Nine out of ten people would say the most important man in Congress is the Speaker of the House, or the President of the Senate. But for my dough it's a quiet, short, little, old—born in 1879—fellow by the name of CLARENCE CANNON.

He certainly should be named among the 10 most powerful men in the world. All his power comes from the word "money." He's chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and not one buffalo nickel of the $64,000,000,000 spent by the United States Government every year can be handed out without his consent.

Representative CANNON hails from the Ninth District of Missouri (his is the longest term of service of any legislator from that State).

All bills for appropriations must start in the House. The Senate can increase or cut down the amount voted for the Marshall plan, or for building a bridge across the Potomac. After that it goes to a conference of the two Houses and then on to the President.

But the Senate can't do anything till Mr. CLARENCE CANNON gives the nod to get the appropriation bill started in the House.

Incidentally, Representative CANNON is an expert on congressional procedure because he was Parliamentarian of the House 'way back in 1917. Has written Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, one of the "bibles" for legislative conduct. Though he's swamped with invitations to social affairs, and lobbyists chase the coattails off him seeking to wine and dine him, he's very seldom seen at any of the Washington parties.

Mr. Speaker, during my short time as a Member of the House, Congressman CANNON, as dean of the Missouri delegation, has been so helpful to me and other freshmen Members that I am certain they share with me a deep sense of gratitude for his good counsel and guidance during the days we were getting started with our work.

The Stalin Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Post, February 6, 1949:

STALIN'S BID FOR TALK WITH TRUMAN SEEN AS MERE POLITICAL MANEUVER—FURTHERMORE, UNITED STATES, AS WELL AS RUSSIA, IS COMMITTED TO PEACE THROUGH UN—AND THE BIG BERLIN AIR LIFT GOES ON

(By John Griffin)

On the day that Stalin suggested President Truman trot over to see him about arranging more peaceful relations between the United States and Russia, American and British flyers set a new record on the Berlin air lift.

They completed the best week since the air lift started last June. For the third straight day American planes flew more than 6,000 tons of material into the blockaded city, which needs 4,500 tons daily. On Thursday they carried 6,543 tons into Berlin.

This was done at a terrific cost in money and materials and in the use of manpower. And it was proof conclusive that Stalin's talk of meeting with President Truman was just talk without sincerity.

All the Russians need to do to prove that they want serious and honest conferences to settle the various problems is to end the blockade in Berlin. The whole thing is phony on the face of it, for it doesn't take a great memory to recall that the Russian excuse for the blockade was "technical difficulties."

That was an untruth, and all that has gone on since has been built on that untruth. And until the lie is absolved there can't be any genuine approach to a satisfactory meeting.

AN INSTRUMENT OF STALIN'S WILL

The suggestion of a meeting is obviously a political maneuver on the part of Stalin, designed to impress people in various parts of the world with the Soviet desire for an understanding, and with no idea that a genuine effort to dissolve differences would be made.

It may be that Stalin thought President Truman would fall for it, or that the desire of the American people for an end to the cold war and for a lasting peace would result in pressure on the Government to accept the proposal.

Perhaps Stalin took special notice of the statement a few months ago of the President which indicated that Mr. Truman thought that Stalin isn't a bad fellow but is hamstrung by the Politburo. Clearly, Stalin is the boss of the Politburo and all Russia. He is a dictator with full power, and has been for several years.

The Politburo, as originally devised by Lenin, may have been an organization of power which could overrule the desires of the person heading the government. But Stalin changed all that and made it an instrument of his will. What he says, goes, and that's that.

Under such factual conditions, it is small wonder that Stalin might have tried to take advantage of any possible feeling in this country that he is a pretty good old guy who is being pushed around by his own Politburo.

IMMORAL FROM ANY VIEWPOINT

It might have appeared to him that the time was ripe for a gesture that could conceivably weaken the unity of the American people who have for many months now been convinced of the necessity of firmness in our dealings with the Soviet.

But Secretary of State Acheson quickly threw the light of logic and common sense on the Stalin proposal and showed it up for what it really is. The main point he made is clear; there are no points at issue between the United States and Russia that cannot be settled through regular diplomatic channels.

Furthermore, the United States could not possibly let down other nations who are vitally affected, by holding two-party conversations with Russia. The other nations are entitled to sit in on any such conference, and to freeze them out would be immoral from any point of view.

The Stalin proposal, which was made through replies to a series of questions submitted by a newspaper correspondent, contained nothing new except an additional condition to lifting the Berlin blockade.

Another reason the United States could not accept any such proposal is that it would be a severe blow at the United Nations. So long as we are committed to sincere participation in the United Nations, we can't be in the position of double-crossing that organization.

The United Nations has certainly not been a potent force to date, and may never be. But it is functioning and we are giving it our support, and we can't very well start circling around it and rob it of its prestige and standing.

SWORN TO PEACE ALREADY

There may have been a sudden surge of hope around the country when the Stalin suggestion of a meeting was made, for everyone is eager to grasp anything that seems to tend toward an end of the present stalemate.

But it was the hope of the heart and not of the head. It was the hope that something valuable would come of a meeting in which the two greatest powers on earth pledged themselves to avoid resorting to war.

But both of them are already sworn to that pledge. And it is a pledge not only to refrain from war against each other, but also a pledge against war with any other nation.

One thing the American people seem in danger of forgetting is that the expenditures of money and material and the imperiling of lives of airmen in the Berlin airlift is not confined to Americans. The British are also flying and risking lives and material in the effort to keep Berlin alive.

Other nations in Europe have a stake. They are just as much at odds with Russia as we are. They are taking the same risks, calculated risks which have as the only alternative a bowing down to the Soviet and a communization of Europe.

They, as well as we, would like an end to the cold war, so that they could get down to the business of recovery and a long era of peace. Their desire for peace, like ours, is intense, and towers over every other consideration, except that of submission.

When Stalin wants to show a genuine desire to end the cold war, he can do it easily through acts rather than tricky words.

America the Profligate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including herewith copy of an informative address delivered by Deane W. Malott, chancelor of the University of Kansas, at the Sixth Annual Economic Conference in Chicago January 19.

Chancelor Malott is one of the outstanding educators in this country. I am sure the Members of Congress and the public will be interested in the views set forth therein.

The address, entitled "America the Profligate," follows:

AMERICA THE PROFLIGATE

We in America have inherited a vast land, wealthy beyond any other country on earth. We have a sense of security, an absence of personal fear, deep-rooted in our way of life. We accept the freedom of our democracy with scarcely a thought to the price our forefathers paid in establishing it more than 160 years ago.

This heritage of ours has been so rich, our resources so abundant, our leadership so assured, our problems so simply solved, that we have been lulled into a sense of false security, which has made us careless of the

dangers of tomorrow, extravagant in our actions and indolent in our thought, as we have swirled merrily on in an ever-accelerating world.

WE HAVE BEEN WASTEFUL OF OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

We have been careless with our land, those millions of acres of fertile soil, of water, and of mineral products, for which we stand as current owners and trustees for the future. Every day through carelessness the equivalent of 200 40-acre farms is destroyed in America. We lost 200 of them yesterday; another 200 today; 200 will go tomorrow, washed or mined away or otherwise destroyed by our ignorance or carelessness.

Within 150 years we have lost one-third of the country's top soil. We have lost more than one-half of our high grade timber. Our current timber requirements are running about 54,000,000,000 board feet; our timber growth is adding annually to the resources of the Nation only some 35,000,000,000 board-feet. There is a day of reckoning ahead, in such a trend.

It is a further tragedy that in this land of plenty we have been allowing rodents to eat up more than $200,000,000 worth of grain each year; in some parts of the world loss by rat infestations runs as high as 25 percent. The abundance of these rodents is often the result of man's activities in destroying the wildlife that keeps the animal populations in proper balance.

We have also ruined water supplies, and destroyed aquatic life, by the industrial pollution of thousands of streams and rivers, with the result that millions of dollars are spent each year in making it safe for the population of cities to drink the waste dumped into the rivers upstream. In our water conservation, we have not always placed first things first. It is estimated that water is worth $54 per acre foot for potable and industrial uses, $27 for irrigation purposes, and only 50 cents for hydroelectric power, yet our Federal policies are to emphasize the power rather than other uses, with the result that a large number of Federal power plants, totaling in production over 3¼ million kilowatts across the country, are now under construction.

And while we waste the irreplaceable resources with which we are endowed, the world population mounts ever upward. There were about 1,000,000,000 people in the world in 1849; today there are 2.2 billions. An increase equivalent to a new Boston occurs in the world every 10 months; a new Chicago every year and a half. These represent hundreds of thousands of additional mouths to be fed from the world's shrinking resources.

Man has become a geologic force, little reckoning the effect of his activities on the world of tomorrow. He has created tremendous problems by his enthusiastic and unskilled use of fire, the axe, the plow, and firearms, with which he has devastated great portions of the earth.

Yet no generation can exclusively own the resources by which it lives. We have life tenancy only. The duty of every generation is to apply its full knowledge to protect and increase the capital sum of the world's great resources.

We have not only been wasteful in using the riches nature has given us but equally so in employing the things we have ourselves made and in utilizing our labor. We have been careless in the use of our machinery and equipment. We make wonderful automobiles, and then smash them by the thousands; we produce efficient farm implements, and often ruin them by careless or improvident handling. We race cars over the highways at unnecessary speeds on unessential errands, and deplete our shrinking oil reserves. We fail to insulate our buildings and waste valuable heating fuels. In 1946 we killed 33,700 people in motor vehicle deaths; around 100,000 a year meet accidental death in the United States, most of which accidents are preventable.

Another source of manpower losses lies in the continuing series of industrial strikes. The shipping strike in 1948 alone cost American industry over $500,000,000. In the year 1946, 166,000,000 man-days of idleness were due to strikes, in the first 10 months of 1947, the loss was nearly 32,000,000.

Man has not yet come to know either the value of his environment or how to handle his human relations.

WE HAVE BADLY MANAGED OUR INDUSTRIAL ECONOMY

In our whole economy, we are often unaware of sweeping economic forces at work and unthinking as to the direction of important trends. We are wealthy. There are in the United States 31,000,000 passenger cars, more than three-fourths of all in the world, and 35,000,000 telephones, which is over 57 percent of the world's total. Our current annual production has been running at the unprecedented rate of $250,000,000,000.

In the two and a half years before July 1, 1948, American corporations invested sixty-four billions in plants and equipment. But only about three billions came from new stock issues; the rest was from borrowings and retained earnings.

Hence today in this era of prodigious plenty, it is most difficult for a man or a group of men to start a new enterprise. High taxes and inflationary prices have reduced the accumulation of savings which are the source of venture capital. In 1947 all Federal, State, and municipal tax collections added up to about $50,000,000,000, or 25 percent, of the national income of that year. That means nearly $350 for every one of the 144,000,000 people in the United States. But each person does not pay $350; the individual share of millions is paid by persons who might otherwise have more surplus for investment. So we seem really to be killing the goose that has laid the golden egg of our great industrial system, the free American investor. And in the meantime our internal economy is becoming more and more out of balance.

American industry paid one hundred and twenty-two billions in salaries and wages in 1947, against less than twenty-nine billions in 1935—an increase of 324 percent. During the same period dividends increased only 224 percent. At present, between 60 and 65 percent of industrial profits are retained to finance future business operations, instead of around 35 percent used in the prewar years. It is thus more and more difficult to expand our business enterprises by the starting of new concerns, while more and more of the earnings of existing enterprises must be plowed back into betterment, expansion, and replacement.

In the field of international economics, our trade is also badly out of balance. In 1947 the world bought from us $19,500,000,000 of American goods and services; the world sold to us only eight and one-half billions.

There was an $11,000,000,000 "shortage," made up by four and one-half billions of gold and dollar assets sent in by other countries, and six and one-half billions in loans from us—out of the pocket of the American taxpayer. In 1948, the picture was a little better, with estimated world purchases of seventeen billions, and world sales of ten billions. But a world-trade balance is not in sight, and again the day of reckoning looms ominously ahead.

WE ARE CARELESS OF OUR POLITICAL RESPONSIBILITIES

We are indolent in meeting our responsibilities as citizens of the Republic. In the November general elections 46,000,000 people voted; some 93,000,000 were eligible to do so. The indifference to events thus shown is reflected in steadily mounting costs of Government. In the decade from 1900 to 1910, Federal expenses averaged $500,000,000 a year; in the decade from 1910 to 1920, they averaged $3,800,000,000; between 1920 and 1930, $3,700,000,000; between 1933 and 1940 they mounted to an average of $6,200,000,000; and in the years 1940 to 1948 the Federal expenses averaged $51,700,000,000, over a hundred times as much per year as in the first decade of the century.

In 1945, the Federal expenses reached $100,000,000,000; we spent more for the cost of our Federal Government in that 1 year alone than the Nation had spent during the entire period from the inauguration of President Washington to the inauguration of President Hoover, a period of 140 years burdened with four conflicts—the War of 1812, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the First World War. We face, in this year of 1949, a Federal budget of nearly $42,000,000,000, and the President's budget message is read by most of our citizens with little or no comment, and less concern. Yet remember that Government as such is producing nothing; these fantastic expenses can be paid only by human labor applied to natural resources. Eventually a growing Federal bureaucracy will consume most of the substance of the Nation, our standard of living will go down, and our freedom will be at first choked and then killed.

In 1933, individual and corporate income taxes totaled $750,000,000; in 1949, these taxes will run to an estimated $33,000,000,000 or roughly 40 times as much. And 1933 is just 16 short years ago.

In 1933, our national debt was $22,000,000,000; in 1948, it has swollen to $252,000,000,000, 11 times as great.

In 1933 there were 572,000 Federal civilian employees; in 1948 there were 2,200,000—or four times as many. In 1933, also, these Federal civilian employees were paid $972,000,000; in 1948, they were paid $6,000,000,000, or over six times as much. And in 1948, the Federal Government added an additional civilian employee every 3 minutes—or 513 per working day, or 150,000 for the year.

In 1915, there were 158 Federal bureaus and divisions; in 1932, there were 529; in 1944, 1,141; in 1948, 2,700. Our very laws foster the growth of bureaucracy, because our Civil Service law bases the pay of Federal employees on the number of underlings.

We have taken onto the Federal pay roll 24,288 personnel specialists; there are twenty-odd lending agencies; there are 45 agencies concerned with housing. For some strange reason, there are 400 people in the legal division of the Department of Agriculture. There is one employee in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for every six Indian families in America. Chicago alone has 530 Federal offices.

In a recent year, the Federal Government gave hand-outs to individuals and grants-in-aid to local and State governments totaling $5,500,000,000. One Federal agency spent $100,000,000 to keep prices down; another spent $80,000,000 trying to keep prices up.

And in all this welter of bureaucratic confusion there is no complete accounting system and no complete set of books.

WE HAVE PROCEEDED WITHOUT DIRECTION IN OUR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The war caught us unprepared for combat. But with amazing energy and singleness of purpose, America marshaled her human and material resources and threw herself into the fray. She emerged victorious in arms, but with no policy for the peace. More than 3 years after the end of hostilities we still have not assumed the leadership which somehow, out of the welter of war, has become inevitably ours.

We have no clear objective in China, although we have sent mission after mission on months-long visits to Asia. We have alternately showed strength and urged appeasement. Now as Nationalist China breaks up like ice in the spring, we stand by, indecisive

in attitude and uncertain of the course to take.

We have no policy in regard to Russia, or we could never have been caught in the ridiculous position of justifying traversing Russian territory by flying above the ground, rather than by moving on wheels over the ground, in maintaining our tenuous hold in Berlin. This extravagant rationalization has already cost $85,000,000 out of the pockets of the American taxpayer. On the broader front, the American public today has only the vaguest idea of its leaders' policies in coping with Russia, or the general strategy of our bulwark against the encroachments of communism.

We are fuzzy in our attitude in regard to the United Nations. We talk vaguely of strengthening the United Nations with never a thought of what we mean by the phrase. In the next breath we talk of the necessity of world government as though the United Nations and world government were somehow synonymous. They are, of course, no such thing. The United Nations is a league of sovereign states, which inevitably means a debating society and probably little more. We fret about Russia and the veto power, as though this use of the veto were some peculiar aberration of the Soviets. But America does not now show, and never has shown, her willingness to forego the veto and to enter wholeheartedly into a true world government—with an international executive, judicial, and legislative body. Yet without such an organization and such foregoing of national sovereign rights, the problems of our shrinking world offer little hope of solution.

WE ARE CARELESS IN OUR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

The greatest national asset this Nation will ever have is her young people. Yet how little are we willing to pay, what little time and attention and money we are willing to devote, to the cause of training and educating these young people, that they may grow in wisdom, understanding, tolerance; that they may have warm sentiments, clear insight, keen analytical ability, a lively curiosity, and a sensitiveness to responsibility.

We underpay our teachers scandalously, and then wonder why they are not all shining examples of devotion to the American way of life. How often do we visit the schools in which our children spend a large proportion of their waking hours? How much do we help in the selection of the teachers? In fostering adequate school budgets?

Today we are spending in this country $2,500,000,000 for elementary and high-school education—less than $20 per capita. Yet we spent four billions for tobacco, fourteen billions for military expenditures, and nine billions for liquor. We spend near four times as much in this country for liquor alone in this great and civilized America, as we are spending for all our public elementary and high-school education.

And we are unsure of the purposes of our educational processes. Some wish to learn how to live; but most, and often under parental prodding, are eager only to learn how to make a living, and in the least possible time. We are too vocationally, too technically minded. Sir Richard Livingstone, the great British educator, defines a technician as "a man who understands everything about his job except its ultimate purpose and its place in the order of the universe." A nation bent only on the pursuit of the immediately practical can scarcely be expected successfully to assume the world leadership that lies within our grasp.

As Gen. Omar Bradley recently put it, "The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants, and ethical infants. We know more about war than peace; we know more about killing than we know about living."

We have, however, the preponderance of strength in the ideological struggle which today splits the world. In the great offensive to preserve freedom in the world, the free peoples whom we may lead number twice as many as the Communists; the free people have 75 percent of the world's steel, 85 percent of the world's shipping, most of the world's petroleum, are out ahead in knowledge of atomic energy, and possess the ingenuity and resourcefulness which go only with a free people.

We are slowly learning also, in this turbulent day and age, and by cruel experience, that in nature there are neither rewards nor punishments—only consequences.

The plight of America in this year 1949 is not hopeless; it is, however, so seriously alarming as to cause every citizen to rally to his responsibility. It is possible so to utilize our natural resources as to conserve rather than squander them, even to increase them in the areas of agriculture and timber. There are principles to be learned, fundamental procedures to be followed in human relations. An aroused citizenry can curtail the bureaucracy and extravagance of our Federal machinery, if only we insist on making our feelings known, vocally, vociferously, and constantly. In a democracy we can hold our leaders to account, we can insist upon statements of policy, and check Government policies by the multiple-minded thinking of our people.

We must understand that man is not only a thinking mechanism, but a moral and spiritual being, living in a moral and spiritual world, under moral and spiritual laws as exacting as the laws of gravity or nuclear affinity. Man may violate these laws, but he cannot break them.

A Congressman, WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, recently said: "When man violates those laws, they break him and his institutions. If we persist in putting our faith in false remedies, and in worshiping the gods we ourselves have created—our mechanical skills, our science, our power, our material success—then we, too, will perish, strutting to our doom like the 20 civilizations before us."

In the last analysis the fate of America is up to you and me, its common citizens. If all of us recognize our responsibilities as citizens, our Nation will grow strong in its leadership, grow in its benefits from generation to generation. If we fail, the future lies dark indeed for the civilization of the world.

Freedom is not bestowed; it is achieved. It is not a gift; but a conquest. It does not abide; but must be preserved.

Frederic W. Cook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following from the Boston Herald, Wednesday, February 2, 1949:

TRIBUTE PAID BY ARCHBISHOP CUSHING TO SECRETARY F. W. COOK

I would have been not a little unhappy if I had not been asked to come here tonight.

First of all, as a bishop I cannot be identified and I am not identified with partisan politics. My people belong to both the principal political parties in this Commonwealth and I represent all of them here tonight. I think it likely that most of them have voted for Fred Cook at one time or another and I know for certain that all without exception share my own high regard for him. And so I belong here as a representative of my people.

GOOD NEIGHBOR

Then I wanted to come for personal reasons. It is now more than a quarter of a century since I began my priestly work and it was in those first years of my priesthood that I made the acquaintance of Fred Cook. He was a good neighbor then and he has been a good neighbor ever since. When I was installed as Archbishop of Boston it was a very special thrill for me to present myself at Fred Cook's office at the statehouse to fulfill the legal requirements of archbishop of Boston as a corporation sole, operating within the framework of the State law. I felt I was calling on an old and faithful friend and I think it likely that only here in America could formalities touching on relations between church and state be so pleasantly and cordially discharged as they were between Fred Cook and me at the statehouse.

HONORABLE MAN

But most of all I wanted to come here officially. I speak for what is quite probably the largest single group of religious people in the Commonwealth. It is my duty to speak up against violations of God's law if, when, and as they occur. It is no less my duty to bear witness to the good, the true, and the upright. It is sometimes necessary for those who speak for morality to denounce the evil and to call to order the offending. It seems less urgent but it is much more important to proclaim the virtues of the upright and to praise the righteous. It is to do just that that I have wished to take part in this little program in honor of Fred Cook.

Fred Cook has been in public office for a longer period of time than many of those who vote for him have been alive. In all these years, through successive administrations there has never been the slightest of scandal attached to the name or office of the truly honorable Frederic W. Cook. Like most others, so I have heard practically every candidate for public office criticized for something or other at one time or another during a campaign or an administration. I suppose there have been many men aspire to Fred Cook's job and in line with their aspirations they must have campaigned against him. If anyone has ever brought so much as a single word of hostile criticism into a campaign against Fred Cook, I never heard that word and I don't know of anyone else who did. Fred Cook, I repeat, is truly entitled to the designation of honorable and placed before his name that proud word is no perfunctory form or empty title. It is the description of the man himself.

When people want to speak kindly of my racial and national background they call us witty or genial or something of that sort. People of German descent are said to be serious and painstaking and earnest. The French are supposed to be well-mannered; the Italians and other Latins excitable, colorful, and warm-hearted. People of Fred Cook's lineage are usually credited with being shrewd, thrifty, just.

Some of these generalizations are a little too easy and a lot misleading. I know several Irishmen who are not the least bit witty. There are probably any number of light-hearted Germans and frivolous Slavs. I suppose there are a few impolite Frenchmen and a few prosaic Italians. There must be a couple of Yankees who could be taken in and probably a sprinkling of them who are spendthrifts. Not everyone runs true to type.

YANKEE GENTLEMAN

But it is true, nonetheless, that there are types. The best types, however, blend with the virtues of their own stock a bit of the

qualities of the others about them. Fred Cook does. He has the shrewdness, sense of justice, the prudence of the best kind of Yankee. But at least in his eye there's a bit of Celt and in his friendly heart some of our laughter. In his public record there is perseverance and the dogged devotion to duty of the Nordic. In his private friendships you will find the warmth and the exuberance of the Latin. His office has always had in it the courtesy of the Gaul, the efficiency of the German, the friendliness of the southern races, and the routine excellence of those to the north. In one word, Fred Cook is a citizen of the world—the best kind of American—a complete gentleman—an all-round Christian.

That is why he has appealed to so many different kinds and classes in the general community. All of us found a bit of the best of ourselves in Fred. On election day all sorts of people found it easy to vote for him. Now as he retires from public service those same people and thousands more will find it very difficult to forget him. I share their gratitude to him for so many decades of devoted public service. I know they share the prayer I offer for Fred: That God may grant him length of days, health, and happiness abounding, His blessing in whatever form Fred's heart may most desire it. Well done thou good and faithful servant. The Lord keep you.

Tulsa, Okla.: A City With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DIXIE GILMER
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. GILMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief article from Colliers' magazine, which will appear in the February 5, 1949, issue, and which briefly discusses the part which this city has played in the oil business.

The name Tulsa has become synonymous with growth and civic spirit. Not only is it the "oil capital of the world" but Tulsa has also become the focal point of one of the most promising areas in the entire Nation where new industry can thrive.

Tulsa and the surrounding area is rich in minerals. Labor is available, and there is power of almost every nature, including electricity, coal, and natural gas.

Tulsa is a city which is noted for its metropolitan air, its beauty, its virility, and its fine, friendly people.

The article follows:

Tulsa, Okla., is a man's town, packed solid with clean, fast-moving power. You can feel it on the streets and hear it in the voices of the people. You can see its strength from the air—a neat, wide, busy town, pushing back from the river, reaching out as far as space can go.

If you're looking for a city that says America clear and fast, Tulsa is your town. It's young—67 years ago it was only a trading post. It's rich—last year it chalked up over $1,000,000,000 in bank clearings. It's beautiful—of its 22 square miles nearly 6 are in parks. It's rooted solidly in the twentieth century—oil, the fuel that makes the world go, is Tulsa's No. 1 industry.

Tulsa was built on oil. In 1900 its total population was 1,390. But on June 25, 1901, somebody struck oil across the Arkansas River. It wasn't Tulsa's oil. It wasn't Tulsa's boom. Yet small as it was, Tulsa was power-packed with enterprise. Three of the town's citizens hurriedly threw a bridge over the river and sent an invitation out to oilmen: "Come and make your home in this beautiful little city." The oilmen came; the town trembled with activity. Tulsa was on its way.

In the next 9 years the town's population jumped to almost 20,000. Today the population of Tulsa's metropolitan area is over 256,430, and Tulsa can call itself the "Oil Capital of the World." It's an honest boast based on plain fact.

Tulsa, in 1949, is the primary producing, manufacturing, and distributing center for the Nation's petroleum industry. The Texas Co. is there. Sinclair, Shell, and Gulf are there. On the banks of the Arkansas River, just opposite Tulsa's downtown district, the refineries of the Mid-Continent Petroleum Corp. gleam in the sun, tank after tank brimming with oil, plant after plant turning crude oil into specialized products for uncounted thousands of industrial uses.

Tulsa is an oil town and proud of it, but it's a wise town, too—smart enough not to become stale with specialization. There are more than 600 factories in Tulsa. They make everything from oil field machinery to sulfuric acid, mattresses, prefabricated houses, plastics, and boats. The wealth they produce (upward of $300,000,000 at wholesale in 1948) is reflected in a cluster of skyscrapers in the center of town.

When the airmen, flying for the Air Matériel Command of the Air Force, flew in over Tulsa and got this picture, their mission might have been a problem in photographing an industrial city. They may have been seeking the effect of a sand-bottomed river on color film.

But whatever they were after, they couldn't help seeing Tulsa for what it is: A young and robust city, inseparable from the wealth of oil, growing of its own power, expanding, rising out of the earth like a cameo portrait of America.

Repeal Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening I made a broadcast over the Mutual network on the legislation now pending before the Senate and House Labor Committees asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Since making this broadcast I have received a great number of letters throughout the country endorsing the thoughts set out in the following speech:

The Congress of the United States—the Democratic Eighty-first Congress—is moving rapidly ahead to carry out the mandate which you, the American people, presented on November 2, 1948.

The Fair Deal program of President Harry S. Truman is designed to bring a happier, more secure life to all our people. It will maintain the stability of our national economy and strengthen America's hand in our quest for peace in the world.

President Truman wants to assure a fair deal for every American citizen.

Tonight I should like to talk to you about a proposal by which the Democratic administration seeks to restore a fair deal for the millions of working men and women of our Nation, and to secure labor-management harmony.

This proposal is the National Labor Relations Act of 1949, which has been submitted in keeping with the pledges made to the people last year by President Truman and the Democratic Party.

The Wagner Act enacted in 1935 for the first time struck a sound, fair balance between the economic power of labor and management. It permitted labor and management to meet on equal footing and tackle their problems with the friendly assistance of Government. It secured for labor the right of collective bargaining, which is the cornerstone of union organization. Thus working people were able to obtain, in a short time, the highest standard of living in history.

The Truman administration seeks to restore this atmosphere to the field of labor-management relations.

In returning to the philosophy of the Wagner Act in our national labor policy, it will be necessary, of course, to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. This act was passed in 1947 by a Republican Congress which sought to destroy the bargaining power of labor and to deprive working people of their full economic rights. It interjected the Government into the field of labor relations on an unprecedented scale, and bound negotiations in a maze of red tape and unnecessary litigation. The Taft-Hartley law was not conceived with the view of equalizing and stabilizing the conditions under which labor and management meet. Rather it was a punitive and restrictive measure.

What were some of the unfair and unwholesome effects of this law which we are committed to remove under the administration's new labor bill?

The closed shop was one major victim of the Taft-Hartley law. Closed-shop agreements had provided a satisfactory method for hiring of workers throughout the history of the American labor movement. Outlawing them was a futile action, since the Taft-Hartley law provided that the union shop, on the other hand, was legal. Workers chose the union shop in 97 percent of elections held under the law. If the architects of the Taft-Hartley law believed that a ban on the closed shop was desired by the workers, they were proved to be sadly mistaken.

As another example, the National Labor Relations Board was forced to seek injunctions against unions to prevent secondary boycotts, even those for legitimate objectives, such as the protection of labor standards. Yet there was no rule requiring the NLRB to ask for injunctions against employers who were guilty of unfair labor practices.

Removal of the United States Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor and the creation of a new, independent agency, was completely unjustified. For 34 years before enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, the Conciliation Service of the Labor Department had settled at least 100,000 cases in which there were serious disputes. Immediately before this transfer of functions, the Conciliation Service was settling, without work stoppages, more than 90 percent of cases in which no work stoppage had occurred at the time a conciliator was named.

One of the significant features of the new labor bill is that the service will be restored to the Department of Labor—where it belongs, by all standards of efficiency and coherence in the formulation of national labor policy.

The Taft-Hartley law's establishment of the General Counsel as independent from the National Labor Relations Board itself was contrary to sound administrative policy. As President Truman predicted in his veto message, this caused conflict between the board and its General Counsel. Under the Taft-Hartley law the counsel not the board,

was allowed to decide which charges were to be heard by the NLRB and which orders of the Board were to be referred to the courts. Under the new bill, the NLRB will no longer be the only agency of the Government with this unworkable separation of functions.

Procedure for the numerous elections required by the Taft-Hartley law was apparently designed to keep unsettled the relations between employers and unions. Denial of voting rights to strikers in representation elections, while granting such a vote to strikebreakers, is a discrimination which would permit the employer to hire nonunion replacements—enough of them to eject the union from the plant.

Under the Taft-Hartley law, by the simple expedient of petitioning for a choice of bargaining representatives—even when not faced with conflicting claims for recognition—the employer can win a year's freedom from union organization.

Welfare funds for protecting the health and well-being of employees were made the subject of stringent regulations—and despite the terms of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, injunctions for violations may be sought.

The prohibition of political activity by unions was an undemocratic provision of the Taft-Hartley law. Labor organizations, alone among voluntary associations, are forbidden to participate in political affairs, under that act.

The Federal courts have become burdened with damage suits allowed by the Taft-Hartley Act. Administrative agencies more properly should determine the complicated questions arising from the evils of unjustifiable secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes—since Federal court dockets are already overcrowded.

All secondary boycotts, whether justifiable or not, are outlawed by the 1947 act. Many such types of boycotts have long been held reasonable by the courts where the existence of the union itself, or the gains made in genuine collective bargaining were at stake.

The Administration contemplates removal of all these objectional features from the basic national labor policy through repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The proposed law strengthens the provisions of the Wagner Act with the following amendments:

The three-man National Labor Relations Board of the original act will now consist of five members, and this can be divided into three-member panels to expedite work.

Certain types of jurisdictional disputes and secondary boycotts will be termed unfair labor practices, if engaged in by a union. Those prohibited are defined specifically in the administration bill, unlike the Taft-Hartley Act. Failure to file 30 days' notice of proposed contract changes or termination is made an unfair practice on the part of either labor or management.

Employers and unions in interstate commerce may make agreements for the closed shop or other forms of union security, even though State laws are in conflict. Uniform rules on these phases of collective bargaining are thus made applicable.

The bill further provides for settlement of grievance disputes without resort to economic force—and with a minimum of Government intervention. This would be accomplished through the Conciliation Service, which is authorized to assist the parties in formulating arbitration agreements and in selecting arbitrators. Employers and unions are thus encouraged to develop effective arbitration procedures on their own, and the evils of compulsory arbitration are avoided.

How does the administration bill deal with national emergencies caused by a strike in a vital industry? This feature is naturally of wide public interest.

Under the terms of the proposed act, the President is authorized to proclaim a national emergency when he finds that one exists, and to appoint an emergency board to investigate, seek to induce a settlement, and make a report of its recommendations.

Twenty-five days following the President's proclamation is the dead line for this report. During this period and for 5 days after the report is issued, the parties shall continue to operate under conditions of the disputed agreement.

It is anticipated that such disputes can be settled during the waiting period through the affirmative assistance of the emergency board and the operation of public opinion.

This procedure is a simple one—and it is established on the theory that free collective bargaining is to be encouraged, not forced through use of Government injunction.

Senator TAFT has already made known his opposition to this method for dealing with the few cases which involve a serious emergency.

However, the New York Herald-Tribune, whose brand of Republicanism is somewhat less neolithic than that of Senator Taft, concedes that the new bill offers an improvement over the Taft-Hartley provision for similar cases.

It is not by accident that the bill for readjustment of the Nation's labor policy should receive a high priority in the program of the Eighty-first Congress.

In the first place, there was an articulate mandate for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law—a mandate the Democratic administration proposes to carry out.

Republican spokesmen have resorted to all kinds of mathematical juggling to prove there really wasn't any mandate. They say that even though Mr. Truman is President, the people who elected him don't want him to do anything about the Taft-Hartley Law.

These Republican spokesmen haven't talked to the 103 Representatives and 17 Senators who are missing from the Eighty-first Congress because they voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. These defeated Republicans can testify, from bitter experience, what the people think about the Taft-Hartley Act.

A second reason for the importance attached to the Administration labor bill is this: Labor-management peace is essential to a stable, productive economy in the days ahead.

The Administration labor bill will guarantee industrial peace because it assumes that harmonious relations are desired by both labor and management. It will permit them to seek it together without resorting to force by the Government.

Under these conditions from 1935 to 1947, labor and management, working together, pulled the Nation out of a disastrous slump. They molded the mightiest industrial machine in history for the gigantic tasks of a world war. Under the same philosophy they can now work together as we try to win the peace as well. For this reason it is imperative that the administration labor bill gain immediate passage in the Congress.

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, as the result of nearly a full year of study, in which I had invaluable assistance from interested groups and individuals, I have introduced into the House today a bill providing for the establishment of a high caliber, bipartisan, temporary Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. In presenting this measure I wish to state briefly its purpose and call careful attention to the importance of the subject to which it relates.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize this fact. I will welcome suggestions and help from any of the other Members. In fact, I will be greatly pleased if, after reviewing this matter, Members of this House and of the other body will introduce identical or very similar legislation, so that the very serious problem to which my bill refers will have the sponsorship and the active support of a coordinated and cooperative bipartisan group of the Members of the Congress.

This bill provides for the establishment of a temporary commission to make a thorough investigation of the whole problem of intergovernmental relations in the United States. Little provision for such relations was made originally in our Constitution, and none has been added since. As a result of the constantly increasing demands for more services from all levels of government, there has been developed over the years—as the Members of this body well know—a vast unplanned, patternless network of interrelationships which have produced an existing situation of great confusion.

The simple truth is, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the facts upon which to work out a solution. We have segments of the facts on particular functions, or in particular areas and jurisdictions. The need is for a comprehensive survey of the entire field for the purpose of determining exactly what the current situation is, what the trends are, and what our future program ought to be.

If this bill is approved, we will have a nonpartisan commission with representatives of all of the parties at interest, public and private, including the various levels of government, and both the executive and legislative branches, entrusted with the responsibility for making a thorough study of the whole problem, and formulating a report for the information and guidance of Congress and of the whole American people. Provision is made for obtaining the services of a professional staff to carry on the research. Sufficient time for the conduct of an inquiry of such far-reaching scope and magnitude has been made.

I would anticipate that this commission would undertake to provide us with answers to such important questions—among others—as the following:

First. What functions are now performed at each of the various levels of government?

Second. What functions should be performed at each of the various levels, and which cooperatively by two or more levels, in order to obtain the most efficient service at the minimum cost?

Third. What patterns have thus far been developed for interlevel and interjurisdictional relations—Federal-State, interstate, State-local, and Federal-local—and where has each proven to be most useful?

Fourth. What are the facts regarding the use of the grant-in-aid system, its purposes, extent, and methods of administration, and how might it be modified the better to achieve the objective of giving aid only to those jurisdictions which actually require it in order to maintain prescribed minimum standards?

Fifth. In the administration of joint programs, such as grant-in-aid, how much of the basic information on State laws must be collected within the administering agency, and how much could be done more effectively in a central clearing house for information on State and local government, law, and administration?

Sixth. What measures may be taken to bring about a greater degree of uniformity in the boundaries of regions, zones, districts, and areas used for administrative purposes by the Federal Government?

Seventh. What functions now performed by the Federal Government can be returned to the States, and what revenue sources now utilized by the Federal Government can be made available to the States to support such services?

Let no one assume that this is merely a quest for theoretical information that can have no practical significance. To me, the practical aspects of this investigation are most important of all. The Congress needs this information in order to pass intelligent judgment on hundreds of proposals that come before us every year.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say hundreds of such proposals each year, because I find that in the Eightieth Congress alone there were more than 300 bills introduced providing for various types of grants-in-aid in at least 28 different major categories.

To continue, I may also say that the executive departments need this information as a guide to the development of future policy.

The State and local units have long complained bitterly of the ill treatment which they receive with regard to revenue sources—the States at the hands of the Federal Government, the cities at the hands of the States. Here may be the means of obtaining information for the satisfactory solution of the problem of the allocation of the major sources of revenue, heretofore regarded as more or less impossible of solution.

Duplication of taxation between Federal Government and the States has long been a source of concern. Lately, however, as has been pointed out in many editorials, cities have found their financial situation increasingly difficult. As a result, duplication of taxation has given way to triplication. Last year, for example, the number of cities taxing incomes rose from 3 to 61, and this number appears definitely to continue to be on the increase. Mr. Speaker, we must find a means by which fiscal problems at all levels of the government are solved in a manner which is fair and equitable to the taxpayers, as well as to Federal, State, and local governments.

The Federal grant-in-aid system is another of the major problems with which the survey will be concerned. This system has been studied from various angles, but we have still to grapple with such basic problems as how much is to be spent, both in relation to the amount of total national income and of total Federal expenditure. In the opinion of many persons, the whole grant-in-aid program has gotten out of control with grants being made on a more or less haphazard basis. Many of the purposes sought are good, but are we going about the problem of meeting these needs in the right way?

The system is completely lacking in uniformity, both as to method of allocation, and method of administration, even with regard to grants authorized for the same or similar purposes. Some grants are made in specific amounts, while others are unlimited authorizations. The factors in the allocation formulae are reasonable and proper ones, to be sure, but they are combined into a bewildering variety of nonrelated patterns.

In presenting this proposal, I desire to emphasize the fact that it is not put forward as an economy measure, actually or in disguise—although it is quite conceivable that it should result in economy through a more effective coordination and integration of existing programs. It is not planned as a device for taking from any worthy purpose a single dollar which has been or which in the future may be authorized for its support. Its purpose is solely to bring some semblance of order into a general situation now characterized by chaos and confusion. By so doing, it is expected that the public may achieve greater benefits for the expenditures that are made as well as much-needed tax relief at all levels of government.

The bill I have today introduced is as follows:

A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a national bipartisan commission, in which the various levels of government are represented, to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). In view of the constantly increasing complexity, during the last century and a half, of a vast network of relationships among the Federal State, county, and municipal governments in the United States, this Commission is established for the purpose of studying and making recommendations to the President and the Congress, in an effort to bring about:

(1) The finding of ways and means of establishing a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government. Major aspects of this problem include the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the increasing demands made upon the Federal Government and the States for tax-sharing and grants-in-aid, without following any consistent over-all pattern.

(2) The elimination of duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions, and the securing of a better coordination of such services, activities and functions among the several levels of government.

(3) The attainment of such an allocation of governmental functions among the several levels of government as will contribute to economy in governmental administration on the one hand, and maximum service to the public on the other.

(4) A reduction in the total governmental expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions.

(5) The development, within the existing constitutional framework, of a governmental structure, and such cooperative policies and procedures as will tend to overcome existing obstacles to efficient governmental administration, and to lay a sound foundation for future development.

SEC. 2 (a). The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and three of whom shall be private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience with or knowledge of major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be State officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted by the Council of State Governments;

(5) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be municipal officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(6) One appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be a county official, from a panel of at least two, submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) Of the members enumerated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), not more than three members shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(e) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3 (a). It shall be the duty of the Commission:

(1) To make a thorough and comprehensive study of the subjects listed below, and of any related subjects, with a view to determining what changes in existing relationships, in its opinion, are necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act:

A. The origin and development, and present status, of the relations and interrelations of the Federal, State, and local governments of the United States.

B. The allocation of governmental functions among the Federal, State, and local governments of the United States.

C. The problem of geographical areas as related to governmental functions, field administration, and metropolitan communities.

D. The gradual encroachment upon our Federal system of current and impending developments in the fiscal relations of the Federal Government with the States, and of the States with their political subdivisions.

(2) To submit its final report and recommendations to the President and the Congress on the subjects indicated above, and suggest plans and procedures for carrying these recommendations into effect, not later than February 1, 1952.

SEC. 4 (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings and take such testimony, sit and act at such times and places as it deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before

the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a director of research and all other necessary personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 are applicable, and within the provisions of subsection (c) of section 5, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of the Congress; but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(c) Each member of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall receive, in addition to the compensation for duties performed in the executive branch, $50 per day for each day he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission, provided, however, that his total aggregate annual salary shall not exceed $12,500; and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the fiscal year during which its final report to the President and the Congress is made.

The Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the Taft-Hartley law, delivered by my colleague [Mr. DOUGLAS] over the CBS network last evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The voters in this last election were asked to choose between the principles embodied in the Wagner Act of 1935 and those of the Taft-Hartley law, passed by the Eightieth Congress in 1947. President Truman made that issue clear-cut in his campaign, as did other Democratic candidates, and in virtually every contest in which this was an issue, the voters chose the Wagner Act and rejected the Taft-Hartley law. We who believe in the principles of the Democratic Party as stated in the Philadelphia platform—we who believe that elections represent basic guides on public policies—are trying to carry out the people's will. We are trying to do so in the face of attempts in some quarters to so confuse the voters with fine-spun distinctions that they will be unable to see what is at stake in the present Senate hearings on a new labor bill.

But these issues are, in fact, very simple. The Wagner Act was built upon the thesis that the average workman in the United States could not protect himself as regards wages, hours of work, job security, and other conditions of employment when he dealt individually with large employers. The Wagner Act assumed that men would find greater freedom and security in these matters if they dealt collectively with employers through unions of their own choosing. This concept in the Wagner Act was based on a sober recognition of the fact that the main reason unions were weak in the great mass-production industries of steel, machinery, automobiles, rubber, chemicals, etc., was because most men were afraid to join them, not because they did not want to join them. In industry after industry, laborers saw that men who joined unions or were active in union affairs were fired, hunted down, and blacklisted so that they could not get a job anywhere. In the main, with certain honorable exceptions, men could exercise their legal freedom to join unions only at the expense of losing their jobs. Moreover, for 20 years prior to 1933, laborers saw that it was a common practice for many employers to impose upon their employees the "yellow-dog contract." Under this contract, men were given jobs only on condition that they agreed not to join a union or even to talk with a union organizer. Men signed these contracts not because they wanted to do so, but because they needed money so badly to support their families.

The courts of the pre-Wagner Act era not only enforced these "yellow-dog contracts" but rejected as unconstitutional any State and Federal statute which outlawed them. The courts in fact went even further. They issued injunctions which restrained unions from even approaching a man who had been coerced into signing one of these "yellow-dog contracts." Thus the courts not only permitted employers to bar unions but they put up legal "keep off the grass" signs around the nonunion plants and provided legal bulldogs to see that these areas were kept as nonunion.

The Wagner Act attempted to remedy this. In the first place, it said that it was an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge or discriminate against a worker because of his membership or activity in a labor union. If workers were found after investigation to have been so discriminated against, they were reinstated on the job and the employers were directed to give them their back pay. Thus freed in part from the fear of discharge, workmen poured into the unions by the millions and set themselves to bargain collectively with their employers.

And here the Wagner Act made its second big contribution to industrial justice. It declared that if a majority of the workers, voting in a free and fair election, chose a given union to represent them, it was then the duty of management to sit down with the chosen representatives of the workmen, to bargain collectively with them, and at least try to reach an agreement. Two things should be noted here. First, that if a majority of the workers did not want to bargain collectively, there was no obligation upon them to do so, and secondly, even if they did bargain collectively, there was no obligation upon the part of the employer to agree to what the union demanded. The employers were left free—and they were entitled to that freedom—to reject any or all of the union's terms. All that was required of them was to sit down together in good faith and at least try to reach an agreement.

The Wagner Act, in other words, did not prescribe what the decisions should be. It merely delayed the use of economic power by the employer long enough to permit the voluntary processes of negotiation to take place.

These were the sound principles of the Wagner Act. Under them union membership has increased to about 15,000,000, though many of these unionists are very weakly organized, and there are many millions more who are still completely unorganized.

Many employers cooperated splendidly in the working out of these principles of collective bargaining and made collective agreements with the union. While abuses did develop here and there, as is true in every set of human relationships, the net effect was to protect workmen against the capricious exercise of power by employers and foremen. It contributed to industrial peace. It enabled employers to lighten their own burden of harassing negotiations with a multitude of separate employees. And it made our labor force a free one—free of the fear of economic reprisals that everywhere menace political liberty.

But, unfortunately, there was a set of employers who never adjusted themselves to the new day. They disliked collective bargaining, and they still wanted to be able to fire men who stood up to them with independence. They fought delaying actions in the courts and they tried to change the law. In 1946 they thought their chance had come. In that year the Republicans won a majority in both Houses of Congress, and they interpreted this as a mandate to gut the labor law of the country. Over the opposition of the northern Democrats and a few splendid Republicans they passed the Taft-Hartley law. Now, what did the Taft-Hartley law do? Instead of trusting to the processes of voluntary collective bargaining, it laid down an elaborate series of detailed rules which encouraged lawsuits and made it more difficult for agreements to be reached.

1. It forbade the so-called closed shop, even though the workers wanted it and the employers were willing to accord it.

2. It prevented the workers from even asking for the union shop unless they had won an election permitting them to do so. In respect to these elections, it tried to stack the cards against the unions by providing that all those who did not vote because of illness, absence, or other reasons were counted as voting "No," even though, if present, they would have voted "Yes." Where the Taft-Hartley law was more severe than a State labor law it was provided that the Taft-Hartley law was to prevail, but when the State acts were more severe than the Taft-Hartley law, and forbade even union shops as well as closed shops, the State laws were to govern labor relations.

3. The Taft-Hartley law made it possible for employers to break unions and destroy collective bargaining. Employers were permitted to ask the Labor Relations Board for a new election upon the statement of organizations or individuals that they were the real representatives of the men. Thus, if a strike occurred the employer could replace the strikers with other men on a permanent basis, petition for an election, and in this election the strikers were expressly forbidden by the Taft-Hartley law to vote. Those who took their places, or what the unionists would term strikebreakers, were, however, permitted to vote. Under these conditions, it would not be difficult to displace the original union as the bargaining unit and to substitute a more or less stooge union. And, now mark this: It now became unlawful for the original union to continue its strike, which was originally legal. The National Labor Relations

Board has been forced by the Taft-Hartley law to indicate in two cases that this result would follow. Should we have a depression and a large amount of unemployment, the way is, therefore, cleared for employers in the big industries to shake themselves free from genuine collective bargaining and to substitute weak groups who would be more or less under their control. This may have been what ex-Congressman Hartley meant when he said, "There is more in this act than meets the eye."

4. The Taft-Hartley law, by outlawing all forms of secondary boycotts, compels members of a union to work on struck goods coming from or destined for another plant where their brothers are on strike. It thus attempts to atomize collective dealings and to say that workers shall only be concerned with what goes on in other parts of their own plant and shall have no concern for general conditions in their industry, even though these may severely undercut their own working conditions. This is in line with the attempt made by Congressman Hartley and others to outlaw industry-wide collective bargaining and to confine the collective agreement to a single plant and a single employer. While this effort failed in 1947 because of the opposition of the northern Democrats and some high-minded Republicans, it would in all probability have been enacted had the Republicans won the election last fall.

5. The Taft-Hartley Act makes it illegal for unions to practice "restraint or coercion" without defining what those terms mean. I want to make it clear that I am opposed to violence in labor disputes and to mass picketing. But those acts are already illegal under the common law, under local police regulations, and under many State statutes. Not only does the Taft-Hartley law nationalize the police regulations of the country and thus take over functions hitherto left to the States and localities, but it also makes it possible for a Labor Relations Board, should that Board become weighted to favor employers, to restrain even peaceful picketing. The Board could, for example, limit pickets to the number suggested by Chief Justice Taft in the American Steel Foundries case, namely, two to a gate—a limit which in modern industry where thousands frequently enter through a single gate, would guarantee its ineffectiveness as a means of peaceful persuasion. This reminds one of the old nursery rhyme:

"Mother, may I go in to swim?
Yes, my darling daughter.
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb
And don't go near the water."

6. The Taft-Hartley law made unions suable financially for the acts of their so-called agents even though a union had never approved or ratified the acts in question. By making such penalties apply to organizations rather than to persons and decertifying them in addition, the way was opened for antiunion employers to smash virtually any union in the land, if they chose to do so.

These are only a few of the crucial weaknesses and injustices in the Taft-Hartley law. In addition, it lays down such a series of legal requirements and prohibitions that it would take a battery of Philadelphia lawyers to determine just what are the legal rights and duties of unions. It has, therefore, largely resulted in turning over the conduct of industrial affairs to the lawyers. This is an unhealthy development. For when friends go to court their friendship flies out of the window. Perhaps the greatest fault in the act is that it shifts the basic relationship between unions and employers from a friendly effort to find common ground to bickering legal proceedings.

In President Truman's proposal, as introduced by Senator THOMAS, we aim to restore the practice of collective bargaining. We want the parties to confer and try to reach an agreement. We think this is better than to prescribe the minute and voluminous rules of an industrial Emily Post and to try to legislate for every conceivable situation under the sun.

And yet our bill does aim to remove some of the weaknesses in the field of collective bargaining. It outlaws jurisdictional strikes and lays down a method for deciding how work is to be assigned. It prevents outside unions from trying by strikes or boycotts to alter the choice of bargaining representatives already made by employees inside a given plan. It declares that once a collective agreement has been signed, the workers should not strike concerning the interpretation of a contract and it provides permanent processes of mediation and arbitration to settle such disputes peacefully.

It prescribes a 30-day cooling-off period for strikes which are threatened in vital industries which threaten the public health and safety. We do not enforce this cooling-off period by injunctions as does the Taft-Hartley law, nor do we compel men to work against their will for the profit of private employers.

The Railway Labor Act does not provide for such injunctions to secure their cooling-off period and yet these waiting periods have always been obtained in that industry. The Taft-Hartley law does use injunctions to get their 80-day waiting period and in a number of cases this has operated to heat the situation up rather than to cool it off.

Under the President's plan, boards of inquiry are set up during this waiting period which are not only to investigate but also to recommend. It is believed that this will lead to agreement between the parties in the vast majority of cases. But should this not occur and a strike break out which would threaten the vital health and safety of the Nation, the President would still have reserve powers to protect the country.

Our aim is to restore the processes of collective bargaining and to encourage the parties to settle disputes by themselves aided by governmental machinery and an informed public opinion. We do not think it wise for the Federal Government to legislate in great detail and to deal with every alleged abuse under the sun. For as Gabriel remarked in the play Green Pastures, "The Lord expects us to figure out some things for ourselves."

We believe the principles for which we stand are correct and we appeal to all citizens regardless of party to inform themselves and then to be governed by their consciences. The sooner we get back to collective bargaining, the better it will be for all.

A Sound Program of Flood Control and River and Harbor Improvements Must Be Maintained

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address which I delivered at the thirtieth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., Monday, February 7, 1949, to wit:

A SOUND PROGRAM OF FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS MUST BE MAINTAINED

The natural resources of the United States have made possible the growth and development of this country as the most powerful nation in human history. Among the most important of these resources are rivers and lands. They will not renew themselves. When they are expended, they are lost forever. The arid lands of the Middle East and China which were once fertile and well watered are a warning that our resources must be preserved. They can be conserved for the benefit of the present and future generations.

The conflict between the use and misuse of land and water is as old as the Biblical contest between light and darkness, and is as new as atomic energy.

We are acutely aware that our natural resources are imperiled. We know that our soils are neglected. We were reminded in the national campaign of 1948 of our failure to utilize the rivers of our country. We must take advantage of the sentiment that now obtains throughout the country for the preservation and conservation of our resources. Probably the most successful appeal in the Presidential campaign was for increased appropriations for flood control and reclamation. We must capitalize upon the prevailing sentiment of the country. We must keep in mind: "There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to fortune."

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

As we assemble today we are reminded that the Mississippi River system is the longest in the world, and that with its tributaries it drains the entire mid-continent lying between the Rockies and the Appalachians including more than 40 percent of the area of the United States. The Mississippi Valley is the most important in the world. Of all rivers the Mississippi is the most marvelous and powerful. Above the mouth of the Missouri its waters are green. There are beautiful palisades and wonderful limestone cliffs that tower far above the green waters. In the upper stretches the Falls of St. Anthony are not only beautiful but they are renowned in song and story. The Indians spoke of the Mississippi as the Big River. Below the Missouri its waters are muddy. South of Cairo it flows into the Gulf of Mexico through the alluvial valley. When we think of the Mississippi River we think of power and glory. It is not only the longest but it is the greatest navigable river in all the world. It loses none of its interest and its fascination as it travels toward the Gulf.

THE FIRST WHITE MAN

The first civilized man ever to behold the Father of Waters saw the mightiest of all rivers at its worst. There was no civilization then. There were no factories to be flooded, cities to be destroyed, or farms to be devastated. Hernando de Soto was thrilled at the majesty of the Father of Waters. The flood of 1541 is the oldest of the recorded floods along the Mississippi River. The next great flood occurred in 1718. Floods have occurred throughout the years at intervals of approximately 15 years. Major floods occur annually along some of the rivers of the United States. The year 1948 was no exception. As long as rains fall and snows melt, and as long as rivers flow there will be floods.

ADOPTED POLICY

The policy of national flood control was first proclaimed by Congress in 1928 and it was finally adopted in 1936. The time for argument and disputation with respect to the methods of solving flood-control problems is passed. All factors of safety have been utilized. The methods have been tested. The policy is sound. The adopted projects along all of the principal river basins in the United States are flexible and capable of being expanded. All works constructed as authorized will be utilized. As new problems arise new solutions will be found.

The policy has been tested and whenever and wherever tested it has been justified. The levees, the revetments, the channeliza-

tions, the cut-offs of the Mississippi River and the flood walls, levees, and dams for flood protection in all of the river basins of the United States are outstanding monuments to the skill and ability of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, and are a justification of the flood-control policy adopted by Congress. The bedrock of the declared policy is that in all improvements the benefits must exceed the cost. When we contemplate the waste and futility of war with its cost and destruction, it is a source of satisfaction that every dollar appropriated by Congress and expended in flood-control improvement adds to the value of the assets of the United States. The dams and flood walls, the levees, and the revetments are distinct contributions to the wealth and security of the country. Under the planning and execution of the Corps of Engineers the interests of the people of the United States and the property to be protected are safeguarded. The policy is as sound as the 162-year general-welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States. The policy is based upon sound economics and sound engineering. Formerly we boasted of our skyscrapers. Today we take pride in our dams and in our levees, high and strong, to conserve waters and to protect lands, people, and property.

ANNUAL AUTHORIZATIONS

I believe in the program of annual authorizations. Projects have been approved and partial authorizations made for the accomplishment of the works. These authorizations have been increased from time to time. Further increases should be made. There should be additional authorizations as favorable reports are submitted by the Chief of Engineers. While authorizations may appear large it should be kept in mind that the annual damages from floods in the United States are larger. It is estimated that the annual destruction, without flood-control works, from floods aggregates approximately $809,000,000 and that the protective works already authorized and constructed prevent annual losses of about $343,000,000, of which $212,847,000 are in the Lower Mississippi Valley. It has been demonstrated that while major rivers are among the most destructive of the forces of nature, that while floods cannot be prevented, they can be controlled and put to beneficial use. The problems range from inundations that formerly covered some 25,000 square miles of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River to the flash type of floods from the bare hillsides of western basins such as of the Los Angeles River which are heavily laden with rocks and debris. Floods are not new. They are as old as the history of lands. They obtained when the native prairie grasses covered the entire Mississippi River Basin and when the primeval forests along the watersheds were still untouched. The settlement and development of river valleys emphasizes not only their destruction but the abuse of lands which has contributed to the magnitude of floods. Each year due to erosion and overuse, 500,000 acres of topsoil are washed away entirely, while many times that acreage is stripped of its productivity. We are exhausting our forests. The cutting is 50 percent greater than the growth. Our minerals are being consumed. Our petroleum reserves are being depleted in excess of new discoveries. The lack of control and the improper utilization of the great river resources result annually in huge flood damages to life and property as well as to transportation and agricultural resources. We must realize that our natural resources were the basis of the unparalleled production that brought victory to the United States in the greatest of all wars. Improvements must continue and annual authorizations should be made in the general welfare of our entire country.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1948

A few projects were authorized in 1948. They were widely distributed, but there was no general authorization bill. However, there are constructive features in the act. It authorizes the Chief of Engineers to construct small flood-control projects not specifically authorized when the cost does not exceed $100,000. The act of 1946 was amended with respect to emergency repairs and maintenance so as to include extensions or other modifications of existing flood-control works. A third provision is a permanent authorization for emergency flood-control rehabilitation. Floods occur somewhere in the United States every year. Works must be done without delay. Appropriations should be made without awaiting emergency authorizations. I regard the emergency authorization as the most constructive feature of the act of 1948.

APPROPRIATIONS

While authorizations should be made annually as favorable reports are submitted, the great and pressing need now is for adequate appropriations for the orderly construction and completion of authorized improvements. Works were discontinued during World War II and the need, with annually recurring floods, is appropriations. There is work for this organization to do. We must be on guard. While the President has submitted recommendations for appropriations along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries and for general flood control along all of the rivers of the United States and for rivers and harbors in excess of the appropriations made for the current fiscal year by the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the spokesmen for economy in the Committees on Appropriations are most vocal and active when it comes to appropriations for flood control and river and harbor improvements. The members of this organization must take nothing for granted. The spokesmen for these great internal improvements, in and out of Congress, must be active. The Committees on Appropriations must be reminded again and again that the country has been sold upon adequate appropriations for flood control and that the most effective appeal in the recent national election was for increased appropriations for flood control and reclamation. I am delighted that President Harry S. Truman has wisely reversed his policy of 2 years ago. He recommended increased appropriations to the Eightieth Congress, second session, and while the budget recommendations were reduced, I am glad to report that the second session of the Eightieth Congress made the largest appropriations in dollars for flood control, rivers and harbors and reclamation, in the history of the country. This was true not only of the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, but of flood control generally. The total appropriations for flood control amounted to $423,000,000; for rivers and harbors $167,000,000; and for reclamation $246,000,000. It must be remembered, however, that while the appropriations are in excess of previous appropriations in dollars they will not accomplish more improvements, for the cost of construction has increased substantially 100 percent since 1939. Adequate appropriations are more important than ever. We favor the elimination of waste and extravagance. We advocate economy in public expenditures. We favor economy in internal improvements, but that economy, like the policy, should be sound.

PROGRESS

No nation has made more progress in flood control than the United States. The advance has been marvelous since the policy was adopted in 1936. Flood-control improvements really began in 1917 when they were confined to the lower Mississippi River and to the Sacramento River. Following the flood of 1927 progress was made in the passage of the act of 1928. The policy then declared has been adopted and extended to include all of the principal rivers and valleys of the United States. The planning and construction of improvements have been declared in all of the flood-control acts passed since 1928 to be the function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. Flood control has been expanded to include not only protection from overflows, but adequate drainage and channelization, for with the soil-conservation practices, small streams and drainage canals are being filled. Flood control has, therefore, been properly extended to make flood-control improvements more effective by improving channelization in natural streams and by improving drainage. While flood control and river and harbor appropriations, as well as appropriations for reclamation, may be increased during periods of unemployment, they are among the types of public works that must be carried on in the national interest annually. They are necessary to the constantly increasing demands not only of production but of consumption.

PERILS

Progress is always subject to attack. It has opposition and today both the adopted policy of the Congress of the United States and the progress that has been made under that policy are under attack. The Tennessee Valley Authority was established primarily as a power project, but after its establishment and immediately following great floods in river basins, the praises of valley authorities were sung and attempts were made to establish other valley authorities. Efforts were made following the successive floods along the Missouri River and its tributaries to supplant the declared policy of the Congress with respect to flood control and river and harbor improvements and reclamation. Congress again reviewed and carefully considered the proposals. The constructive provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944 repudiated a Missouri Valley Authority and wisely provided for the reclamation works of the upper Missouri River and its tributaries to be planned and executed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the flood-control improvements in the lower stretches to be planned and executed by the Corps of Engineers.

COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY

But the superficial planners, following the floods along the Columbia River in 1948, are again on the march. They now sound a lesser note respecting the Missouri Valley Authority, but a higher note in behalf of a Columbia River Authority. They would reverse the declared policy of the Congress and cripple the authorizations, appropriations, and construction in the Columbia Basin both by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The adopted policy in the Columbia Basin as well as in all other basins provides not only for navigation, for the generation of electric energy, and for furnishing water to arid lands by irrigation, but the policy provides for cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and with the Conservation and Forestry Services. Authorizations have been made and works constructed for conserving the soil, improving the use of land for reforestation, for vegetable covers, for check dams and for farm ponds, and for other means to conserve the soil and the water on the lands of the Columbia River and other basins. Bonneville Dam with its power and Grand Coulee with both power and reclamation have been constructed and other projects are under construction by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation. A valley authority that would deprive these established agencies of the Government of their functions in the Columbia River Basin is now proposed by the establishment of a Columbia River Authority. The proposal for other valley authorities has been repeatedly rejected by the Congress, and I believe that it will be rejected again. It is again proposed that bureaucracy shall ride the rivers. Bills for valley authorities in other basins have been offered. Whatever may be said with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority as a precedent, there

is certainly no reclamation of arid lands in the Tennessee Valley, and the principal flood-control project in that valley, which is to protect the city of Chattanooga, was placed by Congress under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The Tennessee Valley Authority for this and other reasons cannot properly be used as a precedent for the Columbia River Authority. There are many reasons why the adopted policy of flood control and reclamation in the Columbia Basin should not be supplanted and replaced by an authority. I mention but a few:

1. I am opposed to the Columbia River Authority because it would not be under the immediate control of Congress and would be responsible directly to no one but itself. The control of Congress would be surrendered.

2. Instead of reducing governmental agencies, an additional and unnecessary agency would be added. Without the control of Congress, the agency would be on its own and irresponsibility would result.

3. I oppose the revolving funds to provide for expenditures by authorities without specific authorizations by Congress. The policy with respect to flood control and reclamation would not only be reversed, but wrecked, inasmuch as under the adopted policy Congress approves, after the most careful scrutiny and investigation, all flood-control and reclamation projects.

4. I believe in definite appropriations for specific purposes. Public projects should be safeguarded. In the case of authorities the selection and approval of projects rests with the authority. I believe that the representatives of the people who levy the taxes should have a voice in the approval of the projects to be constructed.

5. Bills creating authorities are often couched in vague phraseology that can easily be stretched to authorize activities which many patriotic Americans do not consider proper governmental functions.

6. I oppose authorities as they may become a superstate and thus deprive the States of the participation accorded to them under the Flood Control Act of 1944 in all flood-control and reclamation improvements. The sovereignty of the States in the matter of water rights is recognized under existing law, but that sovereignty would be in valley authorities if created. The States would not have, by law, the right they now enjoy under the Flood Control Act to participate in plans for flood control and reclamation.

7. I oppose valley authorities because I believe that their control of the electrical power very largely vests in the authority the control of the economy of the region and further centralizes in a Federal bureaucracy the welfare of the region.

8. I oppose valley authorities because under existing law the Department of the Army, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture submit their studies and surveys to Congress for approval. The authorities would be supreme and would not be required to use the existing agencies.

9. I oppose authorities because they are not necessary to coordinate the improvements of the valley. Existing Government departments work together on a single project. One valley is not entitled to priority. If an authority is necessary to coordinate functions we might as well combine the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. If the departments do not cooperate, the remedy, in my judgment, is not to scrap or duplicate the department, but for Congress to insist upon cooperation.

10. I oppose the valley authorities because of the inherent defects in their organizations. Authorities are managed by three men. A public department or enterprise can better be managed by a single executive. Divided authority can be worse than no authority.

11. Finally, I oppose valley authorities because they would duplicate without improving the works done by experienced existing agencies, in soil conservation, in reclamation, in flood control, and in navigation. Authorities use their own engineers. They have not used the Corps of Engineers in the Tennessee Valley Authority, nor have they utilized either the Reclamation or the Soil Conservation Service.

It doesn't make sense to me that we should not continue to use the Corps of Engineers, with their record of achievement since 1824, and the Bureau of Reclamation with its outstanding record since 1902. They have both demonstrated their worth. Mere change never made progress. It often results in failure. I am for progress, but I want that progress to be constructive, and the best way to promote flood control is to continue the use of the most capable and experienced engineers in this or any other country in the planning and execution of flood control and river and harbor improvements.

THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND REORGANIZATION

Bills for the reorganization of the executive departments are under consideration. I favor such legislation, but I must be realistic. For 20 years, under the guise of reorganizing, efforts have been made to strip the Corps of Engineers of their civil functions. President Hoover submitted a reorganization plan to Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1932 just before the expiration of his term. It proposed to change the name of the Department of Interior to convert it into a Department of Public Works, and it proposed to put the Corps of Engineers under the proposed Department and to transfer them from the Department of the Army. It proposed to strip them of their functions. Congress promptly and emphatically rejected the plan. The Reorganization Act of 1932 was extended and limited to two years, but President Roosevelt never undertook to transfer the Corps of Engineers. Congress has rejected all suggestions for placing the Corps of Engineers under any supervision except the Department of the Army. In the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 the functions of the Corps of Engineers were exempt. Efforts are now being made to authorize legislation that may permit a plan to deprive the Corps of Engineers of their civil functions. Such proposals, whenever and wherever they appear, should be defeated. There are many reasons why the Corps of Engineers should continue to execute flood control and river and harbor improvements under the Department of the Army, and why their functions should not be transferred to another agency. Their record of achievement in flood control and river and harbor improvements is unexcelled. That record is fair and spotless. It has never been tainted by fraud or corruption. Educated by the Government at West Point, where civil engineering was first taught in the United States in 1802, with post-graduate courses in the leading universities of the country, the experience in planning and construction in civil works during peace is of inestimable value to the Corps of Engineers in time of war. To place the civil works in or under another agency, when the Corps of Engineers must be maintained in peace for service in war, is utterly unsound. They not only have the experience, but they have the character and the ability as the impartial agency of the Government to advise the Congress and to plan and execute the works authorized by Congress. In times of peace they should be retained under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army so that they may be prepared for their functions, by experience, in times of war. War is always costly and the construction of the works that are essential to the advance and victory of our armies in times of war must be done by the Corps of Engineers. No branch of the service contributed more to victory in World War II than the Corps of Engineers.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public works as proper functions of the Government must be carried on in normal times. These works include Federal buildings in all of the States of the Union, and flood control and river and harbor improvements. They include reclamation. Immediate improvements are often necessary, especially where there has been widespread suffering or damages, or where the need is great. Since World War II, full employment has heretofore obtained. There has been a scarcity of both labor and materials. Public works not normally required can often be delayed until the costs of construction are stabilized. Such works, however, should be authorized not only for normal construction but in periods of unemployment to provide for sound economy. Often works authorized may be postponed until reasonable bids can be obtained. We have confidence in the Corps of Engineers and in the Bureau of Reclamation. Construction must be wisely handled so that, except in emergencies, contracts at reasonable prices may be made available. There are signs that labor is becoming more plentiful and that materials are costing less, but the need for stabilization in prices and wages is still acute. The best way to provide for employment is to promote production by a sound program of public works. In the event of widespread unemployment there should be no work relief.

PROJECTS

Congress should continue to provide, after careful study and investigation, a backlog or shelf of sound public works needed for the transaction of the functions of the Government and in the public welfare. We must profit by our experience. During the depression of the 1930's appropriations disbursed to provide employment were often wasted because of the failure of Congress to adopt in advance for periods of unemployment adequate programs for public buildings, for roads, for river and harbor improvements. Employment will be promoted and waste will be eliminated. Temporary works will be avoided and permanent projects for the general welfare will result.

CROSSROAD

The important governments of the earth today, including our own, face grave crises. The people are confused in thought and in deeds. Thinking has been warperd. Fear is widespread.

People have been deprived of their liberty in many nations. Mass guilt has been revived. Government by hatred, by exile, has been reinstated. The destiny of the United States will determine the destiny of the world. We are at the cross roads.

PEACE AND SECURITY

The world needs peace today. The United States has taken the initiative to promote peace since the cessation of hostilities. The door to peace must always be kept open, but that door should be kept open not for communistic propaganda but for peace and good will in all the world. The best way that the United States can promote peace is for the United States to be strong. Security is essential not only to the welfare of the people of the United States but to the restoration of peace in all the world. Unless we are strong, unless we can match our words with our deeds, world peace will be delayed.

We failed to cooperate for a permanent peace following World War I. As a result, with other nations, we definitely traveled

the road that led to World War II. We have determined to profit by the experiences of the past. We claim the right to determine our own Government and we accord to all countries the right that we claim for ourselves. The forces of communism are on the march. To promote our security we have provided for European and Chinese aid.

EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Our allies in Europe and our friends in China must keep in mind that the burdens of recovery abroad may strain if not destroy the economy of the United States. If the burden proves too much the hope of freedom in all the world is lost, for today the United States stands between freedom and totalitarianism. If there is a depression in the United States or if our economy is crippled, Joe Stalin would be the most pleased person in all the world. European relief is a burden. That relief and national defense are costing the taxpayers $22,000,000,000. The Federal budget is approaching $50,000,000,000.

TAXATION

Taxes are at their peak. They can be increased only by reducing standards of living. We are straining our production. We are exporting more than our surplus. We have a great armament program, and an adequate program is essential for national defense. We cannot increase either our relief or our armaments without additional taxes, and additional taxes will retard if not prevent the recovery of peace that should follow the devastation of war.

TWO MORE HORSEMEN

We are familiar with the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse. These four horsemen are war, conquest, famine, and death. We are in danger of adding two more horsemen. They are just as destructive. We are face to face with high taxes and inflation, and these two additional horsemen may be more destructive than the other four. Our allies in Europe and our friends in China must not expect us to provide more than the necessities for rehabilitation in order that we may maintain our own security. Additional taxes, if possible, should be avoided. Further inflation must be prevented. I am among those who believe that such inflation can be prevented without the control and regimentation that obtained during the war.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

In addition to taxes there is a domestic question that will vitally affect the economy, if not the security of the United States. The repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is being advocated. Such a repeal would clog the wheels of progress. That act is not perfect and while it may properly be amended, it should not be repealed. The remedy is not to repeal but to perfect, for there must be no jurisdictional strikes. Employers and employees must have a voice in labor relations and they must both be made accountable for their contracts. Secondary boycotts must continue to be outlawed. Strikes against the public interest must be prevented, and there should be no repeal of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent strikes that would paralyze the transportation or prevent the production of materials in the general public interest.

WORLD TRADE

The nations of the world are in debt to us. We can no longer live unto ourselves. Our tariff system should be revised. Trade and commerce between the United States and the other countries of the world is imperative if there is to be world rehabilitation, and no nation is more interested in the rehabilitation of the war-torn countries of the world today than the United States.

The Marshall plan must be followed by other plans. While it was nebulous, the President's plan or dream in his inaugural address, for aid to undeveloped areas, if realized, may well supplement the Marshall plan, for while ultraconservatives and reactionaries may criticize the President's dream as a world WPA and as an effort to make the United States the Santa Claus to the world, I believe that his proposal can be better interpreted, for he was careful to say that there was a limit to our material aid and that the backward and undeveloped countries of the world could be aided by our "imponderable resources of technical knowledge." The President may have been dreaming, but his proposal does not embody handouts, and it may well imply especially trained and technical aid for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. We are our brothers' keeper and we must continue to be the good neighbor of all the nations of the world.

NEW FRONTIERS

While there may be in the future progress and development of our country no new territorial frontiers to conquer, there are frontiers available to the ambitious Americans today that are probably greater than the physical frontiers that were available to our ancestors. We must use without destroying our lands and our waters. They are essential to our freedom. The frontiers of the future are the frontiers of science and invention. We live in the atomic age. Some scientists believe that as a result of the continued scientific researches in connection with atomic energy discoveries may be made that will enable the oceans and the gulfs to be farmed and food to be produced to provide for the expanding populations not only of the United States but of the world. Scientists are optimistic enough to believe that as a result of an invention whereby distilled waters may be available to the passengers on airplanes that may be stranded on the seas, these inventions for distilling ocean waters may be perfected so that the waters of the ocean may be distilled and made available for irrigating the great western plains to supplement the stored waters of our rivers so that the American desert may blossom as the rose.

BUILDING AMERICA

We are interested in the rehabilitation of other peoples and of other countries, but we are supremely interested in building America. In the Middle Ages, as a result of the gifts of the poor of Europe, great cathedrals were constructed and from their foundations to their spires they were symbolic of the faith and of the hope of the peoples of Europe. As we construct our highways, as we build our dams, as we erect structures to be the monuments of our civilization, as we conserve and protect and rebuild our soils, as we improve our rivers, we are building the cathedral of American freedom not only for ourselves but as the hope of freedom to the oppressed peoples of all the world.

Fifty years ago it was the proud boast of the Englishman that he was a citizen of Great Britain on whose possessions the sun never set. Today, as the United States has reached the highest pinnacle of power of any nation in human history, the proudest boast of any citizen is, "I am an American."

As we build for ourselves and the future we must build wisely and well. Cato, the noblest Roman of them all, never made a speech without concluding "Carthage must be destroyed." As an advocate of the improvement and conservation of our natural resources, including our waters and our lands, I close by saying that the sound policy of flood control and river and harbor improvements, established by Congress and tested by the experience of the years that have followed, must be maintained and supported. Above all America must be preserved.

Loyalty Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take exception to the slant of various newspaper accounts on the functioning of the loyalty program for employees in the executive branch of the Government.

A number of these accounts appear distorted and some are actually misleading. The loyalty program was designed to protect the United States Government; to assure that Federal workers possess suitable qualifications to merit their salaries being paid by the taxpayers.

Some of these stories have stated that an employee was being denied his rights; that he was being tried without an opportunity to face his accusers in open court. I think that the public is entitled to have it made a matter of record that a trial in the normal use of that word is not contemplated under the loyalty program. I think that the public should know that dismissal under the loyalty program, for which Congress appropriated money, does not accuse a Federal employee of a crime in contemplation of trying him for a violation of law. Rather, it evidences the impropriety of his employment by the Federal Government and of the expenditure of public moneys therefor. It was designed expressly to protect the citizens who supported the Government with their taxes.

Notice must be taken of the difference between right and privilege. No one has an inalienable "right" to employment by the Federal Government. Even those elected by popular vote are subject to impeachment proceedings. Those who are appointed to positions in the Government obligate themselves to the performance of a duty; to the acceptance of certain responsibilities; and to an undivided loyalty to their employer—the Federal Government; in return for which they receive due compensation, liberal privileges, and certain benefits, but no "inherent right" to such employment. They execute an oath of office which is a solemn undertaking to be regarded with sincere convictions and without mental reservations. If, subsequently, it is developed that this oath was taken lightly; that personal factors are brought to light indicating unsuitability for Federal employment, there should be no allegations of deprivation of rights or persecution.

The loyalty program has no counterpart in normal judicial procedure. Loyalty to the Government is the absolute criterion and a fundamental prerequisite to suitability for Federal employment. Any doubts should be resolved in favor of the Government, not the individual. Indeed, if any doubts exist, there should be no doubt as to the action required. Only by a strict application

of this rule can justice be done to the vast majority of loyal employees. Criminal proceedings in the courts, where those found guilty of offenses are penalized personally either by fine, imprisonment, or both, naturally require a preponderance of evidence to be found against the accused before he is punished for the benefit of society as a whole. Denial of employment by the Government is not a punishment, nor does it preclude employment elsewhere.

There has been too much by way of implication and innuendo that a person discharged under the loyalty program has not been given a fair trial. This is incorrect in many ways. Basically, there has been no trial at all. No rights have been infringed because the person concerned cannot claim any right per se to his employment; the Government does not owe him a living. Loyalty hearings are not bound by any rules of evidence. The person concerned can introduce as many witnesses in his behalf as he desires, whether their information is pertinent or not. Also, his case is not being heard by strangers unfamiliar with the problem until presented, but by coworkers who will examine all facts thoroughly before making a decision. Finally, the employee in all cases can appeal to a higher board to assure that there is an impartial review of his case.

Contrariwise, because of the nature of Federal employment, the burden of proof in loyalty cases must rest with the employee, not the employer. It is necessary that an employee establish his suitability in all respects for his position regardless of whether that suitability affects his professional ability or personal characteristics. One would not think of continuing the employment of an individual who demonstrated a lack of professional aptitude for a given job—nor should consideration be given to retaining one who is actually or even only possibly disloyal. Such a person is a risk, present or future, which should not, and cannot, be borne by the Government.

Any individual in public life, no matter what his position, large or small, owes the highest degree of loyalty to his employer—the United States Government. Where doubts arise that this element is lacking in any respect, the integrity of the Government as a whole must be the deciding factor. To put it tritely but practically, we know that a single rotten apple can contaminate a barrel full. An employee of the Government is no different, he can contaminate by attempts to influence his associates and once his insidious campaign begins to bear fruit, an effective infiltration and penetration has been made.

There is a noticeable tendency in press reports and expressions of public opinion to confuse dismissals under the President's loyalty program with removals of individuals from what are known as sensitive positions both within and outside the structure of the Federal Government for reasons of security wholly irrespective of any loyalty considerations. Someone determined to be habitually garrulous; grossly indiscreet; intemperate; as having a notorious criminal record; or associating with questionable characters, is capable of causing as much embarrassment or actual damage as a disloyal person, and hence cannot be employed in sensitive positions or permitted access to classified information without endangering the national security. Denial to such persons of employment or access to classified information does not impugn the person's loyalty nor constitute a charge against him. It is rather the expression of considered opinion that his employment in a particular position is contrary to the best interests of security. It does not deny him employment elsewhere, either within or outside the Government. It is not governed by procedures under the loyalty program. It has not infringed upon nor abridged his rights. Rather it evidences the right of the employer to utilize the services of his employee where and how he sees fit, or not at all if such employment will not serve his best interests.

I should like to urge that each and every Member of this body in his many contacts with the public, take every opportunity to correct any misconception as to the purpose of the loyalty program. Congress in appropriating moneys to the executive departments, looks to those departments to employ 100 percent loyal Americans. It would be wholly incongruous to appropriate public funds, collected through taxes imposed upon the mass of loyal Americans, to employ and pay individuals who are working against the national interest. I want to make it clear that in loyalty cases no rights are being abridged; instead the temporary privilege of a person to work for the Government has been questioned. If the answer to this question indicates reasonable grounds to doubt that the individual is completely loyal, the over-all public interest must control.

National Council, American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has been given to the statement recently made by Premier Stalin, in reply to the questions addressed to him by Kingsbury Smith, of the International Press Service. In this connection, I would like to insert in the RECORD, a letter sent to Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, Md., a former Member of this body, by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., and his reply thereto. I know this is a matter in which all of you are vitally interested:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 2, 1949.

DEAR MAYOR D'ALESANDRO: We feel strongly that responsible American leaders should do all in their power to encourage our Government to make a positive response to the propositions put forward by Premier Stalin.

It is difficult for us one by one to give effective voice to our convictions. For not only do we need to communicate with the President and the Department of State, we need to express our views publicly so that people throughout the country may be influenced to take action also.

One way to accomplish this objective is for a large number of us from all walks of life to endorse a statement which can be released to the press as soon as practicable.

The draft of statement enclosed has found acceptance with several friends to whom we submitted it. We offer it now for your endorsement.

This communication is directed to several hundred outstanding and representative Americans. We urgently ask your agreement to join with other signers.

Time is of the essence. We know you will give immediate consideration and make answer on the enclosed card. If you reside at any distance from New York we would appreciate your use of air mail.

Cordially yours,

JOHN A. KINGSBURY.
H. P. FAIRCHILD.
ARTHUR UPHAM POPE.

A STATEMENT ON THE PROPOSALS OF PREMIER STALIN

Premier Stalin's answers to questions put to him by Kingsbury Smith, of the International News Service, constitute an important declaration of the Soviet Government's policy concerning American-Soviet relations and the peace of the world. The Premier's statements furnish a basis for action on the part of both countries to solve major differences and to establish international amity.

Premier Stalin offered the following propositions:

First. The Soviet Union is prepared to consider the issuance with the United States of a joint declaration that the two countries would not go to war against each other.

Second. Premier Stalin indicated that the U. S. S. R. would cooperate with the United States in working out measures to implement such peace pact, particularly the matter of gradual disarmament.

Third. Premier Stalin indicated readiness on the part of the Soviet Union to effect a simultaneous lifting by all four powers of the east-west blockade of Berlin and the elimination of the present transport and trade restrictions, provided that a meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the four powers be called to consider the German problem as a whole. The condition is made that the Western Powers postpone the formation of a separate western German state, pending the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers.

Finally, Premier Stalin repeated his willingness to meet with President Truman in a mutually suitable place.

We believe our Government should give favorable consideration to these proposals for the reexamination of American-Soviet relations.

The failure of the Allies to achieve a peace settlement for Germany is the cause of much international tension in Europe and in American-Soviet relations. As one result Germany is split. The Soviet Union offers once more to meet with the Allied Powers to study the whole problem of Germany. The condition set approaches closely the position taken by the United States Government concerning the lifting of the blockade as the prerequisite of further discussion on the German question. American initiative now could bring about this four-power meeting. American interests will be served by taking this opportunity to eliminate a major source of international friction.

The settlement of the German problem would pave the way for an American-Soviet peace pact whose influence in dispelling the fear of war among our own people and the peoples of the world can hardly be exaggerated. This peace pact could be advanced by a meeting of the chiefs of state. Since Premier Stalin, for reasons of health, cannot travel a long distance by sea or air to such a meeting, we believe that some accommodation should be reached on the matter of the meeting place in order that Premier Stalin and President Truman can confer.

This is the way back to the ideal of one world. This is the way by which two great nations can lead the world to peace.

The proponents of the futile and costly cold war will seek to discredit this all-important declaration on the part of Premier Stalin. All people who recognize the creative possibilites for peace-making in these offers must, therefore, urge upon the President and the Secretary of State an equally positive response without delay.

For our part, we promise President Truman our support in all actions aimed at the reestablishment of cooperation between our two countries.

Sponsors of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc.: Louis Adamic, George F. Addes, Maxwell Anderson, John Taylor Arms, Max Bedacht, Mrs. Alice S. Belester, Dr. Henry Lambert Bibby, Mrs. Louis Bloch, Mrs. Anita Block, Simon Breines, Prof. E. W. Burgess, Hon. Arthur Capper, Charles Chaplin, Hon. John M. Coffee, Dr. Henry S. Coffin, Aaron Copland, Norman Corwin, Jo Davidson, Hon. Joseph E. Davies, Dr. Herbert John Davis, Hon. Hugh DeLacy, Dr. Stephen Duggan, Prof. Albert Einstein, Max Epstein, Dr. Mildred Fairchild, Dr. Robert D. Field, Lion Feuchtwanger, Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher, Homer Folks, Dr. W. Horsley Gantt, Dr. Caleb F. Gates, Jr., Dean Christian Gauss, Ben Gold, Dr. Mortimer Graves, Dr. Harry Gundfast, Dr. Alice Hamilton, Lillian Hellman, Mrs. Thomas N. Hepburn, Dr. Leslie Pinckney Hill, Prof. William Ernest Hockling, Dr. William M. Horton, Langston Hughes, Dr. Walter Hullihen, Hon. Stanley M. Isaacs, Dr. Millard H. Jencks, Prof. Howard Mumford Jones, Helen Keller, Rockwell Kent, Dorothy Kenyon, Dr. Serge Koussewitzky, Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, William W. Lancaster, Dr. Emil Lengyel, Prof. Robert S. Lynd, Clifford T. McAvoy, Judge Louis Mary McBride, Maurice Maeterlinck, Fritz Mahler, Dr. Thomas Mann, Frank X. Martel, Dr. Kirtley F. Mather, Lewis Merrill, Dr. George R. Minot, Mrs. Lucy Sprague Mitchell, Charles Michael Mitzell, Pierre Monteux, Mme. Pierre Monteux, Bishop Arthur W. Moulton, Hon. James E. Murray, Dr. Philip C. Nash, Dr. Robert Hastings Nichols, Eugene O'Neill, Dr. Marion Edwards Park, Dr. Frederick Douglas Patterson, Bishop Malcolm E. Peabody, Hon. Claude Pepper, Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, Dr. F. C. Peters, John F. Lewis, Jr., Dr. John P. Peters, Henry W. Pope, Michael Quill, Carl Randay, Anton Refregier, Elmer Rice, Wallingford Riegger, Paul Robeson, Col. Raymond Robins, Earl Robinson, Reid Robinson, Harold J. Rome, Joseph A. Rosen, Joseph A. Salerno, Miles M. Sherover, Raymond P. Sloan, Dr. P. A. Sorokin, Maxwell S. Stewart, Leopold Stokowski, Raymond Swing, Genevieve Tabouis, Hon. Elbert D. Thomas, R. J. Thomas, Dr. Max Thorek, S. A. Trone, Philip H. Van Gelder, R. E. Van Horn, Prof. George Vernadsky, Bishop W. J. Walls, Dr. Harry F. Ward, Leroy Waterman, Max Weber, Dr. Henry N. Wieman, Dr. C. C. Williams, Hon. James H. Wolfe, Dr. Max Yergan, Dean Mary Yost, Dr. J. J. Zmrhal, Leane Zugsmith.

CITY OF BALTIMORE,
February 7, 1949.

Messrs. FAIRCHILD, POPE, and KINGSBURY,
New York, N. Y.

GENTLEMEN: You have done me the honor of including me in a list of several hundred outstanding American representatives, and have invited me to join in a public statement agreeing with Premier Stalin's recent declaration to a newspaperman offering to meet President Truman for the purpose of resolving the differences existing between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States.

The matter is, of course, one for the decision by our duly constituted authorities in Washington; but since you solicit my views I avail myself, as an American citizen, of the right to speak my mind freely. I think you will find that the overwhelming majority of thoughtful Americans entertain generally the same views.

In the first place, I do not understand why Marshal Stalin finds it necessary to offer communications of such vital importance unofficially through a newspaperman, as his government has had uninterrupted diplomatic relations with our Government since 1933.

What puzzles me, too, is your readiness to accept at face value Premier Stalin's professions of a peaceful purpose, while shutting your eyes to his acts, which speak in such volume and clarity as to drown out his words.

The timing of Mr. Stalin's newspaper interview and of your letter to me is also interesting. What faith can American citizens put in the Premier's professed good intentions when they read in this morning's paper of the outrageous travesty upon peace, justice, and ordinary human decency which his henchmen are perpetrating in Hungary in the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

For a time the people of this country were disposed to view with indulgence many of the inexplicable actions of the Russian Government. We thought that the strange character of these actions could be attributed to certain differences between eastern and western habits of thought. We dared entertain the hope and wanted to indulge the belief that while Marshal Stalin's way was different than ours, his objective was the same. Recent events have, however, proved very disillusioning. Particularly disheartening to those who love peace and believe in democracy was the taking over of Czechoslovakia a year ago by treachery and threats of force.

Now comes the crowning ignominy in the form of the palpably trumped up charges against Cardinal Mindszenty. The mere pretense of a trial accorded the accused is so abhorrent to our sense of justice that we cannot trust the indirect gestures of Mr. Stalin in the name of peace. And we are at a loss to understand how Americans like yourselves are willing to follow his leadership blindly while you can hardly conceal your suspicion of the good intentions of the officers of our own Government.

You will find that Americans in general are not less eager than your National Council of American Soviet Friendship, Inc., to promote a settlement of the so-called cold war. The chief difference between your organization and the rest of us is that you are ready to accept Stalin's claims without questioning his motives, while you denounce as "proponents of war" those who are inclined to scrutinize his words and to gather their true meaning by comparing them with his deeds.

Since you ask me to endorse by implication the good faith of Mr. Stalin, it is perhaps not out of order for me to ask if you will join me in sponsoring the following declaration:

"As Americans we claim for ourselves the right, which we as freely accord to others, to life and liberty. Foremost among these rights is the freedom to speak, even in criticism of the Government, and to worship God in our own way. We condemn all efforts of any government to suppress these freedoms within its borders or elsewhere, on either side of any curtain, whether it be iron or silken. We particularly denounce the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and the infliction of torture upon him to extract a so-called confession."

If you and your associates will make such a declaration your fellow Americans will salute you; and if you can prevail upon Premier Stalin to respect it, I shall gladly join you in any movement for peace predicated upon belief and trust in Mr. Stalin's good faith.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, Jr.,
Mayor.

If You Want a Government Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the American magazine of February 1949 written by my colleague the Honorable ED REES, of Kansas:

IF YOU WANT A GOVERNMENT JOB

(By EDWARD H. REES, United States Representative from Kansas)

So you want to work for the United States Government—you want a job in Washington, or in your home State, in which are located hundreds of branches of Federal bureaus and thousands upon thousands of Government employees.

You have heard about the Government's wonderful civil-service system—gilt-edged in security, guaranteeing you a lifetime job as long as you do good work, furnishing good retirement pay. Best of all, you've heard that it is a system in which employment and raises in pay are based entirely on merit. No political pull helps anybody in civil service, you have been told; no favoritism; only the best men and women win.

If you have been disheartened by evidences of favoritism in employment in private business, perhaps you've decided that civil service is the system under which you want to work. You've figured that Government employment promises a first-rate, lifetime career.

If so, you are due for a real awakening. There was a time when most of these things you've heard were true, but no longer.

The shocking fact is that today the civil-service system has broken down. The merit plan is taking a beating in Government offices from Washington to San Francisco. Today, getting a Government job, holding it, obtaining a raise, depends far too often upon knowing the right people.

Most Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies, often evading or actually violating the law, bypass civil service and do their own hiring. Ignoring the rules of the merit system, they retain today hundreds of thousands of favored employees—hired "temporarily" during the war—who should be discharged unless they pass an appropriate civil-service examination.

The Civil Service Commission was set up by law as the central personnel agency, and bureaus are supposed to select most of their employees from the register of those who have qualified in civil-service examinations. Those with top grades, according to theory, are first to be employed.

No longer is the civil service a central agency. No longer is every applicant who passes one examination considered for employment by all bureaus. Today each department has its own personnel bureaus. There are thousands of Government employment

offices throughout the Nation, with no central files. An applicant must go from the office of one department to another as he seeks a job.

Gradually grasping power, the bureau chiefs have practically taken over. In assuming and duplicating many of the functions of civil service, these chiefs and their personnel bureaus not only waste the time of the job seeker and give him an unfair break, but they also waste evey year at least $25,000,000 of the taxpayer's money. In the most flagrant cases, even the personnel bureaus are bypassed. Department chiefs often hand out the best jobs to persons of their own choice.

The Civil Service Commission today places comparatively few men and women except typists, stenographers, and messengers. Ask anybody who works for the Government for advice as to the best method for getting a good job, and he probably will answer:

"Go direct to depeartment personnel offices—if possible, with a letter to a bureau chief from one of his friends. Take a job; get your foot in the door. You need not come to Washington. The same plan works in the thousands of regional offices throughout the United States.

"Once you are in, work fairly hard, play politics, shift from office to office until you find a boss who likes you and your work—a boss who will take care of you. Stick with him and you will prosper as a career employee and eventually retire on nice pay. Don't worry about civil-service rules. Your boss will outwit the Commission."

This is the kind of advice you will get from those who work in government.

Probably the personnel office will give you some type of examination, because to get into Government work you usually do have to qualify for the job. However, thousands of men and women are hired on a temporary basis, which needs no examination or approval from the Commission. You may be a temporary employee for years. Or loaded examinations may be arranged, with questions that you are sure to answer correctly.

Once in, under a boss who is taking care of you, you may be promoted over other employees who are more capable than you are. If you are classed as a secretary and your boss wants to get you a raise, he will reclassify you as administrative assistant; if you are publicity writer, you become an information specialist. If you perform the ordinary functions of interviewing applicants for jobs, you may be startled, but pleased, to get more money because—it says on the record—you devise, collaborate, promulgate, and orientate personnel programs.

If some outsider—operating under civil-service rules—threatens to get your job, your boss may write new qualifications, so the outsider can't displace you. If you are a librarian and are left-handed and know French, and the other fellow isn't and doesn't, it may turn out happily that only a left-handed librarian, who speaks French will do.

One boss, in California, kept a favorite from being displaced by a man with higher rating merely by changing one word in the examination. The applicant wanted to be a training instructor and was well qualified, but when asked, "Have you ever conducted conferences?" he said, "No." So he was rejected. He should have been asked, "Have you ever conducted classes?" The applicant had conducted many classes and would have answered "Yes" to that question. But the $10 word tricked him, and the boss' friend stayed in.

Civil service was devised to destroy political patronage in Government employment, to encourage the career men and women who, before civil service, were likely to lose their jobs whenever a new political party came into power. That it did. Today recommendations from Senators and Congressmen seldom help much.

However, a new system of patronage has developed, a personal-patronage plan. This system is controlled by department heads, administrators, heads of bureaus and agencies, and their assistants and chiefs of personnel divisions. They handle their employees largely as they choose. They even, frequently, deliberately discriminate against veterans.

Among others, these executives control 864,348 employees who, under the Classification Act, are supposed to be employed, promoted, or discharged by civil-service rules. They are spread throughout the United States.

Other groups in Federal employment are the Post Office Department, which employs 517,482 persons where advancements are on a seniority basis. In the post office you start at the bottom and automatically rise as the years pass. Under the wage board are 642,306 employees, mostly "blue-collar workers," as in navy yards and arsenals, whose wages generally are determined by union regulations. These post office and wage board employees are selected through examinations.

There are two groups in the executive branch that legally are exempt from civil service: the Foreign Service of the State Department, with 11,075 employees, and departments that are exempt by Executive order. The latter employ 83,879 and include the FBI, Atomic Energy Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In addition, the thousands of Government lawyers are not under competitive civil service.

The bureau chiefs got their chance to bypass and even scuttle the Civil Service Commission when war came. After Pearl Harbor, bureaus, old and new, began to employ, as fast as they could get them, more than 1,000,000 new workers. Obviously, the Civil Service Commission could not handle the situation, and the bureaus were given the right to employ temporarily all the men and women they needed—sometimes more than they needed. Examinations were abandoned; so great was the need that almost anybody who applied for a Government job, anywhere, got one.

The departments set up, from coast to coast, elaborate personnel divisions to recruit, train, classify, and otherwise handle these workers, and in Government, when you start an operation, it's mighty hard to stop it. These personnel departments still operate.

The temporary war-service workers were employed "for the duration of the war and 6 months." At the end of that period they were to take civil-service examinations and reenter Government work, if they desired, on the merit basis, competing with all others who wanted their jobs.

According to the intent of the law, today there should not be one temporary war-service employee on the Government pay roll—except those known or described as "rare birds," the men and women who are absolutely indispensable. They need not take examinations, because nowhere in the United States can be found persons who can replace them.

Note the strength of the personal-patronage system—how bosses take care of their favorites: Today there are about 400,000 temporary war-service employees from coast to coast still on the pay roll, many of them classified by their bosses as "indispensable." It is hard to believe there are so many men and women in Government service who are so "specialized" they cannot be replaced.

Undoubtedly, most of these favored employees are doing satisfactory work, but many of them hold their jobs because their bosses have made misleading statements about them to the Civil Service Commission. As long as they are not forced to prove their superior worth by taking examinations in competition with all other applicants, the merit system is a joke.

The Civil Service Commission almost invariably takes the word of a bureau chief as to whether a certain man or woman shall be employed, discharged, or promoted. How can such a situation exist? Well, one civil-service official told me, "We have to get along with these fellows. It's almost impossible for us to get evidence that misstatements are being made or rules are being violated, and if we started a battle over every case we'd be in 1,000 wars a day, and would lose 999 of them."

The morale of Government workers is suffering. In bureaus that are being forced to cut their pay rolls, many employees with 15 to 20 years of service, with good or excellent ratings, men and women who expected to spend a lifetime in Government work, have been discharged, while temporary employees—in favor with their bosses—were kept on the pay roll.

Last summer the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was informed that several thousand displaced career-service employees could not find positions with the Federal Government. The Civil Service Commission instituted six programs designed to find positions for these career employees and had almost no success because, the Commission explained, "We received very little cooperation from the departments and agencies." They ignored the Commission and got away with it.

Naturally, in these circumstances, many competent men and women are now reluctant even to try to make a career out of Government service. They suspect that unless they play politics in their bureau, and become chief's favorites, they cannot get ahead.

Here is the way the merit system is supposed to operate: Throughout the United States, examinations are held by the Civil Service Commission for specified types of jobs. Those who pass with 70 points or better are put on the eligible register, and bureau heads may select the worker they need from the top three. Except in extraordinary circumstances, the applicants with the top grades must be employed first.

The Veterans' Preference Act gives a 10-point preference to veterans with service-connected disability ratings and to wives of such veterans if the husbands cannot qualify for Government civilian service. Widows of veterans and widowed mothers of veterans also receive a 10-point preference. All other veterans receive a 5-point preference. This means that if a disabled veteran gets 60 points in his examination, he rates with the nonveteran who gets 70 points. In such jobs as guard, messenger, elevator operator, and in the railway mail service, only veterans are qualified.

By ignoring civil service, bureau chiefs, some of whom in wartime were classed as essential and were exempted from the draft, can nullify the purposes of the Veterans' Preference Act.

Throughout the United States, a good many veterans are discriminated against in several ways. There surely must be thousands who, in competitive examinations, would rightfully displace some of the 400,000 war-service employees who helped fight the war at a government desk and who have not yet been required to prove their ability in a free-for-all test. Veterans have a difficult time breaking into this group.

Even when there is a job open, and there is available a veteran with equal or better rating than a nonveteran applicant, bureau chiefs often choose the nonveteran. Time and again, also, I have received evidence that bureau chiefs who are cutting their staffs have discharged veterans and continued to employ workers who had lower ratings.

The American Legion declares: "Cases are found wherein veterans who have been employed by departments for years, and who have carried 'excellent' ratings, suddenly

find themselves with unexplained inferior classifications. Thus these veterans are the first to be dismissed from their jobs. The difficulty lies with certain chiefs of Federal agencies, who through wartime decentralization exercise discretionary powers improperly in removing (or failing to install) veterans in civil service positions."

Bureau chiefs contend that they are acting for the best interests of their agencies. They say that a nonveteran with 70 points is a better man than a veteran with the same number of points, because the veteran's score is 60 or 65 made in an examination, plus 10 or 5 given him by the Preference Act. They point out that the war-service employees who were employed as "temporary" have had several years of experience, and they argue that if they are replaced by new people the efficiency of the bureau will suffer.

They usually admit that bosses take care of certain employees, get them raises, keep them on their jobs while others are being discharged, but they contend that these employees are taken care of because of the excellence of their work, not because they are cousins of somebody important in the bureau, or because they dance well or give good parties. They say that through their own personnel bureaus they get better workers than through Civil Service.

In some cases what the chiefs say is true. Department personnel bureaus, such as that of the Bureau of Standards, for instance, should select applicants for technical jobs requiring special knowledge or skills.

However, the law gives preference to veterans, and no bureau has ever submitted evidence that it will suffer if the law is obeyed. Nor will efficiency be destroyed if competitive examinations show that certain temporary war-service employees are not as competent as some applicants and should be replaced.

If you work in the office of a private concern, probably you have seen cases of "teacher's pets" and will doubt that merit is always the only factor that inspires the boss' favor. He may think that he is not influenced by other things, but there are times when the sycophants and the talebearers advance faster than employees of equal merit who don't play office politics.

The plain fact is that the only fair method of handling the great majority of Federal employees is through the civil-service merit system. By enforcing the rules, this can be restored. When employment and promotion are based on merit, Government service is an attractive career. The worker has security, comfort, good working conditions, freedom from labor-management problems, and usually more substantial retirement pay than is given in private industry. Under a personal-privilege system, except for the privileged it will no longer attract and hold the kind of men and women whom Government needs.

Each department must have an efficient personnel department to procure and maintain an efficient work force, but not the pretentious, elaborate, and wasteful bureaus of which we have so many today. On January 1, 1940, it took 6,721 personnel department employees to handle the job in the executive branch. The total now is more than 24,000, and salary cost has increased 6 times. Total Federal employment increased 115.8 percent, but personnel bureau employment went up 261 percent.

In 1940 there was 1 full-time personnel employee for every 139 Federal employees. Today there is 1 for every 83. A representative sampling of industry and commerce shows there is an average of 1 personnel employee to every 226. Business has methods of checking waste that are not to be found in Government.

The salary cost of all personnel agencies in the executive branch totals $78,627,183—an average of $38.98 for every employee on their pay rolls. Consolidation and the elimination of functions that parallel, overlap, and duplicate the functions of the Civil Service Commission would reduce that by at least $25,000,000.

Apparently, there is one department in which economy—perhaps mistakenly—is practiced. After squandering all that money to put an employee on the pay roll, Government departments spend only a shade more than $1 to train him.

Not the least of the evils has been the erection of enormous impediments in the path of the man or woman who is hunting for a Government job. If you live in a city, in your Federal building there are probably from 10 to 20 branches of different agencies that you should visit if you are looking for work. In the Washington area, there are 225 separate personnel offices that do their own hiring for the departments, agencies, or bureaus they represent.

You would think that, at least, each department would have one central personnel office. But in Washington, for instance, if you seek a job in the Army, there are 24 different offices in the area, in which you might find an opening. Seven are in the same building, The Pentagon. None makes its application files available to any other personnel office. The Navy, in that area, has 30 different personnel offices, Agriculture has 27, and the Treasury has 24.

To show how the Civil Service Commission has been relegated to a minor position—two departments and one major agency actually utilize more employees in their individual personnel operations than does the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has 3,350 employees who handle its examining, recruiting, placement, retirement, and loyalty programs. The Army has 6,237, the Navy has 6,282, and the Veterans' Administration has 3,778.

If you seek a job in Washington or in your home city, you may be able to make 5 calls a day. One thing that will slow your progress will be the excellent service you probably will get in every personnel department. First you will be asked by a pleasant receptionist to fill out Form 57, answering 37 questions, some in considerable detail. At every office you fill out the same form.

With your form, you will be sent to an interviewer, who will go over it, question by question, usually reading most of it back to you. When that's over, you may go to a job analyst, a placement officer, a test technician—perhaps to one, perhaps to all. If you are lucky, you will be hired. Usually, however, you will be told that your Form 57 will be filed and you will be notified if anything turns up.

Then you go to another office, perhaps one floor up, and the whole thing is repeated. I know one man who made 31 calls and filled out 31 Form 57's before he got a job.

After you have made 10 calls, have filled out 10 Form 57's, and have been interviewed by many men and women with fancy titles, you will realize that all this service usually is not provided in order to furnish work for you, as much as it is to furnish work for the folks in the personnel offices. The elaborate routine too often is set up to justify all those personnel employees at high salaries—when the head of the department goes to Congress for his appropriation.

As time passes and you become acquainted in Washington, or in your home-town Federal building, you will learn that the wisest job-seekers avoid not only the Civil Service Commission, but also the personnel offices. They get a line direct to the chief personnel officer's boss. If you are lucky enough to do that, you probably get a job.

I have a report on one new bureau that had 126 employees in its personnel department, although the total employment in the bureau was less than 500. The startling fact was that although the personnel bureau had been extremely busy interviewing applicants, many of whom were qualified, it had not placed one applicant in 3 months. The hiring was being done by men in the top jobs, who ignored the bureau.

Let's assume that you get a job on merit. A department needs someone of your qualifications; you pass an examination and are employed. Perhaps the system has operated in your favor. Tramping the streets may be 50 job-seekers whose qualifications are superior to yours, but they didn't happen to call at this particular office. However, on the other hand, there may be an opening at an office at which you didn't call, a job into which you would fit and which would pay $1,000 more a year.

Now, how will you get increases in pay that may or may not be due you?

Whether you work in Seattle, New Orleans, Miami, New York, Washington, or Wichita, Kans., the system is the same. If you aren't seeing eye-to-eye with your boss, after a few months, look for chances to transfer to other sections or departments where you may find a friend. Once set, advancement depends mostly upon classification. Everybody who works under the classification act worries about his rating—even the section chiefs.

There was a time when salaries of many men and women depended to a great degree upon the number of workers they supervised. If a chief could double the size of his department, his salary went up. If he reduced his force, his salary went down. This scheme was responsible for much of the overemployment in government; that was why some departments had dozens of employees who actually worked only a few hours a day.

Congress has recently added to appropriation acts a clause providing that money shall not be available for departments in which the classification grade of an employee is influenced by the number of persons he supervises. However, I have no evidence that in any Government department, bureau chiefs have voluntarily cut their staffs, to help reduce expenses.

Because Government, unlike private industry, can apply no cost systems to its departments, it has no means for encouraging department heads to operate economically. Bureau heads appear before congressional committees which have to take the bureaucrat's word for necessary expenditures. After the chiefs have fought for their appropriations and have won, they generally adopt the viewpoint that Congress gives them specified sums of money to spend as they see fit, and they distribute it as they choose, all of it. It is very rare that a bureau head finishes a fiscal year with a report that he has a lot of money left over because he voluntarily reduced his staff.

Since it is impossible for any outsider to place a correct value upon the services of an employee, the rating of a worker is mostly under the control of his boss. Classification officers in departments are supposed to be impartial, but they are susceptible to influence and pressure from bureau and division chiefs.

Of great importance is the job sheet which is prepared by the personnel technicians and which defines the duties of the worker. These job sheets are marvels of literary composition when efforts are being made to promote a favorite. Dictionary at hand, the author picks big words and produces sonorous sentences worthy of P. T. Barnum describing Jumbo.

A clerk in Illinois who puts labels on magazines, newspapers, and reports, routing them to executives, doesn't do that, according to his job sheet. He receives all publications and reports for the division, reviews these publications for the purpose of determining, on a basis of knowledge of the functions of the various officials of the agency, who would

be interested in a part or whole of such material, and routes the material so flagged to these individuals; maintains a follow-up when necessary, so as to know at all times the location of such material.

One clerk in Pennsylvania operates the office clipping bureau. Here is the description of those simple duties: "To go over daily and weekly newspapers, monthly labor and business magazines, weekly commerce reports, weekly railroad magazines, the Federal Reserve Bulletin, reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of the Department of Labor, for the purpose of digesting and compiling material that may directly or indirectly relate to the work of the office." How proud the author of that must have been when he thought up digesting and compiling and directly or indirectly. I don't know how he happened to neglect to say that the man with the shears had to coordinate and evaluate the material.

I have before me a job sheet by means of which an officer in the War Department got his secretary-receptionist a raise from $2,724 a year to $3,351. She is described as chief clerk and supervisor of all civilian personnel of the ——— branch, allotting to such personnel the many duties necessary in carrying out the mission of the branch. That, she says, is news to her, unless it is describing the fact that she routes incoming communication to the desk where they are supposed to be handled.

The job sheet says further that she "reviews all incoming and outgoing mail, supervises the maintenance of files, including a suspense file and follow-up system. Handles secret and confidential correspondence. Meets important industrial representatives and maintains records of such contacts, conferences, and obligations made by branch chief." She says that if all that means that she does what every secretary does, that part is correct. She says, "Isn't most correspondence, in any office, secret and confidential?"

There are many cases in which clerk-typists have advanced from $2,086 a year to $2,724 a year without the slightest change in their work. Usually they stay in the same room, at the same desk.

I have seen a State Department classification sheet which, in the first two lines, describes the actual duties of the employee. Added were 43 lines of description of duties that the employee confesses he has never performed in any way.

To increase the number of employees and to take care of favorites, sometimes jobs are divided. In the Memorial Division of the Army was an employee with an "excellent" rating who had 29 years of Government service and who performed his job well. His superior cut the man's job into seven pieces, furnishing employment for six military and civilian employees.

In their new jobs the military men received increased rank, the civilians went up in grade. But the unfortunate career man, his job sheet rewritten, his duties parceled out, was reduced one grade. Now he works only about 3 hours a day, with 5 hours free to ponder the classification miracle of which he was a victim. His appeals have come to naught. * * *

If the executive branch acts promptly, the civil-service system can be saved, the power of those who operate the personal-patronage systems can be reduced, justice can be dispensed to career workers, and a real merit system provided.

First. The "temporary" war-service employees must be eliminated. The regulations concerning them must be enforced. Those who are competent will pass civil-service examinations in free-for-all competition and will remain in their jobs. The incompetent will go out and be replaced, mostly by veterans who qualify for these jobs.

Second. Department heads must be forced to obey civil-service rules and to make appointments on a competitive basis. Congress can withhold appropriations for departments until they comply. Personnel bureaus must be cut down and duplication of civil-service functions must be eliminated.

Third. The Civil Service Commission should set up a central employment service with a central punch-card file to be used by all departments. Except in unusual circumstances, applicants will need to call at only one office and make out only one form 57. Departments must be forced to select employees from the civil-service register.

Fourth. The classification system must be simplified, job sheets full of flowery and inaccurate phrases must be revised, boards to which employees appeal must be unprejudiced and of higher caliber. The civil-service system and not the bosses must have the last word. An act of Congress can revise the classification system.

Federal employment once more must be made attractive to the conscientious and competent worker who won't stoop to play politics in any respect. We must get back to a genuine civil-service competitive merit system in our Government. Nothing less will do.

Needs of the Indians of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore in a speech in this House referred to the condition of the Indians on the Turtle Mountain Reservation and the Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation. I have just received from the welfare board of Benson County, in which county the Fort Totten Indian Reservation is located, a full report on the needs of those Indians. This report conveys complete information which this House should know and which the country should know. It surely shows that our guardianship over these Indians has been sadly neglected. Having been neglected, there is nothing we can do but appropriate money to take care of them until a self-sustaining program can be inaugurated.

The matter follows:

BENSON COUNTY WELFARE BOARD,
Minnewaukan, N. Dak., February 3, 1949.
Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are enclosing a copy of the estimated needs for Indian relief for the Fort Totten Reservation as submitted to the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota.

The county commissioners of this county in their meeting on February 1 suggested to me that a copy of this estimate be sent to you with a letter informing you of the Indian relief situation as it is in this county.

You no doubt know that a request to the Legislature of North Dakota was made by this county requesting that the responsibility be shifted to the State, and the county relieved of such responsibility. The county commissioners also requested that the request for amendment to this bill be presented to the legislature by myself, which I did during the week of January 17. After careful consideration of this amendment in Bismarck, it was ruled that this was not a feasible bill; however it was very agreeable that the county should not be required to carry the load, and that State funds should be forthcoming. Therefore an emergency bill for the balance of this fiscal year in the amount of $75,000 for Indian relief, and a bill for $250,000 for the next biennial, July 1, 1949, to July 1, 1951, was introduced in the Senate.

In December the Public Welfare Board of North Dakota allocated to this county $3,000 for the relief of Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation at which time Federal funds were exhausted.

The county welfare board and the county commissioners are very interested in the welfare of the Indians on the Fort Totten Reservation, and I, as executive secretary of the welfare board, am very interested in having a program worked out whereby there will only be one agency handling relief for the Indians. This will give the Indian a chance to know what type of relief he may expect and also what he is expected to do in return.

It will be noted on the enclosed report that it is estimated that $13,440 is required for the balance of this fiscal year, and $79,760 will be required for the next biennial. If the county would have to carry this, it would be a burden to them.

The Benson County Welfare Board in this county now have a full staff of well qualified employees which consists of two case-workers, two stenographers and bookkeepers, together with myself, the executive secretary, and it is felt with this staff, if money is provided other than from the county funds, that we would be in a position to carry on a sound welfare program. On the staff connected with this office, one case worker and one stenographer is stationed permanently at Fort Totten.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and trusting that this information will be of some value to you, I am,

Very respectfully,

B. M. HANSON,
Executive Secretary.

Estimated funds needed for Indian relief, Fort Totten Reservation, Feb. 1 to July 1, 1949

Month and year	Number of cases	Average cost per case	Amount
February 1949	45	$104	$4,680
March 1949	45	104	4,680
April 1949	30	104	3,120
May 1949	20	104	2,080
June 1949	20	104	2,080
Medical care other than Indian Service			400
Burials			400
Total need to July 1, 1949			17,440
Cash on hand Benson County welfare fund from PWB			2,000
Cash on hand Turtle Mountain Consolidated Agency allocation to Fort Totten			2,000
Total			4,000
Total estimated need to July 1, 1949			13,440

The case load is based on the number of cases Jan. 1, 1948, to Jan. 1, 1949.

The average cost per case is based on an average family of 4 with a husband and wife, a son aged 8, and a daughter aged 3.

Medical care is for cases requiring the services of a specialist not available through Indian Service. Also transportation, etc., for crippled children.

Burials are based on the number of deaths in which assistance was needed in the past year.

Estimated funds needed for Indian relief, Fort Totten Reservation, July 1, 1949, to July 1, 1951, as of Jan. 26, 1949

Month and year	Number of cases.	Average cost	Total for month
July 1949	20	$104	$2,080
August 1949	20	104	2,080
September 1949	20	104	2,080
October 1949	25	104	2,800
November 1949	35	104	3,640
December 1949	45	104	4,680
January 1950	45	104	4,680
February 1950	45	104	4,680
March 1950	45	104	4,680
April 1950	30	104	3,120
May 1950	20	104	2,080
June 1950	20	104	2,080
Medical care other than Indian Service			1,000
Burials			1,000
Total for year			39,880
Estimate for the year July 1, 1950 to July 1, 1951, the same as above			39,880
Total for biennial			79,760

The average cost per case is based on a State standard, a family of 4 with a child 3 and a child 8.

The case load is based on the number of cases Jan. 1, 1948, to Jan. 1, 1949.

The $1,000 included for medical care is an estimate of cases needing services of a specialist and is for transportation, board, room, etc. This will also be used for crippled children who are receiving care under the crippled children's service when such medical care is paid by that division.

Social security grant, Fort Totten Indians, July 1, 1948, to Jan. 31, 1949

Type of case	Average cases per month	Average payment	Amount
Old-age assistance	54	$33.39	$1,803.43
Aid to blind	3¾	35.39	116.29
Aid to dependent children	33⅓	64.62	2,141.91
Total average security payments per month			4,061.63

Address by Hon. Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, to the Young Democrats of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very brilliant address delivered by Hon. ROBERT S. KERR, formerly Governor of Oklahoma, and now a distinguished United States Senator from that great State. This address was delivered to the Young Democrats of North Carolina at their State meeting in Southern Pines on Saturday night, February 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor and a privilege to speak to the Young Democrats of North Carolina.

It is inspiring to feel the impact of your vigorous spirit of democracy.

It is a pleasure to visit the home State of so many outstanding men and women who have achieved fame for themselves, victories for their party, and luster for their great State.

As a freshman Senator, it has been my privilege for some weeks to be desk-mate to your senior Senator and former Governor, the distinguished CLYDE HOEY.

As Governor of Oklahoma, it was my privilege to be closely associated with your present junior Senator and former Governor, the eminent MELVILLE BROUGHTON, and your illustrious Gregg Cherry, who just recently completed his term as your Governor.

It is a pleasure to be in your State with your present Governor, the Honorable W. Kerr Scott.

I understand that here, as elsewhere east of the Smokies and south of the Mason and Dixon's line, the name K-e-r-r is pronounced "Karr." The pronunciation being of considerable interest to me, I have looked into the matter. I find that north of Dublin and west of the Irish Sea it is called Ker. Out in the Southwest we call it Kerr, and prefer that those using it spell it K-e-r-r. However, in my recent campaign, some of our Republican brethren insisted on spelling it C-u-r.

I am happy to be here in the district of your great Congressman, CHARLES B. DEANE, who very graciously called me on the phone before I left Washington to send his greetings to the Young Democrats of this district and of the State.

I am glad to be in Southern Pines. I have long had a curiosity about Pinehurst. It's fame has spread abroad and I have wanted to get full information about it. I understand that nowhere can that be done with more accuracy than here in Southern Pines. Of course, some day I hope to go to Pinehurst, because I understand that there, better than anywhere else, the low-down is available on Southern Pines.

When your distinguished State president first invited me to come to your meeting I was quite anxious to accept, but I demurred. In fact, I wouldn't agree to come until he had postponed the meeting from rather early in January until thus late in February. I felt that no Oklahoman had any business in North Carolina until at least this long a cooling-off period, following the recent battle at New Orleans on New Year's Day.

Naturally, we in Oklahoma were happy when our team won, but, seriously, we are quite aware of the fact that it could have been much different if Charlie Justice hadn't been weakened by illness.

It is always most gratifying to meet with young Democrats. There has never been a political party in any age in which young men and women are so welcome, or in which they can feel so much at home, as the Democratic Party. Nor has there ever been a political party in which young men and women can have such influence and be so effective as in this great Democratic Party.

I want to urge the Young Democrats of North Carolina to become more active in the affairs of their Government. Let me invite you to set the pattern for the young men and women of the Nation. Nothing can give your Government greater strength than for its young people to become more and more a part of it.

National strength does not flow from the seat of government down to the people. Our Nation is impregnable because of the strength of the people flowing up to, and becoming a part of, it.

The other day I read this story of one of the conferences between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin. In the course of the conversation Roosevelt showed them a gold cigarette case which had engraved upon it these words: "From a grateful people to their beloved President." He was naturally quite proud of it. Then Churchill exhibited a gold cigar case upon which was inscribed these words: "From the people of the British Empire to their greatest hero." Tears dimmed the eyes of the indomitable Churchill as he displayed this evidence of the devotion of his nation. Then Stalin pulled out a gold cigarette case which carried this inscription: "Presented by the grateful people of a Finnish community to a devoted Red Cross doctor"—who had been shot.

No government can fail that has the support and strength of the combined will and purpose of a patriotic people, nor can any government stand which is built alone upon physical might and the strength of a people held together only through fear.

You do not need to think of your Government as being "away off yonder in Raleigh," or "away off yonder in Washington," or as being something anywhere that you need to fear.

The seat of any government is wherever the sovereignty is. And in our country the citizens alone are sovereign. Therefore, where the people are the government is, and their government will be as strong and powerful as they will it to be.

The Democratic Party is the party of youth. It is the symbol of hope for each succeeding generation, and, as each succeeding generation of youth have made it their party, they have renewed the vitality and vigor which have been the characteristics of this party since it was founded by the great Thomas Jefferson. He saw a new day for a new generation. He visualized a new freedom for a new world of men, and he brought into being a new instrumentality through which the brave new dreams of a great young nation might become realities.

Our party is just as vigorous and vital today as it was in Jefferson's day because now, as then, it is dedicated to building for the future.

I think November 2, last, witnessed the most significant political victory in the Nation's history.

The Republican leaders were certain of success. They were so confident that they had already begun to ignore the people's welfare and had started serving notice of their purpose to lead the country back to what they called the "good old days."

The Republican press, which includes most of the magazines and big newspapers in the country, were already referring to the Governor of New York as "Mr. President." But then the people spoke, and the situation recalled the year of 1916, when we went to bed on election night with heavy hearts, thinking that Mr. Hughes had defeated the great Woodrow Wilson.

But sometime after midnight the telegraph wires began to hum—and the Nation was electrified with the information that the final returns showed Wilson had carried California instead of Hughes, and had been reelected.

The newsmen went to Mr. Hughes' room about 5 o'clock the next morning and knocked on his door. After much difficulty they finally aroused one of his servants, who came to the door and angrily demanded to know why all the noise so long before daylight. The newsmen replied they wanted to see Mr. Hughes. Whereupon the servant said: "The President is asleep and cannot be disturbed." "Is that so?" the newsmen asked. "Well, when he wakes up tell him he ain't President."

When Mr. Dewey "woke" up on the morning of November 3 he learned that the people had told him he wasn't President.

Of course, a lot of the Republican leaders haven't "woke" up yet.

I haven't been able to determine whether they are suffering from the shock of the election or whether they are still in the political somnambulism in which they have been wandering so long.

Truly it has been said of the Republican Party that their old men live in the shadows of the past, and that their young men live in the shadows of their old men.

Let the Republicans fight to preserve the gains the people have made under Democratic administrations. Let them sit in the shadows and write the history of the past.

The people, especially young people, are interested in tomorrow, and this party—the Democratic Party—is determined to continue developing leaders who will be the architects of a brighter future.

Ah, we wouldn't depart from the basic principles of our party, but in preserving them we will not be satisfied to merely hoard them. In the immortal Declaration of Independence Jefferson declared that "all men are created equal"; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain "inalienable rights," among which are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

He gave that as an ideal to be achieved, not as a reality already accomplished, and men and women today throughout the length and breadth of the land—and in fact, around the world, above all else, still are working, yes, and fighting, to achieve the blessed reality of equality of opportunity as among all men, and in vitalizing life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We are proud of the progress we have made. My heart thrilled as I sat on the platform a little while ago and saw the inauguration of that great American, President Harry Truman. I was imbued with the essence of his dynamic spirit as he said: "I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Union is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness. It is foremost among the nations of the world in the search for peace."

As I listened my mind went back to that January day in 1943 when I heard another state of the Union message by the greatest President of all time, Franklin Roosevelt. I heard him say: "A tremendous, costly, long-enduring task in peace as well as in war is still ahead of us But, as we face that continuing task, we may know that the state of this Nation is good—the heart of this Nation is sound—the spirit of this Nation is strong—the faith of this Nation is eternal."

In the midst of the most awful war in history, and today in the midst of the most intense effort to win a lasting peace, we are told—and we believe—that the state of this Nation is good, because its leadership symbolizes a program of progress and prosperity and peace.

I thank God for a leadership emblematic of the undying hope and unconquerable spirit of youth and for the party that seeks to lead the people into ever finer fields of progress and security.

We are grateful for a leadership that is aware that we live today in a new America in a new world. We know that America has come of age in this new world. We know that destiny has flung about her shoulders the mantle of world leadership, and we are thankful for the faith and the courage that will enable us to meet that challenge.

You and I know that here in this wonderful land of ours, this giant of the Western World, the light of freedom burns with the fiercest flame mankind has ever seen. Here is the strongest pillar of strength for liberty and justice in all the world.

It is the only one of sufficient strength to guarantee the security of its own people, and to provide the forceful and effective leadership required to enable the rest of the world to find similar blessings.

The light that shines here in America has cast its rays around the world. It is the symbol of hope in the hearts of hundreds of millions of people who are able to continue their struggle in the midst of fearful hardships because of that hope.

In our generation the tides of aggression and conquest have overrun many lands and subdued many people. America has been the Rock of Gibralter against which those tides have beaten in vain. We have seen them hurled against us with all of the fury of hatred, greed and selfish ambition. We have seen them driven back in failure and futility. We have seen our Nation emerge stronger from each impact, stronger by reason of a more vital spirit and greater vigilance in the hearts and minds of our people. We see our Nation today in the words of the poet who said:

"Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale and rides above the storm;
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

But my friends, we cannot rest nor falter here. We face an even sterner task today than those which have already tried us so sorely. Tides of evil propaganda roll against the bulwark of our citadel of freedom today.

The tides of aggression we knew in yesteryears were physical and they sought to subdue only our physical strength. Today's aggressors would use their tides of false propaganda to kill the very spirit of our people and enslave their minds.

They also will fail. It was the spirit of America, the love of freedom, that gave us the unity and the strength and the perseverance to emerge victorious from World Wars I and II. That same spirit will not fail us now.

The sunlight of knowledge and enlightened public consciousness have dispelled the darkness and have settled the gloom which threatened us. The glorious dawn of an even brighter day of freedom in America reveals to the men in the Kremlin that their days of being a threat to the world are most surely numbered; discloses to our own citizens, young and old alike, that the spirit of America in the hearts of a vigorous people, can safeguard their blessings of liberty and freedom; and proclaims to the downtrodden millions in those lands behind the iron curtain that even they may hope for a brighter and better tomorrow.

Nothing worth while was ever easy. Ours is the greatest heritage ever known by any race. It is the result of sacrifice and devotion. It has been preserved through courage and fidelity. It can be kept—and it shall be extended—by a united people and a great democratic leadership.

Why the Taft-Hartley Act Must Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there is a great deal of controversy over the form which new labor legislation to supplant the punitive Taft-Hartley Act should take. Friday night, over the National Broadcasting Co.'s Nation-wide network, I made an address on this issue on the program Pro and Con. In it, I made this comment:

The theory of the Wagner Act was that strong labor unions represent one of the greatest bulwarks of democracy. The theory of the Taft-Hartley Act is that strong labor unions threaten America's economy and safety.

Mr. President, I think that sums up the essence of this entire issue. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address on the subject Why the Taft-Hartley Act Must Be Repealed be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Democratic Eighty-first Congress, one month after it convened for the first time, is now organized, and ready to go to work in earnest. The committees have been established. They are holding hearings and preparing to report vital legislation in the national interest.

The Congress has some solemn obligations to the American people. It is pledged by our 1948 Democratic platform to do certain things—things the people indicated in November they want done.

One of the most important things the Eighty-first Congress must do and must do promptly but carefully, is to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to replace it with legislation on labor-management relations in the spirit of the old Wagner Act which the Republican Eightieth Congress distorted into a vicious and punitive antilabor legislative monstrosity.

The Democratic Party is pledged in its platform to enact such legislation as is desirable "to establish a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining, to determine, in the public interest, the rights of employees and employers to reduce to a minimum their conflict of interests, and to enable unions to keep their membership free from communistic influences."

That is what we are pledged to do and that is what we are going to do.

As chairman of the convention committee at Philadelphia which drafted the Democratic platform which contained that specific pledge, along with many other specific pledges of Democratic intention, I will say to you that we did not assume any of these obligations lightly or with our fingers crossed. We fought out these issues in the platform committee and when we were finished, there was no doubt in anyone's mind where the Democratic Party, as a party, stands on any of the issues mentioned in our platform.

I am very proud of that. At the same time, however, I recognize that it is no easy matter to write into workable law broad general statements of position no matter how desirable those positions might be. The laws resulting from those pledges must work, must do what they are intended to do, or they are a fraud on the people and a mockery of democracy.

Right now, both the Senate Labor Committee and the House Labor Committee are engaged in hearings on new labor legislation to replace the Taft-Hartley Act. The administration has sent to the Congress a carefully drafted and carefully thought-out bill representing the views of President Truman and of his advisers on labor legislation as to what a good bill, a workable bill, an effective bill to establish "a just body of rules to assure free and effective collective bargaining" should contain. This bill is not sacred. It might be changed, either in committee or on the floor of either House. It represents, however, an informed, enlightened, sympathetic, and fair-minded approach to the problem and

as such is entitled to very careful consideration.

I am not a member of the Senate Labor Committee and I am not in a position to predict what that committee will recommend when it completes its deliberations and its hearings. I think, however, that this committee will give us a good bill and one which those of us who believe in fair management-labor relations can support in good conscience.

This bill will probably not satisfy those who wrote the Taft-Hartley Act. This is understandable. The Taft-Hartley Act represented to certain elements in this country the ultimate in desirable regulation of—meaning handcuffing of—organized labor in the United States. There were a few anti-labor fanatics who wanted to go even further than the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, but the Taft-Hartley Act represented, on the whole, the full desires of those who wanted to beat labor down and keep it under rigid restrictions.

The issue before the Congress today, however, is no longer whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. That issue was settled by the voters in November when they elected a Congress committed to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. The time for debate on whether the Taft-Hartley Act should or should not be repealed and replaced is over.

But there is a tremendously important debate shaping up now over the sort of legislation we should have to replace and supplant the punitive Taft-Hartley Act. This debate will occur not only in the Congress, but in every union local, in every management board of directors, in every industry trade association, in forums and discussion meetings all over America. And that's fine. That's exactly the sort of Nation-wide attention a problem like this deserves.

Much of the opposition to the President's proposed changes in labor legislation comes from those who contend that much if not all of the Taft-Hartley Act should be incorporated in disguise into the new act. They contend that although the Taft-Hartley Act may, as they put it, have a few minor faults—a grudging admission at that—that, on the whole, it is a fair, just body of rules for management-labor relations.

Let us examine that premise for a few minutes.

The theory of the Wagner Act was that strong labor unions represent one of the greatest bulwarks of democracy. The theory of the Taft-Hartley Act is that strong labor unions threaten America's economy and safety. In a nutshell, that's the difference between the two.

The Wagner Act was designed to help labor to organize into strong, effective unions, to help labor achieve a status of equality in dealing with management. That was the idea, and the idea was realized in nearly all of the basic industries in America.

The Taft-Hartley Act was designed to put obstacles in the way of union organization, to hobble labor's effectiveness in dealing with management. That goal, thank heaven, has not been realized, because in a boom economy, we have had a tight labor market, full employment, and strong competition between industries for skilled workers. Even so, however, this insidious antilabor law has disrupted peaceful labor-management relations in numerous industries, has unfairly caused great expense and untold difficulties to many unions without improving labor-management relations in any way whatsoever.

I do not intend to make a step-by-step analysis of the Taft-Hartley Act in this short period of time—the Nation's highest-priced corporation lawyers are still arguing among themselves as to what the law actually means in many controversial respects—but I think I can safely say this:

That the Taft-Hartley Act has failed—if its purpose was to improve management-labor relations in the United States; the Taft-Hartley Act has failed—if its purpose was to establish a fair body of rules, just to both management and labor. That, ostensibly, was its purpose, but the proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, as it now appears on the statute books, the labor-union movement in America could be destroyed. It could be destroyed if we had a few million unemployed in America. The labor movement could be wrecked under those circumstances.

When I say that, am I merely mouthing so-called labor propaganda? Am I solemnly echoing the thoughts of the CIO or the A. F. of L. or some other labor group?

My friends, I am quoting not from the CIO News and not from the A. F. of L. Federationist or any such publication—although they have all said similar things—but in this instance I am quoting from Business Week magazine, published by McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., and written for businessmen and generally reflecting business views on controversial issues. It is certainly not a labor propaganda organ.

In an editorial in its issue of December 18, 1948, Business Week says flatly that the Taft-Hartley Act has failed for a number of important reasons, one of them being that it went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate from one which could destroy. That's what Business Week said in its editorial of December 18, an editorial incidentally, which was entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Failed."

I suggest that all those who believe the Taft-Hartley Act was a just body of rules for management and labor obtain a copy of that magazine for December 18 and read that editorial.

It says further:

"Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.

"These are the provisions that could do it," the magazine continues:

"(1) Picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for collective bargaining elections; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote—while the strike replacements"—the magazine means strike breakers—"while the strike replacements cast the only ballots; and (4) if the outcome of this is a no-union vote, the Government must certify and enforce it."

Business Week continued in that editorial with this thought:

"Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions, linked together, presumably can destroy a union."

Business Week, of course, warned in its editorial that if the pendulum—which swung too far in the antilabor direction in the Taft-Hartley Act—is swung too far the other way in the repeal and replacement of the Taft-Hartley Act, we will again be in difficulties. The President and the Democratic leadership of the Congress realize that and are intent on replacing the Taft-Hartley Act with fair legislation, fair to all. There will undoubtedly be some changes made from the old Wagner Act in order to achieve that goal.

But the essential philosophy of the Wagner Act will remain. It will not be distorted. That philosophy is fundamental to the future of the American free-enterprise system in a world in which freedom can exist. That philosophy is that in a democracy such as ours, the rank and file of the American people must have the opportunity to influence their own destinies, to influence their own economic status, to influence their children's future opportunities. Strong labor unions, dedicated to American freedom and to the American free-enterprise system, are among our best guaranties of a solid, firm, free, decent, prosperous America. That must not be lost sight of, particularly now when we are trying to influence the whole world against totalitarian Communist, economic slavery, and political bondage.

The Taft-Hartley Act was passed in the middle of a crisis period in the American economy and was spurred to passage by fear and hysteria over the rash of postwar strikes. What the Congress neglected to take into account at that time was the fact that the big strikes were nearly all bread and butter strikes stemming from the disastrous inflation which had been let loose on this country through the premature murder of price control. Labor demands for modest wage increases in line with the price of living rise in many cases were denied and labor struck. The Eightieth Congress neglected entirely the cause of those strikes and bent its efforts toward merely making it more difficult for labor to strike even in behalf of just demands.

The worst strikes since passage of Taft-Hartley—particularly the coal strikes—were strikes growing out of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act itself outlawing the closed shop, health and welfare funds, and so on. The fact that the Taft-Hartley Act provided some machinery for delaying certain of these strikes or for ending some of them at gun point is secondary to the fact that they would never have occurred in the first instance had the Taft-Hartley Act itself not been enacted.

A half century of peaceful relations in the newspaper composing rooms of America was disrupted overnight by a Taft-Hartley provision outlawing the International Typographical Union's traditional closed-shop contract. This union has had to spend $8,000,000 in strike benefits and legal defenses, submit to nine Labor Board complaints, and four extensive hearings before trial examiners, all within the first year of the Taft-Hartley Act. Most newspapers are still operating with what amounts to a closed shop in their composing rooms, meanwhile, fighting out the issue in a city-wide strike in Chicago newspapers. This whole situation has been senseless. I checked today just to make sure of my recollection that not a single word of testimony was taken in the hearings on labor legislation prior to the Taft-Hartley Act on the closed-shop contracts of American newspapers with the union printers, and yet these contracts were outlawed overnight.

The health and welfare fund of America's coal miners has run the most rocky kind of road because of Taft-Hartley provisions, yet, everyone in the coal fields of Pennsylvania recognizes what a great humanitarian and decent thing this fund has been for crippled, disabled, worn-out coal miners.

We are going to restore the closed shop where management and labor in free collective bargaining mutually agree upon it; we are going to repeal the archaic antilabor injunction feature of Taft-Hartley and put labor and management relations back on a level of real collective bargaining between equals; we are going to take out of labor legislation all the provisions of Taft-Hartley insulting the patriotism, honesty and integrity of the whole labor movement; we are going to put decency back into the American collective-bargaining system.

Does that mean we are going to turn the country over to the unions? Does that mean that the Government is going to abdicate to the A. F. of L. and the CIO and other labor organizations?

It does not.

We are going to write sensible restrictions into law against certain types of unfair labor practices, such as jurisdictional disputes and boycotts against Labor Board certifications; we are going to curb strikes in violation of contracts, and we are going to keep firm control over our economy by protecting the public against national emergency strikes. We are going to encourage arbitration of contract disputes.

But above all, we are going to insist on a well-rounded economic program to curb inflation and to insure at least minimum standards for all of our people in this great and rich country. And if we can put our economy in balance and keep it in balance, we are going to find far less industrial strife than we have ever known.

Labor and management relations do not exist in a vacuum. Labor and management can get along best when both sides recognize that their Government is striving to help both by keeping our country free and prosperous and fully employed. Taken in that light, our new labor legislation will be but a part of a better America.

Agricultural Act of 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. E. H. Agnew, president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, with respect to the Agricultural Act of 1948. I think it is very appropriate to have this statement published in the RECORD at this time. It points out a great many respects in which the 1948 act is wrong.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been my privilege for the past 3 days to sit in as an observer at a meeting of the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Naturally, it is not incumbent upon me to make any public statement of acts or policies of the American Farm Bureau coming out of this board meeting, but it is my privilege, and I consider it my duty, to give the result of some of the actions as viewed in the light of South Carolina farmer opinion.

There are a good many points that I would like to make, but I shall be relatively brief in this summary for the reason that a short statement for your consideration and future reference would likely be better than any lengthy one. From time to time I shall be pleased to keep you informd as to the thinking of South Carolina farmers on the various points as they come up for consideration.

The provisions of the Aiken bill as incorporated in the Agricultural Act of 1948 seemed to please a majority of the American Farm Bureau board of directors. Those provisions in effect constitute minimum insurance for farmers in the Corn Belt particularly and constitute for cotton farmers, as an example, maximum price. This differential is in reality the basis for South Carolina farmers failing to agree that the Aiken provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1948 constitute any worth-while long-range farm legislation.

I was most favorably impressed with the persistent effort on the part of southern members of the board in trying to honestly arrive at some satisfactory compromise whereby producers of each farm commodity should have the privilege of formulating and operating a program according to their best combined judgment and experience. It is regrettable that no such compromise could be effected.

The Aiken provisions to become effective under the law on January 1, 1950, promise to reduce the income of southern farmers in two ways: First, by reducing acreage under a quota and acreage allotment program which is generally conceded to be in prospect; and, secondly, by a rather drastic reduction in the price of cotton because of the fact that the support-price level will no doubt continue to largely reflect the sales price from 90 percent down to 72 percent in 1950.

Farmers in other sections than the South are completely averse to controls while southern farmers welcome controls as the only possible means of making adequate adjustments to bring supplies in line with demand. It is our contention that our willingness to adjust supply to demand entitles us to a continued 90 percent of parity support price program. We are entirely willing to support a program that gives farmers in other regions the kind of program they want and we strongly feel that they should concede to us a comparable privilege.

If the Aiken provisions meet the approval of producers of some of the basic commodities, those producers should have the privilege of operating under such provisions. The Aiken provisions do not suit cotton farmers and they should be privileged to have a quota and acreage allotment program along with a 90 percent of parity support price program according to their desire as it would be expressed in a referendum.

Proponents of the Aiken provisions argue that quota and acreage allotment programs tend to bring about a regimentation, centralization, and government control leading toward a socialistic program comparable to England today. We do not concede that such is the case so long as farmers themselves express their wishes through referendums which must accompany the proclaiming of such quota and acreage allotment programs by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Farm Bureau leaders continue to hold up the 78-3 favorable vote in the Senate on the Aiken bill as evidence of almost complete harmony with respect to accepting such provisions. The Secretary of Agriculture, in a speech at the Atlantic City annual meeting of American Farm Bureau Federation, said that the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1948 was "a political expedient". His statement was correct. After defeat of the Russell amendment, passage of the Aiken bill by the Senate was accomplished as a last resort in making possible the continuation of any kind of farm program for 1949.

Passage of the Agricultural Act of 1948, including the Hope provision for 1949 and the Aiken provisions for subsequent years, was accomplished in order to continue the farm program through 1949 and with the full understanding that the Eighty-first Congress would have ample opportunity to amend the Aiken provisions before their effective date.

It is now incumbent upon Congress to do a job not in conformity to recommendations that may be expected from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There was much disagreement at the Atlantic City annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau and, in order to keep down an open fight on the floor of the convention, a resolution was adopted giving the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau authority to establish a policy after giving serious consideration to recommending that a 90 percent of parity support price level be provided for crops being produced under quota and acreage allotment program.

During the past three days, this consideration has been given and the result is that American Farm Bureau policy is to continue to recommend, without material change, that the Aiken provisions be applied according to present law. (This statement has been publicized.)

Farmers of South Carolina are confident that our Senators and Representatives will exert their full influence to amend the law to provide that crops, particularly cotton and peanuts, shall be supported at 90 percent of parity so long as these crops are being produced under quota and acreage allotment programs. (Used specifically for the purpose of making the needed adjustments between supply and demand.)

It is not only necessary that you vote right when these matters are presented on the floor of the Senate and the House, but it is quite necessary that you take the time and trouble to completely inform yourselves as to the facts and the implications involved and that you exert strong influence upon your associates to obtain the desired action.

As applied to cotton for instance, the effect of the Aiken provisions are comparable to reducing production by cutting the time for employment to four days per week while at the same time cutting wages by 30 percent. The restrictive acreage allotment program would be comparable to a four-day week and a reduction from a 90 percent of parity support price program to a 72 percent of parity support price program would be comparable to reducing wages for producers of cotton by 30 percent.

I shall be very pleased to continue to inform the farmers of South Carolina that they may be confident of your support and your influence in their behalf.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD and a brief word of explanation. We are now engaged in important hearings on the extension of the ECA program. Those of us who are on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House heard this morning a very splendid presentation by Mr. Paul Hoffman, which I hope all my colleagues may find time to read.

The point I now wish to make is this: The Philadelphia Bulletin has, at its own expense, rendered an important service in this connection. Last year the Bulletin sent to Europe a member of its staff named Morley Cassidy. He took a trip all over Europe, and he made his reports, which appeared in consecutive issues of the Bulletin, and gave a running story of what he, as an objective observer, saw there. I have asked the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee to examine these reports, and, based on the

data we have, the staff has given a very favorable expression as to the contents of Mr. Cassidy's articles and as to their accuracy. I feel that it would be of great aid to every Member of the Senate if the articles could be published in the Appendix of the RECORD in connection with our consideration of this important matter, which will come before the Senate shortly for consideration, since we would have the benefit of the findings of an objective observer.

Mr. President, an estimate I have from the Government Printing Office indicates that the articles will make 5 pages of the RECORD and will cost $355. Notwithstanding this, I consider the articles to have so much value and to contain so much information that I request their printing.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MARSHALL PLAN—HOW IT HELPS—FIRST YEAR OF UNITED STATES AID PUTS WEST EUROPE ON THE ROAD BACK

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 1.—There is a new Europe in the world today, and every American can claim about $35 worth of credit for the way it looks.

Most of them, seeing the results close-up, would probably think it an impressive $35 worth.

With American help in the past year, Europe has suddenly come alive. The stumbling, bewildered, sickly Europe that cringed with fear at every Communist frown—even as recently as last April—is gone.

In its place is a Europe that feels blood in its veins again.

THEY DON'T CRINGE BEFORE REDS NOW

Its people are better fed and better dressed. Their houses are warmer. They are working harder, with better tools, and producing more of everything from electric power and coal to wheat, butter, and baby buggies.

They are still far from happy, but they are acting like people who see daylight ahead, and have the strength to walk toward it.

Because they are stronger, they get angry instead of cringing when Communists try to smash their efforts to rebuild. They have begun to fight back.

For the first time since the war, communism is on the defensive in every country in western Europe.

These are some of the visible results, to date, of an experiment without precedent in history.

They represent the more obvious first fruits of the Marshall plan, by which one nation has undertaken to lift a whole continent out of chaos.

They are impressive, and in some ways spectacular. But the Marshall plan, now known as the European recovery program or ERP, is facing question day.

It needs more billions. Before it gets them, it will have to satisfy Congress that ERP billions are doing their job.

ERP HAS TURNED COMMUNIST TIDE

It is easy enough for anyone who is footloose in Europe to reach some general conclusions.

Hardly anyone who had seen Europe emerge from its violent war despondency of 1947, for instance, would question two statements:

First, that American Marshall plan aid has turned the tide against communism, at least temporarily, throughout western Europe.

Second, that without it, France, Italy, and much of western Europe would be living today under the dictatorship of a Communist minority; and Russia, for all practical purposes, would be on the English Channel.

Many an American might say that in stopping communism, even temporarily, the Marshall plan has been worth whatever it cost.

Maybe that's true. But the Marshall plan is trying to do something much bigger than stopping communism. It was conceived as a plan to help create a free, orderly, healthy Europe.

The big question now is: What progress can Europe make toward rebuilding itself, with American help, in the face of Russian communistic imperialism?

And it is here that any observer—in Congress or out—begins to find that the answers are not so easy.

One look at the cost sheet—roughly $5,000,000,000 spent on Europe in 1948—is enough to dampen any impulse to give a snap "good" or "bad" verdict.

SOME RESULTS OF ERP DISHEARTENING

There is much to be seen in the plan's workings in Europe that is disheartening. Its progress is spotty and erratic. There is growing reason to suspect that it will never succeed in delivering, by its target date of 1952, a neatly wrapped up good as new Europe, completely free of the need for extraordinary outside assistance, which is diplomatic jargon for United States dollars.

But, as a personal reaction, after watching the plan at work in 10 of the Marshall plan countries and occupied areas, and after talking to representatives big and little from all of the 19, I find myself unimpressed by the failures or setbacks.

I find myself, instead, awed by the sweep and boldness of what the United States is doing in Europe. It all seemed fairly simple, I remember, when the plan was first suggested.

Europe would draw up its own neat shopping list of its 4-year needs for setting up housekeeping, the United States would send the needed cement, tractors, threshing machines, and ballbearings, and the job would be done.

OBSTACLES TO RECOVERY ARE IMMENSE

It's not so simple. Some of us forget, for the moment, that we would be dealing with a Europe that had sold or lost all the foreign investments that brought it in $1,500,000,000 a year; a Europe whose empires and colonies were dissolving and rebelling; a Europe that had 30,000,000 more mouths to feed and bodies to clothe than it had in 1938.

We didn't know, either, that we would be dealing with a Europe split down the middle by an iron curtain clamped across many of the normal routes of trade; a Europe torn by an undeclared war within nearly every country, where miners would wreck their own mines to block recovery.

We are discovering now, on the spot, what all these things imply.

What we have undertaken, it is now clear, is nothing short of peaceful revolution. We have undertaken to reshape western Europe; to sweep away the habits of centuries.

Meeting these problems, we're finding ourselves facing 19 separate sets of problems, each of which has to be meshed somehow with the other 18.

MILLION AND ONE PROBLEMS

We are finding ourselves helping France to fight inflation, and political instability, and Communist sabotage. Helping England to modernize archaic industries, and whittle down its national debt, and find markets to compensate for a lost empire. Helping Italy to fight an inflation that went into a deflationary tailspin, to find work for 1,500,000 jobless, to grow more food on parched hillsides to feed 4,000,000 extra mouths. Helping Greece to fight a civil war with one hand, rebuild a war-smashed land with the other, and still find homes for about 700,000 victims of Communist house-burnings. Helping Germany to turn peaceful, and cooperative, and productive. Helping—but the list is endless.

When Congress sits down to study the problem, it will face calculations that would baffle a battery of Eniacs.

It will be called on to strike a balance of judgment between honest cooperative efforts and hang-overs of selfish nationalism.

On the tangible side it will find both good news and bad, and some of the bad news will look very discouraging indeed.

COST IS SHOCKING

First of all, the cost:

Since December 17, 1947, Congress has appropriated $5,452,000,000 for aid to Europe—two items of interim aid totaling $577,000,000 for aid to France, Italy, and Austria, and $4,845,000 for Marshall-plan aid (exclusive of China's) to 19 countries and occupied areas. Of this, $536,000,000 is earmarked for the first quarter of 1949.

That leaves the net cost for 1948 about $4,886,000,000—or about $35 for each of America's one-hundred-and-forty-odd million men, women, and babes in arms.

The original idea was that the European nations should draw up their own long-term plan for cooperation that would make them independent of American aid by 1952; and that they should plan on sharp yearly reductions in the amount of aid needed.

On both counts there is bad news.

The 19 nations and areas have recently drawn up their separate lists or irreducible needs for the second year of the program.

ASKING FIGURE PROBABLY HIGH

Their original list totaled $4,636,000,000, which after much wrangling was cut to $4,333,000 in the list just sent to Washington. This represents an unimpressive decline from the $4,845,000 granted them for the first year.

That is disturbing enough as evidence that progress is hardly breath taking; although realists might suspect that it conceals more progress than it reveals, since each nation has doubtless asked more than it expects to get.

But there is more disturbing news. The 19 beneficiaries were asked to have their long-term, 4-year plan ready by November 15. They now report that they have been unable to prepare an agreed plan.

The reason is simple. Their 19 separate plans are, in some of the key points, mutually exclusive.

All of them see one clear answer to their own problem: to sell more to other countries, and buy less. But if no one wants to be a customer—then what?

But Congress will find other news more encouraging.

It will find that Europe's factories and mines in September were producing 28 percent more than their 1947 average, and that first figures for October—apart from the Communist sabotage of France's coal production—looked like the beginning of a great winter upswing.

It will find Europe's electric power production 40 percent above 1938; its steel production 30 percent higher than in 1947; its pig-iron output outstripping 1947 by 34 percent.

EVEN DIETS ARE BETTER

It will find that Marshall plan aid has boosted the daily diet of the average western European to 2,650 calories—halfway between the 2,500 of 1947 and the 2,800 of prewar days.

And it will recall, of course, that Marshall plan aid and its predecessor, "interim aid," played a decisive role in defeating the Communist strikes in France and Italy in December 1947, in the Communist disaster in Italy's elections last April, and in the smashing of Communist efforts to take over the French steel and coal strikes of October and convert them into political wars.

It is the intangible results, however, that any observer will have most difficulty in

weighing. But many Europeans think they are more important than any statistics on production.

One that is most often mentioned, and most visible, is the changed European morale—the belief that Europe can, after all, be put together. Another is the development of a new "cooperative mentality."

Most important of all, they point to the Western European Union and its mutual defense pact, and the likelihood that it may be expanded into a North Atlantic pact.

On this showing, Europeans are convinced, they have done better than most of them had hoped for with their first year of American aid.

WHERE ERP FUNDS GO IS PUZZLE TO EUROPE'S MAN-IN-THE-STREET

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 3.—When the last Marshall plan dollar has been spent and the last economist has rolled up his charts, many a European still will be trying to figure out its greatest mystery.

That is: "What becomes of all that money?"

It is a mystery that grows out of a paradox. The strange fact is that the Marshall plan, or European recovery program, is so vast in its scope, and benefits every European in so many ways, that it is almost invisible.

It is this mystery that lies at the root of much of the coolness that the Marshall plan has encountered in Europe, and presents ERP administrators with one of their most irksome problems.

Take for instance, the case of Marcel Pelletier.

Marcel is a welder, a genial chap of no great intellect, who was sipping a small beer at a cafe near the huge electric plant where he works when I asked him what he thought of the Marshall plan.

MARCEL IS SKEPTICAL

He shrugged his shoulders. "I guess it's all right," he said. "But I don't like Americans telling our government what to do. And I don't see myself getting any of that money."

Marcel could hardly have been more wrong.

In a few minutes' talk, it was easy to see that he was benefiting in a dozen important ways from Marshall plan aid.

His breakfast had consisted of a roll and coffee. About 30 percent of the wheat for his roll was Marshall plan wheat.

He had come to work by train. The new Diesel locomotive that pulled it was a Marshall-plan locomotive. Its fuel was 80-percent Marshall-plan oil.

He was wearing a new pair of corduroy trousers. The cotton in them was 100-percent Marshall-plan cotton.

His home was heated—not too well—by coal that was x percent Marshall plan coal; even an electronic brain couldn't figure out the percentage. His house was lighted by electricity produced by the same proportion of Marshall plan coal.

JOB DEPENDS ON ERP

He works for the huge Compagnie Francaise Thompson-Houston, which employs 6,330 workers making radios, electric refrigerators, high-frequency apparatus, broadcasting equipment, X-ray machines, and a great variety of similar products.

Its raw materials are largely Marshall plan copper, Marshall plan rubber, Marshall plan lead, Marshall plan cotton for insulation. If Marshall plan aid were cut out, its management says, it would have to slash its operations and release at least 3,230 of its workers.

So Marcel, most likely, owes his job to the Marshall plan.

Finally—although the list could go on and on—the 5,280 francs that Marcel takes home on Saturday night has a buying power of about $12 or $13 only because the Marshall plan helps stave off a runaway inflation. Without it, his francs today might be worth $10, or $5, or less.

But don't blame Marcel if he doesn't see how much he owes to Marshall plan aid.

His own employers, the managers of the Thompson-Houston Co.—passionately devoted as they are to the Marshall plan—couldn't tell you precisely how much of their copper, cotton, and lead comes from Marshall plan aid. They only know that without it, they could barely operate at half-rate.

And even when all the benefits are pointed out to him, Marcel—an honest man and no Communist—is still puzzled.

"But nobody gives me anything," he says. "I pay for my flour; I pay for my overalls; my coal costs me dear—1,000 francs for 100 pounds."

HOW TO WIN FRIENDS FOR UNITED STATES

He's absolutely right. And anybody who can find a way to explain the mystery to Marcel, simply and clearly, will win millions of new friends for the United States.

For there is nothing simple about the Marshall plan. It is not a glorified UNRRA, nor a procession of Friendship Trains, delivering a red-white-and-blue sack of flour on every doorstep and calling it a day.

Its task is more complex, and the fact that the Marshall plan, or ERP, is elastic enough to meet the varying needs of 19 different countries is both its strength and a weakness.

Its elasticity is enough to confuse Marcel, or any other average citizen. But there is more, for the Marshall-plan dollars do double duty—when they become "counterpart funds," as we shall see later.

A CASE IN POINT

To watch the system at work, take the case of a friend of mine, who makes washing machines. He uses a lot of copper, and he almost weeps with gratitude when he talks of what the Marshall plan is doing for him. But he hasn't the slightest idea exactly how much copper he owes to the Marshall plan.

He figures, let's say, that he will need 11 tons of copper for his 1949 output. He has the francs to pay for it, but not dollars, of course. And copper nowadays must be bought with dollars.

So, like every other industrial user of copper, he applies for an import license to the Non-Ferrous Metals Syndicate, a trade association.

The syndicate pools his with all the thousands of other applications, balances their relative importance in the national economy, arrives at tentative quotas for each and submits the total to an interministerial council of the Government.

MUST USE UNITED STATES DOLLARS

The council, meanwhile, has been getting similar lists from millers who want wheat, implement dealers wanting to buy tractors and road scrapers, steel makers, paint makers, textile factories, and a hundred other categories wanting materials that cannot be purchased in France.

But all this must be bought with foreign exchange—meaning mostly United States dollars—and the interministerial council knows that its foreign exchange will be highly problematical, consisting of x dollars derived from French imports and y dollars coming from the Marshall plan.

Making a shrewd guess at x and y, the council estimates how much should go to copper, how much to flour, and so on, and the copper quotas are cut accordingly.

The list for all France's needs goes then to the OEEC—Organization for European Economic Cooperation—which balances France's needs against those of 18 other countries and draws up its own list by countries.

The OEEC list goes to ECA, the Marshall plan administrating agency, where, we'll say, it is approved.

WHERE IS THE GIFT?

It comes back finally, and my friend finds that he is now authorized to buy 7.9 tons of copper.

Nobody, however, is giving him anything that can be seen with the naked eye. He takes his import license, goes to whatever dealer he used to buy from in the United States, makes the best deal he can, and pays for it—in francs—through the Bank of France.

And where is the gift in that? asks Marcel, the welder.

The gift lies in the fact that the Marshall plan pays the American seller for the copper and then turns the copper over to the French Government. My friend, in turn, pays the French Government for the copper in francs. Those francs are held in the Bank of France, subject to United States direction. They're called counterpart funds.

But does this mean that my friend owes 100 percent of his copper to the Marshall plan?

Not at all. For if there were no Marshall plan, France would still have some foreign exchange for American copper, and would have some more from Belgium, and a little more that it produces itself.

So not even a Government statistician could tell my friend whether he would have 10 or 30 or 60 percent of his copper if there were no Marshall plan. He only knows that the total—of copper, lead, zince, wheat, tractors, and all the other American gifts—is keeping France on the road to recovery.

If Marcel, the welder, has grasped all this, he will understand that much of his bread and coal is a gift, even though he pays the baker and coal dealer.

THE HEART OF THE SCHEME

But he still won't understand counterpart, which is really the heart of the scheme.

It is counterpart that gives the Marshall plan its double-barreled effect.

The francs that the washing-machine manufacturer paid for his copper go into this special counterpart fund, along with all the billions of francs that are paid by Frenchmen importing flour, machinery, or what-not.

Even the French Government must pay an equivalent value in francs for any imports it makes on its own account for such things as railroad construction, public housing, and so on.

Marcel, it is clear, is never going to understand all this—especially when the communistic press is screaming that the whole thing is an imperialist plot and huffy nationalists are complaining that national sovereignty has been trampled because counterpart cannot be scattered about in pay raises.

ECA WINS BATTLE ON HUNGER, NOW IT FIGHTS FOR PRODUCTION

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 4.—The most beautiful words in the English language, according to one American in Paris, are these: nonferrous metals, raw petroleum, machine spare parts, steel products, zinc ore, and fertilizer.

The ugliest, says the same man, are: wheat, fats and oils, meat.

"Of course," he adds, "their beauty or ugliness depends on the import tonnage figures that go with them."

This American, an official of the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), which runs the Marshall plan, was being slightly whimsical and at the same time deadly serious, for the words—beautiful and ugly alike—are a measure of the progress Europe is making toward feeding 270,000,000 mouths.

"And Europe's basic hunger," he explains, "will never be satisfied with imports of wheat, fats, and meat. Its food must come from shipments of machine tools, raw materials, farm implements, and fertilizer."

On this basis, he finds one of the most inspiring poems ever written in a table of figures sent to ECA headquarters here the other day, showing the list of imports unloaded in France in one recent 20-day period.

It lists 22 main groups—coal, petroleum, machine spare parts, nickel, cotton, molybdenum ore, and so on—totaling 681,925 tons.

A BEACHHEAD WON

Only one line of the table—20,564 tons of fats and oils—is a food import.

All this represents, to this ECA official, a beachhead won in the new battle of Europe.

It is evidence, as he sees it, that the Marshall plan has almost licked its first big problem—the problem of an emergency food shortage (growing out of the crop failures of 1947) that turned ECA, temporarily, into a relief agency.

With this problem licked the Marshall plan is now beginning to throw its greater strength into expanding the beachheads it has won in the real battle; the battle of European production.

The ECA men who speak of the "battle of production" are not unduly imaginative. In fighting its way towards recovery and the conditions that make for peace and stability, Europe (with American help) is fighting a war on many fronts.

It is fighting battles against political unrest, against inflation, against hunger and cold, against the despair of 10 years of war and near war.

But the key battle—the one that must be won before any of the others can be won—is the battle of production. All the other battles might be fought with more gifts of food, clothes, or money. But none of them will be won, and stay won, until Europe itself can produce more wheat and coal and clothing, and more goods that can be sold to buy what it cannot produce.

SOME OF THE DIFFICULTIES

It is a battle almost as challenging, to the Americans who run the Marshall plan, as that other invasion of Europe that started on the Normandy beaches.

Consider some of the difficulties:

Europe in 1938 was living partly "on its fat." It did not produce enough food for the 240,000,000 people living in the 19 Marshall plan countries and occupied areas, nor enough other products to pay for food it bought. It settled its debt, in part, with $1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 in returns from foreign investments.

Now the 240,000,000 people have grown to 270,000,000. The war smashed much of the machinery that was inadequate even for the smaller job in 1938. The war wiped out the foreign income that paid for extra food from abroad.

So Europe—inspired by American courage and money—is starting now to rebuild a producing machinery that will feed, clothe, and house 12 percent more people than it had before, and to do it without the benefit of that billion-and-a-half of fat that used to square accounts.

Can it be done? Americans helping with the job say Yes, provided—— and their provided rests largely on the condition that production can gain a momentum that will overcome all the handicaps of fear, despair, and unrest born of hunger and cold, and ultimately remove their cause.

This view of the Marshall plan as a war waged on many fronts makes the jagged lines on economists' charts take on something of the look of a general's campaign map.

GERMAN OUTPUT ZOOMS

They are lines that show enormous peaks and valleys, and nobody is wholly satisfied with the way they look.

In Germany, total output is zooming—39 percent higher than in the month before the Marshall plan began. In France, coal miners dug 1,000,000 more tons of coal in September than in March, but let 3,000,000 tons stay undug while they struck in October.

In England, Sir Stafford Cripps is expressing fears that the production curve is flattening out; British coal miners are digging only 1,470 tons per man per month, against 1,530 in 1938. Italy is producing 1,717,000,000 kilowatt hours of electric power a month against a bare 1,095,000,000 in 1938; but its steel production is wavering on a level with 1938's, or below it.

All these statistics, however, probably mean less at the moment than the evasive wartime announcements that our troops landed and met strong resistance.

They have to be measured by the fact that the Marshall plan, as originally conceived, has barely begun. The first half-billion of interim aid went principally to meet immediate relief needs; from April (when the European Recovery Act was passed) until November, more than 50 percent of the shipments went to the same vital but nonproductive use.

The program, therefore, is entering in these months on its major test—the task of expanding the beachheads it has won in the field of production, and establishing new ones.

EFFECTS ARE HEARTENING

It is in visiting these beacheads of recovery, and talking to the people who have helped to win them, that one begins to appreciate the staggering scope of the Marshall plan, and its effect on the production of everything from children's sweaters to electric power; and to appreciate, too, the zeal that most Europeans are putting into it.

Here, at random, are a few of these beachhead reports:

I traveled recently to Bordeaux, on a train as fast and comfortable (well, nearly) as any in the United States.

"You should know what our railroads looked like in 1946," said the conductor, and brought me pictures of the Gordian's knot of tangled rails that were the Bordeaux yards after the war.

Then he brought from a cubby-hole a list of new equipment the French railways would soon have—1,000 steam locomotives, 600 electric locomotives, 150 Diesel locomotives, 700 passenger cars, 89,000 freight cars—all to be paid for with French "counterpart" funds created through the sale of the Marshall plan gifts.

"You'll see," he boasted. "In 3 years, our railroads will be the best in Europe!"

At Nantes and St. Nazaire, the latter once a German submarine base, I watched shipyards almost as big as Philadelphia's swinging back into the production of new ships to replace France's vanished merchant marine.

SHIPYARDS CLOGGED

One yard was putting the final touches on the remodeling of the giant Ile de France. Another was launching, that day, an 8,000-ton dredge for the Suez Canal. Another was choked with work on 7 cargo vessels and smaller craft.

"About $15,000,000 of the cost," said an official, "comes from the Marshall plan 'counterpart' funds, but I couldn't even guess at the total of Marshall plan aid in steel, copper, lead, and all the rest. I only know we would be practically out of business without it."

There are hundreds of other beachheads in France. Some are big, as in electric power, with $116,000,000 worth of work on hydroelectric and steam plants; in the coal mines and coke plants, now getting $24,600,000 worth of new modern equipment; in nitrate plants, to provide fertilizer for French farms, being built at a cost of $1,000,000—all paid for with the "counterpart" funds created by the French Government through the sale of Marshall plan gifts.

Some are little, by comparison; like that in the village of Bohars, near Brest, where Americans a few years ago smashed 100 of the town's 156 homes as they drove out the Germans.

"In 9 months," says Marcel Salaun, owner of the village's 4 flour mills, "we have received 800 tons of wheat and flour—enough for 900,000 loaves of bread."

And the village priest, Abbe Le Guen, adds: "That's the village's only source of income. Without it, we'd have to move."

In every country in western Europe, the stories from the beachheads are much the same. In all of them, American machines and American raw materials, or equipment provided by American money, are modernizing industry, building the plants that will provide power or fertilizer or more machinery.

Much of this work is, up to now, in the "build-up" stage. It will be a year, at least, before its full effects will begin to show themselves in actual production.

When that happens, ECA people are convinced, the world will be astounded by western Europe's recovery.

And the most astounded people of all, they feel sure, will be the countries of eastern Europe who are invited to share in this program and—willingly or unwillingly—turned down their opportunity.

AMERICAN DOLLARS ARE TEACHING EUROPE HOW TO COOPERATE

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 5.—One of Europe's most venerable men of finance was telling me the other day how it feels to cooperate with his European neighbors in the way the Marshall plan demands.

"Sometimes I get gooseflesh," he said, "when I hear myself talking at the council meetings of OEEC (the Organization for European Economic Cooperation).

"I hear myself telling the council—my country's competitors—what new industries we intend to develop, where we expect to get the scarce raw materials, what new markets we want to exploit, the weak spots of our banking system.

"I wonder if I am hearing right. Ten years ago, even 2 years ago, those were secrets that we locked up in our strongest vaults. It is dismaying."

His gooseflesh and dismay are shared by a lot of Europeans, and are something of a measure of progress in the Marshall plan's toughest job—the fostering of the cooperation of all western Europe in a common recovery program.

This effort at cooperation has crashed spectacularly against one great rock—the basic contradictions of some of the separate ideas of a joint recovery program.

This has been vividly high-lighted by the wrangling preceding the drafting of their "progress report," announcing that they had not yet been able to agree on a full 4-year program for making the best use of Marshall plan aid. This conflict deserves a chapter of its own.

It is a difficulty, however, that was not unexpected, and does not alter the fact that the 19 benefiting nations and occupied areas have taken many steps of cooperation that seem to them, if not to us, revolutionary.

WRANGLES NOT SURPRISING

Most of them happen behind the closed doors of meeting rooms in a big yellow stone building on the Quai d'Orsay which houses the OEEC, the all-European organization created to plan for the best joint use of Marshall plan aid.

The wrangles that go in these sessions were described to me a little bitterly by the representative of one small country who had been accused of "dragging his feet" on an agreement for the division of raw materials for textile mills.

"Suppose you had a meeting of one representative from each of your States, and suppose it had power to cut off raw materials from one industry and give them to another, to give one State the capital for developing a new industry, and withhold it from another.

"You would find Pennsylvania saying to California and Alabama, 'Your steel mills are not efficient. The country does not need them. We will take all the ore.'

"You would find the South telling New England, 'Your textile mills are out of date. Ours are newer. And our people need work. So give us the wool.'"

CAN COOPERATE—IN TIME

"Could you settle a thousand such problems without fighting and wrangling? Neither can we. * * * But America is an example to the world in cooperation. We can be too, but not overnight."

It is exactly this sort of discussion that precedes every action taken by OEEC, and many of the decisions it is called on to make are as vital to the countries represented as a decision to divert 20 percent of Pittsburgh's iron ore needs to Birmingham, or to tell Philadelphia that it can build no new automobile-body plants to compete with Detroit's.

OEEC has thus become in effect the economic parliament of a loose European federation. Its council's decisions—which must be agreed to unanimously—have the binding force of treaties between the governments. Its chiefs of delegations are of cabinet rank.

The first job it tackled offers a sample of the difficulties it faces. This was the job of whacking up the first year's slice of American aid—$4,845,000,000.

It settled that by appointing a committee of four which heard witnesses from every country, telling of their needs and defending their plans. The committee drew up a list dividing the billions, the council wrangled over them—and agreed.

CURRENCY PROBLEM OVERCOME

It has developed, since then, a remarkable device for overcoming temporarily one of the greatest stumbling blocks to a revival of trade within Europe.

This stumbling block has been the complete break-down in the convertibility of currencies—a break-down which began as far back as 1931, with England's abandonment of the gold standard, and continued with the steady growth of special barter arrangements.

Realists, both Americans and Europeans, have recognized that when most European currencies are worth only half their official value on the other side of any border, trade can hardly thrive.

But the same realists recognize that full convertibility, giving each currency a fixed value with its many neighbors, is not likely to be achieved even in the 4-year life of the Marshall plan.

Sound currency, they point out, is a currency that will buy goods that are in general demand; and convertibility will come only when each nation has raised its production enough to have enough goods that other nations want.

In this bottleneck, the OEEC has worked out an expedient which promises to help greatly to get trade moving again.

This program, the "Intra-European Payments Plan," established an elaborate set of "drawing rights"—in effect, 78 separate trade agreements—by which nearly every country grants credits to others which are heavy purchasers from it, and receives similar credits from certain of its own suppliers.

DOLLARS MAKE IT ALL POSSIBLE

Some, like England and Belgium, advance much more than they receive. Final deficits, at the year's end, will be settled with Marshall-plan funds.

The arrangement, a sort of gigantic clearing house, is frankly labeled an experiment and is made possible, of course, only by the fact that final settlement is assured with American dollars.

Marshall plan administrators, however, who had a hand in its development, regard it as a major achievement in advancing the recovery program.

The OEEC officially estimates that it will add $800,000,000 in this fiscal year to Europe's international trade within its own shores—and this $800,000,000 worth of goods, which would not otherwise have crossed national boundaries, means that much less required from the United States or other dollar areas.

Its defects are plain enough, but one specialist calls it an iron lung.

"And when a man needs an iron lung," he said, "you don't argue about whether iron lungs are a good thing. You put him in one."

UNITED STATES AID AND TRADE PRESSURES ARE PULLING DOWN IRON CURTAIN

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 6.—Gen. Lucius D. Clay, commander of United States forces in Germany, was asked recently by this correspondent whether western Germany could establish a healthy economy if it were permanently deprived of its traditional markets and sources of raw materials in eastern Europe.

General Clay replied:

"The question of such a permanent separation will not arise.

"The normal and traditional channels of European trade are the natural and inevitable result of each area's resources and needs. They cannot be altered fundamentally, because they are created by geography.

"The question, therefor, is not how long any area can endure a blocking of its normal trade. The question is how long it will take for trade pressures to raise the iron curtain."

His answer is being backed up almost daily by a growing mound of evidence that the satellite nations of eastern Europe, forbidden by Russia to accept the invitation to join in the Marshall plan, are beginning to lick their chops hungrily for the industrial products of a reviving western Europe.

TRADE PACTS A SIGN

Their anxiety to fill their needs by selling and buying once more in their traditional market areas has already borne fruit in a number of trade pacts between eastern and western nations.

Others are in the discussion stage. And many more are being gingerly proposed with discreet attention to Russia's feelings.

"You'd be surprised, and so would Russia," said one American with unusual opportunities to know, "if you knew of the many and devious approaches that have been made to Marshall plan countries.

"The countries of eastern Europe are so hungry for all the things that western Europe can supply that most of them are ready to make agreements whenever they can find a way to do it in a way that won't attract attention."

The growing number of agreements and negotiations offers a convincing answer to fears which had been held in some quarters that the Marshall plan would split Europe.

Although it was seized upon by Russia as doing exactly that, and made the excuse for declaring the Cominform's cold war, the recovery which it is bringing about seems to be proving General Clay's thesis that trade pressures are irresistible.

RUSSIA NOT IMMUNE

Russia itself is not immune to these pressures.

The Soviet Government has just concluded a 3-year trade agreement with Italy by which they will exchange $150,000,000 worth of goods in the next 3 years, Russia exchanging its wheat, oats, and other raw materials for Italy's fruit and industrial products.

Russia and England are engaged in negotiations by which both countries hope to extend and enlarge their trade agreement of a year ago. Russia concluded new agreements last summer with both the Netherlands and Switzerland.

From Norway, under an agreement just signed, Russia will get herring, whale fats, and aluminum in exchange for grain.

The most conspicuous evidence was contained in the announcement on Christmas Day of an agreement between Yugoslavia and Great Britain, for the exchange of $120,000,000 worth of goods in 1 year.

This agreement was especially noteworthy for its political implications, since Marshal Tito turned to England for two items which the Cominform lands would no longer supply—gasoline and textiles. They will be paid for with Yugoslavian timber and food products.

SECOND DEAL FOR TITO

Tito had closed a deal a few weeks earlier with an independent British firm for drafting a 5-year plan to modernize and expand Yugoslav industry.

It is expected—since Britain and Yugoslavia are to start negotiations soon on a long-term agreement—that England will have an inside track for equipping this industrial revolution. But Switzerland is in the running, with its own $56,000,000 pact with Tito.

Hungary, meanwhile, has concluded a $35,000,000 agreement with Italy, to provide coal, butter, oil seeds, and raw materials in exchange for machinery, automobiles, and agricultural products.

Poland and France have just completed new trade agreements calling for the exchange of $20,000,000 in products the coming year. An Iceland delegation has arrived in Prague to talk of exchanges of fish for machinery. Czechoslovakia has been sounding out Sweden and Switzerland as sources for replacing machinery on order in the United States, but withheld after the Communist coup because it represented "war potential" goods.

ECA IN FAVOR OF PACTS

The efforts of countries on both sides of the iron curtain to break through this trade barrier are viewed with favor by Marshall plan administrators.

It is recognized that the nations of eastern and western Europe are in many ways complementary, and that the flow of agricultural products and raw materials from the east, and finished industrial products from the west, is normal and healthy for Europe's economy.

More of such trade would vastly relieve the burden of American relief, whether in goods from America replacing those from eastern Europe, or in dollars to pay for purchases elsewhere of meat, wheat, and other products that eastern Europe normally supplies.

This eastern trade was formerly worth about $1,500,000,000 yearly to western Europe.

This, some people are pointing out, is close to the dollar deficit which western Europe seems likely to be facing even at the end of the Marshall plan.

EUROPE WONDERS IF IT MUST PLAN ITSELF RIGHT INTO A STRAIT JACKET

(By Morley Cassidy)

PARIS, January 7.—If Congress runs short of questions when it begins squinting closely at the Marshal plan, Europe can supply them.

Europe, in fact, is already asking these questions. And since Europe's interest in the Marshall plan is highly personal, its questions go deeper in some respects than those likely to be asked by any Congressman.

Some of the questions are clearly stated in the progress reports now in the hands of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Others are carefully concealed. The nineteen benefiting nations spent many weeks cudgeling their best brains to find the pleasantest way of disguising them for congressional palates.

HARD TO PLAN IN A DREAM

Still others are never even whispered within 100 yards of any man who looks as if he might be American.

Most of them grow out of a difficulty plaintively pointed out by one European economist, who happens to be one of the most prayerful workers for European cooperation.

We are trying to plan in a dream, he said. It is difficult.

Some of the questions cannot be answered because they depend on Moscow, or the unguessable turns that world events may take. Some cannot be answered because they depend on the American people and Congress. Some others depend on the European people themselves, facing historic decisions.

Near the top of any informed European's list of questions are at least five of major importance, all affecting their efforts to make the Marshall plan work.

HOW CLOSE IS WAR?

Most of them overlap on one corner or another. But roughly they might be stated thus:

1. What are the chances of war? But more particularly, what does the United States think of the chances? Will the United States undertake a program of rearming Europe for defense, and if it does will it have to reduce the Marshall plan's economic aid?

2. What changes in American policy must be reckoned with? How will Congress feel about continuing aid if it finds reviving European industry shouldering American goods out of foreign markets? And will the United States tariff policy encourage or discourage a market for European goods?

3. How far will the United States go in insisting on "planism" as the basis of aid to Europe? Is the United States determined that cooperation must be carried to the point of requiring European nations to surrender economic sovereignty, and what will this do to countries fighting to preserve free enterprise?

REGIMENTATION OR FREEDOM?

4. Shall Europe aim at "austerity" and risk the freezing of its living standards at a lower level, or stake its future on free enterprise and its promise of a life better than anything regimentation can offer?

5. Can the Marshall plan, whatever decisions are made, achieve its objectives within the time and money limits originally scheduled?

Each of these questions is involved in the reasons for the failure of the 19 benefiting countries to agree, up to now, on the general framework of the 4-year plan requested by the ECA.

The long wrangle which has gone into preparation of the organization for European Economic Cooperation's progress report—submitted in lieu of the missing 4-year plan—has made it plain that the most immediate concern is with questions 3 and 4.

MEANING OF COOPERATION

Europeans think that Americans did not realize (any better than they did themselves) all the implications of a paragraph in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, setting up the Marshall plan.

That paragraph stated that its purpose was "to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, and genuine independence through assistance . . . in a joint recovery program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation."

After 8 months' effort, Europeans think they have an honest question to ask: How far should cooperation go?

They think the United States, when it stops to look at the question, will have some questions itself.

They find themselves faced, for instance, with ECA's request for a 4-year plan—certainly a reasonable request from a nation that is giving some $15,000,000,000 to help Europe to rebuild itself.

WARY ABOUT STRICT PLANNING

But Europeans, after months of trying to shape one, are beginning to realize that any hard-and-fast plan would involve a regimentation of Europe's economy and the strangulation of competition. The United States knows that, too. So any planning is being approached gingerly. Strict planning could mean, for instance, that Italy would agree to give up its ambitious plans for developing its ceramics industry, lest it compete with France; that France would no longer strive to outdo Belgium in finished steel products; that England would pledge itself not to grow too much food, lest France lose a market.

The more complete the plan, they are finding, the more rigid it would become. The end of planning, it seems, would be a straitjacket as binding as that of fascism or communism.

They wonder if the United States would want this, even if it could be done; and how a strait-jacketed Europe would deal with a free-wheeling America.

BRITAIN TAKES AUSTERITY

Then there is question No. 4, the issue of austerity versus free enterprise and a higher standard of living.

In this connection, the British have informed the French tartly that Britain is now a workingman's land, and will be no market for champagne and cologne. French have retorted that Britain plans to use the Marshall plan to make the pound sterling a luxury currency in the money markets.

It is the view of Britain and Norway—stout believers in government planning and the drab, copybook rules of success—that any realistic look at Europe's economy proves that in 1952, when the Marshall plan is supposed to end, Europe will still be from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 in the red each year for imports from other shores.

England and Norway argue that the Marshall plan nations must begin now to prepare for the day when Marshall plan aid stops.

THE THRIFTY WAY

England's way—already in practice—is to behave like any thrifty man, by cutting down its purchases, putting 20 percent of its national income into new money-producing factories and machinery, and finding new markets that will balance accounts.

To do this, its people are doing without butter (to Denmark's regret), without tobacco (to Turkey's anguish), without champagne and potatoes (to France's distress), and without many other things Englishmen would like, and Europe could sell.

All very fine and noble, say the other European countries; but is this mutual cooperation for the recovery of Europe?

It has several defects, as they see it, as the basis of an all-European program.

First, it represents nationalistic planning. If all European nations did likewise, each would do its best to become self-sufficient and buy as little as possible from its neighbors.

The result would be the strangulation of trade between these neighbors.

LIVING STANDARD RESTRICTED

Second, it is based on controlling the living standard of the whole population, to cut down imports and prepare for the day of reckoning when American aid stops.

English workers are accepting this. Other nations are not so sure that their workers would.

Third, they say, the English program involves a high degree of regimentation and government planning of a semitotalitarian order.

It is an issue with a hundred facets, and the foregoing is an oversimplification. Between the extremes are various shades, as in France, which is trying desperately to find a middle-way through adherence to the Monnet plan, which has mapped out a program for rebuilding key industries without imposing the rigid pattern that England has adopted.

WILL STILL BE IN RED

One difficulty faces both sides in this issue—the virtual certainty that Europe will still be in the red, under either program, in 1952.

England answers that Europe will be buttoned-up to meet the chill wind, and with a rebuilt machine to help it work painfully toward better days. The others say that blossoming trade, assisted by all-around improvement in living standards, will attract foreign investment capital—to say nothing of a $1,000,000,000-a-year tourist trade—to make up the difference.

But both sides still have disturbing questions to ask themselves.

There is, first, the question of war. That is one possibility before which Europe's planners simply close their eyes and hope. There can be no planning to met a war.

But there must be planning to meet war preparations. So Europe wonders how much money the United States may feel compelled to spend for rearming Europe—and how much this may cut down the appropriations for Marshall plan economic aid.

UNITED STATES BUSINESS MAY OBJECT

The same troublesome thought runs through their minds as they consider another possibility: That the day might not be far off when European industrial recovery would begin to worry American businessmen and workers.

They are pleased, at first, to note that Britain's sales to six South American countries are up from 10 to 65 percent over 1947; that the Benelux countries' sales in the same area are up from 26 to 90 percent.

But then they note that United States sales in the same countries (outside of Argentina) are from 7 to 32 percent lower.

So they ask themselves what pressures will be put on Congress, this year or next, to stop rebuilding industries that offer this competition.

Here again (talking strictly among ourselves) they wonder if they should trim sail, and plan on finding Marshall plan money dwindling to a trickle in 1950 or 1951.

All of the questions, unfortunately, depend on each other. Congress and Europe, looking at each other, will find that neither of them has all the answers.

Republican Salesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hot Tip From CAPEHART,"

published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT TIP FROM CAPEHART

The Republican national committee has been grunting and groaning at Omaha, Nebr., this week over the question: Why didn't we win in '48, and what can we do in '50 and '52?

The best and smartest remarks yet to erupt from the clambake have come, so far as we know, from Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, retiring chairman of the GOP campaign committee. Said Senator CAPEHART Wednesday to his presumably crimson-countenanced cronies:

SALESMANSHIP AND SUCCESS

"I don't care how good our program is, or how good our record in Congress is, until this party learns how to sell itself, it will never win another election. I've been in business 25 years, and I wouldn't hire one of you as a salesman. If I wanted a sales manager, I'd hire Harry Truman."

The best salesman in today's world, added Mr. CAPEHART, is that same Mr. Truman, who got his foot in the voter-housewife's door during the 1948 campaign and battered her over the head till she bought his line of goods. Further, the Republicans showed themselves to be the world's worst salesmen. Most of them were in some tony saloon down the street, telling one another how wonderful they were, while Harry was working on the voters.

To which we can only add: Senator, you said it. Times have changed since Emerson made the crack about the world beating a path to the door of the man who can make a better mousetrap, without any invitation from that man. Or maybe the revered Emerson was wrong to begin with. Anyway, the Republicans had better heed the Capehart hint, and get busy on a high-octane self-selling, self-advertising job if they want to win any more big fights.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the most consistent opponents of communism and of all subversive groups is William Randolph Hearst and the group of newspapers in which his writings and editorial views appear.

Recently there was published certain selections from his writings and speeches, in which there are some 16 forthright articles dealing with all phases of communism, plus an almost equal number on democracy, as a defense against disloyal activities. I cite this compilation because the many articles and editorials contained therein offer much food for thoughtful consideration by students of American life and of our own times particularly.

Consistent with Mr. Hearst's long policy of opposition to communism and to the injustices which dictatorship breeds is the editorial in the Baltimore News-Post of Monday, February 7, entitled "Senatorial Duty." This editorial presents succinctly the world-wide implications of the Cardinal Mindszenty case, and I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORIAL DUTY

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic prince-primate of Hungary, may take his place this month among the martyrs.

The prelate's "trial" on Communist "charges" of "treason, espionage and black-marketing transactions" is under way in Budapest.

These are not accusations that could be regarded seriously, even by Communists.

They are so alien to the cardinal's consecrated calling, and to his known character as a moralist and humanitarian, as to be utterly preposterous.

And the motive for them needs hardly to be stated.

They are a part of the Communist war on religion—a war that is being waged with savage severity against Catholics because their church, under the inspired leadership of Pope Pius XII, has been the most effective opponent of world communism and its diabolical evils of Marxian atheism and economic enslavement.

For Cardinal Mindszenty has not suffered persecution alone.

In his own country—where 60 percent of the people are Catholics—more than 600 priests and "religious" have been imprisoned, Catholic schools have been forcibly secularized, and church properties have been confiscated.

In Yugoslavia the eminent Archbishop Stepinac lies immured in a Communist prison, and hundreds of Franciscans and other members of holy orders have been slaughtered, jailed, or driven into exile.

In Poland and neighboring Catholic nations similar outrages have been perpetrated behind the iron curtain.

Nor is it only Roman Catholics who have endured these immolations.

Months ago Bishop Ordass, the Lutheran primate of Hungary, and a group of lesser Lutheran dignitaries were arrested.

In Romania all Protestant sects have been put under restraints amounting to proscription.

And on behalf of Hungarian Jews have come pathetic protests that their people are listed by the Communists as "class enemies"—protests sponsored by Dr. Bela Fabian, former member of the Hungarian Parliament and of the Board of the Jewish Community in Budapest, and by Dr. Bela Varga, canon of the Roman Catholic Church, former president of the Hungarian National Assembly, and president of the National Hungarian Committee in Exile.

The "arrest" of Cardinal Mindszenty, under circumstances as brutal as these, evoked horror and indignation.

Mr. Robert Lovett, the American Under Secretary of State, denounced the "charges" against the primate as "patently false" and his imprisonment, with thirteen alleged "accomplices," as a "sickening sham."

Representations have been made to Hungary by the Governments of Eire, Belgium, Australia, and Canada, and at a recent meeting of the British Labor Party Mr. Herbert S. Morrison, the Lord President of the British Council, spoke in terms of abhorrence.

"The arrest," he said, "during the Christmas holiday, of all times, of Mindszenty, prince-primate of the Catholic Church in Hungary, has shocked the whole free world. * * *

"It is further inescapable evidence that the Communists do not intend to rest until they have liquidated every vestige of freedom in the countries under their control."

What the British Labor Party leader said is incontestably true. It expresses an issue which our Government, as the patron of non-Communist peoples, cannot ignore.

The White House and the State Department may be deficient in courage or enterprise.

But they are not the whole Government.

And on January 10, in a statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, suggested an appropriate course.

Referring to the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, and presenting other particulars of the Communist persecution of religion, he said:

"I respectfully suggest that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate this serious situation and report upon its findings for the information of the United States Senate and of the entire Nation."

Obviously, the Senate should—without hesitation and without delay—proceed according to Senator O'CONOR's appeal.

By no choice of our own, we are inextricably engaged in a global and costly struggle with communism—a struggle that involves our own survival as a free people.

In so desperate a contest it well behooves us, in the manner of our devout forefathers, to seek the help of God—and, by our own actions, to deserve it.

Need for Production—Questions on the Taft-Hartley Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation is following with deep interest the hearings being held in the Senate Labor Committee on the Taft-Hartley law. It is the hope and prayer of our country that during these hearings careful consideration will be given to all phases of this subject, and that neither the committee nor the Congress will rush with undue haste into ill-thought-out legislation.

In this connection, Mr. President, the Arcadia News-Leader, published in my State, had a very interesting little editorial on the need for more productivity in our country. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with a pointed editorial recently published in the Washington Post and other newspapers by the National Small Businessmen's Association citing the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law and asking labor leaders for their reactions to these provisions.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arcadia (Wis.) News-Leader]

THIRTY-HOUR WEEK

Now comes one of the A. F. of L. executives and says his organization will push for congressional legislation for a 30-hour week. There is supposed to be a shortage of labor already in this country and a shortage of many staple goods. The only thing which

will bring down the cost of living is more production, and not less. The old basic law of supply and demand is still in operation and is the only permanent cure for short supply and high prices. This condition cannot be cured by writing a law. Every round of increased wages inevitably calls for another round of price increases.

[From the Washington Post of February 2, 1949]

ATTENTION, MR. GREEN AND MR. MURRAY

You, Mr. Green, speaking as the head of the A. F. of L., and you, Mr. Murray, speaking as the head of the CIO, have both on numerous occasions called the Taft-Hartley Act a slave labor law. Why?

Is the Taft-Hartley Act a slave labor law—

Because it prevents a union member from being fired from his job and kicked out of the union at the whim of a union official?

Because under this law union officials cannot force union members to pay exorbitant dues and are unable to collect unreasonably large initiation fees from new members?

Because this law rules out violence, coercion, and intimidation as a means of securing union members?

Because this law outlaws the compulsory check-off? It isn't enslavement, is it, for the union to have to get the consent of the union member before dipping into his pay envelope?

Because this law protects the right of union members to a secret ballot when voting on such important matters as the election of officers, a union shop or acceptance of an offer to settle a strike?

Because money paid by union members and employers into union, health, welfare, and vacation funds cannot be diverted by union officials to other uses?

Because this law gives each union member the right to decide whether he shall take a grievance up through union channels or direct with his employer with a representative of the union present?

Because this law requires an itemized accounting by the union to its members of all receipts and disbursements?

Because union members now have the right to ask the National Labor Relations Board for a hearing on changing unions or not having any union, the issue being decided by secret ballot?

Because under this law union members can, if they choose, go directly to the National Labor Relations Board for relief from any unfair labor practice by either the union or their employer?

Because it is no longer possible for the union to keep an individual worker from getting a job because he does not belong to the union?

Because this law makes unions financially responsible for living up to their contracts and protects union members from being thrown out of work by jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts?

Because this law guarantees the same freedom of speech to employers the unions have always had?

Because this law outlaws the closed shop and requires both unions and employers to bargain in good faith?

Because under this law employers are not required to pay for work not performed?

Because public welfare and safety are protected by machinery set up in this law to reduce the possibility of industry-wide strikes?

Because under this law the public is assured that its interests must be considered in labor disputes and at the bargaining table?

We believe, gentlemen, that these questions cover the main or principal provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and eagerly await your answers, which should be quite helpful in clearing up the confusion which still exists in public thinking concerning this law. Also, if what you call the slave labor sections of this law are not covered by our questions, we'll be glad to have you tell us what those sections are and to explain the provisions in each, which give it the slave labor characteristics you attribute to it.

National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., DeWitt Emery, president. Executive offices, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. National headquarters, 163 North Union Street, Akron, Ohio. Washington office, 1737 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Shortening the Odds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very splendid editorial entitled "Shortening the Odds," from The Progressive for February 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORTENING THE ODDS

President Truman bombarded Congress and the country in January with four messages totaling 50,000 words. Together they added up to a pattern of planning which evoked a great diversity of labels. The President himself called it a Fair Deal. The New York Times thought it added up to a welfare state. The Chicago Tribune was sure it was socialism. Its tabloid cousin, the New York Daily News, was equally positive it was galloping communism. The Soviet press used its standing head: "Capitalist imperialism."

Of all the attempts to capture the scope and direction of the administration's course we liked best the Manchester Guardian's. Mr. Truman's program, said that celebrated British daily, is an indication that "socialism is not the only path to the left. Its goal might be called the insurance state, its method the deliberate shortening of odds against the weak, but without abandoning the basically individualist way of life accepted as characteristically American."

That's pretty much it, we think. If the President means business this time and if the Congress dominated by his party responds to his leadership, we shall have taken a hopeful stride toward equalizing opportunity by shortening the odds against the less blessed, building up a system of national insurance against economic reverses beyond the individual's control, and maintaining undisturbed the basic liberties of the individual.

It's rubbish to call this socialism. There's nothing new or radical in the program. It's as revolutionary as the 162-year-old general-welfare clause of the Constitution. Many of the provisions were proposed and passed by Lloyd George's regime in Britain nearly four decades ago. More than three-quarters of the program has been endorsed by the Republican Party in its platform. All of it was proposed to the people by Mr. Truman as a candidate; none of it represents any basic break with the principles of the American enterprise system.

The nearest thing to something new was the President's mild suggestion that if the steel industry isn't able or willing to expand to meet the Nation's demands, the Government would try to help it enlarge its capacity, and failing that, might build its own plants to be integrated with private industry. This, of course, was done on a great scale during the war, especially in so critical a field as aluminum, without impairing the country, the Constitution, capitalism, profits, or dividends. Actually, the aluminum industry benefited greatly, the Government got desperately needed aluminum for war planes, and the productive capacity of the Nation was increased.

No; what troubles us is not the scope of Mr. Truman's program or the names they're calling it; what keeps us in a restive mood are the recurring queries: Does the President intend to make a fight for his program? Is he equipped to lead his own forces in Congress? How serious is the Democratic Party in its claims to progressivism?

Last year and the year before Mr. Truman dumped scores of proposals on Congress without bothering to classify their relative importance or urgency and without putting up any kind of scrap to get action on them. It was not until the Presidential campaign, during which he made brilliant use of congressional inaction, that Mr. Truman seemed to feel badly about the neglect of his program.

The 1949 program is very much like its predecessors. Perhaps the major difference is the treatment of the Missouri Valley Authority issue; this year Mr. Truman is more evasive and vacillating than he was last year, ostensibly because somebody told him that 9 of the 10 States involved opposed the plan—a claim which seems to have no basis in fact. In most other aspects, the President's Fair Deal is a familiar and acceptable script for progressives. They know and like the lines; they will judge the performance on the basis of the conviction and fidelity with which the principal actors play their parts.

President of Seattle Apartment Operators Association Against Mass Evictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the attempt by certain landlords to protest rent control through mass eviction of tenants does not meet with the approval of Mr. Donald C. Haas, president of the Seattle Apartment Operators Association. In considering rent control legislation, we are trying to be fair to landlords without sacrificing the protection that mus be given to tenants. It is my sincere hope that landlord groups, following Mr. Haas' lead, will offer their cooperation to the congressional committees studying rent control instead of resorting to housing strikes. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Haas' letter in connection with these remarks:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 4, 1949.*
Hon. HUGH MITCHELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: I would like to let you know for the record that I am opposed to the attempt of mass eviction by landlords

in certain areas, as a protest against Federal rent control. I feel that this method of protest against rent control retaliates against an innocent third party, our tenants, and does not affect the Office of the Housing Expeditor, who has created these regulations under which we must operate our properties.

While I feel many of the regulations of the Office of Housing Expeditor are equally unfair to both tenant and landlord, action of this type accomplishes nothing constructive. These property owners, in my opinion, would be far wiser to take up their grievances with their Members of Congress. In this way a constructive effort will result in a more equitable rent-control law.

I am sure that Congressmen, such as yourself on receiving from property owners a truthful showing that adjustments need to be made will give full consideration to these showings in writing a new law.

Hoping that this makes my position clear.

Very truly yours,

DONALD C. HAAS,
President, Apartment Operators Association of Seattle, Wash.

Philip Murray Is a Reticent Gentleman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 years ago, John L. Lewis released a report made by his United Mine Workers, which, among other things, charged that the Communists were trying to take over organized labor in America. John himself later headed the CIO, which used Communists in its raids on the A. F. of L.

For more than 15 years, it has been apparent to inquiring and observant citizens that Communists were a dominating force in many CIO locals, the parent organization of which was headed by Philip Murray.

In the organizing campaigns of the CIO and in the methods it used to obtain the results it demanded in labor disputes, many CIO unions followed the Communist line of coercion, intimidation, violence, destruction of property, and rioting.

Not so long ago and within the year and after an aroused public sentiment demanded that a fight be made against the Communists, Philip Murray, at a national convention of his organization, denounced the Communists in his organization. But there are still international representatives in good standing who refuse to sign an affidavit stating that they are not, never have been, Communists or members of any organization which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force.

And the intimidation, the violence, the beatings, the destruction of property and the rioting by local CIO unions still goes on.

One of the latest most vicious and inexcusable goon-squad raids was the predawn one which men wearing CIO buttons and under the direction of international CIO representatives, Thomas Shane and Glen Sigman, staged on December 1, 1948, at Kalamazoo, Mich.

A few days following that raid, a House labor subcommittee subpenaed Philip Murray, president of the CIO, for the purpose of asking him whether he approved or disapproved of that raid. Philip Murray declined to appear, stating that the committee had no authority and, worse yet, he has made, so far as I know, no public statement condemning that kind of mob violence.

By his silence, by his refusal to appear and publicly condemn beatings of defenseless women and men, bloodshed, malicious destruction of property, mob violence, Philip Murray gives tacit encouragement to activities of that nature.

How long will the gentleman remain silent and by his silence fail to give support to a movement designed to end such unlawful activities?

A clear, vigorous denunciation of mob violence, Mr. Murray, will immeasurably help the labor movement.

A piece in the morning paper by Westbrook Pegler is illuminating:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The defeat of the Communists within the CIO by a few suddenly sanctimonious old Reds and fellow travelers leaves that unregenerate klux no better than it ever was.

The fact that the veritable Muscovite bolos were betrayed by a small set of double-crossers who heard the whish of angels' wings and got afraid of dying unshriven, only proves again that this monstrous power has neither principles nor conscience.

It is to the good that the Communists are made confused and weak. But it is to the bad that men who played with them for years, and then suddenly ratted on their trusting comrades, are now put forth as virtuous leaders of labor, deserving all trust.

Not one of them has made confession and recantation to the public. Any private arrangements they may have made with religious authorities are only hearsay and would be valueless if not cause for further suspicion.

The public is composed of people of all communions, most of them competitive and inherently antagonistic, plus a very large law-abiding body of unreligious citizens who never concede any impairment of their rights on that account.

And the people are the high public authority in the case of these backsliders.

It is for the whole public to hear what they have to say and to turn thumbs up or down. But up to now, these old miscreants are not even avowed backsliders.

In the past, they lacked the manhood to say, "Yes, we are Communists or fellow travelers and we warn you not to trust us." When they changed, they still hadn't the guts to say to the millions whom they had tormented and oppressed, physically and spiritually, that they had seen their error, and ask forgiveness.

Therefore, although we may enjoy the defeat of the Communists, we owe not even amnesty, much less rehabilitation, to the men who got up in the night and let in the law.

The CIO came into the world with the stigma of many original sins—vandalism, anarchy, bloodshed, and false witness.

The bosses of the A. F. of L. howled for years that the Labor Relations Board was an organizing bureau for this lawless system of Communist mobs.

No better proof that it was a Communist front is needed than the recent refusal by Nathan Witt, who held the dominant office of the board, to answer on oath whether or not he ever was a member of the Communist Party.

John L. Lewis, who commanded the CIO in those riotous years of mass lynching, finally wrote that we had no labor movement at all in the United States but only a turmoil of sordid rivalries.

There are clergy who presently take honor because they were influential in the apostasy of our queasy quasi-Bolsheviki. They are welcome to the satisfaction, but other citizens of whatever faith are not obliged to waive their basic objections to the CIO merely because one particular set of enemies of freedom has been frustrated.

The Communist terror and the corruption of society and government were made possible by evil peculiarities of its constitution and character.

Those inequities still exist and the next gang of manipulators wil not necessarily abstain from equally dirty work for some ambitious purpose of their own.

Those who argue, even undertake to order, that American citizens must join unions express only an opinion. To such a counselor I would say, "Show me first that you have done your duty to provide decent conditions for me within that union.

"Show me what you have done to protect me from betrayal by men who first betrayed their subjects to the Communists, and then betrayed the Communists to you.

"Show me what you ever did to reform racketeers who are sensitive to your authority and put them to the penitential task of making restitution according to the duties of your own office.

"Show me this first and then we will argue whether I have a duty to my fellowman to join a union. And let me remind you of your duty to do all you can to make the unions good, first. You seem to have forgotten."

Granting that he never was a Communist, I would never trust Philip Murray, the president of the CIO, with any power over me.

He collaborated with Communists for years to build his CIO into a political edifice. In all his previous years amid the rotten criminality of the A. F. of L. he never said a syllable against the crooks, as any honest man selected as trustee should do.

During his years with John L. Lewis he gave Lewis docile service in a dictatorship of outrageous arrogance and never cried out. I have no evidence that his scale of values ever has changed.

Never try to tell me, as a citizen, that I must join a union and entrust my personality and the livelihood of my family to Murray, Mike Quill, Joe Curran, or any other who recently threw the Communists out of power. I was fighting Communists—"red-baiting" they called it—15 years ago. These men who had the power to drive them out used their power to hurt me instead.

When you try to make me yield and trust these men, whether by abusive language or sacerdotal authority, I don't trust you.

Columbia Valley Authority Memorial Passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a memorial which passed

the House of Representatives of the State of Washington by a vote of 71 to 26 urging enactment of legislation for a Columbia Valley Authority.

This vote by the lower house of the Washington Legislature speaks for itself. The overwhelming majority of the people in my State support a Columbia Valley Authority. The State action of the newly elected house reflects the desire of our people to have a more effective and greatly enlarged program of Columbia River Basin development.

House Joint Memorial 18

Relating to the creating of the Columbia Valley Authority

To the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

Whereas a bill has been introduced before your honorable bodies proposing the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority; and

Whereas Your Excellency has publicly stated your approbation of such legislation and has only recently ordered certain Federal agencies to coordinate their efforts to this end; and

Whereas many publicly spirited groups and organizations in the Pacific Northwest, including the Washington State Grange, Washington State Federation of Labor, the regional Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the Washington Public Utilities Commissioners' Association have long favored creation of an integrated Columbia River agency which would promote and manage the orderly development of the natural resources of this region; and

Whereas the construction of multiple-purpose projects encompassing reclamation, irrigation, flood control, navigation, production and transmission of electric energy, conservation of soil, fish, wildlife, and tourist resources can best be accomplished by the subsidy afforded by the sale of low-cost public power generated by such projects in the Columbia Basin region; and

Whereas the public bodies which have expressed their approval of a Columbia Valley Authority have declared it to be their desire that any measure adopted provide for a maximum of regional control and management;

Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully commend Your Excellency for your courageous and forthright approach to the problems of proper development of the Columbia Basin watershed; and

We respectfully petition your honorable bodies to speedily enact legislation which will establish a Columbia Valley Authority in accordance with the desires and aspirations of the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Who Are Republicans?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Oregonian for February 2, 1949:

WHO ARE REPUBLICANS?

A lot of persons have telephoned asking for a reprinting of the Omaha World-Herald's editorial, God Hates a Coward, which appeared during the Omaha meeting of the Republican National Committee and which had considerable attention on the radio. So we are providing what the radio cannot provide—a chance to study and restudy. In such publication there will be no confusion of voice and context, and the thought can be analyzed at leisure.

At leisure, so far as we are concerned, the editorial appears a brilliant presentation of a point of view but no blueprint for the Republican Party.

Harvey E. Newbranch, editor in chief of the World-Herald, who wrote the editorial, assumes to know what the rank and file of Republican voters believe. As we understand it, the rank and file are opposed to any and all interference by the Federal Government in the lives of the people. "It (the Government) is converting freemen into vassals and dependents." The implication of the heading, God Hates a Coward, and of the editorial as a whole, is that Mr. Newbranch knows the thinking of the Republican voters; that this thinking amounts to absolute opposition to the Federal Government; that any party leader failing to take this view is a coward.

Mr. Newbranch is more dramatic than right. There is, to begin with, no fixed positions as between the parties in regard to Federal intervention in the common affairs of the country. Throughout most of the Nation's history, the Republicans have been more inclined than the Democrats to meet developing problems and involve the Federal Government in proper solutions. More recently, through Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party has tended to take over. And now President Truman is holding along the Roosevelt line. But the assumption of Mr. Newbranch that the Republican Party is and should represent implacable opposition to the Federal Government in all its forms has no historical basis. So far as that is concerned, Nebraska itself is largely a creation of two Federal activities—one, the homestead law, by Republicans, and the other, the rural-electrification program, fathered by Senator Norris, Republican, and taken up by the Democrats.

It is unrealistic in the extreme to assume that the Republicans of Nebraska are opposed to well-calculated activities of the Federal Government—let alone the Republicans of the more industrialized and confused areas of the country. What the editorial amounts to is a demand that at the present moment the Republican Party should take the position that affairs be frozen. That perhaps would only suit Nebraska, as Nebraska stands at the moment.

Actually, of course, if it is true that the positions of the parties are not fixed historically, then Mr. Newbranch's arbitrary assignment of the Republican Party to a State's rights view is entirely his own idea, coinciding with the present mood of his State and the present accidental alinement of the parties. Anyhow, he is going quite a way when he declares that those who do not take his position are cowards. Possibly they do not take his position because they do not believe in it.

In our view, adoption by the Republican Party of what Mr. Newbranch proposed would be disaster. Under modern technology there are increasing numbers of activities which ignore State lines. If the Republican Party, having the majority business brains of the country, cannot offer superior management as between the Federal Government and the State governments, then that party is in tough straits.

In Oregon, the Republicans have offered better management under the stresses of the times. In the Nation they have failed to establish themselves.

And when we look into the future, the party division is no such simple thing as Mr. Newbranch envisages, with the Republican Party merely opposing the federalism. That is what his idea amounts to and that is silly. Neither is it a question of encouraging the Republican Party to outbid the Democrats in regard to the handling of the Federal Government. There is such a thing as producing leaders who offer to maintain the balance in accordance with the needs and developments of the day. We may have a desperate need for such balance in view of the extreme paternalism which President Truman seems to be sponsoring. But the wholesale reaction advocated in the editorial, if it prevailed, would probably prevent the people from ever entrusting the Republican Party with any attempt at reasonable administration.

Missouri River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduced a resolution, calling for a complete study of all of the projects—past, pending, and proposed—which affect the great area in the Middle West known as the Missouri River Basin.

Since the early days when Congress first authorized studies and projects relating to navigation on the Missouri River, the need for development of additional programs, such as flood control, irrigation, reclamation, soil conservation, power, forestry, wildlife conservation, and other related subjects has been necessary.

This need has been recognized by Congress through the adoption of many unrelated statutes authorizing the construction and implementation of many of these programs. The laws authorized and directed the various agencies of the Government to perform their duties to this end.

As a result, no comprehensive, over-all plan has either been studied or adopted which attempts to determine prior needs of these programs or settle disputes between Government agencies as to the jurisdiction over the various projects.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 attempted to meet this problem. In my judgment, it has failed to do so because various agencies were not consulted, nor was any final authority placed in any agency to resolve their differences.

As an example of the unrelated activities of the agencies, the Pick-Sloan plan which was the result of the 1944 act, has been practically completed. Many of its projects are constructed, are under construction, or being proposed to Congress for authorization.

The Department of Agriculture has not yet submitted its report from its far-reaching proposal for soil conservation and its impact upon flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, and the other related subjects.

It is for this reason that I have introduced this resolution. I believe the proper solution of the tremendous problems relating to the Missouri Basin is, perhaps, the most important order of the day for the people of the Midwest.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Missouri River Basin has heretofore been the subject of investigation and study with reference to flood control, irrigation, reclamation, soil conservation, forestry, navigation, power, wildlife protection, and laws have been enacted by Congress at various times without respect to these subjects; and

Whereas the studies and laws have not been correlated in an effort to determine the impact of one program upon the other, or to determine the total effect of all the programs upon the economy and social welfare of the region; and

Whereas jurisdiction of all of the varied problems involved is vested in numerous committees of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas a unified study of the total needs of the basin is necessary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 27 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman; six of said Members shall be appointed from the House at large and three of said Members from each of the following committees: Public Works; Public Lands; Agriculture; Armed Services; Appropriations; Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all the problems of flood control, irrigation, reclamation, soil conservation, forestry, navigation, power and wildlife protection, to determine the total need of the Misscuri Basin; the impact of one program upon the other, and to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the implementation of such program.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) on or before December 31, 1951, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee may employ such experts in all of the abovenamed related fields as may be necessary and to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

The Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Felix Morley, which appeared in Human Events on January 26, 1949:

What did it portend—that great inaugural parade which for over 3 hours streamed its 7-mile length through the heart of the National Capital on January 20, 1949? What, if anything, was the historical significance of this undoubtedly impressive combination of pomp and pleasantry?

Quite a few spectators—though the crowd was smaller than was expected—must have asked themselves those questions. Even in Washington there are a number of mature people. Not all who lined Pennsylvania Avenue went like children to witness a Roman triumph, or the spectacle of a coronation. Nearly everybody likes a parade. But there are always some who like to know what is being paraded.

Actually there were two parades, uneasily blended into one, when Harry Truman was initiated into his first elected term as President. One of these demonstrations was traditionally American. It found place in the homely pageantry of the floats; in the obvious local pride and the appealing native whimsy of the various State delegations.

Regardless of age or circumstance, everybody laughed at the tobacco auctioneer, rattling his seeming gibberish into a microphone on the Kentucky float. Everybody applauded the trained Dalmatian dog, who tumbled and begged his way from Capitol to White House. Equally appealing was the little boy who proudly rode his Shetland pony in the midst of the Southern Maryland Riding Club, complete to stagecoach.

There were merry shouts and squeaks when pretty girls threw oranges to the spectators from the gleaming Florida float. There was great glee when, through some happy blunder, a big limousine labeled "Supreme Court" crawled by, completely empty except for chauffeur. There were gasps of sympathy for the bosomy young lady in chilly decollete evening dress on the Illinois float. And none except the marshals missed the frosty point when, a minute later, she was followed by a car with a banner announcing "Lieutenant Governor Shivers."

But over all this home-brewed circus streamed an unending armada of perfectly alined airplanes. The roar of the huge bombers drowned out the efforts of the gay-colored Danbury Hatters Band. There were no eyes for the pathetic trio of three forlornly feathered Indians when a formation of 50 or more jet fighters streaked wing-to-wing overhead. At these implications others than lieutenant governors shivered.

And always, to stop the frivolity, came the interpolations of the military note; the tramping troops; the federalized college units, doing their best to look like soldiers; the sadly mechanized cavalry, filling the streets with fumes of gas; the jeeps, the tanks, the halftracks, the motorized artillery, and other samples of that appalling weight of armor which the income tax so groaningly supports.

II

At the head of the parade, right after the motorcycle police who struggled manfully to preserve an H and T alinement, rode the courageous captain who has those rectilinear initials. Applause was generous, and at least equally so for the old-time circus calliope which closed the procession with a weary tootling of I'm Just Wild About Harry. The louder that lyric is blared the more inappropriate it becomes. For the one emotion this President does not arouse, does not seek to arouse, and never could arouse, is wild enthusiasm.

As the calliope mechanically brayed this synthetic praise the mind of at least one spectator groped back in Roman history to that strange interlude when the republic was dead, although the outward forms of representative government were still for a time preserved. It was the great Augustus, grandnephew of Julius Caesar, one recalls, who worked out the formula. He refused the title of emperor but ruled autocratically under the title of princeps, or leader. As Gibbon put it:

"Caesar had provoked his fate as much by the ostentation of his power as by his power itself. * * * The title of king had armed the Romans against his life. Augustus was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation that the senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoyed their ancient freedom. A feeble senate and enervated people cheerfully acquiesced in the pleasing illusion, as long as it was supported by the virtue, or even by the prudence, of the successors of Augustus."

The Roman ruler whom the calliope somehow brought to mind was, of course, Marcus Cocceius Nerva, who as a young man for a time commanded a cavalry squadron, perhaps designated by the letter "D," and who then served in the Senate before his election as Princeps after Domitian's death. Of Nerva, who was inaugurated in A. D. 96, one historian (H. W. Household) has written:

"There was nothing great about Nerva. He was mild and inoffensive; his intentions were excellent and he did not lack good sense; but he was weak. The transition from a Domitian to a Nerva was too abrupt."

Or, in the words of another scholar (Cyril E. Robinson):

"Nerva—already past sixty at the time of his accession—was essentially a gentleman * * * by character courteous, conscientious and self-effacing, but scarcely a strong personality * * * Nerva was not without courage * * *. Yet the liberty of which he boasted was no better than a sham. * * * He and his successors were as thoroughgoing autocrats as ever Domitian had been, and the truth is that the artistocracy, at least inwardly convinced that the Principate was inevitable, were prepared to offer their cooperation as a graceful return for being let down so lightly."

III

President Truman's inaugural parade, with its uncoalesced manifestations of homespun pageantry and imperial power, recalled the time of Nerva, the last Roman ruler to whom the adjective "elected" is at all applicable. There is much the same sense of transition in Washington now as was presumably present in Rome then. And there are many other striking parallels.

For instance, Mr. Truman's inaugural address, with its virtual declaration of war against the barbarian empire which challenges the might of modern Rome. This speech showed how far the transition has already gone; how difficult will be the task of saving the Republic which, when abandoned in Rome, was in that case lost without recourse.

What Mr. Truman promised, doubtless sincerely, at his inauguration, is contradictory and confusing. How, for instance, can we "give unfaltering support to the United Nations" by forming within it a military alliance openly directed against a fellow-member of UN? By its initial catering to communism, the United Nations was doomed to failure from the start. Human Events morosely said so when the Dumbarton Oaks draft charter made the eventual outcome obvious. But the fatal blunder is not rectified by the present pretense that a war-breeding alliance within UN will somehow mysteriously support UN.

It makes equally little sense to say unctuously that "we should foster capital investment" abroad at a moment when capital investment in areas needing development is being officially discouraged at home. This is not an auspicious moment to talk lightly about guaranties to the investor who sends his money to China or Peru. What guaranties is the Eighty-first Congress going to offer to venture capital within the Union?

The President further assures the American people that the old imperialism, which he defines as "exploitation for foreign profit," has no place in his 4-point program. Again he is mistaken. The program outlined on inauguration day, starting with an old-fashioned military alliance against Russia, is essentially imperialistic. It alters nothing to add, with a note unusually off key for Mr. Truman, that: "our allies are the millions who hunger and thirst after righteousness."

IV

One value in history is that it penetrates the pathetic pretenses with which those in authority seek to justify the abuse of power mistakenly surrendered to them by the people. Thus history calls Marcus Cocceius Nerva an emperor, although he carefully refused to describe himself as Imperator.

And history is justified in giving Nerva the imperial title which he eschewed, because after Nerva's brief reign there was never again an opportunity to restore the Roman Republic. Not that the period of personal rule which ensued was unhappy for the common man. He enjoyed a full century of bread and circuses—for change was slower in those days—before enlightened autocracy degenerated into the military dictatorships which in turn preceded the complete collapse of Rome.

But the period from the death of Domitian to the accession of Commodus—a period ushered in by Nerva's election to the purple, is seen in retrospect as one of deepening twilight. The power of the State was steadily increased; the virtue of the citizens as steadily declined. And, as Warde Fowler sums up this prelude to disaster:

"From Marcus Aurelius onward the strain of self-defense was too great to allow of progress in any social or political sense. The monarchy became more absolute, the machinery of Government more complicated; the masses were overtaxed, and the middle classes ruined."

The parade up Pennsylvania Avenue last week was really two parades: One Republican, the other imperial. But the imperial dominated. About midway, sandwiched pathetically between some regiments, there walked a figure of the traditional Uncle Sam. He looked bewildered, and no wonder. One felt of him as of a veteran of the Civil War—yet another inauguration and his place will see him no more. Like the disappearing Indians, Uncle Sam too will be elbowed out. And that will be sad.

For Uncle Sam, that droll and homely symbol of the old Republic, is too individualistic for a Caesarian triumph. The old gentleman does not take kindly to mass production and his shambling gait cannot goose-step with marching men and prancing girls. If disciplined, concentrated power is what we seek, then the old Uncle should doff his foolish clothing, don uniform and hide his lanky body within a tank. The national archetype must change his character to conform to changing national purpose. It has been said that the cross of Christ would have been disagreeably out of place in this parade. Uncle Sam, as we used to know him, was almost equally discordant.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from America for December 11, 1948:

THE MEANING OF MINDSZENTY

The General Assembly of UN is authorized to "make recommendations" for the purpose of "assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Religious persecution clearly falls within its scope. There is persecution of religion going on behind the iron curtain which merits the immediate attention of UN.

Take the case of Cardinal Mindszenty. Some weeks ago America protested the imprisonment of the head of the Lutheran Church in Hungary, Bishop Louis Ordass, on a trumped-up currency charge. We then observed that the sentence was obviously an ominous warning given Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, archbishop of Budapest. Undaunted by threats from the Communist-dominated Cabinet, the heroic primate has watched the storm gather about him. His arrest as an agent of "foreign imperialism" or his expulsion as "a traitor to his country" may be expected any day.

Both of the above-mentioned accusations, it should be remembered, were made in telegrams dispatched to the Communist-controlled government by Communist-promoted protest meetings held recently in nine Hungarian cities. The arrest of the Cardinal's secretary, Dr. Louis Zackar, will probably produce a confession, extorted under torture, implicating the Cardinal. It is a successful technique. The arrest of the secretary of Premier Ferenc Nàgy was similarly used as an excuse to overthrow the democratically elected majority party and install the present Communist regime.

The Cardinal cannot complain that he has not been given ample notice. Erno Geroe, generally believed to be the strong man of the party, gave the signal. "The liquidation of clerical reaction is now the order of the day," he declared in a speech that termed the Cardinal "the head of reaction." The Budapest Communist daily, Szabad Nep, called the statement of solidarity of the Catholic hierarchy most inopportune, coming "at the very moment when the government, a few days ago, declared irrevocably that the glass was going to run over. . . This answer will be given soon." Matyras Rakosi, who returned from Moscow to become Deputy Premier and general secretary of the party, assured the central committee of the Communist Workers Party in a broadcast: "We have come to the end of our policy of toleration. We must settle once and for all with this band, and above all with their chiefs."

Six hundred Catholic and Protestant clergymen are now in Hungarian prisons. The Cardinal primate seems destined to follow soon. Protests from the World Council of Churches against the imprisonment of Bishop Ordass won scarcely the attention of an acknowledgment from the Hungarian Government.

The persecution in Hungary is exceeded in violence by the persecution in Bulgaria and Rumania, where the Holy See has granted the extraordinary privilege of allowing mass to be offered by a priest in street clothes, using a common drinking-glass for a chalice. It anticipates the persecution getting under way in Czechoslovakia in accordance with the lines laid down in secret official instructions sent to district action committees last July, published in the Episcopal weekly, the Living Church, for November 21.

Religion is persecuted everywhere behind the iron curtain because religion engenders resistance to tyranny. Persecution is directed chiefly against Catholicism in Hungary and is currently centered on the figure of Cardinal Mindszenty, because defense of the sanctity of the things that are not Caesar's must be crushed if tyranny is to prevail.

Returning from the Nuremberg trials, Justice Robert H. Jackson declared that the "disruptive effect on the international order" of the persecution of minorities "is so direct that tyranny on a sizable scale anywhere is a matter of international concern."

The persecution of religion in Hungary—to name one country—is on a larger than "sizable scale." The UN was created to cope with matters "of international concern." Well, isn't this such?

The South's Political and Industrial Isolation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Chauncey Sparks, former Governor of Alabama, recently delivered a significant address in Alexander City, Ala., entitled "The South's Political and Industrial Isolation." Mr. Sparks is an outstanding student of the problems of our region and his views regarding the interrelationships that bind us to the Nation's economic and political life carry unusual weight. His address is timely and forceful and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text:

THE SOUTH'S POLITICAL AND INDUSTRIAL ISOLATION

In the matter of adherence to fundamentals, and to the early construction of the Federal Constitution, perhaps the South has been the most consistent section of our country. She has and still holds to the principle of local sovereignty. This is both basic and traditional. It involves the determination of much of her economic practices and of her political beliefs. I do not think it has arisen from any desire to be different or stubborn in adjusting itself to a new order following the War Between the States. It is based upon necessity as we see it, and in fulfillment of the pronounced purposes of the Constitution.

We can, perhaps, say that the South has been rather slow in adjusting itself to changes. In the long run she has lost by this. This loss has arisen from a peculiar provincialism which has followed the South's conduct. We have been slow to adapt government to political changes.

In the matter of politics we have held to the old, and tried to make it apply under the new. We have believed the Constitution has not been changed, either by amendment of construction since the first ten amendments.

The last of these amendments states that all powers not delegated "are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." I wonder if that phrase, "or to the people," has any peculiar significance. Of course, our Government is founded upon the will of the people, and derives its power from them.

With the advent of the twentieth century and its more complex economy, I wonder if the form of administration does not have considerable to do with the happiness and prosperity of our people. If so, then they are much less concerned with metaphysical distinction of political philosophies than they are with a government which furnishes them the best method of enjoying the prosperity of the machine age.

Economic change has brought about governmental change. One hundred years ago we needed local administration of most all

our laws because transportation and communication were slow; our life was simple; each community was almost an entity within itself. Today it is quite different. Government has ceased to be a political theory, but has become a great servant in the matter of production and distribution of the many products of an intricate and interwoven economy. We are looking to the Federal Government to furnish us a great deal of the money necessary to achieve a modern state.

Many of our modern problems must be solved at the national level. The States can no longer perform at this or that point. Our agricultural program must be national. Our financial and investment regulations must be national. Much of our economic legislation, such as wages and hours, old-age retirement, must be national. This country, more than ever before, has become united in its economic and political dependence.

Has the South read these signs, or interpreted the trends accurately? Or has it stood beside the road, hugging a dream which only an earlier economy makes possible? While the South, through its political leaders, gave a measure of support to the changes transpiring the last several decades, there has been a holding back on the part of many in fear of the results, and the alleged departure from the old order of things. Has it been that the South has neglected to integrate change with its practices and beliefs, preferring to believe we could have all the new things which changes have made possible under the old regime?

The result of all our neglect is an isolation, nationally, that has retarded the progress of the South. An approach to our national regulations with a chip on our shoulder has kept us from occupying our rightful place in the councils of the Nation and in the councils of the Democratic Party. Commercial and industrial provincialism has followed.

The South has too long remained isolated. It has complained, not about its own shortcomings, but because others have pointed them out. It has refused to get in step with a new era and a new economy. It has held back in fear of a tragedy it imagines will befall it. We tremble from fear of an unforeseen disaster to our way of life.

This isolation has recently been carried into the field of politics. The South is a part of this Nation, and an important part. We do not propose to pull out, nor produce any kind of disunion. Our duty and our hope lie in some national political party with which we can have congenial relations. Splinter parties, so called, offer little hope. If ever we needed proof of this, we have it at hand just now when we in Alabama have become political pariahs. One danger in such a situation is that it offers opportunity for further splitting us up and further neutralizing our influence.

Let us ask ourselves the question, To what party, nationally, do we belong? When we have determined that, then we should be an active part of that party, in its councils and in its legislature. It would have been easy for the South to have established a satisfactory position in the Democratic Party at Philadelphia but for the attitude of some of her representatives in the convention.

Certainly we do not want a regimented society, one that forces association upon any individual against his will. I verily believe our Constitution protects us from that. We want no touch of communism nor the emblem of the hammer and sickle on the flag of our great country. Nor do we want a police state, nor a gestapo, telling us how to live our daily lives. But let's not make these things, nor the prevention of these things, the only subject of all our endeavors.

This all, then, poses the question, What are you going to do with so-called civil rights? We should have no objection to an antilynch law if the Federal Government can do a better job than the States, and that without persecution of officers of the law, or units of government, rather than prosecution of the offenders. And while the Federal Government is in the business, let it pass an antirape law. An anti-poll-tax law cannot be constitutionally enacted by the Congress. At any rate, that is our view. Then let us test it, not only in the Congress but also in the courts, if we desire to keep a poll tax. After all, we are fast coming to the view that a poll tax as a condition precedent to voting cannot be sustained under any definition of the right to vote. It is not a qualification but only a condition precedent to voting after qualification. So far as FEPC is concerned, it is a passing fancy on the part of a few zealous crusaders for a more radical "new deal." It will pass away. If not, and it becomes necessary, we can have our own at the State level and demonstrate to the Nation that such things are best handled by the people involved.

For have we talked too much and done too little? Are we trying to solve our problems by talking about them and not doing something about them? Are we content to announce platitudes and epigrams rather than demonstrate by action that our theory is just as workable as the other fellow's?

It is time, perhaps, that we put to work our theory of States' rights. It is not enough to say we stand for States' rights and then do nothing about solving our problems through State action. We should put our beliefs to work in a way that guarantees justice, equality before the law, and freedom. We can do it within the framework of our theory of segregation and at the State level.

The South has, also, had commercial and industrial isolation. How much of national advertising comes from the South? The smallness of this and the absence of factory smoke stacks indicate what small part of the nation's industrial wealth the South is getting. Since 1865, this Nation has been developing industrially. This has taken the form of production of consumer goods in such varieties and quantities as the world has never before seen. During most of that time the South has been healing its wounds, and building its economy on a special structure which prevented the full and complete use of its resources. For instance, from 1900 to this date the South has lost many millions of unskilled laborers to the industrial North because the South did not devise ways and means of utilizing this labor. The North could and did use it, retaining much of the segregation which the Negro left behind him in the South. In the exchange the South lost a resource, and further became the slave of a northern economy.

Are we permitting this same lack of courage, foresight, genius, or whatever it is to prevent us from now doing what we had neglected to do for 75 years? The South is today, perhaps, the greatest undeveloped section of our country. It, perhaps, offers the greatest opportunity for the development of an industry that will manufacture our resources into usable goods and at the same time take advantage of the great purchaser need and ability of the South.

The South has been low in wealth and income these decades since the War Between the States because it has bought and not produced. We have watched others produce the comforts and necessities of a modern civilization and sell them to us. We have lacked the initiative or something to do what our opportunities and resources invited. Look at South America, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, and Mexico. No country has grown rich by leasing its resources, or letting someone else develop them.

There must be some reason behind all this slow progress on our part. Is it political? Is it social? Is it economic? Perhaps all combined. We have trembled at the thought of force bills, reprisals, and the overturn of a social order that most nearly meets our requirements. We have feared social revolution. We have not known how to use our free and unskilled labor to mutual advantage. We have followed political leadership that sprang from our timidity and fear. We have not been bold to take our place in line with our neighbors.

All of this causes us to live and debate apart from the world of reality. Old shibboleths and outmoded slogans become our refuge. We repel advances and progress because of an imaginary disaster which we expect may follow. We preach constitutional principles and expect them to cure all our ills, and that without action.

The recent action of the Southern Governors Conference is to be commended. It has begun a program of regional education in furtherance of a movement started by me in the conference 4 years ago.

This is a demonstration of our effort to solve our problems fairly and in accordance with long established customs.

Another movement by the Governors is the establishment of a southern foundation for spreading information about the South. Long have we needed some counter movement to that created by northern philanthropists through such organizations as the NAACP. In the long run, the South must make itself understood, and must demonstrate its desire to progress toward the solution of its peculiar problems in accordance with a fair and just plan. We have the problem of demonstrating to the world that diverse races can live together in peace and in large numbers, without undertaking to enslave, in any way, the other. This may be a strain on democracy. It is something the world has never seen on so large a scale. But I am sure we have the genius and ability to demonstrate its practicability without compromising either democracy or an established way of life.

Segregation is essential and desirable. I am constrained to believe both races desire it. This Nation, from its very beginning, has demonstrated that all kinds of people can live side by side, and equally enjoy democracy and its blessings. Our difficulty is the size of our problem. At no other time have so large numbers of two races been placed side by side. There is always danger of conflicting social ideas, political power, and the ambition to exercise it. These things but intensify the problem, but do not make it altogether different from the past, nor impossible of solution. The honest intelligence of the South must tackle it. I have no fear it can be worked out.

Let us shake off our fear, and announce our position whenever and wherever we have an opportunity. Stand for something positive, and stand by it. Don't flee. Choose which way you intend to go, and go. Do not hesitate to turn back. There should be no delicacy in discussing our race problem, our belief in segregation, our political hopes and aspirations. The more we tell the world, the more understanding and cooperation we shall receive.

Rider Haggard, in his book She, tells of the finding, in the lost city of Thor, of a statue of Justice in the form of a woman blindfolded and with outstretched hands, pleading to the world to remove the veil from her eyes. May I liken the South to this illustration? We perhaps, in much, are blinded by our apprehensions, with the result that a goodly number cloak their conception of needed action behind the hood of the Ku Klux Klan. We are stumbling along in uncertainty and fear. Our economy lags behind the Nation as a whole. Our political life is lived from day to day in anticipation of contrary action by the Congress in matters affecting our local issues. We brag of our constitutional rights as a child whistling in the dark. We recognize issues affecting our political, educational,

and economic life, and make no effort to meet them. We content ourselves with proclaiming and in not doing.

Lift the veil from the eyes of the South. Proclaim to her the need for local action, and encourage her to undertake the necessary movements in boldness and that without bluff. She has strength in manhood and in character; she is and can continue to be one of the great sections of our country; she needs but to open her eyes and pursue a firm course, taking the consequences of each day's progress for weal or woe, and moving on to better days. In politics stand by our principles within the party of our choice. In industry and commerce, develop our own resources to the extent of our consumer needs, and export any surplus to other sections. Proclaim our beliefs, demand justice, take action on local problems, recognize that the "world do move," and resolve that we shall not be left behind.

H. R. 2379 Is a Compromise Pension Bill for Veterans of World War I and World War II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and made the following statement in behalf of H. R. 2379, a bill designed to pay a service pension to veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age.

The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to lend my voice to the cause of service pension legislation for veterans of World War I and World War II.

You are all aware, I am sure, that the service pension proposed is by no means a novel one. The veterans of every war in which this Nation has been engaged down through the Spanish-American War, have been rewarded in their ailing and aging years by a grateful Congress with a service pension based on certain degrees of disability or certain attained ages.

This committee has many bills pending before it which relate to service pensions. Although all are directed to the same purpose, they nevertheless vary in their provisions so much that I am sure it must be difficult to point at any particular bill and say that that is a service pension bill to the exclusion of the others.

I have given this matter considerable thought for many years and more recently have analyzed the arguments advanced by the two major veterans' organizations in support of their pension proposals. I have also given considerable thought to the arguments which have already risen in the President's budget message and which are likely to arise as a service pension bill progresses through the Congress.

Several weeks ago I introduced at the request of the Veterans of Foreign Wars the bill, H. R. 8, and at the request of the American Legion, H. R. 2068, both providing for a uniform service pension. H. R. 8 of this Congress is identical to my bill, H. R. 5213, Eightieth Congress, which was pending before this committee when the Eightieth Congress adjourned.

However, in realization of the difficulties we inevitably encounter in seeking a broad objective, I introduced yesterday, February 7, 1949, at the request of the VFW, the bill H. R. 8, which I sincerely believe represents a realistic compromise service pension bill.

The views I am about to present are embodied in this compromise bill.

First, a service pension bill for World War I and World War II veterans should be geared to the financial need of the veteran. Let us pause for one moment and reflect on the traditional basis for the service pensions of the past. Why did the Sixteenth Congress enact a service pension for veterans of the Revolutionary War some 30 years after the completion of that war? Or the Fiftieth Congress over 20 years following the close of the Civil War? Or in 1921 when the Sixty-seventh Congress unanimously voted a service pension for the disabled and aged veterans of the Spanish-American War? Because the people of this Nation decreed that a man who once donned the uniform to defend his country should not and ought not in his declining years to suffer want and privation. There is no question but that a service pension which does not consider need as a factor of eligibility is departing from the traditional basis for the service pension.

I have accordingly set forth as a factor of service-pension eligibility an income limitation of $2,000 per year for a veteran without dependents, and an income limitation of $3,000 per year for a veteran with dependents.

Secondly, the bill would provide monthly pensions for non-service-connected disability as follows: (1) For 50-percent disability, $50; (2) for 75-percent disability, $75; (3) for 100-percent disability, $90; (4) where an aid or attendant is required, $120.

Also when the veteran reaches the age of 65 years he would be presumed totally disabled and be awarded a monthly pension of $90.

Third, a provision in the bill would prevent any pyramiding of service pension with any other veterans' pension or compensation to which a veteran might be entitled through the operation of any law administered by the Veterans' Administration. In other words, no veteran could receive benefits under this bill and at the same time receive monetary benefits under the laws of the Veterans' Administration. He would be forced to elect to take one or the other.

A significant factor that must be considered in connection with this compromise bill is its relatively low cost in comparison with the astronomical sums mentioned in the press and in the report of the Veterans' Administration on a bill which I believe went beyond the scope of an equitable realistic service pension.

In my opinion, a service-pension bill embodying an income limitation, commencing the pension at 50-percent disability, and barring any pyramiding of pensions would cost considerably less than $1,000,000,000; and very likely in the neighborhood of $500,000,000—not too high a price to pay for the extension of this traditional service pension to our disabled and aged veterans of World War I and World War II.

It has been advanced by those opposed to the service-pension idea that veterans of World War I in their declining years may enjoy the benefits of our social-security system which veterans of previous wars did not enjoy. There are two answers to this argument.

First, you are all aware that only a minority of the working people today share in the benefits of old-age insurance, and it must follow that only a minority of veterans participate in that system. The present agitation for wide extension of the social-security system has little if any bearing on welfare of this group of veterans.

Second, and more important, is the fact that in the United States the veterans represent the only class of citizens under our Constitution which may be the beneficiaries of class legislation. There is a reason for this, and it runs part and parcel with the war-making powers of the Congress. We are a Nation of volunteer fighting men when trouble starts. Regardless of the degree of perfection which might be attained in manpower-mobilization planning, universal-training or selective-service systems, and the like—keep forever in your vision the volunteers, the men who first man the guns—the men who become the nucleus for the kind of land forces which stormed the beaches of Normandy and invaded France in 1944. We must keep faith with this spirit.

Members of the committee, all the veterans' benefits which have been adopted since 1921 represent compensation—represent something for services rendered—but in all this legislation, and, indeed, it has all been worthy and meritorious, we have never touched on the wholly and purely American ideology manifested by the service pension. For it, by and of itself, is the people's one steadfast bond with its fighting men. It is as though we said as we did in past years of great crisis, "Go, young man, a grateful Nation will remember you—when you are disabled, when you are aged, you shall never be in want."

This then is the criterion of the service pension.

Your decision to approve such a bill as I present today will clearly indicate that you are tempering tradition with realism, and for this you will earn the gratitude of the people as well as our great veteran population.

Retain the Curb on Paralyzing Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the February 7 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer:

RETAIN THE CURBS ON PARALYZING STRIKES

As the struggle in the Senate Labor Committee to reach agreement on a new labor-management law rises in intensity the glaring weaknesses of the position of the Truman administration becomes more apparent.

Why should Administration supporters bitterly fight against inclusion in the measure of specific authorization for the President to seek injunctions in national labor disputes?

Attorney General Clark has issued an opinion—promptly challenged by a number of other legal experts—that the power of the President to petition for court injunctions under such circumstances is implicit and need not be spelled out in the law. President Truman himself has said that, although the step is unnecessary, he "would have no objection" to writing such a provision in the bill.

The reluctance of the majority party leadership to accept this revision of their bill can be explained only by the fact that a similar provision was contained in the Taft-Hartley Act, passed by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress, repeal of which was promised repeatedly during the Democratic campaign of 1948.

Instead of agreeing to a simple amendment that would remove the issue from the realm of doubt and uncertainty, they are willing to gamble that the Attorney General's view—completely untested—is correct. They are willing to risk leaving the Government without this major preventive weapon when the Nation is next threatened with a paralyzing strike which might affect public health, cripple industry, or weaken national defenses.

Such a course is not only evasive—it's dangerous. Several times in the past Mr. Truman has resorted to court injunctions to end labor disputes. He has indicated, despite the confused testimony of Secretary of Labor Tobin, that he intends to follow this procedure again if circumstances demand. As a matter of prudence he should make certain now, by insisting that his powers be specified in the pending bill, that he will not be caught empty-handed while the public looks to him for protection in a future crisis.

The question whether the Attorney General is correct in saying the President has the power to seek injunctions regardless of whether such authority is written into the labor law, or whether Senator TAFT and others are justified in their flat contradiction of this viewpoint, is immaterial. The important point is that the matter is in doubt and that the doubt must be removed before there can be any clear understanding of the law.

Actually, there is good reason to believe Mr. Clark may be in error. It will be recalled that in 1943, when President Roosevelt was armed with unprecedented war powers, he had no power to compel John L. Lewis to comply with an order of the National Labor Relations Board that the United Mine Workers sign a wage agreement and resume the mining of bituminous coal. All he was authorized to do, Mr. Roosevelt implied, was send Mr. Lewis a note on pink paper and say, "Dear Mr. Lewis, I hope you will sign the contract."

In the administration's squirmings to avoid even the appearance of affronting organized labor, Secretary Tobin, admittedly cast in a difficult role, has displayed an ineptness which may well militate against increasing the powers of the Labor Department when that proposal reaches the floor of the Senate.

By his insistence that the pressure of public opinion could be depended upon to avert disputes and that injunctions were unnecessary, he has revealed a degree of confusion among administration leaders themselves which, in view of the vital importance of this legislation, is far from reassuring.

The issue now in dispute lies at the very heart of the labor bill. In the interest of frankness and clarity the injunctive powers should be written into the measure and the consideration of the public welfare given precedence over political advantage.

The Unfair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, those people who wonder why men with money to invest—whether it is $1,000 or $1,000,000—hesitate to put it into American industry have only to consider the capricious and unwarranted actions of our bureaucrats.

It is a fact, hardly open to serious doubt or to intelligent contradiction, that fewer and fewer persons with money are investing it, voluntarily, in American industry, although private industry needs such venture capital if it is to expand to meet the needs of this Nation. The stock market reflects the opinion of millions of investors, or potential investors, that this Nation's affairs are in the hands of men who do not know anything about the real, basic needs of our capitalistic economy, or, if they know, do not care about the future of a private-enterprise economy.

We are in the midst of one of the greatest inflationary periods in American history, but the stock market is far under what it was a year ago, even farther under what it was 2 years ago and terrifically low judged by its postwar high in 1945 and 1946. What is the trouble? We are sick—economically sick—because of the constant tinkering of Government with the business system.

I hold in my hand a letter from a constituent of mine. He has expressed himself so vehemently I hesitate to ask that this letter be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But I should like to read salient passages so that my colleagues will get in a clear manner some of the problems facing small manufacturers.

He points out, first, that through Government intervention, flat galvanized steel sheets, used in his business, are being shipped from the steel mills to make grain bins.

We, being for years in the drainage culvert pipe business to furnish drainage pipe for cities and farm drains, again are on the short end of the list—

He points out.

Because of the famous Supreme Court decision and the Federal Trade Commission stand on basing-point pricing, this manufacturer tells me, and I quote:

Plants are moving out of Michigan to Pittsburgh to be near a steel source. We cannot all do it. If so, there will be no people left here.

The throwing out of basing-point pricing on steel has also lost a lot of business for us. We cannot pay $20 per ton more for steel than some people next door to a steel mill and be competitive * * *

I know there is not much you can do about it, but you should know facts as they concern people in your district, so we tell you how lousy we think the set-up is for us and there must be many others.

We have just cut our force and shortened the hours per week for others because we cannot get galvanized corrugated metal sheets for culvert pipe, and the mills tell us it will get no better for us.

We are now in the process of passing a drainage job, 6,500 lineal feet of 48-inch diameter pipe, because of no sheets being available for us, from our sources—the Inland Steel Co. and the Continental Steel Corp.

Come and see us when in Charlotte. Sorry to tell you everyone says business is rotten, lots of help out of work, and it will not improve as we see it. No reason at all except too many taxes and too much Government control.

Mr. Speaker, there you have the picture facing small manufacturers in America. They cannot plan on a long-range basis, because they have to take into account the activities of a capricious Government. How can we have stability in business if we do not have stability in government? How can businessmen plan on their expenditures if the Government's own expenditures are going up and up and up, thus raising taxes and throwing business calculations out of line? The answer is, of course, that no one can plan intelligently for anything when we have New Deal planned chaos facing us all over the place. If ever there was an unfair deal, this is it.

Support of Immediate Statehood by Leaders in Business and Industry in Hawaii Strongly Reaffirmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii's request for immediate statehood is supported by every organization of any consequence in the Territory today, including those representing the commercial, industrial, labor, professional, cultural, educational, religious, and patriotic interests of our people.

The most impressive demonstration of this fact in recent weeks was the adoption by the Business Committee for Progressive Legislation in Honolulu of a resolution reaffirming its belief in immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The resolution constitutes also a reaffirmation of the stand taken by the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, the Realty Board of Honolulu, and the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association in support of immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The committee adopting this resolution is representative of the leaders in the management of the sugar and pineapple industries, utilities, banking, and the wholesale and retail trade of the Territory.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Business Committee for Progressive Legislation has been formed to give active and constructive support to measures which contribute to the community welfare, and to advocate those steps which represent true progress for Hawaii; and

Whereas the Business Committee for Progressive Legislation believes it speaks for the people of the Hawaiian Islands in recognizing the many outstanding advantages that would accrue to our island community as a sister in the Union of States, and in welcoming the opportunity for increased responsibilities and services to the Nation which statehood would bring; and

Whereas the Business Committee for Progressive Legislation believes it of paramount importance that all possible attention be focused upon the need for and the reasons for immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the Business Committee for Progressive Legislation sincerely believes that the case for immediate statehood has been amply demonstrated—

By more than 50 years of loyalty and service on the part of the Territory of Hawaii to the Nation since annexation by the United States in 1898;

By the wealth of factual material available which proves beyond all reasonable doubt that the Territory of Hawaii is entitled to, and can ably assume its full responsibilities as a State of the United States;

By the splendid record of the people of the Territory of Hawaii in exemplifying the democratic principles of tolerance and progress among minority groups;

By virtually unanimous support given to statehood by civic, educational, social, economic, and other community organizations in the Territory of Hawaii;

By the inclusion in the current platforms of both the Republican and the Democratic political parties of the Territory of planks for the seeking of immediate statehood for Hawaii;

By the overwhelming public support of statehood shown by a plebiscite vote in the Territory of Hawaii;

By the widespread favorable public opinion for immediate statehood for Hawaii in evidence throughout mainland United States;

By the passage of legislation by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress of the United States granting statehood to Hawaii;

By the wholehearted endorsement of immediate statehood for Hawaii as expressed on numerous occasions by President Truman: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Business Committe for Progressive Legislation respectfully and earnestly urge the senate and the house of representatives of the twenty-fifth session of the Territorial legislature to draft and adopt a resolution memorializing the Eighty-first Congress of the United States to grant immediate statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

Adopted this 1st day of February 1949.

BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR PROGRESSIVE LEGISLATION,
HENRY A. WHITE, *Chairman*.
WILLIAM J. GASKILL,
Executive Secretary.

Protesting the Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in view of the deplorable activities that have taken place during the past few days at the anti-Christian trials in Hungary, as well as in response to large gatherings of members of Catholic organizations and other Christian-minded people of the State of Nevada, I wish to enter a protest against the arrest and trial of the cardinal primate of Hungary. Anything which tends to allow the communistic influences to spread or to gain in power, whether it is by an indifference to the power of right, or the ignoring of certain principles of justice, is a blight upon our civilization, as a whole. Acts of injustice belong to the dark ages. Most of us are trying, through word and deed, to usher into existence a new world of united nations, free from the ravages of religious prejudices, social intolerances, and racial discrimination, wherein the democratic principles which respect the rights of every living individual must be upheld. We have come to the cross-roads of civilization's ongoing, and it is up to every one of us to decide which side we are going to be on—the side that recognizes human rights, human justice, and the dignity of man, or the side which is poisoned with a deadly and pernicious doctrine which recognizes only power, lust, and greed. The one leads to progress; the other to complete destruction. This present trial is a challenge to all persons who believe in Christian ideals, to realize sharply the need for a coming together of all people who believe in the principles of honesty, truthfulness, justice, freedom, and peace, to take up their places in this eleventh-hour crusade against the forces of the anti-Christ. Civilization must be preserved for the world.

The Republic of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members an event of international significance, which occurred during the period when the Congress was not in session, and which was only briefly noted in the press. The Irish Dail—Parliament—meeting in mid-November in Dublin, brought up for consideration the Republic of Ireland bill, which was given unanimous approval on its second reading.

The Republic of Ireland bill proposes by its terms to bring to an end the External Relations Act, under which the King of England signs the credentials of Ireland's envoys to foreign countries and all trade pacts are entered into in his name. When this bill is finally enacted the President of Ireland will assume these duties, which are a proper adjunct of his office. By terminating the External Relations Act, which has been in effect since 1926, Ireland has brought to an end the final link of control which Great Britain has maintained over Irish affairs.

The passage of this act has been hailed throughout the 26 counties of Ireland, which today constitute the Republic of Ireland, as one more step in the centuries long battle for freedom which the Irish have been waging, ever since the British first made conquest on Irish soil. It is interesting to note that with each step that has been taken in the process of obtaining full freedom for Ireland, the deep and often bitter antagonism toward Great Britain has grown less, and a closer feeling of friendship has developed as Irish liberty has grown.

When the proposal to end the External Relations Act was first presented, many feared that such dire results as British reprisals, loss of trade, and general disaster would be Ireland's lot. On the contrary, the trade-preference rights amongst the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations will be continued insofar as Ireland is concerned. I might add that these trade-preference rights are of mutual benefit to the British nations as well as to Ireland. Likewise the citizenship rights which are mutually enjoyed by all persons residing in the British Commonwealth will undoubtedly be continued insofar as Irish citizens are concerned, so that the Irish in England and other commonwealth countries will continue to enjoy the same rights as citizens of those countries, while the citizens of the other countries will be accorded the same privileges in Ireland. These matters may require some additional legislation apart from the recently enacted nationality act, but this act will assure the 2,000,000 Irish residing in Great Britain that their citizenship status will not be affected. Already Canada, Australia, and South Africa have indicated that there would be no alteration of the relations between these countries and Ireland, but that Ireland would be considered as one of the members of the commonwealth and existing trade and other agreements continued in full force.

In commenting upon the repeal of the External Relations Act, the Irish Prime Minister, John A. Costello, made this statement: "I want to make this observation: As realists we have to face the facts of the situation and we have to keep in mind, first and foremost, the peace and unity of our country. For over 25 years successive Irish Governments have successively and genuinely sought to reconcile the historic desire of the Irish people for complete independence and sovereignty with the requirements of British policy by means of different formulae. As the result, the country, throughout this entire period, has been in a constant state of turmoil, with bitterness arising between various sections of our own people. We are determined to end that bitterness among our own people and this is a necessary step to do so. The aim of my government in this connection and by this means is to put an end to that position, and also, insofar as our own country is concerned, to place the question of Irish sovereignty and status beyond dispute or guesswork."

In the course of the debate in the Irish Dail, Mr. Sean McBride, Minister for External Affairs—the equivalent of our Secretary of State—made the following significant statement:

Broadly speaking, the passage of the bill would achieve four main purposes. In the first place, it would place the question of our status and sovereignty completely above dispute. The second purpose of the bill is to try to remove from the body politic the acrimony of the last few years which had obstructed the political life of the country. The third purpose which we hope to achieve is that we have not had normal relations with Great Britain over the last quarter of a century or more because of the unhappy history of our nation, and normal friendly political developments have not been easy, and this we hope to end. Finally, there are now only two points of friction left between our two countries—partition and the constitutional forms maintained by the External Relations Act—that were repugnant to Irish sentiment and unrelated to the facts of Irish history. We are not in a position to remove partition by our own unilateral action, but we are in a position to remove the

other point of friction, and that is what we are doing now. We believe that by removing this point of friction Anglo-Irish relationships can be improved.

Putting into effect the Republic of Ireland bill will begin a new era in Irish history and international affairs. The sovereignty of Ireland is no longer a fiction, but a reality. Ireland can now take her proper place as a free and independent people amongst the nations of the world, and can hopefully look forward to that day, not far distant, when the six counties in the north will be reunited with the rest of Ireland and, the last trace of British domination being removed, all Ireland, united and free, can move forward her program of peace and greater prosperity for all the Irish people.

The Need for a Single Supply Catalog for the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide information on the importance of my bill, H. R. 321, entitled "The National Defense Catalog Act," I include with my remarks an article written at the close of the war by a citizen who served as a supply officer in the armed forces, as follows:

CONGRESS ATTACKS THE UNKNOWN FOE

When and if this Nation is again attacked by an enemy attempting to destroy us, the ramparts of our defense will be composed, as they have been in the past, of our manpower strength, our resources of raw materials, and our productive facilities and the way we use them. The main object of an attacking force is to destroy or dissipate these three things; if this can be accomplished on any one of the three, the defeat and enslavement of this Nation is a certainty.

It is inconceivable that we should not take every step to protect these precious defenses. Yet during the last war and in every previous war, we ourselves have permitted the waste and destruction of a large part of our materials and facilities and the dispersal of our manpower. This was accomplished by a foe so insidious, so subtle, and so complex that not only was it not understood, it was barely recognized. So widespread is its influence that it spread throughout this Nation and into every theater of war; it played a major role in every battle and campaign; rode in every ship and tank and plane; sat at every council table where war plans were made; determined whether the sick and wounded would have proper and adequate care and how much material could be spared to civilian supply; made necessary the construction of extra additional huge plants to provide war supplies; commanded the services of thousands of men who were needed for the war effort; dissipated the Nation's resources of raw materials; and cast its baleful influence over every home.

It has been estimated that this foe during the last war cost us many billions of dollars in addition to canceled or delayed campaigns and the loss of many lives. The money involved is hitting our pocketbooks in the way of high taxes now; but during the war it was not so much the money as end products of steel and rubber and tin that could not be replaced.

How could such a foe be permitted to attack from within and seemingly carry on its destruction unmolested? Let us break it into its various parts and attempt to follow them in all their interweavings.

First, let us take a look at standardization. We can assume that it has been determined that an early warning radar set was needed to protect our coast lines and that it would be needed in every theater. The set is large, costing $250,000 and consisting of 5,600 different items. The contracts are given to 10 different manufacturers. Now each of these manufacturers is interested in securing the orders for the replacement and maintenance parts; so each part is designed so that it is a little different from that supplied by other manufacturers. Tubes may be used to show what happens.

The tubes may be designed to be slightly different, even if it is only in the number or position of the prongs that are used to carry the current and hold the tube in position. The estimate of the number of tubes required on the contract, including the spares, is then prepared by the manufacturer of the radar set and submitted to the supplier of the tubes. These suppliers are already making thousands of different types of tubes that vary but slightly. The new tubes, however, are designed to be slightly different from any types previously produced. Because of these changes new production lines and new facilities are required.

There were examples where unscrupulous manufacturers, few in number, fortunately, grasped at the opportunity to have a new plant built at Government expense with a reasonable assurance it could be purchased at the end of the war at a fraction of its cost.

So pressure is put on the War Production Board to grant the priorities for the material for the new plant and the machinery by using the urgency of the radar set. The priorities are granted; architects and contracts are put to work; scarce building materials are collected and men are taken from other important work to build the plant; orders are placed for machine tools, adding a burden on an industry already breaking. At the plant making the machine tools more scarce materials and men are allocated to the construction of the machine tools. Orders are placed for the steel at the steel mill, where again men and critical materials are allocated to the making of the steel. To produce the steel, it was necessary to open high-cost marginal iron ore mines, using more men to supply the ore to make the steel to go into the machine tools to produce the unnecessary new types of tubes. Thus, lack of standardization wasted our resources. We had over 3,500 different types of tubes during the war; the Germans 57.

One evening in the spring of 1942 a colonel having an office in the Pentagon walked into the office adjoining and said to his fellow officer there, "I have just placed the largest order for tubes ever placed—$30,000,000 worth, enough money to pay for all the tubes we should need for 10 years if the war lasts that long. But next week I am to place another order for 60 millions." Because of the lack of standardization the result was that at the end of the war Army warehouses overflowed with tubes that varied slightly from each other, each one containing critical materials that could have been used to make some badly needed equipment that perhaps could have shortened the war. Each one represented the work of men who might well have been used to bolster some weak points in our defenses. War Assets Administration today are attempting, not very successfully, to recover the money that was squandered.

Remember that this was the story of but one of the items used by one manufacturer in one piece of equipment. It could be multiplied by the number of manufacturers and by the number of items. Crystals were another item. We used 1,350 types of crystals; today this has been reduced to 7. The lack of standardization made tremendous inroads on our resources. So the unknown foe in the guise of a lack of standardization gets in its work.

Now let us consider duplication of numbers—perhaps the most vicious of all in its waste of materials. In the spring of 1943 an attack on the Panama Canal was momentarily expected. Powerful radar sets swept the skies, keeping constant watch for enemy planes. Suddenly one of these guardians broke down. The set was inspected and the broken part discovered. To the horror of everyone it was found that the replacement part was not in stock. A hurried telephone call to Washington was made, requesting that the replacement part be obtained at once from the manufacturer and flown to Panama. Meanwhile that part of the sky assigned that radar set was unguarded, an open path for any attacker.

The officer charged with the stockroom, stung with remorse at his dereliction of duty, desperately searched through his warehouses for something, anything that would put the radar back into service. To his amazement he found eight other bins full of the exact article, but stocked under a different number. The radar was immediately repaired and put into operation long before the replacement part arrived by plane.

The commanding general of the Panama Canal realized that in this case eight times as many parts had been manufactured and were taking up warehouse space; yet in spite of the abundance, only a fraction was available at a time due to the assignment of duplicate numbers. The general was sufficiently interested to send an officer to Washington to discuss this with the agency that assigned the number.

This officer was advised that the condition he described was caused because the function of a stock number was never understood and no proper system had been devised to assign the numbers. As a result all types of numbers had been assigned to the same item. The most generally accepted method was to use the manufacturer's number: the result was that if there were 20 different manufacturers there would be 20 different numbers. Each duplicate number added that many times the load on the production facilities, diverted that many times the critical material, made necessary that many times the number of stock bins, and used the services of that many times the personnel. So the vicious circle of wasting our resources was repeated as in the case of lack of standardization, and the unseen foe in this work.

Each technical service in the armed forces was assigned money, personnel, buildings, critical material, and storage space roughly in proportion to the number and type of items of supply assigned to it for design, procurement, and distribution. Because of the lack of standardization and duplicate number assignment, the number of items could be multiplied to astronomical proportions.

For example, the Army Signal Corps, inspired by the Panama Canal case, made a 3-month analysis, using 400 technical personnel, that eliminated 63,000 duplicate or nonstandard items out of 220,000—a reduction of almost 30 percent. When the results were published all the technical services of the armed forces instituted the same analysis, called the reduction of items program. The results were astounding. For example, bearings were probably the most critical single item in the war on both sides. Remember the Allied mission to bomb the bearing plant Schweinfurt that cost us so many B-29's? As a result of the reduction

of items program it was found that there were 264,000 different types of bearings procured, stored, and issued during the war by the Navy. Yet, analysis of this 264,000 disclosed that there were actually only 8,500 different items and the assignment of duplicate numbers had magnified this 30 times. Had this been known during the war, it is conceivable that there would have been no shortage of bearings. So duplication of stock numbers was another of the elements of the unknown foe.

Descriptions and specifications seem to be so fundamental to a supply system that it is almost unthinkable to attempt to procure, store, and issue materials and equipment without them. Can you imagine Sears, Roebuck and Montgomery Ward starting their business without a catalog containing such data? Yet, although the armed forces carried on a supply business that was so huge that it dwarfed such commercial firms, the war was two-thirds over before some of the technical services published their data; and even then in many cases it was inadequate and inaccurate. As a result, items of supply were poured into the supply line in a huge flood to become a trickle at the distribution end.

An order would be placed for a thousand of a desired items of equipment and the order would include a given number of spare parts to be issued with each unit. Due to lack of proper descriptions and identification, the boxes containing the spares would be stored separately from the set. The set would be issued on requisitions but the spares would remain in the depot unknown and unidentified for years, taking valuable storage space and requiring costly maintenance. These items are a major part of the $29,000,000,000 declared to War Assets for disposal at a fraction of their cost. One technical service desirous of reducing the storage space and maintenance cost during the war cleared their depots of these unidentified items. The cost of the items scrapped or salvaged because of lack of identification was estimated at over $100,000,000.

While the depots were filled with items unidentified and consequently unusable, requisitions for needed parts were going unfilled because of inadequate descriptions. In one technical service in February 1944, 44 percent of the requisitions received by the Supply Control Agency could not be filled; in March this rose to 47 percent—almost half of all the items requisitioned. The commanding general of the Technical Service on a tour of the European theater of operations was told by maintenance people it was easier to throw away a costly piece of equipment out of service because of a broken part and get a complete new set than it was to obtain the relatively inexpensive replacement part. The general, on his return to Washington, arranged for the publication and distribution of the necessary data; by the end of the year the percent of requisitions in his technical service unfilled because of lack of information had dropped so low it was not worth the cost of maintaining the record. And another tentacle of the unknown foe had been cut off.

Now suppose that we look at the least understood of all the elements of "the unknown foe"—the units of supply. In many supply publications appears a column with a heading "Unit of measure"; but after most of the items is shown merely the word "each." In 80 percent of the cases this means practically nothing and is only wasted space. The same designation is used for equipment costing a half million dollars as for replacement items costing a few cents. Because the subjects of units of supply was not understood, supplies were delayed, paper work was multiplied and thousands of people were assigned to operate and maintain the supply records.

Let us see how a supply system operated without proper units of supply. Contracts for supplying the same items would be placed with a number of contractors. Every contractor had his own method of packing so that when the boxes arrived at the armed service depots the only marking on the box would give the purchase order number. In order to determine which of the items on the purchase order was in the box and the quantity, it was necessary to break the seals, open the box and inspect the contents. As many as 100 technical personnel would be needed in each depot for this inspection work. There was no uniformity in the quantity that would be packed. One manufacturer would pack 10 items per package and 50 packages per box; another would pack the same item 100 items per package and 5 packages per box; another 20 and 25 and so on. This made it extremely difficult or impossible to have the stock record properly reflect the actual quantity in stock. Many technical services maintained a large staff of personnel working night and day checking the stocks on a "cycle inventory basis"—a monumental job if done accurately by opening every box and checking each package, and never 100 percent accurate.

But that is only half of the story; the movement from the warehouses on requisitions to distribution points was even more difficult. Warehouses in the United States were filling requisitions for small quantities that had been started by regimental supply troops far up front in the theater of war and passed back through all the supply echelons in the theater, through the port of embarkation and through the supply echelons here in the States instead of consolidating a large number of small requisitions into a few large ones.

Two actual examples show the foolishness and the waste of this system. One manufacturer supplied fine wire on reels of 5,000 feet for 58 cents a reel. Many requisitions were received for fractional reel lengths. For example, 19 requisitions were counted calling for 1,000-foot lengths. When the requisitions were received in the warehouse, personnel opened a box containing 50 reels, removed a reel of 5,000 feet and broke the wrapping; then exactly 1,000 feet was unwound and wound on another reel. Then a special wooden box was made in the carpenter shop, packing inserted and the wire was duly sent, having cost $4.58 to supply less than 12 cents of wire.

Washers were shipped by manufacturers in all different quantities up to the hundreds. One manufacturer was discovered packing a one-half-inch washer made of fiber costing one-tenth of a cent in individual cellophane envelopes.

Actually the subject called unit of measure in some services should be called units of supply throughout the National Military Establishment, and be allied with the specifications for packing and packaging. One unit is the unit of pack which is the quantity contained in a retail package that will be protected while in storage at advanced supply points. It will also be determined by the least procurable quantity for which a contractor will accept an order. The second unit of supply will be the unit of container. This is the number of packages contained in a shipping box.

With the description in the catalog would be shown a packing specification number, a unit of pack (U/P) and a unit of container (U/C). Requisitions and records would all be in multiples of U/P. Shipments to the depots by contractors and from the wholesale warehouses would always be in multiples of U/C; from the retail warehouses it could be either. For a large item there could be one item per unit of pack and one item per unit of container; for replacement parts such as washers, it could be 500 U/P and 10 U/C. This would eliminate all the paper work for retail business in the rear areas and the tremendous waste of packaging and packing material; also it would relieve for another duty personnel assigned to identify shipments and for packing.

These activities, consisting of establishing item identification, description patterns, item descriptions, specifications, standardization, packaging specifications, units of supply, type numbers, stock numbers, supply catalogs, technical manuals, and parts-control lists, may be grouped together in the loose term "cataloging"—the foe that we actually knew so little about that we could not attack it. During the war it was discovered more by inference than by actual knowledge. Mr. Forrestal, then Secretary of the Navy, realized that something was going wrong with Navy supply. He called in some civilian friends, told them they were a committee to find the reason, and gave them carte blanche to go anywhere in the world to discover the facts. They reported back that Navy supply was breaking down because there was not a central supply control agency. "Well," said Mr. Forrestal, "let us have a central supply control system." "Very good," said his committee, "but that is not possible without a single catalog for all the Navy bureaus." So Mr. Forrestal created the Navy Catalog Office, with instructions to create one catalog for all Navy bureaus and, if possible, one catalog for the Navy and Army.

Long before World War II other Government agencies had struggled with the problem. However, their problem was to develop a classification system for budget purposes, not to design a system of assigning identification symbols used to operate a complex, far-flung supply system. Classification is only part of our integrated catalog system. Consequently, when World War II was thrust upon us existing systems were inadequate to stand the strain. Each technical service charged with designing, procuring, storing, and issuing items of supply was forced to develop and operate its own system. There was no central coordination and some services advanced further with a result that their supply system increased in efficiency; others lagged behind, and a poor, inefficient supply system resulted.

The magnitude and importance of the problem became apparent to all Government leaders, even to the President of the United States, and in January 1945 he directed that a single catalog system be developed for all the Federal agencies—"both for the effective prosecution of the war and for the more orderly conduct of peacetime affairs." Since that time little has been done.

Members of Congress have been studying this problem since the early days of the war. Further many Members while serving in the armed forces have obtained first-hand knowledge of the waste and confusion resulting from the lack of systematic procedures.

The present bill, entitled "The National Defense Catalog Act," or H. R. 321, is the result of these studies. Its passage would be of great assistance to the armed forces and undoubtedly can result in enormous savings in money and resources.

The Republican Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to the

editors of Time by Mr. Roy A. Wiley, of Santa Rosa, N. Mex., which appeared in the February 7 issue of that news magazine and which I heartily commend to my Republican colleagues as a concise but forthright creed for our party:

FOR THE OPPOSITION

SIR: Many commentators on the political scene are taking the stand that the GOP needs to liberalize. I demur. What the country really needs is an honest-to-goodness opposition party.

The rank and file of the Republican Party is essentially rightist, conservative, believes in State rights and the responsibility of the individual; decries New Dealism in all its forms; looks with dismay on the growing interference of the Federal Government in business, and with foreboding on the pandering of the Government to the labor unions.

The GOP will never win by becoming imitation New Dealers, but whether it ever wins is a minor consideration. What is important is that the Nation have a genuine opposition party, a conscientious, hard-slugging, conservative party whose leaders are not afraid to explain to the voters the very real dangers to democracy that the so-called liberal policies are breeding.

Would Churchill be a greater statesman if he embraced socialism just because socialism now has the upper hand in Britain?

ROY A. WILEY.

SANTA ROSA, N. MEX.

Tobacco Seed Embargo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

TOBACCO SEED EMBARGO

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, January 22, 1945.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of January 2, inquiring about the act of Congress prohibiting the exportation of tobacco seed and live plants. This law was enacted to protect the foreign market for American tobacco growers. It was felt that the large quantities of tobacco seeding being exported annually to China and other countries which normally imported large quantities of tobacco from flue-cured districts were contributing to the decrease in these tobacco exports.

The act forbids the exportation of tobacco seed except for experimental purposes, and the officials of the Department concerned with plant breeding stated that one-half ounce of seed is more than ample for planting a regulation size experimental plot. This, therefore, was adopted as the maximum quantity of seed that could be exported for any one variety. However, under an approved application, a permit may be issued to cover several varieties. Permits are issued only for seed to be used in the course of scientific experiments as conducted by governmental agencies. During the past 4 years, the total quantity of seed authorized to be exported has been slightly under 11 pounds. A copy of the regulations governing the administration of this act is enclosed.

Congressman KERR, of North Carolina, was instrumental in securing the enactment of this law, and you may wish to discuss it further with him.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Assistant Secretary.

"Nuts" Is Appropriate Reply to Russian Peace Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, various news items that have been published recently about Russia's immediate and long-range aims are both pernicious and misleading, insofar as they delude any American into thinking that it is possible for us to make friends with the Soviet rulers.

President Truman himself has added to the confusion, at times, by hinting that there is a "division" in thinking in the politbureau and that some Russian leaders would like to change their ways and make up with us.

This is absurd, and every American ought to realize that it is absurd and why it is absurd. A bare outline of the recent actions of Russia give the lie to any person who claims that the rulers of that vast barbaric nation want to do anything except destroy every non-Communist government.

Keep these facts in mind:

First under Roosevelt and later under Truman the Soviet leaders have swallowed up Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, most of Finland, and virtually all of China, plus extraneous other territories.

Consistently, and with never a let-up, this Soviet government's underlings and fifth columnists in Italy, France, Germany, England, Canada, and the United States, not to overlook all of South America, have created strife and fomented trouble and frequently have resorted to sabotage in attempts to overthrow the legal, elected governments of those lands.

We in this country have chosen some strange leaders to deal with such a threat. We have elevated to power the very men who were last to see the threat of Communism. Many of our leaders—in high, strategic posts today—were bedfellows with Communist agencies as recently as 5 years ago. Yet, we expect them to deal competently with men who have tricked them again and again and again.

For more than 9 months, the Soviet leaders have caused our Nation uncounted expense and the lives of many of our fliers by causing us to feed Berlin by airlift. They still keep the German capital isolated and refuse to cooperate in any way with us on any important score. Without a let-up, Radio Moscow, Pravda, and every other Soviet organ of opinion consistently have misrepresented our aims and have misled millions of gullible persons in and out of Russia.

But in the face of these facts, the slow-minded administrators who never knew a Communist when they saw one several years ago, now actually seriously discuss a newspaper report that Stalin would like to talk peace. Secretary of State Acheson issued a lengthy statement, that nobody read, discussing in a lofty, comic-serious manner this petty Stalin propaganda trick that should have been dismissed with one word: "Nuts."

It seems elementary to Congressmen that when Stalin wants to make a peaceful gesture, all he has to do is act. We have had Russian words for years, but their actions continue to speak louder than their words. And their actions indicate conquest, confusion, violent revolution wherever and whenever possible. It is stupid to discuss settling anything with Russia as long as the Soviet leaders continue to press for every acre of ground they can gain by hook or crook. It is criminally stupid to talk of having Stalin as a guest in Washington when American airmen are sweating their hearts out, yes, dying, on the run to Berlin because of his trickery and his duplicity.

If your next-door neighbor came over to your house, forcibly captured your living room, held your children captive, bullied you with a gun, and, seeing the police approaching, offered to make friends if you would just let him keep what he had captured, how long would it take for you to make up your mind?

Yet, our State Department, with the supine approval of the President, continues to recognize the Soviet Government and to do business with it and actually issues long statements to justify its own position. If this is not absurdity personified, what is it?

Boy Scouts of America Campaign for Citizenship Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, as many of the Members are aware, this is Boy Scout Week. The Boy Scouts of America, which operates under a Federal charter, was founded 39 years ago. Since that date over 15,500,000 Americans have been on its roll, and the present membership is some 2,200,000, which makes it one of America's great organizations.

This week the Boy Scouts are inaugurating a 2-year campaign to promote a vigorous program of citizen training and to stimulate among their members a realization that liberty is not only an inheritance, it is a fresh conquest for each generation.

They have chosen as their symbol Bartholdi's great Statue of Liberty in New York harbor and their slogan is, Strengthen the Arm of Liberty, to up-

hold the torch which enlightens the world. They propose by the end of 1950 to present to the American people in honor of their 40th anniversary a Scout movement surpassing in program and membership anything previously accomplished.

I am sure that the Congress will view the Boy Scout campaign with favor since it has as its objective the stimulation of patriotism and the American way of life.

A Bill To Enable the Secretary of Agriculture To Extend Financial Assistance to Homestead Entrymen, and for Other Purposes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen which will make it much easier for veterans who are settling on the new unit in western reclamation projects to get their work soundly established in a comparatively short time.

New settlers on reclamation projects ordinarily do not have enough money to carry on farming and at the same time make the necessary improvements to the land. When they are unable to borrow from banks or other regular credit sources, they turn to the Farmers Home Administration for aid. The Farmers Home Administration under authority of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is authorized to make loans to persons receiving the majority of their income from farming operations and who cannot get credit elsewhere at reasonable terms for the acquisition, improvement, and enlargement of farms. Such loans may be made up to the reasonable value of the farm, as certified by the county committee, based on the earning capacity of the farm. The loans are repayable in not to exceed 40 years at 4 percent interest.

The Farmers Home Administration also extends credit under the Water Facilities Act of 1937 for the purpose of constructing water facilities on farms in the arid and semiarid areas. Borrowers may have up to 20 years in which to repay these loans and the interest rate is 3 percent. Real estate is the usual type of security taken.

But at present the Farmers Home Administration is prevented from making farm-development loans, under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or water-facilities loans, to veterans at the time they are settling on reclamation project farms because the title, for the most part, to such lands remains in the Government until certain homesteading and reclamation requirements have been met. If the veteran does not succeed in meeting these requirements, the Secretary of the Interior, under the homestead laws, can cancel his entry and open the tract to another settler, who is not required to pay for the improvements made by the original entryman.

This bill will solve the problem by allowing the Farmers Home Administration to make farm-development or water-facilities loans to settlers on reclamation projects or other public lands before title has passed from the Government to the settler. This bill would also permit the Farmers Home Administration to acquire a lien on the settler's tract of land.

If an entry on which such a lien has been created is later canceled, the land can be opened only to a settler who is eligible for an original entry and an original loan from the Farmers Home Administration, and the second settler will assume the responsibility for paying any balance due to the Government on loans made to the first settler.

Thus the present obstacles in the path of the veteran pioneering new land in the West will be removed. The bill will aid veterans to settle successfully on projects which have been, or will be, opened to them in Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Oregon, California, and Arizona. On one undertaking alone, the Gooding division of the Minidoka project in Idaho, 43 units were opened last year and 46 more will be opened this year. These farms are available only to veterans, but most of the veterans who hope to create homes on them will not have sufficient cash to develop them properly and get them into full operation unless they can get credit as provided in this bill.

Lack of funds has always been a major problem for a large number of settlers on reclamation projects. In 1939 the Wheeler-O'Connor Act was passed to enable the Department of Agriculture to extend credit to settlers for farm and home improvements, and take liens on the real estate as security. That authority, however, was not permanent. The present bill will have the effect of reviving the authority contained in the earlier legislation and placing it on a permanent basis.

My bill will enable hundreds of young farmers to develop their farms and make a decent living—something they are unable to do at the present time.

A Cardinal on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 4, 1949:

A CARDINAL ON "TRIAL"

The strangulation of liberty that is being perpetrated in eastern Europe after a war fought in the name of freedom is illustrated again by the "trial" of Cardinal Mindszenty, which began in Budapest yesterday. The cardinal is accused of treason, espionage, and—in line with the methods introduced by Hitler to discredit the churches—with the nonpolitical crime of black-market operations. But his real crime, as detailed in the communique of the so-called Hungarian Government, is his opposition to the Communist dictatorship and its measures. To that crime the cardinal pleads "partly guilty," while repudiating any charge that he plotted to overthrow the existing regime.

Actually, of course, it is not the cardinal but the Hungarian Government that is on trial. That Government represents a Communist usurpation of power achieved by violence and fraud and resting on the bayonets of the Russian occupation armies. It is run by a Soviet proconsul named Rakosi, who acts under orders of the Soviet military commander and is backed by a small minority which in the last free election in Hungary polled just 17 percent of the vote. But this minority, with the aid of the Russian Army, seized the Hungarian state in a coup d'etat which President Truman denounced at the time as an outrage. Subsequently, this same minority has further entrenched itself by a fraudulent election and by liquidating all political opposition. It has consistently violated the peace treaty which obligates it to respect fundamental political, human, and religious freedoms. It is proceeding either to crush the churches or to make them subservient instruments of its own tyranny.

For the moment, there is little that the democratic world can do about it. Cardinal Mindszenty faces the fate already suffered by many thousands of other martyrs to the cause of freedom. But the world will carefully note and long remember what is happening in Budapest.

Changes in the Displaced-Persons Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, a distinguished clergyman of Rochester, N. Y., and former adviser on Jewish affairs to General Clay, has sent me a copy of a recent letter to him from Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this letter dealing with possible amendments to the displaced-persons law.

It is my understanding that hearings on this matter are shortly to commence before both Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary. The suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that the leaders of the three great religious faiths endeavor to present a united front in the forthcoming hearings certainly merits most careful consideration.

The need for one change in the existing law has clearly been demonstrated. This is the change in date of eligibility from December 22, 1945, the date specified in the existing legislation, to at least April 21, 1947, the date contained in the original House bill passed last year, which was changed in conference to conform to the Senate bill.

To effect this much needed change, I introduced a bill last year on August 4

and again this year on the opening day of the Eighty-first Congress.

The first reason for this change is purely administrative. April 21, 1947, was the date selected by General Clay for the closing of the displaced persons camps in Germany to further entry. A careful catalog of the names of and data concerning those who entered prior to that date was prepared and turned over to the International Refugee Organization at the time that body was created. There are many thousands who fled from persecution and entered these camps between December 1945 and April 1947. By enactment of the Displaced Persons Act our country has assumed its share of the international obligation to find a home for these unfortunate victims of war and religious or political persecution. To divide the present occupants of these camps into two categories; one, those who arrived before December 22, 1945, and the other, those arriving after that date, raises obvious administrative difficulties of great complexity and leaves completely undischarged our obligation, equally strong, to those who sought asylum after December 1945, from the cruelties of persecution.

In other words, to leave the date as it is, is to make two packages out of what should be one, to leave the job only partially accomplished.

There is, however, a further and more compelling reason for this suggested change in date. No doubt, unwittingly, but nonetheless effectively, the selection of the arbitrary date, December 22, 1945, has resulted in effecting a discrimination against religious and racial groups which is foreign to the finest American traditions and should never find a place in legislation. The Jews, those who suffered most from the outrages of their torturers, fled in large numbers from Poland, the Ukraine, and elsewhere following the war, to seek refuge in these camps. Likewise, those professing the Catholic faith fled before the prospective horrors and tortures of Communist oppressors. To mark these groups as ineligible for entry into this country under the displaced-persons program seems to me extremely unfair and unfortunate. Certainly these victims of totalitarianism, whether nazism or communism, may reasonably be expected to appreciate the blessings of American freedom at least equally with the victims of the actual conduct of the war itself who for the most part comprise those already within the camps by December 1945.

In fairness it should be pointed out that the Right Reverend E. E. Swanstrom, of New York, chairman of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, has disavowed any claim that the existing bill is discriminatory. Nevertheless, the council at its meeting in St. Paul, Minn., on June 4, 1948, adopted a resolution urging that April 21, 1947, be selected as the determinative date in this legislation in order to prevent injustice to many good European citizens who fled from Communist-dominated areas after the end of the war.

The simple amendment here suggested, of course, in no way increases the number of displaced persons to be admitted to this country. That is not changed in any way. It merely makes eligible for consideration for admission not only those forcibly displaced during the conduct of the war, but also those equally effectively displaced by conditions resulting from the war.

Senator WILEY's letter to Rabbi Bernstein follows:

DEAR RABBI BERNSTEIN: I am glad to reduce to writing my own ideas as to how I feel the present DP law should be amended to iron out its inequities and get rid of some of the administrative obstacles. In so doing, I would like to get the benefit of your reactions (as former adviser on Jewish affairs to General Clay and General McNarney) and those of your associates who have worked closely on the humanitarian DP problem.

Our principal aim in perfecting the DP law should be, as I am sure you will agree, to remove once and for all from the minds of all observers, any doubts or fears that members of the Senate or House are motivated in any way by religious or racial prejudice, which prejudice is, of course, completely un-American and unthinkable here in the Congress or anywhere else.

Summarizing, therefore, my own opinion based in turn upon my contacts and correspondence with leaders of all faiths and nationalities, the points are:

(1) The so-called cut-off date of eligibility should be revised from the December 22, 1945 date specified in the DP law to a later date, either April 21, 1947 or later date best calculated to include 150,000 or so individuals heretofore excluded from the law.

(2) The present provision of the law requiring that a specific job and specific housing be assured in advance for each DP should be replaced by a provision as follows: a validated commitment by the sponsoring individual, church or other organization that the DP will not become a public charge on the people of the United States. In so doing, we will bring the provisions of the DP law into line with the provisions of the general immigration law which prevents admission of those who would become public charges.

(3) By all means a third revision should be an elimination of that provision which mortgages future quotas. This provision, as you so well recall, was brought over from the House bill and was never suggested originally by the Senate.

These three revisions by no means are all of the revisions that may ultimately have to be made. They are the minimum revisions but undoubtedly there may be others which will merit the close consideration of all members of the Congress.

I should like to emphasize this point: that if it is at all possible, outstanding leaders of America's three great religious faiths, representing in turn all of the nationality groups involved, if possible, might get together around a conference table and agree upon minimum points such as the above for submission to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House. Thus, instead of having the Judiciary Committees of both Chambers confronted by divergence of opinion on every count, perhaps we could secure a maximum of unity on as many issues as possible. This will simplify the problem of the Congress; it will simplify and speed revision of the law; and it will be in fullest keeping with the American tradition of unity and brotherhood.

In closing, I want to express my thanks to you for your kind cooperation and your sympathetic understanding of the multiplicity of problems with which the Congress is confronted. I will appreciate any aid or assistance you can give in ironing out much of this misunderstood problem. In so doing, we will be removing from the field of partisan politics a humanitarian issue which should be considered on a high plane, irrespective of political party or any other irrelevant factor.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the questionnaire on labor legislation sent out by the General Electric Co. has aroused widespread interest, and I am sure that all the Members have received some of them from constituents who are sincerely concerned with improved labor-management relations.

I know that the thoughtful citizens who have completed this questionnaire will be interested in the comments of a leading labor representative on the 18 points posed by the General Electric Co. Following is a letter received from Vincent J. Murphy, secretary-treasurer, New Jersey State Federation of Labor:

NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION
OF LABOR,
Newark, N. J., January 29, 1949.

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In a recent issue of the Newark Evening News there appeared a large advertisement of the General Electric Co., entitled "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" While I was disturbed by its contents, I felt that it was not likely to have much effect, and so did not take action upon it.

However, more recently, I and a large number of others to my knowledge received a copy of this advertisement, in printed brochure form, through the mails, with a request that the 18 questions stated therein be answered and mailed to my Congressman.

I can no longer quietly allow this activity of the General Electric Co. to pass unnoticed. The 18 questions which it asks are snide, tricky, and deceptive, deliberately calculated to deceive for the purpose of industry an apparent support of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

It is impossible at this juncture, or in this manner, to explain adequately the deceptive character of these questions, since each of them requires that kind of explanation which only a fairly ample brief can encompass.

Merely as an example, however, let us consider the deceptive quality of question No. 10, which can readily and in very short form be exposed. It asks:

"Do you believe labor laws should require unions to make appropriate reports to members and Government as to handling of funds—just as companies are required to make appropriate reports to owners and Government?"

The following deceptions are to be noted in this question:

1. Companies are not required to make reports to Government unless they attempt to sell their stock on the open market. This is to prevent fraud upon the public. Unions have no stock to sell.

2. Companies are not prevented from doing business if they fail to make reports to Government. They are merely prevented from selling their stock on the open market. Stockholders have the right to demand financial reports and can secure court orders to that effect. So can union members. However, under the Taft-Hartley law, unions which fail to make reports to the Government are prevented from doing business—are, in fact, put out of business, even though the Government has no need to prevent fraud

against the general public with respect to union finances.

3. There is an implication that unions do not make financial reports to their members. This is utterly untrue. Union constitutions invariably require such reports, and they can be compelled by court order.

4. Public knowledge of the state of the local unions' treasuries can often be detrimental to their interests, for an employer will then be able to judge the strength or weakness of a union in case of an impending strike or lockout. Since only the members of a local union have any rightful interest in its financial status, it is therefore unjust to require public accounting of the union's resources.

You will readily observe how impossible it would be in this letter to expose fully the duplicity and chicanery incorporated in each of the 18 questions.

I am taking this opportunity of cautioning you against being misled by the receipt of answers to this questionnaire of the General Electric Co. from any perfectly innocent and well-meaning but misguided persons. May I respectfully request that if you should feel inclined to place any weight at all upon your receipt of any such answers, you be kind and considerate enough to give me, with other representatives of labor, an opportunity to confer with you personally to explain in detail the questionnaire's insidious quality.

Very truly yours,

NEW JERSEY STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
By VINCENT J. MURPHY,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Oleomargarine Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement:

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
Ames, Iowa, January 31, 1949.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JENSEN: I am enclosing a statement relative to a number of legislative issues before Congress which we are very much concerned with.

While I do not know what action will be taken on some of these issues, we are anxious to have our Iowa Congressmen and Senators know our viewpoints.

Extending our best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. S. QUIST.

EXPRESSIONS OF THE IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION

Iowa Senators and Congressmen:

The Iowa Creameries Association is vitally concerned with a number of isues reportedly before Congress or reported soon to be introduced. We are herewith presenting our position on these issues and our reasons.

I. Oleomargarine legislation: The Iowa Creameries Association as a member of the National Creameries Association supports the stand taken by the three dairy groups, namely, the National Creameries Association, the American Butter Institute, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association. This was the banning of the manufacturing and sale of margarine colored in the semblance of butter.

II. The need of a parity price of manufacturing milk and its products: Iowa ranks fourth as a dairy State—Iowa's geographical location is rather distant from our large consuming centers. The total farm income for dairy products for 1947 in Iowa was $176,734,000. In addition the farmers received approximately $33,000,000 from dairy cattle sold for slaughter.

The 1947 creamery-butter production was 209,145,000 pounds. Approximately 75 percent of the butter production was sold outside Iowa.

Most of the prices paid for Iowa's butter is based on either the New York or Chicago mercantile exchanges prices even though the butter is delivered to other points.

Relative small volumes of butter traded on the exchanges sets the price for the vast amount of butter which bypasses the two exchanges. Also many other dairy products are based on butter prices.

Under marketing agreements and orders, fluid milk in some areas is established at prices out of line with other areas. When surplus milk occurs in these higher-priced areas, the butterfat from the surplus milk is made into butter.

The impact of this situation on the dairy industry of Iowa is this: A relative small increasing amount of butter offered on the exchanges reflects in a depressed market and lower prices. Consequently, the large butter-producing areas of the Midwest are handicapped by a price-supporting system that works to the advantage of one area and disadvantage of another. Any Federal assistance to a marketing or price support based on a parity should give the same relative values to all areas.

III. Tariff reductions on butter imports: Tariff reductions on butter under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will have a depressing influence on the Midwest butter industry. This is largely because any arrival of relatively small shipments creates lower prices on the mercantile exchanges.

Also butter imports should be required to meet the same high production and manufacturing standards as those required for domestic production. During 1948 Iowa creameries spent from three to five hundred thousand dollars for greater dairy quality improvements.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration demands rigid and exacting standards for all dairy products shipped interstate. Imported dairy products should be required to meet the same inspections and exacting standards.

IV. Wage and Hour: Evidence appears that the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division is to recommend a minimum wage of 70 cents per hour and the removal of overtime exemptions of workers engaged in the first processing of farm products.

The Iowa Creameries Association is strongly opposed to the removal of overtime exemptions for workers engaged in the first processing of agricultural products. Local creamery operations are far different than those of the assembly line. For example, unfavorable road conditions can delay the cream and milk haulers many hours. Oftentimes, creamery employees are required to work late at night to handle the late cream arrivals for the cream must be cared for on arrival. Adjustments are made by the creamery management for these irregular hours. Under wage-and-hour liability, and with regulations that only few can decipher, the creameries will be at the mercy of inspectors if exemptions are lifted.

Under the existing regulations, there are changes that should be made. A number of our creameries have milk-drying units. If skimmilk is dried, the operator is exempt, for that is construed as first processing. If buttermilk is dried, the operators are not exempt and must be paid extra for overtime over 40 hours worked per week. Drying buttermilk is not construed as first processing.

The Iowa Creameries Association urges you to do all in your power to prevent the removal of overtime exemptions for agricultural workers and those engaged in the first processing of agricultural products. In fact, the interpretation of first processing should be more liberal and clarified.

Senate bill 546, introduced by Senator CABOT LODGE, proposing mandatory payments of not less than minimum wage for not less than 40 workweeks of not less than 30 hours per week by all concerns selling $10,000 of goods, material, etc., to the Government would be a hardship to a number of Iowa creameries. It would mean that oftentimes a creamery would be unable to meet the annual-employment requirement and thereby lose the opportunity of making a sale to the Government.

IOWA CREAMERY ASSOCIATION,
JULIUS BRUNNER, *President.*
J. S. QUIST, *Executive Secretary.*

Federal Contributions to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government should contribute a sum in lieu of taxes on property which it owns in the various States is generally conceded. The difficulty lies in devising an acceptable formula for computation of the fair and equitable amount in each case. As a result, to date no action has been taken.

Whether the approach to this problem be the one embodied in my bill, H. R. 445, should only be determined after full hearings. It seems clear, however, that we should grapple with this important issue at an early date in order to relieve the present intolerable and unfair situation.

It is gratifying that the Washington Post has indicated its support for some legislation to meet this problem in editorial comment, which follows:

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

If the Federal Government paid taxes at prevailing rates on its property holdings in the District, as Representative KEATING suggests, the District would receive an estimated $16,000,000 from this source. That is five million more than the present Federal contribution to the District's running expenses. While the loss of potential revenue resulting from the tax-exempt status of local Federal holdings provides a strong argument in favor of increasing the size of the Federal contribution, there is little likelihood that Congress would agree to any proposal entailing taxation of Federal property on the same basis as privately owned property. Direct taxation of federally owned property here would establish a precedent for similar taxation of Federal holdings by States and municipalities in all parts of the country. As a matter of fact, Representative KEATING urged abolition of tax exemption for all Federal properties wherever located.

The problem is undoubtedly one of Nation-wide concern that led the American Municipal Association to go on record recently in favor of Federal legislation authorizing local taxation of Federal property or, as an alternative, payment to the municipalities by the Federal Government of annual sums in lieu of full taxes. Various Federal agencies are already empowered to make payments to local government, but, as we pointed out some time ago, these payments are haphazard and often inequitable because of their special character. Consequently, there is pressing need for a change of policy to relieve local governments of the burdens thrust upon them by the withdrawal of Federal land from taxation. In the case of the District, more than 40 percent of the land area is tax-exempt because of Federal ownership.

There are certain types of Federal holdings, such as post office, jails, and hospitals, that ought not to be taxed in any circumstances. There are also undeveloped landholdings in some States whose taxable value would be hard to assess and whose possession by the Federal Government probably yields indirect dividends to local communities that largely offset loss of taxable revenue. For such reasons it would be unwise to give local governments carte blanche authority to tax federally owned property of all kinds at prevailing local rates. But it is both feasible and essential to work out a plan that would insure adequate compensatory Federal payments and compel the Federal Government to pay its fair share of the cost of local governmental services that benefit all property holders—public as well as private. In most cases the size of these payments should, with certain exceptions such as those previously mentioned, be roughly equivalent to the amount of revenue that would be collected if Federal property were fully taxable.

Mobile's Foreign Trade Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a talk on foreign-trade zones which was made by Mr. A. S. Brueggemann, vice president, First National Bank of Mobile, before the Civitan Club of Mobile on December 14, 1948. Mr. Brueggemann, whose knowledge of foreign trade and banking is well recognized, ruefully concedes that the Mobile foreign-trade zone, second to open in the United States, closed down before it had an opportunity to demonstrate its value to the port. He then pointed out that three other ports, one of which is on the Gulf of Mexico, are now enjoying increased foreign trade and prestige through the facilities offered by foreign-trade zones. As the original sponsor of the Mobile zone, I worked unceasingly to obtain the charter from the Federal Government, and, naturally, I was disappointed when it was decided that the zone was to be closed. However, whenever Mobile foreign-trade and shipping interests decide that a zone should be reestablished to meet ever-changing world conditions, I will be happy to work with them.

Mr. Brueggemann's remarks follow:

MOBILE FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE

As you know, Mobile was the second city in the Nation to operate a foreign-trade zone. A foreign-trade zone affords a limited area, perhaps a single large warehcuse, where goods from a foreign country may enter without payment of duty. Goods can be stored, assembled, partly processed, or repacked, and then resold and shipped free of United States duty to a foreign country, or placed in domestic commerce upon payment of appropriate customs duty.

Such foreign-trade zones had their origin in Europe and reached their most advanced stage in Germany, where in the ports of Hamburg and Bremen factories were erected in the free trade zones for the manufacture of various kinds of goods, and the finished product was then exported without payment of duty, also at a considerable saving in freight charges.

With the passage by Congress of the Celler Act in 1934, which authorized the establishment, within the territorial borders of the United States of these foreign-trade zones, the Port of New York was the first to take advantage thereof and obtained permission to set up zone No. 1 in 1937.

Mobile had excellent facilities to offer and foreign-trade zone No. 2 was g anted an application and was formally opened here on July 21, 1938, about a year after zone No. 1 in New York. The primary purpose of zone No. 2 was to attract new business from the countries to the south of us. Despite the extensive campaign on the part of the Pan American Committee of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce, the contemplated increase in business with Latin America did not materialize. Therefore, after about 6 or 7 months of operation at a considerable deficit, the venture was abandoned early in 1939. It was felt that the type of commerce moving through Mobile was clearly not of the kind that would find the privileges of a foreign-trade zone to be advantageous.

I hesitate to venture an opinion as to how our port would rank today compared with other leading seaports, had it been possible somehow to make up this deficit and continue operations of the foreign-trade zone, because in the recent past two other cities have established such zones.

It appears that Mobile was born 30 years too soon because New Orleans, our stanchest competitor on the Gulf, now boasts of foreign trade zone No. 2, abandoned by us early in February 1939, and last June San Francisco's application to operate zone No. 3 was favorably acted upon. Rumors persist that Los Angeles is very much interested and will probably set up zone No. 4 very shortly.

Because of the growth of air express and the future prospects for transportation of goods by air in large volume, directly from and to important interior cities without the planes first stopping at border points, prominent industrial centers in the Midwest are giving much thought to foreign trade zones, and in the press two Sundays ago you no doubt read that Chicago, situated nearly 1,000 miles from any seacoast, is the first interior capital to give serious consideration to such a zone. In addition to air express, advocates call attention to Great Lakes shipping from Canada, the splendid barge service opening up Latin America and the Far Eastern areas by way of the Gulf and Panama Canal, also the proposed St. Lawrence seaway, which will make Chicago an unquestioned ocean port, accessible to virtually all Atlantic Ocean traffic.

(Earlier in the talk Mr. Brueggemann had pointed out how the new, modern facilities of the Alabama State docks and terminals attracted new business to the port.)

Just the same as the new and modern State docks attracted an increasing volume of tonnage and shipping service, which I am sure all of you agree would have moved by other channels if the State's facilities had not been in existence, is it not reasonable to assume that if the foreign trade zone operations could have been continued, and some way found to meet the deficit, it would have attracted business to our port—a more diversified, that is a greater revenue-producing cargo, which is just the type of tonnage we need in Mobile at the moment.

The Need for Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I had the honor of addressing the conference on unfinished business in social legislation on the subject, The Need for Health Insurance. This conference, composed of splendid American men and women who are dedicated to the improvement of social legislation, has the following membership: National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, National Federation of Settlements, American Association of Social Workers, National Council of Jewish Women, Department of Christian Social Relations of the United Council of Church Women, Woman's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Consumers Union, National Consumers League, National Association of Consumers, Women's Trade Union League of America, National Council of Negro Women, Division of Social Education and Action of the Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing my speech in the RECORD:

THE NEED FOR HEALTH INSURANCE

Members of the Conference on Unfinished Business in Social Legislation—a most appropriate title—it bespeaks a serious and realistic approach to issues which so deeply affect the health, welfare, and security of all of us.

It is in this same thoughtful vein that I should like to discuss with you how to improve the Nation's health. Stated more explicitly, the problem is how best to enable every wage earner to secure adequate medical care for himself and his family.

Here are a few figures to make the problem more graphic: We could save each year some 120,000 who die from communicable diseases; some 115,000 who die from cancer and heart disease; 40,000 from accidents; 30,000 infant and maternal deaths, and 20,000 who die from other miscellaneous causes.

You have invited me here, knowing full well, I am certain, that this issue will be before both Houses of Congress. You know the definition of a Congressman: "If he agrees with you, he is an able statesman; if he disagrees, he is a cheap politician."

Though proud of my membership in the Democratic Party, it is not in any partisan spirit that I wish to discuss the question of needed social legislation. Rather, with your permission, I should like to examine the status of our national health as revealed by our leading medical economists. Then, having ascertained our health needs, and the existing or contemplated medical and professional resources, we can shape effective solutions so that they will square with our best democratic principles.

This sober approach, I might add parenthetically, has been used with rare effectiveness by you people. Its increasing popularity is testimony to your achievements in behalf of developing and shaping an informed public opinion.

Now let us examine, first in broad perspective and then in detail, the question of America's health needs.

You and I know that the spectacular successes of the medical laboratory have not been matched by corresponding advances in treating the sick people of our workaday world. The full measure of advancing medical knowledge, particularly in preventive medicine, comes haltingly at best for most of our people. Between the many who need medical care and the few who can afford it, there is a distressing gap. This gap is the fault neither of our doctors nor of our people. American medicine is admittedly the finest in the world. And our people are thoroughly desirous of benefiting from the miracles of modern medicine.

I have dealt so far in general terms. You have a right now to ask for supporting data in proof of these statements. The data are there, and in shocking abundance. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." What would Uncle Sam's health chart reveal if he were given an extensive national check-up? How many people forego needed medical care?

Consider these figures:

One mother out of every two who dies in childbirth dies needlessly. Her life could be saved if known measures were fully applied. One-third of the infant deaths could similarly be prevented.

In any 24-hour period, illness or other disability incapacitates 7,000,000 people.

Chronic disease or physical impairment blights 23,000,000 lives annually.

Four million Americans were rejected for military service because of physical disability.

Many of you are familiar with these figures. You have studied the evidence compiled by the Federal Security Agency. You also know that through illness this Nation loses annually some 600,000,000 man-days. In a world desperately starved for necessities, where hunger and need are totalitarianism's strongest allies, this annual loss in productivity endangers our own security at home and freedom's chances abroad.

The full impact of our disturbing national health picture is not realized until we examine State and regional figures—until we analyze how people fare by income groups.

A direct connection exists between ability to pay for medical care and the chance for health. In low-income-level States, such as Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, the death rate among women in childbirth is three times as high as in wealthier States like Connecticut, Minnesota, or Rhode Island. Infant mortality rates tell the same story. In the 4 worst States, 50 to 100 infants died in their first year as compared with 28 to 30 babies per 1,000 live births in our Nation's 4 best States.

After a careful examination of the health records of the 48 States by income levels, Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing made this succinct observation. From his report to President Truman on The Nation's Health—A 10-Year Program, I quote:

"The conclusion is inescapable that, as among States, there is a direct relationship between the comparative wealth of a given State and the health services available; that this, in turn, has a direct bearing on the health record of the State."

A similar distressing picture emerges from a study of the health of America's 13,000,000 citizens of Negro ancestry.

Consider these facts:

The Negro mortality rate is 60 percent higher than for whites.

Two Negro mothers die in pregnancy and childbirth for every white mother who dies. Two Negro babies die for every white baby who dies.

Three Negroes die of tuberculosis for each white person who dies of tuberculosis.

Would you like to look more closely at a particular State? Reports Mr. Ewing:

"In South Carolina the mortality rate for white mothers was 1.3 per 1,000 live births; for Negro mothers it was 3.6 per 1,000 live births. This 170-percent higher mortality rate among Negro mothers can be related to the fact that a scant 14 percent of Negro births occurred in hospitals and 65.9 percent were attended merely by a midwife or other unspecified person. By contrast, only 2.5 percent of white births were in this latter class."

No matter how the picture is viewed, we are faced with the dismal economic fact that the price of medicine in the market place is beyond the reach of most Americans. This is no startlingly new thought. We have known this for more than a decade. Far back in 1939, the Bureau of Economics of the American Medical Association published a study showing that families with incomes less than $3,000 could not afford adequate medical care for serious illness. With today's greatly increased living costs, it is perhaps a conservative estimate which states that 100,000,000 Americans need help in paying sickness bills.

These facts, buttressed as they are by myriad others, lead us to two inescapable conclusions:

First, here is a national problem—national rather than private or local—since it concerns the great majority of our people.

The second conclusion is that we must devote our energies toward an immediate solution of the problem of improving the Nation's health.

I stress the need for immediate improvement. For so long as we temporize, or delay, or compromise, we shall be condemning to death each day some 900 persons whom modern medicine has the service, the skill, but not the economic power to save under our present system of distributing medical care. Again, I should like to direct your attention to Mr. Ewing's words: "Every year 325,000 people die whom we have the knowledge and the skills to save." Think of that. Each year we lose a Rochester, N. Y.; a Denver, Colo.; a Louisville, Ky. What a frightening and needless waste of human life.

Do you want a break-down of these figures? Here they are, again; I gave them to you at the beginning of this speech. They bear frequent repeating.

We could save each year some 120,000 who die from communicable diseases, some 115,000 who die from cancer and heart disease, 40,000 from accidents, 30,000 infant and maternal deaths, and 20,000 miscellaneous.

Now that we have surveyed our problem, what hope is there for a solution? And what is the best solution to provide this needed purchasing power? How can we break existing bottlenecks in professional manpower, hospital and laboratory facilities so as to give all our people an equal chance for health?

A searching examination of various answers to these questions was made last spring at the National Health Assembly in Washington, D. C. No doubt some of you here today were among the more than 800 delegates from the American Medical Association and allied professions, from cooperative, rural, labor, veteran, church, women, and welfare organizations.

You will recall that the subject of charity medicine versus national health insurance was debated with vigor. Treated with equal incisiveness were such thorny issues as discrimination against Negroes in county medical societies and hospitals; the need for gaining health parity for our rural population; the role of local, State, and Federal Government, as well as private agencies, in health.

Out of the free exchange of ideas among the experts, lay and professional alike, came unanimous agreement on the basic prescription for a sounder, healthier America. "Adequate medical service * * * should be available to all without regard to race, color, creed, residence, or economic status.

"The principle of contributory health insurance should be the basic method of financing medical care for the large majority of the American people in order to remove the burden of unpredictable sickness costs, and avoid the indignities of a 'means test'."

There was also unanimous agreement among the delegates on these four subsequent points:

1. Voluntary health insurance programs must be encouraged particularly in rural areas.

2. Medical and popular groups should work together to repeal restrictive State legislation against voluntary plans, originally passed at the mistaken insistence of State medical societies.

3. Medical care services should be coordinated. Doctors and laymen should cooperate on professional standards and administrative procedures.

4. Tax funds should be used wherever necessary to supplement health insurance in bringing medical assistance to everyone.

As experts, however, you will recognize the fact that the virtue of the term "contributory health insurance" lies in its broad meaning. It covers a basic cleavage as to whether insurance should be compulsory or voluntary.

Again, a long clear look at the record affords us an answer. Voluntary health insurance, excellent aid though it is, affords comprehensive medical care to not more than 4,000,000 persons. I should like to emphasize that figure—only 4,000,000 are covered by comprehensive voluntary medical care programs.

The great clamor about how 45,000,000 are covered by some plan or other and, therefore, there is no need for any further concern is definitely misleading. Twenty-five millions of these forty-five millions have insurance for hospitalization only. Others have even less adequate protection.

The most cogent analysis of why we cannot rely wholly on voluntary health-insurance plans to do the job was stated by Dr. Michael M. Davis, chairman of the Committee on Research in Medical Economics:

"Voluntary plans do not offer broad enough coverage, at low enough rates, to a large enough portion of our people, to justify serious consideration as a national solution to our national health problem."

Furthermore, many voluntary plans, including those operated by State and county medical societies, have contracts full of jokers. When you need to claim benefits you find that you are so beset with ifs, ors, and whereases, that you end up owing the doctor and the hospital a lot more than you bargained for when you signed up.

In fact, I once went so far as to say that your chance of getting your money back under the State Medical Society plan in Wisconsin was so slight that the plan might well be barred under the antigambling ordinance.

Since sickness respects neither pocketbook nor State lines, the problem of meeting our national sickness bill can be solved by nothing less than an over-all approach which coordinates the best effort of Federal, State, and local governments.

Speaking to this proposition, Bernard Baruch—America's elder statesman—told the medical profession a little more than a year ago:

"Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering the people by law and

financed by the Government * * * what some would call 'compulsory health insurance.' It can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what is termed 'socialized medicine.' I do not fear Government's taking its legitimate part in medicine, any more than I fear it in education or housing."

There is now before Congress a national health-insurance bill which embodies the safeguards necessary for the preservation of both American medicine and the doctor-patient relationship. That bill is S. 5 (H. R. 783), sponsored by Senators MURRAY, WAGNER, MCGRATH, PEPPER, CHAVEZ, and TAYLOR, and in the House by Congressman DINGELL.

Briefly, the bill provides:

1. A system of health insurance, national in scope, and covering approximately 85 percent of the population. This includes employees, self-employed persons in business for themselves, and their dependents.

2. Insured persons eligible for benefits would be entitled to medical and dental service from general practitioners and specialists, home nursing care, hospital care, laboratory service, X-rays, expensive prescribed medicines, eyeglasses, and special appliances.

3. Free choice of doctor and dentist by the patient is guaranteed. The right to change one's choice is assured.

4. Every qualified doctor, dentist, nurse, and hospital is guaranteed the right to participate or not, and to accept or reject patients. These guaranties apply to organized groups of practitioners, clinics, consumer cooperatives, and similar health-service plans, as well as to individuals. Every hospital that participates is guaranteed freedom from Government control.

5. Payments for services would be made from the insurance fund instead of the patients having to pay the costs directly. The method of payment is to be decided by the practitioners who furnish the service. The legislation contains guaranties that the amount of payment will be fair and adequate to physicians and hospitals.

6. Provision is made for grass-roots administration of the program. In each local area, administration would be carried out with the help and participation of local citizens, including members of the medical profession. East State is given the right to administer the system through its own State agency, and to divide the State into local areas. The State plan must meet certain general requirements stated in the bill. At the Federal level, administration is under a five-man board, assisted by an advisory council of lay and professional people.

I have explained the bill in this detail because it is essential for all of us to realize the sincerity of its purpose and its straightforward, sensible provisions. Above all, it represents the sound and tested American principle of insurance—a principle that dates back to the days of John Paul Jones and *Old Ironsides*. In 1798 Congress established a compulsory health-insurance plan for its new-born merchant marine. Industrial and fraternal health-insurance plans, organized more than a half century ago, are still going strong. They are proof, if such is needed, that national health insurance is as American as apple pie and as sound economically as the word insurance implies.

But we need not take national health insurance on faith. We can observe its operation abroad in other English-speaking countries like Canada, New Zealand, and England. In Great Britain, for example, national health insurance was first introduced in 1911 over the opposition of the British Medical Association. After working with it for a number of years, the British Medical Association reversed its stand and in 1928 recommended that it be greatly extended.

The recently inaugurated British National Health Act was first proposed by the Conservative Party. Said Winston Churchill in his wonderful style: "Insurance is employing the magic of averages for the benefit of the individual."

Now, after several months of operation, a favorable verdict is being returned by the people who pay for the services and by the doctors and hospitals which render them in England. A survey conducted by the British Institute of Public Opinion revealed in December that the national health program was by far the most popular achievement of Attlee's labor government. This poll, I hasten to add, forecast the election of the labor government in 1945 with an error of only one percentage point. Similar commendation comes from the Lancet, long-established independent British medical publication, and from conservative publications like the Spectator. And, finally, there is this direct quotation from the British Medical Association:

"The doctors want a comprehensive service. Doctors are not against a national health service. They approve of the bulk of the present act. Doctors have been fighting for years to get their patients better medical service."

I could lay no claim to being fair or frank with you if I attempted to gloss over the stubborn opposition of the American Medical Association to all proposals involving the principle of national health insurance. Unlike either the Canadian Medical Association or the British Medical Association, the American Medical Association has rejected all such proposals, lock, stock, and barrel.

Most of you are too familiar with the AMA's objections for me to elaborate upon them. However, I would like to call your attention to the peculiar composition of the House of Delegates. A study of its composition reveals that it does not represent the rank and file of American physicians. A check for age, residence, and type of practice of the 155 delegates (elected by the State medical societies) shows:

1. While nearly 50 percent of all practicing physicians in the United States are less than 45 years of age, 95 percent of the delegates are over 45 years of age. Seventy percent are over 55 and nearly 30 percent are 65 years or older.

2. Half of the country's physicians are general practitioners. But there are only 15 general practitioners among the 155 delegates. Ninety percent are full or part-time specialists.

3. As would be expected from the above, most delegates come from large cities, few are from rural areas. While 30 percent of all doctors live and practice in communities with less than 5,000 population, only 8 percent of the delegates are from such communities.

Perhaps you will agree with me that there is good reason to believe that not all of our doctors wear AMA blinkers. The magazine, Medical Economics (distributed free of charge to all physicians), recently printed the following results in answer to the question: "Would you participate in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell program if it became law?"

	Percent
Yes	15
No	61
Undecided	24
Total	100

Break-down by States and large cities showed wide variations. In New England and the Middle Atlantic States, almost half of the doctors said "Yes" or were undecided. In some eastern cities, one doctor out of three said he would participate in a national health insurance program. A substantial number of others are undecided.

Considering the stream of condemnation and misinformation regarding national health insurance which the AMA has poured out to physicians over the years, instead of an anticipated 85–90 percent opposition, only 61 percent of all doctors would record themselves against participation. Four out of ten are either open-minded on the subject or ready to participate. Five out of ten eastern doctors feel this way.

The impartial observer who surveys the record of the AMA on legislative proposals to help make adequate medical care available to all, will read therein a record largely of negativism, obstructionism and of do-nothingism if you will permit the word. Time and again, the AMA has been called upon by those in Congress and by representatives of public interest organizations for a legislative program to help secure a more equitable distribution of medical care. I should like to echo that call again, but I do so with little hope of receiving any constructive reply.

But in addition to this, I would like to address a request publicly to Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, and often regarded as the spokesman of organized medicine. I ask him in the public interest and in fairness to an ever-growing number of responsible members of the American Medical Association who favor national health insurance to open the pages of the Journal to a fair presentation of both sides of that issue.

The standards of fair journalism and public interest require at the least that the existing iron curtain of censorship be lifted from the pages of the Journal of the American Medical Association, so that the American doctor may find full and fair discussion of the pros nd cons of this significant issue.

And now in closing, may I return to the theme of this meeting—the unfinished business on social legislation.

We have made great strides in recent years in protecting the people of this country against the four great hazards of our industrial world. Through Federal and State action we have achieved an ever-growing measure of security against industrial accidents, old age, and unemployment. Our success in using the principle of social insurance to combat the hazards affords every reasonable proof that it can be successfully employed to overcome the fourth great hazard that faces all of us—paying for sickness cost.

The individual who is laid off today receives compensation. The individual who is injured on the job today receives compensation. But the individual who is ill and, hence, unemployed, with extra costs to meet, receives no compensation. It is unreasonable and unfair.

Certainly it will take courage and imagination, borne of experienced social planning, to develop a working national health-insurance program. But we have these qualities and we shall be secure in the knowledge that however much vision it takes to achieve, the program itself is not visionary.

Here is where your organizations play their vital role as catalysts of public opinion. As spokesman for the welfare of all groups, you can develop informed public opinion which will be more persuasive with the Eighty-first Congress than the multimillion dollar lobby of organized medicine and the large patent drug corporations.

This Congress, I need hardly say, will be responsive to your call.

The recent election has seen to that.

Out of the wealth of statistics, the testimony of medical economists, and the day-to-day experiences of millions of Americans, comes the certain knowledge that national health insurance is the solution to our health needs. It will remove the burden of sickness bills, making adequate medical care available to all Americans, regardless of race, color, creed, or economic circumstances.

But securing this much-needed legislation will take the thoughtful efforts of all us doctors and patients, professionals and laymen. We must all join in a lobby for a stronger and healthier America—a lobby for lives.

The Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my concept of reciprocity is wherein countries exchange goods of which they produce in abundance for goods that they need.

I feel that the present formula used by the Tariff Commission to secure export and import facts by holding hearings should be continued. The reciprocal trade treaties of the New Deal were honeycombed with deceit. Why do I say this? Well, there have been more trade barriers erected since 1934 than existed before in the history of this country. The proof of this statement is (1) the near embargo on short staple cotton which restricts cotton imports to 135,000 bales. The quota on long staple cotton imports as put into effect by President Truman is less of an embargo approach; (2) the near embargo on wheat and flour which restricts wheat imports to 800,000 bushels; (3) the embargo on the export of tobacco seed is the most vicious and severe trade barrier ever erected. This latter legislation, according to the Secretary of Agriculture, was enacted to prevent China and other countries from raising United States types of tobacco for competition on the United States market. Why such hypocrisy?

Before the Fair Deal makes much of an impression on any thinking person in connection with reciprocity speeches, it should first repeal the Tobacco Seed Act. The only similar trade barriers were erected by Russia to restrict the export of sables, and by Australia to restrict the export of a certain type of sheep.

Many things have happened since 1933 that make the Reciprocal Trade Treaty approach really obsolete: (1) The individual agricultural producer and manufacturer in the United States is faced with the State trading. Peron, for example, could put any beef producer of this country into bankruptcy. This was demonstrated by the demoralization of the United States fur farming industry by Russian fur imports in 1946; (2) the FAO is now very much in the picture. This organization, a part of the UN, is trying to divert food products from the surplus producing areas of the world to the food deficient areas of the world. The world wheat conference is a part of this program; (3) a minimum wage may become effective soon, and if we fail to consider the effects of competitive commodity imports additional millions of Americans will find themselves without jobs; (4) the present world prices on most agricultural products, plus present duties, is less than the United States support price; that is, the prices of agricultural products of this country are not only supported under the program, but the agricultural products of the rest of the world as well.

Did not the United States support the Canadian potato prices? Does the wool-support program not only support the 300,000,000 pounds produced in this country, but also include the 600,000,000 pounds we import from Australia, South Africa, and Uruguay? How can we expect to see a normal granary when our abnormal granary is filled with our production plus the competitive imports?

The facts are, (1) that in quantity, volume, and pounds, we have been on an agricultural import basis since 1925 (except during the short period following World War II), (2) that we imported the greatest amount of agricultural products in our history during the 1933–39 period, (3) that we imported twice the amount of competitive agricultural products, during the 5 years preceding the war, than were our total agricultural exports, (4) that at the present time we are not giving away agricultural products as rapidly as our markets are attracting the foreign agricultural products, (5) that the countries receiving feed from us for their cows are now asking us to further reduce the import duty so that they can send more of their dairy products to us, (6) that the United States per capita production of milk is now the lowest since records have been compiled and that some people propose to subsidize these foreign dairymen, (7) that the European countries should reduce their own duties and eliminate trade barriers between themselves before asking us to reduce our import duties while they are increasing their duties. Benelux is a start, and they should use their products to help their own people first before attempting to place their subsidized products in competition with ours in this country, (8) that under the Marshall plan billions of dollars in goods and services are being sent to Europe, and a large share is being used to rehabilitate business and agriculture. This is a direct subsidy to the European producer. Do you think it is wise to subsidize a foreign industry, such as rayon, with Marshall plan money and then turn around and lower the duty on rayon imports to this country? Do you think it makes good sense to use Marshall plan money to feed dairy cattle in European countries and then turn around and lower the duty on butter and cheese imports? This very hour this proposal is being considered, and hearings are being held before the United States Tariff Commission. Anyone who is not balmy should realize that this proposal just does not make good sense, either economically or common.

Many of the dreamers in the State Department have had very little experience in anything other than conversation, and the present law should be continued to eliminate the dream factor. The National Grange desires the present legislation being continued unless some more acceptable form of program is offered. The Farm Bureau is for the reciprocal trade program, evidently desiring to preserve the provisions of section 22 of the AAA Act which has been used to place embargoes on cotton and wheat imports to the exclusion of other agricultural products produced above the Mason and Dixon's line. The Farmers Union, by its testimony, is in favor of going backward, by allowing a further reduction of duties on agricultural imports and not voicing any objection to the proposals for lowering the import duties on butter and cheese.

Perhaps it would be wonderful in the eyes of some people if Australia, South Africa, and Uruguay would furnish all of the wool needed in this country; if Switzerland would furnish all the watches; if India would furnish all of the textiles; if Argentina would furnish all of the meat and dairy products; if Canada would furnish all of the paper; if Czechoslovakia would furnish all of the glass; if Japan would furnish all of the pottery, and if Russia would furnish all of the furs. Most thinking people realize it is high time that we take steps to keep our country economically strong and solvent by showing more respect for the United States Treasury.

Surely, I realize that the President desires the power rather than having it placed in the capable hands of the Tariff Commission. The Secretary of Agriculture desires the power to say just how many acres of cotton a farmer can grow. Power grabbing seems to be the order of the day, and I believe that if Thomas Jefferson were to come back to life he would not feel at home among the power-hungry officers of this administration. The only color of ink that the New Deal knew was red, and from all appearances the Fair Deal will place us further in the red.

Perhaps the unemployed are already aware of the fact that the Eightieth Congress was not as bad as pictured. The farmers also, when they compare their farm incomes for January 1947 and January 1948 with January 1949, will realize that the Eightieth Congress, who for the first time in 20 years kept the country solvent, was a pretty good Congress.

Let us not forget that in August 1939, the seventh year of the more abundant life, the farmer received 5 cents plus per pound for his hogs, 8 cents plus per pound for his cotton, 54 cents per bushel for his wheat, and that most of his milk brought less than 3 cents per quart. And do not forget that we had 10,000,000 people unemployed.

Neither the domestic nor the foreign agricultural programs have accomplished much for agriculture. Today we are faced with a further weakening of the economic structure of this country through the disastrously low farm prices, ever-decreasing pay rolls, and ever-increasing bankruptcies. Why add millions more to the list of unemployed?

I hope that this committee will remember some of these things that you have given me the privilege of presenting to you.

A Great Southerner Speaks on Segregation in the South and How It Works—Joe Louis Declares "While It's True I Was Born in Alabama, I Never Even Heard of 'Segregation,' 'Discrimination,' and 'Jim Crowism' Until My Family Moved Up North, Into Detroit"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia, nor do these United States, have any finer nor higher type of citizen than Mr. C. C. Carlin, Jr., president and editor of the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette. Of old Virginian forebears, there is none more eminent, more scholarly, studious or better acquainted with the social and economic problems of our great Southland—than is that distinguished son of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to my colleagues that on February 5 in the year of 1784—more than 3 years before the Constitution of these United States was ratified and yes—more than 7 years before the adoption of the Bill of Rights—the Alexandria Gazette was recognized as "the voice of the people," "the news organ" of the cotton-, the corn-, and tobacco-producing Southern Colonies, which were destined to later become members of the Federal States.

Then, as now, that publication stood as the champion of a democratic form of government at a time and in a world in which the word "democracy" was little known and infrequently used.

Mr. Speaker, contemplate with me a hand-printed newspaper, the existence of which more than spans the life of this Nation. Then, as now, it was published in the little town of Alexandria, and at a time when Alexandria, Va.—located on the Potomac River at the head of Chesapeake Bay—was considered a great inland maritime port—serving an English colony in the New World across the seas from the mother country.

The District of Columbia had not been blueprinted. The city of Washington as we know it today was not in existence. The building of the Capitol of the United States—on the banks of the Potomac—was not then even a dream of our founding fathers.

What still remains of old Georgetown—named after the British monarch—its shops, its docks, flour mills, mill streams, houses, cobblestone streets—comprehended all of the improvements that had been wrought in the shape of a city development on the Maryland bank of the Potomac River.

From the day of its inception, the Alexandria Gazette, southern in its every sentiment, bridged the difficulties then existent between the northern and southern colonies. From the time it was established, in 1784, and for the duration of the century that followed, it did much to compromise the economic differences which existed between the States in the early years of this Nation. Even though its type, its presses, and all other equipment was destroyed and its building burned to the ground in the subsequent War Between the States, the steadfast family who published the Gazette returned to the old site and built upon the ashes that were left a new, bolder, and ever more steadfast Alexandria Gazette.

There they fought the good fight of our southern people, not alone during the dark days of reconstruction but in all the days up to and including the new era of the twentieth century.

The Honorable C. C. Carlin, Sr., was born in Alexandria, Va., April 8, 1866. He attended the public schools of that little cosmopolitan city as well as the Alexandria Academy. He studied law and graduated from National University Law School, Washington, D. C.; was admitted to the bar in 1891 and began the practice of law in his home city. He was postmaster at Alexandria from 1893 to 1897 and was elected as a Member of this House to fill the vacancy caused by the death of John F. Rixey in the second session of the Sixtieth Congress.

He was reelected to the Sixty-first, Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth, and Sixty-sixth Congresses wherein he served with honor and distinction to himself, his constituency and our country. He resigned the Sixty-sixth Congress to resume the practice of law.

Our distinguished colleague—one of the most able men ever to have served in this body—your good friend and my good friend—the Honorable Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, has long and capably served his people from the very district that was formerly represented by Mr. Carlin.

Several years prior to his death—agreeable to his meticulous methods of planning ahead to meet every foreseeable emergency—the Honorable C. C. Carlin, Sr., transferred the control and management of his newspaper to his son, Charles C. Carlin, Jr. The younger Mr. Carlin is today the editor of that historic publication.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, Mr. C. C. Carlin, Jr., not unlike his father is a man of great vision, great understanding and mental capabilities. He is wise in the wisdom of his distinguished forbears as well as in the wisdom that comes with years, and above all else—he is a true southerner.

He has observed—over the years—every concept of progress of both the white and colored races of the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

Likewise, he has studied the advance made by all the other States of our great South. Desirous of informing his mind still further with respect to the current relations existing between the white and colored, Mr. Carlin recently completed a trip which brought him into every State below the Mason and Dixon's line. I feel that I was fortunate in coming upon an editorial written by him. That article, though brief, is so full of truth, so replete with knowledge, written by one possessed of such an understanding mind and with such a full and complete grasp of the problems involved, that I want to direct it to the attention of my every colleague here in this House.

Mr. Speaker, we have so many members who have not had an opportunity of probing deeply into the question of the so-called civil-rights bill, that I am persuaded it would be helpful for all—and especially to all new Members—if they had an opportunity to read this editorial written by a great southerner.

Mr. Speaker, agreeable to that thought, I, therefore, ask the unanimous consent of this House to insert this editorial in the RECORD of our proceedings and as part of my remarks.

I present it together with another equally enlightening article written by the distinguished Mr. Davis Lee, the respected Negro publisher and associate editor of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, and some excerpts from an article written by Mr. George S. Schuyler, associate editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, another of the large Negro newspapers in these United States.

I wish all would read what these distinguished savants say apropos of a highly controversial question which I fear will shortly be brought before this body for discussion and debate.

The articles referred to are as follows:

HOW IS SEGREGATION WORKING IN THE SOUTH?

The recent political campaign and President Truman's support of the so-called civil-rights proposals plus the fact that these bills will meet with strong opposition in the next Congress has focused the spotlight on the important question, How is segregation working in the South?

Your editor, who was born and has spent his entire life in Virginia, has observed the progress of both races under our State laws. Likewise, he has observed the progress in other States of the deep South. This writer, seeking first-hand information, recently visited North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana, where he had an opportunity to study and observe existing conditions as well as the relationship between the two races.

We have never believed that any laws were perfect because they are laws but we feel that southern segregation laws, based on mutual understanding, provide the best possible approach toward the solution of the controversial race relationship.

In these days of abundant transportation, high wages, and full employment, it is self-evident that the majority of our American Negroes have chosen the South as a good place in which to live or 11,000,000 of the 14,000,000 in the United States would not reside here.

In each State we found the friendliest relationship between the two races. All busy, working together for their joint benefit and for the most part law abiding and contented.

In the cotton States, where the dollar goes further, we were astonished to find that a cotton picker was paid $4 per 100 pounds and that an expert could pick four to five hundred pounds per day. In most places the picking season lasts 6 months. In fact, during the picking season it is extremely difficult for others to obtain help because of the high earnings available in the fields.

Many of these Negro workers own their own homes, farms, profitable shops of all kinds, banks, newspapers, taxicab companies, as well as every conceivable kind of a business.

To top it all, we discovered the town of Mound Bayou, Miss., with a population of approximately 3,000 entirely colored, where

white people come to trade but it is said that the sun never sets on a white person in that community. This is truly segregation in reverse.

In New Orleans, and other large southern cities, there are numerous Negro night spots and clubs and we have yet to find the first white man who was ever entertained in any of them. We know of a prominent white theatrical agent who tried every means to obtain admission to the Negro clubs, but who was politely told "this is a Negroes' club, white folks are not admitted."

Many of the well-to-do Negro merchants will tell you that they prefer segregation and credit it largely for their success. They contend that if segregation were abolished that they would lose most of their trade to white competitors.

There are a few lower class whites, usually newcomers to that locality, who are antagonistic to the Negro and who say they should all be sent back to Africa. Some Negroes are irked by segregation but their main complaint seems to be leveled at the school system where they say the white children have the best of it but most of these freely admit that colored schools in the South have greatly improved during the past 10 years and are still improving.

Very few Negroes are disturbed by the poll tax and those who want to vote are able to do so without difficulty.

We did not find any Negroes who were afraid of lynching, in fact we could not find a single Negro who had ever seen a lynching, or had a friend or acquaintance lynched. All told us that they believed the police officers treated them fairly and that when there was trouble with the law it was invariably the fault of the violator.

In the light of our recent experience in the South, we sincerely wish that President Truman and the others who are urging the passage of the force bills which in our opinion would put an end to the progress being made between the races in the South—would make a personal survey on race relations in the Southern States. If the sponsors are sincere when they say that the purpose of these bills is to aid the Negro race, they should welcome the facts.

The December 1948 issue of the American magazine carries a lead story, which every American should read, written by a Negro executive, son of a slave, entitled "What America Means to Me."

The author, Charles C. Spaulding, is president of the $131,000,000 North Carolina Mutual Insurance Co. and is also the president of a bank which has $5,000,000 in resources.

In this article, he states in part:

"Some of the northern newspapers report only episodes of violence and bitterness of the South but the great news in the South today is that increasing number of men of good will of all complexions are working together amicably for the greater prosperity and well-being of all.

"They are successful in a spectacular way. Anyone who still thinks of people of my race as Uncle Remuses will be startled to learn that last year they had a total income of $10,000,000,000 which I will wager would rival the entire income of the people of any one of several countries in Europe today."

Elsewhere on this page we are reproducing two articles which were written by George Schuyler, associate editor of the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest Negro newspapers in the country, who visited the South to secure first-hand information on conditions pertaining to the races. We are also reproducing a recent editorial dealing with the racial problem by Editor Davis Lee, publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, another Negro publication with a large circulation.

We believe these articles are unbiased and ably present the viewpoint of the well-informed Negroes of good will of our Nation.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following article was written by Davis Lee, Negro publisher of the Newark (N. J.) Telegram, one of the large Negro publications in the United States.)

President Harry S. Truman returned to Washington this week from a much deserved vacation at Key West, Fla. However, during his southern sojourn, our Chief Executive held many conferences with important national figures, and during one of his confabs he announced that he intends to push his civil-rights program.

This causes one to question Mr. Truman's knowledge of the race situation in these United States. Again one wonders if the President hasn't misconstrued the victory which he received November 2. He says that his election was a mandate from the people to carry out the platform of the Democratic Party. Of course, every right-thinking person knows that Mr. Truman was elected because the Republican Party's record was so rotten that the masses feared another depression if Dewey had gotten in. Many southerners who opposed most of the party's platform voted for Mr. Truman because they felt that the Democratic Party would do more for the people—the common man.

One is inclined to wonder if the President is sincere in his declaration of intention, or is he vindictive or just plain bullheaded? If he is sincere then he should familiarize himself with the facts. He should read Joe Louis' life story which has been running in Life magazine.

Joe made a very significant statement which all advocates of civil rights should read. He declared that even though he was born in Alabama, he had never heard about segregation, discrimination, and Jim Crowism until his family moved to Detroit.

Does Mr. Truman and the advocates of civil rights know that millions of Negroes in the South are not affected by segregation and discrimination? Does he realize that by custom and choice the Negroes stay with their own and the whites do likewise? The southern white man has forced the southern Negro to do business with his own to the extent that in Georgia, Negroes own $61,000,000 worth of business. This is not true in any northern or eastern State.

Does Mr. Truman know that Negroes in 15 Southern States own and control more cash and real property than the Negroes in the rest of the Nation?

And despite this glowing picture of Negro success and achievement, the South has many shortcomings—it still perpetrates many injustices upon the Negro, but a Federal civil-rights law will not correct these evils and cure its racial ills.

The South is still the poorest section of our Nation, and it is only human that southern whites will provide better schools, hospitals, etc., for their own than for Negroes. After all, they carry the bulk of the tax load.

If Mr. Truman would foster a program of financial aid to the South like he has to Europe, and with no more strings attached, in a decade it would become a paradise, the land of milk and honey. Ever since the War Between the States the rest of the Nation has criticized, condemned, and taken unfair advantage of the South. Northern agitators who have never been south, and who know absolutely nothing about the fine race relations which exist between the two races, persist in spreading false propaganda.

Mr. Truman's civil-rights program calls for a Federal FEPC, antilynch law, and the repeal of the poll tax. No Federal law is necessary to force southern whites to employ Negroes. They employ more Negroes than are employed by northern whites. In fact you can't find one creditable business in the South which does not employ Negroes.

Last week I was in North and South Caroline where I saw thousands of buildings going up and I saw more Negro carpenters on the buildings than whites. This is true throughout the South, but it is not true in the North. It is hard for a Negro to get a job above that of a hod carrier in these parts.

Last week in the Tidewater area of Virginia I saw more Negroes at work on the ferries than whites. The ferries from Cape Charles to Little Creek are without question the largest in the world, and the entire stewards department is manned by Negroes. These Negroes are so completely in charge that they decide what the white people must eat.

A few weeks ago when I was in Mississippi several white businessmen told me that they employ more Negroes than whites. Then what is the purpose of Mr. Truman's FEPC bill? Such a bill would no doubt anger the South to such an extent that millions of Negroes now employed would be thrown out of work.

As for the antilynch bill, it appears that we are getting ready to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. There are no lynchings now, and why pass a law to antagonize a people who seem to have the situation well in hand?

I don't believe that Mr. Truman is more interested in the repeal of the poll tax than the Governors and many of the Representatives of the poll tax States. Practically every newspaper in the South is for repeal of the poll tax, but all resent outside interference and northern pressure. The poll tax in the several Southern States does not deny unqualified Negroes the use of the ballot any more than it does whites who cannot qualify. Even southerners feel that while many ignorant Negroes and whites cannot use the franchise intelligently, that the law nevertheless should be repealed. And it will be repealed, but not by force.

Before attempting to force through a Federal civil rights law to change the customs of the South, Mr. Truman should straighten out the liberal North. If he wants to end segregation and discrimination, why not start with the YMCA and YWCA and the Christian church?

Notre Dame is a religious university, but it will not accept Negro students. There are few summer resorts in the East or North that do not advertise that their places are restricted, which means no Jews are allowed.

Does Mr. Truman know that New Jersey has an FEPC and a civil rights law, and that both are a joke. Hundreds of big companies still refuse to employ Negroes; that no white hotels in south Jersey will even permit a Negro to drink a Coca-Cola much less spend the night.

Not long ago the New Jersey State Elks held their annual convention in Salem, N. J., and every white restaurant in town closed up during the 3-day confab to keep from serving Negroes.

Someone should remind our Chief Executive of the existence of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The complete enforcement of existing laws will give every one of us, little and big, full protection of our rights as American citizens.

If our President and the advocates of civil rights are in favor of changing the customs of this Nation, they will have to use a different approach. Congress can't do it. However, a well rounded program of education will remove all racial barriers in about 200 years from now.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following are excerpts from an article written by Associate Editor George S. Schuyler, of the Pittsburgh Courier, one of the largest Negro newspapers in the United States:)

Now that we are through with the election, I think we should begin to give more attention to the South and the changes taking place there which are all for the better from the viewpoint of the nearly 11,000,000 Negroes who call it home. We should consider what

are the opportunities for our people there and how they can be utilized to the best advantage, since over three-quarters of the Negroes live there and, from all appearances, always will.

Certainly our people are not taking advantage of the available opportunities in that area where the majority of them elect to live. For all of its faults, it is a good country in which to live, and is getting better. After a recent turn through 14 States of the South (an area with which I have been familiar since 1926) it strikes me that, as elsewhere, the biggest handicap Negroes are encountering is themselves.

Most of what is said and written about the South is untrue. Today it is not a place of terror and persecution, nor has it been in many decades. I am always amused when friends express fear and sympathy because I am going South, assuming wrongly that I am endangering my life. Actually I think no more of visiting the heart of Mississippi or Texas or South Carolina than I do about visiting Minnesota, Maine, or New Mexico.

Contrasted with the rock-ribbed prejudices and persecutions in comparable areas elsewhere, the tolerance on display in the South today is little short of amazing. Moreover, most southern white people of prominence in every State are apologetic about these shortcomings and the less timid are sincerely trying to better conditions. For this they should get far more credit than professional propagandists are wont to give them.

There is little or no evidence that the Negroes anywhere in the South are terrorized and none that I have talked with say so. They don't like to be barred from public places or public activities, and there is deep resentment against color discrimination. But they are not hopeless and despairing, any more than the Negroes in most of the areas outside the South who are subjected to racial proscription. Southern schools for Negroes are not up to the local white standards and certainly not up to the national standards, but any honest observer who has visited Dixie periodically can see and must admit that there have been vast improvements in physical plants and teachers' quality and pay. Swarms of Negroes are graduating from high schools and colleges.

It is my sincere opinion that the more widely southern Negroes apply themselves to these economic fundamentals and become more firmly rooted in the southern economy the easier will the sociopolitical problems be solved. I find no unanimity among southern whites on what should be done about these problems. In some areas I do not think it would be difficult even to get repeals of the Jim Crow laws regarding transportation—if the campaign were intelligently directed by Negroes in the areas concerned, with outside Negroes and whites staying far in the background.

Other (and most) areas would be tougher to crack, but it is sounder strategy to work on the more tolerant areas first and win over some than to antagonize the whole South by loud, mud-slinging campaigns directed from the East and North which accomplish nothing.

United Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress will shortly give consideration to the matter of enacting a long-range farm program for American agriculture. This legislation will be of vital importance to the future economy of our country, and therefore, we must be placed in a position to secure the best available thought as to the needs and desires of American farmers.

A few years ago a group of farmers in the Middle West organized the United Farmers of America. One of the sponsors of the organization was Martin B. Tongen, of Zumbrota, Minn., now president of the organization in my home State. Mr. Tongen is a dirt farmer. He knows what it means to till the soil and produce the food.

The United Farmers of Minnesota held its annual meeting last November, and for the benefit of my colleagues in both House and Senate I am including, as a part of these remarks, the address made by Mr. Tongen at the annual meeting. I am convinced that the members of the Committee on Agriculture and other Members of the House will welcome the opportunity of reading Mr. Tongen's speech, and also of noting with particular care the resolutions passed at the annual meeting.

ADDRESS OF MARTIN B. TONGEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FARMERS OF MINNESOTA, INC., AT ZUMBROTA, MINN.

I feel honored in being the first State president to welcome you to a Minnesota State meeting of the United Farmers Organization.

Our Goodhue County unit being the largest local in this State, decided at our last annual meeting to become incorporated as the United Farmers of Minnesota. A State constitution was drawn up by your board of directors who were authorized to do this work. This constitution was drawn up in accordance with the national constitution adopted at our first annual meeting in January 1947. The constitution and bylaws were left with Attorney Melroy Rockne, who began the procedure of setting up our articles of incorporation and was to procure our incorporation papers for the organization.

There are few, if any, of us who realize the importance and influence of our organization and the importance of the words spoken and the ideas brought forth here today and the resolutions to be adopted.

There are a great many true friends of the farmers in Congress and in our legislature. These men are looking to organizations such as ours, because ideas born here and action taken here truly reflect the thinking and wishes of the grass-roots foundation of our country from the great dirt farmer of America.

As national vice president of the United Farmers of America for 1948, I have been surprised again and again by the importance of this organization, although we are comparatively small. We are considered as truly representative of the farmer, since we are a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization with no class, race, or religious prejudice, and probably most important—no commercial activities or entanglements.

I have received letters from individuals and organizations in several States who are interested and in favor of our organizations. For example, I will read you a letter from E. E. Gelhaus, Webster, S. Dak.

Before I read the letter I want to read a write-up from the Minneapolis Tribune that Mr. Gelhaus wrote:

"FARMER WON'T ACCEPT CUT ON HIS PRODUCTS FIRST

"Your editorial of Sunday, August 29, dealing with agricultural support is very convincing on one point, namely, the Minneapolis Tribune or Star hasn't changed a bit since World War I, and even though it is entirely dependent upon its agricultural environment it continues to select agriculture as the one which it believes can offer least resistance and upon whom it may lay the burden of feeding and clothing a nation at a price to the farmer far below cost of production and below the parity production and below cost of production and below the parity of price paid other industries.

"In other words you still think you can find someone so dumb, ignorant, and disorganized as to be willing to take the short end in the economic struggle and you think agriculture should be the victim so that all other factions may be appeased.

"Farmers assure the Nation full production at 90 percent parity (the equivalent of 10 percent less than other industry) but you suggest it should be lowered at once to a possible 60 percent.

"For your information, farmers will yield on prices only when others do likewise. Your paper quotes its subscription 40 cents a week, daily and Sunday. You may cut this 40 percent and then you may come back and talk to us.

"Yes, we know print paper was raised three times in less than a year. So have there been continuous price raises on the items a farmer must purchase and use in production of a crop; you are no exception.

"And since we live in the same world it would be senseless and needless for you to say 'you don't have to buy a Tribune if you don't want to.' We might answer you, 'you don't need to eat our bread or meat (until you understand hunger)' if that is what you have in mind.

"My observation causes me to say that it would be very wise for some people to quickly learn that it is going to be dangerous to hit the farmer below the belt a second time and that goes for any party or any group.

"ERNEST E. GELHAUS,
"Webster, S. Dak."

I wrote Mr. Gelhaus and complimented him on this write-up, and he answered me with the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1948.

DEAR MR. TONGEN: Please accept my thanks for your kind letter of September 13. Naturally I do like to learn how others think and your applause was much appreciated. You guessed right. My son and I farm about 1,000 acres of South Dakota land. We grow grains, flax, wheat, barley, oats, corn, etc., hogs, cattle, beef and dairy, so we do know a bit about farming. On top of that I am chairman of Day County AAA and have been for about 15 years. Personally know every farmer in my country, some 2,500. I belong to numerous farm organizations, Farm Bureau and Farmers Union, but often disagree with both. I'm an independent Republican, a Methodist, and a Gideon, and my hobby is fighting the wrong and supporting what is right, let the chips fall where they may. Also have appeared at numerous Senate and House hearings. Most of them do as they please after the hearings. My opinion of the Aiken bill is that its a left-handed way of making certain that the farmer is supported at no more than 60 percent of parity when he needs it most. If there are only 100 apples for a crowd of 100 men you don't need supports, it will take care of itself; if there are only 90 apples for the same crowd there is a grand scramble for apples and its resultant price upswing, but when there are 125 apples, that's when we need the support.

From what you tell me your gang seems to see the picture as I do; however, I don't know how I can intelligently belong to it.

I'm going to send you copies of advertisements that I've been running the past 6 weeks. Educating the public and putting would-be candidates on the spot so that if they open their mouths about agriculture they'd better be right.

Thanking you sincerely.

ERNEST E. GELHAUS.

Here is another letter I received through the organization of the State commissioners of agriculture of which R. A. Trovalten, our commissioner of agriculture in this State, is a member.

Mr. Richard G. Hedges, chairman of the agriculture committee of the Washington State Grange is a column writer for the Grange News, published in Seattle, Wash.

I am going to reproduce here Mr. Hodge's column in said News of March 20 as a worthwhile illustration of how he handles his subject matters; it follows:

"WORTHY PATRONS: I wish it were possible for me to impress upon the farmers the important position they hold in our national economy. It was the farmers of America who wrote the Constitution of the United States, of which we are all so proud. If they are capable of such an accomplishment, surely they should be able to manage their own affairs without too much governmental interference.

"Without a stable and prosperous American Agriculture our Nation cannot prosper. If agricultural income drops, our national income goes down proportionately. Past records prove without a doubt that the direct ratio of farm income to national income is 1 to 7. It also proves that factory pay roll increases or lowers in almost exact proportion to farm income.

"The reason for this is that the factory pay roll is dependent upon the marketing and processing of agricultural production, and agriculture still produces 65 percent of the value of all raw materials. Instead of trying to solve our problems from the top down, we should start at the bottom or foundation (which is agriculture) and work up. This would permit our natural economic laws to function. A depression in the United States is nothing more than too low a price to agriculture, which in turn depresses or lowers the income of all other groups.

"Farm income in 1932 amounted to $5,300,000,000 which was a drop of $6,000,000,000 below the 1928 income. Factory pay roll dropped over $5,000,000,000 during the same period and national income dropped just seven times as much as the farm income, or $42,000,000,000.

"National income and factory pay rolls always drop about 6 months after farm income drops, which shows how important it is to industry and labor that farm income should never fall below the average cost of production. Artificial Government price control is not the answer; the consumer must pay the price for the commodity at the market place.

"With an abundant production of farm commodities at prices which are fair to both producer and consumer (average cost of production) as a floor price, we cannot have a depression. The farmers have a right, and should exert that right if they want national prosperity, to establish a floor price for their production which is sold on the domestic market and based upon the average cost. They should sell their surplus on the world markets at world prices, which is all the world markets can afford to pay.

"With a stop-loss price on the domestic portion of our production and an increase of production at that level, our national prosperity would be assured."

I wish to say that the Commissioners of Agriculture with headquarters in Washington, D. C., have been very helpful to our organization in supplying us with information about national affairs, and such men as Commissioner Tom Linder, of Georgia, and Commissioner MacDonald, of Texas, have put up such a good fight for the cause of the farmer that they have been unjustly attacked by our Government because of pressure exerted on some Government officials by international traders who have a great influence on our Government policies.

William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State and now adviser to Secretary of State Marshall, and former Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, former stockholders and directors of the Anderson, Clayton & Co., have had and still have a great personal interest in international trading. I wish to read an item from the Washington Post dated October 22, 1948:

"CLAYTON FIRM TOPS ALL IN ECA TRANSACTIONS

"(By the United Press)

"ECA disclosed yesterday that the cotton firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co. sold more than $28,000,000 worth of recovery cotton to China and France during August.

"The firm engaged in 360 deals for cottonseed cake and Brazilian peanut cake to lead all companies in the number of transactions financed by ECA during August.

"William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State and now an adviser to Secretary of State Marshall, once was board chairman of the company, the largest cotton merchants' outfit in the country.

"He reiterated that his present position with the firm is strictly that of a stockholder. He repeated that he resigned as board chairman in August 1940, when he first went to work for the State Department.

"Clayton disclosed he is leaving the Department in a few days to go back to the company. He added, however that he did not know whether he would resume his former post of board chairman.

"The Clayton family reportedly owns more than 40 percent of the stock of the company.

"ECA's statement listed some 350 companies which have received ERP business. Most of them were American firms but a number were foreign competitors."

Will Clayton also represented this country at the International Trade Organization meeting at Geneva, Switzerland. It is plain to see he has a personal interest in these international agreements such as the reciprocal trade agreement, the European recovery plan, and the international wheat agreement. We have other internationalists with great influence in Congress and our State Department who also would like to reduce our farm prices to a world level and also our standard of living to a world standard.

Some of the principal accomplishments of our United Farmers Organization, State and National, were aimed squarely against these traders.

1. We had a hand in influencing Congress to pass a law limiting the power of the President in making treaties, which power he received during wartime under the reciprocal trade agreements. Under the new law, he can only make a treaty for 1 year's duration and that is subject to the Senate's approval. Formerly he had power to make a treaty for a 3-year period.

By passing a resolution at the national convention at Oelwein, Iowa, last December from each organized State we accomplished our purpose as I just explained.

2. We were the major influence in convincing Congress to reject the international wheat agreement. The information concerning this you can read on the paper we will pass out to you.

Here we find the three largest farm organizations testifying in favor of the international wheat agreement. They were the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, and the National Grange.

But our comparatively small organization sent five men to Washington to testify against this proposed treaty, and consequently the treaty was rejected because it was found the farmers were not in favor of this agreement.

Results such as this give us faith in our organization and its members. However, it is understood this matter will come up again before the next Congress, and probably we will have the fight all over again.

Here are some proposed resolutions that are to be acted upon at this meeting. I think it best to act on them again, the afternoon session also to pass on them before they are adopted.

"PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS FOR MINNESOTA UNITED FARMERS FIRST STATE CONVENTION

"To the Congress of the United States and the State Department we submit the following resolutions adopted at the first State convention of the United Farmers of Minnesota held at Wanamingo, Goodhue County, Minn., November 13, 1948.

"We resolve that—

"1. The Department of Agriculture be made entirely independent from any single farm organization both through its Extension Bureau and through its Government policies.

"2. The cost of producing any agricultural product must be the primary basis for determining the support price for that product and that a cost of production floor price for agricultural products will support the national welfare, by encouraging full production, and by providing a demand for this full production.

"3. Family labor be given the same consideration as hired labor in determining the cost of labor under any price support program for agricultural products, and that farm labor shall have a minimum weekly wage scale equal to that of any other worker's minimum-wage scale for productive labor.

"This action will favor the family-sized farm in opposition to the corporation farm where hired help is recognized.

"4. Our Government must reject the proposed international wheat agreement, since it will force prices far below cost of production and greatly lower the standard of living in this country.

"5. The Federal tax on oleomargarine, colored to imitate butter, be continued at the present rate.

"6. A sufficiently high tariff be levied on competing imported agricultural products to raise their price to a level equal to the cost of production floor price of agricultural products raised in this country, and that this extra revenue be used to help support the cost of production floor price here in this country. This action will help to eliminate surpluses caused by importing foreign raised agricultural products at lower prices than they can be raised here.

"7. Purchase must stop of agricultural products raised in foreign countries to be given away under the European recovery plan, when the same products constitute a surplus in our country.

"8. The proposed plan of socialized medicine is undemocratic, unworkable, and will continue to increase regimentation in this country.

"9. The Aiken long-range farm program be repealed since it makes certain that the farmer's prices are supported at no more than 60 percent of parity when he needs it the most. Surpluses are not made by too great production but by Government action."

(All unanimously adopted.)

Hall Survey Shows Lack of Enthusiasm for Farm Price Supports When Our Dairymen Are Left Out in the Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, as I said previously in discussing the Hall survey of New York's Thirty-seventh Congressional District,

an honest poll is the only kind to conduct. What I want is the truth in finding out how people feel. What good would anything less be?

During the Eightieth Congress, I was set upon by vociferous newspapers because I voted for price supports for our farmers. They took up the cudgel for the consuming public in the Triple Cities and attempted to put me in the middle.

At the time it was well known that the policy of the country was to encourage excess production to supply Europe with all the food and necessities of life for which her population was so sorely pressed.

Knowing that our farmers could not possibly meet these accelerated demands without the utmost of encouragement from the Government, I went along with the price-support program. I did so even in the face of condemnation from the consumers who were told that the price-support program was the main reason for high food prices.

Today, I am submitting the results of the Hall survey for the third question I asked the voters of my district, namely, "Do you want me to vote for or against price support for the farmers?"

Percentages

	For	Against
Triple Cities area	44.8	55.2
Rural	56.5	43.5
Broome	47.3	52.7
City, Norwich	49.6	50.4
Rural	54.6	45.4
Chenango	52.6	47.4
City, Oneida and Canastota	29.9	70.1
Rural	67.6	32.4
Madison	52.4	47.6
Over-all district	48.5	51.5

You will be interested in learning that opinions seem pretty evenly divided in both the city and rural sections. It is obvious that no hard and fast trend can be discerned from these percentages. To me the answer is not clear-cut by any means. The task, therefore, which remains for me is to sift the pros and cons, to draw conclusions that will serve the best interest of all the people.

When I voted for price supports last year, I was accused of being subservient to the midwest and western farm bloc, and not representing northeastern agriculture at all. Be that as it may, there was little incentive to subscribe to the price-support program so far as my own dairymen went. I never was enthusiastic about it on that score.

Whether the bureaucrats here in Washington know it or not, our dairy people are being threatened by the dairy products of the Middle West. I have talked with several men close to our Northeast farmers who predict a considerable falling off of our milk prices in the near future.

If that prediction should come true, it can only mean one thing. Our dairy industry in the Northeast is going to be seriously jeopardized. I cannot stand idly by if such is to be the case.

The big cities of America cannot exist without our dairy farmers. Their populations must be sustained by the dairy industry. Nor can the food program under the Marshall plan be carried out on a full scale. There can be no Army or Navy either without the products of the cow to supply our armed forces.

If prices of milk and other dairy items which are today keeping the farmer in business continue to go down, dairymen ought to be included in any new farm-support-price program. Why should the most important part of agriculture be excluded from participation in something as basic and fundamental as an over-all system of paying support prices, if such is the policy of the land?

In view of the Hall survey which shows a slight margin in favor of opponents to the price-support program, I conclude there is no set issue as yet crystallized in our section on this subject. I am, therefore, all the more free to vote as I please.

My inclination at this time is to vote against the whole price-support program. Unless our Northeast dairy people are allowed to participate in such a plan in the event a possible collapse of eastern dairy prices may be in the offing, I refuse to go along.

My position, in this event, would be no different than on prior occasions. I never could see where the big butter and egg men of the West ever realized the dairymen in up-State New York existed. I have yet to be shown how we have been helped by any of the grandiose schemes the Department of Agriculture hatches up for agriculture in general.

Ours are the family size dairy farms and we have to compete against mass production, giant farm combines, and heavy farm machinery. My attitude toward the whole agricultural picture is wait and see what they offer the Northeast. Call this sectionalism if you like, but I am down here in Congress to fight for the fellows who support me and who need assistance if winter comes.

Address of Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, at Thirtieth Annual Meeting, Mississippi Valley Association, February 7, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers, before the thirtieth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1949, to wit:

During my tour of duty as Chief of Engineers, it has been my great pleasure—and privilege—to address each annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association. However, with my term of office now rapidly drawing to a close, today probably will be my last official appearance before you. It is an appropriate occasion, therefore, to glance back upon the road we have traveled—to survey the progress we are making today—and to renew our faith and confidence in the principles by which we work.

Much could be said of the aspirations, the struggles, and achievements we have experienced in the past. You have worked tirelessly for a greater development, conservation, and utilization of the water resources of this great valley and of the Nation. Yet it is the present that holds the tangibles which confront us today. Consequently, we should—we must—be concerned primarily with what is happening today, and with what is likely to be tomorrow.

When I first had the pleasure of addressing the Mississippi Valley Association as Chief of Engineers—in March 1946—the demobilization of our wartime military forces was rapidly being completed. We were taking a firm grip on the reins of normal peacetime living—reins which we had so quickly and so eagerly picked up following the successful conclusion of our part in the biggest and most devastating of all wars. We had hoped—and sincerely we expected—there would be a long, sunny period of peace, not only in our own land but throughout the world. Today, however, our hope has been overshadowed by unexpected difficulties—problems have arisen from the clash of world attitudes and ideologies. Our national safety has dictated a quick rebuilding of a part of our former combat strength, so that we, as a nation, will be prepared adequately to defend this country and preserve our way of life.

Yet, in the realm of civil works—works in which you are particularly interested—gratifying progress has been achieved. The development of our rivers and other water resources in the interests of navigation and allied benefits—and in the provision of greater flood control for the people of America—have been effectively resumed. Each succeeding postwar year has witnessed an acceleration of these programs.

Recently, announcement was made of the funds recommended to the Congress by the President for fiscal year 1950. I am sure that you are as pleased as I am with the requested increase in appropriations—though the current funds have been an all-time high. If the Congress should pass the 1950 budget as requested by the President, the most important advance in flood control and river and harbor works yet achieved will be made during the 1950 fiscal year.

For the coming fiscal year, the President has requested $734,000,000, to be expended on river and harbor and flood-control work by the Corps of Engineers. This figure compares favorably with current year appropriations of $580,000,000. A total of $430,000,000 is asked for general flood-control work. An additional $70,000,000 is requested for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries flood-control project. A total of $229,000,000 is asked for river and harbor work. Of the over-all total of $734,000,000, approximately $620,000,000 would be for new construction—with practically all of it for projects already under way. About $280,000,000 of this new construction money would be earmarked for the Mississippi River Basin, a proportion not out of line, due to the basin's vast geographic area and pressing needs.

I will not take your time to recite more civil-works figures in the 1950 budget now before the Congress. Any particular item you may be interested in individually may be readily obtained from the engineer officers attending this convention, or from my office. I will, however, sketch briefly some of the projects that are now under way, or which will be made possible during the next fiscal year, provided funds are made available.

On the lower Mississippi River—where no major flood has blighted the valley since initiation of the present Federal project in 1928—further important work is scheduled, including the armoring of main-stem banks to hold the unruly waters in their place. Progress in flood control also will be made

within the alluvial valley's tributary side basins.

On the upper Mississippi, substantial work will be possible on such projects as the Chain of Rocks Canal, which is located almost directly across the river from St. Louis. Construction is already well under way on this splendid engineering solution for a channel condition that has interfered to varying degrees with traffijc on the Mississippi from the earliest days of navigation. The project is scheduled to be pushed vigorously in 1950. It includes the first twelve-hundred-foot lock for the Mississippi River—a modern length lock which will permit passage without break-up of the longest tows now in service.

In the Missouri River Valley, the engineers are well along in the third year of construction on multiple-purpose projects for flood control, irrigation, navigation, hydroelectric development, and other desired public benefits. Further acceleration of work is planned for the construction of the key initial units in the basin-wide comprehensive plan. One of these units—Garrison Reservoir—will continue as our leading individual flood-control reservior, in point of funds expended in 1 year, if the 1950 appropriation is in line with the requested amount. Expenditures at Fort Randall Reservoir will be only slightly less.

In the Ohio River Basin, significant work is planned regarding the replacement of obsolete structures in the canalized waterways. We propose to continue—and expand—construction of the new locks on the Monongahela River at Pittsburgh and Morgantown. We also propose to initiate construction on the Cheatham lock and dam, on the Cumberland River near Nashville, Tenn. This project will replace three locks almost 50 years old.

In addition to actual construction, considerable advance planning is also underway on projects authorized for the Mississippi River Basin. This planning includes such important projects as the comprehensive development of the Arkansas River Basin. Planning is also being continued on reservoir units of the Red River below Denison Dam project.

Our completed reports on proposed new projects includes Mississippi River Basin improvements that have received widespread attention. One such proposed improvement is the construction of a tidewater seaway from the Gulf of Mexico to New Orleans.

Another investigation recently completed involves flood control, drainage, and water supply for the rice-producing Bayou Meto-Grand Prairie region in Arkansas. This proposed improvement contemplates using the augmented flow of the White River—made possible by authorized flood-control reservoirs on that stream—to replenish the diminishing water supplies of a unique agricultural region. It is an excellent example of flood control, drainage, and water supply improvements being combined to effect the full conservation and development of the water resources of an area. My report on this proposed project has been completed, and is now before the Bureau of the Budget, prior to going to Congress.

Of the many investigations which the Corps of Engineers is currently undertaking in the Mississippi River Basin, there is wide interest in the proposed Lake Erie and Ohio River Canal, and the proposed improved Illinois and Mississippi Canal. Both of these important projects have been recommended by our division engineers, and are now before the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors.

Progress continues to be made also in bringing to the service of the Nation the added, or secondary, benefits that result from our multiple-purpose projects. Hydroelectric power is perhaps the most important incidental benefit from such projects. In December last, the Dale Hollow project in the Cumberland River Basin began to develop and deliver hydroelectric power. It became the fifth of our multiple-purpose projects with electric power units to reach the production stage. And in the 1950 budget, special consideration has been given to those multiple-purpose projects whose benefits include power production for areas now deficient in power facilities.

From what I have said, you will understand, not only that we are making progress, but that we also may find satisfaction in the realization that our projects are steadily being completed—are bringing their benefits to the people of this generation, as well as to those who will come after us. With the funds requested for 1950, the Engineers will be able to complete 59 flood-control projects. Moreover, an analysis of the 157 general flood-control projects in the 1950 budget will show that the benefits to the Nation during the projects' assumed life will exceed their cost by more than $5,000,000,000. That is a good investment.

Navigation, too, is benefiting from the steady improvement being brought to our waterways. In the calendar year 1947 the total water-borne commerce of the United States reached an all-time record of 760,000,000 tons. This is an increase of more than 100,000,000 tons above the previous high, reached in 1941. And advance figures indicate that 1948 surpassed even 1947's record total. On the inland waterways of the United States—excluding the Great Lakes—the 1947 traffic aggregated 34,000,000,000 ton-miles—also a new all-time record. Of this record total, the Mississippi River system provided the major share, contributing 23,000,000,000 ton-miles. Volume on the Great Lakes in 1947 totaled 112,000,000,000 ton-miles—just a share under the all-time high recorded in 1941.

These are encouraging figures. Moreover, additional statistics—which I shall not recite—are indicative of the fruitful benefits resulting from other phases of our comprehensive programs, both here in the Mississippi River Basin and throughout the Nation. It should be remembered that in all our planning there is sought a balanced utilization of all the benefits and resources within a river's basin. Under this type of full utilization individual uses often can be achieved at far less cost than if each purpose were developed independently.

It is justly the province of Congress to make all decisions regarding the agencies, the methods, and procedures to be used and followed in developing our great river basins. However, it is my considered opinion that if full consideration is given to the democratic procedures and basin-wide methods, now being followed, there shall be no hasty, future discarding of a system which has served us exceedingly well in the past and which is continuing to provide rich benefits today.

I should like to underline the reference to democratic procedures. You are all well versed in the Corps of Engineers' present—and historical—policy of working closely with the people in the initiation, investigation, and construction of your Federal Government's projects for navigation, flood-control, and allied purposes. But let me remind you of the democratic method which we continue to follow in the working out of our major basin-wide plans.

An example is the Missouri River Basin, for which Congress has authorized a comprehensive plan of development. The plan includes flood control, navigation, drainage, irrigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, improved land-use, forestry, recreation, fish and wildlife, industrial expansion, public health, and other conservation and development measures. To coordinate the work of the various agencies involved in the plan of development, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was established. It is composed of five Governors and five Federal representatives from the Departments of Army, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce, and from the Federal Power Commission.

Through this interagency committee, which meets once a month, the 10 States included in the Missouri River Basin and the Federal agencies involved have demonstrated that real cooperation can be achieved in the development of the resources of a great region. These problems of conserving our natural resources are being solved. The physical structures needed are being brought into existence by agencies whose superior engineering ability, efficient methods, and economy of operation have been proved over many years. Differences and conflicting interests are being resolved in a democratic manner. There is no domination by any one Federal or State agency, or a combination of agencies. There never has been, and—if we are permitted to continue our present cooperative procedure—I am confident there never will be, any domination by special interests.

Such interagency committees are operating in other major basins, and they can be established in still other basins when Congress so decrees. For the development work must—and will—continue. It must go on to help in the maintenance and progressive development of our harbors and navigable waterways, so that these arteries of commerce and sinews of defense may be of maximum value to the Nation. It is needed to help save the homes and property of our great valley areas from destructive floods. It is required to provide incentives for new industries to spring up, and for established industries to continue and to expand. It is urgently needed to increase the Nation's available supply of power for industry, and for lighting the homes of our people in every section of the land. It is needed to help maintain our tremendous agricultural production and even extend it further. It is essential, if we are to keep America strong and invincible.

This is an arresting responsibility. To meet this responsibility adequately, the cooperation of every Government agency, every association such as your own, and every citizen is needed. A method of solving basin-wide water-resources problems is already in use. Its soundness has been proven by many years of successful application. Accordingly, I believe the proper course of action is clearly indicated. Let us employ the lessons of the past in the solution of the problems of the present and of the future. Properly coordinated under the over-all authorization of the Congress of the United States, the agencies of Federal, State, and local governments can continue to provide the best engineering solutions for our water-resource problems in the future, with ever-increasing success.

I have referred to the great need of cooperation on the part of every citizen in the successful continuation of our river basins development and improvement. Particularly does this great program need the active—working—cooperation of each member of associations and other public-spirited groups, such as the Mississippi Valley Association. It is not enough to lend one's spirit, and one's moral support—though I do not undervalue this fine type of support—to such work. But it is the responsibility, and duty, of each member to express his will actively, day by day. And it is this thought, perhaps more than any other, that I should like to leave with you: The development of our rivers and harbors and of our national water resources is an individual responsibility of each of us, as citizens of a Nation whose established procedures are today the world's outstanding example of a free people living, working, and progressing together.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, behind the iron curtain religion is vigorously persecuted because religion is the strongest bulwark for resistance to tyranny. To destroy religion, therefore, is the primary objective of the Communists.

In Hungary we observe concrete evidence of this evil intent in the persecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. The injustices which he suffered should serve to put the world on notice that more of such dastardly procedure will follow unless we take stern steps now to stop such practices.

We are the most representative legislative body in the entire world. It follows, therefore, that we can be an effective instrument to combat the engulfment of justice.

The Cardinal Mindszenty incident is a matter of international concern, and should be promptly dealt with by the United Nations.

I believe that body, and indeed the whole world, should know the attitude of Congress on this very serious matter. Therefore, I have today introduced a resolution which, if adopted, would in understandable terms make known our unalterable position wherever and whenever the rights of man are violated.

Mindszenty's Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Mindszenty's Trial," which appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader, Monday, February 7, 1949. The Manchester Evening Leader is published in Manchester, N. H.

The editorial follows:

MINDSZENTY'S TRIAL

In the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, Catholic primate of Hungary, the world has another opportunity to examine the quality of Communist justice. The Catholic leader is charged with plotting against the present Red regime.

That any religious person should be opposed to the Communist policies is scarcely surprising. It would have been far more startling—and shocking—if any such spokesman favored an administration that by its very nature is hostile to religion and degrading to the dignity of man.

Cardinal Mindszenty is claimed to have confessed, because he acknowledged discussing the possibility that a new regime might emerge in Hungary should a war between Russia and the United States ever take place. If that is a crime, then even the rulers of the Kremlin must be guilty, for beyond any doubt they must have had occasion to reflect similarly.

Another terrible act admitted was the cardinal's attempt to influence the 1947 general elections in Hungary. The Communists' view that such expression is crime convicts them, not the prelate, of political sabotage. They are, in effect, declaring openly that political freedom is a farce, that under their rule Hungarians may vote only the Communist ticket—even as the tyrannized subjects of Hitler were allowed only to vote "Ja" to Nazi proposals.

One of Cardinal Mindszenty's horrible faults was the desire to flee Hungary. Most of his fellow-countrymen will understand exactly how he felt.

No liberty-loving man will be critical of another who is anxious to trade the mental and spiritual enslavement of communism for a new land where he can be free to think and vote and worship, accountable only to his own conscience.

This trial contrasted with that of the Communists in New York is a striking commentary on the difference between justice as observed in a dictatorship and in a democracy. Here, they are granted a fair trial by jury, are allowed their own attorneys, and are given every protection of the law. Such a judicial philosophy is nearly incomprehensible to Communists.

In Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty is accused of resisting a system which devours the independence of its citizens upon the greedy altar of the state. In the United States, the Communists are on trial for seeking to destroy a form of government which is dedicated to the preservation of the sanctity of the individual.

In both cases, the fundamental issue is between despotism and humanity. In one instance, the Communists are the accusers; in the other, the accused—but always they are on the side of the forces trying to destroy man's progress on the long road to civilization.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the Cleveland News of February 8, 1949, entitled "Soviet Hand, Like a Shadow, Moves To Crush a Brave Resistant":

SOVIET HAND, LIKE A SHADOW, MOVES TO CRUSH A BRAVE RESISTANT

The so-called trial at Budapest of Cardinal Mindszenty draws to the tragic farce of an outcome which was predicted for it when the cardinal was arrested.

We say farce because the forms of free trial in Hungary under its Red administration are postured and mocked. No jury weighs the evidence. No evidence is introduced except weird documents and hearsay witness.

Back of the grisly pageantry in the courtroom remains a stark suspicion of drug injections inside prison cells, of exquisite twentieth century physical torture against which human flesh has no recourse. That the cardinal, worn and despairing, who took the witness box was a different individual than the ruling prelate of a once great Catholic dominion can be doubted by none who have seen his courtroom photographs or read his minor-key words to his implacable judges.

The novels of ex-Communist Arthur Koestler serve as a key to what may have been the cardinal's imprisoned fate.

The Red court was unwilling to admit objective reporters or correspondents to the scene of the grim farce. Only registered Hungarian journalists—which is to say, reporters licensed by the Red regime—were allowed to send news of the proceedings to the world. No observers were permitted to be on hand who knew anything of the tradition and the theory of fair trial by courts.

And when the rest of the world raised a question as to the impartiality and dignity of the trial, the controlled Red press and politicians burst into almost an obscene reply that gave away the hysteria and torment of the occasion.

As far as trustworthy fact can be adduced, Cardinal Mindszenty was tried on a charge of treason to Hungary, and a death penalty demanded for him, on the basis of his and others' dealing in other than Hungarian currency, for the possible protection of the church's establishment in that forlorn land.

In any civilized land, courts might have tried him for black market dealings, not for a crime called treason, with death penalty demanded. He has admitted the dealings; it is not clear that he has admitted anything else except a love for his church and his country.

The distortions of statements have been so profuse as to cloud the record while the trial was going on. The actual facts, the outside world may not know for a long time.

But the world knows the reality: That Cardinal Mindszenty was brave enough to stand his ground as leader of a state which was crumbling into communism, and to risk the penalty which Soviet lands and law decree for such resistance.

Too cowardly to brazen out the charge of mere independence by a courageous leader, the Hungarian state proceeded to dress up its punishing with phony charges in which words have been used loosely in the hope they would provoke acceptance. The Reds, in short, swore to get the cardinal for his independence. They may even have been willing to connive at his flight; but he did not flee.

The hand of the Kremlin moves down over him like a shadow. It cannot excuse itself to the world, however much it has pretended. It cannot convince fair-thinking Americans of any fairness of trial or procedure. It only appears to all of us outside Hungary like the stealthy, vindictive tyranny we know it to be from past performance.

Oleomargarine Taxes

REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for years Congress has been the battleground over a law passed 63 years ago. I hardly need explain that I refer to the law taxing and restricting oleomargarine.

Today it seems we are very near a solution. A solution is in my opinion extremely important. Oleomargarine, or margarine, is now an accepted article of diet. It is recognized by a standard of identity of the Pure Food and Drug Ad-

ministration. One survey reported in this Congress a year ago said 84 percent of families used margarine. There is no question as to its status as a nutritious pure food; has not been for many years.

Last year the House passed a bill repealing the margarine taxes and license fees. The bill would have passed the Senate had it not been for lack of time. This year more bills than ever before have been introduced to repeal the law. In addition, the butter industry has come forth with a proposal. I have studied both the new bills and the butter proposal to repeal the Federal taxes on margarine but to prohibit the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine.

The only issue that remains is the question of the sale of margarine as butter in public eating places. There is no danger of deception in store sales or in sales to bakers and the like.

I do not believe I oversimplify the issues at stake. The butter people, by and large, no longer claim that margarine is not a nutritious pure food. They no longer make various claims. Further, they have even abandoned their old, long support of restrictive taxes and license fees on margarine. This has been a rapid turn-about, and of course raises a serious question as to why they fought so hard for so long not only to keep those taxes but to increase them. Their answer to that question, apparently, is embodied in their accompanying proposal—that yellow margarine be prohibited. This, they say, would protect the consumer; and we are led to believe that they supported those taxes and fees all these years, and especially last spring, simply as a means of protection of the consumer. Now, they seem to say, it would be better consumer protection to ban yellow margarine altogether.

I disagree completely with their view. If margarine is indeed a pure food, as much as butter, why can it not be allowed to use yellow coloring under the supervision of the Food and Drug Administration, as well as butter? Many foods use artificial coloring, including butter itself. I need not go into this point now. Today a great deal of yellow margarine is being sold. Since 1940, 11 States have abolished their bans against it. At this time bills in several State legislatures contemplate the same action. Why is it good policy for the Federal Government to reverse this trend? Why is it protection to prohibit? Who is being protected, the consumer or the butter maker?

Last year the repeal bill for margarine was amended to provide that the Pure Food and Drug Administration should have surveillance over margarine being served in public eating places. This idea has been developed more fully in some of the bills before the Congress. One of them, H. R. 3, goes far indeed to protect the consumer in public eating places. It would require the identification of each separate serving of margarine in a public eating place, and a placard, or other sign, posted prominently in a public eating place serving margarine, or a printed notice on the menu stating the establishment serves margarine. Enforcement would be in the hands of the Food and Drug Administration.

I can see nothing wrong or unworkable with this proposal. It has been carefully thought out. It would give consumers yellow margarine under protection of pure-food laws; actually it completes pure-food legislation with respect to the proper identification of margarine.

Now to contrast the two proposals. Our object, please bear in mind, is to protect the consumer in public eating places. It is figured that approximately 3½ percent of margarine consumption is in public eating places. This is the gap that must be given full protection. This is the narrow piece of controversial ground between butter and margarine so far as the consumer is concerned; and all will agree that in this controversy the consumer is our first concern.

The butter proposal is to bar yellow margarine. That means that, to protect the 3½ percent, the 96½ percent must suffer this prohibition. To insure safety through prohibition, not only the relatively tiny restaurant outlet, but the millions of margarine consumers, must be barred from yellow margarine, which is of course the type of margarine preferred and desired by the consumer. This would seem extremely unfair. Mrs. Housewife, who has and is still making her demands for repeal of margarine restrictions known, is on the one hand promised tax-free yellow margarine, and on the other finds the concession snatched away by a prohibition against all yellow margarine.

The repeal proposal to which I have alluded does not try to avoid the problem by running away from it, ignoring the consumer's interest. It sets up protection for the consumer at the debated point—the public eating place. It does this carefully and realistically, invoking the tried experience of the Food and Drug Administration, which has been carefully built up just for that sort of situation. It would give the home consumer yellow margarine, under the usual and normal protection of full labeling as required by law and practiced by the food industry.

The butter proposal does not do what it claims to do. It does not adequately protect the consumer at the public eating place. We all know that few restaurants will serve other than yellow margarine. And, in addition, it forces the home consumer to do without yellow margarine—even in the majority of States where yellow margarine is sold.

To conclude, then, the butter proposal is not a consumer proposal. It is not interested in the consumer at all. It is like all the other butter proposals with regard to margarine, only dressed up a little and shorn of the obviously unsupportable taxes and license fees. It is restrictive. It wants no margarine. It is one more expression of that memorable monopolistic attitude stated so clearly by the Dairy Record years ago when it said:

> The dairy industry must set as its goal the complete extermination of oleomargarine. It must never rest until the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine has been outlawed in this country.

Much more statesmanlike from the standpoint of all interests concerned is the declaration by the American Milk Review recently, when it said:

> The public wants a yellow fat spread for its bread. Oleo colored yellow is acceptable. Because it is markedly cheaper, a large portion of the buying public is using oleo. They are not interested in whether oleo colored yellow is infringing on something that logically belongs to butter. They are not even interested in being protected against oleo sold as butter—largely because they don't believe it. What they are interested in—and the only thing they are interested in—is a cheap, palatable yellow spread for their bread.
>
> There are two courses open to the butter industry, and, therefore, to the dairy industry. We can fight oleo to the last ditch. We can fight in the courts and in the legislatures. And we may possibly win a continuation of restrictions. But it will be an endless battle and it will call for the expenditure of large sums of money for public-relations purposes. Or we can retire from that phase of the conflict, making tremendous capital out of the reasons for doing so, and join the battle anew where it must be eventually joined—namely, in the market place.
>
> We do not believe that the first course, even though successful, will regain the market that has been lost. We do believe that butter is a product superior in every way to oleo. We believe that butter can lick the vegetable juice right out of oleo in any kind of competition, fair or unfair, if given the chance.
>
> We believe that only by aggressive salesmanship, only by enlightened and dynamic merchandising, can this be accomplished. It will cost money to do it. It will cost a lot more money not to do it. We think that the time has come to stop arguing with the umpire over the ringers on the other team. We think that the time has come to bust a couple of long ones right out of the park.

Council of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Council of Europe," which appeared in the Manchester Evening Leader, Saturday, February 5, 1949. The Manchester Evening Leader is published in Manchester, N. H.

The editorial follows:

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Progress toward world stability since war's end has been held to a snail's pace principally because of the lack of international understanding and cooperation, widespread mistrust, greed, and narrow nationalism.

Conscientious efforts in the interest of permanent peace has been repeatedly thwarted by those who refuse to rise above petty pride and ambition in approaching vital world issues.

Occasionally, however, there are developments on the world scene that offer encouragement that we may be inching nearer and nearer to the day when at least some of the more basic deterrents to peace will be removed. The establishment of the Council of Europe may conceivably prove such a development.

It is too early to speculate upon the success of this cooperative move by five western European nations, and the possible effect it will have upon the course of the world's history. Advocating unity and practicing it to the fullest do not always go hand-in-hand. But at least the fundamental principle of the new Council is admirable.

For years Europe has been a hotbed of international jealousy, bitter rivalry, and deep-rooted nationalism. In a way it can be understood. Most of the countries on the Continent are relatively small. Few are economically independent. They have had to struggle to maintain their own sovereignty through the years. But their attempts to protect their own existence have frequently led to open conflict.

Their inherent nationalism traits, developed through many generations, are not easily subordinated to the dictates of internationalism, even if it is apparent that European unity of purpose has become a requirement of peace. But the formation of the new Council indicates a gradual breaking down of some of the barriers of the past.

People everywhere will watch with interest the progress of the Council of Europe. Its success in fulfilling its important aims may play a large part in bringing stability to all the world.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the following copy of a letter to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, from the Catholic War Veterans, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty:

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES PROTEST AGAINST TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1949.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.:

We have learned with profound sorrow of the persecution to which the Catholic Church in Hungary is being subjected at the hands of a Government whose principles are in direct opposition to those of Christianity.

Catholics the world over, as well as millions of others not of our faith, were shocked when Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was brought to a trial that has made justice a mockery and law the whim of a tyrant. To us Catholics, this cruel injustice is a repetition of past history, wherein the enemies of Christ strove to destroy with violence the Catholic Church and the Christian way of life. For those who hate the church of God always strike first at its shepherds, with the hope of scattering the flock committed to their care.

The conscience of all thoughtful people has been profoundly stirred by this latest example of Soviet injustice. The trial is a mockery because the Cardinal was prejudged and predoomed and the whole farcical procedure was a mere ritual, reminiscent of the barbarous customs of ancient times, when men, out of favor with the ruling powers of a country, were humiliated and martyred for the bestial gratification of their tormenters.

It has made the world aware of the lengths to which the Kremlin, acting through the puppet government it has set up in Hungary, is prepared to go in its war against religious faith.

Guilt must be clearly fastened upon the originator and architect of religious persecution, the Government of bloody Josef Stalin, of Moscow.

We feel it incumbent upon ourselves to raise our voices in protest against such a travesty of justice. This we do, not only as Catholics and war veterans, but also as Americans and in virtue of the doctrine written into the Declaration of Independence: "That all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Aware of the importance of the issue, we propose as our resolution—

1. That our Government, through its Secretary of State, express to the Government of Hungary, its anger at such a flagrant violation of the Hungarian peace treaty which guaranteed religious liberty.

2. That the Secretary of State insists that the Hungarian Government release Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and that religious persecution in Hungary be brought to an end.

3. That the Secretary of State take immediate steps if the Hungarian Government fails to comply with the above to sever relations with this ignoble puppet government.

Rev. JOSEPH T. FLYNN, C. Ss. R.,
National Chaplain of C. W. V.
NICHOLAS J. WAGENER,
National Commander of C. W. V.

The Marine Corps Fights for Its Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Richard Tregaskis from the Saturday Evening Post of February 5, 1949:

THE MARINE CORPS FIGHTS FOR ITS LIFE
(By Richard Tregaskis)

During the latter part of any week, Gen. Clifton Bledsoe Cates, commandant of the United States Marine Corps, is likely to become fidgety in his plush-carpeted Washington office up the hill from the Pentagon.

Now well initiated as commandant, Cates frankly states his major problem: "My biggest worry is to keep the Marine Corps alive, to keep it the potent element of national security it has been in the past, to develop its unique capabilities. There are lots of people here in Washington who want to prevent that, who want to reduce us to the status of Navy policemen or get rid of us entirely."

Cates wouldn't say so, but the "lots of people" are mostly Army and Air Force enthusiasts who have long hankered to chop the Marine Corps into nothingness or—worse to a marine—to change it into just another Army unit. The basis of all the antimarine schemes is, as in previous attacks, that the corps is unnecessary, that it duplicates functions of other armed services like the Army or Air Force. But Lucky Cates, like other marines, contends that the corps is invaluable for specialized missions. "We don't want to supplant land troops. We have our certain job, amphibious operations. We are shock troops. We can get in and take a beachhead and get out. And we are trained to be always in readiness for action. The marines always stand ready to do more on a moment's notice than any other service and, on a man-for-man basis, to do it better and for less money than any other service."

Some of the anti-Marine Corps people don't see it that way, and don't pull punches in saying so. Brig. Gen. Frank Armstrong, an Air Force firecracker, is one such. He said in a speech at Norfolk last year: "As for the Marines, you know what the Marines are. They are a small, fouled-up Army talking Navy lingo. We are going to put those Marines in the Regular Army and make efficient soldiers out of them."

The current attempt to assassinate the Marine Corps is only the latest of its kind. The first came in 1864, the last, before the present one, in 1931. Marine Corps history has been a series of fights with the external enemies of our country, alternated with battles with internal political foes in times of peace. As one Marine put it during the Eightieth Congress battle, "We fight for the right to fight." And that is still true in the continuing battle raging in Washington.

When World War II was over, General Marshall, at that time the Army boss, had prepared a paper urging reorganization of the armed forces into three branches, Army, Navy, and Air Force. That paper was secretly considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the head men of the Army, Army Air Force, and Navy. The memorandum is still "classified"—the military man's polite word for secret—but the principal features were embodied in the Collins plan, introduced into Congress, and therefore made public, in 1945.

The Collins plan, so called because it was sponsored by the Army's then public-relations chief, Lt. Gen. Joseph Lawton (Lightning Joe) Collins, was a shocker to the Secretary of the Navy, and especially to the Marine Corps. It provided for a general-staff setup—separate Army, Navy, and Air Force, with a military staff governing their operations, and control centralized in the chief of staff, who would, of course, be an Army general. There simply was no mention of the corps.

Fortunately, the then Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, came up with a counter scheme. His plan recommended three separate departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, but the top control was not centralized in the Army. The proposal provided closer coordination between the separate branches, but not merger under one dictatorial head. It also left living space for the Marine Corps and for naval aviation, ignored in the Collins plan.

A Damoclean sword hung over the Marines. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, meeting in secret session, were concurrently considering papers called J. C. S. 1478. These were later brought into the public light at a House committee hearing under Representative HOFFMAN, so that some excerpts are now printable. They are clear indication that the Army and Army Air Forces planned the assassination of the Marine Corps as a fighting unit.

Said General Eisenhower in one of these memorandums to the Chiefs of Staff: "The following is proposed for consideration: (1) That the Marine Corps is maintained solely as an adjunct of the fleet and participates only in minor shore combat operations in which the Navy alone is interested. (2) That the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army, and consequently the Marine Corps will not be appreciably expanded in time of war. (3) That it will be agreed the Navy will not develop a land army or a so-called amphibious army, Marine Corps units to be limited in size to the equivalent of a regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps, therefore, limited to some 50,000 or 60,000 men." (There were more than 500,000 marines in World War II.)

Gen. Carl Spaatz was quick to support General Ike, adding that Marine forces should be "lightly armed"—presumably meaning that they should be little more than a police force and that the corps' "roles and missions" should be only "to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments."

General Vandegrift, then Commandant, went into a huddle with his chief advisers and they worked out an eye-popping oration to be delivered before the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. It created a furor.

The usually gentle-spoken "Sunny Jim" Vandegrift talked boldly, striking back at the Army's plan to submerge the Marine Corps. "I know that the War Department's intentions with respect to the Marine Corps are well advanced and carefully integrated. * * * Under the provisions of this legislation (the Collins bill), the single Secretary for Common Defense and the all-powerful National Chief of Staff are entirely free either to abolish the Marine Corps outright or to divest it of all its vital functions, leaving only a token organization in order that the name of the corps may be preserved. And if the proposed Chief of Staff is of Army antecedents, I feel there is a strong possibility that that is precisely what will take place."

POINTING TO THE RECORD OF MARINE LEADERSHIP

He asked Congress to save the corps, as it had done many times before in history. Proudly, he pointed out that the Marines have always been spearhead troops in every American war except the Civil War—always ready to fight while the slower moving Army was getting organized. Guadalcanal was one of his prime examples: "The operation against Guadalcanal could not have been launched (without the Marine Corps), because there were at that time no Army troops prepared to conduct amphibious-assault operations. * * * The War Department is now contending that the amphibious efforts of the marines are an invasion of the Army's sphere (but) the amphibious specialty is the Marines' sphere. Furthermore, those Army troops which took part in landing operations during the past war were actually applying the principles and using the techniques, methods, and equipment developed by the Marine Corps. In some cases they were even trained by the Marine Corps."

Sunny Jim ended with a burst of oratory. "The bended knee is not a tradition of our corps. If the Marine as a fighting man has not made a case for himself, he must go. But I think you will agree with me that he has earned the right to depart with dignity and honor, not by subjection to the status of uselessness and servility planned for him by the War Department."

The effect of that counterattack was sensational. The Naval Affairs Committee dropped the Collins bill like a lost election, and didn't bother to report the bill out. Nobody dared resurrect it. But the toughest battles waged by the most colorful combatants were still to follow, in the Eightieth Congress, and subsequently.

This time it was Maj. Gen. Merritt A. (Red Mike) Edson, a Marine Corps Pacific hero, who fought the most spectacular battle for the corps—a risky, bold fight that eventually cost him his job and his career, but helped greatly to prolong the corps' miraculous life.

Of course, the Army foes of the corps made their plans without consulting the Marines. The Marines had their notification in the newspapers that day in January of 1947 when President Truman announced an Army-Navy plan to reorganize the armed forces into three branches—Army, Navy, and Air Force—under a single Secretary of National Defense. A bill to this effect was to be introduced in Congress.

Worst of all to the corps was the invocation of a gag rule by President Truman: All communications with any part of Congress regarding pending legislation must be cleared through Navy Department censorship. This was most unfair, since the Army people were not thus hampered. In fact, they had a special high-powered legislative section for the job of supplying information to Senators and Representatives.

Apparently by spontaneous combustion, one blaze started in the legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

At the same time, fast-moving, impatient Mike had been seen visiting beefy Omar Ketchum, the chief lobbyist—national legislative representative—of the VFW in Washington, to plan the fight for the Marine Corps in Congress.

Shortly after, the VFW legislative committee passed a resolution declaring it the official VFW policy to protect the interest of the Marine Corps before Congress. And the VFW national commander, Louis E. Starr, declared himself a strong supporter of the Marine Corps. Yet in those early days the battle was going badly for the Marines. On March 18, 1947, the unification bill was introduced into the Senate, the first hurdle. Subsequently it was skillfully guided by the dignified, pince-nezed CHAN GURNEY, of South Dakota, a strong Army supporter.

In the House, the Marines benefited from an Army blunder. Army adherents there steered the merger proposal into the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hoping to work a slick maneuver. The maneuver was this: Testy old—72 years—Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, was head of the committee. He had never shown much interest in matters military. His committee was very busy with other governmental affairs. So he would probably appoint a subcommittee to consider the merger bill. If he did, the most likely chairman would be a man who had supported Army projects for a generation, Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of New York.

HOFFMAN was astute and suspicious; he had been aware of the tremendous Army pressure behind the merger bill. So he didn't delegate the bill to a subcommittee; he tackled it himself.

With Representative WADSWORTH only a committeeman and not the chairman, and the thoroughgoing HOFFMAN running the show, the chances of the Marine Corps in the House looked better. Tough old HOFFMAN also wrote to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal protesting the Navy gag rule as a serious infringement of the right of free speech. Forrestal eventually acted on the request, and waived the rule, but not until much later in the battle. The only real effect of lifting the gag then was to give belated legal status to the extracurricular and somewhat risky activities of Red Mike Edson and his Marine Corps cohorts.

Meanwhile, the Marine Corps faced powerful opponents in the House and Senate committee hearings. General Eisenhower was one, and he was so charming that even the Marines were attracted. One Marine officer said, "If they had ever voted on the thing just after Eisenhower finished talking, it would have gone just the way he wanted. He certainly has appeal."

In his testimony, the Army boss gave reasons for streamlining the armed forces, and with his usual supple tact, neatly turned aside pointed questions about the Marine Corps, leveled by Chairman HOFFMAN. HOFFMAN had been examining the so-called 1478 papers of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which had allocated so little living space to the Marine Corps. The conscientious HOFFMAN had secured those papers after considerable wrangling with the Army. Now he taxed General Ike with Ike's suggestions that the Marine Corps should be crippled in size and function. A small sample from the hearings will indicate the quality of this interchange:

"The Chairman (Mr. HOFFMAN). Those views did create in the minds of high-ranking officers in the service the thought that there was a proposal on the part of the Army to eliminate the Marine Corps as an effective combat element, reducing it to the status where it would perform a naval police duty, and possibly certain military service functions in respect to certain operations.

"General EISENHOWER. I have never said that in any statement.

"The CHAIRMAN. Your position created that opinion in the minds of certain officers.

"General EISENHOWER. It may have.

"The CHAIRMAN. It did. Do you not know that to be a fact?

"General EISENHOWER. They said that was the reason they were fearful? I suppose they said that, but I cannot see how any sane man can read those statements and think that I have any thought of eliminating the Marines; therefore, I do not see why they should be fearful about me."

The Army Air Corps generals, of course, backed General Eisenhower in his advocacy of the unification bill as it stood. But when some of the admirals—like the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations Forrest Sherman—supported Eisenhower, the Marines were grieved, and a schism began to develop between pro and antimarine factions in the Navy. Many Navy men were concerned about the future of the Marines, because they felt the fate of naval aviation depended on what happened to the Corps: If the Army and Air Force had too strong a voice in the new set-up, the naval air arm, like the Marine air arm and the Marines, might be squeezed out of existence.

Unfortunately, General Vandegrift was not playing an aggressive hand in the congressional poker game this time. Summoned before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he agreed to an amendment of the bill which, some of the committee said, would protect the Marine Corps. But it was actually a poor guaranty: "The provisions of this act shall not authorize the alteration or diminution of the existing relative status of the Marine Corps * * * or of naval aviation."

Many Marines felt this was much too vague—especially in the words "existing relative status"—to mean anything. Red Mike Edson decided he must do something about it. Edson also felt the control of the armed services was too centralized, that such centralization could lead to eventual control of the civil government by the military. But the gag rule was still in effect. He says now that he had a couple of sleepless nights thinking about it—a degree of indecision unusual in Red Mike. "The alternative," he says, "was to keep my mouth shut and give lip service to the type of organization which is not beneficial to the Marines, to the overall national security or to the Government."

Senator Robertson, of Wyoming, friend of the Marine Corps and a member of the Senate committee, had asked Edson to appear at the hearings. Edson made his decision and sent a note to General Vandegrift.

"In order to feel free to express my personal views on this proposed legislation without embarrassment to or as a representative of the Marine Corps or the naval service, I herewith submit my request for retirement."

General Vandegrift refused the retirement request at the time, but this was before Red Mike began to make sparks fly in the committees. When it was repeated 2 months later it was accepted.

Meanwhile, in the Senate committee, Edson attacked the bill. He lashed out particularly at the joint staff, a large body of officers created by the bill as a sort of executive group, which he maintained was an embryonic national general staff, liable to lead to dictatorship and inefficiency in affairs military; and he suggested a more definite guaranty of Marine Corps roles and missions.

But perhaps, in Red Mike's judgment, his testimony before the Senate committee

was too mild—for the bill, S. 578, was approved by the committee and passed by the Senate. It was still being considered in CLARE HOFFMAN'S committee of the House, as House of Representatives bill 2319. Edson appeared before the House committee, and this time he pulled out all the stops. He attacked the very basis of the bill as a dictatorial infringement of the rights of Government. He warned that it brought grave danger of the repitition of the Prussian general staff's grab for power in pre-World War I days, and of the Nazi and Fascist systems which helped to lose World War II for the Axis. He also bluntly said that the vague relative-status clause accepted by General Vandegrift in the Senate hearings was not enough of a guaranty for the Marines.

On June 25 HOFFMAN introduced his own preferred bill, which embodied Edson's recommendations, including a strong guaranty of Marine Corps functions. This had a tremendous effect on the compromise bill finally sent up to the House for action.

Dapper John Williamson, the VFW lobbyist on Capitol Hill, realized that the handling of the unification bills—H. R. 4214 and S. 758—had reached a critical stage. He spent a good portion of his time during the next few days on the Marine project, supplying information and suggestions to middle of the roaders whose decisions could be vital.

Meanwhile, Army and Air Corps proponents were busily trying to influence the committeemen in the other direction—against the guaranties for the Marine Corps or naval air. On July 22, 1947, Lt. Gen. Laur'is Norstad, the Air Forces handsome Flash Gordon, was to be found busily putting in a good word with passing members of the conference committee outside the door of the committee room.

At the end of that day's argument, the prized Marine roles and missions, the corps' legal warranty, had been preserved. It was a triumph. After that day's battle, a Marine officer wrote: "Few Marine officers will ever realize how close the Marine Corps had been to virtual extinction. * * * I know of no Marine officer who fought with more sincerity or determination for the Marine Corps than did Mr. HOFFMAN."

But whether it had been Red Mike Edson or CLARE HOFFMAN who had done the most, the proper roles and missions paragraphs had been incorporated, and the conference bill passed the Senate as the National Security Act on July 24, the House of Representatives on July 25. Red Mike had lost his job. A good many Marine officers had developed stomach trouble. HOFFMAN was prostrated with fatigue. But the Marine Corps was saved—at least for the time being.

General Vandegrift, at that time still Commandant, could announce with relief, "it is the first time in the history of the Marine Corps that the roles and missions have been spelled out in language that an 18-year old could understand."

Yet the Army and the Army Air Force had not finished their assaults on the corps. At first, subsequent skirmishes were kept off the congressional stage. The Army and Air Force brass, outnumbering the Navy 2 to 1 in the newly created Joint Staff, led the way. In debates on the functions of the armed forces, the Army tried to limit Marine amphibious activities to attacks on small islands. The Navy, parent organization of the Marine Corps, contested this. The Army and Air Force men said Marines should be used only in small operations where less than a division of troops was required. Navy representatives said no. The Army maintained the Marine Corps should never be big enough for sustained combat, which, in the Army estimate, turned out to mean every kind of combat except fights of hours or a few days' duration. The Navy fought back for the Marines. And so the merry-go-round of discussion circled upon itself. The Army bigwigs were finding a powerful source of irritation in the small legal provision of the National Security Act that the Marines were to be the armed forces specialists in amphibious operations. Prickled by this provision, the Army brass was out to keep the Marine Corps' size to a minimum. The Air Force was similarly upset by the law's guaranty of naval air functions.

It was clear to the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, that a conference of big wheels of the several services should be held at some secluded spot away from the knife-fighting atmosphere of Washington. He suggested the naval station at Key West, Fla. Conferences were held there from March 11 to 14, 1948. Generals Bradley, Spaatz, Norstad, Wedemeyer, and Gruenther, and Admirals Duncan, Radford, and Denfeld met in a setting designed to be tranquil.

When the conference was over, the Marine Corps emerged, through the efforts of Navy friends, with another guarantee of its functions—almost verbatim that of the National Security Law. But the Army and Air Force men did succeed in getting through a tentative four-division limitation on the size of the Marine Corps even in time of war.

The Key West conference, however, was not the last word by any means. Congressional advocates of a still stronger centralized control of the services—meaning stronger Army control—began to be heard on Capitol Hill, again as the second session of the Eightieth Congress continued, Senator MORSE, of Oregon, introduced a new bill to this effect. The Morse bill was brought to the Senate too late for action, but its provisions will probably be introduced again in the current Eighty-first Congress, an old bogey in a new night sheet.

Meanwhile, the new Commandant, Lucky Cates, may bring the corps good fortune, and he will surely bring it vigor and freshness at the top. He makes a point of the fact that a Marine is not only America's best shock trooper but the cost of maintaining a Marine for a year is just a little more than half the cost of maintaining an Army man. His figures, arrived at by dividing annual expense for each service by the number of men, are about $4,000 for a Marine, about $7,000 for a soldier. When the current attack on the corps reaches a climax, as it undoubtedly will, in the Eighty-first Congress, Cates and his friends will be put to the final test. And possibly he will bring some of his famed luck to the transaction. He is counting on it anyhow, for he is a great gambling man. Usually he will take a bet on almost any issue, and one of his favorite phrases in everyday life is "Five'll get you ten that" so-and-so will happen. Betting on the future of his corps, however, Cates is inclined to be reckless. "I'l bet you any amount of money, any odds, that it'll survive," he says.

Panama Canal—The Sea-Level Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a paper published in the proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, January 1949:

PANAMA CANAL—THE SEA-LEVEL PROJECT

(A symposium [1] by Harry O. Cole,[2] member, American Society of Civil Engineers)

From the nature of the papers in this symposium, together with another extremely able paper,[3] it is clear that the investigation of the Canal under Public Law No. 280 (79th Cong., 1st sess.) was solely directed toward securing the authorization of the predetermined objective of a sea-level project on the premise that the present lock Canal is totally lacking in security to meet the future needs of national defense, and that the only alternative is a sea-level canal.

It appears that the investigation reported in the symposium was not directed toward securing any major improvement in the operating deficiencies of the present lock Canal. At least, if there was any such objective, the writer has not found it in the symposium papers.

The first major contribution toward the solution of operating difficulties in the Canal was developed by Miles P. DuVal [4] in a paper published in 1947. The plan presented in that paper—its recording and analysis of accidents, hazards, and difficulties encountered by ships in transiting the Canal over a period of 30 years—was so revealing and informative that it has apparently affected all subsequent engineering thinking at Panama. As all informed engineers with experience in building the Panama Canal know, the problems are not problems of complexity as much as there are of magnitude.

Viewing with alarm the breakneck speed at which the United States has been spending hundreds of billions of dollars during the 7 years since 1941 (and still doing so) it is clear to all thinking men that unless the Nation safeguards its resources, present investments, and future expenditures, it will further seriously jeopardize the national security at a critical time.

It is fair to ask the question, and insist upon a truthful and an unbiased answer: Is an expenditure of $2,500,000,000 justified at Panama or elsewhere on the Isthmus for any canal, lock or sea level, under any circumstances?

The recognized superiority of the Panama Canal as a navigable waterway for ocean vessels over any feasible canal at Nicaragua, Tehuantepec, the Atrato River, or elsewhere, and the high vulnerability of any type of canal to the atomic bomb certainly makes the very idea of expending $2,500,000,000 (and probably much more) for a sea-level project at Panama, or for a canal at any other location, entirely indefensible.

The national resources of the United States should not be squandered in a futile Isthmian project at Panama, or any other place, that would inevitably divert funds and resources from other urgently needed projects and defense programs in the United States.

From evidence presented elsewhere by the writer,[5] [6] it is very clear that the great fundamental defect in the original design of the Panama Canal was the separation of the Pacific locks into two groups and the placing of one of them squarely across the south end of the Culebra Cut (later Gaillard Cut) at Pedro Miguel. The writer has given the definite reasons why that was done, and

[1] This symposium was published in April 1948.

[2] Construction engineer, Morgantown, W. Va.; formerly resident engineer, Pacific division, the Panama Canal, Canal Zone.

[3] Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A2449.

[4] The Marine Operating Problems, Panama Canal, and the Solution, by Miles P. DuVal, Proceedings, ASCE, February 1947, p. 161

[5] Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A2743.

[6] Ibid., p. A3190.

has proved beyond reasonable doubt that, had not that decision been reached and carried out at that time, the United States would have had no canal at Panama during World War I.

The third locks project of 1939, had it been completed (it was abandoned in 1942) would not have been the cure, but it would have greatly aggravated and increased the difficulties at Pedro Miguel because this project was not navigationally sound.

Also, revived with the 1939 third locks project was the idea of "converting" the Panama Canal to sea level, with a plan that had not been studied adequately. The Panama sea-level project reported in the Symposium apparently grew out of that plan and will make it necessary to abandon a great part of the present canal. It is not a true "conversion" but really a great project for a new Panama Canal.

Authorities who are considered well informed have expressed the opinion publicly that any type of canal is definitely vulnerable to the atomic bomb and that the only function of the canal is to transport ships safely and conveniently. It is self-evident now, as it was when the Panama Canal was constructed, that a canal formed by large lakes affords safer and more convenient navigation than any canal that has a restricted, canyon-walled channel 30 miles long and whose tidal waters are changing in velocity and direction thoughout every day in the year.

Furthermore, the proposed huge tidal-lock control works with a lock 200 feet by 1,500 feet contemplate an independent 750-foot wide, navigable-pass channel controlled by a 6,000-ton, 6-link, chain-gate system. This project definitely rules out the possibility of converting the lock canal to a true sea-level canal.

According to one of the highest naval authorities, the expenditure of building a so-called sea-level canal, or even huge locks, to expedite the transfer of two or three superwidth Navy ships from one ocean to the other, is not justified, since the United States now has a two-ocean Navy, and since these superwidth ships can readily go around Cape Horn when it becomes necessary for them to be transferred from one ocean to the other.

One other technical phase of this subject is of the most vital importance to the American people. The estimated first cost for converting the lock canal to sea level, of $2,483,000,000 alone (which appears to be grossly underestimated), is prohibitive, unless the cost is to be borne by the national defense budget. The annual interest of 3 percent, not to mention paying off the debt, amounts to about $75,000,000. This would mean an increase in toll charges of about $2 per ton over and above the present toll charge of $1. Even now, shipping interests are clamoring for a reduction in toll charges. If authorized as a defense project with a debt to be paid off in the next 100 years, the American taxpayers would have to do it.

A review of the facts and references as set forth in the foregoing should give a better perspective of the canal investigation that is under discussion.

Apparently the major premise (national defense), on which the recommendation for converting the canal to sea level was based, has now definitely been removed.

The sea-level plan recommended in the symposium proposes to abandon the present high-lake type of canal (which has demonstrated its convenient operation since 1914) and substitute a sea-level canal—at the exexpenditure of untold billions of dollars with no positive proof that in the end it will prove to be as good, or any better, or more economical, or safer for transiting ships, than an improved lake-type canal at only a fraction of the cost and the time to build.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made today by Mr. Walter W. Cenérazzo, president, American Watchworkers Union, Waltham, Mass.:

The statement of Congressman COMBS on the floor of the House was not a full analysis of what was said before the Ways and Means Committee. Waltham watch's misfortune and the industry's precarious position today is directly due to the reciprocal trade agreements, and the failure of the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress to take action in past sessions. There is no way, no method under the reciprocal trade program by which an industry, or the representatives of workers in the industry, may obtain relief under the present administration of the reciprocal trade program. This is evidenced by the fact that on last Wednesday three Congressmen from the three watch-manufacturing districts, the mayors of Elgin, Ill., Lancaster, Pa., and Waltham, Mass., and the Governor of Massachusetts presented the President of the United States himself with a petition with over 50,000 names from the city of Waltham, Mass., asking for relief against Swiss watch imports. The President is quoted by the Governor of Massachusetts, Governor Paul A. Dever, as saying that he recommended a Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee to make a study of the watch situation, and Governor Dever asked him whether or not this was a matter for the executive branch, and the President replied that it was not.

Congressman COMBS' statement that the domestic watch industry has had as much profit if not more than in prewar times is wrong. The percentage of profits as compared to prewar times is less for the entire industry even if we are to exclude Waltham's deficit. The Swiss-watch importers have had a far greater profit during the last 7 years, and at a time when the domestic industry was producing war materials 100 percent.

Speaking for the workers in the American jeweled-watch industry, I say that unless Congress takes action during the Eighty-first Congress, there will be no jeweled-watch industry in America within 4 years. We need help at once.

Something New in Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Sunday News for January 23, 1949:

SOMETHING NEW IN HOUSING

President Harry S. Truman, in his state of the Union message, conceded that American housing miseries were still with us, and hoped again that Congress would do something about it. Shortly thereafter New York's Governor Dewey said about the same thing, and specifically urged his legislature to start off by modernizing New York's obsolete building codes, which add $1,000 or so to the cost of an average Empire State dwelling unit.

We hope that these and other political chiefs will inspire more hammering and sawing, and we'll be delighted to hear those sounds.

Right now, though, we'd like to pass along some recent findings and happenings in the building industry itself. Some of them, just possibly, indicate that we may be getting some housing action even before our lawmakers make up their minds about causes and remedies.

Most unusual recent housing news, it happens, comes from Mr. Truman's own State of Missouri. From, to be exact, Springfield (population 70,514).

Out there a building union, Local 978, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, A. F. of L., suddenly decided to do something about its own housing—and employment—woes.

THE RAISE COST MONEY

The situation: Last spring the carpenters won themselves a 15-percent raise in hourly wages. So did their fellow building craftsmen—bricklayers, plasterers, electricians, etc. But a few weeks ago the carpenters added up their 1948 incomes, and discovered to their chagrin that they had simply priced themselves out of work. In 1947 Springfield's 500 union carpenters worked on 561 new houses. In 1948 only 364 residential construction permits were taken out, and an average of 90 carpenters was unemployed at all times.

The carpenters figured, gloomily but realistically, that 1949 would be even worse. So, by union vote, they decided to price themselves back into their jobs. They decided on a 20-percent wage cut, and simultaneously proposed to other building unions and to contractors, lumbermen, etc., that they slice their fees and prices accordingly.

"FEATHER BEDDING" ELIMINATED

So far, the carpenters haven't sold their bill of goods completely. Two contractors and one lumber company offered to come along. But other building unions shy at hopping off the gravy train before they have to. And some Springfield contractors, soured by previous experience with some feather-bedding craft groups, opine they'd like to dispense with unions altogether.

By employing more reasonable nonunion building workers, they claim, they can pay their help good annual wages, and still save $1,400 to $1,800 per house. Most of this extra cost, they snort, comes from arbitrary, make-work union regulations. If a nonunion bricklayer, for instance, finds it necessary to nail in a board before continuing his masonry, he'll do it himself. Too often the union bricklayer, in the same situation, will sit down at the house buyer's expense, and wait until the contractor finds a carpenter to drive the nail.

VACANT HOUSES

From other parts of the country come reports that the Missouri carpenters aren't alone in their discovery that they have priced or feather bedded themselves out of work. In Los Angeles, for instance, a survey shows no fewer than 6,000 new houses standing vacant. They're not being sold because, apparently, the building industry has just about run out of desperate customers willing to pay $10,000, say, for homes worth only $7,500.

Similar reports come in from St. Louis, Atlanta, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and other cities.

Other housing surveys have it that some 4,000,000 Americans, in the past 7 years, simply abandoned their dreams of new houses and repaired their old ones, or remodeled existing structures into multiple-unit dwellings.

Many of these projects employed a minimum of regular union labor, and some localities report that a considerable number of price-outraged citizens have taken to doing their own painting, carpentry and even wiring and plumbing.

Anyway, there are more and more indications that the bloom is off the boom as far as house building goes. So keep your eye on those Springfield carpenters. There's a sound chance that they were really smart and foresighted in urging their fellow craftsmen to look ahead, and price themselves back into the job market.

Commenting upon the above editorial, Dr. Willford I. King, chairman of the committee for constitutional government, observes:

It is a common fallacy that wages can be elevated by law. However, long experience, as well as economic theory, indicates that such is impossible. All that minimum wage laws ever really do is to prevent the less efficient of the Nation's potential working force from holding jobs, producing, and thus making an honest living. Is it in the interest of the public to throw these potential workers upon the relief rolls, thus pauperizing them against their will?

Freedom Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Freedom Road," delivered by Raymond S. Richmond, Tuesday evening, January 18, 1949, before the Newtown Historical Society at the Elmhurst Public Library, Elmhurst, N. Y.:

The eyes of the Nation are centered on Washington, D. C., this week—and rightly so. A President and Vice President of the United States are to be inaugurated. Hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens are now converging on the Nation's Capital City to witness the impressive ceremonies and to partake of the subsequent merrymaking.

I am not one of those who decry the pomp and circumstance surrounding our inaugurations. In fact, I believe in it. It is good for national morale, and particularly at this moment, when our time-tested political and social philosophies are under attack by a godless alien power and its stooges and dupes within our gates. Inaugurations spotlight our fundamental national unity. They attest to the world that, in keeping with the customs and procedures so wisely outlined by the founding fathers, the quadrennial political contest has been fought and decided and that immediately following the contest Americans have closed ranks and are doing honor to the Chief Executive of their selection. He is being legally and formally installed in his high office, and, regardless of whether we as individuals were winners or losers in the political conflict that preceded the inauguration, we rejoice that our constitutional provisions and precedents continue to be carried out in this time of world tensions and stress. As a people we are proud of our ordered and orderly processes in a disordered world.

Members of the Newtown Historical Society may well ask, after hearing this introduction to my theme, whether I am not going a bit far afield from the announced topic of "The Congress of the United States, Queens and Old Newtown." Possibly, but not so far afield as one might think after relating the ceremonies and festivities of this week to the historic acts that made them possible. And in this field of activities men of old Newtown and Queens played a vital part. Men of Queens, representing their neighbors, and carrying out the wishes of their constituents, were in truth architects of a new country and pioneers of a new idea. The new country is ours and the new idea under which we live—and by God's grace will forever continue to live—was that free men and women could band themselves together in a completely free nation in which the rights of the lowly were coequal with those of any strata of the population.

It took fortitude and blunt, stubborn courage to carve out a new nation against the wishes and the military power of the then greatest nation in the world—Great Britain. And I would be avoiding the truth if I said that all men always measured up to the challenges of that day. There were those who sincerely believed that the Colonies should wrest from the Crown every conceivable concession, short of war and rebellion. There were those, happily greatly in the minority, who marched right up to the gates of freedom, gazed into the vistas of complete independence that lay beyond, and then, in timidity, in cowardice, or still believing in the divine right of kings, turned their backs and fled from the ideal of freedom and equality. Happily, after diligent research, I can find that no Queens members of the Continental Congress flinched when freedom's bullets began to fire with an explosiveness that was heard around the world.

We in Queens had no Isaac Low, who was a New York delegate to the Stamp Act Congress in 1765, a member of the Continental Congress in 1774 and 1775 and a delegate to the Provincial Congress in 1775. He traveled freedom's trail until armed conflict became inevitable. Then after the Declaration of Independence he abandoned the patriot's cause. In 1776 he was accused of treason and was arrested. His property was confiscated in 1779 by the American authorities. In 1783 he moved to England, where he died on the Isle of Wight on July 25, 1791. What a tragic career. This man was born near New Bruswick, N. J., in 1735 and attained high prominence. He was one of the founders and early presidents of the New York State Chamber of Commerce. But because he couldn't or wouldn't face up to freedom's call he died in a country not of his birth, "unwept, unhonored, and unsung," as the poet Scott puts it.

It is interesting to note there was no appeasement in those days. The issues were clearly cut. Those who were not on one side were definitely on the other. It took more guile than most men of that day cared to exercise to walk the tightrope of alleged neutrality between the contending forces of tyranny and liberty. And when a man chose tyranny's side, neighbor and former friend though he might be, he was more than merely ostracized. He was stamped and branded as a traitor and treated accordingly. There was no appeasement. There was no room or basis for appeasement. And it must continue to be our prayer that those in high power in our country, today and tomorrow and in all of the tomorrows to come, will never stoop to appeasement where our fundamental rights and liberties are concerned.

We all agree that the American ideal could well be used to bring freedom to the oppressed everywhere. The ideal is there if the oppressed choose to grasp it—to fight for it. No true American can or should ever tolerate courses of action that restrict our independence as a nation or our freedom as individuals. We must never risk appeasing ourselves into impotence or national oblivion. We must not sacrifice any fundamental in our national sovereignty. As inheritors of the great tradition of the early Queens and old Newtown men we must continue, in our respective spheres, in possibly less heroic times, to keep ablaze the torch of freedom lighted for us by those who came before us.

Four Queens men, who lived their lives here and who loved this borough of ours so much that by their express wish their bodies were buried in the borough, sat in the Continental Congress between September 1774 and March 2, 1789. As you know, the First Congress of the United States in its present general structure, came into being on March 4, 1789. Considering that a total of but 33 men from New York sat in the Continental Congress from its inception until its dissolution, to be succeeded by the present Congress, it is quite apparent that Queens played its full part in the shaping of the Revolution and Revolutionary War policies. I am not including men from the present counties of Nassau and Suffolk or old (and then quite rural) Brooklyn. If I did, so many additional Long Island patriots' names would be added, and this paper would be going so far afield, that it would be difficult to find terminal facilities for it.

It is hardly fair to single out one man as outstanding among these early revolters against the British Crown. It is hardly fair because all so-called rebels ran equivalent risks. Those who raised their voices for independence and gave moral or material aid to the rebellion risked summary execution as and when caught or discovered by the British. And execution did not always mean a comparatively honorable death in front of a firing squad. The sinister shadow of the hangman's rope dangled menacingly in the waking and sleeping moments of those Americans in the forefront of the legislative and military arms of the movement for independence. Equally bad was the risk of jail with its years of near starvation, filth, and degradation.

But, there is one man who chose Queens for his residence we must pause long enough to render special thanks to because every one of us are the beneficiaries of his courage and forthrightness. This man provides a direct contrast to Isaac Low, the member of the Continental Congress who, although born in New Jersey, preferred to live out his days in England rather than to subscribe to a fight for freedom in the rebellion. This patriot, this Queens patriot—Francis Lewis—was born in Llandaff, Wales, in March 1713, and became an American revolutionist by choice and not by accident of birth. Like George Washington, in his earlier years, he fought for the British Crown.

His biography is, I think, an intensely interesting one. As a youth he attended Westminster School in London, following which he entered the countinghouse of a London merchant. He emigrated to the United States in 1735 and established mercantile houses in New York and Philadelphia. He, with a shrewd Welsh eye to business, secured a contract to clothe the British Army in America in 1753. But Lewis was more than a mere merchant, fattening off of army contracts. He participated in the French and Indian War as an aide to General Mercer. He was captured at Oswego, N. Y. and taken to France as a prisoner. On his return the Colonial Government was so grateful for the service he had rendered the Crown they gave him 5,000 acres of land. But the yeast of independence seemed to be rising in this former British contractor and soldier because in 1765 we find him a delegate to the Stamp Congress that met in New York City in 1765. That same year he retired from business and moved to old Whitestone, Queens. He was a Member of the Continental Congress con-

tinuously from 1774 to 1779, delegate to the Provincial Convention in 1775, a member of the Committee of 100 in 1775, served in the Provincial Congress in 1776 and 1777 and was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, Queens' only signer. Thus, forever, the name of Francis Lewis, a resident of Queens by choice, will go ringing down the corridors of time. We honor and revere him.

He was commissioner of the board of admiralty in 1779 and passed away in New York City on December 30, 1803, leaving generations to come and generations yet unborn deeply in his debt. It is interesting to note that he served in the Continental Congress and Provincial Congress concurrently for 2 years. In these days that would be the equivalent of serving as a State senator and Congressman or Senator of the United States at the same time. If this cofounder of our country had any faults, lack of capacity for work and laziness were not among them.

Another delegate to the Continental Congress, who might be claimed as a Queens man, inasmuch as he chose to spend his declining years in old Newtown was John Alsop, a native of Orange County, N. Y. On reaching maturity he settled in New York City and carried on a mercantile and importing business. He represented New York City in the Colonial Legislature, served as a Member of the Continental Congress and served as a member of the Committee of 100 appointed in 1775 to take charge of the Government until a convention could be assembled. In recognition of his activity in commercial life he was the eighth president of the New York State Chamber of Commerce, serving in that capacity in 1784 and 1785. He died here in Newtown on November 22, 1794, and his surviving relatives buried him in Trinity Churchyard in Manhattan.

A name to be conjured with during the pre-Revolutionary and Revolutionary days was that of Egbert Benson, who spent the last years of his life in Jamaica, where he died in August of 1833. Benson had the unique distinction of serving in both the Continental Congress and in the subsequently organized Congress of the United States. His was a life filled with merited honors given him by his fellow Americans.

He was born in New York City in 1746 and graduated from Kings College (now Columbia University) in 1765. He entered the practice of law. He was deputy to the provincial convention in 1775, a member of the Council of Safety in 1777 and 1778; in 1777 was appointed the first attorney general of New York State and served until 1789; he was a member of the State assembly from 1777 to 1781 and again in 1788; in 1789 he was appointed one of the three commissioners to direct the embarkation of Tory refugees to the loyal British provinces in Canada; (this exodus of those loyal to the crown you will recall was set forth at length in Kenneth Roberts' historical novel Oliver Wiswell) he was associate judge of the Supreme Court of New York from 1784 to 1801; he was a member of the Continental Congress from 1784–1788; a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1788, which ratified the Federal Constitution (there appeared to be no limit in those days to the concurrent service of a man in several official capacities and certainly no limit to Benson's ability and willingness to hold public office) he was elected to the First and Second Congresses and served there from March 4, 1789 to March 3, 1793.

One would think this was about all of the public service that one man could undertake. But not this man. After 4 years in the newly created Congress he was appointed judge of the United States Circuit Court, Second Circuit, and apparently tiring of judicial life we find him elected to the Congress again in 1813, after an absence of 20 years from that body. He resigned during his term but lived 20 years longer, spending most of that time in Jamaica, where he died August 24, 1833, to be interred in Prospect Cemetery.

It is interesting to note, too, that he had a proper regard for historial values. He served as the first president of the New York Historical Society from 1804 to 1816.

Melanchton Smith was another Queens man of the stirring Revolutionary days, who achieved eminence as a soldier and patriot. He was born in Jamaica on May 7, 1744, and was buried there on July 29, 1798, although his commercial and Revolutionary activities took him elsewhere. As a youth he clerked and went into business at Poughkeepsie. He was made a delegate to the first Provincial Congress in New York in 1775. In June of that year the Continental Regiment was organized and he served in it. He organized and became captain of the Dutchess County Minutemen. He was later sheriff of that county. In 1785 he moved to New York City. He served in the Continental Congress from 1785 to 1788 and was a member of the State convention that met at Poughkeepsie and ratified the Federal Constitution on July 26, 1788. Later he served in the State Assembly. Queens is proud that she is the final resting place of this distinguished and patriotic son.

Another noted patriot, who served in the Continental Congress is buried in Jamaica, although why his body was taken from its original place of interment in the family vault under the old church of St. Thomas in New York City and reinterred in our borough I have been unable to ascertain. This man, William Duer, had a most interesting career in an age when the uncommon seemed to be the rule and not the exception. He certainly left his imprint on the country of his adoption. He was born in Devonshire, England, March 18, 1747; attended Eton College in England and in 1765, when the North American colonists were meeting to protest the excessive stamp taxes, he was in another part of the world, serving as aide-de-camp to Lord Clive, the Governor General of India. Lord Clive was one of the towering world figures of his day and was chiefly responsible, you will recall, for the imposition of British rule on India; a rule that lasted until only recently. I recall as a boy the thrill I received in reading Henty's adventurous story "With Clive in India."

In 1768, William Duer emigrated to the Colonies and settled at Fort Miller, Washington County, N. Y. There he was appointed justice of the peace by royal authority and on July 1, 1773, became the first judge of Charlotte in Washington County. He built the first saw and grist mill there and later erected a snuff mill and a powder mill.

Evidently the service for the Crown with Clive in India stirred sympathy for the oppressed within him because shortly after settling in Washington County he became prominent in pre-Revolutionary movements. He was a Member of the Provincial Congress in 1776 and 1777; he served in the State senate in 1777 and served 2 years as an appointed judge of the court of common pleas.

In 1778 he moved to Fishkill, N. Y., and later to what is now Paterson, N. J. In Paterson he erected the first cotton mill and this operated so successfully he established another cotton mill in Westchester County. Snuff and cotton mills. Strange enterprises for New York State in light of the location of this type of manufacturing today. Evidently William Duer was more than a revolutionary. He was a pioneer in business enterprises. In 1777 he was a Member of the Continental Congress, serving through 1788, when he moved to New York City. In 1786 he was a member of the State assembly.

At the request of Alexander Hamilton, he assisted in the organization of the United States Treasury Department in 1789 and 1790. Thus, this transplanted imperialist, who became a revolutionist and a pioneer in business enterprise, left his imprint on the fiscal system of our country. Why, after all of his wanderings, his mortal remains finally found their last resting place in Queens, I have been unable to learn, but I plan to research further to get the answer. Unanswered questions such as these are sometimes more interesting than the matter of factual recital of historical data.

This brings us to one of the most interesting of Queens' Revolutionary heroes and lawmakers—another transplanted Queens citizen, whose memory must always remain in the foreground of our thinking when conjuring with Queens' giants of yesteryear. This great citizen was Rufus King.

In his case, as was evidenced in the biographies previously set forth in this paper, we find a flaming patriotism, a resolve to serve his country in high places and a driving restlessness as to place of permanent abode that ended only when he breathed his last in Jamaica on April 29, 1827.

He was born in Scarboro, Maine, which is very near Portland, and which was then a part of Massachusetts, on March 24, 1755. He attended the Dummer Academy at Byfield, near Newburyport, Mass., and was graduated from Harvard College in 1777.

He served in the Revolutionary War and became aide to General Sullivan in his expedition to Rhode Island. He studied law in Newburyport and was admitted to the bar and commenced practice in 1780; he was a member of the Massachusetts House of Representatives in 1782, a member of the Continental Congress from Massachusetts from 1784 to 1787; delegate to the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787, and to the Massachusetts State Convention in 1788, which ratified the Constitutional Convention proceedings.

Then he made another major move. He settled here in 1788. He served as a member of the New York State Assembly in 1789 and 1790. He must have been a man of exceptional attainments to become an official of the State of New York within a year after having moved into the State.

Now note his progress. He proceeded to zoom into national leadership with almost skyrocket effect. He was elected as a Federalist from New York to the Senate of the United States in the First Congress, which convened on March 4, 1789. His New York colleague in that first Senate was Philip Schuyler, of Albany, another Revolutionary giant.

Rufus King was reelected to the United States Senate in 1795 and served until May 18, 1796, when he resigned. Then he was appointed United States Minister to Great Britain, and he served in that capacity from May 20, 1796, to May 18, 1803. Here is drama in history. Only a few short years previously Rufus King had borne arms against Great Britain and now he was an accredited minister at the court of the country he had helped forcibly wrest his country from.

But this man's career was not ended. By no means. In 1804 he was the unsuccessful Federalist candidate for Vice President of the United States when Thomas Jefferson was elected for his first term as President. His successful opponent for the Vice Presidency was Aaron Burr, who was later to create lurid chapters for the historians, and who has become one of the most controversial American figures of all time.

This political set-back for Rufus King was only temporary because we find, 9 years later, in 1813, that he was again elected to the United States Senate in the thirteenth session of Congress. He served in the United States Senate until March 3, 1825—which was the Eighteenth Congress. Think of it. A man who served in the very first Congress finally laying his legislative burdens down in the Eighteenth Congress.

While in his second tenure in Congress he somehow found the time to be a candidate (unsuccessfully) for governorship of the State of New York on the Federalist ticket

and was beaten for the Presidency by James Madison of Virginia.

This particular era was the heyday of the Virginia politicians or statesmen, if you prefer the latter appellation. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, Virginians all, followed in rapid order, with only John Adams, of Massachusetts, intervening as the second President between Washington and Jefferson. And to his dying day Adams thought Jefferson had, to use a current colloquialism, double-crossed him out of a second term. And he told him so the day that Jefferson took over the reins of government.

In any event, there was a time in the early days of the country when Virginia so dominated the high echelons of the American political scene that it seemed that only Virginia mothers could look on their newborn boy babies and say fondly, "Someday you may grow up to be President of the United States."

But to resume the King career. After retiring from the Senate finally in 1825 we find this remarkable man again becoming the United States Minister to the court of Great Britain from May 5, 1825, to June 16, 1826. Ill health forced him to return to his home in Jamaica, Queens, where he passed away on April 29, 1827. His remains are interred in the churchyard of Grace Church.

What a glorious half century Rufus King spent in the service of his country—he was truly a builder of our America and a foremost exemplar of the free political processes he fought for and worked to bring into being.

The King family was otherwise distinguished. He had a half-brother, Cyrus King, who was raised in Maine, who, after graduating from Columbia University, served as Rufus King's secretary when he was Minister to Great Britain. Cyrus King returned to Saco, Maine, where he became one of the founders of Thorndyke Academy; he was elected as a Federalist to the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Congresses. He died in Saco, Maine, still a comparatively young man, in 1817.

Rufus King's son, John Alsop King, subsequently became a Member of Congress and Governor of New York State in 1857 and 1858, and another son, James, served a term in Congress. Although he lived much of his life in New Jersey, James King is buried with his father and brother, John Alsop King, in Jamaica. Truly, a remarkable family — one which produced a United States Senator and three Congressmen in two generations.

It is significant to note that the New York delegation to the first Congress of the United States had eight men in it—six Representatives and two Senators. Of these eight men, two were from Queens—Senator King and Congressman Benson, whose career I set forth earlier.

In this paper I have reviewed the careers of early day Queens statesmen from the days of the Constitutional Convention down to and through the first session of the Congress of the United States.

Possibly "Old Newtown's Part in the United States Congress" shouldn't have been the proper title for this paper. There seems to be much of Jamaica in it. In extenuation, I can only say I had to follow where research led me. But, after all, the history of all sections of Queens is closely intertwined. The people of Old Newtown were the friends and neighbors of the good folk living in Flushing and Jamaica. Their families intermarried and they visited back and forth. They had everything in common, including their love for liberty. Rufus King and Egbert Benson were as close to and meant as much to the people of Newtown as they did to Jamaicans. Old Newtowners of legislative bent begin to dot the pages of history in numbers just a bit later than the era I have high-lighted.

The careers of other Queens and Old Newtown men, who lived and legislated, yes, and fought for their country in 1812 subsequently, are just as interesting as those reviewed tonight. There was Sam Riker, of Newtown, whose direct descendants are our neighbors and friends today. There was Cadwallader Colden, an ancestor of one of our most distinguished Supreme Court Justices, Charles S. Colden. There was Joshua Sands, for whom Sands Point was named. Before it was renamed it was known as Cow Point. Then, there was the magnificent career of John Alsop King, whose luster was not dimmed by his distinguished father and who is a story in himself.

To one who is interested in historical matters, Queens is a fertile field for examination. The street (once country road) we are meeting along has known the tread of patriots and king's soldiers and horses. Those who lived along it or near it have known the sorrows and fierce exultations arising from armed conflict. Queens in that heroic day might have been only a collection of country towns, but what was thought and done in Queens in those far-off days, when our country was being born, with accompanying labor pains, was part and parcel, and an important part and parcel, of the developing fabric of a free country.

In years gone by Queens and Newtown men and women helped mightily in the fashioning of a Nation. They did not want to die by sword or bullet, before a firing squad, or dangle from a hangman's noose any more than any of us want to die in those violent fashions. But, the point is, they were ready to die, for an ideal they had consecrated themselves to—the ideal of national, political, and personal liberty. In selfishness they might have followed the line of least resistance and gone on from year to year, decade to decade, hoping that a half-mad king might grant them the liberties that their dignity as human beings demanded. They did suffer much. And they suffered for years before they revolted.

But when they erupted, when they decided it was time to strike the yoke of foreign domination from their necks, they erupted violently and stubbornly. They were unbeatable because the ideal of freedom and liberty burned high in the breast of all—or nearly all—nothing short of mass extermination would have finally extinguished this flame.

And because of them we sit comfortably here in this beautiful building in Old Newtown tonight. Our sons, mine among them, have fought and shed blood for this country in all our country's wars since the Revolutionary War. God forbid that they or their sons will ever have to fight again. If they do they will not be found wanting. Their patriotism, we know, is as high as that of the early sons and daughters of Queens and Old Newtown.

I am not one of those who entertain special fears for the younger generation. I remember when I was growing up my mother and father used to say mournfully, "What is to become of the younger generation?" And mothers and fathers throughout the land are asking the same question today. And they always will, in every generation. It is not the present younger generation I am nervous about. They have just proved themselves in the most brutal and most devastating of all wars.

We can—and if we are to survive in this turbulent world—we must see to it that no backward steps are taken; that no hard-won liberties are infringed on; that no ideologies imported from godless or materialistic nations get a foothold in this country. And those who gave aid and comfort to alien ideologies must be converted to the American way or ruthlessly have their capacity for injury to our country and its institutions destroyed. It is every country's duty to protect its rights and political and economic systems from enemies from within and without.

We all felt nauseated yesterday when we read of the traitorism of an American soldier who deserted his flag and became a radio voice for Nazi Germany while we were at war with Germany. He received a 25-year term in prison—a light sentence, considering the gravity of his offense. In any other country in the world that traitor would have been shot or hanged. There seemed to be no mitigating circumstances whatever in his case. What could have gone wrong in the thinking of this young man? Can it be that our collective patriotic thinking is not well enough integrated; is not emphatic enough; that fundamental love of country—enlightened patriotism—is not dwelt on enough in our schools and churches? Someone who had the responsibility for the early thinking of that traitorous American soldier failed in his or her job somewhere along the line. Let us make sure there are no failures among those who receive their inspiration and ideologies from us when they are young and impressionable.

And I wonder if you felt a vicarious sense of shame when members of a sidewalk mob, recruited on behalf of an alien power, booed and hissed a Federal judge yesterday when he was about to take his place on the bench to preside over the trial of those accused of plotting to overthrow our Government by force. I did, and along with shame came a feeling of hot anger. This sort of thing must stop. We must see to it that it stops. Respect for law and the courts is fundamental in our national structure. We must not permit those who deride our courts to weaken or subvert the judicial processes. We must not sit meekly by when the ruffian scum that gives its allegiance to a foreign power that is embarked on a program of forcing the entire world to yield to its materialistic philosophy of statism, boos and derides our officials. We must see to it that justice is done, through our courts. We must continue to elect officials who believe deeply that the Constitution of the United States is still the most enlightened document written by man for the government of man.

We must beware of those, regardless of party, who listen to the siren calls of godless, lock-step, collectivist systems for the sake of garnering votes. We must rid ourselves of any and all who would destroy our honored, time-tested American principles of free government.

Let's back up our courts. Let's back up those who are, in their official capacities, seeking to rid us of those who would first topple our form of government into the dust and subsequently enslave us. Let us make sure we continue to have names and do not become numbers in a master file in a room behind an iron curtain.

Let's educate on behalf of the American principles of freedom for all and liberty within the law for the individual. Let's resist, and if need be deport or incarcerate those who value the approving nod of a foreign dictator more than they do their own or our freedom or our country's integrity and sovereignty.

This Broadway, this old street that faces us, is to me a hallowed street—one of the most hallowed and significant in all America. I always think of it as Freedom Road. Through its dust and dirt of other earlier years trod men and women imbued with the ideal of liberty. Their sweat and their tears mixed with the dust of old Broadway in Old Newtown. Out of their reverence for God, out of their beliefs, out of their exertions, out of their sacrifices, out of their wounds, out of their tears, came the freedom you and I so comfortably enjoy.

Let us do our utmost, living on our respective roads, to see to it that every highway in the United States, whether old and much traveled like old Broadway in Old Newtown, or whether the newest paved street in the

newest subdivision of the land, is truly, now and forevermore, Freedom Road. It is the best road that man, throughout all the ages, has ever built and traveled.

Fort Stoddert, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article by Hon. Peter A. Brannon, archivist of the State of Alabama, which article appeared in the Montgomery Advertiser under date of January 30, 1949. This article contains some very interesting history of Fort Stoddert, Ala., and stresses the importance of this outpost in the early 1800's.

THROUGH THE YEARS—ALABAMIANS URGED TO SUPPORT PLEA FOR FORT STODDERT STAMP

(By Peter A. Brannon)

The current agitation started by the Historic Mobile Preservation Society for a commemorative stamp to honor the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of Fort Stoddert, on Mobile River, gives Alabamians an opportunity to revitalize the many interesting incidents connected with that post. FRANK BOYKIN, of the First Congressional District, is making a splendid effort to convince the Postmaster General that the point is of sufficient national importance to warrant the issue. BOYKIN has even gone so far as to introduce a bill in Congress to direct the Postmaster General to issue such a stamp. We Alabamians should vigorously support the Congressman's efforts.

Fort Stoddert, founded as an outpost near the boundary line of Spanish territory and the United States in 1799, bears the name of Benjamin Stoddert, one-time Secretary of the United States Navy and credited by some as once Acting Secretary of War. The post was the port of entry for goods from Spanish Mobile, and was the most important United States military post in the Gulf area for years. It should be remembered that Mobile, located south of the thirty-first degree of north latitude, did not get into the possession of the United States until after Andrew Jackson took the town during the period of the war with Great Britain. Settlers in south Alabama, when they bought commodities which had to come through the Spanish customs, paid a much higher price for goods than those floated down by boat and portage from the Allegheny routes.

Some writers on Alabama history have confused the two sites, Mount Vernon and Fort Stoddert, and have intermingled the historical references, but this need not be confusing for Mount Vernon, up on the hill out of the river swamp, was established as a health resort and for what was known in early military records as a cantonment.

Its history, rich in pioneer American lore, does not need any of Fort Stoddert's to entice the interest of the student. Fort Stoddert had at one time Capt. Peter Philip Schuyler, son of the old Revolutionary New Yorker, as its commanding officer. Capt. Bartholemew Schaumberg, a Pennsylvania Dutchman, was one time commander. Edmund Pendleton Gaines, at times commander in chief of the United States Army, and son-in-law of Judge Harry Toulmin, once commanded the post. It was he who captured Aaron Burr early in 1807 and confined him there until he was sent to Richmond to stand trial for treason.

Fort Stoddert was frequently host to George Strother Gaines, brother of Edmund Pendleton, long time the United States factor at St. Stephens and the removal agent of the Choctaws to the west. Judge Toulmin held court there, having succeeded that interesting old Connecticut gentleman, Col. Ephraim Kirby, who was appointed as the first Federal district judge there by President Jefferson.

Kirby, a veteran of the Revolutionary Army, came as a land commissioner to the Mississippi Territory, and subsequently was named to a post in the Orleans district. But when this was withdrawn, he was designated as the first United States district judge of the eastern section of the Mississippi Territory. The territorial papers published in recent years proved that Mr. Kirby never held a term of court, though the historians did not know that until recently. As late as May 1, 1804, Kirby was addressing the President from Fort Stoddert. Published in Carter's Territorial Papers of the United States, and as excerpts from the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress, is a long letter giving much data relative to that section of the State. Published only 2 pages in advance of Mr. Kirby's letter is one from Harry Toulmin to the Secretary of State of the United States, wherein Mr. Toulmin writes from Frankfort, Ky., his letter bearing the same date as Mr. Kirby's.

Fort Stoddert is located in what the Spanish knew as Ward's Bluff. It was erected by United States troops under Lieutenant Schaumbert (sometimes he is referred to as Captain) in the summer of 1799. It was anticipating that this would be about the line agreed on between Spain and the United States. When the Ellicott boundary line was fixed, it was found to be north of the 31st degree and within American territory. The site was used as a military post with an outlying cantonment at Mount Vernon until the close of the war with Great Britain, when the establishment at Mount Vernon became permanent.

Judge Kirby is buried at Fort Stoddert and his grave bears an appropriate marker.

ECA Can't Do Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Fortune magazine for February 1949:

ECA CAN'T DO EVERYTHING—IT HAS ALREADY BEEN SURPRISINGLY SUCCESSFUL IN PART—TO BE WHOLLY SO, IT NEEDS NOT MORE MONEY BUT (1) A MILITARY GUARANTY, (2) A COMPREHENSIVE FOREIGN POLICY, (3) A PROGRAM ENABLING EUROPE TO EARN MORE DOLLARS

To the Eighty-first Congress and the solid citizens of the United States: This is essentially to remind you of what you probably never will forget: you are stuck with the rest of the non-Communist world. As this appears in print, you will be arguing earnestly how to renew for the next 15 months the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, popularly known as the Marshall plan. Some of the idealists among you may strive to rid the act of jokers such as the provision that one-fourth of the wheat shipped abroad must go in the form of flour. Others, alas, will sweat mightily to introduce new jokers. But many of you will dutifully and conscientiously check the record of the Economic Cooperation Administration against its mandates in the act. Aware that it is "the most portentous experiment in the history of American foreign policy," you will probably scrutinize it with its high objectives in mind. Without too much petty haggling, after the breast beating is over, you will make a deficiency appropriation of about $1,300,000,000 to cover its expenditures up to June 30, 1949, and appropriate between $4,000,000,000 and $4,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

All of which is fine, honorable lawmakers, but will you go all the way in your scrutiny? To appraise ECA you cannot merely look it over professionally, as a Missouri farmer inspects a mule; you've got to climb high enough to take a long deep look at it and the whole complex and difficult world. You must of course weigh what ECA has done to help Europe to viability. You must give more time and thought than many of you seem inclined to give to the question of whether Europe has done enough to help itself by mutual self-aid and particularly by sound fiscal policy. But beyond that you must ask yourselves what ECA was supposed to do and whether it can do it. Do any of you still believe that it can achieve its aims without a military guaranty? Do you think ECA alone can adequately prepare the way for its own demise?

For the disquieting fact, as revealed in the plans and estimates of the 19 Marshall countries, is that they may not achieve the high degree of viability they have been hoping to achieve by 1952. That, after all, is not strange. Even before the late $1,352,000,000,000 war, many of these countries were running adverse trade balances and generally going downhill. ECA is only the latest chapter in the old story. The United States, since World War I, has given away billions of dollars in goods and services to the Marshall countries. Since July 1945 it has topped them with another $9,000,000,000 worth. The foreign investments of these nations, normally equal to the cost of more than half their imported food and raw materials, were largely wiped out in the war. They cannot sell what they once did to others or to one another. Even if they increase vastly their exports to the United States and other hard-currency countries (as they confidently hope to), and even if they export more to eastern Europe than they used to (about which they are less sanguine), they estimate they will be able to afford no more than 75 percent of their prewar imports by 1952. Yet their population will have increased by more than 10 percent. Barring a miracle, they fear they will have to reconcile themselves to a lower standard of living than they had hoped for—and until a few weeks ago, indeed, were led to think they would have. Many Americans think that ECA will end Europe's dependence on the United States. If you think so, how can Europe increase its trade and its exports? Must it reduce its imports, and what will that mean? Can ECA adequately prepare the way for such eventualities?

You cannot escape such questions, honorable lawmakers, if only because you thought you had answered them all when you rushed ECA through in the first place. Taken together, its objectives, even in the well-worn prose of the act, are almost presumptuously Olympian in scope. The act, to preserve democracy abroad, aims to bring about "* * * sound economic conditions, stable international economic relationships, and the achievement * * * of a healthy economy independent of extraordinary outside assistance * * *" to be achieved by a "plan * * * based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade,

the creation and maintenance of international financial stability, the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers * * * to encourage these countries through a joint organization to exert sustained common efforts."

And ECA's unstated but understood aims cover even more ground. Many of you Congressmen—and perhaps enough to defeat the act—were for it because it had been sold to you as the only way to stop communism. To many others it is a substitute for military aid. To still others it is a means of tapering off aid. To people who feel good only when other people are feeling good it is a humanitarian scheme. To farmers, manufacturers, and others of little faith who are beginning to worry about surplus production, it is a handy solution. It is indeed a little of everything to nearly all men; and its strength and defects, its accomplishments and failures, can be appraised in terms of that fact.

IF THERE HAD BEEN NO ECA

You will find it easy to become enthusiastic about much that ECA has already done. Its formation was a triumph of organization. Nine months ago, when Paul Hoffman took over, it was nothing at all. Today it is a flourishing group of more than 2,000, nearly 1,500 of them in "missions" abroad. The staff is the pick of Government and private industry. "As a whole," says Senator VANDENBERG, "ECA is the best group ever put together for public service." Despite early turn-over of expert personnel, owing to the policy of drafting prominent advisers and technicians on a temporary basis, ECA has functioned well, and even efficiently, making more than $5,000,000,000 worth of allocations with more judgment than anyone had a right to expect.

ECA PICKS UP THE TICKET

In the scenes described here, ECA has "picked up the ticket"—provided the means to continue a project or carry it through more thoroughly. Its contribution is often small, dispersed, and hidden—a little concrete here, a little steel there, some wheat for the workers' bread. It is hard to dramatize to Europe. But it deserves to be dramatized, for it is usually the scarcest and hence most vital contribution.

ECA's surpassing achievement so far has been what Europeans call the support it has given their economies. Striking, yet only typical, is the example of Britain. E. Austin Robinson, a Cambridge fellow who sat on the committee deciding British economic policy when the $3,700,000,000 loan ran out and it looked as if more aid would not be forthcoming, recalls the experience vividly. "It was terrifying," he says. "Britain planned to sell everything it could, its plant and machinery, for what quick dollars it could get. Instead of reorganizing and equipping its industry so it could be a source of permanent wealth, it would have had to jettison the whole thing. Our meager rations of butter, sugar, cheese, and bacon would have had to be cut by more than a third, and the weekly ration of about one shell egg and 21 cents worth of meat per person would also have been reduced severely. Worst of all, we would have had to cope with a standing army of unemployed estimated to reached 2,000,000."

So ECA, if only because it gave Europe hope, literally saved the continent, saved it from civil war, economic collapse, and communism. "The money we spent," says Paul Hoffman, "* * * is the best bargain the people in the United States ever got." What is more, ECA is giving Europe a chance to rebuild itself. Production in most countries has risen above prewar levels, and is still rising steadily. Exports to the United States have gone up 39 percent in 6 months.

LIKE NOTHING SINCE THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE

But what has ECA done to improve trade, and otherwise to promote the sustained common efforts, the economic unity that will prepare for a united Europe so confidently ordained in the act? Here it can boast of two phenomena that at first glance are encouraging, even astonishing. One is the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), and the other the Intra-European Payments Scheme. The OEEC was not founded by ECA, but in fact antedates ECA. After General Marshall's famous promissory speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947, European nations were swept by a wave of desperation, relief, and sweet reason. "When they sniffed dollars," remarked one Frenchman, "they dropped everything and came running like cats to fresh milk." Hastily and voluntarily, with Ernie Bevin leading the pack, they formed OEEC to prepare and integrate estimates of what they needed. Whether it was the lure of billions of dollars, or the birth of a new spirit in Europe, they managed to get on together. And when ECA looked around for a means of allocating its aid, it sagaciously gave the responsibility to OEEC.

There is a lot of palaver in the OEEC offices on the Quai d'Orsay above the Seine in Paris—no fewer than 897 committee meetings were held last July and August—and much of it is racked by bickering and argument. But OEEC, like a crocus beside a glacier, blossoms hopefully. Each country, when it presents its program, is cross-examined by at least two others; and it is not only obliged to cough up any and all information, it actually does. It seems incredible, but members insist that central bureaus actually disclose trade practices, and that technicians actually reveal industrial secrets. The British, who only a couple of months ago were accused of dragging their feet at OEEC, are now capitalizing on their relative abundance of trained technicians and their improved trading position to take the lead in the organization's affairs. And although OEEC is plausibly criticized for not being authoritative enough, members of the top council, composed of ministers from the nineteen Marshall countries, do have the power to accept certain changes in their countries' production and trade plans. It is easy to see why OEEC has been fervently if loosely described as something which has not happened to Europe since the Holy Roman Empire.

OEEC's most important achievement is the intra-European payments scheme, sometimes called the little Marshall plan. In the summer of 1947, owing to the ever tightening net of currency restrictions and controls as well as lack of exchange, intra-European trade was mainly on a barter or bilateral basis, and was rapidly grinding to a stop. So OEEC took action. After preliminary haggling, which must have been edifying to listen to, it set up a trial clearinghouse; and after that, last October 16, each creditor country agreed to donate its credits to its debtors by extending them drawing rights. These came to the equivalent of $810,000,000. Great Britain, the major donor, contributed the equivalent of $312,000,000, and Belgium and Luxemburg, next largest, together gave the equivalent of $218,500,000; while France, the major recipient, got the equivalent of $333,000,000. To enable the scheme to work at all, ECA had to give contributing countries conditional dollar grants to match their donations. Since these came from regular Marshall plan funds, Europe as a whole gets no more dollar aid as a result of the pooling scheme. What it amounts to is that the contributing countries, chiefly Britain and Belgium, have generously done unto others as the United States has done unto them. The results are encouraging. Intra-European trade is still less than two-thirds its prewar volume, but it is picking up, and a major part of it is now accounted for by the scheme.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FISCAL RECTITUDE

Nevertheless, honorable legislators and citizens, do not allow your enthusiasm to become unduly inflamed. The plane may be doing 150 miles an hour, but it still isn't off the ground. Partly this is a question of military security; yet if the Marshall countries had a huge modern army, tens of thousands of aircraft, and all the secret weapons known, they still would be insecure. The trouble with ECA's achievements in OEEC, thrilling as they are, is that they are, at bottom, only a substitute for, at best, a step toward sound, old economic practices. If Europe enjoyed responsible governments and reliable currencies, as decontrolled and freely convertible as they were, say, in 1910, there would be little or no need for OEEC and an inter-European payments scheme. Trade would expand naturally. American banks and industries would have incentive to put money into European government and industry. OEEC may be the shining hope of an advance in European cooperation, but it is also the result of a long and depressing retrograde in European cooperation; it must get Europe to adopt sound monetary and fiscal practices before it can amount to anything much.

These practices boil down to balanced government budgets and recognition of the fact that investment plus consumption cannot, in the long run, amount to more than the national output; and ideally they result in a currency sound enough to be freely convertible in the open market. No economy, totalitarian or free, in Siberia or North America, can long flout these principles with impunity; for they are based on the simple laws of arithmetic, which no regime has yet succeeded in repealing. If 90 out of every 100 workers in a country with little or no unemployment are devoted to the production of consumer goods and services, you cannot assign 20 of them to making capital goods without reducing the production of consumers' goods. To put it another way, you should not put them to work at capital goods unless your consumers save enough or can be taxed enough to pay for the capital goods. If you try to turn the trick by running into debt—that is, by creating money by government fiat (the printing press) or private banking (too much credit)—you only reduce the value of your money. If you keep on creating money, you have an inflation on your hands. And the only cure for inflation, in Afganistan or Peru, in Spain or in Russia, is fiscal rectitude. In the late depression, it is true, this principle tended to fall into disrepute when the Keynesian theory of deficit financing became useful. One trouble today is that the politicians, naturally delighted with the practice of deficit financing, have kept on applying this depression remedy to boom conditions.

PLAN AGAINST PLAN

ECA is sometimes criticized for substituting Government planning for the natural play of economic forces. It was, indeed, at the request of ECA that OEEC asked all the Marshall countries to submit plans showing how each proposed to balance its exports and imports by the time Marshall help ended. Even Britain, that citadel of planning, had to be rushed into submitting a plan it did not want to submit. The "plans," however, were unavoidable. Congress could not have been persuaded to grant lump sums to Europe; and, as Paul Hoffman has pointed out several times, the only alternative to wading through interminable shopping lists was to ask the countries for programs. Ernie Bevin recently took great delight in reminding Parliament of this. "I hope I shall not be taken wrongly in America," he cackled, "if I say

that the Americans are a great free-enterprise people inside and wonderful planners outside."

But with all respect to the elated Mr. Bevin and the alarmed critics of planning, OEEC has not advanced the cause of national planning one bit. On the contrary, it has all but ruined it. For once the plans were assembled, they mercilessly exposed government planning for what it is—the preparation of estimates of what might happen if certain policies were followed under dozens of conditions not one of which is very predictable. The plans contradicted one another all along the line. Almost every country hoped to balance its trade by selling goods the others could not buy, and by exporting more than it imports. What is left when these contradictions are resolved is only the most tentative kind of guide, bristling with unresolved problems and bulging with unanswered questions.

The contradictory plans, furthermore, performed the salutary function of demonstrating that the intra-European payments scheme, for all its good works, would collapse like a corncrib in an earthquake without the conditional grants of dollars, and that only sound currencies can in the long run save Europe. Right now, to be sure, such fiscal principles cannot be applied suddenly and dogmatically. If currencies were freed from all controls overnight, much of the capital left in Europe might take the opportunity to flee. Until certain countries can boast more security, capital rests there uneasily and under duress. Not even the Belgians, who enjoy a hard currency and would prefer outright convertibility to OEEC's drawing-rights scheme, seem to think complete convertibility is possible right now. But the time has come, nevertheless (as if it had ever gone), when Europe must take steps to return to fiscal rectitude or let its trade die.

And Europe is obliged to practice it not only for the sake of its trade; Europe must practice it simply to learn to get along by itself. All the signs, to repeat, point to a leaner Continent, one that will enjoy fewer imports per capita than before the war. They also point to a Europe with a very different kind of internal trade. Consider Britain, the most important sector in Europe's mercantile pattern. Before the war, when the pound would buy at least twice what it does today, some 11,000 Englishmen enjoyed incomes of more than £5,000 a year; fewer than 300 do now. The British 4-year plan may be worthless as a prediction, but the British income figures demonstrate clearly enough why Britain is likely to reduce more or less permanently its imports of things like wine, perfumes, and expensive comestibles. As it is, everybody, including Britain, wants to import necessities and export luxuries.

Europe's only sane course is to prepare itself for the future by practicing correct monetary and fiscal policies while it still has ECA. And this does not mean, as many advocates of controls imply, that such policies demand inhuman sacrifices from the common people. The exact reverse is true. They are the people's best insurance against bad times—specifically against inflation, with its high prices, black markets, and a few gorged incomes in an ocean of miserably shrunken ones. OEEC can justify its great expectations no more resplendently than in persuading all free Europe to adopt and enforce these fundamental policies.

THE SPECIAL CASE OF FRANCE

What is ECA doing to bring OEEC and Europe to them? Here the record is spotty, and nearly every fine conclusion carries on its back a mean qualification. Belgium is a model of fiscal rectitude, but it was before ECA. Britain under Sir Stafford Cripps has turned in an all-time example of civilized (if dogmatic) self-restraint; but even Britain is not done with suppressed inflation—that is, an excess of buying power inefficiently and imperfectly checked by price and ration controls. Western Germany, after a good start with its new Deutsche mark, has demonstrated again the national weakness for biting off more than it can chew by increasing its money supply faster than its productiveness, and is mired in inflation. (This is not ECA's fault, for it is responsible for very few of the dollars being used in Germany. General Clay's military government has the money; and it also has the power, which no American agency has elsewhere, to enforce fiscal rectitude. But it let the Germans have their heads.) Above all, there is France, at once the most crucial nation in ECA and the most flagrant example of what is wrong in Europe.

France, as everyone knows, is potentially the Continent's richest and mostly nearly self-sufficient nation. Ordinarily she can almost live on the food she raises; last year's crop, according to dubious official estimates, came within 15 percent of normal, that is, within 10 to 20 percent of supporting the country. She needs to export only 8 or 9 percent of her gross output (she is now exporting 3 percent) to pay for all her imports—compared, for instance, to 15 or 16 percent for Britain. "If she could only reform herself fiscally," says one ECA official, "she would need about 6 weeks to become the most prosperous, stable country in Europe."

ABOVE ALL ELSE, SECURITY

To repeat, Congressmen and citizens, ECA is doing about as much as it can. If you want it to do more, you must give ECA itself some aid, specifically on the political-military fronts. Any organization dispensing free aid on so colossal a scale, to be sure, necessarily wields a political and military as well as an economic weapon. But ECA is a little too much of everything to nearly everybody; it has to function at once as a banker, politician, and propaganda agency. With help, it would have a vastly easier time in its fight for fiscal reform and in its attempts to forfend the so-called long-term dollar shortage. At the same time, it could stick closer to its specific economic function, the allocation of aid. It could investigate more of the countless charges of graft in the import and distribution of aid. And it might get along with less money.

What help will enable ECA to do all this? ECA above all needs some kind of security for the Marshall countries. That surely means a military guarantee, if not an alliance. Much of the current brand of continental cynicism arises, as Fortune has previously suggested, from physical fear. So long as Frenchmen believe that Russia can take over Europe with relative impunity any day it chooses, French capital will flee as it did in the late thirties, even if the franc is miraculously stabilized. Armaments, of course, claim men and materials badly needed in more productive effort. But the governments of Europe, as they gather strength, are bound to arm themselves anyway. It would be senseless for them to set up separate military machines. A military alliance with the United States, accompanied by lend lease, would enable them to form, and should indeed depend on their forming, a common defense organization. Above all, it would restore their confidence in the future. Money would tend to stay at home. The United States would be in a far better position to "recommend" the very economic reforms that would automatically reduce the need for ECA help.

PROBLEM: TO SELL THE UNITED STATES

On the political front the visible sector is propaganda. Here ECA is weak. Americans may be the most skillful sellers and promoters the world has ever seen, but you'd never know it in Europe. When the Communists can spend a few hundred thousand dollars and nullify as much as $160,000,000 worth of aid (as the French coal strike did), something obviously needs to be added to American propaganda.

Selling people on economic aid is hard. Most of ECA's raw materials have gone into stock piles and storehouses, for distribution to factories, mills, wholesalers. Rarely can you point to a bridge or building and say, "Without ECA you would not have this." ECA has set up exhibitions in several cities; its packing cases are frequently marked with its insigne; and sometimes there are little ceremonies when first shipments arrive. But except in the Netherlands, where the Dutch have done a fine job of promoting the aid, the average man in the street, such as the farmer, knows practically nothing about it. Most of what the French know is wrong; the little French businessman figures that somebody must be getting a cut of the swag, and he only knows he isn't. "The Marshal plan? I can't see that it's working," is an old refrain.

ECA doubtless is not yet spending enough, or even all it hopes to, on advertising and publicity. Nearly all reports from abroad indicate that it should spend more. But the problem of selling ECA is more than just plugging ECA—it is the problem of selling the whole United States. That demands first of all a sincere, integrated foreign policy designed to discharge intelligently America's responsibilities to the rest of the world. It is a problem now for the Mr. Acheson who, speaking in Mississippi a month before Mr. Marshall's famous speech at Harvard, proposed a development of the foreign reconstruction policy of the United States. And it certainly is a challenge for the Harry Truman whose election pleased so many people in Europe.

PROBLEM: TO EARN MORE DOLLARS

What ECA needs, finally, is some action on the problem of what Europe will do when ECA is gone. How, aside from slashing their dollar imports, which they must do, can the Marshall countries solve their dollar shortages? In 1952–53, they expect—hope is the more accurate word—to sell twice as much to dollar areas as the $1,300,000,000 worth they sold in 1947. Even so, they may run up as much as a $2,000,000,000 deficit, unless they trim imports very severely. Manifestly they've got to try to export more, and that as soon as possible. They must stop selling in their own high-priced home markets (which wouldn't be so high priced if they punctured their inflations), and must apply themselves more assiduously to studying the American market and sales methods, of which they are distressingly ignorant. Despite the progress Italy is making, for example, she almost surely will be asking for more aid in 1953 unless her exports to the United States increase severalfold. The United States would surely not be going too far if it set up a genuine, live organization to help others sell to it.

The United States is not going too far, either, in taking another long look at its own tariff policies. On the whole they're lower than they've been since 1912, but they're still too high. The Danes complain, for instance, that they could go a long way toward solving their dollar problem were it not for the crippling 14-cent-a-pound duty on all butter after the first 50,000,000 pounds (at 7 cents). The shipping interests in Norway, Britain, and other nations are loud and emphatic: If the United States would apply the same noble concepts of free trade and honest competition to itself as it insists Europe adhere to, they aver, most United States cargoes would be carried in foreign bottoms, which can do it cheaper. Nothing impressed Europe more with the sincerity of ECA than Paul Hoffman's recent threat to stop loading 50 percent of ECA's

bulk cargoes in American ships. And so it goes. Europe still tends to regard the United States as a worker might regard an industrialist who gives millions to old people's homes and soup kitchens while bitterly fighting every little wage increase. So long as the United States maintains sizable tariffs, so long, even, as it restricts immigration, there is an uncomfortable amount of truth behind the attitude. If the United States cannot demolish this, it can at least do all that is humanly possible to make it insignificant.

The best if not immediately the likeliest way of getting dollars abroad is to encourage their export as American capital. Much, much more attention should be given to the idea. In the ECA Act, to be sure, Congress recognized this and allocated $300,000,000 to guarantee the convertibility of money earned by new American projects abroad (up to the amount invested). The trouble with the guarantee idea is that unless Europe adopts correct fiscal policies and gains military security, no politically feasible guarantee will suffice to attract capital. If on the other hand, Europe stabilizes currencies and has security, such guarantees are hardly necessary.

There is, happily, a considerable ferment of ideas on the subject. Eric Johnston would have a $1,000,000,000 fund set up to guarantee American investments abroad. R. W. Gifford, chairman of the Borg-Warner International Corp., would found a relief corporation, financed by international loans and the sale of American industrial equipment abroad, to export badly needed American managerial and technical talent. Something is already being done to export American know-how, on a limited scale, by the Anglo-American Council on Productivity. Others think that foreign countries should guarantee not only the convertibility of profit but the rate of exchange—as the Netherlands has done. Still other schemes would have the Government even underwrite extraordinary risks like confiscation and competition from monopolies. Many of these ideas are plainly unfeasible but all are worth examining. There is no easier, fairer, or economically more valid way of helping other countries to their feet than sending private American capital abroad.

THE BUSINESSMAN ABROAD

And American money should be accompanied by American enterprisers. On page 116 of this issue, Eric Johnston reports on his impressions of the all-too-human European businessman. His report may be somewhat oversimplified, but like all hyperbolic essays, it contains nude and bitter truths. Chew them over, citizens and Congressmen; they will enable many of you to think better of your much maligned American Babbitts. They will also help you understand why Karl Marx, who seems so absurd to most American businessmen, was a Savonarola to so many Europeans.

If, as Mr. Johnston seems to indicate, a considerable percentage of continentals conduct their businesses as devices to get all they can before the police (or the Reds) catch up with them, it may be futile to talk about restoring free enterprise in Europe until you reform the old guard or install a few new genuine free enterprisers there. When you think of dispatching American capital to Europe, therefore, you probably must think of American business teaching European business the responsibilities as well as the opportunities of the system. What! American businessmen as teachers, as missionaries? Well, not exactly. All they have to do is demonstrate how it pays a company to be socially conscious, and to concentrate on large volume and low prices, instead of constricted volume and high prices. That surely ought not to be an insuperable assignment.

Taking everything together, citizens and Congressmen, the prospect may sometimes seem a little more than you had bargained for. But first remember you're stuck with the non-Communist world, stuck with the fact that the seat of world power has shifted squarely to the United States, stuck with the trite but still quite important job of preserving civilization. You can't back out of these responsibilities any more than you can turn the clock back. And there is no reason why you should if you could. With ECA you have taken a major step toward fulfilling your responsibilities. Give it the support it needs, and the rest is possible.

Broadcast of Hon. Joseph C. Harsch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1949, the distinguished news analyst, Hon. Joseph C. Harsch, delivered a broadcast from Station WTOP, on the Columbia Broadcasting System, which I am sure many Members of Congress and many American citizens did not have the opportunity to hear. I consider this broadcast to be so noteworthy that I am including it in the RECORD as part of these remarks. I congratulate Mr. Harsch upon his keen analysis which was in the nature of a valedictory, it being his last broadcast on that particular Sunday program.

The broadcast follows:

Stalin has answered another set of questions put to him by a reporter, this time an American reporter, J. Kingsbury Smith, of INS. Stalin says the Berlin blockade could be lifted if Britain, France, and the United States would agree to postpone their plans for a western German state. Stalin says he would be glad to sign a joint declaration with the United States saying that neither intends to go to war with the other. Stalin says he would be willing to meet President Truman at a mutually acceptable place.

Like all previous Stalin answers to such set questions, this one has already stirred up quite a commotion with some politicians in Washington calling it an "opening wedge to peace." But there isn't really anything new in the Stalin answers, except that he has made them. There is no commitment which hasn't been made before.

The State Department just wonders why Stalin chose this moment to dust off some old ideas. One reason may be to distract attention from the unpleasant questions Moscow put to Norway yesterday. The questions sounded like an effort to scare Norway from joining the Atlantic Security alliance. This morning Norway, Sweden, and Denmark announced their failure to form a Scandinavian alliance. If Norway could also be scared away from Atlantic Security it would be quite a feather in Moscow's cap.

Perhaps also Stalin wants to distract attention from Czechoslovakia. It is official now that Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Vishinsky is there. The Russian story is that he is ill and at a sanatorium at Karlsbad for treatment. Reports persist that there is more to the story, perhaps involving some fairly serious Czech Communist deviationism.

As for other news. Latest reports from China say that Nationalist naval and ground forces have been withdrawn from the Yangtze River line, leaving Nanking in effect an open city. Acting President Li Tsung-Jen is the only high official reported still in Nanking. The 5-month-old government in Paraguay has been overthrown in a bloodless coup d'etat. It was strictly a palace affair. The public learned about it from the radio. Here at home the Air Force has put 10 more C-82 "flying boxcars" into the Nevada haylift. A mass of warm air in western Canada spreading down into the American Rockies promises some relief for the storm-stricken plains. That is the day's news so far.

Now, may I invite your welcome next Sunday at this time to Charles Collingwood, a distinguished newsman and a friend and colleague of mine who is going to take over this Sunday program. You will, I know, find his information and his views most helpful in understanding what is going on in this complicated world in which we live.

Today being my own last appearance on this program, I want to talk in more general and bolder terms than have been my custom about the one matter which has been dominant in the news throughout the nearly 2 years I have been using this time to try to clarify our affairs. The matter is Soviet Russia. When I began this series of broadcasts we had just embarked—because of Soviet Russia—on the Greek-Turkish aid program, more popularly known as the Truman doctrine. The biggest events in our lives since then have been associated with that program and the logical developments from it—because of Soviet Russia. We refurnished our armed services. We launched the Marshall plan. We set in motion a defensive alliance of the North Atlantic nations. We encouraged the western European nations to form a union among themselves.

In all of this we Americans have been playing an unaccustomed role in the world—because of Soviet Russia. It has been a daring, a controversial and an expensive role. Not everything we have attempted has been successful. China is the most glaring of our failures. Our success in Greece, where all this started, has been, to put it mildly, incomplete. But for all the mistakes we have made in the process, we have taken in hand great projects and have gone an impressive distance with them. The 2 years of these events have been anxious, sometimes frightening, sometimes enormously stimulating, and always overlaid with that most baffling question of our times: what is this Soviet Russia which goads us to such unaccustomed actions, which troubles us even in our home lives, which clouds the future with such grim possibilities as even war?

Like everyone else who has lived and worked with the news during this period, I have thought and read and talked endlessly about Soviet Russia. Some of the product has come out from time to time in these broadcasts in connection with passing events. But now I want to put it all together in a single effort to define this force so strange to our American experience which has set our course down such an unfamiliar road. Here, then, is what I would submit to you about Soviet Russia, in the interest of clearer thinking on Soviet Russia:

First of all, while Soviet Russia seems strange and unfamiliar to us, it is not in fact a new thing in this world. It is rather a combination painfully familiar to anyone who reads history. It is the combination of a strong state with a strong philosophy. In effect, it is the religious state, or church state. In this case its religion is antireligion, its God is anti-God, its faith materialistic, not spiritual. Yet antireligion is a form of religion. The French revolutionaries literally worshipped the goddess of

reason. The Nazis revived the paganism of Wotan. Just so Stalin's Communists have made a cult of atheism and combined that cult with the Russian state, and made the purpose of the cult the purpose of the state. The purpose of the cult is the conversion of the world to communism. The avowed purpose of the Russian state is to develop Russia as the physical base for Communist world revolution.

All of that is the direct opposite of our own concept of the purpose of government. Among ourselves we Americans disagree as to how our Government should serve our interests. But we do agree—most of us—that the function of government should be to govern for our material welfare, not for some purpose beyond our material welfare. Our founding fathers were passionately careful to write the separation of church and state into our own political foundations and they did it for a reason. The bloodiest pages of history have been written by religious states.

What challenges us today is not the doctrine of communism alone, or the Russian state alone, but the combination of the two. Communism is not the only universal dogma afoot in the world. In Cairo today orthodox Moslems still preach the holy war against all infidels. But their preaching does us not the slightest harm, because Mohammedanism is no longer combined with a power state. It was once, some 1,200 years ago, just as communism is combined today with the Russian state. In those ancient days a united Moslem world made war on all the rest of the world. Islam pushed east and west. To the east it was stopped only by the physical barriers of the Himalaya Mountains and the Pacific Ocean. To the west it was stopped only by the thick walls of Vienna and the strong arms of men like Charles Martel at Tours and Roland and Oliver, the fabulous palladins of Charlemagne, at Roncesvales. After the Christian world had turned back the religious state of Islam, Christians divided themselves into rival religious states. The most destructive wars in western history were the wars fought between Catholic and Protestant states. It took Germany a century to recover from the awful destruction of life and wealth in the 30 years' war. It may take Germany as much as another 10 years to recover from her losses in this last war, probably not so long.

Communism, as an idea separate from the Russian state would do us no more harm than a lot of other millennial ideas which circulate harmlessly in our midst. Communism was pretty harmless at Brook Farm outside Concord, Mass., in the days of Emerson and Thoreau. Communism, by itself, is simply one theory of how to bring about the millennium, like the single-tax theory.

And the Russian state separated from Communist dogma couldn't do us much harm, either. The average Russian is quite as isolationist in his inclinations as we would like to be. He is no world wanderer like the Englishman of Queen Elizabeth's day. The world has found it fairly easy in times past to cope with a Russian state which was just that and no more.

But when you have the two combined—a concept which would bend all men to its dogma and a power base as big as Russia—then you have something like Islam, or the rival Catholic and Protestant states of the period of the religious wars or the combining of the Roman Empire with Christianity under Constantine. When a leader of a powerful state, takes a mystic symbol in his hand and says, In this sign we conquer, then there is always trouble. Those who disagree with the new faith either accept it, or fight for their lives and their own faiths.

We of the west have resolved our older religious wars. Moslems and Christians, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, neither try to slit each others throats nor are afraid of having their own slit when they live together under a government which is neutral like ours in their religious differences, although Moslems, Christians, Catholics, and Protestants all hold to universal doctrines. The Jews are different. Their faith is exclusive, not universal. They don't care so much about converting the heathen. We might remember, however, that if the Moslem, Christian, Catholic, or Protestant faith were to be revived in fanatical form and combined again with a power state we would have the equivalent of what Soviet Russia is today—a religious state bent on forcible conversion. Every one of these faiths has done it in the past. In theory, though we trust not in practice, it could happen again.

Now, here we are dealing with a religious state bent on conversion of the world. So long as Soviet Russia remains a religious state bent on conversion of the world we who don't like its religion must defend ourselves as best we can against it. But that does not mean that our salvation requires either putting to the sword every Communist, or wrecking the Russian state. We achieve our security if the Communist-Russian combination goes the way of all such combinations in the past. The key to the solution is not to destroy one or the other, but the separation of the one from the other. We must defend ourselves against the combination so long as it exists. But if history proves anything, it is that such a combination tends to fall apart. That can take a long time, and a lot of outside help. Islam plagued the world for two centuries. But the time span has not always been that long. The crusading impetus of the French revolution scarcely lasted 10 years.

The history of such combinations of church and state is that the fanaticism at the center grows cold around the fringes. Long before the end of the Islamic Empire the governors of its border provinces were doing political and commercial business with neighboring Christian princes. We cannot calculate accurately how long it will take for the process to work in the Soviet-Russian Empire to the point where we can feel comfortable again. Conceivably the Communist-Russian combination is immune to the tendencies which have always weakened such combinations in the past. But they have operated in the past, always. And we have already seen them separate one of Stalin's outer provinces from the orthodox communion.

Perhaps Yugoslavia will be brought back to the Moscow fold, by force or by treachery. Even if it is not, Yugoslavia will in all probability call itself a Communist country for many years to come. But the fact remains that heresy in the classic manner has already done its routine work in Yugoslavia, to our advantage. And we know that potential heresy exists in other Soviet provinces. And we have some reason to believe that Moscow is seriously worried over how to sustain the purity of the Communist faith in the vastnesses of China. And we know that even the high priests of communism in the Kremlin have at times compromised the interests of world revolution for the immediate interests of the Russian people.

None of this says that we can afford to let our guard down. There might not be any Christian world today if Charles Martel's sword had broken on the battlefield of Tours. There might not be any Protestant world today if Drake had mishandled his ships against the Spanish Armada. Only the sword has ever held back the onrush of the religious state in its period of crusading ardor. But the ardor does spend itself in time. And the religious state does become either less of a state or less militantly religious.

Today Vatican City is all that is left of the once powerful papal state. Today King Ibn Saud is a Moslem, but he doesn't consider it desirable to put the infidel to the sword either within or without his borders, no matter what the Koran says. In other words, the will to resist, plus time, has always before saved the unbelieving world from the religious state. And making it harmless does not depend on our own actions alone.

We have allies within the opponent's household, the same allies which have always before helped to keep the world from belonging to one man or one faith. And the greatest of those allies is the very fact that the religious state does not put the material interests of its people first. The time comes when the people demand that their government serve them, not some other purpose.

Closed-Shop Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 9, 1949:

Some very shabby arguments were pressed upon the Supreme Court in the effort to have the Nebraska and Arizona constitutional amendments and a North Carolina statute forbidding the closed shop declared unconstitutional. The old shibboleths of an almost forgotten era were trotted out. Only this time they were pressed by labor unions instead of employers. The court was asked to strike down these regulations of employment practices on the pretense that they violate the rights of freedom of speech and of assembly, that they impair the obligations of contracts, deny equal protection of the laws and due process of law. Merely to state these complaints against laws that forbid discrimination against nonunion men is to emphasize the flimsiness of the case.

In writing for a unanimous court in the Nebraska and North Carolina cases, Justice Black gave special point to the irony of the A. F. of L.'s arguments. "There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their own working standards," he wrote, "a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all other persons who will not, or cannot, participate in union assemblies." The whole opinion is a healthy rejection of the idea that the present court can be induced to distort the Constitution for the benefit of organized labor, as the court once distorted it for the benefit of employers.

In the early years of the century, State and Federal laws protecting the right of labor to organize and fixing minimum hours and wages were stricken down in the courts over the protests of Justices Holmes, Hughes, Brandeis and others. Such statutes were said to be unconstitutional for want of conformity to due process of law. It took many years of judicial ferment to establish the principle that legislatures may fix wages, prices, and conditions of employment without running afoul of the Constitution. At last that principle has been so well established, however, that no employer would think it worth his time and money to go into court to challenge it.

The court may well have been shocked, therefore, to hear organized labor mouthing the old discredited doctrines of *Lochner* v. *New York*, *Coppage* v. *Kansas*, and *Adair* v. *United States*. The fact that labor was this time asking the court to strike down laws

forbidding the closed shop does not alter the principle one iota. Obviously, if Congress and the States have the power to protect organized labor, they also have the power to protect the rights of nonunion workers. Labor could have succeeded in this case only if the court had been willing to revert to the reactionary view that the States may not invalidate either the closed shop or the "yellow-dog" contract; for legislation against both is necessarily on the same legal footing.

It is good to have the court emphatically reject such discredited arguments regardless of what the merits or demerits of the closed shop may be. The court says in effect that organized labor is no more immune to the effects of regulatory legislation than is industry. That impartial adherence to the best judicial tradition is the more significant because it comes on the heels of an election supposed to have put labor in the saddle. The decision is such a pointed repudiation of Mr. Dooley's claim that "th' Supreme Court follows th' iliction returns" that Justice Frankfurter felt impelled to quote and discredit that cynical quip. "A court that yields to the popular will," he said, in a phrase that ought to ring through every courtroom, "thereby licenses itself to practice despotism * * *"

With the court successfully resisting that temptation, the closed-shop and union-shop problems may be worked out in accord with the democratic process. We suspect that where the union shop does not develop grave abuses, it will have a large measure of toleration, but it is imperative that the representatives of the people retain the power to legislate against abuses in the employer-employee relationship whenever they arise.

Central Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Water Project Authority of the State of California, created under the laws of California, adopted a resolution at a special meeting of the authority held on January 25, 1949, urging that the appropriation recommended by the President for the Central Valley project for the fiscal year 1950 be increased from $63,000,000 to $66,800,000.

The immediate completion of the Central Valley project is of great importance to the economy of the northern California economic area and the action of the Water Project Authority supports and substantiates that statement so often made upon the floor of this House.

I am including with my remarks the letter of January 27, transmitting the afore-mentioned resolution to me, together with the resolution:

WATER PROJECT AUTHORITY
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, Calif., January 27, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Member of Congress,
Sixth California District,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: Enclosed for your information is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Water Project Authority of the State of California at a special meeting held on January 25, 1949, recommending an appropriation in the sum of $66,800,000 in furtherance of construction of Central Valley project, California, for the 1950 fiscal year. There is being sent to you for your information and in support of the resolution a copy of a report prepared by the staff of the water project authority entitled "Central Valley Project—Construction Progress, Status of Costs, and Recommendations for Congressional Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1950," January 1949.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. EDMONSTON,
Acting Secretary.

Whereas there is included in the budget of the President of the United States submitted to the Eighty-first Congress, the sum of $63,000,000, including $3,000,000 for irrigation distribution systems to be expended on construction of the Central Valley project during the 1950 fiscal year; and

Whereas the water project authority of the State of California considers that the Central Valley project can and should be completed and placed in full operation not later than 1951; and

Whereas the water project authority believes that a sum larger than that recommended by the President can be expended advantageously during the 1950 fiscal year as follows: (1) Shasta Dam and Reservoir and appurtenant works, $3,500,000; (2) Shasta power plant, $1,000,000; (3) Keswick Dam and Reservoir, $2,500,000; (4) Keswick power plant, $800,000; (5) Delta Cross Channel, $2,000,000; (6) Contra Costa canal system, $200,000; (7) Delta-Mendota canal, $25,000,000; (8) Friant Dam and Reservoir, $400,000; (9) Friant-Kern canal, $15,000,000; (10) Madera canal, $100,000; (11) main electric transmission lines, $6,000,000; (12) switchyards, $4,000,000; (13) substations, $300,000; (14) Delta steam-electric plant, $5,000,000; (15) irrigation distribution systems, $500,000; and (16) water rights and miscellaneous irrigation facilities, $500,000; aggregating a total of $66,800,000: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be requested to appropriate in the 1950 fiscal year budget of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, the sum of $66,800,000 for construction of the Central Valley project, California; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive officer of this authority be authorized and directed to make representations before the appropriate bodies in support of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, and to the California Representatives in the Congress.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, without exception, the Republican Members of the House have been shocked by the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. They gave formal expression to their indignation in a resolution adopted in their conference yesterday. The resolution reads:

Whereas the conscience of mankind has been shocked at the brutal proceedings against His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, terminating in a finding of his guilt; and

Whereas the intent of said proceeding appears to be an assault upon the Christian religion and Christian morals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Republican Members of the House of Representatives in conference assembled express their condemnation of the arrest, confinement, and trial of said cardinal and their hope that the verdict against him will be reversed.

The Importance of Development of the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention of the Members to the progress being made in the development of the mighty Missouri River in my State of South Dakota and its importance to the welfare of the entire Missouri River Basin and the Nation as a whole.

Let me give you a few facts and figures to point out the huge size of this undertaking.

The drainage basin of the Missouri River covers an area about 1,300 miles long and 700 miles wide, including part or all of the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri. The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized a general comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of this area, including development of the potential hydroelectric sites. This plan includes a series of multipurpose reservoirs to be created on the main stem and tributaries of the Missouri River so that the water impounded in periods of heavy run-off for flood control and conservation can be released during other periods for irrigation, navigation, and power requirements.

The irrigation development of the Missouri Basin will bring water for irrigation to nearly 4,900,000 acres of new land and supplemental water supplies to approximately 500,000 additional acres of cultivated land.

The navigation development for the Missouri Basin will provide a navigation channel on the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to St. Louis, Mo., and in addition will provide slack water navigation in the reservoirs on the main stem of the Missouri River.

Power development in the Missouri Basin is being planned to provide the maximum possible power output consistent with the irrigation, navigation, and

flood-control requirements of the basin. An ultimate development of over 2,500,000 kilowatts capable of producing an estimated average of 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually is planned for the basin. Approximately 1,360,000 kilowatts of this capacity will be constructed by the Corps of Engineers of the Army on the main stem of the Missouri River, while the Bureau of Reclamation will construct dams and power plants on the tributaries of the river, including about 350,000 kilowatts by diversions of water into the Missouri Basin from the upper Colorado River Basin in Colorado.

The development of the power facilities of both the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers is progressing. The Bureau is now constructing the Boysen and Kortes Dams and power plants in Wyoming and the Canyon Ferry Dam and power-production facilities in Montana. The Boysen power plant, with a capacity of 15,000 kilowatts, is scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1952, and the Kortes power plant, with a capacity of 36,000 kilowatts, is scheduled for fiscal year 1950. The Canyon Ferry construction is now scheduled for completion in fiscal year 1954.

The Corps of Engineers are actively constructing the Garrison Dam and power plant in North Dakota and the Fort Randall Dam and power plant in South Dakota. They are also starting construction at the Oahe dam site located in South Dakota. It is estimated that the first units of the 400,000-kilowatt Garrison power plant will be placed in operation in fiscal year 1955 and the first four units in the 320,000-kilowatt Fort Randall power plant will be completed in fiscal year 1954.

In addition to these power developments already under construction, the Bureau is doing preconstruction work on the Yellowtail Dam and power-plant site in south central Montana and is preparing plans for the necessary transmission facilities to be ready when further power supply is available. At present transmission lines are under construction in Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Colorado, and some power is already being supplied from the Fort Peck project to North Dakota by interim power-wheeling arrangements.

The people of South Dakota realize the importance of development of the Missouri River. When the dam site at Oahe, a few miles north of Pierre, was opened, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, now Chief of Engineers of the Army, called the Missouri a river of gold. It is in reality a river of gold—a river that will bring prosperity and golden happiness to the many persons living in the Missouri River Basin.

The awareness of the value of the river to the State of South Dakota is well illustrated in the inaugural address of the Governor of the State, George T. Michelson. I would like to quote the Governor's remarks at this time:

NATURAL RESOURCES AND MISSOURI RIVER DEVELOPMENT

South Dakota's stake in the development of the land and water resources of the Missouri River Basin is a multitude of tangible benefits of staggering proportions. This gigantic program has properly been termed the greatest piece of engineering in the history of the world. The four dams either in the process of construction or scheduled for construction on the main stem of the Missouri River in South Dakota will constitute the key to the success of the entire program. It is the fulcrum by which the future welfare of the people of this State, area, and the entire Nation will be levered into a better position of economic security and well being. And yet, these key projects, all within the borders of our State, are only a part of the total picture. Dams on the tributaries and streams, combined with the main stem dams and the diversion of stored water for irrigation purposes, comprise the largest program of any State in the entire basin. There is scheduled for expenditure in South Dakota during the next 6 years over $1,010,000,000. This work is no longer just an engineer's vision. Substantial parts of it are out of the planning stage and construction is actually in progress. For the past 2 years I have been urging our citizens to become better acquainted with this vitally important program so that full advantage can be taken of its many benefits. I should like to repeat here and now a statement I have previously made: "That program for developing the land and water resources of the Missouri Basin is the greatest single undertaking since our acceptance of the responsibilities of statehood."

The next 2 years quite conceivably could be the most important 2 years in our State's history. In that time the river program will have advanced to the peak of the construction stage in many of the largest projects, some will have been completed and still other smaller ones will have been started.

We should most certainly be remiss in our obligations to present and future generations if we did not now take the steps necessary to insure the benefits accruing from the results of this stupendous effort. No less than 10 departments, institutions, or other agencies of State government have major roles to play in the successful execution of this plan in cooperation with the many Federal agencies involved.

The functions of the Natural Resources Commission should be expanded and the sum of $100,000 for the next biennium should be appropriated to carry on this work.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent prayer that the South Dakota Legislature will appropriate sufficient funds to carry on the important work of the Natural Resources Commission. It seems to me that this is one of the most important matters facing the people of South Dakota. Adequate appropriations at this time to carry forward the development of the mighty Missouri will, it seems to me, bear untold future benefits, benefits which will accrue as the years go by and which will be reaped by future generations. I sincerely hope nothing happens to stop this important work and that the people generally are made to realize the vast potentials of power, irrigation, and soil development which will be brought to South Dakota and other States in the Missouri Basin through these mighty dam and reservoir projects. We must capitalize on these potentials and develop them, to insure the happiness of future sons and daughters and a prosperous economy to the State through the encouragement of new industries, activities and new business. If proper steps are taken at this time I can visualize a gigantic surge forward in industrial and agricultural progress for our State.

If far-sighted action is taken at this time to make the many opportunities which lie in South Dakota known to business and industry generally, there will be opened to the people of our State the greatest chapter of all in its economic and cultural development.

Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., of February 6, 1949:

SOVIET CHIEFS EX-GANGSTERS—AND THEY RUN RUSSIA BY METHODS THEY LEARNED AS SUCH—TIME TO CALL A SPADE A SPADE

(By Lester Allen)

In a file on the Soviet Union the other day a yellowed clipping popped up which stated in matter-of-fact fashion that a low-life Bolshevik by the name of Vyshinki, who operated the torture chamber of the NKVD in the Lubienka prison in Moscow, was to present the results of his inquisition to a special court set up to try Trotskyites.

It was an old clipping, published in an American newspaper in a day a decade or more back when the American people looked upon the Soviet Union as a bit backward and on Communists—foreign and domestic—as wild-eyed and wild-haired people who had nothing wrong with them that a $5,000-a-year income couldn't cure.

And from that clipping it seemed apparent that what is wrong with our thinking about the Soviet Union and Joe Stalin and company is just that we haven't been calling a spade a spade.

STARTED AS ROBBER

Joe Stalin, for example, is politely called Marshal Stalin. He is top man in the Soviet Union, without question, but that can be accepted as proof that the Russian people are pretty dull tools when they let themselves be bossed by a man who got his start in life by practicing the gentle art of train and bank robbery under the guise of a revolutionist.

Yes, sir, old Joe was a stick-up man, no more, no less, and, even when Lenin took over in 1917, so little trusted because of his propensity for whipping out a roscoe the old Bolsheviks figured that if they sent him around the corner for a bucket of beer he would steal the money and pawn the bucket.

That's a fine background, indeed, for a man the one-worlders want President Truman to meet and settle the cold war. Naturally, he has reformed since his bank-robbing days. There's no longer any need for sticking up banks, because he has all the boodle there is in Russia to command.

Through all the bloody history of the Bolshevik revolution, through the purges, through Stalin's whole regime, there was always something vaguely familiar about the methods—but everyone seemed to be too polite to come right out and say what it resembled. Yet, every newspaper in the United States had published the outline of the methods in their reports of the Chicago gang wars, which were a microcosm of the

methods used by Stalin to gain and keep power. Only a gangster like Capone, directing a campaign of extermination of his opposition, could dream up such methods.

HOW IT WORKS

Is there someone in the mob getting too big for his boots? Give him a job to do that will get him into trouble. Let him know that if he is disloyal he will be bumped off, and if he fails he will be thrown to the legal wolves.

Let's take the most recent case of Comrade Vyshinski, the ex-inquisitor of the Lubeinka torture chamber. A few days ago he was Deputy Foreign Commissar Andrei Vyshinski, the common scold of the United Nations meeting in Paris.

Through semiofficial sources it was hinted that Molotov was in bad and that Vyshinski was being groomed for the job. The same unofficial sources hinted the Politburo was divided into two parties—one headed by Stalin wanting peace, and the other headed by Malenkov wanting war.

Remember how they used to hint that the gang chieftains in Chicago were having trouble with their closest lieutenants, and how, when the lieutenants turned up dead, it was discovered that the gang leaders had no trouble which they couldn't settle with a tommy gun.

The Baltic Review, an anti-Communist group operating out of Stockholm, recently discussed all these semiofficial rumors, which were deliberately put out to keep the western powers off balance.

GROTESQUE SITUATION

It makes very interesting reading. "Any rumors about disagreements in the Politburo can only be inventions and totally unsupported rumors," says the Baltic Review in its news letter from behind the iron curtain.

"The only thing known with any certainty about this institution is that Stalin himself has composed it of his most loyal followers. Its 14 members are men who have been tested over many years and who have always obeyed Stalin unquestioningly. All the 14 are younger than the dictator, all owe their career entirely to him. As secretaries of the party, Zhdanov and Malenkov have been realizing Stalin's wishes down to every detail. The idea that these creatures of Stalin are opposing him is not only improbable, it is grotesque.

"Equally unrealistic is the suggestion that Stalin may have found himself in a minority on the taking of a vote in the Politburo. The time when anybody dared to vote against Stalin lies a good 20 years back. Nowadays differences in the questions of policy are no longer settled by vote in any institution of the Communist Party, for such differences do not exist, least of all in the Politburo where Stalin is present. The members of this body know better than anyone else what lies in store for Stalin's adversaries. The whole tenor of Soviet life, from its lowest grade to its highest, bears witness to this state of things. Once Stalin has had his say the matter is settled for good.

"Moreover, men like Voznessenski and Bulganin (two of those rumored to have split with Stalin) do not belong among Russia's leading statesmen. They are only candidates for the Politburo and have never been known to have any opinions of their own."

The same applies to Vyshinski who, in the absence of Molotov, may be allowed to abuse the western powers at various conferences but has never been anything but a dependent and executive official. This renegade has never played any independent part; he climbed to his position by doing the dirtiest work imaginable for Stalin, and is maintaining it by absolute subservience to the dictator. If he heads the Soviet delegation to a UN conference it is because the Soviet government does not consider the conference important enough to be attended by Molotov.

That last ought to make the State Department and President Truman feel kindly toward the Soviet Union.

An ex-bank robber has the unmitigated gall to treat the peace efforts of the civilized world with disdain and sends to it a loudmouthed ranter under instructions to insult everyone who ventures to disagree with the Soviet Union. That is courtesy, diplomacy, and peace negotiating—Soviet style.

If the Russian people want to put up with semislavery under the command of an exheist guy, that is their affair. If they want to live in fear all their lives—terrorized by a man with a gun, that, too, is their own business. But, when, in this twentieth century, the Soviet Union projects its boorish behavior into such a solemn undertaking as the cooperative effort of the nations of the world—it is time for the United States to refuse to have any more of it.

Gangsterism was stamped out in the United States by an aroused citizenry who demanded that the robber barons of the booze business be put behind bars and assorted Dillingers and Pretty Boy Floyds tracked down and given the coup de grâce.

The practice of communism according to Stalin is even more shameful than the practice of nazism according to Hitler. Nazism never pretended to be other than it was—a cynical racialism and nationalism with no holds barred. Nazis sought power and unblushingly went after it, even to the point of bald genocide.

Stalin's perversion of communism, however, sneaks around with a lot of words. "Workers of the world, unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains." And, even while shrieking this at the top of their lungs, there are 11,000,000 slave workers in labor camps in Russia, condemned to killing labor under appalling conditions for offenses as trifling as deviation. Millions of adult Americans are guilty of deviation every day in the week when they pick up their morning papers and grumble that the country is going to the dogs.

OLD ADAGE APPLIES

It is plain today that the greatest mistake in foreign policy this country ever made was to recognize the Soviet Union and establish diplomatic relations. The old adage that if you wrestle with pigs you are bound to get covered with mud holds true in this case. If you bargain with gangsters sooner or later you will get a hole in the head.

It is almost too much to ask that decent men with decent instincts meet with a crew like that which Stalin has doing his dirty work to arrange anything with as noble an objective as world peace.

If Stalin had been content with keeping gang-rule at home, something might eventually have been done about herding the Russians back on the sane and civilized path, but, even as Capone reached out for the South Side, the Cicero business, the North Side and other beer territory, Stalin has reached out to blight the rest of the world.

In Czechoslovakia, the latest acquisition, church property has been expropriated, priests, ministers, nuns, and monks have been hustled off to slave labor camps, and opponents of the regime are condemned to labor camps. When they really want to get rid of them the Communists ship them off to the uranium mines at Yakhimov in northwest Bohemia. They don't last long there.

CAN'T KEEP THEIR WORD

The clincher, however, in any attempt to make a deal with Russia seems to be that it is a waste of time, because they haven't kept any agreement they have made to date, even with their own satellites. And this isn't a peculiarity of the Russian Communists. Kipling's poetic warning against the truce of the bear was penned long before the Bolshevik revolution.

A truce with Russia means only that it gives Russia time to move in closer and closer to get into position for a smashing blow. That's what it meant 150 years ago, and that's what it means today.

Play friendly and get in close, and then launch the attack. It doesn't have to be an armed attack. It can be a subversive attack, an infiltration. At the moment the Soviet Union is maneuvering the Scandinavian countries into position, first to keep them out of the North Atlantic pact, and next to clamp the bear hug on them.

In News of Norway, the official Norwegian information service in this country, has an ominous paragraph of double talk. It says simply, "Packs of wolves from northern Russia are reported to be sweeping across Norway's arctic Finnmark Province. (That's the place where the Luftwaffe had its air bases), and Lapp herdsmen in the area are applying for army rifles and shells to combat the invaders."

Military authorities have accordingly released 100 rifles and ammunition for the anti-wolf campaign.

Trade Agreements Will Guillotine Our Critical Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following address by one of the great American engineers, Otto Herres, vice president of the Combined Metals Reduction Co., Salt Lake City, Utah:

TARIFFS AND THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN MINES

THE BOLD NEW PROGRAM

"We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas."

In these words of his inaugural address on January 20, 1949, the President described a plan to help peace-loving peoples everywhere realize their aspirations for a better life by fostering capital investments in areas needing development. Needless to say the President was not thinking of underdeveloped mining areas in the Rocky Mountain States at the time he spoke.

The Government is prepared to promote industrial development abroad by offering long-term agreements to buy part of the foreign output of vital materials. It is proposed to encourage American and foreign investors by means of loans and other assistance to put money and equipment into mines and mills in underdeveloped areas by assuring them of a market for some years ahead. A government agency is to sign long-term commitments for the purchase of minerals, metals, and other strategic and critical materials for stock piling, or resale to industry.

There can be no quarrel with a program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available to the people of Asia and Africa in order to better their lot and lighten their toil. That is a service the free people of America have been contributing from their industries, in-

stitutions, and great foundations for human welfare in one form or another ever since the time our forefathers wrote the Constitution and gave the world a tradition of freedom. But there is a feeling of uneasiness concerning the significance of the bold approach and the consequences of adding something new to the program.

POLITICAL PLANNING

In his state of the Union message to Congress earlier this year, the President suggested to the steel industry a program for the expansion of existing facilities, or the alternative of direct construction by the Government of such facilities if action by private industry fails to meet our needs. The inference is that copper, lead, and zinc may be in for the same treatment, but from a base in foreign countries.

The economic planners fix the goals and warn private business to reach them or else the politicians will take over business. From observation of the results obtained by politicians in their handling of the Nation's interests in world affairs during recent years is there any reason to question the high order of their business ability? Has everything they have done been such a success and saving to the American taxpayer in China, eastern Europe, and Germany as to warrant the Nation letting them take over the business of the country? It seems strange indeed that Government economists should have supported the dismantling of German steel plants and later recommended Government intervention in the American steel industry, but in any event neither procedure is likely to prove a kindness to the taxpayers of this country. By lowering the contribution of the German steel industry to world output they placed the burden on us to make up the loss at our expense and created a steel shortage in the United States. Possibly they planned it that way?

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

During and since the Second World War we have become so involved in world politics that we cannot withdraw if we would. Perhaps our Government officials have the wisdom and high moral inspiration to intervene in the affairs of other people on the several parts of the globe and set the world aright. It is a noble aspiration, fascinating in magnitude. But as a man wise in experience once observed, "No one goes so far as he who knows not whither he is going."

We have given our substance and depleted our resources without requiring agreements for a just and lasting peace in return. We have found no brave new world, nor have we accomplished the abandonment of practices objectionable to peace. Our savings are going into armament to rust in foreign fields in a cold war—lost to the productive uses of Americans. There is much to be done—and considerable that remains to be undone. In consequence, it is the view of the mining industry that the political planners who have been guiding our affairs through a sea of troubles, some of their own making, have problems enough without taking over the responsibility for the Nation's mineral resources. Rather the relationship of government should be cooperative with industry to the end that the resources are used in the national interest and that free enterprise is continued and strengthened. It was American industrial strength and capacity for production that carried us successfully through two world wars. And today American industry stands as the one great citadel of economic freedom against an invasion of Asiatic Russian communism. When the planners have done as well in their foreign political fields it will be time enough for them to consider taking over business. It is not wise to discount ability and experience. A more statesmanlike course is to call on sound industrial thinking for assistance.

TARIFFS

The mining industry is greatly concerned with the disposition of the Government acting through its numerous departments and bureaus, to direct and control the national economy. The trend became more apparent from the trade and tariff agreements negotiated by the State Department at Geneva reducing drastically the duties on many metals and minerals produced under wages and conditions unfair in competition to American workers. As the President has indicated, proposals are being considered to make loans and possibly gifts of equipment and financial aid to producers in other countries to be repaid by imports of foreign minerals and metals. The propaganda machines in Washington have been busy for several years turning out "have not" propaganda to prepare the way.

All available evidence indicates that the State Department is not interested in the welfare of the domestic mining industry, or possibly lacks understanding of the domestic industry, even to the point that national security is endangered. Otherwise, why are our strategic metal industries being allowed to die of neglect? What are we going to do for antimony, chrome, manganese, mercury and tungsten if war closes the sea lanes? We are dependent upon overseas shipments for our supplies of these strategic metals and have no assurance of deliveries in an emergency. We cannot afford to pay the price of subservience and insecurity in this respect.

Since January 1, 1948, trade and tariff agreements by the State Department with 23 nations, at Geneva, Switzerland, have become effective for the most part reducing tariffs up to 50 percent in concessions to foreign producers. Reductions were granted on ores, metals or products of zinc, copper, manganese, tungsten, aluminum, antimony, chrome and lead. Many other minerals also were affected, but the list is too long to consider in detail at this time.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Effects of tariff reductions cannot become evident immediately because of world shortages and heavy demands to fill needs deferred during the war and for reconstruction and rearmament purposes. Later on, when foreign production of competing products is restored, and when foreign currencies are devalued, we may expect to lose some of our export markets and see imports into the United States become a serious competitive factor in our home markets. It is important that these facts should be understood clearly, because probably a majority of the people have been converted by State Department propaganda and lack of foreign competition, to the idea that American producers, by and large, do not need protection from outside production. How long they will remain of the same opinion when they again have to face the struggle for existence in a competitive world is yet to be seen. Because the lowering of import duties jeopardizes productive ability and is detrimental to mine development, it cannot be considered as in the best interests of the country. The Nation, for the protection of its people must see to it that the mineral industries, as among the greatest of national assets and safeguards, are maintained in sound and healthy condition.

We are helping backward countries to industrialize and providing industrial nations with efficient machinery and equipment by means of gifts and loans and propose embarking on a bold new program. When the programs are accomplished and our subsidies cease these nations must export or die. Where does that leave us when foreign industrialization becomes effective? The watchmaking industry of New England found the answer recently when the 99-year-old Waltham factory went down. Some 6,000 workers in that and other factories learned that depressions cannot be attributed to our high tariff policy in all instances, regardless of campaign oratory.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

The contribution of the American taxpayer, loaned from his future earnings to help reconstruct countries all over the earth, should receive some consideration in the reciprocal trade agreements program. Devices used by Socialist governments and managed-economy nations such as state trading, managed currencies, quotas, export and import controls, and the like are the real barriers to world trade today, not the little that is left of the American tariff system. The United States will remain more prosperous and the world will be served better if the President's proposal to offer an incentive for exploration and development of mines producing strategic and critical metals and minerals is adopted by Congress rather than measures penalizing the domestic mining industry with tariff cuts.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ORGANIZATION

Minerals and metals normally enter world trade in substantial volume. In dealing with nations that have gone over to socialism and communism in varying degrees the implication of intergovernmental arrangements to control production, prices, and distribution of minerals and metals becomes a matter of great concern to the domestic industry. In considering the proposed charter for an International Trade Organization it must be remembered that our national security rests upon the strength and economic health of our mines, farms, and factories.

Experience of the mining industry under the governmental regulations of OPA was not such as to arouse any enthusiasm for intergovernmental commodity arrangements which contemplate the regulation and control of mineral prices and production on a global scale, or the shifting of production facilities and manpower by political planners. These powers traditionally belong to Congress and the people.

THE TAXPAYER

It is well to consider the taxpayer's place in the bold new program for the development of foreign production and his rather discouraging experience of recent years in attempting to have a part in the brave new world.

For nearly a generation private initiative has been handicapped by restrictive legislation and confiscatory taxation, and as for venture capital, the more successful its efforts to produce and support the more abundant life, the more it finds itself penalized by tax collectors and abused by politicians. A producer, successful against long odds in a difficult underground mining venture, ends up with his proceeds taken from him for resdistribution by the economic planners of "the welfare state." He concludes that what belongs to everybody belongs to nobody, and so exploration to find new mineral wealth is discouraged, development of mines slows down, and State Department economists in Washington reach the conclusion that we have become a have-not nation. Tariffs must be cut and millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money made available for the development of foreign mines.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR DOMESTIC MINES

History indicates that real advancement for mankind is brought about through the resourcefulness of free men. Men will struggle and die to find mineral wealth in undeveloped lands. American miners need an even break with foreign producers in matters of competitive trade and Government assistance if they are to continue the struggle. They ask no odds, but want no handicaps. The mining industry has depended to a large degree upon the small operator to

risk his efforts to find the minerals in our mountain slopes and desert areas. Give him fair treatment and an incentive to work and there will be less need for the Nation to seek foreign mines at the taxpayers' expense.

There can be a reasonable relationship between foreign production, imports, and a healthy domestic mining industry. Complementary foreign trade in goods and services which can be exchanged advantageously is highly desirable and profitable to all concerned. But if we pass the point where we begin to import the things we can produce just as efficiently ourselves and displace our own production, we start to lose. Some little consideration is due our own people. They will pay for what we give Europe and underdeveloped countries, not only through taxation but through living costs and later, possibly, in unemployment.

WORLD ORE RESERVES LIMITED

The United States with only 7 percent of the world's population consumed 42 percent of the world's output of lead, 46 percent of the zinc and some 50 percent of the copper production during recent years. World ore reserves are limited and no more inexhaustible than our own. Political doors are closing access to much of the world's resources in metals and minerals. When the other 93 percent becomes industrialized with the help of our money and our machines, where will the metals be found? Under the circumstances it would seem wise to start considering support for the domestic-mining industry on a long-range basis in addition to arranging for foreign sources of supply of essential minerals lacking or greatly deficient in our own resources. The United States might well afford to guarantee to buy all surplus production of critical and strategic minerals and metals of future utility which can be stored without loss at reasonable established guaranteed minimum prices for at least 10 years.

The development of foreign sources of supply should be left to the industrial organizations of foreign countries in cooperation with American industrial interests, if agreeable to the countries involved. Opening and operating mines cannot be considered a proper function of our form of government in normal times. It is not believed that there is any legitimate field of commercial mineral enterprise that cannot be handled by private business if given proper cooperation from Government. Other nations may have their own ideas about questions of international political leadership, but probably many will cooperate on a live-and-let-live basis of developing natural resources.

CONCLUSIONS

Guardianship of all the world's people and protection of their economic and political interests is beyond the capacity of our taxpayers, as we shall find out in due course of events. Nor is it probable that our resources are sufficient to buy economic recovery and peace for all the world, devoutly as we may desire peace. We are very much inclined to mistake good fortune for wisdom. We owe much to our abundant natural resources and a competitive industrial system of private economic interests under a constitutional government which permits a high degree of individual freedom. Foreigners are not blessed with so fortunate a combination nor have they been so favored by freedom from invasion, but neither are they so lacking in intelligence and ability as our actions sometimes seem to imply. If our giving is held within our means other people will find a way to help themselves and one another.

Our only hope of lasting peace is economic strength. Self-preservation requires us to protect and support our mineral resources that we may remain strong in difficult and dangerous days to come.

Policy on Cartels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the New York World-Telegram of January 13, 1949:

POLICY ON CARTELS

Successive developments emphasize further the need of a full-scale congressional investigation of the antimonopoly program designed to break up the giant industrial cartels in Germany which furnished the munitions of war for Adolf Hitler's war and actively promoted Nazi aggression.

Dissolution of these monopolies was a war aim of ours. It seems to have become obscured.

The latest in a long series of incidents comes to light in connection with the recent inquiry in Germany by a three-man commission appointed by Secretary of the Army Kenneth C. Royall. The Secretary was prompted to order the investigation last month by evidence submitted to him about abandonment of the antimonopoly program as it related to some of the biggest cartels. The program was curtailed several months ago on instructions by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, United States military governor in Germany.

In the course of its inquiry this commission, headed by Garland S. Ferguson, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, called in Alexander Sacks, a lawyer in the decartelization branch of the American Military Government.

Mr. Sacks was critical of William H. Draper, formerly head of the economics division of AMG in Germany, who had much to do with decentralization policy.

The lawyer charged that Mr. Draper had hampered enforcement of the decartelization program in his post in Germany.

Now he has been suspended by an order signed by Gen. Charles Gailey, chief of staff for General Clay. The charge is that he attacked the integrity and good faith of Under Secretary Draper. His suspension is subject to a hearing.

In what appears to be rather unusual procedure in the case of an independent commission, Mr. Ferguson turned a copy of the commission's whole record of its investigation over to Lawrence Wilkinson, General Clay's economic adviser. Mr. Ferguson remained in Germany after the other two members of the commission had returned to the United States—Samuel S. Isseks, New York lawyer, formerly in charge of the New York office of the Justice Department's antitrust division, and Arthur Kearney, business management expert of Chicago.

For a complete understanding, this incident should be related with some past history.

Mr. Sacks, who is a New York lawyer, was one of 19 members of the staff of the decartelization branch of AMG who signed a protest last March against orders of General Clay which thereafter exempted enterprises in the capital goods or heavy industry field from deconcentration action, and specifically exempting two big companies, Henschel, which has almost a 100 per cent monopoly in locomotives, and VKF, which enjoyed a similar privileged position in ball-bearing manufacture.

In their protest they said that General Clay's orders virtually repealed the decartelization law. The orders were never put in writing but were transmitted verbally by Richardson Bronson, chief of the decartelization branch. General Clay confirmed them later in a subsequent conference in his office with the 19 members.

The Pinched People Are Becoming Wise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from communications which I am receiving that the rank and file of the people are beginning to see the futility of our endeavoring to feed the world without impoverishing our own people. I have had some personal experience in what is happening abroad. The emotional propaganda which has been ladled out to the people about the starving is vicious and untrue. There are countries abroad where the people are making a great effort to rehabilitate themselves, and are doing so. There are others that are sitting back and doing nothing, and looking to Uncle Sam as the head of a great WPA.

We know that in order to feed our own people we have been importing foodstuffs from abroad for 16 years and probably before that. It perhaps has not occurred to our officials that there are people of vast wealth in the countries we are helping who have their money safely deposited in the banks of Switzerland and the United States, who are not contributing one cent to the rehabilitation of their own country. The whole world is saying, "Let the United States do it."

Fat jobs have been created for innumerable Americans, and I am not speaking of ordinary jobs with low salaries, but jobs running $9,000 and $10,000 a year for people who never had a salary over $2,500, until they went on the Government pay roll. These people have all their travel expenses paid, including that of their family, furniture, automobile, and so forth. They can, of course, buy at the PX stores, thus enjoying low cost of living, and live in what would be affluence here in this country.

There are, of course, some very selfish, greedy exporters and importers and industrialists who are making their millions by letting the taxpayers of this country pay for the things they manufacture, export and give away abroad, whether needed or not.

This little game is becoming known by the people in this country who are feeling the pinch of the high cost of living, and crushing taxes. I am inserting, under leave to extend, an editorial which appeared in one of my home papers, the Olean (N. Y.) Herald-Tribune, on February 5, 1949:

WE SHOULD TAKE HEED

Some time back, this newspaper reproduced and commented on a letter it had

received from an out-of-town mother with a family of six, whose husband's pay was around $50 a week, and who found that they were barely able to pay for the necessities of life.

New clothes, she said, were not for them; and they could never put by anything for the rainy days. In fact, all the days were rainy.

That letter brought a tremendous response from other readers; so great, indeed, that it is a manifest impossibility to publish the letters.

But they all have one common note—the tragic plight of those who have to get along on a meager income these days, and even on relatively moderate incomes if the family is large.

These are the people who are going without everything they can possibly go without—including dental, medical or other professional care, adequate clothing and in many instances adequate food.

These are the people who pinch and scrape until they can pinch and scrape no further. They have reached rock bottom. They must just let it go at that, and hope for the best.

"Yes, it is hard going for a large family to try and get along," writes one woman who lives out Allegany way.

"We have felt it for a long time; but we just don't like to complain, although really it is the children that suffer mostly with not having the right food and clothing.

"My husband also works out in all kinds of weather. The other day he came home soaked clear to the skin. If he gets sick then where will the family be? We also never have new clothes."

Fortunately, some alleviation is on the way—has already come, indeed—in the way of lowered prices.

The cost of feeding a family is substantially less today than it was 3 months ago; and many other essential commodities are cheaper.

But the situation in general is one that should be brought home to our legislators in every way possible; for the cost of Government is being permitted to go higher, instead of compelled to go down.

Now that the various countries of western Europe are beginning to find their economic feet, our assistance to them should be curtailed to the utmost extent.

Moreover, any administrative activity that will entail the expenditure of vast sums of money, but which can be done without for the time being, should be left in abeyance.

And above all, the most rigid economy should be practiced in the operation of the public's affairs.

A striking cartoon appeared on this page on Thursday of this week. Probably you will recall it.

Everybody had climbed aboard the "gravy boat"—except the landlord; and he wanted to get in, too.

All of us know just what the "gravy boat" is. It is the means whereby we humans try to get "ours" no matter what happens to the other fellow.

But, as depicted in the cartoon, the "gravy boat" can become heavily overloaded; and then it becomes topheavy. It may even capsize altogether.

We have an idea that we Americans will have to get rid of the habit of thinking in terms of billions of dollars. Certainly, we are convinced that we will have to do so as far as aid to other nations is concerned.

For although this is a great and rich country, there is a bottom to the national barrel. We cannot go on indefinitely handing out largesse by the billions—either from the standpoint of the National Treasury or from that of the average, low-income American family which, and we may just as well be frank about it, has forgotten all about the once-vaunted American standard of living.

We should also remember that as long as that condition is permitted to exist, there will be an increasing demand for social security of every possible kind.

And the more of that we get, the less of the old rugged individualism of the past we will have. Maybe, we want it that way; or have we just not given the situation the proper amount of thought?

Low-Cost Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD the appended article by Jacob Hulitt which appeared in the February 1949 edition of the American Legion Journal, Philadelphia, Pa.:

LEGION LEADERSHIP CALLED FOR IN LOW-COST HOUSING TANGLE

(By Jacob Hulitt)

Housing is still one of the great problems facing our country. It must be stated at the outset that low-cost, low-rent housing accommodations are still nonexistent. The low-income veteran is waiting in vain for relief. Those who profited most by the war appear to be least concerned about his plight. It behooves us—all veterans' groups—therefore, to furnish the heart and the consecrated leadership in the premises.

The enlarged edition of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill now pending in Congress and housing legislation proposed by our State administration, if enacted into law, should solve our housing problem ultimately.

The new version of the T-E-W bill, like the old one which died by strangulation in the House in the Eightieth Congress, includes slum clearance and other features not found in the old bill. The current bill calls for 40-year, $18,000,000,000 program.

PROBLEM IS SERIOUS

Legislative representatives of all veterans' organizations, except our own are supporting it vigorously. The American Legion spokesman in Washington has repeatedly expressed opposition to this legislation. Moreover, he has villified proponents of the T-E-W bill on numerous occasions.

I do not know whether he has yet heard the echoes from the national election held on November last, or whether the sentiments expressed at our State and National Legion conventions made any impression on him. I do know this, that the housing problem must not be left to the whims of an indifferent and repudiated spokesman. Our failure to put our best foot forward in Washington at this time may well endanger housing legislation and subject our good faith in the matter to serious doubt.

MUST NOT FAIL NOW

If Americans are to count in the battle of life and preserve democracy they must not be compelled to live under conditions which breed crime, disease, and confusion. We must not remain indifferent or complacent and leave our citizens to the mercy of selfishness, greed, and venomous philosophies. We will have failed in our duty if we do not recognize the present emergency and act accordingly.

In this critical hour our comrades deserve and have a right to expect fearless, enthusiastic, and determined leadership. Let us all take our stations and do our duty. Let us unite with the same strength, the same courage, and the same wisdom which was ours when we faced a foreign enemy, and act now as we did then for the common good.

I ask it in the name of those honored comrades who have found eternal homes; I ask it in the name of their living comrades who are homeless, and finally I ask it in the name of our beloved country.

Mock Elections in Northern Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of an editorial which appeared on January 22 in the Irish press of Dublin. The editorial was written just after the call for a special election was made on January 20 in northern Ireland. No valid reason exists for the calling of this election at this time, other than to demonstrate once again that the elections in northern Ireland are thoroughly controlled through an elaborate system of gerrymandering the parliamentary districts and also to preclude the use of the new voters register, which becomes effective early in April.

As a result the election will serve no purpose, since it is evident that the Unionist forces, favoring union with Great Britain, will again have their usual majority in the Stormont Parliament at Belfast. No opportunity is given to the people to vote on the question of uniting themselves with their fellow Irishmen and eliminating the border, which was imposed upon them by an act of the British Parliament back in 1921. Were that question before the voters, we could get an idea as to the sentiment of the people, since each vote would be counted individually. But under the present arrangement, whereby the districts are gerrymandered into unreasonable and unnatural units, one Union-with-Britain vote is made equal to two Irish Nationalist votes. The processes of true democracy have not yet been applied to northern Ireland, and not until the border has been eliminated will democracy be established there and all traces of bigotry and ill will be destroyed.

Because the editorial in the Irish press gives such a clear picture of the situation in northern Ireland, I desire to include it as a part of my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues. The editorial reads as follows:

THE MOCKERY

The permanent government in the six counties is to demonstrate once again that it has the will of the people in its pocket. That same government was set up by the British Parliament in 1921 and, although a generation has since passed, it has never been out of office. Nor is it just a matter of men with the same ideas being at its head: there have been no changes other than those which death or old age have enforced.

Nothing like it exists in the world today, except in other countries where the forms of democracy have been used to stifle its

spirit. A stranger learning that in a rapidly changing world there is one government that has never been out of office for 28 years could come to only one conclusion—that the people under that government never got a real chance to put it out. And he would be right. For what he would find is the complete and perfect travesty of popular government. There is adult suffrage, there is free speech, and yet no democracy. The reason is simple.

When partition was imposed on this country, an area was carefully mapped out in which the Unionists would always have a majority. It mattered not in the least that the chosen area—ludicrously named Northern Ireland—had no natural boundaries, that it had no distinctive identity mark, that not a single argument in favor of its severance from the rest of Ireland could be drawn either from geography or history. All that mattered was that the area chosen should keep on electing a Unionist Government. To make assurance doubly sure, to guarantee that Britain would always have a puppet government in the northeast to do what it was told, the Nationalist opposition was reduced to a representation far less than its numbers justify. Gerrymandering has been made a fine art, with the result that today 10,000 Nationalist votes are worth no more than 5,000 cast by Unionists. In its treatment of the minority under its jurisdiction, the six-county government has outraged every canon of democracy and the most elementary principles of justice.

Now the same government is staging an election which it will misrepresent as a plebiscite. But in any country the only plebiscite worthy of the name is one that embraces the whole nation. Soviet Russia, for example, if that government decided to adopt the British method, could select areas beyond its own frontiers in which it could find a majority in favor of Communist rule. The most genuine plebiscite witnessed in Ireland was in 1918, when the whole country voted on a single issue. On that occasion there was no doubt whatever about the result. In a free all-Ireland election—free, that is, save for the fact that most of the Republican leaders were in gaol and that intimidation was used openly by the British authorities against Republican candidates and their supporters—out of the 105 candidates returned only 26 were Partitionists. How did Britain react to that verdict of the Irish people? She partitioned Ireland.

That crime against nationhood was committed by Lloyd George and his Tory colleagues. Ulster, they held, would not be permitted to merge with the rest of Ireland whether she willed it or not. Britain determined to hold on to that corner of Ireland no matter what the Irish people might say. Today there is a Labor Government in power in Britain—a government whose members have the word "democracy" forever on their lips—but so far as Ireland is concerned, Lloyd George and Lord Birkenhead and Winston Churchill might still be in Downing Street. Mr. Attlee gives his backing and his blessing to Sir Brooke as Lloyd George gave it to Sir James Craig.

Trial by Error

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Post:

TRIAL BY ERROR

The Budapest trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty cannot prove either his guilt or innocence of treason, espionage, and black marketing, or of any other charges.

For it has been held under a reign of terror. Not only the defendant is the victim of that terror. All connected with the exhibition, including prosecutor and judge, whether willing or unwilling participants, are subject to a law which puts itself above the laws of man and God. That is the law of dictatorship.

In the eyes of that lawless rule all men of honor and conscience who oppose it forfeit their right to live. Whether they are ignored or shot or tortured to death or sent to a prison camp, or whether they are used as drugged or terrorized puppets in an obscene travesty on a court of law, depends solely on the will of the dictator.

A Bridge Between Peoples

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 7, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Marquis Childs that appeared in the Detroit Free Press of February 8, 1949:

A BRIDGE BETWEEN PEOPLES

WASHINGTON.—The good that men do is not always interred with their bones. It does often live after them.

The late Laurence Duggan gave himself in selfless devotion in many ways. But his chief interest after he left the Department of State was the Institute of International Education, of which he was president as his father had been before him.

At the time that tragedy cut off his life, Duggan was starting to raise additional money for the Institute.

Now his friends have formed a committee to contribute a fund in his name to carry on the work in which he so deeply believed.

The Institute of International Education is a private organization that serves as a bridge, not between governments, but between the people of one country and the people of another. It does this by providing funds for American students to go abroad and for foreign students and teachers to come to our universities.

The last is especially important. There is no way of measuring the profound influence of American education and experience on the thousands of foreign students who have come to our shores in recent decades.

One young man returning to his native land to take a position of leadership with a favorable impression of American educational standards is worth millions of words of propaganda by government.

After the Boxer Rebellion in China, the Government in Washington wisely decreed that the indemnity to be paid by China to the United States should go to finance Chinese students in this country. Several thousand Chinese availed themselves of the fund before it was exhausted.

Incidentally, Chinese students in this country now find themselves in a difficult plight. It has been difficult or impossible for them to get American dollars through their government, and under United States immigration laws they are not permitted to earn any money.

A ship is now being fitted out to send back to China those who have completed some phase of their education.

Besides the foreign students who have come here, other thousands have been educated in American schools abroad. That is true particularly in the Near East, where several institutions have done pioneering work.

One of them is Athens College, headed by the redoubtable Homer Davis. At the end of the war Davis returned to Athens, and in the face of seemingly insuperable obstacles he got the college started again. Davis is now in this country to persuade donors to continue their support for the college.

The comfortable assumption is that the Government is taking care of everything over there. Billions are being sent abroad and surely that relieves the individual citizen of responsibility.

But if it is all left to Government, we shall lose something of infinite value; something that has grown out of American idealism and character. Expressions like the Friendship Train to Europe and now, in reciprocation, the French Thank-You Train show how deep is the impulse of the individual to reach across the formalities of Government.

This impulse must be encouraged. It was the goal to which Duggan had intended to devote his life. At the time of his death he was working on plans to enlarge the work of the Institute.

Larry will be long remembered for what he did and what he stood for. Those who slurred him after he was dead dishonored only themselves. That slur will quickly be forgotten. And the job that Larry Duggan started will be carried on.

Our Norwegian Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Post for February 7, 1949:

OUR NORWEGIAN ALLY

Stalin's second intimidating effort to keep Norway out of the Atlantic pact shows how important he considers that proposed democratic defense union. He does not exaggerate. It is the answer to Soviet aggression. And Norway is the key to its effectiveness.

The readiness of little Norway to defy threats of the Russian giant—3,000,000 population against 200,000,000—is one encouraging aspect of a black international situation. The illusion that a small democracy has no stake in this struggle of the great powers, and can remain neutral, is very tempting to those looking into a Soviet gun. The fact that Norway, unlike stronger Sweden, refuses to be caught in this snare is evidence both of her realism and her unusual courage.

Moreover, it is proof she trusts the United States. This is significant because of the general fear in western Europe that American aid may be followed by isolationist reaction, that at the showdown we may withdraw and leave our allies to their fate of Russian enslavement.

Stalin's second move—after objecting to Norwegian participation in the Atlantic pact—is to offer her a Soviet nonaggression

treaty. The Norwegian foreign minister's reply to that is to fly to Washington to hasten the western negotiations. Such a Soviet treaty is a kiss of death for a small neighbor, as learned by the destroyed Baltic republics and by the communized satellite states of eastern Europe.

Norway's importance is threefold. Her decision will influence Denmark, which controls strategic Greenland, and will have some weight at least with Sweden. Norway has minerals needed by Russia. Stalin's best chance of winning a war at sea with his large fleet of German-developed submarines would be from the hundreds of Norwegian fjords, the most deadly submarine nests dominating the North Atlantic.

The United States does not request Norwegian bases now, as charged by Stalin. But our security does demand the requested rearming of Norway with American aid and coordination with the larger Atlantic defense system. Stalin cannot stop that.

The Fate of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following radio speech made on the Voice of America program on the fate of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by our distinguished colleague and outstanding American, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]:

The entire world is profoundly shocked at the momentous and far-reaching decision coming from the godless iron curtain of an enslaved Hungary.

From the meager reports of the trial received here, the life sentence together with confiscation of his properties meted out to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is a source of deep grief and sorrow to all Americans regardless of their religion, faith, or creed.

The right of freedom of speech and religion are among the sturdy pillars of our structure of American freedom and liberty. These rights are denied in too many quarters of the world. It is apparent that the cardinal has met with these denials of right inherent to every citizen, whether he is an American or a subject of any foreign nation living in his native land. That this Catholic prelate occupying a respected position and high rank in his church should labor to defend his faith and defend and protect his followers cannot be gainsaid; that he sought vigorously to further the cause of Catholicism in the midst of a hostile regime, brooking no opposition and bravely fighting a concerted enemy, is also understood.

That he has become a pawn in the power of the iron fist of Communist Russia to be traded to the western world for some concession later, is only too apparent. Suffice it to say, that this is not simply a struggle between the Catholic Church and communism, but it is also a fight between a creed of humanitarianism and God on one side, and irreverence and cruel suffering, on the other. Which shall endure, only time and future will tell.

We in America, thousands of miles removed from the scene of this unfortunate occurence, attempting to appraise and evaluate the seriousness of the situation, must keep in mind that wherever the blame may rest, it cannot be placed upon the already heavily laden shoulders of the Hungarian people. They are, they have been, for many years, bearing a heavy yolk of suffering. Perhaps the day is not too far distant when we may extend to them and others a helping hand, the hand of friendship and cooperation which we have already extended to many distraught and troubled peoples held in bondage and subjugation, in various parts of the world. They, too, have been punished for crimes they have not committed—crimes they have been forced to confess by coercion and by threat.

We in America hold sacred the right to a fair trial without bias and prejudice. The charges of treason, speculation, and smuggling of foreign currency abroad, filed against the Hungarian cardinal, are the most serious of crimes; that a trial lasting less than a week covering such important issues, with 1 day taken by the defense, is food for thought for those skeptical of the fairness of the trial. We have heard little or nothing of the defense, except the statement of the cardinal and excerpts of his counsel's plea for leniency. We have not been told of any witnesses being offered on behalf of the defense. It must also be considered in this connection that also on trial with the cardinal were six other defendants against whom charges were preferred and heard. While we have not been made familiar with the judicial procedure of the Hungarian courts of law, it does require further explanation as to the fairness and equitable manner of conduct of this trial.

We in America rebel at the thought that full and open reports of a trial public in nature, be it of one in low or high estate in life, should be clothed in so much mystery and darkness.

The American spirit of fair play is foremost in our thinking and in our action. The fate of Cardinal Mindszenty strikes at that upholdment. We should, as a people devoted and consecrated to liberty and justice, seek to explore with understanding, with intelligence, and firmness, avenues of aid and comfort for this noble and distinguished churchman who has devoted his entire life to the works of God. Let us as Americans give thanks to Almighty God who, in his goodness and in his greatness, has seen fit to provide us with not only the material benefits of life, but also with a grant of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1949.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the name of thousands of patriotic Americans in my district, I call upon you to protest the inhuman proceedings now taking place in Hungary against Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

As the elected Representative of Americans of many faiths, I feel it my solemn duty to point out to you such ghastly injustice which outrages decency in every land.

The persecution of this high Roman Catholic churchman is the beginning of a wave of intolerance which will push through the iron curtain and endeavor to engulf the entire world. No holy man of any faith will be spared from this Red purge.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty may rank with the martyrdom of St. Joan of Arc in its extent of a departure from justice.

I ask you to lend the support of your great office to assist this unfortunate man now being used as a pawn in the gigantic struggle for power waged by godless leaders abroad.

Most sincerely,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Travesty of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of February 9, 1949:

TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

The mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has come to its predetermined end in a travesty of justice staged for their own purposes by the Kremlin and its Communist henchmen in Hungary. The cardinal and his six codefendants have been found guilty of opposition to the Communist dictatorship in Budapest and have been sentenced to a living death in prison from which few can hope to emerge alive. The cardinal's last sacrifice in pleading partly guilty to violating the letter of the Communist law, which makes all opposition a crime, has failed either to avert this new blot on our civilization or even to serve the end for which it was made—the furtherance of peace between the church and a totalitarian state which regards the existence of any independent body as a menace to its existence.

Cardinal Mindszenty thus takes his place among, and becomes the symbol of, the many thousands and even millions of martyrs who have fallen victim to the Communist state. It is a special irony of history that he has been condemned by a judicial system spiked with former Nazis to satisfy, among other things, the personal revenge of Hungary's Communist Chieftain Rakosi, who was sentenced to death on the same day and in the same courtroom 24 years ago for conspiracy to assassinate leading government officials. But the significance and importance of the case go far beyond the fate of any person involved in it.

For this trial was staged, first of all, as a blow against freedom of religion in general and the independence of the churches in particular, in an effort to bring both religion and the churches under the domination of a militantly antireligious Communist regime and to convert them into instruments of Communist mass control, like the present Orthodox Church in Russia. But it was also staged as a propaganda show against the United States, whose Ambassador was accused of interference in Hungarian domestic affairs. On both these counts, the trial flaunted an open defiance of the peace treaty, which obligates the Hungarian Government to assure to all persons under its jurisdiction all fundamental religious, political, and human freedoms, and makes the United States, a signatory to the treaty,

one of the guarantors of these freedoms. It is difficult to see how the United States, and the other western signatories, can escape responsibility for taking whatever action is possible under the circumstances to uphold the sanctity of that treaty.

"I Wouldn't Leave This City for Anything—It Is the Most Interesting Politically, the Friendliest, the Most Thoroughgoing and Natural City in the World—Above All, Cleveland Has the Courage To Face Its Shortcomings and To Do Something About Them"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, that statement was made by a nationally known, direct actionist, a candid, hard-hitting, and two-fisted fighter, and, above all else, a real newspaper man.

He hits hard but he hits clean. America needs many more like him. Cleveland is a better city today because Louis B. Seltzer keeps on hitting hard and often—and he keeps it up until he gets for his home town the progress that is Cleveland's destiny.

Mr. Speaker, while reading the Christian Science Monitor the other evening I came upon a special feature article entitled: "Growing Cleveland Takes Time Out for Self-Examination."

It is unnecessary for me to remind my colleagues, hundreds of whom daily read the Monitor, of the splendid editorials, news features and other items of factual reporting that it brings to us each day. There is probably no news sheet published in the world sc international in scope. Personally I know of no other daily paper printed in our country that circulates under one masthead daily articles of marked length in scores of foreign countries, printed in as many as 20 different languages.

The Monitor daily carries to a war-torn world inspirational dissertations on moral, ethical, sociological, and spiritual subjects, tidings which bring knowledge, peace, and abiding comfort to millions of people in every clime.

Several days ago one of the articles in the Christian Science Monitor which had to do with my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, spoke at great length of my good friend, Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, and Cleveland's popular editor in chief of the Cleveland Press.

A counterpart of the Cleveland Press is found in the Washington Daily News. These are two of the leading news organs in the great catalog of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, with newspapers in all of our principal cities from coast to coast.

The hundreds of copies of the noon edition of the Scripps-Howard Washington Daily News that are sold each day from the table located at the entry to the House Restaurant, evidences the popularity of that sheet among the Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all could see the grandeur pictorialized in the photograph of Cleveland—the forest city—which accompanied that article. In the foreground one can see the smallest detail of the beautiful arches of the magnificent high-level bridge as it crosses the Cuyahoga River.

Standing majestically in the distance, and backed by a beautiful bank of clouds one can clearly discern the great commercial and industrial skyline of Cleveland. The whole of that majestic pile of architectural masonry is topped by the tremendous tower piercing the heavens above the Terminal Building.

In order that all Members of this body may have an opportunity to learn more about what is now the sixth largest city in these United States, and about the driving force and power behind the Cleveland Press, I am presenting the news article carried in the Monitor about Mr. Louis B. Seltzer entitled "An Editor Chats on Progress in Own City."

The article follows:

AN EDITOR CHATS ON PROGRESS IN OWN CITY

CLEVELAND.—The name Louis B. Seltzer means Cleveland to a lot of people who live here where civic consciousness bubbles over.

It means Cleveland particularly to those people who have grown to appreciate the friendly, over-the-back-fence approach to its readers, developed by the Cleveland Press, a Scripps-Howard paper of which he is editor in chief.

Catching Mr. Seltzer, after a search through the Press Building, was something of an achievement. The date book of this smallish man, who likes loud neckties (today it was a bright red one) and wears a pocket handkerchief that spouts, is crammed with engagements. Fortunately, he was staying close to the office to give phone instructions about a flight to New York. Between this phone call and 12 others (by actual count), the interview buzzed along merrily.

As we chatted, there was buzzing of a different sort and a lot of cars honking outside. "Cleveland's traffic," said Mr. Seltzer, "is a mess." He locked his arms behind his head and leaned backward, pushing his feet against the top of the desk.

"What does Cleveland need?"

He dropped his feet and leaned forward. He emphasized his points by striking his fist quietly on his desk, bare except for a pen set and a single piece of paper.

"We need a rapid transit system. We need greater development of our lakefront. But the plan slides along while courts argue over ownership of the land. We need more parks, more recreational areas. We need homes for the mentally ill and the aged. * * *

"But there's one good thing about Cleveland: it keeps after what it needs."

He grinned suddenly. "If Cleveland would put as much energy into civic projects as she puts into her pennant-winning ball club, this city would go places."

CITY HALL PRODDED

Mr. Seltzer seemed reluctant to criticize the city administration.

"Our city government is reasonably good. It's honest. Mayor Burke is a good housekeeper. But City Hall for years has lacked aggressiveness. It needs more vision."

Like most Clevelanders, Mr. Seltzer proudly proclaimed his city's virtues. Cleveland, he said, is second to none in diversification of industry. It has more home ownership, he believed, than any other city in the country.

"People leave the city at night for home and don't return for entertainment. Night clubs are scarce."

Glancing out of the window a moment, he swung around and said, "I wouldn't leave this city ever. It is the most interesting politically; the friendliest and most thoroughgoing and natural city in the world. Above all, it has the courage to face up to its shortcomings and to do something about them."

CITY'S ROLE STRESSED

Mr. Seltzer, being the stanch Clevelander that he is, will not let you forget that this metropolitan area of 1,350,000 population (the city is sixth largest in the Nation) controls most of the shipping of iron ore from the great Mesabi range in Minnesota to mill cities like Youngstown, Ohio, and Pittsburgh. It founded the community chest idea. It puts on grand opera and makes a success of it. It is the home of the Lincoln Electric Co., whose incentive system pays employees an average of $5,800 a year. It is the largest producer of jet engine parts, and has the largest municipal airport in the world.

Reveling in the success of one of the Nation's most heterogeneous cities, Mr. Seltzer naturally believes that the press has played an important role. However, he thinks there is a great void in understanding between most newspapers and their readers. He says that his Cleveland Press is bridging this gap by being a home-town paper—by keeping its doors wide open to the public.

THE PERSONAL TOUCH

"The editor," as he impersonally refers to himself, probably derives his keenest pleasure dashing off tributes to the big people and little people alike in sincere and sentimental editorials which he signs with his initials. Working up the hard way, Louis Seltzer began his newspaper career in 1911, as an office boy with the Press. Before long he was the youngest city editor of a metropolitan daily in the country. He appears reluctant to discuss his personal history unless it relates to Cleveland's progress.

His philosophy seems to accord with a quotation by Ralph Waldo Emerson, which hangs in the Cleveland public library: "Great men have often the shortest biographies. Their real life is in their books or deeds."

Ireland Is Entitled to True Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there was recently held in Dublin, Ireland, a conference of the various leaders of all the political parties in the 26 counties of Ireland. This conference was called by the Prime Minister, John A. Costello, to discuss means of aiding the Anti-Partition candidates running for election to the Stormont Parliament in northern Ireland. Although this election in the north will prove nothing because of the manner in which the various districts have been gerrymandered and the fact that a 3-year-old register of voters is being used, nevertheless the occasion is noteworthy, in that it calls the attention of the world to the undemocratic methods being employed.

In the event truly democratic methods might be used in holding elections in northern Ireland, then a true picture of the sentiment of these people in regard to the border question might be gained. If the gerrymandering would be eliminated and the natural boundaries employed, with approximately equal numbers of voters in each district, then some insight into the real division of public opinion in that area might be obtained. As it is, those favoring union with Great Britain will again win control of the northern parliament, and one union vote will again outweigh two Nationalist votes, which favor a united Ireland.

To obtain the actual sentiment of the people, however, a vote should be taken in all Ireland, so that every voter would have the opportunity to express his will regarding the continuance of the enforced partition of Ireland. On the outcome of such an election, there would certainly be no doubt as to the wishes of the majority, and it is because of this, that no opportunity for such a nation-wide vote can arise so long as the present conditions continue in northern Ireland.

The Gaelic American in its issue for February 5, contains a fine editorial on the Dublin conference, which, with the permission of the Speaker, I desire to include in my remarks. It reads as follows:

A MAGNIFICENT STAND

It was an inspiring message that came from Ireland last week. The representatives of all parties met in the Mansion House, Dublin, with Premier John A. Costello and the former Premier Eamon de Valera at the head of the conference table.

The purpose of the conference was to decide on the best ways and means of helping the Nationalist candidates in the general elections which will be held February 10, in the six counties now held by the British Government. The unanimous decision was to form a national fund to provide the anti-partition candidates with finances to wage a vigorous campaign against the Partition of Ireland.

At the close of the conference, a joint statement was issued, which in part reads:

"We assert once more the right of the Irish people to ownership and control of all the national territory and we repudiate the right of Britain to carve up the Irish nation, or occupy any portion of it, even though a local majority against unity can be procured in the area which was deliberately selected for that purpose by the British Parliament."

This is a frank and manly statement, made by the chosen representatives of the Irish people today. It practically reiterates the proclamation of the Irish Republic, issued by the martyrs of Easter week, 1916, which states in part:

"We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished, except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national sovereignty; six times during the past 300 years have they asserted it in arms."

The Irish people can never be destroyed. Irish exiles scattered all over the world hail this action of the people at home, in standing as one man against the forces of British might and coercion in the six counties of the motherland.

In whatever land the Irish exile may be, his blood will warm and trickle through his veins when he reads that his kith and kin in the cradle land, have courage enough and gallantly buried their local and domestic differences, and are now magnificently reasserting Ireland's God-given right to full freedom and nationhood.

The long line of Ireland's patriots and martyrs, who have shed their blood and given their lives for a free Ireland, must as they look down from the battlements of heaven, pour forth their blessings on those who stand solidly for a united and free Ireland from Antrim to Cork.

The Irish people and their leaders, regardless of what party labels they may wear, are to be congratulated on the splendid spirit of unity manifested at the recent Dublin conference. In this they have the entire support of the Irish race in America, as is shown by the number of cables sent to Ireland by individuals and organizations all over the country. Copies of these cables are reaching the desk of the Gaelic American editor in every mail which proves that the Irish race in the United States is rallying to the cause of justice and freedom for all of Ireland's 32 counties.

This is all Ireland wants. With the united effort of the people at home and the race abroad the infamous partition of the Irish nation must be abolished and the last vestige of British tyranny and oppression must be driven from the sacred soil of Ireland. May God hasten the day and may He guide the destinies of ancient motherland.

The action taken by the leaders of all parties, in the Mansion House, Dublin, last week brings to mind the Patriot Poet when he wrote:

"A nation's voice, a nation's voice
It is a solemn thing:
It bids the bondage-sick rejoice
'Tis stronger than a king.
'Tis like the light of many stars
The sound of many waves.
Which brightly look through prison-bars
And sweetly sound in caves.
Yet is it noblest, godliest known
When righteous triumph swells its tone.
May Ireland's voice be ever heard
Amid the world's applause,
And never be her flag-staff stirred
But in an honest cause.
May freedom be her very breath,
Be justice ever dear,
And never an ennobled death
May son of Ireland fear.
So the Lord God will ever smile
With guardian grace, upon our Isle."

Cleveland Industrial Workers Contributed Their Brains and Brawn to the Huge New United States Air Force Bomber B-47 Without Propellers and With Gross Weight of 125,000 Pounds Which Broke All Previous Records As It Roared Across the Continent in 226 Minutes

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was thrilled to hear of the record-breaking speed that had been attained by the United States Air Force "Strato-Jet" bomber in its ocean-to-ocean flight across the continent.

Recalling the work that was being done in building the vital parts of a new power plant for just such a craft at our own Thompson Products and Cleveland Pneumatic Tool plants in Cleveland, I called my good friend, Maj. Gen. J. D. McIntyre, USAF, to confirm that report.

More particularly I called General McIntyre to confirm my opinion with respect to the part that the industrial workers in my own congressional district had played in making it possible for the men of the United States Air Force to achieve that great record.

General McIntyre conceded my surmise to be correct, and, splendid gentleman that he is, he even went further and said:

Mrs. BOLTON, the workers in the factories are as much a part of American air power as are the men of the Air Force itself. We only fly the product that they make for us.

Mr. Speaker, the most vital parts of the new and revolutionary method of driving airplanes—by use of jets—minus the old revolving type engine-driven propellers, are in a large part the product of the brain and brawn of both men and women who work in our aircraft-parts industries in the great city of Cleveland.

Think back but a few years, Mr. Speaker, to the days of the old pusher-type airplane—made with a few sticks and bits of canvas, doing 80 miles an hour—a feat that challenged the imagination of men.

Think of the Liberty and the Rotary Engine, propeller types, which boasted a cruising speed of but a few hundred miles an hour.

Now vision with me this latest-type bomber plane of our United States Air Force. Built to carry a 10,000-pound bomb load, it is itself a giant fabrication of 125,000 pounds of iron and steel, aluminum, copper, magnesium, lead, tin, zinc, glass, plastic, fuel, and a host of other organic and inorganic materials, flying through space nearly 7 miles above the earth, and at an average speed of 607 miles an hour in a nonstop transcontinental flight.

Mr. Speaker, and you my colleagues, how few of us vision how this old world of ours is shrinking.

Our Air Force fighter and pursuit planes have already pierced the sonic barrier at speeds exceeding that of sound. Our Super Fortress B–36 can easily span the Pacific Ocean in a nonstop flight and without refueling.

Surely today we can travel fast, and we can travel far.

The battleship and the mammoth caterpillar-treaded tanks of yesteryear are no longer the weapons with which wars would be made today.

Today it is the little factory next door—or the mill down the street—that will supply the military might of the world. Cripple the factories and the productive capacity that supports the Army on land, and divisions of soldiers are immobilized and defenseless. Whole fleets of battleships will sink into the sea.

Mr. Speaker, most of us think of air power as things that fly through the air. But air power is far more than planes, be they fighters, pursuits, reconnaissance, light, medium or super bombers. These with their complement of air and ground crews constitute but the air force of a nation.

The air power of a nation is the nation's air force plus the plants that make the planes and the engines—the thousands of mines and mills and factories and farms, big and little, where men and women labor to make the radio and radar tubes and parts, the instruments, the bolts, nuts, and screws, and the more than 60,000 other presents and components that are necessary to the fabrication, completion, and perfection of our B–36 superbomber.

Mr. Speaker, modern American air power means security to our Nation—yes—and peace to the world.

If we are to remain strong we must have a stabilized aircraft-production industry.

A small but steady and never-ceasing aircraft-production line—daily producing the most modern of all aircraft—is of essence to our national security, and of vital importance to us here in this Nation's Congress.

To my mind the prime order of business here in this Congress is to insure the peace and the security of this Nation and of our American way of life.

Second only to that is to insure continued and uninterrupted employment at prevailing rates of wages to all of our American workers; and, last but not least, to insure to all the most economical expenditure of every last cent of the taxpayer's dollar.

Fifteen billion dollars are budgeted this year for the armed services of this country.

It is not economical to produce 1,000 planes one day and none the next. A stabilized aircraft industry—furnishing planes under a long-term defense program means reduced costs to the Government, and the ultimate savings of hundreds of millions of dollars for aircraft procurement.

It is because of these facts that I am pleased to note that our Armed Services Committee just yesterday unanimously reported out a bill that is favorable to the long-range program for the procurement of aircraft—or to establish what is known as the 70-group air force.

Thus the Nation will at last be assured the annual production of approximately 5,200 planes. This is the rate of annual plane production which our own Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Committee and the President's Aviation Policy Board long since determined was the minimum number of planes that should be produced to provide adequate defense to our country and a stabilized aircraft-production line—with constant employment to the workers of that industry.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of congratulating the United States Air Force and the Honorable W. Stuart Symington upon the splendid job that has been done by them since the establishment of that branch of government as a separate arm of our military services.

I am happy to note the business principles that have been made applicable by the Secretary of the Air Force—both with respect to the budgeting of all funds through a supervised system of cost control—and of the businesslike follow-up of all expenditures, management, and disbursements through the exercise of the control of costs.

Taxes are paid, Mr. Speaker, in the sweat of all who labor. With the billions of dollars of tax levies now being spent, I feel that I bespeak the thought of my every last colleague when I say that the Secretary of the Air Force has the full power of this Congress behind him in insuring to America supremacy in air power and a maximum of national security—at a minimum of cost to our taxpaying citizens.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, yesterday at page 979 et sequentes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there was printed at the request of Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, a summary of the testimony given before that committee on that day by Mr. Leon Keyserling, Vice Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

As vice chairman of the committee, I submit herewith in similar fashion a summary of the testimony offered before the committee at today's hearing by Dr. John D. Clark, also a member of the Council:

Present postwar inflation is world-wide and, in many respects, similar to that after World War I. As then in Russia, Austria, and Germany, so now some countries such as China are licked by the problem. Others, such as France and Italy, emerge with prices several times higher than before. In but few are prices kept under reasonable control. In the United States the amount of postwar rise has been about the same as it was after the Civil War and after World War I.

Since VJ-day inflation has passed through three stages. During the first stage, that is until the removal of OPA, there was only a moderate rise, a continuation of the strikingly successful containment of inflationary forces during the war. When controls were removed in June of 1946 prices jumped. It was during that summer that the Employment Act of 1946 became law. By late autumn, as the Council of Economic Advisers was being organized, every businessman that spoke for the record, and nearly all business analysts and economists, registered the opinion that post-OPA price rises had shot their bolt. Competition was supposed to bring prices back down.

The Council of Economic Advisers hesitated to go counter to such unanimous business judgment, but it saw clearly that the major problem in 1947 would be inflation and urged voluntary self-restraint on the part of all groups—business executives, bankers, labor leaders, and merchants. This was dubbed an effort to talk down prices.

In the second period the economy experienced real monetary inflation. Total industrial production remained the same (the index being identical for March 1947 and August 1948), prices continued an upward surge so great that the general index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics rose from 124.7 in March 1947 to 145.0 in August 1948. This monetary inflation was broken largely by the determined efforts of the American Bankers Association, who deserve for that effort a generous acknowledgment of praise. The total money supply which had risen from $151,900,000,000 in January 1946 to $170,000,000,000 in December of 1947 not only discontinued its rise, but during 1948 has gone down slightly to $168,000,000,000.

It was thought in the collapse of farm prices a year ago that other prices would follow. But the Council of Economic Advisers saw clearly that no such result would follow as it had, for example, in 1920–21. New farm legislation not only protected farmers, but protected business in general against the contagious row-of-dominoes effect which used to take place when farm prices broke. Such assurance to business and to farmers kept the economy operating at a high level.

Since last August, however, the economy has entered a third phase, one in which some prices are continuing to go up, while those of farm products and foods are continuing to go down. The resultant dispersion, disparity, and disequilibrium threatens the stability and upward climb of national productivity and output.

Two kinds of action seem desirable. The first is that of providing a floor, of aiding the price decline in farm products to stabilize to a sound and healthy basis. The second is that of stopping the rise of administered industrial prices by such deterrents as higher taxes on corporation profits, wise credit controls, restriction of unwise spending activity by Government, and encouragement of consumers to put their money in E bonds rather than gray markets.

Thus the Nation enters 1949 with dangerous instability forces at work. The drop in prices of foods and some items of clothing in January 1949 may provide a modicum of relief for individual family budgets, but such price declines achieve vital significance only when they result in lower costs of production. There appears little prospect for lower production costs on most items at present. The record level of personal and disposable incomes does not foreshadow any major decline in total demand. It is probably still true that the 80 percent of American families who have incomes under $5,000 will make full use of their buying power during 1949. The demand for goods may well be maintained at levels little, if any, under present rates of production.

The current dip in consumer buying and in corporate purchases may be accounted for in considerable measure by the fact that during the 3-month period from December 15 to March 15 the Government collects the bulk of both personal and corporation income taxes. In both 1947 and in 1948, 48 percent of total income taxes collected were collected during this 90-day period. These tax collections in fact have a greater anti-inflationary effect than any other Government program. It is thus much too early to state with certainty that beneficial price declines will continue. In the third quarter of 1947 and again in February a year ago similar soft spots were trumpeted as the end of the sellers' market and the beginning of a recession. Dogmatic forecasters may merely be putting on a repeat performance. Patience, an open mind, and caution would seem the better counsel.

Commissioner Ewin L. Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Commissioner Ewin L. Davis, of the Federal Trade Commission, delivered an important statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Trade Policies relative to the basing point question. The entire text of the statement was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee. It appears on page A385 of the Appendix of the RECORD. This is a very important statement and I hope it is read by all Members who are interested in this question. I am quoting a part of Judge Davis' testimony which I hope will not be overlooked. It is as follows:

On January 12 of this year, less than 2 weeks ago, the majority of the Commission approved and made public a letter by its secretary which contains answers to various questions submitted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York as to the meaning and implications of the above described October 12 statement. I believe that these various statements have in large measure explained the views of the law by the majority of the Commission and have dissipated substantially the earlier confusion. If in the future it appears that any significant points are still obscure the Commission will consider issuing an additional public statement. However, there is obviously a limit beyond which the Commission should not go in issuing in its quasi-judicial capacity interpretations of the laws which it administers apart from its decisions in litigated cases. The question presented in these cases is whether or not the effects of certain pricing practices are injurious to competition. It required thousands of pages of testimony and other evidence in the Cement case to determine the facts as to the pricing policy in that industry and the effects on competition of that policy. It is for that reason that while the Commission may, when the public interest requires, make a general statement as to its interpretation of the law, it should not give ex parte opinions on a given statement of alleged facts.

BASING POINT USED AS VEHICLE TO FIX PRICES

Much of the public discussion relative to the recent cases decided by the Commission has been in reference to the basing-point system of pricing and the resulting practice of freight absorption by the concerns parties to that system. The Commission acting pursuant to section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act has challenged basing-point systems when these systems have been used by groups in an industry to establish identical prices at each point of delivery. These are just another and perhaps more complex variety of the familiar collusive price-fixing cases. They constitute violations of the Sherman Act as well as the Federal Trade Commission Act. In these cases the basing-point system was an instrumentality used by concerns to fix prices. When the Commission challenged the fixing of prices by means of the basing-point system it did not necessarily challenge the use of the basing-point method of pricing. The Commission has not in a single case challenged the use of the basing-point method of pricing per se separate and apart from collusion. The Commission has not challenged freight absorption per se. The Commission has not required f. o. b. mill pricing. The Commission has not challenged the legality of the use of uniform delivered prices by an individual concern.

EVERY BASING-POINT SYSTEM NOT ILLEGAL

It should be emphasized that the Commission does not see a violation of the law in every basing-point pricing case which comes before it. Positive and irrefutable proof of this is contained in the fact that the Commission has closed without prejudice matters under consideration in which the facts revealed unmistakably the existence of basing-point pricing which, however, was not accompanied by evidence of collusion in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act or competitively injurious discrimination in violation of the Clayton Act.

INSTANCES WHERE BASING-POINT SYSTEM DECLARED LAWFUL

For example, in two specific cases the Commission investigated charges that a basing-point type of pricing was being followed and that it resulted in a violation of the law. In these cases the facts after investigation revealed unmistakably that a basing-point method of pricing actually was being followed. Investigation also however failed to disclose sufficient evidence of collusion or discrimination to constitute violations of the law. Consequently, the Commission closed without prejudice each of these cases and no complaint was issued despite, and I repeat despite, the fact that basing-point systems of pricing were followed. These cases reveal that the mere existence of basing-point pricing in and of itself does not constitute in the opinion of the Commission a violation of any of the laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission.

EACH SELLER CAN CHOOSE F. O. B. OR BASING POINT

The Commission has not required any concern to use any particular method or methods of pricing. Each seller may choose his own method of pricing provided that he does not conspire or agree with his competitors and provided that he does not discriminate in price in the manner prohibited by law and thereby injure competition or tend to create a monopoly. A seller may absorb freight or absorb part of his manufacturing costs or any other costs in order to in good faith meet an equally low price of a competitor. This price however must be a competitive price, not one fixed by agreement, express or implied, from all of the facts, and it must not injure or prevent competition among his customers.

Which Shall It Be: A Stabilized Currency or Communism?—We Must Either Stabilize the Currency by the Adoption of a Sound Monetary System or Resign Ourselves to the Inevitability of Economic Collapse With Unbridled Anarchy Throughout the Entire World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a sound money bill similar to that introduced in the Eightieth Congress by Senator ECTON, of Montana, and myself. In view of the fact that this proposed legislation is fully explained in a pamphlet titled "Why Prices Are High," which will be mailed free on request, I will limit my remarks.

However, I do want to refute the untruthful statements of opponents of sound money, who would confuse the issue by saying that sound money legislation is instigated by mining interests solely to increase their profits. Neither the price of gold nor the price of silver is an issue. There are just four real issues before the American people—world peace, economic stability, national security, and constitutional government; and all four are predicated upon a sound monetary system. These are not partisan issues; and those who oppose sound money—or are indifferent to the subject—are, wittingly or unwittingly, playing right into the hands of the Communists and international banker-racketeers, who are deliberately and premeditatedly selling America down the river.

THE UNNECESSARY WAR

Economic and monetary authorities of the type of the late Sir Henri Deterding, financial genius of the Royal Dutch Shell Oil Co., repeatedly pointed out in the years between 1929 and 1933 that the depression could have been ended in a few months if silver had been joined with gold, at fixed and proper ratio, to restore monetary reserves, and thereby insure the redemption of paper currency at face value, on demand; and if the London Economic Conference of 1933 had adopted such a sound monetary policy, we would have been spared the horrors of World War II, which Winston Churchill so aptly called the unnecessary war.

THE REAL TRADE BARRIER BETWEEN NATIONS

An unsound monetary system, such as is current throughout the world today, is more fruitful of human misery than war, pestilence and famine; and has brought more injustice than all the bad laws ever written. Every single crisis in the world today—from Berlin to Bagdad, from Korea to Indonesia—can be traced directly to a debauched, manipulated, irredeemable paper currency which, under the pseudonym of managed currency, masquerades as a monetary system. This, and not the tariff, is the real trade barrier between nations, for few businessmen dare the hazard of selling goods across any border in Europe where the value of currencies fluctuate daily, often hourly.

A STRANGE, UNHOLY ALLIANCE

We are being led to believe that communism is the one and only enemy of freedom, but communism is merely one of the instruments that the real conspirators are using. They know that communism is the greatest economic hoax in all history, ready to fall apart from its own internal weakness once they withhold their financial support. It is a recognized fact that international racketeers are financing the Communist leaders of Indonesia, the price of their support being the control of such raw materials as rubber, tin, manganese, and

bauxite—all of which are absolutely essential to our economy; and once these racketeers gain control and set up international cartels for their distribution and sale, American industry can expect to pay through the nose for such materials. The next move will probably be the control and cartelization of the natural resources of the Philippine Islands.

As Gen. Douglas MacArthur so succinctly stated: "Our failure to support the Government of China immediately and vigorously at the end of the war, will turn out to be one of the biggest single blunders in the history of the United States."

For a Communist-controlled Manchuria, Korea, and Kurile Islands provide perfect springboards for attacks on Japan and Alaska; and without the natural resources of Manchuria and northern Korea, China can never develop a sound economy.

ABSOLUTISM OR FREEDOM?

The real struggle that goes on in the world today is not between communism and capitalism, but between absolutism and freedom. From the earliest days of this Republic, the absolutists recognized in our system of government a threat to all forms of absolutism and have never ceased in their efforts to destroy us. But so long as we were able to produce 97 percent of our own raw materials and consume 94 percent of our own production, under a system of free competitive enterprise, protect our home market for our own production, and finance our business enterprises through a people's capitalism, the conspirators were unable to dominate our industry and commerce.

COMBINING THE ISMS OF CECIL RHODES AND KARL MARX

The international bankers are the No. 1 absolutists. They would emulate Cecil Rhodes, who dreamed of a small select group controlling the world's raw materials through cartels and monopolies, not unlike his diamond cartel. Thus, they would control production, distribution, prices, credits, money, and the value of money. Possibly Rhodes, in his ego, envisioned a benevolent despotism directing and controlling the lives and economy of the world's peoples better than they could control themselves. But despotism has a way of ceasing to be benevolent and becoming only despotic.

The international bankers have long realized that before they could control American industry and commerce, they must eliminate the protective tariff and so drain away our wealth that we could no longer consume the major portion of our own production. Then the American manufacturer would be forced to seek foreign markets and foreign goods would flow into free-trade America to pay interest on foreign bonds.

They were quick to recognize as valuable, if but temporary, allies the Communists, fellow travelers, and international do-gooders who, to further their social and economic programs, were steadily draining away our wealth. Thus, through a blending of the ideologies of Cecil Rhodes and Karl Marx, there has been consummated a strange, unholy alliance.

THREE KINDS OF CAPITALISM

The followers of Karl Marx, in pursuit of their vaunted objective to abolish capitalism, have succeeded only in abolishing freedom. But, as a consequence of their machinations, a new type of capitalism has emerged; and the world now has three kinds of capitalism: international capitalism, state capitalism, and a people's capitalism.

The first two mean absolutism, a controlled economy which regiments and controls the lives of the individuals; while a people's capitalism, such as has always existed in the United States since the founding days of this Republic, means freedom for the individual and the right to engage in free competitive enterprise. We must decide, and decide quickly, under which form of capitalism we want to live.

IT IS BUT A STEP FROM PRIVATE MONOPOLY TO STATE MONOPOLY

Europe has always suffered under a semifeudal, monopolistic, private capitalism—international capitalism—which, during the past 75 years, has successfully pillaged every country in the world outside of the United States; and now seeks to pillage us. When the people of other lands rebelled and took over control of their governments, it was but a step from private monopoly to state monopoly—state capitalism. They did not change systems, they merely changed masters. Today, we see international capitalism and state capitalism joining hands to destroy our people's capitalism by taxing free enterprise in the United States to build up socialism (state capitalism) in Europe, which is committed to the destruction of free enterprise. Moreover, through the reciprocal trade agreements and the Bretton Woods monetary agreements, we are subsidizing imports from these Socialist countries 60 percent and discounting exports to them by 37½ percent. How can American industry and labor meet that kind of competition and just how long can our economy stand the strain?

International capitalism and state capitalism are both throwbacks to medievalism, the one difference being that absolute monarchies are replaced by international cartels or state monopolies. There is one way—and one way only—to combat these forces that would put mankind in economic chains; that is by adopting a sound monetary system.

A SIMPLE, PRACTICAL SOLUTION OF THE MONETARY PROBLEM

Since it is perfectly obvious that there is not enough gold in the entire world to furnish a base sufficiently wide to support world currencies and insure their redemption, the monetary base must be widened by joining silver with gold at fixed and proper ratio. There is no intent on my part to be arbitrary about the price at which gold and silver are pegged. You will note that my bill does not increase the value of gold, but merely adjusts the price of gold to the depreciated value of the dollar, while the ratio of 16 to 1 between silver and gold was established by the Congress in 1837.

A correct ratio, based on the relative world production of the two metals, will double the base that supports world currencies. If, after careful investigation by appropriate committees of the Congress, it is decided that a sound currency can be maintained by increasing monetary reserves 70 percent instead of 100 percent, then a ratio of 20 to 1 could be established which would peg the price of silver at $2.80 per ounce instead of $3.50 per ounce.

However, the ratio of approximately 15 to 1, or 16 to 1, was established more than 2,000 years ago; and careful consideration should be given any drastic change in this ratio. For example, you will note in your dictionary that gold and silver shekels of equal weight and size were minted in 139 B. C. and, based on the price of gold prior to 1934, worth $10.88 and 72½ cents respectively, or a silver-gold ratio of 15 to 1. Over the centuries this ratio, based on the relative world production of gold and silver, has become a part of the natural law, and whenever we legislate contrary to the natural law, we get into trouble and the result is the opposite of that "planned."

The principal function of money is to serve as a constant, invariable measure of the value of goods and services. But under the present monetary policy of a "managed currency," money has become a commodity to be bought and sold and made cheap or dear by the manipulations of a group of international bankers, in direct violation of the Constitution, which states in article I, section 8, clause 5: "That the Congress shall have power * * * To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

At the present value of the dollar, any reduction in prices must come out of the farmers and other producers of raw materials. This is not merely the concern of the farmer, for agriculture's income is always one-seventh of our national income, and every billion dollar reduction in agriculture's income causes a reduction of $7,000,000,000 in our national income. It is well for the Congress to ponder these facts.

I will not further burden my colleagues today, but sincerely trust they will read my bill and pamphlet titled "Why Prices Are High" and give the subject their thoughtful consideration.

Basing-Point Decision of Supreme Court Is Helpful to Small Business and Should Not Be Changed by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter from W. R. Archer III, president of the Archer Products Co., Inc., of Fort Worth, Tex. This letter gives in plain, simple language many of the good reasons why the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case

outlawing the basing point, where used in conspiracy against the public and to create a monopoly, should not be changed by the Congress. It is as follows:

ARCHER PRODUCTS CO., INC.,
Fort Worth, Tex., December 9, 1948.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Texas Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the last few weeks the matter pertaining to f. o. b. prices of merchandise with the Federal Trade Commission views and the Supreme Court decision relative to these matters have become more prominent in the public eye. As a result we have expended our energy in all avenues of information, cause, and effect, pertaining to this ruling's effect on our business and we would like to present them to the committee.

I read with considerable concern the statement by the Capehart committee stating, and I quote, "Witnesses before CAPEHART'S committee have complained the decision threatens industry generally with chaotic conditions, and has led to hardships for many concerns, especially small-business men." In our opinion this interpretation will have four-pronged advantages, to first the consumer, second, the small-business man, third, decentralization of industry, and fourth, labor. Since this interpretation is so far reaching I will attempt to cover only the salient points pertaining to little business and its effect. I am not familiar enough with the distribution of goods through wholesale channels to hazard so much as a guess along these lines.

The advantage to the consumer would, first, be lowering prices. In many cases immediately, in other cases subsequently. The immediate lowering of prices to the consumer would be effected by manufacturers' discontinuing zoning practices which make consumers in area of manufacture pay the same price as the consumer in the distant areas. It is obvious that if the f. o. b. pricing system was employed and a manufacturer in the East used a price of $5 per unit of a 50-pound unit weight the consumer adjacent to the manufacturing point in a radius of 350 to 400 miles (average freight rate of 30 cents) would buy this item for $5 per unit up to $5.15 per unit, whereupon the consumer in the Los Angeles area would buy this merchandise (figuring $1.30 a case freight) at $5.65 per unit. The effect of this would necessitate eastern manufacturers to either open a plant in the Los Angeles area or suffer the loss of business in this area to local manufacturers. Local manufacturers generally mean small-business men, consequently the consumer in the Los Angeles area would then have available either the national manufacturers' goods manufactured in Los Angeles or an increase in the small local manufacturers', thus enabling him to reduce his cost by increasing his volume of the f. o. b. basing system. It is not to be construed that in the above statement the writer is attempting to cover every manufactured item in America. There are rare cases where products are indigenous only to a given area and could not be developed in other areas, such as fruits and fish. However, there are many products which could be developed in many parts of the United States but lack the necessary impetus the basic pricing would provide. It is the writer's opinion, however, that these represent less than 10 percent of the manufactured items in America.

The small-business man would immediately receive the protection necessary to make plans in his business without fear of eventually being subject to monopolistic practice of big business because no large manufacturer could, as has been done throughout the history of American industry, reduce the price on merchandise in one area such as the Southwest to a below-cost figure of 5 percent and increase the price in five other areas 1 percent and use this weapon to break or force little business to sell out. It would force big business to use the same basing price for all markets and consequently render it impossible for him to divide and conquer little business competitors throughout the country. If this fear is not existant ask any little businessman who has attempted to expand his operations what answers he receives from the banks and other financial organizations in his locality and you will find that his financers have advised him: (1) Do not grow large enough so as to incur the unpleasantness of national competitors; (2) the man with the most money in this type of business usually wins; (3) if your competitors did not include the largest manufacturers in America we would be happy to go along with you, but the bigger your business grows the more vulnerable you become. Last but not least, the question most prominent with banks and other sources of finance, what are you going to do when your large competitors start after you? You can readily see how f. o. b. pricing would immediately force big business to either decentralize or be noncompetitive in various markets; (4) decentralization of industry with advent of atomic, bacteria, and chemical warfare is perhaps the greatest necessity in this country today.

If the committee were to request of the Secretary of Defense Forrestal and the Ordnance and Quartermaster Departments of the armed forces, I feel certain that they would agree without reluctance to the fact that decentralization in America is necessary for the survival of this country in case of total attack employing the above-mentioned weapons. Even though we are a small industry, the f. o. b. pricing would force us to do one of two things: (1) pull out of such markets as the far West and Southeast and concentrate our efforts in the area surrounding our plant within a 350- to 400-mile area. Our plant could produce merchandise cheaper than our competitors not in this area (because of elimination of freight equalization), or (2) to open plants in the Los Angeles and Atlanta areas. I am certain the f. o. b. pricing would make available finance to small business to accomplish the latter if they so desire. There has been some discussion regarding the effect on little business if big business placed plants in areas of operation. My answer to this is that if any manufacturer does not have the ability he would eventually be frozen out anyway, because the American principle of business is based upon free enterprise and ability. I am certain that few large business executives are happy with the thought of competing with the type of management little business can afford as compared with salaried management big business affords since little business has always had to operate with more efficiency and less overhead to survive. F. o. b. pricing would perhaps go further in accomplishing decentralization than any other factor short of United States Government financing decentralization of big industry. Decentralization through f. o. b. pricing would be done by providing small business with necessary finance and would be accomplished in a course of several years, due to the effect of consumers buying, whereby any other channels might take billions of dollars in decades of years. Just to cite one of the terrific advantages of decentralization in peace and in war, I quote an example existing at this very minute.

The Quartermaster Corps is purchasing at present canned meat for our armed services and ERP. Our plant is located in Fort Worth, Tex., with a capacity of 6,000 cases of canned meat daily. We were not able to bid on any of these contracts because sources of finance would not assist us in enlarging our plant, which was taken up by domestic business; consequently the bulk of contracts for canned meat items, which we manufacture, were awarded to concerns in the Middle West and East. One contract, which alone involves several hundred thousand pounds, was awarded to an eastern concern which is purchasing the boned meat in Fort Worth, Tex.; it is being shipped from Fort Worth to this point at a freight cost of $3 per 100 pounds and a boxing and freezing charge of 1½ cents. On a 1,000,000-pound contract it is costing our Government $45,000 more to secure this item than it would if the same merchandise was manufactured f. o. b. Fort Worth.

The transportation divsion of the armed forces would quickly admit that one of the biggest problems during the last war was rail cars and transporting of troops and supplies. Speaking for my industry alone the facilities are available for the canning of meats in large quantities in southwestern points. The manufacturer need go no further than 250 miles from his plant to secure unlimited supplies of meats and could then ship the finished item to one of the many ports in the Gulf coast area at a saving to our Government of: (1) freight on raw materials to point of manufacture; (2) freight on finished products to port of embarkation.

In the event of mass atomic attack on this country at present one attack each on points such as Detroit, Chicago, and Pittsburgh would virtually render this country impotent since it would demoralize steel, precision manufacturing in the rail hub of America. Whereupon defense plans are to break this country into self-sufficient cells that could operate independent of each other.

The final and perhaps the greatest effect of f. o. b. pricing would be brought about in a more even distribution of labor throughout the country as the No. 1 factor, and secondly a higher standard of wages and living. At present we service the Southeast, Pacific coast, and the Southwest with one superintendent of production, one head of an auditing department, one director of sales, and one general manager, assistants and secretaries for each. The keymen mentioned above have a terrific responsibility and no manufacturer can run without executives in these departments plus capable general management. In the event we decide to open plants in the Los Angeles area or the Atlanta area it would be necessary for us to secure for each of these plants, one production manager, sales manager, etc., making a total of 12 key personnel, whereupon at present we have but four in this capacity. To secure capable personnel in the above-described positions it is necessary to pay a minimum of from $6,000 to $15,000 a year. The cost of this additional personnel would not be paid out of additional cost of manufacturing but would be paid by the freight savings from decentralized plants. For example, we ship canned meats weighing 57 pounds from Fort Worth to Los Angeles at $1.35 per 100 pounds freight rate making our merchandise cost the consumer 76.95 more than if we manufactured the merchandise in Los Angeles. Using 100,000 units per month manufactured our cost would be increased by four key personnel in a Los Angeles plant of only 17 cents per unit, whereupon our cost f. o. b. the plant would be reduced by 59.9 per unit. More even distribution of labor would be brought about since multiple decentralization would divide into units of 20 to 500 employees in one given area, which makes impossible mass lay-offs, unrest, union racketeering, and a thousand-odd evils of mass employment. It is reasonable to assume that 10 small plants would have a better control of efficiency and elimination of waste than one large plant manufacturing the same tonnage.

I would like to reiterate that the facts outlined above pertain solely to the manufacturing of canned meats and canned foods and that I in no way am attempting to voice an opinion with reference to fabrication of automobiles or other type industry. But I am

certain the food industry would be benefited greatly if for no other reason than most food items such as some canned meat items, pork and beans, and other items similar run from 30 percent added water to 75 percent added water. In other words the western consumer is paying 57½ cents for eastern water. It just as easily could be added in the western area.

If I may be of assistance in any manner toward the eventual enforcement of f. o. b. pricing I would consider it a service to my country as well as small-business men and I will be available at any time and in any capacity.

Sincerely,

W. R. ARCHER III.

California Legislature Endorses Full Flood-Control Program for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for 1950 provides $430,287,000 for flood control, general, which is supposed to complete the general flood-control program in the United States in 10 years.

However, the proposed general flood-control appropriation for California projects contained in the President's budget represents only half the amount required to complete California's program on a 10-year basis.

Recurrent floods in California cause loss of life and property, disrupt transportation, and waste water to the detriment of the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State.

The flood-control needs of California should receive consideration on a basis of equality with the Nation-wide program, and appropriations should be provided commensurate with the flood-control needs of the State.

The California State Legislature has passed the following resolution listing the flood-control projects and the amounts which are urgently needed for the protection of life and property in California:

Senate Joint Resolution 17

Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider flood-control needs in California

Whereas recurrent floods in California have caused loss of life and property, disruption of commerce and transportation, and the wasting of water detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State; and

Whereas the local agencies concerned in flood-control works have joined together in the California Flood Control Conference and developed a coordinated program for construction of authorized Federal flood-control projects; and

Whereas the State Water Resources Board has held public hearings on, and carefully screened, the requests for appropriations presented by the California Flood Control Conference, and determined an urgent need for appropriations for the following projects and amounts:

San Francisco engineering district: Salinas River	$1,000,000
Los Angeles engineering district:	
Upper Los Angeles River	2,000,000
Tujunga Wash	3,000,000
Compton Creek	2,268,000
Whittier Narrows	12,000,000
Sawtelle-Westwood (lower)	3,917,000
Live Oak Wash	500,000
San Antonio flood-control basin	2,500,000
Stewart Canyon (Ventura County)	880,000
Carbon Canyon (Orange County)	1,000,000
San Diego River	3,500,000
Sacramento engineering district:	
Black Butte Dam	500,000
Cherry Valley	1,500,000
Farmington Dam	2,000,000
Folsom Dam	5,000,000
Isabella Dam	6,000,000
Merced group	500,000
Pine Flat Dam	12,500,000
Sacramento River major and minor tributaries	1,000,000
Sacramento River (old project)	6,000,000
San Joaquin River levees	1,000,000
Success	500,000
Terminus	500,000
Total	69,565,000

Whereas the Legislature of the State of California demonstrated its concern in the flood-control problems of the State and the authorized Federal program by appropriating $25,000,000 to pay the cost of local participation in these projects; and

Whereas the President's budget for the fiscal year 1950 provides $430,287,600 for flood control, general, which would complete the general flood-control program of the United States in 10 years; and

Whereas the proposed general flood-control appropriations for California projects contained in the President's budget represent about half the amount required to complete California's program on a 10-year basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the flood-control needs of California on a basis of equality with the national program and to that end provide appropriations commensurate with the need as justified in the program developed by the State water resources board; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Compulsory Arbitration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the significant and thoughtful address on the subject, Is Compulsory Arbitration Inevitable? recently delivered by Dr. George W. Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board and now professor at the University of Pennsylvania, together with a brief foreword of my own.

Notwithstanding an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that it will cost $230.75 to print the manuscript, it has such merit and value in connection with pending labor legislation that I request the printing.

There being no objection, the foreword and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

The character of our legislation in the field of labor relations is a test of our essential democracy. To develop clearer thinking and a reliable fund of knowledge and opinion for use by Government, management, and labor, the Industrial Relations Research Association was recently organized. It held its first annual meeting on December 29 and 30, 1948, at Cleveland, in connection with the gatherings of the other learned societies in the field of economics.

Many splendid papers were read to the Government, labor, and management representatives gathered in Cleveland. Special interest was stimulated by the addresses made by the nationally known Dr. Edwin E. Witte, first president of the Industrial Relations Research Association, now professor at the University of Wisconsin, and by Dr. George W. Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board and now professor at the University of Pennsylvania.

As Mr. John Herling, editor of Chester Wright's Labor Letter, remarked over Station WCFM in Washington, D. C., "This hard and clear thinking—whether you agree with it or not—was a fortunate characteristic of this first meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association. The papers of Edwin Witte and George Taylor helped give a cutting edge to the discussions at the first annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association."

IS COMPULSORY ARBITRATION INEVITABLE?

(By George W. Taylor, of the University of Pennsylvania)

Out of the strike experiences of the past decade has come a widespread realization that certain stoppages of production—those which threaten the public health and safety—cannot be used to resolve labor disputes. Because of this practical limitation on the right to strike, an inadequacy of collective bargaining theory has become apparent.

THE FUNCTION OF THE STRIKE

The essence of collective bargaining is a meeting of minds. An agreement as to conditions of employment has to be arrived at as a result of either peaceful negotiations or a work stoppage. Arrangements are made by union representatives on behalf of the employees as a group. According to union standards, unless employment terms are acceptable to a majority of the employees, no jobs are to operate. Defense of the group right to determine whether any jobs will be operated has been so vigorous that, in recent years at least, most employers have not attempted to operate their facilities once a strike has been called. The right to strike, in accordance with the definition long sought by the unions, involves a complete shut-down. This is not compatible with public needs in the emergency disputes.

So much attention has been given to the right to strike that the function of the strike has not been precisely perceived. In a col-

lective-bargaining system, the rights to strike and to lock-out serve as the motive power which induces a modification of extreme positions and then a meeting of minds. The acceptability of certain terms of employment is determined in relation to the losses of a work stoppage that can be avoided by an agreement. In collective bargaining, economic power provides the final arbitrament.

When the rights to strike and to lock out are withdrawn, as during a war or under compulsory arbitration, a most important inducement to agree is removed. The penalty for failing to agree—stoppage of production—is waived. Even more devastating consequences result. Each party is reluctant to make any concessions around the bargaining table. That might prejudice its case before whatever board is set up to deal with labor disputes. In addition, the number of issues is kept large and formidable. Demands that customarily wash out in negotiations are carefully preserved for submission to the board. Why not? There is everything to gain and nothing to lose by trying to get one's unusual demands approved without cost.

The experience of the War Labor Board in World War II, as well as scattered returns from those states which recently passed anti-strike legislation applicable to public utility industries, strongly indicate that possession of the rights to strike and to lock out is essential if labor and management are to settle their differences by their own agreement.

The strike itself is an instrument of persuasion or of coercion, depending upon one's point of view, which is counted upon in the collective bargaining system to produce a meeting of minds in the most persistent disputes. However reluctantly, employees will choose to take up their tools and resume production at the terms finally agreed upon as a strike settlement. With whatever misgivings, management will open up the plant at those same terms.

Arbitrament of economic power, which is implicit in collective bargaining, does not insure that conditions of employment will be fair and equitable by anyone's standards. It does give assurance that working terms will not be imposed by the Government upon either employees or employers. The system obviously involves costs, but they must be weighed against the advantages of the meeting-of-minds criterion. To be sure, if collective bargaining is to operate effectively, the actual resort to strikes and to lock-outs must be the exception and not the rule. At the same time stoppages actually undertaken must be allowed to run their course. Only then can they fulfill their collective-bargaining function of bringing about a meeting of minds.

The strike cannot perform its collective-bargaining function in public-emergency disputes. A work stoppage doesn't primarily exert pressure upon the disputants to come to terms. The parties can hold out longer than the public or the Government. In consequence, a strike which creates a public emergency exerts primary pressure upon the Government to intervene and also to specify the terms upon which production is to be resumed. The use of such work stoppages as a technique is, at least, bad workmanship by any union representatives who want to retain collective bargaining. They and the employers with whom they deal are faced with the necessity of devising means other than the strike for inducing a meeting of minds if they would keep industrial relations safely in their own hands.

In public emergency disputes, then, the ultimate test of economic power cannot, in fact, be used to motivate a meeting of minds. Out of this situation a formidable dilemma arises. Is it possible to find substitutes for the strike that will serve effectively to induce agreements between unions and management in such cases? Or is it necessary to adopt an entirely new concept about the setting of employment terms—that they have to be imposed and not agreed to? Here is the crux of the problem in public-emergency disputes.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Those favoring compulsory arbitration of public emergency disputes would scrap collective bargaining in that one area. The meeting-of-minds criterion of fairness and equity would be supplanted under a system in which a government agency decides employment terms for employees and employers alike.

Nor can these comments be effectively rebutted by insisting that compulsory arbitration would become operative only if the parties failed to agree. Theoretically, avoidance of compulsory arbitration might even be looked upon as an inducer of agreements which serves the same function as a strike in collective bargaining. The evidence strongly indicates, however, that the mere provision for ultimate compulsory arbitration in itself discourages the making of those offers and counter offers without which there is no negotiation. Why should the employer make any offer which the union can use not as a starting point for agreement but as a springboard for arbitration? Why should the union accept any employer offer when, in compulsory arbitration, it would not likely get less and might get more? Why shouldn't a union make and hold to a large number of so-called fringe demands? If they are dismissed in arbitration, nothing has been lost. If they are approved, much has been gained. Negotiating tactics are entirely different when compulsory arbitration and not a strike is the last step. The reason: Under collective bargaining a dispute can only be settled by a meeting of minds; in compulsory arbitration this criterion is supplanted.

Granting that regular collective bargaining won't suffice in public emergency disputes, isn't it inevitable that a new system like compulsory arbitration be introduced? Is there any real alternative to Government determination of employment terms in such cases or to the institution of Government sanctions against employees and employers to enforce imposed terms? Despite the difficulty of the problem, it is my firm conviction that compulsory arbitration is not inevitable. It is unthinkable in this country. And, fortunately, there are alternatives to compulsory arbitration for dealing with public emergency disputes which will, in my judgment, prove to be more satisfactory and more effective.

Before discussing those alternatives, it is important to note why compulsory arbitration doesn't provide the easy answer. To begin with, there is actually no guarantee of a continuity of production. It is even unlikely that compulsory arbitration would diminish the number of crises that have to be contemplated under the alternative programs to be discussed presently. Compulsion could even make the occasional crises more difficult to resolve since maintaining the position of the Government would require the effectuation of an arbitration award regardless of depth of resentment against it. This kind of compulsion in labor disputes is entirely incompatible with our ideas about the way men should live and work together. On less idealistic grounds, compulsion won't effectively meet the problem of avoiding work stoppages that create public emergencies.

ALTERNATIVES TO COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

The shortcomings of collective bargaining in settling public emergency disputes do not call for any pell-mell, thoughtless rush to compulsory arbitration. A further development of collective bargaining to deal with this particular problem is the real need. The basic challenge is whether or not industrial relations in public emergency disputes can be grounded upon a meeting of minds even though a test of economic strength is not available as the final arbitrament.

The needed development of collective bargaining can be facilitated, I believe, by thinking of the public emergency labor dispute as one in which the strike cannot perform its collective bargaining function. Some industry-wide strikes have compelling public emergency characteristics; others do not. On the other hand, some local stoppages would be of vital importance. It would appear from past experience, that a rather extensive shut-down of telephone service, for example, is not nearly as crucial as a stoppage in a local plant making gas for domestic use, which creates almost immediate peril. As a matter of public policy, it should be made clear that, wherever possible and to the fullest feasible extent, a strike called will be permitted to run its course. Nor should Government intervention be made to avoid mere public inconvenience. That is one of the costs of maintaining collective bargaining which is not excessive when weighed against the costs of alternative systems. Nor should there be any certainty about Government intervention by precisely defining industries or circumstances under which action would be taken. Even the hope of Government intervention, in particular cases, can deter agreements. Substantial progress in meeting the problem of public emergency disputes can be made by the acceptance of two principles: (1) Strikes will be permitted to perform their collective bargaining function to the fullest possible extent, even though public inconvenience results, and (2) whether or not the Government will intervene, and when, should, by and large, be determined on the facts of each case and not by any prescribed formula. Such policies would lessen the number of crises which arise.

Against this background, three alternatives to the use of compulsory arbitration in settling public emergency disputes without work stoppages will be discussed. Each of them utilizes, in varying degrees, the collective-bargaining principle of a meeting of the minds. They are (1) voluntary arbitration, (2) procedural substitutes for the strike as inducers of agreement, and (3) plant seizures by the Government as a basis for continued mediation. Each of these will be briefly discussed and evaluated. It is suggested that, if the possibilities in these devices are fully developed, there would be fewer crises than with compulsory arbitration. The crises that would occur, moreover, could be more expeditiously dealt with.

VOLUNTARY ARBITRATION

In public emergency disputes, conferees who have failed to agree have a peculiar responsibility to attempt to agree upon a stipulation under which their differences will be submitted to voluntary arbitration. Every impasse which is overcome by resort to voluntary arbitration narrows the extent of the general problem under discussion. Here is an improvement of the collective-bargaining process which provides an incomparably better approach than compulsory arbitration. A much better understanding of voluntary arbitration is called for.

Recognition of the availability of voluntary arbitration involves no enervation of collective bargaining as in the case of compulsory arbitration. As indicated previously, a principal defect of compulsory arbitration arises from its certain application to any unspecified future disputes that may arise. What is to be arbitrated is an unknown. In voluntary arbitration, there is an agreement covering a clearly specified

dispute after it has arisen. The scope and the risks of arbitration can, therefore, be limited in the stipulation. An arbitrator in whom the parties have confidence can be named by them. Of even greater importance, acceptance of an award does not involve Government sanctions. Acceptance is a matter of the parties keeping their word about abiding by a decision made under a procedure which they have set up themselves. It is in the American tradition to accept losses under such circumstances.

Within the past 10 years, voluntary arbitration has been extensively adopted as the sound way to settle disputes arising under the terms of existing agreements. With the labor contract itself as a point of reference, or as a guide for disposing of those disputes, such arbitration has been adjudged as not unduly risky and hence as a procedure preferable to work stoppages. Unions and management both have been generally unwilling to permit arbitrators to decide the actual terms of their labor contract. The results are too unpredictable, and the stakes are too great. Strikes have been generally preferred to arbitration in these cases.

As respects public emergency disputes, the choice is not a simple one between voluntary arbitration and a strike. In the critcical cases, voluntary arbitration has to be weighed against the consequences of that form of government intervention which, at a given time, is most likely to result from a strike. The choice may still be against arbitration. But not because that will prevent outsiders from having a considerable influence in working out the terms of a new labor contract. Only through voluntary arbitration can the outsider be appointed by the parties themselves and be subject to their joint instructions. For these reasons, voluntary arbitration is in the collective bargaining tradition. There must be some cases where both parties would prefer voluntary arbitration to Government intervention. There would probably be many such cases if the voluntary arbitration process were better understood.

The lack of confidence in voluntary arbitration of disputes over contract terms has arisen from experience with what may be termed open-end arbitration. Since the arbitrator has been asked simply to decide the case as he sees it, decisions have tended to be personal in nature with all the attendant risks. But, the arbitration need not be open-end. The parties who set up the procedure can give the arbitrator instructions and guides. Where this has been accomplished, voluntary arbitration has often produced excellent results.

There has been another kind of experience. In some industries affected with the public interest, notably the transit industry, the parties frequently agree in a current labor contract that any differences which may later arise over a renewal agreement will be arbitrated. The results of this kind of voluntary arbitration have been seriously questioned, but the basic cause of the difficulty has not been generally perceived. Under an agreement to arbitrate any and all differences that might arise in the future, there are no limits to the subjects to be submitted to an outsider and no assurance that the issues will be clearly defined. Nor is there any likelihood of giving instructions to the arbitrator about the guides to be followed by him.

The risks of voluntary arbitration have to be much more limited than in either the open-end type or the prior commitment to arbitrate all disputes if the process is to find more general acceptance. The possibilities inherent in voluntary arbitration lie in the agreement to arbitrate specific issues which is made only after the parties have failed to resolve those issues in negotiations. Specific issues may very well be adjudged to be arbitrable when they are precisely defined, related to particular criteria to be used in deciding them, and made determinable by a Board of Arbitration whose members are mutually acceptable.

The road to be travelled was carefully and helpfully surveyed by the participants in the President's national labor-management conference of 1945. In the report of that conference it was unanimously agreed that, "If direct negotiations and conciliation have not been successful, voluntary arbitration may be considered by the parties. However, before voluntary arbitration is agreed to as a means of settling unsettled issues, the parties themselves should agree on the precise issues, the terms of submission, and the principles or factors by which the arbitrator shall be governed." For the first time, this report focused attention upon the stipulation to arbitrate as the key to sound development of voluntary arbitration.

No one should minimize the difficulties faced by negotiators in consummating a stipulation for voluntary arbitration along the lines just referred to. Skeptics will say: "If the parties could agree on those matters, they could agree directly on the items in dispute." There is substance to that point of view which does not, however, give a complete picture. It is a fact that, in an increasing number of instances, parties have found it possible to agree upon a stipulation to arbitrate, and have thus avoided a strike and the threat of government intervention, even though they were unable to come to a direct meeting of minds as respects the issues in dispute. Voluntary arbitration has to be looked upon as a problem of collective bargaining and not as a substitute for collective bargaining. If it is fully recognized that a failure of negotiations in public emergency disputes invariably carries a choice between voluntary arbitration and Government intervention, then the parties to such disputes may see an important self-interest in utilizing the voluntary arbitration process to a much greater extent than ever before. One of the likely alternatives to compulsory arbitration of public emergency disputes is voluntary arbitration of them.

PROCEDURAL SUBSTITUTES FOR THE STRIKE

What if the parties fail to agree on voluntary arbitration? The crises which public emergency disputes create are so serious that the country cannot count upon the ability and the willingness of labor and management to utilize voluntary arbitration. At best, such a refinement of accepted collective bargaining conduct is certain to be slow. So attention also needs to be directed to various procedural substitutes for the strike as means of facilitating or inducing agreement.

As noted at the outset, the principal function of the strike is to exert pressures to bring about a meeting of minds. Since the strike cannot perform its function in public emergency disputes, perhaps effective procedural means other than the strike can be devised to exert pressures upon disputants to reconcile their defferences. The requirement of the Taft-Hartley Act that demands for contract changes must be made to give sufficient time for negotiations and mediation is one example of a facilitating procedure.

Legislative requirements upon disputants to follow certain specified procedures in an effort to reach agreement will inevitably evoke strong controversy. They involve restrictions upon union latitude in calling strikes. Heated differences will also arise over the extent to which required procedures minimize the power of either side to achieve its purposes. In addition, mere procedural requirements can even provide the inexorable pressure for an agreement that is exerted by a stoppage of production or a threat of one.

For these reasons, procedural substitutes for the strike will be most likely to succeed when they are devised by agreement between the unions and management. On the record are two notable examples of this approach to public emergency disputes. As I understand it, the procedural requirements for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes in the railroad industry were developed essentially by labor and management. The procedures have consequently had a high degree of success in avoiding strikes. It can almost be said that any procedures for the peaceful settlement of public emergency disputes will work if the parties themselves are determined that they will work. And the parties are apt to be solidly behind a program only if it is of their own making.

The machinery of the War Labor Board in World War II was another agreed-upon procedure that served with relative success as a substitute for the strike in public emergency disputes. Throughout most of the war, virtually every labor dispute constituted a national emergency, so desperate was the need for production. Except as respects facilities seized and operated by the Government, it was never illegal for employees to engage in strike action during World War II. But unions and management by and large used the Board instead of work stoppages as a final arbitrament. It was a voluntarily accepted procedure because of the tripartite composition of the Board and because labor and management representatives at all times retained the right to withdraw and thus force a change in national policy.

In contrast to the agreed-upon procedures just mentioned, certain sections of the Taft-Hartley Act are apparently designed to induce a meeting of minds of negotiators in public emergency disputes, industry-wide in nature, without recourse to strikes but without the acquiescence of those directly affected by the required procedures. At any event, labor and management could conceivably feel impelled to work out an agreement to avoid being caught in the emergency dispute procedure of that act. These steps, which would not have to be taken if an agreement is reached, include appearance before a board of inquiry, issuance of an injunction, and an employee vote on the employer's last offer. It is difficult to see how those steps intrinsically help to bring about a meeting of minds once they are taken.

Whether or not these procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act have actually been of material assistance to a negotiated understanding is debatable. Yet it is on this criterion that they must be judged. Only by an agreement of the parties can the dispute finally be resolved even under the Taft-Hartley Act. The ultimate right to strike is retained and at no point does the Government directly evaluate the contesting claims of the disputants.

One of the required procedures of the Taft-Hartley Act is uniquely inept. If a labor dispute persists, the President is finally instructed to report the facts of the case to Congress. Unless the contemplated consequences of congressional treatment are a sufficient threat to bring about a last-minute agreement, the result is not only a critical national emergency but one in which the President is deprived of any power to take action to save the Nation. In the face of national peril, the President should, of course, have a wide latitude to take such steps as are necessary to preserve national health and safety.

Because procedural substitutes for a strike are useful only if they facilitate agreement-making, there is an urgent need for a fundamental understanding between labor and management as respects the steps to be followed in public emergency disputes. A successful labor-management conference to deal with this problem would be of incalculable value to the preservation of collective bargaining. Nor should the conference idea be lightly dismissed because of the lack of success of the 1945 national conference.

In the absence of a labor-management recommendation, there is little doubt that the President must be empowered to secure an injunction against a work stoppage which would jeopardize public health and safety. Otherwise the Government would be powerless to take effective measures to protect the national interest. But, once it is issued, the injunction does no more than give time to work out a negotiated settlement. The ways by which this can be facilitated vary with every case. It follows that required negotiating procedures should not be specific. Such devices as the vote on the employer's last offer have already been thoroughly discredited.

A likely program would be the setting up of a special board, for each particular case, with the widest possible latitude to take such steps as will, in its judgment, aid in the consummation of an agreement. Whether or not a fact-finding report or a recommended settlement should be made would depend upon whether either is likely to help in getting an agreement. It is certainly incongruous to take such steps if they would widen the gap between labor and management.

One possible action by such a board could well be more fully considered than heretofore. Recommendations of substantive terms of employment as a fair basis of settlement, if unacceptable to either party, cause the Government to take sides in the labor dispute and may make settlement more difficult. There are cases, however, in which voluntary arbitration, under specific terms proposed by the board, might be proposed. The precise issues could be stated along with criteria applicable to their arbitrament and possibly suggestions of the names of arbitrators. One of the most feasible ways for dealing with public-emergency disputes might well be through a recommendation of an acceptable formula for voluntary arbitration.

One way for dealing with the public-emergency labor dispute, and in the collective-bargaining tradition, is to devise special procedures to facilitate or to induce disputants to come peacefully to a meeting of minds. Like voluntary arbitration, this alternative to compulsory arbitration depends, in the last analysis, upon the ability and the willingness of labor and management to arrive at a meeting of minds about the kind of procedure that should be used to compose their differences.

If labor and management agree upon the peaceful procedures that should be used, as they did in the railway industry and as respects the operation of the War Labor Board, then those procedures are virtually certain to be relatively successful. It is this fact that underlies a continuing interest in a labor-management conference to deal with the public emergency dispute. In the absence of a labor-management recommendation, the only workable procedures will almost certainly include the issuance of an injunction when the President finds that essential, to give added time for negotiation and mediation. And, if this approach is to work, any Government agency which takes over the task of mediation must not be fettered by inflexible rules. It must have wide latitude in taking such steps as will bring about a meeting of minds.

PLANT SEIZURES BY THE GOVERNMENT AS A BASIS FOR FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS AND MEDIATION

There is one last device, short of compulsory arbitration, which can be, and has been, used to get public emergency labor disputes settled by agreement of the parties but without an interruption of production. Plant seizure by the Government may afford a basis for continued negotiation and mediation without an interruption to production. As will be noted presently, this approach carries an imminent risk that basic collective bargaining rights of employees and employers will be impaired. It still falls far short of compulsory arbitration under which these rights may be eradicated.

A strike vote evidences a group unwillingness of the employees to work at terms offered by the employer. If the public interest would be irreparably harmed by resort to a work stoppage to resolve the difference, as in time of war or national peril, it has been reasoned that men may properly be requested temporarily to work at unsatisfactory terms as long as the Government is the employer. Such employment at the contested terms would not be for the profit and benefit of the private employer.

Although productive facilities have occasionally been seized by the Government in times of great emergency, there has never been a disposition to require individuals to work at contested terms of employment—that would fall within the recognized concept of involuntary servitude. But when it has been said, as in the War Labor Disputes Act, that workers cannot strike against the Government there has been a negation of the claimed right of employees as a group to decide whether or not all employees would work. After Government seizure of a plant, a return of strikers to employment has been conceived as a matter of individual choice and not a group choice.

The results have varied with the cases. Even where the employees unanimously decided to work for the Government, they were assured that, as an employer, the Government would give equitable consideration to underlying disputes. The Government thereupon assumed negotiating responsibilities. When the employees individually refrained from resuming work, even for the Government, until their claims were first disposed of, an even greater complexity ensued. A new meeting of minds became important—between the union and the Government.

Through plant seizure, production stoppages may be avoided in public emergency disputes—though not assuredly. The underlying labor problem still has to be resolved in one way or another. The first obligation of the Government operating agency is to attempt to mediate between the union and the employer. Success in this endeavor is the only sure way to return the facilities to private operation. It is concluded, therefore, that Government seizure need not vitiate the collective-bargaining criterion of the meeting of minds, although the reasons for agreeing may be peculiar to this situation.

If the employees individually refrain from work until their claims have been disposed of, and if a resumption of production is of overwhelming importance, the Government operating agency may have no alternative but to consummate a labor agreement with the union. The so-called Krug-Lewis agreement for the bituminous-coal industry made in 1944 is an example of this kind of bargaining. When this kind of settlement is made, employees as a group are not required to work under unsatisfactory terms, but the position of the employers is most unenviable. Only by embracing a settlement to which they were not a party can they secure control of their plants.

A general defect of the plant-seizure formula is that the executive department of the Government becomes a direct party to the labor dispute. Employees are individually requested to work at terms of employment which they have jointly appraised as unacceptable. According to established union standards, the Government thus acts "as a strikebreaker". At the same time the Government must take a heavy responsibility for successfully mediating the dispute. If it fails in this endeavor, it may have to deprive the employer of his collective-bargaining rights, since a Government-union agreement may be the only way to insure uninterrupted production.

In certain situations, as in wartime, the executive branch of the Government may be under strong compulsion to seize and to operate production facilities. These are times when the public need for uninterrupted production overshadows any of the usual rights of management or of labor. But the right of the Executive to seize and to operate productive facilities should be looked upon as a reserve power usable only to preserve the national interest in times of peril. Seizure certainly should not be a regularly specified step for dealing with public-emergency disputes, and seizure is a feasible step to take only if there is a reasonable assurance that individual employees will choose to work for the Government while their complaints are being adjusted.

CONCLUSION

Compulsory arbitration provides no real answer to the problem of public-emergency disputes in which, unlike other labor disputes, a stoppage of production is, in fact, not available to bring about a meeting of minds between labor and management representatives.

No program for the imposition of unacceptable conditions of employment is complete without sanctions to be used, if necessary, to make employees work and to make employers manage.

Implicit in compulsory arbitration is a dreadful sacrifice of cherished notions about the way men should live and work together; and for what? Compulsory arbitration would not even insure the sought-for continuity of production.

Strikes would still occur, and they would be more difficult than ever to resolve. It should be added, moreover, that working and managing at unacceptable conditions of employment would surely bring an appalling deterioration of effort in day-to-day relationships that would spell the end of economic progress in affected plants.

Some program other than compulsory arbitration is clearly called for to meet the problems created by public emergency disputes. The heart of any constructive program is the cooperation of labor and management in developing substitutes for strike action and the acquiescence of these parties in various procedures that will assist disputants to arrive at a meeting of minds.

Specifically, there is a need for these parties (1) more fully to utilize the potentialities of voluntary arbitration and (2) to join in an effort to evolve agreed-upon procedures that will be effective substitutes for strike action. Labor and management thus have the power to forestall any drift or drive toward imposed procedures or terms.

In the absence of their recommendation, there is no alternative to Government-prescribed procedures for working out public emergency disputes without dangerous work stoppages. They will center about (1) injunctions secured by the President against strike action, to allow time for settling an isssue, and (2) mediation machinery designed to effect a settlement. As a reserve power, to be used to avoid pressing peril, is (3) the possibility of Government seizure and operation.

The more or less voluntary approaches suggested are not "sure-fire"—but neither is compulsory arbitration. Under either, there are certain to be crises where work is interrupted despite great peril to the public—and probably as many by either route. They have to be disposed of as matters of crisis government.

There is neither need nor gain in sacrificing collective-bargaining principles in a vain attempt to avoid public emergency disputes once and for all by compulsory arbitration. It can't be done.

American Industrial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the most interesting and instructive address on the subject Where We Are at in Industrial Relations, delivered at the first annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association, on December 30, 1948, at Cleveland, by Dr. Edwin E. Witte, professor at the University of Wisconsin, and first president of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

I have had an estimate made of the cost of printing this address. The cost is estimated to be $213.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WE ARE AT IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

(Address of Edwin E. Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, president, Industrial Relations Research Association, December 30, 1948)

ATTENTION GIVEN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Industrial relations have been in the headlines very frequently in the last 15 years. In the first part of this period, marked progress was made in protective labor legislation, climaxed by the passage of the Social Security Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act. Since then both social security and protective labor legislation have lagged, but there has occurred a great increase in legislation dealing with labor-management relations.

Unions have increased their membership from 3,000,000 to 16,000,000. The mass production industries, which were considered unorganizable, are now nearly all operating under union contracts. The conditions of employment of one half of all production workers in what might be called industrial employments are now determined by collective bargaining.

Management is giving greatly increased attention to industrial relations. Successively, scientific management, personnel management, labor relations, and human relations have been acclaimed in management circles as the key to improved industrial relations and reduced production costs. Most sizable establishments now have industrial relations departments and there is also widespread use of outside specialists. Top management increasingly regards labor-management relations as one of its major responsibilities.

PROGRESS MADE IN THE LAST TWO DECADES

When it comes to results, there can be no question that conditions of employment and labor-management relations have definitely been improved in the last two decades. Labor's share of the total product has not changed very greatly, viewing industry as a whole, but the workers, the managements, and the stockholders have all benefited from the near full employment we have enjoyed since the outbreak of World War II. Great progress has been made in the development of orderly wage rate structures. "Fringe benefits" in such matters as overtime, vacations, holidays, and shift premiums have become well-nigh universal for production workers. Turn-over has been reduced and a high degree of stabilization of employment has been attained, without much need for conscious attention to the problem. At the same time there has been some growth and greatly increased interest in guaranties of annual wages or employment and in profit-sharing plans.

Very important has been the improvement in the treatment accorded workers within industrial plants. Most such plants now have orderly grievance procedures and workers can get redress when not treated fairly or in accord with human dignity. Arbitrary discharges are far less common than formerly and can no longer be resorted to with impunity as a method of fighting the unions. In lay-offs, and to some extent even in transfers and promotions, seniority rules prevail.

In some respects, also, labor disputes have become less serious difficulties. In all the many strikes we have had since the close of World War II, there has been little violence compared with earlier periods. Industrial espionage seems all but to have disappeared as have professional strikebreakers. Goon squads and racketeering have become much less common than formerly. No less important has been the great progress made in the arbitration of unresolved disputes between labor and management.

UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

But it is very evident that the millenium has not been attained in industrial relations. While there are plants in which the existing relations are acclaimed by both labor and management, and also by neutral observers, as highly satisfactory, there is much evidence of mutual distrust and continuing strife in a large part of American industry. Unions feel that many managements, if not management generally, are still bent upon destroying unionism. Managements are much concerned about unsatisfactory production and inclined to blame the unions for this situation. The public is very jittery about strikes and blames both labor and industry for prevailing high prices.

At this time, the principal interest lies in what sort of legislation the Eighty-first Congress is going to enact to replace the Taft-Hartley Act. I believe that I was the first person from academic ranks to write an article about the Taft-Hartley Act. Later, I discussed this law at a dinner meeting of the American Economic Association and in numerous addresses in different parts of the country. From the beginning, I took the position that, while the Taft-Hartley Act was not a slave-labor law, it was unfair to organized labor and would complicate the development and maintenance of sound-management relations in this country. But, just as I then said that where managements and unions so desired and had developed sound procedures there was no reason why existing good relations could not be continued despite the Taft-Hartley Act, so I say today that the development and maintenance of sound labor-management relations will not be brought about by any new law, regardless of what may be its content.

FREE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Both labor and management have professed and still profess that they want the Government to keep hands off and let them settle their own difficulties. Long before the Wagner Act encouragement of collective bargaining was declared to be our national labor policy. This declaration is repeated in the Taft-Hartley Act. Free collective bargaining is acclaimed by labor and management alike as the best way for determining labor-management relations.

When the present American scene is examined, however, doubt is cast upon the sincerity of these professions. In half of American industry—particularly in the small establishments and the less-industrialized areas—conditions of employment are still determined by individual bargaining. There also is much evidence that many managements which are dealing with unions have not really accepted unionism. But few of them resort to discrimination, company unionism, and similar tactics, which were widely employed in fighting unions but little more than a decade ago. Contests over the recognition of unions are now resolved through NLRB elections, in which employers generally aline themselves against the unions but usually accept the results when the elections go against them. Many managements, however, which have recognized and made contracts with unions representing a majority of their employees, are engaged in vast propaganda campaigns to win the loyalty of these employees away from the unions. They also seek to confine the collective bargaining to narowly defined limits, which place beyond the pale as management rights, never to be questioned or even discussed, many matters about which other unions have long bargained.

Many unions, on their part, similarly act as though the employers with whom they deal were their mortal enemies. Such an attitude is undertandable toward employers who seek to undermine their unions, but, unfortunately, is manifested also toward other employers. The last vestiges of the former Communist control of quite a few unions are rapidly disappearing, but savage attacks upon the integrity and motives of management are not confined to the Communists within labor's ranks. Provoking hatred of management and making unreasonable demands is often the surest way to win and retain union office. Genuine cooperation with management to improve production, I fear, is the exception, rather than the rule.

Free collective bargaining should result in the joint determination of conditions of employment through a meeting of minds. It is a process of give and take, carried on in the realization of common interests, despite differences. In such an atmosphere, the possiblity of a strike, and even an actual strike, may serve the useful purpose of making the parties more willing to compromise. It is not occasional strikes which menace collective bargaining, but the unwillingness often manifested by the contending parties to accept its implications.

To make collective bargaining work both sides must recognize that they have more matters of common interest than points of difference. Clearly, management must wholeheartedly accept unionism and recognize that workers can be loyal at one and the same time to the company and the union, just as it is possible to be loyal simultaneously to parents, spouse, and children, to the church, community, and Nation. Unions must cease berating management, cooperate in trying to secure maximum production, and leave no doubt of their acceptance of our system of free enterprise. A State of armed truce is not a satisfactory industrial relations situation, any more than it leads to peace and good will internationally. Satisfactory collective bargaining is very largely a matter of day-by-day living together and learning to cooperate. Further, it involves more than good intent. It requires also the development of sound procedures for the practical solution of many troublesome problems.

Viewing the total American scene, it seems to me that collective bargaining, as it exists today, still falls far short, not only of the ideal, but of the attainable. But we have made great progress toward truly satisfactory collective bargaining in many industries and in literally thousands of establishments. For the better functioning of collective bargaining, these successes merit at least equal attention with the failures.

GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

As I view the present scene, perhaps the greatest of all dangers to free collective bargaining is the proneness of both sides to seek the aid of Government to give them the victory in their contests with each other.

Until 15 years ago, labor felt that employers, through injunctions and otherwise, utilized Government to defeat and destroy unionism. Since passage of the Norris-LaGuardia and the Wagner Acts and the decisions of the United States Supreme Court sustaining this legislation, management has felt that the Government was on the side of labor.

While the Wagner Act was in effect, the unions greatly increased their strength, although no one can ever be certain how much of this growth was due to this law and how much was a consequence of full employment. Because the unions had been mainly responsible for its enactment, although it was passed practically unanimously, management from the outset sought repeal or drastic amendment of the Wagner Act. In the Eightieth Congress, it was successful in getting rid of this act. But it did not stop with the mere repeal of the law to which it objected. It insisted upon and won numerous restrictions upon the unions. The Wagner Act limited the Government's interference to the organizational stage, stopping at the bargaining table. The Taft-Hartley Act continued the Government intervention in the organizational stage and, in addition, prescribed the procedures to be followed in collective bargaining and, in numerous respects, regulated what the parties might agree upon.

The Taft-Hartley Act seems destined to be replaced by a radically different law. Quite likely there will be some reduction in the extent of governmental interference in labor-management relations. But this is by no means certain, and there is still greater doubt whether the trend will continue in that direction. The truth seems to be that not only do both labor and management want to get the Government on their side but the general public calls on the Government to do something whenever there is a wave of great strikes, or there is any threat to the uninterrupted flow of vital necessities.

Some economists have been very much worried about the danger that employers and employees may gang together to hold up the public. The public, more realistically, has been concerned, not with the possible injury to society which conceivably may result from agreement, but with the consequences of the failure of labor and management to agree. In large segments of American industry, the strike today cannot effectuate its valuable results in facilitating a meeting of minds because the public insists upon an immediate settlement. In such industries the choice seems rapidly to be becoming voluntary arbitration or compulsory arbitration, but with machinery such as that which has long existed on the railroads worthy of consideration.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND PROTECTIVE LABOR LEGISLATION

As I size up the present situation, the prospects for the years immediately ahead are that there will be increased governmental intervention in labor-management relations. I do not like the trend toward increased governmental intervention, but, like about everybody else, want to see Government action extended in some directions.

I strongly believe that improvement of our social security and protective labor legislation is long overdue. Prospects seem good for the adoption of the amendments to the Federal old age and survivors' insurance law proposed by the Advisory Council on Social Security (which, while falling short of what I would like to see, will be all to the good). Some improvements may be expected in the benefits under workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation in many States, although these will probably not be as great as required by the changes in the cost of living. There is every prospect also that there will be laws in many States this winter for cash sickness compensation, with the real battle coming over the extent to which private insurance companies shall administer this new form of social insurance. I wish that I could also say that I expect a national health insurance law to be enacted, but reporting truthfully how I see the present situation, I cannot do so. Although organized medicine bet on the wrong horse in the election, I fear that its influence is sufficiently great to make anything unlikely in the coming session beyond the first real consideration that Congress has ever given to health insurance. Instead of health insurance, we will probably get increased public medical care, as we have been getting for quite some time, while the AMA continues to denounce a contributory insurance system as socialized medicine but offers few objections to increased medical care provided at public expense. It is a safe forecast, also, that union demands for employer contributions to pension, health, and welfare funds and employer costs for these purposes will increase, so long as we do not have an all-inclusive and adequate social insurance system.

I view these developments affecting social security with mixed feelings. I am happy that there is greatly increased interest in social security and that the prospects are good for additional social security protection for many people. But I am concerned because we still lack anything like a common approach to social security problems. Social security involves both benefits and costs. These are the two sides of the same shield. The difficulty is that labor is inclined to look at only the benefits, while industry looks only at the costs. Since 1938 until now, industry's point of view has been largely controlling, with results which now are proving embarrassing to industry. Today, some representatives of labor are going to the opposite extremes. I believe that such a policy will also have results which its proponents do not expect.

I have been impressed by the fact that both extremes recently have been advocating much the same type of social security legislation—a universal flat pension system financed from general taxes—a baby Townsend plan. Mr. Miriam of Brookings Institution and the Hoover Commission advocates such a program expecting that its end result will be that only people in need will receive benefits. Labor advocates of universal pensions favor such a system of social security because they think it will result in large benefits toward whose costs employees will contribute very little. In view of the support which the idea enjoys in both camps, I see a considerable likelihood that some type of baby Townsend plan will sometime be adopted in this country. It is my view that if we ever come to such a plan, we will witness a great battle between the two groups of advocates. The radicals will strive ever to get these pensions increased. The conservatives on the other hand, pointing to the impossible costs, will then press for limiting the benefits to people who are in need. Which group will prevail I would not hazard a guess but it is a certainty that under such a system social security would ever be a political football. On my part, I greatly prefer a contributory social insurance system. Such a system has the official support of both organized labor and organized business, but will be replaced ere long by something very different unless we soon get an all-inclusive, comprehensive, contributory social insurance system, in which equal consideration is given to benefits and costs.

Regarding protective labor legislation, the prospects for some long-overdue improvements seem fairly good, but it must be reported that interest in this aspect of industrial relations continues to be much less than its importance warrants. The Eighty-first Congress seems likely to reverse, in part, the action of the Eightieth Congress in greatly weakening the Fair Labor Standards Act. Almost certainly it will materially increase the very inadequate minimum wage rate of 40 cents per hour. Something also will be done about returning to the United States Department of Labor some of its lost functions. But the bulk of our protective labor legislation is State legislation, and we are still in the mood of overlooking the States.

I would also expand governmental industrial relations activities in the informational and educational fields. For the best functioning of collective bargaining, the parties should have available to them all information which is material and likely to be helpful in bringing about a meeting of minds. An impartial governmental agency is the best possible clearing house for such information. It will never do that the only sources for basic statistical information are partisan private agencies. Government also should undertake research of such dimensions and expanse as to be feasible only for very large organizations. Further, I see nothing wrong with Government aid for industrial relations research any more than with Government aid for research in the medical and natural sciences. Workers' education has such potential ties for improved labor-management relations that Federal aid is clearly called for.

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST HARMFUL GOVERNMENTAL ACTION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Many of you will think that I am very illogical in advocating an extension of governmental activities along the lines suggested while wishing to restrict governmental intervention in labor-management relations. Perhaps I am, but, as I see it, both free collective bargaining and governmental action have their proper place in industrial relations. What I have advocated is a far cry from the complete domination of industrial relations by the Government, which seems to me to be the only real alternative to free collective bargaining and its extension and improved functioning.

Let me add some thoughts about principles and procedures in relation to the Government's role in industrial relations. In the establishment of standards governing conditions of employment, the Government should outlaw only conduct deemed unsocial, not only by employees and the public, but also by most employers. Labor legislation should set only minimum standards, designed to bring the laggards (Theodore Roosevelt's dirty tenth employer) up somewhere close to the average. It should leave for bargaining between managements and unions the determination of the actual conditions which will prevail in the great majority of plants, in all respects customarily dealt with in collective bargaining. On matters not dealt with in collective bargaining, it should stimulate forward-looking employers to exceed the legal minimums.

For the development of sound labor legislation, I strongly believe in the desirability of the conference method, which is really collective bargaining in the legislative field. Under the initial leadership of John R. Commons, the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin for more than 30 years has successfully used advisory committees to draft industrial safety codes, minimum wage orders, apprenticeship rules, workmen's compensation amendments, and more recently, changes in the unemployment compensation law. It has always followed the principle of giving representation to all major interested organizations and of appointing to membership the persons designated by them as their representatives. What these committees have agreed upon—and almost invariably they have come to an agreement, often after wide differences to begin with—the Commission and the legislature have accepted without question. It is this procedure, rather than the detail of the legislation, which accounts for the fact that Wisconsin's labor legislation,

including its much debated unemployment compensation law, has had the support of employers and employees alike and has never become the subject of bitter animosities and knock-down-and-drag-out fights in the legislative halls or on the political hustings.

In Wisconsin collective bargaining of this type has been applied to labor-relations legislation only to a very limited degree. I believe it was worth trying even in that sphere. This was, in substance, President Truman's suggestion in 1946. Neither labor nor management supported the suggestion, and Congress went ahead with the enactment of labor-relations legislation in the old political method, with the result that this legislation aroused bitter resentment on the losing side and must be rewritten. The National Association of Manufacturers now has called for labor-relations legislation to be arrived at by labor-management agreement, but it wants the Taft-Hartley Act to be continued in the meantime. As this is, naturally, unacceptable to labor, this belated proposal is not likely to get very far. The best that can be hoped for is that the politicians this time will give more consideration to the minority's views than they did in 1947. But the principle is sound that not only must labor legislation be impartially administered but that it must be of such character that labor and management are willing to live with.

It is also my view that the national labor-management conference method has promise of being useful on many other aspects of industrial relations. It has had demonstrated value in railroad-labor legislation. Something akin has been followed in social-security legislation. Within the last few days the Board of Economic Advisers has suggested a labor-management conference on wage-price policies. I agree with Dr. George W. Taylor that this is one of the most difficult problems on which to get agreement. But it seems to me that a labor-management conference is more likely to result in the development of principles taking account of the effects of wage-price policies upon the whole economy than we now get under the present system of interunion competition in demands for wage increases and the follow-the-leader policy which is so widely pursued by management. The Labor-Management Conference of 1945 is usually said to have been a failure. Its unanimous and since widely followed recommendation that all union contracts should include a provision for the arbitration of all unresolved disputes over the interpretation and application of contracts, however, alone made a greater contribution to improved labor-management relations in this country than all of the politically enacted labor-relations legislation we have had since the close of the war.

OTHER ASPECTS OF THE CURRENT INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SITUATION

I could go on much longer, giving you my ideas on other current industrial relations problems. But limitations of time compel me to deal only with collective bargaining and the role of the Government in industrial relations. I am aware also that I have not touched upon the broader implications of these aspects of industrial relations. How collective bargaining functions and what the Government does in this field, have important bearing upon the maintenance of a stable, high-level, and progressive economy and the preservation of democracy and individual freedom, upon which depends all else that is worth while. But I must leave this subject to others who are better qualified to deal with it than I am.

I am also not oblivious to the fact that collective bargaining is by no means all there is to industrial relations on the industry and plant level. In no industry, have all conditions of employment become a matter of collective bargaining. While opposed to rigid definition of management rights, all but Communist-controlled unions concede that there are management rights and functions of management which they do not wish to usurp or even share. In any consideration of industrial relations, the existence of management rights must be recognized. But in our democracy, all rights carry with them duties. I believe that we will make greater progress, if management stresses less what are its rights than what it should do so that these rights will be exercised to benefit, not merely the management and the stockholders, but the workers and the consumers as well. Conversely, unions, in this day and age, in which they are assuming an importance comparable with that of corporations, need to recognize that they have a high degree of responsibility for the prosperity of industry and the general public welfare.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TEACHING

Supplementing the observations I have made about the present industrial relations situation, a few remarks would seem appropriate regarding the present status and the prospects for research and academic teaching in industrial relations.

There is today vastly more instruction in industrial relations than ever before. Everywhere courses in industrial relations are among the most popular of college courses. In 1942, when the last classification of members was issued, more members of the American Economic Association listed labor as their first interest than any other field within economics, including even economic theory. Courses in industrial relations, moreover, now are given in many academic departments besides economics. At Wisconsin, such courses are offered in seven departments of the liberal-arts college and in five other colleges and also the extension division; and much the same situation exists in all other large universities. While only Cornell has an independent college of industrial relations, more than 30 colleges and universities now have industrial-relations centers, with differing titles and somewhat different activities and objectives, but invariably seeking to coordinate and improve the campus instruction in industrial relations. Most of them also do a good deal of extension instruction of many types—organized classes, short courses, institutes, and conferences—serving labor, management, and to some extent labor and management together and also the general public. A number of other universities which have not established industrial-relations centers are doing quite as extensive and effective teaching in industrial relations, on and off the campus. Only the smallest institutions of higher learning now lack any special courses in labor economics or industrial relations, and some instruction in those subjects is even getting into the curricula of secondary schools in industrial centers.

All this instruction in industrial relations seems to me to be to the good, if impartially and competently presented. Considerable danger exists, however, in that we may be getting too many college graduates who prepare themselves, narrowly for careers in industrial relations. While employment opportunities for such specialists are increasing, they are far less numerous than the students now in the colleges who would like to go into such work. Important as is the training of qualified specialists in industrial relations (and most such training, I believe, must be done on the job), the greater responsibility of the universities is to give all students some acquaintance with industrial relations problems, the points of view of both labor and management, and the possibilities for the reconciliation of differences. This is particularly important for students, like those in engineering, business administration and law, who are almost certain to have to deal with some aspect of industrial relations in their careers. But it is valuable also for all other college graduates, as training for the responsibilities of leadership and citizenship in our present-day American society, in which industrial relations have come to occupy such a very important place. Equally great is the responsibility of the universities in meeting the ever increasing demand for off-campus instruction in industrial relations which comes from unions, management, and the general public.

RESEARCH IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Growth in the amount of attention given to research in industrial relations has kept pace with the increase in teaching in this field. Nearly all the industrial relations centers emphasize research, even more than instruction. Much important research is being done in universities independently of the industrial relations centers and, also, outside of the colleges. Government agencies, like the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, do some of the most important research in this field. Research is also receiving increasing attention from both industry and labor.

It is almost literally true that some new book dealing with industrial relations has been published in every week of the past year. Articles and pamphlets have been even more numerous. So extensive has been the outpouring that it has become quite difficult for the academic student, to say nothing about the practical industrial relations man, to keep up with this flood of literature.

Much of the research has been done by newcomers in this field. These include many younger economists whose training was mainly in economic theory and who have been surprised that what they have found to exist is difficult to reconcile with the theory they were taught. Others have come from the academic disciplines which have only recently become interested in industrial relations. In plant and other field studies, questionnaire and interview techniques have been extensively utilized in this recent research. Documentary sources have been pretty much neglected and but little attention has been given to earlier studies.

While I am an old-timer who has made little use of the techniques relied upon by the newcomers in the field, I recognize that they have made very important contributions to an understanding of many industrial-relations problems. But I protest against the use made of some of the recent studies by people who have an ax to grind.

The most discussed single research studies of recent years in the industrial relations field are the Hawthorne Studies of Elton Mayo and his associates. I recognize these studies to be of great importance, if for no other reason than that they made such a very great impression upon management and upon many of the younger men who are doing most of the research in the industrial relations field today. Mayo utilized experimental methods, which, while limited in scope and conducted under conditions which made the test group very conscious of being guinea pigs, were in many respects comparable to those of the early days of natural science when many of the most important basic discoveries were made. In discovering the informal groups among the workers in industrial plants and emphasizing that the production of individual workers depends upon group thinking and action, Mayo laid the basis for what is now called human relations in industry. Important as were Mayo's contributions, he was not the first to discover that there are group limitations to production even in unorganized plants. John R. Commons noted this fact in his report on Regulation and Restriction of Out-

put by Employers and Unions, which was published by the United States Bureau of Labor in 1904, and Stanley Mathewson reported the same phenomenon in his Restriction of Output Among Unorganized Workers in 1931. Still less was Mayo the first to make in-plant studies in industrial relations or to conduct controlled experiments in this field.

Mayo did not discover the importance of unions in industrial relations, no doubt, because there was no union in the Hawthorne works when the studies were made. On the basis of the Mayo and similar studies, some managements have drawn the conclusion that unions have very little to do with satisfactory labor relations and even to dream of getting rid of the unions by building up the informal groups within plants—precisely how, has never been clear. It is to the credit of other industrial sociologists that they have discovered the unions and their great influence. But I feel that their work, too, would have been enriched had they known more about the unions before they made their in-plant studies and had made greater use of published sources. I feel that the greatest contribution can, perhaps, be made by the sociologists if they will carry further the study of the unions as institutions, which was begun many years ago by the institutional economists who were called, derisively, "labor economists" by many of their professional colleagues. The community and membership activities of unions I believe to be a most fertile field for study, heretofore almost wholly neglected.

In singling out the industrial sociologists for special comment, I do not detract from their very real contributions to a better understanding of industrial relations. I like their approach much better than that of economists who ignore all but what they call economic factors in accounting for the behavior of employers and employees. I recognize that there is value in reaching the same results through different approaches and for learning through direct observations, even when they are repetitive. Nor do I begrudge investigators the thrill and acclaim they get when, through original research, they discover what they could have learned from published sources. And, of course, we need to know much more about industrial relations than can be gotten from prior studies and documents. I also am very happy that there are so many newcomers in the study of industrial relations. They bring to their studies fresh enthusiasms and new approaches and they have a distinct advantage because they have not been labeled, as [illegible] who honestly express themselves in this surcharged field are certain to be in the course of time.

There is plenty to do for all who seriously want to study industrial relations. No aspect has been exhausted or is in danger of being soon exhausted. There is need for field studies and for library research; for large projects, requiring much manpower, and for smaller studies which are quite manageable for an individual scholar or suitable for an independent doctor of philosophy thesis. We need original investigations, but also compilations, analyses, and interpretations and work of a conceptual character.

There is need in the study of industrial relations for the approaches of all academic disciplines represented in this association and those of practical-minded people who must deal daily with these problems. But it is highly desirable that there should be cross-fertilization between these workers in their differing approaches and points of view and that all people who undertake research in industrial relations should have ready access to what has been done by others. Improvement of the situation in these respects is one of the major objectives of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

Concluding, industrial relations still present many pressing problems. The way these problems are resolved will have much to do with the future of our economy, our Government, and our entire way of life. The development of more satisfactory industrial relations is primarily a responsibility of labor and management, but will be powerfully affected by what the public wants and the Government does. To the members of this association who are mainly academic teachers and research workers or practical practitioners in the industrial relations field, the present industrial relations situation presents both an opportunity and a challenge. We must measure up to this opportunity and meet this challenge. Principally, through the discovery and dissemination of truth we can make our contribution to improved industrial relations.

Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from January 27 to 29 there was held in Washington the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense. This conference included among its patriotic organizations some of the most outstanding groups in the Nation. It was my pleasure to address the conference, along with many other speakers, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the speech which I delivered on January 29.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHECKS AND BALANCES: AMERICA'S GREATEST NEED

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow citizens, it is a real pleasure for me to be with you here today. Organizations such as yours constitute the sentinels of American liberty. One hundred and forty-eight million people look to you and to your constituent patriotic organizations for leadership, for direction, and for guidance. All of America is in flux and ferment today in this troubled atomic age. So, too, the peoples of all the world are looking for light as a war of rival ideologies rages throughout the globe—the ideology of free men versus the ideology of the slave state.

I am grateful to you for the honor of appearing before you this morning and submitting a few thoughts on what I regard as one of the crucial concepts of our American way of life. But before I discuss this subject may I express my deep congratulations to you for your enterprise, your industry, your public spirit in coming together today from distant places, from my own and other States, in order to consider the urgent patriotic problems of this Republic. When you go back to your respective areas, I know that you will be refreshed, reinvigorated. Your batteries will be recharged, so to speak, and you will become better exponents of the American way of life. Now, just what is that way?

THE MEANING OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

Basically, the American way is set forth on what Prime Minister William Gladstone called the "greatest document ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." I refer, of course, to the United States Constitution, the guiding landmark of 170 years of growth and progress on these blessed shores. In this document will be found the basic concepts which are as vital and alive and meaningful today as they were a century and three-quarters ago. Under this document, three separate and coequal branches of Government were established—legislative, executive, and judicial. Each was assigned its proper area. Each was designed to serve as a check and balance against the "will to power in any one branch." Why did the founding fathers do this? Because they had read the pages of history. They knew that throughout history men and women have sought power; and when they have gained power, they have used it often arbitrarily and tyranically, unless they were checked by some other force.

Now, my friends, the greatest challenge to you and to me today is to seek to extend this principle of checks and balances in every field of our national life, so that in no one field can any single individual or group gain such power that it can trample upon the liberties of all other individuals and groups.

EXTENDING CHECKS AND BALANCES PRINCIPLE

Thus you and I must seek the extension of checks and balances in the field of economics, in the field of politics. Yes; basically in the field of men's thinking. We are told by the Good Book that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." When a man becomes obsessed with one single thought, when he doesn't have checks and balances in his own mind, when he forgets moderation, when he goes off the deep end so to speak, then invariably he does damage to himself, and often to his fellow man.

But how are we to extend the principles of checks and balances? The answer is obviously in the field of education.

I am not referring to book learning, nor to some of the processes in the Nation's higher institutions of learning, which go under the guise of "education." I am referring to dynamic inspiration of men and women, young and old, by personal contacts, by heart-to-heart talks, by newspapers, by radio, by motion pictures. Each of you in your own community is a leader—a leader in the women's organizations—a woman's club or veterans' auxiliary, a patriotic group, a business or professional group, a church group. You are coleaders in your own homes, sharing responsibilities with your mates and with your children. In this, as in every avenue of public opinion, it is up to you to help mold opinion along right lines.

WRONG TYPE OF EDUCATION

The alternative is for a wrong type of education to continue, especially in the case of the young. You and I have seen this wrong type of education most dramatically demonstrated in the case of Miss Elizabeth Bentley. As you will recall, she is the reformed Communist who testified some months ago before the House Un-American Activities Committee regarding her own subversive activity and those of her associates. She was an "educated" woman, with a bachelors degree from Vassar and a Masters degree from Columbia. Yet, she had become so inoculated with alien ideas, with subversive concepts with man's transitory knowledge, that she had lost her balance, so to speak; she had become the slave of a foreign ideology and a foreign state. How many other young people have also gone cockeyed by becoming the slavish adherents of foreign beliefs and mere human knowledge. You can answer that question as well as I can, because you know the

problems of schools and colleges in your own communities.

THE CHALLENGE TO LEADERS

And so, good friends, I am calling upon you, or rather your Nation is calling upon you to redouble your efforts in order to preserve the foundations of this constitutional Republic, to conduct a great educational crusade, acquainting our people with the facts about this Republic and its philosophy of government and life. Too often you and I and others simply learn the facts about our Government in school when we are young. Gradually, these facts slip away from our minds and with their loss, we lose a sense of inspiration. We come to regard the Constitution as a dead letter, the Bill of Rights as a fine document but one that does not require our study nor our adherence. We must, however, breathe into the Constitution the spirit of life by our deep sense of loyalty to it. We are told by Paul that "the letter killeth but the spirit maketh alive." This is true of the Constitution, just as it is true of every law on American statute books.

SENATE DOCUMENT ON CONSTITUTION

One small means by which I personally hope to bring about a greater understanding in respect to the Constitution is through the preparation of Senate Document 210 of the Eightieth Congress. This is a document which I prepared in my former capacity as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The document consists of the text of the Constitution, an index to it, a chronology of important events which led to its founding, an amendment, and a series of the most famous quotations regarding the Constitution. I hope that you folks will write in to the Senate and House document rooms for copies, or to your Senators or Representatives. I know that they will be happy to send you copies as soon as they become available, which will be in a few weeks, and as long as the limited supply holds out.

CHECKS AND BALANCES IN INDUSTRY

But let us never forget that behind this document, the Constitution, is the spirit of checks and balances. Let us never forget that in the field of industry, for example, we must not allow any single group to become so powerful that it can dictate to the American public. Years ago a single businessman evidenced the psychology of arbitrary power when he said, "The public be damned." Because power had gone to his head and to the heads of a small group of other businessmen, the Nation enacted antitrust laws. Later, the pendulum of power swung, and this time it was organized labor which secured excessive power. As a result of that fact, the Eightieth Congress enacted the Taft-Hartley labor law. Now we are hearing that there are those who would repeal this law in entirety, even though they admit that without it on the statute books, we may be plunged into industrial chaos. I am hoping that the valuable features of this law will be conserved. The name of the law is not important. Inequities and imperfections under the law can be eliminated, but the basic principle behind this law, the principle of checks and balances in industry, should be preserved.

CONCLUSION

I want to express my deep appreciation to you for the honor of having attended your sessions. Seeing you patriotic women here today and Thursday evening has given many legislators, like myself, a new sense of confidence and faith. By your coming together, you have reinvigorated yourselves and you have served to reinvigorate representatives from your national legislature.

I wish you Godspeed on your great patriotic crusade, continuing success in your efforts on behalf of the greatest way of life which man has fashioned on this planet in all his centuries of existence.

Addresses by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, and Dr. K. Frances Scott Before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. K. Frances Scott, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., on January 3 of this year, at the Hotel Statler in Washington, introducing Senator SMITH of Maine at a dinner honoring Senator SMITH, and the address delivered by Senator SMITH on the same occasion.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. K. FRANCES SCOTT, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

The year 1948 has been memorable in many ways—and not the least of these is the fact that we now have a woman in the United States Senate. In 1948 we observed the one hundredth anniversary of the woman's rights meeting and its declaration of sentiments, listing the legal and social injustices of that day. During this year the women of America celebrated this anniversary and charted, with pride, the gains women had made during the century.

Today we face the beginning of a new century, the year 101 for women. How better could we celebrate such a beginning than by paying honor to the new Senator from Maine, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the first woman to enter the United States Senate under her own steam through the democratic processes of running, against opposition, for nomination and election?

At the beginning of a new century we should pause to consider what we modern women would like to put into a new declaration of sentiments. Unlike the women of 1848, who declared emphatically that men were responsible for the injustices to women of their day, we could not possibly blame men for our failure to achieve the full rights we desire. We must face the hard fact that we begin our year 101 with all the tools needed to gain power to change our status if we will use these tools.

We have the vote. We constitute more than half the population of the United States. Add these two facts together and we have the power to put into elective office those persons most favorable to the changes still needed in the legal status of women and to wiping out discriminations based on sex.

Not only have we the vote, we have the right to run for and hold office. By learning the techniques of our political system; by studying the machinery of our procedures of nominations and elections; by coming up in our political parties through the ranks we can be elected to office.

By using our votes, by earning our elections, we gather power and influence and that will gain us appointments of qualified women to high-policy posts.

Yes; our modern declaration would certainly call on women to enter our political life as full-time working citizens.

To the women of 1949 this full participation in the life of our communities and our Nation is important because they feel they have as much to contribute as men. Their ideas and aspirations are apt to differ from men's and have as much right to be represented in government. In fact, our present governments today are sadly unbalanced—lopsided with the male viewpoint of values. Women are very nearly in a position of taxation without representation and history teaches us what happens in such cases.

To balance the scales and benefit our communities our women must cease hiding their talents and take their places in our governments on equal terms with men.

Such and more might be in our new declaration, but all could be summed up in one sentence: that we, as women, resolve in this coming century to take up our responsibilities as citizens, serving our communities and our Nation as full partners with men.

ADDRESS OF HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH OF MAINE

I shall preface my remarks with what all of you know—that this is a great day for me. To be completely honest with you, I must confess that I'm nervous, I'm walking on air, and I'm choked up a little with my heart in my throat. What is happening to me today has never happened to another woman or man. Rarely has a woman taken a seat in the Senate and I doubt if the hundreds of men Senators have been showered with the generous friendship and honor that you have given me today.

I'm naive enough to admit to you that I can hardly realize that I am not in a wonderful dream. But if that is lack of sophistication, it is because I know now, and I shall always remember, that these unprecedented honors are granted to me not because I am MARGARET CHASE SMITH, but rather because I am merely a symbol of those who have granted me these honors. Any one of you could be in my place today had you been fortunate enough to have the good breaks and fervently sacrificing friends that I have had.

I am not a United States Senator today simply because I am a woman. I was not elected just because I am a woman. To the contrary, I was elected in spite of the fact that I am a woman. And that in itself was a victory for all women for it smashed the unwritten tradition that the Senate is no place for a woman. The point that so many miss is that women do not blindly support some candidates just because they are women, we are not headed for an Amazonian world—rather that no one should be barred from public office just because she is a woman.

Perhaps the greatest significance of my victory is the growing realization that ability and proved performance, rather than sex, are the best standards for political selection just as much as they are for any other kind of selection. I like to think that I am a symbol of this growing realization.

I have been repeatedly warned that while officially I will be the junior Senator from Maine—unofficially, I will be the Senator at Large for women all over the Nation. While my first duty is to the people of Maine, I will gladly accept the unofficial responsibility of being Senator at Large for America's women to the extent that the women desire. This would mean that I should hold myself in readiness to be a voice of America's women on the floor of the Senate and in committees.

But are there any subjects in which women have exclusive interests that might come before the United States Senate? If I were to guess on the subjects of greatest interest to women, I would say (1) world peace and (2) domestic security. But men are just as interested in these subjects as women—men and women are no different on this point.

Through national polls and the great national women's organizations, such as the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., the great majority of women have gone on record as being convinced that the United Nations is the only hope for peace. The pace of the United Nations has been far too slow to satisfy most of us. But the United Nations has been laboring under the great handicap of the uncompromising attitude and obstructionist tactics of one of the largest nations.

At home there are growing signs that we are approaching a buyers' market—and gradually easing away from a sellers' market. Supply is catching up with demand. But that is not the whole story. Buyers are looking more closely at prices. They are hestitating. They are watching for bargains. They seek more quality for less money. The lush days when anything sold at any price are over. Merchants now fear intensive buyers' strikes.

This means that we are at last beginning to curb inflation. And the country can thank the women mostly for this happy turn of events, for it is the women who do most of the consumer buying. They are bringing prices down to fairer levels. They are erasing black markets. They are doing these things themselves which Congress could not do, with or without price control. And yet some people still underestimate the power of American women.

But while we are beginning to solve the very core of our problem of domestic security in the curbing of inflation by consumer restraint rather than government controls, we don't want the curbing of inflation to nosedive into drastic deflation. One need not elaborate on what drastic deflation means or what it is like. One need only remember the depression of the early thirties to realize that we must avoid drastic deflation.

What the women of America want is the highest possible standard of living at the lowest possible cost for the greatest number of all Americans first—and then the rest of the world. They want homes—homes at prices that they can afford. Or they want apartments at lower rental charges—apartments where babies and dogs are not barred—apartments where they can live a healthy, normal American life rather than subject to restrictions that do not make for normal living.

What the women of America want are reasonable prices for good food. They want to be able to go to the neighborhood grocery store and buy enough food for a family meal without draining their pocketbooks.

What the women of America want is a respectable salary scale for the teachers who shape the lives of their children. They want schoolhouses that aren't crowded—schoolhouses that aren't firetraps. They want school lunches that give real nutrition to their children. In short, they want their children to have the best food possible, whether it be for the head in what they are taught or for the stomach in what they are fed.

These are not unreasonable demands. They are not unnecessary drains on the taxpayers. They are sound investments in the future of America. And, after all, these are the desires of the taxpayers themselves, for the bulk of our taxpayers are mothers and fathers.

And as the only woman United States Senator, I pledge myself in full support of these objectives of the women—not just because they are objectives of the women, but because they are objectives upon which we must lay the foundation of America's future.

I am proud to have been a member of the BPW for more than 26 years. The BPW is largely responsible for putting me in the Senate. My work in the BPW taught me the very touchstones of political success. BPW work taught me to develop cooperation. As an inclusive, rather than exclusive organization, the BPW offered me greater variety of personal contacts than other groups. It taught me efficiency in committee work and officership. It taught me how to give and take in the participation of debates and discussions, in the development of powers of expression, and the growth of ideas.

I know of no organization that has as much to offer business and professional women as the BPW. I know of no organization that can provide better training in cooperation, tact, and efficiency. I know of no better way of increasing one's chances of success than participation in the BPW.

And the BPW shows its loyalty to its members when it really counts. I know, because the Maine Federation of the BPW was the only women's organization to endorse my candidacy for the United States Senate. I shall never forget what the BPW did for me in my hour of need—and of how the BPW stood out far above the crowd, and significantly before victory.

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Governor Dewey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, on the evening of Tuesday, February 8, at the Lincoln Day Dinner in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great pleasure to come to Washington—even if it is only for a visit. At one time last year I expected to come for a longer stay. I was under the impression, which was shared by a great many others, that I had a clear call to duty. But last November it turned out to be some other kind of noise. As a result, my relationship with this fair city of Washington will continue, as in the past, to be merely that of an occasional visitor.

Recent events have made it clear that no Republican President was going to live at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue anyway. No Democratic President is living there either. The White House has been in Democratic hands so long that, like the Government itself, it's falling apart.

So, if those 29,000 votes had gone the other way last November, I would have faced a double housing crisis—no White House to live in, and two Democratic houses to live with.

Instead, I find that I have been re-elected for a second straight term to that somewhat mythical office known as titular head of the Republican Party. It is an ancient and honorable office that carries with it the theoretical right to speak for the party but no guarantee whatsoever that anybody will listen to you. I have been graduated at a comparatively early age, to the role of elder statesman, which someone has aptly defined as a politician who is no longer a candidate for any office.

DISMAL RECORD FOR GOP

With the bluntness which that enviable role permits, I should like to discuss with you some of the ills that beset our party and our country.

It is now 20 years since our country last elected a Republican President. In that whole period we elected a Republican Congress once, 2 years ago. This is a dismal record that is important not merely to Republicans. It is of desperate importance to the country, lest we slip unconsciously into the abyss of one-party government.

Without seeking to find scapegoats or to make excuses, I would like to bring out in the open one basic problem. The Republican Party is split wide open. It has been split wide open for years, but we have tried to gloss it over. We have tried to deny it to ourselves and conceal it. That doesn't work. I suggest that we face it; get it right out in the open and look at it. Then let's see what we can do about it.

We have in our party some fine, high-minded, patriotic people, who honestly oppose farm-price support, unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, slum clearance, and other such programs. These people consider these programs horrendous departures into paternalism and would actually repeal them all. These people believe in a laissez faire society and look back wistfully to the miscalled good old days of the nineteenth century.

They also take the position that the sole duty of an opposition party is opposition. They urge Republicans in and out of Congress to fight every proposal of a Democratic administration, regardless of its merits. This group also honestly believes and says with considerable vigor that all Republicans who support these forward-looking programs are me-too Republicans and no better than New Dealers.

At the other extreme are those in the party who seem to embrace the entire New Deal and want to go far beyond it as rapidly as possible at almost any cost and regardless of consequences.

Personally, I disagree with both extremes. The fact that I disagree is not so important, but what is important is that both courses are fatal to our party and would be fatal to the country. If, as a party, we try to go back to the nineteenth century, or even to the 1920's, you can bury the Republican Party as the deadest pigeon in the country.

On the other hand, we can't outpromise the Democrats. If we tried to outbid the Democrats with the public money, it would be wrong, immoral, and a betrayal of our party and our country. Moreover, you couldn't outpromise the Democrats if you tried because they will promise anything to anybody to get a vote.

What we ought to do is to stop bellyaching about the past, either the distant past or the immediate past, and start making it everlastingly clear to the country where we stand and why. And that should not be too hard to do.

It is perfectly clear that only a progressive, forward-looking Republican Party can provide the leadership this country needs and must ultimately get. The overwhelming majority of all Americans in both parties believe that government today has to be more than a cold and impartial umpire.

PLATFORM OF 1948 IS CITED

That has been the position of our party consistently, both in the Congress and in our party's platforms. That position has been repeatedly affirmed in national conventions. In 1948, our platform was unanimously voted without one dissent at the national convention. It must mean something. Unless it was designed to deceive, its various sections say and mean that we are a liberal and progressive party.

To be entirely specific, they say and mean that our party has solemnly declared that we believe wholeheartedly in unemployment insurance, in old-age assistance on an increased basis, in broader social security generally, in slum clearance and public housing, in public development of our water

power resources, in farm price supports, in vigorous protection of the rights of labor.

All these are good. They are necessary; they are right; they are the officially declared principles of the Republican Party as solemnly adopted in convention assembled. I believe that we, as representatives of our party, are bound by these principles and are under a duty to carry them out.

Those who disapprove of these principles and want to fight them ought to go out and try to get elected in a typical American community and see what happens to them. But they ought not to do it as Republicans. They ought not to get their personal prejudices confused with the basic aims the Republican Party has repeatedly set forth in its platforms.

SEES ONLY 5 PERCENT REACTION

The people who want to turn the clock back are a very small percentage of the Republican Party, though sometimes they seem to make all the noise. I believe that 95 percent of all Republicans, whether as voters or public officers, believe in the party platforms, and it is up to us to make it clear that those platforms are the real intent of the party.

Let's let the people know. Let's stop quibbling among ourselves about issues that are dead and gone.

Most of all, we must make our party the vehicle for the aims and ambitions of the young people of the country. One of the most gratifying things that happened last fall was that in the high schools and colleges of this country from Maine to California our party was the choice of a heavy majority of the students. We should welcome these young people with open arms, bring them in, give them a voice in our decisions, a part of the responsibility of carrying them out, and again make ours the party of youth.

But I can still hear people say that if we mean what we say in our platforms, then how are we different from the Democrats? If we mean what Republican speakers said throughout the Nation last year in support of our platform, then, they ask, what better do we have to offer than the Democrats?

The difference is as wide as the ocean. Let me be specific again. In foreign affairs one difference is that we Republicans have insisted on a world-wide foreign policy and not merely a European foreign policy. It is the bitterest irony that it was America's traditional friendship for China and our insistence upon her integrity that brought about the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor which took us into the war.

After terrible sacrifices, the Allied arms won the greatest military victory in history. And then almost immediately the Communist conquest of our traditional Chinese allies began. It was this present national administration which supinely sat by and allowed it to happen.

OUR CHINA POLICY A FAILURE

Fifteen months ago I called the attention of the Nation to the onrushing tragedy. The Republican Congress forced an appropriation for aid to China. But the administration failed utterly in its policy and its implementation of that and succeeding appropriations. We now see the appalling spectacle of 400,000,000 people, our traditional friends and allies, the Chinese, threatened with complete Communist conquest.

We are witnessing the frightening spectacle of all Asia, representing a majority of all of the people of the world, falling ever closer into the Communist orbit. In a little more than three short years, the fruits of the most glorious victory for freedom in the history of the world have been turned to bitter ashes by the incompetence of this administration.

Similar perils threaten us at home if our social progress is to be left in the hands of this administration.

You know, it is a curious thing that the same objectives of full employment and social security are claimed as their purpose by both political parties in America; by both the Socialist and non-Socialist governments of Europe; by the Communist nations of eastern Europe; and were claimed by the Hitler government.

Everybody claims to be going to the same place. But some are going as slaves with chains around their minds and clanking on their heels. Others are going as freemen with their heads high and their minds and souls unfettered by the state.

The whole difference between freedom and slavery lies in how you advance toward your goals, whether you go forward under a free system, or march on the treadmill of a slave system.

DEMOCRATS' AIM CALLED DOLE

I see nothing in the program advanced by the Democrats which is opposed to the belief that they intend to lead us into a system where everything man gets from cradle to grave is doled out to him by a ruling political clique. I see nothing in the program of this administration to lead anyone to believe that they desire to avoid the kind of nation where your home or your job, your right to education, or even to a bread card or a pair of shoes all depend on government.

That is the great fundamental difference between the Democratic and the Republican Parties.

Our party believes in social progress, and we believe it can only be achieved under a flourishing, competitive system of private enterprise where every human right is expanded. We are utterly opposed to tyranny in any form, whether by business, finance, labor, or government.

We are opposed to delivering the Nation into the hands of any group who will have the power to tell the American people whether they may have food or fuel, shelter, or jobs.

As we fight for the view that Government must protect the liberty and security of our people, we should fight also the view that any of these fundamental rights flow from the bounty of any political clique or party which happens to control Government at the moment.

We know and believe that we can pay for the advances of social progress only through more efficient, more economical, and better managed Government. That is an idea that has been completely forgotten in our Federal bureaucracy for a great many years. It is the kind of Government that nobody under 30 years of age can even remember in the United States. Yet, we are trying as a nation to make those advances under a political spoils system which has grown and spread out fantastically in all directions.

There is enough demonstrable waste in this Federal Government to pay for all of the social advances that were proposed by our party platform. We will only get rid of that waste, finally, by getting the executive and legislative branches of Government in Republican hands. Meanwhile, we can fight for part of it, at least, while in the opposition.

BACK-BREAKING TAXES

Only with a new degree of competence and skill in the fine art of government can we make progress which will not break the backs of our people with taxes. We are trying to make progress under a Government that does not seem to realize that the American people are entitled to spend their own earnings to the limit possible instead of having them taken away by Government to be squandered on sheer incompetence.

There are more differences between our party and the Democrats. They are willing, for political reasons, to play with any radical and unsound scheme in order to win over this or that pressure group. A basic issue between us is that we believe with all our soul and with all our hearts in human freedom.

And since that word is so much abused, let me say that I mean a system under which man is free to work at the kind of a job he wants—a job which fits his own skill and talent—to seek a job or to quit one—free to seek the education he wants—free to start a business—free to create—free to produce—free to benefit society by the ablest use of his talents—and free to keep enough of the proceeds to provide incentive to others to go and do likewise.

I mean a way of life under which government exists to protect the rights and equal opportunities of all its citizens—not a way of life in which the individual lives to serve as a cog in the machine of government. This is the heart of our political faith. It is the thing this present administration does not believe in, as their legislative programs and their tax programs prove.

NATIONALIZATION FEARED

Again, let me be exact and specific. The President has asked the Congress for the right to take steps which would lead toward the nationalization of various industries. That is the route to tyranny, in which all employment flows from government and you have to see your district leader to get a job.

Soviet Russia has nationalized her industries. So did Nazi Germany. Other nations are doing the same. But should we follow them down the trail? Let's see.

Right now, today, in the United States, we have 7 percent, or about one-fifteenth, of all the people in the world. Yet we are making by the free system more steel of every kind than all the other nations of the world put together. We are making by the free system more automobiles than all the other nations of the world put together. We have more telephones—and almost everything else by the free system than all the other nations in the world put together.

And yet, this present Democratic administration wants to copy the techniques of all the nations that have failed. They talk about just a little nationalizing. Well, that's like putting just one drop of strychnine in a glass of perfectly good milk. It's good milk until you put in the drop of strychnine and from then on none of it is any good.

Who is going to save a thousand dollars, or borrow a thousand dollars from his uncle to start a little business, or build a filling station, or anything else, if he knows that government may build one across the street, tax free, and run him out of business?

We believe everlastingly in social progress. And we believe in achieving it as free men and not by trying to copy all the nations which have dragged great peoples down to serfdom.

NO COMPROMISE WITH WASTE

There are many areas of compromise in Government. There are many areas of agreement between both parties. But on the great issues which divide us from the Democrats, there can be no honest compromise. There can be no compromise with waste. There can be no compromise with incompetence.

There can be no compromise with efforts which would abandon us to the tyranny of the few, whether within or without Government. There can be no compromise with the use by Government of the instruments of totalitarianism, however smooth and silky may be the guise in which they are presented.

I propose that as a party we turn our faces ahead and keep them steadfastly in that direction. I propose that we build for the betterment of the whole American people, through every legitimate device of Government for their security, for their comfort, and for their individual opportunity.

I propose that we support every proposition which will achieve these ends, regardless of its origin, and without regard to political

credit. And by that I do not mean supporting half-baked, badly drawn laws or evil inventions like the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill which would reduce our doctors to Government servitude. I propose that, opposing every totalitarian device, we fight ever to enlarge the area of human freedom.

That is the historic role of the party of Lincoln, in honor of whose memory we meet tonight. Our party was formed in the hot fires of a struggle to advance the cause of human liberty and under his wise leadership won victories which will resound throughout all history.

It is time we returned to our historic role. The world is in desperate need of a fresh demonstration of faith that free systems are better than slave systems. Adhering faithfully to the principles repeatedly stated in our platform, let us move forward again—the party of progress in America in behalf of human freedom everywhere.

Address by the Ambassador From Norway at the Christmas Carnival, Birmingham, Ala.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on November 27, 1948, I had the pleasure of attending a dinner in Birmingham, Ala., at which the Ambassador from Norway, Wilhelm Morgenstierne, spoke. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the Ambassador may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the last of a series of memorable days and evenings we have had together here in the city of Birmingham. I want to say a few things which are very much on my mind. And I know that my colleagues and friends from the other Marshall-plan countries will join me in this.

We came here last Wednesday not knowing more about the Birmingham Christmas Carnival than Mr. Rayford Ellis had told us during our pleasant talks in Washington. Today we realize that this great Birmingham idea, under the cloak of cheer and joy, represents the determination of the people of this progressive city, to make their contribution to understanding and good will between the nations of the world.

It is true that we have personally had a most delightful time here. I cannot conceive of a friendliness and hospitality more genuine, more heartwarming than that with which we have been met here. After 4 days we do feel, deeply and sincerely, that we are among friends—I almost said old friends. And, by the way, I have never been to a place before where one sees one's friends five or six times a day. That human experience we shall take away with us and always cherish. And for that experience we want each and all of us to express tonight our warmest thanks.

But what has impressed us more than anything else, I think, is the way in which this entire community seems to have rallied to that simple, but fundamental idea that fellowship and understanding between men and women of the nations of the world must be the basis of all international relations and of any international organization hoping to survive. You, the people of Birmingham, have got something here. I feel convinced that this will continue to grow, as it has grown these 14 years, until the Birmingham Christmas carnival will be widely recognized as a real and permanent contribution toward that great goal—Peace on earth, good will to men.

I feel that at this Thanksgiving season we who are privileged to represent the Marshall plan countries want to give our thanks a wider application. We want to take this opportunity to express once more the deep-felt thanks of our respective countries for that grandiose American plan, which bears the name of your great Secretary of State. I, for one, firmly believe that you may search the history of mankind without finding a scheme of greater scope and vision than the Marshall plan. Like lend-lease during the last war, it is expressive of a statesmanship and generosity worthy of the finest traditions of the American people.

Without the Marshall plan—a hand stretched out to all war-stricken countries of Europe, regardless of differences of ideologies—I do not know where the free, democratic nations of Europe would be today. Or shall we rather say that we know only too well where they would be.

In our peace- and freedom-loving countries the name of America stands today for the upholding and protection of those things which we cherish above anything else—peace, freedom, justice, democracy, and the decencies of human brotherhood.

And so we want tonight to extend our thanks beyond the limits of this fine, progressive city and its friendly people, beyond the boundaries of the State of Alabama, to all of the United States of America. Mr. Mayor, Mr. Governor, God bless your city and your State. God bless America, the beautiful and bountiful. This comes from the hearts of the men, women, and children of free Europe, whom you are standing by and giving courage and hope in our struggle for reconstruction and the upholding of our common ideals.

Tribute by Hon. Garrett L. Withers, of Kentucky, to Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARRETT L. WITHERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute prepared by me in memory of Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 9, the State of Kentucky paid its final tribute to a great hero of the late war.

Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner is to be laid away to his final rest in the historic cemetery high on the bluff that overlooks the State Capitol at Frankfort, Ky.

General Buckner was a great son of an illustrious family. His brilliant career was cut short by an enemy bullet at Okinawa in 1945.

He will rest beside his father, a general of the Confederate Army and subsequently a Governor of Kentucky; and beside his grandfather, who fought in the War of 1812.

Not only does the State of Kentucky mourn the death of General Buckner, but so do the thousands of men who served under him as he led our forces across the Pacific. Those men came from all parts of our Nation.

In life he made a notable and worthy contribution to his country and to his fellowmen—in death General Buckner leaves a heritage of which his State and the Nation are justifiably proud.

His life, both as a military man and as a citizen, will ever be an example to the youth of our country, those in uniform and those in civilian life.

Work of the United States Air Force in Maintaining Berlin Airlift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me entitled "Nation Should Honor Air Force for Success of Berlin Airlift."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION SHOULD HONOR AIR FORCE FOR SUCCESS OF BERLIN AIRLIFT

On June 26, 1948, 7 months ago, the United States Air Force began the operation known as the airlift. It started as our answer to the Russian blockade of Berlin and it has continued without interruption through all weather, fair or foul, at all hours, day and night.

From the day that the airlift began, until February 3, 1949, our Air Force has carried 690,443 tons of food, fuel, other supplies and passengers through the narrow air corridors. This has been accomplished with approximately 200 planes in regular use, which have made a total of 78,689 flights into the besieged German capital.

This tremendous job has not been without loss. Twenty-five young airmen have been killed. Seventeen planes have been lost, including nine of the big C54's, six C47's, and two R5d's.

Operation Vittles has been a vast success. The American people should honor the men of our Air Force—from the Secretary down to the most humble recruit—for the brilliant conception and courageous execution of this great feat. History will recall the airlift, not only as a magnificent military accomplishment, but, also, as an amazing demonstration of the best qualities of American leadership, initiative, and resourcefulness.

The Miracle of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, from all directions criticism pours forth denouncing our American form of government and urging various substitutes

ranging from deep red communism to parlor pink socialism. And all too seldom do we pause to take stock of the truth about America, what it stands for, what it has accomplished, and what it can achieve for mankind.

The following article, entitled "The Miracle of America," by Herbert Hoover, which recently appeared in the Woman's Home Companion, is a forthright discourse about the greatness of America. A man who received the highest honor the people can bestow when he was elected President takes pen in hand to remind us of the achievements of America and the bright future we can build inspired by the concepts of free spirit and free mind:

THE MIRACLE OF AMERICA

(By Herbert Hoover)

During the last score of years our American form of civilization has been deluged with criticism. It comes from our own people who deplore our undoubted faults and genuinely wish to remedy them. It comes from our political parties by their denunciations in debate of our current issues. It arises from the forthright refusal of the American people to wash their dirty linen in secret. It comes from our love of sensational incidents where villainy is pursued by law and virtue triumphs. It comes from intellectuals who believe in the American system but who feel that our moral and spiritual greatness has not risen to the level of our industrial accomplishments.

Criticism also comes from our native Communists who want to overturn the system. And from the fuzzy-minded totalitarian liberals who believe that their creeping collectivism can be adopted without destroying personal liberty and representative government. It comes bitterly and daily from the governments behind the iron curtain and their officials and even from the press of the western European nations that we are trying to help.

Altogether we seem to be in a very, very bad way and engaged in our decline and fall. Criticism is no doubt good for our national soul—if it does not discourage us entirely.

Perhaps the time has come for Americans to take a little stock and think something good about themselves.

We could point out that our American system has perfected the greatest productivity of any nation on earth; that our standard of living is the highest in the world. We could point to our constantly improving physical health and lengthening span of life. We could mention the physical condition of our youth as indicated somewhat by our showing in the recent Olympic games.

In the governmental field, we could suggest that our supposedly decadent people still rely upon the miracle of the ballot and the legislative hall to settle their differences of view and not upon a secret police with slave camps.

In the cultural field, we could point out that with only about 6 percent of the world's population we have more youth in high schools and institutions of higher learning, more musical and literary organizations, more libraries and probably more distribution of the printed and spoken word than all the other 94 percent put together.

On the moral and spiritual side, we have more hospitals and charitable institutions than all of them. And we could suggest that we alone, of all nations, fought in two World Wars and asked no indemnities, no acquisition of territory, no domination over other nations. We could point to an advancement of the spirit of Christian compassion such as the world has never seen, and prove it by the tons of food and clothes and billions of dollars we have made as gifts in saving hundreds of millions from famine and governments from collapse.

Much as I feel deeply the lag in spots which do not give equal chance to our Negro population, yet I cannot refrain from saying that our 12,000,000 Negroes probably own more automobiles than all the 200,000,000 Russians or the 300,000,000 Negroes under European government in Africa.

All of which is not boasting, but just fact. And we could say a good deal more.

Whatever our faults may be, our critics do not grasp the sense of a word which is daily on our lips—America. From its intangible meanings spring the multitude of actions, ideals, and purposes of our people. Recently I had an occasion to say something on that subject which I can summarize here.

America means far more than a continent bounded by two oceans. It is more than pride of military power, glory in war or in victory. It means more than vast expanse of farms, of great factories or mines, magnificent cities or millions of automobiles and radios. It is more even than the traditions of the great tide westward from Europe which pioneered the conquest of a continent. It is more than our literature, our music, our poetry. Other nations have these things also.

What we have in addition, the intangible we cannot describe, lies in the personal experience and the living of each of us rather than in phrases, however inspiring.

Perhaps without immodesty I can claim to have had some experience in what America means. I have lived many kinds of American life. After my early boyhood in an Iowa village, I lived as the ward of a country doctor in Oregon. I lived among those to whom hard work was the price of existence. The opportunities of America opened up to me the public schools. They carried me to the professional training of an American university. I began by working with my own hands for my daily bread. I have tasted the despair of fruitless search for a job. I know the kindly encouragement of a humble boarding-house keeper.

I have conducted the administration of great industries with their problems of production and the well-being of their employees.

I have seen America in contrast with many nations and races. My profession took me into many foreign lands under many kinds of government. I have worked with their great spiritual leaders and their great statesmen. I have worked in governments of free men, of tyrannies, of Socialists and of Communists. I have met with princes, kings, despots and desperados.

I have seen the squalor of Asia, the frozen class barriers of Europe. I was not a tourist. I was associated in their working lives and problems. I had to deal with their social systems and their governments. And outstanding everywhere to these great masses of people there was a hallowed word—America. To them it was the hope of the world.

Every homecoming was for me a reaffirmation of the glory of America. Each time my soul was washed by the relief from the grinding poverty of other nations, by the greater kindliness and frankness which comes from acceptance of equality and the wide-open opportunity to all who want a chance. It is more than that. It is a land of self-respect born alone of free men.

In later years I participated on behalf of America in a great war. I saw untold misery and revolution. I have seen liberty die and tyranny rise. I have seen human slavery again on the march.

I have been repeatedly placed by my countrymen where I had need to deal with the hurricanes of social and economic destruction which have swept the world. I have seen bitter famine and the worst misery that the brutality of war can produce.

I have had every honor to which any man could aspire. There is no place on the whole earth except here in America where all the sons of man could have this chance in life.

The meaning of our word "America" flows from one pure source. Within the soul of America is the freedom of mind and spirit in man. Here alone are the open windows through which pours the sunlight of the human spirit. Here alone human dignity it not a dream but a major accomplishment.

At the time our ancestors were proclaiming that the Creator had endowed all mankind with rights of freedom as the children of God, with a free will, the German philosophers, Hegel and others, and later Karl Marx, were proclaiming a satanic philosophy of agnosticism and that the rights of man came from the state. The greatness of America today comes from one philosophy, the despair of Europe from the other.

But there are people in our country today who would compromise in these fundamental concepts. They scoff at these tested qualities in men. They never have understood and never will understand what the word "America" means. They explain that these qualities were good while there was a continent to conquer and a nation to build. They say that time has passed. No doubt the land frontier has passed. But the frontiers of science and better understanding of human welfare are barely opening.

This new land of science with all its high promise cannot and will not be conquered except by men and women inspired by these concepts of free spirit and free mind.

And it is those moral and spiritual qualities which rise alone in free men which will fulfill the meaning of the word "American". And with them will come centuries of further greatness to our country.

Oil Production in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Ernest O. Thompson, commissioner, Railroad Commission of Texas, relating to oil production in Texas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMPSON OUTLINES REASONS WHY FLARE GAS CURB DELAYED

AUSTIN, February 3.—Texas had to wait until oil became plentiful before it could crack down on wastage of flare gas, says Railroad Commissioner Thompson.

In a statement answering criticism of the United States Senate's Small Business Committee, Thompson said the committee complains about flare gas in Texas and at the same time says we do not produce enough oil.

THOMPSON'S STATEMENT

Thompson said in his statement:

"The subcommittee report takes us to task for not shutting in the flare gas from oil wells long ago.

"This would have made the oil shortage of 1946 and 1947 which they complain about even worse. To have shut in the gas then would have shut off the oil produced with the gas. That's why we did not cut off the gas waste sooner."

Thompson said that in 1946 and 1947 Texas produced every barrel of oil that could be produced without doing irreparable harm to the oil wells. We permitted production of oil at the maximum efficient rate in every field in Texas.

"Month after month oil production in Texas was increased until in December 1948 we found it necessary to reduce production because of the flood of imported oil coming into the United States taking the market formerly filled with Texas crude," he said.

REPORT CONFUSED

"The committee complains that we did not allow enough oil to be produced when every Texas well was straining at maximum rates every day all during these years," Thompson said.

"Then they complain at us for not shutting in oil-well flares in the same breath, when to have done so back in 1946 and 1947 would have shut off badly needed oil."

He said the Senate committee's report seems confused.

Surely the Federal control boys can't complain when we produce all the oil the Federal Bureau of Mines says is needed. * * * They even ask that the Bureau of Mines be required to stop forecasting market demands.

"That's like telling the Weather Bureau to stop giving us the weather forecast," Thompson countered.

THE THOMPSON STATEMENT

1. The report is an attack against the method (reasonable market demand) being utilized to prevent physical waste, to provide for constant production to meet the Nation's needs and to obtain the ultimate maximum recovery of petroleum from underground reservoirs. This is a practice of long standing in the production of oil and gas. The first reasonable market-demand law was passed in Oklahoma in 1915. It has been specifically upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States (*Champlin Refining* v. *Corporation Commission* (286 U. S. 210)). In discussing this case the Court said: "The Commission construes the act as intended to empower it to limit production to the amount of the reasonable daily market demand and to require ratable production by all taking from the common source. In current orders it has been found that waste of oil will result in the prorated areas unless production is limited to such demand."

(A complete reading of this case is suggested.)

It should be noted that Texas' market-demand statute (also upheld as reasonable by the higher courts) was enacted after the Champlin case decision.

2. Reasonable market demand is not the sum total of what individual oil producers themselves regard as usable by them or marketable by them but is calculated on a formula which has been worked out over a period of many years and which has proved to be very accurate as being a production figure which will furnish the national consuming public with its varying requirements of petroleum products. It is figured on a basis of national consumption and is used as a guide to meet these needs.

For instance, it is necessary that the total probable consumption of fuel oil be estimated sufficiently far in advance of the winter heating season so that refining, transportation, and storage schedules for fuel oil can be made. This is true, also, of the production of motor fuels to meet the heavy demand for farm fuels during the plowing and planting and harvesting seasons and to meet the heavier demand for gasoline during the summer travel season.

Since it is universally admitted that the oil reserves of the Nation are of such a nature as to require some degree of management to obtain the maximum public benefit therefrom, it would appear prudent to have reputable official agencies make these estimates of reasonable market demand, rather than to trust to luck that somehow and by some method (how, when, or where it might be arrived at no one seems to know) the varying seasonal requirements and total national needs would be met.

3. The agencies charged with providing for our national defense have laid great emphasis on the need for accumulating large petroleum reserves in event of an emergency. Because of its nature, oil and gas cannot be stored above ground without excessive physical waste. Some factor relating production to the total national consumptive requirements must be used as a measuring stick if the armed forces and the public are to be protected in their normal needs and if petroleum producers are to be able to plan this operation to meet any unusual emergency demands.

At the start of the last war, the petroleum industry had producing capacity of approximately 1,000,000 barrels above the then current market demand. In the upsurge of consumption following the war, this producing capacity proved insufficient to meet demand.

As of February 1949 it is estimated that the industry has so increased its potential productivity that it now has a reserve capacity of 300,000 barrels daily. Years of orderly production based on reasonable market demand resulted in storage of reserves underground which were available during the recent war and it was the production of these reserves which made possible the industry's brilliant record in fueling the war machine. It was not too little and too late where oil for war was concerned.

4. The statutes authorizing production based on reasonable market demand spread the total consumer requirements over the entire petroleum industry and producing areas and serve as a restraint on monopoly. Large producers who might be able to meet all their own requirements for crude from wholly owned sources in a single State, or in a single area, or even in a single field, are thus forced to purchase a portion of their requirements in the open competitive market. Constantly we hear selfish complaints that we will not permit selective buying. To do so would stifle orderly development. Those oil fields closest to refineries and close to tidewater would hog the market to the exclusion of those fields further removed from refining centers and ocean ports.

It took us years of effort to make a place in the market for west Texas crude, but when the need for oil was apparent then west Texas crude filled the demand and was most welcome. It deserves its full ratable share in the market-demand picture. Refiners should equip themselves to handle their fair share of sour crudes along with the sweet crudes.

5. The Interstate Oil Compact Commission furthers competition within the petroleum industry. Producers who own large reserves in several States could, by centering their production in any one State, stifle competition and obtain an unfair advantage.

The voluntary association of the respective States in the Interstate Oil Compact Commission also maintains a healthy, public interest relationship between the producing States. States with large reserves thus are deterred from producing at such a rate as might be harmful and cause waste in their sister States. It should be noted that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was established after the Supreme Court of the United States had held valid statutes authorizing production based on reasonable market demand and that the compact was strongly endorsed and espoused by President Roosevelt as an ideal example of worthwhile cooperation between the States in the public interest.

It is a matter of grave concern that the report attacks one of the few cooperative efforts ever made to maintain the sovereignty of the individual States in a voluntary association the sole purpose of which is to protect the States in their sovereignty and at the same time provide the necessary machinery for protecting and serving the public interest in conserving and preventing waste of a valuable resource. The Interstate Oil Compact is purely and simply a physical waste-prevention treaty by and between the oil-producing States whereby the States agree to pass and enforce State laws aimed at waste prevention in the production of oil and gas. The Congress has repeatedly approved this forward-looking action on the part of the sovereign States to do their own work.

6. General: State conservation laws protect the interests of all operators and make it possible for thousands of individual operators to carry on successful exploration for and development of petroleum. In Texas alone, there are 3,200 operators producing crude oil. There is no tendency toward monopoly in oil production in Texas or the United States and the fact that petroleum prices currently are relatively lower than other commodities in relation to the Government's base year of 1926 for all prices is the best evidence that competition operates in the industry and has been effective in keeping prices down.

State conservation laws have been criticized because they provide for limiting production to market demand, and it is assumed that such laws result in fixing prices. The facts are entirely different. Authority to restrict production to market demand is as important in preventing physical waste as regulation of the rate of withdrawal in accordance with good engineering practice. Experience has demonstrated that when a State permits oil to be produced in an excess of demand, physical waste as well as economic waste results and available petroleum resources are dissipated too rapidly, so that ultimate scarcities and high prices develop to the disadvantage of all consumers. The argument that all of the oil that can be produced efficiently could be marketed if the price were low enough does not work out in practice. The effect of producing more than demand is to bring about uneven withdrawals among different properties in the same fields served by purchasers whose demands are not alike. This situation causes physical waste and the loss of recoverable oil. Production in excess of demand also leads to unnecessary storage, resulting in evaporation and waste of oil above ground. If new fields are allowed to absorb too much of the market, the older wells cannot compete and have to be abandoned prematurely with a large loss of reserves.

Regulating production to market demand is the only means by which the industry can build up a margin between its maximum, efficient, producing capacity and current production. Such a margin is needed for national security, according to the statement of military officials. High Government officials have repeatedly stated that one of the most important factors in the success of the military forces of the United States and its allies in World War II was an ample supply of petroleum. This supply was available because State conservation laws had regulated production to demand so that it was possible to increase the production on existing wells by about 1,000,000 barrels daily above prewar production.

The rapid growth in demand during and after World War II eliminated that margin of available production and forced all wells to be produced at the maximum efficient rate, thereby placing the Nation in a vulnerable position with respect to meeting increased demand for military purposes in case of another emergency. Through diligent effort and large capital expenditures, the petroleum industry has increased the production capacity of the country sufficiently to exceed the growth in demand and begin rebuilding a margin of oil available for emergency.

Criticism of State conservation of petroleum reveals utter lack of true information of the contribution which these laws have made toward increasing the recovery of oil and providing ample quantities available year after year so that the customers will not have to pay the high prices incident to scarcity. Conservation has been a major force in providing petroleum products at reasonable prices and the attacks being made against sound conservation and production practices is not only entirely unwarranted but also shows the danger that Federal bureaucratic thinking and Federal control have for the Nation and the consumers of petroleum products.

Under State regulation the domestic oil-producing ability of the United States has been increased by more than 1,000,000 barrels per day since 1941.

The industry shows an increase in production of about 31 percent over all. To my mind that is a record to thrill the hearts of every American.

More than 300 new oil fields have been discovered. Never has there been such a search for oil and the results are at hand.

There are today more than 1,400 separate oil fields in Texas alone, with 111,000 producing oil wells.

Texas is meeting all demands for oil and was recently forced to reduce her oil production by more than 250,000 barrels daily because the flood of imported oil coming into the United States left no room for our full ability to produce. If we produced in excess of market demand, this much desired search for new oil for the future would cease and the United States would become dependent upon foreign oil. This would stifle our domestic oil-producing industry and wither away our greatest munition of defense. Oil is our most potent defense material. We cannot afford to hamper its full development. Oil means security.

We must build up a potential reserve of at least 1,000,000 barrels of oil daily producing ability from wells already on production before we can rest on our oars. The only oil reserve worth while is one ready at the turn of the valve. A fair price for oil will bring about this desired result. The present price is getting the job done.

ERNEST O. THOMPSON,
Commissioner, Railroad Commission of Texas.

California Legislature Endorses McDonough Bills—H. R. 205 and H. R. 208

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the war-levied tax on transportation of persons and property has placed a special burden on those who must use transportation facilities for their business or to ship their merchandise. These levies, enacted during the war, were necessary to dissuade civilians from further burdening the already crowded public carriers engaged in the movement of troops and military supplies, but they were enacted with the implied promise that they would be repealed after the war.

Today there is no longer any valid reason why these discriminatory taxes should be continued. Transportation is an essential service, not a luxury. It is a service which must be used regularly by large sections of our population. And it is a service which should not be taxed at the present excessive rate in time of peace.

I have introduced two bills, H. R. 205 and H. R. 208, which would repeal the present high tax on transportation of property and of persons respectively, and I believe passage of these measures would bring needed relief to which our people are entitled.

Since introducing these measures, I have received an overwhelming response in approval which included adoption of a resolution by the California State Legislature in support of passage of my bills, H. R. 205 and H. R. 208. The resolution follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 14

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax

Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a 15-percent levy upon the transportation of persons and a 3-percent levy upon the transportation of property; and

Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel, the need for which no longer exists; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long-distance shipper and the long-distance traveler as does the present tax on the transportation of property and persons; and

Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of California as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from California to the eastern markets, with the result that those goods are not able to compete freely with the goods originating in more closely adjacent southern areas; and

Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of California, in particular, may compete freely with southern produce without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States H. R. 205, which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and H. R. 208, which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 205 and H. R. 208 or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Peter Marshall, Late Chaplain of the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on the occasion of a recent meeting of the Senate eulogies were expressed by different Members of the Senate concerning the life and work of the late Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, whose recent untimely death has been mourned by us all.

Because I was engaged in a committee meeting at the time when these eulogies were being expressed, opportunity was not given for me to voice my sentiments in regard to Dr. Marshall's noble character, integrity, and attractive personality.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement expressive of my innermost feelings in tribute to his memory.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REV. PETER MARSHALL

With other Members of the Senate and countless friends of our late Chaplain, I was profoundly shocked and grieved to receive the news of his untimely death.

The splendid influence for good which he exerted, the high ideals which were voiced by him in his invocations, and his noble example, all combined to stamp him first as a man of God and, secondly, as a man among men.

I am prompted to express myself because of a unique experience which I had with Dr. Marshall only very recently. Since the beginning of our session earlier this month, death has taken from our family one who was cherished and loved most tenderly. As soon as this event occurred, he brought comfort and consolation to other members of the family and to me by a very sympathetic message. Later, upon my return to the Senate, he made a special point to give personally a most heartening expression of condolence.

His words to me now appear to have been almost prophetic. Emphasizing the fact that life on earth is merely a temporary sojourn, he asserted that all are striving for the same goal, although our course may be along various denominational paths.

While little did he think that he himself was so near to death, his comments on the value of faith in a supernatural life could not help but leave a lasting impression. I can but repeat, in expressing hope for the happy repose of his soul, the very words which he used in commenting upon my bereavement, "May our Lord comfort and give peace."

Dr. Marshall's good works and noble endeavors will be the best monument to him which can be treasured by all who knew him. I express the sentiments of others with whom I have spoken concerning our late Chaplain in tribute to his memory by quoting the lines of the poet:

"Out of the strain of the doing,
Into the peace of the done;
Out of the thirst of pursuing,
Into the rapture of won;
Out of pale dusk into dawn;
Out of all wrong into rightness,
We from these fields shall be gone.
'Nay,' say the saints, 'not gone, but come
Into eternity's harvest home.'"

President Truman's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Truman's Day," published in the Sheboygan Press, of Sheboygan, Wis. The editorial was written by Charles E. Broughton, editor of the Sheboygan Press, and one of the outstanding Democrats in that section of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DAY

How well we can recall the Sheboygan Press editorial of 1933, when we termed Franklin D. Roosevelt a man of destiny.

What we said then is equally true of Harry S. Truman, born of humble parents, coming from a small town in Missouri, where he conducted a retail business, later was county judge, and rose by sheer force to other position of trust, and in 1934 was elected United States Senator from Missouri.

He had no ambitions to be other than a servant of the people and in 1940 was reelected, and it can be said that his record as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense brought additional honor.

Thursday was a new day in history. President Truman was elected Vice President along with President Roosevelt in 1944 and succeeded to the office of President on April 12, 1945, when the man he loved and with whom he had served passed away at the little White House at Warm Springs.

No public servant ever went through more tragic times than Mr. Roosevelt, no one ever gave more for his country than the man who was honored world-wide, as he passed from this life.

To assume the reins of office was a test for Mr. Truman. We were fighting a world war, and our house at Washington was divided, something like in the days of President Lincoln. The things that Mr. Roosevelt had fought for, and we might say died for, were being challenged by the opposition.

Then came the Eightieth Congress and an outright rebellion against the so-called New Deal. President Truman held stanchly to the gains that had been made, and he won the confidence of the American people. On Capitol Holl, and in Wall Street and the great financial centers, it was a foregone conclusion that Mr. Dewey would be elected. It was "in the bag," according to Dr. Gallup and others conducting polls, but the little fighting general had a different viewpoint. He took his cause to the people, and out of a strenuous campaign came victory. In December last he wrote over his signature these words:

"At this season of the year may I repeat what I have often said, that I would rather see lasting peace in the world than be President of the United States. Peace is a goal which can be reached with patience, tolerance, understanding — and work. As the brotherhood of man is the essence of Jeffersonian democracy, it is the essence also of religion, no matter what the creed. Let us all, individually and collectively, take up the task of working toward peace on earth, good will toward men."

Thursday, January 20, at high noon, Mr. Truman took the oath of office and his 4-year term is under way. On the same threshold of the Capitol Building that saw President Roosevelt and the preceding Presidents inaugurated, Mr. Truman took his second oath of office as President of the United States. It was a solemn ceremony. There was something out of the ordinary that drew more than a million people to Washington. It was Harry S. Truman, a fighter and a President in his own right. A veteran of World War I who saw service in the Meuse-Argonne—a man of the people who battled all the way, confident of victory. We never viewed a greater gathering of people, or a more beautiful day in which to carry television; the first inaugural in history to be televised to American homes throughout the land.

Through the ages, the United States of America has been most fortunate in its selection of Presidents. The spirit that dominated Washington, in the cause of freedom, has dominated every President in a war crisis. It was so with Lincoln, McKinley, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. It is our guaranty for a continued democracy, based on the equality of man, and the sacred regard for freedom. We like to quote these words from Mr. Truman's address, a man who as a farm boy rose to the highest position within the gift of the people:

"I accept with humility the honor which the American people have conferred upon me. I accept it with the deep resolve to do all that I can for the welfare of this Nation and the peace of the world."

Patronage Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patronage Jobs," published in the National Tribune-the Stars and Stripes, in its issue of January 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRONAGE JOBS

A new Congress, the Eighty-first, is now in session, and both branches are under the control of the Democratic Party. Although there has long been agitation to place all positions at the United States Capitol under the so-called merit system, and even though years spent in such service do count toward retirement privileges, most jobs on Capitol Hill are still filled by what was once known as the spoils system. "To the victor belong the spoils," is what politicians used to say, and most of them still believe in that principle.

Two years ago when the Republican Party took over—and this has happened as often as congressional control has changed hands—most Democratic job holders lost out. Now the Democrats have turned the tables, and their supporters will replace the political enemy. There are exceptions, of course, but that is the order of the day, and it has always been considered cricket.

What is little known by most people is that there are, in round numbers, about 1,000 of these jobs available and under the supervision of patronage committees. They run from well-paid clerical assignments to police officers, elevator operators, and what not. Many a legislator began his career at one of them, and many thousands of young men and women have completed college courses in Washington while working at the Capitol.

At one time doorkeepers were made up in part by veterans. There used to be a veterans' row of them, all veterans of the Civil War. Even now a fair proportion of the places are filled by veterans of our wars, but, although we would not presume to suggest that all such jobs be reserved for war veterans, we do not think they are receiving a fair shake.

It has been proposed, and with much merit, that legislation be enacted to give veterans' preference to a reasonable percentage of the spoils. In our judgment, they will never be found in any one political corner, and certainly their service to country in time of stress has earned for them greater consideration than they now receive. By the same token military or naval service should be considered in the matter of promotions. Here is something that we believe should have the best thought, not only of Congressmen who have the privilege of handing out patronage but also of the major veterans' organizations which hold to the belief that veterans' employment must ever be one of their principal activities.

Time To Stop, Look, Listen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE M. REED
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial entitled "Time To Stop, Look, Listen," from the Kansas City Star of Sunday, February 6, 1949, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is very timely and is chock full of common sense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

Sometimes, when we read all the clamor from Washington for more taxes, more spending, more Government functions, we wonder if they really know what is going on out over the country. Eventually, Washington and its myriads of experts will find out. Facts have a habit of catching up with theory. But often it is too late and genuine needless damage has been done.

If there ever was a time to look and think realistically, when sober judgment is needed, not just pious good intentions, that time is now. The country didn't begrudge President Truman his joyous, happy inaugural. He had it coming for his surprise victory and the almost single-handed battle he waged for reelection. But the tumult and shouting is over now and the painful "morning after" is at hand—much sooner than anyone anticipated.

Almost unnoticed, except by the people immediately hurt, there has been an acceleration in the drop of commodity prices that justifies genuine concern over the future months to come. The cost of living is coming down, for which housewives the country over probably will sing hosannas. Everyone, including the farmers themselves, recognized that food prices had got out of hand and were entirely too high the last 18 months. It was generally recognized a readjustment was coming and that it was a healthy, not a dangerous, omen. But most economists—and certainly Government leaders—hoped for an orderly adjustment, not a slide such as brought on the depression of the early twenties. What has happened in recent weeks has been a blizzard on farm commodity prices almost comparable to the blizzard that has locked the great West in ice and snow.

From the high spots of 1948, more than $10,000,000,000 has been taken off the value of livestock generally. More than half of this has come since the fateful November 2 election when many farmers thought they were voting for sustained high prices. To be fair about it, this drop probably would have happened just the same whether Dewey or Truman had been elected. But it has stunned cattle and hog raisers out West. The farmers aren't broke, but feeders have been badly hurt, and there is growing uneasiness and concern over the future, which is not healthy.

The Associated Press reported this week that its wholesale commodity index had dropped to the lowest point since February 11, 1947, with a decline of more than 3 percent in the last week and over 7 percent in the month of January. From the all-time high point, the index has dropped from 208 to approximately 170. All this has not been reflected yet to the consumer's table, but it is on the way. Specifically, on the Kansas City market, hogs reached a record high in August 1948 of $31.75. On election day, November 2, they were $25.50 a hundred—one of the reasons many farmers didn't vote or were afraid of Dewey. They felt there was a better chance of getting help from Truman than Dewey. The top price at the end of last week was around $20.50 a hundred, even below the OPA price.

Or take cattle. The record high was in July 1948 at $40.50 a hundred. On election day, the top for steers was $33.50. The very top this last week was $25, and there were days when good fed cattle brought only $22. When it is recalled that feeders often paid above $30 for their steers, the licking they have taken is apparent.

Lard has slipped worse than anything, although the Government is endeavoring to bolster the market by increased shipments abroad. From a record high in March 1947 of $32.75 a hundredweight, lard sold at $19 on election day, bobbed back up on the hope that the Democratic administration was going to do something, and then dropped back down to as low as $13.60 last week. Lambs haven't shown such a wide fluctuation. From a record high in July of last year of $33 and a price of $25.50 on election day, they are off only about $1 now from the election day figure.

The story on grains is a bit different because of Government supports. Wheat, which stood at $2.24 a bushel on election day held pretty well until the last week when it tumbled at least 10 cents a bushel. Corn took its big drop last year because of the huge crop. It was selling for $2.27 last July. By election day, it was down to $1.35, one reason Dewey lost the big corn States. It went up a bit after election, but this week broke below election day figures. The story is about the same on other commodities. Butter in Kansas City dropped from 92 to 67 cents. Eggs have dropped from a high of 51 to 39 cents. Butterfat has dropped from last year's high of 85 to 55 cents, but is up slightly from election day figures.

All this is the story, not of what is going to happen, but of what has happened in the Kansas City territory. The farmer is not broke, but the readjustment has been more violent than expected. Buying power, necessarily, will be affected. The tremendous Government expenditures for shipments abroad and rearmament should tend to put a floor under the decline. If it does, farm sections can weather it. If it doesn't, and the decline continues, it could vitally affect future national economic prospects. Much is heard of keeping the buying power of labor up to keep prosperity, but the buying power of the farmer is just as important in the economic picture.

With such a picture already at hand, it would seem obvious it is time for Washington to show caution, at least, in its thinking and acting. They still talk of inflation controls when, except possibly on rents and a few other spots, inflation is as dead as $3 corn or the dodo bird. Everyone, seeking more spending for this or that purpose and more taxes, is claiming a mandate from the people for his particular pet projects. The facts are, if there was any mandate in the close election, it was that a majority of those casting votes trusted Truman for the future more than they did Dewey.

Both parties promised prosperity. No one wants a debacle. Much of the program being pressed upon Congress might be all right in a period of a rising, expanding economy. But the sharp readjustment, to put it mildly, that has already come in farm commodities should be signal enough, both to the administration and to Congress, to slow up a bit in their thinking, and more important, in their spending on new programs that will increase the governmental load year by year for all time.

If the picture of the country as a whole is looked at realistically, it is a time for tax cutting, not tax increases. It is a time when wage-raise sprees can't be justified, desirable as they might be. All the billions we are spending for defense and building up our armament will be wasted if the Nation's economy is not kept sound. That is the foundation on which the future has to be built.

Americans Have Suffered the Tortures Inflicted on Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that Cardinal Mindszenty, whose tragic fate at the hands of the dictatorial Communist Government of Hungary is shocking the whole world of free men, is not an isolated case, and that similar sufferings and torture have been inflicted upon and have been endured by American citizens, was revealed last year by the manner in which the same authorities in Hungary extorted false confessions from two American citizens, Mr. Paul Ruedemann and Mr. George Bannantine, officials of the Hungarian subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

On October 7, 1948, the Department of State issued a press release in which it was asserted on behalf of the Department that Mr. Ruedemann and Mr. Bannantine had solemnly affirmed that the alleged confessions were wholly false and had been extorted from them under duress.

These two Americans were arrested in the dead of night, thrown into dungeons, subjected to torture for 5 days until their physical being could no longer withstand the treatment to which they were subjected, and, having been "broken" by this treatment, they signed confessions only as a means of escape. Returning to the United States, both men repudiated the confessions.

Their experience is so similar to that which Cardinal Mindszenty has been obliged to suffer that I believe a way should be found to reveal the full story of their sufferings to the people of the United States and the world. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the press release of the Department of State issued on October 7 last.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
October 7, 1948.

Mr. Paul Ruedemann and Mr. George Bannantine, American officials of MAORT whose release from custody by the Hungarian authorities was the subject of the Department's press release No. 782 of September 27, 1948, have now returned to this country, and supplementary information, which they have already made known to the press, is avail-

able concerning the circumstances of their recent detention.

With regard to the so-called confessions which have been attributed to them by the Hungarian authorities, Mr. Ruedemann and Mr. Bannantine have affirmed that these statements were, in fact, prepared by the Hungarian police, that the contents of the documents are wholly false, and that they copied and signed these confessions only under duress. The two men were placed separately in solitary confinement in underground cells for the first 4 days and were subjected to long periods of questioning at all hours of the day and night. On various occasions they were required to stand with their faces against the wall and arms upraised until they collapsed. During this time, they were permitted very little food and sleep.

The arbitrary detention of these American citizens, the unfounded allegations made against them, and the improper treatment which they received while in custody, are characteristic of the methods employed by police states, where the rights and dignity of the individual are, in practice, ignored.

Atomic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles, one entitled "How Many Bombs?" from the Washington Post of February 2; one entitled "A Question Properly Raised," from the Washington Star of February 6; and a third entitled "Kiss of Death," from the Washington Post of February 10.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 2, 1949]

HOW MANY BOMBS?

Senator McMAHON has come courageously to grips with the most vexatious problem of public policy respecting atomic energy. Should the American people be told, he asks, how large a stock pile of atomic bombs we have and how fast we are producing them? Although he did not reach a definite conclusion in his speech Monday before the Economic Club of Detroit, the public is indebted to him for an intelligent and piercing discussion of the issues.

The burden of Senator McMAHON's argument is on the side of frankness. He acknowledges that any disclosure to the American people also would inform the world, including our potential enemies, of our atomic strength. But this would cut two ways. If our supply and production rate of bombs are great, these data would be a convincing testimonial to our power. By the same token they would reassure the American people, many of whom, mystified by the secrecy, are wondering whether we have got any bombs at all. Finally, such data would lend weight to the proposals for international control of atomic energy that no amount of talk or demonstrations could give.

If, on the other hand, the stock pile is small, then that is a fact of immense importance to our own military preparations. It is possible, for example, that because of the cloak of secrecy we are overestimating our own strength. We are, as Senator McMAHON says, "like a general who must train his troops without knowing how many rounds of ammunition they will be issued." It is scarcely possible for Congress to legislate intelligently on other aspects of defense without knowing whether the weapon on which we are placing much of our reliance is actually what it is cracked up to be. And no citizen is in a position to appraise the budget without knowledge of the number of atom bombs we have.

What has been building up since Hiroshima is a secrecy psychosis on atomic energy encompassing many matters not justifiably secret. The unfortunate effect of this psychosis is to make many persons, including legislators, wash their hands of atomic energy as something remote and forbidding. It will also encourage those who think the bomb should be banned like poison gas. Secrecy is a severe deterrent to sensible inquiry and review of our performance on atomic energy. As the new chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Senator McMAHON could help reverse this trend by reinstituting the policy of open hearings that prevailed during the evolution of the McMahon Act. With a revised policy on atomic secrecy, there should be no need for hearings in camera except in a very limited area. A fundamental consideration for the commitee and Congress to remember is that the broader the range of secrecy invoked, the greater is the danger of a backfire.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star of February 6, 1949]

A QUESTION PROPERLY RAISED

Under the law the Atomic Energy Commission is made responsible for policies restricting information which, if divulged, might impair the national interest. Information regarding the number of atomic bombs that have been manufactured and the rate of production is restricted. It is a closely guarded secret. But the Commission could of its own volition choose to declassify such information and make it publicly available.

No such proposal has been made by Chairman Lilienthal or the Commission. But Mr. Lilienthal and Senator BRIEN McMAHON, chairman of the Joint Congressional Atomic Committee, have raised a sort of rhetorical question as to whether the policy of secrecy in such fields is either bad for our potential enemies or good for us. They have not attempted to give the answer. But they are not convinced that secrecy is the answer, insofar as long-time public policy is involved.

There is much to support this doubt. But it seems to the Star that the only way to get anything like a convincing answer is to submit the question, with all its broad implications on domestic as well as foreign policy, to authorities in science and government, and find out what such considered opinion might be. Something of a start in this process has already been made by Senator McMAHON in asking the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is not the sort of question that anyone should attempt to answer by off-the-cuff opinion.

It is to be doubted that Chairman Lilienthal or the Atomic Energy Commission would ever undertake the responsibility of an independent decision. The arguments in favor of secrecy might easily outweigh those to the contrary. But Mr. Lilienthal is absolutely right in continuing to stress the disadvantages of secrecy in a democracy which, as Senator McMAHON has put it, leaves Congress legislating in a vacuum on matters concerning atomic energy and even on matters relating to adequate national defense. In the purely scientific field of atomic energy development there is continuing disadvantage in a secrecy which forbids the free interchange of ideas and the resulting stimulation of thought.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 10, 1949]

KISS OF DEATH

If disclosure of the number of atomic bombs in this country is a good idea, it is worthy of consideration irrespective of what the Russians say about it. The administration and Congress ought to keep this in mind as they review the latest Soviet demands before the Security Council. For the Russians apparently have seized upon Senator McMAHON's suggestion of last week as a part of their new and transparent resolution on disarmament. This resolution, calling for destruction of atomic weapons without effective international control of atomic energy, was succinctly described by United States Delegate Austin as "succotash."

Certainly the Russians would like to know how many atomic bombs this country has. The figures might be of some help to them in planning their own military structure. But this is a minor, incidental, and totally irrelevant factor in the equation. Secrecy puts American defense at a disadvantage. Even if a few Pentagon planners know the facts, they are not known to Congress, which controls the purse strings. Congress, it seems to us, must have this information in order to appraise military expenditures and provide for a realistic defense. Anything else means voting in the dark. To be sure, information to Congress would become public property. What of that? The effect of the release would be to reassure Americans and friendly nations as well as to serve notice on the Russians that this country has the wherewithal of action. Nothing in history has been more responsible for wars than uncertainty—uncertainty of what the other fellow will do and what he has. The A bomb is a matter on which the fullest possible information is basic not only to sound public policy but also to the whole concept of strategy.

Unfortunately, there has been a sort of pressure on legislators and the administration to demonstrate their anticommunism by lining up against anything the Russians favor. This was noticeable during the political campaign when some legislators were confronted with the number of times they had voted on the same side as Representative VITO MARCANTONIO. Are we going to let the Russians make us intellectual eunuchs? It would be ridiculous to allow such irrational and timorous considerations to govern atomic data. Whether information about the production of atomic bombs should be released is a question to be decided strictly on the basis of how it will affect national security. The fullest security calls for the release of all nontechnical information. Indeed, one might surmise that the Russians hope, by the devious methods of Soviet dialectics, that in calling for the disclosure of such facts they will induce this country to keep them secret and thereby impair its own real defense.

The National Health Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the

national health problem, from the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAPPLEYE DEFENDS PREPAID MEDICINE—COLUMBIA DEAN CLASSES IT WITH OTHER SOCIAL-SECURITY NEEDS, BUT LAGGING BEHIND THEM

The development of adequate programs for comprehensive prepayment medical care has been slow and largely unsupported by the organized medical profession, whose policies are determined by persons primarily concerned with retaining the status quo, Dr. Willard C. Rappleye, dean of Columbia University's Faculty of Medicine, declared in his annual report, made public yesterday.

"Because of present-day economic problems, it is impossible for many families to pay for unpredictable and uncertain illnesses," Dr. Rappleye pointed out. "The principle of prepayment insurance is now well established. This principle must be applied to medical services, as it has been to hospital care, unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and various other phases of social security. While many elements of group practice are now emphasized in most medical schools, the young physician upon graduation still finds little or no chance to practice medicine in the cooperating manner he has been taught. For most graduates the only opportunity lies in individual, competitive practice."

NEED FOR INTEGRATION

The dean emphasized that one of the major problems of over-all medical care today was to achieve closer integration between methods of practice in a community and the objectives of medical education. "Medical students," he added, "are being trained today for community medical services, with emphasis upon preventive medicine and comprehensive medical care for the entire family."

"It is generally believed," he said, "that modern medical services cannot be fully provided by the individual physician working alone, since no individual can possibly master all fields of medical care. Specialization and cooperative responsibility for the care of the individual is frequently required.

"Hence, the growing emphasis upon group practice as the modern and most satisfactory method of medical care. This, however, does not shift the major responsibility from the family and the personal physician. In fact, the basic element of any group practice must be the family and the personal physician working in collaboration with specialists."

The failure of the Eightieth Congress to establish the National Science Foundation was "a great disappointment," the dean said, expressing the belief that "there is need for a central coordination of basic policies in relation to governmental support of research."

BASIC RESEARCH STRESSED

"While grants for specific purposes, whether from Government, foundations, industry, individuals, or other sources, have much merit, it is absolutely essential to the future of the country, as far as research and the training of scientific personnel is concerned, that money be made available for the general support of the universities, where future generations of professional workers are trained," he continued. "Today universities are the major source for supplying men for the basic research so necessary for future progress.

"With the increasing cost of medical education and the need for advanced training in a wider range of related activities, proper financial support of medical schools is an investment to insure their fullest contribution to public service in the future."

On the problem of obtaining medical officers for the armed services, the dean emphasized the importance of not letting induction of medical officers interfere with the proper training of the physician.

"Young men," he said, "should be permitted to complete their hospital training before they are called into the service. In this way the Army, Navy, and Air Force would have better medical officers than were the men to be drafted at the end of their internship. If men were taken at the point of completion of hospital training, the supply of properly qualified medical officers could still be maintained."

Dean Rappleye added that "the inducements of the military services can be made much more attractive through better professional opportunities and the development of sound plans for progressive advancement of medical personnel."

TVA After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times entitled "TVA After 15 Years."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA AFTER 15 YEARS

In a little over 15 years the Tennessee Valley program has grown from a dream to a great achievement. Under TVA the valley now produces 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity, as contrasted with about one-tenth of that amount in 1933; per capita income in the valley has risen from 40 percent to 60 percent of the national average; the people of the valley now pay 6.3 percent of the individual income taxes of the Nation, as contrasted with 3.4 percent in 1933; the Tennessee River has been made navigable to Knoxville; improved fertilizers and farming practices have helped to save the wasting land; new industries, big and little, have come in; the initiative of the people has had a chance to show itself. These are some of the gains of which TVA has a right to boast in its fifteenth annual report, made public on the last day of the old year.

There may never be unanimous agreement as to the financial aspects of TVA's operations. The Authority pays sums in lieu of taxes, but it does not carry all the burdens of a private corporation. On the other hand, it is now earning a net return of 4¼ percent on the average net power investment of $405,000,000. It is doing this by selling power at reasonable wholesale rates. The great savings to private consumers are found in the low rates made available by municipalities and cooperatives using TVA power. Yet these distributing agencies have a combined net income of 20 cents on each dollar of revenue. If we assume that the Tennessee River had to be developed as a unit, and that no private agency could or should have done this, we must admit that a great and necessary task has been accomplished, efficiently, honestly, and without deliberate or careless waste.

TVA had a heavy load to carry during the Second World War, and it carried that load superbly. We now know that when its facilities seemed insufficient during the final war years this was because a huge block of power was being diverted into the secret atomic project of Oak Ridge. This one service alone, made possible by the record-breaking construction of new dams, would have justified TVA. Now we face the problems of other possible river authorities, and they are not simple. What TVA has done is to show that they can be solved in a democratic way, with few or none of the evils of a centralized bureaucracy.

President Truman's Interest in the Development of Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, for a long time I have advocated that western Europe turn to the development of the great continent of Africa as an outlet for their surplus energies. I am not speaking of exploitation; I am referring to development for the benefit of all. If I had my way, every cent of our Marshall plan money would go to Africa, where it would be used to produce the foods and fabrics western Europe must have. I repeat, I am not advocating the exploitation of Africa, I am urging that this great continent be brought into its proper perspective as the key to a rounded-out economy for the world.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the pen of Lt. Earl W. Mann, a World War I hero, a former Colorado legislator and a regular contributor to a popular Colorado colored paper, the Colorado Statesman.

This Republican statesman says, "Keep your eyes on Truman." The article is well worth reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP YOUR EYES ON TRUMAN

(By Lt. Earl W. Mann)

The adjustment of relations between peoples of this and other hemispheres is going to be a most interesting problem. This column urges those interested in affairs directed toward this end to follow President Truman's program and our congressional activities.

A recent news release relating to our administration's interest in the possible development of Africa was interesting, and augurs a new and intelligent approach toward processing of human affairs. "Explore but not exploit Africa" appears to have been given deep consideration. Venture capital might well give serious thought to this, as this vast continent contains natural resources beyond man's comprehension and appraisal—only awaiting development and proper plumbing by American skill and ingenuity, if and when those capable of such can divest themselves of Negroitis, or racial jitters.

The cold war now being conducted between the so-called democracies and the Russian bear, in an endeavor to rehabilitate Germany, as each sees it, is proving costly, as an experiment, in American dollars and cents, the American taxpayer realizing that the cost of policing war-torn nations, in-

cluding billions in dollars and gifts, in an endeavor to restore economics and culture, might not prove as valuable, measured in terms of reciprocity, as might be the development of new territories.

Our board of national directors is coming around to the sane conclusion that the true course of human history is determined not by what happens in the skies but by what takes place in the hearts of men.

It has been suggested that the United Nations be replaced by a world government, with every human being a citizen. To make this possible, the great powers must remove imperialism from the photograph. The United States must lead the people of the world in the bold experiment. How ironical that at this moment of unparalleled international unrest we find a President, representing the Democratic Party, being looked to to effectuate a fuller emancipation of humanity, as set forth in the great immortal Abe Lincoln's second Gettysburg Address. The arena of social unrest now being occupied by the bellicose South, as well as communistic Russia.

A BLENDING OF CULTURES

Will Durant is quoted as having said: "The greatest problem of Western civilization is that it is breeding from the bottom and dying from the top." What an electrifying effect and influence to a high degree would be the bringing about of a fellowship between the peoples of the African Continent, and the peoples of America. It would mean the erasure of the days of the slave traffic, when Americans developed the Southland through the toil of the helpless black. It would be an admission that black and white can meet on equal grounds, and upon equal terms. I trust this will go beyond the discussion stage.

The social problem of the future I consider to be, how to write the greatest individual liberty action with a common interest in the natural resources of the world, and an equity of all in the benefits of our combined labors and ingenuity.

By what form of institutions these objectives can most effectively be attained is debatable. Personally I have faith in our great prescription as applied to the affairs of a world government—the Constitution of the United States.

To render the economic and social transformation we seek, either possible or desirable, an equivalent change of character must take place both in the uncultivated herd, who strangely comprise the majority, and those of the so-called upper crust, referred to as the cultural.

There are those who will frown upon any movement designed to upgrade the Negro, and other non-Caucasian peoples. I submit that interest in the ultimate good is at present so weak a motive in the generality, not because it cannot be brought into being, but because the mind is not accustomed to dwell on it as it dwells from morning to night on things which tend only to intimate and personal advantages. The deep-rooted selfishness which forms the general character of the existing state of society is so deeply rooted only because the whole course of existing institutions tends to foster it.

One million mulattoes, the offspring of the iniquitous slave traffic has brought no harm to America or its institutions, other than a mental attitude of those unequipped to accept progressive changes. That such an experiment would doom the great white race to obliteration, cannot be sustained. Has not peaceful commercial intercourse proven advantageous to the colonial powers? The choice between Russia and communism, versus Africa and her possibilities of contribution to civilization should cause no belated choice. May God direct and guide our President.

The Sorge Spy Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I herewith present for printing in the RECORD a case study in international espionage in the Far East, which is prepared for release by the National Military Establishment. I think this report should be of vital interest to all of the Members at this time, and is well worthy of being read by all Americans who are interested in the way that free government operates.

The report follows:

THE SORGE SPY RING—A CASE STUDY IN INTERNATIONAL ESPIONAGE IN THE FAR EAST

1. THE CHINA PHASE

(a) Introduction: A powerful ring of Soviet spies was uncovered in Japan just before Pearl Harbor. Probably never in history has there been a ring more bold or more successful. Although most of the principals are dead, some are still at large. They can be expected to be secretly busy with their trade at this very moment in the capitals of the world.

The famous Canadian spy case during the recent war is the best-known current example of Soviet espionage. Compared to the Sorge case in Tokyo, however, the Canadian affair was an amateur show. Yet many of the principles of Soviet espionage first publicized in the reports from Ottawa are corroborated by the information at last available on the Sorge ring in Tokyo.

Though the work of Dr. Richard Sorge and his companions belongs to history the lessons of their work should serve as a clear warning for today and the future. They concern not just the intelligence officer but every good citizen. Some of their implications are frightening. One begins to wonder whom one can trust, what innocent comrade or loyal friend may suddenly be discovered as the enemy. He may have any face.

For nine productive years a daring and skillful band of spies worked in Japan for their spiritual fatherland—Soviet Russia. Despite their vigorous activity and enormous successes they went unsuspected and so undetected. Led by Dr. Richard Sorge, a German Communist posing convincingly as a loyal Nazi, this ring of spies almost succeeded in committing the perfect crime. Their discovery came through malicious accident and through no error of their own.

While the personnel of his ring varied from the time of Sorge's activities in China till he was operating in Japan, a surprising number of men whom he had recruited originally for work in China became the core of his ring in Japan. Dr. Sorge, the head of the ring, and Ozaki Hozumi, his chief lieutenant, worked as spies for the Soviet Union in both China and Japan from 1929 to 1941. With the shift of major Soviet concern to Japan after the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, Dr. Sorge was ordered to cease his Shanghai operations, to go to Tokyo and to set up a completely new network. Starting from nothing in a country which he never before had even visited Dr. Sorge was able to develop the most complete and successful espionage operation in Japanese history.

Sorge lived on intimate, trusted terms with the German Ambassador and his staff; Ozaki Hozumi, his lieutenant, had a similar close relationship to Prince Konoe, thrice premier. From these perfect sources they drew their masses of information on every subject from politics to war and transmitted their intelligence to the U. S. S. R. by concealed radio, by courier and through the Soviet Embassy. Their primary intelligence targets were Japanese plans and intentions for attack on the Soviet Union. After June 1941 this question became overpowering. As the German armies raced into western Russia, as great Soviet military formations were smashed and destroyed, reinforcement from the Siberian garrisons became vital. But the Red army could not weaken their Siberian defenses if the Japanese Army soon would attack. Sorge was able to assure them there would be no attack: the Siberian divisions were entrained for the west and appeared on the western front for the successful defense of Moscow.

Sorge transmitted an enormous number of carefully analyzed intelligence reports from Tokyo to the Red army's fourth bureau over the years of his work. The nature of his reports and the method of their transmission will be discussed later in detail. Briefly, Sorge was able to keep the Soviet Union fully informed on Japanese military and industrial capabilities and intentions from 1933 to 1941. The Red army always knew the status of current Japanese war plans, and could make their own plans and dispositions accordingly.

The members of the Sorge ring were arrested in October 1941, but not before they had completed their primary mission. Two of the most prominent leaders died in prison and lesser figures got long prison terms. On the morning of November 7, 1944, Dr. Richard Sorge, German, and Ozaki Hozumi, Japanese, were hanged for their great services to the Soviet Union. If Stalin has not posthumously granted them the most distinguished decoration of his country he is niggardly indeed.

It is astonishing that despite their deep suspicion of foreigners, their alertness to the remotest suspicion of espionage or Communist sympathies, despite the insularity of their country forcing couriers to enter or leave only well guarded ports, neither the Japanese civil police, the gendarmerie (Kempeitai), the special higher police (Tokkoka) nor any other Japanese security agency ever had the remotest suspicion of Sorge or any one of his gang of 16 men and women. They were betrayed by a prominent Japanese Communist, Ito Ritsu, now member of the party's central committee. He had a grudge against a minor member of the ring, never suspecting how loyally and dangerously she was working for the cause. It is ironical that this Judas is a trusted leader of the Japan Communist Party in postwar Japan.

The Sorge case concerns the individuals who composed the ring as much as what they discovered and how they operated. Because it is as important to understand the minds and motivations of such spies and traitors, a considerable portion of this account will be devoted to descriptions of people. The questions of what and how cannot well be separated from the question of who.

(b) Richard Sorge, head of ring: Richard Sorge, brilliant leader of this ring of spies, was born in Baku, in southern Russia, October 4, 1895. He remained alive for 49 years. His father was a German engineer working for a German oil firm in the Caucasus and his mother is said to have been Russian. While Richard was still an infant his parents went to Berlin where the boy had a normal German education and grew up a patriotic son of Imperial Germany. He seems to have been impressed quite young, however, with the memory of his parental grandfather, Adolf Sorge, secretary of Karl Marx at the time of the formation of the First International.

Like many other patriotic students, at the beginning of World War I, Richard Sorge volunteered as a private, was wounded on the western front, and after long hospitalization was discharged. In 1916 he reenlisted and was wounded a second time, this time on the eastern front. During his periods of convalescence and after the war he studied at the Universities of Berlin, Kiel, and Hamburg, taking the degree of doctor of political science at Hamburg in 1920. For the next 2 years he worked variously as a school teacher and a coal miner and then in 1922 began to write for newspapers and magazines. Nominally, this remained his occupation till the Tokkoka arrested him in October 1941. But even when he was teaching or digging coal he was doing his best to convert his pupils and his fellow miners to the tenets of Karl Marx.

During the war, while he was hospitalized, influenced in part by memories of his grandfather and in part by the then current Russian Revolution, Richard Sorge had begun the systematic study of Marxian literature and had converted himself. Immediately upon the formation of the German Communist Party in October 1919, Sorge joined the Hamburg branch. One may recall both that many German soldiers who had served on the eastern front returned to their defeated country converts to the Communist cause and that Hamburg was a major center of German Communist activity. Possibly Sorge's maternal ancestry also slanted his thinking towards Russia. In later years he had a fluent command of Russian, and it is likely that he first learned the language from his mother. He was a natural linguist in any case, and by the time he had become established in Japan he could converse easily in French, English, Russian, Japanese, and possibly Chinese.

Physically Sorge was a big man, tall and stocky, with brown hair. His brow was creased and furrowed and his face was lined. As a Japanese acquaintance remarked, from a glance at his face you could tell he had lived a rough, hard life. There was an arrogance and cruelty to the set of his eyes and the line of his mouth. He was proud and overbearing, well-liked and deeply admired by those whose friendship he desired, but ruthless toward others and frankly detested by them. Many of his Japanese press colleagues saw him as the typically swashbuckling, arrogant Nazi and avoided him. He was quick-tempered, a hard drinker, and liked variety in his women. In addition to having a wife in Russia and another, a school teacher in the United States, he is known to have been intimate with some 30 women in Tokyo during his years of service, including the wife of his chief foreign assistant and the mistress of this same assistant. And yet despite his philandering, his bad temper, and his bouts of drunkenness he never betrayed himself. For example, though he lived on the most intimate terms with the members of the German Embassy staff, and drank heavily with them over a considerable period of years, none of them ever suspected that he knew a word of Russian.

Sorge began his professional Communist career in 1924. By that time he had made such an excellent reputation among German Communists and was so respected by Soviet leaders that he was summoned to Moscow. He resigned from the German Communist Party, joined the Russian and became an agent of the Comintern, at that time a body with considerable force in world Communist affairs.

Among Sorge's sponsors to the Russian Communist Party and the Comintern were Dimitry Zaharovich Manuilsky, still member of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, and Soloman A. Lovosky, currently Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs under Molotov, and also a member of the Central Committee. Naturally, even after he joined Red Army Intelligence his Comintern friends maintained their personal interest in him. It is reasonable to assume that Stalin too knew of Sorge's operations, since they were so valuable and completely unique. After the Japanese arrested Sorge, he is reported to have boasted that Stalin was personally acquainted with his work and that if a Soviet-Japanese accord were yet to be made, Stalin would effectuate his release.

For 3 years Sorge was busy for the Comintern at their Moscow headquarters, presumably learning the business, but in 1927 he went abroad to begin his hazardous career of field agent. Using the cover of an obscure German magazine, he spent 2 years in the Scandinavian countries and Great Britain as a special representative of the intelligence and organization bureau of the Comintern. His job was to collaborate with the local Communist parties in the collection, evaluation, and transmission of information on labor problems and Communist activity. In part his job seems to have been to give advice and encouragement to local Communist organizations.

These were the early days of Soviet intelligence activity, and the Russians were giving their intelligence agents the dual mission of espionage and party activity. Sorge became convinced of the error of this practice, and upon his return to Moscow in 1929 made strong representations that it be ended. He pointed out that where Comintern and Soviet intelligence agents were associated with local Communist Party officials, if the latter should be arrested the Comintern agent would be pulled in, too, and the whole intelligence net would be broken. He urged that intelligence and party activity be divorced completely, and that intelligence agents abroad be instructed to have nothing to do with the local Communist parties.

Perhaps his superiors in the Comintern were not sympathetic to these suggestions. Red Army intelligence was, however, Sorge requested relief from duty with the Comintern and transfer to Red Army intelligence, and the request was granted. For the remainder of his dangerous life he was attached to the Fourth Bureau of the Red Army General Staff, the supreme intelligence agency of the Soviet Army.

The change in the roles and relationships of the Comintern and the Soviet Government over the years has often puzzled outsiders. An understanding of them is of great importance to an understanding of current Soviet espionage methods. The alleged suppression of the Comintern in 1943, supposedly to win American friendship and supplies at a critical period during the war, is better understood in the light of Sorge's testimony. In the dreary years after his arrest Sorge came to talk freely and frankly both of his activities and the principles of Soviet coduct. The case had been broken. Others had betrayed every secret, and Sorge seems to have found relief from his melancholy life in a Sugamo cell by talking lengthily with his captors.

(c) Dominance of Russian Communist Party over Comintern: Sorge's testimony as to the identity of the Russian Communist Party with all other national Communist Parties is a useful refutation of the claims of the innocents who persist in viewing such organs as the American Communist Party or the Japanese Communist Party as separate entities. Among other things, Sorge said:

"The Russian Communist Party has become more influential than the guidance section of Comintern. Today the actual spearhead of the Communist Party labor movement is the Communist Party in Russia. Formerly the guidance section of the Comintern was independent in every respect. It consulted the leaders of the Russian Communist Party only occasionally on special problems. Later those consultations became more frequent until today (1942) it is no longer possible for the leaders of the Comintern to act independently of the Russian Communist Party * * * as they once did under the leadership of Zinoviev. Unity between the guidance section of the Comintern and the Russian Communist Party was achieved when the superiority of the Russian Communist Party was recognized.

"* * * But of course this extraordinary position of the Russian Communist Party is not a permanent one. If Communist parties gain power in other countries the center of gravity will again shift from the Soviet Union to the Comintern. The preeminence of the * * * Russian Communist Party is temporary. Nevertheless, for the past 10 years today (1942) and for the next decade its preeminence cannot be questioned.

"* * * The shifting of the * * * leadership of the revolutionary labor movement from the * * * Comintern to the Russian Communist Party can be traced in my own career. All of my activity at first was connected with the Comintern. Later I came to work directly under the Soviet Union. This change did not mean that * * * (the) members of my group had alienated ourselves from the Communist movement as a whole. It meant only that we had transferred our activity from an international movement to * * * the development of the Soviet Union. This activity has worked for the economic and political stability * * * and the defense of the Soviet Union from * * * outside attack.

"* * * It must be remembered that my intelligence work in China and Japan was entirely new and original. * * * This is particularly true about Japan, because I was the first man and the only man ever able to carry out this kind of an assignment successfully for such a long period of time. All of my orders and instructions came from the Fourth Bureau of the Red Army. The Comintern gave me no orders."

Somewhere along the line Sorge developed a profound interest in the Far East. Although he had not previously studied or been trained in Asiatic affairs he became convinced that China and Japan should become the area of his specialization. Soon after his return from northern Europe, and his transfer to the Red Army's Fourth Bureau, Sorge was directed to go to Shanghai to help in developing and then to direct a China intelligence net. The expulsion of Borodin and Galen, with their followers, and the arrest, imprisonment, and execution of numerous Communists, both Russian and Chinese, throughout China during the previous year must have badly shaken the Comintern's net as well as that of the Red Army. Sorge's recommendations that the Soviet intelligence agent should have nothing to do with a local Communist Party group must have had a particular appeal to the directors of Red Army intelligence just at this time because of the disaster which had overtaken their agents who had been identified with the Communist wing of the Chinese Nationalist Party. Sorge proceeded to China strictly ordered not to associate with the Chinese Communist Party and not to engage in any Communist activity of his own. His primary mission was to secure intelligence on Japanese activity, intentions, order of battle, and operations in China. His secondary mission concerned strictly Chinese affairs.

(d) Sorge in Shanghai: Sorge went to Shanghai in January 1930, with the cover of correspondent from the German Soziologische Magazine. Shanghai was a free and easy place, all sorts of odd characters were drifting around and seemingly it wasn't

thought essential to have a substantial cover to operate there successfully.

Three agents of the Fourth Bureau went to China together: "Alex" (not otherwise identified), Dr. Richard Sorge, and a certain Weingart, a German wireless operator. After about 6 months Alex, the chief of the mission, left, presumably to return to Russia, and Sorge became head of the ring, whose headquarters were at Shanghai but which covered most of China, being especially active in Hangchow and Nanking, Canton, Hankow, Kaifeng, Hsian, Peiping, and in Manchuria. Sorge himself traveled extensively, read widely and deeply on Chinese and Japanese politics, history, and culture, studied the two languages and came to be unusually well-informed on Asiatic affairs. He was a formidable agent.

Sorge recruited and developed a ring of spies in China. We know the names of 16 of them, but probably there were more. Three principles which guided them are noteworthy: (1) While the group was highly cosmopolitan there seems not to have been a Russian among them. (2) While every member of the group was either a Communist Party member or strong sympathizer, they avoided association with the Chinese Communist Party. (3) They did not function as a group, and few of the members knew who the others were, or even were aware of their precise mission or who they were working for. They knew they were working for the cause, but not the chain of command.

Some members of the ring are identified today only by their first names or by cover names, such as "John," "Paul," and "Jacob." We know that Jacob was an American journalist, but no more. The four Chinese members we know only by the common Chinese surnames of Chang, Wong, and Li. The five Japanese; one German, named Max Klausen; and an American woman we know well.

(e) Agnes Smedley, American-Soviet spy: This American, Miss Agnes Smedley, has been one of the most energetic workers for the Soviet cause in China for the past twenty-odd years. She was one of the early perpetrators, if not the originator, of the hoax that the Chinese Communists were not really Communist at all but only local agrarian revolutionists, innocent of any Soviet connections. This tall tale has had enormous effect in molding American opinion in China, both private and official, and has bemused American writers for 20 years. Miss Smedley in her five books and innumerable articles, other Communist writers, and numerous liberal innocents have continued to spread this story till today high American Government officials find it difficult to believe any other. It should be noted also that Miss Smedley's writings are used as source material by most writers and commentators on China, many of whom think she might possibly be a Communist sympathizer but nonetheless feel that she is one of the few writers on China who has plumbed the depths of truth, because for so long she has lived with and thrown in her lot with the suffering Chinese. The harm has been done, but perhaps it could be mitigated if she is now exposed for what she is, a spy and agent of the Soviet Government.

Miss Smedley worked closely with Dr. Sorge as a member of his ring from late 1930 until he left China. Presumably in the past she had been a Comintern agent, and we do not know whether she had transferred to Red Army intelligence, as had Sorge, or whether by some special arrangement she continued with the Comintern and yet worked with Sorge. In the light of Sorge's strong stand on the necessity for separation of Soviet intelligence and Comintern-Communist intelligence, however, it is likely that Miss Smedley, too, had been transferred.

The climax and greatest achievement of Sorge's career was his work in Japan, but several of his Tokyo associates first joined Sorge in Shanghai, and they deserve careful description. Without at least Ozaki Hozumi and Max Klausen, Sorge could never have made his smashing success in Japan. He met and developed these men in Shanghai.

Sorge's most valuable single associate in Japan was to be Ozaki Hozumi, a well-known journalist and commentator on Chinese affairs. Years later Ozaki was to have the distinction of preceding Sorge in death by half an hour, the only other member of the ring to share the gallows with him.

(f) Ozaki Hozumi, Sorge's major assistant: Ozaki Hozumi, second son of a journalist from Gifu Prefecture, was born on May 1, 1901. His father moved the family to Formosa to become editor of the Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shimbun, and it was in Taihoku that Hozumi grew up and finished middle school. He later attended and was graduated from the Tokyo first high school (college) and the law school of Tokyo Imperial University, taking his degree in 1925. Any graduate of "Ichi-Ko" and "Teidai" could know that his classmates would become leaders of Japan's business, professional, and governmental world. The men of the class of 1925 at Teidai, while not yet at the top by 1940, would be holding positions of great responsibility throughout Japan, especially in the bureaus and ministries of the Imperial Government. Any young man with the brilliance of Ozaki Hozumi was bound to make and keep many close friends who would know almost everything there was to know and who would be glad to share their knowledge with their trusted confidant. If such a man turned traitor his country's secrets would flow in a steady stream to the enemy. Ozaki was that traitor.

Following his graduation from Tokyo Imperial, Ozaki spent a year of postgraduate reading, chiefly in economics and sociology. Then, following in his father's journalistic footsteps, in May 1926, he joined the staff of the Tokyo Oshai Shimbun. He was transferred to the Osaka Asahi in November 1927, and was sent to Shanghai as a special correspondent of this great paper in 1928. He remained in China for 3 years, during which time he met and worked for Sorge, returning to Osaka in 1932. In the autumn of 1934 he was transferred again to Tokyo, where he joined an Asahi staff research group devoted to a study of Oriental affairs, the East Asia Problems Investigation Society (Toa Mondai Chosa Kai). He came to be known as one of Japan's leading experts on China affairs and wrote widely on this subject in a variety of magazines. He often appeared in English in Contemporary Japan, and was admired for his contributions to the Institute of Pacific Relations, especially after he had attended the Yosemite conference of that body in 1936 as one of the Japanese delegates.

In July 1938 Ozaki resigned from the Asahi to become unofficial adviser to the Cabinet (Naikaku Shokutaku) under Prince Konoe. With the fall of the first Konoe Cabinet, in January 1939, Ozaki resigned this post, but in June he became unofficial adviser (Shokutaku) of the Tokyo office of the South Manchuria Railway, with which he remained until his arrest in 1941. Being an empire more than a railroad, the SMR conducted extensive research on all things Manchurian, and on all such Russian and Chinese matters as affected Manchuria. Ozaki's SMR assignment was invaluable to a man who had a particular need to learn of Japan's plans and capabilities for a war with the Soviet Union.

1. Party sympathy develops: Ozaki originally developed his interest in the Chinese and his hostility to Japanese militarism while he was a boy in Formosa. While he was in college in Tokyo he began reading widely in Japanese leftist literature, which was published in considerable quantity after the First World War, and then taking up the German philosophers, was fascinated by them. He was deeply moved by the first mass arrest of Japanese Communists, in June 1923, when he was 22 years old and a university student. After the great earthquake 3 months later he was greatly disturbed by the arrest of the whole family of Morisaki Genkichi, who ran the Agrarian Movement Society (Nomin Undosha) and by the cold-blooded murder of Osugi Sakae, the anarchist leader, and his common-law wife and nephew by a gendarme (Kempeitai) captain. At the university he began studying Marx, Engels, Lenin, and many books on China. Gradually his sympathies drifted toward communism and so to the Soviet Union, although he never became a member of any Communist Party. In Japan we find, as they found in Canada, that party sympathy is enough to develop a high-class agent and spy. Party membership is not necessary, and the counter-intelligence officer should not be led astray in his search for the enemy by questions of party cards.

After Ozaki reached Shanghai he soon became associated with a left-wing Chinese literary group, the Creation Society (Sozo Sha), to whose magazine he contributed under pseudonyms. He also became associated with leftist-minded Japanese students at the East Asia Common Script School (Toa Dobun Shoin) and with the Chinese Communist Youth League. Through these contacts he came to know the advisers and leaders of the Chinese Communist Party in Shanghai.

Now and then Ozaki visited the Zeitgeist Bookshop on Soochow Creek, in Shanghai, and became well acquainted with the proprietress, a Mrs. Wiedemeyer. Late in 1929 or early in 1930 this woman introduced Ozaki to Miss Agnes Smedley, at that time correspondent for the Frankfurter Zeitung. From this meeting, dates Ozaki's career as a Soviet agent, though it was some time before he himself was aware that such a change had occurred. Since it was Miss Smedley who recruited Ozaki, it is reasonable to assume that she had recruited other Soviet agents before and has recruited many others since.

A deep and genuine friendship quickly developed between the Japanese journalist, Ozaki, and the American Communist journalist, Agnes Smedley. Ozaki met Miss Smedley at many places besides the book shop, and as they exchanged ideas and discovered the depths of their mutual understanding Miss Smedley told Ozaki that she was a Communist. Since he had already reached the conclusion that he, too, was a Communist in spirit he gladly agreed to her suggestion that they exchange information. From his Asahi and other Japanese connections Ozaki had much to tell Miss Smedley that the Communists would want to know. Presumably what Miss Smedley had to tell Ozaki was for his private ear.

2. Ozaki meets Sorge: In the fall of 1930 a Japanese member of the American Communist Party, Kito Ginichi, who had come to Shanghai via Annam, became a frequent caller at Ozaki's office. How Kito discovered Ozaki we do not know, but it is reasonable to assume that Miss Smedley was the connecting link. Almost from the start Ozaki knew that Kito was a Communist. Soon after Kito's first visit he asked Ozaki if he would like to meet an American journalist named Johnson. Ozaki put him off without a definite answer and consulted Miss Smedley, who cautioned him sharply against any further mention of this American. Some days later, however, Miss Smedley reopened the subject and said she herself wished to introduce Ozaki to Johnson. She arranged the meeting at a restaurant on Nanking Road, and over a leisurely dinner Ozaki talked with a tall, stocky man who spoke English with a European accent. Although Ozaki had not been told that Johnson was

a Comintern agent he assumed as much since he knew both Miss Smedley and Kito were Communists. It was not till 6 years later that Ozaki learned Johnson's real name. In 1936 when Ozaki returned from America as a Japanese delegate to the Yosemite Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations a Dutch delegate introduced him in Tokyo to Johnson. The Dutchman called him Dr. Richard Sorge, however.

Obviously Sorge had been fully satisfied with Ozaki's loyalty through the checks and recommendations of Miss Smedley and Kito, for at their first meeting Sorge asked Ozaki to collect and supply him with information on the internal Chinese situation and on Japanese policy toward China. Ozaki consented without hesitation. His consent was not connected with any specific knowledge of the Comintern or of the group with which he was to be associated. As for the Fourth Bureau of the Red Army General Staff, he never heard of it till after his arrest in 1941 when the police interrogators began asking him about it. He was completely indifferent to all matters of organization. He agreed to help Johnson because he was convinced that he would be doing something worth while in cooperating with an intelligence group connected in some way with the Soviet Communist International.

From this time until he left Shanghai in February 1932, Ozaki met Johnson and Miss Smedley two or three times a month at various restaurants or at Miss Smedley's apartment. Ozaki did not have assignments on specific subjects, but rather the three friends engaged in lengthy discussions of current news, to which Ozaki was able to contribute the Japanese point of view, as well as an acute and analytical mind. He had a very wide knowledge of Asiatic affairs, and through his Asahi connections could give information on an extensive amount of current topics. Following these discussions, Sorge would come to final conclusions which he would incorporate in reports sent back to the U. S. S. R. As will be seen, this practice came to be more clearly developed after he reached Japan. Ozaki knew nothing of other Caucasian members of the Sorge group aside from Miss Smedley. He couldn't decide whether Miss Smedley ranked above or below Johnson, although he believed that Sorge was the more important since he acted with more authority. Among his Japanese friends in Shanghai, he was aware that three—Funakoshi Hisao, Shanghai Mainichi reporter; Kito Ginichi; and Mizuno Shigeru, student at Toa Dobun Shoin—were involved with the ring, but he had no precise knowledge of their activities. Actually, in addition to these men, there were two other Japanese members. These were Kawai Teikichi, reporter for the Shanghai Weekly, and Yamagami Masayoshi, correspondent for Rengo Tsushin. These men will be described later in connection with their work after Sorge was established in Japan.

Ozaki himself introduced Kawai to Sorge, who took him into the group on condition that he sever all connections with his Communist associates. After the Japanese attack on Manchuria in 1931, Sorge asked Ozaki to get some trustworthy agent to investigate conditions there. Kawai Teikichi was his choice. Miss Smedley already knew Kawai. In 1932, when Ozaki was recalled to Japan by the Asahi, he recommended Yamagami Masayoshi, the Rengo man, as his substitute, but Yamagami refused to serve and Funakoshi Hisao, reporter for the Shanghai Mainichi, took the post.

3. Ozaki returns to Japan: When the Asahi ordered Ozaki back to Osaka, Sorge wanted him to quit his job and stay in Shanghai, but Ozaki pointed out that if he left the Asahi, his chief information source and hence his major usefulness would be lost. After he returned to Japan, he had no communications with Johnson, but he did correspond with Miss Smedley. When Miss Smedley wrote, asking him to meet her in Peiping, he left at once, sailing from Kobe on December 25, 1932. Miss Smedley wanted him to join a new intelligence agency which she was organizing in North China, presumably to cover developments in Manchuria, but Ozaki refused, and after recommending Kawai Teikichi in his place, returned to Japan. He took with him the translation rights to all of Miss Smedley's books, and ultimately published her autobiographical novel, A Daughter of the Earth, in Japanese as Onna Hitori Daichi Wo Yuku (A Woman Walks the Earth Alone). He used his pen name, Shirakawa Jiro, with which he had often published leftist articles in Shanghai. For more than a year he did not hear from Miss Smedley, who was in a sanitarium in southern Russia. In the summer of 1934, however, she wrote him again, and on her way from America to Shanghai in September of that year she stopped to see him in Japan. By this time Ozaki was Sorge's major assistant in Tokyo. Sorge warned him that it was dangerous to correspond with such known Communists as Miss Smedley; it might well arouse police suspicions where none existed and so bring about the betrayal of their whole operation. Ozaki never communicated with Miss Smedley again, and perhaps to this day she wonders what happened to her much-prized friendship with Ozaki Hozumi. She does know, however, that he died for their common cause, in the service to which she recruited him back in Shanghai nearly 20 years ago.

Ozaki was a prolific writer, and became extremely well known in Japan as an expert on Chinese affairs. His many signed articles in Central Review (Chuo Koron) and his five books on China, the last, Strength of the Great Powers in China (Ajia Ni Okeru Rekkyo No Chikara), published in 1941, give no hint of his Communist sympathies. It is amazing that a man could feel so deeply on the subject of China, Japanese militarism, and communism, could write so much and so widely, and yet never betray himself to the vigilant Japanese censors and thought police.

(g) Max Klausen, radio operator: The rest of Ozaki's story belongs to his activities back in Japan. There is one more member of the Sorge ring of China days, however, who must be mentioned before Sorge's transfer to Tokyo and his prolific work there is described.

When Sorge reached Shanghai in 1930 he found another German, Max Gottfried Friedrich Klausen, also an agent of the Fourth Bureau, who had the simulated rank of major in the Red Army. On this basis Sorge must have rated at least as a colonel. Klausen had come out from Moscow the year before and already had had considerable experience as an operator of secret radio stations. That was to be his role for the rest of Sorge's active life, and in Japan Klausen was to become Sorge's chief communications link with the Soviet Union.

Klausen was a heavy-set, coarse-featured German, not well educated, and the last conceivable suspect as a successful agent of the Red Army. One knew that Sorge and Ozaki were brilliant, whether one liked them or not, but Klausen was not the type of man even the suspicious police were likely to associate with the brilliant journalist, Richard Sorge. Acually Klausen was never the intelligence operative; his role always was in communications.

Max Klausen was born in February 1899 on an island off the coast of Schleswig-Holstein, the son of a poor shopkeeper and bicycle repairman. His mother died when he was only three. After finishing school Max first helped in his father's shop, and then was apprenticed to a blacksmith while attending a trade school in the evenings. Here he laid the foundations of a very considerable mechanical ability which in the end would build for Sorge a radio transmitter so small it could be carried in a brief case and yet so powerful it could send from Tokyo to Vladivostok with the greatest of ease.

In 1917 Klausen was conscripted and served in the German Signal Corps, being assigned to a radio unit on the western front. After his discharge in 1919 he wandered through a number of unrelated jobs, including that of guard at a reform school, until in 1921 he began going to sea out of Hamburg. It was at Hamburg, spiritual home of both Sorge and Klausen, that the latter was converted to the Communist cause. The defeat and postwar confusion, heavy Communist infiltration into the seamen's unions with their propaganda and agitation, unemployment and despair, all left their mark on this stolid young man. In 1927 he joined the Hamburg branch of the German Communist Party.

1. Klausen embraces communism: Part of Klausen's later account of his experiences is worth repeating: "During my early youth I had no interest in political affairs, but after my enlistment in the army I met many soldiers, particularly among my immediate superiors, who were imbued with communistic thought and who were engaged in Communist propaganda. Army life * * * was favorable to the spread of the doctrine. Thus, the young men in our group were gradually attracted to the ideology by our seniors. * * *

"When the war was over, after many of the seniors left the barracks, Communist sentiment was on the wane * * * it had been the wish of my father that I return home to my job with the blacksmith. The second influence in my political life was this master, who was a follower of the Volks Party. Under his guidance I became a Communist sympathizer.

"In 1922 when all mechanics throughout the country went on strike, I was working aboard a steamer. As a Communist sympathizer I became a picket. All sailors at that time were members of the seamen's section of the All German Transportation Labor Union, which was one of the official organizations of the Social Democratic Party. Of course, I, too, was a member of the union. But in 1922, when the German Seamen's Union was formed by Communist elements, I joined.

"Germany was in an extremely difficult economic condition, with more than 6,000,000 unemployed. The government was entirely at a loss what to do * * * I came to feel that the only doctrine which could save the German people from their misery was communism. When I visited Soviet Russia aboard the S. S. *Neptune* and witnessed the fine equipment of Russian industry, I became firmly convinced that communism would promote the happiest society in the world. Since by this time the German Communist Party had been organized as a legitimate political party, I made up my mind to become a member and to engage in Communist activity. Upon my return to Hamburg from this voyage, I applied for membership in 1927.

"My application was not accepted immediately. For the first 6 months I was listed as a marine-cell member. I was assigned as a lecturer to argue the party platform with sailors on my ship. After my initiation I was examined by Karl 'Lesse,' the leader of the union. Having passed the test I formally became a member of the Communist Party."

Klausen must have made an excellent impression for sincerity and devotion to party principles. Only the next year a Soviet operative known to Klausen only as George, upon the recommendation of Lesse, invited him to join an international espionage group as a radioman. Klausen readily accepted the invitation, and in February 1929 he went to Moscow, where he joined the Fourth Bureau

of the Red Army General Staff as a radio operator.

Klausen received only a brief indoctrination, and then was ordered to go to Shanghai to serve as radio operator for the bureau's China unit. Before leaving Klausen received a ticket to Harbin and $150 in American money. He was shown a photograph of a man called Mishin, who was to be his Shanghai contact. He was directed to go to the Palace Hotel in Shanghai, sit in the lobby with a newspaper in his left hand and a pipe in his right. When the Mishin of the photograph came up and spoke to him he was to give the password, "Regards from Erna."

2. Klausen's radio and contacts: In due time Klausen sat in the lobby of the Palace Hotel and gave Mishin Erna's regards. He then went with Mishin to the latter's home, where he was given two rooms on the third floor, and received instructions from Mishin in radio technique. Finally, Mishin took him to meet the head of the China unit, a German named "Lehman," who also used the alias of Grevitch. Lehman told Klausen that he was to replace a renegade Pole, named Goble, who had seceded from the group. From this date to 1933 Klausen worked in various parts of China under the command of Lehman, then of Alex, presumably a Russian, of Richard Sorge, and finally of Paul, who previously had been subordinate to Sorge.

Together Constantin Mishin and Max Klausen built a shortwave radio receiving and sending set and maintained contact with another station known as Wiesbaden. This was the same station which subsequently received his signals from Tokyo. Klausen never was positive whether "Wiesbaden" was Vladivostok or whether it was Khabarovsk, but believed the former was the case. Considering that later Moscow was designated as "Munchen," the alliteration suggests Vladivostok. It is noteworthy that in this operation as well as the later one in Japan, the geographical and national cover of Germany and Germans was used throughout. Even the Russian language was never used, and before coding messages always were written either in German or English.

After getting the Shanghai set in operation Klausen assembled the parts for another set and sent them to Harbin in the care of a French diplomat, who kindly smuggled them up there. In August 1929, Klausen himself went to Harbin to assemble the set, and at the Hotel Moderne he met another agent named "Benedict." Benedict introduced Klausen to the chief of the Soviet agents in Harbin, "Gloemberg-Ott." An American vice consul, Tycho L. Lilliestrom, allowed "Gloemberg-Ott" to use two rooms of his residence, and it was there that Klausen set up his illegal radio set. There is some reason to believe that Lilliestrom also supplied information to his guest.

Klausen was able to get back to Shanghai in October 1929, where he continued with his illegal radio activity under the cover of his work as a garage mechanic. In January 1930 Lehman directed Klausen to go to the Anchor Hotel, where he would meet a friend. This friend turned out to be Josef Weingart, a German, whom Klausen had known earlier in Hamburg, and who had just come to China to join the group. A few days later Weingart introduced his old friend Max to Dr. Richard Sorge. Here began an association which finally was to carry them both into Tokyo's Sugamo Prison.

After his return to Shanghai Klausen moved to a boarding house where a widow, Mrs. Anna Wallenius, a white Russian, was living. She was then 31. Her husband had died 4 years before, and she had been making a living first as a seamstress and subsequently as a practical nurse at the Shanghai Isolation Hospital. Both she and her late husband, a well-to-do Finnish tanner, brother of the Gen. K. Martti Wallenius, of the Finnish Army General Staff, who headed a Finnish military mission to Japan in 1937, had suffered cruelly in the Russian revolution. Like most other "whites" they managed to reach China with little more than their lives, and Anna never recovered from her bitter and intense hatred of all things Bolshevik.

3. Romance of Max and Anna: Anna little guessed when she first met the new boarder that she was also meeting an ardent Communist and Soviet spy. She took Max for a good, steady automobile mechanic with a decent income. Poor woman, she fell in love. Max too seemed to have loved her well, for in later years he submitted not only to many inconveniences but to downright danger to his career with the party in order to keep her with him. Here was a strange union of personal love with mutual hatred of each other's ideals. That it lasted through the years, through terrors and dangers and prison, is testimony to its strength and power.

Anna became suspicious of Max's conduct only a few days after they had been married. (She was his common-law wife for several years before he was allowed to legalize the union.) He constantly went on unexplained errands at night but he quieted her fears by assuring her he was active in an anti-Nazi society. It was not until 1931 or 1932, a year or two after their marriage, that she discovered the headquarters of this anti-Nazi society was in Moscow. By then she couldn't bring herself to leave Max.

Years later Klausen told the Japanese court that Anna had never lost her hatred for communism. She had consented to help him only out of fear of punishment from Moscow, and also because he continually regarded her with valuable and desirable presents. For example, he gave her a $2,000 fur coat, expensive dresses, and frequent small-denomination United States bills. Answering the court's question as to whether their marriage had borne fruit, Klausen said neither love nor money could persuade the woman to become pregnant by a Soviet spy. Through the years Anna complained bitterly that Max had married her because he needed her for camouflage. "News correspondents like Sorge can afford to remain single," she said, "but a businessman like Max needs cover." She scoffed at what she called her husband's dreams of paradise. The court gave considerable weight to this testimony in passing sentence.

Klausen worked in various Chinese cities as directed by his chief. He put up sets in Canton and Mukden, in addition to those in Shanghai and Harbin. For some reason he was unable to raise Wiesbaden from Canton. In August 1933, Klausen left Mukden, via Harbin, for Siberia and the long train ride to Moscow. Originally he was directed to travel with a specified woman agent but Max refused point blank to travel with any woman but his Anna, and finally he was permitted to take his wife instead of the other woman. Anna thought they were bound for Germany, a belief corroborated by their receipt of German passports in Harbin. On the first night they were in Moscow, however, the Klausens were robbed of all they possessed, including their passports. Perhaps the fourth bureau was doing a little checking. In any case Max soon appeared in the uniform of a Red army officer, which he continued to wear as long as they were in Moscow.

4. Klausen joins Sorge: After a 6-week vacation at Odessa, Klausen entered a radio school for advanced training. Suddenly he was transferred out of the school and ordered to one of the German republics on the shores of the Volga as punishment for a record of inefficiency in China. It will be remembered that this was at the beginning of the Russian purges, when thousands of Communists were passing from honor to disgrace overnight, and then as mysteriously being restored to the good graces of the party. It seems that Klausen was a victim of the same hysteria.

For nearly 2 years Klausen remained in this provincial center, mending shoes, plowing fields, and taking part in party propaganda programs. In the spring of 1935 he was recalled to Moscow by order of General Voroshilov to meet Lehman, Sorge, and Weingart, all of whom he'd worked with in Shanghai. Sorge was in search of a good radio operator to replace an incompetent he had with him in Tokyo. He invited Max Klausen to join him. Later Klausen told the Japanese court, "From childhood I had heard nothing but evil of Japan. I detested especially Japan's invasion of Manchuria. Therefore, I gladly consented to go work for Sorge there." He soon set off to join Sorge, who had been working in Tokyo for nearly 3 years.

2. SORGE ORGANIZES HIS RING IN JAPAN

(a) Sorge goes to Tokyo: In China Dr. Sorge's primary intelligence mission had concerned Japan. Probably when they first sent him to Shanghai the directors of the fourth bureau had him in mind for later operations in Tokyo. Having successfully completed his apprenticeship, Sorge now was ready to undertake the most difficult assignment in the gift of the Red Army.

Richard Sorge returned to Moscow in December 1932, and received orders to proceed to Tokyo to organize and operate a completely new espionage ring. Although the Japanese were still in the early stages of their campaign to conquer Manchuria they already had invaded the Soviet sphere of influence. Japanese and Russian antagonisms were old and deep. Japanese ambitions for Siberian territory were common knowledge. Japanese forces had evacuated Vladivostok only a decade before, but perhaps they felt stronger now. What were Japanese intentions and capabilities? As Japanese troops approached and finally reached the Soviet-Manchurian border there always was the possibility of armed explosion. Did the Japanese Government or the Japanese Army intend to precipitate and exploit such explosions into general war?

Sorge's mission was to discover the answers to these questions and to find new answers as conditions changed. In 1933 in the midst of the first 5-year plan and the bitter internal struggle over forced collectivization, the Soviets were in no condition for war with Japan. Subsequently, with the rise of a powerful Nazi Germany there was the constant possibility of a war on two fronts. Perhaps in Tokyo, Sorge could discover the answers to the questions of both German and Japanese intentions. In 1941 he did.

Sorge's job was to paint the big picture. Any Japanese information which he could discover on order of battle, troop movements, or military installations and equipment would be welcomed. His primary mission, however, concerned intelligence at the highest level, the top secret plans of the Japanese Army and Government.

Sorge laid down four conditions for this assignment which were accepted by his superiors: (1) He was to have no relations of any kind with the Japan Communist Party or its known members. (2) He must be supplied with a Caucasian assistant neither Russian nor German. (3) He must be supplied with a high-level Japanese assistant. (4) He must have as little contact with the Soviet Embassy as was conceivably possible, which meant that except in emergencies he would use his own channels of communication.

(b) Sorge establishes cover: Sorge left for Berlin in May 1933 to establish his cover. In Germany he secured assignments as

special correspondent in Japan for the Frankfurter Zeitung, the Bergen Kurier, the Technische Rundschau, and the Amsterdam Handelsblatt. He applied for membership in the Nazi Party, which had just seized power under Adolf Hitler, and his credentials were accepted without question. How he secured these excellent covers remains a mystery. The key newspaper was the Frankfurter Zeitung, whose Shanghai correspondent was a concealed Communist and Soviet agent, Miss Agnes Smedley. It is possible that some editors of this well-known paper were conniving at the appointment of Communist agents.

Having just seized power the Nazi Party and the Gestapo had not yet acquired the efficiency and thorough national coverage they were to develop later. Nevertheless, there must have been a Soviet agent in a responsible post at Gestapo files. When a check was made in 1941, highly derogatory information was turned up at once, yet in 1933 Sorge's applications for party membership and for travel abroad as a correspondent were unchallenged. In due course, after he reached Tokyo, he received his Nazi Party card. Seemingly, in the following years until 1941 when Berlin received a frantic inquiry from the Gestapo man in Tokyo, it never occurred to anyone to run a file check on Dr. Richard Sorge. Even when he was appointed to a post in the Tokyo Embassy in 1939 his party card was considered sufficient evidence of his loyalty. The lessons of this experience are obvious.

With his Nazi loyalties established and having an excellent journalistic cover, Dr. Sorge proceeded to Japan via the United States and Canada. In America he met with some American agents of the Soviets before catching his ship at Vancouver, British Columbia.

Dr. Richard Sorge first reached Yokohama on September 6, 1933. There seemed nothing unusual about this German journalist and the water police quickly let him ashore. Not long afterward Sorge found a house in Tokyo, at No. 30 Nagasaka-machi, Azabu-ku, Tokyo, a good neighborhood, and settled down to covering Japan for his various newspapers. He made himself known at the German Embassy and the German Club and was readily accepted by the German community as well as by his colleagues of the press.

(c) Comintern moves Sorge's assistants: Meanwhile, that extraordinary international organization, the Comintern, at the request of the Red Army, began picking up unsuspected agents and moving them around the world. The evidence regarding world-wide Comintern card lists and controls produced at the Canadian spy inquiry is corroborated by the evidence of the Sorge trial. The Red Army needed some spies in Japan of a certain type and category. In due course the Comintern agents in France and the United States received orders. Men who were complete strangers to each other and who had never heard the name of Sorge began packing their bags for Tokyo. While others came along in due course, the two key figures were Branko de Voukelitch and Miyagi Yotoku. Voukelitch traveled from Paris, Miyagi from Los Angeles.

(d) Branko de Voukelitch, Yugoslav Communist: Branko de Voukelitch was a Yugoslav, living in Paris with his wife, Edith, later described by Miyagi as a "dull woman, good only for cover." De Voukelitch was tall and heavy-set, had brown hair and carried himself in such a manner as to give the impression to Japanese that he was a German. Branko was born in Serbia in 1904, where his father was an officer.

After finishing high school in Zagreb he studied art for a time and then entered the University of Zagreb to take up architecture. After 2 years, in 1926, he went to France, abandoning the arts for law at the University of Paris. Before completing his course, however, he went to work for the Compagnie Generale d'Electricitie. It was during this time that he met Edith, a Danish woman of whom we know little, and married her.

De Voukelitch became interested in Marxian movements during his student days in Zagreb. In 1924, he was arrested as a member of the Zagreb Marxist Student's Group. From about the year 1925 he participated in the Croatian independence movement (against Yugoslavia), which had the support of Communist elements. It was not until January 1932, however, that he formally became a Communist. He had met some former comrades of the Zagreb Marxist Students' Group in Paris and through them joined the party. It is not clear whether this was the French or the Yugoslav party.

In March 1932, de Voukelitch's Croatian friends introduced him to a mysterious Baltic woman, Olga, who persuaded him to join a so-called Red international intelligence organ in Paris. Note that this joining of the party and his becoming a Soviet agent were hardly separated in time. The Soviets seem able to use men as agents who either are not party members at all, and yet who are willing to make every sacrifice for the party's cause, or who hold party cards on which the signatures are scarcely dry. The previous interests and prejudices of the man concerned rather than formal party allegiance seem to be far more important in determining his selection. These facts should sharpen American concern with United States employees who show sympathy with the party and yet who have never joined it.

De Voukelitch first heard that he would be sent abroad from an unnamed Russian Jew, who told him he was to be assigned to duty either in Japan or Rumania. Having received permission from Olga to take his wife with him on this mission, he sent Edith to Denmark for a short course in physical education to give her a legitimate occupation should she need to cover when they got abroad. As it turned out her occupation as housewife was sufficient to disarm Japanese suspicion.

De Voukelitch received his travel orders to Japan in October 1932. He was appointed special correspondent in Tokyo for the French picture magazine La Vue and for the Yugoslav daily Politica. Branko, Edith, and their small boy sailed for Marseilles on December 30, 1932. Proceeding along the tourist route through the Red Sea, and stopping briefly at Singapore and Shanghai, the new journalist and his family landed at Yokohama on February 11, 1933. After staying temporarily at the Imperial Hotel, de Voukelitch found a place at the Bunka apartments in Hongo-ku, probably the best apartments in Tokyo, now used as a United States Army billet.

1. De Voukelitch establishes himself: Since Sorge had not yet arrived de Voukelitch had time to get started on his newspaper career, free of the need to engage in improper activities. He had been told how to get in touch with Bernhardt, Sorge's radio man, however, and net him as Olga had told him to do. After Sorge reached Tokyo in the fall Bernhardt introduced Voukelitch to him. At the first meeting Sorge used the name of Schmidt, an odd precaution since Branko knew he was there to work for him, and in any case both being journalists they were bound to meet at press conferences and other places where Branko would learn his true identity. The reactions of these men at their first meeting, and their conversation have not been recorded.

This was a long term project, and Sorge was in no hurry to get started till his machine was functioning smoothly. He needed agents, a considerable net of them, adequate radio and courier communications, a darkroom and good outside contacts.

The German Embassy was Sorge's major target, but he had no more immediate entree than any other German journalist and less than many since he did not represent the all-powerful DNB agency. But through the man's wife he did know an assistant German military attaché, Lt. Col. Eugen Ott, then on duty in Nagoya with a Japanese artillery regiment.

Ott was out of sympathy with the Nazi program, but he went along with the orders from his Government. He had only arrived in Japan in 1933, being transferred out of Germany by higher ranking officers who feared for his safety in the Nazi purges then under way. Whatever Ott knew or thought about Germany, he knew almost nothing about Japan, and he delighted to find in his new friend Richard an extraordinary fund of information on things Japanese, on Japanese politics and trends, as well as sage advice, When Ott made his next grade and was stationed in Tokyo his friendship with Sorge deepened and their meetings came to be more and more frequent. It may be assumed that the good will of the hausfrau for her husband's friend did him no harm when it came to receiving invitations to social functions.

Very early, then, Sorge began his campaign for acceptance at the German Embassy. Simultaneously he developed his ring. The De Voukelitch family moved out of the Bunka apartments in November to a private house in Sanai-cho, Ushigome-ku. Sorge needed more privacy. Branko, an enthusiastic amateur camera fiend, had a darkroom built in his house for the furtherance of his hobby. Subsequently, documents were photographed there and microfilm was prepared for transmission to Shanghai or the Soviet Embassy. It was at this house that Bernhardt built his clumsy radio transmitter during April and May 1934.

(e) Miyagi Yotoku, artist and spy: The Comintern continued to move their men across the world to aid their man Sorge. The exact process whereby the Comintern supplied men to the Red Army is not known in the Sorge case, although it has been presented with considerable clarity in the Canadian spy case. While it is possible that Olga worked for the Fourth Bureau, and so that De Voukelitch was recruited directly for Red Army intelligence, Miyagi Yotoku, in Los Angeles, had no connections with the Fourth Bureau. Clearly, he was recruited by the American Communist Party and the Comintern, though he came to be an agent of the Fourth Bureau. Miyagi never knew precisely for whom he was working. It is most significant that Miyagi, Ozaki, and many others had but the vaguest idea as to what agency they worked for. All they seemed to need to commit treason was the general knowledge that the Communists wanted their services and that in some manner their information was being relayed to the spiritual homeland of the Communists.

The name of Miyagi Yotoku must be added to those of Sorge, Ozaki, De Voukelitch, and Klausen to complete the list of the top-level operatives in Tokyo. Miyagi, a Japanese who had lived in the United States since 1919, and who was a member of the American Communist Party, was the Comintern's selection to meet Sorge's conditions on assistants: one of foreign nationality, neither Russian nor German (De Voukelitch), and one a Japanese. This was Miyagi, not Ozaki, who later developed as the primary Japanese agent. Sorge personally brought Ozaki into the gang later, but Miyagi was the man he was supplied. Miyagi, too, was invaluable, although considering his previous history it seems strange that Red Army intelligence should have thought of him as a particularly useful agent. Perhaps they were so limited in their choices among unsuspected Japanese that they had to take what they could get.

Miyagi Yotoku was a native of Okinawa, born February 10, 1903. Like many Okinawans, his father migrated, first to Davao and then to California, where he worked on a

farm near Los Angeles. The senior Miyagi returned to Okinawa in 1920 and died in 1938.

The boy, Yotoku, was brought up by his maternal grandparents. After finishing elementary school in 1917 he entered a teacher-training institute, but was forced to quit in 1919 because of illness. He had tuberculosis, which was to plague him for the rest of his short life and finally to shorten his days in prison.

Miyagi joined his father in California in June 1919, and for 2 years went to a school near Brawley to learn English. For the next 4 years he was attending art schools first in San Francisco and later in San Diego, being forced to interrupt his work by that bothersome lung. He graduated from the San Diego Art School in 1925, but worked on a farm near Brawley for about a year before he could put his art training to much use. From November 1926 until 1933 Miyagi ran a restaurant, the Owl, in Los Angeles' Little Tokyo, in partnership with several Japanese friends: Yabe Kenden, Matayoshi Jun, Kochi Shinsei, and Nakamura Koki. He began to paint on the side, and to his pleasure soon made enough from his pictures to support himself independently of the restaurant. In the summer of 1927, he married Yamaki Chiyo, a woman who figures little in this record.

Miyagi's bachelor quarters were inadequate for his married life, and soon he and his bride went to live at the Los Angeles home of a Japanese farmer, Kitabayashi Yoshisaburo. Years later Mrs. Kitabayashi was to become a minor member of the Sorge ring and the unwitting means of the betrayal of the whole group.

In the case of each of these agents the question of motivation as well as of action is of great importance. After his arrest Miyagi testified freely. His testimony portrays him as a rather confused young man of strong social conscience but of uncertain belief. Yet despite this uncertainty a Comintern agent had but to ask him and he gave up his security in Los Angeles to go to Tokyo to betray Japan, to risk, and then to lose his life.

1. Some of Miyagi's testimony: "There was a time in my boyhood when I was a pure and simple nationalist, but even then I detested the tyranny of the Japanese bureaucracy. Doctors, lawyers, bankers, and retired officials were wont to come * * * from Kagoshima, and they became money lenders and exploited the local farmers. I detested these people because my grandfather taught me never to bull the weak. Likewise he taught me Okinawa history, comparing * * * [our] glorious period * * * with the present semicolonial status. * * * I believe that my grandfather's severe criticism of this * * * tyranny and of the poverty of the Okinawa people first turned my mind to political questions."

In America, Miyagi had many discontented friends, and with them he began to read Marxian literature. Of this period, he said, "I do not say that I was not influenced by my friends and by the books which I read, but I was more affected by what I saw: The inconsistency of American capitalism, the tyranny of the governing classes, and, above all, the inhuman discrimination against the Asiatic races. I came to the conclusion that communism was the cure for all these ills."

It will be noted that Miyagi arrived in California at the height of the anti-Japanese agitation as well as during the period of the Russian Revolution. It is likely that he suffered keenly from the discrimination against all Asiatics, but especially against Japanese, then common in the State of California, and in turn looked to the embattled armies of Lenin and Trotsky as the hope of a free and happier society.

Although Miyagi did not join the Communist Party in those early days, he was close enough to it to know a great deal about its activities. He and his friends at the Owl Restaurant organized a study group in 1926 to discuss social problems. The parallel with the Canadian study groups is striking. After the second or third meeting they were joined by some Communist leaders—Takahashi (FNU), an American professor of Russian whose name is reported as Herbert Harris, and a Swiss called Fister. These men gave lectures to the earnest group. Gradually other Communists came to attend the meetings, but there was also an increase of non-Communist members. By this time the informal study group had become a club with the name Society of the Dawn (Reimei Kai).

The club split in 1927 in a dispute between Communist and non-Communist members. The Communists left to form a new association, the Class War Society (Kaikyu Sensen Sha), but Miyagi, who had not yet wholly become a Communist in his own thinking, remained with the Reimei Kai. The Kaikyu Sensen Sha expanded to become the Labor Society (Rodo Kyokai) in 1928, and began publishing a magazine, Class War (Kaikyu Sen), and a weekly news sheet, Labor News (Rodo Shimbun). The California branch of the American Communist Party set up a Los Angeles headquarters at about this time, and the Labor Society (Rodo Kyokai) joined at once. Soon afterward, when a Japanese section of the American Communist Party was organized in San Francisco, Labor News (Rodo Shimbun) came to be published there.

Miyagi had a good general knowledge of all these developments, but hung on the outside. He joined his first Communist-front organization in 1929 when the Proletarian Arts Society was formed by Akagi Tetsu and a Yoshioka under the auspices of the Labor Society (Rodo Kyokai). Many of the members were his friends, such as Kemmotsu, editor of Labor News; Mrs. Kitabayashi, his landlady; and his wife, Chiyo.

Political activity by foreigners in the United States aimed at the change and overthrow of American institutions was an illegal act. Kemmotsu Teiichi and Kobayashi Isamu were arrested in San Francisco and Horiuchi Tetsuji and Yamaguchi Einosuke in Los Angeles in 1929. The American Communist Party sent Yano Tsutomu from New York to continue their work. The Japanese section of the party, however, was very seriously disrupted in 1930 when a large number of Communists were arrested during the party's general meeting at Long Beach. Seven of those arrested were deported to Hamburg, under guaranty of the German Ambassador, instead of to Japan. Miyagi believed they made their way to Russia once they had reached Germany. Although these deportations broke up the Japanese section of the party it was reconstructed in 1931, and although all Japanese were welcomed a special drive was opened to get Nisei members who could legally take part in political movements. Among the new members joining the American Communist Party at this time were Miyagi Yotoku and Mrs. Kitabayashi.

2. Miyagi ordered to Tokyo: Miyagi had been a formal member of the American Communist Party for a little over a year when Yano and another Comintern agent, whose name is unknown, called on him. They asked him to go to Tokyo for a month to serve as a Comintern agent. Nothing was said about the Red Army. It is clear that Yano was an agent of the Comintern, although possibly the man with him represented the other branch. They told Miyagi to call on a Comintern agent then in Los Angeles named Roy for instructions. Possibly this was the same Roy, an East Indian member of the Comintern, who served with Borodin in China in 1927. Miyagi seems to have made an early call, but he put off his departure from month to month because, as he said, he was busy with his painting. Probably, also, he was reluctant to leave his home in the United States and to risk the dangers of Toyko. There was nothing in his record to present him as a heroic figure or even as a potentially dangerous spy. Perhaps that was why he was selected from the many Japanese Communists in California.

Finally in September 1933 Roy demanded that Miyagi start off at once. Roy promised, either ignorantly or to hasten him along, that he would be back in Los Angeles in no time. Roy gave him $200 for expenses and a $1 bill which he was to show to a man who would meet him in Toyko carrying another note with a consecutive number. He was to watch the want ads in the Japan Advertiser. When he saw one asking for Ukiyoe, he was to answer it. If the man he met through the advertisement had this other dollar bill he should follow his instructions.

Miyagi could postpone his duty no longer and soon left for Japan. Since he was expecting to return soon he left all his personal possessions, as well as his wife, Chiyo, in America. He was never to see them again.

Miyagi reached Tokyo in October 1933. Although they had yet to meet together, all of Richard Sorge's gang of top-level spies were now in Japan. Miyagi settled down to adjusting to the life of Tokyo which was entirely new to him, while he daily read the Japan Advertiser. De Voukelitch finally inserted his ad from December 14 to 18: "Wanted to buy Ukiyoe." Miyagi answered the advertisement and a few days later Branko de Voukelitch and Miyagi Yotoku met for the first time at the advertising agency Issui Sha, and compared dollar bills. Neither man has left account of their feelings and hopes at that meeting. Certainly they must have known the dangers they faced, and while they could not have foreseen clearly each might have guessed that the man he met that day would die at Sugamo Prison.

(f) Early days of the ring in Tokyo: The chief links in the ring were now established: Dr. Richard Sorge, the leader; Branko de Voukelitch, the "neutral" press contact man; Miyagi Yotoku, the innocent Japanese artist; and a shadowy and inept figure, the radio operator Bruno Vendt; alias Bernhardt. The task now was to create a simple means of communication within the ring, and to establish Japanese and other contacts who would assure a flow of worth while information. The Soviet Embassy could be counted on to pour out a stream of information on Japan; Sorge's group would have to produce something different and better.

De Voukelitch introduced Miyagi to Sorge near the end of November 1933, at the Ueno Art Gallery. At first the conversation was general, but after four or five meetings Miyagi realized that Sorge's assignment was intelligence rather than Communist propaganda, and that he was expected to help. When Sorge made a formal proposal in January 1934, Miyagi consented with some reluctance. His Communist affiliation had prepared him abstractly for work for the Soviets but his previous experience had not prepared him practically or psychologically to become an agent in Japan. His account of his hesitation is interesting:

"It was some time before I could decide to join Sorge's group. If I had been in the United States my position would have been different, but what would be the position of a Japanese working in Japan? Especially, was this not a contradiction of myself since I had been interested in racial emancipation? I made up my mind to participate, however, when I realized the historical importance of the mission, since we were helping to avoid war between Japan and Russia. At first I meant to get out of the business as soon as I could find someone to replace me, because I had no training for this kind of work. As time went on, I realized that there was nobody who would be willing to do the job. So I stayed on, although I knew well that

what I was doing was illegal and that in wartime I would be hanged."

Both Miyagi and Ozaki satisfied their consciences in their betrayal of their country by argument that they were working secretly to avert a war which would be a catastrophe for both Japanese and Russians but which could be avoided only by flow of significant intelligence on Japanese war plans to the Soviet Union. By corollary they came to the conclusion that if war came despite their best efforts the fundamental interests of the common people would be served by a Soviet victory.

Sorge's immediate contacts were through normal press channels. He had come to Japan with letters of introduction to Japanese prominent in government service, such as Shiratori Toshio, a career diplomat who years later was to be a defendant at the Tokyo War Crimes Trials, and Debuchi Katsuji, another career diplomat with long and friendly experience in the United States. Sorge's Nazi Party membership was sufficient to give him entry to the German Ambassador, Herbert von Dirksen, and to other officials at the Embassy, while his own qualities proved sufficient to assure that he would be invited to return.

1. German contact established: As Col. Eugen Ott rose to major general and from assistant military attaché to military attaché and finally to ambassador, Sorge's access to the best German information in Japan became established. Ott found Sorge's information and advice invaluable and needless to say the fourth bureau in Moscow, through Sorge, found Ott's information even more invaluable. With the passage of years Ott came to show his official documents quite freely to Sorge, to exchange views and to keep him informed. Similarly, the military attaché, the air attaché, the naval attaché, and the Gestapo chief attached to the Embassy from 1940, Col. Joseph Meissinger, came to trust and rely on Dr. Richard Sorge. Only the naval attaché seems to have doubted him, and not on any suspicion of Soviet loyalties but because he didn't like him. Naturally, it took many years for Sorge to arrive at this incredible position of trust at the German Embassy, but by 1939 he had covered the full route. After the outbreak of the European war Ott designated Sorge as press attaché of the embassy, putting him on the German pay roll, and giving him the strength of official position. Most mornings after Sorge had pounded out the press releases on the progress of the war in Europe, he joined the ambassador over late breakfast. Sorge had much to give the ambassador in the way of Japanese gossip and fact, and in turn the ambassador had much to tell Sorge. He showed Sorge the instructions from home and his proposed replies. Having the ambassador's example so did the other chief members of the mission, the officer closest to Dr. Richard Sorge, Soviet spy, being none other than Colonel Meissinger of the Gestapo. On occasion Sorge memorized the essentials of these documents and conversations, and sometimes he recorded the documents with his ever present camera. Like de Voukelitch he was an incorrigible amateur camera enthusiast.

After 1939, with his office at the German Embassy, and in effect a part of that embassy's intelligence organization, Sorge's position was perfect for learning everything about Japan, its capacities and intentions, that was known to Japan's ally, Germany. There was much unknown to the German allies, however, and this information Sorge had to gather in other ways. After the signing of the Tripartite Pact on September 27, 1940, however, the Japanese Army and Navy General Staff discussed their problems far more freely with appropriate members of the German Embassy. These embassy officers frankly asked Sorge for his opinions. Indeed, Sorge had been a primary architect of that Axis pact. General Ott had felt so indebted to Sorge for his work in the development of the Tripartite Pact that he intended to have Sorge present at the official signing in Tokyo. Hitler's special representative, Dr. Heinrich Stahmer, who had come over from China to complete the treaty, however, objected, and Sorge was not present. Stahmer had no suspicions of Sorge's integrity. At most he must have been jealous of sharing credit with a relatively unknown and minor figure. There is nothing more ironical in the history of the Sorge ring, however, than Sorge's part in bringing on the Tripartite Pact which inevitably hastened the war and Ozaki Hozumi's part, related later, in establishing the Imperial Rule Assistance Association.

This highlighting of Sorge's successes skips over his early and most difficult years when he was slowly establishing himself and his ring. As newspaper correspondents Sorge and De Voukelitch attended the press conferences of the foreign office and the board of information, had friendly access both to Japanese and foreign press circles where there was always a great deal of general information to be picked up, and indeed had trustful friends in various consulates and embassies. De Voukelitch was particularly successful in his outside contacts. He was very close to the Reuters man, James M. Cox, who had ready access to the British Embassy before he jumped from a window at Kempeital Headquarters in July 1940. By 1938 De Voukelitch had become a Havas man himself, acquiring more standing and more contacts. He heard the prevalent views and news of the French Embassy either directly or through his colleague, chief of the Havas Bureau, Robert Guillain. Since each embassy was working hard to collect information on Japan, as well as to keep in touch with the views of their home governments, Sorge was able to gather and evaluate the views of the German, American, French, and British Embassies in Tokyo. Naturally, only at the Germany Embassy could he get documentary evidence and secret plans, but the information from the embassies opposed to the Axis served as a very useful check against the conclusions reached by the Germans.

2. Branko and Edith de Voukelitch: Most of the records of the interrogation of de Voukelitch are lost, and it is not possible properly to assess his contribution to the ring. It is possible that de Voukelitch showed greater courage under pressure than any of the others, since even in the extant material and the summaries of the procurators, which we have in full, not much information is attributed to him. His early death in prison raises the question of torture. He was only 41 when he died, and the record does not show that he was physically below par before his arrest. It is very possible that he was firm in his refusal to talk, and was treated accordingly. Miyagi's quick death can be explained by his tuberculosis, but why did de Voukelitch only live to January 13, 1945?

Sorge sharply criticized de Voukelitch and all of his assistants excepting Ozaki in talking with the procurators and the police. Perhaps he hoped to help them by minimizing their work, but it is more likely that his words were a reflection of his own arrogance. He had this to say to Branko:

"De Voukelitch came to Japan for the express purpose of becoming a member of my intelligence group. At the same time he was, like myself, a press correspondent, to cover his espionage work. While I found my newspaper work irksome because intelligence was my real job, de Voukelitch spent more and more effort on his reporting and repeated to me everything he heard with no sense of discrimination. He left all evaluation to me."

Edith de Voukelitch was a dull sort of woman, and Branko soon tired of her. After playing around the Tokyo bars he finally met a Yamazaki Yoshiko, and fell in love with her. She spoke English fluently and seems to have been quite attractive. She soon became Branko's mistress, and according to the Japanese police was not indifferent to the attention of Dr. Sorge. Presumably, Branko did not learn of this lapse.

Edith and Branko separated in July 1938, and Yoshiko came to live with him. Branko persuaded Edith to divorce him; the divorce became effective on December 18, 1939, and Branko married Yoshiko in January 1940. It seems that this was a liaison of romance and passion, and that Yamazaki Yoshiko had nothing to do with espionage, or even any suspicion that it was going on. The Japanese Higher Special Police convinced themselves of this. In making such judgments they were not likely to err on the side of kindness.

There is no doubt that Edith de Voukelitch came to Japan knowingly as a Soviet spy, within her limits helped her husband, and through him helped Dr. Richard Sorge in espionage for the Red army. She left the ring not because of disillusionment with communism and the U. S. S. R., but because her husband, Branko, preferred to live with another woman.

Edith was not permitted to leave before Sorge had received permission from Moscow. Presumably she made pledges which the Soviet authorities felt were adequately binding before they allowed her to leave the ring and Japan. The accounts of her pay-off differ Just before she sailed "Serge" from the Soviet Embassy gave Klausen $500 for her, but he never delivered the money. This was the cause of a violent quarrel between Max and De Voukelitch. A Japanese police report claims, however, that the Russians already had paid her off with $5,000 to which Sorge had added $1,000 on his own responsibility while Klausen had added a bit more.

(g) The Japanese agents: Miyagi only learned gradually about the other members of the Sorge group. Although De Voukelitch had introduced him to Sorge he had no definite knowledge that Branko was a member of the gang until 1936 or 1937, when he met Sorge at De Voukelitch's house and saw Branko photographing documents. At Sorge's request Miyagi went to Osaka in 1934 and arranged for a meeting between Sorge and Ozaki in the park at Nara, but he had no idea how deeply Ozaki was implicated till after Ozaki had come up to Tokyo. Klausen had been in Japan for 3 years when Miyagi first met him at Branko's home. When Klausen said, "I've known about you for several years," Miyagi connected this statement with Sorge's talk of radio messages and deduced that Klausen was the wireless operator. It seems that Sorge did not inform any of his associates, aside from Klausen who knew and perhaps De Voukelitch, that they were working for the Red army. Miyagi never knew exactly where the information went. At first he thought the group was connected with the Comintern's intelligence bureau. After Sorge began to stress the gathering of military information he guessed they were working for the Red army, too, but he never asked. Sorge offered to pay all of Miyagi's expenses but Miyagi refused. He had brought savings of $3,000 from the United States and believed he could make a living selling his paintings. He only took money from Sorge to pay subsidiary agents working under him.

Personally and through his subagents, Miyagi collected information from common gossip, the press, the Official Gazette (Kampo) and magazines. A large share of his gossip and military information came from Taguchi Ugenda and Corp. Koshiro Yoshinobu respectively. He made his general reports verbally, but those on specific subjects, such as the possibilities of attack on Russia, he presented in written Japanese. When a report seemed especially important he had it

put into English before submitting it to Sorge.

1. Ozaki, Miyagi, and colleagues: While Miyagi had been assigned to Sorge as his chief Japanese agent, it was soon apparent to Sorge that Miyagi had no opportunity to make those contacts in high places which were essential for the success of the mission. In a country as carefully guarded against foreign investigation as prewar Japan, even low-level informants were useful. But Sorge needed someone to function at a level with the Japanese Government analogous to his own operations with the Germans. Quite naturally he thought of Ozaki Hozumi for whom he had respect and admiration, and he sent Miyagi to recruit him. Presumably, Sorge did not take this step without receiving the previous permission of the Fourth bureau.

A stranger calling himself Minami Ryuichi, who later revealed himself as Miyagi, called on Ozaki at the Osaka Asahi offices in the early summer of 1934. Minami said that an old friend from Shanghai wanted to meet him again. Ozaki was nervous at conversing with a man who made such disturbing allusions in the crowded Asahi offices, and so invited Minami to dinner at a Chinese restaurant that evening. At dinner Minami revealed that the friend was Johnson, and arranged for the two to meet casually at the deer park in Nara on the following Sunday. In this open place, where conversations were unlikely to be overhead, Sorge explained that the Russians had first centered their activity in Shanghai after the Chinese Nationalist Revolution. After 1931, when Japan invaded Manchuria, however, the Russians considered Japan more important than China. Therefore, Sorge had been transferred to Tokyo and he asked Ozaki's help. Ozaki agreed at once, just as he had earlier in Shanghai.

Ozaki had only a vague idea of Sorge's organization over the years. He knew Miyagi, of course, and from him heard that the group had a radio operator and a photographer. He once met the radio operator at Sorge's home, but only knew him under the nickname Miyagi had given him: Debuko (Fatty). He never met the photographer, de Voukelitch. Later another member of the gang, Guenther Stein, whose activities have not yet been described, met Ozaki as Sorge's deputy. Ozaki and Stein met about four times before the latter left Japan for good in 1938. Ozaki had known Mizuno Shige, Kawai Teikichi, and Funakoshi Hisao from China days, and he himself added some minor figures to the group.

Between them, Miyagi and Ozaki drew in 10 lesser Japanese colleagues either by appealing to their Communist sympathies or by offering financial support. They acted with great caution in selecting candidates. That their judgments of character were sound is proved by the complete security in which the ring operated over the years.

3. THE OUTER RING

While Sorge was in Japan he received specific instruction on intelligence targets. He received his general instructions, however, before he left for Moscow in August 1933, and while he was in Moscow again for 20 days in 1935. The subsequent outbreak of the European war changed the specific but not the general questions. Overriding all was the problem of whether Japan planned to attack the Soviet Union, and if so what were her capabilities. The following eight points, derived from Sorge's replies to his interrogation, cover these targets:

1. Japan's policy relative to the U. S. S. R. following the invasion of Manchuria. Did Japan intend to attack the U. S. S. R.? After 1939 this target became overriding.

2. Organization, armament, order of battle of the Japanese Army and air force, with special attention to military preparations in Manchuria.

3. Japanese-German relations. The Soviet Government early estimated that close German-Japanese relations were inevitable, to the detriment of the Soviet Union. Increasingly after the signature of the anti-Comintern pact heavy emphasis was placed on this question.

4. Japan's policy and activity in China.

5. The development of Japan's relations and policies toward the United States and Great Britain. Before the Manchurian incident the Soviets seemed to have estimated that Japan might attack the U. S. S. R. with support from the United States and Great Britain. Subsequently this question became closely related to Japan's capabilities for attack on the U. S. S. R. as related to her war in China and her program of southward advance.

6. Detailed observation of the role played by the Japanese Army in political affairs, since the Soviets estimated that foundamental foreign policy would be based on army decisions.

7. Systematic observation of the operations and growth of Japanese heavy industry, as well as its branches in Manchuria.

As will be told Sorge amassed an amazing amount of material on these questions, and at the most critical time was able to inform his superiors that Japan did not intend to attack the U. S. S. R. but instead would move south. He served, however, as a high level evaluater of information, not merely as a transmitter of undigested facts submitted to him by his agents. After gathering together facts, opinions and estimates from a wide range of sources, the German Embassy, the British Embassy, and the American and French Embassies and the Dutch Legation, the Japanese War Ministry, the Imperial Cabinet, common household gossip, the press and magazines, Sorge sorted them out. Often he asked the opinions of Ozaki and Miyagi. Having come to a conclusion, usually he would test it by conversations with the German Ambassador, a major general, and the military, air and naval attachés of the Embassy. He had a high respect for their judgments since they were professional soldiers charged with evaluating just such information for the guidance of the German government.

Meanwhile, De Voukelitch would be discussing the same problems with his newspaper friends who had access to the American, French and British Embassies, who were well informed themselves and who could often get a semiofficial view from their diplomatic contacts. Only after he had milked dry every source, had weighed and counter checked did Sorge write his careful dispatches to Moscow. Some of these he sent out over his radio circuit, some on microfilm by courier to Shanghai, some to the Soviet Embassy.

(a) Precautions used by Sorge ring: Sorge limited his own contacts in the ring to de Voukelitch, Ozaki, Miyagi, the radio operator, who was Max Klausen after 1935, and from the period 195 to 1938 to Guenther Stein. He met these people frequently at restaurants and bars like the Rheingold, the Fledermaus and Lohmeryer's, or at his own home. For years these meetings could be held naturally since three of the group were journalists with common professional interests.

It was only after 1940 when police surveillance became more rigid that Sorge began meeting the men secretly. When they met at Sorge's home the members of the ring had to adopt the usual practices of changes of cabs at distant addresses, while Sorge manipulated his porch light as an all-clear signal.

Klausen met de Voukelitch mostly at the latter's home, but sometimes at Japanese restaurants where they pretended that the meetings were accidental. They carried films, messages or money in nearly empty cigarette packages. The receiver would ask for a smoke. Thereupon, the other would offer his packet containing the films. When de Voukelitch returned the pack after taking a cigarette, Klausen would say, "Keep it. I've more." It was all very natural and easy.

Some of the precautions observed by the group, chiefly relating to the radio, were tabulated by Klausen as follows:

1. All members must have a rational occupation as cover.

2. Members must have no traffic with Japanese Communists or Communist sympathizers.

3. The radio cipher must be altered by the use of different scramble numbers with each sending.

4. The transmitter must be dismantled, packed in a case and moved after each operation.

5. Messages must be sent from different locations, never from any one house over a long period.

6. Liaison with Moscow men must be carried out in the utmost secrecy with no mention of names on either side.

7. Each member must have a cover name. Real names must never be mentioned in radios or conversations.

8. Place names must be disguised in code, such as Wiesbader for Vladivostok and Munchen for Moscow.

9. Documents must be destroyed immediately after they have served their purpose.

10. Never under any circumstances must a Russian be admitted to the circle.

1. Ozaki's technique: Similarly, Ozaki discussed his technique and listed the following nine precepts as a guide for any intelligence agent:

"1. Never give the impression that you are eager to obtain news. Men who are engaged in important affairs will refuse to talk to you if they suspect that your motive is to collect information.

"2. If you give the impression that you have more information than your prospective informant he will give with a smile.

"3. Informal dinner parties are an excellent setting for the gathering of news.

"4. It is convenient to be a specialist of some kind. For my part, I am a specialist on Chinese questions, and have always received inquiries from all quarters. I was able to gather much data from men who came to ask me questions.

"5. My position as a writer for newspapers and magazines stood me in good stead.

"6. Because I was often asked to lecture in all parts of Japan I had an excellent chance to learn general trends of local opinion.

"7. Connections with important organizations engaged in the collection of news are vital. I was affiliated with the Asahi Shimbun and later with the South Manchuria Railway.

"8. Above all, you must cultivate trust and confidence in you on the part of those you are using as informants in order to be able to pump them without seeming unnatural.

"9. In these days of unrest you cannot be a good intelligence man unless you yourself are a good source of information. You can achieve this only after constant study and wide experience."

(b) Klausen comes to Japan: Sorge early decided that "Bernhardt" was not suitable for the delicate Japan assignment. In the summer of 1935 he went to Europe, nominally to renew his contract with the Frankfurter Zeitung, but actually to attend the Comintern congress of that year in Moscow, to report to his superiors and to receive their instructions.

He went to New York on his regular German passport, but while there a man called at his hotel room with a new passport already visaed for the U. S. S. R. Sorge went directly to Moscow; it is not clear whether he went to Berlin at all, but presumably he must have gone to maintain his cover. In

Moscow he interviewed his associate of China days, Max Klausen, and selected him to replace the disgraced Bernhardt. Sorge then returned to Japan, one story says by air on the first junkers flight from Germany to Tokyo.

Max Klausen, the radio operator, received his travel orders in July 1935 from the Chief of the Fourth Bureau, General Olitsky, and from the Chief of the Far Eastern section of the Fourth Bureau, "Kalin." In September he bade farewell to Ann, who was to meet him later and started out with three passports in different names, one Italian, one Canadian, and one his own German passport. These changes of identity seem to have been intended to escape the interest of counterintelligence agents while he was traveling in Europe. Klausen described this part of his trip as follows:

"There are hundreds of passports of different countries at headquarters. All are genuine because they have been duly purchased by the Soviet Government from their rightful owners. Only the names and photographs are false. Before my departure I received instructions as to the use of the passports and was given $1,800 in United States currency. I proceeded to Le Havre via Leningrad, Helsinki, and Stockholm. At the Swedish capital I purchased an American seaman's certificate and set out for New York aboard the *Boston*. Upon my arrival I had my own German passport renewed at the German consulate and booked in at the Hotel Lincoln because I had been instructed to do so. There I received a call from a man who said his name was Jones. Jones asked me if I needed money. I refused the offer. I did not discover whether he was a member of the Soviet Embassy or a member of an intelligence group."

Klausen arrived in Yokohama aboard the *Tatsuta Maru* on November 28, 1935. He had intended to continue to Shanghai, where he expected to meet Anna, marry her and bring her to Japan. He was short of funds, however, and had to postpone that trip.

Anna had a very frightening time in Russia before she managed to get to Shanghai, but her experiences do not affect the main Sorge story. It was not until July 1936 that Max was able to meet her in Shanghai, give marriage notice at the German consulate, and then return in August to marry her. He took Anna back to Tokyo, where she served as a minor and somewhat unwilling member of the ring.

1. Klausen establishes cover: Before their separate departures from Moscow, Sorge and Klausen had arranged to meet on Tuesday evenings at the Blue Ribbon Bar near Sukiyabashi, Tokyo. On the day after Max got to town, however, they chanced to meet at the German Club. Naturally, they passed this off as their first introduction, but were spared any further pretense of not knowing each other. Klausen replaced Bruno Vendt and settled down to making himself a cover.

At first Klausen tried to set up an export-import business, but this failed. Then he established the firm of M. Klausen Shokai (M. Klausen & Co.), with offices in the Karasumori building, Shiba-ku, Tokyo. M. Klausen Shokai made and sold printing presses for blueprints, as well as fluorescent plates, and almost immediately began to make money. Among their customers were such firms as Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Nakajima, and Hitachi, as well as munition factories, the Japanese Army, and the Japanese Navy. While Klausen was manufacturing machinery from the Army's blueprints, Sorge was getting the finished blueprints of the Imperial Government. By February 1941, Klausen had done so well that he reorganized his firm as a joint stock company capitalized at Y100,000, of which he contributed Y85,000. He even established a branch at Mukden, with a working capital of Y20,000. In fact, Klausen was doing so well, and making so much money, that his earlier convictions of the perfection of communism were shaken, especially as Anna was always poking fun at his dreams of pie in the sky when she wanted fur coats now. But in the meantime his business not only was a personal cover but also a perfect cover for the financial transactions of the ring. He bought and sold abroad, and there was nothing irregular in his reception of drafts from New York or San Francisco or Shanghai for his bank account.

(c) Guenther Stein, British journalist: Guenther Stein, a member of the ring, is a man about whom too little is known. Stein was a German Jew who seems to have become a British citizen. There is a possibility that now he is an American. He represented the Berlin Tageblatt as a correspondent for a time, but in 1936 came to Japan as correspondent for the British Financial News. His specialty was economic and financial affairs, and his small book, Made in Japan, often is used as an authoritative source of prewar Japanese commerce and industry. During World War II Stein was a war correspondent in China based in Chungking. Late in 1944 he was one of a group of six who visited Yenan, and one of two correspondents whose accounts of Communist China were published as books. His Challenge of Red China, McGraw-Hill, 1945, has the outward appearance of the thoughtful reporting of a serious, objective analyst who is neither pro nor anti-Communist, but who only wants to discover the underlying truth. His book has had a great deal of effect in perpetuating the legend that Chinese Communists aren't Communists and aren't in any way connected with the Soviet Union, a legend started and kept alive so much earlier by Agnes Smedley. Like Miss Smedley, Guenther Stein was a Soviet agent, and one can be certain that neither of them was publishing the truth about Chinese Communists.

Because he was no longer in Japan when they arrested the members of the Sorge ring, the Japanese police didn't go very deeply into Stein's antecedents and complicity. That he was a top level member of the ring is clear, but we do not know how he got into it. Klausen suggested that Sorge recruited Stein after he arrived in Japan, but the speed with which Stein put his home at Klausen's disposal as a radio station makes it likely that he was a party to Soviet espionage before he met Sorge in Japan. We know also that Stein made at least one courier run to Hongkong in 1937, and that sometimes he served as Sorge's deputy in dealing with Ozaki.

Guenther Stein had a woman friend, a Swiss correspondent, Margit Gatenberg, whom he married in Hongkong in July 1938. Sorge testified that "because she was a friend of Guenther Stein we did things for her, and indirectly she did things in favor of our work." It appears that she supplied information to Stein, who passed it on to Sorge, but she seems to have acted knowingly. Sorge went on to testify (when) "she stopped at Yokohama on her way to Hongkong to marry Guenther Stein" (I had de Voukelitch meet her at the ship), "although I don't remember the details. I believe it was because I didn't want to talk to her myself * * * I did meet her just for a moment (however) at a foreign office banquet held at the New Grand."

1. Stein transferred to China: After Stein left Japan for good in 1938 Sorge was ordered to have no further contact with him. Consequently, although both men were in Hongkong in 1939, when Sorge was on a courier run, they didn't meet. As Sorge said, "I didn't meet him, although I had heard from other correspondents that he was in the city."

While this could mean that Stein had broken from his Soviet connections, such is an unlikely interpretation. Sorge and Ozaki were ordered to have nothing further to do with Miss Smedley too, after they were working in Japan, although Agnes was heading a Soviet espionage ring in Peiping and was working as faithfully as ever for the cause. The chances are that since Stein's work took him away from Japan he was separated from further connection with the ring in Tokyo, as a security measure, but that he continued to help the cause in Hongkong and every other place that he moved. Whether his romance with Margit, compounded of journalism and espionage, developed into a lasting marriage is not known.

4. THE JAPANESE AGENTS

Sorge had rings within a ring. The outer ring consisted of the principals; Sorge, Ozaki, de Voukelitch, Miyagi, Stein, and Klausen. Sometimes Sorge dealt directly with each of these men, although often he dealt with one through another. He was trying, of course, to reduce the number of contacts to reduce the risks. For example, on at least four occasions he dealt with Ozaki through Stein. and similarly he dealt with Stein through de Voukelitch and with de Voukelitch through Stein. On occasion his contact with Miyagi was through Ozaki and on occasion this contact was reversed and he dealt with Ozaki through Miyagi. Although he knew her, Sorge seems not to have dealt directly with Stein's friend, Margit Gatenberg, but instead she funneled her probably modest bits of information to Sorge through Stein. Similarly, Anna Klausen received her orders through her husband, and Edith de Voukelitch was dealt with through her husband, Branko.

Within this outer ring were two lesser rings, one maintained by Ozaki and one by Miyagi. The members were not entirely unknown to each other, but where possible they were kept separate. This was the strictly Japanese part of the Sorge ring at the popular level, as contrasted with Ozaki's high-level contacts in the Government. Ozaki and Miyagi met each other easily, since Mrs. Ozaki, who never once suspected her husband, wanted their daughter to receive painting lessons. Every Sunday Miyagi called at Ozaki's house to instruct this daughter in the gentle art of color. Most naturally the growing friendship between her husband and this artist, and his frequent social calls were nothing to arouse the suspicion of Mrs. Ozaki or of anyone else.

(a) Lesser rings of Ozaki and Miyagi: The Japanese in Ozaki's ring were: Funakoshi Hisao, member of the China Research Institute; Kawamura Yoshio, of the Manchurian Daily News; Kawai Teikichi, former China correspondent, member of the China Research Institute, and latterly employed by the Japan Reclaimed Paper Co., Ltd.; and Mizuno Shige, formerly a student in Shanghai and employed in Kyoto.

Those in Miyagi's little ring were: Kitabayashi Tomo, a Seventh Day Adventist and teacher in a sewing school; Koshiro Yoshinobu, a soldier; Dr. Yasuda Tokutaro, physician; Taguchi Ugenda, having minor contacts at the War Ministry; Yamana Masazane, expert on agricultural affairs; Kuzumi Fusako, employed by the Social Mass Party (Shakai Taishuto) but with access to the Cabinet Information Bureau; and Akiyama Koji, who worked as a translator, for pay, and not for the cause. In addition, both Ozaki and Miyagi had many friends and contacts whom they exploited, but none of these belonged to the ring.

While perhaps none of these people were essential to the success of Sorge's mission of discovering Japan's war plans, they did help a very great deal. What they learned was screened through either Miyagi or Ozaki, and subsequently assessed by Sorge in his conversations with experts at the German Embassy. To see the Sorge case in its fullest ramifications it is necessary to know of these

lesser spies, to understand who they were and why they turned traitor.

There is a thread common to most of their lives: residence abroad. The exaggerated claims of Japanese militarists as to their benign conduct in China could not be concealed from Japanese who lived there or from others who live in America and read the papers. These people were both antimilitarist and pro-Communist; they seem to have believed that the one was a corollary of the other. The readiness of these Japanese subjects to commit treason may surprise those who have believed that the Japanese people possessed a unique and fanatical patriotism which permeated the whole nation. Since in the famous Canadian spy case presumably loyal Canadian and English citizens as simply and as readily agreed to betray their countries on behalf of the Soviet Union, no parallel can be drawn between the repressions of militaristic Japan and the freedoms of democratic Canada and England as breeding grounds for disloyalty. The common mind of the Japanese, Canadian, and English traitors, however, was a fanatical faith in the perfection of life and intention in the Soviet Union.

The following is a description of the lesser individuals of the Ozaki and Miyagi rings within the Sorge ring.

(b) Funakoshi Hisao, China operator: Funakoshi Hisao, who served as a China representative of Dr. Sorge until his arrest in 1942, was a newspaper reporter. He had been born in Okayama Prefecture in 1901, and left Waseda University in 1925 without graduating to go to Tsingtao. By March 1927, he had reached Shanghai as a reporter for the Shanghai Mainichi, but soon joined the staff of the news agency known as Rengo Tsushinsha, becoming manager of their Hankow and Tientsin branches successively. For 2 years, from 1935 to 1937, he represented the Yomiuri Shimbun in Tientsin. From 1938 to 1941 he was an unofficial adviser to the headquarters of the Japanese Army at Hankow. Obviously, such a man was in an excellent position to get information on Japanese order of battle, troop movements, intentions and capabilities in China.

Funakoshi became interested in communism in Shanghai, where he was a member of Ozaki's discussion group in 1929. Note again the parallel to the later Canadian study groups. In 1930 he joined the secret Communism Research Society (Kyosan Shugi Kenkyu Kai) of which Kawai Teikichi was a fellow member. In March 1932, Kawai asked him to replace a Yamagami Masayoshi as liaison man between Japanese groups and a Soviet spy ring. Funakoshi seems readily to have accepted this invitation, so Kawai introduced him to Dr. Richard Sorge and Miss Agnes Smedley, who were then active in Shanghai espionage. For the next 6 months Kawai met Sorge every 5 days to pass on the information he had collected. When Sorge was recalled he introduced Funakoshi to "Paul" to whom this Japanese reported regularly till his transfer to Hankow in February 1933. From Hankow Funakoshi continued to supply information on the Japanese Army, through another Japanese, Nozawa Fusaji. In November 1936, Funakoshi established the China Problems Investigation Institute (Shina Mondai Kemkyo Jo) to which such Soviet agents as Nakanishi Ko, now a member of the House of Councillors, and Osaki Shotaro made monthly reports. The Japanese police learned of Funakoshi from members of the Sorge ring. They arrested him in Peiping on January 4, 1942, where he was still operating his China Problems Investigation Institute. Sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment after trial in Tokyo. Funakoshi died in jail on February 27, 1945.

(c) Kawai Teikichi, China adventurer: Kawai Teikichi, who had introduced Funakoshi to Dr. Sorge, was born in 1900 and was graduated from Meiji University in 1925. He constantly moved from job to job, never holding any one very long. In March 1928, he went to China, where he managed to hang on as a reporter for the Shanghai Weekly from 1930 to 1932. He ran a book shop in Tientsin for a time in 1933, but then started on his round of jobs again. For a time in 1939 he was employed by an Army intelligence agency, the Osako special duty organ (Osako Tokumu Kikan). He returned to Japan in 1940, where Ozaki got him a job with the Japan Reclaimed Paper Co., Ltd. (Dia Nippon Saiseishi KK).

Kawai became a Communist at Shanghai in 1928. He joined the Leftist Literary Society (Sayoku Bunkensho Kai) whose members coincidentally were chiefly members of the Communism Research Society (Kyosan Shugi Kenkyo Kai). In this group among others he came to know Komatsu Shigeo, Hidaka Tameo, Tejima Hiroo, Funkakoshi Hisao and Mizuno Shige. The last two men worked in the Sorge ring until the end.

When Kawai joined these men in forming the Sino-Japanese struggle group (Nishi Toso Domei), very naturally he came under the suspicion of Japanese police agents at Shanghai. Kawai moved to Peiping until the heat was off. He was back in Shanghai in 1931, and while working in a second-hand book store he received instruction on the proper collection and assessment of military and political information from Mizuno Shige, Hadaka Tameo, Tejima Hiroo, and Sakamaki Takashi. In October 1931 he met Ozaki, who introduced him to Sorge and Miss Smedley, who soon added him to their group. Sorge sent him to Manchuria which the Japanese Army had just invaded, to gather military information. From this time Kawai was very active in North China and Manchuria, living variously in Harbin, Mukden, Peiping, and Tientsin, and passing a great stream of information to Sorge, to his successor Paul, to Ozaki and to Ozaki's successor, Funakoshi Hisao, at Shanghai and to Miss Smedley in Peiping. For a time he worked closely with Chinese spies.

Kawai returned to Tokyo on a trip in 1934 and saw Ozaki, who seems to have become his idol. Since Kawai's connections with the Chinese spies had ended and he had no known connections with Communists, Ozaki felt he could be sent back to Tientsin safely. He returned to Tokyo again in 1935, however, and worked for Miyagi for a time before being sent back to China. His final homecoming was in 1940.

When he was in Japan, Kawai was chiefly useful as a source on Japanese nationalist movements, having had such connections himself as a young man. He was much more useful in China.

Miyagi's judgment of Kawai is interesting. He told the procurator, "Kawai was introduced to me by Ozaki. He was a China adventurer (Shina Ronin). Whenever he was short of money he ran to Ozaki, who gave him cash * * * because of Ozaki's important position and the high caliber of the men who called on him, I thought it might embarrass Ozaki to have Kawai dropping into his office. After consulting Sorge, I suggested that henceforth I look after Kawai. Sorge approved and told me to train the man to work for me. I gave him ¥60 and ¥100 every month. By May 1940 I had discovered that Kawai had no firm convictions, so I sent him back to Ozaki.

"I could not trust Kawai fully because the standard of his comprehension of communism was low and because his private life was scandalous. He seemed to admire Ozaki tremendously, however. * * * I made many attempts to find him a job, but the man hated work. In the end Ozaki placed him in the paper company in May 1941."

Kawai was arrested on October 22, 1941. He was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment, but was released on October 10, 1945, and now is at large.

(d) Mizuno Shige, high-caliber lesser spy: A higher-caliber man among these lesser spies was Mizuno Shige, who was born in 1909. After graduating from middle school in Kyoto, he entered the East Asia Common Script School (Toa Dobun Shoin) in Shanghai in 1929. Almost immediately he became involved in Communist groups. By October 1930, he had helped set up a cell of the Chinese Communist Party at the school and took a leading part in a student strike. In December he was detained for 10 days by the Japanese consular police for distributing pacifist handbills to some Japanese naval cadets, and in January 1931, he was expelled from the school.

The Sorge group must have been keeping a watchful eye on all potential Japanese Communist agents. Mizuno met Ozaki in October 1930 and the next April was introduced to Kito Ginichi, the Japanese Communist from America, by a Formosan Communist. Kito sounded him out and seems to have been satisfied, for in May 1931, Kito introduced Mizuno to Dr. Richard Sorge. Soon thereafter, Mizuno was gathering military and political information for the Sorge ring. His work was sharply interrupted, however, when he was arrested in August 1931 by the Shanghai police and handed over to the Japanese consulate. He was deported to Japan, not for espionage but for Communist agitation at his school, where he had been active even after his expulsion.

In Japan, Mizuno was employed by the Ohara Social Problems Research Institute (Ohara Shakai Mondai Kenkyo), possibly a Communist cover organization. He renewed his friendship with Ozaki there after Ozaki returned to the Asahi. He was arrested again in 1936, charged with taking part in the attempted reconstruction of Japanese Communist Party. Apparently the police didn't have much of a case against him, for he soon was out, went to Tokyo and got a job with the Oriental Society (Toyo Kyokai). In Tokyo he teamed up again with Ozaki, who introduced him to Sorge in January 1937 and to Miyagi in July. Thereafter he worked continuously for the Sorge ring, gathering news on social and political questions in general and on the Kyoto region in particular. His subsequent employment in the Showa Study Society (Showa Kenkyu Kai) from 1938 to 1939, and his part in the compilation of a yearbook for the Great Japan Youth Association (Dai Nippon Seinen Dan) assisted him in his work for Sorge. In connection with his job he was able to write lengthy reports on the Great Japan Youth Party, the Black Dragon Society, and the reorganization of the old-line political parties in 1940. He it was who reported on the equipment and movements of the Sixteenth Division in July 1939, and One Hundred and Sixteenth Division in August 1940.

Miyagi had this to say of Mizuno:

"I never gave him any money. He was more closely connected with Ozaki, and he had a regular job. If he ran short of money, I think Ozaki helped him out. I wanted to use him for more important work; in fact, I wanted him to take my place in Tokyo in order that I might travel about the country. Sorge and Ozaki, however, did not approve of the idea, so nothing came of it."

Mizuno was arrested on October 17, 1941. He was given a prison sentence of 13 years. He died in Miyagi Prison on March 22, 1945.

(e) Koshiro Yoshinobu, soldier turned traitor: Koshiro Yoshinobu was a soldier, a corporal, the only military man in Sorge's ring. In a country like Japan even a corporal could discover a great deal which is unknown to civilians.

Koshiro was born in 1909, graduated from Meiji University in 1935, and spent most of the rest of his free life in the army. He was drafted in March 1936 and sent to Manchuria. After the outbreak of the China war, in July 1937, his unit was sent to the north China

front and fought at Suiyuan. He made corporal in November 1938 and was returned to civil life as a reservist. Almost immediately, however, he was called up again, was sent to Manchuria and then to Korea, but was back in the inactive reserves in March 1939. He had time enough to get a job in a paper shop, to marry and father a child before he was called up again in July 1941, when he was sent to south China. He was still on duty in China with his unit when he was arrested on April 11, 1942. He was given a dishonorable discharge in January 1943, in order that he might be tried in a civil court. The verdict of that court was 15 years' imprisonment. The court was cheated by the defeat of Japan, and Koshiro was released by order of the conquering Americans on October 8, 1945.

Koshiro became interested in communism while a student at Meiji University through the influence of a neighbor named Kiotake Yasumasa. Years later, in May 1939, while Koshiro was between wars, this neighbor introduced him to Miyagi. (The failure of the Japanese police to arrest Kiotake in 1941–42 seems to indicate that he was dead and so unavailable for questioning.)

1. Treason without hesitation: Miyagi told Koshiro that he was an agent of the Comintern, and asked the reservist to supply information on military affairs and troop movements through his army connections. Koshiro seems to have agreed at once and with no hesitation to commit this treason. Between May 1939 and July 1941, during his short period of civilian life, Koshiro supplied Miyagi with information on the Nomohan battle, the defense plans for Manchukuo, the distribution and equipment of troops and the quality of various weapons. He also secured classified manuals of the Japanese infantry, engineers, and air force as well as other military publications. Miyagi developed such confidence in him that he recommended him to Sorge for designation as a Soviet agent. Sorge approved and transmitted his curriculum vitae to Moscow for consideration.

Miyagi's account of Koshiro gives a clear picture of the treason of this Japanese soldier. He said:

"Koshiro Yoshinobu required no financial help because he lived with his father. I met him in the spring of 1939 after he had been discharged from the army. He impressed me as frank and straighforward, yet reserved. I thought he would become a good helper after training and consulted Sorge as to his future. Sorge agreed to give him about ¥100 a month if he were willing to work for us.

"In May 1939, when Koshiro came to see me, I said, 'If a war should break out between Russia and Japan it would mean a great sacrifice not only on the part of the farmers and laborers of both countries, but also on the part of the whole Japanese people. To avoid such a tragedy that is to say a Russo-Japanese war, I am sending various data on the situation in Japan to the Comintern.' I asked Koshiro if he would help me by telling what he knew about the army and by obtaining military information from his friends. I told him that he would be paid. Koshiro did not say clearly whether he would help; he only smiled and replied that he did not know many secret matters. He declared that I did not have to worry about money because he had savings.

"From that time Koshiro began to tell me things, and I gave him about ¥50 a month. When he took trips for me I paid him more. I intended to train him for a couple of years and then make him an independent member of our group. Meanwhile, I thought it would be convenient to have him employed in some office where he would have access to military information. I thought the War Ministry; if possible the Mobilization Bureau, would be a good place, but before I could arrange it he found a job at the Hakushin Sha through a friend of his father's.

"Of course, I consulted Sorge about my plans, introduced Koshiro to him, and had the boy's curriculum vitae sent to Moscow. To let the headquarters be informed of his share in our business, I always mentioned his name in reporting information which came from him. We called him Miki as a cover name. He was an eldest son, however, with both parents living. Moreover, he married soon after his discharge, and later a baby was born. All of these circumstances made him unsuitable for intelligence work, so I had to change my mind."

(f) Kuzumi Fusako, female Communist: Kuzumi Fusako was one of the two women in the ring in Japan, although there had been several women in China. This woman, born in 1888 in Okayama prefecture and graduated from a girl's high school in 1912, was the divorced wife of a Christian minister and the mother of two daughters. After her divorce in 1920 she became associated with various left wingers and Communists centering around Waseda University, in Tokyo. By August 1921, she became the common-law wife of a leading Communist, Mitamura Shiro, and active in the Communist labor movement. She joined the party in November 1927, and became a member of the Hokkaido District Committee.

Mrs. Kuzumi was in prison from April 1929 until June 1934, along with other Communist leaders. Just before her release she read in the papers of the recantations of several prominent Communists, including that of her husband, Mitamura, so she did likewise. Subsequently, however, she backslid into the Communist movement and was mentally prepared when she met Miyagi in March 1936. Miyagi confided that he was a Comintern agent, and asked for her help. She began to collect information on the February 26, 1936, incident, the Social Mass Party (Shakai Taishuto), the all-Japan Federation of Labor (Zen Nippon Rodo Sodomei), the great Japan Youth Party (Dai Nippon Seinen To) and similar subjects.

Kuzumi Fusako was arrested on October 13, 1941, and received a sentence of 8 years at hard labor. She was released by the Americans on October 8, 1945.

(g) Kitabayashi Tomo, the weak link: Mrs. Kitabayashi was the other woman in this case. She had been Miyagi's friend since his early days in Los Angeles, where she had gone with her husband, Yoshisaburo, in 1920. She had added to her income in Los Angeles by teaching dressmaking, and later found this a useful device for picking up gossip in Tokyo. Mrs. Kitabayashi had joined the Proletarian Art Society in Los Angeles in 1931, along with Miyagi, and soon was persuaded to join the Japanese group of the thirteenth branch of the American Communist Party. Tomo had another type of conversion in 1933, when she joined the Women's Christian Temperance Union and seemingly the Seventh Day Adventist Church. She continued to be friendly with Miyagi, however, and saw him in Tokyo soon after her return alone in 1936. She taught dressmaking in the Los Angeles Seamstress' School in Tokyo until her husband Yoshisaburo, came back to Japan, when she joined him at Kokawa, Wakayama prefecture, in December 1939.

When Miyagi asked her to collect information in April 1938, although she suspected that he was a Comintern agent, she agreed. Her gossip from the sewing classes and the Seventh Day Adventist Church, which she attended, could not have been very important for Dr. Sorge. It seems strange that Miyagi risked disclosing himself to her. Of course, he had known her well in America, and had lived at her home for several years. As it turned out, it was this risk which undid the whole conspiracy. After Ito Ritsu, of the Japan Communist Party accused Mrs. Kitabayashi of being a Communist and a spy, they arrested her and her husband on September 28, 1941. She was the weak link which broke the strong chain and led to the hanging of Sorge and Ozaki.

Yoshisaburo was found innocent, but Tomo was convicted and sentenced to 5 years in prison. She was released, with reduction of time for good behavior, at the end of her term, but has died since the end of the war.

(h) Akiyama Koji, the only mercenary: Akiyama Koji was the only member of the ring who didn't work for love of the cause. According to Miyagi, Akiyama had little interest in causes, and less interest in Miyagi's use of his work. So long as Miyagi kept paying him a modest 60–100 yen a month Akiyama asked no questions and translated into English anything that Miyagi gave him.

Akiyama was born in 1889, and after finishing a middle school in Kanda ward, Tokyo, he taught in a primary school. In 1914 he entered Rikkyo University, but before graduating went to America as an employee of an export firm. In Los Angeles he attended night classes at a high school, at the Los Angeles Polytechnic School, and the California Business College, where he was graduated in 1923. For the next 10 years, until his return to Japan in 1933, he worked in a book shop.

Back in Tokyo, Akiyama had trouble getting a job till he met Miyagi whom he'd known in America. Miyagi offered him a job translating documents into English, which he gladly undertook. He didn't suspect that Miyagi might be passing on these translations to a foreigner until 1938 or 1939, but he wasn't upset then. After all he had to eat, so he kept the job.

Miyagi commented on Akiyama:

"Akiyama was not a suitable kind of man for intelligence work. I never intended to draw him into our group, but I found him useful, for he was ready at hand to translate anything I gave him. He was not interested in social problems, however. I consulted Ozaki in 1939 in hope of obtaining a special translator, but we could not find a satisfactory man. Therefore, I continued to use Akiyama.

"Of course, Akiyama knew I was a Communist, but he never fully understood how secret or important my work was * * *."

Akiyama was arrested on October 13, 1941, and was sentenced to 7 years in prison. He was released on October 10, 1945.

(i) Yasuda Tokutaro, medical informant; Yasuda Tokutaro, a physician, was born in 1897, and was graduated from the medical school of Kyoto Imperial University. While still a medical student he was introduced to Marxian literature by a professor of the university, Kawakami Hajime. He received his M. D. in 1930.

Dr. Yasuda was stimulated leftward by a cousin who raised him, Yamamoto Senji (a labor leader, who was assassinated in 1929), by this Professor Kawakami and by Mrs. Kuzumi Fusako. He first became active in the Communist movement when he joined the Proletarian Scientific Research Institute (Puroretaria Kagaku Kenkyo Jo) and other Communist-front organizations.

Miyagi Yotoku called on Dr. Yasuda in January 1935 as a patient. In March of the next year Kuzumi Fusako told Dr. Yasuda that Miyagi was a Comintern agent, so that when Miyagi asked his help in September 1937, the doctor was quite ready to answer his questions. He was able to contribute information chiefly on the state of medical supplies and gossip on troop movements picked up from his patients.

Dr. Yasuda was arrested on June 8, 1942. He was sentenced to 2 years imprisonment but was given a 5-year suspension of execution. After the war he ran for the lower house of the diet from Kyoto, on the Communist ticket, unsuccessfully, and at this writing is living in Tokyo and reminiscing

of the great days when he was a member of the Sorge-Ozaki ring.

(j) Kawamura Yoshio, Shanghai contact: The only member of the ring about whom almost nothing is known is Kawamura Yoshio. This man, the chief of the Shanghai office of the Manshu Nichi Nichi (Manchuria Daily News), was Ozaki's Shanghai agent. Kawamura was arrested on March 31, 1942, and brought to Tokyo for trial. It was established that Kawamura, then age 32, had been accepted by Sorge as a member of the ring. He was able to supply information on Manchuria because of his job. Unfortunately, however, Kawamura died in jail soon after his arrest, and it was not possible to develop his case with the thoroughness of the others.

(k) Yamana Masazane, agrarian expert: The ring's agrarian contact was Yamana Masazane, son of a Hokkaido farmer. Born in 1902, his formal education ended with primary school. He became a member of the Hokkaido League (Hokkaido Rengo Kai) of the Japan Farmer's Union (Nippon Nomin Kumiai) from which he developed a lifelong interest in agrarian movements. For a time he worked in Manchuria. Through acquaintance with Communist Party leaders, including the present Secretary General Tokuda Kyuichi, he became a Communist and joined the party in November 1927. After being arrested on March 15, 1928, he was sentenced to 5 years' hard labor for violation of the peace preservation law. He joined Kuzumi Fusako after his release from prison, and through her met Miyagi in March 1936. At Miyagi's request he agreed to gather information on rural and agrarian questions. Miyagi describes him as follows:

"Yamana had served a sentence for participating in some Communist affair. He was introduced to me by Kuzumi Fusako soon after he came down from Hokkaido. She asked me to help him find a job. I did not intend to use him in connection with our group except to learn something about Japan's agrarian problems, but after he became connected with the Current Politics Society (Jisei Kai) and began to bring me news about political and economic affairs I started to make use of him. * * * I began to pay him about ¥60 a month, from the spring of 1936 until the beginning of 1938. When he made trips * * * I paid his expenses.

"I tried to find Yamana a regular job but was unsuccessful. He never told me where or how he lived. We met either at my boarding house or at some restaurant in Tokyo. Some time in 1938 I realized that Yamana wanted to cut his connection with me. I wanted to find out why, so I visited his house which I happened to know at that time. I saw at once that he wanted to leave me because of a woman and that I could not stop him.

"Soon after that Yamana found a job with an agrarian union * * * (and not much later) * * * found employment with the Eastern Society (Tohokai). He took many trips Karafuto, Hokkaido, Aomori, Akita, Miyagi, Fukushima, Toyama, Ishikawa, and many other places. I wanted to organize a group of my own with members in Tokyo, Nagoya, Osaka, Kyushu, Hokkaido, and Hokuriku but I couldn't find the proper people. I thought Yamana could be one of them, but he wanted to lead an easy life and I had to give up the idea."

The police arrested Yamana on December 15, 1941. He was sentenced to 12 years at hard labor, but was released by American order on October 7, 1945.

(l) Taguchi Ugenda, minor informant: One of the less useful members of the ring was Taguchi Ugenda, who was introduced to Miyagi by Yamana. Both Taguchi and Yamana were from Hokkaido, and both were members of the Japan Communist Party.

Taguchi, born in 1902, finished the Hokkaido Middle School, studied for a time at the Oriental University (Toyo Daigaku), but transferred to Meiji Gakuin in 1924. Without graduating he left Meiji to go to Sapporo where he joined a labor union affiliated with the Japan Labor Unions Conference (Nihon Rodo Kumiai Hyogigai). He joined the Japan Communist Party in December 1927, a month after Yamana, and was arrested along with Yamana and many other Communists on March 15, 1928. He was sentenced to 3 years' imprisonment, but with time off for good behavior was out by November 1929, when he came to Tokyo and promptly met Miyagi. At Miyagi's request he began reporting on Hokkaido, chiefly on economic matters such as oil, coal, and the food supply.

Miyagi remarked of this agent, "I did not intend to enlist (his) help in the beginning because Kuzumi Fusako described him as a 'formalist' unsuitable for espionage. He had already arranged to set up a peat factory in Manchuria. According to my standards he was not a genuine Communist because he was going to Manchuria to make money. He was always hot after some sort of queer enterprise."

After they had the principals the police soon unearthed Taguchi. They arrested him on October 29, 1941. The court sentenced him to 13 years in prison, but he, too, was released by United States Army order on October 6, 1945.

(m) Nakanishi Ko, postwar Diet member: Nakanishi Ko, Diet member, supposed China expert, former chief editorial writer for Mimpo and leading member of the Japan Communist Party, was associated with Ozaki but does not seem to have been a member of the Sorge ring. He led a Soviet spy ring in China, but his career and his activities so frequently crossed those of the Sorge ring, both in China and Japan days, that it is desirable to describe him here. The records of his trial in Tokyo after 1942 have not been available, so that it is not possible to give a full account of his espionage activities, but a great deal is known from police records and from his own statements since the end of the war.

Nakanishi, who was born in Mie Prefecture in 1910, went to Shanghai after graduation from middle school in Japan and attended the East Asia Common Script School (Toa Dobun Shoin) at which Mizuno Shige was a fellow student. There he joined the Chinese Communist Party's Young Communist League, the Chinese Communist Party and several Communist-front organizations, such as the Japan-China Joint Struggle League (Nishi Toso Domei). Along with Mizuno he took an active part in the Communist-led student strike at his school in 1930, and like Mizuno was arrested by the Japanese consular police for subversive activities. While no evidence is available to prove the point it is reasonable to assume that not only Mizuno but Nakanishi, too, came under the observation of the Sorge ring at this time, and that his first acquaintance with Ozaki dates from this date.

Nakanishi returned to Japan in February 1932, and immediately joined the China Problems Research Society of the Proletarian Science Research Institute, a Communist-front organization. In April he was arrested and detained for 40 days before being released. He then returned to his native Mie Prefecture, where he was active in a secret agrarian reform movement. By June he had gone to Osaka to enter the Ohara Social Problems Research Institute (Ohara Shakai Mondai Kenkyu Jo) to work on labor problems. It will be recalled that Mizuno, too, worked for this society. Nakanishi only stayed with the Ohara organization till November 1933, when he looked around for a new job with wider opportunities.

(1) SMR intelligence agent, secret Communist: The investigation department of the Dairen office of the South Manchuria Railway employed Nakanishi in May 1934 and he continued to work for this organization in various offices until his arrest in June 1942. He served twice in Dairen, once in Tientsin, and most lengthily in Shanghai. Progressively he advanced in rank and pay and responsibility. At this time the South Manchuria Railway, working closely with the Kwantung Army, was investigating a wide range of subjects from the transportation potential of the Trans-Siberian Railway and the capacities of Siberian military bases to the economic and political situation in China. With the progress of the war in China, the SMR extended its offices to the chief cities in occupied China, employing over 1,000 men in the investigation branch alone. Naturally, this organization became a primary target for Japanese Communists, and being staffed entirely by civilians it was easier to enter than the Army intelligence agencies. Out of the 1,000 men about 30 were Japanese Communists either sympathizers or party members, who organized their own investigation body so that the results of the research of this intelligence agency came to be at the disposal of the Chinese Communists and the Soviets. Close liaison seems to have been maintained with both. Recently Nakanishi boasted that he received a secret commendation directly from Mao Tse-Tsung, political leader of the Chinese Communist Party, for his superior espionage work in Shanghai.

Nakanishi took an active part in the China Problems Research Institute, which was headed in Peiping by Funakoshi Hisao of the Sorge ring. It is reasonable to assume that Funakoshi and Nakanishi worked closely together, and that he was in frequent touch with Agnes Smedley, who headed a branch of Soviet espionage in Peiping for a time. It is not believed, however, that Nakanishi was directly a part of the Sorge ring in Japan. Earlier it has been shown that the Sorge group separated itself from all other Soviet intelligence agencies, including former members who were no longer working in Japan, such as Agnes Smedley and Guenther Stein. The fact that the Japanese higher special police decided, after lengthy interrogation, that Nakanishi was not a member of the Sorge ring supports this assumption.

(2) Sentenced to life: One of the lesser members of the Sorge ring informed on Nakanishi Ko. Since Funakoshi Hisao had been arrested on October 22, 1941, while Kawamura Yoshio was not arrested till March 31, 1942, it is possible that the latter was the one to betray Nakanishi, since Funakoshi had full knowledge of him. The Tokyo metropolitan police sent special agents to Shanghai in the spring of 1942 to uncover a large group of Japanese Communists who were suspected both of being members of the Sorge ring and of supplying information directly to the Chinese Communists and to the Soviets. On June 16, 1942, they arrested nearly a hundred men, and held about 20 for prosecution. Nakanishi Ko was one of these who was brought to Tokyo. He was not tried for over 3 years, not until the procurators believed they had secured all the information he possessed. He was tried on September 11, 1945, before the Tokyo district court, the procurator demanding the death penalty for this Japanese subject who had committed treason. On September 28, 1945, the court sentenced him to life imprisonment. This was after the Japanese surrender, however, and Nakanishi was released from prison on October 10, 1945, under the American order for the release of political prisoners.

While Nakanishi was in prison he wrote a 12-volume history of the Chinese Communist

Party, and since the end of the war has become famous not only as an exponent of communism, but as an expert on the Chinese Communists. He had joined the Japan Communist Party and is one of its best-known writers and propagandists. From February 1946 to August 1947 he was chief editorial writer of the newspaper Mimpo, and simultaneously was a director of the China Research Institute. One may recall that before his arrest in 1942 he had been a director of an organization of the same name functioning in Peiping which was a cover for espionage for the Soviets and Chinese Communists. Nakanishi ran for the upper house of the Diet in last April's elections and won a seat in the house of councilors. Currently he is one of the eight Communist Party members in the Japanese Parliament.

(n) Other agents: Possibly some member of the Sorge ring escaped detection yet this possibility seems remote. Once the case had been cracked the Japanese Special Higher Police (Tokkoka) and the procurators who handled it had the most complete opportunity for a definitive examination. They were especially concerned to detect Japanese subjects who might have committed treason, and they thoroughly explored every lead. From the first day of his arrest Miyagi talked freely, and soon everyone with the exception of Sorge and possibly De Voukelitch was telling all he knew. The police had unlimited chances for cross checking, and they did not suffer from a lack of zeal. Anyone mentioned by the members of the ring, or who was known to have associated with the members of the ring, came under suspicion. If not immediately cleared he was arrested and was given a thorough examination. As the case developed men were arrested all over Eastern Asia and brought to Tokyo where attempts were made to connect them with Sorge. In the process many were found to be completely innocent, others to have been naively supplying members of the ring with information without thought of harm, and others to have been engaged in espionage of a wide scale but not as a member of Sorge's ring.

Nakanishi Ko falls into this category. It is not believed that any Japanese connected with Sorge's ring in Japan escaped police knowledge and arrest.

* * * * *

In seeking to connect men now living with Dr. Sorge's activities in Japan it seems well to recall the rigidity with which he avoided all contacts with the Japanese Communist Party and its active members, the success with which he operated for years through keeping his ring small and properly covered so it would not arouse gossip even among those friendly to his cause, and his sharp avoidance of contact with other Soviet espionage agents not assigned to duty with him. It is more than probable that there were other Soviet spies in China, but one would miss the basic principles whereby Sorge functioned so skillfully were he to attempt to connect every Japanese Communist or every Soviet spy with the activities of Dr. Sorge or Ozaki Hozumi. Similarly, it would be an error to assume that personal acquaintance with or even associating widely with foreigners and Japanese who looked upon him as a Nazi journalist. It would be as reasonable to assume that all persons who knew him well were Soviet agents as it would be to assume that Maj. Gen. Eugen Ott, Nazi Ambassador, and Col. Joseph Meisinger, the Beast of Warsaw, were Soviet agents because they looked upon Sorge as their friend and supplied him with so much valuable information. The Japanese procurator and courts went into this question of association with the greatest of care, and it is believed that their assessments of responsibility and innocence were sound.

(f) Couriers: In addition to sending radio messages, Sorge sent a great volume of material by courier, usually in the form of microfilmed documents, chiefly of his own analyses but often actual German or Japanese texts. On occasion some shadowy Moscow man appeared to have made direct contact with Sorge or Klausen in Tokyo, and to have taken away material. But until 1939 liaison with Moscow was conducted chiefly in Shanghai and Hongkong. Most of the members of the group, including the reluctant Anna, served as couriers at different times. In April and July 1936, and again in 1939, Max Klausen took documentary microfilms to Shanghai where he exchanged them for cash and sometimes microfilm, with a stranger who gave a prearranged recognition signal. Once when they projected some of the received microfilm on a wall in the home of De Voukelitch they found the letters from Mrs. Sorge in Russia had been included with the official material.

On these trips, the men found it easy to string the film cartridges on a cord and to hide the improvised belt under their clothing. It was even easier for Mrs. Klausen to hide them. Since she was a former resident of Shanghai, the Japanese police did not think it strange that she should wish to visit her old home from time to time.

In 1937 Richard Sorge took films to Shanghai and Guenther Stein took some to Hong Kong. In October 1937 and again in November 1938, Anna went to Shanghai. Anna refused to go at first, but was persuaded by the threat of punishment by Moscow. Orders for her first trip came from Sorge, for the second direct from Russia. Each time Anna carried about 30 film cartridges, hidden in her seemingly ample bosom. She delivered them to men she met at the Sun Sun Department Store, a bookstore on Bubbling Well Road, in the lobby of the Cathay Hotel and on the sidewalk of Avenue Haig. Each time she received some five thousand United States dollars which she deposited to Max's account with the Hongkong and Shanghai Bank, Ltd. Subsequently, Max transferred the money to Tokyo by bank draft.

By 1939, Sorge decided it was too dangerous for members of his ring to travel to China as messengers. The intensification of the war in China so increased the suspicion and scrutiny of Japanese intelligence agencies that the risks had become disproportionate. Subsequently, with the severance of economic ties between Japan and the United States, it became too difficult to secure funds through American banks. In 1939 Sorge radioed a request for establishment of liaison in Japan. Instructions soon came for Klausen, "Two tickets with higher numbers for 'Fritz'. One with a smaller number for liaison man." Soon afterward, Max found two tickets for the Imperial Theatre in his mail box at the Tokyo central post office. He took Anna to the show, and sat in the lower-numbered seat. In the darkness he passed to his right-hand neighbor 38 film cartridges of photographs of documents from the German embassy. In return his neighbor passed him $5,000.

Klausen's neighbor turned out to be the Soviet Consul in Tokyo. Helge Leonidvitch Vutokevitch. The following April Klausen and Ann attended the All Girls Opera at the Takarazuka Theatre, where Max handed over another 30 rolls of film and received in return $3,000 in United States currency, and Y2,500. Not long after his pleasant entertainment Vutokevitch returned to Russia and was replaced by Viktor Sergevitch Zaitsev, also a Soviet consul, who used the cover name of Serge.

Sorge met Klausen about 10 times, chiefly in Max's offices. He was brief and to the point. Sorge was present at the meetings only once. Klausen recorded the meetings in his diary as, S-TR, for Serge treffen, meaning met Serge. Early in 1941 during one of his visits at Max's office Serge listed the Sorge ring as he himself knew it:

Richard Sorge, alias Ramsey; code name, Fix or Inson.

Branko de Voukelitch, alias Gigolo.

Ozaki Hozumi, alias Otto; code name, Invest.

Miyagi Yotoku, alias Joe; code name, Intelli.

Dr. Woldt; code name, Kommersant.

Victor S. Zaitsev, alias Serge.

Max Klausen, alias Fritz.

Aside from the information on the aliases and code names, this list is significant chiefly as showing what part of the ring was known to the Soviet espionage agent attached to their Tokyo Embassy. It is also significant that this Soviet consul listed himself as a member of the ring.

(g) Money: This extraordinary bold and successful effort cost the Soviet Union practically nothing. Even then they tried to cut down their expenses and in 1940 directed that part of the profits from M. Klausen Shokai should go into the ring. Perhaps they were only wisely trying to forestall the possible apostasy of Max Klausen which his growing wealth might bring about. If so, they failed.

The total cost of the Sorge ring was estimated at about 3,000 yen a month. This was an expenditure of considerably less than United States $1,000 a month to pay for the extremely valuable work of nearly 20 agents. Since, with one exception they all worked for love of the cause and not for money their monthly pay was merely to cover living and travel costs and not to compensate them for their work. Ozaki, for example, never received a penny for himself, and was actually out of pocket, since he supported some of the agents under him. Sorge, de Voukelitch, and Klausen, of course had regular incomes from their work, but still they had extra expenses. Klausen was the treasurer, and about once a year he submitted a statement of income and expenses to Sorge, who had it photostated and a copy sent to Russia. During Klausen's service as treasurer from 1936 till October 1941, he received United States $24,500 and 18,300 yen through the couriers, plus about $10,000 in bank remittances, a total of about $40,000. Certainly the information which Sorge sent after June 22, 1941, was worth many millions of dollars to the Soviet Union. Since it had a profound effect on the Soviet deployment of troops, and hence on the stopping of the Germans at the most critical phase of the war, its total worth is incalculable.

6. REPORTS OF SORGE AND OZAKI

Sorge sent an immense amount of soundly evaluated intelligence to the U. S. S. R. over the years. It would be tedious and unprofitable to list all his reports, even by topics. Under interrogation from memory alone Ozaki described more than 50 reports and Klausen another 50. The decoded radio messages added much greater detail. It is sufficient to indicate the general type of questions studied on which reports were sent to the U. S. S. R. Because of the vastly greater significance the reports of 1941 will be given in some more detail.

From 1933 to 1935 Japanese activities in Manchuria, centering around the Chinese Eastern Railway in which the Soviet Union had a half interest, very naturally were of much concern to Moscow. Based on reports made by Ozaki, Miyagi and then German Ambassador Dr. Herbert von Dirksen, Sorge was able to report that Japan would not fight the U. S. S. R. over the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway, would devote herself to the development of heavy industries in Manchuria and would discuss a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union. In fact, as Sorge was able to report on the basis of information secured through Miyagi and Ozaki in 1935, the Japanese Government placed more stress on the China problem than on that of the Soviet Union and any possible advance to the north. The German-

Japanese Anti-Comintern Pact of 1936 looked like the real thing, but Sorge was able to report from excellent Germany Embassy sources that although the Germans had wanted a military pact it was being limited to an anti-Comintern pact because of Japanese reluctance to have trouble with the U. S. S. R.

Sorge made full reports on intentions and operations in north China after July 1937, as well as the nature of Japanese mobilization. He transmitted Ozaki's estimate that Japan would fail in her plan to solve her north China problem by a fast campaign and that the war was bound to develop into a long struggle. Throughout the rest of the China war Sorge kept a steady flow of fundamental information to the U. S. S. R.

(a) Sorge paves way for U. S. S. R.-German pact: The European picture was very black in the spring of 1939. The U. S. S. R. had a choice of negotiations either with the Anglo-French or the Germans. After they had learned from Sorge that the Germans had proposed to Tokyo, with the support of Ambassador General Oshima Hiorshi, an alliance directed against the U. S. S. R. and Great Britain, but that the Cabinet, the navy and the Zaibatsu were all opposed to such an alliance and had blocked it, the Soviet government itself entered into the famous, and disastrous, nonaggression pact with Nazi Germany in August 1939. It will be recalled that it was the signature of this pact, securing Hitler's eastern frontier, which precipitated the Second World War by the invasion of Poland.

At the time of the Nomonhan incident, in the summer of 1939, when the Red army and the Japanese Kwantung Army engaged in a full-scale local war, the Red army was able to learn Japanese intentions. They learned what units were being dispatched from what parts of Manchuria, as well as what reinforcements would come from Japan. Above all, they learned that the Japanese Government did not intend to exploit this incident, but intended to settle it locally, and the Russians conducted themselves accordingly. Aside from his sources in Tokyo, Sorge was able to get a good on-the-spot report from De Voukelitch who as a correspondent was taken to Nomonhan as the guest of the Japanese Army. The Japanese assessment of their lessons at Nomonhan, especially their need to mechanize all their forces and develop armored divisions on the German model, was transmitted by Sorge on the basis of information gathered both by the German Embassy and by Miyagi.

Sorge sent a reliable account of Japanese output of munitions, aircraft and motorcars, along with a report on the factories making these materials as well as iron and steel on February 16, 1940. From time to time, he brought these figures up to date. In August 1941 he reported on Japanese petroleum resources, a top secret bit of information of the most vital importance in estimating both Japanese war plans and capabilities. He reported that there was in storage in Japan sufficient petroleum for a two years' use by the navy, half a year by the army and half a year by the nation at large. His sources were the German Embassy and Miyagi.

Nineteen hundred and forty-one was the crucial year. After earlier general reports, on May 20, 1941, Sorge flashed the urgent warning that the Reichswehr would concentrate from 170 to 190 divisions on the Soviet border, and on June 20 would attack along the whole frontier. The main direction of the drive would be toward Moscow. It will be recalled that this attack did occur on June 22. Naturally, thereafter, the answer to the question of Japanese attack from the east became the most vital mission of the Sorge ring. All questions, whether of Japanese-American relations, the war in China or internal politics were subordinated to answering that basic question. Without a sound answer the Red army could not draw on their far eastern army for use in the west, and as the event showed, only a massing of limitless reserves made possible the stopping of the violent German thrusts.

Sorge could not come by the answer immediately, partly because it had not been decided definitely by the responsible Japanese authorities. Naturally, Ambassador Ott was urging the Japanese to enter the war and distract the Russians on their eastern frontier. Sorge was able to report on July 2, immediately after the Imperial Council of that date, that the Japanese Government had decided to push southward into French Indo-China and seize various bases. Meanwhile, while adhering to their neutrality treaty with the U. S. S. R., in view of the possibility of war with the Soviet Union, they would mobilize their whole forces. Late in July Sorge reported that a few troops from the Tokyo-Osaka areas had been sent south, but that to advance into Thailand and Malaya they needed 300,000 men. So far there were only 40,000 men in Indo-China.

(b) Ozaki keeps finger on war pulse: Sorge's estimates of late July and early August, based on information supplied by Ozaki, Miyagi and the German Embassy, showed that 1,000,000 new men had been mobilized, that the great majority had been sent to China or further south, and that only a small proportion were being sent to Manchuria. By the end of August he reported that the German Embassy had lost hopé of Japan's joining in the war against Russia in 1941, and on the basis of Miyagi's information he reported that the Kwantung Army did not want to fight the Red army that year. While the decision might be changed if the Russians were crushingly defeated in the west, reported Sorge, the progress of the German Army had been too slow to encourage the Japanese Government, which was devoting its attentions to negotiations with the United States and to a probable thrust southward.

Sorge maintained a steady watch and report on United States-Japanese negotiations during the summer and fall of 1941. His information was full and accurate, naturally so, since Ozaki was so close to Konoe, the keyman in the negotiations. During early October Sorge reported on the third mobilization, completed in mid-September, and subsequently that men from 25 to 35 years old had been called up. He also reported that the mobilization in December and January would be greater than in the previous year. While he did transmit Prince Konoe's optimistic views, he informed his superiors that the Japanese Navy planned to move south if Japan did not receive a satisfactory reply by the first week in October. The next 2 or 3 weeks will be the most crucial with respect to Japan's advance to the south.

By October 15 Sorge had transmitted his final sober conclusions that the Japanese had decided to move south and that there now was no serious danger of an attack by the Kwantung Army across the Siberian frontier. He felt that his mission was completed, and drafted a dispatch suggesting his recall to the Soviet Union. Klausen argued that this request was premature, and the message was never sent. Three days later Sorge and Klausen were under arrest.

(c) Ozaki's contacts and methods: Next to Sorge, Ozaki Hozuni was by far the most important member of the ring. His death on the gallows with Sorge is somber testimony of his importance. During his years on the Asahi, to which his contributions were prolific, he firmly established his reputation as a China expert. In recognition of his abilities he was transferred to Tokyo in 1934 and was appointed to the East Asia Problems Investigation Society (Toa Mondai Chosa Kai) within the Asahi for the study of China problems. He added to his reputation by numerous signed articles on China affairs in such popular magazines as Central Review (Chuo Koron), to the English language, Contemporary Japan, and by his five books, from China Facing the Storm (Arashi Ni Tatsu Shina) in 1937 to Strength of the Great Powers in China (Ajia Ni Okeru Rokkuo No Chikara) in 1941.

In April 1937 Ozaki became a member of the China section of the Showa Study Society (Showa Kenkyo Kai) sponsored by Prince Konoe Fumimaro. The head of its China section was Kazami Akira, who soon became chief secretary of the first Konoe cabinet in June 1937. Ozaki then succeeded Kazami as head of the China section but he didn't lose touch with Kazami. Immediately after a cabinet meeting to discuss policy on the outbreak of the China incident at Marco Polo Bridge on July 7, 1937. Ozaki called on Kazami at his office. Ozaki warned Kazami that Japan's attitude and decisions would decide whether this affair would develop into a second world war. Kazami refused to take this gloomy prophecy seriously, and remarked, "Our minds are made up, don't worry," so Ozaki went on to see Ushiba, Konoe's private secretary, where he repeated this warning. He then published his convictions in an article, The Nanking Government, appearing in Chuo Koron in September 1937.

By the next summer Japan was hopelessly bogged down in the China War. As a war measure, the foreign office set up a special investigative agency in Peiping to study political, social, and economic conditions of north China. Kazami, now in a more somber frame of mind, wished to retain a China expert in Tokyo as an adviser, and chose Ozaki Hozumi. In this manner Ozaki, secret Communist and Soviet spy, first came to hold official position as unofficial adviser to the cabinet (Naikaku Shokutaku) from July 1938 until the fall of the government the following January. Perhaps because his pessimism coincided with that of the Konoe group he was not suspected of being other than a loyal Japanese.

1. Access to state documents: As cabinet adviser, naturally, Ozaki had access to important state documents, of which he made the best use for Dr. Sorge. Even more important than his official positions was his friendship with two old friends of college days at the Tokyo first higher school. Ushiba Tomohiko and Kishi Michizo were both private secretaries to Prince Konoe, three times premier of Japan. In these two men was centered the "breakfast group," sometimes called the Wednesday group, an informal discussion society of bright young men arcund Prince Konoe. Ushiba and Kishi found it pleasant and informative to invite writers, journalists, professors, and other stimulating persons to dinner to draw out their opinions on current subjects. All conversation was off the record and the baleful thought police do not seem to have listened in. When dinners became inconvenient these men met at breakfast, hence the name "breakfast group." At first the meetings were held twice monthly. From 1939 to the autumn of 1941, they met every Wednesday, giving the group its second name. During the first Konoe cabinet they met at Ushiba's home, but later had breakfasts at the Mampei Hotel. From April 1939 until November 1940, they met at Saionji's home. From then until so many were pulled in by the police that there was no quorum to meet, they assembled at the premier's official residence back of the Diet Building.

After the fall of the Konoe cabinet on January 4, 1939, had deprived Ozaki of his advisership with the cabinet he was appointed an adviser to the South Manchurian Railway and attached to the investigation section of the Tokyo office. He continued to hold this post till his arrest. Since the South Manchurian Railway was interested in every activity in Manchuria and Siberia, Ozaki was in an excellent position to learn

anything that might become known to any Japanese. The railway was closely controlled by the Japanese and Manchurian Governments, so that for practical purposes Ozaki was an intelligence officer of those governments with a special assignment to study Manchuria and Soviet affairs. After early 1940 the information section of the SMR exchanged information freely with the information section of Mitsui Bussan Kaisha, so that Sorge's target of Japanese heavy industry was amply covered.

2. Sources in high places: Although Ozaki used all of his sources for the gathering of information for Sorge, and utilized his intimacy with highly placed friends to obtain documents and news, he never passed on undigested information. He stored up his knowledge, weighed it against other relevant data, and made a preliminary evaluation. He discussed his conclusions with officials, his associates, and friends, and with the members of the Breakfast Club. He presented only final evaluations in answer to Sorge's questions, although from time to time he did borrow some document to be photographed by de Voukelitch before he returned it to its proper owner. Frequently, when some friend would ask his opinion, he asked for the basic documents to study before he could render sensible advice. These documents he often took to his home, and since he was entitled to receive them in line of duty no one thought twice about it. Sometimes, officials like young Saionji Kinkazu would give him top-secret information to get his reaction, because he trusted so greatly his judgment and integrity.

During the trial Ozaki gave the following description of his activity:

"If you ask me for special points of my technique, I would say that my activity was characterized by a total lack of special method * * * my success lay in my attitude toward the job. By nature I am a sociable person. I like people; I can make friends with most people. Moreover, I like to be kind to people. Not only is my circle of friends wide, I am on intimate terms with most of them. My sources of information have been these friends.

"I have never looked for specific information * * * I have formed my own opinion on the subject in hand, formulating in my own mind a comprehensive picture of a general trend on the basis of various reports and rumors. I never ask specific leading questions.

"* * * In these days of political unrest individual news items have little intrinsic value, however important or secret they may be. This is because even important decisions are apt to be changed suddenly. For instance, the government or the army may wish to be stubborn, but external circumstances beyond their control often force a change of heart. Therefore, the important thing is to ascertain the general trend rather than to know exactly what has been said or what has been decided. The only information of importance which I was confident I might obtain in advance was the exact timing of a possible attack on Russia by Japan."

It was Miyagi Yotoku, rather than Ozaki, who devoted himself consistently to the small details, such as activation of divisions, new weapons, troop movements, reports on casualties and the like. A great deal of this information was easy for a Japanese to pick up from gossip in bars, talk in a doctor's office, in a ladies' sewing circle or in a military barracks. While the Red Army was primarily interested in the big picture which Ozaki was painting for them, they did not share his disinterest in specific bits of secret information, and Miyagi kept supplying it through his autonomous intelligence net. Despite his disclaimers at his trial, however, Ozaki, too, supplied such information, as for example, a complete division roster in 1941.

(d) Ozaki assesses world affairs: Ozaki's study of world events had convinced him as early as 1937 that the China incident would develop into a second world war. He believed that this second world war would end not in a redistribution of colonies, as in the case of the First World War, but in a fundamental social change throughout the world. The Communist revolution, he believed, which had started in Russia would reach a decisive stage, even though it could not be expected to reach its final completion so soon.

As for Japan, Ozaki considered the country's economic structure unsound because of feudalistic tradition, poverty of natural resources and the preponderance of military expenditures. Japan would be the first to undergo a fundamental social upheaval, he thought. In the end Japan was destined to clash with England and America. She would be victorious during the first stages of the war, but the victory would be short-lived because of Japan's economic weakness and because of her exhaustion from the prolonged China affair.[1] In the final stage, the ruling classes would be powerless to change the course of the country or to effect its reconstruction. The proletariat alone could save the nation, he believed. He thought that Japan's only proper course was to join with the Soviet Union and with Soviet help change and reconstruct her social and economic system. When Japan had become a Socialist state and when Communist hegemony had been established in China, Japan and China with the Soviet Union could form the nucleus of a new order in East Asia.

(e) Lessons from Ozaki's dreams: These views of Ozaki's on a new order in east Asia are of special interest today. They are useful guides to the thinking of postwar Communists on the same subject. For years the Japanese Government propaganda talked a lot about a new order, and despite the enmity which the Japanese created among the Chinese and others by the violence of their attempts to create a new order there really was considerable appeal in their pan-Asia propaganda. The generous assistance given by Malays and Burmese to the invading Japanese armies is a matter of very recent memory. Today we begin to hear a good deal about a new order and pan-Asianism both from China and from India. The Japanese had a good thing which they spoiled by their greed and violence.

Ozaki conceived of a Communist new order which would include not only the Japanese, Chinese, and Russians but also the Koreans, Malays, Mongolians, the peoples of the Philippines, Thailand, the Dutch East Indies, French Indochina, and India. He dreamed of the day when the peoples of all these countries would unite with the Soviet Union according to the views and practices of Soviet Communists in a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics of the whole of eastern Asia. Ozaki thought that he, himself, would play a leading role in this east Asiatic Communist international. As he said, "I felt that it would be easy to cooperate with and assist the Soviet Union, because fortunately, I had become intimate with the authorities of the Comintern and the Soviet Government structure through my espionage activities with Sorge for the past 10 years."

Ozaki, as a Niakaku Shokutaku, was deeply involved in Prince Konoe's new structure movement, which eventually developed into the Imperial Rule Assistance Association. The role of this Soviet spy as a basic architect of the IRAA is both ironical and a high tribute to the quality of the Sorge ring. Perhaps Ozaki also saw an easier transition from the IRAA to Communist Party dictatorship than from parliamentary government.

[1] This prediction was made by Ozaki during interrogation of March 3, 1942, in the midst of Japan's military successes.

1. One world under communism: Ozaki's single allegiance was to the Communist cause. He recognized no proper boundaries between the various countries or between the various Communist organizations throughout the world. The earth was one world centered in the Third International, which happened to be in Russia. The benefits which the U. S. S. R. might derive from the spread of communism were merited by the assumption of leadership of world communism by the Russian Communist Party and by the Soviet Government. In March 1942, Ozaki declared to the procurator:

"In my long intercourse with Sorge in Japan, I was often requested to give information which had a direct bearing upon the plans for the defense of the Soviet Union. Hence I suspected that the data which I submitted was being used directly by the U. S. S. R. However, this did not disturb my peace of mind because the defense of the U. S. S. R. was one of the duties of members of the International Communist Party. In brief, our group belonged to the Comintern. The Comintern today is almost completely in the hands of the Russian Communist Party. The Russian Communist Party is the central force in the Soviet Government. Thus, in a sense, all three organizations can be considered as one."

It will be remembered that Sorge was an agent of the Red Army, not the Comintern. This was a minor detail as far as Ozaki was concerned. His loyalty was to the Comintern; his channel was Sorge.

Ozaki supplied Sorge with crucial information during the decisive months of 1941. The information was interrelated but for convenience may be classified as relating to: (1) Russo-Japanese relations, (2) Possibility of war between Germany and Russia and (3) Japanese-American negotiations.

(f) Sound estimates by Ozaki: Ozaki's accounts of his reports on these three subjects can be summarized as follows: After the signature of the Soviet-German nonaggression pact in 1939 the possibility of a Soviet-Japanese war became more remote. When the German Wehrmacht invaded Russia in June 1941, however, the danger again became great. Ozaki then concentrated his efforts on learning the details of Japanese mobilization, industrial strength and actual war plans. He paid much attention to troop movements during the general mobilization of July 1941. When the German Army was stuck at Smolensk, however, and the relations between the United States and Japan steadily worsened he learned that some who earlier had agreed to the general mobilization in expectation of an early Soviet collapse had become hesitant about attacking the U. S. S. R. Later about the middle of August he discovered that the Japanese Government had decided against war with Russia. He transmitted this vital information to Dr. Sorge.

Ozaki's close relationship with Prince Konoe's close advisers gave him unsurpassed opportunities to learn the exact nature and progress of Japanese-American negotiations during the summer and early fall of 1941. He reached the conclusions that despite numerous Japanese-American common interests the great disparity between the positions of the two powers was such that compromise was impossible. Although the upper strata of the Japanese political and financial circles were anxious to avoid war, the Japanese people, as a result of violent military propaganda since 1937, were confident that they could successfully win their holy war and were opposed to compromise with the United States and Great Britain. Although the economic situation in Japan as a whole was extremely bad the fighting services, especially the navy, had never been so well equipped. By the beginning of October Ozaki was able to give his considered opinion that Japan would embark upon a major military campaign to the south, which would

include the capture of Singapore. He only erred in his timing, for he believed that Japan would not attack Russia in 1941, but before the year was out would attack southward against the United States and Great Britain. Retrospectively, it is clear that Ozaki made a completely sound estimate of the situation, and the government of the U. S. S. R. was fully informed on Japanese intentions.

7. DISCOVERY AND IMPRISONMENT

(a) Ito Ritsu, unwitting Judas: Dr. Richard Sorge and his group were exposed through no errors of their own. Their operations were faultless; no one ever suspected them. A wretched fellow, a Communist, Ito Ritsu, today one of the four or five most influential leaders in the Japan Communist Party, betrayed them in pain and in jealousy. Even he did not know what he did. Although under suspicion of Communist sympathies Ito Ritsu worked in the investigation department of the Tokyo branch of the South Manchurian Railway, the same organization which Ozaki was serving as special adviser. Then aged 29, he was arrested in June 1941 on suspicion of secret Communist activities. Under guidance of officers of the Tokyo Metropolitan Police Board Ito made full confession, claimed to have erred by his Communist faith, and then began to implicate others. Among those on whom he informed was a woman, Kitabayashi Tomo, whom he had known as a former member of the American Communist Party. He had noted that since her return to Japan she had refused to have any intercourse with Communists and appeared to have become an apostate. But she continuously asked questions on all sorts of matters. Possibly thinking to enlist the aid of the enemy, the police, for the punishment of a party traitor, Ito named this woman as a Communist and a probable spy. It doesn't seem that this Judas had any real reason to think of her as a spy, and certainly he never imagined that she was a member of the most successful ring of spies ever to operate in Japan on behalf of his spiritual fatherland.

The police at once began hunting for Kitabayashi Tomo, and upon finding her, put her on the watch list to develop her contacts. They did not arrest her until September 28, 1941, at Konagawa-machi, Wakayama Prefecture, when they pulled in her innocent husband, too. Mrs. Kitabayashi does not seem to have been a very strong character. She soon confessed, and named Miyagi as her mentor. Miyagi was arrested on October 10. From his attempted suicide and from evidence found in his house the police realized that he was a member of an important spy ring. Much information was picked up from continuous interrogation of Miyagi, a frail, consumptive man who certainly wasn't treated gently. He talked freely. Much more was gathered by using his empty house as bait and picking up all callers. Ozaki was soon uncovered, and by October 14 he, too, was behind bars. Since these men had not established an emergency-warning system, and only met by prearrangement, none of them was able to warn any of the others.

(b) Days of anxiety: Max Klausen went to Sorge's home on October 15, 1941, to discuss a projected transmission to the U. S. S. R. Sorge was disturbed. Miyagi had arranged to meet him on the 13th, but for the first time he had missed an appointment. Ozaki had been supposed to come to the meeting on the 15th but he too didn't show, and both Klausen and Sorge were really worried. Sorge showed Klausen the draft of a dispatch on the Japanese Army's advance in Indo-China, followed by a request for new instructions based on his belief there was no further reason for the group to continue operations in Japan. Klausen thought this message was premature, and returned it to Sorge unsent.

Two days later Klausen again went to Sorge's house, where he found De Voukelitch who also was much disturbed by the silence of Miyagi and Ozaki. On his way home Klausen met an officer of the special higher section of the metropolitan police (Tokkoka), named Aoyama. This meeting upset him greatly. He wondered if it were more than accidental and debated in his own mind whether to burn the documents then in his possession and to bury his transmitter in the garden. Finally, he decided to do nothing, went to bed and to sleep.

The next morning, October 18, while Max was still in bed Aoyama and another police officer walked in and arrested him. Anna was not arrested until November 19. While Aoyama was telling Max to get dressed and come along, other officers were giving similar instructions to Dr. Richard Sorge and Branko de Voukelitch. By October 18, 1941, all the principals of the Sorge ring were in jail and what probably was the most successful and most unusual organization of Red Army intelligence anywhere in the world was completely broken.

Sorge's arrest was a great shock to his close friends, Ambassador Ott and the gestapo chief, Col. Joseph Meisinger. They could only believe that the Japanese had committed another of the blunders for which they were legendary, and they worked hard to get their friend out of jail. There also was a disturbing question: if by some remote chance good Nazi Sorge actually was a Soviet spy where did that leave two highly placed Nazi officials who had trusted in and confided in him for so long? But the obstinate Japanese police were adamant. They insisted that they had the principals of the most dangerous spy ring ever discovered in Japan.

(c) Sorge's uneasy German friends: Ott and Meisinger reported the arrest to Berlin, but tried to minimize their relations with Sorge, so that if by some weird chance the Japanese police were right their reputations wouldn't be hurt too badly. After the turn of the year an agent of German Counter Intelligence, Abwher, in Harbin, heard a somewhat garbled account of the Sorge affair from his Tokyo contact and reported on it to his principals in Berlin. It wasn't till then that the German Government became really disturbed. Then von Ribbentrop sharply demanded explanations from Ott. Ultimately, he replaced him by Dr. Heinrich Stahmer, so that the unhappy Ott sat out the war in Peiping, since he couldn't very well get back to Germany. Meanwhile, in reply to Meisinger's inquiry, Gestapo headquarters in Berlin turned up a complete, adverse dossier on Sorge from his earlier days in Germany, indicating his Soviet connections. Meisinger turned this over to the Japanese, and in some manner managed to save his own political skin. He was still German gestapo representative in Japan when Eisenhower took the German surrender in 1945. He was flown to Poland in the autumn of 1945, charged with commission of atrocities at Warsaw. He is believed to have been hanged.

The Japanese police records show that these persons were arrested in connection with the Sorge case:

1. Those arrested in 1941 and found guilty:

Name	Age	Occupation	Date of arrest
Kitabayashi Tomo	57	Dressmaker	Sept. 28, 1941
Miyagi Yotoku	40	Artist	Oct. 10, 1941
Akiyama Koji	53	None	Oct. 13, 1941
Kuzumi Fusako	53	Company employee	Do.
Ozaki Hozumi	42	Consultant, South Manchurian Ry	Oct. 15, 1941
Mizuno Shige	33	Editor, books published, Sakamoto Memorial Hall	Oct. 17, 1941
Sorge Richard	48	Special correspondent of Frankfurt News	Oct. 18, 1941
Klausen Max Gottfried-Fredrich	44	Manufacturer of fluoroscope plates	Do.
De Voukelitch Branko	38	Assistant, Havas News Agency in Tokyo	Do.
Kawai Teikichi	42	Company employee	Oct. 22, 1941
Taguchi Ugenda	40	Broker	Oct. 29, 1941
Klausen Anna	43	None	Nov. 19, 1941
Yamana Masazane	41	Company employee	Dec. 15, 1941

2. Those arrested in 1941 but found not guilty:

Kitabayashi, Yoshisaburo	61	None	Sept. 28, 1941
Okai Yasumasa	26	Student at Tokyo Imperial University	Oct. 11, 1941
Haga Yu	44	Consultant, International Economic Research Department.	Oct. 12, 1941
Suzuki Kamenosuke	50	Broker	Oct. 13, 1941
Matsumoto Itsuo	21	Member of China Research Institute	Oct. 18, 1941
Takahashi Yu	32	Employee, Tokyo branch, SMR	Oct. 22, 1941
Akemine Miye	32	Consultant, Cabinet Information Bureau	Oct. 25, 1941
Shinozuka Torao	41	Factory owner	Nov. 14, 1941
Takeda Takeshi	39	Laborer	Nov. 24, 1941
Takeda Toshiko	31	None	Do.

3. Those arrested in 1942 and found guilty:

Funakoshi Hisao	41	Member, Peiping branch, Research Institute on China Problems.	Jan. 4, 1942
Kawamura Yoshio	33	Chief, Shanghai branch office, Manshu Nichi-Nichi	Mar. 31, 1942
Koshiro Yoshinobu	34	Company employee	Apr. 11, 1942
Yasuda Tokutaro	45	Doctor	June 8, 1942

4. Those arrested in 1942 but found not guilty:

Tanaka Shinjiro	43	None	Mar. 15, 1942
Kikuchi Hachiro	31	Miyako Shimbun correspondent assigned to the War Ministry.	Mar. 16, 1942
Saionji Kinkazu	37	Former consultant of Foreign Ministry and Cabinet	1942
Inukai Ken	47	Member of the House of Representatives	Apr. 4, 1942
Kaieda Hisataka	35	Employee, Mukden station, SMR	Apr. 11, 1942
Goto Noriaki	44	Employee, Mukden Ry. Bureau, SMR	—, 1942
Miyanishi Yoshio	33	Research Department, Tokyo branch, SMR	Apr. 13, 1942
Isono Kiyoshi	36	Tokyo Asahi Shimbun correspondent assigned to the War Ministry.	Apr. 28, 1942

The police were unhurried about their investigation, although Premier Tojo Hideki kept urging speed. So many of their prisoners talked freely that they had no problem in getting a full picture of the whole case and in separating the guilty from the innocent. Having proved their case, they became concerned with the deeper implications of the spy ring. They wanted to know more than how the spies had operated and what they had found out. They wanted to know what had motivated them, especially the

Japanese traitor. Although Sorge attempted to maintain security, and was most contemptuous of Klausen's turning informant, before 5 months had passed, even he came to talk freely and, seemingly, willingly. All of the quotations from Sorge and Ozaki already used in this account come from this period of interrogation.

The police discovered that Klausen's prosperity had dulled his enthusiasm for the Soviet cause. His growing disillusionment, as well as a heart ailment which had kept him in bed from April to August 1940, made him reluctant to send the radio traffic which Sorge was preparing for him in increasing volume. Until the autumn of 1940, however, he had sent every message. From then on he had begun to cut down and during 1941, transmitted only about a third of the messages. Not being suspicious, neither Vladivostok nor Sorge could check on what was not sent. Klausen did receive complaints from the "Wiesbaden", but he replied that atmospheric conditions interfered with his work. Subsequently, in July 1941, when Sorge gave him the call signal and wavelength of a new radio station with which he was to communicate in addition to the old one, Klausen failed to use it.

Klausen's diary substantiated this testimony. It shows that in 1939 he sent 23,139 word groups, in 1940, 29,179 word groups, but in 1941, the most critical year, only 13,103 word groups. Since Sorge himself sent 40,000 word groups in 1941, however, Klausen's sabotage didn't interfere with the success of the mission.

Because of the evidence of Klausen's change of heart, and because of his free confession, the Japanese court only gave him life imprisonment. To Anna, upon whom they looked as a woman who had worked against her will, they gave three years. She was out waiting for Max when he was released from the Akita prison on October 9, 1945 by order of the U. S. Army.

8. DEATH

Ozaki had never really feared the consequences of his treason. He had always believed that if he were discovered all he need do was die. Actually he found this not so simple. Questions of affection for his family, who had never suspected his treason, and of loyalty to the innocent friends whom he had involved weighed heavily upon him. His confessions were filled with the testimony of a conscience weighted by the guilt of having wronged good friends.

After a full and unhurried investigation the various members of the Sorge ring were brought to trial, separately, in camera. Only the briefest mention of the case was released to the press in May 1942. In this release Japanese Intelligence deliberately connected the accused with the Comintern's net, although they had established that the ring worked for the Red Army. There was no point in telling the Russians all they knew.

Sentences were handed down by the Tokyo District Court in September 1943. Both Sorge and Ozaki appealed to the Supreme Court. Oddly, Sorge and Ozaki both made the defense that they hadn't done anything really illegal. They presented the straw-man theory that they had not used force to acquire their secrets and that they only passed on to Moscow information available to any intelligent man. Sorge summed up his defense thus:

(a) Sorge's defense: "Japanese laws are subject to interpretation, either broadly or according to the strict letter of the text. Although leakage of information may, strictly speaking, be punishable by law, in practice the Japanese social system is not amenable to the keeping of secrets. * * * I consider that in the drawing up of the indictment insufficient consideration was given to our activity and to the nature of the information which we obtained. Data which de Voukelitch supplied was neither secret nor important; he brought in only news which was well known to every press correspondent. The same may be said of Miyagi, who was in no position to obtain state secrets. What may be termed political information was procured by Ozaki and by me.

"I obtained my information from the German Embassy, but here again I consider that little, if any, of it could be termed 'State Secret'. It was given to me voluntarily. To obtain it I resorted to no strategy for which I should be punished. I never used deceit or force. Ambassador Ott and Commander Scholl asked me to help them write reports, especially Scholl, who put much confidence in me and asked me to read all of his own reports before he sent them to Germany. As for me, I placed much trust in this information because it was compiled and evaluated by competent military and naval attachés for the use of the German General Staff. I believe that the Japanese government, in giving data to the German Embassy expected some of it to leak out.

"Ozaki obtained much of his news from the Breakfast Group. But the Breakfast Group was not an official organization. Such information as was exchanged within the group must have been discussed by other similar cliques, of which there were many in Tokyo in those days. Even such data as Ozaki considered important and secret was actually no longer so, because he had procured it indirectly after it had left its secret source."

One is amazed at Sorge's claim, "I never used deceit or force" as though the first could have been true or the second relevant.

The Supreme Court was unimpressed by this logic. Sorge's appeal was dismissed in January, and Ozaki's in April 1944.

It is an interesting and perhaps surprising commentary on the quality of Japanese civil justice to note, however, that in the midst of a bitter war the most dangerous spies ever captured were given the benefit of every protection offered by Japanese law. It also seems surprising that of the nearly 20 guilty men and women only two were sentenced to death, although under Japanese law every one of them had subjected himself to the death penalty.

The following is a list of the convicted prisoners, their sentences and ultimate fate:

Sorge, Richard, death; hanged, November 7, 1944.

Ozaki, Hozumi, death; hanged, November 7, 1944.

Voukelitch, Branko de, life; died in prison, January 13, 1945.

Miyagi, Yotoko, unsentenced; died during trial, August 2, 1943.

Klausen, Max, life; released, October 9, 1945.

Koshiro, Yoshinobu, 15 years; released, October 8, 1945.

Taguchi, Ugenda, 13 years; released, October 6, 1945.

Mizuno, Shige, 13 years; died in prison, March 22, 1945.

Yamana, Masazane, 12 years; released, October 7, 1945.

Funakoshi, Hisao, 10 years; died in prison, February 27, 1945.

Kawai, Teikichi, 10 years; released, October 10, 1945.

Kawamura, Yoshio, unsentenced; died before trial, December 15, 1942.

Kuzumi, Fusako, 8 years; released, October 8, 1945.

Kitabayashi, Tomo, 5 years; released, unknown date.

Akiyama, Koji, 7 years; released, October 10, 1945.

Klausen, Anna, 3 years; released, October 1945.

Yasuda, Tokutaro, 2 years, with 5 years' suspension.

In addition Saionji was found guilty of passing secret information to an unauthorized person, Ozaki, and was given a sentence of 3 years' imprisonment with stay of execution. The court and procurators recognized that Saionji's guilt had been too great a trust in a friend, and not a conscious act of treason.

Although the supreme court had denied their appeals in January and February 1944, neither Ozaki nor Sorge, was informed definitely of the time set for his execution. During the intervening months they were questioned from time to time, chiefly on the wider implications of their conspiracy. While Ozaki was more loquacious than Sorge, both talked quite freely. Both men bore themselves well during these last hopeless days. Sorge had boasted that Stalin thought highly of his work and that if Japan and the U. S. S. R. should reach an understanding, Stalin would secure his release. Such an understanding was never achieved. Ozaki filled part of his dreary days writing many letters to his wife, part of which have since appeared as a best-selling book, Love Was Like a Falling Star (Aijo wa Hoshi no Furu Gotoku).

Finally, the last day came. Early on the morning of November 7, 1944, Ozaki had just finished a postcard to his wife full of solicitation for his aged father. He had no reason to suspect that this day would end any differently from a thousand other days. When the governor of Sugamo Prison entered his cell, however, he knew at once that his time had come. He changed his clothing for a set of clean garments which he had been saving for this day, and composed himself for his final, terrible minutes.

(b) Ozaki is hanged: The prison governor, Ichipima, formally asked the name, age, and domicile of the condemned man. Having officially ascertained that this was the man for whom death had been decreed, he stated that by order of the Minister of Justice, Ozaki's execution would take place that day. He added that if Ozaki wished to leave behind a will he should entrust it to the chief chaplain, a Buddhist priest. Ozaki listened with outward calmness and courtesy and bowed formally in the Japanese manner.

Led by the governor and other officials, Ozaki Hozumi then walked down from death row, across the prison courtyard to the place where stands the small concrete execution chamber hidden by high walls. When the condemned man walked through the only door of this awesome building, he found himself standing in a small anteroom facing a large, beautiful, taper-lit altar to Amidha Buddha. The chief chaplain offered Ozaki tea and cake and inquired who should be notified of his death and how he wished his possessions disposed of. After listening to Ozaki's explanation of his written will and waiting till Ozaki composed himself to listen, the chaplain said:

"Life and death are one and the same thing to one who has attained impersonal beatitude. Impersonal beatitude can be attained by entrusting everything to the mercy of the Buddha."

Then with Ozaki kneeling before the image of the Buddha the chaplain recited the Three Promises of the Great Sutra of Constant Life (Dai Muryoju Kyo). Ozaki listened quietly, burned incense, closed his eyes and bowed. Then he thanked all the officials present for their courtesy and indicated that he was ready.

Ozaki was led around the side of the altar and at once was in a gloomy windowless, bare room, with a gallows standing in the center. He was led across the room to stand beneath the gallows, and the noose was affixed in place. There were no stairs to climb, no platform to stand on. The trap was in the floor immediately beneath his feet.

Ozaki began to recite the simple Buddhist ritual of comfort, Namu Amida Butsu.

When he had recited the phrase twice the trap was sprung. This was at 0933. At 0951, Ozaki Hozumi was declared dead.

The same day his attorney was notified of his death, and when his wife presented herself at the prison all that remained of Ozaki Hozumi, Japanese subject, Communist fanatic and Soviet spy, was delivered to her.

(c) Sorge follows Ozaki: Ozaki's body had scarcely been removed from the execution chamber before the prison governor, Ichijima, was making his final, solemn call on Dr. Richard Sorge in Sugamo's death row. As custom required he ascertained the name and age of the man who stood before him, before formally telling him that according to an order of the Minister of Justice he would be executed that day and was expected to die calmly. The governor asked Sorge whether he wished to add anything to the will which he had written previously concerning the disposal of his body and his few possessions. Sorge replied calmly, "My will is as I have written it." The governor then asked, "Have you anything else to say?" "No," said Sorge, "Nothing else." After this brief exchange Richard Sorge turned to the prison chaplain and other prison officials and said, "I thank you for all your kindnesses." These were the last recorded words of Dr. Richard Sorge.

When he had said these few words, Sorge started on the long walk from death row down to the wide prison courtyard, through the somber gray wall around the death house, and so through its single fatal door. Unlike Ozaki, who had preceded him on that long walk so short a time before, he did not stop before the golden altar. Sorge was led directly into the execution chamber, walking firmly to stand on the treacherous trap door. The noose was quickly adjusted over his head, and without a word or any sign of agitation he was hanged. The trap was sprung at 1020, and he was pronounced dead at 1036.

So ended Richard Sorge, a German, a Communist and an incredibly successful Soviet spy.

9. POSTSCRIPT

Where are they now? Eight are dead: Sorge, de Voukelitch, Ozaki, Miyagi, Mizuno, Kawamura, Funakoshi, and Kitabayashi Tomo. But where are the others?

Presumably Edith de Voukelitch still lives in Australia. Taguchi Ugenda and Yamana Masazane are said to be in Hokkaido, but what they are doing is unknown. Former Corp. Koshiro Yoshinobu and Kawai Teikichi are reported to be living in Tokyo.

Dr. Yasuda Tokutaro moved back to Tokyo in July 1947 from Gifu where he had sought refuge during the war. He talks garrulously of the great days when he was helping that most successful of Soviet spies, Dr. Richard Sorge. Kuzumi Fusako is an old woman now, but probably she's still propagandizing for the cause in the same town where she lives in Okayama Prefecture. Akiyama (Frank) Koji, the only mercenary in the ring dropped out of sight after his release from prison in October 1945.

Guenther Stein and Agnes Smedley are still at large, posing as objective analysts of Chinese affairs and still affecting the formation of American policy by the skill of their writings.

Max Klausen was in Akita Prison and Anna Klausen in Tochigi Prison when the war ended. Under the American order for the release of political prisoners both were let out of jail early in October 1945 and under the care of American officers were reunited in Tokyo. Few knew anything about Sorge at that time, and in any case American-Soviet relations were quite friendly. The unhappy thought that a Soviet spy who had worked against the Japanese might later work against the United States had not occurred to many Americans.

Max was ill and very weak from beriberi and much in need of medical care. Soon after he reached Tokyo he called at the Soviet Embassy where he was welcomed and given money. What he told them of his apostasy and free confession, or what they told him in praise and admiration for his highly successful work can only be imagined. For a time Max and Anna lived in the country, in Saitama Prefecture, not far from Tokyo. In December 1945, Max received permission to go to Karuizawa for treatment by his prewar German physician. He made two calls on this doctor, and then returned to Tokyo with Anna, where they lived in a small apartment. No American has seen him officially since that time in early January 1946. In late February 1946, the Japanese man who had shared quarters with Klausen in Saitama Prefecture received a letter from Max saying that he intended to return to the country when the weather became warmer. Apparently Max was referring to the cold of the Siberian winter, however, for by early March the word got around that Max and Anna had gone to another country. How warm their welcome in the homeland of all Communists was can only be guessed. Sorge's contemptuous remark that even though Klausen escaped the noose in Japan if ever he got back to the U. S. S. R. he would be taken care of may be recalled. If Max and Anna are living securely in the Soviet Union today they must be under a constant strain to maintain an agreed-upon story explaining why Max got life while Dr. Sorge was hanged. Perhaps to prove his zeal and loyalty Max was let for some other country and some other post where his skill and experience in secret telegraphy will be useful to the Soviets.

Those men whose only guilt was that they trusted a friend too well are seared for the remainder of their lives by their innocent contact with the members of the Sorge ring. Even though they were proved wholly innocent, men like Inukai Ken will never escape periodical suspicions that possibly, just possibly, they knew what they did. There are other loyal, liberal-minded Japanese in responsible positions in Tokyo today who shudder at the mention of the names of Sorge and Ozaki and who hope never to hear of the case again. They suffered too intensely from the blast.

There are other Japanese not a part of the ring, but who were part of other rings, like Nakanishi Ko, or who simply were Communists who glory in the Sorge case, who try to develop a legend of Ozaki, the patriot murdered by militarists and Fascists. Since no factual account of the Sorge case has yet been published in Japan it is easy for such men to perpetuate such a fanciful tale.

The oddest postwar item of the Sorge case is that the men who betrayed them all 6 years ago, Ito Ritsu, now is a member of the central committee of the Japan Communist Party, a leader of the Youth Action Corps (Totsugekitai), admired, respected, and followed by thousands of the faithful. Can it be that the Japan Communist Party and the Soviets do not know who really betrayed the ring and so killed Richard Sorge and Ozaki Hosumi?

A Middle Way for the Middle West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager of Consumers Cooperative Association. CCA is a fine American institution and Mr. Cowden one of America's leaders in the field of economic democracy.

A MIDDLE WAY FOR THE MIDDLE WEST

Fellow Americans, this broadcast marks the beginning of a great effort at the crossroads. Tonight, from North Dakota to Texas, from the Mississippi River to the slopes of the Rockies, the members of cooperative associations, nearly half a million strong, are talking together, thinking together, and planning action together. Thousands are meeting now, in small gatherings, to hear this address, and to start a great crusade to win new members and friends.

The round-up campaign—an annual event—would build toward a better world, by building better cooperatives all across the land and thereby building better communities. During the next several weeks, neighbors will meet and talk with neighbors about their common problems. They'll talk about some of the pressing problems of our time—about how farm prices are starting to fall, on the one hand, and how the costs of farm supplies are starting to rise, on the other. And the members of farm co-ops are beginning to wonder what this fact, which has such a familiar ring about it—harking back, as it does, to the beginning of the depression in the late twenties—they're wondering what falling farm prices and the rising cost of farm supplies will mean to them in terms of their own futures. They're wondering if they're going to be whipsawed into ultimate bankruptcy, as millions were in the thirties, by an ever-widening gap between prices they receive and the prices they pay.

Well, during the weeks of the round-up, this will be unquestionably one of the prime topics of conversation, as neighbor talks with neighbor and co-op member with co-op member . And they can talk, too, about the solid accomplishments of their cooperatives—how they're a bulwark to a solvent agriculture. And they'll ask nonmembers to come in and share the fruits that result from working together.

As co-op members, they've got a lot more confidence in themselves and their neighbors than they had a short 20 years ago. They won't be talking of what they hope to accomplish cooperatively some distant day in the future, but what they've done this past year. In the past 20 years they've built strong local cooperatives. They've federated these into Consumers Cooperative Association, the largest cooperative wholesale in the world in production, processing, and distribution of petroleum. Last year they purchased $54,000,000 in goods and services through CCA, and in doing that they saved themselves $3,300,000 in a single year. It was their way of lowering the cost of farm supplies and keeping agriculture in balance with industry, and in doing that every one of hundreds of thousands of individuals played a part. Cooperatives give to the little fellow, the man of ordinary means, the stature of a Goliath.

To make these benefits of cooperation more tangible, let's convert that $8,300,000—which farmers saved through cooperation—into some of the things farmers spend their money for. For example, that sum is enough to buy 69,000 electric washing machines. It would buy 55,000 running water systems, or enough to put running water into one-third of the farm homes of the State of Kansas. It would pay all the salaries of all the rural teachers in a State the size of Kansas for more than a year. It would pay for 225,000 tons of fertilizer. It would do all these things or—it would make eight millionaires. And I shall leave to this audience to answer the question:

Which is more socially useful, 69,000 washing machines in that many homes, or $8,000,000 in the hands of eight men?

It used to be thought that farmers could get along pretty well simply tending to the business of running their own farms. But like many other ideas of the past, that one has faded under the pressures of history. There is a vast world of interests, the fluctuations of which affect vitally the operation of farming, as they do the lives of every one of us. And so today, farmers are wondering if the cold war in Berlin, China, and Indonesia will erupt into a Third World War. They're wondering if the struggle of the great powers for Middle East oil may not touch off another world conflagration. They're wondering if the Ruhr, the industrial heart of Europe, is going to be turned over again to the industrialists who financed Hitler and lifted him to power. All of these arenas of crisis affect the farmer every day of his life. The individual, working alone, is helpless in all these matters. But working as a part of a world-wide cooperative movement, he has a strength and an influence far greater than is generally realized.

For example, the world-wide cooperative federation—a federation that embraces people and cooperatives in all lands of the earth—is an adviser to the United Nations. That means that the farmers of the Midwest, through their co-ops, have a seat in the world's highest council, and a means thereby of influencing that council's decisions by their views.

Some of the stands taken by farmers through their representatives on the United Nations are indeed far reaching. For example, the world cooperative federation is seeking to have the oil of the Middle East—one of the world's most notorious trouble spots—put under a United Nations agency or authority. Time and again, tensions developed through the struggle between powers for control of this oil-rich area have brought the world to the brink of war. Is it too much to ask—for the sake of peace—that this struggle be ended, and that the Middle East oil resources be internationalized and thereby shorn of their capacity to provoke conflict? It is the simplest, most logical solution, and one that surely will be realized in our time, in our quest for peace.

Cooperative administration of trouble spots like these is being more and more frequently proposed as the answer to the central problem of our day—the problem of war or peace. Cooperatives have recently proposed that Germany's industrial Ruhr be organized on a cooperative basis, a proposal which has been carried to the White House and which is being championed editorially by newspapers and columnists. The plain fact is that the individual need no longer wring his hands helplessly in these trying times; he has only to unite with his neighbors in the world-wide cooperative movement to become an influential citizen of one world and to exercise an influence far beyond what he could wield working alone as an individual.

Our world is progressing toward a higher and higher degree of organization—that is the lesson of the events of the past 30 years. The question is, will this higher degree of organization be in the interests of peace and democracy, or will the resultant be either of the twin tyrannies of fascism or communism? I firmly believe that here in the Middle West, with our cooperatives, we are developing a middle way between big business on the one hand and big Government on the other—a middle way that will keep our economic system democratic and thus make political democracy a continuing possibility.

The lesson of cooperatives is that they provide a framework within which people can learn the techniques of working together toward their common interests. This is the essence of democracy itself—which is based on the idea that the clash of interests between man and man, and between ideal and ideal can be worked out in the meeting place under democratic procedures. But while we have had democracy for over 150 years, we have yet to apply it on the broadest possible scale. And that is the basic significance of the tremendous growth in recent years of the people's cooperatives—it is a growth which means that the thousands of people who daily join cooperatives are training themselves in democratic procedures and techniques—are learning to work together with their neighbors toward the solution of common economic problems.

Because it is through the patient, give-and-take of democratic group action—a process of which cooperatives are the very symbol—that the ordinary people of the earth will find a common peaceful solution to the vast issues of our time.

No government and no civilization perishes which maintains faith in the people. And it is this faith that the people themselves have the capacity to solve their own problems—political, economic, and otherwise—through democratic action—that is the central ideal of cooperation.

When I was preparing to leave Prague, Czechoslovakia, last September, one of the top leaders of the European cooperatives said to me:

"The cooperators of my country regard the co-ops in the Middle West as the bright spot in the cooperative movement of the western hemisphere. Furthermore, we regard all of you as the outstanding leaders in the whole world in the cooperative production and distribution of petroleum. We are following everything you do closely, for we regard your leadership as encouraging and inspiring."

As I said good-by to him and took a plane for London I felt more keenly than ever before the great responsibility that you and I have to the millions of cooperators around the world, and to hundreds of thousands of nonmembers in the Midwest who have not yet realized the great opportunity that is ours.

One of the great philosophers of the cooperative movement, who was thrilled on reading our twentieth annual report, wrote me at New Year's time: "I take this occasion to convey to you, to your directors, and to your expanding membership my thanks for what you are doing for the sake of the civilization in which I am living. This means not so much for me but for my children's children."

The story is told of an old man who was interrupted in his work of planting an apple tree by a questioning youngster.

"Why are you planting an apple tree, granddad?" he asked. "You'll not live long enough to eat any of its fruit."

"Because," said the old-timer, "when I was a boy I had apples to eat."

We of the cooperative movement are planting apple trees. We're working for today and for tomorrow also, and for the days when, to us, there shall be no tomorrow. We're working for our children, and our children's children. We're working for that fairer land and that better day of which we dream and which we are certain will come.

What we are building here is not an institution to make richer a handful of men already too rich and too powerful, but an institution that will help lift living standards for the people of a great area; an institution that will be representative of the ideals of thousands upon thousands of people, an institution into which has gone not only the labor but the thinking of untold numbers, an institution that may help correct some of the inequalities in our economic and social system and thus create a better nation and a better world in which this and other nations can live in peace and security.

Now To Pay the Fiddler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that we have reached a cross road of determination in this country in dealing with the Federal debt, expenditures, and taxation. No single problem, with the exception of world peace, is more important at this hour to every man, woman, and child in this Nation than economic stability, and this is irrevocably tied to debt, expenditures, and taxation. Already we have seen a loss of several billion dollars, as represented in farm income, and the end is not yet. On the other hand, we are told by the administration that there must be even greater spending and even higher taxes. Over all is laid the heavy and menacing hand of a Federal debt of more than $250,000,000,000. Not a single program has been laid down by the administration for the liquidation of this debt, and there is no reason to believe, as of this date, that any specific legislation will be offered for that purpose. Debt reduction thus will continue to be offered as a political campaign fairy tale. In connection with the foregoing I desire at this time, Mr. Speaker, to offer an excellent editorial as published recently in the Bremer County (Iowa) Independent, published at Waverly, Iowa:

NOW TO PAY THE FIDDLER

We listened in amazement to President Truman's message to Congress. We waited in vain to hear something definite about cutting down the enormous expenses of our Federal Government. Instead we heard the President boldly suggest spending many more millions and call upon Congress to find ways and means to raise $4,000,000,000 more in taxes every year. Just where are we going to stop?

In 1937 it took all of the income of all the people in two States, Pennsylvania and Missouri, to pay the cost of running our National Government for 1 year. In 10 years that cost had mounted to where in 1947 it took the entire income of all the people in 25 States to pay the cost. The Government budget jumped from eight billions in 1937 to forty-two billions in 1947. Now we're headed still higher into the stratosphere. Just how much further can this go before the Government takes over everything and everybody?

Make no mistake about it—national debts and high taxes are the greatest danger Americans right now face so far as their personal liberties are concerned. If the cost of our Government continues to go higher and higher it won't be long until our freedom of enterprise is gone. After that our other freedoms can well be lost in rapid succession. It is no exaggeration to say that the hope and prayer of the Communists in this country is that our Nation will come to adopt enough socialistic follies to deplete our Federal Treasury and invite the kind of national bankruptcy now prevailing in China.

If you think such a thing can't happen in this country, talk to anyone who has been in England within the last few months and learn how far that country has moved in the direction of taking away the freedom of the

individual. History shows that every great nation which fell, did so because its government grew so big and heavy that the people could no longer stand up under it. It is a terrible thing to contemplate, but the reality is now before us. Some one of these days when the workers in our Nation's industries suddenly find their pay checks cut still further because of increased withholding taxes; when farmers and businessmen find their income taxes mounting still higher, a lot of people are going to realize that now at last the time has come to start paying the fiddler.

Enemies of human freedom have lots of clever ways to promote their evil designs. Their clever, sentimental appeals and schemes for the Government to spend more and more money will always find support. Yet adoption of these schemes means heading our country toward bankruptcy and some form of dictatorship as certain as night follows day.

President Truman has made his choice. The idea of cutting Government expenses to make possible a reduction in taxation and lowering the national debt is out the window so far as the administration is concerned. One last hope remains. That hope is that our representatives in Congress will insist upon a drastic reduction in the cost of running our Government machinery. Unless all of us act to let our representatives in Washington know how we feel about more Government expenses and still higher taxes we are headed for President Truman's bureaucratic utopia.

The time to pay the fiddler is at hand.

A Reasonable, Uniform, American, Old-Age Pension

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today, introduced into the House of Representatives a bill that I believe should be of tremendous interest to the Congress. I believe further that this bill is of tremendous interest to the people of the United States. This bill, Mr. Speaker, would provide a uniform American old-age pension to all citizens of the United States who could meet the following qualifications.

First. Applicant should be 60 years of age or older.

Second. Applicant's personal income should be less than the amount making it necessary to file a Federal income tax return.

Third. If not native born, applicant must have been a fully naturalized citizen for at least 10 years before date of application.

These are the three simple qualifications. They are so easily understood that any further explanation of them seems to be unnecessary.

The amount of the pension provided in this bill will be uniform in all of the States, and uniform in all parts of the various States. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that whatever amount of benefit in the way of assistance or old age pension, or other benefit provided by the Government, for citizens, should be uniform. Certainly there should be no disparagement or discrimination because of the State in which the citizen happens to reside.

Many of us have long deplored the fact that under our old-age assistance the amount of benefits was determined by a State matching system. Thus, even today where the Federal Government is matching some of the States up to a maximum of $30 per month, it is at the same time only matching up to less than half that amount in other States. This system, in our opinion, Mr. Speaker, is wrong. Why should not a citizen of any given State receive from the Federal Government the same amount in either old-age assistance, old-age pensions, or any other benefit, as a citizen of Colorado, California, or any other State?

To us the answer to this question is obvious. They should be treated with equal justice in all the States. Their grants should be uniform. The bill I am speaking of will provide a uniform American old-age pension. It will provide the same amount of pension in each and every State. It will provide the same amount of pension for all citizens eligible to receive the pensions.

AMOUNT OF PENSION $60 PER MONTH

We consider this amount reasonable. We believe the aged citizens would desire us to keep the pension modest in order that it would not involve too great a tax burden on the country. We are aware also that the Government is facing heavy demands for funds for national security, aid to education, foreign aid, and many other pressing matters. We believe that all of these should have proper consideration. With regard to our proposed pension for the elders, we think it is as equally important as almost any other subject on which the Congress shall be called to legislate. Certainly the welfare and security of our own mothers and fathers is of vital importance to all of us and to the welfare of our Nation.

THE AMOUNT IS NOT TOO MUCH

First. I am confident the committee will find that $60 per month is not too much pension. It is not too much for the Government to provide in the light of the obvious need of our elder citizens. If we should pay them anything at all we should certainly pay at least this much. Should the committee find the situation justifies a greater amount, say $75 or even $100, and so reports, giving its good and sufficient reasons, I shall certainly be pleased to go along with such a recommendation.

Second. Figures and facts are being assembled as to the cost of this proposed legislation. We are certain that our economy will not only stand it but will definitely be improved by it. We expect to put such figures and facts in the RECORD later.

May I state again, Mr. Speaker, that I do believe, and most sincerely, that if the Government has any responsibility at all in this field of providing security for our deserving elder citizens then it does have the full responsibility of providing sufficient security to enable the citizens to live according to reasonable American standards.

We have committed ourselves to this responsibility. We have entered the field. We are up to our necks in responsibility. The need and the emergency of the situation is really frightening when we consider the sad plight of millions of our citizens. I cannot overemphasize the extent of the emergency. Millions right here in America are, on this cold winter's day, in February A. D. 1949, ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-fed.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

This program has united, bipartisan support. It is not a matter of partisan politics at all. Democrats, Republicans, or members of any party are subject to old age, hunger, cold, the need for proper medical care, and so forth. No, Mr. Speaker, these exigencies respect neither persons, parties, races, nor creeds. They are basic problems of all of our people. We are happy therefore that we can present a completely united program insofar as parties are concerned. We invited all Members of the House who were interested in better old-age pensions to confer with us in preparing this program. We did not ask any Member about his party affiliation or his stand on any other issue now pending before this body or which hereafter may be introduced. We reduced this matter to its actual size as an American issue, and we are trying to deal with it strictly on its merit alone. We do have completely united bipartisan support for this program. In fact, I myself do not know, among our many sponsors, how many are Democrats and how many are Republicans. What is more I do not wish to know. I am anxious that there shall be not even the slightest vestige of partisanship in this matter. Pensions for the aged constitute an all-American problem. Let us deal with that problem with an all-American concept. Let us deal with it with statesmanship. Let there be no partisanship.

We are still extending the opportunity for all Members of the House who desire to do so to affiliate with us in this united program for better pensions. We want each and every Member who favors a reasonable pension to take the place of old-age assistance to join hands with us in our friendly, fair, and bipartisan effort to enact such a bill. We believe that there is a strong majority of the Members in favor of such legislation. Many of us have openly declared our position in this matter both on the floor of Congress and at home with our constituents. We are going to redeem those declarations by doing our best, in this Eighty-first Congress of the United States, to enact such legislation. We shall follow fair and friendly methods and we shall welcome the aid and cooperation of every Member that shares our views.

CALLS FURTHER ATTENTION TO THE BILL

The bill, Mr. Speaker, will doubtless be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. I trust it will have early

and continued consideration. Not because I have introduced it, Mr. Speaker, but because it does deal with a most urgent national problem. Furthermore it represents not merely my interest in this pressing problem, but to just as great extent, it represents, I believe, the interest of every Member of this House who shares with me the conviction that our deserving elder citizens should have an honorable, a reasonable, a uniform, American pension, and that they should have it now.

Trinity River Flood-Control Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, with work progressing rapidly on the reservoirs under construction in the upper Trinity River Basin, it becomes more imperative that the surveys and investigations by the United States Engineers be completed in the middle Trinity River Basin in order that authorizations and appropriations from Congress may be secured. I have appeared with other members of the Texas delegation before the Appropriations Committees in Congress, requesting sufficient funds to carry out this necessary flood-control work and I will continue to do everything within my power to expedite these projects.

The Ennis Labor Council of Ennis, Tex., is very much interested in having work begin on the Chambers Creek Lake project of the middle Trinity River Basin. I sincerely trust that the soil-conservation work, now being accomplished, will soon be concluded as the soil must be held in place before the flood-control structures will prove of lasting benefit.

In May 1948 Chambers Creek and other streams in this area were at their highest flood level in years and the losses of this flood together with a more recent overflow amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars to the people of this area. These losses can be avoided and we will continue to work for an effective flood-control program for the middle Trinity River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following communication received from the Ennis Labor Council and signed by its president, Mr. B. C. Roberts, and the council's secretary, Mr. H. M. Cloud:

At a regular meeting of the Ennis Labor Council representing the union organizations in the city of Ennis, Ellis County, Tex., which have a combined membership of over 1,000 members, the following motion was adopted:

"That the following resolution be sent by the secretary to Senator TOM CONNALLY, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE for their attention and whatever action may be possible on their part.

"'*Be it resolved*, That the United States Senate and the House of Representatives be requested to take prompt action so that the Trinity River flood-control program may be carried out with dispatch and that the Chambers Creek Lake project be given top priority.

" 'That there is now a serious shortage of water in the area to be served by the Chambers Creek Lake project and that at least three cities and numerous towns and villages surrounding said project will be greatly benefited thereby and that it is imperative that the water supply in the area be increased without delay and that the project as outlined by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army is the most feasible method of remedying the serious shortage.'

"Adopted at a regular meeting of the Ennis Labor Council January 10, 1949.

"B. C. ROBERTS,
"President of the Council.
"H. M. CLOUD,
"Secretary of the Council."

Hall Survey Indicates the Bonus Issue Will Face Congress Again Whether We Like It or Not

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago Congress approved the Adjusted Compensation Act and men who fought in World War I received their long-awaited bonus. They were paid off by Uncle Sam at a time when the United States was suffering from the worst depression in history.

I was a bank teller at the time; I remember the long lines of veterans with Treasury checks in front of my paying and receiving window. I remember how great was their need for these extra dollars, which went to cover unpaid bills and to buy necessities which the veterans lacked. That first bonus put the majority on their feet.

Today, 4 years after World War II, little has been said thus far about the bonus as it applies to the new veteran. Times being relatively good, and up to the present, at least, the Nation enjoying pretty full employment, we have not heard much of the subject. It definitely is not as near the fore as some subjects I could name.

I jumped the gun last year and called upon the House to keep the promise we made in the GI bill of rights to make the loan guaranty payable to World War II veterans who could show need.

Of course, I was immediately assailed as a Treasury raider and called all kinds of names for daring to suggest that justice be done the veteran. So I decided to list the bonus question in the Hall survey. I wanted a clear picture of just how people in my section feel about it.

As you know, I asked the clear, direct question, "Do you want me to vote for or against a national bonus for World War II veterans?" The results appear as follows:

PERCENTAGES

Question No. 6. "Do you want me to vote for or against a national bonus for World War II veterans?"

	For	Against
Triple Cities area	56.1	43.9
Rural	61.1	38.9
Broome	57.1	42.9
City, Norwich	57.7	42.3
Rural	47.0	53.0
Chenango	51.4	48.6
City, Oneida and Canastota	28.3	71.7
Rural	45.4	54.6
Madison	38.5	61.5
Over-all district	55.1	44.9

When you consider that very little favorable comment on the bonus subject finds its way into any articulate news organ, and that practically no mention has been made of it by veteran leaders, you will be the more surprised to view these percentages. It should be noted that the over-all picture of my district shows a preponderance in favor of the World War II bonus.

Nor can all those who voiced their opposition to this proposal be classed as dead against it. Ever so many qualified their disapproval as only temporary. "Later on," they wrote, "the boys will need their bonus more than they do at present."

There is considerable justification for their stand. Another 5 years may see a depression; heaven forbid. Then, the flood of a billion dollars in veterans' bonus payments through the channels of trade will certainly help things. Perhaps their contention to delay paying the bonus is reasonable.

My contention was and still is that many veterans could have started out in business or bought homes as soon as they were mustered out of service. They would not now find themselves out of work or in jobs they do not like. They would not be living in some of the rats' nests that they are compelled to call homes into which the housing shortage forced them.

Unfortunately the hue and cry from a few selfish big shots poured cold water on their getting anywhere with the loan guaranty in the GI bill.

But the folks up my way have spoken, and they favor the bonus. They back up my position and I shall continue to be an advocate of this proposal.

My immediate energies, however, are going to be directed to a pension for World War I vets. These are the forgotten men. They have been pushed around long enough.

Now they are reaching middle age. I dare say they average between 55 and 60. The time is ripe to give them a break. With this in mind, I hope Congress recognizes the necessity of passing the Hall pension bill for World War I veterans.

Nobody is going to scare me by yelling "liberal" because I go all out for the veteran. Nobody is going to turn me from my determination to see the veteran get a square deal. Enough voices have been silenced already who spoke in his behalf.

Wait until the big vet organizations start rolling with their campaigns to give the ex-doughboys and GI's their just deserts. Then you will see a lot of red faces. Then a lot of Johnnies-come-lately will climb on the bandwagon and clamor to take the credit away from the rest of us who have never been afraid to take a stand.

Education and Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE MAGEE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Education and Federal Aid," delivered by me before the Brightwood Lions Club, of Washington, D. C., Wednesday, February 9, 1949:

EDUCATION AND FEDERAL AID

Diogenes once said: "Education is a controlling grace to the young, consolation to the old, wealth to the poor, and ornament to the rich."

I believe, as you believe, that the three great institutions in our land are the church, the home, and the school. The church is the common meeting ground for united worship, where a few moments may be spent in turning our thoughts from things material to things spiritual. Upon every strictly moral issue, the church is found upon the side of right. I believe again in the sanctity of the home. It is the fountain spring of life, the altar of hope. From the hearthstone of the home are born the pure emotion of the family relationship. The home has been the bulwark of every nation. Since the beginning of time, man and savage beast have fought to protect it. Savage ancestor living in his dugout or gilded king in his resplendent castle have died to protect its portals.

Yet as strongly as I feel for these institutions, I cannot but believe that the school often wields the greatest influence of the three upon our youth. The home may be torn by strife. It may be a hovel where true love does not abide between the parents; and where existence is not pleasant for the children. The church may fail in its attempt to attract the youth. The school, however, compels attendance in the formative period of the child's life. The teacher has control more waking hours per day than does the parent. In the school are taught the fundamentals of life, the history of the great, and the knowledge of centuries of the best that man has strived for and won.

The public-school system is a great asset. It is the most precious heritage of a free people; but I wonder how many of us have ever paused to consider the rough road the human race has traveled to attain it.

There was a time when only the aristocracy were allowed to think. They made the laws, decreed the form of religious worship, and executed the rules and mode of life. The king or ruler was a supreme being and all power emanated from him. He claimed to be the representative on earth of heavenly powers. Laws were not only made by him. They were executed at his dictation. In those early days, if a crime had been committed, they would take the accused to a deep body of water, bind his limbs together, tie his arms and throw him in. If he drowned, they said he was innocent. If he fought himself to shore and safety, they said that he was possessed of the devil; that he was guilty; and he was speedily executed.

The ruler held his power by the aid of superstition and ignorance. But now and then some individual used his mind and questioned the status quo. He dared to raise his voice against these injustices. He sought to know the truth, believing as Plato did, that "truth will make you free."

Liberty has ever followed education and neither was born in a day. That men might have education and liberty, thousands of heroic souls have lain in dungeons, have felt the thumbscrew, and witnessed the terrible torture of the gibbet.

We can think of how Pericles, who built the city of Athens, was disgraced and destroyed and how he had to go to the Forum and plead for the life of his wife, Aspasia; and how finally she and her son were both executed on order of the government.

We think of how Phidias, the right-hand man of Pericles, and the greatest sculptor the world has ever seen, was executed for blasphemy for putting the picture of his patron on a sacred shield; how he was dragged behind a cart to the place of execution and his body later thrown to the wild beasts.

We think of Socrates, who was almost a divine teacher and one of the great Grecian philosophers, whose only crime had been to deny the existence of the seven gods who were supposed to rule over the destinies of Greece. Instead he taught that there was one Supreme Being, that he was a just and merciful God. Socrates was charged with heresy and with corrupting the youth of the city. He was brought before the Heliaea, the most important court of Athens, and tried before a jury of 500 and by a small majority found guilty. He was sentenced to die by drinking the fatal hemlock. During the 30 days that elapsed between his sentence and day for execution, he was beseeched by his pupils and friends to flee the country. He was given a chance to deny all he had said, but Socrates believed that truth was greater than life itself and on the appointed day he drank the potion with a calmness of spirit that astounded his countrymen. Among his pupils was a young man who had to flee the country to save his own life. However, in a few years he returned and picked up the cudgel of truth that had been laid down by his teacher, and today the name of Plato stands foremost among the great philosophers. He in turn taught Aristotle, another great teacher, who avoided execution for heresy only by fleeing for his life.

We could also mention Hippocrates, Herodotus, and others as among the great searchers after truth, men who believed in what we later have chosen to call democracy. They were all criminals before the law. They all suffered humiliation and were exiled or executed.

We see the Man of Galilee, onto whose temples was pressed the crown of thorns and into whose hands were driven the nails of hate merely because he taught of the brotherhood of man and attempted to portray a new civilization.

We see the Dark Ages, with its night of a thousand years, when men forget to smile; when initiative died and enterprise ceased; when the world produced no literature or no inventions.

We see the world awaken again with the great struggle at the Valley of Runnymede, when the embattled barons marshaled their forces and held King John at bay. We see gained from that conflict the English bill of rights, which forms the nucleus of our own Constitution.

We see Columbus discover a new nation and receive as his reward a prison term, being liberated only when death filed his chains and set the captive free.

We see Galileo teaching the Copernican theory and his own discoveries relative to the movement of the earth and planets. We see him charged with heresy and forced on his bended knees to deny the truths that he had taught or be burned at the stake. Legend has it that as he arose he said: "Yet the earth does move"; and for this insolence he served 3 years in a dark dungeon.

These men were the great teachers. To these men and countless thousands more we owe a debt of gratitude for breaking down the iron curtain of superstition and ignorance.

Some years ago I witnessed an exhibit of man's industrial and social progress. I saw the advance he had made from the birch canoe in which our savage ancestors floated about to the modern steamship that turns her brave prow from New York harbor and sails across 3,000 miles of billowy water within five short days. I saw the advance that had been made in weapons—from the club with which half-civilized men beat other men into subjection; from that club to the flintlock, the caplock, and to the Big Bertha of the First World War, capable of hurling balls of steel for dozens of miles. I saw the protective armor from the turtle shell and porcupine skin to the shirts of mail and ships and tanks of steel. I saw the musical instruments from the tom-tom to the great pipe organs. I saw the paintings from the daub of yellow mud to the masterpieces of Michelangelo; and sculpture from mud-constructed horrid images to the beautiful statuary of the present. I saw the books of antiquity written upon the skins of wild beasts, books written upon the shoulder blades of sheep, books written by crude etchings in the sands and by designs upon totem poles; from all these to the splendid volumes that adorn the libraries of today. I witnessed the advances that had been made in agriculture, from the crooked stick and sharpened stone with which our ancestors furrowed the soil, up to the gang plows; from beating the grain from the hull up to the great combines.

Education has ever been the beacon light of civilization. Education is the difference between the United States and the Fiji Islands. It is the difference between the wastelands and the garden; between the forest trail and the modern highway. It is the difference between the thatched-roof cabin and the steam-heated home; between the oxcart and the automobile; between the crooked stick and the modern implements of agriculture.

As a poetic figure once expressed it: "Education weighs the stars and analyzes the sunbeam. It reads the testimony of the rocks. It bridges the yawning chasm. Education takes the pen and writes the poem. It takes the brush and paints the canvas. It takes the chisel and creates from the rough block the finished statue."

On the effects of education, Lord Brougham once said: "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave."

Several years ago I had occasion to be traveling about the rural sections of Cuba. We came finally to a small village. Some distance from the road was a large mansion in a setting of beauty. Lined along either side of the road were thatched-roof and one-room cottages. Children, emaciated and only half clad, played about. As we stopped the car, they came to us begging for pennies or gifts. Inside the homes were no floors excepting the bare ground and practically no furniture or chairs. The driver of our car stated that the owner of the large home was mayor of the village; that he owned all the land, stores, and other property; that all the inhabitants were in his employ and that they were allowed only enough to barely subsist upon. Here we saw an example of the continuation of ancient serfdom.

Not many months thereafter I read where a revolution had started in Cuba. Peculiar to say, it was not started by the people whom

we saw nor by their kind. It started with the students in the University of Habana. And so it has always been. It is the students who have dared to think, who have been the leaders in progress and civilization.

Education, like civilization, can never remain static. It will grow and expand or it will decline and die. Our public-school system is facing a crisis. Education is facing its hour of decision.

In my judgment, education is a national problem, while remaining a function of the States in actual operation. It is as much a national problem as are defense, flood control, agriculture, and the numerous other functions of the Federal Government.

May we, in sincerity, contend that the Federal Government should be interested in soil conservation and better farm practices, in better livestock, in social security for our citizens, yet be unconcerned about the education of our youth? Is it logical to say that the Federal Government may embark on a pension or assistance program for the aged, and yet turn a deaf ear to youth in its thirst for knowledge?

Shall we be more concerned about the quality of our livestock than we are in the quality of our teachers? Shall we continue to spend billions to raise the standard of living in Europe, and yet forget the sacrifices which our teachers are making in this land of ours. Our teachers, as a class, have never received a salary commensurate with the other learned professions. We have seen situations in this country where the janitors at the schools received a higher monthly wage than did the teachers, and today many ditch diggers receive a higher rate per hour. It is a sad commentary on our national life that members of a noble and honored profession are unable to lay aside something for the ordinary misfortunes of life; that they must face old age with fear and uncertainty.

While we are spending billions on the One World idea, there are those who say that not one cent should be spent to make education a one-nation function. Are not citizens of each State also citizens of our Nation? Do they not move freely about and across State borders just as goods are moved in commerce? Let no man or no organization tell me that the effects of illiteracy in one State are not felt throughout our land.

A little while ago, we saw the Federal Government spend millions of dollars in its Operation Haylift to save starving and freezing livestock. I do not recall that the National Association of State Chambers of Commerce took any exception to this great act of mercy. Nothing was said by them at that time concerning States' rights and Federal encroachment. For years we have taken tax moneys collected from all the States and used it when an emergency arose or when disaster struck in a few sections. The chambers of commerce and newspapers in the affected areas were crying for Federal aid; yet these same people raise the cry of "Federal encroachment" the very minute someone suggests Federal aid to our public schools.

There is nothing new in Federal aid to education. It began with donations of land from the public domain to endow the land-grant colleges. Later came Federal appropriations in aid of agricultural education and vocational training. We are witnessing generous appropriations for the education of veterans. In all these years there has never been one scintilla of evidence that any State has sacrificed any portion of its sovereignty or that the Federal Government has attempted to dictate or supervise the type or manner of instruction.

In both World Wars a staggering number of young men were rejected because of educational deficiencies. I have heard it said that we were too strict in the intelligence tests. I know from personal experience in both World Wars that this is untrue. In each war men had to be screened again because so many were unable to understand simple military commands. Separate units were formed for those of lower intelligence and they were given special instruction at added cost.

Our last decennial census showed that 10,000,000 adults had less than a fifth-grade education. Millions of children are attending no school. Millions are receiving inadequate instruction because of the inefficiency of the teachers. More than 350,000 teachers left the profession between 1940–45. More than 1,000,000 children are attending schools in districts where annual expenditures are less than $500 per classroom. A survey in 1939–40 revealed that there were systems so poorly financed that they spent less than $100 per classroom, while the best-financed systems were spending about $6,000 per classroom.

The ability of the States to support education varies widely. In 1945 the income per capita ranged from $556 in one State to $1,595 in a certain other State. For the same year, the amount of income behind each child of school age ranged from $1,974 in the one State to $9,005 in the other State. I say to you that there is no sane or logical argument why a child's opportunity for a full education should be dependent upon the circumstance of where that child was born.

How do our expenditures for education compare with certain expenditures for nonessentials? During the school year of 1944–45, we spent $2,600,000,000 for the operation of our schools, including teacher hire. In the calendar year of 1944 we spent $2,700,000,000 for tobacco and $7,100,000,000 for alcoholic beverages. In a recent year crime alone cost our taxpayers $15,000,000,000; and it goes without saying that an overwhelming majority of those now serving in our penal institutions are poorly educated.

The best figures available show that both Britain and Russia are spending a higher proportion of their national income on education than are the people of the United States. It was acknowledged a few years ago and may still be true that the rate of literacy in the Soviet Union is higher than that in the United States.

There was a time when commerce between the States was negligible. Each community was a unit unto itself. Individuals lived and died in the locality of their birth. These were the days of the oxen teams or of the horse and buggy. Commerce was mainly a system of barter. Mastery of the three R's constituted a well-rounded education.

We know the great difficulties that confronted the founding fathers in their efforts to form a federation of States—the National Union. People were jealous of their rights. They wanted local self-government. They feared dictation from a central authority, which, at that time, seemed far removed. But I am thankful that today we are one Nation, indivisible; that we are an economic unit; that we are fast approaching the goals laid out by our Federal Constitution; "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Let us ever remember that these aims were not directed toward or for the inhabitants of one State or one section, but to the entire Nation.

I am glad that a majority of us now accept the principle that wealth should be taxed wherever found and the revenue expended wherever needed to promote the general welfare of our people. Our children of today are citizens of the Nation, rather than of a particular State. Let us treat them as such; and let us treat those who instruct them as such.

The first report of the President's Commission on Higher Education contains the following statement, with which I am in full agreement:

"The Federal Government assumes responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts in military defense against the Nation's enemies without; surely it may as justifiably assume responsibility for supplementing State and local efforts against educational deficiencies and inequalities that are democracy's enemies within."

We Could Slip Into Socialism While Hating It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

WE COULD SLIP INTO SOCIALISM WHILE HATING IT

After the election returns were in, the Post raised the question, Did we buy socialism with Truman? Some readers are still bending our ear with complaints that we were unfair not only to President Truman but to the American people. Of course, these optimists assert, neither Mr. Truman nor the American people want socialism, and we were practically indecent to say such a thing. What we said was that, although neither the President nor those who voted for him want socialism, the essence of socialism is what we are very like to get. Now we have the President's state of the Union message, the so-called economic report, and the inaugural address. The defense rests.

According to Mr. Truman, Americans have "abandoned the trickle-down concept of national prosperity * * * (and) believe that wealth should be created for the benefit of all." What this seems to mean is that, instead of the benefits of a dynamic imaginative free-enterprise system trickling down to all classes, including the laziest man on the street, the ordinary man is now to get his trickle from the Government, which, according to the President, must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance." Since the only way the Government can see that one man gets his fair share is to take something away from another man, it is obvious that $6,000,000,000 in new taxes will be cheap in comparison with what will have to be taken from Peter if Paul is to get what he thinks is his fair share.

Apparently foreseeing that when the Truman New Deal gets to rolling, there won't be much to trickle down from American industry, the President is ready with a recommendation that whenever the steel industry doesn't produce enough to satisfy the bureaucrats' idea of ample production, the Government shall finance or actually build competing plants. Having all but crippled the industry's sources of new capital needed for improvements and expansion, the Government, under the whip of the CIO economists, threatens to mow down free enterprise with subsidized competition.

The costs of medical care and social security are to be raised to new heights, on the theory that American medical care, the best in the world, can be improved if it is made as much as possible like medical care in France and England, where it is terrible. "Building costs must be lowered," but apparently by charging them up to Uncle Sam rather than by insisting on modifications of the make-work, slow-down, and stand-in practices of the building trade-unions, which have raised wages enormously and reduced production

per man to new lows. The proportion of rental housing must be increased, and to tempt private enterprise into this field, rent control must be extended and strengthened. To keep everybody in line, the Government must exercise control over the allocation of materials.

Despite all the lip service to private enterprise, the President's program leads straight to socialism, as must any program which rests on the assumption that the Government is responsible for the economic welfare of every citizen, that the Government must give him federalized medical care and subsidized housing, underwrite farm prices and dictate the minimum which people may accept as wages and how much they shall be permitted to retain as profit, in the unlikely event that the concept of profit can survive such a hodgepodge of mothering. The people didn't vote for socialism; they voted for Mr. Truman. Mr. Truman probably doesn't want socialism, but he has allowed a lot of CIO planners to talk him into a scheme of things which, if permitted to run its course, adds up to socialism, however the poor misbegotten thing is christened.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a timely, appropriate, and forceful statement made yesterday by Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, directly on the dastardly trial, conviction, and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty, and also broadly on the vicious Communist attack on all religious denominations:

ACHESON TEXT ON MINDSZENTY

The trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, on whom the Hungarian Government has now imposed a sentence of life imprisonment, confirms the Government and people of the United States in the views expressed by the Acting Secretary of State on December 29, 1948. By this conscienceless attack on religious and personal freedom, as well as by the persecution of Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass and other respected church leaders, the Soviet-controlled Hungarian authorities seek to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove this source of moral resistance to communism.

In their conduct of the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, the Hungarian authorities do not appear to have omitted any of the usual methods practiced by a police state. Such proceedings constitute not the administration of justice but wanton persecution. They have evoked universal condemnation, and the Hungarian Government must bear full responsibility for its action.

The cases of Cardinal Mindszenty and other Hungarian church leaders are not isolated developments. During the past 2 years, with governmental power entirely in the hands of the minority Communist Party, the people of Hungary have been increasingly denied the exercise of fundamental human rights and freedoms. Parliamentary opposition, an element indispensable to the democratic process, has been ruthlessly eliminated, the totalitarian controls of state and party have been laid like a deadening hand on every phase of daily personal existence, and the Hungarian people have been divested of any real independence.

The people of the United States, and without question, peoples of other freedom-loving nations, are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere.

Same Old Arguments Against CVA, MVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial published in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal, of Tuesday, February 8, 1949, in reference to the forces at work attempting to block development of the Columbia River Valley and Missouri River Valley on the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The editorial follows:

THE SAME OLD ARGUMENTS

As was to be expected, the usual forces have quickly alined themselves against the President's proposal for a regional development of the Columbia River Valley on the lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

They are hauling forth all the old arguments for opposing Government power developments. These range the gamut from unfair competition with private utility companies to socialism. Three Republican Governors of Pacific Northwest States have come out in opposition to the President's recommendation for the Columbia Valley.

All the arguments have been heard before in the case of the TVA. And all of them now tend to ignore actual experience in the Tennessee Valley, or try to write it off as not applicable. Actually the case of TVA is a strong argument for similar developments elsewhere—in the Columbia Valley, in the Missouri Valley, and in the St. Lawrence Valley.

And what is the experience with TVA? The area is many times more prosperous than it was before TVA made power available; the people are better off, and so is local business; industries have come to the valley that could not possibly have come without TVA. Even the private utility companies, which feared they would fail or be taken over by public power, are doing better today than ever before.

Furthermore, in the case of the Columbia Valley, the President's proposal is in large measure just a consolidation of work that has been going on without coordination for years. That includes the reclamation of land, on which the Federal Government has already spent millions in the Columbia area. It also includes work that has in the past been done by the Army Corps of Engineers, the National Park Service; the Fish and Wildlife Service, and other Federal agencies.

What the Columbia Valley program will actually do is bring more electric power to the Pacific Northwest, which needs it even more urgently than most of the rest of the country. It will speed the growth and industrialization of the area. And it is a job that private industry cannot undertake, because of its magnitude.

Far from opposing it, the governors of the Pacific Northwest should welcome the program—even if they are Republicans.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, since it has become apparent that subterfuge and chicanery are the most desirable weapons of accomplishment of some individuals high in administration circles, it becomes more necessary than ever for those of us who decry such tactics to be more alert than ever.

The desire for socialism and centralization of government in high government levels becomes more evident with the passing of each day. The determination to impose so-called, though misnamed, civil rights on the people of America, particularly those of us who live in the South, lends itself to any method which will do the job. Judging actions of the past we must recognize that there are no limits to which some individuals will go to attain their end. It all seems to be conducted under the rather dubious policy that the end justifies the means.

In this connection the editor of the Plaquemines Gazette in Louisiana, has written a most interesting editorial alerting the Nation to the dangers which lurk in the shadow of what appears to be high ideals and lofty purposes. It is a most provocative editorial and one which justifies careful reading and mature consideration. The time has gone when such suspicions or fears can be cast off with the thought that it cannot happen here. There are far too many things happening every day about us which only a short time ago we thought could not happen here but they are happening.

Here is the editorial:

[From the Plaquemines Gazette, Pointe-a-la-Hache, La., of February 5, 1949]

UN USED IN CONSPIRACY AGAINST UNITED STATES—MRS. ROOSEVELT'S HUMAN RIGHTS DECLARATION FOLLOWS JOE STALIN'S PATTERN FOR DICTATORSHIP

Much agitation has been carried on for the so-called civil-rights program by certain political groups and political aspirants to attract racial and religious minority voting groups, particularly in the North and East.

On December 5, 1946, Acting President Truman issued Executive Order 9808 establishing the President's Committee on Civil Rights, in which he stated as the basis for his order, without foundation in fact:

"Whereas the action of individuals who take the law into their own hands and inflict summary punishment and wreak personal vengeance is subversive of our democratic system of law enforcement and public criminal justice, and gravely threatens our form of government."

As a matter of fact, during that year there was only one lynching of a Negro in the entire United States; whereas there were scores of acts of violence and the wreaking of personal vengeance by organized union groups which were specifically exempt under the very terms of the antilynching bill introduced as an administration measure and as a part of the so-called civil-rights program.

By that order the President created a committee to be known as the President's Committee on Civil Rights, and he directed all departments and agencies of the Federal Government not only to furnish complete information called for, but "the services of such persons as the committee may require in the performance of its duties," and required the committee to make a report to the President in writing.

The committee made its report to the President, which was published by the United States Government Printing Office in Washington in 1947. The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights is in book form of 175 pages and is entitled "To Secure These Rights."

The report stated that the Federal Government was hampered by inadequate civil rights statutes, and added: "We must provide the Department of Justice with the tools to do the job" (the FBI).

The first part of the report deals with the ideal of freedom and equality, in which such statements as these are made in an attempt, evidently, to place it on a high plane:

Page 4: "The central theme in our American heritage is the importance of the individual person.

"This is the conscious recognition of a basic moral principle: All men are created equal as well as free.

"We abhor the totalitarian arrogance which makes one man say that he will respect another man as his equal only if he has 'my race, my religion, my political views, my social position.'

"We can tolerate no restrictions upon the individual which depend upon irrelevant factors such as his race, his color, his religion or the social position to which he is born."

Page 6: "It is the purpose of government in a democracy to regulate the activity of each man in the interest of all men," (in a democracy).

In speaking of American heritage of freedom and equality, the report says:

Page 4: "We still have their ideological remnants in the unwarrantable 'pride and prejudice' of some of our people and practices."

In dealing with the proposed civil-rights program, the committee states:

Page 100: "We cannot afford to delay action until the most backward community has learned to prize civil liberty and has taken adequate steps to safeguard the rights of every one of its citizens."

This is a statement similar to the one found in the Communist Yugoslavian Government pamphlet on the subject of its law against racial and national discrimination, in which it is stated that that law was the most effective weapon that government had in bringing about its real democracy against certain of its backward people.

Besides the fact that this same antidiscrimination law is found in the Yugoslavian Constitution, it originated with the Russians, and is found in article 123 of the U. S. S. R. Constitution (Joe Stalin's all-races law), which provides that "equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, government, cultural, political, and other public activity is an indefeasible law."

This is the law which Joe Stalin used to make himself the supreme dictator of Russia, because it gave him absolute power over all Russians. Yet, we know what kind of equality and rights Russians have.

In the President's Committee report at page 110, the Committee indicates doubt of the constitutionality of any congressional act to enforce their civil-rights program, but suggests that under the United States Supreme Court ruling in the *Missouri* v. *Holland* case in 1920 "that Congress may enact statutes to carry out treaty obligations, even where, in the absence of a treaty, it has no other power to pass such a statute. This doctrine has an obvious importance as a possible basis for civil-rights legislation."

At page 111, the President's Civil Rights Committee Report says that a strong argument can be made under the precedent of that case for Congress to take separate action to achieve the purposes set out in article 55 of the United Nations Charter designed to secure "respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

The President's committee further states that, "The Human Right Commission of the United Nations is at present working on a detailed international bill of rights designed to give more specific meaning to the general principle announced in article 55 of the Charter. If this document is accepted by the United States as a member state, an even stronger basis for congressional action under the treaty power may be established."

Under the United States Constitution it takes two-thirds of all Senators present to ratify a treaty, and such treaty becomes the supreme law of the land.

It is significant to note that administration bill to carry out President Truman's message on his civil rights program to the United States Congress on February 2, 1948, Senate bill 984, provides, section 2 (c) "That this act was enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race or religion."

This bill failed of passage in Congress.

It is evident that the political proponents of this so-called civil-rights program realize that these are matters strictly reserved to the States of the Union for regulation, but that they are seeking to manufacture alibis for the Federal Government to create a police state to destroy the liberty and freedom of the people of the South in particular, and of all the country as well. So it fell to the lot of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt to use her position on the United Nations Committee to carry out their conspiracy.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, leading spirit in the ADA, radical New Deal political organization, is the United States member on the committee which drafted The Declaration of Human Rights for the UN, and you will see the similarity in the language of those sponsoring the so-called civil-rights program, which the President's committee indicated would somewhat depend on the document to be drafted by the United Nations, if accepted by the United States as a member state, as a basis for congressional action under the treaty power.

In the January 1949 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, page 32, etc., the text of the document approved by the Assembly in Paris on Universal Declaration of Human Rights is given at length. Following are some of its provisions:

Article 2 provides that "everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without discrimination of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status."

Article 7 provides: "All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the laws. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

Note the use of the word "incitement," which would be a restriction on freedom of speech and goes much further than any provision in Senate bill 984 providing for the so-called FEPC.

Both the Russian and Yugoslavian laws prohibit "incitement or advocacy" of racial or national exclusiveness or discrimination and is made punishable by law.

Article 13 provides: "Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state."

Note that this provision would nullify all state laws on segregation of races regarding movement and residence within the borders of any state, and also note particularly that the ratification of this provision by Congress would become the supreme law of the land and would preclude Congress from thereafter enacting any laws restricting immigration of any foreigners, regardless of how undesirable the immigrants may be, whether from communistic Russia or any other foreign country. This means, of course, that our country would be over-run by undesirable immigrants and would make for much trouble in the future and eventually the destruction of our American institutions and government.

Article 16 provides: "Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage, and at its dissolution.

"Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses."

If two-thirds of the United States Senate ratify the United Nations universal declaration of human rights, including this article, it would become the supreme law of the land and would nullify every State law prohibiting marriage of whites and colored or any other legal regulations regarding marriage.

In the final analysis, under article 7, which prohibits incitement to such discrimination, and article 16, which guarantees the right of free marriage between races, if it came to pass that the United Nations human rights declaration became the supreme law of the land, if a father refused his consent to his white daughter marrying a Negro, or even if a white girl refused to marry a Negro, because he was a Negro, they would be violating both the incitement-to-discrimination article and article 16 guaranteeing free racial marriage.

It appears very evident that the purpose of the United Nations' declaration on human rights, engineered largely by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, fits into the pattern of the civil-rights program in Congress and in the very evident campaign of hatred against the South by certain northern and eastern politicians to play up to racial minorities. This constitutes a grave threat and an emergency which is, in fact, right on top of us.

We submit that it is a challenge to the outstanding newspapers and leaders of every southern community, and of the entire country, to expose this hidden conspiracy in the work of Mrs. Roosevelt, and her United Nations universal declaration of human rights, and in the so-called civil-rights program directed particularly against the people of the South, which, in time, would virtually destroy the American way of life throughout the country, because it would lead inevitably to absolute regimentation and dictatorship and to the certain destruction of the liberty and freedom of the American people.

Will two-thirds of the United States Senators vote to ratify Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's conspiracy, through her United Nations committee, against the United States of America?

Library Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, since my State of West Virginia ranks forty-sixth in expenditure per capita for library service, forty-sixth in number of volumes per capita, and forty-seventh in circulation, I am much concerned about the library demonstration bill, H. R. 874 and H. R. 1411, now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Sixty-two percent of the people in West Virginia are totally without library service, 51 of 55 counties do not have county-wide library service and 15 counties have no library service at all. There are in the State of West Virginia 1,200,000 people without library service. I believe the bills under consideration would be genuinely effective in improving such deplorable conditions. It is our farm families that suffer most from such a woeful lack of library facilities. I take the case of my own State merely to illustrate. The situation is not confined to the State of West Virginia.

Today in the United States 35,000,000 people are without library service. Of this number, 32,000,000 live on farms or in small villages.

An additional 35,000,000 Americans have inadequate library facilities.

Out of 3,070 counties in the United States, only 808 have county-wide library service. More than 600 counties—roughly, one out of five—are without any kind of public library within their boundaries.

WHAT IS BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

Some States provide library service to rural areas by using bookmobiles—libraries on wheels—which take books from a central library to outlying districts. At the present, more than 400 of these traveling libraries are taking the pleasures of the public library to farm families in 38 States. Ohio, Georgia, and South Carolina each operate more than 25 bookmobiles. Nine other States have at least 10 traveling libraries to serve rural areas.

The first traveling library dates back to 1905, when a horse-drawn "book-wagon" was used by the Washington County, Md., free library to take books to families in the county. Vehicles used as bookmobiles today include station wagons, small panel trucks, school busses, Army ambulances and trucks, and passenger cars.

Generally speaking, bookmobiles make their rounds once or twice a month. Some leave books at regular distributing stations—post offices, country stores, filling stations, homes, or churches—where it is convenient for patrons to select reading material. Other traveling libraries stop at designated places on certain days, where they are greeted by eager readers of all ages. Some bookmobiles give door-to-door service to homes and schools along the route.

Progress has been made in rural library service in many States, but a great deal remains to be done. To help provide library service to the millions of farm families and others without it, the American Library Association, working with State library groups, is sponsoring a public library service demonstration bill in the United States Congress.

The objectives of the library demonstration bill is to stimulate State and local interest in libraries. The bill will not immediately set up a library in each area without one, but it will demonstrate what can be done to get permanent library service for those areas. For example, a "sample" library will be established in a county or region where there has been no library service or where the library facilities are insufficient to serve the public properly. The library will serve the residents of the demonstration area for a certain period of time, probably a year. After the trial period is over, citizens in the area will vote to determine whether to maintain the library by local taxes.

The library demonstration bill provides for State supervision. States will receive Federal grants to assist them in conducting a demonstration program, but there will be no interference with local groups in carrying out the program.

FARM GROUPS ARE BACKING THE LIBRARY DEMONSTRATION BILL

The Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, Farmers' Union, and Associated Women of the Farm Bureau Federation, are among groups solidly behind the library demonstration bill. Representatives of these groups testified for the bill when it was before congressional committees in the Eightieth Congress. They have adopted resolutions in behalf of the bill, and many State and local farm groups have been active in rallying support for it.

The library demonstration bill was passed by the Senate last year without a dissenting vote, but it did not receive a final vote in the House of Representatives.

Development of the Missouri River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief quotation from the Hoover Commission task force on natural resources in regard to the Pick-Sloan plan in the Missouri Basin. This quotation was published by the Denver Post:

Present estimates are that the construction of projects for the development of the Missouri River will cost nearly $6,500,000,000. One of the unanswered questions concerning development plans is whether there will be sufficient dependable water for purposes of navigation, flood storage, irrigation, water supply and power development.

It is nothing short of a calamity that there should be grave uncertainties on this score at this late date. * * *

After sharp clashes over plans for development of the Missouri Basin, the Corps (of Engineers) and the Bureau (of Reclamation) announced complete agreement on the Pick-Sloan plan. Analysis of that plan reveals the fact that it contains many projects which previously had been subjected to devastating criticism by one or the other agency. The compromise consisted for the most part of a division of projects, each agency agreeing to forego criticizing projects assigned by the agreement to the other.

National Citizens Conference on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the National Citizens Conference on Civil Rights, which will be held in Washington on February 15 and 16. This conference is being held under the auspices of the Civil Liberties Clearing House of Washington, D. C. The sponsors of this particular conference are people of high character, unquestioned American patriotism, and responsibility. A list of these prominent sponsors follow: Mr. Roger Baldwin, Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn, President Mordecai Johnson, Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, Bishop William Scarlett, Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Dr. Channing Tobias, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and Mr. E. Raymond Wilson.

The sponsors have secured some famous American citizens as speakers at their 2-day conference. On Tuesday morning, February 15, the Honorable Paul A. Porter will address the conference on the subject of Government and Civil Liberties. In the afternoon Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean of the school of education of New York University and chairman of the National Citizens Council on Civil Rights will address the group on the subject of Academic Freedom. There will be other speakers whose names are yet to be announced, and there will also be section meetings and panel meetings on different subjects, all pertaining to the subject of civil liberties. The closing address will be made by Morris L. Ernst, a member of the President's committee on civil rights, and his topic will be civil liberties today and tomorrow.

I am sure that it will be profitable for any Member of the House who can find the time, to attend one or more of these meetings.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD a copy of a letter from the President of the United States addressed to Mr. E. Raymond Wilson, the chairman of the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties, a letter which

endorses the meeting which they are to hold on February 15 and 16:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Mr. E. RAYMOND WILSON,
Chairman, National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Please accept my best wishes for a successful gathering of the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties which will be held in Washington February 15–17.

We must provide a solid foundation for the future growth of our country. Of great importance to the present and future generations of America is the development of a program of civil liberties guaranteeing to all people the heritage of freedom which we have received from the founders of this Nation. A free system can endure only when there is freedom of opinion, expression, and conscience.

Your conference has a great responsibility in formulating the kind of program which will give added strength to the principles of freedom which have come down to us from the fathers of the Constitution.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to another conference which is being called on February 11 and 12 by an organization which calls itself the Legislative Assembly and Rally To End Discrimination and Segregation. I think it is fair that the membership should know that this latter group is composed of a very peculiar assortment of sponsors. Among the sponsors of this group are people who have confessed that they are members of the Communist Party. In addition there are other member-sponsors in this group who have historically followed without deviation the Communist Party line. Beside these first two groups there are undoubtedly innocent people who have been persuaded to join in the sponsorship of what many of us believe is a worthy objective, to wit the ending of discrimination and segregation and the protection of civil rights.

I wish to call attention to one name which has been included in the list of this latter organization, the name of Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, the president of the National Council of Negro Women. We all know and admire this venerable Negro lady for her worth-while accomplishments in the field of humanitarianism. Mrs. Bethune, in an article which appeared in the Washington Star on February 3, 1949, announced that she had withdrawn her name as a sponsor to this particular conference. In withdrawing from this conference, which is to be held on February 11 and 12, Mrs. Bethune stated in her letter to Dr. J. Finley Wilson, the national chairman of the assembly and rally, that when she originally agreed to be a sponsor, she was under the impression that the rally was to be held under the auspices of the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. But after seeing the full list of sponsors, Mrs. Bethune wrote Dr. Wilson as follows:

There are a number of names listed thereon who have allowed themselves or their names to be associated with activities and organizations with whose methods and purposes I am unable to agree.

Mr. Speaker, I have made this statement for purposes of clarification in view of the stated objectives of the two conferences and in view of the fact that they are being held within a space of 6 days of each other.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the question of civil rights and the elimination of racial and religious prejudices too often engenders bitterness and acrimony on both sides. Miss Josephine Italiano, of Orange, N. J., is devoting her talent for song-writing to the promotion of understanding and good will among our citizens.

Miss Italiano's efforts are described in the following article from the Newark Evening News:

HOBBY: SONG WRITING

An Orange woman who seeks to lessen prejudice through a better understanding of democracy believes she found her medium when she turned to song writing.

A principal clerk in the Orange tax assessor's office, Miss Josephine M. Italiano, of 399 Lincoln Avenue, wrote her first composition, a march, in 1943. Last week she composed her twenty-fourth, another march, dedicated to an unbiased America.

"America, We Are at Your Side" is the title of Miss Italiano's latest march. Her first, also arranged as a hymn, is called "Heroes of the U. S. A." Sandwiched in between are a number of patriotic and other songs.

She has had most of her compositions published at her own expense, and in the case of the "Heroes" sent 1,500 copies to overseas military personnel, paying the postage.

Miss Italiano's first piece, inspired by America's fighting men and women in World War II, was introduced by the Orange High School Glee Club and played at USO clubs in this country and abroad. Military camps heard it, and President Roosevelt, through his secretary, Miss Grace Tully, thanked her for a copy, which he called "splendid."

Miss Italiano's crusade against intolerance is relentless. She offered her music to a New York publisher once, and he suggested she change her name to sell her compositions. He thought her name too "foreign" for local consumption.

Miss Italiano did not change her name. And she promises many more songs.

The stirring words of Miss Italiano's latest march are as follows:

AMERICA, WE ARE AT YOUR SIDE

United we stand in this land of the free,
So proudly we hail our liberty,
No matter what race, color, or creed
We join our hands in unity.
Uncle Sam we salute you with pride,
America, we are at your side,
On land, on sea, and in the air
Whenever you call we'll be there.
The freedoms we share we will fight to keep,
Our Stars and Stripes will forever be
Waving free and gallantly—
America, we shout with pride,
America, we are at your side.

Steel and Tubular Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 10, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the present system of distributing tubular steel goods required for oil exploration and development has resulted in a very serious shortage of these materials in the State of Montana. Oil and gas explorations in Montana have been seriously retarded.

The situation has become so critical that the State legislature, hoping to attract attention to our plight and secure a correction of the situation, has adopted the attached house joint memorial.

The memorial was prepared following hearings at which the operations of the gray market in steel products and the shipment of large quantities of steel pipe and casing to foreign oil fields were listed as among the principal factors contributing to the shortage in Montana. Montana operators who would ordinarily drill six or seven wells this year will be able to drill only one or two. Operators who require less than carload lots have no opportunity to buy from regular suppliers.

Unless this situation is corrected and additional allocations of steel pipe and casing are made to Montana operators, Montana's oil industry will be unable to continue the development of our vast oil and gas resources.

The House Joint Memorial No. 5 of the Montana State Legislature is as follows:

House Joint Memorial 5

Joint Memorial to the President of the United States, and to the Honorables JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Congressmen from the State of Montana, for appropriate action to alleviate the shortage of tubular goods and steel necessary for the development of Montana's oil and gas resources, and for the end of discrimination against Montana by the shipment of steel and tubular goods to foreign countries for the development of oil and gas resources in such foreign countries, and the end of the gray market in steel

Whereas there are vast undeveloped oil and gas resources as well as vast proven oil and gas fields in Montana; and

Whereas during the past 3 years explorations for oil and gas in Montana have been seriously curtailed and hampered due to the difficulty, and sometimes impossibility, of obtaining the casing and pipe necessary and required for such development work in proven and wildcat oil areas; and

Whereas this situation has resulted in what has been termed the "gray market" and exorbitant prices for steel tublar goods; and

Whereas the ratio of oil discoveries and development of new production has been in almost exact proportion to the amount of pipe and casing obtainable and used; and

Whereas the steel industry is unable to furnish tubular goods in sufficient quantity to meet the needs and demands of Montana producers in the ordinary channels of trade because of the desire of certain interests to exploit foreign oil resources at the expense of development within the borders of the

United States, and has permitted and caused the exportation of thousands of tons of vital steel for the use and development of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia and in other parts of the world outside of the borders of the United States; and

Whereas the situation is retarding the explorations and development of Montana oil and gas resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the President of the United States and Montana's representatives in the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to remove any discrimination which may exist against the oil operators of Montana, to the end that an adequate supply of tubular goods be made available in the regular channels of trade, and that conditions be corrected which retard the exploration for oil and gas within the borders of the United States and the State of Montana, so that the "gray market" in steel will not be necessary or possible; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States and to the Honorables JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana.

Abraham Lincoln, Founder of the Republican Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address which I delivered in Detroit on February 10 at the Lincoln Day dinner.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, tonight we remember Abraham Lincoln, the immortal founder of our Republican faith. We rededicate ourselves to his country, his party, and the common welfare for which he died. In his spirit we sustain liberty and equality under law which make the American way of life the most precious heritage on earth. Our pledge is to destiny, American style.

I waste no time on recent accidents. Our need is to work in the vineyard; not to sob at the wailing wall. Suffice it to note, in November retrospect, that our Democratic friends, as bewildered as we, found themselves fulfilling St. Mark's prophecy, "the stone which the builders rejected has become the head of the corner." Meanwhile, in our stunned and chastened but highly vocal melancholy, we find ourselves sustained by the promise in the Psalms that "the meek shall inherit the earth." I hope we also recall that Heaven helps those who help themselves. There is a job to be done and we must do it.

I present my compliments to the distinguished Governor of New York from the old-home State of his birth.

I present my compliments to the unpredictable gentleman from Missouri—the most famous one-man tornado in the history of political hurricanes. As President of our United States, I wish him luck. But here is a significant fact. This same President who spent six soap-box months telling the American people how the Republicans had ruined them, opened his address to Congress with a complete confession to the contrary. His first official sentence was: "I am happy to report that the state of the Union is good." When I recall how bad he said we were at every whistle stop on the map, my consolation is Lincoln's assurance that you can't fool 'em all the time.

The state of the Union is relatively good. But it could slide from pretty good to pretty bad if the administration should really try to do all the new things and raise all the new taxes necessary to meet all the new expenditures and to mobilize all the new bureaucrats required by all the new promises made in the recent Democratic blitz. You couldn't possibly pay for the recent Democratic national platform with a budget of less than $60,000,000,000 a year; and you couldn't run that kind of a country except with all your economic freedoms in a strait-jacket.

But don't let that keep you awake nights. They won't even try to keep all of these promises. But they'll try enough to make the country thankful that an alerted Republican Party continues to be full of health and vigilantly on guard.

That's where our new job starts. The Republican Party must prove by its works that it knows what it takes to preserve the American way of life—to serve the common welfare and save it from special privilege—to answer human needs without sacrificing human liberty—to preserve solvent, mass prosperity—to restore public thrift to a place of respectability—to conserve both the family budget and the public Treasury—to avoid forever the omnipotence of the "police state" or the "welfare state" in which man becomes the servant and not the master of his government—to sustain our blessings and to deserve the public trusts.

There stands the challenge. We have met it before. We can meet it again. But we can only meet it by proving to young America that here is the party which preserves its precious inheritance; and by proving to the veterans of two world wars that here is the party which conserves the things for which they fought. These are the facts. It is our job to make them throb.

The Republican Party largely built the foundations upon which this Nation has erected the most fabulous economy of all time—6 percent of the earth's population controlling at least 40 percent of the world's income. It largely built the foundations of this free, competitive economy which has produced incomparably the highest wage and living standards anywhere on earth for the uncommon man who is privileged to call himself American. The name of Lincoln certifies that it was born to protect human rights for all without discrimination—and the areas under its normal political control are where these boons best flourish. The name of Lincoln also certifies that it is the party of the Constitution—and I am not conscious that it has ever wavered.

It is our task to put history in gear with the unfolding requirements of our time, and to make Republican achievement for mass America repeat itself.

An inevitable question now intrudes: Should Republicanism be a liberal or a conservative party? Frankly, I do not believe there can be any such categorical identification. Try it, and you will find yourself impaled on the horns of rival definitions. Try it, and you will soon be arguing words instead of realities.

What is a conservative? At one point the dictionary says "one who seeks to prevent loss, decay, or injury and who protects and preserves." In that sense I want my party to be conservative. I want it to respond to the deepest instincts of our Republic. But at another point, the dictionary says a conservative is "one opposed to change or progress." In that sense I do not want my party to be conservative. If it is static it will die. It will promote and not prevent decay for itself and its country. This is not a static country nor a static age. For example, there was nothing static in the vision of those Detroit motor pioneers who dared to think in terms of radical change when they created the techniques of mass production. Yet they were the greatest conservers of their time. They operated within free enterprise. They enriched the American way of life. Conservatives, in the right sense, are not at war with progress. They are its most vivid allies.

What is a liberal? He may be an earnest soul, unimpeachable in his fidelity to the roots and anchors of the American system, who wants the maximum measure of life, liberty, and happiness for our total people. In that sense I want my party to be liberal. On the other hand, he may seek the substitution of socialism for free enterprise, and paternalism for individual responsibility. In that sense I do not want my party to be liberal. I am not interested in equality of servitude. Going still further, his liberalism may be a shoddy cloak for communism dedicated to the violent overthrow of our free institutions and to the degradation of free souls. In that sense I not only do not want my party to be liberal; I want it to be relentlessly hostile, vigilantly militant, and uncompromising even with red herrings.

Where does this leave us? I answer for myself. I want the Republican Party to be the common denominator of sound conservatism and sound liberalism. I want it to travel down the high center road. I think that is its assignment. As Edmund Burke once said: "Virtuous discretion is what keeps governments faithful to their ends."

Let me borrow Lincoln's familiar analogy. When asked how long a man's legs should be, he replied: "Long enough to reach the ground." I want the Republican Party to be conservative enough to save every time-tried fundamental upon which the unique and precious character of Americanism depends, ever faithful to the admonition of the prophet Isaiah: "Look ye to the rock whence ye are hewn." But within these landmarks, I want the Republican Party to be liberal enough to march with the times, to dare new answers to new problems, and to use the power and strength and initiative of Government to help citizens to help themselves when they confront problems beyond their resources and control.

I want the oak to stand. I want the branches to grow.

Let me illustrate. The private banking system of this country was shattered in the early thirties—needlessly shattered in my view, but shattered none the less. Banking confidence struck zero. Today banking confidence is complete and impregnable. Why? At least one of the overriding reasons is that Federal bank-deposit insurance intervened, and at substantial Republican insistence. It was a new device. It was so liberal that even President Roosevelt at first bluntly sought its rejection. Yet it was conservative because it conserved private enterprise in banking—and no legislator has ever been bold enough to propose its repeal. It was a bridge upon which the Nation strode to safety. I want the Republican Party to be the conservative builder of such liberal bridges when necessity requires.

Let me illustrate again. There is vast propaganda today for socialized medicine. I think it would destroy precious personal relationships in the American way of life, produce wholesale mediocrity in the skills which serve the sick, and saddle us with a new and appalling bureaucracy. But this does not require me to blind my eyes to the existence of a crushing and well-nigh universal sick problem in the lives of millions of our citizens. It is a problem that must be met. But

we have a choice of methods. One is voluntary and therefore typically American. The other is involuntary and therefore typically bureaucratic. The latter is socialized medicine. The former is cooperative medicine. I expect the American people and the Republican Party to choose the former. I want my party to look at the great, humanitarian, cooperative effort of the Blue Cross, for example, which represents cooperation and not compulsion. It comes to finest fruition here in Michigan where one of four of our people already thus have cheaper and better protection than they would ever get from socialized medicine. Probably two out of four of our Michigan people are covered by this or other voluntary plans. I expect the Republican Party to offer cooperative legislation to encourage these voluntary plans within the States. Thus it will liberally conserve the public welfare in the best American tradition. Thus it will not create more problems than it solves. Thus it will build another bridge.

Certainly a better bridge is necessary between capital and labor. For either to harm the other is suicide. Take-home pay is of vital concern to millions of workers. Take-home dividends are just as vital to other millions whose savings and investments built the factories and bought the tools and hired the "know-how" without which labor would walk the streets. It is equally true that the factories, without workers, would be futile brick and mortar. The point is, united they stand, divided they fall. I do not want the Republican Party to be the exclusive partisan of either. I do not want it to be left or right. I want it to earn the fair-play confidence of both. I want it to be the bridge. Only thus can it serve the public interest which is paramount to both.

On July 30, 1945, I wrote the Secretary of Labor suggesting a top-level labor-management conference to hunt this middle ground. The President approved. The call was signed by top leaders in labor and business. The official agenda opened with four sentences from my letter. I stand on those sentences tonight:

"Responsible management knows that free collective bargaining is here to stay and that progressive law must continue to support it and that it must be wholeheartedly accepted. Responsible labor leadership knows that irresponsible strikes and subversive attacks upon essential production are the gravest threats to the permanent success of labor's bill of rights. The American public knows that we cannot rebuild and maintain our national economy at the high levels required by our unavoidable necessities if we cannot have productive peace instead of disruptive war on the industrial front. American government knows that social statutes are futile except as they largely stem from mutual wisdom and mutual consent."

For various reasons the conference failed. But that is beside the point. The point is that here was formal recognition of this common interest which I stress tonight. I hope this common interest will be the Republican Party's goal.

Neither big business nor big labor nor big government should be our special client in writing or rewriting these laws. The total welfare of all labor's rank and file, the total welfare of all private enterprise, and the total public interest in industrial peace and equity under law and order—these are the constituents who should be confident of our equal and impartial consideration. The united welfare of the whole labor-management relationship is more important to both than the special interest of either one. I want the Republican Party to be conservative enough and liberal enough to build this bridge. And thus I wish it in all things.

Mr. Chairman, my radio time is pressing; and I must now turn briefly to foreign affairs.

We have won two wars. But there is no peace. The basic reason is clear. The Politburo in Moscow has refused it to us and to other independent peoples everywhere. Instead we face aggressions. We face violent libels against our own democracy. We confront a Communist conspiracy of conquest against free governments, free men, and free souls. Among other things, the mistakes of Yalta and Potsdam thus come home to roost. Our own national security is inseparably involved. In such a cause there can be neither appeasement nor surrender.

It should not be necessary to speak in such terms. This cold war could end in 20 minutes, Soviet Russia being willing, in deeds as well as words. We ask nothing of her except the right of independent nations to live and let live according to their own free choice in their own domains. We pose no threat to Russia's free exercise of this authority for herself. We have even offered to guarantee her against Axis resurgence for 50 years. Let our attitude be plain—particularly to the Russian people who surely must crave peace as much as we. We offer friendship on a two-way street. We will scrupulously observe every obligation we have taken in the Atlantic Charter and under the United Nations. We want no territory. We ask no reparations. We will join in universal disarmament—including atom bombs—under dependable disciplines against bad faith. Despair of honorable peace shall never be chargeable to us.

But we can take nothing for granted. We have learned some painful lessons which we dare not ignore. Where deceit is taught as a diplomatic virtue, one must watch for booby traps and ambush. Only actions speak dependably. Pending the precious day of voluntary peace, we shall look to our own national security and we shall keep our powder dry. We shall support collective security and justice through a United Nations which we shall strengthen in every possible way in the spirit of its universal hopes. We shall join other congenial nations in regional security arrangements inside the United Nations Charter but outside the Soviet veto. Within the limit of our means, we shall continue existing plans to help other free people to help themselves to rise again and stand on their own feet. We shall be relentless against subversive Communist treachery wherever it rears its ugly head. When I say, "we," I am speaking of the predominant Republican record.

These things we shall do in the name of our own security and freedom in a world too small for isolated safety. We shall do them with an eternal prayer in our hearts that international common sense and fraternity may soon be the world's alternative reliance. We shall do them in the name of peace—and the best calculated chance to get it. In this quest we are making profound progress. I believe we shall succeed.

During the last 2 years, when the Presidency and Congress represented different parties, America could only speak with unity, and therefore with power, through some instrument of liaison. So-called bipartisan foreign policy provided the connecting link. It did not apply to everything—for example, not to Palestine or China. But it did apply generally elsewhere. It helped to formulate foreign policy before it ever reached the legislative stage. Otherwise it would not have worked. Let's be clear about that. It was not a carbon-copy process. There are outstanding Republican trade-marks in every act that Congress passed. It was a meeting of minds. Thus we achieved substantial unity. Our Government did not splinter. It did not default. It was strong in the presence of its adversaries.

Without this liaison, I hate to think where we and the world would be today. I shall be forever proud of the notable Republican contribution to this end. We demonstrated our dependability. I shall be forever proud that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee upon 47 key occasions found common ground, unanimously voted 13 to 0, and presented a united front to this distraught world. In this regard, the Eighteth Republican Congress was the best in history—Presidential campaign oratory to the contrary notwithstanding.

Now the Washington scene has temporarily shifted. The Executive and the congressional majority are of the same party. Theirs is now a united authority within itself. The Republican minority is once again the loyal opposition, charged with an obligation to hold the administration to strict accountability for what it does—to see, on the one hand, that our foreign policies are sound and firm, and to see, on the other hand, that we do not overextend ourselves or overpromise others.

Some say this means the spirit of bipartisan foreign policy is dead. Some say that certain recent unfortunate events—like the Democratic raid on Republican representation on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—have pronounced its obituary. That is not my view. The form of things, to be sure, has changed, and responsibilities and initiatives have shifted. But the basic need remains. It will be a sad hour for the Republic if we ever desert the fundamental concept that partisan politics shall stop at the water's edge. It will be a triumphant day for those who would divide and conquer us if we abandon the quest for a united voice when America demands peace with honor in the world. In my view nothing has happened to absolve either Democrats or Republicans from continuing to put their country first. Those who don't will serve neither their country nor their party nor themselves.

Mr. Chairman, the limitations on my time have forced me to a very sketchy presentation of only a few of the problems critically confronting our American judgments. I would like to leave with you the over-all impression that I am proud tonight to stand up as a Republican. We are called to as great responsibilities as we have ever faced. We are needed by the Nation. Through tolerant consultations we shall weld our own victorious unity into great and vital public service, and into popular confidence and trust. I hear 1950 calling. May the Lincoln spirit be our impulse and our benediction.

A Forward-Looking Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject A Forward-Looking Republican Party, delivered by me on February 12, 1949, before the Lincoln Club, Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to be invited to speak to The Lincoln Club of Louisville, Ky. It is also a great responsibility to address you because these are days in the life of the Republican Party when we must engage not only in critical analysis of Republican mistakes but also in constructive building of a great party which will represent and protect the common good.

I do not ask you to agree with my analysis of some of our party's problems. I never ask audiences to agree with me, but I do ask them to think with me about the various issues of government which I endeavor to

raise for consideration in my speeches. It is easy for a politician to win audience approval or at least avoid audience disapproval if he says nothing in a speech but uses a lot of words accompanied by sound and fury in saying it. Unfortunately, too many Republican speeches have been like that and I suggest that Republican platitudes are part of the explanation for our party's not being in control of the affairs of our Government today.

Our defeat on November 2, has in no way changed my determination to continue to do whatever I can to help build public confidence in the Republican Party so that our party will be entrusted with the executive and legislative responsibilities of our Government. I am as convinced today as I was before the election that a Republican victory on November 2, 1948, was needed if we are to protect constitutional government in America and bring to our national administration the efficient farsighted statesmanship which I think it so sorely needs and which the election of a Republican President would have given it.

There is room in the Republican Party for broad differences of opinion on specific issues. In fact, one of the great strengths of our party is to be found in the fact that we have made great progress in our party over the years by hammering out on the anvil of conscionable compromise the differences of opinion which have existed from time to time between conservatives and constitutional liberals within our party. We Republicans have always recognized the importance to sound Republican government of making steady middle-of-the-road progress within the checks and balance system of constitutional procedures. Conservatives and liberals alike in the Republican Party have rejected the technique of the Democratic Party of circumventing constitutional procedures whenever the Constitution stood in the way of some end sought by the Democrats. One need mention only a few incidents to illustrate the point. Yalta and Potsdam stand out as clear examples of circumventing the treaty-making procedures of the Constitution. The price we are paying for those mistakes is a dangerous threat to the peace of the world.

It was at Yalta that Korea was sacrificed on the altar of Russian communism. It was at Yalta that concessions were made to Russia in Asia which never would have been approved by the Senate of the United States had those concessions been submitted as a part of the settlement of the peace through a treaty as they should have been. It was at Potsdam that the Berlin crisis was born. It needs no argument to prove that the Senate of the United States would have at least asked for a corridor into Berlin and would most certainly have insisted upon a clarification of our rights, prerogatives, and jurisdiction in Berlin.

It has been difficult to get the American people to fully appreciate that the Democratic administration has been willing to circumvent the Constitution as was attempted in the court-packing plan of a few years ago. It has been more difficult at times to get people to understand the danger of that policy of the Democratic Party to their rights as individual citizens and to their daily living.

It sometimes seems that to many people the Constitution is but a mere document of empty words. Something to be praised in the abstract but not to be practiced in fact. Too many fail to see that it is a dynamic, living set of principles which grants them their political rights and economic freedoms. Thus they were not too alarmed or at least not as alarmed as they should have been over the Court-packing plan or a proposal to draft men into private industry at the whim of the President and in the name of government direct them to be transferred from point to point in this country and required to work under the instructions and orders of private industry for the profit dollars of private employers. Too frequently the people have not seen the basic conflict between the highly discretionary, arbitrary, and capricious procedures of the Democratic administration and the provisions in this country of principles of government for which we Republicans have fought—namely, government by law in accordance with the liberalism of the Constitution.

Many people call me a liberal, but my liberalism consists of putting into practice the liberalism of the Constitution. It is that type of constitutional liberalism which I am convinced the overwhelming majority of the young Republicans of America, and I believe the rank and file of Republicans of all ages, really desire to put into practice.

Thus tonight I propose to address you briefly on the subject, the new crisis in the Republican Party. At the outset I would stress that, irrespective of what differences may exist in the Republican party, the leaders of that party, conservative and liberal alike, have a responsibility now of trying to weld together a sound program of constructive legislation—a program which will convince all groups within our society that we are the party which seeks to protect the legitimate interests of all segments of our economy without becoming the political tool of any economic pressure group. We must convince the American people that we are striving against the development of political alinements in this country based upon economic class consciousness. Nothing will wreck more quickly or more completely political and economic democracy in America than the development of political alinements based upon class conflict. If I were a member of the Democratic Party, I certainly would be greatly concerned with and deeply disturbed over the rapidity with which the Democratic Party is fast becoming a class-conscious party in America.

The Democratic Party is bound to slip on its own promises. Therefore, we must prepare our party now to stand for a program which will restore the confidence of the American people in forward-looking statesmanship. My campaign experiences in the 1946 and 1948 congressional campaigns have left me with a deep-seated conviction that the overwhelming majority of the rank and file of registered Republican voters of this country are much more forward looking in their point of view as to what the Republican Party should stand for than are many of our Republican leaders who in the Eightieth Congress followed a legislative course of action which cost us the election on November 2, 1948.

In the campaigns of 1946 and 1948 I gave a great many speeches for the party. In fact, in the 1946 and 1948 campaigns I gave more speeches across this country for the Republican party than any other member of the Senate who, himself, was not a candidate for office in those campaigns. In the 1948 campaign I traveled across this country speaking in behalf of the Republican National Committee before many audiences which were greatly concerned over the issues of labor, agriculture, cost of living, taxes, education, and war or peace. I believe that every man who holds high office in the Republican party has an ethical duty to do whatever he can to help win elections for the Republican Party. Until we can place our party in control of both the White House and the Congress, we cannot demonstrate to the American people that we can be counted upon to meet in the people's interest the many issues which are causing the worries that are troubling all citizens these days. I am particularly critical of those so-called liberals in the Republican Party who in times past have accepted high office from the Republican Party, have enjoyed the benefits that the party gives them through their offices, have accepted committee assignments in the Congress of the United States from the Republican Party and then have sulked in their tents during a campaign. In fact sometimes some of them have even gone so far as to bolt their party because their party has not accepted in toto their views on every subject.

Republican conservatives and liberals alike have an ethical duty to work together in campaigns in an endeavor to elect a Republican administration in this country. I recognize that one's intellectual honesty makes it necessary for him on occasions to remain silent rather than support an individual or an issue which in his honest opinion cannot be reconciled with either the best interests of the party or of the country. However, that's quite a different thing from doing what some Republicans, both conservatives and liberals, have sometimes done in recent campaigns—namely, injure their party's chances at election by either bolting their party or failing to cooperate in a campaign.

Of course, some of you may ask how consistent are you in living up to the principle of political ethics which I have just enunciated? Haven't you at times in the Senate of the United States refused to support the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate? I plead guilty to that charge, if charge it is. I most certainly have at times voted contrary to the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the Senate. I shall continue to refuse to support the recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate whenever in my judgment the facts do not support those recommendations. It should be self-evident to every Republican that the voters in Oregon did not send me to the United States Senate to let the chairman of the Republican policy committee, be he BOB TAFT or any other Republican, cast my vote for me. They sent me to the Senate to vote for issues on their merits in accordance with the facts as they are presented.

I shall always vote with the chairman of the Republican policy committee whenever he and his committee can demonstrate that their recommendations on an issue are sound on the merits and are not based primarily on partisan strategy. It needs to be emphasized that the Republican policy committee of the United States Senate is not the Republican Party. The Republican Party is composed of millions of rank-and-file registered Republican voters of this country. I shall always be willing to take my chances any time with those voters when it comes to my honest differences of opinion with recommendations of the Republican policy committee of the Senate as to what are sound Republican policies and principles.

We will never build a strong Republican Party in the Congress of the United States unless and until the Republicans in Congress demonstrate to the American people that we are willing to subordinate partisan and political strategy to the merits of needed legislation. In fact, in the Eighty-first Congress I think we should proceed without delay to offer constructive legislation needed in the fields of labor, agriculture, taxation, education, veterans' affairs, conservation, reclamation, civil rights, and improved policies in foreign affairs plus legislation on many other issues which are causing such great concern to the American people. It is my hope that Republican strategy in the Eighty-first Congress will not be a defensive one trying to block the advance of the party of the opposition.

As a so-called liberal Republican, I would raise the question tonight; What role should liberal Republicans—and there are many of them—play in the Congress now settling down to the serious business of considering vital legislation on domestic and international affairs?

Some of the advice coming to me through the mail suggests that we join the Democrats because on some basic issues we have no significant differences with the Truman administration. Others blame us for losing the

election because of this so-called me-too attitude, and urge us to fall in line with the ultraconservative elements in the Republican Party.

Either course would spell ruin to the two-party system as we know it today, and would certainly relegate the Republican Party—whose first great standard bearer was Abraham Lincoln—to oblivion.

The task of modern, liberal Republicans in the present Congress is twofold: To revitalize the party and to mobilize its forces behind a forward-looking program; secondly, to guard against unsound legislative proposals or existing devices endangering the rights of free Americans and our free-enterprise system. Let me explain why I feel that this is so.

Republicans need to remember that competition is the dynamic force of a free-enterprise system. Dynamic competitive principles must also be applied by the two major political parties in the contest for votes. The criticism directed at those of us who are fighting for a more modern, forward-looking Republican Party, to the effect that we are proposing a "me too" political course of action, overlooks some basic principles of competition.

In the economic life of our free-enterprise system, a successful businessman is always alert to the public's interest in and approval of the merchandise of his competitor. He does not refuse to stock more up-to-date goods when he discovers such goods are filling his competitor's store with purchasers. Rather, he tries to secure better quality goods that will fill more economically the needs of the buying public.

The analogy has its limitations, but does help to focus attention on the fact that the supporters of reaction in the Republican Party need to learn much from business if they hope to satisfy the voters' wants. Their "me too" charge against liberal Republicans is but an alibi for their own lack of appreciation of the needs of our people.

Significant steps have already been taken by a group of forward-looking Republicans in the Senate to modernize the party.

One of their first moves was the attempt to revamp the party leadership in the Senate so that it would no longer stand as a symbol of reaction and defeatism. In that fight I was happy to join with Senators AIKEN, TOBEY, IVES, LODGE, SALTONSTALL, KNOWLAND, FLANDERS, SMITH of New Jersey, BALDWIN, YOUNG, GURNEY, and THYE in the effort to inject new blood into the party organization.

While Senator LODGE, our candidate for the position of chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate, was beaten two to one, two encouraging facts should be noted: The composition of the policy committee was revised to give representation to the more modern point of view, and clear notice was served that the liberals would stand united as a general policy in the effort to shake off the cloak of reaction in which the "old guard" would garb the Republican Party.

We gained our point that contests for party office in the Senate should be decided by secret written ballot. We agreed that for the next 2 years the Republicans in the Senate should devote their major effort to making a record which will permit them to go to the people in 1950 without apology.

We recognize that the greatest organizational need of the party is to change the trend of registration among young people from the Democratic to the Republican Party. This means that the liberal forces shall insist that the national and State party organizations alike give increased opportunities for party positions and public office to young Republicans.

On the broader front, the role of the Republican liberals is also beginning to take definite shape. Let us list some of the measures already dropped into the legislative hopper by Senate Members of this group.

A glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first few days of the present session of Congress makes it clear that the liberal wing of the Republican Party is actively sponsoring bills which make more secure the basic rights and freedoms of the American people.

Four members of this group joined with other Senators in proposing that the Congress prohibit discrimination because of race, color, faith, national origin or ancestry—a measure that has had the overwhelming approval of Members of Congress but has failed of passage because of a Democratic minority.

Three of them sponsored a bill to raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Others again introduced the Federal aid to education bill. No less than four of them are active in backing the bipartisan effort to amend the Constitution so that the voters of this country may have a more direct voice in the election of President and Vice President.

Several of us, in keeping with our pledge to reform the rules of the Senate so that majority rule may prevail, introduced resolutions calling for amendments which would eliminate the filibuster; and we have continued to press for the earliest possible consideration of these proposals.

Among other measures that might be mentioned as part of the liberal program are bills to expand the coverage and benefits of the Social Security Act, to liberalize the admission of displaced persons, and to provide facilities for a labor extension service.

Labor legislation that is fair to both employers and unions, and in the public interest, will be supported by the liberal Republicans. It is encouraging to read that the administration appears to agree with those of us who urged the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the simultaneous enactment of a revised Wagner Act.

In these early days of the Eighty-first Congress it is no visionary prediction to assert that Republican liberals will be found initiating legislation that will, in the best Lincoln tradition, place human rights above property rights. As constitutional liberals, they will fight against reactionaries on the one hand and leftists on the other.

They will support Government aid for improved health facilities and medical services, without adopting the socialistic principle of making the doctors employees of the state. Better housing legislation will be high on their list. Aid to scientific research is another objective liberal Republicans will sponsor.

Inflation controls without police-state methods, a tightening of the laws regulating monopolies, a more equitable Federal tax policy, a far-sighted program of development and conservation of our natural resources, a long-range program of farm-price supports which will remove the causes of consumer criticism but at the same time protect farmers from violent price fluctuations—all are matters which Republican liberals will work for.

Many Republicans—but not enough to outvote the reactionaries in their own and the Democratic Party—have sponsored these reforms in the past. More of them will be found on the liberal, the human side of these issues in the days ahead.

In the field of international relations, every effort will be made to maintain a strong bipartisan foreign policy, so ably fostered by Senator VANDENBERG, for the past 2 years the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The United Nations must be strengthened, for without a strong world organization the armament race will mushroom to such proportions that essential domestic legislation will have little chance of being realized.

The Senate Republican liberals are receiving increasing support. More and more registered Republicans and independent voters are appreciating that the way to make progress on domestic issues and on the international front is to make our capitalist economy and political democracy work through the safeguards of our constitutional form of government.

I think that Senator VANDENBERG in his Detroit speech presented very effectively the challenge which faces the Republican Party when he said:

"The Republican Party must prove by its works that it knows what it takes to preserve 'the American way of life'—to serve the common welfare and save it from special privilege—to answer human needs without sacrificing human liberty—to preserve solvent, mass prosperity—to restore public thrift to a place of respectability—to conserve both the family budget and the Public Treasury—to avoid forever the omnipotence of the police state or the welfare state in which man becomes the servant and not the master of his government—to sustain our blessings and to deserve the public trust."

So far as I am concerned, sound legislative principles must be applied equally and without discrimination to both labor and industry. In this instance one sound principle is that labor legislation must be designed to protect the legitimate rights of both labor and industry and thereby protect the public welfare. One of the issues of the 1944 campaign for the United States Senate was my stand for the equalization of the Wagner Act. Contrary to the opinion of some who have yet to read the constructive proposals I made in the Senate for an equalization of rights under the Wagner Act, I delivered on my pledge to fight for fair labor legislation in the Congress. I am continuing to carry on that fight by advocating a substitution for the Taft-Hartley Act in the form of legislation which revises the old Wagner Act in those ways necessary to make it a fair and workable piece of labor legislation.

No extended comments need to be made about the loss of the labor vote. Everyone knows now that the Taft-Hartley Act was a terrific political liability to the Republican Party. In vain some of us in the Republican Party argued in the Senate that if the Congress passed the Taft-Hartley bill, without removing its unfair, unworkable, and unconstitutional sections, the party would hear about it at the ballot boxes of America.

Here again, Thomas Dewey is not to blame for the loss of the labor vote. He pointed out in his speeches that as the facts were presented showing existing injustices, he would support amendments. Some of us who were campaigning for Dewey assured many labor audiences that we would propose specific amendments to correct what is now generally recognized by employers and the general public as well as labor to be necessary in order to have a fair and just labor law. However, too many workers were afraid they could not count upon a Republican Congress to correct a wrong which it never should have committed in the first place.

It was most unfortunate that during the campaign many farmers developed the notion that the Republican Party will not take those steps necessary to maintain the purchasing power of the farmer. As I said many times during the campaign and repeat now, the Republican party recognizes that the standard of living of American workers, of American businessmen, of men and women in the professions, and of our consumers generally depends upon the purchasing power of the American farmer. The reason for that is an obvious economic fact. We are basically an agricultural economy in the sense that when the purchasing power of the American farmer falls below the standard which permits him to maintain himself in health and decency, the inventories of American business back-

log. Unemployment then walks the streets of America and a depression is the inevitable result.

No one can deny that there are inequities in the support price program and that some changes are needed in that program in the interest of the farmers as well as the interest of the public at large. One cannot talk to a farm leader of any of the national farm organizations who will not tell you that there is a need for a revision in the program. However, the need for revision is in the interest of making the program more economically sound so as to lift from American farmers the criticism and resentment that is developing among some consumer groups of the country as a result of some of the inequities and abuses which have developed in the program.

Nevertheless, we cannot deny the fact that too many farmers became confused about the farm issue in the campaign and voted against our party on November 2. We must demonstrate in this session of Congress that the Republican party stands for a sound and fair Agricultural Adjustment Act.

To my great surprise, in campaigning for Dewey, I found that many small-business men were impressed with Truman's arguments that continued prosperity could best be assured through a Democratic administration.

We have an obligation to our party to make perfectly clear that we are not an antibusiness party. In speech after speech before labor audiences during the campaign I stressed the point that the standard of living of American workers depends upon a successful operation of our capitalistic system. The soak-the-rich philosophy which characterizes the thinking of many so-called liberals cannot be reconciled with the public interest. The soak-the-rich attitude is but another example of class-conscious bitterness which we must guard against in America.

The notion that special privilege, through big business and American monopoly, controls the Republican party is without foundation in fact. Unfortunately, we cannot escape the political reality that too many Americans believe that our party is controlled by big business. Whenever special privilege, be it in the form of big business or labor or agriculture or the pressures of any other economic group in this country, ever seek to foist upon the American people a legislative proposal which is not in the interest of the common good, we must make clear that the Republican party can be counted upon to oppose it.

Likewise, we must make clear that we stand for a legislative program which will protect the legitimate rights of business as well as of labor and the farmer and the professions and all other economic groups. Take, for example, the need for a complete revision of our tax laws in this country. Such a revision is necessary if we are to encourage venture capital in this country to invest in productive enterprise which will create new jobs and new wealth out of which we can obtain the new tax dollars to meet the tremendous obligations of Government which will be with us for years to come.

Any system of confiscation through taxation which has characterized many of the tax proposals of the Democratic Party in recent years truly threatens the economic welfare of the people of this country as a whole and of each economic segment within the country. Likewise, a tax-reduction program which is not based on a sound revision of existing inequities in our tax structure will always cost our party dearly at the polls as it did on November 2, 1948.

The future of the Republican Party, as I see it, will have further defeats unless the party can unite its forces in support of a sound, middle-of-the-road program of constitutional liberalism. Such a program will be unacceptable to the leftists who seek to destroy our capitalistic economy and set up economic statism; it also will be opposed by the political and economic reactionaries—and there are too many in both major political parties—who stand for a laissez-faire economy and a return to the normalcy of the boom-and-bust cycle of the 1920's.

The election has demonstrated, in unmistakable terms, that these extremist philosophies are not favored by the American people. It is plain, therefore, that constitutional liberals within the Republican Party have a real opportunity. They must offer a program based upon the view that one of the primary objectives of the American system of representative government should and must be to protect the economically and politically weak from the exploitation of the economically and politically strong. Such a program, however, must be achieved within the framework of a private-property economy and in accordance with the legal principles and guaranties of the Constitution, including its precious Bill of (human) Rights. I offer such a Republican philosophy to you as being one which keeps faith with Republicanism of Lincoln.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address on the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, delivered by me at the Illinois Republican Lincoln Day dinner, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Saturday evening, February 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, this is indeed a happy occasion. It is inspiring and encouraging to meet with you men and women who have come from all parts of Illinois to honor the man of the ages and to rededicate yourselves to the principles so peerlessly advocated and practiced by the immortal Lincoln.

It is especially fitting that we do honor to Abraham Lincoln in Illinois for it was here he grew to manhood. Here, in the heart of America, he found the surroundings and the wholesome conditions that shaped and fashioned his rugged Americanism. His Americanism was developed as the pioneer, the rail splitter, the storekeeper, and the frontier lawyer. It was given full expression as he became the debator, the legislator, the President, and finally the great emancipator.

It was here in Illinois that Abraham Lincoln left many cherished memories, landmarks along his career, signposts that have guided the people of your State and the Nation in carrying forward the best Government on earth.

To New Salem, to Springfield, and to other places in Illinois come visitors from all parts of the world, to see first-hand where Lincoln lived and where he performed his many deeds of righteousness.

Lincoln lived in a fateful time. He was called to provide leadership in an hour when it was desperately needed.

Again, fellow Americans, our Nation is in an hour of crisis. All around us there are signs, hard realities, that we are reaping the whirlwind of years and years of rudderless and wasteful misgovernment. Let us be completely frank about it. Let's face up to the facts. What has happened since the November election?

Our country is confronted by drastic price dislocations. Producers are being demoralized by falling prices. These falling prices are not being fully reflected to the consumer. The unemployment roll is mounting, 700,000 more were added during January.

In the minds of businessmen, laboring men, and all our people, these unsettled conditions have caused doubt, apprehension, and grave concern. And, they have called a halt to the progress this country was making under the constructive legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress.

During the 2 years of the Republican Eightieth Congress, our ship of state was kept on an even keel. There was a check on the reckless programs of the Truman administration.

That Congress pulled our country out of a tailspin by sound, constructive actions. It rescued America from the brink of catastrophe, and placed us well on the road to a solid and lasting prosperity. But, we Republicans failed, miserably failed, to sell the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress. We let President Truman and his associates smear, belittle, and misrepresent the Republican program. Some of our leaders have alibied for Republican defeat, but, fellow Republicans, we can't escape the hard fact that we did not slug it out toe to toe with the demagogues.

Had we fought it out in the Lincoln way, point by point, up and down, across the country, there would be a Republican President in the White House today, and we would have a Republican Congress cooperating with him in carrying forward the work so well advanced by the Eightieth Congress.

Think back a little. Mr. Truman's campaign methods are still fresh in our minds. In the cities he promised to slash prices. In the farming areas he promised to raise prices. He promised to labor bosses a complete repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, restoring them to uncontrolled power and a return to jungle warfare in labor-management relations.

The farmers of Illinois well remember the opening campaign speech of Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY at the State fair in Springfield. He told his farm audience the Democrat Party was responsible for $40 cattle and $30 hogs. He mournfully warned that if a Republican President were elected farm prices would go down. There he told the farmers of America that if they wanted $40 cattle and $30 hogs they had better vote the Democrat ticket.

But now, only 3 weeks after the inauguration of Mr. Truman and Mr. BARKLEY, I ask you, how are the Democrat campaign promises working out? Top-grade cattle are bringing less than $25 per hundredweight, hogs have hit a new low of $20. Market writers tell us farm prices are demoralized, collapse is the way they describe it. Corn, wheat, oats, rye, soybeans, lard, and other farm products have plunged downward. Was this the benefit expected by farmers when they voted for Mr. Truman and Mr. BARKLEY in November?

Is it any wonder that farmers, and the people generally, are frightened, in the face of the Truman demand for more and more taxes and more spending?

President Truman has submitted to the Eighty-first Congress a spending budget of forty-two billions, the highest in all peacetime. However, that is only part of the story. He has also recommended new domestic programs to be financed out of general tax funds. He has further asked for new and expanded social-welfare programs to be financed by deductions from the worker's pay and from the income of business establishments.

Competent experts estimate that if these programs are authorized, it will immediately require a total annual budget in excess of $56,000,000,000. Is it any wonder that the American people are shocked and alarmed? Is it any wonder that there is hesitancy to venture into new enterprises, under this prospect of unbearable taxation?

There is a limit to the kind of government that pushes our national economy into insolvency and brings in its wake catastrophe for us all. Taxes now are at the saturation point. Twenty-seven cents out of every dollar every American spends goes to meet the cost of government, Federal, State, and local.

Every schoolboy knows that taxes are a drag upon prosperity. We all know that the power to tax is the power to destroy. This affects all of us, all of the American people. The Federal Government could confiscate all personal incomes above $25,000 a year, and the resulting revenue would scarcely make a dent upon the total expenditures of Government.

To saddle heavier taxes upon business firms, generally, simply means the burden must be passed on to the consumers, who, in the final analysis, pay all taxes. The Truman administration simply does not face up to the elementary fact we cannot survive as a nation if our people are taxed out of existence. They seem to think our national economy can stand anything.

An example of the administration's irresponsibility for the public finances is the action taken this week by the Democrat majority to evade the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which requires a spending ceiling to be fixed by Congress on or before February 15 each year. With only the weakest of excuses, the Democrat majority voted to delay until May 1 their decision on the 1949 legislative budget.

By that time many of the appropriations will have been authorized and be in full force and effect. There will be no limit on the amount of money the administration can spend. It will mean that this Government will continue deficit spending, which is in direct contradiction with the fiscal policy of the Eightieth Congress, which balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years.

New Deal administrations have been in power for 16 years. Have they solved our national problems? Remember how the economic planners ordered the killing of our little pigs. Remember how they ordered the plowing under of every third row of cotton. Remember how they devalued and rubberized the American dollar, and remember how they poked their noses into every nook and cranny of our economy with crisis and emergency power abjectly voted by rubber-stamp Democrat Congresses?

During World War II, our tottering economy was bolstered by tremendous military expenditures. Accumulated farm surpluses and commodities of all kinds were swiftly consumed in the maw of war. The problem no longer was one of surpluses. It was how to get more and more goods quickly. Our national economy rested upon temporary and artificial props.

Since the war our economy has been largely sustained by Government purchases for national defense and buying of food, steel, building materials, and countless other materials for the friendly freedom-loving countries of the world. In Europe alone we have poured out more than $25,000,000,000 in cash and goods.

In its eagerness to furnish goods and materials to foreign countries your Government has been taxing you to buy grain and other supplies outside the United States. They have taken your money to buy crops from third-party countries for the needy countries in Europe. Even as prices for American farm products are now tumbling, your Government at Washintgon has continued this policy. Last July wheat was declared a surplus farm commodity, yet in the face of farm prices below parity, and despite the millions of dollars being spent by this Government to take surplus crops off the markets, this administration recently approved a grant of $55,000,000 to England for purchase of Canadian wheat.

So the New Deal administrations failed to solve our problems before the war. They were unsolved during the war, when artificial props sustained our economy. And, now, in their attempt to solve them, they are tearing down the constructive work of the Eightieth Congress. Today the same unsuccessful solutions of the past are still their program. As a remedy they still cling to the theory of a planned economy on an international as well as a national scale and are leading America further across the line into state socialism.

Right now the administration is pressurizing the Eighty-first Congress to undo the sound checks placed in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by the Republican Eightieth Congress. The President wants absolute power, the power of a dictator.

We Republicans believe in reciprocity in foreign trade, but we want it done in the American way. We want final authority reserved to American business and the American people through their Congress. Under the absolute power over tariff making, voted to the President by past Democratic Congresses, all tariff protection for American industries and American labor has well nigh been bartered away.

The full and disastrous effect of this sell-out of America's interests was not noticeable during the war, because in that period foreign trade came virtually to a halt. But with the recovery of foreign countries imports are steadily rising and some of our American industries are being driven to the wall by foreigners taking their American market.

The Republican Eightieth Congress, looking forward to the time when realistic, worthwhile foreign-trade agreements must be made, amended the law to provide standards for negotiations by the President with foreign countries. We provided that when he exceeded those standards the President must report his reasons to the Congress.

Now it is proposed by the administration to restore the law as it was before the Eightieth Congress. American industries and American farmers under that proposal would be completely at the mercy of self-anointed foreign trade planners in the administration.

And while we are on the subject, let me make an observation which, I believe, is not generally understood by the American people. At this very time we are subsidizing foreign countries to process, fabricate, and manufacture goods to be sold in the American market at prices with which American business cannot possibly compete. Ladies and gentlemen, this is being done with the taxpayers' money.

Another piece of legislation that is being forced by the Truman administration in order to satisfy the pressure groups is socialized medicine.

How many people who voted for Mr. Truman understood they were voting to give the Government bureaucrats another opportunity to snoop into the personal affairs and relationships of the American people with their family doctors?

This is not a matter of a few million dollars. It is a multibillion-dollar program to control the family doctor and to control and subsidize the medical treatment of our people in hospitals across the land. Our America has the best health record of any major nation on earth. Our governmental agencies now are giving constructive aid in research and guidance in the direction Government should properly take in the interest of the people's welfare. But now the Truman administration demands that we swing further down the road to national socialism and an all-powerful state through outright socialized medicine.

And, fellow Americans, this administration is just trying to kid you, you are not going to get free medicine under their proposal, socialized medicine is not free.

Another example of the administration's bungling attempt to solve the problems before us is its demand for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The sordid length to which this administration will go to satisfy a pressure group is most vividly portrayed in the battle over the labor-management legislation. In one fell swoop the administration sought to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act in its entirety, wiping out all the protections afforded for the rank and file of workers; their right to join or not to join a union free of coercion and intimidation, and their right to control their unions.

The administration sought to repeal that provision of the law requiring officers of labor unions to file affidavits that they are not Communists, before they can be heard by the National Labor Relations Board.

The administration submitted a bill to the Congress to repeal the authority given in the Taft-Hartley Act for the President to obtain court injunctions against strikes that jeopardize the national health and welfare. This measure has received the condemnation of the American people. We were all shocked to learn that the President believes he has all the powers he needs as President of the United States, so-called inherent powers, to protect the Nation against paralyzing strikes. If this be true, why did not President Truman exercise such power 2 years ago instead of rushing to Congress to ask for special legislation to deal with the Nation-wide railroad strike impending at that time.

Fellow Americans, we live in a country governed by laws, laws that spell out the rights and limitations of the Government. In America, no man has the right to say: "I am the law."

It is futile to discuss these matters in lofty and hopeful phrases. The language of the day is to call a spade a spade. I make no attack upon the character or patriotism of President Truman. But I do challenge the policies for which he stands, and I shall fight them with my last ounce of energy, because they are ruinous for my country.

And I could go on and on, discussing with you the fatal defects of the program offered by this administration to solve our national problems. Summed up, it is always and in every case a planned economy headed up by an all-powerful group of men in Washington. But, fellow Republicans, national socialism has never worked in any country where it has been tried. It won't work here. It is neither progressive nor liberal. It is reactionary because it takes away from the people their liberties and their freedoms.

Lincoln knew that the people might be led astray for a time, by false hopes and false promises. But he had an abiding faith in the people; faith that in the end they would make the right decisions. He offered no easy way of life. He did not offer security from the cradle to the grave. He knew, as you and I know, that socialism does not provide free anything. A socialistic program has to be paid for by everybody, through direct taxes or indirectly, in their cost of living.

Lincoln knew that the strength, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people depend upon their initiative and genius, and not upon any small group of planners in Washington. The American people will not long endure the chains of control by bureaucrats in Washington as a price for security.

All history reveals that where the people were deceived by promises that the Government would supply all their needs, freedom vanished under the heels of dictators. Mankind has gone forward only to the extent that men have been inspired to obtain greater freedom for the individual. Our progress as a nation has been made by preserving the

people's sovereignty over their own Government, and not by letting the Government become their master.

One of the main reasons Great Britain went socialistic was the apathy of her people. They had gotten to the place where they just didn't care. Have we reached that stage in America? Do we realize that we are losing our freedoms and our liberties?

Lincoln said: "At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answered, 'If it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher as a nation of free men. We must live through all time or die by suicide.' "

Fellow Americans, if we are going to heed the warning of Abraham Lincoln, now is the time when we must get out and fight for a strong, free America, and the principles for which the founder of our party gave his full measure of devotion.

Our party is not split wide open. Anyone who says so is doing a disservice to our party and to our country. The rank and file of the Republican Party are united to preserve our freedoms and our liberties. If there be any split whatsoever, the split is in the party's leadership. This is the time for our party leaders to close their ranks, show courage, and not yield to expediency, and compromise with the forces that would plunder our American heritage.

We must know and recognize, as Lincoln knew and recognized: The weak cannot be made strong by making the strong weak. The financial stability of our Government must be made secure.

We have got to find ways to market our crops and manufactured goods and not depend upon artificial Government controls that lead to the loss of our liberties. We must increase production to maintain a high national income.

We must have a realistic foreign-trade policy in which there is true reciprocity. We cannot afford to sell out American industry and labor as has been done by the Truman planners. We must stand on a fair labor-management legislative program. We cannot go back to jungle warfare.

We must maintain a true two-party system. A bipartisan foreign policy does not become bipartisan at least until it reaches the water's edge. Our foreign problems should be taken up in the Halls of Congress and be debated and discussed and thoroughly weighed by the Congress and the people before they are put into force and effect. To do otherwise is to make a me-too party out of the Republican Party and destroy the two-party system in America.

We must expose to the people the shameful result of a foreign policy that has delivered millions of people in Europe and Asia into the hands of Soviet Russia. We must explode the inconsistency of spending billions of dollars to rebuild western Europe, while Asia is allowed to become our Achilles heel and goes by default to Communist domination. We must see that responsibility is firmly fixed upon those who betrayed our people in secret agreements with other nations.

There have been too many commitments made by our Government in foreign affairs before consulting the Congress and the American people, and we are paying for those commitments in higher taxes, higher prices, and the imposition of police-state methods that threaten our very American way of life. Our party demands a rock-ribbed American leadership. We want leaders in this crucial hour who will say with Lincoln:

"There are good, patriotic and able statesmen, whom I greatly would support if they would now place themselves on Republican ground, but I am against letting down the Republican standard a hair's breadth."

That is the kind of leadership that will not barter away our American heritage of opportunity and freedom of choice.

That is the kind of leadership wanted by millions and millions of Americans—both Republicans and Democrats alike.

That was the sound American doctrine of Abraham Lincoln, our first Republic President. That is the sound, American course which lies open to us today. With that kind of leadership we will serve our country and go forward to victory. Let's be Republicans.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], at the Middlesex Club dinner on Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today is Abraham Lincoln's one hundred and fortieth birthday. Annually we Republicans celebrate it all over the country.

In the year 1949 it is particularly significant to us because last November 2, when his party expected to win the Presidency, carry the Congress, and elect a Republican administration here in Massachusetts, we were defeated. We received the worst licking in Massachusetts that we have ever suffered. There is no sense trying to duck that issue. There is no use in recriminations. There is no use blaming any individual or individuals. We simply did not have enough players on our team to win. But we cannot be downhearted. There is too much to do.

There was never a greater need for an alert, aggressive minority in State and Nation than there is today. When difficult problems face us we need a healthy opposition. Dire predictions of a dead Republican Party just don't stand up. Do you realize that in the Nation, out of 49,000,000 votes cast, a total shift of less than 30,000 votes in three States—California, Ohio, and Illinois—would have made Dewey President? That certainly does not call for black pessimism.

But it does call for a careful study of why we didn't win when we expected to. You and I have listened to so many reasons as to why we lost that it would take many pages to enumerate them. Hindsight is always easier than foresight.

But the job ahead of us is clear. We must plan now to work out what it is necessary for us to do to gain victories in 1950 and 1952. That job cannot be done by merely fighting among ourselves.

We may be split today in our points of view, but let us argue them out so we can gain our immediate objectives. In the State that means a Republican administration and a Republican legislature in 1950; in the Nation it means a Republican Congress in 1950 and a Republican President and a larger Republican majority in 1952.

Abraham Lincoln, whom we honor tonight, said, "With public sentiment nothing can fail; without it nothing can succeed." How are we going to obtain the confidence of "public sentiment"? Our platforms have been framed in the best interests of the people, but the people don't believe we are going to live up to them. To obtain public confidence when we accept a Republican platform, we must scrupulously live up to our commitments.

I received a letter just last week from a Massachusetts lady which expresses so well what we Republicans, in my opinion, stand for that I now quote a paragraph from it. It represents the hopes and aspirations of people all over the United States of America. She said:

"I know you are aware of the concern of millions as to where we are going and what is the end. People want health, homes, jobs, education for everyone, but they want capital for business, freedom from excessive taxes, intelligence and economy in government spending, honesty, people of ability and fitness for positions of responsibility. They want peace, freedom from fear, and only those people in our country who appreciate our way of life and want to make it always better; not undermine it."

I do not personally know this lady. She wrote me some of her troubles and in the course of them she made this statement. I use it as my text tonight because it expresses what I believe is the philosophy of the Republican Party.

The average American citizen is moderate. He is neither a radical nor a conservative. He is a progressive in the best sense of the word. He wants more opportunity, more freedom, and yet more security. He wants peace in the world that will make these things possible. Our party must convince public sentiment that we do not want to turn the clock back and become the party of "stand-pat conservatism"; the party of a laissez-faire doctrine that the welfare of the individual is no concern of the Government. On the other hand, we don't want to be known as the party which promises everything and is associated with the word "gimme."

We must convince the voter that we are the party that will carry forward the great American tradition of opportunity and freedom; the great American tradition that we cannot spend more than we have and we cannot expect to get something for nothing.

In carrying forward this great tradition we want always to remember that it cannot be accomplished unless people have health, live in good homes, are well educated, and have jobs.

We do not want socialism. We do not want Government in business. We want Government to regulate our business, if necessary, but not control it. We want Government help in the development of our natural resources where those natural resources are too great for us to develop without the help of Government direction and credit. We want in all these programs, where Government plays a part, adequate, efficient, and economical service of Government for the individual, but never dictatorship of the individual by Government.

In our opposition to the present administration in Washington we have the opportunity to point out the pitfalls, to correct the excesses, and to direct public sentiment to our position.

If Government policies discourage saving, discourage business from risking new capital on untried ventures, we will cease to go forward with the new inventions that have constantly improved our standard of living.

The latest invention—television—has gone forward at a greater speed than any previous invention. More improvements in television for its greater use by more people have become a reality more quickly than in the case of the telephone, the electric light, the automobile, and the airplane. Think of the new jobs this means for our people, the new opportunities to get ahead.

Jobs in American industry and American agriculture have been built up by the initiative and the imagination of our citizens.

Just in my lifetime our country's population has increased by 80,000,000. That increase has come about because people not only here at home but all over the world have recognized that in the United States lies the greatest opportunity for higher wages and a better standard of living. Only by keeping that hope alive can we continue to enjoy the life that is now enjoyed in the United States of America.

The policies we adopt must be those which we believe will add to this standard of life, will actually help the individual, not harm him.

The specter of communism is too real in the world today to allow any consideration which might, under the guise of sugar-coated pills, offer gilded panaceas of prosperity and so bring down chaos on our heads. That is what the leaders of that ideology hope for. That is what we must guard against.

The American people are wise. They are thoughtful and resourceful. They love freedom. Their sons and their parents have died for freedom. The party that convinces "public sentiment," to use Lincoln's words, is the party which they will join and for whose candidates they will vote.

In 1939 when I first became Governor of our State I said to our legislature, and I repeat now:

"It is the duty of government to provide first for the man at the bottom of the hill—to build soundly and constructively so that our economic buildings will not crumble. We must make certain as we climb the hillside that government is serving each and every individual. Democracy is not a government of the few but a government of all. Let us be ever mindful of the rights of every citizen. It is the encroachment upon and the gradual taking away of these rights which lead to dictatorship."

The record shows that since Lincoln's inauguration the Republicans have held the Presidency 56 years; the Democrats 32 years. The Republicans held the leadership in those 56 years because they were able to harmonize the fundamental interests of those who made up the whole community—the farmers, the workers, the housewives, the businessmen. All felt that they were adequately and fairly represented. They knew that measures that benefited one group by injuring another group would not make for success at the polls. Good prices for farm products meant that farmers would vote Republican. Good wages with a full dinner pail meant better standards of living and greater prosperity. A fair chance for success stimulated the man of vigor and imagination to risk his savings in new ventures. He knew if he succeeded he would have a good chance of keeping a fair proportion of his earnings.

Policies are of no avail unless there are able men to carry them into effect. Leaders cannot build themselves up without obtaining the confidence of the people. They must have intimate, first-hand knowledge of just what the average person is thinking and wanting. This can only be done by meeting and talking with just as many of our citizens as possible. It can only be accomplished by going out and getting the information first-hand.

We Republicans are not good self-advertisers. We are guilty of not keeping before the people the many benefits for which we have been responsible.

In Massachusetts under Republican leadership we have pointed the way in the fields of education, labor, housing, welfare, and public health. Just to mention a few: Our department of public welfare was started under Calvin Coolidge. Our old-age assistance was started under a Republican administration in 1930. Our State was the first in the Nation to adopt a minimum-wage law in 1912. In 1908 our State adopted the first workmen's compensation law. We have many firsts in education. Thirty-seven years ago our State first passed a public housing act—the first in the country—but it was declared unconstitutional. We had then to amend our constitution before it became a reality.

So, I assert that here in Massachusetts we Republicans have not only been abreast of the trend toward greater government service for greater numbers of people but we have often led that trend.

Our trouble has been that we have let the Democrats take too much of the credit. Perhaps you'll say the Democrats have done it by outbidding us. They have certainly outadvertised us.

Just talk with a leading cigarette producer or tooth-paste manufacturer. If he stops advertising his product in every way possible 24 hours a day he knows that his sales will drop off and his competitor who does advertise will beat him to the sale.

We who are in Government today are building this country for the youth of tomorrow. If our policies are to be successful they must be put forward by men and women capable of kindling the enthusiasm and attracting the confidence of their neighbors. In my opinion, the whole basic philosophy of a political party is the confidence of your neighbor. It is he and she who cast the votes.

We particularly want to make it possible for more young people in our communities to take part in our local public affairs. They are the citizens of tomorrow for whom we are building our country of today. We need their enthusiasm; we must have their legwork. It is they who must push our doorbells; who must get to know the people in our communities. We can do this if we are willing to recognize that they are all-important to the future of the Republican Party.

But, they have got to have something to do and be recognized if they do the job. Have we allowed them to take an active enough part in our committees? I feel definitely that we have not.

Should we continue to encourage them to form their own organizations as separate from our regular organizations? Today in any one community we may well see beside the local Republican Committee a Young Republican Club, the Republican 21-Club, and perhaps a Young Men's Republican Club and a Young Women's Republican Club, all functioning under different leadership. If we are to be successful they must all be united and working together.

There are lots of jobs in our towns and in our cities besides members of the legislature or State-wide officers. There are members of the city government. There are all sorts of civic organizations.

We should encourage in every possible way the participation of our youth in all forms of civic activity. We should encourage it as Republicans. We should give way as far as reasonably possible to the promotion of youth in the civic life of our communities. That is one field in which I believe Republicans can well take an active part to build the Republican Party.

Here in Massachusetts we have a greater diversity of foreign-born and first-generation Americans than any other State in the Union. I am proud of that fact because it clearly carries out the tradition of our founding fathers. In the last census the population of Massachusetts was just over 4,300,900 of which 2,400,000 were born in another country or are the sons and daughters of a parent born in another country.

Have we done all that we can to try and see if they are becoming members of the Republican Party? Have we encouraged them to work with us in our committees and in our civic activities? I know in a great many cases we have, but I want to stress and stress strenuously that I do not feel we have made enough effort in their behalf. We want their leaders as candidates in local, State, or national offices.

I hope that we in Massachusetts will make a renewed effort to become acquainted with all of our citizens regardless of their origin. They all have a common interest in our Government and that common interest must be preserved.

Now, in radio parlance, "May I take you to Washington?" There we find a Democratic President, a Democratic-controlled Congress with a vibrant Republican minority. Believe me, in the month that the Senate has been in session I have heard more politics discussed than even in the height of the preconvention days of last spring. But, underlying politics, we all realize that we have some mighty difficult problems to work out in the best interests of all our citizens.

Head and shoulders above every other problem is that of obtaining peace in the world. Everyone with whom I have talked wants the United Nations to succeed. No one wants us to withdraw from the United Nations, but does everyone realize that the United Nations was established not to make peace but to preserve the peace that would be made by the nations that had been fighting one another? Perhaps that which discourages us most with the United Nations comes from the fact that we forget this vital point.

So, within the Charter of the United Nations we are trying to build up our greater national security and that of other peace-loving nations. Early we accomplished a pact with the Latin-American countries. Now there is under negotiation a North Atlantic pact. This will be again drafted within the Charter. This will be carefully, thoughtfully debated in the Senate. We all want to make mighty certain where it will lead us before we sign ourselves up to new and vital commitments to our security and welfare for many years to come.

In the meantime we have pushed forward our aid to Europe, to China, to Greece, and to Turkey. We are growing more optimistic about the success of the ECA program. We realize that unquestionably it will have to continue for a year or more. In my humble judgment, if we drop it today, we will throw away all the benefits we have accomplished in the past year. So I want to vote for a continuance of the ECA. I hope the proposition that is finally submitted to us will be fair, will be practical and within our resources.

We are terribly disappointed as to what has happened in China. We may be disturbed about our rate of progress in Japan. It seems to me that we must adopt a watchful wait-and-see program in China today. Let us hope that our historic friendship with China may be continued in a manner that will be helpful to both our great countries.

But, if our plans of helping other nations to help themselves are to be successful, we must remain strong. We must be prepared to supply enough of our young men and of our money to keep our armed services strong and well-equipped. That does not mean that we want war or even expect war. We hope that by spending some $15,000,000,000 this year to keep 1,600,000 men in our armed services that no one will want to go to war with us.

I saw the camps at Buchenwald and Dachau within a few hours after they were taken and before the piles of human dead had been removed. I saw the atomic bombs exploded at Bikini Lagoon. I have seen the cold war in Trieste and in Berlin. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate I am kept informed of present-day military problems throughout the world. I know the respect with which our armed services are held.

It is familiar to all of us that our industrial strength makes any nation think twice before they dare attempt world war III. This is the attitude of mind that we want to maintain in order to make peace a reality and to permit the United Nations to become a functioning body to maintain world peace. That is the problem that lies over every other problem in our National Capital today.

At the moment you read daily of the squabbles going on in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate. I have heard of no one who does not want a labor-management law that is fair to everyone. I have heard of no one who does not believe that collective bargaining is an underlying function of our industry in the United States. Our problem is to resolve fairly the different points of view. What management believes may be fair to them, labor leaders do not think is fair to them. What labor leaders want, management believes is impractical. How much Government interference and in what manner the Government should interfere by regulations is another question on which both sides have varying points of view. What is fair to the public is still a paramount problem that must be solved.

I have confidence that out of it all will come a law that is fairer to those who work in industry than is the Taft-Hartley law in all its aspects and a law that is fairer to management than the Wagner Act in its original form. Over it all is the question of Government participation. There is a universal feeling that the public must be protected from stoppage of industries that concern the welfare of each and every one of us.

I hope to be able to vote for an equitable solution of these questions. I am repeatedly asked about how I am going to vote on some of these problems. What I wish to bring to your attention is the fact that at the moment there is no actual proposal before the Senate. The only bill which has been submitted is now before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate. Until the committee reports its recommendations, neither I nor any other Member of Congress can definitely state how we are going to vote on specific issues that will be presented to us.

Much of the President's message on the state of the Union concerned further participation of Government in its relation to our private lives. I believe that our people expect more service of their Government today. I believe that Government participation in unemployment benefits, old-age assistance, education, housing, health services must be constantly reveiwed to see the benefits, the services, and the security that our citizens expect are provided.

If the President's recommendations were all put into effect, the expenses of the Federal Government, it is estimated, would jump from forty-two billion to over sixty billions of dollars a year. Where would the money come from to pay such a bill? So, I believe that the Republican policy in Congress must be a constant review aimed at making fair and reasonable the benefits that we now provide.

Old-age assistance levels must be brought up to date. Unemployment-compensation levels must be scrutinized. Maternal aid must be made realistic in the light of present-day costs of living. When these things are provided for, we turn to Federal aid to education, housing, and health.

I personally believe that our people do not want us to disregard these services. At the same time, the position of the Republican Party must be to make progress wisely and carefully in order to keep within our ability to pay.

I personally hope that we can go forward with a reasonable program of greater security, more education, more housing, and greater health without increasing our tax burden. In fact, I hope we can eliminate some of the nuisance-excise taxes we now have.

The Hoover Commission will soon come forward with detailed recommendations for streamlining our Government to assure more economical and efficient operation. I cannot too strongly stress the necessity of maintaining in the hearts and minds of us all the optimism that comes with personal savings and the stimulation that comes with new ventures. Unless this optimism and stimulation are constantly with us, business ceases to go forward. Our country becomes static. Only by keeping our industrial and agricultural machine going through the initiative and imagination of our citizens can we hope to have the life, the working conditions, and the greater security that are desired by every thoughtful American.

It may well be that in our approach to these issues we Republicans have tried to appeal too much to reason and too little to human emotions. I am convinced the longer I have been in Government service that voters are governed more by their emotions than by their reason. Yet their emotions are fundamentally based on common sense and what is best for the welfare of the average individual. As Republicans, whether we are in a public office or not, we must examine what it is that people want; we must determine whether this desire can properly be fulfilled by Government; but in doing so we must never be hypocritical. We must never allow Government to make promises it cannot keep. Our program must be built on solid foundations. But it cannot be sold—it cannot capture the imagination and arouse the emotions of the men and women who vote—unless we appeal to those emotions. Every project that is put forward by the majority party in State and Nation must be carefully examined by the minority party to determine our position.

If we base our opposition along the principles that appeal to the average man and woman of America, if we can convince them we stand for no special interests, we have no selfish motives, we will gain the confidence of Mr. and Mrs. United States and their children. We will become the majority party in 1950. We will win the Presidency in 1952.

Let me close with the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our cause is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Report on Economic Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, three important witnesses appeared on Friday at the public hearings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to testify with respect to the legislative recommendations made by President Truman in the report submitted to Congress at the beginning of the session. They were Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Housing and Home Finance Administrator; Mr. Tighe Woods, Housing Expediter; and Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug.

Much interest is being displayed in the effort of the committee to develop through testimony a well-rounded view of the economic conditions in which the country now finds itself. Summaries of parts of the testimony submitted last week have already appeared in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the summaries which I have prepared of the testimony of Mr. Foley, Mr. Woods, and Secretary Krug be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY RAYMOND M. FOLEY, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

The national housing policy should be founded on certain basic principles: (1) every American family should have the opportunity of acquiring a decent, safe, and livable home; (2) our private enterprise system must do most of the job. The Federal Government must do everything it can, consistent with sound public policy, to make that possible; and (3) we must strive our utmost to keep the home-building industry operating at a high level to eradicate or minimize the violent fluctuations that have characterized this industry in the past.

In the furtherance of this policy I have presented my views on new legislation which has the following objections: (1) enunciate a national housing policy; (2) authorize Federal aid to cities for slum clearance; (3) reactivate and expand the low-rent public-housing program; (4) provide assistance for the improvement of frame housing; (5) authorize a comprehensive program of research into both the economic and technical espects of housing; and (6) introduce a series of amendments to the National Housing Act designed (a) to stimulate the production of a greater number of homes in the lower-price brackets, (b) to aid the formation and operation of cooperative housing organizations, particularly for the veteran, (c) to continue the present system of mortgage insurance on rental housing, and (d) to make the Government facilities for secondary mortgage market operations more effective in stimulating the production of lower-price sale and rental-housing and cooperative-housing projects.

Our supply of housing now as in the past may be characterized by the phrase, "Too few of any kind, and too many that are too poor." Human values have been wasted and undermined as a result of inadequate housing. Although the ability of the housing industry to expand its output from 142,000 to 930,000 in only 4 years has been a most gratifying performance, it is high time we cease limiting our housing horizon to our achievements in the past. There have been violent cyclical fluctuations in production; since 1920, production of housing in nonfarm areas has ranged from a peak of 937,000 units in 1925 to a low of only 93,000 units in 1933 and back to about 930,000 units in 1948. During the decade between 1930 and 1939 employment in on-site residential construction ranged from a high of 668,000 to a low of 150,000. The depression low was more than 77 percent below the peak of the decade. Thus instead of being one of the important stabilizing elements in our national economy, home building has actually fluctuated more violently than any other major segment of economic activity.

The extent of our needs can be judged from the estimates that between now and 1960 between seventeen and eighteen million units must be built or rehabilitated. In order to stimulate greater production of good and livable homes in the lower-priced brackets, we must continue to employ liberal

Federal financing aids. Building costs, especially those of building materials, have risen substantially and reached an all-time high in September 1948. By December lumber prices were still three and one-half times as high as in August 1939, and four of the seven basic material groups (brick and tile, plumbing and heating, structural steel, and the classification other materials) were still in their peak. The average hourly rate of earnings on private building construction in November 1948 was at a new all-time high of nearly $1.94 an hour, 108 percent above the 1939 average of slightly over 93 cents an hour. It may be noted that in the 2-year period, October 1946–October 1948, the index for average hourly earnings on private building construction increased 25.8 percent (from 174.1 to 219.1 with 1935–39=100), while the index of wholesale prices of building materials increased 51 percent (from 134.8 to 203.5 with 1926=100).

On the basis of late 1948 trends, experts from both Government and industry now predict a lower level of housing production in 1949 than in 1948. This downward trend occurred not because of any slackening in housing requirements, nor because of any shortages of manpower or materials, but because housing, more than most other consumer necessities, has been pricing itself out of the mass market.

STATEMENT BY TIGHE WOODS, HOUSING EXPEDITER

The critical shortage of rental housing accommodations, which still exists in the 600 defense-rental areas throughout the United States is one of the major shortages contributing to inflation in our economy. If we abandon rent control suddenly we would have a rent increase of at least 50 percent. Although the shortages of rental accommodations are probably most severe in the larger cities, the shortage of rental units is general throughout the Nation. At present Federal rent control operates in 1,150 of the 3,069 counties of the Nation. All available evidence points to the fact that the demand for rental housing has not been reasonably met in most communities. In the entire United States during 1948, only about 17 percent, or less than 160,000 of the 930,000 nonfarm dwelling units started were rental-type units. The outlook for new permanent nonfarm dwelling units to be started in 1949 is about 875,000, less than the present unfilled need for rental units alone in the 91 cities surveyed. If 17 percent of the new units started in 1949 are offered for rent, the total for the entire United States would not be enough to satisfy the need for rental housing in three or four of our larger cities.

All of these facts point toward the need for extension and strengthening of rent control. To this end I recommend the following: (1) Rent controls should be extended for a 2-year period beyond the expiration date of the present act. (2) In order to curb the growing black market in over-ceiling rents the Housing Expediter should be given authority to bring treble damage actions for willful overcharges, apply criminal sanctions for willful violations of the act, and regulate evictions. (3) Permanent dwelling units in hotels and housing units not rented for a 24-month period should be brought back under rent control. (4) Units created by conversion should be decontrolled only upon order when the conversion results in additional self-contained family units. (5) The Housing Expediter should be authorized to recontrol areas and establish controls in new areas where this is warranted by the national defense program or other changing conditions. (6) Where rent advisory board recommendations are not approved by the Housing Expediter, the case should be reviewed by the Emergency Court of Appeals only upon complaint filed by the Board. The time for review of board recommendations by the Emergency Court of Appeals should be extended from 30 to 60 days. (7) The provision for voluntary leases should be dropped because this provision was originally based upon the assumption of a rapid termination of controls, which is no longer true. There is ample provision in the law and regulations for justifiable rent increases. (8) All new residential construction for rental or for sale should continue to be offered to veterans of World War II and their families on the same preferential basis as required in the present law.

It is the policy of the Housing Expediter to see that landlords get rent increases where they are justified. Seventy-three percent of applications for rent increases received since July 1947 have been approved. Rent control itself should last only as long as we fail to reach a reasonable balance in the supply and demand of housing. To reach this balance quickly, we should concentrate on rental housing in multiple units. If total supply of manpower and building materials cannot be expanded rapidly enough to produce more than 1,000,000 units a year, I would recommend temporarily the discouragement of the construction of single family units for sale by a deliberate tightening of credit and risk insurance requirements for homes and by giving additional incentives to builders of multiple-unit structures.

STATEMENT BY JULIUS A. KRUG, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Our high level of economic activity results in a higher rate of consumption of natural resources than ever before. While a beginning has been made in stock piling raw materials needed for national security, we have not yet as a Nation faced the need for equally aggressive measures to assure the continuing supply of raw materials required for a dynamic and expanding economy.

In 1949 the Nation is still as much as 10-percent short of the electric energy that users are demanding. At least 16 States are affected. National reserve generating capacity shrank to less than 5 percent in 1948, less than a third of what the industry counts as adequate reserve. The production of aluminum, which depends on substantial quantities of electric power, is at least 30 percent short of demand. Today the aluminum industry operates at only about half World War II capacity. Seventy percent of the hydro power, on which the aluminum industry depends, is provided by the Federal Government. Other vital industries unable to obtain adequate power include ferro-alloys, abrasives, and phosphate fertilizer. The Nation is 40 percent short of phosphate-fertilizer needs.

In all probability our needs for electric energy will double in the next 10 years or sooner. Generator capacity must increase by 80,000,000 kilowatts by about 1965 if the true needs of the country are to be met. Certainly in the next 15 years, at least, 30,000,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power should be developed by the Federal Government and another 10,000,000 by private utilities and other power systems. The combined efforts of both public and private agencies are indispensable toward overcoming this critical electric-power shortage.

Excess capacity of oil is zero today, compared wtih 1,000,000 barrels a day reserve capacity with which we entered World War II. Proved petroleum reserves within our continental borders are destined to diminish in the near future. The Federal Government should undertake its responsibility for rapid exploration of the reserves remaining on public lands and the continental shelf. This requires immediate legislation. The Federal Government should also foster the early development of a synthetic liquid fuels industry and encourage more adequate conservation laws in some States.

Supplies of natural gas cannot begin to meet consumer demand despite adequate reserves of natural gas because gas distributors cannot get the steel pipe needed to bring the supplies from the fields to the consuming markets. Today the waste of flared gas amounts to at least one-fifth of the annual well output.

With the coal industry serious problems are being neglected, leaving aside the recurrent problems of labor relations. These include: (1) Wasteful mining practices which leave 1 ton of coal in the ground for every two removed; (2) the need for producing large amounts of synthetic fuels from coal that will substantially increase annual mine output within 25 years or less; (3) expansion of work of Government and industry on underground gasification of coal, development of synthetic liquid fuels from coal and oil shale, methods of treating coal or altering it in order to increase the economies of using coal where consumers would otherwise substitute oil and gas. In order to prevent wasteful mining practices it may be desirable to impose a tax on each ton of coal mined and rebate the tax to those producers who follow proper mining practices.

Material shortages seriously affect the expansion of energy supplies. Because of the shortage of aluminum conductor, over 20,000 miles of poles on REA cooperative distribution lines are standing without wire. In 1939 aluminum conductor could be obtained in 3 to 6 months from the date of placing an order. Today, delivery dates are 4 to 5 years. The shortage of aluminum will not end until new power generating plants are built. Federal power systems have also been short of steel and insulators for transmission towers. Federal hydro projects that would provide for 30,000,000 kilowatts of capacity over the next 15 years should be planned and scheduled now.

Conservatively 4,000,000 tons of line pipe will be required by the gas industry alone during the next few years, and this estimate does not allow for the filing of additional applications. Allocations are clearly needed to assure priority of line pipe for the distribution of oil and gas to those areas where the need is most pressing.

Steel supplies for maintenance, repairs, and general operating purposes at the mines have likewise been inadequate. Altogether about 400,000 tons of warehouse steel per year, or between 33,000 and 35,000 tons per month, are required by all of the mining industries. How long the mines, most of which are small, can continue operations without relief is problematical. Unless our industrial momentum is maintained, we must expect a slowing down of economic activity, and the slowing down will be disproportionately larger than the shortages of steel for the industries affected because of the cumulative effect. Allocations of steel will have to be continued and extended.

Manganese, 30 percent of which is imported from Russia, and chromite are both scarce materials currently being sought for the Government stock pile. In addition to the amount that went into the stock pile, there was a deficit of 180,000 tons of manganese which was made up by the steel industry drawing down industry stocks. Imports of manganese for 1949 will fall short of the industry's requirements by about 200,000 tons.

The outlook for iron ore is more favorable. In the long run, the large reserves of low-grade taconite iron ore hold real potentialities, but the program for the ultimate construction of commercial plants for the benefication of taconite will require several years and large expenditures.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a statement made on February 1 before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association by John R. Steelman, the assistant to the President. Mr. Steelman carried to the convention, in New York, a message from the President, pledging continued support of the rural electrification program which has brought light to so many millions of farms in our country.

Mr. Steelman's speech should be read by every American for it states clearly and concisely the importance of the rural electrification program not only to the farmers, but to the people in the cities as well. As Mr. Steelman said, "The benefits of rural electrification extend far beyond its direct effect upon farm families. It means security for the farm family, but it means just as surely increased security for the urban family."

He called for continuation of the program to extend electrification to every section of our country that can benefit from it.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, it is an honor and a privilege to be with you tonight when you are making your plans for the coming year. I am sure these plans will be successful. I wish success to your newly elected officers and to the membership as a whole.

In carrying forward your program, through cooperation with the Rural Electrification Administration, you are demonstrating the value of teamwork, in providing a more abundant life for millions who live in the rural areas of our great country.

Before I left Washington the President gave me a special message which he asked me to read to you tonight. He asked that I convey to you his personal greetings and commendations. This is the message:

"The record of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association has been one of great service to the country. Only 13 years ago electric power was out of the reach of most farm families. Because of the expense, a glance backward discloses, only one out of every nine farms had electricity. Today, the record shows that 7 out of every 10 farms are electrified. This has been made possible through your cooperation with the Federal Government.

"It will continue to be the policy of this administration to provide loans as rapidly as funds are required to extend electrification to rural areas of our country, thorugh the creation and extension of cooperatives on a sound basis.

"I am confident that the Government will continue to have the cooperation of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to the end that we may work together to improve the standard of living of farm families and thus to extend the benefits of our democratic way of life."

The President has a deep interest in speeding up electrification of the rural areas of our country because he knows that where the power lines stop, progress comes to a dead end.

He knows that the electric lines which carry power across the Nation are pumping lifeblood into our democratic, free-enterprise economy.

Electricity links the city and the farm in a thousand ways that give the brotherhood of man new meaning. It has been a force in welding many different groups in our national life into one democratic whole.

When I was a boy in Arkansas, I knew the hardships of farm life without electricity.

Today, on most of our farms, life is far different—and better than it was in those days. And nothing has helped more than electric power to improve living conditions.

The flick of a switch makes it possible for the farm family to hear the news broadcast from Washington, New York, London, or Berlin. Today the farmer's dairy and his silo and his home may operate by power. No longer is it necessary for the farm wife to spend long hours churning up a pound or two of butter.

The REA program not only has brought light to the farm, but has lightened the physical work load of countless men and women of rural America.

I know that most of you here tonight are familiar with the struggle to reach this point in our progress toward the goal of electricity for every section of America. For, to a great extent, it has been your struggle. The story of our great achievement in the rural electrification program, and your part in it, is a story of which you can well be proud.

Let's turn back for a moment to the time of the five- or seven-light-bulb household—you remember, one light bulb in each room. Home owners would add more lights only after careful consideration of whether they could afford them. And a house with a floor plug was a real showplace.

The rule-of-thumb estimate for power needs was made on the basis of one light bulb per room for each average home. The power-company rates were based on the fact that it took a lot of users to pay for a mile of operating line.

Naturally the growth and development of these power companies centered near towns and cities, and their lines served as connecting links between urban areas. There was little incentive for power companies to build lines just to bring small amounts of power to scattered homes out in the country.

Rates for electricity were high. Consumers with electricity had to be frugal in using it.

We had a kind of vicious circle. New lines were not built and rates were kept high because little electricity was used on the farm. And electricity was not used on the farm because the lines were not there and because rates were too high.

I am happy to say we have done something about breaking that vicious circle.

Many of you here tonight are using more electricity in your own homes than 25 to 50 homes consumed when the custom was one light to one room.

In the midthirties the United States, the most progressive country industrially in all the world, was one of the most backward of the major nations in the vital matter of extending electricity to rural areas.

Only one farm out of nine in the United States had central electric service. In contrast, one farm out of every six in the Province of Ontario had electricity, and in the Scandinavian countries half of the farms were electrified. In Japan and Germany the record was still higher. In those countries, only one farm out of 10 was without electricity. And in Holland, nearly every farm enjoyed the benefits of electric power.

However, the American people, recognizing the obvious benefits of electrification, wanted something done about the situation. In 1936 we set out to do something. The Congress passed a law to aid in bringing electric power to farm homes. This law provided for a self-liquidating loan program of $410,000,000 over a 10-year period.

Actually, the Congress increased the authorization to more than twice that amount in the course of the decade. And during the past 2 years, the loans approved for rural electrification have amounted to more than all of the loans approved from the beginning of the program to the end of the war.

As a result of these investments, America has moved forward to a leading place among the nations providing rural electrification. Today, in contrast to our previous record of only 1 farm in 9 with electricity, we have only 3 farms in 10 without it. President Truman's budget request for the fiscal year 1950 will make it possible for power lines to be brought to many thousands more of our farm homes. If the program moves on schedule, the next few years will see the great job of extending electricity to rural America nearly complete.

We are all aware of the contribution of the REA program to the economic and social welfare of the 8,000,000 farm people who are enjoying its benefits. The farmer not only uses power to pump water for his livestock, and to operate machinery, but his wife can enjoy the efficiency of the deep freeze, the electric washing machine and dishwasher, the sewing machine, the vacuum cleaner, and the electric iron. It is now possible for the farm family to have home movies, and radio and perhaps television. Electricity can cook the dinner, heat the bath water, move the hands of the clock, and do a thousand and one other jobs to relieve farm families of much of the drudgery which has been their lot in the past.

Electricity has brought greater diversification to farming enterprise. It has resulted in the development of rural industries. For example, the home and local processing of agricultural raw materials is rapidly increasing as a result of the greater use of electric power. Last year more than 10,000 small rural industries served by REA-financed lines, offered part-time employment to farm people in processing agricultural commodities close to the point of production.

The benefits of rural electrification extend far beyond its direct effect upon farm families. It means security for the farm family, but it means just as surely increased security for the urban family.

When the farmer buys electric fixtures for his home, a vacuum cleaner, a radio, or electrically-operated milking machinery, he is increasing the market of the manufacturer in Schenectady, or Detroit, or Birmingham. The effect goes still further, for the electric appliances and machinery bought by the farmer use steel, aluminum, textiles, and countless other products of the mines and mills of every part of our country. This development, therefore, has brought a substantial market not only for the end products but also for the basic materials which go into their manufacture.

This has been a stimulus to our free enterprise system and has provided employment for thousands of workers. In turn, the increased pay rolls have added their weight to the purchasing power of the people for goods and services of all kinds—including the products that come from the farm.

In addition to all this, rural electrification has brought expanded earnings to the power companies.

That the investment in rural electrification has been a good one in dollars and cents can hardly be questioned.

Furthermore, the rural-electrification program, based on loans, is not a burden on the taxpayer, for it is a sedf-liquidating program. I might add that this is a unique loan program, for in 13 years we have never had a default by any rural electrification cooperative.

The administration policy on rural electrification is a matter of record. The President's message to you tonight carried a pledge that electric power will be carried to every part of rural America as promptly as possible.

The initial phase of extending electric power lines should be completed within the next few years.

We now face the problem of strengthening the system already in operation. I know that you are much concerned about this phase of the program, for already all of the older cooperatives are confronted with the problems of rebuilding their lines to meet the increased growth in consumer demand. A sizable portion of the funds which the President has requested for the coming fiscal year should be used for this purpose.

Even when we reach our goal of building adequate lines into every section that needs them, the job of rural electrification will not be finished. For in addition to needing longer and stronger lines for transmission of power—we need more power.

Power shortages began to affect the rural electrification program soon after the war. Today they are a serious threat to it. Some power suppliers have found it necessary to refuse delivery of additional power to rural lines, and in many cases the suppliers have asked the co-ops to find new sources of power. Some suppliers, to meet the heavy demands on them, have been forced to curtail service or to cut off service during peak periods. The lack of power already has slowed up rural electrification in many areas.

The record of REA in the coming year, measured by demand for electricity, should be the best in the history of the program. This, to a great extent, depends on the sufficiency of materials for line construction and on the supply of power.

To meet these needs in the next fiscal year the President has recommended that the Congress make a new loan authorization for rural electrification of $350,000,000. Together with an unobligated 1949 loan authorization of $119,000,000, this will provide $469,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950.

The President also has called for expansion of our public power program. In his recent economic message to the Congress he discussed the present shortages of electric power, and he pointed out that our long-range needs require enormous expansion of existing capacity. Of course, he was not talking specifically of rural electrification, but of all the power needs of our vast industrial-agricultural economy.

We are meeting tonight in the most brilliantly lighted city in all the world. But there have been times when it was necessary to dim these lights because of the shortage of power for essential industries.

Brown-outs and dim-outs may help to get by in emergencies. But we cannot depend on them to supply the long-run power needs of our economy—on the farm, in commerce, or in industry.

We must develop new sources of power. We must harness our vast natural resources to serve the needs of our people. This can be done by pushing forward plans of development such as the St. Lawrence waterway and power project, the Bull Shoals project on the White River in Arkansas, the Missouri Valley project, the creation of the Columbia Valley Authority, and the Central Valley of California project. Here again we must have broad vision in harnessing our great rivers for power. In meeting the needs for power we must be sure at the same time that we consider and meet our other needs for irrigation, flood control, and transportation.

The lessons we have learned from such programs as REA, Bonneville, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, should guide us in these developments, to the end that they will advance our economy, and by paying for themselves will be no burden to our taxpayers.

Each of these projects, like rural electrification, will prove to be a multiplier of benefits and opportunities in the economic life of our Nation.

This Nation's ability to use electricity has always been underestimated. That is the biggest difficulty we have had in the development of our power resources. There has been the constant and plaintive refrain, "What are we going to do with all that power?" In the past, this complaint was worked to death every time the Government planned and constructed a hydroelectric or other type of power plant.

We have been told over and over again that it was unsound to build lines to bring electric power to the farm and that we couldn't afford to do it. The truth of the matter is that we couldn't afford not to do it. And we have proved it.

Our difficulty seems to be getting everyone to agree on the enjoyment of prosperity. Somebody is always afraid of it.

But certainly those of us here tonight know it is worth while to bring the benefits of electricity to all in our country who are now without it.

I know that your association is going to keep up the fight to do just that.

Rural electrification has turned on the lights in millions of homes throughout America.

But there are still other millions of homes where those lights are needed.

We take pride in the use we have made of electricity up to now. This pride must be matched by our determination that we shall not relax our efforts until its benefits are available for all our people and all their needs.

Stalin Is Willing To Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thought-provoking editorial entitled "Stalin Is Willing To Talk," from the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of February 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN IS WILLING TO TALK

While there has been an obvious tendency in American press discussions to discount all statements from Moscow, and particularly those which reflect a more peaceful tone, any statement from Prime Minister Stalin that he is willing to discuss a peace pact between his government and that of the United States cannot rightly be brushed aside as having little significance.

Statements from the Soviet dictator have been rare, although statements from his diplomatic spokesmen have been so constant as to amount to an international harangue. There is not even an undertone of this in Stalin's statement that he has no objection to a meeting with President Truman, and that Moscow is willing to join with Washington in measures leading to gradual disarmament.

If effective measures in this direction could be agreed upon, they would obviously be of benefit to both the United States and Russia, and to all the rest of the peoples of the world as well.

It is pointed out from Washington that there has been no official Soviet approach for a Truman-Stalin meeting. But in contrast to many previous statements of lesser Soviet diplomats reflecting belligerent aggression, the tone of Sunday's statement by Premier Stalin is one of reasonable conciliation. If we were to completely discount all such statements, there would be little hope of ever progressing from belligerence toward peace.

President Truman made the American position and the projected course of the American Government clear in his recent inaugural address.

It would be premature to attempt to predict what might result from a talk between Stalin and President Truman at this time. But there is always the possibility that the Stalin policy is actually being shaped for that long-awaited change of direction.

Henrik Shipstead's Vote Against the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Henrik Shipstead Is Proudest of His Vote Against the UN," from the Minneapolis Tribune of February 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD IS PROUDEST OF HIS VOTE AGAINST THE UN

Just as Henrik Shipstead, former Senator, was prepared to take a trip to Central America on a freighter he visited with his former secretary, Walter Mickelson. Walter reports in his New Ulm Journal that he never saw "Ship" looking better as he set out in search of "the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter."

Walter says Henrik claims the proudest vote he ever cast was against the United Nations Charter. He is convinced history will vindicate him—if it hasn't done so already."

What about today's world situation? Walter got this reply: "Read my speeches. Everything I said was going to happen is happening. And we haven't seen anything yet." No longer "hired to do the worrying for the people of Minnesota," Walter says Henrik is busy catching up on his rest.

Government Action in Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Government Action in Strikes," by William H. Davis, which appeared in the New York Times of February 12, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT ACTION IN STRIKES—PLANT SEIZURE PROGRAM ADVOCATED FOR POST-INJUNCTION PERIOD

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorial of February 8, Power of Seizure, opens up a chance to clarify the deep confusion that has surrounded the question of how to handle emergency strikes.

Your editor is wrong in thinking that there is a choice between the procedure I proposed to the Senate Labor Committee and the method of action now provided by the Taft-Hartley Act. My proposal deals with a national emergency that persists after the cooling-off period has ended and the Taft-Hartley injunction is no longer available.

The injunction procedure of the Taft-Hartley law is limited to the 80-day cooling-off period. If the dispute survives that 80-day period the court must withdraw its injunction; the workers are free to strike. There is no safeguard for the imperiled health and safety of the public except that the President is required by the Taft-Hartley law to tell Congress about it and make any recommendations he may see fit.

RECENT STRIKE RECORD

I should suppose that anyone who lived in New York through the recent costly longshoremen's strike, which, after the Taft-Hartley 80-day injunction period had expired, tied up our shipping, embargoed freight shipments on the railroads and prevented ERP shipments, would understand that. Similarly, in the west coast maritime dispute last year, the 80-day period of the Taft-Hartley injunction was followed by a strike which lasted 3 months. In the atomic energy dispute at Oak Ridge the 80-day period ended without settlement and a strike was prevented only by the high-level assumption of responsibility in the council of the American Federation of Labor.

My suggestion to the Senate committee deal with the real and final emergency after the cooling-off period had expired without settlement of the dispute. I quite agree with you that it is poor practice "to invoke a wholly fictitious government ownership through the power of seizure." I think government ownership by act of the Executive should be absolutely shunned; that seizure in the sense of taking permanent possession of and title to the properties should be entered upon only by act of Congress.

My suggestion, very well reported by Louis Stark, was, first, that the President, having publicly declared a national emergency imperiling the national health and safety and having reported this to Congress and pending final congressional action to end the emergency, should have the power, declared by act of Congress, to take possession and make use of the property for public welfare and to call on all of the officers and employees of the enterprise and any other citizen of the United States having suitable qualification to carry on the essential services on an emergency basis. It is the ancient common-law idea of the posse commitatus.

There are many, many ways in which such an emergency might be finally determined. Whether permanent Government ownership would be the proper course could not be foretold. If it did become necessary, I suggested that the procedure should be by exercise of the power of eminent domain, with just compensation according to the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

COMPENSATION DURING USE

I emphasized that even during the period of emergency use just compensation should be made and that it would include the wages to be paid to the workers as well as the money to be paid to the owners for the use of the property, so that a board would need to be set up by the President to assess just compensation to employees as well as to employers.

The important points are, it seems to me: (1) That the injunction procedure of the Taft-Hartley Act is not a safeguard in a real emergency but only a means—and, incidentally, a very poor means—of establishing a temporary cooling-off period; (2) that the citizens of the United States are entitled to know that a real safeguard has been provided that will be ready whenever the national health and safety are really imperiled by industrial strife; (3) that instead of arguing about the emergency powers of the President and of the Congress, respectively, the Congress ought to provide a statutory framework within which the President can take emergency action to temporarily safeguard our health and safety; and (4) the final disposition of the controversy, if the parties finally failed to agree, should be left to the specific action of Congress in the particular case.

WILLIAM H. DAVIS.

NEW YORK, *February 8, 1949.*

An Instance of International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which recently appeared in the Seattle Times which ably describes an outstanding instance of international cooperation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Times of Sunday, January 16, 1949]

NATIONS PULL TOGETHER SO EVERYBODY'S HAPPY

The recent conference here of fishermen and fishing-vessel owners with the International Fisheries Commission provided new reminder of one of the world's outstanding instances of international cooperation. Representing the United States and the Dominion of Canada, the Commission's purpose is to conserve halibut resources of Canadian and American waters of the North Pacific Ocean.

For years, the Commission has administered these halibut fisheries on a scientific basis, through mutual agreements between the two countries, so that the fishing industry might prosper and make a nutritious seafood available for public consumption, without depleting the halibut run of this ocean area. It is safe to say that no cooperative effort between two nations has been more productive of good will or more successful in fulfilling its purpose.

The Commission's work has also been a striking instance of cooperation within an industry. All the elements of the fishing fleet of this State, British Columbia, and Alaska have participated in the program, to their mutual advantage. The results have been outstanding. A fishery resource that once was threatened with extinction has been restored and preserved for the utilization of generations to come. The waters of the North Pacific Ocean now produce three-fourths of the world's entire supply of halibut

Seattle can take much pride in the fact that two Seattle men have been foremost in furthering this movement. Miller Freeman, Seattle publisher, was one of its first supporters, and an early chairman of the Commission. His work has been carried on by Edward W. Allen, Seattle attorney, also a former Commission chairman. This community, as well as the fishing industry, owes these two leading spirits and their associates in the Commission's activities a great debt of appreciation.

Trial and Sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from several Boston newspapers regarding the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Post]

BOSTON EDITORIAL COMMENT ON PRIMATE'S TRIAL

THREE BRAVE MEN

The anger that burns in the free world today against the petty hoodlums of an archgangster, who, in their People's Court, have maltreated a Christian prelate whose "offense" was that he troubled the consciences of his persecutors, must touch off the watchfires of freedom.

If the whole free world fails to heed the warning and is not aroused to the true nature of the dark design threatening the comity of good men, then there is no hope.

Cardinal Spellman sounded the warning in his sermon last Sunday. The evil that the Communists in Hungary have trumped up against Cardinal Mindszenty is not contained in the broken vessel that is Hungary. It spills over into the free world, staining the hearts and aspirations of men of all races and creeds. It is not only the Catholic faith that is menaced. It is religion that is under attack—all religion assailed by the robots of the godless.

It is difficult to find it in one's heart today to pray for the enlightenment of the perverted minds and wills of those who have condemned Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment on a trumped-up charge. Yet Cardinal Mindszenty would have it that way. And Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass, imprisoned by the Communist regime in Budapest, would have it that way. So, too, would Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia, whose arrest and imprisonment set the pattern for these travesties of justice.

Longfellow, the gentle poet of a happier day, wrote a phrase to fit the deed and the hour: "Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad."

This madness is the calculated warping of the minds of men. It is designed to take from mankind the universal solace in their hour of need—their religion, their faith, their hope, and their consolation, which would compel them to rely only upon the witless despair of the here-and-now, a despair capable of such an abomination as that which seeks to humble and destroy the prelate of a great church.

In our season of woe we of the free world can find consolation that such mighty warriors for faith as Mindszenty, Ordass, and Stepinac have gone before us to show the way and demonstrate the courage of the most precious convictions.

[From the Boston Traveler]

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Of course Cardinal Mindszenty is guilty of the one thing that really matters to the brutalitarian government of Red Hungary. He is guilty of a gallant stand for human freedom, a noble stand for religious freedom, an unfaltering stand for justice, decency, and human mercy in human relations. Of course he is guilty, this spokesman for an overwhelmingly Catholic people where the Reds are in the saddle only because Russia keeps them there. He would be unworthy of his exalted trust if he were not guilty.

Physically he is a broken man. The Reds know that and they know any eyewitness from the world of freedom would report the fact. That is why the members of the American and British legations were denied admission to the trial. It would not do to have such witnesses of a bowed figure, tortured by incessant grilling, tortured by days of sleeplessness, very probably tortured by drug injections that numb the mind and paralyze the will. In matters such as this, secrecy is the tribute that falsehood pays to truth.

The bigwig of the Hungarian press calls together the foreign correspondents. "You should make it clear that he is actually very weak and pitiful. You should try to make plain that he is not a hero of freedom," are his instructions.

Very weak, no doubt, weakened as he has been by physical and mental torture. Pitiful, no doubt, to those who can feel pity. But like Archbishop Stepinac in Tito's prison, he remains imperishably a hero of freedom. Cardinal Mindszenty is a great prince of the church. Those princes of the spirit that follow the Master who was very weak and pitiful upon the cross have often paid this awful price. Cardinal Mindszenty is of their immortal company.

[From the Boston Globe]

THE TRAGEDY AT BUDAPEST

That behind the iron curtain there should rise a swelling chorus of voices defending the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is good evidence that the Hungarian Government knows its conduct of this case was not what a court trial should be. True justice needs no defense, it speaks for itself. No observer will doubt that the cardinal was tried, not upon the charges enumerated in the indictment, but rather for the qualities of leadership that had raised him to eminence in his church, for the gift of good counsel that had won him the respect of his people, and for the staunchness of heart that had forbidden him to betray his flock.

Of all the bewildering and confusing reports that came out of the courtroom in Budapest during these few days, none has been more curious than the language of the indictment itself and its use of a word officially translated as "continually." The cardinal was accused of a continually committed crime of trying to overthrow the government, of a continually committed crime of treason. But is not continually what we would call constancy? And is not constancy—constancy to ideals and principles which we hold dear, which the Hungarian Government fears—the real crime for which Cardinal Mindszenty now must pay the penalty?

[From the Boston Herald]

HUNGARIAN SAVAGERY

The treason trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty has turned out to be even more criminal a farce than was at first expected. Not only has the Hungarian primate been tried on obviously trumped-up charges, but he was also compelled to testify against himself. For no reasonable person can suppose that the cardinal's confessions were bona fide even though they were uttered by his own lips.

The manner in which the venerable cardinal has been induced to acknowledge crimes of which he could not have been guilty is not known. There have been reports of physical torture, of hypnotic drugs, and of combined physical and mental constraints. But the method is not important. The deed itself is an outrage against human decency.

The cardinal's integrity is still intact. He cannot be held accountable for his acts or statements under these circumstances. But every Christian and, indeed, every person who values his dignity as a man, has been done an irreparable injury by the cardinal's persecutors. We have all been shamed through the Communists' acts.

The Herald has expressed the belief in previous editorials that the treason trial would eventually backfire and that any temporary political gains resulting from it would be more than offset by the new hatreds and distrust it caused. We hope that quite specific retribution will fall on the perpetrators of the recent abuses against the Cardinal's person.

The twisting and misdirection of a prisoner's mind is at least as vicious a crime against humanity as any for which Nazi and Japanese have been hanged since the end of the war.

[From the Boston Daily Record]

SENATORIAL DUTY

Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic prince-primate of Hungary, may take his place this month among the martyrs.

This is the month of the prelate's "trial" on Communist charges of treason, espionage, and black-marketing transactions.

These are not accusations that could be regarded seriously, even by Communists.

They are so alien to the cardinal's consecrated calling, and to his known character as a moralist and humanitarian, as to be utterly preposterous.

And the motive for them needs hardly to be stated.

They are a part of the Communist war on religion—a war that is being waged with savage severity against Catholics because their church, under the inspired leadership of Pope Pius XII, has been the most effective opponent of world communism and the diabolical evils of Marxian atheism and economic enslavement.

Cardinal Mindszenty has not suffered persecution alone.

In his own country—where 60 percent of the people are Catholics—more than 600 priests and "religious" have been imprisoned.

Catholic schools have been forcibly secularized.

Church properties have been confiscated.

In Yugoslavia, the eminent Archbishop Stepinac lies immured in a Communist prison.

Hundreds of Franciscans and other members of holy orders have been slaughtered, jailed, or driven into exile.

In Poland and neighboring Catholic nations, similar outrages have been perpetrated behind the iron curtain.

Nor is it only Roman Catholics who have endured these immolations.

Months ago, Bishop Ordass, the Lutheran primate of Hungary, and a group of lesser Lutheran dignitaries were arrested.

In Rumania, all Protestants sects have been put under restraints amounting to proscription.

And on behalf of Hungarian Jews have come pathetic protests that their people are listed by the Communists as "class enemies"—protests sponsored by Dr. Bela Fabian, former member of the Hungarian Parliament and of the board of the Jewish community in Budapest, and by Dr. Bela Varga, canon of the Roman Catholic Church, former president of the Hungarian National Assembly and president of the National Hungarian Committee in Exile.

The arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, under circumstances as brutal as these, evoked horror and indignation.

Mr. Robert Lovett, the American Under Secretary of State, denounced the charges against the primate as patently false and his imprisonment, with 13 alleged accomplices, as a sickening sham.

Representations have been made to Hungary by the Governments of Aire, Belgium, Australia, and Canada.

At a recent meeting of the British Labor Party, Mr. Herbert S. Morrison, the lord president of the British Council, spoke in terms of abhorrence.

"The arrest," he said, "during the Christmas holiday of all times, of Mindszenty, prince primate of the Catholic Church in Hungary, has shocked the whole free world. * * *

"It is further inescapable evidence that the Communists do not intend to rest until they have liquidated every vestige of freedom in the countries under their control."

What the British Labor Party leader said is incontestably true.

It expresses an issue which our Government, as the patron of non-Communist peoples, cannot ignore. The White House and the State Department may be deficient in courage or enterprise.

But they are not the whole Government.

On January 10, in a statement published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, suggested an appropriate course.

Referring to the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, and presenting other particulars of the Communist persecution of religion, he said:

"I respectfully suggest that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate this serious situation and report upon its find-

ings for the information of the United States Senate and of the entire Nation."

Obviously, the Senate should—without hesitation and without delay—proceed according to Senator O'CONOR's appeal.

By no choice of our own, we are inextricably engaged in a global and costly struggle with communism.

The struggle involves our own survival as a free people.

In so desperate a contest it well behooves us, in the manner of our devout forefathers, to seek the help of God.

And, by our own actions, to deserve it.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

ANOTHER RED "TRIAL"

The court proceedings in Budapest against Cardinal Mindszenty and six codefendants have followed the familiar pattern of the tragic farces the Communists call "trials." These affairs are not to determine the guilt or innocence of the accused. They are designed rather to dramatize "confessions" and persuade the public. As usual, they fail to persuade many people outside the "iron curtain's" smothering grasp.

Indeed, al' such caricatures of justice are bound to arouse free men anew. One joins in protest against them without necessarily assuming the innocence of the accused. For such methods so muddy the waters that the truth is almost impossible to come by. In the present case, as usual, confessions which could have been obtained under torture or drugging have little meaning except where they fit with known facts * * *

Cardinal Mindszenty, either because he was acting as agent of the Vatican or because of his personal feeling, has been unbending. Some Hungarian Roman Catholics have even charged him with making political blunders. The issue which apparently precipitated his arrest was his insistence that the state revoke its law secularizing the church schools. Whether he went beyond the legitimate defense of religion and engaged in political activities that could be called treasonable this Communist "trial" does not prove.

The chief judge, in sentencing the cardinal to life imprisonment, declared: "We have seen here a trial of an organization against the Republic, carrying on royalist activities and black marketing foreign currency, which had nothing to do with religion. But when the judges themselves take the attitude of prosecutors, when totalitarianism is unable to tolerate any opposition, and when court proceedings are surrounded with an atmosphere of terrorism, the non-Communist world will have to draw its own conclusions as to where political activity ends and religion begins. And surely it will say, "We have seen here no trial but a travesty on justice."

ANTI-DEFAMATION STATEMENT

On behalf of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and in my own behalf I express to you our firm support of the American principles you so eloquently enunciated in your sermon on Sunday, called forth by the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. As Jews we know only too well the ravages which come from violations of basic dignity and freedom. Our sympathy goes out to Cardinal Mindszenty in his suffering and we join with you in prayers for him.

MEIER STEINBRINK,
National chairman of Anti-Defamation League.

(The above was addressed to Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York expressing the sentiments of the league on the case of Cardinal Mindszenty.)

Condon's "Trial by Newspaper" Condemned by Scientific Analysis

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House the scientific study which appears in the current issue of the Scientific American magazine. The study is a scientific analysis of the treatment of the famous Dr. Condon case by nine newspapers of New York City. It is especially valuable because of its impartiality and its objectivity. It proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that public opinion can be influenced by biased reporting.

Critical students of propaganda have realized this fact for a long time. However the average newspaper reader does not stop to analyze the average newspaper story for bias. Unless proper weight is given to pro-and-con treatment of public events or public controversies in the press, the reader can be deceived with or without specific intention on the part of an editor or a newspaper reporter.

This is forcibly demonstrated in this analysis which shows that the reviving or repetition of, for instance, a "pro" treatment, can overly influence the reader unless it is balanced by a similarly emphasized "con" treatment of the same subject.

In the case analyzed, which concerns the vicious campaign to assassinate the character of Dr. Edward U. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, it is interesting to note that the reporting of this incident was weighted overwhelmingly against Dr. Condon. It is also interesting to note that the most objective treatment of the Condon case was given by the nonsensational type of newspapers, such as the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, the New York Post, and New York Star.

The sensational headline type of newspapers are revealed to be guilty of having treated the Condon case in such a manner as to emphasize the news stories which were critical of Dr. Condon. This was accomplished by reviving and repeating adverse stories disproportionately. Another important factor in this prejudiced treatment was the omission of news items which were favorable to Dr. Condon, or by printing such stories only once and by obscure placement, in the biased papers.

This analytical article unfortunately will not receive wide coverage because of its scientific nature, and possibly because many newspapers would not be enthusiastic in publicizing their biased and prejudiced manner of treating the news.

This article graphically portrays the danger of "trial by newspaper" to the thoughtful person, and sounds a note of warning to people who are objective in their thinking, and who fear the power of propaganda in a highly literate society. It emphasizes again the danger which is inherent in great newspaper and radio chains, where identical treatment of public issues is ground out in assembly line fashion, to millions of readers and hearers.

In recommending to the Members of Congress a careful study of this analysis, I wish to point out that the merits or demerits of the Dr. Condon case are not considered by the six scientific analysts who made this study. This group of scientists were Nobel prize winner Harold C. Urey of Chicago University's Institute of Nuclear Research, Brown of Chicago University, Lauritsen of Cal Tech, Morse of M. I. T., Pegram of Columbia, and Warner of Carnegie Tech.

The study made by these highly respected scientists is completely objective and analytical, and I recommend it to the members of this body as a valuable example of propaganda analysis.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include at this point an article from this morning's Washington Post, which deals with this subject in a fair and impartial manner:

ASK SAFEGUARDS FOR WITNESSES—SCIENTISTS SAY HOUSE PROBERS TRIED CONDON BY NEWSPAPER

Six leading scientists said yesterday that House Un-American Activities Committee charges against the atomic scientist, Dr. Edward U. Condon, resulted in a trial by newspaper which must not be repeated.

In a public statement addressed through Scientific American magazine, to Vice President Barkley and House Speaker RAYBURN, they urged Congress to set up a minimum charter of rights to protect persons under congressional investigation.

The scientists based their conclusions on a study of the way in which the Condon episode was handled by nine New York City newspapers from March 1 to October 31, 1948. They said the papers "constitute the principal source of news for nearly one-tenth of the United States population."

They decided to undertake the survey, they said, "in view of the peril of our civil liberties represented in this extra-legal institution of trial by newspapers."

The scientists were the Nobel prize winner Harold C. Urey of Chicago University's Institute of Nuclear Research, Harrison Brown of Chicago University, Charles Lauritsen of California Institute of Technology, Phillip M. Morse of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, George B. Pegram of Columbia University, and John C. Warner of the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

"The findings provide a plain measure of the hazard to which a citizen's good name may be exposed through the medium of the press when a committee of Congress fails to observe the elementary rules of fair play which protect his rights in all other procedures under our common law system of justice," they said.

Condon, Chief of the Commerce Department's Bureau of Standards, was accused by an Un-American Activities Subcommittee of being "one of the weakest links" in the Nation's chain of atomic security.

He flatly denied the charge and repeatedly demanded, but never was given an opportunity to answer in person. Condon later was approved by the Atomic Energy Commission for access to top-secret information.

The Democrats recently reorganized the House committee after political control of Congress changed hands. Chairman JOHN S. WOODS (Democrat, Georgia), has pledged that all persons haled before the committee will get a fair hearing. He has indicated Condon will get that privilege.

The scientists said the results showed the committee's reckless, vague, and unsupported charges got far more space than statements in Condon's defense by his colleagues and distinguished and responsible individuals.

"Dr Condon has never been permitted by the committee to testify in his own defense," they said. "Thus the committee brought and prosecuted its charges against Dr. Condon exclusively through the medium of the press."

They said the committee's charges were almost the only basis for 90 percent of the stories damaging to Condon.

"These reckless assertions, carrying the weight of congressional authority, received not only wide but repeated publications; no less than 57 percent of the derogatory materials appearing in the news columns consisted in mere repetition of the committee's baseless charges."

DAMAGING STORIES STRESSED

They said that five of nine New York papers gave damaging stories about Condon far more emphasis than stories in his defense.

"Significantly, these five newspapers outweigh the other four in circulation by nearly three to one," they commented. "That the smear stuck is indicated by the continued high ratio of derogatory statements which attaches to Dr. Condon's name in the latter part of the period studied, long after his official clearance by the Atomic Energy Commission. * * *"

They pointed out that, as a result of the old committee's activities, Congress has before it legislation which would establish rules covering the procedures of investigating committees without limiting their authority.

The legislation would give an accused person a chance to present his side of the case, to call his own witnesses, and to cross-examine witnesses testifying against him. Witnesses also would be entitled to legal counsel.

It also would bar news photographers, newsreel and television cameras, and wire recorders while witnesses were testifying.

"These principles," the scientists said, "would seem to constitute a minimum charter of rights for the protection of persons whose reputations would otherwise be seriously damaged by the publicity which attends a congressional investigation.

"We strongly urge that these proceedings be adopted by Congress in the present session to guide the future conduct of investigations by the committees of the House and Senate."

NEW YORK PAPERS GAVE PREPONDERANCE OF SPACE TO STATEMENTS PRESENTING PHYSICIST IN FAVORABLE LIGHT, SURVEY DISCLOSES

New York newspaper statements were preponderantly favorable to Dr. Edward U. Condon in spite of a barrage of derogatory material issuing from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, 90 percent of which consisted of vague and unsupported charges.

These are among the findings of a content analysis study of the New York City press by Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research published in the current issue of Scientific American.

The bureau studied press reports on the case for and against the Bureau of Standards scientist published from March 1 to October 31, 1948. It covered a period commencing with the first charges of the committee to three months after the Atomic Energy Commission had cleared Dr. Condon.

Taking the New York press as a whole statements favorable to the accused scientist were most numerous. Of 3,909 statements analyzed, 745 or 19 percent were unsympathetic to Condon and 971 or 25 percent were sympathetic. Notable was the wide range of difference from newspaper to newspaper. This is shown on the table published by Scientific American.

	Pro	Con
Times	65	35
Herald Tribune	64	36
Star	63	37
Post	57	43
World-Telegram	50	50
News	49	51
Mirror	47	53
Sun	43	57
Journal American	18	82

The space analysis made no attempt to ascertain what proportion of pro and con statements would have adequately reflected the news about Condon originating in all sources during the period. It was expressly stated that "the fact that a paper may have reported more unfavorable than favorable events is not in itself necessarily a sign of bias."

Newspaper methods of reprinting initial charges in such cases worked against Dr. Condon, the bureau found. If statements on Condon had been limited to new material (without any background reviving initial charges) the pro and con score would have been 416 to 301 instead of the actual score of 695 to 631 in the nine papers.

CALCULATED ON IBM CARDS

The sumary of the study emphasized (1) variation in proportion of pro and con statements from one to another paper; (2) Condon support was most adequately reported in Times, Tribune, Star, and Post and given little attention in the other papers; (3) reviving background material had the effect of building up the case against Dr. Condon but did not build up defense; (4) papers reported the committee's promise to give Condon a fair hearing more frequently than they reported failure to do so.

The study was made by taking all press stories in the nine New York newspapers. They were then broken down into independent statements about the case. Then the strictly neutral statements were eliminated from analysis. The rest were put into various pro and con categories. This permitted the number of statements to be calculated rapidly on IBM cards.

The study was limited to news content and confined to text statements alone. There was no appraisal of the effect of headlines or position. The bureau did not undertake to ascertain the effect of morning or afternoon publication which might have influenced the recency of the studied statement.

Building-Code Revisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there are few more important problems today in the Nation than that of straightening out the housing mess in which we find ourselves. A key element in our effort must be the revision of the obsolete building codes which plague us throughout the Nation and which prevent use of new materials, new methods, in order to cut costs and do the job.

I have spoken, Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate previously on many occasions on this same theme. Revision of building codes is still indispensable if we are to meet the problems of the overwhelming mass of our people who cannot afford custom-built housing, but who can use mass-built homes.

Recently there appeared in the able newspaper, the Commonwealth Reporter of Fond du Lac in my State, an editorial describing grass-roots action in Fond du Lac for a revision of the building code there. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this forthright editorial be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING CODE REVISIONS

Recently members of the Fond du Lac Associated Builders sent a letter to the city council asking for a general revision in the municipality's building code. The association, made up of contractors, in its letter to the city officials, said:

"Our organization is of the opinion that since the present codes were adopted many years ago there are many revisions that should be made in order to bring them up to date. We stand in readiness to assist the council in any way we can to revise the present codes."

Weeks ago the Fond du Lac mayor took a leading part in a meeting of chief executives of municipalities in the Fox River Valley section of Wisconsin and urged that demands be pressed for revisions of building codes in all communities. We presume at that meeting there was talk about so-called model codes which could be applied to all communities of comparable size.

Nationally there is a campaign to provide model building codes and several of them have been prepared for cities in various population classifications. Little has been done actually to write them into the ordinance books of the hundreds of American communities which are sadly in need of revised building codes.

Fond du Lac's building code is pretty close to a quarter of a century old. It is true there have been some changes and amendments, but these have not kept pace with the improvements and advances made in the construction industry.

Building codes are about as inconsistent as any of the laws on municipal ordinance books. One type of construction is legal in Fond du Lac and illegal in Sheboygan. Hundreds of such inconsistencies can be discovered if one cares to compare all of the building codes in existence in Wisconsin cities.

Chicago, which of course cannot be compared to Fond du Lac or any other Wisconsin community, is making a serious effort to rewrite its building code. There is strong opposition and little chance for success in view of the power exercised by big city politics.

The trouble with building codes is that we are trying to build modern homes and other structures by following horse and buggy day methods. The reason can be traced. Workers are reluctant to permit the introduction of new methods because they fear it will result in a loss of work.

But who pays for new buildings? Isn't it the man who pays the bill? Why should he be forced to subsidize certain groups for types

of labor and material which were obsolete a quarter of a century ago?

The failure of public officials to keep building codes up to date is one of the reasons contributing to the high cost of construction. It is one of the reasons for the housing shortage.

The Fond du Lac building code should be revised; in fact, the building code in every community in Wisconsin probably should be revised. When that revision is made the recommendations should be presented by a committee which includes representatives of the contractors' association, the building trades union, and, more important than anything else, by representatives of the public which foots the bill.

GOP Liberals in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article written by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which appeared yesterday in Parade magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP LIBERALS—IN THE SENATE THEY HAVE A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

(By WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

The great American classic—the quadrennial race for the Presidency—has been concluded. President Truman, fighting against odds that all but he and a few others considered hopeless, won a victory last November which restored the Democratic Party to the complete control of the Government. But now that the race has been run and the victory gained, the President and his party have the job of delivering on their platform promises and campaign pledges.

What role should liberal Republicans—and there are many of them—play in the Congress now settling down to the serious business of considering vital legislation on domestic and international affairs?

Some of the advice coming to me through the mail suggests that we join the Democrats because on some basic issues we have no significant differences with the Truman administration. Others blame us for losing the election because of this so-called "me too" attitude, and urge us to fall in line with the ultra-conservative elements in the Republican Party.

Either course would spell ruin to the two-party system as we know it today, and would certainly relegate the Republican Party—whose first great standard-bearer was Abraham Lincoln—to oblivion.

The task of modern, liberal Republicans in the present Congress is two-fold: to revitalize the party and to mobilize its forces behind a forward-looking program; secondly, to guard against unsound legislative proposals of existing devices endangering the rights of free Americans and our free enterprise system. Let me explain why I feel that this is so.

Republicans need to remember that competition is the dynamic force of a free-enterprise system. Dynamic competitive principles must also be applied by the two major political parties in the contest for votes. The criticism directed at those of us who are fighting for a more modern, forward-looking Republican Party, to the effect that we are proposing a "me too" political course of action, overlooks some basic principles of competition.

In the economic life of our free-enterprise system, a successful businessman is always alert to the public's interest in and approval of the merchandise of his competitor. He does not refuse to stock more up-to-date goods when he discovers such goods are filling his competitor's store with purchasers. Rather, he tries to secure better quality goods that will fill more economically the needs of the buying public.

The analogy has its limitations, but does help to focus attention on the fact that the supporters of reaction in the Republican Party need to learn much from business if they hope to satisfy the voters' wants. Their "me too" charge against liberal Republicans is but an alibi for their own lack of appreciation of the needs of our people.

Significant steps have already been taken by a group of forward-looking Republicans in the Senate to modernize the party.

One of their first moves was the attempt to revamp the party leadership in the Senate so that it would no longer stand as a symbol of reaction and defeatism. In that fight I was happy to join with Senators AIKEN, TOBEY, IVES, LODGE, SALTONSTALL, KNOWLAND, FLANDERS, SMITH of New Jersey, BALDWIN, YOUNG, GURNEY, and THYE in the effort to inject new blood into the party organization.

CANDIDATE LOSES, BUT LIBERALS GAIN

While Senator LODGE, our candidate for the position of chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate, was beaten 2 to 1, two encouraging facts should be noted: the composition of the policy committee was revised to give representation to the more modern point of view, and clear notice was served that the liberals would stand united as a general policy in the effort to shake off the cloak of reaction in which the Old Guard would garb the Republican Party.

We gained our point that contests for party office in the Senate should be decided by secret written ballot. We agreed that for the next 2 years the Republicans in the Senate should devote their major effort to making a record which will permit them to go to the people in 1950 without apology.

We recognize that the greatest organizational need of the party is to change the trend of registration among young people from the Democratic to the Republican Party. This means that the liberal forces shall insist that the national and State party organizations alike give increased opportunities for party positions and public office to young Republicans.

LIBERAL WING UPHOLDS BASIC FREEDOMS

On the broader front, the role of the Republican liberals is also beginning to take definite shape. Let us list some of the measures already dropped into the legislative hopper by Senate members of this group, bearing in mind that the following catalog is made well in advance of its publication.

A glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the first few days of the present session of Congress makes it clear that the liberal wing of the Republican Party is actively sponsoring bills which make more secure the basic rights and freedoms of the American people.

Four members of this group joined with other Senators in proposing that the Congress prohibit discrimination because of race, color, faith, national origin, or ancestry—a measure that has had the overwhelming approval of Members of Congress but has failed of passage because of a Democratic minority.

Three of them sponsored a bill to raise the minimum wage to 75 cents an hour. Others again introduced the Federal Aid to Education Bill. No less than four of them are active in backing the bipartisan effort to amend the Constitution so that the voters of this country may have a more direct voice in the election of President and Vice President.

Several of us, in keeping with our pledge to reform the rules of the Senate so that majority rule may prevail, introduced resolutions calling for amendments which would eliminate the filibuster; and we have continued to press for the earliest possible consideration of these proposals.

Among other measures that might be mentioned as part of the liberal program are bills to expand the coverage and benefits of the Social Security Act, to liberalize the admission of displaced persons, and to provide facilities for a labor extension service.

Labor legislation that is fair to both employers and unions, and in the public interest, will be supported by the liberal Republicans. As this is written, it is encouraging to read that the administration appears to agree with those of us who urged the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the simultaneous enactment of a revised Wagner Act.

In these early days of the Eighty-first Congress it is no visionary prediction to assert that Republican liberals will be found initiating and supporting additional legislation that will, in the best Lincoln tradition, place human rights above property rights. As constitutional liberals, they will fight against reactionaries on the one hand and leftists on the other.

They will support Government aid for improved health facilities and medical services, without adopting the socialistic principle of making the doctors employees of the state. Better housing legislation will be high on their list. Aid to scientific research is another objective liberal Republicans will sponsor.

Inflation controls, a tightening of the laws regulating monopolies, a more equitable Federal tax policy, a far-sighted program of development and conservation of our natural resources, a long-range program of farm-price supports which will remove the causes of consumer criticism but at the same time protect farmers from violent price fluctuations—all are matters which Republican liberals will work for.

Many Republicans—but not enough to outvote the reactionaries in their own and the Democratic Party—have sponsored these reforms in the past. More of them will be found on the liberal, the human, side of these issues in the days ahead.

In the field of international relations every effort will be made to maintain a strong bipartisan foreign policy, so ably fostered by Senator VANDENBERG, for the past 2 years the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The United Nations must be strengthened, for without a strong world organization the armament race will mushroom to such proportions that essential domestic legislation will have little chance of being realized.

The Senate Republican liberals are receiving increasing support. More and more registered Republicans and independent voters are appreciating that the way to make progress on domestic issues and on the international front is to make our capitalist economy and political democracy work through the safeguards of our constitutional form of government.

Business Leaders of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I insert an article from the winter issue of the Dixie Business, entitled "South's 50 Foremost Business Leaders To Be Selected," written by Col. Hubert F. Lee, of Covington Road, Stone Mountain, Ga., who is editor of Dixie Business:

SOUTH'S 50 FOREMOST BUSINESS LEADERS TO BE SELECTED

(By Col. Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business)

There have been many distinguished leaders over the South nominated for our annual selection of the South's man of the year.

We have read in letters so many glowing tributes paid to their leadership, their business abilities, their fine characters, their untold achievements and contributions to the development and building of the South, that we have felt keen personal disappointment that only one could be selected.

The letters have come from leaders in the South, from southerners on leave in other parts of the country, from college presidents, heads of giant and small concerns, from employees, from church leaders, from old school business friends and—yes, from some of their competitors.

As we started Dixie Business in 1929, our twentieth anniversary in 1949 gives us an opportunity to honor a greater number of men who have done so much for the South.

The editors of Dixie Business will next year select the South's 50 foremost business leaders. And among them will be the 1949 South's man of the year.

Readers of Dixie Business particularly are invited to send in nominations. Editors, publishers, business and industrial leaders, also are invited to enter nominations.

The list of nominees will be printed in Dixie Business and our readers will be privileged to vote for 47 of the nominees. The remaining three will be the notable men who have been selected as South's man of the year—Thomas W. Martin in 1946; Donald Comer in 1947; and C. Hamilton Moses in 1948.

Those who receive a ballot may also vote for 47 on the list.

Those who are unable to get ballots may write letters on behalf of any of the nominees and the letters will count the same as ballots. This will give the entire South an opportunity to have a voice in the selections.

Already a number of able leaders over the South, from Texas eastward, have been nominated. As nominees will run the gantlet of a mail election it will be a waste of time to nominate anyone not among the South's top-drawer notables. The men who are selected will have achieved so much that there will be no question as to their right to the honors.

We have asked counsel of some of America's notable leaders who are friends of the South, have had a part in the South's development or who, by their own achievements, have added to the South's fame.

It is well that we have the privilege of looking at the South through so many eyes over the Nation. Their views and advice—plus the years since 1921 when we edited the general trade section of the Atlanta Constitution, worked on many newspapers from Virginia to Florida, night-managed the United Press in 1924–25, founded Dixie Business in 1929—will serve to assure what we do in 1949 will be something the South and the Nation can be proud of.

The Honorable Bernard M. Baruch, who was made an honorary member of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and who is an honorary member of the Chamber of Commerce of the South, was consulted and invited to enter a nomination. Mr. Baruch replied:

"Unfortunately I really do not know enough about the young men of the South, but I certainly feel that it is a good idea to build up the country's knowledge of them who are certainly as fine as you can find in any part of the country."

The great publisher, B. C. Forbes, whose Forbes Magazine in 1947 included Thomas W. Martin, our 1946 South's man of the year, among America's 50 foremost business leaders selected through a poll, was asked for advice and if he would object to our doing in the South what he did for America's top leaders. Mr. Forbes replied:

"Be assured that I have not the slightest objection to what you propose doing in the way of selecting the South's 50 foremost business leaders.

"I have felt deeply for at least a third of a century that our most outstanding meritorious, worthy business leaders, usually very large employers, are entitled to due commendation from the rest of us.

"I ardently hope your activity will be crowned with a bumper measure of success.

"My bestest."

E. K. Gaylord, president and general manager of the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times, who was nominated for the 1948 South's Man of the Year, wrote:

"* * * You ask for suggestions as to names of 50 outstanding leaders of the South and immediately there came to my mind the name of E. L. Kurth, president of the Southland Paper Mills, Inc., Lufkin, Tex. I think he surely should be among any list of 50 southern leaders. * * *"

John D. Ewing, editor and publisher of the Shreveport Times, nominated Mr. Kurth for 1948 South's Man of the Year but the nomination came after most of the ballots had gone out. Mr. Ewing wrote in part: "Mr. Kurth has been the guiding spirit of this all-important first mill manufacturing newsprint in the South. * * * His strong leadership at the mill has continued through the years. * * * I truly believe that the Lufkin mill opened the way for a vast southland newsprint industry. * * *"

I quote these letters as Mr. Kurth will be among the South's 50 foremost business leaders—as will Reuben B. Robertson, president, Champion Paper & Fibre Co., Canton, N. C. The editor of Dixie Business in 1923 tried to promote a newsprint mill to use southern pine. Both belong in any selection of the South's 50 foremost business leaders. Our own knowledge of them, plus the letters that have already come in urging their selection, makes it a foregone conclusion these two—as well as others already nominated—will be selected. Selection of Mr. Robertson will be made not only for his years of leadership but will be in tribute, too, to A. D. Wood, who on September 15, 1923, wrote this editor: "* * * It seems to me that, from a scientific standpoint, it is entirely feasible to make pulp from the pine wood to which you refer, and make from this pulp almost any grade of paper desired. The big problem, in my opinion, would be the commercial one, of keeping manufacturing costs low enough to compete with other manufacturers of news and the cheaper grades of paper."

Mr. Wood in 1923 was sulfite superintendent of the Champion Fibre Co., now Champion Paper & Fibre Co., and Reuben B. Robertson was then vice president and general manager.

The editor of Dixie Business would like to nominate our good friend for many years, C. N. Martin, editor and publisher of the Atlanta's Suburban Reporter, and president of the Martin-Johnson Printing Co., East Point, Ga., where Dixie Business has been printed since 2 years after it was founded.

Had it not been for Mr. Martin's faith in Dixie Business, and his willingness to let us spend some of the money due him during the depression years, while he patiently waited, there might be no Dixie Business today to select the South's 50 foremost business leaders.

His community leadership is typical of the fine men who edit and publish weekly newspapers over the South and Nation and we nominate him in their name as well as in our own. These weekly newspaper publishers have done much to build up their towns and help attract new industries and make newcomers welcome.

EARLY NOMINEES

A number of leaders over the South have been nominated and many more will be during the coming months before the poll is conducted. The list so far follows:

Robert M. Hanes, president, Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

Frank H. Neely, chairman, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta and president of Rich's, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

William L. Clayton, board chairman, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

Hal. S. Dumas, president, Southern Bell T. & T. Co., Atlanta, Ga.

I. B. Tigrett, president, Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co., Jackson, Tenn., and Mobile, Ala.

Col. T. H. Barton, board chairman, Lion Oil Co., El Dorado, Ark.

Brownlee O. Currey, president, Equitable Securities Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

Caffey Robertson, cotton merchant, Memphis, Tenn.

Frank P. Samford, president, Liberty National Life Insurance Co., and president Alabama State Chamber of Commerce, director, Institute of Life Insurance, Birmingham, Ala.

James H. Allen, president, Florida Pulp & Paper Co. and Alabama Pulp & Paper Co., Pensacola, Fla.

William Murphey, board chairman, Citizens & Southern National Bank, Savannah, Ga.

Robert W. Groves, president, Strachan Shipping Co., Savannah, Ga.

E. L. Norton, president, Coosa River Newsprint Co., Birmingham, Ala.

Thomas M. Johnson, president, Johnson-Lane-Space & Co., Savannah, Ga.

Harry H. Straus, president, Ecusta Paper Corp., who created a new industry by making cigarette paper from flax straw, Pisgah Forest, N. C.

R. Kirby Longino, president, Longino & Collins, Inc., New Orleans, La.

Frank Gould, editor and publisher, the Manufacturers Record, Baltimore, Md.

John A. Sibley, board chairman, Trust Co. of Georgia, and vice chairman, board of trustees, Southern Research Institute, Atlanta, Ga.

Robert W. Woodruff, chairman, the Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga.

A. L. M. Wiggins, board chairman, Atlantic Coast Line Railway, and president, Bank of Hartsville, Hartsville, S. C.

R. S. Reynolds, board chairman, Reynolds Metals Co., Richmond, Va.

Cason Callaway, founder, Georgia Better Farms, known as Callaway plan, former head of Callaway Mills Co., and now operator of giant farm at Hamilton, Ga., and director of United States Steel Corp.

C. E. Woolman, president, Delta Air Lines, Inc., Atlanta, Ga.

Gen. John C. Persons, president, the First National Bank of Birmingham, Birmingham, Ala.

Jesse H. Jones, publisher, the Houston Chronicle, and former Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Houston, Tex.

E. L. Kurth, president, Southland Paper Mills, Inc. (South's first great newsprint mill), Lufkin, Tex. (See November 15, 1948, issue of the Gulf Coast Lumberman, Houston, Tex.)

C. N. Martin, editor and publisher, the Atlanta's Suburban Reporter, and president, Martin-Johnson Printing Co., East Point, Ga.

A letter from Francis G. Hickman, editor and publisher of the Cotton Trade Journal, Memphis, Tenn., with editorial from the December 17 issue of his world recognized publication, assures Will Clayton's selection as one of the South's 50 foremost business leaders by the editors of Dixie Business. Mr. Hickman, an honorary member of the Chamber of Commerce of the South, writes:

"You may recall that one of our suggestions for the South's man of the year for 1948 was Mr. William Clayton, although we strongly approve the selection of Mr. Moses.

"I take this opportunity to express my pleasure that Mr. Clayton is one of the outstanding nominees for one of the 50 foremost business leaders, as evidenced by the editorial enclosed.

"We compliment you on this enterprising endeavor of Dixie Business, and send best wishes for the holiday season."

The enclosed editorial follows:

"PROPOSING WILL CLAYTON

"Dixie Business each year conducts a poll to select the South's man of the year and to name the South's 50 foremost business leaders. High on the list of nominees for 1949 is the name of William L. Clayton. In our opinion Mr. Clayton stands head and shoulders above all other nominees in both categories.

"There are many reasons that could be given for our choice—but chief of them and embracing the significance of all other reasons is that Mr. Clayton's career is a splendid illustration of what the American way of life has to offer. And this is of paramount importance these days when our heritage of private enterprise is menaced by insidious propaganda for socialism.

"Mr. Clayton's career reads like the Horatio Alger books that used to captivate our imagination in our youth. Most people are familiar with his career as Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and his later role as special adviser to the State Department in conferences leading to formulation of the International Trade Organization. All our readers are no doubt familiar with his success in private enterprise as chairman of the board of Anderson, Clayton & Co. But fewer are aware that this outstanding career was carved out by Mr. Clayton from absolute scratch.

"When he was 13 years old, Mr. Clayton's parents, Mississippi cotton planters, lost their savings in the depression of 1893, and young Will quit school and went to work to drive a laundry truck. At night he studied typing and shorthand, paid for with his own earnings, and at 15 he was so proficient he became a court reporter. A year later he went to New York as private secretary to a cotton merchant—and 30 years later he was head of Anderson, Clayton & Co.

"In 1940, Will Clayton was called to Washington by the President and entered Government service in the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. He then was named Deputy Federal Loan Administrator, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Vice President and Trustee of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, Surplus War Property Administrator, Assistant Secretary of State, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

"There is the sparse outline of the career of William Lockhart Clayton, successful businessman, brilliant diplomat, a man whose life illustrates the truth of the equation that hard work plus intelligence plus service equals success.

"Will Clayton, in short, is an object lesson in Americanism. He is undoubtedly the South's man of the year for 1949 and heads the South's growing roster of business leaders."

As we plan it, the poll will be advisory. The selections will be made in the name of the editors of Dixie Business.

Should the readers of Dixie Business feel we should make the selections through appointing a committee rather than by the editors, we would appreciate their views.

The poll will have more to do with the ultimate selection of the 1949 South's man of the year than the 50 leaders selected. The 1949 South's man of the year will come from the 50 group. The final decision, as presently planned, will be that of the editor and founder of the magazine. If enough of our readers think this plan should be changed, we will listen open-mindedly.

New National Capital Proposal Arouses Unusual Interest—No Space Available in Washington Area for New Government Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the following news item appeared in the Washington Post:

HILL GETS REQUEST FOR $11,500,000 CENSUS BUILDING

Congress yesterday received a proposal for a new $11,500,000 Government building at Suitland, Md., in which to process the seventeenth decennial census being taken in 1950.

The proposal was submitted by Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Federal Works Administrator. He said the building would be needed for about 3½ years for the Census work starting June 1949. No space is now available in the Washington area for the project, he said.

It will be noticed that General Fleming says that no space is now available in the Washington area for the project.

The Federal Government is encountering more and more troublesome problems in the Nation's Capital all the time. It is possible that the time will come when it will be necessary in the public interest that the Congress seek another location for the National Capital rather than try to solve all of the problems that will arise by reason of the congested area, insecurity, and other factors. We may properly commence the study now.

The West will have a 14,000,000 population increase in the next quarter century, we are told. The following Associated Press article on this subject and the need for reclamation in the West is self-explanatory:

WASHINGTON.—The West, facing a 14,000,000 population increase in the next quarter century, must think of reclamation in terms of basin-wide development of huge multiple-purpose projects, Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus said today.

He told the Senate Interior Affairs Committee in a prepared statement that this is essential "If the West is to be given full access to the potential benefits locked up in its limited water resources."

"And we know that the day is not far distant when it will require full access to those resources if its economy is to be kept thriving," he said.

Straus, one of the top Interior Department officials, called before the committee to explain their programs, said the 14,000,000 increase in population for the 17 Western States included in the reclamation program has been forecast by the Census Bureau.

"If all known land and water resources of these States could be developed by that time, it could not produce enough agricultural products to fully supply the needs of these new inhabitants," he stated.

As an indication of the trend in reclamation-thinking, Straus said it is expected legislation will be before Congress to permit the integration and operation of authorized or completed projects on the same river.

Since I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few weeks ago a letter concerning a change of the Capital, I have received letters and telegrams from the Middle West, and especially Colorado, urging its consideration.

1950 CENSUS

The 1950 census will doubtless disclose that the center of population will be much farther west and southwest than indicated by the last census.

Big Steel Fights Little Industry in East Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the building of a blast furnace in East Texas has had the roughest and rockiest road to travel of any proposal that I have ever known to be initiated by any group of public-spirited citizens. After years of effort, the Lone Star Steel Co. finally completed its blast furnace, which is now producing from 1,000 to 1,200 tons of the very best pig iron every day. This concern has enough iron ore within a radius of less than 10 miles of the plant to keep it in production for a hundred years at the present rate. Efforts are now being made to carry out the original plan of building a completely integrated steel industry. As Big Steel fought this effort all during the war, it continues to fight and oppose in every possible way the development of iron ores in East Texas by the use of steel-making facilities.

In the Steel magazine, January 24, 1949, the following editorial appeared:

PORK BARREL STEEL

In his state of the Union message on January 5, President Truman asked Congress "to authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and

to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs."

This proposal startled the Nation because it went farther than any previous President had gone in openly advocating the entrance of the Government into the steel industry. However, persons familiar with the actual situation in steel supply and demand were not too much concerned because they were confident that an honest study would result in findings favorable to a continuation of steel expansion under private auspices. Also it was felt that Congress would be very cautious about committing the Nation to the nationalization of steel.

That such complacency may be unwise is indicated by current developments. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, has used the President's proposal as a basis for suggesting a full employment bill of 1950, which would provide for $15,000,000,000 to be lent by Reconstruction Finance Corporation to public or private agencies for industrial expansion. Almost simultaneously came an application from Lone Star Steel Co. for $65,000,000 from RFC to finance projected steel works and tubular goods mills at Lone Star, Tex. Representative PATMAN says the Lone Star project is only one of six needed in the Texas area.

Thus in two short weeks, and before any study has been made, President Truman's proposal has been expanded into a full-fledged campaign having sinister pork-barrel implications.

As long ago as last September, former President Hoover told the National Press Club that while "we have not socialized industry, we have come close to socializing savings into the Government." The savings of the people are drawn in increasing volume into the Federal Treasury through taxes. If this continues, he warned, "we will come to the point where the only source of capital will be the Government."

To make RFC money readily available for pork-barrel industrial expansion is tantamount to openly inviting the socialization of steel.

On the 31st of January, a week following, the same magazine carried an article by E. C. Kreutzberg about the Lone Star plant. It is as follows:

TEXAS WANTS PLANTS

However, this outlook may be considerably shortened as a result of the application of the Lone Star Steel Co. for a Government loan to finance construction of open-hearth furnaces and a pipe mill alongside its blast furnace at Lone Star, Tex. This application is backed up by the most effective influences imaginable—the Texas delegation in Congress and elsewhere in the Government. Representative PATMAN, who is 100 percent back of the project, told Steel that there is no doubt about the need for more tubular goods in Texas. As a matter of fact, Mr. PATMAN said, northeastern Texas needs the output of six, not one, new steel plants. The expectation seems warranted that the Lone Star application is but the first of a number to be put in shortly to the Government for loans to build steel plants, not only in Texas but in other Western States.

Under existing law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is fully clothed with authority to make loans on projects of this kind. There was some doubt among RFC directors as to how far they might go in insisting on using their own judgment in making such loans. But that was resolved when, under strong administration pressure, they approved substantial loans to a prefabricated housing manufacturer.

ANTIMONOPOLY MOVE?

It would be interesting to see what would happen should one of the existing big steel companies apply for a Government loan to build a new steel plant. Every one of the supporters of the Government steelworks proposal is an archantimonopolist, and a fundamental plank in their platform is that the Government must do something about steel because "steel is a monopolistic industry." It will be recalled that President Truman attacked the steel industry during his campaign talks last year as monopolistic. Only last week Representative PATMAN made another speech accusing a steel company of acquiring a steel fabricator and putting it into competition with a former customer to which it no longer was shipping steel.

So Washington is asking questions such as this: Is it the real purpose of the Government steel plant proposal to break down so-called monopoly in the steel industry? Common opinion is that such a move actually has been launched, and only time will reveal the full program and its effects.

NO LOAN NEEDED BY BIG STEEL

It is ridiculous to suggest what would happen if a big steel company applied for a loan. All big steel companies have retained enormous profits which they can use any way they please and would not consider a request for a loan.

Normally the large corporations pay to their stockholders 65 to 75 percent of their earnings. Now, and for the past few years, they are paying out only 25 to 35 percent and retaining the balance which they use to buy, in many cases, nonrelated and competing concerns. This is costless capital acquired from a helpless public in a seller's market.

The following article recently appeared in Labor, a national weekly:

HOW BOOKS ARE JUGGLED BY BIG CORPORATIONS TO HIDE PROFITS

That the profits of America's big corporations are much greater than the figures they put out for public consumption was demonstrated anew in an analysis of the steel industry's earnings, published this week by the United Steelworkers' Union.

In the third quarter of 1948, the union said, steel firms reported profits, after taxes, which were 54.6 percent higher than in the same period of 1947. That gain is staggering enough, but it tells only half the story.

Actually, the steel corporations covered up additional profits by juggling their books, the union said. For example, United States Steel gave its net earnings for the quarter as $34,599,132. But it also had an item of $13,500,000 under the heading of extra depreciation, over and above normal reserves set aside for plant depreciation.

Thus, United States Steel's real profits for the quarter, the union said, were really over $48,000,000, or at the rate of almost $200,000,000 a year. Other steel companies doctored their books in the same manner, the union declared.

The stockholder is becoming the forgotten man. It results in a slow stock market and dries up the source of credit for small business.

Mr. E. B. Germany, president of the Lone Star Steel Co., and who put the plant into operation and has successfully operated it for more than a year, in a letter of February 1, 1949, answered these articles, as follows:

LONE STAR STEEL CO.,
Dallas, Tex., February 1, 1949.

Mr. E. L. SHANER,
Editor in Chief, Steel Magazine,
Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR MR. SHANER: In your editorial dated January 24, entitled "Pork Barrel Steel," you made references to the Lone Star Steel Co. I am not accustomed to writing letters to the editor, but, in all fairness to our company, I feel impelled to give you a few facts which, it is apparent, you did not have at the time you prepared your editorial. Knowing your reputation as an editor and the respect the industry has for your publication, I believe you will accept these remarks in good faith.

Let me put your mind at rest regarding your statement that Lone Star Steel is a part of a so-called full-fledged campaign having sinister pork-barrel implications.

This company was organized and incorporated in 1942. As agent for the Defense Plant Corporation, the company built the facilities it now owns and operates. Our present expansion program is nothing new. I have been a director since formation of the company and I know that the original intent and purpose was to build a completely integrated steel industry in east Texas. Therefore, our application for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cannot be a part of any "full-fledged campaign having sinister pork-barrel implications."

Your implication that our application to RFC is pork barrel steel appears to be somewhat impulsive or else an indictment of practically every private business enterprise in America.

From 1932 until 1947, RFC made loan commitments amounting to $1,509,831,349.58 not including funds loaned for national defense. Of this amount $1,048,816,086.95 was committed to 82 of the Nation's railroads. In fact, RFC now has outstanding loans to railroads of $143,852,206.68.

This agency had made 158 loans for mining, milling, and smelting of ores not including 121 such loans made in the national defense program. Funds provided by RFC built the great highway and railroad bridge over the Mississippi River at New Orleans and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. It goes without saying that the steel industry must have welcomed the business resulting from these projects.

Did you or your publication or the steel industry cry "Pork barrel," when these loans were made? Were the 82 railroad companies which applied for and received hundreds of millions of dollars to buy steel products accused of being a part of a sinister pork-barrel campaign designed to lead them into nationalization?

Lone Star Steel's program to develop this region's natural resources was first approved by Mr. Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. At that time Mr. Truman was a Member of the United States Senate.

The iron ores of east Texas, Mr. Shaner, have been there a long time, in fact, as long as those of the Birmingham and Great Lakes regions. Eastern capital and industry have not only ignored the possibility of the development of these resources but have actually attempted to discourage local, independent efforts to develop them.

Texans believe in freedom of opportunity of enterprise, Mr. Shaner. We have fought for it since 1836, and it is this same spirit which has prompted our leaders here to prove that a steel industry in east Texas is good for us as well as the rest of the country. More than 3,000 Texans own our company. They believe in the industrial possibilities we have here.

These Texans have no socialistic tendencies. In fact, our people here in the Southwest would be the last to be so accused.

The recent war forced eastern capital and industry to recognize the possibilities here. You will find on investigation that more industries have moved to this area during the past few years than any area in the world.

Now, Mr. Shaner, we welcome outside capital. We want outside industry. We have tried to provide the proper atmosphere which would attract outside industry such as reasonable tax laws (we have no sales tax or personal income tax).

But, in spite of everything we have had to take it upon ourselves to build a steel industry in east Texas. We have succeeded so far without encouragement from the steel industry.

Our facilities are located in the district of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, whom you mentioned. To him, more than any other one man, is due much of the credit for our success, and Texas as well as the Southwest is in his debt for helping to make possible an entirely new industry here.

Because of your reference to the need for an honest study you will be interested to know that our present expansion program is the result of years of planning and not something hurriedly put together in two short weeks. In fact, we engaged the services of a nationally known engineering-research organization to make the study on which our plans are based. This firm is also engaged and consulted by many of the Nation's larger steel companies and other industries.

Your concluding paragraph seems to be particularly impulsive and your fears unfounded. You say: "To make RFC money readily available for 'pork barrel' industrial expansion is tantamount to openly inviting the socialization of steel." We believe the exact opposite is true.

Did the billion dollars loaned to our railroads lead to socialization of railroads? Did the billion and a half dollars loaned to private business enterprises lead to socialization of business? Did the billions of dollars loaned to our insurance companies and banks lead to socialization?

Consider where your steel industry would be today had such loans not been made to build railroad rolling stock, Diesel engines, bridges, factories, pipe lines, refineries, etc. The steel industry benefited to such extent that, when the war came, it was in a position, with the help of additional Government funds, to meet the emergency and avoid any grounds for nationalization.

On the other hand, if the industry refuses to encourage the efforts of local, independent initiative to develop regional resources with which to provide badly needed goods demanded by the regions' markets, the industry will not fare so well in the court of public opinion, where matters such as nationalization are finally decided.

You have our support in any campaign to prevent nationalization of this or any other American industry. At the same time we feel entitled to yours in our efforts to remove any cause for such an attempt.

We extend to you a cordial invitation to visit us here in the Southwest, to inspect our facilities and, at first-hand, America's greatest industrial potential. For, we are certain that if you become better acquainted with our resources and possibilities, our markets and our people, we will have the benefit of your support and encouragement. You will be most welcome to Texas and Lone Star Steel.

Cordially yours,

E. B. GERMANY,
President.

GOVERNMENT AID NECESSARY

It is absolutely necessary that the Government do something to help industry get started in monopolistic lines, such as steel. The big steel companies want a scarcity of steel and they will never properly expand their facilities because it is against their selfish interests to do so. Our country needs 10,000,000 tons of steel this year more than the present steel capacity will permit.

RFC HELP FOR RAILROADS, BANKS, AND INSURANCE COMPANIES

I well remember in 1932, when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created and when every effort to permit the RFC to help the plain people generally was successfully killed in the consideration of the bill in Congress. When finally passed, it only helped the railroads, the insurance companies, and the banks. It was long after the Democrats came into power, March 4, 1933, that the power was extended by Congress to RFC to help others. When the banks, railroads, and insurance companies were bailed out, a lot of the people wanted the Government to stop right there.

SIX NEW MILLS NEEDED IN EAST TEXAS

New steel-making facilities in every section of our country are badly needed. We have enough iron ore in east Texas to take care of six steel mills with the same capacity as Lone Star for more than 75 years. If this steel is used to make oil-field pipe, there will be a big market for it very close to the plant. Most of the steel pipe used in oil fields is shipped from Birmingham or Pittsburgh. There is no reason why a large part of it should not be made right there in the middle of the oil-field area.

SELFISHNESS PART OF PRIVATE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Selfishness to a certain extent is a part of the private-enterprise system. It is a desire to get ahead, make money, accumulate property that has made the private-enterprise system successful in our great country. We want it to continue. However, greed is not a part of the private-enterprise system, so when the leaders of any monopolistic industry curtail production for the purpose of serving their greedy interest, the Government should step in. It is not contemplated that the Government will own the plants, but it is contemplated that the Government will furnish money to help build the plants because they are needed to produce a very essential product in the interest of the general welfare of the people. It is no more socialistic than bailing out the banks, railroads, and insurance companies when they were in distress and ran screaming to the Government for help. Some of the biggest bankers of New York were the first to knock on the door of the RFC with hat in hand when it opened in 1932. Since they were saved with Government aid they seem to oppose others getting similar aid from the same source.

WHO ARE REAL SOCIALISTS?

The real Socialists in this country are not the little fellows having nothing but a loud voice to disseminate their views on soap boxes on street corners or in public parks; but whether they realize it or not, the real Socialists--that is, the ones who are doing the things that will bring our country to socialism quicker than anything else—are the big-business executives of the Nation, who are trying to get all of the units of an industry in one package so they can own it. It is a very short step from monopoly to government socialism.

SOCIALISM

When the number of companies producing steel in England was reduced to six, the industry was so concentrated that the Government took it over. Dr. Steinmetz, the most outstanding scientist and engineer of his time, was chief consultant for the General Electric Co., one of the largest concerns in the United States. He was a Socialist and often made speeches for socialism. When asked how he considered himself consistent being a Socialist and working for a company that was almost a monopoly in electrical equipment and appliances, he replied:

Every Socialist should be in favor of monopoly, since it is such a short step from monopoly to Government ownership and socialism.

Every platform of the major parties the last 50 years has contained a statement to the effect that private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable. The Socialist platform always contains the statement that the Government should own a monopoly, or, in other words, the Government should take over the trusts.

So the big-business men in this country, who are building up monster businesses by destroying competitors and getting all of the units of an industry in the hands of a few people in one company, are the ones who are doing the most in the direction of forcing or causing socialism in our country.

The Trial and Imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the world has breathlessly followed the prosecution and trial and verdict in Hungary of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by the International News Service, dated Vatican City, February 14, 1949, published in the Washington Times-Herald of even date, giving the consistory address of Pope Pius XII, and also a copy of the official English text of apostolic exhortation issued by Pope Pius XII, as published in the Washington Post of Sunday, February 13, 1949, to wit:

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 14, 1949]

SIXTEEN CARDINALS HEAR CONSISTORY ADDRESS

VATICAN CITY, February 14.—Pope Pius XII branded the imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty today "a miserable offense against * * * all believers in human dignity and freedom," and reportedly planned a united front of all Christianity against communism.

The supreme pontiff, speaking before an extraordinary consistory of 16 cardinals, warned that "if religion is swept away and divinity is banished, no civil society can ever subsist." He demanded full freedom for the church everywhere.

UNITY PLANS REPORTED

After hearing the pope the consistory reportedly mapped plans to unite all Christian denominations in the fight against Communist expansion. Such action would be an

historic step for the Roman Catholic Church, which has hitherto insisted on standing alone.

His Holiness, addressing the first meeting of its kind in nearly half a century, bitterly condemned the trial of the primate of Hungary. He declared that Hungary's Communist-controlled government based its case against Cardinal Mindszenty on statements completely alien to the truth.

A high Vatican source said the plans for unity of all Christianity in the war against communism were laid in discussion by the cardinals after the pope's speech.

VOICES PROFOUND GRIEF

The Holy Father said he was "saddened with profound grief * * * by the gravest event"—the trial and sentence to life imprisonment of the primate by the Hungarian Communist-controlled regime.

Above all, about the excessive and suspect rapidity of the procedure, the artificial and captious construction of the accusations, the physical condition of the cardinal—which is inexplainable without unspeakable influences—the condition which suddenly made of a man, who until then was exceptionally energetic by nature and by conduct of life, a being that was weak of action, appeared to be an accusation not against the accused but against those who accused and condemned him.

CHURCH REAL TARGET

"In particular we believe it is our duty to declare that that which was stated during the trial is absolutely without truth."

Then the Pope added bluntly:

"In all this, one thing alone emerges clearly: That the principal purpose of the entire judgment was to disrupt the Catholic Church of Hungary in the hope of obtaining persecution of the pastors and dispersion of the faithful.

"Therefore, in reproving this event and putting it before the judgment of public opinion and the tribunal of history we are not only doing what the violation of the sacred rights of the church require but what the dignity of the human individual demands."

After the address by the spiritual leader of Roman Catholicism, the princes of the church reportedly planned the unity of all Christian sects in the war against Soviet-led atheism.

BID TO OTHER FAITHS

Papal officials recalled that recent letters and statements of the Pope spoke of Christianity rather than Catholicism alone.

This, said Vatican sources, can be construed as an open invitation to leaders of other faiths to form a common religious defense front in the manner that the western democracies are welding a common defense on the political front.

Only at one point in his allocution did the Pontiff suggest that there might still be grounds for a compromise between the church and Communist states. He said:

"(The church) is not moved in its action by temporal motives and the church admits any form of government provided it is not in contrast with Divine human rights."

But a high prelate said:

"The Pope stated the church's stand. Any reconciliation would necessitate a change in tactics by the Communist regimes. This doesn't seem likely, does it?"

Elsewhere in his address, the Holy Father, relentlessly pursued his theme that the lines have been drawn for the decisive battle between Christianity and communism.

The Pope rejected Communist allegations that the church seeks to influence the course of purely political matters, adding:

"In particular we must declare that what has been affirmed during the trial is completely alien to the truth * * * namely, that the entire matter depended on the fact that the Holy See must explain its political domination over people who are supposed to have issued orders and instructions directed at opposing the Hungarian Republic and those presently at its head."

FOR WORLD-WIDE PRAYERS

The pontiff, despite his bitter assault on the political sponsor of atheism, called for world-wide prayers not only for victims of persecution but that "all those to whom public government is entrusted will finally understand this truth—that if religion is swept away and divinity is banished, no civil society can ever subsist."

The Holy Father concluded with the plea: "Let the freedom due the church be everywhere given back to her so that, unhampered by impediments, she can illuminate * * * the minds of men. From this action human civilization has nothing to fear but will have great advantage."

[From the Washington Post of February 13, 1949]

OFFICIAL ENGLISH TEXT OF APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION ISSUED BY POPE PIUS XII

VATICAN CITY, February 12.—The official English text of Pope Pius' apostolic exhortation:

"The conflict between the good and the wicked, in whose ever-tangled strands of human actions and motives history is woven, has seldom, if ever, been so acute as it is today.

"While, on the one hand, no matter where we look out upon the world from this Vatican citadel, we are filled with admiration and joy at the sight of the good people resplendent with those virtues, which, particularly in the glorious fortitude of martyrs, recall the early ages of Christianity: Yet, on the other, we are overcome by grief and anguish as we perceive the iniquity of the unrighteous reach a degree of impiety that is incredible and without parallel. Venerable brethren, we shudder at the mere mention of this wickedness, but the duty of the apostolic office compels us to speak.

"That proud neglect and disdain of divine things which was man's original crime when he ignored God's command is the most pernicious source of all evils, and at the present time is insidiously spreading its ravages almost all over the world like a virulent disease; it is producing evils without number, especially in those countries where a conspiracy has been formed 'against the Lord and against his Christ' (Ps. ii: 2). It deprives man of God and thereby robs him of his spiritual dignity, makes him the ignoble tool of materialism and utterly destroys all traces of virtue, love, hope, and beauty of soul within him. We speak of atheism or, rather, hatred of God.

"With supreme insolence, the enemies of the name of God avail themselves of every kind of help and advantage, books, periodicals, the press, the radio, organizations, public meetings, and private interviews, education, and culture, all are at their service to spread ridicule of sacred things. 'The smoke of the pit arose as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened with the smoke of the pit' (Apoc. ix: 2).

"Let nothing give more concern to you, to the priests and people committed to your care, than battling to defend the name of God, which the angels revere trembling with awe, raise aloft the standard of St. Michael Archangel and renewing the cry 'who is like to God?' Oppose to the blasphemers of the divine majesty your energetic purpose to proclaim, to love, and to preach His name.

"Those who cast scorn on the name of God not only are guilty of a heinous crime, since 'hatred of God is especially a sin against the holy spirit' (S. Thomas, summa theol. 2–2 Q. xxxiv, art. 2 A. D. 1) and brings down upon them the severest punishments, but obviously prove themselves utterly ungrateful. For what is more necessary and salutary than to adore and worship God? From Him we receive both our soul and body, our strength and gifts of mind; the light of the sun, the air, the produce of the earth, our food, the joys of life, and, what is more important, divine grace, spiritual helps, truth, and salvation are from Him. Everything good we have is His gift.

"'O how good and sweet is Thy spirit, O Lord, in all things' (Sap. xxi: 1). But Thou our God, art gracious and true, patient not far from each of us: 'For in Him we live and move and are' (Acta. ap. xvii: 28). He is most wise and merciful, at one time delighting us with His consolations, at another correcting us by His punishments. But we are treated justly when He punishes us, for 'we receive the due reward of our deeds' (Luke xxiii: 41); and even suffering through God's providence becomes a training school of virtue and yields a harvest of eternal happiness. Prosperity or adversity mean little to him who has God as his inheritance and possession; and nothing is to be considered lost if God is not lost.

"There is, moreover, another benefit which love of God brings to men, while, on the other hand, rejection of God brings about disaster. Who does not fear and abhor strifes and civil discords, and wars which in the future with new weapons will cause immense destruction? That such disaster be warded off we welcome with approval the steps that have been taken to unite states together in ever closer alliances.

"But this will be a faltering attempt founded on quicksand, unless there prevails everywhere a strong sense of the brotherhood of men, which renders mutual contracts sacred and secure, strengthens pacts and welds communities together. Experience clearly teaches that men do not look upon one another as brothers unless they recognize that they are all sons of the same father. Without reverence for the Supreme Lawgiver and Divine Judge, right and wrong are mere words; the moral law collapses; if there is no sanction to be feared, inequity in its greed goes to all extremes in deeds of daring and arrogance; men, like wild beasts, engage in mutual slaughter and their one joy is the base pleasure they take in practicing in these cruelties. Now it is to our advantage to serve God. Let us worship with the greatest earnestness and care God's loving presence in the sanctuary of a pure conscience; for the way to grow in virtue and perfection is to withdraw ourselves from exterior things and turn to things interior and thence raise our minds to dwell on heavenly truths.

"Let the memory be filled with His most sweet presence; let the intellect be enlightened, the soul rejoiced, and the will strengthened to act with purity, energy, and piety: 'For to know Thee (i. e., God) is perfect justice' (Sap. xv: 3). All who have erred from the path of justice are to be aroused by prayers, by word and deed, but especially by the example of a life in which the reflection of the fatherly goodness of God shines forth, that they may expiate and atone for their faults. Let sinners turn their thoughts back to the most merciful father 'who calls home his prodigal son and gladly welcomes him when through want he is brought to repentance, sacrifices the fatted calf, and crowns his joy with feasting. Why not? He has found the son he had lost; the son he has regained he esteems all the more. Whom are we to understand by that father? God, of course: none so fatherly, none so loyal as He' (Tertullianus, De Poenit, 8, M. L. 1, 1353). Who-

ever is strong in faith and rich in the treasures of a religious life should share these goods, as far as possible, with others.

"If we wish to promote still further this religious fervor and prepare protection and a remedy for the criminal impiety that contaminates our times on the part of those who revile God, we have most efficacious means at our disposal.

"Is there anything that prayer cannot accomplish? What cannot the confident prayer of an innocent or repentant soul obtain when it is said in the name of Christ and is accompanied with good works?

" 'Prayer is the wall of faith, our shield and weapon against the enemy who studies us from all sides' (Tertullianus, De Oratione xxix, M. L. 1, 1304), but all religious worship and cult yields pride of place to the eucharistic sacrifice, which continues in an unbloody manner the immolation of Christ in a bloody manner on the gibbet of the cross and applies its abundant saving fruits to men.

"The heavenly and eternal Father is honored, is rendered propitious, is appeased by the precious blood on the spotless lamb, whose voice is more efficacious than the voice of the innocent blood of Abel, and of all the just because it has infinite dignity and value; this blood he assumed from one of us, it is offered for us by the Son of God himself, the author of our peace and reconciliation, the ever, ever tireless giver of every heavenly gift.

" 'When through sin we provoke the vengeance of the judge, may we be protected by the presence of the blood speaking for us; then let the host of oncoming evil retreat.' (Hymnus in primis vesperis festipretiosissimi sanguinid. D. N. I. C.) The same sacrifice which is 'truly propitious' (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii, Cap. 2) is offered efficaciously 'for sin, atonement, satisfaction, and other necessities' (Conc. Trid. Sess. xxii, Cap. 3).

"If atheism and hatred of God, which contaminates our times and merits a truly fearful punishment, is a grievous sin, we can, in the fount of Christ's blood, which the chalice of the New Testament contains, wash away the abominable crime, efface its consequences, implore pardon for guilty and furthermore provide a splendid triumph for the church.

"After mature thought and deliberation we have decided to permit and exhort you and all priests to celebrate for our intention on Passion Sunday of this year a second mass which will be the votive mass for the remission of sins, unless this mass must be said for the intention of the bishop or the people.

"Those who for any reason do not use this privilege shall say the mass of the Sunday and at least earnestly commend our intention to God during the eucharistic sacrifice.

"Since the faithful, in keeping with their reciprocal ties as members of the mystical body of Christ, should always share the sorrows and joys of the church, let them be invited by you to the altars on that Sunday in as great number as possible, and as they ponder over the gravity and the importance of the hour let them pray and beseech God with greater fervor, and let them all receive Holy Communion.

"We have no doubt that you will all comply with our wishes the greatest zeal and devotion imploring God with united prayers that evils may be removed, and that the breath of divine charity may renew all things in Christ and thus happily realize the universal desire for peace. Finally, filled with confidence that our desires will be fully realized, to you and to the beloved priests and faithful confided to your vigilant care who in keeping with the duty we have explained will prove their love for their brethren, we impart the apostolic benediction as a pledge of divine grace."

The Atomic Bomb and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important matters the Eighty-first Congress will have to consider is that of increased facilities of the Panama Canal, or an alternative or supplemental Isthmian waterway; or all these. The entire subject is one that should receive the most earnest and comprehensive thought of our membership. A solemn duty is thus imposed, and the Congress should be accordingly governed. Speaking for myself I have read and studied, with much interest, various writings and documents on the subject; and, as a result, I must say that I have been unable to reach the judgment that the so-called sea-level project at Panama is the solution of the pending problems. Unless that type of construction will, indeed, assure protection against atomic bomb attack, it seems to me that, with the largely increased cost occasioned thereby, together with treaty angles which seem never to have been considered in the formal recommendations on the subject, it will be an utter waste of money to construct such a canal; and even with the added cost disregarded, there must be serious doubt as to whether this type would serve navigational needs as well as the present lake-lock system—especially so if the Pacific locks are all united at Miraflores.

Much has been recently published in technical magazines and other publications to the effect that the vulnerability of the Panama Canal to atomic-bomb attack demands a new canal at sea level. None of these articles which I have read have sufficiently dealt with the question from the viewpoint of strategic planning. A most informative discussion of this feature, by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson, United States Army engineers, was published in the January–February 1949 edition of the Military Engineer, an authoritative technical periodical.

In this article General Robinson does not deal specifically with the Panama Canal or other Isthmian water route, but he does develop the subject of atomic destructiveness in enough detail to lead to the inevitable conclusion that an atomic attack would be catastrophic to any type of canal which could be constructed at Panama, or elsewhere. He emphasizes that because of the scarcity of basic material for the manufacture of these bombs, strategic planners cannot afford to waste such bombs on targets whose destruction would not have far-reaching consequences in a war. He also points out that the basis for the military strength of the United States is industrial production, the destruction of which would be the first objective of an atomic attack on our Nation.

I would urge that all Members of Congress—and our citizens, generally—read and consider this timely and informative contribution on the subject, and to weigh what is thus stated by one so well qualified to speak on the subject of the atomic bomb.

In this connection reference is made to the discussion of the like subject by Gen. Leslie R. Groves—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix, page A169.

INDUSTRIAL VULNERABILITY TO BOMBING

(By C. F. Robinson, major general, U. S. Army)

World War II made it obvious to all that the basis of military operations in modern war is industrial. Armed forces are no stronger than the production which supports them. On the other hand, air power in that conflict, culminating in the atomic bomb, made it possible for the first time in the history of warfare, to attack directly on a substantially destructive scale the factories which are the source of military power. The manufacturing system of a nation has become the primary military target. New and improved weapons, developed since the war, and the potential weapons of the future, serve only to emphasize these lessons. They introduce a new factor into the national security of the United States—the problem of industrial vulnerability to enemy bombing.[1]

This problem is both serious and complex. Its solution may well have a major bearing on our survival in any future war. It concerns the great majority of the industrial plants in the country. It has profound economic and social implications. However, the atomic bomb is still a finite weapon and the problem is not hopeless. While no complete solution is probable, a practical approach which would do much to produce industrial security can be evolved.

The problem of industrial vulnerability to bombing is receiving attention in the appropriate agencies of the Federal Government, in the National Military Establishment, and the National Security Resources Board which is charged with the responsibility of strategic relocation by the National Security Act of 1947. The latter has recently issued a pamphlet on the subject.[2] Regardless of any governmental steps, the problem is primarily one which requires for its solution the full appreciation of its importance by and the cooperative action of, private business. It is high time that the industrial corporations of the United States give this factor in our national security, which may well have a direct bearing on their own future, the attention which it deserves.

In assaying our industrial vulnerability there are four major factors: (1) The likelihood of war, (2) the characteristics of bombs, (3) the means of delivering bombs to their targets, and (4) the capabilities of any potential enemy. Much information with respect to these factors is secret. However, a full technical knowledge of them is not essential to the development of a practical industrial approach to the problem. This paper is not the proper place for a discussion of the first factor, other than to note that the possibilities of war are such as to prevent any dismissal of the problem. With respect to weapons, only the atomic bomb need be considered, because any protective

[1] This paper deals only with industrial vulnerability. Equally important problems are presented in the protection of urban concentrations, civilian populations, and public utilities.

[2] National Security Factors in Industrial Location, issued by the National Security Resources Board, Washington, D. C., September 1948.

measures adaptable to it will undoubtedly meet the requirements of less powerful bombs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ATOMIC BOMB

For the purposes of this paper, the two major characteristics of the atomic bomb are its destructive power and the complexities of its manufacture.

The important destructive effects of the atomic explosions that have occurred to date, as publicly released, are given in the following table:

Destructive effect	*Approximate area or radius*
Severe structural damage:	
Reinforced concrete buildings [1] ---feet--	2,000
Heavy steel-frame buildings [1] ---sq. miles--	1.8
One-story light-steel buildings [1] ---sq. miles--	3.4
Nine-inch brick walls [1] -ft--	5,000
One-story brick buildings [1] ---feet--	7,700
Multi-story brick buildings [1] ---feet--	5,700
Wood residential buildings [1] ---sq. miles--	6.0
Wood-frame industrial or commercial buildings [1] sq. miles--	10.0
Plaster [2] ---feet--	9,000
Windows ---do---	12,000
Roofs [2] ---miles--	2
Fires started ---feet--	10,000
Human casualties: [3]	
100 percent---feet--	Up to 3,000
50 percent---do---	3,000 to 4,500
15 percent---do---	4,500 to 7,500
1 to 2 percent---do---	7,500 to 9,000
Few, if any---do---	Over 9,000

[1] United States Strategic Bombing Survey.
[2] United States Senate hearings before Special Committee on Atomic Energy.
[3] Report on Civil Defense, Office of Secretary of Defense.

In attempting to judge the destructive effects of any possible future atomic bombing there are a number of uncertain factors. The height above the ground at which the bomb is exploded probably has a direct bearing on the area or radius of damage, particularly with reference to destruction resulting from penetrating radiation and radiant heat in comparison with blast. Likewise, explosions under the ground or under water would have divergent results. As in all new weapons, there are, of course, important possibilities of improved bombs of larger size and greater power than those exploded at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It should be remembered, however, that blast decreases in proportion to the cube of the distance from the source, and radiant energy in proportion to the square of the distance.

It seems reasonably safe to conclude that the maximum radius of severe destruction from one atomic bomb may well be limited to approximately 3 miles and will not exceed 5 miles, with the possible exception of radioactive particles carried to a greater distance by air currents. This gives a clue to a practical course of action to reduce vulnerability.

Substantial production of atomic bombs requires huge quantities of electrical power and large industrial plants with a multiplicity of highly technical equipment. It puts a severe drain on the scientific and technological skill, strategic and critical materials, and highly specialized manufacturing of any country. The major and unique raw material in the manufacture of atomic bombs, uranium, so far has not been found in abundance. In any future war the supply of atomic bombs will not be unlimited. This means that the results to be expected from their use must be commensurate with their availability and cost in national resources. Strategic planners must follow this general criteria in the selection of targets for atomic bombing and cannot afford to waste bombs on targets whose destruction will not have an extremely important and far-reaching effect on the course of the war.

CARRIERS

To date atomic bombs have been delivered to their targets by aircraft of the heavy bomber type. The effective operational range of such aircraft is still limited and presently not such as to permit wide scale intercontinental bombing. Bases relatively near the target areas are still a necessity for launching sustained bombing attacks. But little comfort can be drawn from this fact, because the range of conventional aircraft is continually on the increase. Other means of delivering atomic bombs, such as rockets and guided missiles, with inherently greater potentialities, can be expected in the future.

CAPABILITIES OF THE ENEMY

The best intelligence indicates that our major potential enemy does not now have an atomic bomb or means of delivering such a bomb any better, if as good as, our own. The best estimates indicate that it will be several years before that nation can produce them in quantity and develop the carriers to launch them from great distances. Any war in the immediate future will probably not entail sustained bombing attacks, atomic or otherwise, on the continental United States. There may well be sporadic raids. But we cannot afford to rely on this temporary situation. There are no inherent factors to prevent an unfriendly power from developing to the full atomic weapons and their most effective carriers. It would be the height of folly not to assume that it is vigorously attempting to do so. The time required to complete any effective measures to reduce our industrial vulnerability is so long that we cannot start too soon. The potential risks are great. The respite of the next few years should be used to full advantage in meeting them.

METHODS OF REDUCING VULNERABILITY

There are four major methods of reducing industrial vulnerability to bombing: (1) Military operations, (2) underground facilities, (3) structural protection, and (4) dispersion.

Military operations against bombing involve the interception of bomb carriers in flight before reaching the target areas; action against the bases from which the carriers are launched; and destruction of logistic and industrial facilities supporting the enemy's bombing offense. This is a problem for the armed forces. However, it must be noted that full reliance cannot be placed on military operations alone to protect us from possible bombing. In spite of the best efforts of the armed forces the tactics and techniques so far developed or foreseeable cannot be expected to prevent all carriers from getting through to the targets. The development of carriers other than piloted aircraft will make interception even more difficult.

UNDERGROUND FACILITIES

In considering the possibilities of underground industrial facilities as a protection against bombing, the German experience of World War II is an available guide.[3]

Allied strategic bombing was so disrupting to German industrial production in the last year of the war that it caused the Germans to embark, in the summer of 1944, upon a broad program of placing important war industries underground. The Germans did not succeed, however, in getting substantial production from underground plants before the war ended.

The original mistake was overestimating the effectiveness of air defense and underestimating the power of allied air attack. New plants cannot be constructed and production transferred to new sites overnight. The Germans should have started moving underground at least 3 years earlier. By the time the Germans started to dig on a broad basis, it was too late. The time to prepare underground sites is before, not during, a war.

The Germans had proceeded to the point where they believed that it was practical to place almost any type of industry underground. The greatest difficulties in doing so were in chemicals and power. The major German underground effort was in synthetic oil, aircraft, ammunition, and V-bombs. Production underground could generally be maintained at the same standards and costs as above ground. There were no outstanding adverse effects on workers. The initial cost of underground plants were, except in rare cases, in excess, and often greatly in excess, of such costs for comparable plants on the surface. On the other hand, maintenance and operating costs were not unfavorable and sometimes less than such costs for above-ground installations.

The great majority of the German underground plants were in existing mines, caves, cellars, and tunnels. These generally were hasty, crude improvisations. They went to show, however, that the highly complex equipment of modern war can, when necessary, be produced under conditions which are almost primitive.

From their study of the problem of underground facilities the Germans concluded that it was better to build a few large centralized underground factories, especially designed for the specific products in question, and as self-contained as possible, than to scatter production in a number of small, dispersed, underground units. To do so minimized maintenance and production costs, permitted better supervision, and tended to overcome transportation difficulties. The fact that the German practice in those plants which got into operations was generally the opposite was because the Germans started too late and had to improvise in hastily remodeled existing sites.

But finally, and most important, the German experience indicated that underground plants were not a complete answer to maintaining war production under heavy air attack. While the underground plants themselves were not effectively damaged by bombing, the lines of communications leading to and from the plants were disrupted and in many cases knocked out by persistent and repeated attack thus slowing down or completely stopping production. The minister of armament and war production, Albert Speer, questioned the desirability of the entire underground program and thought it was a waste of materials and manpower for this reason. The vulnerability of the transportation facilities was so great that many responsible Germans admitted that persistent bombing of the railroads could have paralyzed industry even if the dispersal and underground program had been completed.

Applying this German experience to our larger and more complex industrial system, the conclusion is that going underground does not offer a general solution to the problem of reducing industrial vulnerability in the United States. Even if underground facilities were a completely effective protection against atomic bombing (which it is not—because of the problems of ingress and egress, of protection of workers outside working hours, and of protection of transportation to and from underground factories, and even if the problems of maintaining comparable production volume, standards, and operating costs could be satisfactorily solved, going underground would still not be a practical solution on a broad scale. The time, money, labor, materials, and equipment required for placing any substantial proportion of our industrial capacity underground would be enormous. It could not possibly be fi-

[3] See German Underground Installations by Maj. Gen. C. F. Robinson in the Military Engineer for November 1947.

nanced privately but would necessitate large governmental subsidies. The diversion of such large quantities of labor and materials from normal demand to a broad industrial rebuilding program would undoubtedly necessitate governmental allocations and controls. Such a program would have a far-reaching disruptive effect on our entire economy.

This does not mean, however, that there is no place for underground facilities in a general program for the reduction of industrial vulnerability. The extra protection which underground facilities would offer under special conditions, probably would warrant the effort and cost of placing underground certain highly important military and other governmental installations, such as those used for the manufacture or storage of atomic bombs themselves. Likewise, plants of certain highly sensitive industries, such as optics, precision instruments, aircraft engines, may well warrant underground consideration. In some cases it might be economical to go underground for normal peacetime operations, because of possible savings in maintenance and operating costs, particularly in manufacturing processes that require controlled air conditions of cleanliness, temperature, and humidity. In other cases Government assistance in connection with costs over and above normal surface facilities would be in order.

The underground phase of industrial protection against bombing is, therefore, highly selective, based on military importance, economic factors, and the solution of the engineering problems inherent in such facilities.

STRUCTURAL PROTECTION

The experiences at Nagasaki and Hiroshima indicate possibilities of importance in the development of structural characteristics that will tend to minimize the destructive effect of atomic bombs. Reinforced concrete buildings, as could be expected, withstood the blast effect much better than brick or wood frame buildings. Many materials served as a protection from the radiant heat generated by the explosions. While no feasible structural designs of surface facilities probably will be of much protective value near the center of an atomic explosion, it does appear that a great deal may be done structurally to reduce the destructive effect at greater distances. Here is a new field for engineering experimentation and design. Any additional costs resulting from the introduction of this new factor into the design of structures probably should not be so great as to be prohibitive. The adoption of properly developed minimum structural standards based on the characteristics of the atomic bomb, in the design of future industrial facilities should be one phase of a well-rounded program to reduce vulnerability. In special cases of highly important plants and industries which are likely to be bottlenecks in any future war production, standards higher than the minimum probably would be warranted.

DISPERSION

The finite characteristics of the atomic bomb with respect to its destructive power and limitations on its manufacture, coupled with the strategic necessity of selecting targets for its use, whose destruction will give results commensurate with the cost and availability of the bomb, gives the main clue to a practical, general solution to the problem of reducing industrial vulnerability. In any strategic objective, the advantage sought must be weighed against the cost of attaining it in men, equipment, and energy.

Dispersion, therefore, appears to be the best answer. While it is a negative and not an absolute protection, it would seem the most feasible course to pursue here in the United States. Furthermore, this approach takes advantage of a trend already under way to decentralize many industrial operations for economic and social reasons.

The major value of atomic weapons in any future war will be that of destroying or crippling the industrial production vital to the support of a war effort. A high concentration of essential war industry in a relatively small area will constitute the best target for atomic attack. Single plants in an area of approximately 5 square miles probably will not be militarily or economically feasible targets unless they are of decisive importance to the Nation's capacity to wage war. Geographic locations within the United States because of its remoteness from bases, from which a potential enemy can launch atomic weapons, is not the important factor. While there are, of course, degrees of vulnerability from this standpoint, the continued and anticipated development of increased range of carriers of the atomic bomb make geographic location of slight reliance for the future. The important factor from the standpoint of any single industrial plant is the number of other essential facilities within a radius of 3 to 5 miles of the plant. If they are numerous, the plant is located in a highly vulnerable area which constitutes a potential target. If there are none, there is a very low degree of vulnerability for the plant in question, unless, as mentioned above, it is one of decisive importance to a war effort.

In applying the principle of dispersion as described above, there are, of course, practical limitations.

It is manifestly impossible to embark on a wholesale program of relocating all the plants in the United States which are now situated in potential target areas, just as it is impractical to put them underground. One has only to consider the men, money, materials, and disruption of production that would be involved in attempting to remove the concentration of steel production in Pittsburgh or automotive manufacture in Detroit.

In the general case, the principle of dispersion as a practical matter is applicable to new plants, replacements, and expansions. New plants and equipment in the United States are amounting annually to from $12,000,000,000 to $14,000,000,000. Much of it is being located in highly concentrated industrial areas of high vulnerability to bombing and constituting important potential targets. Approached from a sound economic and engineering standpoint, these new installations could and should be located in areas of little vulnerability.

There are certain high concentrations of vital war industries which should be treated as special cases. These involve a high percentage of total United States productive capacity of an essential commodity located in one vulnerable area. They should receive special study and, if warranted, existing capacity should be dispersed to other less vulnerable locations. In many of these cases Government subsidy would be required.

In locating new, replacement, or expansion facilities, the usual factors of economic feasibility, such as sources of labor, materials, water, fuel and power, transportation, markets, and distribution facilities, must be considered. To these, now, must be added the strategic factor. The introduction of this new factor does not in any way lessen the importance of economic advantages in plant location. Generally, the economic and strategic will not be found incompatible and it will be possible to accomplish both ends. When a comprehensive survey of prospective locations is made, several economically feasible sites will be found and the factor of relative vulnerability among them should be decisive in the final selection.

Through a gradual process of the proper location of new facilities a considerable degree of industrial security can be obtained in the United States. The great bulk of it should and can be financed by private enterprise. Any additional costs (which should be slight) resulting from the introduction of the strategic factor in industrial location should be considered as another form of insurance.

SUMMARY

In spite of its enormous destructive power, the atomic bomb is still a finite weapon. The scarcity of its basic material and the complexities of its manufacture limit its availability in any war in the foreseeable future, thus imposing on the strategic planner the necessity of using it only where the anticipated results will be the greatest and in proportion to its cost. This establishes a pattern for reducing industrial vulnerability to its possible use against the United States.

While there is no positive or absolute protection, (short of the establishment of an international situation that will forever outlaw war) an effective and practical program for reducing industrial vulnerability can be developed. Such a program should center around the dispersion of new and replacement plants and expansions, coupled with the adoption of general minimum structural standards and designs to alleviate the destructive effects of the bomb; and, in special cases where the critical importance to a possible future war effort warrants, supplemented by going underground, relocation of highly concentrated and potential bottleneck industries, and use of maximum protective structural designs.

While governmental assistance will be required in many specific cases, such a program is primarily one for private industry. The manufacturing companies of the country should take the initiative, at least in the dispersion of new plants and protective structural design. In so doing they should enlist the assistance of the best engineering talent available in the field. Every large corporation should make a survey of the location of its existing and proposed plants from the strategic standpoint and on the basis of it evolve and initiate a plan for reducing their vulnerability to bombing. The possible dangers to the very existence of such corporations as well as the security of the Nation as a whole demands such a course of action.

Way of the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent column by the widely known writer on health subjects, Mr. Albert Deutsch, as published in the February 3 issue of the New York Post.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association is presently having some difficulty in persuading its members to contribute $25 a head to an educational fund of the AMA. Dr. Fishbein is one of those who literally takes the lobbyists' registration title of the Reorganization Act as a license for unrestrained lobbying; but some doctors do not feel that their licenses extend so far.

In this column, Mr. Deutsch, in his usual penetrating style, points out some of the AMA inconsistencies which have instigated that rebellion against the Fishbein authority.

WAY OF THE AMA

(By Albert Deutsch)

Dr. Morris Fishbein, factotum of the American Medical Association, has not only decried national health insurance as a Red conspiracy, he has denounced old age and unemployment insurance as a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism. When United States Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER in 1939 introduced a bill authorizing Federal aid for hospital construction—a principle adopted 5 years later when Congress passed the Hill-Burton Act with AMA approval—Dr. Fishbein applied a thick coat of red paint to it.

In an address delivered to a conference of State medical society officials on behalf of the AMA board of trustees, Dr. Fishbein warned:

"The introduction into this Nation of a Federal security plan whereby the Nation itself, as a Federal agency, will step intimately into the sickness and life of every person in the country will be the first step in the break-down of American democracy. Indeed, all forms of compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment, represent a beginning invasion by the State into the personal life of the individual, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism."

Both Dr. Fishbein and the AMA would now be enjoying a far more respectful lay audience if they hadn't cried wolf at virtually every progressive step in the organization and distribution of medical services during the past generation.

Organized medicine opposed workmen's compensation laws as inroads on medical freedom when they were first introduced in State legislatures. Now the medical societies not only accept workmen's compensation; they control the medical end in most States.

In 1932, when the committee on the costs of medical care—headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, a former president of the AMA and Secretary of the Interior in Herbert Hoover's administration—released a report favoring voluntary (private, nonprofit) health insurance for the American people, Dr. Fishbein printed an editorial in the AMA Journal denouncing the report as representing socialism and communism—inciting to revolution. When the same distinguished committee advocated group medical practice—where general physicians and specialists pool their skills and equipment under one roof, as at the Mayo Clinic—the AMA charged it with trying to set up medical soviets.

Now, of course, the AMA hierarchy not only enthusiastically advocates voluntary health insurance but it talks as if it fathered the idea. Group practice, too, has become quite acceptable to the hierarchs.

And so it goes. Rarely has a progressive step in medical economics been proposed without the AMA attacking it as certain to deteriorate the quality of medical care, enslave the American physician and dupe the American public. Time after time, following the adoption of a plan thus opposed, the AMA has embraced it as its own and proudly proclaimed that "American medical care is the finest in the world."

The test of a truly scientific attitude is its power of predictability. When the AMA and its state and local satellites have been proven so wrong so often in the past, they lose claim to scientific objectivity in the field of medical economics. Their present attacks on President Truman's health insurance program can be understood properly only in the light of their past mistakes. The medical bourbons never learn and they never forget.

New York Medicine, official organ of the AMA's biggest local affiliate, the New York County Medical Society, broke out in a rash of unaccustomed editorial candor in its January 5 issue when it confessed:

"Ten years ago there was in the medical profession an indiscriminate condemnation of any participation in non-profit, voluntary prepayment medical care insurance plans.

"Twenty years ago, the same standard attitude was taken when Governor Smith advocated the medical provisions of the workmen's compensation law. In both instances, the medical profession, as is to be expected, incurred public suspicion of self-interest. Allowing for a reasonable number of exceptions, this generalization is a safe one."

Substitute for "medical profession" the more accurate term "organized medicine"—and there you have it.

Rebellion to Tyrants Is Obedience to God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 6, 1949, designated as "Cardinal Mindszenty Prayer and Protest Day" His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman delivered a sermon not only to those who reverently sat before him in Saint Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, but to a country, and indeed a world, that were horrified at the persecution of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, by the Communists in Hungary. Perhaps no words uttered in recent times have so unified Americans, whatever their religious beliefs as have the ringing words of this beloved prelate of the Roman Catholic Church and distinguished American patriot, Cardinal Spellman.

Under leave granted me by unanimous consent, I include herein the sermon of Cardinal Spellman:

REBELLION TO TYRANTS IS OBEDIENCE TO GOD

"A new god has come to you, my people. His fiery eyes do not flash through clouds of incense or from altar candles. They do not gleam from gold-framed darkened pictures of saints. This new god is not a stone statue worn smooth by the kisses of the faithful—he was not born in heaven. He is not far away, nor is he hidden from us. The new god is born from earth and blood—he strides ahead and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west—this is the Red god. The Seine shudders at his impact and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House. Hosanna! New god."

My dear friends, you know these words are not mine. They are the words of an Hungarian Communist, words that echo the thoughts of men depraved and deranged—men who do not know truth, love, justice, or faith—men, who as their gods know only Satan and Stalin. Yes, these lines come from the pen of a Satan-bred man and are taught to the youth of Red-enshackled lands—lands where everybody is afraid of everybody else, where even a son fears his father and fathers fear their own blood-sons, as all become serfs and victims of the relentless god of Baal.

Yes, the blasphemous lines I have just quoted to you are wild words, but they are wild words of warning and, unless we listen well and realize that we must counteract them by concerted, constant prayer and action—then these words but foretell America's and the whole world's doom.

May 8, 1945—VE-day. On that day I delivered from this pulpit my prayer of thanksgiving for the victory of the hour, begging peace with justice, beseeching that as victors we do not offend God by sinning against His mercy. The peace that came was not God's peace, and because in the ensuing postwar years men's hearts have not been won back to God, I must this day as a protest against the crucifixion of humanity entreat your prayers for persecuted, tortured, victimized Cardinal Mindszenty.

This is Cardinal Mindszenty day—a day of prayer and of protest. Prayer for what? Protest against what? There is no use to try to save Cardinal Mindszenty's life, for from the very hour he was taken away in the black of night from his home, his flock, his aged mother, Cardinal Mindszenty became the victim of torturings and druggings that put him beyond the reach or realm of human help. It was he himself who said to me when he was my honored guest less than 2 years ago: "My enemies can take from me no more than my life and that has already been given to God." No, the physical Cardinal Mindszenty can no longer be saved. It is the spiritual Cardinal Mindszenty in his martyrdom of mind and body that we can fortify by our prayers, that in his soul he may know that in another part of the world other men are holding high God's torch of justice for Hungary's anguished peoples and the enslaved peoples of every land. And in our own dear land each free man and woman must protect and fight to keep his own integrity of conscience, his own God-given freedoms, and exert every effort to save America and the rest of the democratic, God-loving world from trickery, torturings, disaster, and defeat. For if we fail to learn a lesson from Cardinal Mindszenty's martyrdom, we shall fail ourselves and ourselves face Communist conquest and annihilation.

When first Cardinal Mindszenty answered the call of Christ, "Come, follow me," to that day when only 2 years ago with 30 other priests and myself, he was received into the Sacred College of Cardinals, he has lived a life full and priestly. Then we rededicated our hearts, our souls, our lives to God, the propagation of our faith, and the perpetuation of Christ's church. And only 3 days ago Cardinal Mindszenty—priest of a people who love, honor, trust, and revere him, was brought to mock trial for his life, even though his life had already been signed away by the lords of communism, men among whom there is no honor, love, or trust, either for one another, for their neighbor, or their God. Thus has the symbolic red of his cardinal's robes literally become the blood red of martyrdom.

Had I a hundred tongues, a hundred mouths, a voice of iron, I could not compass all the crimes of the men of sin as they wage war against the Man of Sorrows; neither can I recount the miseries perpetrated by these slave-men, crimes which it is neither in my personal power to relieve or prevent. Nevertheless so long as my heart beats and breath lingers in my body, I shall never cease to pray and labor to protect America, and warn and work against communism and all the evils growing from out its rotted roots, for I believe that rebellion to tryants is obedience to God.

While a whole world waged war and tragically talked of peace, I witnessed the sufferings of men in a world trapped by fear, famine, and madness called communism. It was then that I resolved to try to pour into the minds of every American a sense of great gratitude to God for our freedom, our liberties, our opportunities, and instill within those minds the realization of the imminent dangers of atheistic communism to America. And I avow that unless the whole American people, without further ostrich-like actions and pretenses unite to stop the Communist floodings of our own land, our sons, for the third and last time, shall be summoned from the comforts, tranquillity, and love of their own homes and families to bear arms against

those who would desecrate and destroy them. Yea, it is full time that a strong and vigilant America unite in prayer and protest against wasting the youth of her own Nation, and try to help save civilization from the world's most fiendish, ghoulish men of slaughter, lest the anguished spending of a million lives will end again in war's beginning.

Therefore, I beg you, my beloved people, let us not confuse prudence with lack of vision, unity, courage, and strength as we watch nation after nation fall victim to communism, for prudence is often but an excuse for silence, procrastination, and compromise. Even today as we read newspaper releases from the Communist-controlled press of Budapest that tell us contradictory stories about a cardinal-priest who, so little time ago, we took unto our own hearts and homes, millions of Americans refuse to recognize that we ourselves are faced with these same merciless dangers.

You have all seen pictures of Cardinal Mindszenty in the newspapers at his mock trial in his own country. And all of you saw pictures of Cardinal Mindszenty when, a free man, he sat kindly, willingly, for his picture in America. Can you fail to see here a man tortured and drugged—even though the Communist press dares to print that he denies duress? The Communists believe the American public is still easy to fool, willing to be drugged into believing whatever leaves them their own comforts, their own freedoms.

But are we, the American people, the tools and the fools for which the Communists take us? Are we always to endure the insults and wounds they inflict upon our American honor and decency as they enslave countries and persecute peoples, as they inflict wounds and beatings upon decent, God-loving men and patriots like Cardinal Mindszenty; for when the cardinal confessed to treason against the present Communist government in Hungary he but professed his loyalty to his country. If this be treason—to deny allegiance to an atheistic Communist government—then thank God Cardinal Mindszenty confessed to treason—as would I—if this free land of America were ever conquered by the demoniac people now using every foul means to overthrow our Republic.

How long are we free-minded, fair-minded, freedom-loving Americans going to allow these same fiendish Communists to drug us with their propaganda and our own apathy? When will the American Government, the American public, the leaders in all phases of American life, religious, educational, political, labor, industrial, communications, yes, and in entertainment, when will all free men raise their voices as one and cry out against and work against Satan-inspired Communist crimes? How long—O my God—shall we stand by and see Thy peoples who love Thee reviled, persecuted, and murdered by atheistic Communists who deny Thee and hate Thee even as again and again they crucify Thee upon Thy Cross? Cardinal Mindszenty's jailers gave him drugs—perhaps without his knowledge. They did not want another hero like Archbishop Stepinac. No, not another martyr would they have in Cardinal Mindszenty. They would break his will and show him to his people broken, weak, and faithless. That is why they took Cardinal Mindszenty away in the night because the first time he was arrested by the Nazis, he walked through the streets with his captors, daring to bless his people with the Sign of the Cross as they lined the streets to pray for him and beg his prayers for themselves who would, they knew, also be persecuted, abused, and slain.

Yet we should not grieve at the death of Cardinal Mindszenty, for man is not completely born until he dies to live in God. No, let us not be sorrowful nor tearful for him—but rather for one whom I pray God to take unto Himself 'ere her heart be more deeply pierced by anguish for her saintly son. I speak of Cardinal Mindszenty's 85-year-old mother. Like unto Mary, our own Blessed Mother, who was witness to the passion of her only Son, this mother's cross is far heavier than her son's. I pray that God shall raise this gentle mother into the arms of His own Mother Mary, there to be pressed close to the Sacred Heart of Christ, her Son—there, at least, to find peace.

In closing my plea for your prayers and protests on behalf of Cardinal Mindszenty, let me tell you a story that will, I believe, touch your hearts just as it touched a spark within my own when first I heard it. It is a story that I heard told by an American of another faith, a Jewish gentleman whose parents emigrated from a country which was then, as now it is again, held in bondage.

"My parents came to these shores about 70 years ago," this gentleman said. "They left behind them an old world filled with bitter hatreds and ruled by despotism. Here they found a new world filled with wondrous things—freedom, justice, opportunity, kindliness. Not things you could touch or eat but—when you've never had them before—things that are more real than a pair of shoes or even a loaf of bread. As long as they lived they never stopped wondering at the glory of America. They were two of the best Americans I've ever known.

"Seventy years ago, they came here with nothing but the clothes on their backs and great courage. Today their boy," this gentleman continued, "is speaking before a gathering of the leaders of America. In one generation our family moved from steerage to distinction. That is not one man's story," he added, "it is the American story. Multiply it a million times or more for every race, creed, and color, and you begin to sense the miracle of America."

And this, my friends, is the America I beg Americans to save.

President Truman's Problems—Radio Address by Hon. James W. Gerard, Our Wartime Ambassador to Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in the turmoil of our country's international relations and the uncertainty of our Nation's future, it is reassuring to have the advice and caution of one of our business leaders and experienced diplomats, an upstanding American who faced the German Kaiser and the German militarist in the tragic days that preceded the First World War.

I esteem it a privilege to present for the consideration of my colleagues and the American people a penetrating analysis of present trends in our national affairs by a great American citizen, Hon. James W. Gerard, of New York:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROBLEMS

(Text of broadcast by the Honorable James W. Gerard)

Last Thursday was a day of triumph in Washington. It was also a significant day for all who ponder America's future.

President Truman, returned by a victorious vote, amused the Washingtonians by spectacles of a magnificence hitherto unknown even in that luxurious city. All the elements of a Roman triumph were present except that the Republican leaders and the beautiful female orators in golden chains did not walk behind the President's car.

Missing, too, was the impudent slave who used to kneel in the triumphal car and whose duty it was to address to the hero of the day remarks calculated to tone down his mental attitude of pride and success.

America's future salutes President Truman and congratulates him on his bold, clear, and splendid inaugural speech. He faces the troubled world with the same courage which won him his election. He deserves the help of every right-thinking American in solving the problems which face his administration. More power to him.

But as the President entered the doors of Blair House, problems awaited him as grave as any that have confronted any ruler in all the march of history. They should be the problems of every citizen who can think constructively about his own future and the future of his country.

PREDICTED BY BALZAC

One hundred years ago the great French writer, Balzac, made one of his characters predict the future as follows:

"If the people triumph," said Balzac's prophet, "they will have a St. Bartholomew of their own. When religion and royalty are crushed, the people will turn upon the great; after the great, they will strike at the rich. Finally, when Europe is no longer aught but a flock of men without cohesion, because it is without leaders, it will be consumed by vulgar conquerors. Twenty times already the world has presented that spectacle, and Europe is preparing to present it once more. Ideas devour epochs as men are devoured by their passions."

Is not all this which Balzac foresaw 100 years ago happening in our time? The weak Czar of Russia and his obstinate wife, their lovely daughters and little son were bayonetted and shot in a cellar; the Kings of Spain and Italy, Bulgaria, Albania, Portugal, Roumania, Yugoslavia, and the Emperors of Germany and Austria have lived or died in exile.

RELIGION IS DESTROYED

Religion behind the iron curtain has been practically destroyed, and the imprisonment of the Hungarian cardinal shows what religion has to expect from the satellite states of the Soviet. As for the great whose doom Balzac forecast, there are no great today. Envious, smearing publicity destroys everyone whose head appears above the mass.

In our country, as yet, the menace of communism is not feared enough. As yet there is no open revolt, but communism is advancing in many disguises. How soon will our Nation wake to find private business enterprise abolished? How soon will the American farmer, if not on a collective farm, be ruled in all his actions as he is ruled today in England? How soon will the American workers in the cities be told where and how they shall live and perform their daily tasks set by the State? How soon will the savings of the thrifty Americans be seized—savings they had hoped to enjoy in old age—and they become, as it were, mere inmates of a Nation-wide poorhouse.

Communism, which seeks to tear down everything, is born of the bitter envy stirring in the blood of the weak and unsuccessful. They seek to establish a "new order" in which all shall be slaves to the state and in which they themselves hope to be the fuehrers, the duces, the commissars or the leaders. Then they can lord it over those they formerly envied, because they will hold in their own hands not only all economic power but the power of torture and death.

In our own time, two of the vulgar conquerors foreseen by Balzac succeeded to a period of confusion in Germany and Italy.

After a brief period of vainglory and success, Hitler died with his mistress, in a double suicide, in a bombproof shelter in Berlin. And Mussolini, with his little mistress, was shot and hung up by the heels by the very populace who a few short months before had painted his name on every blank wall in Italy.

BLOOD BATH FOR POWER

In the pages of history, Communism seems always to follow war, but only in Russia has it managed to survive, and in Russia, communism has held its power only by the ruthless killing of two million intellectuals and white collar people.

In France, after the disastrous war of 1870, the Communists seized and held Paris for several months. Before their fall, they shot their so-called hostages, among them the archbishop of Paris, and sought, as troops entered Paris, to burn that beautiful city.

Still farther back, in the great French Revolution of 1793, the rich and the nobles were guillotined. In the ancient Church of Notre Dame a half-clad harlot was enthroned as the Goddess of Reason and the statue of the Virgin was thrown to the earth. Before that revolution many nobles, who had owned most of France, incurred the aversion of the people. There were good and bad nobles, but the good nobles did not organize to restrain the bad. And so, when the carts rolled up to the prisons to carry the nobles to the guillotine, the good were thrown in with the bad as food for the scaffold.

From this historical background let us examine one of President Truman's problems—a Fair Deal for capital.

With the rise of the great corporations 50 years ago no one foresaw the extent of their power or great size. Banker control was in some cases abused. There have been too many acts that can be criticized.

FACE ECONOMIC EXECUTION

Small-business men and small stockholders feared to fight banker rule as some of them now fear to fight Government rule. But all businessmen should remember that, if American industry, as a result of public resentment, is ever nationalized as in England, the good people of business will be dragged along to economic execution in the same way that the good nobles during the French Revolution were classed with the bad.

This problem which faces the President—how to assure a Fair Deal for capitalistic private enterprise—can never be resolved in the unreason of political partisanship. Communism is out to destroy private capitalism and substitute state capitalism. And communism's weapon for destroying private capitalism is destructive taxation.

The President, and the people's elected representatives in Congress, and every group that is asking something for itself, should remember that "the power to tax involves the power to destroy," and that many of the tax proposals pressed upon Congress, allegedly in the public interest, are designed to cripple and destroy the private enterprise system which has made America great and strong.

And we all should remember that courage is required, especially to fight evil disguised as good. It takes courage to fight entrenched power, whether the power of business monopoly or any other monopoly. On this subject of fear the far-seeing Woodrow Wilson wrote in his book, the New Freedom:

"Some of the biggest men in the United States in the field of commerce and manufacturing are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it."

In dealing with this problem of business monopolies, the President would do well to remember that the good large corporations are most useful in three particulars. First, in time of war their product can be easily turned from civilian to warlike production. Today, when wars can come overnight, when the world has become such a small one, this ability to convert to war production is a great benefit.

Secondly, it is only the great corporations that can spend the large sums necessary for research, for improvements, for the finding of new methods and new materials.

DEPENDENT ON CAPITAL

Thirdly, the great corporations can function in the field of foreign expansion. It is impossible for a government to drill for oil, for instance, in a foreign country. That would indeed lead to complications. It is only the great corporations with huge resources that can peacefully and legally invade the countries of the world. And that again should remind us that only the capital and the know-how of America can develop this one world so that the menace of starvation can be removed and the people of the world enjoy a decent standard of living. But foreign countries must offer and assure that capital will be treated fairly and not be taxed to death, before ou corporations and businessmen can afford to undertake this peaceful and beneficial invasion. There have been too many occasions when American capital, seeking to develop mines or oil or manufacturers in a foreign country, after the work has been once established, has been met by confiscatory taxes, if not outright expropriation.

Another great problem facing our President is that of our attitude in China. Unfortunately, our friend and ally Chiang Kai-shek has been thrown to the wolves of communism. He has been deserted by us in his moment of crisis. He is now threatened by trial by the Communists as a war criminal with all the implications contained in that threat.

DIFFICULTY IN CHINA

We have already lost face in the East. Already, by our conduct in China our hold on Korea is threatened. The least we can do is to threaten, even with the atomic bomb, the Communists of China if they should dare to harm our ally Chiang Kai-shek.

It is difficult to unify China. Many dialects and the lack of roads keep the people of scattered communities apart, but unification by the Russian-ruled Communists is now to be feared. It is a threat to the West, a danger that the almost untold millions of Chinese, disciplined and armed, might, like the armies of Genghis Khan, swarm into Europe and Germany—the point of high tide reached by the invading Mongols of centuries ago.

Those who refused to help Chiang Kai-shek when the helping could have been effective will have bitter thoughts as they sit by the fire in their old age.

I wish that I had time to discuss with you the burning problems of Germany, where I was your ambassador and gained, I believe, some knowledge of the problems we face there today. Enough heavy industry must be restored and given to the Germans to enable the population to live on their own resources. There, on the other hand, is the problem of keeping the Germans from regaining the power to wage another war of hate and conquest.

The President has a new Secretary of State, a good American, well versed in the intricacies of diplomacy and what remains of international law. May Lady Luck and Fortune, the twin goddesses of success, smile upon his administration.

I wish again to thank America's Future, Inc., for inviting me, and the American Broadcasting Co. for giving me this opportunity to address you. In England, the Government controls the radio. Its expense is paid by the tax on receiving sets and nothing goes on the air which is not approved by the Government of the day. It is fortunate that in this country the radio, the greatest power in our political and economic life, is in the hands of upright people and is free.

Waterway Improvements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the magazine Marine Progress for January 1949:

PANAMA VIEWPOINT

The current studies of the Panama Canal which are being made to determine which of the active plans will result in the best waterway has excited the interest of many engineers, ship operators, legislators, and military men. One plan calls for the construction of a sea-level canal, not necessarily along the same route as the present canal, and the other principal plan is for the elimination of Pedro Miguel locks, the creation of a terminal lake on the Pacific side, somewhat the same as Gatun Lake on the Atlantic side, and the rebuilding of the Miraflores locks into a three-flight structure capable of lowering and raising vessels 85 feet to the level of the lakes and the connecting channel.

Marine Progress has received a letter from Harry O. Cole, of Morgantown, W. Va., giving his views on this subject. Mr. Cole was the engineer in charge of construction of the Pacific side locks at Miraflores and Pedro Miguel. His letter follows:

"EDITOR, MARINE PROGRESS.

"DEAR SIR: I congratulate you for the splendid article entitled 'Isthmian Plan.' I consider your article one of the most accurate, fairest, and unbiased analyzations of this vital Canal problem of any short papers I have read in recent months.

"President Truman, in transmitting to the Congress on December 1, 1947, Governor Mehaffey's report recommending the conversion of the present lock canal to sea level, at an estimated cost of $2,483,000,000, has taken the problem of redesigning of the present Canal out of the realm of engineering speculation and placed it squarely before the American people.

"My first article, dated December 18, 1947, entitled 'What Should be Done to Improve the Panama Canal?' was necessarily based on my personal knowledge gained in the construction of the present Canal and a study of the reports of the marine hazards, accidents, and difficulties encountered by ships in transiting the Canal during the past 25 years. My second article, or sequel, dated January 26, 1948, was written after I had studied the symposium papers on the sea-level project as presented to the American Society of Civil Engineers at New York City in January 1948. Of course, the symposium papers, by those who were responsible for the preparation of the governor's sea-level report, utilized all of the 3 days' time allotted to the Panama Canal at the American Society of Civil Engineers annual meeting and allowed no time for preparation or presentation of rebuttal arguments by those in opposition.

"(NOTE.—The articles referred to above were written for publications other than Marine Progress.—Editor.)

"As a consequence, at least for a few months, the public had only one side of the argument. Thanks to the press, the American people are now rapidly being shown the fallacy of undertaking to convert the present Canal to sea level.

"Up to the time I delivered my commemoration address in honor of the late Col. Sydney B. Williamson before the Panama Canal Societies at Washington on May 8, 1948, I had examined only the official report of Governor Mehaffey of December 1, 1947.

"Since my first study of the symposium papers and comparing them with statements made in my articles of December 18, 1947, and January 26, 1948, I have had opportunities to make study of some of the essential parts of the official report of the governor. These studies of additional information have not only confirmed but also have materially strengthened my first views.

"I can quote to you, here and now, with even greater degree of conviction, that which I stated in the last paragraph of my May 8 address, 'I feel it my duty to warn you and the American people that, if this so-called sea-level-conversion project is undertaken, it may prove to be the practical destruction of the Panama Canal and disruption of the world's maritime shipping, for an indefinite period of time, to say nothing of the futile and wasteful expenditure of billions of dollars and the blot on the reputation of the American engineering profession that could never be erased'."

COSTS

"For all practical purposes, it may be said, up to now, the present lake-type canal has made during the past 30 years a net profit equal to the cost of building it. It is true that there is charged against the cost of building of the canal 3 percent interest, that would, when or if paid, just about wipe out that profit and leave us where we started. Shipping interests are now clamoring for a reduction in toll charges.

"To convert the canal to sea level Governor Mehaffey's engineer consultants estimate the cost to be $2,500,000,000, and 10 years to complete. I estimate the lake-type canal cost at $1,500,000,000 and 6 years to complete; $2,500,000,000 at 3 percent interest alone equals $75,000,000—$500,000,0 at 3 percent interest equals $15,000,000—showing an annual net saving in interest alone of $60,000,000.

"This 3 percent interest saving, per annum would pay for the proposed lake-type canal improvement in about 8 years' time.

"Will shipping stand additional toll charges, to pay not the debt but 3 percent interest on $2,500,000,000? If not who would pay? Answer: The American taxpayer, of course.

A-BOMB

"You have in your article in Marine Progress, very ably shown that the recent tests at Einewetok have indicated that improvements in the atom bomb are such that no canal structure can withstand the forces of its explosion * * * as a result, any calculations that entertain the idea that the Panama Canal can be built to withstand an atom-bomb attack are at variance with the known facts and this major premise of the sea-level advocates must be abandoned.

"That statement (with which the leading atomic authorities agree) removes from further consideration practically the sole justification for building a sea-level canal. It completely nullifies the arguments by the sea-level advocates that a sea-level canal cannot be destroyed * * * even after the explosion of an atomic bomb dropped directly into the canal, traffic could be restored within a few weeks' time, provided necessary personnel and equipment were available. Imagine a statement like that being made by engineers to the American people and to the Congress."

CANAL TYPE

"Furthermore, in their endeavor to make the sea-level plan appear to be the only alternative, they submit a monstrosity of a proposal to improve the lock canal, at an estimated cost of $2,308,000,000. In that figure they have apparently included over a billion dollars for security armor. Then, finally, admit in the report, it will still not be effective for security.

"Before closing may I briefly make one further observation: I have analyzed the design for the tidal lock control works as proposed in the so-called sea-level plan. Space here will permit only the briefest outline of one phase of this fantastic layout.

"Separated from and parallel to the huge tidal control lock, 200 feet wide by 1,500 feet long, the plan calls for the construction of an open sea lane for use of shipping during quiet stages of the tide. This sea lane is to be 750 feet wide and about 80 feet deep and is to be controlled and regulated during the rapid flow of high and low tides by a huge chain gate system. The chain gate is composed of six links, each link 84 feet wide at the bottom, 132 feet long and 72 (82 feet?) high and weighs about 1,000 tons, or a total of 6,000 tons of steel. This gate is to be operated as required by tidal conditions every day in the year on steel tracks, they show, 60 feet (should be 70) below mean tide, etc.

"Now please note: There has existed in this Pacific section of sea-level canal channel ever since it was placed in operation, a constant heavy drifting silt, requiring regular dredging in order to maintain proper depth of channel for shipping. Any dredging man familiar with this silt problem in this vicinity should know how difficult or impossible it would be to keep the above-mentioned gate tracks from becoming submerged and fouled up so that these huge gates would become inoperative and useless in a short period of time because the gates are to remain open during part of each day, leaving the tracks unprotected from silt deposit.

"HARRY D. COLE."

The Hall Survey Shows About 2 to 1 in Favor of Keeping the Taft-Hartley Act on the Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, of all the great questions now before the American people, the Taft-Hartley Act still occupies first importance.

The enemies of this measure, passed by the Eightieth Congress, have branded it with every vile name they can coin. They call it the slave law of the American worker. The organized propaganda, the attempts on the part of its opponents to discredit Taft-Hartley have succeeded in drowning out most of the public praise which it has received.

Because this legislation has met with such loud lambasting from those on whose toes it stepped, I was anxious to find out, more than any other subject, just how the folks back home feel about this so-called slave bill.

While there are probably as many nonunion workers as union members in the three up-State New York Counties I represent, I would certainly not call our section antilabor. There are thousands of A. F. of L., CIO., and Railroad Brotherhood people living there, who are patriotic Americans and who voice strong sentiments for organized labor. They are vigorous, militant, and determined to oppose any and all provisions that even suggest Taft-Hartley.

Considering this complexion of my own area, you can well imagine the curiosity which prompted me to ask point blank my very first question on the Hall survey, "Do you want me to vote for or against the Taft-Hartley Act?"

An unadulterated question such as this commands a direct answer and that is what I have been getting. I have received a marvelous response, moreover, to the entire poll. I am satisfied that it is accurate by the very hugeness of its size, and no one is going to push me around or kid me that I failed to carry out the wishes of the majority when I voted for Taft-Hartley.

As loud as have come the protests from the few who claim they have been injured by this law, I have yet to have anybody point to a single specific part of Taft-Hartley and show me where it has increased labor strife, hurt the rank and file of the workers, lowered standards of work, or caused working people generally to be laid off or have their wages cut.

There is no more representative group to contact for their opinions than the enrollment and registration list of voters of my district and that is what I did. I sent ballots to everybody, regardless of party. They all had the same chance to express themselves if they were voters. And if they were not voters, what good could their opinions do anyway?

You will see by the following figures how these folks I represent feel about Taft-Hartley and what they think of my vote, which was for it. You will also observe that, while percentages of answers to some questions I asked were not clear-cut as to a decisive preponderance one way or the other, there is absolutely no question on this one. The majority obviously want the Taft-Hartley Act kept on the books and the majority is about 2 to 1. If that is not a mandate, I do not know what is.

If the Hall survey proved nothing else to me, it pointed out that people are not always swayed by the shouts and alarms that a handful of out-of-town agitators have raised against your own Congressman and his attitude toward this matter.

The story of the Taft-Hartley Act and the general opinion of the Thirty-seventh Congressional District can be found in the percentages I am here submitting:

Do you want me to vote for or against the Taft-Hartley Act?

	For	Against
Triple Cities area	63.9	36.1
Rural	64.9	35.1
Broome	64.1	35.9
City, Norwich	45.9	54.1
Rural	67.2	32.8
Chenango	58.3	41.7
Cities, Oneida and Canastota	85.6	14.4
Rural	75.0	25.0
Madison	79.6	20.4
Over-all district	63.9	36.1

In submitting this poll on the Taft-Hartley question, I repeat, everybody had the same chance to express how everybody feels about it. It is not my fault if a few were too sophisticated or afraid to let me know.

I repeat, they stand to lose as much as I do by not giving me the benefit of their views.

I repeat, nobody is pressuring me into voting one way or the other on this vital subject.

Probably some will yell to high heaven that employers put the heat on me to vote to keep Taft-Hartley. My answer to that one is that most employers have shunned this poll. Mighty few have sent in their ballots.

The same goes for labor leaders. They do not seem to want anything to do with it either and it is O. K. by me.

Perhaps with both the employers and the labor leaders generally refraining, I will get an even more accurate picture from the rank and file. That is as it should be because the rank and file are the ones I depend on for votes anyway.

Frankly, I would not know how a lot of employers stand on this matter. Nor have I gone out of my way to ask them except through the survey. If the act has benefited their status as representatives of our free enterprise system, you could not prove it by me. They have just stayed mum on the subject and certainly have not tried to sell those who are working for them on the Taft-Hartley Act.

One notable exception would be the management of Oneida, Ltd., makers of Oneida Community Plate at Oneida, N. Y.

These people have spared no time, effort, or money in painting a true picture of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill to their employees. Full-page ads and frank public relations have been featured in Oneida, Ltd.'s campaign to present the facts about the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

I have had little ostensible support from many larger employers since I have been in Congress, and that makes it all the more apparent that I never would vote for Taft-Hartley to curry favor with them. I have accepted them as everybody in America accepts them, believing they are far preferable to the commissar who might sometime take their place and really crack the whip over our working people, if free enterprise is weakened.

Certainly the labor leader has as much to fear as the worker when the commissar throws out the employer and ruins all industry just as he has behind the iron curtain.

Some have said to me, "Aren't you afraid of the attacks the left-wing out-of-town labor agitators will level at you if you dare to defend the stand you took on Taft-Hartley?"

My answer again: The Hall survey is good enough for me and it shows that I was right in my stand on five out of the six questions I asked.

The home folks backed me up on the bonus, on price controls, on oleomargarine, on the sales tax, and finally on Taft-Hartley.

All in all, I have been exonerated from far-flung newspaper attacks, from stooges who were given the public spotlight to challenge every position I took during the Eightieth Congress.

The people have spoken. They passed judgment on me personally last November in the face of these unprecedented, unbridled character defamers.

What is more important, they approved substantially nearly every public question I am fighting for and tell me they think as I do on them.

In view of Hall survey results, I see no reason why I should yield to the threats, the innuendos, the baiting of a few who have an ax to grind. I see no reason why I should surrender 1 inch of the ground I took, supported overwhelmingly by those who have time and again voted for me.

The condemnation is coming, as it always has, from the enemies of the people, from the same, irreconcilables who never have and never will back me up in any election back home even if I should survive till doomsday.

In concluding my observations, I am indebted to the excellent coverage and reporting given to the Hall survey by the daily newspapers in Binghamton.

St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sheboygan Press of February 9, 1949:

LET US ALL JOIN FOR THE SEAWAY

The Milwaukee Common Council, in adopting a resolution recommending the approval of the St. Lawrence waterway, sets the pace for other cities. Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan are doomed to continue as landlocked regions until we get this waterway.

The resolution referred to was adopted on January 17 by the Milwaukee Common Council, and it is in line with the thought of practically all of the people of Wisconsin, at least those who believe in a deep waterway which will open the doors of commerce and provide for the day of ocean-bound vessels to carry the surplus of our markets to the world.

President Truman in his state of the Union message delivered on January 5, recommended that action be taken by the Congress to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This was the occasion of five recommendations that have been made by him. In his budget message President Truman included a $20,000,000 item allocated to the Corps of Engineers for St. Lawrence seaway development. In his budget message he said:

"I again urge the Congress to give early approval to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. The navigational aspects of this project have recently assumed an increased importance as a result of the prospects for developing high-grade iron-ore deposits in Labrador. As our domestic deposits become depleted the proposed seaway will become an important link between our steel industry and this new potential source of ore. Furthermore, this dual-purpose project is needed as a source of low-cost power."

The opposition that existed heretofore on the part of Chicago, the railroads, and other interests has broken down and the recent announcement of George M. Humphrey, president of M. A. Hanna Co., was to the effect that his company had reversed its former opposition to the seaway project, which was illuminating news. Here he cited the decline of high-grade ore reserves in the Lake Superior district and the discovery of rich ore bodies in Labrador. Senators TAFT and BRICKER, of Ohio, were urged by him to give the subject a thorough review. In Mr. Hanna's statement he said:

"We now find that new facts have developed which entirely change the situation. Explorations in the last few years now definitely prove that large tonnages of high-grade iron ore exist in Quebec and Labrador which will be most beneficial for use in the steel plants of our Midwest if access is provided to them by direct cheap water transportation."

This newspaper has been committed to the deep waterway back for 25 years and we are especially pleased to announce the brighter prospects of ratification of a treaty between Canada and the United States which will make possible the building of the St. Lawrence waterway. There is another point to be made. Recently President Truman appointed Dean Acheson as Secretary of State, and Mr. Acheson is an avowed friend of the St. Lawrence Waterway and its early completion. We could quote at length from speeches he has made favorable to the landlocked regions bordering on the Great Lakes.

The resolution adopted by the Milwaukee common council or a similar one should be adopted by every common council in the state of Wisconsin; by every village and town board to the end that it will show a united front from a state that is vitally concerned with world markets. The resolution adopted in Milwaukee is so significant, so in line with the thought of the people of these regions that we reproduce it in its entirety:

"Whereas President Truman, in his State of the Union message and in his annual economic report to the Congress, strongly urged upon the Congress immediate development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, to alleviate power shortages and to furnish necessary expansion of our national transportation facilities; and

"Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project will extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Great Lakes area; will permit Milwaukee industries to import essential raw materials at low cost and, through the advantage of direct ocean service, to reach new foreign markets and to expand greatly the foreign trade of this area; and

"Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence River will provide vast quantities of low cost hydroelectric energy now running wastefully into the sea, and, in general, will enhance the economic prosperity, the industrial strength and the well-being of the entire Nation and our friendly neighbor, Canada; and

"Whereas the events of World War II demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe interior location for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials, and for construction of naval and merchant vessels—considerations which have been certified to the Congress by our most eminent military authorities; and

"Whereas the constant growth of population and industry necessitates intelligent utilization of all of our national resources and reasonable expansion of our national transportation plant; and our new international responsibilities require this Nation to rise above sectional considerations

and to develop its full potential strength in the interest of national security and world peace, which national objectives can be appreciably enhanced by the added industrial and military potential of the St. Lawrence seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee,* That we hereby reaffirm the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds such vast potentialities for the future welfare, prosperity, and security of this Nation and the entire world; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we urge his honor, the mayor and the Board of Harbor Commissioners to continue the official effort of the city of Milwaukee to bring this great project to realization; that we urge all civic groups, labor organizations, and industrial enterprises to lend their full support to this great cause; and that we urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to exert their best efforts in the Congress to assure authorization of the seaway project at the earliest possible date; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and to Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin."

The railroads have commenced to realize that they too will profit by opening the harbors on the Great Lakes to ocean-going steamers. They realize that what is stored in elevators will be moved to the markets of the world and in turn we will be able to absorb the things that we do not produce which are vital to our economy. The engineering portion of this seaway is already in process and with Congress approving we could build the seaway within a couple of years. This will bring a new day and increase not only navigation on the Great Lakes, but boost railway transportation from the point of shipment to the waterfronts.

The Public Welfare Act of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the Public Welfare Act of 1949, which is like similar bills I introduced in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. Under leave already granted me, I want to briefly explain the provisions of the bill and my reasons for sponsoring it. I am also including the text of the bill at the end of my remarks.

This bill provides the means to reach the welfare objectives outlined again and again by President Truman in his messages to Congress and most specifically in his message of May 24, 1948, on social security submitted in vain to the Eightieth Congress. This bill provides the means to carry out the clear mandate of the electorate on the Congress to make freedom from want a reality for all our people. This bill, moreover, incorporates the thinking of those who administer these functions at all levels of government and in all sections of the country, developed through their own organization, the American Public Welfare Association, as to how these objectives may best be achieved within the total social-security framework and within the American tradition.

It is not in our American tradition for people to want to seek out public aid. But it is very much in the American tradition for our people, normally self-reliant and self-supporting, to want to know that such aid is available when economic calamity, personal or social, strikes and that it is available on a decent, dignified, and adequate basis regardless of where they live, how they normally make a living, their age and family situation, their color, race or religion, or, in fact, any consideration other than the compelling fact of need itself. This is the purpose of my bill.

The contributory social insurances, dealt with in other measures, are properly the cornerstone of our social-security system. A worker can rightly take pride that he is insured against his retirement, unemployment, or premature death by reason of his own and his employer's contributions into a fund for this purpose. We urgently need to take action at once to extend this system to all working people, bring its benefit level into a reasonable relationship with the price level, and extend protection against loss of earnings due to disability and illness. I am sure the Ways and Means Committee and this Congress will wish to move quickly to fulfill the promises which have been made to the American people in this regard and to answer their hopes, too long deferred, for a real social insurance system.

But even when this is accomplished security from want will not be achieved for all people in all circumstances. A social-insurance system operates on an impersonal basis which cannot, by its very nature, provide benefits adapted to all possible situations or all individual circumstances. Moreover, no matter how far we go in extending coverage and liberalizing conditions of qualification for benefits—and I hope we will go as far in this direction as the insurance principle permits—there will still be some people outside the system: those who have already retired without acquiring insurance rights, those too ill or handicapped to work, children not dependent on a wage earner and others. These people too are demanding, and rightfully so, a form of social security which is immediate, adequate, and adapted to their needs.

This is the job of assistance. Assistance is the ultimate guaranty, government's assurance to people that when all else fails: when insurance benefits are exhausted, inadequate, or unavailable; when work is impossible and savings gone; when veterans' benefits, and union health and welfare fund provisions, and company pensions, and help from church or philanthropic agencies, and all the other ways we seek to aid each other do not meet the need, the Government will stand behind its people to keep the still-remembered specter of want and privation from the door.

Under our American system the job of administering assistance, as well as the other welfare services covered by this bill and, in fact, all public services involving a high degree of individual judgment and adaptation to individual needs, are administered by the State and local governments. But it is proper that the Federal Government should use its resources and its rightful concern with the well-being of all the people in the Nation to assist the States in this task and to extend the leadership of a Nation-wide program. We are one Nation, one economy, and one people. We must find, through measures like this one, the means to meet the needs of all our people without loss of the values of our Federal-State system.

Up to this time we have approached the problem of need on a piecemeal basis. We have provided social insurance only to persons in certain occupations and against only part of the basic economic hazards that beset them. We have extended Federal aid for assistance only to the aged, blind, and dependent children and that on a very limited basis which tends to put the least in Federal money in the areas where the need is greatest. We have provided Federal funds for child-welfare services only in rural areas and areas of special needs and that solely on a demonstration basis. It is time we recognized that need is indivisible. A man who is bed-ridden at 64 is no less needy than his able-bodied neighbor who has reached 65. A child who has been placed under the care of the welfare department by a court is no less in need than one who is still living with his own mother. The elderly woman who enters a public institution for the chronically ill is no less needy than she would have been had she been able to find a place in the all-too few private homes. The family which has fallen into destitution in a place where they lack legal residence is no less needy than the old resident. The people of the States in this country which lack large industries and other rich tax sources are no less needy than those whose accident of birth placed them in the higher-income States. It is the contention of this bill that the American people are entitled to be treated as Americans wherever they may live and that it is the right of Americans to have confidence that they will be free from the terror of hunger and the shame of degrading poverty.

Specifically this bill provides a system of comprehensive Federal aid to the States in meeting welfare needs, such aid to be proportionate to the relative fiscal capacity of the States. The welfare needs defined in the bill involve no new concepts but are simply those which are now within the area of responsibility of public-welfare agencies: cash assistance and those medical services not otherwise available to the needy, child-welfare services, and preventive-welfare services. In return for comprehensive Federal aid the States would be required in turn to take certain steps to assure a program which is available on an equitable basis to all those within their borders who need its services: the elimination of any residence, settlement, or citizenship eligibility requirements, such distribution of funds within the State as to assure equitable treatment to persons in similar circumstances, administration through a single agency at each level of government, no discrimination because of race, creed, or color, and certain other provisions to assure a fair and comprehensive program.

This bill recognizes that the need for assistance should decline as insurance

protection, full employment, health insurance and other programs for medical care serve to reduce dependency to a minimum. The role of public welfare should itself be increasingly preventive and most of its present difficulties spring from the fact that it is having to pay the price in staggering assistance loads for our failure to enact other measures to prevent dependency and give it the resources to stress this part of its function. Public welfare should be the means through which an increasingly complex and frequently impersonal government approaches the special needs of particular adults, families, and children on an individual basis. Assistance places a floor under need, and welfare services help to prevent need, assist people to meet their own problems, and extend protection and aid to children.

In presenting this bill I would like to stress the fact that I do not claim that each of its specific provisions is the only possible way of gaining these objectives. On the contrary I am hopeful that in hearings and in discussion generally these proposals will stimulate a full and free exploration of all the problems involved so that Congress may finally enact legislation which incorporates the best thinking on the subject from all sources. I am well aware, for example, that the problem of equalizing Federal aid among the States is a complex one and that the formula incorporated in this bill is not the only possible way, or even necessarily the best way, to achieve this objective. I am well aware likewise that it may not be practical to extend Federal aid without some limiting maximum provisions. These and other practical problems are questions to be worked out in committee in the light of the total range of social security amendments and the total fiscal picture. I have endeavored in this bill to spell out objectives and certain ways to reach those objectives. Specifically this bill proposes a new title XIV to the Social Security Act which would replace the present assistance and child welfare provisions with the following:

First. Federal financial aid would be available not only for the needy aged, blind, and dependent children as at present but for all needy persons.

Second. Welfare services for adults, families, and children could be included in the public welfare program, and child welfare services could include foster care, temporary institutional care, and services needed to supplement home care.

Third. Federal financial aid would be extended to the States on a basis ranging from 50 to 75 percent of total expenditures, depending on the relative per capita income of the States.

Fourth. Standards of assistance would be determined by the States on a basis of individual need and resources but in such a way as to assure equitable treatment to persons in similar circumstances throughout the State. Standards of assistance would be left to the States without maximum limitations specified in the Federal act.

Fifth. Needy persons requiring medical care would be able voluntarily to enter public medical institutions, other than those for tuberculosis or mental illness, without loss of assistance as at present if the institutions met standards established by the State.

Sixth. Welfare agencies would be authorized to make payment for medical and hospital services furnished assistance recipients directly to the individual or an institution furnishing such care rather exclusively through a cash payment to the recipient as at present.

Seventh. Residence requirements and required transfer of property to the State during the lifetime of the recipient would be prohibited.

Eighth. Administration through a single agency at each level of government would be required.

Ninth. This program is extended to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The bill follows:

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Public Welfare Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. Effective July 1, 1949, the Social Security Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XIV—COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC WELFARE PROGRAM

"PURPOSE

"SEC. 1401. (a) The Congress finds and declares that a public-welfare program is an essential part of the social-security system in promoting the security and welfare of the people of the United States.

"(b) The purpose of this title is to enable each State, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, to develop a comprehensive public-welfare program of assistance and welfare services for families, adults, and children; to make assistance available to all needy individuals in the State whose resources are not sufficient to enable them to maintain a minimum standard of economic security, with due recognition given to the special needs of the aged, the blind, the children, and handicapped individuals; and to make welfare services available in order to promote personal well-being and a maximum degree of self-help.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums sufficient (a) for making payments to each State which has submitted a State public-welfare plan and had it approved by the Federal Security Agency, hereinafter referred to as the Agency; and (b) for expenditure directly by the Agency for the training of personnel for public welfare work and for demonstration projects in cooperation with State agencies administering approved public-welfare plans.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1403. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'public welfare' means assistance and, where the State plan so provides, welfare services.

"(b) The term 'assistance' means—

"(1) money payments to needy individuals who have attained the age of 18 years and are not living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, and, with respect to needy individuals under the age of 18 years, money payments to parents, or to relatives or other individuals assuming responsibility for parental care and support of such children, who maintain a family home for them: *Provided*, That such needy individuals are not patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in any medical institution following diagnosis of tuberculosis or psychosis; and

"(2) where the State plan so provides and where not otherwise available, medical services for needy individuals, provided through payments to persons, agencies, or institutions furnishing or procuring such services, but does not include medical services for individuals living in a public institution except as patients in a medical institution, or for patients in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases, or in a medical institution following a diagnosis of tuberculosis or pyschosis.

"(c) The term 'welfare services' means family- and adult-welfare services and child-welfare services, including (1), with respect to family- and adult-welfare services, social services designed to help families and individuals to become self-supporting, to meet individual or family social problems, and to make use of community resources and to contribute to community life; and (2) with respect to child-welfare services, social services designed to assure the welfare of children and to help them overcome problems resulting from parental neglect or other circumstances likely to result in dependency, neglect, or juvenile delinquency, and care necessary to provide for children without parental care and supervision and children requiring temporary care outside their own homes, such care to be given in foster family homes, temporary homes, or other facilities needed to supplement home care.

"STATE PUBLIC WELFARE PLANS

"SEC. 1404. (a) A State public-welfare plan must—

"(1) provide for the establishment or designation of (A) a single State agency to administer or to supervise the administration of the plan, and (B) not more than one agency of a local subdivision of the State to administer the plan within such subdivision;

"(2) provide (A), with respect to assistance, that the plan shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, and if administered by them, be mandatory on them, and (B) with respect to welfare services, for the progress development of a Statewide program as rapidly as trained personnel can be secured to administer it;

"(3) provide for financial participation by the State in all parts of the State plan, and for such distribution of funds for assistance and its administration as to assure equitable treatment of needy individuals in similar circumstances, wherever they may live in the State;

"(4) provide for the establishment and application throughout the State of standards necessary to the operation of the plan, including standards directed toward enabling each recipient to secure the essentials of living including necessary expense for seeking and maintaining employment through assistance and his other income and resources, which standards shall include provision that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any income and resources of an individual claiming assistance;

"(5) if assistance is administered by categories, provide for a reasonable basis for establishing such categories, such as age or blindness;

"(6) provide that all individuals wishing to make application for assistance shall have opportunity to do so, and that assistance shall be furnished promptly to all eligible individuals;

"(7) provide for granting an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual, whose claim for assistance or welfare services included in the State plan is denied or is not acted upon;

"(8) provide that the assistance and welfare services included in the State plan shall be available without discrimination because of race, creed, or color;

"(9) provide such methods of administration as are found by the agency to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan, including (A) methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personal standards on a merit basis, except that the Agency shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in

accordance with such methods; and (B) a training program for the personnel necessary to the administration of the plan;

"(10) provide safeguards which restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the plan;

"(11) provide, after July 1, 1953, if the plan includes assistance to individuals in private or public institutions, for the establishment or designation of a State authority or authorities which shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining standards for such types of institutions; and

"(12) provide that the State agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the agency may from time to time require, and comply with such provisions as the agency may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Federal Security Administrator or head of the appropriate constituent unit or units of the Agency, duly authorized by him to do so, shall approve any public-welfare plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that he shall not approve any plan which imposes as a condition of eligibility for assistance or welfare services (1) any citizenship or residence requirement, (2) any requirement that individuals must accept any other assistance or welfare services under the plan, or (3) any requirement that an applicant or recipient must, during his lifetime, transfer to the State title or control to any property which such individual may own: *Provided*, That the State may require that a lien or other notice of a claim enforceable only at death of the recipient or his surviving spouse may be filed against such property for purposes of recovering for assistance paid.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 1405. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved public-welfare plan, for each period after June 30, 1949, an amount, which shall be used exclusively for carrying out the State plan, equal to the Federal percentage for such State, as determined in accordance with section 1406, of the total of the sums expended during such period under the State plan, not counting so much of such total expenditures by the State as are included in any other State plan aided by Federal funds.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The Agency shall, prior to the beginning of each period for which a payment is to be made to the State under subsection (a), estimate the amount to be paid to such State for such period under the provisions of subsection (a), such estimate to be based on (A) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such period in accordance with the provisions of such subsection, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such period, and if the sum or such amount and the estimated Federal grant to be paid the State under subsection (a) is less than the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source from which the difference is expected to be derived, and (B) such other data as to such estimated expenditures and such other investigation as the Agency may find necessary.

"(2) The Agency shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by the Agency, (A) reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under subsection (a) for such period; and (B) reduced by a sum equivalent to the pro rata share to which the United States is equitably entitled, as determined by the Agency, of the net amount recovered during any prior period by the State or any political subdivision thereof under the State plan; except that such increases or reductions shall not be made to the extent that such sums have been applied to make the amount certified for any prior period greater or less than the amount estimated by the Agency for such prior period: *Provided*, That any part of the amount recovered from the estate of a deceased recipient which is not in excess of the amount expended by the State or any political subdivision thereof for the funeral expenses of the deceased shall not be considered as a basis for reduction under clause (B) of this paragraph.

"(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Agency, the amount so certified.

"(4) The period for which estimates and certifications are made under this section shall be a calendar quarter, except that, upon application by a State, the agency may extend the period for such State to not more than four calendar quarters.

"FEDERAL GRANT PERCENTAGES

"SEC. 1406. (a) The Federal percentage for any State shall not be less than 50 per centum and not more than 75 per centum. The Federal percentage for the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, and for each State whose per capita income is greater than or equal to the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 per centum. The Federal percentage for each State, whose per capita income is less than the per capita income of the continental United States, shall be 50 per centum plus one-half of the percentage by which the per capita income of the State is below the per capita income of the continental United States, except that such percentage for each such State shall not exceed 75 per centum and shall be rounded to the nearest whole per centum: *Provided*, That the Federal percentage for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 75 per centum.

"(b) The Federal percentage for each State shall be promulgated by the Agency between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year, on the basis of the average per capita income of each State and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall for purposes of this section be conclusive for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation: *Provided*, That the Agency shall promulgate such percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of this act, which promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this section for each of the eight quarters in the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending June 30, 1951.

"OPERATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 1407. In the case of any State public-welfare plan which has been approved by the Agency, if the Agency, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(a) that the plan has been so changed as to impose any requirement prohibited by section 1404 (b), or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(b) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1404 (a) to be included in the plan;

the Agency shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State under such plan or, in its discretion, that further payments will not be made to the State for activities in which there is such failure, until the Agency is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer imposed or that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied, it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State, or shall limit payment to activities in which there is no such failure."

SEC. 3. Section 1101 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia, and when used in titles V and XIV of such act, includes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 4. No payment shall be made to a State under titles I, IV, or X of the Social Security Act for any period for which funds are made available to such State under title XIV of such act and for any period thereafter, or under part 3 of title V of such act, for any period for which funds for child-welfare services are made available to such State under title XIV of such act; and in any event, for any period after June 30, 1951.

SEC. 5. In the case of a State which has a plan approved under title XIV of the Social Security Act, adjustments, which have not previously been made with respect to overpayments or underpayments under titles I, IV, or X, or under part 3 of title V of such act, shall be made in connection with payments to such State under title XIV of such act.

Education in the Atomic Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there is a statement in the education program adopted at the last convention of the American Federation of Labor in Cincinnati, Ohio, in November 1948, which expresses succinctly the heart and core of the UNESCO philosophy of international relations upon which the hope of the world for permanent peace and international friendship must be based. I request, therefore, that this significant statement, which represents the thinking of so large a section of the population of the United States, be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

EDUCATION IN THE ATOMIC AGE

The American Federation of Labor recognizes as never before that education is the keystone which must support the structure of a new and better world. It is an American principle that men are born free and equal and with certain inalienable rights. Men are not born apostles of freedom; apostles of communism; apostles of totalitarianism or apostles of conquest in war. Only through education and environment are men guided into these several ways of thinking.

Education today is faced with its greatest challenge. If world peace through international friendship is ever to be attained, there must be a reorientation of our educational system in terms of teaching human values. The great wars among the nations, which have now gained such proportions as to threaten the very existence of mankind on the earth, have resulted directly or indirectly from struggles for industrial wealth or political power. Today man's commercial prowess and his scientific knowledge have so outstripped his sense of human values that, ironically, the greatest era of civilization in the history of mankind stands on the verge of medieval barbarism. The

development of atomic power, the greatest scientific discovery of the ages, threatens to hurl mankind back to the stone age—if not to utter destruction.

The only power which is still greater than the atomic power, the only power which can stem the tide toward suicide of the human race, is educating men throughout the world in the spirit of brotherly love which, if undefiled by perverse education, is a natural characteristic of men of all nations. A great prophet once said, "Now abideth faith, hope, and brotherly love but the greatest of these is brotherly love." If the world is to survive the dangers of the scientific creations of mankind, this must be the goal of education in the atomic age. If peace on earth is ever to be attained, men must be taught to send ships to sea, to build great factories, and to enter into commercial projects not merely to build fortunes in gold, but to create happier lives for their employees. This is the challenge to education today. The American Federation of Labor, in the future, as in the past, must devote itself with unfailing zeal to meeting that profound challenge.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 1949, I delivered a commemoration address at the Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko Monument in Lafayette Park, Washington, D. C.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

Long ago when our Nation was struggling for her independence there came to our shores a vigorous young Polish officer named Thaddeus Kosciusko, who, in every sense as a man represented Poland's immortal struggle for justice. Humbly he volunteered his sword to the United States in the cause of freedom.

The records of our American history immortalize the triumphs which this gallant general so brilliantly gained in those early days of our fight for American freedom. He indeed served this Nation gloriously, and did so because be believed that the cause of independence was just and right.

In the service of his mother country, Poland, he led its armies to many victories. Wars to him were sacred crusades to free the Polish nation from the shackles of the oppressors. Even in defeat his indomitable spirit renewed courage in moments of despair.

The general, in his last-known message to his armies in Warsaw, said:

"Freedom, that gift beyond estimate for man on earth, is given by God only to those nations which by their perseverance, courage, and constancy in all untoward events, are worthy of its possession. This truth is taught us by free nations which after long struggle full of labors, after protracted sufferings manfully borne, now enjoy the happy fruits of their courage and perseverance."

And he further stated:

"I conjure you not to grow cold, not to slacken in your ardor and in your constancy."

How truly can we see the words of this great patriot reflected in the constant struggle of the Polish people throughout the many years of wars, partitions, and human suffering. Never in their history is it recorded that they have grown cold or slackened in their ardor to fight in the cause of freedom. And, with the passing of time, many enemies of Poland have found out that their resistance to the undemocratic philosophies has been fought with undying nationalistic fervor. Oppressors may liquidate political organizations, but they never will win the hearts and souls of the Polish people.

Poland today is in the grip of a political philosophy unlike any experienced in the history of our world. Locked behind the iron curtain, the Communist-controlled regime has imposed an economy of collectivism and Marxist teachings with no concept of providing autonomy, self-determination, and democracy. It has made elections in Poland a travesty. It has exploited the Polish workers for the economic development of Russia, not for the betterment of their own country. It has made government in Poland Russian, and not Polish.

Poland's internal catastrophe parallels an incident in early Polish history, when Kosciusko began the Act of Rising with these words: "The present condition of unhappy Poland is known to the world." How similar is this cry of anguish in our modern day. The tragedy of Poland is the tragedy of the world. Poland of today is an ocean of human misery, floundering in a system of totalitarianism. Poland is a living monument to the loss of man's most sacred possession—freedom.

On this day of commemoration of the great hero of Poland, Thaddeus Kosciusko, it is a consolation that the freedom-loving people of the world have not cast aside the plight of the Polish nation. Men and women who know the tribulations of modern wars also know that there is a hidden strength and energy in the long, doubtful, dark days which suddenly uncover themselves into a bright new day. Let us remember that this hero who so generously came to the aid of our own great country in time of stress will always be a symbol of a courageous and brave Polish nation.

When all the world yearns for peace as never before, the time has come for us to reaffirm our determination to maintain peace for the preservation of freedom and the growth of the human values of our civilization.

Address of Hon. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. VORYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania, chairman, Republican National Committee, before the Buckeye Republican Club, Columbus, Ohio, Thursday, February 10, 1949:

As we gather here tonight in this Capital of a traditionally Republican State it is well for us to ponder the sage advice given by the founder of our party. It was our first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, whose memory we honor at this season of the year and whose advice we should seek every day of the year, who said: "We must think anew and act anew."

Throughout the history of our party so long as we have remained true to the principles of freedom, of justice, of progress enunciated and expounded by Lincoln, we have been almost uniformly successful and the Nation has grown and prospered under Republican administrations. This is no time to forget those principles. More than ever before, the Nation and the world need a vigorous and forthright presentation and demonstration of Republican principles. That we must provide. Our party demands it; our Nation needs it. Let me say it plainly: for the causes in which we believe, we are going to fight all the way.

In the interval since our unexpected defeat at the polls last November certain long-existing tensions within our party increased until finally the breaking point was reached. It may be unfortunate that there were such tensions but, recognizing the obvious fact of their existence, I am convinced that it was a good thing for the party that the inevitable eruption occurred and that it happened at this particular time. Now, I believe, we have closed ranks again and are in a position to present an undivided front to our common adversary. I am proceeding on that belief.

I am convinced, absolutely, that the Republican Party has been saved for the people and now we will take it to the people—to all the people, because it belongs to all the people.

We are now going into the third round of a no-limit fight to the finish. It is a bare-knuckle fight because the opposition has so decreed and we accept the challenge. On that point, as a matter of fact, we have no choice.

We won the first round in this fight in 1946 when we elected a Republican Congress. That Congress, incidentally, was one of the best Congresses in the entire history of the United States. It kept every major promise which its Members made to the people during the 1946 campaign—tax reduction, curtailment of Government costs, the enactment of a just and reasonable labor-relations law, a start toward the delousing of our vast and Communist-contaminated Federal bureaucracy, legislation to increase benefits for veterans, and many others. It accomplished those results despite the unrelenting, die-hard opposition of the Trumar administration, which chose to ignore and repudiate Mr. Truman's personal and public promise in November 1946 to cooperate with the Eightieth Congress in its plans to translate its campaign promises into actualities.

We won the first round, but we lost the second, when our candidates for President and Vice President were defeated in November 1948, and our majorities in the Senate and House were wiped out.

The third round is coming up. We are fighting it now and we will keep on slugging until the bell rings in November 1950. Winning the third round in 1950 is essential to set the stage for a knock-out victory in 1952, when we can install a Republican President in the White House. But remember that our chances to score a knock-out in 1952 will be very slim unless we win in 1950. Let us not—and personally, I assure you that I will not—be diverted from our primary objective in 1950 by any premature or ill-advised maneuverings looking toward 1952.

I said a moment ago that we are now fighting the third round. Let me tell you a few of the things which the national committee has done within the past few weeks.

It has approved the appointment of a policy committee to be composed of representatives of the national committee itself, of representatives of our Republican Members of the Senate and House, and of Republican State chairmen and State finance chairmen. This committee will be called into session just as soon as the selection of its personnel can be completed. The national committee representatives have been appointed already, but the selection of the other members will require a little time. By the action of the national committee, I was made chairman, ex officio, of the policy com-

mittee and I can assure you that so far as I am concerned, no time will be lost in putting the committee to work. In addition to its authorization to study and make recommendations on party policy, this committee has power to convene a national party policy conference at a later date, to select the time and place for that conference and to prescribe the qualifications for participation. I have said heretofore that I favor the convening of such a conference; I hope that the policy committee, which must decide the matter, will come to the same conclusion.

The national committee has also taken steps to bring about increased coordination of effort between national headquarters and State and local organizations through the use of field representatives of the national committee and by frequent interchanges of information and regional conferences. I believe this procedure will do much to increase the effectiveness of the intensified and expanded campaign which we will inaugurate soon to carry the message of the Republican party to the people through every conceivable channel of publicity.

In addition, right now, a subcommittee of the national committee is studying methods for improving cooperation between national headquarters and the Republican leadership in Congress. Such cooperation and coordination of effort is, in my opinion, essential to party welfare and success. I shall do everything within my power to make it a reality.

As a means for enlisting and utilizing the energies and talents of all members of the national committee I have appointed 10 subcommittees to study and make recommendations with respect to such national problems as those which confront us in the fields of agriculture, labor, civil rights, conservation of natural resources, veterans, industry and other fields.

These are some of the things which have been accomplished within the past few weeks. There will be many more. We Republicans are bound to convince the people that we are acting for their benefit. They want action. It is up to us to give it to them.

We must recognize the disagreeable fact that we now have an administration in Washington which has proved by its record that it is incapable of being honest with the American people. Its reckless profusion of unfulfillable promises during the 1948 campaign was one illustration of that characteristic. Most of the proposals which Mr. Truman embodied in his recent state of the Union message—in accordance with his 1948 campaign promises—were identical with recommendations which he made to the Seventy-ninth Congress as long ago as September 1945. Remember he had substantial Democrat majorities in both the Senate and House in the Seventy-ninth Congress and that Congress enthusiastically ignored about 95 percent of his recommendations. So did the Republican Eightieth Congress—for the very good reason that most of the recommendations didn't make sense, or worse. Thus Mr. Truman has an unblemished record of being unable to get along with a Congress of either party. Everybody is out of step but him.

But let us take one specific and current illustration of the administration's incurable addiction to double-dealing with the people. You will recall that one of the most vociferous and oft-repeated promises made by Mr. Truman during the 1948 campaign was that if he were elected the Taft-Hartley Act would be repealed. He said repealed, not amended or modified, but repealed. Mr. Truman's promise was repeated and emphasized by Senator McGRATH, of Rhode Island, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and other presumably responsible spokesmen of the Democratic Party. That was during the campaign.

But within less than a week after the election Vice President BARKLEY and other Democratic spokesmen were talking about amending the Taft-Hartley law and finally the administration came forward with its face-saving attempt to deceive the people as illustrated by the bill now before the Senate Labor Committee. While we are on this subject I want to venture the prediction that the ultimate result will be the repeal of the name of the law and the retention of the greater part of its substance. The Taft-Hartley law contains too many guaranties of the essential rights of working men and women for any Congress to dare to vote for its outright repeal.

Loss of Senator ROBERT A. TAFT in 1950 is an inconceivable thing which must not happen. It would be a tragedy to the Nation. We will work together to prevent it.

The hearings now in progress before the Senate Labor Committee have served to reveal and high light the administration's standard procedure of trying to kid the people—trying to deceive them, to put it bluntly.

One of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act authorizes the President to resort to injunctions to halt strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health and welfare. During the less than 2 years since the law was enacted over his hysterical veto—with the aid of a majority of Democratic Members of the Senate and House—Mr. Truman has utilized that provision of the act about half a dozen times. He utilized that power—and specified that he was so doing—to halt strikes in mining, shipping, and other industries.

Now, speaking through the complaisant sophistries of Attorney General Clark, head of the Department of Justice, Limited, or Department of Judicial Miscarriage, Mr. Truman tells the Senate Committee that he does not need this provision of the Taft-Hartley Act. He says he has the inherent authority to seek such injunctions without any specific authorization by law. Inherent authority is akin to the divine right of kings and Harry Truman would look odd indeed wearing that type of crown.

Let us see how that contention stands up. If Mr. Truman has such inherent authority today he certainly had at least the same authority back in 1946, when many of the extraordinary wartime powers of the Presidency were still in effect. But on May 25, 1946, when confronted with a Nation-wide railroad strike, Mr. Truman personally went before a joint session of Congress and asked for emergency and temporary authority to draft into the armed forces the railroad workers of the Nation. Fortunately he was stopped in his headlong folly by Senator TAFT. Why didn't he offer to use his inherent authority then? The answer is that he didn't have it then and he doesn't have it now. It is a myth created in an attempt to legitimatize a proposed pay-off for votes.

Moreover, you will recall, I am sure, that back in 1945 and 1946 there was a serious epidemic of strikes in basic industries which retarded change-over to a peacetime economy, aggravated shortages in many commodities, and really started the spiral of inflation which continues to plague the Nation today. That was before the Taft-Hartley law was enacted. Where was Mr. Truman's "inherent" authority, and why didn't he use it? You know the answer as well as I do. I repeat, he didn't have such authority, and he does not have it today except as provided in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Is simple honesty too much to expect from the Truman misdeal? Is equal and fair treatment of all the people too much to expect from these Washington merrymakers?

We think it is. Let us go to the people, then, with reasonable, moderate, and understandable alternatives to misdeal, with a program which has nothing whatever in it of "me-too-ism." We have 22 months to prepare for the end of privilege on the Potomac.

It's not a private fight. It's yours; it's mine; it's John and Mary Doe's; it's a public duty and a civic challenge. Let us get on with the people's business. They will support us, as they come to realize it's their fight too. Let's put the American house in order, that we may live as brothers, in peace, in tolerance, and in prosperity.

Mr. Lincoln would want it that way. Remember what he said? "Have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Italy Climbs to Place Among the Victors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anne O'Hare McCormick from today's New York Times:

ITALY CLIMBS TO PLACE AMONG THE VICTORS

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ROME, February 13.—Italy's postwar successes in the field of foreign policy almost justify the statement that she has regained by diplomacy what she lost in battle. This statement is subject to many obvious qualifications, but it is substantiated by a comparison of the Italian position today and the below-zero status at the end of the war. Italy is hamstrung and shorn of power and possessions by the terms of the peace treaty. Because of Soviet opposition, she is not accepted as a member of the United Nations. Nevertheless this defeated country has taken its place among the victors and become a recognized and valued factor in the reorganization of Europe.

Tomorrow Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza goes to Paris to attend the meeting of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Yesterday Palmiro Togliatti departed for Prague to take part with other Communist leaders in a secret session of the Cominform. These meetings bring together at the same time the representatives of two Europes—the beneficiaries and opponents of the Marshall plan. They illustrate, moreover, the influential role Italy plays in both camps—through its Government on the one side and its large Communist Party on the other. Both Europes are bidding for its favor, and this rivalry underlines the importance of this country and explains in part why the views of its Government are sought and listened to in international councils.

But this is only a partial explanation of Italy's diplomatic come-back. Harold Nicholson once remarked that Italian victories were always won by diplomacy and not by force—a fact the Fascists forgot when they tried to attain their ends by military means. The present Government has neither illusion on that nor the arms that made Mussolini's illusions dangerous. Aided by events, of course, De Gasperi and Sforza have played a poor hand with a quiet skill that has won Italy a place in the big game.

PLACE ON THE GROUND FLOOR

Sforza's trip to Paris illustrates this point. In conversation a couple of days ago on the objectives and limitations of Italian policy the Foreign Minister pointed out that the OEEC is the body that must take over the functions of ERP when Marshall aid stops in 1952. By that time a pattern of cooperation will be established that must be carried

on. To that end, in his opinion, it is essential to reorganize the OEEC now and make it ready for its future task. Count Sforza believes that the economic cooperation forced on the states of western Europe by the Marshall plan is far more important in the long run than temporary financial aid. Like most statesmen working for European union, he wishes the United States would use its unique influence to push its clients toward greater cooperation.

But uppermost in Italy's mind is to be in on the ground floor of this reorganization to insure that this country will be fully incorporated into the new structure of western Europe. The nation was isolated by Mussolini's policy of autarchia and cut off from its natural allies by the Fascist partnership with Germany. Step by step since the war the Government has pursued a policy of making friends of war enemies, difficult in circumstances because of strong anti-Italian feeling, and also because in her ruin and weakness Italy had little to offer as inducement to friendly relations.

That this policy has succeeded is more than a minor triumph of diplomacy. Except for Yugoslavia, Italy is on better terms with her neighbors than she has been for 20 years. Her progress toward recovery against enormous handicaps is so conspicuous that representatives of other governments come here to study her methods. The Italians have seized every chance to maintain official observers at the United Nations sessions and take part in international meetings because they are determined to help shape world policy.

ATMOSPHERE CLEARS

In their own interests they desire to maintain Marshall plan cooperation. This is why Count Sforza goes to Paris. He will not serve permanently on the directorate of the body that will succeed ECA, but he wants to do everything in his power to make sure ECA has a successor and that the transition will be made smoothly and without question.

The plan for economic union with France is another illustration of the Italian method. When the war ended, French sentiment was so bitter against Italy that the chance of political rapprochement was practically nil. In the eyes of Italian diplomats the only hope of resuming speaking terms with France was to start discussions on economic questions. Beginning with technical details of export and import duties, they introduced proposals for a customs union, and as the representatives of the two Governments explored possibilities along this line they began to talk seriously of the prospect of economic union. Agreement on this has been reached, but announcement is withheld pending settlement of the status of Italian workers in France. A great many of the 200,000 now employed desire to return to Italy, mostly because their families cannot join them, and the snag in currency exchange—the greatest single obstacle to normal life in Europe—makes it difficult to send their earnings home.

By using her wits in foreign policy Italy is working her way back in the international field as successfully as she is employing her energies and the industry of her people in domestic reconstruction.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 9, 1949

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to insert the following address made by the Honorable James A. Farley, before the Inter-American meeting sponsored by the International Trade-Mark Committee of the United States Trade-Mark Association held in New York City on February 2, 1949:

AMERICAN ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IN SOUTH AMERICA

In addressing this gathering of experienced foreign-trade specialists and trade-mark and patent experts, I would not presume to deal with the intricate problems which are their chosen field. Since this luncheon is given in honor of Dr. Clovis Rodrigues, the Director General of the Brazilian National Department of Industrial Property, I might only express some homespun observations on the great country from which he comes, and my personal thoughts on the development of relations between our two peoples.

I had the privilege of visiting Brazil twice within recent years, and have also been able to see the practical workings of business relations between our two countries through my experience with my company in the last 8 years.

Brazil is certainly a unique country, in many respects, among our sister American republics. We all know that it is the second largest nation in the Western Hemisphere and the most populous Latin country in the world. Brazil's area is second only to that of Canada in the Western Hemisphere, 3 times the size of Argentina and 65 times the size of England. Its population, constantly growing, is now 48,000,000 people, most of whom live along the sea coast. Were the entire Republic as thickly populated as the city of Rio de Janeiro, the total population of Brazil would exceed 400,000,000.

Perhaps there is no country on the American Continent, outside Canada, the people of which are so traditionally and consistently friendly to the American people as the people of Brazil. This friendship and confidence are so fundamental and thoroughgoing that, if Brazil were geographically adjacent to the United States, we would have had an unguarded frontier with it, as we have with Canada. This factor of friendship, sympathy, and confidence between our two peoples must never be forgotten when considering the development of our mutual business relations.

During the recent war, the Brazilian Government and people stood by the United States from the beginning to the end. Their resources were placed fully and freely at our disposal. The Brazilian people have been in all respects a gallant partner during the war. And, when the end came and the world embarked upon the task of binding up its wounds and securing peace, Brazil has again, and always has been, an eager and sturdy friend and coworker for peace.

Indeed, this spirit of trust, confidence, and cooperation with Brazil, as well as with the other American republics, so happily inspiring the relations of all peoples in the Western Hemisphere, has been the most hopeful factor of unity and harmony in an otherwise disgruntled and unpeaceful world.

For us tradesmen the fundamental force that can knit together the peoples of the world in general, and the American and Brazilian peoples in particular, is the establishment and development of intimate and mutually satisfactory trade relationships. In that respect, the picture of our relationship with Brazil is an especially bright one.

We are customers of Brazil for many of its most important products, particularly coffee, cocoa, hides and skins, iron ore and manganese, and other minerals. And the Brazilian people are customers of ours for all branches of our industry. Our trade, therefore, is on a two-way basis. In recent years Brazil has had a large unfavorable balance in its trade with the United States, due to long-accumulated needs, but this trend is, in the last few months, being corrected with an increase of exports to this country.

With the assurance of a continuing and resolute foreign policy of the United States and in view of the program announced by the President of the United States of making available our scientific and technical knowledge and our capital resources to economically undeveloped countries, I look forward to a great future of economic relations between our people and the people of Brazil.

Great strides have been made in recent years to correct one of the pressing problems of Brazil, the improvement of health conditions. The Rockefeller Foundation and other institutions in the United States have been helping to organize efficient health services. This work must continue.

The second big problem of Brazil is transportation. The development of the interior of Brazil and of its great riches waits upon means of transportation. This will require large outlays of capital, and, as in this country, it will have to be undertaken by capital that will also have an interest in the development of the mineral and other resources of the land beyond the coast.

Brazil cannot exploit and develop its rich natural resources without foreign capital. It is my personal opinion that possibly no other country affords to American capital more promising vistas and possibilities than Brazil. My opinion is founded on the following observations.

First. The basic trust and friendship between our two peoples, which gives an unusual assurance to investments in Brazil.

Second. The essential democracy of the people and the government of Brazil. Indeed, this is a country of law and order and not of arbitrary administrative action. While the legal institutions and agencies of Brazil may be different from ours, Brazil has consciously followed our experience, as expressed in legislation, in many fields. It has, through the years, developed capable administrative agencies, and its administrators in key positions are men of character and integrity.

Third. The Brazilian people have shown a capacity for economic and industrial development. Cities such as Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Belém, Porto Alegre, and others, are thriving cities. Indeed, some of these, such as São Paulo, have grown industrially so fast that they present a spectacular phenomenon. The comparison made of São Paulo to Chicago is entirely true in many respects. There is no reason to doubt that the country is capable of speedy development. It is estimated, for instance, that about 900,000 square miles of Brazilian territory, a little less than one-third of the total, is potentially oil-producing. Of this area only 190,000 square miles have been commercially explored, and there are only 43 producing wells as yet. One-half of the area of Brazil is forest and from this, as yet scarcely tapped, treasurehouse comes a relatively small income up to now, particularly in pine lumber.

Fourth. The Brazilian regulations provide for the export of profits at an adequate rate and the repatriation of capital within a reasonable time. There is no reason to think that Brazil will disturb this position in the future. It is true that dollar exchange is not available at present in adequate quantities to effect payment in dollars without delays, but that problem will be solved when the vicious circle is broken. The dollars must come back to us in the shape of raw materials and other products of Brazil.

I wish to add two more observations concerning our trade with Brazil. We now occupy an enviable position in the trade of that country. This position we will maintain if we guard those standards which are ours, no matter what competition we may meet. Of first importance is the export and sale to Brazil of salable, quality goods. We

must not destroy the confidence and trust of our Brazilian customers by attempting to export and sell products of inferior quality and standard. Secondly, in our business relations with Brazilian customers we must always be guided by fair dealings and the highest requirements of trade ethics. This has been the foundation of our domestic trade and must always remain that of our foreign trade.

While I recognize that in these difficult times Government assistance is necessary behind the problems of international trade, I strongly believe that only free private enterprise is best calculated to release the greatest energy of persons and the highest possible development of world markets. As the United States developed its resources and grew great through the efforts of imaginative and industrious people, so the development of undeveloped areas of the world and of the great resources of Brazil requires primarily the joint efforts and partnership of American and Brazilian individual traders.

Lady From Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 13, 1949.

We are all proud that our colleague, Representative FRANCES BOLTON, of Ohio, has received this just recognition for her many valuable services to humanity. For hard work, expert knowledge, and first-hand experience, she has no peer. In the fields of domestic and foreign policy she is indeed outstanding—and outstanding in her own right.

LADY FROM OHIO

Proof that a woman legislator may have something special to contribute to Congress is afforded in the career of Representative FRANCES BOLTON, who last week received from the American Social Hygiene Society the Snow Memorial Medal for "distinguished service to humanity." Besides being an able Representative of her district for 8 years, Mrs. BOLTON has made an effective "women's contribution" to social legislation, particularly nursing education and public health. She brought to Congress an expert knowledge and first-hand experience in those fields, which, despite her wealth and social position, had not been gained merely as a lady bountiful on boards. For early in life she began to look into social problems first-hand. "I have been a teacher, a nurse, a waitress," she insists.

Carrying out this same method of on-the-spot study, Representative BOLTON, as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, flew to battle fronts to observe the care of the wounded, and later went to critical postwar areas to look into conditions which she felt would come before Congress. Always forehanded in her health ideas, she saw the need of nurses before this country entered the war and pushed measures for nursing education. She worked for control of venereal disease when mention of it was socially taboo. Now one of the most industrious workers in Congress, often putting in a 14-hour day, Mrs. BOLTON most likely would have found it easier to be a philanthropist and patron of the arts. But her conviction that, as she has expressed it, "the more opportunity, the more responsibility" led her into a vigorous political and legislative career. In that, too, she is a symbol of how women who can afford the role of "great lady" are tending more and more to give of themselves as well as their substance.

Calumet-Sag Plan Vital for Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Chicago, the great metropolis of the Midwest, in its determination to build a greater Chicago has repeatedly presented to Congress the necessity of improving and widening the Calumet-Sag Channel, an artificial channel which traverses the industrial section of the Calumet area.

Some effort had been directed toward this project when in 1931 the Corps of Engineers made a study of the Calumet River, Little Calumet River, Lake Calumet, and the Sag Channel with a view toward providing a connection with and terminal transfer harbors for the waterway from Chicago to the Mississippi River. This study concluded that the Calumet route, following the Calumet-Sag Channel, Little Calumet and Calumet Rivers, should be developed as the principal connection between the Illinois waterway and Lake Michigan since this route avoided the congested urban area of Chicago and would serve the large industrial region south and east of the city.

The Rivers and Harbors Act, approved July 24, 1946, authorized the construction of the Calumet-Sag navigation project, which project is designed to provide an adequate barge navigation channel between the Illinois waterway and Lake Michigan. No funds have as yet been appropriated by Congress to initiate the construction of this project, but allotments have been made to the Chicago engineer district for advanced planning and for the preparation of contract plans and specifications.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article taken from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 7, 1949, which very clearly explains the project:

CALUMET-SAG PLAN VITAL FOR CHICAGO—OPEN MISSISSIPPI VALLEY MEETING

(By Philip Hampson)

ST. LOUIS, February 7.—"Development of the Calumet-Sag Channel is of major importance to Chicago and the country and will make of the city's vast Calumet region a manufacturer's paradise," Lachlan MacLeay, president of the Mississippi Valley Association, said here. He pledged the association's fullest support for the project.

The association, which describes itself as the spokesman for the midcontinent region extending from the Rockies to the Appalachians, opened its thirtieth annual convention today. More than 800 persons are attending.

PROJECT HELD PRIME

MacLeay described the Calumet-Sag program as probably the most important industrial project before the American people. Its completion will assure unlimited supplies of raw materials for the great Chicago workshop, so important to the country in times of emergency.

Though primarily a waterway enterprise, MacLeay asserted it actually will stimulate business for the railroads. He estimated that for every carload of raw materials brought in by barge or ship the railroads will transport out of the region two carloads of finished products.

Approved by Congress in 1946 cost is estimated at about $80,000,000. Details as to cooperation among various local governments are being worked out. Congress is expected to make an appropriation at this session to enable work to get started. Completion will take 4 to 6 years.

WIDENING IS FIRST STEP

The first step in the project is the widening to 225 feet of the present Sag Channel at its connection with the Illinois waterway from Sag Junction to Blue Island. The second step contemplates the elimination of a lock at Blue Island and certain channel adjustments. The third and final step proposes the improvement of the Grand Calumet River, from a point near Calumet Lake, to make a connection with the Indiana Harbor Canal and Gary. Depth of the Calumet-Sag Channel is to be continued at 9 feet under the program.

Improvement of Calumet Lake docking and transit facilities is included in the program.

Following are some of the advantages the Chicago region may expect through completion of the project; break a severe transportation bottleneck; provide new employment for thousands of workers; reduce transportation costs; provide adequate facilities for the interchange of cargoes among railroads, steamship and barge lines, and motor carriers; established a badly needed rail-lake-barge terminal area, and enable vessels from the Great Lakes to reach other parts of the country in times of emergency.

SUGGESTS DUAL LOCKS

MacLeay urged that coincident with the Calumet-Sag development, a dual set of locks should be built in the Illinois waterway to handle the growing river traffic and to provide relief in case of damage to existing locks. He said the Illinois waterway carried about 1,500,000 tons of freight in 1948. When it was completed in 1935 engineers estimated it would be 1953 before a 10,000,000-ton total would be reached.

Oleomargarine Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today in the House of Representatives which requires the elimination of all taxes and license fees on oleomargarine while, at the same time, it bans coloration of butter substitutes in the factory or in public eating places.

My bill is based on what I have termed the "Washington plan." I have given it this designation because the legislature of my home State, namely, Washington,

has recently passed a bill which embodies on the State level the national policies of leading dairy and farm organizations.

I think the action of the Washington State Legislature in this connection is particularly significant inasmuch as the overwhelming vote by which this measure was passed demonstrates beyond question that unrestricted sale of yellow oleo is not acceptable to informed lawmakers. The vote for a bill prohibiting oleo manufacturers to imitate butter's naturally yellow color was unanimous in the Washington State Senate. In the house of representatives of my home State it received 95 votes, with only 2 legislators opposed. This bill now goes to the Governor of the State of Washington for signature.

Under the Washington plan housewives will be able to buy all the oleo they want in its most economical, uncolored form without the payment of any taxes whatever. Oleo distributors will be relieved of reports and certificate requirements. At the same time consumers will be protected against fraud and deception and vital butter outlets for the dairy farmer's surplus milk will be maintained.

This marks the first time that the new policy of the Nation's dairy farmers toward oleo has faced a clear-cut test in any State legislature. The triumph of that policy in the progressive State of Washington clearly proves that city as well as rural legislators are now keenly aware of the need for safeguarding both housewives and dairy farmers.

About 40 percent of our beef and veal must come from dairy herds, as well as all of our milk. The Washington plan protects the dairy herds of my State while eliminating all taxes on oleomargarine—but oleo must be sold for what it is, and not as an imitation of butter.

Communism Seeks To Destroy All Christian Religions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Communism seeks to destroy all Christian religions.

Occasionally, one hears it said that the only target of Communist attack is the Roman Catholic Church. Certainly, the recent outrages perpetrated upon Cardinal Mindszenty, and a year ago on Archbishop Stepinac, as well as the consistent course followed by the Communists in all countries, clearly indicates that no stone will be left unturned, no device unused, no diabolical strategy untried, to vilify and persecute those who profess the Catholic faith.

If there were ever any suspicion, however, that the sole object of attack is the Catholic Church, recent events in Bulgaria would serve to resolve any doubts on that score. Here, 15 clergymen of the Protestant faith are now charged with so-called crimes in almost the exact language alleged in Hungary against Cardinal Mindszenty.

It is all a part of one cloth. The pattern is clear and simple. A Communist must not believe in God. He must not worship God in any form of ceremony. For him the State alone can be supreme. Not until we thoroughly understand this fundamental principle of communism can we, as a united Christian people, completely realize the significance of the challenge we face today, not alone in Yugoslavia, in Hungary, and in Bulgaria, behind the Iron Curtain, but equally in Italy, in France, and in our own United States of America.

Last week we adopted a resolution designed to summon to the bar of world opinion those responsible for the outrages in Hungary and Yugoslavia. I now propose that we take similar action regarding the recent shocking episode in Bulgaria. I shall prepare and offer legislation to that effect.

Now is the time for men and women who believe in God to stand up and be counted. Our doctrine, our church dogma, our form of worship may differ. But in our fundamental belief in God, we are one. Communism is our common enemy. With it and its godless doctrine, a true Christian cannot temporize or compromise.

In the accompanying editorial from the Washington Post we have a penetrating analysis of the situation facing all Christendom.

NOW IN BULGARIA

The accusations brought against the 15 Protestant clergymen by the Communist government of Bulgaria follow so closely the pattern pursued in the prosecution of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Bulgaria that it is hardly possible to suppose that a single directing intelligence has not been at work in both cases. One difference, however, between the two cases may be remarked. Cardinal Mindszenty is the representative of the religion which is followed by the majority of the Hungarian people. In Bulgaria the Protestants are a small minority, the bulk of the population being of the Orthodox faith. But if we remember that in Hungary, the arrest and prosecution of the Lutheran Bishop, Lajos Ordass, also the representative of a religious minority, preceded the Mindszenty case, we may have an important key to the tactics of the Communist campaign against the Christian churches of the satellite countries. Communist propaganda has been insistent that this campaign is not being directed against religion as such, but involves matters having nothing to do with religion, such as punishment of active treason, the suppression of black marketing operations, the redistribution of land, government control of schools, and so on.

Beneath this cynical sophism may lie a certain stratum of fact. That eradication of all religion, except the gospel of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, is one of the ultimate aims of revolutionary communism, no reader of the party scriptures can doubt. During the period of the class struggle, however—and particularly during the period of military conflict with the capitalist world, which the party theologians insist is an inevitable phase of historical evolution—an organized church, if it commands a large popular respect and obedience and if it can be made wholly subservient to the dictatorship, becomes a useful instrument of Communist aims and propaganda. This has been demonstrated in the revival of the Russian Orthodoxy under Stalin's patronage and protection. It may be recalled that in the early phase of the Bolshevist revolution, when the Soviet government undertook to destroy the power and influence of the Orthodox Church in Russia, it organized and supported a schismatic body known as the Living Church.

To achieve the servile relationship of church to state in the satellite countries the destruction of all church leaders who remain obdurate and the intimidation of the rest are, of course, necessary. Thus the fact that in Hungary and Bulgaria the first moves of the Communist regimes have been against religious minorities may be explained as part of the process of intimidating the religious majorities. Doubtless the Catholic prelates and clergy of Hungary were expected to take warning from the fate of Bishop Ordass; the Orthodox bishops and clergy of Bulgaria from the example of the Evangelical ministers.

The next logical step would be the separation of the Latin churches of Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia from communion with the churches of the west, and the separation of Orthodox churches behind the Iron Curtain from those which are outside, such as the churches in Greece and the Near East. The separation of a national church from the Roman communion was actually achieved in the case of the Uniate Church of the Ukraine, which, under Communist pressures, transferred its allegiance to the puppet Patriarchate of Moscow, but not, apparently, until most of the Uniate bishops had been sent to prison camps.

If this interpretation of the campaign is correct, it follows that the work is much too important to be left to the plug-uglies and crude careerists who constitute the Communist regimes of the satellite countries. As we say, the campaign against the churches begins to show evidences of expert direction. And we suspect it was by something more than coincidence that Comrade Vishinsky, celebrated impresario of propaganda trials, turned up recently in Prague, a point of easy access to both Budapest and Sofia.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the East St. Louis Journal on Thursday, February 10, 1949, with reference to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

LIFE TERM FOR MINDSZENTY

As had been expected, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary, was found guilty of treason by a Communist-dominated people's court and was sentenced to life imprisonment. The Communist puppet government in Hungary did not dare condemn the outspoken churchman to death.

The 3-day trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and his six associates was conducted in the usual Communist-purge pattern. The defendant didn't have a chance and there is no way, yet, of knowing what mistreatment he endured before he finally was brought to trial on charges of plotting to overthrow

the government, of favoring a royal restoration, and of speculating illegally in American dollars.

The Hungarian Communist regime, acting under orders from the Kremlin, did not dare make a martyr of the prelate whose trial had been publicized around the world and whose resistance to the traitorous Hungarian government had won the sympathy of peoples of all religious faiths. In prison he will be a reproach to his persecutors and cause them to dread an uprising which might oust them in the manner in which they seized power.

In the meantime, for Cardinal Mindszenty "while there's life there's hope."

May he live to see the trial of the Communist rulers of Hungary on charges of treason before a real people's court.

Historic Sugar Pines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the California War Memorial Park Association, of which a lifelong and distinguished Democrat, John B. Elliott, is chairman, a statement showing that the State American Federation of Labor, together with the Gold Star Mothers of America, are added to the two important groups who have joined in a deserving effort to save the historical sugar pine trees in Tuolumne County in my native State of California from the ax and saw of those who would cut them for lumbering purposes.

As the national president of the Gold Star Mothers of America, Mrs. Eleanor Boyd is a resident of my home city of Long Beach, Calif., and, as she and her husband, Dr. Truman Boyd, a celebrated physician of Long Beach, are the parents of two of the American lads who gave their lives for democracy, I take particular pleasure in calling to the attention of the Congress the desirability of immediate action by President Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, and the California delegation in Congress to collaborate that these historic sugar pines may be saved and integrated into a war memorial park. I submit the text of the statement from Mr. Elliott and also a significant and pertinent editorial on this same subject which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner under date of February 5, 1949, which states clearly and emphatically the feeling of millions of us from that great State. Furthermore, those trees are not merely the property of California, but have already been and will give knowledge and inspiration to millions upon millions. The statement of Mr. Elliott and the newspaper editorial are, as follows:

STATE A. F. OF L. AND GOLD STAR MOTHERS URGE SAVING OF HISTORIC SUGAR PINES

Immediate and decisive action by President Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, and the California delegation in Congress to save the historic sugar pine trees of Tuolumne County was urged today by C. J. Haggerty, secretary of the California State Federation of Labor, representing more than a million members.

At Long Beach Mrs. Eleanor Boyd, national president of the Gold Star Mothers of America, of whom there are 37,000, announced that she, too, had addressed telegrams to both President Truman and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan asking that these great trees be integrated into a war memorial park "which would keep the memory of our sons as green as the forest giants which distinguish this outstanding area."

Secretary Haggerty's telegram followed action at Washington in which California Representatives went unanimously on record to save the sugar pines and Sequoias in the Big Tree and Beaver Creek areas.

It was disclosed at a caucus of the California Congressmen that under a Federal statute of 1909 the Secretary of Agriculture is empowered to take over the area where the big trees grow. By a premonitory coincidence the area covered by the 40-year-old statute covers almost the identical ground which Dr. Frederick Law Olmsted, in a 1945 report to the State, specifically urged saving.

Haggerty's telegram, which was in support of invoking the 1909 law, said: "As secretary of the California State Federation of Labor representing more than 1,000,000 members I respectfully urge immediate decisive action on Federal statute 494 to save from imminent destruction the great sugar pine and sequoia forests of Tuolumne County. For us to permit the wanton destruction of these rare and beautiful trees, hundreds of years old, would be inexcusable and earn for us the condemnation of future generations."

In addition to the gold star mothers, John B. Elliott, chairman of the California War Memorial Park Association, announces that some fourteen nationally chartered veterans' organizations have passed resolutions asking the big trees be saved.

In her telegram to President Truman, Mrs. Boyd, national president of the Gold Star Mothers, said, in part: "The Gold Star Mothers have been thrilled and heartened by the efforts of the California War Memorial Park Association to have the Secretary of Agriculture acquire the great sugar pines and sequoias of Tuolumne County, one of the few remaining primeval forests in the land, so that it may be dedicated to the memory of those who gave their lives for us in the World Wars."

Additional support for the State-wide movement was reported from San Francisco today where the northern city's board of supervisors urged United States Senators SHERIDAN DOWNEY and WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND and San Francisco's congressional delegation to take immediate steps toward acquiring the Tuolumne area for a national park.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner of February 5, 1949]

MORTAL PERIL OF CALIFORNIA GLORY

It was the beauty and grandeur of California that first attracted the seekers of El Dorado.

It was the majesty of its mountains, streams, and forests, revealed magnificently in an atmosphere of dazzling clarity, that decided men to live and work here, and create today's industrial civilization in California.

So rich were the Golden State's resources, so impatient were men to exploit them, that at one time they were in peril of extinction unless wiser and farther-seeing spirits restrained the profitable pillage.

Now one of the rarest, utterly irreplacable and invaluable of these assets—the stand of giant sugar pines in Tuolumne County's Beaver Creek—will soon become a pile of lumber unless the National or State Government steps in and prevents the catastrophe.

The giant sugar pines have grown to more than 250 feet high in some 600 or 700 years. They are absolutely unique, "the largest and loveliest in the world," as America's foremost park authority, Dr. Frederick Law Olmstead, has described them.

At present, this stately grove belongs to a lumber company, which refuses to sell, and intends to begin felling next March.

If it is to be saved from the ax and the saw, the California Legislature or the Federal Agriculture Department must step in and legally acquire it for posterity in the people's name.

Thousands of public-spirited citizens and numerous civic organizations recommend that the Beaver Creek sugar pines be made public property and consecrated as a living memorial for America's war dead.

To this purpose, the California War Memorial Park Association has been formed.

The forest giants may be reprieved by a bill introduced but not yet voted upon in the legislature. But whether this measure can pass both assembly and senate before cutting of the pines begins in March is a matter of grave doubt. The legislature will not even reconvene until March 7.

Hence the efforts of California Congressmen to get help from Washington, on the solid ground that this forest is as much a national as a State resource.

And hence the unselfish zeal of thousands of California's men and women, individually and in groups, who are energetically fighting to save one of California's greatest glories.

It is not only a matter of sentiment to prevent this ruin, but a matter of common sense.

Of sugar pine good enough for lumber, there is plenty in the West.

The owners of the Beaver Creek trees could be granted the equivalent in board feet of other sugar pines.

These are all things that can be done right away, things that apply to an emergency, and which are equitable both to lumberman and public.

But if they are not done or delayed until done too late, there is no human power that can replace these marvelous, ancient trees.

There is no profit that can compensate for their loss, nor any excuse that can condone the slaughter of a singular and living evidence of God's grace and kindliness.

These trees must be saved and kept as the most fitting of all monuments to our glorious dead, and noble symbols of life and hope to the generations who come after us.

The Freedom Train

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this is an age of artificiality, of facsimiles and reasonable facsimiles, of photostats and lithographs, and all manner of duplications and multiplications. It is therefore all important that people be called back to a sense of reality—be reminded that there are origins and originals. This can best be achieved by the passage of the legislation continuing the freedom train. Let us remember that the source and origin of these rights and freedoms documented in the papers on this train do not arise from these papers but have their origin in the natural law ordered in man by his Creator as sacred and inalienable.

Ozark National Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, at my request, Paul H. Gerrard, forest supervisor of the Ozark National Forest at Russellville, Ark., has compiled the following information which I think is very pertinent to the development of our forests, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the statement:

THE OZARK NATIONAL FOREST AND ITS SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE IMMEDIATE AREA

GENERAL

The area within the Ozark National Forest and in general throughout northwest Arkansas, consists primarily of marginal farm and timber-growing lands with spots of highly productive land here and there. The southern edge of the forest consists of pine and pine hardwood type with the main portion straight hardwoods. The soil, to begin with, was rather shallow and years of woods burning and continual squeezing of farm land to produce income has resulted in a very deteriorated soil condition. Comparatively low incomes, as compared with the rest of the United States, prevail throughout the area which as yet has not been extensively industrialized. The advent of electric power in connection with the flood-control program, the availability of a good class of labor, including quite a number of skilled laborers, should eventually result in considerable industrial developments.

At the present time, the processing of forest products has not proceeded very far locally outside of the furniture and wagon stock centers at Fort Smith and Fayetteville and the flooring plant at Clarksville. Outside of these there are only a few small handle and other wood processing plants in the vicinity of the forest.

It appears that the most practical long-time land use in northwest Arkansas would be primarily that of growing timber. Even the agriculturists are beginning to think along this line. Studies indicate that much of the timberland outside the forest is noncommercial in nature so far as private capital is concerned. This will probably mean some form of public ownership if the land is to be protected, water and flood-control objectives accomplished, and an attempt made to obtain some return from each acre of land. This would mean a long-time acquisition and conversion program since it would take many years to build up a productive forest from the poor stands and poor soils.

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

About 25 percent of the forest consists of pine and pine hardwood type and the balance pure hardwood. About 15 percent of the forest area probably can be classified as nonproductive or producing only low quality forest products. The remaining 85 percent can and should be used for the production of high-quality timber. Growth is slow, but the quality of the future crop should be excellent. Currently, the harvesting of timber from the forest is producing man-years of work, direct returns to the communities through 25 percent refund of timber receipts and profits through the expenditure of wages received from forest work.

Between July 1, 1947, and June 30, 1948, a cut of 28,500,000 feet of timber from the national forest produced, conservatively, over 709 man-years of work for those engaged in harvesting and in the manufacture of lumber and wood products. An outstanding example is the Ozark Hardwood Co., which employs some 350 men year-long and distributes nearly $1,000,000 locally for wages, supplies, etc. Another example is the handle plant at Lurton which is the primary support of this small community. The total income of this group has not been estimated, but it is known that it is an important factor in sustaining communities both in, and adjacent to the forest. In addition to these contributions, the counties will receive about $83,500 for roads and school purposes. This contribution directly affects the welfare of many small school districts. It is impossible to determine the gross effect of the timber business on the social and economic welfare of the communities, as the gas and oil stations, grocery stores, and all other forms of business are materially benefited by the income from the harvesting of the timber.

For the past few years, over-all growth has been nearly static with mortality practically offsetting growth. Under more intensive forms of management as now being practiced, the future growth can be increased from the present 33 board feet per acre to 75 or 100 board feet. This growth will more than support the present industries and should invite new industries which will help bolster the economy of the communities in, and adjacent to, the forest. As a forecast of the future, we should eventually be able to cut some 75,000,000 board feet of timber annually. The average stumpage price would be about $12 per thousand or a total of $900,000 receipts per year.

WATER MANAGEMENT

A flood control program is in the process of being initiated on the White and Arkansas Rivers. The forest, through proper management, can, and will, play a major role in the protection of the headwaters of a number of streams of these drainages. Continued fire protection and increasingly intensive timber management practices, along with some erosion control measures along roads and in logging operations, will maintain the optimum watershed condition which appears to be desirable. One area on the forest, the Frog Bayou watershed, deserves mention because of its importance for water supply. The city of Fort Smith is dependent upon the water from this watershed for its water supply, totaling nearly 2,000,000,000 gallons of water a year. Under proper management, the watershed can produce two to three times this amount if and when needed. Using a figure of only 1 cent per thousand gallons, as an estimated value for the water used, it would mean a total value to Fort Smith of $20,000 per year, or about 40 cents per acre per year for the watershed. There is also the Illinois Bayou Watershed from which Russellville obtains its water supply, using some 264,000,000 gallons per year. Since this is a large drainage, there is an ample water supply without giving any special attention to timber-cutting practices other than to avoid contamination.

RECREATION

The Ozark Forest is a mountainous and very attractive scenic area but it is handicapped by the lack of paved or dustless roads to reach the most scenic areas within the forest. The public recreational areas which have been developed, however, do have a relatively heavy use by the people of the communities in the surrounding territory. There were 345,000 local and out-of-State visitors this last year (includes hunters, fishermen, etc.) With the advent of paved roads, some of which are now under construction, this use will undoubtedly expand and the local towns and merchants will reap additional benefits in the way of income from tourist travel. The dollar value of forest recreation is difficult to evaluate. However, the forest is considered as one of the attractions which results in the reported $150,000,000 yearly tourist business of the State.

From a regional standpoint, the recreational use is still largely potential but is growing each year. Numerous flood-control lakes in the vicinity of the forest will help attract tourists to the State and many of them are enjoying the recreational facilities of the forest. As the potential use develops, the towns and villages surrounding the forest will be increasingly benefited through sale of goods and services. It is believed that we should eventually be able to build recreation usage to a point where we would have more than 1,000,000 visitors annually. Since many of the people who use these areas are local people, the average expenditure per individual would be low. Hence, if we figure that each user would spend $2.50 to $5 per visit, it would mean that $2,500,000 to $5,000,000 annually would be spent in the immediate areas.

WILDLIFE

The Ozark National Forest is at present the main big game hunting area in the State. In the fall of 1948, it is estimated that there were over 14,000 deer hunters using the national forest. There were 8,900 small-game hunters and trappers, as well as 7,500 fishermen during the same period. Game management, as such, on the forest is still in its infancy. The deer herd of some 10,000 animals can undoubtedly be tripled if properly managed and handled. We also have about 200 head of elk and 120 wild turkeys besides many of the smaller game animals such as possums, coons, etc. This number of deer (30,000) should eventually provide reasonably good hunting for some 60,000 to 70,000 hunters annually. Towns adjacent to the forest, notably Mountain View, Calico Rock, and Ozark, are already depending on increased business during the hunting season. Potentially, all of the other towns and some of the communities within the forest are future headquarters for numerous big-game hunters with additional funds to spend. Average expenditure by hunters will probably vary between $10 to $20, hence, if we use $15 as the average expenditure, 60,000 hunters would result in $900,000 being distributed locally in the communities and areas adjacent to the forest each year if the game resources are fully developed and intensively managed.

Small-game hunters and fishermen amounted to approximately 8,900 and 7,500 respectively, during 1948. Small game, as well as turkey and quail, are on the increase. The local communities are aware of this and also of the fact that without fire protection, this increase would not be possible. Socially and economically, the game increase is of considerable value for recreation as well as the food it produces and the business which it increases.

GRAZING

The grazing of nearly 12,000 head of cattle and horses, 1,200 head of sheep and goats, and 6,700 head of swine is another minor use of the forest. It is important enough to be under regulation only on the Magazine Mountain District. As a commercial enterprise, grazing will probably be only a transition use within the forest except on area suitable for improved pastures. On the other hand, it is now, and probably will continue to be, important from a subsistence standpoint, since practically all the residents within the forest boundaries now make use of the old fields and will continue to do so for what might be called subsistence grazing for cattle, hogs, and horses. The open range will continue to support a limited amount of livestock in natural open areas, but the range will be restricted more and more as the forest takes over and crowds out the grasses. Good forest management will point out the advantage of improved pastures where economically possible, helping to improve the quality of

the livestock on one hand and risking the damage to the forest on the other. This should result in better living conditions through a more stable income and reduce the isolated developments which are socially undesirable.

FOREST IMPROVEMENTS

The 1,200 miles of forest road and trucktrail system has enabled community travel and communication to reach a standard heretofore unobtainable. It has made possible the consolidation of schools and churches in communities where better facilities were available. It has also helped to reduce the number of isolated and submarginal farms because of the people's desire to live near communities and have the advantages of better roads. The construction and maintenance of these roads has also provided work for a number of residents of the forest who depend on part-time labor to help out their income derived from subsistence farming. As a further point, much of the income now derived from the forest through the harvesting of timber, and the sale of commodities and other products from the forest area, would not be possible without the maintenance of this road system.

Highway No. 7, when constructed and black-topped, is expected to result in a large increase of tourist and commercial travel through the forest and adjacent communities. Even now, large tourist courts are under development, with swimming and other recreational features being planned in towns adjacent to the forest as a result of the reconstruction of this road.

SPECIAL USES

This is still another minor use. It involves 200 permittees of which about 100 are for pasture, cultivation, hay, etc. These either fully, or partially, supplement the livelihood of the 100 users. Likewise, the four concession permits contribute part-time earnings to permittees. Receipts from this source amount to $5,250 per year.

About one-half of the agricultural permits are temporary in nature. All, however, contribute to the social and economic well-being of the users. Such uses help to relieve the counties and the State of problems resulting from the land acquisition program.

FINANCIAL RETURNS TO THE COUNTIES

The 25 percent of receipts amounted to 7½ cents per acre last year and will be about 8 cents this year. Since county taxes vary from 3½ cents to possibly 5½ cents per acre, it means that the national forest is returning about double that received from similar private land. Total receipts for the fiscal year 1948 were $340,269.

Schools receive 75 percent of the money, and roads 25 percent. Hence, the school districts gain considerably as a result of these payments. Other returns to the counties have been included in above topics, such as work opportunities and increase in business, as well as partially relieving counties of constructing and maintaining roads within the forest area.

SUMMARY

To sum up the contributions of the Ozark National Forest to the communities within and adjacent to the area, it may be stated that:

1. The forest produces income both in dollars and cents and in man-years of labor from the harvest of forest products.

2. It provides an unestimable value in control of floodwaters in two large river drainages.

3. It provides recreation, and through recreation usage it produces economic returns to the local area.

4. The wildlife of the forest is of value both from the recreational standpoint and from an economic standpoint.

5. The grazing within the forest provides additional income to subsistence of farmers.

6. The road-and-trail system provides communications between communities which aids in their social development and welfare, as well as in their economic stability.

7. Special uses provides a means of livelihood and assists in absorbing the shock of adjustments resulting from acquisition of land.

8. Direct financial returns are about twice that received from private land.

This is a limited discussion of some of the features of the Ozark National Forest which I feel justify its existence through its contribution to the social and economic welfare of northwest Arkansas.

Taxes and Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following open letter to me which appeared recently in the Fresno Guide, of Fresno, Calif.:

ONE MAN'S OPINION

(By W. F. E.)

An open letter to Congressman CECIL F. WHITE, of the Ninth District, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

"DEAR CECIL: Everybody around here is pleased at your success in getting on the House Agricultural Committee, and also at your appointment to the subcommittee on cotton quotas. It will amuse you, I am sure, to learn also that some of the people who were saying, prior to November 2, 1948, that it would take you at least 4 years to get anywhere in Washington, now are letting it be known that they were sure all the time that you could do it. No doubt some of these same people already have been in communication with you on other matters of more direct interest to themselves.

"However, I have taken it for granted all along that you will do a job for the ninth district, and I also take it for granted that if you do that you will continue for a long time to get mail at your present address. So for a few minutes I'm going to talk about a long-range national problem, one that is beginning to bother many millions of people including thousands in this district. Right now it is a very hot topic of conversation. It has been heated up, of course, by the President's budget message and the Hoover Commission's promised report on economy in government. Let me approach it from the personal side.

"A few minutes spent in making estimates and adding them up have convinced me that I pay out in taxes of one kind or another about a quarter of my annual income. This is a pretty rough guess, and I am afraid to go into the matter more thoroughly because if I did so the figure might look worse. Moreover, there are a great many hidden taxes that really are so well concealed that it is hardly worth while to search for them.

"Well, a quarter of one's income out in taxes means that for about 75 days of each year one is working for government, local, State and national. It also means in many cases—for I am sure mine is neither unique nor unusual—the difference between just getting by and getting by with a few dollars left over at the end of the year.

"Now higher State and Federal taxes are clearly foreseeable in the immediate future, and I must confess that I am beginning to wonder how much more blood the ordinary salaried or wage-earning American can part with and still go on living.

"It isn't that many of the schemes this money will be used to support are not worthy or that some are not vitally necessary; it is simply a question whether or not we can afford them while paying for one war, preparing for another, trying to keep Western Europe out of Soviet clutches, and so forth and so on. The stuff you read about how rich the American people are at present sounds fine, but it won't stand analysis. A man isn't rich if his obligations exceed his income; neither is a country.

"Moreover, there are millions of people in the United States who pay no taxes at all except various sales and excise levies, since they own no property, are exempt from withholding taxes and simply do not choose to pay income taxes on or before March 15. The rest of us carry their share of the burden and doubtless will continue to do so for a long time, as it is not expedient, either politically or otherwise, to make them carry it themselves.

"On top of this, all government is wasteful and extravagant, and nowadays it has altogether too many beneficiaries of one kind or another. Millions of people live on the government today—which means on you and me—and some make an adequate return, some make an inadequate one, and some make no return at all.

"It always has been established rule, with only few and sporadic exceptions, that taxes remain stationary or increase; they do not decrease. It is an equally well established custom that taxpayers beef, but never really do anything effective about what (and whom) is biting them. So I'm afraid I know where we go from here.

"However, if a majority of the Nation's taxpayers were to rise up in wrath and refuse to pay any taxes until governmental costs were actually cut one-third at all levels, then we would be getting somewhere. And I wish I had enough faith in human nature to be able to predict that such an action someday will be taken—even if long after I have departed for that region where everybody lives on a Government pension.

"But failing a taxpayers' revolt, it seems to me that Congress can and should do something definite and drastic about waste, and also about the present unfair incidence of income taxation. And your friends would like to see you take a leading part in such a constructive undertaking.

"Sincerely yours,

"BILL ELLIOT,
"Editor, Fresno Guide."

Home Furnishing Under Consumer Credit Control Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, many, too many, of the problems of our constituents result from the administration of acts of the Congress. Latitude upon the part of administrators is of course necessary; however, careful attention upon their part to legislation intent is absolutely essential.

The power voted by Congress to permit credit restrictions was cautionary—not mandatory—and should be invoked

only so far as is necessary. The severeness of the credit restrictions now imposed on consumer goods are working hardships. The letter that follows emphasizes the reflection of the average citizen on this important matter.

The restrictions should be relaxed.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,
January 21, 1949.

Hon. JOHN E. LYLE,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Amid the pressure of your many official duties, I implore you to give some thought to the immediate repeal of, or a drastic reduction of the provisions of the Consumer Credit Control Act. I am certain that the many thousands of veterans over the Nation like myself, who are daily becoming home owners, are finding it next to impossible to acquire the necessary cash to properly furnish their new homes, or to acquire automobiles badly needed in their work, or in order to obtain work.

To properly furnish a home, so that one would not be ashamed to ask even his closest friends or relatives to visit him, a person needs between four and five hundred dollars in cash. This would not be a household of elaborate furnishings, but only the bare necessities to keep the house from looking bare. Even if one were able to raise the necessary amount of cash for the down payment, the monthly payments under the present law would be prohibitive. For instance, I cannot agree with any line of reasoning that will allow a person to purchase a $300 ring or watch for as little as $10 down, and yet requires that same person to deposit from $50 to $90 in order to acquire proper sanitary refrigeration for his food. It stands to reason that a family's health is of much more importance to the welfare of the city, county, State, and Nation, than is the ostentatious display of rings, watches, necklaces, and such trivia. Along the same line, the help-wanted ads in the dailies contain the phrase "car necessary," or "car essential." Even if one were fortunate enough to obtain an automobile and one of these jobs, his monthly salary must reach between four and five hundred dollars in order for him to meet his payments on said automobile and also meet his necessary living expenses.

I feel sure that the above facts, and many more of such, are very well known to you, and that they are already causing you some concern. Your efforts toward relaxing the present law, in order for the new home owners and the average American buying public to purchase the commodities necessary to maintain our present standard of living, will earn you the undying gratitude of the many thousands of such people affected.

Sincerely yours,

C. AUBREY SMITH.

Diplomatic Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 14, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC WARFARE

Hungary's request for the recall of the United States Minister in Budapest is probably a direct result of unrest over the railroading of Cardinal Mindszenty to conviction for alleged activities against the state. Having embarked upon the perilous course of condemning the Primate of Hungary for what is apparently nothing more than exercising the guaranteed right of freedom of religion, the Budapest regime is trying to give a semblance of reality to the "plot" it alleges, by ousting the American Minister. The idea that Minister Chapin was in any way involved in the case is fantastic. We may assume that he was filled with disgust by the farcical nature of the trial, as virtually all other Americans were. It may be that in part he is being punished for the candid reactions of President Truman and the State Department to the trial; but we strongly suspect that the chief motive is closely related to internal propaganda.

If Mr. Chapin had been interfering in the internal affairs of Hungary in any manner not warranted by the peace treaty with that country, Budapest would have ample cause to ask for his recall. On several occasions the United States has acted against representatives of other countries who butted into our domestic affairs. Only last summer the State Department asked Moscow to recall Jacob Lomakin after his outrageous challenge to American sovereignty in the Kasenkina case. The trouble is that the Kremlin-dominated governments cannot be trusted to apply a similar test to the representatives of other countries. For they have no regard for facts, truth, justice, or freedom. Their policy is to strike at any individual who may cause them embarrassment, even if he is the representative of a foreign government. In pursuit of their terroristic policy the ruthless men in control at Budapest have asked for the recall of four American diplomats in 2 weeks.

Under these conditions any well reasoned and tolerant policy of diplomatic representation is likely to be turned against us. This newspaper suggested last August that the State Department would have to insist on reciprocity in the number of representatives exchanged between this country and the Soviet. It may be necessary to apply that rule to specific diplomatic positions and to make it operative against all Communist-dominated governments. Where reason and justice have no standing, even the principle of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth is better than one-sided, arbitrary action taken by the Communists to suit their own purposes.

A Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, February 11, marked the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of a great American, Thomas A. Edison. It is fitting that recognition be given the anniversary of this benefactor of mankind whose numerous inventions have contributed so greatly to our well-being and comfort. I should like to include at this point the following editorial that appeared in the East Orange (N. J.) Record on Thursday, February 10, 1949:

A GREAT AMERICAN

Tomorrow marks the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of one of the world's greatest Americans, Thomas Alva Edison. The late inventor was probably the one man who, more than anyone else, gave us the abundant life which we have enjoyed in the United States.

Thomas A. Edison was born in Milan, Ohio, on February 11, 1847. He passed away on October 18, 1931. In his life span of 84 years he did more than any other American to make this Nation the great country it is today. His entire life was one of devotion to the comfort and convenience of human existence. He gave us electric light, he gave us motion pictures, and he gave us the electronic tube which later proved to be the basis of radio and our vast electronic industry. He gave us the phonograph and simple things, such as waxed paper and gummed paper. Whether we are in our homes, offices, factories, or are traveling by land, sea, or air, we find numerous instances of convenience and comfort that originated in Edison's mind. There are also the necessary machines or devices which were the products of his inventions, machines and devices without which we would be handicapped today.

Thomas A. Edison left more when he died than the vast benefits derived from his 1,150 patents. By his character and devotion to work for the benefit of his fellow men, by the simplicity and honesty of his life, by his modesty he showed that the simple virtues of our ancestors are still the basic qualities necessary for success in the United States.

Through his own greatness he showed us the greatness of our Nation. When he was 12 years of age he was selling newspapers and confectionery on trains; at the age of 23 he received $40,000 for an invention. Where else but in this country could that happen?

Edison was always quick to point that he did not consider himself a genius. His definition of a genius was "1 percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration." When asked about his methods of work he would mention only three things, "imagination, ambition, and a will to work."

Those are the simple precepts of a great man and a guide which we would do well to follow. They describe the American way to achieve a useful and successful life.

Steam Plant for Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a timely editorial from the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald of January 27 of this year. On this week this House will consider and vote upon the proposal to construct a much needed steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., to enable the Tennessee Valley Authority to maintain a steady flow of necessary power in the 80,000 square mile area served by that agency.

The editorial follows:

THE PLACE TO START

We are in receipt of a long telegram from the power lobby in Washington explaining how the cost of government can be cut.

The meat of the telegram is this: (1) Cost-cutting has to start somewhere. (2) Let it start with rejection of the TVA proposal to build a steam-generating plant.

The proposed TVA steam plant appropriation would be about $4,000,000—or something less than one ten-thousandth of the $42,000,000,000 budget Mr. Truman has proposed. Four million dollars would finance the Marshall plan for about 8 hours or run

America's Military Establishment for about 2 hours. Four million dollars would pay the interest on the national debt for something less than half a day.

Unlike the Marshall plan, the military program and interest payments, however, the TVA steam plant would not be a drain on the national resources. It would be a wealth-producer. It would firm up TVA's hydropower, make the TVA system more efficient, make electricity cheaper. Along with flood control, reclamation and a few other wealth-creating enterprises in which the Government engages, power development can make a case for its economic soundness.

The power lobby's telegram is timely, however. It reminds us to congratulate Senator WHERRY once more on the stanch but losing fight he put up in the Senate last year to help save the TVA steam plant appropriation. It moves us to hope that when the same bill comes up in this session he will be joined by Senator BUTLER and the four Nebraska Congressmen.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Brodie Pugh, from the February issue of Soil Conservation:

ALL FORCES PULL TOGETHER

(By Brodie Pugh, district conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, Shreveport, La.)

A master soil conservation program carried out last fall on the John S. Welsh, Jr., farm near Shreveport showed what can be accomplished through cooperation. It demonstrated how easily the soil-erosion problem of this Nation could be whipped if all who are able to contribute to its solution were to get together like friendly neighbors—a trend much in evidence in recent years.

The big program of soil conservation on the Welsh farm was sponsored by the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and the upper West Red River, the Dorcheat, and the upper Sabine soil conservation districts. But in the weeks of planning and on the day of execution, the sponsors had generous help from numerous sources, all working closely together. Business firms furnished seed, lime, and fertilizer. Implement dealers furnished operators and automotive equipment worth half a million dollars. Paper and lumber bills supplied modern equipment and mechanics. Newspapers and radio stations publicized the event and interpreted its meaning for the benefit of their audiences of tens of thousands of persons. Soil Conservation Service technicians and employees of other agencies worked together on the technical phases. The general members of the chamber of commerce, especially the agricultural committees, gave a lot of time over a period of weeks. Soil conservation district supervisors and cooperators carried out important tasks. The United States Air Force, the National Guard, and the State government sent several officials with words of encouragement and the promise of official backing for soil conservation in all parts of Louisiana.

It would indeed take considerable space to enumerate all who worked on this project. The point to be emphasized is that, as was the case on this particular occasion, the conservation of soil and water resources is not a job for the Federal or the State Government alone, or for the owners and operators of the farm land alone. Rather, it is a job for everyone, and a task that needs the help of everyone, if the erosion of the Nation's soil is to be stopped before it is too late and if American agricultural land is to be brought into maximum, permanent production in time to maintain the present standard of living.

An estimated 10,000 persons saw the various dovetailing measures of soil conservation applied to the Welsh farm. They heard soil conservation talks. Many other thousands got an insight into the work through radio broadcasts from the scene and through newspaper stories and pictures.

The idea, of course, was not simply to concentrate thought on the need for concerted action. The immediate task was to convert an eroded and depleted 320-acre piece of land into a productive conservation farm in 1 day. That achievement in itself showed what makes up a coordinated soil-conservation program, how it is applied, and what it does for a farm. It was a dramatic way of calling attention to the entire conservation task—a task that embodies a large number of related practices. Of course, as was pointed out by J. C. Dykes, assistant chief of the Soil Conservation Service, an entire program of soil and water conservation cannot be applied in 1 day, as many practices are seasonal and must be installed at the proper time. For example, certain pasture crops cannot be planted until spring, and pine trees can be planted successfully only in January and February in this part of the country. But many major practices were applied in the 1 day; others were carried out to show how they are done, such as the planting of pine seedlings with a machine; all the others will be applied at the proper time, so that within a year young Welsh will have a farm on which an entire soil-conservation program has been applied.

Nor, as Dykes also noted, can a conservation farmer be made in a day. But those of us who worked out the plan with Welsh agreed with Dykes when he added, "I believe that John Welsh will become a conservation farmer, a conservation farmer being one who farms the conservation way because it is part of him, because he understands that it is good for the land."

In helping to make a conservation farmer out of 31-year-old John S. Welsh, Jr., the sponsors of the master soil conservation program can also feel that they have been well repaid.

False Case Against the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 10, 1949, entitled "A False Case Against the TVA."

There came to me on February 9 of this year from Purcell L. Smith, the $65,000,-per-year-plus-an-unlimited-expense-account lobbyist for the private power interests, a letter seeking to retard and stifle the production of much-needed electric current to the farmers and all other residents of the Second Congressional District of Tennessee and to all of the 5,000,000 persons who reside in the 80,000-square-mile area served by the TVA.

Accompanying this letter is a pamphlet which is full of false and misleading statements. The TVA is self-sustaining and self-liquidating. It is the only source of electric energy for the farmers, dairymen, working people, manufacturing plants, mines, veterans, and business concerns, and other people in the area served by it.

The 375,000 kilowatts of power which will be made possible by the proposed steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is absolutely necessary in order to enable TVA to furnish its customers sufficient power at all seasons of the year. The production of aluminum for defense purposes at the great aluminum plant in Blount County, Tenn., and the production of atomic bombs at Oak Ridge, Tenn., depends upon and is calling for a greater output of electric current by the TVA. This proposed steam plant is the answer to all these urgent needs. It insures the prosperity of the people of this region and the adequate defense of this Nation in the event of a threatened war.

The editorial referred to follows:

A FALSE CASE AGAINST TVA

TVA's urgent need for a new steam-electric generating plant, and the fallacy of the private power lobby's arguments against it, are now amply shown.

An initial appropriation of $2,500,000 was recommended early this month by a House appropriations subcommittee.

The need itself, which the anti-TVA lobbyists have never denied, is documented in impressive detail in a statement reprinted under the cartoon today. In addition, the statement is a fine showing of the leadership which TVA is giving the country in making electricity the servant of the people. It is a notable accomplishment that the percentage of electrified farms in the Tennessee Valley has increased from 30 percent 4 years ago to nearly 60 percent today and is increasing at the rate of 1 percent a month.

Alternatives to a new steam plant which the power lobby has suggested are that TVA buy power from private companies outside its area or that municipalities and industries build their own power plants.

These are not fair, sensible alternatives. Neighboring power companies are hard pressed to supply their present demands, and even if they had a surplus the cost of transmitting it the long distances between their plants and TVA's customers would be prohibitive.

Municipalities might lack sites favorable to low production costs and industries in the Tennessee Valley would be unfairly penalized by not having the choice, enjoyed by industries elsewhere, of purchasing instead of producing their own power. In either case, the private power lobby's proposal would violate the contract which binds TVA to supply these customers.

Altogether, it is a false argument which the power lobby, spearheaded by the National Association of Electric Companies, advances. In the telegram which that association's chief lobbyist, P. L. Smith, recently sent to the Post-Dispatch and other newspapers throughout the country, perhaps the trickiest assertion was that the New Johnsonville, Tenn., project "would be the first steam plant constructed by the Federal Government any time, any place, for commercial purposes."

TVA's statement pointed out that the Federal Government authorized TVA to buy all the steam plants of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. and to build a new steam plant of its own at Watts Bar, so that if there is a grain of truth in the statement that New Johnsonville "would be the first" it is based on a tricky use of words and not on the facts.

We think this misleading propaganda by the National Association of Electric Companies will react against it and to the advantage of TVA wherever it is met by a plain statement of the facts. Mr. Smith's telegram and TVA's answer which were printed on this page February 5, and the TVA statement printed today, give all the pros and cons. We do not have any doubt of the conclusion of any reasonable person who reads them with an open mind.

Tax Saturation Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids Herald of February 8, 1949:

TAX SATURATION POINT

An idea of what Herbert Hoover is talking about when he warns that taxes have reached the saturation point may be had from the annual report of the Michigan department of revenue.

Thirty cents out of every dollar of Michigan income go for taxes, Federal, State, and local.

In some years during and after World War II, the take was higher.

What this means is that Michigan residents must earn $1 in order to have 70 cents to spend on themselves. A $50 weekly wage is worth only $35.

In the year which ended June 30, 1948, tax collections in Michigan amounted to $2,842,700,000. Of this, $2,252,300,000 was in Federal taxes, $343,200,000 in State taxes, and $247,200,000 in local taxes.

Total Michigan income last year is not yet known, but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, according to United States Department of Commerce figures, it was $8,641,000,000, and for 1948 it was probably in the neighborhood of $9,000,000,000.

The percentage of taxes as related to income is far higher than it was a decade ago.

The Department of Revenue notes that in 1940 taxes amounted to 17.38 percent of the income of Michigan residents. In 1941 it rose to 19.42 percent; in 1942 it was 20.67 percent; in 1943 it was 22.48 percent; in 1944 it was 38.17 percent; in 1945 it reached a peak of 43.51 percent. Then in 1946 it declined to 32.25 percent and in 1947 to 26.57 percent.

It is perhaps significant that this rise in taxes in proportion to income has accompanied a great shift in the tax burden. The shift has been from local to Federal taxation.

In 1930, the report shows, local taxes amounted to 49.26 percent of the total, Federal taxes 28.72 percent, and State 22.02 percent.

By 1940, Federal taxes took the greater share, 48.25 percent. Local taxes were down to 28.1 percent of the total, and State taxes accounted for 23.65 percent.

By 1948, Federal taxes amounted to 79.23 percent of the total paid by Michigan residents. State taxes accounted for 12.07 percent, and local taxes only 8.7 percent.

Of course these figures reflect only the collection of taxes. Much of the Federal and State taxes are still spent at the local level, having been returned in various forms of Federal and State aid. At the same time, local Government has transferred or surrendered many of its functions to the State and, in some cases, to the Federal Government.

Almost always, however, there are State and Federal strings attached to funds that pass through their treasuries on the way to local units.

In part, the growing burden of Federal taxes is attributable to the war and to expenditures growing out of the war.

But another part is attributable to inefficiency of a growing bureaucracy.

Local government generally is more efficient than either State or Federal Government, simply because it is directly under the eyes of the taxpayers. Yet today, with 30 cents out of the income dollar going for taxes of all kinds, 24 cents of it is being collected and disbursed by the Government farthest from the people, the Federal Government.

Local units, in many cases receiving more than half of their revenues from higher levels of government, have a spending power that is divorced from the responsibility for keeping taxes down.

When taxes take 30 percent of income, that is perilously close to the saturation point. But under a system in which taxes are collected at a higher level of government, even though spent at a lower level, supersaturation is in sight.

Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 8, 1949, entitled "Continue the Marshall Plan":

CONTINUE THE MARSHALL PLAN

The administration has asked for $5,500,000,000 to continue the Marshall plan until June 1950.

There may be some debate in Congress about the exact appropriation that is necessary, but there should be no substantial disagreement about the wisdom of continuing the program.

Seldom has any American effort in foreign affairs been more quickly successful. Seldom has the American taxpayer gotten more for his money. This was part of the cold war—and it paid off handsomely.

The Marshall plan was conceived when the wave of Soviet-Communist imperialism seemed ready to engulf all of Europe—including the west. The European peoples were war weary, impoverished, desperate, and almost without hope of recovery. All this has changed in scarcely more than a year.

The very promise of Marshall-plan aid reawakened hope in western Europe—even before the aid was forthcoming. Psychologically, the knowledge that the United States would stand behind them was as important to the faltering western European nations as was the aid itself.

Today the tide has turned. Western Europe is recovering. Communist influence is waning. Western Europe is not only rebuilding its own economies but is preparing to defend itself against any Soviet-Communist threat.

The United States undertook a big program when it embarked on the Marshall plan. So far the plan has been outstandingly successful. Of course, this Nation will see it through. All but a few isolationist diehards in Congress seem to understand the need for continuing the plan—for the next year, or until the job is done.

Indictment of Protestant Clergymen in Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the Washington News on Saturday, February 12, 1949:

WAR ON CHRISTIANITY

The indictment of 15 Protestant clergymen in Bulgaria is correctly interpreted by the State Department and the British Foreign Office as part of a concerted assault on all Christian churches by the Communist governments of eastern Europe. It can be nothing else.

The "lynch court" treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary obviously was more than an isolated attack upon either an individual or a single institution. It followed earlier action against Bishop Lajos Ordass, of the Hungarian Lutheran Church.

Just as obviously, these persecutions have the approval of Moscow.

The drive is not confined to eastern Europe. It is world-wide. Witness the fact that Paul Yu-pin, noted archbishop of China, heads the latest list of "war criminals" published by the Chinese Communists.

Churchmen indicted in Bulgaria as "foreign agents" include leaders of the Methodist, Baptist, Pentecost, and Congregational denominations. The usual statement that all of the accused had fully confessed to spy charges accompanied announcement of the indictments. That has been the window dressing for Red purges since Andrei Vishinsky set the precedent in Russia in 1937.

The victims of the Bulgarian dragnet have known the hell of the police state torture chamber more than a month—long enough to be persuaded to sign anything the prosecution submits.

In Bulgaria the attack on the churches has been broadened by naming as alleged accomplices of the accused a list of distinguished foreign clergymen and educators. Included are such notables as Bishop Paul Garber, Methodist bishop of 11 European nations and former dean of divinity at Duke University; Dr. J. Hutchinson Cockburn, former moderator of the Church of Scotland; Cyril Black, professor of Russian history at Princeton; and Robert Tobias, of the World Council of Churches at Geneva.

This must be accepted as a warning that henceforth Christian churchmen will visit Bulgaria at their peril. More than that, however, it is a confession of weakness. The last church census in Bulgaria, in 1934, listed only 8,371 Protestants compared to 5,000,000 members of the Greek Orthodox Church.

A strong state would have no fear of such a small minority, particularly a minority known to be law-abiding. But the petty

regime at Sofia is not strong but weak, and its puppet tyrants are afraid. Because of that fear they seek to crush all independent thought, and all outside contact with enlightenment and truth.

Dictatorships supported by fear and terrorism are built on sand. Given time, such regimes collapse of their own rottenness. The tragedy is that, in that slow process, the innocent must suffer.

Proposal of TVA for Steam Plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is relying on public ignorance to secure funds to expand its operations into the electric-power business.

The proposal of the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a new steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., is just another flagrant case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Taxpayers all over the United States are digging down into their pockets to make up the Government's losses from selling electricity under the cost of production to giant chemical and metal industries.

I want to make it clear right now that I am not speaking out against the TVA. It was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River and its main tributaries to promote navigation and flood control. It was authorized by Congress to construct dams and reservoirs, and, insofar as it was consistent with its primary purpose, to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy.

TVA serves approximately 144 municipalities and rural electric cooperatives that buy the power thus developed and resell it to the areas they serve. It was never contemplated that TVA would become the means by which the Federal Government would embark into the business of producing electric power in competition with industry.

Three million dollars are now being asked for the construction of a steam plant. Ultimately this plant will consist of three units capable of producing a total of 375,000 kilowatts. The estimated cost of the first unit of this plant is $54,000,000 plus $30,000,000 for transmission lines and generating facilities—a total of $84,000,000.

In these days such a cost is incidental when compared with the over-all expenditure of the Federal Government. But the principle involved in the granting of this appropriation and in the Government's operation of such a plant is highly significant and far-reaching.

For the sake of simplicity, let us grant that the TVA area is in need of additional power. This contention has not been proven to my satisfaction but let us assume the need to be a fact. We have been assured that such additional facilities can be secured through private capital. The huge industries operating in the TVA area, and the municipalities served, are well able to install their own steam plants just as they do elsewhere in the country. There is no reason why TVA cannot secure steam power from neighboring utilities with which it already exchanges power. The capacity to produce is there. Obviously, private capital, though abundantly available for such construction, is not forthcoming when, year after year, the Federal Government, through TVA, holds over its head the threat of building the world's largest steam plant and selling power below cost of production.

There are many American ways of working out the problem of securing more power for the TVA area without resorting to decadent socialism or taking these steps toward the nationalization of the power industry in the United States. If, by this appropriation, Congress authorizes the Government to establish itself in the power business, just what barrier is there to prevent it going into the steel business, coal, oil, or railroading?

My desk is piled high with pounds of releases, folders, reports, and so forth, advising me that the people of the Tennessee Valley are proud of the TVA and what it has done to bring prosperity and well-being to that area. Farms have been electrified, farm production has increased, homes have sewing and washing machines and all sorts and kinds of electric gadgets. Rates are cheap, and everyone wants electric fixtures and appliances.

Approximately one-third of TVA's electric power is allocated to the large industries which have moved into that area for the purpose of operating on cheap electricity.

In 1945, the peak years of the war, the residential consumers of the TVA area used 836,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and by 1948 this consumption had risen to nearly 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

TVA estimates that its residential consumers will, in 1952, use 3,750,000,000 kilowatt-hours—or about 3,000,000,000 more than in 1945.

The amount of electricity used on the farms in 1945 was about 85,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and in 1948 the amount used on the farms reached 360,000,000 kilowatt-hours. It is estimated that in 1952 this consumption will rise to 875,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

There are now 250,000 farms electrified in the TVA area and it is planned to extend some 40,000 miles of lines into the rural areas and service another 200,000 farms.

Now these figures are quite impressive, but what is more impressive is an understanding of how TVA finances this widespread, cheap, electric energy.

The overall investment in TVA is $780,000,000, a breakdown of which indicates $480,000,000 for power, $153,000,000 for flood control, and about $149,000,000 for navigation.

In the course of 14 years, TVA has paid back to the Federal Government, on account of principal, a total of something less than $31,000,000, and they have never paid any interest to the United States except on about $54,000,000 at 1 percent. The rates charged the consumers of TVA power are not even sufficient to meet the $15,000,000 interest charges which should be paid, nor are they sufficient to pay off the $12,500,000 depreciation on plants and equipment.

An interesting comparison is available; a corporation which supplies electricity in neighboring territory has about the same capacity as TVA. It does less wholesaling than TVA. In most cases, it sells direct to the consumer. This corporation shows revenues of $125,000,000, taxes of nearly $23,000,000, and a capital investment of $492,000,000 as against TVA's $480,000,000. TVA sets up taxes of $2,000,000 and revenues of $48,000,000.

It is apparent that the competing concern makes 20 percent of its charge against the consumer for taxes it has to pay while TVA makes 4 percent of its charge against the consumer for taxes. The difference is the evasion in taxes and interest charges which enables TVA to give its customers a rate lower than those outside its orbit can receive.

This means that the taxpayers all over the Nation are digging down into their pockets to pay the power bills for privileged corporations and municipalities in the TVA area. High among the beneficiaries of this public largess are such giant industries as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., Victor Chemical Works, the Reynolds Metals Co., and a dozen others smart enough to have moved their plants to an area where electricity is being sold to them under the cost of production.

This is a flagrant case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. How can we explain this type of discriminatory financing to the farmers, miners, housewives, and workers of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kansas, California, and any other State you wish to mention. The Federal Government is relying on public ignorance of the true facts to continue this farce of cheap electricity. It is relying on public ignorance to secure this appropriation for the building of the steam plant at New Johnsonville, which will further enable large commercial interests to mooch on the taxpayer.

If the facts were known and understood this legalized fraud would be dealt with in short order. The public expects the Congress to protect its interests. Bestowing privileges to one area to the detriment and expense of another is not my understanding of that trust.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution pertaining to the Taft-Hartley Act

adopted by the Common Council of the city of Milwaukee:

Whereas in 1935 the Congress of the United States enacted the Wagner Act which gave the workingman the right to organize into labor unions and to collectively bargain with his employer; and

Whereas this law based upon the American principle of equality of opportunity was thereafter hailed as the magna carta of labor; and

Whereas the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of the Taft-Hartley Act because of its inequities and inequalities tended to disturb if not actually destroy the fundamental gains made by workingmen in their quest for economic justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we call upon the Congress of the United States now in session to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and in its place reenact the Wagner Act as originally enacted; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators representing the State of Wisconsin, and the Congressmen from the Fourth and Fifth Wisconsin District, and to the clerks of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Flight of Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE J. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in Human Events, issue of January 12, 1949, entitled "The Flight of Capital."

The need of continuing the encouragement of venture capital is so important to the future economy of our country that this article is worth reading in the light of that need.

The article follows:

THE FLIGHT OF CAPITAL

I

If the owners of capital had the sense they were born with, they would pick up their pennies and silently steal away. They would accept the verdict of the times, that they are pariahs, exploiters who deserve to be exploited, possessors of ill-gotten wealth who must be relieved of it. Since the verdict is confirmed by President Truman's current budget message, the logical thing to do in the circumstances is gracefully to retire from the black-balling society.

That is to say, anyone who is in possession of a competence sufficient for the balance of his expected days ought to allocate it accordingly and live out his life, as far as can be, outside the active market place. This would not constitute the ordinary retirement of a good and faithful servant, but the wise enjoyment of one's property before it is confiscated.

There is, of course, no longer much doubt about ultimate confiscation. The self-haloed planner has cased the job thoroughly and avidly awaits the propitious moment for its execution. Hence, the flight of capital at this time would simply be intelligently anticipatory individual action.

Taxation has already made the employment of capital a fatuous undertaking. If there is a return, the state cuts itself in liberally; if there is a loss the capitalist must absorb it all. That's a heads-I-win-tails-you-lose game which guarantees bankruptcy because of the inclination and the power of the state progressively to increase its "take."

That's the direct discouragement of capital. In an indirect way—and much more viciously—taxation spells the doom of capital production. The only function of capital is to facilitate the making of goods that people want and are capable of buying. The capacity to buy is simply the capacity of delivering other production in exchange.

II

However, one is unable to take to the market place what has been previously purloined by the highwayman. The fact that the highwayman labels his extortion with a pretty name like social legislation does not alter the economic fact of depleted purchasing power. The more social legislation, the less effective demand for the goods capital can produce. Hence, the outlook for capital is—uselessness.

When you examine the use to which much of American capital is being put now you see that it is already a useless commodity. What would happen to our capital structure today if it were not being fed with orders for things people do not want, things they would not buy if they had the choice? Like atom bombs, battleships, and swivel chairs for bureaucrats. The goods produced serve only the whims and comforts of the tax-collector, who pays for them with the taxes he collects from the capitalist. What the tax-collector taxes out of the market place is not replaced with goods wanted. Hence the capital is employed in decreasing abundance. And the profits of the capitalist are purely of the paper variety, as he learns when he seeks to replace the capital used in making the unwanted things.

Thus, capital is now largely engaged in a treadmill economy. The point of exhaustion cannot be far away. Would it not be wiser to get out while the getting is good?

As a matter of fact, capital goes on strike automatically when the returns fall below the replacement point. Plants prefer idleness to producing what nobody wants; machinery would rather rust than wear out in aimless revolutions. Nobody plans it so; the absence of effective buyers in the market place automatically communciates itself to the engines of production and they slow down accordingly. This is a natural process that is far beyond the powers of the planner to avert.

But, why wait for this deterioration to set in? It has already begun, as you see when you try to turn profits into goods. But your accumulation of wealth still has something more than a fictitious value. Smart trading at this time can still turn your factory, your railroad, your desk and tool chest into claims on things you can eat, wear, or read. Let somebody else chase the will-o'-the-wisp of profits in a tax-ridden economy. You know that political intervention in the market place means eventual strangulation, or what will your capital be worth then?

So, sell out. Consult the actuarial tables for an estimate of your life expectancy, and your accountant for a reasonable figure on what your capital will realize. Simple division will then set the standard of your living for the rest of your days. Even if the standard is below what you are accustomed to, remember that the inconvenience is only mental, and that the pain is far less than you would experience from watching your capital wither away. And, if you put a worth on it, there is the gain in self-esteem; your dignity will rise when you no longer have to endure what Hamlet called the "insolence of office and the spurns that patient merit of the unworthy takes."

III

You will get along. You might put your capital into Government bonds. Thus, you join forces with the tax collector, and in these times that kind of alliance is profitable, even though immoral. The tax collector has gratuitously stamped you a parasite, a nonproducer, and there is nothing for you to do but accept the designation by becoming his partner. So long as there is any production which he can tax, you will have something to eat.

You need not worry about repudiation of the bonds—at least, not in your lifetime. The state does not go in for that sort of thing—for fear that its borrowing capacity may be undermined—until the entire economy collapses; until there is not enough production to support the political parasites, the populace, and the funded debt. It is only then that repudiation—the act of national bankruptcy—takes place, and it has been resorted to in the past only by nations subjugated by an invader. There is little immediate likelihood of your Government bonds losing their income-producing quality.

Or, you can buy up some productive land and let it out to others to work. There will always be users, the irrepressible will to live will see to that. Land being the necessary complement of all production, you can be sure that somebody will pay you rent for the use of your site. Urban, rural, or mineral land—it makes no difference what you buy, provided it is desirable for production, it will yield you an income without labor. Under no circumstances, however, should you use it yourself, in any way, for that would put you again in the detested capitalist class. If you buy stocks or bonds issued by a landowning company, be sure the company is not engaged in production, has no capital at all, does nothing but collect rents and royalties.

If, as an extra precautionary measure, you care to earn some wages as your forefathers did, by way of digging in the soil, so much the better for your health as well as your income.

How will society get along? That's an interesting, though unimportant, speculation. Things being as they are, the wholesale flight of capital—or, what is the same thing, the discouragement of savings and investment—is inevitable and your individual strike can hardly retard or accelerate the process. It would be simply anticipatory.

But, let us suppose that a hundred billions of capital should quit simultaneously, and with that sum the entrepreneurial skill needed to put it to work. What would happen then? Most certainly, society would take on a different character; people will live, and if the accumulations of capital are no longer at work, the strong survivors will live by noncapitalistic production. What is known as primitive production, people lived that way for many thousands of years, will replace our highly specialized market place.

IV

For a while, of course, an effort will be made by newcomers to put new accumulations to work, and maybe the enraged planners will confiscate everything in sight in order to keep the tax-producing machinery in some sort of operation. But, the political intervention which put capital to flight will likewise shackle recovery. The only condition which could entice capital, new or old, into productive enterprise is the seemingly unthinkable condition of freedom; the state is not ready to grant that.

For the striking capitalists the scene would be highly interesting. They would actually see the indicated future of America during their lifetime. Maybe they would enjoy the vacuous thrill of saying "I told you so." From their vantage point of detachment they would see the mass of men, in their preoccupation with survival, giving up one spiritual and cultural value after another. The first call on human endeavor being the demands of the belly, there would be little to put into metaphysics, baseball, the latest fashions—or even God. Meanwhile, the self-anointed will be riding herd and belching forth imprecations and promissory speeches, and living in a glory the resigned capitalists never dreamed possible.

The sight would not be pretty, but the prospect is interesting. It is the panorama of the future. Probably, no one now living could witness the final denouement, unless hastened by an atomic war, but it is possible from the evidence to project in one's imagination the complete collapse of civilization. This clear anticipation, if there were no other reason, should induce the suggested strike.

The admonition is sensible. Capitalists have nothing to lose but their chains, and they may gain such pleasure as a dying civilization affords. But the guts that created capital will prevent this alluring flight. It is the alternative of flight which will be chosen.

Indians on Turtle Mountain Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of making myself a nuisance to this House I again call attention to the present situation of the Indians on the Turtle Mountain Reservation. I cautioned this House in a speech made here on January 17 that some money would have to be scraped up for the relief of these Indians without waiting for an appropriation committee to mull over the matter for weeks. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs did gather a little money and sent it out to relieve these Indians, but not enough. In order for you to get a first-hand picture of the situation there, I submit herewith a letter from an Indian on the Turtle Mountain Reservation. I do not print his name as some retaliation measures might be used against him. I assure you, however, that I have this signed letter for the perusal of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1949.

HON. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read the speech that you made to the House January 17, 1949, and want to say, and this comes from all the Indians on our reservation, thank you for trying.

You also said $43,950 had been given for winter aid. I'd like to say here, nothing has been given the Indians on this reservation or off the reservation for nothing except each a sack of potatoes. And not all the families got those. Before an Indian can get any kind of relief he first has to work it out, at the rate of 75 cents an hour. Many of these Indians go to work without eating breakfast and a lot of them stay without dinner so as to save what little they have to eat at home for their children. The grownups can understand about cold and hunger, but try explaining to a 2-, 3-, or 4-year-old child, and, brother, you have a job on hand. Many of these small children die during the long, cold winters we have, but the doctors always find some other cause to sign on the death warrants, when it really should read starvation and exposure to cold.

Even our own agency doesn't really know how bad off the Indians are, because they never venture out to visit the homes. I wish I were to take an investigator around, I sure would be willing to walk through snow 2 and 3 feet deep, just so people would be able to understand our plight.

Did you or your friends ever see your child cry for eats and not being able to get anything, begin to dig all over to try to find even a hard crust of bread that even the dogs wouldn't eat, and finding it, begin to chew on it as if it were a piece of the finest bread ever made? Lots of our Indians see it today. Did you ever have to spank a 3-year-old child who cried because it was denied another slice of bread that really didn't exist, except in the child's hungry little mind? Lots of our Indians do just that, not because they want to, but because they have to.

Our agency is located 18 miles from Dunseith, and when our Indians from around here go to our Indian school to try getting help, they're told, come to Belcourt. If the Indians had money enough to hire cars and taxis I don't think they'd be asking for help. Last week is the first week that our so-called relief girls were over at our school. How many orders were issued I don't know, but it was very darn few—if any. A few men got work slips to go to work and earn their orders. Just those under the doctor's care, aren't. Because if they did go see our doctor he'd give them a bag of aspirins and tell them that's all they needed. Well, we usually do need them after standing around for hours trying to get help, that we usually don't get.

But again I'll say, "Thank you," and if this letter helps in any way at all I'll be grateful, not for my sake, but for the sake of the poor hungry children that are so very, very pitiful.

And I "double dare" any of you men in Washington to come to see for yourselves! But don't get the agency staff to take you around. Get an Indian who knows where these other poor Indians can be found, and it's nowhere where cars can get in or out, you'll have to walk it.

I remain,
Sincerely,

_____.

P. S.—If you are to use any part of this letter to get help for our friend the Indian, kindly do not use my name. Reason: I'm an Indian myself, and people may think I'm wanting something for myself. Thank you! But every word of this is true. If you don't believe it, come and see and I'll personally take you to these homes that I know about. But you'll have to walk it, as I said before, some are way off the car roads.

Your Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, since more than 1 percent of the milk cows of the Nation are in the Seventh Congressional District of Wisconsin and since 50 percent of the farm income is from milk, and 85 percent of the farm income of our State is derived from livestock and livestock products, it is evident that the whole economic life of our district is based largely on the price of milk. What will be the price of milk tomorrow, next week, next month, and next year?

The price-support law guarantees for 1949 that the dairy farmer is entitled to 90 percent of parity for "milk and its products." What is the parity price of milk? During the last session of Congress a bill was introduced by me and three other Representatives in an effort to have the support price of milk announced. The bill was unanimously passed by the committee and the House of Representatives.

This session your Representative introduced H. R. 2200, which will compel the Department of Agriculture to announce the support price for milk for 1949. A number of similar bills were introduced by Members of the House as well as the Senate.

Yesterday hearings were held by the Committee on Agriculture on H. R. 2200 and similar bills.

The surprise of the hearing was when the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture testified that the Department had the power and authority to announce the support price for milk. This was exactly opposite to the propaganda that has been circulated, stating that they did not have the authority.

The hearings were suspended until Tuesday, February 22, to give the Department of Agriculture time to announce a legal, lawful, and satisfactory support price. If the announcement is not made before February 22 further hearings have been promised on the bill H. R. 2200 and companion measures.

The 59-cent butterfat support price announced this week means a $2.06 per hundredweight support for milk, but this does not take into consideration the value of skim milk. In other words, this is not a support price in accordance with the law, which reads 90 percent of parity "for milk and its products."

Most businesses of our district have a direct interest in the announced support price for milk and I expect to continue my efforts to have a legal, satisfactory price announced in conformity with the law of the land.

Navy Department Falls Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Tex Reynolds, columnist of the Racine Journal-Times, Racine, Wis., who calls attention to an incident in which a young Navy enlisted man was denied permission to visit the grave of his brother in France while he was on duty in European waters. The excuse given by the Navy Department in denying the right of this young man to visit the grave of his brother is ridiculous and the Navy Department lacks a sense of reality so far as its public relations are concerned.

The United States Navy comes up with an extremely weak excuse for refusing to allow a Racine young man to visit the grave of his brother killed in action in France.

Readers may recall that I mentioned this case about 3 weeks ago. Lloyde, eldest son of Mr. and Mrs. W. Scheller, 1200 Wisconsin Avenue, lost his life in the Battle

of the Bulge on Christmas Day 1944. Another son, Edwin, who has been in the Marines for 4 years, was home on furlough last August, and informed his parents he has been assigned to a ship for a good-will tour to Europe, including France. When he left, it was with funds to visit and decorate the grave of his brother near Verdun. But when the ship docked in France, the commander of the Navy force refused to grant a leave. Since the ship was to be there for well over a week, and it would take only two days to make the trip, this was hard to understand.

The family that had sacrificed one son for this country, and has another in service, naturally felt it had some measure of courtesy coming. At least, as the mother said, they'd like to know if there had been a good reason for the refusal. So Representative LAWRENCE SMITH, of Racine, was asked to get in touch with the Navy and see what he could find out. The Navy said it would investigate. And here's the "explanation," from Acting Secretary of the Navy John Nicholas Brown:

"Corporal Scheller was on a ship under the command of the commander, Sixth Task Force. In accordance with the desires of the State Department, leave has been granted in foreign ports only to officers and enlisted men of these ships who have bona fide relatives living in the foreign country they desire to visit. The unsettled conditions which prevail in Europe, and which may make it necessary for our ships to sail on short notice, make this limitation of leave mandatory."

In reply to this, Congressman SMITH wrote to Acting Secretary Brown as follows: "The reason you set forth for not permitting Corporal Scheller to visit the grave of his brother is hardly tenable. It is one of those situations where the Navy has failed in its public relations. It would not have taken this boy more than 24 hours to get from a port of embarkation to the cemetery and return. If conditions are so unsettled in foreign countries, both the Army and Navy might curtail the joy riding that is now going on over there. I know, because I have seen it in operation. The refusal to grant this boy's request was, in my opinion, arbitrary and without justification."

One of the big holes in the "explanation" is this: If unsettled conditions make it unwise for one boy to leave his ship to visit his brother's grave, why isn't it equally unwise to allow others to leave for a visit with relatives? Besides, as Mrs. Scheller points out, groups from her son's ship were given leaves in Paris, while his request was refused. In other words, it was all right for some to go on a pleasure jaunt, but wrong for one to go on a serious mission. And on top of this is the fact that the ships of the Sixth Task Force are still in French ports—some 4 months after the request leave was turned down because of the "possibility" that one might leave.

If this isn't a good example of stupidity and lack of human understanding on the part of some "high brass," it will do until a better example turns up—the Navy's "explanation" notwithstanding.

Medical Care for the People of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an address by the Honorable Bernard Baruch entitled "Medical Care for the People of America." This address was delivered at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City on November 19, 1947, at a dinner sponsored by the Medical Society of the State of New York, the Coordinated Council of the Five Medical Societies of Greater New York, and the Greater New York Hospital Association. The address is as follows:

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA

(By Bernard M. Baruch)

You do me honor to ask me to talk to you about health. I almost became a doctor myself.

When I was a boy, my mother took me to a phrenologist. His office was across the street from where Wanamakers now is. He felt the bumps on my head and asked my mother what she expected to do with me.

She replied, "I am thinking of making him a doctor."

"He will be a good doctor," said this phrenologist, "but my advice to you is to take him where they are doing things in finance and politics, he might even make good there, too."

It has been a long detour for the prodigal. He has returned.

In many ways I am sorry I did not become a member of this noblest of professions. For I believe we approach a great adventure in health. That is our goal. I think it obtainable. It would be gratifying to take a more active part in it.

All my thoughts on medicine are colored by memories of my father, Dr. Simon Baruch. He was the wisest man I ever knew. He pioneered in surgery, physical medicine, and incurable diseases. Often, I heard him tell prospective medical students:

"Do not enter the medical profession to make money. Study medicine only with the idea that your greatest compensation will be knowing that you help your fellow man. Do not expect gratitude and you will never be disappointed."

As Chairman of the War Industries Board in the First World War, I realized how important to defense was the health of our citizens. That awareness was reinforced manyfold during this past year.

In preparing a report for the late President Roosevelt on manpower, I was shocked to learn at least 4,000,000 men had been rejected as 4-F's—unfit to defend their country. Some, not all, of these defects were preventable.

How much more shocking would have been the record if everyone had received the same examination?

Since then, I have given the problems of medical care much thought. It deeply concerned me that we not fail the returning veteran, so I studied their medical needs. From that, it was only a step to related problems of general medical care for all.

Soon I was up to my neck in reports, statistics, speeches, congressional hearings. I conferred with many persons, doctors and nondoctors, experts and amateurs.

May I tell you some of my conclusions. They may not be particularly new to you, pioneering this field. They may be helpful, coming from a nonprofessional mind.

But before I list them, I would like to point out that the medical science and art have conferred a new and great benefit upon society in the last generation. The years of our lives have been heavily increased. This helps not merely the individual, who wants to go on living—and living in dignity and self-respect—but all the people to live more comfortably and freer from fear.

And now to go on with my exposition:

There is no question—the need for more medical care exists.

Also, there is no question this need will have to be met.

The problem is how?

All over the world, the masses are stirring for higher living standards. Improved medical care is a foundation of that better standard. Without good health, of what advantage are higher wages or shorter work hours, better education or greater leisure?

The families whose earnings disappear with serious illness, the many who suffer disease which your skillful diagnosis and treatment could have prevented or halted, or whose limited means bar them from the medical attention available to you and me, these people will not remain content.

This striving of the masses for better living is felt everywhere. In health, your profession must steer that surging tide into channels of improvement. Then, the surge does not overspill into the revolutionary flood, which washes away more than it brings.

One of the last things Woodrow Wilson wrote, called The Road Away From Revolution, was this:

"In these doubtful and anxious days when * * * the road ahead seems darkened by shadows which portend dangers of many kinds, it is only common prudence that we should look about us and attempt to assess the causes of distress and the most likely means of removing them."

That was Wilson's method, to assess portending dangers, and anticipate them by timely action. So, he proposed the realistic League of Nations, which men rejected as a dream, and got a nightmare. Wilson knew social change was inevitable. He worked to steer that change into orderly channels.

You should take that as your guiding star.

Society usually divides into three broad groups.

At one end, the left end, are those who burn with a passion to change everything as quickly as they can, if not quicker.

At the other, right end, are those who want things just as they are.

In the middle are people, like Woodrow Wilson, to whose school I belong, who believe in intelligent progress and seek to guide it.

What differentiates these three groups is their attitude toward that vital element of life—time.

The left-enders feel time panting hot on their necks.

The right-enders use time to fight rearguard actions, all the way.

The middlers—sometimes both left and right call us muddlers—seek to come to terms with time, preserving the best of the past, discarding the outworn and moving on to a better future.

In the matter of adequate medical care, too many doctors have been fighting a rearguard action for too long. I feel I must warn those doctors—time is running against them. The medical profession has justly earned great influence in the community. It can keep that hold only as it moves forward. It will lose that hold if it has nothing but objections to offer, if it has eyes only for what not to do.

We must look for what can be done and do it.

The great question is how? I do not want to seem to say I know the answers. We do know the public is demanding better and more medical service through some action, political or otherwise.

What is this adventure in health I see dawning, and toward which you all have been keeping the doctor's vigil through the night? This adventure, which you will have to lead—or it will fail—has many elements:

1. More and better doctors in more places.

2. An immediate, complete survey to modernize medical education, with greater emphasis on chronic and degenerative diseases, mental hygiene, and preventive medicine.

3. More hospitals more evenly spread through the country.

4. Less specialists, more general practitioners.

5. Reorganize medical practice, stressing group medicine where needed and voluntary health insurance.

6. For those who cannot afford voluntary insurance, some form of insurance, partly financed by the Government, covering people in by law. I would call this compulsory health insurance, if that term's proper meaning had not been lost.

7. Increased medical research.

8. Greatly expanded physical and mental rehabilitation.

9. Education to make health a national habit.

10. A vigorous, preventive medical program, reaching everyone, children above all.

11. A new Cabinet post for health, education, and social security.

12. Creation of a nonpolitical, watchdog committee to safeguard progress in medical care for veterans.

13. Increased numbers of well-trained nurses and technicians.

14. Adequate dental care.

15. A stabilizing economy—inflation will make worthless any health program or anything else.

Each of these would take a speech by itself. I can but sketch some of them.

Even the least ambitious schemes for improving the Nation's health require more doctors, all competently trained. Why aren't more doctors being educated? In studying that question, I was struck by how expensive training a doctor has become—in dollars and in time. In its fine report on "Medicine in the Changing Order," the New York Academy of Medicine states:

"There seems no alternative other than Government aid if educational standards are to be raised or even maintained. * * * If medical schools are to continue as centers of research * * * here also Government aid may be necessary."

If science and medicine ask the Government for aid—which even the conservative deems necessary—they must expect he who pays the fiddler will call the tune. This means the Government will rightly insist upon no discrimination in medical care because of race, color, or creed. It will rightly insist upon opportunity for all to enter the profession and advance on the sole basis of ability and character—without restrictions of race, color, creed—or sex. And, I hope, without fear of, or favor from, the State.

Minimum standards should be set for institutions getting financial aid.

How much more the Government is likely to insist upon will depend upon the more progressive leaders in your profession.

According to the Academy's report—I quote: "There has been no fundamental reorganization of American medical education since about 1910." That finding certainly calls for your profession undertaking—now—a most thorough, down-to-earth survey to modernize medical education, making recommendations so boldly inspiring the people will gratefully back them. No one can draw up a better program than doctors.

Chronic illness and preventive medicine deserve greater attention. In all fields—I hope in war as well—there is a new accent on prevention. From answering fire alarms, our thinking is progressing to fireproofing.

Preventive medical care should commence as close to the beginning as society can reach. I favor a major sickness-prevention drive at the public school level. This should include compulsory examination of all children at regular intervals. Means should be made available for correcting defects disclosed.

How wonderful, if children were taught how to properly eat, sleep, sit, stand, play, and take care of themselves, developing both the knack for getting along together, and self-discipline—physical and mental.

Even when medical care is available, many adults neglect or refuse to use it—often because of social taboos, as in venereal diseases, or psychological dreads, as in cancer and tuberculosis. These attitudes reflect our not having outgrown the awkward age in thinking about disease and health. We do not really have a grown-up national health habit—although we are getting there.

People need to be educated on the virtue of medical care; how to use it; how to prevent disease. The greatest asset of any nation is a healthy, educated citizenry.

And now to what is perhaps the toughest problem—how can better medical care be extended to those who cannot afford it?

Your organizations have been particularly active in pressing voluntary health insurance. You and others have proven group insurance to be a sound, practical way. That is a great achievement. You can be mighty proud of it.

But I would not be frank—nor friendly—if I did not add what you know. It is not good enough.

Rome was not doctored in one day. It may be, as some have told me, that the needs of the bulk of our people can be met, given time, through voluntary insurance. What troubles me most are the needs of that sizable segment of society, which does not earn enough to pay for voluntary insurance.

The American Medical Association—its Bureau of Medical Economics—estimated in 1939 that families earning $3,000 or less—two-thirds the population—cannot afford the cost of serious illness. Some of these can afford voluntary insurance, although inflation has reduced their number. But what of the little fellows who cannot?

I have asked that of nearly everyone with whom I has discussed medical care. Nothing has been suggested so far, which promises success, other than some form of insurance covering these people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part—what some would call "compulsory health insurance."

Since doctors, nurses, technicians, and hospitals already are strained, such insurance probably would have to move in stages. That requires careful study. Any program should utilize existing medical facilities to the maximum—it must to get started—and be organized to the local level.

Nationally, the program might well be administered by a body of doctors and nondoctors to keep medical care as free from politics as possible.

As to financing, my own preference runs toward the Government meeting only part of the cost, with part coming from pay-roll deductions from employers and workers. In time, these deductions will become absorbed in general costs of production. I have the utmost confidence in the efficiency of American industry—both labor and management—and which good health will stimulate. We can absorb these medical costs better than other countries which must also meet these needs.

The detailed problems raised by so-called compulsory health insurance are too numerous to be discussed tonight. I have weighed them most carefully. Many doctors and many lay people have sought to paint this issue as a choice—all black or all white. I have found every aspect of medical care to be gray—the happy color sensible compromise wears. All law imposes compulsion. A form of compulsory health insurance for those who cannot pay for voluntary insurance can be devised, adequately safeguarded, without involving what has been termed "socialized medicine." The needs can be met—as in other fields—without the Government taking over medicine, or socializing it, something I would fiercely oppose.

Law protects society. It is the absence of law which destroys it.

I do not fear Government taking its legitimate part in medicine, any more than I fear it in education or housing. I do oppose socialization here. It leads ultimately to the police state, degradation of the individual, and lessened well-being. There should be just one Federal agency, with cabinet rank, for all health and human welfare problems. I do not like Government agencies to be like Mahomet's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth.

Some say many people do not know how to pick their doctors. So, with any human activity. The best insurance against poor choice is improving the general quality of all doctors. But good or poor, it must be the patient's choice. No one else's.

May I interject this about inflation. Should health schemes fail, be sure to ask—were they killed by the plan itself—by incompetent administration—or by an inflation which ruined the plan's financing?

In connection with this doctor-Government relationship, it is a pleasure to point to the excellent medical progress in the Veterans' Administration—thanks primarily to Gen. Omar Bradley and Gen. Paul Hawley. They would never have accomplished their good work, had they not refused to allow the politicos to move in on them.

I would like to see the President name a small committee of top-grade citizens—some doctors, some lay people—to act as a vigilant watchdog over the veterans' medical program, so the ground so arduously gained may not be lost when someone replaces General Bradley. He should be supported by the entire Nation—particularly by doctors. His is the kind of courage and vigilance which will assure good administration of any health program.

More doctors must be distributed to more places in the country, which requires, among other things, less stress on training specialists, more on general practitioners. A number of counties do not even have a doctor. This reflects, in part, a lack of facilities in which doctors can work. Happily, some of this will be corrected under the Hill-Burton Act for hospital construction, with Federal and State governments cooperating.

Orderly change is the American way of life. Remember the spirit of your Oath of Hippocrates. Use your own good judgment to move along with humanity's legitimate aspirations in its trek toward better living.

I would hate to see any medical-care program under guidance of others than those who have the know-how. So would the American people. That is why I urge the doctors to get in and pitch—not stand by on the side lines. You need fear politicians or bureaucrats only to the degree you fail yourselves. You must take the leadership—no—yours is now the leadership. Keep it.

This meeting is an outstanding example of your deep concern to meet the need for action.

I have met people in all fields of human endeavor. I respect no group more—for your unselfish zeal and devotion to the sick, for the jealousy with which you guard your professional virtue—placing beyond the pale the rare violator of your oath.

I envy you the thrill which comes from relieving a patient from pain, and, often, snatching one from death.

I still am sorry that phrenologist didn't let me become a doctor.

Your situation reminds me of something my father said back in 1873, while president of the South Carolina Medical Society:

"Let us not be silent, but offer our facts, and defend them while we may."

"As an Arabian sage has said, 'What good comes from Ali's sword, if it be sheathed?'

" 'What good from Sadi's tongue, if it be silent?' "

Academy of Arts and Sciences Reorganized December 1948

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following from the Academy of Arts and Sciences:

ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AFFILIATED WITH THE ORDER OF DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS, NEW YORK CITY, LOS ANGELES, REORGANIZED DECEMBER 1948

Purpose. To establish an academy for the cultivation and promotion of all the arts and sciences, music, literature, etc.

Lending dignity to the Government, the arts and sciences are the foundation of all commerce, agriculture, and business, and are essential to the welfare of the people, their health, wealth, and happiness.

The academy, guided by learned and scholarly men and women, will provide a medium for the cultivation and diffusion of the arts and sciences.

By research and publication, the academy will encourage the promotion and diffusion of knowledge gleaned by discoveries, observations, and improvements in all fields of human endeavor.

Many worth-while experiments have been abandoned because of the lack of a little assistance at the proper time, the academy will sponsor research and all projects that may contribute to the advancement and welfare of knowledge and the human race.

When possible, the academy seeks to publish those scientific and scholarly works whose learned nature would tend to preclude general publication.

The academy desires to collect and serve as the custodian of works of all types.

The academy, at all times, desires to assist and take part in the war of intelligence versus stupidity.

The arts and sciences, the foundation of a free, honorable, dignified, and independent state, flourish best in that state whose ideals embrace the concepts of freedom and independence.

Membership: Membership is by election and consists of various groups and classifications: Member, associate fellow, etc., in the Academy College of Arts and Sciences, the Academy College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Academy College of Music, the Academy College of Dramatic Art, etc.

Certificates of award and/or of merit: These distinctions are conferred upon men and women for accomplishment and meritorious services. Attached to these dignities are honorary degrees of the order.

Public recognition is given by the conferring of honor upon notable men and women.

The academy is the highest cultural and learned tribunal and the highest order of merit in the world. The international register places the Academy of Arts and Sciences (international), affiliated with the Order of Distinguished Americans, above all groups as the highest ranking in the world, and considers its awards more distinguished than those offered by any other organization or group and their awards, medals, prizes, etc.

The academy award and membership is the highest and most coveted object of pride and display in the world. A legitimate pride arises from being sufficiently notable and distinguished to be elected to membership and receive the academy award for accomplishment.

The Order of Distinguished Americans, affiliated with the academy, confers, within the order itself, the honorary degrees and titles of the order.

Socialites may become associate members in the division, order of honor, by election to membership, and become ladies and knights of the order.

DR. MAXWELL HESS,
Supreme National President and Executive Director.

OFFICERS OF ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (INTERNATIONAL) AND THE ORDER OF DISTINGUISHED AMERICANS

Dr. Maxwell Hess, supreme president, Academy of Arts and Sciences, and supreme national president, Order of Distinguished Americans.

Dr. Walter W. S. Cook, national president, Order of Distingushed Americans, and chairman, board of directors of the academy and of the order (chairman, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University).

Dr. Bruno Walter, president, Academy of Arts and Sciences, and member, board of directors (conductor of the New York Philharmonic Symphony).

Reginald Stewart, vice president and member, board of directors of the academy and order (conductor, the Baltimore Symphony, and director, Peabody Conservatory).

Harrison Keller, vice president and member, board of directors of the academy and the order (director, New England Conservatory of Music).

Alice Healy Hess, secretary-treasurer of the academy and the order, member, board of directors.

Theodore Harrison, member, board of directors (associate director, American Conservatory of Music).

Frank La Forge, member, board of directors.

Members of the general committee of the academy and the order: Dr. George N. Shuster, president of Hunter College of the city of New York; De Witt Wallace, editor, the Reader's Digest; Lila Acheson Wallace, coeditor; Paul D. Bagwell, president, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; Milton J. Cross, American Broadcasting Co.; Maxwell Anderson, playwright; Katharine Cornell.

Housing and the Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's New York Times:

HOUSING AND THE FAMILY

Only a glance at the latest Census Bureau figures on family incomes in the United States is needed to make plain that our housing programs, Federal, State, and local, must be directed with far greater singleness of purpose to production of a low-cost living unit. Almost half of the Nation's 37,000,000 families have an income less than $3,000 a year; 30,000,000 of the 37,000,000 have an income less than $5,000. These figures were for 1947, and it can be assumed that there was an upward movement last year, but the picture is not greatly changed.

The slow pace at which construction is meeting New York City's needs is shown by newly released figures. It is estimated officially that the city is short 260,000 or more apartments, exclusive of slum dwellings that should be replaced. But in 1948 only 20,150 new dwelling units were completed, while conversion of buildings provided another 1,307 units. From this total must be deducted 3,639 living units demolished and 1,093 altered to other uses, making a net gain of 16,725 units in a year. Of these almost half were public housing.

Census reports estimate more than 3,000,000 families in the Nation are living doubled up, most of these being in some way related to the head of the household. This fact points to one of the most serious aspects of the housing shortage; its effect on family life. The Family Service Association of America, which is composed of 135 family service agencies, recently made a survey of results of the housing shortage, and found it was causing acute break-downs in family life, creating tensions between husbands and wives, parents and children, and married couples and in-laws.

The difficulty of finding decent shelter is "resulting in the postponement of marriage and child bearing, as well as overtaxing family budgets to a point where families face real psychological dangers," says this survey report. Many husbands and wives are living apart because of lack of housing. There is extreme difficulty in finding homes for families with children, especially the larger families. Tension between husband and wife because of housing hardships was noted by 122 of 135 agencies cooperating in the survey.

These are the serious conditions, affecting not only the families of lowest income but also those of middle income, that convince us that no single question before our Congress and the State legislatures so vitally concerns the public welfare as the finding of an intelligent and effective solution of the housing shortage. It is not just a question of producing enough housing, but of producing housing units with space enough so that satisfactory family life is possible, and at a rental or purchase cost that encourages health and harmony in the home as well as normal growth of the family.

Farmers and the Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the Washington Post on February 12, 1949:

There is a view which, looking forward to the congressional elections next year, 21 months from now, holds that the Republicans may regain control of Congress. This is worth attention, for a reversal to the Republicans in 1950 would be as arresting and important as was the reversal to the Democrats last November.

For the view that the Republicans may regain control of Congress, a main political justification has to do with the farm vote. The Republican defeat last November was due, in a very special way, to defection of farmers. Return of the farmers, this view holds, is already in the making, and is due to developments in Congress since the Democrats took over, with emphasis on the administration's new labor bill.

The cause of the defection of farmers was so local and restricted that its decisiveness in a national election for President was almost sensational, and has importance in our political history. Its localness and temporariness make plausible the view that the

farmers may return to their traditional Republican affiliation.

The Republican Eightieth Congress had suspended the building by Government of grain bins for growers of corn and wheat. This President Truman exploited in his farm-belt speeches. And his exploitation coincided with weeks of the campaign during which farmers, harvesting bumper grain crops, felt need of more bins. Accompanying his stirring up of farm resentment against the Republicans, Mr. Truman promised that if he were elected the Government would build more bins.

Grain growers voted for more bins, and will get them. Mr. Truman included them in the program of legislation he laid before Congress in his state of the Union message. But farmers, and everybody else, will get also, if the administration's program is passed, some things which farmers as a class are as far as possible from wanting, and quite certainly did not have in mind when they voted for more grain bins.

Several of these are in the administration's new labor bill. That bill, as a whole avowedly and greatly increasing the power of labor unions and leaders, goes counter to a strongly held traditional point of view of farmers. Some provisions of the bill, while objectionable to much of the public generally, have for farmers, because of their habitual attitude, a special objectionableness. It is not, except in some instances, that these provisions bear more heavily on farmers than on others; it is enough that they go against principles which farmers as a class hold with a special intensity.

Many provisions of the administration bill, repealing restrictions on labor unions and leaders that are in the existing Taft-Hartley law, go counter to the view held by most farmers. Examples are the removal of restrictions against the closed shop and the union shop. Two provisions of the new bill are outstanding, in the sense that they suggest a pattern and a trend.

One is the provision in the new bill which repeals a Taft-Hartley law provision giving the President power to get court injunctions against strikes which have a paralyzing effect on the country; examples are the Nation-wide railroad strike in 1946 and strikes in coal mining conducted by Mr. John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers.

To ask repeal of this power presents an extraordinary picture, a picture of Government abdicating, surrendering a power it has, and doing so in the interest of a class, labor unions and leaders.

In the same spirit is another aspect of the new labor bill. It omits a provision which is in the existing Taft-Hartley law against strikes by employees of Government (though during hearings on the bill the administration seems to have receded on this point). This is a picture of Government unwilling, in deference to labor unions, to assert authority over its own employees.

This attitude of the administration and its proposed surrender of power to seek court injunctions, suggests a conception of Government reasonably describable as a labor Government. That would be as far as possible from what farmers want.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much publicity advanced to show the necessity of retaining the so-called union shop as it appears in the Taft-Hartley law that I find it particularly refreshing to see the viewpoint advanced in an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times for February 8, 1949, which calls for the closed shop. Since the inception of the Taft-Hartley law the International Typographical Union and the Chicago Sun-Times have been unable to enter into a contract, and it must be pointed out that the ITU has always been considered a conservative, responsible union by labor and by management. Even prior to the passage of the original Wagner Act its contracts had provided for the closed shop and with this provision in its contract it enjoyed a very fine relationship with its employer. The enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, prohibiting the closed shop, resulted in a strike which has lasted for fully a year and one-half, a strike which was not desired by labor or management but which was made necessary by the very nature of the law itself.

The strike continues and will continue until the Taft-Hartley Act is repealed. We must press unceasingly for its early repeal.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT'S UNFAIR IN LABOR?

As we pointed out the other day, the administration's labor bill offers a way of handling national emergency strikes which probably would be as effective as that contained in the Taft-Hartley Act. What about the other sections of the new bill?

Readers of this newspaper know that we welcome the section which repeals Taft-Hartley's ban on the closed shop. There are industries—newspaper publishing is one of them—where the closed shop among skilled craftsmen had worked well over a long period of years until Taft-Hartley came along.

Whatever the final form of this proviso, we think it ought to permit such employers and unions to continue the closed shop if they wish.

Apart from this, the principal effect of the new bill is to narrow down the list of unfair labor practices chargeable to unions. The bill permits employers to be charged with the same unfair practices listed by the Wagner Act, but penalizes unions only for certain types of secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike.

Under the new bill it would be O. K. for workers in one plant to refuse to handle goods produced in another plant, if they are seeking to promote legitimate union organization in the second plant. But this would not be O. K. if the object is to compel an employer to throw out one union and recognize another.

There is a good case for distinguishing between "justifiable" and "unjustifiable" boycotts and strikes. One can sympathize with the union man who doesn't want to work on goods produced by strikebreakers, but not with the member of union A, who refuses to handle goods produced by members of union B.

Best of all, the new bill sets up machinery for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes which lead to such boycotts and strikes. It empowers the NLRB to appoint an arbitrator whose findings shall be final. If a union defies the arbitrator's award, it can be punished for unfair practice.

The big question for Congress is whether unfair practices chargeable to unions shall be confined to those relating to certain types of boycott and strike. Taft-Hartley contained these additional practices for which unions could be brought to book:

(1) Restraining or coercing workers to join a union.

(2) Causing employers to discriminate against nonunion members.

(3) Refusing to bargain collectively.

(4) Charging excessive initiation fees.

(5) Featherbedding (i. e., demanding pay for work not performed).

Items 1 and 2 provided some employers with a handy weapon in efforts at union-busting. But we see no good reason for eliminating the other three, particularly the obligation to bargain. Bargaining in good faith should be a rule applying to both the employer and the union.

We see no strong reason, either, why the labor bill should not continue the requirement that unions reveal financial reports, and the guarantee of employers free speech in dealing with employees. William Green, A. F. of L. president, says his organization would not object to these provisions.

We like the bill's emphasis on the arbitration of jurisdictional disputes and its statement of public policy that disputes over contract interpretation should also be arbitrated. In general, labor has expressed satisfaction with the bill. That implies a readiness to try voluntary arbitration as a more orderly and more satisfactory way of settling differences than coercion by strikes or government.

Hearings before the Senate subcommittee indicate that the bill faces a controversial experience. Let's have every point debated fully, but let's have no unfair legislative obstructionism. There should be an early vote in each House.

Cardinal Mindszenty's Conviction a Blow at Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, has aroused the ire of all thinking people. I am inserting an editorial from the Tablet, which appeared a few weeks ago. It is a very pertinent contribution to the present controversy regarding his conviction:

Once again the clenched fist of Soviet tyranny has been raised to strike down a man who dared to stand up and speak his piece for freedom and the rights of man. Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, follows his brother prelate of Yugoslavia, Archbishop Stepinac, behind the bars of a Soviet prison because he would not submit meekly to the absolute rule of a totalitarian tyranny under which no man can call his soul his own. It would be a fatal error if Americans should regard the imprisonment of these heroic men as the unfortunate result of some complicated European political situation, or of some involved conflict between church and state, or even as sad evidence of religious persecution.

The arrest and imprisonment of these two heroic leaders of their people strikes a serious body blow at every reason, ideal and principle for which American men and women gave their blood and their lives in two World Wars. The imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, and now the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, makes a mockery of the sacrifices of those who gave their lives in the cause of human freedom. Our soldiers

fought and died that men might be free, that they might be able to worship God as they see fit, that fathers and mothers might exercise their God-given right to educate their children to be other than blind slaves of the bureaucrats in the Kremlin or of their stooges in Hungary, Yugoslavia and elsewhere.

If the American people really understood and appreciated just what is involved in the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, there would arise such a wave of moral indignation as would shake the very walls of the Kremlin in Moscow. If those entrusted with the protection of America understood and appreciated the meaning of the Communist action in Budapest they would jail every Communist in the United States as a traitor to our country.

Cardinal Mindszenty's arrest, as the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, strikes at the very heart and soul of the freedom of the human individual, for which, presumably, every American suffered and sacrificed during the bitter years of the late World War. Let no American say to himself complacently: "What is happening in Hungary is none of my business." It is our business. Every courageous voice silenced by Red tyranny is one less voice that can be raised in defense of our freedom. Every success of aggressive Red atheism is one step closer to the end of our freedom, one threat more serious to our freedom, our life, our liberty, our pursuit of happiness. Every American should ask himself, now, just where he stands. Is he on the side of brutal tyranny and the denial of all human rights? Or does he stand with our Declaration of Independence in believing that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? There is no neutral ground in this conflict for the very souls of men, for the very idea of freedom as opposed to slavery.

Cardinal Mindszenty, as Archbishop Stepinac, stood on the very same battleground on which every American soldier, sailor, and marine stood on the far-flung fronts of the late war, fighting a courageous fight for the ideal of human freedom under God. These men fought our fight against tyranny. They fought the Red as they fought the Nazi because both alike represented tyranny over the mind and heart and soul of man. Their defeat is our defeat. The Red mockery of their heroism is the mockery of every American soldier's heroism. Let the millions of American veterans remember that. By as much as the voice of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac are suppressed and silenced, by just so much are the voices of our beloved and honored dead likewise suppressed and silenced as they cry out to us, the living, not to break faith with the ideal of freedom for which they shed their blood and gave their lives.

This tragic thing that has happened in Hungary is the business of every American. If true freedom is to remain in the world, if the rights of man as man are to be recognized and respected, then every free voice must be raised, every free voice must speak up, and latest Soviet outrage against the very heart and soul of freedom.

What can you do about it? You can get the facts straight and keep them straight. Soviet propagandists will raise a smoke screen of false and lying issues—currency frauds, black marketing, treason, collusion with the West, etc. See the issue clearly: freedom or slavery. Talk to your friends and neighbors about it. Do not let your moral indignation cool. Write to the President, the Secretary of State, your Congressman and Senator, urging that the full force of diplomatic pressure be used and that our influence in the United Nations be used to demand and obtain the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac. Form local committees of protest and spread information about this situation, even among the pro-Communists in your neighborhood. Never give way to discouragement. Keep up the fight for the freedom of these two stalwart defenders of human freedom. Their fight is your fight. Their freedom may mean your freedom.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of the speech I made of Thaddeus Kosciusko at Lafayette Square, Kosciusko Monument, February 12, 1949:

THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

I am grateful for the opportunity to participate in the memorial ceremony, here in Lafayette Square in the Capital of our beloved Nation, the citadel of the governments of the world, observing the two hundred and third anniversary of the birth of Thaddeus Kosciusko. We are gathered here today, as are countless others throughout the Nation, to pay homage to a soldier, statesman, and great apostle of human freedom and liberties.

Particularly in this age, amid so many unsettled crises, it is truly heart-warming and inspiring to be able to look back on the life and ideals of this son of Poland and adopted son of our beloved United States. We can be justly proud of his caliber, tireless energy, and thorough devotion to the causes of liberty and freedom.

It was in 1776, early in the Colonists' struggle for independence, that Kosciusko entered the Army of the United States as a volunteer, and brilliantly distinguished himself as a military strategist, especially at New York, West Point, and Yorktown. George Washington, who had the greatest admiration for Kosciusko, promoted him to the rank of colonel of artillery and made him his adjutant.

In 1783, by act of Congress, the Polish hero was rewarded for his services and his devotion to the cause of American independence, the privilege of American citizenship, a considerable annual pension, with landed estates, and the rank of brigadier general.

Upon Poland's proclamation of the constitution of May 3, 1791—Kosciusko returned to the land of his birth to wage war against the enemies of his country, determined to fight for the independence and territorial integrity of Poland.

Kosciusko, in all his military endeavors, never aided in wars of aggression—as he on various occasions asserted, "I have never fought except in the cause of human freedom, and I can never serve in any other cause." His efforts were always in the cause for rights of the oppressed.

Kosciusko was essentially a democrat of the school of Jefferson and Lafayette. He maintained that republics could only be regenerated on the basis of absolute liberty and equality; he believed in the guaranty of absolute freedom.

Thomas Jefferson has said of him, "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few or the rich alone."

But even as we recall the character and the achievements of the great Kosciusko—even as we realize his untiring efforts and the efforts of Polish-Americans through the years of our Nation's history, our thoughts turn naturally to the pathetic and distressful situation in which Poland finds itself today.

Oh, if we had today men of courage and deep determination for freedom that was characteristic of Kosciusko—men who would today in reciprocity give their ability to help free Poland—the land of his birth.

Justice demands that Poland be accorded true freedom, determined by her rights, primary among which is the right to a free and unfettered election by the Polish people themselves, to establish their own government on their own terms.

If we shall be determined to perpetuate Kosciusko's ideals of freedom and liberty, insuring them for ourselves and aiding others to attain them; then the spirit of Kosciusko has and will prevail.

Little Norway in Tough Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Fred C. Christopherson, editor of one of the leading newspapers in my State, the Daily Argus-Leader, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. In this enlightening editorial, I believe the editor has drawn a very apt picture of the position in which a little country finds herself when she is called upon to choose between the protection of two major world powers.

The editorial follows:

LITTLE NORWAY IN TOUGH SPOT

Norway is in a difficult spot. It is a small nation of great spirit but still quite unable to defend itself against a major aggressor. That was demonstrated in World War II when the Hitler forces invaded Norway and took possession.

Prior to that, Norway had been under the protecting wing of Britain. But in this instance, Britain couldn't help. The British navy tried to block the German invaders but it was repulsed.

Britain, of course, is no longer a potential defender of material substance.

So Norway must look elsewhere. If she is to resist Russia, who will help her?

Obviously the only nation qualified to do so is the United States.

But what assurance does Norway have that we will come to her rescue in event of a Russian expansion move?

Norway sees the situation that now exists in Germany where the United States is shipping goods to its sector of Berlin by air.

Norway may wonder why we haven't cracked through the Russian area by force. Is it because our force is insufficient? Is it because we don't want to risk the danger of war?

Studying these questions, Norway could very well apply them to her own situation.

It is easy on this side of the water to say that Norway should be bold and defy Moscow. But the guns of Moscow are close to Norway's throat.

The Norwegian resistance to Moscow without help would be futile. The Norwegians may be pardoned for considering the elements involved in a nonaggression pact. We aren't courageous enough—or seemingly aren't—to defy Moscow in the Berlin region. Can we blame Norway for the perplexity now evident in her deliberations?

A Modern Hoax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while nearly every thinking person believes in reciprocity and its possibilities for world peace and fair commercial approaches between nations, the New Deal brand of reciprocal trade treaties are entirely a different approach.

Listening to the debates on this issue Tuesday, I first noted the strong endorsement of the New Deal brand of reciprocal trade treaties by the chairman, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina. Then I thought of the tobacco situation. First, the Smoot-Hawley duties are pretty much intact, so far as tobacco imports are concerned, so the Smoot-Hawley Act appears satisfactory to North Carolina. Then I thought of the embargo on exports of tobacco seed, the most severe and vicious trade barrier ever erected in the history of our country. Then I thought of the millions upon millions of dollars worth of tobacco sent under the Marshall plan to feed the starving people of Europe. It then occurred to me that no New Deal reciprocity agreements had been made that would seriously affect our southern friends.

The remarks of the ranking member of this committee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, with strong endorsement of the New Deal brand of reciprocity treaties, brought to mind that his district had not been subjected to any ill effects by the program. The tobacco and cotton of Tennessee had had additional protection by New Deal embargoes.

Then I listened to our colleague from Georgia, the Honorable A. SIDNEY CAMP, and I thought how well Georgia's tobacco is protected by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and by the embargo on the exportation of tobacco seed. In addition, the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates still apply to peanuts, which is 7 cents per pound and a prewar 100 percent ad valorem duty. The Smoot-Hawley protection for these southern-grown crops appears to be not only acceptable, but also desirable. Then I thought about the near embargo on cotton, since only 135,000 bales can be imported each year. This is an additional barrier erected by the New Deal.

Then I listened to the gentleman from Arkansas, my good friend the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, and I thought about the legislation that put tobacco, cotton, and peanuts on the preferred list. It occurred to me then that rice is also enjoying the Smoot-Hawley protection and that this is duty bound. It again occured to me that it is not difficult to support a legislative program that gives one's own district preferential treatment. But, the question is, whether or not it is fair?

Then I listened to the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, and again thought about the Smoot-Hawley tariff on tobacco, rice, and the embargo on certain imports, and I wondered what all this debate was about.

Then I listened to my especially good friends, the Honorable J. M. COMBS, of Texas, and I not only thought about the Smoot-Hawley tariff on tobacco, but embargo on tobacco-seed exports, the embargo on cotton imports, but also the near embargo on wheat imports, since only a few thousand bushels can be imported. What price is Texas asked to pay? Very little indeed.

Then I listened to our colleague from Colorado, the Honorable JOHN A. CARROLL, and I thought of the fixed-support price for Colorado wool provided by the much-criticized Eightieth Congress. I thought of the Sugar Act of 1946 passed by the Democrat-criticized Eightieth Congress to protect the Colorado sugar-beet producers, and I also thought about the near embargo on wheat imports. But how about beef prices? How about the effect of beef imports.

Well, I have listened and I have read the propaganda about the New Deal brand of reciprocal trade treaties. Then I think of how the propaganda artists have deceived the people, the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, and many other groups.

The undisputed facts are that if the New Deal brand of reciprocal trade treaties are so wonderful, why has not the administration tried them out south of the Mason and Dixon's line? Why continually talk about reciprocity, the good-neighbor policy and the Golden Rule, and then turn around and erect the most vicious trade barriers in the history of our country? Why continually lower the duty on livestock and livestock products and then invite additional imports of these commodities grown largely north of the Mason and Dixon's line, and keep the Smoot-Hawley duties and protective embargoes for the South?

While preaching reciprocity, good-neighbor policy and the Golden Rule philosophy, the New Deal has substituted embargoes for tariffs. They should first take a few spoons full of their own medicine before trying to tell others of the merits of their medicine.

Many thousands of American citizens are without jobs today as a result of the machinations of the Committee on Reciprocity. Millions more are evidently to be added to the growing list of unemployed. We should postpone any hearings, in order to invite greater imports, until we find out exactly how many millions are unemployed in the United States.

Our New York City friends appear to be in favor of the Smoot-Hawley duty of 50 percent ad valorem on fur coats or the manufactured product. We become provincial, however, when we protest the $238,000,000 worth of furs that were dumped into the United States in 1946 largely by a state-trading country like Russia. We are accused of being provincial when we take the position that the raw furs are entitled to protection comparable to the finished article. We have witnessed the near destruction of the fur-farming industry in the United States because of the ill-advised and unfair trade policy of the Administration. The Administration is responsible for nearly wrecking one phase of American agriculture and that is the fur-farming industry and no living person can deny this statement.

Since the New Deal and the "Fairy Deal" have given only lip service to reciprocity, good-neighbor policy, and the golden rule in their foreign agriculture approach, and since the New Deal and the "Fairy Deal" have erected the most severe and most vicious trade barriers in the history of our country, I maintain that their false propaganda is most assuredly a modern hoax.

David Marcus Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit an address by a distinguished soldier concerning a stalwart citizen of the United States, a gallant officer in our military forces, a hero who shall ever be revered and honored wherever free men dwell. Colonel Marcus was killed in fighting for the freedom of Israel. I commend General Klein's remarks concerning the martyr, Colonel Marcus, delivered at the memorial services held for Col. David (Mickey) Marcus, on Sunday, October 10, 1948, at the Jamaica Jewish Center, 150–91 Eighty-seventh Road, Jamaica, N. Y.

The memorial was conducted by the Queens County Council, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America and the Zionists of the Long Island region:

INTRODUCTION BY MR. MURRAY APRIL

When Dr. Neuman spoke at the education conference this morning, he said that 1947 was the year of miracles. And I concur with him in that belief for we have had the opportunity to see many miracles happen. Those of us who have been associated with the Jewish War Veterans of the United States had the privilege of experiencing a miracle.

For it was in 1947 when a new leadership came into the organization. We have had many leaders in the Jewish War Veterans of great stature, of great ability, of great vision. But a new leadership was given to us in 1947, with a God-given ability to lead the people of Israel in a new direction. We were fortunate indeed in that to our leadership came our immediate past national commander, General Klein.

It was through his good office and the tremendous prestige that his office carried, and

his great ability to meet people, and to mix with people, and to reason with people, that a great contribution was made in behalf of the ultimate that we experienced from the United Nations.

We may all say thanks to our next speaker, General Klein, for the great leadership he made to our cause—for the great leadership that he reflected in the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, and it is my privilege to present to you my past national commander, General Klein.

ADDRESS BY GENERAL KLEIN

I am deeply touched by the gracious and undeserving introduction of my good colleague in this great fight, in which the Jewish War Veterans of the United States has had such a noble part.

Comrades, ladies and gentlemen: To me this service for my old comrade in arms, Mickey Marcus, is something more than just a memorial service.

Mickey and I served together. I first met him during the Louisiana maneuvers of 1941, when he was a judge advocate of the Twenty-seventh Division and I served with the Thirty-third Infantry Division. We became intimate friends and good comrades. We met again in the jungles of the Pacific, and our friendship continued when I was appointed assistant to the Secretary of War and he was one of the chief executives in the military government of the War Department, and the right hand to the very able and brilliant General Hildring, known as one of the greatest humanitarians to come out of this war.

I saw Mickey for the last time exactly 6 weeks before he was killed. He had flown to New York from Israel. I don't believe more than six or eight people in this country knew that he was back here. He calmly sat smiling—with his great sense of humor—and planned what should be and must be done. For two days we conferred on vital problems facing our heroic comrades in Israel, hoping that he and I would fight side by side in Israel, provided our Government would approve of such action. He assumed his responsibilities and discharged them as a soldier, as an American and as a Jew.

When I think of this great typical American hero, I wonder whether I am qualified—or whether any of you here with the exception of our rabbis—are qualified to speak not alone of his great deeds, but his readiness to sacrifice his life for the cause of freedom, and of what inspired Mickey Marcus to go to Israel.

I don't know whether many of you know that Mickey was readmitted to the Regular Army when I was assistant to the Secretary of War. He left the military profession 15 years ago, joined the National Guard and was reinstated, and made a distinguished record in the recent war. When the Regular Army opened its ranks, Mickey topped the list. He had his seniority back, he had his rank back, and could have gone far. He expected his promotion to a general officer in our Army. And those of us who have climbed the hard ladder of promotion in the service, and especially those of us of our faith who have traveled the path to achieve the distinction of a general officer will appreciate the great sacrifice Mickey made when he resigned from the Regular Army to return to his reserve status, and then finally go to Israel and lead our gallant comrades of the Hagannah as its inspiring behind-the-scene chief.

I saw Mickey before he went on his first mission. I never realized or knew that he was so indoctrinated with the ancient spirit that prompted him and all others to fight for the sacred soil of Israel. Future generations will realize that Mickey, enshrined in the history of all freedom-loving people, was one of the truly great soldiers of our time. Those who are students of history know of the contributions made by great military men throughout the ages. Many of them were not entirely military by nature—perhaps military by profession but not militaristic in character—and contributed to the battle for freedom of all people. We have such noble examples in our own history—men like Lafayette, Kosciuszko, Pulaski, and Steuben, who left their homeland to aid the struggle for liberty.

Theodore Herzl will be known as the father of the new Israel; Chaim Weitzman as its president. But the men who deserve the glory for having established the free and new state of Israel will not be the political leaders of yesterday and today, but the glorious fighters of Israel who astonished the world in stopping the invader and freeing their nation. A battle that began 2,000 years ago came to life again with Herzl and his loyal disciples, continued at the Warsaw ghetto and concluded in the Holy Land.

When heroes are honored, we will pay tribute to the sons and daughters of Israel. Someday, when the story of Israel is written, you will find Colonel Marcus, United States Army, occupying the same role in this story of Israel as Lafayette holds in America's history.

I would like to believe, and I think I am right when I say that Mickey did not die for Israel. Mickey died as an American soldier. Mickey died for America. Mickey gave his life because he felt it was his duty to carry on—on Israel's sacred soil, where freedom's fight left off at Guadalcanal, the "Bulge," the beaches of Okinawa. He carried on because he felt the job was not finished. Let us hope and pray that his sacrifice has not been in vain. Americans of Jewish faith will always honor the memory of this gallant son of our people. And now he has been brought back to America to sleep with his comrades of his alma mater at West Point Cemetery. He came back to an American grave, where his memory will always be honored.

I never knew that Mickey was a Zionist. I still don't know whether Mickey was a Zionist. I don't know whether I am a Zionist. I don't know whether any of us really understand the proper phraseology of Zionism. I listened with great interest today to our distinguished rabbis giving us the interpretation of modern Zionism and the Zionism of tomorrow. To Mickey and to me, and to all other soldiers who have served, bled, and died in Israel that is not Zionism alone, it is also Americanism. This is the way America was born. I believe Mickey would want me to say this to you today.

We can only show ourselves worthy of the sacrifice of Mickey Marcus if we carry on the fight until the democracy of Israel will become a symbol of freedom for the entire world.

I was able, as national commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, to speak with some authority to President Truman and Secretary Marshall only 1 month ago and make known the hopes of the American soldiers of Jewish faith. And 3 weeks ago Governor Dewey, of this State, also heard our plea. We feel that Israel is an American problem. It ceased to be a problem of concern to only the Jews.

As one of the rabbis today explained to this audience, the people of Israel have fought on the side of the democracies in two wars, and God forbid, should there ever be another world conflict, they would again join the ranks of the freedom-loving people. What better base, what better security for an eventuality can we have than to continue to be loyal to our allies who, during the most treacherous days of Rommel in the recent war, made it possible for Montgomery and his great troops, and finally our troops, to be able to stop Rommel.

We were allies in World War I and World War II, and Mickey felt we had a job to do there. We owed something to those soldiers who made it possible to win the war in the Middle East. And to soldiers and students of strategy we realize what it means to have a friendly ally.

And so Mickey Marcus is the best answer to some of the bigots on the American scene, and also to some members of our faith representative of those groups who feel there is still a danger in fighting and supporting Israel. Some might challenge our Americanism. But I believe the Jewish war veteran of the United States, and every Jewish soldier who has fought in the ranks of our great Army since the days of the revolution, need not apologize for his Americanism. Our share in World War I and World War II, the Spanish-American War, the War Between the States, and the American Revolution is the best answer.

It can be said that no one ever challenged the loyalty of the Irish-American when he marched on St. Patrick's Day for a free Ireland. And no one challenged the loyalty of the Bohemian-American on his march for a free Bohemia or Czechoslovakia—or the Polish-American when he marched for a free Poland. And no one challenged the loyalty of the American when he joined the Lafayette Escadrille long before the United States entered World War I. And no one challenged the loyalty of those gallant Americans who joined the Canadian and British Air Forces. No one challenged the loyalty of General Chennault and the Flying Tigers when they joined the Chinese Air Force to stop the Japanese aggressors. That was all right for these gallant comrades of ours to do.

Mickey Marcus told those chauvinist Americans—who can still be found within our own groups, and who criticize American Jews fighting for Israel—"My Americanism is still as good as yours * * * don't you dare to challenge it." And that is what Mickey Marcus would tell you today. And that is what we Americans of Jewish faith proclaim today, tomorrow, and forever.

He leaves a heritage and a challenge to us soldiers to carry on. He has set a noble example. We have only one loyalty, one flag, and one nation—our blessed America. But we know that we went into this great struggle to help the oppressed and finally bring freedom to every part of the world. Israel is part of this world.

And to our people, the land of Israel is holy. It was made holier because a gallant son—my comrade and my friend—Mickey Marcus—paid the supreme sacrifice. As long as there will be soldiers, and as long as they will be marching—next year or 50 years from now—as long as there will be a Memorial Day parade, and as long as we soldiers and those who come after us will remember our comrades who gave their lives so that the next generation may live in peace, in decency, in honesty, and in freedom, our gallant Mickey Marcus will remain the supreme field marshal of our ranks.

I salute you, Mickey Marcus. I salute you and I assure you that we are proud that you have been one of our own. We are proud that you laid down your life as an American soldier in the battle that has lasted 2,000 years, and that finally, with God's help, will bring us to victory.

Can ERP Succeed?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

include an article by Allan C. Butler and Murray P. Yeager, which appeared in the Washington Post February 7, 1949, as follows:

On February 8 the administration will go before Congress to obtain European recovery program appropriations for the fiscal year 1950. It will then become more readily apparent than it is now that the prospects of success for the ERP by 1952 are indeed slim. The European Cooperation Administration will have to report in all truth that the long-range program considered by the organization of European Economic Cooperation in its recently published report offers little promise of being a real recovery program.

That report estimates that under the present program the participating countries will have a $3,000,000,000 deficit in 1952. This means that without drastic changes in the present plans, western Europe will have to take a cut in 1952 of one-fourth of the planned level of imports from all sources. The report states, "Such a reduction in western Europe's imports would be an intolerable solution for both Europe and the overseas suppliers. Western Europe with a population one-tenth higher than before the war and imports one-fourth lower, could hardly prosper. For some countries the reduction in imports proposed would be even greater; for some they would mean misery."

The complete reduction of balance-of-payments deficits within the 4-year framework would involve, on the part of some western States, the imposition of controls hitherto known only under totalitarian regimes. Moreover, from the United States point of view, such controls would mean the elimination of all luxury items from European trade and would permit only the purchase of selected raw materials and heavy industrial equipment from the North American continent. Since under the present program the United States faces a loss of a billion and a half dollars in her sales to Latin America and continued infringement by western Europe on her sales in other areas of the world, any further reduction of exports might occasion severe economic repercussions in the United States economy.

Any penetrating analysis on the part of the congressional committees concerned will involve the posing of questions which the officials of the ECA will find difficult to answer, to wit: assuming that the fiscal 1949 program did serve, and the fiscal 1950 program now under consideration will serve their functions as an integral part of a long-range program, is that program one which holds any promise of achieving a stable level of unsupported European economic activity?

If the answer to this question is negative, as it must be in view of the interim report of the OEEC, the committees should ask if there is any long-term program contemplated by the administration that will achieve within some limits a viable European economy.

This is the time to make known to the Congress and the American public the situation with which they are confronted. The Marshall plan as it now stands cannot be a European recovery program unless we are willing to accept the imposition of the most stringent economic controls in Europe, the reduction of European living standards, and serious dislocations in that part of the United States economy concerned with foreign markets.

ALLAN C. BUTLER.
MURRAY P. YEAGER.

WASHINGTON.

The Supreme Court Should Decide the Colorado River Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] placed in the Appendix of this RECORD a letter from the Bureau of the Budget which stated definitely that the central Arizona project was not in conformity with the President's program, and could not secure Bureau approval. Several bills had already been introduced in this Congress attempting to secure congressional action on that project. Undoubtedly, in the face of Presidential disapproval, these bills will be dropped. In spite of that, the Members of the Congress should keep in mind that this does not settle the water argument between California and Arizona. In the simplest language, it is this: California interprets the contracts and compacts entered into between Arizona, the Federal Government, and itself to establish the right to a certain amount of water for California. It feels that other interpretations than its own support this view. Arizona feels that the amount to which California is entitled is a less amount. Since California has already contracted to deliver this water to various communities, to the full amount to which the State believed itself entitled, and since the population of my State has increased 3,000,000 in the past 8 years, anyone can see this is a serious problem and one which should be settled.

California desires no water belonging to anyone else, nor to any other State. California does not care at all what Arizona does with the water to which she is entitled. All California asks is that the matter shall be decided, so my State will know whether she has the water for which she made a solemn compact with the Government of the United States, or whether she has it not, and has sold water to thirsty people which now, by some changed interpretation, she will not have to deliver. For that reason, California has proposed settlement by conference, or by arbitration, and now by taking the matter to the Supreme Court of the United States, which has always been considered the final authority, under the Constitution, particularly in matters involving legal interpretation. The letter from the Budget Bureau may end the efforts of our Arizona friends to get water by congressional action, before a decision can be secured on the amount to which both States are entitled legally under long-standing contracts, but it still does not settle the basic argument, over the interpretation of the contracts. An excellent editorial appeared recently in the Los Angeles Herald-Express, and I have asked consent today to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include this editorial, under the caption "California will continue fight to settle water dispute."

The editorial follows:

CALIFORNIA WILL CONTINUE FIGHT TO SETTLE WATER DISPUTE

Even though President Truman opposes spending $738,000,000 in Federal funds to develop the central Arizona reclamation project—with Colorado River water diverted from Lake Mead—thus lessening an immediate danger to southern California's life line water supply, this State cannot afford to rest on its laurels, but must carry on its fight in Congress to compel the Supreme Court to establish, once and for all, the rights of California and Arizona to Colorado River water.

Southern California is dependent on Colorado River water to maintain the vast population which has settled in this area, because water from our own mountain streams and deep wells cannot begin to meet the needs of our domestic life, agriculture, and industry.

When the United States Government contemplated developing the central Arizona reclamation project, California became alarmed, for such a development called for the construction of a diversion dam above Hoover Dam for the purpose of diverting a large portion of the Colorado River water to arid lands in Arizona. It would necessarily cut sharply into the water supply which means life itself to southern California.

The President's action is encouraging, but it does not end California's fight to have the Colorado River dispute ended through action of the Supreme Court. The West must continue the fight. Measures still before Congress calling for the development of the costly Arizona project must be killed.

There can be no assurance that Southern California's water supply from the Colorado River will not be drastically cut until the Supreme Court sets up hard and fast laws establishing the rights of the several involved States to water.

That is the problem which California is asking Congress to solve through action which would authorize the Supreme Court to establish the rights of all States affected.

ERP Stopped Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of February 10, 1949:

ERP STOPPED REDS

Secretary of State Acheson's assertion that the European recovery plan—perhaps better known as the Marshall plan—stopped the Reds in Europe last year may well be believed. When we look back to the situation a year ago when Senator VANDENBERG was so vigorously backing up President Truman in pushing this program through, when we recall how powerful then were the Red forces in the elections in France and in Italy, it certainly seems reasonable to assume that the aid we sent those countries in the past year enabled the democratic parties to overcome their Red enemies.

In the past year we have sent over, under this program, some $6,000,000,000 in money

and supplies. For the next 15 months the ERP is asking for $5,580,000,000 more, and intimates that even this may not be fully sufficient. These are large sums, even as we look upon Government spending today. But considering the purpose for which they are being spent they might well prove the more economical way out. The cost of another war would run into hundreds of billions and might end in the destruction of civilization as we know it.

It may be recalled that last year Senator VANDENBERG wisely suggested that, instead of appropriating the entire $15,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 in one lump sum to put through the 4-year program envisaged under the Marshall plan, it would be much better to divide this up into yearly allotments. First, he pointed out, it would be unconstitutional for any Congress to make appropriations for such a purpose for a period of time that would overlap into a succeeding Congress; and that, second, instead of giving Europe practically a blank check for a 4-year period, we might well get better results by telling them they would get further aid at the end of each year only if they were able to prove that they had spent the previous installment wisely and were really trying to help themselves.

W. Averell Harriman, special United States representative to the Marshall plan nations, said that "we are winning the struggle for peace and freedom," and he pointed out the breaking away from Moscow domination by Yugoslavia as indicating the possibilities of further such breaks. Instead of waiting for Russia to poke out at us at all vulnerable points, such as in Greece and Turkey, in Korea and China, it might be good policy for us to poke back by encouraging Yugoslavia, Poland, and Czechoslovakia to stir up trouble for Stalin. Such an offensive might be better than staying wholly on the defensive as we have been for the last 3 years.

Flood Control Is a Vital and Important Year-Round Function

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the subject of flood control is seldom discussed at length in the House except when there is a disaster in some part of the United States due to floods or at the time when an appropriation or authorization bill for flood control is before the House. Undoubtedly many Members of Congress do not know that flood control under the direction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers is a continuing function of the Government and has been of great value in the recovery and restoration of millions of valuable acreage that would otherwise be inundated and for the protection of millions of dollars' worth of real property, such as factories, homes, and public institutions, and for the lives of millions of citizens.

Flood control comes under the jurisdiction of the committee of which I am a member, the Public Works Committee of the House. I am also a member of the Subcommittee for Flood Control, and am, therefore, vitally interested in all phases of this important function of the United States Army engineers.

Flood control on a Nation-wide scale has only been a function of the Federal Government during the past 12 years although it was originally recognized as a Federal activity in 1879 when the Mississippi River Commission was created by Congress. However, since 1936, which is the year the original Flood Control Act was passed, providing for authorization of funds for the control of floods on a Nation-wide basis, much valuable progress has been made and a large and expansive program is planned for the future.

Since the original 1936 Flood Control Act, similar acts have been approved in 1937, 1938, 1939, 1941, 1944, 1946, and 1948. To date, Congress has provided in these acts a monetary authorization of $2,508,784,400 for flood-control work. Under these authorizations Congress has appropriated a total of $1,333,365,925 for the prosecution of the general flood-control program. These appropriations began with the fiscal year 1938, when they totaled $47,000,000. Flood-control appropriations were naturally reduced during the recent war years and reached a low of about $4,000,000 in 1944, largely for continuation and maintenance of projects essential to the war effort; but they rose to 339 million for the fiscal year 1949 to carry out the augmented postwar program. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1950 is $430,000,000.

Noteworthy progress has been made in execution of the general flood-control program. This is particularly true when it is realized that this work has been under way for only about 10 years, since the first flood-control appropriation was made in 1938; and that this decade includes the mobilization and war period of 5 years, extending from 1941 to 1945 inclusive, when Federal civil works were at a standstill.

In this brief period, however, up to June 30, 1948, we have completed 172 projects for local flood protection of cities, towns, and agricultural areas; and 56 reservoirs, some of which are for flood control only while others are for flood control in combination with related uses such as development of electric power, navigation, and water supply. The cost of all flood-control projects completed through June 1948 is $483,000,000.

The flood-control program has already proved itself to have been a sound investment from the standpoint of the Federal Government and of the national economy as a whole.

Benefits of flood-control works are returned to the people of the country and to the Federal Government in many ways. The first and most immediate return is in flood damages prevented. For example our estimates show that in the short period since 1938 the works which we have completed at a cost of $483,000,000 have prevented flood damages of over $500,000,000. Thus they have already paid for themselves; and during their useful lives we may anticipate that they will return their cost many times over by prevention of damage.

Wide publicity is naturally given to flood damages which still occur throughout the country. It is unfortunate however that so little is known of the flood damages which do not occur because of the Federal flood-control program. We estimate that the flood-control works which have thus far been completed, or which are effective, under the general flood-control program now prevent an average annual flood damage of over $130,000,000.

This average annual flood damage will of course vary widely from year to year. The past year 1948 experienced some notable floods. That in the Columbia River Basin in May and June 1948 was one of the most destructive, and caused the loss of some 50 lives and over $100,000,000 in flood damage. Some 582,000 acres of land was inundated in that basin. It is not generally known, however, that the relatively small amount of flood-control work which has been completed in the Columbia River Basin by the Corps of Engineers prevented damages estimated at over $40,000,000.

In late December 1948 and early January 1949 a major flood occurred on the Connecticut River and its tributaries in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Completed flood-control works which were in locations to operate effectively during this flood included the Knightville Reservoir and local protection works at Hartford, West Springfield, and six other cities along the Connecticut River. These works were highly effective and prevented damages of about $11,000,000, which would otherwise have occurred during a flood of this magnitude. The remaining flood damage which actually occurred in the basin was reduced to $1,100,000.

Flood-control works also produce a return to the United States and strengthen the national economy by reclaiming or improving vast areas of agricultural land. This land, being located in our river valleys, is the richest and most productive in the Nation. The project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River is, of course, the prime example of this benefit, as without flood control that entire fertile valley would be alluvial river swamp. The smaller and more widely distributed works of the general flood-control program are, however, accomplishing the same conservation of land in 37 States as follows: (a) Land protected wholly or in part by completed projects, 4,000,000 acres; (b) land that will be protected wholly or in part by projects started but not yet complete, 14,000,000 acres.

The flood-control program will permit increased use of these productive lands, with great benefit to farmers and property owners. The Federal Government has a direct stake in this phase of the accomplishment because of augmentation of the food supply of the Nation and because of increased tax returns from the protected lands.

In addition, Federal flood-control works produce a number of benefits which we may term intangible, but which are of very real importance. The removal of flood hazard from a river valley immediately produces a sense of security

and public confidence which is reflected in improvement of living conditions, establishment of new industries, and a general upward trend in the social and economic structure of the area. During the recent war, flood protection of important industrial areas and centers of transportation has been of vital importance. Floods in 1943 and 1944 caused serious disruption of transcontinental rail and highway traffic. The important rail center of east St. Louis, the gateway to the West, with its rail yards and transfer facilities, was seriously threatened, but the Federal levees held and a disaster was averted.

The Federal flood-control program also produces many collateral benefits which may be enumerated briefly, as follows:

(a) Development of hydroelectric power.

(b) Water supply for municipal, industrial, and agricultural use.

(c) Recreational values—particularly associated with reservoirs.

(d) Preservation of fish and wildlife.

(e) Abatement of pollution and improved sanitary facilities.

At its present stage of progress all of these types of benefits are being returned to the Nation.

Medaling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on February 12, 1949:

Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan's gift for sticking his foot in it has got the country into an embarrassing fix with Argentina which, however, is putting on some ridiculous overtones. Added last week to the "fruit salad" on the chest of General Vaughan was the Order of Liberator San Martin which was bestowed by the Argentine Ambassador. The precise reason for this honor is not quite clear. General Vaughan has rendered no distinctive service to Argentina, so far as we know, and his military exploits scarcely rank as more distinguished than those of any number of persons in and out of the Pentagon. But the general happens to be the President's military aide, and this is doubtless the only reason for decorating him. What the ceremony has done, therefore, is to give an impression of cordial relations between this country and Argentina totally unwarranted by Argentine performance. It looks as if President Perón has decided to do some diplomatic fence mending without in the least altering his anti-American course and had chosen General Vaughan as the most promising dupe to fall into his trap.

Because of his association with the White House, the White House must bear part of the blame for permitting the investiture—the more so because this is only one of a number of blunders committed by the egregious General Vaughan. About a year ago, you may recall, he precipitated an absurd squabble when he announced publicly that he was to be made chief of the President's aides—an excursion properly squelched by the White House. Previously he had caused no end of consternation by referring to Winston Churchill as a garrulous old gentleman, in a speech which almost set a record for indiscretion. Altogether, General Vaughan's penchant for aggrandizement is reminiscent of the late unlamented Hermann Goering, who reportedly wore medals on his pajamas.

General Vaughan certainly loves his medals as much as Hermann did. But he may soon find himself in some predicament in accommodating them on his martial and ample breast. Several other Latin-American nations, irked by the protests of Columnist Drew Pearson over the presentation, are preparing to honor General Vaughan in like fashion. At this rate the general pretty soon will be plastered with fruit salad. (Mr. Pearson, by the way, has quite a bit of it himself.) The farce calls for action on the part of Congress before this depreciation of the currency by foreign governments makes every military breast look foolish.

The State Department has a rule that none of its officials abroad may accept any foreign decorations, and it is not too much to ask that other Americans whose position impinges upon foreign affairs be subjected to similar restraints. Newspapermen must be left with their sense of proportion in the matter. Article I of the Constitution specifically forbids any American officeholder from accepting any foreign present, emolument, office, or title of any kind without the consent of Congress. This excellent rule was suspended during the two world wars in deference to our Allies, though Congress since last summer has reasserted the congressional check. The debasement of medal-giving and the weakness of mortal man are reasons enough for putting a stop to a practice that is in danger of becoming a racket.

Cerebral Palsy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include a statement by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., and a copy of a bill I introduced recently.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is H. R. 1729, and it would authorize research and investigation into the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy.

The statement by Mr. Strachan and the bill follow:

STATEMENT OF PAUL A. STRACHAN, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.

Enactment by the Congress of H. R. 1729 should be a must on the legislative calendar because for many years we have seen the necessity for special treatment and training of those afflicted by cerebral palsy, who number from 500,000 to 700,000 of our citizens.

So far, no cure has been found for cerebral palsy, but, comparatively recently, medical science and methods of education have made some progress in developing latent powers of the individual so afflicted to the extent that much improvement has been noted in the cases of those who could afford such treatment and training. Unfortunately, for the most part, those who need such treatment and training most are denied it because of the high costs thereof. This cannot be construed as criticism of physicians and surgeons, but is the result of a combination of costs of drugs and the necessarily involved therapies that go to make up the whole course.

As I have many times stated, there are three primary phases of importance. Medical treatment, including therapy, education, and training of the individual, and education of the general public. Of equal importance is special training for parents of cerebral-palsied children. There are too many instances where the parents, following the false and often dangerous trail of carrying the child on a pillow, have completely ruined in that child the self-determination, reliance, and energy to carry out a program of attainment of physical and professional proficiency.

Another great draw-back is public discrimination against employment of the cerebral palsied. The average employer evidently feels that a cerebral-palsied person is, as a rule, both incapable and unreliable and, therefore, is a bad employment risk.

We have made and are making strenuous efforts to overcome this unfavorable condition, but we fully realize that until some universal standard of treatment and training is applied, the cerebral palsied will lack the means needed to benefit and fit themselves for any kind of work.

Therefore, in preparing this bill we were mindful of the necessity for adequate medical treatment as a prerequisite, and we consulted the most eminent specialists in the field of cerebral palsy to ascertain their views. We believe the bill represents a fair composite of their views. We also consulted the organizations of the cerebral palsied (spastics) because we are sure that no one can better understand the difficulties and problems attendant upon this affliction than those who suffer from it themselves.

We know enactment of this measure to be necessary to the welfare of hundreds of thousands of our citizens and we therefore urge early and favorable action by the Congress, and the support of all organizations, groups, and individuals at interest, to bring about speedy and effective operation thereof.

We may say that strong endorsements of this bill have been made to us by great national organizations of labor, veterans, educators, businessmen, fraternal, civic, farm, women, scientific, and professional, and other groups and individuals at interest, representing more than 35,000,000 citizens. Surely such powerful support will attest the need and soundness of this important bill.

H. R. 1729

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Public Health Service Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE VII—CEREBRAL PALSY

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'National Cerebral Palsy Act.'

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 702. The Congress hereby finds and declares (1) that the health of the Nation is seriously affected and threatened by cerebral palsy; (2) that approximately 500,000

people in the United States (commonly referred to as 'spastics') have been born with, or have acquired at a later time, damage to the brain which interferes with voluntary motion and coordination and requires special treatment and training; (3) that, until comparatively recently, victims of cerebral palsy were regarded as incurables, but new techniques employing new drugs, therapy, and training give evidence of much progress in the treatment of persons afflicted with cerebral palsy; and (4) that the Federal Government should provide for research and investigation with respect to diseases of and injuries to the brain in order to develop more effective means of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such diseases and injuries, and, if possible, to cure the victims thereof.

"NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY INSTITUTE

"SEC. 703. For the purpose of improving the health of the people of the United States through the conduct of researches, investigations, public education, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis, treatment, and restoration of those afflicted by cerebral palsy; assisting and fostering such researches and activities by public and private agencies, and promoting the coordination of all such researches and activities and the useful application of their results; training research workers, training undergraduate and postgraduate personnel in matters relating to cerebral palsy; training parents of cerebral palsied children; and developing and assisting States and other agencies in the use of the most effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and restoration of those afflicted by cerebral palsy; including refresher courses for physicians; there is hereby established in the United States Public Health Service (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Service') a National Cerebral Palsy Institute (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Institute').

"DUTIES OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

"SEC. 704. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Surgeon General is authorized and directed—

"(1) To conduct, assist, and foster researches, investigations, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the cause, prevention, and methods of diagnosis and treatment of cerebral palsy;

"(2) To promote the coordination of research, education, and control programs conducted by the Institute, and similar programs conducted by other agencies, organizations, and individuals;

"(3) To make available research facilities of the Service to appropriate public authorities and to health officials and scientists engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this title;

"(4) To make grants-in-aid to universities, hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private agencies and institutions, and to individuals, for research, education, and control (service programs for prevention, diagnosis, and treatment utilizing current or advanced medical methods), projects and programs, including grants to such agencies and institutions for the construction, acquisition, leasing, and equipment of hospital, clinic, laboratory, and related facilities necessary for such research, education, and control;

"(5) To establish an information center on research, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, research, and other activities carried on pursuant to this title;

"(6) To secure, from time to time, and for such periods as he deems advisable, the assistance and advice of persons from the United States or abroad, who are experts in the field of cerebral palsy;

"(7) To establish and maintain, from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose, research fellowships in the Institute and elsewhere, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train research workers and procure the assistance of the most brilliant and promising research fellows from the United States and abroad, and, in addition, to provide such training and instruction, and demonstrations, through grants to public and other nonprofit institutions;

"(8) To establish and maintain, from funds appropriated or donated for the purpose of traineeships in the Institute and elsewhere in matters relating to the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, with such stipends and allowances (including travel and subsistence expenses) as he may deem necessary to train persons found by him to have proper qualifications, and, in addition, to provide such training and instruction and demonstrations, through grants to public and other nonprofit institutions;

"(9) To admit and treat at the Institute, for purposes of study, voluntary patients suffering from cerebral palsy, whether or not otherwise eligible for such treatment by the Service; and

"(10) To adopt, upon recommendation of the National Cerebral Palsy Council, such additional means as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

"NATIONAL CEREBRAL PALSY COUNCIL

"SEC. 705. (a) There is hereby created a National Cerebral Palsy Council (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Council'), to consist of the Surgeon General, or his representative, the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration, or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Army or his representative, the Surgeon General of the Navy or his representative, the Chief of the Children's Bureau or her representative, and 12 members appointed without regard to the civil-service laws, by the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator (hereafter referred to in this title as the 'Administrator'). The 12 persons appointed shall be leaders in the fields of medical science, who have qualified as specialists in cerebral palsy, the fundamental sciences, education, or public affairs, and one of these shall be an individual who, himself, or herself, although otherwise qualified, shall be cerebral palsied, and one shall be a registered nurse, qualified by experience with cerebral-palsied patients.

"(b) Each appointed member of the Council shall hold office for a term of 4 years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that, of the members first appointed, three shall hold office for a term of 2 years, and three shall hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Surgeon General. None of such 12 members shall be eligible for reappointment until a year has elapsed since the end of his preceding term. Every 2 years the Council shall elect one member to act as chairman for the succeeding 2-year period.

"(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to utilize the services of any member or members of the Council in connection with matters related to the work of the Service for such periods, in addition to conference periods, as he may determine to be necessary.

"(d) Each appointed member of the Council, while attending conferences or meetings of the Council or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Administrator, but not exceeding $75 per day, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from his place of residence.

"(e) The Council shall meet from time to time to advise the Surgeon General on the conduct of the program of the Institute, and to review and make recommendations regarding requests for grants-in-aid for research, education, and control.

"(f) The Council, with approval of the Surgeon General, shall establish and appoint subcommittees, to deal with various phases of diagnosis, treatment, and training of cases of cerebral palsy, as follows:

"(1) Subcommittee on Prevention, which shall be primarily concerned with obstetrics, shall be composed of specialists skilled in—

"(A) obstetrics;

"(B) pediatrics;

"(C) embroyology;

"(D) physiology (particularly convulsions and the relationship of cerebral palsy to convulsions or epilepsy suffered by children at an early age);

"(E) asphyxia;

"(F) blood—RH;

"(G) infections occurring early in life (particularly the relationship of whooping cough and other diseases of children to convulsions).

"(2) Subcommittee on Treatment, to be composed of specialists skilled in—

"(A) physical medicine;

"(B) neurology;

"(C) physiology (nerve contractions, and so forth);

"(D) orthopedics;

"(E) pediatrics;

"(F) pharmacology.

"(3) Subcommittee on Training of Professional Personnel, to be composed of the following:

"(A) The head of an accredited medical school.

"(B) The head of an accredited physiotherapy school or department.

"(C) Educators of cerebral-palsied persons.

"(D) Occupational therapists.

"(E) Speech therapists.

"(F) Physical-medicine specialists.

"(G) Psychologist (testing of the cerebral-palsied child).

"(4) Committee on Educational Research on the Cerebral Palsied Child, to be composed of the following:

"(A) Qualified educators.

"(B) Persons qualified to conduct clinics and educational forums, for parents of cerebral-palsied children, and other groups at interest.

"CONTROL GRANTS

"SEC. 706. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make grants-in-aid, as provided in this section, to States, counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of States, and to public and nonprofit institutions for the establishment and maintenance of programs for prevention, treatment, and control of cerebral palsy, including the provision of appropriate facilities for care and treatment and including the training of personnel.

"(b) For each fiscal year, the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall determine the total sum from the appropriation authorized under section 707 which shall be available for allotment among the several States and other institutions under this section.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall, from time to time, certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts to be paid to each State from the allotments to such State, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by the amount which he finds that estimates of required expenditures with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the actual expenditures for such period. Upon receipt

of such certification, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay in accordance with such certification.

"(d) The money so paid to any State shall be expended solely in carrying out the purposes for which the grant is made, and in accordance with plans presented by the health authority of such State and approved by the Surgeon General.

"(e) Requests for grants-in-aid for control, including education for projects and programs not in State agencies, shall be submitted, reviewed, and paid in manner similar to that established for research grants-in-aid.

"GIFTS AND AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 707. (a) The Surgeon General shall recommend to the Administrator acceptance of conditional gifts, pursuant to section 501 of the Public Health Service Act, for study, investigation, or research into the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cerebral palsy, or the acquisition of grounds for the erection, equipment, or maintenance of premises, buildings, or equipment of the Institute. Donations of $50,000 or over for carrying out the purposes of this title may be acknowledged by the establishment within the Institute of suitable memorials to the donors.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) Such appropriations as are hereafter made to carry out the purposes of this title may be expended in the District of Columbia for personal services, stenographic recording and translating service, by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses (including the expenses of attendance at meetings when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General); rental, supplies, and equipment, purchase and exchange of medical books, books of reference, directories, periodicals, newspapers and press clippings; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding (in addition to that otherwise provided by law); and for all other necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 708. (a) This title shall not be construed as superseding or limiting (1) the functions, under any other act, of the Surgeon General or the Service, or of any other officer or agency of the United States, relating to the study of the causes, prevention, or methods of diagnosis or treatment of cerebral palsy; or (2) the expenditure of money therefor.

"(b) The Surgeon General shall perform his functions under this title under the supervision and direction of the Administrator. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

"(c) As used in this title, the term 'State' means a State or the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"(d) The Surgeon General shall include in the report for submission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session a full report of the administration of this title, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

"(e) The Administrator is authorized to fix the compensation for the services of certain specially qualified scientific and professional personnel concerned with research activities of the National Institute of Health, and the National Cerebral Palsy Institute: *Provided*, That the rates of compensation for positions established pursuant to the provisions of this subsection shall not be less than $10,000 per annum nor more than $15,000 per annum."

SEC. 2. Title VII of the act entitled "An act to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1944, as amended, is hereby redesignated "title VIII"; sections 701 to 714, inclusive, of such title are hereby redesignated as sections 801 to 814, respectively.

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective 60 days from date of passage thereof.

Miners' Welfare and Retirement Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United Mine Workers Journal of January 15, 1949:

WELFARE FUND REPORTS HELPING 260,123 AT COST OF $68,000,000 IN 20 MONTHS

Rolls of the UMWA Bituminous Welfare and Retirement Fund at the close of 1948 recorded a grand total of 260,123 beneficiaries who in the 20 months since the fund became actually operative had received payments aggregating approximately $68,000,000, it was disclosed in a report by Josephine Roche, director, to President Lewis in his capacity as chairman of the fund's three-man board of trustees.

Coal miners and their dependents in every bituminous field in the Nation shared in these payments, which were disbursed in the form of disability grants, pensions, death benefits, and hospital and medical care. This was the first over-all report since the pension plan became effective last September and covers outlays under the three separate funds of 1946, 1947, and 1948, which have now been consolidated into one fund.

In the months intervening since the legal obstacles to operation of the 1947 fund were cleared away, executives of the fund have moved with such dispatch to establish a smoothly functioning administrative machine that the one-millionth benefit check was about ready for mailing as this issue of the Journal went to press. Fund officials advised President Lewis that its operations are now on a current basis. As a rule death benefit applications are cleared within 24 hours after being received, while disability and pension cases require but a few days, yet each is given the most careful scrutiny.

Examination of the year-end report discloses that the largest single phase of the program is listed under the heading of "Disability benefits," which entailed grants to 88,350 coal miners, miners' widows, orphans, or other dependents. These grants go to miners who are permanently or temporarily disabled by injuries or illness and are timed for periods ranging up to 1 year, depending on the applicant's physical condition. As the beneficiaries recover from temporary injuries or illness and return to work, they are removed from the rolls.

An applicant for disability benefits is examined in his local community by a physician who certifies his condition. The UMWA local to which the miner belongs certifies his membership and the UMWA district office certifies the local's status. Then the claim is sent to Washington, where it is carefully gone over by the staff of examiners who are especially trained for this work.

It is significant that the average age of miners receiving disability grants is 62 years, a time of life when it is not uncommon even for those in less strenuous occupations than coal mining to be laid up for varying periods. The schedule of disability benefits is $60 for a miner, $20 extra for his wife, and $10 for each child. UMWA field representatives have contributed many thousands of hours to servicing this phase of the welfare program.

Although the pension plan of the fund was the last to get started due to the long drawn-out legal battles initiated by the coal operators under the NAM-Taft-Hartley Act, it too is now functioning in high gear and has on its rolls 11,689 retired miners—most of whom are disabled—who are receiving the $100-a-month pension. To be eligible for a pension a miner must be 62 years of age, have 20 years of service in the mines, and have retired since May 29, 1946. The average age of miners receiving pensions is 64 years and they average about 35 years of service each.

Beginning with the families of the 111 victims of the Centralia, Ill., mine disaster, the fund has sent out $1,000 death benefit checks to 10,489 widows or other surviving dependents of miners killed in mine accidents or who have died from other causes. This, the first phase of the welfare program to be activated, has been of immeasurable help to thousands of widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased mine workers in the dark days immediately after the death of the family breadwinner. Since insurance rates are prohibitive for those employed in the hazardous mining industry, the welfare fund's death benefit has brought a degree of protection never before available to miners' families.

With the recent establishment of 10 regional offices at strategic points in the bituminous coal fields over the Nation; the Welfare Fund's hospital- and medical-care program is now in operating order and has on its rolls a total of 2,079 beneficiaries. Included in this number are 218 paraplegics, miners with broken backs who have received or are now undergoing special medical care and rehabilitation in medical institutions from New York to California. Already many of these miners with broken backs, formerly regarded in their own communities as virtually beyond help, have completed their hospital treatment and are back home applying themselves to useful tasks utilizing newly acquired skills. Many have been aided with artificial limbs and prosthetic devices to enable them to get about once more. Life has again been made worth while for these formerly neglected victims of mine accidents.

Physicians in charge of the area offices are now developing as expeditiously as possible a complete program of medical and hospital care for all UMWA members and their families in what is undoubtedly the most extensive health program ever undertaken for any industry. It is the intention of the fund's health service to utilize, wherever possible, existing hospital and medical facilities. As rapidly as plans can be perfected in the field costs of the health program will be borne by the Welfare Fund, thus relieving the miners of the monthly check-off for hospital and doctor care.

Administration of the Welfare and Retirement Fund is carried on in Washington under Director Roche by an efficient team of supervisors, as follows: Disability benefits, Paul M. Nothern; pensions, Val Mitch; death benefits, Tom Williams; hospital and medical care, Dr. Warren F. Draper; comptroller, Tom Ryan; research and statistics, Robert Kaplan; counsel, William L. P. Burke.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Lock Haven, Pa., Saturday, February 12, 1949:

Good evening, fellow Americans, we are assembled tonight as true Americans and loyal Republicans—to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln, whose unflinching devotion to principle gave birth to a new political party—a great party which has served this Nation well through three generations of progress.

We Republicans are the party of freedom—dedicated to save this country from slavery to government.

When the noble aspirations of the Gettysburg address are at last realized for America—it will be under the leadership of the Republican Party.

Our American concept of constitutional freedom—and our glorious tradition of ordered liberty under law—are the most practical—and the most successful—principles of political organization ever devised for human progress and the welfare of all the people.

We intend to see that that system is faithfully protected and soundly maintained.

We do not intend to submit to the police state, or the total state. Our program is to improve and protect the state of the Union.

Abraham Lincoln saved the Republic by his towering spirit of conviction, patience, tolerance, and sincere good will toward men.

We can honor him best by bringing to today's problems and today's tasks the same qualities of mind and spirit which, in Lincoln's day, saved freedom for America—and thus for all mankind.

Lincoln's every thought in time of crisis was for the Nation as a whole.

The spirit of narrow partisanship was not in him.

He could not stomach the council of hate, revenge, or retaliation. He sought nothing for himself—but only to become the human instrument through which American destiny might move on to its brighter tomorrow.

It is fashionable in some quarters today to say that these are new times—that Lincoln's generation did not face the perplexing issues of human welfare and economic stability with which we must deal.

But the simple truth is that every generation of freedom faces the same issues between the powers of aggressive government and the rights and privileges of free men and women.

We Republicans stand on the side of freedom.

If we falter, the black night of tyranny falls on all mankind.

We must not fail. Our Republican Party is the only vehicle remaining today for the persistent, vigorous, Nation-wide defense of fundamental Americanism.

Our way of life is defined in the wisdom of the ages—in the Holy Scriptures—Magna Carta—the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and in the inspired maxim of Abraham Lincoln, "With malice toward none, with charity for all."

In our time, all our Republican victories at the polls have been achieved by fighting valiantly, without compromise, for these deepest fundamentals of the American faith.

So long as we hold this high ground we shall be a strong party—a winning party.

But should we surrender to the glamorous lure of something-for-nothing, deficit spending, growing armies of bureaucrats, and never-ending Federal encroachment upon local home rule, then we shall have lost our greatest strength.

That strength is the deep longing of millions upon millions of Americans to see their beloved country moving forward once more by the true lights of its great heritage.

We can meet our social problems best by American methods. The Republican Party through the years has worked for sound progress in the field of social welfare. These efforts will be continued with American methods.

I need not tell the good people of Pennsylvania how to go about this great work of national redemption. For the most part Pennsylvania gave a very good account of itself last November.

Pennsylvania was established in the tradition of hard work, faithful service to God and mankind, honest bookkeeping, and robust thrift.

Those are the qualities which soon will be called forth, in every State, to save the Republic, grinding hard work, courage, and faith in the face of overwhelming Government propaganda, determination to fight for the right, and unflinching conviction.

Precinct organization is the first step—as your local returns throughout Pennsylvania demonstrated so conclusively last November.

Only through intensive local organization may we offset the tidal wave of Government propaganda which is poured upon our people daily by the Federal bureaucrats—at the expense of the taxpayers.

These bureaus are spending tens of millions of dollars a year in Government publicity and propaganda—seeking always to bend the thinking of the people to their own programs of national socialism. And this gigantic Federal bureaucracy is still expanding—more than 3 years after the end of the war.

A recent report from the Byrd committee reveals that 109,000 new pay-rollers were added to the Federal budget during the calendar year 1948.

That means an average increase of 297 Government workers every day in the year—including Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. And this does not include any increase in our military personnel—just the civil rolls.

We now carry more than 2,100,000 civilian workers in the Federal agencies—more than twice as many as 1940—and almost four times as many as 1933.

This is spendthrift government—government which has closed its mind and heart to the real, practical needs of the people.

One school of political thought in America today is the advocate of managed economy and regimentation—a system in which government rules the daily lives of the people—by allocations, quotas, loans, subsidies, and executive orders.

The other school—by far the overwhelming majority of the American people in every State and every section of this mighty land—supports the system of freedom, private enterprise, and responsible constitutional government.

Through almost 100 years of our party history, Republicans have had but one master plan for government—the Constitution.

Our American system is based on the fundamental principle of local home rule—the principle that people for the most part can manage their own affairs better than government can manage for them—the principle so often written in the blood of freedom's martyrs—that government is the servant, never the master of the people.

That is the system, which—over the span of the years of our national life—carried America to the highest state of well-being for all the people ever achieved by any system of political organization anywhere—at any time—in all human history.

Yet that is the system which has been under persistent attack by leaders in our own Government for more than 16 years.

Socialism, as we have seen it develop among us in our generation, is a creeping paralysis—which ultimately will lay in the bitter dust of frustration and despair, all the bright promises of freedom and plenty which have flowered from the rich seeds of American liberty.

Let us heed, therefore, the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln, who said as long ago as 1858—

"Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them."

The budget now before Congress is the biggest peacetime spending program ever submitted to any legislative body, anywhere, in the history of the world.

It calls for $282 a year from every man, woman, and child in the United States—for Federal Government alone.

Before we approve any additional taxes, we should put forth a determined effort to cut down the tremendously swollen, wasteful, and overlapping bureaucracy.

It has been 3½ years since the end of the war—yet in many cases the people still are paying the full wartime tax rates.

There is a dangerous breaking point in this Federal tax equation—and we have been warned many times during the last few years that the prevailing spendthrift policies in Washington are carrying this Nation dangerously close to that breaking point.

No thinking person in America today can afford to ignore the tragic fact of our nearly 3,000,000 unemployed.

Extravagant Government spending already has given us the 60-cent dollar. We must stop this senseless retreat into fiscal chaos.

The Republican Eightieth Congress passed a tax-reduction bill which made a real beginning toward cutting back the cost of Government to levels the American people can afford to pay.

I predict tonight that, if the present administration is not checked in its run-away spending plans in Washington, that tax-reduction bill passed by your Republican Eightieth Congress will go down in history as the last tax-reduction bill ever passed by Congress in the twentieth century.

If the spenders have their way, no man, woman, or child among us today will live long enough to see another Federal tax-reduction bill passed by the Congress of the United States.

The record of the legislative accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress is a record of fundamental Americanism—a record of constructive purpose to restore orderly constitutional government at a cost the people can afford to pay.

By unrelenting pressure for economy and efficiency, your Republican Eightieth Congress gave this country its first balanced budget in 17 long years.

We built up in 1948 a Treasury surplus of more than eight billions with which to make a substantial reduction in the national debt.

In two short years the Eightieth Congress abruptly reversed America's 14-year drift toward national socialism and toward eventual national bankruptcy.

The Eightieth Congress gave America the most powerful national defense ever provided for any nation not actually at war.

And the Eightieth Congress perfected the most far-reaching and comprehensive system

of veterans' care and rehabilitation ever placed on the statute books of any nation.

We drove some of the Communist termites out of government and properly exposed many others to the broad daylight of public indignation and scorn.

Nor is this good work yet finished. The FBI reported only 2 weeks ago that its loyalty investigations revealed 7,992 people on the Federal pay rolls whose personal records called for a full-scale field investigation.

That's why I say that determined precinct organization is needed, if we are to expose the full scope and sway of Communists and fellow-travelers-traitors who bore at the very vitals of the Constitution from salaried places within the structure of the Federal Government.

A determined effort is being made today in the highest official quarters in Washington to snuff out the investigation by Congress which brought these shocking matters to public notice.

I hope the administration is not trying to put American communism back in the pumpkin shell and bury it under the haystack.

It can't be done.

The days of the red herring are gone forever.

The murderous creed of Kremlin communism is at war with every aspiration of American life.

The glowing promises of world communism—as we see them today in China, Hungary, Poland—make but a one-way street to slavery and black despair.

The biggest army of slave laborers in all history is found today in the 20,000,000 political prisoners who march to work every morning under the prodding bayonets of the secret police in the workers' fatherland in darkest Russia.

Communism despises our American system of justice and equal opportunity for all.

Communism mocks and jeers our aspirations for peace and order in the world.

All the world sees clearly today that communism can govern only with the bloody tools of tyranny.

No; communism is not for free America, and the logical place to uproot it first is in the Government bureaus in Washington.

And let us never forget—that it was your Eightieth, Republican, Congress which appropriated seventeen million for that loyalty investigation to uncover Communist infiltration in our Government—the only appropriation ever approved by an American Congress to drive subversives from the Federal agencies.

It was that investigation which made these Communist depredations at home matters of common knowledge to the American people.

Before the Eightieth Congress took hold, these things were official secrets, known only to those who were privileged to peek behind the iron curtain of official intrigue and palace politics in Washington.

What is the logic of spending billions and billions of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to check the spread of communism all over Europe and Asia, while encouraging it to gnaw at the very heart of American Government at home?

And let me make to you a promise—a solemn promise. This battle to drive the Communists out of our Government will be carried on by us Republicans until the last fellow traveler is separated from the pay rolls and his influence in shaping our policies eliminated.

But this is not all the Eightieth Congress accomplished for progressive Americanism.

Relations between management and labor were removed from the area of administrative discretion and reestablished on the basis of law.

In the field of foreign affairs, your Republican Eightieth Congress enacted legislation to repair and restore the shattered economic structure of war-torn Europe and Asia and to bring hope and faith once more to hundreds of millions of stricken people.

And during those 2 years of the Eightieth Congress this country enjoyed the highest level of prosperity and business activity—and the highest level of employment—ever experienced in our peacetime history.

In the light of that record, could the Eightieth Congress have been such a terrible thing—as some would have us believe—for their own selfish, political ends?

No; we who helped make that program in the Eightieth Congress have no apologies to make for our work. We rejoice in its consistent record of sound, solvent, forward-looking constitutional Government.

Every supporter of fundamental Americanism today should applaud the record of the Eightieth Congress.

As the strongest minority party in modern history, we Republicans face the future with confidence and firm conviction.

No matter how great our task, we can perform it only as Americans.

We can work only through American institutions—and by American methods.

America can develop her utmost power only as she is permitted to work in harmony with her free past, and in tune with her bright hopes for the future of human liberty.

That's why I say we must stand firm for the basic principles of our Constitution—and thus release the energies and ambitions of 145,000,000 Americans to achieve, to prosper, and be free.

With that program, with that vision, with a unity which must be measured by the high purposes of our great cause we shall yet light the lamps of freedom again all over the world.

It is a great challenge to Republicans, to independents, and those millions of Democrats who are devoted to the preservation of American institutions.

Let us turn to our work with a will which can know no defeat.

The sacred torch of freedom—America's future is in our hands.

Some Startling Facts About America's Enormous Drink Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Tate T. Hackney, of Louisville, Ky., entitled "Some Startling Facts About America's Enormous Drink Bill," as published in the Civic Forum, official organ of the National Civic League, in the issue of October–December 1948:

SOME STARTLING FACTS ABOUT AMERICA'S ENORMOUS DRINK BILL

(By Tate T. Hackney)

Huge figures have always fascinated me and doubtless all who read this article were shocked and amazed at the size of America's drink bill for 1947. Here are the figures as released by the United States Department of Commerce in Washington, D. C., under date of June 10, 1948. Last year the people of the United States spent the stupendous sum of $9,640,000,000 for the several kinds of alcoholic beverages legally available.

Let us imagine having this huge pile of money in silver dollars. A silver dollar weighs 1 ounce, is 2½ inches in diameter and ⅛ inch thick. An ordinary railroad boxcar holds 30 tons or 60,000 pounds. This means that in order to transport our huge pile of liquor money in the form of silver dollars there would be needed just 10,041 boxcars and 201 locomotives, each pulling 50 boxcars. In other words, there would be a solid line of cars over 76 miles long. Assuming the rate of speed to be 30 miles an hour, more than 2½ hours would be required for this train to pass a given point.

Now, in our imagination let us lay these silver dollars flat on the ground, edge to edge. They would form a line 228,000 miles long, or more than 9 times around the earth. If laid flat, face to face on edge, more than 19,000 miles would be covered, or four-fifths of the distance around the globe.

There have been little more than one billion minutes since the birth of Christ, and think of it, the people of our so-called Christian nation during 1947 spent enough money for this accursed poison slop to equal $9.00 for every minute since the birth of Our Saviour. Incidentally, this is about three times the amount of money spent for all kinds of public and private education; over nine times the amount of money raised by all religious bodies for churches and their maintenance; over 10 times the cost and upkeep of all libraries; 17 times the outlay for all Federal security, old age, unemployment pensions, training of nurses, and vocational guidance; eight times as much money as required to pay the pensions of all veterans; 70 times as much money as the Red Cross raises and spends; over 100 times the amount of money used in fighting disease, infantile paralysis, cancer, tuberculosis, etc., and 23 times as much money as Congress appropriated for the aid of Greece and Turkey—all spent for booze in a single year.

A BILLION DOLLARS DEFIES COMPREHENSION

Ask the average person—as I did the young lady in my office—"Could you count a billion dollars if I gave it to you in $1 bills? Or carry that amount of money home in silver dollars?" She replied, "Oh, yes, I would get some wheelbarrows and bags and eventually lug it home." She could only carry about one carload of silver dollars home in a year's time. To finish the job of lugging home the 1947 drink bill in silver dollars would require 10,000 years.

Let us further imagine our huge liquor bill in the form of $1 bills. Let us suppose that a young man enters the employ of a bank as clerk and money counter, working 8 hours a day, 300 days a year, doing nothing but counting these $1 bills at the rate of 120 bills per minute. He starts work at 20 and retires at the age of 70. In 50 years of continuous service he will have counted only $864,000,000. In other words, it would take him just 555 years to complete the job. Put another way, the services of 555 expert counters counting money at that rapid rate would be required to complete the job in 1 year. Don't let anyone tell you he could count a billion in a lifetime. It simply can't be done.

Now, let us pave an imaginary road around the world with dollar bills and make it 8 feet wide. Yes, the 1947 drink bill in $1 bills laid end to end to a width of 8 feet would reach a total of 264,000,000 miles or gird the globe just 36 times.

WHAT THE 1947 DRINK BILL WOULD HAVE BOUGHT

It is interesting to note just a few of the many useful things which our colossal liquor bill would have purchased. With a world-wide housing shortage today, we could have bought, or built, 1,606,000 small-family cottages costing $6,000 each; 192,800 small-town schoolhouses costing $50,000 each; 96,400 churches at $100,000 each; 48,200 small hospitals at $200,000 each; 6,400,000 automobiles at $1,500 each; 385,600,000 suits of clothes for men or dresses for women at $25 each.

Money spent in quenching America's thirst for alcoholic beverages would have placed

4,800,000 missionaries all over the world, each to receive a salary of $2,000. A new copy of the Bible, God's holy word, costing $4.50 could have been placed in the hands of every man, woman, and child on earth, assuming the world's population to be slightly over 2,000,000,000 people. We could also have purchased 96,000,000,000 loaves of bread at 10 cents per loaf to feed the millions of starving people all over the world.

Yes, amazing as it may seem, we could actually have built 20 modern cities of 100,000 population each. These cities would have office buildings, apartment houses, homes, churches, schools, city halls, courthouses, post offices, hospitals, theaters, stores, parks, airport, hotels, police and fire departments. Naturally, there would be water, gas, and electric services, sewage disposal, railroads and terminal equipment, busses and streetcars. Yes, indeed, our 1947 drink bill was large enough to build a score of small cities or one large city with a population of 2,000,000 people.

Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the Communist rulers in the Kremlin must have been astounded at the tremendous shout of protest and horror that the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty evoked from the free people of the world. In its anxiety for peace the western world has too often condoned the continuing acts of violence and terrorism, the shocking offenses against decency and the free nations committed by the Communists in every country under their control. But the cardinal's trial brought into such sharp focus the cleavage between the two worlds of communistic totalitarianism and western democracy that the people were stirred to action. It was generally recognized that the cardinal was on trial for refusing to render unto Caesar the things that are God's, and that the conduct of his trial was an utter repudiation of our concepts of justice and of the dignity of man.

The following resolution of the city of Newark, N. J., adopted by the board of commissioners of the city on February 9, eloquently expresses the prevailing sentiments of the people in my area, and indeed in the whole United States, towards the persecution of the cardinal:

Whereas the entire world was shocked by the arraignment and trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and the sentence of life imprisonment imposed upon him by the Hungarian Communist regime; and

Whereas the trial and imprisonment of this distinguished prelate constitute a perversion of justice, condemned by our Government and by all elements of our population who rightly deplore the inhuman treatment accorded the cardinal who opposed the dictatorship now in control of his country and who espoused liberty and humane treatment for his fellow countrymen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark at this regular meeting, February 9, 1949, That we do hereby register an emphatic protest on behalf of all the citizens of our city. We respectfully petition our Federal Government to use its good offices, through proper diplomatic channels, to have this flagrant violation of human rights speedily remedied to the end that the unjust punishment inflicted upon the cardinal shall be revoked. By so doing, we shall again affirm our American heritage of freedom for ourselves and for peoples of all races and creeds and everywhere, and also demonstrate our abhorrence of totalitarianism and the misfortune it inflicts upon the people whom it subjects; finally, be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators from New Jersey, and all New Jersey Members of the House of Representatives.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF NEWARK, N. J.
VINCENT J. MURPHY.
JOHN B. KEENAN.
JOHN A. BRADY.
RALPH A. VILLANI.
M. ELLENSTEIN.

Loans to Farmers To Purchase Homes Through Farmers Home Administration Are Making a Substantial Contribution to the Welfare of the Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration is making loans to farmers who want to become farm home owners. The applications are carefully screened by local committees for the purpose of making sure that only the deserving and well qualified are granted these loans. The losses to the Government will be practically nil. Through this vehicle, the people, who feed and clothe the United States and a large part of the world, are given the opportunity of borrowing and using the credit of our Government to this very limited extent. They pay interest on the loans and will repay the principal.

I do not know of a better way to have a happy and prosperous citizenship on the farm than permitting our farmers through their own efforts, including hard work, to own a farm home of their own.

The biggest interests in our Nation today are using the Government's credit at a very low rate of interest and in some instances without cost.

UNCLE SAM'S CREDIT

I do not know of a better way for Uncle Sam to help deserving people than step up and sign the notes of these farmers, who want to be farm home owners.

Through the parity provisions of the Commodity Credit Act, farm home ownership can be greatly encouraged. If the family-size farm is encouraged and preferred to some limited extent over the large farm or plantation operated for profit or speculation, the real people who work will be given a break. This favored position should extend only so far as necessary to give a farmer and his family a sufficient price to give the family a good standard of living if they work and earn it. Then the larger land owners can sell their land in family-size tracts, although they would not be required to do so, for a good price to people, who will be able to pay a good price; so it will not be confiscation but it will encourage the people, who actually do the work, and make home owners out of them. Support prices should be at least 100 percent of parity since parity is cost. No other group, business, or industry is asked to take 90 percent of what they are entitled to. Surely the family on a family-size farm should have 100 percent even if those who farm for speculation do not get that much.

AMERICAN LEGION SUPPORT

Recently, I received a letter from the commander of the American Legion at Belton, Tex., T. R. Matthews. It is about this program and reminds me that the American Legion has endorsed it. It is as follows:

BELTON POST, NO. 55,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Belton, Tex., February 4, 1949.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States Congressman,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have read with interest a record of your statement concerning the Farmers Home Administration as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 24, 1949. The American Legion National Convention in Miami, Fla., in 1948, passed a resolution urging that the Farmers Home Administration be given more funds to carry out their program. Let me urge you to do everything possible to get through an appropriation large enough for this Administration to take care of the deserving people. There are a number of veterans in this area that need the assistance of this Administration, yet they are denied this assistance due to the lack of money.

We hope you are able to go on through with your statement and get some action on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
T. R. MATTHEWS,
Commander.

LONG LIST OF DESERVING FARMERS BUT NO MONEY

I am also inserting two typical letters, which I have received from farmers, who are greatly interested in this program. They are as follows:

LUFKIN, TEX., *February 9, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago the Farmers Home Administration Committee wired you asking you to support a bill to make larger appropriation for the FHA.

As a member of that committee, I am writing you to give this matter your sincere attention.

I notice you have spoken favorably on the measure in the House and feel you are our friend.

Our county supervisor has a long list of applicants on the waiting list to purchase FHA farms, but there are no funds. The insured mortgage plan does not seem to meet with favor among bankers. So there is nothing to do but tell folks to wait until July.

Then when funds are available it is only a few months and they are gone again.

FHA needs $50,000,000 to do a good job.

I don't think inflation need worry us along this line, for the officials from the top down to the county committee are seeing to it

that the farms being bought are worth the money. There are no more "gravy trains."

I recall one instance where a man wanted to sell a farm that was large enough for three family units. He asked $60 per acre. We waited 2 years and bought the place for $30 per acre for three Negro families. They are all making good. One of those Negroes is declared the outstanding farmer in the FHA.

I have served on the boards of all the various farm agencies and know they are sound.

Thanking you for the nice things you have said regarding the program and feeling you will continue the good work, I am,

Yours truly,

MALCHOM K. AMENT.

HAS SOMETHING TO WORK FOR

TROUP, TEX., *February 10, 1949.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Seeing your recommendation of the House of Representatives of January 24, 1949, in regard to more money being appropriated to purchase farms now and for the next year, I decided to write my own version of how much this program has helped our family.

Before we started in 1940 with the help of the Farm Security Administration we didn't have anything to farm with, we had to give the landlords half of what money we earned on the farm; we moved from place to place, striving to make even a living. We lived in houses that were uncomfortable and undecent for anyone to live in.

The FSA helped us get started right; our supervisors also helped tremendously in teaching us how to grow and maintain a better living system; how to conserve foods, to produce more milk and eggs to sell as well as for our family needs; and many more important things, for which we are very thankful.

In 1947 the Farm Home Administration made it possible for us to purchase a farm of our own and we appreciate it so very much. We have more energy to work harder than we ever have, because we have something to work for.

I would like so very much to see more money being appropriated to purchase farms for other families whom I know would work hard to pay for their farms.

It would take a great lot of space to write the many ways in which we have been helped by the FHA and we sincerely hope the House of Representatives will make it possible for more farm-loving families to purchase a farm of their own.

I can think of no better way for our Government to loan money.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. EDGAR C. JENKINS.

SOIL CONSERVATION HELPED BY LAND OWNERSHIP

Soil conservation is vital in the interest of the future welfare of our country. Home owners take more interest in soil conservation than tenants. Therefore to encourage farm ownership is to encourage soil conservation.

Medical Care for Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by N. S. Haseltine, from the Washington Post of February 13, 1949:

The vast medical care program of the coal miners' welfare fund last week moved into Washington—and into high gear.

It rode into the city of its birth 2 days ago in a Pullman car carrying the hopes and crippled bodies of seven bituminous coal miners. All cruelly paralyzed from mining mishaps, they were entered in George Washington University Hospital.

At the same moment, another Pullman was rolling westward to Vallejo, Calif., with 14 other paraplegics. Snow clearance of Donner Pass permitting, they were to be bedded today in the Kabat-Kaiser Institute Hospital for Neuromuscular Rehabilitation.

The patients, all victims of spine-snapping accidents at work, are starting medical, surgical, psychiatric (if needed), and vocational care to help them get back to lives of usefulness. Strike-won royalties on each mined ton of coal are paying the way.

In prefund days, these victims were virtually doomed to waste out their lives in their own soiled beds and bedsores. Paralyzed legs which could be, and sometimes were, gnawed by rats or roasted by fire without feeling, do "burn," "stab," and "ache" from within, the afflicted complain.

The condition follows injury to the spine, whether the spinal cord be severed by falling slate, or crushed, torn or twisted by force of weight. The latter is more frequent in underground accidents where stooping miners are "jackknifed," shoulders to knees, by falling slabs of rock and slate.

RUNS TO $10,000 EACH

Medical science today has but little to offer, but to the victims that little means so much. It offers, with their help, a program that may give ability to move about, on braced legs or in wheel chairs, and the means to regulate bowel and bladder movements.

The program is expensive. Bills already paid for the more than 200 paraplegic miners now treated or under treatment range from $5,000 to $10,000 for each patient. Hospitalization has ranged from 6 to 8 months. Its dividends are restored lives.

Victims come from the mining camps, small settlements of weathered, unpainted "homes." They come from places like Honey Bottom, W. Va., whose score of shacks rest uneasily on level land at the base of stony cliffs. Cesspool cleaners once dumped their refuse there; the miners who came later shrugged off the town's history with the naming.

Or, like Harrison Stepp, 41, too ill to make the west coast trip, they come from hillside cabins. Investigators from the United Mine Workers Welfare and Retirement Fund drove their station wagon up the running bed of Bug Creek to reach him.

Last Tuesday, Stepp rode 110 miles in an ambulance to the railhead at Charleston, W. Va. Emaciated and ashen, he could not smile with the 14 other paraplegics ticketed to California, medical care and a new lien on life.

"He's in bad shape," said Dr. John T. Morrison. "He'll have to be built up some before he can go."

And the half-alive man was moved to a private room in the Charleston General Hospital.

Stepp, whose mailing address is Lovely, W. Va., was paralyzed from a rock fall in a mine in October, 1946. Other paralyzed miners under treatment lay helpless to their miseries for as long as 29 years until the fund began operating 20 months ago.

HAND OVER HAND

Rejection of the fevered victim was the only cloud in the entrainment proceedings at Charleston that day. The injured arrived in private cars and undertakers' and hospital ambulances. Relatives and union members and officials gathered around to see them off.

One patient stubbornly refused to be carried aboard, pulling himself painfully up the car steps and swinging from seatback to seatback until he reached his allotted Pullman berth. Some had to be swung on stretchers through open windows.

Although boarding was set to begin at 4 p. m., the injured arrived hours ahead of time. First aboard was Dorsey W. Workman, 28, of Bald Knob, 66 miles away. His spine was cracked in a slate fall in a soft coal mine at Wharton, W. Va., 20 months ago.

"It broke me in two," he said, summing up his injuries as a broken spine, crushed kidney and "bushed" pelvis.

A miner for 10 years, Workman said he doesn't live in any company house. He owns his own home, a one-story, two-room dwelling. After his accident, he said, he was in and out of several hospitals until State-administered compensation funds ran out.

"I hope to come back walking," said Workman, and the physician frowned.

Dr. Morrison, medical director of fund operations for the district, said the victims have been warned they are going without promise of cure, or any assurance they'd walk at the treatment's end. The best most can expect, he added, is that they'll get about either on crutches or in wheel chairs.

HOSPITAL BED CAMPAIGNER

Paraplegia to the uninformed is painless. It must be, because the lower body is paralyzed, they reason.

"It is like hell," declared Lewis Edwards, 29, of Taylorsville, W. Va. "It's just one deep, lasting ache."

"It isn't steady with me," said James McCoy, now a justice of the peace at Red Jacket, W. Va. "It hits me about three or four times a day, like someone jabbing a big electric rod through my legs."

Union and fund officials were glad McCoy was on hand to see the patients off. The 36-year-old former miner had just got back home in December after 8 months of the specialized care. Friends had nominated and elected him to his fees-paying post while he was in New York hospitals.

"I get on the bus by myself and ride 4 miles each day to my office," he told the patients. "It takes me 75 seconds to climb on and get seated; my wife has timed it."

McCoy admitted the treatment wasn't too successful in giving him control of elimination processes. He uses enemas regularly, and that helps some, he said.

Asked if his two boys would become miners, he said: "Not if I can live long enough."

"My father didn't want me to go into the mines," he declared, "but he died too soon. He died of miner's TB (silicosis from rock dust in the lungs) in 1927."

Several years later, at the ripe mining age of 16, McCoy himself entered the pits. On September 27, 1945, he was completely buried by falling coal in a "Bloody" Mingo County mine. He spent 7 months in the Williamson (W. Va.) general hospital until his compensation ran out.

RUNS A RADIO SHOP

Edwards, who monopolized McCoy during most of the entrainment proceedings, was in perhaps the best shape of the carload. He had staged his own comeback from a bedridden state to wheel-chair operation of a radio repair shop. The West Virginia State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation paved the way, he said.

Ernest Moore, 32, of Edwight, near Honey Bottom, Raleigh County, W. Va., boasted he has a head start on many of the others. Told that much of his treatment would be exercises to strengthen muscles that still can function, he said friends had rigged up a rope-in-pipe attachment above his bed so that he could swing himself into a wheel chair.

Moore's spinal cord was crushed and four ribs broken when a slab of falling slate hit him on the shoulders and "rode me down." That was last July. Since then he has spent 8 weeks in a hospital, the rest in his bed and wheel chair in his one-story home.

The men weren't complaining Tuesday during the Charleston entrainment. They were too happy and hopeful for that. But they freely discussed their conditions. And the chief expressed complaint was about their loss of bladder and bowel control. None mentioned that the accidents cost them their sex power, too.

Dr. Morrison, however, said that it is for this reason many will require psychiatric guidance. Sex is too powerful a force to be ignored, he said, and the sudden loss can be a great mental shock.

PLASTIC SURGERY HELPS

Those who boarded the train for Washington, and those headed for California, carried the scars and wounds of paraplegia, the pressure sores of long confinement. Loss of sensory power in the afflicted legs and hips causes the ulcerated conditions, said Dr. Morrison.

As he explained it: Bedridden paraplegics do not feel the normal warning pains that come with the loss of blood circulation when their body weight cramps blood flow. As a result the pressure spots "die" for lack of blood, and ulcerating sores are formed.

The ulcers are not caused by continual wetting or otherwise involuntary soiling by the patient, he explained, although such conditions may further aggravate the open sores.

Hospital treatment for the paraplegics necessarily includes plastic surgery. Strips of the patient's healthy flesh are folded into the eroded areas to encourage resumption of normal tissue growth.

Another follow-up ill of paraplegia is drop foot caused when the unused limbs relax too long, Dr. Morrison said. Many such cases require bone surgery, and braces to keep the feet level for getting about on crutches, he explained.

As to bladder- and bowel-control therapy, the paraplegics are given some medical and mechanical helps. Bladder and kidney stones, which form more readily in the bedridden, are surgically removed. In many cases, the patient's bladder must be treated to return it to normal capacity. Then soft-pressure clamps enable the men to control urination, while hand pressure over the bladder helps empty it at regulated intervals.

Bowel control, Dr. Morrison said, is largely regulated among the patients by special diets, and the use of enemas for elimination.

DOCTOR DIDN'T HELP

Among Tuesday's entrainees was one man who offered proof that even the best of family care does not prevent bedsores. He is James Lee, 23, another paralyzed miner of Edwight.

Son of a coal-mining physician, Lee spurned a medical career to go into the pits 2½ years ago. Last June 19, he became one of the year's 65,000 mining casualties. A slate fall caught him as he was loading underground cars in a mine near his home.

Lee told reporters he has two deep bedsores that must be patched up. They developed, he said, despite the constant attention of his wife and his doctor father. Like the others who complained of varying pains in affected limbs, Lee said his hurts seem "like a steady burn in my legs."

Across the pullman aisle from Lee was Hobart Dalton, 29, of Warfield, Ky., who suffered a fractured spine 3 months ago. He said he was unconscious for 6 days after an overhead slab of rock crushed down on him, jackknifing him by grinding his head between his outthrust legs. Married and the father of a 2-year-old girl, he wants to come back as a watch mechanic.

The West Virginia and Kentucky victims are tragedies of past years. With the 7 who later entrained for Washington, they brought to more than 200 the number of miner paraplegics now treated or under treatment by the $100,000,000 welfare fund. About 200 others, presumed in better general condition, are getting compensation and care in their own communities until they can be accommodated in the special treatment centers in California, New York, New Jersey, and now Washington, fund officials said.

PENSIONS FOR THE OLD

But medical care and rehabilitation is just one phase of the vast program financed by 20 cents a ton royalties paid by the coal operators, the official said.

The fund also provides $100 monthly pensions to aged miners, death benefits of $1,000, financial aid to miners' widows, children, and other dependents, and health and medical care to the men and their families.

The program for the paraplegics is just the most dramatic of over-all operations of the independently administered fund, officials said. But it does cover a field that only since the close of the past war has received much specialized attention.

Paraplegia is not confined to mining accidents, though a yearly average of 30 miners is afflicted. War casualties added to the ranks of paraplegics, and civilian accidents, such as the policeman's shot that cut the spinal cord of Washington's Dorothy Kilmer, must be considered.

The welfare fund was authorized, at a starting royalty rate of 5 cents a ton, by the famous Krug-Lewis agreement of May 29, 1946. The rate was doubled twice in succeeding agreements with the coal operators.

In January trustees of the fund reported that $68,000,000 had been paid out in various benefits to more than 260,000 beneficiaries in the 20-month period of its actual operation.

Public Library Service Demonstration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement containing an analysis of the public library service demonstration bill; also questions and answers concerning this bill.

They are as follows:

ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE DEMONSTRATION BILL

PURPOSE

1. To provide demonstrations of adequate public library service to people now without it or inadequately served.

2. To provide means for studying various methods of providing public library service primarily in rural areas, and for studying the effect of planning on an area basis upon the development of library service.

PROVISIONS

1. State library agencies may submit plans for use of Federal funds in demonstrating public library service primarily in rural areas. These plans shall be drawn entirely by the State agencies and need not be uniform throughout the country.

2. Two types of plans may be submitted: one calling for a basic demonstration using $40,000 per year for 5 years in each State, financed entirely by Federal funds; or an expanded plan may be added to this which would allow States to match an additional $40,000 to $100,000 of Federal funds annually for 5 years.

3. The Commissioner of Education would be required to make annual reports to Congress on the operation of the demonstrations and would be required to make a final public report evaluating the demonstrations.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE DEMONSTRATION BILL

1. What is the public library service demonstration bill?

The library demonstration bill is a measure designed to stimulate State and local interest in improving library service. It is an effort on the part of the Federal Government and the States to show how State-wide library service can be established.

2. Who is sponsoring the library demonstration bill?

The bill is sponsored in the Senate by Senators LISTER HILL, of Alabama; GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont; and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The Senate number is S. 130.

Two identical bills have been introduced into the House. One, H. R. 874, is sponsored by Representative RAY MADDEN, of Indiana; the other, H. R. 1411, was introduced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

The library demonstration bill was developed in cooperation with the American Library Association, which sponsors it. The ALA is the national, nonprofit, professional association of libraries and librarians which for the past 70 years has stood for progressive library service. For the past 20 years the organization has administered funds for the extension of libraries to areas without them.

The library demonstration bill is also supported by the National Farm Bureau, the Farmers' Union, the National Grange, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Council of Women, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and many State and local organizations.

3. What is the main objective of the bill?

The main objective is to stimulate interest in State-wide library service and to encourage State and local interest in libraries. The bill will give librarians an opportunity to study the most effective means of providing library service to rural areas. The communities where demonstrations are set up will be expected to continue library service after the test period is over, thereby stimulating their neighbors who have no libraries to establish them. People do not miss things they have never known. After the community has had library service available through a demonstration, the citizens will vote to keep the service.

It is not the purpose of the library demonstration bill to provide universal library service, but merely to demonstrate what can be done.

4. Who will administer the bill?

The bill clearly provides for State supervision. The administration at the State level is in the hands of the State library agency. The Federal Government makes grants to assist the States in carrying out demonstrations, but there is no interference with State and local initiative and responsibility in conducting the demonstrations.

5. What is a library service demonstration?

A demonstration is a sample of good library service. It is provided a community for a period of time sufficient to show the citizens: (1) How books, magazines, films, and other library materials can be made available to the entire community at low cost; (2) why trained librarians are essential to good library service just as trained teachers are essential to good schools; (3) how public libraries are controlled by the citizens themselves through boards of trustees; (4) how public library service can be permanently theirs through tax support, spread over a large enough area to keep the cost reasonably low; and (5) to show taxpayers just what the cost of library service to the community will be.

6. How are demonstrations carried on?

Demonstrations are carried on in various ways, the most common being through the use of bookmobiles. A bookmobile is a library on wheels. The bookmobile makes regular trips to outlying districts, carrying books from a central library. Another type of demonstration is a model library set up in a certain region, usually for a year or more, to demonstrate to the people within that area the value of good public library service.

7. What is meant by good public library service?

A public library is a collection of books and other printed materials organized so that the user can find what he wants. Public library service is the work that goes into making the library useful to its public. Good public library service anticipates the demand of the users, selects materials that will best fill the demand, and encourages and develops reading interests in the community. Good public library service also provides individual consultation and guidance in special reading interests for those members of the community who desire it, and it devotes special attention to developing the inquiring minds of children through books.

8. Specifically how will the plan operate?

State library agencies—the supervising agents—will submit plans for the use of Federal funds in demonstrating library service, primarily in rural areas. These plans would be formulated entirely by the State agencies, so would not be uniform throughout the country, but would vary as State needs vary.

9. What must the States do to be eligible for the funds?

There are five general conditions which the States must meet to qualify for Federal grants for the library demonstrations. These conditions are:

(1) The States must submit for the approval of the United States Commissioner of Education a plan for use of such funds as they are available.

(2) The States must report to the Commissioner on the operation of the demonstrations.

(3) Library services made available under this act shall be free.

(4) No money provided under the act shall be used for purchase or erection of buildings or for purchase of land.

(5) A State may not use funds provided under the act for the purpose of reducing State appropriations to the State library agency.

States may submit either of two types of plans. One plan would call for a basic demonstration, using $40,000 a year for 5 years in each State, financed entirely by Federal funds; the other is an expanded plan under which the States would match an additional $40,000 to $100,000 of funds annually.

10. What happens after the act expires and the demonstrations are completed?

It is then up to the local people to see that the service is continued, preferably on a regional cooperative basis, supported by local taxation and State aid. The test areas will have served to point out to State legislators what can be done, with comparatively modest expenditures, to raise the State level of culture and education. Citizen groups, State library associations, and State library extension agencies will cooperate in planning the most effective means of continuing library service.

11. How will the general public know of the results of the demonstrations?

The United States Commissioner of Education is required under the bill to make annual reports to Congress on the administration of the demonstration program. A final report, outlining the results, will be prepared for public distribution.

12. Have library demonstrations been successful in the past?

Yes; when well organized and when staffed by efficient personnel, the value to the community has been so obvious that permanent tax support has been voted. The WPA carried on demonstrations. Many of them resulted in permanent library service in the areas where they operated.

Louisiana has carried on demonstrations with foundation and State funds for 20 years. Out of 24 demonstrations, 21 districts voted to pay taxes and keep the service. Illinois, Missouri, Tennessee, and Minnesota are among other States which have had successful demonstration programs.

13. Will the demonstrations be staffed by trained personnel?

Yes; the bill authorizes the Commissioner of Education to establish, in cooperation with State library administrative agencies, institutes, or short courses for training personnel for public library service demonstrations. This would insure effective direction of the demonstration programs.

14. Will my State, which has particular library needs, have to follow a national demonstration program?

No; there is no uniform plan for demonstrations. Each State agency will formulate a plan based on the library needs of that State. The plans are submitted to the United States Commissioner of Education for approval.

15. What part will local communities play in the demonstration program?

The State library agency will work with local authorities in setting up the demonstration program. The library demonstration bill will stimulate local initiative in establishing permanent libraries.

16. Some counties already have libraries. Will they benefit in any way?

Yes; they will. Counties which already have library service will benefit in the following ways:

(1) Local efficiency and service resulting from a national study of library methods will be improved.

(2) Functional illiteracy, uninformed mass voting, and factional misunderstanding will be decreased by expanded educational facilities.

(3) Democratic principle of equal opportunity for all will be supported.

(4) Counties which have inadequate library service can participate in the demonstration program.

17. Citizens of the United States have more and better cultural and educational facilities now than the people of any other countries in the world. Why should we worry about public libraries when we have so many other pressing problems?

In spite of our cultural facilities, 42 percent of our citizens over 20 years of age have not gone beyond the eighth grade in school. Huge areas of our country are without even passable educational facilities. Thirty-five million Americans living in rural areas have no form of library service, and another 35,000,000 have library service which is inadequate. Every problem we face must be faced and solved by all citizens together, including the near-illiterates, the uninformed, and the malcontents. During the war, the Army had to educate men before they were acceptable as soldiers. The Government had to train millions of war workers in vocational schools. It would have been absurd for them to say "we have to win the war before we bother with education and training," because without education and training they couldn't have won the war. We feel that without the extension of adult educational facilities now, we can't tackle the problems of peace efficiently.

18. One of the purposes of the bill is to develop means of providing library service to rural areas. Don't radios, newspapers, Grange forums, and the like take the place of libraries for rural people?

Studies have shown that where libraries are poor, other facilities are also lacking. In any case, these advantages only create new needs for libraries among rural people. They have opened many new avenues of thought, put rural dwellers in touch with the rest of the world. But they don't keep pace with the interests they arouse, because the intelligent person very often feels the need for more information than he gets in the brief treatment of a subject possible in a magazine or radio program or newspaper article. The better the article or program, the more likely it is that the desire for additional information on the subject will be stimulated. The greatest contribution of the newspaper, the radio, the discussion is the development of intelligent interest. Libraries can satisfy this interest.

19. If rural people need and want library service, why haven't they done something about it?

Rural people have done something about it. Within the last 20 years, 500 county and regional libraries have been established. Of the remaining counties in the United States, hundreds are actually too poor by themselves to support libraries, although they could contribute to a regional service if they were shown how it would work. Others lack socially minded officials, strong, organized citizens' movements without which good public services are not initiated, even in large cities.

20. Why cannot present State aid for libraries suffice?

Only 23 States have State aid for libraries, and that provided is not always sufficient to make good library service available to all of the citizens. Many of the State laws do not provide adequate aid, and the library demonstration bill will point up the weaknesses and the need for revision in the present State laws.

21. Doesn't this bill advocate Federal control of an activity that should be the sole responsibility of the States?

No, indeed. The library demonstration bill is different from straight Federal aid. Rather than giving control to the Federal Government, one of the principal objectives of the bill is to encourage State and local support and interest in libraries. The library demonstrations will be controlled by State agencies working with local authorities, thereby eliminating any possibility of Federal control.

22. Won't the Federal Government have control over the selection of State personnel?

No; it will not. No Federal agency has authority over selection, term of office, or salary of any individual employed in connection with the State operation of the demonstration programs. The State administering agency will outline personnel qualifications, and selection will be by the State agency or local library board.

23. Won't Federal funds for library demonstrations discourage permanent State aid?

On the contrary, it would act as an incentive to State aid. To receive the Federal grant the governor of the State must certify that the State will not reduce its own library support. It is expected that many States which do not now vote money for the extension of library service will do so as a result of the demonstrations.

24. Doesn't the bill propose a new type of Federal-State relationship?

No; it is comparable to the provisions for the Department of Agriculture and Bureau of Mines experiment stations, the chief difference being that in the public library service demonstration bill policies and administration are controlled locally, and there is a time limit on the extent of the library demonstrations.

25. You can't have Federal aid without violation of States' rights and without Federal control. We don't want that.

State agricultural and mechanical colleges have been receiving Federal aid for years in the form of annual grants of money. All colleges and educational institutions receive Federal aid in the form of tax exemption. The Smith-Hughes Act provided Federal aid for vocational and home-economics training. For many years, the blind have had books in

Braille and talking books paid for and distributed with Federal funds. This has not impinged upon their control by State and local governments. The library demonstration bill specifically prohibits Federal control. Responsibility for selection of books and personnel, for the nature of services to be rendered, and for all actual operations of the library are specifically reserved to State and local authorities.

TEXAS EDITORIAL

The following editorial appeared in the San Antonio Express, February 11, 1949, favorable to the pending bills:

HENSHAW'S APPEAL FOR TEXAS STATE LIBRARY EXTENSION

Though Texans like to brag about their State's bigness, supposed self-sufficiency, wealth of oil and cattle, growing industries and progress generally, they are silent concerning its public libraries.

Texas has nothing to boast of there. In his plea to the legislature, Francis H. Henshaw, State librarian, has shown how Texas stood thirty-sixth among the States in per capita expenditure on library service. What is worse, Texas is the first State in number of citizens who lack book-borrowing privileges. Some three and one-half millions, or half the State's population, are so situated.

Who will deny that a State which spends multiplied millions on its roads and other millions on its school can do better by its libraries—"the poor man's university"?

Mr. Henshaw has given that challenge to the lawmakers at Austin. He is seeking $200,000 to establish five regional libraries where the need is greatest during the fiscal year beginning September 1 next. Each unit would comprise 10 or 15 counties. The State would provide a bookmobile, well stocked; a librarian and a driver, and would split operating costs with the counties. That has proved the most economical means of taking books to the people.

Once the people get a taste of good books, Mr. Henshaw considers—and Texas' own experience with the pioneer county libraries bears him out—they would not let the service drop. Accordingly, after 1 year's operation he would turn the first five regional libraries over to the participating counties and establish five more in new bookless, or relatively bookless, territory. Thereby Mr. Henshaw hopes ultimately to extend library service to even the most isolated Texas communities.

Should Congress meanwhile pass the library demonstration bill—as appears likely at this writing—the Texas plan, if effectuated, would allow this State maximum Federal aid for library extension. Texas then would get an outright grant of $40,000 a year, plus $100,000 matched by State money.

Thus reinforced, Texas could establish 10 regional libraries at a time and cut in half the years required to provide all Texans with free library service. All over the State, friends to libraries have been urging the Texas Legislature to put in a word for the related bill before Congress. The lawmakers could do that most convincingly by approving the plan presented by the State librarian.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. MARY T. NORTON, of New Jersey, made on February 5, 1949, over the American Broadcasting Co.:

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to speak to the people of America about labor legislation now pending before the Congress. This legislation is of the utmost importance to the working men and women of the United States.

I am especially grateful for the opportunity, because for 22 years I was a member of the Committee on Labor in the House of Representatives. For 10 of those years I served as chairman of the committee.

It is a matter of record that I resigned in 1947 because it was apparent to me at that time that the Republicans did not intend and were incapable of legislating in the interest of the working people of America. I realized that I could do nothing to prevent the obvious determination of the Republicans to set aside those measures enacted by the Democrats to promote the welfare of all the people. My time would have been wasted.

What I feared and anticipated came to pass when the Republican Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act and then overrode President Truman's wise and courageous veto of that repressive legislation.

During the debate on the Taft-Hartley Act I predicted that it would be repudiated by the people of America.

On November 2 the voters of the United States affirmed my prediction and rendered a mandate for the repeal of that antilabor act.

Now the Congress is engaged in writing and discussing new labor legislation that will restore the historic American concept of collective bargaining as the cornerstone of our free-enterprise system.

I did not like the Taft-Hartley Act. I saw it in its formative period and I know that it was born out of a desire for repression. It was a retreat—not just a step backward—but a wholesale retreat to the days when labor had no rights.

Even Senator TAFT himself has denied the act that bears his name when he stated on the floor of the Senate, "I wrote no part of the law—there is no particular part of the law that is my own creation."

I must point out, however, that Senator TAFT was not apologizing for the law. He was merely trying to explain how it was that he and then Congressman Hartley, his coauthor, had come to disagree. The disagreement was over an interpretation of the law as to whether the United Mine Workers' contract was collusion with the coal mine operators to violate the law. Hartley had said it was. TAFT disagreed.

I only mention this as an example of the confusion which the Taft-Hartley Act created. If its authors were incapable of agreement as to its meaning, it is little wonder that labor and industry could not bargain under its provisions.

Tremendous influences were brought to bear to insure passage of this law. For instance, the Committee for Constitutional Government, a notorious Tory lobby, reported officially that it had spent $460,000 for lobby activities, principally in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act, in 1947. This was the single largest official lobby expenditure reported to the Congress.

It has been freely stated that the National Association of Manufacturers, whose attorneys were busy helping write the law, raised the sum of $3,000,000 to propagandize in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act. You will remember the flood of full-page advertisements which the NAM used in newspapers around the country in support of the law their representatives were advocating.

Now the same forces are spending money and buying advertisements to retain that law in the face of the expressed desire of the Nation for a return to an enlightened and progressive labor policy.

Both Senator TAFT and Congressman Hartley recognized that the law which bears their name was a prime issue in the campaign. On November 1, the day before the election, then Congressman Hartley said "workers are just wasting their money if they think they can repeal it." He expressed confidence that the Republicans would win and said there would be sufficient Republicans reelected to preserve the integrity of the law for years to come.

Twenty-four hours later he knew better.

Senator TAFT said that labor leaders who opposed his law were idiotic. He also said that the law was a boon to labor and safeguarded the rights of union members. He too recognized the law as a prime issue in the election.

Other Republican leaders went up and down the land pleading with labor to accept the law as in their own interest.

The response from labor is a matter of record.

But now Senator TAFT and others would have us forget that record.

The Democratic Party, under the leadership of President Harry S. Truman, solidly opposed the Taft-Hartley Act. In the Democratic Party platform, adopted at the National Convention at Philadelphia, they pledged themselves to its repeal and to the passage of substitute legislation which would make both labor and management equal before the law, to build a lasting industrial peace.

The Nation voted for that platform and the pledges of the Democratic Party.

Now the Democratic Congress is moving to carry out these pledges with the active cooperation of the Democratic administration.

The Congress is now engaged in writing and discussing new labor legislation that will restore the traditional American concept of free collective bargaining.

We plan to lift the restrictive measures of the Taft-Hartley Act so as to carry out the pledges of the platform. Specifically the bill now being considered in the Congress would—

(1) repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947;

(2) reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935;

(3) amend that act to retain the present Board membership and structure;

(4) enable the National Labor Relations Board to deal with jurisdictional disputes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts;

(5) reestablish the Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor;

(6) provide means for the settlement of disputes arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts; and

(7) provide means for meeting national emergencies in vital industries which affect the public interest.

Thus the administration's labor bill calls for a return to the national policies first enunciated in the Wagner Act. It reverses the policy of governmental interference; it places reliance on processes of collective bargaining for the settlement of differences. The bill regulates collective bargaining only where restraints are needed and practicable. It seeks to develop a system of labor-management relations under which both labor and management, with the friendly assistance of Government, can live together and solve their own problems.

This is the democratic way of doing the job of achieving industrial peace.

It is the way which will bring the most benefit to the Nation as a whole.

For it will free the Government of the impediment of hundreds of cases in the Federal courts, which serve no purpose except to delay the settlement of disputes and overload the already crowded court calendar. It frees the Labor Department and the National Labor Relations Board of the stifling red tape brought about by complicated and unnecessary procedures.

The administration bill makes certain types of activities unfair labor practices if

engaged in by a labor organization. Conforming to the President's recommendation, these are limited to certain types of unjust secondary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes and failure to file 30 days' notice of proposed contract modification or termination. The latter is also made an unfair labor practice if engaged in by an employer.

The proposed act provides necessary limitations on jurisdictional disputes.

It would return to the Department of Labor, where it belongs, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. And this, in addition to other proposals which time does not permit me to discuss, will restore the Labor Department to the importance it should enjoy.

The bill now being considered would end the regulation of labor unions by injunction.

I have never approved the role of the courts in this regard. I feel that it is an unsafe encroachment by the courts on the rights of labor to give them power to issue injunctions against unions, without hearing.

The proposed bill carefully avoids the twin evils of compulsory arbitration and rigidity of procedure. Its provisions are clear and simple.

It will cut down governmental interference.

It will foster free collective bargaining.

It will end the abuses of the Taft-Hartley Act.

It will substitute for a law drawn for the many by the few a statute that has as its concept the protection of the rights of all.

Above all I like the manner in which the Congress is going about the business of correcting these Taft-Hartley abuses, with hearings, open and above board. Witnesses, whether pro or con, are allowed to have their say.

A free democratic process.

A far cry from the conditions which caused my resignation from the House Labor Committee in 1947.

I am for the bill.

Labor is for it.

The people of the United States are for it and have said so where it counts—the polls.

For that reason I am calling upon the people to express themselves and not be misled by the campaign of confusion and double talk now being carried on by the last-ditch defenders of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Lincoln Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein an address delivered by the Honorable JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, at a recent banquet of the Oakland County Lincoln Republican Club held at Pontiac, Mich.

Our colleague from Pennsylvania is one of the great patriots of this country, an outstanding American, who has never hesitated to offer his all in defense of his country. His views are worth the consideration of all who have the best interest of our country at heart.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, fellow Republicans, ladies and gentlemen, it is a distinct honor for a Pennsylvanian to be invited to come to the great State of Michigan and join such a representative group of Americans in honoring the memory of the immortal Lincoln.

It is also a pleasure to visit with the constituents of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable GEORGE A. DONDERO, who so ably represents this district in the Congress of the United States. You are to be complimented in sending such a high-type Representative to Washington. His warm personality, his integrity, his ability, and sincerity of effort establish him as not only an outstanding legislator but as one of the most likable and highly respected Members of the House of Representatives.

George, as you know him and we know him, was elected to the Seventy-third Congress and is serving his ninth consecutive term. During his congressional career, in addition to his ability as a legislator, he has found time to lecture the House of Representatives annually as to the code of ethics a Member must observe. He impresses upon each Member the great responsibility that rests upon his shoulders as a Member of Congress, and warns them that their conduct must be beyond reproach if Congress is to retain the respect of the American people.

Congressman DONDERO has a great love for history and has spent many hours in studying the stirring episodes in the development of this great Nation. This thirst for historical knowledge gave Congressman DONDERO a greater insight into the life of the Great Emancipator with the result that today George is recognized as a profound student of Lincoln.

I received my first impression in 1939 of your Congressman's knowledge of Lincoln. One morning in Washington, George called me on the telephone and invited me to accompany a group of historians on a tour of the Gettysburg battlefield. He pointed out that the delegation headed by him would have maps of the battlefield and that one spot to be visited would be the scene of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. While it was impossible for me to accept the invitation I was favorably impressed with his enthusiasm for these periodic tours, and the manner in which he spoke of Abraham Lincoln.

When Congressman DONDERO returned from his tour, he told me of the great feeling he had, as he stood near the spot where Lincoln delivered his famous Gettysburg Address. The atmosphere gripped him, as his mind recalled the troubled conditions of the Nation when Lincoln uttered his immortal words.

When I accepted your kind invitation I immediately recognized that here was an opportunity to not only pay tribute to Lincoln but to remind all of you that the conditions prevailing when Lincoln delivered his Gettsyburg Address are somewhat comparable to the conditions we are faced with today.

For a moment let us refresh our memories on Abraham Lincoln. Born in the most humble walks of life, in the days when hardship was a common possession, Abraham Lincoln had the stamina and courage necessary in overcoming many obstacles.

An analysis of Lincoln's life reveals that his accomplishments became a reality only after a series of personal disappointments and political defeats. It was through these disappointments and defeats that Abraham Lincoln added to his mental stature, broadened his experiences and established a reputation for honesty and integrity that has become a symbol of mankind.

When I read of Lincoln's life I am reminded of his statement in speaking of his lack of formal education—when he said, "I didn't know much—my schooling was limited to readin', writin', and cipherin' to the rule of three." This statement reveals the humility and sincerity of Lincoln who was not ashamed of his early life and his humble surroundings.

This humility of Abraham Lincoln was reflected in his first campaign for a political office when he was a candidate for the State legislature in Illinois in 1832. At that time Lincoln said, "I presume you all know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a national bank. I am in favor of the internal-improvement system, and a high protective tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles."

Yes. On clearly defined political principles, Abraham Lincoln was content to place his future in the hands of the American people. Yes. It took courage on his part to stand on his principles and to by-pass the political magic of promising everybody everything in the hope of garnering a vote. Certainly Lincoln went down to defeat in 1832 as a candidate for the legislature.

He was defeated again in business in 1833 and lost everything of a material value. In 1838 as candidate for speaker he was again defeated.

In 1840 he lost as a candidate for elector. In 1843 he was defeated as a candidate for commissioner of the general land office, and also as a candidate for nomination to Congress.

In 1848 he lost in his campaign for reelection to Congress.

In 1855 he was the losing candidate for United States Senator.

In 1856 he was defeated as candidate for Vice President.

In 1858 he was defeated as candidate for United States Senator.

But—in 1860—he was elected as the sixteenth President of the United States. What a glowing tribute to Lincoln's perseverance and evidence of the truth of the old saying—"You can't defeat a man who will not quit."

When Abraham Lincoln assumed the Presidency of the United States he became the first Republican ever to hold that high office. He became the leader of a new political party born in 1856 in the midst of the turmoil and terrible disagreements which preceded the Civil War.

While Lincoln was President he gave to the American people a type of leadership that preserved the Union, and its cherished ideals handed to us by the founders of this great Republic. Last but not least, he gave all of us a symbol of hope by the manner in which he met challenges to American unity and emerged victorious under most trying conditions.

It was 140 years ago today that Abraham Lincoln was born, and each year we hear over and over again these words—"God grant that we had another Lincoln to lead us out of the present day wilderness of despair."

As I said a moment ago, Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican President of the United States and the standard bearer for the new political philosophy as exemplified by the Republican Party which came into being in 1856.

For nearly a century we Republicans have functioned as one of the several political parties. As you look back over the accomplishments of the Republican Party, our chests are swelled with pride, when we recall the part we played in the development of this great Nation.

Like Lincoln, as a party we have had our defeats but we have never lost the courage of our convictions. It is true that the party has made mistakes, and some members of our party at times have wavered in their support, but no one will deny that the indomitable spirit of Abraham Lincoln still leads the party as it strives to restore to America a sane, sensible, and sound form of government.

The mission of your party and my party is one that cannot be accomplished unless we stand united, meet the challenge of the opposition, and carry our case to the great masses of the American people. For 16 years our party has been in political obscurity, because the American people have been sold on a political philosophy that is gradually

centralizing Government in Washington, destroying States' rights, and leading us down the road to national socialism. We have had the New Deal and its offspring the raw deal, and now we have been introduced to the so-called fair deal.

During the period of these deals the American way of life has been tampered with to the extent that the founding fathers of our Nation have no doubt turned many somersaults in their graves. If Abraham Lincoln walked this earth today he would no doubt tell you that the Republican Party must be a militant and determined party in its mission to rescue the Nation from its present-day plight.

During the past 16 years in the Republican crusade for good government, we have taken five consecutive defeats in our campaigns to elect a Republican President. At times during these five presidential campaigns the enthusiasm of our party was at its lowest ebb. We heard the statement that the Republican Party was finished, and should give way to a new political party with an entirely different label. Such a defeatist attitude is an insult to the memory of Abraham Lincoln, our first Republican President.

During the 16-year reign of the Democratic Presidents, we as Republicans worked hard. We started from scratch in 1932 and it was not until the elections of 1946 that we were able to gain control of both Houses for the Eightieth Congress.

When the Republican-controlled Congress convened in January 1947 it inherited the colossal mess resulting from 14 years of New Deal blundering, boondoggling, and inefficiency in Government reflected in countless bureaus, and commissions whose overlapping functions and duplication of efforts saddled the American people with high taxes and 76,000 useless Government directives that controlled their daily lives.

The Eightieth Congress also found that Communists, fellow-travelers and parlor pinks were occupying high positions of Government and had a firm foot-hold in the State Department. This radical-minded mob on the Federal pay roll were writing directives designed to regiment the American people and destroy our form of government.

The Eightieth Congress with courage and foresight accepted the challenge to the American way of life and charted a course of action designed to correct the evils that 14 years of Democratic misrule had foisted upon us.

Immediately investigations began to give us the information necessary to restore government to a sound economic basis. But what happened? The Democratic administration threw an iron curtain around the affairs of the various departments of the Government, even going so far as to invoke the aid of the President of the United States in refusing requests for information on their activities. Congress was then faced with the necessity of hiring investigators at the expense of the taxpayers of the country and, arming them with congressional authority, sought to obtain information for various congressional committees as to how hard-earned tax money was being spent. In some cases, congressional authority was scoffed at, even by the President himself, who chafing under the knowledge that Reds were being ferreted out of the Government, made the sheepish remark that certain investigations were only a red herring. As a result of this remark, and of congressional investigations, the President has had to eat crow on several occasions.

While the Eightieth Congress was faced with opposition from the President and heads of governmental departments, it made headway, to such an extent, that when the American people fully realize its accomplishments it will be recognized as one of the outstanding Congresses in the history of our country.

Anyone who takes the time to carefully scrutinize the record of the Eightieth Congress, will find that the American people were freed from some 76,000 government rules, regulations, directives, and orders. The budget was balanced by the Eightieth Congress for the first time in 16 years. The fiscal year 1948 ended with a surplus of $8,500,000,000 which is the biggest Treasury surplus in the history of the Nation.

The Eightieth Congress reduced the public debt by $7,000,000,000, and then cut income taxes over several vetoes of the President. The farmers of the Nation were aided by the Eightieth Congress and increased benefits for the aged under social security were provided, despite a Presidential veto.

Cost-of-living increases were granted to postal and Federal employees and national heart and cancer institutes were established.

Small business was aided by the Eightieth Congress and export controls were extended. Government expenditures were reduced and appropriate funds provided for revitalizing our national defense.

The Eightieth Congress followed a bipartisan policy on foreign affairs and did its level best to provide an equitable labor-management relations program through passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. Not forgetting our debt to our veteran population, the Eightieth Congress approved 188 separate bills liberalizing existing and providing new benefits. These bills were passed after the President stated, "Except for minor adjustments I believe our program of benefits for the veterans is now complete."

These accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress may be an old story to many of you but I feel they are of such importance that they should be emphasized, in order that you may realize that their enactment was possible as the result of a coalition of the Republican and Democratic votes in the Senate and House. In other words, under Republican leadership the Eightieth Congress became a nonpartisan Congress.

While the Eightieth Congress was at work trying to get the ship of state on an even keel, the President of the United States who locked the files of the Government departments against Congress traveled from coast to coast telling the American people the Eightieth Congress was the second worst Congress in American history. He also ridiculed the Republican Party by calling it a refuge for the rich and accused it of turning a deaf ear to the needs of the great middle class.

While the President was chanting such a theme song many Republicans took it as a lullaby and fell into a deep sleep. Those who refused to listen or be lulled to sleep—went fishing.

When we awoke on the third day of November I was surprised, you were surprised, the Democrats were surprised—and so was Harry Truman.

For days after the election the question heard everywhere was, How did it happen?

My answer is that we Republicans went asleep at the switch. We kidded ourselves into believing the election was in the bag. We forgot that in the last 16 years, millions of new voters were created who were 5 and 6 years old in 1932, and were now exercising their right to vote. These new voters knew nothing of any other President but Roosevelt and Truman. They needed political education and we failed to provide it.

While we slept or fished the Democrats rang doorbells and promised the abundant life in exchange for votes.

Let us right now accept the blame for the farce we made of the November election. We are responsible and no one else. We failed to sell the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress to the American people. While we talked of unity, home, and mother, Harry Truman and his cohorts talked of the price of pork chops, socialized medicine, Federal aid to education, and a bottle of milk on every doorstep in the world with Uncle Sam paying the milkman.

On January 20 Harry S. Truman entered upon a full 4-year term as President of the United States. As expected, he asked the Congress of the United States to approve a legislative program that has been termed by many as a step toward socializing America.

The President's budget, the largest peacetime budget in the history of the country, represents $42,000,000,000. Yet this huge sum of money is for operating the Government at the present and does not include $1 of the expense to be incurred in carrying out his recommendations in his state of the Union message. Nor does it contain $1 for his global program of aiding foreign nations which he proposes to add to the aid now being furnished through the European recovery program. If the President's entire program is enacted instead of a budget of forty-two billion it will probably be well in excess of $60,000,000,000 according to well-informed economists.

A moment ago I said the President's program was a step in the direction of national socialism. What is socialism? Webster defines it as "a political and economic theory of social reorganization, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities to the end that competition shall give way to cooperation and the opportunities of life and the rewards of labor shall be equitably apportioned."

This is an excellent definition so let us compare it with the President's proposal when he asked Congress to grant him the power to set up its own steel mills if conditions in the steel industry continue to be unsatisfactory to him.

This is outright socialism. Even the President's warmest supporters agree, that if Uncle Sam goes directly into the steel business, private business is done, because no industry can compete with the Government of the United States who has back of it billions of tax monies and is always in a position to undersell its competitors and absorb its losses. In a few words, President Truman's proposal in point 8 of his program, is pure, unadulterated socialism and a shortcut to nationalizing basic industries in the United States.

There are other portions of the President's program equally as socialistic in character as point 8. On the other hand there are some good points, some of them advocated by the Republican Party and which we should support setting aside any prejudice we may have regarding pride of authorship.

I hope by this time that every one of you understands the problem the country is faced with and the direction in which we are going. We find ourselves in the same position as Lincoln did when after a series of disappointments and defeats he had the courage to carry on his relentless fight in defense of his principles until he finally triumphed over all obstacles.

In my opinion the time has arrived for all Republicans to stand up and be counted. Recently, at Omaha, Nebr., after what newspapers termed a "dog fight," a national party chairman was elected. I am not criticizing our national chairman who is a fellow Pennsylvanian, a colleague in Congress, and a good friend of mine. Instead I offer him my sympathy in the gigantic task he has in satisfying the various factions within our party.

Frankly, in my opinion, too many men high in the councils of the Republican Party appear to be blind to the real significance of the November election results and the recent upheavals of the party itself.

Too many view the party as a vehicle for personal political ambitions. They have forgotten the urgent need these days of an American political program, powerful, appealing, and individualistic.

They have permitted the Democrats to set the pace. They have drafted platform after platform that appears to many voters as an anemic New Deal program, lacking new and constructive thought.

Frankly, too many Republicans have become confused in their thinking and have attempted to keep pace with the liberalism that is nothing more than a carbon copy of the Democratic New Deal.

The National Republican Committee meeting I referred to at Omaha, Nebr., typified this futile thinking. There the battle was not over party principles but over control of the party. Our party leaders have failed to see that the big battle is over the two-party system. They have failed also to perceive their responsibility to maintain a party that is individualistic in nature, American in principle, and independent and courageous in its presentation of the tried, tested, and successful republic form of government.

What I have said in a few words is simply this, that we Republicans must bury our selfish desires, and instead of battling for control of the party let us conserve our strength and use it in making certain that we will have a party.

As I said, the time has arrived to stand up and be counted. We must erase from our minds any defeatist attitude and recall how Abraham Lincoln after suffering 10 crushing defeats from 1832 to 1858 finally emerged triumphant in 1860 by being elected the sixteenth President of the United States.

Let us at this time rededicate ourselves to the principles of Abraham Lincoln and to the Republican Party. In so doing you are simply rededicating yourself to the principles of Americanism as embodied in the republic form of government.

The American way of life is at stake and facing such a challenge, let us as Republicans leave this banquet room tonight with one determination and that is to remember the truth of the old saying about Abraham Lincoln, "You can't defeat a man who will not quit." To these words let us add, we Republicans have just begun to fight.

Congratulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the House of Representatives of the Rhode Island General Assembly publicly recognized the great feat accomplished last fall by President Truman.

It passed the following resolution, which, under leave already granted me, I include as a part of my remarks. The resolution reads:

Resolution extending congratulations and all good wishes to Hon. Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, and to the United States Senator from Rhode Island, Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee

Whereas the intensified campaign for reelection conducted last fall by President Truman against apparently insurmountable obstacles and apathy has aroused the American voters to a realization that this Nation is a land of opportunity in which man as an individual may win to victory in the good fight; and

Whereas the vigor and forthrightness with which the President reported from coast to coast his stewardship in the highest office in the Federal Government, presented his future program, and pronounced his credo had a rocklike tenacity which fired even the most indifferent; and

Whereas the United States Senator from Rhode Island, Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in his quiet and controlled method of solidifying an organization, helped to turn the wheels of party machinery to produce an unprecedented triumph for the Democratic Party at the November 1948 polls: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now express their admiration to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America, for victory glorious in the annals of this country, wishing him every success in the fulfillment of pledges and program that the strength of the Nation shall continue to be used in the interest of all our people to maintain the peace of the world and to keep this Republic soundly prosperous and its people contented and happy; and be it further

Resolved, That this legislature, proud indeed that one of Rhode Island's native sons, United States Senator Hon. J. HOWARD MCGRATH, in the demanding office of chairman of the Democratic National Committee, has undertaken so important a task in the welding of component factors which inevitably has led to that amazing and historic November 1948 goal, now felicitates Senator MCGRATH, acknowledging the forcefulness of his campaign planning, his political astuteness, and skilled strategy; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the President of the United States of America, Hon. Harry S. Truman, and to United States Senator J. HOWARD MCGRATH duly certified copies of this resolution.

Cardinal Mindszenty—Martyr for Freedom

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Communist terror is revealed in all its cynical brutality by the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

Others have suffered his fate before, and others will still be tortured until the aroused conscience of mankind rises up to ostracize from the concourse of civilized nations and civilized people all those who follow the dictates of Red fascism.

Only then will there be a chance for peace and freedom in this world.

Already there are signs that communism has overreached itself.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not only a member of the Sacred College of Cardinals of the Roman Catholic Church whose faithful communicants are numbered in the hundreds of millions. He is a symbol of all religions, of all justice and decency, now under undisguised attack by the cruel forces of materialism.

The mask is off.

The world knows what it is up against. No longer confused by the contradictions, the brash lies of communism, and the middle-of-the-road neutrality of well-meaning liberals who have been misled by devious Communist techniques, it sees evil in action, stripped of its false face.

The storm of protest which has welled up from all quarters of the globe is testimony to the fact that men of good will everywhere are waking up to the danger which confronts them.

Communism can no longer hide behind its propaganda.

It stands, naked and unashamed, as a ruthless tyrant.

In Hungary they had all the outward trappings of justice: a court, witnesses, evidence, affidavits, cross-examination, even legalistic language purporting to be law; in fact, everything except truth, without which the stage setting and the words put into the mouth of the actors meant nothing.

Accustomed as they are to deceiving their own people—who never have access to the other side of any controversy—they fell into the error of believing that this mockery of justice would also fool freemen.

Now they know better, perhaps.

But it is too late.

The line has been drawn between human rights under God, and the devouring materialism of those who believe that man is but an animal to be enslaved by an all-powerful state.

There is no turning back.

The issue is now clearly defined. The pity is that the good cardinal should suffer so that we might learn. But his martyrdom does serve the purpose of uniting all elements among free peoples, fusing them in their opposition to all that is destructive, and giving to democracy that passionate belief in its civilized values which it has lacked for some time.

The ordeal of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty marks the end of appeasement. From now on, political, religious, and individual freedoms are on the march, affirming their faith in one another, and gathering together that moral strength which will turn the tide against this upsurge of despotism.

The proof of this developing unity is found in the official condemnations of this latest Communist outrage by the Governments of two large and powerful nations, the United States and Great Britain, the majority of whose people do not profess the Catholic faith.

The Cardinal Mindszenty tragedy points up this essential fact; that communism is against all regions, all individuals as such, and against every intellectual, scientific, cultural, and political freedom.

Where stands the United Nations on this violation of treaties and of basic human rights?

This is the next step in the chain reaction caused by world protest against Communist tyranny.

This is the last straw. We have had more than we can swallow. By every conceivable application of public opinion, finding full expression and moral force through the family of nations, may we right this wrong.

Together with our prayers, may this succeed, by the grace of God, in redeeming our imperiled freedoms and in liberating Cardinal Mindszenty and all other victims of the Red scourge.

Monster Business Jeopardizing Free Economy—Interesting Exposé by Former Big Business Executive Arouses Attention of Antimonopolist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., San Mateo, Calif., C. Wilson Harder, president, has Edward Wimmer, of Cincinnati, as vice president and in charge of public relations.

Recently, Mr. Wimmer interviewed Theodore K. Quinn on a radio program about his new book entitled, "I Quit Monster Business." Incidentally, I have purchased a number of copies of this book and sent them to people that I believed would read and appreciate a book of this character.

There are a number of so-called small-business groups in this country that I do not trust because they are fronts for big business and are not genuine small-business groups, but I am sure that the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., is trying to work in the interest of small business.

I believe that all the people, who are interested in promoting small business and family-size farms, will be interested in the radio program conducted by Messrs. Wimmer and Quinn. It is as follows:

ED WIMMER. Thank you, and greetings, fellow Americans. This week, ladies and gentlemen, I have a pleasant surprise for you. Here in our recording studios we have as our guest Mr. Theodore K. Quinn, who is head of his own business-management company in New York City. Mr. Quinn was formerly an officer and director of one of America's giant corporations and its many subsidiary companies. He is the author of a new book entitled "I Quit Monster Business."

If you have been a weekly or regular listener to these broadcasts, you are aware that the paramount objective of our organization is to acquaint you with the intrinsic values to be found in our American system of free enterprise and free government. However, we go a little further—in fact, we go a lot further than most individuals or organizations are willing to go in a discussion of this subject—in that we try to get down to what really constitutes free enterprise and free government. In other words, we know that it takes a lot more than automobiles, gadgets, telephones, etc., to make a free-enterprise system work to the best advantage for the average individual. No system is worth talking about or saving unless it provides freedom, opportunity, and security for average individuals willing to earn freedom, opportunity, and security.

The officers, members, and field men of the National Federation of Small Business believe that free government and free enterprise are unobtainable in any nation other than that nation which creates an economy in which there are millions upon millions of people who own their own homes, run their own farms and businesses, and are not dependent upon any individual or group to make their own way.

Mr. Quinn, whom I am now going to introduce to you, believes as we do. He speaks as a man who has had experience in running both giant business and small business. I am sure that what he will have to say to you this week will be of vital interest to every person in this audience. Let me begin by asking you, Mr. Quinn, why you quit monster business.

T. K. QUINN. May I first thank you for your kind introduction. I quit monster business because of a growing conviction, based upon experience, that it is not efficient that much of it is big only for the sake of bigness, that through its tremendous size and monopolistic methods, it is leading us away from the democracy we cherish toward some kind of a collectivistic state and an eventual forfeiting of our freedom.

ED WIMMER. Well, Mr. Quinn, that begins our discussion. Now I wish you would elaborate a little more on that statement by telling our listeners what you mean when you call an enterprise a monster business.

T. K. QUINN. Well, Ed, a $1,000,000 business is a good-sized business, and a $10,000,000 business is a big business. When we come to one that is from a hundred to a thousand times bigger than either of these, with subsidiaries, divisions, factories, and offices covering the whole country, we have a sprawling monster. I know of no more descriptive word for it.

ED WIMMER. I think it makes a very good descriptive word as far as that goes, but I know that our audience wants us to carry this idea of monsterism as far as we can in this discussion. I think that you have answered that question to my own satisfaction, but I just wonder what our audience is thinking. The next question I would like you to answer is this: How many monsters of this character are there in the United States?

T. K. QUINN. Well, of course, "monster" must necessarily be a relative term, but I should say for the purpose of an answer to your question that there are 100 of them. The interesting and significant thing is that 48 of this 100 are billionaire corporations. That is one for every political State in the Union. Many of the monsters are much richer and actually have greater gross assets than a number of States, and they exercise a formidable degree of control over the economy.

ED WIMMER. I agree with you along that entire line of thought. Senator O'MAHONEY, whom I have interviewed over the air, talked along that same line, and he brought out very forcibly the fact that the power of some of these corporations is greater than those of a State. Next week I am going to interview Senator KEFAUVER and I am sure he will go into that a little bit. Now, Ted, since you know the business from the inside, suppose you tell us what the most dangerous factors in the growth and development of monster business are.

T. K. QUINN. Enormous size alone is dangerous. In form and organization and methods the monster usually has a self-perpetuating management and its officers are seldom elected. They are generally picked or favored for their jobs. The individual stockholders actually have no more influence or control over them than Russian peasants. The result is a huge impersonal corporate thing without essential social conscience, democratic ideals, or human attributes.

ED WIMMER. In other words, it is just a great big collectivistic state in a sort of economic state. One that is not political, but which could very easily be taken over by the political state. I think that is a point to which we should all give the utmost thought and consideration. All of my arguments during the past 16 years have been based on the proposition that widespread independent ownership of farms and homes and businesses wherever practical and possible, with local control over local affairs is the seedbed of Christianity and democracy. The two are inseparable.

I have always said, and I know you maintain the same thing, that legitimate big business is a natural development within our free enterprise system, that big business is here to stay, and we want it to stay. Like you, however, I have feared and fought the combining of these big businesses into the monsters that you have described, and their expansion into the buying up of their subsidiaries. One thing that has worried me in all of this expansion is the submerging of the individual. Individual human beings just seem to lose their importance in all this trend to giantism or monsterism. I think we should stick to that word "monsterism" in your particular case. Am I right in this assumption of the submerging of the individual?

T. K. QUINN. Entirely right, I should say, Ed. The bigger the corporation the less opportunity for the individual. He tends to become suffocated and lost. He gets to be a number rather than a name. No matter what his talents, it is almost impossible to find him down the long line. The whole opportunity for rising from the ranks and genuine democracy are necessarily thwarted. A youngster needs encouragement and training to develop his ability and there is much too little opportunity in the monster corporation.

ED WIMMER. I have a little paragraph here which I have taken from your book, I Quit Monster Business, in which you say, "Created by man himself, like Frankenstein's brute, economic monsters are essentially undemocratic and destructive by the very nature of their organizations and size, and are leading us unwittingly toward an inevitable collectivistic type of rulership. I happen to be able to write from experience as an insider as well as a competitor of the system." You know, Ted, this puts you in a most unusual position to speak on these things.

You also say that small independent decentralized business of the kind that built this country is disappearing or being made dependent upon the monsters. Now all we have to do is to walk down any Main Street in America and we can see that for ourselves. Suppose you comment a little on just this idea of decentralization.

T. K. QUINN. I am a firm believer in our constitutional government, in individual freedom, and in opportunity. Nothing should be permitted to stand in the way of the realization of these ideals. After all, these tremendous economic states are man-made, and just as they have been made, so can they be unmade or unmerged. I fear for our democracy today. Other democracies in history have perished, and usually from internal causes, not from outside attack. When wealth and power are diffused, they thrive and flourish, but when power becomes concentrated in a few hands, as in Russia today, they decay and die. It was so in ancient Athens and in modern Germany, in the Rome of Augustus, and in the Rome of Mussolini. That must not happen here.

ED WIMMER. One thing that stood out in my correspondence with you which led to this interview was your statement that you did not agree with everything that I was saying, but that you did agree with the major objectives of our federation, and the major things which I have taken up in my talks. You said that we have no time and that the slack in our line is running out on us. We must forget about our little differences and talk only about those things on which we all agree in the major over-all objectives. That statement of yours impressed me so much because I find in making my talks throughout the Nation, and in coming into contact with businessmen, professors, economists, and other people, that they will pick out some little thing about which I am talking, and will make a big argument out of it. If you and I and the other men who can see the need of restoring individual competitive enterprise in this country can just get to-

gether on that one thing, just imagine where we could go.

Now I know we ought to be talking about remedies to overcome this thing, but we cannot do it in one broadcast, and I believe the response to this talk is going to be great enough to warrant your return. I do think, however, that you should give us one last thought on that remedy.

T. K. QUINN. The economic question always comes first. All of our society revolves around our economics, and as we think in terms of our economic life we will find that some of the other problems will disappear * * * so I am very interested in concentrating on the main objective, which is the decentralization of these monsters.

ED WIMMER. Of course, that is the objective of the federation and our objective in carrying on these broadcasts.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, I want to tell you that you have been listening to an interview with Mr. Theodore K. Quinn, author of I Quit Monster Business, and I am sure that I am going to bring Mr. Quinn back to this microphone again in the very near future.

After all, doesn't it all boil down to this in our thinking? It takes a lot of decent people to make a lot of decent homes. It takes a lot of decent homes to make a lot of decent communities, and it takes a lot of decent communities to make a decent nation. If we think along those lines, and think about the future of our children in the problems which we discuss, we canot go wrong.

Mr. Quinn, it has been a great pleasure to have you as a guest of the federation, and I am sure our audience has gotten a great deal from what you have said.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for listening. Good luck and good thinking to you all.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. Frank B. Keefe, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Lincoln Day address of Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE at Paterson, N. J., February 12, 1949:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I would indeed be ungrateful if I failed to recognize the generous spirit that prompted my esteemed friend, GORDON CANFIELD, to give such a laudatory introduction. I deeply appreciate his comment. To you who are his friends and neighbors and constituents, may I say that I have known your Representative in the Congress during the entire 10 years that I have been privileged to be a Member of the House of Representatives, first as secretary to his illustrious predecessor and later as an intelligent, hard-working liberal-minded Member of Congress. I congratulate the people of his congressional district and especially the people of Paterson where he lives on their spendid judgment in retaining him in the Congress of the United States, where he is rendering such distinguished service as a member of the great Committee on Appropriations.

We assemble here tonight to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. This gathering is symbolic of the spirit of a free people exercising fundamental freedoms that are inherent in our system of constitutional government. I am convinced that from these meetings being held simultaneously all over the Nation, thousands upon thousands of our citizens will receive an inspiration for more vigorous, dynamic participation in the affairs of government to the end that we may ultimately halt the insidious forces of communism and protect and defend and preserve the liberties and freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution. We gather here tonight freely and without fear or intimidation. We are Americans, living in free America.

As Americans we enjoy the largest measure of freedom and liberty of any people in the world. We are proud of our heritage. As Republicans, we are loyal to our country and its traditions and are determined to preserve, protect, and defend our way of life. We meet tonight secure in the knowledge that despite the events of November 2, the spirit of true republicanism still lives as a vital, virile force throughout the Nation. To those of faint heart, may I call your attention to the fact that nearly 22,000,000 people in these United States voted Republican as against slightly in excess of 24,000,000 who voted Democratic. Can anyone say that 22,000,000 Americans are not a virile, vital force in this Nation? No, my friends, the Republican Party which has survived victory and defeat down through the years still lives, and under proper leadership and guidance will again command the intelligent support of those who believe in a fundamental concept of liberty and freedom for the individual and in a government of law under the Constitution.

The events of the recent past ought to serve as a warning to the 40,000,000 Americans who failed to exercise their right of suffrage and ought to inspire them to active participation in the political affairs of the States and the Nation, if we are to preserve our country and prevent an ultimate, devastating collapse that may take us down the path to state socialism or communism. It is indeed refreshing that in the midst of a tangled and snarled mess of social, economic, and international problems we as free Americans can assemble here in Paterson and freely discuss our common interests. Inspired by the life and character and work of Abraham Lincoln and the perils which he confronted at that time, we as Republicans view the future confident that the brains and the genius of the American people will ultimately solve what now appear to be insoluble problems in the interests of making America a better and safer place in which to live for all of our people. Conditions today, with the multitude of problems crying out for solution, are little different than those that faced the American people in 1854 when on March 20 of that year at the city of Ripon, Wis. (in the district I have the honor to represent), a group of militant citizens, aroused over the burning question of slavery, met to discuss freely their common problems. They were men of various political faiths confronted with a confusion of thought quite similar to that which exists in the United States today. They determined the necessity for full and complete mobilization of the forces of the United States that were opposed to the extension and continuation of slavery. With high resolve they determined to organize a new political party. They adopted the name Republican. Because their program was sound, they enlisted the aid of Horace Greeley, one of the great editors of that day. Backed by his virile pen and tremendous influence, the new party was presented to the Nation. On June 6, 1854, at a convention held at Jackson, Mich., the new party was christened. Offers of help and encouragement came from many other States. It was the spontaneous action of a determined people. The first national convention of the party met at Philadelphia on June 17, 1856, and nominated its candidates for President and Vice President. The subsequent history of the Republican Party is academic. The dominant role played by Abraham Lincoln in its formative years needs no amplification. The party has endured through victory and defeat, through war and peace, as a vehicle through which citizens of these United States may express their views and attitudes on great public questions. We are a nation dedicated to the principle of two-party government. I pray the time may never come when we will have such a variety of splinter parties that none can successfully carry on the government. The situation in France should be sufficient warning to cause all thinking Americans to pause. Our Nation has risen to its great eminence because we have always had a strong majority and minority party.

In the last campaign the Democrats were specific in their promises. They left no room for doubt. They vigorously attacked the record of the Eightieth Congress. Many Republicans were either hush-hush or divided on the issue. The Democrats made specific promises to the farmer—to labor—to the aged—to the unfortunate—and to the housewife. The Republican leadership wrote most of the same promises in their platform but refrained at the highest level from slugging it out with the opposition. Many Americans grew sympathetic for the underdog. Many apparently were not impressed by appeals for unity and reaffirmation of the Golden Rule. The people wanted concrete, definite expression from Republican leadership. This ought to teach each and every one of us that the American people are hungry for truth and facts and it is the responsibility of every good Republican in America tonight to actively and militantly fight as Lincoln did for those positive principles in which we believe.

It will not do for us as Republicans to simply say we can do it better, since that is a mere presumptive conclusion. To say that Republicans are competent and the opposition are a lot of bunglers is a mere repetition of the same presumptive conclusion. We must be able to furnish concrete evidence to show how we could do it better and show in specific terms how we can improve the ultimate welfare of our people and the Nation. In my humble opinion there is no use talking about reorganizing the Republican Party with this or that set of leaders when our first procedure should be to organize the thought and purpose of the party in keeping with its record and history. It is my opinion that such a course will develop leaders who will stand stanchly on principles and policies for the ultimate welfare of and service to our people. Our people and the future of our country are not safe in the hands of men or women who think and speak of fear and who listen alone to the coercive threats of so-called pressure groups. We must have leadership that will think first in terms of public service and of the wants and needs of the people. Not promises to the people that are incapable of fulfillment, but public service that can produce and give to the people of America and the great mass of our citizens the things which government ought to give in upbuilding and enlarging our way of life. It should be clear by now that in all times and in all lands leaders have earned their places by courageous stands and not by maneuvering or scheming to foreclose the lawful ambitions of others or by destroying the wants of the people. Our determination to see our country forge ahead is just as great and our faith in our people is just as strong as ever, and I am certain that the Republican Party has men and women who are courageous, dauntless fighters for the right and that out of this conflict that is now going on, there will arise such leadership that will save our country from drifting and sinking into the morass of fear—followed by pure socialism or communism.

On January 5 the President delivered his message on the state of the Union. You will

recall that during the recent campaign he repeatedly declared that the Eightieth Congress was the worst or second worst Congress in the history of the Nation. He repeatedly gave the impression that the Nation was all but destroyed as a result of the action or inaction of the Eightieth Congress. How different was his initial approach in delivering his address on the state of the Union: "I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Nation is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness." He further said: "Our private-enterprise system has reached new heights of production. Since the boom year of 1929 while our population has increased by only 20 percent, our agricultural production has increased by 45 percent and our industrial production has increased by 75 percent. We are turning out far more goods and more wealth per workman than we have ever done before."

This, accomplished in the year 1948 while operating under the legislative leadership of the Republican controlled Congress. Listen, my friends,—the greatest number of people employed—the highest national income—and the greatest production ever achieved in peacetime history of the Nation. And still it was contended during the campaign that the Republican Eightieth Congress failed to meet its responsibilities to the people. I call your attention to these facts merely to demonstrate how necessary it is for our people to think and to reason if we are to find the truth that must guide our actions as citizens.

How well I recall on the 16th of December 1947, when the inflationary cycle was at its height. People were demanding that the Congress do something to control increasing living costs. The Republican leadership and the Democratic leadership were in agreement that prices of commodities were too high. The division arose over methods to be employed by the Government in attempting to fight inflation. The Democrats wanted a return to Government controls of all kinds. The Republican leadership insisted upon providing for a system of voluntary controls, and legislation was introduced to set up such a program. I recall how my Democratic friends denounced that program on the 16th of December 1947. One after another stood in the well of the House and made violent speeches denouncing the Republican program—denouncing the Eightieth Congress for inaction—denounced us for failing to provide higher wages and lower prices for the American worker and consumer. You all recall that situation. They appealed to every housewife and every worker in the Nation that the Republican Congress had done nothing to deal with this problem of inflation. The Republican-sponsored bill providing for a system of voluntary controls was enacted into law. The President signed it reluctantly. It is now February 1949—a year and 2 months have passed since the enactment of that legislation. If it was the vicious, impotent legislation characterized by the Democrats in December 1947, then it would appear logical that one of the first acts of the Eighty-first Congress would be to repeal that legislation. Imagine our surprise when the Democratic-controlled House Committee on Banking and Currency brought to the floor of the House a bill requesting the extension of the Republican measure passed by the Eightieth Congress. Gone were the wails that it was impotent. No longer do they charge that it had failed. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, came before the Banking and Currency Committee and requested the extension of this legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress on the ground that it had worked in the interests of preventing a continuance of the inflationary cycle. Thus we see in one of the initial bills passed by the Eighty-first Congress a complete acknowledgment that the attitude maintained by the Republicans in the Eightieth Congress was sound, and they have nothing to offer to take its place.

One of their campaign promises was the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I know the way in which this law has been assailed, and yet now that the Democrats are charged with the responsibility of carrying out their campaign pledges in that regard, they find themselves faced with a tremenously serious dilemma. It will not be the simple, easy task that was envisioned during the exuberant period immediately prior to and after the inaugural ceremonies. When the history of the operations of that law is carefully and fairly appraised, by labor itself, it will be seen that as a piece of legislation designed to affect the entire economy of our Nation and all of its people, it was in the public interest.

The same may be said with respect to many of the other promises that were made. Democrats themselves, now faced with the responsibility of enacting new legislation, find that the promises which they made are in many cases incapable of legislative fulfillment. For a number of years past they have tried to picture Republicans as a special-privilege class. They have instilled into the minds of many people in America that Republicans are a rich and greedy class who never think of the welfare of the common man. I come from the State of Wisconsin and was reared in an atmosphere of liberalism of thought in legislative matters. Under Republican administration in my State, we passed the first workmen's compensation law, the first unemployment compensation law, mothers and child welfare aids, blind aids, old-age pensions, apprenticeship training, and many other social and economic gains, and did so before the New Deal ever was dreamed of. We enacted laws outlawing yellow dog labor contracts in 1931 under Republican administration. We did away with indiscriminate use of injunctions in labor disputes in the same year and under the same Republican administration we defined legal and illegal labor practices and passed legislation protecting and preserving collective bargaining. These and many other great progressive pieces of legislation in the public interest were passed and became the law of my State long before the New Deal ever came into being. It was all done under the inspiring guidance and leadership of Republican statesmen who have always believed in developing the fundamental welfare of the common man. I am happy to state that the Federal Government and most of the other States in the Union have copied the legislation enacted under wise Republican leadership in Wisconsin and that most of these great progressive pieces of legislation are now the conservative law of the land.

We have a long way to go, and as I vision the future, the Republican Party must and will again represent the hope of the millions of people in America who believe in the accomplishment of social and economic ideas within the framework of our constitutional system of government. The radical cannot wait for the orderly processes of law. He wants to take short cuts that violate the spirit of the Constitution, and as a result we find ourselves now in a morass of economic and political chaos that calls for a return to fundamental thinking. I wonder sometimes how the American people can continue to think as clearly and as dispassionately as they do when overwhelmed by the constant barrage emanating from prejudiced columnists, commentators, and politicians, who instead of giving the people the truth, many times have poured out reams of distorted and prejudicial misinformation.

I have stated that we have a long way to go. Social and economic progress is never static and our constitutional system of government envisions the constant and everlasting need for change in the interest of human betterment. Let us examine one or two of these problems that need immediate attention. The Democrats have been in control of the Government continuously since March 4, 1933, with the exception of the 2 years when Congress passed into control of the Republicans, during the proceedings, of the Eightieth Congress. During all of those years, they have had complete control of all the money—all the executive and legislative and administrative departments of Government, and I may say, in addition, almost complete control of the judiciary. Why, then, with all of the billions available to them, are they still at this late date complaining about the underprivileged, the undernourished, the ill-clothed, and poorly housed third of our population. As a Republican speaking what I know to be the intent and purpose of an overwhelming majority of Republicans in the Congress, we have tried repeatedly during these years to work out a sane program of social security. Amendment of the Social Security Act, originally passed in 1935 and 1936, is long overdue.

Let me illustrate what I mean. The social-security law made provision in title I for a system of old-age pensions. Under this system, the Federal Government provided part of the funds and the State government and local governments provided another portion. As the law now stands, it is possible for an aged person in need to receive a maximum of $50 a month—$30 of which will be paid out of the Federal Treasury, provided the States and local communities put up $20. This would enable an aged couple to receive $100 a month. Remember, this payment is made in the form of old-age assistance without $1 of contribution having been made by its beneficiaries. In the event a recipient of such a pension does any work, the amount of income received is deducted each month from the amount of the pension.

The other system set up under the social-security law is what is called old-age and survivors insurance. Many phases of it are too technical to discuss on an occasion such as this. However, in order to make my point clear, may I say that under the provisions of existing law every employee contributes 1 percent of his wages toward the old-age and survivors insurance fund, and the employer contributes the same amount. Thus, 2 percent of pay rolls are taxed to provide a fund out of which old-age and survivors insurance payments are paid.

Let us take the case of a man and his wife, both of the same age, who entered the system in 1937. The husband continued to work steadily for the next 12 years—until 1949. During these 12 years he has contributed 1 percent of his earnings and the employer has contributed 1 percent to the trust fund. He and his wife attain age 65 at the same time, and he is eligible for a retirement annuity. How much does he get? He receives $44.80 and his wife receives $22.40—a total of $67.20. Thus, this man and his wife who have worked continuously and earned the maximum wage of $3,000 per year and who have contributed out of every pay check to the fund are entitled to receive only $67.20. Furthermore, if this individual does some work and earns in excess of $14.99 in any one month, his entire pension is taken away from him for that month.

Thus, under the old-age-assistance program, the man and his wife who have never contributed anything to any fund may be allowed $100 per month, and the other couple I have just described get $67.20. It is this tremendous inequality that exists that we Republicans have been trying to change—not to reduce any pensions now being paid to the aged but to give to the old-age and survivors insurance annuitants at least an even break with those aged groups who make no contribution. I have long been an advocate of decent, livable pensions for our aged people. To turn a couple out at age 65 and ask them to live upon a niggardly annuity of $67.20

and then take that away from them if they earn in excess of $14.99 in any one month is a horrible monstrosity to call social security.

It is impossible for me to understand how a party that has openly expressed its interest in the welfare of the common man could have closed its ears all these years to the necessity of reevaluating this entire social-security problem. The field is a huge one, and as a Republican I have tried to do something about it by introducing legislation that will give to the aged people of this country and the annuitants under old-age and survivors insurance some sense of security and some assurance that they can live at a subsistence level that will provide adequate nutrition, housing, and medical care.

My friends, you should know that there are hundreds of thousands of our aged people in America tonight, despite all of the 16 years of the so-called beneficent New Deal, who are compelled to live on a subsistence diet that is lower than the diet that we are furnishing to the German people under our occupation program at the present moment. If this means that Republicans do not have the interests and welfare of the common man at heart * * * if this means that we are thinking only in terms of clipping coupons and the interest of the bloated bondholders of Wall Street, then I am sure that we are lost to reason and justice.

During the sessions of the Eightieth Congress I was privileged to be chairman of the committee that provides all of the funds for the public assistance, social security, public health, and education programs of the Nation. It is with great pride that that we can point as Republicans to the work of the Eightieth Congress in the field of public health. Is there a worker in Paterson or in New Jersey or in any other part of the United States who is not an active beneficiary of the great public health programs which were inaugurated in the Eightieth Congress? You have not been told of the fight that we are waging to find the cause and a cure for cancer. You have not been told that the Eightieth Congress set up the program to find the cause and a cure for heart disease and rheumatic fever. You have not been told that the Eightieth Congress set up the great program of research and control in the field of mental health. Is there a person here or in the Nation who has not felt the blighting and searing influence of these devastating diseases either themselves or in their immediate families?

We have inaugurated and set out the greatest and most ambitious program ever conceived or devised to bring health to the people of America, and only until Republicans came into control in the Eightieth Congress were these programs implemented with the necessary funds to make them function.

I have been pleased to introduce in the present Congress a program of research and control in the field of arthritis and rheumatism, and again the Republican attitude of doing something for humanity is reflected in the unanimous support of that legislation.

Thus, my friends, while we know that there are fiscal limits beyond which we dare not go in the matter of Federal expenditures, we have fought to maintain and build up and extend those services that bring the greatest good to the greatest number of people. We want the real benefits of social security to be achieved for all our people. We want the standard of living of our people continuously raised. We want full employment. We demand the payment of good wages. We want a continuation of the program of necessary internal improvements. We want the benefits of rural electrification. We want our waterways harnessed to prevent flood and disaster and to develop the much-needed elcetrical energy for the development of our Nation. We want erosion control and reclamation and good soil practices continued. We recognize the necessity for maintaining support under agriculture in order that that great segment of our society may be able to earn a decent wage in producing the food and fiber that is so essential to our own well-being and so essential to the security of the world.

But, my fellow Americans, great as our interest is in all of these programs of public welfare, we must know where the money is coming from to pay for them. We must know how these vast sums that must be provided by taxation can be raised without breaking the back of the taxpayer. The Democrats never ask that question. They just don't seem to care. They just rely upon a provident future to provide the answer. But I assure you that the accomplishment of these worthy objectives presents no simple assignment. I realize and every thinking person must realize that there are limits to the ability of the American people to pay taxes. After all, the wage earner is the one who must bear the greatest burden of taxation, because taxes are largely translated into the price of the commodities that he must have in order to live. I do believe that so long as the international situation remains as it is, we cannot look for any great retrenchment in the Marshall plan expenditures or in the expenditures for national defense. I do believe, however, that it is possible to materially reduce the appropriation requests without interfering with the orderly carrying on of either of those two operations. I believe that it is possible to install practices of economy in our Government service through the reorganization of the entire Government, and thus effectuate several billions of dollars of savings that can be used to carry on some of the worth-while projects that the people demand.

We must not forget that Federal spending in 1940 approximated $9,000,000,000. And in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, we spend $36,524,000,000. We should also remember that the current annual Federal expenditures exceed the total annual income in 1933. Therefore it must be apparent to any thinking person that the one first obligation of the Eighty-first Congress is to keep the budget in balance and provide for a system of orderly debt retirement. The greatest care must be exercised that taxation does not reach the point of confiscation and dry up the source upon which taxes are levied. The best way to acquire surplus funds for debt retirement is to reduce every Government expenditure not necessary for the maintenance and extension of necessary Government services. There are literally hundreds of places in the Federal budget where savings can be effected and in no way interfere with the orderly and necessary Government services. Citizens all over America must be aroused in some way to the delicate and critical fiscal situation facing your country and mine. We must not look to the Federal Government to support us. We should support, and eventually we will be forced to support, the Government if we are to avoid complete disintegration of our American system of business as well as Government.

Now, my friends, there are many of the proposals submitted by the President in his state of the Union message that any good American who believes in human justice and human liberty can support. There are others so intimately associated with the Communist and Socialist attitude toward government that we who believe in the capitalistic system will be compelled to oppose. As a Republican, however, I do not conceive it to be my responsibility—and in saying this I believe I express the attitude of an overwhelming number of Republicans in the Congress—I repeat, I do not conceive it to be my responsibility to merely become a heckling, defeatist, and unintelligent opposition. I believe that we as a party have a golden opportunity to go to the American people with a definite program of constructive legislation that will permit the accomplishment of many of the social objectives that the people of America demand and yet do so within the framework of our constitutional guaranties and within the framework of our established capitalistic system of government.

The years ahead will present tremendous problems. The solution will affect not only every person in the United States but most of the people of the world. It is a challenging responsibility of government. Whatever the effects may be and whatever the attitude finally adopted, it will fall upon everyone, regardless of political faith or conviction. Therefore, it seems that a solemn responsibility rests upon you, and each of you, to apply to each of the problems that may arise a rule of reason and justice in the interests not of special pleaders or special groups but in the interests of all of our people. We in this Nation want to be governed by law and not by the whims and caprices of mere men. We fully realize the responsibility of government in providing for human welfare. We know that governments are instituted to protect the people against special privileges. We know that as conditions change and society becomes more and more complex, it becomes the duty and the obligation of government through the enactment of just and equitable laws to provide for justice and equality of opportunity.

We as Republicans conceive it to be the duty of the Government not to act in the role of tyrant and master through the continual issuance of Executive orders but rather to provide safeguards for freedom of action and freedom to work and freedom to live by assuming the role of constant arbiter between human rights and special privilege.

My fellow Republicans, on this day dedicated to communion with the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, let us view the future with assurance that the spirit of true Republicanism still lives, offering a safe haven of political refuge for all Americans who believe in true justice, equality, liberty, and freedom.

Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report submitted by Mrs. Walter J. Pfizenmayer at an executive council meeting of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs on January 28, 1949, in support of a resolution adopted urging repeal of the Federal retail-excise tax on so-called luxuries. I commend this report to the attention of my colleagues:

The history of the tax legislation covering commodities cited in this resolution is, briefly, as follows: In 1941 a 10-percent levy was imposed to conserve vital materials in short supply and to provide revenue to support a national-defense program: this levy was increased to a 20-percent war tax in 1943 on so-called luxury items to insure additional revenue and channel off surplus war wages and profits into Government securities, and discourage manufacture of products not necessary to the national defense.

The public was given Presidential assurance that these mandatory war measures would be repealed 6 months after the declaration of peace, that is, on July 1, 1947, but the Congress voted in March 1947 for indefinite extension.

It is an accepted fact that governments cannot continue to exist without revenue. The late Chief Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said that taxes were the price civilized states

paid for their civilization: The higher the type of civilization the higher the taxes. With the expanded social program advocated at the present time it is evident that heavy taxes will be required to support it—a democracy being founded on the premise that the more fortunate share with the less privileged, and that equalization of opportunity in health, education, and advancement is highly desirable for all economic and social levels.

The majority of the industries concerned would be willing to agree to a return to the 10 percent levy on the principle that half a loaf is better than none, but insist that the provisions of the law be more clearly defined and equalization be effected by including in the program purely luxury items now tax-free, such as antiques, hand-made furniture, yachts, race horses, polo ponies, $500 evening dresses and negligees, hand-painted ties—all items well out of reach of the average middle- and lower-income groups. Why should the tie be tax-free when the clasp that holds it in place must bear a 20-percent levy, or the bride's dress, veil, shoes, hosiery go scot free, while her engagement and wedding rings carry an impost? It is both unfair and discriminatory, in our highly competitive economy, to favor one segment of the population and penalize another.

The pocketbook and leather-goods industry regards its product as a necessity—women's handbags, shopping bags, diaper bags, auto and other license folders are in daily and ordinary use. The industry is small, most of its operations are done by hand, its normal rate of employment is about 25,000 workers, more than 5,000 of whom are now on unemployment relief. The handbag is a highly necessary article in the feminine wardrobes to carry safely money, keys, tickets, essential accessories, for which we have no adequately convenient pockets, and the Government itself considered it part of the standard essential equipment of all Wacs, Waves, Spars, and nurses.

The National Association of Retail Druggists, representing 31,000 druggists and pharmaceutical associations in the 48 States, considers the majority of its products as essential to health and hygiene—over 100 items are taxed; the more familiar ones to us, such as baby oils and powders, after shaving and dandruff corrective preparations, foot powders, and deodorants, they class as medicants and not as cosmetics. Beauty and barber shops provide the livelihood for more than 3,000,000 of our population; the greater part of the income of small shops the country over has come from the sale and purchase of cosmetics, the tax has drastically reduced this. The statistical data required to be assembled and reported—the time consuming inspections by Government agents—the high penalties involved for fraudulent reports ($10,000 fine and up to 5 years' imprisonment) all combine to work hardship to the small shopkeeper who can incur liability through the carelessness or inadvertence of a clerk for whose mistakes he must pay out of his own pocket since he cannot afford the protection the larger outfits, with their staffs of highly trained accountants, enjoy.

The jewelry trade report their average sale as under $30 and a large volume under $3. They cite discrimination in the exemption from tax of crystal, glassware, plastic, and stainless steel which are also sold as decorative articles and gifts. The gold in the $15 fountain pen or pencil may total only 50 cents but the tax is $3; the same item made with stainless steel as a substitute is tax-free. Inexpensive lipsticks, compacts, costume jewelry are an everyday part of the wardrobe of the average woman or working-girl—her consumer dollar spent for tax-free articles buys only merchandise, in unfair competition with the tax-bearing commodity in the same category. It is suggested that immediate relief be offered to remove such unfair and unjust discrimination by restoring the 10 percent 1941 rate, granting an exemption from tax on the first $25 of the selling price of all jewelry items. Buyer resistance to tax-bearing articles has caused and will continue to cause severe unemployment in this industry. Income tax cannot be paid where no income is earned, and the added burden of swelling relief rolls with resultant increased income-tax levies falls—as always—on the consumer, in the middle- and lower-income groups.

The fur trade claims to be hardest hit by the combined tax levy and buyer resistance. They contend they are the only wearing apparel industry so heavily burdened. Except in certain parts of the South, furs are a part of the wardrobe of women 6 to 7 months of the year. The industry reports extensive research and technical development in all fields of preparation and handling and working of furs, which have made available to the average woman clothing of the highest quality, utility, and durability, at a cost within her reach, and the trade has been responsive to the changing demands and needs of its customers. Three-quarters of their business falls in the under-$400 category, only a small portion is mink trade, and over 900,000 units of the utility furs—muskrat, rabbit, mouton, skunk, fox, and wolf—were sold last year. A $100 fur coat gives its wearer twice the wear a similar cloth coat will, but a mouton-lined cloth coat retailing at $200 is tax-free, but the cloth-lined $79.50 mouton coat pays almost $16 in taxes. The fur industry is highly competitive and the margin of profit low; an almost virtual cessation of sales is occurring at present; consumer resistance has resulted in piled-up inventories and disastrous distress selling, with loss of bank credit and disturbing financial readjustments.

The consensus seems to be that the tax is regarded as a highly discriminatory imposition on essential products, falsely classed as luxuries; its elimination would give a substantial impetus to sales and relief to drastic and widespread unemployment and reduce mounting business failures. No justification exists for the continuance in peace of war-born measures that are creating unfair and undue hardship. Today's wholesale and retail consumer's index indicates a rise of 71 percent in business failures over 1947, with a disturbing number on the wholesale level. Consumer resistance to high prices is a contributing factor, and while the cost-of-living index indicates a steady decline during the past 3 months, it is still 29 percent higher than in 1942.

The Opportunist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bangor Daily News of February 7, 1949:

THE OPPORTUNIST

Mr. Truman has been a life-long opportunist.

It was chance that brought him to the attention of Pendergast and the same quirk of fate that gave him his first political job—one roughly corresponding to a Maine county commissioner. Then it was the Pendergast machine which catapulted him into the United States Senate where he hitched his wagon to the Roosevelt star of spending other people's money.

He was lucky to have been named Vice President over Henry A. Wallace. (And, for that matter, so were we.) By a single heartbeat he succeeded his mentor. And his luck held out November 2 when he was elected by a minority to succeed himself.

But will Mr. Truman be lucky enough to get the ambitious "gimmie" program he outlined for a socialistic America? Or will the law of averages catch up? And will Mr. Truman's string run out?

As suggested by the United States News and World Report, there is beginning to be some question whether the United States can do everything that is asked of it, whether the taxpayers can support the world in the style to which it would like to become accustomed and assure everybody at home against all the hazards of living.

As we understand the meaning of the word, bankruptcy is that state where liabilities exceed assets. The complete status occurs when creditors get suspicious and tough and shut off credit.

Unhappily we are not approaching that dangerous state. Having tapped every source of revenue to foster laziness and indolence, the Federal Government has reached the bottom of the barrel and is already there.

The theory of sock the rich is no longer tenable. If the entire fortunes of the wealthy were confiscated outright the loot would run the Federal Government only from today until day after tomorrow, both inclusive—3 days. That cow has been milked dry.

Now we hear more and more about appropriating corporate assets. That would be more fruitful. With the spoils the Government, at its present pace, could enjoy a 3-month orgy.

But all that is looking ahead. How do we stand now? Let us take Indiana as an example. New York and California are too extreme; Maine is not sufficiently average. The Hoosier State strikes a better cross-sectional mean.

Indiana's share in the national debt is $7,000,000,000. The share of every family in that debt is $6,000. Now suppose the creditor should suddenly get hard boiled and say: "Your note is overdue. I want my money," and the process of liquidation of assets should start.

After every acre of land, every home, factory, automobile, piece of farm equipment, every mule, horse, pig, sheep, and hen had been sold and the proceeds added to existing cash assets, the State would still owe $3,000,000,000. Reduced to lowest terms, Indiana owes $7,000,000,000 of the national debt and could, if the debt were called, muster but $4,000,000,000. By definition, Indiana is bankrupt. So is every other State in greater or lesser proportion. So, then, is the United States.

And still we hear the continued cry for more revenue; revenue to feed Europe, revenue for the armed forces (and we will not quarrel there), revenue for socialized medicine, for socialized education, and revenue for low-cost housing.

But we never hear the faintest echo of a demand by the majority party to reduce the standing debt or to modify a program padded with impossibilities.

Such an echo, even the faintest echo, would indeed be sweet music.

Colored Oleomargarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. WALSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to ban the imitation of butter through the manufacture and

sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in semblance of butter, which will eliminate the need for any taxes or license fees whatever on the butter substitute. In my judgment, this best serves the interests of my constituents, both workers and farmers, whom I represent in approximately equal numbers. Insofar as Indiana farmers are concerned, dairy products account for 13 percent of their total income. Cows are milked on four out of five farms in my State, which is tenth among all the States in the Union as a source of dairy products. Cash farm receipts from dairying in Indiana in 1947 amounted to $134,000,000, and were 42 percent as large as the total received from all crops in my State during that year.

In 1947 good quality butter sold at wholesale in Chicago for 69 cents. Indiana farmers got 70 cents a pound for their butterfat in the form of cream, or 56 cents for the eight-tenths of a pound of butterfat that goes into every pound of butter. By contrast only one-third of 1 percent of the Indiana farmers' income came from oleomargarine in that year. Compared with the $134,000,000 the farmers in my State received from dairy products, they got less than $3,000,000 for their soybean oil sold to oleomargarine manufacturers.

As a matter of fact the dairy cow is a better customer for the Indiana soybean grower than is the oleomargarine manufacturer. The oleomargarine manufacturers paid only $2,719,000 for the soybean oil they bought from Indiana farmers in the last year for which figures are available, whereas soybeans and soybean meal fed to dairy cattle in my State were worth $6,868,000 during the same period.

The Indiana dairy farmers' investment in barns and equipment amounts to $225,000,000, and the single oleo plant in my State has no such investment at stake in the butter-oleo controversy. On the contrary, it is linked with 27 other oleomargarine manufacturers in the Nation in an ill-advised attempt to destroy the market for butter produced by 3,500 local creameries, 82 of them in Indiana alone. To these butter plants I must add 1,717 dairy plants processing fluid milk, ice cream, cheese, and other dairy products in my State, whose prices will be affected adversely by unfair competition from oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter.

An immense amount of labor interest is also involved in the butter-oleo controversy in Indiana. The 82 plants producing butter in my State employed 1,466 persons at the last census, and paid out more than $2,000,000 annually in wages. No such contribution was made by the single oleomargarine manufacturer in Indiana. The dairy industry is the largest single user of trucks in the Nation, and Indiana has a vital interest in the automotive industry, both as a supplier of parts and as a builder of motor transport. The jobs of many men who build and service dairy equipment are at stake in this controversy, both in Indiana and in the Nation at large.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that consumer organizations have been ill-advised to let themselves become stampeded by oleo propaganda. The oleomargarine manufacturers have said that they wanted discriminatory taxes removed from their product, but when leading dairy and farm organizations approve the elimination of those taxes—as they have—it appears that what the oleo interests now want is really something else entirely.

Oleomargarine manufacturers now demand the unrestricted right to color their product yellow in imitation of butter, which amounts to a license to practice fraud and deception at the expense of consumer and dairy farmer alike. Where is the justification for this demand? Only 3 percent of all the oleomargarine sold in 1947 was colored yellow, but apparently this was no handicap to the industry at that time. Oleo sales in that year were double the volume attained in 1940, and profits were enormous. There would seem to be no reason, now, why the manufacturers of this substitute product should be encouraged to compete unfairly for a butter market that is vital to the dairy farmers of America.

More than 25 percent of all milk products in this country goes into butter. This is because cows produce more milk during the flush summer months than in wintertime, while consumption remains about the same. Butter is the most economical and convenient form in which this surplus can be stored, shipped, and distributed. That is why butter is called the balance-wheel of the dairy industry.

There is no question that every pound of oleomargarine increases the supply of table-spreads and thus reduces the price for butter. This would not be serious if butter were an isolated product, but the fact is that the market for butter affects the price of all dairy products. This is equally true of fluid milk, ice cream, cheese, dry whole milk, and condensed milk. The entire price structure of the dairy industry is so closely interrelated that an unfavorable market for one dairy product affects the farmer's income from all dairy products.

In proof of this we have only to study the figures on the increasing sales of oleomargarine, which have usually been accompanied by lower returns on, and decreased production for, butter. When the market for butter is unfavorable, dairy farmers who milk from three to six cows no longer have an outlet for their farm-separated cream, and under these conditions they dispose of their cows and turn to other occupations. This fact has been brought home to me by the loss of 24,000 dairy cows in my State in the past year alone. A decline in dairy cow numbers on a Nation-wide basis has been steadily under way since 1940, and we have lost nearly 3,000,000 dairy cows in that time. Last year's drop in the cow population was the sharpest in history, according to the Department of Agriculture.

To my mind this is a bad thing for the people of my State, whether they are consumers or dairy farmers or local businessmen who depend on farm income for a large part of their trade. Our population is increasing, and it must be fed. Since 40 percent of our beef and veal comes from dairy herds, as well as all of our milk, it is self-evident to me that dairy farmers must be encouraged rather than discouraged at this time.

The unrestricted sale of oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter does not offer such encouragement. My bill would prevent unfair competition for the vital butter market, and insure a continuing supply of meat and milk for the dinner tables of this Nation, as well as a steady income to farmers and to businessmen who depend upon farm trade for continuing prosperity.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address made by our former colleague and Representative from the Eighth District of Oklahoma the Honorable Ross Rizley, in my home city, Fort Collins, Colo., on Thursday, February 10, 1949, in commemorating the birth of Abraham Lincoln:

I am grateful for the opportunity to come out to this great section of the Rocky Mountain region and break bread with you on this occasion, commemorating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who was the greatest American statesman and humanitarian of them all.

I am especially happy to be here in the home community of your distinguished citizen and able Congressman, BILL HILL. He is my close personal friend. We commenced our service in Congress at the same time. We sat side by side for several years in the Committee on Agriculture, of which he is still a distinguished member. It is also my good fortune to know intimately and well the other former Republican Members of the Colorado delegation in the Congress who served there during most of the time that I was there. Ed Chenoweth was elected at the same time I was elected in Oklahoma. He was my neighbor in Washington. For the past several years we have lived only a few houses apart. We served side by side on the Committee on Executive Expenditures and on the Rules Committee; and Bob Rockwell is also one of my intimate friends who served most of the years that I was in the Congress.

I also have the pleasure of knowing quite well your very able and distinguished Republican Senator, Senator MILLIKIN. He is one of the outstanding Republican leaders in the Senate. All of these gentlemen were, and are, recognized as outstanding Members of the Congress, and I am firmly of the opinion that the people of Colorado will soon see the day they will sincerely regret that they failed to retain in the Congress the service of men like Ed Chenoweth, Bob Rockwell, and Dean Gillespie to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

I am sure this evening we could, with profit to all of us, spend the entire evening in reviewing the life history of that great man whose birthday will occur 2 days hence. He is, perhaps, the greatest character in history to appear upon the scene since the days of the Lowly Man of Nazareth. He exemplified all of the things that are necessary to found, maintain, and keep a great republic such as

ours. His firm and positive stand for liberty and orderly government by law under the Constitution in his day saved our Republic and our representative form of government; and, in my humble opinion, what the Republican Party needs today more than any other one thing is leadership of the courage of Lincoln, who will stand firm and steadfast for the principles and prerequisites that are fundamental to a representative democracy such as ours. If the Republican Party is to be a vital factor in the future welfare of the people in this country, if it is to function either as a minority party representing the loyal opposition, or if at some future date it shall be again entrusted with the responsibility of government in these United States, it should, in my humble opinion, divorce itself from the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal. It must take a definite and positive stand for our capitalistic system of free enterprise. It must take a definite and positive stand for strict adherence to the principles and fundamentals of the kind of government contemplated by the founding fathers—the kind of government provided for in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It was never intended when the charter for our great Government was outlined, as some now advocate, that we were to be a pure democracy. Such a system was frowned upon and turned down by the founders of our Government. In its stead they set up a representative democracy—a republican form of government, and to my way of thinking, it functioned very well for more than 150 years.

The Republican Party ought to take a definite and outright stand against the New-Deal and Fair-Deal socialism. We ought to take a definite stand against communism and all of the other isms that have crept into our governmental structure, and are fast destroying our Americanism. We need Republican leadership with the courage not only to say that they believe in the United States of America and the Republic for which it stands but also with the courage to go out and fight for the things that will keep us a republic. When Abraham Lincoln was the leader of the new Republican Party he had the courage to stand for what he knew was right and to boldly condemn that which he knew to be wrong. Because of his courage and forthrightness he was defeated for political office more times than any other great leader in American history. Defeat did not cause him to compromise with wrong. He could have cut and trimmed, so to speak, just a little, and he would have defeated Stephen A. Douglas for the United States Senate in 1858. He refused to compromise his conscience, and, as a result, even though he was defeated, 2 years later he was elected President of the United States, and made the new Republican Party the most potent political factor in American history for more than half a century.

It was under the leadership of the Republican Party as founded and inspired by Abraham Lincoln, from 1861 until 1932, with only two brief interruptions, that this Nation became the greatest and the strongest in the history of governments, and, if you please, the people living in and under that Government, under Republican leadership all those years, became the best fed, the best clothed, and the best housed.

Yes, we went along for about 70 years under courageous, steadfast, and responsible Republican leadership, and this Nation prospered as have no other people prospered in the history of civilization. We provided more of everything for everybody—the best wages for the laboring man, more prosperity for agriculture, more business incentive, more modern homes for all classes of people, more modern conveniences, more labor-saving machinery and devices, more hospitals and medical care, more educational facilities, the greatest transportation system, the greatest system of communication, more churches and church-going people than at any other period of time in the world's history, and we did all of this under Republican doctrine and Republican leadership, and we did it within the framework of the Constitution and by following the principles of a republican form of government. We did it all with a minimum cost to the taxpayer and with minimum restraint upon the people's liberties, and I sincerely believe with the blessings and approval of the Great God of the Universe. The Republican Party has nothing to be ashamed of, or to apologize for. Ours is a great record, and as long as we boldly stood and fought for great American principles we could not be defeated. It was only after we ceased to stand steadfast, only after we began to compromise the integrity of our party and its principles, that we became unattractive to a majority of the voters. In 1936, in 1940, in 1944, and again in 1948, we lacked the courage and the moral stamina to give the people a choice. We said we were against the New Deal. We pretended that we were against bringing about a socialistic state in this country. We resoluted long and loud against all of this, and then our leadership got cold feet. We let the pressure group scare us. We were so office-hungry that we said, "Put us in office, and we will continue to give you, in bigger and better doses, that which we know to be wrong." Is it any wonder that the American people have, in four elections, rejected such hypocrisy and demagoguery?

The leadership in the party should realize by now that the voters in this country want a choice of remedies. In every off-year election since 1936, when only the Congress and the State officers were involved, the Republican Party has made substantial gain. Why? In my humble opinion it was because the Republican incumbent Members in Congress who have persistently fought the New Deal Socialists and who have stood steadfast for the fundamentals of our great Republican Party met the issue, and we continued to gain the approval of the majority of our people. In 1946 the Republican leadership in the Congress and in the States went all out against the New Deal socialistic schemes of continued regimentation and the destruction of our system of free and competitive enterprise.

We told the people we would get rid of the OPA and price controls. We told the people we would get rid of a million or more Government employees, that we would write a new management and labor law that would stop crippling and devastating strikes against the Government which were threatening the very foundation of our Government, that we would reduce the wartime tax burden, that we would reduce the cost of Government, that we would turn the Government back to the people and once again offer a government by law instead of a government by men, and they elected us. They gave the Republicans a majority in both Houses of the Congress. They elected a majority of Republican governors and Republican State legislators. Then what happened? While it is true that the Republican Eightieth Congress was unable to accomplish all it had hoped for, due to too many weak-kneed, vacillating New Deal Republicans, we did, however, make remarkable progress with our program of reform. I give you a few of the many accomplishments of the so-called bad, bad Eightieth Congress:

1. We balanced the budget.

2. We passed a tax bill, over the President's veto, relieving the people of burdensome wartime taxes.

3. We wrote a new Labor and Management Act.

4. We wrote a sane and conservative program for reclamation and flood control, and implemented it with substantial appropriations.

5. We wrote a sane and conservative program for agriculture and soil conservation, and implemented it with ample appropriations.

6. We amended the GI bill of rights, and made further and substantial provisions for disabled veterans, and the widows, orphans, and other dependents of disabled veterans.

7. We trimmed the President's requested budget, which was an all-time high for Government expenditures, and which would have made impossible the balancing of the budget, to the tune of approximately $5,000,000,000.

8. We provided legislation unifying the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and provided our Military Establishment with sufficient funds to make us the strongest military and naval power on the face of the globe.

9. We provided legislation for dealing with and getting rid, if properly administered, of the Communists which have infiltrated into every branch of our Government during the past 16 years.

10. We took a new look at, and made provisions for, adjusting the salaries and expenses of our postal employees, to conform with the increased cost of living.

These are only a few of the accomplishments and reforms that were brought about by a Republican Congress, the first Republican Congress in 16 years, and many of these reforms were written into law over the protest, and in some instances over the veto, of the President and the New Deal Socialists in Congress.

Then came the election of 1948, and the high command in the Republican Party failed, neglected, and refused to stand steadfast. It failed, neglected, and refused to defend the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress. It failed to call the hand of the little man from Kansas City. Our top-flight candidates failed to slug it out with the former protégé of Pendergast. They chose instead to croon and swoon and talk about the American flag, home, mother, and unity, and they returned again to the same old promises of 1936, 1940, and 1944. They said "We don't like the way the Democrats administer the New Deal. It costs too much. Elect us and we will give you more competent administrators, and less-expensive administrators." Yes, that was the answer of the Republican leadership to the demagogues on the other side of the political alley. It was the Republican leadership answer to the hopes and longings of millions of Americans for a change of New Deal and Fair Deal socialism, and to their prayers for a return to representative democracy and government by law. Red-blooded Americans do not respond to such an appeal, and it should not have been expected that we would win, with that sort of a program. With nothing more to offer than a miserable program of more of the same thing and all things to all men, millions of men and women of good will throughout the country either failed to go to the polls on election day and vote, or decided to register their disgust by voting to continue Mr. Truman in power.

The fundamental issue that confronts the Republican Party today is no different than that which has confronted us in every political contest since that fateful November day in 1932. Concretely and in its simplest form, the question is whether we will keep America strong and free under and in accordance with the precepts of the Constitution, or whether we will continue to subordinate our rights and our individualism to the common level of a world-wide socialism, eventually rendering us helpless to defend ourselves against the serfdom of a communistic state.

I think it will be conceded by a large majority of our people that we have reached the lowest ebb in political morality in the history of our country where subsidies and bribes are the rule, and where the price for appointment to the great mass of created jobs is complete and docile subservience to the

New Deal, and so-called Fair Deal. The American people are now entering the seventeenth year of a continued and unbroken emergency, under which the New Deal has claimed the right to exercise so-called emergency powers outside and beyond the realms of the Constitution.

If we are to keep America strong and vigorous, we must keep her economically solvent. The best way yet discovered in the long trek of civilization through history to do that has proved to be our system of providing competitive enterprise. The benefits of our system are to be seen and valued on every hand and in every action of our daily lives, both at home and abroad. Our personal freedom, our right to worship, the freedom of our press, the integrity of our property rights, the joy of living under a government that protects rather than dominates, stem from our system of competitive enterprise under the Constitution. It is these freedoms that have produced the wealth of America, both material and the physical stamina and inventive genius of our people.

With these great resources and proper leadership we can make America so economically and militarily strong that no nation or even groups of nations would dare to wage war upon us. On the other hand, if we continue the present incompetent and inefficient leadership, and continue to elect men to public office who subscribe to the policy and practice of that leadership, we will bankrupt our country nationally, subordinate our freedoms and constitutional liberties to a world socialism, and destroy our preeminent position in world affairs. If that should be the fate of the American people, not only would they lose the greatest blessings yet bestowed upon any people, but the world would sink into darkness comparable to the civilization of the Middle Ages. History is replete with the story of the fall of many nations, and nowhere is it recorded that any nation, by a majority vote of its people, when they were given a choice of remedies, ever freely agreed to liquidate itself or commit national suicide. It has always come about by vicious and irresponsible leadership that gained control of the government through either weak or dishonest officials.

The challenge of the Republican Party today should be an affirmative program that would elect honest and courageous men to public office—leadership that will take the American people into its confidence with respect to both our domestic and foreign problems and terminate the further senseless waste of our national resources in an attempt to buy the good will of other nations. The new dealers and the fair dealers in the Republican Party who subscribed to the Truman New Deal and so-called Fair Deal ought to get out of the party. They ought to join the Truman party. The people of this country are entitled, as I said in the beginning, to a choice of remedies.

There never has been a time, it seems to me, so opportune for our party to appeal to the young men and young women of the Nation for their support and to join in a crusade to reestablish the fundamental freedoms afforded under a republican form of government as distinguished from the regimentation and government-controlled philosophies, which must of necessity go with the New Deal socialistic scheme of things. Millions of our young men and women have only shortly returned, and some are still returning, from all over the globe.

They witnessed, first hand, the way of life and the final results of what happens to people and to nations who follow patterns or "isms," which in many respects we are today aping in this country. They have seen with their own eyes, the superiority of our country in peace as well as in war, under an economy and practices invoked under a free-enterprise system. They have observed, first hand, the mode of life and the stature and status of human beings who have been the wards of paternalistic governments and who have had subscribed for them by a central government their life desires and ambitions. I cannot believe that the young men and young women in this country want any part of such a system. They want a chance to live their own lives without being dictated to by anyone. Like the pioneers of old, most of them, I am convinced, believe that all the Government owes to them is to keep the channels of opportunity open and even. They want to be free to compete one with the other in commerce, in agriculture, and in the professions. They do not want to have to lick the political boots of anyone as a prerequisite to, or as a condition precedent to, their entering upon a business career, or staying in business once they are established. I think they want to be permitted to do business, and to farm, to practice law, or to practice medicine, or any other profession in their own way, the American way, without being kicked and cuffed about by a horde of political commandos out of some Washington bureau, who are unable to make a living in their own right in any competitive enterprise or profession.

Yes, the time is ripe, the opportunity is ours, to appeal to these young men and women, offer them a political home, so to speak, based upon a progressive genuine Abraham Lincoln brand of republicanism. If we do this, these young men and women will join us by the millions in our fight to save America and democratic ideals from the ideologies of fascism, communism, newdealism, and all other "isms." As I see the picture, I conceive it to be the duty of the Republican Party to give to the voters of this Nation an opportunity to make a definite choice between the unwholesome trend of the Democratic Party toward state socialism or communism, or unbridled radicalism, to a sane, wholesome, statesmanlike, conservatism, aimed to preserve our system and form of government.

The very existence of the two-party system requires a statement of opposing principles and a program in clear terms in order that the people may make a choice at election time. There must be a clearly defined boundary line between the two parties. I want the Republican Party to compel a choice between its program and principles, and the program and principles of the so-called Fair Deal, masquerading under the name of the Democratic Party. President Truman and the Democratic leadership have by word and act established the party line for the Democratic Party. Explicitly and clearly, he has declared the Democratic Party to be the radical party of the Nation, and he has made it crystal clear that the Democratic Party, under his leadership, will continue turning further to the left. His program of legislation will continue to carry the country in the direction of State socialism, and he admits explicitly and clearly that his program shall include further centralization of Federal authority, deficit spending, radical class legislation, administration of the law to favor radical groups, curtailment of individual freedoms, a progressive nullification of the rights and privileges of the 48 States, and increasing circumscription and strangling of the American system of fair and free competition in business.

If the Republican Party is to be true to its obligations to the people of the Nation, it must declare itself to be in determined opposition to the program of radicalism offered by the other party. Our party must offer a home and a rallying place for the American voters of all parties who wish to express their disapproval of 16 years of radical encroachment and who wish to preserve that form of government and that way of life and that wise method of conducting our business affairs which made the United States of America the greatest and most progressive, the most powerful, and the most happy Nation on the earth; a wide-awake party that will fight for America, that will never submit to compromise, appeasement, or imitation, to stand firmly for the right as God gives us wisdom to see the right, to the end that America once more shall be free.

Revision of the Labor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McSWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, on February 2, 1949, requested that my office make a compilation of the questionnaire sent out by the General Electric Co., entitled "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" received by this office. I thought it would be of interest to my fellow Members of the House to give a report on this compilation. The result follows:

RESULT OF QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you believe that labor laws should in general preserve the employee's right to strike? Yes, 37; no, 7; no vote, 2.

2. Do you believe labor laws should give the President of the United States the right to seek, through the courts of law, to delay a strike that would cause a national emergency endangering the health and safety of the entire country? Yes, 44; no, 1; no vote, 1.

3. When two or more unions are fighting each other over who shall do a job or who shall represent the employees, and a strike is called to compel an employer to give to the members of one union the work or recognition being given to the other union—that is a jurisdictional strike. Should labor laws prohibit such strikes? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

4. Should labor laws prohibit secondary boycotts—that is, prevent an employer and his employees, where there is no labor dispute, from being damaged by a union seeking to coerce another employer having a labor dispute? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

5. Should labor laws provide that an employer cannot deduct union dues or assessments from wages unless the employee gives his personal O. K.? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

6. Do you believe labor laws should see to it that both employers and unions be required to bargain in good faith? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

7. Should labor laws give to both employees and employers the freedom to express their own points of view on employee-relations problems, provided such views, or arguments, or opinions do not promise bribes or threaten reprisals? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

8. Should labor laws protect the employee against unfair practices by unions and management? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

9. Do you believe that labor laws should require both union officials and company officials to swear they are not Communists or Fascists or members of any party or organization which plans to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence? Yes, 45; no, 1; no vote, 0.

10. Do you believe labor laws should require unions to make appropriate reports to members and Government as to handling of funds just as companies are required to make appropriate reports to owners and Government? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

11. Should labor laws make it clear that a collective-bargaining contract must be honored by both parties? And that each has an

equal right to sue the other for breaking the contract? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

12. Do you believe labor laws should make it unlawful for a union to compel an employer to engage in featherbedding; that is, to pay money for work which hasn't been done or won't be done? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

13. Should labor laws permit the forcing of an employer to hire only workers who belong to a given union? Yes, 5; no, 41; no vote, 0.

14. Do you believe it should be unlawful for an employee to be prevented from working by the use of violence, force, or intimidation? Yes, 43; no, 3; no vote, 0.

15. Do you believe foremen and other supervisors could properly perform their management duties of serving the balanced best interests of employees, customers, and owners alike if bargaining for supervisors by unions should be included in the labor laws? Yes, 4; no, 40; no vote, 1; don't know, 1.

16. Do you believe labor laws should protect individual workers in the right to join or not to join a union—to remain or not to remain members—just as they individually wish? Yes, 45; no, 1; no vote, 0.

17. Should labor laws make clear that both unions and employers can now so affect the public for good or ill that the labor-management relations of both should be regulated equally by law? Yes, 46; no, 0; no vote, 0.

18. Should labor laws provide that a striker who has been replaced in the course of an economic strike—not involving any unfair labor practice—be permitted to vote in an election to choose a bargaining agent at the conclusion of the strike? Yes, 15; no, 28; no vote, 3.

The total number of ballots received as of February 9, 1949 was 46. The occupations listed and the number of ballots for each were: Accountant, 3; banker, 3; city auditor, 1; city engineer, 1; clerk, 2; farmer, 1; forester, 1; gardener, 1; garage proprietor, 1; general contractor, 2; housewife, 1; industrialist, 1; loan company official, 1; lumberman, 1; manufacturer, 4; masseur, 1; physician, 1; plant superintendent, 1; retired, 2; sales manager, 5; salesmen, 5; spray painter, 1; supervisor, 1; teacher, 1; utilities official, 1; and company officials, 3.

Mr. Speaker, analysis indicates that practically no union labor is represented in the survey. Only one lists his occupation as spray painter. The others are either industrialists, supervisory officials or members of the professions. The ballot itself was worded around the abuses of unions and does not question the voter on how he feels about company black lists; unwarranted lay-offs timed to conincide with a strike on the part of the workers or the use of union spies and strikebreakers.

Some persons added to the list of questions the extension of the rent-control law and others qualified their answers.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the world stands aghast at the mockery of justice which the Hungarian Government has called a trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. Once more we are given an example of the ruthlessness of the followers of communism and of the need of unceasing efforts to crush the philosophy they espouse. The tremendous wave of moral indignation which has followed his arrest and sentence categorizes the action for what it truly is, a degrading attempt by the forces of intolerance and darkness to crush an individual who dares to champion the cause of liberty and justice.

Cardinal Mindszenty, standing in the prisoner's dock, symbolized within his frail exterior, the composite of all the basic human rights which freedom-loving peoples hold most sacred and dear and for which they have fought and bled through the ages. Cardinal Mindszenty represented these—the right of the individual to speak freely and to worship God according to his own belief.

The sentence passed on Cardinal Mindszenty could not by any stretch of the imagination condemn him because the truths which he embodied are eternal. Rather, standing convicted in the all-powerful tribunal of world opinion are his persecutors and communism, which sought to destroy, through this individual, the ideals he represented.

This is not only the fight of the Catholic Church, for communism is an atheistic force which fights any individual who would follow the word of God. It is the fight of every Catholic, Protestant, and Jew who would live under God in a way of life which encourages freedom, justice, opportunity, and kindliness for all. It is the fight of all who believe in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty stands today as the apostle of human dignity and freedom, a martyr to the democratic ideals in which we believe. His courage and devotion to principle will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times on February 10, 1949, entitled "Trial by Tyranny."

TRIAL BY TYRANNY

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, has been found guilty of treason and sentenced to life imprisonment.

The world-wide revulsion against the trial and the judgment means that in the court of mankind everywhere outside the iron curtain the action of the Hungarian judges has been reversed and rejected. World opinion on this case is so strong that the prediction may be made that Cardinal Mindszenty will not spend the rest of his life in prison. He will go free because the tyranny that convicted him will fall long before the convicted defendant lives his normal span of years.

Our Government has told the Communists, from Stalin down, that actions speak louder than words in international relations. The action against Cardinal Mindszenty certainly has proven how right we are. By the single action of the proceedings against Cardinal Mindszenty, the Communists have demonstrated the issue of major prestige that separates the east from the west.

That issue is whether the people themselves run the state or whether the state runs the people.

The court that tried Cardinal Mindszenty was called the People's Court. That was a mockery. The record shows it. After the war, Hungary had a free election. The Small Landowners' Party, headed by a Calvinist clergyman, won 59 percent of the votes. The Social Democrats had 18 percent, and the Communists only 17 percent. That was in November 1945. Presumably a people's government was to rule Hungary.

The Russians, whose soldiers were living off the land, operated the police and the interior department. The Russian Army commander of Hungary ordered a purge of youth organizations in 1946. In January 1947 the Communist police began making political arrests. Non-Communist political parties were undermined. On May 31 a coup was completed. The Russians took over the Government. While the Prime Minister, who was in office by right of the election, was vacationing in Switzerland, the Communists seized power and installed a Prime Minister of their own.

There had been a pledge at Yalta that the citizens of Hungary should have democratic institutions of their own choice. The Communists violated that agreement.

We can go back to our own Declaration of Independence. The Government in Hungary does not derive its just powers from the consent of the governed. It has established an absolute tyranny over the people. It has invaded the rights of the people. It has made judges of the court dependent on the will of the Communist bosses. It has taken away their charters, abolished valuable laws and altered fundamentally the forms of government.

It has intruded its powers into the field of opinion. In thousands of cases it has arrested, jailed, or executed men and women for treason to government which practices the doctrine that the people are, in effect, slaves of the state. Contrary to the declaration of human rights recently approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations, it has denied fair and public hearings by independent and impartial tribunals—especially cases in which the accused have stood up for the Hungarian people against those who insist on being their masters.

Stripped down to one naked issue, the charge against Cardinal Mindszenty was that he was a traitor to such a government. Before the court he said he had never wanted to come into conflict with the laws of the state; if events beyond his control brought him into such conflict, he regretted it. The events beyond his control made the laws with which he was in conflict. They were the events by which the agents of Moscow had grabbed the state. By his confession of guilt in principle, Cardinal Mindszenty was confessing only that he was opposing tyranny, that he was guilty of doing something which he hoped would restore the rule of the people. "I was not and I am not now an enemy of the Hungarian people," he said.

Look at that courtroom. The judges, the prosecutor, and even the cardinal's own lawyer were creatures of the state tyranny. In our own country there are two trials for treason now going on. The defendants have selected their own lawyers. Juries of their fellow countrymen will decide their guilt or innocence.

The court in Hungary was the sounding board for many of the Soviet's propaganda lies against the United States. We were accused as warmongers, as destroyers of democracy. It was the sounding board of propaganda against the Catholic Church. Our democracy and the church are honored by such propaganda under such circumstances. Whatever the faults of democracy and whatever the faults of the church, they remain the outstanding enemies of the doctrine that human beings are slaves of the state.

The essence of this celebrated case is that the cardinal is guilty of treason to communism. His reply was he had not been proven to be an enemy of the people. His stand was akin to that of Patrick Henry's: "If this be treason, make the most of it."

And the world is on his side.

Social Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the speech made by Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., at the annual brotherhood luncheon of the Variety Club of Washington, on February 14, 1949, as follows:

It is delightful to be here in the heart of show business on this day dedicated down through the ages to St. Valentine.

I accepted your gracious invitation in a spirit of deep humbleness. It would be presumptuous of me to feel otherwise.

What could I say about brotherhood to the members of Variety? To the motion-picture industry? To all of show business? Or to the members of the National Conference of Christians and Jews?

The whole creed of Variety is rooted deep in the concept of the brotherhood of man. It is the Good Samaritan.

No medium in all the world has done more to rip up the evil weeds of bigotry and intolerance than the American motion picture. No industry has done more in a practical and positive way to help bring about greater understanding among the diverse peoples of this earth.

To that end, it has been faithful to its heritage from all of show business through many centuries.

What an enthralling story of effective accomplishment has been written by the national conference which sponsors Brotherhood Week in America. My humbleness is well leavened by my pride in membership. What a magnificent thing it is to help give living reality to the immortal concept that all men are created equal.

But my pride is leavened in its turn by a frank recognition that we are a long way from absolute reality of that inspired and inspiring principle. I know that the conference would be the first to say that brotherhood is not a matter of a week, not a matter of a month, and not a matter of a year. That it is, instead, an urgent matter every hour in the lives of each of us.

Here in America, we are shaping what I would call a more perfect legal justice. But we are discovering that justice-before-the-law is not enough in the complex society we have spun about us.

To meet the needs of our modern industrial society, we should supplement legal justice with a new kind of justice—social justice—in the neighborhood, in the community, in the office, in the factory, the countinghouse and the warehouse, as we have enthroned justice-before-the-law in the courthouse.

That is what I want to talk about today, social justice.

What do I mean by social justice? Simply this: It is the decent, human thing to do in our day-by-day relations in our neighborhood, our community, within the factory and the shop, between the worker and the boss.

Social justice is a broader subject, as I see it, than brotherhood, intolerance, or bigotry. It embraces the ideal of brotherhood; it is the antithesis of intolerance; it is the contradiction of bigotry.

Intolerance, as we refer to it, is the prejudice of one man or one group for another on account of race or creed or color or nativity. Bigotry is intolerance raised to the nth power of hate and often spelled out in violence.

Social injustice goes far beyond those circumstrictions. It crops up within the ranks of Protestants; within the ranks of Catholics, of Jews, or of Negroes; within the ranks of the people of a single neighborhood, a single community, one country.

My neighbor may belong to my own church. His ancestors may have immigrated from the same country as mine. We may have identical backgrounds, but I can still be socially unjust to him, and nobody will accuse me of intolerance.

I can be socially unjust to my employee and go scot free from any intimation of bigotry.

I have a favorite example of what I mean by social justice, and it's as new in our time as last fall. It was last fall when Yale University's football squad elected Levi Jackson as its captain for 1949. Why was this young Negro chosen to lead the team this year? Just because he was a Negro? Because Yale wished to impress the collegiate world with its disdain for racial discrimination?

Not a bit of it. It was because young Mr. Jackson was the best man to lead the team—and that's social justice in society and of the graphic sort of kind. It was justice to young Mr. Jackson because he deserved that post of leadership on merit, and the team did justice to itself by choosing the best leader. There was no tolerance shown young Mr. Jackson at all. In fact, from what I've heard of the responsibility of a Yale football captain, his teammates handed him a heck of a job.

I want to see more social justice in industry and in our everyday lives on our jobs. How can that be done?

Like this, I think:

When the individual is treated as the most precious thing on earth, and the scales tip in favor of human rights ahead of property rights if the two conflict—that is social justice.

Social justice is a rectitude of mind, but it's as replete with reason and with common sense as it is with righteousness. It's not all altruistic. It isn't unadulterated idealism. It is a blend and an amalgam of good will and self-interest.

I like to think there is a practical approach to social justice in industry. That, actually, it is good business practice. The worker who feels in his heart that he's being treated fairly by his boss is more than apt to treat his boss fairly. Social justice uncovers talent and unleashes initiative and hope, and in industry there are dividends in that for everybody.

What sort of a world would we have if more men believed in and practiced social justice as proof of their belief?

I'd say we'd have a world in which human decencies supplanted inhumanities, and in which we treated our fellow man as we would like to have them treat us.

Why—if all the world practiced social justice—

How could there be war, for we would set a precious value on life itself?

How could there be class struggle, for each man would respect the inherent dignity of the other.

How could men anywhere be denied the right to choose freely the type of political, social, and economic order they desire if man is a sovereign being?

I realize that it will be said I am painting a social utopia. I am. I plead guilty. But I am not so naive that I expect it to burst full blast upon the world in my lifetime or in that of our children. I will be content with progress if it's steady, sure, and certain, even if I think it's slow.

When we look back on the development of justice before the law we find clues to the laggardness of social justice.

The evolution of justice before the law was a long and tortuous trial. Bogs of superstition and mountains of ignorance beset its way for centuries. The classics of the ages abound with the story of its struggle: trial by fire, by ordeal, and by poison.

Medieval stuff, we say, but less than 100 years before the Declaration of Independence women were hung as witches in the sanctified precincts of Salem; and less than 100 years ago the law of this land let one man enslave another.

We can always legislate a more perfect justice-before-the-law.

For industry, we can legislate a minimum wage and workmen's compensation; a 40-hour week and fair employment practices; collective bargaining and the right of peaceful picketing.

For society in general, we can legislate increased protection of minorities; for relief and welfare and against the major shortcoming of our system—the ones with ugly names like slums, inequality of opportunity; unfair distribution of our abundance.

We can always enact social legislation, but we cannot legislate social justice. Pure justice—legal justice—can be spelled out in the statute books, but social justice must be enrolled and engrossed in the hearts and minds of men. When it isn't, legal justice can turn to ashes, and it often does.

It took a long time for men to develop thinking habits which accept the tenets of justice-before-the-law as axioms. When we say every man is innocent until his guilt is established in impartial courts, we believe it as simply as we believe the sun will rise tomorrow. When we say that no man can be tried again for a crime of which he was acquitted, it is as firmly rooted in our belief as the knowledge that spring will follow winter.

We must develop the same kind of thinking habits with respect to social justice.

The great beginnings of established social justice are evident in such organizations as Variety and the National Conference of Christians and Jews. You have been a bell-ringer against intolerance, against bigotry, and you have exemplified the brotherhood of man.

Open the throttle on social justice, and there'll be no stopping it. It has all the makings for chain reaction. The more it's practiced, the more it will be perfected. And the better and tougher-fibered our society will be.

The tomorrow of democracy pivots on the spread of social justice.

John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of February 12, 1949:

JOHN LEWIS'S SIXTY-NINTH MILESTONE

If John L. Lewis, international president of the United Mine Workers of America, had the choice of a birthday he could not have made a better selection than fate decreed for him. While Lincoln and Kosciusko have prior claim to February 12, Mr. Lewis's activities and achievements as a crusader fully justify his arrival on a day of hallowed memories.

Mr. Lewis does not claim to be another Lincoln or Kosciusko. There could be only

one of each. But, in the troubled era through which the world is passing he has done a great deal to improve the lot of the mine workers and, through them, the lot of millions of other toilers in America and elsewhere. The impact of Mr. Lewis's personality has been world-wide.

Many do not wholly approve of Mr. Lewis and his methods at times. Perhaps, if the truth be known, Mr. Lewis himself would prefer an easier way to obtain results. But he has not flinched from the path of duty because of obstacles in the way. Nor has he ever hesitated to sacrifice popularity for principle. But those who denounce him in no uncertain terms have to admit he has improved conditions for the toilers and that, after all, was and is his objective.

Just as Lincoln was excoriated in his day and Kosciusko in his by royalists and their sympathizers, so John L. Lewis must be judged by the enemies he makes as well as by the cause he espouses.

The Mindszenty Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 8 the New York City Council considered a resolution condemning the prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. In a speech that has attracted wide attention, Councilman Walter R. Hart, of Brooklyn, answered Councilman Benjamin J. Davis, Manhattan Communist, when he opposed the resolution. Following Mr. Hart's speech the resolution was adopted by the council. The text of Mr. Hart's speech follows:

TEXT OF MR. HART'S SPEECH ON MINDSZENTY CASE

I suppose we will never live to see the day when a Communist member of this council will take the floor and admit that there is anything good in the United States or anything bad in Soviet Russia.

For the past half hour, Mr. Davis has bitterly condemned the President of the United States, our democratic institutions, and our judicial system and has praised to the highest degree the so-called democracy of Soviet Russia.

He states that the people of the United States of America are not interested in the resolution and that the whole thing is a tempest in a teapot.

The members of this council were not elected simply to sign the pay roll twice a month, but to express the will of the 8,000,000 people of the city of New York. I challenge Mr. Davis' right to speak on behalf of the people of the United States of America. On the other hand, I frankly concede his right to speak on behalf of Soviet Russia because I cannot deny that he is one of the official spokesmen of the Soviet Union and has acted as such during the entire time that he has been a member of this council.

NO DEMOCRACY IN COMMUNISM

When the word "democracy" comes forth from the lips of Mr. Davis or any other Communist I am overcome by a feeling of nausea. Democracy dies in any country with the advent of communism.

In making a comparison between the judicial system of the United States and that of Soviet-controlled Hungary, Mr. Davis complains of the jury system and reminds us of the fact that he is under indictment for conspiring to teach the overthrow of the United States Government by force. He contends that the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty demonstrates a superiority of the Soviet system of jurisprudence over that of the United States.

The fact of the matter is that, although Mr. Davis was indicted many months ago for one of the most serious offenses known to our law, he has been continuously out on nominal bail and is presently awaiting trial before a jury, members of which may be challenged and excused by his attorney. Under our law, Davis, though indicted, still has the protection of the presumption of innocence guaranteed under our law to all citizens. He sits in the courtroom alongside his attorney in a country so free that he is permitted to openly question the integrity of the judge who is trying the case as well as the system under which the jurors are selected.

SOVIET PROCESS

Under the Soviet process a defendant is never brought to trial until he confesses his guilt and until such confession is forthcoming, the defendant is kept in custody. As soon as an arrest is made one can predict with certainty the pattern that will be followed—incarceration, confession, trial, and sentence. It is true that the Soviet authorities are kind enough to spare the cardinal and his attorney the trouble and expense of selecting a jury; they select it for them.

In this case, although the state is prosecuting the defendant, and the state is the Communist Party, there have been selected two members of the Communist Party and three members affiliated with parties which have coalesced with the Communist Party. The Communist Party accuses, it incarcerates and procures a confession, it prosecutes and selects a judge and jury to determine the guilt of the accused. Now, Mr. Davis, where in the name of hell do you get off to have the unmitigated gall to complain about our judicial system?

HURLS CHALLENGE

You sit in this body by the grace of the Constitution of the United States and the State of New York. You vilify our democratic institutions and even the President of the United States. I challenge you to assert that I would be accorded the same privilege if I were a member of the Kremlin or any legislative body in Soviet Russia. Could I utter one word against Stalin and continue to live? Could I attack their judicial system and walk out of the chamber as you have continuously walked out of this legislative chamber after attacking our free institutions?

You say that this is not a democracy because racial discrimination and lynchings have occurred. I could add that murders and robberies also frequently take place. But all of these acts are in violation of our law and are performed by individuals with warped minds. Our fundamental law provides for racial and religious equality and the President of the United States has expressed his determination to enforce civil rights for all, irrespective of race, religion, or color. Under the Soviet regime the people are slaughtered for their political beliefs, not by individuals in violation of the law but by the government itself.

CARDINAL'S CRIME

In this case, according to the Communists, Cardinal Mindszenty has committed the unpardonable offense of believing in an Almighty God. For practicing and preaching he has been sentenced to imprisonment for life.

In your opinion, Davis, that is democracy. Let me inform you that it is the opinion of the 150,000,000 Americans whose ancestors came from every corner of God's earth and who represent every religious denomination that it is plain unadulterated materialism.

It is true that a Catholic is no better than a person of another religion, but I will fight with my last ounce of strength anyone who will say that because of his religion he is not as good. The character of a man is not dependent upon the religion he professes, but if he has a sincere devotion to the Almighty God, whether he worship Him in a cathedral or in the humblest synagogue, he is entitled to the respect of his fellow men.

Communists, who not only deny the existence of the Almighty, but incarcerate those who differ with them on this point, are not entitled to raise their voices in protest against our free institutions.

I call upon each and every member to vote for this resolution and am sure that, with the exception of the Communist member and those who do not have the courage to admit they are Communists but continuously follow the Communist Party line, that you will do so.

Family Doctor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Medical Association selects one of its own number as "the American family doctor of the year." This selection is made on the basis of a doctor's contribution to the health and welfare of the community he serves—that is, the association selects the physician who, in the opinion of the association, has rendered the greatest, most efficient, and outstanding medical service to an American community.

On December 2, 1948, the honor of being selected the "family doctor of the year" was bestowed upon Dr. William Lowry Pressly, of Due West, S. C. I know Dr. Pressly personally, and I know the American Medical Association made no mistake in its selection. In fact, I wish to congratulate the association for its recognition of a great American.

Dr. Pressly is a graduate of Emory University, and I include herein an article appearing in the January issue of the Emory Alumnus.

From the Emory Alumnus:

"BUCK" PRESSLY QUIT BASEBALL TO BECOME "THE" DR. PRESSLY

Thirty-three years ago, or back in 1915, "Buck" Pressly was a man of two considerable, widely varying talents, and he had to choose between them.

He was a professional baseball player, good enough to have earned $5,000 a year at the sport and to have been tendered (and rejected) a major-league contract. But he also had devoted 3 years' time, effort, and money to getting his doctor of medicine degree and three other years to internship and residency.

"Buck" Pressly chose medicine, and after netting $750 in his first year of practice, began to wonder "how I had come to make such a big mistake." Now he knows.

On December 2, 1948, his sixty-first birthday anniversary, Dr. William Lowry Pressly, 12M, that same "Buck" stood before the delegates to the convention of the American Medical Association in St. Louis, Mo., to receive one of the most meaningful and prized

honors open to a man of medicine: the gold-medal award as "family doctor of the year."

Dr. Pressly, who for all these last 33 years has been living in and practicing in and around the little college town of Due West, S. C., came within a whisker of getting the award a year ago, the first time it was offered. Then, though, he had been ranked as No. 2 in a field of 200 physicians nominated for the honor.

If the AMA had not placed Dr. Pressly at the top this year, it would have had the entire South Carolina Medical Association to contend with, for it was that group which nominated and backed him both years. More specifically, it was another Emory alumnus, Dr. Horace Whitworth, 38M, of Greenville, which is due north of Due West, who first suggested him as a candidate.

"His winning was really a great thrill to me," said Alumnus Whitworth, who is secretary of the Greenville County Medical Society. "I kind of started the whole thing and have watched it grow and have been close to the collection of data. When the AMA first wrote us about having such a selection, I began thinking about 'Dr. Buck' as a man who could win."

Especially does joy reign in little Due West, where Alumnus Pressly is first citizen and a little of everything else. It is particularly proud that not only has he done all his practice there but was born and reared there, attended college there, and in all his life has left there only long enough to get a medical education.

There are those of Due West's citizenry who recollect the good doctor's horseback and horse-and-buggy days, but there are more who know that he has worn out some 24 automobiles in caring for them. In the course of his practice, he has delivered 4,200 babies, several times the total present population of his town.

Many's the patient he's taken to the larger centers of Anderson, Abbeville, and Greenville in his own car for treatment. He has often accompanied them to farther-removed places like Duke University, Boston, or Baltimore, remained with them until after serious operations, then returned to his home by plane.

It's only the complicated cases which require treatment elsewhere, though, for "Dr. Buck" by now well set up to handle most ailments—he and his well-equipped clinic with a staff comprising another general practitioner and a pediatrician, two nurses, a maid, and an orderly.

"He's just a born doctor," says one neighbor. "He's either in his office or out among his patients from 7:30 each morning until about 10 at night, when the last patient is treated in the office. In addition, I believe he is called out of bed at least half of the nights."

The wonder is that Dr. Pressly ever gets to bed, with all he takes on. Besides his general practice, which is at least a two-man job, he is physician for Due West's Erskine College and its athletic teams and surgeon for the Southern Railway. Furthermore, he serves as licensed pharmacist for the drug store in the nearby village of Donalds, which is too small to support a pharmacist.

Too, he is known in his region as "the father of public health," a title which originated when, as a young doctor, he went throughout his county vaccinating against typhoid fever at his own expense all who would let him. That was during a rampant epidemic and marked the beginning of free immunization in his area. Typhoid now is almost unknown there.

He also has sponsored well-baby clinics. But these are only his medical activities. On the side, Dr. Pressly for 26 years has been a trustee of Erskine, from which he received his A. B. and where his father taught ancient languages; for 20 years, a deacon in his church, and for 18, a member of the Due West School Board.

He has promoted the organization of a Boy Scout baseball league and the importation of high-grade beef cattle and hogs into his county; has been active in organizing the Grange and erecting its building, in obtaining better schools and improved medical service for the Negroes of his community, and in organizing a community service club. In World War I he went away briefly to serve as an Army medical officer; in World War II he stayed home and held a variety of jobs, among them that of assignment and procurement officer for medical men in South Carolina.

Long go the ability, energy, and willingness of Alumnus Pressly became known to doctors far beyond the bounds of Due West. He is, or has been, for instance, a member of the AMA Council on Medical Education; chairman of the Southern Medical Association's section on general practice; and president of his State, district, and county medical associations and societies.

Dr. Pressly in 1909–12 attended the Atlanta College of Physicians and Surgeons, which a few years later was merged into the Emory University School of Medicine. A catcher on the college baseball team during his undergraduate days at Erskine, he continued to play ball in the summers during his medical school years—but on a professional basis.

Beginning as first baseman for the Roanoke club of the Virginia league, he became playing manager after his first year and in 1912 the Pressly-run team won the league pennant. His $5,000 manager's salary looked good, especially in those days.

But after interning in Roanoke's Jefferson Hospital, he came back to Due West in 1915, and in June of that year married a Roanoke girl, Miss Elma Lipscomb. She died in September 1948. Everybody in Due West, of course, knows Dr. Pressly, and everybody has for decades. To them he's either "Dr. Buck" or "Buck." He's so well known that, to quote Dean of Women Elizabeth Nickles, of Erskine, "I would say he's cured as many with his infectious smile as with his medical skill."

Along with his nomination there went to the AMA a vast stack of letters from "Dr. Buck's" home-town friends, white and colored.

And when he came back with his award there awaited him hundreds of congratulatory messages from South Carolinians, from medical men and from Emory.

One of the most appropriate comments came from a close and long-time friend, Dr. W. Thomas Brockman, of Greenville, who said: "I can say 'Buck' has brought to South Carolina her greatest medical honor, and it is our hope that the general practice of medicine will become more popular because of him."

Emory, which is doing its best to encourage the general practitioner, hopes so too.

Lincoln Day Address of Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress from the Fourth District, Fairfield County, Conn., at the Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Kalamazoo County Republican Organization, Kalamazoo, Mich., on February 11, 1949:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly happy to be with you all here in your attractive city on the eve of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln. I say this for a number of reasons.

First, because I am here as the guest of my good friend, PAUL SHAFER, who has for many years represented the Third District of Michigan with industry and conscientiousness in the Congress of the United States. Paul is one of the most beloved Members of the House of Representatives. It has been my good fortune to know him well during the time that I have been in Congress, and I can with all sincerity congratulate the people of Kalamazoo upon their choice.

Second, I am glad to be here because I have a strong strain of Dutch blood and I know how many Hollanders came to Kalamazoo to settle and to escape religious persecution.

And third, I am glad to be here on this particular evening because it was here that Abraham Lincoln delivered a memorable address. It was here by the River of the Boiling Pot that the political pot really began to boil in the pre-Civil War days. And it is here tonight that we should make the Republican political pot boil for 1950 and 1952.

On Wednesday, August 27, 1856, under a clear blue sky Abraham Lincoln made one of his most significant speeches to an audience estimated as high as 30,000 people. It was as a result of this speech that Zachariah Chandler, a fanatical sectionalist from Detroit, became the life-long enemy of Abraham Lincoln.

The Detroit Daily Advertiser gives a most interesting and colorful report of the Kalamazoo occasion. Apparently there were nine bands of music and a free public table which was replenished as fast as it was emptied. It appears that 2 tons of bread and 400 hams were consumed. The table was over a hundred feet in length with cross tables and was supplied with many kinds of food. Delegations traveling in caravans began arriving in Kalamazoo several days prior to the event. The Valley City and the Grand Rapids bands were there and it is said that pilgrims came in wagons in a procession 3½ miles long in a great cloud of dust which arose from the dry roads, at times enveloping vehicles, horses, and human beings.

Lincoln's effort was to preserve the Union. He had adopted a conciliatory attitude in his speech in an effort to prevent civil war. Zachariah Chandler, candidate for the Senate from Michigan, was a power with the Abolitionists. He regarded Lincoln's speech only as an effort to undermine his own influence and not as a sincere attempt to avoid civil war. But Michigan fought Lincoln's battle valiantly and in the end smashed the Chandler machine. Although General Fremont was defeated for the Presidency in the fall of that year, Lincoln achieved great political momentum at Kalamazoo.

And so I think it is most fitting that we should gather here tonight to celebrate the birthday of this great and noble man, and to reconsecrate ourselves to those principles for which he labored, for which he fought and for which he died—principles to which he gave dynamic impetus 2 years after the birth of the Republican Party when he stood upon a platform here at Kalamazoo, his long, gaunt frame at ease as he gazed over the heads of the crowd.

The Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, will survive. It will triumph. The survival of the Republican Party is important. It is important not only to the Republicans; it is important to all Americans. On its survival may well hinge the survival of the two-party system. The Republican

Party is the only political force standing between the American people and one-party government. Without the two-party system the entire political fabric of America would be altered for we should then have either a series of splinter parties as in Europe or we should have one party. A one-party system would completely invalidate our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and all our free institutions. A splinter-party system would produce chaos and would create such confusion that economic stability would be impossible and national security would be dangerously compromised. The two-party system is perhaps the most important bulwark of freedom in America.

That the two-party system is still vital is evidenced by the fact that almost 22,000,000 people voted for Thomas E. Dewey as against slightly more than 24,000,000 people who voted for President Truman. The other candidates gathered relatively little support. It can, therefore, be concluded that the people of America are certainly not of one mind, that they believe in the two-party system and that the Republican Party has a numerous and influential following.

Yet although the voters cast a preponderant number of votes for the Republican and Democratic candidates, there is without question an increasing number of independent voters in our country. More and more people feel less and less bound by party affiliations. It should also be remembered that some 45,000,000 people failed to vote. These people must be persuaded to vote. They must be persuaded to vote Republican. This will be to their advantage and it is most emphatically in the national interest. We Americans stand today upon a pinnacle of power and prestige, with the floodlights of the world upon us. We must give a vigorous demonstration that we appreciate the value of our franchise and that our two-party system remains an active symbol of our right to disagree with each other and with our Government.

It has become the fashion in certain quarters to suppose that the Republican Party must either adopt a me-too philosophy or succumb to the stultifying horse-and-buggy doctrines which take no account of the present needs and aspirations of the American people. This type of thinking is encouraged particularly by those who have gained temporary political ascendancy. It has made many victims. Yet the recent elections do not indicate this to be the case. Neither can such a limitation of choice be justified by reason.

The fact of the matter is that the Republican Party is the party of American principles—principles which received strong and eloquent expression by Abraham Lincoln. That these principles are timeless in their validity is further evidenced by the fact that the Democratic Party gives them lip-service while recommending policies which would tend to destroy them. If one could believe the Democrats' heated protestations of faith in the private property free competitive system, the Democratic Party would be the me-too party. Actually, Democratic actions frequently constitute a betrayal of that system. Accordingly, the Republican Party is faced with a clear-cut issue of principle.

Indeed, the value and the present power of these immortal principles is further illustrated by the fact that none other than the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, is to make a Lincoln's Day address at Springfield, Illinois. In these circumstances, I may perhaps be forgiven if I quote the words of Thomas Jefferson: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread * * * when all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive." Ladies and gentlemen, this is the issue. This is the challenge. And it was Lincoln himself who remarked: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society." This, then, was American principle and it is still deeply imbedded in the convictions of most Americans. Under a deceptive fog of hypocritical incantations on the altar of free enterprise, the Democrat Party has departed from these principles.

The choice then is not between a philosophy which was never the philosophy of Lincoln and the much advertised "liberalism" of the Democrat Party. The choice is between the true philosophy of Lincoln and Jefferson—the American philosophy—the true liberalism—and a philosophy which breeds such a dependence on government that the government becomes the master of the people. Lincoln said: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference is no democracy."

That our choice is not between reaction and "me-tooism" is further illustrated by the felicitous fact that there is a large middle ground for useful governmental action. Truth is rarely black or white. It is usually composed of grays and shadows. Indeed, it is usually found in the moderate middle road and not in the extremes, however heady and attractive they may seem at the moment. Now there are many accommodations which government should make to modern needs. In a Nation of our industrial power and productivity abject poverty and extreme hardship can and must be prevented. While many of these problems are primarily for the States and municipalities, there is a substantial area for limited and directed Federal aid. There are many instances where the Federal Government should step in and fill the gaps where our private property system does not reach. Yes, the health of our Nation and the education of its citizens, old-age pensions and social security, minimum wages and unemployment compensation, large-scale production and full employment, rural electrification and flood control, adequate housing and soil conservation are all matters for proper Federal concern. They all involve the people's welfare. But it is most important how these objectives are approached, and it is all important to bear in mind that the essential the ultimate welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free system.

Thus, today 25 cents out of every dollar that we spend pays for the cost of Government, 25 cents out of every dollar is taxes. One day out of every four we work for the Government; we work to pay for the cost of government. Aid to the unfortunate in our society is right and just and feasible. But a policy of Government pensions and subsidies to all would result in a tax burden which would destroy taxable property rather than increase it. It would be subject to the law of diminishing returns. It would be confiscatory. It would dry up the sources of Government revenue. It would destroy incentives. Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere." We shall do well to be guided by this thoughtful declaration.

We must cut our suit according to our cloth. There is a limit to what the American economy can bear in the way of taxes and still retain the resiliency which is its prime virtue. There is a limit to the social welfare operations which we can undertake and still expand our economy. In order to provide more jobs and higher wages, in order to increase our standard of living, we must increase and improve our tools of production. This we cannot do if incentives are stifled, if risk investments are made so risky that people won't take a chance.

This is the paramount interest of all our citizens and in particular of labor. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to the workingman to discourage such investments. The Republican Party must help the working men and women of America in the protection of their real interests. Their real interests lie in the preservation and development of the American system.

The interests of the people who work come ahead of the interests of capital and this is traditional Republican policy. Lincoln said: "Capital, which is only the fruit of labor, could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves the much higher consideration." And he went on to say: "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interests should, after awhile, accumulate property and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace, is right."

Lincoln also said: "The prudent, penniless beginner in the world labors for wages awhile, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all and consequently an improvement of condition to all." In order to retain the right to enjoy the fruits of his labor, it is imperative that the working man should not be weighted down with taxes.

Accordingly, we must establish an order of priority in governmental expenditures.

Surely, the defense of our country and the maintenance of peace are primary considerations. Any social gains we make will melt like snow in the sun if we have war. We must achieve air superiority. We must maintain a strong Navy and increase our Army. We must have trained reserve components to throw into the breach if necessary. We must with vigilant supervision continue the European recovery program in order to create in Europe a political climate propitious for the preservation of freedom. We must help Europe to federate. We must, under the proper conditions, extend military lend-lease to certain nations, and assist them to organize their defense on European rather than on national considerations. We must support the United Nations. In short, we must give first priority to our own survival, firm in the knowledge that peace cannot be preserved unless justice is safeguarded.

For we are faced with the relentless fact that although we are legally at peace actually we are inextricably engaged in a mortal conflict of titanic proportions. It has been called a cold war. It is, in fact, a real war in China, in Greece, and in other parts of our troubled planet. And it is a fight for freedom which we have lost in Poland, in Hungary, in Roumania, in Bulgaria, in Czechoslovakia, in Albania, in Latvia, in Estonia, in Lithuania, and in Yugoslavia. It is a war which is almost lost in China and which is far from won in Greece. We know from grim and recent experience that when freedom succumbs in these countries freedom in America is threatened.

That our peace is precarious is underscored by the further fact that out of every dollar that we spend in taxes, 75 cents goes to the issue of war and peace. Out of that 75 cents, 30 cents goes to our national defense; 16 cents for payments to veterans; 17 cents for European recovery, aid to Greece and other items of foreign aid; and 12 cents for interest on the national debt, a national debt of $252,000,000,000 a national debt incurred chiefly as a result of World War II.

Is it not clear then that we must, in the interest of our national security—of which our economic health is such an essential part—postpone some social legislation, however desirable it may be, in order to achieve the larger, primary objective of world peace and security? Is not the security of the American people affected first and foremost by the issue of war and peace, and secondarily by social welfare measures, however great their intrinsic worth?

Oh, the Communists would be delighted were we to succumb to the siren call of womb-to-grave security fostered by paternalistic planners and administered at great cost to the people. The Communists are striving to induce the American people to embark upon a course which will cause a break-down in the American economy as well as in the American character. Don't forget—the Communists are waging their war on all fronts. They are lying in readiness to take immediate advantage of any weakness. If we attempt to shift our individual burdens to the Government, we shall, in the end, forfeit individual freedom. We shall have abandoned the principles of Abraham Lincoln for Lincoln believed that the individual is the complex heart of society.

Individual freedom. That is the urgent, the exciting challenge to our generation of Americans. The Republican party must rise and meet that challenge in the same crusading spirit which it manifested in 1856 when it sought to abolish slavery and in the succeeding years when it strove to protect the people's freedom against special predatory interests.

We are at this very moment fighting for our lives. In order to win that fight and in order for the Government to remain the servant of the people, it is necessary that the people should discharge the responsibilities which are inseparable from freedom.

We Americans who occupy the spotlight of leadership must strain our minds and our hearts in order to keep pace with the vast ebb and flow of thought and action on our restless planet. In order for America to prosper economically we cannot sit back and live on our income; we must create new wealth. Similarly, in order for us to meet the challenge of dialectical materialism we cannot seek nostalgic refuge in the accomplishments of our ancestors. In the words of Abraham Lincoln: "You cannot escape history."

Acting on the eternal varities which inspired our forefathers to great deeds, we too can blaze a trail of noble achievement; we can be the creators of traditions which will light the way for our descendants.

We shall have failed miserably and, in the end, utterly to grasp the import of these fateful hours if we persist in combating the brutal materialism cleverly and militantly preached by the cynical exponents of communism with apathetic and unconvincing reassertions of truths to which we give half-hearted and mealy-mouthed lip-service.

We shall be hoist with our own materialism if we do not replace the tired and hypocritical platitudes which betray our essential lack of faith with the dynamic actions which are the result of devoted thought and deep conviction.

In fact, it would appear that our failure to treat material forces as a means rather than as an end is one of the prime causes of nihilism, whether red, black, or brown.

Deep down in that dumb region of the heart in which we dwell alone, we know this to be true. We know that we have allowed our goal to become indistinct. We know that the distractions preserved for us by the blood of our fighting men are turning us away from the main job. We know that there is no open sesame out of our difficulties. We know that our material world will crash in splinters around us if it has no lofty thoughts to hold it up.

But, ladies and gentlemen, we know also that we have it within our power to meet the challenge of communism just as we met the challenge of nazism. The men who died in World War II did not die for materialism. You cannot pay a man for the loss of his life. We cannot meet the challenge of communism until we recognize its true nature. As the true challenge emerges sharp and clear from the fog of doubt and despair which has blurred our vision, the American people will rise in all their spiritual might. They have shown that they are capable of great courage and sacrifice. They will set in motion massive forces which will overwhelm our godless adversaries. Freedom will triumph over tyranny.

This is our party's opportunity for distinguished service. This is the challenge to the Republican Party. This is the challenge to America.

Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader:

CITY IS CENTER OF THIRD LARGEST METROPOLITAN AREA IN THE STATE—POPULATION OF 441,518 PLACES WILKES-BARRE NEXT TO PHILADELPHIA AND PITTSBURGH—SCRANTON IS FIFTH

Wilkes-Barre today was officially recognized by the United States Government as the third largest metropolitan area in the State of Pennsylvania.

Only the Philadelphia-Camden and the Pittsburgh areas surpass Wilkes-Barre in tabulations received by J. Arthur Bolender, executive secretary of the Wilkes-Barre-Wyoming Valley Chamber of Commerce. The announcement came from Loring Wood, chairman of the Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Areas.

The official population figures given the Wilkes-Barre area in the survey which determined its standing as a metropolitan area is 441,518.

The top-ranking Philadelphia-Camden area's population is listed at 2,956,296. Next comes Pittsburgh with a total of 2,126,801.

Wilkes-Barre is third, and then comes Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton area with a total population of 346,492.

Scranton is listed in fifth place with a total population of 301,243.

Other metropolitan areas established in Pennsylvania and the order in which they appear, according to population, follow: Reading, 241,884; Johnstown, 213,459; Lancaster, 212,504; Erie, 180,889; York, 178,002; Harrisburg, 177,410; and Altoona, 140,358.

Preliminary work on the program of establishing standard metropolitan areas was started in 1946. The Federal Committee on Standard Metropolitan Areas was set up by the Budget Bureau late in 1947. The survey on which the area classification is based extends up to and including January 30 of this year.

STANDARDS FOR AREAS

According to the definition of what the Federal Government regards as a metropolitan area, "each standard metropolitan area must include at least one city of 50,000 or more. The area as a whole must have a total population of at least 100,000. Areas may cross State lines."

Generally speaking, the metropolitan areas are set up on a county basis except in the New England States.

The Federal Government recommends the use of standard metropolitan areas by all Federal agencies compiling statistical data for general use.

The area itself will benefit because of the more uniform set of figures which might readily be used to serve as a guide to businessmen and industrial firms making surveys, particularly with the idea of deciding on business or plant locations.

The Internal Situation in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, in the last few months the situation in China has been getting steadily worse. Many of us in the Congress believe that it is still not too late to do something. I have been particularly interested in an appraisal of Chinese communism by Prof. Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard University Law School and a man deeply respected by American lawyers everywhere. Professor Pound served as adviser in the Chinese Ministry of Justice.

I want to call attention to the following article of his which appeared in the Harvard Law School Record for February 9 last:

ROSCOE POUND'S ANALYSIS OF CHINESE-AMERICAN AFFAIRS—HITS UNITED STATES AIMS FOR COMPROMISE, MISCONCEPTION OF RED ROLE

American policy in the Far East ought to take into account more than China. It should take account of China, Korea, and Japan in one comprehensive and consistent policy—even one comprehensive Asiatic policy. Indeed, it should be part of a world-wide policy of at least ranging ourselves with the constitutional governments which are endeavoring to set up democracies operating under law. Economic unification of the world, the bringing of every part of the world to our back door by radio and aerial transportation require that a foreign policy look at the world as a whole. It should look at this land or that with respect to the whole and as to the effect of what we do or leave undone upon the picture of the whole world.

Such has not been the American policy as to China since the war. Our policy has been one of consistent and insistent pressure upon the national government of China to compromise with the Communists where no compromise was possible. Before the Chinese constitution was adopted, abrogation of the frame of government under which China had been unified in a national government was demanded and today, while the national government is functioning under a constitution, summary throwing over of that constitution is a prime item in the Communist demands. If any proof was needed, what has happened in Czechoslovakia is proof that no middle way is possible under Communist domination. It shows no less that Communists with Russia behind them will accept nothing short of complete domination. Witness what has been happening in Yugoslavia. Coalition of a constitutional government operating under a bill of rights with Communists is impossible except on the terms in which Mark Twain characterized the Biblical prophecy of the lion and the lamb lying down together—the lamb inside.

Our policy has been in effect to undermine the morale of an exhausted and war weary

people by insisting that it could have peace only by yielding to the Communist demands by compromise amounting to abdication. We must remember that recent China has been long and severely afflicted by war. One might begin with the Opium War in 1840 when a western power forced opium on the Chinese Government of that day. Aggression went on for a generation, and in 1885 France sliced off a great territory. There followed continual and increasing extortion of cessions and concessions by European powers and successive insurrections. At the time of the Boxer Rebellion the European powers and the United States intervened. There were no less than 11 insurrections in 25 years before 1911–12 when the monarchy collapsed. Then followed a long struggle from 1912 to 1928 with the war lords. In 1931 the Japanese set up a puppet regime in Manchuria and began a series of aggressions culminating in the invasion of 1937 and 8 years of occupation of a large and richest part of the country. With the expulsion of the Japanese and while reconstruction was going on the Communists set up a civil war. All this weakened the will of the pepole to resist, and we have made it weaker by persistent calling upon the government to give in. It must be remembered also that during the war, without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese people, we undertook to give away not a little of Chinese territory.

CHINESE COMMUNISM

I hear it said that Chinese communism is only a mild socialism, distinct in all but name from the Soviet brand. The conclusive answer to this can be seen in emphatic pronouncements from Chinese Communists themselves as to the place of communism in China in the world Communist regime promoted in Russia. Even more an answer is to be found in what has happened in Poland and in Czechoslovakia. What so-called liberation by communism means is brought out by Bernard Goldstein, the only leader of the Jewish community in Warsaw at the time of the liberation by Russia. Goldstein was a Socialist. But this was not enough. He tells us that he soon found that the liberation was but another destroying tyranny.

What speaks for itself is the flow of refugees by tens and hundreds of thousands from the Communist-occupied areas to national centers where the Government has found shelter for them, fed them, and provided work for them. There is no such flow into the liberated areas; it is only out of them.

Communist demand for abrogation of the constitution means abrogation of the bill of rights. The bill of rights in the Chinese Constitution is not a mere preachment. It is safeguarded by an independent judicial yuan—an independent coordinate department of government—in which the grand justices have the ultimate power of interpreting the constitution and are authorized to enforce the express provisions of the constitution that executive acts and ordinances and legislative acts in contravention of the constitution are null and void. Demand that this excellent modern constitution, put into effect at the end of 1946, be thrown over before it has had a fair chance to operate, and while the Government was in the throes of reconstruction after a long hard war on its own soil, is but an example of what Communists do the world over in setting up despotic military regimes intolerant of individual rights and repressive of all freedom of belief, opinion writing, and teaching.

AMERICAN PRESSURE ON THE CHINESE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

For 3 years in which I served as adviser to the Chinese ministry of justice, I saw the effect of constant pressure from America on the Chinese Government while it was struggling with a huge task of reconstruction. It was setting up a constitutional government and putting the constitutional organization in operation thereunder. It was restoring the courts and judicial organization and the administration of justice, disrupted by the Japanese. It was restoring the educational system and rebuilding educational institutions. It was restoring and rebuilding penal and correctional institutions, often torn down and everywhere left seriously impaired by the Japanese occupation. It was reconstructing the process of administration. It was rebuilding bridges, railroads, roads, and lines of communication and transportation destroyed or dislocated by the Japanese during 8 years of holding the greater part of the country. Within a year from the time the National Government got back from Chungking the work of reconstruction had made marvelous progress. I conducted a thorough survey of the administration of justice in three provinces and six cities, and could report to the ministry that the courts, the codes, and the correctional institutions were functioning well, and in spite of many difficulties growing out of the Japanese occupation the administration of justice in eastern China would bear comparison with the administration of justice on the Continent of Europe and in America. There has been a tendency in America to be unreasonable in what was expected of the National Government in China. It was impossible to expect 100-percent constitutional democracy and 100-percent perfect administration of justice of a country of continental extent and 400,000,000 population which had never known democratic political institutions nor justice, according to law in the western sense. It was impossible to expect this perfection to be achieved in a generation after the revolution of 1911–12, two-thirds of which was taken up with fighting to establish a national government against the war lords and in standing out against Japanese invasion and occupation, and the remaining time largely taken up in resisting the Communists. When looked at on the background of these difficulties the work of the National Government since 1928 deserves all praise.

We must bear in mind that China had to suffer more and fight longer than any other of the Allied countries or German occupied countries in the Second World War. What the Government had to do was to set up a well organized, modern, constitutional democratic state operating according to law. When this was done it could go about fundamental economic and social reforms. But to try these while endeavoring to set up constitutional government might have defeated both. Chinese popular habits of thought and conduct which had crystallized for ages were not to be remade over night. As I have put it before, form had to come before reform. Let us not forget that we have serious problems of race prejudice and discrimination and of class relations in this country which we have left unsolved for much more than a generation. We do not consider our policy inefficient or reactionary because we have not solved them.

COMMUNIST CLAIMS AS TO SOCIAL REFORMS

I have heard it said that explanation of the progress made by the Communists in China is to be found in neglect of the National Government to take up and push certain fundamental social reforms undertaken and carried forward by the Communists. I have heard it said that these are four: Education of the peasantry, agrarian reform, the youth movement, and the advancement of women.

I suspect that Communist education of the peasantry is simply indoctrination in communism. Over a large part of China the National Government has had to do over again much of what it had achieved in the way of popular education. As to education of the peasantry I have in my possession some charts which I found in more than one place which were used for teaching good agricultural methods and how to read at the same time. One institution in Soochow is devoted to the training of teachers to carry forward this mode of instructing the peasants. It will not do to say that the Government has been doing nothing for peasant education.

I have heard it said repeatedly that the Chinese peasant is under a feudal system of land tenure. Nothing could be more mistaken. The difficulties of the Chinese peasant do not arise from feudalism or from large estates that need breaking up. As far back as the third century B. C. the Chinese abolished feudal tenure and primogeniture. The agrarian problem in China grows out of the very success of that reform which caused the land to be divided and subdivided endlessly. The trouble is not too large estates but minute farms too small to sustain a population sometimes denser in rural areas than in cities of the west. This has been aggravated by the introduction of a western law of inheritance which makes for increased subdivision. Where there had been a household inheritance, a system borrowed from continental Europe has introduced a modern individual inheritance. When an owner of a small tract dies leaving five children instead of the household succeeding, the inheritance must be divided into five. This makes against use of the implements we use, and yet the Chinese farmer gets a larger yield from an acre than cultivators of Europe or America. Next to minute subdivision of the land, his troubles arise from the complete dislocation of transportation and so of distribution during the Japanese occupation.

As to the youth movement, it has gone forward in the domain of the Government quite as much as elsewhere in the world. The Communists have no exclusive claim in this respect.

As to the advancement of women, subdivision (7) of article 26 of the constitution provides for election by women's organizations of delegates to the National Assembly or National Peoples Congress, the body which elects the president and vice president, and has power of amendment of the constitution. At the session last spring in which the constitutional government was organized a number of women sat as delegates. Also a number of women have been elected as members of the legislative yuan, and in the course of the survey of the administration of justice in eastern China I found women judges in many of the courts. In each of the cities which I visited I found a woman judge sitting in domestic relations cases and cases of juvenile delinquency. I doubt very much whether the Communists have done anything comparable to what the Government has achieved in this connection.

I have heard it said that while the Government was carrying on the war, the Communists were reaching the people through a program of social reform. What this really comes to is that while the Government was exerting itself to the utmost to set the country free from the Japanese occupation, and since the war has been exerting itself to the utmost with difficult problems of reconstruction, the Communists have been active in indoctrinating in communism and in destruction.

OBJECTIONS RAISED TO STANDING BY THE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

Let me speak briefly of the objections which are raised to our standing by a government which we treated as an ally during the war—a government which is one of the United Nations. It is said frequently that the Chinese officials and public men are reactionary. In my experience what is said to be their reactionary attitude is simply one of inquiry whether measures proposed to be borrowed from the Western World are applicable in China. It does not take long

for an adviser of one of the ministries to learn that much which he has been inclined to urge at first sight needs thorough examination to be assured that it can be made to work under the conditions in which it must be applied. Much is said about corruption of Chinese officials and public men. I inquired very carefully as to corruption in the administration of justice, conferring with bankers, businessmen, industrialists, members of chambers of commerce, and newspapermen. In no case could I get anything specific. Under the monarchy corruption was notorious. There was a general feeling that under the courts as they are today nothing but a tradition of suspicion could be shown. One newspaperman suggested to me that the pay of the judges was so inadequate that it stood to reason they must be corrupt or they could not live. In fact, I found the judges with inadequate salaries eke out their meager salaries by teaching law. This is something which such lights of our American bench as Joseph Story and Thomas McIntyre Cooley did and many other judges have had to do in American judicial history. It is said also that the Chinese officials and public men are ignorant and inefficient. Association with them for 14 years has convinced me that this is quite unfounded.

Let me name a few with whom I had especially long and close association. Dr. Wang Chen-hui, head of the judicial Yuan, is a D. C. L. of Yale and barrister of Gray's Inn. He is recognized as an outstanding jurist everywhere. His translation of the German Civil Code into English is regarded as a classic. Dr. Hsieh Kwan-sheng is a docteur en droit of the University of Paris, author of a history of Chinese law in French, published in France. He did signal work in keeping the machinery of justice going during the war and his experimental court at Chungking to try out the draft code of civil procedure was a real contribution to the science of law. Dr. Su, the Minister of Education, a doctor of philosophy of Berlin, is a learned scholar and liberal administrator of great good sense. His judgment as to what is practicable in legal education in China has been of real value for reconstruction. Judge Y. H. Kuo, president of the high court of Shanghai, would be a notable judge anywhere. Just before leaving I made a report on his draft of a statute on conflict of laws. It is a masterly piece of work, much better than the draft prepared for the Pan-American Congress of codification of law for the Western Hemisphere. No American city has a better court than his.

I have heard complaint that the Chinese officials do not take advice. On the contrary, I suspect they sometimes have relied too much upon advice from experts from the Western World unacquainted with the conditions to which their advice was to be applied. At any rate, I have found that the Chinese officials give marked attention to advice so far as money is available to carry it out. Where they do not it is usually because of lack of money to do what ideals indicate. Under the constitution the legislature controls the funds and officials can do no more than appropriations allow.

Complaint has been made in this country that the Government ignores minority parties other than the Communists. These minority parties, however, are made up of leaders with few or no followers as it was demonstrated at the time of the first elections under the constitution when the majority party agreed to withdraw its candidates in certain districts and leave a free field for the minority parties. Very generally candidates ran by petition and defeated the candidates of these parties at the election. Moreover one of the leaders of a minority party which has probably the most following is listed by the Communists as a war criminal along with the leaders of the majority party.

I hear it said also that the Government has been guilty of gross violations of the constitution. As to this it should be noted that the constitution was not in force until the end of 1946 and the Government was not fully organized under it until the spring of 1948. Much of what I have read is based on conditions during the war which, of course, were abnormal. In the second place, it must be remembered that civil war is still in progress. We in America have not been too scrupulous to enforce the Bill of Rights or adhere to the strict terms of the Constitution in times of civil war or even of world war. President Lincoln was accused of violation of the Constitution during our Civil War. The action of our Government toward citizens of Japanese birth in California or its setting up of military rule in Hawaii and superseding of the courts there during the last world war serve to remind us that a bill of rights is sometimes embarrassing to a government under the stress of war. But certainly it is not for the Communists to preach adherence to a constitution.

Again, it is complained that the Government employs a secret police. But we maintain a secret service and certainly the FBI do not go about in uniform. Moreover, the third degree has had a high development with us even in time of peace. When war is in progress and a fifth column is active a government cannot confine itself to a uniformed police. Detectives in plain clothes are an everyday matter even in time of peace.

What can the Communists show in the way of constructive achievements even remotely to compare with what the Chinese National Government has done under the greatest of difficulties in the way of building up a constitutional regime and in reconstruction after 8 years of enemy occupation?

WHAT COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CHINA WILL MEAN

Will Communist domination mean a country with which we in America can have commercial relations such as we have had increasingly for 100 years? Will it mean a country with which we can have the cultural relations which we have maintained increasingly for more than 50 years? One has only to look at the pronouncements of the Chinese Communists as to American relations to answer these questions.

What, then, are we to do in our relations with a Communist regime? For one thing, I submit we must bear in mind the effect of what we do on Korea, on Japan, and indeed on all Asia if not on Continental Europe. We must remember the effect of what we do on the remnant in China for the situation need not be more despaired of than when the Japanese occupied the best part of the land. If we give continued aid and comfort to the Chinese Communists by our attitude toward even the remnant of the national government we shall be undoing what we have been striving to do toward maintaining democratic constitutional government in other parts of the world.

Time To Build Homes, Not To Talk About Them

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News of February 14, 1949:

TIME TO BUILD HOMES, NOT TALK ABOUT THEM

Federal financial aid to provide homes for our overcrowded country should be forthcoming at the current session of Congress, if both parties will forget pride and politics. There is no reason why a sensible and workable compromise cannot be obtained on the basis of the three housing measures now before the House and Senate. Three years or more after the end of a war that halted construction it is time to make a start on building, not talk about it.

The administration bill calls for 1,050,000 low-cost units to be erected in 7 years. The rate of construction would be 150,000 a year, with authority for the President to increase it to 250,000 if his Council of Economic Advisers' reports that the building market and continued need justify it. The cost would be $445,000,000 annually.

Senate Republicans fix their sights lower. They propose a 6-year program of 600,000 homes, with 100,000 to be built the first year and 135,000 thereafter. The President could step up construction to 150,000 a year, if necessary. The annual cost would be $240,000,000.

Ten House Republicans, including our own Congressman CANFIELD, favor a middle-of-the-road course. They ask for 800,000 units in 6 years at the rate of 125,000 for the first year, 135,000 thereafter, with 200,000 as the Presidential maximum in any 1 year. Their estimate of the annual charge is $320,000,000.

The slum-clearance features of the three measures are identical, as is the 40-year amortization plan. For replacing slums with modern, low-cost apartments there would be allotted a billion dollars. Nor is there any marked difference in the three proposals for construction of more livable rural homes.

In view of this broad area of agreement, it is time to stop talking and build.

Since one of these bills or a conference substitute for all three is practically certain of being passed by the Eighty-first Congress, it is time now to reactivate the Passaic Housing Authority, created during the Mayor Martini administration, but which was unable to accomplish anything because the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses failed to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which would have given financial backing to slum-clearance projects.

Passaic and other communities interested in rebuilding substandard tenement areas ought to make sure that their low-rent housing project plans get low numbers and early attention. Passaic's survey report and application for approval of 1,500 housing units have been on file in Washington 5 years but may have to be reactivated.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Bishop Haffey appearing in Catholic Light:

With the tragic ending of a mock trial in Budapest, the whole world has witnessed once again, as in ages past, a drama that will be remembered as long as men live on this globe. The essence of drama is conflict, conflict of persons, conflict of forces. The

forces are invisible, but they are as real as God in Heaven, as real as Satan in hell. The forces take up their positions, they prepare for conflict, in the hearts and wills of human beings.

Fate, as the Greeks called it, or divine providence, as we know it to be, truly reveals itself with deliberate dramatic intent. It was decreed on high that John the Baptist, the holiest of men, and Herod Antipas, one of the worst of men, should find themselves in the same generation in the same corner of the world. A clash was inevitable. The drama enacted in the persons of the Baptist and Herod the Fox is one of the masterpieces of all time. John speaks the truth with a courage born of God. Herod rants with a fury born of hell. John loses his material head, but saves his immortal soul. Herod keeps his head and his mistress and loses both his soul and the respect of all mankind.

This day, February 8, 1949, closes the enactment of another drama—the deadly conflict between the invisible power of Christ the Godman and the fulmination of the anti-Christ's wielding a hammer to enslave and a sickle to destroy. Cardinal Mindszenty is our John the Baptist in this age of terrifying conflict. Ever since that fatal November of 1945, when the Kremlin once again gave its answer to the Truman doctrine and put Matyas Rakosi, a brigadier general of the Soviet army, in charge of the work to liquidate freedom in Hungary, one man above all others stood forth and spoke forth as the champion of God, of God's Church, of the rights of all Hungarians to live as free men and enjoy the freedoms of conscience, of education, of the press.

He preached the principles of true democracy as did Pope Pius in his Christmas message of 1942. But he branded communism's brand of democracy as a monster. He challenged them in these words: "Not a democracy that puts in the place of a person ruling with limitless power another person with similar powers, not a democracy that puts instead of the egotism and ruthlessness of one group of people, the egotism and ruthlessness of another group." And then he spoke forth: "The most important feature and safest pillar of true democracy is that she acknowledges fully the laws of nature which no human power should ever dare to touch."

When the Kremlin's stooges stole 4,500 schools from the people who had built them to educate their children for time and eternity, and turned out on the street 15,000 teachers, the cardinal resisted this act of tyranny in language as clear as it was fearless. He repeatedly emphasized that the church of Christ would not surrender her right to have freedom of teaching, and her duty to go and teach all nations.

Would the fearless Mindszenty who stood stalwart against the evil of nazism and suffered imprisonment for his bravery be silent before an enslaving communism? Only a prisoner's cell could silence the voice of this modern John the Baptist. Life imprisonment is but a living death. The church of God will add to its long roster of martyrs another name that will never die, and a world of human beings will thank God for a hero and a saint who by his virile words in life and from his silent cell, worse than death, will inspire us in this evil hour to stand up and be counted as men of God, soldiers of Christ, and apostles of true liberty to all men of all nations. And with Cardinal Mindszenty we will ask God to give us power from on high to accept jailer's shackles rather than compromise truth.

Mindszenty behind the bars of steel will know a peace which the world cannot give; he will know the joy of a victory which has overcome the world, his faith. He prepares for a crown of glory while his enemies who have jailed him for the crime of loving God and serving his fellow man go down to defeat; condemned today, and for all time by the aroused conscience of God-loving, freedom-loving men and women of all climes, as cowards and criminals, the Herods and Pilates of our age, with the blood of innocents on their souls and leaving a memory as loathsome as it will be lasting.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader of February 8, 1949:

MINDSZENTY GUILTY—OF LOVING GOD AND COUNTRY

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was convicted of treason by a Communist People's Court in Budapest today and sentenced to life imprisonment. Many had expected he would be doomed to the gallows, but the Red puppets of Moscow have denied him the crown of martyrdom while they accomplish their foul purpose.

Life imprisonment in Hungary under the ruthless Communist dictatorship is a living death beyond the cruelest concept of civilized nations. This may be a sop of an aroused public opinion elsewhere in the world, but it perhaps would have been far more merciful for this innocent victim of Communist duplicity if his life had been taken speedily. Should he survive the tortures that are in store for him, in the not too distant future it would not be surprising if he were to die after a convenient heart attack or a fall from a window or even attempting to escape from prison. Or he might just disappear and never be heard from again, as so many hapless individuals behind the iron curtain when they obstruct the path of Stalin and his cohorts.

There is only one gleam of hope and that is, by some miracle of God's grace, Cardinal Mindszenty will survive until he can be rescued through the liberation of Europe and Asia from the clutches of the gang of international cutthroats who are attempting the conquest of the world.

The mock trial in Budapest completely vindicated the defendant in the eyes of free peoples of all faiths and just as surely convicted communism. The farcical procedure followed the familiar pattern with the Reds acting as judges, jurors, and witnesses, and the defendant, tortured and drugged, made to appear in the worst possible light. This is justice, Kremlin style. What a travesty.

It wasn't just Cardinal Mindszenty who was on trial; it was the Roman Catholic Church, the United States, and civilization itself—in short, all who have dared to oppose communism. The Hungarian churchman was the symbol of these and he was singled out for crucifixion on the altar of freedom. The great crime of which he was guilty was that he loved his God and his country and refused to accept substitutes for his faith and for his patriotism.

Despite the resentment it aroused, there was little surprise in the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty. And least surprised of all was the defendant himself, for he had said on his visit to the United States 2 years ago that "I am going back to be crucified" and again: "My enemies can take from me no more than my life and that has already been given to God." Recently, he informed the Hungarian bishops that he repudiated in advance any statement or action that might be attributed to him in the event he was taken into custody. He knew the fate that was in store for him, but, to his lasting glory, he remained at his post in the finest tradition of his sacred calling.

Down through the centuries, the enemies of Christianity have failed in their efforts to destroy it. They have failed again in this instance, for the latest savage assault on religion and decency has served only to strengthen the faith and the determination of the millions who are enrolled under the banners of God. How great was the set-back for communism is graphically illustrated by the fact that comparatively few knew who Josef Mindszenty was until his arrest and trial; today, his name is a household word, honored and respected as his persecutors are debased and despised.

Spiraling Prices and Profits Can Create a Depression Deadfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the following article written by Les Finnegan, the widely known labor analyst, writer, and correspondent, as published in the January 1949 issue of North American Labor:

SPIRALING PRICES AND PROFITS CAN CREATE A DEPRESSION DEADFALL

(By Les Finnegan, labor analyst)

Big business and industry are hell-bent on plunging the Nation into a catastrophic depression.

Labor and liberal economists have sounded this warning repeatedly since the end of the war. They have endeavored to warn the public and recently again they warned Congress. Two essential facts, in the opinion of most labor economists, stand out today in any estimate of where the Nation now stands and where it is going:

1. The depression of the 1930's never really ended. It was artificially converted into a spurious military prosperity by the defense program in 1939 and by the war effort in 1941. The three postwar years brought new and presumably temporary economic props in the form of the European Recovery Plan and the rearmament program. Without these, it is agreed, violent adjustments would have already occurred.

2. Big business and industry, bloated with unprecedented profits and reckless of everything save more and bigger financial killings, are throwing the Nation's economy into an increasingly menacing disbalance with every passing month. Industry's greed has created a rat race between prices and profits. The race between prices and living costs has been ignored or forgotten by the profiteers.

Both the A. F. of L. and the CIO told Congress last month that the price-profit spiral will head the Nation into disaster unless checked.

Already it has brought:

1. Greater concentration of economic power and the growth of monopoly.

2. A sharp reduction in labor's share of the national income.

3. The destruction of bank and war-bond savings.

4. Deliberate programs of planned scarcity (as in steel) and pricing conspiracies.

5. An immense growth of undistributed profits and an acute loss of consumers' purchasing power.

6. Resistance to a new round of wage increases while new campaigns are started to reduce corporation taxes but not taxes on low-bracket incomes.

The profit picture is the crux of the problem, the A. F. of L. and CIO agree. If there ever was any hope that industry would voluntarily roll back prices it is blasted now. Industry will do nothing voluntarily to endanger its soaring profits. Even the Commerce Department, enthusiastic advocate of voluntary steel allocations, now admits that program is a failure.

American industry's profits during the years 1936—39 averaged $3,900,000,000 after taxes. Profits after taxes in 1948 were more than $20,000,000,000—or more than 500 percent greater than 1936–39. The $20,000,000,000 net profit in 1948 was $2,000,000,000 higher than the previous all-time record in 1947. Steel, of course, was among the leaders in this profit-taking orgy. Bethlehem Steel showed a 40-percent rise in net profits for the third quarter of 1948 compared with the same period in 1947. General Motors, the Nation's richest corporation, did even better with a 53-percent increase in net profits from $213,000,000 for the first 9 months of 1947 to $327,000,000 for the same period in 1948.

Merely citing profit figures is, of course, not enough. The important thing is: What happens to these profits and what is the effect on the Nation's wage earners and consumers?

Even big-business apologists cannot disguise the appalling disproportion of dividends, profits, and wages. Comparing 1940 with the second quarter of 1948 the following distribution of industrial income is disclosed:

Dividends increased from $4,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000; wages and salaries increased from $41,000,000,000 to $111,000,000,000; and undistributed profits rose from $2,000,000,000 to $13,000,000,000.

In other words, dividends increased 75 percent, wages and salaries increased 270 percent, but undistributed profits jumped 650 percent. (The wages-and-salaries figure is, of course, greatly inflated because it includes the salaries of corporation executives ranging from $50,000 to $400,000.)

What proportion has actually gone to labor? The A. F. of L. told Congress on December 8: "With each postwar year a smaller and smaller portion of the income created by American industry has gone to workers and a larger part to profits. For example, wage and salaried workers in 1939 received 65 percent of the income created by industry; in the first postwar year, 1946, the share paid to workers had dropped to 63 percent, and declined further to 61 percent in 1947 and to 60 percent in the first half of 1948. Meanwhile the share going to profits of both corporate and unincorporated business increased steadily in each postwar year. The share going to profits was 29 percent in 1939 and 37 percent in 1948 (first half), according to Commerce Department figures."

PROFIT RATES

The A. F. of L. cited these "amazing profit rates": Autos, 26 percent; textiles and apparel, 22 percent; petroleum products, 21 percent; office equipment, 25 percent; pulp and paper products, 23 percent.

These booming profits derive, of course, from excessively high prices which in turn depress the standard of living of the Nation's wage earners. How prices have outstripped wages to victimize workers and their families is told by the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. BLS has found that since early in 1945 living costs have jumped 37 percent, while average manufacturing wages have risen only 13 percent.

Still another way in which industry has started to pilfer the worker's pocketbook was pointed out by the A. F. of L.: "During the postwar period American businesses have been depending on profits retained in the business to furnish about 70 percent of the new capital necessary for new equipment, working capital, and other needs. This is in marked contrast to the prewar period when new capital was furnished to a much greater extent by the sale of securities to investors. This change in business practice affects our entire economy. It means in actual fact that by keeping prices high companies actually take their new capital from consumers who pay out needed cash involuntarily to meet high prices, instead of borrowing it from investors who willingly invest their savings. A large proportion of the consumers who pay for this new capital are low-income groups who have to meet high prices by cutting down their purchases of living necessities."

The CIO similarly pointed out that this type of practice produces monopolies. "When retained earnings are used to expand capacity (or to effect mergers) the present owners of the business continue to be owners of a larger and expanded business. This means that a limited number of people continue to control a larger proportion or a larger share of that business' operation. If, on the other hand, new venture capital is secured from stock issues, a larger number of people become shareholders and the managers of the business become responsible to the enlarged number of owners. As long as industry, however, does not secure new venture capital to modernize its facilities and expand capacity, it is engaging in a serious monopolistic practice. * * * This practice of expanding by the use of retained earnings has a tendency to eliminate new competition. * * *"

Proof of this argument is found in a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission showing that from 1940 to 1947 a total of 2,450 independent manufacturing and mining firms with an asset value of more than $5,000,000,000 disappeared as the result of mergers and acquisitions.

AVARICIOUS INDUSTRY

Both the A. F. of L. and CIO economists agree that avaricious industries, by pricing their products higher and higher, seem to be intent on hastening unemployment and depression. For, as the A. F. of L. points out, when workers and consumers are unable to buy the products of industry, production will be cut back, workers laid off, and full employment will be replaced by rising unemployment with immense loss to everyone. Already consumer short-term credit has increased at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a year since the war and is now 80 percent above the previous all-time peak in 1939. On top of this growing indebtedness and the loss of wartime savings is the fact that when the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress reduced taxes it gave preferential treatment to incomes above $3,000.

There are other indexes of what is happening to the wage earner. In 1939 consumers bought 75 percent of the Nation's industrial output; government, 14 percent; business, 10 percent; and exports about 1 percent. But the consumers' ability to buy has slipped constantly and now consumers take only 69 percent of the total product.

Today, despite three rounds of wage increases, prices have so completely outrun wages that the worker's pay check buys 17 percent less than it did in January 1945. Despite wishful-thinking editorials and columns in the daily press the end of the price-profit spiral is nowhere yet in sight.

Must it mean depression? Labor economists declare that if present business practices should continue unchecked and if the European recovery plan and the rearmament program were suddenly ended a depression would not be in prospect—it would be halfway through the front door. The CIO told Congress flatly that the practice of industry to raise prices and thus profits will do more to bring on a depression and reduce production than any other single decision of industry. Industry has raised prices with no regard to increases in costs but only with regard to what the market will bear.

This self-interested thinking on the part of American industry, said the CIO, is the kind of thinking which inevitably will lead to lower levels of production—lower levels which spell unemployment, reduced income—in brief, depression with its misery and chaos. It is the old false notion of making profits through moderate levels of production and high prices instead of making the same level of profits or at least a reasonable level of profits through low prices and maximum production.

PEOPLE MUST ACT

Three years of soaring prices and profits have shown that industry and business will not regulate or check themselves for the benefit of the people and the Nation's economy. And if they will not do it the people will do it for them.

Many labor economists, therefore, want as a starting minimum program the legislation demanded by President Truman in his campaign—stand-by price controls and, above all else, an excess-profits tax and an undistributed-profits tax.

Given those as a beginning it may be possible to stave off the depression toward which the country is being pushed by industry and big business when the European recovery program is completed and when the inevitable cut-backs in military production occur.

Testimony of Dr. John D. Clark Before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on February 9 I extended my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix to include therein a summary of the testimony offered on that day by Dr. John D. Clark, member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Supplementing that summary, I herewith present the statement made by Dr. Clark before the same committee at its hearing today:

Secretary Brannan has assigned to me the responsibility to summarize the views and recommendations of the administration offered in the Economic Report of the President and in the statements in these hearings by department chiefs and by members of the Council of Economic Advisers.

When there are so many cross-currents in the business world as there are now, the citizen is disposed to read a few of the conflicting judgments about the situation and decide that it is too complicated for him to make any decision about the trend of the economy. The President of the United States and the members of this committee are not

permitted to take that easy course. The Employment Act of 1946 requires him to make this report at this time and to set forth therein the current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, together with the program which he recommends to attain the declared policy of the Congress that all of the plans, functions, and resources of the Government shall be used, within certain limits, to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

This committee, established by the same statute, is enjoined to offer, as a guide to the standing committees, its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President. Since any legislative program you may recommend must be prospective and can be valid only if it is relevant to the business conditions in the coming months, you cannot meet your obligation under the statute without reaching some conclusion about the probable course of the economy in that period. Even a negative conclusion that no action need be taken by Government would involve an affirmative judgment that the economic trend does not create a threat to the attainment of the objective of the Employment Act.

In some lines of business the excess of demand over supply which causes inflation is so obvious that the Congress has already begun to provide measures to restrain spiraling prices. The extension of rent control, and of control of exports, and the renewed waiver of anti-trust-law restraints upon agreements to channel steel and other key commodities into preferred uses are justified only because it is believed that demand in these areas is so great in comparison with the supply that socially desirable distribution of these goods cannot be attained through the free operation of the price mechanism.

The program now proposed by the President in his annual Economic Report, which you are studying, is based upon the judgment that the postwar inflationary forces are still strong and will probably become more active in the near future, requiring the provision of measures now to curb spiraling prices. This is the interpretation of the economic situation presented to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers, and it has been discussed at length during these hearings by members of the council.

The anti-inflationary measures recommended by the President upon the advice of the council are those which he first pressed upon the Congress in the special session in November 1947, following a report to him by the council that the period of relative stability in the first three quarters of the year had given way to a dangerously strong inflationary situation. I have already called to your attention the quarterly data of gross national product, national income, and personal income, each of which, after jumping upward in the final quarter of 1947, climbed higher in each quarter of 1948, while industrial production failed to increase. The vindication by events of the report by the council to the President on October 1, 1947, encourages the hope that the economist has professional tools which enable him to analyze business conditions correctly, and what is perhaps more important, to analyze them quickly.

Since October 1947 the council has made a report to the President each quarter, with many intermediate reports, and upon each occasion it has renewed its warning that the postwar inflation had not been liquidated and therefore must be feared. The course of business in 1948 confirmed these judgments, although only once did business analysts generally agree with our view. With no increase in industrial production, wages crept upward, utility charges and other costs of production increased, and the price index of the 700 commodities other than farm and food products gained 5 percent.

The price trend of these 700 commodities is more important than that of food in determining the course of the economy, because the price of food does not directly influence the cost of production of other goods. The current decline in food prices may have some effect upon the size of wage demands, but there is no indication that it will cause labor to forego a drive for another round of wage advances.

Inflationary forces have been so strong that they withstood a terriffic jolt when grain prices collapsed a year ago and they continued to press the price level upward during the rest of the year notwithstanding the erratic performance of prices of farm and food products. More than once in the past 2 years the price level has seemed to become stable as some prices have declined, and soft spots and reduced demand have appeared in the economy, but each time the inflationary movement has been resumed. Conditions are developing for the same thing to happen again.

We can never forget that the collapse of an inflationary boom is always around the corner, and for all the Council knows that corner may be immediately ahead. We have our data about all kinds of identifiable business conditions, but that data fails to inform us whether and when business sentiment will change. If this inflationary boom levels off by itself, it will be a new experience. The typical ending has been a sudden collapse followed by a rapid deflation, and the collapse has occurred unexpectedly when the business indexes are most favorable. Business sentiment changes some night for reasons and at a time which no one can foresee. Inventories which were comfortable the day before now appear to be dangerously large and orders are canceled. Business plans lose their attractive aspect and are put on the shelf. Production is cut back, workers are laid off, and the deflationary spiral is under way.

We have no experience to support the belief that a strong and long-continued inflation which is permitted to run its course can have any other ending than a business collapse. Those who interpret the current situation as the end of advancing prices and the beginning of a period of readjustment which will soon turn into full production and employment at slightly lower prices not only see an economy far more docile than the one the Council studies, but they fail to explain how forces powerful enough to drag the economy back from a beginning recession are not powerful enough to withstand counteracting forces which, according to their own premise, cannot be very strong. I am emphatic about the need to control inflation because I have a deep respect for the devastating strength of forces of deflation which feed upon themselves, and I do not join in the confidence that if they once take charge of the economy they will be easily controlled, or that they will evaporate and need no control.

While the members of the council have said that in their analysis they find greater significance in the facts that the number of workers employed in civilian production in January was greater than a year ago when the inflationary boom was most active and that the flow of income to consumers is greater, we are fully aware that unemployment increased 720,000 during the month. There is no sound basis for saying that this increase was more than seasonal. We have no experience by which to determine the seasonal trend in a labor force of more than 60,000,000. It was not until immediately before the war that we had statistics of unemployment which permitted serious study of seasonal trends in a much smaller labor force, and the war upset that foundation. Since the war we have found seasonal trends in all parts of the producing economy smothered by conditions of short supply of all kinds of goods. We do know that in January a year ago the increase in unemployment was 420,000, but I have described the conditions at that time and they did not permit normal seasonal changes to appear.

It will be April before we will know whether a real decline in employment has set in. It is because we foresee conditions arising at that time which in our opinion will again tighten the labor market that we have not changed the advice we have given to the President about the trend of the economy.

In April the increase in agricultural employment will be setting in. We will be feeling more effect of the increasing expenditures of the Government for defense and for foreign aid. The Government will end the accumulation of a Treasury surplus in March, and in April it will begin to spend more than it collects from the taxpayers. Bank reserves will no longer be suffering the effect of large transfers of funds to the Federal Reserve banks. And businessmen, who are too prone to listen to tales of distress elsewhere even when they consider their own prospects bright, may be expected to accept the significance of the report in the New York Times on February 13, 1949, that—

"Not one of five leading engineering companies could cite a single plant construction contract that had been canceled because of business recession. * * * Large new contracts for either engineering services or new plant construction are moving ahead because demand in many lines is still running ahead of supply."

TAXATION

The program proposed by the President includes certain policies to reduce inflationary pressures by reducing general demand, and others to hold specific points of pressure by direct action. In the first category are the recommendations that taxes be increased $4,000,000,000 and that the credit control powers of the Federal Reserve System be strengthened.

I need not discuss the desirability of providing revenue large enough to permit a substantial payment upon the Government debt, and perhaps there is no need to discuss the suggestion offered in some of your hearings last year that an increase in income taxes is inflationary and not deflationary. The current argument of those opposing the tax proposal is that its effect would be so deflationary as to bring on a depression.

Would the specific proposal of the President to impose the greater part of the additional tax burden upon corporate profits result in reducing the incentive of business managers to invest? I have no doubt that a unanimous vote in the affirmative would come from a poll of businessmen, but I have found that their policies have to be ascertained by considering what they do rather than what they say. Looking at what they have done, we find that corporate profits of $21,800,000,000 before taxes and of $12,800,000,000 after taxes in 1946 caused American corporations to institute a tremendous campaign of investment in new plant and equipment and that corporate profits of $18,100,000,000 after taxes in 1947 were large enough to induce corporate managers to expand new investment in plant and equipment in 1948. The proposal of the President would leave corporate profits after taxes at a level at least as high as the profit figures in 1947 and far above those of 1946.

A second argument against increasing the taxes on corporate profits is that this would reduce the funds available for new investment and it is said that equity funds are not available in capital markets and that it is undesirable or dangerous for business to use borrowed funds, which are available in

large amounts. Despite the persistent assertion that business cannot attract equity capital, there is little proof that this is true. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has had no trouble in securing very large additions to its equity capital by the simple device of offering attractive subscription rights to its stockholders, who first buy debentures and then turn them into stock.

The fact is that corporate managers have not made any serious attempt to secure equity capital because they are unwilling to dilute their capital structures under present market conditions and they find it very attractive to finance their needs by loans. The interest paid on loans is not only very low under the cheap-money policy of the Government but it can be deducted from income in computing income tax. Nor is there any reason to be concerned about the dangers of debt capital. The dogma which arose more than a century ago when interest rates were high, renewal or substitution of loans at maturity if times were hard was seldom accomplished, and bankruptcy was rigorously imposed upon default has little validity in these days when interest rates are very low, many credit openings are arranged for cases of hardship, and defaults seldom lead to dissolution but only to reorganization of going enterprises. The business world itself no longer believes this dogma about the virtue of equity capital and the vice of debt capital. The most distinguished names in American finance are found in the lists of directors of the great insurance companies, whose funds must be administered with the caution and prudence imposed upon the guardian of trust accounts and must be placed in investments which are not expected to default. These funds have been and are now the sources of the most spectacular debt financing in multimillion dollar terms. No one will believe that the insurance directors who make the loans believe that they are assisting the borrowing corporation to place itself in jeopardy or that on account of the loan it may be forced into trouble or be threatened with liquidation in a period of business depression.

CREDIT CONTROL AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

Credit control has been so thoroughly studied by this committee that I shall offer only the briefest summary of the reasons for the recommendation of the President that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System be given the authority to increase the satutory reserve requirements of the member banks and of banks belonging to the deposit insurance system by 10 percentage points. The tightening of bank credit is the oldest of the recognized measures to reduce over-exuberant business activity. The use of this traditional policy is not related to any condition of over-expansion of bank credit itself, but arises from the fact that the commercial banks, perhaps to their misfortune, happen to be the important cogs in a machine which is easily subjected to social control for this purpose.

Although it is a point fully understood by the members of the committee, it is important to emphasize the fact that the central bank authorities are not now able to make very effective use of the original plan to influence the volume of bank credit by changing the discount rate because the Government debt management policy forces the continuance of low interest rates. The policy of supporting the price of long-term Government bonds at not less than par must be maintained, and the President has said in such vigorous terms that it will be maintained that the financial world seems to have accepted the fact. The result has been that the effort of the past year to overturn the policy has subsided, the market is taking care of itself above the peg point, and the difficulites which arose because holders of bonds were disturbed by constant speculation whether the policy would be abandoned have disappeared.

The debt-management policy, like the farm price-support program and many other national policies which our people are determined to continue, is inflationary or is an obstacle to some anti-inflationary policy. This is an inevitable characteristic of our vast economy, and it is our task to find ways, while continuing those policies, to meet dangers to continued prosperity from other sources. In the case of bank credit, such a way is found in requiring larger bank reserves.

INSTALLMENT CREDIT

One selective control of credit which the President recommends is that of installment credit, and the authority of the Board of Governors in this respect, as well as in the matter of raising reserve requirements, should be permanent. Installment credit creates an especially precarious situation because it increases the demand for goods in periods of great prosperity and then by largely drying up in periods of recession when contract debtors are straining their resources to liquidate their indebtedness it contributes a double push to the deflation. There is another reason, from the standpoint of social policy, for controlling installment credit. It is disclosed in the very argument often made by objectors that it prevents a sale to a housewife who has only $5 in her purse and who would yield to the sales appeal of nothing down and a long time to pay.

SAVINGS

An important anti-inflationary policy commended by the President which requires no additional legislation is the encouragement of individual savings. The Treasury Department has been very successful in its effort during the past year to gain the support of an army of volunteer workers and to secure the reestablishment of pay-roll deduction plans which had lapsed. The appeal of the postal savings system should not be limited by new restrictions, and there should be an adequate appropriation for the savings bond campaign of the Treasury Department.

CONTROL OF COMMODITY EXCHANGES

The recommendation of the President that permanent authority be granted to regulate trading in futures on the commodity exchanges grew out of our experience a year ago when we were most fortunate to avoid a disastrous collapse of business following a crash of grain prices which had been carried by speculative trading far above any level supported by conditions of demand and supply for grain itself. We have now had a second experience with the widespread impact of the wild gyrations which can take place only in a speculative market and could not occur in a market dealing with actual commodities. The legislation recommended by the administration would control the purely speculative trading while leaving true hedging sales and purchases free from control. All of the arguments in favor of speculative trading were marshaled years ago in opposition to the bill to regulate the securities markets, which few would now say has not proved to be desirable. It has been a matter of great good luck that in this postwar inflation we have not been forced to meet the problems of wild speculation in the securities markets, and this has had some responsibility for the fact that this business boom has lasted without a crisis much longer than experience indicated would be possible.

DIRECT CONTROLS

Among the recommendations of the President for policies which directly attack points of particular inflationary pressure, that for rent control requires only the comment that the housing situation clearly proves that the economy has not yet entered the phase where Government intervention in the making of business decisions is not needed. If rents were freed from control, the inflationary forces underlying our deceptively quiet economy would become too clear to be discounted.

The case for export controls is generally accepted. Some support such controls upon the ground that they are needed in order to channel goods in such manner as to accomplish the purpose of the foreign aid program, but there is inherent in this argument a recognition that the supply of certain commodities required for that program is too small in relation to total demand to permit the allocation of those goods to be made by the operation of the free market mechanism.

CONTROL OF PRICES AND WAGES

The recommendations of export controls, mandatory allocation powers, and of limited price and wage controls need to be considered together. In the first published report of the Council of Economic Advisers upon this problem, the report upon the impact of the foreign-aid program upon the domestic economy, the point was stressed that there were specific inflationary pressures affecting the prices of key commodities which particularly affect the cost of living and the costs of production. The conclusion then reached that general anti-inflationary measures affecting the entire economy should be supplemented by authority to apply specific controls of the prices of these key commodities is valid today.

Consumers' prices have been receding slightly but the prices of many commodities which are important in determining the costs of production of manufactured articles have continued to rise. It is because there is a chain reaction when these prices move upward that direct action against price increases is necessary in order to break the circle of spiraling inflation.

The most important of these key commodities is steel, the cost of which enters in some way into every productive process. Second in importance may be coal, for most industrial power is produced by coal and increases in its price spread their influence throughout the producing industries very rapidly. These two commodities are of great importance in another respect. The wage contracts negotiated in the steel and coal industries have had strong influence upon other wage negotiations even in industries in very different economic circumstances. A rise in wages in the steel industry tends to establish a pattern, and labor leaders now look upon the steel corporations as being especially vulnerable to new wage demands. Not only are profits running at a very high rate, but the pressure of demand clearly makes it possible for the steel producers to increase prices if wages are raised, they have been raising prices recently, and they have stated their purpose to raise prices further if costs are increased.

The recommendation for authority to control the prices of essential commodities of prime importance in determining the cost of living or the cost of production of goods is not, therefore, entirely forward looking. It relates to a situation which is now developing to a climax. If wage increases are again secured in the steel and coal industries and the prices of those commodities are again raised, the inflationary cycle will be given another twist which will carry the economy we know not where. If the Government is unwilling to take any action to halt price increases, the workers will have no reason to withhold their wage demands in the expectation that prices will not continue to rise, and the Government will have no excuse for asking the workers to make a sacrifice which the owners of business will not make.

If action is taken to prevent price increases, the Government will be justified in taking action to discourage wage increases and the President has already accepted that responsibility. A part of his proposal is that in order to prevent an established price ceiling from being broken through as the result

of wage increases, there shall be a determination by a board that wage advances are justified before those wage advances shall be accepted as a reason for permitting a price increase. The process is awkward and the definition of justifiable wage increases will please no one, but the plan would work for a time long enough, perhaps, to gain our objective of breaking the inflationary circle and attaining a stability in economic relationships which will permit us to scrap this and all other anti-inflationary programs.

The feature of the President's proposal which should come into immediate use is the holding off of price advances by applying to the fixing of prices on goods the same rule which we have applied to the fixing of prices on labor. The administration asks authority to order a delay in increases of those prices which are designated for this kind of attention until the expiration of a limited period after notice of intent to raise a price. Within that period the firm must furnish any information called for relating to the price and the propriety of a price increase, and submit, if directed, to a public hearing. At the end of the period, the Government administrator may turn to the other provisions of the proposed statute and fix the price on the commodity, or he may free the firm to make its own decision about its action. Those who have followed the hearings before this and other committees during the past 2 years when you have looked into business decisions will have little doubt that the enactment of this waiting-time provision will have a real restraining influence upon businessmen who would otherwise advance their prices as they have been doing steadily.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF PRODUCTION

The recommendations of the President with respect to long-term problems and policies cannot be considered in this brief statement, but that which is concerned with the expansion of productive capacity needs to be discussed because it has immediate importance. The one way to stop inflation which all will applaud is to increase production.

The administration is not yet proposing the policies to bring about the enlargement of productive capacity because the President has asked that a study be made both of the areas of shortage and of the manner in which the shortages can be overcome. Their general character may be described, however. There may be subsidies for high-cost producers of commodities, such as minerals, which are produced under conditions where plant capacity is not important. There may be special provisions in the tax laws for accelerated depreciation or even for tax abatement. There may be loans, or guaranties of loans, where credit is not available and capital hard to secure. Government procurement policies may be manipulated, and I use this invidious term in order to make distinct the point that all of these plans require the most careful study because in them are many pitfalls of discrimination and favoritism.

The enlargement of productive capacity is so essential to continued maximum employment and production that neither the concealed dangers in any given plan nor the required scope of Government intervention should prevent action which will be effective. The President has shown how earnestly he seeks effective action by declaring that if it comes to the point where the people cannot be furnished goods which they need in any other way and it is possible for them to secure them by having the Government itself become a producer, he is not afraid to take that final step. Who of us, if forced to answer that question without equivocation, would say otherwise? But I have no doubt that the President feels as strongly as I am sure many of us feel that it is within our ability to adopt policies which will lead private enterprise to expand its productive capacity as may be needed over the long run, and that the Government will not have to go into the business of producing commodities except for one purpose.

The one exception is the building of plants to produce such new goods as synthetic fuel. Where technological progress in perfecting new methods of production are too slow to promise a flow of needed goods as quickly as they are needed, we may agree upon a Government policy of direct action in hastening the technical experimentation and in assuming the risks of constructing commercial plants before private capital would feel justified in doing so.

The administration should have the anti-inflationary measures the President has requested without delay, for the risk in delaying action until spiraling prices are more actively at work and are establishing the base for the ultimate crash is too great. I am not certain that the respected monthly letter of the National City Bank was correct when it said, in June last, that the longer the boom continues the more severe will be the reckoning. It is enough to say that the longer inflation is permitted to run its own course, the nearer we come to a collapse.

Country Almanac

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February issue of the Country Almanac by A. B. Genung, of Freeville, N. Y.:

REVOLUTION—BACKWARD

A day after Roosevelt's election in 1932, Dr. Liberty Hyde Bailey, the grand old dean of Cornell, remarked to this writer: "The thing that's happened here is a revolution not only political but economic. In 20 years you'll understand."

Well, 16 years have gone by and we begin to understand. Truman's addresses to Congress make it clear that we are now about to be shoved further and even faster along this revolutionary road.

Great wars always upheave society and change the order of things. With two of them sweeping the world in one generation, we should have known that there would be profound changes. The surge and strain of war bring new leaders and new ideas to the top.

But the new order is not always a better order, by any means. Sometimes the new order has been better, more progressive, as after the Crusades or the Napoleonic wars. Many times in history it has been decadent, as after the Roman conquests, or the great invasions from the east in the seventh and eighth centuries. The new order has often been merely a new tyranny, which required generations of liberty-loving men to fight off.

During the present war era we have seen monstrous new tyranny come to the top in central and eastern Europe; in the latter it is still extending its power. Elsewhere in the world, including this country, we have seen new rule, new leaders, new ideologies taking over.

The seething caldron underneath all this new froth is made up of the urge among the common people to have more of the fruits of earth than they have hitherto enjoyed. It is the ceaseless battle of the have-nots against the haves. The economic turmoil, out of which the new politician emerges and capitalizes his new strength, is rooted in the determination of the have-nots to force a redistribution of wealth. They want a bigger cut of the pie. It is, at bottom, as simple as that the maid forever covets her mistress' silken gowns, and the janitor his employer's fine office and wealth. This urge is as old as human nature and the inequalities that feed it are as old as time. And one may applaud this divine discontent that wants to get ahead—but there are time-tested constructive ways to go about it and there are destructive ways.

In this country, as in England, the present revolution moves on wheels supplied by the socialistic planners. That is the sorry part about it, for that is the straight road to lower standards of living and less individual freedom. By the time the people awaken to that fact, however, a new set of despots, benevolent or otherwise, may be so firmly in the saddle that they can't be dislodged. Huey Long and his share-the-wealth are reminders.

Truman's blueprints, which are hatched out by the pink and predatory group who surround him, follow the approved code in such matters. First, you promise to take wealth away from those who have it and give it to the have-nots. Heavy taxes (in England outright confiscation) are levied on those who have anything—in this country the latter are hit also as "the corporations."

Then the property is redistributed to the have-nots in the form of fantastically high legislated wage scales and short hours, subsidies, unemployment doles, sick and old-age pensions, broad welfare doles, free education in colleges, free medical care, new houses, forced low rents, and the like. All of which naturally is manna to those on the receiving end, and since in a democracy they have the most votes they gratefully confirm and enlarge the power of the spenders. The early stages are quite simple, quite crude, quite successful politically, and quite demoralizing.

Meanwhile, the planners are always reaching for new powers over the people. Truman's present messages are rather restrained, calling merely for new controls over credit, exports, commodity exchanges, etc.; that is, over money, trade, and work. The sardonic note in all this is that the new controls are demanded in the name of controlling inflation, which is itself the supreme achievement and vehicle of the planners and without which they couldn't stay in power overnight. Real deflation would utterly wreck them.

Next, when the plucked goose shows signs of laying fewer golden eggs, you move in on the goose. You threaten to build millions of new houses, for instance. You threaten to build steel plants with taxpayers' money. Truman has reached that stage now. Then you build them. Then you take over steel bodily, and finally other industries. England has reached that stage.

But by and by you discover that men have learned to like the pleasant habit of leaning on a Government shovel. Nobody works as they used to. The old ideas of thrift and self-reliance are gone. What incentive is there, when you get hand-outs anyhow?

Production goes down and saving goes down, as it has in all of socialist Europe and will here. The difference is that when the European pie shrank they could still get generous cuts from the American pie. When our pie shrinks we'll each just have less, period.

Now, one indispensable part of this downhill revolution is a deterioration of the country's money. You can't debauch the taxation process, spend continuously beyond income, redistribute wealth via huge bond issues, without also debasing the dollar. In other words, you can't have a glorious and permanent inflation and still maintain the old ex-

change value of the money. (Consider the case of the French franc.)

So we find ourselves with money that is worth less permanently. The value of every fixed salary or income, every rent collected, every pension, every insurance policy, has been, roughly, cut in two. And as for these $252,000,000,000 of bonds outstanding, by no practical plan in sight can they possibly be paid off under a hundred years' time, and other wars will dispose of them long before that. In any case, their purchasing power will have shrunk exactly as the dollar has shrunk. That goes for your insurance policy, too.

Also, our own new order has added a really new redistribution feature, which consists in bleeding our haves for the benefit of foreign have-nots all over the globe. By the end of 1952 we shall have given away abroad over $100,000,000,000 worth of the basic wealth of the country. No other socialistic regime can make that claim. In fact, the rest of them look at us with utter incredulity.

The end of this socialistic road is flanked by two very bleak monuments. One stands for lost productive power. The other is lost liberty. The end is less of the good things of life for everybody, plus a strait-jacket of Government controls. There is no exception to this. It always works the same way. If followed far enough, in the end the common man will be a drudge in a system of despotism. But in the pleasant early hand-out stages, nobody can make him believe that for one moment.

So the Truman messages spelling out this redistribution of wealth are cast out upon the political stage with as much assurance as an experienced angler casts worms for spring suckers. We, personally, aren't worrying much about the shrewd and thrifty haves, who didn't get what they have by sloth or ignorance; they can think as fast as the socialists and will adapt themselves. And the have-nots are happy in the thought that they're being handed something—and so they are.

So rolls on the revolution—downhill.

THAT ROOT OF ALL EVIL

Any general talk about price stability must start with the subject of money, it seems to us. Inflation began when the Government confiscated our gold, locked it away in vaults, and began to print paper money that belied the promise printed on the face of it, "redeemable in gold."

But the prewar flood of paper money was a drop in the bucket compared to the deluge of currency, bank-deposit money, and bonds that attended the financing of the war and our global benefactions. From some $38,000,000,000 in 1940, the total money supply (currency plus demand bank deposits or checking money) had grown to around $110,000,000,000 last year. Plus some $252,000,000,000 of bonds, all of which nominally represent paper-purchasing power.

With all that Niagara of paper pouring off the printing presses and spreading through the community, is it any wonder that the value of the dollar was diluted?

With all those new dollars, so-called, bidding for goods, of course, prices rose to great heights.

We know of no way to have stability of the general price level, in terms of money, without having some reasonable degree of stability in the money supply. If the Government doubled the number of paper dollars in circulation tomorrow, nothing is more certain than that commodity prices would shoot further toward the sky. And the converse is true, too.

When our paper money was redeemable in gold, there was always an anchor, always a brake both on quantity of money and on prices; for the quantity of monetary gold stocks in the world is comparatively stable, and such gold exerts its influence upon world prices in accordance with world supply and demand for both goods and gold, more or less irrespective of where the gold happens to rest at a given time. Or so the economists tell us.

One might logically come to the conclusion that the way to stabilize prices would be to get back on gold, make our paper money redeemable. So it would. But the first effect would be to squeeze our inflated balloon of paper like a kid would squeeze an orange—in other words, prices would fall with a thud and would thereafter stabilize at a much lower level. That would be political and economic dynamite. It would scuttle the New Deal. It might even blow us into a revolution.

It seems clear that we can't have a managed money supply that is managed, or rather enlarged, to suit the purposes of socialistic Government spenders, without paying the piper in high prices.

We personally begin to suspect that there is no politically possible way for our present Government to come back down to the prewar price levels; so that stabilizing really means getting adjusted to the present high level or something not far below it. But that is merely the problem of the level, not of stability.

To our way of thinking, the money supply is the real root of the price problem. There isn't any use fooling around with the symptoms, such as attempted price controls, pegging bond prices, managed production, and other mumbo-jumbo, in the expectation that these will stabilize commodity prices and values generally. The place to control steam pressure is where the boiler is stoked, not at the whistle valve.

What this country needs is a good 5-cent nickel, hard money.

CAPITAL ISN'T TRASH

It is difficult to tell just when a great country like this no longer is living on its current production and really has begun to live out of capital. At the rate we're going, there is no doubt that we shall be drawing on our capital resources at some early stage.

Our own personal suspicion is that the country has been using capital wealth throughout the last war period. We do not think the soil has been depleted seriously; but the prodigal use of iron, coal, oil, lead, lumber, and other basic materials, plus the wearing down of our productive machines, may represent quite a big bite gone out of our permanent capital.

A nation is no different, in respect to the operation of this principle, than an individual or a family. It can become poor, poverty-stricken, economically bankrupt, just exactly the same.

The Socialists would have us believe that we can eat our cake and have it too. To follow that foolish line is to lead the United States of America straight to stagnation, ultimate collapse, and the political vultures that prey on dead liberties.

BYLINE FOR HISTORY

As we look over the allocations of money and supplies under the Marshall plan, two thoughts in particular persist with us. The first is the simply incredible fact that one nation is giving away its most vital labor and treasure in this fashion to other nations. And not to meet some unexpected calamity of nature but deliberately and for the restoration of the others' business and productive life.

These princely gifts go not only to nations devastated by war but to others who actually profited by the war, as Ireland, Iceland, Sweden, Turkey. The allocations just for this one year include to Ireland, $89,000,000; Iceland, $10,300,000; Sweden, $41,000,000; and to former enemies, Austria, $220,000,000; Germany, $508,000,000; Italy, $571,000,000, etc.

The second thought which continues to impress us is that this immense spending is different from any other spending. When we produce goods and exchange them in domestic commerce, or for that matter in normal foreign commerce, some kind of a trading balance is always struck as a result of these transactions. There is always a quid pro quo. It is literally a trade. Everybody gains; nobody loses really.

But this Marshall-plan spending is different, it is unique; never been anything like it before in history. The products of our land and labor are sent out and no tangible goods or services come back, for the most part. The wages and profits that grow out of this production, though they really come right out of our economic hide, are still here bidding in American markets. But the goods which should offset that new spending power are not here. Which means, of course, that this process is the very essence of inflation.

These goods handed out spell just so much material loss for the United States of America. One may argue the return in gratitude or in expectation of some future renewal of trade. But the cold fact is that the stuff is lost to us, and it is the most basic wealth of the country: steel, lumber, coal, oil, metals, fertilizer, food, textiles, and so on. By so much has the standard of living in this country got to be cut. The fact that we are able to make some of it a deferred cut is neither here nor there. What is gone is gone, and we can never have the use of it.

As salvage, what we personally would like to dare to hope is that some objective thinker will write into imperishable history that the United States of America, greatest nation of all time, at the height of its power, instead of embarking upon a career of conquest, voluntarily tightened its belt to give its most precious goods to other nations, in colossal quantity, and without expectation of pay, simply because the others asked for it. There is a charity for future generations to ponder, a charity so unprecedented in international relations that even the recipients do not understand nor appreciate it; a gesture that will stand for all time, in our opinion, as the least explainable and the most magnificent in all history.

LABOR IN THE SADDLE

This country is following British footsteps in the development of a labor government. Union labor here has grown strong, arrogant, politically aggressive. It boasts, with some reason, that it can win elections. It boasts that it will defeat any man who seeks to give the rest of the community an even break, as in the case of Senator TAFT.

Labor has been in the political saddle in England for several years. It has demonstrated where its socialistic policies lead. They lead to smaller production, higher costs, fewer things for the ordinary people, complete control of the daily lives of the people by a gang of bureaucrats. In 33 main industries United States output per man has been found by the International Labor Office to be from 113 percent to 423 percent of British production per man.

We had thought that labor leadership in this country was more far-sighted, more conscious of its heritage of individual freedom, more devoted to free enterprise, than those in England. We still hope to find that true. But up to now most of the big labor bosses here seem to be out for power, for Government controls, and for more pie without working for it, just as avidly as are their counterparts across the Atlantic.

In the end farmers will find this kind of thing intolerable, will have to—and will—resist it.

TAKE OUT MORE INSURANCE

We mentioned that the value of your insurance policies has been cut in two. And it begins to look as though that cut may possibly be permanent. In talking with several

neighbors, we note that while most folks understand that fact, very few have done anything about it.

This matter becomes a real hazard in respect to farm buildings, or village homes, for that matter. Maybe your barn has been insured for $3,000 or so for the last 25 years. Most of the time that might have given you enough coverage to help in case of fire. But what will $3,000 do now toward replacing a barn? Just about build a foundation.

Or how much of a house will $3,000 build now? Maybe it would pay for a good-sized tent.

The point is that most of us need new and bigger insurance policies. Most of us know it but put off doing anything about it. Better act on this before you let yourself sleep again.

We aren't saying anything about life-insurance policies, though they're in the picture at exactly the same size. Maybe you're already worth more dead than alive. Or maybe you intend to will your wife to the social-security system.

WE NEED SOME DOCTORS

In the nine rural townships of our county there are about half a dozen doctors. In the county seat, population 25,000, there are 50 doctors.

Doctors won't settle in the country towns. Farm people suffer and die without medical help. Something's got to be done about this situation—and soon.

A New Nation Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the family of nations is larger by one today.

The Parliament of the Republic of Israel met yesterday in Jerusalem.

It was a moment of rejoicing for the Jewish community of this tired world; and, Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are and have long been ardent Zionists, it was a moment approaching exaltation.

Only 15 years ago, Mr. Speaker, there began a series of criminal assassinations of proud and living nations, as the scourge of nazism thrust out in a dark circle from Berlin. At the same time that Hitler was destroying nation after nation, he was destroying European Jewry.

Since the triumph of free democracies over the forces of Nazi evil, not only the national victims of Hitlerism have revived and been reestablished, but new nations have been added—the Philippine Republic, the Indonesian Republic, India, Pakistan, Burma, to name but a few; and now, firmly founded on the rock of democracy, fashioned to the model of the United States, Israel begins its life as an independent state.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I sent to the Press Gallery a statement which expressed my well wishes to the new republic. Under leave, I am inserting that statement:

STATEMENT ON CONVENING OF ISRAEL PARLIAMENT

Today in the Holy City of Jerusalem, sacred to three great world religions, the Parliament of the Republic of Israel convenes in an atmosphere of solemn historical importance.

For the first time in 2,000 years there is an independent Jewish state, sovereign and free.

The long gap of history from the Roman destruction of Jerusalem to the Nazi destruction of Jewry has come full turn, and once more the scattered nation has a national home.

I have just sent the following cable to the Honorable Chaim Weizmann, President of the Republic of Israel:

"Congratulations and best wishes to Israel Parliament on this historic occasion."

But those words do not begin to express the pride I feel that my country, the United States, has once more proved its devotion to democracy by aiding in the restoration of a free Judaic state, and leading the way toward full recognition.

I am inserting also the text of the address to the Parliament of Israel by the Honorable Chaim Weizmann, President of the Republic, as printed in the New York Times of today, February 15:

It is with a feeling of deep reverence and consecration that I rise to open the Constituent Assembly of the State of Israel—the first knesseth Israel [Assembly of Israel] of our time in this eternal city of Jerusalem.

This is a great moment in our history. Let us give thanks and praise God of Israel, Who in His mercy granted us the privilege of witnessing the redemption of our people after centuries of affliction and suffering. Today's event issued from the great awakening of national will that aroused our people in the last few generations. The first signs came about 75 years ago.

The best among our people, men whose names were then unknown, arose to lead their generation toward fulfillment of the dream of all generations, toward the return to Zion and the restoration of Jewish nationhood.

Those who strove to realize this dream took two paths. The first was the way of spiritual revival and the return to the well-spring of Jewish tradition, the renewal of the Hebrew language and literature, the gathering of the scattered forces of our people into one bond, the public proclamation of our historic rights, and the enlisting of help and support from the rulers of nations.

TWO DECISIVE GATHERINGS

Two gatherings mark decisive steps on this road—the Katowice conference and the first Zionist Congress. The first conference led to the creation of the World Zionist Organization workshop, where the vision hammered itself into reality, and to the establishment of the Jewish Agency as the Zionist movement's supreme political organ and the instrument of colonization.

Following this path, we secured the Balfour Declaration, the first external recognition of our right to settle as a nation in the land of our fathers.

The second path, that of practical action, of carrying out things, was the path taken by those who could not wait any longer for the nation to gird up its strength in exile and for others to recognize their rights. They thought to force God's hand, as it were; theirs was the daring to go up to the land to try to hasten the redemption of their people by their own handiwork and by the sweat of their brows and by their life's blood.

These were the first pioneers—the Biluim (first Zionist settlers on the land in Palestine)—and all who followed the flag to carve out the road of return and to lay the stone on which the future would be built. In their footsteps came a new generation of immigrants to settle on the land until the Yishuv (the community of Israel) was created. Those who took the second path also erected an organizational structure, institutions of self-government, local councils in towns and townships and assemblies of the new Jewish community, the Assefath Hanivcharim and the Vaad Leumi, which also has its seat in this building.

It is a good while now since the two paths converged and like two members of one body helped reinforce each other until the great day 9 months ago—the 5th of Iyar 5798, 14 May 1948—when we proclaimed independence and the establishment of our state. The union of two friends was now completed.

Then, compassed about as we were with blood, fire, and pillars of smoke, with the Arab war waged against us from without and within our own house, with chaos bequeathed us by the mandatory, we were not able to hold elections to lay the permanent foundations of our state. A provisional government was set up, comprising a legislature and an executive whose authority was derived from earlier elections. In this provisional government two former supreme institutions—the Jewish Agency Executive and the Vaad Leumi—joined together and were fused into one.

Today we stand on the threshold of a new era. We leave the dawn light of the provisional authority and enter the full sunshine of ordinary democratic rule. This assembly was elected by a body of citizens. In the elections the will of the entire people was fully and freely expressed. From the outset we are building on solid foundations—foundations of freedom, equality, collective responsibility, and national self-discipline.

It was no longer an isolated band of pioneers who elected this assembly, but an independent nation dwelling in its own, free country. This nation is being conceived as a gathering in of the exiles, for there is not a Jewish community throughout the world whose members have not a share in the state of Israel.

Every day, to our heart's joy, tens of thousands of our brethren from countries near and far are entering the gates of the country, which stand wide open to receive them. It is our whole prayer that this gathering of exiles will increase and embrace an ever-larger multitude of our people who will strike roots here and work side by side with us in building the state and make our unproductive places fruitful again. We will make this our goal before all else, to devote to it our best powers of thoughts and action.

HEAVY IS THE RESPONSIBILITY

Heavy indeed is the responsibility laid on us in this assembly. What we began 9 months ago on the same date, we bring to completion tonight—the restoration of the realm of Israel. If we are using state forms molded by the experience of the enlightened nations of the modern world, we know truly that these forms contain the treasured essence of the heritage of Israel.

In the ancient world this tiny country of ours raised the standard of spiritual revolt against the rights of tyranny and brute force. The law of Israel and the vision of her prophets sounded a new epic of relations between man and man, a new ordering of human society. The authority of the King of Israel was limited by law and tradition. The prophets of Israel did not fear to utter rebuke and reproof to kings and princes and with inspired words forged weapons to defend the poor and oppressed, strangers and slaves, and the orphan and the widow.

The very principle of the institution of kingship was hateful to the spiritual leaders of the people. "I will not rule over you nor shall my son rule over you. The Lord shall rule over us," declares the judge to the assembled people. The warnings of the prophet against the dangers of tyranny thunder from on high to the ears of people to our last generation.

In Israel this authority of one man was derived from the noble conception that

people are naturally free and are freely accepting the rule that law and just judgment do not need compulsion from above to live as ordered by society. The root of the principle of the constitution of that novel state was the limit set for the authority of the king, and in this sense the ancient Hebrew policy was the mother of constitutional government in the modern age.

And now it has fallen to our generation to cement anew the links of that life of freedom that were snapped by tyranny's force nearly 1,900 years ago. I do not know why it is precisely our generation that has been privileged to bring about what many generations before us longed for in the exiles of darkness. Unless we earned it by all the hardships, weariness, sorrow, and tribulation that have been our portion during the past 70 years, when one-third of our nation was annihilated.

We suffered torture and affliction as no other nation in the world and because we are a remnant—and no more than a remnant—double and treble responsibility lies upon us to fill the terrible void in our national life.

It is our people who once gave the whole world the spiritual message fundamental to civilization. The world is watching us now to see which way we choose for ourselves in ordering our lives, and is listening to hear whether a new message will go forth from Zion, and what that message will be. The new message was not born without travail and our creative spirit. The creative force of our nation will soon meet the new, serious challenge. The assembly is called on to frame the will for the supreme test. Let us strive in search of the basis of human life. Let us build a new bridge between science and the spirit of man.

This day is a great day in our lives. Let us not be overarrogant if we say that this is a great day in the history of the world. In this hour a message of hope and good cheer goes forth from this place in the sacred city to all oppressed people and to all who are struggling for freedom and equality. From this place we send fraternal blessings to our brethren throughout the world and to all states, great and small, that have recognized Israel.

(Dr. Weizmann concluded by paying tribute to prominent figures in Zionist history, including Theodor Herzl, Louis D. Brandeis, and Edmond Rothschild.)

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican Leader of the House of Representatives, at Charleston, S. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Charleston, S. C. was honored on January 28, 1949, not only in having the former distinguished Speaker of the House, but a great American, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., to address the one hundred and seventy-sixth annual banquet of the chamber of commerce. My city of Charleston prides itself on having the oldest chamber of commerce in the Nation, and has through the years been accustomed to hearing good addresses on our American way of life; but at no time has anyone delivered a more inspiring and thought-provoking address than that of former Speaker MARTIN.

Being one of the Thirteen Original Colonies, we have many things in common with New England, and many of our common stocks stem from the same basic families. Our thoughts and our economic beliefs are quite similar. Quite frankly, former Speaker MARTIN'S address was one which pleased the people of my city because it coincided with the things they have been taught to believe.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address of the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.:

Good evening, fellow Americans. I am happy to be presented to this fine gathering by your able and distinguished Congressman, MENDEL RIVERS. He enjoys a fine reputation for his ability to aid his district and his State.

It is a privilege and a pleasure to come to this fine gathering of businessmen who are engaged in the commendable task of making South Carolina a busier, a better, and a more progressive State. I know there are some who believe a businessman is a menace and an object of scorn and abuse. Yet if it were not for the businessmen of America we could not have manned and directed the arsenals which won two world wars. If it were not for the hard-working businessmen, big and little, we would not be today the richest and most powerful Nation of the world. To be sure, they were ably backed up by the hosts of honest, sincere working men and women of America. United, and working in full harmony together, they are an invincible force. Both are necessary. Each must have respect for the other. There must be general appreciation—each will fall or rise together.

We must keep opportunity alive in the United States both for management and labor. Labor is entitled to and must have its full share of the profits and progress of industry; investments must be secure and given a chance to gain a fair return. This is the system which made America great. It is the only system which will keep us a progressive people. Unjust crippling of either labor or management through regulations, taxation, or excessive controls will retard the onward march of America.

You of South Carolina and I of Massachusetts have much in common. We represent two great American States—States that were part of America from the very beginning. We shared the adversities of less fortunate days, and we fought shoulder to shoulder for the freedom of this great country.

We have had our differences—even the best of families have little differences. Happily these differences were many years ago and are now forgotten by a determination once more to fight for the preservation of American freedom.

Business is the servant of peace. Business conventions, such as yours, represent one of America's finest expressions of constructive cooperation for peace, progress, and human welfare.

The pattern of your work and your constant deliberations for the advancement of abundance is a shining example to all the world in these difficult times of postwar readjustment and world reconstruction.

The longer I live in Washington the more convinced I become that the true path of progress and prosperity is through voluntary cooperation among men of good will.

The practical measures which advance human welfare are seldom the inventions or inspirations of government. Instead, it is the men who keep production and commerce flowing who are the real authors of our material progress, and that peace which can flower only under conditions of reasonable economic abundance.

It is the distinguishing mark of the American businessman that he is always thinking about tomorrow. Business must look forward at all times, because it is the decisions of today which make the substance of tomorrow.

However much we may worr, and fret about Washington as the center of our national economic life, the fact remains that it is the day-to-day operations of hundreds of thousands of small business enterprises throughout the country which really determine the energy, the tone, and the strength of our business structure. American business is too vast, too complex, too widespread to be guided and controlled by any central bureau of thinkers in Washington.

We live these days in an epochal period of testing. All around the world, conflicting ideologies strive for the mastery of men's hearts and minds. On the one hand, we have the system of freedom under law, the system which took deep root in all the soils of America, the system which is founded upon individual responsibility, individual discipline, devotion, initiative, energy, and skill. This is the system which, in times of stress and strain, so often calls forth unmeasured and unsuspected displays of skill and heroic performance in men and women.

Opposed to our American system of freedom and ordered liberty under law, we have abroad in the world today a second school of government—the advocates of many kinds of regimentation, statism, or benevolent bureaucracy. In one direction, this system is called the police state. In another, it is known as the welfare state. But it matters little what the opposing system may be called in different lands—the essential difference from the American way is always the same. These other systems represent the dominance of the government in the daily lives of the people. The essence of the American system is that government is the servant, never the master of the people.

I was happy to accept your invitation to Charleston today because I feel with deepest conviction that everything we hold dear in America—everything to which we aspire as a nation—is wrapped up in the success and survival of our system of constitutional government, a government of balanced powers, a government of local home rule within the States, a government which is forever restrained by law from pushing the people around to the whim of little bureaucrats with big ideas, and big appropriations.

You are all familiar with that celebrated quotation from Thomas Jefferson's letters early in the nineteenth century, when he admonished his countrymen against the perils of excessive government. Said Jefferson:

"Were we directed by Washington what to sow and what to reap, we should soon want for bread."

The world's bitter experiences with the police state over the last quarter century have given new meaning and new urgency to Jefferson's words. We all know from our practical experience on Main Street that there are many things the people can do better for themselves and more economically than the Government can. Whenever the Government moves into a new field of welfare, the costs go up by a certain percentage of bureaucratic brokerage—the overhead, or administrative costs. Then the service to the people costs not only what the people get but, in addition, something for the planners and thinkers who administer the program. That's the item of bureaucratic brokerage, and that's why every Government service always costs more than the original estimates. In the post office, for example, there will be a deficit this year amounting to more than $500,000,000, and that after the recent postage increases.

A part of my job in the House of Representatives is to bring men together on many projects of national scope and significance.

I have had a lot of experience over the last 30 years with the machinery of conciliation and compromise. I know that nothing good, nothing sound, nothing constructive ever is accomplished save in an atmosphere of mutual trust, mutual confidence, and cordial good will. That is the great secret weapon of America, the determined unity of our people in many States behind the basic fundamentals of constitutional government, government by consent of the governed, not by the will or the whim of some secret clique in far-away Washington who are chasing the elusive rainbows of collectivism and all-powerful state socialism.

Nothing has happened in our recent political history to discourage persistent American endeavor. The opposition party in this country is stronger numerically today than at any time in the last 16 years. In several important States the decision last November in the electoral college was by a margin of less than one-half of 1 percent of the total vote cast.

When you hear all this noisy chatter about a sweeping mandate for this or that project in state socialism—remember that the present administration in Washington is a minority administration—that more people in the United States voted against President Truman last November than voted for him.

I do not mention this in any spirit of narrow partisanship. I merely point out a fact which President Truman himself graciously acknowledged in his inaugural address last week, when he asked for the cooperation and support of men of all parties.

But we must keep in mind that cooperation between parties assumes agreement upon the fundamentals of our treasured American constitutional system. There is no mandate anywhere—at any time—by any group or party, to undermine or disregard the fundamentals of constitutional government. As time goes on, I hope, we shall hear less and less about the mandate.

So, I say to you, there are many constructive elements in the national picture today. Fundamentally, the aspirations of American life are much the same in every section of the country—and I am certain that the congressional delegations from the South are in no mood to see our traditional system of constitutional government undermined and weakened by the advocates of European collectivism.

I recall quite clearly that the Eightieth Congress was summoned into extraordinary session last summer to do many things in the space of 2 weeks. We were told to ease the housing shortage, bring prices down, increase wages, and nail down a lasting world peace—all in 2 weeks. But now the Eighty-first Congress has been in session 4 weeks—and all that has happened, so far, is a pay increase for the President and a small relief bill for western cattlemen.

I mention these things merely to emphasize that the new concept of state socialism for America is not moving along too fast in Washington these days.

The next thing on the legislative calendar up there is a measure to extend for six months the voluntary allocation law enacted last year by that so-called terrible Eightieth Congress; and the next thing after that is to extend the export control bill enacted last year by the Eightieth Congress. Both of these measures expire on February 28, 1949. Now, if that was such a terrible Congress, the Eightieth, as so many were told, is it not strange that the first acts of the Eighty-first will be to pick up two laws placed on the books by the Eightieth Congress and extend them for an additional period. These things mark well the difference between reckless political thunder and the practical realities of effective administration of the public business.

When passions are cooled and we view events in proper historical perspective, we will realize that the Eightieth Congress was one of the most constructive in our national life. We who helped make that program, both Republicans and Democrats, have no apologies to make for the Eightieth Congress. And may I say in all the sharp controversial measures we had the support of a majority of the Congress. We rejoice in its support of sound, forward-looking, solvent, Constitutional government.

The South has little patience with men who undertake to make business the whipping boy for all our economic stresses and strains. We accomplish little for the national welfare by lashing out politically at this group or that as the author of all adversity. The fact is that we should spend more time in Washington giving encouragement and moral support to the men and women—the workers and the managers—who keep the tides of business flowing. All too few among us realize how much we owe to the business community—how much we owe for the regular flow of food and supplies to our great cities—how much we owe for the conveniences and labor-saving devices which are obtainable at the nearest store—how much we owe businessmen for the assistance they give in community projects, in welfare work, hospitals, education, and community services of every sort.

Close down our marvelous business enterprises for so much as one week—if you can imagine such an act of folly—and most of this country would be without the barest necessities of life. In many industries there are hardly 10 days between the factory or the farm and the direct consumption of the product in the American home. How complex and how delicately balanced is the fine economic mechanism which moves this tremendous volume of goods for 145,000,000 people so swiftly, and so silently from production to consumption.

It all works like a gigantic clock. Yet some there are who would destroy this wonderful mechanism and begin building another in the pattern of the Moscow master plan.

Instead, we would do well to reflect a minute on the mighty picture of America's economic power for good—and to remind ourselves that we have a great responsibility to protect and defend this system of free-competitive enterprise, which is the source of our strength and well-being.

This job begins, to my mind, with a firm resolve to sweep Communists and fellow-travelers from the United States Government bureaus and agencies in Washington. Two years ago, in opening the Eightieth Congress, I told my colleagues in the House of Representatives: "There is no room in the Government of the United States for any who prefer the communistic system, or any other form of absolutism, to our American system. Those who do not believe in the way of life which has made us the greatest Nation of all time should not be permitted to occupy positions of trust or power in the American Government. They should be—they must be—removed."

That has been the unwavering position of every true defender of the American way throughout this terrible and costly cold war.

Some have called this issue a "red herring."

But I am happy to note that President Truman, in his inaugural address last Thursday, alluded to communism as a "false philosophy"—he said that millions have been misled by communism—and that "many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty, and tyranny, are their reward."

We are happy, indeed, to welcome President Truman to this new position on the menace of world communism. We have known from the very beginning of our fight against subversives in Washington that we were eternally right—and that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people ultimately would compel the administration to take a firm stand against the world menace of revolutionary communism.

But as we expand our national policy against the killing moral and spiritual aggressions of Kremlin communism, let us remind ourselves every day—we must check the spread of communism at home before we can stop its poisonous growth abroad.

We have a duty close to home, to uproot the killing tentacles of communism in the United States. The Government has ample authority, ample appropriations, and ample moral support for that program—and we who love America intend to see that they put their shoulder to the wheel and get that clean-up done. What is the logic of spending billions of dollars a year overseas to check the tide of communism, if we allow it to gnaw at the very vitals of our own Government in Washington? Let's begin this clean-up at home.

There is no official guess as yet concerning the ultimate money cost of the enlarged program of world assistance. The budget sent to Congress 3 weeks ago called for spending amounting to roundly $42,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950. But that budget omitted three important items of expenditure. The three items left out of that budget may amount to several billions of dollars.

They are:

1. Enlarged aid to Europe.

2. Quick expansion of the United States Air Forces.

3. An enlarged program for reclamation, irrigation, and public works, as already outlined in the various engineering studies submitted by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Obviously these unbudgeted expenditures were in the President's mind when he called for new tax increases amounting to something between four billions and six and one-half billions, including increased pay-roll taxes for the social-security programs. The question then arises—how much Federal tax money can you extract from the American people without destroying their incentive to work and save?

My view is that we already are skimming off too much of the national income for Federal taxes—that the American people will not stand still for another tax increase before some serious attempt is made by the administration to reduce Government expenditures—to eliminate the tremendous waste and overlap, the duplication of work in many bureaus, and the steady piling on of new activities which the people could better handle for themselves. I suggest that before we raise any new taxes, we should try first to cut down the tremendously swollen and wasteful rate of Federal spending, for things which are unnecessary—for things we can't afford—for activities which have no rightful place in a government operated under our American constitutional scheme.

We are still paying the burdensome excise taxes at the full wartime rates—25 percent for cable and radio messages, 25 percent for leased wires, 20 percent on telephone messages, 20 percent on electric-light bulbs, 20 percent on jewelry and luggage, 10 percent on toilet articles. These are wartime tax rates—they are a direct burden on every sort of business transaction—they curb the market for consumer goods—they pyramid up and up into exorbitant costs for the whole business community.

They should be rolled back at once to the prewar rates. For no system of economy can indefinitely stand wartime tax rates carried over into peacetime operations. We must insist again that the soundest way to balance the budget and meet additional defense expenditures is to cut down on waste, extravagance, and reckless spending in the bureaus.

The budget now before Congress is the largest peacetime budget every submitted to any legislative body anywhere at any time in all the history of the world. This budget amounts to about $282 a year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That means $1,128 a year for the average American family of four people. Under that Federal tax burden, every family must lay aside almost $100 a month out of income before it has a penny to spend for itself—for food, clothing, rent, recreation, medical and dentist bill. If we would but cut that Federal "take" in half, we could at once balance every household budget in the land. This is no time to be talking about higher taxes. There is a breaking point in this tax load—and I have a feeling that we are already perilously close to that breaking point. The cost of Government must come down.

Besides the budget receipts. the Federal Government takes in about $2,000,000,000 a year in old-age pension and retirement taxes. Those taxes are not in the budget—but the money is spent as fast as it comes in, for the routine expenses of government—and all the social-security fund gets is a Treasury I O U—a special form of Government bond, for the social-security trust fund. That trust fund now amounts to more than $10,000,000,000—and there is not one penny of cash in it—just Government bonds.

When funds are needed to pay the pension contracts the money will have to be taken from the people a second time—either in additional taxes or in new forms of Government debt. So those social-security liabilities will be paid twice by our people—once in the direct pay-roll taxes and a second time in the conversion of the bonds now in the trust fund to make cash available for the pensions.

That's the kind of "blue sky" finance they are trying in Washington these days. Such operations affect the economy of the entire country. The people get no opportunity to put their own financial houses in order at home, because the Federal tax collector is always standing at the door, for more, more, more.

We cannot stand idly by and watch these things go on forever. It's not good business—and it's not good for business. What hurts business hurts America.

These are but a few of the problems which will test our mettle as Americans during the next 2 years.

We must meet them like men—not run to the refuge of glowing promises—to be performed by the next generation.

We have a national debt of $252,000,000,000, and that is the sternest reality before the American people today.

The vital interests of this country are greater than any political party. Men and women who believe in the Constitution and in American freedom must unite for those policies which will put this great country back on the track of its true destiny.

We must be on the alert against threatened bankruptcy through extravagance and waste in Washington.

We must be on guard against the ever-advancing tides of state socialism and Federal encroachment upon local home rule.

We must stand firm against new advances by government upon the daily lives of the people.

On these great principles a host of Democratic Senators and Representatives in Congress stand shoulder to shoulder with the Republicans on the side of the American tradition.

I, for one, am on the side of hope and reasonable confidence. I have never doubted for a moment that the old faith still lives in the hearts of an overwhelming majority of our people—north, south, east, and west. There can be no doubt, as yet, that we shall eventually win through to the great American dream of ordered liberty under law.

By that program, with that vision, with that high purpose, we shall yet light the lamps of freedom again all over the world.

But we must keep our political powder dry.

Let you, as business leaders, turn to your great work with a will which can know no defeat.

It is a great challenge to the people of America. We must not fail.

Jewish State—Economic News Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the semimonthly bulletin about developments in the economic life of Israel, based upon reports from within the Jewish state, is now being issued jointly by the public-relations department and the economic commission of the Zionist Organization of America, of 41 East Forty-second Street, New York City. I am making a part of the RECORD the first issue of that News Letter because I believe it will prove of considerable interest and help to Members of Congress. Any Members who are interested in receiving future issues may address a letter to the editor at the above address, who has advised me that he will be happy to make future issues available to any Member of Congress desiring them.

The News Letter follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

The Economic News Letter represents an aspect of the expanding services rendered by the ZOA to Israel and the American community. The economic life of Israel, the creation of a self-sustaining economy for its people, is an objective worthy of the best thinking and efforts of Zionists everywhere.

The News Letter is part of our program to meet the new needs and adjustments occasioned by the independence of the state of Israel and to acquaint our membership and all those interested in Israel with conditions and developments there.

In linking the economic life of Israel and America, I salute the new medium of information and urge the American community to make full use of the unique and valuable matter contained in these columns by subscribing to the publication.

Sincerely yours,

DR. EMANUEL NEUMANN.

THE ISRAEL POUND

LONDON CONTROL OF CURRENCY

Under the mandatory administration, the country's currency was issued by the Palestine Currency Board—a body situated in England and represented in Palestine by a currency officer.

The currency was rigid. It was covered by British, British dominion, and colonial government securities. No part of the Board's assets was invested in any Palestinian enterprise, and the currency offered no credit or rediscount facilities whatever. After the termination of the mandate, London control of currency became untenable, and previously existing local machinery for obtaining additional notes disappeared from Palestine. Banks were no longer in a position to increase their cash and any nervousness on the part of the public might well have had fatal results if the banks had been unable to pay out deposits.

It therefore behooved the new Israel Treasury to see that its own notes or securities became a part of the central banking and credit machinery as soon as possible.

FARSIGHTED MEASURES OF BANK

Before the termination of the mandate, the Anglo-Palestine Bank, being conscious of its great responsibility, not only to its own depositors but, in view of its leading position in Palestine, to the country as a whole, took some steps to prepare for the eventuality of British departure. The bank laid in great stocks of Palestine currency notes while these were still obtainable. The bank also decided to print its own notes, and hold them in reserve against any possible emergency.

The state of Israel was formally declared on May 14, 1948. Its provisional Government was kept fully occupied with pressing military, political, economic and other tasks. In the meantime, the Anglo-Palestine Bank studied problems of currency and was ready with plans when the Minister of Finance required them. Owing to the difficulty of hastily creating a central bank and to the time required for all preparations, including the printing of notes, the government decided to avail themselves, at least for the time being, of the credit enjoyed by the Anglo-Palestine Bank as well as of the bank's experience, machinery and banknotes. On August 17, 1948, the Provisional Council of State enacted the bank notes ordinance and the currency ordinances and signed an agreement with the Anglo-Palestine Bank under which the bank was authorized to issue its notes, which became legal tender. Palestine Currency Board notes remained legal tender until September 15, 1948. Thereafter the bank notes became sole legal tender. The exchange rate was one Israel pound for one Palestine pound. The note-issuing functions are concentrated in a special issue department of the bank, which is deemed by law to be a separate and distinct legal person. The assets which the issue department may hold against the currency circulation are: gold, foreign currency, currency notes of the Palestine Currency Board, treasury bills and other Israel Government securities due for redemption within 1 year; loans and rediscounts to banks.

CONVERSION OF CURRENCY NOTES

The new currency was favorably received by the public, and the exchange of old currency notes for new bank notes proceeded smoothly. The issue department published its first weekly statement on August 18, 1948. Its statement as of January 12, 1949, reads as follows:

	Pounds
Gold	---
Foreign currency	6,831,658
Palestine currency notes	18,823,342
Treasury bills	6,000,000
Loans and rediscounts to banks	---
Bank notes in circulation	31,655,000

The item, Palestine currency notes, has been decreasing, and will continue to do so at the rate at which these are handed in to the Palestine Currency Board in London, where credit is obtained in sterling (on what is termed No. 2 account), which increases as sterling accumulates.

PRUTA: NEW SMALL CHANGE

The Israel Government has been empowered to issue metal coins for small change. The Israel pound is to be divided into 1,000 prutot (singular—1 pruta) in lieu of the 1,000 mils as heretofore. Coins will

have denominations ranging from 1 pruta to 500 prutot (equivalent to one-half pound).

Government Borrowing

LOAN OF THE JEWISH AGENCY

The first call upon the Yishuv to lend money for defense purposes was made by the Jewish Agency for Palestine in May 1948, before the establishment of the state. The call was for subscriptions to a loan of 5,000,000 pounds repayable in 10 equal semiannual installments together with interest at 3 percent. To make the loan attractive for merchants, certain priority rights as to allocations of dollars against licenses for essential imports were attached to these certificates and the dollar rate was guaranteed at not below $3 to the pound. The loan was fully subscribed shortly after the offering. The first instalment of capital and interest was paid on December 15, and the semiannual coupons were quoted above par on the Tel-Aviv Securities Clearing House (the local stock exchange).

SHORT-TERM TREASURY LOAN

In September 1948, the Government adopted the system of offering Treasury bills maturing after 91 days for tender by banks and other interested institutions. The administrative arrangements are in the hands of the issue department of the Anglo-Palestine Bank, Ltd., which informs banks and others, weekly, of the Treasurer's offer and accepts tenders on his behalf.

NEW GOVERNMENT LOANS

The third phase of public borrowing is about to open with the forthcoming issue of three separate loans. These are as follows:

(a) Seven million five hundred thousand Israel pounds: Three-percent War Loan (1954/59).

(b) Three million Israel pounds: Three-percent Government Loan (1953).

(c) Three million Israel pounds: Popular Loan Premium Bonds (1949–69).

The first (a) is designed for merchants, manufacturers, people of means, professional men, etc., and is in the form of negotiable registered stock. Interest will be payable semiannually in March and September. Redemption will be by drawings or purchase in the open market of not less than one-tenth of the total amount of the loan in each half year beginning September 1, 1954.

The second loan (b) is designed for banks. Interest is payable semiannually. The loan is redeemable at the conclusion of 5 years or earlier subject to 3 months' prior notice.

The third loan (c) is of a type to which some conservatives might object had it not been previously employed—with a slight difference—by the late mandatory government. Interest is not paid in the normal way but distributed in the form of prizes. Four times per annum, 175 bonds will be drawn for capital redemption and prizes. In three of the four drawings, the first prize will be 5,000 Israel pounds, second 2,500 Israel pounds, third 1,000 Israel pounds, fourth 500 Israel pounds, and 168 various smaller prizes. At the third drawing of each year, the first prize will be 10,000 Israel pounds instead of 5,000 Israel pounds, the other prizes remaining the same. The total interest to be distributed by way of prizes amounts to about 3 percent per annum. The loan is designed for the smaller man. The unit is a premium bond of 20 Israel pounds, and half-bonds of 10 Israel pounds, will also be issued.

All bonds not drawn during the 20 years duration of the loan will be repaid on the conclusion of that period.

The proceeds of the above three loans, totaling 13,500,000 Israel pounds, will be used to defray war expenditure except 4,000,000 Israel pounds will be for important public works of an urgent national character (2,000,000 Israel pounds of this for the railways and civil aviation).

In view of the present stringency of liquid means, the raising of the 7,500,000 Israel pounds war loan is an undertaking which will require a considerable effort on the part of the commercial and industrial community. The various public bodies and organizations such as the chamber of commerce, manufacturers' association, etc., have promised their cooperation and the placing of the loan will be done under the auspices of public committees appointed by the treasurer.

The administration of the three loans will be undertaken by the Anglo-Palestine Bank, Ltd., on behalf of the treasury, a service similar to that rendered by the Bank of England in the administration of British Government loans.

Immigration

1948 IMMIGRATION OVER 100,000

The number of immigrants who entered Israel in the 12 months between the United Nations' Palestine resolution of November 29, 1947, and the end of November, 1948, was over 100,000. The reference is to immigrants only, exclusive of tourists and returning residents. The rate of immigration was on the increase during the latter part of the year, and a monthly figure of about 10,000 immigrants is generally accepted as correct. This means today an annual increase at the rate of about one-seventh of the existing Jewish population. It is thus equivalent to an immigration into the United States of America of about 19,000,000 in 1 year. That this is bound to be a tremendous factor in Israel's economic life need hardly be stressed. The absorption of immigration on so vast a scale has never before been undertaken in modern history. It is bound to pose enormous problems, to require considerable investments and to open equally great industrial and commercial opportunities.

The major problem, of course, is housing. Among the many plans for aid is the joint housing project of the Israel Corporation of America and the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

The Israel Corporation of America, 425 Fourth Avenue, New York City, Albert Schiff, president, organized by leading American Zionists, have registered a stock issue of $6,250,000 with the SEC. The stock is sold in units of one share of preferred and one of common for $25. The first major investment will be a low-cost, multiple-dwelling housing project in Israel in partnership with the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Blueprints and plans have been drawn and are being studied by American experts and implemented.

PLANS FOR IMMIGRANTS

Plans for the settlement of new immigrants, as outlined by the director of the Jewish agency's settlement department in December, include the establishment of 120 to 150 new settlements, the sites of 96 of which have already been selected. At least 4,500,000 pounds are needed for the establishment of these settlements, and another 1,300,000 pounds for development work in Negev.

Since the issuance of these figures, the realization of the above plans has already begun, and many settlements have been set up. These matters, too, are at present treated very discreetly for reasons of security, and the locations of the new settlements are not given. It is understood that while strategic considerations play an important part in the choice of location, the settlements will be situated on land well suited for agricultural production.

The major problem, of course, is housing. All possible means of aid are being recruited. Many American investment companies are entering this field.

INDUSTRY

It will be a regular feature of these newsletters to provide at least one item of industrial news. Industrial developments in Israel will be reviewed, or a report will be made on some interesting manufacturing enterprise.

When thinking of the U. S. A. and its industries, we immediately call to mind Detroit, with finished cars rolling off the assembly lines, or Chicago, with cattle entering the factory at one end and coming out as sausages at the other. American readers will have to forget this scale. In the States there are very many small and medium industries much like our own. These should be borne in mind when thinking of Israel and its industries.

One other point must be explained at the outset. Israel is at war, and its manpower is strained to the utmost. All industries, except those working directly for the war effort, are understaffed. Figures of production are, in consequence, correspondingly low.

PLYWOOD: TIMBER IMPORTED

A fairly young branch of industrial production and one which has grown up in two cooperative settlements, is the manufacture of plywood. Plywood is, of course, an essential article in the furniture and building industries and as such, is important in Israel, with its growing volume of immigration. Israel is not alone in building up such an industry, the raw material of which, timber, is not available locally. Quite a number of European countries, including France, Britain, Germany, and Belgium base their plywood industry largely on imported timber.

The older of the two factories was set up by the cooperative settlement of Afikim in the Jordan Valley in 1938. It is called Kelet. It was originally established to produce light boxes for the transportation of agricultural products. During the World War, the British Middle East forces also placed orders, and the plywood factory grew out of these beginnings. The original investment was about 20,000 pounds and further small investment was made until last year, when the factory was enlarged and additional up-to-date machinery was installed. The total present investment is about 125,000 pounds. The factory's products have undergone a steady improvement and are now of the highest quality.

The second factory, Taal, was established by the settlement of Mishmaroth (25 miles almost due South from Haifa) less than 2 years ago. About 35,000 pounds have been invested and a high-grade product is being manufactured. The settlement is planning to increase the factory's capacity and equipment.

The present monthly output of the two factories together is about 200 cubic meters and roughly equals present local requirements. The production planned for 1949 is a total of about 5,000 cubic meters for the year.

The timber used as raw material is mainly brought from Canada, Yugoslavia, and Equatorial Africa. Locally grown eucalyptus was used during the recent World War when timber could not be imported, but eucalyptus is unsuitable for the purpose.

DOMESTIC PRODUCT STRONGER

It is claimed that imported plywood, which is joined with organic glues such as albumen or casein, does not generally compare in strength with the locally manufactured article and can withstand dampness less well. The product of the two local factories is made with synthetic glue. The measurements, too, of the finished product are adapted to the local standards of size, and the

waste which generally occurs in the use of imported plywood is thus avoided.

It might be mentioned that in this branch of production, the cost of labor represents about 40 percent of the total cost of production. This explains in part why such an industry can be successfully conducted despite the fact that the raw material is wholly imported. Moreover, the cooperative settlements are in an advantageous position in regard to labor because they are able to switch more members on to their industrial production during periods when less labor is required in agriculture.

NOTE.—Subscribers may request discussion of particular industries and every effort will be made to treat them as soon as possible.

FOREIGN TRADE

IMPORT AND EXPORT LICENSES

A license is required for every import to or export from Israel, exclusive of goods brought by the government of Israel or goods imported for Government use, as well as goods imported for the Israeli armed forces, and personal or household utensils brought by immigrants and travellers, or gift parcels sent on certain conditions. The conditions are that the equivalent of the goods contained in one postal parcel and in one consignment does not exceed IL.15—and that each recipient of such parcel does not receive more than one parcel, as stated, within any period of 6 months.

Owing to the lack of foreign currency at present, only the importation of essential goods not produced in Israel, e. g., foodstuffs, raw materials for the local industries, or industrial equipment, is allowed. Applications for licenses to import or to export must be submitted to the export and import licensing control. Licenses are issued to Israeli citizens only. The import and export licensing control consults the Controller of Foreign Exchange, the Food Controller, the Controllers of Light and Heavy Industries, the Controller of Fuel, and the Controller of Diamonds. Licenses are confirmed only after the necessary foreign exchange has been secured, and therefore all decisions depend on the foreign currency at the Government's disposal from time to time. In view of this state of affairs, no order of priority of essential goods has been published as yet. Licenses are issued in respect of goods which are essential at the time of the application, in the order of their importance and taking into account the currency available at the time.

All applications received by the import and export licensing department are considered on their merits. The past-trade principle is usually not applied, in order not to discriminate against new immigrants.

CUSTOMS DUTIES

ARTICLES EXEMPTED FROM TARIFF

(According to the Israeli consulate general)

The following articles are exempt from customs duty, if they are included in the passengers' baggage:

(a) Old and new wearing apparel, and personal effects, in reasonable quantities.

(b) Binoculars, photographic cameras, typewriters, and sports accessories, provided they have been used, and the customs officer is satisfied that they are part of the personal belongings of the passenger.

(c) Implements, instruments, and tools for the professional use of the passenger.

(d) Intoxicating liquors up to a maximum of one-quarter liter.

(e) Eau de cologne or other scents, up to a maximum quantity of one-quarter liter.

(f) Tobacco (including cigars and cigarettes) up to a maximum quantity of 200 grams.

(g) Other goods liable to customs duty, if the amount of duty to be paid does not exceed 50 mils.

(h) The exemptions specified above are granted only in the event that the statements made to the customs officer are correct.

2. In spite of the fact that no provision is made in the customs tariff, it is customary to grant passengers exemption from customs duty on minor quantities of other articles (including foodstuffs), provided they are for his own personal use and within reasonable limits. Passengers have to declare to the customs officer that such articles are included in his baggage. If the customs officer is of the opinion that the quantities are extensive, customs duty must be paid.

Rice 1.5 mils per kilogram; canned meat (corned beef) 7.50 mils per kilogram; cheese 20 mils; butter 20 mils per kilogram; milk 8 percent of value; intoxicating liquors 600 mils for a small bottle and 1,200 mils for an ordinary-size bottle; canned fish 10 mils per kilogram; sugar 7.5 mils per kilogram plus 15 percent of value; jams 10 mils per kilogram plus 30 percent of value; other foodstuffs 35 percent of value; cigarettes 6.250 pounds per kilogram; cigars 8.500 pounds per kilogram.

Passengers bringing with them drafts of money, checks, or foreign currency, must give the customs officer detailed information. In these cases, the customs officer will register in the passport all particulars relating to the foreign currency. The foreign currency will be left in the possession of the passenger, but when leaving the country again, he will have to produce to the customs officer the sum registered in his passport. The passenger is allowed to sell the money in Israel, but only to a bank which is authorized to buy foreign currency on behalf of the authorities. In this case, the passenger will receive from the bank a note certifying the sale of the foreign currency, and this certificate must be shown by him to the customs officer, together with his passport, when leaving the country.

POSTAL SERVICE

UNITED STATES PARCEL-POST RULES

Ordinary and registered small packets and letter packages (surface or air) containing merchandise, and ordinary (unregistered and uninsured) parcel-post packages, are now accepted for mailing to the state of Israel, says a recent United States Postal Bulletin.

The weight limit for a package sent by parcel post is 22 pounds; the greatest length allowed is 3½ feet; the greatest length and girth combined, 6 feet. No provisions have been made for the insuring or registering of parcel-post packages.

According to United States Postal Bulletin No. 19192 of December 21, addressees in Israel are required to possess import licenses in order to take delivery of (1) all parcels mailed for commercial purposes; (2) all parcels sent as gifts exceeding $60 in value; and (3) parcels sent as bona fide gifts exceeding $4 but not exceeding $60 in value, when more than one is received in a 6-month period. Gift parcels not exceeding $4 in value may be received by persons in Israel in unlimited numbers without import licenses.

Parcels addressed to Israel must be marked by the senders either "Bona fide gift" or "Addressee has obtained import license," and care must be taken to see that the value of the contents is clearly shown on the customs declarations. It is the responsibility of senders to determine that the addressees of their parcels have obtained import licenses. If the licenses are not produced when required, the parcels are liable to confiscation.

A Rough Deal for District of Columbia Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the basis of American democracy is the public-school system. No nation in the world can boast our educational plant, nor the educational accomplishments of our people.

We demand of our teachers the finest educational background. They have to be college graduates to teach in the primary schools, and we demand graduate degrees of them for each successive step of increased responsibility. They must spend a certain amount of their own time in study, continuously.

Yet teachers are seldom paid in proportion to their responsibilities, to their importance in a representative Republic, and to their needs.

Here in the District of Columbia the salaries of teachers rank almost at the bottom of a tabulation of salaries proportioned to education and tenure.

To attempt to save a few pennies in the District of Columbia budget by paring back the cost-of-living increases for teachers defies all logic and reason. It is clearly discriminatory. It can result only in driving from the teaching staffs of Washington schools the cream of our teachers.

Even the conservative Washington Star feels that the District's school teachers are getting a bad deal. Under leave, I now insert the full text of an editorial from the Star of Sunday, February 13, 1949:

A FAIR DEAL FOR TEACHERS

There is no just basis for discriminating against public-school teachers in the pending plan to include District Government employees in the $330 pay-raise program voted last year for Federal workers. The Federal raise was a cost-of-living adjustment applied generally, except for the District. It costs teachers just as much to live as it does anyone else. It is grossly unfair, therefore, to hold that they should receive less than the $330 awarded Federal employees. Yet a House District subcommittee has voted in favor of giving teachers only $200, instead of the $330 favored for policemen and firemen.

Such an inequitable plan would be piling injustice on injustice and thus would add to the difficulties of School Superintendent Corning in obtaining qualified teachers. Representative BATES of Massachusetts argued that teachers should be given the full increase only if they could show that this sum is needed to meet increased living costs since they last received a raise, in 1947. That raise, he said, had boosted teachers' salaries 80 percent over those of 1942. But Dr. Corning points out that the 80-percent figure applied only to minimum and maximum salaries, that no teachers at present are being paid the maximum allowed and that the average 1947 increase actually amounted to 49 percent. Yet the cost of living has risen approximately 70 percent since the beginning of World War II. It would take a cost-of-living increase more than three times

the $200 proposed to bring the average salary of teachers to a level justified by the rise in prices since 1942.

And it will take a lot more than $200 or $300 to raise teachers' salaries in Washington to the levels prevailing in most of the large cities. Latest salary figures of the National Education Association show that Washington stands eighteenth in the list of 20 of the larger cities. The average pay here for classroom teachers is $3,486, as compared with $4,630 in New York; $4,423 in Newark, N. J.; $4,381 in Detroit, $4,294 in Los Angeles, $4,104 in Chicago, $4,075 in San Francisco, and $4,035 in Milwaukee. Other cities with higher pay scales are Cincinnati, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Mo.; Boston, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and St. Louis.

Mr. BATES has indicated disapproval of basing pay raises here on scales prevailing in other cities. But school authorities here cannot afford to shut their minds to conditions elsewhere. One of the reasons for the teacher shortage is the lure of high salaries in other cities. The Washington school system cannot hope to attract and hold the type of teachers which it should have if the pay scale continues to be so far out of line with the average paid in other large cities. As a matter of simple equity to local teachers and as a means of maintaining good educational standards in the Nation's Capital, Congress should see to it that teachers are treated as fairly as other groups in the matter of wage increases.

Why We Need Government Steam Electric Power Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it seems that so many people miss the point concerning the Government's plan to construct auxiliary steam power plants that I submit here a copy of a letter giving my views on this important issue to secretary of the Associated Taxpayers of Idaho:

FEBRUARY 15, 1949.

Mr. MAX YOST,
Associated Taxpayers of Idaho,
Boise, Idaho.

DEAR MR. YOST: Thanks for your telegram indicating the apprehension of the members of your association concerning the appropriation of funds for the construction of an auxiliary steam plant in connection with the operation of the hydroelectric plants of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I am sure we all recognize the fact that the Federal Government has large investments in the hydroelectric plants in question, and at the present time is unable to get the maximum return from all the power generated by these plants due to seasonal conditions and slack water at certain periods of the year, and that supplemental steam plants are required to provide for the year-around utilization of the hydroelectric power available during the peak production months of the year.

As I see it, denying the Government supplemental power producing facilities to maintain power production in slack water seasons would be like limiting a farmer to the use of a motor truck to serve his transportation needs at all seasons, when horses and a sleigh are a necessity in the season of deep snowfalls.

I trust that the members of your organization will support a program to utilize steam power and thereby increase the revenue-producing capacity of the plants in question.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

The Group Libel Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter to the editor of the New York Times from Mr. Joachim Prinz, chairman, administrative committee, American Jewish Congress. It is an excellent analysis of the provisions and benefits of the bill which is before the Committee on the Judiciary to make unlawful the transportation or mailing of defamatory material relating to racial or religious groups.

The letter follows:

SCOPE OF GROUP LIBEL LAW—BILL ENDORSED AS SAFEGUARD AGAINST ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS DEFAMATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Defamation of ethnic and religious groups stands revealed today as a prime cause of discord in group relations and in the embitterment of millions of individuals. Fairness and humanity demand remedial measures. The group libel bill introduced by Representatives DAWSON, KEOGH, KEATING, JAVITS, and KLEIN attempts to furnish safeguards against the established evil with scrupulous regard for constitutional guaranties of freedom of expression.

The purpose of the bill is to extend to individuals in their capacity as members of ethnic and religious groups the type of protection from libel enjoyed by them in their capacity as unaffiliated individuals.

The law, which in its present state provides protection for an individual defamed as a private party, but not as a member of an ethnic or religious group, presents an obvious anomaly. It can no more be justified than a rule which required the criminal prosecution of assaults and batteries only when motivated by malice directed against the individual victim as distinct from malice against the entire group to which the victim belonged. Such a rule is obviously not the law.

Libelous attacks on ethnic or religious groups as such touch and concern each of their individual component members. Their insidious effects are clearly beyond all dispute. Over and above the personal injuries inflicted, they have nourished and sustained ethnic and religious discrimination, contributed to civic dissension, and enfeebled the Nation at large. Undismayed by these consequences, ethnic and religious hatemongers of all types not only peddle with complete immunity their poison but are abetted in their efforts by the availability of mailing privileges.

PROVISIONS OF BILL

The bill, now introduced, which offers the best remedies to date, makes it a Federal crime to engage in such incitements by way of printed or mimeographed material, distributed in interstate commerce. Truth or reasonable and honest belief in the truth of statements made is an absolute defense under the bill. Responsible administration of the statute is assured by requiring the Attorney General's approval and supervision of each prosecution.

In no way does the bill infringe upon freedom of speech or of the press. Constitutional guarantees of both these freedoms were designed to encourage traffic in ideas and knowledge. Ethnic or religious defamation has no more relation to ideas or knowledge than the use of purely insulting or "fighting" words already barred by the law. Utterances may well be proscribed when, as decided by the Supreme Court in *Chaplinsky* v. *New Hampshire*, they form "no essential part of any exposition of ideas and are of such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality."

The group libel bill in question is not designed to outlaw oral statements or personal correspondence evincing ethnic or religious ill-will. It is not meant to provide a definitive solution to all ethnic and religious conflicts. It is believed, however, that within its sphere it will substantially contribute to the general health of the body politic.

JOACHIM PRINZ,
Chairman, Administrative Committee, American Jewish Congress.
NEW YORK, *February 8, 1949.*

Know Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Earle D. Chesney, a Government career employee of 30 years, has been liaison representative for the Veterans' Administration on Capitol Hill since 1924. He has served in two wars, having been in the Army in World War I and in the Navy in World War II where he was on duty in every theater. Later he accompanied a congressional committee on an inspection trip of all naval bases encircling the globe and has received a commendation from the Secretary of the Navy for extremely meritorious services.

Mr. Chesney was the originator and creator of a cartoon character, Eggburt and other Navy cartoons, which was one of the wartime high lights of the United States Navy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Chesney entitled "Know Your Congress":

KNOW YOUR CONGRESS

(By Earle D. Chesney, Director, Congressional Liaison Service, U. S. Veterans' Administration)

When Rear Adm. Edwin D. Foster, Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Navy Department invited me to speak before the Supply Corps officers on the subject, Know Your Congress, I did not realize what a difficult task I had before me. In gathering the material for this talk, I was quite sure that I would find volumes in the Congressional Library that would be interesting, but was greatly surprised to discover that little had been written on this subject. However, the late Col. Edwin A. Halsey, Secretary of the United States Senate, had written an excellent pamphlet explaining the procedure of the Senate which is good as far as it goes, but it is, I am afraid, too technical

to interest those not already familiar with the work of the Congress. Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, a Member from Texas, and Senator ESTES KEFAUVER from Tennessee, each have written excellent books on government with Mr. KEFAUVER, perhaps, coming as near to giving an over-all picture of Congress in his book entitled, "Twentieth Century Congress," as has been published to date. It is my endeavor to give you the history and function of Congress and its relationship to Government departments.

The House of Representatives is the oldest part of our Government. Its origin came with the convention of delegates representing different sections and communities of the Thirteen Colonies, who met in Philadelphia in 1774 to carve out of the chaos of 13 unrelated local governments a central and more adhesive government. Here we find the birth of the Continental Congress, a unicameral body, which wrote the Articles of Confederation and constituted the sole governmental agency through those trying years when the Colonies were shaking off the shackles of the British Empire. During this time there was no Chief Executive, all power being vested in the Continental Congress, a unicameral body. Officer of the Congress was called the President, and we recognize such eminent names as Peyton Randolph, of Virginia; John Hancock, of Massachusetts; John Jay, of New York; and Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, among those who served in this capacity during the 15-year existence of this Congress.

The framers of the Constitution of the United States retained the format of the Continental Congress, renamed it the House of Representatives, and it remains today the heart of our Government. Provisions for a Senate of the United States completed the legislative picture. It must suffice here to say that the writers of the Constitution in organizing the legislative branch of the Federal Government with an "upper body" and a "lower body" borrowed from the theories and details of parliamentary systems which had been in existence for centuries.

The Constitution contains, in separate articles, provisions for three departments of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. There is a significant difference in the grants of power to these departments. The first article, treating of legislative power, vests in Congress "all legislative powers"; the second article, vests "the executive power" in the President; and the third article states that "the judicial power of the United States" shall be vested in the Supreme Court and such inferior courts as Congress may establish. The doctrine of separation of these powers is that no one of the three branches is to encroach upon another, except as authorized by the Constitution. The essential functions of the legislature are not to be usurped by the executive nor by the judiciary. In this way a concentration of power is avoided and respective powers are delegated to the departments best fitted to exercise them.

Something of the constituency of Congress should be noted. Who is a Congressman and what are the qualifications for the office? A Congressman is a Member of either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Actually the official title of a Member of the House is "Representative," and a Member of the Senate is usually referred to as "Senator."

As it is well known, there are 435 Representatives and 96 Senators.

A Representative must be at least 25 years of age, must have been a citizen of the United States for at least 7 years, and must reside in the State—and usually, though not necessarily, in the district—from which he is elected to Congress. A Senator must be at least 30 years of age, must have been a citizen of the United States for at least 9 years, and must be a resident of the State from which he is elected to Congress. There are no other qualifications to become a Member of Congress, but it is interesting to note that the membership of Congress represents a rather complete cross section of American life. Nearly every professional and many nonprofessional vocations are present. In the Eightieth Congress there are in the Senate 24 former governors, 5 former judges, and 1 general; in the 2 Houses may be found ministers, doctors, dentists, lawyers, bankers, educators, writers, merchants, etc. The Senate has 45 veterans while the House has 200 veterans, of which 65 have been former Naval and Marine officers.

Candidates for office use various methods to attract attention and induce the people to support them. The story of Abraham Lincoln's first race for Congress in Illinois illustrates his cleverness as a campaigner. It is said that on a Sunday morning he attended church in a town some distance from his home town of Springfield. The minister, in his enthusiasm to induce his listeners to declare themselves on the side of the Lord, stopped in his sermon and said, "I want all those who desire to go to heaven when they die to please stand."

When practically all of the congregation had risen, he asked them to be seated. Then he said, "Now, all those who desire to go to the other place when they die, please stand." Nobody stood up.

Then the preacher said, "I notice that our able young lawyer from Springfield did not stand when I asked those to arise who desire to go to heaven, nor when I asked those to arise who wanted to go to the other place. I wonder if he would be willing to tell us where he does want to go."

Lincoln straightened out his long legs and arose slowly, and, turning half way around so he could see most of the congregation, bowed slightly and smiled, as he said, "I want to go to Congress."

As was mentioned before, the Constitution, using the theories of other parliamentary systems as basis for our legislative set-up, spells out the functions and powers of the two Houses of Congress and provides that each House shall determine the rules of its proceedings. The parliamentary practices in Congress have emanated from four sources generally: First, the Constitution of the United States; secondly, Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice, which was prepared by Thomas Jefferson for his own use as President of the Senate, and which constitutes the basis for some of the most important parts of the practices of the House of Representatives; thirdly, the rules of the respective Houses which have been adopted from time to time; and, fourthly, the precedents, which are decisions of presiding officers in the construing of the rules, the authority, etc., of the House and Senate. It is of interest to note that the precedents used in the House were edited and compiled by Representative CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, who, prior to his service in Congress, was parliamentarian of the House in the Sixty-fourth through the Sixty-sixth Congresses.

It would be of little value, as a matter of fact confusing, to take up the procedure of Congress in detail. In certain aspects the procedure of the House and Senate varies drastically, and terms that would be necessarily used would shed little light without long explanation and involved definitions. Therefore, it is felt that nothing can be accomplished by going into these matters, suffice it to say here that the customs of the proceedings, the order of business, priority of motions and proposed legislation, privileges of the Members, follow the long-established rules of parliamentary procedure as qualified and adapted to the problems which are unique to the individual Houses of Congress.

The progress of a bill in Congress before it becomes a law may seem rather complicated to those not familiar with parliamentary procedure so that when they hear someone say there ought to be a law to do this or to do that, they are not in a position to know how much work is involved before a bill is enacted into law. A bill may be drafted by any Member and by placing the measure in the hopper, a box on the Clerk's desk, it is numbered and sent to the Government Printing Office and made available next morning at the document room. The bill is referred to a standing or select committee by the Parliamentarian, who notes the titles and contents of the bill and thereby determines the committee having jurisdiction over that type of legislation.

The committee chairman usually refers the bill to a subcommittee for consideration. The subcommittees are responsible for the major bulk of the workload in Congress. In order to save the time of the full committee it is the duty of the subcommittee to hear testimony, to develop facts, and to report their findings and recommendations of the subcommittee, and report the bill. This same procedure prevails in both Houses.

However, in consideration of bills on the floors of the House and Senate, the technique differs in many respects. This is understandable because of the difference in the make-up of the House and Senate and in their basic functions. As mentioned above, the less said of these procedural matters in an undertaking of this kind the better; but merely for the sake of illustrating the point raised a couple of illustrations will be made. When a bill is read for amendment (i. e., for the purpose of consideration of amendments) no Member of the House can speak for more than 5 minutes on any one amendment. Again, generally, no Member may occupy more than 1 hour in debate on any question in the House. These limitations on debate do not apply in the Senate, and it is well known what effect the filibuster has had in the past on certain legislation.

Where the House and Senate cannot agree as to contents of a bill, an interesting procedure follows. Conferees, usually selected from the subcommittee handling the bill in committee, are appointed by the President or President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to settle the differences. Upon reaching an agreement through compromise, etc., the conferees report to their respective Houses, which accept or reject the results of their efforts. In case of the latter, conferees are appointed again, sometimes different ones, and the same procedure continues until there is a complete agreement between the Houses.

After both Houses have passed the bill the Speaker, in all cases, must first sign the bill; then it is referred to the Vice President or President pro tempore for signature and transmitted to the President of the United States. The general policy of the President is to refer bills to the Director of the Budget and the department involved for study before he affixes his signature. In the event the bill is vetoed, both Houses must vote again on the bill and unless passed by a two-thirds vote the bill does not become a law and the President's veto is sustained. After the President signs the bill, or after a bill has been passed over a Presidential veto, it is sent to the Department of State, where it is recorded and a public law number is assigned and the law print is made available in the House and Senate document rooms and through the Government Printing Office.

This procedure may seem ponderous, duplicatory, and inefficient to the average person. Congress itself made thorough studies of its organization and methods during the Seventy-ninth Congress, which resulted in the Legislative Reorganization Act. Among other things, this act reduced, by merger, many of the congressional committees and authorized the assignment of specialists to the committees to furnish them with much

needed and, theretofore, unavailable information on proposed legislation.

Both Appropriations Committees now have staffs which have authority to investigate Government departments and to check on their accounting systems. The Armed Services Committees have permanent staffs, as well as other major committees, with authority to investigate and secure material for the membership of their committees.

You may ask the question during this résumé of the work of Congress as to what part you may play in the Government departments where Congress is concerned. The answer, I believe, is this:

The Supply Corps of the Navy performs a most important function during peacetime as well as wartime. The Supply Corps exists to serve the fleet, and in this connection it should be borne in mind that Congress has few men in its membership who are authorities on, or who are familiar in any way with, the operation of naval craft, both air and sea, but they all have a general knowledge of the cost of food, clothing, matériel, and most of the activities that come under the cognizance of the Supply Corps and Government agencies.

In the inspections made with congressional committees during the war I noted it was only when the Supply Corps' activities were inspected that one could sense a general feeling among the Congressmen that "Here's a subject that I know what they are talking about," for immediately their interest perked up and more questions were forthcoming. This should make every supply officer a salesman of the Corps, especially in dealing with Congress.

The opportunity afforded Government officials during inspections should be accepted on the theory that "Here's a Member of Congress who desires to know just what we are doing," and explain to him in detail so he will have a clearer understanding of your problems. It must be remembered that the chief of a bureau does not sit on the floor of the House of Representatives when Congress is in session, so he cannot be present to answer any questions that may arise affecting his department. Unless Members of Congress themselves have a general knowledge of facts, it is quite possible for erroneous statements to go unchallenged and to become detrimental to the department which otherwise could have been avoided.

Your Congress, being elected by the people of the United States, is made up of a body of men and women that can truthfully be called your board of governors. They have the responsibility of keeping their voters or the stockholders of your Government advised of the state of the Union. It is impossible for any one Member of Congress to be an authority on every Government agency. It has also been found impractical for Congress to accept all Government reports as presented; therefore they must protect the taxpayers and themselves by having these investigating bodies or groups to check on information received to determine its accuracy and to improve the service and functions of Government agencies.

The word "investigation" as used by Congress is a very overtaxed word. It does not often mean what the word implies, for I am quite sure the attitude of Congress is to work with departments and to enjoy a cooperative understanding. It must be stated, however, that some investigations result from information reaching Congress that would indicate "all is not running smoothly" in some Government agency.

The story of how the Truman committee was born is an excellent illustration. The President, then a Member of the Senate from Missouri, was on the Senate Appropriations Committee and, because of his World War I experience, was particularly interested in the War Department budget. In mid-January 1941 Mr. Truman began to receive disturbing reports on the conduct of the national defense program. Letters from Missouri complained that money was being wasted in the construction work being done at Fort Leonard Wood. The Senator decided to see for himself. He loaded his suitcases into his car and drove from Washington to the fort unannounced. He strolled quietly through the sprawling huts and skeleton framework of the great barracks. On every hand he saw evidence of waste and poor management. Then he drove back to Washington, visiting camp construction projects along the way. Everywhere the story was the same. Mr. Truman returned to Washington angry clear through. On February 10, 1941, he told the Senate about it. He insisted that to avoid a national scandal and to spur on the defense effort a special committee should be established that would hunt down waste and inefficiency and open up the bottleneck. On March 1, 1941, the Senate set up a committee of seven Senators, naming Mr. Truman chairman. It is impossible to assess the accomplishments of this committee in terms of dollars and cents. Thoughtful persons have estimated that it saved between four and six billion dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives.

Not all the investigations were conducted by the Truman committee, since practically every Senate and House committee has authority under the Reorganization Act to investigate any agency which they believe is not conducting its department along sound business lines. For instance, $40,000,000 was appropriated to build the famous Pentagon Building, and, as a result of a one-man investigation by Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, of Michigan, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, it was discovered that the actual, final cost of the Pentagon amounted to $85,861,576. Mr. ENGEL stated that whenever millions of dollars were needed above the legal limit they were obtained through some expert shuffling of funds. The additional cost may have been justified completely, but the point is that Congress was unable to follow through adequately even on this peacetime expenditure. This weakness became a glaring one, as the war made it necessary to appropriate tens of billions of dollars, much of which had been loaned to the Government by the public in the form of war bonds.

Under the reorganization act, Congress now has additional staffs for aiding its committees to enable them to do a better job. However, these staffs are gradually becoming more proficient in the technical services rendered the committees and their permanent status under the reorganization act is building a career public service on Capitol hill.

I believe that Members of Congress and attachés of the Capitol are conscientious and honest in their endeavor to see that this Government is run as efficiently as possible. It is unreasonable to assume that a Member of Congress or a clerk of a committee can know every phase of our huge Government structive any more than one can expect a supply officer to know how to fly a naval aircraft or command a submarine, just because he is in the Navy. For this reason, it is highly essential for every Government agency to acquire a better understanding of Congress and to maintain a close liaison which makes for better cooperation. It is only natural that an official resents the fact that his department is being investigated and too often shows this resentment. It must be borne in mind that policies of the Government departments have been well planned and have cleared all bureaus and the Director of the Budget, if money is involved, as well as the Comptroller General, before they are approved by Congress. Therefore, individual officials in their dealings with Members of Congress or investigators for congressional committees have no need to worry if they can explain clearly the operations of their particular department.

I remember an incident during the war when the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations inspected a naval base in Oakland. While driving over the bridge to the base, I noticed the chairman, Mr. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, was very much interested in the number of railroad cars in that area loaded with war material, standing on the sidetracks. No sooner did Admiral Mayo conclude his introduction than the chairman asked how much demurrage was being paid at that base. The admiral stated that he did not have those figures with him, but perhaps one of his assistants present could give him the information. A young officer stepped forward and gave the amount. The chairman stated that he was quite sure that the figures were incorrect since he had personally observed, as did other members of the committee, the large number of cars surrounding the naval base loaded with war material. The young officer immediately explained that it was true that the committee had seen a lot of war material on cars in that area, but added that they did not contain Navy material; instead they contained Army equipment ready for overseas shipment. The committee in their inspection found the young officer's statements to be accurate and congratulated him. It was then learned that the young officer was John Roosevelt, son of the late President. It can readily be seen that a prompt reply to the committee chairman convinced the committee that the military officers there knew what they were doing. A positive yes or no in such cases is far better than an evasive answer which only leads to suspicion.

One of our leading statesmen made a remark to me when I was first assigned to the Capitol that made a lasting impression. The President was to address a joint session of Congress and there was a bitter feeling from the opposite party as to some of his policies. The statesman referred to was a member of that opposition, and when the President entered the House Chamber, everyone rose and cheered. After the ovation he turned to me and said, "Every President, regardless of political affiliations, wants to do a good job and wants to go down in history as having been a great President." That statement, I believe goes beyond the Presidency to our Cabinet officers, Members of Congress, Government officials, and officers of the Military Establishments. Operating on this theory, I am firmly convinced that troubles can be avoided if Congress and the executive agencies could have a closer understanding. It has been proposed by several prominent Members of Congress that Cabinet officers be allowed to address the House of Representatives so that they could be questioned by Congress and give first-hand information as to the operations of their respective departments.

Under the present system, the major bulk of the legislative work is conducted by subcommittees generally consisting of five to seven members. They spend hours and days listening to testimony on vital subjects which is published after the hearings have been completed. It is a physical impossibility for any Member of Congress to read all the testimony taken before various committees in any one session before he is called upon to vote on major questions. They, therefore, must accept the statements made on the floor at the time the particular legislation is being considered and determine their vote accordingly.

Naturally, it is disappointing to department heads who feel that vital legislation is given so little personal consideration by each Member, but, under the present system, a Member of Congress, cannot possibly keep informed on all pending legislation and still conduct the necessary routine business that his office requires.

In conclusion, I should like to relate a story that former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes told, when he was a Senator from South Carolina, to a group of his friends

when discussing the amount of work conducted by Congress and the momentous decisions that have to be made every day.

A farmer was bemoaning the fact that he did not have any help and would have to give up his farm unless he secured the services of some competent man soon. A friend stated that he might get him a hired hand and to be patient.

The next morning a large strapping fellow appeared at the farmer's house and reported to work. The farmer looked him over and from the physical appearance he looked capable of doing a full day's work, so he took him out to the edge of the lot and told him to dig some post holes 20 yards apart and 3 feet deep, which would be a full day's work if the man worked steadily. About 3 o'clock in the afternoon the farmer saw him return and thought surely it was the same old story—he was quitting because the work was too hard. So he went out to meet him and remarked, "I guess you are ready to quit."

"Nope, I already finished the job," replied the hired man.

The farmer made an inspection and found that he had done exactly what he had asked although he had dug some of the holes a little deeper than was required. The next morning he assigned the hired man to plow the field, which was another full day's work, and about 3:30 p. m. the hired man returned to the farmer's house. This time the farmer was convinced that he was going to quit. But the hired hand told him that he finished the job and, sure enough, he had done an excellent day's work. The next day it was raining so the farmer took the hired hand to the cellar and told him that he was going to have it easy that day since he couldn't work in the fields and asked him to sort a carload of potatoes. He was instructed to throw the bad potatoes into one bin so they could be fed to the hogs, put the good ones in another bin so that they could be sent to market, and the potatoes selected for seed purposes to be put into the third bin. About 2 hours after he left the hired man, the farmer decided to go down to the cellar to see how he was getting along and discovered him lying on the floor, completely out. The farmer threw some water in his face to revive him. When the hired man was able to talk, the farmer asked if someone had hit him or had he struck his head on the beam, or what.

The hired man answered, "Nope, it wasn't that—it was making all those decisions that exhausted me."

Well, Congress gets exhausted too, but the decisions are more complex than those of the hired hand's, and there is no quitting for Congress if the American democracy—which we all are sworn to defend—is to survive as we know it. You in the Government can help Congress in reaching decisions on matters essential to our national interest and security by a continuing attitude and active pursuit of cooperative spirit between yourselves and the Members of Congress in every circumstance that may arise, whether large or small.

Communists Stall for Time in the West and Concentrate on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Toronto Evening Telegram of January 15, 1949, contained an article by Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev regarding the purposes of Russia in the Orient. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article referred to:

(Disillusioned and dismayed, Lt. Col. Grigori A. Tokaev, Soviet jet and air research expert who carried out secret tasks for the Politburo and was privy to the innermost counsels of the Kremlin, fled his country to find freedom in Britain. In a series of articles, on successive Saturdays, he will tell Telegram readers the top secrets of Stalin.)

The most important fact about the U. S. S. R. that you of the West must get into your heads is that Stalin means business. By business I mean world domination by any means, including war. There would in all probability already have been war, or at least a red-hot incident, over Berlin but for three facts:

1. American monopoly of the atomic bomb.
2. Anglo-American air superiority.
3. Widespread discontent inside the U. S. S. R., not only in the armed forces and the population, but also in the ruling circles.

The last fact was perhaps the most important of all, and needs a little explanation. The Politburo made a number of promises to the population during the war, but immediately the urgent need for popular backing was past, it became evident that these promises would not be kept.

QUIETED BY LIQUIDATION

The immediate reaction of the Politburo to the widespread discontent which became manifest was a large-scale purge in all the spheres of Soviet life, and in particular a thorough purge of the intelligentsia under the personal supervision of the late Zhadanov, one of the most hated of Soviet leaders.

The ultimate aim of Soviet policy is the creation, by armed conflict if necessary, of a universal Soviet Union. The argument is stated repeatedly in primer-clear language in all the principal works of bolshevism—and by no one more forcefully than Stalin himself. Stalin said: "The theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a specifically Russian theory but a theory compulsory for all countries." The temptation in the West is to put down Bolshevism's fantastic ambitions as sheer claptrap, but the Soviet Union is rearming as fast as the Politburo can drive the exhausted, disenchanted, and unhappy people in its power.

TEMPO IS FEVERISH

Preparations for the struggle proceed at a feverish tempo in every branch of Soviet life. No single event since the revolution itself—not even the sudden German onslaught in 1939—ever caused more consternation among the members of the Politburo than the dropping of the first atom bomb on Hiroshima. The realization that the most powerful of the capitalist countries had come into possession of a weapon which, at a stroke, had outmoded all the war machines of Communist politics was a stunning blow.

CHANGE IN STRATEGY

Since 1945, by Stalin's specific orders, Soviet strategy started to be completely overhauled to accord with the potentialities of the so-called American experiment. For 3½ years Soviet science has been striving to solve the atom problem in a practical way. Everything connected with the problem commands super-top priority. Great numbers of workmen and the brains of the leading physicists and technologists are concentrated upon this single objective. If all goes as at present, a practical, as distinct from an experimental, atomic bomb will not be in possession of the Soviet Union before 1951–53.

DATES STILL HELD

Those dates were still the basic planning dates in Soviet policy when I left Soviet service some months ago. Since a war with the United States on anything like equal terms was unthinkable without the atomic bomb, the Politburo was compelled to take a number of strategic and tactical steps in order to avoid a direct "hot" war. The outstanding example of one of these steps is the war now being waged in southeast Asia. I do not say that war will necessarily come in 3 to 5 years, but I warn you that Stalin will be ready then. Stalin is the same old Stalin. Mr. Roosevelt failed to charm him, and Mr. Churchill to move him. The fantastic burgeoning of Western power has temporarily puzzled and frustrated him. But as a Marxist-dialectician, he will undoubtedly take any chance which may present itself in any future crisis and/or upheaval in the capitalist world, provided the atom-bomb problem is solved.

POLITBURO POLICY

The next question is: Where is Soviet policy headed right now? There is no such thing as Soviet foreign policy. There is only a Politburo policy. The 13 men who stand at the summit of power inside the Soviet Union conduct its foreign affairs. Looking out from Moscow, Stalin and company visualize the Soviet revolutionary destiny in terms of two immense tasks. Task one is Europe generally, beginning with Germany; task two, Asia, beginning with China. For obvious reasons, Europe was in the beginning, and still remains, task one.

The collapse of Germany, leaving an apparent vacuum in Europe, presented the Politburo with an incredible opportunity. It concentrated at once on task one, confident that in a matter of a few years, possibly by the end of 1950, it would be master of the European continent. However, many things went wrong.

DRIVES FAILED

The failure of Communist drives in Italy, France, and Germany: the inherently anti-Communist cast of British Labor; the defection of Tito; the fact that western Communists exposed themselves as closely linked with the Kremlin; the return of United States power to Europe in the form of the Marshall plan—all these combined to bring the drive westward to a temporary standstill. These difficulties compelled a reappraisal of strategy. It was conceded by the Politburo that the struggle for Europe would prove much harder than had been assumed; and it would be dangerous to attempt to pursue it to conclusion so long as task two remained unmastered. Therefore the Politburo decided to shift its attention to Asia—with consequences now plain to everybody.

MASTERING CHINA

They have so far failed in Europe, but they are on the verge of mastering China. The Politburo has achieved in China success on a scale that the West has not yet even begun to realize. There is a popular theory that the next world war will start over China. No matter what happens elsewhere, the Politburo is basing its strategy upon the assumption that the war will be decided in Europe. As soon as task two approaches completion—perhaps in the next few months, perhaps in another year—then the Politburo will return, with whetted appetite and confidence, to Europe. Therein lies the true significance of China's collapse. From the Soviet strategic point of view, the fact that Mao Tse-tung has finally all but brought Chiang Kai-shek down after two decades of incessant struggle is only of incidental importance.

REAR IS PROTECTED

The great thing is that the ever-vulnerable rear of the Soviet Union is in the process of being secured; China's open door is closing against the West, which first pried it ajar. The collapse of China has advanced with a speed which must have surprised even the most optimistic Soviet military experts. Two mistakes have obviously helped to bring on the avalanche. The lackadaisical attitude of the West to the Soviet grip

on Outer Mongolia, which has since become the main Soviet arsenal in Asia, is the first and most outstanding reason for the present collapse of China. The second mistake was that through General Marshall's efforts to impose a coalition government, the United States, in effect, championed the Chinese Communists as true agrarian liberals and contributed to the undermining of the established government. The attempts of General Marshall to reconcile Chiang Kai-shek with Mao Tse-tung proved that the Americans have not yet clearly understood the basic principles of communism; that is, the fact that never, or under any conditions, would Communists accept loyal collaboration with non-Communists.

SOVIET AMAZED

Inside the Soviet Union, Marshall's strange efforts to divide Chiang Kai-shek's power with Mao Tse-tung's Communist regime were followed with incredulous satisfaction. For one intoxicating moment it almost appeared that the distinguished American would actually succeed where even Vanming, one member of the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party, an outstanding Comintern personality and a close friend of Stalin's, had failed. Though Marshall's coalition scheme finally broke upon the rock of Chiang's opposition, his withdrawal from China, accompanied by a virtual cessation of all United States aid to the Chiang Kai-shek government in effect represented a strategic victory for Mao against Chiang. It cleared the way for the current Communist offensives. With Chiang left to his fate, the way was open for a Soviet thrust into Asia at practically no risk. Soviet arms and military might flowed into the vacuum, and Chiang's unsupported armies were brushed aside. It would seem now that another mistake is to be added to the previous ones.

WOULD AID REDS

Mr. Hoffman, of the Economic Cooperation Administration, has been quoted as saying in Shanghai that even in the event of the Communists coming into control of the government, United States' economic aid to China would continue. Is it possible that the Western diplomats have not yet understood that any kind of compromise with the Communists is a danger to world peace?

There is a myth, fostered with consummate skill and assiduity by Soviet propagandists, that the Chinese Communists, far from owing allegiance to theoretical Marxism or the Cominform, are only simple oriental agrarians hungry for land and democracy. I have also heard the hope expressed by otherwise intelligent people in the West that Mao Tse-tung, though a self-avowed Communist, is really an agrarian nationalist, who, if pressed hard by the Kremlin, would rebel as Tito has done.

Concerning the Chinese masses enlisted under the Red banner, it can be confidently stated that their views will have no more influence upon Mao's decisions than is the case under other Communist dictatorships.

A TRUE BELIEVER

Mao himself is a dedicated Communist, a true believer. He has never deviated from the party line and was the first of the non-Soviet proconsuls to denounce Tito's heresy. If his victories continue he will certainly go down in Asiatic history as the Lenin of China. Chu-teh, C-in-C of the Chinese Communist armies, is a talented military leader. A highly placed Soviet general described him in the following terms: "He could without any further training be put in command of any Soviet front, and would carry out his duties as well as any Soviet marshal."

Chu-teh is not only a revolutionary Communist but also an officer who went through the correspondence course of the Soviet General Staff Academy.

He is supported by good Soviet staff officers, the greater part of whom are of Chinese nationality. I saw him for the first time in Moscow in or about 1934, but I know that he visited the USSR quite often, and I also know that he commands unbounded authority among the Soviet military leaders.

WORKS WITH SOVIET

I could name a number of Soviet officers of all ranks who have been working under him for the past 10 to 15 years. The adroitness with which Chu-teh has maneuvered his armies during the past years suggests a special aptitude for managing mass armies. He and Mao complement each other. They form a powerful combination, the most dangerous pair now tramping the Asiatic stage, and are the revolutionary barometer in Asia. But to assume that they have produced these colossal results themselves, as many do, is to miss the whole point of the struggle for Asia.

I myself never went to China for the Soviet government, but I have served with officers who know the situation well, and I have also studied the question thoroughly.

The Chinese Communist army is some 2,300,000 strong. (The Chinese Communist party has 2,800,000 members.)

The higher staff posts are held by Soviet officers of Chinese, Korean, and Mongolian nationalities. Many of these were recently serving in the Soviet army, went through the Soviet military academies and colleges, or else commanded Soviet military formations in the East.

EASILY OBTAINED

No one can estimate the number of Soviet officers now holding high-ranking commands or staff posts in Chu-teh's and Mao Tse-tung's armies. One thing is certain. There are many more of them than is realized in the West. One must also remember that there are a great many Chinese, Koreans, and Mongolians in the USSR. Finally, one should also bear in mind the existence of the Mongolian People's Republic under Choi Bolsan. The basis of the higher political personnel in the Chinese Communist army was made up of graduates from the Communist University of the Workers of the East (KUTV) in Moscow, and also from the Institute of the Peoples of the East in Leningrad, plus various workers' faculties, institutes, and universities in the USSR.

PLENTY OF WEAPONS

The Soviet areas of China now possess their own armament factories, most of which were built under Soviet direction. But there are not enough of them for the needs of the Chinese Communist army. After the defeat of Japan the Chinese Communists received masses of Japanese arms from the Soviet; in addition they are getting great quantities of arms of Soviet manufacture, but stamped with foreign markings. These include automatic weapons, artillery, machine-guns, grenades, pistols, mortars, etc.

The Chinese Communist Army has a large number of Soviet aircraft, mostly obsolescent. Radio equipment is practically wholly Soviet, except for that captured from Chiang Kai-shek, which is American. Paper used by Chinese Communists is practically all from the Soviet Union. An odd fact is that according to a treaty of June 1945, the Soviet Government agreed to supply Chiang Kai-shek's government with arms. (This agreement was the biggest and stupidest mistake Chiang ever made.)

For the arms never reached Chiang. Mao Tse-tung's forces intercepted most of them on the way from the Soviet Union to Nanking.

CALLED WAR BOOTY

In this way the Chinese Communists could always claim that arms of Soviet origin in their possession were not actually supplied by the USSR but came under the heading of war booty. They thus saved any diplomatic embarrassment which might have arisen. The hidden source of power of Chinese communism is Outer Mongolia, now the so-called Mongolian People's Republic. This is the Soviet fortress. It maintains a very large, well-equipped national army which in the higher echelons is almost entirely Soviet-officered. Beside this, a purely Soviet formation—comprising all types of arms, air force, artillery, tanks, infantry, etc.—are quartered in Outer Mongolia. Soviet formations are being sent there quite openly for duty as they are sent to any other part of the Soviet Union. There was no demobilization of this force after the war—a significant fact.

CHIANG'S NEEDS

Chiang has been discredited as a military leader, but he still retains some political influence. What Chiang always lacked was a clean-cut progressive policy and slogans which would rouse the people to his support in a struggle. In order to remedy the present situation special attention should be paid to what I have just said.

Chiang also needs strong military advisers, capable of appreciating the present serious situation. But all this will not be sufficient if Chiang does not get immediate support in arms, supplies, and technical equipment. If he falls and China passes under Mao's control, the rest of the Asiatic pot, now simmering, will boil over.

The unexpected opportunities for mischief now opening to the Politburo in Asia are almost unlimited. Rehearsals have already taken place in Indochina, Burma, Malaya, and the Netherlands East Indies, and the Politburo has a stern picture of the situation there. The Politburo will now do everything possible and even strive to do the impossible in order to make the Western Powers disperse their armed forces in all the corners of the world—thus striking a mighty strategical blow. It is vital to the West to understand this. Stalin would then consider task two as under control. He could then turn to task one (Europe) with relatively free hands. If the West fails to challenge and check him in the east, the inevitable show-down in the west will almost certainly come much more quickly and under conditions increasingly to Stalin's advantage.

Protest of General Court of Massachusetts Against Arrest and Imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and of Bishop Lajos Ordass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith:

Whereas, the whole civilized world and all, individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, and that freedom of religion is necessary in this troubled world have been profoundly shocked by the arrest, imprisonment and sentence of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and the arrest and imprisonment of Bishop Lajos Ordass, of the

Lutheran faith, by the Communist government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for such arrest, imprisonment, and sentence but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas Hungary, recently styled "a people's Republic," a satellite of Soviet Russia, has shown its utter disregard for freedom of religion in making the arrest and causing the imprisonment of these two men of God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts desires to register an emphatic protest to the government of Hungary in causing the arrest and imprisonment of these two churchmen; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to take appropriate action to convey to the Hungarian government the demand of the people of this country that Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass be immediately released; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago today the people of Lithuania declared their independence. On that day the Republic of Lithuania came into being at Vilnius.

Today, however, there is no free Lithuania any more than there is a free Poland, a free Hungary, or a free Czechoslovakia. All are completely crushed beneath the heel of the Russian tyrant. Freedom to worship, freedom to speak or write what they please, freedom to choose their representatives in government, freedom to join a labor union of their choice, freedom to start a business, freedom to come and go within and outside their country—all these and every other privilege which free men and women everywhere enjoy is denied these unfortunate people. Like that of her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, the independence of Lithuania is today an empty symbol, a hollow mockery.

Little wonder, then, that this day which should be one of rejoicing and celebration is filled with sadness for not only the Lithuanian citizens behind the Iron Curtain but also their friends and loved ones in this country.

Nor can we, professed lovers of liberty as we are, escape in our complacency the charge of participation, at least by acquiescence, in the enthrallment of this brave young republic. No more than we can escape that charge leveled at us by the courageous people of Latvia, of Estonia, and of Poland, for it was at Tehran, again at Yalta, and again at Potsdam that we, for reasons of apparent expediency, deserted the lofty principles of the Atlantic Charter to set at naught the aspirations and destinies of free people. But the American people, Mr. Speaker, have never acquiesced in or condoned this tragic betrayal.

Indeed, our own Government today does not officially recognize the annexation by Russia of Lithuania and her Baltic neighbors. For that, at least, we may be thankful. This negative approach, however, is not enough. Time and again mass liquidation of her citizens and mass deportation to Russian concentration camps have been alleged by representatives of this republic. If true, this is a denial of fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed by the United Nations Charter. If untrue, the charges should be aired to establish the facts. Freedom everywhere and enslavement anywhere are everybody's business—most of all, perhaps, the business of liberty-loving Americans.

I wish each Member might have had, as many have, my experience of last fall in visiting the displaced persons camps in Europe. Here I met and talked with many Lithuanians, as well as those of other nationalities, who had fled from the terrors of Communist or Nazi tyranny. The cheerful courage, the sturdy character, and great industry of the Lithuanians and others who gave up everything they had rather than bend a knee before the oppressor made an indelible impression on my mind and heart.

As we salute the Republic of Lithuania today, let us dedicate ourselves to its reestablishment as a free member of the family of nations.

Taft Urges GOP To Cite Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Bill Cunningham from the Boston Sunday Herald of February 13, 1949:

TAFT URGES GOP TO CITE PRINCIPLES
(By Bill Cunningham)

"Will you run for the Republican Presidential nomination again?" this reporter asked Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, as we began a conversation in an anteroom off the Senate Chamber. "Run" promptly seemed to have been a bad choice of words.

"No," said the man who's tried twice. "I don't expect to be a candidate, and I certainly shan't 'run,' not in the sense of the last time, if that's what you mean."

"Does that mean you could be drafted?" I asked him.

"It doesn't happen that way," he said, "nobody's ever drafted."

"Shining" seems to be the word that best describes the face of Senator TAFT. The rest of him is not especially distinguished nor memorable. He's no particular sartorial model. Possibly 6 feet tall, reasonably erect, but a little too thick through the middle to be called trim figure, his business suits look rather rumpled, and they don't look custom made. His hair is thinning, and such as remains, while never wild, is not in place. He wears white shirts and flowered neckties, but they are not of the violent variety. In fact, he looks about like any other man of his years and general station until you sit looking him squarely in the face at close range.

It's the cleanest face I think I ever saw, with the clearest eyes and the whitest teeth. It also has one of the easiest and friendliest smiles. They say he used to be difficult to approach and that he had a hard time selling himself to an audience. I've never found an easier man to approach, nor one who talked more easily, if always with a certain sense of dignity.

"Well," said I, "while I was waiting here, another Republican Senator delivered quite an opinion upon the subject of Senator TAFT. He happened to pass and he asked me what I was doing. When I told him I was waiting for you, he said, "Then you're waiting to see the keyman in the history of the United States."

"BOB TAFT'S fate is going to be the fate of this Nation," he said. "If they beat him in this next election, as they say they're going to, then the Republican Party is gone, and the 2-party system of government is gone. If, on the other hand, he's reelected, there'll be hope that the party can pick up a few more seats. We might get one in New York. There's another out in Illinois. There are some more here and there. If we get them, the party and the Nation will be back in business, but the keyman is TAFT, and his fate in his next campaign will tell the story."

"Do you agree with him?" I asked.

"Not entirely," he said, "did you chance to see the speech I made out in Niles, Ohio, last week?"

"No, sir," said I, "not beyond the brief summation of it carried in the newspapers."

"Well, I happen to have a copy of it on my desk," he said. "Let me go get it. I think it will answer most of your questions."

He returned with his own copy, marked and corrected and containing notations in pencil, to the corner in which I'd pulled a couple of the big leather chairs together.

He started by sketching the history of the Republican Party.

"The Republican Party was founded," he said, "in 1854 as a party determined to restore the actual practice of liberty in this country in accordance with the theory of liberty which had brought about the founding of the Republic.

LONG REPUBLICAN LEASE OF POWER

"It enjoyed a long lease of power," he said, "from 1860 to 1884, but for 20 years prior to 1896, it was a weak party, living on its Civil War reputation and hardly ever commanding the support of a majority of the people. Then in 1896, it had a new birth because in that campaign it presented fairly, frankly, and effectively its conservative philosophy. It pointed out to the workingman that the full dinner pail depended upon sound fiscal principles and the free economy so necessary for progress.

"An interesting article in Fortune magazine for January describes the real Mark Hanna as opposed to the caricature created by the cartoonists and describes Hanna's sincere interest in the American workingman and American prosperity. It was that interest, and his ability to convince the people of his sincerity, and that of McKinley, which won the overwhelming victory for the Republican Party and gave to it 16 years of power * * *."

All this was in the speech, and the references to Hanna and McKinley were made because the address had been delivered at the McKinley Memorial.

This was all background, he said, establishing the fact that the party has known its

good times and its bad, but that when they grew bad, they had been changed to good only by presenting its principles to the people.

"Some Republicans are discouraged today," he said, "because for five elections now the party has met defeat. But its defeats have been due more to its failure in presenting its principles than in the principles themselves. It lost by narrow margins in 1940, 1944, and 1948. Remember that nearly half the people voted for it in the recent elections, and that its organization is still strong throughout the Nation. Political parties have a strong will to live. The only political parties which have died are those which have forgotten or have abandoned the principles on which they were founded. That should answer your question concerning what's ahead for the party."

"Then," said I, "you feel that the Republicans have lost primarily because they didn't tell the people what they stand for."

"That's correct," the Senator said.

(That same night at the Lincoln Day dinner, I was to hear Governor Dewey say: "It is now 20 years since our country last elected a Republican President. * * * This is a dismal record * * * of desperate importance to the country lest we slip into the abyss of one-party government. * * * Without seeking to find scapegoats. * * * I would like to bring out into the open the one basic problem. The Republican Party is split wide open. It's been split wide open for years, but we've tried to gloss it over * * * to deny it to ourselves * * * to conceal it.")

"Well, what does the party really stand for?" I asked Senator TAFT.

"First of all," said he, "human liberty. That's what created the United States of America. Every American today still pays lip service to the term 'liberty.' But he does not feel it as he did for a hundred years, when the idea of liberty inspired all Americans and they boasted of it until it became tiresome to every visiting foreigner."

MANY HAVE FORGOTTEN WHAT LIBERTY MEANS

Then he explained that the theory of the paternalistic state, regimentation, peacetime controls, and the bureaucratic form of government have so diluted liberty and have placed such restrictions on it that "today many Americans and most people throughout the world have forgotten what it means." He pointed to a part of the speech which said:

"As we look back through history, we see brief periods of time in which liberty has prevailed, but in the major part of historical time, it has been suppressed by emperors and kings, by oligarchies, plutocracies, by so-called democracies and proletarian majorities. It's hard to gain and easy to lose unless it is kept alive by an aggressive determination that it shall not perish from the earth. Today the battle between liberty and totalitarian government permeates every problem of life. It lies at the base of our battle with fascism and nazism and communism. The American people believe in liberty, but the totalitarian creed which we face abroad dominates today the philosophy of the CIO.

"Through that, it dominates the Democratic Party, and, if it prevails, it ultimately will destroy liberty here at home."

Clarifying his personal position on these threats to liberty here at home, the Ohio Senator said he's opposed to price control, wage control, and allocation control in time of peace. "I was opposed to the OPA and the WPB after the war ended," he said, "because they attempted to substitute a detailed control of business for the freedom of business and the freedom of enterprise."

"I'm opposed to socialized medicine, because it takes from the people the right to buy the kind of medical service they wish to obtain, and takes their earnings in taxes to be returned in the form of Government care under a long series of bureaucratic regulations."

He said he's opposed to the tremendous burden of taxation and universal military training because "it takes from a boy and his family the right to choose and pursue his own education and occupation and imposes a year of training and indoctrination determined by so-called experts in Washington."

A few hours later, at the Lincoln Day dinner, I was to hear Governor Dewey say on the same general subject: "The overwhelming majority of all Americans in both parties believe that Government today has to be more than a cold and impartial umpire. That has been the position of our party consistently * * * repeatedly confirmed in national conventions. In 1948, our platform was unanimously voted without one dissent * * * It must mean something.

"Unless it was designed to deceive, its various sections say and mean that we are a liberal and progressive party. To be entirely specific, they say and mean that our party has solemnly declared that we believe wholeheartedly in unemployment insurance, in old-age assistance on an increased basis, in broader social security generally, in slum clearance and public housing, in public development of our water-power resources, in farm-price supports, in vigorous protection of the rights of labor."

OFFICIALLY DECLARED PRINCIPLES OF THE GOP

"All these are good, they are necessary, they are right, they are officially declared principles of the Republican Party."

Senator TAFT went on to cite four other "basic principles" of the Republican Party. The next was "equal justice under law."

"The New Deal and the present administration," he said, "still seek the solution of every problem by the creation of boards and commissions with power to make regulations having the force of law, with power to file prosecutions, try the alleged culprits, and condemn them without recourse to the courts.

"Perhaps the greatest miscarriages of justice which have ever occurred in the United States," he said, "occurred under the National Labor Relations Board interpreting the Wagner Act. Yet today President Truman is trying to restore the unlimited and unrestrained power of that Board. The Republican Party should stand today as it has stood in the past, for a rule of law, instead of a rule of arbitrary men."

The next principle, he cited, was "equality and no special privilege," and in this he cited the Taft-Hartley law. That was passed, he said, "for the parallel purpose of restraining the arbitrary power of labor union leaders. Under previous laws their power had grown until they were able to dominate every private employer, except the largest ones, and to defy the public interest. * * * Liberty may be ended by the tyranny of a majority of the people as well as by the tyranny of special groups. We are concerned that minorities shall receive fair treatment, the same rights to vote, to work, and to live their own lives as the majority."

The other "principles" cited by Senator TAFT were: "The prevention of hardship and poverty" and "higher standards of living." The meat of his comments on these was that Federal aid is often necessary, especially in the poorer States. These, however, are problems primarily for State and local governments, and even when Federal aid is given, "there should be no Federal control, nor concentration of power in Washington."

"A policy of Government hand-outs to all," he said, "would impose an intolerable tax burden, would sap at the energy and liberty of the people, and would destroy the American character. Furthermore, no people as a whole can get something for nothing. They can be only fooled into such a hope.

"The idea that people can get their medical care from the Government without paying even a greater price than they pay today is fantastic. To the extent that we do support those at the very lowest end of the income field by aid or subsidy, they can only be supported by the other four-fifths of the population; and the burden must not be so great as to discourage that four-fifths from the magnificent job they are doing today."

PLATFORM SHOULD BE HAMMERED TOGETHER

The Senator's contention is that these are basic principles of the Republican Party and that the platform should be hammered solidly together from this sort of lumber. He believes, as above quoted, that the party has lost five times because of its failures in presenting these principles of the people. He made no mention of Governor Dewey, nor of anybody else for that matter, but since he is generally accepted as the leader of the conservative wing of the party, he must have had the Willkie and the Dewey presentations in mind. Both those beat him in his tries for the nomination. Both are now generally scored as "me, too" candidates.

It was accepted by all who heard, however, that Governor Dewey was talking directly at Senator TAFT when, after stating the Republicans have lost five Presidential elections because the party is split wide open, he continued:

"We have in our party some fine, high-minded, patriotic people, who honestly oppose farm price support, unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, slum clearance, and other programs. These people consider those programs horrendous departures into paternalism and would actually repeal them all. These people believe in a laissez-faire society and look back wistfully to the miscalled 'good old days' in the nineteenth century.

"They also take the position that the sole duty of an opposition party is opposition. They urge Republicans in and out of Congress to fight every proposal of a Democratic administration regardless of its merits. This group also honestly believes and says with considerable vigor that all Republicans who support these forward-looking programs are 'me, too' Republicans and no better than New Dealers. * * * If, as a party we try to go back to the nineteenth century, or even to the 1920's, you can bury the Republican Party as the deadest pigeon in the country."

The split in the Republican Party is the difference between the types of thinking represented by these two leaders, and the difference between the leaders is that Senator TAFT can tell you what he's thinking and will do it in plain and unevasive language, while you are privileged to do your own guessing in the case of the governor. Mr. Dewey was expected to come out punching at that Lincoln Day dinner because much recent comment has been to the effect that TAFT would have made the better candidate, TAFT, and the TAFT kind of platform.

The defeated standard bearer may have thought he was punching, and he did make all headlines with his descriptions of the split and his predictions of disaster if the old guard gets control. I, for one, however, thought he lost a lot of firepower by not delivering the speech seriously, if not angrily. Instead, he pranced and grinned and smiled up into the television cameras.

There's none of this in Senator TAFT. He smiled in a tired sort of way occasionally, for he's physically weary, and said so, from those long labor-bill hearings. They've been running from early morning until late every night and he hasn't missed a day nor an hour. Around him, somehow, there seemed to be an odor of defeat, but one parted from him convinced that if he does go down, he'll go fortified with absolute belief in his convictions and the knowledge that he did the best he possibly could.

There, at least, is one man who is completely sincere.

Federal Spending Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, while the administration is shouting for an increase in income taxes, and insisting that no relief be given to the people who are paying excise taxes, I want to reassert what I have said before on the floor of the House, that the logical and sensible way to reduce taxes is to cut Government expenditures.

Whenever a person talks about reducing expenditures the demagogues cry out, "Where would you cut, and what would you cut, and how much would you cut?" The attitude of those who have in mind only one thing, and that is to spend and tax reminds me of a few lines from one of Milton's sonnets:

I did but prompt the age to quit their clogs by the known rules of ancient liberty, when straight a barbarous noise environs me of owls and cuckoos, asses, apes, and dogs.

There are many places where expenditures may be reduced, and gradually through the research of various business organizations the duplication of Government expenditures are coming to light. Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am extending in the RECORD a bulletin issued by the Council of State Chambers which is not only revealing, but of the utmost importance to the overburdened taxpayers of the country:

THE HIGH COST OF GROWING PAINS IN GOVERNMENT

Comptroller General Lindsay Warren told a congressional committee on January 25: "The Federal Government is a hodgepodge and crazy-quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies * * * It is an ideal system for tax eaters and for those who wish to keep themselves attached to the public pay roll, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill * * * What we must be after is this monstrous Frankenstein, created in the name of bureaucracy, and already in some instances becoming bigger than Congress, its creator."

The trouble is that our Federal Government has grown too big too fast. Its expenditures have increased from $5,143,000,000 in 1933 to $40,180,000,000 in 1949; during the same period Federal civilian personnel has increased from 564,000 persons to nearly 2,100,000 and is still growing. These facts are indicative of the expansion that has taken place.

Following are just a few of the typical instances of Federal waste, inefficiency, and overlapping which have resulted from 15 years of topsy-like pyramiding of agencies upon agencies and services upon services:

DUPLICATION

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (known as the Byrd committee), in its report of May 1946, cited over 900 instances of duplication and overlapping among the one-thousand-one-hundred-and-odd bureaus, agencies, and departments of the Government. For instance, it found 37 agencies carrying on activities in public health, 22 in housing, 27 in labor relations, 64 in business relations, 37 in foreign aid, 24 in rehabilitation, 16 in water power and power, 24 in mapmaking, 21 in transportation, 16 in education, and so on.

MORE DUPLICATIONS

Recent House hearings on Government reorganization disclosed more instances of duplication. For instance, 65 Federal agencies are engaged in gathering statistics, 34 in acquisition of land, 12 in home and community planning, 14 in forestry, 28 in welfare, and 16 in wildlife preservation. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1949.)

PRINTING PLANTS

There is widespread overlapping in Federally owned printing plants and facilities, not only among departments but within cities throughout the country. There are 61 separate Government printing and duplicating plants in Washington; there are 23 in San Francisco, 25 in Philadelphia, 16 in Chicago, 6 in Kansas City, 6 in Denver, 16 in New York, and so on. The Army and Air Force have 140 printing and duplicating plants, the Navy has 87, Commerce Department has 26, and Interior Department 15 (Senate Appropriations Committee, 1948).

PERSONNEL OFFICERS

A well-managed business or industrial concern employs 1 personnel officer or worker to every 200 to 250 employees. The Federal Government employs 1 to every 78 employees, and in some departments the ratio is as low as 1 to 38. (Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch; also House Appropriations Committee and House Civil Service Committee reports.)

STATE DEPARTMENT RED TAPE

What happens to efficient management of a Government department which grows too fast is typified by conditions in the State Department, concerning which the House Appropriations Committee report of 1948 said: "The tremendous and rapid growth of the Department has resulted in great duplication between offices and divisions." The Committee found, in the course of its studies, that few actions can clear the Department without being referred to from two to six or even more divisions having an interest in the particular subject.

A House Appropriations Committee survey disclosed that it takes as many as 35 separate steps to process a routine letter received by the State Department. A tracer put on one such letter revealed that the letter landed on 21 different desks in three different State Department buildings, and traveled through each building twice.

PURCHASING

The Commission on Reorganization of the executive branch (known as the Hoover Commission) has reported that it is possible to have about $250,000,000 annually in Government purchasing, and to reduce inventories by $2,500,000,000 by applying modern business methods. The Commission's study group found more than 150,000 employees engaged in purchasing activities.

PURCHASE ORDERS

The Commission, in its study of Government purchasing, has reported that half of the 3,000,000 purchase orders by Federal civilian agencies alone (this excludes the armed services) in a typical year are for purchases amounting to $10 or less—and it costs the Government more than $10 to perform the paperwork alone on each of these purchase orders (report of January 1949).

TYPEWRITERS

How supplies pile up under poorly planned and supervised Government procurement practices is readily seen in the following example: The Federal Government recently found its owns three and six-tenths typewriters for every Federal employee who uses one either on full-time or part of the time. (House Appropriations Committee Investigative report, 1948.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING

Federal departments spend an estimated $55,000,000 annually for printing and publications, exclusive of forms, reports, etc.

Tons and tons of unsold and undistributed publications are sold each year as waste paper at about $38 per ton. (Senate Appropriations Committee, 1948.)

Army printing alone is a huge and wasteful business. The Department of the Army printing bill in 1948 was $8,600,000—this was about one-third higher than the entire printing bill of Congress itself. (Senate Appropriations Committee.)

STORAGE-SPACE BUNGLING

The Government Printing Office (which is an efficiently run organization) spends over a half million dollars a year for storage space for inventories, printed publications, etc. Securing storage space is, in fact, one of the Government's big problems, and one of the poorest handled. For example: The GPO learned of a surplus war plant in Baltimore which was excellent for storage purposes and negotiated with the Public Buildings Administration to get it; the PBA in turn negotiated with the War Assets Administration. The WAA, however, sold the building to private interests who immediately offered to lease the space to the Government Printing Office at a rental which would pay for the entire purchase price within a few years. (House Appropriations Committee Investigative Report, 1948.)

BARGAIN BOOKS

The Interior Department is notoriously prodigal in its expenditures for printing and publications. An example: It has published, at a total cost of $61,242, a 23-volume series on the Columbia River Basin. The printing cost per set was $36.06, but the publications were put at sale for $6.90 per set. Many sets also were distributed free of charge (Senate Appropriations Committee, 1948).

WASTE OF MANPOWER

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, according to a survey made by the House Appropriations Committee's investigative staff in 1947, is lucky if it gets 6 hours' work per day from its employees. Some of its field offices claimed that they managed to get about 4 hours per day from their workers.

WASTE OF FORMS

The same study disclosed that in 1946 the Bureau printed 500,000,000 tax forms and 115,000,000 instruction sheets to supply 47,000,000 taxpayers. Hundreds of millions of such obsolete forms are now stored in a leased building.

HOUSING

If the Federal Government should, with congressional approval, embark upon the proposed $17,800,000,000 housing program, the large part of this activity will be handled by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, formerly the Federal Public Housing Authority, concerning which an audit report made for the General Accounting Office said, "every account in the (FPHA's) general ledger is either in error, inaccurate or incomplete. * * * The lack of adequate fund controls has been the cause of a large number of errors." And the House Appropriations Committee report of 1948 declared: "The past record of the Public Housing Administration is replete with instances of maladministration and deplorable abuses of public property and funds."

HOUSING FOR VETERANS

After VJ-day the Government declared surplus some 8,100 prefabricated housing units. They were sold to France by the Federal Public Housing Authority. When asked last year by congressional investigators to explain this action in the face of shortage of housing in the United States, the Agency stated that when the houses were declared surplus the bulk of the American armed

forces was still overseas and there was no indication of a tremendous housing shortage in this country. (N. B.—The transaction occurred at about the time administration-supported housing legislation was already being urged upon Congress.)

MIXED SIGNALS—LUMBER

Senator STYLES BRIDGES has just reported the instance where, after the Army tore down a multimillion-dollar camp in Alaska and shipped the lumber out, the Interior Department bought the lumber and shipped it right back to a point in Alaska within 10 miles of the place where the Army camp had been.

Bigotry in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the indignation of parents, educators, and many other good citizens has been aroused by the discriminatory practices of certain colleges and college fraternities. Under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit two articles written by Howard Whitman on this subject, which appeared in Collier's magazine on January 8 and January 15, 1949.

One of the prime objectives of education is to promote understanding among men. From our institutions of higher learning come our professional men, statesmen, teachers, and leaders in our communities. Rank discrimination is practiced when any group has as one of its admission requirements that "members must be white persons of full Aryan blood." Such discrimination breeds lack of understanding—even hatred—and man commits crimes against his fellowmen because of it. Yet, secret clauses such as the one quoted are contained in constitutions of many national fraternities, which have great influence in our colleges and which help mold the thinking of our youth.

Knowing that this undemocratic and discriminatory system flourishes here, how do we dare to send our emissaries throughout the world to say that our ideology is best and that our people live under a true democratic system? We are in danger of being told to look to our own house first.

Congress has appropriated many millions of dollars to reach persons abroad—to feed, clothe, and rehabilitate them, and, more important, to sell them our belief in democracy as opposed to communism. How incongruous that at the same time Federal funds are spent in this country to maintain colleges and schools which discriminate against students by reason of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin, and where fraternities hold sway whose membership is chosen on anything but the theory that all men are created equal. In fact, on reading the following articles, one cannot help but be ashamed that the young people of this country are subjected to the terrible discrimination, unhappiness, and even mental damage caused by such fraternities.

Our Federal Government, taking the stand it has abroad, cannot afford to be a party to this discriminatory and undemocratic system. If it can do nothing drastic to stop the insidious wrong, it should at least refuse to give one penny toward its continuance. This is the purpose of H. R. 1642, which I recently introduced in Congress, which would withhold all Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin, or which permit students to be members of student organizations which so discriminate.

After reading Mr. Whitman's articles, I sincerely hope that the Members of this Congress will give their support in committee and on the floor to my bill, H. R. 1642.

[From Collier's magazine of January 8, 1949]

THE COLLEGE FRATERNITY CRISIS

(By Howard Whitman)

PART 1. BIGOTRY ON THE CAMPUS

Hidden in the secret constitutions of some of our leading college fraternities are clauses which need airing. They deal with, and some calmly endorse, race discrimination and religious prejudice.

I have toured the colleges and I have met the practitioners of discrimination. I have met their victims. In dozens of fraternity houses I have heard the angry discussions and have visited the battle fronts in a not-too-cold war which is engulfing colleges from Maine to California.

The dawn of 1949 sees the worst college-fraternity crisis since 1875, when President McCosh drove fraternities out of Princeton. Today fraternities are on probation at some colleges. Cries for abolition are resounding at others. Many educators feel like the Middle West dean who said to me, "We'll either have good fraternities or no fraternities."

The secret clauses, upon which the battle pinpoints, may jolt many Americans.

"Members must be of the Aryan race and not of the black, Malayan, or Semitic race"—this from the constitution of one national fraternity.

Another states: Candidates for pledge-ship "must not be of Mongolian, Malaysian, Negro, or Jewish blood."

The words "white Caucasian" are frequently used as an adjustable yardstick of discrimination. It of course rules out Negroes. It has been interpreted to rule out Jews. It has been broadened to rule out, or to put a quota upon, Catholics.

One secret clause, which sounds as if it had been lifted out of Mein Kampf, limits fraternity membership to white persons of full Aryan blood.

I received a baptism in bigotry early in my tour of colleges. It happened at Ohio State, at one of the ranking fraternity houses. In a bull session with the brothers, the matter of discrimination came up. We were sitting around, smoking, talking easily. Somebody said, "Well, as to colored boys—"

A member rose and stomped out of the room. His trailing voice said, "If you're going to talk about niggers—count me out!"

At most campuses I found a few who felt the same way about discussing discriminatory practives against Jews, Catholics, Mexicans, Japanese, Chinese, and that vast group of native Americans from the wrong side of the railroad tracks, known in Greek-letter land as social inferiors.

At the University of Virginia, President Colgate Whitehead Darden told me, "I am determined to fight against social stratification. It is a subversion of the basic policy of the university!"

But for his pains to democratize a university founded by Thomas Jefferson, Darden netted himself a death's head painted on his office door. Beneath it was scrawled, Tyrant!

"Damned if we want our fraternity opened to the common herd!'" commented one of the Greek-letter boys.

At the University of Michigan, Walter Presnell, a Negro, filed his name with the dean's office along with other students who wanted to join fraternities. No fraternity would touch him.

Presnell can't quite understand it, because last summer he went to Harvard (where there is just one fraternity) and lived quite happily with two white roommates.

Dick Maloy, student city editor, writing in the Michigan Daily, stated bluntly, "Fraternities discriminate against Negroes, Catholics, and Jews. Why not clean up these blots right here at the university before trying to convince the rest of society that discrimination is a bad thing?"

But Maloy expresses the minority opinion—more typical was the fraternity man at Wisconsin who said to me, "We have to grab back a pledge pin now and then when we find out a guy is Jewish."

At Michigan, a youth was pledged and then depledged because his ancestry was Japanese-American. "Not pure Caucasian blood," a fraternity man explained.

At Bowdoin College, in Maine, a Negro boy was thrown out of one fraternity because its national organization insisted on white only. He was pledged to a second fraternity, thrown out again. He finally got into a third.

How does the knife edge of discrimination actually feel? Listen to the experience of a Catholic student at Boston University.

"I was asked to join a fraternity," he related. "Having some standing doubts, I asked the person inviting me what sort of an outfit it was.

"'Oh, this is a regular fraternity,' he replied. 'You know—Christian, and all that.'

"I pondered a moment. That word Christian. What did he mean?

"'You know, Christian—no Jews, Negroes, or Catholics. Just a nice bunch of regular fellows. That's our constitution.'"

The University of Minnesota has 32 national fraternities. Forty percent have definite discriminatory clauses in their constitutions. Several others simply discriminate by gentlemen's agreement.

Intimations of reprisal

Should a chapter revolt against what seems to be headquarters policy it would probably find itself up against the sort of situation described to me by John Dablow, fraternity adviser. "Some national fraternities have told us," he said, "that if Minnesota takes a stand against discrimination, they will revoke the charter of their chapter and remove their fraternity from our campus."

One national fraternity, apparently sensing hostility to its policy in some quarters, is sending its national executive around the country—ostensibly to "liberalize" its constitution. Yet students in one chapter were shocked to hear this good-will emissary say, "I've got a good chance of getting that discriminatory clause taken out—so long as you boys don't go taking in any damned niggers."

Picturesque Amherst College, Massachusetts, has been a testing ground in the fight between a national fraternity which favors discrimination and a local chapter of that fraternity which does not. Amherst has 13 fraternities. They all used to be national. Only 11 are national now. Two have been thrown out of their national organizations

for refusing to practice racial discrimination.

At the close of the war a faculty committee at Amherst recommended that fraternities be abolished. An alumni committee, four-fifths of whose membership consisted of fraternity men, surprised the whole campus by making the same suggestion.

But instead of abolishing fraternities, the Amherst board of trustees gave them a sound overhauling. It ruled in April 1946 that fraternities would have to take discriminatory language out of their constitutions or get off the campus. Their deadline for complying is February 1951.

The first national organization to yelp at this order—and other fraternity reforms—was Delta Tau Delta. It sent a letter to its Amherst chapter denying it permission to reopen after the war. It was to stay closed, the letter stated, until Amherst became "a suitable field for national fraternities" and until the Amherst chapter could "conform to the established customs, rules, and standards of Delta Tau Delta fraternity."

Calling a meeting, the Amherst chapter, along with alumni from the Massachusetts towns, drew up a resounding declaration of independence, stating:

"They (members of the Amherst chapter) have gone through a war where the ideals of democracy were tested under fire. They are serious in their wish to see their ideals in action. They are unafraid of, in fact welcome, the opportunity to be in a fraternity, whether it be local or national, where they may exercise their democratic rights to determine with whom they may associate without let or hindrance from some power which considers itself higher than the country in which they live or the college they have chosen."

So saying, the Delta Tau Deltas of Amherst College kissed the national organization good-by and formed their own local fraternity, Kappa Theta. They have already expressed their independence by admitting two boys who would have been barred by the race-and-creed clauses in the national constitution.

In the year just passed, courageous Amherst has had its hands full with the initiation of a Negro student into Phi Kappa Psi. The Amherst chapter informed its national organization 2 weeks ahead of time that the initiation of the Negro boy, Thomas Gibbs, was going to take place. The Phi Kappa Psi executive council reacted with such swiftness that the Amherst chapter was already an orphan—fired from the national organization for "unfraternal conduct"—by the time Gibbs was initiated on November 23.

The Amherst boys seem exhilarated at having fought this issue. Speaking of their new fraternity brother, one of them said, "We want him with us because he's a great guy. We aren't interested in his race, or his color, or anything else—just in what he is for himself."

But this is not being echoed across the country. Far from it. In a bull session of fraternity men at the University of Wisconsin, I heard a towheaded lad jump up and cry, "To hell with this talk of democratization. They've got their own fraternities."

I had heard that phrase often. When I tried it out on Wilbert Whitsett, president of Alpha Phi Alpha, a Negro fraternity ,at the University of Pittsburgh, he replied, "If we are not permitted to join other fraternities, we must form a fraternity of our own. We have no other choice."

One of his colleagues pointed out, "In the land of Jim Crow, you ride in the back of the bus—or not at all."

A member of a Jewish fraternity remarked, "The pattern of segregation is fixed by the so-called white Caucasian fraternities. We simply have to fit into it." He smiled wearily. "Nobody really likes to live in a ghetto. But sometimes you have to."

Indexed by race and creed

Every year thousands of freshmen, accustomed to being regarded simply as Americans, enter college to discover that they are sorted out by fraternities into pigeonholes labeled "Protestant, Catholic, Jew"; then cross-filed as white, black, yellow, or brown.

"Now—just a minute," objected a fraternity man when this subject came up at the Alpha Delta Phi house at Amherst. "What about your golf clubs, your business clubs, your country clubs—aren't they doing the very same thing?"

I jotted his words in my notebook and tossed them a few days later to the president of Amherst College, Dr. Charles Woolsey Cole.

President Cole replied, "Institutions of learning ought to pick and choose the best parts of our culture, not the worst. College students ought to set the pace. If they make enough headway with the democratic idea, the country clubs and the business clubs will come along later."

Setting atop the college fraternity structure is the National Interfraternity Conference comprising 58 national fraternities. At its fortieth annual meeting in New York recently, the NIC abortively battled over the discrimination issue and finally put it on ice for another year.

However, some of the NIC's leaders have not hesitated to present what they call the "other side" of the discrimination picture. At one meeting, a top NIC officer appealed to Americans to "stop shivering at the word 'discrimination.'"

He said, "I love the discriminating tongue, the discriminating eye, and the discriminating ear, and above all, the discriminating mind and soul. The person for whom I can find no love and no respect is the indiscriminate person. To be indiscriminate is to be common, to be vulgar."

One NIC spokesman insists, "There is nothing arbitrary or capricious or unnatural about fraternity membership restrictions based on race, creed, or color. College and university administrators who attempt to prevent forcibly the Nation's fraternities from exercising racial and religious restrictions in choosing members are violating the tenets of democracy."

TRYING OUT A MILDER WORD

With softer pedal, the executive secretary of a national fraternity said to me, "I wouldn't say we discriminate. All we have is a restrictive clause. You simply have to get the consent of every official of the national organization if you want to take in somebody of a different race or religion."

At Williams College, a committee on postwar extracurricular activities while stanchly defending fraternities, made this curious statement:

"It is a truism that fraternities are undemocratic. Any social or caste system is undemocratic. * * * There is no use denying the facts of life merely because one does not like them."

That an undemocratic caste system should be a fact of life in American institutions of higher learning is repugnant to a good many people. Some critics insist that colleges, being tax-free, have no right to harbor such a system. They decry the fact that in 12 States even the houses owned by discriminatory fraternities are freed from taxes.

Between the extremes of the national interfraternity conference and those who would abolish fraternities entirely is a middle ground which is all but obscured by flying fur. Many educators feel that the fraternity system, given—as one of them put it—"a transfusion of free American blood," could get up from its sickbed and walk with a truly democratic stride.

The transfusion had better be given soon. As President John Sloan Dickey, of Dartmouth, said to me, "Our colleges cannot for long be indifferent to an influence on their campuses which tends to fashion men's attitudes in a prejudicial way. * * * We must find a solution in the not-too-distant future."

I spoke with Eric Johnston just after his recent trip to Russia. Johnston is a Theta Delta Chi, University of Washington, 1917. He earnestly declared, "Our fraternities must be democratized. We're competing with another ideology in this world, and the competition is likely to go on for a long time. We've got to show them, and the rest of the world, that democracy is more than a word over here. We've got to live democracy, not just talk democracy."

[From Collier's magazine of January 15, 1949]

THE COLLEGE FRATERNITY CRISIS

(By Howard Whitman)

PART 2. DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

Seventy-five young men from 11 colleges sweated out a hectic week-end in Chicago last May to launch a new national fraternity. They worked night and day. They wrote bylaws, preambles, articles, amendments, and resolutions. They tore up pages, rewrote pages. Finally they came up with the constitution of Beta Sigma Tau, a fraternity which opens its arms alike to Christian and Jew, to white and Negro, to rich and to poor.

Having paid their own way to Chicago, the students didn't have any money to spare. They could not afford more than one paid employee to aid in their labors, a nimble-fingered public stenographer. She sweated it out with them, working way past midnight, taking shorthand, transcribing, typing. She was groggy when it was over.

But after she had typed the final version of the constitution—with its pledge of "brotherhood and democracy which transcends racial, national, and religious differences"—she had all the pep she needed to say, "Gee! I've never seen anything like this in all my life! Do you fellows really mean it?"

Assured that Beta Sigma Tau was in unmitigated earnest, she gulped, "Well, I want to help, too! You can keep my pay check! Call it a contribution—I guess I just worked free!"

Beta Sigma Tau, which formally calls itself an intercultural fraternity, is a dramatic outgrowth of the bare-fist battle over discrimination which is being fought on American campuses. This fraternity draws heavily upon the one world philosophy of Wendell Willkie and has attracted scores of college men to whom fraternities for "white Caucasians" or "full-blooded Aryans" are a little nauseating in this day.

By the opening of the fall term Beta Sigma Tau—without benefit of trumpets' blare—had amassed seven full-fledged chapters, at Ohio State, the University of California at Santa Barbara, the University of Buffalo, Hobart College, Roosevelt College, Baldwin-Wallace, and Ohio Wesleyan. In addition to these, four more chapters were busily forming. November saw the launching of chapters at Stanford, the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Southern California, and the University of California at Los Angeles—all within the month.

While most of Beta Sigma Tau's membership is white Protestant, as is the population of the United States, it includes Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, Negroes, Chinese, and Nisei. John Caldwell, one of the top national officers of the fraternity, happens to be a Baptist from Texas. Kenneth Woodward, president of the Ohio Wesleyan chapter, happens to be a Negro.

Caldwell, who goes to the University of California at Santa Barbara, said to me: "Maybe my Texas raisin' had something to do with it. Out our way we judge a man for what he is—not for the labels on him."

Caldwell had behind him the heritage of the Pecos country, where it once was "justifiable homicide" to shoot a man for asking where you came from and what you had done before you got there.

Eschewing the mumbo jumbo of a secret order, Beta Sigma Tau will gladly tell you that its name stands for "Equality, Understanding, Unity." After the hectic founders' week end last May the boys wrote:

"Coming as we do from different racial, religious, and cultural backgrounds, we are constantly made aware of the dignity and integrity of the individual. As we better understand this concept of equality and do something practical about it, then the unity which is so much needed in our world will come."

In addition to national Beta Sigma Tau, a lusty litter of local antidiscrimination fraternities also has appeared. Union College has a new local named Beta Eta Upsilon. It calls itself an antisegregation fraternity. The fact that it came to life at Schenectady, where America's first social fraternities were born in 1825, is regarded as a meaningful straw in the wind.

In the fall of 1947 a dozen freshmen looked over the fraternities at Union, went to rushing parties, heard the blandishments of upper classmen clad in pin-striped suits, tasted punch at fraternity smokers, and then said to hell with it.

"The exclusion policy, applied to fellows of minority races and religions, stuck in our craws," one of them told me.

They formed Beta Eta Upsilon and were recognized by the college last February. Their constitution states: "This brotherhood is organized on the basis that all men are created equal, and that no discrimination because of religion, race, color, or background should be practiced by a fraternity at Union College." The membership includes nine Protestants, three Catholics, one Jew.

"Practically every fraternity on the campus has a few men who agree with us," President Clarence H. Walker declared. "They're trying to fight segregation within their own ranks. We call it the underground."

Bucknell University was in the fray as early as 1945. Three students just back from war, rebelled at the big nationals and started their own local, Phi Lambda Theta. Prominent Bucknell alumni gave them a helping hand. A year ago they acquired a fraternity house. Of their 55 brothers, 3 are Negroes, 2 Catholics, 5 Jews, and 2 Chinese.

The University of Wisconsin has a new interracial group—Sigma Delta Phi. Bowdoin has a new fraternity which calls itself ARU, meaning "All Races United." The antidiscrimination movement is hopping from campus to campus.

Sobered by a war which turned out to be a young men's proposition, thousands of students are wondering whether young men shouldn't take a bigger part in running the world. They are unwilling to follow hand-me-down systems. They squirm unhappily in the long flannels of fixed ideas. They want to think for themselves.

The wrong-side-of-the-railroad-track notion is thoroughly repugnant to them. They believe no man should be evaluated by his father's bank roll, his father's clubs, or by the social register. No man should be excluded from a fraternity because he isn't a "smoothie" or a hot dresser, or doesn't drive a convertible.

Dr. Max McConn, formerly of Lehigh, has listed the values on which old-line Greek-letter cliques judge new freshmen: (1) Money; (2) family connections; (3) type of preparatory school attended; (4) "Personality."

Personality is in quotes because it does not mean true personality values, but rather what is sometimes called "poisonality"—the ability to flash a toothy smile, a convincing handshake, an assortment of quips for the cocktail party, and, of course, plenty of sartorial whiz. Student reformers chide the Greeks mercilessly for such hot-shot standards.

Said one at Wisconsin, "If grown-ups felt that way, Van Johnson would be president."

Scoffed another, at Yale, "The fraternities are interested in families whose best part is under the ground."

EDITOR BLASTS METHODS OF SELECTION

Clayton L. Dickey, a 1947 Michigan graduate, battled bitterly with his own fraternity, Delta Tau Delta, over social discrimination. He wrote in the Michigan Daily, of which he was city editor:

"Is it a healthy thing to allow the existence, in a university community, of groups which select their members for social graces—values which aren't very important in a university scheme of things Anyone who has been through the rushing melee can tell you that good looks and/or fast chatter are paramount * * * How beneficial to a university community is a system whereby some are accepted and others are barred on the basis of false values?"

Dickey, now a United Press writer in Cleveland, said to me when I was getting this story, "If I went to college all over again, I would not join a fraternity. I liked it best just after the war, when the fraternity houses were thrown open as dormitories. I stayed at the Chi Phi house. We had a mixed group of Christians and Jews, rich and poor boys."

What is the effect of fraternity exclusiveness upon the young men who are left out? What about the 86 boys at Michigan who had their hearts set on being asked to fraternities last fall, who filed their names with the dean's office and who did not get bids?

At Amherst, storm center of the college fraternity crisis, the Amherst College alumni committee on postwar education reports: "The unwanted man psychology plays a real role with too many students. * * * The competitive status of membership among the fraternities gives rise to a good deal of heartache and insidious comparison of social status."

Wrote Amherst's subcommittee on student activities, four-fifths of whom were fraternity men themselves: "The sense of exclusiveness and social preferment * * * is hurtful to the young men who are in the fraternities because it gives them a false and undemocratic sense of superiority. And it hurts the students who are outside the fraternities by giving them a wholly unwarranted sense of being inferior and of being social outcasts."

The committee pointedly recalled that "each year in the last decade a number of otherwise thoroughly desirable young men have left college at the end of the freshman year primarily for the reason that they have failed to be elected to a fraternity."

Many educators feel that the boys who are excluded from fraternities are the very ones for whom a fraternity could do the most good.

"How about taking in an occasional misfit?" I suggested to a group of Phi Gamma Deltas. "You boys could do a lot for such a lad."

The suggestion was laughed at. I was promptly informed that taking in a "spook"—as they put it—was a contradiction of the whole idea of fraternities. It was a heresy. "We only want the cream, not the skim milk," one brother said.

College chaplains often hear the other side of the story. The Reverend John Colburn, at Amherst, has known many a pale hour when a boy has come in, quietly and alone, to weep a little over being left out. "When the fraternities reject them, these boys often live in a psychological climate of defeat—not only in college, but well into life," Chaplain Colburn remarked.

I got a better picture of what he meant when, a few hours later, I talked to a youth who had been turned down by the fraternity to which his father and two cousins belonged. He talked without rancor, but there was something behind his eyes that spelled out the story.

Psychologists are not fooled by the exclusion idea. They have put it in a test tube too many times. Exclusiveness is nothing but the old in-group and out-group mechanism which is as old as man. By forming a clique and throwing a wall of exclusion around it, Mr. A can say to Mr. B, "My group is better than your group. Therefore, I am better than you." Fortunately, men who are confident of their own worthwhileness do not need to resort to this dodge.

"It is no coincidence," one psychologist remarked, "that the men who flaunt their fraternity pins most ostentatiously are the ones who have nothing else to flaunt."

American democracy insists that in this land there shall be no aristocracy save that of talent devoted to the service of man. Thus many a college president feels that student aristocracy, if there be one, should be based upon an oft-forgotten facet of college life—education.

The scholarship ratings of the old-line Greek-letter fraternities have been less than dazzling. At Williams, the Garfield Club—composed of nonfraternity men—regularly whips the academic hides off the fraternities. At Amherst, the annual Treadway Scholarship Trophy has been won 6 times in the last 13 years by a similar group of nonfraternity men, the Lord Jeffrey Amherst Club. Michigan, typical of large universities, finds that fraternity men's scholastic average is 2.47, that of the nonfraternity men 2.56.

One college alumni committee was moved to report, "The number of students who have felt it advisable to move out of their fraternity houses in order to pursue their scholastic careers more effectively has increased in recent years."

It dryly added, "There appears recently to have been more drinking in the fraternity houses—and more women visitors—than would be generally adjudged to be conducive to concentration on intellectual growth."

He laughed at the wrong moment

The intellectual value of secret grips, passwords, rituals, and other fraternal falderal might also occasion some doubt. One New England chapter was rudely awakened while initiating a faculty member to honorary membership. The mumbo jumbo was in full career, grave brothers were arrayed in their hoods and robes, the faculty man was on his knees with his hands folded listening to the esoteric effusions—when suddenly he burst out laughing. He blurted, "Just slip me the grip—and forget this hocus-pocus!"

Many a fighter pilot, infantryman, and paratrooper has turned in his pledge pin when a plushlined punk has tried to "make a man out of him." One veteran quit rather than memorize page upon page of fraternity flummery. "I'd rather memorize a little history and economics," he quietly stated.

To demands for abolition of the fraternity system, many observers complain, "You can't leave students in a void. If you abolish fraternities, you must have a substitute plan."

Two substitute plans are now functioning with notable success: the house plan at Harvard, and the club plan at Princeton. When a freshman comes to Harvard he looks over the seven houses—large clubhouse residences, where students live, eat, and hold their parties. He applies for admission to one of them. He may prefer Lowell House. He may prefer Adams or Dunster.

The important point is: The man chooses the house—unlike the fraternity system in which the house chooses the man. The houses are interracial, nonsectarian, and conscious of neither bluebooks nor bankbooks. Harvard hangs no labels on the men it is educating for democracy.

Princeton, a foe of fraternities since Civil War days, centers its social life in 17 "eating clubs" which are similarly democratic. Vernon Geddy, chairman of the undergraduate interclub committee, earnestly told me, "The thing we're proudest of is that there is no racial, religious, or social segregation. We take a man on his merits."

Along Prospect Street, along which the club mansions are lined in elm-shaded elegance, there is a free and wholesome tang. There is neither restriction nor exclusion, Harold Yerkes, president of the Quadrangle Club, remarked, "The club system is for everybody. Clubs aren't something special. They're part of the whole college experience."

Thoughtful fraternity men know that in the Harvard and Princeton plans the fraternity system is up against a stern rival. Since the war many fraternities, perceiving the neon handwriting on the wall, have tried to mend their ways. Most of them have tossed hazing and hell week into the ash can.

Many observers take heart from what Dan Byrd, until recently president of Alpha Tau Omega at Ohio State, called "the more mature outlook which fraternities are evincing."

If the baiting and paddling of pledges no longer appeals to them, perhaps they are on the way to discovering the human being beneath the pledge pin. And when they do, they may perceive a smidge of human dignity—even in a freshman. Then—who knows?—his clothes, his looks, his race, his religion, and his old man's bank account may not matter any more.

On Keeping the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "On Keeping the Republic," by Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., chairman, Republican National Committee, at Bridgeport, Conn., February 12, 1949, over the facilities of the Columbia Broadcasting System:

As we gather here tonight to do honor to our first Republican President it is inevitable that we should contrast the standards of ethics and political morality exemplified by Abraham Lincoln with those prevailing among the men who rattle around in the seats of the mighty in Washington today.

Such a comparison—let us call it contrast—is invaluable to us. It points up and emphasizes an important fact—that to the extent to which our party has been true to the spirit and example of Lincoln throughout our history it has merited, and generally has received, the support and trust of the American people. Therein is a lesson for all Republicans.

In the words of Lincoln we must "think anew and act anew." We must be clearly conscious of the fact that free governments are devised to promote and expand the liberties and rights of people—not to enslave men, not to shove them around, but to make and keep men free. We must never forget that a promise given to the people is an obligation which must be discharged at all costs. We must never cease to insist that the people's money is to be administered for the benefit of all the people, not as a private or partisan campaign fund. And we must never lose sight of the eternal truth that human progress under free government moves ever forward—forward to greater freedom and prosperity, not greedily to more and bigger government and to inevitable oppression and suffering.

Remembering this, we shall give an adequate answer to the question raised by another great American, Benjamin Franklin, who, as he left the final session of the Constitutional Convention in my own city of Philadelphia, was asked by a little old lady what kind of a government was to be given to the American people. His unforgettable reply was, "A republic, if you can keep it."

We have had a Republic for more than 150 years. We still have its outward forms, but sometimes I fear that its inner spirit has been sadly battered—that unless present trends are halted or reversed it will not survive many more assaults from its enemies within and without our borders.

But keep the Republic we will—keep the Republic we must. The first step in that direction must be the election of a Republican Congress in 1950 and the next step sh ll be the election of a Republican President in 1952. But let us put first things first. Let us not be diverted from the immediate task in 1950 by fruitless and useless bickerings about 1952. Let us not imitate the dog in the fable who beheld his image in a stream and dropped the bone in his mouth in an effort to grab the bone he thought he saw in the water.

I have not the slightest doubt that we can win control of Congress in 1950 if we devote our energies wholeheartedly and, so far as the national picture is concerned, exclusively to that end. That is what I propose to do as chairman of the Republican National Committee, and you may be sure that during my term as chairman the energies of our headquarters staff will not be diverted to any other end. We will need the cooperation—the close cooperation—of State and local committees and of our Republican Members of the Senate and House. During the recent meeting of the national committee in Omaha tangible steps were taken to improve that cooperation, and I promise you now that I will make every effort within my power to bring that Republican joint effort to the people, whose respect we must earn and whose confidence we must gain.

As the opposition party in Congress during the next 2 years we have, as I see it, two principal duties—to propose sound and constructive solutions for national problems and to oppose those parts of the administration's program which would be destructive of our representative Republic and disastrous to our free institutions.

Mere opposition is not enough—not nearly enough—although it has its place in the program of a party which is in the minority in Washington.

Already, as a result of action taken recently by the national committee, the stage has been set, I hope, for much work this year by Republicans working together on party program and policy.

The representatives of the national committee who will serve on this policy committee have been appointed. Provision has been made for the selection of representatives of Republican Members of the Senate and House and of Republican State chairmen and State finance chairmen. As soon as these members have been selected it is my purpose, as chairman ex officio of the policy committee, to call it into session to discuss the direction to be taken by the Republican Party and decide whether or not to call the proposed national conference and, if so, to fix the time and place and to prescribe the qualifications for participation.

If such a conference is held, and I hope it will be, it should result in a clear-cut statement as to those proposals upon which Republicans in and out of Congress will cooperate with the administration and an equally clear-cut delineation of the line beyond which we, as Republicans, cannot and will not go. We should say what we will do as well as what we will not do.

Furthermore, in what may be called a third category, in instances in which the administration may be seeking a proper end by utterly improper means, I believe we must be prepared to propose alternative solutions to national problems and to battle for them to the end. Of necessity, the details of such proposals will have to be worked out by Republican Members in the Senate and House—the only national representatives of our party who have the opportunity to translate declarations of party policy into legislative action. In such instances it is well to remember that the administration by sheer power of numbers may be able to overwhelm our Republican Senators and Representatives. We do not have a majority in either the Senate or the House. Whether by design or—more probably—by carelessness the people have decreed a new lease on life for the Truman "Mis-Deal" or "Ordeal" and we shall have to put up with that situation until the elections of 1950. But every day in every week and every week in every month we can make sure that the administration knows it is in a fight and that the American people realize that it is the Republican Members who are fighting the people's battles in Congress. We can do no more for the time being and, in my opinion, we should do no less. I promise you that you are going to get full value out of the Republicans you have sent to Congress.

I hope I have made it clear that I favor an attitude of helpful cooperation with the administration in every case where that is possible. But, after all, the one sure cure for an abscessed tooth is to yank it out—not to install another abscess as a counterirritant. We may be able to give some temporary relief to the people suffering during the next 2 years but there can be no real cure until the Truman administration, this abscessed tooth in the body politic, is yanked out.

We must put an end to the obnoxious theory that certain men—and always the same old faces of the same old palace guard—are ordained to rule over the rest of the people. We must put an end to a regime which has publicly proclaimed that the people are too dumb to understand what is being done for them in Washington. We must put an end to proposals for unequal redistribution of wealth to pay off campaign debts. In short, we must put an end to privilege on the Potomac. With your help we will bounce out these princes of privilege.

We must do so for a very good and compelling reason, namely, that this Nation now has an administration which has proved by its words, as well as by its record, that it cannot be trusted. It is an administration which has acquired and retained power by making solemn promises to the people which it knew it could not keep and which it would not keep if it could.

Its stumble-bum and deceptive administration of American foreign policy abroad has been matched or exceeded by attempts to deceive the American people at home. Let's take a few examples.

At the moment the administration is trying to kid the American people into believing that the misdeal boys are trying to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, generally known as the Taft-Hartley Act. During the 1948 campaign Mr. Truman promised to repeal that act. So did Senator MCGRATH, the Chairman of the Democrat National Committee, and other Democrat spokesmen. But within a matter of days after the election the Democrats began to talk about revising or amending the act and the administration finally sent a bill to Congress designed to double-talk some labor leaders into thinking the act was being repealed and to double-talk other people into thinking that most of it was being retained. Actually, it is a good guess that the

name of the Taft-Hartley Act will be repealed and much of its substance will be retained. Congress will attend to that, not Mr. Truman's palace guard. You can only fool some of the people some of the time. And there come a time when even sucker bait runs into short supply.

But there are some rather peculiar features in the administration's labor relations bill. In the first place the administration proposes to strike out the Taft-Hartley Act ban on Communists as office holders in labor unions. It proposes to reopen the door for Communist domination of unions at the very time when such labor leaders as Philip Murray, the head of the CIO, are moving heaven and earth to free the ranks of labor from Communist traitors. Peculiar, isn't it—and why do you suppose it is being attempted? And did some of "good old Joe's" United States branch suggest it?

Moreover, the administration has chosen to time its drive for the resubjugation of unions to Communist domination coincidental with the persecution and very probably to the crucifixion of a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church in Communist-dominated Hungary. Of course, the administration is piously washing its hands in public and protesting against the Hungarian atrocity. But Hungary would not be behind the iron curtain today had it not been for the insanities of our foreign policy as exemplified at Yalta and Potsdam, in the days when the Soviet dictatorship was one of our gallant allies in the fight to save democracy and good old Joe was quite palsy-walsy with our rulers. But maybe Mr. Truman thinks the latest Hungarian atrocity is just another red herring. How many must suffer and how many must die before the blind leaders of the Democrat Party wake up to the effect of their foreign-policy waverings and defaults?

There is another peculiarity about the administration's proposed revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Taft-Hartley Act contains a provision authorizing the President to seek injunctions to delay or prevent strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the national health and welfare. Mr. Truman has used that power several times to halt strikes in mining, shipping, and other basic industries. Now, Mr. Truman wants that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act left out of the proposed new law. He says he doesn't need such authority because he already has inherent power to obtain injunctions in such circumstances. Let's see how that contention holds water. Back on May 25, 1946, at a time when Mr. Truman certainly had as many powers inherent or otherwise as he has today, because many of the extraordinary wartime delegations of power were still in effect, he went before a joint session of Congress and personally asked for emergency authority to draft railroad workers into the armed forces to head off a transportation strike. Where were his inherent powers then, and why didn't he use them? You know as well as I do that he had no such inherent power then, and, in my opinion, so does he. But when are we to believe what the President says—in the even-numbered years like 1946 or in the odd-numbered years like 1949? Personally, I don't know.

Now, let's take another example of administration double talk and double dealing in another field. I'm sure you all remember Mr. Truman's campaign promises to enact his full civil-rights program; promises incidentally which were also embodied in the platform adopted by the Democrat national convention. I am sure also that all of you who pay any attention to what goes on in Washington realize that what has blocked Republican efforts to enact real civil-rights legislation in the past has always been a filibuster or the threat of a filibuster by Democratic Members of the Senate. So the way to enact civil-rights legislation is to change the Senate rules to prevent filibusters. That is precisely what Republican Senators have been trying to do ever since the present session convened on January 3.

But Mr. Truman's own Democrat floor leader in the Senate, Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, prevented the Rules Committee from taking prompt action on the proposed changes in the rules. Of course Senator Lucas needed the support of other Democrat Senators and he got it—plenty of it. It's the old familiar pattern which we have seen in operation ever since the Democrats came into power in 1933—and which persisted even when they had far more than the two-thirds majority needed to end a Senate filibuster. It is always the same pattern, civil-rights legislation is kicked around and shunted from hand to hand like a hot potato until near the end of a session. Then it is trotted out for a few days' filibuster and then the Democrat leadership decides that other pressing subjects must take precedence and civil rights legislation goes over until the next session. It is always coming up "mañana" and will be so long as the Democrats control Congress. They talk it up for votes and talk it down in Congress.

For a really prime example of administration double-talk and double-dealing let us now consider the Truman tax-increase program. The Republican Eightieth Congress, you will remember, passed a bill reducing individual income taxes by a total of about $4,000,000,000 and taking 7,000,000 taxpayers off the rolls altogether. The 7,000,000 in the lower income brackets got a 100-percent tax reduction and other taxpayers got less. Mr. Truman vetoed that Republican tax-reduction bill and denounced it as a rich man's bill. Now he tells Congress he needs an additional $4,000,000,000 in revenue to finance some of his schemes—schemes designed for the most part to pay off campaign debts out of the public treasury. Wouldn't you think that the logical thing for him to do would be to ask for the repeal of the Republican tax-reduction bill, the bill he vetoed and denounced as a rich man's bill? That would give him $4,000,000,000. You would think so, but he doesn't do so and won't dare to do so. Those 7,000,000 taxpayers who were relieved of all taxes have 7,000,000 votes—maybe more if some of them live in the Pendergast wards in Kansas City.

Well, we have the Truman administration and we will have it for 4 years. The best we can do about that is to police its every act and try to block some of its more outrageous attacks upon the public welfare. We will have the Truman-Democrat Congress with us for about 2 years—it is just about 22 months until the 1950 election, to be exact. So we can do something about that sooner and the time to start doing something is right now. It will take intensive organization and unremitting hard work. But the job has to be done and the Republican party must do it. It's not just a Republican fight. It's the battle for a better living and a more secure life for every man and woman. It's my fight. It's your fight. It's everybody's opportunity to do something about it. Let's get to work.

Atlantic Defense Pact Warrants Careful Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we are reading and hearing much daily about the formation of a North American military alliance which obviously is being established for the purpose of resisting Soviet influences.

The statements of Senators CONNALLY and VANDENBERG in which they challenge the right of spokesmen for the State Department to commit the United States to this alliance are very timely. These statements bring to the surface a fact that every American should fully understand, and that is, that Congress alone has the right to declare war.

In connection with commitments which are being made in our behalf, David Lawrence in his daily column February 14 in the Washington Evening Star made the following interesting observations in discussing the Atlantic defense pact:

ATLANTIC DEFENSE PACT NEEDLESS IF AIR POWER CAN WIN WAR ALONE—NO JUSTIFICATION SEEN FOR SECURITY BLOC UNLESS BASES ARE NECESSARY

(By David Lawrence)

The "cold war" goes on. The American people little realize the commitments that are being made in their behalf or the fact that Russia may not take complacently the formation of a North Atlantic military alliance obviously set up on the basis of a possible attack by the Soviets.

There are already some curious contradictions about it all. If, for instance, air power is as far advanced as Air Secretary Symington, Gen. Carl Spaatz, and the other champions of that cause say it is, then why is it necessary to have any alliance with the Scandinavian countries? Why, if airplanes like the B–36 can carry bombs from the United States to distant points and return safely within 16 hours nonstop, is there any need to send military equipment to Norway or Denmark or even England?

The American people have been told repeatedly that air power will win the next war, though a few cautious souls, even in the air-power school of thought, have intimated that the use of other armed services would indeed be very helpful. Congress is about to vote appropriations amounting to at least $14,000,000,000 for all armed services. The air-power advocates think more should be allocated to them than has been.

BIG RISK INVOLVED

If air power can do the main job, then the State Department is making a big mistake in pushing the North Atlantic security pact at this time. For a big risk is being taken. The Scandinavian countries are being exposed to possible reprisals from Russia, and it will not be possible to give aid to those countries without declaring war on Russia.

Certainly if the American Army and Navy are to be weakened so that most of the money is to be spent for air power, then it will not be possible for a fleet to cross the Atlantic and land troops without heavy penalties and losses, because the Russians will have overrun the territory and conquered the Scandinavian countries before aid can reach them.

As a practical matter, it is difficult to see what purpose a North Atlantic military alliance can serve unless it is based on the theory that maybe air power cannot, after all, do the immediate job and that it is wiser to have ground troops and air bases in the Scandinavian countries to which our airplanes can go instantly or to which they can go even ahead of any outbreak of war so as to support the Scandinavian countries against a sudden attack.

But such a theory assumes that air power cannot do the job in 30 days as some of its enthusiasts are saying. It assumes, moreover, that maybe the Navy must be strengthened so as to protect the transport of troops

and fuel across the ocean. For, if it be conceded that the bombers cannot use America as the base but must depend on overseas bases, then it makes sense to have both an Atlantic pact and a Mediterranean pact.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS NEEDED

It makes sense also to construct some floating bases—aircraft carriers—which would not be dependent, as would land bases, on the strength of Scandinavian governments, which can always be infiltrated from within and frustrated by Communist political action. Aircraft carriers can move along any seacoast anywhere and protect the landing of troops and supplies.

But the extremists in the air-power school of thought are arguing vehemently against the building of big aircraft carriers. They are insisting that this is a waste of money and that the funds had better be put into long-range bombers and other weapons of the air. Certainly if they are right about it, the State Department is making a terrible blunder in pushing the North Atlantic security alliance at this or any other time.

Admiral Nimitz and General Bradley, in recent pronouncements, have indicated clearly their belief that the Buck Rogers era of air warfare is not here yet and that if a war broke out this year, for instance, it would have to be fought very much along the lines of the last war so far as naval aviation and ground-troop action are concerned. Will Congress take the money away from the other armed services in order to give air power more? If so, the State Department ought never to submit the North Atlantic security pact to the Senate. Only if the air-power school of strategy is wrong is the security-pact plan justified at all as a sensible measure of defense precaution.

Steam Plant for TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the appropriations which will permit the TVA to build a steam plant in order to firm up the power in that great valley. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments pro and con upon this subject.

In my opinion it is the duty of the Federal Government to help harness our great streams in order to produce power for the people in that community. It would not have been possible for private capital to have built the Hoover Dam, the Grand Coulee, or Muscle Shoals. It would not have been possible for private capital to build many of our great irrigation projects that have been built or to undertake those that are now needed.

Nebraska is the only State in the Union that is entirely served by public power. We do have a shortage of power because of the great expansion throughout the rural areas to the smaller towns and industrial sites. It is quite possible that Nebraska's REA or public power groups will need to build additional steam plants in order to firm up the present power and produce sufficient electric energy to supply there needs. Certainly there is a real crusade on among our farmers to get their rural electric lines energized. The farmers all over the country are anxious to get electric energy to bring many comforts to their homes. If steam plants are needed, they should be considered.

It is quite possible that some of the bookkeeping accounts in the TVA would not stand close public scrutiny. It is quite possible they are not charging sufficient for some of their power to repay the interest and depreciation costs, or the repayment of the loans. I would not want the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, or Ohio to be paying in money to subsidize the towns or communities under the TVA. If their rates are not sufficient, then it is a matter of administration. The moneys made available under this bill, and the moneys being made available to the REA and other public power districts, should be so amortized that it not only pay a reasonable rate of interest but that the loan will be entirely repaid to the Public Treasury. The REA districts in Nebraska have a good record of paying their loans and interest.

I expect to support this measure to assist the people in the Tennessee Valley to build a steam plant. I believe it is in the public interest.

Dangers in Peacetime Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram of February 13, 1949:

DANGERS IN PEACETIME RENT CONTROL

Federal rent control in some form undoubtedly will be continued by Congress beyond the present expiration date of March 31.

There is no doubt about extension of controls for the simple reason there are more tenants than there are landlords. Their numerical superiority, and hence their greater potency at the ballot box, seems to blind Congress to some obvious facts, such as:

1. The original reason for rent control has ceased to exist. There no longer are any mushrooming Army or Navy training centers. Workers no longer are pouring into industrial centers to labor in defense plants.

2. Rent control, in the absence of general control over all segments of the national economy, is fundamentally unfair and discriminatory. It penalizes one portion of our society to the benefit of other portions.

3. Rent control was a wartime expedient which has no proper place in a peacetime economy based on free enterprise. It nullifies the law of supply and demand as it relates to rental housing.

4. Rent control in peacetime is inherently dangerous. It is slowly but surely reducing the number of rental housing units available.

5. Substantially all rental housing in the United States came into being when there were no rent controls. The comparatively few rental units which have been constructed since the war are exceeded by the number of units which have been withdrawn from the rental market.

6. With rent ceilings based on depression prices, without regard to increased labor and material costs, landlords have been unable properly to maintain their properties. As a result, much of it is becoming shabby and run down. Eventually it will no longer be habitable.

7. Rent control has not prevented inflation, as it was supposed to do. It has held down the cost of housing for some, but that has been accomplished only at the expense of others. It has compelled many families to buy or build homes which, in some cases, they could not afford.

8. Rents were frozen arbitrarily on a given date in 1941. The ceilings which were established took no account of the relationship between rentals then in effect and the value of the property involved. This has caused all manner of inequities and injustices as between landlords in the same community. Some landlords have fared better than others.

We hold no brief for the rental industry, but we do not believe that landlords as a class are unscrupulous, miserly, and heartless, waiting for a chance to take advantage of every tenant sheltered under their roofs.

And we do not believe that tenants as a class are underprivileged, impoverished individuals who are incapable of exercising independent judgment and who are wholly dependent on the Federal Government for the protection of their rights. Most of them are self-reliant citizens, and many of them are enjoying far greater increases in income than their landlords.

We are deeply concerned over the violence being done to our free-enterprise system by continuation of rent control year after year, and the dangerous precedents being established by this policy.

If today's Congress can legally discriminate against landlords, tomorrow Congress might well discriminate against tenants. It is a definite possibility which tenants should recognize.

Congress should consider the extension of rent control beyond March 31 with a view to both its immediate and long-range effects. Since termination of controls on short notice might result in some cases of hardship among tenants, their extension for a reasonable time seems inescapable. But the renewal law should make definite and specific provision for the gradual tapering off of controls, with complete decontrol at the earliest possible time as the goal.

In its concern for the welfare of tenants, Congress should look to the future and consider their plight when the present supply of rental housing, through lack of proper upkeep or withdrawal from the rental market, has either ceased to exist or become undesirable.

Tenants and the lawmakers alike should consider the deplorable state of rental housing in France, which has resulted from permanent rent control. The story is told briefly in the February 5 issue of the Saturday Evening Post. Tenants, for their own long-run protection, should urge their representatives in Congress to guard against the mistake France has made from being repeated in this country.

New England Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include excerpts of the following article by request:

NEW ENGLAND POWER, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE?—HYDROELECTRIC POWER POSSIBILITIES IN NEW ENGLAND

(By Judson King)

I. FEDERAL POWER POLICY

Multipurpose river development is now the fixed policy of the Federal Government for all great rivers that are interstate streams. This policy evolved with the growth of the Nation to meet modern necessities, such as flood control, navigation, soil conservation, reforestation, etc., of which power is only one factor—but a highly important factor—the integrating key of the whole. It has been 40 years in developing from Roosevelt to Roosevelt and after, and for any statesman or publicist to assert that it was the result of socialistic theorizing, or Communist inspiration, or due to the yearn of bureaucrats in Washington to augment their power and influence, is mere fustian.

It is not wise economy to construct dams, as a rule, for a single purpose such as flood control or power, when other imperative objectives can be combined in one operation and the whole made economically feasible.

These operations require unified management by a single agency with plenary control but in cooperation with other State and Federal agencies, if maximum results are to be realized, and the harnessing of a river from source to mouth, including tributaries. This principle was laid down during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 and its soundness has been demonstrated by our national experience since and by the success of the TVA. The delay and disastrous results of bickerings and conflict between States and between separate bureaus are thereby avoided and each region and the Nation reap the benefits of unified action.

This policy is relatively new in respect of application and is still a matter of heated debate. It has been adopted in only one watershed, the Tennessee, to date, but it points the way, with proper adaptations, to the future if the greatest all-round benefits are to be achieved and we meet the challenge of the machine age of the twentieth century.

II. WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE NATION

As to water power, when one compares what has taken place in New England with what is going forward in other sections of the United States, the result is startling. New England and New York are rich in water power, yet there is not a single Federal project in the whole region.

* * * * *

As to New England we find that the most recent Federal surveys indicate a total of at least 2,500,000 kilowatts of undeveloped capacity on the following rivers: Connecticut, Merrimack, Lake Champlain, Androscoggin, Kennebec, Penobscot, St. John, and St. Croix. If adequately harnessed these rivers are capable of developing 10,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually, which is three times greater than the present output.

Surprisingly enough, the Connecticut has the largest potential. This indicates the uneconomic character of present utilization.

As compared with this 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours now going to waste, it is significant to note that the entire annual power consumption of New England for all classes of service was only 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in 1947, of which 75 percent was of steam generation—with no coal or natural gas or oil in New England.

III. WHY NEW ENGLAND LAGS BEHIND

Informed adults will remember, but young people, including World War II veterans, need to be told why, and who is responsible for, New England's backward status in respect of both flood control and water power. The reasons lie in antisocial policies established when they were babes in the cradle and kids in school. These happenings have cost their parents much grief and millions of dollars and will cost them and their children millions more unless the ancient regime is ended.

For example: In 1926 the six New England Governors, in a united appeal, urged public action for flood control and power development. They got nowhere. The utilities were opposed. Yet the $52,000,000 Merrimack flood of 1927 showed the need.

Again, the Federal Flood Control Act of 1936 authorized $315,000,000 for dams in 40 States, the States benefited to pay 20 percent of the cost; $24,000,000 were allocated for reservoirs in the Connecticut and Merrimack River Basins. An interstate compact between New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Connecticut was necessary but no additional legislation by Congress. Three power company lawyers of high standing were officially connected with the drafting of the compact in 1937 by appointment of the Governors.

When it appeared a bill was introduced in Congress to have it approved. Why? Because the utility lawyers had slipped into the compact a joker in the shape of an innocent-looking reservation which amended Federal law and would strike down throughout the United States Federal control on the people's interest of water power, established by the act of 1920; paralyze the Federal Power Commission; hamstring the President's regional conservation program; radically affect the policy governing the administration of TVA, Bonneville, and all yardstick plants; and establish the utilities' doctrine of States' rights as a national power policy.

The intent, of course, was to enable these States to turn the water power over to New England private utilities which were spearheading an attack on the Federal Power Act. As a cover the utilities and their politicians and newspapers set up a great howl about the "invasion of New England by the New Deal in Washington," which was pure buncombe, since the act had been in effect for 17 years and New England was still in the Union.

But while this propaganda was fooling the people there was silence on the fact that around 90 percent of New England power concerns were controlled from New York.

The trick was exposed. Congress rejected the compact. New England clung to States' rights with the result that she still needs flood control and her unused water power is still running to waste while other regions are forging ahead. New England utilities, bankers, and insurance companies are primarily responsible then for this situation.

The St. Lawrence

But for the controversy over public against private power the St. Lawrence project would have been long since in operation.

In 1922 the International Joint Commission approved the seaway-power plan as feasible. Since private corporations expected to develop the power a long list of such men as H. I. Harriman, president of the New England Power Co., and John H. Finney, for the Mellon aluminum trust, testified in favor of the whole project at the hearings. (See S. Doc. 114, 67th Cong., 2d sess.)

In 1924 Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, was chairman of a committee of officers of 10 Northeastern States which recommended the creation of a gigantic Boston to Washington superpower system of private utilities interconnected by great transmission lines with St. Lawrence power as one of the principal sources of supply.

But when in 1929 Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt declared for public generation and handling of the power in such wise as to benefit homes and farms as well as corporations, the power trust and Wall Street executed a right about face, fought the bill creating the New York Power Authority and killed the treaty with Canada in 1934 with the result that St. Lawrence power still runs to waste.

* * * * * *

IV. ELECTRIC RATES IN NEW ENGLAND

It is well known that from 1935 to date the electric rate surveys of the Federal Power Commission have uniformly shown that New England as a region has over-all the highest electric rates of any region in the United States. Further, that the reduction of private company rates in the northeast quarter of the United States by private utilities has not kept pace with reductions of private rates in the other three quarters of the Nation, although the Eastern States supposedly have the oldest and most efficient State regulatory commissions.

Beyond question, this result has been chiefly due to the fact that the low rates established by the TVA in the Southeast, Boulder Dam in the Southwest, and the Bonneville-Coulee projects in the Northwest have by their competitive effects forced the reduction of private rates. As a rule, the farther you get from these great projects the higher rates prevail in the various States. Yet these private companies so affected are prospering financially despite inflated securities.

Absolutely necessary projects on the Missouri and other tributaries of the Father of Waters, yielding enormous blocks of cheap public power, will in a few years bring down private rates in the entire central and midwest areas.

The reason why the northeast section of the Nation has no Federal projects is that the banking and utilities interests have controlled both State and National Governments and blocked multipurpose development of the watersheds.

* * * * * *

V. WHAT CAN NEW ENGLAND DO?

Apparently a considerable segment of New England voters and a few outstanding public men have lost faith in commission regulation and are turning to public ownership of electric power as the only way by which New England can maintain her status in competition with other regions of the Nation. Those 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of potential hydroelectric power in its rivers must be harnessed by the public. They also realize that along with this must come flood control, improved navigation, ending stream pollution, recreation, domestic and industrial water, reforestation, fish and wildlife preservation, soil conservation, etc., in a correlated grand enterprise—the twentieth century method, because New England like other regions must meet these needs.

Assuming this comprehensive objective and remembering that the United States Supreme Court decision in the New River case in 1940 ended all the quibbling about Federal jurisdiction over the watersheds of the navigable rivers of the Nation, there are two practical methods of procedure.

First, each State can proceed separately or by compacts with other States under Federal license. Likewise municipalities. The Federal Power Act gives preference to public bodies over private concerns. The States by appropriate legislation can aid cities or districts.

The proposed Holyoke expansion

A practical example is afforded by the present attempt of the Gas and Electric Department of Holyoke, Mass., to secure a Federal license to develop to full capacity the water power of the Connecticut River at that point. The city would purchase the properties of an existing company operating without a Federal license, and ultimately generate three times as much power as the present output.

Of course the city is being fought by the combined utilities of New England and will

get no help from the New England council. They will claim confiscation of private property which is false because a fair price will be paid. They will claim a tax loss to the city which is likewise false. Rather, there will be a large increase of tax income to the city and State because of increased business which added power will bring to the city.

TVA pays taxes and so do the municipalities and farm cooperatives. The falsity of the propaganda that the taxpayers of the Nation subsidize the cheap TVA power is a matter of record. In 1933, when TVA started, Federal income taxes from the TVA States totaled $12,000,000. In 1946 they totaled $1,100,000,000.

VI. NEW ENGLAND NEEDS A TVA

But, secondly, from the viewpoint of modern engineering and multipurpose execution in other regions this piecemeal, haphazard method would not meet the New England crisis. A comprehensive, planned, TVA type of development is necessary if the Northeast is to keep pace. Meantime, however, individual projects like Holyoke could go forward but designed to fit into the ultimate scheme.

As to power, a public transmission network like those now serving the Tennessee Valley and the Northwest would be needed. This grid would tie together all water power sites on all New England rivers from source to mouth, integrated with steam generation and connected with the St. Lawrence and Passamaquoddy. Such a hook-up would make feasible and profitable small and abandoned sites, pay for revamping old sites like Holyoke and by over-all interchange of power get the last kilowatt-hour out of the rivers and reduce production costs to the lowest possible point and not otherwise.

Then if, like TVA, uniform rates are established throughout the six States, no section would have an advantage over another and all would prosper together. Maine should consider that, when the final test comes, her law against export of power will be found unconstitutional. States' rights, State pride, State selfishness, as well as the advantage of one municipality or industry over another must be forgotten however much emotional and intellectual laceration is involved. Other regions have painfully learned that lesson in part and will continue to learn to their advantage. New England must recognize the inevitable to survive.

The famous New England council of super-big-business men will doubtless disagree as the recent report of its power survey committee would indicate. The committee engaged the engineering firm of Charles T. Main, Inc., of Boston, to make a study of the power resources of New England and size up the situation to help develop an informed public opinion and point the way to economically sound policies and enlightened action. From it we gather that all is well as is: there remains only 420,000 kilowatts of hydro power capable of feasible development (Federal Power Commission engineers estimate over 2,500,000 kilowatts, exclusive of Passamaquoddy); St. Lawrence would be of doubtful benefit and Passamaquoddy discloses no substantial ground for faith in its feasibility; possibilities of power development are given silent treatment and the question of rates is ignored with one exception, to wit: that the importance of the cost of power in manufacturing has been greatly overestimated.

These findings will not disturb the five top electric utility executives on the committee.

For comparison, New Englanders should read the report of the Muscle Shoals Commission appointed by President Hoover in 1931 after his veto of the Norris bill, to recommend a sound policy for Muscle Shoals. It was composed of State and Federal officials and advised turning the Shoals properties over to the States of Alabama and Tennessee. It engaged the Army engineers to advise them on power and they reported that development by the Government was not feasible and would prove a disastrous mistake since it would duplicate existing facilities serving the area adequately and was not needed.

* * * * *

This is but one instance which demonstrates that bankers, utility executives, and their obedient professional spokesmen anywhere, bent on immediate self-interest, are unsafe long-range planners where the public welfare is at stake.

As to sin and taxes

Whenever or wherever it is proposed that the people assume direct public control of electric service two horrific scarecrows, among others, are promptly erected by private utilities to frighten the unwary and keep possession of these profitable corn fields.

The first is sin, the second is taxes.

It is made to appear that public ownership and operation is an invasion of the sacred rights of private property, tantamount to a gross moral transgression. In Holyoke, for example, since certain gentlemen and their successors have been permitted to use the waters of the Connecticut at that point for a hundred years or so, no matter how wastefully, it will be inferred that they have an ethical right to continue in perpetuity. Hence it is held that for the city to pay them off and take possession is akin to confiscation. And so for all New England.

Now every judge and utility lawyer in New England well knows that this is sheer hokum, both legal and moral. They know that control of water power and utility services of all kinds, local, State, and National, are sovereign functions belonging to the people. They know that legally and morally the operators of private utilities are not competitive businessmen in the ordinary sense of these words, but are actually hired hands employed by the public to exercise these functions under franchises.

* * * * *

Now as to taxes. The big placard on this scarecrow reads in effect: "We pay taxes and public systems don't. Beware of an increase in your taxes."

For half a century this tax claim has been dinned into the American mind. In these days the companies which admittedly spend a million dollars or so a year for those full-page magazine ads signed by "American Business-Managed and Tax-Paying Electric Light and Power Companies" still keep it up. Incidentally 16 are New England companies. I often wonder how these gentlemen will square themselves when St. Peter asks them what respect they had for the ninth commandment, particularly wherever the New England conscience operates. Consider the following:

Twelve years ago the Federal Power Commission issued the first inclusive official study of this subject ever made and its figures were certified as correct by the private utilities before publication. The report was titled "Rates, Taxes, and Consumer Savings," and compared 691 private with 537 publicly owned utilities with respect of these items for the year 1936.

Correctly defining taxes as "payments in support of Government," the report on this item shows the following percent of base revenues paid in taxes:

	Direct taxes	Net cash contributions and free services	Total percent of base revenues
Private	14.4	None	14.4
Public	18.0	8.8	26.8

The above is for the United States. In New England 108 companies paid 16 percent of their base revenues while 39 public plants paid 24.6 percent for the support of Government. Such data is important to the formation of an accurate public opinion upon this vital and highly controversial issue and it is regrettable that the Power Commission has not followed up with annual reports of the same character.

However, Carleton L. Nau, able manager of the American Public Power Association, has abstracted the data from last year's statistical reports of the Commission, and he finds the figures show that in 1946 some 300 large private-power systems paid in taxes 19 percent of their gross revenues while 150 of the larger public systems paid 27 percent for the support of Government. So that while we hear much about that 4.6 increase of company taxes the public bodies still pay far, far more.

Chattanooga and the TVA—Taxes and flood control

Returning to the low Chattanooga rates, quoted at pages 5 to 8, the query arises: Does this plant pay taxes? The answer is, Yes; exactly as all other utilities, private and public, under State law. Chattanooga's official report for fiscal 1947 shows $386,724 taxes so paid.

And does TVA, the Federal wholesaler, pay taxes? Yes; under Federal law it paid in fiscal 1948 a total of $2,005,482 in lieu of taxes to the States affected.

But do New England and other United States taxpayers have to dig down to grant these bonanzas to the Southland? As to power, No. These facilities are self-liquidating and will be paid off in 40 years. From 1933 to 1948, after running expenses, etc., they showed total net revenues of $181,000,000. Of this, $34,000,000 have been paid back to the United States Treasury and $147,000,000 have been plowed back into the vast construction program, thus reducing appropriations by Congress.

Also TVA is boosting the Nation's revenues. Federal income taxes in the TVA States have increased from 3.4 percent of the United States total in 1933 to 6.3 percent in 1947—an up of over $2,000,000,000 in which TVA has been a large factor and which far exceeds Federal income taxes. The Government does not levy on its own enterprises any more than a city taxes the fire department or streets.

As to flood control and navigation, the answer is "Yes," just as Tennessee and other States dig down to finance river and harbor improvements from Boston to Miami and elsewhere, as well as flood control.

Like New England the Tennessee watershed has many rambunctious rivers. In February of 1948 there were big floods which the TVA systems of dams held under control. The estimated savings to agriculture was $1,600,000; to the vulnerable city of Chattanooga alone, $13,000,000 and so on. These dams will take 2 feet off the crest of a major flood on the Mississippi, an insurance value worth many millions. Yet the country is still being told that we cannot have power production at flood-control dams.

But are these reports reliable? They are. Ask Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, whose department keeps tabs on Uncle Sam's accounts, including those of TVA.

To sum up, a basic conflict is in progress between so-called private enterprise on behalf of the few, and planned public enterprise on behalf of the many, over the ownership and control of natural resources. The sole yardstick of the first is dollars; of the second, dollars plus humanity. All projects are necessarily blueprinted to serve one or the other of these objectives. Take your choice in judging them.

The Value of Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Constantin Fotitch, former Yugoslav Ambassador to the United States, which appeared in Human Events, February 9, 1949. This is a timely article by one who knows what is going on in Yugoslavia. It follows:

I

Norway, in northern Europe, and Yugoslavia, in the south, are two small nations which Soviet Russia must dominate in order to nullify the American plan for a North Atlantic military alliance.

If Norway can be added to the Western bloc, Great Britain will be more secure and Communist penetration will be held back from the North Sea. If Yugoslavia can be added to the western bloc, Italy and Greece will be more secure, and Communist penetration will be held back from the Mediterranean area.

Norway and Yugoslavia are thus the key points in the present diplomatic struggle. The contest for control of Norway is currently making the headlines. But the issue of whether Yugoslavia can be detached from Communist domination is of equal importance to the future of western civilization. It is now 6 months since Tito split with the Cominform. The Yugoslav dictator has been at outs with the Kremlin long enough to estimate the significance of his defection.

In the Yugoslav Assembly—controlled entirely by his followers—Tito stated on December 27, 1948, that he may have to sell raw material even to capitalistic countries, in order to buy machinery we need for the modernization of our mines and heavy industry.

Tito thus admitted that the whole economy of Communist Yugoslavia has been completely dislocated by the economic boycott which Soviet Russia has applied to punish him. In consequence, execution of Tito's ambitious 5-year plan, on which he staked the fate of the regime, has been irretrievably compromised. In a recent speech at Zagreb, Tito admitted that he must revise the 5-year plan by eliminating secondary projects and concentrating all efforts on heavy industry and mining.

Tito's statements have raised the question of whether he could be gradually led from economic collaboration toward political association with the western democracies. Any answer to that question must first take into account the charges of those skeptics who still believe that the entire conflict between Tito and his former associates is simulated.

Of course the Communists are past masters in the art of intrigue, but the conflict between Tito and Stalin has gone beyond that stage and seems to be definitely unbridgeable. It does not stop at name calling and recrimination. There have been at least two attempts to liquidate Tito, one of them involving the former chief of staff of the army, who shortly thereafter himself met a sudden death. Stalin expressed willingness to meet with President Truman in Poland or Czechoslovakia, but not in Yugoslavia. The increasingly hostile attitude of Tito's Communist neighbors, especially Bulgaria and Albania, is further evidence that this conflict is genuine.

II

Tito's split with the Soviet bloc has been appraised as of considerable value to the western powers in the cold war with the Soviets. He has been hailed as a national leader who has rallied the overwhelming majority of the Yugoslav people in defense of their independence.

These optimistic appraisals are considerably exaggerated. They credit Yugoslavia with military and economic importance far beyond reality. A good many grains of salt should have accompanied the prediction that the Soviet would suffer greater damage from the conflict than Yugoslavia itself. The same applies to the assertion that Tito is able to divert his great resources in metals to the capitalistic countries.

The prewar production reports of Yugoslavia (the postwar figures are not available in absolute figures but only in percentage) show how misleading such statements are. In 1938, Yugoslavia produced 662,015 tons of copper ore, 551,000 tons of iron ore, 749,183 tons of lead and zinc ore, 47,352 tons of chromium, 84,828 tons of bauxite.

Even if one accepts the assertion that production of these minerals has now exceeded prewar level, it is certain that the magnitude of Yugloslav production is far from being of such importance as to affect world economy in any important degree. Of course, for a country the size of Yugoslavia, it represents a great economic asset; but not sufficient to stir the greatest interest in the west and raise a storm among the governments in the east, to quote one recent observation.

In addition to its mineral resources, Yugoslavia can be expected to show a surplus of food, food products, and timber. But the export of those products has already been pushed to the limit by Tito's trade agreements with Switzerland, Sweden, and Great Britain. The export of food products was made possible at the expense of the domestic population, especially in the cities. The ration of basic food borders on undernourishment, that of meat being only 200 grams (6 ounces) a week, and bread 300 grams a day. Even such meager rations are seldom honored.

In the presence of growing popular discontent, Tito, in his above-mentioned speech in parliament, announced that further exports of food will be discontinued in 1949. He obviously meant that no new trade agreements involving food from Yugoslavia will be concluded.

III

In spite of Yugoslavia's limited economic potential it is suggested that Tito's new orientation will play an important part in trade and commerce with the west. And with the change of economic orientation it is predicted that a political reorientation will follow. Until now nothing has occurred to justify these optimistic predictions.

Tito, hard pressed by the commercial boycott imposed by the Soviet and its satellites, is simply fighting to stave off an economic collapse which would engulf his whole regime. He is trying to obtain from the west the machinery and industrial products on which depend even the partial execution of his ambitious but now unattainable 5-year plan.

Moreover, some of these western countries (such as Great Britain and Switzerland) had important prewar investments in Yugoslavia. Those investments have been expropriated by Tito in the true Communist tradition. But in the discussion of the trade agreements, these bourgeois governments unsympathetically presented Tito with heavy bills for indemnity to their citizens. Great Britain alone requested £7,000,000 for Trepca Mines, Ltd., owned by a British company. Finally the British Government compromised for £4,500,000 ($18,000,000) to be paid in annual installments.

Those payments can only be covered by exports from Yugoslavia, thus diminishing to a considerable extent the return in British goods. To make up this trade deficit the Tito regime seeks to increase domestic production by imposing compulsory overtime and speed-up methods. These have transformed the country into a vast camp of slave labor, mercilessly terrorized by the secret police.

IV

If the economic collaboration of Yugoslavia with the western world is of secondary importance, there should be even less illusion about the potential value of political collaboration with Tito.

Since his spectacular break with the Cominform, the Yugoslav dictator has always emphasized that he remains faithful to communism and loyal to the Soviet Union. At the Danube Conference, held last July and August in Belgrade, Tito's delegation was a most unfriendly host to the American and western European delegations. During the last Assembly of the United Nations the Yugoslav delegation unreservedly supported the Soviets. Recent statements of Yugoslav Communist leaders emphasized that Yugoslavia will always remain loyal to Stalin. The new Chief of Staff of the Yugoslav Army, Peko Dapchevich, on December 14 solemnly proclaimed that in case of conflict: "The Yugoslav Army will be on the side of the Soviet Russia and is already preparing itself to protect the freedom of the eastern countries from the warmongering west."

Recently the United Nations Special Balkan Commission has again formally accused Yugoslavia of giving continuous support to the Greek guerrillas. And Tito's propaganda continues as before its constant attacks against reactionary capitalism.

American and British correspondents in Belgrade have been working hard to detect some signs of a changing attitude on Tito's part. About all they have been able to report in this line is that at the reception given by Tito on the occasion of the anniversary of the Yugoslav Republic—November 29—the representatives of the western countries were for the first time treated on a footing of equality with the Soviets and admitted to the same reception room with their Communist colleagues.

In the face of these facts, Americans should not be lulled into believing that Tito's regime has undergone a nationalist and democratic evolution. Tito is simply struggling to maintain himself in power and to save his regime. He well knows that with the Soviets there is no compromise. Hard pressed, the Yugoslav dictator therefore makes certain overtures to the west, but it would be an inexcusable blunder to believe that he will turn all out against the Kremlin. It would be even more inexcusable if the democratic west should help to maintain in power a dictatorial regime originally imposed by the Soviets against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Yugoslav people.

Tito has a certain "nuisance value" in this cold war. His conflict with the Cominform undoubtedly weakens the monolithic Soviet system. But beyond that he is no asset to the western world. And to try to make Tito an ally would damage the position of the western countries among the people of Yugoslavia as well as among all other nations enslaved by Soviet dictatorship. The prestige of the west depends not only on its material strength, but just as much on its moral position as defender of those principles and ideals on which civilization depends.

Religious Education for Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have just finished an arresting and timely statement by Dr. J. L. Kesler on the place that Christian education occupies in the solution of some of our problems. Dr. Kesler is an outstanding educator, and the views expressed here were presented recently at a meeting of the Education Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, of which Dr. Charles D. Johnson, of Baylor University, is chairman. The lofty ideals expressed by Dr. Kesler have not only an inspirational quality but contain the profoundest wisdom for our times. It is not the purpose of Christianity to serve any particular economic or social patterns, but if our finest political principles are saved, we must draw upon the resources of faith which Dr. Kesler describes. The teachers in our colleges who are supplying a spiritual interpretation of life are rendering a great service in the defense of our institutions. If the college men and women are impressed by this type of instruction and develop Christian principles for their careers as citizens, then there is hope for us. Otherwise, materialism will win, and our western civilization will be weakened. Such men as Dr. Kesler and Dr. Johnson have placed us very much in their debt by advancing the ideals so eloquently stated here.

With the leave to extend my remarks I include the full text of Dr. Kesler's article, as follows:

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION FOR TODAY

(By J. L. Kesler)

Today we face a broken and shattered world.

The problems of human life growing out of the war are tremendous and tragic; and only the practice of the teachings of Jesus himself will keep another world war, with its unspeakable calamities, from coming again; and, possibly, in our lifetime. Such teaching, therefore, and its faithful practice is the most important enterprise that ever made its appeal to human responsibility.

What we need is a religious education that will make Christianity Christian. The Christianity we have is not Christian enough to change our world from a human slaughterhouse to a human brotherhood.

Christianity has not failed. It has never been tried. This has been said before. But it was never so evident as it is today. Not even has friendship been tried in international relations except for selfish ends.

First, then, in what ways do the present uncertainty and confusions in moral and ethical standards affect moral and religious education? The answer is, they paralyze it, wherever they dominate the situation.

Wherever men stand uncertain and confused, stand shilly-shally, with no standard of moral sanctions, no compelling motive, no directive norm, no inescapable conviction, no ethical imperative, nothing happens. Men have to be sure of something or the fire goes out. Nothing great is ever done without some faith seizure, some invincible conviction, some incomparable drive and loyalty that not only unifies and sets on fire the whole community—unifies and fuses it into one indissoluble solidarity, into one undiscouraged strength and power.

This comes about in the educational process by participation; for nothing permanent in character and action is ever done by proxy.

This may be thought of as a challenge to the teacher, and so it is. That is to say, to the real teacher who is not himself in confusion about moral and ethical standards nor the meaning of religion.

But the teacher to whom there is no goal in sight, no meaning in religion, no content, who is simply all dressed up in his mechanism and methods and nowhere to go, what about him? He simply goes nowhere and leads nobody out of the wilderness. We need clear-cut ends in view, frontal purposes built about preferential values that simply will not wait till tomorrow in this swiftly changing world.

We need, may I say, no fixed verbal absolutes in ethics and religion any more than anywhere else. We need no final authority to command and no educational creeds, however well seasoned with the wisdom of passing pedagogs. Instead we need the sense of the infinite values of growing childhood and youth reaching up toward unseen but illimitable altitudes possible to our nature and to our common humanity. We need the ways by which we climb in sight. We need particularly to join intelligence to aspiration in life's long pilgrimage to those tablelands of social and ethical achievement of our race Life has meaning in proportion to our interpretation of our experiences in terms of our almost infinite capacity for hope and love and joy and peace, for truth and the almost endless possibilities of the friendly life.

We are living in a changing world in which a changing world view of religion is going on. And its consequences are seen in fundamentalist and modernist fevers, in the growing pains of religion and science, in magic hopes and irrational disappointments.

The change from an irrational religion—creed, ritual, sacrament—capricious and unreliable—to a scientific, social, and ethical religion, intelligible in terms of the rest of our knowledge and consistent with it, means a total recentering of the content, the outlook, the method, and the motivation of the whole of life and its tasks in the world.

As Dr. Holman says in his book, The Cure of Souls, "Whatever the cause, this disintegration of one's philosophy of life, world view, or fundamental religious conviction, this experience of seeing one's world go to smash, entails for multitudes heart crushing disillusionment and despair. Fundamental doubts about life's meaning and value arise. Why should one continue one's life of moral endeavor, or indeed, continue to live at all?"

Here is a problem of religious education and a challenge to religious education, to courageous, creative religious education in which the student's whole nature and destiny are involved. He is to be enlightened, energized, and motivated anew—no formal or conventional matter, no mere school or church or institutional matter; it needs no priest's fumbling nor side-stepping from reality. Here men find life or lose it.

We must remember that it is the community that educates. We need first of all to Christianize the social order in which we live, to change the central method of our present civilization from competition, trying to get the better of one another for profit, to cooperation, working together in the interest of one another in a world brotherhood of the friendly life, a civilization keyed to prosperity and peace. This would mean the elimination of commercial, industrial, economic, and international wars and every form of exploitation of many by man. Unjust profit motives and all overreaching would gradually disappear as the more satisfying and more profitable service motive took its place. Privileged positions would come to be discredited and despised, so that to accept a privileged position would not only be bad manners but treason against men as men and against God as Father of men who created us brothers. As long as we teach religion as at present motivated we may expect all tests and surveys, as the Indian Survey—and half a dozen since—to find no relation between biblical knowledge and moral sanctions. Why?

We are not teaching the Bible and we are not teaching religion so as to develop the deeply ethical, the profoundly spiritual person who cares for others and treats them, even in the most irritating situations as he himself would like to be treated in like situations, not even asking the question, Do they belong to our race, our color, our creed, or our Nation?

Indeed, we might inquire if there be any difference between good churchmen and outsiders when war breaks out; or when industrial strikes imperil the life of the community or Nation, or when exploited childhood brings a larger profit to the mill owner, or in crises like the present where many starve while many have millions stacked sky high—really can we tell the difference? Yet I think Jesus expected a difference, as every teacher does who has a great lesson to teach and great lives to create. He came to make men good and through them to create a good world—not chiefly to save us from hell hereafter, that is incidental, but to save us to the heavenly life here and now, which makes heaven possible—came to make men good in all the social and ethical relations in the personal, national, and international life—came to get men to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with God, and yet we have made him merely our scapegoat to the wilderness instead of our divine guide to a civilization where life and love are sacred and where men love to bear one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ. Jesus has no limit to his world program for a larger, fuller, freer, better world.

When Lord Shaftsbury, trying to save the children and workingmen in England from unprecedented brutality and misery had to say that he was opposed more by the respectable and religious people than by others; and when Jesus had to say to the best churchmen of his time, "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye shut up the kingdom of Heaven against men; for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in," it looks like something has gone wrong with the guardians of respectable religion. We may yet have to say with the prophet, "The time is come that judgment must begin at the House of God." At least, it is time we were doing something about it in our schools and churches and in the highways and hedges where the people live.

And now, by your permission, I want to quote a statement by Rev. Herman F. Reissig on hearing an American general say, "I don't like war, but I want to protect my country."

Mr. Reissig says, "Protect 'my country.' But where is 'my country?' Who has decreed that 'my country' shall include only the geographical area?

"Where Milton sang, where Rembrandt painted, bounded by the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, Canada, and Mexico? Who has decreed that 'my country' shall embrace only those men, institutions, and events which lie between the year 1942 and the present? Who may thus limit and define 'my country?'

"Where Isaiah lifted up his voice for human justice, there is my country.

"Where Plato announced the reality of the spiritual, there is my country.

"Where Jesus offered his life for men, there is my country.

"Where St. Francis lived the compassionate life, there is my country.

"Where Shakespeare swept the human scene into his dreams, there is my country.

"Where Luther struck for the liberty of the soul, there is my country.

"Where Milton sang, where Rembrandt painted, where Goethe wrote, there is my country.

"Who draws these little lines, limiting my allegiance by accidents of time and space?

"Where Gandhi fights a swordless fight for freedom, there is my country.

"Where Schweitzer heals the bodies of black men, there is my country.

"Where brave men stand firm against Hitler's barbarism, there is my country.

"Where Kagawa champions the underprivileged, there is my country.

"I would protect my country. For my country I would fight against all enemies.

"Where is my country and who are its enemies?

"Wherever men and women lift the flag of justice, or of beauty, or of freedom, or of truth, or of peace, or of fellowship, there is my country.

"Who enslaves men in body for the sake of gain or in mind for the sake of power, who tramples on others' rights, who closes the doors of opportunity, who serves the dark gods of superstition and prejudice, who turns his eyes toward the past, who denies to others privileges he desires for himself—he is my enemy.

"God help me to protect my country against all enemies."

I heard this statement of Mr. Reissig nearly 30 years ago, a few years after the First World War, and to me it expresses the unity and solidarity of mankind, just as Jesus did, where, as world citizens, there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, but a larger and richer and ampler manhood and a fuller interpretation of the universality of the Christian life, creating one world and one humanity.

Finally, in the United Nations there is a possible hope of permanent peace. This can be now only a hope, and a hope that grows fainter as we think of a war-minded world and a not much less war-minded church. But, even so, may this hope have safe pilgrimage under morning stars till the day dawns in some fond future, when Christianity becomes Christian, and lifts the tragedies of war from the shoulders of the world.

My! What Christianity might do it we had it. What a task and what a hope.

In principle, simple as the Golden Rule; in practice, difficult as the perversity of human nature; in achievement, the joy of the whole earth.

Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the succession of events within recent years has placed this great Republic in a position of world leadership unlike that of any other nation in the course of history. All peoples of the world seeking freedom and who are at this moment endeavoring to escape the fears of oppression, want, and tyranny, look toward the United States as the citadel of hope. We in this country have set the course in cooperation with other democratic nations to provide peace with all nations. To accomplish that peace we have dedicated our good will, our sincerity, and the use of our resources in bringing about world concord. Since the end of World War II, while we have been about this job, a colossus has raised its ugly head and cast its shadow across the pathway of our course, threatening the future security of the entire world.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, our former ally in the last great conflict has embarked upon world conquest with an appeal to hate, prejudice, and with the preachments of an ungodly philosophy. This nation is Russia. To thwart the efforts of her doctrine of communism, we must prepare for the preservation of the integrity of all democratic countries. This will require the same effort and the same zeal with which we prosecuted World War II. It is necessary for us at this moment to take an accounting of our capacity to carry out this objective in terms of our natural resources. Certainly the last war made an unprecedented demand on our great wealth.

When we engage in any sort of accounting of our natural wealth and natural resources, we are reminded of our ability to produce on the farm and in the factories. Let us for one moment think of where we find ourselves today with respect to our soil, our forests, and our mineral resources.

Within recent years we have come to realize that the use of our land has not been wise and that fertility and plant life have been literally mined from the soil without replenishment. Erosion was not being arrested and our irreplaceable topsoil joined excessive rainfall on its excursion to the sea. Today, we not only recognize this national problem but we are actually assisting the farmer in programs of soil conservation, flood control, and reclamation. We are encouraging farm practices that are profitable to him immediately as well as the future welfare of the country.

Not too long ago, America abounded with virgin forests across the breadth of the land. Today, we are acutely aware that we have not been wise managers of this great natural resource and we know that very little of this richness will be inherited by our children. In an effort to overcome our shortsightedness we have recently begun the task of reforestation in the hope that some day our forests will again be sufficient to supply our needs.

In the past we proudly boasted about the inexhaustible supplies of natural resources and our geologists speculated that we had sufficient mineral resources to supply our needs for hundreds of years to come. Our unprecedented national expansion and growth, together with two great wars that utilized an incalculable amount of iron, coal, and other minerals, find these geologists now speculating as to where new deposits of these minerals can be found 10, 20, 30 years from now in quantities sufficient enough to meet our needs.

This picture of our present situation with respect to these natural resources is certainly grave enough to cause apprehension and anxiety.

One of the greatest of our natural resources that survives without damage, without injury, regardless of neglect, is the great nonexpendable resource of water power. When the Tennessee Valley Authority was enacted, it was sometimes referred to as a noble experiment. Those of us who have observed it and examined it know that TVA is the accomplishment which its creators dreamed.

The appropriation now pending will mean greater productivity, greater usefulness, and will add immeasurably to our national security by making full use of the nonexpendable water power that now flows in the Tennessee River. I shall not, at this moment, remind you of the virtues nor the accomplishments of this great agency during the course of the last war. Its record is too well known. Its signal successes are now a matter of history.

This appropriation will determine if we are conservatives in the real sense of the word, for the sum that will be appropriated today will further enhance the value of the entire project, and make it more profitable in its repayment schedule.

Gentlemen, the situation in this area of the Tennessee Valley as far as electric power is concerned is critical. And, unless the appropriation is made for the construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant, we will be without electricity to carry on rural electrification, to supply our villages and cities with power, and the resulting lack of electric power will thereby curtail the industrial capacity and expansion of this vast area.

Mr. Speaker, we today are the architects of America for the years to come. I sincerely hope we shall not be shortsighted in providing for the future welfare of this country by denying this most necessary and all important appropriation.

Veterans' Hospital at Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, a meeting of the Maryland congressional delegation was held this morning with representatives of the various veterans' organizations in Maryland. The purpose of the meeting was to bring to the attention of the Maryland congressional delegation the urgent need for a general medical-surgical hospital in Baltimore for the veterans, and to urge their concerted action toward se-

curing the hospital. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the testimony presented by Mayor D'Alesandro as follows:

The State of Maryland has a total veteran population of approximately 288,000. Of this number, approximately 230,000 saw service in World War II, while 58,000 constitute the veteran population of other wars. The latter figure is significant and should be remembered as it will have a bearing on comments included hereunder.

It is understood that Albany, Buffalo, and Brooklyn, N. Y., will have general hospitals with capacities of 1,000 beds each which will be available sometime during 1949 or early in 1950, and that the President has approved 1,000-bed hospitals for New York, N. Y., and Syracuse, N. Y. Certainly, the city of Baltimore, with a population which is greater than any of the cities listed above, except Brooklyn and New York, should have a general medical hospital with a capacity of at least 1,000 beds.

Moreover, it is understood that general hospitals are scheduled to be constructed in the following cities: Denver, Colo., 500 general medical beds; Wilkes-Barre, Pa., 475 general medical beds; Providence, R. I., 399 general medical beds; Wilmington, Del., 300 general medical beds; Little Rock, Ark., 500 general medical beds; Shreveport, La., 450 general medical beds; Seattle, Wash., 300 general medical beds; and 19 other cities are scheduled to have general medical hospitals with capacities ranging from 100 to 350 beds.

Inasmuch as Baltimore is a highly industrialized metropolitan city, it is felt that a 1,000-bed general medical hospital should be built on the 15-acre piece of property owned by the Federal Government in the city of Baltimore at Loch Raven and Alameda Boulevards, which was purchased for the construction of a 300-bed tuberculosis hospital. We believe that all the general medical beds in the State of Maryland should be consolidated and located in Baltimore. As the veterans grow older, certainly there will be a demand for additional general medical beds and all beds of this type for Maryland should be concentrated at one point in the metropolitan area of Baltimore, where approximately 60 percent of the State's veteran population resides.

The 58,000 veterans of other wars must also be given consideration at this time, particularly in view of the average age of those veterans. As those veterans become older year by year, and they are unable to properly support themselves, it appears to us that some action should be taken by the Federal Government to provide domiciliary facilities for them. This could be accomplished by setting aside 300 beds for tuberculosis cases in the 1,000-bed hospital proposed for Baltimore, and converting Fort Howard to a domiciliary facility. Approval of the project suggested would give Maryland a 1,000-bed hospital in Baltimore.

To further point out the justification for such a hospital in Baltimore, I cite the following from a letter of Paul B. Magnuson, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, to the Honorable MILLARD E. TYDINGS, United States Senator from Maryland, dated November 19, 1948:

"We do, however, realize the need for additional general medical and surgical beds in this area, and we are prepared to recommend the construction of a new general medical and surgical hospital in Baltimore in the event of a future hospital-construction program."

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for this Veterans' Administration hospital and earnestly request that you do everything within your power to secure construction of such a hospital in Baltimore.

Former DP Repays Loan With Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and article:

UNITED SERVICE FOR
NEW AMERICANS, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 8, 1949.

Congressman JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: From time to time a story comes across my desk that for sheer drama and warmth is unsurpassed. I had such an experience the other day and it's the type of story I think you will be interested in. You may already have heard about it since it appeared on the front page of the New York Herald Tribune last Friday, a clipping of which I am enclosing.

This story, more than anything else I've seen in recent years, helps to keep alive the spark of personal initiative and ambition which made our country as great as it is today. It is essentially a story of a man who came to this country 2 years ago, homeless, frightened, destitute, and who, today, is a successful businessman, giving employment to American citizens where no employment in this line existed before. This story could have happened only in America, and I think we need all take pride in that fact.

It occurred to me that in these days of crises and stress, that this story would effectively illustrate the fact that America is still the land of golden opportunities. Your colleagues in Congress may want to know about it. In my opinion, it is good enough to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I sincerely hope that you will share my opinion.

Cordially yours,

REUBEN B. RESNIK,
Director, Community Relations Department, a constituent agency of the United Jewish Appeal.

DP, JOBLESS HERE 2 YEARS AGO, PAYS $2,000 LOAN, ADDS $1,000

Leon Jolson, 36, who arrived in New York 2 years ago from a displaced persons camp in Germany, made a gift of $1,000 yesterday to the United Jewish Appeals through the United Service for New Americans, Inc., Jewish relief agency that lent him $2,000 to start a sewing-machine business here.

Mr. Jolson, now president of the Necchi Sewing Machine Sales Co., 1151 Broadway, which he said has done a $1,000,000 business since his arrival, also paid off the last installment of the $2,000 loan. After presenting the $1,000 check to Edwin Rosenberg, president of the relief agency, in the latter's office, 417 Fifth Avenue, Mr. Jolson told the story of his 2-year rise from relief to riches.

Though well established in the sewing-machine busines in Warsaw before the war, Mr. Jolson was unable at first to find employment here. He and his wife subsisted on $90 a month from the agency, until he borrowed a small sum of money to export 10,000 American sewing-machine needles to Italy. The success of that venture, plus the results of a careful survey of his career and personality, led the agency to advance him $2,000 to import to this country a number of Necchi sewing machines, made in Pavia, Italy. These machines, he said yesterday, were equipped to do zig-zag stitching, embroidery and buttonholing and to sew on buttons without the addition of special attachments. Since then, he said, he has imported 15,000 machines, costing more than $1,000,000. He estimated his personal profit last year at $25,000.

He still lives in a four-room walk-up apartment at 980 Fox Street, the Bronx, but hopes to find something better soon because his wife is about to have her first baby.

His gift of $1,000 to the agency was to enable some other displaced person to come to this country in appreciation of the opportunity he had found here, he said. He has taken out first papers for American citizenship.

The sewing machine not only enabled Mr. Jolson to start his own business here but had a part in his wartime experience. Because of his sewing-machine skill he was placed in charge of a uniform-making plant in a Nazi concentration camp, where eventually two guards revealed that they had been employed before the war by Mr. Jolson's father, a Warsaw sewing-machine merchant. Because of this earlier friendship the guards helped Mr. Jolson with forged papers.

Later he and his wife lived for 26 months in a secret room of a friend's house in Warsaw. He never ventured out, but listened all day to a foreign-news radio and his wife distributed bulletins to the Warsaw underground.

Statement of Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., mayor of Baltimore City, and chairman, standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, on S. 138, before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, February 17, 1949:

My name is Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. I am mayor of Baltimore and chairman of the standing committee on legislation of the United States Conference of Mayors, the membership of which comprises practically all of the larger cities of the Nation. Approximately 60,000,000 American people live in the cities represented in our organization.

I am appearing before this committee to record the support of the United States Conference of Mayors for S. 138. This is not the first time that the conference has actively supported a broad slum-clearance and public-housing program. As early as 1935 the conference of mayors took affirmative action in support of a national public-housing program. Each of our annual conferences, since 1937, has gone on record in favor of an expanded public-housing program. We vigorously supported S. 866 in the Eightieth Congress.

There is probably no single group which is more aware of all of the ramifications of the housing and slum clearance problem than the Nation's mayors. In the last few years our offices have been besieged by distressed citizens pleading for assistance in finding homes for their families. We know of the disrupting effect of the housing shortage upon normal family life, of the families which have broken up, of the children who have had no proper homes during their growing years, and of the marriages which have had to be postponed.

The postwar housing shortage has made the headlines, but it is only one aspect of the problem. The evil effects of our slums and blighted areas are more basic than a temporary shortage, and have long been a major concern to the Nation's mayors. We are familiar with the toll that these areas have taken as breeders of crime and disease, and the price paid in warped and twisted lives. Through studies made by various city agencies we have learned of the excessive municipal costs in these areas for public health, fire protection, police protection, and similar services. You have undoubtedly heard the figures which have been collected to prove these points and I will not take your time to cite them again.

The Nation's mayors have been the closest observers of past efforts to remedy these conditions. We know that private enterprise is unable to touch the housing needs of our low-income families despite the notoriously inaccurate claims of certain selfish interests. Private enterprise has not been able to handle this problem in the past and there is no evidence that it would be more successful in the future. If private enterprise could do what has been claimed for it by some who indicate that they are representing the building interests, we would not now have any slums. I do not blame private enterprise for this, but I do blame the exaggerated claims made by the real-estate lobby.

The mayors of this country are completely convinced that public low-rent housing is the only means of providing decent housing for our low-income families. Let me quote you some very impressive figures on this point. Last year a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Housing under Senator WAGNER sent questionnaires to all governors, all mayors of cities over 50,000, and to a number of prominent citizens. Here are some of the results:

1. Practically all of the mayors replying reported that their cities contained a substantial number of low-income families living in slums or other substandard housing conditions.

2. Nine out of ten mayors agreed that within the foreseeable future private enterprise could not provide decent housing, new or old, for these low-income families at rents or costs they could afford.

3. On the other hand, 93 percent of the mayors of cities with existing low-rent public housing reported that these projects, to the extent that they had been provided, were adequately serving low-income families. All said that they had been built and operated efficiently, and that conditions of health, delinquency, and crime had been improved. More than five-sixths of them thought that the cost of city services in the neighborhoods had been reduced and real-estate values increased. All agreed that the projects are not presently competitive with private housing of acceptable standards, and only one mayor indicated that the projects had ever presented any such competition.

4. Sixty-seven out of seventy mayors favored continuation of Federal assistance to local communities in providing public low-rent housing.

This last figure is, I think, really amazing. If any of the charges which have been made against public housing were at all true, certainly the mayors would know, since they have seen public housing operate at close range. If these charges were true there would have been many more mayors opposed to a continuation of the program than a mere 8 out of 70. I can think of no other public issue which could command such complete agreement among mayors.

I have mentioned the charges which have been made against public housing. Let me dispose of a few of them briefly.

It has been alleged that public housing is not serving low-income families and that many upper-income families are residing in public low-rent housing projects. It is true that in the period after the war there were a number of families whose incomes exceeded the limits for continued occupancy. This was primarily due to the fact that during the war a number of projects were diverted from their original purpose and were used to house war workers regardless of income. This diversion was, of course, authorized by Congress. When the war was over these projects reverted to their low-rent status, but it was impossible immediately to remove the over-income families due to the housing shortage. These families have, however, been removed as fast as local circumstances permitted.

In Baltimore, for example, the program for removing over-income families started in May 1947. We have about 5,000 low-rent dwellings in Baltimore, and at that time about 1,000 families were over the limits for continued occupancy. A certain proportion moved out each month, but, even so, the number continued to rise to a peak of 1,200 in February 1948, since this was a period of rising incomes and additional families became ineligible. Now, however, I am informed by the Housing Authority of Baltimore that, as of the end of 1948, there were only 430 ineligible families in our low-rent projects and that even these could hardly be regarded as upper income. The average income of these 430 over-income families was only $2,943 per year. The average income of all 5,000 families in our low-rent projects (including the ineligible families) was only $1,742 per year. Furthermore, the average income of all the new families who moved into our low-rent public housing during the year 1948 was only $1,410 per year. I'll leave it to your imaginations to figure out how a family can be raised on such incomes at today's prices.

It has also been claimed that public housing is not needed in order to get rid of our slums. Slum conditions, it is said, could be eliminated if each city were to adopt an adequate set of housing standards and then see that these standards were enforced. These claims seem to have been based, to a great extent, upon our experience in Baltimore with a housing-law-enforcement program. This program has attracted national attention as the Baltimore plan. As mayor of Baltimore and as the responsible head of the city government which is carrying out this law-enforcement program, I want to clear up once and for all the confusion and exaggerated claims which are being made in various parts of the country about the Baltimore plan.

We in Baltimore are justifiably proud of our law-enforcement program. It is chiefly a health and sanitation measure. It is based upon a housing code, which sets certain minimum health and sanitation standards, and upon a vigorous program of enforcement of this code. Our enforcement revolves around a specially created housing court, which I believe is the only one of its kind in the country.

The program is designed to relieve somewhat the worst slum conditions until such time as the slums can be torn down and satisfactory housing supplied. It does not do more, simply because to do more would be completely impractical in view of the delapidated character of the present buildings. The standards set up in the housing code are as high as are feasible, but even so are well below those of decent and adequate housing. For example, the code requires the installation of an inside toilet fixture, but it does not require the provision of a bath because there is no space for a bath in most of our slum dwellings. Even the small amount of space needed for a toilet must come from some other room, already too small and crowded.

The Baltimore plan might be compared to first aid administered in the temporary absence of a doctor, which would not be necessary if the doctor were present to begin with, and which in no way eliminates the eventual need for the doctor's services.

Our law-enforcement program does not add one dwelling to our supply of low-rent houses and at the moment our crying need is for more low-rent dwellings. In fact, a strict law-enforcement program reduces the total supply of dwellings, since some buildings must be completely demolished. Furthermore such a program must rely upon the availability of an additional supply of low-rent dwellings if it is to be effective in curing one of the principal causes of slums—that is, the crowding of more than one family into a single dwelling unit. I strongly believe that other cities should consider adoption of the Baltimore plan as an interim method of relieving slum conditions to some extent, but don't let anybody kid you into thinking that it is, in any sense, a substitute for an adequate slum clearance, redevelopment, and public low-rent housing program.

It has been said that housing and slum clearance are local problems and should be handled directly by the cities and States without Federal assistance. I am not going to debate the theoretical merits of this question, but I will say that without Federal assistance nothing effective will be done, except in a few of the wealthier States. The areas which have the worst housing needs are those which are least able to help themselves. The problem is one of the most urgent domestic issues confronting the country. For the Federal Government to turn the whole matter back to the States and cities would represent an indefensible neglect of its proper responsibility for the national welfare.

I have so far spoken mainly about public housing because it has caused more controversy than any other aspect of the proposed legislation being considered by this committee. I do not, however, want to overlook two other items covered in legislation before this committee—redevelopment and middle-income housing.

My support for public housing is not inconsistent with my belief that private enterprise should be encouraged and assisted to handle as much of the housing and slum-clearance problem as it can. Private enterprise has not heretofore been able to operate in slum areas because of the high cost of existing properties and the difficulties involved in assembling an area sufficiently large to be usable. Redevelopment, as proposed in title I of S. 138, provides a formula to overcome these difficulties. Use of this formula should enable private enterprise to assume a portion of the job of slum clearance.

The necessity for Federal assistance to redevelopment is illustrated by our experience in Baltimore. The Baltimore Redevelopment Commission was one of the first to be created in the country. Eight official redevelopment areas have been established covering a total of about 400 acres. These areas represent only a portion of our total slum areas. Last November the city overwhelmingly approved a $500,000,000-bond issue for redevelopment purposes. This is the most that the city can afford and yet it will serve to treat only one, or at most two, of the eight areas. Senate bill 138, if adopted, will, in effect, triple our resources and enable us to use private enterprise in tackling a real job of slum clearance.

Senate bill 138 is primarily designed to assist low-income families. These are, of course, the families most urgently in need of assistance, but in centering our attention on this group we should not overlook the fact that there is a middle income group above the public housing level, but below the point at which private enterprise is currently providing decent housing. Certain additional legislation is before your committee designed to deal with this problem through either a liberalization of FHA mortgage insurance or a system of direct loans to cooperatives and nonprofit corporations. I do not wish to

comment in detail on this legislation other than to state that the United States Conference of Mayors heartily endorses its purpose.

In conclusion I would like to make a few specific recommendations with respect to S. 138.

With respect to redevelopment, the requirements set forth in section 105 (c), pertaining to the handling of families who must be relocated, are so rigid as to seriously hamper the program. It has been suggested that a good lawyer might block the program indefinitely by proving that a dwelling provided for a family to be relocated was a block further from the neighborhood grocery store, even though the dwelling was fully adequate in every respect. It does not appear important to detail the handling of displaced families in the Federal statute as this matter is covered in most local redevelopment legislation, and as a practical matter local city councils are not going to give the necessary approvals and pass the required ordinances for redevelopment projects unless they are reasonably satisfied with the handling of constituents who are to be displaced from redevelopment sites. It is recommended that this section be changed so as to give the Administrator broad discretion in determining whether local plans for the handling of this problem are adequate. The proviso at the end of this section which places special restrictions upon demolition prior to July 1, 1951, is undesirable and should be removed from the bill. There is urgent need for starting the program promptly and, as pointed out above, local political considerations will guard against unsympathetic handling of displaced families.

Section 202 establishes an absolute veterans' preference for public housing. I am thoroughly in accord with the purpose of this section. Low-income veterans have undoubtedly suffered more acutely than any other group as a result of the housing shortage and should be given every possible break. In Baltimore, veterans are given preference in our present public-housing projects and, I believe, they are given a similar preference in most other communities. Nevertheless, the bill as now written may result in more housing but no slum clearance.

It must be frankly recognized that in most cities, the initial public housing projects must be constructed on vacant sites because of the present impossibility of clearing slum sites. These first projects can, however, be used as the means for relocating families in specific slum areas, thus enabling those areas to be cleared and rebuilt. Such a procedure might be nullified by the type of veterans' preference in the bill as it is now written. In view of the considerable pressure for slum clearance and the public's expectation that slum clearance will be accomplished under the redevelopment and public-housing programs it may be well to modify this absolute veterans' priority in some manner to provide for persons to be displaced by slum clearance operations.

The United States Housing Act of 1937 requires local annual contributions equal to 20 percent of the Federal annual contributions. In all cases this requirement has been met through local-tax exemption. In many localities, but not all, housing authorities have made payments in lieu of taxes which originally ranged up to 5 percent of shelter rent. Even with these payments the value of tax exemptions have far exceeded the 20 percent legal requirement, and have often been greater than the Federal contributions. The cost to the localities of serving the projects and their occupants has been much greater than the payments in lieu of taxes. Several years ago the Federal Public Housing Authority (now the Public Housing Administration) decided that the then existing arrangements were unfair to the municipalities and it authorized an increase in payments in lieu of taxes to 10 percent of shelter rents. The Eightieth Congress, however, canceled this authorization and insisted upon a return to the original practice, which in some cases meant no payments at all.

The present bill authorizes payments in lieu of taxes at a flat rate of 5 percent of shelter rents. This provision at least has the virtue of uniformity, but we feel that it imposes a share of the burden upon local governments far larger than was contemplated by the original act. It may well cause some communities to call a halt to their public-housing programs long before the need for low-rent housing has been met. We strongly urge this committee to change the payment-in-lieu-of-taxes provision from 5 percent of shelter rent to 10 percent.

Section 505 calls for the elimination of tax exemption for local housing authority bonds. We are completely opposed to this section for reasons which, I believe, are well known to this committee. I understand that it has been generally agreed that this section will be stricken from the bill.

I also understand that the Administration has submitted an amendment deleting the equivalent elimination requirements from the United States Housing Act. We are completely in favor of this amendment. The bill treats slum clearance as a separate, though related, problem from the provision of low-rent housing. Also, circumstances have changed enormously since 1937, when the United States Housing Act was approved. The equivalent elimination requirement, in effect, means that the quality of dwellings available to low-income families can be improved, but that the number cannot be increased. This was all right before the war when many slum dwellings were vacant. Now our need is for both an improvement in quality and an increase in number.

That concludes my comments on specific points in the bill. The actual execution of this legislation would be largely in the hands of local housing and redevelopment officials who have gone over its various provisions with the greatest care. They have suggested several changes of a more detailed and technical nature than those which I have discussed, and these changes have been presented to this committee by Mr. Lawrence M. Cox, president of the National Association of Housing Officials. We know that this committee will give full consideration to these recommendations.

We have worked long and hard for adequate housing and slum-clearance legislation. Last year the prospects appeared uncertain, but I for one have never lost hope. In Baltimore we have been so confident that the urgency of the problem would eventually be recognized that exactly a year ago the city made a special allocation of funds to our Housing Authority to undertake a program of advance planning. Now that it appears certain that we will get some action it is gratifying to know that we will be in a position to start work quickly.

Allow me to thank the committee for the privilege of appearing here for the United States Conference of Mayors in support of S. 138.

Thirty-first Anniversary of the Signing of Lithuanian Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement which I have made on the thirty-first anniversary of the signing of the Lithuanian Declaration of Independence:

Today, February 16, 1949, marks the thirty-first anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Lithuanian Independence in the city of Vilnius. It is with a deep sense of pleasure that I join with many of my colleagues in the House to extend my sincerest wishes for the future to the people of Lithuania and to the Americans of Lithuanian descent.

In the destruction of their independence the sympathy of our people goes to the people of Lithuania in their own homeland and to those living in the United States. I have no doubt in my own mind that this is only a temporary set-back and that in the years to come when communism throughout the world is stopped and rolled back, the real independence of Lithuania will once again be restored and her people will be free to enjoy freedom and free to worship their God.

Although Lithuania has a population of less than 3,000,000 people, the spirit of independence is in the very soil of the country. Liberty-loving Americans sympathize with them and pray for their successful and permanent liberation. It is going to be a long and hard road toward the ultimate goal. With determination and self-sacrifice, this goal will be attained.

As I have said on many previous occasions, Lithuania will once again take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Expansion and Improvement of Steel-Making Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, lately there has been some furore over the ability of American steel companies to make enough steel to meet the requirements of our national economy and our foreign-aid program. The steel industry has been receiving a continuous, and in some cases a vituperative, harassing. A hue and cry has been raised over rates of expansion of steel-making capacity. The rate of steel production has been called inadequate. Governmental pressure is being exerted in connection with the distribution of steel.

Let me say that all of this sound and fury is misdirected. The steel industry should be receiving credit and recognition for great production achievements.

Simultaneously, the steel industry is rehabilitating steel-making facilities worn out during World War II and adding new facilities at a rate unequaled during any other period in the history of our country.

An article in the January 6 edition of Iron Age says that postwar improvement programs of American steel companies add up to $2,000,000,000. Included in this sum is money to increase the capacity of the industry to produce raw steel—steel ingots—as well as to improve and expand steel-finishing facilities.

Iron Age says that between 2,500,000 and 3,000,000 tons of ingots were sold on

conversion arrangements during 1948. This means the ingots were made at plants that did not have enough equipment to roll them into sheet and strip and pipe and plate, the items now shortest in supply.

The major part of the money that steel companies are spending will go to improve this condition. New facilities will make it possible for them to make more finished steel in the types the customer demands. At the same time facilities are being added to make more raw or unfinished steel.

According to the Iron Age story, steel companies of this country will have increased their steel-making ability by more than 5,000,000 net tons in the 2-year period ending December 31, 1949. Half of that gain is already here. The rest will come during the remainder of this year. Five million net tons that will build 2,500,000 automobiles.

This increase in steel-making ability is important. Capacity is a theoretical figure, something that a steel company should be able to attain based on past experience. The 5,000,000-ton figure is made up about half and half of new melting furnaces and technological improvements to present equipment.

Technological improvements are more important to the country because: One, they take less steel than construction of new plants; and two, they mean better utilization of our valuable raw materials.

The magnitude of this effort can be even better told in production figures. During 1948 the steel industry shipped about 65,000,000 tons of finished steel to its customers—more than it has ever shipped in any single year, peacetime or wartime.

This year the industry will be able to ship, barring strikes and other work stoppages, almost 70,000,000 tons of finished steel—5,000,000 tons more than was shipped last year.

This is about 9,000,000 tons more than the average finished steel production during World War II, which we fought and won on an annual average output of or y 60,600,000 tons of finished steel.

The steel companies today are a vital driving force in our fast-developing postwar economy. They are the keystone in our entire industrial structure.

These facts are little known or seldom considered. A case in point is the recent discussion of freight-car building. All over the country we read that steel companies were going to be asked by the Office of Defense Transportation to increase the amount of steel they are allocating for the freight-car-building program. That program now has a goal of 10,000 cars a month. The ODT wants to boost this to 12,000 or 14,000 cars a month. The inference is that only one thing is preventing such an increase—insufficient steel.

If you will look at the record of the number of cars the railroads have been ordering and at the backlogs of the individual shops that build cars, you will find out why.

Orders have not been coming in at a rate to justify a 12,000-car program. The monthly average of orders placed by the railroads during August, September, October, and November last year was only 5,228 cars. The car-building shops cannot build 12,000 cars a month if they do not have orders. Giving them twice as much steel would do no good.

On the positive side of the ledger, let us consider the progress of the steel industry by citing one example: Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., of Pittsburgh, Pa.

The president of Jones & Laughlin is Admiral Ben Moreell, former commander of the Navy's Seabees during World War II. Recently he issued a statement which appeared in advertisements carried by a number of publications throughout the Nation. Because of its significance, I would like to read Admiral Moreell's entire message:

We're backing a sure thing with $210,000,000—the future of the United States of America.

Since January 1946 Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. has been engaged in the greatest improvement program in its 97-year history.

Jones & Laughlin is plowing current earnings back into the business, plus other cash borrowed on future earnings * * * to meet your demands for more steel * * * to guarantee new sources of vital raw materials * * * and to expand and improve steel-finishing mills to better our products.

From this program our 16,000 customers will get more and better steel at lower costs; our 43,000 employees will have greater security and higher earning possibilities, and 2,000 new jobs will be created; our 25,000 shareholders will have a safer and more profitable investment.

And 146,000,000 Americans will enjoy greater national security and better living. This program will succeed because Jones & Laughlin is a typical American industrial team. This team, to serve its customers and the national security, needs the savings of investors, the strength, skill, and cooperation of labor, the leadership and technical experience of management.

We are but one of the many teams that make up our American industry which is moving with increased momentum toward the goal of better living for all people everywhere.

BEN MOREELL,
President.

The major phases of Jones & Laughlin's program completed during the past year include installation of the fastest steel rolling mill in the world and construction of one of the world's largest coke ovens.

During 1949 J. & L. will start or complete construction of the following installations: The world's largest coal washer; consolidation of two mines into what reportedly will be the largest underground coal mine in the world; a new six-furnace open hearth shop with finishing facilities, in addition to the one new open hearth completed during the past year; modernization of a continuous hot strip-sheet mill; and increased blast furnace and cold-rolling capacity.

In view of the current discussion of productive capacity and improvement plans of the steel industry, I believe this information is significant. The program J. & L. is carrying out will increase steel-making capacity, lower costs, and improve the quality of steel products. It will directly benefit industrial users, J. & L. employees and shareholders, and our entire economy.

In relation to the size of this company, it is a very large program. In fact, the total estimated cost of the program is almost as large as the total shareholder investment in J. & L. at the time the program started 3 years ago.

I look upon this rehabilitation and improvement program as an example of what is necessary for the security of our Nation and its continuous prosperity. I feel it is an achievement worthy of recognition and commendation.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of December 28, 1948]

LICKING A STEEL SHORTAGE

The Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.'s $210,000,000 rehabilitation and improvement program in the Pittsburgh district and in Cleveland is further evidence that the steel shortage will be beaten by the industry itself, perhaps some time in 1949, if industry is given half a chance.

Because J. & L. believes in the future of the American free-enterprise system, it is willing to expand at a cost representing 90 percent of the company's total worth at the time the program started 3 years ago.

Capital for this expansion is coming from earnings and from borrowings against future earnings. It has meant sacrifice on the part of shareholders. But it will, in the long run, benefit all concerned. It will provide more and better steel at lower costs to the company's 16,000 customers, provide greater earnings and security for its 43,000 employees, create 2,000 new jobs, and provide a safer and more profitable investment for 25,000 shareholders.

Here is a splendid example of American enterprise under a free economy. It is being duplicated to varying extents by companies throughout the industry. Only last week officials of the United States Steel Corporation testified in Washington that the company plans to spend $250,000,000 in plant and equipment in 1949, providing an additional 600,000 tons of ingot capacity.

And why were these officials in Washington? They went there to try to convince certain Congressmen of the folly of putting the Government into the steel business and of reenacting an excess-profits tax.

If Congress does either or both of these things, it will deal the steel industry and our economy generally a serious blow. An excess-profits tax would prevent expansions of the sort undertaken by J. & L. and United States Steel. Earnings must be good if industry is to expand at today's swollen costs. The Wall Street Journal reported Monday that assuming facilities that cost $100,000 before the war are replaceable today for $200,000, a corporation must draw upon its earnings not for $200,000 but for $261,290. It must earn the original cost, the increased replacement expense, and the tax upon the increase.

For the Government to tax the steel industry to the point where private expansion is impossible, and then to put tax funds into Government steel mills because there is a shortage is to compound lunacy. If the Government will stay out of the steel business and follow a sane tax policy, the temporary steel shortage will soon be licked to everyone's advantage in the traditional American way.

[From the New York World-Telegram of December 29, 1948]

OUTPUT EXPANDED—AMERICAN INDUSTRIES SPEND VAST AMOUNTS ON NEW PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES

(By Ralph Hendershot)

The so-called man in the street is none too well acquainted with the expansion that has taken place in American industry since the end of World War II. During the last 2 years alone more than $30,000,000,000 have been spent to expand and improve this Nation's productive facilities. And that is a very large

sum of money, despite its depreciated purchasing power.

An advertisement being run currently in several publications by the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. tells what that company has accomplished with the expenditure of $210,000,000. Among other things, it installed the world's fastest steel rolling mills, one of the world's largest coke ovens, and a new open-hearth furnace.

The importance of this expenditure can be better appreciated when it is considered that it aggregates nearly as much as the total investment of the company's stockholders 3 years ago, when the program was started. It will mean, according to Ben Moreell, chairman of the board and president, better steel at lower costs. Customers, stockholders, and employees all will benefit.

BACKING A SURE THING

Why did the managements of Jones & Laughlin and all the other corporations, big and small, decide to spend so much money on improvements and betterments at this time? It is because they have confidence in the future of the United States and because they know that if they are to maintain their positions among producers in the years ahead they must be in a strong competitive position.

Mr. Moreell stated in his company's advertisement that "we're backing a sure thing with $210,000,000—the future of the United States of America."

Many people may wonder why some of this money was not spent during the depression of the 1930's, when prices were a great deal lower and when it would have done so much to pull the Nation out of the doldrums. One of the reasons is that the money was not available at that time. A large portion of the recent good earnings of corporations have been plowed back into this expansion program. And the balance was secured primarily from banks and insurance companies.

NEW DEALERS WERE WRONG

It will be recalled that in the early days of the New Deal our people were being told by top people in Government positions that the economy of this Nation had reached maturity. The suggestion was that we would do well to hold our own from a production standpoint and probably would even begin to grow old. These huge expenditures give the lie to that sort of reasoning. They prove that we are still a virile and growing Nation.

Had those who believed that profits were an unnecessary evil had their way, however, their theories might well have proven true. Had it not been for the excellent corporate profits of recent years, this expansion would not have been possible.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of December 30, 1948]

RESERVES MEAN JOBS

There is no great mystery about why union leaders attack corporation profits—even though many of them must know that some of the things they say are exaggerated and preposterous. It's part of the game of keeping the membership stirred up, and also of forcing the employer to make concessions.

But it is more difficult to understand why not only corporation profits, but also corporation reserve funds, have come to be regarded with hostility by union bosses.

If reserve funds are excessive, so that they represent a scheme to avoid taxes, that's a different matter. But this qualification is not made by union critics. They seem to be suspicious of and opposed to all reserve funds—even those which merely represent a safety margin against future hard times, and those which are used to provide expansion, new jobs, and greater security for old jobs.

During the recent congressional investigation of profits, Donald Montgomery, economist for the United Auto Workers, sharply criticized reserve funds. Consumers, he said, have become the main source of new capital for industrial expansion. He said they were unwillingly providing such capital by paying high prices for a company's product.

Various union spokesmen apparently are working on the theory that corporations should cut prices by the amount of these reserve funds, or pay them out as dividends. Then, as Mr. Montgomery proposed, capital for expansion should be obtained from investors.

The catch about this theory is that investors are refusing to put up money for industrial growth. Corporation securities are hard to sell. Investors have been scared by the hostile attitude of both union leaders and politicians. They fear controls and higher taxes will cut profits.

And they'll be all the more scared if corporations are not permitted to set up reserve funds. For this would mean that companies could not modernize or expand their facilities or make provision against times of slumping sales.

A company without reserves is like an individual without any savings. It gets into trouble the first time anything goes wrong. It cannot take advantage of opportunities when they arise.

Not only are investors in such a company very unsafe, and apt to lose their savings. The workers also are very insecure, and apt to lose their jobs.

A case in point is furnished here in Pittsburgh by the $210,000,000 rehabilitation and improvement program of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. and also by the program of U. S. Steel to spend two hundred and fifty millions for plant and equipment in 1949.

All the capital for the J. & L. program has been drawn from earnings and from borrowings against future earnings. As the company points out, its shareholders "have given up returns on their investment in order to make this program possible."

Both the J. & L. and U. S. Steel programs, and similar expansions recently announced by other companies, will do something for which steel union leaders have been clamoring—provide greater capacity, create new jobs, and provide greater security for old jobs.

Yet none of these programs could have been carried out had not the companies saved enough out of earnings to pay the cost. Had the money been paid out, either through slightly lower prices or higher dividends, it would be gone. None would be available to provide better equipment, increased production, new jobs, and security against business reverses.

Mr. Montgomery, the Auto Workers' economist, said companies could get money from investors if they would pay out more of their profits in dividends instead of keeping two-thirds of each dollar for reserves.

That sounds nice—but you can imagine just how the union economists would be screaming about extortionate dividends had that plan been followed.

From the labor standpoint, such a policy would leave workers completely at the mercy of every fluctuation in the demand for products.

Military Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Kendall K. Hoyt, editor of Letter to Airmen, of January 20, 1949:

MILITARY AIRCRAFT

The main issue in aviation this year is how much military aircraft output is needed to maintain adequate air forces and a healthy industry.

The 34,000,000 airframe pounds covered by the budget for next fiscal year will supply half to a third of actual needs.

Here are estimates from various sources as compiled by Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, California, vice chairman of last year's Aviation Policy Board, for minimum procurement. Figures are millions of pounds per year:

Air Coordinating Committee, 1945:	
Minimum after world peace is well assured	30
Minimum to cooperate in maintenance of world peace	60
President's Air Policy Commission, 1948:	
Recommended for 1948 calendar year	34
Recommended for 1949 calendar year	56
Congressional Aviation Policy Board, 1948:	
Initial strength to mount successful air offensive promptly	111
Strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war	63
Stanford University Survey: Minimum to provide base for expansion	80
Budget:	
Ordered in 1949 appropriations (spreading to later years)	45
Provided in 1950 budget	34

Among these figures, just which is the right one for fiscal 1950 is hard to state precisely, because officials who could supply the facts are gagged against support of any budget but the Truman one.

But it is evident that after years of production below the minimum, there is a deficiency which requires a substantial increase to offset.

Depletion of planes in reserve—war leftovers in storage—is at an alarming rate. In the 1948 fiscal year, Mr. HINSHAW says, the Air Force and Navy put into service planes weighing some 64,000,000 pounds.

Of this total 43,000,000 pounds were from reserve; only 21,000,000 new.

The surplus continues to dwindle rapidly, but the budget does not contemplate stepping up new output before fiscal 1951, 18 months hence.

What in the foreign situation, HINSHAW asks, justifies such a policy?

Cost of Hospital Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. JONES, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which was published in the Atlanta Journal of January 25, 1949:

THIS EVER-WIDENING GAP MUST SOMEHOW BE BRIDGED

We are impressed by an article written by Robert F. Whitaker, superintendent of Atlanta's Emory University Hospital, in a recent issue of the Journal magazine. To a

large extent we find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Whitaker's contentions, but with this one we are in especial agreement:

"Somehow the gap between rising costs in the hospital field and the ability of the patient to pay must be closed."

What is more important, particularly in this trouble-torn world of today, than the general health of the people? Its importance is being recognized more acutely every day by private enterprise.

One significant result of that awareness has been the inauguration of a variety of health programs by business institutions—programs designed specifically to safeguard the health of their employees and, consequently, to salvage what otherwise might be a needless and costly loss of man-hours of production.

In our own community we find distinguished examples of this mounting concern of intelligent businessmen with the health of their workers. We find an outstanding example at Fulton Bag and Cotton Mills, which only recently received a national citation for its pioneering work in instituting a foot-health clinic for its employees.

And so it goes. The public health must be safeguarded. Good education and good health—these are two of the Nation's most precious assets. We must allow neither to deteriorate.

In his penetrating article, Mr. Whitaker discerns that the American people today are concerned chiefly, when it comes to the matter of health, with the quality of their hospital care and with its cost. He makes this pertinent observation, "Like good roads or good education, hospital care costs money. It is going to keep on costing money. As our knowledge increases and our tools become more highly developed, it may cost even more than it does now."

The gap between the rising costs and the ability of the patient to pay grows even wider. How then, to bridge it?

Who built our hospitals? Whence came the money to erect these institutions? Mr. Whitaker answers that question in these words, "The fact is that these hospitals are here to serve Atlanta and the South because, in past years, individuals or groups of people, seeing the need for such institutions, gave the money to build them. In not a single case does the patient pay anything toward the multiplied millions of dollars it cost to establish these hospitals and equip them originally. In most cases, he pays absolutely nothing for depreciation or for major repairs or replacements. The hospitals must simply hope that the people who gave the money to build them will again be generous when the time for more capital outlay arrives."

Thus, all of us, the rich and the mighty, the poor and the lowly alike, are and have been dependent upon charity, the generosity of the relative few.

The Detroit Free Press, taking inventory at the beginning of a new year, points to the crying need for public housing, slum eradication, improved transportation, education, and facilities for recreation in which all can participate. Says the Free Press: "Detroit, for example, talks grandly of multimillion-dollar projects which will center the eyes of the world upon the city. But little that is constructive is done to provide adequate parks and playgrounds for Detroit's underprivileged children; to replace firetrap, hopelessly overcrowded school buildings, or to relieve the disgraceful congestion in municipally operated Receiving Hospital."

Is this hospital congestion in Detroit more painful than that in Atlanta, or in numerous other cities of the Nation? It seems unlikely.

What is the answer, then?

The American Medical Association assesses its members to provide a fund to fight a proposed governmental program of prepaid medical care. Does it bite off its nose to spite its face?

The proposed plan is less radical in its intent than the system adopted by Great Britain. The patient would be able to go to the doctor of his choice; the doctor would be free to accept or reject a patient. Moreover, the doctor would be assured of payment (not now always the case).

Only the well-to-do can afford today prolonged hospital treatment or truly adequate medical care. Certainly doctors by the score do work for charity, give freely of their time, their great talent. Should they not be assured of recompense?

We revert to the fine article by Mr. Whitaker. The cost of hospital care, the cost of all medical care, arises. The gap between rising costs and the ability of the patient to pay ever widens. Somehow it must be closed.

We do not have the solution at hand. We do not know that the proposal which has been made for prepaid medical care will solve properly our ills and lacks.

But we do believe that we must assure our people—all of them—of the care of their health to which they are entitled, so that we may remain a nation of strong men and women. They are not now assured of it. The gap is too great for crossing. Somehow, it is imperative that it be bridged.

Infamous Mock Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES R. HOWELL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of this body went on record as vigorously opposing the false trial and outrageous treatment given His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. The people of my district in New Jersey and all of the people of my State are likewise outraged and shocked by this infamous mockery of justice and wish to make their feelings known to the world. To that end, the One Hundred and Seventy-third Legislature of the State of New Jersey on February 7, 1949, adopted a resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to exercise every force at their command to bring about the release of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordaff, who have been incarcerated by the Communist-controlled government of Hungary. That resolution is so important to the people of my district and of my State that it is my desire to have it set forth here and made a part of this RECORD so that all the Nation may know the feelings of our State government on this vital question.

It is as follows:

Resolution memorializing the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to exercise every force at their command to bring about the release of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordaff, who have been incarcerated by the Communist-controlled Government of Hungary

Whereas this house of general assembly has been sickened and shocked by the infamous mock trial which the Soviet Government of Hungary has forced Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, heroic Hungarian patriot, to undergo, as well as the wrongful imprisonment of Bishop Lajos Ordaff, of the Lutheran Church of Hungary; and

Whereas these actions of the Soviet Government stamp them as being criminals against humanity and the Divinity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States be, and hereby are, memorialized and urged to instruct the delegates of the United States in the United Nations to institute proceedings in the General Assembly of the United Nations to indict the Soviet Government of Hungary and to cause the United Nations and the United Nations General Assembly to brand them as world criminals; and

2. That the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States take such steps as will exclude the Government of Hungary from any financial or material supplies of whatever kind from the United States Government by whatever method while Hungary persists in persecuting religion; and

3. That the clerk of the house be, and hereby is, directed to send copies of this resolution to the within-named officials and to the United States Senators H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON for appropriate action by them.

Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Courier-Express of February 15, 1949:

THE POPE'S ADDRESS

The calm, majestic, and sorrowful dignity of Pope Pius XII's speech to the extraordinary consistory of the College of Cardinals yesterday added to the force and effectiveness of his condemnation of persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty by Communists in Hungary. In denouncing the unfairness of the Mindszenty trial and in pointing out that the cardinal's physical and mental condition indicated he had been subjected to secret influences of a sinister nature, the Pontiff concurred in the conclusions of most observers.

Spokesmen of all branches of the Christian church—and, indeed, all who believe in religion at all—must agree with the Pope's declaration: "Those who rashly trample upon the liberty of the church and the rights of human conscience may at length understand that no civil society can endure when religion has been suppressed and God, as it were, driven into exile."

The Pope's address to the cardinals made history; and of comparably historic importance is the report that, in the secret debate in which the cardinals engaged after his speech, plans were made for a united front of all Christians—not Catholics alone—to resist atheistic communism. It is only by presenting such a united front that Christianity can meet and beat back the enemies of religion at all points of attack.

Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the consideration of the Members the Senate Resolution No. 2 of the Senate of the State of Montana, expressing the views of that body on the subject of housing legislation:

Senate Resolution 2

Resolution to the Congress of the United States transmitted by the Senate of the State of Montana relative to housing legislation

Whereas there is certain proposed housing legislation presently before the National Congress known respectively as H. R. 933 in the House of Representatives, and S. 138 in the United States Senate, designed by its sponsors to relieve housing shortages and to improve housing standards in the United States; and

Whereas the above designated legislative matters incorporate therein—

First, a provision for the expenditure of $250,000,000 per year of Federal funds over the next 5 years, or a total of $1,250,000,000, to be matched by municipalities with a sum of $625,000,000, to a grand total of $1,881,000,000 for slum clearance; and

Second. A proposal for the erection of 1,000,000 public housing units over a 7-year period carrying a rental subsidy to occupants of $445,000,000 per year for the next 40 years of the existence of said housing, obligating the Federal Treasury to spend a total of $17,000,000,000; and

Third. A proposal for an initial appropriation of $250,000,000, for outright grants of $1,000 to $2,000 to individual farmers as a subsidy in the construction of farm homes, together with additional sums for architectural and engineering services; and

Fourth. That the approximate total of these nonliquidative expenditures probably will exceed $20,000,000,000; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Members of the Senate of the State of Montana that a more equitable and more economical method of spending these sums for housing assistance should be substituted for the aforesaid described proposals, more suitable to the people of Montana, and particularly to the veterans, many of whom are still in dire need of suitable housing accommodations: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, Thirty-first Legislative Assembly, That there be substituted legislative proposals in the Congress of the United States embodying—

A subsidy of $1,000 for the construction of any new home by any owner-occupant when matched by an equal amount in cash or other equivalent on any new home not exceeding $7,000 in cost, exclusive of land: *Provided,* That such home be constructed in accordance with the minimum construction requirements of the Federal Housing Administration in locations conforming to the administrative regulations of the said Federal Housing Administration, and providing that the borrower in the event that a commitment for an FHA-insured loan is required in the construction or purchase of such home, meet the accepted standards for such borrowers incorporated in the mortgage risk pattern procedure of the said Federal Housing Administration: *And provided further,* That the owner-occupants be prohibited from, by contract agreement or otherwise, reselling such homes at a higher price than the original cost less the $1,000 subsidy except as the same may be adjusted from time to time for actual replacement cost increases as determined through Federal Housing Administration appraisal procedures; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the opinion of the members of the Senate of the State of Montana in transmitting this recommendation that the cost of such a program would not exceed the cost of the proposals above referred to now before the Congress by virtue of the fact that the total yearly volume of units within this price range would not exceed $300,000, involving a total yearly expenditure of $300,000,000, and it is further the opinion of this body that this type of housing assistance is more in keeping with the American tradition of individual home ownership, and that the opportunity provided this large class of substantial citizens for moving into their own homes will release hundreds of thousands of existing older and still useful, satisfactory housing units for occupancy by those who require the low rentals that these properties afford.

Taxes on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following copy of a resolution adopted by the State board of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs on December 8, 1948, which was submitted to me by Julia Macpherson Webster, chairman of legislation of the federation:

Whereas the American Medical Association, the New York Academy of Medicine, the National Research Council, and other leading scientific organizations have now approved margarine as a wholesome food product; and

Whereas yellow is the accepted color for a bread spread, and American housewives spend needless hours mixing in the color at home; and

Whereas discrimination against wholesome and nutritious food products, such as yellow margarine, is wrong in principle and out of keeping with American traditions of free enterprise; and

Whereas the current high cost of living makes it more important than ever that margarine be made freely available to consumers in the yellow color in which they desire it: Therefore be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs assembled in Chicago, Ill., December 8, 1948, That it urge the immediate repeal of those provisions of the Illinois State margarine law which now prohibit the manufacture and/or sale of yellow margarine, and that it urge the immediate repeal of the Federal margarine law, which taxes yellow margarine 10 cents per pound and imposes burdensome levies on retail and wholesale dealers in the products; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the Illinois General Assembly, to the Governor of Illinois, and to the Illinois delegation to Congress.

Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following release from the Irish Legation, February 11, 1949:

WHY THE TORY PARTY WON THE SIX-COUNTY ELECTION

The results of the six-county election could not have been otherwise. The area in which they took place was specifically designed by the British Tory Cabinet of 1920 to produce a permanent majority for the Tory Party in Northern Ireland. It was for that purpose that Ireland was partitioned and that purpose has been fulfilled in this election and in every election for 28 years. No rivers, mountains, or lakes separate the six counties from the rest of Ireland, nor is there any racial, religious, or economic distinguishing marks between the two areas. One basis only existed for partition, and that was to take away from the rest of Ireland as large a territory as the concentration of Orangemen in Belfast, Down, and Antrim could outvote. Wholly Nationalist areas were included in the severed territory because, numerically, the block of Tory votes concentrated in two counties could overwhelm them. The result of the election is merely this process working itself out a generation later.

Because the triumph of the Tory Party is certain from the beginning, strange features show themselves in this election. On nomination day between one-half and one-third of the house was elected without a vote being cast; this is traditional. Indeed, the average number of candidates returned without contest in the last four general elections is 27, or more than one-half of the house. This would mean in America that something like 200 Congressmen would be returned without a fight. The absurdity of the idea illustrates the nature of democracy in the six counties. In the present election there was only one contest in the whole of Antrim, which contains one-sixth of the entire population of the area. The parallel is that in an area with a population of 23,000,000 Americans, every Representative but one got his seat without opposition. There were no contests in 6 of the 16 seats in Belfast. That too is traditional. There are nine electoral divisions in the six counties that have not seen a contested election for over 20 years; in six others there was only one contest in the same period. The explanation is that the elaborate precautions taken to ensure a Tory victory every time has led to a lack of any real vigor in the public life of the area.

To make assurance doubly sure, the Tory Party does not rely on its permanent majority to win. It has so altered the boundaries of constituencies as to confine the opposition and compel them to waste their votes in a few huge majorities. Fermanagh is an outstanding example of this, where Nationalists, the majority, got one seat in this election, and Tories, the minority, got two. This process of elaborate manipulation with constituency boundaries covers the whole area and makes a Tory vote much more effective than (in some cases twice as effective as) an opposition one.

On top of this gerrymandering there was in this election a second major trick played

on the electorate. An out-of-date register was deliberately used. "When Sir Basil Brooke," says the Manchester Guardian, "rushes a general election in Northern Ireland on the partition issue and prefers a stale register, 3 years old, to the new one that will be available on April 1 he is indulging in a pure party maneuver. There is no serious partition issue that calls for an election in February rather than in April." The use of this out-dated register had the effect of debarring everybody who came of age since January 31, 1946, thus disenfranchising mainly young and generously minded voters. The British Labor Party representative in the area, Mr. Arthur Johnson, said on January 21, "It is my considered opinion that the effective strength of this register will be 60 percent and no more." By arranging to keep 40 percent of voters from the polls the Tory Party planned to increase the relative strength of its own vote. It attempted this in another way also. It spread fear that the civic, religious, and economic liberties of its followers were in imminent danger from invaders and so inflamed their passions that many opposition meetings have had to be suspended and candidates were seriously injured by such missiles as oranges studded with razor blades.

As a result of gerrymandering, defective voting lists, and organized violence, general elections in the six counties have been made the opposite to democratic. The effect is that there has on this occasion, as on others, been no real consultation with the people. The average total poll in the last four general elections (1929, 1933, 1938, and 1945) has been 264,919. Of this the Government got 145,801, and opposition groups 139,118. Even if all official and unofficial Tory candidates be lumped together, Government, or pro-partitionist, poll is brought only to about 200,000, which is merely one-fourth of the registered voters of the six counties, one-twelfth of the registered voters of the whole of Ireland, and one-twentieth of the Irish population.

Thus the six-county elections are no democratic test in which a people can change its government. They are merely a machine for returning by a handful of votes the party that has been in office for 28 years, ruling the area created by a British Tory Cabinet to give them this permanent grip on government.

Move Over

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith an editorial from the Palm Beach Post, West Palm Beach, Fla., a newspaper published in my district, entitled "Move Over." The editorial is written by the editor, Hon. Charles Francis Coe. This editorial is constructive and very timely when the question of increasing taxes is under consideration by the Congress. I commend it to the reading of all Members of Congress to the end that we may be more thoughtful of our people when it comes to increasing the burden of taxation more and more and more.

The editorial follows:

MOVE OVER

In the accompanying cartoon, Mr. Enright portrays the humble figure of free enterprise, being pushed off the bench by the crowding figures of tax. The point is well stated.

Free enterprise is the American way. It is the way in which mass production came into being. It is the way in which the blessings of science have been practicalized for everyday use, by everyday people. It is the way in which living standards have been raised above those of any other people. It is the way wars have been won, schools built, churches maintained, roads strewn over the land, homes built.

To overtax free enterprise is to destroy it. That means turning to some new device to keep an ordered society and defend against collapse. No such new device now appears. Free enterprise is, and of right should be, the greatest of our taxpayers. By producing wealth through free enterprise, and allotting that wealth in equitable measure to the common weal, which is Government; and the worker and investor, which is the American home; we maintain order.

Let Government demand a disproportionate share of the wealth produced, and free enterprise encounters strangulation. That means the American home faces strangulation. The incredible number of taxes now levied upon production strikes at the heart of the land. It has long been recognized that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Placing that power in the hands of political organizations, less devoted to country than to political dominion, is playing with fire.

That is what happened in Germany, Italy, and Russia. It is what happens every time the rights of a people are absorbed in the maw of professional politics. The human is so constituted that, wherever he undertakes his work, he will strive for growth. That is just as true in Government bureaus as it is in candy stores, bakeries, steel mills, or farms.

The growth in Government, though, need be controlled only by the political power to appropriate money. Government need produce and earn nothing. That is not true anywhere else. Thus we see an array of Government bureaus which staggers the imagination and withers the purse. The greatest single support of these is free enterprise. When employment falls off, the Government suffers in collections just like everyone else. To erect a steeple of bureaus is to burden the people. It is to take from production and nourish unproduction.

No Government bureau produces anything. Their sole metier is service. And too much service can be worse than none. It can also run costs into fabulous dimensions. It has. If the essential elements of our way of life are to abide with us, there must be room on the bench for all. Every mentally energized bureaucrat must not be permitted the expansion of his dreams, for these will sooner or later yank us summarily back to the vital over-all production from which every dollar must come through free enterprise. And one day we will discover our enterprise no longer free, but under foreclosure of mortgage.

Once we push free enterprise off the bench, we face one of two alternatives. The first is chaos. The second is a new way to assemble and dynamize the essential elements. No new way is even conjecturally on the horizon. Tax. Tax. Tax. City tax. County tax. State tax. Federal tax. Profits tax. Income tax. Undivided-profits tax. Capital-gains tax. Excise tax. In the latter, literally thousands of separate and distinct taxes lie hidden from view.

Recent publications showed more than 500 taxes paid on a single pair of shoes by the time those shoes crossed the retail counter. Old-age tax. Security tax. Transaction tax. Luxury tax. Amusement tax. Utilities tax. Estate tax. Inheritance tax. Stamp tax. Intangible tax. Tangible tax. School tax. Gasoline tax.

We could go on for pages, enumerating the taxes which big Government gobbles from little purses, as well as from big purses.

The backbone of freedom is free enterprise. The challenge to man's dignity and ingenuity is free enterprise. It is a spurious and specious array of ghosts who crowd that free enterprise from the bench. But they crowd.

Theirs is the grasping clutch about the throat of liberty. Theirs is the presence in which freedom cannot endure.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Flood Control in the Wabash River Watershed and Tributaries Thereto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following house concurrent resolution of the Indiana Legislature memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the Southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi River flow; and

Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: Silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; and increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

SEC. 2. The principal clerk of this house is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

AMA Versus the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an important editorial from the New York Post of February 15 which analyzes clearly and accurately the deficiencies of the tardy national health proposals of the American Medical Association.

This editorial, dealing as it does with the details of the AMA proposals, passes briefly over the issue of the necessity of a Federal Health Department with a Secretary of Cabinet rank; but this seems an opportune time to point out a danger in this proposal. Organized medicine asks that the Secretary be, by law, a doctor of medicine. This would introduce into government a very dangerous principle not greatly different from the corporative state of Mussolini. The political power of the AMA in Federal and State government now is too great for comfort or safety; with a doctor elevated to cabinet rank, his qualification as an active member of the American Medical Association virtually specified by law, this country could easily be faced with a situation in which any deviation from the AMA orthodoxy in medical philosophy could result in a new form of Un-American Activities Committee investigations.

THE HIGH COST OF HEALTH

The American Medical Association has offered a substitute for President Truman's compulsory health insurance plan.

It's gratifying that the AMA has shifted from a negative mislabeling of national health insurance as socialized medicine to offer positive suggestions of its own.

The health needs of the United States demand that reform, rather than rebuttal, be applied to the staggering fact that one-fourth of our families could not afford adequate medical treatment in 1946.

However welcome its recognition that 25 percent of our homes cannot be denied full medical care without the sickness of social neglect eventually infecting the entire community—the AMA program, taken by itself, is inadequate.

The proposals are candidly offered as an alternative to the Truman plan.

But the simple truth is that many of the AMA's suggestions must be considered as a necessary supplement to, rather than substitute for, any national health insurance program.

The AMA has called for a Federal department of health which would foster new medical and hospital facilities, particularly for the aged and chronically ill; increase training of doctors and nurses and step up research, public health education, and other programs.

One could argue whether a Federal health department, with a secretary of Cabinet rank, is necessary.

But one cannot argue with the AMA's insight that the United States will never begin to care for its medically underprivileged until we have provided adequate health facilities and educated more dentists, doctors, and nurses.

The United States Public Health Service flatly states that the $375,000,000 of Federal funds currently appropriated to meet one-third the cost for State construction of hospitals, health centers, etc., will produce only 20 percent of the medical facilities imperatively needed.

Further, a recent survey indicates that 40,000,000 Americans live in communities lacking even the basic protection of full-time health departments.

Finally, and perhaps most conclusively, in California 580 people share the services of 1 doctor, while in Mississippi over 1,000 citizens are dependent upon a single physician.

But once we have built the shining new hospitals and trained a sufficient number of doctors and nurses, what then? We still will not have answered the financial problem of families unable to afford decent medical care.

The AMA suggests that voluntary hospital and medical-care programs—such as, we presume, the Blue Cross plan—be extended to cover more families, including those in rural communities. It adds that the States should pay any indigent's way, with a medical-care authority established to receive and administer funds with proper representation of consumer and medical interests.

Yet the New York Blue Cross plan has just announced that rising costs have forced it to increase its subscription rates from 24 to 32 percent.

This suggests that private health-insurance plans—while highly beneficial to middle-income families—are subject to the fluctuations of our economy and could easily be pushed by inflationary pressures beyond the reach of many wage earners. The number of indigents compelled to accept State charity could swell alarmingly, with predictable detriment to their morale and to the solvency of State treasuries.

The administration's program, on the other hand, would be financed by a slight pay-roll tax (rising to 1½ percent of earnings up to $3,600) on both employer and employee, with Federal subsidies expected to make up any difference between current medical costs and the size of the national health-insurance fund.

Under the Truman plan a worker would not be faced with the problem of either paying beyond his means or going without medical care.

The AMA seems honestly willing to consider a realistic health program for the United States. But its realism suffers by ignoring the fact that compulsory health insurance could prevent thousands of American families from being priced out of good health—and productive democratic citizenship.

Ten Years of Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in Michigan where soil depletion and erosion have been a terrific problem, and hence where soil conservation becomes a real need. Furthermore, in view of this need, we want our soil conservation translated into real action.

Fortunately we have a number of excellent soil conservation districts which for the most part have turned out fine records of actual results. One of the best is the South Muskegon Soil Conservation District, which I believe is also one of the oldest in my part of the country. It has just concluded its tenth year as a district and in commemoration has published a fine summary of its work during that period.

I thought I was familiar with the program of that group, but, on reading the summary, even I am astonished at what 10 years of consistent work can accomplish.

When this group came into existence, in 1938, the soils of its area were visibly deteriorated. Sand blows were spreading and threatening thousands of acres of adjacent land. Wooded areas were neglected or being stripped for fuel wood and the general condition of the woodlands was very poor. The better soils of eastern townships were beginning to show the effects of erosion in bare knobs, gullies, and abandoned fields. Delinquent tax rolls were longer every year.

Here, taken from the district's printed report, is the down-to-earth citation of results during the subsequent 10 years:

SOME THINGS ACCOMPLISHED

Seven hundred and fifty acres sand blow stabilized.

Six million trees planted.

Eighty miles windbreak planted.

One hundred and fifty thousand lineal feet sod waterway established.

Two thousand five hundred acres wind strip cropping established.

Eight hundred acres contour strip cropping established.

Seven hundred and fifty farm conservation plans worked out.

TREE NURSERY

To provide a reliable source of tree-planting stock, a tree nursery was established on the Hosted farm, in Sullivan Township, in the spring of 1939. Olaf Hosted, chairman of the district board, was named superintendent of the project and has succeeded in building what is generally considered to be the outstanding district nursery of the country. Visiting students and technicians, some from as far away as Mexico, Chile, and Iceland, say that some of the successful methods used are original and are being copied by other nurseries. Among these are the protection of germinating seedlings from bird damage and from damping off, and growing of seedlings without shading. The first self-propelled seeding transplanter was made for this nursery, and is still in use, though with many changes and modifications. Altogether about 8,000,000 trees have been distributed from this nursery. Cooperators appreciate the fact that they can come here almost any time during the planting season and secure fresh stock not damaged by packing or shipping.

SOIL LOSS DEMONSTRATION PLOTS

A demonstration of soil loss from different methods of cropping was set up in 1944 by the district.

They consist of six plots, each one 6 feet by 72 feet, measuring one one-hundredth of an acre, on a 6 percent slope. The soil is Isabella clay loam. Catch basins are provided so that the loss of soil and water from each separate plot can be measured. Each plot is cropped and cultivated according to a predetermined method of rotation.

The United States Weather Bureau has furnished a rain gauge so that rainfall can be measured and correlated with soil and water losses.

This is one of the two soil-loss demonstrations operated by soil districts in Michigan. It has been visited by many groups of farmers, students, and conservationists from all over the State. It has proved invaluable in showing the results of controlled and uncontrolled water run-offs.

PUBLIC LANDS

During the scavenger tax sales of 1940–41 approximately 6,000 acres of the poorest lands in the district were acquired by the county, townships, and schools, for forest and recreational purposes.

Practically all these tracts are under agreements with the district and in most cases the plans have been carried out. Most of the open areas have been reforested, and many of the units have already received revenue through oil leases, sale of pulpwood, Christmas trees, etc.

Thirty-five schools in this district now have school forests ranging in size from 10 acres to 240 acres. All have held one or more planting bees, in each of which from 10 to 50 students have participated. Many schools use their land for other conservation activities and recreation.

LAND-UTILIZATION PROJECT

During the year 1942 the Soil Conservation Service purchased 600 acres of land consisting mostly of tracts on which were open sand blows, generally in absent ownership, and whose owners could not or would not do the necessary stabilization and reforestation. This work has since been done by the Service with hired labor and is virtually completed. The project has been turned over to the district for management.

REFORESTATION

Since establishment of the district some 5,000 acres of idle land have been planted to trees. About half of this is on public land and half on private land. As most of the public land is now reforested, future plantings will have to be done by private owners unless additional land should be acquired by public units.

A great deal of natural restocking has occurred where land has been protected from fire and grazing. The area so restocked probably exceeds that which has been artificially reforested.

At least 40 percent of the plantings have been made on areas formerly classed as blows and which at that time were an eyesore and a menace to surrounding fields but have now become beauty spots, in many instances producing revenue. Sandstorms which at one time were a regular accompaniment of spring winds are now virtually a thing of the past.

Though not to be measured in dollars and cents, the esthetic value of forest plantings is very large. It is without doubt the most noticeable of the soil-conservation practices used in this district.

Probably nowhere else in the world does such a striking pattern of evergreen plantations exist as in the tree-planting districts of western Michigan.

FOREST-FIRE CONTROL

The district has consistently worked with other agencies for the control and prevention of forest fires. In general it can be said to have been successful. Only one really extensive fire has occurred during the life of the district. However, fire is always a dangerous enemy, and efforts are regularly being made to improve the control organization.

The State conservation department station located on the causeway is the official fire-fighting organization, but the district maintains a supplementary organization of its own, with key men and equipment located at danger spots. Through this set-up several fires have been suppressed before they could make headway.

Seventy-five Indian fire pumps have been purchased by the district, some of which have been resold to other units.

At the tree nursery a trailer loaded with fire-fighting equipment is kept ready for instant use during the fire-danger season.

MARL

For 2 years the district board operated a marl distribution project, and upward of 10,000 yards of marl were delivered to cooperators. When the ACA adopted this program, the project was turned over to them.

TVA FERTILIZERS

For several years the district assisted the Tennessee Valley Authority in its superphosphate experiments. Shortage of help forced the relinquishment of this project, but not before sufficient data for the experiment had been accumulated.

WOODS COOPERATIVE

The district assisted a number of woodlot owners in forming a cooperative for the selective harvesting and marketing of their wood products. Several hundred thousand board feet of lumber were marketed in this way at considerably higher prices than would ordinarily have been received.

TREE-PLANTING MACHINE

The district assisted two cooperators, Howard Hunt and John Kass, in developing a tree-planting machine. This machine combines the best features of other tree planters, with the addition of a planting wheel which spaces the trees uniformly without special effort on the part of the operator. As it is much faster than hand planting, it should help to speed up the process of reforestation.

WILDLIFE

The district has recently assisted the State conservation department in the location of sites and the planting of wildlife food and shelter patches. We believe that the establishment of the regular soil-conservation practices is the best assistance that can be given to wildlife.

PULPWOOD

Through the efforts of district directors and technicians, about 300 standard cords of pulpwood, crate bolts, and fuel wood have been marketed from school and township lands.

Mr. Speaker, those are a few of the specific highlights from the South Muskegon District's 10-year report. Even so the group is not content to rest on its laurels, worthy as they may be. It knows that much good work remains ahead. Here is what it has outlined for itself: Stabilize 300 acres sand blow; plant 34,000,000 trees; plant 910 miles windbreaks; establish 700,000 lineal feet sod waterway; establish 12,200 acres of wind-strip cropping, and establish 8,700 acres of contour strip cropping.

If the past is any criterion, and of course it is, this new record will be accomplished. It is a tribute to the present board of directors, presently made up of Chairman Olaf Hostad, Alwin Woodard, Kenneth Bull, Edward Bossett, and Victor Anderson.

What this program means in terms of actual soil improvement in an area which so badly needs such improvement is of course incalculable. We still have a long way to go but the important thing is that we have made the big decision to stand and fight, rather than to retreat annually in the face of growing soil depletion. I am tremendously proud of the South Muskegon District, and all others like it. It is a real milestone that we can now have reports covering a 10-year period of planned-soil progress. I pledge my continued assistance in that program in every reasonable way.

Address of Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following address by United States Senator IRVING M. IVES upon occasion of commencement ceremony at Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., January 30, 1949:

The other day I received an invitation to make an address on the role of the liberal in modern politics. Because of a very heavy schedule, I was obliged to decline the invitation. But if I had accepted it, I should have been hard pressed in preparing the speech. I am not at all sure that I know the meaning of the word "liberal" as it is commonly employed nowadays; it seems to mean all things to all people and to be a convenient term to apply to political proposals in order to make them attractive in an intangible sort of way. It rather casts an aura of glamour about them, which tends to deceive the unwary and sometimes to annoy the forthright.

But from the title of my suggested address, I got an idea for my remarks today. I shall speak to you on "the role of the citizen in modern politics." Perhaps a better title would be "the role of youth in modern politics."

I suspect that, as has been true in the case of most college graduating classes since 1945, a sizable percentage of you who are receiving degrees today are veterans of the last war, with deep convictions and strong ideas regarding the great issues and problems which confront our Nation and the world. I am sure that all of you have more than a casual interest in these matters. The recent impact of war and the present turmoil of its aftermath, which have brought dislocations affecting all of us, have made us deeply conscious of the world in which we live.

I suspect that some of you—I hope many of you—are intensely interested in our Government and in the political parties which make its operation possible. Some of you may be Democrats; others of your number may be Republicans; still others Socialists perchance. I hope that not one of you is a Communist. I would hazard a guess that many of you are not affiliated with any political party and are groping to find what the parties stand for in order that you may determine whether to join one of them or to remain aloof as independents. I assume that most of you are at least slightly confused by this whole situation, and I should be surprised if you are not confused by it. It seems to be causing some confusion within each of the major political parties at the present time, although because of it the Republicans appear to be the greater sufferers.

Add to this condition the fact that most of you can't remember a Republican national administration during your lifetime and that your only taste of Republican control at the national level was the Eightieth Congress, and it becomes still less surprising if some of you may wonder at the function of or need for an opposition party in our National Government. And yet, when any of you think twice, you quickly realize that a one-party government over a protracted period of time would destroy freedom in Amer-

ica. The day is long past when the people of any country with only one political party can remain free.

This is the fateful record of history in this twentieth century. It is one of the consequences of the social and economic revolution which has been gripping the world since late in the last century.

Some say that this revolution is a continuation of the industrial revolution. Some call it an aftermath of or sequel to the industrial revolution. Whatever its origin, its form is unmistakable. It is the upsurge of the ordinary man to seize his place in the sun. It is a part of or has followed his struggle to be free.

Now, this ordinary man is generally a mighty fine fellow. He is any one of us. For the most part, he demands personal freedom, equality of opportunity, a decent standard of living for himself and his family, an adequate education for his children, and protection against economic insecurity because of sickness and disability and old age.

In his upsurge the ordinary man has pressed along different paths in different countries and in different parts of the world. He hasn't always been prudent in his decisions; sometimes he has followed false gods and sold his birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage; too often until too late, he has traded his freedom for security, failing to realize that security without freedom is worse than insecurity.

Evidences of the present revolution are everywhere. In fact, all human life today is affected directly or indirectly by it.

Communism in Russia, nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy—these phenomena have been part of the revolution. World War I and World War II were violent explosions which it produced. It has assumed a more recent form in the Socialist Government of Great Britain. Analysis will show that it is basic in today's crisis in China. Ominous rumblings are already heard in India. Even in South America there appears to be a seething undercurrent which threatens the peace and stability of all Latin America.

Here in the United States we are experiencing the same revolution. When it began with us is uncertain, but our economic collapse at the end of the 1920's and the resultant depression in the 1930's quickened its pace. It is now primarily responsible for five successive Democratic administrations in Washington, although the present Republican predicament is due in part to Republican blindness and ineptness. As a result of prolonged and continuous one-party control in this country, the opposition is now threatened with extinction, and the American people are threatened with the unhappy fate which has overtaken other free peoples of the world.

I make this statement in no narrow partisan sense. I do not make it as a Republican trying to defend a party record which in some ways does not deserve defense. Neither do I make it in criticism of the ordinary man. I am in full sympathy with the ordinary man in his desires and hopes and demands. Rather do I speak as one who, realizing the justice in the ordinary man's demands, recognizes also the Republican Party's responsibility for his welfare.

If the present revolution has shown one thing above all else, it has revealed that the ordinary man has not yet demonstrated an ability so to govern himself that he can obtain security and freedom at the same time. Not comprehending that collectively, while free, he is the government, he has saddled upon it burdens which have been more than he or it could bear. The consequence has been collapse, disaster, and slavery for himself when, in desperation, he has succumbed finally to the wiles of some demagogue and tyrant.

So today in the United States this same kind of danger confronts us. Here, too, there has been and is a tendency to place an ever greater burden on government and an ever greater responsibility in government. Here, also, the ordinary man in seeking legitimate objectives may overload his government through thoughtlessness and selfishness to the point of catastrophe. And it is right here that he is in greatest need of an alternative medium for self-expression and action through an alternative major political party.

This is the challenge which faces the Republican Party. It is not a question of "outdealing the New Deal" or of "me too, only I can do it better." Nor is it a matter of denying to the ordinary man his right to achieve the objectives he is seeking. Assuming he cherishes his freedom and wants to preserve it—and I am sure this is still a basic desire among most Americans—the problem is how to obtain for him the greatest possible economic security without jeopardizing his freedom.

How great a load can a free government carry without breaking down? Where is the point in government control beyond which our free economy ceases to be free? At what point in his demand on government will the ordinary man lose his personal freedom? And with respect to any of these questions, have we yet reached or passed the danger point? To these and other vital questions affecting our national welfare answers as nearly accurate as possible must be found.

The situation is made far more difficult because of Soviet Russia's apparent intent to conquer the world. Capitalizing on the revolution of the ordinary man, the Communist leaders of Russia have tricked and bludgeoned him into slavery to serve their own diabolical ends.

To meet the Communist menace, to find the answers to the questions I have posed—these are obligations of both major political parties, and they are of particular concern to the Republican Party if that party is to function effectively and constructively as the opposition—an opposition not solely to oppose, but mainly to propose. Only by recognizing and accepting the preponderant mandate of the people themselves can the opposition provide the creative approach to the solution to grave problems which is essential to achievement. Moreover, only by showing that its chief interest is in the welfare of the ordinary man can the opposition win the support of the ordinary man.

I suppose that some of you are now thinking: "Uh-huh, just another Republican speech by another Republican." Well, if you have been following me, you will have noted that I have not criticized the Democratic Party; you will have noted, moreover, that whatever criticism I may have made has been directed toward the Republican Party. Naturally I am interested in the Republican Party, and naturally I should be delighted if all of you were in it. But my primary concern is that there shall be in our Nation an effective party of opposition, and I hope, indeed, that the Republican Party will be able adequately to fill the role of opposition.

"Well," someone will say, "if the situation is as you describe, why bother with the Republican Party? Why not a new party?" My reply to these perfectly appropriate questions is that, regardless of any merit in such a proposal, there isn't time. At the earliest, from 4 to 6 years would be required for the establishment of a new major party, and we need desperately a strong, competent opposition now; 4 or 6 years hence would be too late. Furthermore, the same lines of cleavage and disagreement which trouble Republicans would appear immediately in any substitute party of opposition.

"Well then," someone else will say, "Why not two new parties and a truly realistic party alinement?" Replying to this suggestion, I submit a very practical observation—the supporters of the present Democratic Party would seem in no mood at this time to abandon their party and to turn to something else whose future would be most uncertain and unpredictable.

I know that for some years there has been growing agitation in favor of a new alinement in our two-party system—with two new major parties to reflect more accurately the social and economic conflicts within our American society. I am well aware also that nowadays there exist greater differences of opinion within each of the major parties than are such differences between them; the substance of the party platforms, in contrast to voting records in the Congress, reveals this striking anomaly. I accept the charge as true that present party alinements are artificial and not genuine. I insist, however, that even though it might be possible to realine the two parties on a more realistic ideological basis, such rearrangement, at best, would be certain to stir up class consciousness and class conflict and easily might cause more harm than benefit.

Today the natural variations in American social and economic thought and political philosophy largely follow geographical lines and areas. Two political parties based on these demarcations would tend to be fundamentally sectional and might soon be splintered by differences arising within the several areas and sections. Bloc government, irresponsible government, would be the consequence of these multiplying differences and divisions. The end result of this process might be political chaos followed by political dictatorship.

For the time being and for the foreseeable future, we should probably be better off to retain our present political establishment and to try to make it work successfully. I have stated that this course furnishes a mighty challenge to the Republican Party. But it contains almost as great a challenge to the Democratic Party, and it definitely holds a most fateful challenge to every American citizen.

Much is written and spoken of the grass roots, of grass-roots sentiment, and of the influence of the grass roots on the outcome of elections. Beyond question grass-roots sentiment in the aggregate forms public opinion, and public opinion ultimately determines American policy. But grass-roots sentiment is created by the force and expression of leadership in thousands of American communities, and its nature reflects the accuracy or quality of the information which may be available to the people. It has been said, you will recall, that when the American people know all the facts about an issue they never make a mistake in deciding it. So it is that news commentators and columnists and those occupying positions of responsibility in public life should exercise the utmost scrupulousness in broadcasting or proclaiming personal opinion and ideas. And so it is that those whom circumstance has most favored by educational advantage or cultural attainment have an especial obligation in the shaping of community opinion. Of such is national character formed and national destiny determined.

Therefore, today I call upon you, members of this class of 1949, to recognize civic obligation and to accept civic responsibility as you may enter upon the calling or profession, for which the degree you receive denotes your qualification.

I congratulate you most sincerely upon the mark of accomplishment and distinction which this occasion holds for you. I extend to each one of you best wishes for good health and happiness and continuing success. But I urge upon you an awareness of your duty to your community, your State, your Nation and the world.

In the perhaps too-gloomy picture I have painted of our country and the world as I view them today, I have endeavored, nevertheless to be objective and unprejudiced. The outlook, I confess, is not a happy one. But only the weak and faint-hearted will regard it as hopeless. For the strong and

courageous it offers the most challenging opportunity of all the ages.

So I say to you, my young friends—go forth, confident in the knowledge you have attained and in the preparation which is behind you. Enter upon the new life that lies ahead of you, conscious of your duty to your community and your fellow men. Whenever and wherever your work and chance permit, go into the field of politics and help to make of politics the highly honorable profession it must be if we are to have the America we want. Go forth, believing in the dignity of man and in the brotherhood of man. And, as you go forth, may you be ever mindful of your responsibility for the welfare of the ordinary man, always remembering that his welfare is the welfare of America; for in America every man is the ordinary man.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., urging repeal of the Federal excise taxes on luxuries:

Resolution 2

Resolution of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., urging repeal of the Federal excise tax on luxuries

Whereas the 20-percent Federal excise tax on so-called luxury commodities was enacted during the war emergency for the purposes of raising revenue and discouraging the manufacture of nonessential items in favor of the manufacture of necessary war goods; and

Whereas the conditions that brought about the imposition of this form of taxation have changed; and

Whereas many of the taxable luxury items, such as pocketbooks and other leather goods, drugs, cosmetics, toilet articles, furs, jewelry, and similar items are regarded as actual necessities rather than luxuries by both producer and consumer; and

Whereas business leaders have protested that the existing luxury taxes have created a dangerous buyer resistance, placing several large industries in jeopardy; and

Whereas manufacturer, retailer, labor, and consumer groups are in agreement that the repeal of this form of nuisance tax would be in the best interests of labor, capital, and the consumer; and

Whereas according to figures published in the press, this form of tax, in 1948, brought only slightly more than 1 percent of the total revenue collected by the Federal Government in taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 4th day of February 1949, does hereby call upon the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on luxuries; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs urges the Members of Congress from the city of New York to work for the repeal of the excise tax on so-called luxuries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Speakers of both Houses, the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees, the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and any other appropriate officials.

Decentralization of Death Cases, Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, a great citizen and unselfish patriot of Alabama, Mr. George W. Cameron, director of claims service for the State department of veterans' affairs, has just called to my attention, by letter, a matter that I think will be of interest to the Members of this House. It pertains to the method in which Veterans' Administration handles its files in death cases, and to my mind presents a strong case for the change advocated by Mr. Cameron.

Mr. Cameron has devoted his life to solving the problems of veterans, their widows and orphans. In 1941 he served as chairman of the national convention rehabilitation committee of the American Legion and he has for many years served as department rehabilitation chairman of the American Legion of Alabama. He is an outstanding expert on veterans' problems. I am including Mr. Cameron's letter as a part of my remarks:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Montgomery, Ala., February 11, 1949.

Hon. CARL ELLIOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: For more than 2 years, service officers of veterans' organizations throughout the country have been urging the Veterans' Administration to decentralize death cases. This has been deemed necessary in order that the claims of widows and dependents might be rated in regional offices of the Veterans' Administration rather than in district offices where they are presently being adjudicated.

At its national conventions for the past 2 years, the American Legion has unanimously passed resolutions urging that these cases be decentralized to the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration. In December of last year, at the work clinic held in Atlanta, Ga., the service officers recommended to the Veterans' Administration that they change existing regulations so as to permit the temporary transfer of these XC files to the regional offices for review and development when requested by the claimant or the accredited representative of the claimant. In making this recommendation or request, we realized that the Veterans' Administration was reluctant to decentralize death cases permanently to regional offices, but we did feel that they should be willing at least to permit us to make a review of the records in each case in order that we might determine whether or not it was possible to secure new evidence and develop the case further, or to determine whether or not the claim had been correctly rated in the district office. Our recommendation has been disapproved.

Learning of this, I immediately addressed a letter to the Members of Congress from Alabama, urging that they lend their assistance toward helping us to have these files at least temporarily decentralized to regional offices for review and development. Every Member of the Congressional Delegation from Alabama immediately called this situation to the attention of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

In a letter dated January 17, 1949, addressed to Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator, and signed by Maj. O. W. Clark, Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., the position of the Veterans' Administration in this matter is defended, and I am afraid there is much misinformation in the letter to Senator HILL from Major Clark.

In the second paragraph of his letter to Senator HILL, Major Clark states that the decentralization of death cases to branch office level was in furtherance of the major objective of rendering the maximum service to dependents of deceased veterans, and that by establishing permanent jurisdiction in the branch office, it was considered that more expeditious service would be available.

I am sure that Major Clark knows that these cases were not decentralized to the branch offices, but that they were actually recentralized. I believe that the records will show that from May 1, 1939, to July 1946, a period of more than 7 years, these cases were rated in the regional offices, and during that entire period they were handled most satisfactorily. There has been no decentralization of these cases, but, as a matter of fact, they have been recentralized.

With reference to the cost of handling XC files in the regional offices, I am informed by an official of the Veterans' Administration who certainly knows what he is talking about, that with a maximum addition of 10 employees at this regional office at Montgomery, Ala., all death claims could be expeditiously handled. I am sure that the same situation exists in other regional offices and that the decentralization of these cases to the regional offices would actually result in a saving of money to the taxpayers.

In his letter to Senator HILL, Major Clark further points out that in order to expeditiously adjudicate claims there should be a minimum movement of XC folders after jurisdiction has once been established. I am sure that Major Clark knows that no accredited service officer would want to delay the adjudication of a claim by requesting the temporary transfer of the folder from the district office to a regional office for review and development. It is only in those cases where the claim has already been adjudicated by the district office and benefits denied that we would want to make a review of the records in the XC folder to determine whether or not it would be possible to secure any evidence to further develop the claim or whether or not we believe the decision of the dependents pension board in district office to be correct and in line with the facts in the case.

With reference to the temporary transfer of files to regional offices for development and review, it is a well established and recognized fact that much more accurate information can be secured by the service officer by a review of the actual records than could be furnished him through correspondence. In most instances, letters written to claimants of deceased veterans by the district office are form letters and give little or no information which would be helpful in any further development of the claim.

There are also cases in which we believe the Dependents Pension Board has been wrong in their decisions. To illustrate this point, I recently handled the case of a deceased World War I veteran (XC–1,129,544) in which it was shown from the records that the veteran had service connection on a lung condition diagnosed as bronchiectasis. He was hospitalized in the veterans' hospital, Montgomery, Ala., and was reported to have died with lobar pneumonia, right

upper and middle lobes. A claim was filed by the widow for death compensation, it being her contention that the service-connected disability of bronchiectasis materially contributed to the cause of death. The claim was denied in the district office of the Veterans' Administration in Atlanta, Ga. We were not able to have the file temporarily transferred to the Montgomery regional office for our review, but we were confident that if we could see the file we could find enough evidence of record to justify our taking issue with the decision. We were successful, however, in having the file forwarded to central office of the Veterans' Administration in Washington, and Dr. H. D. Shapiro, senior medical consultant, national rehabilitation commission, the American Legion, had an opportunity to review the file. The first thing that Dr. Shapiro discovered was that an autopsy was performed after death in the case, but that the dependents pension board in district office in Atlanta had not taken the trouble to secure a report of autopsy. At Dr. Shapiro's request, that report of autopsy was secured, and it was found from reading the autopsy report that the veteran did not die of lobar pneumonia but that he actually died from his service-connected bronchiectasis. I quote herewith from the autopsy report: "The most remarkable finding in this case is the presence of a localized bronchiectasis involving the right upper lobe." The pathologist further stated: "The course of the disease in the right upper lobe indicates the presence of a long-standing chronic inflammatory process, which in the later stages of the patient's illness led to the formulation of an abscess with surrounding complete consolidation of the lung parenchyma. Evidently this caused the patient's death."

I feel that we have been very patient with the Veterans' Administration in our request that they give consideration to decentralizing these cases back to the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration where they belong. I am afraid that there is within the Veterans' Administration a group of men who are in key positions and who are of the opinion that nothing can be done right unless it is done in Washington. I do know that for many years the American Legion fought consistently for decentralization of death cases to regional offices, and when this was finally accomplished on May 1, 1939, there were many officials of the Veterans' Administration who predicted that the decentralization of these cases to the regional offices would end in confusion and that they would be centralized back in Washington within 6 months. In spite of these predictions, however, it is shown from the records that the regional offices did adjudicate these cases just as expeditiously and just as correctly as could be done in central office, and I believe the records will show that in most instances the adjudication was accomplished much sooner in the regional offices than had been accomplished in the central office in Washington.

I believe that the widows, orphans, and dependent parents of deceased veterans have just as much right to appear before a rating board handling their claim as the veteran has while he is living. Unfortunately, most of these dependents of deceased veterans are without funds and they are not able to travel to a district office or to a branch office of the Veterans' Administration.

If the Veterans' Administration persists in its attitude of refusing to decentralize these cases to the regional offices, then I believe the only remedy we have left would be to ask that the Congress act and that a law be enacted which would make it mandatory that the original adjudication of these claims would have to be in regional offices of the Veterans' Administration.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. CAMERON,
Chief, Claims Service.

Resistance to Unjust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., of February 15, 1949:

PONTIFF MAPS UNITED FRONT AGAINST REDS—BISHOPS ARE BOUND TO RESIST UNJUST LAWS, HE TELLS CONSISTORY IN COMMENTING ON CASE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

(By Frank O'Brien)

VATICAN CITY, February 14.—His Holiness Pope Pius XII declared today that when a civil government contradicts divine and human rights, "bishops and the faithful themselves are bound by their conscience to resist unjust laws."

Addressing a secret and extraordinary Consistory of the College of Cardinals on the case of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, the Pontiff asked prayers to the end that:

"Those who rashly trample upon the liberty of the church and the rights of human conscience may at length understand that no civil society can endure when religion has been suppressed and God, as it were, driven into exile."

High Vatican circles said that in the secret debate which followed the papal address, plans were mapped for a "united front" of all Christians, not Catholics alone, to resist the tide of "atheistic communism."

TRIAL NOT FAIRLY REPORTED

The Pope said "our soul is crushed with most bitter grief" by the trial and condemnation of the Hungarian primate.

In a brief speech to 16 cardinals closeted with him in the consistorial hall of the Apostolic Palace, the Pointiff declared the Hungarian primate's trial had not been fairly reported.

"The principal object of the trial," the Pope said, "was to disrupt the Catholic Church in Hungary and precisely for the purpose set forth in the sacred Scripture: " 'I shall strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be dispersed.' " (Matthew xxvi: 31.)

The Pope declared Cardinal Mindszenty's physical condition during the trial was "inexplicable except as the result of secret influences which may not be publicly revealed; to prove this, there is the fact that a man endowed with the full vigor of a forceful nature suddenly appears weak and mentally unbalanced." (There have been reports that the cardinal was induced to sign a confession after being drugged.)

DOING WHAT RIGHTS DEMAND

The Pontiff branded "completely false" the Hungarian Government's assertion that "the whole question at issue was that this Apostolic See, in furtherance of plans for political domination of nations, gave instructions to oppose the Republic of Hungary and its rulers."

"We are doing," the Pontiff told the cardinals, "what the outraged rights of the church and the dignity of the human person clearly demand."

It was a speech phrased in sorrow rather than anger. The Holy Father called the imprisonment of the Hungarian cardinal "a most serious outrage which inflicts a deep wound not only on your distinguished college and on the church but also on every upholder of the dignity and liberty of man."

He declared "everybody knows the Catholic Church does not act through worldly motives, and she accepts any and every form of civil government, provided it be not inconsistent with divine and human rights."

Thirty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 16, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today marks the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania. The occasion is one commemorated not only by our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry but by all freedom-loving people. For, although Lithuania is again under the ruthless domination of the Russian bear, the United States still considers Lithuania an independent state.

On February 16, 1918, after approximately 160 years under the Russian Czarist rule, Lithuania declared itself free and independent and broke the terrible yoke. This free and independent status was formally recognized by Soviet Russia. However, this was not for long, for in June 1940 the Russian pattern of treachery again went to work. Russia in violation of its treaty of 1926, moved in its troops.

Today Lithuania lies prostrate under the oppressors' heels. Of her 3,000,000 people, 700,000 have been deported to Siberia and other frozen wastes of Russia in an attempt at mass liquidation. Religious persecution goes on with unabated force. Of 10 Lithuanian bishops, only 4 are known to be alive in the world. Of 1,600 priests, there are only 700 alive, the rest having been killed, tortured, and deported to Siberia. Over 80,000 of its people have fled from their homeland and from those they love in order to be alive and to continue their fight for the liberation of their homeland elsewhere.

Although today, on the anniversary of their independence, the Americans of Lithuanian origin are saddened of heart, as are the hearts of their racial brothers and sisters in Europe, their liberty-loving spirit still burns with a hopeful flame. They still carry on their fight for liberation. The secret Russian police cannot shackle the hopes and aspirations which glow in every Lithuanian heart and mind as they silently rededicate themselves on this day to the eventual liberation of their homeland.

The people of America, who respect the dignity of man, his right to independence, his right to freedom—are taking stock.

They know the story of other trampled countries; they know the tragic fate of Lithuania. They know and are shocked at the fate of Cardinal Mindszenty; at the arrest of the Protestant ministers in Bulgaria. They know that

the treacherous hand of communism is at work in all these cases. And they will not forget, for the finger of accusation points.

We all look forward to the day when the march of communistic rule is stopped, and on that day a new proclamation of liberty shall again bring joy to the heart of Lithuania and her freedom-loving people who, like us, believe in the principle that inalienable to everyone, everywhere, is the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Founder's Day Address at Temple University by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 12 my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] delivered the founder's day address at the founder's day ceremonies at Temple University in Philadelphia. I ask that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Alumni Association of Temple University, distinguished guests, fellow Americans, the moral and physical destruction wrought by the recent war has made itself felt today in every home the world over, even to the outposts of our civilization. Of course, it has been devastating. Despite its tragic effect, however, our own Nation has continued to enjoy precious liberties, freedom, justice, the relatively unmolested right of the pursuit of happiness and social equalities on a level which exists nowhere else in the world. Yet, we find here in this precious land of ours today threats of disloyalty and disunity, even of rebellion against our cherished way of life. To me this is beyond comprehension—it is unforgivable and must be dealt with under our system of justice promptly, firmly, and, wherever necessary, severely. We cannot continue to tolerate in this haven of freedom, men and women who would enjoy and exploit the blessings of this land on the one hand, and on the other "sell short" the basic principles which have enabled us all to enjoy God's blessings in such fullness. To those of us in America today who truly cherish the term "liberty and justice" there is an overwhelming challenge—it is to first answer with complete honesty, by positive action, these questions. Do we today, pay only lip service to those words or are we willing to make them once more a living dynamic force as they were in those days when the patriots here in America and over yonder in France were laying the foundations and establishing the patterns whereunder the term "liberty and justice" could become a reality under well-ordered law? Are we willing to sacrifice our all and die for these words, if necessary, or has the modern totalitarian influence in the world today so softened our regard and respect for them to the extent that we are about to concede that the individual is the servant rather than the master of the state—that the Government must plan, direct, and control the lives of all of us? To answer these questions best, we might draw some startling comparisons; for example, here in America today we see luxuries and comforts in all classes of our society which, in contrast to the poverty and distress of the rest of the world, is well-nigh inconceivable and this despite the burdens of two world wars which have taxed our resources beyond any parallel in history. There is no comparison; there is only a clear and bright beacon light to guide us.

"Liberty and justice," as we know the term, is responsible for our free enterprise system in America—one is responsible for the other and together they have given our people equal opportunities in all things, our critics from within and without to the contrary notwithstanding.

No one can honestly question this statement and support his contention with sound facts. Yet with our magnificent advances in all fields far beyond any comparative effort in the world's history, there are those who, for purely selfish advancement or for some other ulterior motive or purpose, would lead us to "new and uncertain ways of life." What, I ask, my fellow citizens, should be our answer to these people? May I summarize the answer with a few personal observations:

Several weeks ago, I received a handsomely bound book entitled, "The Medal of Honor," published by the Government under the direction of the President to describe those actions which earned a select company of men of our Nation the Congressional Medal of Honor. Because of the high esteem in which I have always held our Nation's heroes, I immediately explored its pages with care and, as I read of the exploits of each of those patriots who were awarded the Nation's highest honor for their deeds of "personal bravery above and beyond the call of duty in the face of the enemy," I thought of the many who have justly earned that award but never felt the exultation which comes from its attainment. Among them were men and women whose services were given in times of peace, but they, too, served with distinction. While I was pondering on the history of the Medal of Honor, I became convinced that, if our Nation is to survive with all of its rich heritages and blessings in this confused, frustrated, and war-weary world, it will need more and more men and women who have the courage and patriotism of those comparatively few who received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In the foreword to this volume, our President has written: "May the courage and heroism of which this medal is a symbol always remind us of our duty to these men, and clearly point to the personal responsibility which every American has today to share in the work of helping to build a healthy and peaceful world." I could not read these words without feeling a grave challenge—a challenge to join in a great crusade—a crusade to maintain the advances which have been won by such men.

Since I have been through the nightmare of war twice, I know the extent to which these men gave of themselves that their principles, their ideals, their love of home and family might survive. Without qualification or reservation, these heroes dedicated themselves "all out" to God and country—otherwise their almost impossible accomplishments would never have succeeded. Let us then remember that only by taking stock of our own weaknesses and our frailties in contrast to their strength and devotion can we secure for ourselves and our posterity, the precious heritages and institutions for which they fought and died.

There is no better time to do this than now. This gathering is one which can lead in a movement toward the reaffirmation of those principles which have motivated American heroes in peace and war throughout the Nation's history. We meet tonight on the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln—quite the most unselfish and, from my point of view, the greatest of all Americans. We meet not only to pay tribute to him, but also to honor one of his distinguished contemporaries, Russell H. Conwell, soldier, writer, preacher, and philosopher, and founder of this university. Can we, I ask, honor these great figures of a past era (an era which gave us national unity and prosperity beyond their fondest dreams) by mere words? No review of their accomplishments, however eloquent, would do either of them justice. But, if we do truly appreciate their inestimable contributions to our present-day comforts and happiness, we can pay them a lasting tribute which will honor their memories forever by rededicating our lives to their principles.

As we do this, however, it is fitting and proper that we should remind ourselves of the problems of the day—that we are living in a world divided—a world divided by two very different political ideologies. On the one hand we have those who believe in human liberty under free representative government; on the other, we have those who believe the state supreme to all things—even to the things of God.

Our own United States is the last strong bulwark—nearly the last citadel of human freedom—of free justice—of true liberty under law to which oppressed people everywhere can still look with some hope. As long as we justify those hopes by the maintenance of well-ordered freedom for the individual and by the continuance of our private enterprise system, our country will be free and wholesome—its independence assured and its economy sound.

In such condition, the United States will always inspire the peoples of the world who are not yet able to see the wisdom of following our example of federation to avoid war and to insure peace. That I will live to see the day when there is a real federation of world states is my fondest hope. In its present position of world leadership, the United States has a grave responsibility of guiding the rest of the world to a way of peace—not a mere armistice or a temporary cessation of armed hostility but a way of permanent peace. The United Nations is, of course, a forward step in that direction, but even on paper it fails to provide a sufficient formula to enable the great powers which were its sponsors to keep the peace. What pattern then must we establish to lead the people of the world in the ways of peace? The answer to this question is not difficult to find. It can only be done through a revised United Nations Charter which looks to a world federation of nations. Nothing short of a world government can adequately deal with the removal of the atomic threat or initiate a just and equitable program of world disarmament. By what name we call this system of international security is unimportant—what is important and indeed vital to the world is that we provide world law which will prevent man from destroying himself and all that he has labored to achieve down through the centuries of his existence. To continue with the present inept structure of the United Nations is only to repeat the errors which grew out of the League of Nations. We must revise the Charter promptly for, in this fast-moving world, time is of the essence.

This revision should look, first, to the elimination of unrestricted veto. It should provide an impartial World Court. It should

treat forcefully with prevention of armaments for aggressive warfare. It should treat squarely and courageously with the use of atomic weapons to remove the atomic threat and then it should provide for a strong internal contingent of military forces under proper direction and control to enforce its mandates. Without a strong international police force, a world government would be as weak and helpless as was our own Government under the Articles of Confederation, but should this federation of nations be given a charter, patterned somewhat in the fashion and spirit of our own—with power of enforcement—the hopes of countless millions can be realized and a sound and lasting peace will be well on its way. If we turn our backs on this opportunity—if we continue to muddle on as we have through the past 3 years of precious time, treating with war as something inevitable, then we must take the risk which goes with frustration, apathy, and despair.

There is no easy way to attain this objective, demanding as it does strength, courage, vision, and the highest degree of effort—but attained it must be. In fact, there are only two alternatives: first, the long and tortuous democratic path which is full of pitfalls and temporary set-backs; and second, world unity through might, conquest, and domination by the mailed fist. The latter is the more rapid and certain, but I feel sure that no nation would ever choose that way if the highroad of peace were presented to it in an intelligent manner.

In a recently published book, Gen. Claire L. Chennault, of Flying Tiger fame, makes the following statements based on his experiences:

"As a practicing warrior for many years, I am convinced of the complete futility of war. It settles only problems of the past and creates the new problems of the future. There is no place in the world today for the narrow, competitive nationalism that sparks the tinder of war. My long experience as an airman has taught me the folly of the artificial borders of political states. The ease with which the airman passes them by with his load of peaceful commerce or atomic destruction should have served notice long since that they are no longer necessary.

"I am convinced that the people of this planet must ultimately and inevitably move toward a single form of world government if civilization is to survive. But it is our immediate task to see that this world government comes as a mutual federation of free peoples rather than through the ruthless domination of a master state enslaving all the others. In this struggle there are still many battles that cannot be avoided." This is an amazing admission from a man of war, but its truth is beyond the shadow of a doubt.

We can, if we but have the will, if we believe sufficiently in our own capabilities under divine guidance, fully meet every burden that world leadership and our own pressing needs impose upon us. On the other hand, if we continue to yield to the demagogic influences at work in the world today and swerve from our charted course, away from those fundamentals of a constitutional republic, if we depart from the tried and tested ways of private initiative which have built our economy, I predict that within another quarter of a century we will be a broken and divided people, stripped of the capacity either to guide the world on the course of peace or to manage competently our own internal affairs. It is a horrible and shocking thought that a country which has been able to feed and supply a broken and crippled world for over 3 years while still maintaining within its borders the highest standards of living ever known to man might yield to forces which lead only to moral bankruptcy and to complete collapse. However, history should teach us that more nations have been destroyed from within than by enemies from without. The ancient world bears mute but eloquent testimony to this fact. Examples in the modern world should be so fresh in our memories that there is no need to mention names. Suffice it to say that, sapped and drained from within, nation after nation in Europe succumbed to the ideologies which recognized the citizen as a ward of the state to be administered to and dominated by the state whenever the state chose to exercise its might and power.

Lest you think from my latter remarks that I am pessimistic about this great land of ours, let me say, emphatically, I am not. Nor am I pessimistic about the future of the world, for I see in America the power, the ability, and the vision to lead the world to better things and to happier days—but there is a warning I would sound.

Let me say to you tonight—you men and women who have enjoyed the rich fruits which come from hard labor exerted under a system of personal initiative and free enterprise—that because of our great idealism, our readiness to lend a helping hand whereever there is a need, we must be doubly on guard, doubly alert to those things which even tend to be false or misleading. This idealism, which has been the real key to our success thus far, now threatens to become our undoing—our tendon of Achilles—for through and by it we can readily dissipate our resources.

Thus, I repeat, we must become circumspect and cautious and yet retain all of those high and noble impulses with which God endowed us. We must temper justice with sound common sense and a true evaluation of our own economy.

As we appraise our Nation's grave responsibilities both at home and abroad in this solemn hour of the world's history, let us by our voices and our votes say to our leaders that we approve the generous spirit which has advanced us so far ahead of other nations on the road to political freedom and social equality. We ask that within reason and within our purse strings these advances be continued, but we insist that the formulas under which they are to be attained shall be free from governmental controls which would limit or subdue fair and open competition.

Further, let us say, with all of the meaning and purpose we possess, that we insist upon the retention of that system of checks and balances which has been provided so carefully and skillfully in our Constitution.

During the last century and a half, and particularly during the past two decades, a vast network of relationships among the Federal and State Governments has developed, a network astounding in its complexities and seemingly infinite in its scope. Interwoven in this web of overlapping and duplication of services there has emerged a most confused competitive system of taxation which is sapping the very foundation of our fiscal structure. A more orderly and less cumbersome system of fiscal relationships between the Federal and State levels of government must be found if free enterprise is to survive and the initiative of the individual is to be encouraged. We must not penalize progress and tax the future for momentary political gain. The cherished tradition of the founding fathers called for frugality, initiative, and hard work. Modern technology has developed no other formula which would better serve us if we are to remain the inspiration for all the people of the world. It is within our power to chart the course we will pursue.

Let us then plead with our leaders to restore, wherever possible, the sovereignty and dignity of our several States, giving unto them those controls which are historically and inherently the rights of the State. All our progress has been attained within the framework of the Constitution, which was so ably defended by the men we honor tonight. It has not only been our guide but in a large measure it has been the inspiration of all our accomplishments. Thus, I say to you tonight that if we are truly in search of a just and lasting peace and security for all mankind (and I think we are) then all we need to do, mindful always of the will of God, is to make ourselves strong and competent under that Constitution. Let us be so strong, so powerful, and so right that no national leadership anywhere in the world will dare to oppose us and expect to survive.

Economic Facts in Relation to Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in regard to the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question of labor-management relations does not exist in a vacuum. To understand the bills we are discussing—the Taft-Hartley Act and the bill that will replace it, the Thomas Act—we must deal with it in relation to the whole economy and the entire community. To understand these laws we must keep in mind the whole history of American trade-unionism and the whole picture of American business.

Further, we must look deeply into the matter of community and social relationships, beyond the matters of dollars and cents. Nowhere, as I recall, has this committee or any of its witnesses brought to mind the important function that American trade-unionism has already achieved. Through their unions the workers of America have attained their rightful status in the community—they have become an equal part of the community—equal with management, equal with the farmer. They are, through their unions, represented on Government boards and commissions, on radio programs and religious and patriotic occasions, on local committees and community councils. They have achieved social equality—real democracy.

But it is with the economic aspect of the labor-relations picture that I want to deal right now, for I think we have lost sight of it here. Let us look back to that immediate postwar of labor friction and disputes and see what exactly the economy looked like at that time. Let me quote the Economic Report of the President transmitted to Congress in January 1949. Here is the record of corporate profits after taxes:

1940	$6,400,000,000
1941	9,400,000,000
1942	9,400,000,000
1943	10,000,000,000
1944	10,800,000,000
1945	8,700,000,000
1946	12,800,000,000
1947	18,100,000,000
1948	20,800,000,000

A total of $106,700,000,000 profits for corporations in 8 years. Corporation war profits totaled $48,000,000,000.

Now, we had a labor-management emergency in coal soon after the war. Let us investigate the industry as carefully as we have looked into the union.

In hard coal, an industry that had gone 8 years without profit, after-taxes profits leaped from $6,000,000 in 1940 to $16,000,000 in 1944, $9,000,000 in 1945, and $14,000,000 in 1946. The profits for each of the years from 1941 through 1947 far exceeded the profits in the boom year of 1929. In soft coal, the picture was even more spectacular. In an industry that earned $9,000,000 in 1929, profits averaged over $38,000,000 in each of the 7 years from 1941 to 1947. What were the mine owners getting out of those tremendous profits? In coal and petroleum industries corporations were earning the fantastic profits of 14 percent on investment in 1947, which leaped to 23.2 percent in the first quarter of 1948, 20 percent in the second quarter, and 18 percent in the third. That's the corporation earnings after taxes—15 to 20 cents a year for every dollar invested in these million-dollar industries.

Other industries were making similar profits. Lumber and wood products, which will have a witness here, earned 19.2 percent on investment the third quarter of 1948 and nearly 25 percent on investment in the first quarter of last year. Iron and steel neared 15 percent and automobiles earned over 21 percent.

What was happening to wages at this time? Well, during the time from 1945 to 1946, when profits shot up 47 percent, average weekly wages in manufacturing actually dropped more than 1 percent. The next year profits rose again, this time 41 percent, and weekly wages limped a sickly 12 percent. The next year profits rose 13 percent and wages increased only 10 percent. Weekly earnings in other industries than manufacturing rose at about the same rate.

Those are pretty prosperous surroundings for management, and probably reminded them of the open-shop days of the twenties, and it is my contention that they felt their oats and began the campaign against labor that resulted in the Taft-Hartley Act.

I would like to remind you of the lengthy strikes in the auto industries following the war—and remind you further that at that time profits in the auto industry broke all records in terms of percentage profit on investment. The same was true of steel.

In that period of labor disputes in 1945 and 1946—disputes the Taft-Hartley Act was supposed to remedy—we find a strange correlation. Just as you find between disease and slums, you will find the relationship between strikes and profits right down the line. And the Eightieth Congress that looked for a solution to labor-management troubles of 1945 and 1946 did nothing to get at the real causes.

While the incomes of our citizens began to spread apart more and more and wealth began to concentrate once more, while real profits rose and real wages dropped, the Republicans decided that the workers were getting too strong. This contrary analysis brought on Taft-Hartley, and brought on the Knutson tax-cut bill. Neither Mr. Hartley nor Mr. Knutson are with us today in Congress.

Thanks to Knutson, income in the higher brackets was increased from tax cuts, while the infinitesimal tax relief of the workers was immediately swallowed in another round of price rises.

And while Taft-Hartley made union organizing harder, the same Republicans were cracking down on the unorganized worker by refusing to raise minimum wages to anywhere near a sensible level. So, today, after only 2 years of a Republican view of proper labor relations, we have a drop in real wages, a rise in real corporate profits, a law making union organizing tougher, and a totally ineffective minimum wage law to help the unorganized. To top it off, the rich were given an extra cut of cake by a completely distorted tax-cut measure.

Is it any wonder, gentlemen, that labor strife has begun to increase since Taft-Hartley? Are you surprised that latest estimates show strikes increased 14 percent in the last half of 1948 over the last half of 1947? Can you blame the workers who lost 2 percent more man-days through strikes in the last 6 months of 1948 over the second half of 1947?

Let's go on to some other points. We have heard at these hearings many vague references to unions getting too big. Let's look at the facts again. Now, at the peak of our employment in this country, in August 1948, we had 63,186,000 in our civilian labor force, and, of that, 52,800,000 were in nonagricultural pursuits.

How many members do we have in organized labor? About 15,500,000 to a maximum of 16,000,000.

It seems to me that unions aren't so big. As a matter of fact, the labor movement has not been able to organize 50 percent of the gainfully employed workers in this country. Actually only 27.5 percent of our workers are organized into unions. Yet, as the distinguished Senator from Florida has pointed out, 2 percent of American corporations hire 60 percent of our industrial workers.

We have heard a great deal about labor's bargaining power growing too great. Let me refer to the facts again. Could workers have too much bargaining power when, in 1948, 31 percent of our families still have incomes under $2,000 a year? Let's get over this monkey-business of bludgeoning poor, innocent management, when average weekly income of all workers falls far short of the estimated budget of absolute minimum living standards for our families, and when 31 percent of our families earn under $2,000 a year. While, in the meantime, corporate profits hit an all-time high.

I think that if this committee looked more deeply into the economic reports and less time-consumingly at a handful of legalistic examples of minor infractions of court orders, we would discover the real causes of labor disputes. We would discover that the number one reason for postwar strikes has been the unusual rise in the cost of living plus the exorbitant profits of American industry. And those profits are going up yet, even as unemployment sets in, even as farm prices come down, even as our dairy farmers are being taken to the cleaners, and our cattle farmers find their market breaking. And what do we find in industry? We find profits going right up.

As a matter of fact, profits went up in the third quarter of 1948 at a 5 percent greater average than they had in any other quarter in the Nation's history.

Now, let me ask some questions of the gentleman now testifying before this committee (Prof. David A. McCabe, Princeton University, Department of Economics):

Mr. McCabe, would the history of American business indicate that the employers, without unions or with unions weakened or unions standing as they are, would openly give fair wages and good working conditions to the working people?

Mr. McCABE. I do not think they would give them any more than they were forced to give them by the unions.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think it is important for the high standards of American living that the individual incomes of our workers be elevated throughout the United States?

Mr. McCABE. Yes, I do.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would you say that the Taft-Hartley Act has hindered unionization in areas of this country where there is a great need for the elevation of the standard of living?

Mr. McCABE. I think that the net result of the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act was to make it more difficult to increase union membership.

Senator HUMPHREY. With 31 percent of our families trying to get along on less than $2,000 a year, do you think it ought to be made more difficult to raise their standards of living or ought it to be the policy of the Congress of the United States to make it easier for them to raise their standards of living?

Mr. McCABE. I think it ought to be made easier for them to raise their standards of living.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think unions serve a function in raising the wages of people?

Mr. McCABE. Of course.

Senator HUMPHREY. Is it better for this to be done in the free play of the free market and by collective bargaining or is it better to be done by what I call congressional action and then bureaucratic control?

Mr. McCABE. Well, If I understand you, I think it is far better that it should be done by free action, but where free action is inadequate, then I would supplement it by Government action.

Senator HUMPHREY. All I want to point out to you and to the committee—and I trust my assumptions about this meet with your approval—is that the labor movement has been one of the great mechanisms in this country for raising the entire standard of living of the United States, making possible our grand national income and such profits as I have recited above.

I can also point out that in the areas of America where there is a weak labor movement the people are impoverished and industry is still living back in the days of the robber barons. I have watched, as you have, great segments of industry leave the New England States, in search of cheaper labor. Now who does that help? Does that help me buy a cheaper shirt? Not at all. As a matter of fact, we pay as much for a shirt whether it comes out of Mississippi or from New Hampshire or Vermont, though wages are a good deal different. And the standard of living of the whole section is reflected in these low wages.

Well, this is the picture I wanted to present to the committee, because these are the basic facts we must constantly have in mind when we write a labor-relations law.

It is in the framework of the whole society and the whole economy that we must work.

Disagreements Among Supreme Court Justices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very challenging address on the subject of disagreements in opinions among Justices of the Supreme Court, delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas before the section of judicial administration of the American Bar Association, Seattle, Wash., on September 8, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All of us in recent years have heard and read many criticisms of the dissenting or concurring opinion. Separate opinions have often been deplored. Courts have been severely criticized for tolerating them. And that is why I rise to their defense.

About 10 years ago when I took my seat on the bench, Chief Justice Hughes said this to me: "I think you will find after you have been on the bench for awhile that in a great majority of the cases, perhaps in two-thirds of them, the judges will ultimately reach agreement and announce opinions that are unanimous. But in at least a third of the cases agreement will not be possible. In those cases there will be dissents—no matter how carefully the judges were chosen—whether one President or several Presidents selected them."

Chief Justice Hughes spoke from a long experience both at the bar and in the conference room. In these days of uneasiness and confusion what he said to me is important not only to judges and lawyers but to everyone. It is indeed only when the meaning of his words is clear that the true nature of the judicial process is brought home to the community.

Holmes, perhaps better than anyone either before or after him, pointed out how illusory was the lawyer's search for certainty. Law is not what has been or is—law in the lawyer's sense is the prediction of things to come, the prediction of what decree will be written by designated judges on specified facts. In laymen's language law is the prediction of what will happen to you if you do certain things. This was the lesson Holmes taught; and every lawyer on reflection knows that it is sound.

There are many reasons why this is so. No matter how clear and precise the code or other legal rule may be, the proof may be surrounded with doubt. And even though the proof is clear to the advocate, the credibility of the witnesses may raise serious questions for judge or jury. Uncertainty is increased when new and difficult problems under ambiguous statutes arise. And when constitutional questions emerge, the case is, as we lawyers say, "at large." For the Federal Constitution, like most State constitutions, is not a code but a rule of action—a statement of philosophy and point of view, a summation of general principles, a delineation of the broad outlines of a regime which the fathers designed for us.

These are the things that Holmes summed up when he described the lawyer's continuing and uncertain search for certainty. They indeed suggest why philosophers of the democratic faith will rejoice in the uncertainty of the law and find strength and glory in it.

Certainty and unanimity in the law are possible both under the Fascist and Communist systems. They are not only possible, they are indispensable. For complete subservience to the political regime is a sine qua non to judicial survival under either system. One cannot imagine the courts of Hitler engaged in a public debate over the principles of Der Fuehrer, with a minority of one or four deploring or denouncing the principles themselves. One cannot imagine a judge of a Communist court dissenting against the decrees of the Kremlin.

Disagreement among judges is as true to the character of democracy as freedom of speech itself. The dissenting opinion is as genuinely American as Otis' denunciation of the general warrants, as Thomas Paine's, Thomas Jefferson's, or James Madison's briefs for civil liberties.

Democracy, like religion, is full of sects and schisms. Every political campaign demonstrates it. Every session of a legislature proves it. No man or group of men has a monopoly on truth, wisdom, or virtue. An idea, once advanced for public acceptance, divides like an amoeba. The ifs and buts and howevers each claim a part; and what was once a whole is soon carved into many separate pieces, some of which are larger than the original itself.

Those who have followed the legislative process can produce examples on end. That process is one of compromise—of qualifying absolutes, of creating exceptions to general rules. At times the process of compromise or conciliation involves well-nigh impossible adjustments. The clash of ideas may be so violent that a meeting of the minds seems out of the question. Where such cleavage is great and involves major issues, it may even tear a society apart. By the same token it can stop the legislative process or render it impotent, and thus deprive society of lawful and nonviolent means and methods of solving its problems. When the breach between the pros and cons is not too great, the legislative process functions. Even then, the compromise between competing ideas that emerges in the final legislation may be more apparent than real. For the legislative solution is often to write two opposing ideas into a statute. Without that solution enactment of the measure might, indeed, be impossible.

And so the bill becomes the law and the law arrives before judges for interpretation. The battle that raged before the legislature is now transferred to the court. The passage of the legislation quieted the conflict only temporarily. It breaks out anew in the process of interpretation in the courts. A storm hits the courtroom, and the advocates take up the fight where the legislators left off. The same cleavage that appeared in legislative halls now shows up among the judges. Each side has eminent authority for its view since two conflicting ideas found their way into the legislation. It is therefore easy for judge or lawyer or editor to accuse the judge, who takes the opposing view, of usurping the role of the legislature. A more honest, a more objective view would concede that interpretation has legislative as well as judicial characteristics. It cannot be otherwise where the legislature has left the choice of competing theories or ideas to the judges.

The legislative process breeds dissension among judges in other ways. An hiatus may be left in a law. The crucial matter may have been too explosive for the legislators to handle. For that or for other reasons they passed it over entirely or left it vague and undefined. The necessity to fill in the gap is then presented to the court. And the judges are left at large in a field that the legislature lacked capacity to define. To a degree the same problem is presented to the judiciary when vague and general language is employed like the words "fair" or "just" or "equitable." The law is not a series of calculating machines where definitions and answers come tumbling out when the right levers are pushed. A judge's reaction to vague statutory language is bound to be like his reaction to the generalities of constitutional clauses. The language that he construes gathers meaning and overtones, significance, and relevancy in terms of his own life and experience, his personal set of values, his training and education, and the genes of the blood stream of his ancestors. It would be as futile to argue that judges are not human, as it would to prove that politics and legislatures can be divorced.

When we move to constitutional questions, uncertainty necessarily increases. A judge who is asked to construe or interpret the Constitution often rejects the gloss which his predecessors have put on it. For the gloss may, in his view, offend the spirit of the Constitution or do violence to it. That has been the experience of this generation and of all those that have preceded. It will likewise be the experience of those who follow. And so it should be. For it is the Constitution which we have sworn to defend, not some predecessor's interpretation of it. Stare decisis has small place in constitutional law. The Constitution was written for all time and all ages. It would lose its great character and become feeble, if it were allowed to become encrusted with narrow, legalistic notions that dominated the thinking of one generation.

So it is that the law will always teem with uncertainty. It has always been the case—and it always will remain that way under the democratic scheme of things. The truth is that the law is the highest form of compromise between competing interests; it is a substitute for force and violence—the only path to peace man has yet devised. It is the product of attempted reconciliation between the many diverse groups in a society. The reconciliation is not entirely a legislative function. The judiciary is also inescapably involved. When judges do not agree, it is a sign that they are dealing with problems on which society itself is divided. It is the democratic way to express dissident views. Judges are to be honored rather than criticized for following that tradition, for proclaiming their articles of faith so that all may read.

Chief Justice Hughes had this to say about the dissenting opinion:

"There are some who think it desirable that dissents should not be disclosed as they detract from the force of the judgment. Undoubtedly, they do. When unanimity can be obtained without sacrifice or coercion, it strongly commends the decision to public confidence. But unanimity which is merely formal, which is recorded at the expense of strong conflicting views, is not desirable in a court of last resort, whatever may be the effect upon public opinion at the time This is so because what must ultimately sustain the court in public confidence is the character and independence of the judges. They are not there simply to decide cases, but to decide them as they think they should be decided, and while it may be regrettable that they cannot always agree, it is better that their independence should be maintained and recognized than that unanimity should be secured through its sacrifice. * * * A dissent in a court of last resort is an appeal to the brooding spirit of the law, to the intelligence of a future day, when a later decision may possibly correct the error into which the dissenting judge believes the court to have been betrayed."

That view was in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, who believed that the English practice of seriatim opinions was the desirable one. He thought each judge should write an opinion in every case so as to "throw himself in each case on God and his country; both will excuse him for error and value him for honesty."

The crises that face a democratic country under the stresses and strains of modern society are shared by judges. The judiciary is a coordinate branch of government, bearing great responsibilities. The judge that writes his own predilections into the law in disregard of constitutional principles or the legislative or executive edicts that he interprets is not worthy of the great traditions of the bench. The judge that quavers or retreats before an impending crisis of the day and finds haven in dialectics or weasel words or surrenders his own conviction for a passing expediency is likewise not born for the woolsack. We must expect of judges the fortitude and courage that we demand of all other servants who man our public posts. If they are true to their responsibilities and traditions, they will not hesitate to speak frankly and plainly on the great issues coming before them. They will prove their worth by showing their independence and fortitude. Their

dissents or concurring opinions may salvage for tomorrow the principle that was sacrificed or forgotten today. Their discussion and propagation of the great principles of our Charter may keep the democratic ideal alive in days of regression, uncertainty, and despair. Indeed what they do and say may in the manner of Holmes and Brandeis and Hughes have a more profound effect on the character of our Government and the future of our country than the deeds of any other public servant. Moreover, their cool detachment and courageous objectivity can set the fashion of a day and stamp an era with a distinctive character.

Archibald MacLeish recently wrote of this age:

"What's changed is freedom in this age—
What great men dared to choose
Small men now dare neither win nor lose."

Judges, like other leaders of thought, must be free to choose—and, being free, must have the daring to let their inner conscience cast their votes. They must be free to speak their minds—and the legal profession must help create an atmosphere of understanding and tolerance for their efforts.

In these critical days leaders in every walk of life must dare choose, publicly and with pride, our constitutional scheme of things in all its applications. They must dare choose it above all lesser things and reject the easy invitation of expediency or complacency. When the leaders make that choice, men of lesser stature and affairs will dare stake their all for freedom.

Farmers Still at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether the farmers of this nation are to be made the victims of another depression—whether they are once again to be put through the wringer of bankruptcy—is still a most vital and unanswered question. It is a question that must be faced in this present session of Congress and the only satisfactory answer that can be given is that the farmers, after all these years, must be recognized for what they are—the producers of the essential food and fiber for this country and much of the world. Recognizing that fact, then we must recognize that the time is long past due for a long-range program that will guarantee simple justice to the farmers in the nature of prices for their products, used in domestic consumption, that will enable them to purchase the products of industry and still retain for themselves reasonable profits.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the following letter on this subject is worthy of the consideration of all Members of Congress:

MASON CITY, IOWA, *February 12, 1949.*
Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After giving considerable thought to the question of the hour, i. e., that of a 90-percent or a 60-to-90-percent flexible parity for agriculture, I would like to present my views. I have tried to consider it from the angle of what is fair and just; keeping in mind the interests of all men, and my answer is: I fail to see any fairness or justice in a 60-percent parity, and only a special few would profit from such a system.

In the first place, the farmer has never had a voice in the price he receives nor in the price he pays. It is questionable whether or not he receives a square deal, even in the years on which parity is based. About that time a neighbor of ours asked a local butcher, "Why is it, that when live hogs go up, meat prices go up; but when hog prices come down, meat prices do not come down?" The answer he received was this: "When the farmer runs our business, it is time for us to quit."

How any farmer can make ends meet with a 90-cent dollar when crops are poor and a 60-cent dollar when crops are good is beyond my comprehension.

The argument put forth by some "friends" of the farmer that 60 percent of parity would cause farmers to produce more butter and meat, etc., instead of the crops supported by 90 percent of parity is absolutely unsound. Why? First of all, butter has been scarce and the price prohibitive in the minds of many, but has it been unreasonable? According to our State agricultural college, it takes 31 hours of labor to produce 1,000 pounds of milk. If we figure the butterfat content at 3.5 percent, we have 35 pounds of butterfat, which, based on the rate of 72 cents per pound, brings $25.20 for 31 hours' labor, or approximately 81 cents per hour gross income. He therefore would have to invest several thousand dollars in land, buildings, livestock, machinery; pay all expenses such as repairs on buildings, machinery depreciation, etc., insurance, taxes, gas, fuel oils, and all other expenses in order to receive a gross income of 81 cents per hour.

Under the 1948 Farm Act, milk and hogs are not under a support price. As soon as a surplus is in sight, butter prices will go down, but, if we figure present prices at parity with a bottom of 60 percent, butter could not go below 48 cents per pound. What would the farmer's wages be? He would be receiving a gross income of 54 cents per hour and then be expected to pay all the above mentioned expenses before his net income could be figured. It is too ridiculous to even try to figure net income.

The meat producer faces the same facts. In the past, the price of pork has been figured by taking the number of bushels of corn required to produce 100 pounds of pork times the price per bushel. But nothing has been allowed for extra labor, risks, and investments. Therefore, if corn prices dropped to 60 percent, causing a surplus of pork with no support price for hogs, the pork producer would still be selling his corn for 60 percent less.

Furthermore, in the event of a short corn crop and a 90 percent parity price for corn with a surplus of pork, the pork producer would be selling his corn for less than market price. And in case he had to buy his corn, he would market it, through his hogs, at a loss.

The dairyman or meat producer cannot start or stop production instantaneously.

Many times he has to keep on producing at a loss or quit altogether. The farmer who has gotten a large check for his produce receives front page publicity, but his costs or losses are not mentioned. The only reason he has received this large check is that he continued to produce at a loss until many of his fellow farmers were forced to quit, thereby creating a scarcity.

Who profits by flexible prices or a flexible production caused by flexible prices? Surely not the poor man who has to sell his crop at a 60-cent dollar, when interest, rent, taxes, repairs, machinery, gas, etc., have to be paid, but the fellow who has money to invest on a 60 percent of parity and hold it until a short crop; then sell for a 90-percent price and so make 50 percent on his money. In other words, the man who has not contributed one drop of sweat to produce for society. Namely, the speculator, the grain gambler, and the processor; who, out of one side of his mouth, talks surplus to the farmer to beat prices down, and, out of the other side, talks scarcity to the consumer to force prices up. This we have seen in recent months with farm machinery, automobiles, etc.

If industry and labor will produce to meet the needs of today for a 100-cent dollar under a 90-percent parity, the farmer agrees to accept a 90-cent dollar in exchange and if they reduce their price by a full production, the farmer's price goes down accordingly.

In conclusion, someone may say that I have not painted a true picture of the farmer's condition by the facts and figures given. To that I will submit the following undeniable facts as "proof positive." Who is buying the land?

If Cerro Gordo County, Iowa, and especially that section between Mason City and Nora Springs, is a fair representation of conditions, here is what you will find:

First, a very large majority of the land purchased and paid for in recent years was not purchased by farmers, but by business and professional men.

Second, the farms that are owned by farmers, in most cases, represent an estate, a part or all of which was inherited, and depicts a purchase price much lower than the prices of recent years.

Third, the land owned by farmers in a large majority of cases is represented in one farm. While there are a few cases where one who might be called a farmer owns several farms, his profits were not made from tilling the soil, but from dealing in livestock or some other side line.

Sincerely,

FRANK L. EMMERT.

Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an article by Grace Bassett from the Spokane Spokesman Review of February 13.

We're proud of "Binks" Penrose out in the State of Washington. This article will tell you why:

YOUNG MAN FROM THE NORTHWEST IS PROVIDING CULTURAL LEADERSHIP IN THE TROUBLE ZONE OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose has meant a pioneering college president for over a half century to the Pacific Northwest. Now the name has the same significance throughout the Middle East. A son promises to enhance his father's contribution to education.

A young graduate of Williams, Ripon, and Yale colleges took over the presidency of Whitman College in Walla Walla in 1894. This oldest college in the State had a great historic tradition and a record of scholarly

endeavor for 35 years. But only three wooden buildings stood on the campus. A debt of $12,000 faced the administration. The retiring president left a note saying that "school will not open in September."

The late Dr. Penrose gave a personal note for the debt, enlarged the faculty and opened the college doors in the fall. He served for 40 years, in total blindness for the last 10. He enriched the lives of thousands of young men and women. The reputation of one of the West's leading small colleges was established during his administration.

His son, Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr., was inaugurated as president of the American University and International College in Beirut, Lebanon, last fall.

The Washington man became a cultural leader in an area seething with unrest. Lebanon's neighbor to the south was Palestine. Jews and Arabs had been fighting there for nearly a year over the United Nations partition. Both factions were smuggling soldiers and supplies into Beirut, a leading seaport, and across the republic's border. Citizens lived in dread that Israel would really go on the warpath against Lebanon and the governments in other Arab league nations.

About 2,500 men with conflicting creeds of 40 nationalities made up the university student body. They had confidence that the college could widen their scope and enable them to work their way out of their present dilemma.

Dr. Penrose's position was unique. His university had promised to produce men of knowledge and moral fiber. It worked daily to realize its goal of a better-informed America on middle eastern subjects.

President Penrose is a man qualified by background, training, and experience to oversee the job.

The 40-year-old executive has had a record of college and government service.

He gained respect early. At 15 he was chosen commander of the student cadet corps, the most sought after honor in Walla Walla High School.

Whitman students recognized him before he entered college as the wiry, active boy who played tennis on the campus courts and shot baskets in the gymnasium. They all had called him "Binks" since he was a toddler in the president's home. Origin of the name probably dates back to a childish mispronunciation.

His college friends have never forgotten two characteristics—he was hard driving like his father, and unlike the senior Penrose, he had ears that were always too big for his head.

"Binks" was president of the associated students at Whitman and a member of Phi Beta Kappa. He found time to sing a strong bass in college operas, become campus tennis champ, and play intramural football.

Beta Theta Pi was his fraternity. His continued interest was evidenced years later when he was district chief of New England collegiate chapters of the fraternity from Maine to Connecticut.

"Binks" was only 20 when his father awarded him a Whitman bachelor's degree with honors in 1928. So he lived at home for another year and studied additional courses.

Then his connection with the Near East began. He went to Beirut as a professor of physics and mathematics. Later the professor returned to his Washington alma mater to teach philosophy. He was also an instructor at Rockford College in Illinois.

Dr. Penrose received his doctorate from Columbia University in 1934. From 1938 to 1942 he was associate director of the American Near East College Association with headquarters in New York. During the war he served as Director of the Office of Strategic Services in the Middle East.

Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands has decorated him as a commander of the Order of Orange-Nassau for his OSS record.

He was special adviser on budgetary matters to Secretary of Defense James Forrestal before his appointment as president of American University.

Dr. Penrose has always been outspoken and sure of himself. So was his father. The faith of both men in the individual seemed to form the basis of their personal and educational theories.

Whenever he thought improvements were at a standstill at Whitman, he submitted his resignation. He would return only under certain conditions. Trustees recognized the inspiration of his leadership and retained him.

His son's viewpoints have been targets of national criticism. Almost the only strong clear voice in support of the Arabs in the Palestine controversy has been that of Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, Jr.

It is interesting to note that Secretary Forrestal has also been attacked for his pro-Arab stands. He has been called anti-Zionist for his public insistence that oil from the Middle East is essential to the success of the European recovery program. He must have leaned heavily on his advisers who had lived, as Dr. Penrose had, among the people of the Middle East.

"Partition is a negation of principles of democracy and self-determination. It was imposed on a country, the majority of whose residents, opposed it," Dr. Penrose was quoted in leading eastern newspapers last year.

He courted disfavor of his fellow Americans by loudly recommending reconsideration of the partition plan. He wanted the World Court to question legality of the UN partition. He thought states of the world should be opened to immigration for displaced Jews.

"This is a two-sided, not a one-sided question," he pleaded. Armenians and other minority groups in the Middle East want land, too. Establishment of a Jewish state might be the beginning of a ring of puppet nations similar to those behind the iron curtain, he feared.

Those were unpopular ideas for an adviser to a Cabinet member to voice at the time of President Truman's recognition of the Zionist state. But Dr. Penrose firmly believed that the success of American foreign aid and the happiness of a people he understood depended upon a reversal of Palestine policy.

His words on inauguration day, October 1, in Lebanon could have been echoes of his father's teaching, reinforced to meet an explosive tension in the Middle East.

Long ago the elder Penrose had dedicated his life to the principle that a small college, by choice not weakness, could transmit personality to a student.

"We want graduates who will not think as they are told to think, not dream as they are told to dream. I believe in an individualizing, humanizing education," he had declared.

Those remarks were basic in what Dr. Penrose, Jr., said in Beirut to alumni and world leaders. He talked about that same individual threatened by government ideologies and misunderstanding of scientific fact.

The university president attacked the social atrophy of today's people.

"By permitting the state to assume their personal functions, citizens fail to realize that governments are made up of individuals whose human frailties may be intensified by their opportunity for power and privilege. If powerful men lose their awareness that their strength comes to them from other men, they can wreak havoc both at home and abroad."

Dr. Penrose indicated that the Middle East, where the great spiritual development of mankind had been fostered, has much to give the west.

The west can contribute information and techniques to civilization. The east can give knowledge and experience in interpreting human and divine values, the president said.

That is the two-way channel of information Dr. Penrose visualizes in Beirut. Already the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, and the Carnegie Foundation are looking to the American university as a source of information about the Middle East.

The new president must have felt some pride as a representative from Whitman College took his place at the inauguration ceremonies beside delegates from Yale, Harvard, MIT, Columbia, Oberlin, Wellesley and Vassar, ecclesiastical dignitaries, and governmental officials.

His wife and two daughters, Margaret Dale, 11, and Mary Shipman, 7, were also symbols of the West in an academic tradition of the East that had existed since 1866 when the university was founded.

One blond 4-year-old in the audience was probably unimpressed. Yet his is the heritage, more than any other person's, of two generations of unselfish service to education. Friends in the Northwest will be watching the little boy. He is Stephen B. L. Penrose III.

Electrification of Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by him before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association of New York, on February 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The attendance here today indicates that this organization has come a long ways since I attended the first meeting in St. Louis in 1943.

It also clearly reflects the progress that has been made in electrifying rural America.

The word "electrifying" means to me something that is exciting, stirring, and memorable. I am sure that this interpretation is familiar to those of you who have watched the faces of farm families when the switch was thrown, bringing electric power for the first time to their farms.

This flick of the switch—when the kilowatts become the chore boys—often marks the transition from drudgery to better living and more efficient farming.

The rural electrification program is one which produces tangible results in the form of modernized equipment and better living conveniences.

In appraising the achievements of this electrification program, I am mindful also of the effort, the heartache, and the struggle that has gone into it.

Our measure of success has not come easily.

Likewise, the road ahead, as you well know, is beset by pitfalls, detours, and even barricades.

These obstacles we must overcome as we have overcome others of equal portent in the past.

The one problem that dwarfs all others—shortage of electricity—is not a new one. It has been with us since the rural electrification program first got under way in 1935.

This problem is still with us and is even more acute now than it was back in those days.

The utility people have been telling us for several years that we were just around the corner from a power surplus.

During the wartime shortage, we were told that shortly after the fighting stopped we would be faced with a surplus of electric energy—that the utilities could produce more power than the country could possibly use in peacetime.

It was recalled that the production of electric energy had virtually doubled since the late thirties and that the 228,000,000,000 kilowatt-hour output of 1944 was a wartime peak that would not be needed in postwar years.

Yet in 1948, the production of electricity reached approximately 282,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours and that was not enough.

Still the utilities are sticking to that same old story that if they are given a little more time they will produce enough power to meet demand. They point to the fact that their plans call for greatly expanded output.

That is the way they attempt to lull us into complacency about the future growth of our Nation; that is the way they hope to stall off the development of our water resources; that is the propaganda line they use against the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and other river resources.

The St. Lawrence River which forms the Northeastern border of our great Nation constitutes an undefended boundary between ourselves and our good neighbor Canada. The waters of this river represent the greatest remaining undeveloped resource—both navigation and waterpower—on the North American Continent.

A relatively small amount of dredging in the St. Lawrence River and in the connecting channels of the Great Lakes would complete nature's work of providing an inland seaway, 27 feet deep, reaching 2,350 miles into the heart of the continent, and connecting our Midwest with the sea lanes of the world.

This seaway would mean cheaper transportation for agricultural products, particularly grain, to overseas points; it would provide a channel for bringing in high-grade ore which is needed to maintain the steel industry along the Great Lakes; it would enable the Midwest to import and export products to and from both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and foreign countries. It would aid in strengthening our national security by providing sheltered shipping lanes and by assuring protected waters for the construction of ships.

Interest in the development of the seaway dates from the early settlement of the North American Continent. To the navigational aspirations of the early settlers has been added the twentieth-century incentive to harness and utilize the enormous volume of potential electric power latent in the rapids of the St. Lawrence River.

The first serious interest in this project on the part of the Government was shown in 1916, when the Congress ordered an investigation of its possibilities. Since that time it has been before Congress several times; every President from Wilson to Truman has urged it. In case anyone here aspires to the highest office in this land, let me remind him that in the last 40 years no one opposed to the St. Lawrence development has been elected President.

Innumerable studies of the project have been made by governmental agencies and by private interests, and every impartial report has been favorable.

This project has been literally studied to death. In fact, the opposition's chief weapon for delaying it has been to call for still more studies.

Last year, in view of the Federal Government's failure to obtain approval of the project, the Power Authority of the State of New York filed an application with the Federal Power Commission for a license to develop only the power phase of the project. Because this involves an international boundary, it is necessary for the international joint commission to pass on the application. However, the State Department on December 16 made public a letter announcing that the matter would not be referred to the joint commission, and that it was "desirable to renew the request to Congress for approval of the 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada for construction of the seaway and power project."

President Truman, in his state of the Union message on January 5, renewed his pledge of support of the project, and urged congressional action.

Several bills have already been introduced in the House for the approval of the 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada to develop both the navigation and power phases of the St. Lawrence Basin.

It is my understanding that a bill is now being prepared for early introduction in the Senate.

I shall continue to do all within my power to secure approval for the construction of this project that would mean so much to the people of the Northeast and to the rural-electrification program. Time is important. We are in desperate need of more power now.

If the St. Lawrence is not developed, I don't know where this part of the country will get the power it needs at reasonable rates.

The proposed St. Lawrence power facilities at Massena, N. Y., would have a capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower, with an average annual output of 13,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. This power would be shared equally by the United States and Canada.

The single dam at Massena will generate more power than all of the hydroelectric developments of the Tennessee Valley area, and at lower cost than any plant in America, with the possible exception of Niagara.

The feasible transmission range for this huge block of low-cost power would include part of New Jersey, most of New York State, and most of New England. All of these areas are notably lacking in other sources of energy. All of these areas are paying excessively high rates for what power is available today.

Water power is of especial importance to any section of the country, whether it has other sources of power or not, because, unlike fuels, falling water meets our energy requirements without impoverishing our resources for the future. It would take 41,000,000 barrels of oil annually to generate the potential power output of the Massena Dam.

Not only is more power needed in New York and New England, but it also is needed throughout the rest of the country if we are to go forward in the development of our Nation.

An unmistakable lesson of history is that the strength of nations, for peace or for war, is measured largely in terms of their capacity to produce energy and turn it to productive purposes.

Electric power has played its vital role in the development of urban America. The availability of electricity accounts in a large measure for the advantages city people have had in the past over country people in living standards and conveniences.

Now, under the rural-electrification program, rural people, through their own efforts and with the aid of their Government, are catching up with city people in living standards. In addition, farmers are finding their work less burdensome and more profitable.

As a result, rural young people are encouraged to stay on the farm. To hold its young people on the land is one of the most serious challenges facing our Nation today. Any program which helps to meet this challenge provides a noble service to rural America.

Moreover, the availability of electricity in rural areas encourages the establishment of industrial plants which in turn means new employment and prosperity to rural communities.

Failure to provide adequate power supplies in any area of the country can seriously hamper or retard growth and development in that area.

The shortage and high cost of power in New England have been a serious handicap to that area.

During the war, for example, the Northeast was eliminated from consideration in the location of new plants and industries because of the lack of sufficient power, and plants were located in areas where power was more available.

The gravitation of new industries to such places as the TVA area and the Pacific Northwest has been due in large measure to the availability of power in those areas.

As a result of that gravitation, those areas are reaching the saturation point and are now facing power shortages themselves. As a matter of fact, the power situation in the Pacific Northwest has become one of the most serious power problems in the country.

So far as the Northeast is concerned, the threat of further loss of industry through moving to other areas is even more serious now than was the failure of industry to locate here during the war.

I would like to stress further my concern over the general power situation throughout the country. The Federal Power Commission has issued a report on Estimated Curtailment of Electric Power Loads in 1947. Of the 184 utility systems reporting, 64 showed load reductions. This is approximately 35 percent of all class-1 systems in the country.

The methods of curtailment included: Lowering voltage, shifting of load to off-peak periods, voluntary customer curtailment, and curtailments of service to interruptible customers.

The estimated load reductions occurring throughout the year of 1947 totaled approximately 1,278,000 kilowatts.

The National Security Resources Board issued a report last December which points out that "in several areas it is necessary for utilities and the governmental agencies concerned to call upon the consumers for voluntary conservation or load shifting during the hours of peak demand."

You and I know of many cases where rural electric co-ops have had their current cut off at great inconvenience and expense to the co-ops and to the farmers served by them.

Even the utilities reporting to the National Security Resources Board admit that there will be a power shortage through 1951, but contend that by that time the margins available for reserves and growth will be adequate, provided, and this is important, provided actual power demand does not exceed their estimates.

I say with all candor that I hope the estimates of the utilities will prove to be better this time than they have been in the past. Let no one be lulled into a sense of false security by these musty, moth-eaten, mirages of the power interests, which never have and never will come true.

It is interesting to note that the utilities did not even want to admit that there was a power shortage in the Northeast during the war. I had quite an exchange of letters with the president of the Connecticut Light & Power Co. on this subject. In support of my contention, I was able to obtain a map prepared by the War Production Board showing areas of power scarcity and surplus in the United States. This map showed that the area around Niagara Falls, N. Y., had the most critical power shortage at that time,

1942, and virtually all of New England was classified in the category of the next most critical area.

I mention this to point up the fact that in the Northeast there is available in the St. Lawrence River a tremendous power potential that was not utilized during the war, and certain groups are trying desperately now to keep the Nation from taking advantage of it during peacetime.

This opposition causes one to wonder how long a little group of utility officials, railroad officials, and shipping officials, aided and abetted by a small number of misguided labor leaders, can exert enough influence to stop the development of such an important resource for the benefit of the people, and the security of the Nation.

The opposition has been vocal, united, extravagantly financed, and, I must admit, effective, even though it hasn't made sense in logic or in fact.

For some time, our opponents said that they were not opposed to the development of the power part of the St. Lawrence project but that they were opposed to the seaway. Then when the New York Power Authority went before the Federal Power Commission last year for permission to develop the power alone, the same old opponents were ably represented by counsel in bitter protest against the power development.

As usual they resorted to a legal technicality, basing their contention on the ground that since only half of the proposed dam would be in the United States, the other half being on Canadian territory; that half a dam is no dam at all, and it would be unconstitutional for American money to be spent on such a project.

That is the kind of costly legal nonsense that the supporters of the St. Lawrence have been confronted with for years.

The opposition also attacks the St. Lawrence project on the ground that it would cost too much; and has always said that the proper time for proceeding with it was not at hand. They have been saying that for years—in peacetime and in wartime.

What they do not say is that the excessive cost of power above TVA rates made against the people of New York and New England amounts to about $400,000,000 annually. This excess charge against the people of the Northeast would pay the entire cost of the development both for navigation and for power in 2-years time.

In the interest of farmers and in the interest of the national economy, it is urgent that the St. Lawrence project be developed at the earliest possible moment. The former Chief of Staff and the former Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, testified that the St. Lawrence is needed in the interest of national security. He was speaking of both navigation and power.

An important feature of the St. Lawrence is the low cost of the power which can be developed there. It is estimated that this power will cost about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour. The existing high cost of power in the Northeast is an old, old story.

I am informed that the national average cost of power to REA co-ops is around 9 mills per kilowatt-hour. For New York and New England, the average rate was 1.26 cents per kilowatt-hour during the 1948 fiscal year.

In other words, the co-ops in the Northeast paid about 40 percent above the national average for the power they bought from commercial power companies.

They paid more than twice as much as they would have paid at TVA rates, and more than three times as much as the Bonneville Power Administration would have charged them.

It is clear that we must proceed, without further delay, to develop the tremendous volume of unharnessed hydroelectric power that is going to waste in the St. Lawrence and the other great rivers of our country.

We must do this in the interest of rural America, in the interest of an expanding national economy, and in the interest of our national security.

Electric energy is the lifeblood of the aluminum industry; it also is an essential raw material for munitions.

I hate to think of what would have happened if we had not had the TVA, Hoover, and Bonneville projects during the last war. God forbid that we should be plunged into another war, but if that should happen, we must not be caught short of power.

Our ability to produce is the key to our future success and safety as a nation, and electricity in ever-increasing volume is the vital force needed to turn the wheels of an expanding economy.

Our failure to develop and use our inexhaustible resources such as the St. Lawrence River is just as short-sighted and just as wasteful as it is to squander our exhaustible natural wealth.

For centuries the forces of progress have waged a running battle with the forces of reaction.

The apostles of scarcity and high prices fought the Tennessee Valley Authority and were defeated.

They fought the REA and were defeated.

They fought the development of low-cost power wherever it might be.

In some cases they have been defeated and in others they have won.

The time has come now when America, for the sake of its own welfare and security, must not let this little group of self-centered men defeat the development of the St. Lawrence, the Missouri, and other great rivers.

The battle for the St. Lawrence is not one which affects New York and New England alone. It affects all America. To win it we must have the support of red-blooded and patriotic Americans everywhere.

The welfare of each of the 48 States in our Union is linked with the welfare of all.

Through united action we can win the victory which will carry us on to a greater, more prosperous, and more secure Nation.

The Reclamation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What We May Expect Out of Washington," delivered by me before the Nebraska Reclamation Association at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am very glad to be here with you today. I am always glad of the chance to come back to Nebraska and talk to Nebraska people about reclamation. Fortunately, this Congress does not yet have before it a great deal of important legislation this early in the session. Most of the more important measures are still being worked on in committee. For that reason I was particularly happy when your invitation to speak arrived, and I could have the opportunity to meet with you.

It is customary on this type of occasion for a Member of Congress addressing a group like this to tell you how strongly and earnestly he supports the objectives of your group. Perhaps it will not surprise you if I tell you that I am for reclamation of all of the acreage that we can possibly bring under water. I was pretty enthusiastic about this proposition before I ever thought of running for the Senate, and 8 years of experience in the National Congress have not yet dulled my enthusiasm. Every time I have spoken on the subject, I have pledged myself to work for just as rapid a development of this program as possible. I believe I have lived up to those pledges, and, of course, they still stand for the future.

Just giving a pledge of support to the reclamation program does not tell you very much. Almost all of us from this part of the country and all the West are enthusiastic supporters of reclamation. I don't suppose you will find over 10 percent of the population of this State who are not in favor of expanding reclamation. When we have all decided that we are for reclamation, however, we have not decided very much. The real problems come when we get down to specific questions and try to determine what reclamation policies will be best in the long run, and just how this program is to be carried out. The reclamation program is moving along fairly smoothly, but there are plenty of tough questions still to be settled in carrying out the program. In my experience, intelligent and sincere men may have honest and sincere differences of opinion on many of these questions. Some of them will take some hard thinking and hard work before we reach a solution.

To name only a few, there is the question of the type of contract that water users should be asked to sign with the Bureau of Reclamation. There is the question of the form of organization; whether we should continue with the Pick-Sloan plan which is now being carried out so successfully, or change over to some other kind of administrative framework and employ a different agency of the Federal Government to do the work. There is a question which is hot in this State, relating to the diversion of water from one watershed to another. There is the question of construction of pen stocks for the production of power at dams that are primarily for irrigation purposes. Related to that, there are the questions of what contributions power revenues could or should make to the financial feasibility of our projects, and the level of power rates that should be set. There is always the question of reconciling the desires of those who are most interested in navigation or flood control or power with the needs of those who are primarily interested in bringing water to the land.

It would be impossible to discuss all these questions in one address, and I would not be in position to go into all the technical details on them, even if I had time. I would like to touch on one or two of them in this address.

Some of you may be aware of the difficulty we have had in reaching decisions as to the form of contracts that should be signed by the organizations of water users in some of the districts. This question has been a difficult one in some parts of the country for several years. It had not given us any particular trouble in Nebraska until about a year or so ago, but last year we really had to face that question. It is not entirely settled yet, but I believe we are making progress, and I should like to give you some of the principal developments in this controversy.

By way of background, you may be interested to know that as of the end of this fiscal year, there will have been appropriated and spent by the Bureau of Reclamation around $1,500,000,000 since the organization of the Reclamation Service in 1902. In the earlier years, the Government first undertook those projects where the cost of construction would be comparatively slight in comparison with

the benefits to be obtained. In other words, the earliest projects were those which were the most feasible, that is, the most profitable, to construct. Originally, the funds available for this program were limited to receipts into the Federal Reclamation Fund, which were not very great by modern standards.

In those earlier years, therefore, the first projects were constructed on the theory that the water users could and would repay the costs in 10 years. For some projects, that basis was entirely practical. It all depended, of course, on the cost of construction of the project applied to the number of acres benefited.

As additional projects became more complicated and, consequently, more costly, the time for repayment was increased to 20 years. Later on, the time of payment was again extended to 40 years, and then a 10-year development period was added which could be applied to projects under certain conditions. Only in recent years, however, have reclamation projects been conceived and planned where the structures served many purposes. Since 1935 the Bureau of Reclamation has constructed projects which provide flood control, navigation improvements, salinity control and prevention, soil conservation, power, municipal water supply, and irrigation. I might add to these purposes three others which very recently have been recognized, namely, silt storage and control, recreational development, and improvement of fish and wildlife conditions.

This list has included 10 different purposes, and I am not sure but what others might be added. Evidently we have moved far from the day when reclamation was purely a matter of developing irrigation. Almost every dam today is a multipurpose dam. Evidently, as we have moved forward, the problems have become more complex from an engineering standpoint, from the point of view of administration, and from the point of view of handling the financial side. To use a term from industry, we have developed so many byproducts, that on some dams it is hard to tell which is the principal product and which are the byproducts. Just as in an industry, such as meat packing, the byproducts must carry a large part of the cost of operation, so with our dams, the byproducts must contribute toward the financial feasibility of the whole program in one way or another.

There is a difference in the way that these benefits have been handled, financially speaking. For a great many years, the United States Government has also been building extensive works to improve navigation, to provide harbor facilities, and to control floods. Under the terms "flood control" and "rivers and harbors" appropriations there has been appropriated to date about $6,125,000,000 for these purposes. Many of our great seaports, for example, have been substantially improved with Federal funds in this manner. You will note that the $6,125,000,000 spent to date on flood control and rivers and harbors is about four times as much as has been spent for reclamation.

On checking the records, I find that only $33,000,000 of these flood control and rivers and harbors appropriations has been appropriated for works in Nebraska. Wyoming, our neighboring State to the west, has received under these headings no appropriations whatever. Colorado, our other neighbor to the west, has received about $31,000,000. To make this picture complete, I should mention the fact that there have been reclamation appropriations for both Wyoming and Nebraska which include some allocations to flood control, just as there have been appropriations to flood control which include amounts allocated to irrigation. These amounts have been comparatively small.

Federal appropriations for rivers and harbors and for flood control, however, are nonreimbursable as to local beneficiaries. Those who receive the protection from floods and those who benefit from improved navigation facilities are not required to sign contracts with the Federal Government to repay the costs. They are not required to repay anything. This is an important fact because large expenditures for flood control have preserved and benefited agricultural areas without any cost to the land owner and without any restrictions as to land use and ownership.

In a way, flood control is very similar to reclamation. The purpose of flood control works is to keep flood waters from overflowing agricultural and other lands and to maintain the value and productivity of that property. The purpose of irrigation works is to bring water to agricultural lands and thereby to create value and increase productivity. In both cases, economic wealth is protected and enhanced.

In establishing the feasibility of a flood control project where agricultural lands have been periodically flooded, the actual valuation of the various crops endangered by flooding are computed. The benefit of the proposed program is worked out on an acreage basis just the same as are the benefits from water brought to arid and semiarid lands for irrigation. The point I want to make is that in both cases economic productivity is benefited by the investment of Government funds. This should be taken into consideration in determining the financial obligations to be accepted by the two classes of beneficiaries, those preserved from flooding and those supplied with irrigation water.

Although flood control benefits are nonreimbursable, irrigation benefits must be repaid at least up to the ability of the water user to repay. I am not by any means suggesting that the irrigator should receive these benefits on a nonreimbursable basis. The point I am making is that there should be a limit to the amount that farmers should be required to repay for a supply of irrigation water.

Under the present basic legislation, the standard period of repayment is 40 years, plus a development period of 10 years. This 50-year period encompasses the entire adult life of a man, even if he lives to the Biblical threescore and ten, and the life insurance companies tell us that that is above the average. I believe that the repayment period should be limited to the life of the average man—40 years, plus the 10-year development period. Repayment obligations should not be handed down to his heirs and the heirs of his heirs forever.

Most of our early districts in the West and in Nebraska which contracted for water with the Government before 1930 are making repayment in a 40-year period. We are now confronted by a new situation. Within the last few years, several irrigation districts have been formed in Nebraska for the purpose of contracting for a water supply from the Bureau of Reclamation. The districts I have in mind were informed through regular and approved channels of information that the customary 40-year period for repayment would be sufficient in their case. Whether it was known when this information was given out that it was inaccurate, I do not know. The fact is that one of these districts was recently told that the period required for repayment would be—not 40 years—but 140 years. That situation means this to these farmers. If the Reclamation Bureau is to continue the construction of the project, the note which the water users will have to sign will be about three and one-half times as much per acre as the original plans called for.

Now in these cases, we are doing either one of two things. We are building irrigation works at costs which are fantastic and beyond reason and are thereby undertaking impossible financial burdens. Either that, or we are hoping that some kind providence will rescue us from about 70 percent of this debt. No kind providence has been written into the statute book as yet. I do not believe that our farmers should be forced to undertake an obligation on which their grandchildren's grandchildren will still be making payments. I am going to continue to support all feasible projects for my State with all the energy I have, looking toward the general national benefit which will result. I believe, however, that after a 40-or 50-year repayment period, at rates which represent the farmers ability to repay, the unpaid balance—the unfeasible balance, in other words—might as well be written off the books, assuming that the benefit to the Nation as a whole from expanding power, increasing productive acreage, and creating wealth made the project feasible in the first place.

If this is not done, the farmer will never become the owner of the irrigation works. He will merely be a tenant of the United States Government, subject to its rules and regulations affecting the use and occupancy of his lands over many generations.

The benefits which come to the cities and counties of our State and of the Nation from a successful irrigation project are great and are unusually dependable. In towns and cities in an irrigated area, you will find an enormous increase in property values and in business prosperity. The biggest cut of all, of course, goes to the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue. The owners of the businesses and the Federal Government benefit immensely by virtue of the work done by the farmer. I do not believe that the farmer should pay in perpetuity while no one else pays anything. I believe that the irrigator deserves at least some consideration, which is regularly given to the man who farms in a region protected, free of cost, from floods by the Federal Government.

There was some difficulty a year or so ago in the Republican River Valley in connection with a contract which had been offered one of the irrigation districts out there, and, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs at that time, I felt it my duty to lend my assistance to the water users in an endeavor to secure a better contract. I am happy to say that my efforts in securing a better contract were largely successful. The water users appear to be satisfied with the changes that have been made. The contract which the district will get, however, is not really a repayment contract but a rental type, which never vests in the water users ownership of project works or water rights. This question of the type of contract has received considerable study by congressional committees during the last year or two, although no new legislation has been passed as yet dealing with it.

Since the end of the session, further work has been done on the question by interested groups in discussions with officials of the Bureau of Reclamation. I am not today prepared to predict what type of legislation will come out. In my judgment, Congress should enact legislation which would provide that long-term contracts also be repayment contracts, and that water obtained by means of them would run with the land and become appurtenant thereto. I will be opposed to any legislation on this subject which does not clearly vest the water right in the hands of the water user.

Before I leave this subject, I would like to mention one further point in connection with developments which would take such an extremely long period to repay. I would like to see an analysis of the over-all benefits to the Nation as a whole from irrigation devel-

opment, taking into consideration the growth in productive capacity, the security of our food supply, and the increase in Federal tax receipts. Upon the basis of such an analysis, I believe we would be in better position to determine which projects are desirable and just how long we should ask a farmer to pay all he can afford to. I believe the community and the Nation, which share the benefits with the farmer, should contribute through the general taxes they pay to the Federal Treasury their fair share toward the cost of the development. The city cannot afford to load the entire repayment burden on the farmer, and the East, in its own interest, cannot afford to load the entire cost on the West.

In my opening statement I mentioned half a dozen problems which I said would require some very serious study to solve. I am certainly not going to discuss them all, but you might be interested in recent Washington developments on that old stand-by issue, the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. Most of you will recall that this issue was heard before congressional committees very thoroughly several years ago. Since then, of course, we have adopted the Pick-Sloan plan which is progressing very satisfactorily. During recent weeks there has been a renewal of the drive to again bring the Missouri Valley Authority up for further consideration. This drive has apparently been spark-plugged by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and Senator MURRAY, of Montana. They and others are working actively to recruit support. They are also revising the old Missouri Valley Authority bill, so as to eliminate some of those provisions which have aroused the most criticism. As this is written, the new revised bill has not yet been introduced for consideration, although I have been advised informally of some of the proposed changes.

One of the changes which is rather interesting would give it a new name, the Missouri Valley Administration, rather than a Missouri Valley Authority. Obviously, this is a distinction without a difference. The important thing is not the title at the top of a bill, but the fine print underneath. If nothing else is changed, it will not be worth while to change the name of the proposed agency. If a Missouri Valley Administration would be good, a Missouri Valley Authority would have been just as good. If a Missouri Valley Authority would be bad, so would a Missouri Valley Administration, if nothing else is to be changed. Shakespeare reminded us many years ago that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Other changes in the old MVA proposal are also to be made. Apparently the new plan also provides a place for the Governors of the States, and would leave the construction job to the Army engineers and other existing agencies. Apparently other concessions are also to be made to the existing plan. I do not know in detail how far the changes will go. Perhaps when these changes in the proposed MVA are completed, we shall find that the MVA has come back to where the Pick-Sloan plan already is. Perhaps when the MVA has been given its "new look," it will be found that there is nothing much really new about the whole proposal except a reexamination of the existing program by a new board of men with a fresh outlook. Of course, there may be more of a change than that; as I said, the new proposal has not yet been reintroduced.

Before we take up this question in Congress again, I want to make one or two suggestions, drawn largely from our experience to date with the Pick-Sloan plan. I do not like to sound unsympathetic to the efforts of sincere men to improve on our present program, whether those proposals have the name of an MVA or something else. It might easily be worth while to have a fresh engineering survey of the present plan. I don't want to approach a new proposal in a spirit of antagonism to it, merely because it sounds like another addition to the Washington alphabetical soup. Certainly we shall have to make changes in the administrative machinery from time to time. No system of government organization ever was perfect; they can all be improved; we might as well admit that frankly.

In any talk about changing or improving our present Pick-Sloan plan, it is worth while to remind ourselves of a few fundamentals which, I feel, we should adhere to firmly. First of these is the supremacy of the water laws of the States in which the development takes place. I will remind you of the existing controversy regarding the diversion of the waters of one river into the watershed of another, as contemplated by the plan of the Bureau of Reclamation for the Lower Platte. Regardless of what the Reclamation Bureau may plan for the Lower Platte, under the present Federal reclamation laws State law will still be supreme. There will be no diversion of water from one river into the watershed of another, unless the State legislature says there may. Another example is the controversy as regards the water rights of the water users. Federal policies should and must fit in with State water laws. I do not believe this country has moved so far toward centralization that we can afford to have Washington write our water laws for each State.

Of equal importance fundamentally is the position of the governors of the States affected in determining policy on the development. At present, the States through their governors are represented directly on the interagency committee. I do not want to see the governors of the States shunted into a position where they could do nothing but advise an all-powerful board holding long-term appointments from Washington.

Recurring again to our present system, a series of hearings has just been conducted on the Bureau's proposals for the Lower Platte. At those hearings every interested organization and individual has had an opportunity to present his views, to criticize the proposals, and to present counter-proposals. The whole program has received a thorough airing, and the comments of interested citizens will without doubt be given full consideration by the governor when he presents his views as the representative of the people of this State. Under any system, we certainly want to retain as much local autonomy as possible.

One other point I want to mention, and I feel it is very important. That is the congressional control over both the policies followed and the funds spent, through detailed basic legislation written by the legislative committees, and through the annual review of operations and of the need for funds by the Appropriations Committees. Without that, I do not see how you can have any real local control over the progress of construction and operation. I have had a little personal experience with that problem, in which you might be interested.

Some of you may be aware that I was the author of the Government Corporation Control Act, which for the first time required all Government corporations to secure their charters from Congress, to accept limitations on their authority based on the authorizing language written into their enabling acts by Congress, and to come before the Appropriations Committees of Congress each year with a full picture of their past financial operations and their plans for the future. That act covered the Tennessee Valley Authority, as well as other semi-independent Government corporations and agencies. At the time that legislation was being prepared, the only agency that gave us any real trouble was the TVA. Practically all the others were perfectly willing to accept whatever limitations Congress felt it desirable to impose. Only the TVA wanted to be different, to continue to frame its own policies and to spend Government money as it saw fit, without answering to anyone. Despite that opposition, I am glad to say that it was possible to pass the bill in a very satisfactory form. Since its enactment, it has been widely commended by outstanding authorities as a notable step forward in budget procedure.

That point is not mentioned with any intention of criticizing the TVA or its present methods of operation. It simply illustrates the danger of letting any agency get too far away from control by the people or their elected representatives. If we are to keep our representative democracy, we must continue to respect the authority and responsibility of our National Legislature, the Congress.

Other points of importance might be mentioned, but I have given about four of the more important ones. I believe it may be in order for me to give this frank warning to those who advocate sweeping changes in our present program. Any proposal which does not adequately recognize the rights and interests of the people affected and the proper functions of their State legislatures, of their governors, and of the Congress, has precious little chance of receiving support from the people of this Missouri River Basin. Construction on the basis of the Pick-Sloan plan is already proceeding satisfactorily. Constructive changes are always in order, but proposals to take away our rights are not.

While I am talking here frankly to friends of the present program, I might just drop you this hint, parenthetically. So long as the Pick-Sloan plan moves forward rapidly and successfully, there is very little likelihood of any fundamental change in the administrative framework. To those of you who believe strongly in the Pick-Sloan plan, I will say that it is up to you to make it work. You all know that the plan represents to some extent a reconciliation of divergent interests—navigation, power, irrigation, etc. The plan has been formally adopted by Congress and is being rapidly developed. Appropriations have, by and large, been generous, and we shall be receiving tremendous benefits from it within a reasonable time. Even so, we have had to contend all along with snipers, those who didn't like this or didn't like that about the program. Certainly much of this type of criticism is sincere, but some of it undoubtedly comes from those who would like to scuttle the plan entirely. Some of the sponsors of the new MVA seem willing to take advantage of this feeling, where it exists, and to try to mobilize the disgruntled ones behind their new dream picture called MVA.

A banana soon gets skinned after it leaves the bunch. The flood-control, irrigation, soil-conservation, navigation, and power-development interests are now united in the valley. All of these groups have been working together to date, and we are making the plan a success by such cooperation. There are those who, like the ancient Romans, would divide and conquer. Let us watch out for them.

It has been a real pleasure to be here with you and talk to you. I hope you all feel that you are free to write me or visit me and talk to me about these questions at any time. I have stated before that I am for the Pick-Sloan plan with all my heart. While I see no need for any fundamental changes, still I am certainly not dogmatic about retaining every comma in it. I am always willing to discuss necessary and desirable changes. That is still my position.

Thank you.

Address by William M. Boyle, Jr., Before Truman Victory Dinner at Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by William M. Boyle, Jr., assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the Truman victory dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on December 7, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, fellow Democrats, it sure is good to be home.

Before I left Washington the President asked me to deliver a message to you. He regrets very much that he cannot be present here tonight.

He asked me to extend his greetings to you and to extend to each of you neighbors and friends his sincere thanks for your faith and support.

I can tell you that all during the campaign, whenever President Truman spoke of Missouri, his face lighted up with pleasure. As he went all over the country, waging the most courageous and most remarkable of all political campaigns, I know that he was sustained by the thought that he had the support of his homefolks—by the thought that you who knew him best trusted him most.

And the people of Missouri did not let him down.

While the President has taken his victory with a spirit of humility, I know everyone will understand that there were many things about the election that have given him great pleasure. And I think that nothing has given him more pleasure than the splendid majorities you gave him right here at home.

I am overwhelmed by a feeling of inadequacy in finding words to express the sentiments that I know are in the hearts and minds of President Truman's friends who are present here and who are better able than I am to describe the great stature of our most distinguished friend and neighbor.

The Democratic victory of November 2 was above all else a personal tribute to Harry Truman. I believe that the Democratic Party was revitalized and rebuilt into an effective enthusiastic functioning organization on election day by the fighting campaign that he waged.

I believe that the foundation of the Democratic Party is sounder and stronger today than it has been in the past 20 years and I believe that this foundation rests squarely on the sturdy shoulders of our President.

Of course, the election was a sweeping endorsement of the Democratic Party, its platform, its record, its candidates all over the country; but it all depended on Harry Truman's personal leadership.

True—his leadership was supported by many men and women. I know the President was always heartened and encouraged by the magnificent support given him by his old friend and teammate, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, one of the outstanding Americans of our time.

Then—there were the millions of men and women all over this country who had an unwavering faith and confidence in President Truman. Then—there were the Democratic Party leaders and workers in every State, county, city, town, ward, and precinct—loyal people like those present here. There was great help given by organized labor—by farmers who realized that President Truman was their best friend. Then there were the candidates, Truman, Barkley, Smith, Blair, Irving, Bolling, and all the others that individually and collectively made up the finest slate of candidates ever presented for approval of the voters of America.

Then there were the leaders and workers on the district, county, and State committees.

And those on the Democratic National Committee, led by Chairman J. HOWARD MCGRATH.

I particularly want to pay due tribute to Matthew J. Connelly, President Truman's faithful, loyal, and efficient secretary; to Charlie Ross, Clark Clifford, Charles Murphy, and to all the others of the Presidential staff.

These are the men I worked with and I know something about the work they did.

They worked on a 24-hour schedule. Those on the train kept in touch with us constantly at national headquarters and at the White House by telephone and wireless telegraph.

We in Washington were in personal contact with the Democratic leaders in every State where the President was scheduled to appear. In that way we were able to keep the President informed as to the issues of most interest to the people.

For my own part the only credit that I claim is loyalty to President Truman and to the Democratic ideals and to the Democratic Party that he leads. I am happy and proud to have had the opportunity to labor in his service.

Now, I'll tell you who really did more than anybody else to help the President win the election. Everywhere he went Mrs. Truman and Margaret went with him. The people saw the President and liked him. They saw Mrs. Truman and liked her. They saw Margaret and liked her. And when they voted for Truman they voted for the whole family. It was a fine choice, too.

But again I say that over, above, and beyond all of us there was always the smiling, courageous, fighting figure of Harry Truman.

This is one of the happiest moments of my life. I guess you all know which was the happiest—the morning of last November 3d right here in the Muehlebach.

But tonight is almost as great an occasion because we have met here to celebrate the victory of a very great American in one of the most important elections in our history.

Now, I am not much at writing history.

But let me say one thing: It is a source of great personal pride with me to have had the privilege of serving with all of the people in helping a man like Harry Truman make the kind of history he made in this last campaign—when everybody said that he did not have a chance—when the newspapers agreed that he was a "gone goose"—and when the columnists and the commentators announced that the election was in the bag for Dewey and Warren and the Republican party.

A minute ago I said "a man like Harry Truman." Now, I stop and ask myself what kind of a man our leader is.

There is no doubt in my mind—and there can be no doubt in your mind—that he is worthy to stand in the ranks of our greatest Presidents.

Let me tell you what I see in this man whom we have chosen to lead us at this turning point in the history of mankind.

In periods of crisis, America has always been fortunate in having the right man for President:

Washington and Jefferson,
Lincoln and Jackson,
Wilson and Roosevelt,
and now, Truman.

Future historians will list these men as the seven greatest Presidents to this time in American history. If Harry Truman were present here tonight he would be the first to protest against calling him one of the seven greatest Presidents. But his modesty and humility only add to his stature.

I have said that he had shown that he belongs in the ranks of our greatest Presidents. Let me try to spell that out.

George Washington?

Harry Truman has much of the largeness of soul and the calm faith that carried Washington through the hard years to prosperity and peace for America.

Thomas Jefferson?

Harry Truman shares Jefferson's unfaltering faith in the average American and Jefferson's unequaled willingness to let the people make their own decisions and determine their own destiny.

Andrew Jackson?

Well, we all know that Andy Jackson was a fighter—a fighter for the people—a man who challenged the gluttons of privilege in his day and age, and who built the Democratic Party into what it has again become—a great middle-of-the-road party of farmers and industry workers, small business and professional men—the party of all the people. Harry Truman is that kind of fighter.

Like Abraham Lincoln, our President is a man of uncompromising integrity—a man of common sense—humble and reverent.

And like Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman believes in political leadership for the people by the Democratic Party. Like them, he is a good party leader who is President of all the people because he follows faithfully the principles of popular sovereignty and representative Government.

Like Wilson and Roosevelt, Harry Truman is not afraid to stand alone when he knows that he is right and to fight wholeheartedly for the things he believes to be right.

But there is more—much more—to our President, friend and neighbor than a list of great qualities and noble comparisons. There is something about him which we all—even the Republicans—like and love. We all feel that he is one of us. We know that there is no envy, hatred, malice or uncharitableness in him. He has given himself with all his heart and soul, to the service of all the people—rich and poor alike—without discrimination. It is this devotion to the people that has made him one of the great campaigners in American politics. The cause of the people has made him—not an orator—but something far greater—a speaker who can convince others by his sincerity and devotion to the truth.

And here's another thing we ought to remember. After he won, there was no anger and bitterness against our opponents or among them. It was as though even the Republicans realized that in Harry Truman the American people had chosen an honest advocate and a wise champion who would seek to bind up the Nation's political wounds and lead us forward to prosperity and peace.

As I said a little earlier. it is an honor to work with such a man and I am deeply proud to have worked with the devoted band of those who did not forget that they were Democrats before the votes were counted.

It is an honor. It is also a great responsibility to have taken part in imposing upon such a man four more years of hard and often thankless servitude in the White House.

We did not fight this election just to keep Truman's job for him. We would all far rather have had him here with us. We fought to keep the Presidency of the United States for the American people. We fought to prevent special interests from taking over the Government of the United States.

That justified what we did when we told Harry Truman to go back to Washington and to stay there and work for us.

I think the history writers will agree that the election of 1948 is one of the three most important elections in American history, and perhaps the most important of them all.

Certainly, the only two others that bear comparison with 1948 are Jefferson's election in 1800, and Lincoln's in 1860.

Jefferson gave the country, under the Democratic Party, a firm political foundation on which 40 years of peace and progress were built.

Lincoln carried the burden and the tragedy of the Civil War.

Now, thanks to Harry S. Truman, of Independence, Mo., by the will of God and the votes of the American people we once more can build solidly and wisely for our future.

We can build for the future because we know—and the world knows—that 1948 marked the beginning of another long and productive tenure of power by the American democracy.

We know what are the goals that we seek to attain.

We seek independent security, public welfare, and respect for human rights at home.

And we seek honorable peace, national security, and world stability abroad.

The peoples of the world are with the American people in these goals. And thanks to the courage and convictions of the modest, unassuming man whom we honor tonight, the peoples of the world now realize that we can attain them.

If Truman's administration must be given a nickname, it should be called the Era of Common Sense. Common sense is so much appreciated in public life because it is so uncommonly found. Truman has it—he always has had it—he always will have it.

As to courage, Truman proved his physical courage in World War I. He has proved his spiritual courage by his daily life in following the Golden Rule. He has proved his mental courage and capacity by mastering the multitude of figures and details in the conduct of the world's biggest business—the Government of the United States of America.

In this connection the newspapers last week carried a picture of President Truman carrying his brief case across Pennsylvania Avenue from the temporary residence at Blair House to the White House office. That brief case contained a large number of papers and official documents full of facts and figures which President Truman had read and mastered. It is this type of mental courage, devotion to duty, and remarkable memory which enables him to astound the heads of the Government departments, generals, admirals, and world diplomats with his grasp of the many subjects involved in the daily conduct of this gigantic enterprise.

We folks here in Jackson County were fortunate enough to have shared a truly wonderful experience in knowing Harry Truman's mother. It was my pleasure and privilege to know her quite well through the years of my close association with Harry Truman. Having known that remarkable woman, I can see in her son the reflection of her strength and character and of her belief in the right and of her unwavering faith in God. I know that in many of the decisions that the President is called upon to make he asks himself "What would my mother think of this?"

I have been asked to mention some of the human-interest background of the campaign. The most interesting thing to me and, as it turned out, the most important, was what President Truman told me at the very beginning of the campaign. He said, "Bill, we're going to win because we are right and they are wrong."

The Republicans were defeated in two of their main purposes, the plan of which began to appear evident as early as last February.

First, a concerted effort to discredit the President was begun through public relations, commentators, and columnists.

Second, propaganda was spread that Truman could not win. That propaganda may have fooled the Republican politicians but it failed in its purpose to fool the American people.

By daily contacts with Democratic leaders throughout every State, which were accelerated during the last few weeks of the campaign, and especially on election day, I knew that we had an enthusiastic, hard-working Democratic organization, Nation-wide in extent, built up and revitalized by the fighting campaign of President Truman. On election day our people were enthusiastic and encouraged and they came through with the hard work that was necessary to win.

I again want to pay tribute to the workers and leaders who participated in this campaign. I had personal experience working with most of them in the 1944 campaign and I want to say that the reports turned in by these leaders and workers over every part of the country were accurate to an uncanny degree, and I so reported to the President. It was on such information obtained personally and directly from the leaders in every State that we based our calculations and our expectations of victory.

A large number of defeated candidates, disappointed newspapers, and discredited columnists, commentators, and pollsters profess to be astonished by the victory. They call it a miracle. There is a much more simple explanation which can be stated in one word, "faith."

President Truman never lost faith in the American people and the American people never lost faith in him.

The pollsters were talking while they should have been listening. They should have listened to the people as the President and those in his party did on the most extensive Presidential campaign in American political history—about 350 stops on tours exceeding 32,000 miles.

Will Rogers said that he never met a man he didn't like. I say that Harry Truman never met a man who didn't like him at first sight and who didn't trust him when they got to know each other. The problem which had to be solved in this campaign, therefore, was to get President Truman together with the greatest possible number of Americans over the widest possible area of the country. There was no doubt that once Harry S. Truman and John Q. Public got together, they would like each other and trust each other.

Our belief that the Democrats could win crystallized into a firm conviction that they would win after the President made his fighting speech at the Philadelphia convention and received a tumultuous ovation from the delegates. Shortly after the convention we marked out on the map every State carried by Hoover in 1932, Landon in 1936, Willkie in 1940, and Dewey in 1944. We tentatively conceded those States together with three Dixiecrat States: Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina. We found that President Truman could lose all of the 193 electoral votes represented by that list of States and still have 338 electoral votes left, or 72 votes more than the 266 necessary to win.

After accompanying the President on the first of the campaign tours, we began the formation of our forecast which finally came very close to predicting the States which would go Democratic. Finally on October 31 we closed the forecast. We included California, Illinois, and even Iowa, and, believe it or not, Ohio, in the Truman-Barkley column. In fact, the only State which upset an otherwise perfect score was Maryland, where we had expected a Truman majority.

Thus it was with unbounded elation, but certainly without astonishment, that I had the greatest thrill of my life in being the man who personally informed the President that Governor Dewey had conceded the election. This took place at 10:15 a. m. central standard time, Wednesday, November 3, in the Presidential suite of this hotel where, with Matt Connelly and others, we had spent a 48-hour vigil in hundreds of telephone conversations to Democratic leaders throughout the country.

Let me say one final word about the President's schedule. It would have killed an ordinary man. As a matter of fact, he did almost wear out all of his staff. But President Truman was just as chipper and in as good physical condition at the end of the campaign as when he started. He has heart and stamina.

And when it was all over the same newsmen who had been jeering finally agreed that our campaign was more carefully planned, more carefully thought out, than that of our opponents.

But in the aggregate it was President Truman in the greatest campaign in history, who brought about the great Democratic victory.

The campaign was fundamentally based on his conviction that if the people were told the truth they would understand and do the right thing.

He told the people the truth.

They did understand.

And they did the right thing.

The election now lies behind us. The factors which were vital in the days leading up to November 2 are now history.

History, with the exception of the pledges which were made by the President to the voters of the United States.

One of the vital reasons for the President's election was the bold affirmative program which he advanced as the program of the Democratic Party.

That program must be carried out. There can be no evasion of responsibility. There will be no failure to act, for President Truman will act. And the great mass of people in the Democratic Party across the Nation will back him up in the future as they have in the past.

With your support, with the support of organized democracy behind him and the Democratic Eighty-first Congress we will go forward with a program of progressive liberalism.

But we cannot relax in our fight.

The election didn't win it.

It merely gave us the opportunity to carry on.

We will carry on.

There is just one thought I should like to leave with you in conclusion. You can usually judge a man by his friends. I would like to say that I have never known or worked with a more loyal, unselfish, and competent group than the men and women who worked and fought to help the President win his battle for the American people. They were a wonderful team and they were politically effective, because we had a great captain and the right cause and we knew that, with that combination, we could not and must not fail.

We did not fail you—just as our President did not fail you—and I cannot help but believe that this was the work of more than human hands and plans. I think it was because with Harry Truman, we were the agents—the human agents of the workings of providence and the will of Almighty God.

Curbing the Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Curbing the Octopus," which I delivered over the Mutual Network on February 15.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak to you tonight on the subject Curbing the Octopus. And I refer to the octopus which sprawls over governmental agencies and which has grown in costs of Government, in overlapping of duties and operations, and thereby built up a force of employees, which is the greatest in our history, with a cost that is staggering, when one becomes aware of its scope and magnitude.

Every so often in past decades, realizing the dangers involved, men have sought to remedy the situation but never with much success.

Right now we have the best brains in the country tackling the proposition and the matter is before Congress.

Let me give you some facts.

We are all conscious, as Americans, that our Government is threatening to outgrow us. In 20 short years it has increased tenfold in size and cost. It employs 2,100,000 people—more than the population of Philadelphia, our third largest city. It consists of 1,816 departments, boards, bureaus, agencies, services, administrations, commissions, corporations, and other subdivisions.

Some of these agencies are bigger than the whole Government was 20 years ago. And the total cost of all agencies has risen from $4,000,000,000 a year to $42,000,000,000 in 20 years. This is one-fifth of the national income—one dollar in five of all the wealth which Americans, as citizens and workers, produce. And it means a burden of debt, equal to about $7,500 per average family. This is not a vague abstraction. This is a real debt, which we, as Americans, have promised to pay. It is a mortgage on our future as a Nation.

Now it is hardly necessary to argue the wisdom of having a big Government. Depression, war, new needs for defense, and vast responsibilities in world affairs, have placed our Government on a wholly new footing. We expect a great deal of Government too. We all want military protection, postal deliveries and other basic services. And most of us want special services of some sort as well.

But there comes a certain point at which any government can become, through sheer magnitude, a threat to the national welfare. Its cost can break down the productivity of its economic machine.

The Government has many huge agencies and they all have their faults. Taken together they can literally break us, unless they are well-managed in the public interest. There is more, much more, than mere billions at stake in this. An over-bearing bureaucracy is a definite menace to our very freedom. I have lived in and with Government for many years, and I believe that the vast majority of Government employees, legislators, and officials realize this danger, and would like to do something about it.

At any rate, it was an act of Congress which brought the Hoover Commission into being. In July 1947, by unanimous vote of both House and Senate, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was created, and it was assigned the task of seeking ways of streamlining the Government, and putting it on a more businesslike basis.

The Commission was conceived on a high plane. It was set up on a bi-partisan basis, with 6 of its 12 members from each major party. Four members each were chosen by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the United States. It was President Truman who chose Mr. Hoover who, in turn, was promptly named chairman by the group. Its members are: Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Vice Chairman; Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont; Congressman Clarence Brown of Ohio; President Arthur S. Flemming of Ohio Wesleyan University; Secretary of Defense James Forrestal; the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy; Senator John L. McClellan; the Honorable Carter Manasco, of Alabama; the Honorable George H. Meade, of Dayton, Ohio; Prof. James K. Pollock, of the University of Michigan; and former Assistant United States Attorney General, James Rowe, Jr.

The names alone inspire our confidence. The choice of Mr. Hoover as chairman, was, of course, superb. He knows and understands the problems of Government. As our only living former President, he has carried the crushing administrative burden, which every President must bear. Above all, his long record of unselfish public service has won the trust and admiration of millions throughout the world. Mr. Hoover has always answered the call to serve, whether it be in Government, in charity, or in the broad field of world famine relief. For decades he has given greatly of his time, effort, and high abilities—asking, literally, nothing for himself.

When the Hoover Commission was formed, it created 24 research task forces to dig deeply into the facts about our Government. Twenty-four of these task forces were formed. Each studied some special topic such as the post office, the armed services, the State Department, agriculture, and the like. The members of the task forces were eminent experts in their field. They included some 300 outstanding persons in all. Among them are 2 former Cabinet officers, 13 former Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of Government departments, 3 former United States Senators, 5 former governors of States, 10 major university presidents, and many executives with special experience in business.

The task forces worked for periods from 10 to 14 months. They brought back no less than 2,000,000 words of facts and figures and presented the Commission with the most comprehensive study of Government in all history, hammering out a broad pattern for an orderly, effective, well-run Government. Last Monday the first of the Commission's official reports was delivered to Congress.

Before we consider the contents of the Commission's report, I must ask you to bear in mind the constructive spirit of the Commission's approach to its task. It is not interested in superficial witch-hunting. It is not out to rip, slash, tear, or abolish the agencies of Government, blindly or thoughtlessly. As it went along it found good work being done, good services being performed. But as the evidence came in, it found also that endless confusion has resulted from the pell-mell growth of Government. It found waste of money and waste of human effort. And it was forced to conclude—I quote:

"The Nation is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch. It has found that great improvements can be made in the effectiveness with which the Government can serve the people, if its organization and administration is overhauled."

The report discloses that aside from multiplicity and overlapping of many agencies, their officials are enmeshed by thousands of strands of red tape, accumulated by legislative and executive action over half a century, which paralyzes the efforts of the best of them.

As a result of this lack of organization, the Commission and its task forces have found antiquated methods in practice throughout the Government. For example, the paperwork involved in processing a Government purchase order costs more than $10 per order, yet half of the 3,000,000 purchase orders which the civilian branches of the Government execute are for items costing less than $10. In other words, on a purchase of a $1 item the cost of purchase may be 10 times its worth. Elsewhere it was found that the Government today has goods in storage, whose total value is estimated at $27,000,000,000, although no one agency or department has all facts about this huge inventory of supplies. Elsewhere it was found that the cost of maintaining a single filing cabinet could be cut $29 a year to $2.50 a year simply by moving it to a cheaper container in less expensive storage space. The Government maintains 18,000,000 cubic feet of records and documents—enough to fill six Pentagon buildings.

But those are minor items. They apply to the so-called housekeeping functions of Government. They need straightening out, of course, and millions could be saved by simply installing better methods. But consider the waste, high into the billions, that can come about through duplication of effort and competition among bureaus.

Some of the early research findings indicate what can be accomplished in better government, if the Nation really wants it. Just the other day, therefore, two congressional committees called on Mr. Hoover to ask his views as to the best method to proceed.

Mr. Hoover told the Senate committee that the necessary first step in reorganizaion was the passage of the bill which would give President Truman a free hand in reshaping the agencies under his direction. As things stand, the President has approximately 65 major departments and agencies reporting directly to him. If he gave but 1 hour of his time per week to each of these agencies he would have no time left for the broad responsibilities of his office. Mr. Hoover has therefore suggested that, through this bill, the President be given the authority to regroup these agencies so that there will be only 20 or 22 operating heads reporting directly to him, and making direct claims on his time.

It seems to me to be a very sensible plan. It would reduce what is called in business the span of authority, so that the responsible executive can maintain a line of authority and responsibility, and at the same time have time for matters of broad policy. It would not in any sense be a dictatorship or give the President any more authority than he needs to do his job properly.

This bill, known as the Reorganization Act of 1949, deserves the full support of every citizen. It should pass Congress without amendment.

But as Hamlet said, "Aye, there's the rub." Reorganization bills have been passed before. But each time they were loaded with so many exemptions that they were practically useless. One bureau or agency after another would step forward and say, in effect, "It is fine to reorganize the rest of the Government, but please have it stated in the bill that my bureau is not to be touched or changed in any way."

One by one, under pressure, exemptions would be made, until finally they would number as many as 30—enough to make impossible any real reorganization of the Government. The sad fact of the matter is that the individual heads of Government agen-

cies usually think that their function and their own little corner of the Government is being very efficiently and economically performed. This is human and natural. Resistance to change is not a monopoly of civil servants by any means—I have seen it operate many times in private industry.

The vital fact remains that resistance to change is the very thing we have got to overcome. Exemptions must not be written into this bill. As Mr. Hoover said in the hearings, the whole effectiveness of the reorganization bill can be destroyed by little grasshopper bites of exemptions here and exemptions there. Many agencies and bureaus have already begun to work to get exemptions concerning themselves written into the reorganization bill. Some of them are putting a great deal of pressure on our legislators now. One hesitates to say that any Government agency is maintaining a lobby, for that is supposed to be against the law. The fact remains, however, that some of these agencies have a suspiciously large number of very active friends working in their behalf.

No Government bureau should consider its operations perfect, or itself above reproach. Yet tremendous pressure is being put upon the Members of Congress by the friends of various agencies. Floods of telegrams are being received by individual Members of Congress, demanding that their particular agency be exempted from the Reorganization Act. These telegrams come from associations and groups of people with personal interests in special areas. They fail to see the over-all picture clearly or, I feel sure, they would be as eager as anyone else to put the entire Government on a businesslike footing.

There is a great similarity among all these telegrams that are being received and the arguments they set forth are very much the same.

There is no one to speak out for the individual American taxpayer against the strident demands of the pressure groups, who insist that their favorite bureaus and agencies be exempted from reorganization. Yet, unless reorganization is effectively accomplished, the present governmental set-up will continue to cost the taxpayer billions in unnecessary expenditures. These billions literally mean dollars out of your pockets. You pay taxes whether you are rich or poor. Reorganization of the Government is in your interest.

The present pay roll of the Government runs about $6,500,000,000 a year. Competent men figure that, if this reorganization bill can become law, at least $3,000,000,000 can be saved annually. Much of this saving will come from avoidance of duplication of work, consolidation of agencies, and from greater efficiency.

I urge you, I challenge you, to write or wire your own Representatives in Congress and demand that the reorganization bill be adopted, without exemptions of any sort. Remind them that this is an urgent recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that the Commission was created by Congress itself, and further that President Truman is fully in concurrence. It is you, as a citizen, who in the last analysis will decide whether the United States Government is to be organized on a businesslike basis or left to flounder, as a huge octopus, a dangerous encumbrance on our economy. Millions and millions of people, acting on their own behalf, should make themselves heard above the voices of the pressure groups. This is your big chance—and it may be the last one—to insure lasting good government for the people of America, and to do something constructive toward reducing the cost of government. This has everything to do with our future freedom and prosperity. Once again, I urge you to tell your Representatives in Congress that you want the Reorganization Act of 1949 to be passed, without exemptions of any sort.

Let the people speak up in their own interests and demonstrate anew that government of the people, by the people, and for the people has not perished from the earth.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address in honor of Abraham Lincoln, delivered by our distinguished Republican colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], before the Lincoln Club of Denver, on February 12 last. The Members of the Senate, and others, will find the address very interesting and helpful in carrying forward our Government along the course so well marked by the immortal Lincoln.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Emerging from a humiliating defeat, we have been salving our wounds with recrimination. The catastrophe was so needless and the sense of personal guilt was so great in so many of us that we have been taking the natural escape of attributing our own faults to the other fellow.

I doubt whether there are many Republicans who would deny on honor that the most of their present wisdom is the result of backsight and, more important, who would state on honor that they did everything within their personal power to help the party win last November.

The angry outbursts have perhaps served a wholesome purpose. But, I suggest, that it is time to get off of the psychologist's couch. We have all purged ourselves of guilt by its transference to those equally guilty.

The mandate to be derived from the last election was to the Republican Party, not to the opposition. It was to get the lead out of our shoes, to come alive, to wake up, to give the people who would like to support us and have not done so a campaign based on accomplishment, issues, and constructive purposes.

To the shiverers, to those who do not have the power of rebound, to those who whine under the shock of adversity, who have no appetite for conflict, we say step aside and clear the road for those who have reshouldered the pack and are moving into battle.

We must never again allow the accomplishments of the Republican Party, current, recent, or historic, to go unexplained and undefended.

In 1946 we won our first important victory since before 1932. We captured the Congress on a definite program which was good for this country, and we shall capture the Congress in 1950 in exactly the same way.

In the campaign of 1946 we promised to reduce taxes and did so.

We promised to balance the budget and did so.

We promised to end the OPA regimentations of our daily lives and did so.

We promised to stay the headlong rush at Washington toward national socialism and did so.

We promised to do all in our power to drive Communists and their stooges out of the executive department of the Government and did so.

We promised to improve the Wagner Labor Relations Act and did so. We promised to make corrections and further improvements as indicated by experience and we shall cooperate in doing so.

Those pledges were in response to clamorous public demand for action along those lines. We were in step with the people. We did what they wanted us to do. And yet we placidly allowed ourselves to be reviled out of credit for those and other outstanding accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress.

Instead of dominating the campaign with confidence from successful performance we asked for a man's job without revealing the tested muscles which were there to back up the ambition.

All over this country there is a powerful ferment working for the reactivation of our party. This is evident from the enthusiastic interest in our Lincoln Day meetings.

We see it in the precincts and counties where aggressive steps are being taken to prevent repetition of the errors of the last campaign.

What would we do with a reactivated organization? In figuring what we are going to do, we necessarily eliminate that which we should not do.

Coming to it bluntly. There are Republicans who are already addling their brains with little schemes for the Presidential race 4 years from now.

Let me make this respectful suggestion. No one can say today what the Presidential issues will be four years from now, or, with certainty, who will be the candidates four years from now, or who among the candidates four years from now, will be best fitted to sustain the issues of that day and lead us to victory.

Surely these obvious facts dictate that in the best interests of our party we concentrate on the immediate business at hand. This cannot stand dissipation of energy, it cannot afford bleeding or distortion by being subordinated to more remote and now unpredictable objectives.

The business at hand is to restore to Republican control our courthouses, our statehouses, and the Congress of the United States in 1950.

Here we have an objective which is achievable and on which we can unite and that fight will soon be upon us. Let us put everything that we have into the job of 1950 and allow the operation of time, with its revelation of now shrouded events, an opportunity to illuminate the tasks of 1952.

I have been talking about a reactivated organization with which to win in 1950, but I would not recommend the effort merely to aid in winning at all costs.

We hear sly voices which would insinuate that doctrine into our party. We are asked to accept, as an end sufficient to itself, imitation and outbidding of the opposition for the people's favor with the people's money.

The answer on this day of remembrance of Lincoln and everyday while we shall live should be that it is our undeviating moral and political purpose to operate our organization so that it may help to save this country, not to destroy it.

The answer of a Republican who loves his country is that he would rather see his party go out of existence than to shrink from drawing and bravely fighting the real issue. This in ultimate terms is, Shall be have sound progressive Republican government with freedom for all or shall we have the national socialism offered by the opposition

with its liberty-destroying insolvencies and regimentations?

Here we should refuse to temper our actions with any kind of opportunism. We should reaffirm our basic article of faith that the right when fully disclosed will prevail and the party standing for the right will receive the confidence of the people.

If debauchery of public opinion ever proceeds to a point where this principle no longer has power enough to surmount temporary befuddlement, then citizenship in this country shall have lost its precious values and the serf's bleak horizons shall bound our further progress.

The answer to the "win at all costs" advocates is that it is not our party's purpose and it will not be its shameful fate to put a helping hand on a plunging knife into the liberties of our people.

We do not want our party to play a Kerensky prelude for the advent of any form of totalitarianism. We do not want our party to achieve victory so that it may lend morbid dignity at the burial of our country.

Last June at Philadelphia, a white-haired man, now in his seventies, an earlier target for political calumnies almost as vile as those heaped on Lincoln in his lifetime, and who happily has outlived them to enjoy again the respect and affection of his countrymen, stood before the Republican Convention and offered advice which by its simple, eloquent sincerity brought into that hall the brooding presence of the Emancipator. The speaker was Herbert Hoover. In closing his remarks to the convention he said:

"If you will calculate what will please this or that little segment of our population, and satisfy this or that pressure group or sectional interest, you will be betraying your opportunity and tragically missing the call of your time. If you temporize with collectivism, you will stimulate its growth and the defeat of free men. If, on the other hand, as a mature and inspired political party you face the truth that we are in a critical battle to safeguard our Nation and civilization which, under God, have brought to us a life of liberty, then you will be guided in every step to restore the foundations of faith, of morals, and of right thinking. If you choose your leadership with full recognition that only those can lead you who believe in your ideals, who seek not only victory but the opportunity to serve the right, then you will issue from this hall a clarion call, in as pure a note, in as full a tone as that call to arms which your political ancestors issued at Ripon, Wis., when this party was born to make all men free. And so I bespeak to you tonight to make yourselves worthy of the victory."

To that let us say "Amen" and "Glory be to God."

What right have we to claim a special interest in the preservation and advancement of human liberty? The answer is by our works from the inception of our party to the present day. And the need for this special interest is found in the works of the opposition.

When Lincoln, our first great leader, freed the slaves our party received the reason for its being and for its ceaseless devotion from that day to this to the cause of human freedom wherever the issue has manifested itself.

Let us take a brief look at some of the highlights of the record. Under national policies established by the Republican Party in all of the territory that came to us as a result of our victory over Spain which made us a world power, we ended the oppressions which had shocked the conscience of mankind and set the liberated on the road to freedom.

In contrast, at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, leaders of the executive department of this Government entered into agreements, some of them secret, and, I emphasize without Republican participation or approval, which put the Communists in position in Poland, in the Baltic regions, in eastern Germany, in the Balkans, and in China to subject to their murderously perverse brand of freedoms hundreds of millions of human beings including the peoples of friendly and Allied nations. And put the Communists in position to menace the rest of the world.

Even the servants of God have not been spared.

It was Republican Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, with the support of his party, who finally prevailed upon the executive department of this Government to stand against further enslavement of the peoples and the beaten-down remnants of civilization in western Europe and to do the things necessary to make our stand effective.

Evidence pops up from time to time that the opposition's conversion is an uneasy one. We see indications of its abandonment of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs.

That which happened to Poland, to eastern Germany, to the satellite Balkan countries, to Baltic nations, and to China resulted from face-to-face conferences with Stalin.

And charting Stalin's progress at those face-to-face meetings there is considerable ground for the fear which is felt by many of our citizens that one more of them and the whole world will have been delivered to communism.

Republican offers of cooperation to take the "stitch in time" in China were rejected by the same administration. Indeed, those offers could not have been accepted because the executive department of this Government, to its everlasting shame, had actually sent emissaries to pressure Chiang Kai-shek into admitting communism into the Chinese Government.

This Nation under Republican government ended the freedom-stultifying overlordships of foreign countries in China by putting into effect the open door.

The open door remained open until it was slammed shut by Communist Russia.

The executive department of this Government put Communist Russia in position to do this and to conquer our ally and friend.

And here at home it is equally easy to judge between the parties to determine which is the most dependable guardian of human freedom by examining some of the measures bearing the opposition's hallmark and which have received its most fervent supporting activity. And I add the most resolute opposition of Republican Members of Congress.

It is not necessary to go back very far. Leaders of the opposition tried to destroy the freedom of the Supreme Court by packing it. They tried to destroy the freedom of Congress by purging it.

Since the war they asked and fought for a law that would have put striking workers in the Army so as to force them to work with bayonets at their backs.

Right now they are trying to destroy the freeman's right to a hearing by steam rollering bills through their heavily packed committees of Congress.

Right now they wish to deprive the Congress of its lawmaking power by claiming for the President the inherent right, reeking of the divine right of kings, to the use of injunctions in labor disputes.

Right now they are proposing taxes and expenditures of such fantastic magnitude that if authorized there would be little left of the citizen's freedom, already gravely enfeebled, to control his own pocketbook.

Right now the cheap stuffing of the fraudulent package which they sold to the people last November is breaking out all over the place.

Lacking a sense of responsibility, everything was promised to everybody and they cannot make good.

They have no integrated program and, because of the deep divisions in their own ranks which are the same now as they were before the election, they cannot make one.

They are actually running filibusters against each other and against their own party programs.

Out of the inspiration of a pigeon bespattered convention last summer they called us into a special session to enact the Truman program in 15 days. At the end of the first 15 days of this, their own Eighty-first Congress, they had done nothing but raise the President's salary.

The principal purpose of that special session, so it was claimed, was to reimpose the OPA controls to prevent further inflation. What did they do about that? Just a day or two before I left Washington to come home, their own Eighty-first Congress—you put your own label on it—extended the voluntary control system passed by the Eightieth Republican Congress.

They were going to repeal outright and right away the Taft-Hartley Act. Although in control of Congress they haven't got the votes to do it, and are in heated disputes with each other as to the foxiest way to reenact the most of it while appearing to repeal it.

We have had enough New Deals. We are sickening of square deals. What we need is an honest deal from a fresh pack by honest dealers.

As a minority party we are performing our proper function. We will try to improve that which if improved would be worth saving. We shall try to kill everything that is hopelessly bad. We shall resist all claimed mandates to make either a clown or a tyrant out of our Federal Government. We shall try to bring every measure into harmony with the preservation of human freedom. Out of our experiences to come and out of those already had we shall develop constructive programs for 1952.

If any of my listeners are clinging to their melancholies of last November 3, cheer up, for already it is becoming clear that 1950 will give us a thumping repeat of 1946.

We all have a sharp understanding of the loss of human dignity and freedom associated with the most lurid and degenerate aspects of totalitarian government such as the banishments, the purges, the studied techniques of terror, the torturings, the concentration camps, the slave labor, the forced mass migrations of peoples from their homes to strange and inhospitable lands.

But we miss the point if we do not keep this in mind: These horrible dramas are the final aggravated symptoms of stealthy, inch-by-inching encroachments on individual freedom which are apt to escape timely observation and correction because of false propaganda and temporary belly and pocketbook benefits.

Those who set up our Government had the whole course of recorded history before them and they chose a system for us so balanced in power between the States and the Federal Government and between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government which, barring our own foolishness, will keep us free.

The Republican Party believes in that system. We recognize that the final and firmest assurance of individual freedom is not to be found in Washington bureaucracy but rather in our city halls, our courthouses, and State capitols. This, for the easily understood reason, that at the city halls, courthouses, and State capitols the individual has the direct, on-the-ground opportunity for influencing the enactment or defeat of proposed measures which would affect his pocketbook, his mode of life, where and how he wants to live, what he wants to do, and where and under what conditions he wants to do it.

We recognize that in Washington the Congress can legislate, but the enforcement, and a considerable part of the content of that to be enforced, is largely in the hands of tens of thousands of anonymous persons beyond the reach of the electorate. Therefore, we cannot look to those persons with assurance to protect our liberties at home, which in the last analysis is the only place where we can keep or lose them.

But this does not relegate the Federal Government to a static and sterile role. There is a vast field of service for advancing the national welfare and the national citizenship which is the inseparable companion of our State citizenship.

The power of Congress to legislate for the national welfare is not limited to conceptions bounded by conditions of bygone eras. There is room and challenge for sound progress. Lincoln, in his second annual message to Congress on December 1, 1862, put it this way:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present.

"The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

For example, health, education, housing, and security are the proper concern of our Federal Government and of the Republican Party.

But as to these and other proposals for Federal action we conserve freedom by making certain that the content and the manner of doing it do not usurp functions, responsibilities, and rights which by their nature and under our plan of government are local.

We must make certain that in whatever we do nationally in these fields we are not destroying the abilities of the States and local governments to tend to their own proper business.

We must make certain that we are not eroding individual human freedom or the ability of the economy to carry the loads which we would put upon it.

When you are in Washington you will notice that on one side of the White House is the old War and Navy Department building and on the other side the Treasury building. This symbolizes that there are two imperatives always resting on our Federal Government which override all others. They are—keep this country safe—keep this country solvent. All other activities and programs must cut their patterns to fit.

The conqueror does not bestow freedom on the vanquished and freedom and security do not ride with worthless wages, worthless savings, worthless pensions, worthless life insurance, or stricken business.

In our effort to contain the blunders of the opposition at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam we are spending in these theoretical times of peace more than $20,000,000,000 a year for foreign aid and back-stop military preparation. We are spending another $20,000,000,000 a year for other purposes.

The President now comes up with a spending program as a mere starter of $42,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 commencing next July 1. This represents 1 year's spending by the Federal Government equal to about 35 times the appraised value of the State of Colorado.

This is only an opener for disclosed, undisclosed, and hinted-at things to come.

Supplemental requests for appropriations of sizable amounts never fail to materialize and make a farce out of sound budgetary procedure.

Then, until peace is assured, there will probably be additional annual expenditures which might run into billions to support lease-lend to the nations of the proposed North Atlantic alliance. No one knows even approximately how much and no one now knows for how long.

The normal expansion of present activities and new ones with their relatively modest and unalarming beginnings would within the next few years enormously magnify the present Federal budget.

Universal military training, if we should come to it, will cost several billions a year.

The debacle in China may lead to more and yet undisclosed expenditures.

The 70-group air force advocates have strong support and they may win their cause and this will add heavily to the estimated expenditures for our military establishment.

Taxes for proposed welfare programs can grow into a staggering number of billions of dollars.

The minimum of prudence requires that we always keep in mind the possibility of turning from cold to hot war with its mountainous jump in spending.

Inflation has turned to recession. The speed of orderly recession under the influence of fear and lack of confidence and the developing instabilities in our economy can quickly change to a panicky flight into depression. That cannot be allowed to happen, and it would probably involve a lot of Government spending to stop it.

Moreover, we should not blink the unpleasant fact that we have a debt of $250,000,000,000 which will have to be paid off out of taxes.

It is folly to blink the unpleasant fact that we are in a state of sharp and possibly dangerous domestic and international crisis.

This requires that all of us act with an alert sense of responsibility which spurns all fakeries.

The aspects are different, but we again have Lincoln's job of saving the Union. If we arise to our duty we shall have another fine hour in history.

If we would keep recession from tobogganing into depression it is necessary that we remove and certainly should not enlarge the stagnating influences operating on our economy.

This means that we cannot add the further discouragement of higher taxes to capital formation for new plants, new machines, new technologies which spell new and revitalized pay rolls.

It means that most careful attention must be given to determine the danger points on pay roll deductions for taxes.

There should be new reviews and eliminations and reductions of exactions which directly retard the volume of business and pay-roll-making activity such as may be found in the field of excise taxes.

In my opinion the boundless Truman programs for spending and taxing would reverse the rosiest of times. They are suicidal under the present turn of our economy.

The essentials of the Truman budget should be brought within the understanding of every citizen.

Its impacts on individual human liberty, on individual and national security, on the performance of our local responsibilities and the enjoyment of our local rights must be made known in terms which can be readily understood.

Let me illustrate with a home-State and home-town example:

Colorado is not a large State in terms of population. About 1,200,000 people enjoy the blessing of living there.

The Truman budget of $42,000,000,000 would exact frrom the people of this State, as a starter, about $340,000,000 per year.

This is about four times as much as the annual cost of our State government.

The Truman starting budget will exact from the people of Denver, our largest city, about $144,000,000 per year.

This is about 15 times as much as Denver spends annually for its schools and about 9 times as much as it spends for all of its other municipal activities.

My listeners, wherever they may be, will be well advised to make local applications of the Truman starting budget of $42,000,000,000.

Now, of course, all of this money which goes to Washington is not lost to us. A part of it comes back after having been heavily nicked by the Federal Government's overhead, but it may not come back in the way that you want it to. You have been deprived of your free choice as to what you want to do with your own money and that is a substantial deprivation of individual human liberty.

This will give you a graphic explanation of why many communities all over this Nation find themselves unable to keep up or to expand their proper functions.

This will explain the process which I have described and the degree of its growth whereby the Federal Government usurps local functions and local freedom.

This will make it clear that unless we reverse direction we are close to the point where State and local governments will simply become administrative agencies for an ever more gluttonous Washington bureaucracy.

It makes it clear, I hope, that we should not be talking about increasing our Federal tax burden, that we should eliminate waste in the Federal Government, that we should reduce expenditures wherever possible without imperiling our security or other vital functions.

We must do these things in these times of domestic and world crises so that we may conserve our strength to meet fully the overriding imperatives of the Federal Government: Keep this country safe; keep this country solvent.

The Challenge to Western Civilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Challenge to Western Civilization," delivered by Dr. Burton L. French, professor emeritus, department of government, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, on January 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Our world is well within the fourth year following VE- and VJ-days, yet as we survey the international situation we must be aware that in spite of tremendous sacrifice of life and treasure and other losses beyond all power to appraise—in spite of our high resolves—in spite of the UN, not only are we challenged to prevent another war, but as never before are we challenged lest the civilization that we know shall perish.

One nation alone stands athwart the way of attaining measurable peace. That nation is Soviet Russia. Not the people of Russia, but Soviet Russia, dominated by the dictators of goodless communism, dictators as merciless, and following, if they did not devise, the pattern of Hitler. Hence the subject: The Challenge to Western Civilization.

Communism always seeks world domination. Thirty years ago, Lenin said: "The

existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end one or the other will conquer." Over and over Stalin quotes those words. More than that, they seem to constitute the mainspring for his actions.

Said President Truman in Kansas City 2 weeks ago: "Christianity and all other religions * * * are based on justice and fair dealing. * * * our great ally to the north has a system of morals that are not moral. Contracts are not sacred with the Soviet Government. I made certain specific agreements at Potsdam, none of which have been kept. Certain agreements were made at Yalta, none of which have been kept."

Soviet Russia, together with all the other great powers and most of the lesser nations, entered into the pact that we call the United Nations. The other nations subscribed to the pact for the purpose of bringing about understanding and accord; the Kremlin for the purpose of chaos. Soviet Russia alone has prevented the UN from functioning by refusing to cooperate, by bringing frustration by the use of the veto, by falsehood in specific areas, by force of arms or the threat of arms against weaker nations, by violating the covenant in the internal affairs of conquered and other nations. By following this policy she has brought under her domination, and thus under communism, three-fourths of Europe and vast areas of Asia.

One of the oldest and most fundamental tenets of international law is that nations shall respect the internal affairs of other friendly nations. Soviet Russia, while inordinately resentful of visits of alien people to her domain even in spite of strictest surveillance, assumes to practice the role of superdictator in attempting to penetrate into the affairs of other states. Witness her conduct when the mask was torn off and her perfidy exposed in Canada, in France, in Italy, and in the United States.

Only less in venality is the penetration of Soviet agents into labor or other civil organizations of friendly neighbors for the purpose of spying on activities, slowing down or stopping or speeding up production, directing or stopping shipping, all in the interest, not of the friendly nations, but of Russia. They take their directions from the Kremlin and they report to the Kremlin as to a master.

We dare not forget that communism and Soviet Russia are one. They are intertwined, and wherever and whenever you find a Communist, there you find an agent of the Kremlin. With the purpose of confusing the issue, communism becomes at once the listening post and the voice of Stalin. Through communism, Soviet Russia professes devotion to humanity; in practice, Soviet Russia is a pyramid of tyranny.

That is why communism can thrive only in darkness.

That is why the freedoms of speech and press are blotted out.

That is why such desperate efforts are made to silence the radio voice of America.

That is why important newspapers of free countries are denied admission to Russia.

That is why you may not travel in Russia save under a chaperone—you may not know it in your naïveté, but the NKVD is giving you full attention.

That is why the repeated purges in Russia.

That is why Russian soldiers who have served on the western front are scattered widely upon discharge—this, lest they talk and be believed.

That is why families of Russians who have escaped are held as hostages—it becomes a way of stilling the voices of some who have escaped.

That is why Russia makes desperate effort to prevent her citizens fleeing to foreign lands.

That is why the Russian teacher, Oksana Kasenkina, who leaped to freedom, and Victor Kravchenko, the author of I Chose Freedom, and thousands more are in constant danger—they know too much.

That is why Communists operate under cover—why they go underground—why they deny membership even when proven beyond doubt—why they deny that their fellow members are members at all—why every Communist of any importance has several names.

That is why Communist cards are turned in when members are placed in certain responsible positions—or maybe no card at all is issued.

In brief, that is why the iron curtain.

Over and over the question is asked of me: "How do Communists operate?" What is their technique? First of all, there are schools and camps for the training of Communists within the United States. Not a few, but many, and everything is taught from the technique of creating and leading a mob and the making of a bomb for direct action, to the more refined processes of propaganda. Russia, of course, is the great center of training, and there are enough Russian-trained Communists in the United States today to staff a university of 16,000 students, upon the basis of not more than 20 students for every instructor.

How do they operate? By every propaganda means under the sun.

By personal contact in the home; by seeking out centers of misery; by arousing class and race warfare.

By denying that they are Communists; by denying the truth about Russia or communism.

By infiltration into groups of all kinds and seeking and attaining offices and control. In Government positions they become the pipe lines to the Kremlin.

By infiltration into offices of nation, and state, and city. By way of illustration, in 1941, the American Federation of Teachers found it necessary to expel three teachers' unions of New York City, with 8,000 members, because these unions were Communist controlled.

They operate by working through gullible people wherever they may be found.

They rejoice when they find a respected member of a public-school faculty or university who in his innocence teaches that communism is just another political party; that it has no allegiance to a foreign power; that it does not stand for lawless means of action; or who, if not these things, will just keep still.

The same rejoicing occurs when they discover an editor, or lecturer, or member of a pulpit who will follow the same line.

And as Communists within their cells they teach the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and Stalin of lawful or unlawful means, of force and violence in the attainment of their ends.

As we stand upon the threshold of the new year, thoughtful people must recognize the threat that is immediate to western civilization.

Let me illustrate: Just recently I received a letter from one of my former students of Miami University who this year is doing graduate work with her husband in another great university. Let me quote a few lines. "It is nearly 1 o'clock at night. We have just gotten rid of a couple who all evening have spoken as the mouthpiece of Stalin. My husband is across the table preparing his assignment for tomorrow. But I am scared because of what we have listened to all evening. And it's all your fault! If I hadn't had that course in government with you I suppose I shouldn't care at all. But thank Heaven, I had the course." This former student didn't need any coaching from me; but she had been shocked and she wanted just a little confirmation for what she had said.

As I have just referred to these apostles of communism and the Kremlin, may I not fail to say that many similar men and women in our country are now on their way back following their excursion into this godless experience.

They were drawn in, maybe through love of the bizarre and adventure, maybe through a passion for mistaken reform. They have been disillusioned, and they are turning their steps back to loyalty in government, back to wholesome living, back to opportunity for service. They have my deep sympathy.

Some of them have come to me to share their dilemma. Just recently a fine Negro lad still in his twenties told me of his problem. A veteran of nearly 3 years—his life spared, though brushed by the angel of death—born in the South, now a resident of a northern city, married and three children, asked to attend a group meeting, race question discussed, lynching, discrimination, then another meeting, asked to say a few words, applauded, other meetings, more applause, then a young woman came to him and said, "You're one of our kind," and she handed him a Communist card. A few more meetings. This young man has had enough. He is withdrawing in the bold way; he has torn his card to shreds.

Another young man, parents born in Europe, joined a Communist cell via a trade-union, disillusioned, but seemingly afraid to withdraw, stayed on for 2 years. Now on the way back, as he hopes, without it being known. I trust he may succeed. He is lacking in courage. I purposely omit names. These men have had grief enough.

To examine a problem is to be on the way of meeting it. That is why I have asked you to glimpse with me the challenge of communism through Soviet Russia to all that we hold dear in western civilization.

We propose to defend the blessed heritage of self-government, together with the ideals of freedom in speech, in discussion, in press, in religious thought, and in the application of simple justice between man and man.

Good government implies vigilance—vigilance not only upon the part of the state itself, but upon the part of the citizen. This means that the individual and the state are specially charged with seeking and preserving the highest well-being of all our people; of hunting out wrongs and seeking their correction; and acquainting our people, and more especially the youth of our land, with the meaning of democracy, the present challenge, and the responsibility that rests upon us all. Students react, and they are proud to have a part.

Address by J. Finley Wilson at Rally To End Segregation and Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. J. Finley Wilson, grand exalted ruler of the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, at a rally to end segregation and discrimination, held in Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Greeting: Our call for those assembled to meet here today has the endorsement of the members of the fraternity which we repre-

sent, the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World.

In this District of Columbia they are 10,000 strong, men and women.

They are united in this legislative assembly, or town meeting, to discuss segregation and discrimination with those in authority in our National Government and in the local government of the Nation's Capital.

They expect to meet with certain Members of Congress who legislate for the District of Columbia, and for the Nation at large.

Our call has stated that we rally here to end segregation and discrimination.

The framework of our discussion of segregation and discrimination, we trust, shall be clearly defined. Segregation and discrimination are evil. They degrade not only the victims, but also the perpetrators. They debase the honor of our Nation in the eyes of the world.

So long as segregation and discrimination exist as the official practice of our Government, we shall look askance at pronouncements about our democratic intentions before the United Nations, in Europe, Asia, Africa, Latin America, or any other place in God's green earth.

Our purpose is in the best tradition and interest of American democracy. This Nation cannot thrive, nor flourish, nor prosper so long as unpunished lynching may be the reward for the laudable effort of an American citizen to cast his ballot because he is a citizen of color in the State of Georgia.

Racial discrimination has been denounced by our President, Harry S. Truman, although it is rampant in our armed forces and in our Federal employment. It has been denounced by the President's Committee on Civil Rights, by the United Nations in its Declaration of Human Rights, by the World Council of Churches at its Amsterdam session, and by the Republicans, Democrats, and Progressives at their national party conventions.

While we are here to commemorate the birthday of our great emancipator, we shall be pleased to have you take note that we have purchased the farm of John Brown, of Ossawatomie, at Harpers Ferry, and that we shall proceed to erect there, near the battlefield of Antietam, a tower to his memory. This tower shall be built in part with the rugged stones and rocks from the castle of John B. Henderson, of Missouri, author of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, abolishing slavery.

It shall commemorate the lives of John Brown, whose soul still marches on, and John B. Henderson, for whom Harry S. Truman has named February 1 as Freedom Day.

The castle, an old landmark, has been turned over to the wrecking crew. It is located here, at Sixteenth Street and Florida Avenue NW., in the District of Columbia, where black men are now being employed to tear down this temple of freedom. Perhaps some of us may find time, before this session ends, to visit the site and say a prayer for the meaning of freedom, as comprehended by both these valiant sons of Missouri.

Like John Brown, like Abraham Lincoln, like Frederick Douglass, we are here as real men and women, willing to labor unto death, if need be, to reestablish faith in our fundamental rights—in the equal rights of men and women—in the equal rights of nations, large and small—regardless of continental origin, or race, or creed, or color.

We have come here because we are men and women ready to die, if need be, that our children may have a safe and fair tomorrow.

We are here because we know that wherever freedom exists, men and women have fought and sacrificed and died for it.

We are here because we concur with Frederick Douglass, who said: "Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never has, and never will."

The ideas for which we stand are those of freedom of the individual, in body, mind, and soul.

We shall contend for the right to go hither and yon, wherever public enterprise is licensed, or by public thoroughfare, or common carrier, in identical compartments with other free citizens, privileged as to public domain, and as to licensed public service.

We shall contend for freedom of all here assembled to think their own thoughts, to investigate, to seek the truth—freedom to debate among ourselves all questions, with the purpose to acquire unity of thought, and concord in cooperation, or in disagreement. That is freedom of the mind. It provides a faith for those who seek truth.

In that faith we hope to find freedom of the soul—freedom to walk with God in His green acres—freedom to seek God's love in the faces of all mankind and all womankind—and to reciprocate that feeling in our countenances and in our hearts—as an inalienable right of all created equal before our Maker.

We believe that, in this Nation, there exists no longer a division of free States and slave States.

There is no longer any danger that slave States shall secede from the Union.

But there is grave danger that the United States of America may secede from the principles of right and justice, and fair play for all, regardless of race, or color, or national origin.

In recognition of the fact that this Nation has already seceded from those principles, Harry S. Truman has installed the Fair Deal policy of national administration.

This policy has been installed, I take it, that this Nation, under God, and in the eyes of other nations of this earth, may come back to the great principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Golden Rule, the Ten Commandments, and the Sermon on the Mount.

If this United States of America cannot stomach a national Fair Employment Practices Act, a national antilynching bill, a national anti-poll-tax bill as against the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting, then this Nation stands before the United Nations of the world in a covenant with death and an agreement with hell.

Long have we loved to call this America a free country.

We recognize, however, that to be free, a nation must be free by the entirety.

There is no free America as long as there exists the Ku Klux Klan, the Red Shirts Brigade, revised constitutions with grandfather clauses, Jim Crow car legislation, lynch law, and rank disfranchisement of colored citizens and their relegation to second-class citizenship.

The outstanding meaning of that new birth of freedom for which we contend today is the standing together fast in the faith.

We know that, born in America, we are free citizens.

In this faith, we know that we are entitled to all the rights and privileges of any other citizen of this great Republic.

God grant that we may ever stand fast in that faith, nor give it up, nor allow anyone, black or white, or brown, or yellow, or red, whether he be friend or foe, to make us retreat, even the first step, from this position. With William Lloyd Garrison we say, We shall not equivocate, we shall not compromise, we shall be heard.

No one of us is free who is not fighting free.

The man who sits down in sweet content, and does not fight, is not a freeman. He is a satisfied simpleton.

We, as freedom-loving men and women, have come here to stand up for all our rights.

We have come here to engage in a continual struggle and contention, as long as mankind is human, and until he is divine.

We are prepared to keep up a constant agitation for the triumph of right, and the downfall of wrong.

We are determined to awaken sleeping justice and keep her awake.

We shall keep up a continual noise about her altar and never, by our silence, give consent to injustice prevailing.

We ask that God may grant America, most especially in its Nation's Capital, through its sense of fair play for all, that larger view of humanity, that greater concept of human duty which is the meaning of freedom in our lives.

In this concept we have assembled.

In this concept we have gathered together in His name.

May the spirit of one free world so enrich our hearts, so harmonize and subdue every discordant passion among us, that we may, at this time, in our deliberations and actions to end segregation and discrimination, our un-American heritage, most humbly reflect that divine order and beauty that reign ever and eternally before the throne of God, our Maker, in whom we have honor and glory, forever and ever.

Monte Cassino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief article entitled "Monte Cassino," by Mr. Isaac Don Levine, editor of Plain Talk, which was recently read on the Justice for Poland hour, station WSPR, Springfield, Mass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTE CASSINO

(By Isaac Don Levine, editor of Plain Talk)

In this series of talks on the tragedy of Poland, I want to speak to you today not of the fearful suffering of her people under a foreign yoke, nor of the suppression of their freedom by a tyranny imposed from abroad. Of these torments, which Poland shares with large portions of the human race, we have all heard a great deal and are bound to hear more.

What I want to talk about is a debt, a very recently acquired debt, which we owe to the sons of Poland. It is a story of glory and of shame. The glory is Poland's and the shame is ours. We owe it to ourselves, to America, not to forget the debt of Monte Cassino, contracted only 4½ years ago, and sealed with the blood of true martyrs.

How many Americans, indeed, how many veterans of World War II, remember the words of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, uttered on the occasion of the pact sealed at Monte Cassino? These words were in the form of a citation by the President—the Commander in Chief of the United States armed forces—to General Anders, who commanded the Polish troops at Monte Cassino. Here is what Roosevelt said:

"Wladyslaw Anders, lieutenant general, Polish Army, for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding services to the United States and the Allied Nations in Italy from October 1943 to July 1944. As commanding general of the Second Polish Corps, General Anders brilliantly led his men in the final overwhelming drive that

resulted in the retreat of the German Army from strongly defended Cassino. This point of stubborn resistance was captured when General Anders guided his troops in a coordinated and inspired Allied drive into the bitterly contested vantage point of the enemy. Later, continuing in the eastern sector of Italy on the Adriatic coast, General Anders again led his men in the capture of the important port of Ancona. The outstanding leadership and tactical ability displayed by General Anders were primary contributions to the success of Allied forces in the Italian campaign."

General Anders has recently published in Europe the almost incredible story of his wartime career. It is a story which every American should read, yet it has been difficult even to get it published in this country. It has been printed in Belgium and in France and is on the way to being published in England. In the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, George Slocombe, one of the veteran laborite correspondents in Europe, has called the Anders autobiography "a passionate saga of Polish patriotism" but it is really a passionate saga of American blindness and of the perfidity of Allied diplomacy.

The story of General Anders sheds more light on Soviet patterns of behavior and is more useful to our proper handling of Stalin than all the reports of all our ambassadors to Russia, and all the columns of our leading commentators, since Pearl Harbor.

But let us bypass on this occasion what General Anders has to say about Stalin and Soviet Russia and about Churchill and our diplomacy at Teheran and Yalta. Let us turn back to Monte Cassino and to his account of the operation which opened up the road to Rome. As we all know, the Germans themselves called Monte Cassino the gate to Rome, and held it with crack troops of special training. The Americans, the British, and the French were stopped in their advance by this impregnable Nazi bastion.

It was in this impasse that the supreme Allied command called upon General Anders to take Monte Cassino. Anders was in command of the second Polish Army Corps. The vast majority of these men had come from Poland, via the inhuman concentration camps of Siberia, to Iran where the flame of seeing their native land liberated from the Nazi invader forged them into fighting men out of the gaunt skeletons that they were. This legion of crusaders made its mark in Tobruk. Thence they moved on to Italy, hoping to complete across its mountainous terrain a vast circuit which would bring them back to a free Poland.

Such were the men led by General Anders. They were men of the stuff of whom mythology is made and ballads are composed and sung down the ages. Homer and Julius Caesar and Sienkiewicz never dealt with nobler and tougher human fiber.

"The task assigned to us will cover with glory the name of the Polish soldier all over the world," General Anders proclaimed on May 11, 1944, in his order of the day, on the eve of the historic assault on Monte Cassino. And here is what General Anders now writes in his book about the event:

"I had often seen pictures of famous battles, with the general in command, field glasses to his eyes, watching the progress of his troops and giving orders. How different was this from present day reality, when battles, for the most part, are fought out of sight of the commanding officers. At Monte Cassino the darkness of night and smoke prevented anything being seen more than a few steps ahead. Our soldiers, frequently diving to take cover from fire, even had great difficulty in keeping contact with each other. Officer after officer was killed, and his place taken by the next in seniority. The battle formed part of a wide coherent action, part of a general plan, but unexpected obstacles and resistance from the enemy where it was not anticipated, caused, as is always the case, local adjustments and alterations to be made. It is accordingly not easy to describe an action made up of the experiences of individual detachments, sections, and even of single soldiers. It was a collection of small epics, many of which can never be told, for their heroes took to their graves the secret of their exploits. The dauntless will of the Polish soldier and his self-sacrifice were the key to a battle in which each man had perforce to play a lonely but heroic part; each minute brought its dreadful experiences, and the sum of them was victory.

"The attacking troops were under a constant hail of projectiles from all directions. Enemy reserves would suddenly emerge from concealment in caves to make a series of powerful counterattacks, which were supported by accurate fire from guns that had been trained on the targets during previous fighting. Our troops, on the other hand, could get little support from our artillery, partly because these latter themselves suffered heavy losses and party because of the complex nature of the ground. The lack of direct reconnaissance of the terrain before the battle, due to the need to preserve secrecy, also caused difficulties. * * *

"The white and red flag of Poland was hoisted over the ruins of Monte Cassino monastery at 10:20 on the morning of May 18 by a patrol of the twelfth Lancers. The fortress that had so long blocked the road to Rome had fallen. Victory had ben won by the gallantry of the Polish soldiers and the joint effort of the Allied armies. * * *

"The battlefield presented a dreary sight. There were enormous dumps of unused ammunition and here and there heaps of land mines. Corpses of Polish and German soldiers, sometimes entangled in a deathly embrace, lay everywhere and the air was full of the stench of rotting bodies. There were overturned tanks with broken caterpillars and others standing as if ready for an attack, with their guns still pointing toward the monastery. The slopes of the hills, particularly where the fire had been less intense, were covered with poppies in incredible number, their red flowers weirdly appropriate to the scene. * * *

"Gen. Sir Oliver Leese, commander of the Eighth Army, was the first to express his appreciation. When leaving me he noticed a great number of foreign correspondents, and said to them: "I am glad to see you here today. I want to tell you that the capture of Monte Cassino was entirely an achievement of the Poles. I am glad that you are here on this historic day for Poland, when Monte Cassino has been taken by the soldiers of the Second Polish Army Corps."

When General Alexander, in the name of His Majesty, George VI, King of Great Britain, conferred upon General Anders the Order of the Bath, he said:

"My sovereign has decorated the commander of the Second Army Corps for his excellent leadership, and also by it expressed his appreciation for the extreme gallantry and great spirit of self-sacrifice shown by the Polish soldiers during the battle of Monte Cassino. It was a day of great glory for Poland when you took this stronghold the Germans themselves considered to be impregnable. It was the first stage of a major battle that you went through for the European fortress. It is not merely a brilliant beginning, it is a signpost showing the way to the future. * * *

"Soldiers of the Second Polish Army Corps, if it had been given to me to choose the soldiers I would like to command, I would have chosen the Poles."

The signpost to the future, of which General Alexander spoke so feelingly on the fresh field of battle, became for Poland a signpost to oblivion. The victory which the Poles helped win for the Allies became a signpost of defeat for Poland, not in the open field, but in the secret chambers of diplomacy. The price of gallantry at Monte Cassino was treachery at Yalta. The glory of men who survived the horrors of Arctic penal colonies, to fight and die for their freedom at Monte Cassino, turned into our shame.

Monte Cassino will remain the signpost of a debt which we must never allow our children to forget. Unless and until we discharge that debt to the full we shall never redeem our shame and shall never achieve the peace with honor under which alone civilization can thrive and mankind go forward to a happier future.

Republican Party Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is necessarily absent, and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial column appearing in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal for February 13, 1949, discussing Republican Party policy and entitled "Who Was a Coward?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO WAS A COWARD?

(If political moderation is cowardice, Lincoln was a coward, the editor of the Lincoln Journal maintains in the following editorial reply to a widely reprinted Omaha editorial, "God Hates a Coward," in which was urged on the Republican Party a doctrine of militant extremism.)

Those of you who are Republicans have been told lately, in the press and on the air, that God hates a coward.

You have been told that the American people likewise hate a coward.

You have heard it suggested that God and the American people take a dim view of the Republican Party because it has been the worst kind of coward, a moral coward. Too cowardly to stand up against the swift trend of the omnipotent state. Too cowardly to stand up and fight for the free Republic of the founding fathers. Too cowardly to champion the traditional glorious American creed. Too cowardly to face the foul intruder who bears the black banner of absolutism and wears the tainted label of the Democratic Party, and drive him back into the Dark Ages.

This cowardly party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe, you have been told, and all because shamefully, hypocritically, it has been pleading for the votes of the rank and file.

The voice that has been telling you this is a voice that has been heard since the Republican Party began.

It does not sound like the voice of the rank and file. It does not sound like the voice of the people. For the voice of the people speaks in many tongues and many accents. It speaks in the spare words of the farmer, the hurried chopped phrase of the city man. It speaks as the housewife speaks, and the student, the teacher, the shopkeeper, the man who works with his hands, or his mind, the doctor, the nurse, the banker, the borrower. And speaking in many accents, it is not heard as harsh and resounding extremes, in shrill and impassioned unison.

It is heard rather—when it is heard—as a harmony of moderation that comes through compromise.

This voice, that designs to speak for God and His judgment, is the voice of the extremist who would destroy the democratic process of compromise and the national unity that compromise makes possible by dashing it on the sharp rock of principle as the extremist himself, and his few companions, not the people at large, conceive it.

It is the voice of the true radical.

It is the voice of the radical who would nurture the political garden by pulling the plants up by their roots.

It is the voice of the radical distrustful of the wisdom of the people on whom democracy is founded, impatient of the slowness of masses of people to reach sharp moral judgments.

It is the voice of the radical whose eye sees things only in blacks and whites, and never sees the white in gray.

It was said this past week by a man who claims titular leadership of your party that the Republican Party is divided. That was hailed as a new truth.

It has been divided since its earliest days. Today they call the factions progressives, or liberals, on the one hand, and reactionaries, or conservatives, on the other.

But in the party's earliest days—and finest hours—they called things by other names. They had their conservatives and radicals—the other way around.

They called Abraham Lincoln a conservative. Lincoln was steeped in the philosophy and ideals of Thomas Jefferson. Lincoln loved and trusted humanity, and expounded the idea that government should be not of the people, by the people, only, but of the people, by the people, for the people. Not of some people, by some people, for some people, but of, by, and for all.

Yet, deep as were his moral roots, broad as was his compassion for his fellow man, humble as was his instinct, and sure his ear for what the people thought and felt, Lincoln clung to one ideal above all others, and that was that the success and conservation of the American experiment in self-government was paramount. To this end, he was willing to let his larger moral principles bide their time.

This conservative was called a weakling of rosewater for not screwing to the sticking point, at every opportunity, his principles that told him slavery was wrong. He was called a cringing hushaby baby, and one who trailed the proud principles of the Republican Party in the dust before the foul intruder of human slavery, because he chose not to try to force events. He was accused of crawling in bed with the southern Democrats, the traitorous rebels, because he sought to foster and to preserve the essentials of broad national unity. He was called a coward because he preferred to adjust problems, even problems where high principles were at stake, rather than to force drastic divisive solutions.

And because he was a moderate conservative, lacking in crusading zeal in the face of the great issue of human freedom against human slavery, because he refused to see the traitorous southerners as all black, because he believed true freedom would be long and slow in coming and could not be forced, but should be fostered in a revengeless spirit by long, sometimes devious compromise, this me-too Republican in the White House was called a moral coward.

It was men in his own party who called this man Lincoln all that, and a great deal more. Some people called these rock-ribbed zealots who plagued Lincoln Jacobins, after that little clique whose narrow zeal for the ideals of freedom in the French Revolution had clabbered into the bloody Reign of Terror. Usually they were called radicals, and that is how history knows them.

But there were still more people in his party, in his time, and these were the rank and file, who gave Lincoln a place in their hearts for his humility and his patience, his reluctance to force events, however festering, to a head, his willingness to ally himself with God's good time, to move with it, and to abide by it.

And God's time, which he tried neither to force ahead nor to turn back, has done well by Abraham Lincoln.

Let us ask these present-day Republican radicals this:

Do the American people hate Abraham Lincoln? Does God?

And of the rank and file:

To which, in the American tradition, do you give the place of greater glory? The brittle, narrow radicalism of the fighting extremist, whose counsels divide and tear down? Or the firm counsel of moderation, anxious for the widows and fatherless in their affliction, meek with the humblest among you, patiently seeking to bind the Nation's wounds, and to further the cherished ideals of Americans, all as the ideals of one undivided people?

—RAYMOND A. MCCONNELL, Jr.

A Defense of Senator Taft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article headed "Defends TAFT as no ogre," by Edwin A. Lahey, published in the January 31, 1949, edition of the Chicago Daily News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENDS TAFT AS NO OGRE

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—Some labor leaders have announced that they intend to knock off Senator ROBERT A. TAFT politically when he comes up for reelection in Ohio in 1950.

This is silly talk. Organized labor has been sadly kidded by the loose left-wing folklore about TAFT, who has been built up as a demon of cold reaction.

The labor leaders would do well to worry about the counterfeits in public life who profess to be their friends, and to respect TAFT for his honest refusal to talk out of both sides of his mouth.

I have myself been victimized by this folklore of the TAFT ogre, and I'd like to tell how I discovered my own delusion.

In September 1947 I was preparing to go to the west coast with TAFT, on a political trip.

Like most people who accept myths without examining them, I supposed that TAFT had destroyed the OPA, and that he had promised the people, as had other Republicans, that prices would adjust themselves if all price control were removed.

For my own background, I went to the Library of Congress and read everything that TAFT had said on the floor of the Senate about price control. It was a shock to learn that he had been bum rapped, and that I had accepted the rap as true. An afternoon with the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD proved that TAFT had never once urged the repeal of price controls. He fought for a gradual liquidation of controls. He wanted price controls abandoned selectively, and only when in particular industries there was a normal relationship between supply and demand.

This was plain horse sense and economic wisdom. TAFT was fighting for orderly liquidation of controls when the clowns around President Truman in 1946 were actually sabotaging the OPA.

The most outrageous bum rap against TAFT is his supposed hatred for workers. President Truman in his campaign, with more political guile than honesty, helped build up this myth.

Yet, when Truman in 1946 tried to get a law to draft the railroad strikers, it was TAFT and TAFT alone who blocked this police-state measure. (It is to the everlasting shame of Governor Dewey that when he recalled the railroad strike crisis, he said that the Republicans had stopped the Truman repression. Dewey completely ignored TAFT's individual contribution on that issue.)

These are only samples of the misrepresentation that TAFT has suffered.

Why doesn't he do something about this? Mainly because he's a complete wash-out in the field of public relations. He won't truckle, he won't explain, he won't polish apples with any group. He says what he's for, and he says what he's against, without quibble or condition, and if anybody misunderstands or misrepresents his position, he won't bother to straighten out the record.

Maybe labor can knock off TAFT in 1950. His margin was pretty thin in 1944. But labor will have little to boast of when they knock off an honest, independent conservative whose greatest weakness is his inability or his unwillingness to cope with the TAFT myth that the left-wing has created.

Presley D. Bowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the less publicized but important functions of the Federal Government, I dare say, is that of the Federal Assay Commission, established under the Bureau of the Mint, the duties of which consist in supervising the check of the Nation's mints and their products.

Its first official act was the selection of a chairman; and it is gratifying to report that from the entire membership, this representative group from different parts of the United States selected an outstanding citizen of Maryland, Presley D. Bowen, of Baltimore, as its chairman. Mr. Bowen is a successful and highly respected insurance executive, and he presided over the sessions of the Assay Commission in his usual efficient manner.

The Commission has just concluded its meetings in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of those meetings as published in the press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWEN CHECKS THE MINT, FINDS COINAGE UP TO PAR

(By Jacob Hay)

PHILADELPHIA, February 10.—If Baltimore's nickels, dimes, and quarters aren't up to snuff during the coming year, Presley D.

Bowen had better head for the swamps and fens of the eastern shore.

Mr. Bowen, who supplies the name Bowen to one of Baltimore's larger insurance agencies, was yesterday named chairman of the Federal Assay Commission, a group which has the job of checking up on the Nation's mints and their production.

The assay commission met in the Philadelphia Mint at the order of President Truman, who appoints its members.

A SHORT CHECK

Their job, which began yesterday and is scheduled to be completed today, was explained to the commission members by Mrs. Nellie Tayloe Ross, Director of the Mint. After the explanation, Mrs. Ross introduced the members to one another. Mr. Bowen's election to the chair followed.

The commission met in a vast and ornately decorated chamber in the mint and conducted its business under the stern eyes of some two dozen oil portraits of past directors of the Nation's coinage.

Back in the bad, old days the commissioners would have been able to enjoy some real sport, for they were once empowered to recommend the death penalty for crooked mint officials. The "to-suffer-death" clause was removed a number of years ago when it became apparent that the people who run the country's mints were painfully honest.

A NOTABLE COLLECTION

Working with Mr. Bowen were such persons as Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, and Mrs. Pearl Mesta, the Washington lady who has gained no small fame as a giver of notable parties.

There was also an assortment of women civic leaders and gentlemen civic leaders from far-off places like Kansas City, Mo., and Bernardsville, N. J.

Dr. Condon brought along the standard weights against which the coins to be checked were weighed.

Arriving several minutes late, the doctor, who wears a crew cut and blue serge suits, told Mrs. Ross that this was the first time he had ever judged coins and that he did not know whether he would enjoy himself.

A BRAKE ON WORRYING

The idea is, Mrs. Ross told the commissioners that the public won't get to worrying about whether their coins are worth anything—a common cause of depression in countries like Bulgaria and Pakistan, where there are no Federal assay commissions.

Americans don't go around biting their coins, Mrs. Ross said, because they know that some leading citizens gather every year to make sure that the mint officials haven't been slipping in old tin cans instead of honest silver.

Set up in the Commission's meeting chamber were a counting machine and a balance. It was Mr. Bowen's job to divide his group into three committees: one to count the coins to be tested, one to weigh the coins, and another to watch the actual assaying.

TOUGHER THAN INSURANCE

"This," muttered Mr. Bowen at one stage in the proceedings, "is tougher than the insurance business. Also it is the last thing I expected."

From every 10,000 coins minted in the country's three mints, at Philadelphia, San Francisco and Denver, the mint superintendents pick one at random. This is sealed in an envelope and sent to Philadelphia for the annual check.

This year's total amounted to 74 half dollars of the regular variety and six Booker T. Washington commemorative half dollars, 6,896 quarters and 16,332 dimes.

157 YEARS IN THE CLEAR

The Assay Commission picks coins at random from these and checks them for fineness and weight. In the 157 years since the Assay Commission was established, nobody has ever found any funny business going on in the mints, Mrs. Ross said.

Carrying his office like a true Baltimorean, Mr. Bowen never wilted his collar in yesterday's bustle, and at the end of the proceedings, his natty gray business suit bore its knife-edge creases as freshly as when the day began.

"Somewhere along the line," he said to Mrs. Ross, "we're related to Alexander Hamilton, but I never thought it would come to this."

A MESSY BUSINESS

Mrs. Mesta, who wore a black dress and a fur hat for the occasion, began looking bored shortly before noon but brightened considerably when one of the mint officials suggested that she might enjoy watching the test coins being melted down.

A lady commissioner who had attached herself to Mrs. Mesta for the day said: "My, but we're in a messy business." Mrs. Mesta nodded.

Today's session sees the Commission's report on last year's coinage completed and signed. When the commissioners have signed, they are given a medallion commemorating the event.

In addition, they receive $10 for each day's service. Plus, of course, the honor and a great little story to tell the grandchildren.

Annual Report of Madison County Soil Conservation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following report from Ewell E. Boyd, secretary of the board of supervisors, Madison County Soil Conservation District, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert this report:

MADISON COUNTY SUPERVISORS' ANNUAL REPORT, 1948

The Madison County supervisors have had one or more members present for each of the 12 monthly meetings. There have been 6 meetings with quorums to perform the necessary new business that might come up that would require a quorum.

In June a conservation tour was made with only one supervisor present, namely, A. H. Berry. The visits included some very creditable conservation work on farms under district agreement.

The outstanding piece of work done by the supervisors was the soil and soul Sunday program. Each took his responsibility and helped to make this a very creditable day for conservation. Much material was distributed to the preachers of the district which was of value to them in preparing their conservation sermons. The articles that were given to the ministers consisted of the following: No Man Layeth It to Heart, The Earth Is the Lord's, and The Lord's Land.

On Monday, November 15, the Bermuda sprig sodding machine was demonstrated at Harrison, Ark. Mr. J. M. Parker, chairman of the board attended with the work unit conservationist and other invited guests.

Mr. Jim Anderson was the only supervisor to attend the State supervisors' meeting in Little Rock on December 3.

Unfortunately, two supervisors in this district have resigned during the year. Mr. Afton Wheeler, secretary-treasurer of the board of supervisors, has moved out of the district and Mr. Jim Anderson's health was such that he was unable to attend the meetings and carry on his work as a supervisor.

The Conservation Leaders' Training Day held at the American Legion hut on February 24 and which is held annually was a very successful meeting this year. (See exhibit A.)

The district received from the Soil Conservation Service technical assistance in the amount of 56 percent in 1948 of that received in 1947. This was brought about by two causes. First, additional districts being organized in the State; second, reduction in funds received for the Soil Conservation Service. This is regrettable and we hope that additional personnel may be forthcoming in the near future.

SEED HARVESTED

The supervisors of the Madison County Soil Conservation District, realizing the need for more vegetative cover and the shortage of seed on the market, have encouraged the farmers of the district to harvest seeds for the purpose of seeding additional acreages on their own farms and for furnishing seed to their neighbors. During the year 1948 cooperators with the district harvested the following seed: 35,582 pounds of orchard grass; 95,445 pounds of Korean lespedeza; 20,000 pounds of Sericea lespedeza; 1,400 pounds of red clover; 1,316 pounds of hairy vetch; 200 bushels of rye and vetch mixture; and 800 bushels of traveler winter oats. Noncooperators within the district harvested: 5,516 pounds of orchard grass; 23,535 pounds of Korean lespedeza; and 2,420 pounds of red clover. Supervisors harvested 4,000 pounds of Korean lespedeza. All this is thrasher- or combine-run seed.

Supervisors practice what they preach. The following is a report of work being done on the farm of A. H. Berry, supervisor of the Madison County soil conservation district:

"My home is at Hindsville, Ark. My wife and I live on a small farm here, where we have lived for the past 30 years, having reared our two sons on this farm. They now have families and homes of their own, joining our home and farm, so we all work together and are trying to save and preserve the soil on these three farms (now in one) as best we can.

"These farms were all in badly eroded condition when we took over, and needed much conservation attention. We all have agreements with our soil conservation district and have been greatly helped by its advice and service. We have terraced some of the fields, have constructed two ponds as part of our soil-conservation program, but want and need more terracing and two more ponds—mainly on the last farm purchased, joining my home on the east.

"We keep most of our land, 290 acres, in grass. We have a small herd of Hereford cattle which is raising some 20 head of calves each year and it takes grass and hay for them. Our pasture grasses have been mostly lespedeza, orchard grass, and rye grass. We grow a little wheat some years and several acres of oats each year, this we feed the calves and other stock that need grain. Some years we grow a small acreage of corn to help feed out the meat hogs—had some 3 acres in 1948, farmed on the contour and gathered over 150 bushels.

"A good portion of the land was limed the past year and we fertilize all seeded small grain crops, also the meadows, and find it pays well.

"Eleven acres were sown to alfalfa and orchard grass last fall and some fifty-odd acres were sown to orchard grass which will also be overseeded to lespedeza.

"We thrashed some 4,000 pounds of lespedeza seed last fall from 10 acres and will reseed all pastures this spring with it and orchard grass. We also seeded 2½ acres to Kentucky Fescue the past fall and are look-

ing forward to the possibilities of this new grass.

"The Soil Conservation Service and the triple A advise mowing pastures, so we do. I mowed some 100 acres of pasture in 1948.

"These are some of the things being done on our farm. By our better farming, our neighbors and most all in the community are falling in line trying to comply with the needed conservation program for their farms and appreciate the Soil Conservation Service for their help in our district work.

"A. H. BERRY,
"Member, Board of Supervisors, Madison County Soil Conservation District."

STORIES OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN THE MADISON COUNTY SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICT IN 1940

Eugene Holloway, of the Alabam community, and a cooperator with the Madison County soil-conservation district, bought an abandoned farm about 3 years ago, and now has it in fair production shape with a prospect of reaching top producing levels in the near future.

Mr. Holloway is a World War II veteran and, like many ex-GI's, came home with new ideas and a determination to make his home as convenient, his farm as attractive and productive as those he had seen in other places.

One field on the farm consisted of about 12 acres and was badly damaged by sheet and gully erosion. Some of these gullies were as much as 5 to 6 feet deep and 10 to 12 feet wide. Mr. Holloway made application to the Soil Conservation Service for assistance and advice in working out a soil-conservation program for his farm. A technician was sent out and, together with Mr. Holloway, planned a complete conservation program for his entire farm.

The large field presented a difficult problem. The soil was of a loose, sandy nature that is easy to erode, yet there was very little slope to the land. It was decided that the field should be terraced. The first thing Mr. Holloway did was to take his team and start plowing in the gully banks. After this he spread barnyard manure over the entire area and seeded it to Balboa rye, hairy vetch, orchard grass, and lespedeza which are all very good soil-building crops.

The next year, however, he got a very poor stand and very little growth, so he decided that building terraces was the only solution to his problem. With the small tractor he had purchased in the meantime, he again started plowing in the gully banks, sloping them to fill in the center as much as possible. Then the terraces were started with large terrace fills across the gullies. From the lack of moisture in plowing up the terraces, the soil became quite loose, thus preventing completion of the terraces before spring work came along. So he applied 200 pounds of 4–12–4 fertilizer per acre and seeded the field to meadow grasses. We had a very good season and the terraces helped to hold the moisture on this field so an excellent growth was secured for a first-year seeding. He harvested 1½ tons of hay per acre, where the year before he had harvested only 1 ton of hay from 6 acres. This spring Mr. Holloway expects to complete the present terraces and construct several more in the lower part of the field.

Paul Smith, of Hindsville community, who owns and operates 760 acres of land and operates 320 acres more all in the Hindsville Valley, is a cooperator with the Madison County Soil Conservation District.

Mr. Smith has what might be called a grass farm; however, he does raise some grain crops. When old meadows are plowed up, he usually puts it in corn on the contour, followed by barley overseeded with orchard grass and alfalfa. Paul likes to have a perennial legume with his orchard grass, because the nitrogen added to the soil by this legume crop increases the growth of his orchard grass and in turn increases the amount of seed he is able to harvest. The orchard grass and alfalfa stand will last from 5 to 10 years. The corn is usually cut off early to fill his pit silo, allowing early planting of the barley which makes an excellent green cover crop throughout the winter and spring months.

Mr. Smith has 500 acres planned for permanent pasture. Grasses used in the permanent pasture are Bermuda grass, orchard grass, red top, blue grass, Korean lespedeza, hop clover, white clover, and Sericea lespedeza. To date he has sodded approximately 60 acres of Bermuda as a permanent base grass, the most of which has been sodded with corn planted on the contour. He also has about 300 acres in grass and legume for hay and seed harvest. Paul's interest in Sericea lespedeza has grown after 2 or 3 years of experience with this relatively new crop in the Madison County Soil Conservation District. He seeded 20 acres about 6 years ago. For the first two seasons he threatened to plow it under, but after serious consideration he decided to give it one more chance. The third season he got one hay crop and a good seed crop from it. This started Mr. Smith to praising Sericea, and now he has increased his acreage to about 70 acres. He tells the following story and swears by it:

"My hired hand who was feeding a group of Black Angus steers told me that the steers ate the Sericea lespedeza better than they did the alfalfa. I couldn't believe it so I went over to the barn at feeding time to see for myself. The barn has feeding sheds on both sides. On one side we had alfalfa and on the other we had Sericea lespedeza hay. Grain was also fed along with the hay. As soon as the grain on the alfalfa side was eaten the steers moved to the side where the Sericea lespedeza was being fed and would clean up every bit of it before they would touch the alfalfa." Now Paul says that Sericea cut and put up at the proper stage is hard to beat.

In 1948 Mr. Smith harvested approximately 1,000 bushels of orchard grass seed, 20,000 pounds of Sericea lespedeza seed, and approximately 20,000 bales of hay. Besides this cash income he has ready for market around 100 head of White Face steers, which have utilized the good pasture and hay produced on his farm, along with 200 head of hogs each year.

Mr. Smith is also a firm believer in the use of fertilizer and lime. He has limed practically all of his land and is a consistent user of commercial fertilizer, and spreads many tons of barnyard manure each winter from the corrals where his steers have been fed.

We cannot emphasize too much the fact that feeding the land is as important as feeding your cows and hogs, and using soil-conservation practices just as you would build a fence or corral to keep your cattle where they belong.

Flood Control, Soil and Water Conservation

I have for the last 15 years been learning my A B C's on the above subject, but the last year, I believe, has taught me some things that may some day get me out of kindergarten. There is so much to learn and so little time to practice it and put into effect what we take a lifetime—no, generations—to learn. If this were not so and our forefathers had seen what we now know to be hard facts, we would not be so hard pressed for time in which to correct what should never have been allowed to happen.

We are told in the Bible that God created the heavens and the earth and after that man to dwell thereon. He divided the land and the sea that we might have abundance of soil and water, but how well we have taken care of the trust placed in us is becoming clearer every season as we see our land disappearing into the sea never to return to us.

In my lifetime of over a half century, I cannot remember how many millions of Chinese have starved to death every year. As a child I thought it awful and could not understand how any country would allow such things to happen. Later I took it for granted, but only in the last decade has it come to most of us that it was impossible to raise enough food there to feed them. Why? It being one of the oldest countries on the face of the earth to be cultivated and their having no thought of the soil—of conserving their own source of subsistence—came to grief early in terms of our own civilization.

We are, or have been until recently, following in their footsteps and will, unless and until we wake up, have our own diet to worry about, not mentioning what will happen to our children, grandchildren, and others.

We have all heard the expression that we are the victims of our own folly. I think this applies very well to our time and conditions. We are told that the world population is increasing at a more rapid rate than ever before. This is due to several factors. First, so many countries are at their lowest ebb in years in the bare necessities of life and we are told that this makes for more births. Second, in the case of the United States there is always an increase of births during war years, also science has added something over 20 years to our life expectancy through medical science. Because of more population we have to produce more food. Since our own country was not torn to shreds by World War II, it has fallen on us to assume the burden of feeding, or helping to feed, the larger part of the world and hence our land has and is being taxed as never before. True we have lived up to that assignment but at what cost. Our land is being plowed in many cases to produce the most now without regard to the future. Examples: dust storms and erosion by water on sloping lands that should never have been plowed in the first place.

In my active participation the past year in flood control as a member of the Arkansas Basin Association, several things have become much clearer to me. We worked at first for river navigation, we have found that it will take power dams to do that. All right, then we worked on power dams and find that if not supported by silt dams they will, in time, be rendered useless by filling up with silt. Then we began to see what would be the locations best suited to place these silt dams and complete our program of navigation but, lo and behold, why would not these silt dams fill up? We had to start all over again on how to protect the silt dams. It led us right back to the top of the hills at the headwaters of our streams, but that was not enough. There was a watershed that included little branches coming into creeks or directly out of our own fields and pastures. But this was not enough. We found that all of our farms sloped somewhere. Now, we were beginning to get to the top of the proposition rather than to the bottom of it. We are now above all feasibility of dams to hold the soil. It is now a difference of procedure. We must include the building of terraces or, where not so steep a slope, contouring, planting of grasses to hold the soil, or the planting of trees.

To me, this is a sound program, but it is a lot of idle talk unless we are all going to do our part, for this means every acre of every farm is affected if we expect our offsprings to survive.

It is an established fact that one-third of our topsoil has already been depleted, having gone downstream and can never be recovered. In other words, out of the average of 9 inches of topsoil over the United States, we have an average of 6 inches left. That don't mean that all of our land has just 6 inches, as some has far more than that, but it also means that some of our land is already completely denuded of any topsoil, which is worse than if we all had the 6 inches, for then all of the land would produce, providing we could hold

it at that figure, but since some has no soil we have to overproduce the good soil left.

If we get busy now and start at the top and make this our slogan: "Keep the soil where it is and the water where it falls," we can, within a far shorter period than you realize, stop silt from silting our small dams, thereby stopping our power dams from filling up and thereby stop the silting of our Gulf port. We will not be losing the equivalent of a $10,000 farm every 30 minutes of the day and night. Neither will our port city have to ask again for hundreds of millions of dollars to open 100 miles by dredging to be able to reach a gulf that has wandered that far from home by our neglect in letting it get away in the first place. I don't want to help build any more silt lands in the Gulf of Mexico. I am a stingy guy.

F. C. HOWARD,
Chairman, Madison County Committee, Arkansas Basin Association; Executive Director of Arkansas-White River Basin Association.

EXHIBIT A

TENTATIVE PROGRAM, MADISON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Conservation leaders' training day, February 24, 1948

Legion Hut, Huntsville, Ark. Jim Parker, chairman, board of supervisors, presiding.

10 a. m.: Meeting called to order, Jim Parker, chairman. Invocation, Rev. R. W. Jones, Baptist minister. Welcome, Afton Wheeler, secretary-treasurer.

10:15 a. m.: Flood Control, Soil and Water Conservation, F. C. Howard, chairman, Madison County Flood Control Association.

10:45 a. m.: Motion picture.

11:15 a. m.: What Are We Spending for Conservation? John I. Smith, secretary-treasurer, National Farm Loan Association, Fayetteville.

11:45 a. m.: Announcements.

12 noon: Lunch.

1:30 p. m.: Discussion of conservation problems and experiences led by A. H. Berry, supervisor.

2 p. m.: Conservation Job Ahead, Lloyd J. White, work unit conservationist.

2:30 p. m.: Motion picture.

3 p. m.: Summarizing high points of the day, J. E. Critz, district conservationist.

3:30 p. m.: Benediction, Kermit Vanzant, Methodist minister.

Adjournment.

WORK RECORD

District: Madison County. Soil conservation district 28. State: Arkansas.

Headquarters: Huntsville, Ark. Period from January 1 to December 31, 1948.

Farm and ranch conservation plans and treatment

Conservation plans	Number		Acres	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
1. Applications received	27	1,089	6,723	184,017
2. Active applications	------	182	------	34,834
3. Plans prepared and signed	28	895	4,325	143,894
4. Plans canceled (−)	8	68	1,208	8,495
5. Amended plans (+ or − acres)	0	6	0	+50
6. Active conservation plans	------	827	------	135,449
7. Combined treatment	------	------	------	------
8. Plans on maintenance	6	20	318	1,452
9. Plans being applied	34	774	------	------

Major soil and water conservation practices, farm and ranch plans

Practice	Planned		Established	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
Contour farming—acre	60	5,720	72	1,644
Cover cropping—do	149	6,779	121	2,602
Crop residue management—acres	640	14,385	4,463	12,656
Strip cropping—do	0	627	60	137
Pasture improvement—do	1,755	58,949	17,171	42,045
Seeding of pasture—do	1,742	60,811	1,171	15,302
Wildlife area improvement—acre	819	819	864	864
Woodland management—acre	6,044	37,617	22,474	32,875
Tree planting—do	0	19	0	0
Farm and ranch ponds—number	17	411	36	221
Terraces—miles	4.7	208.7	1	33
Field diversions—do	2	13	1	4
Farm drainage—acres	36	481	128	128
Closed drains—do	0	0	0	0
Open drains—miles	1	1	1	1
Irrigation land preparation—acres	0	40	14	14
Water facilities—number	22	741	7	153
Collective terrace outlets—number	10	10	0	10
Terraces they will serve—miles	6	6	6	6

Annual report of educational activities

Activity	This period		To date	
	Number	Attendance	Number	Attendance
Educational meetings	1	300	146	7,081
Tours	1	17	10	171
Demonstrations	10	298	23	463
Training school meeting	1	90	3	236
Planning meetings	0	0	43	422
Application meetings	1	60	51	651
Exhibits	0	--------	8	--------
Radio talks	0	--------	1	--------
New articles	5	--------	65	--------

Annual report of receipts and expenditures

Receipts (by source): Balance brought forward	$780.62
Expenditures (classified):	
Cleaning Legion hut after meeting	5.00
Lunches for conservation leaders' training day	50.00
Madison County Arkansas Basin Association	50.00
Dues to Supervisors' National Association	5.00
Total	110.00
Balance carried forward	670.62

RESOLUTIONS

We, the board of supervisors of the Madison County Soil Conservation District, have today, February 8, 1949, passed a resolution approving the material herewith submitted as the annual report of the Madison County Soil Conservation District supervisors for the year 1948.

Respectfully submitted.

EWELL E. BOYD,
Secretary.

Approved:

JAS. M. PARKER,
Chairman.

Other member:

A. H. BERRY.

Appointment of Negro to Raleigh (N. C.) School Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. MELVILLE BROUGHTON
OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BROUGHTON. Mr. President, 2 days ago the commissioners of the city of Raleigh, the capital of North Carolina and my native city, elected a Negro as a member of its school board. As an indication of how we are solving the race problem without Federal action or outside interference, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Raleigh News and Observer giving an account of the appointment.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGRO ATTORNEY NAMED TO BOARD—F. J. CARNAGE PICKED BY CITY COUNCIL AS FIRST NEGRO MEMBER OF SCHOOL BOARD

(By Bryan Haislip)

F. J. Carnage, local Negro attorney, yesterday was unanimously chosen by the Raleigh City Council to serve a 6-year term as a member of the city school board.

It marked the first time in the city's history that a Negro has been appointed to such a position, city officials said. State education officials, while they could not be certain, expressed the belief that Carnage would be the first member of his race to serve on a school board in North Carolina.

Mayor P. D. Snipes recommended the lawyer for the position to succeed Mrs. W. B. Aycock, whose term expires on March 1. Mrs. Aycock, Mayor Snipes said, had stated that she will be unable to serve another term on the board. Mrs. W. C. Pressly, whose present term also is expiring, was named to succeed herself.

Mayor Snipes, who serves as an ex officio member of the school body, said that the board felt there should be a Negro representative among the group. "He has the respect and confidence of both races and is thoroughly capable," Snipes said. "I believe that he will make a most successful board member."

Council members favored the recommendation, presented in a motion by Joe S. Correll, and approved it unanimously.

Carnage, a native of Thomasville, Ga., has lived in Raleigh since his graduation with a law degree from Howard University in Washington, D. C., in 1926. He has been active in civic affairs and ran for a position on the city council in the election of 1947, reaching the final run-off. He is a member of the Lucille Hunter School PTA, where his 9-year-old daughter, Lillian Elizabeth, is in the third grade.

Several city Negro organizations have pressed for representation on the school board. Carnage had the recommendation of both organizations and individuals, Snipes said.

"I am highly honored," Carnage said when informed of his appointment. "I shall certainly do my best to live up to the honor and serve the people of Raleigh."

He is the second Negro to serve in an appointive official municipal capacity. P. R. Jervey, Negro newspaperman, was chosen as a member of the city recreation commission in 1947. He was succeeded by Dean Nelson Harris, Negro citizen, on July 1, 1948.

Other members of the Raleigh School Board are J. D. Clark and H. C. Gillis, whose terms expire in 1951, and Lewis H. Powell and Mayor Snipes, who will serve until 1953. The terms of Carnage and Mrs. Pressly will run until March 1, 1955.

Council Member Fred Fletcher hailed the assignment of Negroes to further responsibility in civic affairs and predicted that Carnage would make a successful start in that direction. Other members expressed satisfaction with the appointment.

The 49-year-old attorney has practiced law here for more than 15 years. His wife, Mrs. Mary E. Carnage, is a former teacher of home economics at St. Augustine's College here, and they live at 1117 East Martin Street.

Senator at Large

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator-at-Large," published in the Boston Post of February 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR-AT-LARGE

Unnoted and unmarked, an interesting, if not important anniversary occurred in Boston yesterday. Just 125 years ago, in famous Faneuil Hall, John Quincy Adams was nominated by the Federalists as their candidate for President of the United States.

Adams, one of the most brilliant men ever to sit in the White House, was opposed in the election by Andrew Jackson. Jackson received more electoral votes but not enough to win. The election was thrown into the House of Representatives and Adams became the sixth Chief Executive of the Nation.

As President, Mr. Adams was independent in his thinking. One term was all that he could obtain. Therefore, he returned to Quincy, to write in his study and prune the trees on the Adams farm. He was full of honors. He had been President, United States Senator, Secretary of State under Monroe, as well as envoy to the courts of the Netherlands, Russia, France, and England.

Yet 3 years of the bucolic life was enough. He heeded the call of constituents, ran for and was elected to the National House of Representatives. He served there 17 years, his span terminated when he died of a stroke in the House at 80. During those 17 years his vast wisdom and experience proved invaluable to fellow legislators.

Adams was not the only ex-President who returned to Washington. Seven years after Andrew Johnson completed the second term of Abraham Lincoln as President, he was elected United States Senator from Tennessee. He was willing to serve. But after a few months death cut short his political career.

Pending at the moment before Congress are two bills, one introduced by Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, and one by Representative CANFIELD, of New Jersey. The bills have the blessing of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and Senator SMITH of Maine. Both would automatically make an ex-President a Senator-at-Large without a vote.

Theodore Roosevelt became an ex-President when he was 49. Grant was 54. Hoover was 58. Cleveland was 59. Washington was 61. Coolidge was 56. These men being willing, did the Nation lose the benefit of their experience and counsel when they might have served as elder statesmen in Congress? Today, at 75, ex-President Hoover is doing a momentous and invaluable job of reorganizing the Government.

The proposal of Senator-at-Large is revolutionary in our governmental system, but so was the popular election of Senators and the limitation of a President to two terms, which is now nearing passage. When Churchill stepped down as Prime Minister of Great Britain, he did not retire. As a member of Commons his nation still has the aid of his eloquence and training. Senator-at-Large for the United States has merit. It warrants consideration and support.

The Law Profession and General Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of my very able friends and one of the prominent and distinguished citizens of Florida, Hon. J. Velma Keen, of the Tallahassee bar, delivered an address entitled "The Law Profession and General Education," which I believe to be so meritorious that it might well be read by all those who have access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So I ask unanimous consent that this very profound address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAW PROFESSION AND GENERAL EDUCATION

(By J. Velma Keen, of the Tallahassee bar)

General education has the responsibility of developing the pattern of conduct of the person who would be a member of the law profession, furnishing the background information and the broad outline of aims and objectives for the productive life of the lawyer. It is not, however, the responsibility of general education to provide the technical and professional information necessary to practice law.

We inquire as to the qualities that should be possessed by one who aspires to wear the mantle of the law profession.

First. He must believe with great zeal that his status in society imposes upon him the opportunity and duty to protect and nurture the democratic way of life. He must entertain the strongest possible respect for the civil, economic, social, and religious rights of the individual in his person and his property. He must be tolerant of others and their errors without sacrificing the high principles of democracy. Making and acquiring money must be secondary to his social responsibility. Money will flow to him from the proper pursuit of his profession. He who would amass a fortune should avoid being a member of the law profession. It is often said that the successful lawyer works extremely hard, lives well, and dies poor.

We believe in democracy and the freedom of the individual that attends its practice. The importance of each individual in our society is often pointed to as a primary characteristic of our form of Government. We are not all created equal, but democracy in its best American tradition guarantees to each individual an equal opportunity to make the most of our unequal talents and abilities.

Six democracies of the past have been destroyed by internal causes but only two have expired at the violent hand of the invader, The citizens of Rome voted away their liberties in the age of Augustus. Florence by strictly constitutional methods placed the Medici family in complete power, thus insuring the speedy demise of Florentine democracy. In Venice a small group of powerful citizens, through the practice of fraud, corruptly purchased enough votes in the popular legislative body to turn the country peacefully over to a dictator. The First Republic of France naively invited Napoleon Bonaparte to become Consul and Emperor under the false hope that this dictatorship would save the democracy. The citizens of Italy with wild expressions of joy marched to the polls to fling away their democracy in exchange for the dictatorship of Mussolini. The voters of the Weimar Republic of Germany, by an overwhelming vote at the polls, destroyed what little democracy they had and invited the horrors of Hitler in the hope of better economic and social conditions. Only Athens and the Third Republic of France succumbed to violence from outside and then principally because of their weakened internal conditions. The Macedonians overran Athens and Hitler the Third Republic of France.

History points to the tragic fact that in times of great economic stress enemies of democracies have too often been successful in persuading its citizens to exchange liberty for proposed security. Hunger demands bread, not platitudes. Democracy cannot operate without intelligent direction from its leaders. With appropriate modesty it can be said that lawyers are generally as well or better equipped to render this service than any other group of citizens. Therefore, the lawyers have much greater responsibility in this respect than do other members of a democracy. It is a solemn duty of one who would become a lawyer to recognize and accept this grave responsibility early in his prelaw training.

Democracy in our country, particularly in times of economic dislocation, is more vulnerable to death by vote of the people than by the strength of a foreign conqueror.

He who would fulfill the highest duty of the lawyer must understand democratic practices, its precepts, and be willing to give freely of his talents, time, worldly goods, and best thought to protecting it and insuring its sound and sturdy growth.

Second. He must develop the ability to work well and effectively with other people. This assumes independence of thought with tolerance for the views of others, social ability, emotional stability, self-reliance, reliability, adaptability, industry, honesty, and good sportsmanship. Great learning and lofty ideals will be of little value to a person without the capacity and ability to translate them into accomplishments through contacts with other people.

Third. He must have good health. Effective living is greatly diminished by a sick and ailing body. It is generally agreed that the physical condition of a person materially influences his thinking and conduct. The temple that houses a good mind and a noble spirit deserves the best care and consideration. The strenuous and exacting life of a lawyer demands a well body with an almost inexhaustive supply of energy.

Fourth. We must have an inquiring attitude. The desire for truth should be high on his list of essentials. Refusing to accept

theories or statements without sound proof or logic, yet tolerant of the views and beliefs of others, he must be willing and ready to toil long hours to satisfy his desire for truth. Curiosity may have caused the demise of the cat but we have no record of a lawyer dying from this cause.

Fifth. He must have such specific information and skill as can be acquired during his general education period which will contribute to his profession. For example, the lawyer needs basic accounting and public speaking.

Sixth. He must be a person of deep human sympathies and understanding. His work and conduct should be directed to serving human beings. Institutions and systems are of importance only when their use improves the lot of individuals. Progress in this direction is often discouragingly slow because of ignorance or selfishness or both. The bright light of faith in the value of man must burn vigorously in the breast of the lawyer. The lawyer is called upon to be a skilled practitioner and is frequently expected to act as business doctor, adviser on intimate marital relations, and consultant on public relations. His knowledge of history and human experience must be broad and his sympathies attuned to mental and spiritual misery and misunderstanding. Such a man is humble and tolerant, but a tower of strength for those whom he serves.

Seventh. He must have an analytical mind. He must have the ability to analyze facts in terms of their origin and their present and future significance, at least to the extent of his experience and learning.

Eighth. He must know and understand the use of the English language. A large part of the work of a lawyer is expressed in speaking and writing, both of which require the use of the English language. The success or failure of the lawyer, perhaps more than other man, is measured by his ability to effectively use the English language.

Ninth. He should be a religious man. The lesson of history is that those who have influenced humanity, or segments of humanity, for good have been religious men. To have a satisfactory life a person must know, and at least at intervals, experience inward tranquility. This comes only to the person who feels a unity with God. Great strength and power is his who knows and practices this inner tranquility.

How can general education best serve the person who aspires to be a lawyer?

First. Aptitude tests and examining board.

Every person who would be a lawyer is not properly equipped educationally, temperamentally, mentally, or morally to enter the profession. The successful lawyer must have certain definite characteristics, as we have already indicated. If the prelaw student does not, at least, have the capacity to develop these characteristics, to the minimum degree necessary for a reasonably successful career, it would be the part of wisdom to so advise him and thus save the time and money, if nothing more valuable, of the student and the university. This could be accomplished by adequate aptitude tests and a careful examination by a board composed of competent and sympathetic persons. The members of such a board might be an outstanding psychologist, lawyer, judge, clergyman, and businessman. In addition to being an examining board it could also furnish guidance for the improvement of the applicant and student. If the applicant is recommended by the board, he would be admitted to the courses designed to further develop the desired characteristics. This board or another board would make such additional examinations of the student from time to time as might be found desirable, with a required final examination immediately before the student is scheduled to enter law school.

Second. Courses designed to develop a love for and understanding of democracy, and to define and promote the common good.

Courses in world political, social, and economic history, with emphasis on the democracies and the other specific forms of government, as well as courses in political science and economics, should be required. The theory of each type of government and its practice should be thoroughly understood and compared. The economics of a country influence its form of government and therefore should be studied by the prelaw student. Citizens haunted by the fearful specter of economic insecurity are an easy prey for those who promise immediate relief. The democratic way of life can be quickly exchanged for apparent security and an autocratic government. The mechanics of the service of a citizen in a democracy should be taught with a view of inspiring the student with the desire to take an active part in the operation and preservation of a democratic government when he becomes a lawyer. Freedom can best be preserved by one who understands its functions and the attendant evils of its loss. The properly trained lawyer is preeminently qualified to furnish leadership in this field. His knowledge and understanding of the value of democracy as compared with all other forms of government and his zeal for its perpetuation should come primarily from his prelaw training.

Third. Efficient use of the English language.

Every lawyer should be able to use language effectively. The prelaw training should encompass a general knowledge of the origin of our language—Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and Norman French—and a thorough understanding of English grammar, reading, spelling, poetry, public speaking, logic, and the great literature of the world, with emphasis on American and English literature. Most prelaw students are deficient in their ability to read and many are not good spellers. These are defects that must be corrected in prelaw training. The ability to think and express thoughts logically is an indispensable tool of the lawyer. In addition to speaking and writing correct English, a student should be taught to speak and write interestingly. Bare facts are often not enough. Even the dry bones of the law may be brought to life in a vivid description of their dust. Interest should be added to English courses by the study of the lives and speeches of great lawyers and important opinions by great jurists. The English courses should be given a place of first importance and should be pursued with vigor throughout the prelaw period. An intimate knowledge of the great poetry of the world is a mark of the educated man. The poet often sees and expresses in clear and interesting form the fundamental truths, hopes and aspirations of the human race. Prose writing never reach the height of imagination, beauty, and grandeur of great poetry. All human experience and ambitions find their highest and most poignant expression in poetry. The lawyer will find in the poets an ally and in poetry an arsenal for ready and effective use for important occasions. Personal pleasure and exercise in flights of the imagination are his who consorts with the poets. If he would "lift wing—fly—clutch great battlements, and walk legendary floors he must know and love poetry. (Sonnet from Beauty in Exile, by Arthur Davidson Ficke.)

Fourth. Courses designed to develop ability to work with others.

Courses in psychology and its practical daily application should be required of the prelaw student. Individual and group reactions should be understood and the rules applied in actual living. Good manners are based on a genuine consideration for others and should be taught in every class and activity. The student should have good manners when he enters the university, but the fact is that many do not. This condition must be recognized and corrected in the courses designed to help the student get along well with other people. The lawyer must be a salesman of high ability. He sells to other people. Clients do not seek out the misfits, the contentious and contrary, the selfish and the bad-mannered lawyer. With equal ability, the lawyer who has an attractive personality and inspires confidence will succeed when the recluse, the ill-adjusted, the contentious, and the bad-mannered will fail dismally. In the prelaw courses emphasis must be placed on developing a good personality. Much practice in applying the rules will be gained from clubs, forums, games, and other student activities. Encouragement should be furnished each student to take an active part in student activities. Careful supervision of these activities will accelerate the learning process, particularly in the field of satisfactory human relations. The prelaw student who completes his course without the ability to get along reasonably well with and inspire confidence in others should look elsewhere than the law for his vocation.

Fifth. Good health is essential to the lawyer.

Blackstone spoke from deep experience when he said, "The law is a jealous mistress." The quotation applies to the health of the lawyer as well as to his intellectual interests. No person can adequately serve the law who has a sick or unsound body. Well-directed courses in physical education, including the effect of emotions and food on human health, will give the prelaw student necessary information and develop habits that will insure a healthy body for vigorous living.

Sixth. Skills for the profession.

General education can furnish the student with certain skills and general technical information that will be useful to him as a lawyer. Examples are:

1. The ability to speak well in public.
2. The ability to reason and to think.
3. Basic accounting.
4. History and general practices of management—labor relations.
5. General principles of business management, including the corporate mechanisms.
6. General principles of various types of insurance. Aside from the skill in public speaking and in reasoning and thinking, the training should be of general nature and should not cover more than two quarters of a school year and preferably one quarter.

Seventh. An inquiring attitude and analytical mind.

Every lawyer should have an inquiring mind and enjoy intellectual pursuits. Thorough investigation of the subject is a characteristic of the good lawyer, an eagerness to exhaust the sources of knowledge in the matter under consideration is one of the hallmarks of a careful practitioner. This inquiring mind is sometimes referred to as the scientific mind; one that takes nothing for granted but measures all facts by the scientific yardstick. The courses of the prelaw student should develop these characteristic. Perhaps courses in biology, physics, or chemistry, and courses in logic and in analyzing problems of human conduct would develop the ability to analyze facts in terms of their origin and their present and future significance, as well as help develop the inquiring mind.

Eighth. The development of human sympathy and understanding.

All courses, to some extent, contribute to development of human sympathy and understanding. The social sciences, with emphasis on sociology, should assume first place in obtaining this objective. Some of the specific matters to be considered are:

1. Community relationships such as the individual and: (a) the local government; (b) civic clubs; (c) chamber of commerce; (d) church and school.

2. Christian ethics. Personally I would recommend a course in Bible, with particular emphasis on the book of Proverbs. The study

of a course in Bible may not be practical in a State institution, but there can hardly be objections to a course in Christian ethics. This training I consider basic.

3. Family relations.
4. Social effects of taxation.
5. Social effect of advertising.
6. Housing.
7. Social security.
8. Minority groups.

Ninth. Religious development.

Here again many courses of the prelaw student will furnish help. The world's great literature and art bear evidence of the faith of the human race in God as a source of power beyond the individual. Science carries forward this faith. The social sciences spring largely from the influence of the religious impulses of man. Philosophy in the main is the effort of man to discover a satisfactory system of daily living. If it is not necessary to have specific courses on this subject, then related courses should be designed to make it possible for the student to develop a closer relationship with God. Inward tranquillity is "the pearl of great price" and is more to be desired for satisfactory living than great riches.

Industrializing and Exporting to Nonindustrialized Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, President Truman in his inaugural address made some proposals looking toward the exportation of American industrial ability and equipment to the undeveloped parts of the earth. I think, therefore, it would be very useful to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a highly intelligent article by Mr. George H. Houston, entitled "Industrializing Nonindustrialized Areas of the World." I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Senators may wish also to refer to an earlier article by the same author entitled "Postwar Exportation of Capital Goods to Nonindustrialized Areas of the World," a copy of which can be obtained from the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIALIZING NONINDUSTRIALIZED AREAS OF THE WORLD

(By George H. Houston)

The subject assigned to me today is far too vast and intricate for adequate presentation in the brief time at our disposal. I shall endeavor, however, to give you a bird's-eye view of what is to me one of the great economic movements of modern times and to indicate how the United States and particularly the capital-goods industries can participate in it constructively.

In the remarks I had the pleasure of making before this organization some years ago, of which your president has so very kindly spoken, I undertook to show how the postwar industrialization of various areas of the world is really a continuation of the industrial revolution that began much more than a century ago. Industrial development in the modern sense began, following the invention of the steam engine, in a small area, probably not more than 1,000 miles in diameter, comprising parts of western Europe and Britain. It was organized generally along lines of what I would call European capitalism, based primarily upon the proposition of monopoly. This development was the natural outgrowth of feudalism and of the mercantile system from which it sprang. History shows that many venturesome undertakings of those times were initiated by monopolistic grants from the sovereign to individuals or groups of indiviuals; also the guilds of the mercantile age were highly monopolistic in their operations. These practices appear to have had a great influence upon the concepts and practices of European capitalism as it evolved from these origins.

The industrial development of the United States, starting early in the nineteenth century, caused the first break in this tight ring of industrial monopoly. During this early period, enterprises sprang up rapidly in the northeastern part of the United States in competition with European industry. Subsequently occurred the phenomenon of European capitalism supporting with capital and leadership this American development because Europeans found it not only inevitable, but, with many exceptions, very profitable. Later on, this industrial development moved westward and then southward in the United States. During this period industrial development started in other parts of the world, but in much smaller volume, all tending, however, toward the one inevitable objective of converting and manufacturing raw materials into finished products at the points of greatest over-all convenience and economy in the natural flow of such raw materials from their sources to the areas of their consumption as finished products.

Following World War I we saw a further surge of this character in the Soviet Union, as well as further industrial activity in Latin America, South Africa, and other parts of the world. Following World War II we see these trends resumed with pressures increasing steadily, particularly in Latin America, looking toward the general industrial development of many different localities.

I do not see how these trends can be stopped, although they can be retarded. I do not believe, however, that it is to the advantage of the developed areas of the world to attempt to retard them. In fact, I think the true interests of such developed areas lie in encouraging these developing areas in every practicable and reasonable manner to accomplish their objectives of industrial development. It is my observation that most people in the United States are in sympathy with these developments, except that some question whether they will not reduce our own foreign markets for manufactured goods. This is a fallacy carried over into our present-day thinking from nineteenth century Europe which wished to hold much of the world in what has been called a condition of colonial economy, engaged in extracting raw materials, raising agricultural products, sending them to western Europe for manufacture and then taking them back, in part, as finished products.

The buying power of any country, from foreign sources, is obviously dependent upon the foreign exchange and foreign credit that is available to it with which to pay for what it buys. Do not let there be any mistake about the fact that the industrial development of undeveloped areas of the world will increase and not decrease their ability and desire to buy and import goods of foreign make. The best market that western Europe and Britain have ever had in all their history is the United States of America, a market that was created in spite of the initial opposition of the Old World. By the same token, our best markets in the future will be the areas of the world that have the highest standard of living. These are the areas that will have the greatest volume of needs to satisfy by foreign purchases together with the greatest resources with which to pay for them. Our poorest markets always will be those which are living a subsistence existence, producing what they consume and being required to live largely on the consumer goods they can produce.

It is imperative for the future well-being of developed areas that the standard of living of these undeveloped areas be raised by every practical, proper, and effective means. The populations in these areas are growing rapidly, some of them more rapidly than at any time in their history. These populations cannot be confined in their activities to the old colonial concepts of economic servitude to the developed areas. They must be given the opportunity to use their own labor in converting their own raw materials into finished products with which to satisfy their own wants. Hence, it is of importance to understand the problems involved in these world-wide trends toward industrial development, and to participate to the best of our ability in the great undertakings involved in carrying them forward.

The questions remain, however, as to the nature of this industrialization process and as to how it can be constructively supported and assisted by the people of the United States.

In my earlier remarks on this subject I called attention to the fact that this process involved not only the procurement of the required capital goods but also, and of equal importance, the procurement and assimilation of the techniques pertaining to the design and use of the products to be produced and to the processing of their manufacture by the use of the capital goods provided, as well as the acquisition and assimilation of the managerial arts applicable to production and distribution in these new undertakings.

Without successfully acquiring and assimilating these techniques and managerial arts, progress in the effective use of new capital goods, especially in new lines of product, will be extremely slow and surprisingly expensive. These techniques and managerial arts cannot be imported into a given locality, packaged and earmarked as a commodity. Rather, after all the textbooks and written records available have been studied and assimilated, there is a vast area of interpretation, explanation, adjustment, amplification, and actual application which can be accomplished only by individual human effort and contact.

It will be appreciated, of course, that processing techniques must, to a substantial degree, follow the characteristics of the capital equipment used; also that the use and maintenance techniques applicable to the products made must to a large extent follow the performance and design characteristics embodied in the construction of the related products. Even the managerial arts and practices used in a given situation must follow to a degree the characteristics of the equipment used. An automatic plant making a given product requires quite a very different plan of organization for its successful operation as well as a different type of individual supervisor from one making the same product by processes which are not automatic. It will be apparent from these brief comments that there must be a continuous, close, and intimate relation between the products made, the production equipment used, and the related techniques and managerial activities. All too frequently, however, these relations are neither close nor intimate and sometimes are most apparent by their absence.

Technicians and industrial managers in these undeveloped localities are almost

wholly absent, beyond the areas of agriculture and lumbering and the extraction industries. Mr. McLain (Chester A. McLain, general counsel, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) spoke very interestingly about the lack of manpower in these localities. It has not been my observation that there is a general shortage of worker manpower in many of these localities or that the worker lacks inherent ability. I have observed, however, an incredible lack of competent personnel in the classifications of workers between the mass of manual workers on the one hand and on the other, the promotional and financial leaders of these ventures. In most of these countries there is almost a total lack of this middle class of business people, the thing which has made the United States and Germany great industrial countries. This deficiency is not going to be quickly satisfied; it is probably the greatest single deterrent to the industrial development of these areas, which development can go forward only so fast as this type of manpower can be developed and maintained.

Before pursuing this question further, I want to speak for a moment about worker capability. I have had some experience in training large numbers of workers without previous experience in industry of any kind. In the Appalachian Mountains of the United States I have seen thousands of people employed in the metalworking industries who never before had seen the inside of a workshop. I have seen these people with proper and adequate supervision made into good workers in a short time, and I have seen them, both men and women, become deeply interested in the acquisition of skill and craftsmanship. I have seen workers from many privitive groups in the West Indies—Cubans, Jamaicans, Dominicans, and Haitians, employed in large numbers, and except where these people are not adequately fed, I have found it quite possible to make them into good manual workers, provided the undertaking is properly organized to teach and train them, and the tasks are broken down to start with, into relatively simple operations. Under these conditions I have seen these workers grow rapidly toward competence in the manual crafts. The successful employment in industry of inexperienced and unskilled labor involves intensive, high-grade supervision and careful, exact, forward planning.

With respect to the intermediate group of technicians, administrators, supervisors, and managers of which I was speaking, there are only three ways I know of by which they can be procured and developed by any locality in which they are lacking. One is by the process of internal development by trial and error without outside assistance. This process is extremely slow. Of necessity it was used in western Europe in the early days of its industrial development, because it had no developed locality to draw from, but it took a century to develop anything approaching modern concepts of competence in these fields. We cannot recommend this process except as one facet of the over-all development. The second method is to send personnel from these developing areas into developed areas like the United States for training. This is faster, but still is slow. Industry in the United States does not expect to put men into important technical or supervisory positions until they have had years of actual experience. How many countries are going to send their men abroad in large numbers for years of training in actual business? As a rule, they expect to accomplish the required objectives in about as many months of actual experience as our industry requires in years.

The third method is to import into these developing areas technicians, managers, and supervisors from developed areas to provide the required leadership in the use of the capital equipment provided. This importation must be accomplished primarily by the bringing in of trained individuals competent not only to practice what they know but to transmit it to others by training, teaching, and demonstration. Such individuals must be adaptable and accommodating to their new environment without sacrifice of their technical principles or essential practices. They must be competent at all times to separate the nonessential from the essential, and to modify and adapt the nonessential without impairment of the essential. Such individuals are difficult to find, but when competent and properly placed and supported, they can make a very valuable contribution to the desired objective of industrial progress. This is the most effective method of developing rapidly and soundly in new localities the essential staff for industrial development, but it must be coupled at all times with training and development of local personnel, gradually to supersede in part at least such outside personnel. Many undeveloped localities welcome incoming personnel of this type, realizing that they bring with them assets of great value; unfortunately, however, all too many communities fear and resent such newcomers as dangerous competitors for the opportunities that may arise, and make their way difficult and thorny. Frequently such antagonisms are the result of conflicting personalities and thus are more or less inevitable, but I believe it to be essential that localities seeking industrial development must come to realize that they can learn only from those who know and can teach them, and that they lose much more by rejecting the assistance of an individual who is competent than he does by being forced to return to the environment from which he came. I have seen this process of rejection by prejudice and jealousy at work over a long period and in many different situations, and it is a condition that requires continual thought and attention to prevent.

The ultimate solution of this problem of manpower for leadership must be achieved by a combination of these three methods starting first with the importation by developing areas of foreign personnel; proceeding at the same time with the sending of their own personnel into developed areas for training not just for a few months, but frequently for years; and finally by the training of local personnel at home as rapidly and as thoroughly as is possible. This matter of competent technical, administrative, and supervisory personnel is an acute problem and, except as it is dealt with intelligently, sympathetically, and understandingly, the desired industrial development will proceed exceedingly slowly and with many heartbreaking disappointments because of lack of this vital ingredient in the industrial equation.

The exportation of capital goods from the United States has proceeded at a high rate since the end of the war and it looks as though this condition will continue for an indeterminate period (a) for the rebuilding of Europe, (b) for the continued development of unindustrialized areas, the extent of this latter development depending, of course, upon many factors some of which lie wholly outside of the control of American business but many of which are at least partially responsive to American business leadership.

I have had the temerity to attempt to form some idea of the size of this world movement toward industrial development, but it is exceedingly difficult. I will give you one example, however, as an indication. If by 1980 the Republic of Mexico is to have a degree of industrial development per capita equal to the per capita development of the United States in 1930, there must be found for use in Mexico in connection with this development machinery and equipment of an aggregate value of about $8,000,000,000, at 1929 price levels. This is without consideration of any increase in population and the Mexican population is increasing rapidly. Further, it is without the inclusion of any form of construction or real estate improvements which would be undertaken with internal labor and materials and thus does not enter into the question of importation.

The greater part of this machinery and equipment would have to be imported, particularly during the early part of this period, as the production of capital goods, particularly machinery and equipment, should not be an early objective in any such industrial undertaking. You will find in my remarks of some years ago a discussion of the sequence in which such industrial development might best be undertaken. I will not attempt to repeat it here, except to say that the production of machinery and equipment does not fit well into its early stages. This would mean an annual input of capital equipment in terms of about $275,000,000, United States, possibly diminishing in future years as the production of machinery and equipment expanded within the country. If 1929 price levels are adjusted to prospective costs in nearby periods, some idea will be gotten as to the cost of the capital goods required in this one area. Yet, if the man on the street is asked "Should not a country like Mexico look forward to an industrial development equivalent to that of the United States 50 years earlier?" I think you would find the almost universal reply that this would be expected. To accomplish this objective involves this enormous input of capital goods. Multiply this one instance by all the areas in the world seeking industrial development, and you will have some measure of the size of this world movement. Mr. McLain very well pointed out that not all areas seeking industrial development are qualified for it. Probably some never will be ready for it, but even those that are represent undertakings that will require many years for realization.

The financial problems involved in these undertakings are those which frequently come to mind first, although I do not believe they are as important as the problems of leadership personnel of which we have spoken, for if these projects succeed, the financial problems will progressively become easier, but if these projects fail, if we have a repetition of much of our experience following World War I, then I believe this movement will be set back for many years. Success or failure will be determined by the leadership, technical and managerial, given to these undertakings, more nearly than by any other one factor. It seems to me that in considering the financial problems involved in undertakings of this character, we must break down available and potential resources into four distinct phases.

The first consists of the internal savings of the community seeking development, together with its ability prudently to expand its internal credit, available for long-time investment. This buying power, however, has no value for financing imports of capital goods, unless it is accompanied by the second phase, namely, the availability of foreign exchange arising primarily out of the volume of exports in excess of imports of other things than the capital goods sought for. Neither is effective for the acquisition of large volumes of capital goods, without the other.

Third, is the importation of permanent venture capital of which Mr. McLain has spoken. The United States in the nineteenth century benefited enormously from the importation of venture capital from Europe, particularly following the American Civil War. It probably moved the economic development of this country forward from 50 to 100 years.

Finally is the development of long-term foreign credits.

Much of the internal savings and available credit of these developing areas must be consumed, not in the importation of machinery and equipment, but in the type of capital expenditures that will be made with internal

materials and labor, such as buildings and all kinds of real-estate improvements. Only a portion of these internal financial resources can be looked for to finance the importation of capital goods from abroad.

As Mr. McLain has pointed out, the fundamental requirement for the free importation of foreign venture capital into these developing areas is confidence, confidence in the fact that the hazard to the capital will be confined to the venture itself, and will not be increased by political or social conditions in the community, unfavorable to its conservation. There must be confidence also as to fair and impartial treatment of this capital within the locality and, ultimately, confidence as to the ability of the investor freely to take out of the country the fruits arising from the use of his capital. As Mr. McLain said, much of the earnings from such venture capital will remain permanently within the country, but if it remains under compulsion, the fact that there is compulsion will be a very serious detriment to the encouragement of the movement of new capital into these developing communities.

Another very vital need, from the point of view of the American investor, is the revision of the United States income tax law so as to relieve capital thus invested in foreign countries from tax burdens identical with those that such capital has to bear when invested at home. Unless the United States Government gives recognition to the fact that such capital is subject to greater hazards abroad, while performing a useful and necessary function in these developing areas, and gives it this relief, I do not believe there will be anything like the necessary movement of venture capital from the United States into these developing areas that the economic conditions will warrant and justify. This venture capital is in turn of two distinct types. One is what I would call corporate capital, that is, capital of existing United States corporations used in the building and developing of branch plants throughout these developing areas. The other is the private capital of individual investors seeking venturesome opportunities for profit. They each need the United States tax advantage that I speak of, as an encouragement to move in the volume that otherwise is justified. Such venture capital incurs risks, sometimes very great risks, and it is entitled to a corresponding reward. Naturally, such rewards are higher in communities where capital is scarce and where opportunity for development is great than in the older industrialized localities. Even this increased opportunity for reward will be insufficient, however, to draw venture capital from the United States in adequate volume in the absence of the tax relief referred to.

The various financial resources here discussed will not be sufficient, however, to provide the capital needed, and particularly the foreign exchange, to finance the undertakings now pressing for realization. In addition to these resources, we must look also to long-time foreign credits. Many projects that are necessary to the industrial development of these areas are not suitable for venture capital—foreign or domestic. We must recognize that practically all of these developing areas throughout the world are organized politically as mixed economies; that is, government is intervening more or less intimately in the business activities of the community. I know of no country in which the concept of private enterprise that prevailed in the United States during the nineteenth century now exists. Practically all of them have some degree of economic planning by Government for the development of the country and some degree of governmental intervention in business. Many projects essential to the development of the country such as water conservation, irrigation, and highways are by their nature unsuited to venture capital and must be financed largely by Government credits. These long-time credits are likely to include, in the long run, government-to-government loans which already exist in some instances, and which probably will exist in larger amounts in the future: loans from the International Bank which we heard Mr. McLain discuss so ably a while ago; and Export-Import Bank credits to finance the export of capital equipment, which credits generally will be of intermediate term.

Finally, there is need for the use of the capital markets of the United States for the procurement of private capital through security distributions; I say finally, because, in my opinion, the use of the capital markets generally for foreign investments of this character will be practicable in volume only in the later stages of these developments. I know of two issues of securities of Mexican companies that have been sold in the United States in the last few years, but I think that such issues will be relatively infrequent until these developing localities and individual ventures have more fully proven their ability to support effectively the securities they wish to distribute abroad.

All of these financing resources will be needed. Probably the greatest of them, speaking for the long term, will be the exportation of venture capital in large part through the sale of securities on our United States security markets.

There are serious defects, however, in many of the practices now being followed in the promotion, financing, and development of new ventures in these developing areas. These defects arise out of an inadequate understanding frequently of the conditions under which a new enterprise must operate, conditions of marketing, of raw material supply, of availability of equipment, and of availability of technicians and management. Frequently there is entirely inadequate advance investigation in connection with such new undertakings.

This investigation is sometimes very difficult, due to the fact that the areas under development lack organized statistical information, and business is carried on under the old European concept of secrecy where it is considered very detrimental to disclose information and where much of the information that is disclosed is misleading. The American idea of laying on the table much of what is being done is completely foreign to the mental processes of many of the people who must be looked to in order to get a clear understanding of what a given venture is all about.

In general, the outstanding characteristic of many of these new ventures is overoptimism. Similar conditions existed in the early days of the United States. All one has to do is read the history of many things that went on in the United States from the sixties to World War I, to see the tendency to overoptimism at work. The fact that those conditions are now being duplicated in these developing areas does not, however, simplify the problems that arise in dealing with them.

As a result of this overoptimism, initial financing is almost always inadequate and too much of it all too frequently is provided by debt securities rather than by capital stocks, so that many of these ventures face failure before they get started through inability to carry the heavy load of fixed charges. The thinking in these areas is almost always on a short-term basis. There is one industrial leader from continental Europe now operating in Latin America who has said many times that no new venture should be undertaken in these countries in expectation of putting it on a profitable operating basis in less than 5 years and in some cases even 10 years. All too many of the plans that have been attempted must have profits in a few months or else they must collapse, or be refinanced. These defects in promotional set-ups and financial structures must be recognized and prevented. They are vital to the effectiveness of this movement. While we know they are growing pains, and more experience will help to cure them, yet they are serious while they last and are detrimental to progress.

In conclusion I would again emphasize that this industrial development of undeveloped areas is a wide and deep surge toward a better economic organization of the world. This movement is of supreme importance to economic stability and particularly to pan-American prosperity. Except as it is encouraged and assisted, peaceful, orderly development will be difficult in many areas seeking profitable employment for rapidly growing populations. The standards of living in these areas must be improved. This can be accomplished only by such areas producing more of what they need to consume. It is to the best interests of the people of the United States to contribute constructively to this movement with equipment, with techniques and management, with sound planning and with capital—not by granting every loan asked for or by always saying yes, but by genuinely constructive aid in planning and execution.

Great wealth will be created through this process over the next two or three generations. There are some areas of Latin America that in my opinion face a future development similar to that experienced in the United States following the close of the Civil War and in the southern and western parts of the United States at a later date. Other areas will not experience a growth of this character, but we cannot escape the fact that some are now ready. When the people of the United States participate in these undertakings, they are entitled to participate also in the benefits fairly gained from them by sound business practices and without improper exploitation. It seems to me that there is a growing recognition of this right of the industrialist, the entrepreneur, and the creditor to benefit from the gains arising from the use of their knowledge and resources in these developments. I look forward to great benefits accruing to the people of the United States from these developments, but only as we proceed realistically and carefully, but with enterprise and initiative, and as we contribute to them soundly and to the best of our intelligence and ability.

New Johnsonville Steam-Generating Plant

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, this week, in all probability, the House will vote upon a proposal to authorize the construction of a steam-generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., to supplement the output of hydroelectric power by the Tennessee Valley Authority. This steam power is absolutely necessary if that agency is to furnish its customers, who are the farmers, the wives of the farmers, the working people, the veterans, and all business establishments and all industries in that area, with sufficient power, because there are periods of drought when the hydroelectric installations cannot furnish an adequate supply of power.

There has come to my desk this week, and I assume to the desks of all other

Members of the House, a letter from Pursell Smith, who receives $65,000 a year plus an unlimited expense account, and this letter included a pamphlet which reeks with falsehood and misrepresentation. During the debate on this measure I shall point out specifically the falsehoods in that lobbyist's pamphlet, which he makes bold to send to the Members of this House.

Food for Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting article, entitled "Food for Europe, But With an If," written by Nathan Koenig and published in the January 1949 issue of Survey. I have submitted the article to the Public Printer and have obtained an estimate of the cost of printing it. The estimated cost is $177.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR EUROPE, BUT WITH AN IF

(By Nathan Koenig)

All through the summer and into the fall the land in Europe was green—a healthy, vigorous green. Mother Nature it seemed was making amends for the disastrous effects of last year's drought.

And in quite the same way, the spirit of hope that I found in the hearts of western European people during the trip from which I returned in September was in strong contrast to the despair I saw there in the summers of 1946 and 1947.

Despite shortages of fertilizer, farm equipment, and other essentials for production, this year's crops have been good in nearly all European countries; and European farmers are filled with real satisfaction for a job well done. They are looking ahead with greater confidence in the future, for they know that with more grain available throughout the world they can begin laying plans for more desirable patterns of production, with the increases in livestock essential to a balanced agriculture. They know, too, that with more food the people in the cities will be able to produce more of the consumer and industrial goods needed by everyone and the interdependence between country and city will again find expression in the exchange of goods and services.

Aside from the role played by favorable weather in crop production, much credit for this improvement must certainly go also to the European recovery program. This help from the United States is beginning to make itself felt in concrete terms of increased production of the basic sources of industrial energy. Now, with a good harvest in hand and with the people of Europe—for the first time since the end of the war—in a position to count on enough bread in the world to see them through until the next harvest, continued progress is underwritten at least for the months immediately ahead.

But this encouraging picture leaves no room for complacency on our part. For even though an adequate supply of the two basic elements of diet—bread and potatoes—is in sight until the next harvest, the fear of hunger still dominates the minds of western Europe's 280,000,000 people.

As 1949 begins to unfold, the eyes of these people are already searching for signs that will further bolster their spirits and strengthen their recovery efforts in the new year. Their anxiety centers around many complex questions including these two: Will the next harvest yield enough food to keep up the human energies needed for additional recovery gains? What will the United States Congress do to provide for the second year of help under the European Recovery Program? Little by little during the next 6 months the answers to these particular questions will become apparent. In the meantime, however, these people are starting the new year with hope and prayer.

Another harvest aproaching the size of the last one is urgently needed to raise low ration allowances, to increase the meager stocks, and to consolidate the gains currently being made under ERP. Substantial increases in the output of raw and finished goods have been achieved through this program and the pace of economic activity is rising. The countries taking part in this program are hopeful that the results being attained will merit a decision by the United States to provide adequately for the second year of its operation.

Most of the countries of western Europe cannot produce all of the food they need to keep their people reasonably well fed—with heavy population and amount of land available for agricultural uses definitely limited. Their problem is to increase industrial production to provide an exportable supply of goods above domestic needs in a volume that will return the foreign exchange needed to pay for imports.

I could not escape the conclusion that the food-deficit countries of western Europe are paying more and more attention to increasing further their own production largely in order to become less dependent on outside sources. This trend is being accelerated by the shortage of dollars, which is forcing curtailment of imports from the United States and other dollar-trading areas. Whether this is to become a permanent trend remains to be seen. But—obviously—unless these countries are in position to get hold of dollars through exports they will follow it willy-nilly, for they will not have the dollars to pay for imports.

Among the food-importing countries, France, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Sweden are definitely reorienting their production (mainly through extensive use of subsidies) so as to be less dependent for their food and feed requirements. This raises a serious question of whether the deficit food-producing areas of Europe are embarking on a course which in the long run means abandonment of the old idea of each producing what it is best adapted to and of obtaining through international trade the products more advantageously produced elsewhere.

In the case of the United Kingdom, for example, no one questions her need for more food. The fact is that the United Kingdom, being primarily an industrial area, has long relied on manufacturing for export to provide through imports the bulk of the food and feed for home consumption. During the war she was forced to expand food production and elaborate government machinery was organized for that purpose. Now, even though world food prospects are greatly improved and promise further improvement in the future, there is to be no let-up in the home effort.

I found the British vigorously pushing a newly announced agricultural program which—if translated into output available for sale and adjusted for requirements of imported feedstuffs—would raise food and feed production 50 percent above prewar by 1951–52, or 15 percent above the wartime peak of 1943–44. This is to be accomplished by higher minimum prices to farmers together with extensive subsidies to raise total returns to producers. The British frankly admitted that the emphasis has been deliberately placed on saving dollars, especially on livestock products and cereals, in marked contrast with wartime when the emphasis was on saving ships.

Efforts of other countries to become more self-sufficient follow the same dollar-saving emphasis, although in each case there is the further desire of achieving greater security in their food supply. At the same time, many of the more important European food-exporting countries, such as Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, and Poland, along with others behind the iron curtain, are not only aiming to restore their prewar levels of production but to expand them for even greater exports. If these objectives of increased production are achieved by both groups, serious economic disruptions are almost certain to follow.

Already some of the agricultural exporting countries of Europe are having difficulty in finding outlets for all of their products. This past summer, Italy and Holland had surpluses of fresh fruits and vegetables which could not readily be sold because importing countries either lacked the money to pay or else had ample supplies due to the season's good growing conditions. Similarly, Turkey and Greece now have surpluses of dried fruits and tobacco literally begging for markets. And in Germany—in the area which we are supplying with thousands of tons of necessary foods in order to maintain a minimum diet—I heard farmers actually complaining against imports on the ground that prices for their own good crops were being depressed.

I observed, too, that the Communists were not slow in taking advantage of this. In all the countries where farmers are facing marketing problems—and throughout Europe, for that matter—the Communists are spreading the idea that the European recovery program is simply a means by which the United States hopes to solve some of its own problems. European farmers are being told that the United States foresees huge agricultural surpluses and that it is using the ERP solely as a means of dumping these surpluses. In countries where surpluses do exist, it is not surprising that this argument is finding some receptive ears and is arousing the antagonism against the United States that its proponents hope for.

On the whole, however, the good crops this year have weakened the force of Communist arguments relating to food. One French farmer summed it up this way: "Farm workers and city people listen to the Communists more readily during poor seasons, such as in 1947. Then they can agitate and make the people dissatisfied. But this is hard to do when crops are good."

Although fruits and vegetables were high in price, they were rather plentiful in most countries of Europe during the past summer. On the other hand, meats, cheese, eggs continue in short supply along with fats and oils, especially butter. Prices for these latter items are for the most part beyond reach of the great mass of people in many of the countries. A good cut of meat in France retails from 400 to over 500 francs per kilogram, or from 65 to over 85 cents a pound. Compared with current dollar prices in the United States this may not appear to be high for meat. But to the average French worker who earns around 5,000 francs a week it is a very high price, since the purchase of, say, 2.2 pounds of meat for his family would take about 10 percent of his weekly wages.

Talk to the average European about food today and his biggest complaint will be about high prices. Since the masses of people are paid low wages, the skyrocketed prices leave only the simpler rationed food

within the workingman's reach. A prosperous French businessman with whom I had discussed food problems on previous visits to Europe told me:

People with money have no trouble getting food. What we can't buy on the legal market we can buy on the black market. You can get any kind of food you want on the black market—but it takes a lot of money. But for the wage earner, it is different. He has little money and so must live off what he is able to get from the ration.

In view of this year's supply prospects for food grains in many of the European countries, there has been marked improvement in the quality of bread permitted to be distributed and an increase of the bread rations. Farmers also were encouraged to market their wheat to the flour mills rather than feed the year's increase to livestock. In France, for example, the price for wheat was raised by nearly 30 percent, the increase being paid by the government to avoid boosting the price of bread.

This year's wheat crop in France is just short of prewar level, and under ordinary circumstances the crop of from seven to seven and one-half million tons would not have required any imports. Under present conditions, however, with the shortage of other foods, France will probably have to import one to one and one-half million tons of either wheat or coarse grains in order to make sure of an ample bread supply. Moreover, there is reason to fear that even with this year's big wheat crop it will be impossible for the Government to collect all the grain that it should. France needs a minimum of 5,000,000 tons of wheat for food alone and it is estimated that around 4,000,000 tons will be collected. Out of last year's drought-stricken output it collected only a totally inadequate 2,000,000 tons. Thus, even with the price increase, it is expected the farmers will hold back on deliveries so as to feed livestock or to sell on the black market.

All over Europe there is an almost inescapable incentive for farmers to feed part of their grain since the excessively high prices for meat and other livestock products make it exceedingly profitable to feed as much grain as one can safely hold out. This meat shortage throughout most of Europe is a result of the wartime need to use grain for direct human consumption instead of as livestock feed. A further liquidation was forced by the 1947 drought, which burned pastures and sharply reduced production.

Livestock, moreover, is basic to the type of agriculture carried on in most countries of Europe. The animals, especially cattle, not only provide food products and draft power but also the manure which is a precious fertilizer. This is particularly true in Germany, where a definite program is under way to increase livestock to the prewar level—a reversal of the policy dictated so far by the need for more grain for direct human consumption.

In Germany, also, I found other signs of healthy economic activity that were missing in the two previous years. It seemed as if a frozen corpse had suddenly come to life. Where before stores were meagerly stocked with pitifully crude goods, they now had many household and personal items. People stood in front of the store windows feasting their eyes on the displays; it had been years since they had seen such things. For the first time, too, a real start is being made in private repair and construction of buildings, although with the shortage of material it will, of course, take many years to overcome the war damage. Also black-market operations have been greatly reduced.

The German people with whom I talked were far more optimistic and hopeful. One factor behind the tremendous transformation was the currency reform measure which put into effect the new Deutsche mark with a conversion ratio of 10 to 1 for the exchange of old money for new. The action has provided a currency in which the people of Germany could have confidence. As soon as the new currency was issued, vast stores of goods came out of hiding to stock empty store shelves.

From the standpoint of Germany's food supply problem the currency reform came at a very appropriate time—a little in advance of harvest. It made farmers more eager to market their products through legitimate channels, a great improvement in the availability and distribution of foodstuffs to the German people.

The combination of good crops and sounder currency is contributing much to the economic rehabilitation of the German economy. At best, however, progress is going to be very slow and a great deal of patience will be required not only by the Germans themselves but by the world as well. The fact that the Germans do not as yet have a central government makes it difficult not only to fix responsibility (which is now so likely to be evaded) but also to provide the machinery essential to the operation of an economy.

There is, for example, the problem of agricultural credit. Being short of the new currency, German farmers with good crops on hand now find themselves in need of an agricultural credit system which can make loans so as to encourage orderly marketing as well as help finance future production. Since the beginning of this year's harvest, it was apparent that the storageable crops were being marketed off the farms too fast because farmers could not get loans to tide them through until their products could be sold on a more orderly basis. Also, the late summer and fall is the time when German farmers buy their fertilizer and other supplies for the next crop year. Lack of means for financing has slowed the early movement of production essentials. For fertilizer alone it was estimated that loans of 1,000,000,000 Deutsche marks, or $300,000,000, would be needed.

Wherever one travels through Europe there is a tremendous amount of interest in how things are done in the United States. I talked with farmers in France, Germany, Denmark, and England and practically all of them were genuinely hungry for information on production techniques used by American farmers. A German agricultural scientist bemoaned the fact that for 9 years the farmers of his country have had no contact with the outside world.

The European farmer has long been recognized as a good farmer, one who tills his soil with great care to preserve its fertility and at the same time obtain maximum yields. Yet many of his methods are primitive and inefficient by our standards. The human being still remains the major source of work power in European agriculture. One reason for this backwardness was the abundant supply of labor available to farmers before the war. The war has changed this in many respects, so that now in many areas there actually is a shortage of farm workers and the combination of a shortened labor supply and a relatively improved farm income has brought on a great interest in mechanization—creating other problems.

On some farms I visited, the number of tractors and horses, and in some cases oxen, were far in excess of the draft power an American farmer would use for producing the same crops. In addition, these farms had more labor than appeared necessary for efficient operation.

One of the more progressive large farms I visited in France, about 24 miles from Paris, has 800 acres of land which I was told had been cultivated for the last six or seven centuries. This year's crops included 275 acres of wheat, 100 acres each of oats, sugar beets, and mangels for livestock, a little over 60 acres each of potatoes, alfalfa hay, and green peas for canning, plus a total of 25 acres in barley and mustard seed. Livestock included 12 cows to supply milk and dairy products for farm use, 400 sheep, and 1,000 chickens. Draft power was supplied by three horses, eight oxen, and six tractors, three of which were American made, the others being Swedish, French, and German. Labor was supplied by 23 families living on the farm in addition to 14 German war prisoners.

This case is illustrative of other mixed situations I found. While great emphasis has been placed on the acquisition of tractors, some countries of Europe still are unable to cultivate all of their land because of the continuing shortages of draft power brought about by the war. There are other countries with considerably more draft animals than before the war. Still others have increased their tractors to a point where total mechanical and animal draft power is materially above prewar.

The high preference is for American-made farm machinery. European farmers like the ease with which such equipment can be handled and they marvel at its efficiency. The one complaint of these farmers is that they are unable to get all of the American farm machinery they would like. This difficulty is due in part to their shortage of dollars and in part to the legal limitation on farm machinery exports. Congress earlier this year forbade the shipment of this product abroad in excess of a total of $75,000,000.

Congress will probably need to reexamine this provision to determine whether it is desirable from our own national standpoint. It was obvious in Europe that farm machinery actually needed from the United States could very well exceed the limit and with careful distribution would be very helpful to economic restoration. There is and will continue to be a definite market in Europe for American-made farm equipment, and it might be detrimental to us in the long run if by our unwillingness to meet the need now we forced European countries into this production.

It should be noted, however, that mechanization of much of western Europe agriculture is not possible. A large proportion of Europe's farms are barely large enough to provide a fair living for the family even with very intensive operation. Most of the farms are under 20 acres and are in the main owner-operated. In many areas the landholdings of an individual farmer are widely scattered parcels grown smaller and smaller as they were handed down through the generations.

I talked to the owner of one such farm in Germany, a woman whose husband had been killed during the war. She operates with the aid of hired help and her two young sons. The 15 hectares, or 38 acres, she owns consist of 60 plots of land, the nearest being located within 10 minutes walk from the village, where she has her home and barns, the farthest being about 30 minutes walk away. The one major piece of farm equipment, aside from the necessary plow and similar tools, is an American-made grain binder over 20 years old. When I visited the place it was being used by her sons. In addition to wheat, oats, and some barley, the 15 hectares produce potatoes, sugar beets, and hay—which was cut green for cattle feeding. The livestock included 12 head of dairy cows and four draft horses.

In Switzerland I visited a farm of 10 hectares or nearly 25 acres operated by the owner and his three married sons, all of whom worked and lived on the place. The principal crops were grain, potatoes, and grass and hay. This farm was stocked with nine milking cows, three heifers, three sows, one horse for draft power. I saw on the wall of the barn a battery of eight scythes bearing signs of heavy use in cutting grass. In sharp

contrast was the newly acquired one-cylinder self-propelled grass cutter with a 5-foot cutting bar in front. It was the first piece of mechanized equipment ever owned on this farm, which had been in the same family for generations, and the owner showed it with pride.

Although from an economic standpoint the European farmer is far better off than the man in the city, he is not the free individualist we in the United States consider our farmers to be. In each country of Europe the farmer is subject to direct government controls in practically every phase of his work. He is bogged down with the necessity of making frequent reports to government agencies and he carries a high tax burden.

At the same time, the governments are inclined to cater to the needs of their farmers because those in power recognize the important role of an adequate food supply in preventing political upheaval. The danger now cropping up—and which I mentioned earlier—is that western Europe will go to such an extreme in promoting further increases in food production to achieve greater self-sufficiency that it may actually lower the standard of living for the people.

For right now the emphasis is on bringing agricultural and industrial production up to a level where western Europe can trade within itself. This emphasis not only overlooks the mutual advantages of trade with the rest of the world but also disregards the extremely disruptive fact that eastern Europe, a natural surplus food-producing area, may in the next year or two be forced to seek markets outside of the Russian sphere of influence. If the necessary markets are available, these countries in turn can buy the surplus manufactured goods for which western Europe may by then require outlets.

Further, this emphasis disregards the interest of the United States and other Western Hemisphere countries in a goodly volume of trade with western Europe from a long-time standpoint. True, during and since the war, the United States has had to ship to these countries vast quantities of grain and other foods far beyond normal world trade. But if the countries of western Europe are to become self-supporting and make their contribution to world peace, then certainly some part of their exportable commodities—and of ours—must find a place on that broad two-way avenue of world trade that lies between our shores and theirs.

Which thought brings me home with a concluding moral for ourselves: We in the United States, along with the others, must remember that ships crossing the Atlantic move both ways—that if we want to export we must be willing to import. Only in this way can we provide the exchange necessary to keep the cargoes moving. For in the final summing up, the efforts now being made to get production up under the European recovery program will be to no avail unless the resulting goods find outlets and meet human wants.

California Celebrates Its One Hundredth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in 1950 the glorious fabulous State of California will celebrate the one hundredth anniversary of its admission to the Union. A great centennial celebration in honor of this event began in 1948 on the anniversary of the discovery of gold in California and will continue through 1950.

The California Centennials Commission, under the cochairmanship of P. G. Winnet of Bullocks, Los Angeles, and Joseph R. Knowland, publisher of the Oakland Tribune, has prepared a comprehensive program in cooperation with local communities and organizations in California which will include the reenactment of the Portola exploration of California in 1769, the cultural Centennials of Art and Literature, the Historical Caravan, and a great historical pageant planned for the Los Angeles Coliseum.

While the centennial celebration is in progress, we should remember the events which brought this great land of California from wilderness to empire, and the following article prepared by the California Centennials Commission outlines the outstanding events in the romantic and picturesque history of California:

"California, land of gold * * * at the right hand of the Indies * * * close to the terrestrial paradise." So wrote Ordones de Montalvo, Spanish teller of tales, in a chivalric romance of the fifteenth century. Thus a myth came into being which was to be transformed into reality.

Hernando Cortes seized the Aztec kingdom of Mexico in 1521 and sent out troops in search of further spoil. An expedition, led by Fortun Jimenez, crossed the gulf and discovered the peninsula of Lower California. Jiminez was slain by Indians but his followers returned with tales of a new land of high mountains and rugged coasts which they believed to be that fabled country of which Montalvo had written, California, the land of gold.

In 1542 came Juan Rodrigues Cabrillo who sailed up the coast of Lower California and discovered a port which he called San Miguel (now San Diego). He continued northward, paused at the Channel Islands and Santa Barbara, but failed to find harbors of consequence beyond Point Concepcion.

In 1579 Sir Francis Drake, commander of the *Goulden Hinde*, landed on the northern coast of California on his voyage around the world. He was hospitably received by the Indians and, in solemn ceremony, took possession of the country in the name of Queen Elizabeth of England. He called the white cliffed harbor New Albion and returned to Britain with glowing reports of a new empire where there is no part of the earth to be taken up wherein there is not some likelihood of gold or silver.

Sebastian Vizcaino led a Spanish expedition in 1602 which founded San Diego and Monterey and, late in the eighteenth century, came Father Junipero Serra, Gaspar de Portola, Juan Bautista de Anza, Juan Manuel de Ayala, and others, all seeking to extend the conquest of church and state in the New World.

Missions were soon established along El Camino Real—the King's Highway—one day's march apart from San Diego to Sonoma. Presidios were built to guard the many harbors and the air of old Spain clung about the rambling adobe walls of the haciendas. The early explorers were disappointed in their search for the fabled gold and precious stones with which the western wilderness was said to abound but many a settler found life easy and profitable in raising cattle and sheep and in various forms of agriculture.

The years from 1782 down to the time of the American occupation have been called by historians "the romantic period of California." This was the era of the Dons, great landowners, whose Castilian hospitality was a byword. It was the day of hidalgo and vaquero, caballero, and conquistador, of the thrilling rodeo and gay fiesta. It was during this period that other nations began to take a greater interest in California. Russians, who had established trading posts in Alaska, secured a tract of land on the Sonoma coast and constructed a settlement known as Fort Ross, which consisted of a stockade enclosing a church and several other structures, and a number of buildings located outside the enclosure. For 30 years they remained, but hunting and trade finally ceased to be profitiable and they disposed of their holdings to Capt. John A. Sutter (later referred to as general), George Vancouver, English explorer, on his visit to California, revived the claims of Drake. Ships of many lands called frequently at the ports of the western coast.

Across the Rockies, too, there was a growing curiosity about the West. Trappers had found wealth in the fur trade; merchants from Boston had come around Cape Horn. John A. Sutter, of German birth but a Swiss national, reached California in 1839 and received permission from Governor Alvarado to establish a colony and build a fort on the Sacramento River. He gave it the name of New Helvetia. Fremont describes the fort as a quadrangular structure of adobe, mounting 12 pieces of artillery and capable of admitting a garrison of 1,000 men; this at present consists of 40 Indians in uniform, one of whom is always on duty at the gate. The whites in the employ of Sutter number 30 men. The inner wall is formed into buildings comprising the common quarters, with a blacksmith and other workships, the dwelling house with a large distillery, and other buildings occupying more the center of the area.

On April 11, 1822, Spanish rule in Alta California had come to an end. Mexican governors replaced the Spaniards, the missions were secularized and gradually fell into decay. By 1840 there was an increasing influx of immigrants from the "States" and organized parties braved the hardships of the plains and mountains to seek out this new land of promise.

The United States Government sent Lt. Charles Wilkes and John C. Fremont to explore the country. President Andrew Jackson sought to acquire both Texas and California by purchase from Mexico, without success. President John Tyler continued these efforts. In 1842 Commodore Thomas Jones, commander of the Pacific squadron of the United States Navy, was anchored in Peruvian waters when he received word that war had broken out between Mexico and the United States. Fearful that some foreign power might take this as an excuse to seize California, Commodore Jones sailed to Monterey Bay and called on the port authorities to surrender. The American flag was raised only to be lowered when it was found that the war rumor was false.

Meanwhile, Daniel Webster, Secretary of State in Tyler's Cabinet, had proposed a three-point plan which included the acquisition of California, the satisfaction of claims of American citizens against Mexico and the settlement of the Oregon boundary dispute with Great Britain.

As overland migration from the "States" rapidly increased, the Government at Washington felt the need of a source of information on the development of political matters in the West. President Tyler therefore appointed Thomas O. Larkin, a Monterey merchant, as American consul. Larkin had come to California in 1835. The new consul did his work well, keeping Washington informed on the activities of the Mexican leaders and supplying eastern periodicals with an abundance of material on the opportunities for settlers on the Pacific coast.

President James K. Polk was inaugurated in March 1845, and immediately began the renewal of negotiations for the purchase of California. When these attempts again failed, Consul Larkin was advised:

"Whilst the President will make no effort and use no influence to induce California to become one of the free and independent States of the Union, yet if the people should desire to unite their destiny with ours, they would be received as brethren, whenever this can be done without affording Mexico just cause for complaint."

Larkin proceeded to win the cooperation of leading citizens in the cause of California's independence. Among these were Gen. Mariano Vallejo and Gen. Jose Castro, Jacob P. Leese of Sonoma; J. J. Warner of San Diego, and Don Abel Stearns of Los Angeles. There were other forces at work, however, seeking the same objective. John C. Fremont, on a Government exploring expedition with a considerable army of followers, was also eager to play a part. On June 14, 1846, at dawn, a small band of American settlers under the leadership of Ezekiel Merritt, surrounded the house of General Vallejo at Sonoma and the General soon found himself a prisoner of war. "To whom are we to surrender?" asked the wife of General Vallejo. Then it was found that there were no definite orders from Fremont and many wished to back out of the affair. Benjamin Ide, however, stepped forward and assumed the leadership. The Bear Flag, symbol of the independence of California, was raised, and Vallejo and his companions were sent in custody to Sutter's Fort.

William L. Todd, a member of the revolutionary party, later described the making of the Bear Flag: "We procured in the house where we made our headquarters, a piece of new unbleached cotton domestic, not quite a yard wide, with stripes of red flannel about 4 inches wide * * * on the lower side of the canvas. On the upper left-hand corner was a star, and in the center was the image made to represent a grizzly bear, so common in the country at that time. The bear and star were painted with paint made of linseed oil and Venetian red or Spanish brown. Underneath the bear were the words 'California Republic.' "

Whether Fremont was responsible for the uprising is a matter of historical debate, but at least he accepted the result and turned over the prisoners to a member of his company with explicit instructions on their care:

"You will retain Messrs. Vallejo, Preuxdon, Leese, and Carillo at the fort, of which you are hereby placed in full command. * * * Iron and confine any person who shall disobey your orders; if necessary, shoot any person who shall endanger the safety of the place."

The California Republic was short-lived, for, on July 9, Fremont received word by courier that war with Mexico had been declared and that Commodore John Sloat had raised the American flag at Monterey on July 7.

The members of the Bear Flag Battalion were immediately sworn in as volunteers in the United States Army, and Fremont was given a major's commission. San Diego and Los Angeles were occupied, at first without opposition, but later the native Californians rallied a small body of armed men and skirmishes ensued in which many were killed and wounded. American forces reoccupied Los Angeles on January 10, 1847, and 3 days later Fremont and Andres Pico signed the "Cahuenga Capitulation," which ended hostilities. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ceded California to the United States and officially ended the war, was signed a year later, on February 2, 1848.

Only a week before James Marshall, who was constructing a sawmill for John A. Sutter on the south fork of the American River, had found some shining metallic particles in the millrace. He gathered about 3 ounces of the substance and hurried to Sacramento, where he and Captain Sutter tested it and decided that it must be gold. They tried to keep the discovery secret, but the news spread, and the trails were soon crowded with the rush of prospectors bound for the treasure area.

It was not long before the whole world learned of the new El Dorado. Immigrants set out by the tens of thousands. Some came by sea around Cape Horn and others across the Isthmus of Panama; still others came by oxcart or horseback across the Plains. Many met death at the hands of the Indians or in the snow-clad Rockies and Sierra. Disaster had befallen the Donner party in 1846 and struck again as the Manly expedition toiled over the barren wastes of Death Valley in 1849. But the crowds still came in ever-increasing numbers, all seeking a land of promise where the stream beds were said to be lined with gold.

From 1846 to 1849, California had almost as many governors as under Mexican rule. Commodore John D. Sloat, who had assumed command with the seizure of Monterey of July 7, 1846, resigned and Commodore Robert F. Stockton took over the administration. In January 1847 Stockton appointed Capt. John C. Fremont as military governor. Fremont was replaced in 60 days by Gen. Stephen W. Kearney, who 60 days later was succeeded by Col. Richard B. Mason. Mason served until the appointment of Gen. Bennet Riley on April 12, 1849. The government during this period was described as "part military and part civil and part no government at all * * * the laws were most variant and variously conceived * * * and the courts were as unique as the government and the laws. They were American-Mexican, military-civil, with a good degree of the vigilante."

Meanwhile Congress delayed organization of a territorial government until the citizens of California took matters into their own hands. Brig. Gen. Bennet Riley, the military governor, called a general election for a State constitutional convention. The delegates met on September 1 in Colton Hall, a Monterey schoolhouse, and, on October 13, 1849, the convention completed its deliberations. A month later the constitution was ratified by 12,000 votes.

More delays ensued while Congress debated, but finally a bill for the admission of California into the Union was passed, and President Millard Fillmore affixed his signature to the measure on September 9, 1850.

So the myth of the fifteenth century had become a reality. California entered into statehood and a century of progress, to fulfill her destiny as "a land of gold, near the terrestrial paradise."

The Mr. Winant I Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the late John Gilbert Winant, of Concord, N. H., who was Governor of New Hampshire for 3 terms, later became our Ambassador to Great Britain, and held several important positions in the interim. After his death his friends here and abroad have written eulogies of the man, because of the great services he rendered to his country and to humanity while he lived, and in memory of him after his death. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Mr. Winant I Knew," by Ethel M. Johnson, reprinted from the South Atlantic Quarterly of January 1949, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Notwithstanding an estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript will exceed two printed pages of the RECORD and cost $248.50, I consider it to possess such value that its printing is more than justified.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MR. WINANT I KNEW

(By Ethel M. Johnson)

In some respects John Gilbert Winant was a paradox: an aristocrat who was devoted to service of the underdog; a Republican who embraced the New Deal and became an ardent admirer and close personal friend of President Roosevelt; a politician with the qualities of a statesman, or a statesman who knew his way in politics, as one may choose. He was an unusual man, a man whom many would call great, a man who possessed exceptional ability and rare personal charm, a man who exerted a remarkable influence over others. He was born in New York, February 23, 1889; studied at Princeton; taught history at St. Paul's school for boys in Concord, N. H.; married Constance Rivington Russell and made his home with her and their three children—Constance, John, Jr., and Rivington—in a lovely spot not far from St. Paul's. There was little in these things to distinguish him from other successful young men of prosperous families. He left St. Paul's during World War I to enlist with the First Aero Squadron of the American Expeditionary Force and was honorably discharged in April 1919 with the rank of captain.

In his public service, however, the flame which burned within him gave an outer light. His three terms (1917, 1921, 1925) in the New Hampshire Legislature—a ponderous body corresponding in size to the Congress of the United States—suggested the idea that human problems were not being met by antiquated laws and horse-and-buggy methods and were not likely to be met if selfish interests were permitted to control the State. Hence he decided to run for Governor. He had a natural flair for politics and a genuine interest in people and their problems. He went about the State meeting people and making friends. They liked his frank and pleasant manner, his honesty and sincerity. His success in interviews and conferences and his effective organization offset the poor impression he made as a public speaker. The working people, the women, the young men—whether young in years or in spirit—were with him. Harlan Pierson, who belonged to the latter category and helped in managing his campaigns, used to worry over Mr. Winant's platform appearances. "We should have trained him better," he would say regretfully after a public speech. Despite this handicap, which he never overcame, he won the election. In fact, he shattered precedent by serving three terms as governor; whereas one term had formerly been the rule. He defeated as astute a politician as Frank Knox and bucked the powerful Moses organization.

He was a hard-working executive and a reformer. He used his powers of persuasion, his personal charm, and his political skill on the legislature to secure the enactment of a number of social-welfare measures. He was in fact responsible for much of the legislation in the State providing for such things as shorter hours of labor, minimum-wage machinery, and unemployment insurance. He improved the State's financial methods, reorganized the welfare work, tried

to bring the antiquated workmen's compensation law into conformity with good practice and to modernize the creaking labor bureau. He organized the New Hampshire Commission on Unemployment Reserves, which drafted the unemployment insurance measure later enacted into law. He formed the New Hampshire Commission on Interstate Compacts Affecting Labor and Industry. Lacking a staff of trained investigators, he induced the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor to make a study of the boot-and-shoe industry in the State. At his request, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics conducted an intensive survey of family expenditures in New Hampshire cities to help in establishing a base for a cost-of-living index. He participated in the Eastern Interstate Conference on Labor Legislation and was represented at the National Conferences of the States convened by the United States Secretary of Labor. In an effort to meet the current social problems, he virtually started a little New Deal of his own in New Hampshire, perhaps one reason why he so readily embraced the Roosevelt New Deal. His innate loyalty, his desire to alleviate human suffering, and his feeling that in a crisis the demands of the Nation were above those of party were, however, the compelling motives.

He came to be known throughout the country as a progressive young executive, who was loved by the plain people of his State and feared by the old-line politicians. One reason why the politicians distrusted him was his practice of appointing persons from outside the State to positions in the public service when he could not find properly qualified candidates in New Hampshire, though he naturally tried to find an acceptable appointee within the State. For example, he secured a former city manager to revamp the State's financial system. He employed an expert from another State to study the labor bureau and draw up a plan for a modern department of labor. Another foreign expert was placed, in a somewhat extralegal fashion, in charge of the administration of some of the labor laws.

Nevertheless, Mr. Winant possessed unusual political acumen and understood what makes the politician tick, knowledge which he used with remarkable singleness of purpose in the service of the people of his State. He never willingly antagonized the legislature or the political party leaders. Rather, he sought their cooperation, though he did not hesitate, if necessary, to incur their wrath and that of powerful interests when he was convinced that to do so was essential for the well-being of the public. Some of his achievements for the public welfare were virtually put over on an unsuspecting General Court. He once laughingly said that he had been obliged to do illegally all the good he had been able to do for the people of New Hampshire. Though an exaggeration, this statement had some basis in fact. An official of an employers' association, explaining its opposition to an appropriation for the minimum-wage law, said in all seriousness that his association did not object to having labor laws enacted, but did object to having the laws enforced. Governor Winant was interested both in having progressive legislation enacted and in securing competent officials for enforcement even if he had to go outside the State to find them.

The Labor Commissioner whom he had inherited from his predecessors was fonder of talk than action. Inspections were few and far between. Many industrial establishments went uninspected, and there were flagrant violations of the labor laws. Governor Winant tried to replace the Commissioner, but found him too firmly entrenched with the legislature and the Executive Council. Failing to get approval for his proposed change, the Governor assigned some of the Commissioner's functions to others and permitted him to dangle without a reappointment, which made the Commissioner more amenable to suggestions from the executive office. The legislature had seen to it that the administration of Winant's minimum-wage law was vested in the Labor Commissioner. The Governor, however, engineered an arrangement by which the Commissioner abdicated his authority in favor of an appointee of the Governor.

Since the State salary scale was modest, to put it mildly, and the legislature extremely conservative with respect to innovations, Mr. Winant sometimes personally paid the "outsiders" he brought in to help with special studies; sometimes he supplemented the official stipend from his own pocket. He might also invite the "outsiders" to stay at his home until they could find satisfactory living arrangements in Concord. This disposition to think of the comfort and well-being of others inspired a friend to say in jest to Mr. Winant, "I wonder how it would seem to be a fairy prince like you." "Ah," he sighed, "if I only had the money to enable me to do the things I would like to do." Of himself he took far too little thought or care. He wore the plainest of clothes and worked indefatigably. He practically never took a vacation.

From early manhood he carried the problems and burdens of others. The tragic death of his youngest brother, whom he dearly loved, left its mark. He had business and financial worries. Money meant little to him except as a means of helping others. Many who had no rightful claim upon him poured their troubles into his ears, wrung his heart, and received his assistance. Some of the problems he met as governor taxed his time and ingenuity, though not his patience. For example, he was told by a friend of the troubles of some girls who worked in a factory in Rochester. They wished a conference with the governor, but, being employed during the week, they could come to Concord only on Sunday. Mr. Winant agreed to meet with them in the council chamber on Sunday afternoon. The girls came dressed in their holiday best, put on to impress the Governor. The leader of the group, a young woman in her early twenties, wore a silk frock, a picture hat, and narrow, high-heeled patent-leather pumps, scarcely an outfit that suggested the need for higher wages; but Mr. Winant understood. He listened patiently while the girls told their stories, asked questions, explained what could and what could not be done under the existing laws, and told them what he was trying to do in order to improve wages and working conditions in the State. He promised to send a representative to the factory as though on a routine inspection, so that the girls would not be implicated, in an endeavor to correct some of the conditions of which they complained. After the conference, which took practically the entire afternoon, the group leader went into raptures over the Governor. "He is so handsome, so gentlemanly, so sympathetic and kind," she said, "and he has such a beautiful voice * * * I could have sat all day and listened to him if my shoes hadn't pinched my feet so."

Some of his problems as governor stirred him deeply. A condemned murderer appealed to him for clemency. There was no question of the man's guilt. The governor saw the man and talked with him; then he spent much of the night walking out of doors. In the morning he commuted the sentence to life imprisonment. He was sensitive, sympathetic, and generous—far too generous for his own good. This was true with respect to his sympathy and time as well as his money. He made it a rule as governor to see all who wanted to see him; his door was open to everyone in the State. As a result, the corridors at the Capitol were always crowded with persons waiting to speak with him. His sympathy with his callers and their difficulties tempted him not to hold them to the 10 or 15 minutes his secretaries had allotted. In consequence, he was almost invariably behind his schedule, sometimes hours behind. This despite the fact that he arrived at his office early, worked through the lunch period—sometimes he sent out for a sandwich and coffee; frequently he went without anything—and often remained late in the evening. He secured shorter hours for others, not for himself. After these long periods at the office he always took home a brief case filled with papers to go over at night. Sometimes he would return to his office after dinner and work until well past midnight. He had little sense of time. One wondered how Mrs. Winant managed about their dinners; he was absolutely unpredictable.

Once the governor sent word for an aide to come to his office in the late afternoon for a conference. The assistant went to the inner office at 5 o'clock, when the line of "mourners" on the corridor benches, as the staff called them, was beginning to thin out. The governor handed her some papers to look over and went into the outer office to speak with some of those still waiting to see him. From time to time he returned to exchange casual words, paced back and forth across the floor as he considered a problem that had been presented to him, took a long-distance call, or gave instructions to a secretary in the adjoining room. The dinner hour came and went. The time for a conference the governor had planned to attend if possible passed. The procedure continued—the interviews in the outer office, the restless pacing of the floor in the inner office, with occasionally a few words, more in the nature of a soliloquy than a conversation. Finally he came back and sat down in a chair by his assistant. He was tired after the endless stream of people who had come to tell their problems and to ask his help. He looked at his aide earnestly but absent-mindedly, and inquired, "What can I do for you?" In his exhaustion he had completely forgotten that he had sent for her and confused her momentarily with the applicants who had crowded his day and evening.

Again, at the International Labor Office in Washington, a secretary was working with him on a speech he was to give in a distant city the following night. They started just after dinner. The secretary determined for once not to remind him of the time in order to see how long he would go on before noticing the hour. Mr. Winant had the artist's feeling for words and always tried to find a phrase to convey the exact shade of meaning he intended. He could write beautifully. At its best his style was clear, direct, and arresting. There were times when it had something of the simplicity of Lincoln's. When composing he would pace the floor as if tracking down the elusive words he sought. In his refusal to accept any substitute for those that belonged in the pattern, he had a certain resemblance to Barrie's Sentimental Tommy, who, by devoting an entire examination period in English composition to a quest for one particular word, lost the prize to which he was rightfully entitled. A friend used to repeat this story to Mr. Winant, but he neither took offense nor changed his ways. The evening wore on. Mr. Winant smoked and paced the floor; at times he sat meditatively for a few minutes or discussed the general subject of his address. He dictated a paragraph or two, revised it, and continued his search for the perfect word. The secretary took notes; sometimes, unable to stand the strain, she made a suggestion. Occasionally Mr. Winant approved the contribution; more frequently he did not. Sometimes it upset his train of thought; though grieved when that happened, he was unfailingly patient. At length the secretary began to weaken as they worked on into the wee hours with no sign of let-up on Mr. Winant's part. He was completely

oblivious of time. Should she wait until the sun rose? Finally, she could stand it no longer. "Do you know what time it is?" she inquired. "No, what is it?" he asked. "Three-thirty a. m.," the secretary replied with a yawn she could not stifle. He was genuinely distressed and contrite.

Mr. Winant, to some observers, was not an efficient administrator. In a sense, that is probably true. He was not systematic. He could not keep to a rigid schedule. He was absent-minded; he was always losing his papers or borrowing papers from the files and forgetting to return them. He had his own personal filing system, which consisted in part in stuffing letters, telegrams, memos, and papers he considered especially important into his pockets. His staff used to watch with mingled consternation and amusement when he emptied his pockets in quest of a particular note. Once when governor he employed an expert to organize his office. The files were modernized and put in order, the official documents arranged; the staff duties studied and systematized. The expert, however, was not satisfied. To organize the office was not enough; what was really needed was to organize the Governor. If, however, the test of an executive is an endeavor to secure the most competent officials available to assist him, willingness to delegate authority to them and to support them even in unpopular policies if convinced they are right, an ability to inspire those working with him to put forth their best efforts and to strive for his objectives; if, in short, it is measured by his power to fire others with his own enthusiasm and ideals, then Mr. Winant was a great executive.

Long after he left the Social Security Board officials and staff members continued to express regret over the loss of his inspiring leadership. Under his guidance they were crusaders in a noble cause. Without him they were ordinary civil servants, engaged in a routine grind of monotonous daily details. Only a few months before Mr. Winant's tragic death, the wife of one of the officials at the International Labor Office in Geneva wrote to a friend in the United States expressing the longing of the staff for his return. His influence with others came from his own idealism, his magnetic personality, and his warm human interest in all who worked with him or came in contact with him. This interest included the higher officials, but also extended to the humblest employee. The cleaning women at the American Embassy in London went into raptures about the Ambassador. The matron who took care of his office used to tell American members of the staff in a strong cockney accent of his kindness and helpfulness to her. When her home was destroyed by bombs, he had temporary quarters fitted up for her in the basement at Number One Grosvenor Square. " 'E has such a beautiful voice, so soft and gentle," she would say, her eyes glowing with emotion. "And no matter 'ow busy 'e is, 'e always says 'Good evening' to me when 'e sees me and asks 'ow I am getting on." The doormen and night watchmen at the Embassy were likewise enthusiastic admirers of Mr. Winant. The employees at his home adored him.

One secret of his charm was the fact that he was always doing something for others. He was interested in causes; but he was also keenly interested in individuals. If they were in difficulty, he was eager to help them. At almost every interview his inquiry was, "What can I do for you?" From him this came not as a stereotyped question, but carried the assurance of action. When he was chairman of the Social Security Board, a boy holding a minor position on the staff received word that his father, who lived in a Western State, was dying. He could not possibly reach home in time if he went by train, nor could he afford the expense. Mr. Winant, learning of the matter, got a plane reservation for him, paying the fare himself, and so made it possible for the boy to see his father before his death. His sensitive nature made him acutely aware of the feelings of others. At receptions which he and Mrs. Winant gave when he was in public life, he sought out the guests who seemed shy and diffident and put them at ease by his informal and friendly manner. He had infinite patience with those who were in trouble, when one less charitable might have classified some of them as pests.

There were certain types of persons, however, whom he could not tolerate. He had no use for bores, professional propagandists, and lobbyists. Like all prominent men, he was plagued by individuals of this kind. As a means of self-protection and conservation of time, he developed effective techniques in avoiding them or in escaping their clutches when they lay in wait for him in hotel and office corridors, though he was tactful in his methods.

His own inner sadness was perhaps one reason Mr. Winant was so responsive to the suffering of others. He could not refuse a request for assistance, even from a complete stranger. One evening in Washington when he was walking with some members of his staff, a panhandler approached and asked for money. Without a question, Mr. Winant gave the man a bill. "You shouldn't have done that," his secretary protested. "We're warned not to give money to persons who beg on the streets." "Is that what the Bible teaches?" Mr. Winant inquired innocently. "I thought it said to give to those who ask of you." Much of Mr. Winant's giving was of a more constructive kind. He helped many young men and women complete their studies and start upon careers. He put more than one boy through college. He found positions for those out of work. He paid for medical aid in families that needed but could not afford the services of a specialist. Nor were his benefactions confined to those he knew personally. During the depression of the early thirties one of the radio stations gave time on the air to young men out of work to tell their stories and explain their needs. Mr. Winant, then Governor of New Hampshire, was impressed by the story of a youth who broadcast from another State. He sent for the boy, took him into his household, and made arrangements for him to go to the State university to complete his college course. Later he got a job for him; and, finding him a bright, agreeable young man, launched him on a successful public career.

Working for Mr. Winant was a rare and wonderful experience for those who had the privilege. If he had confidence in his assistants, he would let them do anything they wanted and would do anything in his power for them. At times, it is true, he made strenuous demands upon them. They understood this to be a part of the opportunity that was theirs. Carried away by his example, they, like him, even on occasion forgot that time existed.

When he made a hurried airplane trip from Geneva to the United States, his Washington office was alerted for action. He usually packed a week's work into 2 or 3 hectic days. His arrival had an electrical effect on the staff. All day dreaming and gossip stopped. Young men who had been working leisurely, tipped back in their chairs with their feet on their desks, snapped briskly to attention. The office, which had been proceeding at a moderate tempo, suddenly became a beehive of activity. Telephones rang. Typewriters banged. A stream of callers arrived as if by magic. The staff made appointments, took dictation, dispatched telegrams and cables, and attended to reservations for the return trip. Mr. Winant's departure was even more dramatic than his arrival. He always seemed to leave but a split second's margin for making his plane. One member of the staff would corral a taxi, which would wait honking impatiently in front of the office while Mr. Winant made a last-minute phone call or exchanged a few closing words with a late conferee. He appeared perfectly calm and cool, although the entire staff was jittery. When he finally left, someone would telephone Eastern Airlines to inform them that Mr. Winant was on his way and to ask that the plane be held so that he could make it. In some miraculous way he always did make it. Then the office would take a long breath and return to the humdrum existence of ordinary days.

Mr. Winant always insisted that the staff be given a generous amount of time off or extra pay for the additional hours they put in when he was present. When his program permitted, he would take members of the staff to lunch or dinner with him or even perhaps to the theater. He had the rare faculty of winning and holding the loyalty of the men and women who worked for him. One reason for this was his unwavering loyalty to them. He did not change as new honors came to him. His early friends remained his friends through life. His personal secretary in Concord continued as his secretary in Washington and Geneva. The young New Hampshire lawyer who advised him on legislative matters when he was Governor became one of the attorneys at the Social Security Board and later went with Mr. Winant to London. The man he employed to study the New Hampshire State labor bureau served as one of his assistants on the Social Security Board and then joined the International Labor Office staff in Montreal while Mr. Winant was Director. His economic counselor at the International Labor Office in Geneva and Montreal headed his staff of special assistants at the American Embassy in London and subsequently served as chief economist on Mr. Winant's personal staff in New York in connection with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. Winant demonstrated his skill as a conciliator when President Roosevelt named him Chairman of the Federal Textile Inquiry Board in 1934. In this capacity he helped in settling strife in the industry, winning the respect and confidence of both the employer and employee members of the Board. Just after he completed his third term as governor of New Hampshire he met Harold Butler, Director of the International Labor Office. The United States had joined the International Labor Organization in 1934; and Mr. Butler was looking for an American Assistant Director. Mr. Winant's reputation, his ability, his interest in labor and social welfare problems, and his personality convinced Mr. Butler that he was the ideal choice for the position. This was the beginning of a friendship that lasted for the rest of Mr. Winant's life. He went to Geneva in May 1935, and remained through August of that year. As Assistant Director of the International Labor Office he soon made his influence felt. He initiated the First Regional Conference of American States Members of the ILO, held in Santiago de Chile in January 1936. He helped to broaden the objectives of ILO work.

Although he felt it his duty to accept President Roosevelt's call and return to Washington to serve as Chairman of the Social Security Board in 1935, his heart was still with the ILO. He hoped to return to Geneva after the social security program was organized and functioning successfully and retained his contacts with the International Labor Office. In the spring of 1937 he served as Chairman of the ILO Technical Tripartite Textile Conference, which was held in Washington. That summer he headed the United States delegation to the regular ILO Conference in Geneva. Later in 1937 he returned as Assistant Director. In 1938 Mr. Butler resigned, and the governing body of the International Labor Office elected Mr. Winant Director. It was a critical period, not only for

the Organization, but for Europe and the world. Mr. Winant remained in Geneva throughout the Munich crisis. When he assumed his new position as Director of the International Labor Office in January 1939, the war clouds were darkening over Europe.

Even in normal times the position of director of the International Labor Office and secretary-general of the International Labor Conference was an exceedingly difficult one, calling for exceptional qualities of leadership, skill, tact, and diplomacy. The Office when operating at capacity had a staff of several hundred from some 40 different nations. The Conference was made up of government, employer, and labor representatives from the countries which are members of the International Labor Organization, at that time more than 50 in number. There were conflicting national and group interests to be harmonized and a definite program of work to be executed. One by one the Continental member states were overrun by the Nazis. With the victims of Hitler's aggression unable to continue participation in the Organization, and other European countries fearful of offending the Germans, the problems of the ILO became increasingly grave. Mr. Winant realized that the fate of the Organization depended upon strengthened American contacts and service to the Americas. He therefore arranged the Second Regional Conference of American States Members of the ILO held in Habana, Cuba, in November and December 1939. With the assistance of the late Dr. Oswald Stein, an authority in the field of social insurance and a prominent ILO official, he organized at Lima, Peru, the Inter-American Conference on Social Security, which later was developed into the Inter-American Commission on Social Security. He loaned ILO experts to assist Latin-American countries in establishing a system of factory inspection, drafting a labor code, or developing a social insurance program. His transfer of the headquarters of the International Labor Office to the Western Hemisphere during the war was responsible for saving the organization.

In February 1941, he resigned as director of the International Labor Office to accept appointment as United States Ambassador to the Court of St. James. In peacetime the position is the chief diplomatic plum in the United States Foreign Service. In 1941, however, the role of Ambassador to a bombed and battered Britain, threatened daily with destruction, was a grim and dangerous business. It was not a job for a socialite or a cookie pusher, which was the reason Mr. Winant took it. He was modest and unassuming in his manner and did not care for titles. His immediate staff was always requested to call him simply "Mr. Winant." To business associates and political acquaintances he was "John Winant" or "John," depending upon the degree of intimacy. To a smaller group of personal friends, he was "Gilbert Winant" or "Gil." After the Senate confirmed his appointment and he had taken the oath of office, an enthusiastic member of his staff in Washington inquired, "Now may I call you 'Your Excellency'?" "The correct title," he replied, as he paced the floor of his office, "is 'Mr. Ambassador,' but," he added with a twinkle, "if you ever call me that, I'll spank you." And he continued to pace the floor.

Walking was for Mr. Winant a form of self-expression, of relief, of relaxation, as his mood might be. Always, under the stress of strong emotion he walked. As he dictated letters, he walked slowly back and forth in his office. When composing a speech he paced the floor. Often when talking to visitors he strode up and down the library in his attractive home in Concord. When he had a perplexing problem to consider, he frequently called a friend to go for a walk with him to discuss it. One evening in Washington he walked around and around the paths in Lafayette Park while pondering aloud whether or not to permit his name to go before the governing body of the ILO for election as Director. Sometimes he walked like a caged lion. Sometimes he walked slowly and thoughtfully. At times he walked for the freedom and joy of walking. One of the few pleasures he permitted himself in Geneva was walking home from the ILO office by the lake and through the woods. Sometimes he took members of his staff with him. Occasionally he walked the entire distance to the chateau where the Winants lived; frequently Mrs. Winant would meet him part way in the car. On rare occasions, on a Saturday afternoon or Sunday, there would be a drive to some attractive spot in France. Mr. Winant's wealth of information, his familiarity with many places of interest, and his knowledge of history made it a fascinating experience to be included in a family party of this nature. It was quiet trips like this—walking or driving in the country—that Mr. Winant most enjoyed.

During the last months in Geneva there was no time or inclination for recreation. Hitler's armies were streaming over Europe, surrounding Switzerland and isolating the International Labor Office. The Nazis wanted to gain control of the Office. Some of their men were planted among the staff. Geneva was full of spies. Mr. Winant's life was in constant danger. In the early summer of 1940 he decided to transfer the key personnel of the Office to Canada. By so doing he preserved the ILO as an independent agency. For financial and security reasons it was necessary to curtail the staff drastically. In fact, it was cut to one-tenth of its full size. This involved selecting the members to be transferred and explaining the situation to the others, who were given the option of resigning with a pension or accepting suspension without pay until such time as the Office would be in a position to reemploy them. This hard task fell upon Mr. Winant. Only those who knew him intimately understood the suffering it meant to him.

All of this with the previous years of overwork and worry affected his health. Thus he was not a well man when he went to London as Ambassador. Nevertheless, he threw himself unreservedly into the work. That he might be available at a moment's notice day or night at the Embassy, he took a modest apartment at Grosvenor Square in the Embassy building instead of using the mansion provided for the Ambassador at Princess Gate. No problem was too difficult or too dangerous for him. No question of personal comfort or convenience influenced him. Refusing to avail himself of his privileges as a diplomat, he restricted his household to the British wartime rations. Instead of driving the Embassy car—a luxurious high-powered automobile that took a generous amount of gasoline—he used a small car or one of the Army vehicles. When incendiary bombs were dropped near the Embassy, Mr. Winant went out and helped extinguish the fires. With officials of the British Government he visited bomb-shattered communities and assisted in maintaining morale.

Never perhaps have the reserved British people loved an ambassador as they loved Mr. Winant. He came to them in their hour of greatest need. He gave them sympathy, wise counsel, and effective help. He shared their privations and their danger. They liked his modesty, his unassuming manner, his genuineness. The fact that he was not an orator—in truth, a very poor public speaker—mattered not They probably liked him the more on that account His sincerity, his friendliness beneath a shy exterior endeared him to them They recognized in him a kind, astute, and understanding friend, a friend who interpreted their problems and their needs effectively to the President of the United States. They appreciated his knowledge of political and military strategy, his experience in international affairs, his skill in bringing about a better understanding between the United States and Great Britain. Those who heard the moving tributes paid to Mr. Winant in the speeches of Anthony Eden, Ernest Bevin, and Sir Walter Citrine at the farewell banquet given by the British Government in the spring of 1946 could have no doubt as to the esteem and deep affection in which he was held.

Mr. Winant's resignation in 1946 after the end of hostilities came as a shock to the British—officials, and ordinary people alike. Just before he left London, he showed some American friends a letter Anthony Eden had written on learning the news. It was an intimate, personal message, expressing Mr. Eden's affection and friendship and his sense of poignant personal loss in Mr. Winant's departure. He referred touchingly to the help and consolation Mr. Winant had given him when word came of the death of his son in the war. No one who read that letter could think of Englishmen as cold and unemotional. At the time, Mr. Winant was speaking words of comfort to British friends, his own soul was torn by fears for the fate of his son. He was pleased and proud that both of his boys had enlisted in the armed forces. Rivington, the younger, left school to join the Marines and served in the Pacific area. John, Jr., who, following his father's footsteps, had gone to Princeton, left to enter the Air Corps. While on a bombing mission over Germany he was shot down and reported missing. For anxious months Mr. Winant did not know whether or not he was still alive. Finally word came that he was a prisoner of the Germans. Near the close of the European phase of the war, the Nazis transferred him from one military camp to another, apparently intending to use him with other prominent prisoners as a hostage. Mr. Winant suffered agony of spirit until John was rescued. Yet he did not permit his personal grief to interrupt his work. He continued his indefatigable labors at the Embassy, his assistance to others, and his active participation in high-level strategy.

One afternoon in London in the late spring of 1946, just prior to his return to the United States, Mr. Winant showed his friends the medal of merit conferred upon him by the President in recognition of his wartime service as Ambassador to Great Britain. It pleased him very much; it probably would have meant even more to him could it have been presented by President Roosevelt, who had appointed him. The death of President Roosevelt was a heavy blow to Mr. Winant. An autographed photograph of the late President was among his treasured possessions, as were similarly autographed pictures of General Eisenhower, General Marshall, and Cordell Hull. At the memorial services for President Roosevelt, conducted jointly by the American Embassy and the British Government at St. Paul's Cathedral, Mr. Winant read the lesson from the Scriptures. Standing at a lectern placed high above the throng in a niche between two great columns, he looked, according to an enthusiastic admirer, like a Greek god. The Cathedral was packed with notables. The King and Queen, the Archbishop, the Prime Minister, and other high dignitaries of church and state were present. It was an impressive gathering. Some members of the Embassy staff, however, insisted that Mr. Winant was the most impressive, the most princely in bearing, and the handsomest of them all.

I have never been able to understand the adjectives employed by some writers in asserting a physical resemblance between Mr. Winant and Abraham Lincoln. Such terms,

for example, as uncouth, awkward, gaunt, ungainly were not appropriate in his case. Mr. Winant himself, a devoted admirer of Lincoln, was none too flattered by these comparisons. He once said that it always pleased him when there was suggestion of a spiritual resemblance; but when he was told that he looked like Lincoln, he always remembered that Lincoln was described as an exceedingly plain man. Mr. Winant was in reality a handsome man, tall and graceful, with a good figure, a fine sensitive face, and magnificent eyes. Perhaps his eyes gave him the closest physical likeness to Lincoln. They were deep set and piercing, sometimes sad and melancholy, sometimes humorous and whimsical, but always kindly and sympathetic. They reminded me of Franklin Lane's beautiful tribute to Lincoln's eyes written after seeing St. Gaduens' impressive statue in Chicago of the great emancipator. Mr. Winant loved and often quoted that passage.

Mr. Winant stood out in any gathering, often making a deep impression on persons who saw him for the first time. Once when he called at a hotel in Paris to see a friend, the manager who took the message either forgot his name or could not pronounce it. His description, however, left no doubt as to the identity of the caller: "A tall, handsome gentleman, with dark eyes and hair, an American with perfect manners and a beautiful voice, very distinguished looking." There was something magic, something magnetic about him. One felt his presence the moment he entered the room. One was conscious of it over the telephone on picking up the receiver and hearing his friendly, "Hello there." Many persons who had never met him were his devoted admirers because they had read something he had written or had heard him speak over the radio or had caught a glimpse of him at a meeting. Recently an acquaintance said, "Just to see him for a minute, to clasp his hand and hear his greeting gave one a spiritual lift and altered the entire day." It is inexpressively sad that a man who did so much for and meant so much to others, who had made so great a contribution through public service to his country and to the world, should in his illness and exhaustion come to feel that he was no longer of use. He had given of himself far too generously and had forgotten how to relax and rest. When he needed rest most, he was unable to find it.

After resigning as Ambassador, he accepted the position of United States Representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Many would have liked to see him Secretary-General of the Organization. His diplomatic skill, his experience in international affairs, and his high idealism would have fitted him admirably for the post. Selection of the United States as headquarters for the agency, however, ruled out that possibility. He was offered an Assistant Secretaryship, but declined. He would have been interested in the position of Deputy Secretary-General had the post been authorized. It is said that an effort was made to set up such a post for Mr. Winant but that it was defeated by the objections of one of his countrymen. Partly because of failing health he resigned from the Economic and Social Council a few months after accepting appointment and started to write his memoirs. They were to have appeared in three volumes. He was working on the second volume at the time of his death. So great was his fatigue that sometimes, although he worked all day, he was unable to accomplish anything. On the evening of Monday, November 3, 1947, the end came.

He was a genius with some of the erratic characteristics of genius. He was an idealist and impractical in financial matters, as idealists frequently are. He was a rare public servant with selfless devotion to the public welfare combined with a shrewd knowledge of politics and the ways of politicians. He was a statesman, a diplomat, a leader in international affairs. But his memory will be treasured by thousands of persons in this country and abroad, not because of his genius, his fame, or his greatness, but rather because of his warm human sympathy, his capacity for friendship, his personal interest in and helpfulness to those in trouble. By the plain people, whom he loved, he will be cherished for those intangible values "that form the best portion of a good man's life—the little nameless, unremembered acts of kindness and love."

In December 1946, the British Government conferred the Honorary Order of Merit on Mr. Winant, the only American besides General Eisenhower to receive this distinction. November 19, 1947, the British people held another memorial service in St. Paul's this time in memory of former Ambassador Winant.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The action of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs today, in approving H. R. 2681 to grant non-service-connected pensions to all World War I and II veterans, was bitterly criticized as a betrayal of thousands of aged and ailing veterans by the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting in Washington.

Speaking for the disgusted and incensed members of the VFW committee, Chairman J. R. Klawans, of San Francisco, bluntly declared: "The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse." He described the legislation as an abortion that must have been railroaded through the committee. He challenged Chairman RANKIN to defend this bill as an answer to the needs of the great mass of aged and ailing veterans who must depend on pensions for a bare subsistence, but who have been completely ignored in this so-called pension program.

"As a matter of fact," Klawans said, "the only practical result of this bill is to enable those veterans who have reached age 65 to get on the pension rolls, even though they have not previously been eligible for such pensions because of income limitations in existing law. On the other hand," he said, "it does nothing whatever for totally disabled veterans who are under that age. This is an abortion, pure and simple."

Klawans emphasized that the VFW will continue to fight for an equitable and adequate pension program, particularly for those veterans who are not totally disabled and who have not reached age 65, but who, nonetheless, are in need of assistance.

The VFW spokesman questioned the intent or desire of the House Veterans' Committee to report out a bill which would answer the needs of veterans and still stay within the limits of reasonable economy. He suggested that if the committee did have this in mind it would have seriously considered H. R. 2512, proposed by the VFW, which would have taken care of the most needy veterans without costing more than a half-billion dollars in the first year.

Klawans explained that the VFW compromise bill would provide non-service-connected $90 a month pensions to World Wars I and II veterans for total disability as well as at age 65. "In addition, the bill would grant $75 a month to veterans with 75 percent or more disability and $50 a month to those with 50 percent or more disability," he said. "Unlike the bill reported out today by the House Veterans Committee, however, the VFW bill would establish income limitations of $2,000 a year for veterans with no dependents and $3,000 a year for veterans with dependents. Ex-servicemen would have to earn less than these amounts to qualify for the pension. We do not like any needs provisions, but would accept this reluctantly as probably necessary at this time."

Klawans clearly indicated that the VFW would fight for a bill which would reach the targets set forth in the VFW compromise bill, and declared that "the gesture noted today by the committee—if you can call it even a gesture—is nothing but a betrayal of thousands of aged and ailing veterans."

Communism Versus Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, seldom in recent history has the conscience of the civilized world been more deeply shocked than it has been by the recent trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian authorities.

The entire life and character of this distinguished priest of the church is so wholly inconsistent with his statements and demeanor on the witness stand as to make it perfectly plain that he has been subjected to some form of overwhelming pressure.

The trial is a mockery of justice and has been deeply offensive to the sensibilities of everyone. Men of all religious faiths everywhere have joined in deploring it.

To illustrate the extent of indignation which has swept all over the world, the diplomatic representatives of 33 nations, just this week, have made representation on the subject, and extended their sympathy to Pope Pius.

The first semiofficial action taken on the matter was taken by the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, which unanimously passed a resolution denouncing the trial and urging prompt official action. I am glad to say this recommendation was immediately followed by the House, which passed a resolution urging immediate action through the United Nations or by other appropriate means.

If further evidence is needed that communism is a spreading cancer, surely this is it. No man of high or low degree, of any faith or political belief, anywhere in the world, is safe in a nation which has succumbed to the Red menace.

I hope the administration will swiftly take every appropriate action to rectify this deplorable and dangerous thing which has happened.

For the information of the thousands of my constituents who are interested, I append a copy of the resolution passed by the House on February 9, 1949.

House Concurrent Resolution 19

Whereas on September 18, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinatz, Roman Catholic Primate of Yugoslavia, was arrested on charges of committing "crimes against the people" and of "being the center of terrorist opposition" to the Government of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas on October 11, 1946, the said Archbishop Stepinatz was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 16 years and deprived of his civil rights for 5 years; and

Whereas the conduct of the trial of the said Archbishop Stepinatz which resulted in such sentence was a travesty on justice and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas on December 26, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses" and has been held incommunicado since such date; and

Whereas the charges upon which the said Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested constitute distortions of truth and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the two eminent Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Stepinatz of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *", and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that these issues should be raised by the United States either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at a dinner in Baltimore last night, the members of the Council of Lithuanian Societies celebrated the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania. The consul general of Maryland, the Honorable Jonas Budrys, spoke in his native language.

I am confident that this group was but one of the many, all over the world, who paused to pay tribute to that great country and to express the fervent hope that in the not too distant future this brave nation will once again enjoy true liberty and freedom.

Those inside of Lithuania are fighting in a great underground movement, in an heroic effort to expel their oppressors. The Russians do not, of course, give this underground movement any publicity. But they are making reprisals, not only by subjecting the people to oppression and terrorism, but also by carrying out a program of extermination and deportation, in an effort to suppress the underground and reduce the Lithuanian population, and thus, the resistance.

Lithuanians outside of that country have been working hard to help their homeland regain its independence, and all Americans lend their strong moral support to their efforts and pray that the day of their liberation may not be far off.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a translation of the address delivered at the dinner by the Honorable Jonas Budrys, and also a resolution adopted by the Council of Lithuanian Societies:

ADDRESS BY HON. JONAS BUDRYS

The State of Maryland commemorates, every year, February the 16th as the Republic of Lithuania Day. I wish to assure you that this expression of Maryland's friendship to Lithuania has always been deeply appreciated and the sentiment fully reciprocated by the people of Lithuania. Particularly in these times of Lithuania's struggle for survival Maryland's observance of February 16 is a very real source of encouragement and inspiration to all Lithuanians.

Your magnificent State and your noble and foresighted statesmen will be inscribed in the annals of Lithuania and our entire Nation will remember gratefully the friendship shown by Maryland to Lithuania during its hours of distress.

Our Nation is leading a heroic fight for freedom because her children will not live enslaved. From the Right Reverend Monsignor Mykolas Krupavicius and Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, our two great statesmen and fighters for freedom, who spoke in Baltimore recently, you have already had the opportunity to hear about the tragedy of Lithuania and her efforts to regain liberty. But today it is not Lithuania's freedom alone that is at stake. The question is: Will the entire world be free or will totalitarianism and brute force win over democracy and justice?

In the recent war that was supposed to bring lasting freedom to humanity, the democratic world sacrificed hundreds of thousands of lives and incalculable wealth to defeat one dictator; but the rejoicing was short-lived, for another and no less inhuman dictator emerged as the real winner, bent upon conquering the world by force, terror, and deceit.

The three Baltic countries were the first to learn, some 30 years ago what Bolshevism represented and at what Moscow was really aiming. Only now is the rest of the world beginning to open its eyes, only now, when not the three small Baltic countries alone, but a number of others, too, have succumbed one after another and disappeared behind the iron curtain. Some of these countries are still indicated on the map as independent nations or else they are misleadingly termed satellites of the Soviet Union. But Mr. Stalin's recent suggestion that he and the President of the United States meet in one or another of these so-called independent states, without even bothering to ask the government involved for its permission and without being invited to hold the meeting in its territory, shows only too clearly—if any additional proof should be needed—that the NKVD is the sovereign master in those states.

Stalin allegedly proposes peace, but one who sincerely seeks peace would not use such methods as the Berlin blockade against his allies and comrades-in-arms of yesterday.

Now China with its immense human reserves is about to be devoured by the Red colossus. The very enormity of this new conquest will require 2 or 3 years of undisturbed absorption, which could be gained by further deceitful offers of peace with the consequent confusion among statesmen and the fruitless deliberations. Then, fortified by hundreds of millions of bolshevized Chinese, the Red dictator could resume his march toward further liberations—pressing on until he achieves his aim of world domination.

This goal of the Bolshevik dictatorship is no longer, or should no longer be, a secret. Little by little the danger has become pretty generally realized, and it is high time that the challenge be firmly met. The example of China demonstrates that the Red menace cannot be defeated by palliative measures. The enormous amounts of money and quantities of equipment that such methods have already entailed may prove to be completely wasted—worse, they may fall into Communist hands with the conquest of whatever country is receiving our aid. The policy of containment, although seemingly successful in Europe for the time being—if we forget the conquest of Lithuania and nearly all of eastern and central Europe—has suffered a terrible defeat in Asia, where Communist hordes, almost unopposed, are surging forward and threaten to submerge the entire continent.

The last 30 years of continuous Communist aggression have sufficiently proved that communism cannot be contained or restrained any more than can a beast of prey, unless it is destroyed, that patiently crouches in its lair, awaiting the opportune moment to pounce upon its next victim.

Let us hope that it will not be too late when the only logical and inescapable conclusion is reached—the realization that the menace of Bolshevik enslavement must be fought, not passively, but actively; that the world cannot endure half free and half slave, for the liberty of the free half will soon be lost if the other half remains enslaved.

Let the democratic world rally and proclaim its goal of liberty and justice for all. That is a purpose that is worth fighting for with an even greater determination and with even more forceful means than are now displayed by those who fight on the side of evil.

The whole world is weary of conflict and hopefully waiting for peace. All eyes are looking toward America as the strongest western nation, the leader of the democracies, which can defeat totalitarianism and save the world. Only when the last dictatorship has been ousted will the UN show what we can expect from her, only then will the various concepts of a European federation find a real foundation. Federation and cooperation are democratic ideals and their meanings are foreign to dictatorships. Only after a complete victory over totalitarianism will the world be really free; and in a free world all nations, without exceptions, will find their place. And then there will be a place for our own Lithuania.

RESOLUTION

We, citizens of Baltimore, assembled February 16, 1949, at Lithuanian Hall, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies, to commemorate the thirty-first anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Lithuania, declare:

Our wholehearted approbation of certain statements made by President Harry S. Truman on the occasion of his inauguration to the effect that the American people desire and are determined to work for a world in which all nations and all peoples are free to govern themselves as they see fit and to achieve a decent and satisfying life, and, above all else, our people desire and are determined to work for a just and lasting peace based on genuine agreement freely arrived at by equals, and that in pursuit of the abovementioned aims, the United States and other like-minded nations find themselves opposed by the Soviet, which has contrary aims and a totally different concept of life.

In view of the above pronouncement by our President, it is our earnest hope that

measures will be adopted to apply these principles to the Lithuanian situation before the planned liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people by Soviet Russia destroys the national entity of Lithuania; that no peace settlement will be entered into without the restoration of freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other nations finding themselves in a similar situation, and that in the interim more liberal legislation will be enacted by the Congress of the United States relative to the admission of displaced persons to this country.

COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES,
ANTHONY J. MICEIKA, *President.*
KONSTANT MATULIAUSKAS,
Secretary.

National Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, since its proposal, House Joint Resolution 104 to provide for a national theater, opera and ballet introduced by me in the House and by Senator IVES of New York—with Senator ELBERT THOMAS of Utah as a cosponsor—in the Senate, has been much praised and also attacked. Those who attack it as a bill for a national theater fail to recognize that it seeks only to bring about an assembly of the constituent elements of the theater, opera, and ballet to determine whether national establishments are possible and, if so, what are the bases upon which they can be set up, and to provide for direction and control by democratic processes. The appropriation sought of $250,000 is solely for purposes of convening the assembly and the amount, of course, is an estimate to be evaluated at the time of hearing on the bill.

The following articles by Charles Parmer from the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette and Richard L. Coe, drama critic of the Washington Post, discuss the resolution. Responding as it does to a cultural need of Americans, especially from broad areas of the country not now reached by living theater, opera, and ballet, these articles should prove of great interest to every Member.

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette]

PARMER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Charles Parmer)

If you read Mr. Brooks Atkinson's theater column in the New York Times, you must have seen these words last Sunday:

"Although we Americans are constantly taking bows for our wealth, enterprise, and virtue, we are the only first-class nation that does not recognize art as an integral part of national life.

"* * * Apart from the Federal Theater, which was an emergency relief project, we have never regarded the support of art as a legitimate function of government.

"* * * Art has not yet been absorbed into the democratic way of life."

All of which is true—in the main. Now come two hard-headed legislators, Representative JACOB K. JAVITS and Senator IRVING M. IVES (both from New York) sponsoring bills in the Congress which could ultimately give us a national theater, opera, and ballet.

The bills would have the President summon practitioners of those three art forms to devise plans for national institutions in their chosen fields. In due course committees from Congress would review those plans; and if acceptable, would authorize funds for a national theater, national opera, and national ballet, respectively.

That is a skeletonized idea of the plan. A book can be written on implementing it. As to whether Congress is going to authorize even that first step—oh, well, if not, at least the idea will be broached abroad and at home—as I am doing now.

Too bad that Mr. Atkinson forgot to give credit to the Commonwealth of Virginia (for surely he knows of it) for sponsoring in part the now-famed Barter Theater, which has become an accepted part of Virginia's cultural life. Hard, cold politicians voted cold, hard cash for that propect. It has been a success; the South is not the Sahara of the arts, as testy Mencken once dubbed it.

Aside from governmental support, some of the finest experimental work for the theater has been conceived, born, and nurtured in the southland. A fact which would entitle southern art leaders to front-rank participation in any governmental discussion of nationally endowed art forms.

New Orleans has not only a Little Theater, but a Little Theater building that is nationally known; the work of Paul Green at Chapel Hill in North Carolina is famed. A few years ago the Drama Caravan in Nashville on the Cumberland, in Tennessee, made one of the unique presentations in modern theatrical history; producing a play of the soil on the very ground where it was laid—and shifting the audience and not the scenery.

It is an odd commentary that theatrical arts in America have had governmental support—wholly or partly so—in times of depression; while lawmakers won't look at such in days of prosperity. The erudite Mr. Atkinson may have something when he writes:

"Culturally we have never completely outgrown the nineteenth century attitude of regarding art as a respectable and harmless diversion that rich people magnanimously patronize, thereby acquiring some good marks redeemable in heaven."

A salute to Representative JAVITS and Senator IVES for having the courage to sponsor bills which would give government backing to forms near the pinnacle of the arts: the theater, the opera, the ballet.

[From the Washington Post]

WE CAN LEARN FROM THEATERS OF OTHER LANDS

(By Richard L. Coe)

Simply because other nations, great and small, have what are called national theaters is no particular reason why we should have one in the United States. But we have much to learn from these ventures of other lands.

How these theaters arose in other countries varies greatly. From Peru, Britain, France, Sweden, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet, way over to Egypt, the birth of governmental interest in promoting a national culture has followed no strict pattern. Each nation has worked out the matter according to its own particular demands.

The Peruvians, for instance, are newcomers to the national-theater status. Several years ago their Congress financed a theater and dramatic school by requiring every movie house and sports center to devote the value of one seat (bull rings giving the equivalent of a seat in the shade) for each performance to support a theater in Lima whose company would tour the provinces. Our O'Neill is popular down there, prizes are given by the organization to stimulate playwriting, and, while the theater is only in its infancy, the beginnings have been made in the land of the Incas.

BRITISH RENEWAL

The British surge toward a national theater in the past few years has been an astonishing wave, after generations of apathy. Indeed the reawakening to the pleasures and stimulus of all the lively arts has been one of the few heartening aspects on the world horizon.

This British renaissance resulted directly from the war, during which, to comfort a battered people, the Government promoted what became known as CEMA, the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. This sent dramatic, opera, and ballet companies from Land's End to John o' Groats.

Sparked by that financial wizard, the late Lord Keynes, this became the British Arts Council, which united the Old Vic with the Shakespeare Memorial National Theater Committee. Public support of the Old Vic's and other organization's tours has been so wholehearted that there have been no losses for the Government to underwrite. The arts council works under the treasury and last month one further stride forward was made when $4,000,000 was voted to increase the council's work.

That it has taken so long to evolve a national theater in Britain is but one of the anomalies of the case. After the restoration brought back the theater to Britain in 1660, it might have been expected that the court would sponsor such a movement as was then current in the France Charles II had only just left. Theaters did require a license (patent) from the Crown, a right to play that brought endless bickering to the world David Garrick knew, but the houses were privately run and it took a Second World War to bring fruition to the project leaders had been seeking several generations.

FRENCH THEATER

The French growth came in quite another manner. Francis I, of the sixteenth century, gave subsidies to the arts and artists of his day and the fourteenth Louis had his state company.

The Comedie Française rose shortly after Molière's death in 1673 and has remained to be one of the few stable factors of the Fourth Republic. Reorganized several times, it is now under jurisdiction of the Administration of Fine Arts of the Ministry of Public Instruction. Long devoted purely to the classics, the Comedie lately has gone into more modern fields, as have its sister state theaters, the Odeon, the Theater of the Republic, and the Popular Theater. (France also has two opera groups, the Opera and the Opera Comique.)

Apart from its national and international tours, the French National Theater has a noteworthy lesson for American actors. You may have noticed in French film credits, the line "Societaire de Comedie Française." This means that the player has the honor of being a member of the National Theater; other actors may make five times his salary in the purlieus of the Champs Elysee, but they are not permitted to make that honest boast.

SWEDISH FOUNDED IN 1788

Sweden's National Theater was founded in 1788 and while on a more modest scale than France's, it was under considerable French influence until, wi: the rise of August Strindberg (who has had such a great influence on O'Neill), a national lottery was organized to raise funds for a splendid new home opened in 1907. (Why not a Mrs. Hush contest to raise money for our national theater?)

From this Stockholm center, aided by Government grants, the Swedish National Theater has sent out touring plays and opened a dramatic academy, attended by such

embryonic stars as Greta Garbo, Ingrid Bergman, and Viveca Lindfors. Touring companies from the capital now go out to places that would be devoid of the lively art.

The birth of the Czechoslovakian theater is a different story. So long part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Czech patriots formed their own theater even before they achieved an autonomous state. The National Theater in Prague was one of the glories of middle Europe before 1939, playing as many as 450 performances a year. Generally restricted to Prague these days, its companies still tour many of the municipally owned theaters of the country.

The story of the Soviet theater is so vast it would take books to relate. So important is this medium deemed that the enormous U. S. S. R. has at least 850 state theaters, 10 theater institutes, and over 70 schools. Surely there is a lesson in this for the long-gone Romanoffs. The Communists have recognized that the culture deprived the people by the Czarist regime is something vital.

For all one hears of the axes over critical and playwright heads, American travelers in the Soviet are in remarkable agreement on the glories and largess of the Soviet theater.

EGYPT'S THEATER

As for Egypt, the Arab culture has produced next to nothing, but so great has the French and Italian influence been, there is a department of fine arts administering occasional theatricals as well as Cairo's famed opera house (built to celebrate the opening of the Suez Canal and for which Verdi composed Aida). Recent years have brought strong nationalist feelings in the most ancient of lands, and both the living theater and Arabic films are financially encouraged by the Government.

Those are but some of the world's national theaters, all of them, as I say, stemming from very different beginnings. Like them, the American theater and its people will have to find specific ways and means to bring to life the bill for a national theater lately introduced in Congress by Representative JACOB K. JAVITS. As illustrations of what lesser nations have done with a rich art, they serve as thought-fodder for those who've never had the time nor the inclination to consider what the living theater can mean to one's national pride.

Break-Even Points in Farming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Break-Even Points in Farming," by Sherman E. Johnson, appearing in the Agricultural Situation, a publication by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, in its issue of January 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAK-EVEN POINTS IN FARMING

(By Sherman E. Johnson, Bureau of Agricultural Economics)

Farmers' costs climbed rapidly in 1948. The $18,200,000,000 farmers are estimated to have spent for production expenses is almost a billion and a half more than in 1947 and more than gross farm income in any year before 1942.

With prices of many farm products leveling off or declining last year, gross farm income increased only slightly from 1947. This was the first year in a decade that gross income failed to rise more than costs. As a result, farmers' net income fell below 1947.

Not only are farmers spending more for production items than ever before, but a much larger proportion are cash expenses than after World War I. Consequently, farmers can't reduce their cash outlays during a price squeeze in the same way that they did formerly.

For example, horses and mules fed largely from farm-produced feed furnished most of the farm power just after World War I. Today, fuel and oil and repairs for the farm tractor are out-of-pocket expenses. A larger share of family living costs also are cash expenses. Most farms now have electricity, and fuel for the farm furnace is delivered by the oil man or the coal dealer rather than being cut from the farm wood lot.

Farm real-estate taxes, another important cash cost, have been rising for four consecutive years. They are not likely to drop quickly in a period of declining farm prices. Land values for the country now average the highest in history and are two to three times higher than in 1935–39 in many States.

Inventory values of livestock and machinery are about three times their prewar levels. In this way, much of the income improvement of recent years has become capitalized into higher costs for the young man who is getting started in farming. He will have to invest two to three times as much for land, equipment, livestock, and supplies as before the war. As long as net farm incomes are high, this is not a serious obstacle to young farmers. But if prices and incomes turn down, heavy debt on such an investment could be an unbearable burden.

Farm mortgage debts are much lower now than in 1920 (they were about five billion in 1948, compared with over eight billion in 1920), but the debt load has been rising since 1946, and interest rates have stiffened during the past year. Information on the debts of individual farmers is not available, but many undoubtedly have a heavy load of both mortgage and short-term debts.

Although prices received for farm products have been going down in recent months they still average higher than prices paid. The parity index was 109 in December 1948 (1910–14 equals 100). But prices farmers pay for labor and materials used in production, except for farm-produced commodities like feed, show no signs of a downturn.

COSTS LAG ON DOWNTURN

Table 1 shows that in periods of rising prices farm products usually go up further and faster than farm costs. However, table 1 also indicates that when farmers' prices are declining, prices they pay tend to lag. Even when they do decline, they fall only about half as much as prices received.

If prices received by farmers should decline considerably, and cost rates lag as in the past, we would need to give considerable attention to break-even points in the farming industry.

FAMILY ABSORBS SQUEEZE

We hear a great deal about break-even points in other business but very little about them in farming. One reason is that on family farms a price-cost squeeze is frequently absorbed by the farm family accepting a lower return for its labor and investment. But this can be done only at the expense of family living and maintenance of the farm plan. On farms free of debt, the income left after paying cash operating expenses can be used for family living and upkeep of the farm. If the income falls, outlay for family living can be reduced and repairs and replacements to the farm plant held to a minimum. In such cases, the break-even point depends mainly on the extent to which the family is willing to lower its level of living in order to stay on the farm. On farms on which there is a large debt, the interest and amortization payments come out of what otherwise would be available for family living. Debt service and family living become competitive in low-income periods.

FIGURING BREAK-EVEN POINTS

Break-even points can be calculated for farms with varying amounts of debt by making a somewhat arbitrary allowance for family living. The break-even point will, of course, be different on every farm and it will vary a great deal among the different types of farming. But, as we have seen, the high proportion of cash expenses to total expenses and the tendency of costs to decline more slowly than prices of farm products affect farmers generally.

Suppose that prices received were to go down to 70 percent of their 1947 average; they would then be 195 percent of the 1910–14 average. Suppose also that prices paid, interest, and taxes dropped only half as much—about the same as in previous periods of declining prices. They would then average 196 percent of 1910–14 and the parity ratio would be only slightly below 100. If prices received declined to 60 percent of 1947 levels and again prices paid dropped only half as much, the parity ratio would be approximately 90, which is the upper level of present support-price legislation.

These illustrations are not a forecast that prices will fall to the levels indicated. And, of course, some commodities are protected by legislation against so large a drop. But table 2 shows what might happen to the income of farm families on midwestern hog-dairy farms if the prices those farmers receive for their products were to drop to 70 percent of 1947.

The net cash income in 1947 on Corn Belt farms of this type was $6,177 when rent and interest payments are excluded. These must come out before we can arrive at the income available for family living. If we assume that such a farm is operated by a young owner who owes $20,000 in the farm, livestock, and equipment, he would have to pay about $1,100 in interest and amortization payments. This would have left $5,077 for family living in 1947. But if prices for the products sold from this farm drop to 70 percent of 1947 levels, the income available for family living would be down to $2,432. Since the index of prices paid for family maintenance is now 220 percent of 1935–39 this would be equivalent to a prewar income of about $1,100.

IS INCOME ADEQUATE?

Is that the break-even point on this kind of a farm? The answer, of course, depends on whether farmers on these farms consider such an income adequate for family living. It also depends on whether the drop in income is temporary or more permanent. If farm prices remain at the lower levels for several years some of the costs might drop more than is indicated in table 2. But it would also be necessary to spend more for farm maintenance, which could be postponed if the low incomes for a year or two were followed with years of higher income.

What protection do farmers have against a possible price-cost squeeze? They do have price support legislation. But even high-level price supports cannot furnish complete protection because in a sagging market they would have to be combined with output restriction. That in turn would mean a smaller gross income, and probably higher costs per unit of product.

DEMAND WILL VARY

The best protection, of course, would be sustained demand for farm products, but some ups and downs are to be expected, at least in the transition period that we are now experiencing. Farmers cannot afford to shut up shop during a price drop if they depend on farming for a living. Some retrenchment is possible, of course. Some cash expenses can be cut but there is less opportunity for this on the highly commercialized farms of today than in 1920. Farmers who are free of debt and who have adequate financial reserves can adopt soil-maintaining rotations and relieve the pressure both on the farm plant and on the work load for the farm family. But most of them would be likely to maintain output if they thought that would mean higher incomes to them.

The farmers who are heavily in debt would be forced to produce at high levels in order to meet their fixed charges. Credit programs are geared to the expectancy of a stable rather than fluctuating farm income. Therefore, interest and amortization payments are a heavy load in years of adversity.

It may be possible to make the farmer's cost structure more flexible. In recent years we have experimented with variable payment and prepayment loan programs. Many leases are now written on a sliding scale, and it seems quite possible to do this generally. Landlords and tenants would then share both the ups and the downs. Some form of variable payment or prepayment might be adopted for taxes.

In periods of lower prices, farmers need to utilize every opportunity to reduce costs. Farmers canot influence a great deal the prices that they pay for labor and production supplies, but they can adopt improved practices that lower costs per unit of product. These practices become doubly significant if farmers are caught in a price-cost squeeze. Many improved practices involve additional current expenses or new investment that may not be feasible in periods of low prices, but if they greatly increase the output per worker they are also likely to result in higher net incomes to the farmers who adopt them, even in periods of adversity.

BUILD RESERVES NOW

Perhaps most important of all, however, is greater attention now to building up reserves from current incomes to tide farm families over any future periods of adversity. Farmers as a group have been reluctant to invest their savings in anything other than the farm plant. But other investments are available that could constitute safe and liquid reserves to help tide over low-income periods. Payment of debt is, of course, one of the best ways of building protection against financial adversity.

TABLE 1.—*Indexes of prices received and paid by farmers at various dates (August 1909–July 1914=100)*

Date	Prices received	Prices paid by farmers		
		For living and production, interest, and taxes	For production	For family maintenance
1920	211	202	174	222
1921	124	165	141	161
1929	149	167	147	159
1932	68	124	109	108
1939	95	125	122	120
1947	278	231	233	255
1948 [1]	287	249	255	271
Dec. 1948	268	247	250	270

[1] Preliminary.

TABLE 2.—*Investments, income, and expenses on family operated hog-dairy farms in the Corn Belt, 1947, and under possible condition of lower prices* [1]

Item	1947	Prices 70 percent of 1947
Acres in farm	144	144
Total cash receipts	$9,175	$6,423
Total cash expenses	2,998	[2] 2,891
Net cash income	6,177	3,532
Interest and amortization payments [3]	1,100	1,100
Available for family living	5,077	2,432

[1] Assuming the same output as in 1947.
[2] Feed, livestock, seed, and other supplies at 80 per cent of 1947 levels. Hired labor at same rates as in 1947, and machinery, building, taxes, telephone, electricity same as 1947.
[3] Assuming total debts of $20,000 and interest and amortization charges averaging 5½ percent.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the luncheon of the Ohio Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 8, 1949:

LET US LOOK FORWARD

Mr. FARLEY. When Miss Marlay asked me to join you folks during this convention and talk to you I was quite pleased. On several occasions Miss Mary Lou has invited be, but both the pressure of other matters and my being out of the country made it impossible for me to accept until now.

Ohio is a great State, with seemingly unlimited possibilities. In other days when I drove through Ohio, selling stamps and soliciting support for Democratic nominees, I was always impressed not only with the natural beauty and the lush farm lands and industrial greatness, but also the proximity of your cities and towns to each other—you are almost the city of Ohio in many respects.

Before coming out here I looked into some of the background statistics concerning Ohio. I found that Ohio ranks thirty-fourth in area in the United States, and that in 1948 there were only four States, namely, New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Illinois, that outranked Ohio in population.

In 1947, for instance, it is reported that the retail sales in Ohio had increased 93 percent over 1941; and also in 1947 the effective buying income in Ohio had increased 91 percent since 1941. As of July 1948 there has been an increase since 1940 of 12.9 percent in the population of Ohio, while the increase for the United States is 11 percent. Of the five leading States in population, only California had an increase greater than the State of Ohio.

Of course, having been chairman of the National Democratic Committee for many years it would be useless for me to say anything about the importance of population and the increase in population.

America has demonstrated its great ability as a Nation of producers, but when we look at the unlimited opportunities for sales we see that we have a long way to go in perfecting the techniques of selling. We are ever reaching out for new and better methods of selling—those industries which reach out effectively, firmly, and vigorously get their fair share of the national income; those which do not reach out equally strongly and effectively must need to do so if they would get their fair share.

Aside from the actual selling, advertising, and marketing of a particular industry, the industry, as a group of businesses, lives and operates in an atmosphere or a climate. Each industry is surrounded by economic forces, which forces influence to a great degree the ability of the industry to expand, flourish, and grow.

A great deal of the climate surrounding an industry is beyond the ability of the industry to influence or control. Great national and international forces shape the economic surroundings in which our businesses must live, and we must make the best of those circumstances. However, much of the weather in which our businesses operate could be shaped by the efforts of the people making up the industry. There will always be disagreement and strong disbelief regarding announced policies, for, in order that there be progress, there must be a constant challenging.

America, for instance, could go isolationist; we could move our forces out of Europe; we could withdraw support from the Marshall plan and save the money and taxes involved, and there are many who would have us do so, but we must carry on. Thus as a Nation we hazard money and run great risks that the whole may be preserved, and in so doing we cut back, suffer, and give, so there are times in the life of an industry as well as in the life of a nation when the immediate requires sacrifice to attain the ultimate.

From a business standpoint, the farmer knows this better than most business people. He has learned from centuries of gambling against the weather and the fertility of the soil, and he has never been able to anticipate a full and bumper crop from year to year. He is conscious of the unsurmountable influences of flood, drought, and pests, and has adjusted his philosophy to this unbalance.

In spite of such disagreement there has emerged a national unity—a willingness to go along—so it must be with an industry. An industry must have unity in order to have strength; and industry must have unity if it is to exert the necessary molding influences on those external forces which surround its operation.

As I look at the structure of your great industry, I see it composed of National, State, and even local organizations, all tied in for a constructive purpose. However, associations cannot guarantee strength to businesses that make them up, but, on the contrary, the businesses that make up an association breathe strength and life into the association.

The problems of people within an industry vary greatly—as much as the products they produce vary, and it is not within the contemplation of an association to solve the problems of the individual businesses, nor the operating problems of the cumulative businesses, but it is the problem of the association to work for the creation of an atmosphere surrounding the businesses within the industry so they may more effectively capitalize on operating forces which they set in motion.

In the soft-drink business good will is a most important factor. Confidence is essential, for the market for soft drinks is 140,000,000 people in all walks of life and in all income brackets. Good will must be had

with the dealers and with the public, and as I think of the term public relations with regard to business, it plays a tremendous part in helping create the atmosphere that surrounds the entire industry. By public relations I do not necessarily mean publicity and press agentry, but rather the broad concept of public relations, which involves quality of product served; the kind and type of advertising used; the design and condition of the trucks that deliver the products; the uniforms and courtesy of the men driving those trucks; the condition of coolers in the dealers' stores, and many other things about this industry's operation which affect people's opinions.

People in the soft-drink industry have come a long way in their sales and advertising techniques, but there is a long way yet to go. It is in the realization of the road ahead and the goal ahead that I speak to you of unity. The products of this industry compete not necessarily against each other, but against the products of other industries which are competing for the same consumer attention. As we move along we are distracted and harassed, but as was so aptly said many years ago, "The winds and tides are on the side of the ablest navigator."

I have been informed that this industry was the thirty-first industry in dollar volume in the United States in 1939, which year was the last official census made by the Department of Commerce. This is an industry whose products are available in every square inch of territory in the United States of America, and I cannot help but see ahead greater and more glorious times—but they will not come by themselves—something must be done to bring them about.

In chatting with you today, I have somewhat of a background about what has gone on in the industry since rationing was removed in 1947. We are going through a serious period of transition—one that unquestionably requires severe readjustment; but to the ablest navigators the course is clear.

In the foreign operation of a business such as this, many of the same problems beset the operators, but they move ever forward in their attempt to create and satisfy markets such as you have available.

A business is limited by the vision of its management—a business without a goal—without an objective is not pointing in any direction; therefore, the soft-drink industry in Ohio is as great as the vision of you in this room, for you set its pace; you set its ceiling. This is a dynamic age, and we are constantly in the process of change. We must be equal to our opportunities and our problems.

What was sound and effective yesterday may require complete scrutiny today; and what was considered radical yesterday may be more conservative today. Self-analysis, self-evaluation, business analysis, and an analysis of the total industry operation are the first steps in the right direction under any and all circumstances when one is charged with the responsibility of guiding the destiny of a business.

This industry has many highly desirable characteristics. It is practically entirely locally owned, and the more than 6,000 plants in the industry are scattered fairly evenly, geographically, over the entire United States. It has overcome geography and climate, and the businesses have integrated themselves into the local community life, bringing pay rolls to the cities and towns in which the plants are located. A bottler of soft drinks is a leader in his community, and his business is an asset to that community.

Rationing was an economic illness; the recuperating period may not have been comfortable, but the will to live is what pulls the patient through, and the will to do is what pulls a business through, if the individual patient will do those things essential to his mode of living that will conserve his strength. If all businesses within the industry have unity in their approach to the over-all external problems which create the atmosphere in which the business of the industry must be done, I think it safe to say this industry will retain its leadership as a selling industry in the fraternity of selling industries.

In my experience with government it became quite common that when any segment of our national business life suffers from slings and arrows of strenuous fortune, it immediately turns, as the benighted seeking a savior, always to the Government; and no matter what is asked, the anomaly of the situation is that, even if the Government does intervene, it is only a short time, maybe a few months or a year, when the same group is contending that there is too much government in business.

My travels around the world only confirmed this opinion. Everywhere the area of government activity increases and the area of business freedom shrinks. Government in business is like the camel in the tent—easy to get in but hard to get out. Government in business may start out as help, but it always winds up as regulation.

The matter is more than ordinarily important now because, in common with all businesses, this industry has the problem of readjusting itself to the postwar era. Everywhere there are signs that the seller's market is over and that once again we are in a market where the buyer is king and the customer is right. For the first time in years the newspapers are full of the news that the cost of living is going down, commodity prices are receding, and their advertisements are full of bona fide sales. Last week's New York Times carried the news that food prices had gone down one-half of 1 percent and that mink coats were off 50 percent.

How are we going to adjust ourselves to the needs of these new marketing conditions?

The answer is the same answer that has brought this industry to its present importance. We will tackle the buyer's market with the same tools that have built us up in the past—namely, by self-reliance and promotion.

This industry has always depended upon promotion to such an extent that it has continually set standards for other industries to follow.

A moment's consideration will show why, important as promotion is to oil businesses, to the soft drinks industry it is vital.

If you need a new tire and don't buy it today, you are going to need it all the more tomorrow. If you need a new pair of shoes and you postpone the purchase, it only becomes all the more needed. You can postpone the purchase of a set of tires or a pair of shoes, but you cannot avoid it. Cars won't run without tires and you can't make a business call barefoot.

A soft drink, on the other hand, is an impulse purchase. If it is handy when the desire for it occurs, you will buy it—but if not you can forget it or have a drink of water. A sale missed in this industry is not a postponed sale—it is a sale that is lost forever.

More than for any other industry, therefore, to us promotion is necessary. We must continually work at and be ingenious about devising ways of going out to people, meeting them not half-way as most industries do, but nine-tenths of the way, making ourselves available any and everywhere and by fitting into their lives and habits whatever these may be.

In its origins the soft drinks industry was a humble one. It does not have the benefit of great scientific laboratories, huge production plants, or great engineering works in the sense that is true of the chemical or steel industries. It does not have the benefit of bringing out new models continually as is true of the automobile industry or the fashion field. In comparison with most industries, we produce a simple, stable, and permanent line of merchandise which is the same from day to day, and the job is to make that piece of merchandise permanently attractive and appealing.

It is in finding new ways to make itself attractive and appealing that the soft drinks industry has been particularly ingenious and it is this ingenuity that has built the soft drinks industry into a respected and important business.

As I have said, I think that all this is more important to us than ever before. With the problems of a buyer's market we must devise ways to increase our promotional effort rather than to allow it to decrease. We must see to it that the total promotional effort that we put forth in competing with other industries for the buyer's dollar becomes greater and not less. The one thing that can hurt us is that as an industry we should fail to sufficiently call ourselves to the attention of the public. Failure to make the public see us more strenuously and effectively than ever would reduce the importance of the industry in public eyes so that people would spend their money for the products of other industries rather than our own. That is a real danger.

While it is a danger, I have no doubt as to the abilities of the members of the soft-drinks industry, and particularly of the soft-drinks industry of Ohio, to surmount it. In a way, at the present time, Ohio is pointing the way in sales promotion. I think you know who I am talking about. I am referring to that estimable gentleman, Mr. William Veeck, owner of the Cleveland Indians. He has shown the whole world what can be done by ingenuity and alertness both in overcoming obstacles and in devising new ways to attract new customers. The average man could well be overwhelmed by Mr. Veeck's personal problems. Instead of succumbing, Mr. Veeck has not only overcome them but has found time to win a world championship, break all attendance records, and put together what is probably the most successful baseball operation of all time. In New York City today the Cleveland Indians get nearly as much publicity as the Yankees. That's what ingenuity and an indomitable spirit can do.

There are two great ideologies at work in this world today—democracy and communism. Typical of democracy, we have the free enterprise system; and if democracy and the free enterprise system are to be perpetuated they will be perpetuated, first, by the desire to have them, and, second, by the willingness to do something about them. There is no finer place to start than in the development of sound small locally owned businesses.

We have a lot to look back upon, but we have much more to look forward to—let's not look back—let's look forward.

Religious Persecutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Christian nations of the world cannot ignore the inhuman treatment during the fake trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. The entire Christian world has been shocked by this cruel and inhuman treatment. The arrest of Protestant religious leaders gives the signal for a complete crack-down on all religious

education and worship in Communist-dominated Europe and Russia. There is no question but what this Communist terror is now revealed in all of its nakedness and is a definite pattern set by the Communist-controlled countries to not only eliminate, but persecute all religions. These great religious leaders are symbols of all religions, of justice and decent living, and are now under attack. Their trials have been a mockery of justice. There is no question but what religion is being crucified on the altar of freedom. There is a great wave of moral indignation going up all over the country because of these attacks.

Communism has always been a ruthless tyrant and nothing will stand in its way. It is my humble opinion though that Christianity can never be destroyed. These savage assaults on religion and decency should help to weld together the Christian nations of the world and strengthen their faith and determination to carry on the banner of Christianity.

I have vigorously protested to the State Department and have urged them to take action against this godless communism that would throttle all religious freedom. The Christian world cannot ignore these violations against human freedoms. There must be some sanctions, either through the United Nations or through this country that will stop the persecutions of the Christian leaders.

Federal Deposit Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the cashier of the First National Bank of Dyer defalcated with an estimated $300,000 of the bank's money. Plans were immediately made for the bank to be taken over by the Gary National Bank, with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation guaranteeing loans up to one million and assuming to pay loans at the end of a 6-month period.

If this situation happened before 1933, there would have been a run on this bank and it would be compelled to close its doors. If, at that time, business conditions were subnormal, it would have caused runs on banks in adjacent territories and possibly have brought financial chaos to a great area in that vicinity.

In the old days the Dyer bank would have to close its doors and go through long and costly proceedings of liquidation and receiverships. The depositors' money would have been tied up for a long period of time, and business in the whole community would have suffered. The depositors, at best, would have received only a gradual and partial return of their life savings over a period of years. The stockholders would have been assessed their 100-percent double liability and most of the bankers' assets would have been dissipated in attorney and receivers' fees, and so forth.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which was created by a Democratic Congress under the so-called New Deal administration, has averted financial chaos to business in the area of Dyer, Ind. Depositors now know that their life savings and bank funds are protected by the Government up to $5,000. Under the protection of the FDIC, the Dyer bank continues to do business as usual.

I recollect back in the early days of the New Deal, when this legislation was enacted, how most of the banks and bankers in the country opposed the guaranty of bank deposits. Today the bankers realize and admit it was the greatest blessing that has come to their business. The bankers no longer endure constant worry, fearful of runs on their banks, which sometimes start from rumors without foundation.

The bankers opposed Government insurance because certain of their leaders told them that it would bankrupt the Government and be a first step toward causing Government control. Today it is difficult to find a banker in the country who is not wholeheartedly in favor of this Government insurance.

I call this to the attention of Congress because propaganda against Federal insurance of bank deposits was identical with the propaganda that was circulated against other progressive Democratic legislation, not only in the last 15 years but even today against progressive legislation in the Eighty-first Congress.

Let us profit today by the experience we have had in the past with unfair, misleading, and reactionary propaganda.

Look to Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article entitled "Look to Lithuania," which recently appeared in the Worcester Telegram newspaper, of Worcester, Mass. The author is the distinguished international affairs authority, lecturer and professor, Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, of Clark University, Worcester, Mass.

Dr. Ekblaw poignantly reminds us that the principle of political independence, enunciated in the declaration by the United Nations and the Atlantic Charter, is a hollow mockery in the present suppression of the Lithuanian people, and the other small nations of the world.

The recent great conflict was fought with the clear understanding and pledged purpose that common victory should bring restoration of self-government and territorial integrity to the oppressed nations of the world. We cannot conceive of World War II being won until that pledge has been carried out.

As Dr. Ekblaw points out, it is high time this Government demonstrated, in unmistakable manner, our insistence that the Lithuanian people, and the other persecuted peoples, be permitted their inalienable right to govern their internal existence as they themselves see fit.

Dr. Ekblaw's article follows:

LOOK TO LITHUANIA

(By Dr. W. Elmer Ekblaw, Clark University)

Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's treaties of nonaggression such as that Russia has just offered Norway. Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's treatment of minorities. Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's Communist improvement of economic standards. Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's regards for the rights of man, for his freedom, for his social security. Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's ruthless imperialism, both in territory and sovereignty. Look at Lithuania, and recognize once and for all the gruesome travesty upon democracy and liberal government that Russia's sovereignty represents.

With Lithuania as example it is easy to realize what China will become under Russian rule. With Lithuania as example it is easy to realize what would happen to the cultural standards of Sweden and Denmark if they submit to Russian dictation of their policies. With Lithuania as example it is easy to realize what is happening to German craftsmanship, German agriculture, German industry in the Russian zone of occupation. With Lithuania as example it is easy to realize the fate of Greece, Turkey, Palestine, Iraq, and Iran if they fall under Russian domination. With Lithuania as example it is easy to realize the ultimate submergence of Finland, the Baltic states, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria, perhaps even Austria, in the barbarous flood of Russian materialism, atheism, and totalitarian despotism.

The time has come, indeed, it is already past, when Americans and the rest of the democratic peoples of the world must doff their present tolerance and passive acceptance of Russian territorial and political aggression and imperialistic expansion of virtual sovereignty, and don the definite, unequivocal, and undeniable role of leader not only in militant opposition to further Russian encroachment upon the rights and sovereignties and territories of autonomous peoples still free, but also in militant leadership of restoration of rights, sovereignties, and territories to once free and autonomous peoples whom Russia has conquered. It is just as important that Lithuania and the Lithuanians, Poland and the Poles, Estonia and the Ests, Latvia and the Letts, and all the middle European peoples from the Baltic to the Black Sea that have fallen under the terror and horror of Russian tyranny should be freed of that enslavement and bondage, as it is that Finland and Greece, Turkey and all the Near East, China and Chosen, Scandinavia and Pakistan should be spared the dread and horror of further Russian expansion and debasement of economy and culture.

Under the guise of Christian humility, meekness, and pacifism, we and the rest of the democratic states are not only accepting the barbarous practices that characterize present Russian administration and institutions but also condoning the policies and activities by which that barbarism is achieved. We are appeasing a brutal imperialism that does not look to improvement of man's economic standards or to accelerating man's cultural progress, but to the establishment of a tyranny that will permit none of the "four freedoms," and that only prolongs the rule of force over the rule of reason in all man's efforts to rise from savagery to some degree of security, peace, and satisfactory living standards.

Since Lithuania's reincorporation into the Soviet state there has been only misery, humiliation, suffering, and death for the noble

Lithuanian folk. Their land has been expatriated and given to Russian veterans. Their industries have been despoiled and depreciated, and their means of integrated economy ruined. Their families, their communities, their institutions have been disrupted, even destroyed. Hundreds of thousands of the good Lithuanian folk have been slain, some by murder, some by being worked and starved to death, some by slavery in alien climates and lands to which they could not be acclimated.

Complacently and appeasingly, we, and the rest of the free, democratic, and presumably righteous folk of the world, have permitted the cruel devastation of a proud, free, enterprising Christian people and state, like Lithuania and her people, without ever effective protest. Only the Lithuanians themselves, and their emigrant relatives have dared to oppose and challenge Russia's ruthless might. It is time that we and our democratic allies bestirred ourselves.

Increased Federal Aid for National System of Interstate Highways Needed—and Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Cleveland Press of February 14, 1949, upon a matter of utmost importance to the people of our Nation.

Without a doubt, construction of a national system of interstate highways should begin immediately and be planned to provide very rapid transportation and elimination of traffic bottlenecks in industrial cities of America.

Should war be forced upon us by the Soviet Union, acting as an aggressor nation, our great need would be apparent and immediate. If peace and prosperity continue, as we hope and pray will be the situation, the immediate need is evident for a scientifically planned system of highways to provide speedy and safe transportation through our great cities, as well as in the rural areas.

People are entitled to know how many miles have already been constructed under authority of the Public Roads Administration of the 40,000-mile national system of free highways. How much money has this agency spent to date upon this project? I seek answers to these questions.

I urge that my colleagues give this important matter their consideration.

The editorial from the Cleveland Press is as follows:

ALL OHIO CONGRESSMEN HAVE CHANCE TO PUSH HIGHWAY PLAN

All Ohio Congressmen who are interested in rebuilding the roads of this State should get behind Congressman at Large STEPHEN M. YOUNG'S proposal for construction of the national system of interstate highways. It is of particular interest to the metropolitan areas, for YOUNG seeks a start on the urban sections where the real bottlenecks of the system are. The plan recognizes the inability of the cities to raise large new matching funds from real-estate taxes.

Congress, under this plan, would assume most or even all the cost of this 40,000-mile national system of freeways, including rights-of-way. That would relieve Cleveland, for example, of $65,000,000 now asked as its share of the $240,000,000 freeway system here. Cincinnati, Toledo, Sandusky, Dayton, Akron, Columbus, Massillon, Canton, Youngstown, and other Ohio cities on the national highways also would be relieved of proportionate matching of funds.

This would be a tremendous lift to this State. Congressmen of both parties should be able to get together on a project so important to the entire State and all its people.

False Argument Against TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of Congress who has been critical of the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority would read the following editorial entitled "False Argument Against TVA," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and was reprinted in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on February 14, 1949.

It shows clearly and convincingly that so many of the arguments made by the National Association of Electric Companies under the guidance of that superlobbyist, Purcell L. Smith, against the construction of a steam-electric generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., by the TVA, are misleading and false. It looks like the private power lobby will never learn a lesson from past experience. They are "fouling their own nest" by their unfair, unjust and misleading propaganda against TVA. They should profit by their mistakes in the past and should abandon their despicable tactics toward TVA.

The editorial follows:

FALSE ARGUMENT AGAINST TVA

TVA's urgent need for a new steam electric generating plant, and the fallacy of the private power lobby's arguments against it, are now amply shown.

An initial appropriation of $2,500,000 was recommended early this month by a House appropriations subcommittee.

The need itself, which the anti-TVA lobbyists have never denied, is documented in detail in a recent statement. In addition, the statement is a fine showing of the leadership which TVA is giving the country in making electricity the servant of the people. It is a notable accomplishment that the percentage of electrified farms in the Tennessee Valley has increased from 30 percent 4 years ago to nearly 60 percent today, and is increasing at the rate of 1 percent a month.

Alternatives to a new steam plant which the power lobby has suggested are that TVA buy power from private companies outside its area or that municipalities and industries build their own power plants.

These are not fair, sensible alternatives. Neighboring power companies are hard pressed to supply their present demands, and even if they had a surplus, the cost of transmitting it the long distances between their plants and TVA's customers would be prohibitive.

Municipalities might lack sites favorable to low production costs and industries in the Tennessee Valley would be unfairly penalized by not having the choice, enjoyed by industries elsewhere, of purchasing instead of producing their own power.

Altogether, it is a false argument which the power lobby, spearheaded by the National Association of Electric Companies, advances. In the telegram which that association's chief lobbyist, P. L. Smith, recently sent to the Post-Dispatch and other newspapers throughout the country, perhaps the trickiest assertion was that the New Johnsonville, Tenn., project "would be the first steam plant constructed by the Federal Government any time, any place, for commercial purposes."

TVA's statement pointed out that the Federal Government authorized TVA to buy all the steam plants of the Tennessee Electric Power Co. and to build a new steam plant of its own at Watts Bar, so that if there is a grain of truth in the statement that New Johnsonville "would be the first" it is based on a tricky use of words and not on the facts.

We think this misleading propaganda by the National Association of Electric Companies will react against it and to the advantage of TVA wherever it is met by a plain statement of the facts.

Declaration of Independence—Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, February 16, was the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania.

Today that declaration of independence of the free people of Lithuania exists only in their hearts, for, like the other Baltic nations, that country is isolated from other freedom-loving peoples by means of the Soviet iron curtain.

It is true that Russia has annexed the geographical unit called Lithuania, as well as the physical boundaries of her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. It is true that the oppressive measures of Soviet domination are wreaking havoc with the traditionally liberty-loving Lithuanians. It is not true, however, that Lithuania has been forever crushed, for at this moment a heroic armed resistance is carrying out the will of the people against their oppressor.

To the lasting credit of the United States, Russia's greedy annexation has not been recognized by this country.

Today I call to the attention of the Congress the fact that the spark of freedom still glows in Lithuania—crying out to us and all free peoples that the darkness of the iron curtain must be lifted and Lithuania must be allowed once more to walk in the sun with the other free nations of the world.

Medical Care and Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1949, and an article by Marquis Childs appearing in the Washington Post of February 16, 1949:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 15, 1949]

PRESCRIPTION FROM THE DOCTORS

Probably the most significant thing about the American Medical Association's plan for the extension of medical care is that the AMA has offered one.

Up to this time the doctors have found themselves in a curiously untenable position. In the face of a growing popular demand for some governmental program that will make medical care more generally available and mitigate the financial catastrophe of illness, the doctors have relied too strongly on a purely negative opposition. Now they have come forward with a positive plan of their own which they are willing to push as vigorously throughout the country as the proponents of so-called socialized medicine have done in Washington.

This is a sound approach, from the standpoint of the doctors' own public relations and from the standpoint of the public that in the end will decide what it wants. It should lead to a debate that will get down to details and present to the people an opportunity to judge between the advantages to themselves of such schemes as compulsory health insurance, administered by the Federal Security Agency and financed by another pay-roll tax, and the voluntary insurance method advocated by the doctors with public assistance reserved for those who cannot help themselves.

Thus far the doctors have been conducting a sort of orderly retreat. In 1946 they were able to support the Hill-Burton Act for assistance to the States in hospital construction, while centering opposition to the much broader Murray-Dingell compulsory health-insurance measure. They have favored Senator TAFT'S bill for aid to the States in providing medical care for the indigent, which was not approved but which lessened pressure for the compulsory insurance plan in the Eightieth Congress. This year Senator TAFT is coming up with a new measure. But in the meantime the administration is pretty well committed to the Murray-Dingell bill, and now the doctors, under great pressure from the AMA's own membership, have brought out the plan announced yesterday in Chicago.

Its governing philosophy is encouragement of voluntary health insurance, which has come to assume substantial proportions, instead of a pay-roll tax-supported compulsory system. The Federal Government, through a new department under the professional administration of doctors, would assume direction of aid to States in other particulars as a substitute for administration by the Federal Security Agency.

The doctors are also active in the States and have lent their prestige and influence to numerous State plans which are being written in the legislatures. They will go further and faster if they drop such smear-terms as "socialized medicine" and "sprawling bureaucracy" and get busy educating the general public on how the public interest, not merely the interests of the medical profession, will best be served by taking what the doctors have now prescribed.

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1949]

THE AMA AND HEALTH INSURANCE

(By Marquis Childs)

The health plan presented by the American Medical Association is tragically late. It is an eleventh-hour deathbed conversion, and because it is that the sincerity and the intention of the AMA will be questioned.

The plan was made public as the Truman administration is working on a comprehensive national health insurance scheme to recommend to Congress. The health insurance bill will go up to Capitol Hill in the near future with the President's O. K.

While they have heard propaganda on both sides, and particularly from the AMA, most Americans know little about health insurance. Whether there is any real sentiment in the country for such a widespread program is doubtful.

But what most Americans do know is this: Medical care is so costly that in any adequate form it is beyond the reach of millions. The very poor in cities where there are free clinics and free hospitals can be cared for without cost. The rich can pay their doctor and hospital bills.

In between is the broad band of middle-class Americans for whom a long illness may mean ruin. For millions too proud to accept charity, medical costs are prohibitively high. These are the Americans who have looked hopefully for some decent and honorable plan that would give them medical care at a price they could pay.

One method is the prepaid, group medical care plan. Families formed in voluntary groups each pay a fixed sum per month to cover doctor and hospital bills.

But the AMA has not encouraged such plans. The public has had the impression that the medical association has set itself against any change. Such a reasonable man as Gov. Earl Warren has been denounced for his proposed California State-wide health insurance plan.

In the absence of any concerted movement for a gradual betterment of health standards and a lowering of medical costs on a cooperative or group basis, a Federal measure was certain to be put forward. The tragedy is that the AMA might have pioneered in discovering a grass roots, voluntary, truly American way to meet the problem.

Instead, until the 12-point health plan of this week, the AMA has devoted its resources to attacking Federal health insurance as socialism. Agencies such as the National Physicians Committee, which was endorsed by the AMA house of delegates at the St. Louis meeting in December, have stooped to dubious, and what might even be called un-American, propaganda.

One example is the letter sent to all Protestant ministers and addressed to "Dear Christian American." Apparently through a blunder it was later sent to Roman Catholic clergy and to Jewish rabbis and produced a violent reaction. One passage in this extraordinary letter says:

"To the Christian who believed in the sanctity of life, nothing could be more dangerous than the spectacle of politicians arbitrarily juggling the birth rate, through the application of propaganda or compulsion by means of an abuse of political medicine. Once power over all medical services is concentrated in the hands of a few bureaucrats, it would be inevitable that—sooner or later—they would misuse it to establish quotas for the baby crop in the same way that the Agriculture Department theorists set quotas for farm production."

In a special note to members the National Physicians Committee said that the mailing of this Dan Gilbert Washington Letter had come out of conferences and contacts extending over a period of 2 years. The doctors were advised to take it up with your minister and the editor of your local newspaper.

AMA representatives say the association was not consulted at all about this letter. They seem to realize that this kind of propaganda can do far more harm than good.

The AMA is seeking to raise a fund to fight the Administration proposal by levying a $25 assessment on each of 140,000 members. There are growing signs of resistance to this assessment. Many doctors are acutely aware of the trouble their patients have in meeting medical costs.

Like the average middle-class American, they would go for a sensible proposal having as its base a voluntary and independent association of doctor and citizen. The Republicans are coming up with their own health and medical plan. They have a magnificent opportunity to show that the choice is not between do-nothingism, clinging to things as they are, and on the other hand, a Federal blanket covering all of medicine.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Mr. George Gallup, which appeared in the Washington Post February 6, 1949, is very pertinent in view of the current controversy over the enactment of national health insurance. Interestingly enough, it shows that the people questioned would be willing to pay an average of $3.10 a month for medical and hospital care under an insurance program. According to a 1946 American Medical Association survey, the Nation's health bill—including drugs and dental care—was about $40 per capita. In other words, the average person is willing to pay this sum in regular insurance payments if he can be assured of complete personal medical and hospital care. I include this column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE GALLUP POLL

HEALTH INSURANCE AT $3 A MONTH

(By George Gallup)

Within the next few weeks, hearings are scheduled to start in Congress on the national health-insurance bill. Bitterly opposed by the American Medical Association, which is raising a special fund to fight the measure, medical insurance promises to be one of the major controversies of the Truman Fair Deal.

At this stage of the fight, approximately three out of every five of the Nation's voters have heard or read about the idea of Government health insurance, Nation-wide questioning of voters shows.

The persons interviewed said they would be willing to pay, on the average, approximately $3 a month if they could be assured of complete personal medical and hospital care. Presumably they would be willing to pay somewhat more than this for medical and hospital coverage of the entire family, which is the plan envisioned in the Senate bill.

So far as the medical profession is concerned, a major issue in the controversy is whether health insurance ought to be handled by the Government or by private medical organizations similar to those now offering hospital insurance. Future surveys by the institute will test public attitudes on that point.

12 percent free

In today's survey, the following question was put to all persons, whether they had heard of the proposed national health insurance program or not:

"If you were assured complete medical and hospital care (excluding dental care) for yourself, how much would you be willing to pay per month for such service?"

The following table summarizes the results. The median average of all sums named was $3.10.

	Percent
Under $1 a month	2
$1–1.99	12
$2–2.99	15
$3–3.99	10
$4–4.99	5
$5–7.99	18
$8 or more	9
Not willing to pay anything	12
Don't know	17

The survey is not a test of the degree to which the voters approve or disapprove of Government health insurance, but simply a test of what the individuals questioned might be willing to pay for such a service if it were offered.

The medical insurance program proposed in Congress envisions a monthly rate, which would include the families of persons enrolled, of up to about $54 a year or $4.50 a month on the first $3,600 of wages, with the employer paying an equal amount. Discussion of the exact sums is still going on.

Physician choice

Future surveys by the institute are scheduled to probe public attitudes on many other aspects of the proposed program; to find out, for example, how well informed the average American is about the medical services he would get under the program if passed, and whether he thinks he would have free choice of physicians to treat him.

Meanwhile, a point of considerable interest in the medical profession is how much the average American now spends a year on medical and hospital services.

According to an estimate by the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the per capita expenditure in 1947 for personal medical and hospital care was $38.74. According to a study by Frank G. Dickinson of the American Medical Association, the Nation's total health bill for 1946 was $5,600,000,000, which would be about $40 per capita. These figures are not confined to doctor and hospital services only, but include drugs and dental care.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New Leader, New York, is pertinent in view of the controversy over the Taft-Hartley law:

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

The hearings on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law have brought the leaders of the House and Senate up against a basic social problem to which, apparently, they are not prepared to give adequate attention. The question is: What powers are to be given to the President to enable him to deal with strikes or threats of strikes which endanger the public health and safety? The law adopted by the Eightieth Congress provided that the Government could prevent or end such outbreaks through the operation of injunctions. The President and many Democratic Congressmen are pledged to the repeal of this law.

It is now maintained by Senator TAFT and his followers that if the measure were repealed and for the present the Wagner Act without amendment were substituted for it, the Nation would be at the mercy of John L. Lewis or any other labor boss who might decide to tie up an industry or service upon which the public is dependent for its very life. The Republican Members of House and Senate, with the help of some Democrats, can be depended upon to make a vigorous fight in favor of salvaging the parts of the Taft-Hartley law applying to this problem.

This matter of defending the public against the cutting off of vital supplies and services is so important that it demands more serious consideration than can be given to it during the hearings preliminary to the changes which the Democratic administration is pledged to make. It involves the sort of study of labor relations which no congressional body has ever undertaken.

The leaders of labor would be among the first to acknowledge that the nation has a right to protect its existence. It has been taken for granted here and everywhere that a society can and must use whatever measures are necessary to ensure its continuation. Long before the Taft-Hartley Act was ever dreamed of, American Presidents found means—sometimes brutal and unjustified means—to end strikes which seemed to them to involve a threat to the nation's existence.

But since the days of Grover Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt much progress has been made in this matter of handling labor problems. The idea has gradually been worked out that solutions should be sought through application of principles of justice rather than by the application of force. And we are admitting defeat if we acknowledge that strikes in vital areas cannot be settled in this way. What is needed, then, is not the use of court injunctions which may lead to the sending in of police or troops, but an agreement upon ways and means of settling differences which will lead to mutually acceptable solutions.

If the workers in any great area of employment are to be deprived of the advantages of a strike, they must receive compensation in the way of machinery for negotiation and arbitration which will ensure satisfactory solutions without the cessation of work. Any solution which is forced upon the workers, which leaves them suffering under a sense of injustice, cannot serve. In the end, any system based on such methods must break down.

But this whole area of discussion is so complicated and so important that it is impossible to do anything satisfactory about it during the present hurried hearings. After thorough investigation at some later date a law covering it should be perfected. In the meantime, the President and the Attorney General are obviously correct in saying that, no matter what happens to the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, we are in no danger of suffering death at the hands of the terrible John L. Lewis or of anyone else.

Our Debt to Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 I endeavored to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Lady From Ohio," published in the Washington Post, but found that my colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] had deprived me of this privilege by action taken the day before. His extension of remarks appear at page A769 of the Appendix of the RECORD.

A signal honor has come to our distinguished and beloved colleague from Ohio, FRANCES P. BOLTON. We rejoice with her and her constituents whom she serves with such unfailing devotion in this recognition of her outstanding qualities of mind and heart.

One of the great joys and priceless privileges of service in this body is the opportunity to know and work with men and women dedicated so completely to their country's services as FRANCES BOLTON.

The editorial commending our colleague is language to which, I am confident, we all subscribe enthusiastically.

Government Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of Congress would take the time to read the following editorial published on February 14, 1949, in the Paris Post-Intelligencer of Paris, Tenn., located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. It is one of the strongest, most convincing and most persuasive editorials that I have ever read against the evils of Government compulsory health insurance, State medicine, or socialized medicine. I am in full accord and complete agreement with the views expressed therein and I congratulate this splendid newspaper upon this timely editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

WHAT ABOUT GOVERNMENT HEALTH INSURANCE?

With our Eighty-first Congress being high-pressured so strenuously by the Fair Deal administration to enact its scheme for compulsory health insurance, it is imperative that we, the American public, recognize the proposal for what it is, and for what effect such legislation will have on our individual lives.

If there is any single feature of compulsory health insurance which reveals it to be fundamentally incongruous with the American way of life, it is epitomized in the first word of its title. If it is compulsory, then it is admittedly hostile to the principles of personal freedom, which is what democracy really amounts to. If it despises the right of the individual to take it or leave it, then it is un-American from its roots up.

We're not impressed, either, by Uncle Sam's sudden concern about health and medicine. We have plenty of confidence in the ability of our local doctors to take care of our community's health, and we like the way that both doctors and community cooperate in behalf of the underprivileged who need medical attention. By the same logic, we feel that our statesmen are capable of running the Government, but by no process of reasoning can we expect Uncle Sam to run the medical profession any more than we want our doctors to try their hands at administering the affairs of state.

The author and promoter of the administration's national health proposal is Oscar Ewing, who oddly enough has never attended a medical school. He is not a doctor, but, like Eleanor Roosevelt, a social reformer. The idea of a social reformer dabbling in medicine is no more inspiring than the thought of a business executive dabbling in his wife's biscuit dough. If the Nation's

health is turned over to bureaucrats in Washington, we urgently recommend that they be put through the gruelling experience of a medical education before they are allowed to operate on the American public.

Compulsory health insurance is particularly undesirable for the very fact that it is government insurance. Is there any one who thinks that any government can run an insurance agency as well as the rugged private companies that have blazed their own trails and helped build the nation during their individual struggles for survival? If Metropolitan and Prudential, for instance, had operated for just 1 year on the same basis as Federal old-age insurance, they too would have needed compulsion to keep their policyholders paying premiums. And only recently it was announced that millions of insurance dollars will be returned to veterans who have overpaid on GI policies because the experience tables used by the Government agency were based on material from the last century.

Socialized medicine is repugnant to American ideals in its very origin. Every student of philosophy knows that the theory is to be found in Karl Marx's treatise on communism, expounded in 1848. Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, first put it into effect in Germany, whence it was later carried into Austria and France; but no honest way of financing the "free medical service" was ever hit upon, and history records the subsequent bankruptcy of these three countries.

The question is asked, naturally enough, that if socialized medicine isn't a good thing, why is it still practiced in other countries? The answer is simple—those countries are not free republics like our own. The Soviet constitution guarantees free medical care and security in sickness and old age to every ward of the U. S. S. R., but the cost to the individual is his personal liberty. England has socialized medicine today, and England's once-supreme medical rating has declined below that of its own dominions. Furthermore, the absolute monarchism of the past and the socialism of the present under which the subjects of the British Government have existed both represent a part of Europe that the citizens of the American Government willingly left to the Old World.

If we intend to remain free agents in a democratic government, we must rise above the level of confused thinking about such schemes as compulsory health insurance, which is but another subterfuge plan for directing America down the same weary road known to the countries of Europe. It is the road which leads away from the fertile fields of individual freedom, of States' rights, and of the democratic way of life toward the desolate wastes of federalized control in every private walk of life.

Hon. J. Harry McGregor, of Ohio, Calls for Better Roads in Rural Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me at the road-builders' conference and forty-sixth annual meeting sponsored by the American Road Builders' Association, February 7, 1949, Washington, D. C.:

Mr. Chairman, members of the American Road Builders Association, and guests, I appreciate the privilege of being with you today and discussing briefly some of the issues confronting us relative to our road-building program. Really I think I should say—to discuss with you the economic and military issues which confront our Nation, as most certainly our road program is a major part of both of these subjects. I have been asked to speak on a subject very close to my heart, the Program of Secondary or Local Rural Roads—Farm-to-Market Roads.

We must not be interested in roads, or any other legislation for that matter, from a selfish viewpoint. We must consider what is best for all of us—not only from the viewpoint of highway contractors but from the viewpoint of citizens we should carefully analyze and agree on a policy that will benefit all, and formulate a program that will make ours a greater America.

Secondary roads—farm-to-market roads—how shall we define them? When we speak of them do we mean the feeder roads, the tributary roads, the farm-to-market roads, country and township roads, local roads, or do we mean all the roads below the level of the primary system? Certainly some of the terminology we use in classifying our highway systems is rather misleading. For instance, take the term "farm-to-market road." When most people use this term they certainly are not referring to our primary highway system, yet many of our main roads would warrant such a classification. Many of our farmers and industrial workers are located along this primary system and so to them the main highway becomes the farm-to-market road.

And even the farmer who resides on the tributary roads may use the main road in the last lap of his trip to the market. So as farmers travel to their markets they may travel over a route which includes sections of township, county and State roads. And they all can rightfully be called farm-to-market roads.

The crops, upon which depends the economic well-being and continued existence, not only for farmers, but for the American people, must be transported in a large part from the farm to the market and ultimate consumer on our roads, including farm-to-market roads. Both consumers and farmers, therefore, suffer from an inadequate road system.

Of the 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys, and streets in our Nation, 3,000,000 miles are in rural districts, only 23 percent of which are graded and drained but not surfaced, and 31 percent are primitive, undrained and not surfaced. Thus more than half of the roads serving farmers are not all-weather roads. Over the secondary and feeder roads, 4,000,000 children ride to school daily; 33,000 rural letter carriers travel each day approximately 1,500,000 miles serving their mail routes. In doing that they directly serve 30,000,000 people of this country.

About 80 percent of our total road mileage is under local jurisdiction. Studies of our highway travel characteristics show that our paved roads aggregate about 10 percent of the total rural mileage. They carry more than 70 percent of our total vehicle miles. Yet this 10 percent of paved rural roads provides direct service to less than 25 percent of all our rural dwellings. This leaves 75 percent of our rural dwellings on the remaining gravel, earth or unimproved roads.

It is estimated that between 65 and 70 percent of our raw materials from the farms, the mines, and the forests are transported over the roads under local jurisdiction to the factory and to the city. While 70 percent of the total vehicle miles occur on 10 percent of the paved rural roads, much of this traffic is generated by rural activities, which are dependent upon the use of the gravel, earth, or unimproved road in travel to and from market.

From a defense standpoint, these farm-to-market roads are also important. During the war when gasoline was rationed, highway traffic was divided into essential and nonessential classifications. It was determined at that time that 67 percent of all farm-car travel was essential whereas only 53 percent of the automobile travel of other classes was considered essential. These farm-to-market roads are the supply lines of our Nation. They are also the roads which would enable traffic to disperse from the arterial system in case of atomic bombing of our cities. If our main roads should become blocked, they would serve as alternates or relief roads.

The 1948 highway act provides for a reduction of 10 percent in appropriations. If continued on the basis of present Federal-aid appropriations for a period of 15 years, this program will be barely sufficient to construct a mileage of principal secondary roads of over 15 percent of the total rural mileage. It can, however, act as a spark plug for the local highway program and can serve as an instrumentality to bring about improved local highway administrative practices. It can serve to stimulate cooperation between the Federal, State, county, and other local agencies.

It is interesting to note in the Annual Report of the Public Roads Administration that the cost per mile for Federal-aid secondary roads have averaged about one-third that of primary roads. The progress we have made to date on our highway system represents the united effort of the Federal, State and local governments. With a varying degree each has exercised responsibility and control of roads within its own jurisdiction. A sound, integrated highway program is an essential part of our economy. If we are to meet the transportation needs of all of our people, we must not only improve our primary system, but must extend adequate highway facilities to the people living on our farm-to-market (county and township) roads as well. In such a program it is necessary that we enlist the cooperation of the Federal, State, county and township units of government.

With automobile registration expected to reach 50,000,000 by 1960, and the entire highway system in need of overhauling, a greatly accelerated highway program is a vital need. Congress must recognize that need. State legislatures and local officials must aid in solving their highway problems. The road building profession and industry now face the biggest challenge in their history. With cooperation and teamwork we can meet that challenge.

A great many people, including me, wonder why our own farm-to-market roads (county and township) are not being improved more rapidly. Let us take Ohio for example.

Ohio's allotment of funds for secondary roads is $13,836,000. The November 30 report from the Public Roads Administration indicates that Ohio has now a program under way which adds up to $27,178,000. This will finance the construction of 568 miles of secondary roads. Two hundred and twenty-five miles have been completed involving an expenditure of $8,832,000, a little less than one-half of which is Federal funds. The balance of funds are in the various stages of programing, contract awarded and under construction. Thus it would seem Ohio has quite a sizeable program, yet it involves improvement of only 568 miles, as compared to the 28,747 miles under county control and 40,938 miles of township roads in Ohio.

What is wrong? And to be perfectly honest there is something wrong, and it is time to find out what and see that it is corrected. Is it red tape? Is it overlapping of power? Is it caused by unnecessary plans and specifications? Or is it just indifference on the part of someone in authority?

In my opinion, we need a complete reorganization of that branch of our various

highway departments, National and State, that has control of the road program dealing with farm-to-market roads—county and township. Why not establish, National and State, a division to handle farm-to-market roads, county and township? A division to cooperate with the county and township organizations and to delegate to the county and township officials as much responsibility for planning, engineering, and construction as they are organized and equipped to undertake. The creation of this division will give to the local people an opportunity to put practical knowledge into our road program. They will know local problems, needs, and conditions, and then we can truly design and build a road to fit the traffic which it bears.

Give to rural Americans, the farmer, the shop worker, the mail man, and the school bus driver, an opportunity to get to and from their work 12 months out of the year. We want and certainly are entitled to "an all-weather road."

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial by Mr. C. G. Thomason, editor and publisher of the Industrial Press, of Ensley, Ala., concerning the proposed new labor-management law.

This editorial has gained much praise in the industrial Ninth District of Alabama, and especially from many union members. It calls for calm, sane, and unselfish thinking and pleads for a law that will not lose sight of that all-important factor—the public interest.

I feel that the country would greatly benefit if the Members of Congress will read this editorial and adopt the suggested policy of giving first consideration to the welfare and security of our Nation, then make all provisions just or fair as possible to labor and management.

The editorial follows:

PUBLIC SHOULD COME FIRST

The way things are shaping up all indications point to quite a battle in the Eighty-first Congress over passage of some kind of labor law. Leaders of the A. F. of L. and the CIO will bring all the pressure possible for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. Industry will fight to have it maintained. John L. Lewis, United Mine Workers' chief, is advocating repeal of the T-H law and is opposed to the enactment of any law to replace it. He says let labor and management settle their own differences without resort to Government interference.

Both the CIO and A. F. of L. will seek to have the Wagner Act reestablished.

In this fight both sides to the controversy will overlook the public interest. Chances are that Congress will also lose sight of this important factor.

Organized labor represents some 15,000,000 people and management only a very small percentage. On the public side there are 130,000,000. But they don't count. They are merely the bulk of the American people. They are unorganized and confused, have no spokesmen and are not represented in these selfish controversies. They are the ones that suffer every time labor and management get the upper hand.

Both labor and management yell that they want a law that is fair to both sides. That is not true. Management wanted the T-H law which union leaders believe is unfair to them. Labor wants the Wagner Act back on the books. No one, even labor, will admit that it is fair to management.

Consequently both sides are intensely selfish and greedy, constantly fighting for every possible advantage, and, in their zeal, completely unmindful of the public interest.

A national labor law in all probability is necessary to umpire labor-management disputes. But such a law should be entirely in the interest of the public as a whole. Here is what we believe the public wants:

A law that will give it complete protection against both strikes and lock-outs. Any strike or work stoppage of any duration affects the public. A railroad, bus, or any type of transportation stoppage not only inconveniences the public first but proves more costly to it than to either side in the controversy. Any work stoppage on a national scale affects the general public more than those involved in the dispute. Even the smallest local work stoppage has its inconveniences for the public.

Therefore, we believe that if a national labor law is passed the public would want it to provide for compulsory arbitration by a board composed entirely of unbiased, level-headed citizens representing the general public. A majority decision by such a board should be final.

Such a board would be fair to both sides. If a jury composed of plain American citizens can be trusted to settle legal controversies involving great sums and even deciding the question of life or death, such a group certainly could be depended upon to render a fair labor decision.

The process of determining the right or wrong under a labor law should not be any different from that of any other law.

All laws are supposed to be fair to every citizen and for the protection of all. Laws designed to benefit any selfish group, class, or clique are undemocratic and un-American.

Our Socialistic Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech entitled "Creeping Paralysis," made by Dewitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association, before the small business day dinner at the Hotel Statler on Wednesday evening, February 16:

I'm very happy to be here this evening. I consider it a high honor and a great privilege to speak at this meeting. I say that particularly because the more than 350 members of our association who are here have almost 200 Members of Congress as their guests.

I've been in the House galleries many times when the Congressman who had the floor didn't have nearly that many Members listening to him, and on the Senate side the full complement is 96.

So, when a layman, and a small-business man at that, has an opportunity to talk to 200 Members of Congress at one time and also more than 200 beautiful and charming ladies and in addition has 350 businessmen from all over the country all in the same audience, he is indeed highly honored and has a unique opportunity which he should make the most of, and that's exactly what I propose to do.

What I have to say is not directed to either Democrats or Republicans. My primary interest, the primary interest of the National Small-Business Men's Association is in good government and no one knows any better than I that the friends of good government are found on both sides of the aisle in our National Legislature.

I'm speaking as an American to a group of Americans. I'm speaking as an American who knows beyond any shadow of doubt that his is the greatest country in the world and who is fully and firmly convinced that his country has the best form of government in the world. I'm speaking as an American who has enjoyed the blessings of liberty and freedom all his life and who proposes to enjoy these blessings for the balance of his life or die fighting for them.

Freedom—that's what makes America, and freedom is what makes it great to be an American.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I'm concerned, deeply concerned. This great Nation of ours got off the track some place along the line. Where, I don't know. John T. Flynn, in his book, Men of Wealth, says that John D. Rockefeller started us down the wrong road in 1872. E. S. Pillsbury, of St. Louis, says that we took the wrong turn in 1913 when the Federal Reserve Act was passed and we substituted debt-backed currency for gold-backed currency. Uncle Joe—Stalin, that is—says we never were on the right track and adds—I'm using a liberal interpretation of his remark—"There isn't any point in going to war with the United States. Capitalism will destroy itself from within much faster than Soviet arms could destroy it from without." The sad part of what Stalin says is that it's much too close to the truth. We actually are destroying ourselves from within.

What do I mean? How are we destroying ourselves? I ask you Members of Congress who have 15 years or more service to your credit to compare Congress today with what it was during your first term. Compare the prestige, power, and authority of Congress then and now. Then picture in your mind what Congress will be like after 10 or 15 years more of the same.

I ask you businessmen to compare the way business was done in this country 15 years ago with the way it is done today. Then if you will project that curve into the future, I believe even the doubting Thomases, if there be any among you, will be convinced that another few years of travel down the same road in the same direction at the same rate of speed will entirely eliminate freedom of enterprise from the American scene. And, ladies and gentlemen, if we ever lose freedom of enterprise, all of our other freedoms, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and so on, will go along with it. All of our freedoms are wrapped up in the same package.

Why is this country where it is on the road to the left, the road away from constitutional government and freedom of enterprise? The answer, in my judgment, can be given in one word: ignorance. Not nearly enough of the American people understand the facts of life concerning our capitalistic system.

Who's to blame for this?

I'd put some of the blame on our educational system. I'd put some more of it on the people themselves. I'd put more of the blame on our two major parties and I'd reserve the major share of the blame for this economic ignorance for businessmen. I say

that because in my book it's up to each businessman, small or large, to see to it that those on his pay roll understand what freedom of enterprise is, how it operates, who benefits and why. I know that's a large order but it's one which must be filled if we wish to avoid slipping into national socialism by way of the back door.

At the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, 162 years ago, as Benjamin Franklin was leaving Independence Hall following the end of the final session of the Convention, he was asked, "What kind of a government have you given us?" He replied, "A Republic if you can keep it."

Why did Franklin include "if you can keep it" as part of his answer? Was it because he foresaw that as the country grew and prospered under its Republican form of government that the people would become indifferent to public affairs; that as each generation got further and further away from the life and death struggle their forefathers had to make to win and hold freedom and to advance our frontiers, they would become less and less vigilant, most of them eventually forgetting entirely that "Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Liberty"?

I think this is what Franklin foresaw and is why "if you can keep it" was part of his answer.

We have kept our Republic for quite a few years and we can keep it for a far greater number of years provided we have the wisdom and the courage to do what needs to be done.

Now here is where I rush in where "angels fear to tread." Here's where I get my neck out about seventeen feet because I'm going to tell you what needs to be done.

First, foremost and above all else we must drastically reduce the spending of our Federal Government.

I'm thoroughly familiar with most, if not all, of the reasons why it is impossible to reduce Federal expenditures and I still say the budget must be cut, cut drastically.

I know the so-called sacred, untouchable items add up to such and such a sum and that if everything aside from these special items were eliminated entirely it would save less than five percent. At this point the proponents of big spending usually add, "So you see our actual cost of government is only five percent of the total. All of these other things are extras and it's impossible to do anything about them." That, my friends, in the vernacular of the day is eye-wash, ten cent store eye-wash.

There's only one untouchable item in the budget: that is the interest on the public debt. All of the others, each and every one of them, can, should and must be cut.

For one thing, every department of the Govenment is grossly overstaffed. You can walk into the Washington office of any of these departments any hour of any day of any week and find at least fifty percent of the employees sitting around doing nothing. One reason for this is our cockeyed civil service setup which bases a supervisor's rate of pay on the number of people he has under him. If he has six people in his section who don't have anything to do and he can, by some hocus pocus, get six more who also wouldn't have anything to do, he gets a raise.

In business, the increases in salary and other rewards go to the person who can do the most with the least. In Government service the rewards go to those who can do the least with the most.

For several years Senator BYRD has been telling Members of Congress, businessmen, and others how to reduce Federal spending. He has compiled a great mass of interesting data and has his recommendations well documented. Now the Hoover Commission, after an exhaustive study, is making its report, which is pretty much of a blueprint for reducing expenditures. So there isn't any doubt that Federal spending can be cut.

I've had some first-hand experience on both increasing and decreasing expenditures and while it's a far cry from my personal expenditures to the expenditures of our Federal Government, nevertheless the same principle applies and there is a considerable parallel.

On my first full-time job, which was in the trust department of a bank, my salary was $75 a month. After I'd been there about 4 months I told the trust officer that I'd have to have more money as I wasn't making enough to live on. He looked at me out of the corner of his eye and said, "You'll probably have the same complaint when you are making ten thousand a year." He was right; I did. Each year as my income increased my expenses kept pace. Exactly the same thing is true of our Federal Government. Each year as it found it could get its hands on more and more money, expenditures went up and up and up. Frill after frill was added and each frill within a year had twins or triplets, which increased expenditures more and more.

There are now more unnecessary bureaus, agencies, and projects in our Federal Government than there are fleas on a cur dog, and there's more water in the expenditures of each of the several departments than there is in the Pacific Ocean.

I was brought back to earth with a resounding crash in 1932 when my income was exactly one-third of what it had been the year before. If you want to find out for sure how many unnecessary expenditures you make, try living on one-third of what you are accustomed to spending.

We discovered right quick that belonging to a country club wasn't a necessity. We discovered much cheaper cuts of meat we'd never heard of before, but which when properly prepared—my wife is one of the best cooks in the country—really weren't bad.

We came through this period all right because we did what had to be done. I realize that the compulsion the Emerys were under is not yet apparent to most people so far as our Federal Government is concerned, but the handwriting is on the wall for anyone who will read.

Not long ago, after I had spoken at a businessmen's banquet and said some of the things I'm saying tonight, I was told by the president of a manufacturing company that I was all wet, that everyone had more money than he'd ever had before, that everyone who wanted to work had a job at high wages, that business was better than it had ever been and that he was in favor of more rather than less Federal spending.

My answer to him was, "You remind me of the chap who fell off the roof of a 20-story building and who called to some people in a window on the fourth floor as he fell past, 'I'm all right so far.' "

Maybe the spending of our Federal Government is all right so far. Maybe it is. Maybe it still has more than four floors to go before disaster strikes. But I don't think so. There are any number of reasons why I don't: The drop in commodity prices, the decrease in the price of clothing, the decline of retail sales, the increase in unemployment to mention a few. Those are important factors but here's my main reason for believing that disaster is not very far ahead unless we mend our ways.

In 1937 it took all of the income of all of the people in two States—Pennsylvania and Missouri—to pay the cost of our Federal Government—$7,910,000,000—for 1 year.

Ten years later in 1947, it took all of the income of all of the people in 25 States to pay the cost of our Federal Government—$42,505,000,000—for 1 year.

In 1947 it took all of the income of all of the people, that's right, all of the income of all of the people in Minnesota, Iowa, Indiana, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Alabama, Mississippi, and Maine to pay the cost of our Federal Government for 1 year.

I ask in all seriousness, how much further can this creeping paralysis go before the economy of our entire country is completely paralyzed, before the Federal Government takes over everything and everybody?

It can't happen here. I say it can happen here. We've been traveling toward it at an ever increasing rate of speed for many years and it's way past time to stop and reverse this headlong rush. The place to start is with the budget for fiscal 1950 which begins next July 1. Every item in that budget, including each and every one of the so-called untouchables, must be drastically reduced.

There are many other phases of this problem I would like to discuss but time will not permit, so I'll close by giving you my definition of our American way of life. Here it is.

Our American way of life is made up of many things, bathtubs and automobiles; big cities and small towns; farms and victory gardens; mammoth steel mills and village machine shops; colossal educational institutions and the little red school beside the road; churches and hospitals; railroads and air lines; chewing gum and ice cream; department stores and cross-road-general stores; specialty shops and beauty parlors; pool rooms and race tracks; Hollywood, Broadway, and the high-school play; laughter and sorrow; eagerness and despair and people—millions of all kinds of people—gathered together from all over the world, drawn by the magnet of freedom, opportunity, and justice.

Our American way of life provides each individual an opportunity to go as far and climb as high as his willingness to work, his skill, ingenuity, and integrity will carry him.

Our American way of life recognizes that the individual has the right to work when and where he wishes, the right to worship as he pleases, to speak his mind on any subject, to meet with his fellow men for any peaceful purpose, to be secure in his possessions and to have his day in a free court. It also recognizes that the individual is superior to the state, that our public officials are servants of the people and that they derive their just powers from the consent of the people.

These things taken together created an atmosphere of freedom and an economic climate which made possible in the United States the greatest production and diffusion of wealth in the history of the world, and the establishment, for even the lowest paid workers, of the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

Why? Because for more than 150 years, free men in a free country have been working together to provide this better way of life. Let us hold what they have given us and go forward in the sure faith that the American way of life is the greatest blessing known to mankind any place on the face of God's earth.

Religious Persecution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper

article from the Washington Times-Herald:

FURTHER RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION BY REDS PREDICTED BY WALSH—TELLS GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY ALUMNI MINDSZENTY CASE IS BUT NEW TACTIC IN OLD CAMPAIGN

PROVIDENCE, February 16.—Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, tonight told a meeting of the Georgetown Alumni Association of Rhode Island to expect further religious persecution by Communists.

"Aware that the Marshall plan is succeeding, that western Europe is being stabilized and united, and fully conscious that the church is the last domestic obstacle to total domination in the satellite states, Moscow is reacting swiftly and ruthlessly within an organized pattern," he said.

PROTESTANT ALSO JAILED

"In addition to the Catholic primate of Hungary, a Protestant bishop has also been imprisoned there; Evangelical ministers have recently been rounded up in Bulgaria and similar persecution is in progress in Rumania.

"Indications point to the arrest in the near future of the leading Catholic ecclesiastic in Czechoslovakia, the archbishop of Prague. Then it could well be Archbishop Sapieha of Poland. China will come next.

"To maintain its present control of approximately 30 percent of the human race, world communism must consistently and progressively eliminate the leadership of Christianity in every area where the Soviets gain the upper hand. This necessity is perfectly clear to the high command in the Kremlin. It has likewise always been understood by the Catholic Church."

VARIED RED TORTURES

The prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty was a "renewed attack in a very old campaign but with new tactics and smoother techniques," Walsh declared.

Reviewing the various forms of torture known to have been used by the Russian secret police, he said that two drugs, actedron and scopomorphine, fed the prisoner in liquids after a state of unbearable thirst had been developed, would produce both moral and mental collapse.

"The cardinal in his first public appearance (after Communist seizure) followed precisely the pattern which he had predicted when he warned his friends that he might be drugged and tricked into a compromising confession. This performance took place in a manner and in language wholly at variance with his known character and public history. He debased himself publicly, recanted neatly and with a childish enthusiasm confessed to all the things which his tormentors had dictated to him.

"From a human point of view, it would have been far better for Josef Mindszenty to have been hanged immediately or decapitated by the butcher's knife. But with a refinement of the diabolical sadism which characterizes their hatred, his enemies have consigned him to a living and lingering death of obscurity in the dungeons of their despotism, meanwhile attempting to blacken his name and ridicule his moral grandeur. However, the true Josef Mindszenty disappeared into darkness on the night of December 25, 1948, leaving behind him an unsullied reputation and that written testament in which his honor was committed to the civilized world."

ATTACKS ON CATHOLIC CHURCH

Walsh attacked the "gullibility of some pseudo-liberals in this country who commit intellectual suicide on the altar of expediency and solace their cowardice with a pitiful array of ifs and buts and countercharges."

"Saddest spectacle of all is the case of that well-known professional bigot who uttered a few weasel words of regret on the fate of Cardinal Mindszenty but then tendered solace and support to the common enemy of Christianity and democracy in the Kremlin by launching on a diatribe of recrimination in an unrelated field against the Catholic Church.

"Fortunately, such ungenerous spirits are rare in the American democracy and the practically universal indignation of responsible Protestant leaders over the Mindszenty case is a fine tribute to their sense of fair play and clearness of spiritual vision at this historic moment."

Address of Hon. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from address of Hon. HUGH SCOTT, JR., chairman of the Republican National Committee, before the Cabell County Young Republican League, Huntington, W. Va., February 14, 1949:

It is indeed a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak in West Virginia under the auspices of a young Republican group. It is to the younger voters that the Republican Party must make its appeal for support during the next few years. No party can go on indefinitely without reinforcements. I am happy to be able to report that during the 1948 campaign we did receive substantial support from voters in the younger age group. It is true we did not receive quite enough. We must do better in 1950 when we have an opportunity to elect a Republican Congress.

The support which we received last year from the younger voters was demonstrated by the numerous straw votes taken in various colleges throughout the Nation. So far as I know, the Republican Party won in every one of those contests. And, what is even more important, since the election last November, I have had thousands of letters from young men and women all of whom express a desire to assist the Republican Party in staging a winning fight in 1950 and 1952. That is one of the most encouraging features in the situation which confronts our party today.

There is every reason why the younger generation of voters should turn to the Republican Party and give us their support in our fight to preserve the Republic and the institutions which have made this a powerful and prosperous Nation. The younger men and women have a far greater stake in the future of this country than do those of more advanced years. It is the younger generation which, of necessity, will have to pay most of the bills for our present reckless and extravagant expenditures in the field of government. And, furthermore, if a continuation of our stumble-bum administration of foreign policy should involve us in another war it will be the younger men and women who will be called upon to fight that war. Therefore, aside from all other considerations, it is to the advantage of the younger generation of voters to support a party which stands for sound and thrifty administration and under whose leadership we have never become involved in a major foreign war.

As Republicans, it is our duty and our job to carry this message to young men and women everywhere, and to welcome them into the organized ranks of our party.

During the past week I have had an opportunity to make speeches from California to New England. Everywhere I have found Republicans in a fighting mood. I believe that is a sign that the party is in a healthy condition. Sometimes I wish that attitude had been a little more prevalent a few months ago. But, anyway, we have it now and let's keep it.

We might as well face the fact that we are in a fight to the finish against powerful and unscrupulous opposition. The only way we can win that fight is to go in slugging and keep on slugging every day from now until November 1950. That is going to be my policy as chairman of the national committee and I shall do everything in my power to encourage other Republicans to do likewise.

But, of course, we have to know what we are slugging for as well as what we are slugging against. We must take to the American people a program of constructive action and sell it to the people as an alternative—an infinitely better alternative—to the program of junior grade socialism exemplified by the Truman administration. That Truman program, incidentally, is becoming considerably shopworn. It's the same old program, with only minor exceptions, which Mr. Truman first proposed to Congress back in September 1945. I might add that at that time many people were struck by the fact that the Truman program bore a startling resemblance to the Communist Party program. Anyway, Mr. Truman presented it to the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945, and, although the Democrats had substantial majorities in both the Senate and the House at that time, the program was enthusiastically ignored. It was also ignored, for the most part, by the Republican Eightieth Congress because most of it simply didn't make sense—or worse.

After the Eightieth Congress, in its regular sessions, had refused to go along with Mr. Truman on the road to Moscow, Mr. Truman called a special session of the Eightieth Congress last August. He presented the same old program and told the country that the Congress could pass it in 15 days. Maybe he intended it as a compliment to suggest that a Republican Congress could do in 15 days something that the previous Democratic Congress had not done in two years. Now we have another Congress—the Eighty-first—in which the Democrats once more have a majority. At the beginning of that Congress Mr. Truman tossed out his perennial program. It struck his Democratic Congress with all of the terrific impact of a soft-boiled egg dropped on a featherbed from an altitude of 2 inches. His Democratic Congress met on January 3. It is now February 14, almost three times the 15-day period in which Mr. Truman said the Eightieth Congress could pass the same program. And what has happened since January 3? I would not want to have you think that the Eighty-first Congress has been doing nothing. No indeed. It has done nothing about Mr. Truman's program, but it has passed a bill to raise the President's salary to give him a $90,000 tax-exempt expense allowance for which he does not even have to present an accounting. Wouldn't most of you like to have just about one-tenth of that amount tax free?

Incidentally, this was one bill dealing with taxes which Mr. Truman signed. You will recall that three times during the Eightieth Congress he vetoed tax reduction bills designed to give the taxpayers relief to the extent of $4,000,000,000 per year, and to take 7,000,000 individual taxpayers off of the tax rolls entirely. The last time Mr. Truman vetoed such a bill he denounced it publicly as a rich man's bill, and the Congress, including the Democratic Members, were so dis-

gusted with his demagoguery that the bill was passed over his veto.

While we are on the subject of taxes, I suppose you have noticed that Mr. Truman is now asking Congress for new tax legislation which will raise about $4,000,000,000 in additional revenue? That is just about the amount by which taxes were cut under the Republican Eightieth Congress. And, remembering that Mr. Truman denounced the Republican tax reduction bill as a rich man's measure, wouldn't it seem to be logical for him to now ask his Democratic Congress to repeal that tax reduction bill? It certainly would, so far as I am concerned. But, does Mr. Truman do it? He does not. He knows very well that 7,000,000 taxpayers have 7,000,000 votes and, as has been suggested, maybe they have more than that if some of them live in the Pendergast wards in Kansas City.

So, we have the spectacle of the present Democratic Eighty-first Congress, after it has been in session more than 40 days, coming up with just one accomplishment—a $90,000 per year tax-exempt expense allowance for the plain son of the people who only a little more than a month ago was telling Congress that taxes must be increased for everybody else.

* * * * *

I said a few moments ago that the Republican Party must present to the people a constructive and affirmative program. I am sure you will be interested in knowing that at the recent meeting of the national committee in Omaha a definite and, in my opinion, an important step was taken, looking toward the formulation of such a program. The national committee voted to create a committee on party program and policy. It is to be composed of six representatives of the national committee—three men and three women, all of whom have been appointed—two representatives of Republican members of the Senate and two representatives of Republican Members of the House, two Republican State chairmen and two Republican State finance chairmen. The chairman of the national committee and the secretary of the national committee hold ex officio the same positions on this policy group. As soon as the full membership of this committee has been selected, it is my intention to call a meeting of the committee. It has been empowered to decide whether or not to convene a national conference on party program and policy, and if so to fix the time and place for the conference and to specify the qualifications for participation. As I have said previously, it is my hope that such a conference will be convened some time during the latter part of this year.

On this subject I would like to make two things clear. Generally speaking, of course, party policy is fixed by the platform adopted by each national convention. In my opinion, the 1948 platform was an able and admirable document. So far as I am concerned personally, we can start with that as a basis. But national conventions meet only once in 4 years. Changing conditions frequently require a reappraisal of the party's position and the formulation of new policies to meet new conditions.

In the second place, as a Member of Congress I realize as keenly as anyone else that party policy on the national level can be given effect only by the votes of Republican Members of the Senate and the House. But, again speaking as a Member of Congress, I am convinced that it would be most helpful to our Republican legislators to know that they have back of them an organized and articulate expression of the views of Republicans throughout the Nation.

* * * * *

During the recent campaign Mr. Truman barnstormed throughout the Nation scattering promises like a New Year's Eve reveler throwing confetti. Many of his promises have just about that consistency. There is one thing about the Truman administration which the American people will find out in the very near future if they have not done so already—it just can't be trusted.

Let me give you one definite illustration of what I mean when I make that serious charge. The Senate Labor Committee is now considering an administration bill which is represented as a proposal to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. You will remember, of course, that Mr. Truman promised to repeal that act on many occasions last year. So did Senator McGRATH, the chairman of the Democrat National Committee, and other Democrat spokesmen. Actually, the bill which the administration has presented to the Senate committee is a proposal to amend or revise the Taft-Hartley Act and to retain many of its valuable guaranties of the rights of working men and women. However, one provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which the administration proposed to abolish is that which authorizes the President to obtain injunctions to prevent strikes which would imperil the national health or welfare. Mr. Truman has used that authorization half a dozen times since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed over his rather hysterical veto, with a majority of the Democrats in the House and Senate voting against him. Now, however, he comes up with the very startling assertion that he does not need any such authorization; that he has inherent powers to obtain such injunctions without any authorization by law. Let's look at the record on that point to illustrate what I mean when I say you can't trust the Truman administration. On May 25, 1946, Mr. Truman certainly had all of the inherent powers which he has today. As a matter of fact, he had more power then because some of the extraordinary wartime delegations of authority to the President were still in effect. But it was on that date that he, personally, went before a joint session of Congress and asked for emergency and temporary authority to draft railroad workers into the armed forces to head off a Nation-wide strike. Where were his inherent powers on that date, and if he had them why didn't he use them? Sometimes I wonder if we are supposed to believe the President in the even-numbered years like 1946 and not believe him in the odd-numbered years like 1949. What do you think?

* * * * *

It is a serious and depressing situation to have an administration in power which cannot be trusted. However, we may as well face the fact that that is what we have today. The only way that situation can be remedied is for the Republican Party to fight everlastingly to bring decency and honesty back into our Federal Government. It is going to be a hard fight, but it is not altogether a Republican fight. It is your fight as well as mine and the fight of every American who wants a trustworthy Government in Washington. Let's all get together, and let's all get to work. Let's do it right now.

REA Housing for Both Rural and Urban Housing, H. R. 2811

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a statement that was prepared when H. R. 2811 was introduced by me today. It is as follows:

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas today introduced in the House what he described as an "REA" housing bill. The bill would have the Government dedicate itself to the promotion of home ownership through encouraging cooperative housing associations to be formed and through providing them with mortgage insurance such as has long been granted to speculatively built housing under the Federal Housing Administration. Veterans would be granted an increase of 10 percent in the mortgage insurance on their homes. The bill also provides for the development of housing for farm tenants and farm laborers and for temporary shelter in migratory farm-labor camps. PATMAN said his bill would encourage ownership of homes in cities and on farms and would help small business.

"This bill has been written to express a first interest in the men and women, or families who want houses to live in and then to own so they can make them into homes," said PATMAN. "Our housing legislation has been written heretofore to express a first interest in the mortgage money lenders and the builders and speculators in the housing field. We know now, from experience, that we failed to get housing and home ownership for the great mass of our American families. But now we are going to lay the sound foundation, to cut the cost of housing, to help the consumer of housing, and then let the question of profits take care of itself.

"Less than 15 years ago we talked about getting electric power to our farmers. Only about 18 percent of our farmers then had electric power. The power trust and all the big utility interests said we could not do it. They had every opportunity under the REA law to build electric lines into the farms but they refused to do it. The cooperatives entered that field and proved the job could be done. More than 80 percent of our farms are now electrified and in some States as many as 92 percent of the farms. Exactly the same principle can be used, under my bill, to break the monopoly bottlenecks in the housing field and we are going to see to it that the job is done."

PATMAN said that in working on his bill he had consulted with leaders in Congress and the administration, and in business, veterans' organizations, cooperative organizations, farm organizations, and labor organizations. He said there was general agreement on the basic principles of the bill, and on most of the details, and that he thought any differences of opinion that might develop could be ironed out in the hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

"I just came from a meeting of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report where Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League, U. S. A., was talking about what he called a program of abundance to replace the policies of scarcity," Patman said. "It is interesting that Lincoln proposed that through an REA program the people could solve their problems and break the monopolies in housing and steel and farm machinery and fertilizer production. I have been working on this REA housing bill for several weeks and I think Lincoln is right. The people can do the job through cooperatives and other independent small business organizations. We can create abundance and that will provide an opportunity for every small business organization which monopoly has stifled and destroyed."

The Patman bill (H. R. 2811) would do the following:

1. Create a Cooperative Housing Administration and provide for the appointment of a Commissioner to administer the cooperative provisions.

2. Instruct the Commissioner to encourage the development of cooperative housing organizations and give to the Commissioner power to issue rules and regulations and to supervise their operations during the years the Government had financial investments in their projects.

3. Provide for direct loans from the Government, which would then be refinanced through the mortgage-insurance provisions of the Federal Housing Administration.

4. Provide that veterans would have a 10-percent increase in the mortgage insurance or direct grants from Government.

5. Provide for formation of cooperative housing associations to build houses for farm laborers and tenants and instruct the Secretary of Agriculture, who would administer this part of the law, to encourage the tenants to become owners of their housing.

6. Strike at the disgraceful labor camps for migratory farm labor through assisting in the development of sanitary and wholesome camp shelter.

PATMAN said he provided for the creation of a Cooperative Housing Administration to administer the law because it had been proved in REA that the law should be administered by someone who believed in it. He said that the Federal Housing Administration had been created to help the speculative building industry and the mortgage money lenders. He said to put cooperative housing under the Federal Housing Administration would be unfair to FHA and to cooperative housing as it would cause distrust and suspicion and conflict within FHA.

"Other housing bills, introduced in the House and Senate, have attempted to recognize our debt to veterans by providing that certain numbers of veterans should constitute a housing project," said PATMAN. "This bill recognizes our debt to the veterans in a much more democratic way. Under this bill, one veteran or a dozen or a hundred veterans could be granted preference. This bill is based on sound cooperative principles, and incidentally the basic democratic principle expressed by the phrase 'of the people and for the people and by the people'—that is for all people. It does not attempt to create classes of any kind of people and particularly of income classes. Moreover, this bill is economically sound and more in the interest of veterans and others, with small incomes, than is the other plan."

PATMAN said there had been some difference of opinion about the percentage of value of mortgage insurance and about the rate of interest but that he desired to put the program before the House Committee as soon as possible and for study by the committee experts. Then, he said, the proposals could be debated and any sound amendments could be offered.

"I am just as much interested in getting rid of the slums and subslums which farm tenants and farm laborers have to occupy sometime," said PATMAN. "I think this bill will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he needs to attack the housing problem on the farms and particularly in the migratory labor camps."

"It is interesting that practically every REA cooperative is retiring its debt to the Government ahead of the time when the debt is due," said PATMAN. "If we can develop a sound home-ownership housing plan through this bill, and I think we can, I am sure the cooperative housing associations which wil be formed will demonstrate that they can handle the financial problem so it will not be a burden to the Government.

"We are developing here something that has been tried and proved successful. We have proved it through the mutual home-ownership plan which was tried out under the Lanham war-housing acts. We have a number of big housing projects under that act, where through cooperative-mutual housing associations, the tenant occupants are acquiring ownership of their houses. They are doing that at far less cost than they would pay for housing otherwise. And more important than the money concerned, we are developing a high degree of citizenship through the ownership motive. There is no juvenile delinquency in several of these little towns which are owned by these cooperative-mutual organizations, and that is evidence of what we can do if we give the people a chance to own their homes."

The American Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the trend toward more Government aid and more so-called Government security is almost overpowering, I submit this letter from one of my constituents to give hope that we are not completely lost. In this letter the real spirit of progress is evidenced and the spirit that made America great is so abundant that it is refreshing to read. I commend Mrs. Sanders for her attitude and forthright expression and urge my colleagues to read her message with the hope that it will help point the way to a new turn in governmental practices.

The letter follows:

MARSING, IDAHO.

Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
Representative from Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In view of the fact that more people voted for other candidates than did for Mr. Truman, as revealed by the recently released election returns, and that therefore any talk of a mandate from the people is very questionable, I think it should interest you to know the views of one of the majority who did not vote for him.

I have reached the point where Government schemes for the security of the common man make me utterly angry. It appears to me that in order to guarantee this so-called security in the rosy future we are being asked to sacrifice all hope of security in the present. Right now the Government takes so much of my husband's salary—he is a teacher—that we find it difficult to meet our obligations with what is left. If it isn't asking too much, we would much prefer living decently and buying the things we need now to piling up highly doubtful future Government benefits. I say "highly doubtful" with reason. While working my way through school I had to pay part of my small earnings for social security. I needed all the money desperately, but I had to send some of it to the Government. Will I ever see it again? Certainly not. I didn't contribute enough in the period of time I worked. It has happened and is happening to many others.

I consider myself competent to handle my own finances, much more competent than any dreamy-eyed theorist in Government circles. If our family want old-age insurance, we'll arrange for it ourselves; when we need a doctor we'll pay our own bills, without having also to pay the wages of the hundreds of Federal administrators and clerks to handle a national health set-up. Incidentally, this way we get the best of medical care, which is more than we could count on under a Government arrangement. If we run into emergencies, we'll handle them ourselves. At least we know where our money goes and can keep our books balanced. The Federal Government is the most inefficient, untrustworthy, and wasteful manager of money there is. I see no inducement to entrust my future security to it.

This social program of Mr. Truman's would impoverish the group to which we belong—the lower middle class. We don't want the Government to pay for anything for us; we just want to be allowed to earn and to receive our full salaries and to pay our own bills and to stand on our own feet. I am so sick of the Government's sticky fingers in my pocket that I am at a point of absolute rebellion. And if any darned fool in the White House or Congress thinks that I, as a housewife, will buy social-security stamps to pay anyone who works for me, he has another large think coming. I just won't do it, if I can never hire anyone.

I'm fed up with Federal aid for this, that, and the other. The Government pays farmers' price supports, and our food bill soars. The farmers around here drive 1949 cars and live in new houses; we drive a 1939 coupe and live in an old rented house. In my opinion the Government would do better to balance its own budget rather than playing Santa Claus by unbalancing ours and pushing us into poverty now so that we can live in security in a future we may not live to see.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. H. SANDERS.

Charles Taft—Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following testimony by Mr. Charles P. Taft before the Ways and Means Committee on Tuesday, January 25, 1949, because Mr. Taft has called to my attention the fact that in my speech on the floor of the House on the reciprocal trade agreement extension program as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 8, 1949, I misquoted him regarding his testimony concerning Alger Hiss. I am accordingly inserting the complete printed testimony on this point in order to clarify any misunderstanding as to exactly what Mr. Taft did say on the question of the part played by Alger Hiss in the conduct of our trade agreements program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Taft, something was said yesterday by one of the members of the committee with respect to Alger Hiss. Now, I have the impression that you worked in the State Department when he was employed there?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, sir.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Are you well acquainted with him?

Mr. TAFT. When I went into the State Department in the fall of 1943 I was on the economic side under Mr. Acheson, whose responsibility was entirely economic. At that time Mr. Alger Hiss was in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, and he remained in that office until he became Deputy Director of it, if I am not mistaken, until about the summer of 1944, when he went over into what became the United Nations Office, and then was secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Con-

ference and later of the San Francisco Conference.

During that entire time while I saw him and knew who he was he had no connection whatsoever with the economic operations or with Mr. Acheson.

Mr. Donald Hiss had been Mr. Acheson's executive assistant and later became an associate of mine as Deputy Director of the other parallel office. What has been said about the connection of Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hiss I happen to know about. It is not true. Mr. Berle's memory was mistaken in referring to Mr. Alger Hiss as having been Mr. Acheson's assistant, and if his character is of any importance, it is perfectly clear that he had nothing to do with the reciprocal trade agreements, I think, since the first time Mr. Sayre left the State Department in 1941 before the war. Mr. Donald Hiss was his assistant.

So far as Mr. Berle's argument is concerned, he is mistaken in his own position, because I was present on the Policy Committee of the Department when the argument came up, which I suppose he is talking about, and it was with Mr. Dunn and not with Mr. Acheson. It was on the subject of his position on Russia, which was not as he describes it, seeking a clear-cut show-down with Russia, but his judgment, which I think was very acute, was the place where war might develop, was in the Middle East.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is, Mr. Berle?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, Mr. Berle; and that is very different from what he said to Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hiss that he thought it would develop between the British and Russia, that it might develop between them. He was just mistaken in what he said to Mr. Acheson and Mr. Hiss. We in the economic side of Mr. Acheson's office never had an opportunity to find out.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then Mr. Alger Hiss never had any duties in connection with the reciprocal-trade-agreements program?

Mr. TAFT. I know he had them in 1937 and 1938, because then he was in Dr. Francis Sayre's office, who was in charge of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. As I say, my impression is he left that operation before the war and had no further connection with it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And you had a pretty good opportunity to observe Mr. Alger Hiss and to form an opinion as to his loyalty and capabilities?

Mr. TAFT. I am afraid not, because he was in a completely different operation in the Department. Of Mr. Donald Hiss, I did, and I would, certainly testify as to his loyalty.

The "Dead" Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this editorial from the Chicago Daily News which I think hits the nail on the head—in other words, by subterfuge the administration has killed the Un-American Activities Committee:

THE "DEAD" COMMITTEE

The House of Representatives has appropriated $200,000 to carry on the work of the Un-American Activities Committee, which President Truman not so long ago characterized as "dead." It has yet to be shown that Mr. Truman was not correct.

For the committee clearly intends to work very closely with Attorney General Clark and the Department of Justice. Under Democratic management, the inquisitors promise to conduct themselves in a very shy and retiring manner, avoiding publicity, suspicious of anything sensational.

This will eliminate the circus flavor from the committee's procedure. It should end the abuses and injustices of which the former committee was frequently guilty. It should mean that suspected persons will no longer be pilloried by publicity without a chance to defend themselves.

But it may also mean that the committee will operate as a sort of apprentice Justice Department. The role could have very little value. The usefulness of the committee, irresponsible and flamboyant as it may have been at times, was to provide a check on the efficiency with which Mr. Clark's hunters were hunting.

Legislative inquiries exist because administrative branches cannot be expected to investigate themselves or to confess their own shortcomings. The Chambers-Hiss matter, for example, for whatever it may turn out to be, would never have had the airing it is getting except for the blatant persistence of the old committee.

Too close a rapport with the administrative agencies will detract from the effectiveness of the new committee as well as the confidence in which it is held.

Report of Col. Melvin J. Maas, National President, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of Col. Melvin J. Maas, national president, Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association:

No group of men has met at a more serious time, nor with any more solemn purpose than this conference. On the face of it, as things look today, the balloon of communism is swelling so large that our hands cannot press to contain it. Another way to put it is that the dike against the menacing flood of communism is springing more leaks than we seem able to plug up.

When we put our finger into the hole in the dike at Greece, another hole appears in Palestine. When we shove our fist into the hole at Berlin, the dike breaks wide open in China. And all of the time we are hampered, harassed, and beset by insidious subversive activities at home.

Never in history was there a greater need for unity, loyalty, and selfless leadership, yet we meet today faced with dissension, backbiting and frequently a leadership of selfishness and greed even in our own military forces. Our enemies couldn't by design set the stage for their purposes better than we ourselves are doing.

A bewildered and confused world—yes, including the peoples of our own country—are crying out for a leadership that will point the way out of the seeming hopelessness that now faces us all. In an era that is still military and semimilitary, the peace-loving world is looking to the United States for wise, calm, and statesmanlike leadership from our military experts.

What do they see? Still all too much of a mad scramble to either hold blindly to outmoded traditions and weapons, or to greedily reach out and grab control of the weapons, personnel, and funds of sister military services, as if the battle were among themselves, instead of against a common enemy.

Bickering, backbiting, sly undercutting, exagerated claims, slurs, and ill-concealed hostility among too many professional military leaders of all ranks, is discouraging our allies, disgusting Americans, and causing gleeful jubilation among our enemies. All know that we are not to be the hope of a much divided and discouraged world, unless we ourselves can be united, confident, positive, and resolutely firm. How as a nation can we present that picture to the world—friend and foe—unless our right arm—our military and naval forces—are united in purpose, in spirit, and in a common plan for the defense of our security? How can we expect the liberty- and peace-loving peoples of the world to feel secure in our leadership if we can't even have the type of unity needed to assure our own safety?

The time has come when our military leaders must stop fighting each other and unite to present a common front, with closed ranks, and a single plan of action.

This applies also to the attitude of the professional military toward the Reserve components. There are still too many Regulars who seem to feel that Reserves are outsiders, that we are trying to "muscle in," that we are just "rank seekers" and parasites on their appropriations. Also, there are too many Reserves who always have chips on their shoulders and take the attitude that the Regulars are all brass hats, incompetents, and interested only in holding down Reserves.

This friction among the professionals, and between professionals and the Reserve, is a luxury that this Nation can just no longer afford.

This does not mean that there should be no honest differences of opinion between military men, nor healthy competition between Regulars and Reserves. From now on, however, they must be on the merits of issues, and after sincere debate and free expression of professional opinion, they must be resolved within the family and not in headline seeking, and public charges and countercharges.

Once such problems are resolved they must be gracefully accepted and there must be honest cooperation to make the decisions work in the interest of the United States, regardless of the personal interests of those involved in such disputes.

The present deplorable situation is partly the fault of the imperfections in the unification law itself, the rest is the unyielding attitude of individuals in the military service. Where the law is at fault, let us openly work for congressional action to improve the law. Where the fault is in the individual, vigorous steps must be taken to see to it that such individuals henceforth accept the official decisions that are made, or else get out of the service.

The military have a hard enough time holding public support, in peacetime anyway, and they must do nothing to create distrust in themselves by the public. The present interservice bickering is accelerating the disintegration of the public support for the armed forces.

Let all of us, professional and Reserves, so conduct ourselves and our military affairs as to regain and then hold the active interest and support of the Congress and the general public. To that end, let the membership of this association lead the way by setting an example. We have had and doubtless will continue to have professional differences with the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the defense establishment. We will however, present our views in the proper way, with dignity and on a high professional plane.

I call upon Marine Corps Reserve officers—the few hundred here and thousands all over

America—to take the lead in actively promoting interservice cooperation and understanding. Specifically, I ask this conference to consider the necessity of adopting as part of our chapter program for 1949 the following:

1. Each chapter to hold one all-service social function during 1949, possibly during February in which National Defense Week is observed.

2. A joint meeting of all local Reserve units in all MCROA towns once a year at which prominent speakers will highlight an interservice program.

3. Follow the lead taken by some MCROA chapters and invite Regular and Reserve officers of the Army, Navy and Air Force to address chapter meetings at suitable times and partake of interservice understanding and share their knowledge with us.

The opportunity is ours to perform as salutary a service in peacetime as we did during hostilities. We are all Americans first and we must never forget that the uniform we wear does not alter the flag we serve or the Commander in Chief we follow. With God's blessing MCROA will continue to serve our country unselfishly and in a spirit of understanding of and cooperation with all other Regular, Reserve, and National Guard units.

A civilian commission has recommended a sweeping change in the pay and retirement basis for the military services. Certainly an upward readjustment of service pay is long, long overdue. I urge MCROA to support the pay features of the Hook report, now before Congress.

On the other hand, there are features of their proposed disability retirement provisions that appear disastrous to lower ranking Regular officers and extremely discriminatory against all Reserve officers of every rank. I urge that we withhold support for those features of the Hook report.

While MCROA by direct poll, is supporting universal military training, we cannot remain blind to the increasing evidence that there is no immediate prospect of its enactment. The time has come when the Military Establishment must not only give thought to what shall be done if universal military training is not adopted, but it must now come forth with an alternate plan to provide the backlog security that UMT was intended to supply.

Oviously, the only logical alternative is an enlarged and intensified reserve program. From now on the emphasis must more and more be placed upon a live, vigorous, and expanding Reserve program, with practical and realistic training for both officers and men.

To assure the success of such a program, and to safeguard against any future tendency to militarism in our land which is the last hope against military dictatorships, new emphasis must be placed upon the civilian direction of our military establishments, including military policy-making matters.

The best way of providing this is the creation of the office of Under Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, and assistant secretaries for Reserves in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In addition, there should be established a deputy chief of staff for reserves in the Army and Air Force, a vice chief of naval operations for Reserves in the Navy, and an assistant commandant for Reserves in the Marine Corps.

At the same time, some way must be found to bring representatives of the Reserve components into the active over-all policy-making of the Military Establishment and the basic military services.

Is that too much to ask on behalf of the 95 percent who will actually fight a war if it does come—the civilian in uniform?

The general public, in peace and war, will accept the professional much more readily if it knows that the semiprofessional civilian has a healthy part in the direction and formulation of military policies.

It's the best antidote for the unnamed fear by the public of a military domination in this country. In the past that fear has always expressed itself in the curtailment and reduction of the military forces to the point where they became almost impotent. True, the system has worked to prevent the military from domination of the Government. But, unfortunately, it also has made it impossible to have a vigorous foreign policy that might have prevented wars, since we seldom had a military large or effective enough to back up a vigorous foreign policy. Just remember the Manchurian incident. We warned Japan not to invade and take over Manchuria. Our words were bold and brave. They went unheeded, since the world knew we did not have the naval and military establishments capable of stopping Japan's conquests in China. Our opposition to Japan's aggression ended with our comic-opera protest.

Whether the Nation repeats these errors of the past largely depends upon how the military deports itself in the coming months and years.

The military always blames the situation upon the Congress, but the Congress only reflects public opinion back home—a public opinion largely created by the military itself. The public reacts favorably or unfavorably toward the armed forces, largely as a result of the kind of leadership displayed in peacetime by the military leaders.

Either the United States will give the world the leadership that will take the world along a path of peace and better standards of living and expanding liberties, or we will have to surrender our leadership to an opposing ideology, and we ourselves will become subjected to an intolerable foreign domination.

No longer can we sit back and trust our security and our future to the mere possession of the atomic bomb. Soon, two may play at that game. The atomic bomb is really not a suitable military weapon, unless we intend to make real all-out war in the manner of Genghis Khan. If we mean to completely destroy and totally wipe out the population of our enemies, the atomic bomb is the thing to use. If we mean only to knock out the Government of our enemy and to help the peoples of such countries to reestablish themselves, we had better never again use atomic bombs. Reconstruction of the bomb's destruction will bankrupt us, and we will never overcome the mass bitterness toward us, after a large scale use of atomic bombs, atomic dust clouds, radioactive rain, etc.

Anyway, there is no assurance that we will win such a war. The only way we can be certain of winning the next war is to prevent such a war. Only the wisest of leadership, with overwhelming public support, can do that, but it is our only real hope. Let us pledge our association to assist in developing and supporting in this country that kind of leadership.

The Alaska Highway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a very much worth-while and up-to-date story on the Alaska Highway carried in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch under date of December 9, 1948. The article in question has been written by the Honorable Richard L. Neuberger, a member of the Oregon State Senate and the outstanding authority on the Alaska Highway. Dick Neuberger played an active part in the building of the highway during the war, when he enlisted in the United States Army, and since has maintained his great interest in the northwestern part of the United States and Alaska. His writings are practically the only source available to the American people, and we are deeply indebted to him for keeping us informed of developments in these important areas of our Nation.

The article follows:

ALASKA HIGHWAY UNLOCKS DOOR TO FAR NORTH, CHANGES LIFE THERE—ROAD MEANS MANY NEW SETTLERS, BREAK IN SEATTLE MONOPOLY ON COMMERCE, AND HARD LIVING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT FOR SOME

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

WHITEHORSE, YUKON TERRITORY.—The Alaska Highway is the biggest single fact of life in Alaska today. This 26-foot gravel road, 1,519 miles in length, was opened last April to general traffic for the first time by its Canadian guardians. In the months which have passed since spring the influence of the wilderness road has been felt in every community on the Alaskan mainland.

In a sudden, swift burst Alaska has been subject to a wave of migration typical of the pilgrimages which built the American West.

Until the prodigious highway was opened Alaska claimed immunity to such migration. Alaska was, to all intent and purposes, an island. It was as cut off by the forest and mountain solitudes of British Columbia and the Yukon Territory as Hawaii is by the sea. No one could reach Alaska except through the steamship and air-line firms whose headquarters are in Seattle.

AIR, SHIP FARES HIGH

This often acted as a kind of protective tariff. Fares are high to Alaska. Comparatively few workingmen could pay them, and certainly not for their families. Pan American charges $103.50 for a 1,300-mile flight from Whitehorse to Seattle. This compares with a fare of $143.50 for the 2,900-mile passage by Northwest Airlines from Seattle to New York City.

The expensive tickets necessary to reach Alaska kept out people without considerable means. It limited northward migration by laborers to those who already had signed up with canneries, contractors, and mining companies, and thus had their passage paid for them. In addition, every community had a shipping manifest by airmail and thus knew in advance who would step off the next steamer or airplane. It was easy to get rid of undesirables. They just had to be prodded up the gangplank when the boat called.

ROAD REASONABLY GOOD

Today anyone may migrate to Alaska. Old jalopies bounce over the highway's 1,519 rugged miles. The road is in reasonably good condition, its curves banked, its grades gentle. Yet it still is a gravel road, and rocks and pebbles for a distance exceeding half that across America can do considerable damage to tires. Few wayfarers reach Fairbanks without acquiring proficiency in the use of lug wrench and air pump.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Whitehorse report that 2,200 automobiles headed for Fairbanks on the highway in July. This figure becomes all the more amazing when compared with the total number of cars licensed in all of Alaska last year, 9,876.

Largely because of the influence of the highway, the Territorial Tax Commission will issue license plates in five figures this year for the first time in Alaskan history. To date in 1948 more than 14,000 vehicles

have been licensed. This is particularly high in view of the fact that some Alaskan communities—notably Skagway and Ketchikan—have no roads which extend more than a few miles beyond the edge of town.

In some Alaskan cities there is an unemployment problem. Men are on the streets of Anchorage looking for work. Fairbanks is afraid the jobs on the new Army airfields cannot absorb all its newcomers. The housing shortage in Anchorage, now Alaska's biggest city, is so acute that many families face the sub-Arctic winter in tents, tar-paper shacks, and old railroad boxcars taken off their trucks.

Ben D. Stewart, Territorial Commissioner of Mines, who has lived in Alaska for 30 years, said that in Anchorage he saw a scavenger grubbing through garbage cans in back of the Westward Hotel. "It was a sight I never expected to see in the North," observed Stewart. "It was then that I realized the highway has exposed Alaska to all the good and all the bad in the civilization we always thought was so far away."

To some degree, the opening of the highway to unlimited traffic has jarred Seattle's traditional monopoly over Alaskan commerce. In the past neither a pound of freight nor the most casual traveler got to Alaska without first clearing through Seattle. The Alaskan highway, however, takes off not from the vicinity of Seattle, but from the Middle West. It approaches through St. Paul or Great Falls, Mont., and then via the Canadian city of Edmonton.

This fact lies behind Seattle protests over this choice of a route by the American Army, when the highway was surveyed in 1942. The Army claimed the road would be principally useful as a guide for military aircraft, winging over the trackless Yukon wilderness. Gen. H. H. Arnold, then commanding the Air Corps, claimed that flying weather was generally better east of the Rockies than along the coastal slot extending northward from Seattle.

Within Alaska itself, the highway has upset even more the usual balance of trade deals and relationships.

Since 1901 the narrow-gage White Pass & Yukon Railway, owned primarily by British capital, has controlled all commerce into the upper Yukon Basin. Only over this spectacular 111-mile line could supplies be transferred from tidewater to the head of navigation on the Yukon. Now, an offshoot of the Alaska Highway is a 250-mile cutoff called the Haines Road. It twists through the foothills of the St. Elias Range to Port Chilkoot at the head of the Inside Passage.

TRUCKERS CUT RATES

A group of American ex-GI's are trucking on the Haines Road, aided by the Alaska Yukon Trucking Co., of Whitehorse. Their activities have brought down the White Pass through rate from Vancouver nearly 30 percent—from $90 a ton to $62. Great jockeying is taking place over whether the Haines Road will be kept open this winter. Gov. Ernest Gruening has announced that Alaska will clear away the snow on its side of the international boundary, but Canadian Army headquarters at Whitehorse favors letting the road be plugged.

Carl W. Heinmiller, one-eyed spokesman for the American veterans at Chilkoot, has claimed that the White Pass & Yukon is influencing the decisions of the Canadian Army. However, C. J. Rogers, president of the White Pass & Yukon, counters with the answer that "we can't haul only the Yukon's winter freight and then lose the lucrative summer business to the highway."

SNOW 14 FEET DEEP

Rogers says that his line spends $12.50 in maintenance for every winter ton hauled across White Pass. Snows are often 14 feet deep on the level. A gap of as much as 2 minutes between train and rotary plow may mean that the train will be choked off by drifts for the next month.

The Alaska Railroad, owned and operated by the United States Department of the Interior, also is alarmed over the competition afforded by the Haines Road. A Fairbanks trucker named Al Ghezzi is highballing cargo from Haines to Fairbanks in faster time than the same freight can reach the Alaskan interior via Seward and the railroad. Heinmiller charges that the Interior Department assessed the Chilkoot veterans $200-a-month rental for old, abandoned Army living quarters when they first moved in.

Fares on the White Pass & Yukon and the Alaska Railroad have been the highest on the continent. It costs $12.70 for a one-way ticket from Skagway to Whitehorse in day coaches nearly half a century old. The distance is 111 miles. Rates between Fairbanks and the seacoast are comparable over the line operated by the United States Government.

RISE IN POPULATION

It is as a disturber of old, long-established customs and relationships in the North that the Alaska Highway is having its greatest influence. George Sundborg, manager of the Alaska Development Board, estimates that the population of the Territory is now 95,000. Small as this is, it represents a terrific gain over 1940 when Alaska had 39,000 white and 33,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts. Today the native population is practically the same, but the number of whites has increased to 62,000. This is a gain since 1940 of 62 percent in white population, far more even than that of California.

"The Alaskan Highway," adds Sundborg, "has meant that any American with an old car and a few hundred dolars for gasoline and tires can drive to Alaska. What is more, he can bring his family. We do not welcome unplanned and helter-skelter migration, yet we realize that this is exactly the sort of migration which transformed the American West from a wilderness into a prosperous civilization."

Trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the world has been shocked by the unfair kangaroo-court tactics which the Communist government of Hungary used to convict Cardinal Mindszenty.

All religious organizations in America have taken the stand against the campaign emanating from Moscow to stamp out religious liberty and freedom not only in Europe but throughout the world.

The following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, further illustrates this fact:

MINDSZENTY TRIAL FOLLOWS USUAL TOTALITARIAN PATTERN

We now know a little more about the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. It followed the customary Hungarian court procedure of questioning the defendant in jail, although this fact was not brought out in the news dispatches. Indeed, there appears to have been some kind of censorship connected with the news dispatches, probably a result of the totalitarian atmosphere rather than actual editing of copy.

The Cardinal and the other prisoners apparently were subjected to the usual totalitarian questioning in jail by teams of interrogators. These teams work in relays and subject the prisoner to hour after hour of what must be mental torture. The teams wear out and are replaced with new ones, but the poor prisoner, even though he falls into a stupor, is reawakened so that the torture can continue until he is ready to confess anything.

It is not known positively that this method was followed, but enough has been said to provide a very large suspicion that some kind of third degree was used. However, one English newspaper reporter telephoned to London that the prisoners seemed to be in a normal state of mind during their appearance in court. He said that if the Cardinal did not look like one who had been subjected to torture he did look like a man defeated.

From what we know of the Communist totalitarian procedure, however, it seems most unlikely that a public trial would be scheduled without full assurance of the outcome. The European method of taking evidence in jail fits in with the working of the Communist apparatus. Unless the defendants give the testimony the state wants they stay in jail or go to one of the labor camps where they are worked to death.

But, on the other hand, if they admit guilt they are hauled before the judges whose business is to condemn and are then sent to a labor camp where they are worked to death. So it doesn't make much difference in the final outcome what the defendants do. But of one thing we can be quite positive—if a trial is held the defendants will admit enough to cause their conviction.

Therefore, the actual facts have little to do with the outcome. The Cardinal was arrested and tried because he would not go along with the Communist state. He took that stand because he knew the Communists are intent on destroying the Catholic Church in Hungary, just as they are trying to destroy all other churches where they come into power.

Communism, which is the basest materialism, cannot exist for long if religion exists in the hearts of the people. Communist ideology reduces man to the status of the animal and permits him to exist for the one purpose of serving the state. Yet the state is a mere collection of individuals, who, whatever they profess, are chiefly interested in remaining in power.

In every totalitarian state the individual has been crushed to a pulp so that out of this base material might be created a new race of robots. This is the process now being carried out in eastern Europe and we see one part of the procedure in this trial in Hungary. The process will continue as long as the omnipotent state continues to advance.

Is Foolocracy the Answer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the State of Virginia, "The Old Dominion," has produced many outstanding statesmen. One of these was Hon. Henry St. George Tucker, a constitutional lawyer of great fame, whose opinion on the fundamentals of free government was sound, respected, and followed by those who firmly believed in liberty under law. I may be guilty of lese majesty in these days of New Deals, Square Deals, and

Raw Deals to mention the philosophy of those who laid the foundation and charted the true course of our Republic. The rocks and reefs to avoid were well known and distinctly marked by men like Hon. Henry St. George Tucker. The thoughts and warnings of the sages of old are the subject of ridicule by the planners, the spenders, the wastrels who make up the foolocracy of the present administration, but "truth crushed to earth will rise again."

Be this as it may, let Hon. Henry St. George Tucker, of the Old Dominion, be heard:

If B takes A's property by force for his own use, it is equivalent to a claim of mastery by B and a condition of servitude to A. And when Government, by form of law, takes the property of A and gives it to B, whether by direct confiscation or by indirect means, it is a violation of duty and a usurpation of power. It is none the less robbery, because it is done under the form of law and is called taxation.

When government advertises itself as the munificent almoner of indefinite charities, as the machine through whose grind benefits may be conferred on some at the expense of all, and enterprises be fostered or destroyed at will, contestants for the prize of its power will spread their nets to catch the most powerful and combine the most influential, until extravagance, plunder, and corruption will fill the land. Elections, being the game for great stakes, will be controlled by political gamblers; money, not morality, will rule its results; and the democratic patriarch will become the paternal plutocrat of the country.

But this is not all. As soon as paternalism holds itself ready to help its children out of the common fund, furnished by the taxation of all, everyone will demand what another receives. They will argue, if one enterprise is aided by gift or loan, why not all? Equality is equity. If the Government may lend to C without security, why not to others on mortgage? If one producer receives bounty to raise a crop, why not all? If one is relieved of loss by fire or flood, why not all? Is not the Government the impartial father of all its children? If it directly or indirectly helps one to make a billion out of the many, why not in turn, help the many to distribute their excess? If it can give plethora of wealth to monopoly, why not help commune by healthful depletion in order to return ill-gotten gains to the victim of privilege? These questions confront us with the truth: Privilege and communism are twin monsters from the womb of the patriarcha of Filmer, the paternalism of today. Privilege sows the wind; the commune will bring the harvest of the whirlwind.

A Plea for Tenants—Concerning Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, why does this ever-expanding, all-powerful central Government propose to extend rent control for 27 months? We are in the fifth year of peace, yet it is proposed to continue wartime rent control for a longer period than we did during the war.

Why? What is causing a worse shortage of rental housing in peacetime than in war? Why not find out the cause of this shortage. If we can abolish the cause, the shortage will end.

In 1947 the Census Bureau made a survey of housing. The results are almost unbelievable. The number of dwelling units in the United States in 1940 was 34,854,000. By April 1947 they had increased to 39,016,000. In spite of this increase of housing units by more than four million, the number offered for rental dropped by two million. There were less rental units in 1947 than there were 7 years before, the first drop in our history.

Here are the actual figures for two major metropolitan areas. Rental units in Chicago dropped from 863,000 homes in 1940 to 819,000 in 1948. In Philadelphia, the drop was from 432,000 to 381,000. Figures for most American cities tell the same tale.

Perhaps the most thought-provoking picture is that presented by the Scranton-Wilkes-Barre area in Pennsylvania. There was no housing shortage there in 1940. In the next 7 years its population declined 15 percent. In spite of ample housing and the population decline, there was the same old complaint, "A severe shortage of rental housing." Overcrowding of veterans was one of the worst in the country. Two or more families were found in 19 percent of the units occupied by veterans.

What happened? Under rent control owners of about 11,000 dwelling units quit renting and threw them on the market for sale. Owners of non-income producing investments take their losses and get out as quickly as possible. The horrible crowding of veterans and others who must rent was caused by the Government's destruction of rental values. There was actually more living space per person than ever before. Fifteen percent of the people moved away, but the houses with more than enough space remained. There were only 3.7 persons in the average home in 1947 compared with 4.3 persons in 1940. But the rental shortage has become so terrifying that Government propagandists propose that Government build more houses to cure the shortage it created.

Actually there is no housing shortage. The only shortage is one of dwellings for rent. The proof of this is most dramatically illustrated by comparing the real-estate advertistments found in our newspapers. In 1940 there was a surplus of housing. Vacancies ran about 7 percent. In 1948 there was an alleged housing shortage. Thus, one would expect to find many for-sale advertisements in 1940, and practically none in 1948. Here are the facts: In August 1940 the New York Times carried 6,322 classified advertisements of houses, apartments, and apartment houses for sale; in August 1948 it carried 23,036. The Chicago Tribune went up from 11,303 to 32,045 in the same period. The Los Angeles Times showed an increase from 18,930 to 78,925. This same fantastic increase in houses, apartments, and apartment buildings for sale was found in the Pittsburgh Press, the Atlanta Journal, the Cleveland Press, the San Francisco Examiner, the Baltimore Sun, and almost any other newspaper that you may wish to consult.

Now how can there be a housing shortage when hundreds of thousands of desirable dwellings are literally being thrown on the market at prices below present building costs. Can it truthfully be claimed that there is a housing shortage when there are more houses than ever before; when the newspapers are doing a land-office business in selling houses but not in renting them?

The only shortage is one of dwellings for rent. The dwelling units that were formerly for rent are now offered for sale. This is not because owners want to sell but because they are forced to sell. When Government destroys 40 percent of rental income from property, it destroys 40 percent of the investment value of that property. This moral break-down of Government causes owners to dump their buildings and retire from that investment field. In other words, they are being liquidated—American style—and those who want to rent must buy or double up.

The Census Bureau furnishes still more evidence that rent control is the cause of our shortage of rental housing. In April 1940, it found that 7 percent of all urban housing units were vacant. In 1942 rent control began. In its 1945 study the Census Bureau found few vacancies in rental property. However, it did find a 30 percent increase in the number of dwelling units occupied by only one person. It also found a 22 percent increase in the number of units occupied by only two persons. During the same period the dwelling units occupied by five, six, and seven or more persons decreased rapidly.

In other words, tenants in all categories were spreading out and using more space than ever before. One person occupied space that was formerly occupied by two or three and so on throughout the frozen housing situation. Under rent control, if the husband or wife dies, the survivor stays on. If children marry or leave home, parents stay in possession of the unneeded and unused space. For them space is cheap, but newcomers, newlyweds, and returned veterans find no vacancies. Those vacancies which would normally appear in a free economy are no longer released. Thost who could get along with smaller space do not move because they cannot find it. The October first moving date for all manner of adjustments to needs and pocketbook is prohibited by law.

Why is this? Why are people forced to buy houses when they prefer to rent them?

Here's why. The purchasing power of the 1949 dollar has dropped to about one-half that of the 1940 dollar. This has resulted in higher prices for all goods and services except one—rent-controlled housing. Since most people know a bargain when they see it, the demand for rental space at about one-half its real value has increased enormously. It is still increasing.

That is why tenants are spreading out and demanding more space per person than ever before. That is why the number of apartments occupied by one or

two persons has increased so rapidly. That is why the number of rental houses occupied by five or six persons has decreased. That is why home owners would rather sell their homes than rent them. That is why there is a shortage of units for rent. That is why people must purchase houses they would rather rent. Thus it can be accurately stated that rent control is the sole reason why prospective tenants cannot find apartments and houses for rent. And the longer this restriction on freedom—rent control—is continued, the worse this shortage will become.

Now it is claimed that most tenants would not be able to pay the increased rents that would result if we returned to freedom. It is charged that there would be mass evictions and millions of homeless people. These are utterly false and irresponsible statements for this reason: Home owners cannot charge more than tenants can afford to pay. More than they might wish to pay—yes—but not more than they can pay. If the home owners tried it, their rental units would be vacant. Does anyone claim that home owners would deliberately keep rental property vacant in a free market? Did they do it before rent controls? The price for free-market rent will automatically be within the means of the tenants.

It is admitted that the abolition of special privileges in housing would inconvenience many persons who now occupy apartments that are underpriced by Government decree. Many of these tenants might find it necessary to seek smaller and lower-priced quarters. Many of the persons who now live alone might find it necessary to share their apartments—or give up apartments for rooms—in order to pay the increased rents. The trend under controlled rents toward single-person occupancy would stop. As a result, persons who could afford only $50 quarters would move there instead of staying in their present $75 quarters that they are appropriating for $50. The persons who could afford the more desirable—and higher-priced—locations would then move into them.

What would happen if we abolished the special political privileges granted to one group at the expense of another group by rent control? Let me cite a concrete example—a certain Chicago apartment hotel. When rent control came 11 of its 50 apartments were occupied by 1 person, and the balance by 2, 3, or 4 persons. The building housed 96 persons.

As time passed, changed circumstances caused tenants to move. Whenever a vacancy occurred, those who had been sharing apartments requested separate apartments. With higher income and frozen rents, they wanted more living space. This was O. K. with the manager. From his viewpoint, fewer tenants meant less wear and service. After 5 years of rent control, 35 of the 50 apartments were occupied by single persons. The other 15 were occupied by married couples. Not one apartment was occupied by two girls, two men, or even a mother and daughter. The building housed 65 persons on July 1, 1947.

Rent controls on apartment hotels were removed July 1, 1947. The manager raised rentals $12.50 a month for 2 months in a row—$25.00 in all. Within 3 months 14 tenants moved. Four moved back to their parents; four doubled up; and six moved into rooms in private homes. All are adequately housed with perhaps a little less luxury. New tenants moved in. Within 3 months the building housed 93 persons—43 percent more than under rent control. Can this result accurately be called bad for tenants as a whole?

So we see that rent control, like price control, which it is, produces scarcity. Remove rent control and the scarcity is cured almost immediately. This is how the free economy works.

Conversely, if Government control of housing continues, the present demand for rental units at a price below their true value will multiply. The shortage will increase because tenants can afford to buy more space at this bargain rate. In fact, many present homeowners will sell their homes and try to become tenants at the bargain prices arbitrarily set by Government. Building for rent will stop. Tenants in free-market-rental properties will soon insist that in all fairness Government should reduce their comparatively high rents. If it is fair for one group of tenants, why is it not fair for the other?

Rent control stops tenants from advancing to new jobs in other cities. If you doubt this, read the apartment-for-exchange columns in any metropolitan newspaper. Thousands of tenants wish to move to new locations. The reason is often a new and better job. It may also be a desire for larger quarters, a change in scenery, new neighbors, or any other good and valid reason. But unfortunately for the tenants, they are caught in the trap of rent controls. They cannot hope to duplicate their Government-set rents in a free market. So they advertise in a pitiful—and usually unsuccessful—effort to find someone else under Government control who also wishes to move. Then the Government-controlled tenants usually forget the new job, the larger quarters, and the better opportunities. They remain rooted in their Government-controlled dwelling to continue their bitter arguments with the home owners about needed painting, repairs, and services. Does anyone honestly believe that a continuation of this situation is in the best interests of the tenants? Does any Congressman dare use the word "American" to describe this degrading favoritism?

Probably the most unfortunate result of rent control is the discrimination against prospective tenants with children. Now there have always been apartments reserved for persons without children. This is because tenants themselves demand it. But before rent controls were imposed upon home owners and tenants, there were always plenty of desirable rentals available for families with children, any number of children. The home owners provided facilities for children and made them welcome. Under freedom, home owners with dwellings for rent had to do this in order to keep their building occupied. But all this changed under Government-imposed rents. Single persons and childless couples have an advantage in bargaining for the space usually reserved for families. Home owners feel that they can make up a part of their lost rent by reducing the number of occupants per unit. They feel obliged to try to balance their increased fuel, service, and repair bills by avoiding the increased fuel, service, depreciation, and repair bills that come with children. And as the Government tightens its control over the price of rent, this discrimination against children increases. Thus persons who own rental property—and 80 percent of all rents go to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 a year—use one of the few legal methods left to them whereby they can attempt to balance their depressed rental income against their inflated costs.

Now, Congress can condemn the home owners and the tenants by passing another law against them. This law could follow the recent French decree that forbids each person from occuping more than a Government-decreed amount of rental space. Or Congress might decree that hereafter no person may sell a dwelling unit above 60 percent of value. That might bring about more rental units by making the loss on sales about the same as the loss on rentals. Does any sane American advocate that kind of robbery; the moral collapse of government? The only permanent solution to this desperate situation is for Congress to reject these rent-control laws which utterly fail in their purpose because they are morally and legally wrong. Economically they are crazy. A return to freedom would mean that rental space, prices, number of occupants, location, and services would, in a matter of weeks, adjust themselves to the relative needs, desires, and abilities of all concerned. That is the American way.

This proposed rent-control measure has a time limit of 27 months. As was to be expected by any student of history, this time limit is longer than the limits set in the previous extensions. And it can be safely predicted that the next extension will have a still longer time limit, if any. The same thing happened in France, Austria, Germany, and all other countries that tried rent control. They kept temporary rent controls after World War I for exactly the same reasons that we have kept rent controls after World War II. They, too, extended those measures temporarily from time to time. They, too, once removed rent controls from new construction in order to induce persons to build new dwellings for rent. Finally the clamor of the tenants in those newer and higher-priced units caused the Governments to bring them also under Government control—temporarily, of course. Next the word "temporary" was dropped forever from the rent-control laws. Now those tenants are forced to remain permanently in their rapidly deteriorating government-controlled dwelling units. Those are the lucky tenants who have apartments. Their rent is only 2 percent of

their income. A month's rent will not buy the landlord a pair of shoes. He is frankly conceded to be among the underprivileged classes. The Government promises to do something about it, but nothing is done. Who will buy property that offers nothing but losses? It is a liability in France today where there is no equity or justice governing property ownership. Nobody benefits. The poor, as usual, suffer most of all. Would-be tenants cannot find a vacant house for rent at a legal price. There just are not any. In spite of the destruction that rent control has brought to housing in these European countries, the tenants and the Government officials still seem to believe in the myth that Government rent controls were and are in the best interest of the tenants.

We Americans are following this same path. So far, we have not deviated in any respect from the European pattern of Government-controlled housing after World War I. It is as though we had taken their blueprint for the destruction of housing and decided to follow it line by line. This present proposed extension of rent controls in America is in exact agreement with the European timetable. The proposal to bring certain uncontrolled housing back under rent control fits the pattern perfectly. The reasons are the same. The time and extent are identical. And the inevitable results cannot vary in any respect.

Who benefits from rent control? A few tenants continue to enjoy an unjust enrichment they have had for years. A few landlords of new uncontrolled housing enjoy abnormally high rentals. A few bureaucrats enjoy Government checks. In the end owners are robbed and liquidated. Many tenants are shut out of needed space. The public pays more taxes to build public housing to cure a Government-created shortage of rental housing.

Government control of housing is contrary to freedom, justice, morals, reason, progress, and the best interests of the American people including tenants. We must summarily reject this monstrous evil of rent control while it is still possible; before it grows into a vested interest that will forever defeat a return to freedom.

The British Medical Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, frequently we are told in an irresponsible and biased way that the British medical program is a disastrous failure and an example of what would happen here if we adopted a national health program.

There are, of course, many fundamental differences between the program the British have adopted and the plan proposed for this country. But quite aside from that, the best evidence available here indicates the British plan is far from the failure that certain spokesmen for the American Medical Association represent it to be. Officers of the British Medical Association, which speaks for British doctors, have repeatedly protested the distorted stories which have been spread in this country about their experience.

Recently the New York Times printed a well-rounded report on the British medical program by the chief of its London bureau, Herbert L. Matthews. While he made no attempt to gloss over the troubles the British have encountered, Matthews reported that some of the difficulties arise because it—the British plan—is almost too successful. In order that my colleagues may have a chance to read this important and impartial report, under unanimous consent, I am having it reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

REPORT ON BRITAIN'S CRADLE-TO-GRAVE PLAN—ITS FIRST SIX MONTHS FINDS FREE MEDICINE FOR ALL POPULAR, DESPITE CONTROVERSIES AND HIGH COSTS

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

The greatest experiment in social service ever attempted by a democratic government—Britain's cradle-to-grave National Health Service—has been in operation for 6 months. That is too short a time to pronounce it a success or a failure, but not too short to describe and assess its early life.

It is yowling with aches and pains, but all things considered, one must account it a lusty infant.

American critics or champions who look across the Atlantic for arguments to oppose or support President Truman's plan to introduce compulsory health insurance will find whatever they are seeking. The American Medical Association will be able to produce a mass of testimony from British doctors on how badly the scheme is working. Conversely, the Federal Security Administration should be able to compile a still more formidable body of testimony from patients, druggists, dentists, and many doctors to prove that a Nation of nearly 50,000,000 can take care of the health of every man, woman, and child from teething to senility.

This old country has frequently shown a genius for new ideas, and it was natural that a Socialist government should decide that a scheme which was designed to benefit 95 percent of the people ought to be good. However, no one expected a colossal and revolutionary plan of this sort to function smoothly and efficiently in only 6 months. Even a generation is a brief period in the life of a nation. At this early date, one merely has the right to report the way the scheme is working now, to list the opposing arguments, and to analyze the effects of the service to date on doctors, patients, and the general health of the country.

But, first, one must know what it is all about.

The actually ill could always be taken care of free in Britain, and there has been compulsory national health insurance for virtually all workers since 1911. However, wives and children had to pay doctors' bills, and only half of the insured workers used to qualify for dental services.

Now everybody gets everything, so to speak. Doctors and dentists, specialists and hospitals, maternity and child welfare, home nursing, spectacles, dentures, wigs, deaf aids, artificial legs and other necessary appliances as well as all drugs and medicines are yours for the asking. You can have a baby, break a leg, get a toothache and go insane, and it won't cost you a penny of direct outlay.

Yet despite the scope of this program medical treatment here remains outwardly unchanged. Doctors keep their same offices. Patients come in as before and wait their turn, or the doctor goes to their homes as he did when they were private patients. Hospitals and clinics are carrying on without the slightest difference so far as anyone can see. For his medicines, the patient still takes his prescription to the druggist of his choice.

Everyone under the health scheme is entitled to choose his doctor and change him at will. Doctors can accept or reject anybody. The scheme is completely voluntary, and the public and practitioners alike can stay out of it if they wish.

It is what might be called the mechanism of administration that has changed. Most Britons today belong to the national insurance plan and every such insured person pays 4 shillings 11 pence (slightly under $1) per week by buying proper stamps at any postoffice. Of that amount 8½ pence (less than 15 cents) goes to the National Health Service; the rest is for old-age and widows' pensions, and unemployment, sickness, and disablement benefits.

You can join the health scheme whether you are insured or not. If insured, you continue paying your "4 and 11" and nothing more. If you elect to register for the health service and are uninsured, you pay nothing. In either case, you have no other financial medical worries unless you want some extra fancy eyeglass frames or an expensive hearing aid. Employers make a small contribution to the health scheme, but five-sixths of the total cost comes from the national budget. Higher income taxes take up part of the slack.

It is, therefore, the Government that settles all bills on behalf of the patient. Doctors, dentists, druggists, and the like get quarterly checks from the Government, instead of being paid as they go along by their clients.

Such is the scheme that Britain's dynamic and sharp-tongued Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan, pushed through Parliament and got working last July 5. He fought it out with doctors and dentists, meeting just such opposition as the AMA is now mustering in America, and, while it was universally agreed that he was high-handed, tactless, and ruthless, it was an unequal struggle, since the Government has a safe majority in Parliament and could push the health bill through.

Now "Nye" Bevan is feeling moderately well pleased with himself and his National Health Service. It is creaking and groaning, but it is under way and gathering steam. In fact, some of the difficulties arise because it is almost too successful.

Out of an estimated total of 21,000 general practitioners in England and Wales, more than 18,000 agreed voluntarily to join the scheme. There are about 10,000 dentists here, and 8,700 of them have joined up. Of the 14,000 chemists, as druggists are called here, virtually all are in the health service.

Most impressive of all are the figures for patients. The population of England and Wales is about 43,000,000. Well over 40,000,000 have registered with doctors, the remainder being mainly well-to-do and elderly who carry on with their old family physicians on a paying basis.

(These figures are limited to England and Wales because the original bill covered only those two political divisions. Similar bills have been passed separately for Scotland and Northern Ireland, and the situation is virtually the same there.)

As the figures suggest, the British public in general likes the new scheme. Demands of all kinds have been so great that Mr. Bevan had to make a public plea recently for everybody to go easy. The luxury, so to speak, of enjoying bad health without paying for it has been irresistible.

Some abuses have been reported. Patients are suspicious that they aren't getting the same treatment now, although they really are, and ask more of doctors than they did before. A Scottish ear doctor recently told of a man who, having already got two pairs of spectacles and a denture from the state, asked him for a hearing aid to complete his outfit, although he wasn't deaf. An optician wrote to a British medical journal that "I have discovered that in a southwest town a considerable number of brand-new spectacles have been located in pawnshops."

Dishonesty, however, is rare. What has happened in the case of spectacles, for instance, is that many thousands who would have gone without them or bought them—as Britons did to an amazing extent—in 5-and-10-cent stores, now get proper glasses after examination by an oculist.

Typical of the general reaction to the scheme is the attitude of young Mistress Doris Collier, whose husband, a clerk, pays his "4 and 11" weekly. She says she likes it much better now.

Not being insured, Mistress Collier used to have to go to a district nurse and to pay for prenatal care. Now she is getting better care for her coming child and getting it free along with a weekly grant for 13 weeks and a lump sum of £4 when the baby is born.

Evelyn, who will be 2 "next Sunday week," is Mistress Collier's other chief reason for rejoicing. When Evelyn had enteritis a year ago she nearly died before they took her to the clinic. Last week Evelyn was taken to the family doctor—at no cost to the family—because she had a cold and was sniveling.

The medical effectiveness of the National Health Service is more difficult to assay than its popularity. There have been no epidemics this winter, and except for one fog that lasted 5 days, no weather calamities to put undue strain on the profession. Everyone connected with the service itself insists that it is too soon to pass judgment on the country's health after only 6 months.

Nevertheless, certain specifics cannot help but be noticed. There can be no question that medical attention, medical appliances, and medicines are more widely distributed than ever before. Spectacles, already mentioned, are a case in point. Before the new act took effect Britons used four to five million pairs of spectacles annually. The present demand is estimated by representatives of the ophthalmic industry at a little under 8,000,000 pairs.

There is a similar story for medicines. Britain's chemists' shops are now dispensing nearly 100 percent more prescriptions than a year ago. In the old days doctors hesitated to prescribe expensive medicines like penicillin and sulfa drugs, knowing that the patients couldn't afford them, but now they not only can do so but are tempted to prescribe large doses in order to postpone the next visit from the patient. Because the doctor's pay is based on the number of patients rather than the number of calls, it is to his advantage to do preventive work, a practice which also benefits the patient.

Finally, since records must be kept of every visit and every patient, Britain in the next generation is going to have a national medical record unequaled in the history of the science.

From the doctor's viewpoint, the plan has both advantages and disadvantages. Doctors are given the choice of being paid entirely by so-called capitation fees amounting to about 17 shillings 6 pence (about $3.46) annually for each patient on their panels or they can accept a fixed annual payment of £300 (about $1,210) plus a capitation fee of 15 shillings 2 pence (about $3) for each patient. No doctor may handle more than 4,000 panel patients.

There are many possibilities for adding to basic earnings. Doctors can continue to take private patients and charge their usual fees. They get extras for maternity cases and for special work on medical boards and in clinics.

On the average, it is conceded that remuneration is fair, and it was, indeed, fixed by a committee composed half of doctors and half of laymen. However, it is natural that distinguished physicians and specialists and those with especially lucrative practices are losing out, and in general the scheme favors the younger doctors against the older ones with established practices.

Typical of these young doctors whose careers as medical men will be pursued under the National Health Service is J. Leslie MacCallum. Dr. MacCallum's office, or surgery, as the Britons call it, is in the Bloomsbury district of London. He has 2,100 patients and doesn't see how any doctor can give proper service to many more than that.

Dr. MacCallum's panel runs from the very poor to the professional middle classes, who live by the thousands in Bloomsbury. He feels he must treat them all as if they were private patients, and he encourages them to join the health scheme. They can telephone and make appointments to go to his surgery, or, if they are confined to bed, he visits them just as he did before July 5.

For anyone in his early thirties like MacCallum, who was just starting to build up a practice, there was really no choice but to join the health scheme. Anyway MacCallum, while critical, believes that it is a democratic scheme with possibilities of preventive health services on a vast scale for the nation.

"It is surprising how much illness that used to remain undisclosed and unchecked, particularly among women, has come to light in the last 6 months," he says. On the other hand, he worries because he can't give as much attention and service to each patient as he would like.

Like all doctors, MacCallum was dismayed at the smallness of the first quarterly installments from the Government last September which, because the quarter was a short one and because some items were temporarily withheld, turned out to be less than everyone expected. Most doctors are living on loans from their banks, but the kinks in the payment plan are being smoothed out.

If doctors have been busy since July, dentists are frantic with work. Unlike the doctors, there aren't enough dentists to go around and nobody can register with the dentists. There is a priority for children, maternity cases, and emergencies; otherwise you wait your turn.

It is a well-known fact that when a Briton has a toothache, he waits until he can stand it no longer and then goes to a dentist and has the tooth yanked out. When a number of teeth have been pulled he is in the satisfactory state—to him—of being able to get the rest extracted so that he can have a denture made.

The result, now that dentures are free, is to give the impression of an impatient population queuing up to get their teeth pulled and dentures made. The Socialist government seems to be realizing the prophecy of the Scottish divine who was asked how there could be gnashing of teeth for toothless sinners. "Teeth will be provided," he replied.

Because of the shortage of dentists and the demand for their services, dentists' earnings have rocketed into the big money. The ministry of health had it figured out that the average dentist working some 1,500 hours a year would earn £1,600. Instead, dentists are working on the whole about 3,000 hours and, with extra remuneration for special services, are making from £4,000 to £10,000 annually in many cases.

Mr. Bevan's ministry announced new regulations limiting those earnings only a week ago, a move which annoys the dentists who point out that the income tax extracts from 40 to 65 percent of their earnings. The danger, of course, is that they will simply take less patients and leave more toothaches. Another danger is that the public dental services for school children may be wrecked if dentists quit for private practice.

The strongest opposition to the National Health Service exists, as might be expected, among the doctors. The British Medical Association debated the issue heatedly for a few years. At first it advised doctors to stay out, but when Mr. Bevan, who had antagonized the doctors by his high-handedness, made some concessions, there was a close vote in favor of advising doctors to join. However, a die-hard group has set up a dissident wing to fight on.

Doctors and dentists who stay out of the health service simply carry on as before. Specialists and those with well-to-do clients and long-established practices can manage, although they earn less. They were surprised and disconcerted when more people joined the health scheme than they had expected, leaving fewer private patients. However, the doctors who stayed out were obviously those who could afford to do so.

One of the most repeated arguments of the opposition group concerns the high cost of the plan. It is a fact that the cost of the scheme far exceeds the official estimates, and is proving a great worry.

The original estimate in the Parliament bill for the first year was £152,000,000 (about $612,000,000). When the time came to make up the civil estimates for the 1948–49 figure, it was raised to £218,000,000. The actual cost will be fully £240,000,000, which is getting close to a billion dolars—a tidy budgetary sum for Sir Stafford Cripps to find.

A more fundamental controversy is being fought out on the quality of the service that can be rendered. Lord Horder, who was physician to the royal family and is one of Britain's most distinguished doctors, has been leading this battle.

"A variation on a current gibe," he recently wrote, "might be to say that we seem likely to get not only the best Government, but also the worst medicine that money can buy."

No medical man or woman, Lord Horder holds, should be responsible for the health of 4,000 patients. "That may be making medicine available for every citizen but is it medicine?" he asks.

One well-known surgeon, Scott Edward, bases his opposition on a different argument. "As a surgeon visiting a hospital today," he wrote recently, "I take responsibilities for human life and happiness, for hope or for despair, success or failure, life or death for 15 shillings (about 60 cents) each."

This sort of injustice, however, is being recognized, and payment for specialists is going to be reconsidered. It is one of the quirks that were inevitable in starting anything so colossally new as the National Health Service. Lots of doctors are grumbling, but in the nature of things it is the grumblers whom one hears and not those who are quietly and determinedly trying to make the scheme work.

It will be years before there are enough dentists, enough nurses and health visitors, enough hospitals and beds, and, above all, before the "health centers" that will form the real basis for service in the future are built. Success of the whole health act really depends on these centers, where doctors, specialists, nurses, and clerical staffs will all work together, sharing expensive equipment and laboratories, and handling their patients with maximum speed and efficiency.

Meanwhile, if the National Health Service is working smoothly in 10 years it will have been a great accomplishment. And there will be no turning back even if the conservatives win the next general election, partly because eggs that are scrambled can't be unscrambled and partly because everyone applauds the ideal behind the new service. Critics have no valid alternative to offer, which was why

the British Medical Association finally agreed to cooperate with the scheme.

If the Tories come back to power they will make changes in the Health Service, but they won't try to abolish it. A great social experiment is under way, and a nation is committed to make it work.

Keep Santa Solvent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Frank Tripp, which appeared in the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald under date of January 25, 1949:

A young fellow said to me: "Yes, but you got started back when you could save something out of what you earned and get somewhere."

His remark embodies the essence of what most bothers youth, why many a thrifty lad is discouraged, why he spends what he gets like a drunken sailor, and seems to have no thought of the future.

He does think much of the future, but it looks so futile. The security he earnestly craves looks so impossible of attainment that he shoots the works, lives just today, and gets a reputation for being a spendthrift—which he doesn't want to be at all.

Then older people condemn him and cry, "What is youth coming to?" Youth didn't get that way of its own volition. We oldsters sat back complacently and let things drift to where they are.

What has happened has put youth in the dog house. The kid was right when he said: "Sure, I get what you call big pay, four times what you got when you started; but by the time I've paid off the Government, the butcher, baker, and candlestick-maker, I do well to break even. So what's the use?"

The butcher, baker, et al., some day will take less toll from the young fellow's earnings. The inescapable law of supply and demand will see to that. No manhandling by politicians, economists, and price controllers can prevent it. Prices will come down—and wages with them.

But what about his taxes? They must come down, too, for they now take 31 cents of his dollar. It is to Government retrenchment that youth should give attention; vigorous, tough attention. Government, National, State, and even local went the way of the abundant life, but painted no picture of the pit into which they have led the next generation.

We see it even in the struggle for our communities to collect enough taxes to operate under the extravagance forced upon cities and villages, a pace which they cannot afford.

The common man is learning that he emerges a commoner man than ever and is stuck for the cost of it all.

It has always got to be that way. No security program, unemployment insurance, or dole by any other name can defeat the certainty that everything the people enjoy they must pay for themselves.

It is only the product of the people's labor that can make the wheels go 'round. All who do not labor, or who shirk, only move the burden to their fellows' shoulders. The public till is filled by the people. When one of them takes more out, another must put more in.

The era of the common man, through shots in the arm, subsidies, and creation of destructive things for war, turns out to be, when thus bolstered, one of the highest employment and highest wages ever known. Yet, right in the midst of it, one common man pays to another more in public relief and unearned benefits than at any time in world history. The abundant life notwithstanding, the common man is getting nowhere fast.

What will it be when times are worse? It can be so staggering that even this richest country on earth cannot stay solvent under it. At our present gait, we can become a country of dependents upon a government which cannot tax a people who are broke.

By this route came the end of great empires. We are not smart enough to forever defy the laws of nature, of economics, and of God—as we now are doing—and remain a free and independent people.

So, young man, if you would regain for your children the opportunities which you say were mine, a place to start reform is with a government of Roman extravagance.

One can be so liberal that he goes broke. So can government. He who would perpetuate liberalism must keep Santa Claus solvent.

The Moral Core of Military Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Moral Core of Military Strength," by Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham, Director of the Staff, Personnel Policy Board, Office of the Secretary of Defense, at the small-business day banquet of the National Small Business Men's Association, in Washington, D. C., February 16, 1949:

The evils that attend us today are abundantly evident wherever we look. In this, the fourth year since the destruction of the Axis Powers, we have found neither peace nor tranquillity. On the rubble of broken cities and in the desolation of ravaged countrysides, weary and bewildered men scrabble for food and for hope, while the first fruits of their labor are still claimed by the mechanisms of death that dominate our shrunken planet. This is the true face of the obscene imposter that for four long years has worn the bright name of peace.

Here in our own broad land the picture is different, but the difference is only one of degree. For even here 1,600,000 men are diverted from the fruitful tasks of America and apprenticed to the barren profession of arms. Nor does the bitter paradox that we maintain this military might in the name of peace lessen our yearning for a sane and stable world free from the tramp of marching men, free from the shadow of the bomber's wing, free from the unseen death that moves beneath the oceans.

Nonetheless, we are confronted with this fact, and therefore we must learn to live with it. As a free people, our most compelling concern is to cauterize the vast potential for evil that is inherent in this as in any other great concentration of power. We have learned that lesson thoroughly, and there is little likelihood that we will forget it now. At the same time we must avoid the equally grave danger of building a barrier of distrust and suspicion between the civil community and the amazingly young men who now make up our armed forces. To allow such a situation to develop will more than counterbalance all the billions we are currently devoting to the dreadful paraphernalia of war, for an army derives its moral strength from the people it defends—from their confidence, their affection, their institutions, their beliefs.

There is no substitute for this. The Nation's will is our will; the Nation's faith is our faith; the Nation's virtues are our virtues. Even those countries that are the most barren politically and the most retarded morally recognize that fact and strive endlessly to create the illusion of civic virtue and moral rectitude. For they understand that neither a nation nor its army is any stronger than its beliefs. The centuries have underscored this truth with blood and ruin for those leaders, both civilian and military, who have ignored it. Over and over again, gigantic concentrations of physical power have gone down in defeat before a lesser strength propelled by conviction; over and over again the Goliaths have perished at the hands of the Davids.

Therefore, without deprecating our armed might and the evil circumstances that make it necessary, I contend that we must be increasingly vigilant lest we come to evaluate our strength and our security exclusively in terms of material power. Our true strength resides in the philosophy upon which our country stands and the degree of understanding and acceptance of that philosophy by our people. Here lies our fundamental security whether the threat be external or internal, by ideology or by force. And about this hard and enduring moral core must we build our military strength. To do otherwise is to build a colossus of straw.

Until the eve of World War II this basic consideration played no significant part in our military thinking. Until that time we had taken for granted the ancient virtues of our people—a deep knowledge of our freedoms, an almost instinctive awareness of dangers that threatened those freedoms, a broad fund of factual information from our amazing press and radio, and a public-school system that had always been the source of our civic strength and unity. In mid-1941, these complacent assumptions came down like a house of cards. For in that year we found that the young men in our expanding Army were divided and confused. We found that great numbers of them were literally ignorant of the catastrophic events in Europe and the dark portents in Asia. And since they saw no danger, they saw no compelling reason why the Congress had decided to retain them in the service. In common with many of their fellow citizens, they appeared to be unaware of the human values at stake in a collapsing civilization—values which they would soon be called upon to preserve at the ultimate price of their lives.

Somewhere, somehow, a perverted philosophy had found its way into our national blood stream; a philosophy that placed peace before freedom, comfort before sacrifice, self before the common good, and rights without obligations. It is not likely that any nation which embraces such principles will long endure; and it is certain that any military force so motivated will collapse at the first shock of battle, no matter how magnificently it may be equipped.

Pearl Harbor automatically restored all of us to our good senses and united us as we have never been united before. Nevertheless, the great gaps in the moral armor of our young fighting men had been made clear. Anger and indignation at Japanese treachery had served to unite us, but anger and indignation were not substitutes for an understanding of the freedoms we were committed

to preserve or the moral issues involved or the nature of the dark forces that were loose in the world. Therefore, the Army undertook to remedy these grave defects as best it could.

This was a strange and unfamiliar mission; and since it was strange and unfamiliar, mistakes were made and acceptance was slow and difficult. But the important thing lies in the fact that the Army had at long last come to recognize that its fighting strength depended completely and utterly upon the understanding and acceptance of an idea. That idea was the preservation of freedom and the fearful consequences of failure. We recalled belatedly that even in our own war for independence General Washington had engaged Tom Paine to do an identical job—to keep the idea of freedom burning like a beacon before his little Army. We recalled that the philosopher Spinoza had observed that "men fight better with ideas on the ends of their bayonets." We remembered that nearly every great captain in history had testified that the decisive factor in war lies in the moral field, in the will to win. Not all our billions can arm one man with this determination; nor can all our fabulous machines of war make good its absence. That ineluctable power is derived from the spiritual and moral roots of our country. It carries no price tag.

Thus were our traditional military patterns shaken. Today our concepts are beginning to crystallize. We realize now that we can no longer live in our former military isolation, walled up in forgotten garrisons and divided spiritually and intellectually from the civil community. We realize, too, that we are citizens first and soldiers second; that we cannot exist as a separate organism divorced from the context of citizenship and the social fabric of our country.

Similarly we have taken a long, hard look at our human relations within the Military Establishment. Here, too, a new philosophy is beginning to take on form and substance. At the moment we see it shaping up toward four broad objectives. These I should like to discuss briefly.

At the head of the list we set as our No. 1 goal the preservation of the dignity and the identity of the individual soldier. This is the very foundation of our system of government; it must also become the solid foundation upon which our military structure rests. For man can suffer no greater indignity than the loss of his identity. He can sustain no heavier spiritual blow than the thought that his life or death is of no consequence. Too often has the conviction that the individual is of no importance led the soldier to the collateral belief that his individual effort is of no importance either. If this thought be generated in enough men in an army, the end result in battle is obvious. Therefore, we are striving to build an officer corps that will recognize, honor, and preserve the dignity and the identity of the humblest soldier. At the same time we use every device available to us to convince the soldier himself that his well being, his aspirations, his service are all matters of prime importance to his country and to his Army. Thus do we seek to fulfill the desire in every human heart to count for something, to be needed.

Our second aim is to provide an answer to the soldier's inevitable and eternal question "Why?" We base this on the fact that the American soldier can be led but not driven; and to lead him he must have an adequate and an intelligent explanation of the things he is called upon to do. You will recognize, of course, that this does considerable damage to that ancient school of thought which contended "Theirs not to question why; theirs but to do or die." Enlightened leaders have always done their best to answer this ever-present question whether it was spoken or unspoken. Now, as it should be in the army of any free people, it is a fundamental requirement of command.

Strangely enough, this policy has been questioned not only by some of our military men but by some of our civilian critics, too. This, in common with the rest of the philosophy I have been describing to you, has been indicted as mollycoddling. It has been categorically charged by some that such procedures will destroy discipline without which an army cannot exist. It appears to us that the critics of those policies are mistaking the shadow for the substance. Quite apparently, they are advocates of that brittle counterfeit of discipline which is based upon fear. We seek as a matter of fundamental policy the tougher, more enduring discipline that is rooted in understanding. This, the true discipline, by its very definition renders an Army propaganda-proof and subversion-proof. As a matter of cold fact, nothing short of this has ever produced a first-class American fighting unit and nothing ever will.

Our third goal is to bring to our young men an understanding and an appreciation of the American ideal; to nourish that ideal; and to build an abiding belief in the future of our country and the democratic process. Here lies the very bed-rock of motivation; here lies the hard, enduring core of our military strength. Occasionally it is contended that this is not our business, that our business is to develop a body of trained fighting men for the Republic and nothing else. For our part, we contend that love of country must live in the heart of every fighting man and that anything we can do to strengthen it we should do. No group should have a monopoly on civic education; it is a job for all of the people all of the time.

Our fourth objective is to keep the men of our Army aware of the great national and international issues that confront us from day to day in order that each man may understand the vital interest those matters hold for him as a soldier and as a citizen. The military man, as well as the civilian, is entitled to a free flow of information. But for reasons I have cited earlier, we believe that these matters are of such vital import to the soldier that we cannot leave the question of his current knowledge entirely to chance or inclination. Therefore, in addition to providing him with broad access to the American press and radio, we make positive provision to bring him objective presentations of the more important matters transpiring in his country and in his world and, then, encourage organized discussion of those matters on duty time. There is no attempt to influence his thinking. On the contrary, every effort is made to encourage him to think for himself and to discuss his views with his fellow soldiers. The virtues of this process both from the military and from the civic points of view are too obvious to this distinguished audience to warrant elaboration.

These four goals I have listed are among the more important on the human side of the new Army we are trying to develop. There are many derivative objectives, but I believe these four are sufficient to make the point that the philosophy of the Army of 1949 is far removed from that of the Army of, say, 1939.

There are many activities and many programs that bear directly on the attainment of these good ends. I will make no effort to describe these, but I would like to list a few of the more important ones. We are particularly proud of our fledgling career-guidance program that picks up the young soldier at the beginning of his service, channels him into a service career compatible with his inclinations and aptitudes, and thereafter purposefully helps him climb as far and as fast as his ability and his ambition will carry him. This is one of the major devices for attacking the savage anonymity that has been the traditional curse of every military establishment.

We are equally proud of our character-guidance program and the philosophy that underlies it. No longer are we content to regard the religious and moral welfare of our men with indifference. Our efforts in this field are being richly rewarded. Our chapels are crowded. Post activities and post interests grow. The venereal rate steadily declines. The civil communities near our garrisons are helping us enormously in this work, and they, too, are profiting by it.

Our great educational program is almost too well known to comment on. More than 200,000 men of our Armed Forces are actively participating in some phase of it. More than 70,000 are attending organized classes on off-duty time. Incredible though it sounds, approximately 5,000 servicemen are winning their high-school diplomas or certificates of equivalency each month. This program is one of our most profitable enterprises: It provides us with an alert soldiery; it pays rich dividends in terms of prestige for the man in uniform; it is one of the primary inducements in attracting high-quality volunteers; and, finally, it represents a permanent social gain to the Republic.

Other constructive personnel activities are grouped in our troop information program whose major effort is devoted to civic education. By means of weekly discussion groups, Army radio stations, soldier papers, motion pictures, posters, and other graphic and printed materials, we bring our men the story of our country and of the world. We may truly boast that our Army is the best informed and the most objectively informed in the world.

In summary, then, these are some of the innovations you will find in your Army of today. You will not find perfection. You will not find that every officer is an Eisenhower or a Bradley or even a competent practitioner in the difficult art of leading his fellow soldiers. But you will find that the doors and windows of the Army are open and that a clean, invigorating wind is blowing away the cobwebs of a narrow and fruitless traditionalism. A good start has been made. It cannot continue without the interest, the understanding, and the help of our fellow citizens. It cannot succeed if young America comes to us imbued with a hatred for the Army and a contempt for the corps of officers. Nor can it succeed without first-class leaders who enjoy the confidence of their country and of their men.

It might be well to pursue this thought a bit further. It seems significant to me, for example, that three key groups in our country are under ceaseless attack—our representatives in Congress, our businessmen, our military leaders. These three groups are made the butt of endless ridicule; vicious stereotypes unendingly depict them as fools or scoundrels or advocates of the blackest reaction. The fact that completely honest and worthy citizens are occasionally involved in this practice does not disguise the treacherous inspiration nor hide the treacherous intent to undermine confidence in our political, industrial, and military leadership.

We of the Military Establishment are particularly handicapped by this attack, since we cannot strike back. Our defense, therefore, must be left in the hands of others. For our part we have nothing to apologize for. The professional officers of our Army are justly proud of their service to the American people. Our senior officers find it difficult to believe that their fellow citizens regard them as incompetents, as unscrupulous seekers of tarnished glory, or as heartless and inhuman martinets. We are unwilling to believe that after a hundred and seventy years the American people have suddenly come to regard success as shameful and mediocrity as an ideal. For 4 years the attempt has been made to drive these vicious wedges between

the corps of officers and their fellow soldiers and between the corps of officers and the civil community. That way lies disaster for any army any time, anywhere.

It would also be well to remember that a man of ability in a free society will not elect a profession that promises no reward for achievement. Our whole society is based on incentives. Competition and personal initiative have carried us to the pinnacle of the world. Dare we set these aside for the military profession and still expect to attract men of ability or hold those we have? I submit that this is a matter of profound concern now and in the future.

For a considerable period of time we have concentrated almost exclusively on the soldier. Perhaps it is time we gave a little sober thought to the men who may some day have to lead him in battle and upon whose ability and wisdom and judgment his life will depend. Therefore, while we strive to build a more perfect Army about the central core of our way of life, let us remember that such armies are not built by second-rate leaders with second-rate minds. Nor have our wars been won by such men. It is the devout hope of all of us that we may never again be engulfed in war, but if we should be, let us hope that the policies we adopt today will attract to our ranks the Eisenhowers and Bradleys of tomorrow.

Address of Gen. Omar N. Bradley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, at the Third National Industry Army Day conference, held in Boston, Mass., and which address was given at 8 p. m., Friday, February 4, 1949:

In the creation of a sound military force for the armed defense of the Nation there is no place for free competitive enterprise among the separate services in the business of fighting a war.

Security is a cooperative venture; it is not a competitive race. To forewarn aggressors and to construct effective military might, we are in need of partnership, not partisanship; concern for the safety of this Nation, not the survival of our arms.

Because we insist that every American armchair has a right to its own home grown general, the agreement of our armed forces on a strategic plan for defense is on trial today before a bar of public debate.

I certainly do not question the right of any American to speak his honest opinion on the fitnesss of our plans. His is the Nation to be defended and his are the taxes that pay the bills.

And I respect the constitutional right of Congress to make such provision as it may judge essential to the Nation's safety.

But as a soldier, entrusted by you with a share of responsibility for the Nation's defense, I feel it my duty to speak the truth as I see it, to state my convictions as plainly as I can that you may know my position and that of the Army today.

Let me make it clear at the outset, that what I have to say this evening is not in criticism of the Air Force. I work in daily close association with General Vandenberg, of the Air Force, and Admiral Denfeld, of the Navy. And I know they both believe as strongly as I do that the security of the Nation depends upon the teamwork of the services. It was General Vandenberg himself who said only 2 months ago: "The three services are in complete agreement that no one service can do the job alone."

Because too many Americans are searching for an easy and popular way to armed security through top-heavy trust in air power at the sacrifice of our remaining arms, we are in danger of reckoning our safety on fantasy rather than fact.

I do not deprecate the vast capabilities of air power as a priority weapon for attack against any aggressor state. Nor do I deny that the threat of instant retaliation through an air offensive is our greatest deterrent to war today.

But I must part company with those enthusiasts who ascribe to air power limitless capabilities in winning an instant decision. Air power, like every other weapon, has gaping limitations for war as we shall know it for many years to come.

However crippling air attack can be, I am convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that should this Nation be forced into still another conflict, we shall once more be forced to gain the inevitable victory over our dead bodies—those of our soldiers on the ground.

If I did not believe that war in the future will still thrust its eventual burden on the soldier who fights on ground, then I would readily recommend abolition of the Army and happily bequeath our missions to anyone who would have them.

To provide long-term security for the Nation, our military requirements must be related both to American foreign policy and to the known offensive capabilities of likely enemy states. They must be predicated upon preparedness for a plan of war—a strategy that can defend our shores, aid our allies, and preserve a foothold from which to strike the aggressor in his homeland.

Even in the combined employment of air, naval, and ground arms—war presents a problem of priority and sequence in mounting an offensive against the aggressor's forces and the sources of his strength. To survive, the United States must be prepared instantly to gear its counterattack to a war of increasing violence, a war of growing intensity, and a war of widening global dimensions.

At the instant of aggression, the United States must fling the full force of its strategic air offensive against the enemy's heartland. But however savage this attack might be, it is dangerous for us to count on a decisive knock-out in the first round. For the concentration of this initial air offensive must diminish as we dip deeper into the stock pile of our atomic bombs.

In the second stage of war, we must rapidly seize, hold, and push nearer the target those strategic bases from which we might bomb the enemy and from which he might bomb our cities. At the same time, while the enemy is flooding his neighboring states with troops and thundering against ground defenses, we must commit ourselves unreservedly to the preservation of a springboard for an eventual climactic ground attack.

If we were to accept the inevitability of enemy superiority on the ground, we should not only be forced to abandon our allies with frail hope of liberation, but we might also find ourselves trapped in a long and punishing war of attrition through air bombardment. While the odds in such a conflict would presumably lie with us, an air war of attrition could readily lead to disaster—to a duel, a duel in the best fabled tradition of the gingham dog and calico cat who ate each other up.

Unless the enemy suddenly were to collapse from the wounds of those first two blows, the United States must then be prepared in the third round of a war to strike at the enemy's forces, wrest from him his bases, and destroy the enemy's armies in large-scale ground assaults. Whether they be airborne or seaborne, these piercing attacks of mobile mechanized troops provide the only weapon that can find its way to the roots of enemy resistance and there crush it or subdue it.

Because the Army cannot subscribe to the thesis that air power is a self-sufficient power capable of single-handed victory in a global war, I am dismayed that those who dare question it should be tagged as oxcart soldiers in an atomic age.

And I am alarmed that the Army's insistence on a combined defensive force should be distorted in the minds of some Americans as stubborn opposition to the strengthening of air power.

The United States Army does not question the need for placing first emphasis on strategic air as the most formidable weapon of attack. We confirm the premise of most airmen that the fear of instant retaliation at the hands of our strategic air offensive is the most substantial deterrent to war today.

We freely affirm—in concert with the Joint Chiefs of Staff—our critical need for creating an instant war readiness in American air power.

And we readily agree that while the Nation in times of peace must curb exorbitant spending for defense, first things must come first—and the first is readiness in air strength.

But this does not mean we can abandon the others of our armed resources. For if we are to construct air power at the fatal expense of ground and naval arms, then we may foolishly be forced to desert our allies and forsake our capacity to wage a sustained war.

By reckless reliance upon a knockout blow in the opening months of a conflict, we might unwittingly risk defeat in war and the possible loss of our lives. Even a champion does not enter the ring until he has trained for the full bout.

If the Army and Navy were to be denied relative readiness in their striking forces to hold and seize advanced bases, we might easily waste our air strength in an overextended and therefore far less effective preliminary air war. This could do nothing but lengthen the conflict and multiply its eventual cost.

By our failure to preserve a foothold for subsequent ground assault, we might have to abandon the promise of help for our allies and discard our hopes for decisive invasion against the enemies' armies.

For no alliance can be effective anywhere in the world until the United States is ready to deploy its strength immediately in the critical theater of war. And no massive invasion can succeed without a near and friendly base from which we might launch it.

Unless the Army can maintain a minimum mobile striking force as well as an effective base for mobilization of its civilian soldiers, the Army cannot be readied in time to accomplish its mission in war.

In our mounting sequence of attack against an enemy aggressor, we cannot ring a bell for the third round and have the Army answer: "Wait a couple of years and then we'll come out swinging!"

"Then" will be too late because of too little now.

The roles of defense forces are publicly defined during Congressional hearings on their budgets. But because limited peacetime budgets cannot—and will not provide—for the wartime mission of the Army, that mission is too often forgotten and frequently ignored.

Because air power is essentially a first priority weapon, its first priority needs are provided in peacetime readiness budgets.

And because the Army is a lesser priority weapon in the sequence of attack, many of its peacetime needs are preparedness needs for wartime mobilization.

If we starve the Army in an effort to feed those first priority forces, then we shall have to anticipate that ground support will be perilously thin in the initial stages of war and the large-scale ground offensive will, of necessity, be long delayed.

Ultimately a war between nations is reduced to one man defending his land while another tries to invade it. Whatever the devastation in his cities and the disorder in his existence, man will not be conquered until you fight him for his life.

I repeat to you this evening what I said last week before a committee of Congress: The Army will live scrupulously within the means of a budget recommended to the Congress by its Commander in Chief.

It is clearly apparent that in the absence of any precipitant danger, the Nation must curb within reason that share of the national income it would devote to its common defenses. A nation cannot hope to purchase within the limits of its purse an assurance of guaranteed security against aggression. But it can spread the risk among its several services so that with reasonable safety we may forewarn aggressors and intelligently provide for an effective force in the event of war.

This I believe we have done—critically, soundly, and with the general approval of the services themselves.

The Department of National Defense is not irrevocably split—as critics would have you condemn it—among partisans of the several arms. We have made a start in compromising our individual requirements to construct—one with another—a security force that can best fulfill both our instant and eventual needs in the event of war. And we have learned that just as important as step-by-step sequence of fighting in modern war is the fundamental demand for complete unity in word and heart among the armed forces.

I pledge to you the willingness of the United States Army constantly to review its requirements that you need not be taxed for the maintenance of nonessentials. We do not exist to defend stubborn traditions, obsolete concepts, or yesterday's tactics. We exist to defend the Nation, tomorrow as well as today.

And in subscribing to the need for prudence in military spending, I say to you that I would much prefer to take some military risk rather than have to weather the dangers of an economic bust.

For only so long as we encourage the investment of our earnings in more production and better living for those who labor at our machines can we be assured that our massive industrial plant and the health of our people are equal to the challenge they face. And only so long can we sustain the faith of our allies, aid them in the task of defending their reconstructed cities with some resources of their own.

The danger of conflict today appears to have slackened, partly because we are chewing sedatives in this constant war of nerves. What the coming years may bring will certainly be shadowed in the strength, resolution, and common sense of the United States.

Michael Straus and Richard L. Boke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial published in the San Francisco News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, under date of February 9, 1949:

WILL EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS RIGHT THIS WRONG?

United States Reclamation Commissioner Michael Straus and California Regional Director Richard L. Boke are still on their jobs despite the action of the Eightieth Congress in cutting them off the Interior Department pay roll. It looks as if the Eighty-first Congress will undo the wrong its predecessor committed and put these two public servants back on pay.

Cutting them off was a cowardly act for a body like the United States Congress to commit. It was in the form of a rider to the appropriation bill providing that no man could hold either of these positions who had not had five years of engineering experience. Neither Straus nor Boke was named in the rider. But, inasmuch as neither was an engineer, the intent was plain.

Like this newspaper, the Washington Post denounced the action at the time. In an editorial recently the Post commended President Truman's special message urging repeal of the rider and added the following pertinent comment:

"The proviso was carefully drawn to get around the constitutional prohibition on bills of attainder while accomplishing the same end. Since the jobs of Straus and Boke are primarily administrative, engineering training and experience are totally beside the point. In fact, one of Mr. Straus' predecessors, John Powell Davis, was fired back in 1923 on the precise ground that he was an engineer rather than an administrator. The President's request has been referred to the House committee on appropriations. We hope that it will move toward rectifying the last session's egregious misdemeanor with the speed that other committees are attaining in handling emergency legislation."

We join the Post in that hope.

Fairness to Veterans Improperly Removed From Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under a bill passed last year, it is provided that a veteran in Federal service who is removed from his position but later reinstated to duty on the ground that the removal was unjustified, shall be entitled to be compensated for the period he was out of work. Certainly this is only simple justice.

The purposes of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, however, are not served unless this measure is made retroactive to the date that Act was passed, June 27, 1944. The reason is that any veteran who has received such treatment between this date and the date of passage of this law last year is not entitled to take advantage of its provisions.

For that reason, I am today introducing a bill to provide for this retroactive feature. It seems only just that one who has served his country in wartime in the armed services and who, while later employed in a civilian capacity, loses his job through the unjust or illegal action of a superior, should be entitled to pay for the time he has lost.

Veterans' Hospitals in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James E. Folsom, Governor of Alabama, and the Honorable C. C. Horton, director of the department of veterans' affairs of the State of Alabama, have called to my attention the reports of the most recent inspection of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Alabama. These inspections were made by the Department of Veterans' Affairs of the State of Alabama, and the reports are objective and factual. As a citizen and as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of this House, I am intensely interested in an adequate hospital program for the veterans of all our wars. Believing that these reports might, by way of comparison with similar reports from other States, be of interest to the Members of the House, I am including as a part of my remarks the letters of Governor Folsom, Director Horton, and the Veterans' Administration hospital inspection reports referred to:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Montgomery, February 10, 1949.

HON. CARL ELLIOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CARL: Alabama's State department of veterans' affairs advises me that they have mailed you a copy of a recent inspection that they have made in this State covering Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tuscaloosa, Ala., Veterans' Administration Hospital, Tuskegee, Ala., and Veterans' Administration Hospital, Montgomery, Ala.

I believe that these reports will prove beneficial to you and your staff, in view of the fact that it gives a very good picture of the veterans hospitals in this State. It is pleasing to me to know that these facilities apparently seem to be in good condition and are rendering our veterans a good service. I would particularly like to call your attention to the report concerning the Veterans' Administration hospital in Tuskegee, Ala., page 3, in which it is recommended that a lighter variety of dishes be secured in order to keep the patients from injuring each other and the attendants. I believe that if this was called to the attention of the proper authorities, something could possibly be done about the matter.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. FOLSOM.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Montgomery, Ala., February 10, 1949.

To the Members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation:

GENTLEMEN: This department makes a semiannual inspection of the veterans' hospitals in Alabama, and in the belief that the

most recent reports might be of interest to you, we are taking the liberty of forwarding them herewith.

We are grateful for your consistent support of veterans' welfare, and should an occasion arise where we can serve you, please give us that opportunity.

Yours very truly,

C. C. HORTON, *Director.*

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Montgomery, Ala., January 26, 1949.

REPORT OF OFFICIAL HOSPITAL VISIT, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

An official visit was made to the Veterans' Hospital, Montgomery, Ala., December 15, 1948. I was accompanied on this visit by Dr. H. D. Shapiro, senior medical consultant, the American Legion, Washington, D. C. I felt that every effort should be made to utilize the services of Dr. Shapiro, and for that reason our entire visit was devoted to looking into the medical side of the hospital.

Clinical records were inspected on the various wards to determine what effort was being made to properly diagnose a case and how quickly proper treatment could be instituted. Owing to the fact that there is a tremendous shortage of beds in this area, there is a rapid turn-over of patients at this hospital. We find that once a patient is admitted to the hospital, no time is lost in seeing that he receives the necessary physical examination with the necessary laboratory tests. This hospital also has an excellent staff of consultants in the various phases of medicine, and at least one of these consultants is in attendance at the hospital every day in the week. Any unusual case or any case in which there is any question as to proper diagnosis, and as to the proper method of treatment, is immediately called to the attention of these consultants when they visit the hospital.

It was found that accurate clinical records are kept on each patient. In most instances, diagnosis is quickly and accurately made and proper treatment instituted as early as possible with a view to getting the veteran on his feet and out of the hospital in order that room may be made for other patients.

The veterans' hospital, Montgomery, Ala., is now fairly well staffed with doctors, and in addition to the number of doctors, they seem to be outstanding in their profession. Dr. Shapiro was pleasantly surprised to find that we had here in Montgomery, a veterans' hospital which would measure up with any other similar veterans' hospital in the country.

Another amazing thing about this hospital is that somehow, they have been able to take care of the emergency cases and the service-connected cases in fairly good order. There have been times when there was not a vacant bed in the hospital, but in some way the hospital could manage to discharge some patient who had reached maximum hospital benefit in order to receive the next emergency case.

I feel that the hospital at Montgomery is doing a good job. The manager, the chief of professional service, and the entire staff are vitally interested in their work and in the welfare of the veterans entrusted to their care. I feel that every effort is being made to constantly and continuously improve the hospital and make a better hospital out of it. So long as this situation exists, it is felt that this hospital should receive the support of every veteran and veterans' organization within the State, and that every effort should be made to cooperate with them in order that we may eventually boast of the fact that we have here in Montgomery, the finest veterans' hospital in the United States.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. CAMERON,
Chief, Claims Service.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Montgomery, Ala., February 3, 1949.

REPORT OF OFFICIAL HOSPITAL VISIT, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, TUSKEGEE, ALA.

On January 24, 1949, an official visit was made to the Veterans' Administration hospital, Tuskegee, Ala. I was received by Dr. T. T. Tildon, manager, who assigned the assistant executive officer as a guide for me, and gave instructions that I was to be taken any place which I thought necessary to accomplish the aims of my visit.

Dr. Tildon stated that the 100-bed addition which had been in the blueprint stage had been delayed and that he was afraid the whole addition was going to be dropped at this time. He stated that he was not giving up hope, however, because it seemed to be the present plan to scrap some of the new hospitals now in the blueprint stage because of various shortages and building costs, and he hoped the Veterans' Administration would make an effort to enlarge and improve the existing facilities.

In a conversation with Dr. G. C. Branche, chief of professional services, it was learned that a great deal of success is being obtained from the whole physical medicine rehabilitation program. Almost every patient was receiving therapy treatment of various degrees, the exception being those who could not participate because they were too ill. The hospital is even working in close cooperation with Tuskegee Institute on their educational therapy courses, and in some cases the veterans continue to receive training after their discharge from the hospital (Public Laws 16 and 346).

Upon visiting the manual arts therapy shop, I discovered an apparently well equipped division with facilities for teaching woodwork, auto mechanics, radio repair, photographic work, watch and jewelry repair, and academic subjects. There was, however, a surprising lack of patients present to take advantage of the training offered. Of course, this could have been due to the fact that they were held on their wards pending daily doctors' examinations. In that event it seems that some more desirable scheduling system could be instigated. The personnel in this division are most enthusiastic; they are all very proud of the work they are doing, and show their enthusiasm by constantly trying to improve on the existing facilities by improvising tools and other items needed in the teaching in their classes.

Upon visiting the physical therapy section, it was found that everything seemed to be well kept and clean. The portable whirlpool tanks and the Hubbard tanks were in the best condition. Here again it was found that there was a high degree of enthusiasm on the part of the employees. One device had been improvised so that by using pulleys, a patient was exercising a paralyzed arm by pulling a rope with his useful arm.

The wards appeared to be neat, although there was a natural amount of litter which had accumulated since they had been cleaned that morning. The nurses were cordial and there seemed to be no shortage of nurses. One was constantly reminded, however, that there was an acute shortage of attendants everywhere. The day rooms were clean and well aired with cross ventilation. It was learned that when USO shows come to the hospital, they are taken to the various wards where the patients are not able to go to the recreational building. It was also learned that there is no shortage of organizations interested in the welfare of the patients. The wives of the doctors and other employees are constantly about on the capacity of "Gray Ladies." Groups from the campus of the institute frequently come over to entertain the patients, and the citizens of nearby Tuskegee are also very cooperative in contributing to the entertainment.

I was informed that plans were under way to build an outdoor basketball court for some of the NP patients. The staff had been hoping that there might be a chance to get authorization for a gymnasium. They felt, however, that it was very unlikely that such an undertaking could be possible. There are golf classes for some of the patients, and it was felt that by the time the golf season arrived, there would be several patients who would be skillful enough for competition.

The patients seemed to be well satisfied with the food, and it appeared to be well prepared and balanced. There was, however, one point of the feeding of patients which struck this writer as being not only impractical, but dangerous. The china from which the patients are fed is a very heavy, course type which affords a disturbed patient a very lethal type of weapon. This was especially true of the cups from which they were served coffee. These cups stand about 6 inches in height and weigh in the neighborhood of 12 ounces. It was learned that on several occasions a disturbed patient had hurled one of these cups at a member of the personnel. One case was related to me where a nurse was struck on the breast with a cup, and another of an attendant being injured by a flying cup hitting him on the back of the head. It was stated that at irregular intervals, patients had injured each other by throwing these heavy cups. The substitution of these cups should be accomplished at as early a date as possible for a lighter variety.

Upon visiting the registrar's office, it was learned that the registrar was at a meeting. However, the assistant registrar informed me that there were 1,732 NP patients and 431 general medical patients now in the hospital, or a total of 2,163 patients. I was informed that there were no service-connected cases on the waiting list, and the non-service-connected cases had been reduced to about 89. When I remarked about the amazing reduction of patients on the waiting list from 800 in the early part of 1948 to the above numbers, it was stated that this number had been reduced by placing patients in other hospitals; also by letters written to the veterans requesting information as to whether or not they still desired hospitalization. By this method, it was stated, they were able to eliminate patients who were able to receive treatment elsewhere, or who no longer required hospitalization, and transfer the more acutely ill patients.

The canteen was in a large, clean looking quonset hut, one of a group of three. It appeared to be well stocked, and I was advised that plans were under way to have a beauty shop installed when that group of buildings had been completely furnished, also a cafeteria and cleaning establishment.

In conclusion, I feel that the hospital at Tuskegee is doing a fine job. The entire staff, from the manager and chief of professional services down, seem eager to perform their jobs at a high degree of efficiency and show their eagerness to be of service to the veterans by their interest in every patient. One can see that every effort is being made to constantly improve the hospital and treatment in all departments. I feel that so long as this situation exists, they should have the support of all veterans in the State.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL B. EASTMAN,
Claims Reviewer.

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Montgomery, Ala., January 26, 1949.

REPORT OF OFFICIAL HOSPITAL VISIT, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, TUSCALOOSA, ALA.

On December 13, 1948, an official visit was made to the veterans' hospital, Tuscaloosa, Ala. I was fortunate in having with me, Dr. H. D. Shapiro, senior medical consultant, the American Legion, Washington, D. C. In order that I might fully utilize the services of Dr. Shapiro during our visit, it was felt that statistical information and an inspection of the physical features of the hospital should be dispersed with and that an intensive study should be made as to the kind of medicine being practiced in the hospital. Dr. Shapiro is a certified neurologist and psychiatrist and is a professor in neurology at George Washington University Washington, D. C.

Much of our time was spent in discussing treatment of neuropsychiatric patients with the staff of the hospital. We had an opportunity to talk to the entire staff, and it was interesting to note that the doctors at the hospital asked Dr. Shapiro numerous questions concerning medical treatment and procedure which would be helpful to them in treating patients. Many clinical records covering treatment of patients at the hospital were scrutinized by Dr. Shapiro and me, and a thorough study was made of the medical side of the hospital.

I am glad to report that Dr. Shapiro stated that the doctors assigned to the veterans' hospital at Tuscaloosa were above the average; that the treatment being carried on at that hospital was in keeping with modern medical science. It was found that the records were somewhat slovenly kept and that hospital summaries submitted to the regional office for rating purposes were not all that was to be desired, but in discussing this situation with the staff, it was found that the poor hospital summaries which were sent to the regional office resulted from the fact that no one had ever taken the time to properly instruct them as to the type of reports necessary in determining degree of disability in rating a case.

For a period of about 3 months, additional doctors were borrowed from other veterans' hospitals, and during this period it was easier to get a patient into the hospital. These doctors, however, were only sent to Tuscaloosa on a temporary tour of duty. Their temporary tour of duty has now been finished and it is again exceedingly difficult to get a patient admitted to the hospital. Only service-connected cases and emergency cases may expect admittance.

During our discussion of the situation with the officials at Tuscaloosa, the manager of the hospital made the statement that more than 50 percent of the admissions to the hospital were psychoneurotics; that is, patients who were not insane and had nothing mentally wrong with them except perhaps an anxiety neurosis. When questioned as to why this situation existed, it was stated that it had been represented to the hospital that these patients were frankly psychotic, but upon arrival at the hospital, it was found that this was used as a subterfuge to get them into the hospital, and in most cases, the only thing wrong with them was psychoneurosis with chronic alcoholism.

We asked the manager for a report, giving us a summary of the source of admissions to the hospital, or that is, who initiated the action which resulted in the veteran being hospitalized. This summary showed that the largest percentage of patients were admitted by friends or members of the family calling direct to the hospital. The next highest number on a percentage basis were those cases where the family physician called in seeking hospitalization for the patient. I am glad to report that the records showed that our veterans' service officers were guilty of this in only a few cases.

It is felt that a splendid service could be rendered to the hospital at Tuscaloosa, Ala., and to the veterans in the State of Alabama, if an educational campaign could be conducted as to the type of hospital at Tuscaloosa and the further fact that in most cases, hospitalization of psychoneurotics does no good whatsoever.

We found the manager and the entire staff at the hospital alert and sympathetic toward the patients. At intervals during the period being reported on, world-famous neurologists and psychiatrists have come to Tuscaloosa and lectured to the staff for as much as a week at a time, teaching them the new trends in treatment of psychiatric patients. In addition to this, the staff is lectured to twice each week by instructors of the medical center of the University of Alabama.

It is believed that conditions at the veterans' hospital, Tuscaloosa, Ala., have materially improved in the past 6 months, and with the present program being carried out, further improvement may be expected.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE W. CAMERON,
Chief, Claims Service.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of stimulating discussion in Congress, under unanimous consent, I extend in the RECORD the 18 questions on the Taft-Hartley law that the General Electric Co. is disseminating all over the United States; together with my answers thereto and my questions to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, as president of General Electric.

This material, not as mine, but as the other side of Taft-Hartley, is also entitled to public consideration. General Electric has the wealth to, and has covered the Nation with these rather ornate poll sheets. The public press has a duty to report to the public suggestions and arguments in this Congress. The press is, of course, and of necessity must be, its own taskmaster. But should it not devote, say, 1 percent of the space to these opposing views that is currently consumed in upholding Taft-Hartley proponents?

If it would do so, it would go far toward earning its claim to selfless public service.

There is no more important domestic issue before this Congress and the country we represent. There is no more confused subject than this complicated law. The press has a singular opportunity to help clarify this issue in the public mind. I hope it will seize the opportunity and respond accordingly.

FEBRUARY 9, 1949.

Mr. CHARLES E. WILSON,
President, General Electric Co.,
New York, N. Y.

Subject: Labor legislation.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I received your questionnaire entitled "How Would You Revise Our Labor Laws?" containing 18 questions, in ballot form, requesting a straight "yes" or "no" answer.

My response must be by more extended statements than categorical "yes" or "no" answers. The questions will be repeated verbatim and marked with the answer obviously expected. They disclose the inadequacy of a "yes" or "no" answer.

Interrelated questions will be grouped. I shall ask you to comment upon my views. I trust you will respond, and I assure you respectful consideration of your opinions. We can use all the help and wisdom available to enact a fair labor law.

I. THE EMERGENCY STRIKE

(Your questions Nos. 1 and 2)

"1. Do you believe that labor laws should, in general, preserve the employee's right to strike?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐

"2. Do you believe labor laws should give the President of the United States the right to seek, through courts of law, to delay a strike that would cause a national emergency endangering the health and safety of the entire country?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐"

A labor questionnaire put question No. 1 to me as a candidate, but not No. 2. My response was as follows:

"The right to strike is necessary in a free economy, which I would defend for reasons presently stated herein. However, one limitation is necessary to avoid destruction of free economy and that is the closing down of an entire vital industry, whether by strike or lock-out.

"Industry-wide strikes will bring irresistible public demand for Government control over such industry, which in turn results in wage and, ultimately, price fixing; hence, a controlled economy.

"A controlled economy inevitably results in socialism, communism, fascism, or some form of state monopoly, under which the Government exercises all the power inherent in mass wealth. Again the inevitable final result of such concentrated power would be forfeiture of personal liberty to entrenched officials.

"Curtailment of labor's right to strike is proper only to the extent of preventing industry-wide cessation of production which would create the pressure indicated above, and curtailment of any combination of industry, or any governmental action having like effect, should be likewise treated."

This response illustrates how a categorical answer would not clearly disclose one's honest opinion to the single question. And I believe, Mr. Wilson, that your position in industry, and mine in Government, demands our being rather specific upon this dangerous problem.

In order to help me, would you please give me the benefit of your views upon the following questions:

1. An emergency strike (or lock-out) is unsettled after the period of legal delay expires. How would you deal with the problem then?

2. Specifically, would you favor compulsory settlement?

3. If wages were fixed, would not prices also be ultimately fixed?

4. What, if any, other approach is there to this problem?

5. The Taft-Hartley law provided a union membership vote on the employers', but not a stockholders' vote, on the union's last offer. Do you think this omission discloses any basic lack of objective and unbiased thinking in the construction of the law?

II. TWO EXAMPLES OF BIAS IN LEGISLATION ON LABOR DISPUTES

(Your questions No. 18 and 12)

"18. Should labor laws provide that a striker who has been replaced in the course

of an economic strike—not involving any unfair labor practice—be permitted to vote in an election to choose a bargaining agent at the conclusion of the strike?

"Yes_____ ☐ No_____ ☒"

While this is your last question, it goes to the heart of the Taft-Hartley law. Therefore, I discuss it early in this letter.

You refer to section 9 (c) (1) (A), and 9 (c) (3), permitting an election for decertification of a union during, not merely "at the conclusion of the strike," as your question implies. The Taft-Hartley law provides:

"Employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement shall not be eligible to vote" (sec. 9 (c) (3)).

This makes quite a difference. This is but the first step in requiring the Government to use its full power as a strike-breaking force without regard to the merits of the dispute. Here is how it works:

1. Union A strikes for higher wages.

2. Company A employs replacements, or strike-breakers; term depending upon one's bias.

On this subject Business Week, December 18, 1948, had this to say:

"Given a few million unemployed in America, given an Administration in Washington which was not pro-union—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.

"These are the provisions that could do it: (1) Picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for a collective bargaining election; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote—while the strike replacements cast the only ballot; and (4) if the outcome of this is a 'no union' vote, the Government must certify and enforce it. (And this is the point where the mandatory injunction against all union efforts is prescribed.)

"Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions, linked together, presumably can destroy a union."

(Parenthetical comment added)

(Passing strange indeed that Business Week and others, Fortune and Life included, should, after the election, tell the people what I had claimed throughout the campaign.)

3. Replacements can petition for election to obtain decertification of union A and probably succeed, since they by working are already in disagreement with union A.

4. Strike by union A becomes an unfair labor practice by virtue of Taft-Hartley law, section 8 (b) (4) (B) and (C), which provides:

"(b) It shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents * * *

"(4) to engage in, or to induce or encourage the employees of any employer (including their own erstwhile employer) to engage in, a strike or a concerted refusal in the course of their employment to use, manufacture, process, transport, or otherwise handle or work on any goods, articles, material, or commodities or to perform any services, where an object thereof is * * *

"(B) forcing or requiring any other employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization (the decertified union) as the representative of his employees unless such labor organization has been certified as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9;

"(C) forcing or requiring any employer to recognize or bargain with a particular labor organization as the representative of his employees if another labor organization has been certified (by decertification election, at the petition of a new union formed by strike-breakers, or replacements, during a strike) as the representative of such employees under the provisions of section 9."

(Parenthetical comment added)

The precise effect of the Taft-Hartley law up to this point is to permit the struck employer (company A) to manipulate the decertification of the union of his old employees (union A). Thus a condition is created whereby the old union and its members commit an unfair labor practice if they even try peaceably to induce the strikebreakers to join them to hold up the wage scale.

The right to picket, take note of nonunion workers in order "to seek their acquaintance * * * visit them at their homes * * * and at all other suitable places, discuss with them the mutual benefits of the union and the importance of their quitting work" was a nonenjoinable right recognized by the courts 44 years ago. (*Karges Furniture Co.* v. *Amalgamated Wood Workers, Local 131* ((1905) 165 Ind. 421).)

Thus the old employees are forbidden to exercise this early right, now outlawed by Taft-Hartley, but which was recognized even in the days when the yellow-dog contract was upheld as sacred.

But this is only a relatively minor and preliminary application of the Taft-Hartley law. It provides that (1) the exercise of this early right is an unfair labor practice after such decertification; and (2) that a complaint on such case "shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases" and "the regional attorney * * * shall, on behalf of the Board, petition * * * for appropriate injunctive relief," immediately. Thus, without regard to merit, if the employer can procure pliant replacements, he can force the Government to enjoin even peaceful persuasion, picketing, boycotting, etc.

Now, there is the whole story involved in the subject posed by your question No. 18. In short, by simply employing unemployed people the employer can enlist the whole power of the Federal Government as a strike-breaking force. Perhaps, Mr. Wilson, you would never consent to do such a thing. But could you meet the competition of a concern who did employ this "gimmick" on a trend of rising unemployment? With the national debt we have today we must expand, not palsy our economy. You, as an enlightened businessman, know that purchasing power for your product comes from the earnings of the people at large, and the lack of that purchasing power will stagnate business. I fear now the effect on purchasing power the unreasonably high prices of the last 3 years may have.

I have three questions to ask you regarding this point:

1. Do you agree with my analysis?

2. If you do not, give me your analysis of all the provisions discussed.

3. Do you think the Taft-Hartley law is fair in this regard?

(Your question No. 12)

"12. Do you believe labor laws should make it unlawful for a union to compel an employer to engage in featherbedding; that is, to pay money for work which hasn't been done or won't be done?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐"

Had you asked if I opposed featherbedding I would say "Yes." But I oppose a law forbidding such.

I oppose whisky, but I don't favor prohibition. We tried it.

But if I did favor outlawing featherbedding by labor, I'd have to favor similar restrictions on business.

Featherbedding means, as you indicate, the acquisition of pay for doing nothing. The laborer asks extra help or stand-by men, usually to spread the work and hence the pay.

Let me give you an example of featherbedding in industry and business: I am a stockholder (somewhat substantial for me, although really a comparatively small one) in one of your competitor corporations. It has never paid a dividend. I wrote, as a stockholder (without disclosing my office) and asked to purchase a television set at factory price. I was advised that the retailer was entitled to his profit, hence, I must pay the full retail price. There is quite a difference, too.

I use considerable dictating equipment, purchased from the manufacturer, a representative of which admitted a mark-up of at least 600 percent. There must be some featherbedding in this over and above a fair profit, especially in such a well-established business.

Last year I bought a radio-phonograph. This year, with labor costs no less, I saw it advertised for less than 50 percent of what I paid.

1. Are these things not in the nature of getting pay for nothing?

2. What is your opinion as to whether or not, if featherbedding is to be outlawed, you would favor price fixing, at least, in cases of unconscionable profits by a well-established business?

3. Do you believe the problem is simple enough to regulate fairly in a free economy?

III. Secondary Boycotts and Jurisdictional Strikes

(Your questions No. 3 and 4)

"3. When two or more unions are fighting each other over who shall do a job or who shall represent the employees, and a strike is called to compel an employer to give to the members of one union the work or recognition being given to the other union—that is a jurisdictional strike. Should labor laws prohibit such strikes?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐"

"4. Should labor laws prohibit secondary boycotts—that is, prevent an employer and his employees, where there is no labor dispute, from being damaged by a union seeking to coerce another employer having a labor dispute?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐"

Jurisdictional strikes, where the employer is taking no sides in the primary dispute, should be prohibited. Jurisdictional disputes should be made subject to an appropriate election (in cases of plant or department representation; that is, where permanent employees are selecting a union to represent them).

In case of different work of an intermittent nature for the same employer, as in craft trades, and particularly in construction, a far more serious and complicated question is presented.

Here, decisions, to be effective, must be reached with dispatch; else the question becomes moot, the work having been stopped or finished.

Nor does this type of dispute lend itself to a fair settlement by election among interested workers. Usually the employer is dealing with several crafts who belong to unions laying general claims to the disputed work. If craft A outnumbers craft B the election results would be a foregone conclusion and without much regard to the competence or skill of the parties in dispute.

The problem of skill might, standing alone, warrant the conclusion that the employer be the sole arbiter, but the opportunity to use this power to favor or destroy one union is a factor we cannot disregard if you ask us to legislate upon the subject. Stated otherwise, can you honestly ask us to say to the carpenters and the machinists, "Your historical jurisdictional dispute is handed to the employers for their decision."

Do you not see the tremendous bargaining power the employer would be thus handed

by the law? Each group would be tempted to underbid the other in its bid for the employer's decision.

Nor does this mean that I do not appreciate the plight of the employer who desires to complete his work without being caught in the cross-fire between two competing unions.

But over-all, this points up the pressure of conflicting interests in any legislation. Every man who comes before our labor subcommittee proclaims his undying faith in "free enterprise." I, for one, believe they all mean it, but most of them have blind spots when they view the prospects of free enterprise for the other fellow.

For example, let us take two measures—first, the Fair Labor Standards Act on which we are now holding hearings. Almost every witness agrees that a minimum wage is desirable in our economy. But it should not apply to the special circumstances of his own case. When we are impressed with those special circumstances (as we often are) and try to phrase the act to avoid his special case, we complicate the law almost beyond understanding. The employer complains that the regulations go too far. They protest in the name of the eighteenth century interpretation of the commerce clause. They say regulation is bad for the country. But the workers think these regulations are necessary.

Now, let's see the reaction of the parties to Taft-Hartley regulations. The positions change. Business has forgotten all about the commerce clause. Labor thinks the Government is going too far with regulations.

Naturally; but perhaps both are partly right and both partly wrong. We in Congress are supposed to be right.

I read this essential difference between the Taft-Hartley provisions and the administration proposals.

Under Taft-Hartley Act, the jurisdictional disputants were forbidden to strike, regardless of whether or not the Board had, or even could possibly, hear and make a decision in time to be applicable to the job in question.

Under the administration proposal, the jurisdictional strike is forbidden if the Board (or legal arbitrators) have decided the jurisdictional dispute. Until there has been a decision or award, the parties are not restrained by legal inhibition. This is not a complete remedy. However, some situations defy remedy. Is this such a situation? Let's test it by an example.

Take the case where crafts A and B contend for assignment of 10 days' work on building construction. Neither A nor B will yield. A hearing and determination within 10 (perhaps 30 or 60) days is impossible. Employer C awards the work to B. A either acquiesces or strikes, if the law permits. He has his day in court; true, a rugged court—the court of economic endurance.

But suppose the law forbids. A awaits the decision. Suppose A wins. Who should pay? Suppose further, both B and C were in good faith. Would they stand to be penalized? Or would it be fair to penalize either of them?

Remembering that the very purpose of the remedy is to avoid work stoppage, will you tell me how to fairly meet this problem?

True, we could avoid the entire stoppage, and the dispute, too, by simply making the employer the sole judge. In fact, all labor disputes could be thus stopped. But I don't believe either you or I want that sort of settlement. At least, it indicates the question is not as easy as the question itself suggests.

Do you agree?

A secondary boycott, where the second employer is not participating in the primary dispute, should be prohibited as an unfair labor practice.

1. What do you think should be the case where the employer is participating in the dispute?

As an example to illustrate: Employer A is struck. Employer B manufactures the same goods or furnishes the same service. Employer B takes over A's struck work. Taft-Hartley forbids B's employees from refusing to perform the struck work. But no law forbids B and A from agreeing that B undertake to do the struck work and thus starve out A's employees. The law permits this combination of the two employers, but forbids a counter combination of the two groups of employees.

1. Do you deem this fair?

IV. Free Speech

(Your question No. 7)

"7. Should labor laws give to both employees and employers the freedom to express their own points of view on employee relations problems—provided such views, or arguments, or opinions do not promise bribes or threaten reprisals?

"Yes_____ ☒ No_____ ☐"

No law, including the Wagner Act, ever denied the employer free speech.

What the employer, the press, and many misinformed people have called denial of free speech was simply the application of the law of evidence. Example: The employer expressed his utter dislike for unions. Then he fired the union leaders. If for union activities, it was and is an unfair labor practice. At a hearing on this question; i. e., "Was the discharge because of union activity?" the employer used to hear his own words given in evidence as tending to prove his motive. The same rule of evidence applies in every field of jurisprudence, and did in the labor law until the Taft-Hartley Act provided (sec. 8 (c)) that, unless the statement contained a "threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit," it should "not be evidence of" an unfair labor practice.

A man's expressed dislike of another has always been deemed competent and probative evidence of his motive when his conduct or treatment of the other person becomes the subject of judicial inquiry.

An excellent example of the application of this section is disclosed by the following quotation from the case of intermediate report in the matter of Greensboro Coca-Cola Bottling Co. and International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., Local 391, Case No. 34-CA-25:

"CONCLUSIONS AS TO THE DISCHARGE OF HODGE

"Inasmuch as Hodge was discharged by Parker after obtaining approval from Carter, and immediately upon the conclusion of Carter's talk to the employees, it would normally be presumed that Carter's speech might throw some light on Hodge's discharge and help to clarify Parker's charge that Hodge was 'dissatisfied,' a term which, without clarification, is vague and ambiguous. If, for example, and as the general counsel contends, this 'dissatisfaction' amounted to nothing more nor less than his activity in organizing the employees, it should be helpful in determining the respondent's motivation—the thing at issue—to know whether Carter expressed a dislike of unions or of union activity.

"Reasonable as this course might seem, and firmly rooted in legal precedent as it is, the undersigned is prohibited from following it by the language of section 8 (c) of the act. Not that he may not examine the speech and construe it. In fact, he has done so. He has been impelled to do so because if it had appeared that its declarations were favorable to union organization, that the respondent, for example, preferred to deal with a collective-bargaining agent rather than with all its employees individually, that would be persuasive evidence that Hodge's discharge was not connected with his union activity and that the term 'dissatisfied' had reference to something else. And there would be no difficulty in using the evidence for such a finding. For section 8 (c) forbids only the use of views, arguments, or opinions, not associated with threats of reprisal, or force, or promise, or benefit, as evidence of an unfair labor practice. In other words, the undersigned may use Carter's words for the respondent but not against the respondent, odd as such a result may appear to the lay mind.

"Actually, Carter's speech strongly opposed unions and the undersigned may not, therefore, use it in making a finding that Hodge was discharged immediately afterward, and without perceptible change of pace, in violation of the act. The finding hereinafter made, that Hodge was discharged because of his union activity, is based on other evidence entirely."

Do you believe a different rule should apply in labor relations?

V. Closed Shop and Union Conduct Toward Employer

(Your questions Nos. 13, 16, 15, 5, 9, 10, 11, 14)

These questions are all related to the problem of the closed shop and the union's conduct toward the employer. Hence, they are all treated under this heading, and in the order set forth above, because they seem to me better related in that order.

(Your question No. 13)

"13. Should labor laws permit the forcing of an employer to hire only workers who belong to a given union?

"Yes_____ ☐ No_____ ☒"

Of course, you know the law never required the employer to grant a closed shop. The question of the closed shop was a matter of bargaining. Taft-Hartley forbid the bargaining, or the bargain, either. The question of the closed shop has been obscured in platitudes and epitaphs. The closed shop simply provides that the employer employ union men. You apparently oppose this. O. K.; but you want the Government to join you in opposition.

But let's examine the real issue. Is it not something of a question of free enterprise? Are you asking the Government to write for you the favorable provisions of your labor contracts?

Are not the employers, like they accuse the unions, trying to enlist governmental aid in winning at the bargaining table?

I cannot extend this letter to examine all the phases of the closed-shop question, but I think it only proper to point out a few of the obvious facts of industrial life.

Closed shops are not peculiar to labor. Recall I couldn't buy a television set from a company in which I have money invested. That company and the retailer have a closed shop. Do you have a similar closed shop?

Now let's take a very practical aspect of the question: When your company bargains with your employees it is not weakened by any fractional stockholders' groups at the bargaining table. You, the management, present a solid front. It is natural that the union should seek like unity. It is to management's advantage that the employees be divided.

This is best illustrated by three quotations:

A UNION SPEAKS

"The theory of the open shop as a permanent arrangement presupposes a stable balance of power as between the employer and the workers, if not a safe preponderance of power on the side of the former. It breaks down in practice as soon as one or the other

party attempts to alter the balance. It breaks down when the employer feels himself sufficiently powerful to endeavor to rid himself of whatever restraints the activity of the mere presence of the organization imposes on his freedom. It breaks down, likewise, when the organization gains in power relative to the employer and uses this ascendancy to secure from him recognition for itself and concessions for its members that he would not voluntarily grant. In practice, therefore, the tendency of an open shop is either to degenerate into a nonunion shop or to develop into some form of union shop with union recognition or participation." (Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, the Clothing Workers of Chicago, 1910–1922, p. 330 (1922).)

AN EMPLOYER SPEAKS

A rather frank employer speaking on a resolution before the New Idea Convention in 1921: "It is unpopular to say you don't believe in the open shop, but I confess I do not quite know what the open shop means. To my mind it is a good deal of a question of a nonunion shop or unionized shop, and I hate to be a hypocrite under a resolution or anything else, or to vote or declare in favor of open shop when my own policy is not to carry that out, but to hit the head of the radical in my shop whenever he puts it up." (Nation, 112: 529 (April 13, 1921).)

AN EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION SPEAKS

That this thinking is not dead is illustrated by this very enlightening (though not enlightened) quotation from a 1948 employers' association bulletin, "Antiunion Campaigns":

"How far management can go in its efforts to keep a union out of its plant is something most employers would like to know a great deal more about."

Then this bulletin, sent to all employers in a great industrial State, proceeded to inform upon the subject. The executive secretary of this employers' association informed me that he favored unions. I had the bulletin in my pocket at the time. No; I didn't flash it on him.

But it is living proof to me that some men haven't yet changed too much. This is a factor which Congress must keep in mind if the laws it enacts are to be fair and effective.

In my opinion, the evils of the closed shop have been used as a pretext to create a divided front for labor at the bargaining table.

The closed shop has been abolished before. The Landis Commission once awarded an open shop in building construction at Chicago. The employers disdained the award within a few months.

Were I wont to do so I could name employers who have entered into closed-shop contracts since Taft-Hartley, not from force, but because they prefer such. The watchdog committee complained of such contracts, calling them bootleg contracts.

But you will never stop labor's efforts to create for itself a single front to match the strength the employer finds in unity. In practice there is both justification and often abuses; abuses I will discuss under the last heading.

(Your question No. 16)

"16. Do you believe labor laws should protect individual workers in the right to join or not to join a union—to remain or not to remain members—just as they individually wish?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

The workers should have the right to contract with the employer that only those who bear their share of the expense of collective bargaining, and help sustain the employees' side be employed. This means union membership. I would not favor a law providing you had to agree to the closed shop nor that you couldn't.

However, I have been asked by a large union to support legislation retaining the Taft-Hartley union-security election with the proviso that when the union won, union security would become a part of the contract by operation of law. I rejected the idea. It didn't fit my philosophy. But if you say the workers must twice win their right to bargain for union-security shop, perhaps it is logical that, having won twice, the employer should not have a veto. I think the workers should "have a say" but when they select the bargaining agent, it should mean "the" not "one of many" bargaining agents. Again, remember the employer presents a unified front at the bargaining table. Here he asks the Government to forbid the union to bargain for a vital right; one sometimes important to its existence.

(Your question No. 15)

"15. Do you believe foremen and other supervisors could properly perform their management duties of serving the balanced best interests of employees, customers, and owners alike, if the bargaining for supervisors by unions should be included in the labor laws?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

I agree the foremen should not be permitted to belong to the production workers' union. But beyond that let's examine the point.

You speak of the foreman's obligation and loyalty to management. In that you are right. But is the foreman's contract of employment dictated by his and the company's loyalty to each other? Or is it a case of getting down to "the captain and the cook" where arms-length bargaining takes place? Remember there is just one company.

1. In your plant, how many foremen are there?

2. Doesn't one foreman loom pretty small across the bargaining table from General Electric?

(Your question No. 5)

"5. Should labor laws provide that an employer cannot deduct union dues or assessments from wages unless the employee gives his personal O. K.?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Now we find the employer again advocating something he says will protect the worker, his employee. But coincidentally that proffered protection, if accepted, will also weaken the union. If the union has been selected as the bargaining agent, the workers should support it. Even Senator TAFT agreed to this. But all sorts of devices are invented to discourage membership. Iowa required the wife's written consent. A double shot at an antiunion veto. I am sure many men are honest in advocating such measures. But are they practical?

I am reminded of Justice Brown's comment in 1898 in the case of *Holden* v. *Hardy* (169 U. S. 366). Here the employer contended a Utah law providing an 8-hour day in mines was unconstitutional. The opinion remarked rather dryly:

"It may not be improper to suggest in this connection that although the prosecution in this case was against the employer of labor, who apparently under the statute is the only one liable, his defense is not so much that his right to contract has been infringed upon, but that the act works a peculiar hardship to his employees, whose right to labor as long as they please is alleged to be thereby violated. The argument would certainly come with better grace and greater cogency from the latter class."

I recognize abuses in the use of union funds. They are discussed under the last heading.

(Your question No. 9)

"9. Do you believe that labor laws should require both union officials and company officials to swear they are not Communists or Fascists or members of any party or organization which plans to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Again, your question is misleading if it is meant to sustain the Taft-Hartley law, inadvertently so, I am sure. The Taft-Hartley law does not require officials (union or corporate) to swear they are not anything. It denies legal remedies to the union if its officers do not swear they are not Communists or subversive.

Of course, one is expected, from a political viewpoint, to support that section. It bears the label anti-Communist. But I'll risk castigation to examine the provision and its effect.

What is the result of a union officer's failure to so swear. The employer can engage in unfair-labor practice with impunity. The union can't get its case of unfair-labor practices or question of representation before the National Labor Relations Board.

Strange, is it not, that in every provision, said to be designed to protect the worker and to prescribe patriotism and honesty, somehow, by practical application, the employer stands to benefit. As in the case of the financial report, not one provision of the Taft-Hartley Act affords any remedy to the union member who demands an explanation of the prescribed financial report, to protect his rights against a dictatorial labor official except to forsake his union. No provision for democratic government (by which to oust Communists and dictators in the American way) or a look at the books (without fear of capricious expulsion) if the union official is dishonest and all powerful in the union.

Recently, J. Mack Swigert (author of Saturday Evening Post articles, October 25, 1947, The Taft-Hartley law: Does it really hurt labor? and October 30, 1948, Should we repeal the Taft-Hartley law?) and I debated the Taft-Hartley law before the Indiana State Bar Association. He said (and wrote) that if international union officials didn't swear to anti-Communist affidavits, or thus qualify, the locals could secede. Brilliant idea, but wrong on two counts: First, legally a local cannot secede if the union constitution prohibits such, as they all do. (*Martin* v. *Smith* ((1934) 286 Mass. 227); *Harris ex rel. Carpenters' Union No. 2573 of Marshfield, Oreg., Lumber and Sawmill Workers* v. *Beckman* ((1939) 160 Oreg. 520, 36 P. (2d) 456); *M and M Wood Working Co. (and Plywood & Veneer Workers' Union)* v. *N. L. R. B.* ((*C. C. A. 9th, 1939*) 101 F. (2d) 938); *Winnetka Trust & Savings Bank* v. *Practical Refrigerating Engineers' Ass'n.* ((1944) 322 Ill. App. 154, 54 N. E. (2d) 253); *Local No. 2618 of the Plywood and Veneer Workers of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America* v. *Taylor* ((1938) 197 Wash. 515, 85 P. (2d) 1116); *Local No. 2508, Lumber and Sawmill Workers* v. *Cairns* ((1938) 197 Wash. 478, 85 P. (2d) 1109); Dangell and Shriber, the Law of Labor Unions (1941) 257; *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen* v. *Williams* ((1925) 211 Ky. 638, 277 S. W. 500).) And I think this is sound law. I prefer to cleanse and preserve, not destroy unions.

Secondly, the thought of secession illustrates the philosophy of the Taft-Hartley law. Every child that has read American history knows secession means destruction of the union.

(Your question No. 10)

"10. Do you believe labor laws should require unions to make appropriate reports to members and Government as to handling of funds—just as companies are required to

make appropriate reports to owners and Government?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Here is a question very dear to my heart. I tried to get Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress to sponsor such legislation. I tried again in the Eightieth and with failure.

The Taft-Hartley law only adds the financial report as an added impediment to the union in presenting its bargaining claims to the employer and in prosecuting unfair labor practices.

Furnishing a financial report means nothing unless the examiner can also look at the books. Taft-Hartley does not provide the right to look at the books. Of course, we know this is inherent. But in practice how does it work?

Taft-Hartley does not provide a remedy if the worker is expelled for demanding a look at the books, or for any other reason, for that matter. I can cite you a local union president who announced he would demand, as a delegate to the international convention, an explanation of the following item in an international treasury report:

"Special organizing, $1,101,025.03." That's all!

He said he would ask who got the money and what the union got in return for it. A fair question, I would think. Wouldn't you? He was expelled before he ever reached the convention floor. I successfully prosecuted his case for reinstatement to judgment in the civil courts.

I had also called this case to the attention of Congressman Hartley (March 12, 1947). Mr. Hartley answered me 7 months later, October 7, 1947. He wrote that the Taft-Hartley bill was now law and the man should file a complaint with the "Labor Board." I immediately wrote back and asked Mr. Hartley to inform me what section or provision of the Taft-Hartley law afforded this man any remedy. Mr. Hartley never answered that question, dated 16 months ago. Can you give me the information? I have been unable to find where the law provided a remedy. It only immunizes the employer, in case of the failure to furnish a formal report. The union I am talking about always furnished reports which balanced, but there was a large embezzlement, which we proved when we went behind another report. But it took an expensive common law remedy to procure a judgment reinstating the man who had the courage to raise the question. And that judgment is yet ineffective because it is on appeal, almost 3 years after expulsion. This man is entitled to a more efficient and seasonable remedy.

I have seen about all the evils in unions there are to see and I favor remedying them by wholesome legislation, not by destroying the union and immunizing the employer that engages in unfair labor practices.

I would appreciate your comment upon these problems.

(Your question No. 11)

"11. Should labor laws make it clear that a collective-bargaining contract must be honored by both parties? And that each has an equal right to sue the other for breaking the contract?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

J. Mack Swigert, a law partner of Senator TAFT, wrote in the Saturday Evening Post that there had been more nonsense written about this point than any other. Though he was my worthy adversary in a recent debate, I am forced to agree with him. Why? Because a union has always been suable. (See *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering Press* ((1921), 254 U. S. 443); *Laylor* v. *Loewe* ((1915), 235 U. S. 522).)

The truth is the Taft-Hartley law favored the union member in this regard at least. It limited liability to the union treasury, where-as previously the members' own funds or property was subject to levy. Mr. Swigert also pointed this out, and I agree with his conclusion.

I sicken at the utter misunderstanding the public gets from such propaganda that only under Taft-Hartley was the union suable. The facts are many suits are and were generally filed in connection with labor disputes. Few judgments are rendered because when the dispute is settled both sides quit "lawing each other" and go back to work. Not a bad idea.

(Your question No. 14)

"14. Do you believe it should be unlawful for an employee to be prevented from working by the use of violence, force, or intimidation?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Certainly, I agree; and it is unlawful and always has been. I am also against sin. Of course, the same should apply to the employer, who in recent years has been less prone to violence than in the past, and always less prone than the employee. But the employee has never had a complete monopoly on violence, though the employer usually acts by proxy.

The employee, however, lacking economic strength to match the employer, is naturally more prone to use violence as a substitute for economic power. Violence is foolish, ineffective, and wrong; it always has been and should be forbidden to all men.

VI. UNION RESPONSIBILITY TO PUBLIC AND MEMBERS

(Your questions Nos. 6, 17, and 8)

(Your question No. 6)

"6. Do you believe labor laws should see to it that both employers and unions be required to bargain in good faith?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

To this question I can say "Yes" without further comment.

(Your question No. 17)

"17. Should labor laws make clear that both unions and employers can now so affect the public for good or ill that the labor-management relations of both should be regulated equally by law?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Now we are getting to the meat of the question. In my experience with men no difference in basic characteristics has appeared, whether the man was trying to plow a straight furrow in a stumpy field with a balky mule, working at a factory bench, or at the director's table, or perhaps even legislating in Congress; though my experience here is very limited.

In each case the man is trying to better himself, his place in society, perhaps financially; maybe socially, or in political preferment or in the esteem of his fellow creatures, or in all those respects.

But none is divinely anointed by virtue and few are utterly depraved.

Another thing pretty clear is that combinations of men, whether corporate or union, spell power.

Furthermore, Government has but one rightful claim to exist; i. e., to protect its citizens from the unwarranted exercise of power from within or without its borders.

With those indisputable facts understood, how could any man deny that unions as well as corporations should be fairly regulated. The question is the fairness of the legal regulation, and that we in Congress refuse to "rook" one or the other. To avoid doing so we must be on our guard against propaganda emanating from those of greater experience than ours.

Such regulations should be as simple as clarity permits. They should leave as much to individual decency as experience warrants. But a government that fails to recognize the necessity when it exists and cries out for remedy is a static government and has lost all claim to the respect, or if it becomes too lax, to the support of its owners, the citizens.

With that in mind I shall answer your only remaining question.

(Your question No. 8)

"8. Should labor laws protect the employee against unfair practices by unions and management?

"Yes---------- ☒ No---------- ☐"

Of course. No combination should be permitted to crush the individual. But we must, as reasonable men, agree upon what should be unfair labor practices, and be fair in that determination.

Until the Railway Labor Act, I believe legal unfair labor practices were nonexistent. The employee was a pawn, almost an expendable material in the employers' hand. His only defense was unionization. He fought an uphill fight against the "yellow dog contract." Only the Wagner Act fully outlawed the "yellow dog contract." It prohibited the employer from wringing a promise from the employee not to organize. The law finally recognized that the employer's power was so great the worker was forced to sign by duress. Thus, the ancient common law principle of duress was for the first time made applicable to the labor contract. Like the lender who was restrained by usury laws in dealing with the borrower, the employer was restrained in his absolute power by the Wagner Act. For a half century Congress and state legislatures struggled to enact such protective legislation. But the lawmakers were always thwarted by the courts.

Finally the courts recognized the evils.

In the meantime, unions had struggled to some positions of power in some crafts. Then their power increased. Their power was not, and never has been (generally speaking), equal to the power of the employer. Wealth is power. No one knows that better than you. When people speak and write of the amassed wealth of unions, they think in terms of their own personal holdings, not in the terms of corporations having more assets and employees than there are wealth and population in many States. Statistics disclose that the combined treasuries of all international unions is about a quarter of a billion dollars. This is but a minor fraction of the wealth of any one of several corporations—one thirty-second the value of American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and but one-fourth of your own company, General Electric.

However, the union's wealth and prestige are tremendous when applied to the individual, or individuals, in one local. Some union officials have wantonly abused this power of wealth and position, and such abuses affect the working terms and conditions of their members and their fellow men of the same trade.

The Taft-Hartley law regulated, not the use, misuse, or abuse of this power, as directed against these individuals, but curbed that power as it was pitted against the greater power of the employer for the benefit of the individual member.

Taft-Hartley proponents have inveighed against the closed shop. But I challenge the closed union, from which stems much of the abuse. California has, by common law, decided that it is tortious to deny membership in a union which controls work in a craft or area. Thus the single front in collective bargaining is preserved; but the worker is not denied membership necessary to a job and protection on the job.

I have heretofore, and will again in the Labor Committee, advocate legislation to prescribe that union officers be elected in fair elections; to prohibit an international

officer from making a local captive and handling all its funds and negotiations, and concluding its contracts without submission of terms to a vote.

I suspect, Mr. Wilson, that you have not had experience with this particular type of abuse. But I have seen men in a captive local union working alongside men in a free local for 25 percent less wages. I won't say why it occurred that way. The fact that it occurred is enough. And when democracy was reestablished, the inequities ceased.

I have seen men expelled because they demanded decency in the union they needed and supported, and without effective remedy, Taft-Hartley claims notwithstanding; and Taft-Hartley remedies all the while nonexistent. Yet it was held up as a bill of rights for labor.

I have talked to union men, leaders, if you please, in as high a rank as president of internationals, all agreeing that remedies in these matters are long overdue. But they mortally fear any legislative move in this direction because they are upon them would help us more than a million questions that the architects of the Taft-Hartley gimmicks seized to justify their provisions; provisions which do not strengthen nor sustain decency, democracy, or justice in the unions; but which add further burdens to break them down. The workers in those few unions that abuse democratic processes would welcome legislation affording remedies. But they don't want their union destroyed.

I know that many honest and sincere union leaders would welcome legislation, fairly designed, to provide:

1. Secret elections in local unions; including delegates to national or international conventions.

2. A remedy for fraud or duress in such elections.

3. A right for any member or body to look at or audit any of the union books.

4. Provisions regulating seizure and holding of captive locals; allowing only reasonable discipline of locals and members.

5. Remedies for capricious and fraudulent imposition of heavy penalties and prohibition against violation of the principles of due process of law generally.

Incidentally, all these rules are now the law of the land by common law. But the remedy is expensive, slow, and generally ineffective. A worker hasn't the means to pursue these remedies, nor to sustain himself while he waits for them. They should be codified and the remedy made more accessible to a man of moderate means.

For emphasis, let me repeat, Taft-Hartley set its provisions against the union leaders who stood stanchly for their members' rights in bargaining with a usually stronger entity, the employer. It ignored, in all practical respects, the abuses of the union leader who oppressed his own members.

I sincerely hope both these errors will be corrected.

In closing, I wish to say to you, Mr. Wilson, that the problems upon which your questions are predicated are not as clear as those questions are transparent to one with a mite of experience. I doubt if you prepared them, or possibly comprehended their import and the mischief their leading effect might have. That they might mislead the people (since they were printed in daily newspapers) is obvious. And that they might affect Congress is possible. Hence, your responsibility in this regard is tremendous. It has been said that to whom much is given, of him much is expected. Therefore, I invite you to give us in Congress some broader and well-reasoned comment upon the subjects concerning which I have inquired.

None of us can know too much, even in that area of the broad field of legislation assigned to our committee, and even in that area we "fear a doubt as wrong."

For my part, I feel I know a little (yet far too little) about the subject of this letter. But (and you may find it difficult to believe this), I had no burning ambition to be a Congressman. And I believe I would not have sought the office had it not been for my interest in this subject, and a desire to help construct some fair legislation in the place of what I knew was unfair. That I am going to try. In so doing, I will probably incur enmity of some folks on both sides. Perhaps that will be the best proof that I am doing the right thing.

But in trying, I and my associates would be heartened by a more objective approach by men of your position and standing than by broadsiding us with a meaningless, or at least confusing, questionnaire ballot barrage. They are balanced by mail from the other side. You can't estimate logic by weighing your mail, or counting induced pros and cons.

One good logical letter, outlining facts, and pointing to specific and fair remedies, marked by persons obviously confused by leading questions of great cleverness.

I trust you will accept this letter in the spirit intended and give me the benefit of your considered judgment upon these several matters.

Most sincerely yours,

ANDREW JACOBS.

Two More States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of February 19, 1949:

TWO MORE STATES

In a few more weeks Congress again will take up the question of granting statehood to Hawaii and Alaska. Hearings on the proposals will probably be held before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.

We believe the Senator should give a sympathetic ear to requests from the people in our two Territories so they may take their place shoulder to shoulder with the residents of our 48 States.

At this time in our history, when national life is threatened by communism, the most terrible foe it has ever faced, we need to bind our outposts as closely to the Union as possible.

The mere fact that the two Territories are not a part of the continental land mass of this country is not a valid argument against counting them in. We have to protect them anyway, whether they are a State or Territory.

Remember, Hawaii was the starting point of the last war and Alaska looks like the place the next war is going to start, if it does.

NOT FAR AWAY

And neither of the places is so far away now that we are in the air age. Just a couple of weeks ago the Air Force flew from Fort Worth, Tex., to Hawaii in a few hours and the trip to Fairbanks from our northern cities is just as short.

In the past, when statehood proposals for Hawaii and Alaska were brought up in Congress, there was some hollering that we shouldn't increase the number of the States. There's no magic in 48.

The country began with 13 colonies and advanced up to the 48 States as the people living on the land asked for a chance to live under our constitutional government. We've only been 48 States for 37 years.

Oklahoma entered the Union February 16, 1907. New Mexico joined January 16, 1912, and Arizona, the last one to come in, became a part of the Union February 14, 1912.

ALASKA WAS PURCHASED

Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867 but little was done to develop it until gold was discovered 30 years later. The boundary dispute with Canada was settled in 1909 and, strangely enough, Alaska was given territorial status in 1912, the same year that New Mexico and Arizona became States.

Hawaii became a Territory of the United States in 1900 and time after time since then attempts have been made to turn it into a State. Alaska is the outpost in our defense against attacks from the north. Hawaii is our outpost against attacks in the Pacific.

Each of the Territories is rich in natural resources. The sugarcane crop on the Hawaiian Islands amounts to approximately $65,000,000 a year. The pineapple crop amounts to about $60,000,000 annually.

Besides gold, Alaska is rich in other minerals, in oil, in lumber, in fish and furs. Its swift rivers make available vast water power for industrial expansion. It is a land much more valuable than the people in this country thought when the purchase was made. And now the Russians would like to have it back and are making all kinds of passes at it.

This country has prospered and become stronger as it grew to the 48 States that now make up the Union. It would be stronger and more prosperous with 50, or 60.

OTHERS WOULD LIKE TO JOIN

To look ahead a little further, it is not at all improbable that we will soon be receiving requests from peoples in all parts of the world to be allowed to join our Government. For ours is the oldest constitutional government on this globe. It has survived and grown because it teaches its citizens to balance liberty and responsibility.

This Government is now the only hope of many of the smaller nations whose feeble governments are facing complete obliteration at the hands of the Russians.

So, you might as well get used to the idea of expansion over and above our continental limits. We ought to start right now taking in the two Territories.

And, while Congress is busy at this problem, might we also suggest it ought to do something about giving the people in the District of Columbia a voice in the National Government. The District is in the heart of the Nation. It is the heart of the Nation. Why not give us representation in Congress and a right to vote for President?

The High Cost of Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Item has hit the nail on the

head in the editorial which it entitles "The High Cost of Winning."

It is a timely editorial.

It is an editorial which should be read before and not after campaigns.

Too often some political candidates seem to stand on Olympus and the voters, who will not take the trouble to look, fail to notice that despite their apparent lofty position, their feet are in the clay below.

I know it might be asking too much for the American people to evaluate the difference between promise and performance and it perhaps would be asking just that much more for them to pause and look at the record before making a decision on candidates, but at least we can hope.

Anybody can criticize, but few can accomplish.

As a member of the Eightieth Congress I refuse to believe that the Eightieth Congress was as black as it has been painted by some individuals merely for the sake of getting votes. I remember that the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, of which I was also a Member were likewise lambasted as rubber-stamp Congresses by a minority party which, too, was also interested in getting votes and not in the facts.

It seems to be that more action and less talking would be in order.

My very good friend and a most able newspaperman, Herman B. Deutsch, of the New Orleans Item, is the author of this editorial which merits your attention:

THE HIGH COST OF WINNING

President Truman is now learning something that, soon or late, is brought home to every winner: The cost of victory is nearly as great as that of defeat. It was one thing to say, in the thrilling days of campaign oratory, that the Republicans who opposed him were promising to do next year what "the Republican Congress could accomplish in 15 days right now, if it wanted to." As titular head of a minority party, though still in office, it was wonderful to charge the Republican majority in Congress with responsibility for all the things Candidate Truman was assailing in order to win votes.

"They could do it in 15 days"—if they wanted to, if they weren't "the worst Congress in the country's history," if they weren't simply trying at all costs to discredit the Truman candidacy, if they weren't so intent on baying the red-herring trail, if they weren't determined to keep the Taft-Hartley law on the books, etc., etc., etc. Repetition made it a familiar refrain—all the things a Republican Congress could do in 15 days according to the Harry Truman who was running for the Presidency last September and October.

The new Congress has been in office not 15 days, but 45. It has been in session since January 3. Its Democratic majority is far heavier than was that held by the Republicans during the past 2 years. And where is the legislative program Candidate Truman insisted the Congress could enact within 15 days—if it wanted to?

The tax legislation he demanded is not yet written. Taft-Hartley repeal is not even well on the way out of committee. The longer it stays there the more it becomes obvious that, like the wedding in an old-fashioned melodrama, it will be a repeal in name only; that its major features are likely to be maintained in full force and effect. The President's call for price-control legislation is puffing and panting and straining to catch up to the price drop which Messrs. Truman and Brannan still insist can only be brought about by Government controls.

We have no quarrel with the delay. On the contrary, we think those Members of Congress, in either House, who insist on thoughtful evaluation of the President's proposals instead of the push-button procedure inherent in the precipitate action he advocated last fall are entitled to a hearty vote of commendation.

This applies especially to any reckless hiking in taxes, and Government spending in general. It also applies to broad-scale tinkering with the Taft-Hartley Act, under the delusive and often disproved notion that the President is fully capable of handling any situation that might arise in industries affecting public health, safety, and general welfare.

In calling attention to the difference between a candidate's stump speeches and an officeholder's performance we merely seek to underline this interesting conjunction of facts: In 45 days President Truman's administration has not even made a good start on what Candidate Truman insisted the Republicans could finish in 15. Mr. Truman, in short, is learning—the hard way—about the cost of victory.

Surgeon General Praises State's Health Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

SURGEON GENERAL PRAISES STATE'S HEALTH SERVICES—SCHEELE SPEAKS AT DINNER MEETING OF SECOND DISTRICT MEDICAL SOCIETY

KINSTON, February 1[illegible].—Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, United States Surgeon General, in an address before the second district of the North Carolina Medical Society, Wednesday, pointed to North Carolina as the foremost State in the Union in the establishment of public-health service.

He stated that Edgecombe County was the first to offer the cooperative Federal-State and local service in America. Dr. J. W. Norton, State health officer, presented the speaker.

Guests included Dr. J. F. Robertson, of Wilmington, State society president, who spoke briefly; Dr. John A. Ferrell, of Raleigh, executive secretary of the State Medical Care Commission; and others. Dr. Floyd Woodten, of Kinston, retiring district president, recognized guests. Dr. Rachel Davis, of Kinston, is retiring district secretary and she arranged the program. Dr. H. Fleming Fuller, president of the Lenoir County Medical Society, was toastmaster. New district officers are Dr. Sam Thompson, of Morehead City, president, and Dr. L. W. Moore, of Beaufort, secretary. The 1950 session will be at Morehead City.

LAUDS LEADERS

In his prepared address, Dr. Scheele paid tribute to North Carolina's health leaders, past and present, and cited statistics showing the present ratio of medical and hospital facilities to the needs of the people over the Nation. He said there are about 880,000 acceptable hospital beds in the country and a recent survey shows 897,527 more beds are needed. In North Carolina the ratio, even with current expansions in progess, is somewhat worse. There are approximately 20,000 beds now available to 3,500,000 people while 26,550 more are needed and the 21 hospital projects that have been approved will provide only 1,300 of that number, Dr. Scheele observed. He stated that North Carolina is one of 8 States furnishing State aid in hospital expansion under the Hill-Burton Federal aid program while only 11 States have applied for aid.

Dr. Scheele stated that in 1948 this State received $148,526 in 18 Federal aid grants which went for medical research. There were 14 to Duke University, 1 to University of North Carolina, 1 to Wake Forest, and 2 to the State tuberculosis sanatorium. He commended the plan to set up a 4-year medical college at Carolina stating it would make possible the provision of adequate doctors and nurses for the State's far-reaching medical care program.

Dr. Scheele did not commit himself on the controversial Ewing bill for Federal health insurance but stated in response to a question that the State medical care program, with some exceptions, dovetails with the Federal program. Dr. Robertson gave an interesting review of the North Carolina program in his remarks. About 100 doctors over the second district attended the supper program and a number participated in the question and answer forum which followed Dr. Scheele's address.

Address by Hon. Irving M. Ives, of New York, Before Michigan Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Republican Opposition," delivered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] before the Michigan Republican State Convention at Grand Rapids, Mich., on February 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The honor and privilege accorded me by your invitation to participate on this significant occasion are greatly appreciated. I term this occasion significant advisedly.

It marks the first important official Republican gathering since the fateful Republican reversal of last November 2. It takes place in one of the great States of the Union, where dynamic Republicanism is still alive and on the march. It takes place in a State which is represented in the United States Senate by two outstanding leaders in Republican thought and action, my two distinguished friends and colleagues, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON. It takes place in the native State of him who is the great governor of my own State of New York, my very good friend and your former neighbor, Thomas E. Dewey. It takes place at a time when the fate of the Republican Party literally is hanging in the balance.

This is no time for recrimination and backbiting—let those things end with Omaha.

This is no time for post mortems and inquests—we have had enough of them since the last election. This is no time for discussing any possible need for new major parties or new party alinements—such discussion can only waste precious opportunity and prove barren of results. This is no time for retreat or surrender by the Republican Party—that way leads to disaster for the country and the snuffing out of freedom everywhere.

It may have its faults; it may be divided; but however great its faults or serious its divisions, the Republican Party must be preserved. Only by its preservation can our two-party system be saved and only in this way can the American people be protected from the evil consequence of one-party government, which has overtaken other free peoples of the world.

And I say to you today, my fellow Republicans, our party can and will be preserved because you and I and millions of other Republicans in America are determined that it shall be preserved. We are determined that it shall play the great role in the future of our country which the course of events has demanded and will demand that it play. We are determined that in the exigency of the moment it shall provide an opposition at once creative and constructive, an opposition not solely to oppose, but mainly to propose, an opposition which by promise and performance will deserve and receive the overwhelming confidence of the American people.

Now, all this can and will be achieved if the Republican Party will recognize conditions as they are and will pursue a course in line with realities. It seems to me that we, as Republicans, need reorientation; we need to place first things first; we need, at the outset, to revive our party's basic principles; then we need to apply these principles to the society in which we live.

Ours is a party of great tradition. It came into being at the time of our gravest national crisis. It met that crisis victoriously and opened the way for the greatest advancement and achievement in our Nation's history. A large share of our national progress has been the result of Republican policy and Republican success. Much of the enlightened legislation which has been enacted in the last 90 years has been of Republican origin.

And ours has been the party which has cherished and defended the Constitution. Believing in the Constitution as the final protector of liberty, we have sought to defend it against the apostles of usurpation and other evangelists of a new order, who have held it in contempt. We have insisted that ours is a government of law and not of men, recognizing that a government of men brings despotism. We have sought to achieve and have achieved progress within the framework of the Constitution. We have known that, without the Constitution or with the Constitution ignored, no progress is possible and liberty is dead.

And yet, in spite of worthy heritage and splendid earlier record, our party now finds itself sorely pressed, with Republicans divided among themselves. This present low Republican estate is something for which Republicans have not been primarily responsible, although for its persistent continuation Republicans have been largely to blame. World conditions, over which none of us could have had control, caught our party off balance and unsuspecting—and pitched us headlong into our present plight. We are still in the political doghouse because too many of our number do not appreciate the problem before us or, appreciating it, are unwilling to take steps which are necessary for its solution.

So it is we are having conflicts within our ranks over the course we should follow. So it is we are told the issue for us is the choice between conservatism and liberalism. So it is that many among us are bewildered about their status for nearly every so-called conservative protests that at heart he is a "liberal" and nearly every so-called liberal asserts that fundamentally he is conservative.

In this connection I urge that we forget the terms "conservative" and "liberal" and try to be realistic in our appraisal of the situation in which we find ourselves. Let us remember our party's great tradition and be ever mindful of its historic devotion to the Constitution. Let us discover where this tradition and this devotion can be made to apply in meeting present-day needs and in solving present-day problems. Let us make of our party the flexible instrument for promoting the general welfare which it must be if it is to endure. Without sacrificing principle, let us again champion the cause of the ordinary man because only by strict adherence to principle can the ordinary man in America be saved from a doom with which he is menaced by the uncontrolled force of the social and economic revolution that is now gripping the world.

When this revolution began is unimportant. There is evidence that it was under way before the close of the last century. Some say it is a continuation of the industrial revolution. Some call it an aftermath of or sequel to the industrial revolution. Whatever its origin, its form is unmistakable.

It is the upsurge of the ordinary man to seize his place in the sun. It has been a part of or has followed his struggle to be free.

Now, this ordinary man is generally a mighty fine fellow. He is any one of us. Among his number are included the common man of Henry Wallace—and the economic royalist of early New Deal days—and even the "uncommon man" to whom reference was recently made by that great American and our beloved former President, Herbert Hoover.

For the most part, the ordinary man demands personal freedom, equality of opportunity, a decent standard of living for himself and his family, an adequate education for his children, and protection against economic insecurity because of unemployment and sickness and disability and old age.

In his upsurge the ordinary man has pressed along different paths in different countries and in different parts of the world. He hasn't always been prudent in his decisions; sometimes he has followed false gods and sold his birthright of freedom for a mess of pottage; too often until too late, he has traded his freedom for security, failing to realize that security without freedom is worse than insecurity.

Evidences of the present revolution are everywhere. In fact, all human life today is affected directly or indirectly by it.

Communism in Russia, nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy—these phenomena have been a part of the revolution. World Wars I and II were violent explosions which it produced. It has assumed a more recent form in the Socialist Government of Great Britain. Analysis will show it is basic in today's crisis in China. Ominous rumblings are already heard in India. Even in South America there appears to be a seething undercurrent which threatens the peace and stability of all Latin America.

Here in the United States we are experiencing the same revolution. When it began with us is uncertain, but our economic collapse at the end of the 1920's and the resultant depression in the 1930's quickened its pace. More than anything else, it is responsible for five successive New Deal administrations in Washington, from which we Republicans have been the chief sufferers. As a result of prolonged and continuous one-party control in this country, all opposition is now threatened with extinction, and the American people are threatened with the unhappy fate which has overtaken other free peoples of the world.

I do not make this statement as a Republican who is unmindful of Republican shortcomings. Neither do I make it in criticism of the ordinary man. I am in full sympathy with the ordinary man in his hopes and desires and demands. Rather do I seek to emphasize our party's responsibility for his welfare.

If the present revolution has shown one thing above all else, it has revealed that the ordinary man has not yet demonstrated an ability so to govern himself that he can obtain security and freedom at the same time. Not comprehending that collectively, while free, he is the government, he has saddled upon it burdens which have been more than he or it could bear. The consequence has been collapse, disaster, and slavery for himself when, in desperation, he has succumbed finally to the wiles of some demagogue and tyrant.

So today in the United States this same kind of danger confronts us. Here, too, there has been and is a tendency to place an ever greater burden on government and an ever greater responsibility in government. Here, also, in seeking objectives which separately and individually are wholly legitimate, the ordinary man may overload his government through thoughtlessness and selfishness to the point of catastrophe. And it is right here that I most severely condemn the New Deal through all its administrations since 1932.

Instead of warning the ordinary man of his grave danger in asking too much of government, the New Deal has encouraged him to demand more and more of government. It has promised everything to everybody everywhere. In effect, it has treated the ordinary man as a commodity to be bought and sold on a political auction block. It has failed to meet a basic obligation of a major political party in the great American tradition.

"Oh," someone will say, "what difference does it make? The New Deal will not deliver on its promises because it can't deliver on them, and everybody knows it can't." Well, if such is the case, the New Deal is all the more culpable, for it has added trickery and deceit to an already impressive list of derelictions.

And right here is where we Republicans must meet our test. With us it cannot be a question of "outdealing the New Deal" or of "Me, too; only I can do it better." This course leads to the Nation's destruction just as surely as that on which the New Deal is now embarked.

Neither with us is it a matter of denying to the ordinary man his right to achieve the objectives he is seeking. Assuming he cherishes his freedom and wants to preserve it—and I am sure this is still a fundamental desire among most Americans—our problem is how to help him obtain the things he demands, including the greatest possible economic security, without further jeopardizing his freedom.

How great a load can a free government carry without breaking down? Where is the point in Government control beyond which our free economy will cease to be free? At what point in his demand on Government will the ordinary man lose his personal freedom? And with respect to any of these questions, have we yet reached or passed the danger point?

The situation is made far more difficult because of Soviet Russia's evident intent to conquer the world and to destroy all religion. Capitalizing on the revolution of the ordinary man, the Communist leaders of Russia, wherever possible, have tricked and bludgeoned him into slavery to serve their own diabolical ends. Taking advantage of the inexcusable opportunity afforded them by the betrayal of the ordinary man at Tehran and Yalta and Potsdam, these leaders have engaged our Nation in the "cold war," upon the outcome of which may rest our survival.

To meet the Communist menace, to find the answers to the questions I have posed—these are primary obligations of both major political parties, and they are of particular concern to the Republican Party. Only by recognizing and accepting the preponderant mandate of the people themselves can we Republicans provide the creative approach to the solution to these grave problems which is essential to achievement. Moreover, only by showing that our chief interest is in the welfare of the ordinary man can we win the support of the ordinary man.

Somehow, over the years, we Republicans have acquired the reputation of being champions of big business and of the vested and special interests. This has come about, at least in part, because we are champions of the free competitve-enterprise system, by which our country has largely attained its greatness. We do believe in property rights as well as in human rights, because, without property rights, human rights are illusory and nonexistent. Too often we have neglected to point out that only through our free competitive-enterprise system can we safeguard our other basic freedoms, including the freedom and right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively. We have been so occupied in striving to help preserve these freedoms that we have failed to give proper heed to the misrepresentations and distortions which have been aimed at our activities by our political opponents. Unfortunately, it is true, we have been sometimes negligent in fulfilling platform promises.

So today I urge, most of all, that we stand solidly by our party platform adopted last June in Philadelphia. I urge that we strive to keep the pledges in that platform. I urge that we honor our given word as formally expressed in convention assembled.

This is neither the time nor the place for a review of that platform. Suffice it to state that in it all the important questions and issues and problems now facing our country and the world are comprehended and covered. It provides a guide and chart for the Republican Party by which to revive and carry on our great tradition in meeting adequately, and within the limitations of free government, the needs and demands of the ordinary man. It offers a plan and program for our party's revitalization.

Thus we Republicans in the Congress can provide the answers to the challenge which circumstance has forced upon us and we can parry the New Deal threat to our free society. Thus we can resolve our differences and reach agreement by way of the lowest common denominator in every controversial issue before us.

In this way we can favor a social-security system in our country which is comprehensive, adequate, and sound—without socializing American industry; we can favor a uniformly high quality and standard of education throughout America—without Federal interference or control; we can favor slum clearance and public housing—without a Government program which would drive private industry from the housing field; we can favor an effective over-all public health program—without socialized medicine; we can favor price supports for farm commodities, which will insure our agriculture against depression and will help to stabilize our economy—without throwing our economy out of balance through inequitable and excessive subsidization; we can favor new undertakings and projects in reclamation, conservation, flood control, water power development, and rural electrification—without destroying private initiative and incentive, but rather with the assurance of increased opportunity for private initiative and incentive. All these things, and more, we can support through so moderate an approach that our national solvency will be protected and our free economy will be benefited.

In the broad area of human relations, however, let us refrain from partisanship just as far as the New Deal will permit us to do so. This is one area where partisan politics can cause only trouble for our country.

It seems to me, for instance, most unfortunate that in our foreign relations the administration appears now to insist on going it alone, although our party's obligation to cooperate beyond the water's edge must nevertheless continue in the face of grave emergency. It becomes no less our duty, therefore, to hold the administration to strict accountability in its conduct of international relations.

Again, in the field of labor relations, let us strive for objective consideration of legislation—in spite of the fact that the President and his New Deal colleagues would use labor relations as a political football. No good can come to an individual or party that seeks to take partisan advantage of the relationship between workers, employers, and the public. By this callous attitude toward so delicate and technical and vital a subject, the country can only suffer injury.

Furthermore, let there be no partisan controversy over civil rights. Happily the platforms of the two major parties are largely in agreement at least on this part of the area of human relations.

Discrimination in employment, for example, denies the principle of equality of opportunity and makes a mockery of our pious boasting about our American way of life. There is no room in America for second-class citizenship; either we are united in ideals and purpose and example, or ours is a Union in name only, torn by resentment and dissension among heterogeneous minorities in conflict with whatever majority may be in the ascendancy at the moment. To those of us—Republicans and New Dealers alike—who constitute the immediate over-all majority is given the task of translating our lofty ideals and principles into a living reality.

By and large, however, we Republicans do, and must inevitably, differ with the New Deal on either principle or method. Where these differences are over method, we must offer sound alternatives as I have indicated, and we must be so right in our proposals that we shall be supported by strong public opinion. Where we may disagree on principle, as evidenced by our opposition to the proposed socialization of the steel industry, we must fight the New Deal to the limit, leaving no stone unturned in an all-out effort to obtain overwhelming public support and to convince the ordinary man that our battle is his battle.

Most of all, we must have cohesion and unity in our own ranks. United in determination and effort, scorning personal advantage, obsessed with a common desire to help make the Republican Party the kind of powerful, creative opposition it must be for its own sake and for the sake of the Nation, we can recapture for our party the confidence of the American people. We can assure for the Republican Party victory this year and in 1950 and 1952.

The Right to Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, this House will soon have to make a decision in connection with revision or amendment of the so-called Taft-Hartley Labor Relations Act.

One of the most controversial problems is the so-called closed shop.

My attention has been called in this connection to an article written by Mr. George Rose in the American Bar Association Journal, which seems to me to be most persuasive.

Mr. Rose speaks and writes with authority. He is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania and practiced law in the District of Columbia. At one time he was a trial attorney for the National Labor Relations Board and since 1939 has been in private practice in Indianapolis, specializing in labor law.

He is so right in entitling the article: "The Right to Work—It Must Be Supreme Over Union Security."

In these times when so many of us prate about liberty and freedom and bellow forth with the full power of our lungs about the civil rights of the individual but who advocate legislation which would curb that very liberty and freedom through many devious legislative protections, we could gain much by reading this article.

It is of more than passing interest and cognizance that those individuals and organizations loudest in their cries for "equal rights" and denouncements of discrimination "because of race, color or creed" are making even more noise for the kind of legislation which will deprive an individual of the right which is akin to life itself, the right to work. In their book it would seem that it is all wrong to discriminate against an individual because of "race, color or creed," but it is not wrong to discriminate because of labor union affiliation. It does not make sense to me.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when such individuals and organizations shed crocodile tears and bleed so profusely from hearts supposedly overburdened with the welfare of their fellowmen, that we should scrutinize them closely and minutely and evaluate them for their real and true sincerity—or lack of it.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that any man has the right not to work if he doesn't care to work. By the same token I believe that no man has the right to prevent any other man from working who desires to work. That is fundamental under a Constitution which guarantees to each and every individual the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

I believe in labor unions. I don't believe the laboring man has a chance of effective bargaining except through organization. My belief and advocacy of labor unions, however, does not transcend the right of the individual to his freedom of speech, his freedom of movement and his freedom to work whenever and wherever he can get a job.

I cannot reconcile the attitude of the so-called "liberals" who, out of one side of their mouths scream in anguish for so-called civil-rights legislation to guarantee full protection to individuals regardless of "race, color and creed" and who, out of the other corner of their big mouths, plead for a law which would deprive an individual of the right to work in order to provide the necessities of life for himself and his family.

Mr. Rose, however, says all this far better than I can.

Here is Mr. Rose's article:

THE RIGHT TO WORK

In all cases of conflicting rights we must determine by a delicate balancing which right must prevail. At one time it may be the right of the individual that will be paramount, while at another, it is the right of the group or the community. It must be this way, lest the individual become submerged in the mass, or we lose the group in an anarchy of individual claims. Neither extreme represents the democracy which we have known.

Before us we have a very vital question: the controversy relative to the individual's right to work, regardless of membership in the majority union, and the right of the union to force the employee to join the union, if he wishes to work. It is especially timely to consider this, in view of the cases decided January 3 by the United States Supreme Court, arising under State laws banning union security. Which right is more important in this extremely elemental situation, and which is entitled to the precedence?

Let us look at it from different angles. Is the individual merely being stubborn and anti-group-minded in not joining the union, and in failing to unite with his fellows for the betterment of all, if there is no principle at stake? Or is he actuated by principle? Is the group seeking a justifiable control over all the employees, in order to secure better performance of their agreements, or is it striving for a domination over all the employees, which is unnecessary for the protection of the rights of the group, and is an unwarranted interference in the rights of the individual?

When the community considers it essential to have all persons attending school vaccinated, the opinions of a contrary minority must yield to the considered determination of the majority that vaccination is necessary to the protection of the health of the whole community. The Supreme Court pointed out that "real liberty for all could not exist under the operation of a principle which recognizes the right of each individual person to use his own, regardless of the injury which may be done to others."

Under this principle the union claims that the individual must not use his right to the detriment of what it calls the economic health and solidarity of all the employees. However, we must examine what the union is trying to do. It would deprive a man of his essential right to work, without establishing that this solidarity and discipline are a sine qua non of union existence, for the protection of joint rights and the requirements of economic health.

Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, recognizing and enforcing the right of self-determination, which, under this Act, is the right of individuals to form labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining because of the individual's inability to bargain with a corporate employer with any degree of equality.

The right of self-determination would therefore seem to be, not a mere supplanting of the individual right to bargain, but a requirement that individuals unite to bargain, if a majority desire it. In other words, it is a reinforcing by merger of the individual rights of the members of the group, because of their separate ineffectiveness, and giving this group action paramountcy.

The union contends that without union security self-organization is similarly ineffective. This argument appears erroneous from the experience of unions. Without union security, the union is denied great power, which has at times meant arbitrary power, but it is neither requisite to the purpose of the union and its agency, nor is it a privilege to which the union is entitled on its merits.

The right to self-organization is founded upon the right of a man to work and pursue a calling, for it is the uniting of fellow workers for their economic betterment. In upholding the constitutionality of the act, the Supreme Court described it as a "fundamental right," giving "employees * * * as clear a right to organize and select their representatives for lawful purposes as" a corporation has. In providing for collective bargaining the act assumes the existence of the right to work, since the representatives are to bargain as to "rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment." To reason otherwise would be to argue that the right to work arises from the right of self-organization, which is contrary to fact, as the right to work exists regardless of self-organization.

The Supreme Court links this right of self-organization with the right of people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for the redress of grievances. In a democracy all persons must be permitted peaceably to assemble for a lawful purpose either in the advancement of their private interest or of the general interest. The union would identify this right of assembly with the right to union security, as being inseparable, yet unions have notoriously denied their own members the right of assembly with regard to their own union governance, calling it dual unionism. Union security therefore appears suppressive of the right peaceably to assemble, upon which the right of self-organization is based, and consequently it interferes with the right of self-organization, as a continuing right.

While the union emphasizes the right of self-organization, with all its pendant privileges and claims accruing to the union, including union security, it rejects the individual's right to work, which is even more basic, proceeding from the United States Constitution itself. This is a primary right, more essential than any other except the right to life, which are both part and parcel with the right to liberty. If a man cannot choose his calling, business, or trade "as may be best adapted to his faculties," he is being deprived of his liberty. A man must work if he is to live and reap the full advantages of democracy. To be denied the right to work, must condemn him to being a state dependent.

The right to self-organization, as we have pointed out, is a merger of individual rights to bargain, and is correlative with the right to form, join, or assist labor organizations, serving the advantage of the group. If this right of self-organization interferes with or deprives others of the right to work, as the union would have it, then it must yield, because the right to work is primary, while self-organization is secondary.

A superficial consideration of this matter might lead one to conclude that under the National Labor Relations Act, the domain of self-organization includes the right to work, which is the right to be employed. This is rebutted by the Supreme Court which, in discussing the effect of the collective agreement with regard to individual contracts, said: "There is little left to individual agreement except the act of hiring. * * * In the sense of contracts of hiring, individual contracts between the employer and employee are not forbidden, but indeed are necessitated by the collective-bargaining procedure." Therefore the right to work, to obtain employment, has not under the act been amalgamated with the collective agreement, although its terms may regulate employment. Consequently, a group of employees, even though they are a majority of the employees of an employer and desire to make membership in the union an essential requirement of the right to work for that employer, do not have the right and should not have the right to deprive an employee of the primary right to work. This would be repugnant to our ideas of democracy, for as the Supreme Court has said, "the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself."

An attempt is made by the union, in its attack upon this right to work, which it describes as an alleged right to work, to draw an entirely unjustified analogy between the union and the state to support the right of union security. Our national state was established by the people to provide a government of democratic principles, and to give protection to the basic and fundamental rights of persons. The union was not formed to give economic government to its members, but to enable them to bargain more effectively with the employer as to certain economic matters. The idea of economic government came later, when union leaders saw in union security the means of more aggressive control over the members, and better discipline, more comparable to an army than to a government.

The union is the representative and agent of its members, and under the National Labor Relations Act, of all the employees of the employer in the appropriate unit, but it has no right to assume or claim a political authority under the guise of economic rights, which would have the result of barring primary rights to other persons. Such authority would be unconstitutional and presumptuous. To have any validity at all, it must come from the body politic, and not from a small segment, which desires to increase its own power.

It is one thing for the union to represent the employees in a plant and bargain with the employers for the purposes of concluding the conditions of employment; such proper agency cannot be said to exist where the union is no longer acting in such capacity, but seeks to establish an extra-constitutional, a pseudo-political status. In any case, the union is not entitled to oust all employees who will not join the union and keep them from working for that employer or at a trade. But over and beyond this, the employees themselves, whatever form or capacity they assume, do not have the right to do this, as it deprives others of more basic rights than the secondary right of self-organization which they allegedly strive to realize. This is not the case where one individual is trying to use his own liberty regardless of the injury or consequences to others, referred to above, but on the contrary it is an effort by the group to prevent a person from exercising a superior right, the right to gain employment, regardless of union membership.

The claim that this right or liberty, as they would call it, has become an institution seeks to give it an authenticity and authority which is lacking. The fact that the union-security forms have been acquiesced in cannot give them any legal sanction, for no statute of limitations could run against such basic rights of the people. The claim that this right is necessary to give strength and stability to the union is merely to plead expediency and to confess the failure of the union to win democratic support.

Its true analogy is to the totalitarian state. The unions quite naturally have recognized the advantage of universal membership and have resented the rivalry of other organizations, even that of sister unions. However, if such supremacy cannot be attained by democratic methods, with the maintaining of democratic standards, it cannot be recognized. Under the yellow-dog contract the employer has sought by force of the employees' economic necessity to obtain his agreement not to join a union. Likewise,

through the union or closed-shop contract, the union has sought by the same undemocratic methods to compel him to join the union. Both the employer and the union are to be condemned for resorting to such undemocratic practices.

The limitation upon the individual's right to work where he can find a job must lead to the undermining of our democracy. This is only the first step, but the second step, which follows close behind, is the right of the Government to determine where the individual should work, and to shift the employee from job to job. We cannot welcome this possibility, because such regimentation, domination, and interference with the individual's activities must shatter and destroy our highly prized freedom. Consequently, the right to work and to do such acts as the individual may judge best for his interest, consistent with the equal rights of others, must be upheld as being an essential element of that liberty that we claim as our birthright.

Lincoln Day Address at Colorado Springs by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at a Lincoln's Birthday celebration held under the auspices of the Colorado Republican State Central Committee at Colorado Springs, Colo., on February 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate more than I can tell you the great honor of being invited here tonight.

I am sincerely grateful for this opportunity to pay another visit to the great and beautiful State of Colorado.

Colorado represents in full measure the courageous spirit of America. You are rightfully proud of the romantic history of the Old West. You have inherited the pioneer traditions of self-reliance, hard work and thrift.

By your own courage, energy and industry you have built a grand State that looks forward with full confidence to greater progress and increasing prosperity in the years ahead.

It has been my happy privilege to serve as a Member of the Senate Finance Committee under the chairmanship of your able and distinguished United States Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN. He is not only a great Senator but a great American patriot who has given many years of magnificent service to our country as a soldier and as a statesman. His sound judgment and his high sense of public duty are needed in Washington to continue to advance the welfare of our Nation. Colorado is indeed fortunate to be represented in the Senate of the United States by a man of such outstanding ability.

Although we are not of the same political party, I am glad to express my admiration and regard for ED JOHNSON as a public servant of unquestioned integrity and high character. It will be a real pleasure to continue in the Eighty-first Congress the pleasant association which I enjoyed in the last session with GENE MILLIKIN and ED JOHNSON.

We meet tonight to commemorate the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, first Republican President of the United States and one of the outstanding figures of world history.

We honor his memory in praise and gratitude and in reverent recognition of his service to America and mankind.

The glorious story of his life and his steadfast devotion to the Union will everlastingly inspire Americans to greater love of country and more intense allegiance to the principles for which he lived.

More than any other man in American history, Abraham Lincoln knew the real meaning of Americanism. The story of his humble birth and early struggles are known to all. He knew the hardships and suffering of pioneer life on the rough frontier. He experienced defeat, disappointment, and discouragement.

But he never lost faith. He held firmly to faith in himself, faith in the people and faith in God.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic in Lincoln's makeup was his undeviating faith in the capacity of a free people to govern themselves.

He realized that the people might be led astray for a time by false hopes and false promises. But he was firm in his belief that the good judgment of the American people and their love of freedom would lead them, in the end, to the right decisions.

Lincoln did not promise an easy way of life. He did not offer security from the cradle to the grave. He had the courage to stand by what he believed to be right—even though it did not attract votes or popular acclaim. He did not compromise principle for expediency.

Today, as in Lincoln's time, America's greatest need is faith in the fundamental truths that have given our people a greater measure of individual freedom than has been enjoyed by any people since the world began.

As we consider the problems confronting America and the world today, we cannot escape the conclusion that we need a rededication to the principles of Lincoln. We must face the dangers to which we are exposed with the same courage and the same determination to follow the right that brought undying fame to the memory of the Great Emancipator.

Lincoln knew the vital importance of national strength—military strength, material strength, and spiritual strength. He knew that the greatest danger of American freedom was not from outside our borders but lurked within our midst.

He sounded a warning in his famous Cooper Union speech of February 27, 1860, when he said:

"At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

My fellow Americans, if we remember and heed the warning of Abraham Lincoln, America will not die by suicide but will live through all time—a strong, free Nation of free men.

Let me repeat Lincoln's question:

"At what point, then, is the danger to be expected?"

The answer is given in the tragic fate of great nations that have gone down to destruction because they prized so-called security more highly than freedom.

In all history every nation where the people were deceived by promises that the government would supply more and more of their needs, freedom has been swept away by dictatorship, tyranny and misrule.

The history of advancing civilization from ancient times is a record of the struggle of mankind for freedom. Submission to the dictatorship of an all-powerful government in the false hope of security has always resulted in disaster.

Every forward step in human enlightenment, in higher standards of living, and in cultural development, has been achieved when men were spurred on by incentives that brought them a greater share of individual freedom.

The great victories of civilization were not won by men who placed personal safety and security first.

Let us review briefly the record of history.

In its days of glory, Rome enjoyed the highest standard of living then known to mankind. Rome was the center of freedom. As her victorious legions brought western Europe and northern Africa under the rule of the Roman Republic, freedom was extended to her colonies.

Then the leaders of Rome reached out for more power. The Republic became an empire. The people were placed under regimentation and control. At the same time they were assured that they would retain their ancient freedoms. The people were told they needed protection. A planned economy was instituted with absolute control over food, clothing, wages, and many activities of their daily lives.

The people were given the illusion that the paternalistic government, always concerned with their welfare, would confer blessings upon them that they could not achieve for themselves.

A huge bureaucracy was established to carry out the edicts of the central authority. The people gladly accepted the bread and circuses provided by the government. The more the people received the more they expected.

What was the outcome? Taxation rose to unprecedented heights. Initiative was destroyed. Production was crippled in industry and on the farms. Scarcity of food and goods brought on inflation. Poverty was created where once there was plenty.

The national treasury was empty despite the imposition of more exorbitant taxes.

Corruption in the servants of the government added to the general demoralization. Honor and justice became forgotten virtues.

Thus were brought into play the forces of evil which weakened the moral fiber of the Roman people beyond hope of recovery. History records that Rome, robbed of freedom and dignity, impoverished by economic collapse, was no longer able to defend itself against invaders who wrought its destruction.

Does not this recital bring to mind a pattern of government that is being presented today under the guise of liberalism?

Will future historians write a similar story about the decline and fall of our Republic?

The same pattern of concentration of power brought the downfall of the French empire of Napoleon III. It brought death, hunger, and despair to Germany under Hitler and to Italy under Mussolini.

Great Britain was once looked upon as the world's great stronghold of human rights and property rights. Now it is struggling in the grip of a socialistic government which is day by day increasing its power over the affairs of individuals.

Strengthened by American dollars taken from the earnings of the American worker and American industry, England has nationalized its coal, power and transportation industries, and is about to place iron and steel under government ownership and operation.

Once Great Britain proudly boasted that the sun never set upon its flag. Today many of its people are cold because the output of

its coal mines has been greatly reduced under nationalization.

Today many of the British people do not have sufficient food, even though all supplies have been placed under rigid governmental rationing.

Is England's socialistic course leading that once great nation along the road to demoralization and eventual destruction?

The heroes and patriots of the American revolution fought not for independence alone. They defied the mighty power and force of England because oppression by British rules threatened the liberty and personal freedom which was their most precious possession.

In erecting the structure of American freedom the founding fathers exerted every effort to protect the individual from oppressive control by government. The primary object of the Constitution they framed was to limit the power of the central government over the lives of freemen. The Bill of Rights was added in order to state explicitly the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Today we are confronted with proposals which, if adopted in their entirety, would defeat the principles of individual liberty to which the founders of our Nation were passionately devoted.

Many of these proposals and recommendations are based upon socialistic theories which have failed in every part of the world where they have been attempted.

In many instances the doctrine of control by the Federal Government is made palatable to the people by sugar-coating it as social legislation.

The promise of an easy way of life is held out to divert attention from the costs involved and the increased burden of taxation which must be imposed upon the people.

The hope of security is advanced to overshadow the greater boon of liberty and individual freedom under which all American progress has been achieved.

As I study the recent proposals of the President of the United States, I cannot escape recalling the stern warnings that have come down to us through the ages. The lessons of history and what we have seen of dictator governments in recent years should make us resist with all our strength every move in that direction.

As Americans and as Republicans we must impress upon all of our people the fact that when government increases its power to do things for people it also increases its power to do things to people.

Too much government, too much dependence on government, and government that gives no heed to the cost are the milestones along the road to a socialistic pattern of government. The end result is always the same. The government becomes supreme. Individual initiative, thrift, opportunity, industry, savings, and freedom are wiped out.

Lincoln's great task was the preservation of the Union. The great duty before us is to preserve individual freedom by safeguarding the right of every American to live his own life free from strangling control and regulation by government.

Only by maintaining America's strength can those objectives be achieved.

We are now gravely concerned with national defense and the threat to peace in the world. We have embarked on the expenditure of vast sums of money to assure adequate protection of our homes and our independence.

We are determined that America shall be so strong that no aggressor nation will dare threaten our safety or our national security.

We are committed to a tremendous outpouring of our wealth and resources to bring peace and freedom to people in many lands who live under the threat of disaster and enslavement.

Can we at the same time fail to realize that our treasure chest is not inexhaustible? Can we continue to consume our substance in excessive taxation and Government spending that gives no thought to the inevitable day of reckoning?

Recent campaign promises and President Truman's state of the Union speech give emphasis to the statement made by John Stuart Mill many years ago. That great economist said:

"It is the art of the demagog to tempt people into idleness by promising them a share in a fictitious hoard lying in an imaginary government strong box supposed to contain all national wealth."

The President has proposed a budget of $42,000,000,000, the biggest peacetime budget in all history. But that figure alone does not give the American people a true picture of the magnitude of the proposed public spending which must steadily increase in each succeeding year.

The President has asked Congress to approve 15 new domestic programs to be financed out of general tax funds. In addition he has asked for three new or expanded so-called social-welfare programs to be financed by pay-roll deductions.

Experts have estimated that when these programs are in full bloom, they will add to the Nation's permanent tax burden a minimum of $14,800,000,000 and will require an annual budget in excess of $56,000,000,000.

The same experts say that these programs could reach a maximum cost of $42,700,000,000 a year, if all the objectives of those promoting the programs are realized.

If we add that staggering sum to the present already swollen budget we would have an annual tax burden of $84,000,000,000.

These are shocking figures. They cannot fail to alarm every American who is concerned with the future of our country and the welfare of his family.

We cannot undertake all of these constantly increasing expenditures without rushing headlong into state socialism and national bankruptcy. That would mean the loss of all freedom and the destruction of our Republic. It would be disastrous to us and to the free world that is now depending upon our leadership for guidance and assistance.

It would expose the United States and all we hold sacred to the same cancerous condition that resulted in the death of Roman civilization and in the downfall of every other nation that adopted the Socialistic system.

I do not mean to imply that sound progress should be checked. But I do say that we must search our souls and give honest, conscientious answers to these four questions when considering every piece of proposed legislation:

1. Is it right?
2. Will it work?
3. Is it for the benefit of all the people?
4. Can we afford it?

I am sure the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln would have rejected every proposal upon which he could not answer these questions in the affirmative.

There is wise counsel in the statement Lincoln made in 1863, in which he said:

"I hope to stand firm enough not to go backward and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause."

In conclusion I would like to read another quotation from Abraham Lincoln which is appropriate to the problems of the present day. Lincoln said:

"If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage."

I need not point out to this audience that the ship of state is now embarked on a voyage fraught with peril. Its precious cargo is the freedom of the individual. The survival of the American Republic and the future of the world depends upon its safe deliverance.

Let us, in the words of Lincoln, "here highly resolve" that our ship of state shall be guided, now as in the past, by our sacred charter of freedom, the Constitution of the United States.

Let us make common cause in renewed allegiance to the principles which made us a great nation. In no other way can we make sure that our ship of state will not be wrecked on the rocks of socialism, fascism, communism, or any other philosophy that corrupts and destroys the God given rights of freemen.

Lincoln Day Address at Oklahoma City by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] at a Lincoln Day dinner held under the auspices of the Oklahoma Republican State central committee at Oklahoma City, Okla., on February 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have conferred a great honor upon me by your invitation to address this Lincoln Day celebration.

It is a real pleasure to return for another visit to Oklahoma. I recall with deep gratitude the splendid hospitality extended by your former Governor, now Senator BOB KERR, and the State of Oklahoma to the governors' conference which I attended as Governor of Pennsylvania in 1946.

The romantic story of Oklahoma and its progress to greatness is a thrilling record of real Americanism.

The men who made frontier history in your early days were men of courage, vigor, and determination.

Pioneer life was hard but the difficulties faced by the early settlers did not discourage their faith in the future.

America is proud that Oklahoma has made greater material and cultural advance in a shorter time than any other comparable area in the world.

The marvelous development of oil in your State links Oklahoma with my own State of Pennsylvania where the first oil well was drilled in 1859.

From those Pennsylvania fields, which are still producing the world famous Pennsylvania grade crude, came the men with the know-how who helped Oklahoma in the beginnings of its rich oil industry.

Oklahoma has produced many great Americans.

I want to pause for a moment to pay my respects to my former colleague, a distinguished Oklahoma statesman, whose sturdy independence and stalwart Americanism has been an inspiration to all who benefited from his wise counsel and patriotic guidance. I refer to my good friend, your former United States Senator, Ed Moore.

It is an honor and a privilege to have been associated with him in the Senate.

In reviewing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we are reminded that his life was one of toil and struggle, self-reliance, humility, and faith in God.

Those qualities, combined with his tolerance, his sound common sense and his loyalty to American ideals exemplify the spirit and courage of the American way of life.

He truly believed in freedom—in the right of every American to work and prosper—to establish his own security by industry and thrift—to make a better life for himself and his children through his own initiative and energy.

One hundred years ago he expounded a principal of government to which the Republican Party has adhered ever since.

In a speech of July 1, 1854, he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Lincoln recognized that interference by government in the lives of its citizens was an encroachment upon individual liberty and a barrier to opportunity.

In recent years we have seen the extent to which government has interfered and the evils that have resulted. We have been led into a time of grave danger by oppressive taxation, extravagant and wasteful spending by government, deficit financing and a staggering national debt.

We have allowed the cost of government to grow and grow, year by year, until we are consuming nearly one-third of our national income just to govern ourselves.

What is the reason for this? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-government? Must cost of government be so great as to endanger our national existence?

Must peacetime taxation placed upon our people be so burdensome as to destroy all incentive for industrial growth and economic progress?

Must the people give up to government such a large share of their earnings that they are deprived of all opportunity to get ahead?

The greatness of America was not built by Government spending. It was not created in legislative halls. It was not produced by the enactment of laws which led people to believe they were getting something for nothing.

The greatness of America is ours to enjoy because of the toil and sweat, and the inventive genius of generations of courageous, industrious, self-reliant Americans. They were willing to work and sacrifice and save to build economic security for themselves, for their families, for their communities and their country.

They knew the value of thrift. They did not look to government for aid when the going was rough. They worked harder. And they saved a portion of their earnings to risk in productive enterprise. They cleared our forests. They developed our natural resources. They invested in business, in factories, in farms. They provided employment for others.

From the earliest days of our Republic, these men, with the extra dollar they put aside from their earnings, built our great cities, our great industries, our railroads.

With that extra dollar, they built our churches, our schools and colleges, our temples of art and music.

That extra dollar supported our charitable institutions and maintained our medical and scientific foundations.

And that extra dollar has given America the highest standard of living in all the world.

What was there peculiar to America that enabled this young Republic in 170 years to reach a place of greatness unparalleled in the history of the world.

What unique quality did Americans possess that gave them advantages over older and more advanced nations when we won our independence?

That quality was freedom of the individual—freedom of opportunity—freedom to strive, safeguarded in the sacred rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Individual freedom is the keystone in the structure of the American way of life.

Just as Lincoln preserved the Union so must we dedicate ourselves to the preservation of individual freedom without which private enterprise cannot flourish but must wither and die.

Taxation which dries up the sources of venture capital destroys individual freedom which is the birthright of every generation. It robs our young people of the boundless opportunities which the American system offered to generations of the past.

If, through indifference or recklessness, we fail to keep open the avenues of opportunity for every boy and girl we will betray our sacred trust. America will no longer be the stronghold of freedom. Individual liberty will be lost.

The time has come when we must abandon the easy going attitude toward needless and wasteful government spending.

Of course, the essential programs of national defense must be strengthened. Our commitments to restore economic stability to lands threatened with disaster and enslavement must be met. Essential domestic services must be maintained.

But no matter how attractive or how desirable spending proposals are made to appear we must first decide whether we can afford them.

The budget offered by President Truman calls for the expenditure of nearly $42,000,000,000 during the next fiscal year.

He has asked Congress to approve and to provide the funds for 15 new domestic programs to be financed out of general tax funds. In addition he has asked for three new or expanded so-called social-welfare programs to be financed by pay-roll deductions.

He has proposed that an additional load of $4,000,000,000 be added to the tax burden of the people.

It must be remembered, however, that many of these new spending proposals are of the foot-in-the-door variety, opening the way to vastly increased expenditures when they are in full swing.

It has been estimated by experts that the minimum cost of these new projects, when they are in full operation, will shoot the Federal tax bill above $56,000,000,000. It has been estimated also that if all the objectives of those promoting the new programs are realized the added cost could reach the staggering figure of $42,700,000,000 a year, or an annual tax burden of $84,000,000,000. That would be double the tax bill we are paying today.

Those figures should make every American shudder. They are frightening. If we fail to check the trend toward unlimited spending now, we may never have another chance.

The present national income of $210,000,000,000 a year, great as it is, cannot sustain a spending program of such vast proportions.

Furthermore, no one, whether an average citizen or an expert economist, expects that we will go on year after year with a national income as large as at present.

When the inevitable drop comes disaster will loom over us.

Even if the national income should drop, let us say, to $175,000,000,000, the loss of Federal revenue would throw the present budget out of balance by at least ten to twelve billion dollars. We would be forced into deficit financing and instead of reducing the present national debt of $252,000,000,000 we would go deeper and deeper into debt.

All experience has shown that once a new governmental function is undertaken it is impossible to stop it or even restrict its expansion into wider fields and higher cost.

I regret that it has become necessary to paint such a gloomy picture. But, ladies and gentlemen, I am gravely concerned, just as you are, with the future of our children and our grandchildren and the perpetuation of America as a land of freedom and opportunity.

The writings and utterances of Abraham Lincoln have a significant bearing on the problems of today.

The background of his humble birth and his early struggles gave him a clear insight into the vital importance of maintaining the freedom which gives equal opportunity to all. Let me quote from his remarks made to a regiment of soldiers after he had reviewed them in Washington. Lincoln said:

"I happen temporarily to occupy this big White House. I am a living witness that anyone of your children may look to come here, as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have, through this free government which we have enjoyed, an open field and a fair chance * * * that the struggle should be maintained, that we may not lose our birthright."

Turning once more to the wisdom of Lincoln, I would like to quote from a speech he made in March 1864, when he said:

"That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example, assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

Discussing the dangers of excessive national debt in a paper addressed to the people of Illinois he wrote:

"Coming expenditures must be met, and the present debt must be paid; and money cannot always be borrowed for these objects. The system of loans is but temporary in its nature, and must soon explode. It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who lives by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with government."

We honor Lincoln tonight as a leader in world progress and as a benefactor of mankind. We honor him as a great statesman of clear vision and deep understanding of real Americanism, whose great achievement was the preservation of the Union.

We honor him as one of the founders of the Republican Party and the first Republican President of the United States.

Principle was paramount in his political activity. In his famous Cooper Union speech in New York he said:

"Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

Our duty as Americans and as Republicans is clearly defined. It is to save our Nation from the course which must inevitably lead to bankruptcy and disaster.

The Republican Party must be a fighting party. We must have the courage to battle for the fundamental principles enunciated by the founding fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We must talk fearlessly about the folly of a domestic program that teaches people to depend upon government for all the good things of life.

We must constantly warn against the dangers of a fiscal policy that deceives people into thinking that what they receive from the Government costs them nothing.

We must call forcefully to the attention of the people the shameful outcome of a foreign policy which has placed millions of people in Europe and Asia under the tyranny of Soviet Russia.

We must place where it properly belongs full responsibility for the secret agreements which betrayed free nations into communistic enslavement.

We must point out, so all may understand, the fallacy of spending billions of dollars to prop up western Europe while we leave the back door wide open for Communist domination over 450,000,000 helpless people in China.

We must fight here at home against the drift into a socialistic pattern of government because that system has brought death and destruction to every country where it has been attempted.

We must enlist all who love our country, regardless of political affiliation, in a great crusade to save America.

We need Americans who will place themselves, like Lincoln, above sectionalism, class, creed, and personal advantage and will be for those things which make America a stronger and greater country based upon justice and right.

We need Americans who will not be bribed by the promise of selfish advantage or special privilege.

If America is to continue to be the country planned by the founding fathers, every action must be based upon justice and right.

That was Lincoln's way. Let us, in the words of Lincoln, "here highly resolve" to make it our way.

Good Highways Promoters of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Good Highways Promoters of Good Will," delivered by my distinguished colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] before the American Road Builders Association Conference and Forty-sixth annual meeting in Washington, D. C., on February 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

It is always a real pleasure to address an American Road Builders meeting or convention and it is especially an honor for me to address the Pan American delegation to the conference.

The fine work that the Pan American Division is doing has never been given sufficient attention. What the division is doing in fostering friendly inter-American relations deserves more credit and praise. The program outlined by your president, Ing. Rene Pulido y Morales, of the Public Works Ministry of Cuba, cannot be overexaggerated. When men can get together on a subject of common interest, friendly relations are established. Road builders are ambassadors of good will.

I take special interest in Latin-American affairs, perhaps because I am of Spanish ancestry, but principally because I believe that a strong union of western hemisphere nations is the surest means of promoting international peace today. If our countries are strong industrially, economically, and politically, we can assure peace for the world because none will dare attack us.

When I first came to Congress in 1931, there was no such thing as a good-neighbor policy. I was convinced that the big-stick policy and dollar diplomacy was outmoded and above all a menace to Inter-American understanding and amity. So when President Roosevelt and his great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, initiated the good-neighbor policy I welcomed and encouraged it in every way I could; and then even as now, I felt that highway construction was one of the surest means of creating international understanding and good will. A network of roads, radio, telegraph, and telephone, if developed throughout the hemisphere on a scale comparable to that attained in the United States would constitute sinews of steel linking our countries in indissoluble union.

We applaud the daring and statesmanship exhibited by our President in his inauguration address. Last week I talked with the President on the general subject of highways, public works and flood control. I found him vitally concerned not only with the highway construction program of our country, but most deeply interested in the development of avenues of communication throughout the world. He has a high regard for your organization and he told me that he has often attended your conventions.

Last July in Chicago I had the honor and privilege of addressing the representatives of your international division. I believe some 1500 enthusiastic representatives of foreign countries attended that convention. My address outlined relation of Congress to the general highway construction program. I attempted at that time to praise your association for the work it is accomplishing in the international field. I can assure you that your executive secretary, Charlie Upham, is known and respected in engineering circles throughout the world. Through his sponsorship and that of the President and Secretary of the Pan American Division, American road building techniques are being made familiar to the world.

Last December I visited Brazil, Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay. Your association is recognized and respected in every country. The engineers and technicians with whom I have come in contact are vitally interested in our new engineering techniques. They are anxious to obtain for their countries the latest machinery developed during the recent years. For example, I was truly surprised in Brazil when a local engineer told me about the miracle highway constructed on Guam in 60 days during the war by the Sea-bees. South American engineers whom I met on my recent visit want to learn the know-how that made that highway possible.

Road builders appreciate more than most people what good highways really mean. The greatness of the Roman Empire can be attributed in no small measure to a highly organized and efficient highway system which they developed. The Phoenician Empire was based on avenues of communication established by well charted sea lanes. A study of all of the great civilizations of the past will convince one that if the civilization was advanced there were always highly organized systems of communication. The Inca culture was based on a highway system which had no equal in the entire world. It extended for thousands of miles in South America. When Cortes landed at Vera Cruz the news of his arrival was conveyed to Montezuma in 2 days. The Aztec runners used a highway which, from an engineering standpoint, was comparable to the best highways built today. In contrast, when highways were absent, the cultural level of the civilization has always been low.

In Chicago last year at your convention I described the sad plight of the Navajo Indians in New Mexico and Arizona and the situation is so much in point that I am repeating the story today. Dr. George Sanchez, of the University of Texas, and one of the leading educational authorities in our country, made a special study of the Navajo Indians. One would expect that an educator would recommend the construction of schools and the employment of teachers, but Dr. Sanchez said the way to solve the problem was first to build roads. Culture, industry, and prosperity would follow if the Navajo only had modern avenues of communication.

We in the United States take highways and roads too much for granted. For example, I live in Albuquerque, N. Mex., a distance of some 2,000 miles. I can drive there without pushing in 4 days. Twenty years ago that trip would have taken a week. Last week the son of a former Senator from Tennessee, Luke Lea, Jr., told me that in 1920 he and his father took a trip from Nashville to Asheville by motor car. It took them 4 days. Today the same trip can be made in 4 hours.

The social and economic advances that this country has attained are attributable principally to our modern system of communication. Some analysts insist that the remarkable growth of New York City is due to its geographical position. However, authorities on transportation inform me that the growth of New York is the result of its cheap and efficient subway and surface transportation systems.

Telling road builders that highway construction is important is like trying to convince the directors of a bank that their mission in life is to make money. Your Pan American division, however, is more aware of the need of highways than even the parent organization. We know that highways bring prosperity, encourage industrialization, and bring about elevated standards of living and assure political and economic security. In our hemisphere a casual study of the highway systems should be sufficient to convince us that much remains to be done if we are to launch a really effective highway construction program. The American Road Builders Association and your division should take the lead in developing such a program. International good feeling and the promotion of peace are objectives worthy of our greatest efforts. I am convinced that highways bring good feelings because I saw what happened when the Laredo, Tex.-Mexico City portion of the Inter-American Highway was constructed. Years ago the average Texan was suspicious and prejudiced of things Mexican. Today, when a trip to Mexico City and Monterrey can be undertaken over a week end, prejudices are fast disappearing.

President Truman's inaugural address is one of the most significant public statements pronounced in years. His global plans for assisting backward areas have commanded the attention and endorsement of the world. Americans unanimously praised and approved it, but I cannot help but feel that for once we might be a little selfish and perhaps confine some of that help to develop the highway systems of our own hemisphere first.

I recall so well during the war the reluctance of the War Department to undertake the completion of the Inter-American Highway to Panama. The military could not see the advisability of diverting machinery and equipment to that task, but when the submarine menace grew intense the Department finally undertook the completion of the highway. Since the war's end construction has lagged, but the necessity of an all-weather highway to the Panama Canal should be apparent to everyone. I am not an alarmist and, frankly, I don't feel that at this time the Soviet Union menaces our national security. However, I cannot close my eyes to the possibility of our relations growing worse and in the event of war we will surely have to contend with her

undersea fleet which she is building with the assistance of German technicians.

The average layman looks at highways and roads from a tourist point of view; but from a security standpoint, and without being military experts, would we all not feel more secure if, in addition to the sea lanes which we control, we had an all-weather highway to the Panama Canal and to Alaska?

The thought struck me, when I heard President Truman outline his fourth point, of how much good has resulted from the construction of the portions of the Inter-American Highway built during the war. Vital goods and raw materials which were absolutely essential for the continuance of the war effort would not have been utilized had these highways not been constructed.

I am enthusiastic about highways because I am convinced that if we had a highway system through the hemisphere like that which we possess in the United States, Latin-American living standards would be equally as advanced. I heartily recommend that you do everything on your part in developing this program.

Great progress has been made. The educational program initiated in 1946 by your association, the United States Department of State, and the Public Roads Administration had truly remarkable results. Of the twenty-two engineers brought to this country from Latin America to be trained by the State highway departments, by the Public Roads Administration, and by the machinery manufacturers, three have become ministers of public works in their countries; seven have become directors of highways; and three have become directors in engineering and highway construction organizations. That was the good-neighbor policy in high gear. We need more of the same medicine.

Our hemisphere is rich in raw materials and manpower. Our security would be more secure if a highway system as extensive and as efficient as that which we have in the United States today existed in both North and South America. We would be eminently more powerful today if we had better highways. This is a matter of policy. Public policy is not administered by road builders, but road builders can take the lead in influencing the fashioners of policy.

One of the principal points of contention affecting our relations with our Latin American neighbors is the failure of our country to furnish machinery and building supplies with which to build highways. Quotas established by manufacturers and Government Departments are based on 1938 requirements, and not on 1949 demands. The highway now being constructed by Mexico from Juarez to Mexico City has been delayed 50 percent by the failure of the United States to furnish Mexico with essential materials and machinery.

Your association can contribute vital impetus to the good-neighbor policy by urging Congress, the administration, and American manufacturers to increase quotas of machinery and construction supplies. The education program, which I mentioned a few moments ago, must be revived. I am sure that you will find the American Congress receptive to the initiation of such a program. Cooperation of your associations, the Public Roads Administration, and Congress is needed to launch the program.

In closing I would like to call attention to the really novel program conceived by a good friend of Latin America. My good friend Dr. Axel Wenner-Gren is an international figure of much repute. I have followed his career with interest. I knew him to be a close friend of the former President of Mexico, Manuel Avila Camacho, and his brother, Maximino. Dr. Wenner-Gren has invested vast sums in Latin America and he feels, as we all do, that the defense of Christian ideals and western European principles will ultimately depend on the power of the civilization which we are developing in the Western Hemisphere. He sees South, Central, and North America as the last bastion of democracy, and he feels that the development of a highly efficient highway system is our most pressing problem. It is his thought that private capital associated with international banking institutions should finance and promote the organization of regional corporations for the construction of international highways and other communication mediums. He envisions a corporate structure like the Tri-Borough Bridge Authority. In other words, just as neighboring States can get together and organize semigovernmental institutions for the construction of bridges and highways, nations in the Western Hemisphere can do likewise. Neighboring countries can organize authorities on a strictly sound banking basis and build highways which we so badly need. I have informed Dr. Wenner-Gren that the Public Works Committee of the Senate would be delighted to have his views on such a project.

In closing I offer you my sincerest congratulations for your splendid efforts in the international field. The friends you are making are insurance for the future. Keep up the good work. I thank Mr. Upham, Mr. Keefe, and Ingeniero Pulido for the opportunity of addressing you.

The Struggle for Hebrew Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on February 13, I had the pleasure of participating in the ceremonies of the American League for a Free Palestine in New York City, where a farewell send-off was staged at the Waldorf-Astoria for two valiant Hebrew patriots, Mr. Peter Bergson and Mr. Samuel Merlin. Both of these men, who, during several long years of exile from Palestine, worked to arouse American public opinion, were elected to the Constituent Assembly of Israel.

On this occasion some of America's most notable champions of freedom were gathered. Among those present were the distinguished Under Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar L. Chapman; Judge William S. Bennet, head of the Sons of the American Revolution; the great playwright, Ben Hecht; and the eminent short-story writer, Konrad Bercovici; the great artist, Arthur Szyk; Mr. Will Rogers, Jr.; Elliott Roosevelt; Paul O'Dwyer; and many other figures from public life and from the world of arts and letters.

The spirit of the occasion was most eloquently voiced by a man who, as president of the American League for a Free Palestine, dedicated several years of his time and wisdom to awaken America to the just cause of Hebrew liberation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by this outstanding leader in the cause of freedom, our eminent colleague the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], whose words expressed the full meaning of this memorable occasion.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are here today to bid farewell to two friends about to take their seats as elected representatives of the Hebrew people in the Constituent Assembly of Israel. I think this is a fitting occasion to review one phase of the struggle for Hebrew liberation in which some of us here in America were privileged to be associated with that group of Hebrew patriots whom Mr. Bergson and Mr. Merlin so well personify.

In 1940, a small group of Palestinians who went into voluntary exile because they considered their country, Palestine, as an oppressed nation under foreign occupation, came to the United States in order to present to America the case for the Hebrew people and to enlist support among Americans for the Hebrew liberation struggle. It was not an easy task. And today even, it is difficult to realize how great the obstacles were. Today when Israel is a topic for daily reports and articles in the American press, when almost every American newspaper and press agency has special correspondents in Tel Aviv, it sounds almost incredible that in 1940 one could scan any American daily from cover to cover without finding a single line referring to Palestine and to the national aspirations of the Hebrew people. It is one of the great historical achievements of our honored guests who have put Palestine on the map both here in the United States and in the world at large and thus made an immense contribution toward the advancement of the cause of the restoration of Hebrew freedom and independence.

But it was not only a conspiracy of silence that these pioneers of Hebrew freedom had to overcome. No sooner had they made their plans known than active opposition appeared from numerous quarters, opposition which sprang from the fountainhead of British propaganda in this country and which, I am sorry to say, was not always characterized by strict adherence to the rules of fair play. If only an infinitesimal part of all the malicious and libelous statements about the Hebrew Committee on National Liberation and the American League for a Free Palestine that were published in this country were true, Bergson and Merlin instead of taking up their seats in the Constituent Assembly should have landed in the dock of a criminal court and indeed all of us who gave them some measure of support and encouragement should have been there with them. But history fortunately is not made by sensational headlines and misleading or misled propaganda. The very fact of the existence of Israel and the role which Bergson and Merlin, together with other members of the Hebrew Committee for National Liberation and of the Irgun Zvai Leumi with whom they were intimately connected, are being called to play in the shaping of its future is sufficient vindication of the nobility of their purpose and the greatness of their achievement. I know that many among those who took it upon themselves in the critical days of the Hebrew fight for survival and liberation to label noble patriots as terrorists and gangsters and hoodlums are now ashamed of their reckless action and would like very much to bury the past. I will not dwell any longer on this painful aspect of the fight that was so brilliantly won by the great courage and devotion and the combined efforts of the patriots in Palestine and their friends in the United States, and the international political arena.

How well the task of the American League has been accomplished may now be estimated. Today, with half a million members, the league can look back on its basic program. We called for the three R's of the Hebrew revolution—resistance, repatriation, and recognition. The resistance won, driving out

the British and creating the groundwork for the victorious army of Israel; the repatriation—not illegal immigration—of the Hebrew people to their homeland is now proceeding, perhaps not at the pace some of us would like, but we all can continue to help in this so that the Hebrew DP problem may be truly solved by Israel this year. And recognition—the cornerstone of the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation's program has been won. What has been achieved has been a beginning—not a final victory, but a glorious beginning.

Those of us in the United States who backed the Hebrew liberation fight, and I am glad to say that they were counted in the hundreds of thousands in all walks of life, of all creeds and persuasions, were motivated first and foremost by a sincere and deep conviction that this was a fight for a righteous cause, a fight of a people which for nearly 2,000 years suffered martyrdom and persecution and yet refused to acknowledge defeat or to give up the hope for a rebirth of freedom and independence. They were inspired by that fundamental American love of liberty and abhorrence of tyranny in any form and in any place on God's earth. They were inspired by that great American tradition which was handed down to us by the founding fathers and the great heroes of the American Revolution. They joined the Hebrew liberation struggle because deep in their hearts they felt that this was a historical repetition of the great revolutionary struggle which was fought by our own Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton. But there was more to it.

We backed the Hebrew liberation fight because we were resolved to solve a complex age-old problem which had become a sore on the body politic of the entire world and which was a serious stumbling stone on the path toward a peaceful world for which, in the past generation, we have fought two great wars. A free independent Palestine and a free Hebrew nation were to be the ultimate solution of that vexing Jewish problem. Not a symbolic or token solution, but a practical solution that would give normalcy and security to the Hebrew people and thereby contribute toward the establishment of world peace. This task i still far from achieved, for we must remember that it was not our intention to collect the individual components of the problem and to concentrate them in one place so that we might change the problem from one of individuals to one of a misfit state. As Israel's boundaries, its economic possibilities, and its relative position among the nations of the Middle East exist today, we have not a complete solution but, in many ways, a continuing problem. As matters stand in the Middle East today, Israel could be, in many ways, an irritant rather than a contributing factor toward stabilization.

Perhaps the most fitting formulation of this as yet unachieved goal was given by President Truman in his statement of October 29, 1948, when he said that "it is my desire to help build in Palestine a strong, prosperous, free, and independent democratic state. It must be large enough, free enough, and strong enough to make its people self-supporting and secure."

This means that what has been accomplished in Palestine today must be treated only as a first phase in the establishment of a normal republic with adequate boundaries and with an economy which can validly serve the needs of its population without the outpourings of charity or subsidies. This means that there is still a considerable discrepancy between the goal set by the President of the United States and what some people and some governments would have us believe to be the ultimate and maximum that could be achieved. This discrepancy is not accidental. It is an outgrowth of the development of the role which American policy has played in the drama of Hebrew liberation. Regarding America's policy, I should like to present this simple history.

Our foreign policy in the Middle East can be divided into three phases, which can be characterized as, first, the phase where America subordinated our own to the British policy; second, the phase where we disassociate ourselves from the British and let them go their own way without United States backing; and the third, future phase, wherein we must take the lead and formulate a positive American foreign policy for the Middle East.

During the years of Mr. Bevin's tenure, which was characterized by an unprecedented, stubborn, and unjustifiable hostility toward the legitimate and internationally recognized national aspirations of the Hebrew people, the United States functioned for all intents and purposes as a tail for the British kite. In crass contradiction to numerous pious utterances in behalf of the Hebrew people, we as a government, too often condoned and even supported the actions of Mr. Bevin and his colleagues in the British Government which aimed at suppressing Hebrew freedom and at thwarting the efforts of the Hebrew people to achieve real independence. While the overwhelming majority of the American people and American public opinion gave generous support and encouragement to the Hebrew revolutionary war for independence, our official expression often seemed to back the British oppressor.

It was only recently that a more happy policy, a policy which promises to reflect the true sentiments of the American people has been initiated. The first step in this direction was made when we felt compelled to disassociate ourselves from the British. Indeed, the Anglo-Arab aggression in Israel had reached such a frenzy that we had to indicate clearly our serious disapproval and to leave what Mr. Churchill so aptly calls Bevin's "sulky war" against Israel, to be an exclusively British proposition. This shift in American policy at once showed gratifying results. Mr. Bevin, minus American support, no longer was able to persist in his vicious aggressiveness against Israel or to continue a policy which was not too popular even within his own labor party. The simple fact that we withdrew our blessing compelled Britain to recognize the Republic of Israel and to refrain from creating any further incidents that would endanger the present truce.

I must, however, warn here and now against undue optimism. Mr. Bevin, with whom I conferred in London in 1940 as head of a special mission of the American League for a free Palestine, is not a man to change overnight a policy of many years' standing. We must be realistic. What Mr. Bevin did should not be overestimated, he just recognized a hard fact that stared him in the face—that Israel was now a fact and not a hope only. There is no indication whatsoever that he gave up his attitude toward the Hebrew people or that he is reconciled to the necessity of giving the Hebrew people a chance and an opportunity to become what President Truman wants it to become—large enough, free enough, and strong enough to make its people self-supporting and secure.

In order to achieve this, American policy with regard to the Middle East must now enter a third phase. A positive constructive American policy for the Middle East must be formulated and implemented. Only such a policy will guarantee peace, justice, and progress in that vitally important region. Only such a policy, based on America's own interests, will bring to the fore these forces in the Middle East which favor democracy, human rights, and social and economic progress. Such a policy is needed at once.

Imperial colonialism which flourished on the fertile soil of medieval feudalism has been mortally wounded in the Middle East. A political vacuum now exists there. Politics abhors vacuum, and communism conceivably could move in, if we don't act swiftly and decisively. With the emergence of a free democratic republic in the present state of Israel, I feel confident that democracy has the advantage and that backed by a positive American program this new state will become the beachhead of progress and freedom in that entire area. I am confident that all those who so substantially helped the Hebrew people to victory in the first phase of its fight for freedom shall from now on devote themselves to the great task of furthering an American policy which will make that victory final and ultimate both in the interests of America and world democracy.

Address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen Before Pennsylvania Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at the fiftieth anniversary dinner of the Pennsylvania Society, at New York City on December 11, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, president of a railroad named after one of the two greatest States in the Union, Your Excellency, Governor Duff; Mr. Chief Justice; Senator Pepper; Senator Martin; Senator Myers; distinguished guests, members of this remarkable Pennsylvania Society gathered on this golden anniversary: Speaking to you tonight I would like to tell you first of all of a vivid scene at the end of the war which I shall never forget.

It was in Japan. When the order to "Stop shooting" was received by Admiral Halsey off Tokyo, immediate action was taken to locate, assist, and liberate the prisoners of war held by Japan. The Japanese command was immediately directed to permit the prisoners of war to paint the letters "P. W." on the roofs of their camp buildings. The carrier planes were sent in to find the camps and radio back their location.

This information was relayed to the B–29's which then flew up with food, medical supplies, and clothing for the thousands of men who had been held under desperate conditions of imprisonment. Under Admiral Halsey's famous command, "Those are our boys—go and get them," the landing craft and hospital ships went on in advance of the surrender. The evacuation proceeded with speed. Then came word, relayed through the prison camps, that a large camp in the western part of Japan had not been located. It was cloud covered in the mountains and the pilots had been unable to see it. No mercy drops had been made. Conditions were desperate. The tension and suffering were extreme. But the message also said that the senior prisoner-of-war officer, a young American captain, had taken command with unbelievable courage and determination, had maintained discipline in the camp, had organized the systematic foraging of the countryside, had given orders to the Japanese, and had prevented disaster.

Of course, rescue was dispatched at once and soon American planes were landing on

the airfield near this camp in the mountains. The young American officer in command came out to meet us, lean and gaunt, but erect. I told him that I trusted he had heard that the ships were in Tokyo Bay, that emergency supplies were at hand, and that evacuation would proceed promptly. He looked straight at us, his lips quivered, tears streamed down his cheeks, but not a word came. Moments seemed like ages. Finally he said, "I'm sorry, Commander; you see, you are the first free man I've seen for 2 years. Freedom is so precious."

I will never forget that scene. I will never forget those words.

"Freedom is so precious." These simple words spoken in that dramatic scene have a tremendous meaning far beyond prisoner-of-war camps or time of war. They are the subject of my address to this distinguished audience of the Pennsylvania Society tonight.

And I am doubly pleased and proud that it is the occasion on which one of the truly great Americans, a truly distinguished Pennsylvanian, the Honorable Owen Roberts, is receiving your medal.

Freedom is so precious.

The underlying question which cuts across all of the international and domestic, social, economic, and political problems today, is whether or not man shall be free in the years ahead. As I see it, there are four principal dangers to the future freedom of men.

The first danger arises from those who sincerely love freedom, but believe that the way to preserve it is to give more and more and more power to do good to centralized government.

The second comes from those who sincerely love freedom, but believe that the way to preserve it is to stand still, to maintain the status quo, and to look backward.

The third originates with those who seek to destroy freedom by using freedom's openness as the avenue for subversion and sabotage.

The final threat is found in those who would destroy freedom by the use of aggressive military force.

The fourth of these dangers is the one most generally recognized. It clearly demands today that our country be strong and alert in its armed forces. It requires that our research be continuous, that our strategic thinking be modern. It demands that minimums of trained manpower be maintained. But it is of grave importance that the free men of the world recognize that freedom can be lost without a shot being fired. And also that strength for defense can be undermined through actions entirely nonmilitary in nature.

Is it not clear from the facts disclosed in Czechoslovakia, in France, in Canada, in Burma, that there is a world-wide network of agents of a foreign power, under direct orders to destroy the freedom of men? Does not this modern technique of assault require a modern defense. We should never abridge freedom of thought, or of speech, or of press. But this does not mean that we should permit organized, direct agents of a foreign power to operate legally as they endeavor to destroy those very freedoms that we hold so very precious.

I believe our thinking might be clearer if we analyze the question entirely apart from the fact that they bear the label of Communists and consider it solely on the basis that it is an organized set of agents of a foreign power whose objective is to destroy freedom. Viewed in that light, it seems to me it becomes mandatory that our laws should be modernized to protect our freedoms from those under direction of a foreign power who would sabotage and destroy our liberties, the liberty of free nations, including our own, from within.

I have also referred to the danger of the loss of freedom as the result of the decisions of those who sincerely love freedom, but who believe that the way to preserve it is to delegate great powers to centralized government. These are predominantly the Fabian Socialists. This is the course now being followed by England. The government has taken over the coal mines, the transportation systems, and is now proposing to take over the steel industry. I do not doubt 1 minute the sincerity of those who move upon this program. I am certain that they love freedom. We should continue to have a sympathetic interest. We should extend a helping hand to the people of this great country. But I do believe they are making a sad mistake by placing in government the extreme powers that go with the nationalization and control of basic industry. We who believe in freedom should speak out upon these basic subjects in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, all of history shows that for every one time that great concentrations of power have been used wisely there have been a hundred times in which it has been abused. All of history shows that the greatest production and the highest standards of living have come under decentralized and private ownership and management.

Even this year, nationalized British coal mines, with the whole weight of British Government seeking to bring up production, are mining only 200,000,000 tons, compared to a 10-year average before the war of 220,000,000 tons. On the other hand, British steel under private ownership produced 15,000,000 tons in 1948, compared to a 10-year average before the war of 12,000,000 tons, or an increase of over 20 percent.

It is my further view that the lack of decentralized management and initiative becomes progressively more severe as the cumulative effects of governmental supervision are felt. Granted the parallels are not complete, I do report to you that the lack of management attitude and ability and the contrary routine, stagnant following of a 5-year plan imposed from above, is the most striking observation in the low production in the industries of Russia.

I earnestly hope that the recognition will soon come that economic freedoms are inseparable from social and political freedoms and the trend toward centralized government-operated economics will be stopped. Is it not clear that if men are not free to buy and to sell, to work and to produce, to fabricate and to mine, to trade and to profit on their own decisions, then the other liberties are in danger and are soon lost? It is the story from ancient Rome down to Europe in the wake of World War II. It is particularly evident in the Balkans and in Russia.

But, ladies and gentlemen, the point upon which I would give the greatest emphasis tonight is this: If we would preserve and expand the precious freedom of men, it is not enough that we be armed and alert, that we modernize our defense against sabotage, and that we oppose centralized-controlled economics. It is of even greater importance that within the framework of our Government and within the outlines of our free social and economic system we move and act and progress in the well-being of our people, in the humanitarian returns to all from our system, in the correction of shortcomings, and in the education of the youth of our land. In other words, the maintenance of freedom is not a static process. It must be a dynamic program of action.

Science moves with amazing speed in pushing back frontiers. We can split atoms and do strange things with neutrons and electrons directly related to that awesome force that was demonstrated in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. The world is constantly changing, and we must ever find the new answers to meet the new conditions. But we must do so in keeping with the fundamental concept of the nature of man, that he was meant to be free.

It is so obvious that if the founding fathers of America had been content to win freedom and then to stand still, freedom would have long since been lost. Instead at Philadelphia in 1787 they entered into a bold experiment of a new form of government. They developed new rules for the conduct of business and of labor and of the rights of citizens. They established new institutions of higher learning. The action of Benjamin Franklin and his associates in founding our University of Pennsylvania is a significant instance of this early purposeful pioneering. In later years the corporate device played a key role in the development of huge production and of vast trade, and all secured advantages from it. As the corporate power grew it was in turn wisely curbed through laws against monopoly and restraint of trade and by the development of minority rights.

The founding fathers did not refuse to give powers to government. But they did insist that those powers be specifically defined, that checks and balances be placed upon them, that the basic concept of the nature of man be maintained. Care was ever exercised that officials of government should not be given the authority to exercise whim and caprice over the individual citizen.

The same fundamental approach, it seems to me, is so important today. We should not block and obstruct all action by government upon the obvious problems of health and of education and of housing. Rather should we seek to have that action taken in accordance with the superb fundamental American traditions. The authority and action by government should be clearly defined. Blanket powers which could be used at the whim of administrators should be refused. Standards definite and clear should be set by the Congress.

If we demonstrate the alert, dynamic, and ingenious approach to the new problems that the early leadership of our country displayed, holding fast to the fundamental concepts which come from our religious basis, as to the nature of man, and as to the moral principles under which he should live, then I am confident that we will win the economic struggle against those who would destroy the freedom of men. We will also win the ideological struggle against those who would destroy the freedom of men. The prospects will then be bright that we will never need to win a grim struggle by military force. And, finally, by that course, we would insure that if a tragic military struggle ever came, we would win—we would win for that freedom—which is so precious.

Missouri Basin Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Missouri Basin Power Program," delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Interior William P. Warne before the Nebraska Reclamation Association annual meeting at Lincoln, Nebr., on February 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure to speak before this annual meeting of the Nebraska Reclamation

Association on the subject of the power development under the comprehensive Missouri Basin program.

The State and the Nebraska Reclamation Association have always been in the forefront of the fight for a comprehensive power, irrigation, and flood-control development for the waters of the Missouri River Basin. Since the early part of the century, Nebraskans have advocated reclamation developments. Your North Platte project was a pioneer private project that mothered the more extensive development that was made in the North Platte Valley under the Federal reclamation laws. Enders, one of the first of the great Missouri Basin project dams, was started on the Republican River in Nebraska, and there also was executed the first of the Missouri Basin repayment contracts, one between the Secretary of the Interior and the Frenchman-Cambridge irrigation district. Your State has been in the forefront of public power, and your public power agencies are now working out with Interior Department representatives the policies and program that will bring Missouri Basin power to Nebraska consumers.

Last year your State reclamation association adopted resolutions that were widely noted by all who were interested in water and power problems. Resolution No. 1 of your association last year expressed concern with the infiltration into local and national reclamation association of certain groups with special objectives not compatible with the best interests of reclamation water and power users. In response to that resolution and to similar expressions from other groups interested in reclamation, a rededication to the fundamentals of the reclamation movement has now been set in motion. These fundamentals are to secure for the enjoyment of the people the widespread distribution of the benefits of irrigation and power developments in order to prevent monopolization of the public's resources.

The second resolution of your 1948 meeting recognized the critical shortage of electrical energy. It reaffirmed your faith in power development as the partner of irrigation, and it pledged your support in cooperation between the public bodies of your State and the agencies of the Department of the Interior that handle Federal power projects. That resolution is indeed gratifying to all of us who, in the Government agencies, deal with the valuable and coveted electric power output from federally constructed dams. There has been progress in the cooperative work of the Nebraska public power agencies and the Bureau of Reclamation. I regret that since your 1948 meeting the power-supply situation has not improved, but, rather, that present and impending shortages of energy are intensified. The plants simply cannot be built fast enough to meet rising demand.

The Missouri Basin program of the Department of the Interior, coordinated with that of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, was formulated with a view to generating as much electrical energy as possible to meet the requirements of Nebraska and other States of the basin. We need to remember the great scope of the integrated system that has been undertaken. Under the program that was adopted by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944 all of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries, from the farthest reaches in northwestern Montana down to the juncture with the Mississippi, will be conserved and put to beneficial use through a series of reservoirs, power plants, transmission lines, irrigation facilities, canals, and navigable channels.

In order to assure those multiple purposes, and also to provide as needed flood control, silt retention, pollution abatement, municipal water supplies, recreation, and favorable habitat for fish and wildlife, the Federal, State, and local agencies that are concerned operate in a carefully coordinated system. In accordance with the basic statutory provision provided by the 1944 act, the Corps of Engineers is building the mainstem and certain tributary dams below Fort Peck in Montana, and will operate them for flood control and navigation. The Bureau of Reclamation is building the reservoirs on the upper reaches of the river and most of those on tributary streams, as well as the irrigation projects, and the electric power transmission lines. The Bureau of Reclamation through a single transmission backbone system will transmit and sell, with preference to cooperatives and public agencies and on a uniform rate schedule, all of the power generated in the entire project, including energy generated at Army dams as well as those constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin was adopted by the Congress, and it sets forth the objectives of the program, the works to be constructed, and the manner of financing and accounting for the expenditures and repayment. The program is formulated with a view to construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers of all of the units described in Senate Document No. 191, as supplemented by the further engineering findings in Senate Document No. 247. Necessarily, the program contemplates that where appropriate, alternative reservoirs and other facilities may be substituted for units described in the plan, and additional features and developments may also be undertaken in furtherance of the objectives as set forth in Senate Document No. 191. Those physical aspects, although to a large extent accurately forecast in 1944, were subject, of course, to improvement by development of additional engineering and other physical data.

The principles of the Missouri Basin program as set forth in the basic documents do not change with the accumulation of additional engineering information. The works are constructed to bring about the full productive use of all of the natural resources in a manner that will best meet the needs of the region and that will make the maximum contribution to the people living there, as well as to improve navigation and provide flood protection. Among the brightest promises of the project are that it will minimize the impact of drought disasters in the livestock and dry-farming economy of the Great Plains and will promote sound urban and industrial development, as well as light the farm houses of States where rural electrification had lagged furthest behind.

The Bureau of Reclamation plans to build as rapidly as is feasible and as rapidly as funds are made available the major facilities under its jurisdiction for control and conservation of the waters of the Missouri Basin and its tributaries. Irrigation works and generating and transmission facilities are to be geared to the construction of the control and conservation works on which they are dependent. In establishing the priority for the construction of the irrigation and power facilities, a prime factor is the extent and manner in which such facilities will contribute to the over-all land use and economy of the northern Great Plains. Other factors include securing suitable geographical distribution, the desire of local people for construction, and, in the case of irrigation works, readiness to assume an appropriate share of the reimbursable construction costs. And, of course, consideration must be given year by year to national conditions that affect Federal budgetary policy, for in the Missouri Basin project we have undertaken a job so vast that it will be constantly a factor in national financial management.

The Congress approved the comprehensive Missouri Basin plan in 1944 on the basis of the showing then made of the national and local benefits. The cost of construction to fulfill the primary control and conservation functions of the program—that is, of the main regulatory reservoirs and associated facilities of the Missouri River and its tributaries—is not a burden on the water and power users. The Congress has, however, required of the Secretary of the Interior that, in connection with the construction of irrigation, municipal water and power facilities he provide for a return to the Treasury of an appropriate share of their construction costs. That fair share of the costs of construction, which does not include the portions properly assignable to nonreimbursable functions such as flood control and navigation, is determined on a basin-wide basis which seeks to equalize the payments throughout the basin, taking into consideration the benefits received. With respect to any given unit, the amount to be returned to the Treasury by irrigation and power is determined in relation to the direct benefits that are to be obtained from all units theretofore or thereafter constructed. Revenue from and returns for power produced at Missouri River dams constructed by the Corps of Engineers are included in these basin-wide determinations. In other words, the plan is one that is integrated in every respect.

Without the pooling of the cost of individual dams, power plants, and canals, and for divisions on a basin-wide basis among the benefits—flood control, navigation, irrigation, power, municipal water supply, etc.—for accounting and repayment purposes where the law requires repayment, only a part of the Missouri Basin program could have been undertaken. No adequate program for irrigation in the high-plains States that are so frequently drought stricken could have been devised with piecemeal plans and programs. Inaction and no progress in 50 years proved that. In contrast more than 120 dams and associated works are projected for construction under the adopted plan and more than 25 units are already under way. Almost 5,000,000 acres will receive irrigation water. A backbone transmission grid will reach from western Montana, where it will interconnect with the lines from power plants in the Columbia River Basin, through the Dakotas to southern terminals in Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa. That backbone grid will integrate the output of the mainstem dams at Garrison, Gavins Point, Fort Randall, with the generators at Canyon Ferry, Boysen, Kortes, and elsewhere throughout the basin, and it will interconnect with the Colorado-Big Thompson, Kendrick, and Fort Peck systems. The power generation capacity that thus will be linked into a single grid will ultimately be in excess of 2,500,000 kilowatts. This will become a mighty factor in the strengthening of the economy of the basin States. Computation cannot be completed until final costs are known, but Missouri Basin power prices are expected to put this energy in a relatively low-cost bracket.

In Nebraska high voltage transmission lines will initially be constructed to Ogallala, Columbus, and O'Neill. Other reclamation lines will bring power soon to the Omaha area and will extend into western Iowa. In order to meet the urgent power requirements of the southern portion of the Missouri Basin, the Bureau of Reclamation is investigating the possibilities of installing additional generating facilities on the Platte and other Nebraska rivers. We are also planning high voltage transmission lines that will bring Colorado-Big Thompson power into the western part of the State, thereby permitting substitution and transfer elsewhere of the power now moving westward.

Right here in the State of Nebraska you have a continuing problem of meeting power loads. Recently in my office representatives of one of your State power agencies reviewed with me that situation. Conservative estimate of power requirements revealed that future power demands will exceed the available supply, and even with the great power

plants of the Missouri River Basin we still will be scratching about for more kilowatts in the States along the Big Muddy. Through the years I have had so many times to answer assertions that some one of our great projects would find nothing but jack rabbits to use its power that I make a particular point here of the fact that we already foresee in the Missouri Basin the time when all of the power from this great project will be committed and more will be needed.

I am pleased to remind you that a good start has been made for distributing Missouri Basin power in Nebraska. Last September the Secretary of the Interior, after a series of conferences with representatives of all of the Nebraska State power agencies, issued a statement of policy regarding the purchase and distribution of federally generated power in Nebraska. That initial basic policy contemplates that the large State public power-distribution agencies will purchase power from the Government and they will distribute it to wholesale agencies, which in turn will sell the power to the ultimate consumer. It is our belief that such a system will result in a most efficient use of existing State-wide transmission and distribution facilities. It is now up to your public power organizations, the public power districts, and he REA's to work out arrangements among themselves so as to be able to inform the Secretary of the Interior how the policy that was formulated in the preliminary conferences can best be adapted to your local requirements.

I have sketched for you a broad outline of the structure of the Missouri Basin program. You will want to know also the progress to date in accomplishing our purposes. One hundred million dollars have already been appropriated to the Department of the Interior for the Missouri River development program. With these funds construction now is going forward on 20 Missouri Basin units. The appropriations requested by the President for the next fiscal year amount to an additional $87,000,000 for the Missouri River Basin. Of that about $13,000,000 is for projects, including transmission lines, in the State of Nebraska. The network of reservoirs along the Republican River is well advanced, with five major dams under constructions—Enders, Culbertson, Medicine Creek, and Bonny, as well as the Army's Harlan County dam. Irrigation facilities on the Republic River are also well under way, including about 50,000 acres in the Frenchman-Cambridge area, which will receive water within a year, and a comparable development under the Bostwick unit, which is served by the Harlan County dam. Preconstruction plans are being pushed in the central Nebraska area, including work at Columbus, Grand Island, and at Middle Loup. Phase C, general planning, to develop the basic engineering and economic material, is proceeding in the basins of the Niobrara, North Platte, and the South Platte Rivers.

In summary fashion I have done but scant justice to the magnificence of the conception, to the boldness of the engineering works, and to the urgency of the need. I have sketched for you the current status of the Missouri River Basin program. Ultimately, more than 1,600,000 acres of irrigated land may be added to Nebraska's resources. Electric power will come to you over a backbone transmission grid that will place a far-flung system of generating plants at the service of urban, industrial, and rural power consumers. I have reminded you that $100,000,000 has already been appropriated to the Department of the Interior and that this year an additional $87,000,000 is requested to carry forward Interior's work program. The overall cost for the Department of the Interior's share of the job may reach $3,000,000,000, exclusive of the costs of the Corps of Engineers' works. Similarly, the Army has proceeded with its segment of the coordinated program. In addition to Interior's expenditures, the Corps of Engineers has had $133,500,000 appropriated for use in starting 6 dams.

I mention these figures not to dazzle you with hundreds of millions and billions of dollars but for the opposite purpose. Soberly each of us must constantly be aware that the great work program in which we are engaged requires for its fulfillment a tremendous investment by the Federal Government of public funds. Nor can we afford to plan in terms more cautious than annual appropriations of the $100,000,000 order. You here in Nebraska know the urgency of your power and water needs. The same urgencies are equally pressing elsewhere in the basin. To meet them requires a construction schedule that will soon be expending annually more than double that amount of money.

The investment by the United States in the Missouri Basin will be forthcoming in annual appropriations only to the extent and only so long as all of the people of the country have confidence that the investment is for truly public purposes and that it is not being made for the enrichment of a limited and entrenched group of vested interests. So here again I revert to two of the resolutions which your Nebraska State Reclamation Association adopted at your 1948 convention. One of these resolutions I have already mentioned. It is your resolution No. 2 that reaffirms your faith in public power development as a corollary of irrigation and as a means of securing maximum public benefit from the generation of power at the reservoirs in the Missouri River system.

Another resolution adopted by your association last year that provides reassurance as to the public purposes of the Federal investment in the Missouri Basin is resolution No. 5. In it you reaffirmed your support for acreage-limitation provisions of the Federal reclamations laws, which are as old as the reclamation program itself. In your resolution No. 5 you endorsed the policy of limiting the benefits of Federal reclamation projects to individual farmers on family-size farms. Ever since white men settled in this country, ever since the Thirteen Colonies banded together to form these United States, right down through the western reclamation program, the principle of individual owner-operated farms has had the determined policy of the Nation as a whole. Throughout many portions of this country where irrigation is an unfamiliar word describing some unknown (to people there) kind of farming, the 160-acre provision and the family-size farming concept command support for the reclamation program.

I am confident that continuation of our work here depends for its financial support on the preservation and effective application of the principles of public power and acreage limitation. President Truman repeatedly has affirmed his commitment to these principles. As recently as 1 week ago I attended a conference in the President's office, during which he emphatically instructed us of the Interior Department to maintain without relaxation these existing policies so as to assure that public confidence in the reclamation program is well founded and that the investment of public funds remains truly for public benefit. It is with deep appreciation that I find in the Nebraska State Reclamation Association consistent response and repeated reassurance that you, too, are working for a reclamation program with the widest possible spread of the benefits.

Among the many significant precedents that have been established in connection with the Missouri Basin development, one more is of great interest and importance. The Federal agencies of interest and the States of the basin have worked conscientiously together in the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee to eliminate the friction and conflicts that attend uncoordinated programs. In this way the physical plan has been completely coordinated, the construction programs are being kept in harmony, and work is progressing on plans for integrated operation of the river control works. Like democracy itself, this device for basin administration has at times appeared unresponsive in emergencies and cumbersome, but, again as in the case of democracy, it has risen to its occasion and acquitted itself well. There has been much clamor surrounding this experiment in resource administration. The verdict on it will be rendered in the future on the basis of the effectiveness of the flood control, the number of successful farmers on the newly irrigated land, the extent to which the project works provide against disaster when drought again stalks the plains, the number of farms electrified, factories built, and mines opened with the project power.

You may have heard or read scare stories arising from the attention being given by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch to reorganization of the administration of the natural resource programs of the Federal Government. Some of these imply that the Interior Department may be abolished. Such stories bore me. One thing should be kept in mind. The advance of a dynamic people toward a sound, secure future, rooted in development and use of their resources, is a resistless force. Whatever program of reorganization may be evolved, I know that basin resource development will continue to be pushed forward vigorously. A soundly conceived, logical regrouping of the functions of Federal agencies dealing with resource development could accelerate the construction of the Missouri River Basin project. Though the name of the Department of the Interior might conceivably be changed, the functions of the Department are indispensable and will continue to go forward with a force impelled by the requirements of a growing nation. Next March 3, Interior will celebrate the end of its first 100 years of service to the Nation. It is now ready and able to start a second and greater century.

For 5 years now, from the time we began drafting the final reclamation report on the Missouri River, I have been working intimately with this program for the development of this basin. On the foundation laid by the Army's General Pick and Interior's W. G. Sloan, we have begun the erection of the structure. Pain and some strife have attended the birth of the project, but it nevertheless is a healthy and promising infant today. So far, I say, so good. I know not what influences may mold its character as it grows toward maturity, but a good start on a project, as in the life of a man, is largely determinative. There is every reason, therefore, to believe that the Missouri River Basin development will bring to all of the people of this great area the manifold blessings that are anticipated. Time, labor, and the faithful pursuit of our objectives are all that are needed now.

Support Price for Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Committee

on Agriculture in the House of Representatives on February 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, I don't come before this very distinguished committee of the House as an expert. I am one of the freshmen on the other side of Capitol Hill and I am over here because of the tremendous demand on the part of our people that something be done in this rather serious situation that confronts the dairy industry in the State of Minnesota.

I have some prepared testimony I would like to read.

I was very interested in what I heard Congressman MURRAY, of Wisconsin, say to the committee, and in the main I concur with his remarks.

I would also like to say that we feel our representation from Minnesota has presented bills to the committee and the House as a representation that clearly understands the agricultural problems that face our people, and I am in support of the legislation which has been presented by Mr. ANDRESEN. I have not seen the bills from Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HAGEN, or Mr. O'HARA, but I imagine they are right along the same line as that which Congressman ANDRESEN introduced.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, may I interpose a comment? I understand that all of the bills listed by the chairman are identical to the bill entered by Mr. MURRAY.

Senator HUMPHREY. Fine. I, of course, took notes on the bills presented by the Congressmen from our own State.

I have here a folder packed full of telegrams and letters from people in the dairy industry of the State of Minnesota. I have one here from the Twin Cities Milk Producers Associations from which I would like to read a paragraph. This letter is signed by Mr. Harry Leonard, general manager of the Twin Cities Milk Producers Association, and is dated February 8, 1949:

"Help has been so long delayed that a large part of its value has been lost. Butter has dropped from a high of 92 cents to the present 60-cent level; cheese, from 47 cents to 30 cents; dry milk dropped during the past week 1½ cents per pound to a level which returns the farmers not over 25 cents per hundred for skim milk. We got this much in the depression period of 1933."

That is the statement from Mr. Leonard.

A telegram arrived just before I came here today, from the Tri-County Dairy Association over a whole list of signers. I would like to read that telegram.

"We, the undersigned, do hereby urge your representation at a hearing which will be held by the House Committee on Agriculture Thursday, February 10. The manufactured milk market is in a precarious position. The price has dropped to the point where the dairy industry will suffer enormous damage. We think the price for butter and milk solids should be supported at a level whereby the farmer will be in a position to realize enough for his products to help sustain the national economy. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated."

My background in government was as mayor of a large city, the City of Minneapolis, Minnesota. I have always believed that the stability of our economy is basically predicated on the stability of our agriculture. Possibly that is because of the intimate relationship I have had with agricultural economy in South Dakota and Minnesota.

As a mayor, I tried to get that message across to our own people. Sometimes there is a difference of opinion between persons in an industrial area and persons in rural areas. To me their economies are inseparable. All too often we have watched our farm economy become depressed. I think the economic history of this country clearly reveals that every major recession or depression has been born in the agricultural community where there was a sudden price break, a decline in prices and values which in turn reflected itself in a break-down in inventory prices, unemployment, and ultimately in a depression.

I know of no committee that has more responsibility for the future well-being of American economy than the House Committee on Agriculture, and the similar committee in the United States Senate. I realize the great burden that is yours. I have the greatest respect for this committee, its distinguished chairman, and his colleagues, who have given many years of study to agricultural legislation. I come here to give you my point of view as to what I think ought to be done on an emergency situation, and on a long-range basis.

I have a statement here that I hastily prepared—and, believe me, it had to be hasty, because as you know we have been having a little trouble on the other side with hearings that have taken from 9:30 in the morning until 10 o'clock at night. With the few minutes I had before those meetings, and the late evenings, I put down the following remarks which I would like to have the privilege of reading. At any time, of course, I will stand open for questions.

Markets for factory milk in the United States are demoralized. Prices for manufactured milk have taken a terrific drop since last August. They have fallen from above four dollars per hundred pounds to less than three dollars a hundred pounds.

Without question, they have fallen below the Government guaranty of 90 percent of parity—if we could get the Department of Agriculture to establish a parity price for manufactured milk.

Our dairy farmers and processors are in distress. I am receiving hundreds of telegrams and letters asking that the Government make good on its pledge to support the prices of milk and milk products. Butter is in trouble, cheese is in trouble, and perhaps in the worst trouble in Minnesota now is dry skim milk.

One of my constituents sets forth the situation quite clearly. He points out that production of dry-milk solids in the United States last year was about 650,000,000 pounds. Of this, 479,000,000 pounds were sold in commercial channels; 100,000,000 pounds to the Children's Relief Fund of the United Nations; and 25,000,000 pounds to the Army. The balance, 46,000,000 pounds, has no market outlet now. It is dragging down the price of current production. Prices dropped by one-third in January. Some producers in my State say they are receiving only $2.50 a hundred for their milk. Yet parity for all milk is about $4 a hundred.

This man believes the Department of Agriculture should buy this surplus dry skim milk at once for 15 cents a pound—what it paid last year when the commercial price was 18 cents a pound. I agree. This one move right now would help restore confidence in an industry so discouraged that one plant in Minnesota is actually considering paying farmers for their milk in dry skim milk instead of in dollars.

This man also asks that the Secretary of Agriculture establish parity prices for manufactured milk—just as Congressman MURRAY's bill outlines. I agree, but I would go much further, as I shall show later.

I am told that the Department of Agriculture is giving notice today that it will buy dry skim milk starting February 21, on an offer-and-acceptance basis. That means bids. A distressed industry is bound to bid low to get rid of its surplus. The great Department of Agriculture, which must buy large quantities of this product this year anyway, for foreign relief and for the Army and school-lunch program, is likely to buy now at bargain rates.

If such is the case, I have little respect for the officials who would thus drive a hard bargain at the expense of farmers and processors who are already hard pressed. At this time, when we are all concerned about the spreading market declines and mounting unemployment, we ought to be doing all possible to bolster depressed markets. It seems to me this is no time for the Government to drive hard bargains. Strong, fast, price-supporting moves in farm markets right now will do much to halt the price panic that is gripping so many people in a deadly fear of depression which should never be permitted to arrive.

In regard to this business of setting parity prices for manufactured milk, I have been told that the Department of Agriculture does not now do this because its lawyers do not think the law requires it.

You have had some questions about that from Congressman MURRAY and your colleagues.

The Agriculture Department's interpretation is that the law only requires prices of butterfat and milk be supported. And milk is milk to them, whether it is high-priced fluid milk, or low-priced manufactured milk. So the prices of all kinds are averaged together to get the price of milk received by farmers each month.

Naturally, this blended, average price is much above what farmers get for milk sold to factories. And manufactured milk accounts for about 55 percent of all the milk sold in America.

By this legal interpretation, the Department feels that it never has to support the price of the milk that farmers sell to powder plants, condensaries, evaporators, and cheese factories. It may do it once in a while, but it does not think it is required by law to do so, even though prices as now are without doubt well below 90 percent of a realistic milk parity.

I think this policy should be ended. If the Department of Agriculture is too timid or conscientious to interpret the law as I feel sure its makers intended, then let us clear the matter up by a Congressional directive. Such as the bill and companion bills that have been presented here.

Now, permit me to quote from an article that appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, St. Paul, Minn., under the date line of Friday of last week—February 4, 1949. This article is by Alfred D. Stedman. He is the farm writer for the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, St. Paul, Minn.

"Four hundred harassed dairy men were joined by Minnesota legislators here Thursday in demanding that the Truman Administration make good its pledge that the farmers will not again be the first victims of a postwar depression.

"Mincing no words, they called on two top dairy officials of the United States Department of Agriculture, to insure immediate, emergency Government action to stop the present slump in milk prices and save cooperative and other dairy plants having backs to the wall.

"The two administration spokesmen, Mr. Philip Nelson and Don S. Anderson, were told bluntly by dairymen and legislators assembled in the Capitol Office Building Auditorium that the farm vote in the dairy States swung the recent presidential election against Dewey and to Truman."

I don't want to inject politics in here. I did not even know that was there. But I guess that is a matter of record these days anyway.

"The farmers voted in expectation that the Truman Administration pledges of price protection would be fulfilled."

By the way, this is coming from a Democrat, too, and I expect the Democratic Party

to fulfill its pledges to our farmers or they do not deserve that farm vote.

"Now, when the dairymen are being forced up against it, is the time to make those pledges good, the Federal officials were told.

"Responding to those demands the two officials who are Director, respectively, of the Production and Marketing Administration's Dairy Branch and Chief of its Manufactured Dairy Products Section, told the mass meeting these three things.

"First. They believe the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to establish a separate parity for manufactured milk as distinct from bottled milk, as the dairymen demanded.

"Second. That an official search now is on in Washington for funds to finance Government buying to support country milk prices up to 90 percent of that new parity.

"Third. That the way for dairymen to have permanent price supports is to get together on a long-time program which provides funds and disposal outlets through school lunches, stamp plan, or otherwise, for Government-purchased products."

I bring this news report to your attention because here are two officials who say that they believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to establish separate parity for manufactured milk as distinguished from bottled milk. I believe that the Government has that power, too, and they ought to act. If the Department does not act I think the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives, ought to help it act by a directive from the Congress.

Just a few more words and then I shall conclude my testimony.

This present system, blended milk parity, is now about $4 a hundred. I suspect that if two true parities for milk were worked out fairly that parity for fluid milk would be $4.50 a hundred, or more, and parity for manufactured milk would be at least $3.50 a hundred. That would make a 90 percent of parity support price for manufactured milk about $3.15 a hundred. Do not misunderstand me; I do not think that is enough. But if the Secretary of Agriculture is instructed to announce this "manufactured milk" support price regularly, and instructed to see that every farmer gets it, it would be a big help in the market.

The fact is that 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers is almost a depression level in these days of high, inflexible costs. If parity is right, then dairy farmers ought to get 100 percent and not some fraction of it. If the formula is not right then let us remake the formula. I am sure that this committee has given a good deal of study and time to the parity formula.

Farmers sell in a highly competitive, free market. Their prices are flexible, without any help from the Aiken Act. Farmers buy industrial products the prices of which are quite inflexible. For industrial prices are administered prices—managed by monopolies in their own interests. They can do this because of Government privilege in the form of tariffs, franchises, concessions, subsidies, etc.

Our economic system cannot stand two kinds of prices that work so differently. That is why we were finally driven to establish farm price supports.

If we are going to do the farm price support job which the national economy demands in order to keep functioning without a crack-up, we must have a minimum of 90 percent of parity price supports for every product for which we can work out a practicable plan. Let us not try to fool ourselves and the farmers into thinking some such formula as 60 or 70 or 80 percent of parity will do.

Maybe that is beyond the question here, and I will come back at a later time in regard to that, but I just wanted to give you my convictions on it.

There are two things I think ought to be done right away, and I would like to bring them to your attention. The immediate thing for the Department of Agriculture to do is to come back into the market and purchase dairy products at a price that will afford support to manufactured milk. That should be done immediately. They already have a plan by which they can support butter. Dry, nonfat milk solids should be purchased at about 15 cents per pound, and cheese, dry whole milk, and evaporated milk should be purchased at prices which will allow these producers to live also. This will have the effect of assuring the commercial buyer as to what the floor in the market will be and bring him back into the market now—and now means today, not next week when it may be too late for many of the plants.

I want to emphasize that. Many of our dry milk plants are literally with their backs to the wall. I have letters and telegrams showing that they are actually having to close their doors. They are up against it. To me that is a tragic situation. There are a number of people who have entered this business, young men who have come back from the war who have put their time, effort, and savings into this business, and they are just being rubbed out. Where on the one level their tractor prices are still up, their fertilizer prices are still up, and their feed bills are still up, whereas on the other level their processed milk prices are falling out from underneath them. That is what happened in the late twenties and early thirties.

The second step is to establish a separate parity price for manufactured milk. I admit this will take a little time.

I want to emphasize that the House bills would do just that—establish a parity price for the milk that goes into manufactured milk products.

I do not need to say more. You know how much the price of manufactured milk products has gone down, as much as 33 percent. I have learned a good deal about this in the last few weeks. I can say to my colleagues from Minnesota that the dairy business is an intricate and complex business, and I have great concern for it. I would be remiss in my responsibilities as a representative of the people of my State if I did not appear before your committee and urge upon you the most expeditious action and at the same time a long-range program on a sound and constructive basis.

I emphasize the two things which ought to be done: The urgency to act now. I think the Department of Agriculture should act now, and Congress should instruct the Department of Agriculture to act. Secondly, a long-range formula should be worked out. I agree that there may be need for two formulas, one for the dry-milk products, and one for the fluid milk. That is something that will take time to formulate. In the meantime, give us the emergency action so we can hold together and not permit financial ruin to come to a great section of the American farmer.

Thank you.

Mr. MURRAY. I don't think you intend to infer that Mr. Anderson or Mr. Nelson are opposed to anything we are trying to do.

Senator HUMPHREY. No; not at all. I can appreciate the circumstances under which Mr. Anderson and Mr. Nelson are working when we have three or four hundred good Minnesota farmers who want some action.

Mr. MURRAY. They have several hundred lawyers down there, too.

Senator HUMPHREY. Over in the Senate I said something about lawyers, and I had some lawyers get after me, so I am here again to voice my respect for the legal profession.

However, I say again that the lawyers are best in the legal field, but the farmers are best in the field of husbandry and agricultural economics.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. PACE.

Mr. PACE. It is recognized that it takes some time to work out these parity figures, but it is also true that the law requiring 90 percent of parity for milk and its products for the year 1949 went into effect on July 3, 1948, over 7 months ago. I think one of the principal complaints is that notwithstanding the expiration in excess of 7 months the figures are not yet available. I presume, Senator, that the dairymen in your State have encountered the enormous increase in the cost of producing milk just as all other producers of agricultural commodities.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is surely true.

Mr. PACE. The fact is that you are now paying two, three, or four times as much as you were a few years ago for the labor.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is right.

Mr. PACE. Assuming that the Department works out a parity as now provided by law, do you not think it most unfair that even when they get that figure it does not in any respect reflect this enormous increase that your dairymen are having to pay to their workers?

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely do. I believe that a parity formula should take into consideration the labor costs. After all, the farmer has to hire labor just the same as any industrial producer, particularly if he has a large dairy farm.

Mr. PACE. Whatever parity they work out, with or without this bill, it takes into account the wages they were paying back in 1909 to 1914, 30 years ago. When they work this out, it is not going to be a fair parity then.

Senator HUMPHREY. That is my point of view. Just as sort of a layman's opinion on this, without, as I say, appearing to be an expert at all, but just one vitally interested in agriculture because it is a great part of our life, it seems to me the parity formula which is based on the 1909–14 structure is a bit outdated, and we ought to find a better period, a more modern period, on which to base it. We ought to take into consideration what you have just suggested here, labor costs as well as other costs that go into the production of the product.

Mr. PACE. As you say, the dairymen and other milk producers must get a fair price in order to maintain the economy of this Nation.

Senator HUMPHREY. When I read the papers, which we all have a chance to do—and I imagine very sparingly in these days—what do we see in the headlines? We see what has happened to our South St. Paul cattle market; what has happened to corn prices; what has happened to wheat prices; what has happened to dairy products prices. The first people who are taking the rap again in this year 1949 are the farmers.

I have not lived too long, but I have lived through one depression, and I know that the very first person who got it in the neck in my native State, which was South Dakota, was the farmer. When he caught it, my dad caught it, who was a businessman, and then the wholesaler, because we could not pay our bills, and then later the industrialists caught it. Then we had unemployed people on the streets of New York, Detroit, Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis, St. Louis, Boston.

I think that ought to be adequate warning to a Government that has long viewed the people's problems in this country.

I speak for a political party that has many responsibilities. We made many pledges, and I hope that we will be wise enough to understand what can happen if a depression hits us. I do not think it is going to happen, and I pray God that it does not. But, believe me, we had better see to it that American agriculture is not shoved around and left in some dark corner by itself. If that happens, we will have labor unions and businessmen before your committee, and everyone else, begging that some great project and

formula be created that will get us out of the depression.

I do not want to be a pessimist. I am really quite an optimist. But I believe I am beginning to see some signs which are distressing and disturbing.

Mr. PACE. Do you not think it is a warning that the Congress had better not let the Aiken bill go into effect which would knock support prices down to as low as 60 percent of parity?

Senator HUMPHREY. Congressman PACE, to me, no truer words have ever been spoken in any congressional meeting than the words which you have just spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY. I certainly want to thank you for the indulgence of the committee. You have been very gracious to me and I hope that we can reciprocate at some time on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. We have been very glad to have you with us. You have made a fine statement.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from Mr. HULL.

(Senate bill 881: On February 10, 1949, Senator HUMPHREY introduced in the Senate a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk. This bill is now in the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry.)

Historic Sites and Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. David E. Finley, Director of the National Gallery of Art, before the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings, at its annual meeting in Washington, D. C., on November 4, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The executive board of this organization held a meeting about 2 weeks ago at which we had a short but profitable discussion of the subject I have been asked to talk about today, namely, the present and future role of the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings.

At the board meeting the discussion arose in connection with consideration of plans for seeking from Congress a charter for the proposed national trust for historic preservation, about which you will hear shortly from Mr. Alexander Smith, Jr., and his committee. The members of the board felt that we should all give serious consideration to the role which the trust can play in carrying out the purposes of its parent organization—the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings. They also felt that, in order to justify our own existence and certainly to justify to Congress the creation of a new, subsidiary organization, we must be quite clear in our own minds as to just what our opportunities for usefulness will be and how we propose to meet those opportunities.

In the back of all our minds probably is the thought of the British National Trust and the long list of achievements that stands to its credit in the field of historic preservation. In connection with that trust, we should also remember the splendid achievements of its American godparent, a more ancient organization known as the Trustees of Public Reservations of the State of Massachusetts. The bylaws of the Massachusetts association were substantially adopted by the British trust when the latter was organized in 1895, and I understand the Massachusetts body has the right to nominate a member of the council of the British trust.

Both of these organizations were early pioneers in the field and to them we are all indebted for what they have been able to accomplish in preserving historic monuments and scenic areas. We would do well to model ourselves on them in some respects but not entirely, for the situation that confronts us today is very different from that existing in 1895.

Since that time, thanks to the vigorous championship of Theodore Roosevelt, Stephen Mather, Gifford Pinchot, and others, there has been a great awakening in this country to the necessity of safeguarding our natural resources and especially our outstanding scenic areas.

Dr. Mather's great contribution was the organization of our national park system, which is so ably directed by Dr. Drury. What the National Park Service has already accomplished and what it is doing now and is equipped to do in the future fills us all with justifiable pride in our native American genius for organizing and operating an undertaking so filled with possibilities for the happiness of the American people. It was said of Dr. Mather after his death: There will never come an end to the good that he has done. I will add that the same can also be said of the Park Service which he founded.

In view, therefore, of what is being done to safeguard scenic areas, both by the Federal Government and also, to some extent, at least, by some of the States, we do not need to shoulder so much responsibility for the preservation of these areas as is true in the case of England with their national trust. In England, after all, the national trust has the responsibility both for safeguarding their historic and architectural treasures and also for saving England's green and pleasant land from the encroachments of those dark satanic mills against which Blake inveighed so long ago.

Here in this country our National Park Service is doing splendid work not only in scenic preservation but also in acquiring and opening to the public a few of our outstanding houses of architectural or historical importance. It makes us very happy to think of what the Federal Government, through its Park Service, is doing in the preservation and operation of such houses as Arlington, Hampton, and others in the short but distinguished list of national monuments which are now in the capable hands of the Park Service.

But the role of the Park Service is, after all, limited in this field and circumscribed, as in the case of all Government agencies, and properly so, by limitations imposed by Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget. We must not expect the Federal Government to organize all the rescue parties and do all the work of historic preservation for us. Much of it is our own responsibility in this fortunate country of ours where individual initiative still persists and where everyone does not expect the Government to do everything for everybody, as is the case in many countries across the sea. We must, in short, not lean too heavily on the Park Service. We should, on the contrary, invite the Park Service to lean on us, though I hasten to add, we hope they will not lean too heavily at first.

We, in turn, should not be content to fill merely the role of clearing-house for those older societies, such as the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society, the Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities, and other organizations which have such long and distinguished records and so many achievements to their credit in the field of historic preservation. These and other organizations, which came together in the spring of 1947 to form the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings, did so because they realized that there was, at that time, a no-man's land in the field of historic preservation which was not filled by any organization, governmental, regional, or private, and would seem to be indicated as the field in which the National Council and its proposed subsidiary, the National Trust, could do useful and important work.

First of all, the National Trust, when organized, will provide a legal entity which can assume title to such properties as may be donated to it and can be operated either by the trust itself, or by some qualified organization to which this responsibility can be delegated. The National Council has now the authority to accept legal title to property, if anyone will be kind enough to make us a gift. But the Council is too large and unwieldy a body to operate such properties as efficiently as would a smaller and more compact agency, such as we hope the National Trust will be.

We should recognize, however, that neither the National Council nor the National Trust is likely to be given important properties very often on a silver platter, so to speak. "The Lord helps those who help themselves," as most of us have found to be only too true in our own experience. Sometimes something you want drops into your lap, but mostly one is obliged to go out and get it the best way one can.

A case in point is Woodlawn. Last summer, in August, when most of those interested in historic preservation appeared to be happily engaged by the sea or in the mountains in conserving their own natural resources, Woodlawn came on the market. It was bought for what seems quite a reasonable sum by a Mission Society whose plans for its use did not contemplate that it would be opened to the public. A 3 months' stay of the sale was secured, with the kind cooperation of the Mission Society, and through the untiring efforts of a few individuals, headed by Mr. George Morris and Mr. Armistead Rood. This group has formed the Woodlawn Memorial Public Foundation, which is now endeavoring to raise more than $175,000 before the end of the year, so that Woodlawn can be opened to the public as a national monument and operated in the same manner as its neighboring property of Mount Vernon. The National Council has given such help as it could, including the use of its headquarters as offices, but the real burden of saving Woodlawn rests, and I fear may continue to rest, on the broad shoulders of Mr. Morris and Mr. Rood.

This is merely one example of the difficulties that will confront us in taking quick and effective action to preserve important properties for the public. What can we do in such situations? Certainly we cannot expect to provide the trust with funds sufficient to buy and operate all the desirable properties that may be offered to us. Nor do I think that we can expect, as in England, that the owners will often be in a position to give us title to the property free of encumbrance. There are, however, certain things we can do.

First of all, we must set up criteria as to what properties should be classified as historic or architectural monuments; second,

we should list the properties that conform to these requirements; and third, we should try to induce Congress and the various states to pass legislation that will minimize the hardships of owners in continuing to live in such properties and passing them on to the next generation, provided these properties are opened at stated times to the public, as is done in England.

There is a limited number of houses and other buildings of architectural or historic importance in this country that will meet the criteria we shall set up. Among them, there will be only a few of really primary importance. Today the public has access to such shrines as Independence Hall, Mount Vernon, Monticello, Arlington, Kenmore, Stratford, the Adams Mansion at Quincy, and others which are operated as historic house museums. From them the public carries away a renewed feeling of patriotism and a stronger belief in our own American way of life. They understand George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Robert E. Lee, and the Adamses better because they have some knowledge of the surroundings in which these great men lived and some appreciation of the tangible objects that filled their homes and were part of their lives.

These great historic houses and others which will be opened to the public in the future correspond to our art and science museums and like them, they preserve, under glass as it were, the finest specimens of a civilization that is not passing but merely changing and on which we are trying to graft new ways of living that, in some respects at least, will be not inferior to the old.

Few of us can live in large and beautiful houses, any more than we can own Rembrandts and Cezannes. But there is no reason why our smaller houses, or even our one or two room flats, should not be beautiful and in good taste, provided we have some knowledge of the best that is available and suitable under the circumstances.

But how, may I ask, are future generations to educate themselves and acquire a taste for what is best, not only in architecture and gardens, in pictures and prints, in furniture and textiles, in porcelain and crystal, but also in the amenities that were part of a civilized existence in the past and should be carried into the life we are building for future generations in this country?

In the art museums our people are brought into direct contact with the greatest works of art. In the historical field, however, much still remains to be done. Mr. Rockefeller has provided at Williamsburg an object lesson for all of us as to how it should be done; and this is true also in the case of many other architectural and historical monuments that have been preserved and opened to the public throughout this country. But these monuments are few and far apart, while Americans in fast-moving motorcars, with time on their hands and nowhere to go, crowd the roads and look eagerly for instruction as well as entertainment.

It is not only our business, it is also their business, to provide objectives which they can visit and enjoy and from which they can take home new ideas for the decoration of their houses and, more important still, a better undertanding of history. Somehow, we must induce the average man, woman and child to become interested in these things and conscious of their value. We must make them aware that the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings and the National Trust for Historic Preservation are their agencies and their clubs to which all can belong and to which all can contribute in saving the important monuments of our American civilization.

We must also enlist the interest and cooperation of powerful and public-spirited bodies throughout the country, such as the chambers of commerce, the Rotary Clubs, and others. We should leave nothing undone to bring about a realization of the fact that an important historical or architectural monument, well-preserved and properly shown, can be a source of revenue to a city, as witness Washington, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston, not to speak of London, Paris, Rome, and Florence. Mexico has learned this lesson, as all of you know who have visited that interesting country, so filled with famous and well-cared for monuments of its recent and more remote past. In Mexico City they have followed the example of Paris in preserving intact a beautiful facade, while allowing the interior to be put to some modern and profitable use, as in the case of the Iturbide Palace, which is situated on one of the most crowded business streets in the city. Part of our battle will have been won if we can convince the chambers of commerce and other local organizations that their city can acquire greater fame and perhaps more lasting prosperity by maintaining intact a famous and important building rather than by replacing it with a new skyscraper, such as one may see in any American city.

All this is a long-range program and requires intelligent planning and constant activity by an adequate staff at the headquarters of the national council and the national trust. Even a small staff, such as we now have, requires a steady revenue for their salaries and to carry out the work assigned to them. A steady revenue cannot be based on a few sporadic gifts, but must be derived from many modest dues, such as would appeal to the average man and woman, provided they are given a quid pro quo that they deem adequate—and by that I mean such privileges as free access to historic monuments, frequent reports of current and contemplated activities, and lectures with slides and movies in schools and clubs throughout the country.

We cannot expect at first to have large capital funds with which to finance emergency rescue parties. But certainly we should start to build up a revolving fund by means of gifts and bequests, so that the National Trust will some day have the means to help in cases where quick action is necessary.

Perhaps our most important role will be that of educating people to value and enjoy our own American heritage. It is a positive, active role and one, it seems to me, which we are peculiarly fitted to carry on. We have come into existence at a time when the country has need of us. And certainly we could ask for no more important task than that of helping to preserve intact our own heritage of freedom and cuture. This is especially true at this time when America and everything she stands for is under attack by ruthless, militant nations that do not believe in our American way of life or the institutions that produced the fabric we are trying to preserve.

Here in America, since the earliest days, a man has had freedom to choose what is most worth while in the cultural life of his time. But freedom to choose, unfortunately, is not a universal privilege in this strange and uncomfortable world in which we live, divided as it is into two parts; one based on democracy and freedom and the dignity of the individual; the other based on the harsh realities of the police state, the concentration camp, and the forced submission to uniformity in order that all men shall think and see and act alike. Such submission is the absolute negation of human liberty and will eventually warp, if it does not destroy, whatever is left of individual initiative in the totalitarian countries in things that have to do with the mind where spiritual and artistic impulses find their outlet.

In many parts of the world where totalitarian rule extends and the police state lays its heavy hand, the artist, the musician, the architect, is told what to do. His work is judged not by its excellence according to world standards but by its value in building up a consuming nationalism that admits of no equality elsewhere.

Certainly we want no such nationalistic point of view here in our arts or in our architecture. In this happier and more tolerant country a man may choose a design for his house derived from Palladio or Thomas Jefferson, or Eliel Saarinen, or from Spain or England or France or Pennsylvania or Cape Cod or the Pueblo Indians. He may be as derivative or as original or as modern as he pleases; and while the result may be a fairly inharmonious landscape, in any event, a man may choose what he wants; and that is very important and in line with American tradition, as taught not only in our histories but in our architecture. We see, as a result, a distinctive American pattern which has made its own original contribution to the world's architecture and, at the same time, has excluded nothing of value from whatever source it may have been derived.

We shall defend a man's right to choose, even to choose badly. But we also owe it to him and to all Americans to give them criteria on which, in time, they can base an informed judgment. To do this, we must preserve not only our great monuments of the past, but also those built in our own time and that will be built tomorrow and the day after.

Historic preservation is no cloistered, unimportant activity. It is part of the battle we are fighting in America today for the only kind of world that is fit to live in—the kind that generations of Americans have paid with their lives to preserve for us and for those who will come after us.

The Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated February 15, 1949, which was sent by me to the editor of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1949.

The EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I have read with considerable interest Mr. Arthur Krock's column of February 11, 1949. Appreciative as I am as a freshman Senator for Mr. Krock's political analysis of the Democratic caucus of February 5 and the developments which have taken place on the floor of the Senate pertaining to Senator KNOWLAND's resolution to discharge the Rules Committee, I humbly observe that the analysis is incomplete.

Senator KNOWLAND, of California, presented a resolution on the floor of the Senate to discharge the Rules Committee because of what he termed its failure to expedite action on a change in the Senate rules so as to curb the filibuster. This action on the part of Senator KNOWLAND was subsequently discussed by the Democratic caucus held on Saturday, February 5. It was patently clear that Mr. KNOWLAND's resolution was an attempt on the part of the Republican minority to challenge the majority leadership on a

very crucial question. This matter was thoroughly discussed and those of us who are strong supporters of civil rights legislation and supporters of Senator MEYERS' resolution proposing a majority vote for the application of cloture, were strong and firm in our conviction that we were not going to permit a political trick on the part of the Republican opposition to upset the Senate organizational structure of the Democratic party. However, I personally made it crystal clear by my remarks in the caucus that while I would support the Democratic leadership in voting down Senator KNOWLAND's resolution, I would expect the Rules Committee to expedite its report to the Senate and there I would reserve my right to vote my convictions.

Mr. Krock has quoted me as saying that the Knowland resolution "was obviously a political attempt to embarrass the Democrats and start taking control. If the Republicans who voted for the motion will support the program, civil rights, then we shall deliver every single pledge made by both national conventions." Mr. Krock makes a point of the fact, however, that I did not take note that the administration's refusal to face the civil rights and cloture issues was also for obvious political reasons. It is only fair to state that your reporter did not question me as to the administration's tactics. I was questioned only as to how I viewed the Republican or Senator KNOWLAND's strategy.

My position, however, is clear. The administration must quickly come to the decision that it cannot refuse to face the inevitable split over civil rights that exists within the Democratic Party. The administration leadership must clearly recognize that if we are to pass civil-rights legislation the rules of the Senate must be amended to permit a majority vote to apply cloture. I repeat, that is my position. It has always been, and I will fight for it.

The tragic mistake of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which mistake produced the Republican Eightieth Congress, was the unholy alliance of the Republican Party with the conservative wing of the Democratic Party. Specifically, I mean the Taft Republicans and the soon-to-be Dixiecrats. No greater political blunder could be made by the Democratic leadership in the Eighty-first Congress than to permit the direction and strategy of Democratic leadership to be guided and watered down by the willful purpose of a few Senators who are unwilling to subscribe to the clear-cut provisions of the Democratic platform. I should add that this willful group is not only demanding that the civil-rights issue be pushed aside, but it is equally adamant in its attitude toward fulfilling our pledges on such matters as the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the increase of the minimum wage, the health program, and other issues.

The time has arrived, in my judgment, for positive and bold action on the part of the President and the administration leadership. It is only through presenting the specific items of the Democratic platform in terms of legislative proposals that the country will be able to find out just how liberal some of the liberal Republicans really are. It will also provide a good political blood test for the revived Democratic Party. I am one of those who likes to have people stand up and be counted.

Those of us who have made clear our position on the civil-rights legislation will make equally clear our position on the application of majority rule for cloture. An amendment to the Rules Committee proposal will be presented on the floor of the Senate. At that time we will find out where Senator KNOWLAND and his Republican colleagues stand.

A political problem in the Senate regarding civil rights, if I may differ with Arthur Krock and Senator KNOWLAND, is not that of the Dixiecrats. We cannot blame the Southern Democrats for the dilemma we face. There are not enough of them to block legislation. The political problem we face is whether or not the Republicans and the Democrats who say they are for civil rights and who say they are for curbing the filibuster will really stand up and be counted when a roll call is made. The responsibility for this legislation is on both parties and I am eager to see what the roll call yields.

I am convinced that I have the full support of the President in my expression of these opinions. No President in the history of this country has been more courageous in his support of civil-rights legislation than President Harry S. Truman. I am convinced that the Democratic platform helped make the victory possible on November 2. I am equally convinced that the failure of the Democratic Party to enact that platform will make possible a victory of Republican reaction in November 1950. I complete the trinity by saying that I am wholeheartedly convinced that our success in the passage of civil-rights legislation and the other important aspects of the platform will make the Eighty-first Congress go down in history as one of the greatest of all time.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Consolidation of State Agencies To Save Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARRETT L. WITHERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. WITHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD a most interesting letter from Hon. Earle C. Clements, the governor of my State. Governor Clements, by consolidation and efficient administration, has been enabled to operate several of our State agencies without seeking additional Federal moneys.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, February 11, 1949.

Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am attaching a copy of a telegram received from Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments.

The message, you will note, is self-explanatory. However, upon its receipt the matter was taken up with Mr. Vego Barnes, commissioner of the department of economic security, with reference to the needs for additional funds to cover administrative costs of the unemployment compensation commission and the employment service.

As you may know, at the last session of the legislature the above-mentioned agencies together with the division of public assistance and child welfare were combined, and the outcome was the creation of a new department of economic security, headed by Commissioner Barnes, which embraced all of the State agencies spending both State and Federal funds in the over-all social-security program.

Since this consolidation was effected, and as a result of prudent and efficient administration, the commissioner reports that his department will be able to live within its budget and will not need additional allocations. It is his opinion that the support which the deficiency bill has is being generated by those States refusing to consolidate their various social-security programs—thereby failing to realize the economies which Kentucky has demonstrated to be possible through such a move.

Sincerely yours,

EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor.

(Following is the telegram referred to by Governor Clements:)

FEBRUARY 8, 1949.

In the great majority of States the appropriation and allocation for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, were inadequate when made. Since then increasing loads and lack of administrative funds have combined to create situation that not only causes great waste public funds but serves to undermine system of employment security.

The problem is immediate and urgent. Congress now considering deficiency bill and States must have approximately $20,000,000 additional for this fiscal year to insure effective and economical administration.

If this situation exists in your State, and if you think wise, suggest you wire your congressional delegation.

FRANK BANE,
Executive Director, Council of State Governments.

Relations With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by my good friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, the only United States honorary fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil, and an honorary professor of the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Honor and gratitude alike suggest that we remember the solemn pledge given by our late President, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the people and to the Government of Spain. At the time of the fateful landings in North Africa, when loyal friendship in the Iberian Peninsula was vital, President Roosevelt, addressing himself to the head of the Spanish state, declared that "Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations."

In the light of this assurance, Spain, her Government and her people, furnished solid protection to our flank when our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines made their initial onslaught on the enemy. That was an hour in United States history, when a friend in need was a friend indeed. Spain, acting in her own true interests, defied the Axis more than once. In every such instance, the security of Spain coincided with the best interests of the United States.

During the past few months, I have had several personal conferences with wartime Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes. This scholar,

although restored to his post as Seth Low professor of history in Columbia University, retains all his interest in, and love for, Iberian culture. Best of all, he is in intimate touch with contemporaneous Spanish history as well as with the most recent developments in Hispanic-American affairs. It is the conviction of Professor Hayes, author of the famous best seller, Wartime Mission in Spain, that we should grant the 28,000,000 people of Spain generous economic collaboration. His reasons for such a policy of friendship and cooperation may be summarized as follows:

1. Spain and Portugal are essential to the success of the good-neighbor policy. This feature of Hispanic-American relations was admirably outlined in a statement by Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS on February 3, 1949. It is available in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 509.

2. Under Spain's Foreign Minister (now Ambassador at Large Don José Felix de Lequerica in the United States), as well as under his predecessor, Count Francisco Jordana, the Spanish Foreign Office, with the obvious approval of the head of the Spanish state, granted us more favor than did any other neutral government, whether Sweden, Turkey, Switzerland, or Portugal. Not only did the Spanish Government pledge itself not to interfere in any way with our fateful landings and campaign in north Africa. Not only did it assure us as early as February 1943, that it would join us in war if the Axis should attempt an invasion of Spain. Not only did it permit us to use Spain as the base for invaluable espionage of Axis activities in France and the Mediterranean, it also accorded us important positive favors. It allowed us to get over 1,200 American airmen safely across the peninsula, without any internment. It permitted the transit and exit of over 25,000 members of the French resistance movement as reinforcements for the Allied Armies in north Africa. It choked off export of strategic war materials to Germany before any other neutral had done so. Spain, too, was the first country to conclude a permanent air agreement with us, and one whereby we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes.

In the light of all such facts, it is simply hypocritical to countenance the notion that Spain has been hostile to us and should therefore be treated as a pariah among the nations. It certainly belies the solemn assurances which President Roosevelt gave to the head of the Spanish state in November 1942.

There is in Spain a natural and almost inevitable evolution of the domestic administration toward greater liberty and democracy. The municipal elections in last November and December are evidence of this healthy trend. Freedom's progress can best be served by understanding, good will, and friendship. That is the United States role in the development of democracy in the Iberian Peninsula.

On the other hand, no nation likes to be dictated to by foreigners, least of all the Spaniards, and when our Government joins Generalissimo Josef Stalin in trying to tell the Spanish people that they must get rid of the present head of the Spanish state, the natural response is popular feeling in support of the existing administration. And how silly it is to allege that Spain—or the head of the Spanish state—is a threat to world peace. The real threat to world peace is in Moscow, not in Madrid.

Not only should we in the United States resume full and friendly diplomatic relations with Spain, and counsel our other friends in western union to do likewise. We should seek to cooperate with Spain commercially, economically, and culturally, and forswear any interference in its internal affairs. We should eventually help to secure Spain's admission to the United Nations or to any other world or regional organization which may supplant or supplement it.

Fortunately, the United Kingdom now favors an exchange of ambassadors between London and Madrid. For some time, our own State Department has recognized the folly of the now obsolete and invalid 1946 UN resolution, which was canceled out by the failure of the identical resolution in the General Assembly in 1947. Appeasement of the Soviet Union has failed. Consequently, political blunders that were perpetuated in the name of Soviet appeasement must be obliterated, if not atoned for. Truth and fairness toward Spain are better than any amount of political appeasement of the unappeasable Soviet Union.

For Spain is vital, as we see it, to American interests. The late war has abundantly demonstrated the enormous strategic importance of the Iberian Peninsula for any war in which the United States, unhappily, may henceforth be involved. Nor can the United States have enduring proper understanding with Hispanic America without proper understanding with Spain. As House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK puts the case for friendship between the United States and Spain, the "goal is inescapable." Once more, the brave, liberal, noble-hearted leader of Democracy was right. He was the first statesman of Capitol Hill to call for the recognition of the present administration in Madrid as the de facto and de jure Government of Spain early in 1939. Now, early in 1949, he points the way again for those who love liberty.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Advice for Americans," from the New York Enquirer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVICE FOR AMERICANS

In these days when too many are being misled by the false doctrine of communism it would be well to recall the words a great American—Charles H. Silver—uttered in warning against this false philosophy.

Mr. Silver, who was toastmaster, spoke at the recent dinner held in honor of former Gov. Alfred E. Smith, his warm, personal friend for many years. He paid tribute to the late governor as "a product of the American way of life," and asked if the liberty of belief and expression enjoyed by Smith and by all Americans would be possible under communism. Then he said:

"Communism is the enemy of human liberty. It is an ugly challenge to our freedom. It seems to strangle liberty.

"It is the Communist thesis that the state is god and master; that the rights of the individual belong to the state; that the common man must be kept common.

"It seeks to disrupt and destroy our American way of life. It seeks to weaken and destroy our American democracy."

Warning that we must always be on guard against communism, Mr. Silver said:

"You and I want to see our children happy and free * * * with love in their hearts and a true understanding of what the American way of life means to them; * * * we want to encourage industry and commerce to function without orders from ruthless dictators; we want to keep our houses of worship open so that Catholic, Jew, and Protestant may enter without fear of attack from those who destroy all religions."

Mr. Silver stressed that the strongest weapon against communism "is the philosophy of democracy itself." He said we need have no fear of the destruction of democracy if "we cling to its teachings, and that the only danger lies in our departure from a form of society which has made this country the most powerful Nation on earth."

Our Spanish Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very scholarly discussion of our Spanish policy which appeared in the letter column of the Washington Evening Star, October 30, 1948, from the pen of Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SISTER REPUBLICS AND SPAIN

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

It was as refreshing as it was gratifying to read the factual and well-reasoned editorial on our Spanish policy in a recent issue of the Star.

The message which the Star formulated in patriotic terms may be read with profit, not only by the residents of the District of Columbia, but also by all the citizens of the United States. It is correct to urge that in the current crisis we have an obligation to base our foreign policy upon enlightened self-interest. Those who are charged with the Nation's security have recognized the strategic importance of the Iberian Peninsula. Last spring the House of Representatives, reflecting a good deal of public sentiment, voted overwhelmingly to include Spain in the European recovery program. The Members of Congress realized that it was criminal folly to invite Soviet-dominated countries like Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to accept American help and at the same time to exclude from the benefits of this program the Spanish people and the Spanish Government which accorded us valuable assistance in World War II.

It is interesting to observe that the foremost witness to the help we received from both Spain and Portugal was and still is wartime Ambassador Carlton J. H. Hayes. Although Professor Hayes has returned to his post, as Seth Low professor of history at Columbia University, he continues to point out that it is a matter of American honor to be grateful to the present Spanish Government.

The Star's editorial raises an interesting point with respect to the United Nations resolution of 1946 which recommended the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid. Whenever this 1946 resolution is mentioned, it is imperative to add that when the same resolution was reintroduced in 1947 it failed to secure the two-thirds vote necessary for adoption.

PRACTICAL VIEW EMPHASIZED

Technically, to be sure, some State Department experts seem to make out a good case for their view that since the 1946 resolution never was formally repudiated it continues to remain in effect. From a practical point of view, however (and this is what should interest us in our duel with the Soviet Union), it is fair to raise the following questions: Why was it judged necessary to reopen the whole question in the 1947 General Assembly of the United Nations? Why was a new vote taken on the identical proposition that, under Soviet pressure, had been acceptable in 1946? Why continue to follow an admittedly bankrupt policy face to face with the monstrous realities of 1948? The best evidence as to the practical nature of these questions may be obtained by studying the record of diplomatic activity displayed by the other American republics in 1947 and 1948. Since the failure of the United Nations' resolution against Spain in 1947, many South American countries, including Peru, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Argentina, have accredited ambassadors and ministers as chiefs of their diplomatic missions in Madrid. The same movement is noticeable in Central America. The Acting Foreign Minister of the Republic of Costa Rica has announced that that republic is sending a chief of diplomatic mission to Spain. Previously, the republics of El Salvador and Nicaragua had taken the same step precisely in the light of the reasons admirably set forth in the Star's editorial. This is a trend which the citizens of the United States, who cherish the good-neighbor policy, should study with profound attention.

Much more is at stake than the security of Europe against further Soviet aggression; the high principles and ideals of inter-American friendship are involved in this struggle between the Soviet regime of slavery and the non-Soviet world whose aims must be liberty and progress. It is time entirely to disregard subtleties and technicalities in order to protect human rights in the Western Hemisphere. Our sister republics have shown the way. It is our duty to think in practical terms of our own national welfare.

Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of the Americas and World Affairs.

Religious Pressure on Trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from O. K. Webb, pastor of the Rutledge Avenue Baptist Church, of Charleston, S. C., together with an article entitled "Baptist Ministers Here Attack 'Religious Pressure' on Trial," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of February 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUTLEDGE AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH,
Charleston, S. C., February 16, 1949.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: In our Baptist pastors conference today they voted to ask me to send the enclosed article to you that you might see how the Baptist ministers of this section feel about world life and the issue confronting us. If it's of any value to you, you may feel free to use it or any part of it in any sort of way.

Yours sincerely,

O. K. WEBB,
For Secretary,
Charleston Baptist Pastors Conference.

BAPTIST MINISTERS HERE ATTACK "RELIGIOUS PRESSURE" ON TRIAL

The trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was a civil trial and to inject religious pressure into it is un-American and dangerous beyond estimation, the Charleston Baptist ministers conference declared in a statement issued after a meeting in Citadel Square Baptist Church yesterday.

"The sentiments developed from this trial are extremely dangerous," the statement read. "Agitation by radio and press has been of such nature as to actually tend toward a state of war between this country and communistic Hungary. We would urge therefore that the American people think carefully and prayerfully before reaching conclusions which would lead to such a disaster.

"Numerous occasions have arisen in recent times where individuals of different faiths have undergone such trials, but their cases have not been used for pressure purposes by the religious bodies of which they are a part."

The statement follows in full:

"Baptists have traditionally stood for liberty of conscience and the other liberty necessary for maintaining liberty of conscience, liberty of speech. Baptists introduced the idea of democracy into this land of ours and we stand ever jealous of any infringement upon the doctrine of the individual. Necessary to the doctrine of the dignity of the individual is that of the separation of church and state. Where the state has supremacy over religion or a religious sect has authority over the state, individuals always become subservient to the authority in power. History is monotonous in its proof of that fact.

"As Baptists we see a grave danger in the sentiment arising from the case of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. The trial of Mindszenty was behind the iron curtain and doubtless held rigidly to communistic philosophy, which must be condemned by any freedom-loving individual.

"Because the trial was behind the iron curtain, all the facts in the case cannot be known. The conviction of Mindszenty was a matter for the civil courts of Hungary. Mindszenty was a citizen of that country and under the jurisdiction of the laws of that country as much as is every other Hungarian. The fact that he was a cardinal in the Roman system should have had no connection with the fact that he was convicted.

"He was convicted according to the communistic type of justice. Whether he was guilty or not is a matter which ought to concern every person in the world who regards his freedom as of any value; for an infringement of his freedom is essentially a challenge to all freedom. However, protecting him from the courts of the land behind the cloak of Romanism, is equally a threat to the liberty of every man who regards freedom a dear possession.

"We deplore the effort of Cardinal Spellman, President Truman, or anyone else who tries to inject into a civil trial immunity from justice because of the religious position of the one being tried. We consider this a serious threat to the freedom of mankind.

"The trial of Mindszenty may be an attempt on the part of the Government to control religion but no more so than was the trial of the humblest Christian in any other communistic country.

"It is certainly no more of an attempt to control religion than the Roman Catholic Church is doing in Spain, where none but Catholics are allowed to hold public services and private services are ever threatened with violence. Section 6 of the Spanish Constitution of June 17, 1945, reads as follows: 'The profession and practice of the Catholic religion, which is the religion of the Spanish state, will enjoy official protection. * * * No public ceremonies or manifestations will be permitted in any religion other than the Catholic religion.' Nor is it any more of an effort to control religion than the Roman Catholic Church is doing in sections of South and Central America. This is a civil trial, and to inject religious pressure into it is un-American and dangerous beyond estimation.

"The sentiments developed from this trial are extremely dangerous. Agitation by radio and press has been of such nature as to actually tend toward a state of war between this country and communistic Hungary. We would urge therefore that the American people think carefully and prayerfully before reaching conclusions which would lead to such a disaster.

"Numerous occasions have arisen in recent times where individuals of different faiths have undergone such trials but their cases have not been used for pressure purposes by the religious bodies of which they are a part."

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Must Still Guess on Foreign Policy," published in the Grand Forks (N. Dak.) Herald of February 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUST STILL GUESS ON FOREIGN POLICY

If there ever was a time when the people of the United States and those of the world should have certain knowledge of our foreign policy, that time is now. They at least should know, without having to guess, which direction the State Department is going on developments which are either democratic or opposed to democracy.

Our Government has had ample time to build the ground work of a policy which could be accepted with confidence everywhere, but such is not the case. It cannot be accepted with confidence even on the North American Continent. Yet the United States is expected to be and is attempting to fill the role of world leader.

That our foreign policy cannot inspire confidence on this continent was demonstrated when our State Department recognized totalitarian governments in Venezuela and El Salvador. Naturally, there was sharp criticism in Washington of the course taken, particularly as it had to do with the casual attitude toward the situation in Venezuela. Administration officials offered weak defense in a statement which generally deplored plots to overthrow governments in Latin America.

Last November a military clique staged a coup d'état in Caracas. At that time our State Department announced it was too early to discuss formal recognition of the new regime. The Gallegos government, which was

overthrown, had polled 70 percent of the Venezuelan vote in a free election last spring.

Despite the fact that the regularly elected administration had come into office by democratic process, some two months later President Truman's State officials placed their stamp of approval on a group of plotters who overturned the legal government of that country.

A State Department spokesman has gone at length to make it abundantly clear the United States still regards such overt acts as not only deplorable but unusually inconsistent with the acknowledged ideals of American republics."

We need no State Department official to tell us such acts are inconsistent with the ideals of democracy. We need not be told, either, that the decision of the Washington administration in condoning such an act is inconsistent with our own ideals and position. What we would like to know is when we are going to have a foreign policy that is consistent—one that follows a logical line of reasoning and in which we and the rest of the world can place some confidence.

Migratory Bird and Game Treaty With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Kem Resolution on Ducks," published in the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune of February 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEM RESOLUTION ON DUCKS

Director Albert Day, of the Interior Department Fish and Wildlife Service, told reporters the other day that the resolution which has been introduced by Senator JAMES KEM, of Missouri, for an investigation of Mexico's observance—or lack of observance—of the migratory bird and game treaty with the United States would not help negotiations between the countries on this subject.

Director Day discounts numerous and widespread reports of how wild ducks are being slaughtered in Mexico for commercial purposes and of other destructive practices that disregard all principles of modern wildlife conservation. Day bases his opinion on information gathered on a recent visit to Mexico.

Other opinion disagrees with this.

The Missouri Duck Hunters' Association has conducted a vigorous campaign to get something done about what it describes as the slaughter of ducks in Mexico, and Matt Morse, a member of the Missouri group, paints a sordid picture of the Mexico situation in a recent article in Field and Stream magazine. In fact, Senator KEM introduced his resolution largely at the behest of the Missouri duck hunters.

It may be, as Director Day says, that Mexican officials resent the American attitude that we own all the ducks on the continent. The Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service might have politely replied to these Mexicans that American sportsmen also resent being held to a measly bag limit of 4 ducks per day and a meager season of only 30 days, while Mexican laws permit a daily bag of 25 ducks and a 4 months' open season.

Furthermore, Americans have spent millions of dollars and unlimited time and energy to improve breeding grounds throughout the plains and marshes of Canada. These efforts have produced a definite and gratifying increase in the duck population. It doesn't make American sportsmen feel very happy to hear reports of how the ducks they have helped raise in Canada and helped protect during their flight through the United States are being slaughtered for fun and profit after they cross the border into Mexico.

If these reports are untrue or exaggerated, as Director Day contends, then a public investigation of the facts as called for under the Kem resolution would reveal information most gratifying to all concerned and not in any way embarrassing to Mexican officials whose feelings Director Day is fearful of hurting. If the reports are true, then a public investigation would help pave the way for speedier action toward a remedy.

Either way, the Kem resolution would seem to be in order.

Federal Government Structure in Relation to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Good, Hard Look," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 15, 1949, dealing with the resolution proposing a study of the structure of the Federal Government in relation to State and local governments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR GOOD, HARD LOOK

A bill of laudable purposes—the purposes of examining the results of the steady centralization of power in the Federal Government, of ascertaining how much of this centralization has resulted from necessity and how much from political design—has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio.

The bill by the former governor and the present junior Senator calls for the creation of a national commission on intergovernmental relations. The commission, which would be somewhat comparable in scope of authority to the Hoover commission on the reorganization of the Executive branch of the Federal Government, would be composed of representatives of the national administration, Congress, State government, municipal government and the taxpaying public that foots the bill for the oppressive snarl of Federal-State-local taxation and the wasteful, confusing jumble of jurisdictions of the three levels of government.

As Senator BRICKER accurately points out, not since the adoption of the Constitution, the framers of which believed they had stipulated a "proper division of powers and functions between the Federal and State governments," has a thoroughgoing inquiry into intergovernmental relationships been conducted. Senator BRICKER is deeply concerned, and rightly so, with the way in which the three levels of government, Federal, State, and local, have crisscrossed the jurisdictional lines—and with the enormous concentration of governmental power in Washington.

In presenting his bill to set up a commission to determine the best allocation of functions between the Federal and State governments, and mark out appropriate fields of taxation in harmony with its proposed allocation, Senator BRICKER made some remarks that should be soberly pondered by the American people generally, and by the Republican Party leadership particularly, if that party is to be the party which the senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT, believes it should become: the party militantly protecting human liberty against the steady encroachment of government.

"I believe the Congress should find out, if it can," said Senator BRICKER, "what factors have contributed to the centralization of government in Washington, and the degree of contribution of each."

"I believe the Congress must carefully examine the ultimate result of the trend toward centralization. Are we faced with an irresistible rush toward centralization—then state socialism—then dictatorship? I do not believe we are. I do not believe that this trend, which to my mind will certainly lead to the eventual destruction of the Federal form of government, is irreversible. Again it is high time the Congress stop and take stock—high time to find out where we are going.

"It may be," Senator BRICKER said later in explanation of his bill, "that State and local governments are expensive, archaic manifestations of a bygone day and should be dissolved. Heaven forbid such a finding—but if they are, let's find it out and stop paying lip service to the Federal system."

Senator BRICKER is quite right; it is time to take a good, hard look and see what time, a vastly changed economy, and the dreamers of a welfare state have done to the handiwork of the creators of the Federal government who delegated what they thought were carefully enumerated powers to that government.

The Atom Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Momentous Decision," from the Bridgeport Telegram of February 7, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MOMENTOUS DECISION

Chairman BRIEN MCMAHON, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, made a very daring address in Detroit last week when he pointed out that there lurks in so much secrecy over our atom bomb, a possible threat of war.

The barrier to truth set up by the iron curtain, the Senator said, has brought about the current armament race, and history is replete with proof that every unrestricted armament race can have but one result—war.

No wonder the correspondents say he has thrown a bombshell into Washington, a miniature atom bomb, and a pretty row has been stirred. Mr. MCMAHON doesn't say we should reveal the strength of our atomic energy development, but in the interests of peace, he

asks, "How can we expect mankind to believe us unless all the world knows that atomic weapons are capable of being produced in quantity? Are we not obligated to tell mankind what this elemental force means—in terms of production facts and figures?"

Immediate objection came from other Senators, yet Chairman McMAHON has directed David E. Lilienthal, chairman of the Commission, to study the question of secrecy. "My request refers solely to the size of the stock pile," the Connecticut Senator emphasized. "This is a highly guarded secret. In my opinion, the time has come to reconsider that question."

It is clear that Mr. McMAHON is not trying to bring into public knowledge any of the secret processes involved in the development of atomic bombs or any of the data on military strength. What he would like to know is where we actually stand today. It is likely that we have the only bombs in the world, and certainly, according to Mr. Lilienthal's current report, we have the most powerful ones and are producing bigger ones all the time.

But the Senator, who is chairman of Congress' joint committee on the subject, doesn't know how many we have, or how rapidly we are making them. This lack of information, he complains, makes the United States like a general who must train his troops without knowing how many rounds of ammunition they will be issued.

It may well be that the information will never come out, but Senator McMAHON is perfectly justified in demanding to know where the country actually stands, in light of the Lilienthal report. After all, what is the chairman supposed to be, and the Senate, figureheads? At least now the matter will be studied and debated by those who, like Senator McMAHON, have our country's interests at heart always.

The Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time To Stop, Look, Listen," published in the Kansas City Star of February 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME TO STOP, LOOK, LISTEN

Sometimes, when we read all the clamor from Washington for more taxes, more spending, more Government functions, we wonder if they really know what is going on out over the country. Eventually, Washington and its myriads of experts will find out. Facts have a habit of catching up with theory. But often it is too late and genuine needless damage has been done.

If there ever was a time to look and think realistically, when sober judgment is needed, not just pious good intentions, that time is now. The country didn't begrudge President Truman his joyous, happy inaugural. He had it coming for his surprise victory and the almost single-handed battle he waged for reelection. But the tumult and shouting is over now and the painful "morning after" is at hand, much sooner than anyone anticipated.

Almost unnoticed, except by the people immediately hurt, there has been an acceleration in the drop of commodity prices that justifies genuine concern over the future months to come. The cost of living is coming down, for which housewives the country over probably will sing hosannas. Everyone, including the farmers themselves, recognized that food prices had got out of hand and were entirely too high the last 18 months. It was generally recognized a readjustment was coming and that it was a healthy, not a dangerous, omen. But most economists, and certainly Government leaders, hoped for an orderly adjustment, not a slide such as brought on the depression of the early twenties. What has happened in recent weeks has been a blizzard on farm commodity prices, almost comparable to the blizzard that has locked the great West in ice and snow.

From the high spots of 1948, more than $10,000,000,000 has been taken off the value of livestock generally. More than half of this has come since the fateful November 2 election, when many farmers thought they were voting for sustained high prices. To be fair about it, this drop probably would have happened just the same whether Dewey or Truman had been elected. But it has stunned cattle and hog raisers out West. The farmers aren't broke, but feeders have been badly hurt, and there is growing uneasiness and concern over the future, which is not healthy.

The Associated Press reported this week that its wholesale commodity index had dropped to the lowest point since February 11, 1947, with a decline of more than 3 percent in the last week and over 7 percent in the month of January. From the all-time high point, the index has dropped from 208 to approximately 170. All this has not been reflected yet to the consumer's table, but it is on the way. Specifically, on the Kansas City market, hogs reached a record high in August 1948, of $31.75. On election day, November 2, they were $25.50 a hundred—one of the reasons many farmers didn't vote or were afraid of Dewey. They felt there was a better chance of getting help from Truman than Dewey. The top price at the end of last week was around $20.50 a hundred, even below the OPA price.

Or take cattle. The record high was in July 1948, at $40.50 a hundred. On election day, the top for steers was $33.50. The very top this last week was $25, and there were days when good fed cattle brought only $22. When it is recalled that feeders often paid above $30 for their steers, the licking they have taken is apparent.

Lard has slipped worse than anything, although the Government is endeavoring to bolster the market by increased shipments abroad. From a record high in March 1947, of $32.75 a hundredweight, lard sold at $19 on election day, bobbed back up on the hope that the Democratic administration was going to do something, and then dropped back down to as low as $13.60 last week. Lambs haven't shown such a wide fluctuation. From a record high in July of last year of $33 and a price of $25.50 on election day, they are off only about $1 now from the election-day figure.

The story on grains is a bit different because of Government supports. Wheat, which stood at $2.24 a bushel on election day, held pretty well until the last week, when it tumbled at least 10 cents a bushel. Corn took its big drop last year because of the huge crop. It was selling for $2.27 last July. By election day, it was down to $1.35, one reason Dewey lost the big corn States. It went up a bit after election, but this week broke below election-day figures. The story is about the same on other commodities. Butter in Kansas City dropped from 92 to 67 cents. Eggs have dropped from a high of 51 to 39 cents. Butterfat has dropped from last year's high of 85 to 55 cents, but is up slightly from election-day figures.

All this is the story, not of what is going to happen, but of what has happened in the Kansas City territory. The farmer is not broke, but the readjustment has been more violent than expected. Buying power, necessarily, will be affected. The tremendous Government expenditure for shipments abroad and rearmament should tend to put a floor under the decline. If it does, farm sections can weather it. If it doesn't, and the decline continues, it could vitally affect future national economic prospects. Much is heard of keeping the buying power of labor up to keep prosperity, but the buying power of the farmer is just as important in the economic picture.

With such a picture already at hand, it would seem obvious it is time for Washington to show caution, at least, in its thinking and acting. They still talk of inflation controls when, except possibly on rents and a few other spots, inflation is as dead as $3 corn or the dodo bird. Everyone, seeking more spending for this or that purpose and more taxes, is claiming a mandate from the people for his particular pet project. The facts are, if there was any mandate in the close election, it was that a majority of those casting votes trusted Truman for the future more than they did Dewey.

Both parties promised prosperity. No one wants a debacle. Much of the program being pressed upon Congress might be all right in a period of a rising, expanding economy. But the sharp readjustment, to put it mildly, that has already come in farm commodities should be signal enough, both to the administration and to Congress, to slow up a bit in their thinking, and more important, in their spending on new programs that will increase the governmental load year by year for all time.

If the picture of the country as a whole is looked at realistically, it is a time for tax cutting, not tax increases. It is a time when wage raise sprees can't be justified, desirable as they might be. All the billions we are spending for defense and building up our armament will be wasted if the Nation's economy is not kept sound. That is the foundation on which the future has to be built.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the English-Jewish Press in America

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and pleasure to be present at a conference of the American-Jewish press representatives, representing nearly every large city and nearly 52 of the really American patriotic and loyal independent Jewish newspapers. In that connection, the President of the United States sent a letter congratulating them on the one hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first newspaper in English in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in my remarks the letter of the President and also a review of the first publication 100 years ago of the Jewish-American-English newspaper, which has always remained loyal and extremely patriotic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

(The matters referred to are as follows:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 2, 1949.

Mr. PHILIP SLOMOVITZ,
President, American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers, Detroit, Mich.

MY DEAR MR. SLOMOVITZ: Please give my warm greetings to all those who are attending the convention of the American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers February 18 to 21. The one hundredth anniversary of the publication of The Asmonean is a significant occasion, and I am delighted to have a part in it.

The century that has passed since that date has witnessed our country's rise to a commanding world position. This has been possible because we were richly endowed by nature, but even more because we have drawn to ourselves from all the nations of the earth those who loved freedom best.

It is our people who have made America great, and I am proud of the fact that there have always been many of Jewish origin among us. In the development of our country, in its defense, and in upholding its high ideals, American Jewry has played a distinguished role.

For 100 years the Jewish press has been a potent force in building the America we love. May it long continue to uphold the highest ideals of human dignity and social justice.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENGLISH-JEWISH WEEKLY PRESS IN AMERICA

(By Philip Slomovitz, president, American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers; editor, the Detroit Jewish News)

There are several stages in Jewish journalism in which Ladino (Judeo-Spanish), German, Hebrew, Yiddish, and English were the language media.

The first Jewish periodical in the world, which made its appearance at about the same time that the general European press was born, was published in the Ladino language, in Amsterdam, in 1678, under the name Gazeta de Amsterdam. It is interesting to note that the second Jewish publication in the world on record was published in 1687, also in Amsterdam, in Yiddish, and was known as the Tuesday and Friday Courant. It was short-lived—it survived only 16 months—and its text was in the Judeo-German known as Ivre Taitsch, its actual name having been Dinstagishi und Freitagishi Courantin.

In the following century, Hebrew publications began to make their appearance. Moses Mendelssohn published a Hebrew weekly, Kohelet Musar, in 1750. During the Haskalah period, Hebrew dailies were published and were the media for spreading modern ideas among Jewish communities, meanwhile setting into motion the movement for the revival of the language of the Bible.

Toward the end of the last century, Yiddish dailies assumed the leadership and became the dominant factors in guiding the thinking of the Jewish masses throughout the world. This was as true of the United States as it was of European countries. In this country and in Poland the Yiddish dailies predominated, although newspapers and periodicals also appeared in other languages in the Jewish communities of both countries. There were Polish and Hebrew journals in Poland. In the United States, Jewish periodicals appeared in German, Hebrew, and Ladino. La Vara, a Ladino periodical, edited by Albert S. Torres, was published in New York from 1922 to 1948, and it was only about a year ago that this Judeo-Spanish weekly finally ended an interesting existence in the declining community of Spanish Jews.

Prior to the era of Yiddish journalism in America, there were a number of German-Jewish periodicals and attempts also were made to foster a Hebrew press. At present, there is one Hebrew weekly, Hadoar, now prospering, in its twenty-sixth year, under the editorship of Menaham Ribalow. There are four Yiddish dailies, the Forward, Der Tag, Yiddish Morgen Journal, and Freiheit, Daily Yiddish newspapers at one time appeared in Philadelphia, Chicago, Cleveland, and for a very short period in Detroit. All of them disappeared. In Chicago and Cleveland Yiddish weeklies, offshoots of the earlier daily newspapers, still are circulated. But in the main the Yiddish press began to decline with the cessation of immigration to this country. A new era, although slow-moving, therefore began for the Jewish newspaper published in English.

The first English-Jewish periodical published in English in this country was the Occident and American Jewish Advocate, which made its appearance in Philadelphia in April of 1843 under the editorship of the able Rabbi Isaac Leeser, of Congregation Mikveh Israel. The Occident, about which Rabbi Leeser reported that "we circulate scarcely above 510," for 26 years struggled to advance cultural Jewish ideals and to clarify religious issues. But the Occident, like earlier periodicals which appeared both in English and in German, was a monthly publication.

The first English-Jewish weekly newspaper to make its appearance in this country was the Asmonean, which was published in New York by Robert Lyon in 1849. From that year, therefore, begins the history of the Jewish-weekly press in America, published in the English language.

The Asmonean, a "family journal of commerce, politics, religion, and literature," lasted only 9 years. Before it suspended publication it added occasional German supplements. These were indications of the prevalence of German as the language used by the Jews in the United States at that time. But its beginning marked the introduction of an important factor in American journalism—the English-Jewish press—which today is acknowledged as one of the most powerful factors for good in American and Jewish life in this country.

There were approximately 50,000 Jews in the United States in the year of the birth of the English-Jewish press. New York and Philadelphia were the largest Jewish centers of population. The first English-Jewish monthly magazine was issued in Philadelphia, while New York saw the birth of the first English-Jewish weekly—Robert Lyon's the Asmonean. A new cultural center was rising, however, in Cincinnati, where Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise was laying the foundation for the Reform Synagogues and for Hebrew Union College. In 1854 Rabbi Wise founded the oldest surviving Jewish weekly. He then called it the Israelite, which in 1874 assumed the present name of the American Israelite.

Early beginnings in Jewish population expansion in this country are evidenced by the fact that an English-Jewish weekly, Jewish Times and Observer, edited by M. S. Levy and William Saalburg, was published in San Francisco from 1855 to 1905. Another early English-Jewish weekly, the Jewish Messenger, established in New York in 1857, was absorbed by the American Hebrew in 1903. The latter, for many years among the more popular weeklies, has changed publishers and editors many times in the past 20 years. The American Hebrew first made its appearance under its own name in 1879. Among the other more popular weeklies in the English-Jewish periodical field, all of whom, like the American Hebrew, had declined from their earlier standings, were the Reform Advocate which was edited by Dr. Emil Hirsch, in Chicago, and the Hebrew Standard, later merged with the Jewish Tribune, which also was absorbed by the American Hebrew.

The Jewish Exponent, of Philadelphia; the Jewish Criterion, of Pittsburgh; the B'nai B'rith Messenger, of Los Angeles; the Jewish Community Bulletin, of San Francisco; the Jewish Review and Observer, of Cleveland; the Jewish Advocate, of Boston, are among the oldest English-Jewish weeklies in America.

At present, 51 English-Jewish weeklies are published in 43 cities in 33 States.

There are two Jewish news services—the Jewish Telegraphic Agency and Seven Arts Feature Syndicate. The Independent Jewish Press Service folded 2 months ago after about 12 years of circulating news and feature articles.

The American Association of English-Jewish Newspapers, organized 6 years ago, includes in its ranks the leading English-Jewish periodicals. The association uses the term English-Jewish instead of the previous reference to Anglo-Jewish papers in order to differentiate between Jewry's English newspapers published in America and those appearing in England.

The American Jewish community in the days of the Asmonean numbered 50,000. Today, we are the largest Jewish community in the world, with a population of more than 4,750,000. The important role played by American Jewry in the rebirth of the state of Israel is ascribable, in great measure, to the influence of the English-Jewish press, which has assumed an important place in the molding of public opinion in this country and in advancing the most liberal causes.

A new era begins for the English-Jewish press in 1949—the first year of the second century of this press, whose beginnings were with the Asmonean in 1849.

American Teachers and the American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the February 1949, issue of the magazine Wisconsin Journal of Education, published by the Wisconsin Education Association, there is carried an article which I prepared. The subject of the article is the interrelationship between America's educational system and the American Congress.

I am indeed grateful for the opportunity of having my thoughts appear in this splendid periodical, which speaks for the forward-looking, forward-moving educational system of my State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TEACHERS AND THE AMERICAN CONGRESS

(By ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

"How soon will the Federal aid to education bill come up in the Eighty-first Congress?" "What will be the decision of the House of Representatives on it?" A decision

that seems more in doubt than that of the Senate, since the Senate already voted for the predecessor bill, S. 472, in the Eightieth Congress, while the House refused to act on that bill?

These are questions with which American teachers, school principals, and superintendents are deeply concerned, which engage the attention of all thinking American parents and which in turn are high on the agenda for consideration by Members of Congress.

If the debate on the Federal aid to education bill during the Eightieth Congress served no other purpose, it did bring into the sharp focus of national attention the whole matter of the crucial relationship between our national government and those who mold the Nation's youth in American classrooms.

PROBLEM OF UNDERPAYMENTS

During my 10 years in the Senate, I have seen the problems of American education change dynamically with changing times, but the problem of a comparatively very low schedule of compensation for teachers has remained. American education has experienced the GI floodtide of students; it has experienced classrooms crowded with youngsters born during the war years and it has experienced other changes, but always there has remained this one fact: The American teacher has been paid a disproportionately low salary in relation to the compensation in virtually any other profession, and, for that matter, any other significant job when one considers the years of patient and costly study as well as other preparation for the career of pedagogy which a teacher must undergo.

The debate on the Federal aid to education bill did, however, bring home to the United States Senate the fact that the teacher as one element of the white-collar class was, by and large, still a forgotten man and woman, although some important improvements had been made in his or her living standards. The debate showed, too, how crucial was this aid legislation, considering such facts as the United States census estimate, which showed that in 1945 more than 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, attended no school whatsoever.

NEGLECT OF EDUCATION

Teachers who are my readers are more than familiar with the sorry tale of under-education in our supposedly well-educated population. They are familiar with the fact that in World War II 8 percent of the young men examined by selective service were rejected for educational deficiencies. Teachers know that between the years of 1941 and 1945, some 350,000 qualified teachers left their life work, many never to return, particularly because of the low pay which they received and, too, because of lack of public appreciation of the staggering burden on teachers. 1946–47 estimates indicated that around 54 percent of the teachers in public schools were paid less than $2,000 for the year, and 16 percent were promised salaries of less than $1,200. So serious had the situation become that in 1946–47 only 67 percent of teachers' college enrollments were actually in teachers' preparatory courses, as compared to 90 percent taking courses leading to employment in teaching in 1941.

These are some of the facts which I personally bore in mind when the vote came up on the Federal aid to education bill. To be sure I recognized how strained the Federal budget is at the present time, the vastness of our defense and foreign commitments. Yet it was very obvious that if America is to be adequate to her responsibilities in these technological times, she cannot afford the terribly high rate of illiteracy and under-education in her youth, nor can she afford to ignore and neglect her teachers, to permit overcrowded classrooms, completely obsolete textbooks, supplies and equipment and other alarming conditions. Acting upon that basis, I cast my vote for Federal aid to education. This bill, S. 472, would have, as you know, assured for Wisconsin an allotment of around $3,300,000. It is estimated that Wisconsin would have received an allotment per child, age 5 to 17 years, of $5 apiece, whereas in Mississippi, where the need is much greater, the allotment would be as high as $28.50 per child.

OPPOSITION TO LEGISLATION

There have been and will undoubtedly be many sincere-minded and expert folks and organizations arrayed against future Federal aid legislation. Many of these folks fear Federal regimentation of education—something which I'm sure I don't want and which my readers don't want. We feel, however, that by carefully drawn aid legislation, we can prevent Uncle Sam from unduly interfering with State and local jurisdiction in the education field, while affording needed help.

Proponents of this legislation know, too, that passage of the Federal aid to education bill will not, of course, relieve the State and localities of doing their utmost independently and cooperatively for improvement of education. Teachers know from their study of social sciences that, too often, when the Federal Government shows an interest in a particular field, State governments and localities take this Federal interest as an excuse for showing less and less interest themselves. To be sure, the States and localities may match funds in accordance with Federal legislation, but unless with that matching of funds, the States and localities demonstrate an increasing attention and constant desire for improvement in educational administration, then the major purpose of Federal action will not have been achieved. We all recognize the heavy financial burdens upon our States and localities, but we recognize too, that the Nation's youth is the Nation's hope, the Nation's future, the Nation's responsibility.

It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Eighty-first Congress will take prompt action on this Federal aid to education bill. Only by giving this legislation high priority can we begin to meet the long-present challenge to American education.

The new Congress, too, should give prompt and careful attention to other legislative fields in which teachers are deeply interested such as the oft-proposed legislation to exempt the first $1,440 of teacher's retirement pensions from taxation plus a long list of other bills with which educators are concerned.

LETTERS ON LEGISLATION

I am glad to say that many letters come to me from the Wisconsin Education Association, from Wisconsin teachers, from members of Parent-Teacher Associations, and others deeply interested in educational problems, as affected by legislation. Although it is not always possible for me to answer this correspondence in as great detail as I would like, I try to promptly and carefully read, answer, and act upon each letter and telegram that comes in and then, later on, to review the communications' contents at the appropriate time when, for example, a particular bill actually comes up for a floor vote.

This then, is the first major front on which Congress has relationship with American teachers—the actual legislative front.

There is a second front, and that is through formal visits of legislators with teachers and with pupils in Washington and back home. In the last few months, we in the Wisconsin delegation in Congress have been glad to see several groups visiting from Wisconsin schools and colleges. Various enterprising teachers conduct their students to Washington to see, at first hand, their Nation's legislators in action. This is a part of the same wonderful but, we recognize, oftentimes difficult process which sends Wisconsin pupils and teachers to Madison and to other important locations in our State for study at first hand.

If any educator who reads these words is thinking of bringing a school group to Washington, I hope he or she will write me so that I can cooperate with the Washington Board of Trade and other public and private officials in helping to make arrangements for their visit.

SUPPLYING LITERATURE

There is a third front on which Congress has relationship with the teacher, and that is through the supplying of numerous informational materials and literature. Although a Congressional staff is necessarily limited, and the number of items that can be obtained on a complimentary basis is also restricted, we do try to send out to Wisconsin's teachers and schools interesting booklets, copies of bills, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies, debating materials, and other items which they can find helpful in their work, particularly in social-science classes.

We want and need your requests, your suggestions, your candid comments and constructive criticisms.

OUR MUTUAL WORK

Congress and American teachers are, of course, engaged in the same vital work, that of maintaining and building this Republic. Certainly, there is no more important job in the world today than perpetuating the last best hope of earth by strengthening the foundations of freedom and liberty.

You and I are indeed engaged in the same patriotic job, and I hope that we will cooperate toward it. I, like all my family, am a product of Wisconsin's educational system. We are proud of the wonderful educational advances that Wisconsin has made, pioneering in paths that have been followed by many other State educational systems throughout the Nation. You and I know that Wisconsin educators will ever be on the march for self-improvement of our Badger system. We are, after all, always confronted with the challenge of making our educational process even more adequate to the changing needs of America in the atomic age.

With courage, with confidence, with understanding, we can be adequate to that challenge and to the even greater challenge of maintaining this blessed Republic.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks I desire to include a notable address delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, REA Administrator, before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association:

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to attend and address again your national convention. It is a privilege indeed to be associated with the men and women who are working so energetically, unselfishly, and effectively in making the REA program one of the most beneficial movements in American history.

This occasion gives me an opportunity to carry out one of the responsibilities that I have under the REA Act. Section 2 of the act says: "The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans * * * for rural electrification * * *; to make

* * * studies, investigations, and reports concerning the condition and progress of the electrification of rural areas."

This is one of the best opportunities I have to make such a report and to discuss the condition and progress of rural electrification. I am most grateful to you for it.

The calendar year just closed was by all odds the greatest in REA history. A total of 147,000 miles of line and 468,900 consumers were added on REA-financed systems. That is, 106,700 consumers more than the highest previous record established in 1947.

Today 70 percent of American farms have central station electric service—as against 11 percent when REA was started less than 14 years ago. There are now a total of 2,500,000 consumers on REA-financed systems.

These are impressive figures, but they are not the sole measure of the progress that has been made. The most important thing, of course, is the tremendous increase in the happiness, health, and economic well-being of rural people which the program has brought about. Rural people are using electricity in ever more ways and in ever greater amounts to achieve a better life. We estimate that REA co-op members who were getting service 5 years ago have about doubled their consumption since that time.

I am proud to report that the REA program continues its record of outstanding financial success. Our financial record must command respect even here in New York, the financial center of the world. Since the start of the program we have advanced $1,100,000,000. I want to call attention to the fact that approximately 60 percent of this amount has been advanced in the last 3 years. This means that much of the REA-financed construction is so new that it has not yet had a chance to contribute toward the amortization of the indebtedness. Despite this fact, REA borrowers have paid, as part of their debt service, a total of $185,000,000, of which $106,000,000 has been paid on principal. Does anyone know of a better record in the electrical-utility business?

From every standpoint this program has made a remarkable record. How that record contrasts with the prophecies of failure which were made by the people who opposed this program! The prophets of doom said that farmers would not use enough electricity to make it profitable to serve them. They also said that only men of long experience in the utility field could make a success of managing an electrical enterprise. They predicted that they would have to take these systems off your hands, after a great financial loss to the taxpayers. They have been wrong on all counts. Incidentally, one company learned the hard way, down in Virginia, that it couldn't take over—even by slipping up on the blind side.

Let us look ahead to the future. You directors and managers have shown what can be accomplished when a conscientious, intelligent, and determined effort is made to reach a worthy objective. We are going to need that same kind of effort to attain our ultimate objective, which is to make plenty of reliable, low-cost power available to every rural community of this Nation. There are many difficult problems to solve; there are many important decisions to make. Many of these decisions involve not only the success of the REA program but the welfare of the Nation and even its leadership in world affairs.

Let us consider first those problems which pertain directly to the bringing of service to every rural community. There is the matter of loan funds. Although the Congress has made large amounts available for loans in the postwar years, substantial amounts are still needed if construction is to continue its rapid progress.

Materials are needed in larger quantities. The availability of aluminum conductor is the controlling factor in construction for many REA borrowers. The supply situation on the other types of conductor has been tightening. The Wisconsin Electric Cooperative's contract with the Reynolds Metals Co. for aluminum conductor offers a bright ray of hope on what otherwise is a darkening picture in this field. It deserves your careful consideration.

Despite our combined efforts to hold costs down, construction and operating costs have gone up, increasing the difficulty of establishing economic feasibility in areas of low financial return. This places on us the responsibility for being ever more persistent in our efforts to resist the inflationary tendencies and to find economies wherever possible all along the line. We may have to look to other solutions as well. In some instances a lengthening of the amortization period from 35 to 50 years would help to insure economic feasibility.

Of vital importance to REA consumers everywhere is the problem of power. In fact, solution of this problem on a broad front is vital to the welfare of our entire Nation. We find sometimes that we cannot make loans for distribution lines until the power problem is solved. The energization of lines already completed has been delayed in some places because of lack of power. In other areas service is poor because of power shortage. Rising wholesale power costs are hampering the program in many ways.

Steady growth of our national economy to meet the expanding needs of our people is essential to our national welfare. This growth is being restricted today by the shortage of electric power. That shortage must be eliminated by Nation-wide action. We have the natural resources. They must be developed to insure that our national well-being will not continue to be jeopardized again by power shortages.

First, we must develop our great hydroelectric resources. This can be done effectively only through the Federal agencies which are charged with responsibility for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and reclamation. We can double our generating capacity by proper development of these resources. Fortunately, in many instances, they are situated adjacent to plentiful supplies of cheap fuel which can and should be used for firming up the hydrogenerators.

Second, the power from our river developments must be made available to the consuming centers at low and equitable rates if the country is to get maximum benefit from its own resources. This can best be accomplished through the Federal financing of the necessary transmission systems. The decisions in all these matters must be made in the interest of the consuming public and not for the benefit of the power monopolies.

The growing needs of REA cooperatives and the shrinking supply of low-cost wholesale power has made it necessary for REA to make an increasing proportion of its loans for the construction of generation and transmission facilities. From July 1, 1948, up to the middle of January we have loaned $45,000,000 for generation and transmission systems. We anticipate we will have to more than double this amount of loans before the end of the fiscal year because of the inadequacy of low-cost power. The increase in these loans is not due to any change in REA policy. That policy, as you know, is to make such loans only when it is necessary to solve a power shortage or to effect savings for consumers. It was established at the very beginning of the REA program and has been discussed and confirmed in congressional debates.

Despite the strict standards we are following, virtually all of the generation and transmission loans which we have made recently have been violently opposed by the commercial power companies. It is apparent that they are going to continue to seek legislative action to stop us from following our policy. Your representatives in Congress are the only people who can make a change in the policy. Until there is a change, I am going to follow conscientiously our present policy in regard to these loans.

So far I have reported to you briefly on the condition and the progress of rural electrification. I have pointed out some of the problems and decisions facing us and our fellow citizens as we continue to move forward in this program. Now I would like to discuss with you some of my thoughts as a farmer and as a citizen about this program in which we are engaged.

In the future we should devote more thought and effort to gaining a better understanding of the opportunities and responsibilities that we REA members and officials have in this great program. The principles and objectives of our program are basic to our democracy.

As many of you know, I am a member of an REA cooperative by choice rather than by happenstance. You see, before REA was created I had tried for years to get the power company to build a couple of miles of line to serve my neighbors and me. The power company officials were not interested unless we would agree to build the lines and then turn them over to their company. When, in 1936, there was talk of REA in my neighborhood, the power company people suddenly changed their attitude and offered to put the lines in at their expense and do it immediately. I said, "No; I will wait until I can get service through my own cooperative." I waited a couple of years. I am very happy that I made that decision. Together with all of my neighbors, I am enjoying reliable and adequate electric service today. We have no complaint of any kind. Every year we have an annual meeting, at which reports are made and policies and plans are discussed. The directors are democratically elected from the nominations which are made in our smaller district meetings. These directors are my neighbors and friends. They are capable, conscientious public-spirited men. They have selected a manager who is courteous, efficient, and interested in our community. I know these men are always thinking and working in the interest of my neighbors and me.

I know that none of the money I pay for electricity is being used for high-priced lobbyists, high-pressure propaganda, fancy entertainment, retainer fees, and other questionable activities which are completely unrelated to the service I use. I know that all money not needed for legitimate operating expenses is being used to retire the indebtedness of my cooperative. I know I am being credited for my contribution to the capital of my cooperative under the capital credits plan adopted by my cooperative.

I am pleased that my co-op is a member of the State Association for the purpose of representing my interests at that level. I am glad that it is a member of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which is so effectively and wisely protecting and promoting the REA program at the national level.

From a purely self-interest standpoint I am very glad that I am a member of an REA cooperative. However, there is a broader and more important reason for my being proud to be identified with the REA program. I believe that this program offers a most effective way of preserving and promoting free enterprise and democracy.

As you know, we have in the world today two divergent and conflicting ideologies concerning the proper function of government. One is that government should dictate and dominate the lives and activities of all citizens—in the interest of the State. The other is that the true and only function of government is to provide opportunity and protection for its people—in the interest of the people. We liberty-loving Americans hold to the latter concept. We know it is sound

and satisfying in practice as well as in principle. Under it we have enjoyed both liberty and prosperity.

But we must be ever alert if we are to preserve and promote democracy and free enterprise.

We Americans look after the political responsibilities pretty well. We exercise our voting privileges. We debate political issues in and out of our legislative halls. Our government, in my opinion, is more responsive to our wishes than ever before.

However, our free-enterprise system is being jeopardized a little more all the time by big corporations and monopolies. For several decades we have worried about this problem. We have passed antitrust legislation. We have set up regulatory bodies. We have sought remedies in our courts. These are all proper and in the interest of our people. Yet they have failed to halt the alarming concentration of power in the hands of the officials of a few big corporations. That increase in power is stifling free enterprise in many fields today and, ironically, is doing it in the name of free enterprise. In 1939, one-tenth of 1 percent of all business firms employed 40 percent of all wage and salaried workers outside agriculture. I suspect this concentration of economic power may be even greater today when 200 corporations own 55 percent of all of the assets of all the nonfinancial corporations of the country.

We are told that big corporations insure efficiency. That is the way defenders of big business rationalize the absorption and elimination of one after another of their competitors until they completely dominate the field. When there is a monopoly there usually is little incentive to try newer and more efficient methods. Moreover, under monopolistic conditions big corporations are in a position to dictate when and to what extent the public may have their services without being challenged by competition. These corporations have been known to hold back the use of patents and inventions to further their own ends. If steps are taken to introduce competition into their fields, corporation officials weep bitterly about the interests of their stockholders. What control does the average stockholder have over the big corporations? For all practical purposes—none. And neither does the customer.

We are told that it takes big corporations to fill our needs for goods and services, usually the basic goods and services. We are told to wait—that everything will be provided in proper time and in the quantities needed. Let us examine that theory in the light of the present situation—in the light of our own experience.

Steel is a monopoly that is big. Yet it has not produced the steel we need for national well-being. Aluminum is a monopoly that is big. Yet it is not giving us the aluminum we so sorely need. Perhaps the Wisconsin Electric Co-op-Reynolds plan is a step toward breaking this very type of monopoly.

The telephone business is in the hands of the biggest corporation of all. Yet the telephone monopoly has not given us farmers the kind of telephone service as far as coverage, rates, and quality of service are concerned, which we must have in this modern age.

As a matter of fact, instead of promoting efficiency, monopoly too often stifles it. The electric power monopolies failed to use their opportunity to provide rural people with electric service. Not only have they failed to take care of the power needs of the Nation, they have vigorously opposed the efforts of the people to provide adequate power for themselves.

Further concentration of power in the hands of the officials of a few big corporations must be stopped if we are to satisfy the ever growing needs of our people, and in order to protect our competitive free enterprise system which I consider in turn, absolutely essential to the preservation of our democracy.

One effective way of counteracting this dangerous trend toward concentration of economic power into fewer and fewer hands is exemplified by the REA program. To my knowledge, this program is unique throughout the world in its demonstration of how a government nationally and the people locally can work together to promote the economic welfare of people and communities within the framework of the private enterprise system.

The REA Act contemplates no ownership or operation by the Government. It is clearly designed to aid the people locally to own, operate, and control the electric systems serving them. Instead of making for greater and more centralized ownership and control by the State, or by huge private profit concerns of monopolistic tendencies, this program actually leads to decentralization of ownership and control back to the grass roots, back to the people who use the service and pay the bills.

The formula which made the REA program so successful is really a simple one. It is based on the belief that farm people are capable of working together effectively in their joint interest and that they assume obligations with an adequate sense of responsibility. It grows out of the philosophy that, in a democracy, it is the function of government to encourage, instead of suppress, the initiative and desire of people to do things for themselves through voluntary organization and action, provided such action is not in conflict with the public welfare. The formula itself merely provides for the Government to supplement the limited financial and technical resources of a given group of people with loan funds and technical advisory services as needed until the group has developed its enterprise and has learned to operate it effectively without further need of governmental assistance.

Curiously enough, while I was organizing my thoughts for this talk, I received a rather unusual letter from Dr. Horace M. Gray, professor of economics at the University of Illinois Graduate College. I am sure you will be interested—as I was—in his appraisal of one aspect of the REA program. I quote:

"Aside from the sheer physical feat of making electricity available to rural people, I have always felt that the greatest social contribution of REA was the demonstration that the distribution of electricity is, after all, a rather simple undertaking which people can manage cooperatively for themselves without benefit of billion-dollar corporations, expensive legal counsel, public-relations experts, New York headquarters, holding companies, utility commissions, and all the other elaborate impedimenta that is associated with large private utility organizations. Until REA proved this, I could never quite convince my students that large, complicated, expensive organizations were unnecessary to get electricity distributed. After all they have been brought up on a steady diet of propaganda designated to convince them that large-scale operation is always more efficient and it requires a clear-cut demonstration to shake them loose from this conviction."

That is what the professor of economics at the University of Illinois wrote me the other day. Far too few people seem to be adequately aware of what the REA program is demonstrating in actual practice.

How effectively the REA approach can be made to work is readily apparent if we contrast the utility industry's long record of failure with the records which have been established by your REA cooperatives in so short a time. You have extended an essential service to millions of rural people who otherwise might never have received it. You have set new standards for quality of service. You have made a financial success where officials of power monopolies said success was impossible. You have kept the ownership and control of your organizations in the hands of the members. You have made your organizations responsive to the welfare of the people dependent on you for service. You have gone about your business in an open, forthright, and efficient manner.

Above all, you have demonstrated that it is possible to have opportunity and prosperity without sacrificing liberty and democracy.

Has a Depression Already Started?

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there are some Members here who, like President Truman, cling to the idea that we are not going to have any depression and that all that has happened so far is a "leveling off" process. There is not a better criterion as to what the future holds for us than a careful examination of what has happened in the past.

In the United States we have never had a disastrous depression that did not start first with a fall in the price of farm commodities. Those who are supposed to know the most about national economics, seem to know the least. Right now farm prices have already fallen to disastrously low points, yet the everyday cost of living has not followed this decline. Wheat at $3 a bushel saw bread selling at 14 cents per loaf, and now that wheat has fallen $1.03 per bushel from the highest point, bread sells for 15 cents per loaf.

The price of beef steers has fallen in Chicago from 39 cents per pound to 24 cents for the tops, yet beefsteak has not followed suit.

The next thing I have noticed about a depression is that after farm prices have fallen, unemployment begins to grow. In normal times we have about one and one-half million people unemployed, but since December 15 to date we have increased this number to 3,000,000. Few soup lines have yet shown up but it is now apparent that there will be plenty of them in the next 6 months.

Conditions here may absolutely prevent the United States from playing Santa Claus to the world. We cannot keep up this process of giving away billions to foreign countries. We can afford that only when we are operating under a sound economic standard here at home. With the drop in farm prices and the increase of unemployment, plenty of notice is given that we must stop this flow of exorbitant tax money to foreign countries. It will be well to stop and examine what good our flow of money to China has done; what good has it done in Greece, what good did it do in Czechoslovakia? Our ostensible purpose was to stop the spread of communism, but in Czechoslovakia and China our altruistic contributions have only helped

the spread of that ism. Will it not be so everywhere?

There is some reason why communism spreads and we have not discovered what that reason is. Or, if we have discovered it, we have taken no heed of it. If this flow of our money were stopping hunger, suffering and want, and was putting teeming millions back on the soil where they could make a living, I would say go ahead. But the landless millions are still landless except in Russia where large estates have been confiscated and turned over to the people with a string to it. They pay no attention to strings as long as they can find a home on the land. Homeless people are not acutely concerned with who rules them, so long as they are promised the prospect of eating again.

A great force to bring Christianity to the Indians in the West was Father DeSmet. But he never talked religion to Indians who were destitute and hungry. He fed them first, and then his brand of Christianity took effect.

In Greece we have done nothing to force that monarchy to apportion land among the people. We have been backing a ruthless monarchy with our money, guns, and ammunition. What we have done will continue the struggle between the landed and the landless, but this action on the part of the United States will not and cannot put out the fires of want among the "have nots" of the Greek Nation.

If America is sliding into a depression, and I am certain we are, should we not look to the condition of our own people rather than be so concerned with people everywhere else?

Here are some other aspects: This Government will soon learn that the farm population is one of our best taxpayers. Can we keep on giving away our money when one of our big taxpayers has been put out of business?

We can tax a thing too much. Taxes have gone up on telegrams 25 percent but what about the income when a tax is too high. The tax that is too high kills the goose that lays the golden egg. Chairman Doughton once said in one of his characteristic speeches, "You can shear a sheep every year, but you can skin it only once."

Taxes have gone up on packages sent by mail, but will that bring more revenue? It is doubtful for there will probably be fewer packages sent. And there will be no revenue from income taxes, no matter what the rates are, when there is no income to get more money to send to Europe, we will have to have more taxes, and in increasing the tax, are we not liable to actually lessen the amount collected?

If a real hand-sewn depression starts here, millions of taxpayers will be taxpayers no longer. Who will be left to pay the tax? Isn't it a better policy to go slow with increase of taxes until we find out where we are? Should we not consider that with the fall of prices of farm products and the increase in unemployment, the crop of taxpayers will grow steadily smaller?

Indiana's Interest in Forest Restoration and Conservation

REMARKS
OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, we of Indiana, as well as the many fine citizens of our sister States, are fast growing cognizant of the deplorable deterioration of our forest resources and we realize that it is time to give the serious situation our careful concern.

When the Creator designed the universe He did the magnificent piece of work with microscopic nicety, and it is safe to assume that He trusted mankind to render the type of stewardship that would not deface His handicraft with devastation and unsightly scars.

However, in our great United States, the scenic and garden spot of the world, man, in his struggle for higher standards of living and grabbing for the almighty dollar, has spread barren waste to millions of our acres, resulting in soil erosion, loss of soil fertility, countless destructive floods, tremendous reduction in the supply of our valuable hard woods, unemployment to thousands of our citizens employed in the lumbering companies and industries connected therewith, dust storms injurious to health and unsightly impressions engraved on the scenic face of the earth to commemorate man's bad judgment and lack of foresight. In fact, if we pause to give retrospection to our stewardship of God's priceless gifts to humanity, we will quickly discover we have been a most extravagant and wasteful people and our carelessness rises to haunt us in many disturbing ways.

Our neglect has reached the stage where just a conservation program will no longer suffice. In far too many places we have to inaugurate and promote a restoration program in order to have something to conserve. Thus, our timely program takes on a dual complexion and we are compelled to think of it as restoration and conservation.

There are many fine pieces of legislation pertaining to forestry already introduced in this Eighty-first Congress, and I want you to know that I join with the Honorable Ralph F. Wilcox, State forester, of the State of Indiana, in asking that every Member of Congress give these measures his most serious consideration.

I quote from bulletin No. 9 a suggested policy for Indiana by the Indiana Economic Council, which is as follows:

WHO WOULD HAVE TO PAY THE COST OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP?—NO ONE

The money would, almost literally, grow on trees. There would be nothing but money saved for everyone—farmers, labor, businessmen, the general public, and the State of Indiana itself.

Studies in sample areas indicate that about 90 percent of the cost of services furnished by Government to such areas comes from outside the areas themselves—from the State, and from better-land areas in the same township and county.

School costs are high because the population is so widely scattered; roads and bridges have to be maintained for isolated settlers; a high percentage of the population receives relief and old-age assistance; losses on school fund loans are high; and so it goes.

FOR EXAMPLE

Studies in one Indiana county, where some 20,000 acres were purchased by the public in 1935–37, indicate that reduction of Government costs over a 12-year period would equal the cost of the land itself. For every $1 decline in tax revenue to the State from the land purchased, there was a $10 decline in the cost of local government.

Since 1905, when the State school-relief system began, Indiana has distributed about $1,000,000 to another county for school-relief purposes. Yet that county's land use planning committee has classified some 100,000 acres as unsuited to agriculture. So the situation there is no nearer solution in 1947 than it was in 1905. A program of public-land acquisition would gradually reduce the need for State school relief there.

Such a program would be eminently fair to the individual farmers themselves. Most of such land is occupied by transient occupants or by those who would like to move on to better land if they could. When newcomers arrive they are unfamiliar with the land's poor productivity. They waste time, money, and energy trying to make a living where others have failed. They soon exhaust their resources and move on, or apply to the township trustee for relief.

SO, WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT?

The facts, plus logic, dictate a threefold objective:

1. Increased productivity (through sound forest management) of Indiana's approximately 4,000,000 acres of privately and publicly owned land best suited to forests.

2. Increased efficiency in the utilization of trees, and increased processing of wood produced in Indiana—to provide additional income for local labor and industry.

3. Development and administration of publicly owned forests for maximum multiple-use benefits (soil conservation and rehabilitation, flood control, hunting, fishing, other recreation, etc.), and encouragement of similar development of privately owned forests.

This objective can be attained in five main ways:

1. Protect present woodlands from grazing and from fire—

(a) By construction, operations, and maintenance of fire towers.

(b) By providing fire-fighting equipment.

(c) By developing an organization of trained fire fighters.

(d) By an educational program stressing the full importance of protection from grazing and fire, and demonstrating most effective fire-fighting methods.

2. Encourage farmers and other owners of the 2,400,000 acres of forest land which should remain privately owned to follow sound forestry practices in the management of their woodlands—

(a) By expanding State nurseries to meet the planting-stock demands of farmers and other landowners.

(b) By educational programs in soil conservation, fire prevention, forest-management principles, timber estimating and appraisal, harvesting, and wood utilization.

(c) By giving woodland owners on-the-farm assistance in soil conservation and woodland management.

(d) By increasing woodland acreages in classified forests.

3. Undertake research sufficiently comprehensive to solve the many problems inherent in the production and utilization of Indiana

hardwoods, and establish adequate facilities for the training of professional foresters—

(a) By increasing teaching and research personnel (despite the fact that findings in other States are not always applicable to Indiana's problems, Purdue University now offers the only accredited forestry course in the north central hardwoods region—Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and northern Kentucky).

(b) By increasing laboratory and classroom facilities (identical facilities in many instances can meet both teaching and research requirements).

(c) By establishment of research and instructional areas.

4. Expand State and Federal forests (the potential contribution of county forests to solution of this problem is inconsequential) to include all of the 1,600,000 acres of land unsuited to private ownership, except areas reserved for public and private recreational uses—

(a) By developing closer working relationships between local landowner advisory groups in the establishment of purchase-area boundaries and in the determination of base prices and purchase priorities.

(b) By more comprehensive land-classification studies to determine which parts of given areas should be purchased by the State —which should remain under private ownership.

(c) By legislation enabling exchange of lands between the State and Federal Governments.

(d) By continuous, rather than spasmodic, appropriations for land acquisition (to avoid too rapid purchase at one time, and the inability to purchase at other times).

5. Develop, manage, and administer public forests for timber production and for public uses—

(a) By stand improvement.
(b) By tree planting.
(c) By fire prevention.
(d) By timber harvesting.
(e) By provision of recreation and hunting areas.
(f) By construction of ponds and lakes.

Lives there a man with soul so dead who never to himself has said, in the words of Joyce Kilmer:

"I think that I shall never see
A poem as lovely as a tree.
A tree whose hungry mouth is prest
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;
A tree that looks at God all day,
And lifts its leafy arms to pray;
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair;
Upon whose bosom snow has lain;
Who intimately lives with rain,
Poems are made by fools like me,
But only God can make a tree."

Overtime on Overtime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in the two cases before the Supreme Court, Bay Ridge Operating Co., Inc., against Aaron and Huron Stevedoring Corp. against Blue, the 5-to-3 decision and a 10,500-word majority opinion, and a 6,500-word dissenting opinion, the latter written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, is a new chapter in American jurisprudence. In the majority opinion "regular rate of pay" under the Fair Labor Standards Act, was defined. As a result today, employers in the stevedoring and building-construction industries, and others, are potentially liable to employees, due to alleged overtime pay in the amounts of hundreds of millions of dollars of windfall wages, even though never contemplated by the Fair Labor Standards Act or collectively bargained for between the employers and employees. This screwball theory, vehemently denounced by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, is called "overtime on overtime." In order to relieve employers of their liability in the future, H. R. 858 was introduced, and is before the House today. In effect, the courts held that "time on overtime" is computed on the theory that "regular rate" should be defined as whatever wages, overtime and other compensation were earned during any particular week added together and divided by the number of hours worked during the week. The amount so arrived at then becomes the so-called regular rate basis for computing statutory overtime after 40 hours. Hence, the term, "Overtime on overtime", and hence additional wages retroactively and prospectively. One witness sometime ago made the following observations before the Committee on Education and Labor:

Unfortunately, some unscrupulous persons saw the possible opportunity of large windfall payments because of a lack of proper definitions in the law. The suits so far brought have been on a narrow front. We believe this to be strategy on their part to establish the principle, after which all American industry operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act can expect a similar attack.

The amounts involved are almost unbelievable. The labor pay roll of the United States is a gigantic amount. The retroactive feature will reach backward probably 6 years. It requires only a small percentage of such an amount, together with penalties and costs, to run into billions.

A good example of the far-reaching possibilities of the above-mentioned cases was ably discussed, I think, in an editorial in the Washington Post under date of Monday, June 14, 1948:

In the portal-to-portal cases the Supreme Court adopted a definition of working time that resulted in claims for back pay amounting to billions of dollars. In the Mount Clemens Pottery case, for instance, the Court declared that the time spent by employees walking to their jobs after punching time clocks and performing various preliminary tasks must be paid for regardless of contrary custom or contract. As a result of that decision thousands of firms faced bankruptcy and Congress promptly passed a law barring such portal-to-portal pay claims unless employers had been previously compelled by custom or contract to make such payments.

Now the Supreme Court has done it again. This time it was called upon to deal with the question of what constitutes the regular rate of pay to be used in computing overtime rates for work in excess of 40 hours, as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act. By a 5-to-3 decision, in a case involving dockworkers employed by two New York Port stevedoring contractors, the Court held that the time and a half rates of pay agreed to under union contracts for night work and work done on Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and holidays were not overtime rates of pay in the legal sense of the word, but rather premium rates paid to employees to induce them to work at undesirable hours. Accordingly, the Court said, those payments must be included in any computation of regular rates of pay, which in turn become the basis for computing rates of pay for real overtime. The result of this decision is to make the employing companies liable for back pay computed in such fashion as to justify the complaint that overtime is pyramided on overtime.

Once more anguished cries arise. One stevedoring concern estimates its liability under the overtime-on-overtime formula for back payments at $43,000,000. Just the accounting work connected with going over pay rolls and determining the amount of back payments due would cost another firm about $265,000. An estimate of total costs, not only for the stevedoring industry but other industries affected by the Supreme Court ruling, runs to fantastic figures.

Employers are not the only ones to complain bitterly of the Supreme Court's latest interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act. For in a dissenting opinion of Justice Frankfurter, concurred in by Justices Jackson and Burton, the majority decision is described as "another doctrinaire construction" of the act applied "in disregard of industrial realities." Justice Frankfurter goes on to say, with his usual vehemence, that the majority decision treats the words of the act as though they were parts of a crossword puzzle. Against the protests of the union, as well as the employers, the decision dislocates arrangements of long standing designed for the benefit of both employers and employees. "The present decision," Justice Frankfurter adds, is "heedles of a long standing and socially desirable collective agreement and is calculated to foster disputes in an industry which has been happily at peace for more than 30 years."

Since the phrase, "regular rate," is not defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act, Justice Frankfurter concluded that the term may be properly used to mean what the parties to the wage contract understand by the term, provided there is no intention to circumvent the policy of the statute. Hence he is of the opinion that the regular rate of pay for the Port of New York longshoremen should be the straight time scale of the union contract. To call the longshoremen's one for overtime pyramided on overtime "is not to use a clever catch phrase, but to describe fairly the true nature of the claim."

The next step will be a movement to nullify the Supreme Court decision by remedial legislation, as was done after the portal-to-portal decisions. But this kind of piecemeal legislation obviously does not meet the needs of the time. What is called for is a thoroughgoing overhaul of the Fair Labor Standards Act to clarify it and relieve the courts from the necessity of interpreting obscure provisions of the law. At present our judges are compelled to grapple with technical details of interpretation of labor laws with which they are not qualified to deal.

It can readily be seen from the able editorial that the courts differ on their interpretations of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is time for the Congress to redefine overtime liability. Before the Fair Labor Standards Act, longshoremen and shippers, through many years of negotiations, arrived at a solution for overtime compensation. Their president, Joseph P. Ryan, of the international longshoremen, appeared as a witness in a Federal court and repudiated the suits mentioned above as well as the thousands of suits which may be brought as a result.

In New York, Judge Rifkind stated that to require the payment of overtime on overtime would create havoc with established labor relations by collective bargaining in the category of false pretenses and probably restrain the re-

sources of a substantial portion of American industry, and he goes on to state that it would restrict the scope of collective bargaining as well as affect the developments of agreements more favorable than the required standards established by the Wages and Hours Act, as well as retarding the use of overtime when the national interest required.

The Congress must act. We must save private industry.

The Issue of Our Times

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, shall we let Russia, or any other foreign power, select the times and places for unlimited commitments of American forces?

Or, shall the United States, while making clear to the world a firm policy of working for and protecting free institutions, reserve to ourselves the deployment of our forces?

Those are basic questions which should be considered in the making and carrying out of foreign policy these days. They are, in essence, the questions which I raised in my letter to President Truman following the vote on the original bill for aid to Greece and Turkey.

They are the questions implicit in an address by Chief of Staff Omar N. Bradley in an address, last fall, when he said:

> If we are to hop, skip, and jump every time a paper is rustled east of the Elbe, we shall place ourselves supinely and helplessly at their feet, the Russians', while they call the tune.

Mr. Speaker, in an era which Sir Oliver Franks has called a possible plateau of tension, we must not permit ourselves to be drawn out of position and be teased into galloping off into every direction when someone cries "The Commies are upon us."

We can no more maintain peace with freedom that way than a football team could win if its captain permitted his ends to be sucked in and his secondary defense to be drawn forward when the opposing quarterback called a trick line play and then sent his backs on a wide end run or shot the ball overhead with a long pass.

The United States has taken extensive positions in widely scattered places. Our commitments we should keep; our general over-all policy should be made clear; our resolutions should be firm; but we should remember that there is no surer way to die than to bleed to death.

And there is no surer way to lose the great contest of this age for the freedom of the individual than to give to uninformed parties, least of all an opponent, the power to spread us so thin that we lose the power to mount an offensive in our own time and on our own choice of lines.

Indeed, the very hope of winning the world to a way of peace without another bloody war rests upon consolidating a total strength which commands respect for its striking power. No bully is impressed by a flurry of feather dusters.

This central problem in our developing foreign program was so well pointed up in Walter Lippmann's column in the Washington Post this morning that I have asked permission and will insert it in the RECORD at this point:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Royall incident—leaving the journalistic aspect of it aside—points up the hardest and the least clarified problem of our foreign policy. There is no dispute, for it is a matter of record that General MacArthur has asked for reinforcements and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had to say "No."

They have had and are having to say "No," or something very like it, to many similar requests—to those who argue that we must hold on strongly in Korea, to those who wanted to give Chiang Kai-shek strong military support, to intimations that southeast Asia is threatened and must be strengthened, that Iran is threatened, that Greece needs still more military aid, that the Berlin airlife needs to be enlarged, and most recently that Norway needs to be reinforced.

All of these claims are in addition to the project of rearming western Europe under the Atlantic pact.

We have here, in the concrete and no longer in the form of diplomatic rhetoric, the test of the famous policy of containment, otherwise known as the Truman doctrine.

As stated 2 years ago by Mr. Truman "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure." As understood by General MacArthur and the Japanese, by Chiang Kai-shek and Congressman JUDD, by the Greek Government, the western Germans, the peoples of western Berlin, Mr. Lange of Norway, by the Dutch, the Belgians, and the French, this is an American commitment to defend them, to create the equivalent of a Maginot Line for them, to give them an automatic guaranty that American force would be available on their frontiers to contain the Russians.

That has never been the view of the American Chiefs of Staff.

They have known that it was an absurdity to suppose that adequate local force could be developed on the whole vast periphery of the Soviet Union in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. To attempt that would be like sending three policemen to surround a building that has 25 exits.

They have known always that a power like Russia cannot, if it wishes to make war, be contained by local defenses—that it can only be held in check by the deterrent power of the over-all force of the United States.

CONTRADICTION IN PLANNING

During the 2 years of the Truman doctrine there has, therefore, always been a deep contradiction between America strategical planning and American diplomatic planning.

Mr. Lange, relying on our diplomatic declarations, was quite right in coming to Washington to find out—not whether the United States would go to war if Norway were attacked but—whether the United States could and would defend Norway against invasion. This is also the issue between General MacArthur and Secretary Royall. It is not whether the United States will go to war if Japan is attacked. It is whether in case of war Japan is to become another Bataan.

That is what really interests the French, the Belgians, the Dutch, and also the western Germans, and the western Berliners.

We are misapprehending the realities altogether if we spend time arguing whether the United States will go to war if the Soviet Union goes to war. Nobody in his senses thinks we would not go to war. What the Europeans want to know is not whether we shall go to war "automatically."

They want to know whether we can defend them successfully if we are unable to prevent a war.

Just as General MacArthur does not want to be in another Bataan, so they do not wish to be in another Dunkirk.

That is why the real issues, as they become concrete, become so much sharper. That is why Mr. Acheson is entering upon a period when major decisions of high policy will have to be taken—in conjunction with General Eisenhower. Mr. Acheson is not able merely to carry on and administer as a going concern a policy laid down for him by his predecessors. For that policy is coming apart at the seams from Korea to Norway, from China to Greece, from Tokyo to Berlin.

Rural Electrification in the National Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, New York, N. Y., January 31, 1949:

It is a pleasure to greet this great group of representatives of business-managed, taxpaying organizations. It is a pleasure to greet you as a part of the Department of Agriculture family. You have achieved a record of service to farmers that is difficult to duplicate in the history of American agriculture. You have added another page to the long record of farm co-op accomplishment.

You have built a record of excellence in business management that rates with the best. Where else can you find an enterprise in which more than 99 percent of the loans are being paid on schedule or ahead of schedule? Many a banking house would be proud to have borrowers with a record like that. In the 14 years of the program REA has had to foreclose on only one operating borrower, and that borrower was a commercial power company.

The excellence of your management skill speaks for itself. It is especially remarkable in view of the fact that you are operating power systems to a considerable extent in territory that the utility industry refused to electrify because it supposedly lacked sufficient revenue to pay out. Well, it is paying out. All that was needed was a group of determined farmers to make it pay. And, come to think of it, I wonder what all the fuss is about. Is there any good reason for opposition to REA co-ops? Why should a utility company worry about business management or tax collections in an area which the utilities thought only a few years ago was worthless as an investment?

Now how about that tax-equality line? Who says you don't pay taxes? I don't think many people are fooled by the tax-equality slogan. It isn't difficult to recognize a smoke screen devised to hide the real objectives of a group hostile to co-ops.

The fact of the matter is, of course, that in most States co-ops pay many taxes. You know and the hostile utility companies know that co-ops pay real-estate taxes, personal property taxes on equipment, occupational license taxes, social-security taxes, various excise taxes, sales and use taxes—just as any other business. You know, of course, what the general public perhaps doesn't know, that one objective of those hostile to farmer co-ops is to force them to pay Federal corporation income tax on all amounts received from patrons in excess of the cost of service, including amounts which are returned to the patrons as patronage refunds or credited to them as capital contributions. Some people seem to forget that co-ops are not in business for profit and that you can't pay a tax on a profit that doesn't exist.

Cooperative rural electrification is an integral part of our national farm program through which farmers themselves are employing the homespun brand of private enterprise to improve their living and working conditions.

Farmers found long ago that cooperatives were an effective method for solving many problems that were not being met satisfactorily in any other way. Getting electric power was one such problem. The development of farmers' co-ops is a familiar story that goes back more than a hundred years. Marketing co-ops, production and processing co-ops, purchasing co-ops, farm-machinery co-ops, fertilizer co-ops, and many others have long been used by farmers to improve their production, their incomes, and their living. And we work for those same objectives in our whole national farm program.

Cooperative rural electrification is an essential part of the national farm program. However, under the able guidance of Administrator Wickard, REA has had complete freedom of action within the Department of Agriculture. There is a big job yet to do in rural electrification and it must be the concern of all of us who understand the full significance of what this program means to make sure that the work of REA will not be hampered. In building its record of accomplishment, the REA program has operated pretty much under its own steam and appears to be entirely capable of continuing to do so.

We in this country have come to recognize that the Nation as a whole has a big stake in the welfare of agriculture. Out of that recognition has come our national farm program. Because success of the over-all effort depends so much on the effective planning and working together of groups such as you are leading, I think we may well examine briefly some of our joint long-range objectives for American agriculture.

Someone has said that in these days of fast-moving progress, a man has to go 60 miles an hour just to stand still. Whatever the truth of that, agriculture surely has not been standing still this past decade and a half. The very face of agriculture in America has been changed. I am not thinking only of income—of the fact that farmers have climbed from the depths of the worst depression in history to their greatest prosperity. I am not thinking only of the ability of farmers today to protect themselves against ruinous price collapses. Nor am I thinking merely of the vast increase in agricultural productivity—so that today agriculture's ability to produce an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable cost is demonstrated beyond question.

I am thinking of all these things—but I'm thinking also of the particular changes that have been wrought by the giant hand of electricity.

A decade and a half ago, 9 farm homes out of 10 were illuminated at night by smoky, dangerous kerosene lamps or by some other dim, unsatisfactory form of light. The broom and dustpan were the instruments by which floors and rugs were cleaned. Lack of refrigeration resulted in food waste—and no end of inconveniences. Water was pumped by hand. Other chores were done the same way—the hard way. It's hard to realize now that all that was less than 15 years ago on 9 farms out of 10. The fact that more than 7 out of 10 farmers and their wives are today able to call on electricity for modern convenience and help with the hard work stands as great tribute to the ability of farmers to work with Government and with each other in solving problems that can't be handled individually.

Yes, the past decade and a half has been a period of immense progress in virtually all phases of agriculture—but nowhere more so than in rural electrification. The fact that 7 farms out of 10 are electrified is good. But the fact we need to concentrate on now is that 3 out of 10 farms are not electrified. That is our challenge.

In our consideration of the future of rural electrification, there are important facts about the past that we should not forget. The great progress that has been made by REA co-ops has paralleled the great progress that has been made in national farm programs generally. Progress in rural electrification has paralleled the most dramatic rise in farm income we have ever seen in any similar period of years. Without this improvement in farm income, progress would have been slow.

While we recognize that rural electrification has been an important factor in helping to build farm income we realize, at the same time, the importance of farm program provisions that protect farm income, because that will help to assure further extension of rural electrification lines.

Rural electrification, then, does not stand alone. It is part of the national farm program. The substance of that program has been summed up in the phrase "organized, sustained, and realistic abundance." This is the basic goal of our national farm policy. I believe it to be the only practical goal. For when we look back down the corridors of history which man has traversed, we find that the basic strength of nations is in their land. No nation—no people—seems to have been able to remain permanently strong after it has allowed its capacity for agricultural abundance to be dissipated.

We need abundance to fill the gap that exists between the ideal of a good diet for the American people and the realization of that ideal. We need it to provide strength, vigor, and alertness to our growing population.

But this is not all. For a century or more there have been demands from abroad upon our land. Huge quantities of American wheat, lard, and cotton have crossed the seas to sustain life in other lands. But in this our own day the demands upon American agriculture from abroad have been far greater than ever before—so great, in fact, that our Nation has been supplying half of all the wheat that moves in international trade.

We need abundance not only for our own health but for world peace. Food still is an important weapon in our effort to help bring about stability in the world. And it seems to me that, if we who are concerned with agriculture use our land, our energies, and our technological skills to build a permanently sound and productive agriculture in America, we shall be making a fundamental contribution to peace.

If we are to do that job, we shall have to accomplish it through an over-all, long-range program in which electrification, conservation, price supports, storage programs, and research all contribute to improved rural living.

We have made good progress.

We have well-tested methods to help agriculture avoid wasteful production.

We have had experience in the orderly handling of surpluses.

We have the means of helping farmers meet their credit needs.

We have a national conservation policy of protecting the land and programs to back it up.

We have expanded research programs to help farmers lower costs and increase efficiency.

We have price-stabilization policies and the machinery for price protection.

The fact that we have all this means that rural electrification can be more effective.

I am proud of all these things. They represent more programs in the space of 16 years than was achieved in the whole previous century of American agricultural history. But, as you know, we do not yet have a complete and a wholly effective long-range farm program.

Last year farm net income turned downward for the first time in a decade. This year there may be some further decline. This would indicate a repetition of the traditional trend with agricultural prices making the adjustment first. It's a reminder that we must be doing our best to build a more stable agricultural prosperity than American farmers have ever enjoyed in the past.

For more than a decade farm production has been increasing and we have needed as much as could be produced. We shall continue to have need of full farm production in the future—with some crop adjustments in our pattern or production in line with changes in demand and the needs for soil conservation. In spite of our vast shipments of grain abroad, the American people are eating substantially more food per capita than they did before the war. They are eating more meat, more fruit, more vegetables—except potatoes—more eggs, more dairy products.

But can we go on finding markets for our abundant farm production? Many farmers are looking fearfully at the decline in prices of some commodities from the peaks of a yeat ago. They wonder what lies ahead.

Well, I'd like to say here what I have said before. I am not pessimistic about the future. I do not believe that our enjoyment of abundance must be adjusted downward. I believe, on the contrary, that we can have an expanding economy. But we shall need a strong and prosperous agriculture to do its part, and that means having a fully effective farm program.

I am a firm believer in a price-support system that will protect farm income. Along with a good support program we need ample storage. And if we are going to have real abundance, we may have to revise somewhat for the future our estimates of ample storage. We used to think a corn carry-over of one hundred to two hundred million bushels was plenty. A carry-over of four hundred or five hundred million bushels would have looked like a surplus. As long as we continue to demand more meat and milk and eggs we'll need more corn to produce them and a bigger margin of reserves as insurance against crop failure.

We know from experience that people want and will buy an abundance of livestock products and other foods as long as they have good purchasing power. The quantity and quality of food consumed in this country varies substantially with the level of national income.

So the first essential in the maintenance of farm prosperity is full employment at good wages. But I think we must be prepared if necessary to go even further in assuring markets for abundance. If people find their food dollars running short, we cannot afford to allow surpluses to pile up—for that means terrific pressure on farm prices. Nor can we afford to allow food to be wasted because people who need it are unable to buy enough food. I believe that the American people will want to have a floor under food consumption.

In addition to abundant consumption in this country we shall need foreign markets for some farm products. The foreign market

has long been important to American agriculture. It will be important in the future—not only to the corn-hog farmers—to the wheat farmers—to the cotton growers—but to all agriculture and to all Americans. For we are so closely interdependent in the modern economy, that what affects one group inevitably spreads out and affects others. One of the efforts being made right now to meet this need of foreign markets for farm products is through a revival of the International Wheat Agreement Conferences.

In a well-rounded farm program, we shall also need increased conservation efforts. We can produce abundantly now. But what about a century from now? Only if we take care of our resources, can we be certain that generation after generation we shall be able to produce abundantly.

A well-rounded long-range program calls for adequate research which is basic in any program of abundance because of its importance to increased output and greater efficiency.

Finally, rural people have as much right to good living as anyone else and the long-range welfare of farm people should include improved housing, better schools, more hospitals and other medical facilities, and more telephones.

Farm homes ought to have telephones as a matter of convenience, but, in a farm home especially, a telephone is more than a convenience. It's really a necessity. A telephone might easily prove to be a necessity for fire protection or health protection. In our efforts toward better living for farm families, we are lagging seriously in the expansion of telephone service. According to a recently published telephone company booklet, only 45 rural homes out of 100 have telephones. It doesn't seem reasonable to me that less than half of the rural homes of America have telephone service when more than two-thirds of them have electric service. In view of this situation it appears evident that Federal loan assistance to existing or new exchanges would be helpful in speeding up the job of making telephone service available to rural people.

The attainment of national farm program objectives depends, among other things, on the availability of abundant, dependable, low-cost electric power to all of our farmers. Modern agriculture, like modern industry, goes forward on power.

Low-cost electric power can make a great contribution to more efficient farm production, more stable farm income, improved farm family living, and the revitalization of rural communities—all of them major objectives in our national farm program.

The co-op rural-electrification program calls for good engineering, but it is more than an engineering job. It calls for sound financing, but it is more than a banking operation. Rural electrification is one of the major tools for achieving the goal of better farm living that I have been talking about today. I know that as long as the program has in its leadership the caliber of men represented here, this real objective will continue to be uppermost.

Reclamation Policies on Water Allocation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the growing shortage of water in California has focused attention on Bureau of Reclamation policies with reference to the allocation of water under reclamation law especially as that policy relates to the exportation of water from one region for use in another. The letter which I received from the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation under date of November 15, 1948, will be of interest to all Californians concerned with that problem. I wish to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Sacramento, Calif., November 15, 1949.

Hon. CLAIR ENGLE,
Red Bluff, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. ENGLE: In response to your request to Mr. Carr, we have assembled excerpts from various statements by Bureau and Department officials relating to the subject of diversion of water from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley through the operation of the Central Valley project.

A factual review of available water supplies over a period of more than 40 years of record and the estimates of future water requirements made by State and Federal agencies makes it clear that there is no reason for concern about the problem at this time.

For your convenience, I have summarized policy statements that have been made by Bureau of Reclamation and Department of the Interior officials. These excerpts are in the following paragraphs:

On February 20, 1942, in announcing the capacity for the Delta-Mendota Canal, Commissioner John C. Page said, as a part of his Washington, D. C. press release:

"The capacity of 4,600 cubic feet per second was approved, with the understanding that the quantity in excess of basic requirements mainly for replacement at Mendota Pool, will not be used to serve new lands in the San Joaquin Valley if the water is necessary for development in the Sacramento Valley below Shasta Dam and in the counties of origin of such waters."

On July 18, 1944, Regional Director Charles E. Carey wrote a letter to Mr. Harry Barnes, chairman of a committee of the Irrigation Districts Association of California. In that letter, speaking on the Bureau's recognition and respect for State laws, he said:

"They [Bureau officials] are proud of the historic fact that the reclamation program includes as one of its basic tenets that the irrigation development in the West by the Federal Government under the Federal reclamation laws is carried forward in conformity with State water laws."

On February 17, 1945, a more direct answer was made to the question of diversion of water in a letter by Acting Regional Director R. S. Calland, of the Bureau, to the Joint Committee on Rivers and Flood Control of the California State Legislature. The committee had asked the question, "What is your policy in connection with the amount of water that can be diverted from one watershed to another in proposed diversions." In stating the Bureau's policy, Mr. Calland quoted section 11460 of the State water code, which is sometimes referred to as the county of origin act, and then he said:

"As viewed by the Bureau, it is the intent of this statute that no water shall be diverted from any watershed which is or will be needed for beneficial uses within that watershed. The Bureau of Reclamation, in its studies for water resources development in the Central Valley, consistently has given full recognition to the policy expressed in this statute by the legislature and the people. The Bureau has attempted to estimate in these studies, and will continue to do so in future studies, what the present and future needs of each watershed will be. The Bureau will not divert from any watershed any water which is needed to satisfy the existing or potential needs within that watershed. For example, no water will be diverted which will be needed for the full development of all of the irrigable lands within the watershed, nor would there be water needed for municipal and industrial purposes or future maintenance of fish and wildlife resources."

On February 12, 1948, Acting Commissioner Wesley R. Nelson sent a letter to Representative Clarence F. Lea, in which he said:

"You asked whether section 10505 of the California Water Code, also sometimes referred to as the county of origin law, would be applicable to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation. The answer to this question is: No, except insofar as the Bureau of Reclamation has taken or may take assignments of applications which have been filed for the appropriation of water under the California Statutes of 1927, chapter 286, in which assignments reservations have been made in favor of the county of origin.

"The policy of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, is evidenced in its proposed report on a Comprehensive Plan for Water Resources Development—Central Valley Basin, Calif., wherein the Department of the Interior takes the position that 'In addition to respecting all existing water rights, the Bureau has complied with California's "county of origin" legislation, which requires that water shall be reserved for the presently unirrigated lands of the areas in which the water originates, to the end that only surplus water will be exported elsewhere'."

On March 1, 1948, Regional Director Richard L. Boke wrote to Mr. A. L. Burkholder, secretary of the Live Oak Subordinate Grange No. 494, Live Oak, Calif., on the same subject, and said:

"I can agree fully with the statement in your letter that it would be grossly unjust to 'take water from the watersheds of one region to supply another region until all present and all possible future needs of the first region have been fully determined and completely and adequately provided for.' That is established Bureau of Reclamation policy and, I believe, it is consistent with the water laws of the State of California under which we must operate."

On May 17, 1948, Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne wrote a letter to Representative Lea on the same subject, in which he said:

"The excess water made available by Shasta Reservoir would go first to such Sacramento Valley lands as now have no rights to water."

Assistant Secretary Warne goes on to say, in the same letter:

"As you know, the Sacramento Valley water rights are protected by: (1) Reclamation law which recognizes State water law and rights thereunder; (2) the State's counties of origin act, which is recognized by the Bureau in principle; and (3) the fact that Bureau filings on water are subject to State approval. I can assure you that the Bureau will determine the amounts of water required in the Sacramento Valley drainage basin to the best of its ability so that only surplus waters would be exported to the San Joaquin. We are proceeding toward a determination and settlement of Sacramento Valley waters which will fully protect the rights of present users; we are determining the water needs of the Sacramento Valley; and it will be the Bureau's policy to export from that Valley only such waters as are in excess of its needs."

On October 12, 1948, Secretary of the Interior Krug substantiated former statements of policy in a speech given at Oroville, Calif. Secretary Krug said, with respect to diversion of water:

"Let me state, clearly and finally, the Interior Department is fully and completely committed to the policy that no water which

is needed in the Sacramento Valley will be sent out of it."

He added:

"There is no intent on the part of the Bureau of Reclamation ever to divert from the Sacramento Valley a single acre-foot of water which might be used in the valley now or later."

We believe the foregoing is a summary of the main policy statements by Government officials on the subject of importation of Sacramento Valley water to the San Joaquin Valley. Please inform me if you wish additional information.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. BOKE,
Regional Director.

Eightieth Congress Distributed Free Several Hundred Thousand Copies of Communism in Action but Refused To Permit Any Free Copies of Fascism in Action To Be Distributed—Resolution for Free Distribution of Fascism in Action Now Before Committee on House Administration—Dangers of Fascism, as Well as Communism, Should Not Be Overlooked—Fascist Cartel System, Deadly Enemy of Small Business, Being Revived in Germany

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, January 7, 1949, I introduced House Resolution 38, providing for the printing for use of the House one hundred thousand copies of House Document 401, Eightieth Congress, entitled "Fascism in Action." I am asking the chairman of the committee for a hearing and favorable report on this resolution.

One cannot prove that he is an ardent believer in political and economic democracy merely by the violence of his opposition to communism. No more vehement renouncer of communism ever existed than Hitler. A real American is opposed to every form of totalitarianism and tyranny, whether left wing or right wing. The Communists would fasten our attention so completely and exclusively on fascism that we ignore the dangers of communism. Those who are sympathetic with Fascist economic policies—the monopolists, the cartelists, the hatemongers—would so exaggerate the dangers of communism that we would become as did Germany, Italy, and Japan, the easy prey of Fascists. The democratic way is the middle way—the road of all-around alertness, of informed, intelligent opposition to totalitarian tyranny in all its disguises. To this end the greatest single need is complete information constantly provided to the masses of the citizens. It is high time that this House authorize the printing and free distribution of thousands of copies of Fascism in Action.

INFORMATION AGAINST COMMUNISM FREE—INFORMATION AGAINST FASCISM 40 CENTS PER COPY

In a letter to me dated January 31, 1949, the Public Printer, Hon. John J. Deviny, stated:

> The Superintendent of Documents has ordered 39,000 copies of Fascism in Action, of which 36,790 copies have been sold at the established selling price of 40 cents. As requested by you, it may also be stated that the House of Representatives has not passed a resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Fascism in Action for distribution to Members of Congress.

In this same letter, it was disclosed that 482,145 copies of Communism in Action were printed and made available for free distribution to Members of Congress, March 19, 1947.

In all, 536,856 copies of Communism in Action were distributed free, but in order for any person to get a copy of the booklet Fascism in Action, it was necessary that it be purchased directly from the Superintendent of Documents for 40 cents per copy.

May I state in support of House Resolution 38 that I regard its passage as an important step toward overcoming totalitarian tyranny in all its disguises.

We in this House have often been warned against the tyranny behind the iron curtain. And rightly so. On more than one occasion I have led such campaigns. Nearly 3 years ago, September 24, 1946, I expressed myself on that subject in a letter to Dr. Ernest S. Griffith, in the following terms:

> I am opposed to communism in any form. It should be fought with every means at our command. It is obnoxious to our American democratic system of free enterprise based upon initiative, intelligence, ability, and hard work. Our system is the best in the world, and, because it is so much better than communism, I just can't believe that communism can get any hold in America, yet we must be on the alert and make sure that there is no formidable start toward communism.
>
> At the same time I dislike fascism. I think fascism is just as bad as communism. They are both equally mad. I would not attempt to say which is worse. To my mind fascism has a stronger hold in our country today than communism because its roots have become so firmly planted by so much abler and stronger hands and minds. Facism in our country today is backed by plenty of wealth and a day never passes that the people of our country are not flooded with literature which would lead them down the road to fascism.

On the subject of communism I feel that I can say beyond possibility of contradiction that this House has been fully alert. At a cost to the taxpayers of the United States of nearly $35,000 we have printed for free distribution almost 600,000 copies of Communism in Action.

TYRANNY OF RIGHT CAN BE AS DANGEROUS AS TYRANNY OF LEFT

But let me remind you that totalitarian tyranny has other symbols besides hammer and sickle and the red flag. The perpetual ideological competition and warfare in which our system of democracy and free enterprise is engaged is not a one-front war but a two-front war. The tyranny of the left is intolerable. Quite so. But that of the right is equally dangerous. It is but yesterday that right-wing totalitarianisms cost us hundreds of thousands of lives of our best young men and hundreds of billions of our treasure.

I was afraid then that we might keep our eyes glued so tightly on the left-hand side of the road and try to steer our course so surely away from the dangers on our left that we might forget all about the abyss on the right-hand side of the road.

FASCISM IS TODAY AN EVER-PRESENT DANGER

It was but natural that we should do so. Consequently, I asked that a study be made by experts of what this right-wing tyranny really is. Their findings were compiled in a book called Fascism in Action. In a foreword to that book I warned that though—

> To most Americans the threat of fascism vanished with the defeat of Germany and Japan. * * * There is a real question whether we defeated the evil itself in destroying its two principal exponents. Public opinion appears in general to hold that fascism is a wholly European, or at least a wholly foreign, movement. Yet there are many strong symptoms of fascism in our own democratic society. True, this movement in the United States masquerades under other names than the discredited one of fascism, but, whatever it may be called, its peculiar characteristics are alarmingly evident.
>
> If we are to combat successfuly such an insidious movement, many Americans must understand clearly what fascism is.
>
> * * * Fascism is today an ever-present danger to our democracy. We must consider not only how to recognize its manifestations but also what we can do to combat it. * * *
>
> Perhaps the best means of fighting fascism is to recognize it, no matter under what title it masquerades. Not all "hate" organizations are necessarily Fascist, but they have certain definite trends toward such a policy. If members of groups of this type can be made to realize the dangers inherent in such beliefs, a long step toward overcoming fascism will have been taken.
>
> It is my belief that persistent and fearless exposure will kill pro-Fascist organizations and discredit the individuals who have formed them. (Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, Fascism in Action, H. D. No. 401, 80th Cong., 1st sess., 1947, pp. v, vi.)

This House will be happy to know that its effort to keep the American people informed about Fascism in Action has had a large measure of success. Despite the fact that virtually no copies were printed for free distribution even to Members of Congress—as opposed to more than half a million given away of Communism in Action—as of January 31 of this year Fascism in Action was a governmental best seller, nearly 37,000 people having plunked down their cash for a copy.

CLEVER DISGUISES OF FASCISM

It is very easy to be deceived by the various innocent-appearing forms and clever disguises that fascism takes, for it goes by different names in different countries and readily adapts itself to any political or economic climate. But, as the volume Fascism in Action demonstrates, the underlying principles are the same everywhere. They have been put together in this book, which represents the results of a careful study of fascism in

Germany, Italy, Spain, and Japan. In its concluding chapter, after careful comparison of all the facts, the men of international reputation who, in this book, pooled their knowledge of fascism in action devoted several paragraphs to a summary of the meaning of fascism. Permit me to quote the seven items receiving top billing:

1. Fascist government is rule by a leader possessed of dictatorial powers supported by a single political party, and an elite class. (That clearly points to Russia and her satellites, Franco, Perón, and some others.)

2. Education and thought control are used to condition the mind of the masses at home for the Fascist struggle by all the devices which create, mold, or influence ideas, beliefs, and impressions. (Again characteristic of the East, but not unknown in the West.)

3. Fascist foreign policies are dynamic and aggressive. (Among many of our great neighbors this is frequently considered to fit other nations besides Russia.)

4. Finance and fiscal policies direct banking and private investment decisions in accord with general Fascist policies.

5. Foreign trade is no longer simply an economic phenomenon but becomes one of the many instruments through which the state achieves its political objectives.

6. The economy generally favors big business, strengthens the position of heavy industries, retains enough of the profit system to permit the elite to build up personal fortunes, emphasizes self-sufficiency, institutes higher tariffs, facilitates cartelization, and spends huge sums for military purposes. (The problems of monopoly and huge military outlays are likewise not restricted to foreign countries.)

7. Labor is regimented with the result that free collective bargaining and self-government by labor organizations is abolished. (Fascism in Action, p. 204.)

I wish that it could honestly be said that the fascism which our heroic veterans destroyed abroad has been permanently ended. But that flies in the face of unmistakable evidence and events since VE-day. I wish there were time to go into this matter thoroughly. Only a full-dress investigation by some alert committee of this House could do that. So I shall limit myself rigidly to a few recent happenings in Germany.

OUR COUNTRY FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND AGAINST MONOPOLY

You all know, of course, that this country has a traditional policy of opposition to monopoly, expressed not only in our antitrust laws, but in the protection which we have placed on the statute books for small business, for farmers, for independent merchants, and for the public. It was not only logical and natural, it was unavoidably dictated by our historical traditions and our love of Americanism that this basic cornerstone of our economic policy should be laid down as a foundation for our occupation policy, first in the original order 1067 of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and then in the Potsdam agreement.

Let me recall here the pertinent passages from that document:

At the earliest practicable date, the German economy shall be decentralized for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts, and other monopolistic arrangements.

It was restated and carried over into the controlling directive of July 15, 1947, as follows:

Pending agreement among the occupying powers you will in your zone prohibit all cartels and cartel-like organizations and effect a dispersion of ownership and control of German industry through the dissolution of such combines, mergers, holding companies, and interlocking directorates which represent an actual or potential restraint of trade or may dominate or substantially influence the policies of governmental agencies. You will not, however, prohibit governmental regulation of prices or monopolies subject to governmental regulations, in fields where competition is impracticable.

The last sentence was designed to apply primarily to transportation and communications services.

FIGHT AGAINST MONOPOLY NEVER WON BUT NEVER ABANDONED

It is likewise an historical fact that the fight against monopolies is a continuing fight. It has been so in our own country, and it will be so in all democratic-capitalistic societies. Once the fight is relaxed the monopolies grow. The fight against monopoly is never won, but at the same time it is never abandoned.

There is evidence that our Government has no thought of abandoning it.

Nor is the antimonopoly fight a political fight. The basic antitrust law was enacted by a Republican administration, and in every campaign year for the past half century there have been planks in both the Democratic and Republican Party platforms pledging vigorous enforcement of the antimonopoly laws. It is doubtful if any other public program in the history of our country has received such consistent and unanimous public support.

POLL ON CARTELS

In 1947 the Council on Foreign Relations polled the leading citizens in 22 cities on the question of German cartels, and 68 percent answered that they thought German cartels should be eliminated, 17 percent were uncertain, and only 14 percent favored keeping the cartels. When arranged by groups it was revealed that the editors, to a greater extent than any other group, felt that German cartels and monopolies should be eliminated.

The Charter for the International Trade Organization of the United Nations, approved by 53 participating nations, contains a sweeping prohibition against business practices which restrain competition, limit access to markets, or foster monopolistic control, and it sets out six specific prohibitions comparable in their essence to those contained in our decartelization law.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S WARNING

In all of the array of policy indications available there has not been a single statement indicating any desire or intention on the part of our Government, or on the part of the vast majority of the American people, to temper their demand that German cartels and monopolies shall be eliminated. On the contrary, numerous Congressional inquiries, one of which was chairmanned by President Truman, when he was Senator, warned this country against the revival of German cartels.

BACKWARD STEP IN GERMANY

Yet today our whole program of breaking up monopolies in Germany has been abandoned. To get German production back up to self-supporting levels those who make economic policy in Germany say that they must revive cartels. This is an absurd policy. Cartels fix prices, limit production, allocate markets, and do away with competition. How can we get efficiency if there is monopoly?

CAMPAIGN TO HAMPER ANTIMONOPOLY ENFORCEMENT

I am not talking about size or large-scale production. Some people seem to think that those who want to get rid of the wastes of monopoly are against business as such, or bigness as such, or want to break down the economy into a lot of little units without regard to optimum efficiency. This is a false and malicious misrepresentation of the views of those favoring the good old American system of free competitive enterprise. It is the historic tactic employed by representatives of special interests to retard and embarrass antimonopoly enforcement.

Those who are ardent supporters of the capitalistic system, of the profit motive, and of free competition know that it is necessary in doing away with German cartels to deal with three general categories, as follows:

First. Isolated agreements among the independently owned enterprises which are designed to eliminate specific types of competition;

Second. Association of independently owned companies into a cartel for the purpose of eliminating competition in an entire industry; and

Third. Monopolistic control of an industry by a single enterprise.

Unless domination of a whole industry by one enterprise is removed little is accomplished by attacking the other two. As a matter of fact, unless the excessive concentrations are dispersed at their roots, it might be actually harmful to engage in something suggestive of harassing actions against the smaller enterprises which may have banded together for protection against the dominant enterprises of the industry.

Moreover, all cartels must be dealt with. Those in the consumer-goods industries are no worse than those in the heavy industries. Consumers ultimately foot the bill, no matter where cartels limit output or raise prices. Thus before the war, because of the high prices set by the steel cartel, Germany was paying approximately $80,000,000 annually more for its steel than world market prices. It is true, of course, that there was only one principal customer, the German Government, but surely no one can contend that the monopoly differential of $80,000,000 a year was not ultimately paid by the same consumers who bought food and clothes and housing within the German economy.

A consumer does not buy a railroad locomotive, but when monopolization forces the Reichsbahn to pay a notoriously high price for its locomotives, the differential finally finds its way down to the consumer who pays a little more in freight for his food, his clothes, and the materials that go into his house. Multiply this situation by the number of heavy

industries and it presents a monopoly tax on the consuming public which has been conservatively estimated to run in excess of $5,000,000,000 a year.

PREVENT ANOTHER WAR BY BREAKING UP GERMAN CARTELS

Nothing, therefore, is clearer than that the break-up of the big monopolistic combines in Germany is necessary not only to take the fetters off the German economy, but necessary to prevent these cartelists from fomenting another war. Yet a vicious un-American policy of rebuilding German cartels is now being followed with full vigor.

This House has been warned about this affair several times during the last 12 months. On March 25 of 1948, Congressman SADOWSKI stated:

Before our eyes, Germany is being rebuilt by the same despicable pack of militarists, cartelists, and Junkers who made Hitler's war machine.

He specifically named 24 top Nazis who were given supreme executive positions by our military government.[1]

On May 6, 1948, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD added more documentation to what he termed—

the current emasculation, I might even say the deliberate sabotage, of our program of eliminating German cartels. * * * Detail for detail, it repeats the process that took place following World War I. If successful, this drive on behalf of the monopolies and the monopolists of Nazi Germany will seriously weaken our efforts toward world recovery and provide a new totalitarian threat to our national security.[2]

Congressman HOLIFIELD then placed his finger squarely on the reason for our abysmal failure to carry through the traditionally American anti-cartel policy which President Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and President Truman and this Congress have so consistently championed.

The change in policy—

Said Congressman HOLIFIELD—

is to be attributed to the fact that in places of authority are too often to be found men who have had previous connections with the very business firms who have engaged in cartel practices in the past.

He specifically named them, yet to this day, they continue to hold their positions of power and are vigorously continuing their Fascist un-American policy of rebuilding German monopolies. Who are these men?

Since the order of March 13, 1948, which set aside the decartelization program of this Government, the recartelization program in Germany has been in charge of Phillips Hawkins, son-in-law of Under Secretary of War Maj. Gen. William H. Draper, Jr. Before entering Government service, Mr. Hawkins was connected with the Hercules Powder Co. His deputy, C. H. Collison, was a former member of the legal staff of the United States Steel Corp. General Draper, who for some time headed the Economics Division of the American Control Council, was formerly with the firm of Dillon, Read & Co. This Wall Street firm prior to the war floated in the United States a $30,000,000 bond issue on behalf of the Thyssen Vereinigte Stahlwerke, the German steel trust. Deputy assistant to Dr. Willard Thorp in the State Department and backstopping the revival of German cartels at high levels here is Mr. Paul Nitze, another vice president of Dillon, Read & Co. His record was made public in the June 1948 number of the magazine To Prevent World War III in an article entitled "The Right Men in the Right Places."

FASCISM IN JAPAN

Not only has General Draper obstructed decartelization and denazification in Germany, but it is notable that he has also taken a hand in urging modification of the policy of the far eastern command designed to break up the concentration of the economic power in the hands of Japanese feudal combines known as the Zaibatsu.

Two recent books[3] have explored this whole situation. One was written by Howard Ambruster, author of the monograph on Cartels in the Encyclopedia Americana. The other was written by Richard Sasuly, who served under Colonel Bernstein in Germany. Mr. Sasuly states that the policies embodied in Directive JCS 1067 were frequently ignored by officials of the United States military government and that by mid-December 1945 only a few units in two I. G. Farben plants within the United States zone had been destroyed of those built entirely for war purposes. "In all respects the picture was one of regrowth of I. G. Farben," he stated.

CARTELS PROTECTED BY NEW POLICY

Congressman SADOWSKI has already put in the RECORD the following documentation concerning the episode in March 1948 when our entire decartelization policy was scrapped. Practically the entire staff in the decartelization branch resigned in protest. I have here the memorandum which 19 members of that staff signed, and submit it for the RECORD:[4]

OFFICE OF MILITARY GOVERNMENT
FOR GERMANY, UNITED STATES,
Berlin, Germany, March 13, 1948.

Subject: Decartelization policy.

To: The Military Governor, Office of Military Government for Germany, United States, APO 742, United States Army.

1. On March 11, 1948, Mr. Bronson called a meeting of all the members of the Decartelization Branch and read excerpts from a memorandum which he said you had approved and had been approved in principle by the State Department. This memorandum announced a new policy for decartelization. In the opinion of the members of the staff, it virtually repeals the decartelization law and contravenes the July 15, 1947,[5] directive. We asked Mr. Bronson to furnish us copies of this memorandum, and he refused. Therefore, many members of the staff prepared memoranda and we herewith respectfully submit a composite version for whatever clarification you might consider necessary.

2. Mr. Bronson stated that your orders were as follows:

(a) No deconcentration action is to be taken against enterprises in the capital goods or heavy industry field but only against enterprises having monopolies in consumer goods.

(b) No action is to be taken against vertical integrations.

(c) The only standard to guide our future proceedings is a rule of reason.

(d) No action is to be taken against Henschel, although the Bipartite Decartelization Commission had found it to be an excessive concentration within the terms of law No. 56, and no action is to be taken against VKF.

(e) Enterprises against which no action is contemplated are to be officially given a clean bill of health soon.

(f) Violations against trade practices provisions of law No. 56 are to be pursued, and eight such cases against now unknown companies are to be submitted by May 2, 1948.

3. It appeared to be the unanimous opinion of the staff of the Decartelization Branch, or at least no contrary opinions were expressed, that the order given by Mr. Bronson excludes from decartelization action the principal group of monopolistic enterprises which the law says must be eliminated. We do not believe that such amendatory restrictions should be made except by either repeal or drastic revision of the law itself. The law does not draw any distinction between capital-goods industries and consumer-goods industries. On the other hand, it is our view that monopolies in the capital-goods industries are more frequent and more repugnant to the purposes of the law than are concentrations in consumer-goods industries. The effect of such an amendment, we believe, would be to leave the fundamental concentrations of economic power intact while engaging in little more than harassing attacks on the smaller companies. This, of course, aside from being in contravention of the law, would tend to make its enforcement unpopular and completely ineffectual.

4. We also think there are very serious objections to giving immunity to "vertical integration" since the law makes no such exceptions; we believe that to give a clean bill of health to subjects of investigation is contrary to all established principles of law and law enforcement; and we think that being guided by a rule of reason rather than standards in the law offers many obvious dangers.

5. Since it is inevitable that such a new policy, given only by verbal instructions, has produced a state of demoralization throughout the staff we respectfully request that you give us a clarification.

6. It is of importance to add that no solicitation was made in behalf of this memorandum. The following members of the staff are among those who voluntarily asked to join in this expression.

(Signatures.)

The requested clarification came. On March 25 General Clay interviewed the staff of the Decartelization Branch and informed them that the revised policy as announced was official and would not be altered. General Clay further stated that he personally had ordered the case against VKF and Henschel dropped. The New York Times reported of this conference:

General Clay was flanked by Lawrence Wilkinson, his economic adviser, and Phillips Hawkins, chief of the Property Division, of which the Decartelization Branch is a part. His manner was cold and military through most of the conference and he seldom smiled.

Gradually one by one most of the 19 men and women in the Decartelization Branch found their way back to the

[1] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1948, pp. 3552–3556.

[2] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 6, 1948, pp. 5457–5460.

[3] Ambruster, Howard W., Treason's Peace. New York, Beechhurst Press, 1947. Sasuly, Richard, I. G. Farben. New York, Boni and Gaer, 1947, p. 201.

[4] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 25, 1948, p. 3553.

[5] Elsewhere given "as July."

United States either to private life or to the Antitrust Division and other Government agencies.

Early in December of 1948 at the request of the President, the Secretary of the Army sent an investigation committee to Germany to get the facts on the administration of the decartelization program. This committee was headed by Mr. Garland S. Ferguson, a member of the Federal Trade Commission. Its report has never been made public. One incident, the Alexander Sacks case, was reported in the New York Times for February 8 of this year. I hold in my hands and submit for the RECORD a copy of a letter by Mr. Wendell Berge, former head of the Antitrust Division, to assistant Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray.

POSNER, BERGE, FOX & ARENT,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.

Hon. GORDON GRAY,
Assistant Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I represent Alexander Sacks, formerly an attorney in the Bipartite Control Office, United States Decartelization Element, Frankfort, Germany, but now a member of the staff of the Civil Administration Division, Legislative Branch, Berlin, Germany. As you know, Mr. Sacks has been charged with "making statements attacking the integrity and good faith of the Under Secretary of the Army and of key United States military government officials charged with the formulation of policy and the implementation of the decartelization program in the United States zone of Germany." The statements on which the charges purport to be based were made by Mr. Sacks in a memorandum dated December 20, 1948, which he prepared in response to a request from a member of the Ferguson investigation committee after Mr. Sacks had testified before that committee. The committee, as I understand it, had been designated by the Secretary of the Army to investigate certain charges involving the administration of the decartelization program in Germany that had been made by former members of the staff.

I have not seen the transcript of the oral testimony before the Ferguson committee, but I have a copy of Mr. Sacks' memorandum of December 20, 1948, referred to in the charges preferred against him. Although there are a number of statements in Mr. Sacks' memorandum which might be construed to fall into the scope of the charges, I presume that the principal language to which offense was taken is the following:

"The men charged with the highest responsibility by the Commander in Chief have failed signally to carry out the explicit orders of July 15, 1947, Directive to the Commanding General and Military Governor in Germany. The policy of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations has been flagrantly disregarded by the very individuals who were charged with the highest responsibility for carrying them out. Instead, these individuals have let themselves be guided by subjective standards, not to be found in the July 15 Directive, or in Military Government Law 56. They have permitted the intrusion of other agencies in military government who either do not understand, or do not care to understand, the purposes and techniques of the decartelization law.

"By the application of extra-legal and purely personal standards of judgment, they have succeeded in killing the action against the VKF ball-bearing monopoly and Henschel & Son. It is no answer to say that these individuals had the authority to do what they did. Their actions were clearly a usurpation or abuse of their authority and function, and cannot be regarded as having been instituted or carried out in pursuance of their legitimate functions.

"It is no secret that the operations of the decartelization program have been hampered by Major General Draper and his associates in military government, and by Leland Spencer, of Commerce and Industry. They have done whatever they could, by innuendo and misstatement, to discredit a program which they either did not understand, or did not like. These individuals, and others assisting them, have persistently maintained that the decartelization program would injure production, that it would make unprofitable the operation of business enterprises, etc. Their accusations and criticisms are full of unfounded assumptions, none of which have been proved, or could be proved. But the prestige of their positions has lent weight to their criticism, and although they do not have the legal authority to stop the decartelization program, they have, in fact, succeeded in paralyzing it by involved procedures, devious interpretations, and by obtuse improvisations of policy."

As a result of making these and other statements in the memorandum, Mr. Sacks was suspended and advised that his retention in an active-duty status pending the outcome of the consideration of the charges against him would be detrimental to the interests of military government. Mr. Sacks has been advised that it is proposed to separate him from the Department of the Army rolls with the Office of Military Government for Germany, and he has been formally advised of his rights to reply to the charges and request a review of the proposed action, as well as his rights under the twenty-fourth article of war. A cable recently received in this country by one of his friends indicates that a grievance hearing has been scheduled in Germany for the morning of February 10, 1949.

I have just entered the case and have not had an opportunity to review the various technical regulations alleged to be applicable. For the time being, I am not concerned with whether the action proposed to be taken is technically authorized by law or valid rules and regulations. For reasons not in any way related to the technical legal situation, and which I shall set forth below, I request on Mr. Sacks' behalf: (1) that the proceeding against him be immediately terminated without prejudice to Mr. Sacks' status in the Military Government for Germany, or (2) in the alternative, that a public hearing on the charges against Mr. Sacks be held in Washington, D. C., where all of the witnesses who are in a position to testify in Mr. Sacks' behalf would be available, whereas no witnesses in a position to testify in Mr. Sacks' behalf are available in Germany.

Mr. Sacks will make no issue of the fact that he prepared, at the request of a member of the Ferguson committee, the memorandum of December 20, 1948, or that, at the request of the committee, he testified as the transcript of the hearings will show. Therefore, the only substantial issue pertinent to the question of whether Mr. Sacks should be separated from his position is whether he told the truth. The witnesses whose present positions permit them freedom to testify in support of the statements made by Mr. Sacks are all in this country.

The formal statement of the charges against Mr. Sacks appears to proceed on the theory that the making of statements by a subordinate employee criticizing or attacking the policies and actions of his superior officers constitutes a type of disloyalty which per se warrants separation from the service, irrespective of whether the statements are justified or true. This theory is apparently being carried even so far as to apply to statements made by a subordinate employee in response to questions from a committee appointed by the Secretary of the Army for the very purpose of investigating the policies and actions of his superior officers. I submit that this theory should be totally rejected.

I respectfully suggest that the Department of the Army make it abundantly clear to the public that, at least in the execution of economic policies under the administration of the Army, employees will not be disciplined or discharged for making bona fide responses to questions or requests from investigating committees concerning the policies and conduct of their superior officers. Otherwise an iron curtain will descend around such investigating committees and they will be unable to get at the truth of situations which they are commissioned to investigate. Obviously, if Mr. Sacks is now separated from the service, other employees cannot afford to take the risk of cooperating with the Ferguson committee. As a matter of fact, one witness presently in this country declined by letter to come to Washington to testify before the Ferguson committee because of the fact that he holds a commission on the retired list of the Navy and cannot afford to run the risk of retaliatory action should his testimony be displeasing to the military authorities. I am also reliably informed that there are many persons on the staff in Germany who share Mr. Sacks' view, but obviously they could not afford to testify in his behalf because to do so would subject them to charges similar to those already preferred against Mr. Sacks.

It is Mr. Sacks' position, which I propose to urge wherever appropriate, that a civilian official has a duty to tell the truth as he sees it, particularly to investigating committees, and that it is not "disloyalty" under such circumstances to recite facts as they have occurred or to express opinions which may be contrary to those held by superior officers. The official charges against Mr. Sacks seem to rest upon the erroneous notion that a civilian employee's primary loyalty is to his immediate superiors irrespective of whether they are acting within the law or are faithfully executing officially declared policies. I submit that the primary loyalty of such an employee is not to his immediate superiors but to the United States Government and the people of the United States. Such a civilian employee is a public servant and not a servant of his immediate departmental superiors. I go further and urge that it is not only appropriate for a civilian employee to speak up when in good faith he has reason to believe that his superiors are mishandling public matters, but that it is even his duty to do so. Not to do so would be in violation of his primary loyalty to the public. If this principle were not accepted, then the lips of subordinate officials would be sealed even though they had knowledge of misconduct, violation of law, or action contrary to officially declared policy on the part of their superiors. Important avenues of information necessary to keep the administration of our Government clean and responsive to the mandates of Congress and the announced policies of the President would be obstructed.

It must not be overlooked that the officials who have been sent to Germany in connection with the carrying out of our decartelization policy were sent there to execute a policy, not to make it. Long before the termination of the war responsible public officials in this country announced that it would be the purpose of this Government after the war to deconcentrate German industry and break up the power of the German cartels. That policy manifestly has the approval of Congress. It was stated in JCS 1067, in the Potsdam Agreement, and it was restated in the revised directive from the Joint Chiefs of Staff as late as July 1947. So, clearly, it is not a question of an argument between a superior and subordinate officer over policy which the superior is charged with making. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that Secretary Royall

sent the committee to Germany for the express purpose of determining whether or not the policies of the Government were being properly carried out by Mr. Sacks' superiors. Certainly Mr. Sacks' opinions, as well as his knowledge of facts, are pertinent to the inquiry of the committee.

I maintain that the only pertinent issue is whether Mr. Sacks told the truth. If it is proposed to press this matter, the hearings should be held at a place where the witnesses who are necessary to Mr. Sacks' defense are available. To hold a hearing otherwise would be a mockery of justice and would amount to a star-chamber proceeding. I should advise you that in presenting Mr. Sacks' defense it will be necessary, among others, to call as witnesses the following:

Hon. William H. Draper, Under Secretary of the Army.

Hon. Garland S. Ferguson, chairman of the investigating committee.

A. Thomas Kearney, member of the investigating committee.

Samuel S. Isseks, member of the investigating committee.

Johnston Avery, special assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

John C. Stedman, special assistant to the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

Col. William H. England, chief economist (retired), Federal Trade Commission.

James S. Martin, former chief of the decartelization branch, now living at Annapolis, Md.

In addition to the above principal witnesses, it would be necessary to call several other civilians resident at different points in this country who formerly were associated with the decartelization staff in Germany.

I hope that the Department of the Army will conclude that an unfortunate mistake was made by the officials in Germany who preferred the charges and that it will direct those officials to withdraw the charges immediately and to restore Mr. Sacks to his previous status without prejudice. But if for any reason such a decision cannot be made without further investigation, then I submit that common justice requires that the case be transferred here so that witnesses necessary to Mr. Sacks' defense may testify.

Yours respectfully,

WENDELL BERGE.

FASCIST POLICIES IN JAPAN

If time permitted I could document with equal ease how Fascist economic policies are being put into operation again in Japan. There, too, the breaking up of cartels or Zaibatsu has been stopped by direct order and official activities of the same persons who have scuttled the reestablishment of free private competitive enterprise in Germany. The evidence is unmistakable that we have not been sufficiently alert to prevent the rebirth of fascism and Fascist economic policies, even in the countries we occupy. It is high time we watched the right-hand side of the road a bit from time to time.

BASING POINT PART OF GERMAN CARTEL SYSTEM

The basing-point system as used by the cement and steel trusts and outlawed by the Supreme Court recently came from the cartel system as practiced in Germany. It is against the public interest.

HEARINGS ON RESOLUTION TO PRINT FASCISM IN ACTION

In the early part of 1947 I introduced House Resolution 83, providing that the book on Fascism in Action be printed as a public document. A hearing was granted on the resolution by the Honorable KARL M. LECOMPTE, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, June 3, 1947.

The hearings were conducted June 3, 4, and 5, 1947. Thereafter, the committee authorized the printing of the book as a public document, with the understanding that certain comments of one of the members on the then majority side should be inserted in the preface; but the committee during the Eightieth Congress repeatedly refused to make any copies available for free distribution by Members.

The book, Fascism in Action, a documented study and analysis of fascism in Europe, was prepared at the instance and under the direction of myself by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress under the direction of Ernest S. Griffith, director. In other words, it was prepared by the same organization that prepared the book on Communism in action. It has 206 pages on what is fascism, how it operates, some origins of fascist doctrines, and chapters as disclosed by the following table of contents:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	x
Preface	ix
Introduction	1
Part I—Political:	
Chapter I. Government and Political Parties	7
Chapter II. Education and Thought Control	23
Chapter III. Foreign Policy	37
Chapter IV. Finance and Fiscal Policy	56
Chapter V. Foreign Trade	75
Part II—Economic:	
Chapter VI. Organization of the Economy: Germany	88
Chapter VII. Organization of the Economy: Italy, Spain, Japan	106
Chapter VIII. Labor	119
Chapter IX. Agriculture and the Farmer	131
Chapter X. Transportation	142
Part III—Individual:	
Chapter XI. Living Standards	156
Chapter XII. Use of Leisure Time	169
Chapter XIII. Religion	187
Chapter XIV. Freedom	197
Part IV—Conclusion	204

In my testimony, June 3, 1947, before the Committee on House Administration, I stated:

I would invite your attention here to one thing. On page 20 it says: "Financed at first by men of wealth as a defense against socialism, the Fascist Party later became dependent on membership fees, special letters, and so forth, which brings in ample funds."

In other words, the very wealthy people—not all of them but some—tried to organize the Fascist Party and take over the Government, and they did that on the pretense that they were fighting socialism, and I hope that we do not have a situation in this country where we are fighting the Communists here on the left, while we are overlooking an equally bad enemy on the right.

Mr. MORRIS. And that could be easily done.

Mr. COLE. If there is so much interest in this book, why can it not be published personally?

Mr. PATMAN. It can be.

Mr. COLE. Is there any likelihood of slander suits or anything of that sort?

Mr. PATMAN. I certainly would be criticized if I were to take the work of the legislative service and commercialize it. I would be open to criticism. They are working for the Government. If this committee does not want to do it, it will be printed, all right, I think. I honestly and sincerely hope you will make some kind of report, either favorable or unfavorable. If it is unfavorable, I hope to get it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if I do not, as a last resort, I will get private printers to print it, because I think it is of such tremendous importance that the American people are entitled to the facts that are in this book.

* * * * *

I do not think the Communists, if they are true to form, if they are working like they worked in other countries, will object to the growth of fascism. I think they want that in this country, because it will be so much easier for the Communists to take over the Government from the Fascists than it would be to take it over from a democracy such as we have now. Their policy is to divide and conquer, weaken, cause confusion, and everything else, which would be the case if fascism were to grow and prosper in this country.

I think the Fascist element in this country is in very strong hands. They have money, they have wealth, they have power. It is in much stronger hands than the Communists. The Communists fight just as hard, or probably harder than the Fascists, but the Fascists are in stronger hands in this country than the Communists or any other group. But we do not want either one of them to prosper. We want to keep our own system of private enterprise, our own system of government, which is the finest, best Government on the face of the earth, and when we teach the people what fascism is, and what communism is, and then compare it with our own Government, we do not have to wonder what they are going to do. We know what they are going to do. They are going to stay with our own Government, and that is the object of this publication, to let the people know the danger signs which can be seen in certain movements. It takes an alert person. You have to be rather clever sometimes to detect these things. But if we can point out to them the danger signs, that will help them in warding off both communism on the left and fascism on the right, then we will be rendering a great service to our country. And it is because of that great service to our country that I would like to see this made a House document.

If the committee does not feel that way, I will not criticize the committee. I consider each Member of Congress has his own responsibility. It would be very undignified of me to criticize a Representative of some other district. That is not my duty or my obligation. Each one of us has his own duty and responsibility. I am not criticizing any member of the committee or Member of the House. I never do that. But if the committee, in its wisdom, decides not to make this a House document, I hope it will say so, and I hope you do it with the understanding that I am at liberty to have a private publisher print it and distribute it.

I do not think I am privileged to do that now, because the Government has put money into this publication, and I would certainly be subject to criticism, and should be, if I were to take this document, prepared by people paid with Government money, and let some private publisher publish it for profit and distribute it over the Nation. But if this committee should turn this down as a House document, I want you to at least make a recommendation along that line. I certainly feel we should not try to stop a publication of this sort. So, if you do not make a House document of it, I hope you will give me the green light to have it published, as a last resort, by private publishers, because I think the story ought to be told.

If the committee had not made the book a public document, it would have

received much wider distribution through its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or by a private publisher. I never expected the committee to make it a public document and then not authorize a generous number for free distribution in the same way and manner that the copies of the book on communism were distributed.

My testimony on the printing of the document before the committee June 3, 1947, was as follows:

Mr. MEADE. How many copies do you contemplate asking to be printed?

Mr. PATMAN. I thought of asking for the same number Mr. Dirksen did.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dirksen's original resolution called for a half million, and I believe it was amended down to 375,000.

Mr. PATMAN. I would say 100,000. I expect 100,000 would be enough, and as the demand grows, if it does, I presume additional copies will be requested. I do not think the cost should enter into it much. The importance is what we should consider. The cost is the smallest part about it.

The book on fascism in action is approximately the same size as the one on communism in action.

The City of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Greensburg, Ind., within my district, has been chosen by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as the City of Democracy. This very high honor means that Greensburg will represent the junior chamber of commerce at the International Congress at Brussels, Belgium, in April. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a newspaper article from the Greensburg News:

NAME GREENSBURG "CITY OF DEMOCRACY"—MODEL TO BE SHOWN AT BRUSSELS, SITE OF JAYCEE CONGRESS

Accorded special recognition by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce as "the City of Democracy" of the Nation, Greensburg is to be shown in miniature at the International Congress of the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Brussels, Belgium, in April.

A scale model of Greensburg—the one city in the entire United States to be shown at the international congress with representatives from 44 nations—will be constructed, according to plans formulated by the Greensburg Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Approval of Greensburg as the representative small city in the United States has been made, according to word from Paul Bagwell, of Lansing, Mich., president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Plans for proceeding with this project, which will give Greensburg national and international publicity, were formulated Monday night at a meeting of Jaycee leaders with directors of the Greensburg Chamber of Commerce.

CITY OF DEMOCRACY

Explanation of the project and its possibilities was outlined at the meeting by Charles F. Scheidler, president of the Greensburg Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Ray Lindboe, first vice president of the Indiana State Junior Chamber of Commerce. The replica of Greensburg will be captioned "Greensburg, Indiana, U. S. A.—The City of Democracy." Presented in miniature in the scale model will be churches, schools, industrial plants, public buildings, businesses, and areas with individual homes.

ARMY TO PHOTOGRAPH CITY

Announcement was made that aerial pictures will be taken in the near future by fliers of the United States Army Air Forces, as the first step in providing the background for the scale model. Assurance was made that the model can be completed in time to be loaded in a plane at New York City on April 18. The scale model will be divided into several pieces and will be 15 feet square. It will be exhibited at numerous State and national conventions and meetings following the display abroad.

Several national publications are reported already to be interested in preparing articles regarding Greensburg, in view of the signal honor accorded this community. The State Department of Commerce is interested, according to Mr. Ayres, because it will afford unusual publicity to Indiana as a whole.

Detroit Common Council Supports St. Lawrence Seaway Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a recent meeting of the Detroit Common Council the following resolution requesting expeditious fulfillment of the St. Lawrence seaway project was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the President of the United States, in his recent message to Congress, has pledged full support to the St. Lawrence navigation and power project for the deepening of the present channels in the St. Lawrence River and the building of locks and dams that would permit its navigation by large ocean-going vessels; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended an initial appropriation of $20,000,000 in the budget now under consideration, to be used to commence this work; and

Whereas this project, after thorough consideration covering a considerable period of time, has been recommended by congressional committees and has been shown by United States engineering surveys to be a practical project beneficial to the entire Nation and by the imposition of tolls self-sustaining over a period of years; and

Whereas the city of Detroit, the State of Michigan and the great midwestern section of the United States are vitally interested in this project, as more production for export originates in the Detroit industrial area than in any other area of the country, more agricultural commodities and manufactured goods are produced in the midwestern section of the United States than in any other area, and therefore a substantial portion of the workers in this area are continuously employed in the production of goods for shipment to foreign countries and a direct water route to the Atlantic Ocean will give this area ready access to all of the ports of the world without a transfer and would constitute a vital stimulant to the employment of additional labor in the area as well as creating new industries in Detroit, in Michigan and the Midwest; and

Whereas the depletion of iron ore deposits in Michigan and Minnesota is having a serious effect upon this important and vital industry, which, in order to maintain the economic stability of the Great Lakes region, needs direct access to the high-grade Quebec-Labrador iron ore; and

Whereas making the St. Lawrence waterway navigable for ocean-going vessels would be of immeasurable benefit not only economically but defensively to the entire Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of Detroit, by its mayor and common council, hereby reaffirm their whole-hearted approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation for its successful completion; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he hereby is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from the State of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That he forward a copy of this resolution to the American Municipal Association, the United States Conference of Mayors, the Municipal Finance Officers Association, the Michigan Municipal League, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers, and the Great Lakes Harbor Association, with the request that these organizations request their members to adopt similar resolutions and forward them to their Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

We Must Preserve Our Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there is no industry more beneficial to the human family and to agriculture itself than the dairy industry. Dairying is the backbone of agriculture. It builds the bone and sinew of the rising generations.

It is the main dependence of the farmer to build up the fertility of the soil. The importance of dairying has long been recognized by our national leaders and the Congress in its wisdom has established a policy and enacted laws to safeguard our principal dairy product—butter—from destructive competition of cheap butter substitutes to enrich profiteering manufacturers at the expense of the American farmer.

There is inserted herewith a letter expressing my views on this vital issue to one of my constituents:

FEBRUARY 21, 1949.

Mr. GEORGE A. WITTE,
Post Office Box 231, Caldwell, Idaho.

DEAR MR. WITTE: Answering your letter of February 9, concerning the production and marketing of oleomargarine, as a boy I was impressed with the comparison made in the adage "Carrying coals to Newcastle," but I never expected to get a letter from the seat of one of the most important and successful dairy cooperatives in the United States, the town of Caldwell, advocating the unrestricted competition of cheap butter substitutes with the products of our dairy industry, which as I see it, is the backbone

of agriculture, the main dependence of the farmer to increase the fertility of his farm, a farm product that builds the bone and sinew of the rising generation.

I cannot bring myself to support a plan that would permit profiteering packing-house companies and butter-substitute manufacturers, using cheap vegetable oils and surplus tallow and grease to come in and take away the market of the farmer engaged in the dairy industry of this country.

Since oleomargarine has been invented as a cheap butter substitute, we have followed a long and tedious course in formulating a Government policy and enacting the necessary law to protect our dairy industry, and at this late day to meet a temporary emergency caused by inflated prices, I cannot bring myself to support a program that would tear down the laws that have been wisely enacted to protect our dairy industry.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Economy in Government

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, economy in government is essential if we as a Nation are to survive. Last week I stated on the floor that I hoped the President would talk economy, or have someone in the Government who could and would talk economy in Government spending. No word was forthcoming, until last Thursday I noticed an item that the President in speaking against the Rankin veterans' pension bill said that we would not be able to pay the veterans more pension.

Well, I am glad that the President has found out that we cannot do everything that everybody wants, notwithstanding the fact that he has advocated taking care of everybody from the cradle to the grave. You will recall that in his state of the Union message he requested more subsidies for the farmer, more subsidies for mining, more power projects in Tennessee, power projects on the St. Lawrence Seaway, more social security benefits, more Federal aid to the schools, socialized medicine for the general public, more low-rent housing at less than cost, more military training when we already are spending $15,000,000,000 for our military forces, more money for foreign countries under ERP, and suggesting that we arm all the countries of Europe.

Now if the President is unable to find money to take care of the veterans, how can he find the money to do all these other things? It is not common sense, it is not good business, and if we continue this trend, there is an inevitable wreck ahead, tax bill of $4,000,000,000 or no tax bill. You know it and so do I, and it is the responsibility of everyone of the Members of Congress to stop this squandering.

We cannot stand more taxes. Everybody is protesting now about the high taxes, yet all seem to think we can do more spending. That simply does not add up right. Before you vote "yea" on any legislation, consider whether it stands this test:

First. Is it right?
Second. Is it sound?
Third: Will it work?
Fourth. Can this country afford it?

Unless it passes these four tests, vote "nay." Use your good common sense, your brain and will power, and remember the oath you took to uphold the Constitution of the United States. Let us all do our duty as sound Americans, for unless we change the present policy I can see nothing but a wreck ahead, and it is coming only too fast.

Federal Aid Costs Too Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

FEDERAL AID COSTS TOO MUCH

(By H. J. Stuhlmiller)

Federal aid, in its many forms, costs the American people more than it is worth. Such aid was practically nonexistent in the United States until the thirties when it was a measure taken presumably for emergency purposes only. Now this aid is running into billions of dollars annually. Yet more of such aid is being proposed. If enacted into law, the Government will pay part of our teachers' salaries, as well as help build our school houses and other public buildings; it will help us pay our doctor bills; social security will be expanded. Government money will go for farm housing as well as for extensive city housing projects; high price supports will be continued along with all of the other present aid projects. All of this sounds good. Eventually this help will do us harm; for the Government has no source of income other than the local communities which it means to aid.

We recall the promises that something will be done about the high cost of living. People who are being hurt by rising living costs are increasing in numbers. But it is the pouring out of money by our Government that has directly been responsible for these high prices about which we complain. It is the pump-priming of the thirties, the war costs, and the Federal-aid projects of the more recent period that is shrinking the value of the dollar. In only two of the past 16 years has the tax money been sufficient, so the deficits had to be made up mostly by diluting our money supply with the unavoidable result of raising prices.

The bad effects of Federal aid more than cancel out the good intended. Even public projects are becoming harder to finance. Adair County, for example, is getting a substantial Federal grant to build a new hospital. But rising costs caused by the very Government that wants to give aid have made it necessary to redraw the plans for a smaller building. Again, there is the 23-mile gap in the pavement on State Highway No. 92—the traveling public needs to have it paved. And we need more surfaced farm-to-market roads. But even with the help of Federal money it is harder to finance these necessary improvements now than it was in the twenties, when Federal aid was not so extensively available. Indeed, most of the paving of Iowa roads was then put in.

Federal aid has to be paid for. The money comes from two sources: First, oppressive taxation (the Government now takes more than 80 percent of all the taxes we pay, leaving too little to support our local and school governments; second, deficit financing (this is what shrinks the value of the dollar and is likely to bring on rationing again and more crippling Government controls).

Of course, all communities take Federal aid when they can get it. In fact, it is their own money in the first place. Therefore, each community has to compete with all others in attempting to get back as much of its money as possible. The biggest share often goes to those who have the most political pull. It would probably be shocking if we knew how large a share was never returned to us.

When we receive Federal aid, it seems we are getting something for nothing. We should not be deceived. We actually are the losers.

Daylight-Saving Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article on daylight-saving time by Charley Stookey, farm editor of Station KXOK, in St. Louis, Mo.:

CHARLEY STOOKEY SAYS

People who come to St. Louis or any part of the metropolitan area, any time between the first of May and the first of October know the confusion which is caused by daylight-saving time.

Personally I think daylight-saving time is absurd.

However, we are going to have to put up with it because of the attitude in the eastern half of the United States and because of the short-sightedness of a minority in the cities like St. Louis.

So I have suggested that we have daylight-saving time on a Nation-wide basis but for the months of June, July, and August only. Following up the suggestion I wrote Congressman MEL PRICE, of East St. Louis, Ill., on the subject:

Here is his reply dated from Washington, D. C., January 5:

"This has been a difficult question ever since the Congress, through the war years, exercised authority in setting daylight time throughout the country. Except during the period of war emergencies, Congress has avoided this question, but there has been a growing concern on the part of people everywhere for a national decision on the matter. Railroaders, farmers and a lot of people are disturbed about conflicting times in all sections of the country, and I think that most people would appreciate a standard settlement on the matter. I certainly would be glad to cooperate in any manner possible.

"MELVIN PRICE,
"Member of Congress."

I read the letter on my Town and Country program over KXOK one morning recently and asked for opinions. The replies came in. Folks from St. Louis as well as from the farm wrote me.

Most of them detest daylight-saving time, but agreed that national daylight-saving time for only 3 months would be better than regional and for 5 months as it now stands in many areas.

A dairy farmer on Route 3, St. Charles, Mo., wrote: "Rather not have it at all, but if it has to be, June, July and August won't be too bad. Our cows don't even like the change."

A lady in St. Louis said about daylight-saving time, "Kick it out all together. It only benefits school kids and golf players."

From Mount Vernon, Ill., a farmer wrote to say he hoped the Nation would establish "sun" time for the year around, and two listeners at St. Clair, Mo., raised cain with me for even suggesting it be made national for 3 months.

The proprietor of a hardware store in a coal mining town in Illinois is in favor of making it Nation-wide or not at all.

What do you think about it?

I'm convinced we'll never be able to get the East to go back to standard time in summer and when cities like St. Louis insist on throwing the Midwest out of joint by having local daylight time, why not make it Nationwide but for the months of June, July, and August only?

Congressman PRICE said he'd be glad to cooperate in any possible manner. If you'll send me enough mail on it, we'll send it on to Congress and see if we can get something done.

Write to me, won't you?

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Dr. Daniel A. Poling which appeared in the New York Post on February 17. Thank God, we still have enough brave Americans who are not afraid to stand up and be counted.

AMERICANS ALL

(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

The Americans All orchid of the week goes to Governor Warren, of Florida. A colorful personality he is is, rugged and dynamic, given perhaps to the spectacular (but then why shouldn't he be?) and always human. He surprised the rest of the country when he came out with a smashing attack on the Ku Klux Klan, surprised those who did not know him, but not many of his friends. Fair play is his second name and a good American name that is. What this Governor now attempts will do more for a brave cause than anything that I could write and much more than any nagging from the North. Always courage on the spot and wisdom too is more difficult than when we offer it as advice to our neighbor. Governor Warren has courage on the spot, and wisdom too.

Dr. Hugh A. Brimm, one of the leaders of the Southern Baptist Convention, also has courage on the spot. In an article sent to the editors of all publications of his church in 21 States he describes a recent incident near Chattanooga, Tenn., when the local Klan came hooded into a church and made a contribution to the pastor. He then said, "The incident will probably be repeated many times now that the Klan has sunk to such a low level in the thinking of decent and respectable people."

The Baptist clergyman describes these contributions as bribe money. Bringing them into the church should be openly resented and refused by Christian people, he declares.

Dr. Brimm is a realist, he knows that it will take courage for preachers, particularly in small Southern communities to follow his advice, so he breaks it down into these suggestions: (1) Keep cool, no one should be afraid of cowards who won't show their faces. (2) Remember that superficial piety is hypocrisy before God and man. These men cannot wash the blood stains of lynched victims from their skirts by merely walking into a church with blood money. (3) Refuse any gifts and invite the Klansmen to stay only if they remove their masks.

In these uncertain times the Governor and the preacher have set a brave example for all Americans.

Army Engineers Know Their Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of February 2, 1949:

THE ARMY ENGINEERS KNOW THEIR PLACE

Army engineers, now holding a series of hearings on the new 308 report, a master control plan for development of the Columbia basin, are 100 percent right in barring discussion of a Columbia Valley Authority.

It is the function of the Army engineers to deal with the physical and engineering phases of Columbia Basin development. It is their function at the direction of the Congress to evolve plans and specifications for flood control, navigation and power projects, indicating suitable locations, estimating costs and benefits.

It is not their function to determine the priority of these projects, or how rapidly they shall be built. That is the function of the Congress. Nor is it the function of the Army engineers to engage in an ideological controversy over CVA or any other administrative device for coordinated development and control of the region. And they are wise enough to know it and state it publicly.

The Army engineers have done a magnificent job of developing a major control plan for Columbia Basin. It is the most thoughtful and comprehensive job ever undertaken for regional development. Current hearings prove that it is rapidly winning friends throughout the Pacific Northwest, and is destined, we believe, to supersede all previous plans. It projects seven great dams on the Columbia and recommends other multiple purpose works on its principal tributaries, works designed to beat the critical power shortage, control rampaging rivers, and add to the industrial and agricultural wealth of the region.

The acclaim given this coordinated report by representatives of the Department of the Interior (whose Bureau of Reclamation brought out its own comprehensive plan for western development 2 years ago) and by private and public power agencies, chambers of commerce, labor-management groups, and State and municipal officials tells its own story. It indicates clearly enough the belief of many residents of the Pacific Northwest that coordinated regional development is practical, and preferable to a super-State authority such as that superimposed upon the Tennessee Valley.

But again, this is not the concern of the Army engineers. It is the concern of the people of the region and of the Congress. Theirs is the final decision.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio script written by Kerron Johnson, of St. Paul, Minn.:

I speak for democracy, and so I speak for all men everywhere. Not famous or lionized, but the creators of wealth, the masses that are the power and the essential glory of the world. The people are the wealth of a country, the unacknowledged masters of kingdoms, empires, and governments. They are those to whom all leaders are accountable, no matter the divine right of kings or the mailed fists of dictators.

If oppressed, they will rise. No army shall hold them, for they are unconquerable. Yet the people do not cry for war, for they do not glory in it. They rather cry for peace—to live and love as is their birthright. Some may have money, some power, and some great minds. But they, as well as an unknown laborer will fall even as flowers in a field—for the grim reaper does for all men the same.

It is only under democracy, however, that men can find their hopes fulfilled whether it be that he would speak and criticize without fear, or own a piece of land. Only in a democracy can men go to a church or stay away with their only censor that of their own beliefs. Only in a democracy do the lights of justice, freedom of religion, freedom of speech and freedom from fear, stand side by side. In her lamp, the Statue of Liberty holds all these and more. The greatest possession a man can have is his liberty. Here he may have liberty if he will but abide by the Golden Rule—"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

What is democracy, you ask? There is no cut and dried answer to that question. Democracy is many things. Democracy, if properly developed, could grow to mean all things to all men. Democracy allied with faith in God and man could be the great living symbol needed to encourage every man to freedom.

It means that you have a right to trial by jury, or that you can travel wherever you will over this land, and give no one any reason, nor ask any permit. It means that you are free to work or pray or play without being so ordered by the State or by any individual. You can take a ride in the country or see a ball game, You can be an engineer or a ditch digger.

Your fate is in your hands. With ability, talent, and opportunity, there is no limit to your rise in a democratic country. But let it not be supposed that all this is to be had merely for the asking. There is a price for everything, but the price of freedom is exceedingly low for such a great possession—it is responsibility.

Your responsibility is that of voting, of knowing about public affairs, in seeing that justice is done, as much as is in your power to do so. Your rights lie in taking jury

duty, in doing your best to abolish racial and religious prejudice. It is the duty and privilege of every man to serve his country by upholding her laws, her creed, and her ideals.

In a true democracy, it should be a well-taken privilege to pay taxes, knowing that they are not diverted into the pockets of a favored few, but are used for the benefit of all. It is one of the best points of democracy that every man can serve his country in some civil or political office. Thus will he obtain a greater understanding and insight into the affairs of his country and his fellowman. He will learn as he could by no other course the ways of democracy. These are some of the ways in which democracy can be served.

The benefits of democracy are many and varied. Its gifts will contribute to the building of a better world, in which freedom, justice, mercy, and tolerance will be the tenets of civilization. Now, again, in these trying days, the good way of life is being threatened as it has been so often in the past.

But, the common man, who is, after all, the last judge before God, has made up his mind. He knows that democracy in its finest form can be the only path to world union and the ending of wars.

Let us hope that with the grace of God, he will win through to make on earth a true brotherhood of man—democracy.

Need for Veterans' Hospital in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith House Resolution 24 adopted by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois:

House Resolution 24

Whereas the needs of sick, aged, infirm, and convalescing veterans in the various parts of the country continue to require the establishment of hospitals for their care by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas it is desirable so to locate these institutions as to best serve the interests and convenience of veterans residing in various portions of the United States; and

Whereas the State of Illinois, recognizing the conditions stated above and responsive to her obligations to those who served their country, has for some 60 years maintained a home for soldiers and sailors at Quincy, Ill.; and

Whereas there are now domiciled at this home approximately 1,200 veterans, many of them sick, aged, and infirm, with a long waiting list of applicants for admission to this home already in existence; and

Whereas there does not exist at this time anywhere in this region adequate Federal facilities for full hospitalization of sick, aged, infirm, or convalescing veterans, because other veterans' hospitals in Illinois are not located so as to serve west-central Illinois and adjoining areas in neighboring States; and

Whereas there is sufficient vacant land adjacent to the Illinois Soldiers and Sailors Home at Quincy now owned by the State of Illinois which is particularly suited for use for a veterans' hospital and convalescing home; and

Whereas the proper agencies of the State of Illinois are ready and willing to offer a full measure of cooperatiton to the Federal Government in locating a new institution at this site: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That the proper authorities of the United States Government be and are hereby urged to examine the need for veterans' hospital services in the territory surrounding Quincy, Ill., and to examine the desirability of utilizing the land located and now unused by the State of Illinois; and be it further

Resolved, That the Illinois Veterans' Commission and other appropriate agencies of the State of Illinois are hereby authorized and instructed to confer with the proper authorities of the Federal Government as to the desirability of carrying out the provisions and purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be prepared and forwarded by the secretary of state to the Honorable SCOTT W. LUCAS, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and to the 26 Representatives of the State of Illinois in the Eighty-first Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the house, February 15, 1949.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CHAS F. KERWIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Big Brother Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Big Brother Bulletin for February. I know of no more worthy project in this country than the big-brother movement. We should all support it.

The article follows:

FOUNDER OF BIG BROTHER MOVEMENT IN NEW YORK TELLS HOW WORK AIDED 22,000 BOYS IN 45 YEARS

(By Col. Ernest K. Coulter)

(When clerk of the newly established New York Children's Court in 1904, the author made a suggestion to the Men's Club of the Central Presbyterian Church that each man take a friendly interest in one boy brought before the court. From this suggestion grew the big-brother movement.)

The big-brother method is so sane and humane that it must appeal to all men of good will who want to do something for their less fortunate little neighbors.

It costs nothing in money to the men who engage in it and it pays bigger human dividends proportionately than any philanthropy I know of. What reformatory can show more than 90 percent salvage of its charges; And this without expense to the State.

"Great oaks from little acorns grow" and surely when the idea of the big brother "one-man-one-boy" therapy was planted 45 years ago its beginning was small. But like the oak its growth has been steady and strong.

HOW MOVEMENT WAS STARTED

The original group of big brothers in New York came from all walks of life—architects, lawyers, doctors, printers, bank clerks, etc. They were members of a club studying civic betterment. When speaking to them, I asked "Why not do something for civic betterment?"

Someone asked: "Is there something we can do?" The answer I gave was: "If each of you will be neighbor to one of the youngsters whose name I shall send you, show him there is someone who cares whether he makes good or not, you will be doing a fine job for civic betterment."

Forty-some men volunteered. They were told that a definition of a friend which a neglected boy gave years ago was "a fren's a feller who knows all about you and likes you jes the same."

These men went into wretched homes as friends. Three don'ts were laid down in the beginning: "Don't preach," "Don't patronize", "Don't pauperize." If a youngster was given money, the Big Brother was to see that he performed some service for it. In other words, the boy was to be helped to retain his self-respect. These don'ts have been adhered to strictly through the years.

The magic miracle-work of friendship has been applied with great profit to boys who came from rich homes as well as poor. Boys from wealthy homes too have been driven to crime by parental neglect.

INNER SATISFACTION IN WORK

Big Brother work is a quiet, personal work which has no place for self-seekers; there is that tremendous inner satisfaction of having had a deciding hand in the saving of a delinquent or predelinquent boy for good citizenship.

Some of the finest men in New York have been and are Big Brothers, and some of the best have formerly been little brothers.

The Big Brother Movement of Greater New York, in its 45 years alone has aided 22,000 delinquent and predelinquent boys. Of the boys referred to it by the courts, over 90 percent do not appear in courts again.

After more than 45 years in the field of legal protection of children from cruelty, neglect, and wretched living conditions, I claim the right to make a statement that while crime can never be completely eliminated, the Big Brothers of the United States and Canada have the best approach to checking the criminal army and reducing our alarming delinquency problem of any philanthropic endeavor.

Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some information which I have received from the Interstate Commerce Commission in connection with a bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas described as A Comparison of Freight Rates and Estimated Weights on Carrots, Carload:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, February 17, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will have reference to your memorandum of February 14, 1949, with which you transmitted a pamphlet prepared by the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas relating to a comparison of freight rates and estimated weights on carrots, carload. As requested, the pamphlet is returned herewith.

The pamphlet discusses our report and order in Docket No. 29645, Transcontinental Rates and Estimated Weights on Vegetables. I asked Examiner Mohundro of our staff, who conducted the hearing and issued the examiner's proposed report in that proceeding, to give me the benefit of his study of the pamphlet. Enclosed is a copy of his memorandum, together with a copy of the Commission's report in Docket No. 29645, a decision of the Federal court before whom certain parts of that report and order were contested, and a petition filed on February 11, 1949. The examiner's memorandum and attachments appear to contain a rather complete report on the matter, and I trust it affords you the information desired. Please advise if I can be of further assistance.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES D. MAHAFFIE,
Chairman.

FEBRUARY 17, 1949.

CHAIRMAN MAHAFFIE: I have examined the bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas (5th series, vol. 4, Oct. 1, 1948, No. 10), a comparison of freight rates and estimated weights on carrots, carload, by Jean D. Neal and W. B. Langford.

The bulletin reflects an excellent study of the subject from the approach made by the authors. It appears to me to be largely an analysis of the Texas phase of our docket No. 29645, Transcontinental rates and estimated weights on vegetables. That proceeding was instituted on the Commission's own motion for reasons stated in the press notice which was released with its order of July 6, 1948. I conducted the hearings, issued an examiner's proposed report, and assisted in the preparation of the Commission's decision in the matter. Many of the topics discussed in the bulletin are maturely considered in the Commission's report, copy attached. The Commission's order, except as to the lawfulness of the rates, was contested in the statutory court and sustained in civil action 546. A copy of the per curiam opinion of the court is attached.

The bulletin appears to be dated October 1, 1948. Certain statements made in the bulletin as matters of fact were changed by the postponement of the effective date of the Commission's order from December 1, 1948, to March 1, 1949. Certain phases of the order are under appeal by petition filed by the Western Growers Association on February 11, 1949. It was stated by the western shippers that it was expected that the Texas shippers would concur in this petition. This petition was served on the Texas interests, but their reply or advices in connection with the request contained in the petition has not been received.

The issues with respect to reasonableness and lawfulness of the rates applicable from Texas are pending before the Commission in docket No. 30074, *Texas Citrus and Vegetable Growers and Shippers* v. *The Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry. Co., et al.* The complaint in that docket was received here September 13, 1948, the day before the hearing in the court in the proceeding referred to above. Certain corrections were required and the complaint was not docketed until September 23, 1948. The complaint is broad and brings under attack practically all phases of the lawfulness of the Texas rates. In my judgment, it is not proper therefore for the Commission to express any opinion on the details in this bulletin as they relate to rates. I recognize several of the tables and comparisons as being similar to those offered in evidence in No. 29645 and which were stressed in brief and fully considered along with the rate evidence.

As stated above from the approach made in this study, I think the authors have done an excellent job. Counting the interveners there are now more than 100 parties to the proceeding in which the Texas rates are under attack. Certain of the defendants have asked that the proceeding be not heard until the Commission has concluded ex parte No. 168, the general increase rate proceeding. Copies of the request were sent to all parties of record and there is no opposition evidenced to it. Apparently all parties to the record and the Chief Examiner have acquiesced in the request. With the proceeding No. 30074 pending, I think of nothing more that can be said about the bulletin because it certainly should not be expected that we could prejudge the pending case with nothing but the pleadings and correspondence in the docket.

MOHUNDRO, *Examiner.*

The Outlook for Government Control of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by J. L. Nellis, attorney, Washington, D. C., to delegates of the Forty-fifth Annual Convention, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill., February 17, 1949:

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates to the convention, I am very pleased to be here with you this afternoon to discuss with you some of the high points involved in the outlook for Government controls and the relation of your industry to the work of the National Security Board.

Many of you here today will recall the hectic times during the war years under OPA. You will remember that I played a modest part in the formulation and enforcement of regulations for your industry from the inception of food price control. Therefore, I feel that in this room we have as much experience as can be mustered by any industry in a program designed to serve both our needs and the needs of the Government if another national emergency should arise.

Among the lessons from the past, we have learned that when an emergency arises there is a great tendency on the part of government to experiment until it reaches what it thinks is a fair and logical conclusion to the many problems. Speaking now of price control as an example of the type of emergency controls which we are likely to face should another emergency arise, you will recall the inadequacy of so-called voluntary agreements between producer and customer to limit prices. This was the first attempt on the part of the Government to exercise its influence toward a limitation of price. This idea failed for the same reason that present efforts by the steel industry to effectively allocate steel on a voluntary basis, are unsatisfactory.

The inadequacy of planning on both the Government side and the industry side was such that even the obvious problems had to be solved by a roundabout and wasteful method. It was the Pearl Harbor of the domestic scene. A good deal of this was due to the lack of understanding on the part of the Government of your business problems and your business structure. Conversely, the rest of it was probably due to the absence of understanding on the part of your industry as to what the Government's program was and what the Government was attempting to do. No specific persons or groups could or should be blamed for it. It was part of the general atmosphere of shock and alarm brought about by the manner in which we were thrown into the war.

We therefore come to the first major thesis, and that is this: If there is to be no repetition of the wastefulness of the past, the industry and the Government must come to an advance understanding on principles; and if a national emergency occurs at a given moment, the time thereafter should be spent in perfecting mechanics and techniques best suited to your industry and involving the least amount of friction, rather than on fundamentals.

You will recall that shortly after the decision was taken to limit the prices of agricultural products, and the necessary authority obtained from Congress, the Government attempted to regulate prices by a number of methods, almost all of them unsatisfactory. It was not until the administration of Chester Bowles, the present governor of Connecticut, that a system for industry advisory committees was set up—and frankly, it was the first time that the Government had found it impractical to proceed further without full industry advisory participation. With the aid of the committee working on fresh fruits and vegetables, the Government was finally able to arrive at what was considered a fairly feasible method of control—that is, a fixed dollar-and-cent price at the grower and shipper level, allowance for freight, handling, icing, and for proper commissions, the end result culminating in a so-called terminal market ceiling price.

The problems which you had in the control of your prices were multiplied by similar problems in connection with freight, priorities, wages, allocations, containers, and manpower controls. In each case you had a separate Government agency to deal with, a separate set of officials to convince, and a separate set of conclusions to arrive at. We now come to the second major point of our consideration of this problem for the future, and that is this: In any future emergency, the Government will undoubtedly establish a single over-all control agency, and understandings on principle can be worked out with one central authority involving all of these possible controls. In anticipation of this, the National Security Board was established by the President. Its duties are to evaluate the mobilization of our civilian economy in the event of emergency.

For the present, most authorities agree that business itself is in the process of settling down. In most fields of commerce and industry, supply is beginning to catch up with demand, and we have entered a business era in which the keynote is a rebirth of competition. In the fresh fruit and vegetable industry, I do not know of any commodities commanding prices that are unreasonably high in relation to prices charged for other commodities making up the cost of living, nor is there much indication of a demand in excess of vailable production. On the contrary, many segments of your industry have a real sales problem. For this reason, I think you will agree that your business, and most business, has no cause to fear an immediate imposition of controls. And as to what the Truman administration has in store for business, I can only agree with Secretary of Commerce Sawyer's remark, on January 25 that the only thing business need fear is continued prosperity for the next 4 years.

You are aware that President Truman, in his message to Congress on the state of the Union, requested, among other things, standby authority to control prices. In general, the President's reelection, in the face of overwhelming odds, means more—not less—Government in business. But specifically, this does not mean that the Eighty-first Congress is likely to go along with even this stand-by authority, nor would it go along with demands for immediate imposition of price ceilings any more than it would for the imposition of wage controls. We are in a period

where the policy of the Congress, it seems to me, will be the same as that which the Government is following in relation to our national security—namely, a policy of planning a policy of preparedness, and a policy of watchful waiting. As the tensions of inflation and the tensions leading to war decrease, there will be much less inclination on the part of both Congress and the President to enact and make use of stand-by controls of this sort.

During the course of our discussion following, I hope you will make some suggestions, other than those which are about to follow, in relation to the question of what your industry can do in planning for its role in the event of a future emergency.

Let us be sure of one thing: We are in an emergency now. Government spending exceeds that of any peacetime year. Our relationships with Russia are so delicate that no one can tell when this economic and financial emergency might become a shooting emergency. If it goes to that stage, the controls imposed upon you during the last war will seem absolutely mild in comparison to those which are likely to be imposed. My major purpose, therefore, is to get your association to thinking about the domestic situation in which our country will find itself in the event of trouble. It seems to me that there is a substantial need for comprehensive planning now to assist and acquaint Government planners with the way you do business, the normal and natural charges which are made, and to develop a scheme for price, priority, wage, container, and manpower controls which could be put into instant operation should a national emergency be declared. Some of the vital questions to be considered by your committee of planners are these:

1. What are the historical and natural functions of the recognized factors in your business? Can you develop a flow chart to demonstrate the differences in marketing employed by the producers and shippers of all types of fruits and vegetables?

2. Should prices, wages, and freight rates be frozen at a fixed rate during a fixed period; and if so, how do you solve inequities?

3. Should the actual mechanics of control be essentially the same as those in effect during the last war?

4. What do you do about the relationship of quality to prices established, trade names, brands, and other differentials?

5. How do you avoid the friction which occurred the last time in providing for the operation of all legitimate factors in the business?

6. Should a system of zone pricing, zone freights, etc., be established for all commodities?

7. How can a system be established which will give a proper place in the scheme of things to your industry's demands for labor, materials, replacement parts, gasoline, etc.?

8. What type of a control agency would you recommend to the Government? Should it be a combined OPA and WPB establishment, or possibly a new type of civilian economy control agency?

These, it seems to me, are the type of questions with which you must concern yourselves as an industry in order to avoid the chaotic losses, both to yourselves as well as to the consumer and the Government, which occurred through time wasted and efforts spent in wrangling over fundamentals. The business policy your industry could follow concerning this important question is that to which I referred previously: intelligent planning for an emergency which we, as a Nation, are devoting all our efforts to prevent.

While we hope for an end to our present emergency of inflation, and for an end to the international tensions which might lead to an emergency of another type, we must now work toward solutions of the known problems, all of which we have met in our past experience, and all of which we will face again if the dreaded day comes.

Translating this principle into action for your association, I strongly recommend to you the creation of a special emergency planning committee within the framework of your organization, empowered to study the questions propounded and to report regularly to the membership on its progress. In addition, this committee should work closely with the National Security Board and all other Government agencies similarly engaged in civilian planning. Your association's executive vice president, Mr. Kitchen, has been in close touch with the National Security Board concerning various phases of this planning program; but I believe that this is the function of a committee of your organization, the burden on your executive vice president being too heavy as it is. I believe that this committee and this association will perform an invaluable service to all, even if, as is hoped, the plans resulting from this study are never put into practical use, but remain permanently in industry and Government archives as a contribution to the advancement of trade and commerce.

There is sometimes a tendency on the part of those of us close to the Washington scene to overemphasize the planning activities of the Government. On the other hand, the immense decisions already taken and those to be put into effect under existing emergency legislation are of such far-reaching nature that no individual and no industry can afford to be unfamiliar with them.

No industry can afford to have Congress unaware of its problems. Congress certainly can be either the fountainhead of prosperity or that of trouble. If it is not properly posted on the many problems your industry encounters, it will act on whatever information it has at hand. Your organization should be prepared to furnish your executives with a powerful vehicle, through professional knowledge, experience, and contacts, to enable them to act intelligently and quickly. Certainly, with no disrespect to labor or to the National Association of Manufacturers, this industry is just as important to the progress of this Nation and its people as are these two other fine major organizations. If you will help your executives to establish machinery with which they function on a major scale in a manner similar to that of labor or N. A. M., you will find that a job will be delivered which will be on a par with the success of the organizations just mentioned. You should have a committee of this organization which could have personal and immediate knowledge of all present or prospective legislation and all present and prospective departmental regulations.

Our Members of Congress are at all times eager and willing to listen to truthful data concerning any organization or industry which affects the progress of this Nation, and if we fail to keep our chosen instruments, these Members of Congress, properly acquainted with the problems of our industry, we are not then living up to our responsibilities of citizenship.

Washington at the present time and for long in the future is and will be the hub of the universe. We are financing, schooling, and feeding the world. Because of that, it is the fountainhead of banking and industrial activities. Legislation and instructions for the operations of industries and trades will emanate from that point. Therefore, it would be amiss for you at this time not to give serious consideration to the importance of proper and adequate contacts with all of those who are entrusted in Washington with our leadership.

In conclusion, I am reminded of a story which I think is thoroughly applicable to you at this time. There were two traveling salesmen who had been out on the road for 6 months, such a long time, in fact, that they became immensely homesick. Driving along the road, they saw a sign, home cooking, home atmosphere. Mike said to John, "John, hell, I'm homesick. Let's stop in here and have lunch and maybe get a little home atmosphere. Maybe it will carry us through until we do get home." So the boys went in. The lady came over and said, "What will you have, gentlemen?" One of them said, "Lady, we've been away from home about 6 months and we're so thoroughly homesick that your sign interests us. We would like to participate in this home atmosphere." The lady said, "Fine, gentlemen. Just what can I do for you, and just what will you have?" So they gave their order. "Will you please bring us in some soft toast, some 4-minute eggs, and coffee." The lady then turned away from the table, and one of them called her back and said, "Lady, I want you to bring in that toast burned black, the eggs so damned hard that we won't be able to eat them, and the coffee so weak that we can see through it—and then sit over in that chair, damn it, and nag." Now, gentlemen, if you do not properly prepare your program, you should be nagged, and you will have it coming to you.

Imprisonment of Protestant Ministers in Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, D. D., Archbishop of Cincinnati, and chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, expressing his indignation at and condemnation of the arrest and imprisonment of the 15 Protestant ministers in Bulgaria:

STATEMENT OF ARCHBISHOP M'NICHOLAS—IMPRISONMENT DENOUNCED

"The whole Christian and religious world outside the sphere of Moscow-controlled governments" said Archbishop McNicholas, "will extend its sympathy to the 15 Protestant church leaders who are imprisoned in Bulgaria.

"These religious leaders will be tried according to the Moscow pattern. Such trials are iniquitous, shameful, and inhuman. Trumped-up charges are made; alleged self-confessions of guilt are broadcast to the world by the reporters of courts that have no freedom of action. The sympathy of all normal men goes out to all Christians and religious persons behind the iron curtain who are persecuted, degraded, and even liquidated unless they become slaves and tools of the perverted clique controlling the Communist Government of Bulgaria.

"Likewise, the leaders of the Orthodox Church, as well as Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish leaders who do not submit to the enslavement of Moscow must expect infamous defamation, persecution, exile, slavery, hard labor, starvation, and death.

"No credence whatever can be given to the alleged confessions of the imprisoned Protestant leaders in Bulgaria. The Communist courts know how to torture and to administer drugs that break down the physical and mental powers of their victims."

The Need for Expanded Veteran Hospital Facilities in the State of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Veterans' Administration has cancelled the construction of new veteran hospitals for Michigan which had been previously approved and were scheduled for construction. What we need most desperately are hospital facilities for tuberculosis and psychoneurosis cases. A few days ago the Governor of Michigan, G. Mennen Williams, together with many representatives from the State of Michigan, met with the Michigan congressional delegation to discuss this problem and to protest the arbitrary action that has been taken by the VA authorities. At the joint meeting that we held here in Washington, which was attended by Democrats and Republicans alike, we agreed as a body to oppose this unfair and discriminatory action that was taken against the veterans of the great State of Michigan. We had requested that a memorandum be prepared and the whole subject of veterans' hospitalization for Michigan be investigated. As a result of this investigation, I have received a report from the Comptroller of the State of Michigan stating that as of September 1948, the number of veterans of World War II resident in Michigan was 648,000. In addition, there were 237,000 veterans of World War I and all other wars, making a grand total of 885,000 veterans. There may have been some change in this number since last September, but it should not be significant.

The Veterans' Administration has the following facilities in Michigan for treatment and care of veterans:

	Beds
1. General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Dearborn	1,100
2. Marine Hospital, Detroit	175
3. Percy Jones Hospital, Battle Creek	200
4. Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Battle Creek	2,148

Making a grand total of facilities now in operation of 3,623 beds. In addition, the following facilities are under construction:

	Beds
General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Iron Mountain (open Sept. 1, 1949?)	250
General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Saginaw (open Jan. 1, 1950?)	250
General Medical and Surgical Hospital, Ann Arbor (open Jan. 1, 1950?)	500

After these hospitals are completed, the total number of beds available under the Veterans' Administration hospital program, will be 4,623.

That number will represent 1 bed for every 197 veterans domiciled in Michigan. Every adjacent State has a much larger number of veteran hospital beds available, in relation to population. After all projects now under construction are completed, the Veterans' Administration in Washington reports Wisconsin will have 1 bed for every 134 veterans; Illinois 1 bed for every 135 veterans; New York 1 bed for every 141 veterans; Minnesota 1 bed for every 138 veterans; Indiana 1 bed for every 158 veterans, and Ohio 1 bed for every 175 veterans. Throughout the Nation, there will be 1 bed for every 146 veterans.

It appears to us that there has been, and continues to be, very severe discrimination against the veteran population of the State of Michigan in comparison with other areas of the United States.

Under the former program of the Veterans' Administration, two additional veterans' hospitals were projected; one was a 500-bed tuberculosis sanatorium to be located in Detroit, and the other was a 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital at Grand Rapids. These projects were cancelled last December, under Presidential directive, which at the same time stopped the plans on 15,300 other hospital beds elsewhere in the United States. The Presidential directive merely cut back 16,000 beds on the whole program; it left the decision concerning which projects should be cancelled to the Veterans' Administration. We are informed that the basis of selection of projects to be cancelled was primarily the question as to whether actual construction had begun. Since neither of these Michigan projects was actually under way, they were among the facilities cancelled. However, even if these hospitals are actually built, there will be only 1 veteran hospital bed for every 168 veterans. This will still leave Michigan far short of the national average.

There is full recognition that service-connected cases of all sorts should be hospitalized in Veterans' Administration hospitals. At present, there are 150 service-connected patients hospitalized in State, county, and other tuberculosis sanatoria in Michigan. There are 200 other cases on which claims for service connection are pending. In addition, there are 250 veterans whose claims have been denied and who are in tuberculosis sanatoria in this State. Some of these are being appealed. In addition, veterans with Michigan residence are being treated in many veterans' hospitals outside the State. The number of Michigan veterans receiving treatment for tuberculosis at Sun Mountain, N. Y., and at Wood Memorial Hospital in Wisconsin is 110; while at other veterans' hospitals in the United States there are 340 others receiving treatment for tuberculosis. Altogether, there are 1,050 or more tuberculous Michigan veterans hospitalized, but without any Veterans' Administration facilities for their care in this State.

The justice of Michigan's claim to hospital facilities for tubercular veterans is recognized everywhere. It is reported that when the 500-bed sanatorium at Detroit was canceled, there was an allocation of $1,000,000 of Federal moneys to provide for the conversion of 200 beds at the Dearborn General Medical and Surgical Hospital to use for tubercular patients. However, there is no evidence presently available that this plan is being carried forward. If there is $1,000,000 available for construction of facilities for the tuberculosis veteran population of the State, it would not take many additional millions to provide for the original plan of construction.

As to the general need for hospitals in the various areas of Michigan, the 1946 Michigan hospital survey, entitled "Hospital Resources and Needs," shows that the additional number of hospital beds required in the Detroit area was 2,231, and the number of additional beds needed in the Grand Rapids area was 1,107. Except for the Saginaw-Bay City area, where part of the need is being met under Veterans' Administration construction now under way, these are the largest numbers of additional beds necessary to meet a decent standard in any of the areas of the State of Michigan.

Perhaps the discrimination being practiced against the State of Michigan under the present Veterans' Administration program is due to the fact that this State is making unusual efforts itself to provide State care for veterans. At Grand Rapids we have a veterans' facility with a rated capacity of 1,050 beds of which over 950 are filled, although the most recent wing was completed less than 12 months ago. Less than half the cost of this facility is reimbursed from the Federal Treasury, so that this State is carrying a rather heavy burden in connection with veterans' hospitalization entirely on its own. That does not appear to be any reason for justification, however, for the failure of the Federal Government to assume its full responsibility.

The general hospital-bed space needed by the major regions in Michigan, as shown by the 1946 Michigan hospital survey, was as follows:

Region and community	1940 population	Occupied beds needed
Detroit	2,346,583	7,435
Saginaw-Bay City	401,271	1,540
Grand Rapids	381,522	1,455
Ann Arbor	132,856	1,053
Flint	316,063	1,034
Kalamazoo	186,787	752
Lansing	186,624	669
Muskegon	163,543	616
Battle Creek	136,886	592
Jackson	153,855	588
Traverse City	118,701	530

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Walden Citizen-Herald:

HE NEVER WOULD HAVE BEEN

Former Governor of Kansas, Henry J. Allen, recently had the following comment to make about Abraham Lincoln, according to the New Mexico Free-Mason.

"Had Abraham Lincoln been living today: The Rotary Club would supply him with a set of books. The Lions Club with a good

reading lamp. The Cosmopolitan Club with writing equipment. The Kiwanis Club with a wooden floor for the cabin. He would have the protection of the child-labor law and Government old-age insurance. A kindly philanthropist would send him to college with a scholarship. Incidentally, a case worker would see that his father received a monthly check from the county, the OPA would reduce his rent by 50 percent. He would receive a subsidy for rail splitting; another one for raising some crop he was going to raise anyway, and still another subsidy for not raising a crop he had no intention of raising.

"Result: There would have been no Abe Lincoln."

Dodging Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier of February 19, 1949:

DODGING TAXES

There is one type of political shell-game that seems to work at least once on each generation of voters.

This gold-brick scheme is for political leaders to tell large groups of people they are going to give them batches of government checks or other benefits—and make someone else foot the bills.

We're up against it in this country. The basis of President Truman's program is his pledge to give out a flood of new Government checks, which will boost our national budget by 50 to 100 percent—but at the same time to reduce or eliminate the taxes of Americans who earn less than $6,000 a year.

It may be that this touches on a fatal weakness in what we call the democratic form of government. The historian Macauley warned long ago that wherever the people themselves rule a country, the time will come when the majority will cut themselves so many benefits out of their government it will go broke. Maybe that's what's happening to us.

One would think that in a country like this, which has given its people freedom, the highest standards of living in history, and opportunity for unlimited personal advancement, the humblest citizen would be proud to help pay the tax bills which make this possible.

Not so! Already millions of persons have been eliminated, through their own pressure, from at least the income-tax end of taxation. The New Dealers have preached for years that taxes on the low-wage groups were unjust. President Truman unsuccessfully vetoed the present tax law on the grounds that it eliminated only some 6,000,000 persons from the income taxes—that wasn't anywhere near enough to suit him.

Ambitious politicians have used many tricks to convince voters that they could get money to run the government, and make it still more "liberal," without making the recipients of its spending pay the cost.

Hitler was going to take it out of the savings of the German Jews; the Russian Communists were going to take it out of the hides of the "landed aristocracy"; the British Socialists have been promising to wring the income out of private industry—what part they couldn't collect from the American taxpayers. Hirohito was going to make the Chinese pay the bills for the Japanese Government, and Mussolini was going to make Ethiopia finance the Fascist regime in Italy.

Looking back at these events, we can see clearly how these unscrupulous leaders played their own people for suckers. The pretense that someone besides the citizens was going to pay the government's bills was only a pretense. In each case, the people wound up paying these bills themselves—in blood as well as in wealth.

On the face of it, the English are the only ones who have found a "cinch." Over there, if that was your home, you could make the Government help furnish diapers for your baby, get it to buy a wig if your hair fell out, have it furnish you a dental plate if you got tired of your own teeth, or arrange for it to supply the coffin for your funeral.

Moreover, if you lived in Britain, you would know that every time your Socialist government had obtained a new "loan" from the United States, they reduced the taxes you had to pay—perhaps took you clear off the tax rolls.

But does anyone seriously question that the English people are paying for this experiment in tax-dodging far more than they are saving—paying for it many times over in scarcities of food, clothing, shelter, fuel, electric power; paying for it in a substandard living; paying for it in loss of personal liberty, of opportunity, of self-respect?

Sixteen years ago the New Dealers pulled a trick out of the hat as a means of convincing the American people that they were clever enough to spend billions of public moneys without making the present generation pay for them. They invented "deficit-financing." What that means is spending all they could find an excuse for spending—and passing the bills along to future generations.

Only a little thought is needed to convince anyone that the American people already have lost far more, in reduced value of savings, investments, securities and currency, than it would have cost to keep all the New Deal spending on a cash basis—and we still haven't paid off the national debt.

The debt chickens of 16 years ago are now coming home to roost. The bonds are coming due, in steadily larger amounts. Hereafter, if Uncle Sam can sell new bonds fast enough even to keep up with the repayments on his old ones, he will be doing well. The Federal Government has passed the stage where it can raise spending-money by selling bonds.

But President Truman, determined not to retrench the spending, is on deck with a new device to make what he assumes to be a majority of the American people think he can increase the flood of government checks—and still make someone else pay the bills.

He's going to saddle onto the 5 percent or so of the American people who earn $6,000 or more a year the bulk of the costs of running the National Government at a sixty- to eighty-billion-dollar a year level.

Can he get away with such a program? Not in the sense of making it work. But he can try—and he could wreck the country in the effort, too.

There are a couple of jokers about the Truman scheme. For one thing, there isn't enough income in the $6,000-a-year-and-up end of the American population to pay for government on the scale which Mr. Truman has in mind. Approximately 80 percent of the Nation's income goes to the 95 percent of the people who earn less than that amount. If you took every cent from those who get over $6,000 there would still be far too little to finance the Truman program.

Here's another joker: The small, high-paid group contains the brains and initiative which makes industrial enterprises successful. Tax them out of business, and you will lose not only their share of the tax resources, but slow down the machinery so that no one will be earning enough to pay taxes.

And here's still another joker: The bulk of the big-money incomes in this country come from industrial operations—from the making and selling of commodities. In this field, heavy taxes on the industry itself, or on its owners, in the long run get passed along to the consumer, in higher prices. If the low-income majority insist on trying to shove their proper burden of taxes over to the management and owners of industry, all that will happen is that these low-income groups, who are the consuming public, will wind up paying these higher taxes themselves, whenever they go shopping.

At any event, you can't get blood out of a turnip—and you can't collect taxes equaling a fourth of national income if you start out exempting those who receive 80 percent of that income.

Power Shortage in Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., of February 7, 1949:

NORTHWEST POWER SHORTAGE MOST CRITICAL IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Tom Humphrey)

No half-way measures for us! It's feast or famine.

Eleven years ago, when I wrote More Power to You for the Journal—when Bonneville and Grand Coulee were just coming into the picture—we had so much power on the line and in sight that it scared the pants off all of us—all but wise old J. D. Ross, first Bonneville Power Administrator.

Power was literally running out our ears in those days—at least we thought it was. It had us worried to the point where we were seeing white elephants and beating the bushes for customers, public and private, anywhere we could find them.

Today, with almost three times as much installed capacity as we had then, we're starving for power. Literally starving.

ELEVEN SYSTEMS BOGGING DOWN

Every plant we have in the Northwest power pool (11 great systems, 300 plants with a total capacity of 4,000,000 kilowatts) is producing every kilowatt it possibly can. Every generator, every transmission line, every transformer is overloaded—straining to meet unprecedented demands.

At times, in cold weather, we have had actual peak demand deficiencies of 300,000 kilowatts (roughly 8 percent), and we have a continuing peak shortage of 150,000 kilowatts which can only be met by voluntary curtailment.

Sometimes in the later afternoon or early morning hours the load on the power pool is so heavy that frequency drops from a standard 60 cycles to 59½—and 59.6 is considered the danger mark. Generators slow down, so do our electric clocks and the motors that drive our machines.

The whole interconnected system is in danger of breaking apart, getting out of step, and staying that way for hours, meanwhile blacking out a region 700 miles wide and 1,000 miles long.

LIFEBLOOD OF ECONOMY

Since power is the lifeblood of our economy and generators the heart of it, our power system reacts like a man suffering from pernicious and secondary anemia and their byproduct, enlargement of an overworked heart. He hasn't blood of sufficient quality and quantity (power, that is) to satisfy the insatiable demands of his muscles, brain, vital organs, and nervous system (consumers to you).

He's actually starving for oxygen and food. The old heart (corresponding to the power generators) can't pump fast enough to force the depleted corpuscles through his arteries (the transmission and distribution system) to do the job thrust upon them.

His heart develops leaky valves. He tires. He pants. He slows down. If he doesn't find relief or get a transfusion, he dies.

Before you conclude that this is just idle talk, let's look at the record:

In recent weeks I've consulted the governors of the four Pacific Northwest States, the presidents of all the principal power companies, the Bonneville Power Administrator, district and division Army engineers, Department of Interior and Bureau of Reclamation officials, the men who run the Northwest power pool, the superintendents of the principal municipal systems of the region, and our Congressmen.

I've asked them about the power shortage, present and future, what they are doing about it, how we got into it, and what we can do to alleviate it. And they've all told me the same story:

The power shortage is critical.

It is more critical here than anywhere in the United States.

It will remain critical for the next 5 years, or until McNary Dam is brought into production, probably in mid 1954. Longer if we don't build to needs.

If we get a low-water year meanwhile, it will be disastrous.

WHAT TO DO

The only thing we can do about it right now is take full advantage of the great northwest power pool—it's the equivalent of another Bonneville Dam—and continue our voluntary curtailment program—that and pray for better weather and normal water conditions.

To be safe, we should now have a usable reserve capacity of some 450,000 kilowatts, that is, it's good practice to have your biggest—Grand Coulee—generator plus 10 percent of your installed capacity in reserve. Instead, we're using every hydro and steam generator in the region, depleting our storage reservoirs, importing what power we can from British Columbia and eastern members of the power pool, and we're still short—dangerously short.

Army engineers, BPA and bureau officials agree that we must install another six to eight million kilowatts of power in the next 10 or 12 years if we hope to catch up with current needs and meet future demands.

And just to put that in proper perspective, it means the equivalent of 12 to 16 Bonneville dams. Our peak demand is conservatively estimated at ten to twelve million kilowatts by 1960—three to five million of it for heavy industry.

Our power needs doubled during the war, after 40 percent of the Nation's aluminum industry and the Hanford atomic energy plant were located here. They're in the process of doubling again, after a very temporary postwar slump. And they're likely to triple in the next 12 years.

It's fantastic, but unless experience is meaningless and all signs fail, it's true.

IRONIC SITUATION

It's ironic, when you think of it, that we should have a critical power shortage here in the Pacific Northwest. In the Columbia River and its principal tributaries, we have the greatest hydroelectric power potential in America.

Because of the basin system's great volume of water and its comparatively rapid fall to the sea, it is capable of producing from thirty to fifty million kilowatts of power—almost as much as the entire installed capacity of all existing power plants in the United States.

We have 40 percent of the hydroelectric power potential of the United States right here in Columbia Basin, yet we have malnutrition amid plenty. We've actually developed less than 10 percent of our power resources even though we have twice as much installed capacity per person than the national average.

And how did we get into this power jam?

First, no one, not even the wildest enthusiast, could anticipate that the Pacific Northwest would continue to grow as rapidly after the war as it did during the war. Yet we're gaining in population at three times the national rate.

Oregon has shown the greatest growth of all States, percentage-wise, and Washington is pressing California for second honors. Almost one and one-half million new people have poured into these two States in the last 8 years. And industry has followed them.

Furthermore, no one anticipated that the aluminum industry would continue to boom after the war. But it did. It takes from 42 to 48 percent of all BPA power and wants more.

There is the further fact that domestic consumers of the Pacific Northwest who enjoy the cheapest power rates of the Nation—cheaper even than TVA—use 2½ times more power each month than the national average. They have more electric ranges and more electrical gadgets than any other regional group.

And up to recently they were using more power for space heating than any other group—until the power stringency forced both public and private power distributors to put on the brakes.

Finally, we in the Pacific Northwest, seeking to balance our unbalanced agricultural, timber, and tourist economy with more year-round industry (light metals, plutonium, electro-chemical and electro-metallurgical industries) are attempting to do an industrialization job in 25 years that took 200 years in the East.

And power is the key—great blocks of cheap power.

Thus we use more power proportionately and need more power than any other region, bar none. We must have it if we expect to achieve our destiny.

But right now we have no more power to sell. We're saying "No" oftener than the Russians. We can't supply the power needs of existing industry, let alone new industry. You simply can't invite new industry into the Pacific Northwest to share a power shortage.

Bonneville Power Administration alone has turned down applications from electrochemical and electro-metallurgical industries seeking 225,000 kilowatts of power for plants costing $25,000,000. And these industries would have meant 25,000 additional jobs.

SAME ELSEWHERE

And every power system in the region, except those on the eastern rim of the power pool, reports similar experiences. They're even spending good money on newspaper ads and on radio time to ask their customers please to use less power. The response to these pleas has been so good, on the part of all classes of consumers from big industries to householders, that a power system collapse so far has been averted. We're lucky.

The emergency has also had the effect of uniting the entire region in a drive to develop every possible kilowatt of power in the shortest possible time.

The feud between public and private power agencies has been set aside. Presidents of private companies have teamed with Bonneville and municipal power officials not only in trading power from system to system as the need arises, but in seeking appropriations to keep approved Federal projects going and to obtain authorization of other projects.

A series of Pacific Northwest utilities conferences has been held at Tacoma, to work out uniform curtailment programs. The Columbia Basin Interagency Committee has done much to iron out conflicting views and unite all interests.

Bonneville Power Administration has obtained approval by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of schedule R, which not only conforms to the longer range plans prepared by each for the comprehensive development of the Columbia and its tributaries, but also is the fastest construction program that can be evolved under normal construction procedures.

Though some conflicts still obtain, some encouraging compromises have been worked out between fish and wildlife interests and proponents of more dams, to the end that we may have both fish and power.

Necessity is a great persuader.

Luxury Taxes on Purses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Doris Lockerman, able and energetic associate editor of the Atlanta Constitution, who has made a distinguished place for herself in journalistic circles, had an article in the Atlanta Constitution, Thursday, February 17, 1949.

The title of this article is "That's No Luxury—That's My Purse." It opens with these lines:

I am going to see my Congressman.

We are going to discuss luxury taxes and the first thing I am going to ask him is to tell me whether he considers his pants pockets a luxury or a necessity.

Then she proceeds, from a woman's viewpoint, to show that women's handbags are not luxuries, and that such things as baby oil, wedding rings, face powder, toilet preparations, and so forth, are as much entitled to be free from Federal taxes as razor blades, and other masculine necessities and luxuries.

I am writing her that it is not necessary for her to see her Congressman to enlist his interest in the removal of the taxes she referred to. I concur in her statement that they should be removed, along with some she did not mention, such as taxes on school basketball games, parent-teacher plays, charitable entertainments, and a number of other items which Uncle Sam now seizes upon as a source of revenue to finance his $42,000,000,000 budget.

I have been advocating repeal of these taxes for some time. I know that if taxes are to be removed, spending must be reduced. I favor that action also, and I hope that there are enough Members of

the Eighty-first Congress who favor it that we vote it into effect.

Mrs. Lockerman's article deserves to be read by every Member of Congress, and I insert it herewith:

THAT'S NO LUXURY—THAT'S MY PURSE

(By Doris Lockerman)

I am going to see my Congressman.

We are going to discuss luxury taxes and the first thing I am going to ask him is to tell me whether he considers his pants pockets a luxury or a necessity.

I will hate to embarrass him, but I will then ask him if he thinks baby oil is more luxurious than a shaving cream, and after he answers that one, we are going into such intimate problems as shiny noses, chapped hands and personal daintiness. And I do mean deodorants.

All this will lead us to the subject of taxes that have been unfair to women and children since their inception during the war.

We have been asked, for many weeks, really, to do some verbal protesting on the subject of unfair taxes against certain feminine items, but it never came to a crisis until yesterday when I fell in love with a handbag.

It was a big, beautiful thing, with enough space to pack an overnight wardrobe, and it was made of leather the color of a Palomino pony, with the supple resilience of a pair of kid gloves.

Besides that, I needed it.

On normal days I carry 10 pounds of notes, lipsticks, keys, pencils, receipts, and ticket stubs around in my bulging little purse and now I am confronted with the kind of traveling that will double the requirement.

I compromised with my soul for its price, clicking it off in the kind of amortization figures one uses for the purchase of a house, and I thought I had it all figured out when I glanced down and saw, to my horror, the sales clerk adding 20 percent of its cost for luxury tax! The total cost will probably engulf me and someone more hardy will inherit the Palomino pocketbook.

Until that moment comes, I will continue to be aroused over a situation that permits a tax on baby oil and leaves a $1.50 cake of perfumed soap tax free, that exempts shaving cream and razor blades but taxes face powder, that does not count a billiard table a luxury but socks talcum to the hilt.

By what logic is cold cream taxed as a luxury while cabin cruisers are tax free? Why are race horses not taxed when electric irons are, and why are roulette wheels exempted while $20 wedding rings are called luxuries?

No carefree bachelor pays a tax on cut flowers or candy, but when he marries he will provide a tax for his wife's lipstick and his baby's unguents. He may buy a $1,000 toy train to play with himself, but when he buys an electric fan or a heater to keep the little nest comfortable, there is an extra fee.

His wife can get a sewing machine and a vacuum cleaner, but a hot water heater is taxed, and so is the electric grill on which to warm the baby's midnight bottle. Who, once a parent, ever thought a bottle warmer was a luxury?

Now, according to current rulings, one may pay any amount for a cloth coat with collars and cuffs of furs, with no tax whatever, but the shivering little budgeteer in a cold climate will have to put out her 20 cents on every dollar she pays for the mouton that keeps her warm in zero weather.

No fur coats may be bought without tax * * * unless, of course, you are eccentric and wear the fur on the inside. Then it is tax free.

By the time I have finished with this tirade, I know our Senator or Congresman will have counted his pockets and discovered he has at least 12 of them, built in, and stuffed with indispensable objects.

When he sees me carrying my miserable belongings in a brown paper sack, maybe he will relent and speak his mind * * * and mine.

And maybe it won't be too late to get my big blond purse on Peachtree Street.

Electoral College—Proposed Change in the Election of a President Should Have Adequate Safeguards Against Minority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Gossett-Lodge resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to change our present method of electing a President has one provision that should be very carefully considered before approval. It is the provision that permits the candidate for President on the ticket receiving the highest number of electoral votes to be elected, without requiring a majority of the electoral votes, as at present.

It is noticeable that strong organizations representing the very reactionary and conservative groups in the Fascist-minded class are not opposing this resolution. Is it because they think it is possible for the electoral votes to be spread so thin among many parties that they will have a chance to elect a President?

The extreme leftist groups in the Communist-minded class are not opposing this resolution. Is it for the same reason?

TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Our two-party system has worked well during the past 160 years. Minority parties have not been encouraged under our system but under this new proposal they would have plenty of encouragement. It would be possible for 10 or 15 different political parties to divide the electoral votes in a way that 10 percent of the voters could elect a President.

DIFFERENT PARTIES, PAST AND PRESENT

The Legislative Reference Service has prepared for me a list of the political parties, past and present. It is very interesting and discloses 105 such parties, as follows:

A LIST OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE UNITED STATES, PAST AND PRESENT

(a) Parties that have elected one or more Members of Congress; or have nominated a Presidential candidate:

NAME AND YEARS OF CHIEF ACTIVITY

Administration, 1789–1791.
Opposition, 1789–1791.
Federalist, 1791–1825.
Republicans, 1791–1825.
Democratic-Republican, 1792–1812.
Anti-Federalists, 1796.
Independent-Federalists, 1796.
Fusion, 1812.
No Party, 1824.
Administration, 1825–1827.
Jacksonian, 1825–1831.
Democratic, 1828.
National-Republican, 1828–1832.
Anti-Masonic, 1831–1835.
National Republican, 1831–1835.
Independent-Democrat, 1832.
States' Rights, 1833.
Nullifiers, 1833–1837.
Whig, 1836–1856.
Conservatives, 1837.
Sub-Treasury Whigs, 1837–1839.
Abolition, 1840–1848.
Tylerites, 1841–1845.
Native Americans, 1845.
Free Soil, 1848–1855.
Liberty League, 1848.
Industrial Congress, 1848.
Free Soil-Democratic, 1852.
Republican, 1855.
American (Know Nothing), 1855–1861.
Anti-Lecompton Democrats, 1857–1861.
Constitutional Union, 1860.
Unionists, 1861–1867.
Republican (Radical), 1864.
Liberal, 1871–1877.
Anti-Monopoly, 1884.
American-Prohibition, 1884.
Woman's Right (Equal Rights), 1884–1888.
United Labor, 1888.
Union Labor, 1888.
Prohibition, 1872.
Liberal Republican, 1872.
Labor Reform, 1872.
Independent National (Greenback), 1876–1884.
American-National, 1876.
Progressive, 1876.
Readjuster, 1879–1885.
Nationalist, 1879–1887.
Labor, 1887–1889.
Farmers' Alliance, 1890.
Peoples, 1891–1908.
Populist, 1892–1904.
Middle-of-the-Road (Populists), 1900.
Socialist-Labor, 1892.
National Democratic, 1896.
Nationalist, 1896.
Silver, 1896–1929.
Fusionist (Democratic and Peoples), 1897–1899.
Democratic and Populist, 1900.
Silver-Republican, 1900.
Socialist-Democratic, 1900–1904.
Socialist, 1904.
Progressive, 1913.
Progressive-Republican, 1912–1915.
Farmer-Labor, 1920–1945.
Communist, Farmer-Labor, 1928.
Workers, 1928–1932.
Communist, 1936–1940.
Union, 1936.
American-Labor, 1939.
American Vegetarian, 1948.
Christian-National, 1948.
States' Rights, 1948.

(b) Splinter parties or factions (in alphabetical order):

American, Anti-Nebraska Men, Barnburners, Bucktails, Bull Moose, Copperhead, Conservative Democrats, Conscience Whigs, Constitutional Union, Coodies, Cotton Whigs, Democrat and Liberal Republicans, Democratic and Populist, Democratic-Republican, Equal-Rights (see Locofocos), Hunkers, Fire Eaters, Forty-eighters, Locofocos, Loyal Legion, Native American, National Unionist, Peace Democrats (see Copperheads), Radicals (Republican), Socialist-Worker, Temperance, Tory, Union-Labor, Union League, War Democrats, Wide Awakes, Workingmen's Party (see Locofocos).

Sources: Binkley, Wilfred E., American Political Parties: Their Natural History, Al-

fred A. Knopf, New York, 1943, 407 pages, plus index. McKee, Thomas Hudson, The National Conventions and Platforms of All Political Parties, 1789–1905; Friedenwald Co. and the Lord Baltimore Press, Baltimore, 1906, 418 pages, plus appendix. McLaughlin, Andrew C., and Albert B. Hart, editors; Cyclopedia of American Government, volume I, pages 388–393; D. Appleton Co., New York, 1914, three volumes. United States Congress; House; Platforms of the Two Great Political Parties, 1932–44, pages 437–447; compiled by William Graf under the direction of South Trimble, Clerk of the House; United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1945, 459 pages. United States Library of Congress; Legislative Reference Service; Political Classification of the Congress of the United States, 1789–1948; Lewis J. Williams, General Research Section, January 20, 1948, 7 pages (manuscript).

COMMUNIST

If this new proposal had been in effect last year, 1948, the Communist Party would have received a substantial number of electoral votes. This would have encouraged members of this party and possibly by 1952 there would be several other minority parties that would receive electoral votes. Under the present system they are not encouraged but under the new system they will have a chance to divide up our country like France has been divided for sometime.

FRANCE

The following information concerning political parties in France prepared by the Legislative Reference Service is also very interesting:

Political parties in France and certain election returns

[From Foreign Policy Reports, Jan. 15, 1949]

SEATS WON IN FRENCH NATIONAL ELECTIONS

Party [1]	Constituent Assembly		National Assembly		Council of Republic, December 1948
	October 1945	June 1946	November 1946	December 1946 (Council)	
Communist	159	153	181	84	21.
Socialist	146	129	106	62	62.
MRP	150	167	167	70	18.
Radical Socialist	29	32	43	RGR 44	79 (22).[2]
UDSR	31	20	27		
Independent Republic	14	23	28	28	38 (23).[2]
Peasant Group	11	9	6	5	16 (7).[2]
PRL	39	35	37	11	12 (9).[2]
RPF			Intergroup, approximately 74.		Intergroup, approximately 56.

[1] Affiliates are counted in with each party.
[2] Members chosen on coalition lists with RPF.

EXPLANATION OF INITIALS

MRP—Mouvement Republicain Populaire (Popular Republican Movement).
UDSR—Union Democratique et Socialiste de la Resistance (Democratic and Socialist Resistance Union).
PRL—Parti Republicain de la Liberte (Republican Party of Liberty).
RPF—Rassemblement du Peuple Francaise (Assembly of the French People).
RGR—Rassemblement des Gauches Republicaines (Assembly of the Republicans of the Left).

According to the French electoral law, the assembly is made up of members of the parties in proportion to their voting strength in the elections. Hence, all available figures on the election returns are expressed in terms of number of Assembly seats won.

The conduct of the government in France the past decade is certainly not an argument in favor of adopting a policy in this country that could give us the same type government.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT BY HOUSE

Possibly some change should be made in our Constitution concerning the election of a President in the event no one candidate obtains a majority of the electoral votes. At present, under this method, each State would have one vote. Possibly each Representative should have one vote instead. I hope the Judiciary Committee that is now considering this matter gives some thought to a change in this provision, but I sincerely trust that no change is proposed that will give 10 percent of the voters an opportunity to elect a President of the United States.

I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary last Wednesday and pointed out the question that I believed should be very carefully considered in this resolution.

The Detroit Common Council Commends President Truman for Stand on Cardinal Mindszenty Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution that was unanimously adopted by the Council of the City of Detroit condemning the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, and commending President Truman for the stand he has taken. The resolution follows:

Whereas President Harry S. Truman, on February 10, 1949, denounced the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Government of Hungary "as one of the black spots" on Hungary; and

Whereas the State Department of our National Government is investigating the question of whether the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty violates the treaties between Hungary and the United States and other nations; and

Whereas the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty violates the spirit of every objective to which the charter of the United Nations is dedicated; and

Whereas the infamous and communistic treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government and the threat to other church leaders by other iron curtain countries is to be deplored by God-fearing people of all faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Detroit commends President Harry S. Truman for his forthright denunciation of these communistic acts which threaten the religious freedom of all peoples everywhere; be it further

Resolved, That the President urge and request the United Nations to intervene and prevent further persecution of peoples for their religious beliefs which will ultimately result in the complete destruction of the sacred right of religious freedom; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman and to Senators VANDENBERG and FERGUSON, and the congressional Representatives for the State of Michigan.

Communists Taking Over China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including two magazine news items relating to China. This is a situation that must be approached with realism by our State Department, else our great military victory in the Pacific will have been lost.

The items follow:

[From Newsweek magazine]

THE PERISCOPE

UNITED STATES OUTLOOK IN CHINA

Washington diplomats freely admit that an all-Communist China would tilt the balance of power dangerously in favor of the Soviets. But at the same time they believe a Red China would suffer from three grave weaknesses: (1) The job of running the country would bring out among the Communists the same graft and incompetence that doomed Chiang's regime; (2) Chinese communism would develop the same nationalistic tendencies in Asia that now have developed in Yugoslavia—especially in view of the Kremlin's long-time effort to stir up far eastern sentiment against the west; and (3) Communist China would need outside economic help even more desperately than did Nationalist China, and the United States is the only country able to provide most of the things needed. Washington thinks the whole situation would lend itself to political and economic pressures which could be exploited by the west against Soviet domination.

[From United States News and World Report of February 4, 1949]

United States policy toward China, given this turn of events, has to be overhauled from stem to stern. New United States policy, accordingly, begins to look like this:

Military aid can be considered finished, not likely to be revived.

United States base at Tsingtao won't be retained very much longer.

Economic aid, though, is something else. United States agents are staying in Peiping, Tientsin, other cities to supervise distribution of United States supplies, may stay on quite a while, if Communists let them. And Communists may need help in feeding Shanghai, and later Canton. United States relief, in that case, may seem to Washington to have some propaganda value in China, may keep Chinese friendly.

Trade between China and Japan also is important, if Japan is to revive.

United States recognition of Communist China is thus ultimately to be expected.

United States reasoning will be to keep a foot in China's door, in order to get back in during the long years the Communists must have before they can swallow China.

Comparative Strength of United States and Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Associated Press article:

National power is measured in men, space, and natural resources.

The United States and Russia both are rich in population, land area, and mineral wealth.

Like our own Federal Union of 48 States, the U. S. S. R. is a federation of 16 national republics. Each nation spans a continent.

The Soviet republics include almost one-sixth of the world's land area and more than 200,000,000 people—almost a tenth of the world's population. The United States covers one-fifteenth of the world's land surface and has a population of less than 150,000,000.

While Russia still has a long way to go toward mechanization and industrialization, the United States now uses half the mechanical energy of the world. The vast expanses of Soviet-land have yet to be linked with adequate transportation and communication systems. The United States has the world's greatest economic strength.

Russia is runner-up to the United States in a number of vital natural resources. This is particularly true of such energy-producing necessities as coal and petroleum. Both are vital in an age which has hardly begun to harness the newer, more exciting potential of atomic energy.

Coal reserves in the United States are estimated at 45 percent of the world total. Russian reserves, second to our own, total 27 percent. Leading the world in petroleum, the United States has an estimated 31 percent of the total. The U. S. S. R. ranks fourth, with only 11 percent. Both nations are interested in the Middle East as a new source.

Water power is another source which the two great powers are developing. Hydroelectric plants are vital to the production of such products as aluminum, made from bauxite. The United States and Russia are equally poor in reserves of this vital mineral. Each has only 3 percent of the world's supply.

The two countries run first and second in reserves of zinc and iron ore. But United States zinc reserves total 34 percent, while the U. S. S. R. has only 12 percent. With 34 percent of the world's iron ore reserve, the United States is far ahead of Russia's 11 percent. Moreover, American steel producers are developing new ore fields in Labrador and South America.

The world-leading United States has 35 percent of the lead reserve, while Russia ranks ninth with only 2 percent. In copper the United States is second with 22 percent, and Russia is fourth with 16 percent.

While both countries are rich in strategic minerals, neither has within its own borders all the resources necessary to its industrial and military survival.

Soviet System Destroying Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 21, 1949:

SOVIET SYSTEM WORKING FOR OWN DEFEAT

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ROME, February 20—Discussion of the Atlantic Pact revives in Europe all the old questions regarding the attitude of the United States, but not to the extent the Government spokesmen and newspaper commentators imply. The ordinary European does not take too seriously the Senate opposition to including an automatic war clause in the proposed treaty. His offhand reaction is that terms and conditions of the defense arrangements should have been settled among the original five Powers before other countries were urged to join, but he does not make a great point of that maladroitness because he does not expect much wisdom and forethought from governments. On the main point he reasons simply that since without a pact the United States was unable to keep out of the European wars there is no question of the American position in the event of new aggression.

Because of its impact on the emotions, the Mindszenty case has perhaps contributed more than any single event to sharpening of the issue. As the most Catholic of continental countries and center of the Catholic Church, Italy feels the attack on the cardinal more than most countries. No demonstration of protest elsewhere could equal in size or solemnity the extraordinary gathering addressed by the Pope this morning in St. Peter's Square. These outdoor sermons of the Pontiff to the populace are new but increasingly frequent in Rome.

The Basilica of St. Peter's holds 50,000 people, but it is not big enough any more to contain the crowds that flock to hear Pius XII when he speaks, as he did today with unprecedented forthrightness, on the great question that divides Italy and disrupts the order of the world.

AN IMPORTANT REACTION

This is not so much a sign of a religious revival as of growing awareness among ordinary people of what is at stake in the so-called east-west conflict. Italy knows it isn't a geographic or even an international conflict; it cuts too deeply into the fabric of this nation. But because Italian Communists have played down the religious issue as they did in Hungary until they gained control, people here have not fully realized that Communism in power will tolerate no rival religion and respect no rights of conscience, no system of law or justice that opposes its purposes.

They realize it now. It is not farfetched to suggest that the fate of the Hungarian primate has lined up many former "neutrals" on the side of the west. Today's demonstration was special to Rome because it was primarily an expression of devotion to the Pope in time of trial but it was not unique. It was one of many popular protests in all parts of the world.

These protests reflect a reaction that should not be taken lightly either in Budapest or Moscow, for it brings emotional as well as reasonable support to measures to halt expansion of Soviet rule, and this in turn gives wider backing to western defense plans and supplies a new and telling argument for solidarity among people who prize freedom of conscience and deepens division into two worlds by showing how unbridgeable is the gulf between them.

For reasons already mentioned, this country is an exaggerated example of the effect of the Mindszenty trial. But Catholic Italy has more than 2,000,000 avowed Communists among its citizens, many of whom call themselves Catholic. Even leaders trained in Moscow keep on reiterating that there is no incompatibility between Catholicism and communism. Religious persecutions in Hungary and elsewhere cast doubt on these assertions, and the Mindszenty case just about finished that particular line of propaganda. Communists and anti-Communists agree that hereafter the Communist gospel will appeal only to the frankly irreligious.

THE LINES ARE DRAWN

Communist leaders here are making new efforts to assert their power. They have called out all transport workers on a 24-hour strike tomorrow, but are so afraid of the effect on popular opinion that they promise to discommode the public as little as possible. They have adopted a policy of noncollaboration in important factories, which De Gasperi announces he intends to fight to a finish. Annoyance strikes are of everyday occurrence and in the Chamber of Deputies Communist members shout down Government speakers, stage walk-outs, and exert themselves in general to make Parliament as ridiculous and ineffective as they can. Their greatest enemy, however, is Russia. When the Soviet at Lake Success offers to accept a candidate for Governor of Trieste it refused to consider last year, Italians interpret the action as a move to foil the western plans of returning the city to the Italians. And when Soviet agents stage a mock trial to degrade a cardinal of the church and destroy Catholic influence in Hungary, they cancel propaganda by which Communist leaders have induced many Italians to join their ranks. But this is not the chief consequence of this strange episode. The number of Communists it causes to waver is not so important as its effect in revealing what is really at stake in the cold war to multitudes who regarded it as a classic struggle for political or economic power. In this sense it vitally affects discussion of the Atlantic defense system and the European Union. It furnishes a final argument to convince Europeans that even if the United States refuses to pledge automatic action in case of attack on Europe it will be in the war on the first round. The lines are drawn.

Persecution of Catholic Priests in Satellite Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of New York. Mr. Speaker, the arrest and mock trial of Cardinal

Mindszenty the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary was just a renewed drive on persecuting all Roman Catholic priests in the satellite countries.

This was evidenced by the arrest of 20 priests in Poland by the Communist-led government. The communistic form of government is more dangerous now than ever. Since 1946 priests had been placed on trial and sometimes sentenced to death as saboteurs with little or no publicity permitted.

The Polish people will never yield to the dictates of the Communist government as long as there is red blood flowing in their veins.

The following article is from the Washington Evening Star:

POLISH BISHOP CHARGES REGIME ABOLISHES RELIGIOUS TRAINING

WARSAW, February 9.—Roman Catholic Bishop Stanislaw Adamski today accused the Polish Government of abolishing religious teaching and ordering the removal of crucifixes in some schools in southern Poland.

Unconfirmed reports said from 6 to 20 priests have been arrested for reading the bishop's pastoral letter, containing the charges, in churches of Poland's great coal and steel industrial district.

A Government spokesman said he knew nothing of such arrests or of the pastoral letter of the Bishop of Katowice. He reiterated the Communist-led government's position that it is not interfering with church affairs. He said that the Government desired only that the church keep its hands out of state affairs.

Bishop Adamski declared that an anti-religious campaign in the Katowice area was being pursued despite assurance from President Boleslaw Bierut, of the Polish National Council that the right of religious teaching was guaranteed by the Polish constitution.

The letter said protests to the Government authorities of the district brought the reply that religious instruction had been halted because of the lack of teachers.

The pastoral letter apparently is being given general circulation since copies arrived in Warsaw today.

The letter charges that crucifixes had been removed from the walls of school rooms and pressure has been brought to bear on parents to demand removal of crucifixes.

Bishop Adamski said Catholics were resisting such pressure and children were carving their own crucifixes and placing them on walls.

Address of Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug at the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Hotel Commodore, New York City, February 2, 1949:

It is fine to get back home to rural-electric cooperatives. I have been associated with your movement and with many of you ever since the REA was born. I have negotiated power sales to your member co-ops and I've sweated out with you hundreds of the mean and troublesome operating and construction problems of a rural-electric co-op.

Last year, I was unable to attend your meeting but I promised myself that I would this year and when Clyde Ellis called me I made it a definite commitment even though several other important matters threatened to compete with this meeting—and have.

I am glad to get back home, because the rural-electric co-op symbolizes my idea of the function of electric power in the world today. Electric service is a service to humanity. It services factories, farms and shops; businessmen, housewives and children; army barracks, churches and hospitals. For privately owned publicly owned, or cooperative-owned utilities, the main and sole function must be good service at minimum cost to everyone.

When the private utilities forgot that, they were confronted with the competition of publicly owned utilities. Should the publicly or cooperative-owned utilities forget that they exist to serve the community, region and Nation, as well as their own electric-power consumers, they too will face trouble.

This possibility is not too strange to contemplate. There is no magic in either Government ownership or cooperative ownership. They were both born of a need to serve where service was not being given. If and when they fail to give that service they will be through.

One of the great attributes of our people has been their ability to devise economic and political institutions to serve their needs in a democratic manner. And we have not been slow to change, when change was required.

One example will suffice. Before 1900 the accepted form of municipal government in this country was based on an elected mayor and board of aldermen. When that, in many cases, provided inefficient administration, corrupt government, and inadequate services to the people, the council, or commission, and city-manager method was devised. In most cases this was an improvement. Yet, where it made the city government unresponsive to the needs of the people, cities have been quick to go back to electing their administrative officers.

Public power, in the broad sense, is now a permanent part of American life. But we are a dynamic people and we keep our economic, social, and political patterns alive by constant change. To survive, public power will have to be a good as and a little better than private power. We've got to run fast to stay where we are in the competitive field. And we've got to run very fast to improve our position.

The drive which your organization is conducting to guarantee itself a supply of aluminum conductor, is the most recent evidence that you are in there fighting every minute. I believe that you will get your needed conductor and other equipment and you have the full backing of the Interior Department in that activity.

But the country's record in rural electrification is the most striking evidence. Unprecedented rural line building in less than 15 years has jumped the number of United States farms with central station electric service from 1 out of 10 to 7 in 10 and what is equally important, you have perfected the distribution know-how to reach the other 3. The recent political decision by the American people in favor of candidates running on full public-power platforms is another. The idea advanced last summer that public power should be developed only as incidental to irrigation met with little favor and I believe it will meet with even less favor in the present Congress.

There are tremendous opportunities and responsibilities facing us. We are now in a period of critical shortage of electric power. In some regions of the country, consumers are voluntarily reducing their use during peak hours to keep the power systems from breaking down completely. Any industrialist who wants to build a plant to use a large block of power will search the Nation only to find that he must wait 2 years or more before he can get it. We are far from having any cushion of reserves to meet new loads or emergency requirements.

Certainly, an essential part of our national power policy should be that our power supply must be sufficient to meet all of the requirements of a full-employment economy and provide reserves for all emergencies whether those of an operating character or those threatening our national security and welfare.

When we start to put that policy into effect, we find that it involves the construction by the United States of more hydroelectric dams and powerhouses and the facilities for marketing their output. And that will bring another very critical barrage from certain segments of the power industry. What are the basic elements of this controversy?

The water resources of America belong to all the people. Since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, our national policy has been to conserve and develop these resources for the people's benefit. The first Roosevelt had bitter opposition, especially from his own party. During the intervening period before 1933, many battles were fought between the representatives of special interests who wished to exploit these resources and the champions of the people's rights and in most of them, the people lost. The late Franklin D. Roosevelt renewed the fight in this great tradition and brought the public interest into action to a degree surpassing all previous progress. And now President Harry S. Truman has added new strength to the movement in his forthright stand for public power and publicly owned transmission lines as part of his program to develop the Nation's resources.

Faced with the clear decision of the people—as expressed many times by the Executive and the Congress—that our water resources are to be developed for the benefit of the people and are not to be monopolized by limited groups, the segments of the power industry to which I refer have elected to follow a "rule or ruin" policy.

In the face of growing power shortages, one after another of the Federal power developments has been subjected to attack. The New Johnsonville steam plant of TVA, the steam plant and marketing facilities for the great Central Valley project in California, the marketing program of the Southwestern Power Administration—every one projected in areas where power needs are great, have all been hampered and hamstrung.

Some high-priced lobbying talent and some vicious propaganda have been employed. Most of you know that the top power lobbyist in Washington receives a larger annual salary than the combined and total annual pay of any five of the President's nine Cabinet officers. Only last week this gent commanded news headlines in our leading newspapers by damning the President's proposal for a Columbia Valley Authority.

Many of you have seen the power lobby's motion picture "The Power of a Free People." In it a swastika was used to characterize the Government's representatives working for a public power agency. In order to complete the confusion, cries are raised of "socialism" or "communism." It is charged that the Government's power activities are the advance guard of an army that will socialize American industry.

I am sure that this opposition will fail as it rests on false assumptions. It tries to pervert the language of liberty and freedom to cover privilege and monopoly. It strives to prevent the development of low-cost hydroelectric power and its sale at low rates where that kind of development is just the kind of support and encouragement which private enterprise needs for rapid progress and expansion. No one could go down to the

Tennessee Valley and take a poll of businessmen or even bankers as to whether private enterprise has prospered with the TVA program without getting an overwhelmingly favorable reply.

The Federal Government's role in the power business is properly that of a wholesaler. Local agencies, such as your cooperatives, should distribute the Government's power. In order that the wholesaler can operate on a businesslike basis, Congress has authorized construction of transmission facilities to take power to the load centers from which it can be distributed. Without that authority the only buyers would be those who could come to the dams, or principally the utilities already operating in the region.

Of equal importance to businesslike operation, in most regions of the country, is a supplemental source of energy, such as steam generating plants, to "firm up" hydroelectric energy which otherwise would have to be sold at bargain basement wholesale prices as secondary or dump power to be resold at retail at the existing rate of the private utility. Clearly that generation is of no benefit to the consumer.

It is good business for the country, too, to develop its constantly-renewed water resources in order that their energy potential may help conserve our exhaustible energy resources—oil and coal.

"These considerations, while important to the Nation and its future welfare, cannot determine the decisions of private management in the power business. As witness to this fact, the private companies of the Southwest are installing over 1,000,000 kilowatts of fuel-burning generating plants in the next 3 years, while several times as much water power could have been available if its development had been carried forward in time.

In a few cases, there has been an encouraging demonstration of the kind of industrial statesmanship which is required to reconcile the interests of private management and the public. The latest of these occurred a few months ago when the Interior Department executed a contract with the Georgia Power Co. for the sale to that company of the output of the Allatoona Dam, being built by the Corps of Engineers for flood control on the Etowah River, near Cartersville, Ga.

That contract will yield the United States over $1,000,000 a year. It will also permit the Government at any time to withdraw firm power to meet the requirements of public bodies and cooperatives which may desire to purchase power directly from the Government.

This contract is good for both sides. It leads me to hope that the blind opposition of parts of the power industry to the Government's program for development and marketing of power will be abandoned in favor of a good-faith effort to develop workable arrangements which both meet the requirements of public policy and yield a fair deal to private management.

It may well be that in some areas, as in the TVA region, the predominance of the power resources to be developed by the Federal Government may be such that the entire power market will ultimately be served from Federal projects. In still other areas, relationships may be entirely different. In either case, private equities and interests can and should be protected fully.

In the TVA area, and I speak from personal experience, the private owners of the electric systems acquired by TVA and the cooperatives and municipalities which it serves, received 100 cents on the dollar for their investments. This precedent can be followed elsewhere if Federal power sources predominate and communities desire to undertake their own power distribution business. In other areas, arrangements such as the one with the Georgia Power Co. may suggest the answer.

I believe that there should be the same kind of change of pace in hydroelectric development as there was in rural electrification. The total capacity of the power industry must at least be doubled in the next 10 years or so. During the last 15 years, we added 6,300,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric capacity in this country. In the next 15 years, we should add at least 25,000,000 kilowatts. Most of this additional capacity will be built as an integral part of our Federal multipurpose river-control programs. Much of it will be developed in our western regions where cheap power will make it possible to use the now undeveloped mineral resources and where additional power development can provide the basis for financing badly needed new irrigation facilities.

We need to be as decisive about our power supply as we were about our electrification of rural America. We need great efforts over the next decade on the part of the entire power industry, both public and private, to provide enough electric power to meet America's needs.

We should provide a substantial part of our additional capacity out of our inexhaustible water power resources. The power developed by the United States should continue to be marketed on a basis which will assure its widespread use by the ultimate consumer at the lowest possible rates.

Obviously, the power marketing operations of the Government should and will be conducted on a businesslike basis.

We will continue to uphold the principle that power from Federal projects in a region is developed for the benefit of the people of the region as a whole and is not to be monopolized. This is the purpose of the provisions of law which direct preference in the sale of power to public bodies and nonprofit cooperative organizations.

In carrying on the electric business, your cooperatives must recognize increasingly the importance of assisting their members to develop their use of electricity. It is not enough to deliver electrical energy at the customer's meter and then forget about it. In order for your service to do the job it can do in the home and on the farm, you must effectively discharge your responsibility to advise your members of ways to put your service to work more and more effectively and thereby to improve their level of living. In this work, there are great opportunities for cooperative action with other interested agencies, such as the Agricultural Extension Service and the Federal agencies marketing power to you at wholesale.

As I said earlier, these opportunities and responsibilities are tremendous. Public power—and by that I mean not only generation and transmission by the Federal Government and other public agencies, but also public and cooperative distribution—is going to have to be organized and prepared for the job. It is going to have to start now the operational planning and research which will allow it to shoulder effectively this new load.

I think that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at this meeting should take positive steps to prepare for this future of expanded power needs and expanded public power supplies. If you or any of the other public power groups in the country are not ready when the need is at hand, you will be by-passed. Your past progress has not been achieved because of any magic in "public power" but through the initiative and resourcefulness of your leaders. In that lies our hope for future progress. You should be ready to double your activities just as the country doubles its power activity.

Again I want to pledge to you the wholehearted cooperation of the Interior Department and its power agencies. The power-using public has benefited much in the past from our association with you and we expect the benefits to "snow-ball" in the future. Thank you.

Richard F. Pence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the outstanding service of a young man of Roanoke, Va., has earned the 1948 Distinguished Service Award of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce and merits its recognition in the RECORD. This award was presented to Attorney Richard F. Pence by Frank Rogers, Roanoke attorney and vice president of the University of Virginia Law School Alumni Association.

The award was given to Mr. Pence, in part, for his service as civil and police justice for Roanoke from which position he resigned in November to resume his law practice. He passed judgment in over 20,000 criminal cases and 3,000 civil cases.

Mr. Pence was nominated for the award by Attorney General J. Lindsay Almond, Jr. In his nomination brief, Attorney General Almond said of Mr. Pence:

> He brought his court to a high level of efficiency not heretofore attained and has won an unparalleled reputation for decisions characterized by foresight, practicality and justice—impartial and equal for every race, creed, and nationality.

Mr. Pence is president of the Roanoke City-County Public Forum, Business Men's Club and Patchwork Players; chairman of the Roanoke Battalion, United States Navy Organized Reserves; vice president of the Roanoke chapter, Mental Hygiene Association of Virginia, and Mental Hygiene Service; vice chairman of the board of stewards, Greene Memorial Methodist Church, a member of the Welfare Conference, YMCA, Roanoke Council Boy Scouts of America executive board, Community Fund, Kiwanis, Junior Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke, Va., and American Bar Association.

He is also a member of the board of directors of the American Red Cross, Community Concert Association, Family Service Organization, Travelers Aid Society, Touchdown Club, and the Western Virginia Division of the Automobile Association of America.

He was chairman of the Roanoke Navy Day program last year and is a recipient of the Roanoke Junior Chamber of Commerce distinguished service award.

Mr. Pence received his BA degree from the University of Virginia in 1935 and his LLB degree from Harvard Law School in 1939. He was admitted to the Virginia Bar in 1939.

He has been secretary and clerk to Justice H. B. Gregory of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals and assistant Commonwealth's attorney for Roanoke. He is now a member of the law firm of Dodson & Pence.

He was in the Navy for 4 years and served as director of the legal department of the United States Navy Military Government on Okinawa. He was dis-

charged in 1946 as a lieutenant commander.

Judges for the award were Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News Leader; William E. Blewett, vice president of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.; and Mr. Rogers. James V. Creasy of Charlottesville was the Jaycee State chairman of the award project. Also on the committee were Charles F. Clark of Roanoke, and Arthur S. Beauchamp of Newport News.

The Place of Psychology in Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Arthur A. Ballantine at the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association, January 29, 1949:

That a tax may have an important effect on the mental state of the taxpayer is obvious to all. Those who dispassionately consider the raising of maximum revenues through taxation of incomes recognize that rates may be so high as to discourage income production. While difficult to determine, there is a psychologically optimum rate from the Treasury standpoint, and that rate is by no means the highest rate conceivable.

What I wish to discuss here is not the psychological effect of taxation, but the use of a state of mind as a basis of tax liability. One might suppose that a basis so elusive would not be utilized in anything so strikingly practical as taxation. Yet the tendency to resort to a psychological base seems to be on the increase, and that tendency requires consideration.

The difficulty of basing tax liability on a state of mind may be seen from a simple illustration.

Suppose that you visited a jeweler and selected a watch to purchase. You then asked the jeweler about a tax on the sale, and he replied, "That all depends. If you are buying the watch to keep it for necessary personal use, the tax is $5. If you are buying the watch to give away, the tax is $10. If you are buying it to put away, to hoard, the tax is $20." You would probably say "Who determines why I am buying the watch?" The jeweler would then say, "I cannot determine that any more than you can. That has to be determined by the tax authorities."

And "When?" you say. "Oh, perhaps not for years" is the answer, "the authorities have much ground to cover."

Might not your conclusion be "Keep the watch. I cannot be bothered with having the tax uncertainty hanging over me. Perhaps Uncle Sam will be coming down on me when I am not in the mood or financial condition I am today."

Now that answer, springing from the difficulties of tax liability psychologically based, would be unfortunate for you, for the jeweler, the watchmaker and for Uncle Sam.

As we examine bases of tax liability utilized in the Federal tax law today, it will be seen that while the watch illustration is extreme, it is by no means fantastic.

CONTEMPLATION OF DEATH AS A BASIS

Treatment of property transferred "in contemplation of death," although perhaps many years before the death, as being part of the estate of the transferor, while not of great day-to-day importance in the application of the tax law, nevertheless shows the difficulty with the utilization of a state of mind as a basis of tax liability.

When the Federal estate tax was first imposed by the Act of September 8, 1916, following the practice in State statutes, it was provided that the estate subject to tax should include property transferred by the decedent "in contemplation of death." The statute made no definition of the possible liability. The Treasury recognized that "in such a case the question is necessarily as to the state of mind of the donor."

In the early leading case of *United States* v. *Wells* (283 U. S. 102 (1931)), the Supreme Court said that to make the transfer fall within the statute the death motive must be the inducing, compelling, controlling or dominant cause of the transfer. A subsequent authoritative decision in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit qualified the requirement somewhat, but left it that the death motive had to be important or substantial. (*Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* v. *Bowers* (98 F. (2d) 794 (1938), certiorari denied, 306 U. S. 648 (1939)).)

It was the belief of the Treasury that in practice trial courts were unduly hard to convince that the death idea had been the motivating cause, even where the donor had been of advanced age and infirm health.

The Treasury sought to overcome difficulties as to proof of the mental state by the use of presumption. The original statute contained a presumption, which was rebuttable by evidence, that gifts within two years before the death were gifts in contemplation.

The 1926 act contained a provision (sec. 302), adopted at the instance of the Treasury, that in the case of gifts within 2 years a presumption of "contemplation" was to be conclusive. In *Heiner* v. *Donnan* (285 U. S. 312 (1932)), the Supreme Court held, with Justices Stone and Brandeis dissenting, that the conclusive presumption, incapable of being overcome by proof of any character, was void under the due-process clause of the fifth amendment, in that it operated to measure the tax on property of the decedent by including property that was not property of the decedent.

In actual practice the Treasury has found that the establishment of the state of mind of the donor on the basis of testimony is impracticable, and that "the effective administration of the contemplation of death provision" is limited to transfers which are presumed to be in contemplation of death. (See report of Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 6712.)

The result of experience of difficulty with state of mind as a basis of tax liability found reflection in the inclusion of section 204 of H. R. 6712, passed by the House of Representatives last June, extending the rebuttable presumption to 3 years, but giving up any attempt to assert liability in the case of gifts back of 3 years.

Grounds for giving up the assertion of liability in the case of gifts long past were set forth by the Ways and Means Committee (Rept. No. 2087, p. 6) as follows:

"Under existing law the Government may raise the question of contemplation of death no matter how widely separated the time of transfer and the date of death may be. The consequence is that the executors of an estate may be put to a great deal of trouble and expense in order to disprove such an assertion of deficiency by the Government, which can be sustained in only a small percentage of the cases."

It will be of interest to find whether the Eighty-first Congress takes this sensible view.

ACCUMULATION OF EARNINGS TO PREVENT SURTAX

A very important instance of the use of a psychology test as a basis of tax liability is presented by the provisions of the Federal income tax levying a penal tax upon corporate earnings accumulated "for the purpose of preventing the imposition of the surtax" on shareholders. That tax, the very much discussed section 102 tax, reaches 38½ percent of the condemned accumulations. Under the law, liability depends upon the existence of the motive of retaining the earnings to prevent imposition of individual Federal income tax upon shareholders who would receive the earnings if distributed.

The actual application of the tax rests mainly upon the utilization of a presumption established by the law (sec. 102–c):

"The fact that the earnings or profits of a corporation are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business shall be determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the corporation by the clear preponderance of the evidence shall prove to the contrary."

Of much importance to growing enterprises, this tax has several distinct aspects, but my purpose is to discuss those aspects only so far as they are bound up with the use of the psychological test of liability.

Of those other aspects, there is first the original fraud aspect, which should now be regarded as defunct. Under the first income-tax act, passed after the adoption of the sixteenth amendment, the tax on individuals was made up of a normal tax of 1 percent and surtaxes beginning at $20,000 of income, reaching 5 percent. The tax on the income of corporations was a flat tax of 1 percent. Because the corporation income paid a tax equivalent to the normal tax, dividends received by individuals were exempt from normal tax.

Under that set-up, it was conceived to amount to fraud or evasion for a corporation to retain earnings instead of distributing them, as surtax on the earnings would be thus avoided. While the form of the penal tax has changed during the years, there is still embedded in the phraseology that thought of preventing the imposition of surtax.

Of course the fact is that the exemption of dividends from normal tax was abandoned back in 1936, so that dividend income is subject both to the corporation income tax, now very heavy, and to full individual income taxes, normal as well as surtaxes. The shoe is now rather on the other foot not of avoiding tax but of thrusting income under the yoke of double tax.

Another important fact on this phase is the presence in the law since 1934 of provisions taking by taxation substantially all the undistributed income of closely held corporations with income that is primarily of an investment character, the so-called personal-holding companies, popularly called incorporated pocketbooks.

A second phase of the penal tax is the strictly revenue phase. Does the presence in the law of this threatening provision add to the revenue, and if so does it add more in the long run than would have been added had the income in question been retained by the enterprise and used for its development? With regard to the payment of dividends under present conditions, there would seem to be the strongest kind of pressure from stockholders who so need cash returns to meet living costs.

A third phase may be termed the social or economic phase. The consideration here is brought out by the undistributed profits tax, enacted in 1936, altogether eliminated by 1940. Under that short-lived tax whatever appeared as earnings or profits, no matter how difficult or damaging to pay out, had to be distributed in cash, or in the form of debt, to avoid application of the tax, running up to 27 percent.

The theory of the undistributed profits tax was that the development of enterprise in America had been largely completed: that the economy would be better sustained if substantially all corporate earnings were

distributed or placed into the stream of consumption: that such a policy would take away much of large business units and that it would be wholesome to have any cases of needed expansion made the subject of market financing under SEC regulations.

What led to elimination of the undistributed profits tax was general recognition both that what were stated as corporate earnings could by no means be treated as all distributable because necessarily invested in the business in various ways, that business enterprise in this country was far from completed, and that if enterprises, large or small, could not build up out of earnings, as so notably in the past, a large part of the vitality of American enterprise would be lost.

When the undistributed profits tax was eliminated there was some difference of opinion in Congress as to how far the retention of the penal section 102 tax, never abandoned, represented continuation of the policy of compelling distribution.

In phraseology, however, the 102 tax differs vitally from the undistributed profits tax in that it would penalize nondistribution only where accumulation was motivated by intent to prevent the imposition of the surtax. How does the psychological test work?

When active enforcement of section 102 began, it was urged that the purpose test of liability was too vague to be constitutionally valid. In rejecting that contention, Judge Learned Hand recognized that "a statute which stands on the footing of the participants' state of mind may need the support of presumption, indeed be practically unenforceable without it." Judge Hand then rested his rejection of the vagueness argument on the ground that

"Standards of conduct, fixed no more definitely, are common in the law; the whole of torts is pervaded by them * * * the [standard] reasonable needs of the business, which is immediately within the ken of the managers, the supposititious standard, though indeed objective being as accessible as those for example of the prudent driving of a motor car or of the diligence required in making a ship seaworthy." (*United Business Corporation* v. *Commissioner* (62 F. (2d) 754 (C. C. A. 2d, 1933)).)

When this question came before the Supreme Court Justice Brandeis took the rather remarkable view that the tax is not on a state of mind as "the existence of the defined purpose is a condition precedent to the imposition of the tax liability" upon the retained income. (*Helvering* v. *National Grocery Co.* (304 U. S. 282 (1938)).)

The judges did not have occasion to point out that a standard which might pass the court test for constitutionality might nevertheless fail to pass the test of workability, particularly for such a practical subject as the determination of tax liabilities.

In the earlier years it was also urged that the penal tax was not intended to apply in the case of active manufacturing or commercial businesses, the needs of which are varied and developing. The argument was that the tax should be confined to investment companies, and the like, which are closely held and have since been thoroughly dealt with as personal holding companies. In the case of such companies even the psychological test is comparatively easy to apply. But that argument did not prevail and, indeed, there is nothing in the law to limit the application of the tax to any particular type of corporation.

What then became and remains the question is how the penal tax shall be applied in practice. Under the regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as under the wording of the statute, application turns exclusively upon the presence or absence of the purpose to avoid individual surtaxes on shareholders. Application of the tax is not limited to cases of unreasonable accumulation of earnings or profits, but if earnings or profits are permitted to accumulate beyond the reasonable needs of the business, that fact is determinative of the purpose to avoid surtax upon shareholders unless the taxpayer proves the contrary by such a clear preponderance of all the evidence that the absence of such a purpose is unmistakable (regulations 111, sec. 29.102-2).

What part does established intent to avoid surtax actually play?

One would think that as it is such intent that determines liability, the condemned intent would have to be the inducing or compelling cause of the accumulation, following the opinion of the court in the Wells case as to the contemplation of death motive, or shown to be at least a substantial motive for the action, following the qualification of the court of appeals for the second circuit in the Bowers case.

The tax court has, however, maintained that the tax applies if it can be inferred from the circumstances that the thought of avoiding surtaxes played any part, no matter how small, in the determination of corporate policy—that the requirement for nonapplication is a complete lack of the condemned purpose. And the Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, then acting upon the theory of very limited review, refused to correct that extreme position. (*Trico Products Corp.* v. *Commissioner* (137 F. (2d) 424 (C. C. A. 2d, 1943)), certiorari denied, 320 U. S. 799).)

In practice, application of the tax is made to depend on whether the retention of earnings or profits seems to be warranted by the reasonable needs of the business. No reliance either way seems to be placed upon establishing the actual mental attitude of directors or stockholders.

The difficulty with the intent question is thought to be avoided by making the answer turn to whether retention is beyond the reasonable needs of the business. Virtually complete reliance is placed upon the statutory presumption which Judge Hand recognized to be practically indispensable.

What is here overlooked is that the reasonable needs of the business test in which refuge is sought, is itself a psychological test. Judge Hand took the view that reasonable needs of the business was virtually an objective test, like the safe driving of an automobile or the seaworthiness of a ship. The truth is, however, that the needs of a business means very little except in reference to a mental conception of what the business requires or should be. On that there may be difference even among managers and of course between managers and revenue officials.

What the dangers and possibilities of business are is something to be estimated only by minds familiar and responsibly familiar with the conditions of the business. Who but Henry Ford himself could have estimated the reasonable needs of the Ford business?

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has again and again assured directors that no fair or honest determination of the needs of the business will be rejected so that the tax will apply to earnings retained against those needs. In spite of the Commissioner's enlightened attitude, there remains the difficulty that with the law so broad and so vague, honest determination by directors may be attacked by revenue-enforcing officers.

An illustration of this is the recent case of a moderate sized newspaper enterprise in a western city. The corporation owning and conducting the newspaper enterprise in 1941 had a book surplus of $562,000. The directors deemed that the enterprise needed a new building, new presses, and a radio station. The minimum then estimated cost of those improvements was $500,000. During the war years of 1942 and 1943 it was impossible to obtain the desired material, and in each of those years the corporation added something to its surplus, $80,000 in 1942 and $70,000 in 1943. In 1945 all the long contemplated additions were completed, at a total cost of $938,000, almost double the original estimate.

Officers of Internal Revenue assessed the penal tax on the accumulations for 1942 and 1943, and their action was sustained by the circuit court of appeals. Certiorari was applied for on the grounds that the imposition of the tax in this case rests upon the substitution by the revenue officers of their judgment for the honest judgment of the informed officers of the company. But on January 17 the Supreme Court declined to consider such question. (*World Publishing* v. *United States* (169 F. (2d) 186 (C. C. A. 10th, 1948)).)

In fact, revenue officers are not selected or qualified to pass upon the financial needs of active and developing corporate enterprises. They have not the background or experience to do so. So long as the imposing of a penal tax may result from the substitution of the revenue officer's judgment for the honest judgment of management, the psychological provision in the law remains a threat to the development of enterprise, never more important than it is today.

Suggestions made to the last Congress included placing upon the Commissioner the burden to establish both the unreasonableness of the accumulation and the existence of the necessary tax avoidance purpose. This idea was watered down to the suggested provision that if a corporation being notified of threatened assessment should file a written statement of the reasonable needs of the business, the burden of proof should be on the Commissioner to prove them inadequate.

Changes in the burden of proof still leave vital questions in the fog of psychology. Section 102 requires cure not by shifting assumptions, but by the ax.

PSYCHOLOGY IN CORPORATE REORGANIZATIONS

The psychological test in the contemplation of death and accumulations of earnings cases was placed in the statute by Congress. In dealing with the provisions of the statute relating to corporate reorganizations, the courts have introduced a psychological test of exemption not set forth in the law. That test has resulted in confusion and frustration.

The corporation reorganization sections may not seem of importance to the average taxpayer, but they are whenever he is a shareholder, and they have general importance because they are intended to facilitate flexibility in the use of the corporate form, and that flexibility is intended to further the development of industry.

If the businesses of two or more corporations are to be put together, if a corporation finds that part of its business should be conducted by a subsidiary, or perhaps that a subsidiary should be turned over to its stockholders, it makes a great deal of difference whether the intercorporate transfer or the receipt of new shares by the stockholders, for or in addition to their original shares, is treated as a closed transaction giving rise to tax liabilities, measured by the excess of the market value of the new over the cost of the old.

The theory of the reorganization sections appearing in the Federal Act from 1919 on, almost as soon as Federal income taxes became high, is that certain transfers or exchange transactions turning on the use of the corporate form should be exempt from tax because in fairness they do not mark a time for a tax levy.

As the statute was drafted, it was found that the definition of what the exemptions should be, required change from time to time. In the light of experience and reflection, sections were added or taken out of the statute in its reenactments over the years.

In 1934 the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit had before it a case, the celebrated *Gregory case* (69 F. (2d) 809), in

which certain transactions involving the formation of a new corporation resulted in the owner of all the shares of the corporation receiving "a parcel of shares" owned by that corporation on a reorganization basis, permitting her to account for the proceeds of the sale of those shares as a capital gain instead of accounting for them on the more expensive dividend basis.

The Tax Court which first considered the case concluded that as the application of the terms of the statute to the procedure which had been followed resulted in the lesser tax, the taxpayer should prevail over the irate revenue authorities.

The Court of Appeals took the view that such a result was not acceptable and rejected the consequence of literal application of the language. In construing the section, Judge Learned Hand in his vigorous opinion stated:

"The underlying presupposition is plain that the readjustment shall be undertaken for reasons germane to the conduct of the venture in hand, not as an ephemeral incident, egregious to its prosecution."

The Supreme Court, affirming the Court of Appeals stated:

"When subdivision (B) speaks of a transfer of assets by one corporation to another, it means a transfer made 'in pursuance of a plan of reorganization' * * * of corporate business; and not a transfer of assets by one corporation to another in pursuance of a plan having no relation to the business of either, * * *. Simply an operation having no business or corporate purpose."

Given this new psychological weapon—the purpose test—the Treasury proceeded to attack corporate transactions other than the type before the courts in the Gregory case, a type later expressly excluded from statutory exemption. "'Recapitalizations", by which a stockholder receives new securities in place of those originally held, were sought to be confined to readjustments having to the satisfaction of the Treasury a business purpose. Such restrictions were sustained by the Tax Court and by Circuit Courts of Appeal.

Restrictions in such cases were sustained by the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court did not follow the courts below in announcing the business purpose test of conformity to the statutory exemption. Instead the highest court reasoned that if the effect of what was done was to create what might be regarded as a taxable dividend, the dividend tax and not the exemption should apply. This is the new well known effect test. (*Bazley* v. *Commissioner* (331 U. S. 737 (1947)); *Adams* v. *Commissioner* (331 U. S. 737 (1947).) In the Bazley opinion, the Court said:

"Since a recapitalization within the scope of section 112 is an aspect of reorganization, nothing can be a recapitalization for this purpose unless it partakes of those characteristics of a reorganization which underlie the purpose of Congress in postponing the tax liability."

It seems not to have been perceived that the effect test is in essence the purpose test, simply given a less questionable label. This is made reasonably clear by the fact that the effect test excludes from exemption all cases that are excluded by the purpose test. It is still more clear when it is considered that all exchanges and distributions would be taxable and not exempt but for the reorganization sections. Those transactions, singled out under the effect test as not exempt, are simply those not conceived by the court to meet the test of business need or purpose.

Since the Gregory decision, a corporate reorganization has been like the fish in Alice in Wonderland, after the notable admonition by the mock turtle—it can't go anywhere "without a porpoise."

Elsewhere I have maintained that the courts as a matter of construction were not justified in reading into the statute the business purpose or effect test. Here I am maintaining that such a test, even if included in the very wording of the statute, is confusing and unworkable.

So long as the idea that a business purpose or effect appealing to the court is necessary to establish the taxable status of a transaction, the businessman or executive who must plan ahead is left puzzled, if not paralyzed. Treasury officials are very naturally tempted to push the doctrine further and further, even to qualify what seems to be a self-defining transaction like a dividend in kind.

In any genuine application of the test, the essential difficulty is as to whose purpose is to be taken into account and how it is to be determined.

For some years after the Gregory decision there prevailed in the Tax Court the idea that the exemption-giving purpose could not be a business purpose of the stockholders, but must be the purpose of that abstract entity, the corporation. That metaphysical conception was always opposed by clear-thinking judges in the Tax Court and in the court of appeals, and was never accepted in the Supreme Court. Confronted with a case in which the taxpayers found it to their interests to maintain that certain transactions were not reorganization transactions because lacking a business purpose of the corporation, the Tax Court finally abandoned this metaphysic in ringing terms, stating (estate of John B. Lewis (10 T. C. 1080, at p. 1086)):

"To say that a corporation, as such can have motives and purposes apart from its stockholders, the collective group of individuals who own it, is to indulge in metaphysical reasoning which has no proper place in such practical matters as taxation."

Even with the metaphysics out of the way, the psychological test leaves great trouble. What is a valid business purpose or effect is largely a question of how one looks at the corporate purpose and needs in general. It presents the same problem of whether the judgment of responsible officers is to be set aside by that of officials.

The only really workable solution is to get rid of anything so vague as the psychological test and make the statute so clear that it defines objectively the taxable status of transactions, and then, perhaps by a new revival in the courts, induce them to stick to the law as written by Congress.

The Treasury, the taxpayer, the worker, will all be helped if we get away from founding part of the tax house on the sands of psychology and found it all on the rocks of objectivity.

Michigan Needs a Fair Deal in Veterans' Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

AND

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

AND

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1949

Messrs. ENGEL, POTTER, and FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend our remarks in the RECORD, we include the following:

Mr. Speaker, following is a letter and table covering the veterans' hospitalization situation in Michigan and the 22 other States having the greatest number of veterans' hospital facilities. The table was prepared by us from statistics furnished at our request by Veterans' Administration.

This statement and table, which we wish included as a joint extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, show conclusively the shocking degree to which Michigan war veterans have been discriminated against, in comparison with other States, particularly those in the South, in the matter of hospitalization.

Here is the complete text of our joint letter to the Federal Board of Hospitalization, asking that, as a first step, two proposed veterans' hospitals—one a 200-bed hospital at Grand Rapids, another a 500-bed hospital at Detroit, both of which were canceled in the recent curtailment order of the hospitalization board—be reinstated:

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

FEDERAL BOARD OF HOSPITALIZATION,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned Members of Congress are all war veterans, Mr. ENGEL being a veteran of World War I and Mr. POTTER and Mr. FORD being veterans of World War II. All three have had overseas service. We are naturally very much interested in adequate hospital facilities for war veterans. We were therefore not only amazed but shocked, when in view of the lack of hospital beds in Michigan the President ordered the proposed hospital program in Michigan reduced by 700 beds. Michigan has always trailed other States in hospital beds for veterans. As far back as 1935, a committee of Michigan Members of Congress appeared before your board protesting the lack of hospital beds for veterans. Despite the fact that there were at that time 196,000 war veterans in Michigan, there was not one general medical and surgical hospital bed in the State. Fifty beds had been assigned to the State by the Public Health Service. The veterans' groups came down here begging that another 50 beds might be assigned. Michigan veterans were being sent many miles from home, far from their families and loved ones for hospitalization. The result was that Michigan veterans refused to go to these hospitals, preferring to get along as best they could at home without the much-needed care.

Mr. ENGEL, one of the undersigned, was a member of that congressional committee which appeared before your board. Your record will show that he pointed these facts out to your board at that time. He pointed out that while there were many surplus hospital beds in the Nation at that time, the vacant beds were located so far from the homes of veterans who needed hospitalization that they refused to accept such hospitalization. Mr. ENGEL cited some cases in point. One in particular was that of a veteran whose wife was dead and who had one son. This son was 2 years old when the father was sent to a distant veterans' hospital, The veteran died in the hospital 14 years later. During those 14 years the father was able to see his son and the son the father only twice, and then only through the financial help of a friend. There were and are many similar cases. Most of these surplus hospital beds were and are in the South.

Your Board as then constituted gave the matter careful consideration with the result that Michigan was given its first general medical and surgical hospital. This hospital was built at Dearborn, in the center of the greatest Michigan veteran population. Michigan veterans, including Mr. ENGEL, were grateful for the action of this Board.

We are now confronted with another hospital crisis. Michigan today has not 196,000 but 788,000 war veterans. Again we find glaring discrepancies and injustices to the veterans of Michigan due to the lack of hospital beds. We are attaching hereto a table giving the 23 States which have the greatest number of veterans' hospital facilities. This table shows the number of veterans in each State, the veteran hospital bed capacity as of January 1, 1949, the beds proposed to be added by the Veterans' Administration construction program, the number of beds that actually will be added under the revised program, the total number of beds under the revised program and, most important of all, the veteran bed ratio under the revised program per 10,000 veterans.

Under this revised program, Georgia which heads the list has a veteran population of 341,000. It had a veteran bed capacity on January 1, 1949, of 2,505 beds. Under the revised program 1,200 beds are being added, giving Georgia a total of 3,705 beds, or 179 beds per 10,000 veterans. Michigan, which is number 23 and at the bottom of this list, has 788,000 veterans. It had on January 1, 1949, 3,265 beds. The original program, proposing 1,650 beds, was cut back to 950, giving Michigan a total of 4,215 beds or only 53 hospital beds per 10,000 veterans. An examination of this record will show that Georgia, Kentucky, Arkansas, Kansas, Alabama, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Virginia, and Maryland, nine States, eight of which are in the South, have a bed capacity ranging from 102 beds to 179 beds per 10,000 veterans. These nine States under the proposed program as revised will have anywhere from twice to three and one-half times the bed capacity per 10,000 veterans that Michigan will have under the same program. It is also interesting to note that 10 out of 12 States that top this list are in the South. Kentucky has 170 beds per 10,000 veterans, Arkansas 159, Kansas 155, Alabama 131 and so on down the list.

If the Veterans' Administration construction program had not been cut and if the entire 1,650 proposed beds had been added to this construction program, Michigan would still have been in twenty-second place with only 62 beds per 10,000 veterans. The 788,000 veterans of Michigan surely are entitled to a fair deal. The fact that only those hospitals were eliminated or delayed where construction had not been started does not alter the fact that Michigan will still have only 53 beds per 10,000 veterans under the revised program.

We repeat that the President's Hospitalization Board in its recent curtailment order has only increased this discrimination. It has removed two proposed hospitals in Michigan, a 500-bed TB hospital at Detroit and a 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital at Grand Rapids, Mich. It has approved 950 new beds, 500 added GMS beds at Ann Arbor, 240 GMS beds at Iron Mountain (first and only facility for Michigan's detached Upper Peninsula) and 200 GMS beds at Saginaw—950 beds in all. While expressing this generosity to last-place Michigan, it has approved 1,200 new beds for first-place Georgia—Georgia which already had more than three times the veteran bed capacity of Michigan, a State which apparently, with Government sanction, is out to set itself up as the hospitalization oasis for such distant States as Michigan. Massachusetts in turn is granted an added 2,000 new beds as against 950 for Michigan, North Carolina 1,500 and so on, despite the fact, again that these States are already far in excess of Michigan in veterans' bed capacity.

World War II veterans who come from Michigan will be in the same position that World War I veterans were as to lack of hospitalization. We realize neither Veterans' Administration nor your Board endeavors to even out veterans' bed capacity precisely by States according to veteran population within those States. But a geographical pattern is followed, as evidenced by the fact that one or more VA hospitals is found in each of the 48 States. We believe emphatically that veterans are entitled to be hospitalized within reasonable distance of their homes, for medical as well as humane reasons.

It is difficult to understand just what rule was used when the distribution of the veterans' hospital bed capacity was made. We ask that your Board give careful consideration in order that the 788,000 Michigan veterans will have the same opportunity for hospitalization that veterans have who are fortunate enough to come from other States and particularly veterans who come from below the Mason and Dixon's line.

In view of Michigan's extremely unfavorable present hospital ratio, as a first step the proposed hospitals at Detroit and Grand Rapids should be promptly reauthorized and we would like the attitude of your Board in that regard. As we have explained, even with such approval Michigan will still have only 62 beds per 10,000 veterans, in twenty-second position among the 23 States listed on the attached table.

May we have your views, and particularly your decision as promptly as possible as to whether the two Michigan hospitals will be reauthorized?

Most sincerely,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.
CHARLES E. POTTER.
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.

Veterans' hospitalization in 23 States

(Those 23 States with the most VA hospital facilities—States are ranked below in descending order in terms of veteran-bed capacity)

State	Number of veterans Dec. 31, 1948	Veterans hospital capacity, Jan. 1, 1949	Added beds proposed by Veterans' Administration construction program	Added beds under Veterans' Administration revised program	Total beds under revised program	Veteran bed ratio under revised program (per 10,000)
1. Georgia	341,000	2,505	1,800	1,200	3,705	179
2. Kentucky	320,000	2,914	750	500	3,414	170
3. Arkansas	188,000	2,396	500	500	2,896	159
4. Kansas	241,000	2,738	1,000	1,000	3,738	155
5. Alabama	313,000	3,503	600	600	4,103	131
6. Tennessee	361,000	4,662	1,500	0	4,662	129
7. Massachusetts	674,000	5,087	2,000	2,000	7,087	105
8. Virginia	357,000	3,704	0	0	3,704	104
9. Maryland	263,000	2,393	300	300	2,693	102
10. North Carolina	406,000	2,412	2,921	1,500	3,912	96
11. Mississippi	225,000	2,086	400	0	2,086	90
12. Louisiana	302,000	1,332	1,200	1,200	2,532	84
13. California	1,346,000	8,579	2,699	2,499	11,078	84
14. Wisconsin	403,000	2,891	500	500	3,391	84
15. New York	2,047,000	9,929	7,975	6,725	16,654	80
16. Illinois	1,213,000	8,687	1,750	1,000	9,687	80
17. Indiana	460,000	2,699	700	700	3,399	74
18. Texas	896,000	5,462	2,500	1,000	6,462	72
19. Ohio	983,000	4,455	4,462	2,462	6,917	70
20. West Virginia	240,000	1,290	400	400	1,690	70
21. Missouri	484,000	1,532	2,450	1,700	3,232	67
22. Pennsylvania	1,426,000	4,563	5,070	3,670	8,233	58
23. Michigan	788,000	3,265	1,650	950	4,215	[1] 53

[1] Thus Michigan, although seventh in war veteran population, is last on the list of 23 States in veteran hospital bed capacity. Even if the proposed VA hospital-construction program had not been cut, if the recommended 1,650 beds had been authorized Michigan still would have only 62 beds per 10,000 veterans and would still be next to last on the above list. As it is, despite Michigan's predicament, 700 proposed new beds have been eliminated, leaving Michigan still well in last place on the above list.

Problems Before Congress and the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the Frankford (Pa.) Dispatch of February 18, 1949:

A LETTER FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

This new Congress has emerged from the organization stage with the Truman legislative program parceled out to committees for hearings. The Senate side of the Capitol held the spotlight with its Labor Committee preparing to make recommendations about the Taft-Hartley Act. In the meantime, the floor debate was on cloture, with an eye to the future when bills on race discrimination are put to vote.

However, as I write this, the Russian situation transcends all other considerations; the cold war has had a rise in temperature, the Reds secure victory of arms in China, Norway is warned by Moscow, General Eisenhower takes leave of his Columbia University presidency to confer with our top brass in Washington. We get more convincing evidence that patience and a will for peace are not virtues, but signs of weakness in Kremlin eyes. With new and cruel forces we are compelled to see that you cannot do business with a gang whose word is worthless, and who no longer attempt to disguise their aim at world domination, by whatever means.

The recent affront came with the mock trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. We could not, if we would, be passive. Nothing could have stirred the Christian world as did the torture of the Hungarian prelate. Protestants, Jews, and Catholics have been stunned by this display of international arrogance. It is no mere Catholic matter, rather it is an offense against all God-fearing men of good will; for it insults human dignity and degrades justice. Now the line is drawn, God versus the antigod. Somehow we hoped that situation could be met in some other way, and yet we could have been prepared for it, had we harkened to the predictions made at Fatima in Portugal in the year 1917. World War I was still being fought. A vision of the Virgin appeared to three simple peasant children and predicted the outcome of the first war, the rise of the antigod in Russia,

then our ally; and World War II with its outcome. This miracle has attracted world attention and pilgrimages. The present crisis was foretold all too accurately, and the final word was "My immaculate heart will triumph in the end." The happening was written up, with illustrations, in Life magazine in December 20, 1948, issue. It has since been reported that Hollywood will make a feature film of the subject.

It is not likely that the disciples of Marx have much interest in history, and its lessons. If they did they would know that you cannot eliminate God from the individual or the nation without disaster. Any triumphs of the antigod, down through the ages, have been short lived. The Kremlin gang will fare no better than its predecessors. Examples: Hitler and Mussolini.

Cordially your Congressman,

WILLIAM J. GREEN, Jr.

George Washington Prayer 150 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as the 22d of February 1949 comes, and as we sit as Members in the United States Congress, on this day, it appears appropriate and of value that we also remember that George Washington was a man who believed in prayer to the Divine.

The other day, I received from a distinguished citizen, of my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif., Mr. Jackson M. Prentiss, a brief letter to me enclosing the text of A Holiday Prayer. Mr. Prentiss wrote me as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *February 7, 1949.*

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: When the 22d of the second month nears, I always think of this prayer by the father of our country, so I am sending it to you. I know it by heart. If you do not already know it, I hope that you will find time not only to read it, but also to learn it. It has been very, very helpful to me for many, many years.

Sincerely yours,

JACKSON M. PRENTISS.

The prayer by George Washington, which my neighbor Prentiss sent me, is as follows:

Almighty God, Who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance and from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Imbue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of Government, that there may be peace and justice at home; and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity fill our hearts with thankfulness and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Ominous Implications of the Recent Closed-Shop Decision of the United States Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND W. KARST

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, there is no subject before us requiring more careful and temperate consideration than the field of labor relations. Our Supreme Court lately has dealt with this field in its very broad and far-reaching decision of the Closed-Shop cases.

The Court upheld the rights of the States to enact legislation outlawing closed shops and union shops. Had the Court done no more, our misgivings about such legislation might properly be addressed to correction by the political process. But a close study of the Supreme Court's decision indicated that its ruling may have gone much farther.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Sunday, January 9, 1949, made a great contribution to the study of this question, in an editorial entitled "The Closed-Shop Decision." As is the custom of newspapers, the editorial is unsigned, but I am informed that it is largely the work of the wise and widely respected expert, Mr. Irving Dilliard, whose views always command attention.

The editorial follows:

THE CLOSED-SHOP DECISION

The United States Supreme Court has made a lot of trouble by the way in which it has handled the closed-shop cases. It has made trouble not only for trade-unions, but also for many employers. It has made trouble for the States and for Congress. And unless we miss our guess, the court has made trouble for itself.

What is wrong is not so much the end at which the Justices come out in the immediate cases, although there may even be argument on that, but in the manner in which they arrive at the end. By saying more than they needed to say, the Justices appear to have put the closed shop under a judicial cloud. It is a question now what the States may do about guaranteeing the closed shop when employees and employers desire to put it in a contract. It is a question now as to whether there would be a conflict between the court which handed down this decision and the restoration by Congress of the Wagner Act's approval of the closed shop.

Here are the basic facts:

Sixteen States have passed laws or amended their constitutions in such a way as to forbid the closed shop—the arrangement by which a union and an employer agree in a contract to work only union members.

Most of these States are in the South. The southern nine are Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Georgia, Florida, South Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland. Four other States made up a North-Central agricultural, almost antilabor bloc, namely, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Iowa. The only other States with such prohibitions are Delaware, Nevada, and Arizona. It is notable that the list contains no industrial State, such as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, or Illinois, which has had extensive experience with the closed shop.

A COURT IN AGREEMENT

North Carolina's 1947 statute and the constitutional amendments of Nebraska and Arizona, both adopted in 1946, were challenged by labor unions. In each instance the State supreme court ruled against the union. It was on appeals from these rulings that the highest tribunal decided last Monday in upholding the anti-closed-shop enactments.

For a court which has been unanimous in only 6 of 27 decisions thus far this term, the Supreme Justices were in surprising agreement. Justice Black spoke for a unanimous bench in the merged Nebraska and North Carolina cases, to which Justices Frankfurter and Rutledge appended concurring opinions. In the Arizona case Justice Black was the spokesman for eight Justices. Only Justice Murphy dissented, and he without opinion.

The essence of the Black opinion is that the States are within their rights in specifying that a worker need not belong to a trade union. The senior Justice agrees that this may "weaken the bargaining power of unions and correspondingly strengthen the power of employers." There are, he says, other matters to be considered, as, for example, the "employment opportunities of members of independent unions." He then finds the prohibition of the closed shop to be a sort of opposite of the ban on the yellow-dog contract—the odious employment contract in which the worker pledged himself not to join a union.

In the end Justice Black says that the Supreme Court, at least since 1934, has "consciously returned closer and closer to the earlier constitutional principle that States have power to legislate against what are found to be injurious practices in their internal commercial and business affairs, so long as their laws do not run afoul of some specific Federal constitutional prohibition, or of some valid Federal law.

"Under this constitutional doctrine the due-process clause is no longer to be so broadly construed that the Congress and the State legislatures are put in a strait-jacket when they attempt to suppress business and industrial conditions which they regard as offensive to the public welfare."

Now what is unfortunate about all this is that the effect of the language appears to have the court taking sides on the closed shop. It may believe that it has left to the States the decision as to whether they forbid or tolerate the closed shop. The court may think it has issued an even-handed decision. We submit that in sum it seems not to have done so. Instead of deciding the issue closely on the constitutional right of the States to regulate their internal affairs, the justices give the impression of disapproving the closed shop. They have, in effect, linked the closed shop to injurious practices and conditions offensive to the public welfare. Even though this may not be their intention, or at least not the intention of all the justices, it is, so we believe, a result.

AN OLD BRANDEIS LETTER

Justice Frankfurter's extended concurring opinion demonstrates this to a more marked degree. He is at great pains to say that the role of the Supreme Court is not to set social or economic policy. Pointing out that "Mr. Dooley's 'th' Supreme Coort follows th' iliction returns' expressed the wit of cynicism, not the demand of principle," Justice Frankfurter says that "it is right that the court should be indifferent to public temper and public wishes."

Moreover, he recalls that Jefferson all his life thought of the court as an irresponsible body and says that "in the day-to-day working of our democracy it is vital that the power of the nondemocratic organ of our Government be exercised with rigorous self-restraint."

But having said this, Justice Frankfurter proceeds to throw away restraint. He literally studs his opinion with figures designed to show that the argument that a closed shop is needed by the unions does not stand up statistically. He presents tables of union membership and employment from 1898 to 1948 and similar tables concerning the membership of the railroad brotherhoods since 1919. He quotes the experience of countries advanced in industrial democracy, such as Great Britain and Sweden, where deeply rooted acceptance of the principles of collective bargaining is not reflected in uncompromising demands for contractually guaranteed security.

Then, as if to sweep the closed-shop adherents off their feet, Justice Frankfurter reaches back to 1912 to quote a letter from Louis D. Brandeis to Lincoln Steffens. The Supreme Court Justice-to-be said, 37 years ago: "The American people should not, and will not accept unionism if it involves the closed shop."

Several other extensive quotations from Brandeis in the Frankfurter opinion are calculated to argue against the closed shop. Justice Frankfurter sumarizes all this by saying: "Mr. Brandeis on the long view deemed the preferential shop a more reliable form of security both for unions and for society than the closed shop."

Now it happens that it was Justice Brandeis who in 1937 wrote the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Paul Senn, of Milwaukee, against the Tile Layers' Protective Union. Senn, a nonunion tile layer, hiring nonunion workmen, complained that union pickets deprived him of jobs and hence of his rights.

Justice Brandeis, not in a letter but in a considered decision, went to the heart of that issue. He said: "Each member of the unions, as well as Senn, has the right to strive to earn his living. Senn seeks to do so through exercise of his individual skill and planning. The union seeks to do so through combination. The disclosure of the facts may prevent Senn from securing jobs he hoped to get. But a hoped-for job is not property guaranteed by the Constitution, and the diversion of it to a competitor is not an invasion of a constitutional right."

AS IMPOSSIBLE AS FLYING

Where Justice Brandeis would have stood in the closed-shop cases today, we do not presume to say. We are sure of this however, he would not be bound by the past if he thought subsequent experience showed the need for change. In his memorable opinion in New State Ice Co. versus Leibman (1932), he took the view that Oklahoma had a right to enact a law prohibiting an increase in the number of ice companies unless the need for a new company in an area was certified by the State. He said:

"It is one of the happy incidents of the Federal system that a single courageous State may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory and try novel social and economic experiments without risk to the rest of the country. This court may strike down the statute * * * but in the exercise of this high power we must ever be on guard, lest we erect our prejudices into legal principles. If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

Noting that there are many men now living who were in the habit of using the age-old expression "It is as impossible as flying," Brandeis said: "The discoveries in physical science, triumphs in invention, attest to the value of the process of trial and error."

Perhaps the most notable appeal by Brandeis to his fellow Justices to search their souls rather than stay the hand of experimentation—whether in taxation or labor relations—came in his luminous opinion in Burnet against Coronado Oil and Gas Co. (1932). Asking the Court to reverse itself frankly and thus permit the taxation of incomes from leased State lands, then immune under outmoded precedents, he wrote:

"Not only may the decision of the fact have been rendered upon an inadequate presentation of the then existing conditions, but the conditions may have changed meanwhile. Moreover, the judgment of the Court in these earlier decisions may have been influenced by prevailing views as to economic or social policy which have since changed.

"In cases involving constitutional issues of the character discussed, this Court must, in order to reach sound conclusions, feel free to bring its opinions into agreement with experience and with facts newly ascertained, so that its judicial authority may, as Mr. Chief Justice Taney said, 'depend altogether on the force of the reasoning by which it is supported.' "

THE UNSETTLED STRIKE QUESTION

So much for Justice Frankfurter's reliance on Louis D. Brandeis to appraise the closed shop. The point is that all of this consideration of the closed shop as wise or unwise public policy is unnecessary in these State cases. It would have been enough to do as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes so often did. He said that it was immaterial whether he agreed or did not agree, that the States had a right to experiment and that was that. Holmes had his say in such cases briefly and was done with it.

Justice Frankfurter notes that in 1948 the voters of three States, Maine, Massachusetts, and New Mexico, rejected anticlosed shop and otherwise labor-restricting measures. He suggests that what one State can refuse to do another can undo.

But—and here is grave danger in the decision—can a State, if it so desires, guarantee labor's right to a closed shop without running into conflict with this new decision? Can a State's experiment be just the opposite of the experiment which the Court has now upheld? Has the Court not made it possible for opponents of the closed shop to argue that such experimentation in permitting the closed shop is unconstitutional? In what position has the Court left a union whose members prefer to go on strike for a closed shop rather than work with nonunion employees?

This last question is one Justice Rutledge found unanswered in Justice Black's opinion. Accordingly, on this matter Justice Rutledge's reserved judgment "until it is squarely and inescapably presented"—probably under strike conditions, since these cases were tests that did not involve closed-shop strikes.

The closed-shop principle appeared in union rules as early as 1799 and by 1842 a closed-shop strike was upheld in court in Massachusetts. That there have been abuses is a matter of common knowledge. It is also a matter of common knowledge that the closed shop has worked not only satisfactorily, but with notable social and educational benefit in many instances.

FOR WISE PUBLIC POLICY

Such a case is that of the International Ladies' Garment Workers. It is altogether possible for a closed-shop union to show complete awareness of its responsibility to use its power for good. The record is not so black as Marquis Childs seems to suggest in his comment under today's cartoon, though admittedly there are some kinds of work for which the closed shop may be unsuited and some other kind of shop is preferable.

One of the most mistaken provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act was that outlawing the closed shop in interstate commerce industries. It is a provision that should be taken off the Nation's lawbooks by the new Congress. Neither Members of Congress nor members of State legislatures should be confused by this unfortunately timed Supreme Court decision. The only sound course for our lawmakers is to work out wise public policies and leave them for the judiciary to approve.

For sooner or later the Supreme Justices will have another go at the question of the closed shop and the free rider it seeks to eliminate.

God Hates a Coward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, if our constitutional form of government is to survive, it must do so consistent with the check and balance system of two strong political parties.

I have been deeply impressed with an editorial in the Omaha World-Herald of January 26, 1949. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

GOD HATES A COWARD

That's gospel truth. If any witness were needed to attest it the Republican Party of 1936–1948 would more than suffice.

For 12 years the Republican Party has been a coward; the worst kind of coward—a moral coward. In consequence it begins to take on the appearance of something the cat dragged in.

It is hard to define as an entity the Republican Party or any other large group of people, since however closely banded together all cannot think alike in all respects. But, speaking broadly, the Republican Party consists of men and women who in firm conviction are opposed to the swift trend toward the omnipotent state that is sweeping over every section of the earth. Whether it be defined as communism, fascism, socialism, totalitarianism, statism, the New Deal, the insurance state, these men and women regard it as a thing of infinite menace, however cunningly disguised, and however ardently supported by good but misguided people.

But the Republican Party has lacked the courage to say what its rank and file believe. Out of hunger for the flesh pots it has lacked the patriotism, the loyalty, to stand up for the free Republic of the founding fathers and to fight for it. Due to that lack of moral courage, of loyalty to the American creed, the United States, almost the sole remaining bulwark against the advancing tide, finds itself without a spokesman, without a champion to proclaim and battle for its traditional, glorious creed. And it finds the once-so-firm foundations of its temple crumbling.

The fact is known of all men.

Here too, in our own America, the state is taking control and ownership of the people. It is using the power to tax to destroy their independence and self-reliance. It is converting free men into vassals and dependents. It is devouring the substance of self-supporting people to render them self-supporting no longer, and to establish a condition of universal reliance upon the biased paternalism of a Great White Father—a "Father" corrupted and corrupting, since great power does corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

And the Republican Party has not dared resist the tide; it has gone along with it. Not out of conviction, but out of cowardice. It has not dared to be a Daniel; to have a purpose and to make it known. Its plea for votes has been the shameful one: Give us the offices, the power, and we'll give you as much

of what we believe to be wrong as will the Democrats themselves.

Americans do not respond to any such appeal. They, too, hate a coward. They despise hypocrisy. They hunger for a leadership of good faith. They will accept a brave and fighting leadership tainted even with Pendergastism and absolutism rather than a leadership that crawls—and trails its flag.

What a wonderful thing it would be if the Republican National Committee meeting here in Omaha, if other constituted Republican leaders, could realize how desperately these United States need an honest and brave Republican Party—how true Republicans above all others hunger and thirst for it. A Republican Party to raise high the flag of a loyal opposition. Opposition not alone to a misguided and recreant Democratic Party here at home, but opposition tenacious and resolute, brave and unyielding, to all the monstrous wrong and error that today menaces freedom, self-reliance, the courage to adventure, human dignity, in every land and every clime.

How joyously, with what reborn hope, men and women of the ancient faith of this Republic would rally about such a standard. Proud of it they would be in victory. No less proud in defeat.

Surely, surely, it shall not be recorded by amazed historians of a later day that when the black flag of absolutism was raised back in the twentieth century, when the fate of all mankind was involved, there was nowhere, in any land, not even our own, an organized body of men and women who had the courage, the devotion, the wisdom, the loyalty to God who made men free, to challenge that foul intruder and to dedicate their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor, to driving him back into the Dark Ages whence he emerged.

Never has there been sounded such a call to service as rings today in the ears of the Republican Party. Never, for men and women of courage, of character, of conviction, has there been afforded such an occasion for rising to the heights of human devotion to imperishable ideals.

The Republican Party can keep on crawling ignominiously along the dusty trail of an order it abhors but shrinks from challenging. Or it can rise out of the dust of four merited defeats, stand erect and unafraid, proudly to take up the battle for all that free men prize.

Courage or cowardice? Loyalty or recreancy? Conviction or time serving?

It is as simple as that, ladies and gentlemen of the Republican National Committee.

TVA To Remain Independent—Hoover Commission Recommends That This Great Government Project Not Be Merged With Functions of Interior Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a news story written by Mr. J. Lacey Reynolds, Washington correspondent for a number of papers in the South and Southwest, concerning results of the Hoover Commission report with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The news story, indicating that study of the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority has been successful and that this agency is performing a useful service and doing a good job, is in line with the favor of the people of the Tennessee Valley area and the news of action recommended in this instance is gladly received.

The news story is as follows:

COMMISSION BACKS TVA INDEPENDENCE—HOOVER GROUP EXEMPTS PROJECT FROM INTERIOR DEPARTMENT MERGER

(By J. Lacey Reynolds)

WASHINGTON.—The Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Federal Government has exempted TVA from absorption into the Interior Department, it was learned exclusively yesterday.

The exemption was voted by the Commission in executive session Thursday over the opposition of former President Herbert Hoover and the so-called task force of experts who studied the Government's power activities.

The task force's original report and the initial action of the Commission would have lumped the power activities of the Government under Interior and included the TVA.

The task force even recommended that the Secretary of Interior or Under Secretary sit as a member of the TVA Board of Directors.

STRUCK FROM REPORT

Upon reconsideration, the Commission struck all such suggestions about TVA from its forthcoming report on water resources projects.

A reliable source said the action was taken by a majority of the Commissioners "because they felt TVA is doing such a good job."

In fact, the labor-relations policies of TVA will be recommended to other Government agencies in another of the Hoover Commission reports, this source said.

The argument for placing TVA under Interior revolved around the contention the President is overburdened because of the number of extraneous agencies reporting to him.

Although the Commission favors reduction in the number of such reports direct to the President, it made TVA an exception. The net result is to maintain the independence of the TVA and retain administrative direction of the project in the Tennessee Valley, rather than in Washington.

Kingsdale Dairies Unmasked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month some newspaper columnists and oleo-minded people made considerable fuss over a letter which Kingsdale Dairies, of New York City, sent to Members of Congress urging repeal of the Federal tax on yellow-colored oleo.

The letter was hailed by Drew Pearson as lobbying for the public good, which he called rare indeed.

But before anyone gets too enthused over the letter or the comments, he should be informed of the real motive of the sender. For that information, and for a complete rebuttal of the letter's inferences, I submit herewith a copy of the letter which Mr. Milo K. Swanton, of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, addressed to Drew Pearson:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE,
Madison, Wis., February 7, 1949.

Mr. DREW PEARSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: On February 1, 1949, in your syndicated column in a Madison newspaper you paid tribute to the Kingsdale Dairies, of New York City, for their letter urging Congress to legalize the sale of oleomargarine tax free in complete imitation of butter. In praising the Kingsdale Dairies you state "such a letter—lobbying against the sender's interest for the public good is rare indeed. Congratulations."

In your column you referred to Kingsdale Dairies as a producer. The facts are, Mr. Pearson, that the Kingsdale Dairies is not a producer. It does not produce, process, or manufacture any dairy products.

The Kingsdale Dairies is owned by Benjamin Redman, whose name, before having it legally changed, was Benjamin Rothenberg.

Mr. Redman is a dealer. He buys and sells butter, cheese, eggs, and oleomargarine. In fact, he handles two brands of oleo. One brand is Numaid, manufactured by the Miami Margarine Co., of Cincinnati. The other brand is Viola, which is a less-known trade name in the oleo world.

I think that you should know that Mr. Redman has a still deeper interest than the ordinary handler of oleo. He wants to expand his oleo business so as to have it shipped to him in bulk form. The reason is that he was the original inventor of a chiplet machine used in chipping butter. It seems that Mr. Redman was the original owner of the patent on this chipping machine for which he charges one-fourth cent per pound royalty. He would like to expand the use of this machine in the chipping of oleo.

The last week in January 1949, when customers opened their boxes of chipped butter, chipped by the Kingsdale Dairies, they found enclosed in each box a folder urging the use of oleo. Yet, when asked about this enclosure, Mr. Redman claimed to have no knowledge of it.

Mr. Pearson, it seems to me that before lending the prestige of your column you should look the whole facts in the face. I believe it is only fair to yourself as well as to the millions of people who read your column that you pull back the curtain of reality to determine the real influences behind the oleomargarine scene.

The facts I have given you should make it very plain to you that Mr. Redman has a very personal ax to grind. In reality he has no real interest in either the welfare of consumers or producers of dairy products that would warrant your broadly publicized congratulations.

It should now be plain to you that Kingsdale Dairies is not making any confession that they have nothing to fear from the removal of oleo taxes or from the removal of yellow color restrictions. It should be clear to you that Mr. Redman has everything to gain if Congress carries out the request he has made in his statement, which, in reality, is a proclamation of his personal interest.

Mr. Redman's letter states that he has no fear of fraud. Why should he have any fear? He is in a position to profit from the sale of oleo, which, if colored yellow like butter, is intended to be a fraud. Mr. Redman minimizes the danger of substitution even though a careful survey has shown that one-third of the public eating houses in eight States serve yellow oleo interchangeably with butter.

Through your column you have helped broadcast Mr. Redman's weasel words about "favoring one industry by restricting another." The dairy industry has no desire to restrict the oleo industry. The dairy industry asks only for fair play for the dairymen by eliminating oleo's determination to parade in false colors which makes oleo guilty of an unfair trade practice against the dairy industry and guilty of confusion and deception against the interest of consumers.

The dairy industry promises never to imitate whatever color the oleo people adopt and guarantees to support the repeal of oleo license fees and taxes the moment the oleo monopoly ceases its unfair trade practice of consumer deception by coloring their product in imitation of butter. In this the dairy industry has made a definite guaranty, but we have yet to hear a comparable guaranty from the oleo monopoly.

On the issue of allegedly favoring one industry at the expense of another, let us look at the facts. The oleo industry is protected by a 15-cent-per-pound import duty. If any vegetable oils are imported which might be used in making oleo, there is a further tax of 7 cents per pound. The protection to the dairy industry against imported butter is only 7 cents per pound.

The oleo makers can combine any number of various fats and oils. The butter industry can use only one fat. Oleo can be made with a preservative. Butter cannot.

In regard to comparability of tax treatment let me add further that if butter is made by the processes of heating and refining, similar to the processes used in making oleo, it must pay the same one-fourth cent per pound Federal tax. If butter is made with some fat other than butterfat it must be plainly labeled "adulterated" and must pay the same 10 cents per pound Federal tax that is paid on yellow oleo. In many States the sale of such butter is prohibited even though it is a nutritious food product.

Mr. Pearson, these are facts you should know before lending the prestige of your column in support of the hidden interests of men like Mr. Redman. A retraction by you of the support you have given to Mr. Redman would be of two-fold benefit. It would help to protect consumers against confusion and deception. It might help to end the oleo monopoly's unfair trade practices that today are threatening the welfare of millions of family-sized dairy farms in America.

Sincerely yours,

MILO K. SWANTON,
Executive Secretary.

Levy on Public Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, on January 25 to be exact, I introduced H. R. 1822. This bill is one to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies.

At the time I introduced H. R. 1822, I submitted for the RECORD and for the information of the distinguished Members of this House a statement emphasizing the need for enactment of this bill, and also directed attention to the invaluable and unselfish services rendered by volunteer fire companies throughout the United States.

In connection with H. R. 1822 there appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer a splendid article by the able columnist, Mr. Herman A. Lowe, which I wish to include as a part of my remarks at this time:

LEVY ON PUBLIC PROTECTION—BILL BANS TAX ON DONATIONS TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—If you live in Philadelphia, a share of your municipal taxes goes to support the paid fire department. Your city taxes are a deductible item in making out your Federal income-tax return.

But if you should reside across the line in Flourtown, Montgomery County, and make a donation to the support of that community's volunteer fire company, the donation—whether it be large or small—is not a deductible item under the Federal income-tax law.

Philadelphia's paid fire department protects the property of all the inhabitants, the property of the municipality, and even the tax-free property of Uncle Sam, such as post-office buildings and the mint.

The volunteer fire companies of smaller towns also protect the property of all the residents, of the local governments, and even post-office buildings and other Federal property. Contributions to these companies go to buy uniforms, fire-fighting equipment, and the like.

So the interesting point arises—why should Uncle Sam demand his pound of flesh on such contributions?

In the Eightieth Congress, Representative J. CALEB BOGGS, Republican, of Delaware, introduced a bill to make these contributions exempt from Federal income tax. His bill got nowhere. But he reintroduced it the other day.

At first careless glance, you might decide—why shouldn't he? The State of Delaware has only one paid, professional fire department, the one in Wilmington. All the others, about 45, are volunteer companies.

That would be short-sighted. Pennsylvania is the virtual seedbed of volunteer fire companies.

Pennsylvania leads the Nation in volunteer fire fighters, so it behooves the Commonwealth's Federal legislators to get behind the Boggs bill.

The Keystone State has approximately 200,000 volunteer firemen. They are grouped into about 4,000 volunteer fire companies. Outside of about 20 to 25 large communities, the volunteers fight all the fires in the State. In some communities, a small share of municipal funds is given toward the support of these companies—particularly for the salaries of a handful of salaried drivers of the big mechanical equipment. The large part of the bill is paid by contributors.

Yet, our Federal tax law is so drawn that the contributions are not tax exempt.

In the United States as a whole there are about 650,000 volunteer firemen, contrasted to only 81,000 paid firemen. And there are from 14,000 to 15,000 volunteer companies, as against only 1,000 or so fully paid fire departments.

Even New Jersey (where the ratio of paid fire departments is much higher than in Pennsylvania) has several hundred volunteer companies. The International Association of Fire Fighters, an AFL international union composed of paid firemen, admits that in no State of the Union are there nearly as many paid firemen as there are volunteer firemen.

Which gives a pretty good idea of the importance of the volunteers in safeguarding the Nation's property.

"In nearly all the communities throughout the Nation served by volunteer fire companies," says Representative BOGGS, "our Federal Government has post offices and other public buildings and properties of tremendous value. For the protection of these public buildings from destruction by fire, our Government is wholly dependent upon the unselfish services of the volunteer firemen.

"I am not suggesting that these firemen be paid or that they receive any Federal subsidy, but I do say that we should enable these companies to raise larger sums of money by reason of tax exemption to donors so that our public property may be more adequately protected.

"Volunteer fire companies are to a very large extent educational organizations. For many years, in thousands of communities, they have conducted campaigns to educate the public in fire prevention. The number of lives and the property values saved from the ravages of preventable fires cannot be ascertained in dollars.

"Everyone who has ever lived in a rural community also knows that the very existence of a volunteer fire company represents an actual annual dollar savings to him by reason of reduced fire insurance rates. Our Federal Government is enjoying the same saving on the insurance on its public buildings."

The Defeated People in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, Mrs. James Morris, of Bismarck, N. Dak., addressed the Congressional Club in Washington. Her remarks deserve perpetuation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Her message is one that should be understood by all people in this country. I am including it as part of my remarks as follows:

Madam President, members and guests of the Congressional Club, to have the opportunity to address this club, founded in this beautiful capital city over 40 years ago, which was conceived with the purpose of good fellowship and has maintained it, is a coveted privilege. To have the pleasure just to look at you, who are so representative of the best of America's gracious and competent womanhood, is recompense enough for looking upon a miserable, defeated people during the year I spent in Nuremberg, Germany, as the wife of one of the judges serving upon War Crimes Tribunal No. 6, which tried the I. G. Farben case, which is now jurisprudence history.

Blessed America! Whose womanhood could blossom forth in the new look during the year I was away, taking the new hats, the gowns, and the shoes for granted, even as she takes her birthright of American democracy.

Because the accident of birth made me an American, and the beneficiary of that democracy, I appreciate, more deeply than ever before, its privileges and the duty I owe to others to give to them a glimpse of life in a defeated Germany and what it would mean to be a defeated people. In all honesty, I can give you but a glimpse, for no one who is not one of a defeated people themselves could possibly know.

In giving to you these high lights of defeat, may I preface this necessarily personal story upon the two-fold premise: First, that the German people brought a well-merited defeat upon themselves by following a crim-

inal leadership; secondly, that the early occupation of Germany was in accordance with the Morgenthau plan, which is rapidly being modified today, as it becomes more and more apparent that the rehabilitation of Germany, under proper controls, is necessary to the economic stability of western Europe.

In the Bremen enclave, which is an area of 1,200 square miles, on the Wesser River, stands the port of Bremerhaven, which was allotted to the United States during the war as our port of entry, and has since remained so.

When Judge Morris and I arrived in Bremerhaven on August 4, 1947, nothing that we had read or seen in print or on the screen had prepared us for the indescribable destruction which we saw. This great seaport, with a prewar population of some 50,000, had been 65 percent destroyed by Allied bombers within 17 minutes. The great docks were a mass of twisted steel, except those repaired for use, and block after block of public buildings and homes were a mass of brick rubble. Here and there parts of buildings were still standing, and our startled eyes beheld in many of those inhabited gay window boxes of flowers. Cellars had been roofed over, and people were living in all kinds of makeshift shelter.

The American military train, minus all luxuries, of course, in which we entrained for Frankfurt that afternoon, traveled through the British zone, with its great partially destroyed seaport of Bremen, before arriving in the American zone, which bespoke the friendship of our two nations.

When we arrived in Frankfurt the following morning our eyes again beheld the stark, tragic destruction of that great city, for it had been an industrial center, the financial capital of Germany and home of the world-famous I. G. Farben Chemical Works. The great factories were now destroyed or stilled, and the huge depot and public buildings and many homes partially destroyed or a mass of brick rubble, which was being cleared in many sections to make of Frankfurt the present headquarters of the American occupation.

The drive of a hundred miles from Frankfurt to Nuremberg was an unforgettable experience. The summer of 1947 was one of severe drought in Germany, and the harvest very poor. The people were living upon a diet of 1,200 calories per day, when they could get it, with fats, meats, and potatoes often unobtainable in their stores for weeks and months at a time.

All along the highway were men, women, and children, trudging along, or at best riding a bicycle, and gleaning what food they could from the surrounding fields. In the harvested wheat fields they gleaned, straw by straw, until they had a neat bundle for their rucksack. In the potato fields, on hands and knees, finding here and there a precious tuber. Underneath the fruit trees, which lined the highways and whose fruit is usually apportioned to the people of each respective village by its burgomaster, they searched for a stray apple or pear. The green grass along the roadside was being cut by hand for the few cattle they had. And in the forests, in accordance with their rigid conservation regulations, the people were picking up twigs and leaves for their neat bundles, until the forests looked as though they had been swept.

Stretching as far as the eye could see were seemingly vast farm lands, but in reality small individual farms averaging from 5 to 50 acres. The German farmer lives in small farm villages and tends his crops from these, often in primitive fashion, with oxen and scythe.

These quaint farm villages have narrow, winding streets and red-roofed tile buildings, some of them hundreds of years old.

In spite of the destruction of the cities we passed through, we found Germany a beautiful country, with its vast forest areas and its illusion of vast farm lands, with its cities linked together by Hitler's magnificent modern highways, or autobahns, until we came, at eventide, to Nuremberg, our final destination.

Nuremberg, founded in 1050, as a center of international trade, later one of the art and cultural centers of Europe, made famous by Albrecht Durer, Hans Sachs, and Peter Henlein, whose old walled city had been a mecca of tourists for generations, now presented to our shocked eyes, a scene of indescribable destruction and desolation.

The scene of Hitler's first triumphs and shrine of nazism, Nuremberg had witnessed their gigantic parades within its huge stadium, which seated 500,000 people and from whose famous balcony, Hitler had reviewed his troops and exhorted his people to a patriotic frenzy. I stood on the famous balcony and watched an unkempt German woman pull the grass of the little green plot that grew at the base of that huge, deserted balcony, where once the great of Germany had trod, and put it in her rucksack.

From that famous balcony, I could look across Hitler's artificial lake, to his immense, circular, unfinished World Congress Building, which was to be Hitler's Capital of the World and house the representatives of those nations included. In the other direction, I could see the tall pillars of Hitler's unfinished stadium, which was to be the largest in the world, seating 800,000 people.

Truly, Hitler thought in terms of magnificence always, and had so convinced the people of Nuremberg of his greatness, that his storm troopers, entrenched within the old walled city, refused to surrender it or to declare it an open city. It was, therefore, of necessity, 75-percent destroyed by Allied bombers, within 20 minutes. The memorial wreaths of flowers or cedar that we often saw placed upon the piles of brick rubble were a grim reminder of what lay beneath.

The first day after arrival in Nuremberg, I stood on the balconies of the Grand Hotel and looked out over the ruins of the old, walled city. I could see the Kaiserschloss, or castle, atop the hill, which had housed units of the Hitler Youth, when bombed. I could see the world renowned Gothic churches of St. Laurence, St. Seybold, and Our Lady, completely gutted, but being lovingly and patiently restored, stone by stone, standing in the midst of, perhaps, the most awesome ruins of all Germany, whose streets led away into mere footpaths over hills of rubble.

Below me was the city square, just outside the old wall and city gate. On one side was the huge and partially destroyed depot; on the other, the old Roman Tower, with gay window boxes at its ancient portholes, which bespoke habitation.

As I stood there, across the square, came an old lady, clad in a once beautiful gray satin dress, pulling a four-wheeled cart of firewood. Below me, in front of the door of the hotel, was another, clad almost in rags, picking up the bits of paper and burned matches, with which to start her fire. Across the street intersection came an old couple pulling a four-wheeled cart, upon which reposed a simple, wooden casket. Down the other street came a man on crude sticks for crutches, his coat indicating that he had once been an officer in the German Army. They came, young men, old men, women, and children, clad in all kinds of garments which indicated anything but the new look, wearing all kinds of broken and fabric shoes upon their feet, and bearing all kinds of burdens in cart, rucksack, or handbag.

This then, was my first glimpse of defeat, within the 3 days' time of debarking until we were comfortably billeted in Nuremberg.

This was defeat I saw, not of armies, but of a great civilian population.

I stood there on that balcony and wondered what defeat would have been like for us, if our victory had been reversed. I wondered, too, what modern warfare would be like today, with assuredly America the first target, and with atom bombs loosed from rocket ships with a speed swifter than sound, which could lay waste our great harbors and industrial cities, in much less than 17 or 20 minutes.

I stood there on that balcony and thanked God over and over that the accident of birth had made me an American, instead of one of those hopeless, misguided people I saw out there.

For I realized then, as never before, that but for the grace of God in giving to America priority on the atom bomb, and the valor of our manhood and womanhood, at the front line and the production line, that port of Bremerhaven that we had entered might still have been standing, and that great, proud American harbor of New York that we had left might have been a mass of twisted steel and concrete rubble; and our great industrial cities destroyed, with their factories destroyed or dismantled and their workers gleaning in the fields for a bit of food.

Blessed America. With hope always, for a still more glorious future than her past and who has never known the bitterness of defeat, as a united Nation.

In subsequent travels throughout Germany, we became so accustomed to scenes of destruction that they no longer registered a shock to the senses.

Someone has said that, in the division of Germany, Russia was given its rich farm lands, Britain the Ruhr, France the Saar, and America the scenery. Certainly, Bavaria, in the American zone, is so noted for the magnificence of its Alpine scenery that Hitler chose a site there, near Berchtesgaden, on Mount Kelstein, for the cabin where he wrote Mein Kampf and later built his home and, atop the mountain, his Tiehaus, rechristened by the Americans the Eagle's Nest.

We were privileged to spend a week end at Berchtesgaden Hof, which was Hitler's beautiful hotel and is now an American rest center.

Halfway up the mountainside stands the ruins of Hitler's home, the homes of Goering and Bormann, the guest house of Mussolini, a huge hotel and garrison. These buildings were so well camouflaged and protected by artificial fog, which was released from huge hydrants when Allied bombers were detected, that Hitler's Storm Troopers finally destroyed them and the Eagle's Nest is still intact. Americans are allowed to reach the Eagle's Nest in summer, in a jeep driven upon a tortuous mountain road that winds around the mountain, passing guardhouses at intervals, once equipped with telephones.

One finally leaves the jeep and enters a long tunnel through which Hitler's Mercedes car, specially equipped to climb the mountain, and once been driven to an elevator. One enters the elevator, which is of ornate brass, with two floors. The upper compartment was for Hitler and the lower one for his guards, whose conversation, unknown to them, was registered by a microphone in Hitler's upper compartment.

One ascends in this elevator, through sheer rock, 400 feet to the Tiehaus, or Eagle's Nest, which was once sumptuously furnished and is now dismantled. The Eagle's Nest was used only for entertaining and Hitler is reported to have used it only five times in all, although the road alone cost millions of marks to build and maintain. It is truly the dream of a mad man.

We stood in the sumptuous picture windows of Hitler's home and Tiehaus, even as Hitler himself must have done, and gazed out over the mountains of Germany and Austria, to the magnificent panorama spread

out far below, to the colorful Bavarian villages, with their quaint balconied homes, upon whose walls were often inscribed religious paintings. We wondered how any man, unless mad, could so love beauty of nature and architecture and yet plan such diabolical crimes against humanity in that gorgeous setting. We wondered most of all how any educated, cultured, industrious, and religious people, whose beautiful old churches and cathedrals were the very first buildings to be restored and were so well kept and well attended, could so blindly follow such a criminal leadership and allow their money to be used for such crazy ventures as the Tiehaus.

We glimpsed the answer to that question when our young German guide suggested that we visit the fabulous castles of King Ludwig of Bavaria found in that vicinity, which are almost a shrine to the German people today.

At Chiensee, we found that the mad King of Bavaria had builded an unfinished replica of the Palace of Versailles, with its Hall of Mirrors more beautifully kept than that of the original. At Garmish, the Linderhof Castle was complete and utterly fantastic in the beauty of its gardens, fountains, and statuary, with its interior decorated in priceless gold leaf, paintings, and porcelains.

When we suggested to our young German guide that these castles must have cost the people of Bavaria millions of marks to build, he replied that King Ludwig had vast holdings and had built them himself. When we further suggested that King Ludwig's holdings had originally come from the people themselves, he was utterly speechless, for the thought had evidently never occurred to him before. He, like his people, live in the glories of a past feudal system, almost revering the old castles one finds in every city and village, and the history of a bygone era.

For generations the people of Germany have been educated in the "fuehrer" principle of government, of following a leader, and presumably their leader could do no wrong. Certainly, at first, they believed that Hitler could do no wrong, blindly believing his promises, as he pitted one class and one race against another, until it was too late, and they were enmeshed in the sinister military power of Hitler's stormtroopers and Gestapo.

This, following a criminal leadership, was the basic plea of almost every one of the defendants tried in the respective war-crimes tribunals soon to be terminated. I sat in the beautiful Palace of Justice, in the large courtroom where Goering and other satellites of Hitler had been tried and where now the I. G. Farben case was in session, and listened to the final pleas of the 23 defendants in their own behalf. It was, again, a tragic and sordid story of famous chemists and industrialists following a criminal leadership.

Germany's leadership will have received its punishment, with the termination of the War Crimes Tribunals, with the result that never again can any nation wage aggressive war and commit crimes against humanity, without, not only the nation receiving punishment, as heretofore prescribed by international law, but its leadership as well.

Whether or not we approved the validity or justice of these courts is beside the point. The fact remains that we have set the pattern. They will soon be history and history that America helped to write.

It would therefore seem that if any permanent good is to result from these trials they should be made the basis of an international code, providing for the just punishment of the criminal leadership of a nation, as well as the present provisions of sanctions, indemnities, and reparations, now invoked and exacted from nations.

How great was the crime of German leadership against their own people, we realized as never before when we drove through the great industrial areas of the Saar and the Ruhr, for on VE-day one-fourth of all German industry lay destroyed.

This was the death knell which heralded surrender, for the 70,000,000 people of Germany have always lived by exporting manufactured goods in return for food. Here, in this economic heartbeat of western Europe we found great factories, not only destroyed and stilled, but being dismantled for war reparations. In October 1947, the American, British, and French authorities published a list of 918 factories already dismantled in the three zones. But, in July 1948, the report of American military government revealed that the dismantling of German industrial plants in the American zone for war reparations had been virtually concluded.

This meant that the industrial capacity remaining there was virtually assured that it could now begin to work for the peacetime recovery of Germany. It meant much more than that. It meant that once again the German people might enjoy that greatest boon of all mankind, a job, and earn for themselves, food, shelter, warmth, and clothing. All life in Germany revolves around these four essentials of life, especially for its women, who outnumber its men by 7,500,000.

Before we left Germany, the first week of August 1948, we had witnessed a bumper crop in Germany and the reconversion of its currency, with the result that food was once more to be found in German shops, although very high in price. The basic food ration had also been stepped up. Today, food is being used as the incentive to put people back to work again, to force the production of coal and to use coal as the dynamic means of reviving industry within Bizonia.

As one official said to me, "When the German people go to work again, their hopelessness will disappear and they will stop the spread of communism west of the iron curtain." This is the hope of America for the older generation of Germany.

The hope of America for its youth lies in their reeducation, which is proving very difficult. The widespread destruction of their schools and denazification of their teachers has made a minimum of both available. Democracy was being taught, not in sunny schoolrooms, but in cold, unheated, gray ruins, with conditions so crowded that the children went to school in relays of a few hours each.

Whether or not we sell democracy to Germany, in my estimation, will depend upon how well we sell it to her youth and to her womanhood. You will recall that Napoleon sought to impose a form of democracy upon Germany which only intensified her nationalism. Democracy came again, with the advent of the Weimar Republic, after a lost war, as an imposed blessing and was rejected. Today, for the third time, the victor nations offer the blessing of democracy to the German people in opposition to communism.

I have found over here that, within the past year, Americans have had to ask themselves this question, Will democracy be accepted by the German people this time, if again synchronized with hunger and distress, or predicated upon a short-range program which would allow communism to move in when democracy moved out? It would seem that our Berlin lift has been our temporary answer.

I have found, too, that Americans have had to ask themselves another question within the past year, Can democracy be brought to any people, in one decade, who have followed the fuehrer principle of government for generations? It would seem that the proposed three-power controls of the Saar and the Ruhr and the economic recovery program is again our temporary answer.

But finally, it seems to me, this question resolves itself for all Americans to answer, "What is it that America has wanted from Europe in fighting two world wars and that she still wants today?"

I believe we can all agree upon the answer to the last question.

America has wanted a peace that would make America and the world safe for democracy. But peace, like victory, must be earned, step by step.

Today, America has finally awakened to the fact that, whether she wishes it or not, she has been given the place of world leadership among nations. But America is just beginning to realize that the nation that carries the lantern for democracy must walk ahead.

Blessed America! Given through the grace of God and the valor of her manhood and womanhood, the beacon light of leadership for the world. Let us thank God, every day, that the accident of birth made us Americans, with the privilege of sharing in that challenge, and willing to do our part. Let us have faith that we can achieve the peace, even as we achieved the victory. For faith ever marches at the head of the army of democracy, and the peace of this world will be what Americans believe it can be, and work to bring into reality.

The Need for a Single Supply Catalog for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the following are excerpts from an article written by an ex-soldier of World War II. The article, which in 1947 won a prize given by the National Association of Purchasing Agents, gives an account of some of the experiences which the author encountered during five years of warfare including five major campaigns.

Lieutenant Colonel Rathbun, of Palo Alto, Calif., the author of the article, has as a result of these campaigns almost completely lost the sight of both eyes.

Excerpts from Colonel Rathbun's article follows:

The author finds that writing this manuscript affords an excellent opportunity to present to the National Association of Purchasing Agents some facts pertaining to the United States Armed Forces procurement and supply organizations as seen by a line officer of the United States Army Ground Forces in his travels throughout the world; statements collected from other service personnel; and a general plan that would alleviate some of the current malpractices. It in no way represents anything other than the personal opinion and observations of the author. If there is any similarity with any other written document or manuscript it is strictly coincidental.

During the period between 1941 and 1946 the author had the pleasure of participating in five major Army-Navy amphibious operations and several amphibious maneuvers. In all of these operations the problem of supply constituted one of the primary problems of both Army and Navy commanders, high and low. All officers were directly affected by this problem, while many, including the author, were responsible for maintenance of adequate supplies to the front-line forces. As will be brought out later in

greater detail, this problem could not be segregated into two separate categories, i. e., Army and Navy, but had to be attacked and solved jointly by both groups. The fact that there were two separate groups with responsibilities to two different heads only complicated procedures and hindered the successful prosecution of the war.

In addition to the author's private experiences and observations, many other officers of all branches of the armed forces whose experiences occurred in other theaters of operation have been interviewed on the subject. As a whole, the fallacies of decentralization vary only in degree of intensity. It must be noted that the most flagrant incidents of maldistribution were in the Pacific theater, due largely to the magnitude and frequency of joint Army and Navy operations. Procurement inefficiencies, of course, were centered in the eastern United States, where lie the majority of the industrial centers. The prevailing opinion among the new ex-service personnel is that the United States won its battles not because of the supply system but despite it. It has also been suggested that much of the current economic maladjustment of false prosperity is the direct effect of inefficient governmental war purchasing.

By standardization and simplification of many of the services' specifications, purchases of materials can be made in larger quantities. Maintenance on these equipments used in all branches will cost less by lowering the necessity of large inventories of different kinds of spare parts, quicker replacement of parts, cheaper training costs of maintenance presumed, and the ability to salvage parts to repair other equipment. All services used the world-famous one-fourth ton 4 by 4 "jeep." Each supply unit had to carry a stock of spare parts for this vehicle. The fact that there were both Fords and Willys used only increased the problem. If there had been only one standard make (that is, one standard specification for all manufacturers) and only one supply of parts at each geographical base, parts would have been easier to secure when needed and still have a lower total supply. As it was, if one unit ran short of parts, it had to go to its own base of supply for replenishment regardless of distance—all other services were afraid to release parts to another service for fear of running short.

Along the same line, many shiploads of supplies went overseas unnecessarily due to the lack of proper distribution of supplies already in the area. Under one head (and one identification system) such supplies could have been properly distributed to those who needed them and only that amount of additional material would have had to be shipped. This would have permitted the shipment of other more necessary equipment at a much earlier date and combat operations would not have had to be delayed. Such a delay of only a few days may lengthen the war many months. The lack of gasoline in France during September 1944 brought the Allied armored advance to a halt, giving the German forces time to reorganize and continue the war many months longer than was necessary. Not only did the delay cost money but it cost the Allies dearly in lives.

The vast variation in specifications only increased the cost of the materials by necessitating increased production costs. It is cheaper to produce a million items to 1 specification than it is to produce 10 lots of 100,000 to 10 different specifications. There is the cost of set-up training personnel, trial runs, ironing out the bugs, and the delays, all of which increase the unit cost. Since most contracts were cost plus, it was the taxpayers' loss rather than that of the producer. Standardization of specifications between the services will eliminate much of this cost and increase the production efficiency of the Nation in time of emergency.

It is a corollary to the above statement that the longer the production run is, the fewer poor-grade items are produced and the higher the standard of quality of equipment that reaches the armed forces. Such was the case of the C–47 transport plane. The producer had been manufacturing them for the air lines, and by not having to change his production set-up, he supplied the Air Forces with the most reliable transport plane of the war.

A good example of lack of coordination in standardization between services can be seen in the case of the Army-marine controversy over the adoption of the new semiautomatic rifle just before the war. A marine developed a new semiautomatic rifle and at the same time Garand developed the now famous Garand M–1. Many tests were made, and it was eventually decided by the General Staff to adopt the Garand M–1 as the primary rifle for all the services. Top marine and Navy officers objected loud and long, claiming graft, foul play, and conspiracy, but of no avail. The new rifle was adopted, and used throughout the Army with great success. It is claimed that it gave the American forces enough added firepower to be able to make successful attacks with only half the number previously required. For all of this, the marines refused to accept or use the new rifle even after the weapon had been proven in war. The prejudice was limited strictly to the high brass.

On the battlefields of the Pacific, where both marines and soldiers were fighting side by side, marine riflemen would discard the old 1903 bolt-action rifle every time they could find an M–1 dropped by some Army casualty. Some went even so far as stealing M–1's before they went into combat. The effect of the Marine high command's policy can be seen in a study of casualty figures in battles where both soldiers and marines were involved; an excessive loss of life was the reward of such foolish prejudices.

A good example of specification variations can be seen in the instance of rope purchases by the Army and Navy early in the war. The rope in question was to be used to make debarkation nets, and to be used by Army landing parties. The Navy used theirs aboard ship, while the Army used their net both for training and aboard ship. Significantly enough, the Navy inspectors refused to accept rope made for the Army and vice versa. The exact difference between the specification standards is not known by the author as the incident was learned during the war, when such information was secret, but nevertheless it points out one of the thousands of inefficiencies that are now reflected in the magnitude of the national debt.

Quality control will be enhanced immeasurably by standardization and simplification. It is only reasonable that it is easier to control quality of fewer variations and the resultant smaller number of items. There will be fewer inspectors to manage and, with the greater quantity of each standardized item, these inspectors will become more skilled and specialized. The producers will be able to increase and maintain a steady quality of products by having longer production runs. Slight variations in requirements between the services such as color can be handled in the flexibility of specifications.

The American Nation cannot afford to allow tradition and custom to interfere with its survival. If it permits such ideas to prevail the United States is doomed to die as have all the other great powers of history. Each one, down through the ages, maintained its progress as long as it was young, but as soon as it grew old enough to develop traditions and customs with strength such as we have seen in the United States Navy, a younger nation unhampered in its desire to progress and adopt new ideas became the victor. Any member of the armed forces who spent any time on foreign soil can testify that both Europeans and Orientals are so steeped in tradition that they have become a menace to themselves. France was defeated by the Germans simply because she relied on the traditional type of trench warfare and defense lines. With all the previews of fast moving tactics in Spain, Ethiopia, and China, she refused to change—when the attack came and the Maginot Line was broken she had no mobile forces to stave off disaster.

The same was the case when the British sent out their two prize battleships off Singapore without air protection. Traditionally, battleships could not be sunk by air power, but the result is well known. As a result, naval warfare was radically changed. Even after such a concrete example the "old Navy brass" refused to put much stock in air power until the carrier task forces began to check the Jap advance in the South Pacific. Tradition is a great thing and impossible to do without when morale is concerned, but it must not become an anchor around the neck of the entire Nation's existence. It must not be construed that the author advocates abolition of tradition, but only such modifications that will allow the United States to protect itself effectively and efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, many such reports of similar experiences and recommendations have been received by Members of Congress. These letters and reports from ex-servicemen are valuable in helping us to understand the needs of the services.

Behind the Scenes With the Arizona Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, my State of California and its neighboring State of Arizona have been for some years engaged in a most serious controversy over division of the waters of the Colorado River.

As might be expected, we who have been defending California's position have been the subject of bitter attacks by the Arizona press. That in itself is inconsequential, as far as I am concerned. The propaganda that Arizona reporters have deemed it necessary to write deceives and injures only the newspaper readers of Arizona.

However, it appears that the Arizona forces have let their fanaticism carry them beyond ethical bounds. A situation has arisen which has prompted me to ask certain questions. They follow.

Is it permissible for a full-time Government employee to serve at the same time as a correspondent for a newspaper?

Is it proper that a full-time Government employee, with access to confidential Government information, work at the same time as a Washington correspondent?

In the Phoenix Republic, a daily Arizona newspaper, there appeared in the issue of February 8, 1949, a dispatch under the byline "By Uttis Peterson."

Above Mr. Peterson's name was this information: "Republic's Washington Bureau, 1397 National Press Building."

This identification, I suppose, means that the dispatch came from Washington, and was written by the Republic's correspondent, Mr. Peterson.

The headline on this dispatch was as follows: "Few of its creators 100 years ago would know Interior today."

The Department of the Interior informs me that Mr. Peterson has been regularly employed since January 19, 1949, in the information, or press, section of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The dispatch in question, appearing under Mr. Peterson's name, apparently was sent to Arizona February 7. That is the date on it. Yet, that was 18 days after Mr. Peterson was receiving a salary from the Interior Department as a full-time Government employee.

I know of my own knowledge that Mr. Peterson has been a Washington correspondent for the Phoenix Republic for some time. He has written innumerable propaganda stories about the Colorado River controversy, and has called upon me for information. When I questioned him about inaccuracies contained in his dispatches, his reply was that he was obliged to write what his employers wanted to publish.

Arizona now is engaged in a strenuous effort to secure congressional authorization for a billion-dollar reclamation project to rescue a few thousand acres of privately owned land in central Arizona. It is an interesting fact that the Phoenix Republic has contributed money to the lobby working for the proposed central Arizona project.

As a partisan of Arizona, and as a correspondent for the Phoenix Republic, Mr. Peterson is in a strategic position as a press officer of the Bureau of Reclamation. Presumably he advises newsmen who call there for information. Presumably he has not permitted his Government position to interrupt his journalistic endeavors.

I repeat: Is this permissible, and is it proper?

"Zionist Organization of America Should Dissolve," Says Washington Chapter, American Council for Judaism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news release from the Washington chapter of the American Council for Judaism, issued on February 17. It is as follows:

The board of directors of the Washington chapter of the American Council for Judaism today urged the dissolution of the Zionist Organization of America as a logical consequence of the United States grant of full recognition to Israel. This, the chapter pointed out, would be an appropriate action recognizing the full sovereignty of the new State and enabling it to stand on its own feet. At the same time it would make it unmistakably clear that Americans of Jewish faith were, in no sense, obligated to, or participants in, the national affairs of the state of Israel.

The very existence of a private organization like the Zionist Organization of America engaging in such nationalist-political activities as have occupied it up to the present, will serve only to interfere in the affairs of a now sovereign State of Israel. Conversely, the continued existence of the Zionist Organization of America will have the unfortunate effect of linking the nationalism of the sovereign State of Israel to the lives of Americans.

Furthermore, the dissolution of the Zionist Organization of America would make possible humanitarian and philanthropic support of those of Jewish faith and others in Israel, through the medium of organizations for charitable purposes and charitable purposes only.

The State of Israel has now been accorded de jure recognition by the United States and de facto recognition by many nations of western Europe. Since no foreign nation can have agencies of its nationalism operating in the United States, as American institutions, without damage to itself and America, it behooves the World Zionist Organization and its American affiliate, having achieved its objective of creating an independent State of Israel, forthwith to dissolve.

The Reader's Digest and the Real Estate Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of the House has received one or more copies of the reprint of the Reader's Digest article on rents in France. The following is an excellent analysis of that article. It appeared in the New York Post on February 17 in the column entitled "Washington Memo" written by Charles Van Devander, Oliver Pilat, James A. Wechsler, and William O. Player, Jr.

READER'S DIGEST DROPS NEUTRAL MASK AND GOES CRUSADING FOR LANDLORD LOBBY

WASHINGTON, February 17.—The Reader's Digest is a monthly magazine read by several million Americans who have never suspected that it would embark on a crusade. It is ostensibly a respectable, neutral journal devoted to the presentation of every side of every question. But this pale description must be drastically revised. The Digest is becoming a militant, fiery organ with deep convictions. Within the near future leaders of the real estate lobby may even be prepared to state publicly that this austere monthly journal is indispensable reading for patriots. The Digest no longer pretends to sit on the fence; it has aggressively joined the battle to destroy rent control.

Its venture into the realm of unpleasant controversy, however, has already produced a backfire; and in their sanctum at Pleasantville the Digest editors may be wondering whether there is any profit in preaching.

The story begins with the publication in the Digest this month of an article "No Vacancies." A promotion letter transmitted by the magazine to officials of real estate boards throughout the country reads in part:

"In the belief that it will be of particular interest to you, we enclose a copy of 'No Vacancies' by Bertrand de Jouvenel which is appearing in the February issue of the Reader's Digest. 'No Vacancies' describes the tragic effect of rent control of French housing, and draws a moral which is particularly pertinent at this time in our own country.

"Because the Reader's Digest believes this article to be timely and important, reprints are being offered at cost to interested individuals and organizations. If you feel that 'No Vacancies' should be seen by your friends and by leaders of thought in your community, you may obtain as many copies as you wish simply by dropping a note to the reprint department, the Reader's Digest. The price of 10 copies is 20 cents; of 100 copies, $1.50; of 1,000, $12.

"You may have other ideas for bringing the message of 'No Vacancies' to a still wider audience. If so, we should be very glad to hear from you."

One of those who received this objective, disinterested communication was Earl C. Burdic, president of the Nebraska Real Estate Association. Mr. Burdic does not conform to the usual stereotype of a real-estate lobbyist. He believes profiteering landlords are imperiling the status of all property owners. So he has sent this response to the magazine's invitation:

"No—we don't need any reprints of what is going on in France.

"And possibly you should stick to the printing and magazine business—and let Congress take care of the lawmaking. You will remember what happened to the Literary Digest. Also, please remember that tenants greatly outnumber landlords. If you want to get into housing, I would suggest that you impartially present a picture of both sides of rent control. Give us facts of and in America.

"Forget Europe—it never was a parallel for us to follow.

"In Norfolk, Nebr., a city of 12,000, we had no rent control until after the war was over and the boys were returning home. Why then? Because of runaway rent charges and demands made by some landlords. Greed and selfishness prevailed. Whereupon a United States office of rent control followed in our city—that is to say, they moved in and took charge. At first, I, like most realtors, was angry. I thought we had no use for such controls.

"However, as time went along and I saw and realized the magnitude of all injustices of exorbitant rent charges and unwarranted evictions, I, too, became somewhat converted in favor of the underdog.

"Let's don't forget, there's always two sides to every story."

In his voluminous mail yesterday, President Truman received a carbon copy of Mr. Burdic's letter to the editors.

That Tidelands Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth herewith an editorial from the Shreveport Journal of February 7, 1949, entitled "That Tidelands Threat":

THAT TIDELANDS THREAT

If anybody doubts the extreme menace to huge Louisiana income from tidelands usur-

pation demands by the National Government's anti-States' rights advocates, they are invited to consider this significant morsel of information reported from Baton Rouge by the New Orleans States' capital news bureau:

"Records in the office of Lucille May Grace, State register of the land office, disclosed that the State has been paid a total of $91,410,-356.76 in bonuses, royalties, and rentals from submerged lands in the Gulf, lands beneath the navigable waters, and on leases beyond the 3-mile limit."

These are among the lands which President Truman is on record as wishing the Federal Government to take control over, thereby depriving Louisiana and other coastal States of rights always considered theirs without question until the present Federal threat was instituted.

The threat is serious. The Nation's President has strong allies in his fight to deprive the States of their valuable tidelands—just another evidence of the trend toward centralized national government.

Assistant Attorney General John L. Madden, who has carried on the legal end of Louisiana's fight for these holdings for some years now, is in Washington at this time, as a member of Attorney General Boliver Kemp's personnel, to lend assistance in preparation of briefs to be presented to the United States Supreme Court with a view to halting United States Attorney General Tom Clark from pursuing his suit to obtain the tidelands for the National Government. This is proper activity by our State attorney general department. However, it is not all the State's official activity that should be put behind the movement to defeat the Truman plan. Every State official, as well as other citizens in position to lend aid to the resistance of the Government's grab program, should get vigorously into this scrap.

As shown by the report from the office of the register of the State land office, Louisiana has a gigantic source of revenue at stake in the tidelands litigation. No effort should be unexpended in this fight. Ninety-one million dollars is a huge sum of money, from which vast public benefit is made possible in Louisiana. The fund will grow, too. The National Government has no right to this property, but the national would-be usurpers, headed by President Truman, are determined to defeat the States in their endeavor to hold on to what by every logical and legal reason should be recognized as theirs in the future as in the past.

China—Statement of Hon. John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON GEORGE J. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the timely and interesting address delivered in Salem, Mass., on January 30, by my colleague, Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Boston, on the tragic story of China:

Over these past few days we have learned the extent of the disasters befalling China and the United States. Our relationship with China since the end of the Second World War has been a tragic one, and it is of the utmost importance that we search out and spotlight those who must bear the responsibility for our present predicament.

When we look at the ease with which the Communists have overthrown the National Government of Chiang Kai-shek, it comes as somewhat of a shock to remember that on November 22, 1941, our Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, handed Ambassador Namuru an ultimatum to the effect that: (1) Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and Indochina; (2) the United States and Japan will not support militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China.

It was clearly enunciated that the independence of China and the stability of the National Government was the fundamental object of our far eastern policy.

That this and other statements of our policies in the Far East led directly to the attack on Pearl Harbor is well known. And it might be said that we almost knowingly entered into combat with Japan to preserve the independence of China and the countries to the south of it. Contrast this policy which reached its height in 1943 when the United States and Britain agreed at Cairo to liberate China and return to that country at the end of the war Manchuria and all Japanese-held areas, to the confused and vacilating policy which we have followed since that day.

In 1944 Gen. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell presented a plan to arm 1,000,000 Chinese Communists, who had been carefully building their resources in preparation for a post-war seizure of power, and with them to capture Shanghai and clear the Yangtze. This plan was supported by some State Department officials, including Ambassador Clarence Gauss. Chiang Kai-shek refused to cooperate with this plan, which would have presented the Chinese Communists with an easy coup. Chiang requested that Stilwell be recalled, which caused such bitter comment in this country; and Gauss resigned. From this date on our relations with the National Government declined.

At the Yalta Conference in 1945 a sick Roosevelt, with the advice of General Marshall and other Chiefs of Staff, gave the Kurile Islands as well as the control of various strategic Chinese ports, such as Port Arthur and Darien, to the Soviet Union.

According to former Ambassador Bullitt, in Life magazine in 1948, "Whatever share of the responsibility was Roosevelt's and whatever share was Marshall's the vital interest of the United States in the independent integrity of China was sacrificed, and the foundation was laid for the present tragic situation in the Far East."

When the armies of Soviet Russia withdrew from Manchuria they left Chinese Communists in control of this area and in possession of great masses of Japanese war material.

During this period began the great split in the minds of our diplomats over whether to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek, or force Chiang Kai-shek as the price of our assistance to bring Chinese Communists into his government to form a coalition.

When Ambassador Patrick Hurley resigned in 1945 he stated, "Professional diplomats continuously advised the Chinese Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the national government did not represent the policy of the United States. The chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from American career diplomats, the embassy at Chungking, and the Chinese Far Eastern divisions of the State Department."

With the troubled situation in China beginning to loom large in the United States, General Marshall was sent at the request of President Truman as special emissary to China to effect a compromise and to bring about a coalition government.

In Ambassador Bullitt's article in Life, he states, and I quote: "In early summer of 1946 in order to force Chiang Kai-shek to take Communists into the Chinese Government, General Marshall had the Department of State refuse to give licenses for export of ammunition to China. Thus from the summer of 1946 to February 1948 not a single shell or a single cartridge was delivered to China for use in its American armament. And in the aviation field Marshall likewise blundered, and as a result of his breaking the American Government's contract to deliver to China planes to maintain eight and one-third air groups, for 3 years no combat or bombing planes were delivered to China—from September 1946 to March 1948. As Marshall himself confessed in February 1948 to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, this "was in effect an embargo on military supplies."

In 1948 we appropriated $468,000,000 for China, only a fraction of what we were sending to Europe, and out of this $468,000,000 only $125,000,000 was for military purposes. The end was drawing near; the assistance was too little and too late; and the nationalist government was engaged in a death struggle with the on-rushing Communist armies.

On November 20, 1948, former Senator D. Worth Clark, who had been sent on a special mission to China by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in his report to that committee said, "Piecemeal aid will no longer save failing China from communism. It is now an all-out program or none, a fish or cut bait proposition."

Clark said this conclusion was confirmed by Ambassador J. Leighton Stuart and top American Army officers in China.

On November 25, 1948, 3 years too late, the New York Times said: "Secretary of State George Marshall said today the United States Government was considering what assistance it could properly give to the Chinese Government in the present critical situation."

On December 21 a Times headline was: "ECA Administrator Hoffman, after seeing Truman, discloses freezing of $70,000,000 program in China in view of uncertain war situation."

The indifference, if not the contempt, with which the State Department and the President treated the wife of the head of the nationalist government, who was then fighting for a free China—Madame Chiang Kai-shek—was the final chapter in this tragic story.

Our policy in China has reaped the whirlwind. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the national government. So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfections of the diplomatic system in China after 20 years of war, and the tales of corruption in high places, that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

There were those who claimed, and still claim, that Chinese communism was not really communism at all but merely an advanced agrarian movement which did not take directions from Moscow.

Listen to the words of the Bolton report: "Its doctrines follow those of Lenin and Stalin. Its leaders are Moscow-trained (of 35 leading Chinese Communist political leaders listed in the report, over a half either spent some time or studied in Moscow). Its policies and actions, its strategy and tactics are Communist. The Chinese Communists have followed faithfully every zigzag of the Kremlin's line for a generation."

This is the tragic story of China whose freedom we once fought to preserve. What our young men had saved, our diplomats and our President have frittered away.

Appropriations for Unemployment Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I include a letter from the able and distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITAKER], accompanied by correspondence from the Governor of his State, the Honorable Earl C. Clements, relating to Federal funds carried in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill:

FEBRUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Enclosed herewith find copy of letter which I received on February 15 from the Honorable Earl C. Clements, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and copy of wire from Mr. Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments.

I did not have an opportunity to present to your committee data touching the splendid progress which has been obtained by the creation of the new department of economic security, which department is headed by Commissioner Vego Barnes and embraces all of the State agencies spending both State and Federal funds—for, as you know the deficiency appropriation bill was at that time under consideration and being voted on by the House. However, I felt like this informative letter from Governor Clements should be filed with your committee in order to show the economy which Kentucky has demonstrated to be possible by the creation of the Department of Economic Security.

Respectfully yours,
JOHN A. WHITAKER,
Member of Congress.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Frankfort, February 11, 1949.

Hon. JOHN WHITAKER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I am attaching a copy of a telegram received from Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments.

The message, you will note, is self-explanatory. However, upon its receipt the matter was taken up with Mr. Vego Barnes, commissioner of the department of economic security, with reference to the needs for additional funds to cover administrative costs of the Unemployment Compensation Commission and the Employment Service.

As you may know, at the last session of the legislature the above-mentioned agencies together with the division of public assistance and child welfare were combined, and the outcome was the creation of a new department of economic security headed by Commissioner Barnes which embraced all of the State agencies spending both State and Federal funds in the over-all social-security program.

Since this consolidation was effected, and as a result of prudent and efficient administration, the commissioner reports that his department will be able to live within its budget and will not need additional allocations. It is his opinion that the support which the deficiency bill has is being generated by those States refusing to consolidate their various social-security programs—thereby failing to realize the economies which Kentucky has demonstrated to be possible through such a move.

I thought this information sufficiently important and interesting to pass along to you for whatever benefit it might be to you at the time this bill comes up for consideration.

Sincerely yours,
EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
Governor.

FEBRUARY 8, 1949.

In the great majority of States the appropriation and allocation for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service for fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, were inadequate when made. Since then increasing loads and lack of administrative funds have combined to create situation that not only causes great waste of public funds but serves to undermine system of employment security.

The problem is immediate and urgent. Congress now considering deficiency bill and States must have approximately $20,000,000 additional for this fiscal year to insure effective and economical administration.

If this situation exists in your State, and if you think wise, suggest you wire your congressional delegation.

FRANK BANE,
Executive Director, Council of State Governments.

American Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Congress and the people of the United States, I wish to note in the RECORD my correspondence with the Honorable James Forrestal on a matter of deep national concern.

I include also a portion of the article referred to in my correspondence with the Secretary of Defense. I hope, in later extensions, to include two further installments of this article from the magazine Politics.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1949.

Hon. JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will remember that I have on frequent occasions called attention of the House of Representatives to the danger of penetration of pro-Communist elements into the American military government in Germany.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a detailed article appearing in Politics, a liberal magazine, which describes conditions in considerable detail and fully corroborates what I have said. The article, beginning on page 194, is written by Peter Blake, who was a political intelligence officer with the Army's European headquarters in Frankfurt.

While the article describes conditions in this particular area, it is in fact a pattern of conditions under our occupation forces in Germany and Austria, which demand immediate correction. No doubt some steps have already been made in this direction.

Let me point out also that Brig. Gen. Robert McClure, in charge of the activities described in the aforementioned article is now head of the reorientation branch in New York. I am sure the National Military Establishment has his exact position and present title.

I am also enclosing the record of Cedric Belfrage, mentioned in the article.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

AMG IN GERMANY
(By Peter Blake)

Reeducation, according to Potsdam, was one of the primary missions of American occupation forces in Germany. The strange collection of American liberals, Stalinoids, Russia-firsters, etc., that assembled to lend the United States Army a hand in accomplishing that mission has, instead, spent the better part of the past 3 years in making our zone in Germany ripe for Stalinism. This effort was substantially aided by theïveta displayed by the highest officials in the United States military government when faced with the facts of political life. Not until very recently did MG show even an elementary understanding of the methods and objectives of Soviet imperialism, and at no time during the past 3 years did MG show any ability to counter these objectives.

Two MG agencies especially have helped to break the ground for Stalin's agents in the American zone of Germany: The Information Control Division, whose functions include the organization and licensing of the German press, theater, radio, film, and musical effort; and the Political Affairs Division, which was supposed to establish German political life on a democratic basis.

(A) INFORMATION CONTROL DIVISION (ICD)

Organized early in the war as the Psychological Warfare Division under the command of Brig. Gen. Robert McClure, attracted a great many American and British intellectuals of somewhat varying, and not necessarily western democratic views.[1] Into these assorted hands the United States Army placed one of its most important missions in Germany: The education, by democratic propaganda, of the German people. The manner in which this mission was not accomplished by ICD can be seen from a number of case histories.

Item No. 1: The Frankfurter Rundschau

The most important newspaper to be licensed by ICD in the American zone was the Frankfurter Rundschau; circulation, over 150,000 copies. The Rundschau was started shortly after the end of the war, and its licensees were carefully selected by Mr. Cedric Belfrage and a juvenile ICD official named Adler. Two other ICD agents went as far as Thuringia to find the "right" kind of licensees. The result of this careful selection was an editorial board of three Communists

---

[1] Among those who served with ICD were members of PM's editorial staff such as Saul K. Padover, and men like Hollywood's critic, Mr. Cedric Belfrage. These liberals and other ICD employees are not best known for their ability to distinguish between Stalinism and democracy. There were also a number of former OWI employees who suffered from a similar failing. It was interesting to note, for example, that the former OWI Chief of the Czechoslovak Division of that organization, Mr. Adolf Hoffmeister, was recently appointed Czech Ambassador to France by the new Communist Government of that country. Mr. Hoffmeister, it develops, is a member of the Czech Communist Party. The OWI, which selected Hoffmeister for a key position, also supplied many ICD recruits.

and some ineffectual Social Democrats, who were soon forced out of the paper. There then remained: (1) Emil Carlebach, Communist, 12 years in Buchenwald Concentration Camp (where, according to excellent ICD sources, he had consistently worked with the SS)[2]; (2) Arno Rudert, Communist; and (3) Wilhelm Gerst, alleged Christian Socialist, but actually an energetic and consistent Stalinist throughout. Gerst had finally to be fired late in 1946 in connection with some unsavory publicity during his trial before a denazification court. At the time of his appointment, Gerst had admitted to ICD officials that he had written in praise of Hitler—yet, Gerst, too, was appointed by ICD in clear violation of its own directives. Since his dismissal in 1946, Gerst has been extremely active trying to organize the Russian Socialist Unity Party in the Frankfurt area.[3]

The case of Belfrage and Carlebach is even more fascinating. In the June 1948 issue of Harper's Magazine, under the title "The German Who Should Have Been Dead," Mr. Cedric Belfrage defended his appointment of Carlebach and admitted that he knew that Carlebach had drawn up death lists for the SS in Buchenwald. Belfrage explains all that away by indicating that the ethics of Buchenwald were different from those of the outside world. Two months later, in Harper's the ex-inmate of Buchenwald and witness of Carlebach's murderous SS-collaboration, Mr. Ernst Federn, a Socialist, utterly refuted Belfrage's specious arguments, and testified to Carlebach's typical party-line ethics in helping in the murder of Buchenwald inmates, who might have turned into potential postwar rivals of the Stalinist movement. In a reply remarkable for its decency and restraint, Mr. Federn cites two instances in which Communist Carlebach personally murdered, or attempted to murder, fellow inmates of Buchenwald concentration camp.

The case of Mr. Cedric Belfrage reached its logical conclusion when he appeared October 17, 1948, as the editor-in-chief of a fascinating pro-Wallace, pro-Stalin magazine called the National Guardian. In Mr. Belfrage's editorial company we find such Soviet-apologists as Louis Adamic, Konni Zilliacus, O. John Rogge, Frederick L. Schuman, Johannes Steel, William Gropper, and Leo Huberman. Business manager is John T. McManus.[4]

The manner in which German Communists approached their Stalinoid friends in ICD and persuaded them to cooperate in such important press ventures may be observed in the following transcript of a conference between Bruno Goldhammer, chief of the Bavarian Communist Party, and Dr. Joseph Dunner, former Chief of Intelligence of the OWI in Europe, and then an ICD official. Goldhammer evidently—and very mistakenly—assumed that Dr. Dunner was another innocent abroad. The following quotation is reproduced from the New Leader of June 8, 1946:

"I understand," he (Goldhammer) said, "that you are about to organize a German newspaper in Munich. You know that in Frankfurt, where such a paper already exists, several Communists have been admitted as licensees of the paper. I have come to you to ask you, in the name of the Communist Party, to follow the example of your colleagues in Frankfurt and to include among the licensees in Munich Communists whom my party will nominate."

Dr. Dunner, of course, refused, and a non-Communist paper, the excellent Süddeutsche Zeitung, was set up in Bavaria. Attacks upon it started immediately from both German Communists and their friends in ICD. According to Dr. Dunner, Mr. Mathieu, an ICD intelligence officer was sent down to Munich where he held long meetings with Goldhammer, wrote a detailed report fully supporting the Communist Party stand, and demanded that a member of that party be added to the list of licensees of the Süddeutsche Zeitung. A few days later Goldhammer himself, using almost identical words, sent a similar protest to the United States Third Army. An investigation was ordered by Third Army Commander Lieutenant General Truscott, which cleared the non-Communist paper of all Mathieu-Goldhammer charges.

ICD's excuse for having set up the Rundschau as a Communist organ was that there were no untainted Germans of other convictions to call upon. This is untrue. Not only did ICD later find many German Socialists, Liberals, and Conservatives upon whom it could depend, but there was, in 1945, the top-notch former editorial staff of the old liberal Frankfurter Zeitung—one of the finest European papers, with a tradition which ICD might well have emulated. These men had not compromised with the Nazis, but ICD agents "kicked them around" for so long, in the words of one of these editors, that they finally took off for the French zone where they were received with open arms.[5]

Item No. 2: DENA

One of ICD's early efforts concerned the setting up of a German-American news agency (DENA). Again according to Dr. Dunner "the Communists and their fellow travelers established a center in * * * the Information Control Unit for Greater Hesse. On June 29, 1945, Brig. Gen. Robert McClure, chief of the Information Control Division, assigned seven civilians of the OWI, two lieutenants, and four enlisted men to Bad Nauheim (in the American zone) to lay the foundation of DENA, the German news service. The team was headed by Lieutenant Edel, a former correspondent for PM." (New Leader, May 25, 1946.)

In addition to PM correspondent Edel, ICD enlisted the help of one Dr. Hans Mayer, who had spent the Nazi period in exile in Switzerland. There Dr. Mayer was one of the leaders of the Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller—Protective League of German Writers—a well-known and painfully obvious Stalinist-front organization. Dr. Mayer, like Carlebach & Co., was especially selected by ICD and brought in from abroad to help out. When I talked to him many months later he told me, with praiseworthy candor, that he "thanked God (sic) for the Soviet Union."

After the early arrangements had been completed, DENA was handed over to a number of German licensees. The top licensee was none other than Dr. Rudolf Agricola, member of the German Communist Party since 1933, and ICD appointed editor of the important Rhein-Neckar Zeitung, circulation over 100,000. Of Dr. Agricola, an ICD official said to me in 1947: "You know, he is one of those mild and decent Communists, like Gottwald of Czechoslovakia." Another ICD agent told me that Agricola had not been appointed to DENA, but had been elected to the post by all the licensed German editors in the American zone. "And there are hardly any Communists among those," the ICD official added. On the face of it this is true; as of February 1947 the official ICD list of German newspapers shows only 4 or 5 avowed Communist licensees. But as we have seen in the case of Wilhelm Gerst, who was officially listed as a Christian Socialist, the official listing of avowed party affiliations is extremely misleading.[6] The fact that Communist Dr. Agricola was elected proves not only the extent of the prestige with which the American ICD had endowed him, but also the sad truth that many a nominal Socialist or nonparty man among ICD's German editors was not all he seemed.

Item No. 3: Radio Frankfurt

When he was no longer needed at DENA Dr. Hans Mayer was transferred by ICD to a more important job: He was appointed political chief of the American-controlled Radio Frankfurt, together with Radio Munich (see below) the most powerful broadcasting station in the United States zone. While this station is currently being used in feeble and sporadic attempts to refute the Soviet campaigns of lies and slander directed against the West, it was not put to such use until 3 years after VE-day, and not until Dr. Hans Mayer had finally been removed from its political directorate. Even ICD found his denunciations of Churchill and others as warmongers a little hard to swallow, and it even penetrated MG's consciousness that a Communist political commentator, broadcasting three times a week over one of western Germany's principal stations, was not the best advertisement the United States could produce of the democratic way of life. Whatever the reasons, Dr. Mayer was "granted his request to be permitted to resign." It came as a great surprise to him.

While Dr. Mayer operated a Communist radio station in Frankfurt, Radio Munich was also well taken care of. Dr. Dunner writes in the New Leader of June 8, 1946: "The Bavarian Radio in Munich—an American Army institution—is still today in the hands of a Communist, a Mr. Bentschen, and his assistant, Dr. Hahn, a former dentist from Koenigsberg."

While ICD thought nothing of placing Radio Frankfurt and Radio Munich in Communist hands, it sharply discriminated against at least one, and probably many another young German Socialist. The case of Herr , who was rejected for a job on Radio Frankfurt, is typical of antidemocratic personnel practices as carried on by our ICD.

H's political past includes several years with the Italian underground, indirect aid to Allied intelligence, close connections with the German resistance, and an intimate friendship of several years' standing with two outstanding American anti-Nazis: Dorothy Thompson and Edgar Ansel Mowrer. Despite his excellent record, H was declared politically unreliable by ICD's screening unit. The report on H, signed by a United States Army major who had told H that he okayed only heroes, contains the following phrase: "Herr H claims to be a Socialist, and claims to favor a United States of Europe, by which he presumably means a United States directed against the Soviet Union." After this astonishing observation the screening report on H was heavily, obviously, and utterly unfairly weighted against him in every single respect, including details which easily could

[2] This appears to have been common practice among German Communists. Bavarian Communist Karl Feuerer, secretary of the party in Munich, did similar work in Dachau. Cf. Rousset's The Days of Our Death (Politics, July–August 1947).

[3] In the first free election in Frankfurt the vote was 90 percent anti-Communist, despite the existence, as the sole information medium and propaganda weapon, of the American-promoted Communist newspaper. During this period, numerous Americans, including State Department officials, a general officer, and a former military governor of Frankfurt, repeatedly protested against continued American support for the Rundschau. They were politely told to go climb a tree.

[4] The Guardian is a direct product of AMG. Thus its editors write, in the October 25 issue: "No 90-day wonder, National Guardian has been 3 years in the making. It began in 1945 on a B–17 bound from Frankfurt to Bremen. On board were Cedric Belfrage and Jim Aronson (another Guardian editor), who had been assigned by the Allied forces the task of setting up democratic newspapers in defeated Germany."

[5] There they started a first-rate fortnightly Die Gegenwart, which has become one of postwar Europe's best magazines.

[6] Dr. Hans Mayer was officially listed as a nonparty man.

have been verified by a routine check with United States or British intelligence (both of which had screened H about a dozen times).

H of course wrote to his American friends of his misfortune. They, in turn, immediately made a strong protest with the State Department, where they were assured that there would be another investigation. Some weeks later they were informed that another investigation had confirmed ICD's earlier findings. This was quite untrue, although the State Department probably didn't know it. There had never been another investigation into H's past. Instead he had been summoned to the Frankfurt headquarters of the ICD to be threatened as follows by ICD officials (the following quotations are from a sworn affidavit I asked H to prepare for me immediately after his new investigation by ICD): "I was told by ICD intelligence that they were no longer willing to tolerate my open criticism of members of the Army of Occupation, and that other steps might well be taken against me if nothing else was effective—such as a trial by a military tribunal. It had been established as a fact that I was politically unacceptable." And later: "The official said that the Americans were, after all, no Gestapo."

The new investigation ended upon a tragicomic note: Herr H had in his possession a letter from the Provincial ICD headquarters (which I have read), signed by its chief, a Mr. McCarthy, assuring him that his political past was beyond ICD reproach. Since such a letter (from the ICD point of view) was obviously a highly dangerous and incriminating document for H to possess, the "no Gestapo" official ordered H to surrender the letter to him without delay. This was done in the presence of several witnesses. Thus ended ICD's new investigation.

Eisenhower on Paternalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of February 15, 1949:

EISENHOWER ON PATERNALISM

If any American enjoys more public confidence and esteem than Dwight D. Eisenhower we don't know his name. General Eisenhower has just been asked by the President to return to temporary duty in Washington. His job is to coordinate the plans of the three branches of national defense at a time when they tend to pull apart, even as their requests for funds are pending in Congress.

No man could perform better than Eisenhower this task which is equally important to the American economy and to American defense. But the man who was chiefly responsible for the Allied victory in the field can see a great danger on the horizon. Speaking, appropriately, on Lincoln's Birthday, "Ike" warned the Nation against a creeping paralysis of thought. This is the result of the public's readiness to accept paternalism in government and the constant drift toward centralized bureaucratic government.

With a bluntness that Governor Dewey never approached in the last campaign, "Ike" warns that this tendency could lead the country into a dictatorship—a dictatorship not born of guns but of the extension of Government controls into every phase of the Nation's life in this complex era. The paternalistic state tends to become the all-inclusive bureaucratic state.

General Eisenhower is not the man to underestimate the menace of Russo-communism. But it is significant that, on the eve of his return to Washington, he warned the country against the menace to American freedom that lies in the surrender of our own responsibilities and * * * of our own thought over our own lives.

Commission on Service Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. Charles R. Hook, Chairman of the Advisory Commission on Service Pay, before the House Armed Services Committee, February 21, 1949:

This program of career compensation that you are considering is based on the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Service Pay in its report to the Secretary of Defense.

As Chairman of the Commission which prepared the study, I should like to explain briefly the method of our investigation and the philosophy which motivated us in the busy year during which the report was developed. At the same time, I would like to tell you about the way in which we proceeded and to present to you some of the basic considerations that affected our decisions.

Taking into consideration the size of the job, it was apparent to us we could not all devote a lot of time to the same subject. Each one of us, therefore, agreed to take the lead and sponsor a certain part of the program.

Surveys were made to determine the compensation of positions in civilian fields at comparable levels of responsibility and technical requirement. Insofar as the management field is concerned, we do not have knowledge of any other study of this kind and scope having been made before. It has taken months of most careful investigation and cooperation on the part of the chief executives of our major industrial institutions to gather this information.

To arrive at a pay scale that would attract and retain the men and leaders which our national security requires, the Commission decided to construct a military compensation scale on the scales paid for comparable civilian responsibilities, so far as practicable. By survey and proper adjustment, it obtained current data on civilian-pay ranges not only for nonsupervisory employees but for management. This principle departed from traditional methods of establishing military pay, but we, of the Commission, consider it essential to have such a foundation to insure success for the Military Establishment under present and probable future conditions.

Rates for positions comparable to those held by officers were obtained from selected large firms whose structure and method of operation would be deemed similar to the huge Military Establishment by comparing the descriptions of military jobs within each level with those in industry. As you know, no private industry comparison could be made with the combat arms, but since a great majority of service personnel are not now in combat branches, it was possible to select jobs in fields well known and easily identified in business. Job descriptions covering military duties were, therefore, developed in the eight fields of finance, transportation, construction, communications, selected manufacturing, warehousing and procurement, armament and mechanical equipment production, that is, ordnance, and shipbuilding. The firms which cooperated with us determined whether the job descriptions we furnished were identical with or closely comparable to those used within their organizations, and, if so, furnished us the rates and ranges payable during the early part of 1948. Where no comparable descriptions were available, the firms slotted our descriptions into their organizations if in their opinion such jobs would reasonably fit, and then indicated, on the basis of their wage and salary structure, what the pay would be. On the basis of the data so obtained, we prepared weighted averages for each level of military responsibility and drew a smooth curve, which seemed to us an adequate representation of civilian income for comparable responsibility.

With respect to enlisted personnel, we were fortunate in having available the current surveys of the Army and Air Force Wage Boards, covering over 2,000,000 workers, chiefly in the manual and trades occupations, which corresponded closely to the work performed by the privates, corporals, and sergeants and their counterparts in the other services. We then estimated for enlisted personnel the value of the free goods and services which the Army or Navy supplied, such as food, clothing, and shelter, and arrived at a pay scale which included both real pay and free goods and services, which seemed to us comparable to civilian cash payments.

Recognizing that advancement through the military grades does not follow the pattern of advancement in industry, we modified the industrial wage and salary range for responsibility concept in industry by using a range for each military grade which is a composite of proper pay for responsibility plus a far less significant factor for total length of service. In addition, for purposes of administrative simplicity, the pay scales were constructed so that payments covering periods of less than a month would be made without involving complicated percentages and fractions.

Although we have endeavored to match the military curve with the civilian curve throughout, it will be noted that the recommended pay for enlisted personnel, including an estimated $108 per month for the lowest four grades representing free goods, is consistently higher throughout their careers than comparable pay in industry. This was done in recognition of the fact that a good portion of their income is not in cash and that some leeway was necessary to offset the removal of certain special pays which many enlisted persons now receive. Most important, however, was the determination of the Commission to develop a plan which would attract and hold qualified personnel. On the other hand, in the officer grades it will be noted that although at the outset military pay exceeds civilian pay, the recommended compensation for officers in the rank of colonel and above falls below that for comparable civilian positions. At this stage the accrual of retirement benefits becomes significant and such benefits as proposed in our plan are far more generous than those usually provided in industry. At this time also I should like to mention that our survey was taken at a time when the pay of executives whose duties correspond to the colonels and general officers is relatively high, since it is based on gross compensation and includes in many cases incentive compensation based on earnings which are related to

corporate sales and gross corporate income, which is quite high during this postwar period. As all of you know, compensation of this group is unstable and is materially reduced when business falls off. This is a traditional pattern in American industry and probably will prevail in the future as well.

It was only after we had determined on a proper pay for each level that any cost estimates were made. And here I want to emphasize my belief that proper pay provides proper leadership and guarantees the opportunity for a satisfactory career and is more important to the Nation than the small percentage of the budget that would be saved by cutting here.

Using force figures as of November 1948, these recommendations would increase total pay costs by 14.2 percent, or $440,000,000, for the Military Establishment. These impact costs will be materially reduced in succeeding years as due to the savings provision it will take some time for all the special pays to be eliminated. My colleague will speak to you on this point in some detail.

Throughout our study we recognized that it was as important to protect the interests of the taxpayer as to protect the interests of the man in service. In view of my own position, and I think I may also speak for my colleagues, it is only natural that we would consider the effect which our proposal might have on the ultimate cost of Government and, in turn, the possible effect on taxation to support these costs. We are fully aware of the fact that what we propose would immediately add about four hundred million dollars to the expense of operating the Military Establishment. We agree unanimously, however, that this additional burden is essential and, indeed, feel that this cost is slight compared to the ultimate costs which may be incurred if we do not now provide means for attracting and keeping the best qualified men.

We members of the Commission are what might be termed generally managers of one sort or another, and are keenly aware of the need for good management in any enterprise. The scales we recommend for officers particularly and the costs involved, we regard as a sound investment in good management. Experience shows that well trained leaders and executives, who should be highly paid in accordance with their responsibility, generally save money in the long run. We, therefore, strongly urge you to retain the pattern of pay which we suggest to insure the best of administration and the most capable leadership. Even if the total military budget, within your wisdom, must be curtailed at this time or later, we feel that savings should be made elsewhere and not at the expense of responsible leadership.

As a result of this study I believe the recommendations made provide adequate compensation at all levels, for the work any serviceman may be called upon to perform. It provides an inducement to seek advancement and assume responsibility. In the uniformed forces in the Military Establishment in particular the responsibility of management is enormous. The property value alone runs into billions of dollars. I have been furnished an estimate that places these values at approximately, forty billion for the Navy, twenty-two billion for the Army, and thirteen billion for the Air Force. To this must be added the billions spent annually for current expenses. Enterprises of this magnitude require top-flight management and in my opinion it would be very short sighted policy to deprive the services of adequate leadership by failing to provide an adequate pay. In addition, the very security of the nation depends on the competence of our military leaders and the well-being of the hundreds of thousands of our young men in service is contingent upon proper administration and this can never be any better than the men who do the administering.

The Secretary of Defense appointed the commission in December 1947. We have worked individually and as a group for well over a year, bearing in mind at all times that our chief responsibility was the strengthening of the defense of our nation. We have sought to develop a program that would be fair to the military and to the taxpayer. We have considered the effect of our proposals upon the present military establishment and upon the economic life of the nation as a whole.

The Commission obtained its information and developed its report through formal meetings, presentation of witnesses, technical investigations made by its staff and consultants and through personal, independent inquiries and interviews with civilians and military personnel. My colleagues and I had many conferences singly and with groups of officers and men in all the services. The frank and open discussions which we had made it possible for us to realize, as no other method could, the principal problems of the men now in service and those who had been on active duty. We familiarized ourselves not only with the difficulties they experienced in meeting rising living costs but the problems of housing, moving, and continual adjustment which are peculiar to military life. We investigated the resources of men in service and men on the retired list to determine their current needs and their ability to support themselves and their families after a career in service. Special attention was given to the problems of enlisted personnel and to the proposed career programs which the services have developed and which will shortly be instituted. The pay of enlisted personnel was examined both in terms of the cash take-home and free goods and services such as food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and other emoluments. From the comments of enlisted men themselves, we were able to appraise the value to them of these noncash items.

Throughout the study the Commission checked carefully with the representatives of the services. Sections of the report were discussed informally and confidentially to insure a proper understanding of existing laws and practices and the needs and objectives of each of the services. Although the Commission's recommendations were arrived at independently, the factual background on which they were based was developed through constant and fruitful contact with the services. I should like to add that although we believe we have satisfied the primary needs of the military, consistent with the national economy, and have composed many of the differences which were very apparent at the beginning, there may still be areas in which we have not been able to compromise our independent judgment to satisfy a special demand.

In view of the Commission's determination to base military pay on corresponding civilian pay and provide comparable careers, it seemed to us that the impact of income tax on military pay was not a subject for consideration. The Commission felt that with the granting of proper pay and comparable opportunity, the soldier and officer should undertake an equal responsibility to support himself and his dependents and participate in the cost of Government as a taxpayer. Accordingly no attempt was made to adjust the proposed pay because of the existence of a wartime tax concession which the military enjoyed until January 1949. Although in some very few cases military personnel who paid little or no tax during the war may find that their take-home pay is about the same, or possibly slightly less following enactment of the Commission's program, the Commission did not regard tax amount and tax policy as within its province.

Taxation policy is developed for the American people as a whole and is subject to change for a variety of reasons. Indeed, during the course of our study taxes on incomes were revised and, if any attempt had been made to provide a scale which would fluctuate in accordance with tax incidence, our scales would have had to undergo revision. Manifestly no pay structure which is based on a sound pattern and which is a reflection of a career system can be tampered with as taxes are raised or lowered or extended to different groups of people. Moreover, to the extent that taxes may be imposed as part of a general economic policy predicated on a recognized system of earnings, adjustment of earnings to meet taxes might well defeat any such policy.

The Commission found that the present pay structure was characterized by a variety of unrelated pays, allowances, and benefits. Inequities among the services and within each of the services was the natural result of this history of piecemeal legislation. Not only are different laws applicable in many cases to each of the services, but differences in administration, legal requirements affecting promotion, authorized and actual strength, integration policy and budget permit the spectacle of higher pay for lesser responsibility and the pyramiding of pays without regard to relative authority and responsibility. Although the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 attempted to provide a uniform pay system for the seven services, the objective has not been attained because of significant variations in career possibilities within the services and different concepts concerning certain positions. The Army warrant officer, for example, is treated in a markedly different manner from his counterpart in the Navy. The Pay Readjustment Act, moreover, did not affect separate pay scales, the existence of which further distort the concept of equal pay for equal work. In addition, the unanticipated expansion of certain segments of the Military Establishment because of the war deepened the contrast. The Air Force, perhaps, affords the best example of rapid growth and variance from the normal promotion system.

The outstanding fault, however, is found in the emphasis placed on length of service in the compensation now provided. Thus a lieutenant colonel may draw the same pay today as a brigadier general although his responsibility and importance is considerably less. Such over-laps in pay frequently permitting junior officers to earn as much as an officer two or three grades higher or permitting an enlisted man to earn as much as or more than a field grade officer cause dissatisfaction and are, in the opinion of the Commission, completely unwarranted.

For this reason the Commission decided that a percentage increase could not correct existing inequities and would simply postpone the overhauling of the pay system which we have attempted in our study. The cost of living increase would, of necessity, be a percentage increase, whether flat or varying and would constitute an improper solution to this problem. The Commission's recommendations, it is hoped, produce a framework in which there is due regard for increased responsibility. Appropriate differentials between grades are suggested and ranges within each grade are constructed so that there will be no over-lap if the promotion scheme is properly administered, and very minor overlaps even in the event of stagnation.

The Commission is presenting an integrated program which should be considered as a whole. Each part has a clear and definite relation to the whole and to every other part. The total is aimed at the principal objective of attracting and holding in service personnel adequate in numbers and capabilities. It is my belief that the proposal represents a proper balance between the basic and special pays and allowances and the retirement and death benefits.

In the course of our study individuals and groups have importuned us to give special consideration to certain features of pay or

benefits. For example, considerable emphasis has been placed upon the apparent necessity for extending the period during which length-of-service increases could be added in the junior grade because of the numbers of officers in those grades with considerable service. Obviously such a concession would result in continuing a distorted pay structure over a long period of time to meet a temporary problem. With respect to retirement benefits, similar demands have been made to continue certain early retirement features, although no good reason has been advanced which would be consistent with the philosophy underlying the Commission's benefit program.

It is important to bear in mind that each feature of the Commission's plan has been thoroughly considered and checked against the needs of the Services. I firmly believe that the parts fit properly and add together to make a sound career program for the man who chooses a military career. The selection or special emphasis of a particular feature, or the elimination of certain pays, or percentage reduction of the compensation suggested for certain grades or special duty may well upset a carefully planned structure.

Civil Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, an article which Gould Lincoln, the eminent reporter for the Washington Star, wrote in connection with the so-called States' rights movement, is one of the finest analytical pieces I have read in any newspaper in recent months.

Mr. Lincoln's handling of the subject definitely stamps him as an objective reporter of unusual ability. He has hewed the line of objective reporting in discussing the status, purpose and future of the States' rights movement within the ranks of the Democratic Party. Mr. Lincoln is one of the few reporters who seems to have a firm grasp on the subject and for that reason I have asked permission to bring his timely article to the attention of the Congress.

There has been so much confusion and erroneous impressions concerning the States' rights movement that it is about time that the facts be brought out.

It is also about time that we decide whether we are fish or fowl. It is about time we walk either on one side of the street or the other. For my own part I find it impossible to walk on one side of the street down home and then walk the other side of the street here in Washington. I am not, nor do I desire to be, that good a political contortionist or acrobat.

I shall have more to say on this subject at a later date, so in the meantime here is Gould Lincoln's most informative and factual article from the Washington Star.

DIXIE'S POLITICAL COURSE TO SWING ON CIVIL RIGHTS—LITTLE CHANCE SEEN FOR CREATION OF REAL SECOND PARTY IN SOUTH, BUT STATES' RIGHTS MOVEMENT MIGHT GAIN

(By Gould Lincoln)

Passage of President Truman's civil rights program by Congress—and, more important, its enforcement—will have wide political repercussions in the Democratic "solid South," but there is not yet in sight opportunity for the creation of a real two-party system in that region.

One immediate effect would be the strengthening of the States' rights movement.

This summarizes the opinions expressed by Democratic Members of Congress representing the 11 States which make up the "solid South"—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

FACTOR OF PARTY'S FUTURE

Four of these States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, gave their electoral votes last November to Governor Thurmond, of South Carolina, the States' rights candidate for President. Tennessee also contributed one of its electoral votes to Governor Thurmond. It is well within the probabilities that efforts by the Federal Government to enforce on FEPC law—fair employment practices—would bring the Democrats in others of these Southern States into line with the States' rights movement and so solidify it that a Democratic candidate for President who supported the civil rights program would be deprived of the electoral votes of those States—just as President Truman was denied the electoral votes of four of them in 1948.

To understand the situation it should be remembered that the States' righters are Democrats. In the States they carried the States' righters controlled—and do control—the Democratic organization. In other words, they are the Democratic Party—and if they continue to be active—they will remain the dominant force in the Democratic Party of those States.

For all these reasons, the progress or nonprogress of the civil-rights program in Congress becomes an important factor in the future of the Democratic Party—not only in the South but nationally.

Within a few weeks, the States' rights plan to set up a States' right institute in Washington, D. C. It is to be educational its sponsors say. And it will be well financed and well staffed, with an organ of its own—a newspaper. The reports are that they plan a circulation of from 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 copies of this newspaper, at the start. The purpose of the institute, its backers say, is to return the country to constitutional government and the Democratic Party to the principles of Jefferson.

NOT LIMITED TO SOUTH

The race issue, involved in the civil-rights program and the issue of State or Federal ownership of oil-rich tidelands are incident to the whole campaign of the States' righters, who are opposed to the wide extension of Federal control over the activities of the people within the States.

The campaign which the States' righters plan to wage will go far beyond the confines of the solid South—it will go to every State of the Union, if they have their way. As one of the States' rights supporters put it, too, the campaign will be to restore the Democratic Party as a States' Rights Party and to shuck off the present control of radical Democrats. He insisted that the Democrats of the conservative South had always been the backbone of the Democratic Party; that had it not been for the persistence of the southern Democrats, the party would have vanished long since. If and when, he said, the Republicans regain control of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, the Democrats of the South would continue to be the strong backlog of the party.

Report has it that former Gov. Ben. T. Laney, of Arkansas, will head the States' Rights Institute in Washington. Mr. Laney was active in the organization of the States' rights group, although his State remained faithful to the Truman ticket in the national election.

Nothing arouses the States' righters more than to be called a splinter party—they insist they are Democrats. They consider it unfortunate, too, that during the campaign they became known as Dixiecrats. They are, they say, just as strongly opposed to socialistic proposals advanced by the Truman administration as they are to the civil-rights measures, anti-poll-tax, antilynching, anti-segregation, and FEPC measures. All of these civil rights proposed laws, they contend, are infringements on States' rights by the Federal Government.

POSSIBLE VOTE EFFECT

These southern Democrats agree that enactment of the civil-rights program by a Democratic-controlled Congress and approved by a Democratic Congress will arouse tremendous resentment in their States against the present national Democratic leadership. They do not expect that resentment to take many southerners into the Republican Party. Obviously, they point out, the civil-rights program, if enacted, would have been impossible had it not been for its support by the Republicans in Congress. The Democrats of the South will owe the Republicans nothing.

One effect, they admitted, might be the casting of Democratic votes for a Republican Presidential candidate—against Truman should he be renominated, or some other Democratic candidate who went all out for the civil-rights program. Indeed, one southern Democratic Senator offered the suggestion that had the Republicans nominated Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, instead of Governor Dewey, of New York, last year, Mr. Stassen might have carried several Southern States. He recalled that Mr. Stassen had made several speeches in the South during the preconvention campaign which had been well received. Governor Dewey, on the other hand, was known as the governor who had given impetus to the passage of a State FEPC law in New York, and the southern Democrats had little use for him.

States' righters insist that their organization, composed of conservative Democrats, is within the Democratic Party just as much as is the Americans for Democratic Action, representative of the left wing of the party.

The States Rights Institute may become a powerful propaganda instrument against Federal Government expansion and particularly against the civil rights program. It will, its supporters insist, give the conservative Democrats a better chance to spread their ideas and philosophy of government. In the past, they say, the propaganda has been all on the other side, with well-financed organizations like the ADA, as well as the Federal Government spreading left-wing doctrine all over the country.

The only chance for the development of a two-party system in the South would appear to rest on control of the Democratic organizations in the Southern States by the New Dealers, the Fair Dealers and the left wingers. This might drive many of the conservatives into other fields—though there is still a wide question whether they could persuade themselves to go over completely to the Republican Party.

DEBATE RULE IS HURDLE

The crux of the whole fight is found—for the present at least—in the fight over the civil rights program. This program could be jammed through Congress without a doubt were it not for the Senate rules of unlimited debate—and a cloture difficult to impose. Similar measures have been filibustered to death by groups of Southern Senators over a long period of years. So an effort is under way to change the Senate rules, making it easier to impose cloture and to get to a vote. So slow has been the administration in

getting the proposed change in the rules before the Senate, that the civil rights measures may be lost in the great mass of pressing legislation that must be passed by Congress before it adjourns next summer. Even now the Democratic leadership, while prepared to bring the new cloture rule up some time after February 28, does not plan to keep it before the Senate until it is disposed of, but will lay it aside for the other important bills that require early attention.

The southern Democrats in the Senate hold a rod over the heads of the administration forces. They have the votes, joined with the Republicans, to defeat all the principal items of the President's legislative program. They may use them to do that thing, if they are sufficiently provoked. Also they have little use for many of the President's proposals anyway. This may explain to some degree the seeming softness of the administration leadership in dealing with the civil rights program. It's anyone's guess today whether, at the present session, a vote can be had on any of it.

Also the southern Democrats are quietly threatening the Republican leadership if it persists in needling the administration leaders to bring up the new cloture rule. They are letting the Republicans know that, unless they quit such tactics, enough of these Democratic Senators may vote to ditch the Taft-Hartley labor law pretty completely, and also the Republican tax law of the last Congress.

The Southerners are not particularly excited over the antipoll tax and antilynching proposals of the civil rights program, they say. They are red hot against a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act, and against any attempt of the Federal Government to ban segregation of the races

The Eighty-first Congress has been in session for a month and a half. It does not go out of existence until January 1951. In all that time, the chances would appear to favor action on some of these civil rights measures. Indeed, some of the Southerners, when pressed, admit the chance for action is very real. It is when that happens, the real political repercussions will start.

The Vulnerable Flanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph Alsop, from the Washington Post:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph Alsop)

THE VULNERABLE FLANKS

LONDON.—From the vantage point of this old, indomitable city, it is clear that the world crisis is entering a new phase. In Europe, the chief scene of Soviet aggression since the end of the war, an uneasy stalemate is being reached. But the attack is meanwhile shifting to the vast colonial area which is the vulnerable flank of the western world.

As the disastrous developments in China and Indonesia suggest only too clearly, the first center of this new attack is the Far East. But China and Indonesia are by no means the whole story. What is going forward in the Far East is nothing less than a Soviet land drive toward Australia in many ways comparable to the Japanese drive by sea.

China being lost, the decisive area in this struggle will be to the southward. The outlook is nowhere good. In Indochina, the French have thus far failed miserably to deal with the Communist regime of Ho Chi Minh. Being unwilling either to make convincing concessions to Indochinese nationalism, or to convince by sufficient force, they have merely wasted men and treasure. London has now urgently warned Paris to get on with the job, grimly pointing out that the jig will be up if and when Chinese Communists control the other side of the border from Ho Chi Minh's forces.

In Malaya, the British are having serious trouble with small but elusive groups of Communist guerrillas. And in Burma, the situation is worst of all. The primitive Karens from the hills are giving a drubbing to the forces of the incompetent, frivolous and corrupt Rangoon government. Only one Rangoon leader of any consequence, Thakin Nu, remains unmurdered. Two factions of Communists are in the field. And if present anarchy continues, the Communists, being the only organized element, must win in the end.

Add these situations to the situations in China and Indonesia, and the danger in the Far East becomes apparent. The strategic consequences are past computing. Burma and Indochina are necessary rice bowls of the Orient. Malayan rubber and tin are among the foundation stones of the British economy. If Japan is denied commerce with Asia she can only survive precariously, if at all, on huge American subsidies. And if the rest of Asia falls into the Soviet grip, the subcontinent of India will also be in immediate peril.

As yet, no comparable Soviet drive has begun in the Middle East. But in this area the attempt at assassination of the Shah of Iran is only the last of a series of disquieting signs.

In recent months there have been many incidents on the Iranian border, and an Azerbaijanian government-in-exile has been set up in Russia. A sustained effort is being made to infiltrate Israel with Communist refugees from eastern Europe. And Communist agents everywhere are redoubling their efforts to capitalize on the dreadful disparity in circumstances between the Arab pashas and the Arab poor.

A full-scale Soviet effort in the Middle East must certainly be expected, if the Soviets score further successes in the Far East. Nor are these dangers which can be safely ignored on the grounds that we must not disperse our efforts. Any such upset in the world balance of power as now threatens will almost surely lead in the end to war.

More knowledgeable about the menaced areas than the State Department, the British have long been seeking desperately to erect defenses. Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin was on the eve of forming India and southeast Asia into another regional grouping like western union when the Dutch attack on Indonesia wrecked his plans. Despite their distracting indignation against western imperialism, the Indian leaders at Delhi are deeply disturbed by the Burmese situation. A commonwealth consultation on the Burmese problem with India participating may soon be held in Ceylon.

The truth is, however, that despite their fine recovery, the British now lack the resources to overcome such dangers as have been described. That is why men on lower levels here are beginning to talk of the organization of fire brigades, led by America and Britain, for both the Middle and Far East.

It is thought that the famous fourth point in President Truman's inaugural address provides the basis for American action, and joint Anglo-American efforts are proposed because of the vital British interests in the areas concerned.

Certainly it is hard to see how these new dangers can be averted except by this kind of manifestation of the Anglo-American partnership. The task of restoring stability in the Far East must be undertaken on a major scale by both, on all three levels—strategic, political, and economic.

In sum, if there is a lesson in London, where one sees beyond the borders of Europe, it is that our job is far from done when Europe has become temporarily stabilized. Indeed, we shall be worse than ostriches if we mistake great local successes, such as Britain's recovery, for decisive turning points in the world struggle. The world struggle is actually broadening and intensifying.

Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James L. Holton:

REAL ESTATE—HOLDEN MAKES BLISTERING ATTACK ON PUBLIC HOUSING BILL—TERMS ITS NEED "PROPAGANDA"

(By James L. Holton, World-Telegram real estate editor)

Adoption of the vast Federal public housing program now before Congress threatens to jeopardize the national credit and would be a step toward changing the whole pattern of American economic life and government, Thomas S. Holden, president of the F. W. Dodge Corp., told the Senate Banking Committee yesterday in Washington during a hearing (on S. 138).

Moreover, backers of the administration housing bill, Mr. Holden charged, have grossly exaggerated and distorted the actual housing needs of the country to win public and Congressional support for this $21,000,000,000 raid in the Federal Treasury. Mr. Holden cited Government figures to dispute the "propaganda" claims of NHA.

CITES HOUSING RECORD

Mr. Holden made his blistering attack on the proposed General Housing Act of 1949 on behalf of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., almost at the same time that William E. Russell, general chairman of the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee, New York, was urging the House Banking Committee to continue Federal rent controls for another year, but to allow owners a 25 percent mandatory rent increase over June 30, 1947, levels.

Mr. Holden asserted that under private enterprise people in the United States are more adequately housed than is true of any other nation. Also that the two and one-half million housing units produced here since VJ-Day is twice the combined production of homes in 16 western European countries in the same period.

WOULD HIT OUR ECONOMY

But he declared that putting the Government into the housing business here could only lead to vast additional public debt, new demands for controls over business, and eventually, a lower standard of living for all. Public housing and rent control, Mr. Holden asserted, were steps toward nationalizing all industry and business.

The Senate committee was told by Mr. Holden that the cost of this Federal housing

program would be fantastic. "Seemingly innocent provisions in the bill promise housing for all citizens and hold a threat of controls over all business to provide this shelter," he added.

"The supposed need for this legislation is based on propaganda not on facts," Mr. Holden declared.

SAYS BACKERS DISTORT FIGURES

"Support for (it) has been secured through gross exaggeration of the postwar housing shortage and a grossly distorted picture of the housing needs of the country."

Congress by adopting the housing program and other welfare legislation now being urged by Government "planners," Mr. Holden said, will bring on Federal insolvency, and lead us to "some sort of blurred carbon copy of the socialist and semisocialist states of Europe" or a form of "American statism."

Criticizing the slum clearance title in the bill, Mr. Holden said these reclamation projects should be left to local communities under State and municipal redevelopment laws. He charged the slum program was a "convenient" scheme of postwar planners for large-scale Federal spending.

INVITES EXTRAVAGANCE, WASTE

Federal subsidies for slum clearance will "encourage extravagance and waste," as well "as subservience of local governments to the party currently in power nationally," Mr. Holden protested.

Drawing a picture of the terrific cost of the vast housing plans in the bill, Mr. Holden asserted it would end up as a socialistic program, and predicted it would result in virtual extinction of private home building.

"Provisions of decent minimum housing for low-income families is a problem closely related to relief," Mr. Holden urged.

"History and experience show that such matters are more apt to be handled with a minimum of political abuse and economic dislocation by local authorities empowered to administer public housing projects under a system of differential units and subsidies to individual tenants," he concluded.

The Ethics of Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I desire to include a speech made recently by Hon. Robert E. Freer, former Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and now prominent attorney of Washington.

The speech is as follows:

THE ETHICS OF ADVERTISING

(Speech of Robert E. Freer, before the Women's Advertising Club, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C., February 9, 1949)

P. T. Barnum in the nineteenth century testified to his most complete faith in advertising as the royal road to business, and it has been said that the genesis of industry's wide-scale adoption of advertising was when it simultaneously dawned on many established concerns that if the charlatan and even the swindler could make advertising pay so well, why wouldn't it be a profitable medium for businessmen who kept their promises? The chiselers, they felt, would always be with us but as subjects for control. The price of that control has been a measure or regulation of the whole advertising structure exemplified by Better Business Bureaus, by State Printers' Ink Statutes, by the Food and Drug Laws, and by the Wheeler-Lea amendments to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The Federal Trade Commission Act and these amendments, among other things, declared the use in interstate commerce of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts and practices to be unlawful. Lawyers characterize this kind of language as flexible language. So did Justice Brandeis when he said in an opinion, "Instead of undertaking to define what practices should be deemed unfair * * * the act left the determination to the Commission. Experience with existing laws had taught that definition, being necessarily rigid, would prove embarrassing and, if rigorously applied, might involve great hardship. * * * Furthermore, an enumeration, however comprehensive, of existing methods of unfair competition must necessarily prove incomplete, as with new conditions constantly arising novel unfair methods would be devised and developed."

In its administration of the act the Commission has encountered the new and the novel especially in the field of false advertising. For humor, I recall such a case against an individual marketing what he called Oriental love drops, a perfume guaranteed to make a man irresistible to his lady love; alas, it was not so. Another was against a motion-picture concern in Hollywood for advertising a picture as "an authentic, uncontestable celluloid document"; "the spectacular, sensational, real adventure film made with untold difficulties in the heart of Equatorial Africa," and that a strange new beast, the Tortadillo, had been discovered. The picture had been filmed right around Hollywood; the savage tribes all lived in the vicinity of Los Angeles; and the Tortadillo was a turtle to which had been glued wings, scales and an arresting tail.

Deceptive advertising harms customers and scrupulous business. In one famous case the Court said:

"The customer is prejudiced if, upon giving an order for one thing, he is supplied with something else. In such matters the public is entitled to get what it chooses, though the choice may be dictated by caprice or by fashion or ignorance. Nor is the prejudice only to the customer. Dealers and manufacturers are prejudiced when orders that would have come to them if the lumber had been rightly named, are diverted to others whose methods are less scrupulous. * * * The careless and the unscrupulous must rise to the standards of the scrupulous and the diligent. The Commission was not organized to drag the standards down."

The Government and the advertising industry see eye to eye on the proposition that false or misleading advertisements are harmful both to the consumer and to business. Agreed on the intellectual level of forthright condemnation of outright falsity, differences of opinion sometimes arise on the level of practical application to borderline situations. Words and sentences literally true, may be framed in a confusing setting capable of—if not artfully designed to be—misleading. It is just hard luck—yours and mine and the Federal Trade Commission's and the courts'—that no magic formula can resolve the implications of such loosely written advertising copy.

Many of the artful and unethical are to be found in the ranks of those selling nostrums suggested as safeguards against nonexistent dangers. To them, in the language of the police court, unspent consumer dollars are vagrants, to be forthwith corralled from the prototypes of the terrified gentlemen and agonized ladies whose innards may be depicted in the lurid copy.

No ingenious advertiser or Government expert as yet has invented the precise rule of thumb which will segregate the artful from the true, unvarnished variety of advertisement. The Commission has declined to issue advance opinions as to proposed advertising. Such a course I agree, gradually might evolve into some species of censorship, the attendant evils of which I need not discuss.

On the basis of the Commission's past experience and the known scientific information to which it has access, I believe that we can assume that it regards with suspicion advertising claims of any temporary relief preparation offered to cure the symptoms of, or to stop or end, any disease. Its suspicion extends also to the advertising of any simple emollient cosmetic offered as rejuvenative or restorative of ladies' beauty. On the other hand, without comprehensive investigation the Commission cannot know if there is concealment of material facts or if a twist here and a turn there distorts the truth.

These facts are or should be more readily available to the advertiser. What has been characterized as the addition of subjective values to selling by means of advertising cannot do away with what the Commission regards as the need for relevant truth as a competent guide to use. Whether calculated insertion of a restrictive weasel word here and a contradicting and subtractive phrase there are sufficient, in a given case, to remedy the deceptive ambiguity often presents a troublesome question. The test of unfairness was made elastic so that the Commission might keep pace with new promotional inventions. To evaluate, and to calibrate to the exact degree, the level of improvement to which business morals in general, and advertising in particular have evolved, is not possible. The upward trend though is plain and the Commission's action in resolving such matters should not be expected to run counter thereto or drag your ethical standards down.

In my experience I found myself often confronted with advertising claims which lay in another borderline zone—claims which were true literally when subjected to cold legal scrutiny—but which still were objectionable because of omission or inuendo, which might mislead the average consumer who does not read an advertisement as a legal document. At times the Commission proceeds against claims in this borderline, at other times it refused to take jurisdiction. Part of, but not all, these borderline cases were proper subjects for legal correction. As all such copy disseminates, however, it represents just one more temptation put in the path of others of the border fringe. Through precept and example, and by instilling into the minds of the users and producers of advertising the hard fact that complete candor and good taste in advertising is good business, you are in a position to accomplish as much as, or more than, the Government in discouraging the unethical. The Federal Trade Commission and other Government agencies may swing the big stick relentlessly against the border fringe without accomplishing much more than a segregation of those sinners whose horns are developed beyond the legal limit. This is the field in which your organization may be most effective, not by regulation, but simply by educating the businessmen and the advertising agency to the appreciation of the fact that the cumulative effect of such advertising policies must inevitably be loss of confidence in the product or its maker by the purchasing public. And for those of you who wish to make of your own or your clients' enterprise a lasting business, confidence of the public, more than mere recognition or knowledge of a brand or trade name is a pearl without price.

MISLEADING IMPRESSIONS

Now more about the legality of advertising of the misleading or deluding variety as dis-

tinguished from outright falsity. Here is a concrete example:

"Look 10 to 15 years younger, the way the stars do. Why worry because you have wringles, lines, baggy eyes, double chin, sagging muscles, or other age signs. Be amazed. Send $1."

Nowhere does this advertiser affirmatively state that these hallmarks of experience and wisdom in some, or addiction to the pleasures of the table on the part of others, will disappear. He merely suggests significantly that we dispense with worry, he invites our amazement. None of you, I am sure, will be amazed that, the respondent having admitted, in answer to complaint, that his face cream would not remove or eradicate such facial age signs, the Commission's order ran against representing directly or through inference that it would.

The courts as well as the Commission are sensitive to misleading impressions, as recorded in the following opinion:

"The buying public does not ordinarily carefully study or weigh each word in an advertisement. The ultimate impression upon the mind * * * arises from the sum total of not only what is said, but also of all that is reasonably implied. * * * such representations are made to the public, who, we assume, are not, as a whole, experts in grammatical construction. Their education in parsing a sentence has either been neglected or forgotten. * * * The law is not made for experts but to protect the public—that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, who, in making purchases, do not stop to analyze but too often are governed by appearances and general impressions. * * * Advertisements are intended not 'to be carefully dissected with a dictionary at hand, but rather to produce an impression upon' prospective purchasers."

TRADE PRACTICE CONFERENCES

The Federal Trade Commission's trade practice conferences afford valuable enlightenment on trends in business ethics. In some instances conferences have brought cooperative and simultaneous discontinuance in whole industries of twilight zone practices, in such conferences entire industries meet together under Commission auspices, discuss frankly their trade practices, and undertake to clean up all false and deceptive advertising. The conference procedure recognizes that the average American businessman is no petty pickpocket, to be haled into court at every opportunity. Giving him this chance to cooperate with his competitors and the Commission, with the objective of improving his business "morality" is generally more effective than swinging the big stick. Many industries formerly numbered among the Better Business Bureaus' Augean Stables stand witness to this method of house cleaning. Such conferences result not only in formal rules forbidding practices which are unfair under the law, but also in expressions of policy discouraging practices in the "twilight zone," and encouraging, in the interest of both industry and the consumer, the voluntary adoption of ethical standards considerably above the legal minimum.

The trade-practice conference is an unusually fine method of wholesale enforcement of the legal minima of fairness in many industries, obviating the necessity of many formal enforcement proceedings against individual concerns, and the attendant temporary competitive advantage of the recalcitrant firm over those more high-minded or tractable. But principally the advantage lies in the fact that often more real good can be accomplished on a voluntary basis than in an adverse proceeding, and much higher standards of ethical conduct adopted.

It is a hard and basic truth that a businessman wants his competitors to advertise truthfully. Upon information or belief that one or more of them is nibbling at truth's edges, he may adopt tomorrow at his office desk certain practical compromises with those concepts of truth in advertising, which today he enthusiastically endorses when he hears them expressed at a luncheon of his advertising club. When he shares in making trade practice conference rules for others, he is more apt to see to it that his business lives up to them.

I do not mean to infer that such conferences are always filled with sweetness and light. Often there is at least as much heat as light. I can recall particularly conferences which led to adoption of the trade-practice rules for the rayon industry. In fact the reverberations are still with us. The history of the rayon industry in this country points a good moral for the advertiser, and if any remark I make in this connection can be construed to bear resemblance to any particular advertiser, it is purely coincidental. It is not in the too distant past that the synthetic fibers were considered by the purchasing public to be sleazy substitutes for the real thing. How that impression came to be created may be a matter of debate, but no one ever denied that the best of them were of superior quality to the cheaper natural fibers. As a matter of fact, this was used extensively by opponents of proposals to require accurate descriptions of rayon as an argument to permit continuance of the practices which led to deception of the public.

Justice Holmes once made a statement to the effect that the test of truth is its ability to get itself accepted at the market place. The synthetic fibers have in a few short years demonstrated the truth of their desirable characteristics in the market place, not as substitutes but as what they really are, demonstrating perhaps more dramatically than is usual that the American consumer can be trusted with the real truth if it is given him or her. Thus, a product which was once advertised and labeled as if its marketers were ashamed of it and as if consumers would avoid it if possible now stands solidly on its own feet and commands buyer preference on its own merit. Despite the predictions of many persons that disclosure requirements would seriously injure industry, benefits to the trade actually followed their employment.

It is this characteristic of the public, its ability to handle the truth if furnished with it, that some advertisers seem to overlook. Conditions of modern marketing, where the purchaser may no longer rely upon his senses of touch, taste, or even sight in appraising the wares offered him in such bewildering profusion, make his need for honest information greater than it was even a few years ago. Numerous proposals have been made by consumer groups and others for some authoritative and official source of consumer information.

The popularity of some private bureaus, institutes, and consumer reports suggests some public approval of proposals for an authoritative or official source of consumer information. Advertising should concern itself with supplying such information. If it turns a deaf ear, who knows but that this polite consumer agitation may become a roar for establishment of machinery bypassing advertisers. I believe this is a field in which advertising itself can do much toward satisfying the consumer's great need, not so much for guidance as for enough information to make a wise selection. Now, I don't mean by that that it can be expected that second- or third-rate merchandise would be so described in such bald language in an advertisement for which good money was spent by an advertiser desiring to sell his products. Even the most visionary reformer would hardly expect human nature to change that much. But the advertising business as a whole should be alert to the public search for more honest information than generally is supplied, and, it seems to me, should be seriously concerned with the proposition of being the first to supply it.

A last year's issue of Printers' Ink referred to a poll of wage earner husbands and wives in which three-fourths of the pollees said that advertisements help give better products for the money. At the same time over one-half expressed the opinion that advertisements add to the cost of things. Two-thirds expressed some specific criticism of advertising they had recently noted. The general tenor of some complaints coming to me while I was chairman of the Commission indicates that at least a segment of the public holds either an emotional grudge or an intellectual spite against advertising as an institution. At times their observations bordered on the purple side, especially where the charge was lack of good taste, the regulation of which is certainly no function of the Commission or of any Government agency.

Elaborate aids are now available to test the reactions of the public to copy suspected of transgressing on the side of bad taste or indelicacy. Every program or piece of copy which offends even a few people harms advertising as an institution. Questionable taste and lack of candor harm advertising before they begin to affect sales of the advertised product. It is such an elemental truth that I hesitate to express it, that, however fine and constructive advertising may be as a whole, if any considerable portion of the public loses confidence in it for any reason, whether justified or not, the efforts of the best elements in the business will be wasted.

I have no doubt that advertising standards will be raised in the future as they have been in the past. Only by digging back into media of 10, 20, and 30 and more years ago can the great strides of past advancement be fully appreciated. Of course, the most obvious improvement is the conspicuous decline of the fly-by-night, get-rich-quick type of ad. Some are still with us. Like the poor they, no doubt, always will be with us. Certainly they will be so long as any media will disseminate them, since they have a one-crop harvest which can usually be gotten in the barn before the frost of a legal proceeding descends. And, like the modern farmer, this type of advertiser is a devotee of crop and field rotation. But to me the really impressive improvement is the rise of the informative and truthful type of advertising for established business, those of you who expect to be in the same business tomorrow, next year, and for years to come.

Such changes do not come easily, nor do they come chiefly as the result of Government regulation. As a matter of fact, if advertisers as a whole were no better than the Government required them to be, the situation would indeed be serious. The Food and Drug Administration, the Post Office Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Congress, of course, have participated in this change, and many practices which would have been ignored in the 1920's are now clearly within FTC's jurisdiction, either by decision or by amendment of the law. But in this change there is a lag between the minimal legal requirements and the best standards of business itself. By continually raising your standards, you make it possible for Government regulation to protect more fully the public and ethical business from the depredations of the unscrupulous.

And now, in conclusion, and I do wish to conclude promptly, since I am talking about advertising saints and sinners and an evangelist once observed that no souls were saved after the first 20 minutes, I want to express my personal appreciation for your fine work and to wish you every success in the future. This is not an entirely gratuitous and unselfish wish, for as a lawyer aiming to keep clients from straying into trouble I realize

full well that the effectiveness of such work depends in large measure on your support and cooperation in educating the businessman to the realization that the adage "honesty is the best policy" is not just an old saw, but is the cutting edge of really effective copy.

The $25 Poll Tax of the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial column by Albert Deutsch, as printed in the New York Post of February 9, 1949:

AMA BACKS DOWN
(By Albert Deutsch)

American doctors can refuse to pay that $25 assessment imposed by the American Medical Association without fear of being thrown out of the organization. That fact is now definitely established, following weeks of uncertainty since the AMA house of delegates secretly voted the tax in the hope of raising $3,500,000 for propaganda against national health insurance.

Dr. Morris Fishbein, AMA factotum, has stated authoritatively the national organization will not enforce sanctions of any kind against members who turn down the assessment.

Many doctors, resentful of the way in which the $25 tax was put across, and unwilling to pay it, have been worried about possible punitive action on the part of the State and local medical societies authorized to collect the tax for the parent organization. These doctors can now rest easy.

The Massachusetts State Medical Society has informed its members that payment of the tax is entirely voluntary, not compulsory. Many physicians in that State had vowed not to pay and to fight any effort to penalize them.

A spokesman for the New York State Medical Society informs me definitely that no action will be taken against any member refusing to pay the assessment. Nonetheless the assessment letter sent to all members last week over the signature of Dr. Leo F. Simpson, president of the New York State Medical Society, was so ambiguously worded that the recipient couldn't tell whether he was being asked or commanded to remit a $25 check.

There is little doubt that the AMA originally intended to make the $25 tax compulsory. Shortly after it was voted Dr. George F. Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, told me that, in his opinion, the assessment had the same binding force as regular dues and had to be paid. The AMA apparently changed its mind when disconcerting reports of resentment at the grass roots filtered into Chicago headquarters.

The AMA has sent word out quietly to all State and local affiliates that the $25 propaganda tax must be considered a voluntary matter.

Regardless of Dr. Fishbein's public statements to the effect that only a few medical malcontents are protesting the $25 assessment, the revolt against it is widespread and serious. In a letter to the New York Times the other day Fishbein wrote that only some 20 letters of protest had reached AMA headquarters.

At the time he wrote that letter Fishbein had on his desk a round-robin letter signed by 100 distinguished physicians—most of them conservatives and heads of medical-school departments throughout the country—vigorously protesting the $25 assessment.

The signers of the letter, headed by the great pediatrician, Dr. Edward A. Pack, of Johns Hopkins University, wrote Fishbein that unless the letter was printed in the Journal of the American Medical Association by February 12 it would be released to the general press. The signers of the letter were carefully selected for their conservative reputation to forestall any attempt to smear the protest as the product of "radical agitators."

It is expected that a large proportion of the AMA's 140,000 members, buttressed by the definite knowledge that payment of the assessment is not compulsory, will refrain from helping build up the war chest.

The threat of possible expulsion for nonpayment of the assessment hung heavily over many doctors whose very livelihood depended on their medical society membership.

Now that the punitive threat is lifted, the propaganda war chest is likely to be much lighter than originally expected.

Protest Against Imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Other Clergymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the executive board of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, CIO, Local Union No. 261, of Fall River, Mass., urging a diplomatic protest by the Government of the United States to Hungary and all foreign powers which are persecuting religion on false pretenses:

Whereas this executive board being composed of true, loyal Americans, it wishes to go on record, protesting the recent trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, prince of the church and primate of all Catholics of Hungary;

Whereas the result of this so-called kangaroo trial was known to the prosecutors and the whole Christian world even before said trial took place;

Whereas another foreign government is also persecuting ministers of the Protestant faith;

Whereas these governments being inside the iron curtain, controlled by orders of the Communist Party;

Whereas the ideologies of the Soviet Government toward God and religion are known to the Christian world;

Whereas these arrests and trials have been held in foreign countries where our great, free, independent Government has representation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this country, through its State Department head, enter a diplomatic protest to Hungary and all foreign powers who are persecuting religion on false pretense; Therefore be it

Resolved, That a protest also be made to the Security Council of the United Nations.

(Introduced by Raymond McGough, president of Local Union No. 261, URWA, CIO, and accepted by the executive board of said local.)

Something for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit an editorial article from the February 1949 issue of the Welding Engineer and an editorial on Americanism by Eddie Rickenbacker:

[From the Welding Engineer of February 1949]

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING

Since the very beginning of civilization man has tried to obtain gold from lead. Perpetual motion, another way of saying riches without effort, has been a popular quest too. The end of all such schemes has always been the same—proof that you can't get something for nothing.

History, which is a record of past mistakes, bears out the above conclusion. Every nation which rose to greatness in the past began to decline as soon as it started to adopt socialistic policies. A dictator of Athens replaced thrift and frugality with an elaborate and expensive program of public works. Look what happened to the Athenians of the next generation in their long conflict with Sparta. Rome, too, began to go down as soon as the stern simplicity of the Republic was replaced by the bread and circuses of Roman emperors.

The basic laziness of human beings prompts them to seek an easy road to success. That's why we have so many race tracks, slot machines, punch boards, and give-away radio programs. The political version of the something-for-nothing philosophy is, however, the most dangerous. To strip it of its camouflage verbiage, the idea is simply to take away from the so-called haves and give to the have nots. Neither the demagogues who advocate this unjust social program nor the rapacious multitude who clamor for it bother to think about what will happen when they have run out of something to give.

Utopia is a lovely word, promising peace and plenty for everyone, but it never seems to work out in practice. Committees and bureaus are poor substitutes for the creative powers of free individuals. The more paternal the government, the more stifling an effect it has upon the initiative of its citizens. The rule of the unrestrained majority puts the minority—which in reality may be an unorganized majority—completely at the mercy of the mob. Tumbrils to the guillotine are the next logical step.

England voted for the something-for-nothing plan at the close of the last war. Despite lavish "borrowings"—the Government of England in the past 8 years has received about $48,000,000,000 from freedom-loving America—the British ship of state has been barely kept afloat. The socialistic schemes promoted have made everyone more poor.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford Cripps, bragged recently in print about the manner in which incomes have been leveled in England. In 1939 over 11,000 English families had incomes of $20,000 or more a year; in 1948 only 250. Unfortunately, such leveling always means dragging down, never raising up. Incomes of the British lower classes have not been improved; in terms of what money is allowed to buy they are probably worse off than they have ever been.

A government which lowers top salaries to the level of unskilled labor may be popular

with the masses but it offers little scope to the ambitious. Such a political system may not produce grossly overpaid movie stars and Jack Bennys, but it will certainly sacrifice the Henry Fords, Edisons, Westinghouses and others of their type who have helped to make America great.

As far as our own industry is concerned, we cannot do better than quote from the magazine Welding. In discussing the possible nationalization of the iron and steel industry (Mr. Truman would like to have $5,000,000,000 for experiments along this line), this British publication states: "As has happened with the prices of nationalized coal and electricity, we may expect a rise in the price of steel generally. * * * As for welding electrodes, we have already seen what Government aid can do in that direction by allowing the import of expensive foreign brands and depriving our own factories of wire. Under the new regime it may be expected that this state of affairs will be allowed to continue. Highly probable increases in the prices of such wire as may be available will strike a crippling blow at welding, which must remain an economical process if it is to be used at all."

In theory one of your best friends is your Congressman. Have you written to that best friend lately? Better keep him posted as to your thinking on the present trend. We don't want it to happen here.

T. B. JEFFERSON.

GOODS FOR GOODS

Capitalism is a steadily shrinking island of free enterprise surrounded by turbulent and destructive seas of monopoly controlled by economic and political dictators.

These monopolies, in which neither producer nor consumer, employer nor employee, determine the scale, standard, or cost of living, range all the way from the so-called Socialist system now in control in England to enslaving communism as practiced in Russia and other iron-curtain countries.

The whole purpose of business, industry, finance, and agriculture is to produce at costs that provide the greatest volume of goods for the greatest number of people.

Men can fill libraries with books on economics, monetary systems, political sciences, and social reforms. I will not say that this is a waste of time, but I do claim that all the codes which govern and concern the comfort of man can be compressed into these three words, "Goods for goods."

The sooner the world reestablishes this simple fact the sooner we will return to an even keel of political, mental, and economic security.

There is no wealth of any kind outside of products in services and goods. The only riches which enable us to eat and drink, or clothe, shelter, and educate ourselves and our families are the riches that are made through the skills of man in industry or grown through the skills of man on farms.

No government can wave a magic wand and provide things for people who do not produce. No social code, no political vote bait, no creed, can meet the needs of those who do not produce. "Goods for goods" is the controlling law. It cannot be amended nor repealed.

Production, not money, is the master of the world. And I, for one, have never been able to understand why a system such as America's unbeatable policy of productive and shared free enterprise needs so much explanation, so much underscoring, so much selling. Free enterprise should sell itself every day in the world-wide news you read in newspapers, hear on the radio, or see on the news screen.

Capitalism has become a highly misinterpreted word. Capitalism, in the true productive sense, is not a banker under a top hat, a boss in a limousine, or a stockholder on a yacht. Capitalism is a structure of production, and I invite anyone to show where the state ownership of socialism or mass enslavement of communism have provided so much for so many in any land on earth as has capitalism in America.

We in America are free to work where we want to work; free to work at the type of work we want; free to live where we want to live. Try to do that in Russia, and you land in jail.

EDDIE RICKENBACKER,
President and General Manager,
Eastern Air Lines, Inc.

Recovery, Not Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the ECA has from the first been the racket of the few who have sought to keep it so. Now those on the outside of the racketeering ring want to get in and get theirs. The entire swag will be paid for by the taxpayers.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am inserting an article which appeared in the Washington Post, Monday, February 21, 1949, the title of which is "Recovery, Not Relief."

RECOVERY, NOT RELIEF

By far the most important task confronting ECA is to persuade Congress and the American people to recapture and effectuate the vision and meaning of the Marshall plan. A locust crowd of lobbyists is trying to devour whatever sen: the program may contain. They are agents of the coal-mining industry, shipping and marine insurance companies, manufacturers of machine tools, tires, and automobiles, and other producers—all have come to Washington to plead for more generous allotments of ECA dollars to finance shipments of their products or to pay for their services. If these petitioners had their way, ECA funds that otherwise would be available to build up European industries would have to be spent on American automobiles, machinery, and equipment and used to subsidize American shipping. Unless this drive to force ECA to provide larger export outlets for American goods and American services is arrested, the recovery program will soon degenerate into an outright relief program. Participating countries would then be compelled to use ECA allotments to buy products needed to expand their own industries and speed recovery.

It is reported on reliable authority that Administrator Hoffman intends to issue a statement next Monday pointing out that the ECA was established for the express purpose of helping other countries to increase their productive capacity, not to create markets for American goods. A timely warning of this kind is greatly needed, not only to apprise the public of the present threat to the integrity of the ECA but to remind certain Members of Congress that they are endangering the recovery program by sponsoring demands of special interest groups for a larger share of ECA funds. The Washington Post hopes that Mr. Hoffman will register a vigorous protest against the destructive activities of the lobbyists. They have forgotten, if they ever knew, that the purpose of ECA is to foster economic recovery abroad, not to subsidize domestic exporting industries; to wind up Operation Rathole, not to perpetuate it; to put Europe on its feet, not in the American pocket; to promote self-reliance, not chronic mendicancy. It would be scandalous if Congress were to yield to importunings which would justify Russian criticism and encourage those self-complacent Europeans who have been saying all along that the Marshall plan was merely a device to get rid of American surpluses.

Why Americans Have the Best and Cheapest Food in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in the Saturday Evening Post for February 5, 1949, there is an advertisement by the Country Gentleman magazine which ought to be of interest to every American.

This advertisement points out that our great industrial production and our high standard of living in this country have been made possible by American farmers and their families. I think every Member of Congress will be interested in reading the text of this advertisement; and, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the same herewith:

THANK THEM FOR ROARING FACTORIES AS WELL AS ABUNDANT FOOD

We owe thanks to our farmers and their families for much more than the world's best food on our tables.

America's farm families also make possible our great industrial production with widespread employment at good wages.

Not just because most of industry's raw material—65 percent of all new wealth created annually in the Nation—has its origin in the soil.

And not just because farm families, as customers, buy more than a third of our factory output.

But mostly because their bountiful production makes food so abundantly available to all people in America.

We spend relatively little of our earnings for food. Over the long period in which records have been kept by the United States Department of Agriculture, food has taken an average of only 24 percent of our spendable personal income.

Contrast our situation with that of less fortunate countries.

England must export a major share of its industrial production—to pay for food which even in the low-price prewar years took over 35 percent of its people's spendable income.

In France and Italy, the average workingman spends 70 percent of his earnings to feed his family on lowest quality food.

In China and India, where food requires nearly all of the people's energy and income, there is little left to support industrial production of other goods.

Only in America have people been able to eat so well, so inexpensively, and have so much left for purchasing the products of industry that they need and want for good living.

In America, farm families have earned a generous slice of the Nation's prosperity. By farming better, they have made possible better living for themselves and everyone else. The farmer and his family now share a blessing to which they have contributed so much * * * the highest standard of living of any country in the world.

Solvency of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 19, 1949:

ABROAD—ITALY MAY BECOME SOLVENT IN 3 YEARS

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

ROME, February 18.—The budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1 will be presented to the Chamber of Deputies before the end of February. This is part of the routine business of every government, but Italian budget makers and members of the ECA mission in Rome talk of it as excitedly as if it were the turning point in a war. In a way it is; one thing the itinerant reporter learns on his rounds these days is that there are all sorts of unreported battles. One is the battle of the budgets and under the ERP it takes on an international character.

The ECA casts a probing eye on the national balance sheets. American experts watching the Italian Ministry of the Budget juggling figures seem highly pleased that a country like Italy, left bankrupt by the war, is able to reduce its deficit from 700,000,000,000 lire to 250,000,000,000 lire in 2 years and expects to strike a balance by the time the Marshall plan aid ends in 1952.

The new Italian budget gives promise that at the present rate of progress the country can become solvent in 3 years. Final estimates are not yet completed, but the figures at hand place the national revenue for the coming year at about 1,000,000,000,000 lire and expenditures at about one thousand three hundred and fifty billions. Something over one hundred billions represents the so-called lira fund, the counterpart for American aid, and is earmarked for capital investment in permanent projects. Therefore it is figured that the real deficit will not be over two hundred and fifty billions as against five hundred billions in the current year and seven hundred and fifty billions last year.

A KEEN-MINDED PROFESSOR

Former Minister of the Budget Luigi Einaudi is now President of the Republic. Italy's leading economist, he is credited with saving the country from the runaway inflation that threatened 2 years ago and with putting it on the road to solvency. Many Italians regret he is no longer where he was to stem the present inflationary movement. In talking to him in the great echoing palace of the Quirinal one suspects the President shares this regret. A handful of royal guards and lackeys remain to provide a modest show of state for the republican successor of departed royalty, but he is still a simple little professor—keen-eyed, keen-minded, interested as ever in the subject to which he has devoted a lifetime of study and thought. His vast house, built to lodge a conclave of cardinals, offers him less comfort than the little villa he occupied last year and his high office gives him less power than he wielded when he was called "economic dictator."

Unless the average income and standard of living are raised—the aim of experiments in land reclamation proposed by the ECA—balancing the budget may add to the stability but not to the prosperity of the country. Against the optimistic picture suggested by the diminishing deficit is the hard fact that the value of the lira is also descending. Obviously there is inflation. Prices are abnormally high and the plight of the middle class, which is being squeezed out of existence all over Europe, is worse here than elsewhere. In part, as Dr. Einaudi and other economists point out, the present inflation is due to the circumstance that Italy has become a creditor country. It has a slight excess of exports over imports. And since credits are in French francs, pounds sterling, and other currencies with which she cannot buy essential materials at prices she can afford to pay, these funds accumulate in the Bank of Italy while lire have to be issued against them. This is only one of a thousand proofs that the currency question lies literally at the heart of economic sickness. Until the circulation system is made to do the world's work normally, no amount of pumping will cure the disease.

PARADOX IN ITALY

Nor can it be forgotten that the figures being debated in the Finance Committee of the Chamber do not take into account the war indemnities to which Italy is liable under the terms of the peace treaty. Another of the crowding paradoxes of our strange times is that Italians are delivering ships and preparing to pay reparations to one victor while their economy is being restored at the expense of another. For if the outlook is brighter than could have been foreseen a year ago even the Communists cannot deny that American aid is the decisive factor in the improvement. All they can say is that it means American domination, and even that automatic cry falls pretty flat in the face of the practically unlimited freedom they and all other citizens enjoy under the most stable and democratic government Italy has known since the First World War.

A shrewd Swiss observer who knows the country well thought that pessimism was the chief danger before last year's elections. Today he thinks it is overoptimism. It is true, as the wise old President observes, as he looks across Rome from the oddly detached and quiet heights of the Quirinal, that an improved budget is only one index of economic health. How far national income can be cut and stretched to satisfy the clamorous demand for necessary services is the real test.

Italy's perpetual handicap is poverty. Under the spell of the sun, abundance of good food in shop windows and restaurants, and cheerful faces of people who have a habit of smiling, the traveler is apt to forget how desperately hard life is for the majority. Italians are resilient, quick to react to any lightening of their lot, cheered by any sign of American optimism.

Their biggest national assets are energy and hope. These are not negligible quantities in the ERP balance.

Veterans Will Pay Large Part of Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this editorial from the Portage (Wis.) Daily Register:

Now that the issue of pensions for veterans is before the Congress, it might be interesting and significant to get the opinions of rank-and-file veterans.

They are not united in favor of such legislation by any means. Many of them insist that in the end they will be forced to pay a large part of the cost themselves, and they wonder if that isn't an example of boot-strap lifting, or trying to make money by taking in your own washing.

One veteran we know who is just getting a start on his career feels that great new financial burdens on the Nation will inevitably be carried by the ambitious young men of today. He favors a system where he has an opportunity to earn his own pension or retirement reserve rather than one in which there is little opportunity for business success, but pensions and benefits from the Government for everybody.

We do believe that there are still some debts due the veterans of World War II. The on-the-job and educational benefits granted under the GI bill have discharged that obligation to some veterans, but others have not been in a position to take advantage of this. Perhaps there should be some form of adjusted compensation for them also.

But every veteran should view the program of pensions for all veterans with some misgivings. For the fact cannot be ignored that a large proportion of the gainfully employed men of the Nation for many years to come will be veterans, and they will be the ones who will have to pay a large part of this pension in one form or another.

High Prices, Small Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have heard in this House many comments concerning the Government's potato program. Apparently this program has never been satisfactorily rationalized for America's housewives.

The Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., discusses this problem in an interesting and thought-provoking editorial which I wish to include as part of my remarks at this time:

HIGH PRICES, SMALL POTATOES

The distaff side of the household, who lists among her other manifold duties that of purchasing agent, has been wondering for some time what has happened to the big potatoes she used to find at market. There are some around, we are told, but you have to hunt far afield for them. The general run are the small, knobby kind.

Now, thanks to Senator WILLIAMS and Washington Columnist Mark Sullivan, we have an answer. It is very revealing, and not of the type that housewives will find soothing. It is all tied up with the Government program of price supports of farm produce, and, as Mr. Sullivan explains it, works something like this:

The Department of Agriculture, to keep the price of potatoes up, pays growers $2.92 per hundred pounds for big potatoes. For little potatoes, and inferior grades, the Department pays $1.46. Since the market price for the big potatoes was below the Government price, growers naturally sold their top grade to the Government, and diverted the lower grades to the consumer market. What happened to the big potatoes then? They were diverted to other than normal channels, i. e. for the manufacture of industrial alcohol, starch, and other items. Some of the top-grade potatoes went to feed livestock, accompanied by a stipulation which, accord-

ing to Senator WILLIAMS, "will not allow any of them * * * to be used for human consumption."

To sum it up, the Department's price support program has the effect of making prices higher, and potatoes smaller (for the consumer).

Mr. Sullivan thoughtfully asks (and so do we), "Is price support (in this case) justified in the public interest?"

The Waterline's War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Los Angeles Daily News:

[From the Daily News of Los Angeles, Calif., of February 15, 1949]

THE WATERLINES WAR: I

Human values as well as money values in southern California are written in great measure in terms of water. The lifelines that reach from the Colorado River to the homes, farms, and industries of southern California sustain our regional economy.

Expressed in another way, the 5,326,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water in use or authorized for use in southern California cities provide millions of jobs.

But if from an ultimate defici' of the river's water additional quantities are taken away to serve a huge project in thinly settled Arizona, then southern California will suffer.

This is the issue over which today's Arizona-California water war is being fought.

A few days ago southern California won a victory in a major battle of this water war. President Truman's opposition to the proposed central Arizona project was clearly stated in a letter addressed to Secretary of the Interior Krug by Director Frank Pace, Jr., of the United States Budget Bureau. Subsequently the President reaffirmed his stand.

The President's position, as outlined in the Pace letter, is that the Arizona project is "not in accord with his program at this time and that he again recommends that measures be taken to bring about prompt settlement of the water rights controversy."

Thus undoubtedly final solution of a conflict which has persisted for more than 25 years has been brought nearer as the result of the administration's clear-cut rejection of the Arizona scheme. The cartoon on this page by Daily News Artist George Fisher proclaims hope the war soon may be ended.

But southern Californians can't relax in their fight, nevertheless. Until the issue is brought before the United States Supreme Court—which will require action by the Eighty-first Congress authorizing a suit—local residents can't assume they won't be plagued by new water diversion projects.

The Arizona bills still are before Congress. They remain a continuing threat to southern California's water supply.

Essentially the Arizona-California dispute stems from the fact that the two States do not agree on their interpretations of certain provisions contained in the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon project, and related documents.

To get an impartial interpretation—fair to all the people of the Southwest—is the purpose of the proposed Supreme Court suit. Gov. Earl Warren was among the first—if not actually the first—to suggest this means of resolving the controversy.

Arizona, however, has refused this method of adjudication, instead has lobbied for a $738,000,000 Federal appropriation for an all-Arizona project at Bridge Canyon and an aqueduct to transport water to central Arizona through tunnels 80 miles long, bypassing Boulder Dam.

What's wrong with the Arizona scheme is that there just isn't enough water in the lower basin of the Colorado to supply such a project. Any water made available by such a project would have to be taken by depriving Californians of their rights on the river upon which investments of more than $500,000,000 already have been made.

California water interests—notably the Colorado River Association—point out that the sponsors of the central Arizona project are in reality seeking to break down the long-established standards of feasibility set up in reclamation law.

Arizona backers propose extending the repayment period from the present requirement of 50 years to 80 years or more. They also propose that money collected as interest on the power features of the project be diverted to repay the capital cost and subsidize the irrigation features of the project. This would mean a loss to the taxpayers of the United States of approximately $250,000,000. And it would stand in sharp contrast to the Boulder Dam project, which is paying, through power income, 3 percent interest to the Federal Treasury.

In the light of these facts President Truman's thumbs-down on the Arizona business makes a great deal of sense.—R. E. G. H.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Daily News of Wednesday, February 16, 1949]

THE WATERLINES WAR: II

Because the thirsty land of southern California looks first of all to the Colorado River for its life source, all local citizens must protect their rightful share of the river's total available annual average supply of 10,900,000 acre-feet of water.

Water requirements pressed upon the Colorado by the entire Pacific Southwest already exceed the river's long-time average supply. These requirements, as compiled by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, are as follows:

Colorado River water available in lower basin

(Data from U. S. Bureau of Reclamation March 1946 Report. "The Colorado River," App. I, pp. 282–283, except as noted. Lee Ferry is division point between upper and lower basins.)

	Acre-feet
Colorado River average (1897–1943 period) annual virgin or undepleted flow at Lee Ferry	16,270,000
Upper basin allocation by Colorado River Compact	−7,500,000
Lower basin's available supply at Lee Ferry (Estimated long-time average, which would be reduced to 7,500,000 acre-feet as a 10-year average, in severe drought periods)	8,770,000
Net average gain (less river losses) of lower basin tributaries, except Gila River	+400,000
Main stream reservoir losses, Lake Mead, etc (U. S. Bureau of Reclamation estimate, including Davis and Bridge Canyon projects)	−870,000
Lower basin available supply from main Colorado River	8,300,000
Gila River Basin of Arizona net beneficial consumptive use	2,300,000
Probable salvage of natural main stream losses, upper and lower basins	800,000
Lower basin total average available supply	10,900,000

Water requirements

	Acre-feet
Nevada: Contract with United States, plus a possible claim on portion of surplus	800,000
Utah and New Mexico: Portions in lower basin U. S. B. R. estimate, but these States' claims may be greater	138,000
Mexico: Including regulation losses, estimated not less than average of	1,700,000
California: Operating projects, by contracts with the United States	5,362,000
Arizona: Gila Basin present use	2,300,000
Yuma project in Arizona	200,000
Parker Valley Indian lands	300,000
Little Colorado River and other tributaries	90,000
Mojave Valley, etc., on Colorado River	10,000
Gila project (new) from Colorado River	600,000
Total for present and authorized propects	3,500,000
(Does not include 1,200,000 acre-feet annually called for by the proposed central Arizona project)	
Lower basin total for present and authorized projects	11,000,000
Lower basin total average available supply	10,900,000
Deficit indicated on long-time average basis	100,000
(Amount of beneficial consumptive use on the Gila River is in controversy, but this does not affect the main stream deficit because the figure for such beneficial consumptive use, no matter what it may be, appears on both the credit and debit sides of the computatiton)	
The figure of 100,000 is based upon U. S. Bureau of Reclamation records up to 1943. Low flows on the river since that date increase the deficit to	300,000

(Note: Despite the ultimate deficit of from 100,000 to 300,000 acre-feet now confronting operating and authorized projects, the proposed central Arizona project seeks to take another 1,200,000 acre-feet annually.)

The above figures explain why the Arizona scheme is inimical to local interests. These figures support Reclamation Commissioner Straus' contention that further development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin, particularly large-scale development, is seriously handicapped, if not barred, by lack of determination of the rights of the individual States to utilize the waters of the Colorado River system.

Certainly United States Supreme Court adjudication, as proposed in bills submitted last year at the Eightieth Congress, offers a sensible, peaceful, disinterested way of ending the water war.

California strongly favors Supreme Court disposition of the water dispute. California feels any fair and impartial body will respect its riparian rights. The problem, therefore, is to get the Eighty-first Congress to do what the Eightieth Congress sidestepped doing.

If California should lose its long-standing water rights on the Colorado, a pall would be cast over the whole Southland's future. Actual valuation of property in member cities of the metropolitan water district—cities that depend on the Colorado River for the protection of their property values—is more than $8,750,000,000. Yet this is only one

measure of the immense stake involved in the Arizona-California water controversy. There are other values. For example:

Human values assume even greater significance when the proposed use of the Colorado's limited water is examined. In Arizona only some 4,000 farm families would derive benefits. In California cities, not less than 5,000,000 men, women, and children are, or will be, sustained by the waters of the Colorado.

Consider, also, the cash receipts from farming of the six southern California counties within the service area of Colorado River water:

Cash receipts from farming in the 6 southern California counties within the service area of Colorado River water, 1947

Los Angeles	$198,165,000
Riverside	70,014,000
Orange	77,065,000
San Bernardino	73,115,000
Imperial	87,377,000
San Diego	37,738,000
Total	543,474,000

Source: California Crop and Livestock Reporting Service.

Yet even as valuable as this total farming economy is, it is restricted by lack of water. Only 10 percent of the 25,000,000 acres of land in all southern California, including the six counties listed above, is arable because of lack of water.

Whether, in view of a late dispatch yesterday from the Daily News Washington Bureau, President Truman will remain opposed to the Arizona scheme is a pertinent question. There are signs the President may be backing down.

Thus there's all the more reason for southern California to continue the fight and to press for a peaceful and just solution of the water controversy.—R. E. G. H.

Rail Safety Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times on rail safety improvement.

RAIL SAFETY IMPROVEMENT

American railroads are to be commended for an outstanding safety record in 1948. The number of passengers killed in train collisions or derailments was the smallest in 12 years. Fatalities to employees dropped to the lowest level in half a century.

The Interstate Commerce Commission lists 19 passenger deaths in collisions or derailments. There were 34 in 1947. There were 566 fatalities to employees from all types of accidents, compared to 709 the previous year.

As good as it is comparatively, the record does not invite complacence. As long as train collisions occur, there is always the chance that one wreck will take as many passenger lives as were lost in the whole year. This chance can be reduced only by widespread adoption of train-radio communication and other devices that serve when human judgment fails.

The railroads can take pride in their 1948 record. They and the ICC, however, must face the fact that thousands of miles of main-line track still rely on hand signals, flares, and written train orders. These are not enough in a day of mile-a-minute trains.

Film "State Department, File 649" Lauds Government's Unsung Consular Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Hollywood, from time to time, has done its share in calling attention to governmental activities. There came to my attention recently a motion picture entitled "State Department, File 649," which tells, in interesting manner, how the unsung heroes of the State Department's Consular Service perform their varied functions, sometimes in the face of great danger. I would like to praise Mr. Joseph Bernhard, president of Film Classics, Inc., and of Cinecolor, as well as Mr. B. G. Kranze, vice president and general sales manager, for turning the spotlight of Hollywood's attention upon those in Government service who ofttimes are ignored and neglected.

"State Department, File 649," is a story of a young consulate employee whose exploits are listed, in matter-of-fact manner, in the files of the State Department. Dramatized by Hollywood's writers, the film helps focus attention upon the manner in which our Government and its employees operate in foreign countries.

It is interesting to note that Hollywood, through Film Classics, Inc., and perhaps through other companies, is calling attention to the work performed by Government agencies, not only in the United States, but in other countries. If such films succeed in creating a better understanding of Government operations, I think it is important that these efforts on the part of men like Mr. Bernhard and Mr. Kranze deserve a measure of praise.

Address of Hon. Ralph Harvey, of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. RALPH HARVEY, of Indiana, at Lincoln City, Ind., February 12, 1949:

Friends of southern Indiana, you and I are privileged to meet and meditate in a place of eloquent charm. It was near this spot, on the fringe of a river-bottom wilderness, that the immortal Lincoln spent the impressionable days of his poverty-ridden boyhood. It is here now, in the heartland of the Republic he saved, that Americans must keep forever alive and inviolate the rights of freemen, their love of liberty, and their passion for justice.

The few minutes we take now to recall Abraham Lincoln and the story of his life are well invested. His breadth of tolerance, his compassion for the less fortunate, and through every adversity, his strength of soul are ennobling inspirations to us all. It is to the lasting credit of this State and you, the people of this community, that here, enshrined in this memorial to his mother, his greatness will never be forgotten.

You and I have inherited more than the lore of a great man. We, in addition, have inherited the opportunity to preserve those simple virtues that he lived by and the duty to advance those causes that meant more to him than life itself.

Abraham Lincoln is today a symbol—a symbol of goodness that shines majestically against the brooding skies. The brilliance of that goodness cannot be dimmed by the shams of lesser men—their jealousies, greed, or hypocrisy. It is a steady flame, calm and consecrated, burning on into eternity.

Lincoln's origin in Kentucky, his youth in Indiana, and his maturity in Illinois are facts of time and place. In them we Hoosiers share a possessive pride without sentimental illusions. We recognize that in his climb from the crude cradle of the untutored to the pinnacle of his country's leadership, Lincoln became the statesman; by his constancy of character through his Nation's darkest hour of tragedy, he became its savior, and when the mad assassin's bullet cut short his life, the memory of his noble labor carried his name to the heights of immortality.

We who now dwell and toil on the plot of earth young Abraham Lincoln loved so well must share with all the peoples of the world the lessons of liberty he passed along to our own and other generations.

Our reverence today is less for the memory of Lincoln than for the mood and motive of the man. He might have lived at any period and place, for in the small affairs of neighbors or the larger ones of a divided nation, he brought to bear the ageless wisdom of those cardinal virtues—honesty, humility, and the practice of the Golden Rule.

Yet all these assumed new stature and clearer meaning when sustained by the courage, the tenacity, and the unyielding faith of his genius.

Lincoln's mood, in spite of the trials he endured, was serene, patient, and forgiving. Born and bred as the most common of commoners, he so persevered in his devotion to unaffected honesty and natural simplicity that those about him failed to sense his quality. They could not fully realize that a man so tall, so gaunt, and so ungainly could possess such a depth of understanding, such a wealth of human sympathy, and a grace of mind which could and did transcend the petty and the mean.

The motive of Lincoln was love of his fellow men. Within him the thirst for knowledge was exceeded only by a consuming zeal to be of service to all who came his way, whether a neighbor, a client, or as events later demanded, a nation torn by conflicting philosophies of fundamental human rights.

We are hard put, at this stage of our national life, to practice the philosophy of Lincoln. It seems to most of us that the world has come farther and faster in the 140 years since the birth of the Emancipator than in the aeons before that day. Our times, we say, are filled with the complexities of a mechanized age, our country engulfed by challenging problems of vast social significance, and our shrinking world woefully impoverished by the devastation of two great wars.

The backwoods youth who studied a few borrowed books by firelight seems a spirit far removed from one plumbing the incredible secrets of atomic energy. Yet Lincoln knew that for all the wonders they may achieve with hand and brain, men in their natural aspirations remain much the same. The years he spent living here close to nature enriched for him a keen and penetrating grasp of nature's divine miracle—humanity.

When reminded that "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community

of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well for themselves in their separate and individual capacity" we are being counseled by the sixteenth President of the United States. But to complete his definition of the object of government, Lincoln added these words:

"In all that people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

Somewhere between these two basic concepts lies the ideological differences of our two major parties, and while allowing for the occasional errors of our public policies, we cherish America's two-party political system because it, in sum total, has provided us the best government yet devised by a free people.

Neither of two parties, we know beyond question, can ever betray its mission so long as both dedicate their efforts to sustain Lincoln's profound utterance: "That government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

If we would profit by Lincoln's example, we can do no better than stand before the world as a Nation of good will. Our growth as a constitutional sovereignty, our endless contributions to the science of civilization, our institutions founded on freedom, equality, and opportunity mark us a self-ruling people of divergent interests—yes; mixed ancestry—yes; and of varying creeds, but one and united in political purpose—the pursuit of peace, progress, and prosperity for all.

Our country is cooperating with others in the quest for peace. We have volunteered our aid to lands and peoples throughout the free world. We seek trade relations and honorable intercourse with any and all who respect our rights as we respect theirs. We are striving unselfishly, through the town hall of the United Nations, to cooperate with others in attaining that degree of international order and stability which will spare from a devastating war the masses of people in all corners of the globe.

Today, through sheer and stern necessity, we are arming ourselves and lending help to the task of maintaining freedom wherever its existence is threatened. As with Lincoln, the President, we confront a menace not of our own choosing, and like Lincoln, the humble, we seek providential guidance in a crusade to uphold good over evil, right over might, and freedom over tyranny. We are compelled by events to prepare for war, but we are spurred by conviction to pray for peace.

We need not fear that stronger hands than ours will reign over the rest of the world so long as ours are clean. There is for us a moral duty, not alone to those who have given their lives in battle, but to countless millions who live in hope of a better life, to face realistically the enemies of freedom and decency. We are not endeavoring to thrust upon them our way of life, but we stand resolved in our belief that all free peoples should remain free to work out their own salvation. It cannot be successfully argued that we seek abroad a dominion to rule, an empire to covet, or a people to exploit. Instead we encourage all men to emulate the political ideals, the material abundance, and the spiritual strength we have nurtured and multiplied through centuries of free and competitive enterprise.

Within our Union of 48 States, we propose that our people shall determine their destiny by exercising constitutional rights—their guaranteed freedoms of speech, assembly, press, and religion. Theirs, too, must be the right to select public officials, and through them so construe and execute the laws that a maximum of economic opportunity, civil equality, and social justice is assured every citizen.

It is as individuals that we need to clarify our thinking with Lincoln's political philosophy. In current times of stress and pressure, we are tempted to risk those courses that promise profit where there is no production, security where there is no creative force at work. Profit and security, in whatever form they take, are but compensations for those who have earned them through a judicious investment of sweat and skill.

We are beset by earnest folk who would ease our individual responsibilities with schemes of collective welfare. Their proposals warrant sober study, for we have developed an intricate society balanced between the resources of capital and labor.

But we are besieged, too, by the impractical and fuzzy thinkers, the demagogues who would assume our personal obligations if we but surrender our liberties in the bargain. They fill the air with their cry against the unjust, but their subtle schemes to give every man his due include the unfailing device to level off by leveling downward. Somehow they would have us individually poor but collectively rich.

Lincoln, when driven to the extremity of war to save the Nation, looked back upon the experiences and the wisdom of earlier patriots. He found in their lives and teachings the principles that have become the fiber of America.

In order to form a more perfect union and secure the blessings of liberty, our forefathers ordained the Constitution.

We the people, to sustain their faith, now pledge anew our trust in God and resolve to keep this mighty Republic worthy of its heritage—the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Congress: The Safeguard of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dictators' First Move Is To Wreck Free Legislatures," from the newspaper Labor for February 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DICTATORS' FIRST MOVE IS TO WRECK FREE LEGISLATURES—CANNON, OF MISSOURI, IN A GREAT SPEECH, DEFENDS THE LAWMAKING BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

"Wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government."

Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, Democrat, made that statement in the course of an unusual speech in the House. He was defending the lawmaking branch of government against the cheap, nasty attacks directed against it by the ignorant, the careless, the designing. It was a carefully thought-out speech, marked by flashes of genuine eloquence. It was probably the most worth-while speech of this session of Congress, but, unfortunately, the press had little or no space for it.

So modest is CANNON that most Americans have never heard of him, yet he is one of the influential figures in the House and recognized by all as a leading authority on parliamentary law. He wrote the manual which Congress uses to determine problems of procedure. He knows the lore of all representative bodies which have come and gone in history.

He has been 26 years in the House and heads the Committee on Appropriations, which holds Uncle Sam's purse strings and is probably the most powerful committee of Congress.

CANNON, talking from all this knowledge and experience, said:

"Oliver Cromwell, ending the British Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons, and cried: 'Take away this bauble.' Out with it went representative government in England.

"Napoleon stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried: 'Follow me! I am the divinity of the day.' His bayonets drove out the representatives of the people—drove out civil and religious liberties.

"Hitler, seizing the reins of government in Germany, burned the Reichstag building, so Germany's House of Representatives was unable to meet. Free government was destroyed in Germany and put in peril throughout the world.

"Of course, armed interference with the legislative branch of the government would be impossible in America today. But there are other ways of undermining the people's confidence in Congress."

CANNON quoted many of the recent extravagant attacks on Congress—columnists, radio commentators and others, including a newspaper editorial screaming: "The crisis is a challenge to do something before it is too late. It is an alarming situation."

"Too late for what?" CANNON asked. "What is it that is so alarming?"

Turning from the unbridled criticisms of Congress, CANNON praised some sane appraisals.

"Here," he said, "is one by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor: 'Anything that brings Congress into disrepute weakens the fabric of American democracy.'

"Let me also include a comment from Labor:

" 'We still believe that the best way to streamline Congress is to elect the right kind of men to the House and Senate. They will always find a way to enact desirable legislation'."

Labor has often criticized individual Members of Congress, and will continue to do so. As CANNON said, that is the right and duty of every citizen.

But we agree that attacks upon Congress as an institution are a different and dangerous thing. So long as we have a freely elected Congress there will be liberty throughout the land. When Congress goes, our freedom will go with it.

The Economic Situation of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK B. KEEFE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, today's mail contained a letter from a constituent living at Kiel, Wis. He said:

DEAR MR. KEEFE: Can you give me more data on the present conditions we are experiencing these last 2 months? Why are so many men being laid off. Why is industry cutting down to 32 to 40 hours a week? Why is business way off in all lines. Are we headed for a depression? The average pay check around here is from $28 to $30 a week and the cost of living has not gone down as yet. The average man can't make ends meet. What are the reasons for this condition? Is it the reckless spending on the part of the Government, or what?

Well, I do not profess to know all the answers to the questions in this letter, but a lot of scattered evidence has been piling up indicating that the false prosperity induced by Government wartime spending may be about over. Some prices have turned downward; unemployment is appearing in many parts of the Nation. A note of caution is appearing in most business transactions. The experts deny that the Nation is heading into a depression, but cautiously admit we may be approaching a leveling-off period.

The facts, if you actually want to recognize them, are that the causes of the 1929 depression were never really corrected. It may have been a temporary palliative but was no solution to the problem to have the United States Treasury pour out millions of dollars for leaf raking from 1929 to 1939. Unemployment remained until the United States was converted by Government decree into the arsenal of democracy and then an actual participant in World War II. Under the stimulus of the conflict, men went to work or to war, income was high, enforced savings put paper wealth in people's bank accounts and safety deposit boxes, but the goods produced were principally for waging war, and, as such, were shot away and destroyed. When the war ended we found we had few goods on hand to purchase, a tremendously inflated supply of money, and a great demand for all of the things we had gone without. The result was a scramble for the available supply of goods with plenty of ready cash to bid up the price of the scarce articles. Government contributed to the pressure by competing with the citizenry for food and machinery to give to Europe. It added further to the high cost of continuing taxes at wartime levels. Over the entire picture hangs the burden of the greatest national debt ever accumulated by any nation in the history of the world.

There is a fable about the last straw that broke the camel's back. Could it be that we have piled cost upon cost until many items are out of reach? The inventory statistics show that the store shelves are filled; the pipe lines from the producers are clogged and backing up. Under the circumstances the only recourse the manufacturer has is to reduce production, which means reduce pay rolls and lay off workers.

When job security diminishes consumer spending dwindles. Business slows down and we have a recession. The great danger is that a recession may snowball downhill into a depression.

However there are no responsible sources in Washington even conceding at this time that we may be approaching a recession. The President and his economic advisers have not observed any signs of a deflation period; they have asked the Congress for legislation to halt inflation. They have asked for stand-by price controls; they have asked the Congress for an additional $6,500,000,000 in the form of higher corporate, individual and pay-roll taxes. They are asking for another $5,000,000,000 installment on aid to Europe and have a multibillion scheme in the works to reactivate the arsenal of democracy and furnish armaments to North Atlantic nations. They are proposing a $10,000,000,000 health program, bigger pensions, higher unemployment benefits, a million new homes put up with taxpayers money.

Where will all this lead? Only time will tell. At any rate my good constituent at Kiel appears to be fully justified in his concern. Certainly we must all be on the alert to make sure that the would-be saviors in charge of Government do not "kill us with kindness."

Hoosier! A Word With History All Around It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hoosier! A Word With History All Around It," from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, February 21, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOSIER! A WORD WITH HISTORY ALL AROUND IT

INDIANAPOLIS, February 21.—For 33 years, or ever since the Indiana centennial of 1916, historians, teachers, and research scholars here have been delving into pioneer archives seeking the origin of the distinctive nickname: Hoosier. It is a term of dignity and character, they conclude, and applies to anyone native to Indiana or who is a resident within the State's borders.

Specifically, the scholars have concluded the word Hoosier means: An important caller, and a dignified, self-reliant person.

But reports in the files of the Indiana Historical Society disclose there are three schools of thought concerning the manner in which the word might have been born, perhaps between 1810 to 1830, and got into common usage.

AN IMPORTANT CALLER

There are many claimants for "who's hyer?" said to have been hallooed by a cabin settler to a wayfarer on horseback, or vice versa, during territorial times. The traveler, according to a poem written in 1830 by John Finley, titled "The Hoosier Nest," proved to be an important caller and a fine gentleman. Novelists of Indiana's later golden age of literature, including Lew Wallace, of Ben Hur fame, and Booth Tarkington, liked the idea of "who's hyer?" becoming in time "Hoosier," and meaning important caller or friendly traveler.

The second school gives the word military dignity—from hussar.

It is said Colonel Lehmanowski, a Polish hussar of the Napoleonic wars, appeared so resplendent in his uniform of military braid and decorations during a sojourn across the new State of Indiana that he inspired coonskin-capped riflemen of the frontier militia to glorify themselves as hussars, which they pronounced "Hoosier." The scholars declare that in the war with Mexico and long after the Civil War all parade soldiers in Indiana were called Hoosiers.

The poet, James Whitcomb Riley, believed either of these legends could have been the true source of Indiana's nickname, but in his lyceum recitals he pointed out that much of Indiana's speech, quality talk, and slang stemmed from a southern immigration.

THE THIRD SCHOOL

The third school suspects this southern group of immigrants gave the word "Hoosier" to Indiana, and remarks that it was popularized by riverman Mike Fink from Pittsburgh. He was a man of invincible strength, who picked up the word "husher" and used it often while traveling up and down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers.

"There is not another like myself in all this country. I'm a hoosher," the keelboatman is said to have remarked with gusto.

"Hoosher" was Mike's pronunciation for "husher" meaning mighty man. Researchers found husher is out of the particular dialect of settlers in the Carolinas and Georgia, who hailed from Cumberland, England. "Husher" means big, important, large, able.

Tracing the word back to England the scholars found it was written "hoozer," and that Mike Fink, the skull cracker and braggart, used the word "hoosher" to proclaim he was the best man in a crowd. When challenged he promptly staged an eye-gouging hard knuckle fist fight. For years his strength, vocabulary, and use of firearms provided fabulous tales for rivermen and settlers throughout southern Indiana.

His skill and gusto gave the word "hoosher" real meaning as it became hoosier and denoted a unique individual of exceptional abilities, the historians declare.

FEW CHALLENGERS

Few dared to say that Mike wasn't a very remarkable fellow, nor did they argue about the prowess of his 100 boatmen. Most rivermen agreed that Mike was something they didn't want to get tangled up with, yet were his friends. Mike roared, boasted, fought, and raced up and down the length of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers from the close of the American Revolution to 1821. "Then," says an idolatrous historian, "to use the words of Mark Twain, he moved westward with the jug of Empire."

Wandering ahead of the tide of settlers, Mike accompanied a fur-trading expedition up the Missouri River, and met his death at a lonely post near the Yellowstone in the winter of 1822–23.

Do It the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star, issue of February 17:

DO IT THE AMERICAN WAY

Our European friends are unduly alarmed over the warning by Senator VANDENBERG and Senator CONNALLY that no Atlantic alliance would be acceptable that provided a legal and automatic commitment to go to war without congressional approval. These European nations know what is in the United States Constitution. They know that the State Department cannot commit us to war. But they also know, or should know, that we are not sending them aid under the Marshall plan in order that Russia will be allowed to move in and seize it.

It is certainly possible for the United States to make a strong enough commitment

assuring military support in case of aggression to the nations of the North Atlantic alliance. We made such a pact with the nations of the Western Hemisphere. As a matter of fact, the State Department could make an even more reassuring agreement with these European nations if they followed the suggestions of the proposal written for the United Nations Association by Sumner Welles and Quincy Wright.

This proposal suggests that the North Atlantic alliance be turned into an open regional agreement under the United Nations Charter, article 51. The Muncie Star has been advocating this sort of agreement for more than a year. For an exclusive military alliance is neither in the best traditions of American diplomacy nor the spirit of the UN Charter itself.

The Welles-Wright proposal requires that, if an armed attack occurs on any member of the regional organization or of the United Nations, and if the Security Council is prevented from taking action by a veto, then a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly would decide whether an attack had occurred and direct the use of armed forces against the aggressor. In addition, if time were short, an individual member or group of members of the UN could immediately go to the aid of the nation attacked and ask for approval of the General Assembly later.

Thus the United States could act quickly by itself if Norway were attacked and if Congress approved. Congressional approval would already have been gained if the United States had previously approved the regional arrangement under the UN providing for action by the General Assembly. Nor would the United States be bound to go to war solely because one of the members of the UN group had provoked an attack upon itself which we and other nations disapproved.

Let us do this thing the American way, the democratic way. Let us use the UN for the purposes it was intended to fulfill instead of making an old-fashioned military alliance of the sort that has never before kept the peace.

The Doctors' Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the February 19, 1949, issue of Labor, the railroad labor official weekly. It shows all too well the kind of tactic the American Medical Association uses to defeat compulsory health insurance.

DOCTORS' TRUST BOASTS OF HOW IT BOUGHT SUPPORT OF NEWSPAPERS IN CALIFORNIA

A startling story of how the doctors' lobby put cash on the barrel head to buy support of newspapers for a fight against health insurance came to light this week and from an unexpected source.

A radio commentator—Don Hollenbeck, who pilots the program, CBS Views the Press—told the details the other day.

Hollenbeck obtained a transcript of discussions that were held at a Nation-wide conference of the secretaries and editors of State medical associations. A California delegate at that parley told how the medical association of his State licked a health-insurance plan sponsored by Gov. Earl Warren, Republican.

Here are the direct quotes from the delegate:

"We have 700 newspapers in the State, a great many of them small weeklies. Never before have we been able to get any real support from the newspapers because the answer constantly came back: 'Why should we give the doctors any support when they don't advertise?'

"We now have an answer to that. We went to the California Newspaper Publishers' Association and said: 'Gentlemen, we are going to spend a lot of money with the newspapers. We are going to advertise in every one of the 700 newspapers.'

"Each of the 700 newspapers in the State received a minimum of 100 column inches of advertising in a period of 12 months. We found that the response from editors, in publicity, has been far beyond anything we expected when we started the campaign."

In short, every newspaper in California gave columns of news space to publicity hand-outs smearing Warren's health-insurance bill—in return for the money turned over by the medical association for advertising space.

Advocates of health insurance, on the other hand, were virtually blanked out when it came to getting their side in print, because they couldn't match the slush fund of the medicos.

It's rare, said Hollenbeck, that anyone "so boldly admits that editorial favors—publicity—had been bought with advertising," but there are the facts in black and white.

Who planned this scheme of bribing the press? It was, the commentator explained, a "go-getting" public-relations firm of San Francisco known as Whitaker & Baxter.

That's significant because it's the very firm which the American Medical Association, the national doctors' trust, has hired to conduct the campaign against Federal health insurance, advocated by President Truman and backed by organized labor.

And the AMA is raising a $3,500,000 "war chest"—through a $25 per head assessment on 140,000 members—to finance the drive.

That means the AMA will have millions to spend on newspaper advertising. It's a foregone conclusion that most of the Nation's newspapers will repay the AMA with oodles of free space for publicity smearing health insurance, just as the papers in California did.

So, if from now on you see the press filled with propaganda picturing health insurance as a dire menace to the Nation, you'll know it has been bought and paid for.

There were other important developments on the health-insurance front this week:

Outstanding was the disclosure that 136 physicians, many of them distinguished in the profession, signed a joint letter to the AMA threatening a revolt against the $25 assessment plan. The list was headed by Dr. George Baehr, former president of the New York Academy of Medicine.

The 136 announced they would refuse to pay the levy if the money is "to be used for propaganda and legislative lobbying." They declared they would gladly contribute only if the funds are devoted to formulating a "comprehensive medical-care program" which is "considerate of the needs of the people and fair to the interests of the physicians."

Also, the signers predicted a general grass-roots revolt among doctors if the AMA insists on going ahead with merely a smear campaign. Such a drive, they warned, would "add to the already firmly rooted suspicion that the association's objectives are primarily economic and selfish."

The biggest blow to the AMA's assessment scheme came from the Kings County (Brooklyn) Medical Society, which is one of the largest AMA branches in the Nation. In a referendum the members voted by a majority of 861 to 755 against paying the levy.

Dominican Republic Making Rapid Progress: Housing, Health, and Business Problems Being Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 17, 1949

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest in the United States in the Dominican Republic, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very interesting and most enlightening article concerning the work being done in that small nation by its leader, President Trujillo. A feature article, published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Sunday Tribune for January 2, 1949, and written by Mrs. Virginia Safford, after first-hand observation of activities in that country, describes the new developments and advances being made.

The article follows:

(By Virginia Safford)

Dominican Republic: On his first voyage to the New World, Christopher Columbus fell in love with what is today the Dominican Republic. He wrote to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, "There is no finer land than this under heaven." He spent so much time on this one island instead of looking for new lands that when he left Spain on his fourth and last voyage the king and queen ordered him not to stop there. Columbus' bones rest in the cathedral in Ciudad Trujillo, according to his wish. Of course, I visited his tomb in what is the oldest church in the Western Hemisphere, saw the religious jewels and relics.

Talk around the capital is of a new tomb for Columbus, a lighthouse on the high promontory at the mouth of the Ozama River. It will take the form of a mile-long recumbent Christian cross. Each of the 21 Latin-American countries will have a room in the lighthouse and share the $5,000,000 construction cost. It will be stepped up like a pyramid to a height of 100 feet. In the center of the lighthouse will be the crypt holding Columbus' bones. Construction began when ground was broken by atomic energy last May.

You'd look far and wide over the world, yet never find any cleaner city than Ciudad Trujillo, capital of the Dominican Republic. It was practically rebuilt in 1930, after a hurricane destroyed it. Yet enough of the old landmarks remained to retain much of its old Spanish colonial charm. Besides the cathedral, there's the palace of Diego Colon, son of Columbus, who became governor of the island. The new buildings in the capital are amazing. There's the matadora, the dazzling white slaughterhouse built along the shores of the Caribbean and set in a lovely landscaped park. It could be mistaken for a country club.

I did visit the market, and in all my travels have never seen a more orderly place of its kind. Skylights from the arched concrete roof brighten the buildings. On the main floor the displays of fruits and vegetables would rival those of any de luxe grocery store. On the mezzanine floor meat and fish are sold.

While living is not too cheap in the Dominican Republic you can buy avocadoes for 3 cents apiece, and 100 luscious oranges for 45 cents. The best filet of beef—provided you can eat it fresh-killed—costs you only 60 cents a pound. Pork chops come at 32 cents a pound, eggs are 6 cents each. You

doubt if anyone goes hungry in the Dominican Republic that not only feeds itself but exports some foods. Plantains, those large-size bananas, are a main diet staple. Sliced thin and French fried they make wonderful hors d'oeuvres. I've eaten lobster, shrimp, and wonderful fish that came from the local market. Of course, sugar is the money crop. The first sugarcane brought to the Western Hemisphere came with Columbus on his second voyage. The Dominican soil is so rich that cane will grow from the same roots for 10 years or more.

Among the things to impress you about Ciudad Trujillo is the Barrio des los Obreros—or the workingman's housing project. Little by little, one block at a time, Trujillo is clearing out all old houses in the slum areas and in place are being erected small stucco, pastel-colored homes. To date 2,000 have been built. The goal is 10,000. They cost $1,800 to build, are paid for at an $18 monthly rate. In 10 years they belong, without encumbrance, to the owner. As a birthday present to Trujillo, everyone in the city paints his house in October. They're usually in a frantic rush to get the work done because of fall rains.

The country is the flag-flyingest I've ever seen, with the possible exception of Denmark. Everyone has to fly a flag on national holidays, and they come around often. Taking down a flag involves much ceremony. People in the street stand stock still at attention. All traffic stops. Incidentally, there's a traffic cop dressed in neat khaki on almost every corner. He takes the place of the mechanical stop and go sign. You must pay great attention to him. You're not allowed to blow your horn at a corner where a cop is standing. You signal which way you want to go and he gives you the high sign. At night he holds two small flashlights, operating them for red and green signals.

CIUDAD TRUJILLO IS BASEBALL CRAZY

By coincidence I arrived at the time the victorious Dominican Republic team was returning from Puerto Rico, having won the little world series. They declared a national holiday. Plane formations flew so close I thought they'd take the roof off the beautiful Jaragua Hotel. That night the outdoor patio of the Jaragua was crowded with dancers and baseball heroes. Of course, the baseball team never forgets it beat the Brooklyn Dodgers once during last season when the Dodgers were training in the Republic.

Every child between 7 and 14 must attend school. Parents are fined unless they can satisfactorily explain a child's absence. Today the country has sufficient school facilities with 1,700 rural schools and 230 in cities and towns. Along the streets of Ciudad Trujillo you see boys and girls dressed in thin khaki-colored uniforms when school lets out.

Trujillo does not allow slot machines, in order to protect the little fellow. But the national lottery affords an outlet for the gambling instinct. And if that is not enough, there's always the casino at the Jaragua. There, around dice and roulette tables, you'll see the sugar kings and queens of the Republic, as well as the tourists who consider that all a part of a vacation or holiday.

Bob Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is the citation presented to Bob Hope by Gen. James Doolittle, on February 8, 1949, on behalf of the 52 Association for the most outstanding accomplishment in 1948:

BOB HOPE

Fifty-two weeks a year, every year since the beginning of World War II, the lives of many thousands of the wounded have been made easier because you have taken such great pains to remember. To America's wounded and ill veterans and servicemen in the hospitals, to those stationed at far-flung outposts of democracy, yours has been the voice of the folks. You have known them in their happy childhood, their valiant youth, their responsible maturity. They feel that they have known you all their lives, for you represent all that is good and clean, true and abiding in America. Through the alchemy of your good cheer, there has been created a brighter future for all of them. The 52 Association of the United States is honored to honor you, Bob Hope, for the most outstanding accomplishment in 1948 so that "The wounded shall never be forgotten."

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, there are in Washington this week four high-school students who have been chosen as winners of the Nation-wide Voice of Democracy contest. Each of them has been awarded a trip to Washington and a college scholarship. They are Richard Caves, Bath High School, Everett, Ohio; Charles Kuralt, Central High School, Charlotte, N. C.; George Morgan, Jr., Hutchinson High School, Hutchinson, Kans.; and Kerron Johnson, Wilson High School, St. Paul, Minn. On tomorrow at a luncheon here in Washington, Attorney General Tom C. Clark will present the awards to these young men.

The Voice of Democracy contest is sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and endorsed by the United States Office of Education. It began as a feature of National Radio Week last November. First, there were school contests, then community contests, then State contests, and finally four regional contests covering the Northeast, the Southeast, the Southwest, and the Northwest parts of the country. Each of the young men in Washington this week is a winner of the contest in his area. The judges for the national finals were Margaret Culkin Banning, novelist and author; Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, pastor emeritus of Riverside Church, New York City; Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, wartime director of the Women's Army Corps, now vice president of the Houston Post, operator of radio station KPRC; Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.; Miss Frances Perkins, member of the Civil Service Commission; Glenn E. Snow, Dixie Junior College, St. George, Utah, retiring president of the National Education Association; and James Stewart, motion-picture star.

The fact that 250,000 students in the 48 States, Alaska and the District of Columbia prepared broadcast scripts shows the great interest which the youth of today are taking in government. The subject given each of the contestants was, I Speak for Democracy. I have had the pleasure of reading the 5-minute scripts prepared by the four winners. They are eloquent and moving documents. They show that those who spoke the words knew and lived democracy, that they had an appreciation of the democratic way of life and of those principles and human values upon which it is based. They are worthy to be heard and read by every American and no one can help but be a better citizen from having heard or read them.

One of these splendid young men, George Morgan, Jr., is from my Congressional District. He is 16 years of age and a sophomore in the Hutchinson, (Kans.) High School. He comes from what I like to think is a representative Kansas home. He is an all-around boy. He carried a paper route while his father was overseas during the war. He works during his school vacations and Saturdays. He is on his high school football squad. He sings in the school glee club and a church choir. He flies model airplanes and is greatly interested in aviation mechanics. He teaches a boys' Sunday School class and takes an active part in young people's work in his church. He plans to enter college upon completion of his high-school course.

I am proud of George Morgan, Jr., and I congratulate him and his fine parents on his success as one of the winners in this national contest. I also want to congratulate the National Association of Broadcasters, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Radio Manufacturers' Association, and the United States Office of Education for sponsoring and carrying out this contest, which I feel has made a great contribution to a better understanding of democracy in this country. Because I believe that every Member of Congress will be interested in reading the script prepared by George Morgan, Jr., I am including the same as a part of my remarks herewith. The scripts prepared by the other winners have been placed in the RECORD by Members of Congress from their home districts.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I speak for democracy. In order to understand more fully the meaning of democracy, I asked my father for a definition, and he said it was a system of government where the people elected representatives to govern them and these representatives derived their powers from the consent of the governed. Why did I believe my father could give me a good definition?

Let me tell you. One morning, February 16, 1943, to be exact, I heard him go out of the house, possibly never to be seen again by the ones he loved. He left a job, friends, a wife, and three children that loved him dearly. He left all of this to defend the very thing I'm talking about—democracy.

Through his letters, I saw a man quite different from the man I had known. I saw a man packed with other men, growing

further and further away from the things he held dear. I saw a man trudging through snow, learning to fight, learning to defend democracy.

Later I saw him standing on a spray-swept deck of a tossing ship, sailing through the black water with an unfriendly sky overhead. He had a pair of binoculars in one hand, a rifle over his shoulder. He stood alone, a silhouette against a warring world. He stood, and still stands for democracy.

Another time I saw him unloading other men into that bloody battle for Okinawa. I saw tracers throwing their tell-tale trails behind them feeling out his ship. Feeling, seeking, trying to snuff out his very life. I saw him bending over a box or table in his small compartment, far below the water line, writing home. I saw him look up as a matter of routine at the public address loudspeaker, to hear the heart-gladdening shout—the war is over. Then a happy, almost incredulous look spread across his tired, weary face. To a far-away sailor, America, democracy, home, loved ones, all beckoned.

But what does democracy mean to American youth—the American youth—who are they? They were the little children of yesterday. Today they are the young men and women who are asking for the family car, running out of their allowances. They are the young people we all know. They will be the America of tomorrow, the democracy of tomorrow—yes, the world of tomorrow. They are you—Mr. and Mrs. America, in miniature.

Now, another question. What does America mean to us and what is democracy doing for us—the young people of today? A current author has said that America means a way of life. That is really what democracy is doing for us—establishing a way of life. None of us would like to think of living without it. How can we maintain this American way of life? By upholding the standards of our forefathers—we alone can keep democracy what it is.

But are we satisfied to maintain it merely as it is? Of course not. But how can we improve it? By deeper appreciation of our privileges, and a more complete fulfillment of our obligations. The things I have presented are important issues concerning this matter of democracy. Our obligation is to forward these ideals in our American way of life and add more to them. A just balance between privileges and obligations form the rock-like core that can and will keep our America truly great in this uncertain world.

This philosophy of life which maintains that each of us must love our neighbors as ourselves, give our lives for our country if need be, not only enjoy our privileges, but also shoulder our obligations, shall inevitably further our cause. Our wonderful American democratic heritage has been handed down to us from past generations.

Let all present-day Americans dedicate themselves to forwarding our cause around the world. A people thus united in this common cause shall forever preserve a way of life that will stand the test of all time.

I plead for democracy.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the Legislature of the State of West Virginia:

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *February 2, 1949.*

Committee substitute for House Concurrent Resolution 6, memoralizing the Congress for the enactment of legislation to extend and liberalize the present Federal social-security law

Whereas the Federal social security program has proved to be of great value to the citizens of this country in both economic and humanitarian sense; and

Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to Congress that the present Federal social-security law be extended and liberalized; and

Whereas by act of the 1947 legislature, Senate bill 351 relating to the acceptance of future Federal legislation by the State of West Virginia permitting State and local public employees to secure coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act was enacted into law; and

Whereas it has been ascertained that an extension and liberalization of the provisions of the present Federal social-security law is contemplated by the Eighty-first Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That we approve the movement to secure an enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States which will extend and liberalize the benefits of the present Federal social-security program to include States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities and that we earnestly request our Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to use all honorable means to secure the prompt enactment of such legislation at this session, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the West Virginia Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Tax Slash Pays Off

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following editorial from the Boston Daily Record of February 21, 1949:

TAX SLASH PAYS OFF

The final argument against President Truman's proposed $4,000,000,000-tax increase—and in favor of another tax reduction—has been provided by the United States Treasury Department.

The Eightieth Congress gave the overburdened taxpayers the first decrease that they have had in years. Social planners and spenders at Washington protested in anguish. They predicted a great decline in Federal revenues and another unbalanced budget.

But they were 100 percent wrong.

Under the reduced tax rates, the Treasury finds that the Government collected in 1948 nearly $3,000,000,000 more than in 1947 under the previous higher rates.

Moreover, the New Deal was given the first balanced budget that it ever had.

This record confirms an economic fact with which all competent tax authorities are familiar but which the New Deal has never acknowledged.

That fact is that the law of diminishing returns operates in governmental finance as it does in all private affairs.

When tax rates exceed a certain level, normal business investment and business transactions either cease to expand or else actually decline, and the Government's share in production—which is expressed in terms of tax returns—contracts correspondingly.

Shortly after the First World War, the late Andrew W. Mellon, as Secretary of the Treasury, recommended tax reductions and predicted that an abandonment of wartime rates would return an increase in peacetime revenue.

This proved to be exactly correct; and, during a period of prosperity and industrial expansion, the national debt was reduced by billions of dollars.

Financial history proves that when taxes consume more than 25 percent of national income, industrial decline sets in.

Investors, having no incentive, quit investing; the volume of production fails to provide necessary increasing employment; and stagnation turns into depression.

With a $41,000,000,000 Federal budget, with several State budgets exceeding a billion dollars each, and with counties and municipalities seeking more money to permit more public spending, this country is at the danger point.

Congress should read the current Treasury report, and the administration's high-tax demands, with these portents in mind.

Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 22 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorial comments which bear on the proposed appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington State, to become Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Because the question of Mr. Wallgren's fitness for this position is of real importance and interest to every American and to every Member of Congress, I would urge that the material submitted be thoughtfully read and considered.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune of February 17, 1949]

HELPING AN OLD CRONY

The best thing to be said for Mon Wallgren is that he enjoys the friendship and confidence of President Truman. The Senate Armed Services Committee has been studiously inquiring into Mr. Wallgren's qualifications to be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and apparently finds little specific evidence that the former United States Senator from the State of Washington fits the job. Mr. Wallgren, true enough, served in Congress a dozen years and as a Governor of his State, was long and profitably engaged in private business as a retail jeweler and optometrist, and even gently suggested last spring that he might

be available for the Democratic Vice Presidential nomination. None of this bears against Mr. Wallgren, but an impartial observer would hardly pick him on the demonstrated record as the planning genius and economic mobilizer envisaged under the National Security Act to keep tabs on America's resources against all emergencies.

The post of Chairman of the NSRB carries in theory a tremendous responsibility; so vast, in fact, that the conception is perhaps incapable of achievement in any absolute sense. This is the Board designed to advise the President concerning the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. What power the Board actually possesses is still uncertain, apparently a question for Mr. Truman to decide and perhaps depending largely on the Chairman himself.

Mr. Wallgren's qualities, what one can make of them, are largely political and personal. The President remembers him fondly from the days of the Senate War Investigating Committee, and finds him excellent company. These are rather narrow grounds for this $14,000 appointment, but then Mr. Wallgren may be concealing unsuspected abilities. As Senator TYDINGS was saying the other day, Mr. Truman was elected on "practically the same experience qualifications," a statement not to be denied. But the real explanation is obvious. Mr. Wallgren, an old crony out of a job, likes the Washington life, and the President is taking care of him.

[From the Chehalis (Wash.) Daily Advocate of February 18, 1949]

MR. WALLGREN'S APPOINTMENT

Few eyebrows were raised when President Truman announced his appointment of former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. From the moment Mr. Wallgren began angling for a good spot everybody knew he would get it because of the President's disposition to care for his friends, often at the expense of the Government. And when the announcement came the tendency was to still shrug it off as the job appeared to be one of those routine affairs with a high-sounding title, in spite of its generous salary.

That was before the public was familiar with Mr. Wallgren's potential position. We are now learning, through the revelations of Senator HARRY P. CAIN, and others, that the chairmanship of this Board is one of the powerful jobs in the Nation. The State of Washington, which has expressed its conviction that Wallgren was not qualified to run the State, would never sanction his elevation to a place of such terrific responsibility.

The extent of this responsibility is disclosed by Marquis Childs, the Washington columnist. In his words, the National Security Resources Board, by act of Congress, possesses "the most extraordinary authority to use Federal money in a variety of ways to develop and acquire natural resources and relocate and reorganize industry for the security of the Nation."

For instance, Childs continues, the Board Chairman can authorize a contract to any mining company on the ground that important mineral resources are to be exploited. Then the mining company can get a loan from the RFC for development.

Such powers are granted in order to equip the Nation for a wartime emergency. Extraordinary powers are needed in this event, but when and if we are at war we shall want the power delegated to one who is proven as a top man in the Nation. We believe that, on a list of the top men in the Nation, Wallgren would be so far down the list that he wouldn't be on it.

Senator CAIN challenges Wallgren's fitness for such a position on the ground that he conspicuously lacks the requirement demanded by the assignment he seeks. He has carried his battle to the Senate, claiming that Wallgren is personally obnoxious to him. It should be explained that this term is used in accordance with a Senatorial custom, the practice being that the Senate does not confirm any appointee who is personally obnoxious to any Senator. While there is doubt that Senator CAIN would make progress on that score, he should have plenty of ammunition on the ground that Wallgren is unfit for the job.

It is known by most of the State, if not by the Senate, that Wallgren ran our government in the manner of a politician rather than as a statesman, with the Democratic Party and party leaders receiving a lion's share of the benefits. It is known that he ran it like a closed corporation, keeping the people in the dark as to its operation. His administration was notable for its waste, as shown by his operation of the highway department, the motor fleet, State parks and other divisions, and the general State fund was seriously reduced. He spent a quarter of his time out of the State.

If the voters of Washington had the power of confirmation of this high appointment, Wallgren would be soundly rejected. The Senate, which does have that power, is duty-bound to reject it. Whether they will is a question, because Wallgren's party is in power in the Senate. But on the basis of fitness for office, and for the sake of our future security, we hope the Senate will act positively on Senator CAIN's recommendation.

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald of February 15, 1949]

WALLGREN JOB ENTAILS VAST POWER

Senator HARRY CAIN's opposition to the confirmation by the Senate of President Truman's nomination of Mon C. Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board has pinpointed the Nation's attention on this important Government agency.

Senator CAIN denied in a statement to a correspondent of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer that he regarded the former Governor of the State as "personally obnoxious"—as he had been quoted by another source as saying. He said that in a personal sense—and he did not know him well in that sense—Wallgren "has always seemed amiable, courteous, and agreeable." But:

"My opposition to him isn't personal, I just don't think he has ability and capacity to serve in this tremendously vital job in a way that the welfare of the Nation, as I see it, demands.

"As I read the job specifications, the Chairman of the Securities Resources Board is one of the two or three most powerful men in the world.

"I just don't think Mr. Wallgren is qualified to run the next war—if there is a next war—or to guide the expenditure of billions involved in building our security."

Light on the functions of the Board is shed by an article for the Wall Street Journal by Ellis Haller. Mr. Haller writes from the national capital:

"A group of Washington newspapermen were talking the other day about the relative importance of Federal agencies in Mr. Truman's new term. Someone asked: 'What will be the most important single Government unit in months ahead?' The almost unanimous answer was 'the National Security Resources Board.' * * *

"As the year goes on, the NSRB will play an increasingly important role in President Truman's 'fair deal' program. Ostensibly, its job is to advise Mr. Truman on how to coordinate military, industrial, and civilian mobilization so the United States will not be caught short in case of emergency. But in these uneasy times its activities have taken on greater significance.

"The plans NSRB is drafting for the Nation's defense will mesh with other economic projects the administration has mapped for the next 4 years. The legislation it is about to propose will stir sharp debate in Congress. The policies it will enunciate can affect the future of many businesses and the course of the national economy.

"In plain terms, this little publicized Board will become overnight the most powerful agency in our Government if we get into war, or if we approach a state of national crisis. In any case, it is a body that business and industrialists take seriously as nonwar military spending soars and as foreign policy planners map United States strategy against the spread of communism.

"NSRB has functioned quietly for nearly a year and a half, seldom making spectacular news. It was created when Congress passed the National Security Act of 1947. This act set up the Board as a permanent civilian agency of the United States Government, responsible only to the President. The Board may, at any time in war or peace, call into play the facilities and resources of any department, agency, or bureau of the Federal Government.

"If Congress declares war, or if the country is plunged into an emergency at a time when Congress can't act, NSRB would shift at once from a planning to an operating set-up. It would establish temporary agencies to control prices, wages, the flow of raw materials, manpower, transportation, and the conversion of production facilities. * * *

"Military men generally favor the NSRB set-up, even though it doesn't give them the upper hand in running the country in case of war. They claim they are willing to accept civilian direction in return for the speed-up that will be possible in industrial mobilization. * * *

"The Budget Bureau has asked an appropriation of $4,000,000 for NSRB for the forthcoming fiscal year. That's an increase of $1,000,000 over the amount NSRB was appropriated for fiscal 1949. Most of the budgeted increase would be spent for hiring more staff members who, in the words of the Budget Bureau, would make further progress in developing resources and requirements data as a basis of planning mobilization of the Nation's resources in the event of war."

Clearly, the general public has slight conception of the importance and power of this little publicized Federal agency.

Senator CAIN deserves credit for bringing the issue into the limelight in connection with President Truman's selection of his Senate crony, former Governor Wallgren, for the vast responsibility the job entails. If the Board chairman, as Senator CAIN says, is "one of the two or three most powerful men in the world," the question of Mr. Wallgren's qualifications is of moment to the entire Nation.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 15, 1949]

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

SOP TO WALLGREN

A President has many friends. They come trailing out of his past, some loyal, some self-seeking, some just good-time pals.

President Truman has named an old friend out of his freshman days in the Senate to one of the most important offices within his power to give. He has nominated and asked the Senate to confirm Mon C. Wallgren, former Governor of the State of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board at a salary of $14,000 a year.

Because this is a comparatively new agency, the far-reaching extent of the powers of the Chairman and the Board he heads are little understood. But the act passed by Congress creating the Security Resources Board spells

out the most extraordinary authority to use Federal money in a variety of ways to develop and acquire natural resources and relocate and reorganize industry for the security of the Nation.

Take one example of the powers of the Chairman. He can authorize a contract to any mining company or individual miner on the representation that important mineral resources are to be exploited. That mining company or miner can then go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and get a loan for the development.

Besides the Chairman, the Board is made up of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. These are all busy, overworked men, and the tendency is to let the Chairman run the Board pretty much as he chooses. It has been said that, next to the President's own job, this is the most important assignment in the Nation.

The future security of the country might well turn on how this assignment is carried out. It is either of the first importance and should be so regarded, or it is worse than nothing, since the mere existence of such a board might give a false sense of accomplishment.

Nothing in Wallgren's past would appear to equip him for this supremely important task. He has been an amiable politician, a good companion on a fishing trip or a party. For part of a term in the Senate he voted with the New Deal.

Wallgren left the Senate to become Governor of Washington. He was defeated for reelection last fall while the rest of the Democratic State ticket was swept into office and Truman carried the State.

During the campaign Wallgren was charged with favoring a clique of Democratic lawyers who were influential in obtaining licenses for so-called private clubs where liquor could be sold by the drink. There were also charges in connection with the sale of a company operating ferry lines across Puget Sound. Wallgren says this was purely politics, and he points out that nothing was proved.

He was considered a liability to Truman in the campaign in Washington. Yet not long after November 2 and his defeat Wallgren flew to Key West, Fla., to be with the President. Truman got him to give a demonstration of his skill as a billiard player for the newspapermen covering the Presidential vacation.

Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington, a Republican, has said he will do everything in his power to block Wallgren's confirmation. He has even hinted that he would resort to the senatorial prerogative of declaring that Wallgren was personally obnoxious to him. But the precedent is that this applies only when the nominee is to fill an office, such as a judgeship, in the home State of the Senator applying the personally obnoxious label.

The Senate should examine this appointment with the greatest care. There should be hearings and, if necessary, extended hearings.

At the time of the Senate investigation into Howard Hughes' airplane contracts in the summer of 1947 Wallgren's name came up. He was listed as one of those attending gay parties given by Hughes' publicity man, John Meyer. Those parties were charged to the Government as expenses under the cost-plus contract.

Only a part of Meyer's expense accounts were available and the public never heard the whole story. It might be well to open those records to bring out what was held back. Asked by reporters about his presence at the Hughes-Meyer parties in New York, Hollywood, and Palm Springs, Wallgren gave a rather flippant reply, pointing out that both Republicans and Democrats of prominence had enjoyed the lavish hospitality.

This may seem mere trivia not worth recalling, but, measured against the momentousness of the position Wallgren has been named to, it is not trivial. Everything is relevant in the career of the man on whom so much must depend.

[From the Daily Olympian, Olympia, Wash., of February 7, 1949]

ANOTHER CRONY TAKEN CARE OF

Former Gov. Mon Wallgren's singular showing at the polls last November—he was the only Democratic candidate on the State-wide ticket who failed to make the grade—was apparently exactly what the doctor ordered for a man who insisted on going first-class. The picture of Wallgren sweating out the Truman gravy train for the past fortnight has been truly a touching one. It is said that the genial fellow had been growing anxious. Now he can relax as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and enjoy the $14,000 annual stipend—more than the President thought he was giving his friend.

Washington columnists, along with most of us home folks, had deprecated the supposedly impending appointment of Wallgren to a Cabinet post, thinking him, as the Alsop column put it, "second-rate." As Chairman of the Resources Board he will be called upon to preside over a group containing most of the Cabinet members, who act in a consultative and fact-finding capacity. As American foreign policy drags the country closer toward the threat of war, the National Security Resources Board's functions grow more and more important. At this point America's readiness to mobilize industrially to reestablish her war potential is the strongest deterrent the country can offer Moscow—even stronger than the army of boys we are preparing and the rumored collection of atomic bombs and the experimental planes and missiles. Russian agents will note well what our erstwhile Governor and his new Board are doing.

Let us hope fervently that Wallgren will watch his step: That he will not get too preoccupied with building another private Navy, that he will forget about the opportunity to improve his outside investments, that he will not try to bull his way through situations as he has in the past. This time it is not visiting politicos he has to impress. We feel nervous about seeing the President do this nice thing for his friend, even if the friend learned (as the President said in justifying this appointment) something about stock piling when he was a Senator. It seems certain that Wallgren knows something about spending public funds, though it must be mournfully acknowledged that we see no valuable stock piles that he has left in our State. Especially not of funds.

Let us hope for the best. (The Seattle Argus.)

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 9, 1949]

WILL MR. WALLGREN RETURN TO US?

Shortly before ex-Gov. Mon C. Wallgren was taken care of by President Truman with a $14,000-a-year job in Washington, D. C., the Spokesman-Review suggested that the defeated Governor might be in line for the managership of the Columbia Valley Authority then being proposed by the President.

The Portland Oregonian now considers also the possibility that Mr. Wallgren may again be in our midst.

"Our guess," writes the Oregonian, "is that the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren, ex-Senator and ex-Governor of Washington, as Chairman of the National Resources Board—a $14,000-a-year post—will not take him out of political circulation for long.

"Governor Wallgren's defeat by a Republican, Arthur Langlie, in a year of national Democratic victory will be forgotten by the public as he serves in his new position, and when the time is ripe he can again claim the loyalty of his friend, President Truman, for appointment to a position more in the public eye. Mr. Wallgren is not one to languish for long in obscurity—and the Resources Board, though important, is not very newsworthy.

"In any event, we think the Northwest is happier that he has been named to this position than it would have been had he been nominated for Secretary of the Interior. There is a speculative report that if Mr. Truman's Columbia Valley Authority is approved, we will have Mr. Wallgren back among us."

As it now stands, the situation suits us completely. If Mr. Wallgren can keep occupied in an orbit that does not include the Pacific Northwest, there will be little repining here.

[From the Centralia (Wash.) Daily Chronicle of February 18, 1949]

SALES VERSUS INCOME TAX

We have been waiting for the hue and cry to start that immediately after he was elected Governor Langlie at once started to work to discover a new means of raising taxes. That is a usual political maneuver regardless of who was to blame for the condition which forced an increase in revenue. But so far we have failed to have heard any such accusation.

The financial condition the State is in was caused by just two factors, the looseness of the fiscal policy of ex-Gov. Mon Wallgren and the passage of initiative No. 172 by the people. And we should not lay all of our troubles to No. 172. The wasteful administration of Wallgren put the State in such a financial condition that no governor nor legislature could carry on and pay all of the increased allowances forced by the passage of the initiative without finding an additional source of revenue.

Arguments against the sales tax include the fact that border cities will lose a considerable amount of their retail business to cities in other States. Vancouver, Wash., is a concrete example. Residents of Vancouver even now go to Portland to trade if they anticipate their purchases will reach any considerable sum. They are thereby able to save $3 on every $100 they spend there. Vancouver businessmen insist that a 5 percent sales tax would more than double this loss of business to our sister State of Oregon.

Those opposed to the State income tax insist that, once a new tax avenue is opened it will never again be closed. This, in spite of the fact that Governor Langlie insists the income tax would be for but 2 years.

The legislature has a real problem on its hands. It can accept the income tax or add a sales tax. It will be criticized for either action. But the increased expense incurred through the liberalized social-security measure must be met. What the final decision will be is yet to be learned.

[From the Centralia (Wash.) Daily Chronicle of February 18, 1949]

CAIN FIGHTING APPOINTMENT

Senator HARRY B. CAIN is to be congratulated on the fight he is making against the Senate confirmation of ex-Governor Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Wallgren has none of the qualifications which a man should have to fit him for such a position except his friendship with President Truman.

CAIN, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, charged Wallgren with lack of "character, courage, capacity, and knowledge." He insisted the position is one which should be filled by one of the best men the Nation can produce.

Wallgren's qualifications, the Senator stated, consist principally of being a good companion around a pool table or on a

fishing expedition. He also stated he was very capable in the banquet room. Other qualifications, if any, were omitted.

We, who have carefully watched his administration as Governor of our State know he is entirely unfitted for the position to which he was appointed by the President. We know he was wasteful, and that is putting it mildly, of the State's resources while holding the chief executive position. We know he is reputedly the owner of considerable property which he did not possess before he entered politics. We know the voters of the State of Washington retired him at the first opportunity. We believe Senator CAIN is right in fighting the confirmation of his appointment.

If more Senators would take such an interest in the confirmation of appointments, perhaps we might expect better men in high Federal positions.

Address of Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at a Washington's Birthday observance sponsored by the Republican committee of Fairfax County, Va., at Fairfax courthouse, Tuesday evening, February 22, 1949:

I hope the Truman administration is not out of touch with the times on the American business front, as it was when it predicted 8,000,000 unemployed to follow the end of the war.

Today, when unemployment is spreading in industry, the planners in Washington are still tilting their lances at the windmills of inflation. The economic weather has changed abruptly, however, during the past 3 months. We have today almost 3,000,000 unemployed in this Nation. Prices are falling in many lines.

Instead of pressing for more business controls, for Government-owned steel plants, for more taxes, more spending, and more bureaus, the administration should be devoting itself to constructive measures to encourage business, expand private investment, and to hasten new business ventures which will provide jobs. We simply cannot afford the luxury of a depression and every effort must be made to avoid it.

This is no time to ask the American people for more taxes, for more spending on things we can't afford. Our thoughts and energies must be devoted to keeping the people at work and maintaining the national income.

During the 2 years of the Republican Congress, this country enjoyed the highest level of prosperity and business activity, and the highest level of employment, ever experienced in our peacetime history.

Now that the strong tide of business has been halted, we are not immediately faced with the problems of inflation, shortages, and runaway prices, but rather with the problems of a possible business recession, which must be handled with wisdom and vigorous purpose if we are to head off further unemployment.

I hope the administration thinkers and planners catch up with the business picture as it exists today, before it is too late.

The Republican Eightieth Congress passed a tax-reduction bill which made a real beginning toward cutting back the cost of Government to levels the American people can afford.

Today, in millions of American homes, as the final tax returns for 1948 are being prepared, there is a wider appreciation of the work of the Eightieth Congress in its tax-reduction program. Everyone, as he makes out his tax return and realizes the tax cut given by the Eightieth Congress, must conclude it was a pretty good Congress.

I predict tonight that if the present administration has its way with its fabulous new plans for Government spending, the tax-reduction bill passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress will go down in history as the last tax cut ever given the American people in the twentieth century.

This is no time to consider further tax increases.

The great need of this hour is for less Government spending, lower taxes and less interference and obstruction to the normal American instincts for business expansion and new economic ventures.

A stimulant to employment could be given by reducing the excise taxes at least to their prewar levels. They are killing some businesses and depriving people of jobs.

The Government at Washington has been over-spending for 16 long years. That is why we have the 60-cent dollar today, as measured in terms of 1940 purchasing power. We must stop this senseless retreat to fiscal chaos.

The record of legislative accomplishments of the Republican Eightieth Congress is a record of fundamental Americanism. After those tax cuts of $4,800,000,000, we ended the fiscal year 1948 with a Treasury surplus of more than $8,000,000,000, with which to make a substantial reduction in the national debt.

The Eightieth Congress gave America the most powerful national defense ever provided for any nation not at war. It provided a broad program of veterans' care.

It restored law and order in the field of labor-management relations. It enacted a broad program of economic aid for war-torn Europe and Asia. In less than 2 years, the Eightieth Congress abruptly reversed America's 14-year drift toward State socialism and eventual national bankruptcy.

We who helped make that program in the Eightieth Congress have no apologies to make for our work. We rejoice in its consistent record of sound, forward-looking, solvent constitutional Government. Every supporter of fundamental Americanism today applauds the record of the Eightieth Congress.

The 52 Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 15, 1949, commending the 52 Association for the splendid job it is doing among the wounded veterans of World War II:

THE 52 ASSOCIATION

Four years ago American troops smashed their way into Japanese-held Manila, Corregidor, and Bataan and planted the American flag atop Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. On the other side of the world the battle of the bulge had ended, General Patton's tanks were approaching the German borders and Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin met at Yalta. The end of the war was in sight.

That same month in New York a group of businessmen met to make plans for the returning veteran, plans that included a pledge that the wounded shall never be forgotten. These men, as the founders of 52 Association, have observed that pledge during the past 4 years and have served more than 35,000 wounded and disabled servicemen and veterans with a personal program of entertainment and job placement. These activities are services that cannot be purchased by money, for the members of the 52 Association give not only of their substance but of their time and themselves.

The more than 11,000 hospitalized and disabled servicemen and veterans whom the 52 Association aided last year can testify to the good faith with which this organization has lived up to its 1945 pledge.

American Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the second installment of an article from the magazine Politics, dealing with our military government in Germany.

The first installment of this article, together with my correspondence with Secretary of Defense Forrestal, was included in my extension of February 21, 1949.

The article confirms in no uncertain terms what I have charged on the floor of this House on more than one occasion—the infiltration of people who have no sympathy toward our form of government and whose whole philosophy leans to some other form of control.

The article follows:

INSTALLMENT II

Item No. 4: The magazine Heute

So far, I have only mentioned German-operated enterprises and the manner in which ICD entrusted these to Stalinist agents. This particular case concerns the American-published, German language magazine Heute, a periodical similar in layout to Life, and an official organ of the United States military government. Published in Munich, Heute was an enormously important propaganda weapon and education medium.

In May 1946 Heute was entrusted to Capt. Heinz Norden, a former counterintelligence officer in the Army's Frankfurt headquarters, where I knew him slightly. Norden is an intelligent, intense person; fanatically anti-German, I think, but otherwise a very pleasant young man.

Captain Norden was also—and this is more to the point—(1) a member of the American Labor Party; (2) a one-time financial contributor to the American League Against War and Fascism which, according to Francis Biddle when he was the Attorney General, was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf

of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." The league's vice president was Earl Browder. In addition, (3) Norden was involved in several agitations in New York City in which the Communist Party was also involved; (4) Norden was publicized in the Daily Worker of January 28, 1938, in connection with a speech he had made before the American Youth Congress.[1]

I repeat that Norden seems to be a perfectly nice guy. He has, of course, every right to hold the views he does hold. But there is no excuse for MG to have engaged a person (or persons) holding such views to fill positions of critical and strategic importance in Germany. MG headquarters, when in possession of the above evidence, still (in 1947) saw nothing to warrant Norden's dismissal, but asked him nevertheless not to resume his contract with ICD when it expired in the fall of 1947.

The magazine Heute under Norden's editorship published articles by such noted democrats as Ilya Ehrenburg, and gave frequent publicity to the kind of self-styled progressive circles in the United States which are currently circling Henry Wallace. Whatever one may feel about them, they hardly represent a majority cross section of the United States. During a sample period (January 1 to August 15, 1947, i. e., after Norden had already come under criticism for his editorial policies, and was presumably on his best behavior) Heute, which appears twice a month, contained the following type of articles and pictures:

January 1, 1947: 2 pages Langhoff Moorsoldaten (CP Spanish Civil War anthem). Picture of friendly U. S. S. R. soldiers, tough, hard-boiled western soldiers. Picture story on seamy side of London. One-page story on Berlin (Soviet sector) theater. Full-page photo Paul Robeson as Othello.

January 15, 1947: Picture of Friedrich Wolf (Professor Mamlock) and Johannes Becher, president, Soviet Culture League. Picture story of idyllic Budapest. United States—represented by Lilly Daché.

February 1, 1947: Picture story on Warsaw lives—popular demonstrations for Communist front, etc. Stalingrad article. U. S. S. R. article by Russia-apologist Edgar Snow. Picture story on idyllic U. S. S. R. United States—represented mostly by basketball games.

February 15, 1947: Statement by Heinz Norden defending Soviet expulsions of Germans from the East, referring to them as "Allied extradition policy." Three-page story on Palestine troubles, British arrests, etc.

March 1, 1947: Picture—Leipzig Fair (Soviet zone): CP minority delegates in Bavaria: Chaplin as Verdoux. United States—represented by Greer Garson. Photo: Kindly U. S. S. R. soldier, mistrustful British official. Four pictures on idyllic U. S. S. R.

April 1, 1947: Picture of beatings in Trieste, Friedrich Wolf (Professor Mamlock) play in Soviet sector, Berlin. United States—represented by football free-for-all. Picture on idyllic Moscow. Photo of outcast, homeless New York City veteran couple, living on park bench. United States—represented by 14 pin-up pictures.

May 1, 1947: Critical story of Greece, showing happy, bouncing Partisans, seamy side of Greek Government. Picture story on happy Polish DP's return to idyllic Poland—almost a straight copy of current Soviet propaganda hand-outs.

May 15, 1947: United States—represented by Ozark hillbillies. Picture story of idyllic Weimar, rebuilding fast under Soviet occupation. Picture of Soviet-sponsored ballet in Berlin and Leipzig.

July 15, 1947: United States—represented by picture indicating labor exploitation, money grabbing in Texas. Three pages on trouble in India. United States—represented by drugstores. Two pages of cartoons critical of United States atomic policy.

August 15, 1947: Picture of trouble in Palestine. Picture of trouble in Indonesia.

And so it goes.

Since Captain Norden left Heute a definite change of policy has been noticeable. Picking up the issue of December 1, 1947, I find:

1. Story on Martyrs of Freedom—Mikolajczyk, Maniu, Petkov, and Nagy.
2. Three-page story on transit camp for German expellees from Soviet zone (most of them political refugees who dared refuse to join the SED).
3. Story on French efforts to help German prisoners of war.
4. Excerpts from Byrnes' Frankly Speaking.
5. Picture of transformation of German armament industry in United States zone to peace production (thus scotching favorite Soviet propaganda lie).
6. Picture showing United States Army helping orphaned east German refugee kids.
7. Pleasant, intelligent story on small United States town.
8. Good article by André Gide.

Stalinist infiltration into even so well-guarded and colorless a newspaper as the official American Neue Zeitung is demonstrated by a series of five articles on the Literature in Exile, written by the Czech Communist F. C. Weiskopf, and published in this official MG paper during the months of March, April, and May 1947. Weiskopf, using the well-known technique of camouflage reporting, deliberately overemphasized the part played in exile by German pro-Soviet writers, from Brecht and Becher down to dozens of unknown party members, while omitting the names and works of those who, during the thirties, revolted against the Stalinist-controlled Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller.

To round out the picture of the Norden case, I will add that Miss Ruth Norden, a former OWI employee and an associate of her brother Heinz in various political enterprises, was in charge of the political direction of the German-language radio station in the United States sector of Berlin. That's the lot then: Dr. Mayer in Radio Frankfurt, Bentschen in Radio Munich, and Ruth Norden in Radio Berlin—which last was as blunt a democratic weapon as was Heute.

Item No. 5: Alfred Kantorowicz

This particular case history is presented more as an explanation of the manner in which Soviet agents have been able to use the naïveté of liberal Americans, than as an indictment of ICD methods. Alfred Kantorowicz, organizer of the French section of the Schutzverband Deutscher Schriftsteller, was a German refugee in the United States when the war ended. Some who know Kantorowicz believe him to be almost as important a Soviet agent as Gerhard Eisler. Evidently the State Department did not know about him, for it permitted him to return to Germany after VE-day—although I believe that his request to return by way of the U. S. S. R. was refused.

Kantorowicz arrived in Germany loaded down with a number of introductions and recommendations. Among those who—as I recall it—approved of him were William L. Shirer and John Scott, Time's Berlin correspondent. With this kind of backing Kantorowicz was able very quickly to obtain interviews with the highest ICD officials in Berlin, and before long there was a scheme afoot that he should publish a highbrow magazine in the United States Zone; the project fell through only because of a paper shortage. Next there was talk of getting Kantorowicz an ICD license to edit the United States-Zone Weser Kurier—a Bremen newspaper, published in the strategic and only supply port for the United States Army in Germany. This, too, had to be abandoned, for his Russian friends had different plans for him; Kantorowicz is currently engaged in editing the Soviet-licensed, Berlin magazine Ost und West, the sort of Soviet propaganda sheet that tells the West how the warmongers are all wrong in their pictures of the progressive, peaceful U. S. S. R. Yet, as late as 9 months ago, Mr. Kantorowicz was still in contact with American officials, trying for an ICD license. If past performance is any guide, there is no reason to think that he won't get it.

Item No. 6: ICD Censorship

While the Soviet-controlled German press began almost immediately after VE-Day to criticize, slander and malign the Western Allies in flagrant violation of the Potsdam and other agreements, ICD ruled its German newspapers with an iron fist, insisting that no hint of criticism of the U. S. S. R.—or even of Stalinism—taint their editorials and news stories. This might have been all right if such had been the policy vis-a-vis all Allied Powers; but while no German editor dared to come out against the savage mass-expulsions of millions of Germans from the areas East of the Oder-Neisse line (and while Editor Norden defended these expulsions editorially), Communist Editor Carlebach of the Frankfurter Rundschau was perfectly at liberty to attack French attempts to stir up separatist sentiment in the Rhine and Saar Valleys. Such attacks, appearing in the United States-licensed German press, were among other things designed to provide Thorez, Duclos & Co. with some of their best election material.

Yet there was not a shadow of doubt that some of the most important German news stories of the 1945–47 period concerned—as Victor Gollancz saw so clearly—the unspeakable excesses committed by hordes of Red Army vandals in eastern Europe, the equally fantastic brutalities attending the expulsion of Germans from eastern lands, and the resulting starvation throughout Germany.[2] In addition, millions of Germans knew, and many Americans could and did confirm stories of feverish Soviet efforts to mine uranium in Saxony and Thuringia (areas which we had handed to the Soviets at Yalta); millions knew of the Soviet manufacture of German war machines—jet planes, V–1 and V–2 weapons, tanks, guns, etc., throughout the eastern zone—all, of course, in direct violation of every single article of the Potsdam agreement; millions knew of the terror spread through the eastern zone by the combined forces of the MVD (Soviet secret police) and the ex-SS against German anti-Nazis, with the kind help of the Gestapo;[3] millions knew of the collaboration of prominent eastern Nazis with the SED, of German General Staff officers with the Red Army General Staff, and so on. And millions had heard recurring rumors of German armies being organized by the Soviets in the east, and of thousands of German prisoners starving to death in Russia, under conditions resembling Belsen and Dachau.

All these, and many other stories, facts, rumors were withheld from the ICD-licensed German press, although there was never any lack of confirming evidence. No German editor had the guts—or the political attitude—to print such news. It would have resulted in his immediate dismissal.

---

[1] All these references and additional details can be found on p. A207, January 15, 1948, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, address by Representative GEORGE A. DONDERO.

[2] See Politics, December 1945, January 1946.

[3] The Russian-appointed chief of the Berlin Criminal Police, for example, was exposed as a war criminal and leading Gestapo agent, and finally had to be sacked—in 1947, as a result of western pressure.

In view of this terrible gap in German news coverage—a gap that was only too apparent to most German readers—the reeducation effort through the German press in the United States zone became a depressing farce, and Germans quickly lost confidence in their newly acquired democratic press. It is no exaggeration to say that ICD's press effort was almost totally wasted during the 2 years after VE-day—unless it was designed to discredit western standards of journalistic accuracy and truthfulness in German eyes.

(B) POLITICAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

I had occasion to be in Berlin immediately after its capture by the Soviets some days before VE-day. The capture of Berlin had been denied to American troops who could have accomplished it in 3 weeks before the Red army got anywhere near it. (So, too, American troops were held back from capturing Prague so that the Red army could get credit for the city's liberation—a credit the Communists cashed in on when they took over Czechoslovakia recently.)

The Russians had entered Berlin not only with tanks, but also with thousands of posters bearing Stalin's famous quote: "Hitlers come and Hitlers go, but the German people go on forever." To one who had just come from Eisenhower's Germany, in which we stood as conquerors, not as liberators, the Soviet attempt even before VE-day to win over the popular sentiment of the Fascist beasts seemed strange in view of the viciously anti-German propaganda drives by the American pro-Soviet press. But there it was, visible even to the newly formed American military government.

MG's vision, however, had been skillfully obscured. For years western Stalinoids had prepared for the Soviet entry into Berlin. Trumpeting the most illiberal anti-German declarations, a peculiar assortment of Stalinoids, liberals, and mixed "Germanophobes" had seen to it that the Morgenthau plan would represent the western attitude toward the Germans—while Stalin's would be the gracious offer of a new Hitler-Stalin pact, addressed especially to the Junker militarists and the Fascist beasts. It was a neat arrangement, and whichever way the Stalinoids played it, they could make it stick. If the Western Powers slipped Germany a Morgenthau, Stalin would wave Von Paulus & Co.; if the Western Powers retained their reason (and a few vague memories of the Atlantic Charter), Stalin's propagandists—from the New Times to PM—would yell that the monopoly capitalists were building up the German war machine against Russia. It was a wonderful scheme, for not only did it work both ways alternately, but it also worked both ways at once: Stalin would privately pat the Junkers on the back and let the Gestapo in by the back door, while publicly accusing us of doing that very thing—which, of course, scared the living daylights out of American liberals in MG. They therefore saw to it that our Germans did nothing that could possibly offend the U. S. S. R.

Lincoln Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILSON D. GILLETTE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wayne Independent, Honesdale, Pa., giving excerpts from an address by the Honorable FRED L. CRAWFORD at the annual Lincoln Day dinner of the Wayne County Republican Committee on February 17, 1949:

More than 300 paid tribute to Lincoln at the annual Lincoln Day dinner held on Thursday night at 7:30 o'clock in the Eagles' Hall, Main Street, Honesdale. The affair was sponsored by the Wayne County Republican Committee and the Wayne County Republican Club.

Attorney Lester R. Male, Republican county chairman, gave the address of welcome stating it was a critical time at the time of Lincoln's birth, when he was President and the time is critical now, but the Republican Party has stayed alive and on the job during all these trying times. We have not broken in faith, in enthusiasm, or in a financial way. It is our duty and responsibility to carry on the two-party system of our country.

FRED L. CRAWFORD, Congressman of the Eighth District, Michigan, who has had a wide experience in fields of banking, industry and in the National Government then gave a stirring address, which did not paint a very good picture of world conditions today, nor of our national situation in conjunction with world problems.

Before going into the subject of his talk, National and International Trends, he spoke in complimentary terms of our Congressman, WILSON D. GILLETTE. He considers him a stalwart Republican in Congress, which is now engrossed in the most crucial period in the history of our country. The speaker termed GILLETTE "a genuine Republican, conservative and one with well-balanced judgment. He is of the type upon which we will have to depend to pull our country through its interior and exterior mess as it exists today. Mr. GILLETTE is faithful to his duties, ever present and holds a record for attendance at committee meetings and House sessions." The speaker then emphasized: "Radicals do not solve our problems, but rather put us into more problems for solving."

As for himself, Congressman CRAWFORD, stated he had lived in 16 States, traveled 3,000,000 miles, visited 37 countries on this globe and has seen the broken cities, the rubble of destruction, men and women scavenging for food.

Just recently he had the privilege of visiting Rome and having a personal interview with his Holiness the Pope, who said "My friend, you have had the opportunity to visit these death spots, seen the destruction of war, noted the suffering. It is the responsibility of your people to render assistance."

The speaker said in part:

"In the formation of our Republic, the drafting of our Declaration of Independence, the designing of our Federal and State Constitutions and the provisioning of our early laws, the preservation of the dignity and the identity of the individual held a top position and in the all-over approach.

A person without identity is also one with no dignity. Allow a person to feel he is of no consequence, and he automatically loses all contact with the spiritual forces which constitute the cornerstone of organized society.

In your heart, my friends, is a burning desire to amount to something—in your vocation, your company, your church, your club, and in your political party. You wish as an individual to touch the throne.

Out of the desires and efforts of individuals, men and women who have been inspired by the Anglo-Saxon Christian religion, this Republic derives its moral, material, and political strength. Until within recent years all our people were quite clear on the proposition that the state existed for the benefit of the citizen, instead of the citizen being the vassal of the state.

The great Lincoln recognized the prime importance of the dignity and identity of the individual.

There was in Lincoln's heart no room for the slave, for the caste system, for the savage anonymity that has been and is the traditional curse of every social state of every dictatorship, of most all military establishments.

Lincoln's philosophy placed freedom before peace, sacrifice before comfort, the common good before self, and, most fundamental of all, Lincoln was opposed to the philosophy of one man eating his bread from the sweat of another's face. He was opposed to human slavery in all of its forms. He contended each able-bodied person should make his own contribution to organized society and draw his returns from his own efforts.

Lincoln did not evaluate strength in terms of material power. He well knew that the history of man up to Lincoln's day was proof sufficient that the true strength of nations and their armies rests in the beliefs of the people. Past centuries have underscored with blood and blasted cities, dead bodies, and broken souls that great aggregations of physical power alone cannot survive the God-given strength which rests in a firm conviction that right must prevail. The Goliaths depending only on power will continue to go down before the Davids who are vigilant, and who fight for the freedom of individual man.

But our people must understand and accept the right philosophy; by this, I mean the fundamental principles of freedom, initiative, incentives, and energy which made this country great. Our moral care must be preserved. Perverted philosophies, to the extent they have entered our national bloodstream, must be eliminated. This gives you and you and you a job to do.

We should recall that General Washington engaged Tom Paine to keep the fires of freedom burning in the hearts of his soldiers. Spinoza (philosopher) observed: "Men fight better with ideas on the ends of their bayonets." But have you observed that vast sums of your dollars in recent years have been used to promote the social welfare state? To convince you that you are incapable of managing your own affairs; that you must rely on one collectivist approach after another for your social and material security; that what now is past production should be redistributed by Federal Government?

And pray tell me, why during the past few years the administrations in power have lent such great aid to those who have sought to drive wedges of hatred, suspicion, and scorn between the voting public and three certain groups: 1, the National Congress; 2, those who manage business; 3, the general military staffs. These three groups have been maligned, pointed out to us as scoundrels and black enemies of the people. And for what purpose?

Simply to destroy the main ramparts charged with the responsibility of protecting the freedom of the individual. Incentives and personal initiative plus freedom has carried our people to the pinnacle of the world.

The speaker repeated recent words of General Eisenhower that dictatorship is not brought about by guns but by the surrendering of our responsibility. We must exercise the policies of our country. As Lincoln said: "I have been given a job to do for the United States, and I will do it." Why did Eisenhower make these observations of his relative to individual freedom of our people, and the marching of dictatorship over the face of the world?

Mr. CRAWFORD noted the presence of many young people at the banquet. When he was a young man our national debt was $1,500,000,000; today it is $252,000,000,000. It takes great management even in the attempt to pay it off. It will mow us down just as physical storms mow down crops. The largest budget in the history of the world has now been presented by President Truman. The speaker referred to the North Atlantic Pact

which is rocking the foundations of Washington at the present time. Included in this will be the fact that war can be declared without the sanction of Congress. Congressman CRAWFORD watches this with great interest and concern.

The dangers to private enterprise were discussed clearly and aroused one's thoughts to the dangers that lie ahead if various industries, particularly the steel industry, is federalized. Truman made a direct attack against steel recently and when this is federalized, the social state has moved in.

Socialized medicine received scorching denunciation from the speaker. In England today the women have been forced to their knees due to this socialized-medicine program. It costs England $2,800,000 a week. Would you like your case histories taken and then sent down to the Labor political headquarters? That is what is happening in England. Do you want the patient completely destroyed? The state cannot furnish the doctors, the nurses, the hospital, or the medicines. I am definitely against socialized medicine.

There is a bill being presented for the creation of a Department of Welfare which will add another member to the Cabinet for this Department, which "will look after you."

Congressman CRAWFORD urged that we pay more attention to Government, study Government, have our children study Government, and use more energy toward the right form of government. It is better to inform ourselves, our associations, our churches and clubs. We must have the courage of our convictions, reached from studying the various problems at hand and based on our conclusions.

The speaker reviewed the incidents of socialized England and France, where we have been pouring millions of dollars for their reconstruction since the war.

He warned that there is a bottom to our economic meal bag and we will find out soon about this. Truman is making the same errors as Roosevelt.

The ideals of our Constitution must be upheld and there is a tough job ahead. The balance of the world is looking toward us.

The intricate political problems of China, our virtual "checking out" of the Far East was discussed at length, and again there was a note of warning of the future. Work is being rushed for the fortification of Alaska.

In closing, Congressman CRAWFORD again urged everyone to use more energy to uphold the democratic form of government.

All joined in singing the Battle Hymn of the Republic, and Rev. Francis J. Merkel, Rock Lake, pronounced the benediction.

Dancing was enjoyed with special entertainment featured by group of musicians and dancers.

Four-Year Term for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Oregon Statesman, Salem, Oreg., of February 17, 1949:

FOUR-YEAR TERM FOR CONGRESSMEN

An Arkansas Democrat, OREN HARRIS, wants to have the Constitution changed to give Representatives a 4-year instead of a 2-year term. Such a change ought to be made. Now, a Member hardly has a chance to warm his seat before he must begin active campaigning for reelection. The cost takes a substantial slice out of his salary, if he has any opposition at all, and he is kept in political hot water all the time.

There is no need to make Representatives jump through the hoop every 2 years. They ought to have tenure for at least 4 years so they get to know their way about the Capitol, and not be kept on political pins and needles all the time out of concern for their reelection.

Arab Refugees in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a copy of a letter by Kermit Roosevelt to the editor of the New York Times on February 1, 1949. Mr. Roosevelt is an authority on this subject and his letter will be of interest to the Members of this Congress who will soon be called upon to approve a request for som $16,000,000 to aid these unfortunate refugees.

The letter follows:

PEACE IN MIDDLE EAST HELD DEPENDENT SOLUTION TO PROBLEM

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The penetrating articles of your correspondent Anne O'Hare McCormick from Israel are a reminder that, whether individual Americans be pro or anti Israel, there are certain basic goals of American policy in which almost all of us believe. Likewise, the discussion of liberalization of existing displaced persons legislation should remind us of certain basic humanitaran goals which almost all of us share. We should be careful in each case not to allow partisan debate over means to endanger the goals.

In Palestine and the Middle East our goals are peace, security, and to the extent possible in a contradictory world, justice. And the DP legislation should be an expression—though it is prejudiced and inadequate in its present form—of our goal that the suffering shall be comforted, the hungry helped to find food, the homeless and dispossessed assisted to shelter, the outraged restored to security and human dignity.

Mrs. McCormick's articles suggest how these two problems overlap. The European DP problem is not our only, nor even our biggest, refugee problem. There are 750,000 Palestinian refugees, mostly Arabs, many of them Christians, who formerly made their homes in Palestine but are now homeless wanderers outside the proclaimed boundaries of Israel.

STATEMENT ON FLIGHT

Writing from Tel Aviv, Mrs. McCormick comments: "So far no one here has expressed any responsibility or sympathy for these wretched victims of the Palestine war." Later she observes that "Israeli authorities argue that the Arabs' panic flight was unjustified even by the admitted excesses of illegal terrorists (such as the massacre of Deir Yassin, which most correspondents agree started off the main evacuation). They say that there is plenty of room for the refugees in the undeveloped Arab countries."

According to Mrs. McCormick, Israel's Foreign Minister Moshe Shertok, expressed the view "that Israel should compensate the (Arab) refugees for their property on the condition that the money be used constructively to settle them in new homes and not 'frittered away' in temporary relief measures."

I agree with Mrs. McCormick when she states: "This seems to preclude the possibility of the return of the exiles, many of whom are waiting in camps across borders and in Arab Palestine in confident expectation that they will go home as soon as peace is restored." They will be denied a right to return to homes where they were born and lived, where their ancestors have lived for at least 1,300 years but which are now under Israeli domination.

As Mrs. McCormick's stories make clear, entire Arab villages are being demolished as rapidly as mechanized equipment can do the work. Ancient Arab Jaffa has been swallowed by modern Jewish Tel Aviv. The doors are locked. Although Israeli officials indignantly repel the insinuation that the Arab evacuation was the result of a deliberate policy on their part, Mrs. McCormick notes: "They cheerfully acknowledge that they lost no time taking advantage of it."

GOAL OF EXILES

As Americans, we must ask ourselves, What will the creation of three-quarters of a million exiles do to the long-range prospects for peace in the Middle East? We cannot expect that these exiles will abandon willingly the goal of returning to their own homes. The lands into which they have been driven are shaky, both economically and politically; they are in no condition to cope with a refugee and resettlement problem as large as this.

If our object is the establishment of peace and security in the Middle East, the solution of this refugee problem must be high upon our agenda. It is a problem which should be faced conscientiously by Zionist and non-Zionist alike, as is the problem of European DP's, whose relief has long been delayed by confusion of their plight with the aspirations of political Zionism.

KERMIT ROOSEVELT.

WASHINGTON, *February 1, 1949.*

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following portion of a radio broadcast made by myself upon the subject of social security:

I propose that the present social-security law be amended to extend coverage to the following:

1. Employees of small firms.
2. The self-employed, such as small-business and professional men.
3. Agricultural people, both owners of farms and farm laborers.
4. Employees of nonprofit charitable institutions, such as hospitals.
5. Employees of States, counties, cities, and subdivisions thereof.
6. All those who become injured and disabled before reaching retirement age.

Regarding coverage for the self-employed, Mr. Arnold Beezer, Seattle attorney, writes: "I am firmly convinced that the act should be amended to include all self-employed individuals. Many others with whom I have talked concerning this phase of social security agreed with me without exception."

Mr. M. C. Fortney, president, Municipal Employees Civil Service League of Seattle, writes as follows: "This organization, composed of civil-service employees of the city of Seattle, respectfully requests your support of expansion of social security to include employees of local governments." And in this same connection Mr. Mark Wienand, vice chairman, State employees retirement board, writes: "With regard to the State of Washington, as long back as 1941, the State legislature voted an enabling act that would bring all public State employees into Federal social security, whenever such coverage became available." National coverage of all public employees would in no way affect local pension programs such as those in operation in many cities. If the firemen of a city did not wish to be included because of their local pension program, they could stay out. On the other hand, if they have no program of any kind, they should, in my opinion, be automatically covered.

Mr. Charles Potter, of Tacoma, writes an interesting letter in which he describes the need for the injured and disabled to receive social-security benefits before reaching the age of 65. Writes Mr. Potter: "I am 61 years of age and a plasterer by trade. Since June of 1947, I have been in the hospital five times and am now under doctors' orders not to work. Our savings are about gone and I have nothing to live on, since I can't receive social-security pension payments until I am 65. I have paid social-security withholding taxes ever since the law was passed." Mr. Potter's case is duplicated many times throughout the country. Such cases can only be properly dealt with if our present laws are amended to provide pension payments for those covered by the Social Security Act who become disabled.

Next, I advocate lowering the retirement age of women to 60. If it is financially possible, we should reduce the retirement age of our men also. In this connection Mr. John Wade, of Tacoma, writes: "We American men are prone to marry women years younger than ourselves. I think the age for wives should be lowered to 60 for purposes of the Retirement Act." And to prove Mr. Wade's statement, Mrs. J. Bath, of Graham, writes: "My husband is 70 years old and receives $17.58 per month. I am 63 years old, in ill health, unable to work, but can't get any pension for two more years."

Next I shall urge Congress to increase the monthly social-security pensions to the highest degree that is financially sound. At present the pensions could be increased substantially without requiring any increase in the withholding taxes. In the 12 years that old-age and survivors' insurance has been in operation it has collected $6 for every $1 it has paid out. Five dollars in every six has gone into a general reserve fund now containing almost $11,000,000,000. Higher withholding-tax rates should not be necessary until such time as the pay-outs for pensions begins to approach the income of the fund. In this regard Mr. W. E. Stanhope, of Tacoma, writes: "Will you please use your influence to increase Federal social-security payments. I believe the amount in the surplus fund with the amount steadily coming in from pay-roll deductions will easily take care of a substantial increase." Graphically describing the need to increase present pension payments, Mrs. Maude Wood, of Tacoma, writes: "I am now receiving social security, but even though I own my home, I have difficulty getting by. My monthly pension check is less than $30." And Maude Wood is not alone. The average national social-security payment is now only $23.25.

Next I propose that the $14.99 allowable monthly earning be increased to $50. Under present law, if a Federal pensioner earns more than $15 in a given month, his entire pension for that month is thereby affected. Mr. Joseph Hunold, of Tacoma, wrote me an interesting letter which clearly shows the unfairness of the present law. Said Mr. Hunold: "There are 18 of us former employees of the Tacoma News-Tribune who individually are not receiving more than $34 per month Federal pension. We are not even allowed to take 1 day's work at our former job because we would earn $15.25, which would mean that we would lose our social-security pension."

In testifying next week before the House Ways and Means Committee, I shall further urge that veterans be allowed credits on a reasonable hypothetical salary for time served in the armed forces. At present, veterans who come under the Railroad Retirement Act and the Postal Retirement Act do receive credits for time spent in the service. This often means an increase of $5 per month in monthly pension payments.

Time does not allow me to discuss social security in greater detail today. In closing let me briefly review the testimony I shall present to the House Ways and Means Committee next week when it begins hearings on social-security legislation.

First. We need to develop an over-all national program insuring equal treatment for all our people.

Second. We need to extend social-security coverage to include the self-employed, employees of small firms, public employees, agricultural people, employees of nonprofit institutions, and all those injured before reaching retirement age.

Third. We should lower the retirement age for women to 60. If financially possible, the retirement age for men should be lowered to 60 also.

Fourth. We should increase the monthly pension payments to provide a decent retirement.

Fifth. The $14.99 allowable monthly earning should be raised to $50.

Sixth. All veterans should be allowed wage credits for time served in the armed forces.

At the present time it is too early to tell exactly what action Congress will finally take. I want to assure you now, however, that as your Congressman I will do everything possible to obtain satisfactory action on the six major points I have discussed with you this evening. Poverty and hardships are no respecters of time. This is a job we should have done long ago.

ECA Bacon for Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, a document issued by the Economic Cooperation Administration entitled "Commodity Supplier Data" shows that during the period from October 1 to 15, 1948, ECA purchased more than 120,000,000 pounds of bacon from Canadian concerns. All purchases were for the British Ministry of Food, and the invoice amount shown for the purchases totals in excess of $11,300,000. Not 1 pound of bacon is shown to have been purchased from any American producer.

In giving these figures, I have omitted 966 bales of bacon purchased from Canadian concerns and having an invoice amount of $83,593.21. I am not sure how many pounds of bacon there are to a bale.

Personally, I cannot understand why American producers are excluded from these bacon purchases, and I would like to see an explanation of that conduct.

Can it be that the ECA program is, after all, favoring foreign competitors over American industry and labor? If such is the case, it is time we find it out.

Outraged Christianity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include a very well thought out editorial from the Yankton Press and Dakotan, of Yankton, S. Dak., concerning the Cardinal Mindszenty incident and subsequent events which are shocking to the Christian world. The editor of the Press and Dakotan is my good friend, Fred Monfore.

The editorial follows:

MORE PURGING

An outraged Christian world scarcely had time to catch its breath after the sentencing of Hungary's Cardinal Mindszenty before the familiar pattern began again in Bulgaria. This time 15 Protestant clergymen, rather than a Roman Catholic primate, were the victims. But the charges were much the same.

Once again there were accusations of treason, currency manipulation, and spying for the United States and Britain. Once again came the official announcement that the accused had "fully confessed" their alleged crimes.

The closeness and similarity of these two events might be due to carelessness, but it seems more likely that they result from indifference. It is as if the Kremlin's agents in Budapest and Sofia were saying, "You denounce these charges as trumped up. You say they are part of a Communist campaign to wipe out religion wherever it can. You say the charges are a baseless insult to the American and British Governments and their citizens. All right, what are you going to do about it?"

And what, indeed, can be done? These half-secret mock trials and the ensuing punishments are violations of the terms which gave Hungary and Bulgaria a limited sovereignty under their peace treaties. The terms include freedom of religious worship, speech, and political opinion, and freedom from discrimination because of sex, race, religion, or language.

Under normal conditions, complaints of this sort would be settled by the treaty signatories, Russia, Britain, and this country. But under present conditions it is almost certain that the Communist heads of government in Hungary and Bulgaria would say that the accused were tried under laws applying to all citizens and that, moreover, they had confessed their crimes.

Even if the signatory powers did go through the motions of meetings and discussions, there is no chance of their agreeing. Moscow obviously ordered these travesties of justice. And Moscow just as obviously isn't going to admit that it was wrong or permit its decisions to be reversed.

So the prospects are for more persecutions and purges of religion and its leaders in the

Soviet satellite states. One may wonder, in that connection, why Russia permits its own war-revived religions to continue operating with no more apparent hindrance than the usual denunciations in the Communist press.

The answer can only be guessed at. But it seems likely that the Russian churches have been allowed to continue only on condition of prescribed behavior. In the satellite countries both Protestant and Roman Catholic churchmen are threats to the Communist dictatorship, just as they were to the Nazi dictatorship when it existed in the same countries.

Cardinal Mindszenty and the Bulgarian clergymen are to the Communists what Cardinal Hlond and Pastor Niemoeller were to the Nazis before them. They are champions of the rights and freedom and dignity of man. They are foes of atheism. They are believers in truth, justice, and charity. As such they are enemies of the Communist state. Their light must be extinguished.

Subsidies Fully Repaid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article in the Maritime Reporter of February 1, 1949, entitled "Subsidies Fully Repaid," and to include also remarks by Hon. Raymond S. McKeough of the United States Maritime Commission, and by Hon. S. O. BLAND, Member of Congress and chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The article appearing in the Maritime Reporter is as follows:

SUBSIDIES FULLY REPAID

Checks totaling $5,252,628.66 were delivered recently to the United States Maritime Commission by the American Export Lines in a ceremony in which the steamship company repaid in full the operating-differential subsidies it had received during the last 10 years.

H. M. Gillespie, vice president and secretary-treasurer of the American Export, presented the checks to Raymond S. McKeough, vice chairman of the Commission at a meeting of the Government agency attended by Commissioners Joseph K. Carson, Jr., J. Grenville Mellen, and David J. S. Coddaire. Also present at the ceremony was Representative SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, chairman of the House Maritime Committee, who fostered passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 under which subsidies are paid by the Government.

In a short talk after the checks had been turned over, Representative BLAND hailed American Export's payment as "the strongest proof that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is the public's greatest guarantee of a strong American merchant marine for both economic and national security.

"This repayment, and others which will follow," he said, "disproves the fallacy long held by many that operating-differential subsidies paid to shipowners have been of enormous size. Actually such subsidies during the past 10-year period averaged about $2,000,000 net to the Government per year; and of all Federal subsidies, that paid to ship operators is the only one subject to recapture."

It was just a little more than 10 years ago that American export lines became one of the first companies to apply for and receive a contract under the 1936 act. That contract covered regular scheduled operations of modern, express passenger, and cargo steamers between North Atlantic ports of the United States and ports in North Africa, the Mediterranean Sea, Black Sea, and was later extended to include the Red Sea, India, Ceylon, and Burma.

American Export was the third company to return operating subsidies in full and its payment made a total of about $16,000,000 in subsidies that have been returned. Other companies that made full payments recently were Lykes Brothers Steamship Co. and Mississippi Shipping Co. Payments are scheduled to be made this year by United States Line Company, Grace Line, New York, and Cuba Mail Line, and Oceanic Steamship Co.

Commissioner McKeough, speaking in behalf of Vice Admiral W. W. Smith, chairman of the Commission, said the operating-differential subsidy does not assure shipowners a profit or guaranty against a loss. In noting that the subsidy is paid simply for the purpose of making up the difference between costs of operating an American and a competing foreign ship, Mr. Gillespie emphasized that 61 percent of the payment received by American Export, or $3,234,756.09, was for seamen's wages over and above the average received by seamen who manned competitive foreign-flag vessels.

Mr. Gillespie said American Export is currently operating four combination passenger and freight vessels and 20 modern express freighters, all built for its particular trade routes and of approved Government design for naval auxiliary service in the event of any national emergency. The company now operates a schedule of 130 regular sailings annually, including 26 annual sailings to each of 5 overseas areas that comprise the essential trade routes. In addition to its 24 wholly owned modern vessels, the line has several Government-owned freighters on bareboat charter to supplement regular schedules. It has also signed construction contracts for two express liners for its Mediterranean services at a cost of more than $46,000,000. These liners are to have 30,000 tons displacement and 20,000 gross tons and a speed of 25 knots. Preliminary work on these ships has been under way for some months at the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co.'s Fore River Yard, Quincy, Mass., where keels are due to be laid soon.

The remarks of Commissioner McKeough on the above occasion were as follows:

The repayment today points up sharply the manner in which the subsidy program provides a form of insurance that our essential trade routes will be serviced by American ships.

During a 10-year period when the average profits have been good, such as this first period, the cost to the taxpayer is at a minimum. The total return, for example, from all the steamship lines (of which there are seven) in this first accounting period, will amount to about $26,000,000 compared to a total of $36,000,000 paid out by the Government. This means only $1,000,000 per year net cost to the Government. When all the returns are in, for all of the 12 subsidized companies, it is estimated that the annual cost to the Government will not be more than $2,000,000 per year.

The operating-differential subsidy program should be thought of as having a cushioning effect; the subsidy at least places American operators on a basis of parity, insofar as costs are concerned, with their foreign competitors on the same routes. That is the principle behind the subsidy program. It does not guarantee a shipping line against loss. A steamship company must continue to practice economy and efficiency of operation if it hopes to make money.

The reason for the Government's participation in the costs of merchant-ship operation is the need of insuring that the trade routes deemed essential to our economy are served. At the same time it encourages private capital to engage in water transportation and thus assures a modern American merchant marine in being so that it may serve, if necessary, in cases of national emergency.

The subsidy program under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has only been in operation since 1937. Since that time the Nation has been through the greatest war in its history, and built the greatest fleet of merchant ships in history. Because of the subsidy program with the impetus it gave to construction and operation of modern merchant ships, the start of the war found many new ships available for the defense of our country.

American Export Lines was the first to come in under the postwar building program under existing legislation to begin construction of badly needed passenger vessels. They have replaced vessels as rapidly as possible in the vital United States to Mediterranean service. Congratulations are due the American Export Lines for its fine work in maintaining close cooperation between the industry and the Government in providing an American merchant marine adequate for trade and defense.

The remarks of the Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND were as follows:

The repayment by the American Export Lines to the United States Maritime Commission of more than $5,000,000 as the full amount of the operating-differential subsidy they received from the Government since 1938 is again to me, as it must be to the Congress of the United States, the strongest proof that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is the public's greatest guaranty of a strong American merchant marine for both economic and national security.

This repayment, and others which will follow, disproves the fallacy long held by many that operating-differential subsidies paid to shipowners have been of enormous size. Actually such subsidies over a 10-year period will average about $2,000,000 per year; and of all Federal subsidies, that paid to ship operators is the only one subject to recapture.

The operating-differential subsidy does not assure shipowners a profit—or guarantee against a loss. They do not hamper initiative or destroy competition. They are paid only to place American shipowners on a parity with their foreign competitors, and thus preserve to American maritime labor far higher standards of wages, working, and living conditions.

The repayment speaks for itself and is practical proof that Congress enacted a fundamentally sound statute which will continue to guarantee this Nation, at the lowest possible public cost, an American merchant marine commensurate with the Nation's position in world affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Senator Royal Copeland, of New York, could have been present with us at the ceremony described above. I miss him very much. This was the result of his labors, and I would love to have his guidance and assistance now. He worked hard and too much credit cannot be given him for the result of our labors.

Transportation Tax Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the South Dakota State Legislature:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

Concurrent resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-first Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring):

Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a 15-percent levy upon the transportation of persons and a 3-percent levy upon the transportation of property; and

Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel, the need for which no longer exists; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long-distance shipper and the long-distance traveler as does the present tax on the transportation of property and persons; and

Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of South Dakota, as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from South Dakota to the eastern markets, with the result that those goods are not able to compete freely with the goods originating in more closely adjacent southern areas; and

Whereas the State of South Dakota is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of South Dakota, in particular, may compete freely with southern produce without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

Whereas the State of South Dakota is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity, and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States H. R. 205 which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and H. R. 208, which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact into laws H. R. 205 and H. R. 208, or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

Summary of Situation Concerning Request for Emergency Flood-Control Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on about February 5, 1949, the Chief of Engineers requested a telegraphic report from seven division engineers concerning the situation with respect to snow cover throughout the western United States. This request for information specified that each division engineer was to prepare an estimate of the amount of emergency money required in the event that unfavorable weather conditions in the spring break-up caused severe flooding.

In response to this telegraphic request, reports were received from the division engineers throughout the Mississippi River Basin and all States west thereof indicating that an unfortunate combination of temperature and rainfall during the spring break-up would produce floods in that portion of the country which would make necessary the expenditure of approximately $25,000,000 in emergency money.

This information was communicated to an informal meeting of Senators in the Senate Public Works Committee room on February 11. On February 18, Secretary of Army Royall transmitted a request to the Bureau of the Budget for the approval of a budget estimate in the amount of $22,500,000, for emergency flood-control funds chargeable against the authorization contained in the Flood Control Act of 1948.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations has scheduled a hearing for Wednesday, February 23, when testimony will be taken concerning the need for emergency funds in the Western States. It is understood that the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate intends to amend the first deficiency bill now before that committee to include the additional emergency flood-control funds which it believes to be necessary in order that the Corps of Engineers may meet its obligations in connection with emergency flood fighting during the coming spring.

It is most important that emergency money be made available to the Corps of Engineers at an early date. The snow cover throughout the western United States is abnormally heavy and an adverse combination of temperature and rainfall during the spring break-up could produce record or near record floods in many of the major rivers including but not limited to the Missouri and tributaries, the Rio Grande, the Colorado, the Columbia and tributaries, and certain streams lying entirely in the State of Utah and the State of Nevada. In the event that funds are made available to the Corps of Engineers in the ve_y near future, certain emergency repair work can be undertaken in advance of the flood season. Work done under normal conditions, in advance of a flood, produces greater benefit for each dollar expended than any emergency work which can be undertaken when a flood is actually upon us.

Stop Subsidizing Socialism in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the remarks before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the proposed appropriations for ECA for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1949, by Merwin K. Hart, president, National Economic Council, Inc.:

Last year I urged this committee not to make any appropriations unless the condition were attached that none of the proceeds should be used to subsidize socialism—that is to say, that the beneficiary countries should go no further in nationalizing their own industries or activities.

I urged this because it is perfectly clear to us in the National Economic Council that socialism is the next step to communism, and I thought it inconsistent for the United States to be spending hundreds of millions in the effort to stop communism in Greece and elsewhere while appropriating billions for European countries which in effect are subsidizing Marxist socialism.

Today it is even more apparent to us that we were right in our contention.

The Congress, however, under the instigation, I believe, of Marxists in the administration and under the influence of the propaganda of numerous left-wing organizations the country over, did not attach any such conditions.

The reason given was that it was not for the United States to interfere in, or with respect to, the internal affairs of any nation; that every nation should be free to have any kind of government or economic system it wished, regardless of its possible and future menace to our own safety.

This attitude is obviously insincere when one considers that the admitted reason for refusing to include Spain in the Marshall plan is that the administration does not like the present form of government in Spain. In other words, it was all right for the American administration to interfere as it has been

doing for many years in the Government of Spain, but it is not all right for us to attach the slightest condition to our loan to Britain and other Marshall-plan countries.

I have gathered first-hand information in visits to Europe during the last two summers. I have had considerable acquaintance with Europe through visits there over the past 52 years. I have been compelled by my own observations to conclude that the motivating cause of the refusal of the United States to attach any conditions to our loans and gifts to the 16 so-called Marshall-plan countries, as well as the successful efforts made by the administration to persuade the Congress last year to reverse the overwhelming vote of the House to include Spain in the Marshall plan, is that the American administration is guided, whether aware of it or not, chiefly by Marxist Socialists. Although the vast majority of the American people retain their confidence in, and are loyal to, the private-enterprise system of government, yet because the left-wingers are better organized, they are, through such measures as this Marshall plan as it is now being administered, driving the United States straight into the arms of socialism.

There has been fresh evidence the past 12 months of the futility of socialism. Every nationalized industry in Britain is losing money. In an interim statement, the chairman of the British Transport Commission announced that for the first financial year of transport there would be a loss of $112,000,000.

During the first year of nationalization, coal mining lost $94,000,000.

Civil aviation lost $100,000,000 the first 14 months.

Electricity in the few months it has been in operation has already lost $28,000,000.

Now the Socialist government which you are asked further to subsidize proposes to force through, before it can be voted out of power, nationalization of the iron and steel industry.

It is interesting to compare the experience of coal under socialism and steel under private enterprise. The last year before the recent war, the British coal industry produced 227,000,000 tons of coal. The target set by the Socialist government for the first year under nationalization was 211,000,000 tons. It actually produced 208,500,000 tons—although using 8,000 more men than were engaged in the industry in the year 1938.

On the other hand, steel production in 1938 was ten and one-third million tons. The Socialist government called upon the steel industry to produce 14,500,000 tons. Under private enterprise, steel actually produced about 14,900,000 tons. Still, the Socialist government is going ahead with nationalization of steel—unless something or somebody stops it.

Crossing the channel, we find every nationalized French industry also has been losing money. The five banks that have been nationalized used to be among the heaviest taxpayers in France, but in the past year they lost $30,000,000 at the present rate of exchange. The nationalized airplane factories have constantly been turning out poorer work and over a period of a few months last spring and summer—I have no first-hand information later than the summer—there have been major disasters to French-made planes.

Whenever an industry is nationalized, whether it be in Britain, France, or the United States, the incentive to conduct the enterprise on a sound, solvent basis disappears. That is just what has happened in Britain and France and just what will happen here unless this Congress has the wisdom and the fortitude to turn down every proposal that takes us, directly or indirectly, down that same road.

Socialized enterprise, everywhere, is everybody's business—and so it is nobody's business. Just one illustration in France: A young friend of mine, a veteran of the French underground, told me that on his weekly commutation ticket a single trip of 15 miles costs about 2½ cents. The French Government takes the loss—and the United States in turn pays for it.

In such ways as these, the money of the American taxpayers is being thrown down the drain.

I find that in Britain conservative sentiment, of which there is a vast amount, is mostly prevented from reaching the columns of newspapers and magazines—and almost never the radio—largely due to the pressure of the government in power and to the fact that most writers, including news writers, incline toward Marxist beliefs. Hence, left-wing publications are favored in various ways by the party in power.

Reverting to steel nationalization: The steel employers are against it. The union of iron and steelworkers is against it. Yet, the left-wingers in the British Parliament are resolutely pushing this thing through.

We believe the Congress of the United States will make a fatal mistake if it does not insert in the current appropriation bill a condition that the nationalization of iron and steel, as the most basic of industries essential to private enterprise, shall be dropped and that no new projects of nationalization shall be undertaken. For if we permit the nationalization of iron and steel to go on, the back of private enterprise in Britain and on the Continent will be broken forever.

Then it will be hopeless to try to rehabilitate Europe.

Men are traveling in this country today, obviously sent here by the Labor Government of Britain, lecturing the American people that socialism in Britain is a success. One such is Skeffington-Lodge, chairman of the left-wing Parliamentary Socialist group which he says seeks to "break with the standards of conduct that were encouraged by the jungle law of private enterprise." Under these standards of conduct Britain built herself up to become great. So did we in the United States.

Another more polite apologist for British socialism is the learned editor of the London Economist, Geoffrey Crowther. Mr. Crowther recently made an address before the entirely unofficial National Planning Association, many of whose officers I would infer from the letterhead are not averse to a certain amount of Marxist socialism. In it and in another address which I myself happened to hear, Mr. Crowther, while admitting that British socialism has still to prove itself a success in certain respects, nevertheless asserted that nationalization of industries had hurt no one in England—except the stockholders.

I don't agree with him for an instant. But what interests me most is that he apparently feels that the stockholders, or those who have saved their earnings and by investing them have made possible the purchase and maintenance of tools needed by British industry, are of little consequence—that those frugal persons who have furnished the capital are entitled to no consideration.

Here in the United States, I am informed, we have more stockholders in corporations than we have workers. If we had not had persons able to invest and buy stock, where would the jobs be that are available today?

In handing out the American taxpayers' money to Britain and these other Socialist nations of Europe, we are going against every tradition our people have held and every principle on which they have acted.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that I believe for us not to attach the condition I have indicated will be a fundamental and disastrous mistake.

In any event, the appropriations if wisely used are far greater than are needed to stage recovery in Europe. They raise the strong suspicion that the sums asked for, even if being trimmed down by our own administration, are based not upon practical needs in the light of common sense and experience, but in order to sustain an ideology totally foreign and repugnant to the American people.

More than all else, I urge the committee to stop nationalization of industry in the countries that are to be the beneficiaries of our gifts and loans.

Because of the extremely limited time allotted for the presentation of the views of the National Economic Council to this committee, it has been impossible to treat of many other important considerations which should be weighed in considering the whole ERP program. If there were more time, the National Economic Council would stand, also, upon the following propositions:

1. That there is grave doubt as to the constitutionality of the entire program.

2. That so-called dollar shortages in Europe, which ERP professes to attempt to cure, are the result of exchange controls operated by the beneficiary countries, and that if all such currencies were made freely convertible there would be no need for vast donations from the United States.

3. That the program contains a psychological error at its very heart—the naive idea that affection and cooperation can be purchased. It is much more likely that when the program ends we will be bitterly attacked because we do not keep it up forever.

4. That the program will have grave inflationary effects.

5. That the long-term effect upon Europe will be nil, so far as improvement is concerned, since the decline of European trade has taken place over a period of 75 years and it is not caused by the late war.

6. That according to statements made by persons high in ECA the so-called dollar shortage will still exist in Europe in 1952 in an amount variously estimated at between one and three billion dollars annually. This is evidence of the basically unrealistic nature of ERP, which does not deal with the real economic ills of Europe but rather conceals them. It is the philosophy of WPA on a global scale, and will not bring prosperity abroad any more than WPA brought prosperity to the United States of America.

7. That the long-term effect upon the economy of the United States will be bad, because our money is now creating future competitors for world markets, based upon a lower standard of living than our workers enjoy.

8. That the noncooperation of beneficiary countries in making available to us strategic materials is notorious, and that stringent conditions in this matter should be attached to any further aid.

9. That dismantling of German manufacturing plants is a scandal, and that further aid should be conditioned upon the beneficiaries waiving all further claims to such facilities.

10. That the requirement that ERP goods must be shipped at least 50 percent in American bottoms should be written into any legislation enacted, and its provisions made mandatory upon the Administrator.

11. That before any further authorizations are made for ERP there should be a thorough study of the whole picture of what further expenditures may be required to implement the so-called North Atlantic defense pact. Our resources are not unlimited.

Big Bad Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I have read the editorial published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 20, and regard it with such approval and favor that I am offering it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the bebelief that all Members of the Congress will find it worthy of careful study. It calls attention to fundamental facts, generally overlooked.

The editorial follows:

BIG BAD BUSINESS

Indications are increasing that the Governernment intends to continue the Rooseveltian policy of ferreting out evil monopoly with haymaker prosecutions. Until the war intervened and the late President was forced to call for help from the big bad business he deplored, the tactic was to slug any enterprise that looked capable of monopolistic practice, regardless of reasonable evidence. The innocent were condemned with the guilty.

It is not likely indiscriminate attacks on all big business as bad business will eliminate giant concerns from the American scene. But in simple fairness the Government should help, not discourage, the public to recognize the part they have played in giving us the comforts of life we take for granted now.

Certainly among them are a few miscreants. But to use these to damn the system is to violate the spirit of the Constitution and aid the crackpot radicals toward their objective of a state socialism of the Moscow stripe.

Where, indeed, would we be without the maligned big business? Could the railroads, which own $27,000,000,000 worth of property but which nevertheless are highly competitive, operate as small concerns? Yes; but what would be their rates and the prices of the consumer goods they carry? At present they provide jobs for 1,300,000 workers and a market for a good portion of the coal mined by 200,000 men and the steel produced by 400,000 employees.

Is General Motors the biggest in the auto industry and therefore to be cordially hated? How about the thousands of jobs it provides, the dividends its securities pay to thousands of little stockholders, its parts contracts upon which hundreds of small businesses and their employees depend? Has it not given Americans cars cheaper than any other peoples, its own possible price excesses being curbed by its own big competitors? Could little firms match, for example, the Big Three's operating economies and research activities?

Could a multitude of little chemical manufacturers match both Du Pont's prices and its 77,000 employment? Could a small packer obtain the capital and achieve the efficiency to serve the Nation's meat needs at one-fourth of 1 percent profit per pound, as do the "bad" Big Four?

We accept more graciously the principle of bigness in public utilities, on the theory regulatory bodies will hold down rampant evil. But when they get going good, we begin wondering if they are not nevertheless chiseling in supplies companies. Now that American Telephone & Telegraph, for instance, has set up Western Electric Co. to supply all its mechanical equipment, we are not eager to admit it may be passing on to A. T. & T. the savings it obtains in not having to maintain sales, credit, and collection departments. Here again we prefer to suspect big business rather than search for its virtues. But would we want telephone service broken down into little units?

Outside the manufacturing field, big business similarly benefits the people. One western bank has distanced all the rest through better serving its customers. One life insurance company bulks far above the others and consequently affords its policyholders protection at much lower net cost.

Be it big league production, service, or finance, the rank-and-file consumer usually benefits.

In striking contrast to the Government's bigness phobia is its hand-wringing preoccupation with little business. The incongruity is remarkable. The number of new businesses has been dropping for some time. Less than 400,000 started last year, as compared to 600,000 in 1946, and 300,000 shut up shop in 1948. Part of that is due to a return to normalcy.

But what portion of the loss was due to the Government's tax and persecution policies against the large concerns which farm out much of their work to the small ones?

The facts of our economic life are that there must be both big and little business if we are to fare best. Unless one feeds and stimulates the other, the economy cannot enjoy healthy growth and living standards cannot continue to rise. There must be small, middle-sized, and large businesses to supply the people with the variety of things in the way they want them. In no other way can the varied business talents of individuals be most profitably used.

It would be foolhardy to impose rigid limits on the size of enterprises, thus to promote inefficiency in production and distribution. It would be disastrous for that over-all limitation to be left in the hands of Government—subject to the mercy of little bureaus judging which and how much industries should expand.

The customer, through long-range control over prices, still is the final arbiter of business' size. He will be the principal loser if he isn't allowed to retain that control.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of House Joint Memorial 1 as passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana. I want to urge the House Labor Committee of the Congress to give every possible consideration to this expression of Montana's legislators:

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation authorizing the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, Public Law 101 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, cited as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

Whereas the citizens of the United States of America have indicated, by their vote at the recent general election, that they are dissatisfied with the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, popularly known as the Taft-Hartley Act; and

Whereas the provisions of that act are incompatible with the tradition of free collective bargaining in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring): That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact proper legislation providing for the immediate repeal of Public Law 101 of the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Taft-Hartley Act, cited as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Represenatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana.

The Judge Gives His Opinion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the writer of the letter I include with my remarks is a county judge who, as he writes me, has reached his conclusions from his experience as an operating farmer, administrator of old-age assistance, county judge, former district attorney, and practicing attorney.

We hear so much about the family-size farmer benefiting under the present agricultural program, but the fact is that the larger farm operators are receiving most of the money.

The letter follows:

COUNTY COURT, WAUSHARA COUNTY,
Wautoma, Wis., February 1, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: One of the matters coming up for legislation in the very near future is the continuation of price controls for farm products. In our district the potato price support seems to be more important than the regulations covering other farm crops. Before the era of price support and controlled production, fully 80 percent of the farmers of our district planted potatoes as one of their chief cash crops. We now have a situation where very few farmers are raising them for the market but a few growers operating on a large scale, such as Gunderson of Waupaca, Woodward of Plainfield, Oneida Farms Co. of Clear Water Lake, and Owens Farms Co. of Dousman, are producing practically all of the potatoes that go to market. When the quotas are allotted, the real farmers are allowed such a small acreage that they are not warranted in spending the money for the purchase of proper equipment to produce a crop.

I believe that this is the time to determine just what you are trying to accomplish by supporting the price of potatoes and whether the results will be important enough to warrant the expenditure of the millions of dollars of tax money used for taking pota-

toes off the market. If you are merely trying to raise the price that the consumer pays, or protecting the investments of speculators who have gone into potato raising in a big way, the present program is well adapted to accomplish those results. However, I don't think either one of these justifies the use of money raised by taxation. Through the use of subsidies and by withdrawing millions of bushels of potatoes from the market we are building up fortunes for a small class of farm operators—not real farmers—and compelling the consumers to pay an exorbitant price for their food.

It has occurred to me that the program should be calculated to insure an adequate supply of food at a reasonable price; to conserve soil fertility by limiting the acreage (or rather encouraging the limiting of the acreage) of soil-depleting crops and to encourage the continuation of the operation of family-unit farms. If those are the objects of the program, Congress can legally guarantee to the farmers who contract to supply the potatoes a reasonably adequate return for their labor and adequate rental for the use of their land.

Through the medium of the Farmers' Home Administration, and at a cost of many millions of dollars for service loans and subsidies, the Government is trying to establish operating farmers on family-unit farms. But at the same time we are spending other millions of dollars in the form of price supports in a reasonably successful effort to place agriculture in the hands of corporate farmers. If this keeps on, our farmers will become migratory wage earners following the Mexican families from place to place in search of seasonal work. Something has already happened that should cause us grave concern. In 1907, the total bill for all forms of public aid in Waushara County was $3,600. In 1947, with fewer people, our bill amounted to $225,000. We seem to be on the road to almost complete dependence on public aid. We ought to return to the path of self-support.

I have been trying to form a plan that should be adopted but will not burden you with an explanation of it, because you have probably thought of a better one. However, if you think my plan would be of interest to you, I will be glad to write you again. Maybe a Republican can still accomplish something in Congress.

Yours truly,

GAD JONES.

Our Plundered Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by me before the Forestry Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, Thursday morning, February 24, 1949:

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered judgment that the continuing depletion of our natural resources is the most urgent domestic problem with which our Nation is confronted at present. If the dissipation of these resources continues unchecked, it will be only a matter of time until economic disaster overtakes us. Timber is a case in point. An adequate supply of forest products is absolutely essential to this Nation's peacetime welfare and wartime security. Wood is one of our indispensable raw materials. And yet the wastage of this prime natural resource continues at an alarming rate for want of sufficient Federal authorizations and appropriations.

The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 marks the real beginning of attention to forest conservation by the Federal Government. The programs set up under it are, however, in urgent need of expansion. Consequently, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2952, which proposes a five-point expansion policy for the restoration and development of our forest resources.

Section 1 of my bill authorizes additional funds for forest-fire control. Fire protection is, of course, a fundamental step in timber conservation. The Clarke-McNary Act set up a program under which the Federal Government assists the States and private owners in preventing and suppressing forest fires. Forty-three States are now cooperating; and more than two-thirds of our 439,000,000 acres of non-Federal timberland is now receiving the benefits of organized protection. However, the funds available under present authorizations are wholly inadequate; hence, the protection is spread too thinly. In my State, Iowa, for example, the State government spent something more than $15,000 last year and the Federal Government contributed approximately $10,000 to protect 2,250,000 acres of timber against fire hazard. This is less than one-half of the amount of money needed to do a thorough job. We will reap returns amounting to many times the expenditure proposed in my bill if unnecessary losses are eliminated by the expansion of fire-protection activities.

Mr. Chairman, section 2 of my bill proposes to enlarge the tree-planting program under which the Federal Government cooperates with the States in producing and distributing seeds and plants for the establishment of forests, windbreaks, shelter belts, and farm wood lots. This is another basic conservation measure. It is a shocking fact that we are still cutting many more trees annually than we are planting. Ever since our country was first settled we have taken the wood we needed from old-growth forests without proper regard for wise forest management and conservation practices. Consequently, we now have 62,000,000 acres of idle and unproductive forest land, and less than 10 percent of our forests still have virgin timber. Henceforth, to get the lumber we need, we shall have to grow it as a crop. Tree planting has been carried forward on a small scale under the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts, but limited funds have retarded the program. In Iowa, only 200,000 acres have been planted and 650,000 still require attention. Last year the Federal Government contributed less than $3,000 to the Iowa project while the State government spent something more than $16,000. State Forester G. B. MacDonald, Iowa State College, has this to say about the program:

"For many years we have been cooperating in Iowa under the tree-planting program of the Clarke-McNary Act. Although we have made some good advances in reforesting denuded lands for soil and watershed protection and timber production, we are not accomplishing this work in time to avoid serious trouble. If Congress authorizes appropriations such as you have suggested in your bill, this should go a long way toward getting our denuded timber lands replanted within the next 25 or 50 years."

Sections 3 and 4 of my bill, Mr. Chairman, are closely related. Section 3 proposes to expend the extension program under which the Federal Government cooperates with the land-grant colleges in disseminating useful forestry information to farm and rural people through the extension-agent system. Section 4 proposes to expand the program under which the Federal Government cooperates with the States in providing technical guidance and assistance to small timber growers. These forestry-education programs are necessary for promoting wise conservation practices. The task is magnified, of course, by the fact that three-fourths of our private forest land is in small holdings. In other words, forestry education must be brought to the individual farmer. Although he may be skilled in the latest methods of producing the usual agricultural crops, the average farmer has had no experience in planting, harvesting, and marketing forest products. He needs, first of all, the advice and services of a trained forester to get started properly. Then he requires authentic up-to-date information on good management and marketing procedures. The present authorizations for these programs under the Clarke-McNary Act are pitifully inadequate. In Iowa, for example, there are no large forest owners. Approximately 80,000 small owners control more than 2,000,000 acres of timber—the average holding being 27 acres. Lack of adequate funds restricts the personnel to two extension foresters and three local farm foresters. Obviously, five persons, no matter how capable and active, are physically unable to give personal attention to the needs of 80,000 small forest owners. Iowa provided more than $14,000 for these programs last year, and the Federal Government contributed about half that amount.

I should like to direct the attention of the committee to one feature in section 4 of my bill which differs from other similar bills now under consideration. At the suggestion of Mr. D. C. Kern, chairman of the Forestry Committee, Iowa Division, Izaak Walton League of America, my bill provides that the Federal Government shall contribute $10,000 in addition to the matching of funds to each cooperating State. This is similar to the provision which I believe most of the bills under consideration contain insofar as section 3 funds are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, section 5 of my bill proposes to amend the McSweeney-McNary Act of 1928, as amended. It merely provides authorization for sufficient funds to complete the initial survey of our national forest resources, previously authorized, and to maintain a continuing inventory of such resources. I understand that about three-fifths of the United States has already been surveyed, but I regret to report that Iowa has not yet been covered. Prof. George B. Hartman, head, department of forestry, Iowa State College, has written to me on this point as follows:

"Those of us who are interested in forestry in Iowa have been trying for some time to have the United States Forest Service extend its Nation-wide forest survey to cover Iowa. Missouri and Illinois have both been covered. * * * Recent estimates indicate that there are in Iowa 2,250,000 acres of forest land which may support something around 5,000,000,000 board feet of timber. In 1946, some 850 sawmills in Iowa cut better than 90,000,000 board feet of lumber. This production of native timber means a lot to Iowa farmers. During the war, about the only lumber which was available for repairing or replacing farm buildings was that which came from the woodlot of the farmer himself or his neighbor. In addition, from the farm woodlot come such necessary items as fence posts and fuel. * * * Until we know definitely just how much forest land we have in the State, where it is located, how much timber it supports, and how fast it is growing and is being cut, we are unable to plan adequately for meeting our needs. Insofar as wood products are concerned, we believe that the State can be more nearly self-supporting in regard to wood requirements than it is at present, and we would like to undertake a forestry program which would bring that about. Facts which would be obtained by the Nation-wide survey are basic to setting up such a program."

Mr. Chairman, I close as I began with emphasis on the great need for conserving our

natural resources. The legislation pending before your committee seeks to restore and to perpetuate our forest resources. It is very important legislation. Its enactment at this time will not only insure an abundant supply of timber for future generations but it will help materially in the promotion of soil and water conservation, in erosion and flood control, and in the propagation of wildlife.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of my bill, H. R. 2952, and I solicit your favorable consideration.

McNary Dam—Answer to Power-Hungry Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted, I am including as part of my remarks an article on the McNary Dam project written by Tom Humphrey and published in the Oregon Journal February 8, 1949. The article follows:

MCNARY DAM—ANSWER TO POWER-HUNGRY NORTHWEST

(By Tom Humphrey)

To the power-hungry Pacific Northwest McNary Dam, now well under way, is the answer to a region's prayer.

Impressive is the word for it.

First, it will be one of the world's most magnificent hunks of power—840,000 kilowatts from the first 12 generators, with 140,000 more to follow.

Think of McNary in terms of horses—more than a million of them—or in terms of Bonneville, almost two of them.

POSITION STRATEGIC, IDEALLY LOCATED

Think of it in terms of its strategic location—between Bonneville and Grand Coulee, close to the rapidly developing Pasco-Kennewick area and the greatest of all atomic energy plants, the Hanford works. Relatively close to the great load center of Portland with its aluminum industry. Within easy range of eastern Oregon. Ideally situated as a relay point, boosting power from Coulee to Bonneville.

Think of its navigation feature—drowning out the difficult Umatilla Rapids, backing slack water up to the base of Ice Harbor, lowest of the four lower Snake projects.

Think of McNary from an engineer's point of view—a nice job physically and economically—not beautiful, but massive and extremely practical. A spillway that doesn't interfere with the locks. The single-lift locks, designed to take bigger tows, will be the largest in the world. An opportunity to advance the science of turbine designing, the turbines having the largest thrust load of any in the United States—3,750,000 pounds maximum.

MONUMENT TO LATE, GREAT SENATOR

Think also of McNary as a monument to the late, great Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary, who, more than any other man, except Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was responsible for Bonneville, first giant project on a mighty river.

Think of McNary as the means of averting a tragic black-out in the Pacific Northwest—doing it quickly and effectively, breaking the bottleneck that is strangling the industrial development of the most promising region in America.

Then think of McNary in terms of its job-making capabilities—4,000 year-around jobs for 4 years, then slanting off gradually to the completion date. Labor will receive about $167,000,000 of the project's total cost—about $73,500,000 on the site, $94,000,000 off the site.

Now think of McNary Dam as a dream come true—the dream of those who conceived it and fought for it through the wearisome years, against skepticism, special interests, and all odds.

Finally, think of McNary Dam in terms of human values, of what it means to people, our own and those coming in seeking a new way of life. These people need everything—housing, food, goods, services, schools for their children, hospitals, highways. But most of all they must have jobs. And the only way we can provide new jobs is to provide new industries. And the only way we can provide new industries is to supply more power—power from projects like McNary.

PROVIDE JOBS

Conservatively speaking McNary Dam will be able to provide power for industries with a tax-paying investment of $100,000,000 and supplying 100,000 jobs. And we don't mean during the construction period; we mean for the next 50 years. Think what 100,000 new year-around jobs would do for Oregon right now. They would wipe out current unemployment, with 30,000 jobs to spare. Or, to put it another way, they would take care of the over-all needs of 350,000 people.

McNary Dam is going to cost some money—plenty of it. Remember, heavy construction is up 175 to 225 percent since Bonneville. So McNary is going to cost around $270,000,000. And that isn't hay, even in these days of four-bit dollars. But here's what McNary will do, besides repayment of every penny allocated to power:

1. Benefit navigation at the rate of $1,000,000 a year—$800,000 net after paying for operation of navigation facilities.

2. Reduce pumping costs for land adjacent to McNary pool by $298,000 a year.

3. Produce approximately 7,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of power, worth $17,500,000 each year. One way to estimate the value of that amount of power—inexhaustible power—is to remember that it would take 3,000,000 tons of coal or 11,000,000 barrels of oil to produce it—irreplaceable coal, irreplaceable oil.

There are secondary benefits from McNary Dam, of course. While it is a relatively low, stream-flow dam (91 feet high) it will form a pool 59.2 miles long and will help firm up Bonneville power during low water periods.

As for the fish problem, the Army engineers plan an elaborate system of ladders and fish locks, comparable to those used at Bonneville, but taking advantage of Bonneville's experience. These facilities will include two ladders—one on the Oregon side and one on the Washington side. Two fish elevators are also planned, one now and one later. Thus if the salmon have trouble with McNary Dam, it will be their own fault. It won't be the fault of the $20,000,000 fishways.

There will be no highway bridge across the dam, although a 34-foot roadway, with walkways on either side, was once included in plans. Army engineers determined, however, that it would be cheaper and better for security reasons to construct a separate bridge below the dam, and Representative STOCKMAN, of Oregon, has already introduced a bill for this purpose.

It wasn't easy to get McNary started. For years the site (once called Umatilla) has been pegged by Army engineers as one of the best on the Columbia. For years farsighted engineers, Congressmen, and residents of the mid-Columbia have envisioned it as a golden key to basin development. It wasn't until 1945 that the project was authorized by the Congress. And the first $4,500,000 in construction funds, nailing the project down and getting actual work started, wasn't appropriated until 1947.

Even then, with a power shortage looming large on the horizon, it wasn't easy to convince eastern Congressmen that the fastest growing region in America had to have more power, great gobs of it, and fast.

FUNDS CUT

It not only wasn't easy, it was impossible.

We asked the Eightieth Congress for $40,000,000 for McNary. The Budget Bureau recommended $30,000,000. We finally got $22,000,000. And that cut-back cost us a full year's time. A year gone forever.

But that is history.

President Truman, who recently labeled the Pacific Northwest power shortage critical, has recommended an appropriation of $40,000,000 for McNary next year. He has recognized that precious time has already been lost—recognized it by recommending a supplemental appropriation of $8,000,000 to speed work between now and fiscal 1949–50. He knows that every cent of the power cost will be paid back into the United States Treasury, with interest—just as power installations at Bonneville and Grand Coulee are being amortized, with interest—and 2 years ahead of schedule.

We aren't out of the woods yet on McNary.

Both of the President's recommendations will have to run the gantlet of the House subcommittee on civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, the House Appropriations Committee as a whole, the House itself; then the Senate subcommittee, the full Committee on Appropriations, and the Senate itself, then conference action. It's a long, tough road, but McNary now has powerful friends in Washington as well as in the West.

PRAYER'S ANSWER

If this year's financial hurdles are cleared, it may be possible, by increasing regular and supplemental appropriations for the next 6 years, to recapture that precious year the Eightieth Congress cost us. Maybe, mind you, miracles take a little time, even for Army engineers.

It's worth trying, however. And everyone in the Pacific Northwest—Congressmen, chambers of commerce, labor-management groups, power company presidents, newspapers—are giving it everything they've got.

That's because they regard McNary as the most important project in America right now and because they know that it will repay $1.25 for every $1 invested in it.

As we say, McNary Dam is the answer to a region's prayer. A Nation's prayer, really.

William E. Tate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay my humble tribute to one of those great Americans who devoted his life to the cause of his fellow man.

Death came last night, as it must to all men, to William E. Tate, national director of rehabilitation for the Disabled American Veterans.

Though severely disabled while serving his country in World War I, Mr. Tate for more than 2 decades devoted his entire energies in assisting his disabled comrades and widows and orphans of the ones who made the supreme sacrifice in

order that they might be adequately cared for.

Mr. Tate, a native of South Carolina, was a past national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and was at the time of his death not only national director of rehabilitation but also president of the service foundation fund for the Disabled American Veterans.

In the legislative field he was especially helpful to Members of Congress, especially to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in formulating policy and working out the details of legislation for the benefit of service-connected disabled veterans and their dependents. His death, therefore, will be mourned by many Members of Congress as well as hundreds of thousands of disabled veterans, widows, and orphans throughout the country.

In the passing of Bill Tate the disabled American veterans have lost one of their best friends and our country has lost one of her finest and most patriotic citizens.

General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the enclosed communication from our good friend and former colleague, Mr. Lindsay Warren, is extremely interesting. I presume that it has been sent to every Member of the House and Senate, but I think it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for others to read.

It is of more than passing interest to note that the General Accounting Office is one of the few agencies of the Government that does not have a press agent. Personally, I believe that some other agencies should follow this excellent example.

The communication is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 23, 1949.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The other day two Members of Congress came to me seeking some information about the General Accounting Office, and the conversation broadened into a general discussion. They expressed amazement at some of the things I told them, and called my attention to the large turn-over in the Congress since my term began on November 1, 1940, and to the inability of so many Members to find time to inform themselves about the Office. They mentioned that the Annual Report of the General Accounting Office had not yet been printed, and that at best few Members have time to read such reports. They suggested that I tell other Members of Congress some of the things I said to them, and that is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is a nonpolitical agency. It was set up as the agent of the Congress and has always been a part of the legislative branch of the Government. Congress emphasized that in the 1945 Reorganization Act, and the same provision is now in the pending reorganization bill which has already passed the House. The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed, and can only be removed by the Congress.

On April 15, 1946, we reached our peak employment of 14,904. On February 1, 1949, our personnel numbered 9,499, showing a net reduction of 5,405. This reduction was made without any instructions from the Congress, which has always given us the appropriations we have requested. For the next fiscal year we hope to have a still further small reduction in personnel. At the time I took office the annual appropriations made for the entire Government were about $17,000,000,000. They are nearly forty-two billion for the present fiscal year.

The General Accounting Office is one of the very few agencies in the Government that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury and saves untold further amounts by the deterrent effects of its work. I am sure it will be interesting to you to know that in the last 8 years and up until January 1, 1949, the General Accounting Office has collected back and put back into the Treasury over $608,000,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out by various offices in the Government, and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would ever have been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Our appropriation for the current fiscal year is $35,901,000. The latest pay raise amounted to $3,000,000 for the Office. I am happy to report that we will absorb $1,000,000 of this in our current appropriation. During the last five fiscal years the General Accounting Office has returned $13,000,000 of its appropriations unused because we were unable to obtain the type of employees needed.

During the last fiscal year we audited over a year's payments by all the departments of the Government, with over half of our audit force working outside of Washington and on the site; we settled over 550,000 claims; settled over 62,000 fiscal officers' accounts; made 429 legislative reports to the Congress and its committees and handled 6,605 inquiries from Members of Congress; rendered over 12,000 decisions to the departments and agencies, claimants and others; visited 1,166 different offices in 395 cities on inspections and surveys; examined over 800,000 contracts; and audited the multibillion-dollar operations of the Post Office Department. We are constantly sending to Congress our commercial-type reports on audits of Government corporations.

Our methods and systems are under constant review to effect economies and improvements, wherever possible. We are continually lending assistance to agencies in the executive branch on legal and accounting problems, and are now carrying on with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Budget, with participation by all of the agencies, a joint accounting program which has met with enthusiastic reception. This program bids fair to produce outstanding accomplishments for better Government.

The General Accounting Office is an office of law. Its duty is to enforce the will of Congress with respect to expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

As the General Accounting Office is one of the few agencies of the Government that does not have a press agent, I am sending you this information which I hope will be of interest to you.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MVA Propaganda Mills Going Full Blast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Miles City Star of Miles City, Mont., which was published in that newspaper February 20, 1949:

MVA PROPAGANDA MILLS GOING FULL BLAST

The lads who want to foist off a Missouri Valley Authority on the people of Montana and nine other States, are going full blast again, turning out propaganda. Confirmed Socialists never give up. They are eternally at the business of spreading the doctrine, which in this country is drifting along the line of national socialism. But the answer is always the same in the end—dictatorship of one kind or another.

Just why the MVA lads have come to life all of a sudden is a bit of a mystery. And then again, maybe it isn't. Press dispatches of a month ago told how the MVA association was going to start out shaking the tin cup for more funds. Seems whatever was gathered on previous jaunts is all gone. This time they want a mere $100,000 from the valley—$10,000 from Montana. And for what?

Well, probably for "expert" pronouncements like this one:

"HELENA, February 11.—'The Pick-Sloan plan for Missouri Valley development is now as dead as a salted mackerel,' was the comment of Col. Jerome G. Locke, chief engineer of regional committee of MVA, here today. Colonel Locke said that within the past few days the Interior Department has urged the President to back MVA, and the Hoover Commission has declared the present Missouri Valley Basin development calamitous, with a recommendation that Army engineers be taken out of all river-improvement work.

"Senator MURRAY'S revised MVA bill will be dumped into the Senate hopper within a day or two, and MVA's greatest opportunity is now on our doorstep. However, opposition forces are politically strong and equipped with untold financial and publicity facilities. We will get a decent democratic valley development only if the people in this region fight for it like Trojans."

Now, then, who is this expert that has come forward with a know-it-all opinion about everything? Perhaps we can identify the expert a little more closely. Let's try.

The present Governor of Montana told the legislature there were worthless securities in the holdings of the industrial accident board. He said an investigation ought to be made to learn more about the matter. Everybody listening on the radio to the Governor took his charge to be directed at the late J. Burke Clements, chairman of the board until his untimely death shortly before the turn of the new year. Since the Governor named no names, we looked into the matter, and this is what we found out.

There are worthless securities among the holdings of the Industrial Accident Board, as charged by the governor. So worthless that the legislature now has a bill before it to permit settling for anything at all and charging the balance off as a complete loss. When did these worthless obligations get into the fund? Certainly not in Burke

Clements' time. Certainly not while Clements was chairman of the board. Who was chairman, then?

Ah! None other than the same guy who is now telling the people of Montana that he knows more about water, steam, electricity, hot air, cold air, land, mud, snow, sleet, rain, concrete, iron, steel, copper, slide rules, engineering, or what the heck have you.

None other than the "Col. Jerome G. Locke, Chief Engineer of Regional Committee of MVA" who has made the august pronouncements in the foregoing quoted "release on receipt." Yes, sir, here is that man again with another bill of goods for the people of Montana. The colonel says the Pick-Sloan plan is as dead "as a salted mackeral." (We pause here to correct his spelling for him. The word is "mackerel," Colonel.) There are those who think Col. Jerome G. Locke's MVA plan is likewise as dead "as a salted mackerel."

Some time ago the wildly edited mouthpiece of the MVA and assorted socialistic eager-beavers—The People's Voice—quoted at length from Business Week about the MVA. Now you must understand the reason for such quoting from Business Week was to indicate that even a magazine of the hated capitalistic class had given up to the inevitable. The Voice said this, in regard to Business Week.

"The article does * * * explain * * * there may be a good deal of truth in the MVA contention * * * there is an insufficient supply of water in the Missouri River to serve both the Pick and Sloan plans. In this event, admits Business Week, there will have to be a very considerable modification of the Pick and Sloan plans."

Well, what did the Business Week article really say. We are giving it to you in their words, not in what somebody else wants you to think they said, such as the above quotation from the Voice. Here it is:

"The backers of a Missouri Valley Authority * * * gathered at Omaha last week. Their objective: to get the Eighty-first Congress to set up a TVA-type administration for developing the water resources of the Missouri and its tributaries. By the time the meeting adjourned, it was understood that Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana, would introduce an MVA bill. MURRAY sponsored two earlier, unsuccessful MVA proposals. This bill will be only a gesture; the backers of MVA don't really expect it to pass. Too much has already been invested in the Missouri Valley by Government agencies—particularly the Army engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation. Besides there is not much local support for MVA."

Now let's get back to the quotation from the Voice, supposedly quoting the opinion and statement of Business Week. Here is what was actually said:

"MVA proponents financed an engineering study by Jerome G. Locke; it indicates that water needed by the western, headwaters area will be drawn off by navigation projects of the engineers on the lower Missouri. Locke says that only about 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 acres could be irrigated in the western area if the navigation proponents have their way; on the other hand, 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 acres could be irrigated if water in the western part of the basin were reserved for western use. MVA supporters are confident that if Congress orders an over-all engineering survey of the basin, it will vindicate the Locke report. But the Army engineers disagree: They think enough water comes down the Missouri to satisfy everybody."

There you have it in cold turkey. Business Week was not making any pronouncement on the Pick-Sloan plan. It was merely quoting the report of the paid heirling of the socialistic forces trying to put over an MVA on us.

Of course, this opinion of Col. Jerome G. Locke and his spelling of "mackeral" is not the first and only time he has been off base. He continually prates about the lower States of the Missouri Valley stealing all the water for navigation purposes, leaving the upper-basin States, including Montana, divested of their natural water supply. That's a bunch of hooey, and even Col. Jerome G. Locke should know better, unless he suffers from the same blind staggers that put the worthless securities in the industrial-accident fund.

In 1944 Congress passed a flood-control act, setting up the Pick-Sloan plan, and authorizing the development of the Missouri basin thereunder. In that act Congress incorporated the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendments—a set of carefully thought-out specifications designed to specifically prohibit the thing the colonel constantly squawks about. Those amendments provided that—

"The use of water arising west of the ninety-eighth meridian for navigation shall not conflict with its use for irrigation and other beneficial consumptive purposes."

The upper-basin States, including Montana, all are west of the ninety-eighth meridian. The colonel knows that as well as anyone else, but the MVA can't pass the tin cup to finance the colonel's studies if points like the one cited are made known to those under whose noses the cup is to be waved.

So remember this expert when the tin cup comes along. If you must give your dough to finance more expert dissertations, at least know you are giving it for propaganda purposes and for feeding distorted facts and quotations back to you, in order to becloud your vision of the real intentions of national socialism, now on the march in this country.

Air Power Is Peace Power—the Necessity for a 70-Group Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I attach hereto the following copy of an address I delivered before the Fourth District Rural Letter Carriers Association of South Carolina at Union, S. C., on Tuesday, February 22, 1949:

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Rural Letter Carriers Association, I am greatly honored in the privilege of being with you on this occasion. We are observing, as you know, the birthday of George Washington whose name is honored and revered as the father of our great country. It is a coincidence that we are also celebrating the fifty-sixth anniversary of rural free delivery mail service. We can hardly realize up to a little more than half century ago no provision of any consequence was made for the official delivery of mail. You are members of one of the most efficient and far-reaching service agencies in the country. So far as many people are concerned you are the only Federal official they ever see or know. I congratulate you upon your fine organization and the faithful service you are rendering to our country.

I am familiar with your problems and shall continue to vote for improvements in the mail service, including better pay and better working conditions.

I ask permission to speak somewhat out of order on probably the most important subject confronting the world today—that of peace.

During the past 2 years a great deal has been said about an adequate national defense. When the flush of victory had receded after the last war we discovered that the possibility of still another war was not nearly so remote as we had assumed. Furthermore, we discovered that our national defense program had sadly lagged, and that, in the words of the wartime commander of the Air Forces, this country's Air Force had become a one-punch outfit. All leading authorities of military concepts agree that air power is essential either for an adequate defensive or an offensive force. The time when this country could feel secure against a sudden attack because of our geographical location is gone forever. The science of aeronautics has brought the nations of the world so close together that none may feel secure against attack. It is obvious, therefore, that we must maintain an adequate Air Force. All who are interested in the welfare of the United States concur on that point. The question is not whether we should maintain a strong Air Force—everyone agrees to that. The question is what size Air Force we should maintain in order to have an adequate national defense. I am in favor of a force composed of 70 groups.

It is not by accident or at random that I have chosen that figure. I am not a military man, but civilians, as well as the military, can, in times of peace, examine the available data and draw conclusions. During an emergency we must rely upon our military forces and accept their decisions. When speed of action is a requisite civilians must place their trust in their professional servicemen and aid them in every possible way to accomplish the results that are necessary for the security of all. In peacetime the situation is different. We are prone to look distrustfully at the requests of the military men, and we generally feel that they are asking for more than they expect when we examine their demands for appropriations. Such accusations cannot be made against disinterested civilians who study a situation and then make recommendations. Within the past 18 months two civilian groups have thoroughly examined the national defense picture and made recommendations concerning an adequate Air Force. These two groups were the President's Air Policy Commission and our own Congressional Aviation Policy Board. It is significant that both recommended the same number of planes that our military men deem essential—70 groups.

If it were not for the cost, there would be little opposition to the 70-group program. Our expenditures for national defense must, of course, be kept within the country's ability to pay for them. I believe our economy can easily stand the 70 groups. Even if supporting an air force this size should prove quite expensive, it seems to me that we have no alternative. The element of time which has been on our side in previous conflicts is not likely to be with us again.

If it should prove necessary to build our defenses from the bottom up after a war started, the task might be impossible. In addition the nucleus of a powerful air force should be a strong deterrent to any nation considering an attack upon this country.

Maintaining a force of 70 groups will be more expensive than a smaller force, but in the long run it may prove much cheaper. The cost of a war will be far greater than the comparatively low cost of keeping an adequate air force in time of peace. There is no denying that an aggressor nation might not risk an attack if the possibilities of losing the ensuing conflict are strong.

There seems to be a great misconception in the minds of some as to the purpose of those who advocate an air force of 70

groups. Certainly building a force of this size cannot be construed as a preparation for war. It would take a far greater number of planes to win a war. The advocates of 70 groups feel that a force this size would be sufficient to hold any enemy until we could fully arm and take the offensive. A force this size is merely a defensive arrangement.

Building an adequate air force is not a matter of days, weeks, or months. It is a matter of years. Over a year ago the President's Air Policy Commission made their recommendations. Comparatively little has been done since that time. The Air Force now has only about 50 groups. Approval of the 70-group program does not mean that we will have 70 groups by next year or even the next. As Secretary of Defense Forrestal summed up the situation, this program merely places a ceiling upon the size of the Air Force, with the yearly appropriations determining the actual strength. It is essential that we get this program approved and under way. There are numerous factors and problems involved in building up our air power. The new technology has greatly intensified the engineering and research problems of the aircraft industry upon which the Air Force is dependent for its planes. A strong and healthy industry is indispensable to our national security. If the plane manufacturers are not able to turn out the needed planes for the Air Forces upon short notice, we might well lose a war before getting started. Getting this program of expansion under way will be a breath of life to the aircraft industry, which has not been healthy since the end of the war. In terms of airframe weight the industry has produced less than half what it turned out during the war and has at times fallen to about one-fourth the amount produced during the war years. This is an alarming situation in that these low-production figures make it difficult to keep adequately trained personnel on hand, and in the event of a national emergency the plants would be slow in producing their quota of planes. We must assume that if we are attacked the enemy will be well prepared, and a delay in our production anywhere along the line could be disastrous. These facts demonstrate that the expansion of the Air Force to 70 groups will also bolster our defenses from another angle, since the expansion will aid the ailing aircraft industry.

In supporting the 70-group program let me state that I do not consider this step a panacea for all of our military problems. Everyone must realize that there is no absolute defense against an enemy equipped with modern weapons. All that is possible for any nation to do in these dangerous times is to be so well prepared as to discourage any possible aggressor. The threat of a strong retaliatory force is more eloquent than words.

It is a striking paradox that peace may be achieved by air power, that implement which has become the greatest force for destruction in the history of the world. While a strong Air Force cannot give us absolute security, it does provide relative security from two directions. The first I have just mentioned. This relative security is provided by the fact that any nation would hesitate to attack us if we are well armed. The second state of relative security which an adequate air strength provides is the ability to smash any attack which might come. National security demands that we equip and maintain an adequate force. This is not preparation for war. It is preparation for the possibility of war, and between those two goals lies a world of difference. After the last war wishful thinking on the part of many people in this country caused us to disarm at an alarming rate. No one wished war, and we even refused to accept the possibility. We placed our hopes for peace in the newly created United Nations and let our military affairs lag. Today the error of that policy is very much in evidence. Another powerful nation chose to place its trust in its military strength rather than in the United Nations. Now our country is in the position of having to rearm or face disaster. We do not have to face disaster. Our resources and wealth are such that we can build up adequate defenses without seriously upsetting the economy. While we are building up our air power, we must continue our efforts for peace through the United Nations. The fact that we expected too much from such a young organization must not be allowed to hamper its future possibilities. We are striving for peace, and, while we must now place our faith in a strong air defense, perhaps our children or grandchildren can place theirs in a strong United Nations rather than in their military potential.

Less than a year ago the Congressional Aviation Policy Board completed an extensive survey of this country's air-defense needs and reached many of the same conclusions that the President's commission had reached. To any civilian interested in military affairs this is highly important. The interservice squabbles over what we need for defense have often put Congress in the awkward position of determining who is right and what is best for the country regarding strictly military affairs. We face no such dilemma in the matter of an expanded Air Force. The recommendations of both the Board and the Commission were explicit as to the minimum needs. Both emphasized that weakness and uncertain national security are greater risks than the cost of this program. Both reports were made after months of exhaustive study. Both were made by groups who were interested in nothing but the security of our country. In the light of these facts it is necessary that we give sober consideration to their findings and recommendations. The Board's statement that "Anything less than complete supremacy in the air is self-deception" is especially significant. It is emphasis of the fact that an inadequate Air Force is not far from being as bad as no Air Force at all.

It was in recognition of the importance of air power that the Air Force was created as an autonomous military service by the National Security Act of 1947. Quite recently the Chief of Staff of that service listed the tasks of the Air Force in a given military situation. These tasks include the delivery of an immediate and powerful offensive against the basic sources of the enemy's war-making capacity; the defense of United States bases against air attack; and the tactical support of the Army and Navy in exploitation of the opportunities presented through the success of the first two tasks. Our present air strength would not allow the Air Force to accomplish these objectives. It must be placed in a condition of readiness to handle any situation which might arise. Where our national security is involved we are not at liberty to gamble, and anything less than an expansion toward 70 groups seems like a gamble.

The President's Air Policy Commission divided the threat of an attack against this country into two phases. We are in the first phase now. This phase represents the condition of world affairs. If war comes, it will be by accident, not by design, since the enemy is not fully prepared. The Commission assumed the enemy would be full prepared by January 1, 1953. In other words the enemy can be expected to have the atomic bomb also, and phase two will begin. During this phase we can expect a deliberate and unprovoked attack. It is well to remember that during World War II most of the initial attacks were sudden and unexpected. The beginnings of any new war will undoubtedly follow the same pattern, and it is not at all unlikely that our country will be the target this time. The date at which one phase will merge into another is nothing but an intelligent guess. Although it seems unlikely, this year could conceivably be the beginning of phase two. We suspect that the enemy is not yet fully prepared; we know that we are not.

Our military men and two separate civilian groups have informed us of the size and type of Air Force that is essential for national security. The size is a force of 70 groups. We must take immediate steps and plan to reach that goal within the next 4 years. Our present force is inadequate. The national security is at stake, and we have no alternative but to remedy the situation by expansion of the Air Force. To say that any other course would be disastrous is highly arbitrary, since no one knows for certain that war will come. To say that any other course would be inviting disaster expresses the situation clearly and accurately. It is within our power to reject this invitation. We must not fail to do so.

From the Good to the Bad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that, under the Constitution given us by our forefathers, adhering to the principles therein laid down, through hard work and thrift we became the most powerful nation in all the world; our people had and exercised the greatest degree of individual freedom and they enjoyed more of the things which men desire than any other people anywhere in the world at any time.

In other lands, under other forms of government, the individual was poor, oppressed, and, as a rule, had neither freedom of thought nor action, nor was he able to better his condition or provide for his future.

Notwithstanding the fact that, under our form of government and our way of life, we have become the most powerful nation, the most prosperous people, for some strange and inexplainable reason, of late we have been propagandized into either believing, or, at least, pretending to believe, that forms of government, ways of doing things which have but brought disaster to every other country which has tried them, should be here substituted for the best way, our own way.

That we are on the wrong road; that we are deliberately ignoring the principles which have made us what we are, which have given us so much, is becoming apparent day by day to those who watch our National Government.

The President and the administration, ever since 1933, have been steadily, deliberately, and successfully changing our representative republican form of government into a dictatorship.

From the right of the individual and local governments to conduct their own affairs within constitutional limitations, we have passed to a dictatorial system, which shortly will have us into a completely socialistic form of government.

From the Allegan Gazette of February 21, a small-town weekly published at Allegan, Mich., comes an editorial which clearly and concisely shows what is happening:

TRUMAN'S ECONOMIC PLAN WOULD MARK TURNING POINT IN HISTORY

Not so long ago some Government officials in the agricultural department expressed alarm at the downward trend of prices. In Wednesday's dailies we read that a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers told the Congress that an inflationary movement will set up again this spring and could lead to an ultimate crash.

Immediately following this warning, Truman sent a draft of his socialistic plan to Congress for their consideration. This scheme was submitted in the form of a bill granting the President power to impose controls on prices and wages and to build and operate industrial plants.

In general this bill provides:

1. Authorization for the Government to make loans for industrial expansion and where needed as a last resort, actually to construct facilities for larger production.

If passed, the above provision would give the President the power of a dictator over certain large essential industries. He could and would bestow his political favor on those industries he favored, in the form of loans, and could and would engage in competition with those industries opposing the socialistic state. Thus, a favored few industries subservient to the state would become rich and powerful and those not favored, unable to compete, would suffer.

This undemocratic proposal follows the pattern of the German dictatorship. A few German industries willing to cooperate with the Nazis were permitted to grow and expand at the expense of the other industries, resulting in complete control of German business in the hands of the Nazis.

Another provision is as follows:

2. Mandatory priority and allocation to be used in channeling scarce materials and facilities into essential production and uses, to relieve or prevent shortages and maldistribution affecting essential domestic requirements, cost of living, national security, and the carrying out of foreign policy.

This provision would permit the President to control material, and he could and would provide his favored industries with material to the detriment and eventual destruction of other industries. This, too, follows the pattern of Germany and Russia, where the state had complete control of industry.

There is absolutely no need and no reason why our supposedly democratic government should be granted these broad life-and-death powers over industry. If this bill is passed by Congress, it will later be considered by historians as the turning point in the history of our country.

We will have become a dictatorship. We will have turned our backs on democracy and followed the European plan, eventually leading to the utter destruction of freedom in this country.

LEO W. HOFFMAN.

Fair Rents Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the public hearings on rent controls before the House Committee on Banking and Currency there was considerable discussion about writing into the bill a formula for a fair return to property owners.

I have no doubt that there will be considerable discussion about the subject on the floor of the House when the bill reaches us for debate and passage.

A rather complete discussion of the subject, including the legal involvements and implications thereof, appeared in an article entitled "Fair Rents Systems," written by John W. Willis for the George Washington Law Review of December 1947.

Since it will provide much valuable information for use, I set it forth in full, as follows:

FAIR RENTS SYSTEM

(By John W. Willis)

Although overshadowed by international affairs and the labor situation, one of the important issues in American public life in recent months has been the question whether we shall continue to have rent controls and, if so, what kind of controls. The question has been only temporarily settled by Congress, for the new Federal act[1] expires February 29, 1948. It may very well be extended; if it is not, State and local governments will probably take steps to continue controls under their own laws.

In the discussion of the subject there has been widespread criticism of the freeze type of rent regulation practiced by the Office of Price Administration over the past 5 years. The purpose of this article is to examine a different type of control, which for easy reference is called the fair rent system, without attempting at this point to evaluate the relative merits of the different types of control.

Under the freeze system, rents are fixed by legislative fiat, by reference to the rents charged on a given date. While adjustments are allowed on various grounds, there is usually no attempt to guarantee each individual landlord a fair return. The fair rent system, on the other hand, looks toward the fixing of rents in individual cases upon some basis designed to give the landlord a fair return, while protecting the tenant against profiteering.

The various countries throughout the world which have experimented with rent control have employed variations of one or the other of these systems, or a third system, whereby rents are fixed across the board on the basis of a percentage of the value of the property.[2] In a few isolated cases, dollars-and-cents rent ceilings have been fixed.

Rent control as administered in the District of Columbia and in several States during the early 1920's was based on the fair-rent principle,[3] and the same is true under the New York Business and Commercial Rent Acts of 1945.[4] The recent Virginia Emergency Fair Rent Act also adopts this concept.[5] In enacting the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1941[6] and the Emergency Price Control Act,[7] on the other hand, Congress definitely rejected the theory that each landlord should be entitled to a fair return. The Emergency Price Control Act required only that rents be generally fair and equitable (sec. 2 (b)). During the consideration of the original price-control bill Congressman Dirksen proposed an amendment to allow adjustments so as to produce a gross rental which, after payment of taxes and other costs of ownership, management, and operation, including depreciation and an allowance for vacancy, will provide a net return which is reasonable upon the value of the property.[8]

The amendment, however, was subsequently withdrawn. In *Wilson* v. *Brown*[9] the complainant had proposed that the rent regulations be amended to permit adjustments where "the rents for the entire property for a period of 1 year nearest the date the petition is filed, after deducting normal and customary expenses of operation, including general real-estate taxes, depreciation, reasonable allowances for vacancies, and bad accounts, etc., provide a net return of less than 6 percent per annum to the landlord, based upon the fair market value of the property as of March 1, 1942."[10]

The Price Administrator rejected the proposal[11] and the Emergency Court of Appeals upheld him, stating that there was no constitutional requirement that each landlord receive a "fair return" under wartime regulations.[12] The Supreme Court later came to the same conclusion.[13]

During the debate on the extension of the Price Control Act in 1944, Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH proposed an amendment striking out the word "generally" in the provision that rents must be "generally fair and equitable," stating that:

"It is not necessary to have generally fair rent control, because what they did as a matter of administration, is to fix the price of every single individual living unit. Every house, every apartment has to be registered. So it is not a great job to revise in any particular instance. So, we provided that they must not only be generally fair and equitable

---

[1] Housing and Rent Act of 1947, Public Law No. 129, 80th Cong., 1st sess., act of June 30, 1947. See Willis, The Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947 (1947), 47 Col. L. Rev. —.

[2] I. e., it is provided that rents shall not exceed a specified percentage of the value of the property. The percentage may vary with the value of the building but there is no attempt to fix individual maxima for each house, or to guarantee the owner a profit.

[3] See infra, text accompanying note 26 et seq.

[4] Infra note 31.

[5] Va. Acts Extra Sess. 1947, ch. 68. See Willis, The Virginia Emergency Fair Rent Act of 1947 (1947), 33 Va. L. Rev. 395.

[6] 55 Stat. 788 (1941), D. C. Code, Supp. V, secs. 45–1601 et seq. (1946).

[7] 56 Stat. 23 (1942), 50 U. S. C. Supp. V, secs. 901–946 (1946).

[8] 87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9211 (1941).

[9] 137 F. (2d) 348 (E. C. A. 1943).

[10] Id. at p. 352. The proposal continued as follows: "In determining fair market value the Administrator shall consider sale prices of comparable properties, construction costs less depreciation and obsolescence, and rentals for comparable units in similar buildings. In determining expenses of operation the Administrator shall consider only current expenditures within the year and grant only pro rata portion to said year of those expenditures which are not annually required; interest payments shall not be regarded as an expense of operation; depreciation shall be based on normal life of building or equipment; management fees or rental commissions or both shall not exceed 5 percent of gross annual rentals; insurance expenditures shall be customary and reasonable; real estate taxes shall be prorated for said period. In no event, where an increase is requested on the grounds of unproductivity or underproductivity, shall the granted increase exceed a net return of 8 percent per annum, based upon the fair market value of the property as of March 1, 1942."

[11] *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Ave. N. Corp.* (1 OPA Op. & Dec. 1402 (OPA, 1943)).

[12] *Wilson* v. *Brown*, supra, note 9. See text accompanying note 63, infra.

[13] *Bowles* v. *Willingham* (321 U. S. 503, 64 Sup. Ct. 641, 88 L. ed. 892 (1944)).

in their rents, but they must be fair and equitable to everybody." [14]

The bill reported out of the House Banking and Currency Commitee, however, merely provided for individual adjustments where the rent on the maximum rent date was, due to peculiar circumstances, substantially higher or lower than rents generally prevailing in the area for comparable accommodations. Chairman SPENCE pointed out that it would have been "absolutely impossible to make specific findings in each case." [15] The latter amendment was adopted.[16]

As far as new priority-assisted construction was concerned, however, OPA accepted the rent fixed by FHA. The method employed by FHA was described as follows:

"On newly constructed rental housing, the FHA establishes maximum returns on an economic-return basis rather than a fixed ratio to a comparable property on a freeze date. In setting these rents recognition is given to necessary current costs of construction, including land. Rents are fixed on a basis to permit an annual return of 6½ percent on that investment, after allowance for all operating expenses, maintenance, and local taxes. This return on investment is also predicated on a 7-percent allowance to cover vacancy and collection losses, so that to the extent that any particular landlord has smaller losses, to that extent his net return is increased." [17]

The Federal Housing and Rent Act of 1947 states that rent control "should be administered with a view to prompt adjustments where owners of rental housing accommodations are suffering hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rents applicable to their housing accommodations * * *" and directs the Housing Expediter to "make such adjustments in such maximum rents [established under the Emergency Price Control Act] as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title." [18]

Congressman WOLCOTT, now chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, during the debate interpreted this latter phrase as meaning "that if the landlord is not receiving rent which covers the cost of maintenance, plus a reasonable return on his investment, an inequity exists which should be corrected." [19]

The committee report does not support this interpretation.[20] The Housing Expediter, however, who had merely repromulgated the former OPA regulations on adjustment of maximum rents,[21] on August 22, 1947, amended them to provide that in issuing adjustment orders "full consideration shall be given to hardships resulting from the inadequacy of the maximum rent applicable to the housing accommodation and any inequity within the meaning of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947." [22]

What instructions may have been given the local rent officials [23] as to the meaning of this vague language have not been made public. The term could very well, however, be interpreted as at last opening the door to the use of the "fair return" concept—despite the absence of standards in the regulations.[24]

Fair rent laws may be divided into two main classes: Those under which rents are determined on the basis of a fair return on some definite base—similar to the fixing of rates for public utilities—and those which apply more vague and general standards. The former class includes most of the fair rent laws in the United States,[25] as well as Australian, New Zealand, and South African legislation. The second method has been used most widely in the British Empire and to some extent in Europe and Latin America.

THE FAIR RETURN METHOD

The method under which the landlord is given a fair return on a rent base, as might be expected, imports many problems. On what basis is the return to be calculated? What is a fair return? What expenses are to be considered in calculating a fair return?

In the United States, the solution of these problems has usually been left to the courts or commissions with little or no assistance from the legislatures. The various laws adopted in the 1920's required merely that rents be fair and reasonable [26] or reasonable and just [27] or provided that the tenant could defend an action for rent or for possession on the ground that the rent was unjust and unreasonable and that the landlord could plead and prove a reasonable rent.[28] Some of these laws created certain presumptions as to reasonableness, based chiefly on the rent charged on a previous date, or listed items of information which the landlord was required to furnish in a bill of particulars, but they made no attempt to spell out any complete formula for fixing rents. About the only exception to this rule was a Los Angeles ordinance of 1921, and it was held unconstitutional because it set out a standard which the court considered unlawful.[29] It is interesting to note, however, that both in New York and the District of Columbia the courts in interpreting these vaguely worded statutes were drawn as by a magnet to the theory of a reasonable return on the fair value.[30] The same is true of

---

[14] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5463 (June 7, 1944). See Fifth Intermediate Report of the Smith Committee (H. Rept. 1366, 78th Cong., p. 11 (1944)). See also H. R. 1877, 78th Cong., sec. 2 (1940), which would have guaranteed every landlord a "fair and equitable" rent.

[15] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5478 (June 7, 1944).

[16] See Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, section 102, adding a sentence to section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act to read as follows: "Under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator, he shall provide for the making of individual adjustments in those classes of cases where the rent on the maximum rent date for any housing accommodations is, due to peculiar circumstances, substantially higher or lower than the rents generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable housing accommodations, and in those classes of cases where substantial hardship has resulted since the maximum rent date from a substantial or unavoidable increase in property taxes or operating costs" (58 Stat. 632, 50 U. S. C., Supp. V, sec. 902 (c) (1946)). See *Kuskin & Rotberg, Inc.* v. *Porter* (153 F. (2d) 1016 (ECA 1946)) construing the term.

[17] S. Rept. 86, pt. 2, 80th Cong., p. 3 (1947), quoting the National Housing Administrator. New construction is exempted from control under the new Federal act, supra, note 1, sec. 202 (c) (3) (A).

[18] Supra, note 1, secs. 201 (b), 204 (b).

[19] 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 1, 1947, at 4403. See criticism by OPA memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative DOUGLAS, 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix, A2208; cf. notes 130–136, infra.

[20] "The title directs that such adjustments shall be made as may be necessary to correct inequities or to further carry out the purposes and provisions of the title. The committee is unanimous in its desire to correct inequities in rents and to insure correction has provided a mandate that such shall be done as expeditiously as possible. One of the major criticisms of the administration of rent controls under present law has been the almost total lack of prompt allowance for hardship relief in rent cases by the Office of Price Administration. The committee reiterates such criticism and condemns the intricate and dilatory procedures now in effect for requesting such relief and the inflexible standards on which applications for such relief have been continually decided. Such relief, where justified, should be granted, and granted promptly." (H. Rept. 317, 80th Cong., p. 12 (1947)).

[21] Controlled Housing Rent Regulation, § 5, 12 Fed. Reg. 4331, 4334 (1947).

[22] Controlled Housing Rent Regulation, Amdt. 2, 12 Fed. Reg. 5699 (1947).

[23] Under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, supra note 1, adjustments are made by area rent officials, but the advisory rent boards set up under sec. 204 (e) are authorized to make recommendations to the area officials on individual cases.

[24] Amdt. 2, supra note 22, also deleted the former provision in sec. 5 of the Controlled Housing Rent Regulation, which prevented adjustments on the ground of hardship from raising the rent above the level for comparable accommodations in the area.

[25] But see Hawaii, Session Laws of 1945, Act No. 69, sec. 7 (d), providing for the fixing of rents on individual commercial premises which are generally fair and equitable, judged in the light of what the premises are worth for their licensed use, but excluding from consideration any rental rate which could reasonably be met only by an increase of the prices generally prevailing in such line of business.

[26] District of Columbia, Ball Rent Law (41 Stat. 298, sec. 106 (1919)).

[27] Wisconsin, Laws of 1920, ch. 16. This law was declared unconstitutional because it applied in Milwaukee only. *State ex rel. Milwaukee Sales & Investment Co.* v. *Railroad Commission* (174 Wis. 458, 183 N. W. 687 (1921)). See also Maine, Laws of 1919, ch. 256 (Rev. Stat. 1944, ch. 124, sec. 41) penalizing "unreasonable or unjust" rents "taking into due consideration the actual market value of the property at the time, with a fair return thereon."

[28] New York, Laws of 1920, ch. 136, as amended by ch. 944, secs. 1, 4. Section 2 of the statute provided that when the answer set up the defense of unjustness and unreasonableness the plaintiff would be required to file a bill of particulars, setting forth "the gross income derived from the building of which the premises in question are the whole or a part; the number of apartments in the building and the number of rooms in each apartment, and the number of stores in such building; the rent received for each such apartment or store for the period of one year last past; the consideration paid by the landlord for the building, if he be the owner thereof, or, if he be a lessee, the rent agreed to be paid by him; the assessed valuation of the property and the taxes for the current year; the annual interest charge on any incumbrance paid by the landlord; the operating expenses with reasonable detail; and such other facts as the landlord claims affect his net income from such property." New Jersey, Laws of 1924, ch. 69, and Massachusetts, Acts of 1920, ch. 578, were similar to the New York law; so also is a Virgin Islands Ordinance of June 13, 1941, infra note 156; and cf. Philippines, Commonwealth Act No. 689, secs. 2, 3 (1945).

[29] The ordinance (No. 41266 (N. S.) of January 12, 1921) limited rents to 11 percent of the landlord's investment in the building and 16 percent of his investment in the furnishings. Superior Court Judge J. B. Wood held the law unconstitutional, stating that he would have upheld it if the rent had been based on the fair market value rather than on investment. Berger and Emery, Rent Control in War and Peace (Nat. Muni. League, 1939), p. 42.

[30] See infra, passim. Information is not available on the operation of the Massachusetts and New Jersey laws, supra, note 28.

the New York business and commercial rent laws of 1945.[31] While these acts are considerably more detailed, they provide that the rent to be fixed shall be a reasonable rent based on the fair rental value of the tenant's commercial [business] space and create a mere rebuttable presumption that a net annual return of 6 percent is a reasonable return; [32] but the courts have held that the statute requires the rent to be computed so as to return the landlord a reasonable net return on the value of the premises.[33]

The rent base

Among the bases which have been used or suggested the most important are the owner's investment, the cost of reproduction, the assessed valuation, the preemergency value, or the fair present value.

The owner's investment, or original cost, has been used as a standard in some instances.[34] It is not a satisfactory base, however, from the standpoint either of the landlord or of the tenant. What the landlord receives or what the tenant pays should not be made to depend on such adventitious matters as how much the landlord gave for the property or has invested in it.[35] Many rental properties were bought up at sacrifice prices during the depression, but that is not a good reason why the owner should be forced now to accept lower rents than other landlords; on the other hand, tenants should not have to pay a high rent because a speculator has bought the building at an inflated price.[36] It has been pointed out also that—

"The original cost test does not take into account changes in rental value resulting from such factors as changes in the character of the neighborhood or in transportation facilities." [37]

[31] New York, Laws of 1945, ch. 3, as amended by ch. 315, id., ch. 314; McKinney's Unconsolidated Laws, secs. 8521 et seq., 8581 et seq.

[32] Id., sec. 4 of each act. See also text accompanying note 80, infra.

[33] See *Application of Frankel* (269 App. Div. 531, 533; 56 N. Y. S. (2d) 316, 318 (1st Dept. 1945)), "While the court is to determine what constitutes a reasonable rent for the commercial space, the amount is to be arrived at by a mathematical computation in accordance with a formula set forth in the law." Compare *Matter of Place Plains Holding Corp.* (115 N. Y. L. J. 1762 (Sup. Ct. 1946)) and *Champion Realty Corp.* v. *Wapniak* (63 N. Y. S. (2d) 388 (Sup. Ct. 1946)), giving the statute a wooden application resulting in rent increases from $100 to $302.53 a month in the first case and to $216.98 a month in the second, with *Rothschild* v. *Web Garage, Inc.* (114 N. Y. L. J. 1778 (Sup. Ct. 1945)) and *Matter of Dom Ben Realty Corp.* (115 N. Y. L. J. 67 (Sup. Ct. 1945)), giving the statute a broad interpretation.

[34] Queensland, Fair Rents Act 1920, 10 Geo. V, No. 31, 11 Queensland Acts 9195, sec. 8; South Africa, Act No. 26 of 1940, Statutes of 1939–1940, p. 496; cf. *Stein* v. *Eckert* (188 N. Y. S. 469 (App. Term, 1st Dept., 1921)); and see note 29, supra.

[35] See *Hirsch* v. *Weiner* (116 Misc. 312, 190 N. Y. S. 111 (App. Term, 2d Dept. 1921)).

[36] See Berger and Emery, op. cit. supra note 29, at p. 63–4. Cf. Mauritius, No. 52 of 1920, 6 Laws of Mauritius (1920 Revision) 3567, sec. 9; Govt. Notice No. 167; Procs. and Govt. Notices 1939, p. 328, Reg. 11 (1) (committee is not bound to accept latest purchase price since date of outbreak of war as basis on which to calculate a reasonable rent).

"Original cost varies with the circumstances surrounding the construction or purchase of the rental property." *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra note 11.

[37] *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra note 11, aff'd *Wilson* v. *Brown* (supra note 9).

Accurate records of investment and depreciation are frequently not available;[38] and the standard cannot be applied where the owner acquired the property by gift or bequest.[39] The common-sense view seems to be that taken by a New Zealand court, which held that while the actual investment was a relevant factor, it might or might not be decisive: If the owner paid too much, his imprudence should not be rewarded at the tenant's expense, while if he made a good bargain the tenant should not be entitled to share in his good luck.[40] Where new housing is concerned, however, it may be expedient—in order not unduly to deter construction—to guarantee the landlord a fair return on his actual cost. This was done, for example, in the South African Act of 1920.[41] A different base was substituted in the World War II legislation, but cost of erection is still to be considered.[42] The Canadian regulations, which had theretofore adhered strictly to the "freeze" method, were amended in April 1947 to provide for fixing the maximum rent of accommodations completed by original construction or structural alteration on or after January 1, 1944, "at an amount which, in the opinion of the rentals appraiser or of the court of rental appeals in the event of appeal, will yield a fair return, based on prevailing costs of land, labor, and material." [43]

And as we have seen, a similar procedure was followed under the joint OPA-FHA plan.

Cost of reproduction as a base has generally been discarded for the obvious reason that reproduction value during an abnormal period of high building costs—which generally accompanies housing shortages—is not a fair test of property valuation for purposes of fixing fair rental values,[44] and because reproduction cost at any particular time may be much greater than the cost at which the property could sell.[45]

"The reproduction cost basis is also unsatisfactory because reproduction costs are highly conjectural. In addition, it fails to consider such factors as location and transportation facilities which influence rental value." [46]

[38] Ibid.

[39] *Hirsch* v. *Weiner* (supra note 35). See also *Jash-Lap Realty Co.* v. *Fishman* (115 Misc. 485, 190 N. Y. S. 117 (Muni. Ct. 1921)) (as between the two, cost of reproduction and not purchase price determines value; but value is not always determined by cost of reproduction).

[40] *Wedderspoon* v. *Taylor* (36 Magistrate's Ct. Rep. 126 (1941)).

[41] Act No. 13 of 1920, 3 Rev. Stat. 1917–1920 (Rev. 1933), 1106, sec. 14. See also Federated Malay States, No. 14 of 1940, sec. 6 (iii) (in fixing rents for new construction, board shall allow a reasonable return on capital reasonably expended); Malta, No. 16 of 1944, 77 Ordinances of Malta 31, sec. 2 (fair rent of house completed after March 31, 1939, is 3½ percent a year on freehold value of site and 5 percent on capital outlay on construction).

[42] Act No. 33 of 1942, Statutes of 1942, p. 200, sec. 1.

[43] Canada, Wartime Prices and Trade Board, Order No. 707 (April 5, 1947).

[44] *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Co.* v. *Moos* (200 App. Div. 66, 192 N. Y. S. 530 (1st Dept. 1922)); *Maitland* v. *Kerrigan* (187 N. Y. S. 495 (App. Term 1st Dept. 1921)).

[45] *Jash-Lap Realty Co.* v. *Fishman* (cited note 39, supra).

[46] *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.* (supra note 11). See Whitman, The Public Control of House Rents (1925), 1 J. Land & P. U. Econ., 343, 351–2, suggesting that reproduction cost less depreciation is the best basis if it is assumed that normal competitive conditions and prices prevail. But what is "normal"?

About the only instance in which this base has been used is the New South Wales Act of 1915, under which the capital value of a house was defined as the unimproved value of the land plus the estimated cost of erecting the house at the time of the application less an allowance for depreciation.[47] The 1928 act changed this, providing that the value of both the house and the land was to be determined on the basis of what they might be expected to realize if offered for sale on such reasonable terms and conditions as a bona fide seller might require—the test previously used for the land alone.[48]

Assessed valuation has generally not found favor as a rent base because it usually does not correspond to the actual or market value.[49] This is not necessarily true, of course, and if assessed valuation corresponds to "actual" value, or has some fixed relationship to it, it may be used as a base, either as it stands or increased by a given percentage.[50] In any event, assessed valuations are properly considered in deciding on "actual" or "fair" value.[51] The New York commercial rent laws of 1945–47, for instance, provide that assessed value shall be prima facie the fair value, but that this presumption may be rebutted by other evidence.[52]

Present market value, without qualification, cannot well be used as a base, although it has been; [53] the conditions which the rent laws were meant to counteract result in high market values as well as high rents.[54] For this reason some courts have used market

[47] Act No. 66 of 1915, N. S. W. Stats. of 1915, p. 193, sec. 9 (1).

[48] Act No. 32 of 1928, N. S. W. Stats. of 1928, p. 230; Act No. 37 of 1939, N. S. W. Stats. of 1939, p. 441, sec. 9 (1) is the same.

[49] Whitman, supra note 46, at p. 352.

"* * * the common practice is for the assessors to undervalue realty, so that tax valuation of realty is not admissible as evidence of value in a suit for any other purpose." Karl N. Llewellyn, article on Valuation and Valuers, 22 Encyclopedia Britannica 960.

"Such valuations frequently reflect the application of inarticulate policies and assumptions which may be valid for tax purposes but do not furnish a uniform basis for determining fair value." *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra note 11.

[50] See Report of United States Housing Corporation, 103 (1920) (local committees in New London, Conn., and Bath, Maine, allowed 10 percent on assessed valuation increased by one-third; Chicago committee allowed approximately 6 percent on appraised value). Compare Philippines, Commonwealth Act No. 689, sec. 3 (1945) (rent presumed to be unjust and unreasonable if it exceeds 20 percent of annual assessment value of building and lot).

[51] *Forster* v. *Eliot* (52 App. D. C. 107, 282 Fed. 735 (1922)); *Jash-Lap Realty Co.* v. *Fishman*, cited note 39 supra; South Africa, Act No. 33 of 1942, supra, note 42, sec. 1.

[52] Supra note 31. A similar provision was inserted in the 1920 law by Laws of 1922, Ch. 644. Cf. *Ward* v. *Stilwell* (118 Misc. 462, 193 N. Y. S. 550 (App. Term 1st Dept. 1922), aff'd without opinion 204 App. Div. 875, 197 N. Y. S. 955 (1922)), using assessed valuation as the base without discussion of the point.

[53] *Maitland* v. *Kerrigan*, supra note 44 (value of property is determined by price at which property of similar character is bought and sold in the open market); New South Wales, Act No. 32 of 1928, Act No. 37 of 1939, supra note 48; Victoria, 2 & 3 Geo. VI, c. 4626, Sec. 5 (1938); see also the Maine statute, supra note 27.

[54] Whitman, supra note 46, at p. 352; *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra note 11.

values existing before the emergency period.[58] Capitalization of rents is not a legitimate method to use in arriving at value, since this is going in a circle.[56]

Fair value: It will be seen from the foregoing discussion that neither investment, reproduction cost, assessed valuation or present market value, taken by itself, is an adequate standard. No one factor can be adequate in all situations.[57] The idea of a fair return, however, ex necessitate, requires that some base be selected on which the return is to be calculated. Probably the best course is that taken in a leading New York decision of 1922 and followed by the District of Columbia Court of Appeals under the Ball Rent Act. This is to take as a base the fair value of the property—an amount arrived at after considering original cost, cost of improvements, purchase price, reproduction cost, assessed valuation, rental value, bona fide sales of similar property in the neighborhood, market value before the emergency, the design and facilities of the building, its location with respect to the purposes for which it is used, etc.[58] This way all of these factors can be given some weight, but none need be controlling. Assessed valuation may be taken as presumptively the fair value, in order to provide a starting point and simplify proof; but the owner should be allowed, if he can, to show that the property is worth more than its assessed value, and the tenant to show that it is worth less.

The discretionary nature of this test is well illustrated by a very recent decision of the New York Supreme Court in a proceeding to fix a fair rent[59] under the Commercial Rent Act. The present owner of the property in question had formerly been the mortgagee under a mortgage for $38,500; in 1945 the mortgagor had defaulted and the mortgagee had taken a deed to the property in lieu of foreclosure. The court held that this fact did not prove that the fair value of the premises was only $38,500, since it was probably worth more. Nor was the owner estopped from asserting a higher value by the fact that on a proceeding to reduce the assessment it had contended that the property was worth only $25,000. In arriving at a fair value of $40,000 the official referee had considered the condition of the building, its location for transit purposes, the zoning restrictions on its use, selling values and rental values of comparable properties, assessed valuation, opinions of experts, and the above-stated facts as to the mortgage and as to the attempt to reduce the assessment. The court affirmed the finding.[60]

The fair value is to be determined without regard to encumbrances. Whether a property is mortgaged or not has nothing to do with its rental value; to allow a return only on the owner's actual investment would result in disparity in rents between houses otherwise identical, and, if carried to its logical extreme, would give the owner no return at all if the mortgage equaled or exceeded the value of the property.[61]

It should be understood that the concept of fair value, as used herein, is not the same thing as the much vilified and now substantially rejected fair value standard which the courts employed for many years in cases involving rate making for public utilities.[62] Actually, fair value, as used in the utility cases, meant, to a large extent, reproduction cost, and we have seen that that standard—whether or not it was ever workable in the public-utility field—will not do as a basis for fixing rents. But neither will the prudent investment theory, now given the sanction of the Supreme Court, since it depends on elaborate accounting data as to historical costs, which cannot be supplied in the case of the average dwelling house. The short of the matter is that a fair return to the owner of a dwelling house cannot be fixed with the same degree of mathematical precision as the reasonable return allowed a public utility. While principles of public-utility law may be helpful as analogs, they cannot be applied too rigidly. In a cogent decision by Judge Magruder, the emergency court of appeals rejected the contention that the Emergency Price Control Act was unconstitutional because it did not guarantee every landlord a fair return, saying:

"The due-process requirement of fair return upon fair value in rate regulation of public utilities is supposed to rest upon some analogy to the requirement of just compensation in the taking of property by eminent domain. See *Reagan* v. *Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (1894, 154 U. S. 362, 410); *West* v. *Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.* (1935, 295 U. S. 662, 671). Recently the soundness of this analogy has been questioned. See concurring opinion by Black, Douglas, and Murphy, JJ., in *Federal Power Commission* v. *Natural Gas Pipe Line Co.* (1942, 315 U. S. 575, 602 et seq.).

"However this may be, we are satisfied that principles derived from the law of eminent domain are not the proper constitutional criterion for determining the validity of a Nation-wide program of price and rent control enacted by Congress under its war powers. In the case of public utilities there is an extensive and permanent regulation of the use of the properties in the public interest, of which the regulation of rates is only a part. The situation more nearly approaches a taking of the properties, or the use thereof, than in the case of wartime rent regulations. * * * The useful life of housing accommodations extends far beyond the contemplated period of rent control. There is, in fact, no appropriation of the housing accommodations at all, and so far as there is a narrow restriction on their use, it is for a very limited period. 'A limit in time, to tide over a passing trouble, may well justify a law that could not be upheld as a permanent change.' *Black* v. *Hirsch* (1921, 256 U. S. 135, 157). Furthermore, the act does not require the landlord to continue his property in the market for housing accommodations. * * * The landlord is thus free to occupy the property himself, or devote it to some commercial enterprise, or utilize it in any other way. This serves to emphasize that there has been no taking of his property in the constitutional sense.

"The proper test of constitutionality, we think, is the more general one applicable where legislation is challenged under the due process clause as constituting an arbitrary and capricious exercise of a granted power."[63]

The Supreme Court subsequently approved the holding.[64]

The rate of return

Economists tell us that the rate of return under the fair-rent theory should be high enough to allow the owner the current interest rate on the fair value of the property plus an amount for additional risks and entrepreneurial effort, and that it should be fixed at a point between the normal competitive return—i. e., an amount sufficient to enable the owner to continue operating his investment unimpaired—and the high scarcity return. The exact point is a matter of moral and economic judgment; extortion should be prevented but new capital should not be discouraged.[65] The courts, legislatures and commissions have generally attempted to approximate this, although it is said that they have not always distinguished between the legal return—the amount necessary to avoid confiscation—and the economic return, the amount necessary not to discourage new capital.[66]

It is probably an economic fallacy to assume that a rate of return can be fixed by legislative fiat which will be fair under all circumstances.[67] Legislatures in the British dominions have indeed attempted to do this,[68]

---

[55] See *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Corp.* v. *Moos*, supra note 44. Cf. the Mauritius legislation supra note 36; and see text accompanying note 89, infra.

[56] Jelbart, Fair Rents Legislation in New South Wales (1939), p. 30.

[57] "It is impossible to fix any definite standard by which the reasonable value of premises is to be determined which would be applicable in all cases * * *" *Schwartz* v. *Deutsch* (187 N. Y. S. 521, 522 (App. Term 1st Dept. 1921)); per Lehman, J.

[58] *Forster* v. *Eliot*, cited note 51, supra; *Karrick* v. *Cantrill* (51 App. D. C. 176, 277 Fed. 578 (1922)); *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Corp.* v. *Moos*, supra, note 44. See also note 10, supra.

[59] Actually, the proceeding was not one to fix a "reasonable rent" in excess of the "emergency rent" (115 percent of the March 1, 1943 rent) but was a proceeding initiated by the tenant to fix the emergency rent, the premises not having been leased on March 1, 1943. However, the court treated the case as one for the determination of a reasonable rent.

[60] *Zellner* v. *Brooklyn Trust Co.* (70 N. Y. S. (2d) 114 (Sup. Ct. 1947)).

[61] Whitman, supra, note 46, at pp. 355–6; *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra, note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra, note 35.

[62] See *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.* (320 U. S. 591, 64 Sup. Ct. 281, 88 L. ed. 333 (1944)); *Federal Power Commission* v. *Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America* (315 U. S. 575, 62 Sup. Ct. 736, 86 L. ed. 1037 (1942)); Blachly, The Role of *Smyth* v. *Ames* in Federal Rate Regulation (1947) (33 Va. L. Rev. 141); Bonbright, Contributions of the Federal Power Commission to the Establishment of the Prudent Investment Doctrine of Rate-Making (1945) (14 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 136); Hale, Utility Regulation in the Light of the Hope Natural Gas Case (1944) (44 Col. L. Rev. 488); Harbeson, The Demise of Fair Value (1944) (42 Mich. L. Rev. 1049).

[63] *Wilson* v. *Brown*, supra, note 9, at pp. 351–352. See also *Helfend* v. *Fleming* (159 F. (2d) 730 (E. C. A. 1947)); *Mortgage Underwriting & Realty Co.* v. *Bowles* (150 F. (2d) 411 (E. C. A. 1945)).

[64] *Bowles* v. *Willingham* (321 U. S. 503, 64 Sup. Ct. 641, 88 L. Ed. 892 (1944)). The Court concluded that "A nation which can demand the lives of its men and women in the waging of * * * war is under no constitutional necessity of providing a system of price control on the domestic front which will assure each landlord a 'fair return' on his property" (321 U. S., at p. 519).

[65] Whitman, supra, note 46, at pp. 351–354; Dorau and Hinman, Urban Land Economics (1928), p. 346.

[66] Whitman, supra, note 46, at p. 354. As far as courts are concerned, the author fails to realize that under some statutory schemes (see note 76, infra) the power of the court is limited to determining whether a rent is confiscatory. See *Kennedy Bros.* v. *Sinclair* (52 App. D. C. 398, 287 Fed. 972 (1923)), where the court complained that if the rent commission fixed rents at the bare minimum above the point of confiscation, investment in that class of property would inevitably cease to be desirable and tenants would be worse off, but held that the court could not interfere unless the rent fixed was confiscatory, that is, below the "legal rate" of interest, 6 percent.

[67] "The determination of what rate of return on a landlord's investment is 'fair' presents an additional problem. Different types of investment yield different rates of return. Furthermore, even the rate of return realized by different units representing the same type of investment varies under normal conditions. The assumption that there is one ascertainable fair return rate is entirely inconsistent with the normal situation in a competitive economy." *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra, note 11.

[68] See note 81 et seq., infra.

but it is preferable to leave the matter within the discretion of the board or court which administers the law, so that it can adapt the rate of return to changing conditions. The approach taken by the recent New York Business and Commercial Rent Acts seems a wise one: the acts create a presumption that a specified return is reasonable, but permit the landlord or tenant to rebut the presumption.[69]

The reasonable return of course is a net return, after payment of necessary costs of operation.

The courts and legislatures have varied considerably in their ideas of a fair return, but most of the figures are found in the range from 6 to 12 percent. To some extent, of course, this is affected by the rent base employed. The New York court, in *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*,[70] held in 1921 that a net rent not exceeding 10 percent of the present value of the property was not unreasonable, although it might have been if the evidence had showed a different situation as to possible return from other investments than it did. In a later case the same court said that 10 percent was not a conclusive and invariable standard, but what was a fair return depended on the conditions of the financial market, and that where there was no proof as to the return on good securities at the time of the trial, a finding that 8 percent was reasonable was not wrong.[71] Another division held that the rate should vary with market fluctuations of returns on other investments, but should not exceed 8 percent.[72] Less than 5 or 6 percent was held insufficient on appeal.[73] Some New York courts, on the other hand, held reasonableness of the rent to be a jury question.[74] In one such case the court said that 10- or 11-percent net income was not unreasonable, but that this was not a matter of law and net income was not the only factor to be considered.[75] The District of Columbia Court of Appeals, approaching the question from a different angle—as it was required to do because of the differences in the statutory schemes [76]—held that a net income below 6 percent of the value of the property would be confiscatory.[77] This was qualified in a later decision of an inferior court, which held a 5-percent gross return not unreasonable because of the run-down condition of the particular property, the court saying:

"If one should erect a peanut stand upon a million-dollar lot, he could hardly expect to receive 6 percent upon the sale value of the lot. The rate of 6 percent refers to property reasonably adapted to rental purposes, and the value must be fixed with respect to such purposes, not to other and remote uses involving a total change in the character of the property." [78]

A Denver ordinance limited rents to 12-percent gross return, but since this allowed only a 5-percent net, we are told that the Rent Commission actually permitted a somewhat higher return.[79] The New York Commercial Rent Acts of 1945–47 provide that a net annual return of 6 percent on the fair value of the entire property, including the land, plus 2 percent for amortization of mortgages shall be presumed to be a reasonable return,[80] but this presumption is rebuttable.

The original Fair Rents Act, that of New South Wales, contained elaborate provisions designed to keep the rate of return in line with current market conditions. The act provided that the return should not be less than the interest charged on overdrafts by the Commonwealth Bank and not more than 2½ percent in excess of that amount, to which various items of expense were to be added.[81] Actually, in most cases the Fair Rent Court allowed 6½ percent (the Commonwealth Bank rate) plus a half percent for collection.[82] The 1928 act raised the minimum to 1½ percent above the Commonwealth Bank rate and removed the maximum.[83] Under the 1939 act the rate was 1½ percent above the average interest rate on first mortgages on urban securities, as calculated by the Government statistician (5½ percent in 1939).[84]

These provisions apparently did not commend themselves to legislators elsewhere in the Antipodes. The Queensland Act of 1920 merely provided for a fair rent not to exceed 10 percent of the total value of the land and house,[85] as did the Victoria Act of 1938.[86] The 1916 act in New Zealand guaranteed the owner of a house let before August 3, 1914, 8 percent on the capital value.[87] The 1920 act permitted any landlord to apply for relief on the ground that the standard rent [88] did not give him a net annual return of 7 percent on the capital value as of August 3, 1914.[89] The 1936 act empowers the Governor General to provide by regulation that the annual amount of fair rent shall be a prescribed proportion of the capital value, between 4 and 6 percent, plus certain expenses; [90] no regulations have ever been made, but the magistrates generally allow 5 percent.[91]

In South Africa the rent is not "reasonable" if after deducting certain expenses the owner receives more than 8 percent per annum of the reasonable value of the dwelling and 6 percent on the land.[92] Previously, the presumption was the other way, and the rent was not unreasonable if it gave the owner a return of 10 percent on the actual cost of the building and 6 percent on the land.[93]

OPERATING EXPENSES

In order to ascertain the net return it is of course necessary to decide what expenses are to come out of the gross rental and what are to be borne by the owner out of his return. The process, as defined by the courts, is to determine the gross rentals demanded by the landlord, and then deduct the gross operating expenses, leaving a net rental, the fairness of which is determined under the rules laid down in the preceding section.[94]

Interest on mortgages is usually not allowed as an operating expense.[95]

The reason for this is apparent. The landlord is geting a return as rent on his total investment which includes that part represented by the mortgages on the property, which must be paid to save the amount actually advanced.[96]

While the man who owns his property free and clear obtains a higher return, this rule makes for uniform rents of similar properties and simplifies accounting.[97] Indeed, economists have found it necessary to justify any margin between interest paid and return received on the ground of the owner's risk and entrepreneurial activities.[98] Amortization of mortgages also should come out of the net return. The New York Business and Commercial Rent Acts, however, provide that a net annual return of 6 percent on the value of the property and 2 percent of principal for amortization of mortgages shall be presumed to be a reasonable return.[99] The court may allow 2 percent even though the owner is actually paying only 1 percent.[100] The acts have been criticized as penalizing him who owns his property free and clear, and rewarding him who owns his property on a shoestring investment, by depriving the former of the 2 percent allowance for amortization and granting it to the latter.[101]

The one who is penalized, however, is the tenant, since he must in effect contribute to the retirement of the mortgage by paying a higher rent than he would have to pay if there was no mortgage.

Depreciation: In *Schwartz* v. *Deutsch*,[102] Justice Lehman (later Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals) held that the owner had a right to an allowance for depreciation in order to keep his capital intact, and that this was a proper charge against gross income. The court said that depreciation might be

[69] See note 80, infra.

[70] Cited note 35, supra.

[71] *Kelly* v. *Madford* (191 N. Y. S. 702 (App. Term 2d Dept. 1922)).

[72] *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Co.* v. *Moos*, supra note 44; *Ward* v. *Stilwell*, supra note 52.

[73] *Auer Real Estate Co., Inc.* v. *Wriggle* (189 N. Y. S. 160 (App. Term 1st Dept. 1921)); *Stein* v. *Eckert*, cited note 34 supra.

[74] *Graeber* v. *Nichols* (190 N. Y. S. 198 (App. Term 2d Dept. 1920)); *Jash-Lap Realty Co.* v. *Fishman*, cited note 39 supra; *Shapiro* v. *Goldstein* (113 Misc. 258, 185 N. Y. S. (Muni. Ct. 1920)); *Marchbanks* v. *Moore* (113 Misc. 647, 185 N. Y. S. 226 (Muni. Ct. 1920)).

[75] *Marchbanks* v. *Moore*, supra note 74.

[76] Under the New York statutes, the court (or jury) decided whether a rent was "unreasonable and oppressive" or was "fair and reasonable." Under the Ball Rent Act, the rent was fixed by a rent commission, and the court had only limited power to review the finding of the commission. The court could hold that a rent was confiscatory, but it could not directly fix a fair rent. See *Kennedy Bros.* v. *Sinclair*, cited note 66, supra.

[77] *Kennedy Bros.* v. *Sinclair*, cited note 66, supra; *Rust* v. *Heavey* (52 App. D. C. 320, 286 Fed. 782 (1923)); *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra note 58. See note 2, supra.

[78] *Walker* v. *Hunt* (51 Wash. L. Rept. 321, 322 (D. C. Sup. Ct. 1923)). This principle is implicitly recognized by real-estate men. A one- or two-story building erected on valuable real estate in "New York parlance" is termed a "taxpayer," *Adda, Inc.* v. *Commissioner of Internal Revenue* (9 T. C. No. 33 (Aug. 18, 1947)).

[79] Berger and Emery, op. cit. supra note 29, at p. 26, citing Denver Municipal Facts, June–July 1921, p. 12. See also note 29 supra as to the Los Angeles ordinance.

[80] Supra note 31.

[81] Fair Rents Act of 1915, supra note 47, sec. 9 (2).

[82] Interstate Commission of Australia, Prices Investigation, Report No. 12 (1919) p. 14; Jelbart, op. cit. supra note 56, at p. 29.

[83] Act No. 32 of 1928, supra note 48.

[84] Fair Rents Act, 1939, supra note 48, sec. 9 (2); Jelbart, op. cit. supra note 56, at p. 30.

[85] Fair Rent Act of 1920, supra note 34, sec. 8.

[86] Fair Rents Act, 1938, supra note 53, secs. 5, 6. This act was suspended by 3 and 4 Geo. VI, c. 4686 (1939).

[87] War Legislation Amendment Act, 1916, 7 Geo. V, No. 13, sec. 6 (a), amended by 15 Geo. V, No. 3 (1924), repealed by 17 Geo. V, No. 36 (1926).

[88] I. e., the rent on August 3, 1914, or the last rent charged before that date, or the first rent charged thereafter, or at the tenant's option the lowest rent charged between August 3, 1914, and December 1, 1915; or 8 percent of the capital value, whichever was greater. Sec. 6 (a), 1916 Act, supra note 87.

[89] Housing Amendment Act, 1920, 11 Geo. V, No. 49, sec. 17 (1).

[90] Fair Rents Act of 1936, 1 Edw. VIII, No. 14, sec. 24 (1).

[91] Information from New Zealand Legation.

[92] Act No. 33 of 1942, supra note 42, sec. 1.

[93] Act. No. 13 of 1920, supra note 41, sec. 14; Act No. 26 of 1940, supra note 34.

[94] *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra note 35.

[95] See the New York Acts, supra note 31.

[96] *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra note 35, at p. 115; see also *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra note 58, and see note 10, supra.

[97] *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Co.* v. *Moos*, supra note 44.

[98] Whitman, supra note 46, at pp. 355–6.

[99] Supra note 31.

[100] *Schack* v. *Handel* (271 App. Div. 1, 62 N. Y. S. (2d) 407 (1946)).

[101] *Zellner* v. *Brooklyn Trust Co.*, supra note 60, at p. 119. See also Whyman and Frank, Valuation Problems Under Commercial Rent Control (1945) 113 N. Y. L. J. 486.

[102] Supra note 57.

covered by the allowance for repairs, but that the landlord was entitled to receive it in some way. Other courts held the same way, sometimes fixing 2 percent as the proper figure.[103] Under the Commercial Rent Acts of 1945–47, however, the New York courts have held that depreciation is not a proper item of operating expense, on the ground that in listing various items which are to be considered, not including depreciation, the legislature indicated its intention that depreciation should come out of the fair return.[104] A contrary result was reached in a case where the lessor was tenant of the land under a long-term lease, and would have nothing left at the end of his term.[105] In South Africa, the owner is entitled to an allowance for maintenance and repairs or to depreciation not in excess of 2 percent.[106] The New South Wales statutes include in operating costs "an amount estimated to be the annual depreciation in value of the buildings, if such depreciation diminishes their rental value." [107] Other statutes seem not to have mentioned the matter.[108]

Repair costs of course are a proper item of operating expenses if they are of a recurring or current nature.[109] Repairs of a more or less permanent character, however, should be spread over a period of years and not loaded on the particular tenant who happens to be in possession at the time they are made.[110] Repairs due to previous neglect, similarly, should not be charged off all in one year.[111] The reasonable rent cannot be based on an estimate of repairs to be made in the future.[112]

Maintenance costs obviously are to be allowed. In addition to such items as taxes, insurance, janitor service, gas, water, fuel, and electricity,[113] this category also includes "necessary legal expenses made by the landlord incidental to maintaining his right to possession and necessary expenses actually paid out for collecting rents." [114]

An allowance for vacancies should be made in the unlikely contingency that vacancies are proven.[115]

Income tax of course is not part of operating expenses, since it is a tax on profits and the tenant is not required to contribute to the landlord's taxes beside paying his own.[116]

Miscellaneous considerations

Apartment rents: The courts have held that apartment rents should be fixed on the basis of the value of the particular apartments in proportion to the value of the entire property, regardless of what rents may be obtained from apartments not included in the proceeding; in other words, the landlord cannot be required to take a low rent for one apartment because he may be obtaining high rents from other apartments whose rent is not in question, or from unregulated store or office leases.[117] Of course, variations in desirability of different apartments in the same building should be recognized.[118] The New York Commercial Rent Acts provide that the reasonable rent "shall be fixed in such manner that it shall not exceed a fair and reasonable proportion of the gross rentals from all the business space in the entire building or other rental area, giving due consideration to the amount and character of the business space used or occupied by such tenant, provided, however, that the gross rental from all such business space shall not exceed a fair and reasonable proportion of the gross rentals from the entire building or other rental area." [119]

Furnished accommodations: Special provision must, of course, be made for furnished apartments or dwellings; furniture depreciates much more quickly than real estate, and it would not be fair to the landlord to limit him to the same rate of return on the former as on the latter. Valuation of furniture, too, does not involve the same difficulties as valuation of real property, and it may be practical for that reason to treat furniture separately. The Australian legislation specifically empowers the rent boards to determine separately the fair rent for any furniture which is rented with the house.[120] Under the New South Wales Act, 10 or 12 percent was usually allowed on the value of the furniture, as against about 7 percent on the real estate.[121] A Los Angeles ordinance provided for a return of 16 percent on the landlord's investment in furnishings as against 11 percent on the realty.[122] A different tack is taken in the South African act, which mentions "a reasonable allowance for furniture" as an item of gross expense.[123] Elsewhere the question seems not to have been mentioned in legislation;[124] how the New York courts and the District of Columbia Rent Commission may have handled the matter under the 1920 laws is not known.

Subleases: How is the fair rent to be determined where the landlord is himself a lessee? [125] A New Zealand court has held that in fixing the fair rent for a sublease of a part of a house, the same procedure should not be followed as in fixing the rent for a part of the premises as between an owner and a tenant (i. e., apportionment of the fair rent for the whole premises), but that the sublessor should be allowed a "fair and reasonable profit"; in the particular case, the court reduced the profit from 45 percent to 20 percent.[126] In a 1922 New York case, *Ward* v. *Stilwell*,[127] the trial court followed a similar method where the landlord was a lessee under a long-term lease, allowing a 10-percent profit on the sum of the ground rent, taxes, depreciation, insurance, and repair costs. The appellate court, however, reversed, holding that the proper procedure was to compute the fair return on the assessed valuation of the property; no consideration was to be given to the ground rent paid by the lessor, although the other items mentioned were allowable as operating expenses. In that case the lessor himself contended for the method adopted by the appellate court, since it gave him the benefit of an increase in the value of the leasehold due to changes in the character of the neighborhood. Usually, however, the shoe will be on the other foot. Thus in a 1945 proceeding the New York Supreme Court, following *Ward* v. *Stilwell*, fixed a rent for a sublease which was something less than the total of the ground rent plus allowable expenses. The court said:

"The clear intent of the statute is that upon any application in this period of emergency to increase the rentals of business property more than 15 percent over the June 1, 1944, rentals, a 6-percent net return upon the fair value of the real property shall be presumed to be a fair rental or return upon the property, where the property is unmortgaged. The legislature did not intend a 6-percent return to the owner and a 6-percent return for each subsequent lessor. Nor did the legislature intend that by the simple expedient of adding a lessor's ground rent to the operation expense, such a result could be accomplished. Ground rent like other

---

[103] *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra note 35.

[104] *Application of 76 Crown Street Corp.* (271 App. Div. 1030, 69 N. Y. S. (2d) 319 (App. Div. 2d Dept. 1947)); *Schack* v. *Handel*, supra note 100; *Application of Michel* (185 Misc. 876, 57 N. Y. S. (2d) 32 (Spec. Term 1945)).

[105] *Application of Flushingside R. & C. Co.* (186 Misc. 117, 59 N. Y. S. (2d) 131 (Spec. Term 1945) aff'd 271 App. Div. 888, 67 N. Y. S. (2d) 155 (2d Dept. 1946)). See note 125 et seq., infra.

[106] Act No. 33 of 1942, supra note 42, sec. 1.

[107] Fair Rents Act of 1915, supra note 47, sec. 9 (2); Fair Rents Act of 1939, supra note 48, sec. 9 (2) (a).

[108] The New Zealand Act of 1936, supra note 90, states that the Governor General may provide by regulation that the fair rent shall be an amount between 4 and 6 percent of the capital value together with average annual expenses on rates, insurance and repairs, and an allowance for depreciation. Sec. 24 (1). However, no such regulations have been made.

[109] *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra note 35.

[110] *Schack* v. *Handel*, supra note 100; Whitman, supra note 46 at p. 355, criticizing the Hirsch and Karrick cases. The court in the Hirsch case noted that "ordinary repairs are spread over a period of years by some justices, while others add repairs to capital account," but held that almost anything that could be considered repair should be charged off in the year when made; this decision was followed in the Karrick case. Cf. the proposal quoted in note 10 supra.

[111] *Maitland* v. *Kerrigan*, supra note 44.

[112] *Goeman* v. *Boyle* (189 N. Y. S. 238 (App. Term 1st Dept. 1921)).

[113] *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra, note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra, note 35; New South Wales Fair Rent Acts, supra, note 107.

[114] *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra, note 35. Some lower courts had stated that they never allowed legal expenses, but this was condemned in *Hirsch* v. *Weiner* and in *Schwartz* v. *Deutsch*, supra, note 57. The South Africa Statute, supra, note 42, specifically mentions "collection charges."

[115] *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra, note 58; *Hirsch* v. *Weiner*, supra, note 35; New South Wales Acts, supra, note 107. See also note 17, supra.

[116] *A. C. & H. M. Hall Realty Co.* v. *Moos*, supra, note 44.

[117] *F. H. Smith Co.* v. *Verzi* (53 App. D. C. 363, 290 Fed. 338 (1923)); *Rust* v. *Tucker* (53 App. D. C. 41, 287 Fed. 1018 (1923)); *Rust* v. *Heavey*, supra, note 77; *Karrick* v. *Cantrill*, supra, note 58; *Elvira Realty Corp.* v. *Bracegirdle* (115 Misc. 197, 187 N. Y. S. 518 (Spec. Term, 1st Dept. 1921)).

[118] Whitman, supra, note 46, at p. 356.

[119] Supra, note 31. See Whyman and Frank, supra, note 101.

[120] New South Wales, Fair Rents Act of 1915, supra note 47, sec. 12; Fair Rents Act of 1939, supra note 48, sec. 12; Queensland, Fair Rent Act of 1920, supra note 34, sec. 10; Victoria, Fair Rents Act of 1938, supra note 53, sec. 6 (2); Australia, National Security (Landlord and Tenant) Regulations, Statutory Rules 1945, No. 97, reg. 24 (2).

[121] Jelbart, op. cit. supra note 56, at p. 42.

[122] Supra note 29.

[123] Act 33 of 1942, supra note 42, sec. 1.

[124] Except Malta, Ordinance No. 16 of 1944, supra note 41, sec. 8 (2), (3), (4) (board may fix fair rent for furniture at 15 percent of appraised value).

[125] The Virginia Act, supra note 5, sec. 8 (d), provides that "* * * Nothing herein shall restrict the power of the board to determine the fair and reasonable rent for a dwelling payable by a sublessee," but does not otherwise indicate how the board is to proceed.

Several of the statutes adopting the discretionary method, discussed infra, expressly mention the rent paid by the landlord as a factor to be considered; e. g., Northern Ireland, infra note 137; South Australia, infra note 142; Isle of Man, 13 Stat. 87, sec. 3 (1930); and see text accompanying note 149, infra.

[126] *Berry* v. *Coad* (35 Magistrate's Court Rep. 99 (1940)). But cf. Jelbart, op. cit. supra note 56, at p. 44, stating that a determination of a fair rent for a dwelling applies also to a sublease.

[127] Cited note 52 supra.

rent is essentially a return from the premises and not an expense of operation. It is true that in the case at bar the rentals are divided between the owner and the petitioner lessor. But to construe the statute so that each would be entitled to at least 6 percent of the value would be disastrous to the tenants, in that legal sanction would be given to oppressive rents sought to be avoided during the period of public emergency. The question becomes clearer if we consider that situations undoubtedly exist where there is more than one sublessor of an entire premises. Following the petitioner's theory, each of these in turn would be entitled to net 6 percent. The mere suggestion of such a possibility demonstrates the fallacy of petitioner's contention. The intent of the legislature was clearly that in a proceeding under said statute the tenants in business property should not be called upon to pay rentals which would total more than 6 percent over and above the ordinary operation and maintenance charges upon the property." [128]

The court did, however, allow depreciation and management fees as proper items of expense. This position seems the more equitable one: As the court said, tenants should not have to pay an excessive rent merely because of the interposition of a sublessor between them and the owner, although the sublessor should be entitled to compensation for management functions actually performed by him. It is perhaps relevant to note that the New York courts have declined to extend to a sublessor, not in possession of any part of the premises, the security of tenure accorded true tenants.[129]

Administration

An argument repeatedly advanced by the Office of Price Administration against the fair-return system was that it is so cumbersome and complicated as to be impossible of administration on a Nation-wide scale—or even on the narrower stage of the District of Columbia.[130] As the Office said in one of its last official statements: [131]

"This requirement [that each landlord be guaranteed a reasonable return on the fair value of his investment] would make effective rent control impossible, because rent control cannot be administered in accordance with the concepts employed in fixing public-utility rates. There is no satisfactory standard by which fair value of individual rental units may be measured. * * * Whenever in the past such standards have been introduced into State rent-control legislation the whole system of administration has bogged down. The staggering administrative burden involved in any determination of a reasonable return on the fair value of each piece of rental property throughout the United States would reduce the whole rent-control system to impotence."

This conclusion may be true.[132] The proof which the Office marshals in support of its conclusion, however, is weak. The only State rent-control laws on which any information is available are the New York laws of the 1920's and the Ball Rent Act of the District of Columbia.[133] The New York laws were not as effective as they might have been,[134] but this was probably due as much to the awkward procedure for judicial determination of fair rents and to the loopholes in the statute as to the use of the fair-return formula. The history of the District of Columbia Rent Commission furnishes a better example, but while it is apparently true that proceedings before that body were long-drawn-out,[135] it is hyberbole to say that the whole system of administration * * * bogged down. Studies of the New South Wales and New Zealand fair-rents laws report no criticism of the procedure on the ground of delay.[136] Adequate statutory standards are, of course, a valuable aid to the courts or agencies administering the law, although they have frequently not been provided.

THE DISCRETIONARY METHOD

The various statutes and regulations which have been grouped under this head do not lend themselves to analytic comparison; about all that can be done is to quote or paraphrase the legislation itself, and for this reason only a representative number of examples will be given.[137] The characteristic of the discretionary method is that the fixing of a fair rent is delegated to a board, officer, or court; the administering agency is directed to consider various listed factors, but no formula for computation of the fair rent is laid down, and the concept of reasonableness is not that of a fair return to the landlord but a more vague and abstract one.

One of the most elaborate provisions is that found in the Australian landlord and tenant regulations. The original fair rent regulations, promulgated in 1939, provided merely that the fair rent boards should determine the fair rent without giving any definition of the term.[138] However, the landlord and tenant regulations, issued 2 years later, set out a detailed list of factors which the boards were to have regard to. In its latest form, this list reads as follows: [139]

"(a) The capital value of the premises at the prescribed date, or, if the premises were not in existence on that date, on the date on which the erection of the premises was completed;

"(b) The annual rates and insurance premiums paid in respect of the premises;

"(c) The estimated annual cost of repairs, maintenance, and renewals of the premises and fixtures thereon;

"(d) The estimated amount of annual depreciation in the value of the premises and the estimated time per annum during which the premises may be vacant;

---

[128] *Application of Flushingside Realty & Construction Co.*, supra note 105, at p. 134.

In *Gulf Oil Corp.* v. *Paino* (115 N. Y. L. J. 1525 (1945)) an official referee fixed the fair rent for a gasoline station at an amount less than the landlord paid its own lessor. The referee followed the unusual procedure of basing the reasonable rent on the amount of profit the subtenants were making from their use of the property. The referee's report was confirmed without opinion, but after notice of appeal was served the tenants vacated the premises and the appeal was dropped. (Information from Samuel H. Borenkind, Esq., counsel for the landlord.)

[129] *WMCA, Inc.* v. *Blockfront Realty Corp.* (67 N. Y. S. (2d) 867 (Sup. Ct. 1946), affirmed 272 App. Div. 800, 71 N. Y. S. (2d) 895 (1947)); see also *44 West 14th St. Co., Inc.* v. *Chanlan Corp.* (73 N. Y. S. (2d) 95 (Sup. Ct. 1947)). Contra: *Gasoff Realty Corp.* v. *Serval Food Exchange, Inc.* (71 N. Y. S. (2d) 58 (Muni. Ct. 1947)).

[130] See OPA, First Quarterly Report (1942), p. 52, commenting on the hearings preceding the enactment of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act: "The Office of Price Administration, through its experience with voluntary rent control in cooperation with Fair Rent Committees, was convinced that such [fair return] methods would be unworkable, particularly in emergency legislation which demanded expeditious action as a first essential of fair administration. Any formula based on fair or reasonable return on investment ran the risk of long drawn-out proceedings, which might be appropriate for certain types of rate fixing but were definitely not well-suited for the establishment of equitable maximum rents for the thousands of rental dwellings in the District of Columbia."

[131] Memorandum on H. R. 3203, prepared May 2, 1947, 93 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Appendix (May 9, 1947), pp. A2209, A2210. As of May 4, 1947, OPA was terminated and its rent-control functions transferred to the Office of the Housing Expediter. Ex. O. 9841, 12 Fed. Reg. 2645 (1947).

For similar statements see OPACS, Fair Rent Committee Bulletin No. 2 (1941) ("If the [fair rent] committee is to function successfully and to cover a substantial number of cases, it is not practicable to enter into the elaborate analysis involved in any judgment of return on original investment."); OPA, Fair Rent Bulletin No. 1 (1941), pp. 3, 6, reporting testimony of District of Columbia Commissioner Guy Mason (a member of the 1920-25 District of Columbia Rent Commission) at hearings on District of Columbia emergency rent bill: *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra note 37, discussing the New York experience; Linowitz, State Rent Control After Two World Wars (1947) 19 N. Y. State Bar Assn. Bull. 10.

[132] See remarks of Representative SPENCE, supra, note 15. In *Wilson* v. *Brown*, supra, note 9, the Emergency Court of Appeals, after quoting at length from the OPA opinion in *In the Matter of 900 Michigan Avenue North Corp.*, supra, note 37, stated that " We could not improve on this statement which, we think, amply demonstrates a rational basis for the judgment of Congress that to make the wartime regulation of rents effective it was necessary to authorize the Administrator to establish rents which are 'generally fair and equitable' instead of requiring him to make individual adjustments so as to assure to each landlord a fair return on the fair market value of his property." 137 F. (2d) at p. 354.

[133] This is the only legislation referred to by OPA, see notes 130, 131, supra. On the Massachusetts experience, however, see Report of the Special Commission on the Necessaries of Life, Massachusetts House Document 1210 (1925).

[134] See Report of the Commission on Housing and Regional Planning, New York Legislative Document (1925) No. 91, pp. 19, 27.

[135] See testimony of Commissioner Mason, supra, note 131.

[136] Interstate Commission of Australia, Prices Investigation, Report No. 12 (1919), p. 15; Evatt, A "Fair Rent" Experiment in New South Wales (1920), 2 J. of Comp. Legis. and Int. Law (3d series), 10; Jelbart, op. cit., supra, note 56; Heine, The Fair Rents Legislation (New Zealand, 1936).

[137] For other examples see Northern Ireland, (Pub. Gen. Acts of 1943, c. 9 (Rents Tribunal determines whether rent is fair and reasonable, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the poor-law valuation, the rent which the landlord pays anyone else on the house, the cost of renovations and repairs, etc.); Mauritius, No. 52 of 1920, supra, note 36, sec. 9; Government Notice No. 167 of 1939, supra, note 36, Reg. 11 (1) (committee is guided by the rent on a given date, the state of repair, increases in taxes, cost of improvements, increased cost of repairs and of living, locality of the property, any benefit derived directly or indirectly from the tenant's occupancy, etc.); Hong Kong, ordinances of 1939, No. 44, sec. 4 (court can decide if any proposed increase is fair and reasonable; assessor's certificate of what he considers to be fair and reasonable is prima facie evidence); Kenya, ordinances of 1940, No. 12, sec. 2 (iii) (where "frozen" rent would yield landlord an uneconomic return, board can determine rent at such figure as it considers reasonable in all the circumstances of the case); Straits Settlements, ordinances of 1921, No. 3, sec. 9; No. 35 of 1939, Laws of Straits Settlements (1940 Supp.) 650, sec. 7 (no standards).) See also note 25, supra.

[138] National security (fair rents) regulations, statutory rules, 1939, No. 104, reg. 6. The Tasmanian Increase of Rent (war restrictions) Act, 1939 (3 and 4 Geo. VI, No. 39, was similar. See also western Australia, Increase of Rent (war restrictions) Act, 1939, 3 and 4 Geo. VI, No. 45, sec. 6).

[139] National Security (landlord and tenant) Regulations (Stat. Rules 1945, No. 97, Reg. 19 (1), superseding Stat. Rules 1941, No. 275, Reg. 9 (8) as amended.

"(e) The rents of comparable premises in the locality of the premises the subject of the application;

"(f) The rate of interest charged upon overdrafts by the Commonwealth Bank of Australia;

"(g) Any services provided by the lessor or lessee in connection with the lease;

"(h) Any obligation on the part of the lessee to effect any improvements, alterations, or repairs to the premises at his own expense;[140]

"(i) The justice and merits of the case and the circumstances and conduct of the parties; and

"(j) Any hardship which would be caused to the lessor or lessee or any other person by the making of an order increasing or reducing the rent of the premises including (but without limiting the generality of the word 'hardships') any loss which might be imposed upon the lessor by an order fixing the rent of the premises at an amount less than the lessor's liability under a mortgage of, or contract of sale in respect of, the premises, or under a hire purchase agreement or contract of sale in respect of any goods leased with the premises." [141]

Under the South Australia Act of 1942, the Housing Trust or the court fixes the fair and equitable rent, having regard to the accommodation provided, the state of repair and general condition of the house; the neighborhood; if the lease relates to a part, the rent of the whole, if any, and any right of the tenant to use other parts of the house or fittings therein; the value, condition, and suitability of any furniture the use of which is included in the lease; if the tenant is to pay the landlord for electricity, gas, water, fuel, etc., the reasonable value thereof; and any amount which the lease requires the tenant to spend for repairs, renovation, or improvement. If because of the tenant's dirty, harmful, or careless habits, greater than the usual expenditure on repair or renovation will be necessary, that can also be considered.[142]

The South African legislation has combined the fair return and the discretionary methods. The first act provided for the fixing by the rent board of a reasonable rent, defined as the rent which the board found under all the circumstances and conditions of the particular case to be reasonable, regard being had to the rent payable immediately prior to July 1, 1914, in respect of the same or similar dwellings, the actual amount of the increase or decrease in taxes on the dwelling and land since that date, any improvements or additions since that date, the increase in cost of repairs not to exceed 10 percent of the rent, and any rent payable by a sublessee to the lessee. The act contained a proviso that as to a building constructed since July 1, 1914, the rent was not unreasonable if it allowed a specified return to the landlord.[143] In the 1940 amendment, the section was recast to provide that the board should consider collection charges, costs of maintenance, repair, replacements, and insurance, and depreciation not exceeding 2 percent of the cost of the building annually, but that as to any building the rent should not be considered unreasonable if it gave a specified return to the landlord.[144] In the 1942 act, it is provided simply that reasonable rent shall mean the rent which the board finds in all the circumstances of the particular case to be reasonable. The rent is not reasonable if it gives the landlord more than a specified return.[145]

The New Zealand Act of 1936 provides that in fixing the fair rent, the magistrate shall have regard to the relative circumstances of the landlord and the tenant, and to all other relevant matters.[146] Actually, however, the magistrates have usually allowed 5 percent on the capital value.[147]

The British Furnished Houses (Rent Control) Act, 1946, and its Scottish predecessor provide merely that the tribunal shall approve the existing rent or reduce it to such sum as they may, in all the circumstances, think reasonable, or increase it in certain circumstances.[148] The acts do not indicate what factors are to be considered by the tribunal, except for a specific provision in the British act as to increases since September 3, 1939, in the cost of providing services. The interdepartmental committee whose report preceded the passage of the act, however, had the following to say: [149]

"The function of the rent tribunals should be to decide applications for an increase or reduction of the registered rent in respect of any tenancy or subtenancy furnished or unfurnished to which the act applies. Upon such applications they should determine what is a fair rent for the tenancy or subtenancy having regard to all the circumstances of the case, including the situation of the premises, the accommodation, amenities, furniture, or services to which the tenant is entitled, the expenditure necessarily entailed on the parties on the assumption that they are fulfilling their respective obligations under the tenancy agreement as regards repair or any other matters and the general level of rents of comparable houses in the district which are kept in good repair. In the case of a subtenancy, the tribunal should have regard to the rent payable by the sublessor, and the amount of accommodation comprised in the subtenancy, and take into account any additional wear and tear due to the subletting. In view of the recommendation we make in paragraph 84 for the reduction of rent on the issue of a certificate of disrepair, the tribunal should determine the rent on the assumption that the house is in good repair. Any deduction the tenant is thereafter entitled to make on obtaining a certificate will be made from the registered rent as defined in paragraph 61.

"The tribunal will have to take into consideration the rent charged for any uncontrolled premises which the tenant may be required to take in conjunction with the controlled premises. We mention this point because it has been suggested to us that landlords sometimes seek to evade the rent restriction acts by compelling would-be tenants to take a tenancy of uncontrolled premises, such as a garage, as a condition of letting them a controlled house and charging an excessive rent for the uncontrolled premises. Tribunals can defeat this device by reducing the rent for the controlled premises so as to insure that the tenant is only required to pay a fair rent for the whole of the premises let to him."

Examples of the discretionary method may also be found in European and Latin-American legislation.[150] In general, most weight is given to the location, construction, and condition of the accommodation.[151]

EFFECT OF HISTORICAL RENTS

In order to give some point of departure and to deter inordinate increases it may be well to provide that rents on some previous date should be considered prima facie reasonable, thus putting the burden on the landlord to justify a higher rent. If some increase is regarded as justifiable in every case, this can be handled by providing that an increase in excess of a given percentage shall be regarded as unreasonable.

The original New York law of 1920 (ch. 136) provided that—

"Where it appears that the rent has been increased more than 25 percent over the rent as it existed 1 year prior to the time of the agreement under which the rent is sought to be recovered, such agreement shall be presumptively unjust, unreasonable, and oppressive."

This provision was generally misconceived as authorizing any landlord to increase his rents by 25 percent.[152] Six months later the legislature deleted the words "more than 25 percent," so that the landlord had to justify any increase if the tenant resisted it.[153] The Massachusetts law of 1920, however, contained the same 25-percent provision.[154] The New Jersey law of 1924 permitted the tenant to raise the defense of unreasonableness in an action for rent or for the recovery of possession where the rent had been increased over that charged a year before; the rent was considered prima facie unreasonable and oppressive if it had been increased 35 percent or more within 3 years prior to institution of action.[155] A Virgin Islands ordinance of 1941 permits a tenant to defend an action for possession by showing that the rent is unjust and unreasonable; rents on April 1, 1941, are considered reasonable and an increase up to 15

[140] Subdivision (h) did not appear in the original Landlord and Tenant Regulations, supra note 139.

[141] Subdivisions (i) and (j) were added to the original regulations as Reg. 9 (8) (aa) and (ab) by Stat. Rules 1942, No. 412.

[142] Acts of 1942, No. 33, sec. 21. See also Housing Improvement Act, 1940, Acts of 1940, No. 56, sec. 54, under which the Housing Authority can fix rents for substandard housing, considering the state of repair and general condition of the house and the accommodation provided in it. Uniform rents for houses of similar condition and accommodations in the same locality are to be fixed so far as possible.

[143] Act No. 13 of 1920, supra note 41, sec. 14.

[144] Act No. 26 of 1940, supra note 34.

[145] Act No. 33 of 1942, supra note 42, sec. 1.

[146] Fair Rents Act of 1936, supra note 90, sec. 7, see infra, note 160. Heine, op. cit. supra note 136, at p. 21 says that the court should consider the rate of mortgage interest payable by the landlord, the size of the landlord's equity, the state of repair, whether the tenant has sublet, subsidiary use for business purposes, etc.

[147] Information from New Zealand Legation.

[148] Furnished Houses (Rent Control) Act, 1946, 9 and 10 Geo. VI, ch. 34, sec. 2 (3), (4); Rent of Furnished Houses Control (Scotland) Act 1943, 6 and 7 Geo. VI, ch. 44, sec. 2 (2).

[149] Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Rent Control, Cmd. 6621 (1945) pp. 18, 19. See Horton-Smith, the Furnished Houses (Rent Control) Act 1946, a 6 Months' Retrospect (1947), p. 26, on "neighborhood" as a factor to be considered.

[150] Italy, Royal Decree Law No. 331 (1921), Leggi e Decreti 860, Art. 8; Royal Decree Law No. 1355 (1922), 5 Leggi e Decreti 4188, Art. 7 (a); Royal Decree No. 8 (1923), 1 Leggi e Decreti 25, art. 8; Luxembourg, Arrêté of June 3, 1919 (1917–1920) Pasinomie Luxembourgeoise 370, art. 3; Denmark, Law No. 54 of 1937 (1937), Lovtidende for Kongeriget Danmark 118; Ecuador, Ley de Inquilinato, 1 Registro Oficial 2361 (1945), art. 16; Venezuela, Resolution No. 66 of Junta Nacional Reguladora de Precios, Gaceta Oficial 16 (1943), art. 3; Resolution No. 28 of Comision Nacional de Abastecimiento, Gaceta Oficial 145.718 (1945), art. 9.

[151] See particularly Monaco, Law No. 437, Journal de Monaco, April 25, 1946, p. 1, art. 5 (commission is to consider age of house, its general comfort, its situation (quarter, orientation, view), the servitudes and neighboring structures affecting the conditions of occupation, the interior and exterior entretien (facades, common parts, stairs, cellars, etc.), and elements peculiar to the apartment (size, height from the ground, interior arrangement).

[152] Lauer and House, The Tenant and His Landlord (1921), pp. 185, 307.

[153] New York Laws of 1920, ch. 944, sec. 3.

[154] Massachusetts Laws of 1920, c. 578.

[155] New Jersey Laws of 1924, ch. 69, sec. 2.

percent "to cover improvements" is also considered just and reasonable.[156]

The New South Wales Fair Rent Act of 1915 provided that the "fair rent" should not exceed the rent on January 1, 1915, unless circumstances rendered an increase equitable.[157] This deterrent feature of the act was said to represent its "most valuable achievement." [158] The Queensland Act of 1920 contained a similar proviso,[159] as do the New Zealand acts of 1936–42.[160] The more recent Australian legislation, however, omits any such provision.[161]

Logically, it would seem that historical rents would be more important under the discretionary method of fixing fair rents under the fair-return method. In fact, however, express reference to historical rents is rare. The South African Act of 1920 provided that the rent board should consider rents paid immediately prior to July 1, 1914, with respect to the same or similar dwellings.[162] The Ecuador law of 1945 (which never went into effect) provided that rents fixed by the Junta de Inquilinato should not exceed rents charged on December 31, 1944, in the absence of express resolution to that effect by the Junta.[163]

COMBINATION OF FAIR-RENT PROVISIONS WITH RENT FREEZE

Under the New York rent laws of the 1920's, and similar laws adopted in other States, limitation of rents to fair levels was dependent upon affirmative action by the tenant. As the court said in an early case:

"A landlord still has the right, if he finds a tenant willing to pay him the rent demanded, to accept the rent which such tenant is willing to pay." [164]

If a tenant wished to obtain an adjudication that the rent demanded was oppressive or unreasonable, he had to refuse to pay it and thus invite legal proceedings. In such an action there was a presumption that the rent on a given date was reasonable, so that any increase had to be justified;[165] but if the tenant was willing to pay the increase, the landlord was free to impose it. Similarly, several of the Australian laws,[166] as well as the South African Act of 1920 and the New Zealand Act of 1936, while permitting the tenant to apply to a court or fair rent control board for determination of a fair rent, nevertheless put no restriction on rents where such a proceeding had not been instituted.

It seems obvious that under such a system there must be many tenants who pay unreasonable rents rather than bring their landlords to bar; and it might well be contended that the burden should be on the landlord to obtain official sanction for any increase, at least if the housing shortage is acute. And most of the more recent legislation takes this point of view, providing that rents shall be frozen at the amount charged on a given date unless and until an increase is duly authorized. This is true, for example, of the Australian regulations,[167] the South African legislation,[168] and the New Zealand Economic Stabilization Regulations.[169] The New York Commercial and Business Rents Acts freeze rents at 115 percent of the rent on the base date; if the landlord contends that a higher rent is "reasonable," he must generally initiate court or arbitration proceedings.[170] The Virginia Emergency Fair Rent Act of 1947 freezes rents to those charged at the time an emergency is declared, until the fair and reasonable rent is determined.[171]

PROPRIETY OF CONSIDERING PERSONAL SITUATIONS OF THE PARTIES

Under the "fair return" method of determining fair rents, the personal situation of the landlord or the tenant is of no moment; what is a fair return is a matter of law and one landlord should not get more than another because he needs more, nor should the landlord be forced to take a smaller return because the tenant is in financial straits. The same considerations of course do not apply to the discretionary method, but except for laws in Australia, New Zealand, and Italy, no instances have been found where the personal circumstances of the parties is expressly mentioned as a factor to be considered.

The New Zealand act provides specifically that the magistrate in fixing fair rents is to consider, inter alia, the relative circumstances of the landlord and of the tenant.[172] For this reason the determination does not run with the house, but terminates if the tenant moves out.[173] The extent to which the magistrates have given effect to this provision is not known to the writer, but it is reported that the courts usually fix the rent on the basis of a 5-percent return on capital value.[174] Under the New Zealand Economic Stabilization Regulations, the relative circumstances of the parties was expressly not to be considered.[175]

The Australian regulations, quoted above,[176] mention "the justice and merits of the case and the circumstances and conduct of the parties," as well as possible hardship to the lessor, lessee, or any other person from an increase or reduction in rent, as factors to be considered. Paradoxically, however, the determination of a fair rent runs with the property.[177]

An Italian law of 1923 provided that rents should be fixed at a figure which would not aggravate disproportionately the tenant's economic position, especially if he was a state employee or pensioner with a modest income.[178]

During the committee hearings and debates on the British furnished houses (rent control) bill,[179] several members of Parliament expressed the view that "a reasonable rent ought to be divorced entirely from any consideration of the personal circumstances of the parties." [180] As Mr. Willink, the member from Crydon, said:

"Tribunals would get into the most hopeless mess and confusion in dealing with registered furnished rents if any encouragement were given to the view that the proper rent to one person would be so much and to another a different sum. A reasonable rent must be quite objective." [181]

Similar views were expressed by Lord Llewellin.[182] The member from Coatbridge, Mrs. Mann, on the other hand, took a different view. She pointed out that where people live in the same house, clashes of temperament often arise, and frequently that "where services have been agreed upon, the dominating personality of one woman makes the other woman perform all the services in order to keep the peace."

She suggested that "in cases where there is great difficulty by reason of the clash of temperaments" or "if the lessee [sic, lessor] is having a great deal to put up with she should have a profit of 25 percent." [183]

The fair rent committees, set up before passage of the Emergency Price Control Act, were advised by the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply (as it then was) not to consider the tenant's income or any change therein since the maximum rent date.[184]

CONCLUSION

The two types of fair-rent systems discussed above have the same laudable objective: the fixing of rents which will be fair, both as to landlords and as to tenants. They vary widely, however, in the means employed to achieve that end. Which is the better method would not be easy to say, but the fair-return system is certainly more in line with prevailing economic and legal concepts in the United States. It is not an easy system to administer, and involves many problems; but it has the merit of positing definite bases on which the calculation of fair rents is to be made, whereas the discretionary method presupposes a grant of broad and ill-defined powers to the agency administering the law, and puts fewer checks on arbitrary action.

American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article on the American merchant marine, written by Mr. Frazer A. Bailey, president

[156] Municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, Ordinance of June 13, 1941.

[157] Supra note 47, sec. 9 (2). This provision was deleted by the 1928 act, supra note 48. As to the 1939 act, see infra, note 167.

[158] Interstate Commission of Australia, Prices Investigation, Report No. 12 (1919), p. 15.

[159] Fair Rents Act of 1920, supra note 34, sec. 8.

[160] Fair Rents Act of 1936, supra note 90, sec. 7, as amended by 3 Geo. VI, No. 43 (1939), and 6 Geo. VI, No. 19 (1942).

[161] See p. 138, infra.

[162] Act of 1920, supra note 41, sec. 14. This provision was deleted by Act No. 26 of 1940, supra note 34.

[163] Ley de Inquilinato, supra note 150, art. 16.

[164] *Elvira Realty Corp.* v. *Bracegirdle*, supra note 117.

[165] See p. 135 supra.

[166] New South Wales, Fair Rents Act of 1915, supra note 47; Queensland, Fair Rents Act of 1920, supra note 34; Victoria, Fair Rents Act of 1938, supra note 53.

[167] National Security (Landlord and Tenant) Regulations, supra note 139, Reg. 15. Earlier regulations were substantially identical. Similar provisions are found in the New South Wales Act of 1939, supra note 48; the South Australia Act of 1942, supra note 41, and the Tasmania Act of 1939, supra note 138.

[168] Act No. 33 of 1942, supra, note 42, sec. 16.

[169] N. Z. Economic Stabilization Regulations 1942, Stat. Rules 1942, p. 815, Serial No. 1942/335, sec. 14(2).

[170] Supra note 31.

[171] Va. Acts Extra Sess. 1947, ch. 68, sec. 9 (a).

[172] Fair Rents Act of 1936, supra note 90, sec. 7.

[173] Id., sec. 8 (1). As to whether a determination under the New York Business and Commercial Rent Laws runs with the property, see 118 N. Y. L. J. 706 and 880 (1947).

[174] Information from New Zealand Legation, See also Heine, op. cit. supra note 136.

[175] New Zealand Economic Stabilization Regulations, supra note 169, Reg. 16 (1).

[176] See text accompanying note 139, supra.

[177] Regulations, supra note 139, Reg. 31 (1).

[178] Royal Decree, No. 8, supra note 150.

[179] Supra note 148.

[180] Parliamentary debates, House of Commons, Standing Committee C, December 6, 1945, column 30 (unrevised). Per Mr. Willink.

[181] Ibid.

[182] 139 H. L. Deb., 5th series 1920, column 152 (Feb. 5, 1946).

[183] Standing Committee C, supra note 180, December 13, 1945, column 93. See also Mr. Willink's remarks and Mrs. Mann's rejoinder, columns 98–99.

[184] O. P. A. C. S., Fair Rent Committee Bulletin No. 2 (mimeo., 1941), p. 2.

of the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., entitled "Sound, Continuous United States Shipping Policy Needed." This is an article which appeared in the March 1949 issue of Lykes Fleet Flashes, published by Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., Inc., of New Orleans, La.

The article is as follows:

SOUND, CONTINUOUS UNITED STATES SHIPPING POLICY NEEDED—HISTORY OF OUR MERCHANT FLEET HAS BEEN A STORY MARKED BY INITIAL SUCCESS AND A SUBSEQUENT DECLINE

(By Frazer A. Bailey, president, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.)

Thirteen years before the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, a little ship, the *Virginia*, was launched by George Popham's colonists in Maine near the mouth of the Kennebec River. The launching of that 30-ton pinnace and her daring trans-Atlantic voyages in 1607–8 marked the birth of the American merchant marine.

If since 1607 our national shipping policies had been sound and continuous, this article would be just another American success story. Unfortunately the history of our merchant marine has been quite different—a story of initial success, subsequent decline, and future uncertainty.

By the time of the Revolution and the War of 1812 the American merchant fleet had grown to a stature demanding world respect. It gave us such brilliant naval leaders as John Paul Jones, John Barry, and Stephen Decatur. In 1807 it carried 92 percent of our foreign commerce. Its tonnage ranked second to that of Britain. By the 1850's the United States clipper ships were the envy of the world. They broke record after record and carried 70 percent of our exports, 65 percent of our imports, and a substantial part of the commerce of other nations.

But following the 1850's public apathy, economic opportunities in other fields, and foreign competition forced the American merchant marine into a rapid decline. Forgotten were the admonishments of Washington, Jefferson, and Madison: "To have vessels employed in commerce * * * to lay the foundation of a navy." Efforts of Presidents Grant, McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt to hold our place on the seas were without avail. In 1901 we carried only 8.2 percent of our foreign commerce.

World War I found us with a wholly inadequate merchant fleet and forced us into a frantic $3,000,000,000 emergency program of construction, most of which was completed after the end of the war. We were reduced to the ignominy of having Japan build desperately needed ships for us. This new fleet provided a stimulus to our shipping for a short time, but by the late thirties we were again in the rut, carrying less than 30 percent of our foreign commerce.

With the outbreak of World War II we were forced for the second time in a generation into a frenzied and extremely expensive construction program to provide the required shipping to support our military. This time we built some 5,500 ships of 55,000,000 deadweight tons with over $15,000,000,000 of taxpayers' money.

Today, about 3 years after VJ-day, we are carrying only 39.5 percent of ou exports. Our position in foreign commerce is deteriorating. We are rapidly trending toward our prewar participation in the transportation of our foreign trade.

Even with the cogent and expensive lessons of history fresh in our memory, the United States today does not occupy a position in world shipping commensurate with its importance as a leader in world affairs. The burden of the military, economic and political security of all freedom-loving peoples has fallen primarily upon us. History and common sense establish inescapably that our merchant fleet must play a major role in shouldering that burden. No nation which has failed to maintain its flag upon the seas has long retained a position of prosperity and of leadership in world affairs.

To meet our responsibilities, we must have a merchant fleet in service capable of meeting our immediate shipping requirement at the impact of an emergency. It must be one which will not desert us leaving our foreign commerce piled high upon our wharves and terminals, as foreign ships have in the past when opportunities for more lucrative employment were suddenly offered elsewhere.

Our military leaders have stated that we must have a minimum active impact fleet of some 1,300 privately owned vessels capable of absorbing the work load incident to the outbreak of an emergency, and that we must also have a national defense reserve fleet properly conditioned and husbanded, for prompt commissioning to transport military supplies and to replace casualties until shipyards can begin turning out ships in volume. Our so-called moth ball reserve fleet is vitally essential. It is supplemental and auxiliary to the active impact fleet. It fills voids which would otherwise exist in expanding military requirements and war casualty replacements.

If we lack these active and reserve fleets at the outbreak of war, how will we keep our war industries supplied, provide for our essential civilian requirements, and furnish sea transport for men and materials to our armed forces? Many fail to appreciate the magnitude of the supply problem involved in war. Even with 5,500 ships produced by our shipyards for World War II, Admiral Nimitz said that we never had sufficient shipping.

No thoughtful person would minimize the great value of aircraft, both in combat and supply. But aircraft are not a substitute means of transportation for the great volume of heavy logistical materials which must be transported overseas in war. Even considering differences in speed and turn-around, an average merchant ship can, in a given period, carry overseas the equivalent capacity of some 175 large cargo planes. On this basis, 5,500 ships are the equivalent of almost 1,000,000 large cargo planes.

Aircraft have their place in an integrated, over-all transportation system as emergency suppliers at high cost of very limited quantities of highly essential supplies. But they can only skim the cream of military transportation requirements. The basic large tonnages of material for base depots can only move in ships.

The problems of maintaining a merchant marine adequate for national security, and the responsibilities of world leadership are not easy of solution. Our American standards of wages, crew subsistence, working conditions for seamen, and safety at sea impose substantially higher cos on American operators. Without compensating Government aid there does not exist realistic competitive opportunity for American ships in the foreign trades.

Again we continually encounter misguided persons who would have us abandon our merchant fleet in favor of ships of other nations because they can more cheaply operate with underpaid foreign crews or because they need credits to bolster their sagging foreign exchange. Recently there was a serious effort to turn over to the Marshall-plan nations a large part of our national defense reserve fleet. Luckily this effort was killed by wise congressional action.

The United States is seriously advocating the rebuilding of the Japanese merchant fleet to over four million gross tons—a fleet as large as they possessed in the early thirties when they carried 65 percent of their overseas commerce, 92 percent of their nearseas commerce and all of their domestic commerce in their own ships. Fortunately this is being opposed by other members of the Far Eastern Commission. It is often forgotten that the productive capacity of Germany and Japan has been largely destroyed along with their shipping and that their import and export requirements could not in the foreseeable future support such a fleet upon a basis of reasonable participation.

Fortunately public interest is becoming aroused and farsighted vigilance is being exercised. Congress, the Government agencies concerned, national organizations like the American Legion, the Propeller Club of the United States, chambers of commerce, labor groups and the general public are assuming a more interested attitude toward American shipping. This can be expected to accelerate even more during 1949.

Another difficulty with which American shipping is faced is the increasing prevalence of discriminatory practices against our shipping by foreign governments, particularly in South America. Laws, decrees, and regulations have been passed designed to require carriage in their own ships of a major part of their international commerce. We are not afforded in their ports the treatment which we give to their ships in ours. Free and fair competition for this traffic is not permitted. Diplomatic efforts by our State Department have proven fruitless. The Maritime Commission has agreed to investigate these malpractices and report their findings to the President. Until we are prepared to enforce a firm policy for equal treatment, our ships in these trades will continue to suffer. It now appears that congressional action as a basis of such a policy will be necessary. Fortunately, the industry has found a sympathetic attitude in certain congressional quarters.

While we have made a fair showing in restoring our shipping to foreign routes, we have done less well in our domestic trades, where our fleet is about one-quarter of its prewar size and capacity. These ships were valuable for national defense purposes, since, being always in home waters and readily available, they were among the first ships utilized by our military.

Operating costs, and more particularly cargo handling and fuel expenses, have risen sharply; competitive rail rates have been deliberately lowered to noncompensatory levels to take competitive business. Expenses have out-distanced revenues. There is small encouragement to a private owner in these trades even upon the basis of getting a new dollar for an old one. The industry is struggling, with no success so far, to create an economic atmosphere in which the domestic trades may successfully operate.

In the face of these circumstances, it is high time for us to set a definite goal for our merchant fleet. We should have a merchant fleet of modern combination and cargo vessels manned by American officers and seamen, transporting (a) all of our domestic coastwise and intercoastal and territorial commerce; (b) at least one-half of our imports and exports; and (c) backed by a fleet of modern passenger vessels operating between the United States and all important world areas.

It is not an overambitious goal nor can we be accused of selfishness in seeking it. Since the war we have generously sold some 1,132 large vessels to foreign nations on terms as favorable as those offered our own citizens. We will still have a privately owned fleet smaller than Great Britain. It will not represent encroachment upon the legitimate business of other countries.

In the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress took a long step toward creating realistic economic conditions for American shipping and toward reducing the competitive disadvantages inherent in the disparity between cheap foreign labor costs and our own higher labor standards. To permit

our ships to compete in the foreign trades and to provide dependable American-flag services for American importers and exporters, it authorized the payment of a subsidy, plainly labeled as such, to equalize these expenses while providing a regular scheduled service over trade routes deemed by the Maritime Commission essential to the foreign commerce of the United States.

This ship-operating subsidy has not proved to be expensive. It amounted to but $20,000,000 for the first 10 years of the act. Senate Document 13, Eightieth Congress, shows that total Federal subsidies payments to all business and farmers in the years 1934–46 amounted to over $13,600,000,000. Of this, the ship-operating subsidy has amounted to only six-tenths of 1 percent. It is far less than price support and subsidies of other business activities.

The Merchant Marine Act also endeavored to maintain our shipbuilding capacity for defense, and to provide ships for our foreign-trade companies at the same capital investment required by competing foreign owners by authorizing a construction subsidy in appropriate cases to cover the difference between American and foreign shipbuilding costs. To induce the construction of vessels especially adaptable to defense requirements it also authorized Government payment for national defense features incorporated in the ships at Navy request.

Certain extensions and modifications of this law now appear to be in the public interest. All cost disparities, not merely selected ones, should be removed. The construction of passenger vessels adaptable for troop transports must be encouraged. Contracts have recently been placed for the construction of five fine passenger and combination passenger and cargo vessels, but these contracts are only the beginning. We are still definitely on the deficit side and we must have progressive legislation to encourage further construction.

One opportunity to aid the intercoastal trades appears in an equitable adjustment of transit tolls at Panama. The Panama Canal was built for the dual purpose of serving our national defense and the commerce of the world. Without adequate means of prompt interocean transfer of our fighting ships, we would require a complete two-ocean Navy. However, no part of its cost of operation has been charged to national defense, but rather a charge has been made of 3 percent interest on the funds advanced by our Government for its construction and improvement. Omitting interest, tolls paid by commercial shipping over the life of the Panama Canal plus tolls forgiven on Government vessels which transit the Canal toll-free have been sufficient to pay not only all operating and maintenance expenses of the Canal but also all of its construction cost plus a profit of $2,000,000.

It is the contention of the shipping industry that the waiving of the interest charge is the minimum contribution which can equitably be made by the Government for national defense. President Truman recently suspended a proposed increase in Canal tolls predicated on the fact that he anticipated Congress would shortly examine into and recommend a fair and equitable tariff of tolls for the future.

These are the problems upon whose solution will depend the maritime power and prestige of the United States, and even upon the ability of the Nation to help in maintaining peace in the world.

It is indeed fortunate as the Eighty-first Congress meets in Washington that all segments of the maritime industry—the United States Maritime Commission, seafaring and shipbuilding labor, shipbuilders and shipowners, are aware of these problems and have a common desire and the will to work for their solution.

A Part of the Whittaker Chambers Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country were shocked at the story unearthed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities when Whittaker Chambers testified that former employees in the State Department had been transmitting confidential information from State Department files to the Russian Government. The climax to the story told by Mr. Chambers came when he led members of the Un-American Activities Committee to a pumpkin garden and from a pumpkin lifted microfilm which told the story about this espionage matter.

Mr. Speaker, the story told by Whittaker Chambers required a lot of courage, and while we do not condone his activity as a participant in this underground movement, yet we must give him credit for revealing the information which is now public property. At this time we owe him a debt of gratitude rather than a vote of censure.

Mr. Speaker, Isaac Don Levine in the January issue of Plain Talk has written an article relating to this matter which is important and should become part of the record in this case. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including it herewith:

If Whittaker Chambers had chosen to keep silent, the shocking truth about the Soviet espionage ring in the State Department would still remain a deep secret from the American people.

This is the key to the prime issue raised by the Chambers revelations. If in 1938, when there was no Soviet-American rivalry, Moscow's underground machine was pumping out of the offices of the Secretary of State highly confidential papers at the rate of some 30 a week, then what is the extent of Soviet espionage in Washington in 1948?

During these 10 years, the United States and the Soviet Union were partners in the war against Nazi Germany. We courted the rulers in the Kremlin, we cultivated certain ideological bonds with them, and surely that must have produced a large crop of ideological traitors.

How long will it take for us to be abreast of the new recruits in Moscow's underground network and its present-day operations, when we have hardly caught up with the disclosures of 1938? Must we wait until 1958 to get the evidence from the future emulator of Chambers?

If Whittaker Chambers had not commenced some 5 years ago to talk in journalistic circles about his amazing experiences as an underground Communist, our Government and our press would in all probability have maintained their attitude of indifference and disbelief toward any reports of widespread Soviet espionage.

If Whittaker Chambers had not volunteered his information in his appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities early last August—an appearance which came in consequence of his talking—the country would perhaps never have learned the detals of the sordid epic unfolded day after day in the daily press.

My own painful experiences in trying to break through with the truth since 1939 only serve to underscore the signal service rendered, of his own free will, to America and to humanity by Whittaker Chambers.

When I first found myself in possession of the appalling facts, I was sure that I could storm the citadels of political and journalistic power, and help smash the subterranean empire of treason in the Capital. It took me about 6 months, from September 1939 to March 1940, to spend myself in fruitless assaults upon the blindness or naiveté or apathy or irresponsibility or helplessness of those whom I approached with the Chambers story.

But as I look back to my first involvement in the affair (see Plain Talk, October 1948), I can recall 10 specific instances, over a period of 7 years, of my efforts to reveal the truth. I outlined the salient features of the story to 10 public figures. To only the first two did I disclose the name of Whittaker Chambers. These 10 were—

Marvin H. McIntyre, secretary to President Roosevelt. At the end of August 1939, after the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact, I called on Mr. McIntyre at the White House and asked him to arrange for a private audience with President Roosevelt for Whittaker Chambers, a former Soviet agent in Washington, who had some astounding information of the veracity of which I was utterly convinced. I indicated to Mr. McIntyre the nature of the disclosures in all its gravity. He referred me to Mr. Berle, then Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Intelligence.

Adolf A. Berle, Jr. At a private dinner in his home on September 2, to which I had brought Whittaker Chambers, Mr. Berle listened to Mr. Chambers' description of two underground Soviet rings operating in Washington. The startling information included names of many Federal officials who had supplied top-secret documents to Chambers for transmission to Moscow. Six of those named were State Department employees, including Alger Hiss, his brother, and one Wadleigh. It was Chambers' and my understanding that the information would be conveyed by Mr. Berle to the President and that Chambers would not be punished for his service.

Loy Henderson, then chief of the Russian section in the State Department and now United States Ambassador to India. To Mr. Henderson, a close friend, who had served in our Embassy in Moscow and who was deeply concerned over Soviet infiltration, I confided much of what had been divulged at Mr. Berle's home. I was worried lest important papers relating to our Russian policy, then in Mr. Henderson's jurisdiction, would find their way to the Kremlin. I took it for granted that Mr. Henderson would put the security officers of the State Department on the alert.

Adelaide Neall, lifetime assistant to the late George Horace Lorimer and then a senior editor on The Saturday Evening Post. In the course of several visits to Philadelphia, I kept Miss Neall in touch with the developments, expecting a national sensation as a result of Government action on Chambers' revelations. I had hoped to do a series of articles for the Post reviewing the story in all its frightening ramifications.

Senator Warren R. Austin, now United States chief representative at the United Nations. Having formed a close friendship with Senator Austin, of Vermont, on a tour of the Near East in 1936, I went to him in the early months of 1940 with a fairly comprehensive account of the Soviet underworld in Washington. It seemed to me then, and I made no secret of it, that the information on Communist espionage, if presented under his authoritative auspices to the American people, might justly earn for him the nomi-

nation of the Republican Party for the Presidency and enable him to clean house in Washington. Senator Austin did not react to my disclosures as I had hoped.

Martin Dies, then chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee. After virtually giving up hope of Executive action on the Chambers disclosures, I submitted to Martin Dies in a private conference in March 1940 sufficient facts to convince him of the need for an intensive probe. We agreed that it would take a staff of 12 ace investigators to secure the evidence on Communist espionage in Washington, an assignment for which the committee lacked the necessary funds. Shortly after our conference Chairman Dies issued a public statement through the Associated Press to the effect that he had uncovered a "lead" on far-flung Soviet secret-police operations in the United States and that he would hear testimony soon from "the head of the OGPU" in this country. The hearing was, of course, never held.

William C. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to Soviet Russia and to France. At a breakfast conference with Mr. Bullitt at his Anchorage Hotel apartment I related the main points of the Chambers-Krivitsky revelations. A confidant and favorite of President Roosevelt at that time, Mr. Bullitt, who had known me since 1918, was sufficiently stirred to indicate that he would take the matter to the White House at the first opportunity. I had informed him of my conversations with Mr. Berle and my conferences with Loy Henderson, who had served under Bullitt in Moscow.

Walter Winchell, columnist and frequent White House guest. A year and a half after my first efforts to bring into the open the Chambers story, in March, 1941, I called on Walter Winchell at the Roney Plaza Hotel in Miami. In the course of a long talk dealing with subversive activities, when he informed me of having President Roosevelt's ear, I acquainted Mr. Winchell with much of the information furnished by Chambers and told him that at least six Soviet agents were known to have operated within the State Department alone. Mr. Winchell, greatly shaken, indicated that he would take the matter to the highest quarters. In his broadcast of December 12 last he announced that he had carried the story to President Roosevelt.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey. In the early summer of 1944, a couple of weeks before the Republican convention, I was invited to a private luncheon with Governor Dewey in his apartment at the Roosevelt Hotel in New York City. I sketched for the Governor the underground Communist spider web in the Federal service, with special emphasis on the operations of the Soviet unit in the State Department as described by Chambers. I urged upon Dewey the vital need for informing the American people during the campaign of the shocking state of affairs inside Washington. Governor Dewey pledged vigorous action, if elected, in clearing out the nests of treason from official Washington.

Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life and Fortune. The late Raymond Leslie Buell, formerly the head of the Foreign Policy Association, arranged early in 1946 for my meeting Mr. Luce at lunch at the St. Regis Hotel. Without once mentioning or otherwise identifying his employee, Whittaker Chambers, I described to the powerful publisher the underground Soviet apparatus in the State Department which had been exposed to the authorities by a former Communist agent who was an editor of a national magazine. Mr. Luce obviously had no idea that the editor in question was on his own staff. It is only fair to add that my disclosure to Mr. Luce was intended merely as an illustration for his benefit of the vast scope of Soviet espionage in the United States.

If we are ever to get to the bottom of the traitorous and multicelled underworld planted within our free and carefree Government, we must recognize the patriotic motives which led Whittaker Chambers to make amends for his past sins by offering to his Government and his country incontrovertible proof of Soviet espionage.

It is not generally known that Mr. Chambers began to atone for his past long before his recent disclosures. He cooperated some 7 years ago with the Rapp-Coudert committee in New York in ferreting out subversive Communists among the teachers in our public schools. During the war he cooperated unreservedly with naval intelligence officers in their efforts to identify secret Communist agents in the armed services.

Above all, the American people should be grateful to Chambers for preserving the microfilms and the other documentary evidence of the deadly germs in the bloodstream of our Nation. Chambers could have destroyed all the evidence and been the better off for it. His possible error of judgment in not bringing forth the precious evidence earlier is inconsequential as compared with the enormity of the error committed by those who refused to heed his warnings.

Punishment on any technical ground or severe censure by the press of the course of action pursued by Whittaker Chambers would be punishing the American people by discouraging any further disclosures. The great challenge of the Chambers-Hiss affair is how to unearth and expose the entire subterranean labyrinth installed within America by Soviet technicians.

The Government of Canada knew how to meet this challenge. It rewarded the Soviet code clerk, Igor Gouzenko, who came forward with a batch of documents showing widespread Communist espionage, by conferring upon him Canadian citizenship and other emoluments.

If the Government of the United States recognized the service rendered by Whittaker Chambers to our national defense, it would encourage many an underground Soviet agent on the point of deserting the Communist fold to come out into the open. Only in this manner can we catch up with Stalin's secret brigade operating now in our midst, and keep pace with Moscow's operations in the cold war.

Cement Union Fears Price Ruling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the Supreme Court's decision in the so-called Cement case. My home town, Oglesby, Ill., is a city of 4,000 people, most of whom depend upon our two cement mills for a living. The pay rolls of the two Oglesby cement mills constitute the major part of the financial lifeblood of our community. No wonder I am deeply concerned over the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case.

Mr. William Schoenberg, general president of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, has made the clearest and most concise statement in connection with the Cement case that I have heard or read. It was carried in the January 1949 issue of the Machinists Monthly Journal, the official organ of the International Association of Machinists. Since this article explains the effects of the Court's decision better than I can, I include it as a part of my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

CEMENT UNION FEARS PRICE RULING

My interest in these hearings arises out of what we construe to be real dangers stemming from the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission in the Cement case, and threatening the welfare and future happiness of that group of citizens employed in the cement industry.

These dangers, of course, first threaten the industry, and because these workers and their labor union are an integral part of the cement industry they are deeply concerned about the impact of the ruling in the Cement case upon the industry.

Because of the present enormous demand for cement and the existing sellers' market, no serious ill-effects have yet been suffered by the industry in complying with the Federal Trade Commission's rulings, other than curtailment of scheduled expansion of certain production facilities and an unhealthy distortion of retail prices in some areas.

However, when every indication points to the outburst of a serious conflagration it is extremely unwise to await the actual envelopment by flames before notifying the fire department.

It is my desire to approach this vital subject matter in a logical manner and from the point of view of the workers employed in the cement-manufacturing industry.

My appearance here is in the capacity of general president of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor.

Approximately 80 percent of the workers in the cement industry are members of our organization, and we have well-established contractual relationship with practically every operating cement producer in the country.

WORKER'S FUTURE INVOLVED

At the outset, I wish to state that it has never been, and is not now, the policy of our organization at any time, in any shape, manner, or form, to interfere with the prerogatives of management to establish their marketing systems and determine their marketing areas so as to safeguard the best interests of the capital investors in the industry; the workers who invest their knowledge, experience, and intelligence in the producing of cement; and, finally, the general public, who are the purchasers and consumers of portland cement.

However, since the workers who are employed in these mills, quarries and plants are a very integral part of the industry itself, it becomes incumbent upon our international union to exert every reasonable and practical effort in order to bring about equitable relief from the impending ill effects created by the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission against one particular industry.

I am not concerned with trying to defend any collusion or conspiracy on the part of industry to fix prices or eliminate competition.

We wish it understood that our organization has at all times, as a group of law-abiding citizens of the United States, fully adhered to and complied with all the requirements of any and all laws, whether they were Federal, State, or municipal.

Nevertheless, in the Cement case we are convinced that the Federal Trade Commission's ruling outlawing "delivered prices" is beyond the intent of Congress, as expressed and defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is also our considered opinion that in this particular ruling the United States Supreme Court may not have had all the facts in the case, including the impact upon our

economy as will result, in due time, from enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission's contention.

THE PRICE SYSTEM IN CEMENT

Portland cement is an exceptionally heavy commodity and, therefore, is not generally shipped to markets too distant from production site.

Because of freight costs, cement is seldom shipped any farther than within a radius of approximately 600 to 700 miles, yet in the past portland cement was sold within the larger cities of the United States much at a uniform price.

As an illustration, in the city of Chicago it was immaterial whether the purchaser bought from the nearest portland cement producer (Universal Atlas Cement Co., at Buffington, Ind.) or from the Lehigh Portland Cement Co., the Dewey Portland Cement Co., or the Lone Star Cement Corporation, or others.

The distances between Chicago and the nearest manufacturing plants of the other companies mentioned range from 100 to 250 miles; nevertheless, the price of cement in Chicago, depending upon the type, was more or less the same.

Under the present ruling of the Federal Trade Commission, as we understand it, each of the above companies must use a f. o. b. mill price for marketing their product.

Thus, due to different freight costs (added to f. o. b. price) controlled by distance of each mill from Chicago, prices for the same highly standardized types of cement are quite unbalanced.

In normal times, this condition will simply result in a virtual monopoly of the Chicago market by the closer producers, for we cannot visualize any purchaser being willing to pay even 5 cents per barrel more in order to purchase from a particular producer.

Under the above conditions, as a matter of necessity, for a cement-producing company to remain in a competitive position they would be compelled, in our judgment, to move large aggregates of their entire plants, including movable equipment, closer either to Chicago or some other cement-consuming areas.

MILLS MUST BE NEAR SUPPLY

That in itself, of course, would be wrought with many difficulties, for in order to produce portland cement economically mills must be located near the source of the raw material, where the stone is quarried.

Thus, the moving of plants or the building of new installations well-removed from the source of raw material, thereby placing them near to markets, would involve the hauling of raw materials long distances and, necessarily, add materially to the cost of producing cement in the new location.

The dividing of a present-day portland-cement-producing plant into two or three separate and smaller units would, indeed, be a costly process.

Overhead expenses would be heavily increased, for instead of having one group of executives in a supervisory capacity this would entail three such groups.

In addition, and disregarding the above burdens, it is our judgment that the three subdivisions would not be able to produce the equivalent number of barrels of cement of the one integrated plant.

From the foregoing description of plant disruptions and removals, the genuine dangers confronting the cement workers become vividly apparent. We find that within the cement industry the turn-over of workers is very low.

Generally speaking, the workers are old-time employees of their respective companies, many with 25 to 35 years of service. Often we find that the second and third generations are already employed in a particular plant or by a particular company.

Because cement plants are now located at the source of the raw material, a great majority of the plants are in rural districts.

Even at that, because of manufacturing conditions and problems peculiar to the industry, were it logical to assume that if necessary raw materials were available on La Salle Street in Chicago, or on Broadway in New York, or on Chestnut Street in Philadelphia, the industry still would not build a portland-cement plant in these fine cities.

As mentioned, cement plants are located in very small communities—the community, indeed, having grown around the cement plant.

As these cement plants grew up, the workers built churches and homes for their families, and schools for their children, in which all of their savings and entire equity in life are involved.

The moving or closing of any of these large cement plants, or even a part of a plant, would disrupt the community life of these small towns, because these small towns are more often one-industry communities.

At that, it would be impossible for most of these workers to migrate to new locations because of family conditions and other reasons, and it would all result in the creating of small ghost-towns, such as we have experienced in coal-mining communities after the supply has been exhausted.

I assure you that, in my opinion, the foregoing calamities to the workers would not occur in just a few isolated cases but, due to conditions peculiar in the industry, such would become the general rule.

OTHER WORKERS INVOLVED

The cement workers have been deeply concerned during the past several years about the apparent unsound reasoning of the Federal Trade Commission on the question of "delivered prices" as they affect their industry.

Nor are only the workers in the cement industry involved in this probable calamitous situation, but also the lime, gypsum, and workers in the allied building-materials industries, for the products of these plants are also heavy commodities, on which shipping costs are a vital factor in competitive selling prices.

Equally threatened by such dislocations and subsequent miseries are literally millions of other workers in various industries, such as iron and steel and their fabricating industries, rubber, tobacco, food products, and most basic industries.

DELIVERED PRICE WIDELY USED

Perhaps it is most fortunate for the cement workers that this question of delivered prices affects such a large segment of our industrial economy, or else the cement industry might have become completely demoralized and severely crippled by the Federal Trade Commission's ruling before this dangerous condition was fully recognized and remedied.

I do not profess to be either an economist or an authority on marketing and selling practices or customs, yet, as a practical-minded person, it does seem strange that the welfare of the cement workers should be so seriously jeopardized by an unsound Federal Trade Commission ruling, when every day thousands of other business concerns employ the same principles in their sales methods as are involved in the delivered price method.

May I utilize some of the committee's time by briefly describing a few of the everyday and normal practices which apparently the Federal Trade Commission failed to realize would also be adversely affected by the marketing principle they have enunciated in the Cement case.

1. In Chicago, you may purchase the Chicago Daily Tribune right in front of the Tribune Building for 4 cents per copy.

When you buy the Tribune 50 miles away, in suburban Maywood or Chicago Heights, you also pay 4 cents per copy, although it must cost something to deliver it from their Chicago plant to the neighboring communities.

2. In my pocket I have a package of ordinary "Vicks" cough drops. On the package is imprinted the price of 10 cents.

These cough drops are made and packaged in Philadelphia. They sell for 10 cents regardless of whether you buy them in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia or Washington.

3. The Federal Government follows this same principle, particularly in the Post Office Department. To have an ordinary letter delivered within the city limits of Chicago, one must affix a 3-cent stamp thereto.

For the price of the same 3-cent stamp, the Post Office Department will also deliver anywhere in the continental United States an ordinary letter posted in Chicago.

In many, many other cases similar principles prevail throughout our economic life. They are essential parts of our highly organized industrial set-up.

INVITING CHAOTIC CONDITION

Now, it apears inevitable to me that should we knowingly permit the Federal Trade Commission to change and eliminate these customary "delivered price" selling practices, so widely prevalent throughout industrial America, we are virtually inviting chaotic conditions within our economic system.

My intense interest in the question, and my opportunity to observe conditions, has taught me that what is true of the situation concerning the portland cement industry and its employees is equally true with respect to a vast number of other industries and the little towns and industrial communities scattered over America.

In reality, those who will be most adversely affected are the thousands of workers who have established, built, and paid for their modest homes; where they have brought up their children; established schools for their education and churches for their religious worship; and where the small-town merchants, and, in fact, the whole life of these little communities, as well as the families of these workers, depend upon the pay rolls of these widely scattered units of manufacture.

I know that what will happen to the little towns and settlements around the cement plants will be repeated, time and again, in hundreds of other similar situations involved with scores of other industries, all of which may be affected alike.

They will be made into ghost towns, and their inhabitants will become displaced persons. This, we are striving so hard to prevent. Collectively, we of the American Federation of Labor have been grateful and happy at the recent trend toward locating manufacturing enterprises in the little towns and hamlets of America.

REVERSING DECENTRALIZATION

We have felt assured that the effects of this decentralization of industrial production would be highly conducive to our national well-being, safety, and security, both in time of peace as well as in the event of any future military conflict.

This trend definitely appeared to improve and strengthen the position of the many thousands of small, single-unit manufacturers, generally described as little business.

Now, there is conclusive evidence and fact that the rulings of the Federal Trade Commission not only threaten to disrupt this trend but actually to reverse it.

Gullible's Travels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Alfred Hassler, from the Christian Century for February 9, 1949:

GULLIBLE'S TRAVELS

(By Alfred Hassler)

I

It was in the year of our Lord 1949 that I, Jason Gullible, having looked to my affairs, written my last will and testament, and bid fond farewell to my loved spouse and dear children, found myself standing amid my bags and bundles on the dock at New York, waiting to board the vessel that was to take me on the amazing voyage that will be recorded here.

My ship was the bark *Hurst Press*, and a tight, seaworthy craft she was. While she could not take me all the way to my destination—that being a landlocked country—she did her best, and much of the success of my mission I attribute to the *Hurst Press* and her captain, William Randolph.

This mission of mine was, in short, to see for myself the wonderful Swiss people and to discover the secret by which they, a small nation, had managed to remain at peace while all their neighbors were at war. These are parlous times for my own beloved country, whose people, loving peace, yet seem constantly threatened with war, and our accustomed tranquillity is rent with dissension over the question of how best to assure continued peace.

Truth to tell, the answer to this question was already clear to me before I ever arrived in Switzerland, the matter having been explained to me by my doughty captain, William Randolph, who was brimful of admiration for the noble and courageous Swiss people. One conversation I had with him will indicate the force of his personality and the logic of his thinking.

"Captain Randolph," said I one evening as we stood together on the deck, "how did the Swiss remain at peace during the war that so recently scourged the world and raged at their very borders?"

Without removing his pipe or opening his lips, the captain answered succinctly: "Peacetime compulsory military training. It never fails."

"You mean," I interpreted, "that the sight of a strong Switzerland, prepared to defend herself, was enough to keep the Nazi hordes at bay?"

The captain nodded. "Aggressors respect strength and only strength," he explained crisply.

"Captain," I asked tensely, "how can our own dear country keep aggressive powers at bay and remain at peace?"

The captain peered first over his left shoulder, then over his right. Assured that no subversive characters were eavesdropping, he replied in a lowered voice: "By strength. By adopting peacetime conscription of all our young men. By seeing to it that every youth learns the art of killing by the most advanced methods. By taking them from their homes while they are yet in their formative years and imbuing them with the military virtues: unthinking obedience to orders, and reliance upon force as the ultimate means of settling all disputes."

"Will that work?" I inquired.

"It's worked for the doughty Swiss," retorted the captain. "Isn't that proof enough?"

So the reader will understand that I had the answer already, and that the rest of my travels was primarily to see for myself how well the captain's formula had worked.

II

I will not weary my reader with an account of my travels through France to Switzerland, except to record a curious conversation that I had on a train with a man who professed to be French.

The day had been long and tedious, so when this traveler entered my compartment I welcomed the chance for diversion. In my fluent French, which has served me well in many a New York restaurant, I inquired as to the state of his health. Glancing at me curiously, he responded in imperfect English. His unwillingness to converse in his native tongue aroused in me suspicions which his later remarks served to heighten. (In my own beloved country, I may say, we have not always been sufficiently suspicious of such actions, which frequently betray the character we label subversive, and it is only in very recent times that a healthy distrust of everyone has become a part of our national life.)

In any event, when my companion asked the purpose of my trip, I recounted to him my desire to see for myself how peacetime conscription of young men had helped the Swiss to remain at peace. When I had finished, he glanced at me quizzically.

"Have you stopped off in France?" he inquired.

"Only long enough to change from boat to train," I replied courteously.

"Look," admonished my companion, pointing out of the train window, and I saw we were passing by one of those tragic villages that were completely destroyed by bombing and shellfire during the late war.

"You should have stopped in France," my fellow traveler continued sadly as we watched the shattered walls and chimneys. "La belle France had peacetime conscription, too, for many years before the war. La belle France had the strongest army and the biggest trained reserve of any country in the world. It did not save her from war."[1]

My suspicions of my neighbors's character were instantly confirmed, and I lapsed into a dignified silence, that being the only way of avoiding contamination from subversives. After a few tentative efforts to renew our conversation, my companion drew from his bag a volume on modern mythology and proceeded to read.

III

In Switzerland I was immediately impressed by the way in which compulsory military training has succeeded in locating many very high and very steep mountains about the country, thus increasing the hazards of invasion enormously. This served to heighten my admiration for the doughty Swiss and to increase my resolve to secure such compulsory military training in my own country.

Safely established in a comfortable hostelry in Berne, I proceeded to cultivate the acquaintance of one Colonel Yodel, who kindly offered to act as guide on my trip. Here also I made the acquaintance of an obstreperous individual who introduced himself as However Butt. He fastened himself to me like a leech and would not be shaken off during the remainder of my trip.

My first inquiry of the brave colonel was as to the number of young men required to take military training in Switzerland.

"Every last one of them," replied the colonel, "except the unfit."

"Ah," said I, "that would explain why an aggressor nation would fear to attack you, with every young man a well trained soldier."

"However," interrupted However Butt, "their training period is for only about 4 months. Polish young men were each trained for 2 years, and the nazi armies invaded and overran Poland in 19 days."[2]

"Oh," said the colonel complacently, "but Switzerland is Switzerland, while Poland is only Poland."

I would have thought that the conclusive logic of this remark would silence Butt, but he was as impudent as ever.

"Yes," said he. "Switzerland had in 1939 a population of only 4,000,000 against Poland's 32,000,000; no standing army against Poland's army of 266,000 and reserves of 1,500,000; a professional military establishment of 337 officers and 23,000 trainees[3] against Poland's yearly crop of 200,000."

This exchange appeared to me totally unhelpful to my quest, so I suggested that it be discontinued, and it was.

IV

I was most anxious to see some of the famed Swiss engineering accomplishments, and Colonel Yodel suggested that we visit the St. Gothard and Simplon railway tunnels. Since However Butt seemed equally desirous of visiting the tunnels, we set out without further ado.

On the way, Colonel Yodel, who is one of the top-ranking Swiss officers,[4] spoke enthusiastically of the role of peacetime military training in keeping the Germans out of Switzerland during the war, of the effective mobilization of these trained reserves, and of the determination and courage with which they prepared to defend their borders. I was ecstatic, and could see in my mind a picture of the grim Swiss soldiers confounding the nazi hosts.

"However," interrupted However Butt, a trifle drily, "you had no standing army and your total reserves of all kinds totaled only 450,000, didn't they?"

"True," said Colonel Yodel.

"And you had no armored forces of any size, no tanks, and your airforce consisted of only 5,000 men, all in the reserve?"

"That about describes our situation," said the colonel stiffly.

"And that kind of army struck terror into the German Army of 9,000,000 men, with 10,000 fighting planes and the most highly mechanized forces in the world? An army of which sections numbering 300,000 men smashed the combined Dutch, Belgian, French and British armies in little more than a month of fighting?"[5]

"I can only tell you what happened," repeated the colonel in an offended tone. And since this conversation, too, seemed irrelevant, I bade Butt be quiet. He thereupon made a rude noise with his lips, but said no more for the time being.

V

Unfortunately, Butt resumed his impudent ways at the tunnels. Breaking in on Colonel Yodel's recital of the size and capacity of the tunnels, Butt asked if it were true that both tunnels had been mined by the Swiss during the war.

"Yes," said the colonel, "that is true."

---

[1] The French Army in June 1939 numbered 800,000 men, backed by a trained reserve of 5,500,000. "As of June 1939, the French Army is still the strongest all-around fighting machine in Europe."—Time, June 12, 1939.

[2] Germany invaded Poland September 1, 1939; took Warsaw, last seat of organized resistance, September 28.

[3] 1937. See Report of President's Commission on Universal Military Training, p. 297.

[4] The highest Swiss Army rank in peacetime is that of colonel.

[5] Germany invaded Belgium, Holland, and Luxembourg May 9, 1940. Holland surrendered May 15; Belgium, May 28; France, June 17.

"Isn't it also true," persisted Butt, "that three-fourths of the rail traffic between Germany and Italy, carrying vital war materials and other freight, passed through these tunnels?"

"Correct," said Colonel Yodel.

"And that Switzerland informed the Germans and the Italians that the tunnels would be blown up at the first sign of invasion?"

"Absolutely right," thundered the colonel proudly. "And that made them stop and think, believe me."

However, Butt looked at me and winked. "It seems to me," he said sweetly, "that the tunnels did more to protect you from invasion than all your trained soldiers."

But this was such a fantastic statement, and so obviously inspired by unworthy motives, that I again bade Butt be silent, and spent an agreeable half-hour listening to the colonel repeat how military training had saved his country and kept it at peace.

VI

My visit was nearly at an end, and I spent the rest of my stay there in the very pleasant occupation of marveling at the way in which the Swiss have combined compulsory military training with true democracy, though noting also that Switzerland, like my own dear country, numbers among its citizens a proportion of malcontents who have no compunctions about criticizing their government most disloyally. Some of these subversive characters, whom I met through the officiousness of However Butt, insisted that I visit the prisons where some conscientious objectors to military training were locked up. The sight of these men languishing in their cells at first raised some doubts in my mind, but the warden in each case assured me that they were receiving first-class treatment, and pointed out to me that a personal conscience is a luxury in such times as these, and must be paid for, which is a piece of wisdom I hope to remember for future use.

Others of the critics I met pointed out to me the strong influence the military exercise even in the earliest grades of public school, and asked me if that was in line with the conception of true democracy held in my own dear country. Others referred to the fact that Swiss women, while legally liable to be conscripted, are not permitted to vote. However, while these seemed somewhat deplorable weaknesses in the Swiss democracy, I could not believe that they were in any way connected with compulsory military training.

On the last day of my visit Butt insisted that I must talk with a professor of economics at the nearby university, and though I protested vigorously, I had to yield.

Professor Profitt proved to be a fine-appearing man, and he and I had a most interesting discussion, though with no bearing that I could see on the problem of military training. He explained to me how the Swiss had done business with both sides during the war, and how important much of this trade had been to the Axis nations, cut off from other sources of materials by the British blockade. At this point Butt, who had been sitting silent in the corner, interrupted:

"So it really was to the interest of Germany to have Switzerland at peace, professor?"

"By all means," agreed Professor Profitt.

"That's all, brother," said However Butt, and bade the professor good day.

I record this incident merely to show how profitless were these experiences with However Butt, and to show why I was forced finally to send him away. When one is on a serious mission such as mine, one cannot afford to be distracted by such irrelevancies, however well intentioned.

VII

Three days later I was once again aboard the *Hurst Press*, having passed as rapidly as possible through Austria, Poland, Holland, and Belgium. In each of these countries I encountered seedy characters who tried to deceive me into believing that they had had compulsory peacetime training before the war, and more rigid than the Swiss system, but had not been able to stay out of the war or to vanquish the hosts of Germany and Italy (which they said also had had military training).

On board the *Hurst Press* the days passed pleasantly. To Captain Randolph I recounted all that I had seen and heard, not excluding the strange comments of However Butt, but this person the captain dismissed as an obvious subversive, and congratulated me on the wisdom and insight that had enabled me to see the truth in spite of Butt's attempts to deceive. And so I came home to my loving family, and shortly thereafter redoubled my efforts to assure the adoption by my own beloved land of universal-military training, since surely my travels revealed that such a course, having kept doughty little Switzerland at peace, can do the same for us.

Small Business Should Be Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the United Mine Workers Journal of February 15, particularly with respect to that portion of the editorial which refers to the National Federation of Small Business and its director, George J. Burger, who so ably represents it here in Washington:

BIG SHOTS DUCK UNDER COVER OF SMALL BUSINESS IDENTITY TO DECEIVE PUBLIC

Professional public relations fakers have long looked upon the legislative activities of State legislatures and the Federal Congress as the most lucrative of pay-dirt fields.

The depletion and depreciation provisions of tax bills, as well as the tax rates, legislation to curb monopolistic practices, new laws giving Government agencies power to force observance of fair trade practices, legislation to curb labor unions and stimulate a song of hate among the populace against the men who perform America's work, and general institutional advertising to promote good will among the voters, and what have you, all in all constitute the basis for the intangible package which the shrewd public relations salesmen peddle to businessmen, big and little.

Just how these fakers succeed in deceiving men who head large corporations into believing that the people turn off their radios, pass up dances and shows, refrain from visiting sick friends and sit up to the wee hours of the morn to read their advertising and pamphlet copy, as well as the editorials and special articles that they allege appeared as the result of their "in" with publishers here and there is something that has perplexed the legitimate editorial and advertising contingent for a long time.

A three-column page-length ad published in the New York Times February 2, stresses the over-all gullibility of businessmen whom the fakers cash in on. The ad copy is directed to the attention of labor leaders, and its 17 paragraphs attempt to show why the NAM-Taft-Hartley law should remain intact. The ad is signed by National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., DeWitt Emery, president.

The ad carries the address of the national association as Akron, Ohio, with two branch offices, one in Washington, D. C., and the other in Chicago, Ill.

The ad structure smelled to us on first reading as the hue and cry of a phony setup. We discovered that the Emery outfit may be milking small-business men on the side but, in the main, its clientele is big industry, with the take largely from the coffers of rubber and oil.

The National Independent, dated January 1948, refers to DeWitt Emery as a promoter of small business outfits, and says this:

"One of Mr. Emery's mailing efforts contains a listing of prominent contributors to his foundation. It includes, among others, the following firms: Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; B. F. Goodrich Co.; Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.; Pure Oil Co.; Socony Vacuum Co.; Standard Oil Co. of Indiana; Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; Texas Co.; Chrysler Corp.; DeSoto Motor Corp.; Plymouth Motor Corp.; Libby-Owens-Ford Glass Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Inland Steel Co.; Republic Steel Co.; American Rolling Mill Co.; Electric Boat Co.; First National Stores, Inc."

The contributors read more like a roll call of the topnotchers listed in the American blue book of industry. Reading the list, we cannot find a single company which through the years has not been able to take care of its interests against all comers—including Government and labor.

It isn't anything new to learn that these companies would contribute to a fund to conduct advertising against any amendment, no matter how sound or practical, to the NAM-T-H law. It cost these concerns a wad of money, directly and indirectly, to support Taft, Hartley, and Ball, and the coterie of corporate attorneys and lobbyists who formed the un-American antisocial legislative political pact which succeeded in double-crossing the American people by passage of the NAM-T-H law.

Since the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce are presently refraining from an open advertising antirepeal publicity campaign, big business heads who always sit back and try to escape the odium of the misgivings of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the NAM are resorting to other avenues to deceive and mislead the public. Hence, the present use of the alleged National Small Business Men's Association.

There is a national small-business men's organization. It bears the name of National Federation of Small Business, Inc.

The federation's headquarters is San Mateo, Calif., and its Washington office is in the Bond Building. George J. Burger directs the affairs of this federation. It publishes the National Independent, the magazine that exposed Emery's big-business contributors.

Mr. Burger has informed the UMWA that Mr. Emery, instead of aiding small-business men, actually fought for the big rubber companies by strenuously opposing the adoption by Congress of the rubber-tires bill, the purpose of which was to give full and adequate protection to 300,000 retailers of tires throughout the United States.

Further investigation reveals that Congressman PATMAN and numerous others have looked upon the Emery set-up as a phony for a long time. Congressmen have no hesitancy in declaring the Emery outfit a fake. And, furthermore, they understand to the fullest that Emery is financed by big industry—rubber and oil, for the most part.

One of the "because" reasons contained in the Emery ad attacking repeal of the NAM-T-H law states that—

"This law requires an itemized accounting by the union to its members of all receipts and disbursements."

If our information is correct, Emery does not personally believe in the same accounting methods in the conduct of his private phony Small Business Men's Association that he so ardently praises as a provision of the NAM-T-H law.

Investigation reveals that Emery has had numerous financial squabbles with his coconspirators in the conduct of his public relations set-up. According to one who occupied a post as treasurer of the set-up, Emery has persistently refused to let the books be audited and insists on performing the duties of the treasurer to the exclusion of all others.

It is said that the organization has approximately 500 members, and 2,500 affiliated members—who evidently pay a lesser tax. The membership roll is merely a list of donators to the Emery set-up. The outfit is said to hold a phony convention now and then, at which time an advertising program is published that collects from $20,000 upward in advertising from the gullible big moguls.

The Journal has insisted for a long time that Congress should call before it the leading lights of phony business organizations and phony public relations set-ups—whether they deal with transportation, industry, or labor—and reveal the manipulations of these sinister endeavors so the public can learn the identity of the culprits who are employed and financed by big business to deceive the American people.

Right now—when we have a peak load of social legislation in the congressional hopper—would be an ideal time for Congress to do something about these separate and collective packs of monetary wolves and brand them for what they are.

United Farmers Demand 100 Percent of True Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1949

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is holding hearings on the long-range farm program. Members of the committee are anxious to secure information from all reliable sources on the needs and desires of American farmers.

On February 1, 1949, Mr. Martin B. Tongen, of Zumbrota, Minn., president of the United Farmers of Minnesota, made a statement on support price and parity before the Committee on Agriculture of the Minnesota House of Representatives. His statement will be of value to Members of Congress engaged in the drafting of the long-range farm program. It follows:

STATEMENT OF MARTIN B. TONGEN, STATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED FARMERS OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE OF THE MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I am a farmer from Goodhue County, Minn. I farm 140 acres near Wanamingo and am engaged in diversified farming of grain, hogs, poultry, beef and principally dairying.

Although my farm work keeps me rather busy, I have been elected to represent the United Farmers of Minnesota, Inc., as their president and am also vice president of the national organization. Other members of the State board of directors attending this hearing are Melvin Ramstad, Dennison, Minn., and Edward Swanson, Cannon Falls.

I will now explain why we are here:

The State board of directors of the United Farmers of Minnesota, Inc., met in Wanamingo January 14 and voted to ask Representative Roy L. Voxland and Senator Grover C. George to request the legislature to "press Congress to enact a farm program of 100 percent true parity for all farm products under a revised formula that shall include all necessary costs of production and reasonably sufficient wages for all productive farm labor."

We also went on record "favoring federally financed, but privately owned increased storage facilities for farm products to help protect both producer and consumer from sudden disastrous fluctuations in farm prices."

This action corroborates similar action taken previously by the Minnesota Farmers Union through four State legislators, Odean Enestvedt, Reuben Felt, Otto Clark, and Curtis Olson. This action is in variance with the Farmers Union program, however, in fact that their request calls for 100 percent parity while our program calls for 100 percent true parity, although both organizations call for a revised formula.

We are most interested in this revised formula. Parity means equality, but under the present way of figuring parity it is far from equality for the farmer. I will try to prove this to you.

In looking over the past record, back to 1929 and all the way up to the end of 1946 (the latest available records from the United States Agriculture Department) we find that the per capita net income of the farm people was never one-half of that of the rest of the population in any year. The average for farmers was about one-third that of other people. Yet the same table tells us that the farmers had all the way from 61 percent of parity in 1932 to 168 percent parity in 1946. In the latter year at 168 percent of parity our per capita net income was $620. That of the rest of the population was $1,326. Now, how can that be called parity at all?

Therefore we stipulate true parity. Farm business must be handled like any other business to be successful. We must have support prices under an up-to-date revised formula that will include, as in any other business, all our necessary costs of production. When we speak of cost of production we mean depreciation, soil depletion, interest, taxes, an equitable return on our investment, and wages for farm and family productive labor at a reasonable rate necessary to maintain a high American standard of living.

Such a support price would only give us equality which is only just and sound. No consumer expects anyone to operate and receive prices below cost. You may call this 100 true parity or simply true parity.

Now we hear so much about the danger of too high support prices. The argument is that they may create surpluses. I will try to prove this is not so. In regard to this I have some interesting figures from the United States agriculture census. The population in 1890 was 63,000,000; in 1944 it was 138,000,000. An increase in 54 years of 120 percent.

In 1889 we raised 34 bushels of corn per capita.

In 1944 we raised 20 bushels of corn per capita.

In 1890 we produced about one hog per capita.

In 1945 we produced about one-third of a hog per capita.

In 1889 we raised 13 bushels of oats per capita.

In 1945 we raised 7 bushels of oats per capita.

In 1889 we raised 7 bushels of wheat per capita.

In 1944 we raised 7 bushels of wheat per capita.

These are figures for the whole United States. Our production of wheat per capita, even with tremendous wheat crops of the war years is no greater than production per capita in 1889. The last depression of the thirties was said to be partly due to surplus production. This was not the case. In 1934 we imported 3,600,000 bushels of wheat more than we exported. In 1935 we imported 30,709,000 bushels of wheat more than we exported. In 1936 we imported 26,340,000 bushels of wheat more than we exported and during the war in 1943 we imported 96,201,000 bushels more of wheat than we exported. (From U. S. Department of Agriculture statistics.)

During the days of the acreage allotments and wheat penalties we imported more wheat than we took out of production here at home. It was these imports during this period of depression that brought about the depression to a great extent. These imports came in at prices far below our cost of production. From 1932 to 1936 we imported more wheat than we exported, but we were made to believe that we had a surplus of wheat. In this same period farm net income in general was 61 percent, 81 percent, 83 percent, 107 percent, and 99 percent of parity respectively under our present parity formula.

Proper distribution is the problem; surplus is not the problem. Our country normally consumes 90 percent of its farm production; of the remaining 10 percent we need to store some from the fruitful years to prepare for the lean years and for emergencies; we can export some at a world price, and we can find new uses for increased production.

Any production consumed domestically must have a true parity support price to protect our national economy. When farm prices are below true parity, labor and industry suffer with agriculture. You cannot have low agricultural prices and have full employment. There exists a 1-1-7 economic formula. Every $1 of gross farm income generates $1 of total factory pay roll and $7 of national income. This is conclusively proven over the past 25-year records. With our high national budget and our tremendous national debt (which is equal to a mortgage of $220 per acre on all farm land in the Uinted States), our Nation cannot let agriculture suffer and still stay solvent. We must look at the problem with a long-range view ahead. A revised formula must be established to support agricultural prices for all farm products and sufficient storage capacity must be built to store crops and produce from the fruitful years to tide us over the lean years.

We must encourage foreign trade but not at the expense of agriculture. Any product we can raise here must be protected by a tariff high enough to bring the price of a competing imported product equal to true parity or the cost of production floor price. Under our high American standard of living and high cost of production we cannot compete with foreign labor at lower living standards.

As legislators you know that to make appropriations for the numerous increased costs of State government you are faced with raising a great deal more money necessary to satisfy the wants of our modern high standard of living. You are faced with this problem at a time when agricultural prices are sinking rapidly, unemployment has started and business is slackening. Judging from the past we know that the total factory pay roll will decline within 6 months to an extent approximately equal to the present decline in farm income. Farm buying power in Minnesota has dropped 19 percent in the last year (according to report from university agriculture economists). You can look for the factory workers buying power to drop 19

percent within 6 months, business and industry will follow suit and the national income will decline proportionally, unless something is done soon.

The farmer is getting tired of making his investment each year and plans for full production without having any assurance of what market he will have for his year's work. Support prices we have had during and after the war have helped raise production to record heights and have assured the American people of plenty of food and raw materials for industry and a high standard of living. With sufficiently high support prices that will guarantee the farmer at least our costs with a fair return for our farm and family labor, we will be encouraged to reach still greater achievement, will in turn supply sufficient raw materials for industry, food for the consumer, buying power for everyone, and a national income that will prevent bankruptcy.

This plan is the best European recovery plan we could extend to our friendly neighbors overseas. It is a sound plan that will put them on the road to recovery quicker than any other plan.

The United Farmers ask you to pass a resolution to memorialize Congress and our President to establish a floor price for all farm products at not less than 100 percent true parity, or, as we call it, the average cost of production. We also ask that Federal loans be extended to private enterprise to construct sufficient storage facilities for farm products.

Farmers Home Administration Provides Assistance to Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, last summer I visited a number of farms in my district in Texas and I obtained first-hand information on the work being done on the farms by our governmental agencies, especially the work of the Farmers Home Administration. Farmers who are not able to borrow from banks or other private or cooperative credit sources may receive a loan from the FHA to help operate their farms, to purchase a family-size-farm unit, or to make improvements on their farm.

An additional service has been added by the Farmers Home Administration which I believe will prove to be of great help to our farm economy. Banks and other private lenders can make certain approved loans to farmers and the FHA will guarantee the repayments. This new mortgage-insurance program offers a greatly needed service to supplement the program of farm-operating loans, farm-ownership loans, and the farm-improvement and water-facilities loans now being made.

Loans and insured mortgages made by the Farmers Home Administration have proven to be very sound investments from the financial standpoint as well as from the necessity of helping our operators of small farms to help themselves. Sufficient funds should be made available to the Farmers Home Administration to encourage more tenant farmers to become owners, and to provide financial assistance to owners of small farms to make necessary improvements to operate more efficiently. I trust that the Congress will make adequate appropriations to take care of these needs.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a newspaper report regarding the Farmers Home Administration which was published in the Fairfield Recorder, Fairfield, Tex., on February 17, 1949:

FARM EQUIPMENT BOUGHT BY VETS THROUGH FHA

About 41 percent of the $81,000,000 loaned by the Farmers Home Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, during the year went to returned servicemen to buy or equip farms, it was pointed out in the agency's annual report for 1948, released through the Dallas State office by State Director L. J. Cappleman. Veterans who are becoming established in agriculture made up about a quarter of the 320,000 farmers participating in the program.

Supervised credit has proved well suited to the needs of many young veterans and their wives whose financial assets and farm management experience are limited but who desire to become successful operators of family type farms, the report stated. Veterans receive preference for all loans. Special loans were made to 141 disabled veterans who bought farms suited to their abilities.

The annual report pointed out that many farmers are still earning low incomes. Despite the relatively high prices and good yields of recent years, the average gross income from half the Nation's farms is less than $1,000 a year.

"A large part of our farm population has not shared to a very great extent in the Nation's prosperity," wrote Dillard B. Lasseter, administrator, in a letter to the State director. "This fact is often overlooked. It can be completely realized only by examining the limited farming facilities of many rural families."

The report said that additional working capital and better farming methods are two of the main needs of low-income farmers whose output is limited.

Only those farmers who are not able to borrow from banks or other private or cooperative credit sources are eligible for assistance from the Farmers' Home Administration.

Applications for credit increased over the 1947 totals, but fewer loans were made because of smaller appropriations. There were 117,885 farm-operating loans, 1,904 direct farm-ownership loans, and 884 water-facilities loans made during the 12 months ending June 30, 1948. The number of families off loans in the same period totaled 146,000.

A new mortgage-insurance program put into effect in October 1947 aided 352 farmers in 33 States to buy, enlarge, or develop farms. Banks and other private lenders advanced $2,490,910 for these loans, and the Farmers Home Administration guaranteed the repayments.

The agency said its field workers reported gains in crop diversification, new sources of income, widespread adoption of modern practices on borrowers' farms. "The great majority of the families have built up their herds and flocks, worked out soil-conservation programs, improved their homes," the report stated. "Farmers and their wives who once could not afford to enter into community affairs are becoming active in church groups, joining farm organizations, and taking a leading part in neighborhood activities. Children are finishing school with chances for college or special training."

Statement of John G. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the dying American Eagle turned his head and saw that the arrow piercing his heart was feathered from his own wing. So it is with the Marshall plan dollars directed against our industries.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a statement made by Mr. John G. Wright, president of the Boston Wool Trade Association, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 833, a bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948:

My name is John G. Wright, of Boston, Mass., where I am engaged in the wool business. I appear here today as president of the Boston Wool Trade Association. This association has among its members about 650 individuals and firms engaged in the business of buying and selling and manufacturing wool. Almost all of the wool consumed in the United States is handled through the members of this association and most of the wool which is manufactured in the United States is manufactured in the northeastern and middle Atlantic States.

The business of buying and selling wool is practically at a standstill today, and many wool mills are either shut down or are running at curtailed capacity, resulting in much unemployment.

The causes for this stagnation of business are several. This country consumes annually approximately one billion pounds of wool, less than one-third of which is grown in the United States. A large portion of the fine wools which this country is required to import is grown in the British colonies, particularly in Australia. This means that American business must convert their dollars into pounds sterling to pay for such wool, and the British government compels us to pay $4.03 for our pounds sterling (the official rate), whereas some European nationals with Marshall plan dollars are permitted to purchase their sterling in the free market at a cost of approximately $3.20, which gives them a 20 percent advantage over American business. This has had the effect of increasing the prices of Australian wool to the point where it has been, and is, impossible for American business firms to compete in the purchase of such wools. Some of this wool is purchased by countries with Marshall plan aid and then is manufactured by the purchasers into yarns and cloth and shipped to the United States where the seller receives dollars with which he is again able to purchase cheap sterling.

On behalf of the members of the Boston Wool Trade Association I wish to present for the consideration of the committee the following recommendations which the wool trade believes would solve this problem:

1. That American business be permitted to purchase sterling at whatever price it is offered in the market just as certain other European nationals are permitted to do today, thus allowing American business to compete with the European business in the purchase of wool in the foreign markets, or,

2. That American business be permitted to make separate exchange agreements with wool-exporting countries such as Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. By this we

mean to suggest the dollar and the pound of these countries should be freed to find their own relative value, which course if adopted would result, we believe, in a far greater bilateral trade.

I cannot bring to the attention of this committee too forceably the fact that unemployment and further deterioration in our Wool Textile Industry will continue and become more acute unless the advantage enjoyed by certain European nationals who have access to free-market sterling, is also made available to American business.

I appreciate the opportunity that the committee has extended me in presenting the problem of our industry to the committee and in conclusion, may I express the hope that our problem will have your serious consideration.

World Government and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, about 160 years ago the founders of this great Nation had some very difficult decisions to make in setting up the American Republic which would be strong enough to exist and yet retain the democratic principles of freemen. These truly great statesmen resolved their differences of opinions and today we still enjoy the benefits of our form of government.

The world must also settle its differences and certainly we have made such an attempt within the organization of the United Nations. A great deal of thought is being given to proposals to form a world government by strengthening the United Nations. A group known as the United World Federalists, Inc., has endeavored to create interest in such a project which in their estimation is the only hope for permanent peace in this world.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Mr. Lindsay P. Walden before the Oklahoma annual convention of the Oklahoma State CIO which deals with a most timely and serious subject, World Government:

LABOR AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

International peace is the gravest problem facing the United States and the world today as our new Congress goes into session. We of the CIO, together with other groups in this country, emerged successfully in the recent elections, and, in doing so, we rode the ship of grave domestic issues. These issues are important to us, but, let us ask, what have we profited if we conquer the domestic front and yet lose the peace of the world? The threat to peace is real, not imaginary. We may again in our generation see the workers of one nation providing and exhausting their resources, not for their domestic use but for the purpose of destroying their fellowman and the fellow workmen of other nations.

No longer can we say that "to the victor goes the spoils," but rather we must say that "to the victor goes the responsibility for all."

In order that we may understand the underlying condition that prompts this threat to our international peace, I would like to cite a portion of a statement from our own Chief of Staff, General Bradley, made on Armistice Day of last year, as follows:

"With the monstrous weapons man already has, humanity is in danger of being trapped in this world by its moral adolescents. Our knowledge of science has clearly outstripped our capacity to control it. We have too many men of science; too few men of God. We have grasped the mystery of the atom and rejected the Sermon on the Mount. Man is stumbling blindly through a spiritual darkness while toying with the precarious secrets of life and death. The world has achieved brilliance without wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more about war than we do about peace, more about killing than we know about living. This is our twentieth century's claim to distinction and to progress."

Workers are vitally interested not only in industrial peace, but in world peace as well. This interest does not stem from us alone as members of the working class—we are also members of a world society, even though that society is loosely organized.

Regardless of the merits for or against a closed shop in the industrial world, we cannot have world peace unless we have a closed shop in a world organization, and membership in that organization must be open to all nations of the world. Just a closed shop in the labor movement is restricted to certain purposes and powers—a world closed shop may be restricted or limited to certain purposes and powers—that of preserving peace between nations and of preventing wars. Just as a labor organization may be operated on a democratic basis, so may a world society be run democratically. Yes, a democratic and restricted world closed shop is indispensable to world peace.

In terms of political science this closed shop means world government with limited sovereign rights not only to mediate and adjudicate disputes between nations, but also with vested rights to enforce its decrees against the individual citizens of this world order who may undertake to violate these decrees.

Today, there is a decided tendency among some people to brand all talk of world peace as communism and to brand peace advocates as Communists. Certainly, we should not make that mistake even though we are well known in our opposition to communism. It is true that in order to have world peace, a world government must accept Communist nations into its membership, but this does not mean that the other member nations must accept communism in order to be a constituent part of world government. One of the purposes of world government would be to decide disputes between a free enterprise nation and a Communist nation and thus prevent war between the two.

Communist nations so far have not appeared to support the idea of the kind of world government of which we are here discussing. Likewise, our own Government has not appeared ready to accept such a plan. Recognizing this problem, the United World Federalists, of which our own CIO secretary-treasurer, James B. Carey, is a prominent leader, in its November convention in Minneapolis, adopted the following resolution:

"A new and broader approach must now be adopted, recognizing that the problem of transforming the United Nations into an effective federation and the problem of settling the main issues between the Soviet Union and the West are inter-dependent and cannot be separated. We believe that the time has now come for a great effort to achieve a general settlement with the Soviet Union, and, as an integral part of such settlement, the simultaneous charter revision essential to lasting peace."

Someone will naturally ask "Do we not already have a United Nations for this purpose?" The answer is "yes", but the UN Charter does not go far enough to accomplish its objective. It is similar to an "open shop" as we know it in the industrial field—each affected employee in an open shop is free to accept or reject the majority decisions of the union, just as any member of the UN may accept or veto the decision of the Assembly. We today, can see the ineffectiveness of the UN Charter by looking to the wars in Palestine, China and Indonesia. No, we do not need to abandon the UN—we simply need to give it power to try disputes and to enforce its decrees, with such Charter revisions as may be necessary to that end.

Did any of you ever hear of the great war between your State of Oklahoma and my State of Texas, which was fought because of a disagreement as to the boundary between the States? Well, of course, you didn't because no such war was ever fought, but it could have been, because, a serious dispute over this issue flared into the open not too many years past. Why didn't these two States go to war over this issue? The answer is simple—we had previously relinquished a part of our respective State sovereignty to a larger government, known as the United States, which had the power to hear and determine the issues, and to enforce its decree, if necessary. If Oklahoma and Texas had not previously entered into a larger federation, most likely this actual dispute would have been determined through open warfare. My relatives and fellow workmen would probably have killed many of your relatives and fellow workmen and vice versa. Thank God, we had a Constitution and a Supreme Court.

The principle of settling differences between nations of the world is the same as settling disputes between States of our Federal Government. Yes, we need a World Federation, too.

Some people say that it is impossible to get all nations of the world to agree to enter into a world federation because of the differences in: (1) Political thinking, (2) races, (3) languages, and (4) economic interest. You know some people were just as pessimistic in 1786 and said that it would be impossible to establish a Federation of States on the North American Continent. But, it was done, in spite of the fact that:

1. There were no automobiles, railroads, airplanes, telegraph, radios, telephone, or television.
2. New York wanted to retain control over commerce and trade on the Hudson.
3. The southern States wanted to retain human slavery, while the New England States wanted to abolish slavery.
4. Virginia, the largest State, wanted popular representation in the Federation, while Delaware and several other smaller States wanted equal representation.
5. Some delegates insisted that "property was the main object of society."
6. Some delegates insisted "there never was, nor never will be, a civilized society without an aristocracy."
7. Some delegates thought that wealth, rather than numbers of persons, should determine State representation in the new federation.

Yet, with these and many other basic differences confronting these States, a new and lasting federation was created.

In 1786, it took George Washington over two weeks to travel from Mount Vernon, Va., to Philadelphia, and some delegates took over a month to attend the Constitutional Convention. Today, a delegate from any single nation in the world can go to a world conference at any place in the world, in less than two days. In 1786 it took over a month for people in Georgia to communicate with people in Massachusetts, but today it takes only a few minutes for the Secretary of State in Washington to converse fully with the

Foreign Minister of Australia or of any other nation in the world. People in South Africa today can read full newspaper accounts of political and economic events in the United States on the same day of such happenings, while in 1786 such communication would have taken months, and then South Africans would have gotten only small segments of such news.

With our modern system of communication and transportation, ideas likewise travel throughout the world quickly. Yes, people in all lands are longing for a world government at the same time. Should we now have a world constitutional convention, the results would be known simultaneously throughout the world, rather than months later, as in 1786.

Yes, world government is possible now. It has as good a chance now, as did the State Federation in 1786.

Do you want peace in our time and for our posterity? If so, let's actively let our feelings be known to our own Congress and President. Ask them to support a move for world government through the United Nations, with full power to prevent war.

Light in a Dark Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to our good colleague, Congressman GOSSETT for giving some very important information as the result of his personal investigation of a very serious situation concerning the infiltration of undesirable immigrants—a situation that was thought to exist for some time without having definite information.

There is submitted for printing in the RECORD information concerning the admission of displaced persons:

GOSSETT ADDRESSES WOMEN'S CLUB OF CHEVY CHASE

Immigration based on need or merit should be drawn from other sources than displaced persons' camps, Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, said yesterday at the monthly meeting of the Woman's Club of Chevy Chase.

"There are 10,000,000 others in the world more worthy of immigration here," he stressed. "We should take care in this day, when fifth columns are the order of infiltration, of the folks we invite over here," he declared.

The speaker, who visited some of the DP camps in Europe, is a member of the House subcommittee dealing with immigration and allied problems.

Mr. GOSSETT said the "hue and cry" that the DP's would be killed if they returned to their countries is "pure bosh." He declared that persons in a Jewish camp outside a Frankfurt, Germany, when questioned made it clear they "didn't want to return to their countries because they wanted to come to America."

"It became a preferred status in Europe to be in an American DP camp," Representative GOSSETT continued. "We feed these people 2,000 calories a day. Many said they had no place to go, but the plain truth was there was no place they wanted to go, but America. Australia literally is begging for immigrants."

"Sentimentalists say we ought to open the door to the displaced persons," he continued. "No other country on earth operates this way. It's our door and throwing it open is not for our country's best interest.

"Some people say we must be good Christians and take in the people who have sat in our camps for years. I say this wouldn't be good Christianity—it would be stupidity."

Mr. GOSSETT warned the audience to read between the lines when they saw pictures of little children as representative of the people in the DP camps. It isn't the children who are coming over, he said.

Mr. GOSSETT said workers were not needed in this country and a club member asked why there had been a story in the news that we needed farm labor.

He replied that the displaced persons "wouldn't strike a lick on a farm."

Federal Security Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the George E. Hilgard Post No. 58, American Legion, Belleville, Ill., in opposition to a single Federal Security Agency to combine the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Public Health Service, the Army and Navy hospitals, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

A resolution against the Federal Security Agency as recommended by the Hoover Commission

Whereas the medical committee of the Hoover Commission recommends the creation of a single Federal Security Agency under which would be placed the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Public Health Service, the Army and Navy hospitals and the Bureau of Indian Affairs hospitals; and

Whereas veterans' hospitalization was not competently and efficiently administered until placed in a category all its own; and

Whereas these four groups have problems and needs, individual and vital to each group, demanding individual administration for effective and efficient solution; and

Whereas the combining of this administrative authority under a single Federal Security Agency as proposed by the Hoover Commission would improve none and impair all four of the existing services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of the best possible service to the largest possible number of citizens of the United States the Veterans' Administration hospitals, the Public Health Service, the Army and Navy hospitals, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs hospitals remain under separate administrative authority: And be it further

Resolved, That our Representatives in both Houses of Congress be urgently advised to use their best efforts to defeat the recommendation of the Hoover Commission for the creation of a single Federal Security Agency.

Approved and passed this 10th day of February 1949, by the 1,057 members of Geo. E. Hilgard Post No. 58 of the American Legion in regular meeting assembled.

NORMAN BIEBEL,
Commander.
GEORGE VARONE,
Adjutant.

Indian Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, with leave to print granted me, I wish to include herewith the text of a memorial, Senate Memorial No. 1, from the Senate of the Arizona State Legislature requesting immediate action by the President and Congress with respect to social security payments to Indians on reservations.

The entire country has been greatly disturbed and almost horrified by the widely published stories of the plight of the Navajo Indians during the past two winters. This present winter distress has been augmented by a natural disaster, in that the high plateau on which these Indians live has been covered deep with unprecedented snow threatening great loss of animal life and some human life. However, the distress of last winter was not so largely caused by natural disaster as an unfortunate situation due to governmental negligence. It all points up, however, to the fact that these Indians, more than any other Indians in America, lack wise and humane social security.

There is a difference of opinion as to what should be the nature of that social security, even among the friends of Indians. Some would-be friends of the Indian believe that the Indians ought to be turned loose to get their full rights and privileges as citizens from the States in which they live, which in that case would mean turning the entire problem over to Arizona. Others equally friendly to the Indians, of which I am one, believe that their care in their present condition is chiefly a financial responsibility of the Federal Government. There are various suggestions between. I have introduced legislation, H. R. 1921, looking toward a partial solution.

The memorial is as follows:

Senate Memorial 1

A memorial requesting immediate action by the President and Congress with respect to social-security payments to Indians on reservations

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

That the Federal Social Security Administration has threatened to withhold Federal social-security grants to Arizona unless Arizona assumes the obligation of the Federal Government with respect to the payment of indigent assistance to Indians living on reservations within Arizona.

That Arizona, because of the effect of such threatened action on thousands of its citizens who are now receiving and require assistance, is being bludgeoned into accepting an obligation which it does not have and which it cannot afford to assume.

That there has been introduced in the current session of the Eighty-first Congress legislation (S. 691) which, if enacted, will afford an equitable solution of the problem for all concerned.

Wherefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, requests:

1. That the President, as head of the executive department of the Federal Government, direct the Federal Social Security Administration to cease and desist from withholding Federal social-security grants to Arizona, pending consideration by the Congress of the problem of assistance to reservation Indians.

2. That the Congress give immediate consideration to, and enact, such legislation as will eliminate the present situation, assure to Indians living on reservations within Arizona the indigent assistance to which they are entitled, remove from worthy and eligible citizens of Arizona the current threat of hardship and distress, and relieve Arizona from the assumption of an unjustified and undue financial burden.

Adopted by the senate February 9, 1949, by the following vote: 18 ayes, 0 nays, 1 not voting.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 10, 1949.

What Really Happened at Yalta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article by Raymond Swing, entitled "What Really Happened at Yalta," printed in the New York Times, Sunday, February 20, 1949:

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED AT YALTA—CRITICS HAVE TRIED TO MAKE THAT MEETING A SYMBOL OF FOLLY, EVEN TREASON. HERE IS AN EVALUATION REACHING THE OPPOSITE CONCLUSION

(By Raymond Swing)

Four years ago, on February 4, opened the most discussed and surely the most misjudged conference of World War II. By now Yalta is considered by many unbigoted persons as an occasion when a dying President lost his grip on American interests and made a number of fateful surrenders to the Soviet Union. They think they are generous to forgive him for the secret agreements about the veto and voting strength in the United Nations, and for bargaining away the rights of China, because he labored under the shadow of death. Others less generously accuse President Roosevelt of flagrant betrayal of his country. Yalta has almost ceased to be the name of something historically measurable and has become a byword for failure, folly, or treason.

Let it be said first that there are no more Yalta Conference secrets. Although the minutes and attendant letters and memoranda have not been published they hide nothing of importance. Everything that was done at Yalta has been revealed, so has nearly everything of moment that was said. A few snatches of conversation remain unreported, some of them piquant, but they are only conversation. The story of the conference has been adequately told by former Secretary Byrnes in Speaking Frankly and by Robert Sherwood in Roosevelt and Hopkins, based on the Hopkins papers.

According to them it was not a conference of surrenders, but one that developed give and take beyond expectation and set the stage for postwar Allied cooperation that promised to establish enduring peace. The talk was of a peace of 50 years. None of the Yalta negotiators could have believed that the cold war would be on in 3 years. Why this cooperation was to be lost after Yalta remains in part a mystery, certainly more mysterious than anything that happened at Yalta itself.

The Yalta Conference was acclaimed at the time as marking the high point in Allied unity in the war. Now that the unity has vanished it may be superficially considered to have been of little value. But that is true only if Allied victory was of little value, and those who disparage the work of Yalta are in danger of doing just that. At the time, the grand coalition had only just come in sight of victory, after surmounting much menacing mutual distrust. Since the last previous conference at Tehran, the second front at last had been opened. It had come a year late in terms of the precise pledge given to Russia, but it was on a scale to eradicate most of the Russian fears that the Western Powers were conniving to let Russia bleed to death along with Germany on the embattled eastern front.

It was a burst of such positive effort that it seemed to assure early victory in Europe and pave the way for the defeat of Japan. The Battle of the Bulge had closed the horizon for a spell, but shortly before Yalta the German counteroffensive had been mastered and advance from the west could again be scheduled. The Russians for their part had smashed and shelled their way to the German frontier in the east.

What had to be assured at Yalta was the consolidation of the mutual confidence so lately established by these military successes. In their report to the conference, the spokesman for the Russian Chiefs of Staff could boast of a 4-to-1 preponderance over the Germans in the east, whom they were crushing by an unprecedented concentration of artillery and manpower. The American chiefs could boast with even greater pride that they were meeting and beating the Germans on a division-for-division equality in the west. Both sides were impressed.

Now, for the first time, the great Allied personalities were able to confer over final operations of a victory that was within grasp rather than one still only hoped for, and, to do this, they needed more open-mindedness and faith in each other than had yet characterized their dealings.

The scope of the conference was unlimited. It had to build on full military agreement, with each of the two fronts trusting the other to do its utmost. Then it had to envisage the broad outlines of a German settlement. From that it had to pass to the task of defeating Japan, and, finally, to the establishment of the world organization which was to be the coalition's crowning creation.

Suspicion was not altogether allayed by the Yalta Conference. There were to be occasions when both western and eastern leaders thought they detected in each other evidence of malingering in the conduct of the war. Events, however, showed the suspicions to be ill-founded, and the complete victory was won as a joint enterprise in the fullest sense of interdependence. This, no doubt, is the fruit by which Yalta should be judged first, and perhaps finally. Only those willing to espouse the idea that this complete victory was a mistake and that compromise with Nazi Germany would have been preferable are logically justified in condemning the achievements of Yalta.

The conference brought together the finest galaxy of Allied leadership. In addition to the two heads of state, Stalin and Roosevelt, and the British Prime Minister, were gathered all the Chiefs of Staff of the three countries, excepting only General "Hap" Arnold, absent through illness. No such array of military chiefs, prepared to discuss the actual cooperation of such vast armies, air forces and navies, had ever been held. And because of their intentions and the state of the war, Yalta must count as having been dominated more by military than political considerations. But the array of political leaders was hardly less notable, with the Foreign Secretaries, Molotov, Eden and Stettinius, in attendance with such colleagues as Vishinsky, Gusev, Gromyko and Maisky for Russia, Clark-Kerr for Britain and Hopkins and Harriman for the United States.

And the economic implications of the coming peace were emphasized by President Roosevelt's insistence on the presence of Mr. Byrnes, at that time his economic alternate in domestic affairs. No more comprehensive wartime conference ever assembled, not only in World War II, but in history.

Americans should know that the first objective of American policy at Yalta was military; it was to fix the date desired for Russia's entry into the Japanese war. Here the Chiefs of Staff set their requirements and President Roosevelt had to meet them as best he could. That was their duty and his. It should be clear that the objective was not to obtain a pledge of Russia's entry into the Japanese war. That had already been given by Premier Stalin to Secretary Hull at Moscow in 1943. The point at issue was the time. The political terms granted the Russians in return for their promise to attack within 2 or 3 months after the surrender of Germany were frankly the price paid for this date, to which tremendous importance was attributed.

Much of the criticism of American policy at Yalta has been possible only because the critics subsequently learned what President Roosevelt and his military advisers could not know in February, 1945. This was that Japan was to surrender in August of that year, without invasion and without much regard for Russia's entry into the war. With this knowledge they can argue that the promises given the Russians were at best unnecessary and at worst were immoral and ultimately disastrous to American interests in the Far East. They do not argue that the military and the President should have known that the surrender was so near. To do so would be absurd, for they could not have known. But the critics do not hesitate to condemn a policy based on a miscalculation even though it was unavoidable.

The importance of Russia's entry into the war within 3 months of Germany's surrender lay in the intention of the American high command to invade Japan in November 1945. This was expected to be one of the most sanguinary actions in history, costing up to a million American casualties. For it to succeed the Japanese must not be able to reinforce their home garrisons from their infantry in Manchuria, reputedly the flower of their army. Indeed, the American strategists foresaw a tremendous struggle between the Japanese and Russians, in which the Red army would bear the brunt of the land fighting in Asia in much the same way it had done in eastern Europe while the United States and Great Britain were pouring their men and weapons onto the Normandy beaches.

If the Russians waited until after the invasion of Japan to enter the war, and if the Japanese army in Manchuria had been weakened to strengthen the homeland, the Russians would have had a walk-over, and might have emerged in the Far East more powerful than we. So there appeared to be impelling reasons to pay a price for the Russian commitment. Not to do so, might cost tens of thousands of American lives and promote Russian supremacy in the area. The considerations of ultimate power may not have been uppermost in American minds at Yalta. What did obsess them was the success of the projected invasion at a minimum cost in American lives.

So the political price was paid. In addition to the Kuriles, the agreement gave the

Soviet Union the position Russia enjoyed in the Far East before the Japanese attack of 1904. This involved the rights of China in Dairen and in the control of the Manchurian railway. The record of the Yalta conference shows that President Roosevelt did not carelessly agree to everything the Russians asked in the Far East. They wanted Port Arthur and Dairen outright, as well as full control of the Manchurian railways. He urged that both cities be made free ports and that the railways be administered by a joint commission with the Chinese.

Mr. Stalin assented to these modifications in a conversation with Mr. Roosevelt, but when the Russian draft of the agreement was produced it said nothing about free ports or a joint commission, and it ignored Mr. Roosevelt's insistence on obtaining the concurrence of Chiang Kai-shek. So the negotiations were renewed through intermediaries. Stalin insisted on a naval base at Port Arthur, so here a free port would be impossible. But he acceded to one in Dairen. He accepted the joint commission for the railways.

The need for the concurrence of Chiang Kai-shek also was set forth in the final wording of the agreement. However, it went on to say that "the heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union should be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated." And China's recognition of the status in Outer Mongolia also was demanded by the Russians. It was left that President Roosevelt was to ask China's agreement to these terms, but not until after 25 Russian divisions could be moved from Europe to the Far Eastern front after the German surrender. (Later, Stalin undertook to obtain China's agreement himself on the occasion of T. V. Soong's visit to Moscow in July 1945. This was one of the minor successes of Harry Hopkins' mission to Moscow in May of that year.)

It is clear that this bargain was kept secret temporarily from the Chinese only because disclosure to the Japanese was feared. Chungking at that time was notoriously loose with secrets. Had the Japanese known what was up they could have attacked the Russians in the Far East and presumably overwhelmed them.

The morality of bargaining away Chinese rights behind the back of Chiang Kai-shek has been legitimately challenged. It is true, too, that President Roosevelt, after holding out for Chiang's right to be consulted, accepted the peremptory clause in which he and Mr. Churchill assured the Russians of getting what they wanted. But it is only fair to see the agreement as it appeared at the time to the men who made it. If there was to be the heavy fighting anticipated, and if the Russians defeated the Japanese, they would be in a position to take whatever they wanted in Manchuria. So the terms granted actually set a maximum to Russia's demands. To grant them did not appear to be doing China a disfavor. And when the terms as finally formulated included a pledge by the Russians to sign a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Nationalist Government in China, they looked both moderate and cordial.

Former Secretary Byrnes has pointed out that the Russians might have entered the Far Eastern war without accepting any limitations at all, coming in at a time of their own choosing and demanding whatever they could exact. They had a score of their own to settle with Japan, and vital interests in the Far East. The agreement at Yalta did override China's rights, but it cannot be said to have overridden China's interests, in view of all the circumstances.

Nor is it certain that Chiang Kai-shek was unprepared for all the demands. Mr. Sherwood found among the Hopkins papers a note scribbled on an envelope at Cairo suggesting that the Generalissimo had there agreed to Dairen's becoming a free port. Long after Yalta the Russians tried to press the Chinese for greater concessions, and Secretary Byrnes strongly supported their resistance. But the Chinese agreed to the Yalta terms without making a great public outcry.

The bargain about the Far East cannot be challenged for not having served American interests as they were conceived at the time. Had it not been made, and had the far eastern war developed as expected, the cost in American lives would have been heavy. Then President Roosevelt would have been justly condemned for not having done his utmost to obtain Russian cooperation, and it is to the credit of this agreement that General MacArthur could be accepted as supreme commander in the Far East. So an indirect benefit is that today we do not suffer in Japan the danger and dismay from divided counsels which confront us in Europe.

Though the political accord about the Far East had to remain secret, no apparent need for secrecy existed for the decision at Yalta to give the Russians two extra votes in the United Nations Assembly. President Roosevelt himself insisted on the secrecy in a strong memorandum Harry Hopkins sent to Mr. Byrnes. This is mystifying and it proved unfortunate, for the issue was not a major one, and the resort to secrecy threw suspicion over the entire Yalta proceedings. Mr. Roosevelt did not like the concession he made to the Russians. Before going to Yalta he had told congressional leaders that he would oppose it, and, if necessary, demand 48 votes for the United States.

At Yalta he found the British agreed with the Russians; they wanted to be sure of obtaining a vote in the Assembly for India, not then a sovereign state. The minutes simply record a change in the American position, in that no opposition was raised to the extra votes when the foreign ministers got down to a discussion of it. But Mr. Byrnes was greatly troubled. He privately urged the President to insist on at least equal voting rights for the United States. The President wrote letters to Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill, who promptly acceded to his request.

The only plausible reason for secrecy is that Mr. Roosevelt was afraid the news might hurt the United Nations before it could be established. But it may be that he had a strategy in mind. He may have hoped to confide in Mr. Stalin that American opinion would be offended by the voting proposal, and suggest that both Russia and the United States drop the demand. At the time the news leaked out I was told this had been the President's intention. But once the news was out retreat was impossible. So the Russians got their extra votes, the United States never asked numerical equality and Yalta came to be known as a place of sinister secret bargains.

At Yalta the Russians gave as well as gained. Not that a conference should be scored like a ball game for the concessions won by the two sides. But to succeed it must reveal willingness to yield as well as to insist. The Russians were precipitated into an immediate and unexpected meeting to establish the United Nations. Then they accepted the American compromise formula for the Security Council veto, which had been sent them in December but had remained unacknowledged.

At Dumbarton Oaks the Russians had insisted on a veto by any of the three powers on any question whatever. At Yalta they accepted the American proposal by which two categories of conflicts were defined, one in which military sanctions were to be imposed, where the veto could operate, and one in which the dispute was to be settled without sanctions and a party to the dispute could not vote, not even if one of the major powers.

The Russians also were pushed into a corner to agree to supplant the Lublin regime in Poland with a Government of national unity. And they concurred in a ringing American-drafted resolution reaffirming the Atlantic Charter in a declaration of policy for liberated countries in Europe.

It is true that almost immediately after Yalta the Polish agreement began coming apart at the seams. Russian intentions in Rumania also awoke suspicions as to whether a government friendly to the Soviet Union could at the same time be free. This was while President Roosevelt still lived, so that he himself began to have doubts about the unity established at Yalta.

What today counts as the failure of Yalta is in fact largely the failure after Yalta. Now it is clear that the death of President Roosevelt marked the end of any real hope of maintaining allied unity. Had he lived, he would have attempted to conduct a good-neighbor policy with Russia. He would have wished to continue lend-lease, and he would have supported—on strict terms—a large postwar credit to Russia for reconstruction. (At Yalta Secretary Stettinius cordially agreed to discuss one at any time, either in Moscow or Washington.)

Whether American opinion would have supported such a policy may be open to question. Shortly before his death Mr. Roosevelt expressed a fear that the American people might make some great mistake, as they had done after World War I. He may have been thinking of another wave of isolationism, and if so he was wrong, as he rarely was about American opinion. He also may have dreaded a repudiation of a policy of patience and generosity toward the Soviet Union. Since then, the conduct of the Kremlin seems to have amply justified any American distrust.

But it is necessary to recognize that this conduct developed after Moscow reached the conclusion that Washington no longer intended a good-neighbor policy. Stalin complained bitterly to Harry Hopkins over the sudden end of certain lend-lease shipments to Russia after the German surrender. He could understand why they had been discontinued, but he had been offended by the way it was done. He called it brutal.

He pointed out that it had not been discussed frankly in the manner necessary to keep Russian friendship. Later, when the Russians did ask outright for a postwar credit, the request was not even answered, having been inadvertently mislaid by a State Department official, surely one of the most eloquent of gestures known to diplomacy.

The good will created at Yalta swiftly seeped away, and antagonism developed on both sides. To judge what would have happened had President Roosevelt lived may be thankless guesswork. It now is hard to believe that the United States and the Soviet Union could have kept in step for a long time. But in a world of only two great powers, if they were striving sincerely for a relationship of good neighborliness, the day of disillusionment might have been put off for many years. And in the interim progress might have been made from a world of power and war to a world of law.

Soviet Russia's Strategy To Dominate the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following summary of an address by Kenneth deCourcy, editor

of Intelligence Digest, published by The Union League Club of Chicago, as a contribution of important information of interest to Americans, February 1949:

SOVIET RUSSIA'S STRATEGY TO DOMINATE THE WORLD

For the first time in the history of the human race the very existence of the human family is at stake. We should face that fact while we have an opportunity to do so.

The present situation is a great deal simpler than it was in 1937 when the question of Germany was rolled in with many other problems, which made it very difficult to solve at that time.

In contrast, the present situation is very simple, indeed, although it is a very grave one.

SOVIET RUSSIA'S PREPARATIONS FOR WAR

There is a country occupying a sixth of the area of the globe which has devoted and is devoting, with ever greater intensity, her whole resources to the making of a great machine of war. We should all realize before it is too late that all these political activities, which Russia sponsors all over the world and in the most secure as well as in the most insecure areas, are geared to a general staff plan.

They are not mere political activity. They are activities of a kind designed to undermine the strategic security of Russia's enemies, and these great fifth-column movements are used as espionage organizations everywhere.

This Soviet system, which has 14 ministries working on war production at this moment, which last year produced 35,000 tanks from her war plants—the best tanks in existence today—has a design, a policy, an overall strategy which is being worked out, step by step, and phase by phase.

Intelligence in Russia is very difficult to organize and to maintain. But some information does reach us in London and Washington, which is reliable. It is known as a fact that a number of very important conferences took place in the Kremlin during the summer of 1947, many of them presided over by Stalin himself, to consider an over-all strategy for the next 10 years or so.

Stalin did not preside over all these conferences because his health has not been very good. He has some stomach trouble, the exact nature of which we do not know, but it takes him away a good deal from Moscow to a warmer climate; but during the hot summer months of 1947 he was well enough to attend many of these important meetings; and the Russians considered very carefully what their situation was as compared with ours.

RUSSIA SEEKS TO GAIN TIME

Those who conferred at those important meetings made up their minds that Russia must, at all costs, gain time.

First of all, they believe that economic difficulties are likely to overwhelm Britain and America, and in the course of a number of years so to weaken us that Russia will be relatively stronger. That is nonsense because the economic position of Britain and America is not likely to change greatly for the worse in the immediate future.

They also considered that they have had many internal difficulties at present of a grave kind, which required time to arrange. They have guerrilla troubles in the Ukraine. They have some troubles in their Asiatic Republics. They have a great mass of people moving about without documents as a result of the disturbances of the war, and they have a certain amount of trouble—which we should not overrate—in the satellite countries. Therefore, they required time to iron out those difficulties and to settle those things down.

Above all that, they required time in order to build new industrial plants in the vast, almost invulnerable, hinterland of the Soviet Union, in the great semi-Asiatic areas, and in the great northern areas where weather conditions are so bad for so much of the year that attack by us from the air would be extremely difficult. Some of these areas are even scheduled on our most secret intelligence maps. They required time for development.

Above and beyond all, they required time in order to get ahead with their research into atomic warfare and the mysteries of nuclear energy. They have, as a matter of fact, all the theory of atomic energy and nuclear energy already, but they have not so far been able to come up to schedule in the production of their first militarily useful atom bomb. But the time is not far distant when they will have settled that problem.

The Soviet high command, therefore, decided that it would go in for piecemeal aggression for 5 or 6 years, getting away with what it could while preparing a military endeavor of first magnitude and hoping that in the meantime, by fifth-column activities here and in Britain and in other countries, that it would undermine every policy and every device of ours to deal with Russia before they reached that time of military superiority.

WASHINGTON AND LONDON SLOW TO ACT

When these decisions were taken and when the news reached Washington and London, great disquiet was caused. Many people felt that the whole Soviet production schedule and its foreign policy plan should be examined afresh to decide whether we could really allow them to operate until they reached the moment that suited them best, and then "face the music."

We were very slow in taking any decisions at all. But about 3 or 4 months ago so much news came to London and to Washington, which confirmed everything we had heard, that certain decisions were at least considered.

It was planned to try to give a little extra help to China so as to keep the pot boiling there, and to pin down the maximum Russian forces in the Far East that could possibly be pinned down in case of world war, so that they would not be available for use in western Europe, or in the Middle East.

But that decision, unfortunately, was taken too late. One of my observers on my paper has just been in the Far East. He tells me that the situation there now is far more serious than even our most pessimistic newspapers tell us; that we are on the verge of seeing the complete collapse of the defense of the anti-Communist forces in the Far East.[1] This means not only the loss of China but also the loss of Malaya, of Indonesia, and of Siam. It means the outflanking, on the largest possible scale, of Japan and Australia and India. It also means the consequent release for use elsewhere, in case of world war, of great forces of the Soviet Union, which might otherwise have been pinned down and kept busy there so that they could do no harm anywhere else.

STRENGTHENING THE MIDDLE EAST

Another decision which was taken, or which it was hoped should be taken, in order to face this Russian menace, was to strengthen the whole defensive position in the Middle East. But unfortunately, owing to disastrous mistakes made last summer in Greece, we did not send the right help to the Greek front, with the consequence that we have not been able to strengthen the whole Middle or Near Eastern position.

I went to the Greek front and saw for myself what the situation was—and I guarantee to you that what I say is factual. We did not send the resources which would have settled the war in Greece last summer.

[1] This statement was made November 23, 1948.

For that reason alone, the Greeks will have to remain mobilized for the whole of this winter and the whole of this spring that is coming. Because they will have to face another campaign next year, Greece may break and a government may be established there which will be hostile to western powers.

Another reason we have not been able to carry out the Middle Eastern policy of securing the situation there against the Soviet Union is because the Palestine war continues, and thus makes any coordinated effort in that area extremely difficult.

PLANS UPSET IN WESTERN EUROPE

And, finally, it was the intention of Britain and America to increase the defensive strength of western Europe so that it would be almost impossible for the Russians, in case of world war, to make a great breakthrough there and thus destroy, in 1 hour, the cradle of civilization.

But all our efforts to secure western Europe and to strengthen our position there, and thus to deter Russia in time of war, have been upset by the constant interruptions of recovery. In France Communist activities are all planned by Russia and geared to their General Staff plans. The unhappy relations which exist between Spain and the rest of the countries of western Europe are, of course, also stirred up by every device which the Soviet Union can use.

All that is bad enough; but it is made worse when we have a political complication in England which makes a really strong policy extremely difficult. I have no doubt that the majority of members of the British Cabinet are anxious to avert further Russian expansion. But, unfortunately, these Cabinet ministers are dependent for their parliamentary support upon a party which has a very strong and powerful left wing. This group has much too close liasion with Russian friends for my measure of patriotism. Consequently, the Cabinet is under pressure the whole time not to pursue a strong policy, not to go too far, and to dilly-dally. It thus makes possible this Russian policy of gaining time until 1954 or 1955, which is what the Russians want. All that adds up to an extremely grave total.

DRIFTING FROM ONE WEAKNESS TO ANOTHER

We could have settled the whole Russian question in the summer of 1948 if we had so desired. If we had declined to accept the blockade of Berlin and had used the resources we now possess in scientific weapons, which are vastly superior to those of Russia as we now stand, they would have capitulated over Berlin and the whole world situation would have changed.

Or, if they had not capitulated and risked a war in the summer of 1948, we would have decisively won it within a very, very short period of time. We would have had to undertake a certain amount of mobilization and even to accept a certain retreat on our side; then to use our atomic bombs against, not their women and children, but against their main military concentrations. They would have "had it," as we say in England.

They would have been cut off from their sources of supply. Between them and their own country would have been great areas of radioaction, which would have been impenetrable for a very significant period of time; and the whole thing would have been settled.

But we have drifted from one weakness to another. We talk about being strong over Berlin. I see no signs of any strong policy whatsoever. We accept the blockade of Berlin, and go to enormous expense and trouble to send in frugal supplies by our air forces, when we ought to be sending them by the most convenient manner, down the autobahn, with an ordinary convoy. But we keep on doing exactly what the Russians themselves have calculated we will do, namely, compromise; capitulate; retreat; arrange—while they are getting stronger and stronger and stronger.

RUSSIAN ATOM-BOMB PROGRAM

There is strong reason to believe—and I want to put this to you very gravely, indeed—that next summer the Russians will have produced their first large-scale usable atom bomb. From separate sources of secret intelligence, one of the most powerful anti-Russian nations in the world has been told, and its intelligence services have accepted as a fact, that between June 1 and June 15, 1949, Soviet Russia will have produced its first atom bomb in Atomgrad, under the direction of Marshal Berier. Atomgrad is in one of the Asiatic Republics of Russia, bordering on Afghanistan. From then onward they plan, and believe that they can carry out, the production of four such bombs per month.

The Russian general staff takes the view that 30 such bombs would be decisive in a world war, directed against the western powers, because all that we have and possess on our side is concentrated in highly vulnerable areas of great population.

ATOM BOMB OUTMODES DEFENSIVE MEASURES

Of course, our steel production will always outmatch that of Russia and our technical efficiency in the production of aircraft will always outmatch that of the Soviet Union. Of course, in the normal world war, where things are slowly mobilized and where the great forces of Britain and America and our allies get into the field, we shall always be victorious.

But what of a war in which the other side has concentrated very large resources for use in a short space of time against our most vulnerable areas?

What about a war in which two or three atom bombs are dropped on London and our biggest industrial centers outside London, though London is by far the most important?

What about a war in which the Soviet Arctic Air Force, the most efficient Arctic air force in the world, developed on the largest possible scale in the last 2 or 3 years, drops atom bombs on the most vulnerable centers of Canada and the United States?

How can we ever mobilize? How can we ever continue? How can we ever put our natural resources into the scales?

Thirty atom bombs directed against our most vulnerable areas would, I fear, be decisive; and we have it in our hands to make such a catastrophe impossible by taking a strong policy now before the other side accumulates this fearful resource of power.

But if with all our intelligence, with all our democratic spirit, and all the democratic resources of information available to us, if with all our long experience of many generations and many centuries, if even after the experience of 1940–45, if even after the experience of the last 2 years, we really are such fools as to sit down here and wait until the Soviet Union has accumulated 30 or 40 atom bombs and loaded them up in her Arctic aircraft, and so on—then we really deserve certain defeat.

It is absolute madness for us to sit here and wait until the other side has prepared, on the largest scale, the most devastating weapon ever known to mankind, that is going to strike us in the most vulnerable bases and against our most highly populated areas.

But that is what we are doing at this moment. We have played about with a counter-policy, as I have said, of securing the position a little more in the Far East; of building up a little more in the Middle East; and making a greater buffer in the West. We have cleared up a few Communist agents here and there. But even the things we have done have been undermined by the things that I have described to you.

But on the whole, and taking the thing at large and looking at the over-all picture, we have let the whole position, so far, go by default.

WE HAVE ANOTHER YEAR AT MOST

We have another year at most, and probably less, in which to settle this matter on our own terms. Winston Churchill spoke the other day at the Conservative Annual Conference in London and based his remarks and the policies he suggested on the most intimate knowledge of the most secret documents of the most secret facts available to the greatest intelligence services in the world.

He declared that we must bring the Russian question to a point of decision now. If we do not do it, we shall be obliterated, not by marching Soviet armies, not by Soviet fifth columns, but by scientific weapons against which there is no defense. To allow them to manufacture, to accumulate, to prepare their use is a madness unparalleled in human history.

Mr. Churchill, well aware of all that, sounded his grave note. When the story of these times is written, if it is written, it may well be that Churchill's speech at London will go down as of far greater importance than the others he has delivered.

The child's play of the German war, and the monstrous difficulties of politics at home and abroad, are nothing to compare with this single, all-powerful, transcendent issue. We shall have no time, no opportunity of setting our political philosophies, in order, of bringing about the renaissance in religion, which we also desire, and the other great things which we have in mind, if we allow the next year or so to drift on, as we are allowing things to drift now.

There is no expert in Europe or America today, in any of the intelligence services, and in any of the high official levels, who does not fully and 100 percent share the views that I have ventured to express to you today.

I hope that you will go away from this meeting very seriously to consider what is your duty, as powerful citizens of a great country, in such a moment as this. If democracy means anything at all, it is for us to direct what governments and cabinets should do in circumstances of this kind. History will request and require an answer from you gentlemen, as it will request and require an answer from me, as to what we did with the democratic powers with which we were entrusted.

TRIBUTE TO UNITED STATES

(In his opening remarks, Mr. deCourcy paid tribute to the economic and political power of the United States; he also urged a program of economic development of natural resources as a means of speeding world economic recovery.)

The United States of America is at the height of her power and her prestige and her influence upon all the affairs of all the world. Your vast productive capacity, your great economic strength, your great manpower, which has military significance as we now know from the last war and the one before it, your vigor, springing from your abundant youth—all those things together and more besides give you a position of preeminence in the most critical moment of world affairs in all recorded history.

This vast wealth, this great prestige, this unprecedented success, of which you are the inheritors and to some extent the creators, have sprung from one of the most remarkable things in history. In all the record of the human story no great nation has been founded so decisively by so small a group of people of one mind as this Nation was founded.

First, they were convinced that they could do nothing of themselves; that they were entirely dependent upon Almighty God; and, secondly, that they believed in freedom above all else.

In many great nations you can find a gradual evolving sense of religion and God-fearing conduct, and an evolving sense of freedom, and so on; but I do not know, in all recorded history, of a case where a nation was founded by men and women who, at every turn in their adventure, referred in every detail of their affairs to their God-fearing convictions.

I have no shadow of doubt that it is that great witness in history, which they made, which God has honored; and it is for that reason that this country has risen to its vast position of prestige and power which it now enjoys. I equally have no doubt that their great devotion to freedom has also been honored with this result.

For these reasons the United States is at the height of its prestige and power and, therefore, forms a supremely important influence in the world situation from every point of view—economic, military, and, of course above all, morally.

WE HAVE SCARCELY SCRATCHED OUR RESOURCES

There are certain things about my country, England, which ought to be more clearly realized. Unlike the United States of America, we have scarcely scratched our resources yet. If you look at England as the center of a great commonwealth of nations which exists in a very powerful form, and perhaps even more powerful than the old imperial form, you will find that she possesses undeveloped wealth which is unrivaled by that of any nation in the world.

The time is not very far distant, for example, when the United States will draw upon the British commonwealth's resources for her iron ore, and in the very near future Canada will be a gold-producing country of greater power and influence than ever South Africa was. If one will look through the whole British commonwealth, he will find vast, untouched resources which, if they were developed, and if they were used, would make that system of nations a very powerful and influential one. If you will put that potentiality alongside your existing power, you have a combination of forces and nations which is unrivaled in all the world outside.

"CHARITY GOES DOWN THE DRAIN"

It is an astounding thing to me why this practical and powerful Nation of America insists upon doling out charity to the British Commonwealth of Nations when you could so easily invest your money in profitable enterprise to develop these great resources and bring into existence new wealth. That course would be so much more wise than giving charity which goes down the drain, leaving the problem at the end of the charity even more acute than the problem was before it was given. The present policy does nothing except to deceive the people in my country as to their true position.

Unfortunately, in my country these great resources are not being developed. This idea of expansion and enterprise has been damped down because we have been taught by 40 years of propaganda that personal success is an unrighteous and illicit thing and that it's wrong to be successful; that wealth is somehow a sign of disgrace; and progress in economic affairs something of which we have to be ashamed. That, of course, is a Socialist doctrine. We have to reduce everything to drab ugliness and mediocrity instead of raising it to greater wealth and power and therefore to beauty and success.

INFLUENTIAL CHANGES IN THE MAKING

That is an unhappy state of affairs. I hope that America will do nothing to subsidize that monstrous system. I hope, on the contrary, that the great influence of this Nation will always be used in the English-speaking world for the putting forward of greater ideas of enterprise and adventure and personal in-

itiative and personal success from which national success springs.

If there were no interruptions from outside I have no doubt whatsoever that before very long we should see in this country many influential changes and in my country many of these monstrous ideas of reduction and mediocrity and reducing of enterprise would be swept away, and we should see a great renaissance there, too.

We should see, within 50 or 100 years, the great African continent as powerful and as mighty economically as the United States is today. We should see Canada going forward in great power and strength, with a vaster population and all her resources being developed; and we should see Australia, which has practically no population at all and yet is of unparalleled wealth, developing a great community, a great influence in the Far East; and we should see similar things in New Zealand, where everything has been reduced to an abysmal mediocrity by 7 years of rotten socialism. All that we should see if we were left undisturbed for the rest of this century.

What Has Become of the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the more I listen to the speeches made in the House and the comments by and large in the dining room and to the conversations among various groups of people, sometimes I wonder whether the United States as such still exists. It is a rare thing to hear any person express the slightest interest in our domestic problems. It would seem that the philosophy of spending has become the chief topic of interest. The public debt means nothing to those who converse about conditions. The ultimate cost of various programs relating to foreign affairs is of no little consequence apparently to those who desire to spend other people's money.

We see before our eyes a repetition of what happened as a result of arming Japan—only that now we are arming Russia. Those who thrive on war and make millions out of war have set their stakes for the next war 15 years from now. The babies born within the United States and who survive until they are 21 will be in the next war, according to the military timetable of various nations, including our own. I wonder if the American people, divided as they are into respective congressional constituencies, really sent their Representatives here to devote all of their attention to affairs in every remote country on the face of the earth. It will be some time before our people realize that their birthrights have been bartered away for a mess of foreign pottage. This generation and succeeding generations will suffer the loss of liberty as a result of the reckless program under which a great bureaucracy will spend the crushing taxes exacted from our people because this great collective Frankenstein believes that the American taxpayer lacks the intelligence to spend his own hard-earned money.

It has always been said that experience is a good teacher, but after arming Japan and then sending our boys into the Pacific to give their lives and shed their blood to conquer Japan it would seem that this experience had taught our internationalists and interventionists nothing at all. They still clamor to pour our resources into the hands of our potential enemies without let or hindrance.

There appear to be no such words as "stop, look, and listen" in the affairs of Government. Pressure groups here and pressure groups from abroad seem to be the dominant influence in the Capitol of this great Nation. The foreign social lobby is at work. The pressure groups, like flocks of howling wolves, are barking at Congress to raise more money to spend here, but mostly abroad. I wonder if it will ever dawn upon the sovereign citizens of this great Republic that their safety, their liberty, and that of their children and their grandchildren must be based upon a solvent Government?

I notice in today's Washington Times-Herald an article which, of course, will fall upon deaf ears, yet it is one of the things that points to a repetition of the ineptness of the administration that suffered and permitted the arming of Japan. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the article written by Frank Holeman:

ERP GOODS BEING SOLD TO RUSSIA—MARSHALL PLAN NATIONS MAKE DEALS WITH REDS

(By Frank Holeman)

Soviet Russia and her satellites are acquiring through 91 trade deals with Marshall plan countries many of the potential war materials which this Government, through export controls, refuses to ship to the U. S. S. R. because of the cold war, a survey showed yesterday.

Statistics on the flow of trade—amounting to about $3,000,000,000 in total value—across the iron curtain came from Government agencies and embassies here of our European allies.

SPIRIT OF ACT VIOLATED

Such trade deals involving heavy industrial equipment and similar war-vital goods violate the spirit if not the letter of the Marshall Plan Act, and also grabs off potential markets behind the iron curtain denied American exporters by the export control policy.

The cautious Eightieth Congress inserted in the Marshall plan law a provision designed to prevent recipient nations from selling behind the iron curtain those goods which this Government will not export into the Communist domain.

On the other hand, an ECA official pointed out yesterday, this trade is saving the United States money in that the ERP nations swap their exports directly for food and do not have to use dollars. If all raw materials had to be bought outside the iron curtain, the cost of the $17,000,000,000 Marshall plan would go up another $5,000,000,000 over 4 years, officials estimate.

METHOD USED BY REDS

The way in which Russia and its satellites have been able to force industrial equipment from Marshall plan countries in exchange for vitally needed food and raw material shows up in these trade facts:

1. In fiscal 1950 Britain, France, and other western European countries are committed to sell to iron-curtain countries an estimated $1,500,000,000 in goods which will further build up the Communist economy and make Russia tougher to fight if war comes. Crude rubber, tin and nickel, scientific equipment, locomotives, generators—those are some of the 'hot items."

2. In exchange for this inward flow of potential war material, the Communist nations are turning over approximately $1,500,000,000 in raw materials, including grain, coal, timber, potash fertilizer.

CAN'T BUY IT HERE

A Commerce Department official freely admitted that no export licenses for delivery to Russia would be granted on such items as these on the Russian-British trade list:

Ten oil refineries, 2,400 flat trucks, $600,000 worth of scientific and laboratory equipment, 1,100 narrow-gage locomotives, 150 mobile Diesel electric generators, 24 steam power turbines, 18 ball mills for copper ore grading.

The strict export controls have cut our outgoing trade with Russia down to $500,000 a month, compared with $12,000,000 a month in 1947.

One top ECA planner declared:

"If we served an ultimatum, and told the western European nations to quit doing business with the Communists, or give up Marshall plan aid, they would probably have told us to go to hell," he said, bluntly.

"They would rather have their world trade than the aid program any day."

Britain, getting the lion's share of United States aid, has besides its Russian agreement, a trade pact with Poland. This 5-year barter deal calls for Britain to supply $40,000,000 worth of wool a year, 3,000 to 5,000 tons of crude rubber a year, $500,000 worth of rubber tires for cars and tractors a year, $500,000 worth of auto spare parts, and 3,000 pounds of semimanufactured copper.

TITO GETS MACHINERY

In addition, Britain agreed to clear the way for British merchants to sell Poland 180,000 to 250,000 tons of crude oil from the Middle East every year. Also, they would help find sisal, manila, electrolytic nickel, ferrotungsten, ferrovanadium, ferromanganese and 1,000 tons a year of tin.

None of the stuff could be exported directly from the United States, the office of international trade advised. Moreover, the United States Munitions Board is still buying sisal, manila, tungsten, vanadium, and manganese for war stock piles, an official said.

The British-Yugoslav Pact provides for Tito to get $10,000,000 worth of "miscellaneous machinery," $2,400,000 of "electro technical material," $140,000 worth of "instruments and parts for scientific use," 3,000 tons of rolled steel, 10,000 tires, and 1,500 tons of rubber.

Other deals in the British pattern include:

France: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. The French generally export luxury goods, wines, and light manufactures in exchange for timber and other raw materials.

Benelux countries (Belgium, Netherlands, and Luxemburg: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, Soviet zone of Germany. Light manufactures and industrial goods, scientific instruments, and so forth, for food and raw materials.

SOVIET GETS $9,000,000

Sweden: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Soviet zone of Germany. Sweden sells ball bearings, a wide range of industrial products in exchange for raw materials, sending Russia $9,000,000 of stuff a year.

Italy: Pacts with Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, Soviet zone of Germany. Italy sells agricultural products, wines, and industrial goods for raw materials.

Turkey: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Poland. Poland has imported $166,000,000 worth of goods from Turkey and sold $106,000,000 since the agreement was signed in July 1948.

Greece: One pact, with Czechoslovakia. Terms secret.

Switzerland: Pacts with Finland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Poland, Russia, and the Soviet zone of Germany. Switzerland deals in a wide range of industrial and agricultural products, as the middleman of Europe. Own manufactures are mainly instruments and watches.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 22, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it seems that now, with war emergency past, the people of this country would be given back the control of their property. The law of supply and demand controlling the thrift and industry of our citizens has built this Nation. It is time that we let the law of supply and demand adjust the value and use of rental property in this country. I enclose herewith an editorial for the consideration of my colleagues:

THE MODERN MAN NOBODY LOVES

The man no one seems to have any sympathy for is the landlord.

This isn't just today. It's been the case for a good many years. Landlords have been the subject of almost as many jokes that combined digs and humor as the fat man.

All during the war years nobody thought about the landlords. Workers got higher wages and bonuses and time and a half for overtime. Farmers got bonuses for planting one crop and not for planting another, price floors, and higher parity ratios. Industry got fixed-costs-plus contracts and, even under controls, realistic pricing schedules.

But the landlords got only rental ceilings. Since the war landlords have gotten the chance of raising rents 15 percent over prewar figures, if they and their tenants got together and voluntarily signed 2-year leases. The talk in Congress today on rent-control extension is that this provision for an increase ought to be kicked out and rents raised under this system put back where they were.

There have been a lot of incongruities, however. A brand-new building, or single home, for example, could apply for rental ceilings and get them on the basis of construction costs. A five-room home, for example, that cost $11,000 to build in 1948 could get a rental ceiling of around $95 a month. But the exact duplicate of this home built before the war at a lower cost but just as salable now at $11,000 can't earn its owner more than $45-a-month rental.

The owner of this prewar model house, however, has to pay the same inflated taxes. He has to pay a plumber $3 an hour instead of $1.50 before the war when he repairs. The same holds true for painters and electricians. Out of his rental income he has to pay 90 cents for a dozen eggs that cost 45 cents when he started renting his house at $45 a month. All during 1948 he paid for cost-of-living items roughly 65 percent more than he paid in 1941.

Some landlords in Oklahoma and Colorado have decided their only recourse, in the face of a promised stricter rent-control law from the Eighty-first Congress, is that might makes right. This isn't, of course, a new economic theory. John L. Lewis has used it with superb effect on numerous occasions. But when Lewis used it nobody in Washington got excited until the country was about out of coal. But right away now the United States Attorney General is busy with the Oklahoma landlords, who say they're going to put their renters out and let their properties stand idle. He's dispatched some assistants out there to get busy. He's telegraphed the Federal attorneys in Oklahoma to get going and drag the landlords into court. Under what statutes isn't yet fully determined; they're busy now trying to find something that might fit.

No, we're not in favor of gouging, whether by landlords, coal dealers or butcher shop owners. But we're in favor of a fair shake, both for the man who puts a new faucet on the kitchen sink and the man who rents the sink as part of the equipment of an apartment or house. And we don't think they've both been dealt cards from the same deck.

International Communism: Its Origin and Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Col. Walter L. Furbershaw, chairman, committee on un-American and subversive activities, the Union League Club of Chicago, and wartime director of military intelligence, Sixth Service Command, United States Army, published by the Union League Club of Chicago as a contribution of important information of interest to Americans, February 1949:

INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM: ITS ORIGIN AND GROWTH

ORDER OF THE ILLUMINATI

It was during the latter part of the eighteenth century, due to the revolutionary change in the means and methods of production and the consequent concentrations of population in industrial centers, that radicalism, as we now understand the term, was conceived and began its gradual development. In May 1776, Adam Weishaupt, a professor of canon law in the college at Ingolstadt, Bavaria, founded the Order of the Illuminati, a secret society, to spread his economic, philosophic, and political views. The main objects for which this society was formed were:

1. Abolition of all ordered government;
2. Abolition of religion;
3. Abolition of the family relation and the institution of communal rearing and education of children;
4. Abolition of nationalism and patriotism;
5. Abolition of what is now called capitalism;
6. Abolition of all private property and property rights, including the rights of inheritance.

These principles have been adopted by all succeeding revolutionary movements down through those of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in 1848, 1864, and 1889, to that of Nicolai Lenin, Leon Trotzky and Josef Stalin of 1916 and 1919.

Weishaupt had been educated under Jesuit auspices, but early in life had met one Kolmar, a radical of whom little is now known and from the latter received and accepted his subversive ideas and philosophy, which he later elaborated. He left the Catholic Church and became a bitter enemy to all religion.

The membership of his Order of the Illuminati was divided generally into a comparatively few adepts or leaders, who were thoroughly trained and initiated into the inner workings of the order, and dupes, who were many and had little information of its real purposes. The order spread rapidly throughout France, Italy, and what was later the German Empire. The Bavarian Government, realizing the menace of the order, investigated and outlawed it and sent copies of its voluminous evidence to every civilized government. This exposure and edict of proscription, as well as internal dissertion, caused the downfall of the order in 1785. The remnants of the order went underground and thereafter operated as the inner circle of an international revolutionary movement. Weishaupt died in 1830, and it is said his declining years were filled with remorse and regret for his early assaults on religion.

ADEPTS AND DUPES

Modern communism follows the original Weishaupt Illuminati plan in its means used to recruit adepts, or inner circle members, and dupes, or those whom it used as fronts for furthering its revolutionary program and spreading its propaganda. Nesta Webster, in her authoritative book, World Revolution, says:

"It was in the training of adepts that Weishaupt showed his profound subtlety. Proselytes were not to be admitted at once to the secret aims of Illuminism, but initiated step by step into the higher mysteries—and the greatest caution was to be exercised not to reveal to the novice doctrines that might be likely to revolt him. * * * 'One must speak,' Weishaupt explained to the superiors of the order, 'sometimes in one way, sometimes in another, so that our real purpose should remain impenetrable to our inferiors.' * * * This device proved particularly successful not only with young novices, but with men of all ranks and ages. 'The most admirable thing of all,' wrote Spartacus (Weishaupt) triumphantly to Cato (von Zwack), 'is that the great * * * theologians (Lutherans and Calvinists) who belong to our order really believe they see in it the true and genuine mind of the Christian religion. Oh! man, what cannot you be brought to believe!' By this means, as Philo (the Baron von Knigge) later on pointed out, the order was able 'to tickle those who have a hankering for religion.' "

The modern Communist movement even adopted the Illuminati practice of having secret or party names for its leaders. As Weishaupt was known as Spartacus, von Zwack as Cato, and Baron von Knigge as Philo, etc., among the Illuminati, so in the present Communist movement Vladimir J. Ulianov became Nicolai Lenin (patron saint of communism), Josef Djougashvili became Josef Stalin (present dictator of Soviet Russia), Vyacheslav Scriabin became Molotov, Bronstein became Leon Trotsky, Appelbaum became Zinovieff, Rosenfeld became Kameneff, Sobelson became Karl Radek, Sacha Maximovich became Maxim Litvinoff (Soviet Foreign Minister and angel of peace at Geneva), etc. This practice was formerly rather generally followed by American Communists and is still used when expedient to protect the real identity of prominent members. Karl Marx, himself, was no exception in this regard—his real surname having been Mordecai.

The Jacobin Club, organized in 1789, during the French Revolution, and which was responsible for so much of the Reign of Terror, was organized by many who had been affiliated with the Illuminati. Originally composed of bourgeoisie, the Jacobin Club was later dominated by Robespierre, whose ruthless methods have been adopted and practiced by the present Communist dictators

of Russia. At the close of the revolution in France the radical movement again was driven under cover where it remained awaiting patiently its opportunity.

FIRST INTERNATIONAL

As it became necessary for capital to organize to meet the needs of the stupendously growing industries, so, also, leaders mostly intellectuals and dreamers arose and called upon the workers to organize internationally to protect their rights and demand more of the products of their labor.

Several efforts were made to form international labor movements, the first in England, in 1823. But it was not until 1848, when Karl Mordecai, alias Marx, and Friedrich Engels issued their Communist Manifesto, that the first definite international workers' movement took form. This document broadcast that well-known slogan that has since been the rallying cry of all radical sects: "Workingmen of the world, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, and the world to gain!"

Speaking of the effect of the industrial revolution and the capital organized to meet the greatly changed industrial conditions, Marx and Engels in their Manifesto of 1848 wrote that "During its [capitalism's] rule of scarce 100 years it has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature's forces to man and machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphy, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labor?

In addition to adopting the six basic principles of Weishaupt's Illuminati, the Communist Manifesto of 1848 promulgated the following program for the more advanced countries:

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

"5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

"7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

"8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

"9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

"10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of child factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, and so forth.

"When in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class; if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

"In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

MARX INFLUENCED BY WEISHAUPT

Marx, who was born in 1818, was a man of education, having graduated from the Universities of Berlin and Bon in Germany. He had made a deep study of the writings of Adam Weishaupt, much of which he revised and modernized and published as his own. While Marx's works are generally considered as the original source of information concerning modern socialism, they are in fact but a restatement and plagarism of the subversive ideas of Kolmar and Weishaupt. Germany, considering the teachings of Marx as too radical and dangerous, ordered his deportation, and the rest of his life was spent in Paris and London. His Manifesto and other writings divided modern society into two general classes, the bourgeoisie, representing capital, and the proletariat, representing the workers—classes having nothing in common and therefore to be separated by hatred and class warfare until such time as the workers shall have overthrown and forever destroyed the bourgeoisie. This would be accomplished only when religion, family relations, patriotism, capitalism, and property and inheritance rights were abolished.

The work of Marx and Engels and their associates was successful and the First International was founded in St. Martins Hall, London, on September 28, 1864. It was called the International Workingmen's Association, and was organized for the purpose of uniting all workingmen's organizations of revolutionary tendencies, and included working-class leaders of all schools, from extreme anarchists to the most moderate and conservative type of trade unionists. England sent trade unionists; Germany, Socialists; Russia, France and other Latin countries sent anarchists and syndicalists. Several American workingmen's associations were affiliated also.

There was little or no unity at its meetings until Marx, using the common radical opportunist tactics, seized control of the policies of the international. Up to that time some of the representatives present demanded that the international be turned into an organization of conspirators to assassinate existing rulers; and Michael Bakunin, the Russian anarchist, insisted upon the adoption of his formula of "No God, no state, no politics." A bitter struggle ensued between the Marxists or Socialist groups and the anarchists, due to the fact that the Marxists aimed to displace one economic system by another while the anarchists decreed death to all economic and political systems. In order to destroy the growing power of the anarchists, who controlled the revolutionary movement in Russia and wielded considerable influence in Italy, France, and other countries, Marx virtually destroyed the First International in 1872. The Franco-Prussian War of 1870, however, had much to do with its downfall. The Marxist group moved the headquarters of the International to New York in 1872, and the last convention was held in Philadelphia in 1876.

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM

Salient differences between the Socialist and anarchist movements caused the disruption of the First International. Socialism, despite many opinions to the contrary, is not a state of mind. The new society, political and industrial, which socialism has in view, necessitates a complete reorganization of the world, reversing our present system and making the political body subordinate to the industrial organization. It hopes to institute a cooperative commonwealth, through common ownership of the means of production; to abolish private property; and to denationalize peoples and governments. These reforms are to be effected by political action, that is, by first securing control of the body politic through a strong political party. Socialism considers only the material interests and is therefore opposed to religion, to ethics, and to all other concepts not purely material.

Anarchism, on the other hand, is difficult to define, as each advocate of its philosophy gives expression to his own concept. Emma Goldman, the anarchist, who several years ago was deported from the United States to Russia, where she received scant welcome, defined it as "The philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary."

Philosophical anarchists are not bomb throwers and believe in a society made orderly by good manners rather than by law, but the theory of an unrestrained society has attracted to the anarchist ranks great numbers of those who see no distinction between the terms "liberty" and "license" and who seek to give free rein to their greed and passions without incurring the penalties imposed by organized society.

The anarchism of Bakunin was expressed in open warfare against the autocratic powers of Russia, and he had many followers in those times when all Europe was more or less in revolt. The anarchist believes in the abolition of all governments and laws and of all national boundaries. He sees in the different radical movements the possibility of overthrowing the existing economic system in all countries, and is therefore willing and anxious to assist other movements having that end in view.

The true anarchist is an extreme individualist, while the Socialist is irreconcilably opposed to individualism. We thus have no difficulty in understanding why Marx was so willing to sacrifice the fruit of his long labors rather than see the First International fall into anarchist control.

It should be remembered that Marx did not force the radical ideas of his Manifesto on the First International, due to the presence of so many conservative trade unionists, but for 10 or more years after its dissolution and until his death in 1883, he and other Socialist leaders in Germany, France, and other countries of Europe put on a campaign of intensive education of the workers in the principles of socialism.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL

During this period, also, Socialist parties and trade unions developed in many of the great industrial countries, and leaders of these groups felt the urge to organize into another International. Pursuant to call, the Second International met in Paris in 1889 and was attended by some 400 delegates, representing 20 countries. This International later held congresses at Brussels, in 1891; at Zurich, in 1893; at London, in 1896; at Paris in 1900; at Amsterdam in 1904; at Stuttgart, in 1907; at Copenhagen, in 1910; and at Basel in 1912. In 1900 it established a permanent International Socialist Bureau at Brussels. This bureau was later transferred to The Hague.

During the period from 1889 to 1914 great progress had been made in forming Socialist political parties throughout Europe and in America, and workingmen more and more were brought into the Socialist fold and an aggressive class consciousness aroused in them. The Second International received a severe set-back at the outbreak of World War I, in July 1914, as the Socialists with few exceptions put patriotism above class consciousness. The most notable exceptions

were the Socialist Party of America and the Socialist Party of Italy.

The complete failure of the Second International to oppose the outbreak of World War I, and what its more radical element considered its betrayal of the workers during the war, precipitated a revolution in its ranks in nearly all important countries, its members being divided into parties of reformists, radicals, and revolutionaries. The reformists stayed with what remained of the Second International.

The real split in the ranks of the Second International took place definitely in Germany in 1917, at which time the Independent Social Democratic Party was formed. Similar groups were formed in other countries, and in 1920 these groups united themselves into what is known as the 2½ International, or the Workingmen's Union of Socialist Parties, with headquarters in Vienna. This International, in May 1923, amalgamated with the remnants of the Second International at a meeting held in Hamburg, and the new organization became known as the Labor and Socialist International, with headquarters at London. It comprised practically all of the Reformist, Socialist, and Labor Parties as contradistinguished from the Communist or revolutionary groups. Bitter strife arose between this organization and the Communists, who charged that the 2½ International, notwithstanding its radical phraseology, had no other program than the promised reforms of the Second International.

THIRD OR COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

We now come to the Third, or Communist, International, which is the revolutionary international of the proletariat. Its beginnings date back to the conferences held at Zimmerwald in September 1915 and at Kienthal (cities in Switzerland) in April 1916. Both conferences were called by the uncompromising, antinationalist revolutionary Socialists, who broke with the Second International. Some 40 delegates, representing a following in the principal countries, attended both meetings; but at neither were there any representatives of the majority or patriotic Socialist Parties of France, Germany, or England, nor was the Socialist Party of the United States represented. A manifesto was issued by the Kienthal conference calling upon all parties, organizations, and minorities to educate the masses in the spirit of the International Socialist Democracy, in order that the individual sparks and coals of discontent may rise to a mighty flame of invective and widespread protest in order that the international proletariat may, in accordance with its historic mission, hasten the world-liberating task—the fall of capitalism. It was at these conferences that the Communist or pronounced left-wing tendencies came to the front and Nicolai Lenin, of Russia, then in exile in Switzerland, took his place as an international revolutionary leader.

The bourgeois revolution in Russia in March 1917 led to the abdication of the Czar and the assumption of power by the Kerensky provisional government. In April 1917 Lenin and a number of his trusted lieutenants traveled by sealed train from Switzerland to Russia through hostile Germany, with the permission and financial assistance of the German general staff and Government. Lenin, in consideration of German help, had agreed to attempt the overthrow of the provisional government and, if successful, to desert the cause of the Entente allies. The Soviet of Soldiers', Workmen's, and Sailors' Deputies in Petrograd was then established as the center of all disloyal activities against the provisional Russian Government. The provisional government was overthrown on November 7, 1917; Kerensky was driven into exile and Petrograd was captured by the Red Guard.

The success of the Soviet revolution was due to the fact that the All-Russian Congress of Soviets had been packed so as to insure a majority for the Bolsheviki, or majority faction of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party. The Bolsheviki had split with the minority, or Mensheviki, when the former, some years previously, had insisted on an immediate revolt against the Imperial Government rather than await the further development of socialism and the education of the masses of the Russian people. The Bolsheviki, or Russian Communists, were for "direct action," and, by such action, seized control of Russia.

The Bolshevik leaders declared the international character of the principles of the Soviet regime, and, arrogating to themselves the title of the highest exponents of the teachings of Marxian socialism, conceived the rather ambitious plan for the establishment of a world Soviet regime by instigating social revolution in all countries. It is this attitude toward foreign countries that makes the spread of the teachings of communism a vital concern.

In January 1919 the Russian Soviet Government sent out a call for the Congress of the Third or so-called Communist International to convene at Moscow the following March. The call was addressed to some 40 Communist, revolutionary, or left-wing Socialist and syndicalist groups in all the principal countries of the world, and proposed a platform (which was later adopted) demanding the overthrow and annihilation of so-called capitalist governmental power and its replacement by proletarian power. It demanded that the proletarian system should include the dictatorship of the working class, including in some places peasants and agricultural workers, which dictatorship should be the instrument for the overthrow and utter destruction of the so-called exploiting classes; that the dictatorship should aim at the immediate expropriation of capitalism, the expropriation of private property and its transfer to the proletarian state under Socialist administration of the working class; and that the Socialist revolution should be secured by the disarming of the bourgeoisie and its agents and the arming of the proletariat.

The platform further called for mass action of the proletariat, going so far as advocating open-armed conflict with the governmental power of capitalism. Against the so-called patriotic Socialists remaining with the Second International, the platform declared for war without mercy, while every possible effort should be made to secure the support of the syndicalist element of the labor movement and the other groups and proletarian organizations of the left, or revolutionary, tendency.

AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED

The following American organizations were among the 39 or 40 included in the call for the Third International: (1) The Socialist-Labor Party of America; (2) the left wing of the Socialist Party of America, that is, the wing of the party having tendencies represented by Eugene V. Debs and the Socialist Propaganda League; (3) the Industrial Workers of the World, and (4) the Workers International Industrial Union. This call, it should be remembered, was issued before the formation in Chicago of the Communist and the Communist-Labor Parties of America, both of which later affiliated with the Third International. Neither the Socialist Party of America nor the Industrial Workers of the World affiliated with the Communist International, as they refused to subscribe to the 21 humiliating conditions for affiliation, nor would they submit to the discipline of a centralized world party with headquarters at Moscow.

Originally, the Third International was composed of labor unions, as well as political parties, but the Communists soon saw the need for a trade-union international based upon revolutionary principles. As a consequence, in 1921, a world congress was called at Moscow, at which was formed the Red International of Labor Unions, the membership of which is composed of radical labor unions and organized revolutionary minorities of conservative organizations. The best-known American representative of the Red Labor International is William Z. Foster, an able organizer and former syndicalist and member of the Industrial Workers of the World, who was given the mandate by the leaders in Moscow to organize the Trade Union Educational League. This was to be a propaganda agency charged with the duty of implanting the germs of industrial unionism and communism among the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor. The end in view was to overthrow the officialdom of that movement in this country and affiliate American labor with the Red International.

Foster's organization was later called the Trade Union Unity League, and was aggressively active in this country disseminating propaganda and conducting organizing drives. It had some success, especially in the textile industry in the South, the coal- and metal-mining industries, and other industries where great numbers of semiskilled and unskilled laborers are employed. The public press has been filled with references to rioting and bloodshed following in the wake of these Communist organizers.

The Third or Communist International uses the Red Labor International in the industrial field in combating the tactics of the International Federation of Trade Unions (or Amsterdam International, which is the trade-union arm of the Second International) and the American Federation of Labor in this country.

SYNDICALISM

Anarchist and socialist movements, posing more or less as political parties, have spread a spirit of revolt in the ranks of the actual workers, not only against the social order and organized government but as well against all conservative and constructive organizations of labor. This movement in England is known as syndicalism, in France as revolutionary syndicalism, and in the United States as industrial unionism. Its object is to break up the craft or trade-union system and organize the actual workers (not theorists) in what is known as one big union, having subdivisions along industrial rather than mere trade lines. In addition to fighting the everyday battles of the working class, syndicalism, said William Z. Foster, who is and always has been a syndicalist, intends to overthrow capitalism and reorganize society in such manner that exploitation of man by man through the wage system shall cease. The syndicalist is antipatriot and antinationalist; that is, he sees no need for a political supervising body, the workers in each industry managing their particular affairs. He hopes to effect his objective by the ruthless general strike and direct action, rather than through political action. He believes also in sabotage. To quote Foster: "The syndicalist accepts on principle the anarchist positions on the modern school, neomalthusianism (race suicide), marriage, individualism, religion, art, the drama, literature, etc., that go to make up the intellectual revolution, but he expends energy upon their propagation only insofar as they contribute to the success of his bread and butter fighting organization." The anarchist, for this reason, refers to the syndicalist as a "pork-chop revolutionist." Syndicalism has worked in close harmony with communism and ought to be considered as a part of that movement.

Syndicalism originated in France during the great French Revolution and exists today in practically every industrial nation. It has, or until recently had, its own international, with headquarters in Berlin, and is commonly called the Berlin International, although officially it is known as the International Work-

ingmen's Association, the name originally borne by the First International in 1864. The Industrial Workers of the World is the true American syndicalist movement.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) was set up along syndicalist, or industrial union lines and has, at times, used syndicalist strategy and tactics, such as the general strike, violent mass picketing, slowdowns and sit-down strikes.

The anarcho-syndicalists and anarcho-Communists are primarily anarchists who hope to bring about pure anarchism through the use of syndicalist and Communist tactics.

The success of communism in Russia resulted in the formation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. It is not a republic, or union of republics, but an arbitrary and intolerant dictatorship under which over 180,000,000 people are dominated by a comparatively small number of organized and disciplined leaders of the Communist Party, the membership of which was then estimated as being between 200,000 and 500,000. The former figure is probably nearer correct. In Russia the Communist Party, in general, comprises three main branches, the Politburo, which is a cabal of a few dominating leaders and is the real force of the movement; the Soviet Government, which administers the affairs of Soviet Russia; and the Comintern, or Third International, which is the center for the dissemination of revolutionary propaganda and direction of revolutionary activity throughout the world. (The Comintern is now known as the Cominform, or Communist Information Bureau, with headquarters until recently in Belgrade.)

The Communists also maintain a school in Moscow where radicals from all the countries of the world are trained as organizers and for sabotage and espionage work in their native lands. As a result the Soviet MVD, or secret police, have sources of information that are world-wide and a list of trained spies and saboteurs in every country that can be called upon at any time. This organization, under various names, is and has been for 30 years active in America.

For propaganda purposes the Communist Party of the United States has divided our country into districts, each with well-trained and organized directing and organizing forces. Nuclei, or units, of the Communist Party or its affiliated or sympathetic groups, are being organized in our Military and Naval Establishments, our law-enforcement agencies, our schools and colleges, our religious bodies, and our shops and factories.

By means of subtle propaganda and contacts in influential quarters, communism has been able to further its plans by stimulating the activities of the liberal, or "pink," elements in our churches, schools, and colleges, and even in our executive departments and legislative halls. These liberal fronts are referred to as "fellow travelers" and are usually socially, politically, or financially prominent. Wittingly or unwittingly, they are of great service to the subversive cause. In this class are included members of the numerous groups in America who are forever censuring our governmental and economic system, but offer nothing in the way of constructive criticism; who come to the defense of every subversive movement and condemn every effort of government to protect itself by prosecuting the disseminators of the doctrines of violence; who blatantly demand for themselves almost unlimited constitutional rights and yet preach the destruction of our present Constitution by narrowly limiting the powers of our courts—the very branch of our governmental system charged with the duty of protecting and enforcing personal and property rights; who advocated the recognition of the Soviet Government of Russia, which has resulted in Soviet diplomats and consuls flooding our country with the Red propaganda of communism, atheism, and destruction; and who strenuously oppose all efforts adequately to provide for the national defense and, in their zeal to prevent appropriations for our Army and Navy, would leave our country in as helpless and defenseless a condition as China finds itself today. Let me warn you against the subtle inroads being made by this class of propagandists. We should under no conditions forget that their propaganda is as surely directed at the destruction of our republican institutions and economic system as is that of their brethren, the rabid Red revolutionists.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that the yearly observance of Brotherhood Week should coincide with National Security Week. Perhaps no single factor is as necessary to the strength of our Nation as the unity of purpose of her citizens. Conversely, nothing can equal disunity and division in undermining our national strength.

Military might, our extensive economic aid to friendly countries, the maintenance of a vigorous domestic economy, our program in providing a better and happier life for our citizens—all these and every other worth-while effort can be set at naught through the bitterness engendered by religious or racial strife among our people.

At times of great national emergency, when we faced a common external enemy, there was little need for talk about brotherhood. On a foreign battleship, a sinking ship, or crippled plane, it was instinctive. Great sorrow, misfortune, or danger kindle the fraternal feeling.

The problem lies in keeping alive this flame when fortune smiles.

Without a true spirit of brotherhood, we can never achieve our objective of building a better and stronger country—of helping to build a better world. We may speak in different tongues. Our economic conditions may widely vary. Our customs, our secondary national loyalties, our form of worship may differ substantially. This week, however, serves to emphasize this central theme. We are all sons of one Father. We are, therefore, brothers. Let us strive to conduct ourselves as such. Therein lies the basic formula for national strength.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorials from the New York Times, Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, and the Rochester Times-Union commemorating the observance of Brotherhood Week:

[From the New York (N. Y.) Times]

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

If there is one lesson that the yearly observance of Brotherhood Week has taught us in this country, it is that the spirit of genuine brotherhood, of racial amity and religious good will should prevail not for 1 but for 52 weeks of the year. Yet it is fitting to set aside 1 week for emphasis on brotherhood through special meetings and programs as a rule of life among all our citizens of every religion, race, and national origin.

This year's Brotherhood Week, sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, opens today and ends next Sunday. It gives us a special opportunity to remind ourselves that each of us has rights which we are bound to respect in others. It challenges us to reorient our thinking in order to deal successfully with new problems and new opportunities. Only through harmony and fellowship can we make certain our own tranquillity and continued progress.

Our words cannot help to establish peace in an outer world torn by dissension unless, through the practice of real brotherhood, we maintain a strong and united nation here at home. We must shun intolerance lest it divide and weaken us. We must reaffirm in our own lives the principles of Brotherhood Week through never-ending devotion to the democracy, humanity, and justice which we seek to exemplify. If we can take Brotherhood Week to our hearts and make it part of our very existences, we will have earned the peace and happiness we so greatly covet for ourselves and for all nations throughout the world.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle]

BROTHERHOOD WEEK

The ideal of human brotherhood takes in the whole world. It implies emphasis on the common aims of humanity rather any differences between races or tension between nations.

Our first task, however, is right here in our own land. And while the effort is one which should be persisted in day by day, it is worth while to direct especial attention to it this week, in Rochester and throughout the Nation.

Such a call has been issued by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. It has, in a broad sense, a religious basis, as was indicated from many pulpits yesterday. Assuredly the moral principles which the churches seek to inculcate are the same for all faiths.

But the ideal of brotherhood, carried into the daily relations and acts of each one of us, is essential to practical, working democracy. If we are to maintain and foster effective unity as a free people we must put aside our prejudices. We must oppose intolerance and unfair discrimination of every kind.

Each one of us is different. No two human beings are cast in exactly the same mold. A sweeping adverse judgment on any group or race is not only unjust but at variance with the facts.

All Americans owe the high aim of Brotherhood Week firm allegiance.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union]

BONDS THAT UNITE

Brotherhood, in the sense in which it is used in the observance of Brotherhood Week, which begins today, suggests to most persons closer unity between the racial and religious groups of our own country. It is a plea for tolerance, for better understanding, for a removal of bars of prejudice and suspicion that cause so much unnecessary friction here at home. Where true brotherhood exists, there are no discriminations against any race or class, no favoritism in opportunity, no exploitation of the weak to the advantage of the strong.

We need more emphasis on brotherhood here at home, but we need it also in our relations with and our thinking about the people of other countries. The saying attributed to Will Rogers, that he never met anyone that he did not like after he got to

know him, might be extended to the international field. It is doubtful if there are any people in any land—speaking of the masses—whom we Americans could not grow to like if we knew them well enough.

Yes, even the Japanese whom we were vigorously hating a few years ago, have their good points. This is rather amusingly set forth by Richard D. Jones, director of the Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, who in an article in the Kiwanis Magazine tells of his experiences as referee of a basketball game in Yokohama.

"I have heard the fans and players of the United States call me a robber, crook, blind man, and bum," he writes. "But once I refereed a game in Yokohama between two Japanese teams. I know my decisions were as bad as those I made in the United States, but this time the slightest complaint was preceded by a bow, and the player on being told to return to his position did so, but first bowed again, again, and yet again. The Japanese. I like the Japanese. How polite."

Over here, of course, we do not bow to our basketball referees, and we certainly do not extend our ideas of brotherhood to a baseball umpire after a bad decision, but we, too, have our good points which the people of another country do not always understand. Too many people of other countries think of us as braggarts, possibly snobs, yet when they see American gifts rolling abroad in a volume never matched by any other country in history they get a different impression, and we hope the correct one, of this country.

Brotherhood is largely understanding, and we need much of that at home and abroad. Brotherhood does not mean giving up one's particular faith or convictions. On the contrary, as a speaker said in this city last week, the more deeply Protestants, Catholics, and Jews practice their various faiths, the deeper the bonds of brotherhood and understanding between them. The only convictions that endanger our society are those based on prejudice, hatred, intolerance, and the totalitarian conception. We have such convictions, even in America. One function of Brotherhood Week might well be to emphasize the barriers to brotherhood no less than the bonds that unite.

Floods and Flood Control—The Mississippi Threatens to Change Its Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, at this time when hearings are being held by Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate on flood control and rivers and harbors matters, and coming from a State that is annually threatened by or actually is devastated by terrible floods, and as a matter of fact, at this moment due to the extraordinary snows in the North and Middle West of the United States, the stage is all set for another major disaster to strike Louisiana. I do not think it is amiss to call to the attention of the Congress the necessity to give careful consideration to the appropriation of the maximum amount of funds possible to protect our country from these recurring catastrophes.

Mr. Speaker, these recurring floods are not confined entirely to Louisiana and the South, but unfortunately all parts of our country at one time or another have suffered from floods, and will continue to do so unless we continue to make provisions for the Corps of Engineers to continue the battle on all fronts.

Thousands of lives have been lost and billions of dollars of damage to property have occurred, and if we avoid another major disaster again this year, it will be due largely to the fine work that has been accomplished over a long period of years by the Corps of Engineers of the United States by the great flood-control works which they have built, or by Providential control of the melting snows and rains from the upper portion of the country.

The Mississippi Valley, as is well known, is the drainage ditch of the Nation. Thirty-two States and 41 percent of the waters of the country drain down the mighty Mississippi and converge in Louisiana to reach the Gulf of Mexico.

The above startling fact that 32 States drain through the Mississippi Valley throwing 41 percent of the waters of the United States down the Mississippi River and converging upon Louisiana through all of the tributaries of the Mississippi is sufficient, I believe, without elaborating or going into further detail.

This is not Louisiana's making and Louisiana would prefer that this not be the case. Louisiana has been blessed with many natural resources, and were it not for the flood waters of the country being converged upon us to find a way to the sea, Louisiana could well take care of its problems.

I do not claim that Louisiana alone suffers from terrible floods almost each year, as I know that other States and river valleys are also susceptible to floods with their devastation and loss of life, and our people are solicitous and sympathetic with all other sections of the United States in affording protection to all parts of our Nation in solving their problems in regard to flood control. I believe that our Senators and Representatives in the Congress have manifested this fact by their full cooperation and support in this regard in the past, especially do I refer to our late lamented United States Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana, who gave many of the last years of his life to the service of our entire country in flood control and rivers and harbor work.

I know that other portions of our country have had great disasters, but I would say that Louisiana has had more disasters and more often than any other portion of the country, and to bring this claim more vividly to the attention of the Congress I submit a list which I have compiled showing lives lost and property damage suffered from floods, hurricanes, and tidal waves which occurred principally in the eastern portion of the United States over a long period of years, to wit:

Isle Dernier, La., 1856: Four hundred lives lost.

Louisiana, 1863: Floods.

Louisiana, 1882: The greatest flood, setting a record at that time.

Johnstown, Pa., 1889. Two thousand one hundred lives lost; millions of property damage.

Galveston, Tex., 1900: Four thousand to six thousand lives lost; property damage, $20,000,000.

Kansas City, Mo., 1903: Many lives lost and millions of property damage.

South Central and Southeastern States, 1906: Property damage, $23,000,000.

Mississippi Valley, including Louisiana, 1912: Two hundred lives lost; property damage, $45,000,000.

Dayton, Ohio, 1913: Four hundred lives lost; property damage, $128,000,000.

Ohio-Indiana, 1913: Seven hundred and thirty lives lost; property damage, $181,000,000.

Galveston, Tex., and Louisiana, 1915: Three hundred lives lost; property damage, $20,000,000.

Atlantic coast, 1916: Fifty lives lost; property damage, $15,000,000.

Louisiana, 1922: Lives lost and heavy property damage.

Mississippi River Valley, including Louisiana, 1927: Two hundred lives lost; property damage, $200,000,000.

Lake Okeechobee, Fla., 1928: Two thousand lives lost; property damage heavy.

Pennsylvania, 1935: One hundred and thirty lives lost; property damage, $120,000,000.

Ohio-Mississippi River Valley, including Louisiana, 1937: Four hundred to nine hundred lives lost; property damage, $400,000,000 to $500,000,000.

Louisiana, 1940: Loss of life, and property damage, $11,000,000.

Nebraska-Missouri, 1941: Lives lost, and property damage, $13,000,000.

Omaha-Missouri, 1944: Lives lost, and property damage, $13,000,000.

Arkansas-Louisiana, 1945: Loss of life and millions of dollars of property damage.

Mr. Speaker, from the above partial list of disasters it would seem to me that it is a good investment for our country to provide funds for flood control and rivers and harbors projects to protect the lives and property of our people in all parts of the United States.

In this connection I include excerpts from an article from an AP news feature published in the New Orleans Times-Picayune on February 20, 1949, from which it is stated that Army engineers entrusted with flood-control work estimate that projects already in operation saved at least $69,000,000 of damage to areas hit by high waters in 1947. However, despite their efforts floods cost the Nation at least a billion dollars in that year alone.

The article above referred to follows:

HIGH WATERS STILL CAUSE HEAVY LOSSES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES

For almost a century the United States has fought a losing battle against annual floods.

The cost in property damage and flood relief has run into billions. The toll of lives has been heavy.

Spring of 1949 probably will be no exception. Flood-control authorities, studying the effects of the most severe winter in western history, predict heavy damage.

Snow deposits 40 to 60 inches deep have blanketed a vast area, threatening 1,250,000 square miles of watershed. A quick thaw accompanied by a rapid break-up of ice in the rivers would endanger the river valleys.

The Mississippi River still brings flood threats, despite flood-control efforts in recent years. The combined attempts of Federal, State, and private projects to harness Ol' Man River haven't been able to cope with the major floods that menace farms and cities each spring.

ASKS FOR PLAN

Engineers estimate that adequate measures would require at least 10 years of effort and the expenditure of ten to twenty billion dollars. Estimates of the cost range from four to ten billion dollars.

During the 1947 floods which ravaged the Missouri and upper Mississippi basins President Truman asked Congress for an effective 10-year program backed by adequate funds to end the flood menace. The flood-control act passed in July 1947 appropriated almost $300,000,000 for work during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

The United States had 52 dams and reservoirs and 153 local protection projects in operation by June 1947. Congressional authorization has been obtained for more than 750 projects, with an estimated cost of more than $2,000,000,000. Many of the dams and reservoirs serve multipurpose use, including hydroelectric power, water conservation, irrigation, navigation, pollution abatement, and recreation.

The Mississippi River has a 2,500-mile levee system. Its valley includes rich farming and industrial sections, covering more than 40 percent of continental United States.

SAVE MILLIONS

In the Missouri River Valley, Federal and State representatives have coordinated their planning to develop a 6-year flood-control program. Congress will be asked for appropriations to carry out the integrated plan.

Included also in flood-control planning are the Sacramento, Ohio, Arkansas, and Columbia Rivers, together with their tributaries. In New England, the Connecticut and Merrimack River Basins have been the chief sources of flood problems.

Army engineers entrusted with flood-control work estimate that projects already in operation saved at least $69,000,000 of damages to areas hit by high waters in 1947. Despite their efforts floods cost the Nation at least $1,000,000,000 in that year alone.

Mr. Speaker, much has been accomplished as a result of the Congress making appropriations for the Corps of Engineers to harness the flood waters of the country as is well pointed out in the foregoing article, however, much remains to be done to protect the lives and property of our people.

At this time, in Louisiana, we are greatly concerned with a new threat of the Mississippi River diverting its channel from the main river through Old River to the Atchafalaya River, which would result in changing its course completely, and would leave Baton Rouge and New Orleans high and dry.

The Atchafalaya River forms the eastern boundary of my district, and part of my district lies in the Atchafalaya River spillway, and therefore, I am directly interested in this eventuality, for should this occur, not only will the Atchafalaya River Basin be flooded, but all of the southeastern portion of the State of Louisiana would be under water.

On this subject, Mr. George Healy, Jr., of New Orleans, La., has just published in the magazine section of the New Orleans Times-Picayune an informative and interesting article discussing this serious matter, and I include the same herein as follows:

OLD MAN RIVER

DON'T GET EXCITED. FATHER MISSISSIPPI ISN'T KICKING UP HIS HEELS AND TAKING HORACE GREELEY'S ADVICE—NOT YET, THAT IS—EXCEPT FOR WATCHFUL VIGIL OF UNITED STATES ENGINEERS, THE POSSIBILITY COULD EXIST THAT ONE FUTURE DAY THE MIGHTY PORT OF NEW ORLEANS WOULD BE LEFT WITH A SHALLOW LAKE—RIVER'S COURSE HAS CHANGED FREQUENTLY DUE TO NATURAL TENDENCIES, HAND OF MAN

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Is fickle Father Mississippi making ready to wander off and leave New Orleans?

It's possible, for the big stream has changed course and left many another settlement on the shore of a new lake—or at the side of a new sandbar.

It's improbable, though, for several reasons. Principal among them is New Orleans' dependence on the river. Most of the towns or cities which have been deserted by the Mississippi during its meandering have depended less on the stream than does New Orleans. All of them were smaller.

A few years ago the river's swift current swept past Greenville, Miss., within sight of that city's main business district. Today Greenville is on Lake Ferguson, named for a former president of the Mississippi River Commission. The muddy river is several miles away, in a new channel.

Countless other towns which were built on the river's banks now overlook "false" rivers or "horseshoe" lakes—still water which covers the bed of what once was the mighty Mississippi.

Some of the changes have been natural. In other cases, like that at Greenville, Father Mississippi had the help of man in moving into a new bed. Since 1933, the United States engineers have dredged or blasted 17 new channels for the main stream between Memphis and Old River. These cut-offs have shortened the river about 170 miles.

Left to its own devices, the river probably would forsake New Orleans and make a natural short cut to the Gulf of Mexico—down the Atchafalaya Basin.

Considering the stakes, there's little likelihood that the river will be left to its own devices. There's too much talk about the danger of its deserting New Orleans—the kind of talk that usually precedes action.

Among the most articulate talkers and writers about this danger is J. P. Kemper of Franklin, engineer for the Atchafalaya Basin Flood Protective Association. He sees immediate danger, unless drastic action is taken to stop the enlargement of Old River—the short stream which connects the Atchafalaya and Mississippi Rivers.

"Water out of control," says Kemper, "can be as destructive as fire. Why not quit fiddling and get busy?"

The United States engineers themselves see no urgent need for drastic action, but hope to begin corrective measures within 3 or 4 years. They estimate that the Atchafalaya River can continue to grow at its present rate for 40 years before that stream can capture 50 percent of the water flow which originates above Old River.

Dewitt Pyburn, member of the Mississippi River Commission, agrees with the Federal engineers that there is no imminent danger of capture of the Mississippi by the Atchafalaya. Like the engineers, he knows it would be unwise to wait 40 years before taking action to prevent this possible capture.

The problem of preventing the enlargement of the Old and Atchafalaya Rivers has received official attention for many years.

The first report submitted by the Mississippi River Commission, which was created by a Federal act of 1879, included estimates of costs for checking the expansion of Old River.

George Hudson, chief of the engineer division in the office of Col. John R. Hardin, United States district engineer at New Orleans, has studied early recommendations concerning this problem. The first commission report proposed (1) separation of the Red from the Atchafalaya by diversion through upper Old River and (2) closure of Old River. A board of engineers rejected both proposals on grounds that they would increase the danger of floods.

Unlike some problems, enlargement of Old River isn't one which everybody always talked about and nobody ever did anything about. In 1839, something was done about it.

To limit the flow from Old River down the Atchafalaya River, two sills, or sunken dams, were placed in the Atchafalaya River near Simmesport. The sills were about 250 feet wide, with their crests just below the low-water mark—except in the middle of the channel. There they were lower, to permit navigation.

Studies in 1894 indicated that these sills halted the expansion of the Atchafalaya.

Meantime, in the low-water season of 1888–89, a dam was started west of Turnbull Island to divorce the Red from the Atchafalaya. This structure was intended to force the Red River to flow into the Mississippi instead of the Atchafalaya. The plan didn't work, and the project was abandoned.

Despite this failure, the annual report by the Mississippi River Commission in 1913 included discussion of a project for closing Old River with a dam connecting the levee lines, with a lock for navigation.

The flood of 1927 changed thinking about ways to prevent floods. After that disaster there was greater effort to find new ways for the main river to reach the Gulf and less talk about stopping up natural outlets.

The Atchafalaya apparently has been a natural outlet for the Mississippi for several centuries. Earliest maps of the region which are available to the Corps of Engineers show the Mississippi River connected to the Atchafalaya in the vicinity of the present Old River. Some of these maps were prepared by followers of De Soto.

Because the 1927 flood magnified the need for better, newer flood-control works, it was followed by strong sentiment in favor of new spillways to relieve burdened levees. Consequently, efforts to halt enlargement of the Atchafalaya were relaxed. Sills which had been sunk near Simmesport were permitted to wash away. People along the big river's banks were more concerned with getting lots of water out of the Mississippi at high stages than with keeping the Mississippi's banks full at low stages.

As a result, the Old and Atchafalaya Rivers have continued to enlarge during the past two decades. In 1927 approximately 75 percent of the water originating above Old River passed to the Gulf by way of the Mississippi River channel. The other 25 percent flowed down the Atchafalaya Basin.

Today, almost 22 years after the 1927 flood, approximately 72 percent of the water originating above Old River is flowing down the Mississippi to the Gulf. The remaining 28 percent takes the route down the Atchafalaya.

If this ratio were constant, the engineers would be unconcerned. But it isn't. At some future day, 29 percent of the flow will go down the Atchafalaya. Later, unless new control steps are taken, more water will move down the Atchafalaya than down the Mississippi.

There's no mystery about why the water is flowing in increasing volume down the Atchafalaya. The reason is simple: From Old River to the Gulf via the Mississippi is

322 miles; from Old River to the Gulf via the Atchafalaya is 159 miles. Obviously, the route which is 163 miles shorter is the one the water seeks to follow.

Limits in the carrying capacity of the Atchafalaya River alone have forestalled capture of the full flow by that channel.

United States engineers say they can keep that carrying capacity limited by following a plan which has been approved by the chief of Army engineers and which will be considered by the present Congress. Part of the plan is old; part is new.

First, completion of the Morganza floodway is expected to slow the expansion of Old River. This structure was started under the Flood Control Act of 1928, as amended, but construction was delayed by World War II. On the basis of expenditures which have been made and which remain to be made, the floodway is about 33 percent complete. Guide levees from Morganza to the Gulf have been finished. Utilities, including railroads, highways and communications lines, have been elevated at Krotz Springs. Utility crossings are being raised at Melville, and plans are complete for a dam structure at Morganza which will carry utilities there.

When the Morganza floodway is opened, engineers say, much water will flow through this opening which otherwise would race through Old River and the Atchafalaya River and contribute to their continued enlargement.

The engineers, however, don't propose to depend entirely on the Morganza floodway to halt expansion of Old River. They plan to take positive control of the flow of water between the Mississippi and Atchafalaya Rivers by building a new spillway and navigation lock in the Old River area.

This spillway would include a needledam similar to that in the Bonnet Carre spillway, 25 miles above New Orleans. It could be opened or closed, as conditions might require.

United States engineers say operation of this spillway would accomplish several desired ends. It would halt enlargement of Old River without eliminating the Atchafalaya Basin as an outlet for Mississippi River floodwaters. It would permit the engineers to control the diversion of Mississippi River water into the Atchafalaya River in times of low stages, when salt water from the Gulf backs into the river at New Orleans and creates a serious problem.

An auxiliary part of the Old River area project would be a levee system to limit the backing of water into the Red River backwater area, relieving some areas now repeatedly flooded by backwater.

The new Old River project, at present costs, would call for an expenditure of $29,000,000 and would require authority from the Congress for spending in excess of the $14,000,000 already authorized for the protection of the Red River backwater area.

Time will tell when this additional authority and the necessary money will be available and the whole job will be done. Generally, the urgency of changing conditions influences final decisions in matters of this kind.

From a practical point of view, construction of the several features of the project could be initiated at any time that funds can be made available, but the actual closure of Old River should not be undertaken until the Morganza floodway control structure is ready to operate.

This Morganza floodway, delayed by war is an urgent part of the over-all flood control plan.

Folks who have been watching the Mississippi River a long time are confident that $29,000,000 or more will be spent to keep Old Man River from meandering off and leaving the city.

Baton Rouge, New Orleans and scores of other communities along the lower river need the river—and must keep it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not presume to enter into a technical discussion of the procedure to be taken to prevent the Mississippi River from changing its course into the Atchafalaya River, since the solution is an engineering problem and one which must be solved by the Corps of Engineers; however, I do say that from information which I have been furnished and from my own observation and study it is necessary that quick action be taken to prevent such a catastrophe, for, with the amount of water that is anticipated to be carried by the Mississippi River this year, it could happen this year. Some engineers in Louisiana predict it could occur this year and others from 1 to 3 years, but the fact remains that no one can say definitely when this change may occur, and, therefore, it is my opinion that proper steps be taken at once; otherwise it may be too late.

Authorization has been made by the Congress under the Flood Control Act of 1928, as amended, and the Flood Control Act of 1936 to deal with this situation, and some funds are available to undertake the necessary work on this project. However, additional funds are required, and no doubt at this session of the Congress the Corps of Engineers will present a report and estimate of the amount required and a request will be made of the Congress to appropriate the additional funds required to provide construction for this important project.

If we fail to take action immediately, the result may prove calamitous.

Since preparing the foregoing remarks, Mr. Speaker, as an evidence of the importance and seriousness of this matter, I submit a copy of an editorial just received, published in the city of New Orleans, La., again from the Times-Picayune, of date February 22, 1949, from which it will be noted that urgency and acceleration of the construction and completion of this program and project is imperative and immediate.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

FINISH MORGANZA

At every recurrence of high water in the lower Mississippi there is a new flood of suggestions ranging from temporary relief to permanent protection. But remarkably little is said about one of the priority projects in lower-river control—the Morganza floodway. It should occur to more people disturbed by the high-water threat that completion and use of the Morganza outlet would tend to reduce or solve many of the problems for which they seek emergency measures in time of danger.

Morganza is a fixed part of the control plan adopted 25 years ago and amended several times since. It would take Mississippi flood waters from the Mississippi about 30 miles below Old River, allowing it to flow between guide levees through the marshes east of the Atchafalaya to the Gulf. It is about one-third complete and could be used. But to turn the water through before it is finished would involve heavy damage.

The floodway probably would have been put to use in the 1945 flood except that wartime rail and highway transportation across the State would have been interrupted. Since then transportation arteries have been raised, but millions of dollars worth of uncompleted works are still needed to complete the job.

It seems to be generally acknowledged that use of Morganza, as intended during extreme high water, would substantially reduce the problem at Old River and on the Atchafalaya. There would be less need for alarm over the increasing flow through Old River and the tendency of the Mississippi to take to the Atchafalaya River bed. The people in the West Atchafalaya floodway would have less reason to fear that the fuse-plug levee between Simmesport and Hamburg would be overtopped, carrying the overflow down upon the Teche country.

While control and navigation works at Old River are a part of the plan and are necessary for several reasons, these probably are some distance in the future. The Morganza project can be readied for emergency relief service in a reasonably short time if the money is provided.

The work was held up during the war, but the Chief of the Army engineers said it should and would be completed after hostilities ended. In the 4 years that have intervened the State and the utilities companies have accomplished something, but the fact remains that there is still more to be done than what has been accomplished in the 25 years since the original plan was adopted. This may be the time for Louisiana Members of Congress to take up the Morganza project vigorously where the late Senator Overton left off. The construction lag could result in serious damage to the State at any time it becomes necessary to open the levee.

Mr. Speaker, the above editorial confirms practically all that I have mentioned hereinbefore, and I would like to particularly point out the statement made in the editorial that, notwithstanding the fact that authority for the Morganza spillway was enacted into law more than 25 years ago, that the project is only about one-third complete.

Under these circumstances, it will readily be understood that the Morganza spillway, in its present one-third completed condition, could not be utilized in the present emergency, nor will it be usable in the future until it is fully completed for the purposes of relief to the Mississippi River and the Atchafalaya River, for if the use of the uncompleted spillway would be utilized, this would place portions of south Louisiana under water just as would a break of levees in the main river or the Atchafalaya, and my constituents are unalterably opposed to the utilization of the Morganza floodway until it is fully completed and properly controlled for the purposes for which it is intended.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the Government having expended funds to the extent of one-third of the cost of completion of the Morganza spillway, it necessarily means that it would be good economy to finish the job.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to point out and discuss the whole problem and situation under consideration here in the space which is allotted, but it is proper for me to say that all of these matters are tied in under the comprehensive plan of the Corps of Engineers under the authority hereinabove mentioned and provide for projects affecting the lower Mississippi Valley, the Atchafalaya and Morganza spillways, the Bennet Carre spillway, the Red River, the Ouachita River, and other streams; however, to emphasize the threat of the Mississippi River changing its course through the Atchafalaya River, I would point out that the Atchafalaya River is the only stream in the United States into which the Mississippi River discharges, and through the channel of the Atchafalaya River it reduces the distance by 165 miles to the

Gulf of Mexico in comparison with the present course of the Mississippi. The Mississippi has been straightened between Memphis and New Orleans and the distance has been reduced 150 miles.

The Atchafalaya River is reputed to have one of the swiftest currents of any river in the world, and with the natural drop in elevation, the acceleration of the discharge in the Mississippi occasioned by the straightening of the Mississippi River; if the Mississippi would change its channel into the Atchafalya River, and since it is obvious that the Atchafalya River cannot take the water from the Mississippi; all of this great wall of water would pile into the Atchafalaya River and virtually drown out the best part of south Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, if Providence will protect us from this disaster this year, or for a few more years, it is my fervent hope that the Corps of Engineers will be provided with the necessary funds to complete this great program which is so nearly completed, and if so, the country will discharge a reasonable obligation, and our people will be protected, lives and property saved and our natural resources preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in constant consultation with the Corps of Engineers in regard to these problems, and only last week I directed communications to the Chief of Engineers, the Mississippi River Commission and Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, at Vicksburg, and the District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, at New Orleans, La., calling to their attention, in more detail, all that I have stated, and I have been advised that they realize the seriousness of the situation; that they are aware of same, and that they will, and are ready to give their full cooperation in taking the necessary steps to complete this vital program just as soon as the Congress provides the balance of the funds required.

The Washington War: Economy Versus Gimme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to comment on the editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Item recently under the title of "The Washington War: Economy Versus Gimme."

It tells a story which can neither be added to nor detracted from .

It is undoubtedly one of the most terrific and powerful editorials I have read in any newspaper, any place, anywhere.

It says eloquently what so many million Americans would like to say if given the opportunity.

Here is the editorial:

THE WASHINGTON WAR: ECONOMY VERSUS GIMME

By stepping up the pitch of their demand for $4,000,000,000 of added Federal taxes to still greater intensity, both President Truman and Treasury Secretary Snyder make themselves the prophets and advocates of an illusive administrative policy. This is the theory of government by gimme. Gimme this, gimme that, gimme money, gimme taxes, gimme more money, gimme still more taxes—gimme, gimme gimme!

The Government needs more money. Well, so does Joe Doakes, who is a clerk or ditch digger or cotton farmer or bank teller or physician or the owner of a small corner grocery store. General Motors, Metropolitan Life, the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the newsboy on the corner all need more money for a new plant or a pair of shoes. But they, like Joe Doakes, can do one thing the Government can't, and another thing which the Government won't.

They can produce more at a profit in a free and competitive market, and thus provide more money to spend, or they can cut down present expenditures and apply the money thus saved to more compelling needs as these arise. The Government can't produce more because it can't produce anything. It merely levies tribute on its citizens. And apparently the Government won't save money by eliminating waste, in order to make its present resources go further.

THE BLUEPRINT HAS BEEN MADE

We don't assume to point out just where and how such savings can and should be effected. For one thing, there is no need to do so. A corps of experts, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, has just done that job to the queen's taste. Mr. Hoover's estimate is that the Government could save $3,000,000,000 a year or more by eliminating duplicate bureaus, by better budget making, and by a general overhaul of its structure * * * and only 5 of the 15 special Hoover Commission reports have r yet been submitted.

Nor is he the only expert who has pointed out, from intimate, first-hand knowledge, the various points at which governmental savings could be achieved. Said Comptroller General Lindsey Warren, in testifying before a House committee less than a month ago about the present administrative set-up of Government bureaus and departments: "It is ideal for the tax eaters or those who wish to keep themselves permanently attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill."

He and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, point out that no less than 29 separate Government agencies, each with a full staff of employees, now are engaged in the business of lending Government funds; 28 agencies are concerned with welfare, 65 with gathering statistics, 34 with the acquisition of land, 16 with the preservation of wildlife, and so forth and so on.

Secretary Snyder says the Government must have $4,000,000,000 of additional tax money in order to make payments on the public debt. That is a laudable purpose. Debts must be paid. And the Hoover Commission says, in effect: "Here are $3,000,000,000 you can use for that purpose because the money is now being wasted. Your Government business would be better run if you eliminated this extravagance." But President Truman and Secretary Snyder are the arch-proponents of a very different philosophy. Their solution is to say, with one voice, to the taxpayers of the Nation: "Gimme! Gimme more—$4,000,000,000 more!"

PROFITS, WAGES ARE ONE AND THE SAME

Since the Government creates no wealth, that additional money can come only from those who do. In other words it must come from the wages, professional earnings, and profits of those who create new wealth. This is a rich and productive country. Its sturdy tradition of free enterprise has made it so. The tax pasture of annual earnings is green. But our cattlemen learned by bitter experience what happens when any range is overgrazed. When the good earth is cropped too heavily and incessantly, the rich and fertile fields become a dust bowl. Out of still earlier lessons of man's individual economy come warnings against the folly of working a willing horse to death.

Louisiana pays nearly $1,000,000,000 a year—something over $880,000,000—to the Federal Government in income taxes. In Louisiana alone, 10 percent of all earnings go to State Government. Louisianians have other reasons for knowing, through recent legislative developments, that proposals to give State benefits to the people mean taking more from the people in the way of taxes first. Government by gimme has its limits, however, like the rich pasture that is overgrazed or the fertile field that is overcropped.

ALWAYS A HIGH-TAX ADVOCATE

President Truman believes in high taxes, and appears to be ready to fit whatever facts he encounters to that belief, rather than modify his belief in accordance with the facts. Federal income taxes were reduced for 1948. The reduction was slight. But even so, it was put into effect only over Mr. Truman's veto. At that time he declared openly that it was necessary to take the additional money out of the hands of the people in order to check the inflationary spiral of rising prices by reducing the Nation's purchasing power. The tax cut went into effect in spite of him, the additional money went into the hands of the people—and prices are now on the way down.

But no matter. Mr. Truman, and his Treasury Secretary, Mr. Snyder, can blow cold as well as hot. If they cried "Gimme!" when inflation was still on the march, they cry "Gimme!" even more loudly when the trend has been reversed and there is apprehension lest too rapid a deflation set in.

Let there be no mistake about one thing: "Gimme a bigger share of your profits" means, word for word, "Gimme a bigger share of your wages." Without profits there can be no employment, and without employment there can be no wages. This is a machine civilization. The cobbler who makes shoes by hand, or the weaver who produces cloth with a foot-power loom can't create wealth fast enough to keep us supplied with electric refrigerators, automobiles, television sets, and college educations for our children. It takes huge factories, filled with costly machinery, to do that sort of a job. And no one builds million-dollar factories or maintains million-dollar pay rolls for laughs and the exercise. It is done to make profits; profits that can be distributed in one way or another to the benefit of investor, manager, wholesaler, retailer, clerk, and laborer. Take away profits and you take away wages. That is why Government by Gimme can be carried to the point of disaster.

STATESMANSHIP CAN PREVAIL

We don't anticipate any such outcome, of course. Government officials are made of the common clay from which all of us spring. Some of them tend to forget this. Their unwillingness or inability to exercise the same hard-headed common sense in public administration that the successful citizen must exercise in conducting his personal business has made the governmental structure cumbersome, unwieldy and wastefully extravagant.

But Congress is closer to the people than are the bureaucrats. There are indications that in both House and Senate a sound core of statesmanship is making itself felt today, and that the test of realism is being applied to the President's soaring demands. "Wisdom," said Wordsworth, "is ofttimes nearer when we stoop than when we soar." If Mr. Truman's reiterated dictum that taxes must be raised by $4,000,000,000 a year is subjected to careful scrutiny and dispassionate study, Government by Gimme is not likely to receive anything more than a sound rebuff.

Some Basic Meanings of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, recently Dr. Forrest A. Irwin, president of the New Jersey State Teachers College at Jersey City, delivered an address before the Jersey City Kiwanis Club on Some Basic Meanings of Democracy. The address is so thoughtful and so superior in its content to the usual address of this character that I asked Dr. Irwin for permission to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is worthy of our earnest consideration.

The address follows:

President Dillon and members of Kiwanis, it is a high privilege to appear before you today, and especially to speak on the subject that we have chosen for our consideration. Much has been said in recent years, and more generally since the end of the war, about democracy, the democratic social philosophy, and the preservation of the American way of life. Notwithstanding all that has been said and done, democracy is not adequately, generally, and fundamentally understood by our people. The speaker has developed a sensitive attention to the concepts revealed by word and action of our citizenry, and especially by a considerable number of college students, and he is forced to the conviction that the degree of understanding is not commensurate with the potentialities of democracy or with either the domestic demands or the world leadership role in our contemporary situation. Our conception of democracy must be sound, adequate, and socially potent. It is toward the clarification and refinement of this conception that I would speak to you today.

I venture the initial emphasis that this treatment of the subject, severely limited as it is by the brief time at our disposal, will undertake but one thing. This is to discuss some of the basic meanings of democracy and a few of their implications. It is important for us to remember that the present practices and current patterns of democratic procedures in the United States have their imperfections, even weakness, and sometimes unworthy manifestations. We know something about the limitations of our ways of life, and about our social, economic, and political problems. Our actions in some aspects of our national life are not always exemplary. These things we know, but they will not be the center of our attention today. To repeat, we want on this occasion to examine together some of the basic meanings of democracy and a few of their implications. Notwithstanding the fact and the admission of the imperfections just suggested, American democracy stands today as the one greatest hope in a troubled world. It may prove to be the stabilizing influence that will prevent wholesale disaster.

The major problem in the world today is that of human relationships. The social frictions, the contradictions in our collective behavior, the conflicts among individuals, groups, nations, and regions are dissipating our energies, wasting our resources, breeding skepticisms, and promoting dissensions. These things are hindering the progress of civilization and are, indeed, threatening to destroy the civilization that has been so laboriously developed. Today too much of our effort, our energy, our strength, and of both our material and human resources are being used to assuage the results of actions that are far less noble than those which should characterize intelligent, cultured people. More effective ways must be found to arrest human deterioration and social disintegration in the world at large.

It is our thesis that democracy, properly understood and faithfully developed along the lines here defined, is our hope and therefore worthy of our best efforts and our devoted loyalty. The test of the soundness and desirability of any social system is whether or not its full development according to its essential nature is conducive to the abundant life for all the people. It can be stated with considerable confidence, as a fundamental principle of successful and enduring social organization, that that system is best which when carried to its logical conclusion and applied in the greatest measure will develop most fully and utilize most completely the potentialities of the greatest number of people, toward the welfare of all.

We urgently invite you and all our people, to apply in all places and to all aspects of our national and international life the basic tenets of the democratic social philosophy as here to be defined. Some of the basic tenets of the democratic social philosophy are these:

1. The central meaning of democracy should be the essential dignity and worth of man. Democracy, or any kind of society, that respects the dignity and worth of man, obligates itself to seek by every worthy means the optimum development of every individual compatible with the social welfare.

Any social process that ignores or deviates from this position makes itself vulnerable to the exploitation of human beings. And the exploitation of groups and segments of humanity by other groups and segments is a major sin in contemporary society.

2. Democracy assumes that men possess the potential capacity and intelligence to govern themselves, to determine their own goals, to manage their own social processes, and to appraise their own achievements.

The people in a healthy democratic society know that they are the authority for government. They do not shift the incidence of responsibility to an abstract state removed from themselves.

Democracy deprecates paternalism as a principle in human affairs, for paternalism seductively substitutes external authority for potential self-reliance. A colossal temptation and a studied technique in the ideologies opposed to democracy.

3. Democracy predicates inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is worthy of note and of tenacious retention that inalienable rights are those with which man is endowed by his Creator, not those which are dispensed by government.

This position implies the principle of equal opportunity for all citizens in a democratic society for individual development irrespective of color, race, or creed.

The fuller realization of this principle is a part of the unfinished business of democracy in the United States.

4. Government in a democracy is conceived as a servant of the people, not as their master. Hence it is a means, not an end.

Government is instituted for the people, not the people for the government.

5. In settling its questions and solving its problems, democracy employs the methods of deliberation, debate, reflection, consultation, arbitration, moral suasion, cooperation, reasonable compromise, and education, rather than the methods of coercion, blind obedience, and brute force.

The former procedures tend to dignify and develop its people; the latter tend to depreciate and enfeeble their potentialities and powers.

6. Democracy seeks enlightenment for its people and is devoted to the discovery of truth and its application to human affairs.

It must develop and effectively preserve the best traditions of intellectual freedom and inquiry.

7. The rights, liberties, and freedoms provided by a democratic society for its citizens have no existence in fact and no social meaning apart from commensurate duties, obligations, and responsibilities.

In a democracy a person cannot legitimately claim liberties which he does not use responsibly.

This is a lesson that education has not adequately taught and the people of the United States have not yet soundly learned. It is one of those weaknesses referred to early in our presentation.

8. Democracy assumes that the game of social life will be played according to rules that have been deliberately and collectively made, and that the rules will be respected until changed in an orderly manner (as set forth in tenet No. 5 above).

The intelligence which the rules reveal and the respect which they command are criteria of political and social health.

9. Democracy is more than a particular form of government, more than a pattern or spirit of social relationships, more even than an attitude of mind. It is a great social faith. It promises a possible development and state of human affairs progressively more intelligent, more civilized, more ethical, more genuinely satisfying, and profoundly more meaningful than man has yet achieved.

Democracy believes in the improvability of man.

10. The democratic way of life and the fruits of democracy are never fully and finally attained. Each successive generation of people may inherit conditions and traditions of a high order, but only by the efforts and devotion of each such generation in turn can democracy be preserved and improved.

Eternal vigilance is the price of democracy.

Our purpose today has been to examine the fundamental nature of the thing we profess. We wish to know if it is worthy of a dynamic faith. We have no disposition to overlook our national shortcomings or to overrate the quality of our society. We believe that it can be improved and that it is the sober duty and high privilege of every lover of liberty and humanity to devote himself to this end.

Democracy and the Hebrew-Christian tradition in the western world have much in common. Democracy as here set forth is the highest conception of a social order yet developed. It promises much more than has yet been achieved. But no serious student of human society and of man believes that man has reached the peak of his potentialities. There are possibilities ahead.

It is the function and the responsibility of education, and of every other social institution in a democratic society, so to relate itself to the basic social processes that the ends here envisioned may be progressively realized. A successful and enduring democracy requires a higher level of education, of practical intelligence, of self-discipline, and of ethics than any other form of society yet undertaken.

The supreme challenge to the United States today is the more complete application of these principles to our own people in all phases of our social order, and to demonstrate their successful operation to the other peoples of the world. In the degree in which we can incorporate these principles into our national life and are guided by them in all our relationships with other nations—in that degree we can look the world in the face without fear or apology. Any nation that so builds its life and so orders its action is worthy of leadership in this troubled world. The searching question for us today is whether we have the vision, the maturity, the discipline, and the moral stamina to perform the role creditably.

Basic Economic Structure of America Is Being Destroyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, at the annual Lincoln Club banquet at Battle Creek, Mich., February 10, 1949:

At no time in the history of this 172-year-old Republic have the life-long teachings and the example of Abraham Lincoln been needed more than at this moment.

Lincoln said on one historic occasion more than 100 years ago that "you can fool some of the people all of the time and all of the people some of the time; but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

I believe that sensible statement is still true—however, neither Lincoln nor the American public had, at that time, even been subjected to the greatest propaganda machine ever built up in this or any other nation.

Through this superlative propaganda masquerading in each case under a Washington Government department news service the public mind is being focused upon special group legislation—while the national economic rug is being literally pulled out from under our feet.

The finest example of the selling job accomplished by the greatest public relations steam roller ever built up in the Nation's Capitol, is that practically all of the time of the Eightieth Congress was used up, and most of the time of the Eighty-first Congress will be consumed in committee hearings and debates on the floor of the United States Senate and in the House of Representatives on highly controversial group legislation, including farmers, manufacturers, veterans and labor.

While at the same time the basic three-part economic legislative program designed to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world is in high gear, and if their plans are successful, will be adopted by this Congress with a minimum of debate. This three-phase program provides for making up the trade balance deficits of all of the European nations in cash each year, currently called the Marshall plan, a 3-year continuation of the selective free-trade policies adopted by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act to divide the markets of this Nation with the low-wage living standard countries of the world and the creation of a permanent international-trade organization made up of the nations of the world to meet each year and to divide the remaining production and markets of the world among them, eventually on a basis of population.

This three-part program is designed to undermine the basic economic structure of this country, with the one objective of dividing our markets and leveling our living standard with the low-wage living standards of the Asiatic and European nations.

First. Appropriations to make up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations in cash each year, currently labeled the Marshall plan. Our chief export is cash;

Second. Extend the selective free-trade principle adopted by the State Department through a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act; and

Third. Adoption of the international trade organization—52 nations with 52 votes. The United States would have the same vote as Siam or Lithuania. They would meet at least once each year with free trade the ultimate goal, add up the remaining production and markets of the world and divide them eventually on the basis of population.

The first step of the three part permanent program—that of making up the trade balance deficits of the European Nations each year in cash—our chief export is cash—began rather modestly with scattered gift loans to these nations, leading up to the gift-loan of three and three quarter billions of dollars to England in 1946—and then to the $17,000-000,000 5-year program currently known as the Marshall plan and soon to be followed by the Truman global recovery program.

The second step inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the State Department has adopted the selective free trade principle, is to be extended for 3 years at this session of Congress—and the principle later to be made permanent through the adoption of the international trade organization principle.

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people—cloaked with a more involved and less understandable phraseology.

The third and final step of this very clever three phase program to divide the markets and to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world, is the adoption of the presently proposed international trade agreements act—under which the selective free trade principles, currently adopted by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, will be made permanent and become the settled policies of this Nation.

All of this division of the wealth of this Nation with the countries of the world through gift-loans to make up the trade balance deficits of the European countries—and the division of the markets through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—and later to be adopted and made permanent through approval of the International Trade Organization—is on the theory that the living standards of the remaining countries will thereby be elevated to ours—and that in some mysterious way we will benefit through an increased foreign trade.

As a matter of fact, with 7 percent of the population of the world, the actual effect will be a substantial reduction in our own wage-living standards, with very little, if any, rise in the wage-living standards of the remaining 93 percent of the world's population.

It will be like deciding to average the level of the water in a water glass and the city reservoir—you may pour the water out of the glass into the reservoir until your glass will be empty, but the water in the reservoir will not be affected very much.

There is no bipartisan foreign policy as such—in the first place, we do not have a foreign or international policy—we have a succession of administration programs as already described—to which some of the Republicans subscribe.

There can be no bipartisan foreign policy. First, until there is a foreign policy, and second, until such policy is confined to foreign affairs and not at the same time designed to control national affairs through the State Department, as the present programs are set to do.

This Nation has no definite national or international policy as such, but has substituted a system of programs of "free trade" and of financing foreign nations dominated by the State Department. This is a deadly serious thing, and could, if not soon corrected, well result in a major change in the principle upon which our standard of living has been established and maintained—a change in our standard of living for which the majority of our people would not vote.

This change is being promoted by economic one-worlders who have for generations been trying to gain control of the American markets and who are the heirs and proponents of the "free-trade" theories first advanced in a different form through the European and international bankers more than two generations ago, when this Nation first began to rise above the European wage-living standards.

In place of the distribution of the wealth of this Nation throughout the world through making up the trade-balance deficits of the European and other countries each year in cash and by the division of the markets of this Nation through the selective free-trade theories of the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the Congress of the United States could establish a definite national policy and basis of trade with the foreign nations of the world through the flexible import-fee method.

This method was first adopted by the Congress of the United States in 1930 and proposed in the Eightieth Congress through a bill introduced in the United States Senate giving the Tariff Commission full authority to determine the differential of the cost production, mostly due to the difference in the wage-living standards based on "fair and reasonable competition" and to adjust such import fees in accordance with their findings—founded upon the principle of law and not upon the whim of a bureau official.

The work of the Commission would be conducted on principles established in such legislation as in the case of the Interstate Commerce Commission on freight rates and would remove the adjustment of import fees from the field of logrolling, lobbying, and horse-trading methods, and make the decision based on principle of law and not subject to executive order or the capricious judgment of a Bureau official.

The market for foreign goods would be definitely established in this country in this manner on the basis of equalizing the wage-living standards through the flexible import-fee methods and our economic structure would be protected while we were assisting the 57 lower-wage-standards-of-living nations to improve their living conditions.

This method would leave to every country in the world the power of self-determination with respect to its own wage-living standards, but would provide a definite incentive for the other 57 member nations of the United Nations to raise their wage-living standards since they would immediately be given credit for such accomplishment through a corresponding reduction of our import fees.

Then when any nation raised its wage standard of living to approximately our level, free and unrestricted trade would be the immediate and automatic result. Each nation would be the sole judge of its own living standard.

Our position in Europe and Asia at the moment is intolerable, and is the direct result of our own bungling in most of our recent foreign dealings, and lack of a clear international policy.

The basic subject of foreign policy has never been frankly discussed with the American people through two world wars.

The issue is the same now as it was in 1823 when President Monroe met the same threat from the empire-minded nations, in the Western Hemisphere and prevented the encroachment and domination of the nations of the Western Hemisphere by the European nations through a simple pronouncement of an international policy later to become known as the Monroe Doctrine, which said:

"We owe it therefore to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and these powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

I would not name any nation, since while Russia may be the worst offender in attempting to extend their system, they are not the only one.

President Monroe further indicated that if conditions changed in the future, the authorities at Washington could extend the

doctrine. Advances in methods of communication and transportation have greatly changed the physical world since President Monroe established his policy, but the fundamental principles involved have not changed.

The State Department and the President are charged with the responsibility, through the Constitution of this Nation, of fixing foreign policy. Therefore, they should immediately determine the areas and name the nations in Europe, Asia, and the South Seas, in addition to the Western Hemisphere, whose integrity is important to the ultimate safety of this Nation.

If it should be determined after full consideration of our experience through two world wars that a threat to the integrity of any member nation of the United Nations Organization by any other nation would constitute a threat to our ultimate safety, then President Monroe's exact words could be utilized in announcing an extension of the established 125-year-old Monroe Doctrine or the open-door policy in such nations, simply leaving out any reference to the Western Hemisphere.

Congress has no authority to establish international policy. It can only be done through the executive department in the manner established by the Constitution of the United States.

We should then build at once a military force, spearheaded by an air corps, that would bear silent evidence to all concerned that we were ready and able to enforce the extended doctrine, just as we have enforced the original Monroe Doctrine covering the Western Hemisphere for more than 125 years.

As a result the nations of the Western Hemisphere are still free and we were kept out of a major war for more than 75 years.

The Congressional Air Policy Board and the President's Air Policy Board reported early in 1947 and recommended a long range military plane purchase program which would provide a 35,000-plane striking force costing $16,800,000,000 over a 5-year period, which would keep any other nation on the ground in the event of war. The subject is still under consideration.

In the debate on the Marshall plan on March 4, 1948, I challenged the State Department to name the nations of the then 56 member countries of the United Nations Organization, whose integrity we must currently protect for our ultimate safety and to tell the world and the American people so that any empire-minded nations would be apprised of our intentions and thus avoid what could well develop into a third devastating world war. Our own people deserve to be informed in matters of such vital importance. I renew that challenge.

We apparently do not learn from our experience through two world wars. From 1914 through 1916 we denied that we would fight—were not prepared to fight—and upon examination the Kaiser did not think we could prepare to fight in time to be effective in his war—so he swarmed over Europe.

In 1939 to 1941 we denied we would fight—were not prepared to fight—and upon examination Hitler did not think we could prepare to fight in time to be effective in his war—so he swarmed over Europe.

We are now confronted with a similar situation for the third time in my generation—as we still have not defined the areas or named the nations whose integrity is currently important for our ultimate safety—neither the nations of the world nor our own people know what we consider important.

We are in a fair way to lose all of Asia—the Middle East and the South Seas through our lack of decision—and vacillating tactics. Furthermore, our action in Yalta in giving Manchuria and Berlin to the Russians—could well prove to be the two major mistakes of the century.

Following a definite pronouncement of a foreign policy for the Nation the Congress of the United States can arrange in any emergency for the feeding of hungry people within the areas named as a matter of charity to the extent that it may be done without undue injury to our own economic structure—and also provide for the rehabilitation of industries within the areas designated on the same basis as such industries are rehabilitated in our own country in an emergency. There are huge sums of foreign capital that would be available in many areas provided the governments in those areas would encourage and protect the integrity of private investment.

Rehabilitation of industry could then be assisted through loans from the world bank in the same manner as money is loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the same purpose in this country.

Businessmen and industrialists will take the business risk—but they cannot take the risk of nationalization and socialization of their capital.

My inspection of these areas definitely indicates that it will prove a pleasant surprise to both the Congress and the people of the United States, the relatively small amount of funds that such nations will require for industrial plant refinancing if such loans must be secured on a business basis as is required for such loans for rehabilitation of the same type of industries in our own country.

Abraham Lincoln made some observations on foreign trade that are as sound today as when they were made. It will be remembered that he said, in effect, on one occasion when the matter of import fees versus the free-trade principle was under discussion that "when we buy goods within our country we have both the money and the goods; when we buy goods from foreign countries we have the goods and they have the money."

Were he alive today he probably would add that when we give money to foreign governments to buy goods in countries other than the United States we have neither the money nor the goods, but probably a good measure of hate for our industry and ability that put us in so favorable a position.

The Lincoln principle is still sound and we must not confuse the assistance we are rendering other nations with any profit that we might secure for ourselves.

The United States does not have any monopoly on natural resources, nor on technological ability. Some of the most important contributions to our development have been made by our own foreign-born citizens and through patents and processes secured from enemy countries.

Our position in the world has been reached because, until recent years at least, every boy could rise to the top in the profession or business that he chose to follow. We are great because of the opportunity every man had to improve his position in the community.

It is strange that it is the governmental philosophy of the peoples who are clamoring for our aid that so many of our own people in authority are endeavoring to adopt as the philosophy of this Nation, regardless of our experience.

If we allow ourselves to be diverted on any subject, however important at the time, and allow our wage-living standard to be lowered through imports from the low-wage Asiatic and European countries, then we not only cannot help other nations but we cannot help ourselves.

For myself, I see no difference in the importation of goods produced by cheap labor and the importation of cheap labor itself. The result is the same.

In fact, the importation of the goods is only the first step—the dream of the economic "one worlders" is also unrestricted immigration.

We are now in the most critical period of United States history, and the policies that control our course in the near future may well determine whether or not the form of government that we have known is to endure or whether we shall live in the future under some form of government that takes from the individual all individual freedom.

The Republican Party was born of a crisis. For years it stood as the political symbol of honesty and efficiency in government. We have recently been told on high authority that the party is divided and apparently about ready for oblivion. I do not subscribe to that defeatist view.

What the Republican Party needs is a return to the fundamental philosophy that made it great. What it needs is more men of courage who will stand up and fight for its principles rather than try to ape every demagogue who appears to catch the favor of some group or faction for a moment, or who invents some catchword or phrase which captures the public fancy.

This Nation desperately needs national and international long range policies designed to protect our own living standards and the free-enterprise systems which made us the greatest Nation on earth—while assisting the low-wage living standard countries of the world to help themselves on a business basis.

Progress is a process of evolution and we cannot expect to create a faultless society either by resolution or by revolution.

Everyone hates a coward. Let us have courage to stand up and defend the system, face the issue and to fight for those things that we still retain of the privileges of a free citizenship in this United States of America—the greatest nation of this or any other age.

John Gunther on Postwar Warsaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article that appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 8, 1949, written by John Gunther, the author of Inside Europe:

(By John Gunther)

Let me drop politics and personalities, except simply to describe the city of Warsaw instead. Warsaw today might well be called the most phenomenal sight in Europe.

First, two blunt figures. Eighty-four percent of all buildings in this great city, the capital of Poland, were rendered uninhabitable during the war. Not merely damaged, mind you. But rendered uninhabitable. And Warsaw, the population of which was 1,300,000 in 1939, lost during the war approximately 700,000 dead. Some appreciation of the enormity of this figure may be gained from the fact that the total war dead of Great Britain and the United States together was only about 555,000. Warsaw, just the city, lost 700,000 killed; the entire United States lost, roughly, 310,000.

BITTER WIT

One Pole we met put it this way with bitter vigor: "You in the west may have the highest standard of living in the world. We Poles have the highest standards of death."

But the point I am hoping to make is not the frightfulness of the destruction we saw in Warsaw, indubitably frightful as that is.

The real point is the remarkable success of the Poles in rebuilding their city, the massive energy and zip they have put into the job, and the electric animation and effervescence they seem to show. Warsaw is a ruin. But it is the liveliest capital in Europe.

Take Berlin by comparison. Berlin has about as much vitality as a mass of putty. The very grass has grown over the streetcar tracks on Kurfurstendamm. People walk slowly, with hunched and sagging shoulders; an almost suffocating dreariness hangs over the community; the food shops are scraped bare; except for the pulsating throb of airlift planes overhead, the city seems almost soundless. And I found much the same sort of deadness in Frankfurt, Vienna, and, in a different political category, Prague.

HUM OF ACTIVITY

But Warsaw. It bounces, hums, and buzzes. Clouds of dust envelop the passers-by. Buildings are going down and coming up. The streets are jammed; the hotels and restaurants are full to bursting. Food is cheap, good, and plentiful, and the shops are tolerably well stocked, though many commodities are of inferior grade. The people are poor—no one would attempt to deny that—but they are rising out of their own ruins by their own efforts, which helps to give them their morale.

Not for a moment would I suggest that the exclusive reason for this is the character of the Polish Government. Most Poles hate Russians and they would not go through the terrific adventure of rebuilding Warsaw for Moscow's sake. The deeper reasons are the buoyant Polish temperament, Polish tradition, Polish history, and Polish romanticism.

"Poland has been destroyed four times. Very well. Let's create it all over again and make it better and make it last." This, in a phrase, expresses the Warsaw spirit. These people are not cowed like the Czechs. They are alive, tenacious, almost gay in the midst of tragedy, and going places, if history will let them.

LITTLE PRESSURE

There is plenty of discontent and opposition, of course. Only a fool would deny that. Conversely, very few signs of overt pressure are manifest. I talked to an American who bitterly hated the regime. He said: "There is no arbitrary use of police power here. The government is detestable, but there are no concentration camps or terrorism. This is the freest of the satellite states. You can go around pretty much as you please."

We arrived at dusk, and took a walk after dinner. I was stunned. I knew Warsaw fairly well before the war. The destruction was so great that I could not find my way to the simplest objectives. Almost all the landmarks I remembered, like the Foreign Office, have completely disappeared. For mile after mile the city looks like a gutted moon.

NOT EVEN SKELETONS

In Berlin, if you stand near Brandenburg Gate, you can at least see the outline of what buildings once were. There, you say to yourself, are the remains of the Hotel Adlon, there is the skeleton of the house I dined in once, there is what was the French Embassy. But in Warsaw it is impossible over large areas to identify any buildings at all, or even to see where street intersections were, because the ruin is total, the destruction is complete.

The worst area is the ghetto, which is literally a heap of rubble. It looks like an empty rocky lot. A few straggly weeds, bearing a few pathetically valiant flowers, grow in what was once the busiest section of the city, and a clump of dusty bushes has spurted out over the area where the biggest synagogue in Europe once stood. Grass grows again. Human beings do not. And never let it be forgotten that of the 3,500,000 Polish Jews who lived in this country before the war, not less than three solid million were murdered by the Germans. The total number of Jews surviving in Poland today is only between 70,000 and 80,000.

PIECEMEAL REBUILDING

In other parts of the city—not the ghetto, which is beyond any possible hope of restoration—we watched the work of rebuilding. The old bricks are used in the new structures, which gives a crazy patchwork effect. Hundreds of houses are only half rebuilt; as soon as a single room is habitable, people move in. I never saw anything more striking than the way a few pieces of timber shore up a broken heap of stone or brick, so that a kind of perch-like room is made available to a family, high over crumbling ruins. One end of a small building may be a heap of dust; at the other you will see curtains in the windows.

Every Pole I met was almost violent with hope. "See that?" a Cabinet Minister pointed to something that looked like a smashed gully. "In 20 years that will be our Champs Elysee."

Much of this furious reconstruction is done by voluntary labor; most, moreover, is done by the human hand. In all Warsaw, there are not more than two or three concrete mixers and three or four electric hoists; in all Warsaw, not one bulldozer! A gang of men climb up a wall, fix an iron hook on the end of a rope to the topmost bricks, climb down again, and pull. Presto!—the wall crashes. Then the same distorted bricks go into what is going up. No time for fancy masonry!

NO RED FLAGS

There are some strange juxtapositions in this bizarre Warsaw of today. This is a Communist-dominated country. But I paused for a long moment before a well-stocked Catholic bookshop selling only religious works. This is a country supposed to be run by severe standards of economic logic. But near my hotel were big posters advertising a national lottery. Never once in Warsaw, incidentally, did I see a red flag, a photograph of Stalin or a Russian soldier.

In 1945 the city was totally without water, transportation, gas, power lines, a sewage system, or electricity. Hardly a cat was alive. The Government, having made the herculean decision to rebuild Warsaw instead of establishing a new capital at Lodz, got to work. The first phase was cleaning up the wreckage, getting a bridge across the Vistula, and restoring the public services. The second was reconstruction of buildings capable of being reconstructed. Buildings damaged beyond repair are destroyed. The third, in progress now, is construction of new elements of the city according to strict plan.

WILD-WEST TYPE

We walked down the main shopping streets one morning—they are rebuilt with one-story lath-and-plaster shacks resembling those of a wild west town—and looked at goods and prices. The great shortages are in clothing (because almost everybody's wardrobe was destroyed) and leather (because almost all the cattle was slaughtered). Most prices were very steep, but the variety of merchandise available was much greater than in Belgrade, Frankfurt, or Vienna.

We saw a girl's sweater at 17,800 zloty ($42.50 at the legal rate of exchange), a silver bracelet at the same price, lipsticks at 525 ($1.32), a coarse soap at 90 (22 cents) a cake, a brand of California apricots at 185 a can (46 cents), a muskrat coat at 75,000 ($1,870), a basket of cut roses at 5,700 ($14.25), a pair of men's shoes at 19,000 ($47.50), and an American fountain pen at 2,500 ($6.25). Incidentally Warsaw was the only iron-curtain capital we saw where American name-brand cigarettes were freely available (at a price), British magazines and French luxury products.

But to revert to the main theme of this article—the rehabilitation of Warsaw after ruin. One of my Polish friends snapped: "War? If we thought war was coming, do you think we'd have bothered to rebuild our capital?"

Nijmegen University, the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the monthly meeting of the Yo-Men of Grand Street Boys Association, New York, N. Y., on February 17, 1949:

There is a controversy going on in The Netherlands whether Nijmegen is the oldest city of that country or Maastricht.

However, there is no controversy about the question of which city suffered the most during the war. Our bombers in February 1944 mistook Nijmegen for a German town and destroyed the heart of the old city, taking a toll of more than 800 lives. The people took it as one of those unfortunate things which happen in every war, and when our Eighty-second Airborne Division liberated Nijmegen in September of that year they were amazed at their cordial reception. It puzzled some intelligence officers, so they investigated and found out that the Germans had tried to stir up the feelings of the population, pointing to the tragedy of the first bombing and saying that that was what they got from their Allies. But the reaction was different from what the Nazis had hoped for as the Dutch retorted: "If you had not started this war on us, this never would have happened. You are the real culprits."

It was the same when the Dutch were forbidden by their occupiers to teach the English language in their schools during the war. I was amazed to find how many people spoke English, but here again the answer was: Because the Nazis had forbidden it they wanted to learn it all the more.

I was in Nijmegen last summer. It was an interesting visit. Nijmegen became world famous due to its association with Arnhem in the glorious and tragic battle of September 1944. Countless soldiers know its bridge, a magnificent single arch across the Waal, the chief branch of the lower Rhine, the biggest stream of Holland. Travelers may remember its skyline, bristling with old and new spires, one of the finest of Europe. And connoisseurs of seventeenth-century art evoke its mysterious carolingian castle towering high above an immensely broad and placid river, on certain grey-brown pictures of Jan van Goyen.

Today the steeples are broken, the skyline has miserably collapsed, the town seems sevenfold beheaded. The old commercial and civic center, once picturesquely sloping down to a crowded riverside, red from bricks and tiles several centuries old, scabby like a ghetto, lies empty and meaningless between the shells of a dozen burnt out palaces and churches; pieces of sky glowing behind broken tracery in the evening; series of open caves gaping between empty sidewalks; street cars gliding hurriedly beyond the broken statues of emperors on the facade of the town hall, through suddenly interrupted rows of patched up houses, to overcrowded suburbs hidden in glorious green. The great church of St. Stephens, a thirteenth century

collegiate church, the plan of which shows the exact shape and even the enormous dimensions of Cologne Cathedral, is a ruin overlooking a cataract of ruins. In 1591 she lost part of her roof and her medieval furniture; in 1672 her vaults through the bombardment of Louis XIV; in 1944 by mistaken bombs her carillon and eversinging belfry, after the Germans had already silenced her imperial bell named after Charlemagne, and tolling majestically over the red tiled roofs, every evening after nightfall.

During the battles of 1944 and the subsequent 6 months' shelling, Nijmegen lost more than half of its buildings, 2,000 lives and nearly all its beauty; its commercial center was totally destroyed. However, there is one monument found to be intact. It was the latest in date of its monuments: the big bridge. During the night of September 18, after the Eighty-second American Airborne Division had landed on the south and west and the Second Army made its thrust upward from the Albert Canal, and Arnhem was at stake, the bridge, then a capital spot in the Allied plan, was saved from a second destruction. In May 1940 it had been blown up by the Dutch themselves. They had it repaired in 1943. But on September 17, 1944, the most perfect airborne invasion in daytime, as the jump was called, took place. Nearly 500 C–47's carried men of the Eighty-second over drop zones just south of Nijmegen in what the high headquarters called operation "market." Fifty-seven miles behind enemy lines the drop was made. The orders were to take the high ground between Nijmegen and Groesbeek, to take the Grave Bridge, a span over the river Maas between Grave and Nijmegen, and to capture intact the all-important gateway to Holland, the big bridge at Nijmegen.

Almost unmolested on the drop the division had to repulse savage counterattacks by the Sixth German Parachute Division. On the second day when the British armored guards arrived, every mission had been accomplished, except taking the big bridge at Nijmegen.

The epic taking of the Nijmegen Bridge will live as long as old troopers gather. Ferried by members of the Three Hundred and Seventh Airborne Engineers, the Five Hundred and Fourth Parachute Infantry made a daring daylight crossing of the swift Waal River. Only 11 of the first 26 boats returned for second trips, but enough troopers reached the other shore to take the northern approach to the bridge. Meantime, the Five Hundred and Fifth had swept past enemy defenses to take the southern approach with the aid of British armor.

Of this action Bill Downs, CBS correspondent, said: "Compares in magnificence to Guam, Tarawa, and Omaha Beach. Should be told to the beating of drums and blowing of bugles for the brave men who made the crossing of the swift Waal possible."

It is for these men that a memorial is going to be erected in the city of Nijmegen. This memorial will be the rebuilt university, destroyed by the Nazis as a matter of revenge for the resistance which professors and students had put up during the war. When the board of this university offered General Gavin and the Eighty-second Airborne Division Association to dedicate the reconstructed building or buildings as a memorial to the Eighty-second and its heroic dead, they were thrilled. And at the first national convention thereafter the association resolved to take this as their official memorial and to sponsor a campaign which the American Committee To Aid the University of Nijmegen was going to start. The War Battle Monuments Commission gave its O. K. and encouragement to the plans. When the committee went to President Truman, the President said: "This is one of the sanest war memorials I have heard of thus far."

I believe it is. On my visit to Holland last year I also visited this university. I saw its ruins, its emergency buildings, and how professors and students are carrying on in places you would not think of as suitable for higher learning. Nevertheless, they do not give up. There is something left of a spirit which never should die in Europe and in the whole world which maintains its heritage of western civilization. It was the great promoter of western civilization, who once for a long while resided in Nijmegen—Charlemagne. His name is given to the university. No civil ruler has done more for education than he had. When our ancestors emigrated to what is now the United States of America, they brought the same civilization over to these shores, and so we may deduct that Charlemagne has also his merits for what we proudly call our American civilization.

Why are we talking so much about western civilization today? We know something about the fiercest menace to this civilization today; don't we? This menace is, I believe, one of the greatest challenges that our western civilization is now called upon to face, and it is for this reason that some outstanding Americans have joined together and taken on the task of helping to rebuild the Charlemagne University in Nijmegen. They think that the type of training given at this university is badly needed to serve as a bulwark against those subversive influences that are infiltrating throughout Europe. The Eighty-second Airborne Division Association is fully behind this undertaking and thinks that their heroes cannot be honored in a better way than by promoting the education of future leaders, who during their years of study will be daily reminded of the example given by their American brethren and of the price the professors and students of this war period had to pay for their loyalty to their conviction.

I wish to tell you a few things of the war record of this university. When the Nazi propaganda spread over Europe it was this university which organized special lectures to refute the errors of the Nazi ideology. During the night of May 9, 1940, the German Army entered Nijmegen. At that time five students lost their lives. On June 26 four professors were imprisoned. One was released in the summer of 1941, but 10 days later, due to previous maltreatment, he died. Two others were sent to the horror camp at Dachau, where they died after 2 years of suffering. Nine more were imprisoned for longer or shorter terms.

The toll of the students was altogether 38 dead as victims of war, resistance, and underground work. The Nazis demanded that the students sign a declaration of allegiance to them. They refused. The university closed its doors. The students were forced to work in Germany, but many escaped and went underground. Among them was the president of the students' association (Baron Joseph van Hoevel tot Westerflier). He built up the students' resistance movement throughout Holland and was one of the council of nine of the student underground. He died in the concentration camp of Neugamme.

There is another interesting point which shows how this university stood toward anti-Semitism. In 1942 the Nazis ordered the students' clubhouse to display a sign: Forbidden for Jews. They refused and promptly the Nazis confiscated the building.

This university has proved its character. It did not yield to nazism—it will not yield to communism. It deserves our help, and I am happy that your great club of the Grand Street Boys has spotted this grandiose plan. I hope you will give it some help, some support, some energy, some time. There are several activities the committee is anxious to have carried out. I wish you would plan your cooperation with some of the officers of the committee.

Let me say this in summation: Europe is not going to be saved by economic help alone; there has to be some contribution in the cultural field, too, for which we Americans should be proud to procure the means as generously as we provide them with economic aid. The Dutch know how precious a legacy they carry. They realize the advantages and responsibilities of their position among the nations of the old continent; they are not emerging from a regretted phase, but putting their hands to another task; not so much planning an unknown and therefore unreal future, but trying to live up to a very real present. Nijmegen being one of their old and natural centers, they feel that its being replanned and rebuilt may be part of remaking the world, and may interest their friends in that country far off to which since September 1944 they associate the very notion of human freedom.

And what makes this project of Americans partly rebuilding this university more attractive is the fact that it honors at the same time the boys of an American division which through special ties is linked up with our city of New York. As you remember the Eighty-second Airborne Division was selected to hold the victory parade on Fifth Avenue on January 12, 1946. New York, which received this most heroic division so proudly, should be no less proud to contribute to its memorial.

Hon. Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, delivered by Hon. Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, at a testimonial dinner for Hon. FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER, Representative, Twentieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, Easton, Pa., Thursday, February 17, 1949:

It is indeed an honor to have this opportunity to tell his friends in his own district what we in Washington think and know about FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER.

Whatever nice things I may say about him are not necessary. The fact that you have returned Tad to the Congress with such potent majorities nine successive terms is the most wonderful testimonial that can be rendered him. You know him as a true friend, an able lawyer, and a capable legislator. I know him as a statesman—an untiring, devoted American.

Few men have served longer in the House of Representatives than has this outstanding Congressman whom we are toasting here tonight. This is his seventeenth year in the service of his country as a national lawmaker.

Prior to entering the national field of politics he served his county—Northampton—as solicitor from 1928 to 1933, and his country as a gob and ensign in World War I. In World War II he again returned to the service, this time as a lieutenant commander in naval aviation.

It was only at the direction of his commander in chief—President Franklin Delano Roosevelt—that he left the Navy to return to his post on Capitol Hill, the President of the United States stating that men of his caliber could not be spared from the Halls of Congress.

I have known Tad during my entire career of 14 years in the Department of Justice. We

have worked often together on many matters and problems affecting the welfare of our country. He is a member of several important committees—especially, ranking member of the Judiciary Committee. The latter is one of the most important, if not the most important committee of the House, 52 percent of the business on the floor of that body originating in the Judiciary Committee.

It was Hatton Sumners, the distinguished Texan and former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who, recognizing Tad's ability, sincerity, and application to work, persuaded him to become a member of his committee. Yes, I should add modesty in my description. Actually I have never met a man with so many accomplishments who is as modest as our honored guest.

I thought I would find in the Congressional Directory something about him—something that would glorify him and I could boast about at this banquet. This is the Government publication that is supposed to print a complete and lavish biography of the Members of both Houses, as the Members themselves furnish the information for their own biographies. Much to my surprise, all I found was four short lines telling the date of his birth, 54 years ago in this fine, progressive city of Easton, that he was a graduate of George Washington and Georgetown Universities, that he was Northampton County solicitor from 1928 to 1933, a veteran of the two World Wars, and that he was elected to the Seventy-third and subsequent Congresses. Nothing about being a student at Princeton or of Lehigh, or honorary degrees conferred upon him.

Not one single word of his many achievements, not one word of the hard, effective work he has done to make our democracy thrive in the face of attacks from within and from without. Not one word of the service that he has rendered humanity as the father of the humanitarian displaced persons legislation that permitted the entry into our glorious land of some victims of war-torn lands. No written record of the services he has performed for war veterans. No mention of the fact that he was instrumental in securing the congressional charters for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the AMVETS.

Not a solitary note of the fact that he served on the select committee of the House to investigate the feasibility of the plan to aid Europe. Out of this exhaustive and wise inquiry came the Marshall plan which is now working to help stricken European countries on the road to recovery and self-maintenance, and stop the onrushing sweep of communism.

So adept is Tad at hiding his light under a bushel that few know the American Bar Association paid him a special tribute for the lead he took in the adoption of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act by the Congress in 1946. All lawyers know the importance of this act.

To illustrate how faithful and watchful he is about matters in his district I think I'll tell you about an incident that recently occurred.

Confined in the Lewisburg prison is a multimillionaire from New York State. A fantastic story was published to the effect that this particular prisoner was receiving all sorts of courtesies, such as being permitted to leave the institution, get special meals, spend all his daytime in the recreation room. The writer had called it Clark's Country Club.

FRANCIS WALTER heard the story. Incognito, he hastened to visit the prison. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, he wanted to get the facts. A few days later a Congressman rose on the floor of the House and repeated the bizarre story of the millionaire's pleasant sojourn at Lewisburg. Tad waited until his colleague had ended his political tirade, got to the floor and proceeded to refute every reckless and irresponsible allegation that was made. He told them what he had found in the institution; that it was a model modern institution where absolutely no favoritism was shown. His fellow Members applauded him when he brought out the fact that the job of the wealthy prisoner was assistant janitor of a barracks occupied by 33 prisoners.

Yes, Tad is always on the job. You can always depend upon him—which reminds me of this story:

Once the House was desperate to get a quorum. The Speaker despatched telegrams to all absent Members.

One Member, delayed by a flood, wired back:

"Wash out on line; can't come."

The Speaker answered:

"Buy another shirt and come on next train."

Shirt or no shirt, FRANCIS WALTER gets there.

If he had done nothing else than what I have related here, he would have won the admiration and praise of not only his fellow-townsmen but the whole Nation. But he has done tremendously more than what I have spoken about. He is chairman of the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee, ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and when the leaders of Congress canvassed the membership for a man who would regain the confidence of the American people in the Un-American Activities Committee they unanimously selected FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER.

In him they knew that they had one who would adhere to our American principles and doctrines, one who would exercise judicial wisdom in conducting the necessary investigations, one who would shun premature publicity, who would consider every accused innocent until proven guilty, and one who would be unrelenting in ferreting out those who attempt to overthrow our form of government.

I don't have to tell his fellow-townsmen gathered around this festive board that he is a friend of both the worker and the employer—that he is a warm-hearted person, loving mankind; that he respects all religions and faiths. The coal miners, the operators, the steelworkers and industrialists, the farmers and the consumers, and the small business men that make up this fine, progressive section of Pennsylvania with its nearly 300,000 people know that perhaps more so than I. However, I also want you to know that we in the Department of Justice admire and esteem him as you do, and that no man is more welcome at the White House by our great President, Harry S. Truman, than is your Representative from the Twentieth District of Pennsylvania.

Our freedoms are safe when men like FRANCIS EUGENE WALTER guard the ramparts.

Bless you, Tad, and all your loyal friends.

Excerpts From Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Hon. Brien McMahon, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts from remarks delivered by me last night at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at New Haven, Conn.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL TEXT OF ADDRESS BY HON. BRIEN M'MAHON, OF CONNECTICUT, AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER AT NEW HAVEN, CONN., ON THURSDAY NIGHT, FEBRUARY 24, 1949

The projected North Atlantic Alliance, especially the form which it ultimately takes, may be the most far-reaching proposal, and the most important proposal, to come before the Senate at this session.

The exact form of this instrument is now a subject for formal study by the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and diplomatic representatives of the interested powers. I have no wish at this time to attempt a forecast of the ultimate form of the pact or to suggest the precise wording of the treaty. I do wish to make this general observation.

The best pact will be the pact which states in the plainest terms our obligations under the treaty. The weakest pact, and the one most dangerous to our future safety, will be the pact which tries to water down, to hedge in, or to circumscribe beyond easy recognition the commitments of the United States to the other signatory powers. A half-hearted entrance into this alliance may be the worst possible move we could take.

Over a century and a quarter ago we learned one of the great lessons of history—the fact that a nation which states its position firmly and unequivocally thereby wins the respect of the other nations of the world. We learned at the same time that straight talking is the best way to prevent misunderstanding and to prevent war. I refer to the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The United States was then a fledgling Nation sprawled along the Atlantic seaboard. The pronouncement of President Monroe was a direct notice to the powers of Europe that we would tolerate no interference into the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. In his message to Congress in 1823, Mr. Monroe said that any attempt by those powers to extend their political systems into this hemisphere would be dangerous to our peace and safety. His message said further that such action on their part would be the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

From the time of its promulgation, there has never been any doubt that this doctrine had for its enforcement the military might of the United States. During the whole of its existence, the Monroe Doctrine has been respected by the strongest governments on both sides of the Atlantic. In our negotiations through the years with Great Britain, with Germany, and with the other powers of Europe, its existence has been uppermost in those negotiations. The Monroe Doctrine, since its inception, has had the full force and effect of a formal treaty.

With little behind him except the moral power of a new and comparatively weak nation, President Monroe drew a line and served notice that any nation which passed beyond that line was an aggressor nation in the eyes of the United States. At that time, Europe was approximately 60 days away by the fastest sailing time. The time lag for voyages to South America was considerably greater.

In our day and time, with Europe only a few hours away by flying time, it would be well if the United States showed some of President Monroe's spunk in defining what we consider to be a threat to our peace and safety. The proposed North Atlantic Alliance, in a very real sense, is a projection of the Monroe Doctrine to new geographical

lines. We should not hesitate to say so in plain words.

The Monroe Doctrine is frequently referred to as a moral commitment on the part of the United States. That it has acquired legal force over the years, no one disputes. In theory, a legal commitment has greater force because it commits the signatory nation to a definite course of action. In actual fact, a legal commitment is no more binding than a moral commitment because it is not enforceable except at the will of the signatory nation. Unless a nation lives up to its pledged word, there is no way to compel it to do so.

In practical terms, the moral commitment has behind it far greater power because it binds the conscience of the Nation. The magnificent part played by the Monroe Doctrine in American foreign policy is an excellent illustration.

I strongly dissent from the view that the constitutional power of Congress to declare war prohibits the United States from entering into a realistic pact or treaty, the purpose of which is to safeguard the Nation's basic security or to clarify our position on international problems which vitally affect our interests. Two decades ago, the United States was a signatory to the Kellogg-Briand treaties in which we formally renounced war as an instrument of national policy. That treaty certainly circumscribed the congressional power to declare war but it was approved by the Senate of the United States.

In our efforts to insure national security, we have gone further. In 1904 the President of the United States and the Senate approved a treaty with Panama which said: "The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama." This was a legal commitment to go to war for Panama which remained in force until 1936, when it was abrogated at the request of the Panamanian government but not at our request. With or without a treaty, would we tolerate the seizure of the Panama Canal by a foreign power?

In the troubled world in which we live today, with weapons existing which may wipe out whole parts of a nation overnight, the guiding principle of our foreign policy and our military defense must be the highest law of all—the law of self-preservation. The Constitution was never conceived by its creators as a static document, the rigid interpretations of whose provisions might some day work to endanger the national security.

We have no formal defense pact with Canada, but if a hostile invading force of dangerous proportions landed in Canada on Monday morning, we would have counter forces in Canada on Monday afternoon, whether Congress was in session to declare war or not. If the Government acted otherwise, it would be guilty of a serious breach of faith with the American people.

The North Atlantic Alliance will be seriously weakened unless it says just exactly what we mean. In the past 3 years, militant communism has overrun 10 nations in Europe, crushing out those precious civil, personal, and religious liberties which were won by hundreds of years of struggle and bloodshed. This pact, if it means anything at all, means formal notification that the United States will not stand idly by if the black night of communism should threaten to fall over western Europe.

A weak pact may convince the devious minds of the Kremlin that we really don't mean what we say. A strong pact will convince them that we do mean business. A strong pact will do more than that; it will be the surest guaranty against further Communist aggression and the safest insurance for peace.

Address by Hon. Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, Before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at the fortieth annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, at Philadelphia, February 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of addressing such a distinguished gathering under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association. It is a great pleasure for me to see again your distinguished Governor, Jim Duff, with whom I have not had an opportunity to talk since those fateful days in June 1948. I shall never cease to be grateful for what he did then. I see ED MARTIN, and many other of your representatives in Washington, with whom I have enjoyed the closest association, and HUGH SCOTT, the chairman of the national committee.

It is nice to meet Harold Stassen again in his new role as president of a great university. In fact, as I look around, I wonder whether this is a meeting of manufacturers or perhaps of Republicans. In any event, I want you to understand that the speech which I am about to make is a strictly nonpartisan approach to our present problems.

It is because of the last election, however, that, in my opinion, we face today a real crisis in the future of this country. We have presented to us in Congress a program which, if enacted in full, will change the whole character of our Government and of our people. While that program has acquired great force because of the result of the election, I question whether there really is any popular mandate for it or for any single feature of it. I am quite certain that the people did not consider the program as a whole. As a matter of fact, I believe that there was no overriding national issue or national interest in the last election. Only a small proportion of the voters exercised their right of franchise. If we had voted this year the same proportion of the adult population as voted in 1940 in the Willkie-Roosevelt election, we would have had 7,000,000 more votes for the Presidential candidates. As I look over the pattern of that last election, I feel confident that it was determined very largely on local issues and the strength of State and district candidates. Congress, as the representative of the people, must consider the program presented to it not on the basis of any mandate but on the merits of the various proposals.

Broadly speaking, I believe we face now the question whether we shall maintain a government based on liberty or establish a Labor-Socialist government very similar to that controlling the destinies of Great Britain, imposing the wishes of the state on a regimented people with little freedom to move except as the Government permits.

What is this liberty which has inspired this country from its foundation and brought about the great production and high standard of living which makes it possible for us even to aid less fortunate peoples? It is freedom of speech and of the press, as the President said in his inaugural—but it is much more. It is the freedom of the individual to choose his own work and his life occupation, to spend his earnings as he desires to spend them, to choose the place where he desires to live, to take the job that fits him whether some union official is willing that he get it or not. It is the freedom of the local community to work out its own salvation when it has the power to do so. It is the freedom of cities, of counties, of school districts, the freedom of educating one's own children as he thinks best. It is the freedom of thought and experiments in academic institutions. It is the freedom of men engaged in industry to run their business as they think best as long as they do not interfere with the rights of others to do the same. Certainly, there are limitations which must be imposed by the state to protect the liberty of others more and more as our economy becomes complex. But a party which believes in liberty will see that such limitations are only imposed to the extent it is absolutely necessary.

As we look back through history, we see brief periods in which liberty has prevailed, but in the major part of historical time it has been suppressed by emperors and kings, by oligarchies, by plutocracies, by so-called democracies and proletarian majorities. It is hard to gain and easy to lose unless it is kept alive by an aggressive determination that it shall not perish from the earth. Today the battle between liberty and totalitarian government permeates every problem of life. It lies at the base of our battle with fascism and nazism and communism. The American people believe in liberty, but the totalitarian creed so prevalent abroad would be fully established by the program which we now face here at home. What is that program?

1. A planned and controlled economy. We have now had presented to us an economic control bill which clearly accepts the principle that the Government is responsible for every detail of the operation of our complex economic machine which lies at the base of our standard of living. The bill gives the Government the power to fix prices over the protest, maybe, of farmers and other producers and businessmen. It gives the power to fix wages over the opposition of labor. It gives the Government power to allocate materials and ration consumers over the opposition of businessmen, farmers, and housewives.

If these powers are to be given, obviously the power to control rents is to be made permanent. Further powers are sought over the banks, and a wide extension of the Government's power to lend money. Finally, the Government is authorized to go into any business if it feels that the private capacity in that industry is insufficient. Obviously, no private man can ever compete with the Government, and of course Government entrance into an industry would check all private development.

2. The Government proposes to restore a condition in which the bosses of labor unions become also the bosses of industry and of their own members. The Thomas repeal bill removes all responsibility again from unions and restores irresponsible power. Yielding to the demands of Mr. Green, it is proposed that unions be relieved from any legal obligation to bargain collectively, from any liability on their contracts, from any liability in damages to those third parties whom they may injure by secondary boycotts and juris-

dictional strikes, from any legal responsibility to withhold Nation-wide strikes which threaten the safety and health of the people of this country. The repeal bill proposes the restoration of arbitrary power over individual workmen and union members. The Taft-Hartley law reaffirmed the liberty of the individual to work at the job which he found most acceptable, the right not to be coerced by either employer or union, the right not to be called out on boycotts in which he was not interested in order to increase the power of some union leader, the right not to be bossed by Communist leaders, the right to receive his full pay without check-off unless he desired to pay his dues to the union in that way, the right to receive financial reports of the operations of his union. The right to be free from discriminatory and excessive dues, the right to be free from forced political contributions, the right of freedom of speech.

All of these liberties which lie so close to the welfare of the average man and to the welfare of his wife and children are to be wiped out by the restoration of special privileges to labor unions which are enjoyed by no other man or organization in the United States.

3. Now we have a bill to establish a complete welfare state going far toward the Beveridge plan of Government subsidy from the cradle to the grave. It is proposed to increase tremendously the pay-roll taxes on all employees and then put the Federal Government into full control of all welfare operations. One bill proposes the socialization and nationalization of the medical profession. The Government is going to extend the public housing program to a point where the construction of 250,000 public housing units a year will interfere seriously with the development of the private housing industry.

The Federal Government is now going to subsidize all of those people who may be considered needy by some Government bureau including, I suppose, somewhere from ten to thirty million people, and all of this is to be done under a very tight Federal control out of some Washington bureau without regard to expense and without regard to the interest of the taxpayer. It would indeed be the establishment of a welfare state. Organized charity and Government welfare service to the whole population can destroy the freedom and also the character of the people to whom it is extended. It can increase the power of the central Government in Washington until Washington bureaus govern the daily lives of every family in the United States. Incentive and initiative can be paralyzed. We will be ruled by people who take no personal risks and create no jobs. The people will be taxed without realizing it through a deduction from pay roll, and perhaps get some part of those taxes back in the form of Government services and activity which they may or may not want. There is real danger to liberty in the welfare state.

4. Of course, this entire program will tremendously increase the expenses of government and the taxes to be paid. Already the budget has reached $42,000,000,000. The immediate proposals will increase it to at least $50,000,000,000, and the working out of those proposals will reach at least $60,000,000,000 within 4 or 5 years. Domestic expenditures are supplemented by liberality in expenditures abroad which shows no sense of restraint or of the burden on the American taxpayer.

The imposition of such a tremendous tax burden on the people and on the productive machinery of the country is likely to be a serious deterrent to further expansion. Already it is difficult to find new money for investment. As industries become unprofitable, the Government is to step in until the burden on those that remain will be so heavy that a private system cannot continue at all. You can socialize just as well by a steady increase in the burden of taxation beyond the 30 percent we have already reached as you can by direct Government seizure. Of course, the very imposition of heavy taxes is a limitation of a man's freedom. There was a time when he could decide how he would spend the money which he earned in the sweat of his brow. Today the Government takes from him a large proportion of those earnings and decides for him how they shall be spent—perhaps without benefit to him, perhaps in the rendering of services which he does not desire.

This entire program taken together can only mean the abandonment of real liberty in the United States. It can only mean a vast increase in power in the Washington Government which will enable it either to operate itself in many fields where freedom now exists or to direct in detail the manner in which agriculture, commerce, and industry shall be conducted, and in detail the manner in which families shall conduct their daily lives. In my opinion, a totalitarian state of the character which is now contemplated cannot long remain democratic if it is to be effective at all. The American people, at least, in our vast diversified country, will never stand for the socialization of their lives unless it is imposed on them by an overpowering force.

The present Congress has therefore a tremendous responsibility. I believe that its principal task is to prevent changes which would affect the whole nature of our Government and the character of the American Republic. Of course, its job should not be purely negative. It should develop an affirmative program to assure progress within the limits of the principles of liberty and justice for which this Nation was founded. We need the support of the people of this country to withstand the attack on the American people.

Our own program is an affirmative program:

1. The Taft-Hartley law was a bill to prevent the abuses which had arisen in our present system and restore liberty to employers and to individual employees. We believe that we can deal with the economic problems by the traditional weapons of sound fiscal policy and credit control and such other Government operations and public works as are part of the recognized activities of a free government.

Our program is that the Government operate within the present tax burden so long as we must engage in extraordinary foreign expenditures, and that it operate within a reduced tax burden as soon as those expenditures can be reduced.

In the field of welfare, I am convinced that we can make more real progress within the principles of liberty than we can by setting up the Federal Government as a dispenser of bread and circuses. Of course, we are just as much concerned as anyone that there shall be in this country as little hardship and poverty as possible, and particularly equality of opportunity for every child no matter how poor the family or the community into which he may be born. For that purpose I have favored a bill to give Federal aid to education particularly in those States where the average income is so low that a minimum education has not been and cannot be provided without assistance. I have favored a bill for Federal aid to the States to enable them to expand their operations in public health and in the furnishing of medical and hospital care to those unable to pay for it themselves. We have all long recognized the obligation of the local community to give free medical care to the needy, but the system is a combination of private and State activity which has grown up in a haphazard way and in which there still remain gaps. It is absolutely unnecessary to scrap our whole system which has given this country the best medical service in the world, destroy the freedom of the medical profession and the freedom of families to determine the kind of medical care they want. We can retain all the good points of the present system and expand it to give complete coverage.

I have introduced a public housing bill as the only practical method I can find to provide decent housing for the very lowest income groups. But if the Federal Government is going to aid in these fields, it is absolutely essential that its role shall be only a secondary role of advice and assistance. Housing, medical care, education, relief are all the primary obligations of the States and local communities. Federal-aid bills must provide, as our bills do provide, that there shall be no Federal control or interference with the administration by State or local authorities. A country of this size cannot remain free unless we maintain the freedom of our communities within the field which is properly theirs.

In the second place, the Federal Government should not spend its money except for the purpose of eliminating hardship and poverty and giving equal opportunity to the children of the Nation. If that limit is imposed, then these activities are not socialistic. It is not socialism, for instance, to give free medical care to the needy, as we have done in every community for years. It is socialism to dispense free medical care to the whole population, most of whom are fully able to pay their own way. If we give free medical care, why not free food, clothing, housing, and every other necessity of life? Housing activities are not socialistic on the part of any State as long as they are intended to assist those who cannot otherwise obtain decent housing and as long as nine-tenths of the housing industry is in the hands of private builders and paid for by those who can afford to pay. To this extent, housing is just as much a legitimate problem of Government as education or medical care.

Unfortunately, the States have not gone ahead so much with housing on their own, but it is primarily their concern, as apparently your Governor here appreciates. Federal aid in housing should be one of assistance to State and local activity. In short, the Federal Government should promote, advise, and assist in the welfare field. It should not control or interfere with administration or, except in cases of real need, subsidize services of this kind.

The matter of relief is one that is now being cared for by the States, and cared for successfully. I think it is most unfortunate that the new program suggests a direct Federal subsidy as a normal matter. I think we must recognize that in times of great unemployment, State resources are insufficient for relief, as they were in 1933, but I suggest that Federal aid be given to the States so that they may determine their own method of relief, work relief or other remedy, and that it be given to a State only after the relief-case load has reached some percentage beyond the power of the State to handle.

The program which I have suggested attempts to meet the just demand of the American people for the most humane treatment of those who fall behind under the pressure of a productive free economy while it maintains the liberty of the people and the liberty of their States and local communities. Real progress toward human welfare will be much more permanent if it is based on the initiative and interest of the

people in each State. There can be an infinite variety of new methods developed until we find the best. The whole country will not be forced into the strait-jacket of an ideology which controls a few experts in Washington.

The program which I have suggested is an affirmative program. It will require an aggressive battle to defeat those who have been misled into the belief that a central government can cure all the ills of the people and knows better than the people themselves what is good for them, but I am convinced that we are fighting the cause of free government, the cause of the liberty of the people, the cause of our local communities to live their lives as they want to live them, the cause of the American Republic.

Effect of Steel Shortage on Development of Western Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to submit for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio speech delivered by one of Montana's outstanding lawyers, Cedor B. Aronow. It relates to the critical effect of the steel shortage on the development of our western oil industry, a subject on which the Montana House of Representatives has memorialized the Congress and the President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, it is indeed a privilege to be permitted to speak over this fine Montana network on one of the greatest problems hindering the advancement and development of Montana's oil and gas production and in ustry. Montana and the whole Rocky Mountain area has unlimited possibilities for production of oil and gas. Structures that were condemned years ago by one shallow well are now being leased with the hope of being drilled to test deeper horizons. That is, if pipe and casing can be obtained to do this exploratory work. Oil fields that have produced millions of dollars worth of oil from shallow sands are now being tested for production in the lower or deeper strata whenever oil operators can get tubular goods for this development work.

You might well ask what does the oil industry mean to Montana? During the past year there has been produced in the State of Montana, and sold, crude oil of the value of $23,500,000. This new wealth for the State of Montana was brought into being by the oil operators in Montana's oil industry. This amount of $23,500,000 does not include the natural gas which has been distributed and sold to the people of Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Out of the $23,500,000, one-eighth, or the sum of nearly $3,000,000 was paid to landowners as royalty which payment was made to the landowners free and clear of all costs and expenses of production. The school funds of the State of Montana received one-hundred-and-sixteen-thousand-odd dollars for royalties from lands owned by the State of Montana. Again, these amounts do not include royalties paid on natural gas produced in Montana.

Oil wells cannot be drilled without steel tubular goods which includes casing in different sizes, tubing and rods to pump oil from the well after it is drilled, and flow lines to convey the oil from the well to the storage tank and from the storage tanks to loading racks for loading into tank cars or trucks or to the refineries where the oil ultimately goes. I have talked to perhaps 100 oil operators or more, and as the chairman of the Committee on Petroleum, Oil, and Gas, in the House of Representatives, I have listened to the testimony of oil operators and others connected with the oil industry as to the difficulties of obtaining tubular goods in Montana. Every operator that I have talked to has to curtail his development work. That is, the drilling of additional wells, by a minimum of one-half to 90 percent. In other words, many operators have drilling commitments for, let us say, 10 wells and have only sufficient pipe to drill one well.

This means that the State of Montana loses the new wealth which comes into being when oil is discovered and produced. It also means that State lands are not being developed for oil and gas and the school funds of the State of Montana are losing the revenue which they would otherwise receive as royalties from the production of oil and gas on these State lands. Private-land owners, farmers, and ranchers, are deprived of their one-eighth of the production, commonly known as royalty. Further, by the lack of tubular goods for development in Montana, we are being deprived of developing a reserve to take care of the petroleum needs of our people in the West and we must import our petroleum products from other areas and foreign sources, thus draining dollars out of Montana instead of creating new wealth and bringing money into our own Treasure State.

For every wrong or lack of the things that we need, there must be a cause, and in the matter of the shortage of tubular goods there is a cause which we in Montana feel is unfair and discriminatory toward us and the rest of the Western States. During the past 2 years you have read about the development of oil in Arabia by corporations formed in foreign countries in order to escape the payment of income tax in the United States. Our steel tubular goods, which we so sorely need in Montana, have been going for the development of oil fields in the Middle East and in other foreign countries. During the year 1947 there was exported from the United States for development of foreign oil fields 333,500,000 tons of oil-field tubular goods. If we could have had only a small percentage of that for use in Montana, think of the development of oil that could have been in our own State. I have talked to people who have been in Arabia and they tell me that there is shipload after shipload of oil-field tubular goods stacked and rusting and not being used because of political disturbances in the Middle East and war conditions. I have also stood at the railroad depot in Shelby, Mont., and watched trainload after trainload made up of many carloads of oil-field tubular goods going north to our neighbor, Canada. Some one and a half years ago the tremendously prolific LeDuc oil field was discovered in Canada. This is an area that did not have any history of pipe usage and is an entirely new area, but the LeDuc field in Canada is controlled by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, through its Canadian subsidiary, Imperial Oil Co., and they have drilled approximately 70 wells of a depth of about 5,000 feet.

Our average well in the producing fields of Montana is around 2,000 feet deep. Just think what the pipe that went to drill those 5,000-foot wells in Canada could have accomplished if made available for us in the State of Montana.

The testimony of the oil operators has shown also that, although it is impossible to buy oil field tubular goods through the legitimate supply houses at the quoted market price, they are able to go out in the gray market and at more than double the listed market price are able to buy a portion of their requirements. The issue for January of this year of the Independent Petroleum Association of America monthly publication shows that whereas in 1941 oil operators bought 92 percent of their pipe through regular suppliers and used only 8 percent second-hand pipe, that in the year just completed they were only able to buy 39 percent of their requirements from regular suppliers, they had to use 25 percent second-hand pipe, much of which was barely fit for use, and buy 22 percent of their requirements in the so-called gray market. And 11 percent of their requirements came through another version of the gray market and that is tie-in sales. In a tie-in sale you must buy something else which you do not need in order to obtain the product that you must have. Finally, 3 percent of their needs came from the conversion of one type of material into the type needed.

We, the Committee on Petroleum, Oil, and Gas, have introduced a House joint resolution requesting the President of the United States and the congressional delegation from Montana to stop some of the exports of oil field tubular goods in order that Montana may have her fair share of the output by the steel mills of pipe and casing. The lack of casing has caused many of Montana's skilled oil-field workers and drilling contractors to leave the State, as there was no work for them, and go to foreign countries where the development work was being carried on. This is another loss to our State. If you wish to see Montana's oil industry developed, if you wish to see more natural gas developed in order that there will be an ample supply for use by the people of the State, if you wish to see this new wealth created and this industry take its rightful place, then I can only urge you to write your congressional delegation in Washington, D. C., as to the lack of tubular goods in Montana and request them to do something about giving us a fair allocation for Montana.

Thank you.

The National Security Resources Board—Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a radio speech which I have prepared for a listening public in Washington State. The subject covers the missions and responsibilities of the National Security Resources Board, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency, together with my announced opposition to the proposed appointment of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington State, to be the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is HARRY CAIN in Washington.

For the past week you have become aware, many of you for the first time, of the existence of the National Security Resources Board. This awareness may have been due, in part, to my current concern with the recent nomination by President Truman of a man, well known to the State of Washington, as Chairman of this Board. This nomination still awaits the necessary sanction of the United States Senate.

Because I am protesting this nomination, I want to take the time this evening to tell you why you ought to know. To do this, I shall try to explain to you the functions and ramifications of the National Security Resources Board and its relative and gigantic importance as a Government institution.

Comparatively new, the National Security Resources Board was established by the National Security Act of 1947 and was approved on July 26 of that year. The Board is comprised of a chairman, appointed from civilian life by the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate; and as members, such heads or representatives of the various executive departments and independent agencies, as may be designated by the President. Included in the membership, as it stands today, is an imposing list of names. They are: The Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor. In other words, the Cabinet. Obviously the National Security Resources Board, comprising such membership as this, immediately assumes top importance in the Government structure.

The functions of this Board are overwhelmingly far reaching. In a single sentence, they are this: to advise the President concerning the coordination of the military, industrial, and civilian mobilization in the event of war. However, we are not at war, but the National Security Resources Board is vested today with responsibilities for which it is working under an authorized budget, for 1949, of $3,000,000. These responsibilities are:

1. Advising the President concerning the industrial and civilian mobilization for the maximum use of the Nation's manpower in the event of war.

2. Advising the President concerning programs for the most effective use, in time of war, of the Nation's industrial and natural resources for military and civilian needs.

3. Advising the President concerning policies for unifying, in time of war, the activities of the Federal Agencies and Departments engaged with or concerned in production, procurement, distribution or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products.

4. The National Security Resources Board will determine and advise the President, ladies and gentlemen, on the relationship between potential requirements for manpower, resources, and productive facilities in time of war.

5. This Board is vested with the responsibility of establishing adequate reserves of strategic and critical material and to conserve these reserves.

6. The National Security Resources Board shall advise the President on the strategic relocation of industries, services, and economic activities, the continuance of which is essential to the Nation's security.

In other words, in the hands of the National Security Resources Board is placed the final responsibility as to whether this Nation lives or dies, in the event of war. This is the reason, and the only reason, that as a Representative of the State of Washington, certainly a vulnerable spot should war come, and as an American deeply concerned with the national security, that I have taken it upon myself to ask that the Senate scrutinize most painstakingly, the record of the man whose name the President has submitted to be placed in the highly strategic position of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The responsibilities of this man do not stop with the position to which the President seeks to appoint him. Upon further scrutiny, we find that the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board automatically becomes a member of the National Security Council, which was set up under the same act which created the National Security Resources Board. Here we have a membership including the President and the Secretaries of the Navy, Army, Defense, Air Force, and State, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The function of the National Security Council of which the National Security Resources Board Chairman is a member, is to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security, so as to enable the military services and other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters concerning national security.

Now we come to a third responsibility in which the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board finds himself involved. By virtue of his office, we find, that under the same National Security Act of 1947 under which NSRB and the National Security Council were established, there was also established the Central Intelligence Agency, which under the act, functions directly under the supervision and direction of the National Security Council. Thus we find the man who serves as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, a member of the National Security Council, and as such, having a direct hand in the affairs of the Central Intelligence Agency. So that you may clearly understand what is involved here, let me list the functions of this third agency, the Central Intelligence Agency. Briefly they are these:

First, it advises the Security Council in matters concerning such intelligence activities of the Government departments as relate to national security, and makes recommendations for the coordination of these activities.

Second, it correlates and evaluates intelligence relating to the national security, and provides for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government, using existing agencies and facilities.

Third, the Central Intelligence Agency also performs such other duties related to intelligence affecting the national security, as the National Security Council may, from time to time, direct.

Fourth, the Central Intelligence Agency, ladies and gentlemen, is also authorized to perform, for the benefit of the existing intelligence agencies such additional services of common concern, as the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally.

Let us reflect on this last statement. This agency, operating under the direction of the National Security Council, of which the chairman of the National Security Resources Board is a member, may, to repeat, perform such additional services of common concern, which the National Security Council determines can be more efficiently accomplished centrally. The implications here may be of vital concern. The inference is strongly suggested that the functions of Army Intelligence, Navy Intelligence, and the FBI could very well be forced to relinquish to the Central Intelligence Agency any one or all those functions which the National Security Agency, might deem necessary in the interest of efficiency. Helping to make this decision, in a very leading way, will be the man who assumes the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

Now that you have heard the functions of the National Security Resources Board and what the chairmanship of that organization involves, I earnestly hope that you agree that the terrifying responsibilities of this office demand the services of not just any man, not even a man above average, but a man with the finest background, the best education, with unquestioned loyalty and integrity, and the highest intelligence that this land can offer.

Of Arthur M. Hill, the first man to serve as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, I know little. I have heard no criticism of him, and because he resigned several months ago, we shall not discuss him here.

Since Mr. Hill's resignation, Mr. John Steelman, assistant to President Truman, has been acting chairman, until such time as the President should appoint another man. Dr. Steelman is a highly capable, intelligent man and highly esteemed by many who know him. But his heavy responsibilities preclude his being able to assume permanently the job he is now filling on a temporary basis. Obviously a permanent chairman should be appointed as soon as possible. President Truman has seen fit to submit for this office the name of a very close personal and Army friend, a former Governor of our great State of Washington.

The President's nominee has a unique political record in the State, being the only man, I believe, who has been a Member of the United States House of Representatives, the United States Senate, and Governor of the State. Certainly few men from the State have had the honor of such an appointment as President Truman seeks for him. It, therefore, has been an extremely difficult thing for me to protest, as I have just begun to do, this appointment.

But, in consideration of the pregnant importance of the Board to the lives of every American man, woman, and child, and in the light of the nominee's limited background, I cannot feel that the latter's fulfillment of the responsibilities which are intended for him, will bring honor and achievement to the nominee, to the State of Washington, or to the Nation.

If necessary, I shall carry my protest both willingly and as strongly as I can, which I have placed before the Senate Armed Services Committee, to the floor of the Senate. I shall do this only because I deeply feel that should the President's choice become the Chairman of the vitally important National Security Resources Board, that action might well be responsible for the writing of one of the most tragic chapters in the history of our Nation.

Prospect of National Bankruptcy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, one of our Members is a very modest and honest individual——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, such a remark as that has been ruled as being

a violation of the rules of the Senate—a remark to the effect that one Senator is honest.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I desire to make the statement that the fact that this Senator has been considered a very honest individual in no way reflects on any of the rest of us, inasmuch as I do not happen to be the individual referred to. He is very modest, also. Recently he received a letter from one of his young constituents in which the young man indicated a great deal of concern over the possibility of the United States going bankrupt. In reply to that letter the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota wrote a letter, which is comparatively brief, but which is one of the best examples of an explanation of the situation as it is, the outlook as it is, the progress, and the course we should take in meeting the conditions with which we are confronted.

For that reason I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD both of the letters to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMPSON, MINN., *February 9, 1949.*

Senator THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am not yet old enough to vote, but was wondering whether or not we, the United States, are going bankrupt?

I should think we would stop helping other countries so much and try to help ourselves. Will this stop us from going bankrupt?

From the following question you may see that I presume that we are going bankrupt.

Sincerely yours,

MARX CAMPBELL.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 16, 1949.*

Mr. MARX CAMPBELL,
Simpson, Minn.

DEAR MARX: You ask me in your letter of February 9: "Are we, the United States, going bankrupt?" and you wonder whether stopping help to other countries and trying to help ourselves would save us from going bankrupt?

Marx, the United States is not going bankrupt. A nation only goes bankrupt when its people lose their spirit and character, when opportunity, enterprise, creative ability, and productive capacity are destroyed, or when conflicts and differences within the nation or with other nations remain unsolved and we turn to violence for their solution.

The United States will be bankrupt when young men like you are no longer sufficiently interested to ask questions about its Government. It will be bankrupt when its people care more for their own comforts and pleasures than for peace and justice in the world. It will be bankrupt when it fails to extend help to other nations seeking to rebuild themselves or when it fails to share in its responsibility to others. Yes, it will also be bankrupt when it fails to look out for its own and doesn't try to help itself.

It is true, Marx, we have a huge national debt resulting from the war. We have assumed international obligations that will cost many millions. We have many social and economic problems to solve, the solutions to some of which will cost money.

It is true, too, that we must reduce the dollar cost of our Government so that our people may bear the burden of taxation and our industries and agriculture will have the incentive to expand and develop. And it is true that we must always be ready to ask ourselves the searching questions, such as you have done: Where are we going? Are our policies wise? Are these things we propose to do good for our country and our people?

I hope you will always ask such questions and that never in your life will anyone be able to deny you the right as an American to ask them. I hope you will want to study them and learn what the answers ought to be. I hope also that you will have faith in your country, and faith in yourself, so that you can do your part to help make this land of ours true to its great heritage and worthy of its high destiny.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senate.

On Acquiring a Reputation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the Spoken Word, heard over radio station KSL and the Nation-wide Columbia Broadcasting System, from the Tabernacle, Temple Square, Salt Lake City, Utah, Sunday, January 16, 1949, entitled "On Acquiring a Reputation," by Richard L. Evans.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON ACQUIRING A REPUTATION

(By Richard L. Evans)

Reputations are built on many factors—some of them seemingly unpredictable. Many men have become known for things for which they would never have chosen to be known. Men of many talents sometimes become best known for the talents which they themselves esteem the least. It has sometimes happened, for example, that actors who would like to be known as great dramatic artists have come to be typed as comedians. Likewise there are those whose hobbies catch the public fancy, whereas their professional pursuits are all but unnoticed. A single event in one's life, even though it be seemingly unrelated to all that has gone before and all that follows, may fix a reputation—desirable or undesirable. Often young people acquire reputations of one kind or another early in life; for example, a student, having early in his school career become known as a conscientious scholar, is likely, from then on, to find the going much easier. The reverse is also true. An answer from a student of poor repute may not be well rated even when it is right. This may not be just, in a sense, but it is nevertheless the way it often works. Good reputation is often accepted at face value and tends to open up the way, while poor reputation multiplies difficulties. And young people who, by some thoughtlessness or some careless conduct, acquire a reputation of the kind they would later have cause to regret, are needlessly complicating their own lives and closing doors in their own faces. Fighting through life against an unfavorable reputation, whether deserved or not, is difficult and discouraging. And some things which, in our thoughtlessness, we may have supposed didn't matter much, often cling as stubbornly as nicknames, no matter how we try to shake them. Certainly reputations which are undeserved will not be the basis of ultimate justice or judgment, but the fact remains that our lives are in some ways modified by what others think of us. And once a man gets a rating with his fellow men, once he gets himself classified in the minds of others, it is often difficult to get a reclassification. Therefore, to him who is beginning his way in life, and to all others, there is wisdom in these words from Scripture: "Abstain from all appearance of evil," [1] as well as from evil itself—for the generations have proved that good reputations are exceedingly perishable, while poor reputatitons are almost indestructible.

Drift Toward Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Drift Toward Dictatorship," published in the Youngstown Vindicator, February 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRIFT TOWARD DICTATORSHIP

Many Americans believe that the world-wide drift is to socialism, if not to communism, and there's no use resisting it. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower had something worth while to say to them in a little speech he made Saturday to the first annual Columbia College Forum on Democracy.

Referring to the tendency to accept the paternalistic government as inevitable, General Eisenhower branded it as a "creeping paralysis of thought" and said that it could lead this country into dictatorship.

Such a dictatorship, he said, would be born of "a surrender of our own responsibilities and, therefore, of our own thought over our own lives and our own right to exercise our vote indicating the policies of this country."

The constant drift toward centralized government, concluded the new presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will result in "a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that central government, and finally you have a dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge and great organization. I believe that it is things such as that which we must watch today if we are going to be true to the standards that Lincoln gave to all of us."

With the same thought in mind, Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, of Ohio, has introduced a bill in the United States Senate calling for a study of the increasing centralization of power in the Federal Government, how much of it has been necessary, and how much is

---

[1] Thessalonians 5: 22.

the result of a deliberate purpose to change our form of government.

"I believe the Congress should find out, if it can," said Senator BRICKER in presenting his bill, "what factors have contributed to the centralization of government in Washington and the degree of contribution to each.

"I believe the Congress must carefully examine the ultimate result of the trend toward centralization. Are we faced with an irresistible rush toward centralization—then state socialism—then dictatorship? I do not believe we are. I do not believe that this trend, which, to my mind, will certainly lead to the eventual destruction of the Federal form of government, is irreversible. Again, it is high time the Congress stop and take stock—it is high time to find out where we are going."

Senator BRICKER carried his thought further in a Lincoln Day address in Kansas City. At present, he said, one-third of our national income goes for upkeep of big Government. "We must pare expenses in preparation for the great needs of tomorrow. We cannot stand for $45,000,000,000 annually for the upkeep of Government. If we spend ourselves recklessly, then America will fail in her great mission."

There never was a time when our country was called on to take the leadership of the world as it is today. The survival of freedom and civilization depends upon what we do. We need the highest statesmanship in our foreign relations and also at home. To meet the demands upon us we must avoid extravagance of every kind. Senator BRICKER told the Missouri Republican Club that if President Truman adopts the recommendations of the Hoover commission for reorganization and merger of many existing Government bureaus $3,000,000,000 can be saved annually. This would be a beginning. Beyond it is the larger task of making local, State, and Federal governments do their work efficiently and economically, so that this country will be prepared to meet the emergency that will arise as Soviet Russia constantly takes over more and more of the globe.

Practice Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Tulsa Tribune, together with the heading which says: "'Don't spread patriotism too thin.'—Theodore Roosevelt."

There being no objection, the editorial, together with the heading, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of February 19, 1949]

"Don't spread patriotism too thin."—Theodore Roosevelt.

PRACTICE PATRIOTISM

(From an address before the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, February 17, 1949)

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

We have voted to impose upon ourselves greater tax burdens than the stupid king of England dared to do. We have placed in power bureaucrats masquerading as Democrats. We have endorsed wholesale vote buying, compounded confusions and incompetencies. And we look upon it as funny. Most of our voters do not understand, and what is dangerous, do not care.

The Tories of our time are exalted. Their numbers are few, but their work is effective. Like holes in the dikes, they let the devastating seas roll in.

If we are patriots, politics must not mean Democratic or Republican activities. Politics is the people's welfare. It is the public affairs. Are we afraid of ourselves? Are we afraid to talk about ourselves?

What a grand army of civic righteousness we would have if our citizens' organizations enlisted, soldier-like, to save the Republic.

We have masses of men. Many weekly luncheon gatherings. They open their meetings facing the flag. They sing, My Country 'Tis of Thee. And then they are afraid to talk about it.

He is a partisan rather than a patriot who cannot think of the people's welfare in terms larger and nobler than that of the capture of the public pay roll.

Let these collective enterprises emulate the Masonic order of Washington's time. The Masons took a lively and aggressive part in the people's welfare then. They ferreted out the Tories and silenced them. The Knights of Columbus today are enlisted in an organized fight against the Communists in our country. More of this and the Tories of today will fade as they were forced to fade in Washington's time.

We have the manpower right here at home to put the patriot's courage into timid Congressmen who stand in fear of organized forces that assert themselves.

There were no Democrats, and there were no Republicans at Valley Forge. But every suffering soldier there was in politics, with his musket.

Every one of us can remind our Representatives and Senators in Washington today of George Washington's suffering soldiers, and ask what soldiering are they doing for the George Washington cause today.

Today we have so far undone the work of Washington that all our educational and eleemosynary institutions stand stranded. The fountains of endowment have dried up. And we have hailed that arrest as a progressive triumph. At this Washington would weep.

So, instead of standing like an artillery in defense of our freedoms, our educators are carrying their tin cups to Congress. Our once self-reliant sovereign States, self-reliant cities, and school communities everywhere have become beggars, scrambling for a handout.

The time has come for good men to be brave men. For both Democrats and Republicans to shed the cloak of party limitations. Americanize their parties. Make both parties aggressive in defense of the Bill of Rights without which this country never would have been.

Out of the little red schoolhouse, the great America flowered. Out of free enterprise, initiative and encouragement of inventions, America became the benignant land to which all war-wrecked peoples have turned for succor.

Yet we have those who insist on destroying this gift of Washington and Lincoln. And those self-styled broadminded demand that everybody who wants to destroy us be granted the right to go ahead and do so.

Out of 313 signers to a petition demanding that Congress abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities, 124 were college teachers. Twenty-one from Harvard. Eleven were from Yale, New York University had eight. Massachusetts Institute of Technology six. Princeton and Columbia each five. Others scattered. And they all have the backing of the American Association of University Professors.

Apologetically it has been said that these professors were largely innocent. Fellows who liked to see their names in print. So they lent their autographs without realizing what they were signing. Well, if they are that dumb, no college should permit them to teach. It matters not how impressive may be their accumulation of academic decorations, they are not entitled to the badge of educators.

Our book publishers have found a market for treasonous literature. The alien-minded who want to destroy us write books. And we are urged to read them.

We once had magazines, weeklies and monthlies, which took pride in revealing our robust America. Many of these periodicals today are seeking sales through those who look with contempt upon our country.

Such editors should get an avalanche of letters from the men and women who believe in America. Organized encouragement comes to those editors from the punks.

Are we dumb or too timid to be alert and aware of this intrigue? Every one of us can contribute to the arrest of this subtle and seditious menace.

Are we to so soon lose the lessons of our country's story? If we remember, this Republic will come through. It cannot fail. But if we carelessly forget where we came from, if we are to listen to the deniers and mockers, then will continue this growing rot and this dissolution.

Liberty is not cast in bronze. Patriotism is not perched on pedestals. Liberty lives in the hearts of men and women. No constitution, no law, no court can put it there or keep it there. Liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women and to respect their rights and freedoms. He is our enemy who denies our constitutional rights. And those rights are now being officially denied.

The time has come when every American should make it known to the judges who sit in our courts that an impatience and an indignation is rising against those cowardly courts that now blemish our heritage by tolerance of those who would destroy us.

America—given to us by Washington, saved for us by Lincoln—is in danger. Washington's foe was the British crown. Lincoln's America was endangered by division. But today we face a greater enemy, apathy. Apathy murdered all the republics before us. It can murder us.

The will of the people is the law of the land. When that will becomes weak, the land is lost. The archives of history are filled with the records of republics that rose out of strong-willed men to collapse when the will was gone. Despotic powers rose to tax enterprise into paralysis and the people into slavery.

What are we Americans doing today to save our country?

If we put our patriotism into practice we could halt this tax raid, restore the sovereignty of our States, build magnificent YMCA's, expand our educational and humanitarian enterprises. This must be done or we lose the last best hope on earth.

However all this talk is futile unless we do something about it. Were this chamber of commerce to adopt emphatic resolutions ordering our Senators and Representatives in Washington to rid us of all the devastating bureaucratic waste, and to stop imposing paralyzing taxes upon the people, the chambers of other cities would follow Tulsa's pattern, and we could prevent the impending national disaster.

Establishment of Wage Scales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of Thursday, February 24. This article quotes the eminent author and psychologist, lecturer, and teacher, Dr. George W. Crane, of Chicago. I believe his observations and suggestions regarding the establishment of wage scales are worthy of consideration by the Members of the Senate and every employer and employee in this country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. CRANE SAYS: "FLUID-DRIVE SCALE NEEDED"

"It is not efficient nor humane," Dr. George W. Crane, the noted psychologist, said yesterday, "that wage scales should be treated as a political football.

"Nor should intimidation be necessary, either on the part of management or of labor unions, to obtain a specific wage."

Dr. Crane, noted author of Chicago, has been a visitor in Anderson for the past week. Sunday he addressed a crowd of 1,600 at the First Baptist Church and last Friday evening was speaker at annual ladies night of the Anderson Rotary Club.

Commencing further on labor-wage problems of today, Dr. Crane said, "Let's adopt a hydromatic or fluid-drive shift in regard to labor-management affairs so wage scales will automatically adjust themselves to the immediate conditions of industry.

"Science needs to be applied to the matter," he emphasized during an interview; "here's how it could be accomplished:

"A differential wage rate should be determined for the major trades, whether in carpentry, plumbing, coal mining, or even the operation of a typewriter by a stenographer.

"The basic rate should be determined by such relevant factors as the amount of intelligence demanded by the job, plus the minimum amount of training or apprenticeship required.

"In addition," Dr. Crane said, "the hazard to life should be equated, for a coal miner might not require the technical training of an electrician, but the hazards of life might be much greater.

"Even the shortness of the working season or seasonal nature of the trade should likewise be considered. And if a worker must furnish his own tools or equipment, that factor might properly be taken into consideration.

"Thus," he said, "a relative wage scale should be set for the major trades. But the specific hourly minimum would need to be determined by a consideration of the commodity-price index at the current moment.

"Once the wages of a carpenter were set, in comparison with the simultaneous wages of a plumber or coal miner, it would be a comparatively simple thing to adjust them thereafter in accordance with the changing commodity price index.

"At periodic intervals, say at 3-month periods, the Department of Labor could show whether workers were being underpaid or overpaid.

"It would then be unnecessary for hundreds of thousands of honest workers to be on strike, thus depriving their families of the weekly pay check.

"For changes in pay scales would be mechanically adjusted to current economic conditions, much as the new hydromatic gear shift on the late model automobiles likewise automatically shifts the gears to meet the immediate need of the car for power.

"At present, men may be on strike for months or even years to gain a wage increase, let us say, of 10 cents per hour. Even when they do obtain it, if they do, their many months off the job during the strike may cost them so much in lost wages that they'll need to work for 5 or 6 years at the higher wage scales just to break even with the board.

"And during those 5 or 6 years, if a temporary recession takes place, obviously they have lost in income despite the 10 cents hourly increase.

"Under this new so-called hydromatic technique for setting wages in accordance with the commodity price increase and the relative merits of one trade versus another, a worker would rarely, if ever, need to lose time from the job. When wage increases were merited, they'd automatically be forthcoming. And when wage decreases were indicated, they'd likewise occur.

"So let's apply as much horse sense and efficiency to our field of human engineering in respect to labor and management as our motorcars."

Veterans' Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which will appear in Army Time. The article is a very thoughtful and helpful analysis of the so-called Rankin pension bill, which is now pending in the House.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAD LEGISLATION

There is so much resentment, misinformation, and confusion over the form, substance, and implications of the so-called Rankin pension bill that a further discussion in this column is merited.

We believe in economic security for the aged people of the United States, regardless of whether or not they are veterans of any of our wars. We believe also that the Government is moving forward into an era where more and more attention will be given to this aspect of the general welfare.

We believe that aged and ill veterans of World War I are deserving of and should have pensions from the Government they fought to defend when and if such pensions are necessary to provide the necessities of life or otherwise lighten the burden on the aged and ill.

We believe with a deep and abiding sincerity that the needs of the widows and children of veterans of World War II are entitled to early and equal consideration with the needs of all our veterans.

We believe that first things should come first; that if old-age pensions for aged and ill veterans of World War I are a necessity, they should be voted on the strength of their own merits, and not in conjunction with long-distance legislation to provide pensions for War II veterans some 30 years from now, or in conjunction with immediately necessary legislation for widows and orphans.

We do not believe that the needs and plight of widows and fatherless children should be buried in subprovisions of such highly controversial legislation as the Rankin bill, ignored in public discussion of the bill, but doomed to stand or fall on the wholly unrelated issue of old-age pensions for living veterans of both world wars.

We do not believe that now is the time to agitate or antagonize the public, to jeopardize the forward march of all other veterans' legislation, or to create new causes for anti-veteran sentiment, particularly against the young veterans and widows of World War II who must bear much of the onus of "Treasury raiding" while sharing little of the immediate material benefits.

There is every reason to believe that even if Congress passed the Rankin bill in its present form, and even if it were signed into law by the President, the eventual high annual cost would make it a target of the economizers and the law probably would be repealed long before more than a very few World War II veterans could qualify for its benefits.

The Rankin bill is not good legislation because it obscures the immediate good and high lights the long-distance harm.

Ninety percent of the public opposition to the Rankin bill is due to the fact that it would add some $7,000,000,000 to the already high annual cost of veterans' benefits in the remote future of the 1980's and 1990's. On that basis, for the next 30 or 40 years, the veterans of World War II would be required to pay a large share of the freight, but would receive none of the benefits and most of the abuse.

We now have on the statute books an inadequate social-security law which provides small monthly payments for the aged, veteran and nonveteran alike. In addition, existing laws administered by the Veterans' Administration make it possible for any veteran who has reached age 55, and who has a permanent disability—service-connected or otherwise—and who is unemployable, to receive a pension of $60 a month. When the veteran reaches 60, the disability requirement is lowered to 50 percent; when he reaches 65, the pension is increased to $72 and the disability requirement lowered to 10 percent—a rating which almost automatically makes every 65-year-old veteran eligible for a pension.

Why all this apparent concern for the welfare of World War II veterans 30 years or more from now? Were they included in the Rankin old-age-pension bill, as some suspect, merely to win their support for the needs of World War I veterans? Or, as others suspect, were the World War II vets included so that the estimated cost would pyramid to such prohibitive figures that enough opposition would be generated in Congress and elsewhere to assure defeat of the bill?

These are questions which deserve the most careful thought and consideration.

Right now the veterans of World War II and the widows and children of their comrades in arms have more pressing needs than old-age pensions for which they could not qualify for three decades.

Congress should consider the merits of legislation for veterans of World War I separately from legislation for the veterans and widows of World War II. Otherwise the harm which will result may be irreparable.

Saving Our Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Star entitled "Saving Our Future." This editorial pays a well-deserved tribute to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

If this Nation desires to maintain its exalted position of leadership among its colleagues, it must give heed to the protection, conservation, and wise use of its natural resources.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVING OUR FUTURE

It would be hard to find a more important undertaking, whose success or failure means more to the future of this country, than the one outlined to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by its Chairman, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

In opening a series of hearings this week in search of an improved policy for conservation, development, and administration of the country's natural resources, Senator O'MAHONEY remarked that unless we keep strong at home, the peace effort so largely underwritten by this country can easily fail.

Secretary Krug gave some examples of current waste and profligacy in the use of precious resources:

For every 2 tons of coal mined, 1 is left in the ground and lost.

More energy is being wasted through flaring of natural gas in the fields than is being produced by the entire series of dams under TVA.

In the face of declining ore and petroleum reserves, the automobile manufacturers are adding to the average weight of pleasure cars.

The public range has been overgrazed, with resulting loss tomorrow of wool and meat. Twenty-two million acres need reseeding now to halt irreparable depletion.

We do not have the farm land now required to feed the number of people who will be dependent on it a few years hence. Millions of tons of topsoil are carried away by rivers every year. Yet millions of acres can be added to productive land by reclamation and irrigation; millions more can be preserved by proper soil conservation.

We are using up our saw timber at twice the rate it grows. More than a third of approximately 5,000,000,000 acres of commercial forest land is denuded or poorly stocked. We have only 1,600,000,000,000 board feet of timber left out of the 8,000,000,000,000 board feet of three centuries ago.

Senator O'MAHONEY spoke of the necessity for a vigorous policy of conservation on a national scale—not merely in selected regions of the country—if we are to maintain our responsibility for world peace and carry out some of the things we have undertaken. He might have gone much further. Without such a policy our existence as a people, without counting the added devastation of another war, is at stake. We have not gone far in conserving our resources of forest, stream, soil, and minerals. But we have gone far enough to see the potential results in safeguarding our future, maintaining our prosperity, and raising the standard of living for our people that are available to us.

Lifting the minimum wage, adding to the coverage of social-security schemes, tiptoeing into socialized medicine and universal health insurance—all such things have a fetching sound to many people, with or without counting the cost. But they are superficial and merely expedient compared with the fundamentally important issue of conservation, assuring to our grandchildren at least a continuation of some of the bounties that we inherited. The hearings before Senator O'MAHONEY's committee may not be spectacular. But there could be nothing more dismally spectacular than the results of a failure to carry out what the committee has chosen as its objective.

Is CVA-MVA-TVA Legislation Socialistic?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article received from the Pacific Northwest Development Association, of Portland, Oreg., entitled "Is CVA-MVA-TVA Legislation Socialistic?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS CVA-MVA-TVA LEGISLATION SOCIALISTIC?

We must bring this issue of encroaching socialism out into the open. The real issue must not be covered up in bills appearing merely to provide for flood control and the development of natural resources.

The Pacific Northwest is threatened by another Columbia Valley Authority bill, this time the administration's bill which President Truman has directed to be drawn. We do not know the form this bill will take nor the powers to be delegated to the Corporation, but the record of its proponents and their bills is clear.

Most of the proponents of valley authorities deny and even scoff at the idea that these measures are socialistic. Others frankly admit that they are.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

The aims of socialism are explained by Dr. Harry W. Laidler, a nationally known social economist who was at one time secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. In his book Socialism in Thought and Action, he wrote, "The socialist advocates the collective ownership and democratic management of the socially necessary means of production and distribution."

Even these broad objectives are exceeded by the discretionary powers granted the Corporation in S. 1716 and H. R. 5083, identical CVA bills introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress and similar proposed measures in Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses. Following are excerpts from the bills indicating the concentration of power in the board of directors:

BROAD POWERS GRANTED IN CVA BILLS

Section 6 (e): The Corporation "shall have power to acquire, by purchase, lease, condemnation, exchange, transfer * * *, or donation such real and personal property and any interest therein, including water rights, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of any real and personal property and any interest therein, as in its judgment may be necessary or appropriate in carrying out the purposes of the Corporation under this act or under any other law of the United States."

Section 6 (i): The Corporation "shall have power to enter into such contracts and agreements and to exercise such powers and do such things as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers now or hereafter conferred upon it by law."

Section 10 (a): "The Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to construct, operate, and carry out such projects and activities in the Columbia Valley region as will best serve to control and prevent floods, to safeguard the navigable waters, and to promote navigation and the reclamation of the lands * * * the Corporation shall have such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to construct by contract, force account or otherwise, operate, and carry out such projects or activities so as to accomplish the purposes of this act, including, but without limitation, the power—

"(1) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, sewage-disposal, water-purification, and other sanitary works, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment, and facilities incidental thereto;

"(2) to acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such canals, conduits, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines and substations, and such machinery, equipment, structures, and facilities for the storage and transmission of water or the generation and transmission of electric energy as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to supply existing and potential markets;

"(3) to develop and provide such methods and conditions of water and land utilization as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to prevent and abate floods and droughts."

Section 14 (b): "The allocation of costs, the assignment of reimbursement obligations, and the periods and rates of amortization so determined by the Corporation, when approved by the President, shall be final and shall be used thereafter in keeping the books of the Corporation."

Section 19 (a): "The Corporation shall, without regard to any other laws, rules, or regulations relating to the employment or payment of employees of the United States, except the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the extent that it otherwise is applicable, employ and fix the compensation of such managers, assistant managers, officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants as are necessary for the transaction of its business, define their duties, * * * and provide a system of organization to fit responsibility and promote efficiency. Any employee of the Corporation may be removed in the discretion of the Board."

Section 20 (d): "The General Accounting Office, in the settlement of the accounts of the treasurer or other accountable officer or employee of the Corporation, shall not disallow credit for, nor withhold funds because of, any expenditure which the Board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act."

Section 21: "The Corporation is authorized to issue and sell or exchange from time to time revenue bonds * * *. The said revenue bonds shall express on their face that they are not direct obligations of the United States, and that the payment of the principal and interest on the bonds is not guaranteed by the United States. Such revenue bonds * * * shall be issued in such manner and amount, and shall be sold at such prices and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Corporation."

CVA BILLS HAVE BEEN BLANK-CHECK LEGISLATION

All CVA bills thus far proposed have been socialistic and even communistic. Under the provisions of these bills, the directors of the Authority Corporation are authorized or given broad discretionary powers to condemn, own, and operate business enterprises that are now owned and operated by private enterprise.

These discretionary powers are subject to the desires of the Corporation directors and are limited only by their interpretation of what is necessary or appropriate to carry out the purpose of the act or any other law of the United States.

Courts have put a very liberal interpretation on the broad powers of the Corporation. They have been unwilling, as demonstrated by the Supreme Court decision (*Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Welsh et al.*) rendered on March 25, 1946, to question or rule as to whether or not discretionary powers by Government corporation directors are properly or improperly used. Thus, the Authority may enter any business which in the judgment of the directors is "necessary or appropriate." Government's subsidized competition and confiscatory policy of encroachment in fields of private enterprise is definitely socialistic.

SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Criticisms voiced by the Overton subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, John H. Overton, chairman, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Charles Gurney, and Hugh Butler, members, which reported adversely on the Missouri Valley Authority, are equally valid with respect to a CVA. This committee said, in part: "The creation of an MVA would amount to the welding of economic and political powers resulting in nothing short of autocracy. It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic processes. It would mean the creation of a superstate, neither Federal nor State, and not contemplated by our Constitution. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a three-man board, not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself. It would constitute a virtual abdication by the Congress in favor of government by Federal corporations wielding autocratic powers. It would challenge State sovereignty and destroy systems of laws, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered. It would throttle in the West the reclamation program which has been prosecuted through the years by an experienced agency and which has met with the approval of the Congress and of the people directly affected. It would permit a three-man board to avail itself of trust funds created for reclamation. It would be an excursion into an unchartered field of vast expenditures of public funds and of experimentation under a board unencumbered by the restraints that a democracy should erect against agencies of Government."

Why have the proponents of CVA thought it desirable to claim exemption from civil-service laws and regulations affecting other Federal employees? Is it because they wish to revert to the spoils system? Or is it to circumvent the loyalty check to which civil-service employees are subject so that the authority may be loaded with communistic sympathizers? Recognition of the Veterans' Preference Act appears to have been primarily for its vote-getting value.

THE TRANSITION FROM STATE SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM IS HARDLY PERCEPTIBLE

Bolshevik Nicholai Lenin was not being merely cynical when he said, "Communism is government-owned power plus bookkeeping." And David Lilienthal, former Chairman of the board of TVA and now Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—the controlling agency for the greatest potential source of power in the world—was equally clear in his assertion: "Those who control energy, control people."

Here is what other men, prominent citizens who have studied and given much thought to valley authority proposals, have to say:

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho, author of a CVA bill in the Eightieth Congress, as quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1945, and the Idaho Daily Statesman of May 31, 1946: "When I see some of the opposition to the various authority projects, I wonder. I will admit that these projects are socialistic. There is no use beating around the bush about it."

H. S. Rauchenbach, until removed during a session of a Republican Congress, Chief of the Research and Planning Section of the Power Division of the Interior Department, was on record as a militant Socialist prior to his employment by the Department. In the book, Socialism of our Times, and the publication, The New Leader, of March 5 and 12, 1927, he wrote:

"Our long aim is the abolition of the profit system for private use; we must force our experts on agriculture, trusts, coal, power, subways, housing, milk, etc., to tell us correctly what the next steps are.

"Between cataclysmic socialism and encroaching controls, the latter will be the only one acceptable to this Nation for a long while. * * *

"* * * one good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him inside the Department * * * can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside."

Senator GLEN H. TAYLOR, of Idaho: "If the country wants absolute labor peace, though, we will have to nationalize those basic industries that control the country's economy. * * * Nationalization or socialization would have to stop somewhere. If I were drawing the line, I would list those basic industries as coal, steel, transportation, utilities, communications, and aluminum, because that's a monopoly. * * * By nationalization, I mean Government ownership."

Norman Thomas, former Socialist Party candidate for President of the United States, in an address made in Nashville, Tenn., in October 1944:

"The TVA exemplifies what socialism might do, and the technique it would use in the process."

Dr. Carl Thompson, one of America's leading Socialists, secretary of the Public Ownership League, and for a long time consultant for the Bonneville Power Administration, released this statement when he was manager of the Socialist Party information bureau:

"States under the direction of this Socialist program, and finally the Nation, will take over one after the other of the public utilities, mines, railroads, interurban electric lines, power plants, telegraph and telephone systems, waterways, forests, and all of this may be done by methods perfectly legal and constitutional."

While employed by Bonneville Power Administration, Dr. Thompson did an effective job in helping to take the power industry away from private enterprise and put it in the hands of government. He also made public talks advocating a CVA and the socialization of basic industries.

Former Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, testifying before the Senate Commerce Committee on the MVA bill, S. 555:

"The committee should not underestimate the magnitude of the task that is before it. You have before you not merely a question of establishing a single authority, for eventually the Congress will not do less for one watershed than for another. Therefore, there is before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United States as we have known it for the last 150 years."

Gen. Thomas M. Robins, former Deputy Chief, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in a publication entitled "Development of our Natural Resources":

"It seems clear that establishment of a CVA as proposed in S. 1716 and H. R. 5083 will mean creation in the Pacific Northwest of a socialistic form of government, and would place the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the entire region in the hands of a board not responsible to the people, and, for all practical purposes, not responsible to Congress. Such a form of government was never contemplated by the Constitution of the United States.

"No real need exists for establishment of any more valley authorities in this country. Existing laws and procedure provide for full coordination between the competent Federal agencies now engaged in adequate programs for development of our natural resources under a sound Federal policy. * * * Most serious consideration should be given by all the people of any region to the consequences before giving up all the protection of their rights afforded by existing law and subjecting themselves to an authority unencumbered by any of the restraints that a democracy should erect against agencies of government."

Judge Clifford H. Stone, of Denver, Colo., referring to the Supreme Court decision of March 25, 1946 (*Tennessee Valley Authority* v. *Welsh, et al.*):

"It emphasizes the far-reaching effect of such discretionary power in the hands of an agency charged with the control and development of the water resource of large sections of the country.

"It shows that an authority may expropriate private property whenever the board of directors determine it is necessary to do so in order to carry out the purposes of the act creating the authority."

Hon. John C. Vivian, Governor of the State of Colorado, at United States Senate hearings on S. 555:

"These authority proposals violate policies and laws, both Federal and State, which have been worked out and which have been recognized over the years.

"Authorities are devised as instruments to accomplish a planned economy which bypasses our constitutional system; they represent a welding of economic and political power which side-steps the powers and functions of the individual States and of existing Federal departments; and they are designed to launch the country into an experiment in state socialism."

Majority report conclusion No. 8 on MVA by the Missouri State Commission; L. T. Berthe, commissioner:

"The purposes of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority go far beyond those of

water control and utilization and would invade fields of endeavor which, under our form of government have been reserved for development by individuals, private industry, State or local government, or by long-established agencies, of the Federal Government. Quoting Arthur E. Morgan, first Chairman of TVA: 'MVA would be a powerful instrument for bringing in a new social order.' "

T. C. Compton, president, Pacific Northwest Development Association, states:

"Are we going to continue our rapid drift toward state and national socialism or are we going to maintain our representative form of government as we have known it and progressed under it for the last 150 years? This is the most important question before the American people today.

"The real issue is Americanism versus the clever subversive propaganda of socialism and communism, which for the past several years under the guise of security, prosperity, streamlining government, more projects, etc., has taken us far down the encroaching control road to socialism. Unless the American people become aware of this soon, it may be too late. CVA, as proposed in S. 1716, a 70-page bill, is another method that is being cleverly employed to bring a Socialist form of government to our country."

J. Howard Toelle, professor of mining and irrigation law, Montana State University, Missoula, Mont., at United States Senate hearings on S. 555:

"Finally under various provisions of the bill * * * this Federal corporation is given control over all natural resources of the basin, not over water alone. Thus, TVA has engaged in about 22 different kinds of private businesses. Not only does the measure destroy the balance of the Federal Government in its relation to the States, but it constitutes the entering wedge for federally owned Government-operated enterprise. It would lead to vast bureaucracy dictating our economic and political life. And the strategy is one of infiltration."

Hon. FRANCIS CASE, Member of Congress from the State of South Dakota, at United States Senate hearings on S. 555:

"That provision of the bill alone is far too broad a power to grant to any three men now or ever.

"In conclusion, I would like to say this: There is no desirable end or purpose of S. 555 which I have been able to find in reading it that cannot be accomplished under existing authorizations or supplementary legislation, if desired."

Hon. Sam C. Ford, Governor of the State of Montana, from testimony presented at the United States Senate hearings on the MVA bill S. 555:

"It is my considered judgment that the enactment of S. 555 would create a super-government, placing in the hands of three men power to dictate and control the social and economic life of the Missouri River Basin. It would be a long step toward state socialism.

"The broad powers proposed to be delegated to a three-man board, appointed and serving under the executive branch of the Government, is nothing short of congressional surrender of functions which should, under our Constitution, be exercised by Congress. We are concerned with great natural resources which vitally affect the welfare of the people of the Nation. The economy incident to their development, in my opinion, should never be entrusted to three men with no State and so little Federal control."

Kent Lane, president of the Gering-Fort Laramie irrigation district, from testimony presented at the United States Senate hearings on the MVA bill, S. 555:

"In conclusion, we think that in use of water from the North Platte River, irrigation should always remain first in right and first in use. We believe that we do not need a new agency to tell us how to run our farms. * * * We object to dictatorship in imposing a limit to the size of our farms by armchair conclusions. We object to a superboard, over which no one has control, putting into effect arbitrary regulations, restrictions, directives, or regimentive orders."

H. R. Lippincott, director of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, from testimony presented at the United States Senate hearings on the MVA bill, S. 555:

"I have yet to find a resident of Nebraska who knows the contents of this bill who is for it. In most legislative proposals in our State we can find many people on both sides of the question. On this one there is but one side. We are absolutely against the passage of this bill.

"We do not scare out in Nebraska. But the threat of this bill frightens us as though it were an atomic bomb. We, the farmers of Nebraska, ask this committee to kill it before it ever has a chance to do the damage that we know it is capable of doing."

Guy C. Jackson, Jr., president, Texas Water Conservation Association; from testimony presented at the United States Senate hearings on the MVA bill, S. 555:

"May I say that it is my considered opinion the passage of the authority bills now pending in Congress would change our form of government, taking away from States the power of control of waters and their functions of administration. * * * It would transform our present economy from one in which private enterprise is the major factor into a system of socialism, communism, or fascism."

Everett T. Winter, manager, Missouri River division of the Mississippi Valley Association; from testimony presented at the United States Senate hearings on the MVA bill, S. 555:

"I do not like dictators, benevolent or otherwise. The MVA has been proposed as a benevolent dictator.

"I quote from an article in the Detroit Free Press by Malcolm W. Bingway: 'The story of the rise of nazism in Germany is the story of a people who lost their moral sense in seeking security. It is the story of the world today. It is the story of the horrid appeasement at Munich. It is the story of America whenever men think more of profits and political preferment and comfort than they do of the souls God gave them to make them free.'

"If this bill is passed, we would give up a great deal of our freedom."

United Mine Workers Journal, November 1, 1945, referring to the MVA bill, S. 555:

"What the title page doesn't state is that the act is really asking your Represenatives in Congress to vote for a project which would:

"1. Do great damage to such industries as coal mining, railroads, and electric utilities, which employ millions of workers and pay billions of dollars in taxes to the Government.

"2. Reduce jobs in private industry.

"3. Force workers onto the public pay roll where the Government would have absolute say over the rates of pay, hours of work, qualifications for a job, and other conditions.

"4. Make Government the complete master of 7,000,000 people in the Missouri Valley, including farmers, businessmen, and workers."

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION ADVOCATES CVA

Most active proponent of CVA has been Bonneville Power Administration. Created during President Roosevelt's administration to sell surplus power generated at the Bureau of Reclamation's Grand Coulee Dam and the Army engineers' Bonneville Dam, this marketing agency apparently has ambitions that go far beyond the service for which it was created.

Socialists, organization leaders, and others have been employed as consultants who spread the Authority doctrines. Dr. Carl Thompson has already been quoted. Farm organization leadership and others are employed and used. They often serve as mouthpieces to advance the public ownership ideology of this pro-Federal authority Government agency.

C. Gerard Davidson, now Assistant Secretary of the Interior, was at one time employed by the Bonneville Administration. It was he who drafted the Mitchell bill making Bonneville the Authority which would absorb the functions and resources of all governmental agencies in the region. It was also Davidson who, with Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator for Bonneville Power Administration, advocated that BPA be relieved of the regular procedure relating to appropriations. They seek amendment of the law to permit the Administrator to use revenue from power for anything he thinks necessary or appropriate. In effect, they would establish an authority which could build up prejudices against any industry they decided to take over.

Last December, at a conference in Spokane of Northwest mining people, Davidson declared that Government-owned steel mills in the West may be necessary to overcome eastern objections to western development. He said: "Steel magnates are opposed to any enlargement of our capacity. These men of little faith dread a depression that might leave them with too much steel."

A Bonneville Power Authority or Columbia Valley Authority if created, patterned after TVA, would dominate the economy of the entire region. Its scope of activity would be practically unlimited. In its ever expanding program it would employ, if operated like the TVA, 50,000 men on operations and up to 200,000 more on construction of projects throughout the region. The result would be little short of a regional regimentation.

GENERAL EISENHOWER ISSUES WARNING

Speaking at his installation as president of Columbia University, Gen. Dwight Eisenhower warned against this encroaching menace. He said, "All cherished rights—the right of free speech, free worship, ownership of property, and equality before the law—all of these are mutually dependent for their existence. Thus, when shallow critics denounce the profit motive interest in our system of private enterprise, they ignore the fact that it is an economic support of every human right we possess and that without it all rights would soon disappear. There, demagogery, unless combated by truth, can become as great a danger to freedom as exists in any other threat."

General Eisenhower further stated: "A paternalistic government can gradually destroy, by suffocation in the immediate advantage of subsidy, the will of a people to maintain a high degree of individual responsibility. And the abdication of individual responsibility is inevitably followed by further concentration of power in the state. Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried because of historic inefficiency of governmental management of productive enterprises; its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effect, absolute power over our lives."

PACIFIC NORTHWEST
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

Proposed Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 13, 1949, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, two of our colleagues, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] took part in the discussion of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act on the People's Platform program. Because of the general interest in the theme, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. COOKE. Certainly no law of Congress in my memory has caused more commotion, more flat disagreement than has the Taft-Hartley Act. And so, Senator TAFT and Senator DOUGLAS, as you reconsider that law in the Senate, I'm asking you here on the People's Platform how would you revise our labor law?

ANNOUNCER. You have just heard Dwight Cooke state the question for today's timely debate on Columbia's People's Platform. Seated with Mr. Cooke in the CBS Washington studios are United States Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, from Ohio, whose name is on the present labor law, and United States Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, formerly professor of economics at the University of Chicago and recently elected junior Senator from Illinois.

And now, for our debate on the need for new labor legislation, here is the regular chairman of the People's Platform, Dwight Cooke.

Mr. COOKE. Gentlemen, it seems to me there isn't very much I need to add to the millions of words which have been roared about the Taft-Hartley Act. It was passed by you and your Republican colleagues of the Eightieth Congress, Senator TAFT, over the President's veto. It is approved by business, loathed by the labor unions. And Mr. Truman and your fellow-Democrats, Senator DOUGLAS, are pledged to its repeal, and you're trying to carry out that now in Congress. But as the two of you eminent authorities and Senators join me here on the People's Platform this morning I'm going to ask you not only to state your own powerful convictions but to act as analysts and try to focus for us what's most important, basically, in this very complicated area. Maybe I'd better start out with the real basis of it all. This is supposed to be a country, Senator DOUGLAS, of free enterprise and free collective bargaining; therefore, why not just have labor and business sit down at a table, under free collective bargaining, and work out their own basis of agreement?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, that was the fundamental purpose of the Wagner Act, which was passed in 1935. It was found that before that time, when workers tried to organize in unions, that commonly the employers would fire them for doing so. And frequently these men would be black-listed through an entire industry or an entire locality. As a result, men in general were afraid to join unions, and consequently unions were weak.

Mr. COOKE. So, as you see it, Senator DOUGLAS, the Government had to step in, to write a balance and make things fair for labor unions?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes. And the Wagner Act did two very simple things. First, it said that if men joined unions the employers should not fire them or discriminate against them because of their union membership; and, secondly, that if a majority of the workers in a free and fair election chose a given union to represent them, then the employers should sit down and bargain with them. He didn't have to agree with them. All that was required of him was that he should sit down in good faith and try to reach an agreement.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Cooke, I'd like to correct one thing you said in the opening, about the Republicans having passed this law. More than 50 percent of the Democrats in the Eightieth Congress voted for this law and voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. COOKE. I stand corrected, Senator TAFT, although I believe that you and your Republican colleagues had a certain amount of enthusiastic backing.

Senator DOUGLAS. The Republicans furnished the hard core and they were aided by certain Dixiecrat allies.

Senator TAFT. Oh my, many northern Democrats voted too. On the subject of the Wagner Act, Mr. Cooke, of course, we left the Wagner Act in effect. The trouble with the Wagner Act was in redressing the balance it went so far that it gave a complete priority to unions. The Wagner Act operated only against employers, required them to bargain collectively, but not the unions. In effect, it legalized every strike and had the actual effect, the way it was administered, particularly in the beginning, of putting the Government on the side of every strike. With the Norris-LaGuardia Act, it removed all remedy against the most arbitrary acts of the union bosses, whether by the man seeking a livelihood, the union member, the employer, or the public; all but the largest employers were practically at the mercy of the union boss.

Mr. COOKE. So you see, Senator TAFT, a kind of pendulum activity here. First, the Government came in to correct a balance which was too far against labor, via the Wagner Act; then it carried it too far for labor and, therefore, you felt the Taft-Hartley Act had to bring it back into neutral, as it were.

Senator TAFT. That's right. And to get free collective bargaining, collective bargaining must be equal. And that's what the Taft-Hartley law attempted to do. It made the law work both ways. It had unfair labor practices on the part of the employee, as on the part of the employer; responsibility on his contracts for the union, as on the part of the employer; an independent mediation service; a judicial National Labor Relations Board.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator TAFT speaks as though the situation had developed to the point where you had a huge Goliath of labor threatening and intimidating small employers. This is a very false picture of American industry. What we have in American industry is that manufacturing and other branches are largely dominated by big industrial concerns. And what the Wagner Act did was to build up units of labor, chosen by labor, who were on a greater scale of equality with big industry than before. But even then the unions were weaker than were the big corporations.

Senator TAFT. In a few cases the big corporations are as big as the unions, but in many cases not. In the coal industry you have one union, you have thousands of employers; in the printing industry you have one union, you have thousands of employers; in the teamsters union you have one union, operating all kinds of secondary boycotts, you have almost millions of employers, divided among themselves and forced to do what the union demands that they do.

Senator DOUGLAS. But in steel, automobiles, rubber, chemicals, machinery, and so forth, what you have are giant industrial concerns dealing with unions which are financially and economically still far weaker than are the big corporations with whom they deal.

Senator TAFT. Those unions have been in no way weakened by the Taft-Hartley law in dealing with those big corporations. No one has testified to that effect; no one claims that in those cases there isn't equality now as there was before the Taft-Hartley law.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would deny that, because at every conference table the weapons which the Taft-Hartley law gives to the employers hang over the heads of the unions and directly weaken their bargaining power and directly restrict the agreements which they might otherwise be able to make.

Senator TAFT. Take the United Automobile Workers. How does it do that?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well in a number of ways. In the first place, there is a provision that if a strike occurs and the strikers are replaced by the employers, the employer can then call upon the board for a new election and say that someone else claims that he is the real bargaining agent; and when the board orders this election, the strikers are barred from voting and the replacements, whom the workers regard as strikebreakers, are alone permitted to vote.

Senator TAFT. Well, Senator DOUGLAS, that is a small case, an imaginary case built up. It wouldn't affect the United Automobile Workers for a moment and, as a matter of fact, that one little provision about voting, as you know, I'm quite in favor of eliminating from the Taft-Hartley Act. It never was an essential feature of it, and it's been seized on as a propaganda feature. But as far as I'm concerned it can go out. I regard it as of no importance.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, Senator TAFT, you may think it's a small feature, but in practice it is not a small feature. It is one of the hidden mines inside the Taft-Hartley law which can explode and in a period of unemployment blast unions out.

Senator TAFT. Well, I'm in favor of amending it anyway. So that's out of this discussion here.

Senator DOUGLAS. I'm delighted that you cede ground on this point.

Senator TAFT. Three weeks ago I introduced an amendment which eliminated that particular question.

Senator DOUGLAS. We're delighted for this concession.

Mr. COOKE. Let's see what happens on a very central point which you've been discussing in your Senate hearings, and that's the place where any labor law and labor-management relations most concern the third party in this problem, the general consumer. And that's, of course, the area of strikes and the question of whether or not the Government should have special power to go to the courts to prevent such strikes.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I think strikes can be classified as local strikes, fairly serious strikes, and gravely serious strikes which threaten the national health and safety.

Mr. COOKE. Let's discuss that, because that's the most urgent of the three.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would prefer to discuss the local and the fairly serious strikes, because they are the most numerous.

Mr. COOKE. I'll compromise with you, Senator. Let's discuss all of them then.

Senator DOUGLAS. All right. Well, I will say that in the case of the normal strike, the Taft-Hartley law greatly restricts the powers of unions and directly plays into the hands of employers, for a number of reasons. There's a provision in the Taft-Hartley law which says that "restraint or coercion" upon the part of labor is an unfair labor practice.

Now, I want to make it clear that I'm opposed to violence in labor disputes, I'm opposed to mass picketing. Those tactics are already forbidden by local police ordinances and in many cases by State statutes and certainly by the common law. They can be dealt with on a local level. But here you have Senator TAFT—in all good faith, I'm sure—putting into this act a national restriction on these points, and it enables the National Labor Relations Board, if it should get into unfriendly hands, to restrain peaceful picketing and to prevent more than two pickets, say, operating from a given gate.

Senator TAFT. Well, there isn't any danger that the National Labor Relations Board is going to get into unfriendly hands and it isn't in any unfriendly hands. I don't quite see why, if it's an unfair labor practice for employers to coerce workmen not to join unions, why it shouldn't be an unfair labor practice for unions to coerce workmen into joining unions when they don't want to. Now, that's the provision to which Senator DOUGLAS objects. As to the injunction feature, it's very doubtful whether an injunction could issue or would issue on that provision; it's not like the secondary boycott; it isn't treated like the secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike. And I think that's a question, I agree, whether there should be injunctions in that case. Certainly one of the things we may discuss. And I think it's doubtful under the present act whether it can be done. But I'm more concerned about the secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes.

Senator DOUGLAS. I'm delighted that Senator TAFT cedes ground on this point, too. He's beginning to discover that there are a great many things wrong with the Taft-Hartley law.

Senator TAFT. I'm beginning to discover the Taft-Hartley law was an experiment and there are many features which no doubt can be improved in the law. Only that's not what the labor people want. They want repeal of the law, repeal of the whole business. That's the thing we've had to fight. If we can get this thing down to a discussion of merits, even Senator DOUGLAS and I may agree on the merits of particular provisions.

Senator DOUGLAS. Senator TAFT sees only the flowers in the field; he does not see the mines underneath or the concealed pillboxes which can open up at short notice upon labor. In fact, I think the attorneys sold Senator TAFT a bill of goods on this. I'm sure he has the best intentions in the world and wants to do the best thing for the United States of America. But the smart attorneys took him in on this point.

Senator TAFT. Well, the Wagner Act set up machine guns and everything else for labor against the employer and they were freely used.

Mr. COOKE. Well, gentlemen, would you like to look at this national injunction in terms of very serious strikes and tell me whether you think it's full of beautiful zinnias or machine guns?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, so far as strikes of grave national emergencies are concerned, all that the Taft-Hartley law did was to restrain them for 80 days and to use the injunction as a means of restraining them for 80 days.

Mr. COOKE. That is, the President could go to the courts and ask for a court injunction forbidding the union.

Senator DOUGLAS. That's right. A cooling-off period. I would like to point out that in the Railway Labor Act there are no such injunctive powers, and yet the cooling-off period, so far as that is concerned, has always been put into effect. It has not been necessary to use injunctions to get cooling-off on the railroads.

Mr. COOKE. But we did hav two or three railway strikes.

Senator DOUGLAS. We had one big railway strike, and that was settled by the vigorous action of the President. And if a strike were to occur after the 80 days, under Taft-Hartley, you would still have the problem as to what the President was going to do. And the Taft-Hartley gave him no more added powers than he had before, or no more powers than he would have under the Thomas bill, which we Democrats are supporting.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Cooke, on this question of national emergency strikes, in the first place, I'm very loath to enjoin people from striking and maintaining the status quo, where the issue is an economic dispute; I'm in favor of enjoining secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, which seem to me to have no jurisdiction, which are not disputes between the employees. And so I refuse, certainly, to go along with the proposal, 2 or 3 years ago, 2 years ago, that we enjoin permanently these national emergency strikes, put a provision in the law for that; it would force compulsory arbitration or Government wage-fixing, and I'm against that. I do think that the provision of the Taft-Hartley law which provides that the President may go to court and require the striker, the head of the union, to come in and stand up in court and state his case and then permits the court to enjoin the thing for 30 days, or 60 days, 80 days—I don't much care what the period is—30 days, or 60 days, or 80 days, in order that the Government may make a final effort with all the President's power and all his prestige to settle that strike, I think it's a good provision. I don't say that if the labor people simply say, "we'll wait until it's over" and then go on strike, they can pretty well nullify it. But I think on the whole it's better to have it than not to have it.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I would like to point out that, so far as the injunction powers to get the 80-day cooling-off period is concerned, it has not been necessary to use it on the railways to get the cooling-off period observed, and that its employment in other branches of industry would make labor feel that it was being compelled to work for the private profit of employers. This isn't the only way in which the Taft-Hartley law gives great injunctive powers. The counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, who is an independent person and really runs the administration of the Board, has the power to get injunctions to restrain what he believes to be unfair labor practices, even though the Board some months later may decide that these are not unfair labor practices. He is put in as a dictator, a legal dictator, who can restrain actions which later are adjudged to be legal but which, because they have been previously restrained, have gravely crippled labor in the conduct of its activities.

Senator TAFT. Well, I don't see any reason why some Government official isn't just as reliable as some other Government official. In fact, the Board may decide at one time that they have a temporary case and they may reverse themselves later. I think the separation of powers of the Board, between the Board and the general counsel, is very important. I think, if you want to get justice in this country, you can't have the same fellow prosecuting cases and then judging their own case and then enforcing their own decisions, acting as police officer and everything else. Now that, I take it, Mr. DOUGLAS, is complaining of—Senator DOUGLAS. But the main point is this: Are we going to enjoin secondary boycotts? If we only make secondary boycotts an unfair labor practice, it will take the Board about a year to get around to them. And I think the important provision of the Taft-Hartley bill, one important, is the right of someone—here, the general counsel—on a showing of cause that he thinks is a violation of the law—that a court finds to be presumptively a violation of the law. I believe that that's one of the most important provisions of the bill and has done more to stop strikes, unnecessary strikes, unrighteous strikes, of anything we've had in this country for many years.

Senator DOUGLAS. So far as this separation of the prosecuting from the judicial functions is concerned, that had already been effected by the Board inside its own organization for years prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. The attorneys who prosecuted the case were directly separated from the examiners who heard the case. And, as a matter of fact, that similar separation inside the organization had been carried out in the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and so on. It had also been prescribed by the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946.

Senator TAFT. I heard the testimony in '39, and at that time that wasn't so. The Board assumed to be a crusading organization to put a CIO union in every plant in the United States, and it was so testified to. And Bill Green denounced them.

Senator DOUGLAS. But in 1940, that had been altered.

Senator TAFT. They had somewhat reformed, but there's no reason at all why the law shouldn't be such that they can't go back to that particular kind of a practice again.

Mr. COOKE. How about your judgment, Senator DOUGLAS, on this whole question of secondary boycotts and the prohibiting of them helping in the strike situation?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I notice that Senator TAFT does not mention the fact that under the Taft-Hartley law it is now illegal for workmen to refuse to work on struck work. Let me take an illustration. Suppose the workers in plant A are on strike, but the employer in plant A sends the material to plant B. Then the workers in plant B, even though they belong to the same union, are not permitted to refuse to work on that work. They must continue to do so, and, if they do work, they can be sued, they can be enjoined, and, in effect, they can be compelled to be strike-breakers. This is another very crucial weakness in the law which Senator TAFT seems to ignore and does not pay proper attention to.

Senator TAFT. The definition of secondary boycott is a difficult one. The Taft-Hartley law is a sweeping prohibition for all secondary boycotts; the President prohibits a very narrow field of secondary boycotts—about 1 in 10 or 1 in 20—where there's a fight between two unions. The great field in between is justifiable, in my opinion. Take the typical case where a teamsters' union comes to an employer and says: Make your employees join the teamsters union. Well, he says, maybe so. He goes and talks to employees who say they don't want to join the teamsters' union. Thereupon the teamsters, over and over again, have called a secondary boycott against that man, with whom they have no relations, refuse to carry his goods; the same thing in declaring "hot" the product of some mill that isn't organized but may pay the best wages in the world. Now those things, I'd say this, if the committee gets down to business and discusses merits, I'm perfectly willing to discuss the particular kind that Senator DOUGLAS objects to. I'm perfectly willing to consider whether that should be excluded or not. Perhaps the definition of the Taft-Hartley Act is too broad. But one thing is certain, the definition of the President's act is so narrow that it will not stop nine-tenths of the secondary boycotts which seriously interfered with the whole course of free commerce in the United States prior to this law.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, Senator TAFT seems to be softening on this point as well and

discovering some of the booby-traps and mines which we told him at the time existed.

Senator TAFT. Not at all, Senator DOUGLAS. The labor people—we told the labor people, if you can come in and define for us a kind of secondary boycott which is justifiable, we'll make the exception. And the labor people said, no, we don't want any law, we don't want any prohibition of secondary boycotts. They don't even want what the President is proposing here.

Senator DOUGLAS. In this act we say that there shall not be strikes or secondary boycotts by outside unions to try to alter the choice of a bargaining representative made by workers inside a plant. We say that outside unions should not coerce workmen inside a plant in the choice of a bargaining representative, just as we say that employers should not coerce workers.

Senator TAFT. I want to say one thing, the President has accepted many provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill, including this, including the making of unfair labor practices against unions. They say they want to repeal it, and yet the President has come in with many things that are contrary to the whole theory of repeal.

Senator DOUGLAS. There were about 60 features in the Taft-Hartley law and we have taken 4 new features, not precisely like the Taft-Hartley law but which we believe will remedy certain inequities which developed under the Wagner Act.

Senator TAFT. Sixty features of the Taft-Hartley law; about 30 there's no objection to at all. So we might just as well keep those.

Mr. COOKE. Well, let's come to one feature of the law that there's been a good deal of conversation about, and that is this question of Communist affidavits from labor leaders. Should that, Senator TAFT, be continued or should it be expanded so that businessmen as well have to give anti-Communist and anti-Fascist affidavits?

Senator TAFT. Well, I rather think the officers of companies that want to take advantage of the law ought to make the affidavit, just like the labor leaders. Of course, at the time it was put in hastily, on the floor of the Senate. The committee didn't give consideration to it; it wasn't a committee provision. Now, the testimony is that that affidavit has worked. It has weakened all Communist-dominated unions, has driven out many Communist officers, and while there are still some left, apparently it is an effective means of fighting Communists.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, I am not opposed to that affidavit, provided it is mutual. The present affidavit merely requires union officials to state whether or not they are Communists. It does not require company officials to state whether or not they are either Communists or Fascists. I would not oppose requiring union officials who negotiate collective agreements in which they state whether or not they are either Communists or Fascists. But I would make the penalty fall not against the union or the company which they represent and which may be ignorant of their status but against the individuals themselves.

Senator TAFT. Well, I'm glad to see that Senator DOUGLAS is willing to amend the Taft-Hartley Act and not repeal it, in this respect at least.

Senator DOUGLAS. No. What we say is that we should return to the principles of the Wagner Act and reestablish genuine collective bargaining and only make such changes in the Wagner Act as are necessary to protect both workers and the general public.

Mr. COOKE. I think that brings you back, Senator DOUGLAS, to where you started, in terms of what you believe is the all-importance of the Wagner Act in here. But as you two Senators have gone through, this question of Communist affidavits has been the first place where I've seen a conspicuous agreement. That does not seem to indicate a very quickly settled new labor legislation in the Senate, or in Congress, does it?

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, to my mind, the country will decide and the country should get educated on what the real issues are. What we are striving for—we Democrats and, I hope, some liberal Republicans—is to reestablish the principles of collective bargaining, so that groups of workmen who are weak, individually, can deal with the huge and mighty corporations on terms of greater equality.

Senator TAFT. We left every unfair labor practice against employers in the Taft-Hartley law that was in the Wagner Act. There is free collective bargaining, they have the right to organize, the employer must recognize the union, which was the essential feature of the Wagner Act; we retained all of that; we only put corresponding obligations on the unions.

Senator DOUGLAS. But you so crippled the economic powers of the unions that when they sat at the conference table they were greatly weakened. And also, in a period in which we might have considerable unemployment, the employers could break virtually any union in the land by suing them, by replacing the strikers and having the replacements vote and take the union out of existence, and if the Republicans, or the right wing of the Republicans, were ever to get control of the Nation and control the Labor Relations Board, you would have those terms "restraint or coercion" interpreted so strictly that peaceful picketing would be broken.

Senator TAFT. This is all theory. The Republicans are just as equal, in fact, they are far more fair, between employer and employee than the Democrats today, the left-wing Democrats, who refused to vote for the Taft-Hartley Act last time. And far from weakening the unions, the union membership has steadily increased under the Taft-Hartley Act, until I think there are nearly a million more members today than there were 2 years ago. That doesn't—all of this thing about weakening the union is pure theory. No union in the United States has been weakened. They have only been restrained from doing unlawful things which injured the rights of third parties and their own members and the employers.

Senator DOUGLAS. Any small growth in unionism that has occurred has occurred in plants and shops which were already organized. But in plants and in industries which previously were not organized, the unions have not been able to make headway just because of these powers given to the employers by the Taft-Hartley law.

Senator TAFT. Under the Taft-Hartley Act a union could go into a new plant, if it can persuade a majority of the employees to be for its union; it can get an election, as it always could, and that election can establish it as the bargaining agent for the employer. That's the American way of organizing; persuade the people by reason and justice to join the union, if the union is what they want to join, not coerce them into joining a union, if they don't want to join a union.

Senator DOUGLAS. But the general counsel of the Board is then given the power to get injunctions, restraining unions from some of the union activities, legitimate union activities, which they have previously used in organizing——

Senator TAFT (speaking simultaneously). Except the secondary boycott and jurisdictional strike, which are the racketeering type of strike that the public universally disapproves.

Senator DOUGLAS. You can give such a strict interpretation to the phrase "restraint or coercion" as virtually to prevent peaceful persuasion.

Mr. COOKE. Well, now summing up briefly here, gentlemen, let's start with you, Senator TAFT. In terms of the present Taft-Hartley Act you want it what might be described as slightly modified?

Senator TAFT. Yes; I think there are a number of respects in which the provisions of the law should be studied and in many respects probably changed after study. The hearings to date have served a very useful purpose. They've changed the issue from one of repeal or no repeal to such an intelligent consideration of the many separate issues which are in the bill, and that's what I've been trying to bring about. We found there's no real objection to many of the less-important features of the Taft-Hartley law and there is no sound objection to many of the important features of the law. There are probably three or four important fields where there is a legitimate and clear argument, merits on both sides, which I certainly am willing to discuss.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, we feel that we should return to the principles of the Wagner Act, which aimed to set up machinery whereby workers could, if they wanted to, choose representatives who would then deal with management, and that we should, instead of beclouding that issue with a whole series of legal prohibitions and restraints, permit workers and employers freely to work out collective agreements with each other in a spirit of good will, instead of turning the whole thing over to the lawyers. That is our fundamental purpose.

Mr. COOKE. Well, thank you both, Senator TAFT and Senator DOUGLAS, for joining me here on the People's Platform today and stating not only your very powerful convictions, as I said earlier, but also trying to clarify this for us and presenting it in the good faith and in the cooperative spirit which I hope will lead to a satisfactory conclusion to everybody in this very difficult area of the Taft-Hartley Act and labor legislation.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to Columbia's People's Platform as it discussed the need for new labor legislation. Chairman Dwight Cooke's guests today were United States Senators ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Prophecy of Rev. Fountain E. Pitts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 25 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, because this may be of historical interest to many, I request permission to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of Charles Parmer's syndicated column from Washington, which appeared on Washington's Birthday.

This column tells, from historical records, events in the Congress when the Reverend Mr. Fountain E. Pitts addressed both morning and afternoon sessions, in 1857, 92 years ago.

It is noteworthy that, according to these records, the Reverend Mr. Pitts foretold the United States would be the world's uncompromising representative of popular freedom, that Russia would become the representative of absolutism, and that a confederated republic, under the counsel and example of the United

States, would rise and stand for world peace.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARMER FROM WASHINGTON

(By Charles Parmer)

Ninety-two years ago today the Reverend Fountain E. Pitts, Methodist pioneer, and the first Protestant missionary to the Argentine, addressed the Congress on the occasion of George Washington's Birthday.

It so happens that the Reverend Mr. Pitts was the great-grandfather of my wife; and among family records are full accounts of that occasion; including this bit of Americana:

A slender volume, entered according to the act of Congress in 1857, with this frontispiece:

"A defense of Armageddon or our great country foretold in the Holy Scriptures in two discourses delivered in the Capitol of the United States, at the request of several Members of Congress, on the anniversary of Washington's birthday, 1857, by F. E. Pitts, of Nashville, Tenn.

"Thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name." (Psalms cxxxviii: 2.)

"Doomed by an edict written in the sky,
The monarchies of earth shall be no more:
Heaven's sealed wonders open to the eye,
In rising glories on the western shore."

A preface states:

"Notice from the National Intelligencer of February 24, 1857:

"Services at the Capitol: In the place of the Reverend Mr. Waldo, Chaplain of the House, Rev. F. E. Pitts, of Nashville, Tenn., appeared agreeably to previous announcement, and delivered a discourse on the fulfillment of prophecy, with reference to the United States. With no leaning to cant or fanaticism, and with no tendencies to a politico-religious sermon, the reverend speaker entered upon his task of unfolding the prophecies, both of the Old and New Testaments.

"The events which he detailed with reference to our own country were made to fit with such surprising chronological accuracy to the predictions, that it was by the almost unanimous desire of a large and attentive audience that his lecture was continued in the afternoon. At the appointed time, 3 p. m., it was no easy task to find a seat in the great Hall of the Capitol, so deeply interested were the people to hear the sequel of the morning discourse." (The great Hall is the House of Representatives.)

The Reverend Mr. Pitts gave this warning shortly after beginning speaking—a warning against fanatics who "have deluded thousands. Whenever, therefore, an interpreter of prophecy attempts to tell when the days of judgment will come, just rest assured he is wise above what is written; for we are taught by the Great Prophet himself, 'Of that day, and hour, knoweth no man; no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only.' This divine announcement should always quiet such unauthorized pretension."

Matters of the immediate future are not necessarily hard to predict, based on known factors in a situation, the desires and powers of various elements; long-range prophesy calls for, well, call it inspiration.

The Reverend Mr. Pitts had traveled in many lands—and that in a day when the average American didn't range far from his courthouse. But even with his knowledge of world movements, a bit of inspiration must have prompted this prophecy:

"That of a period of great friendship—during a time of world-stress—between the United States and France."

(A footnote, by a reporter of the day, says that the Speaker thrilled the hearers in the House of Representatives by turning to "a large, lifelike portrait of Lafayette, hanging on the wall, opposite that of Washington.")

As to that prophecy, remember, "Lafayette, we are here."

Then looking far into the future, he spoke of two countries, and the forms of statecraft for which they would stand. The first he named:

"The United States of America, young and vigorous * * * she is the enlightened and uncompromising representative of popular freedom."

As for the second one:

"And there is Russia in gigantic proportions * * * with her millions of warriors * * * occupying one-seventh of the earth's terra firma * * * the representative of absolutism."

All of that has come true. Here is a final prophecy. Looking far into the future, the speaker saw a world organization of nations (we call it United Nations) but this is what the Reverend Fountain E. Pitts told the Congress of the United States on Washington's birthday, 92 years ago, today:

"Henceforth, 'nations shall learn war no more.' Confederated Republic, under the council and example of the United States, will arise in the former 'habitations of dragons,' and the 'deserts' of cruelty 'shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.'

"And, like an elder brother, our Republic will kindly instruct them in the principles of popular freedom."

The tremendous truth of all that, well, shall we be practical and earthy and say, foresight is emphasized when one considers that the Reverend Mr. Pitts spoke when the United States was the only true republic in the world (save Switzerland) in a day of strong monarchy. (He could have been speaking with divine inspiration.)

Knowing that such an occasion took place in the Capitol in 1857 aids one in charting the slow but persistent growth of the movement for popular freedom and cooperation among nations. While other men in other lands were speaking of freedom during the same period, many were forced to do so furtively, in no other Capitol building in the world could such an address, prophesying a future brotherhood of nations, have been delivered. Not in the English Parliament, certainly not in Russia. It was delivered in the Congress of the United States of America.

The world took a step forward that day.

Israel—The Sources of Its Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Bnai Zion, Sunday, January 30, 1949:

In the many years, and they are many, I assure you, of facing audiences on the issue of Jewish national independence in Palestine, it is seldom, indeed, that I face one, as I do today, of whose sympathies and warmth and, above all, understanding I can feel so sure that I do not have to measure my words. It is my knowledge first hand of the significance and worth of the achievements of the Bnai Zion.

I want to jump across some thousands of miles at this point to a brave, inspiring, new republic. Israel, of course. But the line of connection between Bnai Zion and Israel cannot be broken. You, my good people, have made that line—strong, direct, and enduring.

Keep this in mind. Whatever it is I find necessary to say about Israel, I know and I am fully aware of it, that your role, through the Bnai Zion is that not of spectators, mere onlookers, but participants.

Let me tell you that the excitement of my visit to Israel is still with me. I welcome every opportunity, most particularly an opportunity of this kind, to break forth in a torrent of enthusiasm. I refuse to be inhibited on the subject of Israel. I want to transmit my enthusiasm to everybody I talk with. There may be those of you present who have been to Israel, and, if so, you will understand my fever. I want to say without reservation that everyone who contributes, in small measure or large, to Israel's rebirth and development has gained for himself an enrichment and fulfillment that no degree of personal, self-serving success can bring.

Mark you, when I stepped into Israel, I did not step into a country of luxury, of factories producing at furious rate, or of mile upon mile of growing grain and wheat, or of furs and perfumes; in short, of material abundance. No, I stepped into a country at war, with shortages evident everywhere, food, clothing, shelter, a country with bomb-ripped buildings and stricken farms. But if I stopped there, I would be giving a picture completely out of focus, for there is a tempo in Israel, as quickening to the blood as the rhythms of the Hora that no honest description of Israel dare omit. There is no self-pity; on the contrary, there is almost an exultant fever about the people that animates their whole being, the way they walk, talk, jest—and eagerness and a vitality that defy definition. They are fighting a war unaided, striving to win the peace, they are building a country, they are teaching their young, they are welcoming and integrating the immigrants, they are forming a government, they have blueprints and plans, they are in the midst of a hundred and one activities, and yet, over all, there is no feeling, none whatsoever, of a regimented people. This fact has been amply demonstrated by the vigor of the campaign and diversity of political parties in the recently concluded elections. Consider how remarkable that is. Each one remains an individual with his personality and expressions and opinions intact, and all the while they work together for a common purpose.

You will find it hard to believe when I tell you that with all the burdens, the responsibilities, the privations, the dangers and the death, the animosities and indifferences of the world outside, there is today in Israel a joyous people. They feel they belong; no longer surplus, no longer apologetic for being Jewish, no longer alternating between fear and defiance, for this is "their own, their native land."

I think we can sum it up by saying that each one feels he has a reason for living; he's glad he's alive, and that grip on life seeks and finds a diversity of expression, not only in the work, in the everyday pursuits, but in the arts and sciences. Israeli literature is already in the making, in the contemporary sense. The Israelis are experimenting with art forms. I saw an exhibit of soldiers' art in Tel Aviv. It was far from primitive, although still, in the main, imitative of the modern masters. I heard the mature performance of the Israeli Symphony Orchestra, by our own Leonard Bernstein. I listened to a performance of the opera Thais in Hebrew translation.

Indeed, Israel is the fruit of faith.

Knowing of Bnai Zion's inspiring work with the Jewish national fund, you see evidence all about you as you go through Israel. As you travel, you see alternating areas of green and dust; here a patch of resuscitated soil; there a patch of arid strips. This is the work of JNF, you say to yourself with

pride. This is the work of the trees that were planted, the water resources developed. You see the people on JNF land, land redeemed and reawakened by JNF. You see the newly occupied parts of the country, the settlement activities, you see the antimalarial work and the road constructions, the drainage and hydrological processes, and you understand all over again the relationship running from such organizations as Bnai Zion to the Jewish National Fund to the proclamation of the Jewish state.

I saw another piece of the concrete achievements of Bnai Zion in Israel. The Kfar Bnai Zion, parented by Bnai Zion. The settlement, as planned and conceived by Bnai Zion, is a proud testimonial to individual initiative coupled with collective security. The settlement, located between Tel Aviv and Haifa, consists of 30 families, each family living in its own home; each family allotted 15 dunams of land, which the family unit operates as an independent enterprise except for collective buying and selling. Each family has its own livestock, cows, chickens, goats. In less than 2 years' time, from an arid, uncultivated, dour bit of landscape, it has proved itself to be a lusty child, of both promise and achievement. Cabbage, turnips, lettuce, corn, and wheat rise boldly from the soil, yielding two and a half crops a year.

I saw the sturdy, eager youngsters of the Kfar Bnai Zion, straight of limb, happy and secure. At the time of my visit, ground was being broken for the school which would house a kindergarten, schoolrooms, libraries, and a recreation hall. You can well believe me when I say I can hardly recall a more satisfying experience than the one I had when I dug a spadeful of the ground. In many of the settlements, the children live a life apart, eating, sleeping, and studying in quarters remote from those of their parents. In Kfar Bnai Zion, the children are part of the family, living with the family in a way of life familiar to us here.

Individual incentive is a part of the pattern of life in Kfar Bnai Zion, but set within another pattern of collective concern and mutual benefits. Kfar Bnai Zion, not losing sight of the part it must play in contributing to Israel's strength has set aside a tract of land within its settlement for the housing, equipping, and training of refugees. These are the sons of Zion—the Bnai Zion. What Bnai Zion has helped to create in Israel is zionism in action; it is the practical expression of the vision and the hope that brought Bnai Zion into being.

The sources of the strength of Israel. They flow from every corner of the world, from people like you, from the indefatigable spirit of the citizens of Israel. Let me tell you the fascinating story of a brilliant piece of military strategy which enabled the Israeli army to chase the Egyptians out of the Negev. Pretending to be attacking Gaza, the Jews concentrated their main forces and made a secret 40-mile night march along a forgotten Roman road across the desert wasteland. They used chicken wire and roofing paper without which their tanks would have bogged down in the treacherous quicksands. The Egyptians considered such a march impossible because they didn't know of the existence of this ancient road. Fortunately, Col. Yigal Yadin knew all about this ancient and forgotten route because as a young lad he had assisted his father, an eminent archaeologist, in exploring the Negev. The Egyptians had created powerful defenses but their guns were facing the wrong way. King Farouk's forces, stunned by the sudden attack from the rear, fled in confusion. "How can you beat an enemy that performs such miracles?" asked a captured Egyptian soldier.

Israel's sources of strength likewise flow from her statesmen. I have watched them in action at the United Nations. I have seen them at work, turning the wheels of government. The quick wit, the ready answer, the knowledge of history and the steadfast purpose have all been dedicated to Israel. I am happy in the vote of confidence the people of Israel have in the democratic way of life bestowed upon them.

But in counting the sources of Israel's strength, we dare pass over, in easy optimism, the strength of her opposition. True, Bevin's Palestine Policy won grudging approval in the House of Commons this past Wednesday, but it won. True, Churchill called that policy one of folly, futility, and fatuity, but it won. And true, also, that a hundred Laborites abstained from voting and the Conservatives and Liberals, who together gave 204 seats, voted almost unanimously against the Government, but a miss is as good as a mile, and the Bevin policy on Israel carried approval in a 283 to 193 vote.

Mr. Bevin in his speech offered no apologies and admitted no mistakes. He warned that if fighting were to break out again, "I am afraid it would be very difficult to stand by indifferent or inactive." The threat does not have a happy ring.

Was there ever in history such a series of British blunders which has gained them no friends, no political or diplomatic advantage, and which is so contrary to the professed concepts of the Labor government? Because of Mr. Bevin's pet aberration, the citizens of Britain, faced with the severest austerity program known in modern England, must bear the cost of sending British warships to the Mediterranean and the costs of sending British troops to the Red Sea port of Aqaba in Transjordan.

Who has been the gainer in these sulky maneuvers? The authority and prestige of the United Nations have been undermined. Lives, English, Israeli, and Arab, have been lost. The economy of all these countries has been strained to the breaking point. A breach has been widened between the United States and England. It has cost friendship, good will, lives, and money. All because of one man's baffled fury. Had England and the United States firmly adhered to the United Nations decision of November 29, 1947, all this could have been spared.

Here is the clearest example of a monomania which has discarded all reason and all reality. Throughout the peace talks, Britain keeps rearing it's you-know-what head in uncontrollable fear lest stability be restored to the Middle East and negotiations successfully concluded between Egypt and Israel. "What," cries Bevin, "a Middle East without British control. Unthinkable."

Tragically, the shadow of Bevin lies over the whole of the Middle East. He is charged with the direct and personal responsibility for keeping the area in seething unrest. As one of the Conservative leaders stated, "The Bevin policy on Palestine is not only dead; it is in an advanced state of decomposition."

Whatever intelligence is serving British foreign policy in the Middle East, it is sadly amiss. Britain has been steadily losing face throughout the region, and with the shooting down of five British planes, its military face is very much lost and very much red.

The assertion of independence on the part of the United States with reference to Israel is a healthy thing. The British attitude, maneuvers, and blunders are a threat to the peace. In the Bevin obstinacy lies the danger of a conflagration that can spread far beyond the present seat of difficulty. The United States must recognize this, and in self-interest, if for no other reason, and must bring all of its weight to bear, both independently and within the United Nations to stop the course of British mischief in Palestine. British action in Palestine is just as reprehensible as Dutch action was in Indonesia, and there is just as ample justification for the United States not to mince words with Britain any more than she did with the Dutch.

The new State of Israel has succeeded in its election, held under most trying conditions, in again proving its maturity to the world. The elections were held in the most orderly fashion. Arab women, for the first time in history, voted. We can take great pride in the democratic balloting in the midst of an armed truce. It was a gain for all democratic peoples everywhere to find one more ally dedicated to the principles of political freedom. It reaffirms the decidedly western orientation of Israel.

This leads me to the thought that no time must be lost now in extending the provisions of the Economic Administration Act (the Marshall plan) to cover the Middle East area. The existence of the state of Israel is the dynamics that will awaken the whole region to constructive use of its resources for the benefit of all the people. Israel is the sparkplug in the Middle East machinery. The Marshall plan is based on the principle of helping free countries which are ready and willing to help themselves as well. The extension of economic aid by the United States to the Middle East, with Israel as the focal point, will mean the revitalization of an area which civilization has too long passed by and forgotten. It is in the self-interest of the United States to do so, for so long as any blighted area exists, just so long is the democratic way of life subject to dangers and demoralization. Israel, having proven its democratic pattern, merits the strengthening of its structure.

Farm Prices and National Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Prices and National Prosperity," delivered by me at the annual banquet meeting of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders' Association at Kansas City, Mo., on February 23, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to be here with you today. I am always glad to take the opportunity to meet with a group of real producers and discuss our mutual problems. I am a farmer myself, and, unfortunately for me, I have some cattle on feed right now at my farm near Cambridge, Nebr.

In Washington, we spend a great deal of time debating and studying labor relations, development of mineral resources, manufacturing problems, development of power, transportation, housing, and so on. These problems are very important, of course, but none of them can compare with the importance of preserving a stable and productive agriculture. There is only one thing that we really have to have, and that is food. And there is only one place to secure our food supply—most of it—and that is off the farm.

In some foreign countries this elementary truth seems to be much better realized than it is here. I recall a few years ago when I

visited the great country of India. The average man there has hardly anything he can call his own except food, and generally not enough of that. Many of them have no housing at all—they sleep in the streets or in the fields. They have almost no clothing, many children none at all. They simply cannot spare the energy for production of anything except food, the one prime necessity. Aside from the small class of rich people they cannot spare any money for anything other than food.

Here in America we have the opposite extreme. Out of the 60,000,000 people who work only about 8,000,000 are employed on the farm. About one family in seven is a farm family. The farm family not only produces enough to feed and clothe itself but it produces enough to feed and clothe the other seven families that are employed in manufacturing, mining, transportation, Government, trade, and so forth. It would have been completely impossible to build up our tremendous manufacturing capacity if the farmer had not had a surplus of food to sell to the workers in the factories. Our whole economic system simply could not exist without a highly productive agriculture.

Every time we forget that we run into trouble. Back in 1946 we forgot it for a little while. Because of misguided national policies there was no meat for sale to city and town consumers. Those national policies had to be changed so that our people could continue to eat.

If we are to have a productive agriculture we must also have a prosperous agriculture. That is the principal thing I want to talk to you about today. Farmers cannot continue to produce at a loss any more than anyone else. If national policies are adopted which force down agricultural prices the farmer has no choice except to reduce or discontinue his operations. That was brought home to the rest of the country rather forcibly in 1946. At the present time we are faced with several policies which seem deliberately designed to force down the farmer's price. Those policies, it seems to me, carry a tremendous danger, not only to the farmer, but to the Nation as a whole, to the national food supply and to the industries that depend on the farm market for their prosperity. That is what I want to talk about with you at this time.

It happens that as we meet here today, agriculture has just gone through a disastrous slump in the prices of almost every farm product. I believe cattle feeders may have been hurt the worst by this slump. They must normally work on a comparatively close margin, between the cost of their cattle and their feed, and the price they receive when sold. A change in the market of a dollar or two can wipe out the feeder's profits completely, and the slump has already gone far, far beyond that point, as you know. Although producers of other crops do not work on such a narrow margin, they have also been seriously hurt. All the fats and oils and oil-bearing materials, such as lard, tallow and grease, cottonseed oil, and soybeans, have also slumped. Prices for all the grains are down. Just a few months ago, it seems we heard nothing but complaints about the price of butter. Now the price of butter has fallen to the point where price supports are necessary.

In short, the inflation is definitely over for agriculture. Our problem now is to ward off disastrous deflation, not inflation. From experience, we know that when agriculture is depressed, the rest of the country is soon depressed along with it. Under these circumstances, it is bewildering to learn that the administration still desires the authority to restore price ceilings. We don't need to push prices down. They are already down. What we need is something to hold them up.

In this discussion, of course, I shall not try to cover the entire agricultural picture. That would be out of the question. I do want to discuss one or two of our present programs and their relationship to farm prices. The first of these is export controls and the policies that have been followed in administering them.

The handling of export controls on lard is the best example of maladministration by Washington that I have seen. For many months we have had, side by side, a contradictory situation. On the one hand, we have had here at home a mounting surplus of grease and tallow, then lard, then cottonseed and soybeans and other fats and oils. I do not want to bore you with statistics, but during the current crop year, 1948–49, the indications are that domestic production of the three major food fats—lard, soybean oil, and cottonseed oil—is 1,500,000,000 pounds larger than the normal prewar average, an increase of 40 percent. At the same time, there has been a pressing demand in foreign countries for additional supplies of fats and oils. Several months ago a spokesman for General Clay told the Department of Agriculture, and I quote: "There is a perfectly tremendous demand for fats. The need is desperate. The fat crisis is here. We will take anything at any time that will be furnished us." Just a few weeks ago, Dr. FitzGerald, the Food Chief of the Economic Cooperation Administration, told representatives of your organization that he badly needed several hundred million pounds of fats beyond the quantity authorized for export.

What kept us from filling this foreign need? What kept our surplus lard and other fats dammed up in this country? The control on exports was able to maintain an airtight curtain between American supplies and foreign demand. The administration of these controls broke the price of lard down well below the OPA ceiling, down toward prewar price levels.

Just at the time I was preparing the draft of this address, the announcement was finally made that lard and other edible fats and oils had been taken off the so-called positive list of commodities, the exports of which were strictly controlled. This change is welcome, although it is certainly long overdue. It was too little, and much too late. The change was not made until surplus stocks had been built up and the price had been broken. The surplus is still with us. That surplus lard and the other fats and oils are likely to stay at bargain prices for some time before they can be moved into consumption.

Unfortunately, the removal of controls on fats and oils does not solve the whole problem by any means. Fats and oils are only a small part of the picture for the livestock feeder. We cannot accomplish very much by trying to save one agricultural product at a time. Most of you, I expect, like myself, are also interested in the price of both hogs and cattle, as well as wheat and other grains and, perhaps, dairy and poultry products as well. Practically all of these commodities are still under export control. These limits on foreign sales weaken the price structure, either immediately or ultimately, for all agricultural products.

With agricultural prices heading down toward postwar lows, the time has come to remove all limitations on exports of agricultural products, except those needed for our national security. These export controls have been used to beat down the prices of agricultural products. In one section of the Export Control Act, it is stated that the purpose of the program is to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. Translated into plain language, that apparently means that it is intended to push down commodity prices. The administration of the program has been in the hands of those who apparently think along such lines. That is confirmed by what has happened to lard. On the basis of our experience, there is every reason to fear that the controls on various other agricultural products will continue to be miserably handled, as the spokesman for the administration, Senator MAYBANK, of South Carolina, frankly admitted had been done in the case of lard.

The whole problem of maintaining a sound agricultural price structure goes a great deal further than the handling of export controls. Surveying some of the events of the last few months, there appears to have been something like a pattern of policy designed to push down agricultural prices. One good example has been the policy followed by the Army, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and other agencies of using our money to buy a portion of their needs of wheat, meat, and other commodities from offshore sources.

You livestock feeders are probably familiar with the fact that our Army has been buying beef and other meat from the Argentine. You may be interested in the figures on such offshore purchases during last year, which I just secured a few days ago. For troop issue overseas, the Army bought offshore in 1948 over 11,000,000 pounds of fresh and chilled beef and over 9,000,000 pounds of canned meat, chiefly canned beef from South America. In addition, the Army bought about 4,500,000 pounds of lamb and something over a million pounds of poultry for troop issue from offshore sources. For Greek relief, the Army also purchased from offshore sources over 5,000,000 pounds of fresh and chilled beef, over 14,000,000 pounds of mutton, and over 5,000,000 pounds of various canned meats, especially mutton. Altogether, these purchases constitute a very substantial proportion of the meat procured by the Army for overseas during 1948.

When business that should belong to the American producer is placed with foreign suppliers, of course, the effect on American prices can be disastrous. We have seen what has happened to livestock markets over the past few weeks. In all fairness, I do not believe we should blame the Army too much for this policy. In determining its procurement policy, the Army generally follows the forecasts and the suggestions of the Department of Agriculture. The Agriculture Department has predicted a rising trend in livestock prices. On the basis of this forecast, the Army, no doubt, felt that domestic producers did not need the business. In other words, it traces back to a very unfortunate prediction by the Department of Agriculture. This prediction is typical of the inflation psychology that has dominated most administration officials for a long time. I do not believe the mistake was intentional, but it was certainly disastrous for us.

I am glad to say that the Army has at least temporarily discontinued its purchases from Latin America. Some days ago I made a formal request of the Department of the Army that they announce a firm permanent policy of making all their meat procurement from domestic sources, but I have not yet received a definite reply to this request.

There is another important case of offshore procurement of an agricultural commodity by an administrative agency for which there is no excuse. I refer to the decision by the Economic Cooperation Administration to buy 120,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada for shipment to Europe. When Congress enacted the legislation authorizing the ERP this question was foreseen, and Congress was careful to write into the act language which definitely required the procurement of surplus agricultural commodities only within the United States. That requirement has been ignored and the clear language of the act has been violated. Canadian wheat was purchased while American wheat has accumulated in the hands of the Commodity Credit

Corporation. For months the price of wheat has been at or below the loan rate, which means that it has been well below parity.

Temporarily, while the Commodity Credit Corporation is making price-support loans at 90 percent of parity to wheat producers, it might seem that it makes very little difference to the wheat farmer what is done with his wheat so long as he can always dispose of it to the Government at support levels. That is not the case. When surpluses of wheat in the hands of the Government become too heavy two things happen to the wheat farmer. First of all, he may have acreage allotments or marketing quotas imposed upon him, and those controls will carry us back to the old regimentation system of the 1930's. Secondly, when stocks of surplus wheat reach a certain point, the price supports offered by the Federal Government decline from 90 percent of parity to 70 percent or 60 percent. Under present conditions that would mean a drop of 50 or 60 cents a bushel in the support level on wheat. If the present policy of permitting wheat stocks to build up is continued that can happen by next year.

It appears to me that if we are to put up the money for European recovery, we have the first right to supply the goods to be purchased with that money—at least where we have heavy surpluses of the particular commodity available. That was certainly the intent of Congress.

I hope that cattle feeders will not feel that I am talking about something that is of no interest to them when I discuss the problem of wheat prices. Even if some livestock feeders do not grow wheat for sale I believe we all have a common stake in maintaining a fair price level for all agricultural products. If wheat goes down to depression levels I do not believe that cattle can be kept up to a fair price.

The precise effect of the Government withdrawal from domestic grain markets is strikingly revealed by the experience during the last few weeks. During a recent Senate investigation the Secretary of Agriculture categorically denied that the price slump was due to Government withdrawal from the buying side of the market. He declared point blank that the Government had not withdrawn from purchases of domestic wheat. That is a half-truth.

It is perhaps true that the Government continued to buy wheat. The break in commodity prices was started by the break in the corn market, however. That break in corn can be laid directly at the door of Commodity Credit Corporation. During the week ending February 4, Commodity Credit purchases of corn were cut 93 percent below the average purchases for the month of January. The same thing is true of Government purchases of flour. Commodity Credit Corporation reduced its purchases from 20,000,000 pounds during the preceding week down to 4,000,000 pounds during the week when commodity prices broke, the week ending February 4.

When wheat and corn went down cattle and hogs went down, too. It is clear that we have reached the point where the decisions of one man can make or break the prices for our principal agricultural products. In my judgment, that is a very dangerous situation. During the last few weeks we have seen just what can happen when that situation is permitted to exist.

Unfortunately our Government still appears to be obsessed with the idea that the important problem is inflation. Too many administration leaders appear to feel that agricultural prices must be forced down. It is taken for granted that wage rates must not be reduced. Apparently it is felt that lower agricultural prices would relieve the pressure for higher wages. The events I have discussed make it appear that there is a regular pattern in administration policy directed toward that end.

In my opinion, agriculture cannot afford to accept such a policy without a fight. We know too well from experience that when agricultural prices collapse the farmer's costs and the price of things he must buy do not go down in proportion. Wage rates are very inflexible. The prices of all sorts of industrial goods tend to remain very stable, even when demand drops off sharply. Taxes and interest on debts probably do not go down at all. However, a slump in the farmer's income is frequently the signal for a general depression. We went all through that in the 1930's, and we must not let it happen again.

The agricultural areas of the Nation are as well represented in Congress as any other single group. I believe that you men who produce the Nation's food supply have a right to demand that your representatives in Congress express your point of view. Certainly the representatives of industry, labor, and other groups are not at all hesitant about expressing their needs and bringing their demands to the attention of the public. There is no reason why agriculture should not express its views and claims. We know that agriculture prices are not too high. Prices of most agricultural products, in fact, are below parity, and parity is nothing more than a minimum goal of fairness for the agricultural producer. I know of no reason why farmers and their representatives should not point that out on every possible occasion.

I do not pretend to have the final solution to this question. I have already mentioned one or two things that I believe we should press for. First of all, I believe we should insist that American Government funds should not be used to buy foreign agricultural products when American producers are in position to supply those needs. The farmer pays his share of the taxes for these programs. ERP and Army procurement should not be used to break down farm prices here, while other countries get the markets. If these other nations wish to sell their products, let them make their own contribution to European assistance out of their own pockets. As mentioned, I have already asked the Army to establish a firm policy of procuring its meat requirements here. Although the Army has not yet given me a definite answer, it has at least discontinued purchases of Argentine beef for the time being.

Secondly, I discussed the effect of export controls on our own agricultural prices. Those controls cut off foreign sales and back up the surpluses here. It is time to get rid of export controls on agricultural products when farm prices are falling. These export controls have been used as effectively as the old CPA in pushing farm prices down. We cannot afford to have our agricultural price structure sacrificed to a system of Washington regulations and controls. Many of us in Congress have protested and fought against this policy. We have made some headway, but there is a long way yet to go.

If I have discussed our national policy so frankly, it is because I want to represent the farmers of my State and other States to the best of my ability. I hope my thoughts have been of some interest to you and have given you something to think about. I happen to know that your splendid organization is doing a first-rate job of representing you and your problems, and I am sure it will continue to do so. I hope you will not hesitate to pass your ideas along to me from time to time and to give me the benefit of your suggestions. We all have a common stake in agricultural prosperity, and I want you to feel that I will always be glad to be of any possible assistance in defending the farmer's rightful place in the economic picture.

Jefferson's Contribution to Religious Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Jefferson's Contribution to Religious Freedom," delivered by me at the Pi Kappa Alpha banquet held at Williamsburg, Va., last Friday evening.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am proud to be a member of this organization, founded at the University of Virginia shortly after the War Between the States to promote fellowship and cooperation between the young men of the South who faced the problems of a new era.

While membership in a college fraternity means more in college than at any other time, promoting friendships with brothers in other colleges as well as our own, it likewise proves a bond of fellowship throughout adult life.

The principles of brotherhood and good will, which are the foundation of fraternalism, are likewise the foundation of any successfully functioning free society. I would therefore like to focus your attention tonight on the most fundamental principle of a free society which had roots in the past history of William and Mary.

I would like to ask you to think back to the year 1760, when Virginia, in population as well as area, was the largest of the Colonies and Williamsburg, its capital, was the finest city south of Philadelphia, with a population of a thousand people.

The marvelous restoration work which has been done here makes it easier for the visitor to picture this city as it was in the eighteenth century; but the emphasis, quite properly, is on the fine and beautiful aspects of our early colonial life. We may easily forget that the main street of this city, with the capitol at one end and the College of William and Mary at the other, in 1760 was only a broad road, dusty in summer, muddy in winter, and unlighted at night. The houses along it were mostly of cheap frame construction, unheated by a furnace or stove, and there wasn't even a match to light a fire quickly.

Into these surroundings, which now seem primitive to us, came in the early fall of that year a 17-year-old, half-orphan boy. He enrolled in the college under the name of Thomas Jefferson.

While other educational institutions have excelled in contributions to the physical sciences, the most notable contribution of William and Mary has been in the fields of the humanities and the social sciences. It was appropriate, therefore, that this institution should have enrolled the boy who was to become the greatest political philosopher our Nation has produced.

The potential value of the things for which a college fraternity stands is indicated, however, by the fact that the influence of the college on the young Jefferson probably was less than that of three friends he made during his college days. One was Francis Fauquier, Governor of the Colony. Another was George Wythe, subsequently a signer of the Declaration of Independence and law tutor of John Marshall and Henry Clay. The

third was Dr. William Small, a Scotchman, professor of mathematics at William and Mary, later to be known as the great Dr. Small, of Birmingham.

These four, all mature men except Jefferson, met once a week for the 2 years Jefferson was at William and Mary, and the conversation at those dinner meetings shaped and molded the future life of Thomas Jefferson. From Fauquier, the polished British gentleman and world-traveler, Jefferson imbibed a fine European culture which was his lifelong standard. From Dr. Small came his ambition to study the sciences and from the self-taught lawyer, Wythe, he learned the fundamentals of American democracy.

On this foundation Jefferson built his own political philosophy. He summed up that philosophy with a rare sense of permanent values when, in writing his own epitaph, he asked to be remembered as the author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Virginia statute for religious freedom, and as the father of the University of Virginia.

In penning the Declaration of Independence he voiced the hopes and aspirations of all oppressed and down-trodden people. That was his first contribution of freedom to mankind—freedom of the person. In presenting his bill to the Virginia Legislature for a system of general popular education with a State university as its capstone, Jefferson said his purpose was to qualify the citizenry to understand their rights, to maintain them, and to exercise with intelligence their part in self-government. Later he said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be." Thus he sought to promote a second freedom—freedom of mind.

In drafting his statute for religious freedom and fighting for its inclusion not only in the laws of Virginia but in the Federal Constitution, Jefferson fought for the third freedom—freedom of conscience.

It is these freedoms—of person, of mind, and of conscience—which have made us a great as well as a happy Nation and they are the freedoms which now are threatened in our world-wide struggle against the aggressive forces of communism.

And, because the anti-God ideology of communism is the dominant feature of that system seeking to destroy the Christian religion as a prelude to the enslavement of the individual it will pay us to recall Jefferson's ideal of religious freedom and his contribution to it.

The importance of Jefferson's contribution to this cause has sometimes been underestimated because of a misunderstanding of his personal attitude toward religion and the established church. Political opponents during his lifetime tried to picture him as an atheist and an enemy of the church. The extent to which they succeeded is indicated by the fact that when Jefferson became President certain pious women in New England buried their Bibles in their gardens, fearing they would be confiscated by Government agents.

On the other hand, Jefferson had a devoted following among the dissenting clergy in Virginia. A certain Baptist elder named John Leland, for example, went to Massachusetts and preached sermons so full of praise of Jefferson that his congregation made a cheese which weighed 1,600 pounds and Leland drove it to Washington in a sleigh in the winter of 1801. Jefferson offered it to the Democratic and Federalist Congressmen alike, but the Federalists didn't want any part of either Jefferson or his cheese.

Those who understood Jefferson's views on religion realized that he was not an enemy of the church. His fundamental tenet was that a man's religion is his own concern, not any other man's and certainly not the Government's concern, except to the extent of guaranteeing the individual's right to his own mode of worship.

Jefferson's interest in the Bible was demonstrated by the fact that when he was President he took the direct quotations attributed to Jesus out of their context and arranged them for his own convenience in a blank book to which he gave the title "The Philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth." Later he went a step further and made up a book in which he put down in parallel columns the sayings of Jesus as they appeared in varying texts of the Bible. Jefferson called this book: The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth, Extracted Textually From the Gospel in Greek, Latin, French, and English.

The conclusion he reached from his studies was indicated by a letter to a friend in which he said: "There never was a more pure and sublime system of morality delivered to man than is to be found in the four evangelists."

But, when he got beyond the phase of moral philosophy and into that of pure theology, Jefferson found difficulties which he summed up thus in a letter to a minister:

"When I was young," Jefferson wrote, "I was fond of the speculations which seemed to promise some insight into that hidden country, but observing at length that they left me in the same ignorance in which they had found me I have for very many years ceased to read or think concerning them, and have reposed my head on that pillow of ignorance which a benevolent Creator has made so soft for us, knowing how much we should be forced to use it. I have thought it better, by nourishing the good passions and controlling the bad, to merit an inheritance in a state of being of which I can know so little, and to trust for the future to Him who has been so good in the past."

His acknowledgment of the existence of a supreme being was indicated also in other correspondence in which Jefferson referred to himself as being "of a sect by myself, so far as I know," and said that each person's convictions or principles "are a subject of accountability to our God alone." The limited knowledge we have as to Jefferson's personal beliefs may be explained by his statement, made in 1815, that "I not only write nothing on religion, but rarely permit myself to speak of it, and never but in a reasonable society."

To understand Jefferson's reluctance to enter into debate on religious subjects and to appreciate the importance of his contribution to the cause of religious freedom, which permitted those who came after him to profess or practice any form of religion without fear of persecution, we must consider the conditions which prevailed in Virginia and in the other colonies in his day and time.

While some of the other American colonies were founded by groups fleeing from religious persecution, the Virginia settlers brought no such grievance. They patterned their social system on the one they had left behind in England and naturally made an established church a part of it.

The economic indiscretions of the colonial governors of Virginia, which set the stage for the Revolution, were duplicated by their attitude in the field of religion. Thus, under Virginia's first code a blasphemer suffered a thrust of a bodkin through his tongue, violators of the Sabbath were whipped and the death penalty might be imposed for uttering doubts about the Trinity. Slavery for varying periods was imposed as a penalty for failing to attend church on Sundays and holidays.

The first group of Puritans to migrate to Virginia was driven from the colony. Quakers also were expelled and warned of imprisonment if they returned once or twice and punishment by death if they returned a third time.

The first real challenge to the rule of the established church came after the arrival of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in 1683. Possessing the fighting qualties of the Irish and the tenacity of the Scotch, this group was allowed to settle in the Valley of Virginia because they promised to hold the western frontier against the Indians. In return they demanded the right to worship God according to the principles of their education.

By training and temperament the Scotch-Irish were enemies of arbitrary government in either church or state, and they became supporters of Jefferson in his fight for democracy. But, while these Presbyterians obtained some legal concessions and kept just within the bounds of the law, a more direct challenge to the established order was offered by the crusading itinerant preachers of the Methodists and Baptists and some of the forms of persecution characteristic of the early days of the colony were revived and applied to them.

It was this situation which Jefferson had to deal with when in 1776, shortly after writing the Declaration of Independence, he found himself a member of a Virginia Assembly Committee on Religion which had been carefully packed with a majority of defenders of the established church.

In notes which he prepared before going to Williamsburg for the Assembly session, Jefferson expressed his belief that the legitimate powers of the church were exhortations, admonitions, and advice, and ultimately expulsion or excommunication," which he considered "the utmost limit of power." He wrote too that "Each church being free, no one can have jurisdiction over another one, not even when the civil magistrate joins it." Jefferson also argued that "No man has power to let another prescribe his faith. No man can conform his faith to the dictates of another. The life and essence of religion consist in the internal persuasion of belief of the mind. External forms of religion, when against our beliefs, are hypocrisy and impiety."

The speeches Jefferson made in the Assembly and the proceedings in the conference rooms were not recorded but the arguments he offered for the separation of church and state and in support of his Ordinance of Religious Freedom are suggested by the quotations I have given from the notes he made in preparation for these debates.

Jefferson found two strong allies in George Mason, who had stated his views on religious freedom in the Virginia bill of rights, and James Madison who was later to make his own notable contribution in framing the Constitution of the United States. He met opposition from others including Patrick Henry, who favored a compromise under which a general tax would be imposed for support of churches but the individual taxpayer might designate the denomination to which his contribution should go. Edmund Pendleton, who had himself sent Baptist ministers to jail, presided over the Assembly and was described by Jefferson as his most dangerous opponent.

After 3 months of struggle in the packed committee, petitions which had been pouring into the Assembly were referred to the committee of the whole house and debate there led to adoption of resolutions which went far toward accomplishing Jefferson's purpose. These resolutions outlawed criminal penalties against dissenters, admitted the reasonableness of their objections to being taxed for a church to which they did not belong and opened the way for repeal of such taxes.

A committee on which Jefferson served then drew a bill which was a compromise, making concessions to religious liberty but leaving a connection between church and state. It had the effect of separating church and state, however, because with dissenters exempted the tax burden for support of the church in some parishes would have been unbearable and since that time a tax for religious purposes never has been levied in Virginia.

Jefferson was dissatisfied, however, because although dissenters had been relieved of

making payment for support of the church, the state was left with the power to regulate religious assemblies.

The struggle was renewed in 1779 when the legislature ordered the framing of a bill for religious freedom. Since he was then serving as governor, Jefferson could not personally lead the fight this time but he gave to Madison, as his spokesman, the ordinance he had drawn and which he classified in his own mind as having an importance comparable with the Declaration of Independence.

Defenders of the established church tried to win the dissenters to their side by denouncing Jefferson as an enemy of religion and offering as an alternative to Jefferson's bill a proposal that "the Christian religion shall in all times coming be deemed and held to be the established religion of the Commonwealth."

The struggle continued until 1786—10 years after he had written the Declaration of Independence. Then, finally, while Jefferson was serving as United States Minister in Paris, his ordinance was adopted.

Accepted with few changes from the language in which Jefferson wrote it, the law set forth in burning language the argument for religious freedom and concluded with the provision that "no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities."

Several of the other colonies followed the lead of Virginia by putting clauses for religious freedom in their constitutions and the influence of Jefferson's statute was felt in other parts of the world where copies were distributed and studied.

When the Constitutional Convention met at Philadelphia the year after the Virginia statute was adopted, Madison tried unsuccessfully to have a clause included in the Constitution proclaiming the principle for which he and Jefferson had fought so long in Virginia.

He failed then but renewed his fight in the First Congress when amendments to the Constitution were considered. As a result the first amendment proposed by the Congress for ratification by the States became a monument to Jefferson's effort.

It began with the now-familiar statement that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This amendment, repudiated by all totalitarian states, accepts the assumption on which democracy depends, that man is a reasonable creature. It denies the doctrine and practice of coercion of opinion and affirms the view expressed by Jefferson in his Notes on the State of Virginia, when he wrote: "It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

That was the Ebenezer of all of our freedoms and on that rock we have built a great Nation. I have taken a solemn oath to support and defend that amendment and all other parts of our Constitution and with God's help I shall never knowingly vote to undermine it.

I glory in the training in Jefferson's freedoms which you young men and women are receiving at Jefferson's alma mater for "who knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this."

Address by Hon. William Langer, of North Dakota, at University of North Dakota Founders' Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered last Saturday evening before the Alumni Association of the University of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed a privilege to be invited to address this distinguished group of fellow North Dakotans on this founders' day anniversary.

We are all proud of the great tradition of citizenship, service, and achievement of our splendid university of North Dakota.

Yet, no group of North Dakota folks ever gather just to talk about the glories of the past. We never assemble anywhere merely as a mutual admiration society. On the contrary, we are the kind of folks who are constantly looking forward, eager to learn how we can better serve the people of our State and Nation.

Tonight, I want to devote my few remarks to the matter of improving the educational opportunities of the youth of North Dakota, a problem, in the outcome of which we all have so much at stake.

As you know, there was a time in North Dakota, when we spent more for the development and care of our cattle and hogs than we did for the education and care of our children. So far as the Nation as a whole is concerned, recent figures showed that the American people were spending more money throughout the country for cosmetics and beer than for the education of American youth.

Those days have passed in North Dakota, when we failed to meet our obligations to our youth; indeed, in recent years the cry has been raised that, because we had more normal schools and other institutions than other neighboring States, such as Iowa, we had too many educational facilities.

However, the truth is, as we all know, that we still do not have enough. We knew that this claim that we have too many educational institutions has been due to the lack of money with which to support them, as they ought to be supported and expanded, to keep up with our growing needs.

This brings me to one of the most intriguing and important questions that has faced the American people for a long time, namely, the matter of tidelands oil.

Some years ago, off the coast of California, within and beyond the 3-mile limit, billions of barrels of oil reserve deposits were discovered. For years now the State of California has been leasing these properties and deriving a percentage of the income for purely State affairs.

A few years ago, the question finally arose, as to whether or not that oil belonged solely to the State of California, or whether it belonged to the Federal Government, and the American people as a whole, and why the State of California, which was using the proceeds from these leased oil deposits for educational purposes, should be the only State so to profit from these natural resources.

Finally in October 1946, the decision was made by the United States Government to litigate the matter to find out what the holding of the Supreme Court would be as to whether these oil reserves did or did not belong to the United States as a whole and whether or not the inland States were to share the anticipated profits with the tideland States.

On June 23, 1947, the Supreme Court ruled that these vast oil reserves were rightfully the property of the United States Government and of the American people as a whole, and that, as lessor, 12 percent of the income was to go into the Federal Treasury.

On October 27, 1947, in issuing its order and decree to clarify its findings, the Supreme Court stated:

"1. The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California and outside of the inland waters extending seaward 3 nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein."

Strangely enough, about the time this opinion was handed down oil was discovered 40 miles off the coast of Texas, in the Gulf of Mexico.

The Texas Legislature thereupon passed a law saying that these oil deposits belonged to Texas and that the profits would be used to provide funds for educational purposes. The same thing happened in Louisiana, where the legislature claimed all the oil reserves that extended 100 miles out into the Gulf.

Competent experts have estimated that these reserves in the Gulf of Mexico alone amount to at least 10,000,000,000 barrels, worth $27,000,000.

Then, in a recent article in Life, Dr. E. L. DeGolyer estimated that 100,000,000,000 barrels in oil reserves may ultimately be discovered on the continental shelves of the United States.

It is perfectly obvious that the tremendous wealth represented by these oil deposits will pour hundreds of millions of dollars into the treasuries of the inland States, as well as of the tidewater States, which means that hundreds of millions of dollars can be used by the State of North Dakota to improve and expand the educational facilities, to increase the salaries of teachers and give them a decent wage, to provide school-lunch programs, and to set up a loaning fund to enable the young men and women of North Dakota to go to college by borrowing the necessary funds and repaying them later in a revolving fund.

Strangely enough, it is North Dakota that took the lead through the Bank of North Dakota in 1933 to enable any child that wanted to borrow money from the Bank of North Dakota to do so out of the fund of $150,000 that was borrowed by the State Board of Administration, of which Mrs. Jennie Ulsrud was president. One thousand and two hundred children took advantage of that loan fund, up to the amount of $300 per year, at 1 percent interest, the amount to be paid back whenever in the dim and distant future, after graduating from college, that they could afford it, and every one of you remember the pitiful tales that the newspapers of North Dakota put out—that that money was a political fund and that it never would be repaid.

Well, now, after 15 years have gone by, I am happy to say that 95 percent of the money loaned has been repaid by these students—boys and girls who today are teachers, lawyers, and doctors—men who got a splendid education in agriculture because they were able to get these loans.

Only last week a young man came down with the Farmers Union group. His father is a member of the legislature from Slope County. This young man is 25 years old, is the oldest son, and his political views are directly opposite to those of his father. He took me aside with tears in his eyes and thanked me for having helped give him the opportunity to go to college and get a splendid education.

It is my personal conviction that such educational opportunities ought to be strengthened and expanded. You will be interested to know that 1 week before the election I wrote a letter to President Truman in which I told him that I totally disagreed with the Republican platform adopted at Philadelphia which provided that these enormous oil reserves should be recognized as the property of the respective adjoining individual States. I complimented the President in having directed the Attorney General to bring a lawsuit involving the California oil reserves.

I have been down in Texas and watched the big oil companies spending millions upon millions of dollars in developing these oil reserves, which I believe belong to the American people as a whole.

In keeping with this conviction, I contacted Mr. Bernard J. Golding, one of the most brilliant attorneys in the Southwest, and asked him to bring a lawsuit for an injunction to keep these big oil companies from developing and exploiting those Gulf of Mexico reserves.

I then had Mr. Golding come to Washington and draw up the papers. We consulted with the firm of Keenan, Kanfer, Wiener and Murphy. And after an all day meeting, it was decided that a letter to the President would be more effective because a United States Senator would have no authority to bring this kind of an action.

I could not bring action as an individual and since Gov. Fred Aandahl, on February 27, 1948, telegraphed his opposition to the Federal ownership of these termendous oil deposits, it meant I also would be opposed by his attorney general at the time, Mr. Nels Johnson.

As events have turned up, action has come through President Truman's instruction to the Attorney General who is now requesting permission to bring this action into the Supreme Court. In my judgment, that permission will be granted, the same as in the California oil case, and the findings will be the same.

I have already asked permission to file a brief in the Supreme Court of the United States, setting up North Dakota's position and that of all the other inland States whereby the interests of our school children and our taxpayers will be protected.

I am satisfied that permission will be granted and I am going to file that brief.

There cannot be any doubt whatever that these tremendous oil reserves already discovered off the coast of California and in the Gulf of Mexico will continually be added to by new discoveries off the coast of Alaska and the Arctic Ocean. I want to make it very clear and that is that the position of the Supreme Court concerning the ownership of these properties, the position which I endorse wholeheartedly, does not include a claim to any oil rights in waters that lie under navigable rivers and harbors.

It is obvious that the billions of dollars represented by these reserves are part and parcel of the total wealth of natural resources which belong to the American people. An equitable distribution of the income derived from the production of this wealth is the only honest and fair-minded way to make these benefits available to the American people as a whole. We of the inland States, particularly of North Dakota, cannot find a more deserving cause to underwrite with our share of this great national wealth than that of providing the educational facilities and opportunities to keep pace with the growing needs of our rapidly expanding society. The greatest task that we confront as fellow North Dakotans and as fellow Americans is to pass on the wisdom and experiences of our generation to the next.

I am confident that the vast majority of the people of North Dakota will join with me that we may do everything in our power to meet this challenge and to keep the traditions of our great American heritage alive through the finest educational facilities and the finest teaching staff that a proud and grateful State and Nation can provide.

Tax Reduction, Revision, and Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my pleasure to participate in a radio interview with a distinguished Washington commentator, Mr. Charles Parmer, on his regular Sunday program, which, incidentally, was his one hundred and ninth Parmer-From-Washington broadcast.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of our broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX REDUCTION, REVISION, AND REPEAL

Mr. PARMER. We have in our studios today United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin. Senator WILEY is no newcomer to this microphone. Our listeners have heard him deliver vital messages on this program in the past on the theme of Government decentralization, a department of peace, and other inspiring messages. Senator WILEY is now ranking Republican member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and formerly served as its chairman. In addition, he is second highest ranking Republican Senator on the powerful Foreign Relations Committee. But our senior Senator from Wisconsin is not going to discuss either judicial or foreign problems with us today. What are you going to talk about, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Well, Charlie, we are going to discuss today one of the most important problems facing the American people today—tax reduction, revision, and repeal.

Mr. PARMER. Why do you regard it so important, Senator, as compared with some other issues?

Senator WILEY. The answer to that one, Charlie, is a quote which all our listeners have heard. It came no less than from the United States Supreme Court. The quote is: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." I repeat, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

INITIATIVE BEING DESTROYED

Mr. PARMER. What's being destroyed, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Charlie, the thing that is being destroyed is the initiative of the American people, their enterprise, their desire to build, to create new jobs, new wealth, new products. The reason their initiative is being destroyed is because we Americans today are groaning under the heaviest tax load in our peacetime history. I say it is time to call a halt.

EXCISE-TAX-REDUCTION BILL

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, in addition to what you say, I think that our listeners will be interested to know that as a man of action you have already taken steps to put your principles to work. You have already introduced a bill which would lop off $650,000,000 in excise taxes a year. Will you tell us about that bill, Senator?

Senator WILEY. I would be delighted, Charlie. The bill's number is S. 1029. Its purpose is to end the wartime levels of excise taxes on a vast number of items like furs, jewelry, cosmetics, telephones, telegrams, admission fees, photographic apparatus, ladies' handbags, purses, leather goods, entertainment, and scores of other items.

Mr. PARMER. Senator, why did you introduce that bill?

Senator WILEY. Charlie, the basic reason is that, after all, we are at peace and our United States Government made a solemn promise to the people that when the war was over, we would cut the heavy wartime tax rates—rates like 25 percent on some items and put them back to prewar levels like 5 percent or 10 percent of value. I feel that a promise made is a promise that should be kept. Moreover, I feel that Uncle Sam is not so poor that he must exorbitantly tax the lotions and powders that mothers use to handle babies, for example. Uncle Sam isn't so poor either that he requires the taxation of countless other items which the Treasury Department calls luxuries but which are absolute necessities.

OPPOSITION TO PROGRAM FOR MORE TAXES

Mr. PARMER. Wait a minute, Senator. You are talking about tax reduction and repeal, but the President is talking about more taxes. He has asked Congress for $4,000,000,000 in higher taxes.

Senator WILEY. That's right, Charlie, and I feel that the administration is absolutely wrong in recommending higher taxes at this time, especially in view of the slight recession that we have run into, the unemployment. Now is the time for lower taxes, not higher taxes. Moreover, the more taxes that we give to the administration, the more fantastic spending programs the administration is going to recommend. We used to think that the New Deal had gone crazy with its program of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. Well, the New Deal was a measly piker compared to the cockeyed idea of adding more taxes and spending more and more that the Fair Dealers are glibly recommending.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, last year you Republicans cut taxes by $4,000,000,000. Do you regret that move?

Senator WILEY. Absolutely not. The people recognize that that move was one of the many sound actions taken by the Eightieth Congress. Moreover, as the Treasury's figures prove, tax reduction actually helped encourage business. The result is that last year we collected $3,000,000,000 more in total taxes than we did the previous year. Many times in American history we have seen how wise tax reduction results not in a decrease of Federal revenue, but ultimately in an increase. The reason is that when you cut taxes you encourage initiative, you encourage corporations to expand, to add new machinery, new plant facilities, new jobs that create wealth, and through wealth we have a wider tax base to secure necessary revenue.

Mr. PARMER. Well, Senator, that seems to be the story then on the excise-tax reduction bill you have recommended, but where do we go from here?

MAKING TAXES CREATIVE, NOT DESTRUCTIVE

Senator WILEY. I think the best answer to where we go from here, Charlie, is in a single sentence: Reform our entire tax structure so that taxes become not a hindrance, not a nuisance, not a burden, but a creative stimulus to our free-enterprise system.

Mr. PARMER. Let's get specific. What do you mean?

Senator WILEY. Well, let's take the single instance of using taxes in order to meet one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation's communities today. I refer to the stream-pollution problem, with wastes fouling more and more streams and rivers throughout the land.

Mr. PARMER. What are you going to do about this stream-pollution problem, Senator?

DEDUCTING ANTIPOLLUTION EXPENSES FROM TAXES

Senator WILEY. Plenty. Tomorrow at noon, when the Senate meets, I am going to drop in a bill which will encourage businessmen to take steps to curb pollution by adding new facilities and machinery to their plants so as to eliminate wastes. The costs of this deduction would be permitted to be deducted as ordinary expenses in the year of construction. Right now businessmen can only deduct their depreciation charges on capital improvements to end pollution. The result is that our businessmen who own plants (which have a lot of waste products which cause pollution)—our businessmen are not encouraged to solve the pollution problem. Why? Because capital improvements take money, and Government isn't giving them sufficient credit in the tax set-up to meet the pollution problem.

Mr. PARMER. What does the Government think about your idea, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Well, in the last Congress there were bills for this objective. The Interior Department endorsed them, but the Treasury Department opposed them.

Mr. PARMER. Why does the Treasury Department oppose the idea, Senator WILEY?

Senator WILEY. The answer is, Charlie, that the Treasury Department feels that to give businessmen meeting the pollution problem this special feature would be giving them a distinct advantage over other taxpayers. Well, that's true to a certain extent, Charlie. But, after all, the pollution problem is a distinct problem, an extraordinary problem, and we have got to take extraordinary steps. That's why I recommend that we change our tax laws to encourage businessmen to meet the pollution problem. You know, Charlie, there is such a thing as creative taxes in place of destructive taxes. That is what I am recommending today and every day.

ENCOURAGING NEW TAXES

Mr. PARMER. Can you give us another instance of what you mean, Senator?

Senator WILEY. Absolutely. Take the housing picture. We are still faced with a critical housing shortage throughout the Nation. Our veterans who fought for us in fox holes are being required in many instances to live in rat holes, in makeshift barracks or huts, or to double up with their families. What are we going to do about it? Well, there is a lot of housing legislation pending before the Congress. I wouldn't try to comment on all of those complicated housing bills. But I do say that if we were to creatively revise our tax laws we would do this. We would permit builders to take a large depreciation on their property in making out their tax returns. After all, the value of their property is vastly overrated because of high building costs. Let them take the higher depreciation until the book value of the property is down to a fair value.

You know, Charlie, I'd be glad to fight for legislation with such a provision in order to stimulate housing construction.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. PARMER. Senator, time is getting short and so perhaps we had better summarize what you said today.

Senator WILEY. Fine. This is the essence of what I am recommending: (1) Reduce nuisance excise taxes that were set during the war. (2) Repeal completely those taxes on items on which Government shouldn't impose taxes at all, like taxes on baby powder or lotions, and a lot of other necessities. (3) Survey this whole tax field as I have proposed in Senate bill 810. Find out where the Federal Government and where the States are duplicating taxes. Cut out this duplication. Give the States and localities a chance to collect their own revenues, so they won't have to run to Uncle Sam for grants every minute of the day.

(4) While you are surveying taxes, survey this whole question of tax-exempt property. You know, Charlie, one of the reasons our cities are going broke or having such difficult financial problems is that so much of their property is tax-exempt completely. Washington, D. C., is a good example. The Federal Government has more and more property here which is tax exempt, with the result that the District of Columbia can't meet its obligations because it can't fairly tax the property. In Madison, Wis., the capital of my State, 30 percent of the property is tax exempt, and a good deal of that is Federal property. We cannot allow that condition to continue if we are to enable our States and localities to meet their obligations.

(5) Change our tax laws so that we encourage businessmen and others to meet the pollution problem, to meet the housing problem and other urgent problems. Yes; I say give them a tax advantage, make an exception of their case. That exception is necessary if we are to meet these problems. (6) Tell the administration in no uncertain terms that we are going to turn down flatly its cockeyed ideas of $4,000,000,000 more in taxes. We want less taxes, not more taxes; less Federal spending, not more spending. We want the adoption of the Hoover Commission reports, to cut down Government overhead, eliminate needless bureaus. Thus it won't be necessary for the Congress to add more weight to the tax burden on our people. We have got to get away from the idea of socking and soaking the middle-class taxpayer, particularly the little fellow who is the backbone of our whole system, the little fellow whom the Fair Dealers want to smack so hard that he will lose his business and join the proletariat. Well, Charlie, that is part of my over-all tax program.

Mr. PARMER. Thank you, Senator. Now, Senator, I was down at the White House this morning. The word is that the President feels like going out, making a campaign to the people; that is, on his legislative program—public housing, Federal aid to education, general health program; all of that will call for a bit of taxation. What do you say to that?

Senator WILEY. I've already commented on this cockeyed notion of more taxes. As for the President going out to the people, that is, of course, in the exercise of his own prerogative. I should say that the opposition party would welcome such a situation. It would again give the opposition the opportunity—which it muffed in the last campaign—to argue out the issues; to again put out the facts, and tell a few of the things that weren't told in the last campaign. I think it would be a good idea to have a post-campaign campaign so to speak.

Mr. PARMER. Well, will you lead it?

Senator WILEY. Will I lead it?

Mr. PARMER. Yes, you.

Senator WILEY. I'll be glad to engage in it, of course, and do my part. My whole theory and idea of politics is not to confuse, but to bring light into a picture. If the people will reason this out, will cut out the wild talk, the false propaganda, the loose concepts, the repetition of lies, the people will be benefited. However, if we go into a class war, figuratively speaking, or if we go into a mere propaganda campaign, or engage in an ideological scrap without reference to the facts, we won't get anywhere. Therefore, let's keep it on a high level if we do have this second opportunity.

Mr. PARMER. Senator WILEY, I'd say you are for tax reduction.

Senator WILEY. Charlie, I certainly am.

Mr. PARMER. Thank you, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin. I know that you in turn would be glad to hear from our listeners and get their reactions to your ideas.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Senator from the great State of Wisconsin, who has discussed with us today one of the crucial problems facing the American people—tax reduction, revision, and repeal.

The Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me before the Senate Committee on Finance on House bill 1211, which is presently being considered by the Finance Committee. House bill 1211 is a bill to repeal the act of 1948 extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for only 1 year in modified form and to reenact the previous Reciprocal Trade Act for 3 years from June 12, 1948.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT MUST BE RESTORED

At Philadelphia last July, the Democratic Party drafted a national platform which contained this unequivocal statement:

"We pledge ourselves to restore the reciprocal trade agreements program formulated in 1934 by Cordell Hull and operated successfully for 14 years—until crippled by the Republican Eightieth Congress."

This bill, H. R. 1211, as reported by the House Ways and Means Committee and as passed by an overwhelming vote of the House on February 9, is the vehicle for carrying out that pledge. It repeals the Eightieth Congress act and extends the previous act for 3 years from last June.

The Democratic House in the Eighty-first Congress has done its part on this issue, and I am sure the Democratic Senate in this Congress will do likewise.

As chairman of the committee which drafted that platform, I realize, of course, that not every pledge in the Democratic platform has the complete and enthusiastic backing of every Democratic Member of Congress. The platform, however, does represent the convictions of the majority of the delegates to our convention on every issue, and the almost unanimous opinion of the

party's representatives in Congress on most issues.

This is one of those issues on which our party has stood united and strong over the years since the first Roosevelt Administration.

All of us in the Democratic Party have welcomed the support of a great number of outstanding Republicans and of the great mass of the Republican rank-and-file of voters on the issue of reciprocal trade, which is recognized as an integral part of the bipartisan foreign policy, a foreign policy which is slowly but steadily winning the battle for a decent world in which men can be free.

As I listened to the debate in the Senate last year on the crippled reciprocal trade bill which was then before us, and as I have reread that debate from time to time since then, I became convinced that the responsible spokesmen for the bipartisan foreign policy on the Republican side of the aisle in the Senate were struggling desperately to save as much of the original act as possible but were forced to go along with this crippled bill out of a fear that any attempt to strengthen it—as the then Senator BARKLEY and just about all of the Democrats sought to do—would result in a stalemate with the House leaving us with no reciprocal trade act at all.

This fear was indicated in the speeches of nearly all of those Republicans who have joined with us in a genuine defense of the bipartisan foreign policy.

The situation is entirely changed now. The House has given us a good bill—a bill which conforms in almost every detail with the original Cordell Hull program, a bill which adopts the principles which we attempted to put back in the act by means of the Barkley amendments of last year, all of which were defeated on strictly party-line votes.

Every Democratic Senator, I firmly believe, who was here last year and who supported the Barkley amendments will support this bill as it came from the House this year. And the new Democratic Senators who ran on the Democratic platform are, I am sure, committed to the forthright pledge it contains on the reciprocal trade program.

The folly and fallacies of the bill passed last year by the Republican Eightieth Congress became obvious shortly after the bill was enacted. The State Department attempted to enter into negotiations with other nations for new trade agreements, reciprocally reducing tariffs and thereby stimulating international trade and thus stimulating one of the greatest avenues to the achievement of world peace.

It discovered, according to information which I obtained from the Department from time to time over the summer and fall, that it found great reluctance on the part of many nations even to join in initial conversations for the simple reason that the act under which these agreements were to be negotiated had a life of only 1 year—and that first 9 or 10 months of that year would be consumed in preliminary procedures required under the truncated act.

Sure enough, after a number of nations did indicate a willingness to discuss reciprocal tariff reductions on a variety of products, the whole matter had to be turned over to the Tariff Commission for these seemingly endless investigations and studies in regard to so-called peril points. The Republican act of 1948 required that the Tariff Commission be given 4 months for this research.

Thus, under this present act, it will be about April 1 before the State Department and the nations with which it has held preliminary discussions on new agreements can again sit down and resume negotiations on specific tariffs. That means that the 1-year program authorized by the Republican Eightieth Congress would be expiring soon after negotiations started.

I am afraid that if the same party which had been in power in the Eightieth Congress had succeeded in capturing the Eighty-first Congress, the reciprocal trade program which was so badly battered in the Eightieth Congress would have been dealt the final death blow in the Eighty-first.

Most Americans genuinely concerned about our bipartisan foreign policy recognized that fact regardless of their political affiliations or views on domestic issues.

Throughout the Eightieth Congress, there was an obvious feeling of tension among supporters of our foreign policy that isolationism as reflected in such a large group of the majority party of the Eightieth Congress would destroy the careful groundwork which had been laid for world peace and world decency.

This tension evaporated completely when the new Congress was elected. The American people were sure that this Congress would give more than lip service to the bipartisan foreign policy but would implement it with legislation and, when necessary, with funds.

That is what we in the Democratic Party intend to do and that is what we will do.

I therefore sincerely urge that those Republican members of this committee and of the Senate who believe in the bipartisan foreign policy, as many do, join with the majority party in reporting out this bill favorably, without any of the unlamented provisions of the bill enacted last year, and help us to put this program back into operation along the lines it followed so successfully for 14 years.

Farm Price Supports and Economic Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the matter of price supports and economic stabilization.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM PRICE SUPPORTS AND ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

"Let the farmer be the goat."

Nobody says that out loud. Perhaps few people admit, even to themselves, that such a thought is in their minds. But that is the essence of oft-repeated objections to the farm price-support program.

Those who object to farm price supports have now "discovered" that the program is "inconsistent" with the Administration's economic stabilization policy. Last summer it was "discovered" that Congress could do nothing effective about high prices "because supports hold up farm prices."

Like flying saucers and pink elephants, these discoveries are more apparent than real.

The truth is that farm prices came down a lot last year, while industrial prices went up.

Does that sound as if farm price supports were holding up the cost of living?

Last summer, when all the noise was made by those who opposed the President's anti-inflation program, the high-priced foods that worried consumers—milk and butter, for example, and chicken, pork, beef, and other meats—were above the price-support levels and, obviously, were not being held up by the price-support program. In fact, beef and veal were not even covered by the price-support law. Furthermore, on farm commodities that were dipping down to the support level there was such a wide spread between the farm price and the retail price of food derived from those farm products that no logical person could possibly blame the supports. For example, bread went up while wheat was going down almost a third in 9 months, and it didn't seem quite sensible to blame price supports for that. The support price for eggs out in the country had little relationship with the prices city consumers paid for eggs, which were in abnormal demand because of the meat shortage. Potatoes, of course, were supported at a higher level than they will be from now on, but they represent a very small part of the cost of living. If growers had received only half as much, potatoes would have cost the average consumer about $1.50 less per year.

At the very time the storm of criticism broke, price supports were actually holding down the cost of living by encouraging farmers to produce at record levels, assuring them that they would not have to go through the economic wringer. Farmers were willing to produce so much—not because supports were holding up prices but because the Government's commitment of support took some of the gamble out of the future. Farmers knew that if their prices tumbled to support levels, they would stop there instead of going on down as they did in the days before price-support programs were devised. This was proved in the market break of February 1948 and again, it appears, this month.

We all know that farm prices dropped 50 percent within 12 months back in the early 1920's, and this laid the groundwork for a major depression that hurt all of us.

Today the price-support system will help prevent such a disaster. On the other hand, price supports do not prevent farm prices from coming down gradually. The support level automatically comes down if prices paid by farmers come down. It should also be remembered that when farm prices come down to support levels, farmers are getting less than parity—less than fair prices.

Far from being inconsistent with a policy of economic stabilization, the farm program is an integral part of such a policy.

In the American free-enterprise economy, one of the most difficult problems is how to maintain balance between the farm and nonfarm segments. This is the lesson of history, and it is true today, as we can readily learn if we will only let our eyes see the facts spread out before them.

In 1948, despite our price-support system, farmers got an average of 20 percent less than in 1947 for their crops. They got 7 percent less for their livestock and livestock products. The average of all prices received by farmers went down 13 percent. On the other hand, prices paid by farmers went down less than 2 percent, and this drop in average was due mainly to a big drop in prices paid for feed. In other words, most of the drop in prices paid by farmers was due to a drop in prices to farmers, the producers of feed.

Industrial products as a whole went up in 1948, and some important basic items went up 40, 50, and 60 percent.

Let me put this another way. Agriculture last year set a new record in output—the sixth in 9 years—and prices went down. In industry, shortages of basic materials held production of most goods well within the bounds of demand, and prices kept on going up. Recent production statistics show drastic cuts in the manufacture of washing machines and vacuum cleaners. Some automobile manufacturers have issued statements

warning that they are cutting or may cut production.

Thus, the stage is being set for a possible reenactment of the old tragedy of falling farm prices and rising or steady industrial prices. The hope that the old drama of the past will not be repeated lies in our farm program, which we already have and will improve, and in other measures embodied in President Truman's stabilization program. Some of those measures are already in effect, and I am sure we will have the good sense to add those which are now pending.

Whenever I hear or read statements which boil down to "let the farmer be the goat," I remember that goats sometimes are used in packing plants to lead sheep to slaughter.

In the past when we have let the farmer be the goat, he has perforce led us all to the merciless slaughter of depression. And unlike the "Judas goat" of the packing house, the farmer is the first to go on the block.

Not only in justice to the farmer but also in its own self-interest, the public needs a strong economic stabilization program, including effective farm-price supports.

The Meaning of Intellectual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered at the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., February 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEANING OF INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

Intellectual freedom, like all freedoms, is not absolute. On first thought, it seems that nothing can control the wanderings of the mind. With a simple task to perform, requiring full mental employment, our minds seem to jump to every corner of the globe when we want to concentrate on the paragraph in front of us. However, freedoms have limitations. The mind itself can no more wander into the realms of the unknown than can we earthbound creatures take a hop, skip, and jump to the moon. Still all things made by man are conceived by the mind first. Religionists say that all things in creation were first spiritually created before they were physically created. I do not know what either of these two propositions actually mean. But our own experience shows us that those things which men have said could not be done actually have been done because one or a few men have thought they could be done.

The great Arctic explorer Peary is the first man I met who seriously got me interested in aviation. He did it by explaining how much more could be done by the many directional freedoms an airplane has over anything that moves on the surface of the earth. I accepted his thesis as true. From that day on I was sure men would fly. Then I read an article, I think in the old North American Review, which said that men can fly, but they never will, because while they can get off the ground they will never be able to land again and remain alive. Thus flying in my mind became not a problem of getting up in the air and staying there but of getting back again if flying were to become useful. Then came the time when men had proved their ability to get up in the air, to stay up, and to come down, but the world was not doing much about it. At that time I felt wholeheartedly that the only way to make flying successful was to give Government a sanction to go into this field with a strong and vigorous program, and I introduced the Army air base bill. This idea met with no enthusiasm in the Army generally because the leaders said aviation must always be an auxiliary force. Six years after that we found ourselves in war. Everybody was doing everything that could be done. Lethargy was removed from the minds of men, and because the ultimate end was destruction men followed the old habit of civilization in their thoughts, forgetting all the rules of good government, and expended all of their energies for waste and destruction. That is the way of war. Men never think straight when their minds are dominated by fear and hate. Yet under the stress of war, fear, and hate, some of our greatest scientific inventions have come into being.

At the beginning of the war we were building planes, tearing them to pieces, putting them in boxes, and then shipping them to some place like Egypt. When the planes arrived at their destination they had to be taken out of a box, put together again before they could fly, and, of course, in each case we forgot to send a monkey wrench along with the boxed plane. It was at this time I made a suggestion in a speech delivered at the banquet when Tom Beck, of the Crowell-Collier Corp., received the Hawkes award in New York. I pointed out how wars in the past had been won by new ideas, and I suggested that from that night on our slogan for sure victory should be "airplanes direct from the factory to the battlefield." The practical-minded, the men in the know, and the newspapers discounted the idea. However, it was not long before little girls were flying the planes from the factory to the battlefields, landing at airports which were built solely for ferrying purposes.

Now, I do not know how to fly. I have never been interested in aviation from a scientific, personal standpoint. If I have had any training in my life, it has been in government. But here comes the real key to the practical aspect of the science foundation bill and the problem you have given me tonight, the meaning of intellectual freedom. In the field of science, in the field of intelligence, the untrained idea might go quite as far as the deduction sometimes reached from conclusions drawn wholly from knowledge which has been gained from actual experience. Therefore there must be a sort of intellectual freedom of the mind which at least keeps the skeptics from throwing out all ideas excepting those which come from their own caste thinking and experience. In other words, caste thought produces good Brahmans, but it does not produce good democrats (spelled, of course, with the little "d").

The man in the exact sciences who thinks there is no room for social science in a science foundation bill may be curbing that thought which may go further in making the exact sciences contribute to the ultimate good of mankind than anything else. I am utterly opposed to letting the practical, the trained, those "who think they know" be the sole rulers of this world, despite the fact that I am the author of the soldier education bill.

In my reading of history I have not found what was the original motive behind most of the good things that have happened to man in the development of our culture and our civilization. I would point out, however, that I have been told that the old gentleman who contributed as much to the development of the loud speaker for radio as anyone was a religious zealot who believed in the "second coming" so literally that he thought that, if the Master were to come again, He would want to speak to all of the people in the world. Therefore something ought to be done to make it possible.

Now intellectual freedom may be a bad thing. The ability which man has acquired to reproduce voices from all parts of the world has probably brought as much confusion to the thinking of man as it has contributed to his comfort and to his joy. It has been said that Mr. Edison, when told that probably he could be given a device which would cure his deafness, decided that being deaf was not so bad after all for his purposes.

Many a time as a missionary, carrying a message which I believe to be the truth, I realized that if anyone accepted my message there would be no peace in his heart again and in the hearts of his neighbors toward him. Truth in the guise of a new idea is an upsetter, not a leveler of life's pathway. Yet who dares stop an enlargement of truth. It is in the ultimate that truth makes man free, not in the process of its realization. Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother," etc.

Freedom never means license even in the realm of thought. There is as much danger that will come from absolute and complete intellectual freedom as from any of the other freedoms. Good taste must find a place in the use of all freedoms. There is a great risk in any one of the freedoms, as has been said so many times. The man who is free to dig in his garden may accidentally turn up an earthworm which may give him other ideas and instead of digging in his garden he may go fishing. What is really the matter with us is that we are as much afraid of intellectual freedom as we are of any other kind. It is the fear of change that bothers most men. They want to be free to do anything in their way. Throughout the whole of Christendom most everyone repeats the Lord's prayer which suggests that the Master's Kingdom come again. But nearly everyone prays with the faith that it won't happen until after next Thursday because if the Kingdom came before that day it might interfere with the meeting of the sewing club.

In my own State it took us nearly 75 years to appreciate the beauties of our canyons. The worth of scenery does not dawn on anyone seeking a spot to plant needed food. The average monk, as he traveled through the Alps during what we call the Dark Ages in European history, thought so much about heaven that he did not notice earth, excepting for once in a while to cuss the difficult roads or become a bit impatient because his mule became exhausted. We are that way today.

The thinking through and analyzing of present-day problems is harder than writing Utopias. It is easier to hold out the hope of heaven than to correct an ill on earth. Fighting the devil seems to be no hazard at all if we may judge from health and accident premiums. A minister of the gospel gets the lowest rate. It is hard to get a new idea. It is harder still to express it. But it is harder than that to get it published. But the hardest of all hard things in relation to anything new is to get someone else to accept it.

All thoughtful persons condemn what we call sloganized thinking. But thinking in and of itself is not enough. It is the slogan that puts the thought over.

In the war days the ideas that came over my desk for ways to win the war were so many that there was hardly a day that went by that I didn't refer something to the committee that was handling those ideas. I

remember one idea coming in in the form of what I called a mathematical formula. I smiled and said to someone that here's a guy who is going to win the war by a formula. Then I heard of Mr. Einstein explaining what he had worked out to the President. Had Mr. Einstein brought the other fellow's mathematical formula personally to me instead of the man himself sending it through the mail it might have had a better chance. But the point is—are we big enough to lay aside the notion that there is an aristocracy of good thinking?

I told of the soldier education bill at the last international conference I attended, and I mentioned that 2,000,000-odd leaders would be created through that act. I thought the whole world understood what American democracy meant, and it was with that enthusiasm I spoke, only to find myself almost completely squelched when one of the leaders of one of the finest little oligarchies in the world asked me after the speech: "What is America going to do with all their leaders?"

I remember writing a sentence during Hitler's first year wherein I said: "Hitler removes the responsibility for thinking from the people. He knows what is for their best good, and they leave it to him. But that is not the way free men live and work." The weakness of the German people was shown, for when Hitler fell the German people fell. And that people is still today without leadership. Intellectual freedom, above all things, means that there is no place for the single will in the state, in the association, or in the group if democracy is to work. It is hard for us to see sometimes that liberty means everything if men are to be men, but to those who are thoughtful about the development of man in the course of civilization this thesis is crystal clear.

We say now that Washington was great because he was not afraid of counsel and discussion; in fact he went out of his way to seek it. When members of clubs, labor unions, employers' associations, or even the Congress of the United States find themselves in the midst of discussions, sometimes individual argument and the discussion itself slip to a level which makes no one pround, but out of it come great things. Out of it we find democracy seeking the truth. Out of it come that unity and stability which reflect so well our democracy, a unity which is attained after harsh discussion. We call it freedom of speech. It is much more than that. It is man learning how to live with his fellow men, learning how to reason out his problems, and learning how to gain understanding.

As I pointed out in the first of my remarks, intellectual freedom can never be any freer than the bounds of its physical, mental, political, and economic environments. If we are to attain the ultimate which a free mind should offer, we can do it only when the bounds which pin us down are made less narrow. There are not many freedoms; there is in reality only one freedom, for the many are so closely related. Perhaps it is better to call it man's free agency. If we could once attain the freedom from fear of what our neighbor may think, we may go very far. The sad part of this whole portrayal is that those who realize and know that Socrates drank the hemlock because he had a new idea that did not fit the notions of his contemporaries and that Jesus was hung on the cross because he too was not appreciated by the people of his time are the hardest to budge in their own communities and in their own environments. It is easy to be a martyr if one imagines he lived 2,000 years ago. But it is just as hard to go down to one's grave and take with one an idea which would have helped mankind unnoticed, not recognized, and socially lost as it ever was. This is the trial that he who accepts the invitation of intellectual freedom must face.

The Role of the Lawyer in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Role of the Lawyer in Government," delivered by the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Bar Association in Washington, D. C., on February 16, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The role of the lawyer in government has become increasingly important in recent years. The growing complexity of our national problems in both the domestic and the international fields, which has made necessary a great expansion in public administration, has placed ever increasing demands on those with legal training.

Since the time of the establishment of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congress has recognized the desirability of delegating to special administrative bodies the power to administer specialized activities of the Government. The Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and many others, now are accepted as part of our everyday life along with the older established agencies. And each of these many agencies, in greater or less degree, has an influence on the economic welfare of the Nation.

The work of the lawyer in the administrative agencies of the Government is concerned largely, of course, with the conventional aspect of legal work—with the analysis, the interpretation, and the application of specific laws dealing with such matters as taxation, commerce, shipping, agriculture, labor relations, natural resources, and a wide variety of other subjects. More in the public eye, perhaps, is the conduct in the Federal courts of prosecutions by the Government for violation of law, or of defense of the Government from suits brought against it.

Of increasing importance, however, particularly from the viewpoint of its influence on the national welfare, is the rendering of legal advice in the formulation of important policy decisions.

The legal training of the lawyer contributes to a balanced judgment in selecting constructive actions to be taken and suitable means of carrying out these actions. It enables him to aid in the planning and organizing of effective management programs. It leads to skill in suggesting methods of coordinating the efforts of personnel.

Because of the wide variety of tasks that fall to them as legal specialists, many Government lawyers are inevitably drawn into the broader stream of general administration.

Thus the effectiveness of a Government lawyer's work must depend to an important degree on an understanding of the problems of the various Government agencies, and on a broad knowledge of the effect which important policy decisions may have on the national welfare.

From this viewpoint, I should like to tell you about some major problems of the Treasury Department and the policies we are following in meeting these problems. I shall confine my discussion to the important matters of fiscal policy which come before me as Secretary of the Treasury, centering around the management of our large public debt.

The Treasury Department has many responsibilities, but its primary one is that of maintaining confidence in the credit of the United States.

In any nation, economic development will be slow, uncertain, and dangerous unless it is based upon a foundation of national confidence. This fact has been made clearly evident among the nations of the world today, where even moderate differences in national confidence have been plainly reflected in their economic progress.

To maintain our position of economic leadership, the people of this country must continue to have confidence in their future, in the security of their jobs, in the safety of their investments, in the soundness of their banking system. Above all, national prosperity must be predicated upon the financial soundness of their Government.

I feel this to be particularly essential today, not only in the interest of our own economic position, but because the people of all the democratic countries of the world rely upon the United States as a bulwark of economic and financial strength.

This objective has involved two separate lines of action: to develop a sound fiscal policy, and to manage the public debt in such a way as to assure the Government's credit.

A sound fiscal policy must be based upon a revenue system that will meet the cost of prescribed Government functions, and provide adequate funds to reduce the public debt.

The correct management of the public debt has been a task unprecedented in our history. The national debt was expanded by the requirements of war financing to a peak of $280,000,000,000 in early 1946. Though it has since then been reduced appreciably, the debt still exceeds $250,000,000,000.

The visible evidence of this debt, of course, is in the bonds, notes, and other Government securities held by individuals, banks, insurance companies, and other institutions. Its most painful feature to many of us is the interest cost of close to $5,500,000,000 annually, which is nearly 15 percent of present Federal expenditures.

One-third of the Federal debt is held by the banking system; one-fourth is held by individuals, largely in savings bonds; another one-fourth is held by insurance companies, business corporations, and other nonbank investors, and about 15 percent by Federal agencies and trust funds.

Before the war, the public debt was less than 25 percent of all public and private debt. Now, it constitutes some 55 percent of the total debt of the Nation. The large proportionate size of the Federal debt makes it the dominant factor in determining interest rates on private debt and the return on private investments. Thus, the prices of Government bonds and other securities have a far greater effect on the interests of all of us than they had in former years.

Because the Federal debt is so intertwined in the financial and economic structure of the Nation, its management is a matter of grave responsibility. This responsibility, by law, must be exercised by the Secretary of the Treasury himself.

Since I came to the Treasury in June 1946, I have felt that stability in the markets for Government securities would encourage business confidence during the reconversion period and would aid materially in promoting our industrial development.

Therefore, during my tenure of office, the Treasury has directed its efforts toward maintaining such stability. In cooperation with

the Federal Reserve, we have sought to maintain bond-market stability in both directions—to keep bond prices from going up too fast and to keep them from going down too sharply. Beginning in the spring of 1947, we took various actions to control an incipient boom in the bond market. When conditions changed and selling pressure on bond prices developed, we stabilized the market through purchases of bonds. In recent months the pressure has again been upward and we are again selling bonds to stabilize prices.

It may be reasonably said that the bond-stabilization program has contributed materially toward promoting financial and business confidence and has helped to stabilize our entire economy. The present situation contrasts markedly with that after the First World War, when a severe decline in Government-bond prices was a factor contributing to a business collapse within 2 years after the war ended.

The responsibility for the management of our huge national debt is not mine alone; it is the responsibility and concern of the entire Nation. The burden of the interest cost is with us year after year. At $5,500,000,000 annually, it amounts to some $10,000 a minute, and it will continue, regardless of whether business is good or bad.

It is essential that we provide in our budget program for a consistent policy of debt reduction. It is particularly necessary in our national financing to follow the sound business policy of reducing the debt in prosperous years.

Now we are enjoying the greatest prosperity in our history. If any time were propitious for reducing the Federal debt, this should be it. Yet, because of the tax reduction last year, the prospect is actually for a budget deficit of $600,000,000 in the current fiscal year, and an even larger deficit next year.

The President has asked for a tax increase of $4,000,000,000, a part of which would be applied toward reducing the debt. It is highly essential that this increase be granted.

There has been some tendency recently to argue that reduction of the debt should be postponed until the business outlook becomes clearer, in view of recent downturns in agricultural prices, and some softening of business in certain lines.

These developments, in my opinion, represent no more than a further readjustment in our national economy to normal buyers' markets and normal competitive conditions. Several such readjustments have occurred previously in the 3 years since the war ended, with only temporary effect on production and incomes. They are part of the essential process of reestablishing the economy on a sound basis for a further advance.

We hear of some increase in unemployment, but the important fact is that the total number of persons employed in the United States during January was at an all-time high record for that month.

We hear of some reduction in farm incomes and of a disappointing Christmas season for retail stores, but the important fact is that total personal income in both November and December rose to new all-time highs.

We hear of some slackening in residential construction, but heavy construction is continuing at a very high level. Heavy construction contract awards in January exceeded all previous records for the month. The great demand for steel from many sources is keeping the steel industry operating at peak rates. The output of steel in January broke all previous records.

There is every reason to believe that the economic situation remains basically strong. It is true that the urgent demand for many products due to wartime shortages has now largely disappeared. Salesmanship and quality are now needed for selling goods. But this is merely part of the inevitable process of getting back to normal. It paves the way for promising developments in many kinds of consumer goods which have been awaiting a return to fully competitive conditions. I see great opportunities for business in the years immediately ahead.

Your work as lawyers in the Federal Government places you in a peculiar position of responsibility, a position not ordinarily shared by those in private practice.

I refer to the fact that the lawyer in Government represents not only the Government agency that employs him, but should also represent the interests of the people at large, from whom the Government derives its sovereign powers.

The record which he establishes in any given case must withstand scrutiny not only as an example of faithful and honest discharge of duty to employer, but on the broader basis of how well it fits into the whole picture of traditional Government justice and fair play.

This is rightly so, for if he is one-sided, if he seeks to use the law or regulatory power arbitrarily or autocratically, if he disregards the rights of a single citizen or any group of citizens, or if he shows a disposition to seek out the merits of only one side of a controversy, the public will be quick to condemn.

The more the Government lawyer appreciates the potentialities of his role as protector of the citizen and of the agency alike from the dangers of an arbitrary, one-sided approach, the greater will be his influence in making the law serve right and justice. The more, too, will he earn respect from the people for his profession and the better will he sustain both effective public management and democratic Government.

Our traditional concept of Government is one of laws, not of men, which is merely another way of saying that we prefer a democratic process to an autocratic or dictatorial form of government. The Constitution and Federal Statutes are the tools with which you work primarily, and the training you receive in these wide fields is a source of strength to the whole country. Many of you, like your predecessors, will leave the Federal Government to enter private law practice, to enter the legislative bodies of your State, or the Congress—or to enter into the stream of industry and commerce. But wherever you go, or wherever you may be, I know that you will take with you this rich experience gained in the crucible of a working democracy.

To those of you who will remain in the Federal service, and to those who will follow in your footsteps, I urge you to give serious thought to the great responsibilities which face us now, and which will face us in the future. Your continued attention to the vital legal machinery of the Federal Government is a source of pride and satisfaction to all who know of your contribution to the democratic process.

Program for Democracy by Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of the resolutions committee adopted at the eleventh annual stockholders meeting of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, at St. Paul, Minn., relating to a program for democracy.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE AT THE ELEVENTH ANNUAL STOCKHOLDERS MEETING OF FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, ST. PAUL., MINN.

Members of resolutions committee: Ervin Schumacher, Drayton, N. Dak., chairman; R. W. Redlin, Crosby, N. Dak.; Jeff H. Tikkanen, New York Mills, Minn.; Wallace Weir, Ulm, Mont.; August E. Zamow, Watertown, S. Dak.

PREAMBLE

The year 1948 is the eleventh year of GTA. Our achievements in the year that has just drawn to a close are most encouraging. The very things that many critics said we couldn't do—have been accomplished.

However, there is a lot of building left to be done. We shall strive constantly and vigorously for an agricultural position consistent in every way with other members of this Nation's economy.

We are sincerely grateful for the loyalty and devotion of our members, our employees, and our leaders; all have contributed in wonderful measure to the success of GTA.

Our task is to strive constantly by every action and deed to be worthy of continued confidence and support.

We should dedicate ourselves to the building of a bigger and far greater cooperative, whose sole purpose is to serve its members better.

Working toward this goal, your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION 1—THE 100-PERCENT-PATRONAGE GOAL

We congratulate the member associations which this year joined the honor roll of those which are marketing their grain 100 percent through the GTA.

We desire to call to the attention of such member associations which do not now market all of their grain through GTA, to study once more the advantages of so doing, in order to increase the proportion of grain marketed cooperatively at both the local and regional level.

It is clearly a matter of good business for every association to use fully the marketing facilities they own. The objective of 100-percent patronage by all of the members of GTA must be a continuing objective and it should be realized more fully during 1949.

We recommend that GTA keep an honor roll and that it inaugurate a policy of issuing annual citations to all member associations which ship 100 percent to GTA.

RESOLUTION 2—A SQUARE DEAL FOR FARMERS

Taking note of the increasing frequency of forecasts that a depression is inevitably ahead and the seeming acceptance of a philosophy that such a depression cannot be prevented, this convention goes on record that in its opinion depressions are preventable just as peace is attainable. We note, too, the general acceptance of a belief that farmers must suffer a depression as the first step in a general depression. Again we desire to reaffirm our belief that agriculture need not be crucified and the millions of people who devote themselves to the production of food and fibers need not be sacrificed to a whimsical economic cycle.

A depression in agriculture will lead inevitably to unemployment, to lowered national and individual incomes. We urge that first consideration should be given to providing a framework within which agriculture can function securely against a serious depression.

We believe that support prices, soil conservation, and the ever-normal granary, constitute the basis of an effective program in fighting an agricultural depression. We feel that assurance of an adequate share of the national income to American agriculture is a major weapon to prevent depression.

We, therefore, recommend that:

The new Congress enact legislation in 1949 which will first provide a new parity formula which is fair to farmers and to the consumers of the Nation. We recommend that support prices be established pursuant to this fair parity formula under which farmers shall be assured not of fractional parity but of 100 percent of the parity prices. These prices should be consistent with the objective of abundant production.

We believe that in the new legislation, account should be taken of the family-type farm which is occupied by its owner. We cannot ignore the social significance of farm families living under conditions where they have an opportunty for decent living standards, including adequate health protection, good housing, and reasonable educational opportunities for farm children.

We believe, too, consideration should be given by Congress to the establishment of a commercial wheat area, similar in principle to the commercial corn area principle first enacted by Congress in 1936. This principle would assist farmers largely limited to wheat production to continue supplying the Nation's needs for wheat in abundant measure.

RESOLUTION 3—A NATIONAL GRAIN STORAGE PROGRAM

We deplore action of the Eightieth Congress in restricting the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease or build storage. We believe that the Eighty-first Congress has an outstanding opportunity to correct this by enacting policies which will provide the Nation with an adequate grain-storage program.

Such policies should contemplate the stock piling of grain as a national food defense measure, and to assist in keeping an adequate supply so as to reduce the dangers of scarcity. This will help to assure fair and stable prices to consumers; it will provide insurance against drought and other weather disaster.

The farmer, however, should not be expected to finance the cost of this type of national food insurance. He should not suffer in the market place because his willingness to produce abundantly has eliminated scarcity.

In addition to support price legislation to protect the farm, authority should be granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation under which it is authorized to make long-term, self-liquidating loans, at a low rate of interest, to producers and associations of producers so as to supplement the present limited storage facilities. Existing facilities are inadequate if we are to stock-pile wheat, corn, and other grains adequately to meet any crisis ahead.

The storage program should enable farmers, where this is the wise course of action to expand farm storage. This is often true in the case of corn. This program should also enable associations of producers to expand substantially local, subterminal and terminal storage of corn, wheat and other grains.

The plan of financing should be patterned after that so successfully employed by the Rural Electrification Administration. Thus, the REA idea would assist farmers and the Nation, as a whole, in meeting the urgent storage situation with full ultimate repayment of capital, with interest, to the Government.

RESOLUTION 4—BANKS FOR COOPERATIVES

We strongly favor legislation which will enable farmers, through their cooperatives, to acquire the capital and control of the Central and District Banks for Cooperatives over a period of years. Legislation was introduced in the Eightieth Congress, but rejected by it, looking toward the attainment of this important objective.

The Banks for Cooperatives, together with the other agencies of the Farm Credit Administration, have been helpful to agriculture and its institutions.

But, as a result of inflation, lowering the value of the dollar, the Banks for Cooperatives must have an increase in their capital if they are to perform the functions for which they were established.

RESOLUTION 5—INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

We are mindful of the refusal of the Eightieth Congress to ratify the proposed international wheat agreement, which would have been an important step forward in the field of international cooperation, as well as in assuring this Nation of a reasonable share of the world export market for wheat in future years.

We endorse the effort of the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, to renegotiate an agreement and we urge that in event a satisfactory agreement is negotiated that it be supported by the Congress of the United States.

We feel that such an agreement should insure a supply of wheat for years to come for the many nations which depend upon imports of wheat, while at the same time facilitating the orderly sale by countries capable of producing wheat for export.

Through international cooperation lay many of our hopes for the future; such cooperation will not be achieved in single large slices of achievement, but in achievement bit by bit.

The international wheat agreement is an important contribution, looking toward more international cooperation and world peace.

RESOLUTION 6—THE TAXATION OF FARM COOPERATIVES

We are aware that there will be no let-up in the effort of the National Tax Equality Association to injure cooperatives.

This association in seeking national legislation to tax farm cooperative savings before the distribution of such savings in the form of patronage refunds.

Such a proposal is clearly unconstitutional. Congress has rejected it on several occasions. However, we believe that all farmers who are members of cooperatives or who benefit from cooperatives established in their area, should be alerted to the activity of NTEA.

The general public, too, is being misled into the belief that farm cooperatives are tax dodgers. This is in complete contradiction to the findings of the United States Treasury Department.

It is our belief that the effort of the NTEA is not truly inspired by any concern for the National Government revenues, but that its campaign is maintained to destroy farm cooperatives because of the competition they are providing in the marketing of farm products.

RESOLUTION 7—THE FARMERS UNION HERALD

The Farmers Union Herald is a welcome and valuable visitor to 200,000 farm homes in the Northwest. It is an outstanding source of information for us. It has improved steadily over the years.

We commend the Herald's alert and aggressive editorial policy and urge it be continued. We favor further growth and expansion for the Herald. It deserves GTA's fullest support and the support of every one of our members and the members of the other Farmers Union regional cooperatives which sponsor the Herald.

RESOLUTION 8—STATE ORGANIZATIONS OF THE FARMERS UNION

We favor continued financial support of the State organizations of the Farmers Union in the States in which the GTA is operating. The State organizations, as well as the National Farmers Union are advancing steadily and understanding and appreciation of the objectives, the methods, and the significance of cooperative endeavor among the rank and file of farmers.

These organizations also are fighting the political battle on many fronts, State, and national. On these fronts the enemies of farm cooperatives have concentrated in their efforts to destroy the teamwork of farmers because they fear and dislike the competition which farm cooperatives are at last providing in the farm marketing and supply fields.

We believe these Farmers Union organizations should be supported financially by all cooperatives, regional and local.

We recommend that all member cooperatives pay educational funds to their Farmer Union State organizations and that they consider the use of some type of a dues-check-off plan to help the Farmers Union maintain a stable membership.

RESOLUTION 9—ASSOCIATED INSTITUTIONS

We commend the work of the Terminal Insurance Agency, the Farmers Union Grain & Supply Co., and the Great Plains Supply Co. They have strengthened the cooperative movement in the Northwest and have been of great usefulness to farmers. We commend our board of directors for aiding the growth of these institutions during the past year, especially by the purchase of a wholesale lumber house, the Minot Builders Supply Co. We avor further expansion of these valuable activities. We also endorse the Grain Terminal Foundation.

RESOLUTION 10—REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

We favor strongly development of the resources of the Missouri Valley for the benefit of all the people. We favor the establishment of a single responsible authority to assure both full and unified development.

We also urge action to establish the St. Lawrence waterway and the Columbia Valley Authority.

RESOLUTION 11—NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES

GTA has and should continue to work closely with other regional grain-marketing cooperatives. The problems of the farmers in other regions are much the same in their basic character as those in the area which GTA serves.

The regional grain-marketing cooperatives, working through the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, now in its tenth year, have demonstrated an unusual capacity for teamwork and interregional cooperation. The National Federation of Grain Cooperatives has served a most valuable purpose in facilitating this development.

We are always interested in assisting cooperative marketing efforts everywhere in the Nation, and we favor the continued support of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

RESOLUTION 12—APPRECIATION OF CIVIC SUPPORT

We note with satisfaction the welcome that is extended to GTA institutions and personnel in all sections of our region.

As our program is understood, it has gained in civic appreciation. The right of farmers to market their own products cooperatively has come to be accepted as a matter of course among enlightened people generally.

We are glad to see this welcome and to note that GTA and its affiliates have earned an important place in community affairs and civic undertakings everywhere.

We are highly appreciative of the understanding and support of such outstanding publications as the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch and to the intelligent and reliable reports of its distinguished associate editor, Mr. Alfred D. Stedman.

We appreciate the fine welcome which has been given to us this year and in previous years by the city of St. Paul; its officials, its citizens, its businessmen have made us welcome. Its hospitality has been outstanding.

The secretary is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the mayor of the city of St. Paul.

Military Order of the Carabao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Saturday night the annual dinner of the Military Order of the Carabao was held in Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a very interesting editorial entitled "Order of the Carabao," published in the February 19, 1949, issue of the magazine Bataan. The editorial explains the significance of that organization.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDER OF THE CARABAO

One of the many evidences of the excellent relations existing between the people of the Philippines and the people of the United States is the existence of the Military Order of the Carabao.

This organization is composed of commissioned officers of the military services of the United States who have served in the islands.

The editors of Bataan felt that they could honor this organization in no greater way than by dedicating an issue of the magazine to it. Consequently, this February 1949 issue of Bataan salutes the very famous Military Order of the Carabao.

Many may wonder why this group selected the carabao—the Filipino beast of burden—as its "patron saint." We are well aware of the fact that Filipinos are known throughout the world for their courage, their love of freedom, their devotion to the United States, their strong desire to make the Philippine Republic the greatest in the Orient, and their tremendous pride in being the living example of American democracy in the Far East.

But Americans, even while they are being serious, look at things in a humorous way. While visitors to the Philippines are impressed by the qualities mentioned above, they all remember with affection the carabao.

Our beast of burden, we will admit, is not very attractive. His bulky body is strikingly marked with a cow-shaped head, topped by long borns, covered with wrinkles. These horns, which are flattened and triangular in shape, extend outwards and backwards toward his shoulders. His ashy black body and extraordinarily broad feet do not make him the most attractive animal in the world. Yet he is the Philippine beast of burden and a symbol of the islands.

Perhaps the officers who formed the order felt that this animal was symbolic of their affectionate, sentimental feelings toward the Philippines.

The carabao does not like to work during the hottest hours of the day. For this we do not blame him. In fact, we share his reluctance. This feeling is probably that of many members of the military order. However, we and the order cannot go along with the carabao in the way he spends these torrid hours each day.

For when the sun is white hot, the carabao immerses himself in mud and rests with his head and horns above the surface.

While the carabao wallows each day, the members of the Military Order of the Carabao wallow but once a year. This is at their annual celebration held in Washington each year. It is reminiscently called the Annual Wallow of the Military Order of the Carabao.

At it, only the best in food and wine is served, high lighted with Philippine cigars.

All the good times in the Philippines, mellowed by the years, are recalled by members of the order. But each year a member is selected to be honored.

This year's prize wallower is Gen. Carl Spaatz, until recently Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force.

General Spaatz, who has been honored by his own Government and many foreign governments for his brilliant service in the two world wars, was commander in chief of the United States Strategic Air Force against Japan. Following this assignment, and before the recent one, he was commanding general of the United States Army Air Forces.

Any words of tribute that we could give to General Spaatz would be anticlimactical to those of the wallow. Therefore, we second the tributes and wish him Godspeed on his way.

To the Military Order of the Carabao, we express our deepest gratitude for their interest in the Philippines and their continued example of friendship for Filipinos.

Progress in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have read with interest three articles by Alfred A. Strelsin, noted engineer and industrialist, relative to the industrial progress being made and the ambitious program being considered for the new state of Israel. I ask unanimous consent that the three articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Evening Press of December 3, 1948]

OIL REAL REASON FOR STRUGGLE TO CONTROL NEGEV—AMERICAN INDUSTRIALIST IN EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT OF FIGHTING

(What is the real reason for the all-out international struggle for control of the apparently barren region of the Negev in southern Palestine? How did Israeli forces smash the Egyptian Army in the showdown for this area in a battle of which little has so far been told, but what may come to rank as one of the most decisive in recent times. Herewith is an eyewitness story of that fight and the author's account of the reasons it was fought. Alfred A. Strelsin is an American industrialist, engineer and writer who has just returned from a 4 weeks' tour of Israel.)

(By Alfred A. Strelsin)

NEW YORK, December 3.—The value of Israel as a military ally to the West was demonstrated during the climactic 48 hours of the battle of Negev. It helped me, as I was watching it from the air, to understand some of the miracles of the Bible.

When my observation plane first arrived over the Negev, all was quiet and calm throughout the desert. In huge military camps, the Egyptian Army was visible on the eve of battle. On its camouflaged airfields the formidable Egyptian air power was deployed, ready to strike a mortal blow.

A few hours later, all this was a heap of unrecognizable burning rubble, a twisted and upturned mass, underneath which Egypt's dream of middle eastern domination was hopelessly buried.

Western military observers, following the intricate tactical maneuvers as they unfolded, declared that both the Israeli military plan and its execution was worthy of an army far senior to Israel's fledgling military forces.

"No West Pointer could have improved on that plan," a high-ranking American officer declared.

This plan was drawn up by a young archeologist who now doubles as chief of operations of the Israeli Army.

According to UN observers, Egypt committed more than 20,000 first-line combatants and large numbers of supply troops to this action.

I saw them in a number of so-called offensive hedgehogs, designed and planned by the German tactical adviser of the Egyptian general staff, a 55-year-old ex-aide of Marshal Rommel, now known by the cover-name Hassan Salame.

This was the flower of the reorganized, revamped, reequipped army of Egypt, carefully trained in the western desert.

But just 48 hours after the first shot of the Negev battle was fired, these hedgehogs were pockets in which major contingents of a defeated army were hopelessly trapped.

When the smoke of the battle lifted it was revealed that this modern military miracle was the handiwork of about 2,500 Israeli first-line combatants, supported by no more than 2,000 second-line troops and supply forces.

The ratio of combatants was easily 8 to 1.

The political victory of Israel was as great as its military triumph.

What was the shooting and shouting about?

What is the inside story of the Negev?

When the Israeli Army penetrated into the mysterious desert it found three eloquent reasons for Anglo-Arab determination to keep this arid land from Israel.

The three reasons were three secret oil sites—one in Jebel Usdum near the Dead Sea, the other two at Huleiqat and Kurnub near Gaza.

These oil sites were in that part of the Negev which has long been closed to all Israeli exploration and colonization. It was, in a sense, the Tibet of Palestine.

The existence of these oil sites was long suspected by the Israeli authorities.

I have in my possession photographs showing one of these secret sites in various stages of prospecting. They reveal a derrick standing over the Huleiqat well where workers, sworn to secrecy, have brought in a first well at 2,200 feet.

All above-ground installations had later been removed. The holes were capped and the sites camouflaged. Apparently the camouflage was ineffective, for the Israeli Army found the sites without much difficulty.

Here told for the first time is the full chronological sequence of the story behind the story.

It all began on March 22, 1946, in London, with the ceremonial signing of a treaty of alliance between Britain and Transjordan recognizing Amir Abdullah as the sovereign of the new kingdom.

A special annex of 10 articles attached to the treaty established Britain as the sole military protector of Transjordan.

The treaty was accompanied by nine notes exchanged between Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin and Prime Minister Ibrahim Pasha Hashim, of Transjordan. Eight of these notes were published simultaneously with the treaty. The ninth remains unpublished to this day. It is what diplomatic parlance calls "secret protocol."

This secret protocol assured the new King of Transjordan, first, that his aspirations for greater Syria would be supported by Britain; and, second, that the Negev would be transferred to his kingdom, should there be a change in the status of Palestine within the 25 years' duration of the treaty.

Simultaneously the Iraq Petroleum Corp. invited King Abdullah to "enter into agreement aimed at the eventual exploitation of his kingdom's oil resources."

Shortly afterward an agreement was concluded between Transjordan and the Transjordan Petroleum Corp.

The deal surprised insiders of the oil world. All experts knew that Transjordan had no oil deposits in commercial quantities. On the other hand, it was equally known that the Negev contains appreciable deposits.

There was, therefore, an immediate connection between the secret protocol of the Anglo-Transjordan treaty and Transjordan Petroleum Development Corp.'s agreement with King Abdullah.

The oil company was not bidding for Abdullah's nonexistent oil wealth. It was staking out a claim against the day when, under the secret protocol, the Negev would become part of Transjordan.

The promising deal was completely shattered by the boom of the Davidkas (a large mortar), Israel's world-renowned homemade secret weapon, which helped to decide the Negev battle. The oil wealth of the desert was an important stake, to be sure. But it was by no means the decisive factor for Israel.

The Israelis knew that the transformation of Negev into a fertile plain was scientifically possible. Innumerable soil analyses were made in the Weizmann Institute at Rechoboth, and in other Jewish agriculture laboratories, proving beyond a doubt that the Negev's neglected soil was fully salvagable, with proper irrigation.

Several test wells were drilled and their water analyzed, with positive results.

A network of meteorological pilot stations had been established throughout the Negev. They yielded the astonishing information that the climate of this mysterious desert was better than that of Jerusalem.

In Tel Aviv and Haifa, as well as in the United States, engineers have drafted blueprints for settlements, agricultural stations, experimental farms, factory sites, and a gigantic irrigation project from which Transjordanian and Palestinian Arabs would benefit as much as the Israelis of the Negev.

Possession of the Negev is also essential for Israel to retain control of the Dead Sea, with its priceless chemicals, including potash and bromide, which American technique and money have helped them develop.

And, above all, the new state perceives in the Negev the only space available for the settlement of Europe's Jewish DP's and the new Jewish victims of the Arab lands.

These were the stakes of the battle for the Negev.

[From the Dallas Daily Times-Herald of December 6, 1948]

ISRAEL BELIEVED SET TO JOIN WEST NATIONS

(By A. A. Strelsin)

NEW YORK, December 6.—I am able to disclose on the highest authority that, in two daring diplomatic and political moves, the provisional government of Israel has definitely commited the new state to the Western World.

First, in a secret meeting of the state council, in which the new state's foreign policy was discussed and resolved, the government proclaimed this commitment in these significant words:

"Israel regards itself as a western nation. Its destiny lies with the west."

This pronouncement was made in the presence of the council's only Communist member, which was akin to broadcasting it to the eastern bloc.

CONSCIOUS OF RISK

I was told by one of the leaders of the Israeli Government that they were conscious of the calculated risk involved in their sweeping prowestern policy statement in the face of the consistent UN support Israel was receiving from the east.

Second, even before the council's secret meeting in Tel Aviv, spokesmen of the Israeli Government, in direct conversations with Soviet diplomats in Glen Cove, Long Island, advised the U. S. S. R. of their determination to stay in the western orbit.

As of today, the vast majority of the Israeli people backs the government's western orientation.

But should the gyrations of the west continue, the Israeli provisional government stands to lose its most effective military ally and only bulwark against communism in the Middle East.

These are the major conclusions of my exhaustive investigations on the spot, covering all the military and diplomatic fronts of the Palestine war, from Paris to the southern Negev.

SPECIAL STUDY

I made a special study of charges of communism frequently raised against Israel. My investigations extended from the armies in the field through the farms and factories in the hinterland to the very doors of the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv. My knowledge of the Russian language facilitated this particular investigation.

My own investigation proved that such charges are based on deliberate falsifications.

They are used as weapons of psychological warfare waged by men who know best that the Jewish community of Palestine has always been and is bitterly opposed to communism.

These charges are coordinated and master-minded by an organization called the Middle Eastern Intelligence Center, located in Cairo.

The present leadership of Israel is traditionally anticommunistic and was, for more than 25 years, the favorite target of the Comintern's most venomous abuses.

Despite the consistent Soviet support of Israel in the UN, Zionism continues banned in the Soviet Union.

WIDE RANGE OF TALKS

I interviewed all the top members of the Israeli Government, from Premier David Ben-Gurion to Fritz Bernstein, secretary of commerce. I talked with dozens of Israeli soldiers and officers, from the top-ranking brigadier to privates in advanced field posts.

They all dwelt on the problems of tomorrow's Israel and all asked how Israel could best interest United States capital and know-how to join in the building of an industrial democracy along American lines.

David Ramez, leader of the Histadruth, the Israeli federation of labor, told me in no uncertain terms:

"Industrialists need not worry about social unrest in Israel, about strikes or lack of cooperation on the part of our workers.

"We want to build a modern, prosperous democratic country and we all realize that this can be accomplished best through American know-how and with the modern American production methods. Israel is too small to become a purely agrarian country. Its prosperity depends on a happy wedlock between industry and labor."

[From the New York Sunday Mirror of December 12, 1948]

ISRAEL AWAITING PEACE FOR "TVA" IN HOLY LAND

(By Alfred A. Strelsin)

American engineering skill that made the TVA a successful reality and turned southern California into an agronomist's dream has completely blueprinted the economic salvation of Palestine in terms of irrigation and hydroelectric power.

Patterned after the TVA in fact as well as in name, the projected Jordan Valley Authority (so named after the Holy Land's main water source) would spark-plug the most far-reaching reclamation project on earth. It would solve virtually all of the region's economic questions—including the burning problem of the Jewish and Arab refugees uprooted by the present war.

Though promoted by Israeli initiative, it would benefit the neighboring Arab peoples and the new stateless refugee Arabs of Palestine as much as Israel.

A string of irrigation projects could turn 700,000 acres of neglected land into fertile fields—seven times the area now under irrigated cultivation in the whole of Palestine. New hydroelectric plants could produce 800,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year—more than four times the total peak energy produced in the whole of mandated Palestine by hydroelectricity, steam, and Diesel power.

It would speed and facilitate exploitation of the vast mineral resources of the Dead Sea and give employment to thousands in newly developed industries. It could provide an economic base for more than 3,000,000 new immigrants and improve the living standards and earning capacity of old-timers and newcomers alike.

It would provide abundant power for factories and farms at prices but a fraction of the rates charged by the utility companies under the mandatory administration. Above all, it would resettle the fugitive Arabs for whom the neighboring Arab countries seemed reluctant to provide shelter, and thus eliminate the No. 2 headache of the region.

The JVA is no pipe dream of starry-eyed engineers. Neither is it a potential bubble of money-mad promoters. It is the carefully thought out, painstakingly calculated, completely blueprinted plan of the world's foremost soil conservationists, energy experts, and project managers.

Men like James B. Hays, project manager of TVA; John L. Savage, chief engineer of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, and Walter C. Lowdermilk, chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, vouch for the feasibility, practicability, and profitability of the project. In fact, they are its creative architects.

The JVA is projected to cost no more than $250,000,000 even at today's sky-high construction prices.

The idea of JVA was conceived by Dr. Lowdermilk in 1939, while he was making a plane survey of Palestine in quest of a solution of America's own acute erosion problem. He was struck by the similarity between the Holy Land's and southern California's topography, and by the evident prospect of applying to Palestinian soil the reclamation and irrigation techniques which have already turned California's Imperial and Central Valleys into garden spots.

Lowdermilk perceived still another similarity. Like California, Palestine has more land than water. But the peculiar topographical features of the Holy Land suggest the source for additional water.

Lowdermilk was startled by the extraordinary difference in altitudes between the Jordan Valley and the Mediterranean, only 23 miles apart. It would be relatively simple, he thought, to divert the sweet water of the

upper Jordan into a network of irrigation canals and introduce sea water from the Mediterranean to compensate the Dead Sea for the loss of these waters.

Anyone standing at Naharayim, at the junction of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers, where the hydroelectric plant of the old Palestine Electric Corp. is located, must marvel at the scientific skill of engineers who can produce so much energy from so little water. The average total annual flow of the Jordan is in the vicinity of 1,000,000,000 cubic meters, sufficient to have produced more than 170,000,000 kilowatt-hours' electricity in 1944 in the Naharayim plant alone.

The advocates of the JVA project enlisted the support of David Lilienthal, then head of TVA, who assigned his chief engineer, Col. T. B. Parker, to outline the necessary engineering studies.

A commission on Palestine surveys was set up and a group of experts recruited to carry out the engineering investigations, both in the United States and in Palestine.

The staff worked over 18 months in America, then spent 6 months in Palestine studying conditions on the spot. Refusal of the mandatory power to permit the project, followed by the present war conditions in the Holy Land, plus lack of capital, has prevented the implementation of the JVA.

As soon as peace returns to Palestine, the proponents of JVA will place before the United States Congress a plan to finance the project with funds lent by the Export-Import Bank or by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation, on a self-liquidating basis, plus interest.

They will argue that the JVA project should save a great deal of the money that America will otherwise be called on to dole out to the Arabs of the Near East for economic rehabilitation—never to be repaid.

Federal Aid to Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal, of December 9, 1948, on the subject of Federal aid to the State of Delaware.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A story published in this paper under a Washington date line the other day said that the Federal Government is giving Delaware $1,384,000 this fiscal year for airports, hospitals, school lunches, wildlife, and so on. The way the story reads, it sounds mighty generous of Uncle Sam.

. But, wait, a minute. Where did Uncle get the money he is handing out so liberally?

Well, he got it from taxes, of course. Washington collected $323,000,000 in income taxes alone from Delaware firms and individuals in the year ending June 30, 1947. The Federal Government's gift to Delaware amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of Delaware's contribution to the Federal Treasury.

We don't object to that—too much. But would you call it a gift when you pay a man $10 to do a job and he lets you have 4 cents back? We don't.

One-Hundred-Dollar Dinners for Privileged Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "$100 Democratic Dinners Bring Out Privileged Few" written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, February 26.—In the gold-plated program of the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson victory dinner in this town the other night there appeared as part of a creed for democracy these paragraphs taken from President Truman's message to the Congress on the state of the Union:

"The strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interest of all our people, rather than the privileged few. It must continue to be used unselfishly in the struggle for world peace and the betterment of mankind the world over.

"This is the task before us.

"It is not an easy one. It has many complications, and there will be strong opposition from selfish interests."

A reasonably large number of the privileged few, which is to say folks who can pay $100 for a meal supposedly honoring the memory of the Democratic Party's patron saints, greeted President Truman warmly and listened to him intently at the two feasts, one in the Mayflower Hotel, the other in the Statler. It took the combined feeding facilities of the two establishments to accommodate the segment of the privileged few which turned out.

They heard the President relate that the progress of the administration's program is being impeded in Congress by the same old special interests. This unidentified and mysterious force was belabored by Mr. Truman during the campaign last year.

As he went up and down the country denouncing the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress as the tool of the special interests and promising all things to all people, he asserted time and again that if he were given a full term and a Democratic Congress everything would be lovely and happiness and prosperity would be the reward of the people.

Mr. Truman was elected. With him was elected a Congress Democratic in both branches. And now it appears the special interests, the privileged few, have the Democrats by the throat.

Close by the President as he spoke were living symbols of the Democratic victory. At one dinner he shook the hand of Senate Majority Leader SCOTT LUCAS; at the other he pumped the paw of House Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK.

No major part of the President's program, whatever it may be, has been enacted into law by the Congress. The Taft-Hartley law, which most of us thought would be out the window within 2 weeks after the Democrats took over, is still the law of the land. Recently he tossed into the lap of Congress a welfare and social-security program virtually the same as the one handed the Republicans in the special session, he called last summer immediately after his nomination in Philadelphia. And in accepting the nomination he remarked that the entire program for the special session could be enacted in 15 days.

By inference if not by actual accusation the Republicans are blamed by the President for the failure of the Congress to rush through important legislation at lightning-like speed. They, of course, are the time-tested tools of the special interests, they are the privileged few.

Even as the President spoke, members of his own party were scheming to scuttle his civil-rights program. Southern Democratic Senators, defying the President, decided at a caucus to launch on Monday a filibuster against a move to tighten the rules covering debate.

Before the $100-a-head diners had finished the steak, they heard President Truman say he is thinking of stumping the country in an effort to get action from Congress. He would deliver speeches along the lines of those with which he regaled the country in last year's campaign, but this time the purpose would be to build a fire under a Democratic Congress rather than one controlled by Republican agents of the special interests and the privileged few.

With the exception of Vice President Barkley who was in California, President Truman at the victory dinner was surrounded by the men responsible for Democratic action on Capitol Hill. Not only were the elected leaders of the Senate and House there, but Senator MCGRATH, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was on deck.

The truth of the matter is that this Eighty-first, or Democratic Congress is not jumping whenever the President cracks the whip. This may be good for the country or it may be bad. It all depends on the individual viewpoint.

But the country isn't going to be fooled. It isn't going to be misled into believing that the Republican, or minority, party or some privileged few or special interests have the Congress in its grip. The responsibility is on the party in control. Only a few months ago Mr. Truman was busy trying to convince the country that all the woes and shortcomings of his administration were directly traceable to the Republican-controlled Congress.

Now he would like to have us believe the tail is wagging the dog. If the good burghers of the country fall for this one, they'll fall for anything.

Filibuster in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials which appeared this morning regarding filibustering in the Senate, the first in the New York Times, the second in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1949]

NO TIME FOR COMPROMISE

If present plans are carried out a score of United States Senators, at noon today, will

attempt to paralyze the legislative branch of our Government until this small minority, representing a small minority of the Nation's population, many of its Members elected by a small minority of the adult citizens of their constituencies, has enforced its will. This group proposes to stop all legislation, to hold up all authorizations and appropriations, including those for the national defense, and to hinder all Executive action which depends on congressional approval.

For what purpose will these gentlemen rise? What is the justification for the incalculable harm they may do their country? Let us look back into Senate history. Thirty-two years ago a "little group of willful men," as President Wilson called them, talked to death a bill to arm American ships against submarine attacks. The resulting scandal led the Senate to adopt rule No. XXII, which stipulated that by a two-thirds vote debate on "any pending measure" could be limited to an allowance of 1 hour for each Senator. Under this rule cloture has been applied four times. Last August Senator VANDENBERG, then Presiding Officer, reluctantly decided that even this feeble weapon could not be used on a motion to take up a measure. The Senate will have before it today an amendment designed to fill this gap. Even if this amendment is adopted, or if Vice President Barkley holds that rule No. XXII can be applied to motions, a minority of one-third-plus-one of a quorum present can still keep a motion or a measure from being put to a vote.

If this modest step is a limitation on freedom of debate, as Senator RUSSELL and his followers insist it is, what of the freedom of Senators who wish to get on with the business for which they were elected? What of the freedom of both great parties to keep their campaign pledges? What of the freedom of the public to get done what it wants done?

No amount of specious reasoning, not even the presence of men of character and intelligence among the prospective filibusterers, can conceal the real nature of what seems to be about to take place. This is a plain case of a minority arrogantly assuming, as it has done before, the right to veto legislation—in this case Mr. Truman's civil-rights program.

Compromises have been proposed. No less a person than the Democratic leader, Senator LUCAS, has indicated an amiable willingness to suspend the battle occasionally in order to pass needed legislation. We believe the vast majority of the American people will agree that this is no time for either compromise or defeatist postponement. The question is whether we are to have some approximation of majority rule on Capitol Hill. More than that, it is whether our national legislative system can be made to work properly in a time of crisis. That issue had better be settled now.

[From the Washington Post of February 28, 1949]

ACID TEST

At noon today Majority Leader LUCAS will move to take up in the Senate the proposed change in the rules making it possible to cut off a filibuster at any time by a two-thirds vote. The motion is certain to encounter a filibuster. Southern Democrats rightly look upon this effort to facilitate the limitation of debate as the first step toward enactment of the President's civil-rights program. Indications are that they will resist it with all the wind and laryngeal fortitude they can muster. The fight will thus doubtless become a severe test for the Truman administration.

If the filibuster runs on week after week, the possibility of enacting Mr. Truman's Fair Deal into law will be seriously impaired. The administration is said to fear, and not without good reason, that if the struggle becomes acrimonious it may lose many Southern votes for other parts of its program. Yet that is a chance it has to take. If the right of unlimited debate against taking up a bill is not curbed now, talk-fests will have to be faced later when the calendar will be crowded with important measures awaiting action. There seems to be no easy escape from the dilemma. Even if Vice President Barkley reverses Senator Vandenberg's ruling and holds that the present cloture rule can be applied to debate on motions to take up a bill, he may not be sustained by vote of the Senate. Senator Taft thinks the rule should be changed by amendment and not interpretation. If most of the Republicans agree and the administration holds to its purpose, the filibuster can go on indefinitely.

It will be an acid test for the Democratic Party as well as the administration. Presumably the voters returned that party to power because of disgust with the record of the Eightieth Congress. But if the performance of Congress is not improved, what will the voters say in 1950 and 1952? Democratic leaders in both the North and the South will have to find ways of working together or risk a critical loss of public confidence. The dissidents cannot be expected, of course, to swallow the President's program whole. But at some point there will have to be a meeting of minds if the country and the Democratic Party are to be saved from tragic failures. The impending fight over the elementary issue of majority control in the National Legislature is certainly not an encouraging prospect.

Nomination of Hon. Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials bearing on the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Director of the National Security Resources Board. These editorials have been received from Detroit, Mich.; San Diego, Calif.; Portland, Oreg., and Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 25, 1949]

GRAVY FOR AN OLD PAL—WALLGREN

At the risk of being called a s. o. b. by the President of the United States for daring to disagree with him we insist this is requisite and necessary for a free discussion of vital national problems.

One of them in his merry-Andrew clambake crony, the highly perfumed ex-Governor of Washington, Mon C. Wallgren.

It is Mr. Truman's grim determination to place this pool parlor hail fellow all wet in charge of the most important position in the Federal Government as we prepare for possible war. That is the directing head of the National Security Resources Board.

Upon this man will depend our preparation.

If war should come and your son is killed in battle because of lack of desperately needed supplies, it will be no comfort for you to know that the President of the United States permitted such gross inefficiency in order to find a political job for one of his elbow-bending pals.

Wallgren admits he is without qualifications for the job.

This man who will attempt to direct the whole industry of the United States and integrate it—as William S. Knudsen did so brilliantly—into one vast machine shop, is an optician whose educational background consists of a night-school course in bookkeeping.

If war comes—the most hideous possibility in the history of the human race—our fate will depend upon this professional good fellow back slapper and story teller.

He will be pretending to hold down the most responsible job in the Nation with the possible exception of the Presidency itself.

It is blandly and unblushingly conceded that Wallgren is totally unqualified for the post.

But his defenders point out that he can always call on the Budget Bureau for anything he needs to know.

If the Budget Bureau has experts who can serve as Edgar Bergen to Wallgren in the role of Charlie McCarthy, why not appoint one of them to head the National Security Resources Board in the first place?

For one thing, how is Wallgren going to know what to ask the Budget Bureau? A man so hopelessly unqualified for a job can't even know what information he needs.

However, that plainly is not a consideration with either Mr. Truman or Wallgren. The idea is to do something nice for an old pal out of work, and to let the old pal in turn take care of some of his friends who'd like a cut of the big dough being kicked around Washington so freely—the dough you're handing in to the internal revenue collector this month, to be specific.

Wallgren, you see, has been out of work since January 1, when the people pried him loose from the pay roll. His one term as Governor of the State of Washington expired. He was so bad that he was defeated despite the fact that otherwise Washington voted Democrats in and supported Mr. Truman.

Actually, during the campaign Wallgren's presence on the ticket was considered a hazard to the President's chance of carrying Washington.

Already, with his confirmation being fought in the Senate, equally unqualified friends of Wallgren are being led up to feed at the trough which the National Security Resources Board affords. There is some mystery as to who hired them, or at least that's the pretense.

But all three came from Wallgren's State.

They are a former laborer, a former bookkeeper, and a former printer who left their vocations to dabble in politics and got shuffled out.

But not for long!

Now they're to get $50 a day as consultants to the Security Resources Board as it goes about the task of coordinating this country's industry and energies to meet the threat of war.

But don't raise your voice about any of this. The President might swear at you. After all, Mon is his buddy and that's all the qualification you need to get a job guiding the destinies of the United States in these perilous years. As Mr. Truman so bluntly says:

"No s. o. b. is going to tell me—"

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Tribune-Sun of February 25, 1949]

MISTAKEN VIEW

President Truman's contention that high-salaried offices in the Government are his to be spread among his friends regardless of competency is based upon a mistaken view. His appointment of Mon Wallgren, former Washington State Governor, is an example.

Mr. Wallgren never has distinguished himself in public service. At one time he was a United States Senator, and it was while serving in that capacity that he met the President. Later he was elected to the governorship, from which the voters ousted him last autumn.

During his incumbency at Olympia Mr. Wallgren had his State in constant turmoil. He ran a machine-dominated system which often was involved in charges of corruption. Although those charges were not proved, the voters were convinced that Mon Wallgren was not the man to be their governor. Illustrative of the disregard in which he was held, the voters elected Democrats from the top of the ticket to the bottom, except for governor. Here they rejected Mr. Wallgren in favor of a Republican.

This was the verdict of people who know him. He was not good enough to be chief executive of one of the 48 States of the Union, and yet President Truman claims to believe he could fill the $14,000 chairmanship of the Security Resources Board.

Oddly enough, and brazenly enough, there has been no claim that Mr. Wallgren is competent for the position to which he has been nominated. Even Mr. Wallgren himself has not made such claim. If he is confirmed for the position he seeks, it will be one of the boldest pieces of political pap within the generation.

Even so, the matter might be endured were the duties of the Security Resources Board not so important. But this Board will be entrusted with vital preparations for the Nation's defense. It cannot be run on the basis of politics in its worst form, and that is the kind of politics which Washington State knew under Mr. Wallgren's reign.

The people have a right to something infinitely better than his appointment promise.

[From the Washington Post of February 27, 1949]

BAD AND GOOD

What is the use of trying to reorganize the executive branch of the Government? Members of the Hoover commission may well wonder as they read of some of President Truman's latest appointments to high and responsible office. In one of its first reports, the Hoover commission said, "We cannot entrust the Government of today to second-rate men and women." The President continues to violate this principle, although he professes to want efficiency and competence in his administration team.

A case in point is the nomination of former Senator Mon C. Wallgren to head the National Security Resources Board. This is a revival of "government by crony" which, we thought, went out of fashion with Warren G. Harding, though Harding did not, as Mr. Truman has done, defend the system as a new dispensation in political philosophy. The President has every right to appoint men he knows and trusts, but he also has an obligation to appoint men with executive ability and knowledge equal to their new duties. He has not lived up to the obligation in the case of Mr. Wallgren, or in the far more flagrant choice of Cornelius Vanderbilt Whitney as Under Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. Whitney is likeable, charming, generous, but by no stretch of the imagination a fit appointment for the managerial post in a crucially important department. The Department of Commerce is intimately concerned with the maintenance of the country's economic stability. Mr. Morris Ernst is constantly insisting that only this Department can safeguard the integrity of small business. It is directly related to the development of our foreign economic policy. Only last Friday, Secretary of State Acheson said that to this Department would go much of the responsibility for the programing of point 4 of the President's inaugural address, yet the Department of Commerce has been virtually gutted of its leadership since Mr. Harriman, Mr. Foster, Mr. David Bruce, and many lesser officials went to the ECA in Paris.

In shining contrast to the Wallgren and Whitney appointments are the choices made in the State Department since Dean Acheson became Secretary. Here, at least, fitness has ruled. Many more appointments will have to be made if the Hoover commission's proposals are carried out, but those already announced are first class: Mr. Ernest Gross and Mr. Dean Rusk as Assistant Secretaries, Mr. Philip Jessup as Ambassador at Large, Mr. Merle Cochran as Ambassador to Pakistan—a tribute, incidentally to Mr. Cochran's resolute course as member of the Good Offices Commission in Indonesia—and two appointments from the ranks of journalism, Mr. Mark Ethridge as member of the Conciliation Commission for Palestine and Mr. Erwin Canham as alternate delegate to the coming United Nations General Assembly.

Since all of these are Presidential appointments, Mr. Truman can claim a share of the credit for them. He has proved in the past that he knows how to disregard political debts and personal friendships in finding the right men for important posts. He likes to read American history, and he must know how past Presidents have handicapped themselves by choosing weak advisers. Why, then, does he persist in spoiling his record by appointments of the Wallgren and Whitney variety?

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 27, 1949]

THESE CHARMING PEOPLE

(By Austine)

Of course, every word or group of letters uttered by a President causes ears to perk. A Presidential phrase used to Lyall Beggs, national commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, didn't rate as widespread publicity as some other remarks. Harry, the President, was describing HARRY CAIN, the Senator (now fighting Mon Wallgren's appointment as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board). Truman spluttered that CAIN was acting as if he was bitten by a goose. That the President was annoyed, Beggs gathered, but he's a little puzzled on one score.

How does a goose bite, anyway?

[From the Portland Oregonian of August 11, 1945]

REPUBLICANS NEED NOT APPLY

Since taking office, Gov. Mon C. Wallgren of Washington has been ruthless about kicking out Republican heads of State departments, regardless of their records for efficiency, and replacing them with Democrats. That is more or less common practice, incident to the construction of a political machine designed to retain the party in power. But the Governor has gone off the deep end, if quoted correctly in a United Press dispatch of August 4.

The Governor told his news conference that State departments are working shorthanded to hold jobs open for veterans. There will be many State jobs for veterans who are independent in their political thinking, said the Governor, "but those veterans who have been active in the Republican Party need not apply—they should wait for their party to get back into power."

Governor Wallgren, who implies that the Democrats won the war singlehanded, proposes to carry partisan politics to a shameful low. The good people of Washington who voted for him should see that he doesn't carry out his intention. Neither Democrats nor Republicans, we think, will approve political discrimination in employment of the men who have fought for them. As Mrs. F. I. Hodges of Albany says, in a letter on this page, the Governor's statement is "a blot on the State of Washington."

NO JOBS FOR G. O. P. VETS

To the EDITOR: It is unbelievable that in considering jobs for veterans the Governor of any State would be so lacking in patriotism that he would consider the political thinking of the veteran before giving him a job.

It is a blot upon the State of Washington that Governor Wallgren has said, "Many jobs for the veteran who is independent in his political thinking will be assured. Those veterans who have been active in the Republican party need not apply—they should wait for their party to get back into power."

I believe that the men who have fought this war should be given preference in jobs because of their service and their qualifications for the job. Whether Republican, Democrat, black or white, all have served their country alike, and should be rewarded alike.

Mrs. F. I. HODGES.

ALBANY, OREG.

The Administration's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The President Can't Shift the Blame," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT CAN'T SHIFT THE BLAME

President Truman's threat to stump the Nation in an effort to whip Congress into line is a frank admission of the extent to which the administration's legislative program has bogged down.

Coming less than 8 weeks since the Eighty-first Congress, with comfortable Democratic majorities in both House and Senate, convened, it is a startling confession of the weakness of the party's leadership both in the White House and on Capitol Hill.

It is now apparent that the honeymoon of Mr. Truman and Congress, widely predicted after last November's surprising election, has not taken place and that the President has abandoned hope that it ever will. His threat to pressure Senators and Representatives into rubber-stamping his complex and costly batch of proposals by taking his case directly to their constituents has aroused resentment which, understandably, only widens the breach between the executive and legislative branches.

Just what Mr. Truman can hope to gain by this declaration of war is difficult to imagine. The only predictable result is an intensification of political bickering that will militate against bipartisan agreement on even the soundest projects advanced by the White House.

Of all Presidents, Mr. Truman should be aware of the value of maintaining good working relations with Congress and of avoiding even the appearance of dictating its actions.

His failure to win cooperation of the Eightieth Congress, which he called the second worst in the Nation's history—reserv-

ing the No. 1 position for the Congress that impeached Andrew Johnson—was spectacular. Much of his effort during the preelection campaign was devoted to shifting the blame for the shortcomings of his administration to the Republican-controlled Congress when his own divided party was in large degree at fault. It is apparent that he now plans to return to that strategem and make the Democratic Eighty-first Congress a whipping boy.

It was late in the session of the Eightieth Congress that Mr. Truman directed his fire against the legislative branch and not until the opening of the Presidential campaign did he tour the country denouncing it, and certain of its Members, for failure to carry out the wishes of the White House.

He shows no such commendable restraint now. He has turned his guns against the Eighty-first Congress before the most vital and far-reaching portions of his program have even reached the floor of House or Senate.

A great deal of Mr. Truman's attack, at a dinner in Washington, was directed against special interests, although he never made it clear just what they are. It would appear that the general public which insists on retention of adequate safeguards against the disastrous effects of national strikes becomes a special interest when it opposes outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Taxpayers who view with increasing alarm the tremendous total public expenditures involved in the mass of administration proposals for social betterment, national defense, and foreign aid becomes special interests when they point out that the national economy would be impaired by such an acute financial strain.

The fact is that Mr. Truman and his advisers blundered badly in failing to give the administration's far-reaching legislative program more full and painstaking consideration before dumping it into the lap of Congress.

The serious mistake must be corrected if the Nation is to be spared the expensive maladjustments which invariably follow enactment of unsound legislation.

It is the task of Congress to perform this invaluable service, and it will not be made easier by Mr. Truman's intemperate attacks upon everyone who opposes any portion of the program he has submitted.

Filibuster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and praiseworthy editorial entitled "Filibuster," published in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of February 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILIBUSTER

Regardless of the civil rights issue, nothing can be honestly said in favor of the filibuster that has for years been a childish and unfair device to delay and often kill legislation proposed in Congress.

Now we have the ludicrous threat to filibuster to death the proposal to outlaw the filibuster. The proposed change in the rules would limit debate so that a bill or resolution could be brought to action in a reasonable time. By every conception of what is fair and right this impediment to orderly transaction of the business of Congress ought to be discarded.

The filibuster in itself accomplishes nothing in the way of debate. The person who has gained the floor for an indefinite period determined only by his physical endurance, utters nothing whatever of value in his address. His purpose is solely to kill all the time that can be allotted to the measure.

The ludicrous figure of the filibusterer is typical. Nearly all the Members of the body leave. Only a few may be seen reading newspapers or even dozing. No one pays any attention to what the speaker says. Often he reads from long technical pamphlets on subjects in no way related to the subject at issue, sometimes even resorting to the encyclopedia for material.

It is ridiculous that any deliberative body would allow such a device to kill time. Congress is there to do the will of the people. Always it has before it for consideration many highly important matters. What Congress does often shapes the course of history and determines the welfare of the Nation. Its time is of great value and to waste it by the petty custom of the filibuster is to mark Congress as lacking in intelligence.

It is generally conceded that the civil rights issue is being attacked by powerful interests and that the fight is not at all the fight of the people of the South. These interests want to preserve the cheap labor market that has existed in the South ever since slavery. The issue is not the right of all freemen to vote, but to prevent the poorer and underpaid class voting against their exploitation. White supremacy is not the issue.

The Democratic Party has stood and still stands for the poor man, and in no other section of the country is he quite so poor as in the deep South. President Truman declared for civil liberties that would elevate the poor of the South to a class of properly paid workers. The President is now fighting for the supporting legislation, and the Democratic Congress, with the exception of those southern Democrats who have always stood for the subjugation of labor, stands for civil liberties.

It will be an eternal disgrace if this Democratic Congress allows the special interests of the South to kill the civil liberties issue by the use of the filibuster. It will be to the everlasting credit of this Congress if it will right now outlaw forever the filibuster device for impeding legislative progress.

Federal Rent-Control Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Property Owners' Association is composed of several hundred property owners of the city of New Orleans, who feel they have been aggrieved by the administration of the Federal rent-control law, and have organized for the purpose of combating any further rent control.

At a meeting of the organization held on February 16 in New Orleans, Government figures were studied by the association, and the membership unanimously passed a resolution protesting against further rent control. A copy of this resolution has been sent me by Mr. Scott, president of the association, with the request that I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that it might be available to the Members of this House for their study and consideration if and when the proposed extension of the Rent Control Act comes to the floor for disposal.

Following is the resolution:

Whereas the rent-control law was passed as an emergency war measure and should have been terminated when all other emergency war controls were terminated; and

Whereas the continuance of this law is an unjustified encroachment upon the rights and privileges of property owners; and

Whereas the continued application of this unfair and discriminatory law is causing extreme hardship on the part of the property owners because a large percentage of the property owners are dependent upon the rents collected for their livelihood; and

Whereas the majority of the landlords so dependent upon rents collected are widows, aged and infirm people, as well as minor dependents of deceased relatives; and

Whereas the present costs of maintenance, repair, and operation of rental property dangerously reduce and in many cases wipe out the net revenue justly due the property owners; and

Whereas in no case do current revenues permit the property owners properly and adequately to maintain and repair their properties; and

Whereas depreciation of inadequately maintained property accelerates rapidly with each day of occupancy; and

Whereas property owners are arbitrarily deprived of just and adequate returns on their investments; and

Whereas enforcement of rent controls is in effect depriving property owners of the rights and privileges granted them in the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas such denial of constitutional rights is tantamount to confiscation of property without due process of law; and

Whereas the continued enforcement of rent controls, now that all other controls have been terminated, constitutes class discrimination; and

Whereas this discrimination is greatly emphasized by the farm price-support program which guarantees return to the farmers while depriving property owners of just returns; and

Whereas the United States Government through the Department of Labor has encouraged, aided, and abetted organized labor in its drive to increase wages many times over during the same years that property owners were restrained from increasing rents thereby again emphasizing class discrimination; and

Whereas in both examples of rank discrimination herein exposed the beneficiaries are represented by powerful vote-controlling lobbies; and

Whereas such deliberate official Government discrimination suggests and promotes class distinction, discord, and hate; and

Whereas the function of providing and maintaining adequate housing is as important as providing food and clothing, both of which have been decontrolled and permitted to return to their normal status, while rent controls have been retained; and

Whereas the grave injustice done the property owners is graphically revealed and proven in exhibits A and B attached herewith; and

Whereas exhibits A and B are a tabulation of statistical data compiled and issued by

the United States Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies and bureaus; and

Whereas the accuracy of the data so compiled is, therefore, not open to question; and

Whereas the tables in exhibits A and B forcefully indicate the extent to which rent controls unjustly penalize property owners; and

Whereas there is no legal or moral justification for the continuation of rent controls: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the property owners of the city of New Orleans hereby urge the Congress of the United States to immediately terminate all controls over rental property.

EXHIBIT A

Percentage of increase and index of rents, cost of building, furnishings, and insurance during period of rent control

	Index		Percent of increase		
	1939	1942	1948	1939–42	1942–48
Rents	100	106.5	113.2	6.5	6.2
Building costs:					
Labor	100	[1] 117.3	276.8	17.3	136.0
Material	100	[1] 111.0	174.6	11.0	57.3
Total building costs	100	[1] 113.1	222.0	13.1	96.3
House furnishings	100	125.8	197.4	25.8	71.6
Insurance [2]	100	113.1	222.0	13.0	96.3

[1] These figures are for 1941; 1942 not available. Source: Table F5. Number and construction costs of new permanent nonfarm dwelling units started, by urban or rural location, and by source of funds; U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data prepared by New Orleans Association of Commerce, research department, Arthur S. Graham, director; break-down of building costs into material and labor was made according to the Federal Housing Authority estimate that labor amounts to about 60 percent and materials to about 40 percent of total costs at the present time.

[2] Increase in insurance cost indicated has no relation to changes in premium and applies only to increased amount of insurance required to cover present high replacement costs and also to comply with coinsurer requirements of insurance companies in order to qualify for full coverage on partial losses. Because Government statistical bureaus do not tabulate repairs and maintenance costs and because new building and replacement costs are relative to repairs and maintenance costs the index of building cost and percentages of increases shown above are used to indicate the increase in cost of maintenance and repairs which has occurred since rent control has gone into effect. Increases in cost of maintenance and repairs would be even larger if more recent statistical data were available.

EXHIBIT B

	Index			Percent of increase		Average percent increase cost of repairs by trade, 1942–48
	1939	1942	1948	1939–42	1942–48	
Rents	100	106.5	113.2	6.5	6.2	6.2
Plumbers	100	114.9	163.6	14.9	42.3	72.1
Plumbing material and supplies	100	98.2	198.3	1.8	101.9	----
Carpenters	100	110.0	150.0	10.0	36.3	97.5
Lumber	100	133.1	344.3	33.1	158.7	----
Roofers	100	115.0	172.5	15.0	50.0	50.0
Roofing material not available	----	----	----	----	----	(1)
Painters	100	131.4	185.7	31.4	41.3	68.3
Paints and paint	100	100.8	196.8	.8	95.2	----
Plasterers	100	100.0	145.4	0.	45.4	50.9
Cement and mortar	100	93.6	146.4	6.4	56.4	----
Bricklayers	100	108.3	166.0	8.3	53.3	68.0
Brick and tile	100	97.1	177.3	2.9	82.6	----
Electricians	100	112.0	158.5	12.0	41.5	41.5
Electrical materials not available	----	----	----	----	----	(1)

[1] Labor only.

All-Out Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the New York Times of February 17, 1949:

ALL-OUT CONTROLS

A few days ago Government officials were testifying before a Senate committee on the administration's labor bill. Since that measure would abandon the prerogative granted the President under the Taft-Hartley Act to seek court injunctions in the case of strikes threatening public health and safety, the witnesses were asked how the administration proposed to deal with situations of this kind in the future. Their reply was that the President doesn't need specific statutory authority, since he already possesses inherent powers which he can invoke if such emergencies ever arise again.

But if the administration is extraordinarily coy and diffident when it comes to asking for authority to deal with labor crises, its inhibitions disappear as if by magic when the question is one that concerns industrial prices, profits, and production. Such problems it approaches with sublime confidence and with a singular eagerness for responsibility and authority. We have had numerous examples of this attitude in the past, but the so-called "Economic Stabilization Act of 1949," just introduced in Congress, makes all previous illustrations look like practice performances.

Superficially, this measure appears to be merely a repetition of the recurrent requests of the President for power to deal with certain material shortages that have carried over from the war. Actually, it goes far beyond that. The implications of the proposed legislation can be grasped only by understanding the philosophy on which it is based. Fortunately, the economic advisers to the President, who are obviously its principal architects, have thrown more than a little light on that point in the last few days. Dr. Leon H. Keyserling has warned us that business decisions must not, in the future, be swayed by psychology. Said he, in testifying recently before the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report: "An industrial price, or profit or capacity policy which gears itself, not to the requirements for stability and growth throughout the economy, but rather to the expectation of economic decline, tends to bring on the very calamity which it fears." And he added: "No one industry or business can afford to act alone in the interest of stability."

Now, either this means nothing at all or it means that Dr. Keyserling believes that the Government is a better judge of how much should be produced by a given industry than is industrial management itself, guided by such signposts as prices, costs, and profits. These observations weren't without meaning. If any confirmation of this fact had been required, it was furnished in subsequent testimony by another Presidential adviser, John D. Clark. Dr. Clark has declared that the President must have the powers now requested, including the right of the Government itself to become a producer. And he has added: "The enlargement of productive capacity is so essential to continued maximum employment and production that neither the concealed dangers in any given plan nor the required scope of Government intervention should prevent action that will be effective."

The bill which would give legislative effect to this philosophy was prepared under the direction of Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and according to its author its immediate purpose is to meet the problem created by "critical shortages of some essential materials and inadequacies of production capacities, together with pronounced and continued increases in some price levels." * * *

The so-called Economic Stabilization Act, offered now, 3½ years after the fighting war came to an end, proposes, without even the justification of mounting living costs, to give the President a measure of control over the economy never previously granted a Chief Executive of the United States in peacetime. It would authorize the President to fix prices and wages, to put into effect priorities and allocations, and to use Government funds to expand production in key industries through direct Government construction. The administration could fix prices if a commodity's cost has risen, or threatens to rise with reference to December 1948. But this measure differs from earlier control programs in that it aims, not at controlling inflation, but at controlling one segment of prices, namely, those of industrial materials and products. Although maximums are mentioned for agricultural prices, the administration would enjoy abundant leeway in dealing with these by such hedge words as "parity" and "comparable" prices. Wage increases would be forbidden in price-controlled industries, unless a sort of peacetime War Labor Board, which would be set up under the legislation, should find them necessary—but at least a half dozen formulas are provided by which the necessity clause could be automatically invoked.

As a combination of political expediency and arrogant economic planning, this measure seems calculated thoroughly to alienate the support of every legislator who believes that the American system of free enterprise is not a philosophy that you doff with a change in the weather, a change of seasons or even a change in the political complexion of the administration.

Health Insurance Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Insurance Facts," from the Oregon Teamster of January 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE FACTS

The United States Congress is studying proposals for compulsory national health insurance. Opponents of such legislation, including the American Medical Association and individuals and groups who fear that this would be another step in the direction

of socialism, advance many objections to health insurance.

It is claimed that medical and health services will require a greater national expenditure than under the present system and the costs of administering the program will be too high.

Those who oppose national health insurance are sound on their first argument. It will cost more but of course a lot depends on the definition of cost. The failure to spend more money for health actually costs our Nation a great deal in terms of sickness, disability, and death.

Every year 325,000 people die. Some of these could be saved. Every year we lose 4,300,000 man-years of work. Every year we lose $27,000,000,000 in national wealth through sickness and partial or total disability.

National health insurance could substantially lower these costs of bad health to the American people.

The second charge, that the costs of administering the program will be too high, or at least higher than the administrative costs incurred by private groups or State medical societies sponsoring voluntary prepayments plans, does not appear to be valid.

According to available records, the administrative costs of Blue Shield, Blue Cross, and similar plans are about 13 to 15 percent of the total income.

This may be compared with the only example of compulsory hospitalization insurance in operation on the North American Continent in the Province of Saskatchewan, Canada, which has been conducting such a program for the past several years.

It is a fact that the cost of administering Saskatchewan Hospital Services Plan, which covers over 90 percent of the people in that province, is only 8 percent of the total income. The reasons for the lower cost in this Government program are not hard to find. A large part of the administrative cost of Blue Cross and other voluntary plans goes for soliciting and keeping members and for promotional purposes. This extra cost is unnecessary in a government plan.

American Policy in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Harvard Law School Record of February 9, an analysis of Chinese-American affairs by Prof. Roscoe Pound, who recently returned from China where he served as adviser to the Ministry of Justice.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American policy in the Far East ought to take into account more than China. It should take account of China, Korea, and Japan in one comprehensive and consistent policy—even one comprehensive Asiatic policy. Indeed it should be part of a world-wide policy of at least ranging ourselves with the constitutional governments which are endeavoring to set up democracies operating under law. Economic unification of the world, the bringing of every part of the world to our back door by radio and aerial transportation require that a foreign policy look at the world as a whole. It should look at this land or that with respect to the whole and as to the effect of what we do or leave undone upon the picture of the whole world.

Such has not been the American policy as to China since the war. Our policy has been one of consistent and insistent pressure upon the National Government of China to compromise with the Communists where no compromise was possible. Before the Chinese constitution was adopted, abrogation of the frame of government under which China had been unified in a national government was demanded and today, while the national government is functioning under a constitution, summary throwing over of that constitution is a prime item in the Communist demands. If any proof was needed, what has happened in Czechoslovakia is proof that no middle way is possible under Communist domination. It shows no less that Communists with Russia behind them will accept nothing short of complete domination. Witness what has been happening in Yugoslavia. Coalition of a constitutional government operating under a bill of rights with Communists is impossible except on the terms in which Mark Twain characterized the Biblical prophecy of the lion and the lamb lying down together—the lamb inside.

Our policy has been in effect to undermine the morale of an exhausted and war weary people by insisting that it could have peace only by yielding to the Communist demands by compromise amounting to abdication. We must remember that recent China has been long and severely afflicted by war. One might begin with the Opium War in 1840 when a western power forced opium on the Chinese government of that day. Aggression went on for a generation, and in 1885 France sliced off a great territory. There followed continual and increasing extortion of cessions and concessions by European powers and successive insurrections. At the time of the Boxer Rebellion the European powers and the United States intervened. There were no less than 11 insurrections in 25 years before 1911–1912 when the monarchy collapsed. Then followed a long struggle from 1912 to 1928 with the war lords. In 1931 the Japanese set up a puppet regime in Manchuria and began a series of aggressions culminating in the invasion in 1937 and 8 years of occupation of a large and richest part of the country. With the expulsion of the Japanese and while reconstruction was going on the Communists set up a civil war. All this weakened the will of the people to resist, and we have made it weaker by persistent calling upon the Government to give in. It must be remembered also that during the war, without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese people, we undertook to give away not a little of Chinese territory.

CHINESE COMMUNISM

I hear it said that Chinese communism is only a mild socialism, distinct in all but name from the Soviet brand. The conclusive answer to this can be seen in emphatic pronouncements from Chinese Communists themselves as to the place of communism in China in the world Communist regime promoted in Russia. Even more an answer is to be found in what has happened in Poland and in Czechoslovakia. What so-called liberation by communism means is brought out by Bernard Goldstein, the only leader of the Jewish community in Warsaw at the time of the liberation by Russia. Goldstein was a Socialist. But this was not enough. He tells us that he soon found that the liberation was but another destroying tyranny.

What speaks for itself is the flow of refugees by tens and hundreds of thousands from the Communist-occupied areas to national centers where the Government has found shelter for them, fed them, and provided work for them. There is no such flow into the liberated areas; it is only out of them.

Communist demand for abrogation of the constitution means abrogation of the bill of rights. The bill of rights in the Chinese constitution is not a mere preachment. It is safeguarded by an independent Judicial Yuan—an independent coordinate department of government—in which the grand justices have the ultimate power of interpreting the constitution and are authorized to enforce the express provisions of the constitution that executive acts and ordinances and legislative acts in contravention of the constitution are null and void. Demand that this excellent modern constitution, put into effect at the end of 1946, be thrown over before it has had a fair chance to operate, and while the Government was in the throes of reconstruction after a long hard war on its own soil, is but an example of what Communists do the world over in setting up despotic military regimes intolerant of individual rights and repressive of all freedom of belief, opinion writing, and teaching.

AMERICAN PRESSURE ON THE CHINESE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

For 3 years in which I served as adviser to the Chinese Ministry of Justice, I saw the effect of constant pressure from America on the Chinese Government while it was struggling with a huge task of reconstruction. It was setting up a constitutional government and putting the constitutional organization in operation thereunder. It was restoring the courts and judicial organization and the administration of justice, disrupted by the Japanese. It was restoring the educational system and rebuilding educational institutions. It was restoring and rebuilding penal and correctional institutions, often torn down and everywhere left seriously impaired by the Japanese occupation. It was reconstructing the process of administration. It was rebuilding bridges, railroads, roads, and lines of communication and transportation destroyed or dislocated by the Japanese during 8 years of holding the greater part of the country. Within a year from the time the National Government got back from Chungking the work of reconstruction had made marvelous progress. I conducted a thorough survey of the administration of justice in three provinces and six cities, and could report to the ministry that the courts, the codes, and the correctional institutions were functioning well, and in spite of many difficulties growing out of the Japanese occupation the administration of justice in eastern China would bear comparison with the administration of justice on the continent of Europe and in America. There has been a tendency in America to be unreasonable in what was expected of the National Government in China. It was impossible to expect 100 percent constitutional democracy and 100 percent perfect administration of justice of a country of continental extent and 400,000,000 population which had never known democratic political institutions nor justice, according to law in the western sense. It was impossible to expect this perfection to be achieved in a generation after the revolution of 1911–12, two thirds of which was taken up with fighting to establish a National Government against the war lords and in standing out against Japanese invasion and occupation, and the remaining time largely taken up in resisting the Communists. When looked at on the background of those difficulties the work of the National Government since 1928 deserves all praise.

We must bear in mind that China had to suffer more and fight longer than any other of the allied countries or German-occupied countries in the last World War. What the Government had to do was to set up a well-organized, modern, constitutional democratic state operating according to law.

When this was done it could go about making fundamental economic and social reforms. But to try these while endeavoring to set up constitutional government might have defeated both. Chinese popular habits of thought and conduct which had crystallized for ages were not to be remade over night. As I have put it before, form had to come before reform. Let us not forget that we have serious problems of race prejudice and discrimination and of class relations in this country which we have left unsolved for much more than a generation. We do not consider our polity inefficient or reactionary because we have not solved them.

COMMUNIST CLAIMS AS TO SOCIAL REFORMS

I have heard it said that explanation of the progress made by the Communists in China is to be found in neglect of the National Government to take up and push certain fundamental social reforms undertaken and carried forward by the Communists. I have heard it said that these are four: Education of the peasantry, agrarian reform, the youth movement, and the advancement of women.

I suspect that Communist education of the peasantry is simply indoctrination in communism. Over a large part of China the National Government has had to do over again much of what it had achieved in the way of popular education. As to education of the peasantry, I have in my possession some charts which I found in more than one place which were used for teaching good agricultural methods and how to read at the same time. One institution in Soochow is devoted to the training of teachers to carry forward this mode of instructing the peasants. It will not do to say that the Government has been doing nothing for peasant education.

I have heard it said repeatedly that the Chinese peasant is under a feudal system of land tenure. Nothing could be more mistaken. The difficulties of the Chinese peasant do not arise from feudalism or from large estates that need breaking up. As far back as the third century B. C., the Chinese abolished feudal tenure and primogeniture. The agrarian problem in China grows out of the very success of that reform which caused the land to be divided and subdivided endlessly. The trouble is not too large estates but minute farms too small to sustain a population sometimes denser in rural areas than in cities of the West. This has been aggravated by the introduction of a Western law of inheritance which makes for increased subdivision. Where there had been a household inheritance, a system borrowed from Continental Europe has introduced a modern individual inheritance. When an owner of a small tract dies leaving five children instead of the household succeeding, the inheritance must be divided into five. This makes against use of the implements we use, and yet the Chinese farmer gets a larger yield from an acre than cultivators of Europe or America. Next to minute subdivision of the land his troubles arise from the complete dislocation of transportation and so of distribution during the Japanese occupation.

As to the youth movement it has gone forward in the domain of the Government quite as much as elsewhere in the world. The Communists have no exclusive claim in this respect.

As to the advancement of women, subdivision (7) of article 26 of the Constitution provides for election by women's organizations of delegates to the National Assembly or National Peoples Congress, the body which elects the President and Vice President, and has power of amendment of the Constitution. At the session last spring in which the constitutional Government was organized a number of women sat as delegates. Also a number of women have been elected as members of the Legislative Yuan, and in the course of the survey of the administration of justice in eastern China I found women judges in many of the courts. In each of the cities which I visited I found a woman judge sitting in domestic relations cases and cases of juvenile delinquency. I doubt very much whether the Communists have done anything comparable to what the Government has achieved in this connection.

I have heard it said that while the Government was carrying on the war, the Communists were reaching the people through a program of social reform. What this really comes to is that while the Government was exerting itself to the utmost to set the country free from the Japanese occupation, and since the war has been exerting itself to the utmost with difficult problems of reconstruction, the Communists have been active in indoctrinating in communism and in destruction.

OBJECTIONS RAISED TO STANDING BY THE NATIONALIST GOVERNMENT

Let me speak briefly of the objections which are raised to our standing by a government which we treated as an ally during the war—a government which is one of the United Nations. It is said frequently that the Chinese officials and public men are reactionary. In my experience what is said to be their reactionary attitude is simply one of inquiry whether measures proposed to be borrowed from the western world are applicable in China. It does not take long for an adviser of one of the ministries to learn that much which he has been inclined to urge at first sight needs thorough examination to be assured that it can be made to work under the conditions in which it must be applied. Much is said about corruption of Chinese officials and public men. I inquired very carefully as to corruption in the administration of justice, conferring with bankers, businessmen, industrialists, members of chambers of commerce, and newspapermen. In no case could I get anything specific. Under the monarchy corruption was notorious. There was a general feeling that under the courts as they are today nothing but a tradition of suspicion could be shown. One newspaperman suggested to me that the pay of the judges was so inadequate that it stood to reason they must be corrupt or they could not live. In fact I found the judges with inadequate salaries eke out their meager salaries by teaching law. This is something which such lights of our American bench as Joseph Story and Thomas McIntyre Cooley did and many other judges have had to do in American judicial history. It is said also that the Chinese officials and public men are ignorant and inefficient. Association with them for 14 years has convinced me that this is quite unfounded. Let me name a few with whom I had especially long and close association. Dr. Wang Chen-hui, head of the Judicial Yuan, is a D. C. L. of Yale and barrister of Gray's Inn. He is recognized as an outstanding jurist everywhere. His translation of the German Civil Code into English is regarded as a classic. Dr. Hsieh Kwan-sheng is a Docteur en Droit of the University of Paris, author of a history of Chinese law in French, published in France. He did signal work in keeping the machinery of justice going during the war and his experimental court at Chungking to try out the draft code of civil procedure was a real contribution to the science of law. Dr. Su, the Minister of Education, a Doctor of Philosophy of Berlin, is a learned scholar and liberal administrator of great good sense. His judgment as to what is practicable in legal education in China has been of real value for reconstruction. Judge Y. H. Kuo, president of the High Court of Shanghai, would be a notable judge anywhere. Just before leaving I made a report on his draft of a statute on conflict of laws. It is a masterly piece of work much better than the draft prepared for the Pan American Congress of codification of law for the Western Hemisphere. No American city has a better court than his.

I have heard complaint that the Chinese officials do not take advice. On the contrary, I suspect they sometimes have relied too much upon advice from experts from the Western World unacquainted with the conditions to which their advice was to be applied. At any rate, I have found that the Chinese officials give marked attention to advice so far as money is available to carry it out. Where they do not it is usually because of lack of money to do what ideals indicate. Under the constitution the legislature controls the funds and officials can do no more than appropriations allow.

Complaint has been made in this country that the Government ignores minority parties other than the Communists. These minority parties, however, are made up of leaders with few or no followers as it was demonstrated at the time of the first elections under the constitution when the majority party agreed to withdraw its candidates in certain districts and leave a free field for the minority parties. Very generally candidates ran by petition and defeated the candidates of these parties at the election. Moreover one of the leaders of a minority party which has probably the most following is listed by the Communists as a war criminal along with the leaders of the majority party.

I hear it said also that the Government has been guilty of gross violations of the constitution. As to this it should be noted that the constitution was not in force until the end of 1946 and the Government was not fully organized under it until the spring of 1948. Much of what I have read is based on conditions during the war which, of course, were abnormal. In the second place, it must be remembered that civil war is still in progress. We in America have not been too scrupulous to enforce the Bill of Rights or adhere to the strict terms of the Constitution in times of civil war or even of world war. President Lincoln was accused of violation of the Constitution during our Civil War. The action of our Government toward citizens of Japanese birth in California or its setting up of military rule in Hawaii and superseding of the courts there during the last world war served to remind us that a bill of rights is sometimes embarrassing to a government under the stress of war. But certainly it is not for the Communists to preach adherence to a constitution.

Again, it is complained that the Government employs a secret police. But we maintain a secret service and certainly the FBI do not go about in uniform. Moreover, the third degree has had a high development with us even in time of peace. When war is in progress and a fifth column is active a government cannot confine itself to a uniformed police. Detectives in plain clothes are an everyday matter even in time of peace.

What can the Communists show in the way of constructive achievements even remotely to compare with what the Chinese National Government has done under the greatest of difficulties in the way of building up a constitutional regime and in reconstruction after 8 years of enemy occupation?

WHAT COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CHINA WILL MEAN

Will Communist domination mean a country with which we in America can have commercial relations such as we have had increasingly for 100 years? Will it mean a country with which we can have the cultural relations which we have maintained increasingly for more than 50 years? One has only to look at the pronouncements of the Chinese Communists as to American relations to answer these questions.

What, then, are we to do in our relations with a Communist regime? For one thing, I submit we must bear in mind the effect of

what we do on Korea, on Japan, and indeed on all Asia if not on continental Europe. We must remember the effect of what we do on the remnant in China for the situation need not be more despaired of than when the Japanese occupied the best part of the land. If we give continued aid and comfort to the Chinese Communists by our attitude toward even the remnant of the national government we shall be undoing what we have been striving to do toward maintaining democratic constitutional government in other parts of the world.

Keep Uncle Sam Solvent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Henry J. Taylor on Monday evening, February 14:

KEEP UNCLE SAM SOLVENT

The Government is pouring out money these days, and some people feel they may as well ride the gravy train. But I think the gravy train will be our funeral train if we don't watch out.

If we want to keep our jobs, we've got to help keep this country solvent. Some place along the line we must do a little choosing. We can't spend everything, spend everywhere, be as blind as bats, and still not go broke.

Most politicians, left to their own devices, will bankrupt anything. That's the record. I'd like to mention tonight some of their plans for spending at our expense. You may find it difficult to believe these plans, but they should be revealed to the public. For if America goes broke, the public goes broke. You go broke. I go broke.

NO WORLD POWER WITHOUT HOME POWER

Our Washington spenders and taxers say that they want to put the world on its feet. But unless some limits are defined, they will try to put so many people in the world on their feet that they will knock us all off our own feet here at home. Then what will happen to our security and to world security? What will happen to world prosperity and to world peace?

The future of the peace of the world depends, uniquely and entirely, on what happens inside the United States. Our world power depends on our home power. If our home power is lost, our world power is lost.

THE RUSSIANS' BET

What are the Russians betting on? They are betting we will knock ourselves out in our own gymnasium.

Listen to Lenin. He laid this important idea right on the line. Lenin said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

How can our political spenders be so blind as not to see that this is Russia's fundamental aim? They preach security from the cradle to the grave, as well as unlimited taxing and spending to achieve it. But though we were cradled in liberty, we may well get a grave in bankruptcy.

UNCLE SAM EVERYBODY'S SANTA CLAUS

Although we have less than 7 percent of the world's population—and have already undertaken enormous military commitments to maintain world peace—we are now to charge right into even wider and wider plans, to give nearly everything to everybody, any place and every place, or go broke in the effort.

For example, the newest spending plan will reveal that we are to be taxed for (1) schools and highways in Cuba; (2) railway expansion in Mexico; (3) flood control in Brazil, a new global boondoggle on the Amazon River; (4) industrial development in Colombia, Peru, Ecuadro, Bolivia, and Chile; (5) water power in the Argentine; (6) industry in Africa, India, Pakistan, along with Rhodes; and (imagine this) a beautiful belt of hotels. Apparently Uncle Sam wants to stop being called Uncle Sap and start being called Uncle Statler.

TAX RELIEF FOR OFFICEHOLDERS ONLY

Meanwhile, officeholders are still being added to the public pay roll here at home. The Federal pay roll alone has reached $9,000,000,000 a year.

Moreover, top Government employees have voted themselves salary increases, along with amazing and highly questionable tax-exempt allowances. They've given themselves tax relief that separates their own tax burden from the burden carried by all other citizens.

But I, for one, think that there's a certain amount of immorality in this—to say that taxes must go up, then vote themselves enormous exemptions from taxes and vote those taxes onto the backs of you and me.

What does the bill add up to? What does it mean to every man and woman who is working at a tax-paying job?

THEY CAN TAX UNITED STATES INTO A BUST

Assuming that the people give the tax-exempt spenders all they want to spend, the Government in the next 18 months will consume $66,000,000,000. Ten years ago the spenders broke all records when they spent $14,000,000,000 in the same period in which they now propose to spend $66,000,000,000.

This increase alone is at the rate of about $1,400 in new burdens against every American family in your land and mine. It comes on top of a burden we already carry—the largest mountain of debt ever placed on a people in the history of the world.

Do you wonder I say that our Washington spenders must watch their step or they will tax us into a bust? This country's present prosperity is a very touchy thing. It won't stand much more kicking around from Washington, D. C.

The proposed increase in taxes really amounts to $7,000,000,000. It's not $4,000,000,000 more—it's really $7,000,000,000 more, when the full charges are added. That's the simple truth. Yet, not one penny of tax increase would be necessary if waste were cut—as it should be cut, could be cut, must be cut.

PEOPLE EVERYWHERE ARE WORRIED

I have just been out in Illinois and Iowa and Kansas—in the heart of the farm country. I talked with farmers, storekeepers, country bankers, and a good many housewives. I talked with anxious workers in railroad yards, where railroads are now being forced to lay off a number of men. Saturday and Sunday I was in upper New York State, around Buffalo and Lockport, and tonight I'm here in Michigan. In all these sections, the same thing applies.

Whether Washington knows it or not, people are worried. Instead of a Roman holiday, this should be a day for very sober action in Washington, D. C., with respect to taxes, labor laws, and everything else.

The working people of the country foot the bill. They have a right to insist that the money they earn should not be thrown around like water.

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE AND PRUDENCE

Taxes should come down—not go up. This is something for public opinion to take hold of—and now. The politicians should be told that the party is over.

This is no time for any more hey, nonny-nonny and hotcha-cha. This is no time to be wasted into oblivion and taxed into a bust. Times are too serious for that. This is no time for global boondoggling, or for boondoggling at home, either. This is no time for anything but common sense and prudence on the part of our tax-exempt spenders and taxers.

TAKE HEART

As good citizens, we should be too proud of this country to preach our indifference about a matter of this kind, or to be outshouted. We are not indifferent—and we need not be outshouted.

The future of our homes is at stake. As the spending and taxing of this country go, so goes the country and so go we all.

But take heart. The great days of this country are by no means done. If our high-taxers sober up in time, and give the average workingman a chance, we will find that we have not even glimpsed the borders of our individual and national achievement. We will still have a real chance to go ahead.

If we did not believe this, we could not be believers in America. Because that faith is America—and America is your land and mine.

National Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 27, by Reginald Hale-White, M. D. It gives the doctor's view on how the National Health Service is operating in Great Britain.

DOCTORS OBJECT TO LOW PAY AND OVERWORK IT CAUSES—TRIVIAL COMPLAINTS CLOG THE CLINICS AND CONGESTED SURGERIES CAUSE DELAYS FOR BONA FIDE CASES

(By Reginald Hale-White, M. D., vice chairman of the British Fellowship for Freedom in Medicine)

LONDON.—The Fellowship for Freedom in Medicine was founded as the outcome of grave anxiety caused by the uncontestable and alarming decline in the quality of doctoring in the British Isles since the National Health Act came into operation in July 1948. It aims at restoring and preserving freedom and professional standards in the medical services of this country. It is concerned also to safeguard freedom in all matters pertaining to medical education, and to protect medicine from becoming a state monopoly. The fellowship is committed in principle to state medical services covering the entire population. There are right means and wrong means of achieving this end. The means adopted by the government have produced chaos.

That standards of doctoring have deteriorated is certainly not the fault of the profession. The blunt fact is that doctors are now desperately overworked. Why? Mainly because the bureaucrats who devised the National Health Service either have no knowledge whatever of human nature or pretend that nothing of the sort exists. The natural inclination of most people when told they can have something for nothing is to ask for rather too much of it. If, when the state

took over British railways it had been announced that everybody must contribute a pound a year and could then travel ad libitum, millions would have been journeying to land's end for no reason at all. That is precisely the kind of thing that is happening under the National Health Service.

DESERVING CASES SUFFER

It is not uncommon nowadays for the urban general practitioner to have a queue of 60 at each of his surgeries (daily consultation sessions at his own rooms). Before the introduction of the service the average attendance per surgery would be a dozen to a score. Of the 60 registered patients in the doctor's queue now it often turns out that perhaps half are not really ill at all. Their complaints are trivial. They have been attracted by the prospect of free treatment and free medicine. The surgery is increasingly regarded as a state gift shop. People drop in to get a prescription for a truss, or a sleeping draught, or a roll of medicinal cotton wool. The harassed doctor is often tempted to make out prescriptions not because they are needed, but to save time.

The longer the surgery queue, of course, the harder the lot of the really ill, who, if they happen to be at the wrong end, have to wait until the more superficial cases in front have had their trivialities attended to. Insofar as the scheme is insuring treatment for those who previously could not well afford it, the fellowship rejoices, but in the present congested state of the surgeries it is often the deserving cases who get the worst deal. Most general practitioners hold two surgeries, one in the morning and one in the evening, with home visits between. In the old days, when private practice went hand in hand with a limited State health-insurance scheme (for wage earners of relatively modest means only), this routine worked smoothly and efficiently enough. Nowadays it has become slavery. In trying to cure other people, the doctor is in danger of killing himself. What is more serious, he no longer has the time for careful and considered diagnosis—the ground work of all medicine.

EXAMINES ENTIRE FAMILY

The 9 a. m. surgery, which once lasted for perhaps an hour and a half, commonly goes on till noon. The 5:30 p. m. surgery may not be over till 10 p. m. The home visits which complete the general practitioner's day used to average, perhaps, 10 minutes each. The national health service has changed all that. Not only is the wage earner (or professional man) entitled to free medical attention, so also are his wife and children. This, I agree, is a wholly admirable provision, but, more often than not, it means that the doctor, once he puts his head around a patient's door, cannot get away in under half an hour. He is usually asked to examine the entire family. In one way and another, he is on the stretch for 13 hours a day. After bedtime there are the usual birth and emergency calls. Should there be any odd half hours of spare time, these are devoted to the endless clerical work which the scheme entails. Every surgery now has its filing cabinet of record cards. On these every illness of every registered patient is entered—for inspection, if need be, by authorized government officials. There are also stacks of official forms. The doctor has to issue two certificates before a sick man can stay away from his job for a fortnight and a third authorizing him to return when better. There are forms to fill for people who want free milk, extra milk, exemption from jury service, extra allocations of coal, free transport to the polling booth, and other benefactions. The rulings and schedules of the Ministry of Health have to be studied with care. If, distracted by pressure of work, the doctor makes out a prescription for a nerve food which happens not to be on Whitehall's latest free list, the patient is duly supplied by his druggist, but it is the doctor who must foot the bill.

Many doctors find that the desk and administrative work which the service has piled on top of their purely professional duties is too much for one brain and one pair of hands. They have almost given up hoping for the Government's promised local health centers, at which doctors were to have found all the secretarial and nursing aid they needed. There were to have been hundreds of these centers up and down the country. They would, in part, have supplemented, in part supplanted, the surgeries of some 25,000 doctors, mostly in the towns. As outlined by Mr. Bevan, the Health Minister, the project was in many respects alluring. Upkeep of private surgeries has always been a heavy item in the private doctor's overheads. Unfortunately, the entire scheme had to be shelved because of the shortage of building labor and materials. Nobody could have been more acutely aware of these shortages than the health minister himself, whose department has charge of Britain's entire housing program. Plans have only just been completed for the first local health center. It is not expected to be built for 3 or 4 years. Is it surprising that practitioners should feel a little cynical when promise and performance are compared?

For the secretarial help which was to have been provided at the health centers the average general practitioner relies upon his wife. It is she who, unpaid, types for him, answers the telephone, opens his door, helps with the form filling, enters up his home-visit diary; all this on top of family and household work, which are a whole-time job in themselves.

RETURNS INADEQUATE

The provisions of the act are such that it is easy to misjudge what doctors earn. For example, it is pointed out that the individual doctor may have up to 4,000 patients on his list. In some urban areas a man might be able to undertake this maximum number if he happened to be fatigue-proof. It is a fact that a few doctors are earning more than they did before. But a more typical list would be one of about 2,000 patients. A list of 2,000 patients would keep most men busy; in the case of rural practitioners, very busy. The capitation fees for 2,000 patients come to about $6,400, from which at least 30 percent must be deducted for expenses. This leaves the doctor with about $4,000 a year, on which he has to pay income tax. His net income is undoubtedly an inadequate return for very hard work, following a long and expensive training. He cannot possibly live or educate his children in a manner commensurate with the services he gives.

The doctor may, if he wishes, of course, stay out of the scheme, and depend for his living on private patients. Or he may be half out and half in, combining private with State service. Such, at least, is the theory. In many districts, however, private practice is dying out. When the National Health Service was being formulated, Mr. Bevan blandly assured the country that private practitioners would be at liberty to carry on as before if the scheme did not interest them. Actually his measures are putting the private men out of business—and seem deliberately designed to do so. The fellowship is constantly getting evidence on this point. Of two letters recently received from doctors, one says: "My private practice has completely disappeared." The other says: I now have three private patients left." The fact is, that while many patients prefer to avoid NHS queues and to consult their doctors on a fee-paying basis as before, few are prepared to pay into the bargain for drugs which everybody else is getting nominally free of charge. The private patient is as entitled as the rest to free pills, medicines, spectacles, false teeth, and what not. After all, he pays his contribution under the scheme like anybody else. But the laws tells the private patient, "No, you must pay for these things twice over; firstly as taxpayers and health service contributor; second over the druggist's counter." Here is an anomaly that cries out for reform.

REMEDY FOR DISASTER

However, the paramount question is: How does the general public fare? They gain in the matter of free dentures, spectacles, and such like; but when their appetite for such benefits has been satisfied they will find at what cost these good things have been purchased. There will be a service run by overworked and tired doctors who cannot give the time or thought necessary for good work. The public will find their doctors fast becoming civil servants who are more responsible to Whitehall than to their patients. That treasured, though undefinable thing, doctor-patient relationship, does not permit of third-party interference; and it is already going fast. In short, the service will be entirely soulless.

This disaster can only be remedied by far-reaching amendment of the act. Matters of pay can be settled by regulation. One suggestion is that the capitation fee should be much higher for, say, the first 1,500 patients, thus discouraging large lists. Another suggestion is that each patient shall contribute a small sum for each item of doctor's service in addition to his weekly contribution. In this way frivolous misuse of the service would be stopped.

But, urgent though the financial aspect may be, there are matters of even greater importance. The dictatorial powers of the minister must be limited; private practice, the only safeguard against state monopoly, must be encouraged and the doctor must once again be given the chance of serving his patients according to their needs and his conscience, and not according to the edicts of the ministry.

Veterans' Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Joint Memorial 9

Joint memorial of the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Montana, to the Congress of the United States, to the honorable United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and ZALES N. ECTON, and to the honorable Representatives in Congress, MIKE MANSFIELD and WESLEY A. D'EWART, relating to veterans' housing

Whereas we have been informed that Raymond M. Foley, Federal Housing Administrator, has told you that the Nation needs some 18,000,000 new dwellings in the next 10 years; and

Whereas a portion of that need for new housing exists among veterans in the State of Montana; and

Whereas many of the citizens and the residents of the State of Montana believe that the need for furnishing assistance to these veterans in building homes for themselves and families is of paramount importance to the welfare of this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the Senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass legislation at the earli-

est possible moment which will aid and assist veterans in building homes for themselves and their families; be it further

Resolved, That immediately upon passage a copy of this memorial be forwarded to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana, by air mail.

Protection of New England From Economic Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include therein recent editorials entitled "A Goal To Unite New England" and "Local Industry Menaced" from the Fitchburg Sentinel concerning the basing-point system and the importance of uniting New England behind a constructive economic program.

It is very interesting for me to note that these excellent editorials stress the need for close and effective cooperation between various industrial, labor, and civic groups in order to promote sound and lusty economic conditions in New England.

I personally do not think too much emphasis can be placed upon the present importance of united action to protect New England from economic discrimination and to revitalize our industries and consequently extend employment and business opportunities. Our working people depend upon healthy and thriving industries. That is why it is of paramount interest at this time through a union of private and public-interested groups to map a program which will prevent further recessionary trends and reestablish our industry and economic system on a secure foundation.

LOCAL INDUSTRY MENACED

Associated Industries of Massachusetts has laid before the Senate Trade Policies Subcommittee the results of its study on the basing-point system and a Supreme Court decision which has thrown the traditional system of differential freight rates into confusion. Associated Industries has declared in favor of a bill filed by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, which is similar to one filed in the House by Congressman PHILBIN; and the observations of the Massachusetts manufacturers are parallel to those made by Mr. PHILBIN when he spoke on the measure before the House.

Chief objective is to clear away confusion resulting from the Supreme Court decision and to protect Massachusetts capital and labor by making certain that previous freight-rate differentials will be guaranteed by congressional action. Roy F. Williams, for Associated Industries, reminds the Senate committee:

"Massachusetts has no mines or other deposits of basic raw materials. We, therefore, must import all the raw material we must use in our industries and pay the freight from distant points, and at rates that are constantly rising. It is of the utmost importance to us if we are to survive as an industrial State that our freight bill be equalized with that of our competitors."

Associated Industries conducted a questionnaire survey of 1,800 manufacturers in this State and on the basis of the study concluded that if the present situation is not clarified not only will Massachusetts plants lose profits, but Massachusetts workers will lose jobs and some Massachusetts industries will be liquidated, or forced to move out of the State closer to supply and markets.

As Mr. PHILBIN urged, appeals should be addressed to our Senators and Congressmen that the Philbin or Johnson bill, or some similar measure, be passed. Here is a proposition on which all elements of the Massachusetts population should be able to come to quick agreement and reveal a united strength before Congress.

A GOAL TO UNITE NEW ENGLAND

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN of our third district has filed a bill whose subject matter is too complicated to produce a flood of letter-writing to Congress, but is nevertheless of utmost importance to every family in Fitchburg and all of New England. He urges careful study of it by local government units, labor, management, and various organizations concerned with the welfare of New England.

It has to do with freight-rate differentials and the so-called basing-point system. Under traditional practices New England manufacturers were able to compete in prices with manufacturers in distant parts of the United States with the basing point system which in general permits freight absorption by sellers and shippers and insures relatively equal competitive advantages for all regions and sections in the national market. It is obvious to the most casual observer that such a system is vital to the survival of many industries in New England, which must draw their raw materials from distant regions and must sell most of their output outside New England.

A decision by the United States Supreme Court threw this traditional system into confusion and uncertainty. Mr. PHILBIN's bill aims to remove the confusion, and at the same time to protect business and the consumer against illegal conspiracies, combinations, and agreements in restraint of trade, monopoly, and unfair trade practices and competition.

In a speech before the House on his bill Mr. PHILBIN remarked:

"It is asserted by business groups, economists, and experts who have studied the broad, intricate ramifications of this question that irreparable damage will be done to our industry and widespread unemployment will directly ensue unless our New England industries are able to compete on an equal price basis with competitors in the national field. The available evidence indicates that with basing points eliminated freight costs will increase, industries will be crippled and liquidated, or required to move to other localities."

The decision of the Supreme Court, if allowed to stand without rectification by Mr. PHILBIN's bill or similar clarifying legislation, would result in literally cruel punishment economically of New England for no fault other than being located at the extreme northeast corner of the Republic, removed from sources of raw material and from the markets for its output.

Through war and peace, New England has supplied for centuries the sinews of national strength by its manufactured products, made possible under the traditional basing-point system with its freight-rate differentials. Is this great workshop of the Nation, a vital part of the arsenal for democracy, to be penalized now "under tortured concepts of various and wholly desirable trade-regulatory laws?" The answer lies not only with Congressman PHILBIN and others in Washington, but also with the chambers of commerce, industrial and trade organizations, mercantile groups, labor, management, and everybody concerned with the problem of keeping New England economically sound and lusty.

Mr. PHILBIN hopes that all such individuals and groups will appear before committees of the Congress to urge a careful study and every prompt remedial action necessary in a situation which could have such dire consequences to New England.

Too often those who have the welfare of New England at heart feel that they are stymied in their efforts to protect its interests, that they are fighting against inevitable economic and social trends; but in this instance there is offered a specific issue on which they may draw the sword and go forth to battle for New England. May Fitchburg and the Montachusett region be found in the vanguard of battlers seeking to erase the uncertainty and confusion caused by the Supreme Court decision.

Visit of Speaker Rayburn to Tennessee

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, February 24, our beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives visited Tennessee, with a number of our colleagues in Tennessee, and addressed a tremendous Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner.

As we all know, the Speaker is a native of Tennessee, and his return to his native State was a welcome and happy occasion. He spoke to an overflow crowd, and although I was not present I received a telephone call in the midst of the occasion that 400 people were on the outside waiting to get in, and they asked me if I could do anything at all to get them inside.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that your able address be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. SAM RAYBURN, SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Chairman Evans, Governor Browning, Senator Kefauver, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, who have done me the honor to journey down to Nashville to see me, my fellow Democrats of the great State of Tennessee:

It is a happy privilege that I have this evening in coming back to my native soil, the soil of the great volunteer State, and I would be untrue to myself and to the blood that courses through my veins if I did not say that I am deeply touched and greatly honored that my kinsmen and the descendants of the friends of my father and mother from Roane county have come out to greet me this evening. In those hills of East Tennessee, a rugged country, rugged men and women grew to manhood to serve their day and their generation.

IN POLITICS 42 YEARS

I have been in politics for nearly 42 years. Twenty-two times the people of my county have honored me by supporting me. Nineteen times the people of a great congressional district have honored me by choosing me as their spokesman in the greatest legislature upon all this earth.

I have served in the House of Representatives with more than 2,300 men and women. Many of them have left me there and gone to what Senators call the upper body. There is no upper body in Washington. We are coordinate and of equal power.

Sometimes people say that men in public service have deteriorated in ability. Looking back over these 36 years with all of these men I have served with in the House of Representatives, and the many, many Senators that I have known, I say to you that the Members of the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives today are men of as high character and as great ability as any Members who ever served in these Congresses that I have been a member of.

RICH IN HISTORY

Tennessee, rich in history, has today in the Senate and in the House of Representatives men of as high character, as noble purpose, and of as great ability as this or any other State ever sent to that high council.

And so I am glad to come to Tennessee and before their friends and constituents attest for your Representative in that great body. I also am proud to come to Tennessee and to this great outpouring of Democrats to give you greetings directly from our great leaders.

As a Republican the other day described in a Lincoln Day dinner the greatest political tornado that had struck the United States in a century, Harry S. Truman. It was his courage, his fighting spirit, his never-say-give-up that led us to victory in November.

TALKED IN NINE STATES

Now I have talked in nine States. Senator BARKLEY, probably the greatest campaign speaker in America, talked in many States. Some people tried to tell us that we had something to do with the election of Harry Truman, but I say to you that 95 percent of the credit belongs to the fighting President of the United States.

I am glad to come to Tennessee because I am a Democrat, without any apologies here or elsewhere for being a Democrat. Some people wonder at my success in politics, being elected all of these times. I have been elected because I have played the game as a regular Democrat every election year. I never saw a Democratic platform, State or National, that I endorsed every plank in but in no Presidential election, nor in 1948 was I going to let one plank in the Democratic platform drive me out of the Democratic Party.

ROOM ENOUGH IN PARTY

There is room enough inside our party for everybody who believes in government, who believes in fair play, who believes in equal opportunity, yea, who believe in liberty and in democracy. The State of Tennessee has given to the Nation many of its great, and it would have been enough if Tennessee had done no more for civilization than to have given to it the imperishable name and fame of Andrew Jackson. Tennessee gave to America and to the world the greatest Secretary of State since Jefferson in the person of Cordell Hull.

CALLED RUBBER STAMPS

Oh, we are called rubber stamps in Washington many times. I was in that position where I many times was called a rubber stamp because I went along with everything Roosevelt wanted. Well, that wouldn't have been so bad. But each Monday morning the Speaker of the House, I should say the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader in the Senate, and the majority leader in the House sat down with President Roosevelt, as we do now with President Truman.

For an hour or more there we thresh out the program and the policies. When the decision was made up by a majority of that meeting I went along because I was on the team, and if I couldn't have gone along with a majority, I'd have gotten off the team.

So I say to our Democratic friends that were a little wayward in the last election that there is room enough back under the tent for all who believe in the policies of Jefferson and Jackson. I'm proud to be a Democrat because I know something about the history of our mighty Nation.

MOUNTAIN PEAK DEMOCRATIC

The mountain peak in American politics, since Washington belonged to no party, has been Democratic. Many forward-looking men have all been criticized severely; they've been called Socialists, they were first called Populists, and then they coined the word Socialist, and now in some sections of the country and in some groups, if you are a friend of the people, they want to call you a Communist. Let me tell you a few of the reasons why we should be proud to be Democrats:

Thomas Jefferson was the greatest Democrat that ever lived at any time in all the history of the world. He was a Democrat because he believed in the capacity of the average man and woman under proper leadership to govern themselves. He was called a radical.

JEFFERSON CALLED RADICAL

The Tidewater farmers of Virginia called him a radical and a Socialist. They said he has gone off with the Rednecks and the hillbillies of the mountainsides. We do not remember the name of any Tidewater farmer, but we do remember the name and glory in the fame of Thomas Jefferson.

Jackson was cartooned as no other man in the history of American politics was cartooned, but his detractors—long since their names have passed into the shadows and they are not known.

PEOPLE CALLED ON PARTY

Take every hour in American history when forward-looking statesmanship has been needed, when we were upon bad and sad times, the people of the country have called upon the Democratic Party to lead them.

We have to go back only a few years, at the end of the administration of Woodrow Wilson our country was at the highest peak of prosperity it had ever known in all of its history. It took three Republican Presidents only 12 years to bring our country from that high state of hope and prosperity to the lowest point of poverty, unemployment, want and nakedness that the people of the United States have ever known.

AVOIDED CANDIDATES' NAMES

And do you know something, it was a funny thing, we talk about Jefferson and Jackson and Cleveland and Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman; do you know something, that neither Mr. Dewey, in the campaign of 1948, nor any Republican orator from coast to coast asking the American people to put them back into power, called a name of a single one of the last Republican Presidents of the United States.

What did we find when we came into power in 1933? Fourteen million people unemployed, walking the streets of the towns and cities, the byways and highways of the countryside looking for work, and willing to work, but no work to do.

We went into that terrible thing with a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of the Treasury, they did nothing but wring their hands and say, "Please, people, be patient, prosperity is just around the corner."

COULDN'T FIND PROSPERITY

But nobody had a neck long enough to look around that corner and find any prosperity coming. If those 14,000,000 unemployed men had a wife and only one child that made 42,000,000 Americans that had no buying power at all, because they had nothing to buy it with. Add to that the 33,000,000 people on the farms of the country, who were selling the products of their toil at a price so far below the cost of production, their buying power had vanished or been reduced to the very vanishing point, that made 75,000,000 American people who had no buying power, or practically none.

FACTORIES CLOSED

What happened?

Other factories closed turning others upon the street. Fifty-seven hundred and seventy banks and trust companies throughout the United States closed their doors, and at that time this socialistic thing that we put into effect guaranteeing bank deposits was not in effect.

You who had money in the bank at that time, you who owned stocks in banks know what happened. We came into power, we went to doing something about it, we started to spending a few million dollars to put people to work, a great public building program, farm-to-market roads, price supports and things like that, and some of them said, "Oh, we are upon evil days, we are spending the country into bankruptcy."

PUT PEOPLE TO WORK

Our national income in 1933 was $39,000,000,000. We started putting people to work. We put price supports under farm products. We went about the business of doing something about it. Our national income started up, banks began to open again, factories threw open their doors because people had something to buy their products with.

We thought that if we could get the national income up in the neighborhood of $90,000,000,000 we would be very rich, and we would have been.

We got the national income up to nearly $90,000,000,000, and the war came on.

INCOME WENT UP

The national income went up greatly during that time and they said, "Well, when this war is over we're going to have another depression, it always follows war." A depression followed the First World War because people in charge of government had no vision, no plan, and not the courage to put it into effect if they had it.

We didn't have a depression after this war was over. Our income didn't fall off. We spent $350,000,000,000 fighting the war in 5 years, yet the country wasn't bankrupt. Our national income in 1946, not a war year, was $176,000,000,000.

NOT A WAR YEAR

Nineteen forty-seven wasn't a war year, but our national income was $217,000,000,000. Nineteen forty-eight was not a war year, but our national income was $20,000,000,000 more than it was in 1947.

That's the way the Democratic Party has sent the country into bankruptcy. And some people still want to change. I visited the President down in Key West a few weeks ago and they said they wanted me to meet the press.

There were a hundred of them down there. They represented everything from coast to coast and from the lakes to the gulf. They asked me what I thought about conditions and I said I think we are all right.

We are prosperous, the most prosperous we ever were. More people are employed—not 14,000,000 unemployed people but nearly 60,000,000 Americans gainfully employed at good wages.

I think we are going to get along all right. I think our income is going to remain up. The backlog of buying power that the American people have built up under our law I think is going to stay. I don't think there is going to be a permanent recession even, much less a depression.

They ask "But what about Wall Street?" They've all got the jitters. Well, I said my answer to that is that it seems like some people in the world just love to be scared and try to scare somebody else. Let me say this to you. In my humble opinion watching affairs in Washington over more than a third of a century, there is nothing in our economy at this time, Mr. Businessman, Mr. Banker, Mr. Farmer, or anyone else who is interested in the affairs of government, there is nothing fundamental in our economy today to bring about a recession that will hurt much or anything like a depression.

WHY ARE THEY SCARED?

You know, these very people that are scared, I wonder what they are scared about. Their income is greater than it ever was. Their factories are humming from coast to coast, all over the land. Their profits were greater in 1947 than they ever were, and they were greater in 1948 than they ever were.

Are they scared of profits? Are the bankers scared of the biggest deposit lists that they ever had in the banks in all the history of this or any other town or city in the United States of America.

I want to say to you that I think that even though times look bad, and they do, times are bad—we are living in a dangerous age. I think we are nearer a permanent peace and a world accord than we were a few months ago. That's a prophesy only, but that's what I think.

Let me ask you just a question or two. When this depression wes on, did the Republicans do anything? No. Did they do anything to bring about employment? No.

FAILED TO AID FARMER

The farmer selling the product of his toil at a price far below the cost of production, they gave him no buying power. Did they do anything like that? Did they ever know a Republican Congress in the history of all America who thought of price supports? Did a Republican Congress ever think of appropriating millions of dollars, yea, billions now, to bring the comforts and conveniences of rural electrification to the farm homes of the country?

Did they ever think of the great problem of soil conservation, our major domestic problem, in my opinion, because I know if we keep on allowing this rich topsoil to run into the creeks, the rivers, and into the sea, that even our generation will be looking for some fertile spot somewhere within the confines of the United States to raise what we eat and what we wear?

COULD SPEAK TWO HOURS

I could stand here for 2 hours and say to you Democrats of Tennessee the things that in the last sixteen-and-more years we have done for the ordinary plain American citizen, things that gave them bread and meat and clothing no Republican administration ever thought of.

So we are glad to report to you this progress, this great prosperity under the leadership for more than 16 years of Democratic Presidents and Democratic Congresses, except that do-nothing, good-for-nothing Eightieth Congress that was controlled by the Republicans, and their blunderings, their mistakes, made it certain that we'd reelect Harry Truman and a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House.

HAPPY TO BREATHE AIR

I see that time is almost gone. Let me say to you people from Tennessee again how happy it is to me to breathe the atmosphere of this great Commonwealth and tread its sacred soil; and to you and each of you, until I may greet you again, it is my fervent hope, and it shall be my constant prayer, and with your able Senators and your able fine young Representatives in the House of Representatives, I shall labor in the years to come with them and for you that you may enjoy to the fullest measure the rich blessings of health, of prosperity, and one day, under God, a permanent peace.

The North Atlantic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Felix Morley from Human Events for February 16, 1949:

THAT NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

(By Felix Morley)

In his statement of February 9, condemning the vicious persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, Secretary of State Acheson took occasion to attack all governmental procedures in Communist Hungary.

Mr. Acheson noted that in Hungary: "Parliamentary opposition, an element indispensable in the democratic process, has been ruthlessly eliminated." Then he added: "The people of the United States * * * are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere."

There is no question that the American people are sickened and horrified by the action of the Communist tyranny in Hungary and elsewhere. But a good many Americans also remember that it was our own Government, with Mr. Acheson even then prominent in its councils, which acquiesced in the Soviet occupation of Hungary, to say nothing of Communist infiltration of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Albania, Romania, Bulgaria, and much of Austria and Germany as well.

So it is somewhat naive, to say the least, for Mr. Acheson, who served the Roosevelt administration well, to be critical now of the results of our earlier ardent flirtation with communism. It is only a little over 5 years since President Roosevelt, on December 24, 1943, told the American people that "I got along fine" with Stalin. This stalwart Communist dictator, Mr. Roosevelt said further "is truly representative of the heart and soul of Russia; and I believe that we are going to get along very well with him * * * very well indeed."

It is not Stalin who has changed in the interim. In 1944, as 20 years earlier when he pledged himself to the cause of atheistic world revolution at Lenin's bier, Stalin was working to destroy all democratic processes. And if Secretary Acheson is really surprised by the present logical application of Stalin's philosophy in Hungary, the blame for retarded education cannot fairly be placed on the Kremlin.

II

Short of another war—this time to destroy Soviet Russia and rebuild a powerful Germany—there is little we can now do to save the helpless millions of people whom we have turned over to the tender mercies of communism. But Secretary Acheson, however shortsighted in the past, has currently made an observation of great cogency. It is his statement, already quoted, that: "Parliamentary opposition [is] an element indispensable to the democratic process."

The Secretary of State thereby passes much-needed criticism on the so-called bipartisan foreign policy, which has so far meant in effect that parliamentary criticism in this field is eliminated here as completely as in Communist Hungary. Mr. Acheson is to be congratulated for thus indirectly denouncing the pusillanimous Republican leadership in Congress. And it may be hoped that the words of the Secretary will encourage the most careful congressional scrutiny of the so-called North Atlantic defense pact, now under preparation in the Department of State.

The precise content of this projected treaty, on which the great minds in the Department of State have been working for months, is still a carefully guarded secret. These officials are quick to denounce infringement of the democratic process under the Soviet tyranny. They are much more cautious about open covenants openly arrived at when it is a matter of upholding the democratic process at home.

The Department of State, however, has prepared the groundwork for this treaty carefully. It bases its legal case on two earlier governmental actions. One of these is the adoption of the United Nations Charter, in which it is stated (article 51):

"Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

A second justification for the projected North Atlantic treaty is found in the so-called Vandenberg resolution, adopted by the Senate on June 11, 1948. In principle this indorsed association of the United States by constitutional process in collective-security arrangements within the United Nations framework. In debate on the resolution (May 22) Senator VANDENBERG assured the Senate that no European alliance would be underwritten without specific congressional approval.

The Department of State is trying manfully to turn the Vandenberg resolution, and article 51 of the Charter, into two pillars for the support of the North Atlantic treaty. It can only be done by a tour de force. The projected treaty is clearly designed as a military alliance of some members of the United Nations directed against other members (the Soviet bloc) of the United Nations. And to assert that the UN Charter ever contemplated such a travesty is absurd on the face of it. The Vandenberg resolution, on the other hand, specifically stated that subsequent treaties must be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and that provision undermines the contemplated alliance.

III

Among the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution is that of declaring war. Section 8 of article I says flatly: "The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war."

From the viewpoint of an autocratic administration, willing to make war an instrument of national policy, this is a most unfortunate provision. One of the great assets of a dictatorship is absolute control of foreign policy, including the right to declare war at what seems to the dictator the correct psychological moment. That comes when people have been so conditioned by governmental propaganda as to believe that an act of aggression by their leader is really an act of national self-defense. This was the Hitler-Goebbels technique, and they were good at it.

The constitutional provision that only Congress can declare war is not very much of

a safeguard against the will of a President determined to go to war, as we learned in 1940–41. But it does raise difficulties. It means that a state of war cannot be imposed on the American people automatically, and to that extent it hampers the Executive will. Naturally enough, the other parties to the projected North Atlantic alliance are not interested in the liberty of the American people. If we cannot preserve self-government it is not the business of others to give us lessons on the subject. So Great Britain and France have stipulated, very naturally, that in the proposed military alliance we should go to war automatically if they are attacked.

That request is currently causing headaches for the Department of State. It is a reasonable enough request, under the age-old pattern of European thinking. The very essence of the European alliance system is that if one ally goes to war, the others automatically become belligerents. But the men who wrote our Constitution had the temerity to despise what George Washington called entangling alliances. So they put into the Constitution that awkward little provision about Congress. Secretary Acheson, believing as he does in the desirability of congressional opposition, can scarcely wish to circumvent it.

IV

But Secretary Acheson, with the enthusiasm of a new appointee to a post of command, has been making his difficult job even harder than it needed to be. It wasn't easy to work out a binding military alliance confined to ourselves, Canada, Britain, France, and the Benelux nations. The Dutch, for instance, have pointed out that if the Netherlands decides to smash the Indonesian Republic, and if we are an ally of the Netherlands, then we too should line up against those aggressive Javanese natives.

All that has been tough for the Department of State. Yet Mr. Acheson has proceeded to enlarge the problem. Even before the alliance in its original design was concluded he sought to bring the Scandinavian countries into it. And there he has met a diplomatic defeat which would seem crushing if our diplomacy were not so well accustomed to reverses.

The obstacle encountered by this diplomacy, when it sought to bring Scandinavia into the projected alliance, was the traditional neutrality of Sweden. The hard-headed Swedes, like the Swiss, successfully sat out the last two wars. They are perfectly willing to sit out a third in the series. And it is difficult for us to tell the Swedes that since the establishment of the United Nations, the concept of neutrality is meaningless. The obvious retort is that the United Nations, as our diplomacy set it up, has even less meaning. Only Americans are fooled by our feverish effort to build an alliance against Russia within the framework of the United Nations.

The wholly intelligible Swedish plan is for a Scandinavian neutrality pact, embracing Norway and Denmark. If we could offer the Norwegians and Danes an automatic guaranty of military aid, we might be able to seduce them from the side of Sweden. But section 8 or article I of the Constitution prevents. And—again thanks to Mr. Roosevelt's trust in the "stalwart" Stalin—both Norway and Denmark are far too open to Russian occupation to invite that fate without even a "moral commitment" from us.

Secretary Acheson is not unique in sketching out policies which look magnificent, but wither away before the cold winds from Russia. Where Mr. Acheson differs, from his immediate predecessors at the swinging tiller of the Department of State, is in his frank tribute to the value of that parliamentary criticism which he rightly calls indispensable to the democratic process.

It now seems certain that the State Department planners will get this criticism, and nobody is likely to call it premature. Of considerable significance in domestic politics is the fact that the first real rumblings of opposition to the proposed North Atlantic alliance come from Senator TOM CONNALLY, the old-fashioned Democrat who now sits as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Is Compulsory Health Insurance Practical?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my opening statement on radio station WOL, the Washington Forum broadcast, which I made on Friday, February 25, 1949.

IS COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE PRACTICAL?

Is compulsory health insurance practical? My answer is "No," for the following reasons:

1. It would mean an assembly line of medicine, unable to deal with serious cases. The rich would still get good medical care, but those under the bill would find an inferior type of medical service.

2. It would mean a big bureaucratic, political machine with so much paper work involved that the doctor would probably have ink on his fingers instead of iodine.

3. It would be expensive, wasteful, and time consuming. It would probably require 8 or 10 billion dollars to operate, with some 2 or 3 hundred thousand additional Federal employees. The proponents would make you think you are getting free medicine, but my friends, Uncle Sam can give you nothing until he first takes it from you. From your pay check would come the money and the Government would direct your medical care.

4. It would destroy all the present services of the insurance company's voluntary plans, such as the Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and industrial types of health plans. There are now 52,000,000 Americans under some type of insurance against illness.

5. It is not practical because it is compulsory health insurance, which means regimentation not only for the doctor but the patient. The program could not be administered in this great country in a manner pleasing either to the patient or the doctor. It would bring a third party—a politician—between you and your doctor. It would bind up your family's health in red tape.

6. It is not practical because there would not be enough doctors, nurses, dentists, or hospitals to take care of the people under this plan.

7. It is not practical because the Federal Security Administrator would prescribe the rules and regulations under which the practice of medicine and the care of the sick should be carried out. It would destroy the most humanitarian concept of all time—the traditional American freedom. Why destroy a successful medical system, the best the world has ever seen, and substitute for it a system that has failed every place it has been tried?

8. In every country that has adopted socialized medicine—and all the socialistic and communistic countries have adopted this system—it has been demonstrated that patients stay in hospitals two or three times as long as in private or community hospitals. England and Germany found that the days lost by sickness of those insured increased steadily. The hours lost in England because of sickness is 50 percent more than in those countries who are not compelled to receive medical care under government supervision.

9. I have carefully examined socialized medicine in Germany and England on three different occasions. The type of treatment given was appalling. It would not have been tolerated in the United States. There is just no personal interest in the patient. The doctors there fail to take postgraduate courses. Germany and England were the happy hunting grounds for quacks. Medical education became static; research was curtailed. There was no initiative or desire to get ahead.

10. No, my friends, compulsory health insurance is not practical. The practice of medicine under our free institutions has advanced the healing art until it is the envy of the whole world. New methods of treating diseases and many new drugs have been discovered under our system. Here freemen with great minds have made progress. There has been a ceaseless probing and searching of the unknown for the purpose of curing disease. Why try to revolutionize the medical practice, medical schools, hospitals, and technical research when they are doing such a good job?

Socialized medicine is political medicine. It would regiment, pigeonhole, and blueprint the physician and the patient, making them do a mental, physical, and ritualistic goose-step with the tune being played in Washington.

I am sure that you will all agree that there comes a time in the lives of all of us when cold, hard facts of science do not prevail. The people want a personal service, with sympathy, cheerfulness, understanding, and confidence in the doctor. No amount of scientific efficiency can take its place in the dark hours of sorrow and trouble so common in the experience of all of us. These are intangible things, and I have found, as a physician, that through the troubles and difficult situations of life, fame will die, honor perishes, but loving kindness is immortal.

I believe we should enlarge our public health program to include more preventative medicine, the building of hospitals, public health centers, and for research. If the States need some Federal aid, it should be granted, but the administration should be under their own local control. They should accept their responsibility for the care of the indigent and other individuals needing medical care. We can enlarge our Federal program with aid through the States in research on cancer, mental health problems, heart disease, tuberculosis, and dental defects. The problems of health and medical care will then be solved in our own good American way.

Post Card Postage Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

"X" MARKS THE SPOT

First it was the surrey with the fringe on top, which flourishes now only in Broadway shows. Then it was the model T Ford, suc-

cessor to the surrey, the passing of which was immortalized in the New Yorker magazine piece Farewell, My Lovely. The Second World War gave the coup de grâce to the 5-cent cigar, of which the late Vice President Marshall spoke so eloquently. Must the penny post card now follow these into limbo?

Representative HALL's impassioned plea to Congress not to permit the Post Office Department to raise the post-card rate from 1 to 2 cents must twang a responsive chord in many a heart. Is nothing sacred? What diversion is the postman plodding his weary round to have if the scribbled notes from wandering loved ones are enclosed in sealed envelopes, which may very well be the case if the differential between the postal card and the sealed letter is reduced to only 1 cent? Is the American public to be deprived of its vicarious tours with acquaintances which it heretofore made via the colored post card where "x" marked the writer's room in the imposing resort hotel?

Let air-mail rates go up and down. There will be no loud complaints. There is no great difference between 5 cents and 6 cents. At least not the difference there is between 1 penny and 2. We suggest to Postmaster General Donaldson that he search for some other means of securing the revenue that would take his Department out of the red ink. But spare, sir, the penny post card. It is, as Representative HALL says, an American Institution, with a capital "I."

Americanism of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

Speaking at Upton last night before the combined Kiwanis Clubs, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, called for "the revival of the militant Americanism of George Washington." Pointing to current dangers in the world and Nation, PHILBIN declared that there was no panacea short of faith in fundamental American principles, courage, and hard work that will solve present problems. His remarks follow in part:

"It is appropriate that we should reverently pause today to consider and laud the memory of the first great President of the United States, George Washington. He and the early founders who worked with him, by idealism, faith in democracy, courage, and sacrifice shaped the free institutions which we enjoy today. These institutions did not grow overnight. They came from long struggle, hardship, and bloodshed. They came from vision, imagination, courage, and hard unremitting work.

"The Nation has grown and expanded greatly since that time. It has developed unbelievable industrial techniques, scientific inventions, managerial and labor skills which enable us to enjoy the highest economic and social standards ever attained by man.

"But the basic values and principles which underlie this great Government and this unparallelled productive system have not changed. They are immutable truths which are as valid today as when first proclaimed. They are at once the guide and safeguard of our freedoms. If we seek to reshape or abandon them under the pressure of socialistic, of communistic doctrines destructive of democratic ideals, Americans of present and future will be the sorry losers. We have solemn obligations, not to ourselves alone but to future American generations to transmit the God-given liberties which we have inherited, preserved, and strengthened for the enjoyment and benefit of posterity.

"Let us therefore in the spirit of Washington militantly oppose every attack upon American institutions. Let us courageously expose and weed out the termites endangering us from within and be ready to deal with the tyrants that may assail us from abroad. The American people of every rank who desire to protect the integrity and glory of America and everything it means must enlist in the struggle now or choose the other alternative of standing by indifferently while an organized minority destroys our democracy and dragoons us into the totalitarian state."

Touching upon relations with Russia, the Clinton Congressman expressed the hope that patient, far-sighted statesmanship on both sides could avert war. "However," he declared, "the situation is grave. Some early settlement must be reached to keep the peace. In this atomic age no one nation can be permitted to obstruct the cause of peace. In the light of present conditions the United States has no choice but to maintain commanding armed strength to guard against aggression and fulfill international commitments, nor has the Nation choice in the matter of pressing immediately for a world dedicated to enduring peace. If efforts in this direction are delayed until aggressor nations possess the atomic bomb in significant military quantities, the situation will be even graver than today. Now is the time to have a definite understanding with Russia; in fact, we should have pressed this aim long ago. It should be sought in a moderate, patient spirit, but also with unyielding firmness and determination to safeguard our freedoms and security and insure a free peaceful world. There can be a limit to patience."

PHILBIN discussed the current recessionary trends in business and employment at some length and stated that these trends appeared to be something more than seasonal.

"Here, again," he said, "the Nation must get down to fundamentals. Social advancement is necessary and desirable, but it must be accomplished sanely and prudently and without placing oppressive tax burdens upon business and our working people."

Billion-Dollar Industries Plead Right to Pauper's Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Peoples Lobby Bulletin, published at Washington, has some very significant facts which should be called to the attention of the people of this country.

BILLION-DOLLAR INDUSTRIES PLEAD RIGHT TO PAUPER'S OATH

The procession last month, of business tycoons and their professional apologists, before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, bodes no good for consumers.

Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University, thought that in the past few years corporations had overstated their profits by at least several billion dollars, through including high pricing of inventories, and neglecting to appreciate the reduced purchasing power of the dollar. He also stressed the higher costs of replacement of plant and equipment.

Prof. Seymour Harris, also of Harvard, Stanley Ruttenberg, director of research, CIO, and others, claimed profits are too high, Prof. Harris holding they should have paid more taxes, and Mr. Ruttenberg, that they should have paid a higher wage scale.

Eugene Holman, president, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey (who is working to grab the oil resources of the Middle East), told the committee:

"Profits are not something taken out of the stream of economic activity for the benefit of a few. They are the means by which our productive facilities expand." He gave some figures on his company:

"On the basis of including minority interest the consolidated accounting profit was $145,000,000 in 1940 and will be about $474,000,000 this year"—that is three times as large.

Enders M. Voorhees, chairman the finance committee United States Steel Corp., cited figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics showing that from 1940 to September 1948, iron and steel prices increased 72 percent, and prices for all commodities 115 percent, while prices of farm products increased 179 percent and of foods 161 percent.

In the 20 years 1928–47 inclusive, he said, United States Steel Corp. receipts from customers were $22,363,900, while dividends paid were $1,013,000, or 4.5 percent of sales and $153,200,000,000 were reinvested in the business.

A return of 3 percent of sales used to be considered good.

Dr. Emerson P. Schmidt, Director of Research, United States Chamber of Commerce, said that while national income since 1939 had increased by $148,700,000,000; wages and salaries had increased by $85,500,000,000, farm income $20,000,000,000 and net corporate profits $15,300,000,000.

Dr. Schmidt, well trained in the economics of the Chamber of Commerce, did not report that these figures show that since 1939, national income has increased 205.1 percent, wages and salaries 187.1 percent, farm income 229.9 percent, and net corporate profits 306 percent.

COMMITTEE SHUTS OUT LOBBY

November 29, People's Lobby, Inc., asked an opportunity to present the consumers' viewpoint, but was informed, December 12, that it was Senator FLANDER's intention to make these hearings a series of case studies, rather than to have generalized statements such as your organization is prepared to present.

Generalized statements the Lobby wanted to present are unpleasant to profiteers, as the following samples show.

In 1938, corporations paid out 86 percent of their earnings in dividends, and as most dividends go to people with substantial incomes, this meant larger returns to the Government through progressive tax rates, than the yield of a small uniform profits tax.

In 1947 and the first half of 1948, less than 40 percent of all corporate profits, after taxes, were paid out in dividends.

This practice provides corporations and all business enterprises and their stockholders, much more effective social security, than the paltry payments to most Amercians. If corporations finance their expansions and new equipment out of profits—the fruit of

high prices consumers pay—they reduce fixed charges for interest, while stockholders can get their smaller but uninterrupted dividends, even when, in hard times, corporations don't make much profits.

Net profits after taxes in 1948 were about $20,300,000,000—compared with $5,000,000,000 in 1939—which is 12 percent more than in the prosperous year 1947, and 2½ times profits in 1929.

Dollar totals of business have increased enormously since 1940, but the percentage return on sales after taxes, for all corporations in 1940 and 1948 (estimated), also show marked improvement for all industries, except communications and public utilities and mining.

The percentages for 1940 and 1948 are:

All industries (except finance and real estate), 4.6 and 5.4.

Wholesale and retail trade, 1.7 and 2.9.

Transportation, 2.3 and 4.1.

Communications and public utilities, 14.0 and 9.7.

Manufacturing, 5.8 and 6.4.

Mining, 11.7 and 11.5

Other industries, 3.9 and 5.6.

EFFECTS OF ARMAMENT SPENDING ON NATIONAL ECONOMY

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Chairman, the President's Council of Economic Advisers, warned the Joint Orientation Conference composed of business and civic leaders, that if the armed forces spend much more than at present, a return of direct controls over business—and price controls, rationing, allocations, and controls over labor supply, will be forced.

This Conference, called by Secretary of Defense James A. Forrestal, was held at the Pentagon Building, and was attended by Army, Air, and Navy leaders.

Dr. Nourse revealed his social approach in his statement:

"A full perspective on our problem of national and international security requires that it be seen from the point of view of its impact upon the civilian economy."

He quoted from the Council's quarterly memorandum to the President, April 9, 1948:

"The last 2 years have given us a fuller measure of the productivity of our resources when aggressively used. We were not staggering under the load of $11,000,000,000 for our protective forces, and the rise in this item to fourteen or fifteen billion dollars will not swamp our economy nor require us to pass from free enterprise to regimentation.

"Some rather systematic and vigorous discipline, however, must be exercised to redirect our economic effort so as to meet the new goal in an orderly and economical manner."

Dr. Nourse said:

"If prospects for peace had improved, or even not grown worse, throughout 1947 and 1948, our ability to adjust our economy to the requirements of sustained peacetime prosperity would progressively have been put to the test in one industry after another, as each passed from a condition of scarcity to one of abundance, from a sellers' market to a buyers' market—or true competitive enterprise.

"If the practitioners of communism had not thrust us back into the danger of war, we would soon have been thrust forward into the difficulties of peace. * * *

"Even if the defense program were limited to $15,000,000,000, the expenditure of that amount would exceed by at least three billions the present annual rate of cash outlays for national defense. If to this are added further increases, to a level of eighteen or twenty billions, there are bound to be important repercussions on the operation of the economy."

With commendable candor, Dr. Nourse told the brass hats not to go berserk, and put responsibility directly upon Government and the people—in his conclusion:

"If any moral is to be drawn from the objective analysis of this problem, it would go to these points.

"(1 That those who are entrusted with our foreign relations must be wise as serpents and harmless as doves so that the need for military effort shall be held or reduced to the lowest point; (2) that those who are entrusted with the military effort display the prescience and the abnegation that will direct every dollar to the point of greatest effectiveness, and forego every outlay based on traditional practice, corps prides, or dispensable ceremony; (3) that the Government stand ready to introduce those measures of finance and control which minimize the disturbing effects upon the economy; and (4) that the people at large face the necessities of the situation, make the sacrifices, and accept the disciplines which are entailed."

"The people at large" want to know why it is a choice between "the danger of war" and "the difficulties of peace."

President Truman's Statement as Reported Unbecoming to Dignity of Office of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me by the House, and following a statement I made earlier in the day, I am including herewith an article from the Washington Star by the well-known editorial writer, Mr. David Lawrence, concerning Mr. Truman's expression because of a criticism by a radio commentator and columnist. You will observe Mr. Lawrence does not uphold the columnist but believes the language used by the President is improper and out of place.

The article follows:

TRUMAN BLUNT WORDS SEEN AS UNFORTUNATE SLIP OF THE TONGUE—AIDE COULD NOT OFFEND ARGENTINE BY REFUSING TO ACCEPT DECORATION

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman's use of the term "S. O. B." in a public gathering at which women were in attendance has stirred Washington. Mr. Truman did not, of course, say what he meant by the initials—he might have meant "Son of Beelzebub"—but most people here feel he made an unfortunate slip of the tongue for which he should be forgiven.

Certainly Mr. Truman isn't the type of man who uses language of that kind normally. He was provoked to indignation by newspaper criticism. Some Presidents can take adverse comments, and some cannot.

The particular episode which angered Mr. Truman had to do with criticism of the acceptance by his military aide, General Vaughan, of a decoration from the Argentine Government. It is true that President Peron, who bestowed the decoration, is a dictator and that many people in the United States have been alienated by the course of events in Argentina, where liberty has been trampled upon.

AIDE COULD NOT REFUSE

But a Presidential aide could not publicly offend the Argentine Embassy, which offered the decoration, without seeming to reflect the position of the President of the United States. Just at the moment, friendly relations are being maintained with Argentina for a host of practical reasons. To accept the decoration was a step taken as the best way to handle a delicate problem. To have refused it would have caused an international incident and unnecessary embarrassment for the United States.

But Mr. Truman wasn't discussing the merits of the case in his address to the Reserve Officers Association. He was indignant at the newspaperman and radio commentator, who, of course, was well within his rights in raising the question as to the meaning of the decoration and its acceptance by the President's aide.

Again and again Mr. Truman has shown little tact in handling critics. He should have ignored altogether the criticism about the Argentine decoration. There is no rule that requires the President to defend all members of his official family from criticism. In a democracy and with a free press, it is natural that many things distasteful to a President will be printed, and he can reply with vehemence, too.

DIFFICULT TO CORRECT

To use improper language, however, is a grievous error which is sometimes difficult to correct. Many people, for instance, have been arguing for a long time that, in books and plays, words in common usage—even if vulgar or profane—should be printed because they have been so widely used as to become part of the vocabulary of people in various walks of life.

Perhaps these debates on what is or is not proper to permit in books and plays will be affected now by the precedent established here this week. It will be contended that if a President of the United States uses a term, it certainly has something approaching official sanction.

It would be regrettable, however, if the impression created upon the youth of the land is that language hitherto deemed improper had suddenly been given sanction through usage by a President of the United States in a public meeting.

The only way out for the President, it was suggested on many sides, was a public expression of regret and apology. Such a step never hurts a public man.

Farmers' Income Causes Prosperity or Depression for Entire Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a very fine editorial that appeared in the Texarkana Gazette, February 24, 1949, on Income of Farmers. It is as follows:

INCOME OF FARMERS

Announcement by the Department of Agriculture that the average farm income per person was $909 in 1948 does not confirm a popular impression that agriculture has been a bonanza for those engaged in it. In spite of good crops and high prices they earned only $75 a month on an average, about normal weekly wages for a city mechanic.

Those on the land have fared better in recent years, but it is not fair to judge their economic situation as a class by the earnings of some of the larger landowners, or

the fact that many in the Wheat Belt have had profitable harvests.

The backbone of agriculture is the small farmer, the man on a hundred acres who is subject to the vagaries of wind and weather and market trends. Their best efforts through the years cannot bring more than an average existence.

The title "rich farmer" is largely a misnomer. He may have more security than the wage earner in the city, but he is not rich as a class. Not so long as his earnings are $75 a month.

Over a period of decades it has been determined that the prosperity of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of the farmer.

INCOME PER CAPITA OF PERSONS ON FARMS AND OF PERSONS NOT ON FARMS

During the 1935–1939 period average persons living on farms received $243 per capita income annually, while persons not living on farms received $603 per capita annually. In 1946 persons on farms received $774 per capita, but persons not on farms received $1,300. In 1947 it was $851 to $1,453, and in 1948 a person on the farm received $909 annually compared with the person not living on the farm receiving $1,569.

LEON KEYSERLING TESTIMONY

Mr. Leon Keyserling, as Vice Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, February 8, 1949, appeared before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of seven Members of the Senate and seven Members of the House of Representatives, and testified concerning the future outlook for our country. He presented a number of charts to illustrate his points. I am inserting herewith a part of his testimony relating to the farm income. It is as follows:

The most important of these changing relationships has to do with the prices of farm products and foods on the one hand, and the prices of industrial products on the other. As the same chart 15 shows, since the middle of 1939 the price rise has been 175 percent for farm products, 143 percent for foods, and 91 percent for other than farm products and food. However, since mid-1946, when the most rapid increases in the over-all average of wholesale prices have taken place, the increases in farm products and food have assumed a diminishing importance and the increases in industrial products an increasing importance. Thus, since the middle of 1946 the wholesale price index for all commodities has risen 42 percent, for farm products it has risen 22 percent, for foods 45 percent, and for industrial products 45 percent. Since the middle of 1947, the rise has been 8 percent for all commodities and 16 percent for industrial products, while foods have risen only 1 percent and farm products have declined 4 percent. And since the beginning of 1948, as chart 16 shows, the index for all commodities has gone down about 3 percent, but this has reflected a decline of almost 14 percent for farm products and almost 9 percent for foods, while industrial prices have gone up about 3 percent.

JUSTICE TO FARMER REQUIRED

These sharp and divergent trends of agricultural and industrial prices seem to me to be of high and unfavorable significance. It is no answer to say that the prices of farm products and foods have increased more since the prewar year 1939 than other prices, because we would all admit that the farmer was very disadvantageously positioned in 1939 and that this was not good for the economy as a whole. Even if farm prices were relatively too high in 1947, the trends since then show clearly how quickly agricultural prices respond to changes in conditions of supply or demand. Actually, I believe that recent trends show the clear emergence of the farm problem in its more traditional aspects. This problem is to maintain farm prices and incomes in a high enough relationship to other prices and incomes to do justice to the farmer, to further the desirable objective of bringing his standards of living into a closer proximity to those of other groups, and thus to maintain his share of demand for the products of industry and contribute to the full prosperity of the country at large.

In 1919, as chart 17 shows, net income derived from agriculture was at the unusually high level of 17.9 percent of total national income. By 1921, it sank to 9 percent, and in 1932 it was only 7.4 percent. Consistently the farmer has lost ground fastest when the economy has run downhill, because he is less favorably positioned in the economy than other groups. By 1946, net income derived from agriculture had risen again to 11½ percent, but this percentage dropped slightly in 1947 and dropped at a faster rate in 1948.

This loss of relative position by the farmer hardly seems desirable when, as chart 18 shows, the per capita net income of persons on farms was estimated at only $909 in 1948, contrasted with $1,569 for persons not on farms. This is far better than the 1935–39 average when the figures were $243 for farm individuals and $603 for nonfarm individuals, but it is by no means good enough. Nor is the loss of ground by the farmer to be justified by use of the mistaken theory that the demand for farm products has been abnormal during the past few years and should decrease in future years. If we maintain maximum employment and production throughout the economy as a whole, we shall need even higher farm output—though with some changes in composition—in the years ahead to keep industry running at full speed and to satisfy the dietary requirements for good standards of nutrition for all American families.

BRING INDUSTRIAL AND FARM PRICES INTO BALANCE

Our objectives for agriculture should not be to let forces drive farm incomes still lower in relation to other incomes, but, rather, to bring the two into better balance. This can be achieved consistently with a somewhat lower cost of living if the farmer is helped to improved efficiency through a variety of agricultural measures, if the prices of durables and the incomes of those producing durables are not allowed to continue their disproportionate increase, and if there is a reduction of the spread between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets through more attention to distributive costs and distributive profits. As chart 19 shows, the farmers' share of the consumer dollar spent for a typical market basket has declined from 54 percent in 1946 to 53 percent in 1947, to 52 percent in 1948, and the marketing margin has correspondingly risen.

PRICE OF FLOUR LOWER—PRICE OF BREAD HIGHER

From January through November 1948, the prices received by farmers for farm food products dropped almost 10 percent, while the retail prices of farm food products declined only 3 percent. From January through October 1948, the farm price of wheat dropped about 30 percent, the price of flour at the mill and the miller's margin after allowance for change in value of feed byproducts dropped by about 20 percent, but the price of bread rose slightly and the baker's and retailer's margins increased 15 percent. This is but one example of what I have already called the revival of the farm problem in its more traditional aspects.

The prime problem of prices and incomes rising out of line with other prices and incomes is not now in the farm area, but, rather, in the industrial area. As chart 20 shows, since the beginning of 1948, the wholesale price index for other than farm and food products has risen by about 3 percent while, as I have said, the wholesale prices of farm and food products have been declining sharply. In fact, the weekly figures for the last week in January 1949, which are not shown on the chart, indicate that wholesale prices for other than farm and food products are at their all-time peak.

Here's Further Proof That the American Farmer Has Been Handed a Makeshift, Ineffective Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have for years advocated that prices for that portion of farm products used in domestic consumption be based upon costs of production plus a reasonable profit. Surpluses, if any, would command prices paid in the world market.

It becomes more obvious each day that the present program provides neither equity nor justice to the American farmer. It is bogged down by red tape, misunderstanding, and worse.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to present the following newspaper article:

(By Thor J. Jensen, farm editor, Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette)

About three dozen farm editors and reporters walked into a press conference with United States Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan at the National Farm Institute in Des Moines, hoping to get the answer to just one question:

"Do you favor rigid, 90 percent price supports for farm commodities or do you favor the 60–90 percent flexible supports called for in the 1948 congressional farm bill?"

The flexible versus rigid support battle has been raging for months. The American Farm Bureau Federation fought a stiff battle at its national convention and finally came out for the Aiken flexible supports.

The National Farmers Union, the Grange and, at its St. Louis session recently, Production and Marketing Administration directors went on record for rigid supports and a change in the 1948 law.

TWO THOUSAND AT INSTITUTE

Approximately 2,000 people interested in agriculture attended the institute and every one of them knew that the administration's views on price supports will weigh heavily when Congress begins work on the farm bill. Every one hoped to hear what those views would be—hoped to hear it from Secretary Brannan.

Here is what they got:

"This is not the occasion for full-length discussion of the best possible farm program."

Reporters at the institute read that from the Secretary's manuscript before noon Saturday in advance of his Saturday evening headliner speech. They read further:

"A well-rounded farm program must provide reasonable income protection for farm

producers, and that means that we must have an adequate price-support program."

WHAT IS ADEQUATE?

To be sure, to be sure. But there was nothing to define adequate.

So the reporters went to an afternoon press conference with Secretary Brannan to try for that definition. They tried for more than an hour, by direction and by indirection, and when they gave up had discovered just one thing:

The United States Secretary of Agriculture did not know that he is to support the price of hogs at 90 percent of parity through 1949.

Farmers, by the way, are well aware of that support because it can mean the difference between a price equal to the cost of production or an outright loss when their spring pig crop goes to market next winter.

MAY GLUT MARKET

What Congress does about supports after January 1, 1950, will decide whether or not the hog market sees the worst glut in history next December. It would be understandable if the Secretary was giving the matter considerable thought now. He is sending to Congress his recommendations on a permanent farm program in about 30 days, he said.

Unfortunately, the Secretary's unawareness of the problem could not be passed off as a temporary lapse of memory because he recalled that he is to support eggs and milk but even after consulting with his aide could not remember about hogs.

Secretary Brannan, as it happens, was a Denver attorney and came to the Cabinet by way of the Farm Security Administration, so he has had little personal experience with or interest in hogs.

PEAK NOT REACHED

The question the Secretary was asked was: "Suppose we have a bumper 1949 corn crop and price supports on hogs die next January, then what?"

His answer will be of little comfort to farmers who make their living raising hogs. It was: "We haven't yet reached anything near the peak of potential consumption. If prices go down, consumption will go up."

Secretary Brannan admitted that PMA releases advocating rigid supports have been called to his attention. "We will not countenance any unauthorized conduct on the part of any of our field staff," he said.

GAVE STERN ANSWER

He also gave a stern answer when one reporter suggested that the PMA St. Louis meeting had put the Department of Agriculture on record for rigid price supports.

"They did not speak for me," countered Brannan.

But when a reporter came out bluntly and asked his views on rigid price supports, the Secretary answered:

"That's a long speech and, incidentally, one I'm not going to make today."

He was very pleasant in his conversations with the group but the reporters are still waiting for information.

Proposed Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill., dealing with the over-all Truman legislative program and, specifically, the tax phase thereof:

THERE'S A LIMIT

It is a little difficult to fathom Mr. Truman's legislative strategy—assuming that he wants his $4,000,000,000 tax boost. For he has set before Congress an overload of legislation on which he wants prompt action—legislation topped off by a social-security measure so sweeping and costly that Congress may be tied up for months debating it.

Democratic leaders in both Houses are cocking fishy eyes at the business of hiking taxes. Several have said flatly that the Nation's economy could not now assimilate the poison of new taxes. Yet, Mr. Truman has reasserted his demand for a tax increase, which would bear largely on business, but which would also punish the middle bracket of income-tax payers.

Right now, the legislative machinery is grinding on labor-law revision, the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, rent-control extension, housing, and social security, to say nothing of the antifilibuster and other proposals for expediting several items of legislation which the South opposes. Debate on the Atlantic pact is in the offing. Work on these measures will consume months of law-making time before a tax measure can actually get under way.

It may be that Mr. Truman intends to let tax legislation go over until near the end of the present congressional session and then to attempt to stampede Congress into a quickie tax bill. But in the interim—if there is action on social security in the Presidential pattern—individual taxes will have been sharply increased through SS taxation. A worker now paying 1 percent of his wage or salary on a maximum of $3,000 of his annual income, or $30, would under the Truman proposal, by next January 1 pay 2 percent on all income up to $4,800 per year. For an $80 per week worker, the tax would have risen from $30 per year to $83.20—no mean increase.

Meanwhile, industry and business would have to match that increased sum, and you can't raise taxes to that degree, even SS taxes, without reflecting the increase in the price of everything. Moreover, other groups of workers, now outside the social-security system, would be drawn in, and SS taxes paid by these groups would also contribute to higher costs.

There are limits to what even the welfare state can stand in the way of taxes. These multibillion SS taxes, topped by the four billion program that Mr. Truman wants, would cause more than an economic setback; they would heave us into a first-class depression.

Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a letter signed by Maj. Paul S. Davis—no relative or acquaintance—which appeared on the editorial page of the Washington Star. I take this means of calling the contents of the letter to the attention of the members of the House, and particularly to the members of the Committee on Armed Services:

MILITARY JUSTICE

To the EDITOR of THE STAR:

As a reserve officer in the Army with several years' wartime experience in the Judge Advocate General's Department, I should like to comment on the proposed "Uniform Code of Military Justice" recently introduced in Congress (S. 857 and H. R. 2498). Your recent editorial (February 12) suggests that it combines the best features of existing laws in each branch of the service, and some other current comments give the impression that it would improve court-martial procedures throughout all the armed services and benefit accused personnel. In fact, however, this bill, if enacted, substantially would curtail the rights now given by law to accused personnel of the Army and Air Force. It would discard many of the constructive changes made in the Army court-martial system since 1916 and particularly in 1948.

Specifically, the following changes would restrict the rights now given to the accused in the Army and Air Force:

(1) Under the present law a general court martial must have a trained lawyer as law member who rules on all legal questions. Under the proposed code the law member would no longer sit as a member of the court but would be limited to ruling on evidence and other matters during the trial and advising the court on legal questions. Thus the accused would lose the important safeguard of having an informed lawyer present at all times during the deliberations and voting of the court in closed session.

(2) The power of immediate commanding officers to impose so-called company punishments would be vastly increased. In the Army and Air Force a commander now can impose only minor punishments such as extra fatigue, reprimand, or restriction or hard labor without confinement for not more than 7 days. Soldiers and airmen need not accept such punishment. If they do not believe themselves guilty, they may demand trial by a court martial. The proposed code would authorize commanders to impose on enlisted men forfeiture of one-half month's pay, confinement for 7 days, confinement on bread and water for 5 days, or reduction in grade. Furthermore, unless specifically authorized by departmental regulation, a soldier would no longer be able to refuse punishment and demand trial.

(3) The right of a soldier to have enlisted men sit on the court trying him, conferred by the 1948 amendments, would be made subject to decision of the commanding officer as to physical conditions or military exigencies.

(4) A summary court martial (consisting of one officer) would have complete power to try any non-commissioned officer, even one of long service with the highest rating, and could reduce him to the lowest grade. As the law now stands the higher grades of non-commissioned officers can request trial by special court martial and thereby insure that the case be heard by at least three officers and an adequate record made.

(5) Reserve personnel during inactive-duty training periods might be subjected to courts martial for absence, tardiness, or other alleged offenses during training periods and could be placed on active duty without their consent in order to stand trial and suffer punishment.

(6) Under the present Army and Air Force law soldiers may be confined in a penitentiary only for very serious offenses, such as wartime desertion, mutiny, or crimes of a civil nature for which penitentiary confinement is authorized by other Federal laws. The proposed code would authorize penitentiary confinement for any offense, no matter how minor, thus potentially branding a soldier with a penitentiary record even for an insignificant military offense.

Apparently the proposed bill adopts many provisions of the Naval Code of Justice, which has not been substantially revised since 1862, and attempts to impose them on the Army and Air Force. The 1948 amendments to the

Army system were made after 3 years of careful consideration by Congress during which hearings were held and all points of view considered. The new Manual for Courts Martial has just gone into effect, and the Army and Air Force should have a chance to give the new law a fair trial. If more changes are desirable, they can then be made in the light of experience.

I am not sufficiently familiar with naval problems to know whether the Army system could or should be fully applied in the Navy or to express an opinion as to what changes, if any, should be made in the present Navy code. But whether or not uniformity of procedure between the services is an ultimately desirable goal, it certainly should not be achieved at the cost of destroying wholesome safeguards now existing in the Army and the Air Force system of military justice.

PAUL S. DAVIS,
Major, JAGD (Reserve).

House Joint Memorial 1, Legislature of the State of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the House of Representatives of the thirtieth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

House Joint Memorial 1

A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in its thirtieth session, do respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has favorably recommended the construction of a series of four dams with locks to provide slack-water navigation from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho; and

Whereas the site locations are, namely, Ice Harbor Dam, at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River; Lower Monumental Dam, at mile 44.7; Little Goose Dam, at mile 72.2; and Lower Granite Dam, at mile 113.1; and

Whereas these dams are to be enduring structures, constructed for the welfare and benefit of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the names and works of many of our early explorers and missionaries are indelibly written into the history and development of the Snake River and the entire Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the name of the Ice Harbor Dam be changed to Whitman, to commemorate the deeds of Dr. Marcus Whitman, who was martyred in the performance of his missionary works among the Indians of the Northwest; that the name of the Lower Monumental Dam be changed to Lewis, honoring and perpetuating the name of Capt. Merriwether Lewis, who led the first expedition to explore and open the Northwest country; that the name of the Little Goose Dam be changed to Clark in honor of Capt. William Clark, who so ably assisted Capt. Merriwether Lewis; and that the name of Lower Granite Dam be changed to Spalding, honoring and commemorating the name of Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding, who, after 1836, taught the Christian faith and better ways of living to the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians until his death; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress.

This joint memorial passed the house on the 20th day of January 1949.

JOHN HOHNHORST,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

This joint memorial passed the senate on the 31st day of January 1949.

DONALD S. WHITEHEAD,
President of the Senate.

Siena Heights College and Mother Mary Gerald Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, located at Adrian, Mich., in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is Siena Heights College. This is one of the finer girls' schools in the country and is under the supervision of the Sisters of St. Dominic.

Pursuant to permission given to me by the House, I am including an article from the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram, which is as follows:

SCHOOL RECOGNIZES CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY DOMINICAN ORDER—OLD WORLD PAGEANTRY MARKS PRESENTATION OF DEGREE AT COLORFUL CEREMONY

The University of Santo Domingo of the Dominican Republic Wednesday conferred upon the Rev. Mother Mary Gerald, O. P., mother general of the Sisters of St. Dominic, the honorary degree of doctor of philosophy. The honor was in recognition of the contribution to Christian education and culture in the Dominican Republic made by the Adrian Dominican Community under the leadership of its mother general.

The Reverend Mother Mary Gerald is the mother general of the Dominican Sisters, who, numbering some 1,500, teach in six archdioceses of the United States and Santo Domingo and 18 dioceses including San Juan and Ponce, of Puerto Rico. She has been visiting schools in Florida, the Dominican Republic, and Puerto Rico, and returned to Santo Domingo for the presentation ceremonies. She is expected to return to Adrian in about 2 weeks.

There will be further investiture ceremonies attached to the honor at Siena Heights College during the Pan-American Day celebration in April.

The University of Santo Domingo was founded in 1528 by the Spanish Dominican Fathers who later were forced to leave the island because of war and devastation. It is the oldest institution of higher learning in the New World. In special solemn convocation with all the colorful pageantry of the Old World the university convened to do honor to the head of a community that traces its source to the earliest roots of the Order of St. Dominic, founded in the thirteenth century.

Colegio Santo Domingo, a school for girls in Ciudad Trujillo, city first built by Columbus, is the first institution built outside of continental United States by the Adrian Dominican Sisters, who besides staffing the school, teach at the National University and carry on a program of social and catechetical instruction throughout the island.

The college was built in 1946 under the direction of Mother Mary Gerald at the instigation of the archbishop and the President of the Dominican Republic.

Fighting Constitution—Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Atlantic Pact is one of the most important issues facing us today. On February 25, 1949, the Washington Post had an editorial entitled the "Fighting Constitution" and an article contributed by Messrs. Cox, Cutler, and Brown, entitled "Atlantic Pact." Both of these discussions are excellent and I would like to have them printed in the RECORD with my recommendation that every Congressman, public official, and private citizen read them. The Washington Post and Messrs Cox, Cutler, and Brown are hereby congratulated on their splendid contribution toward the clarification of this important issue.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 25, 1949]

FIGHTING CONSTITUTION

Objections to the proposed Atlantic pact on constitutional grounds seem to us to be a bugbear. The issue was threshed out in great detail before the Senate gave its approval to the United Nations Charter. That Charter, it must be remembered, contemplated the establishment of a UN military force that could be used at any time by the Security Council to put down aggression. American troops were to become a part of that force under a simple act of Congress. As such, they were to go into action, in case of necessity, at the direction of the Security Council without any declaration of war by Congress. The United States consent would be given only by the executive branch as expressed through our UN representative.

If the signing of the Atlantic pact should be followed by creation of a joint defense system in the Atlantic area, the international force could properly operate under a similar arrangement. The result would not be to supersede the power of Congress; rather, Congress itself would make the decision to act jointly with our allies in setting aside a portion of our armed forces to participate in the international force. The power to commit the Nation to all-out war would still remain in Congress, although, as a practical matter, probably it would always come to the support of the international force, as it has always done in the past in the case of wars initiated by the President in defense of American interests.

If no international force should be created under the Atlantic Pact the United States could go to the support of its Allies under aggressive attack in either of two ways. The President might decide on his own initiative that the assault against one of our allies was an attack against the United States and act immediately to repel it. The authority of the President to resist attack is well established both in constitutional theory and in

history. As Mr. Oscar Cox points out in a communication on the opposite page, the question of what constitutes an attack upon this country is not a judicial issue. It is a question for the President's discretion.

In the exercise of that discretion in the case of an attack upon an ally, however, a conscientious President would doubtless ask for a declaration of war before ordering American bombers to take off. That would avoid any possibility of the President being left with a war on his hands and no support for it in terms of funds, equipment, and regimentation of the national economy. While the founding fathers did not create, as Charles Evans Hughes pointed out, an imposing spectacle of impotency, they divided the power to make war successfully between the Executive and Congress, and the two branches must pull together to give a real impact to our military might.

In no event can it be assumed that our constitutional system does not lend itself to defense pacts of the type contemplated. If it is to be understood that the President would call upon Congress before moving to implement the treaty in case of aggression against an ally, Congress would be under the strongest sort of obligation to act with appropriate speed. We do not think that Congress would be any more likely to dishonor its obligation than would the legislative body of any other democratic power.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 25, 1949]

ATLANTIC PACT—A COMMUNICATION

The proposed Atlantic Pact raises grave issues of high policy for the United States. It is extremely difficult for any nation to lay down precisely the conditions under which it will commit itself now to use armed force in the future. Such problems must be faced squarely by those who have the responsibility for conducting our foreign affairs.

These issues are far too important for anyone to take refuge in the comfortable but erroneous theory that they need not be faced because our Constitution does not legally permit them to be faced. Whether the United States should give any commitment to use military force, and upon what conditions, are very hard questions indeed. But the questions are questions of policy and not of legal power. It is clearly demonstrable that the United States is legally under no greater disability than any other sovereign nation to make a solemn commitment with another state that each will use armed force to repeal an attack on the other.

The debates in the Constitutional Convention, the provisions of the Constitution itself, and the subsequent conduct of the Nation have clearly established the following:

1. The President and the Senate are authorized to enter into treaties of alliance with other nations involving commitments to defend each other against invasion or attack.

2. The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, has the power to make war to the extent necessary to repel sudden invasion or attack. What constitutes an invasion or attack is for the President to determine, either in advance by a formal declaration of policy such as the Monroe Doctrine or by the making of a treaty with Senate approval, or at the moment when it occurs. Throughout our history, all three methods have been used to extend our concept of what constitutes an attack on the United States.

3. When and if the President makes war to repel an attack, the Congress has the power to declare war in support of this act, or not to do so as it sees fit. Whether the President acts pursuant to a Senate-ratified treaty or on his own initiative, Congress is, of course, under strong moral compulsion to stand behind him. But despite the position in which Congress would thus find itself, the framers of the Constitution never indicated that the legal power of the President and the Senate to take such action is or ought to be limited.

I

One of the major purposes for creating the Union was self-defence. The Constitution attempted to give the most ample powers necessary for this purpose. As Hamilton said, "The means of security can only be regulated by the means and the danger of attack. They will in fact be ever determined by these rules and by no others. It is in vain to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation."

In the minds of the framers, an important means of self-defense was the power to make treaties of alliance involving solemn commitments between nations to defend each other against attacks by third parties. The constitutional debates do not indicate that the treaty-making power was to be limited to such innocent topics as commerce, navigation, or the standard of weights and measures. The whole flavor of the intense discussion of the treaty-making power in the convention debates and in the Federalist papers shows full appreciation of the fact that treaty-making involved great powers that could be used to save the Nation.

Solemn treaty commitments to defend others against attack or invasion were not unknown to the framers of the Constitution. Under the Articles of Confederation, the United States in 1778 entered into a treaty with France for this very purpose, guaranteeing to the King of France, against all the world, his continued possession of French territories in North America. Article VI of the Constitution specifically reaffirmed this obligation to France by providing that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

This pledge was made in the very same document which gives to Congress the power to declare war. It proves specifically that, in the minds of the framers, considerations might exist—and in fact did exist under a treaty already made—which would morally oblige the Congress to declare war.

Similarly, article IV, section 4, of the Constitution states that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion." Here again is a specific commitment, contained in the Constitution itself, that under certain considerations, the Congress is morally obliged to exercise its power to declare war, in order to protect the States against invasion.

It was because treaties were recognized to be such grave affairs that the framers debated at great length whether the President alone should be allowed to make them, whether the Senate alone should be allowed to make them, and whether the approval of the House of Representatives should be required. In support of the proposition that the approval of the House should be required, it was argued that treaties were the supreme law of the land and binding on the Congress and should, therefore, be approved by the entire Congress in advance.

The argument was rejected after James Madison had pointed out in the debates the inconvenience of requiring a legal ratification of treaties of alliance for the purposes of war. The conclusion is inevitable that in committing the treaty-making power to the President and to the Senators, the framers knew they were giving to these men, and to these men alone, the power to commit the United States to make war to the extent of repelling attacks against our treaty allies.

II

The Constitution states significantly that the Congress shall have power to declare war. An earlier draft had given the Congress the power to make war, but "make" was changed to "declare" during the debate of August 17, 1787, on motion of James Madison, of Virginia, and Elbridge Gerry, of Delaware, for the specific purpose of leaving to the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks. The change was supported by Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, on the ground that the Executive should be able to repel and not to commence war.

It has never been contested that the President has the power to use armed force in order to repel invasions or attacks. This means that the President has the power to "make" war, even though Congress has the power to "declare" war.

The President's power to use military force to repel an attack has been exercised on numerous occasions in our history, the most recent, of course, being the Sunday of Pearl Harbor. When the Japanese planes began shooting on our fleet, the Navy did not have to wait for instructions from Congress before shooting back. Significantly, when the President subsequently asked Congress to declare war, he asked for a declaration that since the Japanese attack on December 7 "a state of war has existed." The Congress thereupon resolved that "the state of war * * * which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared," and authorized the President to employ the entire resources of the Government to bring the conflict to a successful termination.

Since the President can himself repel an attack, the crucial question is what constitutes an attack. This is a poltical question for the President to decide. It is not a legal question. *The Prize cases* (2 Black 635, U. S. Sup. Ct., 1862).

Throughout our history it has been the policy of our Presidents to regard an attack against the vital interests of the United States in the same manner as an attack against its physical territories. In 1823 President Monroe declared that "any attempt on the part of other powers to expand their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety" and "the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States."

In 1904 Theodore Roosevelt obtained Senate approval of a treaty which said categorically that "the United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama."

President Wilson asked for war against Germany in 1917 on the ground that Germany had "committed repeated acts of war" against us, even though these acts had been committed far from our shores. In 1922 Secretary of State Hughes signed the Nine-Power Pact, with Senate approval, in which we gave a commitment and obtained similar commitments to respect the territorial integrity of China.

In 1941 President Roosevelt authorized American naval craft patrolling out to the middle of the Atlantic to "shoot on sight" when German naval vessels were encountered. In 1947 President Truman requested and obtained Senate approval of the Rio Pact, which stated the principle that an attack on any American state would be regarded as an attack on all the American states. Today the President and the Senate are considering whether, when, and how to announce that an attack against western Europe will be regarded as an attack on the United States.

It thus appears that our Presidents (and the Senate) have steadily broadened our notions of what constitutes an attack and that they have employed the treaty-making procedure, just as President Monroe employed his famous message to Congress, as a useful means of defining, for the benefit of other nations, precisely what we would regard as an attack on ourselves. And once the President has decided that an attack has been committed, this legal power to repel

that attack with armed force is clear. For example, if an attack is committed against an American nation—defined in the Rio Pact to be an attack against the United States—the President, if he thinks the situation requires, has clear power to repel such an attack by armed force, before asking Congress to declare war.

When the situation permits, any President will undoubtedly prefer to consult Congress first. But there may not be time to indulge this choice. "There frequently are occasions when days, nay, even hours, are precious," said John Jay in 1788. "As in the field, so in the Cabinet, there are moments to be seized as they pass, and they who preside in either should be left in capacity to improve them."

III

When the President finds it necessary to repel an attack without waiting for Congress, it is, of course, for the Congress to decide whether to follow that action by a declaration of war pledging all the resources of the Nation to a military conclusion of the dispute. The Congress can decide that the President acted hastily or improperly, and decline to declare war. Or, as has always proved true in the past, it can decide that he acted properly and back his action by a declaration of war.

The problem does not become essentially different when the President's action in repelling an attack is taken pursuant to a treaty commitment rather than in the absence of any such commitment. The President has power to repel an attack, treaty or no treaty. Once the President has exercised this power, the Congress is under strong compulsion to support him, treaty or no treaty. In this respect the treaty itself makes little difference. In either case, the Congress can be compelled to take action only by its own conscience. There is no national or international tribunal which can force it to support the President.

It is apparently true that Congress has never failed to take legislative action required by a treaty commitment. A serious and inescapable question of policy, therefore, arises each time the President and the Senate consider whether and how to engage the good faith of the United States in any treaty commitment to repel an attack against another nation. But the question is not one of legal power under the Constitution.

The President and the Senate have the power to make such treaties and the President has the power to use armed force to carry them out. While the making of such a treaty creates the possibility that Congress may be confronted with a fait accompli, it also creates the possibility that a potential aggressor may be deterred from attacking. It can hardly create the second possibility withour creating the first. That is the nub of the problem—not whether the President and the Senate can take action, but whether they should take action, and of what kind.

When the Constitution was being debated many people argued that the powers of making treaties and repelling attacks were too great to be lodged in the President and the Senate. It was pointed out that these powers might be abused and that officeholders might be corrupt or inept. But the framers expected the President and the Senators to be men of the highest character and achievements, fully capable of facing and making great decisions. "With such men," to quote John Jay again, "the power of making treaties may be safely lodged." This argument was accepted by the American people in 1789. Nothing in our past or current history indicates that their judgment was erroneous.

OSCAR COX,
LLOYD N. CUTLER,
PHILIP B. BROWN.

WASHINGTON.

Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by J. Carson Adkerson, president, American Manganese Producers Association, and printed in Made in America Monthly of November 1948:

WANTED! A MANGANESE POLICY

(By J. Carson Adkerson, president, American Manganese Producers Association)

Manganese today overshadows all strategic materials in our planning for national security. Without manganese, the "starch" in steel, our steel mills would close. There is no known substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel.

In case our stock piles are used up, foreign sources of supply cut off, and we do not have our own deposits developed and in operation, Elmer W. Pehrson, Chief, Economics and Statistics Division, Bureau of Mines, says: "I feel if we ever get to that stage in regard to manganese, and if we are in a real war, we might just as well acknowledge that it is over."

We have enough manganese ore in the United States to last from 100 to 300 years and longer, but most of the deposits are undeveloped. It takes time to develop mines and get them in production. It cannot well be done after an emergency starts. As in the case of copper, lead, and zinc, manganese ores, both foreign and domestic, are low grade. Manganese ores have to be concentrated and processed. After being processed, domestic ores are higher grade than foreign. But it all takes time.

Domestic manganese developments should proceed during peaceful years when we have time, labor, and equipment.

Development of domestic deposits was underway in 1930 when the Soviet started dumping manganese in the United States. They undersold domestic producers regardless of price. Many domestic mines were forced to close. Then in 1935, under the reciprocal trade agreements, the manganese tariff was cut in half. As a result a number of domestic mines were abandoned and allowed to collapse.

During World War II many new domestic mines started developments. Few were fortunate in getting their plants completed and were able to continue in operation. Others had the market for the lower grade ores withdrawn without warning and were left holding the bag. Many lost their shirts and have never been paid even their cash expenditures.

In 1947 Congress passed a premium price bill intended to stimulate domestic production of manganese and other strategic minerals. The bill was vetoed by the President. On account of unfavorable Government policies producers are afraid to again stick their necks out. In 1948 the tariff was again cut in half.

Proper foresight and wisdom on the part of the State Department in the precious prewar years, 1935–1940, would have dictated a 50-percent increase rather than a decrease in the duty on manganese ore. This would have announced to producers that the Government encouraged rather than discouraged further development of manganese deposits in the United States. Instead, the officials of the Department, while other nations were preparing for war, pursued their single-minded policy of sacrificing our own national defense to what proved to be a utopian dream of peace and foreign trade.

Today we consume approximately 1,500,000 tons of manganese ore a year and produce only 130,000 tons.

According to estimates recently given before the House Public Lands Committee we now have in the national stock pile approximately 1,840,000 tons of manganese ore; a little more than 1 year's supply. For security we need an additional 8,638,000 tons in stock pile and a going nucleus of a domestic manganese mining industry. Stockpiles in the hands of consumers today amount to approximately 676,000 tons. During the second quarter of 1948 consumers were compelled to draw heavily on inventories; receipts at consumers' plants were 24 percent less than the quantity used; imports during the period dropped 21 percent from the first quarter and amounted to 272,975 tons. Of this the U. S. S. R. furnished 38 percent.

Receipts from India, which amounted to 45[illegible],644 tons in 1947, are now curtailed because of recent disturbances in that land. Major operations in Cuba during the recent war years supplied the United States with a total of more than 1,000,000 tons of manganese ore. These deposits are now exhausted and the machinery dismantled and gone.

How long shipments from Russia will continue is anybody's guess.

There is no surplus supply of manganese ore available in the world today. New sources must be developed. Foreign or domestic, we should get every ton of manganese ore available in the world as speedily as possible, and stock-pile it in the United States until our position is secure. This ore is more valuable than our gold at Fort Knox. If developed in foreign countries, however, there is no assurance that these sources may not fall into the hands of an enemy and be turned against us. Russia today is supposed to have several times the number of submarines Germany had at the beginning of the last war. The cost to the Nation, the excessive number of manganese ships sunk, and the number of seamen who lost their lives in a desperate effort to get manganese from far-off countries during the last war is a story yet to be told.

Developments in the United States can be carried forward in less time and offer greater security.

Manganese stands in a category all its own. Dependence on foreign ores has led the Nation into a blind alley, escape from which may again be costly in lives and money.

There is no place in the manganese industry for conservation advocates. Ores conserved in the ground are of little or no use in an emergency. Development and production increases rather than decreases our known reserves of manganese ores. At the beginning of World War I, in 1914, our total known reserves of manganese ore in the United States were less than 1,000,000 tons. Since 1914 we have mined and shipped more than 2,500,000 tons of high grade ore (35 percent manganese and above) and more than 7,500,000 tons of low grade (10 to 35 percent manganese) from this 1,000,000 ton reserve.

If a strict policy of conservation had frozen our manganese developments in 1914 we might still have less than 1,000,000 tons in reserve. Through mining, production, and metallurgical research since 1914 the country has enjoyed the shipment of more than 10,000,000 tons of ore and our indicated reserve of manganese has been multiplied a hundredfold.

Billions are now proposed for mining developments abroad—nothing for domestic.

We have the manganese; we have the processes; we have the know-how, the labor,

equipment, and the money to do the job and make the United States safe in an emergency. What is now needed is a policy—a determined policy to bring forth domestic production. Action must be speedy, positive, and lasting.

Is There a Real Danger of Fascism in the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, hour after hour and day after day the Kremlin in Moscow is broadcasting millions of words of hate against these United States. What is the theme of this barrage of slander? It is that the United States is a Fascist country, bent on a war of aggression against the Soviet Union. This has been going on for years.

On Monday last the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] extended his remarks in the RECORD at pages A962 to A967, a total of five pages, and comes forward with the amazing proposal to reprint at an estimated cost of $35,000, 100,000 copies of a pamphlet which tends to substantiate these ridiculous charges of the Russians, intimating that there is a real danger of fascism in this country. I hold no brief for totalitarianism be it red, black, or brown. But I say creating the impression that we are confronted with a Fascist danger is not only feeding grist to the Communist propaganda mill, but is diverting our attention from the real and main danger, namely, the menace of international communism.

The resolution in which the gentleman from Texas expresses an interest would have us fight the battle against Hitler and Mussolini all over again. It simply would revive a dead issue. We need to keep our eyes on the ball, the red ball of communism.

The gentleman from Texas refers to Richard Sasuly and Bernard Bernstein in his remarks attacking General Draper and I have the records of these men before me. The gentleman from Texas quotes these men as his authorities for criticizing the policy of the American Military Government in Germany and the attempt to tie-in leading American business firms with fascism.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the gentleman from Texas did not know who these men are, and that if he had known he would not have used their words as the basis for what he said.

Richard Sasuly and Bernard Bernstein are followers of the Communist Party line and have been for years.

Richard Sasuly and his wife, Elizabeth Sasuly, have many Communist affiliations and have also received much space and praise in the Daily Worker. Richard Sasuly has been praised by the Soviet Government directly as reported in the New York Times for February 11, 1948, at page 20. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but both Richard Sasuly and his wife have been guests in the Washington home of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, charged with being a wartime spy for the Russians while employed in the United States Government and who only recently, when appearing before a Committee of this House, refused to answer the question, "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"

Bernard Bernstein has also been praised by the Moscow New Times and was a speaker before the Congress of American Women, a Communist-front organization, at which time he attacked the Congress of the United States and defended Soviet Russia.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I wish to have included in the RECORD, the Communist records of these persons:

Richard Sasuly

Front organization	Affiliation	Source
Citizens Board of Inquiry Into Germany	Speaker	Daily Worker, Oct. 25, 1948, p. 11.
Daily People's World (2, 5)	Reviews book	Daily People's World, Aug. 23, 1948, p. 6.
Daily Worker (1, 2, 5, 6)	Quoted by Rob Hall, Communist	Daily Worker, Oct. 8, 1948, p. 9.
Do	His book, I. G. Farben, and activities praised	The Worker, Aug. 10, 1947, p. 11-M; Aug. 31, 1947, p. 17 (Three Star edition).
Federated Press (2, 5)	Writes articles	People's World, Mar. 19, 1948, p. 6; Daily People's World, May 7, 1948, p. 6; Daily Worker, Aug. 13, 1948, p. 6; Daily Worker, Aug. 23, 1948, p. 5; Daily People's World, Sept. 22, 1948, p. 6; Daily Worker, Dec. 12, 1948, p. 10, sec. 2.
Frontier Bookstore	His book, I. G. Farben, offered for sale	Circular, Frontier Bookstore, 602 3d Ave., Seattle, Wash.
Statement attacking American policy in Germany	Signer	Daily Worker, Jan. 28, 1948, p. 3.
Letter attacking American policy in Germany	do	CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1948, p. 7166.
Author of book, I. G. Farben, which attacks Brig. Gen. William N. Draper		Worker, June 29, 1947, p. 3 m.
Author of book, I. G. Farben, which follows the same Communist line of seeking to link American business with the Nazis; has been associated with the American military government in Germany.		CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 9, 1947, p. 8564 (speech of Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO).
Praised by Soviet Government		New York Times, Feb. 11, 1948, p. 20.
Guest at home of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster		New York World-Telegram, Aug. 4, 1948, p. 1.

Key: Cited as Communist or Communist-front organization by: (1) Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) Special Committee on Un-American Activities; (5) California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities; (6) Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Elizabeth Sasuly (Mrs. Richard Sasuly)

Front organization	Affiliation	Source
American Peace Mobilization, Los Angeles Branch (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8).	Member, executive board; secretary, trade-union committee.	Proceedings, first convention, Nov. 30 to Dec. 1, 1940, pp. 4, 9.
Civil Rights Congress (1, 3, 5)	Member of delegation	Daily Worker, Mar. 19, 1948, p. 3.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare (1, 2, 5)	Member of executive board, Washington committee	Letterhead, June 4, 1947.
Guest at home of Nathan Gregory Silvermaster		New York World-Telegram, Aug. 4, 1948, p. 1.

Key: Cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by: (1) Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) Special Committee on Un-American Activities; (3) Attorney General Tom Clark; (4) Attorney General Francis Biddle; (5) California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities; (7) Rapp-Coudert Committee (Joint Legislative Committee to Investigate Procedures and Methods of Allocating State Moneys for Public School Purposes and Subversive Activities, New York State); (8) United States Secretary of Labor decision in the case of Helen Miller, Aug. 1, 1941.

Bernard Bernstein

Front organization	Affiliation	Source
New Times (1, 5)	Praises him	New Times, July 14, 1948, p. 15.
Congress of American Women (3, 5)	Speaker	Daily Worker, Mar. 8, 1946, p. 9.
Excerpts from speech of Col. Bernard Bernstein before the Congress of American Women on Mar. 8, 1946: "The ink had hardly dried on the Potsdam agreement when fundamental differences between the great powers * * * began to be revealed. * * * Russia * * * proceeded substantially to carry out the provisions of the Potsdam agreement. Britain is seeking * * * to become the leader of a bloc of countries, throughout the world, including at least western Germany * * *. Our country's administration of its zone in Germany has been vacillating. * * * Inspired by groups similar to those that fostered the German propaganda campaign * * * a minority group in the Congress has recently been making repeated attacks on the Potsdam agreement and linking these attacks with attacks on Russia. This congressional group is seeking to gain sympathy for the German cause * * *. It is encouraging to note that there is a Congress of American Women which recognizes the fact that fascism is not dead. It is encouraging that the Congress of American Women is preparing to fight fascism everywhere * * *."		Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A2278.

Key: Cited as a Communist or Communist front organization by: (1) Committee on Un-American Activities; (3) Attorney General Tom Clark; (5) California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities.

Articles in Daily Worker attacking American policy in Japan and Germany: February 18, 1949, page 9; February 21, 1949, page 7; February 22, 1949, page 4; February 23, 1949, pages 6 and 9.

Articles in New Times (Moscow) attacking American policy in Japan and Germany:

March 14, 1947: What Is Behind the Plans for the Dismemberment of Germany, by A. Leonidov, page 3.

American Policy in Japan, by M. Markov, page 11.

March 21, 1947: What Is Behind the Plans for the Dismemberment of Germany, by A. Leonidov, page 4.

May 30, 1947: What We Saw In Japan and Korea, by M. Tarasov, page 20.

September 3, 1947: The American Plan for Germany, by K. Hoffman, page 14.

October 22, 1947: American Policy Toward Korea, by I. Yermashev, page 13.

December 10, 1947: The American Policy of Dismembering Germany, page 1.

December 24, 1947: Who Is Responsible for Frustrating the Framing of the German Peace Treaty?, page 1.

January 7, 1948: General Clay's Offensive Against German Democracy, by L. Chornaya, page 8.

February 11, 1948: Behind the Scenes of the Frankfort Plot, by I. Zvezdin, page 3. General Clay's Hitlerite Cadres, by P. Troyanovsky, page 23.

March 17, 1948: From Nuremberg to Tokyo, by A. Trainin, page 11.

March 24, 1948: The Making of the Second World War: American Loans and German Monopolies, by M. Gus, page 7.

April 21, 1948: Falsification of History at the Tokyo Trial, by M. Markov, page 7.

June 9, 1948: New Stage in the Dismemberment of Germany, page 3.

June 16, 1948: Militarism Being Revived In Western Germany, by I. Zvezdin, page 3.

July 21, 1948: The Berlin Question, page 1.

July 28, 1948: The Marshall Plan in Austria, by Y. Klemanov, page 13.

August 4, 1948: War Criminals Acquitted In Nuremberg, by L. Zelinsky, page 27.

September 29, 1948: The Berlin Situation, page 3; True and False Friends of the Korean People, by M. Markov, page 14.

October 6, 1948: Autumn In Berlin, by A. Galkin and L. Zelinsky, page 22.

October 13, 1948: American Policy In Berlin, by N. Sergeyeva, page 13.

Reds Building Up Free China Fable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York World-Telegram of February 26, 1949:

REDS BUILDING UP FREE CHINA FABLE

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

SHANGHAI, February 26.—If you don't look too closely, the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists and their fellow travelers will prove the Chinese Reds are strictly on their own.

The ostensible independence of Mao Tse-tung and his followers will be the keynote of the new democracy which is now being laboriously installed in North China and which later may be imposed upon most of China.

The strange case of Anna Louise Strong is probably a case in point. So is the dickering of the Russians and Chinese Nationalists for a new understanding in the Chinese northwest.

Added to the careful preservation of diplomatic relations between Russia and the Chinese Nationalist Government, and published hints from Peiping that the Russian consulate has or may cease functions in that Chinese Red capital, these circumstances suggest a deliberate casting of Mao as a Chinese Tito—by mutual consent.

Miss Strong has become one leading foreign apologist for Mao and his new democracy.

Weeks before Miss Strong was expelled from Russia as a spy it was reliably reported she was coming to China to cover the Chinese Communists' activities—and she probably was en route to North China when she was detained.

It will be interesting to note whether the Chinese Communists in face of Moscow's denunciation of Miss Strong will admit her to Red China if she leaves the United States. It is a fair bet she will be welcomed by the Chinese Reds though the New York Daily Worker probably won't print her dispatches.

Free Trade Undermines Federal Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Paul T. Beardsley, of Sloan, Iowa. Mr. Beardsley is a prominent farmer of my congressional district, who has given much thought and study to questions of trade and commerce as they relate to our agricultural economy. His splendid statement tends to show how a free-trade system may ultimately undermine our Federal revenues.

FREE TRADE UNDERMINES FEDERAL REVENUES

(By Paul T. Beardsley)

The Constitution ordained Congress to be trustee of the peoples economic freedom in one sentence. The charge to coin money and regulate its value and to establish a standard of weights and measures cannot be fully discharged until monetary values are regulated in the public interest.

Tariff, parity, and minimum-wage legislation are all monetary acts. As the record now stands, Congress has legislated tariff eradication under pressure from tory internationalists and parity-price and wage-support legislation under pressure from nationalist groups, farmers, and wage earners. These laws are in sharp conflict and set up dislocations that result in both price and wage disparities, our only cause for economic depression.

The tory theory of free trade was invented by the British to cheapen the costs of raw materials they must buy in ratio to national productive deficiencies. It sets up world supplies against British demands in speculative trade price-fixing procedures. When we fall victims of tory propaganda we finesse ourselves out of the value of our abundance.

The economy of the United States is 98 percent self-sufficient. It has an average production volume constancy of 97½ percent. Some 95-percent-plus of our markets are domestic subject to our own management laws. Therefore, our economy can be designated as 97½–98–95. Intelligent management of our 97½–98–95 economy dictates the vital need for monetary stabilization. We can achieve an average of 97½–98–95 stability by setting up domestic supplies against domestic demands, and that means constant prosperity.

In 1937, under the benefits of reciprocal trade we imported 50,000 head of Canadian cattle. These imports, a fraction of 1 percent of domestic production, broke our cattle prices $2 to $3 per hundredweight. The average loss in value of 1,000-pound cattle was approximately $25 or 25 percent of the then average value of $100 per head.

If we duplicate with present values of approximately $200 for cattle, a 25-percent loss will extend to $50 per head. The average national inventory of 75,000,000 cattle times $50 adds up to $3,750,000,000 contraction in domestic values.

Of course, this is a paper loss unless or until cattle move to market. But it is an inventory loss taken into consideration in income tax accounting. A $50 per head loss will wipe out all cattle-production profits upon which Federal income taxes are a levy. If all cattle producers use the accrual method of income-tax accounting, and most of them do, the loss is equal to the national average of income-tax payments of 15.67 percent in ratio to earned national income (1945–48 inclusive) times $3,750,000,000 or $293,812,500 contraction in Federal revenues. Congress can reduce this estimated loss by all factors of legal and illegal adjustments that creep into the great mass of income-tax returns and then compare the answer with the $5,000,000 value of the Canadian cattle to arrive at the monetary effect of its policies.

In 1939, we reached the apex of imports of Polish cured pork, stopped by war. These imports have been revived and if they attain prewar volume, the impact on Federal revenues will be disastrous. The Department of State can never justify its dual policy of syphoning needed meat supplies out of Europe with the Marshall plan free exports of meats to combat communism. If we needed the Polish pork we might justify taking the food out of the mouths of our peace-loving friends in Europe, but every Member of Congress knows we can produce all the pork we can consume.

The 1939 imports broke domestic hog prices $10 per head. The 1934–39 average Chicago top hog price was $11.30 per hundredweight, extending to a value of perhaps $25 per hog. Therefore, the $10 loss was a 40-percent loss. If current Polish imports again contract domestic hog values 40 percent the loss will average $18 per head compared to $45 current values. If Congress wants to do a simple problem in arithmetic, multiply the present hog population by the $18 per head estimated loss times the 15.67-percent average conversion of profits to Federal revenues and find income taxes contracted in excess of $175,000,000, probably several times the value of the imports.

Tory policy includes the artificial imposition of world supplies, as a surplus factor, to the other artificial surplus situations arising from market conditions at harvest time and inventory accumulations in ratio to underconsumption caused by price collapse in our speculative commodity markets. We have never built an enduring surplus, except perhaps in cotton, potatoes, and one or more other items. To say we have too

much production is tantamount to an admission we have too much real wealth.

Giving consideration to the fact that each dollar of farm income underwrites $7 in national income, reported by Wilken, each $1,000 sale of cotton, potatoes, etc., extended to $7,000 national income, subject to the income-tax levy of 15.67 percent, therefore develops an average of $1,069.90 Federal revenues when parity or profit prices are present. Therefore, the rate of conversion of raw materials into dollars is fully as important as the tax rate in developing revenues.

It is much more scientific to follow the logical nationalistic policies in developing the revenues needed to pay all costs, including the costs of liquidation of any surplus, than to follow tory tactics in permitting artificial surpluses to develop depression prices and wages.

These same conclusions apply to all types of imports that displace domestic enterprise to the extent of depressing prices so low there are no profits available for conversion into Federal revenues. If the spokesmen for industries adversely affected by tariff reductions would present Congress with a prospectus of revenue losses caused by imports displacing potential profits, the tory apparatus could not continue the illogical propaganda that reciprocal trade was in the public interest. The seven turns in our national economy, not including official and unofficial auxiliary services, are:

1. Raw-material production.
2. Transportation to manufacturer.
3. Manufacturing.
4. Transportation to wholesaler.
5. Wholesale sales.
6. Transportation to retailer.
7. Consumer sales.

When finished goods are imported domestic profits begin on the wholesale level bypassing the first four turns. The unearned profits of those whose enterprise is relegated to the levels up to the wholesaler are not available to be taxed. If the imports contract prices of an entire dometic industry to the low point of finessing the people engaged therein, out of profits, the losses in Federal revenues will exceed the dollar value of the imports that caused the dislocations.

Importers set up landed costs of imports, as costs of sales, in income-tax accounting. Therefore, Federal tax levies apply to the profits made on imported goods beginning with the wholesale level, are three-sevenths of the potential taxable earnings of domestic industry. The tory theory of free world trade and free enterprise being synonymous does not prove itself when considered in the light of the truth regarding the actual and natural operation of our 97½–98–95 service capitalism.

There is no measure of free enterprise for farmers priced out of profits. There is no measure of free enterprise for workers disemployed in ratio to contraction in farm market buying power. There is no measure of mass benefits of free enterprise when the Federal tax levies fail to develop sufficient revenues to balance the budget.

Congress, the trustee, set up world supplies added to domestic supplies by virtue of reciprocal trade legislation. Then Congress tried to stabilize the value of our goods and services by enactment of the parity and minimum-wage laws. These latter laws are monetary acts regulating the domestic value of goods and services jeopardized by free-trade legislation. They did not conform to the intent and purpose of the tory apparatus whose objective is profits made in monetary and market manipulation. Therefore, the tories prevailed upon the Eightieth Congress to enact a sliding-scale parity law to insure the tory objective of fluctuation of values in the face of an average of 97½–98–95 actual stabilization.

The next tory objective will be a sliding-scale minimum-wage law to effect a fluctuation in wage values in harmony with price values. If Congress is going to let the Reciprocal Trade Acts and the sliding-scale parity laws remain on the books, it logically ought to enact a sliding-scale wage law, then naturally nationalistic United States will have the full benefits of internationalistic policies.

How can Congress discharge its trusteeship of the people's economic freedom in enactment of legislation designed to finesse the people out of earnings essential to private and public solvency, while appropriating $45,000,000,000 of the people's future earnings?

Progress Report on the Cooperative Sea Lamprey Investigation on the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a progress report on the cooperative sea lamprey investigation on the Great Lakes prepared by Dr. John Van Oosten, Chairman, Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Committee.

This report was prepared at my request, through the cooperation of the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, in order that Members might be informed as to the progress that is being made in the eradication of this vicious destroyer of our lake fish. As can be seen from reading the report, there are still many problems that must be solved before this menace to our commercial fisheries can be removed.

The report follows:

PROGRESS REPORT ON THE COOPERATIVE SEA LAMPREY INVESTIGATION ON THE GREAT LAKES

(Dr. John Van Oosten, Chairman, Great Lakes Sea Lamprey Committee)

In 1946 Congress passed a resolution directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to prosecute "investigations of the abundance and distribution of sea lampreys, experiments to develop control measures, and a vigorous program for the elimination and eradication of sea lamprey populations of the Great Lakes." Soon after the adoption of this resolution I drew up a detailed plan of action and on September 10, 1946, organized the Sea Lamprey Committee at St. Paul, Minn. On November 14 and 15, 1946, this Committee met at Ann Arbor, Mich., to discuss and integrate the investigational programs of the various Great Lakes States, the Province of Ontario, and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The research program adopted by the Committee covered the following broad objectives:

1. A survey of streams to determine the presence, location, and size of the lamprey runs and to determine the characteristics of streams used by spawning lampreys.

2. An investigation of various phases of the life history of the lamprey to discover vulnerable stages subject to control measures.

3. Experiments with weirs, traps, nets, electric screens, bright lights, electric shockers, flumes, dredges, bulldozers, poisons, baits, predators, parasites, or other possible control methods.

4. A survey of the extent of lamprey attacks and their effect on the abundance and marketability of Great Lakes fishes, especially lake trout.

5. A study of the possible utilization of lampreys as a source of food, oil, or vitamins.

6. The enlistment of aid from sportsmen's clubs, 4–H Clubs, Boy Scouts, and others in reporting lamprey spawning runs and in collecting specimens for identification purposes.

7. A review of Russian and other European literature on the life history, utilization, and control of sea lampreys.

Michigan agreed to allot as high as $10,000 per year, Wisconsin $5,000, and Ontario $10,000 for the work, whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service expected to receive $20,000 or somewhat less. The remaining States agreed to obtain, when possible, information on spawning runs and scarring of fish. Michigan, Wisconsin, and Ontario started or resumed their lamprey program in the spring of 1947, but because of a delay in the appropriation of funds the Fish and Wildlife Service could not begin work at that time. It was not until August 1947 that members of the Service's Great Lakes staff working on other fishery problems were temporarily assigned to the lamprey study and not until December 1948 that a full-time Federal investigator was employed for the project.

In 1947 and 1948 field work was conducted on Lakes Huron and Michigan; in 1948 it was extended to Lake Superior. The Service's investigators interviewed fishermen, examined catches of lake trout and other species for lamprey scars, collected biological data, and surveyed Lake Superior tributaries to locate spawning runs. It was not until October 1948 that the Federal weir trap costing nearly $13,000 was installed on the Ocqueoc River, a Michigan stream on which the major biological investigations of the lamprey have been conducted in United States waters. Michigan investigators concentrated on an intensive biological research not only of the lampreys in the Ocqueoc River but also of those in the nearby Carp Creek, both of which streams flow into northern Lake Huron northwest of Rogers City, Mich. Weirs and/or traps to capture adult and young lampreys were installed on these two streams and on Carp Lake River, and extensive surveys of many other Michigan streams were made to locate lamprey spawning runs. Wisconsin men performed some biological work, operated a weir trap on Hibbard Creek in Door County, and surveyed streams. Ontario scientists likewise studied intensively the life history of the lamprey in a number of tributaries flowing into the North Channel of northern Lake Huron and in which weir traps had been installed. Ontario streams were also surveyed to determine the extent and size of lamprey spawning runs, and commercial catches of fish were examined to ascertain the severity of scarring. The remaining Great Lakes States have contributed very little to the program so far because of the scarcity of lampreys in their waters.

The preliminary conclusions reached or results obtained so far on the main points of interest may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. The lamprey problem apparently is not acute in the United States waters of Lakes Ontario and Erie where the species has long been a resident. No definite information is

available for the Canadian waters. Lampreys invaded Lake Superior too recently (verified in 1946) to have created a problem there. No noticeable decrease in the United States lake trout (the species preferred by lampreys) catch has yet occurred.

2. In Lake Huron the lake trout has all but disappeared from the commercial catch. From an average annual United States yield of 1,831,898 pounds over a long period of time (1879–1935), the catch has fallen to 12,300 pounds in 1947 and to about 5,000 pounds in 1948. Each successive year since 1939 broke the record low.

3. In Lake Michigan the trout catch has just begun to show a sharp progressive decline. Over the period, 1879–1945, the average annual take was 6,026,790 pounds. In 1946 the yield dropped to 3,974,000 pounds, in 1947 to 2,425,000, and in 1948 to about 1,163,000 pounds. Each of the last 2 year's production broke the record low.

4. The percentages of United States fish scarred by lampreys were determined by inspection to be as follows:

Lake Huron: Lake trout 82 (1947); whitefish 4 (1947), 7 (1948).

Lake Michigan: Lake trout 69 (1946), 67 (1947), 53 (1948); whitefish 2 (1947), 7 (1948).

Lake Superior: Lake trout 1 (1948).

The percentage of scarred trout increased progressively with size as the following data from Lake Michigan indicate:

Length:	*Percent scarred*
5.0 to 16.9 inches	0.5
17.0 to 18.9 inches	13.6
19.0 to 21.9 inches	45.4
22.0 to 24.4 inches	67.0
24.5 to 35.4 inches	80.0

The number of scars per trout averaged about 2.5 and varied from one to nine. The presence of scars indicate that fish may survive attacks by lampreys. No precise data on the mortality of attacked Great Lakes fish are available. Commercial fishermen have reported finding as high as several hundred scarred and dead trout in a gang of nets immediately after a severe storm. Experiments just completed by Prof. D. A. Webster, of Cornell University, indicated that mortality may be heavy. Out of 13 small-mouth bass attacked by lampreys in aquaria all died—12 with the first attack. One fish measured 18 inches; the others varied from 6 to 8½ inches in length. Three of the five attacked suckers succumbed—two with one attachment; whereas three of the six rainbow trout died—two with one attack. The suckers ranged from 10 to 14½ inches in length; the rainbows from 14 to 18 inches. None of the yearling rainbows were injured. The length of attachment varied from a few hours to about a week, the lamprey frequently adhering to the host after its death. Sometimes two holes were punctured during a single attachment. The data suggest that most fish die during the first attack.

5. The presence of mature or spawning sea lampreys was verified in 92 Michigan streams and reliably reported in 18 additional ones—a total of 110. They covered every major watershed on Lake Michigan, nearly all of them on Lake Huron, and five Lake Superior tributaries. Lampreys have also become established in two inland lakes, Burt and Mullett, and were present in Lake Charlevoix and Pentwater Lake—all in Michigan. In Wisconsin the few lamprey spawning runs discovered so far were all restricted to the Door County area in the northern part of Lake Michigan. No sea lampreys were reported taken in Indiana and Illinois streams or in the Lake Superior tributaries of Wisconsin and Minnesota.

6. Spawning runs varied in size and in the same streams with the years. Records show, for example, that the Little Thessalon River, a Canadian tributary of the North Channel, produced at least 11,286 adult lampreys in 1946, but only some 5,442 in 1947, and a similar number in 1948. Carp Creek in Michigan yielded 1,617 adult lampreys in 1947 (entire population); in 1948 the number was 2,938. Hibbard Creek in Wisconsin produced 596 in 1947. Records for the Ocqueoc River in Michigan are too incomplete to give reliable data on the size of the population, but in 1944 some 3,366 lampreys were removed, and in 1945 about 4,600; in 1947 the population was estimated to number between 8,000 and 9,000.

7. The Great Lakes sea lampreys from streams apparently cannot be utilized for the market. Preliminary analyses indicate that both their vitamin A potency and oil yield are much too low for commercial exploitation; lampreys may possibly be used for reduction purposes. A small quantity can be sold to biological supply houses. Cooking tests failed because of the extreme susceptibility of lampreys to fungus infection and softness of body. A Canadian canning test, however, showed some promise of success.

8. The larvae of the sea lamprey cannot as yet be distinguished from those of native lampreys. Such identification is necessary to avoid spending time and money on the destruction of apparently harmless forms.

9. Much of the known life history of the sea lamprey from inland lakes in New York, based on the work of early investigators, was found to be applicable to the Great Lakes form. Great Lakes sea lampreys may begin to enter streams as early as April and as late as July for purposes of spawning. They do not feed in these streams. The factors that decide their choice of streams have not yet been determined, but they seem to avoid polluted tributaries and they must have adequate amounts of gravel for their nests and a certain amount of current flowing over them. The peak of spawning occurs sometime between late May and late June, the time depending largely on suitable water temperatures. After spawning the lampreys die and rapidly decompose. If prevented from reaching suitable breeding grounds they die without spawning. Females of average length (17.4 in.) produce about 62,000 eggs; the number varies with the size of the lamprey from about 24,000 to more than 107,000. The larvae burrow in the soft bottoms of streams where they live from 3 or 4 to perhaps 5 years. They then change to the adult form at a size of about 6 to 8 inches and during the period from late September to perhaps late April. After transformation they descend to the Great Lakes and begin to prey on fish. The spawning adults range from 12 to 26 inches in length and average about 17 inches; they average about 6 ounces in weight. Adults have been taken in the Great Lakes from depths as great as 90 fathoms (540 feet). They do not seem to concentrate in these lakes except at spawning time. It is believed that the lampreys remain in these lakes from 1½ to 3½ years before returning to the streams to spawn. It seems obvious from the above life-history notes that attempts to control the lampreys must be directed principally at those stages of the life cycle that occur in streams.

10. Weirs and traps were effective in taking both adult and young lampreys in streams. Hoop nets were not satisfactory. The latest type of electric shocker was only partially successful in flushing the larvae; it did not kill them nor drive them completely from their burrows. Other methods of control (see item 3, p. 1) have not yet been tested. It is probable that a combination of methods must be employed to eradicate or control the sea lamprey in most streams. Efforts must be concentrated on major runs.

Some very pertinent questions concerning the sea lamprey still remain to be answered.

1. Why do lampreys enter certain streams and not others with apparently similar characteristics? What is the basis of their selection?

2. Do lampreys usually return to the parent stream? If so, what factors guide their return?

3. Are streams absolutely essential for spawning or can lampreys spawn in the Great Lakes and inland lakes when diverted from streams or blocked by dams? And would the eggs hatch or larvae survive in these lakes? What happens to those lampreys that are blocked by dam near river mouths?

4. Do all transforming lampreys return to the Great Lakes or do they readily become residents of inland lakes?

5. What percentage of the eggs and larvae survive?

6. Can eggs or larvae be destroyed in streams in large enough numbers to eradicate the species?

7. Can adults be captured in the Great Lakes in sufficient quantities to affect their abundance? Do the nonspawning adults concentrate anywhere?

8. Can the electric screen prevent spawning lampreys from entering streams?

9. Will blocking or destroying a major run of spawning lampreys, such as the one on the Ocqueoc River, materially affect the abundance of Great Lakes fishes?

10. How deadly is the attack of lampreys to the Great Lakes fishes? Do most of them succumb to the first attack?

11. How can we distinguish the larvae of the sea lamprey from those of native lampreys?

12. How long do the sea lamprey larvae remain in streams and how long do adults live in the Great Lakes?

13. Can we develop a method of tagging or marking live lampreys?

ANN ARBOR, MICH., *February 10, 1949.*

Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to draw the attention of the Congress to the following announcement by that splendid friend of the United States, Ambassador Mario Esquivel, of Costa Rica. Don Mario Esquivel, by his tact, talent, and magnificent spirit of cooperation, has endeared himself to all the people he has met in Washington. His most recent announcement, which follows, is gratifying to all who believe in the good-neighbor policy, liberty, and democracy:

WASHINGTON.—Ambassador Mario Esquivel, of Costa Rica, announced today that Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, had been invited to San José to receive an honorary degree

from the National University of Costa Rica and to give a series of lectures about the life and achievements of Francisco de Miranda, the precursor of South American freedom. In making the announcement, Ambassador Esquivel described Dr. Thorning as "a dynamic worker for the good-neighbor policy and one of the best-informed scholars in the United States on the history and culture of Costa Rica. Through his labors, he has effectively contributed to the growth of the inter-American ideals of mutual friendship and understanding among our peoples."

Interviewed at the editorial offices of World Affairs in Washington, Dr. Thorning expressed his "gratitude for the gracious invitation of Ambassador Esquivel, Dr. Fernando Baudrit, rector of the National University of Costa Rica, and the members of the university council who no doubt wished to show their good will toward the editors of two quarterlies that are dedicated to the cause of inter-American friendship and world peace."

At the same time, the Maryland educator, author, and lecturer added that "this most recent gesture of friendship indicates, once more, that the Republic of Costa Rica is 100 percent pro-American and anti-Soviet. Wherever the cult of Miranda and Simón Bolivar flourishes, the love of liberty, democracy and true independence is strong. By studying the lives of the precursor and the liberator, the young people of Middle America are bound to foment their attachment to these principles."

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, rural electrification had its record year in 1948. In Montana and throughout the Nation, the mileage of lines constructed, the number of farms connected, the purchase and use of power, the allocation of loan funds, and the advance of construction funds were greater than anything REA had ever experienced.

The remarkable progress made in the United States during the last few years is brought home by the fact that on January 1, 1934, only 743,954 farms had central-station service, or less than 11 percent of all farms. On June 30 last, 4,019,476, or 68.6 percent of all farms, were receiving this electric service. In the 6 years from December 1941 to December 1947, the kilowatt-hour use of electricity per farm doubled to 117 and is still going up.

REA Administrator Claude R. Wickard presented some interesting statistics in his annual report which should be of interest to every Member of Congress and every rural dweller in America. Mr. Wickard said rural America moved further and faster into the power age during the year ending June 30, 1948, than in any previous period in history, and went on to prove it with these figures:

Four hundred and twenty thousand new consumers connected, 43 percent more than previous high.

Forty percent increase in power consumption over previous high.

One hundred and twenty thousand miles of line constructed, one-fifth of 12-year total.

For Montana, for the year ending December 31, 1948, the record is as follows:

Funds as advanced for construction	$8,000,000
(This is about one-half of the total funds advanced in the 11-year program.)	
REA loans approved	$7,000,000
Miles of line energized	4,301
New consumers connected	5,000
(This compares with 5,633 miles energized and 15,000 consumers connected in 11 years.)	
Funds allocated Dec. 31, 1948, but not spent	$7,000,000
(This will build 5,000 additional miles and connect 9,000 consumers.)	

It is encouraging to note that with funds provided by the Eightieth Congress, most of the present plans of Montana REA cooperatives can be completed. As of January 7, 1949, REA cooperatives had applications pending for $7,873,000. Mr. Wickard advised me that Montana's share of 1949 authorizations would be about $9,000,000. Since the fiscal year began, REA has allocated about $1,640,000 of this share. The remainder of Montana's share is roughly equal to the total of all of Montana's requests for funds. This should be encouraging to Montana farmers and ranchers who are awaiting REA service.

It is gratifying that Montana has been able to do so well in its rural-electrification program during the past year, in view of high prices, shortage of material, and lack of manpower. There has been no shortage of either administrative or loan funds at any time, despite dire predictions made last spring.

I would like to quote from Mr. Wickard's report to the Secretary of Agriculture on REA's 1948 program:

One of the most significant aspects of the program during 1948 was the greater assumption of responsibility on the part of REA borrowers themselves.

It is the policy of REA to encourage borrowers to become self-reliant—looking ahead to the time when they will own their systems outright. It is a function of REA to assure repayment of its loans, but, as rapidly as borrowers achieve sufficient operating stability, REA management assistance is being withdrawn. This policy is consistent with the directives of the Congress.

As borrowers gain in experience and financial security, REA's work is concentrated on the unusual and more complex problems confronting its borrowers.

But by the end of June 1948 more than half of REA's borrowers were preparing applications for new loans and routing proposed lines without REA assistance. During the fiscal year, 123 cooperatives, which had acquired the necessary experience and equity, operated virtually without management service from REA. REA personnel was available, however, for consultation on complex problems.

I believe REA members will be interested in a brief summary of the development program being carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, the United States Army Engineers, and other Federal agencies in cooperation with the States and the people of the Missouri River Basin.

For the current fiscal year the Eightieth Congress gave more funds for the development of our soil, water, and mineral resources in the Missouri Basin than ever before in the history of our country. In addition to these projects previously put under construction, such as Hungry Horse and Fort Peck, five new projects were authorized for construction. They are Canyon Ferry, Lower Marias, N-Bar-N, Moorhead Dam and the Missouri-Souris project. Preconstruction and planning surveys, studies, and research went ahead on 15 other Montana projects. The Hardin unit, known as Yellowtail Dam, is ready to start construction as soon as the Bureau of the Budget will give it the green light. That Bureau has taken the position that with so many new projects started last year, no new ones should be put under construction during the coming fiscal year.

In addition to the actual engineering work outlined above, the National Park Service, Geological Survey, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Affairs have been making studies and cooperating in the work so that the development of all the resources of the basin will proceed in a carefully coordinated and well-rounded program in which no essential resource will be neglected.

The Department of Agriculture through the Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, Rural Electrification Administration, and experiment stations is taking an increasingly large part in these studies and in the field work.

During the year a new electric generator was put into operation at Fort Peck and orders placed for a third. Construction of transmission lines, substations, and other facilities to make power available from this dam progressed as fast as contractors could get supplies.

I think we can look forward with real optimism to the coming fiscal year. While it is too early to know what appropriations will be made, I think we can safely be optimistic. Bureau of Budget requests are known and if they are implemented by appropriations our program can go ahead most satisfactorily with the exception of the Hardin unit. I regret that it is not set up for construction.

Construction can proceed in the coming year at an accelerated rate on all projects. In fact, the budget request for appropriations for the Missouri Basin program of the Bureau of Reclamation is $87,150,000 and for Hungry Horse in the Columbia Basin, $24,000,000. Our Montana Missouri Basin projects are in the budget for $18,526,000, and $3,400,000 is requested in addition, to permit the completion of the power plant and

other facilities, including recreation, which are under the jurisdiction of the Army engineers at Fort Peck. Included in the Bureau of Reclamation request is $5,522,000 for the cooperating agencies of the Department of the Interior listed earlier in this statement.

In short, great progress has been made in the current year in study, planning, and construction of a well thought out and carefully coordinated program for the development of Montana's great natural and human resources. We can look forward with optimism to an accelerated program for the coming fiscal year.

REA-financed program in Montana

Name	Loan approvals, Jan. 1, 1949			Applications pending Jan. 7, 1949	In operation			Debt service report as of Jan. 1, 1949		
	Amount	Miles	Consumers		Funds advanced Jan. 1, 1949	Miles energized Nov. 30, 1948	Consumers connected Nov. 30, 1948	Principal and interest paid	Prepayments on principal	Payments overdue more than 30 days
Ravalli County Electric Co-op., Corvallis (1)	$495,800	332	888		$335,750	292	774	$94,229		
Sun River Electric Co-op., Fairfield (2)	1,614,500	1,448	2,098	$115,000	1,157,459	1,100	1,743	241,673	$55,507	
Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Co-op., Sidney (5)	1,011,600	697	1,176	100,000	585,692	327	753	69,159		
Yellowstone Valley Electric Co-op., Huntley (9)	1,058,498	704	2,117	175,000	853,536	712	1,891	217,208	20,777	
Vigilante Electric Co-op., Dillon (10)	1,465,000	956	1,583	503,000	1,235,750	754	1,441	172,294	18,067	
Missoula Electric Co-op., Missoula (12)	955,000	536	1,040		436,518	315	621	95,549		
Flathead Electric Co-op., Kalispell (13)	1,048,700	431	3,130	300,000	451,302	350	1,327	112,516		
Fergus Electric Co-op., Lewistown (15)	1,961,000	1,218	1,765	235,000	1,742,270	1,037	1,575	167,325	40,505	
Park Electric Co-op., Livingston (16)	905,000	540	955	100,000	830,996	466	925	55,367		
Mid-Yellowstone Electric Co-op., Hysham (17)	388,500	250	557	170,000	350,515	309	571	74,011	15,244	
Beartooth Electric Co-op., Red Lodge (19)	1,172,000	795	1,486		998,292	761	1,364	119,375	31,384	
Big Horn County Electric Co-op., Lodge Grass (21)	1,007,000	616	1,107	170,000	810,019	445	947	78,638	16,700	
Big Flat Electric Co-op., Turner (24)	469,000	330	640	585,000	350,899	229	307	1,800		
Sheridan County Electric Co-op. Westby (25)	1,675,000	949	1,466	700,000	651,031	352	593	830		
Northern Electric Co-op, Opheim (26)	1,355,000	834	1,084	300,000	889,041	236	340			
Valley County Electric Co-op., Glasgow (27)	670,000	429	752	175,000	543,236	313	343			
McCone County Electric Co-op., Circle (28)	786,000	432	1,230	1,000,000	662,714	177	663	1,928		$167
Goldenwest Electric Co-op., Wibaux (29)	989,000	663	960	300,000	658,881	333	368			
Glacier County Electric Co-op., Cut Bank (30)	881,000	406	1,795	750,000	732,385	171	1,755	52,918		
Marias River Electric Co-op., Shelby (31)	1,555,000	581	1,726	400,000	1,392,801	323	1,635	85,333		
Hill County Electric Co-op., Havre (32)	1,775,000	1,156	1,252	1,038,000	1,388,156	938	650			
Tongue River Electric Co-op., Ashland (33)	265,000	162	239	550,000	150,945	NE	NE			
Southeast Electric Co-op., Eklaka, Mont (34)	500,000	211	417			NE	NE			
Lincoln Electric Co-op., Eureka (36)				200,000						
Elmo Electric Co-op., Polston (37)				110,000						
Total	24,002,598	14,676	29,463	7,873,000	17,228,189	9,940	20,586	1,640,153	198,184	167

Let's Keep Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article which appeared in the Boston Post, Boston, Mass.:

WORLD MUST WATCH SOVIET—CONSTANT AWARENESS OF THREATS TO FREEDOM NECESSARY IF LIBERTY IS TO SURVIVE ATTACK ON IT

(By Lester Allen)

The individual who cries incessant warning against the Soviet Union risks the danger of being dismissed as an insufferable bore with a fixation, but unless the whole American people are kept alert to the peril, there is no hope either for the free world or for the peoples of Europe and Asia who are now enslaved.

In his day, Marcus Porcius Cato, who croaked his famed phrase "Delenda est Carthage" through a whole generation, was regarded as a pompous old earache, but he aroused the Roman world to the growing might of the Carthaginians. The result is too well known. All that is left of Carthage is a few snag-toothed ruins—and Rome still stands, brandishing the bright torch of human liberty from superstition, paganism, and oppression.

As a result of World War II, 12 European states have fallen under the sway of the Soviet Union. At the moment, 110 different racial groups in Europe and Asia feel the hard hand of despotism. This unexampled growth of Soviet power is due in a large measure to the bad faith, double dealing of the Soviet Union, and gullibility of Soviet allies.

DECEPTIVE FEELING

The deceptive feeling of security which is so prevalent in the United States stems from an almost unbroken history of security from a foreign invader. But we are not secure. It is difficult for the American people to see the forest for the trees that obscure their view.

Having crushed the Nazi regime in Germany, the American people have closed their eyes to the fundamentals of what took place there. The Nazis were professional Communist-haters. They set out to exterminate communism in Germany, root and branch.

Whether the Nazi leaders were sincere in this objective it is impossible to know. They did miscalculate. However, they believed they could trick the Soviet Union into a military alliance that would give them time to prepare to crush Russia beyond recovery. The desire to smash the Soviet Union by all the arts of deceit, double dealing, and military power was not enough. The west chose the Soviet Union as the lesser of two evils and everyone knows what happened.

So, it is not merely abhorrence of the Communist system, military power, and adroit diplomacy that will defeat the Soviet objective of world-wide domination. There must be something more—and it appears that it is a world thoroughly aroused to a duty under God to free the enslaved masses of Russia and the 110 races held in subjugation. It's a large order. No matter what your religious faith, a good place to start the fight is in church.

Not until the larger picture of Soviet operations in the so-called satellite countries became apparent with their persecutions of church leaders, their organized campaigns against all religion, their elimination of all individuals who might organize resistance against the Soviet Union, did it become apparent to all the people of the free world that the Soviet Union is here and now trying to put the plan for world domination into effect.

SECRET ORDER

Here is the substance of a secret order issued by the Politburo last July which was scheduled to be placed in operation in November or December in the Finnish and Baltic Soviet Republics, both captive areas.

All political prisoners were to be evacuated to the Soviet Union. A complete register of former professional soldiers, noncommissioned officers and officers, former civil servants, teachers and professors, priests and members of religious organizations, members of legal, medical, and engineering professions was to be prepared by the MVD.

Particular attention was to be given to their family status—which means that their families would serve as hostages. Special units were ordered to transport duty, and additional light armament was issued to MGB units, with incendiary equipment so that installations could be destroyed by fire.

Evacuation orders were prepared to clear certain areas for military operations. Persons charged with espionage or subversive activity were to be executed. Civilian population was to be evacuated either by genocide or evacuation in the event that hostile forces, mutiny, sabotage, or Soviet Army security became imperiled. Mountain, diving, and paratroop units were to be retrained in topography and map reading, and personnel able to speak Finnish or Baltic languages were to be sent to the Soviet Union for 8 weeks' political training.

That was the substance of the secret order that fell into the hands of the Lithuanian underground and was sent to Sweden.

What does it mean? The best interpretation of it was that the Soviet Union expected an armed attack from the west sometime late in November or early December, or the Politburo wanted to give the appearance of expecting an attack, or the Politburo was framing up a border incident as justification for an attack upon the west.

CALLED OFF

But coupled with the known military intelligence that large forces of MGB and MVD

personnel were concentrated in eastern Poland and Silesia at the time that this order was issued, it looks as if a sneak attack was called off at the last minute.

It is known that MGB and MVD units are used for the purpose of taking over recalcitrant satellites of the Soviet Union, countries like Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The MGB moves in to take over control of all transport, and the MVD moves in to seize everyone who might take part in or lead resistance. After that comes the trials by the people's courts and the rest of the formula.

When the MVD and MGB are in position and the Communists are in control, the steps are always the same in every country they tackle. They secularize the schools, they seize larger landholdings, they trump up charges against leaders, and the MVD conducts mass arrests of opposing politicians.

Although the first Communist target is control of the government and the transport and police forces, the Catholic Church is the next target, not because of any culpability on the part of leaders of that faith, even under the Communist system where culpability can consist of mere expression of doubt of the infallibility of Stalin. The Catholic Church is the chief target because Catholics are the largest religious groups of the population of 13 European countries. They are predominant in Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, France, western Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and Yugoslavia.

Having broken the power of the Greek Orthodox Church in 1917 in the revolution, which was the greatest factor in the Bolshevik victory, Stalin and the Politburo hold to their theory that once the dominant church group is broken, all the rest is easy.

The lines are drawn all over the world. The terms of the fight have been set forth by Pope Pius XII and Marshal Stalin. Pope Pius has said: "Communists conceal their real purpose from the masses. Once they have won power they let fall the veil, and pass, by successive stages, from oppression of the dignity and liberty of man to abolition of all authentic and independent religious life."

WON'T YIELD

Stalin has said: "The Communist Party cannot be neutral toward religion and it does conduct antireligious propaganda against all and every religious prejudice as the best way of undermining the influence of reactionary clergy who support the exploiting classes."

It is quite plain now that the Soviet Union has not the slightest intention of negotiating with or yielding to the west. It has no intention of halting its fight for world domination. It is forlorn hope that the dictatorship will collapse of the weight of its own evil. It will fall only when struck hammer blows of unexampled force—not only military force, but moral force.

The mere fact that some of the western democracies have flirted around with watered-down socialism is encouragement to the Russians. The mere fact that bigotry and intolerance exist in the western democracies is grist for their mill.

The religious faiths in the west are in a common fight. It is a fight for survival. Regardless of what faith a clergyman may be who is convicted in a people's court by a travesty of justice—it is an affront to all religious faiths. It is their fight.

Religious faiths must fight together or be conquered separately. And not only religious faiths. The little countries which have vanished from the maps, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania—all of them are peopled by those who wait and hope that they once again will know freedom.

If the source of their hope in the west forgets for a single instant that those little lands once were free—then we must share the burden of blame for our own eventual subjugation. There is no longer a choice between the lesser of two evils. There is no choice. The filth and grime and appalling stench of the self-styled classless society, the overpowering odor of the so-called decay and withering away of the state according to Marxist philosophy, are too keen in the world's nostrils to be ignored.

There is no sacrifice too great to be made for what we have here and now in this Nation and in this time. It is far, far better to groan under taxation, to give of our leisure, our substance and surrender our petty prejudices than to stand by as sluggards and watch the manufacture of our own doom from afar.

There are those who feel triumph over the hard times that have befallen the British Empire. They would dismiss this travail as the expiation for the crimes of empire. But the people of the west should remember the century of peace under the British empire and recall that in that century the democracies developed and reached the peak of their power.

There is much to be forgiven the nations of Europe, but the errors of our anti-Soviet allies are forgivable. There are national crimes, however, which are too base, too appalling ever to be forgiven. One such national crime is the Soviet Union's betrayal of the noblest aspirations of men of many faiths and many races.

Men wanting security only have been betrayed into slavery. They have been persuaded to trade off their heritage for a false promise of a better life. Let's not deceive ourselves. Do not close your ears to the reiterated cry against the Soviet Union.

Custer Battlefield Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

House Joint Memorial 6

Joint Memorial to the President and Congress of the United States, requesting the introduction and enactment of appropriate legislation for appropriation of funds by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress for the building of the Custer Battlefield Museum, at Custer Battlefield National Monument, Mont.

Whereas the Director of the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the sum of $96,000 be appropriated in the 1950 fiscal year funds for a Memorial Museum to be erected on the site of Custer Battlefield National Monument; and

Whereas Custer Battlefield is one of the most prominent patriotic shrines in American history, the site where General Custer and 262 men of his gallant regiment were slain at the Battle of the Little Bighorn River, June 25–26, 1876, also known as Custer's Last Battle; and

Whereas the purpose of the Custer Battlefield National Monument is to preserve for all time the memorable ground of this great conflict and to present for public benefit the chapter it has to tell in the story of the westward advance of our settlements in the Northwest. It is necessary that a museum be erected on this battlefield site to properly care for, display, and maintain the many valuable historical artifacts, relics, and mementos pertaining to the battle that are now in storage awaiting the opportunity of proper care and display that only a museum can offer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States, that the act of August 10, 1939, "To provide for the erection of a Public Historical Museum in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, Mont." (Public No. 362, ch. 634, 76th Cong., 1st sess.) signed by the President of the United States, to pass legislation for funds as mentioned in the 1950 fiscal year estimates, for the erection of this museum; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, t the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana.

H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have today received a letter from a veteran of World War II, who is a clerk in the post office in Atlanta, written in behalf of H. R. 87. This letter so ably and well states the case of postal employees who are veterans, that I am inserting it in the RECORD with the hope that Members will read it and give it earnest consideration. The letter follows:

ATLANTA, GA., *February 25, 1949.*

Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is not a plea for a handout for veterans. It is only a matter of asking that we be not discriminated against.

As a veteran of World War II, and as a clerk in the Post Office Department, I would like to ask your consideration and influence in regard to a very important bill for the veterans in the Postal Service.

We do not believe that the existing pay rates which penalize us for serving our country during the war were passed with that intention. We are proud of our country, glad to defend her from all enemies, would do it all over again if necessary, and we do not believe that Congress owes us an easy living for the rest of our lives. We like our jobs and expect to remain in the Postal Service. But we cannot understand why we should be worth $400 per year less to the Post Office Department because we were in the armed forces until after July 1, 1945, than were the younger men who were employed by the Post Office Department before that date.

In 1945, while World War II was still in progress, Congress passed a bill giving the then war temporary indefinite postal employees credit on their pay status which has resulted in the returning veterans being penalized as to their future pay in relation to that of the war temporary indefinite postal employees.

For example, a veteran entering the Post Office Department after July 1, 1945, is now drawing base pay which is $400 less per year than that of the war temporary indefinite employee who entered the Post Office Department before July 1, 1945. This situation is very unfair to the veterans who, because of military duty, could not enter the Post Office Department until after July 1, 1945, since it will require 10 years for these veterans to earn the equivalent pay grade. Also, there will be a loss of approximately $4,000 to each veteran on income during the intervening years.

Few, if any of us, knew that this unfair situation existed until after we had worked at the post office several months, months of hard work coupled with studying after working hours. In most cases, we men who are earning $400 less per year because we were in the service and could not start working at the post office until after July 1, 1945, are older than the young fellows who came to the post office before that date as war temporary indefinite employees. Most of us had families or have acquired them since. Yet these younger men, with fewer expenses and responsibilities received $400 more per year when they were made regular employees than did we.

We see these younger men, most of them having come to the post office while we were out of the country, simply because they were then too young for the draft, enjoying new cars and other luxuries which their extra salaries afford, while we find it difficult to pay for the necessary groceries for our families, and find a doctor bill a major calamity.

Mr. DAVIS, we believe that if Congress had realized that this unfair situation existed, something would have been done to correct it long ago. As you know, there is now a bill in committee known as H. R. 87 which would correct this inequity. I urge your influence and support in getting this measure passed.

Mr. DAVIS, we are not asking for new cars. We are not asking for any consideration because we are veterans. Our only desire is to earn equal pay for equal work. We believe we are worth as much as those who were too young or too old or for some other reason, were not serving in the armed forces of their country during World War II. It does cost us as much to feed and clothe our families.

Very respectfully yours,

ROBERT M. BROOKSHIRE.

Truman: Is He the State?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on last Saturday contained a pertinent editorial relative to President Truman's Jackson-Jefferson Day address. I commend it to the attention of every Member of the House:

In his Jackson-Jefferson Day address President Truman followed the pattern of his preelection attacks against the Eightieth Congress that helped to win votes and return him to office. This time, however, he directed his fire against those special interests that, he charges, twist and misrepresent the measures the people voted for at the last election. Apparently the President regards his victory at the polls as a mandate to force his legislative program through Congress, although that program was very sketchily outlined in his preelection speeches. Moreover, he assumes that it is the duty of a Democratically controlled Congress to follow passively wherever he leads. At any rate, all critics of the administration's labor, anti-inflation, social security, and other measures are denounced as selfish special-interest groups, whose activities are inimical to the national welfare. There was a hint, too, that the President himself might resort to pressure tactics, if Congress failed to obey his commands, by taking another swing around the country to tell the people how their Government is getting on.

This brand of political oratory is highly disturbing, because it shows that the President has some very false and dangerous ideas concerning the powers and duties of the Chief Executive. He seems to forget that lawmaking is a legislative process in which Congress plays the chief role. The President may—and should—use his influence to advise and try to persuade Congress to pass measures that he believes to be in the national interest. And he has great influence in molding legislation because of his veto power. But under our system of divided powers it is the duty of Congress to make its own legislative decisions after study and discussion. The special interests whom the President denounces because they object to certain policies and proposals that he approves are sometimes selfish and sometimes obstructive. But often their suggestions and criticisms are germane and constructive. In any case the method of hammering out legislation through public discussion by all interested groups is an integral part of the lawmaking process under a democratic system of government. If only the rubber-stamp advocates of administration-sponsored legislation were allowed to express their opinions, Congress might as well fold up and let the President run the Government as he sees fit.

This newspaper shares to some extent the President's irritation as those special interest groups that spend their time sniping at his programs without offering constructive suggestions for their modification. But even negative criticism is preferable to passive acquiescence. American democracy has survived and grown in strength because our laws are based on free and open discussion of controversial issues—the product of compromises. The President's intolerance of dissent and his assumption that what he considers best for the people is precisely what the people need and what is the type of thinking that put in power men like Hitler and Mussolini and enabled other dictators to defend suppression of free speech and free elections as a protection against enemies of the public welfare.

Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following letter sent by Thomas Dorgan, clerk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Superior Court for Civil Business, county of Suffolk, Mass., to the Honorable Dean G. Acheson:

FEBRUARY 21, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On March 14, 1948, while speaking before the North Cambridge Council of the Knights of Columbus, I made the following remarks which, in the light of an article I read on the first page of this morning's New York Times, I consider very timely.

At that time, I said, "It is indeed very difficult to understand the way some of our leading educators are thinking. For instance, not so very long ago, one of our leading astronomers, Dr. Harlow Shapley of Harvard University, was chairman of a dinner given to Foreign Commissar Vishinsky by the American Soviet Friendship Organization. Commissar Vishinsky viciously attacked the policy of America in Germany, and distorted the facts completely. Our great American intellectuals listened attentively and it is an amazing fact that not one of them stood up to repudiate his statements."

The article which appeared in this morning's Times and which impressed me to the point of writing to you in protest, was to the effect that a Soviet delegation is coming to New York shortly through the invitation of the same Dr. Harlow Shapley. I believe that this delegation should be carefully screened and it should be remembered that Dr. Shapley is a prominent member of the American Soviet Friendship Organization which was classed as subversive by Attorney General Tom Clark not so long ago. Haven't we had just about enough Commie-Con from the Kremlin boys and when are we going to wake up to the peril of atheistic communism? Why, our Senators and Representatives couldn't get into the Soviet Union on a Cook's tour basis. And, furthermore, I do not believe that the Constitution of the United States ever gave the right to citizens of the Soviet Union to trespass on our soil when we know definitely that communism is an international conspiracy to overthrow our Government by force and violence. It is pretty obvious what is happening throughout the entire world and the fate of Cardinal Mindszenty and the 12 prominent Protestant clergymen should be a warning to us all.

In my opinion, this delegation should not be allowed into our country until the Soviet Union extends a similar courtesy and allows delegations from this country to travel freely throughout Russia.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS DORGAN.

UMW's Welfare Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of February 23, 1949:

UMW'S WELFARE FUND

Although differences of opinion exist regarding the proper method of establishing and administering industrial welfare and retirement funds, there is no disputing the fact that coal miners are in greater need of disability and retirement benefits than

the great majority of workers. A pamphlet just issued by the United Mine Workers describes in some detail the nature of the benefits now being paid to disabled miners and their dependents and outlines plans for the hospitalization and specialized care of the victims of mine accidents. Already quite a number of men paralyzed as a result of such accidents have been greatly aided by this special care. Last week seven paraplegics injured by rock and slate falls in mines were brought to Washington to be treated at a local hospital.

Even more impressive evidence of the good work being done by the welfare fund is the fact that 63,583 disabled UMW members and 109,081 wives and children of these men have received benefits, while more than 2,000 workers or members of their families have been given medical and hospital care. This is a gratifying record of accomplishment; it is at the same time a reminder that the coal-mining industry has an appallingly high accident rate. Only occasionally is the public aroused to a realization of the hazards of the mining industry when a particularly shocking disaster, such as the Centralia mine explosion, occurs. Now that the cost of caring for the injured and aiding the dependents of those disabled or killed in mine accidents has become an obligation of the industry, it seems likely that self-interest will spur the operators to greater efforts to improve working conditions.

For every million man-hours worked 65 disabling accidents occurred in the mining industry, compared with 30.8 such accidents in the construction industries and 18.6 in manufacturing industries. The percentage of fatal accidents in the mines is also far ahead of that in other industries. Disabling diseases such as tuberculosis and rheumatism, occupational in origin, also help to account for a much higher death rate for miners—15.1 per 1,000, as compared with a rate of 10.3 per 1,000 for the Nation as a whole.

By adding these victims of disease to the list of killed and injured, which totaled nearly 235,000 for the past 5 years alone, it becomes possible to envisage the terrific cost in human lives and hardship of the millions of tons of coal used by the people of this country. Pensions do not compensate for such sufferings, although they alleviate the misery of disabled miners and lighten the economic distress of the victims' families. The next step should be an intensified effort on the part of mine operators, unions, and public authorities to make mining a safer occupation.

The Hunt for Whipping Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal under date of Monday, February 28, 1949:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

THE HUNT FOR WHIPPING BOYS

All during the Eightieth Congress and right through the political campaign, President Truman kept telling us that the reason he couldn't get his legislative program enacted into law was on account of the Republicans running Congress.

Last fall he called the legislators into special session. He handed them a long list of major legislation which he said they could dispose of in 15 days. When they didn't, he went about the country blaming inflation, deflation, and everything he could think of on the obstinacy of the Republicans.

Now, the Democrats are running Congress. They have ample majorities in both Houses and on all the committees. The committee chairmen are Democrats. In the House, the rules have been changed so any committee chairman can bring bills to the floor when ready; in the Senate that rests with the Democratic leaders.

The new Congress has been in session since January 3, nearly four times 15 days. No part of the Truman program, except his own pay raise and a few minor bills, has been enacted.

Mr. Truman is irritated. The other day the Democratic congressional leaders emerged from the White House and explained that the delays were still due to the Republicans. This sounded strange—and unconvincing—since the Democrats are a majority and hold every key post.

So now the President hunts a new scapegoat. He says he will go about the country exorcising the malevolent spirits—lobbyists and pressure groups—who are now to blame for blocking his will.

Mr. Truman obviously speaks not of the farm lobby nor the labor lobby—both of which claim to be such powerful pressure groups that they can dethrone Congressmen and elect Presidents—because they, at least nominally, support his program.

But even if there are spirits more enticing than these two large groups, who is it that has succumbed to their seductions? Why, the Democrats. The Republicans that are left in Congress may still protest Mr. Truman's program, but only the Democrats can block it.

If Congress is not responding promptly to the White House whip, it is the Democrats who are laggard. Either they are men easily seduced by these unidentified spirits, or else in the bright light of after-election day they have come to feel doubts about the wisdom and urgency of the Truman program.

Democrats, and very prominent ones, have begun to raise questions about the wisdom of increasing taxes on the people, of abolishing the Taft-Hartley labor law out of hand, of giving the President carte blanche controls over the Nation's economy.

Mr. Truman convinced us in the last campaign that he is a handy man with the bull whip. But maybe he ought to have care how he flays the Eighty-first Congress lest he find that he has, inadvertently, flayed the hide of the wrong party.

North Atlantic Defense Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Evening World-Telegram, Omaha, Monday, February 21, 1949. The editorial deals with the commitments we are about to make in the so-called North Atlantic defense pact.

A SMALL BOY'S GAME

It is becoming increasingly clear that the attempt to draft a North Atlantic defense pact was an ill-advised adventure.

It was an American idea. What precisely, the State Department had in mind has not been stated, but it is fair to surmise that this was to be a major maneuver in the cold war. We of the West, so it must have been reasoned, would unite for our mutual security, and thereby we would notify Soviet Russia that to touch any of us—even the least of us—would bring down the wrath of all of us.

A slick idea, on the face of it. Unquestionably it appealed to the diplomatic mind.

But there were practical difficulties in the way, some of which had not been anticipated. They have risen to plague the sponsors of the pact, grievously.

One trouble was that some of the beneficiaries didn't want to be benefited. Chief among these was—and is—Sweden.

Sweden is the key country of the Scandinavian peninsula. The peninsula is of vast strategic importance. It stands at the flank of the east-west line. Whichever side dominates it will hold a considerable advantage when and if World War III breaks out. The political sympathies of the people lie with the west. The State Department thought it would be a simple matter to bring the three countries—Sweden, Norway, and Denmark—into the alliance.

Norway was agreeable. Denmark was willing to listen. But the Swedes said "No." They have remained neutral through a century of European wars and they propose to continue that policy. They don't want the first bombs of the atomic war to drop on their cities.

Perhaps Scandinavian adherence is not essential to the pact, but it would have been exceedingly advantageous. As matters now stand, Scandinavia won't adhere.

Walter Lippmann has pointed out in recent columns that the attempt to bring the northern countries formally into the orbit of the west was a grave mistake, both from their point of view and ours. Most Americans who have followed the news agree with that.

But an even more costly blunder was made in the negotiations with nations which are actively eager to join the alliance.

No doubt the State Department assumed that western Europe was familiar with the American Constitution.

But certainly the people of the western countries, including the press, did not understand. They assumed that when Uncle Sam talked about a "defense pact" he meant just that—the kind of military alliance with which Europe is familiar.

Presently they were told, however, that that kind of pact is impossible. In this country neither the State Department nor the President has the power to declare war. That right is reserved to the Congress, and cannot be delegated. The issue must be decided when and if the question of war arises. No promise can be made to other countries that the United States, under certain conditions, will go to war.

That is no mere technicality of the Constitution. It is a basic part of the American system of government.

If the system were otherwise, if it permitted firm military alliances, this country's foreign policy would be at the mercy of every ally. By imprudent actions, little Norway, for example, or Belgium or Holland or Luxemburg, would be able to force the United States into an atomic war.

The American people don't want that. They wouldn't stand for it, even if their Constitution permitted it.

When belatedly that truth was made clear, the air of western Europe rang with angry protests. The press charged that the State Department proposed a good idea and then tried to welsh on it.

The State Department knew in advance any defense pact it could draw and reasonably recommend would have to be couched in weasel words. It would be meaningless and

worthless, except perhaps as an irritant to Soviet Russia.

As matters have turned out, our intended allies are more irritated than Russia. They, our friends, are in doubt about our purposes and our sincerity. They are saying, "If the Americans won't stay put in time of peace, how can we count on them in time of war?"

It was all totally unnecessary.

As events had developed since 1945, all the world knew that the United States was committed—psychologically if not constitutionally—to resist Russian aggression. All the world knew that if Soviet Russia tried to push its way beyond the frontiers granted to it by President Roosevelt at Yalta, an angry America would join the battle instantly.

But that implicit commitment wasn't good enough for the State Department. It sought to draft an explicit treaty which, although it could not be binding on the United States, at least would be aggravating to Soviet Russia.

It was a small boy sort of game. A writing of nasty words on the international sidewalks. And now the leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to save face, are faced with the task of rephrasing the proposed pact in such a way that, while meaning little, it will still soothe the aggrieved feelings of America's friends.

Dairymen Face Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday February 28, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the weekly newspaper editors in my district who well understands the problems of our State's dairy industry is Gordon W. Crump, who for several years has been closely connected with the State's agriculture department and particularly with our nationally famed State fair. I therefore would like to include in the RECORD a recent editorial from his newspaper, the Cambridge News:

With our Wisconsin dairymen for the first time in recent years being plagued with surpluses again.

With millions of cases of condensed milk looking for users.

With the price of milk and milk products to the farmers dropping in price during this time of year.

With a Democratic Congress and a Democratic President convinced that oleo laws should all be repealed, the meeting of the American Dairy Association should be an important one.

It is time this organization and the Wisconsin dairy farmer quit kidding themselves about this dairy market and its future and get down to some serious thinking and common planning on the program to pursue.

Among the subjects which would make interesting study is the present price of dairy products and the price the farmer is getting. Lower prices in several fields are entirely possible and consumption will increase with lower prices.

Another matter is to acquaint labor and industry all over the country that the farmer is going to rebel against further increases in his costs. It is time this combination of business and labor knew that the public which has been goods hungry for so long has finally decided that prices are too high in many fields and they will wait for prices to drop before they buy.

However, these problems are simple to the great thinkers in Washington. There is nothing here that the repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill and another billion spent in 22 more commissions won't fix.

Overtime Pay for Substitute Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, regular postal employees are paid time and one-half for overtime. This is now a well-recognized practice in industry generally. In many fields of activity, it is required by Federal or State laws or both.

A substitute postal employee, however, when he works more than 8 hours a day receives only pay for straight time. There seems to be no logical reason why such an employee, if he is working alongside a regular employee and performing the same service, should not be entitled to the same compensation.

Abuses should, of course, be avoided. It is an administrative responsibility to insure that surplus employees beyond the needs of the service are not retained. But those on the pay roll who perform faithfully equivalent services should be equally compensated.

Today I have introduced a bill which provides that when a substitute employee is working in a category of the service in which a regular employee is paid time and one-half for overtime, he shall likewise receive the same compensation. It seems to me this legislation should appeal to the sense of fairness and equity of the Members.

American Military Government in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the third installment of an article from the magazine Politics, dealing with our military government in Germany.

It must be obvious to any fair reader that the personnel was not carefully screened and that people who have no sympathy with our form of government, but who are either left-wingers or radicals, were employed at the expense of the American taxpayer to misrepresent the United States in our effort to bring about a stabilized government in Germany.

This third installment confirms the charges I have heretofore made on this same subject.

INSTALLMENT III

THE SOFTENING OF THE LIBERAL BRAIN

In 1945 and later, American liberals by and large held three convictions about Germans, some of which were even embodied in military government directives, and all of which shaped their general attitude toward the inhabitants of our zone:

(1) All Germans were burning to start a war between the United States and the U. S. S. R. This included the subconvictions that

(a) German stories about Russian atrocities were all lies (corollary: pro-Russian Germans were the only real anti-Nazis);

(b) All Germans who thought Potsdam's program was insane wanted to prepare for war; and

(c) All Germans who talked about mass expulsions from east of the Oder-Neisse line were Fascists.

(2) All Germans could be classified according to a sliding scale of democratic convictions. Reading from left to right, the most reliable Germans were the Communists (see Edwin Hartrich's dispatch below), then the Popular Front Socialists, then Social Democrats, Centrists, Liberals, Conservatives, and professional Christians. Everyone to the "right" of the Popular Front was increasingly suspect.

(3) There had been no anti-Nazi movement inside Germany, and all those who did not emigrate were therefore guilty of Nazi collaboration. Erika Mann and others aided this conviction in several speeches and articles during and after the war. This conviction, like the other two, was, of course, false.

As a result of these three basic convictions, American liberals in military government came to believe that only Communists and associated Stalinoids filled the anti-Nazi bill completely: They never uttered a word against the U. S. S. R.; they never questioned the Potsdam Declaration (although in eastern Germany they whispered that it was all a western plot to destroy German competition in world markets); and, finally, they got first place and show on the liberal sliding scale.

It is essential for an understanding of Communist tactics in postwar Germany to analyze the political situation which confronted the United States Military Government upon the defeat of Hitler. This situation was, of course, like a vacuum; and military government, like nature, seemed to abhor it. To do away with it, military government promoted certain German political parties.

There were two possible alternatives to follow in dealing with the German vacuum. The first—and the alternative which the majority of German resistance members advocated—was to postpone the creation of a party-political structure for as long as possible, until it grew up as an organic part of German popular thought. Until that time, most observers on the spot preferred to see a regime by carefully selected, military government-appointed Germans, functioning not only as administrators but also as educators. The idea was that German community life had so completely disintegrated that only a thorough reeducation from top to bottom could even begin to create the basic conditions under which democratic self-government can function. The Allies had decided at Potsdam that the Germans needed reeducating before they could be trusted with self-government. Well, if they needed reeducating—which was true—you couldn't very well expect them to act like old, accustomed democrats overnight, could you?

Military government thought you could. Accepting the second possible alternative, military government insisted upon the creation of political parties, and demanded absolutely that its German appointees to provincial governments join one of the four parties that were suddenly grafted upon the lethargic, unwilling body of nonpolitical Germans, who were thoroughly sick of it all. The result was, sure enough, a German political scene—a scene, however, in a puppet theater. The newly (by themselves) selected party leaders (with the important exception of the well-trained, highly disciplined Communists), were a sad collection of elderly, fourth-rate standins—kindly German Santa Clauses, who had been much too unimportant to have been troubled by the Gestapo. The principal leaders of the German resistance—or, rather, those that survived—refused to join this political flea circus, and were left out in the cold. That left the Santa Clauses—who had no popular mandate whatsoever—to develop quickly under military government's excited nursing, into back-room politicians, who settled candidacies, lists of delegates, party policies, and in general behaved as if they were young again. No one, except military government, was fooled.

The organization of German self-government in the United States zone fell into three separate phases: The first phase covered the selection and appointment of Germans by the political affairs division of the military government to serve in three provincial German governments—those of Hesse, Wuerttemberg-Baden, and Bavaria. The second phase was the election of German party deputies on a local level. And the third phase concerned the election of German parties on a provincial level, and thus the election of German provincial governments. These governments are currently functioning—poorly.

Phase 1. We appoint German governments: In the Province of Hesse, with which I am rather more familiar than I am with the other two, the military government appointed a government early in the game. There were only a few Germans from whom the military government could have chosen, but with its unfailing touch, the military government chose the wrong ones. I have explained above how the survivors of the German resistance groups were bypassed by the military government, because they had declined to become parts of the military government's political puppet theater. Now the military government turned to the only remaining German politician material; the Santa Clauses, and the well-organized German Communist Party, whose alert leaders were just returning home from 12 years of intensive training in the Soviets' political schools—fit as fiddles.

The military government selected provincial government of Hesse was typical. Selected to be Minister of the Interior (the one post the Communists always fight tooth and nail to get, since it means control of the police) was a Nenni-type Socialist by the name of Venedey. To him and his Stalinist bosses the military government presented, on a silver platter, the Hessian police. The second Stalinist appointed by the Hesse military government was again given a post fervently coveted by the Communists; the Ministry of Labor. His name, Oskar Mueller, important functionary of KPD.

Phase 2. We hold local elections: Early in 1946 MG decided, against practically everybody's advice, to hold local elections and thus to force the creation, overnight, of complete party machines. The net result of the elections, though showing a clear Communist defeat, represented an indirect victory for the anti-democratic Communist-Nazi front: the elections consolidated the leadership of the Santa Clauses in the democratic parties—i. e., leadership by the weakest possible elements. Even Schumacher's Social-Democrats (who concentrated their principal effort in the British zone to the North and in Berlin), were represented in the United States zone by the feeblest of prehistoric trade-unionists.

Despite the Communist defeat at the polls, Communist influence in the Hesse government characteristically did not diminish. Although Venedey was fired upon the insistence of the Schumacher forces, his appointees were not. Many months after Venedey was out, I received the following report from a German friend:

(a) Every department in the Hesse Ministry of the Interior has either a Stalinist head, or a Stalinist executive.

(b) The police organization of Hesse is under Communist control.

(c) The police department in charge of weapons is thoroughly Communist-infiltrated.

(d) Two confidential police couriers, whose job it is to transmit important communications that cannot be entrusted to the wire or the radio, have been members of the Communist Party for years.

(e) The German border police patrolling the American-Russian zone border is strongly Communist infiltrated.

My informant added: "I heard that MG in Berlin, when told of this, simply answered that the German Communist Party was a legally constituted party, and that there was no reason why a policeman should not belong to it."

The following dispatch by Edwin Hartrich to the New York Herald Tribune, dated Frankfurt, April 16, 1948, supports my informant's point:

"The American military government has requested German state officials in the American occupation zone to purge their police departments of 'all Communist elements,' * * * In the early days of the occupation, many Communists were selected by AMG for positions in the various police forces * * * the problem of finding trustworthy anti-Nazi personnel became acute for the AMG. Proven anti-Nazi Germans were hard to recruit except for the organized Communists * * * hence they obtained positions of power in the various police forces.

Phase 3. Germans elect provincial governments: By the time the zone-wide elections took place late in 1946, three important developments had determined Communist strategy in the United States part of Germany. They were: (1) The U. S. S. R. had come out for a united and centralized Germany (with a Soviet-controlled Government in Berlin), and the Communists had therefore received orders not to cooperate in western Germany's bizonia;[1] (2) the Communists had discovered that their numerical strength in western Germany was so small that they could best damage Bizonia by concentrating upon penetration of trade unions and upon sabotage strikes in the Ruhr,[2] and (3) other German parties in the west (with the exception of Schumacher's Socialists who had, unaided, won the Berlin elections) had become exactly what the Communists—and, perhaps, their friends in MG—had hoped for: a catch-all for fourth-rate nonentities, so weak that it required little effort to make them topple over. These nonentities now proceeded to form three provincial governments headed by three santa clauses. One of them had once timidly compromised with the Nazis, and was now spending his time trying to explain it all; another was an elderly, harmless Bavarian yokel; and a third was cleverly picked from the staunch ranks of the Christian Cigar-Makers Trade Union of Darmstadt.

This left the Communists in the enviable position of being able to criticize everything, attack and sabotage anything, bear the responsibility for nothing, and claim that everything in the eastern zone was better. In spreading this last belief, MG decided to lend them a hand.

IDEOLOGICAL LEND-LEASE TO RUSSIA

Meanwhile the larger battle, the battle for central Europe, was being fought not by the Americans, but by Kurt Schumacher's and Julius Kaiser's underfed bands of Socialists and Christian Socialists. Banned from the Soviet Zone, they fought in Berlin; and in a magnificent effort on October 20, 1946, they won Berlin from the combined MVD-Gestapo administration established there by the Soviets. Forty-nine percent of the vote went to the Socialists, 22 percent to Kaiser's party. Now, surely the Western Powers would act—now that there was no diplomatic risk involved.

Not at all. What the German democrats had won at such high cost was promptly lost to the Soviets on the Allied Control Council. After typical wrangling, vetoes, subterfuge—the whole sordid bag of tricks—the Russians got just what they wanted: an enfeebled, unrepresentative Berlin City administration, totally out of keeping with the overwhelming democratic victory. Berlin was a precedent, in miniature, of what was to happen a year later in Budapest.

Next came the Berlin Trade Union elections. Let me quote the N. Y. Post's labor correspondent, Victor Riesel, who wrote on March 18, 1948:

"Pardon me if I seem to be talking about beauty culture magazines and interior decorating bulletins at a critical moment like this * * * [that] pulp stuff is being printed in Germany today—especially in Berlin—while democratic union chiefs starve for newsprint for their anti-Communist papers. Stupidity is the word for it * * * much less charitable words would be invoked to describe what I say is valuable aid to the Communist propagandists abroad * * * the State Department's refusal to provide the democratic, non-Communist German labor leaders with paper for propaganda during the recent union elections in Berlin—while the Communists had tons to spare for their publications, and they weren't devoted to beauty culture."

Reisel goes on to describe the difficulties encountered by the A. F. of L. in trying to get United States Army permission to distribute in Germany an A. F. of L.-financed labor pamphlet. Such permission presumably had to come from ICD.

We lost the Trade Union elections in Berlin. We might attribute all of this to the well-established nitwittedness in the higher circles of MG. But it is hard to remain so charitable when we see that Political Affairs of MG, while undermining the anti-Communist effort in Germany, was giving direct and immensely valuable aid to the agents of the U. S. S. R. To prove this allegation, I shall merely cite the example of the extensive speaking tours through the United States Zone of the leaders of the Russian-operated SED—a party that was not licensed in western Germany, so that there was not the slightest justification for MG to permit its leaders to campaign in those areas.

Three leaders of the SED repeatedly received MG permission to campaign in the United States zone. They were: Red Army Political Commissar Walter Ulbricht (whose rank, I believe, is that of brigadier general); Wilhelm Pieck, Moscow-trained Communist party wheelhorse; and Otto Grotewohl, opportunistic renegade "Socialist" who merged

[1] Communist Deputy Max Reimann, leading Stalinist in the British zone, announced in March 1948: "I consider as traitors those who cooperate in the splitting of Germany." With the Red Army only 100 miles away, those were strong words.

[2] Oskar Mueller's early appointment by the Americans to the Hessian Ministry of Labor paved the way to much of this work.

with the Communists in the eastern zone to form the SED. These men formed a veritable propaganda circus that traveled wherever it wished to go in the United States zone. I have attended some of its performances, which resembled Nazi meetings in every detail. But while every allegedly "nationalistic" utterance by Kurt Schumacher brings upon his head the extreme displeasure of MG's Stalinoids, the direct and repeated calls to arms [2] issued at these SED meetings were not considered sufficient reason for MG to cancel its permission to hold such meetings. I need hardly mention that neither Kaiser nor Schumacher were permitted to speak in—or even enter—the Soviet zone; and that their lieutenants in Berlin were kidnapped again and again by the terror squads of the MVD—often in broad daylight, often directly under MG's nose.

And this is not all. At an SED meeting in Frankfurt in the critical winter of 1946–47 I discovered 20 or 30 large, gasoline-burning trucks and busses parked just off the "Roemer" where the meeting was being held. These trucks, I was informed, had come from towns many miles away, carrying the Communist Germans who made up Comrade Pieck's claque. Who had issued permission to use critically short, rationed (and probably American-supplied) gasoline for this purpose? Why, the American MG, of course. That same MG that was having so hard a time, that winter, getting enough transportation facilities to distribute the meager 1,500 calory ration, which Pieck & Co. were criticizing so violently just around the corner * * * That same MG that was finding it so hard to supply anti-Communists with newsprint and with gasoline for critical election campaigns * * *. That same MG, however, that seemed always somehow able to lend the Russians a hand.

It is becoming increasingly obvious each day that the American military government is finally being introduced to the facts of life. As this is written MG is learning the hard way—in Berlin and elsewhere. Some of the situations I have described have been remedied; others are about to be.

But regardless of all the good intentions in 1948, regardless of our sudden realization of what is at stake—not frontiers, territories, bases, but the most elementary human rights themselves, all over the world—regardless of our belated understanding of these real issues, I regretfully believe that our positions in Germany, at least, have been damaged almost beyond repair. The time has probably passed when we could rally the anti-Communist forces of the German trade unions; and thanks to our incompetence, Schumacher's Socialists are today much weaker than they were when they captured Berlin in 1946. All over western Germany there are democratic Germans who have been lost to us as a result of MG's prototalitarian fumbling. It may prove almost impossible to call upon these men and women now.

But if there does remain a chance, I hope that those with the authority to act will grab it with both hands—today, now, and before all is gone.

Record of Cedric Belfrage

Communist-front organization [1]	Affiliation	Source which can be quoted
American Friends of Spanish Democracy (2)	Signer of petition to lift arms embargo	Daily Worker, Apr. 8, 1938, p. 4.
Anti-Japanese picket line (Long Beach, Calif.)	Picketer	Daily Worker, Jan. 21, 1939, p. 4.
Black and White (5)	Contributor	Black and White, Dec. 1939, p. 5.
Commonwealth College (2)	Member, advisory board	Commoner, Mena, Ark., June 1939, pp. 1, 4.
League of American Writers (Hollywood chapter) (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10).	Signer, cable to Leon Blum, President Roosevelt, and Secretary Hull to send supplies to Loyalist Spain.	New Masses, Mar. 29, 1938, p. 21.
National Committee for People's Rights (1, 2, 3, 5)	Member	News You Don't Get, Nov. 15, 1938; Letterhead, July 13, 1938.
National Gazette, a pro-Wallace paper	Editor	Daily Worker, July 21, 1948, p. 5.
National Guardian, a pro-Wallace newsweekly	do	New York Times, Sept. 10, 1948, p. 25.
New Masses (2, 3, 5, 6)	Contributor	New Masses, Dec. 28, 1937, p. 6.
People's Institute of Applied Religion, Inc. (4)	Research director, member of the international board, and sponsor.	Letterhead, Jan. 1, 1948.
United American Spanish Aid Committee (2, 5)	Signer, statement to Assistant Secretary of State	Daily Worker, July 23, 1940, p. 3, column 3.
Writers for Wallace	Member	New York Star, Oct. 21, 1948, p. 20 (political advertisement).
Young Progressives of America	Speaker with Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Communist	Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 7.
South of God They All Hold Swords	Author (books sold at Communist Progressive Book Shop, 625 West 6th St., Los Angeles, Calif.).	People's World, Nov. 21, 1942, p. 7; Nov. 14, 1942, p. 7.
Abide with Me	Author (recommended by The Worker)	The Worker, Dec. 19, 1948, p. 10, magazine section.

[1] Key: (1) Cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the congressional Committee on Un-American Activities; (2) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities; (3) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the former Attorney General, Francis Biddle; (4) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by Attorney General Tom Clark; (5) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities; (6) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities; (7) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the Pennsylvania Commonwealth Counsel; (8) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the New York City Council committee investigating the Municipal Civil Service Commission; (9) cited as Communist or a Communist-front organization by the Rapp-Coudert committee (Joint Legislative Committee to Investigate Procedures and Methods of Allocating State Moneys for Public School Purposes and Subversive Activities, New York State); (10) cited as a Communist or Communist-front organization by the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

What's Your Pressure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I am inserting an article by Mr. Wheeler McMillen, which appeared in the February 23, 1949, issue of the Pathfinder entitled "What's Your Pressure?":

WHAT'S YOUR PRESSURE?

One thing this country sorely needs. That is an uprising of citizens, and of organizations, against spending public funds for their own benefit.

At the risk of being tiresome on this subject of public spending, I want here to emphasize the influence citizens can exert.

First of all, the Eighty-first Congress will appropriate few dollars except as pressures demand.

Some of this will be the pressure of responsibility. Congress bears the responsibility to maintain the necessary activities of government and to provide for the Nation's defense. It would authorize funds for these purposes whether or not anyone asked for such appropriations. It would be delinquent not to do so.

Much pressure upon Congress comes from within the Government. Bureaus and agencies present able pleas which tell how urgent and desirable it is for them to spend more money. Few representatives of the taxpayers ever appear to oppose them. The conscientious Congressman usually is forced to conclude that he should vote for the appropriation.

Another kind of pressure comes from groups of citizens organized for good purposes. Their spokesmen appear with skilled arguments. No one asks whether the money involved would do more good if left in the pockets of the taxpayers. The Congressman who wants to serve his country finds little support for voting against the good purposes.

Then come the pressures for multitudes of regional and local expenditures—spent for a dam here, a post-office building there, and something somewhere else. When the demand comes from his own district, the Member of Congress has to think of his political future. He knows he will lose votes if he opposes what people in his own area ask; he has no reason to expect to make votes if he supports economy.

It was not without knowledge that a cynical legislator once explained his political long life by saying that he "had supported every appropriation and opposed every tax increase."

The Government bureaus and agencies have friends and beneficiaries in every State. They can easily arouse a back-home pressure campaign to protect their appropriations. Every organized group knows how to persuade members and sympathizers to write or wire their Congressmen.

Thousands of taxpayers who squawk with justified horror at their own tax bills have been among those to write or wire in behalf of some expenditure they themselves wanted.

Is it any wonder that spending grows bigger and ever more lavish?

Should your Congressman receive a resolution from your chamber of commerce opposing a proposal to spend Federal money in your town, he would probably drop dead from amazement.

He would be greatly surprised to read a letter from you opposing an expenditure from which you might expect benefits. If he were

[2] I am referring literally to a clause in the SED constitution which was pointedly read at these meetings.

to receive several such communications, he might conclude that his people were seriously opposed to bigger spending.

Every Congressman respects his mail. An individual, personal letter impresses him. If he should now begin to receive many letters favoring economy in Government, they would have some effect on his attitude toward expenditures. Probably he personally favors public economy because he sees so much waste. He would gain support from quantities of written evidence that a spirit of self-denial has begun to arise.

Bigger spending can only make dollars cheaper and prices higher, since Government borrowing is what pumps up inflation. Every dollar the Government spends is a dollar some citizen has been forbidden to spend or invest for himself. At some point Government spending will put an end to American individual opportunity.

St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include a recent statement as published February 18 by the Power Authority of the State of New York, upholding New York's right under the Federal-State accord in the St. Lawrence hydroelectric power development. Editorials from the New York Times and the Watertown Daily Times are also included:

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY STATEMENT

More than 20 bills have been introduced in Congress to approve the draft United States-Canadian agreement and to authorize the St. Lawrence seaway and power project since the agreement was signed March 19, 1941.

Each of these measures heretofore offered has definitely provided for turning over to New York State the power facilities to be built within the State, upon assumption by the power authority of the allocated costs of the power project, pursuant to the Federal-State accord of February 7, 1933.

On February 15, 1949 House Joint Resolution 161 was introduced by Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, to approve the 1941 United States-Canadian agreement and to authorize the dual purpose St. Lawrence development. This is the first bill offered in the entire history of the project which attempts to repudiate the Federal-State accord. It completely eliminates the Federal-State accord provision, which appeared as section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 104, Seventy-ninth Congress, introduced by Senator BARKLEY and 9 cosponsors, and as section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, introduced by Senator VANDENBERG and 15 cosponsors.

Every President and every governor of the State of New York has endorsed and upheld the Federal-State accord since it was entered into in 1933. Legislation containing the Federal-State accord provision has repeatedly been recommended to Congress by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the State Department, and every other Federal agency concerned with the St. Lawrence development.

Bills containing this provision were favorably reported after public hearings by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Seventy-seventh Congress, in 1941; by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Seventy-ninth Congress, in 1946; and by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Eightieth Congress, in 1948.

In reliance upon the Federal-State accord, the State of New York has made substantial expenditures in completing engineering and marketing plans, all predicated upon ownership and operation of the power project by the public agency of the State, as provided in the accord.

In his message to Congress October 3, 1945, recommending the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, President Truman referred to the State power program embodied in the Power Authority Act as follows:

"I have always been, and still am, in favor of that program. Under it the power facilities are to be constructed by the Federal Government and turned over by it to the State of New York. The terms of allocation of costs to the State of New York have been agreed upon in a memorandum of agreement dated February 7, 1933, recommended for execution by the United States Army Corps of Engineers and the power authority of the State of New York. This basis of allocation is fair and acceptable.

"It has always been understood by the responsible proponents of this development that the water-power project should become the property of the State of New York, and that the electric power should be developed and handled by the State. That should continue to be the policy, and I recommend that it be so declared by the Congress."

Since its creation in 1931 the power authority has appeared at every public hearing held by a congressional committee on behalf of the St. Lawrence project and has joined with all other public agencies, Federal and State, in support of the Federal-State accord provision. It is wholly inconceivable to the power authority that the Federal Government or its agencies will at this late date sponsor any legislation to scrap the Federal-State Accord. The trustees of the power authority are unanimously and unalterably opposed to the Blatnik bill or any other bill that fails to include the Federal-State accord provision.

In its annual report of January 31, 1949, the power authority reaffirmed its stand against any proposal to Federalize the power development in New York State; to increase the proportion of costs to be assumed by the power project under the method of allocation provided by the Federal-State accord; to restrict or hamper the use of St. Lawrence power for the benefit of the people; or to deny to the State the right to proceed with the power project duly authorized by act of the legislature.

The power authority will continue to uphold these substantial rights and interests of the people of the State of New York, consistent with the terms of the Federal-State accord, in connection with any future public hearings held on the St. Lawrence project.

(The above statement is signed by the five trustees of the power authority, Gen. Francis B. Wilby, Geneva, chairman; Fred J. Freestone, Syracuse and Interlaken, vice chairman; George Stephens Reed, Lowville; Gerald V. Cruise, New York City; and Jacob Grumet, New York City; and Ralph G. Sucher, executive secretary.)

[From the New York Times of February 23, 1949]

ST. LAWRENCE POWER

Since the United States and Canada in 1941 agreed formally to carry out the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project more than 20 bills in approval have been introduced in Congress. All stipulated that the hydroelectric power plant to be constructed was to be turned over to the State of New York, provided the State paid its share of the cost. Now comes Representative BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with a resolution that flies in the face of State ownership and calls for federalization. His is the first bill that repudiates a Federal-State accord which has been endorsed by every President and by every government of the State since 1933, as well as by the Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, the State Department, and every other Federal agency concerned with the development of the St. Lawrence.

If a St. Lawrence hydroelectric plant generated an excess of power that could be utilized in New England, a case for federalization might be made out. But there has long been a shortage of electric power in upper New York. Even in the New York City area the demand for electric power exceeded the assured supply in 1947. Such is the demand for power that the public utility companies of the State are prepared to install new generating capacity of 280,000 kilowatts in the New York City area alone and 354,000 kilowatts elsewhere. If we now had both St. Lawrence hydroelectric and the planned public utility steam power the State could utilize it all.

Since the American portion of the St. Lawrence plant will lie within the boundaries of the State and since the State needs all the power that it can obtain there is no need of federalization. Representative BLATNIK'S bill can serve no other purpose than that of granting the Federal Government rights for which it has never asked and for which there is no justification.

[From the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of February 18, 1949]

THE POWER AUTHORITY'S STATEMENT

The New York State Power Authority today announced its opposition to any St. Lawrence seaway bill which did not clearly recognize the property right of the State of New York in the developed power. The statement was directed particularly against the Blatnik bill, described by the authority as the only St. Lawrence seaway bill ever introduced which did not contain the Federal-State accord.

The authority cites the fact that President Truman in 1945 conceded the right of New York State to the developed St. Lawrence power and says that every other President, since the St. Lawrence seaway was first discussed, has recognized this right. It was primarily for the purpose of administering the developed power that the New York Power Authority was first created and the State has spent a great deal of money in anticipation of having the developed power turned over to it.

The power authority makes a strong case but whether it will impress Washington is another matter. Fortunately, it now develops that the Blatnik bill is probably not an administration measure. Nevertheless, it is known there is a sentiment in certain Washington quarters to make the St. Lawrence development another TVA.

The strongest thing in the power authority's favor is that President Truman is definitely on record for the Federal-State accord. No man could have made a more positive commitment than he did in 1945. And there is nothing so far to indicate that he has changed his stand in any particular.

If the power authority were authorized to make it clear to the White House that if the developed power is turned over to the State, it will be distributed so that the people will receive the maximum benefit from it, it might be the one thing needed to make sure that we will get the power. At any rate, it would make our case much stronger than it is now and would be an effective answer to those people in Washington who are charging that the State wants the power only to turn it over to the utilities.

Saving Bond Theme Song Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, I informed the House that the lack of a peacetime savings-bond theme song was being remedied by the talented harmonizers of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. The 6-week competition closed on February 15, and a total of 43 original compositions, both words and music, have been submitted for the approval of the United States Savings Bonds Division. Fred Waring, whose name is a byword in national harmony circles as a band and chorus leader, will act as chairman of the board of judges who will select the prize song among the 43 submitted, and render a decision by March 1.

I am proud today to acclaim my own State of Illinois for entering nine songs, as compared with five each for the District of Columbia, Indiana, and Ohio; Michigan, four; New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin, two each; Georgia, Maryland, Rhode Island, Delaware, Wyoming, and Nebraska, one each. Thus, Illinois led the Nation's barbershoppers in responding to the Treasury Department's urgent call for a bond song to succeed Irving Berlin's wartime inspirational tune, Any Bonds Today? My own chapter of SPEBSQSA—Bloomington, Ill.—is represented by two songs, Buy a Savings Bond Today, by William Bourges, and Buy Some Bonds Today, by John Hansen in collaboration with William Bourges.

Frank H. Thorne, of Chicago, former international president of SPEBSQSA, entered Keep America Saving, adapted from his famous song, Keep America Singing, which was recently sung at the inaugural gala. Billy Hannon and George P. Hill, also of Chicago, entered Buy a Bond Today and Let's All Buy Savings Bonds, respectively. Oak Park chapter was represented by The Bond Song, by R. George Adams and R. F. Svanoe, and Nothing Could Be Finer Than To Be a '49er, by George H. Zdarsky. Harold Price, of Belleville chapter, wrote a Bond Anthem, and Johnny Goering, Sr., of LaSalle chapter, wrote Buy a Bond Today.

Edward R. Place, of Washington, until recently a congressional secretary in the office of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] and now the assistant conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, conducted this competition for SPEBSQSA in cooperation with the United States Savings Bonds Division. The Nation's Capital led all chapters in the country in number of entries with five, including Ed Place's Bonds for Happiness, Mark Bowsher's Be a Minute Man of Forty-nine, in collaboration with Place; E. Taylor Papson's Buy a Bond; Edward A. Carey's Buy a Bond Today, and Charles J. Hay's Put Your Savings in a Savings Bond. Mr. Hay is a Government employee with the War Assets Administration.

Ed Cronin and Pat Sands, employees of the collector of internal revenue in Boston, Mass., entered their song, Freedom Rings. Former International President Hal Staab, of Northampton, Mass., author of the popular song, Violets Sweet, submitted a composition in the bond song competition, I Am Proud of the U. S. A.

I would like the RECORD to show the remaining entries in order to be fair to all the composers who have contributed their talents, time, and effort to the savings-bond song-writing project.

Indiana: International board member Ted E. Haberkorn, Sr., Fort Wayne chapter, two songs, O Save and You'll See and Savings Bonds Keep That Wolf Away; Arnold McPhee, Evansville chapter, Get on the Bond Wagon; Larry Smith, Muncie chapter, Buy Bonds; M. H. (Skeet) Bolds, Lafayette chapter, Buy Another Bond or Two.

Ohio: Tim Murphy, Columbus chapter, It's Bonds We Have for Sale; George B. Murphy, Columbus chapter, Opportunity Is Knocking; A. E. Stull and Howard K. Hansen, Lakewood chapter, Buy, Buy Bonds; R. F. Verderber, Cleveland chapter, Buy Buy Bonds, and Nathaniel Berthoff, Elyria chapter, Buy a Bond of Liberty.

Michigan: Willis A. Diekema, Holland chapter, chairman of SPEBSQSA's Song Arrangement Committee, Brother, Sign Up for Bonds; Dal Metcalf, Grosse Pointe chapter, Bonds on Parade; Keene W. Wolfe, Battle Creek chapter, The Victory Call, and Hal Reinhardt, Grosse Pointe chapter, Buy a Bond From Uncle Sammy; Joseph E. Martin and Howard Liffick, both of the Benton Harbor-St. Joe, Michigan chapter, Buy a US Bond Today.

Wisconsin: Cleve B. Akey, Wisconsin Rapids chapter, Buy a Bond, and Edward Berg, Milwaukee chapter, Buy Bonds Today.

New York: Walter K. Beyer, Hamburg chapter, Buy Bonds Today, and Fred J. House, Hornell chapter, assisted by his wife, Bonds of the U. S. A.

New Jersey: Edward Miltner and Gus Patzig, Jersey City chapter Give Yourself a Helping Hand, and Louis M. Casale and Pat Owen, Leonia chapter, The Bond Song.

Nebraska: Warren Adler, Lexington chapter, We'll Keep America Singing.

Delaware: Maurice Donovan, Wilmington chapter, Save for a Rainy Day.

Rhode Island: Alfred F. Girard, Providence chapter, Buy, Buy, Buy a Bond Today.

Maryland: Paul J. Griffin, Baltimore chapter, Buy Bonds for Security.

Wyoming: Francis Stroup, Laramie chapter, If You Want Four Dollars.

Georgia: R. H. ("Dick") Sturges, Atlanta chapter, Buy, Buy Another United States Savings Bond.

SPEBSQSA has given its answer to the Treasury with a flood of harmony and thanks National Director Vernon L. Clark, Des Moines, Iowa, of United States Savings Bonds Division, for the opportunity which he extended to the society to demonstrate its spirit of patriotism and public service. National Director Clark has been ably assisted by his colleagues in the United States Savings Bonds Division in cooperating with the various chapters of SPEBSQSA throughout the Nation, notably by Harold B. Master, director of community activities, and Nate Colwell, director of radio, who is one of the advisory judges to the panel to be selected by Fred Waring, who incidentally is a member of the Sheboygan, Wis., chapter of SPEBSQSA.

My hearty congratulations also to President O. H. King Cole, Manitowoc, Wis., and Secretary Carroll C. Adams, Detroit, for their promotional efforts on behalf of the bond-song competition, which has had such happy results.

Outagamie County Board Denounces Hungarian and Bulgarian Trials of Religious Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution passed by the Outagamie County Board of Supervisors, Appleton, Wis., on February 15, 1949:

Whereas our forefathers came to this country from foreign lands so that they could worship as they desired; and

Whereas over the years that have elapsed many lives have been lost in defending their country to keep it a free democracy; and

Whereas in 1917 many more lives were lost when Kaiser Wilhelm tried to place himself above God, the Maker of the universe; and

Whereas in 1941 we were again embroiled in another war on account of nazism, which was finally overcome; and

Whereas we have not had a good breath to breathe from that turmoil and now we are confronted with communism; and

Whereas just recently in Hungary that Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty was found guilty under duress and was given a life sentence; and

Whereas also more recently a goodly number of Evangelical Church members were placed in jail in Bulgaria awaiting trial by Communists: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we send to the President of the United States and the Congress stating our opposition to such unjust convictions as have taken place recently.

A Revitalized, Patriotic Republican Party That Can and Will Serve All Groups of American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an address delivered by Hon. Cal Johnson

former Member of the House of Representatives, in my congressional district at Somerset, Ky., on the night of February 11, 1949, and which, in my opinion, sets forth basic principles of the Republic Party and shows that our party can and will be of great service not only to the free enterprise system of America and the business people of America but to the laboring men and women and to the American farmers.

The address is as follows:

Fellow Kentuckians, fellow Americans, I am indeed happy to be here and to have this opportunity to join with you in this splendid gathering.

As a wandering son of old Kentucky, I suppose that I should first thank you good folks for permitting me to come back. My case is not like that of the revenue agent over in our section of Kentucky who was seeking a moonshine still. The Government knew that there was a still in our community and they had several agents out looking for it. Finally they sent one of their best men with instructions to stay there until he found it. He searched for weeks without any luck, until one evening when he was coming in along the ridge he noticed a little spiral of smoke arising from down in the valley. He decided to investigate and found a log cabin in which there was a little girl about 12 years old doing the dishes.

He asked her: "Is your pappy home?"

"No," she answered, "Pappy's not home. He's down at the still."

"Oh," said the revenue agent, "Has your pappy got a still?"

The little girl answered: "Yes."

Then he asked her where it was and she answered: "Why, I won't tell you where it is, for you might be one of them revenooers.'

"Oh," he said, "now don't let that worry you. I'll tell you what I'll do. If you will take me down to your pappy's still, I'll give you a dollar."

"All right," she said, "I'll take you down there for a dollar."

But she kept on washing dishes, and after a while he said: "Come on honey, let's go."

"Oh no," she said, "You haven't given me my dollar yet."

"That's all right," he told her, "I'll give you the dollar when we come back."

To which she replied: "Oh no, you won't, mister, you'll give it to me now, for if you go down there you ain't comin' back."

I am happy to report, folks, that in all the years I have been away, there has been only one time that I was criticized for being from old Kentucky. It was back in 1942 in a congressional primary campaign. I had for my opponent an eminent judge who had sought the nomination 2 years previously and who resented very much that I should oppose him. We were speaking on the same platform in Alton, Ill., and he preceded me. Imagine my surprise when he said, in addressing the audience:

"I was born in Illinois in this congressional district and have lived here all my life, and my opponent was not. He was born in Kentucky, and now he comes to my district and seeks to take from me, a native of this congressional district, the nomination to which I am entitled."

When he finished, I followed him to the platform and said: "Yes, folks, just as the good judge told you, I was born in old Kentucky. My mother was there on the night of my birth and, although I had nothing to say about it then, I am proud of it now, because I recognize in this audience the faces of quite a few people whom I met at Edwardsville a short time ago when we observed the birthday of another Kentucky Republican, a man by the name of Abe Lincoln. You know folks, he came to Illinois at the same age that I did. He went to the Illinois general assembly, just like I did, and then he became Congressman just like I am trying to, and then he became President. Shucks, folks, two more jumps and I'm following right in his footsteps. You may be looking at another Abe Lincoln."

I am so happy to be here tonight and to have this opportunity to join with you in paying humble tribute to the sacred memory of that great American and fellow Kentuckian, Abraham Lincoln. When I walk in silent reverence by the site of the little cabin where he was born at Hodgensville, or visit the grave of his sainted mother in Indiana, or stand in solemn adoration before the marble shrine erected to his memory in Washington by a grateful Nation, I cannot help but lift my eyes toward heaven and thank my God that I am an American privileged to partake of liberty and freedom in a united Nation, the unity of which this noble, yet humble, American died to preserve.

This was Lincoln's America and this was his State. He loved his country fervently because he realized that the very soil of America was sacred; hallowed by the memory of those who once upon it dwelt; and sacred because within its gentle embrace remains all that is mortal of those great Americans who gave their all that you and I might be a free and independent people and enjoy the blessings of liberty as we assemble here tonight.

Abraham Lincoln is long since dust. The curtain of time has forever closed the portal of his tomb, but so long as time shall be—so long as America stands, the record of his words and deeds shall be woven as golden threads in the fabric of American history, and when the Great Scorer calls the roll of the States, and asks that they list their illustrious men, proudly will Kentucky present the name of her immortal son, the rail splitter, whose righteous ax hewed to the line of principle, struck the shackles from enslaved men and blazed a trail through the wilderness of ignorance and bigotry, that all men might follow in his footsteps to a better understanding of one another's problems and to a greater and more fruitful life for all.

It was men like Lincoln who were the builders of our country and their spirits hover over this Nation. By reviewing their lives we find a pattern for our own. They were men of action, men of honor, and men whose every act was motivated by the love of liberty and of country. They were men who taught their children by the family hearthstone that America was a land of opportunity and that there was no height too great for any boy or girl in America to reach if they would work and strive to forge ahead. They were men who taught that individual initiative and a willingness to work would overcome all things and that sweat was the only cure for economic ills.

The mantle of authority has been transferred from their shoulders to yours and mine. Our duty is to carry on and preserve the type of government that made America great, the type of government that permitted the progress which, during 170 years, has placed America upon the pinnacle of world domination; the type of government built by incentive, ingenuity, and initiative; the type of government built by men who hewed an empire from a wilderness and who realized that nothing of any value was ever produced that was not the result of the sweat and toil of men's hands.

Such were the ideals of Lincoln—such was the Government of our fathers who were taught that public office was a public trust; that the Supreme Court was akin to holy and that no matter how high or how low a man's station in life, when he appeared before that tribunal he would be accorded justice and I defy you to show me a man who has that confidence today.

They were men who were taught that the Constitution of these United States was sacred and was to be held inviolate by every true American. In their wisdom they gave us a government of many freedoms, for they realized as Jefferson that "the best government is the least government," and that "When the Government shall tell the farmer when to sow and when to reap, the people shall soon go hungry."

They realized the dangers of an all-powerful centralized government, so they delegated certain fundamental rights to the States in an attempt to prevent a bloated Federal cyclops from blindly using its power to control the destinies of our people. They had fought a war to break the shackles of a monarchy and they did not intend to have another one arise to take its place.

They planned well and wisely and as a tribute to their planning in 170 years, this Nation has grown from a few struggling colonies to become the most powerful nation on earth. It grew because under its system of free enterprise business was encouraged instead of regulated, and where business is encouraged there is incentive and initiative and where there is initiative there is prosperity and progress.

But there is a new philosophy in Government now in Washington and that philosophy is that we should change from a government of laws to a government of men. It is the false philosophy that teaches that the world owes us a living and instead of stressing individual rights as our forefathers did, this new philosophy stresses the right of the individual to help himself to that which has been accumulated by others, not seeming to realize that unless we are willing to contribute of our own efforts, we should not be permitted to partake of the fruits of the labor of others.

This false philosophy has been nurtured by the demagogues of this new order who would teach that the Lord helps those who help themselves and the New Deal helps those who don't.

In a Nation where once the patriot, Patrick Henry, voiced the soul-stirring phrase, "Give me liberty or give me death," today the political Mountebanks say: "Give me the votes and I'll change the law of the land to read the way you want it."

It is indeed a sorry state of the Nation when men entrusted with public office place personal and political interests before public interest, and are willing to sacrifice principle for political expediency. When this happens, they cease to be public servants—they constitute a public menace, and they have no business in public office.

Two great political parties were created in this Nation. One was the party of Jefferson—the other the party of Lincoln. I do not charge the follies of the New Deal to true Democrats, as the record of the party of Jefferson is long and glorious, and one of strict adherence to the principles of our Constitution, but the record of the New Deal is brief and shadowy and its attitude toward our Constitution is one of abrogation and disregard.

The party of Jefferson has all but disappeared. Its last remnants were routed at Philadelphia during the New Deal convention, and although those remnants had the courage to refuse to m ch under their party's stolen standard, they stand today alone in the Congress, a small but determined group of Americans who are spurned by the New Dealers, but welcomed by the Republicans.

What are some of the follies of the New Deal, and what are its ideologies? It has placed political demagoguery on such a high plane that Diogenes decided to swipe another barrel of oil by which to continue his search for an honest man. Their candidate for high office, in his Labor Day speech in Detroit, set forth a perfect example of pure political demagoguery of the most puerile type. It was a continuation of the New Deal policy of

spreading class hatred. It was most deplorable, because it was made by a man who sought the highest office in our Nation and also because it was directed toward the same employers of American labor who, but a short time ago, were asked by their Government to produce the guns, ships, tanks, and planes with which to equip your sons and mine.

Labor and industry cooperated in the last war as a team to complete the greatest production job the world has ever known, and it does not increase the stature of any man when he attempted to set one against the other. Let us hope that when the American people hear rantings about yellow-dog contracts and labor hater, they will pity the speakers and regard them with the kindly thought of "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

The New Deal has so burdened our Nation with debt and overlapping governmental bureaus during its 16 years in office that one-third of our national income is used for the maintaining of Federal and State government. It has increased the cost of maintaining Federal Government from $2,800,000,000 in 1932 to $42,000,000,000 in 1948. It has increased our national debt from $22,000,000,000 in 1932 to approximately 270,000,000,000 in 1948. It is now collecting $42,000,000,000 in taxes each year for the maintenance of the Federal Government, and in addition it is estimated that $15,000,000,000 are required to maintain local and State governments. This total equals $57,000,000,000, or one-third of our national income, and yet they demand that $4,000,000,000 more in taxes be extracted from the American public. This Nation can be grateful that the taxation committees of the Congress are headed by Congressman DOUGHTON of South Carolina and Senator GEORGE of Georgia, two men who adhere to the principles of Jefferson.

Not satisfied with its present program, which has expanded the principle of WPA to Europe through the Marshall plan, it now proposes through the so-called Fair Deal to make this program global in its scope and extend its benefits to all the nations of the world. Since learning of the latest phase of this program, it is my intention to call upon my friends in Congress and plead that a resolution be introduced cutting out all appropriations to scientists for the development of rockets. I am fearful that some one will perfect one that will reach the moon and discover that the people on that planet are in need of assistance and the present administration would immediately expand the program to cover the universe instead of the globe.

The New Deal has coddled Reds and fellow-travelers and protected them from the righteous wrath of true Americans. The un-American Activities Committee disclosed that various Federal agencies were honeycombed with pinks and fellow-travelers. Their proof was dismissed with a wave of the hand and called a red herring, and the scourge that has spread like a plague throughout Europe is permitted to grow unabated here in America.

The Administration has proven by such actions that it is willing to deal with questionable groups in order to obtain political support. History has proven to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Austria, and other countries of Europe that you cannot do business with Communists. The teachings of Carl Marx propose to its adherents that they promise anything including the signing of treaties or the entering into any type of agreement, in order to gain an advantage, with the understanding on the part of the Communists that such pledge will never be kept.

Communism could be likened unto cancer. It is a creeping, consuming fungus that destroys the fabric of free government as completely as cancer destroys the tissues of man. It is a malignant growth in the minds of its adherents that obstructs their ability to think for themselves as completely as cancer obstructs the ability of the other vital organs to function. It warps man's perspective in life as disease warps his body. Its breeding place is in the shrouds of fear, hate, envy, and sedition, and its goal for free government—like cancer's for man—is darkness and dissolution.

As we trace the development of communism in this country, what do we find? The New Deal recognized Russia after two Republican Administrations had refused to do so. Browder, the leader of the Communists in this country, was sentenced to the penitentiary by an American jury and he was pardoned by the late President Roosevelt. Mrs. Browder, with the assistance of the White House, migrated to the United States from Canada to become a citizen of this country. All this was engineered by the White House, in order to gain the support of the American Labor Party in New York. That is the pattern of politics they have set.

The record of the New Deal in handling Foreign Affairs in the Nation is pathetic. The fighting men of America won the war—the diplomatic arm of the Nation lost the peace. Berlin, Vienna, and Prague, are shining examples of our stupidity, when American troops find themselves without access to the areas they occupy, except at the whim of the Russians.

China's present position can be attributed directly to her betrayal by this Nation. At Cairo, Roosevelt and Chiang Kai-shek entered into a solemn agreement in which it was understood that when the Japanese were driven from Manchuria, that the industrial installations and arms would be turned over to our Chinese allies in order that they might put down the civil war in their country. That promise was broken at Yalta, where the same promise was made to Russia, who in turn, gave the arms to Communists in China, who have used them to overwhelm the Nationalist Government.

Poland, the first nation to feel the heel of the aggressor, was also betrayed at Yalta. Ambassador Bullitt's articles in Life magazine published last August and September are indeed revealing as to the vacillating foreign policy of this Nation.

The President, in his recent address to the Congress on the State of the Nation, inferred that the Lord will help on his program. The Nation joins with him in that prayer, as the Scriptures inform us that Christ was a carpenter and it would be a great consolation to the American people to know that at long last there was one builder in the New Deal, which for so many years has held only wreckers.

So much for the New Deal. What of our own party? Today the Republican Party is like a great, tempest-tossed ship. The winds of time have swept the Lincolns, the McKinleys and the Teddy Roosevelts from her bridge. She wallows helplessly in a sea of socialism, swept by Communistic tides toward the rocks of destruction, because for 16 years there has been no organized crew on her decks and no able helmsman at the wheel. It is high time that we reestablish unity in our party and return to the principles of Lincoln in order that we may regain the confidence of the people. To regain that confidence, we must prove ourselves to be leaders and we cannot prove that ability by adopting a me-too attitude or by sniping at the other fellow's ideas. We must prepare and submit a progressive legislative program to the Congress at once in order that the citizens of this country may have two legislative programs from which to choose.

Let us propose a farm program that will guarantee to the farmer a fair return for his labor based on a graduated parity, and let us establish the same graduated protection through tariffs for our industries.

Let us submit a health and welfare program that will permit a worker to draw against his own unemployment compensation account to meet a health and welfare problem and pay his physician, and let us fight with every fiber the proposed Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill which would destroy the medical profession in this country and place the family doctor under the control of the ward heeler.

Let us, as Republicans, join with true southern Democrats in Congress in a coalition of Americans to defeat every fool measure that leads toward socialism or government ownership.

In our dealings with foreign nations, let us help those who are willing to help themselves and adopt a policy toward all nations of fairness and firmness.

Let us realize that there can be no peace in the world until a strong and united America standing four square in the family of nations announces a definite set of principles upon which we are willing to stand or fall.

Our national history will cause the peace-loving nations of the world to gravitate toward us, and our strength will command the respect of aggressors. The road to peace is hewn in the bedrock of firmness, and the road to war is cluttered with broken promises, vacillations and the debris of indecision.

Let us build a strong and united America, secure in our unity and strength, and let us pray that war will never again come to America, for when we think of war we remember 1917 and it seems but yesterday that we stood in awed silence as Old Glory passed, held aloft by those stalwart sons of America. We heard the roll of drums and the echoing tramp of millions of marching feet as the legions of America marched off to war.

But folks they did not all return, and tonight as you and I assemble here there are more than one-half million dads and mothers whose hearts are heavy, for down through the years there comes to them the memory of a curly-headed little boy who once crawled across their kitchen floor. They can remember him when he was just big enough to stand on tip-toe and reach on the table to clutch at his daddy's pipe. They can remember how they toddled him on their knee and taught him to love his country and revere his flag for the things for which it stood. They can remember how he would come home in the evening from the little school around the corner and excitedly tell about the lessons in history he had learned and of the heroes who had gone beyond. They remember how proud they were when he marched away in uniform, and they remember the telegram from their Government telling them he would never again return, for he sleeps tonight beneath a whited cross upon some foreign battlefield.

Friends, I know the meaning of one of those telegrams, for the icy hand of death reached into my home during the recent war. On July 29, 1943, my son, Lt. John Bernerd Johnson, made the supreme sacrifice and joined that legion of heroes that march silently through eternity. Above his grave there is a simple cross marked: "Here lives a soldier."

I pledge to him and to his comrades in death and to those who have returned that I shall bend my feeble and untiring efforts towards the preservation of the government of their fathers. A government perpetuated by the consent of the governed, and I ask that history record of me that I had but one prayer, that this Government of ours, this great citadel of freedom, may stand forever as living, throbbing proof that government of the people, for the people, and by the people has not perished from the earth.

And to those who would launch their false ideologies at the American ship of state and attempt to drag our Nation down to the level of their own, may I paraphrase the immortal Farragut and say, "Damn their torpedoes and their ideas—full speed ahead America on the course that was charted by our fathers."

Persecutions in Hungary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John F. Beirne, secretary of Branch 624, National Association of Letter Carriers, Orange, N. J., has kindly forwarded to me a copy of a letter of protest to the Secretary of State, denouncing the trials of Bishop Lajos Ordass of the German Lutheran Church and of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. The practically universal indignation of American citizens over the persecution of the leadership of Christianity by the Hungarian Government is well illustrated in the letter which follows:

BRANCH NO. 624,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
LETTER CARRIERS,
United States Post Office, Orange, N. J.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

HON. DEAR SIR: At a meeting of Branch 624 National Association of Letter Carriers, this city, the officers were instructed to communicate with you protesting the mock trial in Budapest.

We denounce the trials of Bishop Lajos Ordass of the German Lutheran Church and Josef Cardinal Mindszenty as reversions to barbarism and call upon our representatives to take whatever action is possible to secure their release.

Since the Government of Hungary is a puppet of Russia, and since Russia is signatory to a peace treaty in which she agreed to respect the religious rights of the people, now she has flagrantly violated that treaty and her conduct is a menace to world peace. Therefore, she should be brought before the United Nations to answer for her deeds.

Religion is the only hope for survival of western civilization behind the iron curtain and none has a greater stake in the survival of that civilization than the people of the United States. But we now witness the liquidation of that spiritual leadership in an effort to paganize Hungary. The sentencing of Bishop Ordass to 15 years and Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment should be stigmatized before the tribunal of Christian civilization as infamous.

If our Government fails to rectify this crime against humanity we shall not have kept faith with our brave sons who died in two world wars.

Yours very truly,
FRED R. BAYLISS,
President.
JOHN F. BEEONE,
Secretary.

Lithuania's Long Ordeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Shenandoah, Pa., of February 16, 1949:

LITHUANIA'S LONG ORDEAL

A few months short of 9 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania ceased to exist. Erased along with two other Baltic countries by a power founded on terrorism, it was absorbed by the Soviet octopus.

Maps these days designate that erstwhile land of free men and women as the Lithuanian Soviet Socialistic State, a part of the U. S. S. R. Through a tragic set of circumstances, Lithuanians are trapped in an unyielding system wherein their cherished independence has been sacrificed on the altar of state for the greedy purposes of communism.

But let no one suppose the spark of liberty has gone out in the hearts of these gallant people. The torch burns low and in secret but the flame steadfastly resists all efforts to extinguish it.

Lithuanians have endured almost 9 years of bitter suffering which witnessed the initial red wave of terror, succeeded by brutalities of the Nazis and a return of the Reds. Their homeland since June 1940, has, in a diplomatic sense, become a forgotten country.

There has been a determined campaign to sweep away all of Lithuania's cultural values. More than 50 percent of the Catholic clergy have been killed or deported. Only 40 percent of the Protestant churches remain in existence. The vicious Soviet war against organized religion, spotlighted by recent events in Hungary, is an old and tragic story to Lithuanians.

Lithuanian patriots have been slain or deported to Siberia by the thousands. Today, it is believed that almost half the population is made up of Russian and Mongol "settlers."

Schools have been thoroughly Sovietized with great care taken to see that teachers are loyal to the "Party." Those brave souls who seek to acquaint little children with the story of Lithuania's relatively brief period of independence are soon detected. They are shown no mercy; they die like heroes.

Tens of thousands have been torn from their homes and taken into the far reaches of Russia to be used as slave labor. It is useless to remonstrate. There can be no appeal. The rights of a mere individual brook no recognition from the all-powerful state.

Undaunted by all this, forays of militant Lithuanian patriots from forest hide-outs are a nightly occurrence. They strike swiftly at the oppressor and disappear. The patriots suffer heavy casualties but thinned ranks are soon filled again with valiant replacements. The underground has never relaxed. It won't until liberty is restored.

History conveys a message of encouragement to these Lithuanians. They know of mankind's difficulties since the world's dim past in climbing civilization's ladder. They know of the halts and temporary descents, such as the Dark Ages. It is well understood that tyrants and war lords have come and gone down history's trail. And they know, too, that mankind, after each upheaval, has resumed the ascent toward the shining goal.

The deep sympathy of those of us in and about Shenandoah, many of whom are of Lithuanian descent or nativity, is deep for those people in the Baltic who are helpless in the midst of a hostile regime. With sadness but hope for a better future, we commemorate today the thirty-first anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania.

We pray with earnestness that the cruel, stealthy, and vindictive tyranny of the Kremlin will one day recede into history, remembered only as a dark blot.

There is a tendency to forget that communism has been a force for only 32 years. Measured in time, this is a fleeting split minute when the globe's history of trial and tribulation is considered.

Our own Government has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union. Such an eventuality is unthinkable. And some day the Republic of Lithuania will again arise. Pray God that we live to see this bright day.

Speech of Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, the New Jersey State Democratic organization conducted its Jefferson-Jackson victory dinner at the Essex House, Newark, N. J. More than 2,200 members of the party gathered in three large dining rooms to commemorate the deeds of Thomas Jefferson, the founder, and Andrew Jackson, the sword of the party, to celebrate the well-merited victory of President Truman in the 1948 election and the return of a Democratic Congress, and to signify their readiness for the gubernatorial campaign of 1949.

The feature address of the evening was that of Attorney General Tom C. Clark. First on the speaking program was Col. William H. Kelly, of Newark, N. J., Democratic State chairman of Essex County and honorary chairman of the dinner committee, who expressed his pleasure over the great outpouring at the dinner and then introduced the toastmaster, Hon. Thomas J. Holleran, magistrate of the court, Irvington, N. J., who presided with grace and skill. Besides the Attorney General, Judge Holleran presented as other speakers Hon. Vincent J. Murphy, mayor of Newark; Hon. Elmer L. Wene, formerly a Member of this House and now State senator from Cumberland County, who has the indorsement of the party leader, Hon. Frank Hague, as candidate for Governor; Hon. Frank H. Eggers, mayor of Jersey City; and myself. Hon. MARY T. NORTON, also scheduled to speak, was, unfortunately, unable to be present.

After the diners had listened with marked attention and obvious approval to the radioed addresses of the President and Vice President, the Attorney General was presented to the large audience. His speech delighted his hearers, even as his personality captivated them. Speaking with an air of deep personal conviction, he left with them a most favorable impression which will long endure.

His speech was as follows:

I am happy to be in the great industrial city of Newark tonight to greet old New Jersey friends and to meet new ones. It is a delight to join this enthusiastic and inspiring gathering of Democrats honoring the memories of Thomas Jefferson, a founder of the Democratic Party, and Andrew Jackson, a sturdy champion of the plain people.

But Democrats don't have to hark back to the triumphs of 170 years ago of those two

famous men to find a reason for a celebration. All we have to do is recall the November 2 triumph of Harry Truman and ALBEN BARKLEY.

However, our Republican friends don't seem to realize as yet what actually did happen in November—they still seem to be in a political daze—still furiously and futilely fighting the Presidential battle of '48, wielding verbal punches in all directions.

The period of 1948 and 1949 will probably be recorded by history writers as the Republican alibi era. We have heard more alibis for the defeat of their Presidential candidate than we ever thought the human mind could conceive. The one reason they have failed to recognize was the fact that the people of the United States saw and heard Harry Truman and believed him. They knew that here was a man who would never let them down—that he was sincere, genuine, and capable. They also saw and heard ALBEN BARKLEY and knew he, too, possessed these great qualities.

What was planned recently by the Republican leadership at Omaha, Nebr., as a resurrection of the rejected national party wound up in a battle royal. The Old Guard and the young liberals proceeded to stage a battle of words that amused the Nation. When the oratory subsided the bosses emerged from the scene of strife and turmoil with a blazing sensational announcement of the issuance of a new edict.

Behold, the edict blared forth: "The ancient GOP—Grand Old Party—shall henceforth be hailed as Great on Progress."

No, the Republicans didn't have to go out to Nebraska to give birth to this brilliant and enthralling idea—millions of voters could have furnished them a more descriptive and more appropriate epitaph, at a lesser cost. Yes, even I can suggest a few for the GOP. What's wrong with—Great on promises—Great on privilege—Great on profits—Great on panic—Great on power—Great on poverty—yes, Great obstruction party.

Our political foes have well earned the right to these slogans through their record down the years.

Let us now for a moment leave our opponents floundering in their political sea of uncertainty—it is the only party which I know that claims to be able to go forward going backwards.

However, we are not here only to rejoice over our recent victory or to elate over the difficulties in which our opposition finds itself.

We assemble to pay tribute to the creators of our Nation's traditions, and also to take stock to ascertain whether we are meeting our responsibilities as citizens to uphold these sacred traditions and to rededicate ourselves to the cause of democracy.

The traditions of a country are the symbols of its character. They are the milestones which mark the growth and development and the shaping of our destiny.

In that sense a nation's traditions are similar to those which go into the shaping of our characters as individuals.

As individuals we are what we are today because of the numerous influences which affect the course of our earlier lives. We are the product of our inheritance, of our paternal training, of our various religions, of our learning, of our associations, and of the strong currents of our time.

In like fashion, our country is what it is today as a result of similar influences—of its inheritance, of the wisdom of its founders, and of the lasting contribution of a continuing line of great statesmen who, by their deeds and words, have shared in the molding of its character.

To a large extent the character of our country today is merely a reflection of the characters of such immortals as Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Marshall, Jackson, Lincoln, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and others.

The best traits of their collective characters, the toughest iron of their will, the vision and wisdom of their assembled statesmanship—all of these have gone into the mold of our Nation's character.

These are our traditions. These are the things which make us understandable to ourselves, if not always understandable to others. These are the things that bind us together as a people and as a country.

Jefferson believed in a democracy with liberty and opportunity for all. He held the faith that the democratic process would release the energies of every human being to live more abundantly.

Author of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia statute of religious freedom, father of the University of Virginia, and fighter for freedom of education, he, in a vast measure, was also responsible for the fact that our country's spiritual, educational, and material growth has been unhampered by limited area. His vision in the historic Louisiana Purchase more than doubled the domain of our young Republic, and helped to make the greatness of America as a world power.

Jackson carried on the principles of Jefferson, and battled the vested interests in behalf of the people.

Jefferson was a man of peace. He expanded our boundaries, not by force of arms but by legal acquisition. Jackson, although a soldier, made his greatest contribution to the cause of a peaceful democracy by driving special privilege from our temples of finance.

Yes, while other nations may revere great conquerors, we have as our national heroes men of peace. We remember and revere them, not for the ravage they wrought to the world about them, but for their contributions to their fellow men.

All of our history, all of our tradition, and all of our national character show us to be a peaceful nation—a peaceful people. We impose no intentional injustice on others, nor will we submit to injustice being imposed on us. We honor above all else the dignity of man and the rights of the individual.

Foreign statesmen, however, who fail to interpret us in the manner in which we understand ourselves do a dangerous disservice to their own people and to the contentment of the world. The iron in the characters of Jefferson and Jackson, to whom we pay special tribute tonight, has long since been transplanted into the heart and sinews of our Nation. It is at once a part of our tradition and a part of our present national character.

These inheritances, well understood by us, should not be misunderstood abroad. They were passed down to us by men whose lives were dedicated to the principle that our people should govern rather than be governed. They are among our national heritage.

These things to us are easily understood. We understand that such a heritage entails vast and violent disagreement among ourselves. We understand that those disagreements, honed on the flint of public opinion, are the conditions which keep our democracy virile and vigorous.

We understand that the right of disagreement, the right of freedom of thought and speech, the right of individual dignity—those rights, jealously protected at all times, are the basic conditions to a strong and fervent democratic government.

We also understand something else. In spite of these political differences, when we are in the face of an internal or external threat we spring together as the one powerful nation which we are, and all of the tradition of our heritage keeps us firm and calm and determined until the hour of final victory.

Foreigners who misunderstand those characteristics, and mistake our individual freedom for national disunity, are committing a tragedy of immeasurable proportion.

And those proponents of totalitarianism, or of other vicious ideologies, must be made to realize in no uncertain terms that the paths of freedom in America will never be closed.

We want nothing of any people except their good will. But we shrink from no duty in the protection of our liberties.

So tonight we ask ourselves, has the Democratic Party of this generation helped to keep secure the heritage handed down to us? "Let us look at the record"—at least part of it, for time will not permit to enumerate all the virtues.

First, a quick answer is that the people think we, as Democrats, have done a good job because five consecutive times they have elected Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman to the Presidency. It is rather noteworthy and gratifying that, as the years marched on, whenever the Nation faced a crisis the people chose Democrats, or believers in and advocates of democracy, to steer the ship of state out of the turbulent waters to tranquil shores.

Today our people revere the names of Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Truman.

I know I don't have to tell a New Jersey audience about Wilson's greatness. But it is most appropriate to emphasize some of his deeds because it is so timely.

When Woodrow Wilson, with his "new freedom" program, came onto the political scene in Washington, the Nation was in the grip of privileged groups. Even the Government itself was a facile instrument in the hands of private interests.

Wilson had an entirely different concept. He believed that government exists for the benefit of the people.

Under his leadership came a flood of progressive legislation more sweeping in its objectives than the Republic had witnessed since the days of Andrew Jackson.

The legislation included the Underwood Tariff, the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Clayton Anti-trust Act, and the Federal Farm Loan Act—all designed to preserve the economic, as well as the political freedom of the individual.

Woodrow Wilson also strove to make the world safe for democracy—to bring peace and safety to all nations and to make the world itself at last free.

What this great man started we are trying to complete and make enduring.

If I were asked to outline the difference between the two major parties, my reply would be that Democrats eagerly boast about their record, and want the people to remember it, while the Republicans work furiously trying to erase their record and to have the people forget it.

It is our duty not to let the people forget the Republican faults and errors. Every man and woman in our land should know that at this very hour some in the opposition party in and out of Congress are busy trying to frighten the Nation with reckless talk that a depression has hit us—merely because the price of meat and the price of eggs have dropped so that more housewives can provide better and more nourishment for their families. Too long have the prices been too high.

Now, however, when some prices begin to come down there are prophets of gloom who immediately begin predicting that we are heading into a depression. These dismal predictions frighten the timid employers and they begin laying off workmen, which further contributes to the seasonal unemployment situation. This in turn further feeds the grist of the prophets of gloom.

Those apostles who would have you believe that the profits of the large corporations have dwindled so extensively that they

are compelled to resort to mass lay-offs of employees should be exhibited in their true greedy colors.

Those preachers of pessimism who would create fear among the workers of the Nation by predicting mass unemployment are doing harm to the country. I think there is nothing from which Communists at home and abroad derive more joy, more solace, more hope, than from the fearmongers in our midst.

Panic-provoking statements about our national economy are more malicious because they are utterly without basis in fact. The proof of the dishonesty of this economic scare campaign is the statistics available to anyone. A simple inquiry at official sources would have revealed the fact that there were over 300,000 more persons employed in January of this year 1949 than in the same month of 1948. A further question would have disclosed that there were over 100,000 more persons employed in January 1949 than in any other January in the Nation's history.

Some corporations have been shedding Hollywood tears, in the name of private enterprise, claiming that they suffer because of interference by your Federal Government. Statistics upon which business and Government reports rely show that of 14 major corporations, representative of a cross section of our economy, earnings for the year 1948 were 30 percent greater than the previous year, aggregating approximately $1,348,000,000. They surely should dry those tears.

In 1948 the corporate profits in this country, after taxes, were more than $20,000,000,000—the highest of all time.

In 1948 the total personal income passed $213,000,000,000—the highest of all time.

In 1948 the total farm income passed $2,500,000,000—the highest of all time.

In 1948 the total national income reached $224,000,000,000—the highest of all time.

In 1948 there were around 60,000,000 civilians employed in industry and agriculture—the highest of all time.

Now it is obvious from those facts that we have obtained a degree of prosperity heretofore unknown in the world. It is only natural that some adjustments must take place. But it is very difficult to picture the conditions of a depression out of such statistical material as this.

There are other reasons, such as Federal deposit insurance and unemployment compensation, which make a depression most unlikely. But the strongest asset we have is a sound and prosperous country itself. Yes, we will run into times when profits will get too high, and when inventories will get too large, and from those conditions some readjustments must inevitably follow. But by and large the basic wealth of our Nation remains as a source of enduring confidence.

The singers of economic blues and the forecasters of dire things are surely short-sighted if they think the people have already forgotten the pollsters' crash of 1948.

Now that was a depression—the biggest depression in the history of forecasting.

Since Truman knocked the L out of "polls" you know how it spells backwards?—"Slop"!

What do we get from this talk of mass unemployment—mass unemployment that does not exist?

What do we get from talk of a business recession that does not exist?

What is the talk of tumbling prices?

I will tell you.

It's the old bugaboo of the psychology of fear.

They cry unemployment to depress the pay of the wage-earners.

High-bracket taxpayers cry for big reductions at the expense of the small taxpayers.

No, our Nation was not built on the doctrine of fear and more fear.

We must not and will not be deterred by cries of discouragement and by shouts of despair. The Philadelphia platform has not been filed away in the cabinet of forgotten political pledges. The platform lives today—now—in the White House and the Capitol of the United States.

There, some of the most distinguished leaders ever to grace our legislative halls are shaping into a living monument the progressive program that was adopted in the City of Brotherly Love.

Our country today is blessed with the boundless energies, the skill and talent, the wisdom of such men as Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky; Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois; Senator FRANCIS MYERS, of Pennsylvania; and Representatives SAM RAYBURN, of Texas; and JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

This team, together with Democratic and other progressive legislators, is forging a new and just labor bill, legislation for veterans' care, for educational aid, adequate housing measures, improved medical welfare, and other legislation for the betterment of our people.

We must never forget that our freedom was not a gift. It was earned—and must be earned by each generation again and again.

Harry Truman is showing the way, with his usual vision, courage, determination, and good will toward all men.

In a world where freedom is in peril let us thank God for America and its leadership.

The League of Nations and the One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents who is a student of political history contrasts the political conditions of 1920, when the League of Nations legislation was defeated, with the conditions in our day when so many of our people want to force us into a "one world."

Mr. Howell is a patriotic American who does not want us to lose our heritage of liberty and freedom under which we have grown to be the mightiest Nation in the world. His newspaper article is inserted as a part of my remarks, and follows:

In his broadcast Friday, February 18, Mr. Kaltenborn stated that a conference had been held between Secretary of State Acheson and leaders of the Senate at which they had agreed on the wording of that part of proposed mutual aid treaty with foreign nations referring to our obligations to go to war to protect any contracting nation when unjustly attacked. That the State Department would immediately submit the draft to the other nations for their approval.

State newspapers, the next day, carried an AP dispatch which said that the huddle between Secretary Acheson and the Senators failed to produce agreement on the wording of the proposed North Atantic defense pact.

It is unfortunate that such broadly accepted and highly authenticated sources of information should make such contradictory statements on a subject of such vital interest to all the citizens of the United States. Such errors detract from the confidence we all feel for such trustworthy sources of information.

I think Mr. Kaltenborn slipped when he compared the action of these Senators in accepting Secretary Acheson's version of the treaty (which they did not do) to the refusal of the Senate to agree with President Wilson on the provisions of the charter of the League of Nations (1919–20). Article X of that charter obligated the United States to go to war on order of the League without a declaration of war by the Congress.

The Senate demanded modification of article X and certain reservations. President Wilson stubbornly refused to consider reservations. The Senate did not ratify the treaty and we stayed out of the League of Nations.

The issue went to the people in the Presidential election in 1920. The Republicans, opposing article X, nominated Warren G. Harding. The Democrats, favoring the charter, nominated James M. Cox, perhaps an abler man than Harding. Harding was elected.

Now, this vital issue has been dragged out again by this Democratic administration. If we are to live under the Constitution of the United States; if our Government is to function and our foreign relations conducted under that Constitution, there can be no argument as to who has the authority to go to war with a foreign nation.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution says, "The Congress shall have power to declare war." Further on in the same section it says "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." This last clause prohibits the President or any agency of Government from carrying into execution any powers to wage war except in obedience to the laws of Congress.

The State Department is in a terrible fix, trying to say one thing and mean another. President Truman is a past master at this trick, but this one stumps him. Even if the Senate consented to delegate its war-making powers to the State Department, how about the House of Representatives, elected by the people? A declaration of war must be passed by both Houses of the Congress.

They may be able to fool the other nations of the proposed pact, but they cannot fool the American people. Article X did not get by in 1920. It shall not in 1949.

A. V. HOWELL.

Thirty-first Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered on February 20, 1949, at Lawrence, Mass., on the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of Lithuanian independence:

Friends of Lithuania, even though my ancestors did not come from the same homeland as yours, I am happy to join with you on this thirty-first anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

My people came from Ireland, which is also a small nation. They endured long persecution before they won their independence. That is why we have so much in common.

When we look around at our neighbors in Lawrence, we realize that they are descendants of people who left every country in the world to find freedom and opportunity in America. We are united by our twin faith—in democracy and in God.

This being so, our sympathies are on the side of those who are fighting for liberty, wherever they may be.

February 16 marks the thirty-first birthday of Lithuanian independence. We meet on this Sunday to pay tribute to that occasion.

In your homeland, by the Baltic, your kinsfolk cannot celebrate it openly. They would bring down the wrath of their oppressors if they did. For the Communists both fear and hate God and freedom.

But all the power of their armies and their dreaded secret police cannot crush the souls and the minds of men. Today, in Lithuania, there are no parades and festivals to honor the great event which took place at Vilnius on February 16, 1918. All seems quiet. The Communists think that they have conquered Lithuania completely.

In that they are mistaken. Every Lithuanian is thinking of his birthright and of the future day when it will be redeemed. The Communists, believing in force alone, are ignorant of the greater strength which glows in the hearts of men. They forget that the Lithuanians are a proud, brave people. The more they are persecuted the more they will resist, strengthening their spirit for the day when they will break the oppressor's chains.

The Communists close their eyes to the lessons of history, and this will be the cause of their inevitable collapse.

They would destroy a people's belief in God, without which men would be like animals in the jungle. They destroy prayer books, close churches, imprison or murder those who have dedicated their lives to religious instruction. But they cannot kill the soul of man. For it is eternal.

And the laws of God by which it lives during this journey of life strengthen men in their determination to build a free society on this earth. It can suffer. It can wait. Its triumph is inevitable.

For this is not the first time that Lithuania has been crushed only to rise again.

The czars were the first to conquer her in 1795. For over 200 years the Lithuanians suffered under the iron heel of foreign tyrants, but they did not forget. From generation to generation, parents whispered to their children of the days when Lithuania was free, and they nurtured in their children that hunger for liberty which would some day find fulfillment.

On February 16, 1918, that day came. The czars were overthrown and Lithuania was a nation again. Soviet Russia gave full recognition to the reborn state and renounced for all time all rights to the territory of Lithuania. The United States and other nations recognized the sovereign independence of Lithuania.

We meant it. The Communists did not. And that is the lesson for us to learn this day. In their short history, the Communists have broken so many treaties and have betrayed so many solemn promises that we are forced to the conclusion that they can never be trusted.

A Communist is a creature who looks like a man and who thinks that he is very clever because he cheats you. By trickery, lies, and brute force he takes your property, your freedoms, and sometimes the lives of those who are dear to you. He thinks that you are no match for him, and that you will permit him to do as he pleases with you.

He does not realize that he is fast losing your confidence and that of the whole civilized world.

He does not seem to understand that we are slowly but surely uniting against him and those who traffic with him.

He has drawn down an iron curtain against us, which may turn out to be imprisonment for him. And when he has exhausted his bag of tricks and has failed to conquer the world he may wish to call off the one-sided game he has been playing and act like a human being again.

Then will come the time when he will know how much he has lost. Like the man from Missouri we will say: "Show me."

The road back for the Communists will be hard. They will have to make amends for every atrocity they have committed, but I am afraid that it will be impossible.

The peoples of this world are slow to righteous anger. Once aroused, they will strike this evil from the face of the earth.

Look at Communist Russia today. With its satellites and its victims, it covers a large part of the earth's surface like a huge red stain. To some this may be frightening, but I say that the more it seems to spread the weaker it becomes. Its armies get farther from Moscow and its close controls. Its soldiers see for the first time how much better other people live. These Red soldiers cannot fail to compare their own wretched standard of living with the material comfort enjoyed by freemen. They visit homes where there is no fear of secret police. They learn of countries where there is no slave labor and no concentration camps.

No wonder, then, that tens of thousands of Russian soldiers have deserted. They have seen the truth against which the barrage of Communist propaganda fights in vain and bounces off like an echo in the wind.

Once upon a time Napoleon invaded Russia and found that it was too big for him to conquer. He was lucky to get out alive. Now the shoe is on the other foot. Russia tries to invade the world and finds that she has bitten off more than she can chew. But I venture to predict that the Communists will suffer a worse fate than Napoleon. Eventually, they will try to retreat only to find revolt behind their own lines.

And the Lithuanians will be one of the first to rise against them.

Let us look at the record.

From the very beginning, the United States refused to recognize Russia's conquest of Lithuania.

For 2 years after the war we negotiated patiently in the hope that we could draw up treaties which would bring peace to the world. Russia balked us at every turn. She did not want peace. Her policy was to spread hate and fear, to prevent recovery, and to so disorganize the world that chaos would breed communism.

The Communists blockaded Berlin, thinking that would force us out of Europe and leave it at her mercy. We refused to be shouldered out by this maneuver. At great cost and with superhuman effort we started to supply the men, women, and children of Berlin with food and necessary supplies.

The Communists laughed. They thought we could never do it. Through fair weather and foul, however, our men and our planes built up the Berlin airlift. Through summer, fall, and winter we stuck to the task until today we are delivering 6,000 tons daily, proving that we are in Berlin to stay until the Russians get out.

Communist propaganda is there suffering one of its worst defeats. We are proving that democracy can deliver the goods. And by this fact, we are building up the morale of those who were fearful and disheartened.

The United States is giving hope and help.

A year and a half ago, in one of the most generous and realistic foreign policies ever conceived by any nation, we started the so-called Marshall plan.

We began to pump the life blood of economic aid into a Europe which had been exhausted by the ravages of a long and most destructive war.

That plan is bearing fruit, and the Communists know it. Day by day Europe is getting stronger and, as it does, its spirits rise. The despair upon which communism thrives is lifting. The help which encourages self-help is bringing Europe up from the floor. Men are beginning to talk as men again and not as silent hostages waiting to be taken to the slave market.

In spite of bold talk, Moscow is not so sure of itself.

And in spite of the iron curtain, you may be sure that the people of Lithuania are getting the good news that the world at last is standing up to the Communist evil and is building that material and spiritual unity against which the devil's advocates cannot prevail.

The underground is smuggling in the news of the western nations who no longer are afraid to do or say anything that might offend Russia. They will tell of Norway, for example, a northern neighbor of Russia. The Reds tried to scare these brave people and to prevent them from making any plans for their own defense. Last week the Foreign Minister of Norway came to the United States and he made no secret of his trip. He came to consult with our highest officials over the broad terms of the North Atlantic security pact. Such an agreement would take the form of a collective defense arrangement within the framework of the United Nations Charter. It would include the United States, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Norway, and any other freedom-loving nation which might wish to join in a working arrangement to protect any member from attack. Attack by whom? Only Russia.

And Russia, for a change, is beginning to wonder if she has gone too far. For the world is beginning to organize against her.

The torture of Cardinal Mindszenty and other clergymen has angered the world and is bringing all decent people together in opposition to the Red terror.

Once the pressure was all from Russia. By her excesses, she is inviting retaliation.

From every home in Lithuania the prayers, which even the Russian secret police cannot stop, rise up in a great spiritual chorus asking God to cleanse the hearts of all Communists before it is too late for their own salvation.

We in the United States know that the Lithuanians are a peaceful, hard-working, and happy people who are a credit to this Nation and to the world.

The trials of the Lithuanian Republic touch a responsive chord in our hearts. It reminds us of the struggles of the American Colonists to win their freedom 174 years ago. And as the independence day of your homeland takes place between the birthdays of the two greatest Americans—Lincoln and Washington—it brings close to us the high responsibility we share to work for freedom everywhere.

In the forests near Vilnius, the guerrillas fight on. They know that they are not alone. Word comes to them that the free nations are getting stronger, and that the subject nations under communism are becoming restless.

The Reds will not last as long as the czars. They think that the number "16" means that Lithuania is the sixteenth Soviet state. But the number "16" means something entirely different in the minds and hearts of your people. It stands for that 16th of February 1918 when Lithuania proclaimed her independence. It is the rallying cry of the resistance. It is the day which will be celebrated openly, in the not-too-distant future, when the Reds are gone.

And so we salute the Republic of Lithuania and her brave people.

Each day brings us closer to the rebirth of her freedom in which all Americans will rejoice.

Communists Push Idea of National Churches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

John MacCormac, which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 27, entitled "Communists Push Idea of National Churches":

COMMUNISTS PUSH IDEA OF NATIONAL CHURCHES—THEY ARE SEEKING TO CONTROL RELIGION AND WIN CATHOLICS FROM VATICAN

(By John MacCormac)

VIENNA, February 26.—Although the direction of the Communist attack on the Christian religion in iron-curtain countries shifted last week to Protestantism in Bulgaria, there has been no relaxation of the steady pressure on Roman Catholicism that began long before Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested and tried in Hungary.

The three Soviet satellite countries where Roman Catholicism predominates are Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. Of 37,000,000 Catholics in the three countries, Poland has almost 22,000,000 and is in this and other respects the most important.

But Hungary, rather than Poland, was chosen by the Communists as the initial object of persecution. Churchmen here believe this was because in Hungary the leader of Catholicism was strong but the Hungarians are passive and Hungary is weak.

SITUATION IN POLAND

Had August Cardinal Hlond, of Poland, lived, the sequence of events might have been different, since he was as determined an enemy of communism as Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary. But Cardinal Hlond died in Lourdes last October, and the present leader of the Polish Church, Archbishop Sapieha, of Cracow, has exhibited the same tolerance of communism that Archbishop Czapik, of Eger, is said to represent in Hungary.

Agitation for the nationalization of the Polish schools and alienation of the church lands has begun, and it is believed to be only a matter of time until Catholicism in Poland will suffer the same sort of attack as the church did in Hungary.

Catholic churchmen who are accustomed to taking a long view are themselves convinced that the differences in the Cominform's treatment of the church in the various satellite states are only questions of timing and that the strategy is the same for all. The strategy is to destroy the universality of Catholicism by breaking it up into national churches and eventually to absorb these into the Russian Orthodox Church.

CZECH CONFERENCES

There are indications that the Czechoslovak Catholics will be the next objects of the attack.

Two months ago the Czech Catholic hierarchy warned the faithful in a pastoral letter against the danger threatening them. The letter declared that even John Huss never intended to form a national church in Bohemia, recalled that an attempt had been made to form a Czech national church after World War I, and warned: "Your loyalty to the church may be subjected to a new test. Your way of life and your eternal will depend on whether you withstand it."

Czechoslovak newspapers were not allowed to publish the pastoral letter, but were instructed to polemicize against it without quoting it. There was a rapid succession of resolutions by the executive committee of the Brno freedom fighters, the central council of Moravian trade unions, a representative of the League of Catholic Women and Girls, the Czechoslovak Women's Council, and a representative of the Catholic high-school students condemning the Catholic hierarchy.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH BISHOPS

Since then Communist Cabinet Ministers at Prague have declared publicly they were ready to negotiate with the Czechoslovak bishops regarding the relations of state and church, but not with the Vatican. The ministers have coincidentally promised to help progressive Catholics and their clergy to free themselves from the pressure of clerical reaction.

In Slovakia, where Catholicism is strongest and most influential, a number of its publications have been restricted this year. Three Communists named by the Ministry of the Interior have been put on the staff of one Catholic journal and the ministry has ordered the closing of the Catholic Central Office in Bratislava.

The last measure is believed to be a first step toward realization of the resolution by last year's conference of leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow requesting dissolution of all Roman Catholic Church central offices in the peoples' democracies.

The latest development in communism's war on organized Christianity in Hungary has been an attempt to use Cardinal Mindszenty in jail to bring about that agreement between church and state that he had refused to endorse as a freeman.

LETTER PUBLISHED

What was purported to be a letter from him to Archbishop Czapik, of Eger, was published by the Hungarian official news service. The letter asked that, in the interest of such an agreement, the cardinal be permitted to receive a visit from the present acting head of the Episcopate, Archbishop Grosz, of Kalocsa. A remarkable thing about the cardinal's letter was that it was addressed to the Cardinal of Eger whereas Cardinal Mindszenty must normally realize there is still only one cardinal in Hungary—himself.

Cardinal Mindszenty had late last month, before his trial, received a visit in prison from Archbishop Czapik. According to reliable reports, Monsignor Czapik then concluded that the cardinal was under the influence of drugs.

As a result the episcopate in Hungary has declined to act on Cardinal Mindszenty's alleged proposal that an understanding be reached with the Government. It has declared this to be a matter beyond its competence. There seems little doubt that it has received instructions from the Vatican to hold fast.

Address of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the fighting speech delivered on the occasion of the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner on Thursday, February 24, 1949, by my fellow Missourian, the great leader of the Democratic Party and of the people of the United States, President Harry S. Truman:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, this is a happy occasion for the Democratic Party. I know that all the gatherings of our party, throughout the country, are as cheerful as this one, and I give all of them greetings.

I am happy to be up here talking to you once more from the same old stand.

Incidentally, this is right where I expected to be.

What I feel tonight is not personal pride or elation; it is a deep satisfaction that our party has served its country so well that the people have endorsed it for the fifth consecutive time.

I am aware that this was something of a surprise in certain quarters. I am told that some persons were even making elaborate plans, with considerable relish, to bury the Democratic Party and all that it stands for.

These persons were like certain friends of Andrew Jackson, whose memory we are honoring tonight.

Once upon a time there were a number of citizens who thought that Andrew Jackson ought to have a suitable coffin. At great expense, they went to Syria and purchased a marble sarcophagus. A sarcophagus, as you know, is a tomb, a big marble coffin with a marble lid. These citizens then shipped this marble box to Washington, which was quite a job as it weighed 4 or 5 tons.

At last, they thought, a suitable resting place had been provided for Andrew Jackson.

The only trouble with the project was that Andrew Jackson was not dead. Moreover, he wasn't ready to die. He did not intend to be hurried to the grave.

Courteously but firmly he wrote to these well-meaning citizens, and said, "I must decline the intended honor."

And they never did get Old Hickory into that thing. You can still see it, if you're interested, out in front of the Smithsonian Institution.

I think that this little story has a moral in it. It is this: Before you offer to bury a good Democrat, you better be sure he is dead.

There is another lesson we can derive from the more recent past: You cannot bury the Democratic Party as long as it is working for the welfare and the advancement of the people of this Nation.

The central issue of the campaign last fall was the welfare of all the people against special privilege for the few.

When we made it clear where the Democratic Party stood on that issue, the people made it clear that they stood with us.

The Democratic Party has had a long and glorious history. Through its founders and leaders, whom we honor tonight, its roots go back to the American Revolution. But however ancient and glorious it may be, our party is not and never has been an end in itself. The only justification for the Democratic Party is its usefulness to the American people in achieving the government they desire.

I am proud to say that never before has the Democratic Party been more firmly dedicated to a program in the interest of all the people. The platform adopted at the Democratic Convention of 1948 is clear and forthright.

Our job now is to enact into law the programs that the people need and deserve.

That is exactly what we are doing.

We are meeting determined opposition.

The special interests are fighting us just as if they had never heard of November 2. For them, campaigns and elections are just preliminary exhibition matches—the fight in Congress is the main bout.

The special interests are on the job year in and year out—7 days a week and 24 hours a day. They work through their lobbies and pressure groups, through the editorial pages and the columnists and commentators they control. They twist and misrepresent the measures the people voted for. They are again trying to frighten the people with the old, worn-out bugaboo that socialism is taking over in Washington.

This one-sided barrage of propaganda seems overwhelming at first. There are no full-page ads on our side. In fact, all we have on our side is the people.

But that is enough, because the people are aroused.

I did a lot of traveling around the country last fall, and I found that the people were vitally interested in what their Government

was doing. Make no mistake about it, there has never been a time when the people were so well informed about Congress, and the President, and the records of their Representatives and Senators as they are now.

This concern on the part of the people is a fine thing for the growth of democracy and responsible government. I propose to do all I can to help it along. In fact, I may even get on the train again and make another tour around the country to tell the people how their Government is getting on.

If we keep the people fully informed, I am confident that they will support the Congress and the President in our fight against the special interests.

It is important that the American people should be aware of the tactics that the special interests are using to obstruct our programs.

Right now the special interests are using every trick they can think of to defeat our labor policy.

After the election, hardly anybody had a good word to say about the Taft-Hartley Act.

But now, when I ask the Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, exactly as I said I would in the campaign, there are great outcries from the special interests. "He can't mean it," they say, "Repeal the Taft-Hartley Act? Repeal that beneficent, charitable, kindly old statute—the charter of labor and the workingman's friend! Why, it's unthinkable!"

And they keep this up night and day in an effort to convince the people that the Taft-Hartley Act is a good law. But it's no use.

All the oratory in the world won't change a bad law into a good law.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was before the Congress, a Republican Senator called it, "a device for making unions so weak they cannot carry on effective collective bargaining."

That was true then, and it is true now.

The Taft-Hartley Act is an insult to the working men and women of this country and they will not rest until it is destroyed.

After the election, I thought we would have the cooperation of our Republican friends in this effort. I felt sure that the Republican Party would be anxious to throw the Taft-Hartley Act overboard faster than the sailors got rid of Jonah. I am beginning to think that maybe I was wrong about that.

No matter what the Republicans do, the course our party should follow is clear.

The Democratic Party, in its platform, is solemnly committed to work for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We are working for its repeal; and with the support of fair-minded Americans, regardless of party, we will continue to work for its repeal until it is replaced upon our statute books with a labor law that is fair and decent.

The same die-hard reactionaries who want to cripple labor unions have also started a campaign of confusion against all our other measures for the welfare of the people.

They say they are for extending and improving social security—but they call our proposals a bureaucratic system that will destroy the character of every American.

They claim to be in favor of housing—but they say our low-rent housing program is a mistake because it does too much for low-income families.

They make speeches about the American home—but they encourage landlords to lock out their tenants until rent control is repealed.

They say they are in favor of good wages—but they argue that the minimum wage should be held down to a starvation level.

They claim to be in favor of developing our great river basins—but they raise the old cry of superstate against every practical step we propose.

We will not be deceived by their propaganda. Despite their efforts to confuse, we will enact the programs to which we are committed.

We can and we will provide a better life for our people.

At the heart of our program lies our determination to preserve the health of our economy. We know that the welfare of the whole Nation depends upon keeping our economy well balanced—seeing to it that each group gets its fair share of the goods we produce.

The special interests have attacked every governmental measure we have devised to keep our economy on an even keel.

As an example, last year some selfish groups tried to destroy our farm-price-support program.

It is a good thing for the country that they failed.

These farm-price supports are actually supports for our entire economy. In the twenties, the collapse of farm prices brought on a depression in agriculture which ultimately spread to the whole economy and dragged the country down to breadlines and bank failures.

But this time the farmer and the economy are protected from such a collapse by the farm-price-support program. I ask you to remember these facts when the special interests begin to raise their usual hue and cry about the cost of price supports.

In further support of Nation-wide prosperity, I have submitted to the Congress proposals for maintaining full production and full employment.

The proposals I made are designed to aid business in increasing production and eliminating bottlenecks; they are designed to keep price movements balanced, and to prevent shortages from driving certain industrial prices higher while farm prices are leveling off.

These proposals are being attacked by those special interests who are making excessive profits out of present shortages. And the usual outcries about regimentation are now filling the air.

It is easy to be misled by a small group of special interests engaged in a campaign of misrepresentation. We must not let the selfish demands of special groups blind us to the common good.

The success of every business enterprise depends upon the prosperity of the whole country. Your Government is pledged to use all its resources to maintain the economic health of the country and to prevent depression. To do this means that Government must act—wisely and judiciously—but it must act.

A government able and willing to act in the interest of the whole economy is a better friend of free, competitive enterprise than a do-nothing government ready to let the economy slide into a depression.

The great problem of the free western democracies is the problem of boom and bust. The future of the world depends upon our ability to master that problem. During the last 16 years this country has made great progress toward finding the solution. This progress has been made over the protests of selfish and short-sighted people. We have not let them stop us in the past.

We will not let them stop us now.

In his first inaugural address, 148 years ago, Thomas Jefferson said that this country was in "the full tide of a successful experiment." He called our Government "the world's best hope." Today we are again in the full tide of a successful experiment—the experiment of achieving economic abundance and basic human rights in a society of free institutions and freemen. Today this experiment is again the world's best hope. Today it is the hope of a world confronted by greater dangers and greater possibilities for good than were dreamed of a century and a half ago.

Great as our responsibilities are, we have nothing to fear if we rely upon the energy, the resourcefulness, and the common sense of the American people. So long as the people understand the issues of the day, the special interests cannot prevail against the general welfare.

With the understanding and energy of this mighty people, our Nation can move confidently toward the goals of prosperity and peace.

The Tale of Two Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few well-meaning but ill-informed Americans who still have an utterly unrealistic conception of what communism actually is and what it portends for all of us should have their illusions pretty well shattered these days as they read newspaper accounts of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, the trials of the Protestant clergymen now being dragooned in Bulgaria, and the amazing spectacle of the trial which is running the judge up in New York City. Communists are involved in all three trials, and, while at the moment it appears the Communists are also running all three of them, there is good reason to believe that before long Judge Medina will assert himself and prevent the legal proceedings in New York City from going down in history as a farce.

In all events, the following editorial from the Daily Plainsman, published in Huron, S. Dak., and edited by Robert D. Lusk and Bruce Campbell, provides us all with food for thought. Even a hasty reading of this brief editorial dramatizes the difference between living in the slave lands of communism and in the free air of the United States.

In the darkness of the lonesome night it would seem that many an American Communist must at times awaken to realize the awful fact that if communism succeeds in its drive for power in this country it will mean an end to all judicial processes which protect the innocent and preserve the rights of disagreement and discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TALE OF TWO TRIALS

In Budapest and in New York, by coincidence, are occurring two trials involving the Communist Party.

In Budapest the Communist Party through its judicial arm—the so-called people's court of Hungary—has gone through the mockery of a trial of a cardinal of the Catholic Church, Josef Mindszenty, outspoken opponent of both nazism and communism, and spiritual leader of 7,000,000 Hungarian Catholics.

As this is being written, Mindszenty's sentence has not been pronounced, but by the time this is read it will have been. Such is the unvarying technique of Communist trial, however, that it is perfectly safe to assume that the verdict is guilty and that the pun-

ishment is death, or a life sentence worse than death.

The technical charge is of little consequence. It was that of treason, but the charges were all trumped up. The so-called confession by Mindszenty presented in the people's court obviously was wrung out of him by torture, a thing which he himself had foreseen before the start of the trial and of which he himself had given warning. Had the charge of the trial not been treason, the Communist Party would have found another, however, so it is of little matter. What is important is that Cardinal Mindszenty was keeping alive the spark of individual freedom, freedom of the soul, in Hungary against the ruthless doctrine of a totalitarian state. The Communist Party could not allow such a breach in their political state and so it proceeded to silence him.

Meanwhile in New York, the 11 key leaders of the Communist Party in America are on trial.

For the first time, the court is given the basic question to decide: Whether being a Communist in itself constitutes treason to another form of government. Does Marxism teach the overthrow of the government by force, and is such teaching and belief a danger to the United States?

The trial is proceeding according to the laws of the land. And the Communist Party and its defense attorneys are now utilizing every legal weapon in the jurisprudence of American democracy to drag out the trial. They have picketed the court and tried to charge that the American jury system is not fair. Their methods have been so patently crude and mocking that the judge has warned defense counsel of the danger of contempt of court.

Because the trial has not yet progressed far enough for evidence to be submitted and summarized, no one can safely predict what the sentence will be.

Certainly, however, one can point out that the writings and speeches and actions of Communist doctrinaires have proved again and again that they do advocate world revolution.

And the method of trial of Mindszenty in Hungary probably could be offered as evidence in the New York trial of the threat to individual freedom which communism in any country contains.

Health Insurance Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 1 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Health Insurance Costs," from the Christian Science Monitor for February 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS

It has become a habit for Federal officials promoting compulsory health insurance in the United States to minimize or ignore its costs. The original Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill played down the costs. The last of the series under this name left them out altogether. Effort has been persistently made for the past 10 years to sell the American public something calling for a huge expense without giving an accurate forecast of the ultimate cost. That may be ingenious, but it is poor public policy.

However, analysis is now and then furnished by independent sources. W. Rulon Williamson, former actuary of the Social Security Board, says there could be a high of 18 percent of pay roll, a plausible medium of 12½ percent, and a low, hardly to be expected, of 7 percent when years hence the program is fully under way. These benefits include both medical care and cash benefits for disability—the standard features of Government health insurance.

Mr. Williamson points out that a great deal depends on the liberality both of the formula and of administrators, and hence estimates must vary widely. But in his view the total cost of social security, with health insurance added to the liberalized old-age and survivors' insurance and unemployment compensation, could come between 18 percent and 36 percent of pay roll.

The greatly mounting costs of the British and New Zealand health-insurance programs indicate that the United States would be faced with the same problem. If introduced here and really made effective, health insurance for many years would probably require much more tax money than old-age or unemployment insurance. Its financing should be adequately explored.

Supreme Court and Tidelands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to bring this matter to the attention of the House when the misrepresentation was first given the public in the columns of the Washington Post but a series of incidents over which I had no control took place.

On February 15, 1949, 2 days after the article appeared I directed a letter to the editor of the Washington Post setting forth the real facts in the case. After waiting a week without seeing the correction in print I personally called the Washington Post and was informed that no communication had been received from me. I then sent a second copy. In today's issue, the letter, or rather the letter minus a most important paragraph, was printed on the editorial page.

I have no knowledge or information whether the paragraph was deliberately deleted or not but it read as follows:

The Washington Post has supported editorially the position of the Department of Justice in this controversy. When an error as flagrant and serious as this one appears in a leading article in such an influential newspaper, we in Louisiana naturally wonder just how such a thing could happen. We wonder how a paper the caliber of the Washington Post could make a serious and inexcusable error like this one, and whether the so-called free press in the Nation's Capital is becoming a political mouthpiece of the Federal Government.

The rest of the letter follows:

SUPREME COURT AND TIDELANDS

On February 15 there was an article on page 3 of the Washington Post, the first part of which reads as follows:

High Court to hear tideland argument

"The Justice Department yesterday won a preliminary round in its effort to have the Supreme Court determine Federal rights to the submerged oil lands off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas.

"Oral arguments to help decide if it has jurisdiction to entertain the Justice Department suits were ordered by the Supreme Court over objections of both States."

Farther down in the article, it is stated:

"Should the Government win, it could claim royalties from sales of oil obtained by oil companies from offshore wells."

The statements in the Washington Post constitute flagrant and outrageous misrepresentation of the status of the attempt by the Federal Government to sue Louisiana and Texas over the tideland areas. The oral arguments were not granted by the Court over the objections of both States, but at the specific request of Louisiana and Texas.

Ordinarily, oral argument is not had on motions in the Supreme Court, and the granting of oral argument in these cases at the request of Louisiana and Texas can only be construed as a pronounced set-back for the Department of Justice. It is a clear indication that the Supreme Court considers that the question as to whether or not it has jurisdiction over Louisiana and Texas in the tidelands controversy is a very serious, if not doubtful question.

In this great tidelands controversy, which has now shaken the States to their very foundations, the Federal Government is openly seeking the nationalization, without compensation, of all resources within the marginal sea areas. In this serious controversy, the States are entitled, at the very least, to fairness and accuracy in the reports of the press. Certainly, if the press is ever reduced to the low and servile state of being a political instrumentality of the Federal Government, then the rights of the States, and indeed our very dual form of government, will be close to extinction.

Most assuredly you have every right to take any side of any issue you deem proper in your editorial columns and I respect that right. With the privilege of a free press, however, goes the responsibility of news columns free from propaganda and inaccurate or sloppy reporting.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT,
Representative from Louisiana.

WASHINGTON.

National School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a table showing facts about the national school-lunch program. One of my constituents, Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, is chairman for Spokesmen for Children, Inc. This organization is very much in-

terested in the school-lunch program. It believes that due to the increased enrollment of children in our schools the Federal grant should be increased to $100,000,000. The table showing the facts follows:

Facts about the national school-lunch program, 1947–48

[All figures from the U. S. Department of Agriculture]

State	Percent children participating	Percent schools participating	State appropriation	Matching funds from sources within State [1]	Federal indemnity	Number of schools aided by sec. 32 [2]	Number of schools aided by sec. 6 [2]
Alabama	29.2	29.5	$130,000	$6,199,759	$2,185,523	1,723	1,233
Arizona	27.0	28.7	17,525	1,485,406	323,497	203	165
Arkansas	29.7	20.6	24,550	3,395,512	1,431,269	869	554
California	19.0	37.4	99,271	9,309,631	1,970,097	1,201	1,039
Colorado	18.8	13.9	14,650	1,010,220	436,517	309	313
Connecticut	17.5	29.9	12,440	1,461,830	448,492	28	98
Delaware	22.4	23.7	4,400	1,123,079	78,464	66	59
Florida	33.3	31.2	[3] 32,320	3,508,893	880,943	829	759
Georgia	32.6	27.7	48,000	6,464,864	2,179,467	2,154	1,111
Idaho	27.0	20.6	7,500	696,655	219,552	237	237
Illinois	22.5	19.1	1,347,000	12,697,703	2,122,655	1,709	1,188
Indiana	20.4	25.8	67,500	2,708,481	1,216,597	822	708
Iowa	22.8	9.3	37,000	2,329,295	855,517	665	660
Kansas	15.0	9.3	19,372	1,638,879	632,398	575	567
Kentucky	27.7	16.2	16,800	3,714,651	1,847,063	1,356	1,515
Louisiana	28.3	35.4	513,734	3,090,422	1,505,867	1,036	1,010
Maine	18.8	23.0	14,250	1,102,996	332,939	270	304
Maryland	24.8	38.9	16,980	2,708,232	617,304	699	439
Massachusetts	25.8	57.1	65,000	6,789,608	1,106,543	542	511
Michigan	19.9	14.3	----------	7,045,093	1,833,812	855	751
Minnesota	26.1	14.7	25,000	3,040,234	994,184	820	662
Mississippi	26.0	20.8	[4] 63,435	3,775,397	1,740,903	1,128	1,146
Missouri	19.8	16.0	20,000	4,123,673	1,347,876	888	755
Montana	19.3	10.1	[4] 20,000	526,082	179,347	171	161
Nebraska	16.7	5.7	19,000	980,029	454,044	316	266
Nevada	18.6	18.7	[4] 18,500	151,268	43,436	52	48
New Hampshire	25.4	17.4	8,731	435,361	190,656	44	55
New Jersey	17.6	43.9	22,300	3,254,105	1,106,752	572	553
New Mexico	16.1	21.7	18,437	552,090	278,168	308	191
New York	23.1	26.7	2,500,000	19,867,350	2,850,867	1,946	2,060
North Carolina	27.4	25.7	71,852	7,010,909	2,584,366	1,378	1,200
North Dakota	23.3	13.4	10,320	370,053	219,055	158	199
Ohio	16.5	22.5	32,500	10,419,030	2,119,875	1,391	1,140
Oklahoma	22.8	31.8	185,500	3,368,029	1,138,814	1,429	1,461
Oregon	23.0	27.2	18,045	1,960,270	348,815	518	459
Pennsylvania	12.4	17.9	[4] 90,000	5,661,264	2,230,421	649	552
Rhode Island	16.3	39.6	90,000	723,890	214,436	78	69
South Carolina	33.0	34.4	258,780	5,394,245	1,596,273	3,076	1,208
South Dakota [5]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
Tennessee	25.4	27.4	35,000	5,425,759	1,756,409	1,891	1,628
Texas	19.8	24.5	27,380	9,505,103	3,333,157	2,377	1,982
Utah	32.7	52.7	200,000	2,149,553	301,606	274	274
Vermont	25.1	28.0	16,300	529,299	139,493	335	376
Virginia	23.6	24.1	40,000	5,362,033	1,521,067	1,057	912
Washington	24.4	41.8	[6]	3,187,108	507,800	701	692
West Virginia	21.8	27.2	105,500	2,648,948	1,165,312	1,264	1,264
Wisconsin	19.8	16.5	42,000	2,557,239	1,086,286	808	721
Wyoming	23.1	23.0	11,500	353,167	100,292	98	100

[1] "Matching funds from sources within State" indicates penny milk, lunchroom sales, contributions by organizations, and State appropriations. While figures for 1946–47 are latest available, provisional reports indicate States did equally well in 1947–48.

[2] Secs. 6 and 32 of the Agricultural Act allow for distribution of fresh and dried fruits, fruit juices, canned fruits and vegetables, fish flakes, cheese, peanut butter, jam, dried eggs, nut meats.

[3] Local, $475,000.

[4] Biennial appropriation.

[5] Not in program this year.

[6] Amount unspecified.

Speak Up and Work for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a speech delivered by Mr. E. D. Anthony, Sr., of West Palm Beach, Fla., before the Rotary Club on February 15, 1949, entitled "Speak Up and Work for America." Mr. Anthony is one of the outstanding business, civic, and religious leaders in south Florida and his remarks are very opportune at this particular time in our Nation's history. I commend it to your careful reading and consideration.

SPEAK UP AND WORK FOR AMERICA

Ten miles south of West Palm Beach, on U. S. No. 1, west of F. E. C., is located J. R. Hine's hydroponic tomato industry, an investment considerably in excess of $100,000.

I asked him one day, "Why are you doing all this? You have a good business." He replied, "We have many men who have been with us 25 or more years. If we put them on pension, their expectancy is 3 to 5 years. Change their work, put them out in the Florida sun, and let them share in the profits, and you change their expectancy to 12 to 15 years."

That statement came home to me with tremendous force. Like John Alden of Longfellow's The Courtship of Miles Standish, "Why not speak for yourself, John?" After 52 years I find myself retired. Will my expectancy be 5 or 20 years? This is the most important question I face today. I have the time to travel, play golf, fish, shrivel up to die. Instead, I stand before you today, looking at this new freedom as a time for growth and study. For some months I have been turning my attention to the blessings of being an American and a Rotarian. In that spirit I speak today.

In a study of a few months I have discovered some startling facts about this blessed country we call America. My first statement is—

I believe we have no more important job facing us today than to see to it that the United States continues to do business in our own American way. The American way of life offers the opportunity for a free flowering of the spirit no other land can match.

There are millions in many parts of this free land who do not know the full meaning of America. They are reaching out for communism and socialism because they do not know any better. I find it healthy mental exercise to review our glorious industrial past.

(a) America offers greatest opportunity to acquire more of life's material riches in return for a smaller expenditure of effort than anywhere else in the world.

(b) In no country at no time in the history of the world has a standard of living been so high as we enjoy here. In no other country can an hour's labor be exchanged for so many hours of comfort and luxury as in America.

(c) We Americans total only one-sixteenth of the world's population, produce seven-sixteenths of the world's goods, own 48 percent of the world's electric power, 50 percent of the world's radios, 55 percent of its telephones, 60 percent of its steel capacity, 64 percent of its life-insurance policies, 87 percent of its automobiles, and 94 percent of its bathtubs. These are not wonders to us, who have been accustomed to them from the time we were born.

(d) In 150 years America has made more industrial progress than all the other nations have made in 6,000 years. Some others more richly endowed with natural resources, some more land and more people. We have only 6 percent of the world's area. What a job we are doing with our small area. It is our free enterprise which gives us the edge on the rest of the world.

(e) Here is an especially startling fact. Our system is the most progressive and democratic form of capitalism ever devised. It is the only system which provides all three of its component parts—the investor, the producer, and the consumer—with equal freedom of choice and opportunity. It is a 3-in-1 system.

(f) There are 9,000,000 free enterprises in America today. Each and everyone lives and has its being according to the buying whim of the customers who support them.

(g) Every time you spend a dollar you cast that purchase vote for the future of that business. That purchase helps determine which business shall be large or small. The survival of every business depends upon winning the free purchasing vote of the free American citizens.

(h) There are 57,000,000 workers who work at the pleasure of these customers. Note how our 3-in-1 system works. As workers they insist on high wages. As customers they demand low prices. As capitalists they demand a return on their money. American business is forced to operate with greater efficiency so we can produce better goods at lower cost.

A quick look at the fundamental differences between our system and communism. America was founded on faith and the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience. Faith in God. Faith in our fellow Americans. We believe that every man should have the right to extend his ability and enjoy the emoluments of his labor. Communism was born in want, reared in poverty, is without faith in God or man. Their philosophy is that there is not enough

of the good things of life and that every man should have too little. Socialism denies the dignity of the individual, and holds to the belief that the state can do what man cannot. That security by the state is a proper exchange for individual liberty. The government makes the decisions. All its capital is taxation or capital levies. The state decides wages and prices.

In England today everyone is disciplined from cradle to the grave. An unthinkable condition for free America. Freedom of choice. Freedom of belief. Freedom of movement—of occupation—all exchanged for the coin of security. The state operates the Bank of England, the mines, the railroads, the utilities. The inheritance tax consumes the life estates of all the wealthy who pass on.

Salaries have been limited by taxation to $8,000 top. A joke for our labor leaders, much less our industrial leaders and movie stars. Our system produces six times as many goods as the average workers abroad, because of our machine superiority. The record has never been equaled in the history of the world.

We produced 45 percent of the world's goods before World War II. Today, 50 percent. This makes greater buying power. The dignity of the individual is the great mainspring which makes our free enterprise work. Our machines take the burden off labor to an extent unknown anywhere else in the world. One hundred years ago the workman averaged 70 hours per week and earned a bare existence. Did most of the work with his hands. $500 of invested capital averaged the capital to provide facilities of production he used. Today 12½ times as much capital is needed for machines. He works 40 hours per week and earns 16 times as much in wages. His purchasing power has increased and passing strange his production has increased in ratio to capital investment increase. His muscular strength is no longer the standard of his production.

In 1908 the automobile industry was young. It took one man 8 hours to shape the top half of a gas tank. Today one man, plus machines, can do the same job in 1 minute. Today our autos produced by that day's hand method would cost $50,000. By our machine method, the cost is cut to 5 percent, or $2,500.

QUICK LOOK AT FARMING INDUSTRY

(a) Three million tractors, thirty-five million farm equipment. Doubled since 1940.

(b) Our farms feed 40,000,000 more than in 1920.

(c) Use the same 360,000,000 acres.

(d) One and one-half million less workers.

(e) Eighteen hundred, 3 out of every 4 worked on farms.

(f) Same ratio holds true today for the rest of the world.

(g) America today, due to machinery, employs 1 in 7, and produces more than we need, and enough to help feed the rest of the world.

(h) One farm of 11,000 acres, using $250,000 of equipment, employs only 500 men.

Annually: Gross $8,000,000; net $800,000.

Cotton, beet sugar, and vegetables. More machine power on farms of America than there is in all of our factories.

Today $6,500 in capital is required for machine investment for every worker.

This is where the capitalist comes in. Who is he? The answer is you and me. Whoever and wherever you are under our American free economy. The true capitalists are the Americans who have life-insurance policies, savings accounts, a few bonds, or shares of stocks. In America, a capitalist is the average prudent and thrifty individual who saves part of his income daily.

The Government records show that 90 percent earn $5,000 or less. More than one-half of all corporate dividends go to this 90 percent. Fifty million people in America have savings accounts. Their savings, plus their life-insurance policies, total $135,000,000,000. The checking accounts of corporations and individuals total $65,000,000,000. Grand total, two hundred billion. Only two and one-fourth million earn $5,000 annually; 138,000 each $25,000 and upward; 80 people earn $1,000,000 or more. It is easy to see our capital investments come for the big companies, like Western Union, for our average Americans.

FAIR WAGE FOR CAPITAL

These people of modest income, through frugal living, have made our system possible to a large extent. They have a just claim for return on use of their capital as labor has for his wage. What is the true story? The stockholders wage comes out of the profits of industry. This is a much misunderstood situation.

The Government figures for 1946 show a year of 6.2 profit. Machines accomplished 85 percent of the work. Only 5 percent by human energy. You pay 10 times as much for the labor part as for the machine portion of production. Almost 60 percent went into pockets of labor. Only one-half of the 6-percent profits went to dividends. Other half to replacements. Department of Commerce reports industry needed eleven billion for replacement. Only seven and one-half billion available from the 3-percent dividends—other had to be financed. The remaining portion of this speech is devoted to changing conditions and what we should strive to do about it.

1. (a) Grover Cleveland was the only Democratic interlude from Mr. Lincoln to Woodrow Wilson. The financial interest had become strongly entrenched. Cleveland's second term followed a Republican 4-year term, sandwiched in between Cleveland's two terms.

(b) The financial interests of Wall Street did everything in their power to wreck his second term. They just about did it. The panic of 1893–96 was when we had 3-cent cotton and 5-cents-per-dozen eggs.

(c) President Cleveland did not have money to meet the Federal pay rolls. He went in person to New York and negotiated a Government loan with J. P. Morgan. The Democrats charged he had sold out to Wall Street. His reply was epic, "I faced a condition that had to be met and not a theory."

(d) This was the Wall Street financiers big moment. Their attitude—"To hell with the public." William Jennings Bryan and his theory of 16 to 1 flourished as the savior of the down-trodden average man. Time marched on. The Spanish-American War and spending changed conditions.

2. Teddy Roosevelt and his "Big Stick." His Ananias Club made very little dent in the financial grip Wall Street had on the control of our way of life.

3. Woodrow Wilson, the historian and great thinker, became President in 1912. Both Houses of Congress solidly behind him.

a. Almost overnight he passed the Federal Reserve Act which technically transferred the financial center from Wall Street to Washington.

b. He followed England's example and passed the income-tax law so he would never be caught as Mr. Cleveland was with no money to meet Government pay rolls.

c. He put his benedictions on the cooperative system in 1916, which has now grown to be a cancer eating at the very vitals of our free institutions. I cannot spend much time on this menace.

(a) It can borrow our tax money at 2½ percent. Pays no taxes. Is tax exempt by Wilson's approval. Doing 15 percent of the Nation's business in open competition with honest businesses, taxed almost to extinction.

(b) At a recent merchants State meeting, a brilliant young attorney from Atlanta delivered a wonderful address exposing this evil. I have personally had this speech printed and have 300 copies here to distribute with my compliments.

(c) I want to call your attention to one outstanding fact. They are now doing all kinds of business, far afield from what they were supposed to do.

4. We can skip the period of Mr. Harding and his return to normalcy, and Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Hoover.

5. Things began to really happen in 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt took office—"Nothing to fear but fear itself."

a. Bank failures was the last great act of the financial regime.

b. Bank guarantee law added stability to our national economy and really put Government in the saddle.

c. The New Deal and Government spending with accompanying new taxes became the order of the day.

d. The next great cancer, which is eating at the moral heart, is unemployment insurance. Born with the finest purpose, but has grown by unrestricted use into a chisler's bonanza. Let me quote: "The men who originated unemployment insurance never thought that chiselers and crooks would loot the funds which belong to honest workers, and get away with it."

(a) Pennsylvania was chiseled out of over $500,000 in 1947.

(b) One shoe factory in New York paid $40,000; 200,000 job tickets to run down rascals.

(c) New York State, with its thousands of summer hotels whose employees come to Miami Beach and collect unemployment insurance.

(d) Perfect racket for girls who want to get married.

(e) Over 3,000 in Miami now trying to collect $40 to $50 per week while they vacation.

THE REMEDY

1. Have reached several definite conclusions:

(a) It is time for the business and professional men to organize and begin a concentrated fight to preserve this great Government of ours.

(b) Have reached a definite opinion that there is a great difference between politics and policy in government. That the businessmen should plan and think out the policy and let the politicians handle the details.

(c) In my long career, I attended to my business and left politics to the politicians. This study has taught me how wrong I was, because today this Government is the biggest business in the world.

(d) The State of Florida is a $200,000,000 business.

(e) Palm Beach County is a $3,500,000 business.

(f) West Palm Beach is a $1,500,000 business.

2. The United States Chamber of Commerce will send field men here to help businessmen organize. They will actually run a school.

(a) They will teach us how, through concerted and intelligent cooperation, the consent of the governed can be made into a mighty force.

(b) I plead for the awakening of the businessmen as a balance of power between labor and capital.

(c) I plead for business and professional men to study the local conditions and reach definite business conclusions as to what our county commissions and city fathers should put first on the business agenda.

(d) I plead for a clearer understanding of the relation of our politicians to the taxpayer. In America, the taxpayer is likened to the stockholder in this big business of ours. Some have defined the taxpayer as the real owners of America. Others have defined the officeholders as the hired men of the taxpayers. It is certainly true that

they hold their jobs at the pleasure of the voter. The taxpayer certainly has a perfect right to study common problems and help decide which projects should come first. As illustrated with possible change in attitude of new governor on the water-control bill.

Here are 10 socialistic planks in the 1936 campaign which have been written into our laws since 1938:

1. Minimum Wage Act, 1938.
2. Old-age pension; we have them now.
3. They asked for system of free public employment service. We have it.
4. Unemployment compensation. It is a cancer eating at the heart of America.
5. Sharp increase in inheritance and personal income taxes for those in higher brackets—70 and 80 percent.
6. They wanted aid to farmers. You know the story.
7. Five billion for housing. Pikers.
8. Wanted recognition for Soviet Russia.
9. Wanted all war debts canceled.
10. Wanted the cooperatives given a break.

In spite of the foregoing, I say there should be a cordial relation such as exists in big corporations where stockholders and directors direct the management.

The great question: Are we headed for socialism? My answer is a great big "No," for the following reasons:

1. These 9,000,000 free enterprises and 50,000,000 savings-account depositors will not stand for it.
2. Labor does not want socialism. They are homeowners, small capitalists, owners of life-insurance policies, have savings accounts, and love our way of life. In the majority they are true Americans. I do not believe labor has reached the frenzied stage that capital reached, under Mr. McKinley, when the campaign slogan was a "full dinner pail" for 70 hours' of labor per week.
3. We have too many auto owners (40,000,000), radio listeners, and too many common, everyday people who are informed and who are studying these problems as never before.
4. There are millions of people in the country anxiously awaiting the much-heralded Hoover report, which will show we have 2,030,000 people on the Government pay roll. That the Government pay roll can be cut $3,000,000,000 per annum permanently by adopting the report as submitted. Here is your opportunity to instruct your Congressman on how you want him to vote.
5. Public opinion when aroused is still the uncrowned king in America.
6. We are not a warlike people, yet we pack a mighty wallop when we make a business of war. When we are aroused in our might, politicians, bankers, and labor all look alike. This free people will not perish from this earth.

Arab Refugees in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the rehabilitation of the Arab refugees will be tangibly contributed to by the proposed appropriation by the United States of a $16,000,000 fund for that purpose to be utilized by the United Nations together with other funds similarly made available. The displacement of these unfortunate Arabs was attributable to shortsighted fanaticism by Arabs so harmful to their brother Arabs. Let us hope that now that peace is in sight an effective rehabilitation will take place under the auspices of the United Nations.

The following letter from the New York Times of February 27, 1949, by Rabbi David DeSola Pool of the Portuguese Synagogue, one of the oldest congregations in New York, carefully analyzes the situation and shows the constructive and cooperative role of the new State of Israel in it:

TO AID DISPLACED ARABS—RELIGIOUS LEADER CALLS FOR UNITED EFFORT TO REHABILITATE REFUGEES

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your issue of February 11 Kermit Roosevelt gives his own theory to explain away the flight of the Palestinian Arabs from their villages. No one can accept this theory who has seen Arab villages near Jewish settlements going on their wonted ways, or the city of Nazareth, where an Arab population double that prior to the war is living and working peacefully.

One must set Mr. Roosevelt's theory also against the ruins and the destruction of Jewish villages in the wake of the war. The Palestine Arabs fled before the invading armies of neighboring Arab states. The blame for the mass flight of the Arabs cannot be laid at the door of the Israeli Army or the Israeli Government. Mrs. McCormick makes that clear, and Mr. Roosevelt does her less than justice in taking out of their context some lines from her searching and moving articles.

It is perhaps too soon accurately to measure the degree of responsibility that we may charge against each of the many partners in the creation of a new aggregate of DP's. This is rather the time to bring all minds together to meet the problem of these unhappy people. Jews can be depended on to respond and cooperate in a constructive program of rehabilitation. Their own experience in suffering and succor alike is the best guaranty of this.

History has more time than has relief; it will apportion just blame where it belongs, on the irresponsible terrorism at Deir Yassin, on the mandatory administration which withdrew in chaotic indifference and on neighbor Arab states that gave no thought to the victims of their policies of invasion. Indeed, a number of observers have stated that Arabs sought the creation of an Arab refugee problem as a weapon of calculated strategy against Israel.

Another point in Mr. Roosevelt's letter should be noted. In passing he writes of individual Americans as being pro- or anti-Israel. This is a surprising phrase. Until recently American citizens were with complete propriety Zionist or non-Zionist, and a few were anti-Zionist. But with the establishment of the Jewish state zionism is no longer on the debating boards. Israel is a friendly nation with which our Government now has full diplomatic relations. An American citizen labeling himself anti-Israel seems to imply support of the aggressive Arab states which as their answer to the United Nations resolution brought war to the Holy Land, with the creation of the problem of Arab refugees.

Has not the time come to stop partisan debates and get to work unitedly to rehabilitate the Arab refugees in accordance with a constructive plan and to help Israel establish itself as a free nation in a peaceful world? Only thus can we give to the entire region of the Near and Middle East a lift out of the lethargy of the ages and bring it into an aware and alive partnership in extending the frontiers of democracy. Those like Kermit Roosevelt who are closely associated with Arab groups can do very much in achieving this high aim.

D. DE SOLA POOL.

NEW YORK, *February 15, 1949.*

The New American Revolution—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on February 24, 1949:

THE NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION—IV

Henry Luce has called this the American century. Henry Wallace has called it the century of the common man.

Unquestionably, this is the century in which the full force of American technology has hit the world with revolutionary impact. And it is also the century in which the worldwide revolt of the masses has challenged Americans to revolutionize their concept of their international role.

Yet the dominant political fact before humanity today is neither that America is "top dog" in an economically stricken world nor that the underdogs of society are on the march. If we lived in a wholly materialistic, dog-eat-dog world, these two facts might determine history between them. But man is more than an economic animal; he is a moral and spiritual being. Specifically, he has arrived through the centuries at the concept of freedom under law.

With the peculiarly favorable circumstances which a new, virgin continent offered to men and women seeking greater freedom for themselves there grew up in America an independent spirit, tending at its worst to lawlessness but at its best to an advanced degree of freedom under law, diversity within unity.

So the Declaration of Independence opened the way for the Constitution, and a revolution fought for freedom led in time to a civil war fought to preserve the binding principle of federal union. Liberty, Americans had discovered, required law for its preservation.

Today, as the world struggles through the throes of technological, social, and political revolution, an increasing number of people look to the federal principle as the solution for world chaos. As the most successful example of large-scale federalism on the globe today, the United States has the opportunity to furnish leadership in this direction. Paradoxically, the establishment of world law on a federal basis still seems revolutionary to most people, immured within traditional concepts of national sovereignty; yet that way lies the future.

Here, in fact, is the dominant political fact of our day, though it will not be realized tomorrow or the next day. There is a long, hard job of education to be done. Countries still in the colonial stage must pass through the phase of nationalism. The anarchic power struggle which marks the present exaggerated nationalism of the world must be mitigated by the growth of a conscious community of mutual interest. Regional federalism and perhaps a federation of like-minded democracies are likely to be required steps toward the ultimate goal of world government.

Yet the idea is at work in human consciousness. Already today Americans find their country a member of a United Nations organization which, however much it is bypassed, flouted, deadlocked, and denounced, remains an inescapable necessity for nations

which hope to live in atomic peace. American emergence from isolationism to the degree represented by United Nations membership is itself a fact of revolutionary importance.

Surely if this century is anything it is a century of exploration. America is discovering the world; the common man is discovering his opportunities; and increasing numbers are discovering that, in this world of swift change, freedom for the individual will persist only under law for the whole.

Private Utilities Oppose Public Power Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Other Side of the Kilowatt Crisis" which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 16, 1949. This article is signed by Tillman K. Garrison, assistant to the president of the Washington State Federation of Labor; Roger Williams, president of the Public Power League of Seattle; and J. C. Unger, publicity chairman of the Public Power Committee. It constitutes a reply to an address recently made by Frank McLaughlin, president of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., which has been printed by the Post-Intelligencer in digested form in a series of three articles, entitled "The Kilowatt Crisis."

OTHER SIDE OF KILOWATT CRISIS

The main theme of the articles on "The Kilowatt Crisis" was the present acute power shortage and who is responsible for this deplorable situation.

Mr. McLaughlin stated: "Prior to the advent of the Federal Government into the power field in this area, the construction of power-generating facilities was the responsibility of the private utilities and the municipal power systems."

He admits the private utilities had responsibilities in the early days. We would like to ask him why they did not continue fulfilling these obligations by doing their utmost to build generating and other power facilities to meet an ever expanding demand for more power to serve our rapidly growing region? The records show his company had not built any major generating facilities for more than 10 years, while other private power companies in this State have built only a few minor plants during this long recent period.

By what line of reasoning could Mr. McLaughlin or any other private power executive rely upon the Federal Government alone for its entire future supply of wholesale power? Nearly all Federal laws pertaining to the disposal of power from Government-built dams or other power projects provide that priority must be given publicly owned power distributing agencies as against private power companies.

In the Bonneville Power Act this priority is even more definite than in some others. Never since the first kilowatt was generated from either the Bonneville or the Grand Coulee Dam has any private company been able to contract for a long term for any power from either dam which might soon be needed by any publicly owned power distributing agency in the entire Pacific Northwest.

The law pertaining to this priority is so definite that no Bonneville administrator would ever dare ignore it. This has been the law of the land for nearly half a century for such Federal power projects. All the powerful opposition has not been able to get this priority taken out of the Bonneville Act.

Space will not permit us to cite all the many instances in which nearly all the private power utilities of the Pacific Northwest have opposed needed appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration.

For the past 2 years, during which even the Pacific Northwest private power executives have realized we are rapidly approaching a power shortage, they have merely condoned, and with their contributions assisted, this opposition, which the eastern private utility executives and their high-priced lobbyists have continuously carried on.

This State's leading prominent crusader for the Columbia Basin project as recently as January 4 gave a vivid account of this private power opposition to Pacific Northwest Federal power projects. This man is Mr. Rufus Woods, publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World and possibly the best informed man in the State on who is really responsible for our present power shortage. In this recent article he devoted nearly two columns of his paper to answering this question. We will quote him only briefly:

"The Columbia Basin Commission, with its job relating to the Columbia River and the Columbia Basin and with the advice of some of the best engineers in the world, has consistently urged the necessity of building hydroelectric power somewhat in advance of demand.

"With that in view, its members have asked for the authorization of Foster Creek Dam (Chief Joseph Dam). That authorization has been given by Congress. But there has been a steady opposition to its construction on the specious plea that we wouldn't need this power—there was 'a surplus of 1,000,000 to 1,800,000 kilowatts which would last for 10 years.'

"Oh, these foolish, foolish men! * * * What have they done? Today the groups these men represented are crying for power and attempting to lay the blame on the Bonneville Power Administration for not giving power to them. But it was only 3 years ago in a meeting in Seattle on January 4, 1946, that the three different companies had men testify that we would have a surplus supply of power so great that it would run a million kilowatts or more for a period of 10 years.

"Why the power shortage? It is due to the men and the interests who opposed construction of Foster Creek Dam.

"Who held up the development of Foster Creek Dam? Men representing the private power companies of the Northwest met in Seattle and Portland with other groups to discuss the power situation. The general feeling of those present was that there should be a surplus of 10 percent to provide against threatened shortage. The private power men—three of them—said this was too high. * * * The private power men were M. L. Blair, of the Washington Water Power; H. H. Schoefield, Pacific Power & Light; J. D. Ellis, Northwestern Electric. They said:

"'In 1955 there will be a surplus of 780,000 kilowatts and a peak surplus of 1,450,000, and in 1960 there will be a 580,000 kilowatt surplus and a peak surplus of 1,100,000 kilowatts'."

We ask: Who is responsible for the power shortage?

In his second article Mr. McLaughlin said:

"Now as to what is basic in the Government's failure to provide an adequate power supply, you have, of course, numerous agencies and bureaus and the Congress and the President, all with their finger in the pie, and you have lots of hocus-pocus and politics."

Most of the hocus-pocus referred to has really been engaged in by the private power companies' lobby in the Nation's Capital, headed by Mr. Purcell Smith, who is reputed to get $60,000-a-year salary besides a liberal expense account. Of all the dark and shady chapters in the history of private power operations in our Nation, these national lobbyists have produced the worst. Our own experience in our own State with private power lobbying would fill many books.

In his third article Mr. McLaughlin said:

"As I see it, the biggest task confronting the Pacific Northwest today is that of assuring this region of an adequate power supply without regimenting our economy. * * * This is a tremendously grave and complex problem, * * * and the highest order of statesmanship and the greatest degree of unity, both at the national and at local levels, is necessary if the right and proper solution is to be obtained."

We say amen to every bit of that, also.

It seems rather amusing to have any private power company executive plead for real cooperation from the Federal Government or from other public power executives insofar as power questions are concerned.

Public power leaders have witnessed the private power interests' continuous and most vigorous hostility until within the past 2 or 3 years a few of them have "slowly been preaching the same power faith" which the "torch bearers of public power" have been preaching for at least 40 years. Why the sudden change? Let us answer this question from the record.

None of these private power executives ever showed any degree of friendship or cooperation or unity with any segment of the public power movement in the Northwest until they simply could not do anything else if they contemplated staying in business at all. These private power companies, especially the company of which Mr. McLaughlin is president, had "their backs to the wall" through their own folly, and they have suddenly "found religion."

So we suggest a real burying of the hatchet by our former opponents, including Mr. McLaughlin and his entire staff and board. Let them confess their past sins, with a contrite heart, and then really march forward with us in real unity.

A Call for More Inflation

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to an editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Times-Herald headed "A call for more inflation."

Mr. Keyserling has appeared before our Joint Committee on the Economic Report. He is one of the chief advisers of the President of the United States, along with Mr. Clark. If you will read this editorial, you will see that now, when the price index of the Department of Labor shows that prices are coming down, Mr. Keyserling is advocating to the labor unions of this country that they strike for higher wages. Mr. Clark said the same thing as a witness before our committee. I tell you that these men are poor people to have as advisers to the Chief Executive, especially at this time

when conditions as they are, with that advice we will never stabilize our economy and bring prices and wages to a level that the economy will be stable and sound.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial is as follows:

A CALL FOR MORE INFLATION

Leon H. Keyserling is vice chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The other members of this important and influential agency are John D. Clark and Edwin G. Nourse.

In New York Sunday evening, Mr. Keyserling made a significant speech to a gathering of representatives of the 100,000 members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America (AFL).

"Labor," said the Presidential adviser, "should be militant in this period of slightly declining prices"—meaning labor leaders should get out and fight for higher and higher wages regardless of what prices are doing.

"Nothing at this time," said Keyserling, "would do more to accentuate the beginnings of a softening up that we have seen in a small way as to follow price adjustments by wage reductions which would cancel out the consumers' increased buying power."

The whole speech was keyed to this note—that we can and should push up wages indefinitely, and that wage hikes should not be reflected in higher and higher prices for consumer goods.

Nothing was said by Mr. Keyserling, so far as reported, about increasing production per worker, by step-ups in the worker's own efficiency and the use of better and better machines. That cuts costs of production per unit of the things produced, and justifies higher wages. But this fact of economic life apparently is outside the limits of Keyserling's philosophy.

What he evidently is calling for is more of the inflation which has plagued us since wartime—and he cheerfully ignores President Truman's insistence that inflation is still the worst economic danger now menacing the country.

We don't know of anybody who quarrels with the general proposition that labor in a profit system must have generous wages, so that it can buy what it produces.

But what if labor leaders, taking the Keyserling advice, work this general proposition to death? They will only end, it seems to us, in pushing prices so high that the bulk of the unorganized consuming public cannot buy enough goods to keep the factories running and all the workers working.

When and if that happens, we'll have the depression so many people fear, plus. That's mathematical.

However, this Mr. Keyserling is a trusted adviser of Mr. Truman's, and is said to have the inside track just now to the Presidential ear. So maybe we're in for a bust, brought on by doctrinaires and economic quacks whose heads are as soft as their hearts are warm. And maybe that helps explain the continuing apathy of the stock market, and the widespread hesitancy of businessmen to expand operations.

The Rankin Pension Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorials which deal with the pension introduced in the House by the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

[From the Providence Journal and Evening Star]

VETERANS' HAND-OUTS

The political axiom that nobody wants to shoot Santa Claus was bound to make our unqualified opposition to any general veterans' pension or bonus legislation unpopular among most ex-servicemen. For that reason we are particularly gratified by such support as we have received from that quarter. One veterans' organization, the American Veterans Committee, whose Providence chapter specifically endorsed our stand, has now actually carried its own opposition to hand-out legislation into congressional hearings being held on the latest and most extravagant pension proposal.

The attitude of this organization and of many intelligent individual veterans may not carry much weight with such politicians as Chairman Rankin of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who openly denounced the adverse testimony of the AVC's national vice president on the proposed Rankin pension bill. The best chance of licking this particular piece of pork-barrel legislation seems to rest rather with the administration, which has also made known its opposition on budgetary grounds.

But the ability of at least a few veterans to put the national interest above their personal gain is important in a broader sense. It gives special point, on this anniversary of Lincoln's birth, to one of the Great Emancipator's wisest warnings of an ever-present danger to our democracy. "The struggle and scramble * * * for a way to live without work will finally test the strength of our institutions."

[From the Kansas City Times of February 21, 1949]

LIMITS ON VETERANS' AID

Well-reasoned advice to the country's veterans has been offered by President Truman. In an indirect comment on the big-money pension bill being pushed by Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, the President has spoken of "certain limits" which "cannot be stretched" in providing for the collective welfare of former servicemen. He indicated that to exceed these limits would create hazards for the future stability of the Nation's economy.

This warning commands the attention of every one of the approximately 18,800,000 living veterans. Together they comprise about one-third of the jobholders in the United States. With their families they will soon make up about one-half of the total population.

It is no longer possible to regard veterans as members of a relatively small group who have performed special patriotic services and are therefore entitled to almost unlimited benefits. There are simply too many now to permit them and their dependents greatly preferred treatment over the other half of our people.

This does not mean, however, that nothing is due those who were exposed to physical danger, hardships, and personal sacrifices in wartime. The Nation has taken on a full set of obligations to ex-servicemen. There is no sentiment whatsoever for dropping them. As cited by Mr. Truman last week, these include the welfare and rehabilitation of disabled and ill veterans and the care of their dependents or survivors. Also called for is the fullest of efforts to establish former service men and women in the economic place they would have held had they not gone into uniform. The GI bill of rights has been an effective aid to that end for a majority of the 15,000,000 with service in World War II.

To say that more boons should be granted the older veterans of the two world wars implies a need for fulfilling promises to these men which were never made. They were called upon to fight not for mercenary reasons but to defend their Nation against forces prepared to conquer it if possible. To put a deferred price on their contributions would be to deny that this was the case.

The country preserved by their service is theirs to maintain. It does not belong to a citizenry standing apart from them and obliged to reward them free-handedly for what they did. Additional benefits paid to them on a large scale would take the form of a tremendous burden on the national economy. There are definite limits to what it can carry without collapsing. These apply not only to veterans' pensions but to various other proposals for scattering public funds around in a manner dictated more by emotion and good intentions than to reason.

As the President has just reminded all veterans, a solvent government able to function on a sound basis for all the people must come ahead of other considerations, however alluring they may seem.

[From the Des Moines Register of February 15, 1949]

ONE VETERANS' GROUP WITH COURAGE

When the American Legion and the Veterans of Foregn Wars announced some time ago that they would support Government pensions of $60 a month for all veterans after age 60, few people paid much attention. It sounded so extreme even the most cynical observers thought it would have no chance in Congress.

But now that Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Democrat, Mississippi, of the House Committee on Veteran Affairs has introduced a bill for such pensions, it seems to have a better chance than anyone expected. The Rankin bill even goes the Legion and the VFW one better. It provides for increasing the $60 pensions to $90 when the veteran reaches age 65 and also has liberal disability benefits for veterans.

Of all the major veterans organizations, only one, the American Veterans Committee (AVC), that high-minded group with the slogan, "Citizens first, veterans second," opposes this bill. In testimony before the Rankin committee, AVC said:

"The country owes the veteran a right to readjustment into his community life, and a chance to get started as a civilian, but the country does not owe the veteran a hand-out which has the effect of a boomerang endangering the stability of our economy as a whole."

The Veterans' Administration figures that the cost of the Rankin bill would be nearly $2,000,000,000 the first year and that by 1985 it would be between five and six billion. Even in the first year this bill—for veterans alone—would cost more than the Federal social security, welfare, and health programs for the entire population.

Veterans now are receiving about $6,000,000,000 a year in special educational, readjustment, and other allowances. These benefits are, for the most part, paid on the basis of special needs of citizens who took time out from their civilian activities to serve their country.

But the grandiose social-security program Congressman RANKIN proposes has no such basis. It is sponsored merely as a gratuity for those citizens who happened to be in the age bracket able to fulfill the duty of every citizen in time of war.

Strangely, the veterans organizations who do the most talking about the free-enterprise system and their devout faith in capitalism are the ones supporting this "Townsend plan" for veterans.

The country can be thankful one veterans organization, at least, is clear-sighted

enough to see that social security is not a veterans' problem alone—and courageous enough to oppose a Treasury grab for their own special benefit.

Negro History Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the New York Times of Friday, February 25, 1949, explains so eloquently and factually the meaning of this week, that I believe it will be of interest to all Members:

NEGRO HISTORY WEEK

The Negro American has come of age, and a celebration of the achievements given to civilization by present-day Negro scholars, singers, writers, and scientists is in keeping with the American tradition of paying homage to leaders of every age and race. Some fear that Negro History Week has become a beating of drums and sounding of trumpets to make American history a little more Marxian than it is, and its peoples the subjects of forces that would carry all of us on to a totalitarian finale. The history of our 13,000,000 Negro Americans belongs to all of us, and it should not be altered to make a poor propaganda.

The accomplishments of George Washington Carver and his studies of the peanut and other lowly plants are well known, but few of us have heard of Benjamin Banneker, a freeman of color who lived in Baltimore in the days of Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, and by his knowledge of geometry, the climates, and other useful things was able to help in laying out the city of Washington. This was refutation enough to all the people who saw black people only as historic hewers of wood and drawers of water.

The last war and subsequent social upheavals in Europe, Asia, and Africa have taught this generation that wars can free people, or wars can enslave them. It should clarify our thinking to have learned that race and religion have long been reasons for enslaving or exterminating entire races, nations, and classes. It will only be when we have learned more of the history of Africa that we will be able to say truthfully who was weak and who was strong in moral courage and fortitude. Negro History Week can be used among students as a stimulus to more scholarship. Among average people it can widen the range of cultural contacts and narrow the abyss of racial intolerance.

Rural People in Washington Favor Group Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent study by R. W. Roskelley, formerly associate rural sociologist, agricultural experiment stations, the State College of Washington, throws light on the attitude of rural Washington families regarding present medical practice. This study, entitled "The Rural Citizen and Medical Care," is printed as Bulletin No. 495, December 1947, of the State College of Washington, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Agricultural Experiment Stations. On the basis of interviews with homemakers and heads of 595 representative rural families in the State of Washington, it was found that two-thirds—67.2 percent—of the people wanted medical care administered on a group basis. Few more than 1 person out of 5—22.4 percent—wished to continue with the system of private medical practice which has prevailed in the past. Approximately 1 out of 10 was not sure whether he wanted to continue with private practice or wanted his medical program administered by some other system. The general conclusion of the study follows:

The prevailing system of medical practice—private practice—in the State of Washington today is at variance with the wishes of a large majority of rural people. These wishes, which differ so greatly from the prevailing methods of administering medicine, appear as handwriting on the wall for changes in the operation of medical programs, if we continue to live in a country where the people's desires are given consideration in the determination of programs that affect them.

Although the entire study is too long to be reprinted here in full, I believe the Members will be interested in the information as summarized by the author:

This study reveals rather clearly that the practice of private medicine in rural Washington is not the first choice among a large percentage of the rural population as the method by which they would like to have their medical service program administered. The desire for change is marked. Two out of every three persons desire a change.

Of the five alternative methods, a larger majority preferred the social-security program as outlined by President Truman to any other system. Private practice was the second most popular choice; Medical Bureau plan was third; the cooperative approach, fourth; and tax-supported State medicine was last.

It is significant that the social-security program should be desired by so large a portion when one considers how limited the information has been explaining the details and the nature of the program. In addition, much publicity about it has been negative.

It seems particularly significant that in Pierce and King counties, where the Medical Bureau program was developed 25 years ago and has functioned since, the most desirable medical plan in the minds of the people would be one developed under an expanded social-security program.

Nearly every person who expressed a desire for a change in the method of administering medical-service programs expressed a positive desire for comprehensive coverage of all medical, hospital, and dental services. A large majority also indicated a preference for a prepayment plan for medical bills, based upon an insurance principle, and they expressed a willingness to pay 5 percent of the first $3,000 earned a year in order to defray costs.

Although there were many people who expressed a desire for private practice, it does not have the support of many related attitudes in the minds of the people which may be necessary for its continuance as an effective competitor to other systems of administering medical services.

The people who want change and those who desire to retain private practice as the method of administering medical programs represent a cross-section of the rural population. This suggests that a desire for change is not a phenomenon of the poor man, the rich man, the educated, or the uneducated, but is an expression characteristic of the attitudes and values of a great majority of rural persons in the State of Washington.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the delegates to the convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on February 4, 1949:

Whereas existing Federal, New York State, and New York City rent controls on residential housing accommodations will come to an end on February 28, 1949, unless further extended; and

Whereas the housing emergency is still serious in the city of New York, as well as in other parts of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 4th day of February 1949, does hereby go on record in favor of the extension and strengthening of Federal, New York State, and New York City rent-control laws relating to residential housing accommodations; and be it further

Resolved, That appropriate protection be given to tenants of decontrolled housing accommodations who have given voluntary increases to landlords under the law; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of New York, the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the New York State Legislature, the vice chairman of the city council, and the Clerks of both Houses of Congress, and of the State senate and assembly, as well as other appropriate public officers.

Cooperative Health Plans in Tampa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 28 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, at a time when we are considering health care for the people of the country I think it appropriate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to do so, an article entitled "Cooperative Health Plans in Tampa" by the Honorable Angus Laird, which is reprinted from the July 1942 issue of Medical Care.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Government Printing Office that the printing of the article in the RECORD will require 2¾ pages at a cost of $195.25.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE HEALTH PLANS IN TAMPA

(By Angus Laird)

(After personal visits to Tampa, Mr. Laird prepared his article and also obtained comments from local physicians and others. These are appended. Mr. Laird is merit system supervisor, Florida State Department of Health.—The Editors.)

For 50 years a group of people in the city of Tampa, Fla., with a Latin-American background has been quietly developing a comprehensive program of medical and hospitalization services and health insurance. Organized into democratically controlled societies for educational and social as well as medical purposes, these people provide for themselves a health service that begins before birth and ends only when the body has found its final resting place. Membership in the societies is open to all persons of the white race of good character and in good health. The oldest and largest "club" is the Centro Espanol de Tampa, with a membership of more than 6,000 persons. One-third of these are men. The women and children members are entitled to the same medical and hospital benefits as the men. The Centro Asturiano, with about 5,500 members, has representatives of some 40 different nationalities in its membership. There are nearly 4,500 members in the "Italian club," which was limited to people of Italian blood until 1913, but is now open to all. The Circulo-Cubano, the last of the present important clubs, has about 2,700 members. While the age limit is generally from 40 to 60 years, some of the groups allow older people to join.

THREEFOLD OBJECTIVES OF THE CLUBS

In a broad sense, the societies are organized not merely to provide medical services and health care but for general social and welfare purposes. Thus, the objectives of Centro Asturiano, according to its officials, are threefold: "Primarily, it is a beneficent organization, tendering help, medical and surgical aid, treatment, and hospitalization to its members. Secondly, it is an educational institution, conducting classes in English, in art, and in other subjects as the requirements arise. Thirdly, it is a social center for the members, their families and friends, fostering dances, theatrical performances, literary meetings, parties, picnics, and other social functions, and encouraging clean social contact and relations amongst the members." The other societies have similar objectives.

SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF THE SOCIETIES

One major reason for the success of these societies is the democratic type of organization and the wide participation in club administration by the members. All of the clubs have large boards of directors. Centro Asturiano elects half of its 60 directors each year and frequently has spirited elections. On the day of election, members stream into the palatial clubhouse to cast their secret ballots. All members may vote, including men, women, and children. The election procedure of other clubs differs only in details. A club election is as important to a member as a political election is to any other American citizen who feels that voting is an obligation of citizenship.

Several occupations or professions are usually represented on a board of directors. At a typical board meeting, a lawyer, a banker, a cigar manufacturer, a cigar maker, and day laborers may sit round the same table. As one prominent club member told the writer, "We would rather have a good banker than a poor cigar maker, or a good cigar maker than a poor banker."

These clubs seem to have a remarkable record for stability in administration, and the paid managers, or secretaries, are generally considered permanent employees. An administrative turn-over rarely takes place.

One of the secrets of the success of these organizations is that they have been able to enlist the active participation of their members in their governing bodies and activities. While to most of us medical and hospital services are still the responsibility of the individual, to the Latin—in Tampa, at least—they are the responsibility of the community or the club.

DUES AND SERVICES

The amount of dues varies in the clubs, depending upon the type of membership. Thus, in the Italian club, the 65-cent weekly rate entitles a member to the following benefits:

1. Two dollars a day in case of sickness where a member is unable to work after having been a member of the club for 8 weeks.
2. General medical care, available at once after the first payment of dues.
3. Eye, ear, nose, and throat specialist; medicines; electrotherapy; laboratory examinations after five payments have been made.
4. Tooth extractions; X-rays; surgical operations, except tonsils; and hospitalization after 6 months' membership. Tonsils may be removed at the end of a year's membership.

Subscribers may also pay lower rates; service benefits are the same but cash benefits are reduced or omitted.

The Italian club's sickness-benefit plan provides for regular monthly payments in case of permanent disability from accidents. Thus, a member disabled by loss of a limb or of eyesight, will be paid $30 a month as long as the member lives and does not become a public charge.

Upon payment of rates varying from 20 to 30 cents per person weekly, depending upon age, a member's family may become members of the club and receive all benefits except the cash payments. Other clubs have different rates, varying from 35 cents per week to $2 per month. The benefits vary in detail, but are essentially the same. Additional benefits may be allowed by the payment of small additional sums.

Two of the clubs, Centro Espanol and Centro Asturiano, operate their own hospitals. Several members proudly informed me that these were the only hospitals in Tampa with X-ray therapy machines. The Italian club and the Circulo Cubano do not own hospitals, but their patients are free to choose any hospitals of the city with which their clubs have agreements.

A large part of the club revenues comes from social activities. The exact amount is available only to club members so that definite percentages cannot be given. However, in some organizations quite a large proportion of the revenues for health and hospitalization services arise from this source. While technically a member is financially liable for his weekly club dues only, actually he is expected to make some contribution through participation in social activities. This provision has probably been a deterrent in securing Anglo-Saxon members who often do not care to participate in these social affairs. The membership from this group is growing, however. Twenty percent of the members of the Centro Asturiano are said to be of Anglo-Saxon stock.

HOW MEDICAL CARE IS PROVIDED

Each club has a panel of salaried doctors who have regular consulting hours during which a member can come for examination and treatment. Some of the clubs have specialists on their staffs who receive a regular stipend. Generally, however, persons requiring a specialist's attention are referred to an outside specialist who is paid on a fee basis. Members may choose their family physician from the club panel. They may choose specialists from among the many, though by no means all, of the city specialists who have entered into agreements with the club. Dentists are paid on a fee basis and there is similar free choice within the panel.

PREVENTIVE HEALTH SERVICES

Most of the members of the clubs come from the low-income groups. If they did not have the clubs to look after their medical needs, they would be constantly worried about the expense of medical care in times of illness and might even become public charges. As club members, they go to see the doctor whenever there is the slightest doubt about a health matter. While this may mean more work for the doctor, as a rule it means better health for the members. Their physicians are able to carry on a considerable amount of preventive work. Many stories are told by both physicians and members of cases in which precautionary examinations and treatments prevented serious illness.

COLLECTION OF DUES

Collectors call upon members in their homes to receive payment of dues. Usually this payment comes before many things that the average American would consider much more important—in fact, before everything else. When a member is delinquent, a committee from the club calls upon him to find out the reason for nonpayment. If dissatisfaction is the cause, the committee endeavors to convince the backslider of the value of retaining his club membership. Where unemployment is the reason, the committee may order his dues paid out of a special fund raised for that purpose by the club. This assistance may be continued, if the member is considered worthy, for the duration of his unemployment and is considered one of a member's basic rights. This fund is also used to pay the dues of aged members and occasionally of employed persons in great need.

WHO ARE THE CLUB DOCTORS?

In the early days of the club, most of the doctors were of Anglo-Saxon or native American stock—in fact, the first doctor at the Centro Espanol was a graduate of the University of Tennessee Medical School, and helped to found the organization in 1891. Today, however, a number of the young doctors in the societies are of Latin stock, who are serving their own people through the medical societies. Still many continue to be of non-Latin ancestry, as for example, the hero of the Latin community in Tampa just now, M. R. Winton, M. D., head surgeon of the Centro Espanol Hospital. Because of his connection with the Latin clubs, he was not considered eligible for membership in the County Medical Society. As a result, in 1939 the Municipal Hospital, of which he had long been a staff member, was compelled to dismiss him in order to obtain reinstatement as a hospital approved by the A. M. A. for the training of interns. In that year, the A. M. A. had dropped the Municipal Hospital from its approved list, because, among other reasons, certain members of its staff were not eligible for membership in the local medical society. Dr. Winton appealed to the courts and won a verdict which denied the right of the hospital board to deprive any physician qualified under the laws of the State from serving on the staff of a hospital because of nonmembership in the Medical Society. Members of all clubs considered that Dr. Winton was fighting for the principles upon which their organizations were founded. They look upon him as their leader against what they believe was organized medicine's efforts to destroy their societies.

HOW THE DOCTORS ARE PAID

In most cases, doctors are employed on a part-time basis, and are paid from $150 to

$200 a month plus special fees for maternity cases. Some doctors are employed by more than one club, and nevertheless have time for private practice. One of those who complained most strongly against the clubs was employed by three organizations and claimed an income from all sources of more than $600 per month. When it is remembered that this amount is net and that office expenses, drugs, and other items are not paid out of it, his income does not seem too low for a professional man in such a community as Tampa. Many doctors in 1939 would have been willing to trade places with him—as he admitted. His net income was probably considerably above the average for doctors in private practice with similar clientele.

While club doctors are not as free to use their own time as private practitioners, their status in this respect probably does not differ from that of the average institutional doctor. They are allowed a month's vacation with pay every year, provided they can arrange to have other club doctors handle their patients.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Of course there have been criticisms of the clubs at times by both physicians and club members. Most of the group doctors interviewed felt that they were overworked. Some of them, thoroughly in favor of club medicine and hospitalization, accepted this situation philosophically. Some thought that an improvement would come in time. Others complained bitterly. Among club doctors the writer found no division of opinion as to the value of the services to members, but there were some differences in views as to the status of the club doctors.

One club informs me that over a period of time their doctors have on the average 7 house calls and 18 office calls a day. Another states that the approximate number of house calls for the average doctor per day is 4, while the approximate number of office and hospital cases handled by the average doctor is 10. Two of the doctors informed me that they are sometimes required to see as many as 25 to 30 patients daily. There was particular objection among the doctors to the number of home calls. They felt that many were unnecessary, although they had to make them for fear of criticism by the members. The writer has been assured that steps are being taken to improve this situation.

The lot of the doctors probably could be improved to the advantage not only of the medical personnel but of the club members themselves. No matter how well pleased the member may be with his club, he can hardly expect to receive good care consistently over a long period, unless the club doctors are loyal to the club type of hospital and medical services.

Members of the medical profession have also objected to the type of medical and hospitalization services provided, sometimes for good reasons, at other times on grounds that are hardly valid. Nonclub members frequently state that members do not get as good medical attention and care from club doctors as they could get on the outside. While this is probably true of members who could afford to pay for better service on the outside, one prominent physician who engaged in both club and private practice insists that club members get better medical care than do any other citizens of Tampa. The truth is that the average member would not be able to pay anything like the amount necessary to obtain similar medical care for himself and his family if he had to purchase it at the usual rates. The secretary of the Italian club believes that without the club, 75 percent of his members would become public charges in case of illness. The city health officer remarked that while he did not believe the clubs rendered the best medical service that could be given, he did not know what in the world Tampa would do without them.

A large part of the success of the Latin clubs is due to the intense loyalty of the members. Next to their family, the club is the center of their lives. It takes generations to develop such an organization, with the ties of devotion that have helped to make the Latin clubs in Tampa a success. For this reason, it is unlikely that this type of organization will ever develop on a large scale in America. Yet the clubs appear to be on a permanent and stable basis in Tampa, as any observer who has met and talked with members will agree. Perhaps the key to their success is explained in the statement of the late venerable Fermin Souto, of Centro Espanol: "The officers and members who work for this club are not working for money; we are working for humanity."

COMMENTS

From the committee on public relations of the Hillsborough County Medical Society: H. Mason Smith, M. D.; Robert G. Nelson, M. D.; H. G. Cole, M. D.:

"Your [Mr. Laird's] letter addressed to Dr. Robert G. Nelson, president of the Hillsborough County Medical Society, requesting a statement from an officer of the Hillsborough County Medical Society concerning the Latin clubs and the status of the medical personnel connected with them, was received by Dr. Nelson, who was president of the society in 1941, and referred by him to Dr. Blackburn W. Lowry, the president of the society for 1942. Dr. Lowry in turn referred this communication to the undersigned committee on public relations.

"The committee feels that it is not qualified to give you a statement concerning the status of the medical personnel connected with the Latin Benefit Societies of Tampa. The rules and bylaws of the Hillsborough County Medical Society prevent the physicians serving these clubs becoming members, unless they give up their contract with the Latin clubs. That is, no one is acceptable for membership who is on a contract to provide medical service to any organization or group that makes a profit on such services.

"Other than this, we do not know anything about the conditions of employment of the doctors in the Latin Benefit Societies doing group practice in Tampa. Therefore, we are not in a position to provide the statement as requested by you."

From Aeto P. Leto, an officer of the Italian Club (principal, Tampa Bay Boulevard Elementary School):

"The medical and human value of the Latin mutual-aid organizations in Tampa can never be overestimated. From a very humble beginning these societies have grown to where they now occupy a very prominent place in the civic and medical circles of our city. I have personally had a fine opportunity to observe the work they are doing, having belonged to the board of directors of one of them for 6 years and on the executive committee for 2 years.

"During good times and bad, taking time out on several occasions to fight back at the attacks by organized medicine, they have continued to grow and expand, always increasing the benefits to their members. Not even during the most critical periods of the depression were benefits to the members curtailed.

"These organizations have definite human and medical values. What human value could be considered greater than the feeling of security the head of a family feels when he knows that in spite of his very limited income his family is guaranteed medical attention and hospitalization if it should be needed? He also feels secure in the fact that if he himself were to become ill he would not only have proper medical care but that his loss of income would be replaced by the cash benefits paid by his organization.

"One of the greatest values of these organizations in my estimation is their value in the field of preventive medicine. When a member of one of these organizations feels the first symptoms of illness he can immediately visit a doctor and be attended without having to worry about his ability to pay for it. My experience as a public-school teacher further emphasizes this point. I find that when children in our schools are examined by public health doctors and medical treatment is recommended by them, those who are members receive this treatment immediately while others have to wait until their parents can afford it or else receive this treatment as charity.

"The Latin Mutual-Aid organizations do not stop at simply giving medical care to their members. As you will observe in the article by Mr. Laird, they carry on extensive cultural, educational, and recreational programs. Besides this classes in American citizenship are conducted. All the members of the societies are reached by these activities and the value to their morale is immense.

"The members take great pride in the achievements of their organization and are always glad to contribute of their time and effort. They derive a great deal of pleasure and a sense of belonging, which in turn animates their spirits.

"These organizations are indeed an excellent example of what can be accomplished by cooperative effort in a democratic nation."

From Charles Wm. Bartlett, M. D., a former club physician:

"Physicians that work for the health clubs in Tampa, do so at a flat rate monthly, with the exception of nose and throat specialists, and occasionally surgeons who may be paid on a per case basis. The average monthly fee, up to a short time ago, was $150.00 a month. For this fee, the physician had to make unlimited house to house calls and hold two separate consultations per day. One of the consultation hours had to be after 5 p. m. when shops were closed, permitting a large number of members to seek medical advice for the least complaint. Besides the prior mentioned services, about every third week, the doctor has to take night calls referred to him regardless of the nature, or the extent of his day's activity. If he is possessed of any surgical ability, he is expected to perform operations without further remuneration. In rendering these services, the doctor must furnish his own transportation and the essential instruments needed in his bag.

"As can be seen from this brief outline, the amount of work is considerable and the remuneration is small. Young physicians, in order to improve their financial conditions, usually work for two or more health clubs. This requires them to be on the go continuously with a big overhead for car expense. The number of calls vary with the season of the year, averaging from 12 to 40 house calls a day. The office consultations vary from 10 to 35. Due to the large number of house calls, these doctors try to see this large number of office patients in a period of about 2 hours, which precludes any scientific investigation in most cases. The surgical and critically ill medical cases in these clubs, are furnished with hospitalization which, in my opinion, is the chief benefit that the members derive from them, for this allows first-class treatment which, otherwise, would be out of their reach except as a service case (charity) in the local municipal hospital.

"The majority of these health clubs are governed by a board of directors, composed of cigar makers who have not had more than a ninth-grade education, and who, like most people who have not had any opportunity, like to show their authority when they have an opportunity to do so. If the doctor should happen to displease one or more of these powers that be, he may be dismissed from service without even the customary courtesy extended a janitor of a week's notice. These clubs are composed mostly

of cigar makers whose average earnings are from $18 to $20 a week, so that if a doctor spends 10 or 12 years working in these organizations and then decides to shift for himself in private practice, he cannot even look forward to drawing from this practice which he has established, for even if he has made a favorable impression upon them, they will continue to use his successor, feeling that they cannot afford his private services.

"In conclusion, I will say that from a physician's point of view, the health clubs are favorable only if he needs an immediate income and will not stay in this type of work more than 2 years. Prolonged practice in this field will tend in most cases, to cause a deterioration in his work, which may prove hard to overcome."

From M. R. Winton, M. D., a participating surgeon:

"I am surgeon to the Centro Espanol Hospital and have been for more than 7 years. In that capacity, I think I can judge the contract in contrast with pay. I am frank to say that I am better paid by contract or club work than I would be if I did the same work as private practice.

"Another important feature, I do not have to hunt up surgical cases to increase my volume of work, thereby increasing my income.

"You know it is estimated that 75 percent of the volume of surgery in this country is not necessary—of no value to the patient, but brings suffering and incurs heavy expense. The same applies to prescriptions. The usual doctor feels that he cannot charge a fee if no prescription is written—result—$10 worth of medicine, 10 cents worth of good to the patient; the truth is, 10 cents worth of advice is worth $10 in medicine—but you cannot collect.

"In club work, you can tell the patient "Yes" or "No"; in surgery, you are paid just the same—you avoid night calls, house calls, wrangling over every fee, etc., all of which require more than three times as much of your time as club work.

"Another thing, if you could place all doctors at good salaries, there would be an all-out endorsement. You must consider all doctors are not good surgeons or other specialists; that there is a majority that will always cry against it.

"If I had my way, I would compel all people with an income of $2,500 or less, to join a good club and if they could not pay their dues, the State should pay. They would have the best service and less butchering.

"It is well known that charity patients have been getting the best service of any class of people. They have a staff as their doctor and they have the best the staff can give. The rich have to be on guard against a sinister opportunity to make a fee—whether surgery, hypodermics, or electric treatments.

"Here, at present, the club patient is getting better treatment than the poor or the rich, and they are satisfied, as a rule. No one makes them join a club or compels them to use one doctor."

Luxury Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the delegates to the convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, held at the Hotel Astor, New York City, on February 4, 1949:

Whereas the 20 percent Federal excise tax on so-called luxury commodities was enacted during the war emergency for the purpose of raising revenue and discouraging the manufacturer of nonessential items in favor of the manufacture of necessary war goods; and

Whereas the conditions that brought about the imposition of this form of taxation have changed; and

Whereas many of the taxable luxury items, such as pocketbooks and other leather goods, drugs, cosmetics, toilet articles, furs, jewelry and similar items are regarded as actual necessities rather than luxuries by both producer and consumer; and

Whereas business leaders have protested that the existing luxury taxes have created a dangerous buyer resistance, placing several large industries in jeopardy; and

Whereas manufacturer, retailer, labor and consumer groups are in agreement that the repeal of this form of nuisance tax would be in the best interests of labor, capital and the consumer; and

Whereas, according to figures published in the press, this form of tax, in 1948, brought only slightly more than 1 percent of the total revenue collected by the Federal Government in taxes; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Club, Inc., in convention assembled this 4th day of February, 1949, does hereby call upon the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on luxuries; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York City Federation of Women's Club, urges the members of Congress from the city of New York to work for the repeal of the excise tax on so-called luxuries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Speakers of both Houses, the Chairmen of the appropriate Congressional Committees, the Representatives in Congress from the city of New York, the secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives, and any other appropriate officials.

Bishop Lajos Ordass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written for the Brooklyn Eagle by John A. Heffernan:

HEFFERNAN SAYS LUTHERAN JOINS THE CHRISTIAN MARTYRS

Now that the case of the Hungarian Lutheran Bishop, Lajos Ordass, has popped out of the diplomatic top drawer, we may consider what is really going on under the most stupid of the Red regimes that have sprouted from Marxism. Hungary's population is as predominantly Catholic as the United States is Protestant.

However, there are half a million Lutherans in Hungary and, despite the effects of the war, a by no means negligible number of Jews. All of these people have received monetary gifts, and those most in need, clothing and food from their coreligionists in this country. For instance, Bishop Ordass received $500,000 from American Lutherans. It was not a personal gift but a fund for carrying on the church work by the daring religious leader, who, like his Catholic and Jewish fellow countrymen, was undergoing a second persecution, more savage than the first.

Failure to register such gifts is a crime under the Red regime, which confiscates them when they are registered. That is what, in the Communist-dominated countries, is called black marketing, or an offense against the currency laws.

It has been noted by such historians as Macaulay that countries which became Protestant at the time of the Reformation have remained predominantly Protestant, while countries that remained Catholic in the main, continued so. The Red regime at Budapest and other Communist capitals desires to garb itself in respectability by having at its several courts little national church hierarchies. It is an old trick of dictators. Machiavelli taught it in his political philosophy.

In his war memoirs Churchill tells of a conference at which the question of the Pope came up. "The Pope?" said Stalin. "How many divisions has he?" Churchill's comment was "More than you think, although they are not always visible." Stalin may now be surprised to find the soldiery of Christendom, some in the cardinal cap and robe, some in the black cassock, some in the simple civilian garb, marshaling in the divisions that denominationalism brought about, to wage battle against his armor.

He may hear their battle cry, sounding strangely like the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," and the noise of the captains in the words of Theodore Roosevelt, "We stand at Armageddon and we battle for the Lord."

Veterans of Foreign Wars Explain Veterans' Pension Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress are greatly confused over the veterans' pension issue that will no doubt reach the floor in the near future.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars through their national legislative director, Omar B. Ketchum, has attempted to clarify the issue by sending to Members of Congress the following letter which contains certain statistical information including the comparative costs of various pension plans.

The letter is as follows:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1949.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: There appears to be so much confusion over the pension issue that I am taking the liberty of presenting the views of the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to this subject. A bill identified as H. R. 2681, by Mr. RANKIN, has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and will no doubt come before the House of Representatives for a show-down decision in the near future. Press and radio reports on this bill, stating

the position of this and that veteran organization, together with astronomical estimates of costs, has created such confusion and raised such a smoke screen that the real facts have been obscured.

For 10 years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has gone on record in each national convention advocating and urging the adoption of a pension program for the ailing and aging World War I veterans similar to the pension benefits which are available to Spanish-American War veterans. Up until the Eighty-first Congress we made some progress but had been unable to bring the pension issue up for serious consideration in either the House or the Senate. This year, however, the pension issue has been developed in the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs with a fanfare of exaggerated and distorted publicity which threatens to nullify or delay further our efforts over the years.

The bill, H. R. 2681, which was reported out of the Veterans' Committee, is not the pension program which was advocated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. While we are not opposing Mr. RANKIN's bill we think you should know that it falls far short of the target and will not take care of the group of World War I veterans who are so desperately in need of pension assistance from the Federal Government. The Press reports and cost estimates on the Rankin bill are completely distorted and exaggerated because the bill in its present form actually would cost very little above the present pension costs for non-service-connected pensions, for World War I and World War II veterans. Briefly summed up, the Rankin bill pending before the Rules Committee would grant pensions to World War I and II veterans when they reach the age of 65 irrespective of physical condition or income. The only advantage of the Rankin bill over the present law which grants non-service-connected pensions to World War I and II veterans is that the Rankin bill would pension a group of veterans who reach the age of 65 and who cannot now qualify for pensions because of good physical condition or substantial income. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has proposed a bill identified as H. R. 2512, by Mr. RANKIN, and H. R. 2379, by Mr. VAN ZANDT, which was a compromise between the most expensive bill which had been introduced, H. R. 1693, on which hearings were held, and the Rankin bill, H. R. 2681, which has been reported favorably.

This compromise bill (H. R. 2512) proposed by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is completely realistic and approaches the problem of a pension program for World War I and II veterans on the sound basis of helping those who are desperately in need of help. A cost estimate prepared by the VFW, which we believe to be as accurate as any cost estimate could be, indicates that our bill would cost approximately $375,000,000 more in 1950 than what is already being expended yearly on existing part III non-service-connected pensions for World War I and World War II veterans. The VFW compromise bill would provide pensions on both an age and disability basis with an income limitation to make certain that the pensions would be paid only to those veterans who are actually in need of pensions. When the Veterans' Administration submitted a cost estimate on H. R. 2512 they did not take into consideration the income limitation in the bill, which cuts the cost almost in half.

It is our viewpoint and our hope that if and when the Rankin bill, H. R. 2681, comes before the House that it will be amended by substituting the provisions of either H. R. 2379, by Mr. VAN ZANDT, or H. R. 2512, by Mr. RANKIN. Both of the latter bills are identical in wording and purpose.

I am attaching two exhibits identified as A and B. Exhibit A is a chart showing (1) the present part III non-service-connected pensions available to World War I and II veterans; (2) the Rankin bill, H. R. 2681, as reported out of the Veterans' Committee; and (3) the VFW compromise bill, H. R. 2512, which we recommend as a substitute for the Rankin bill. Exhibit B is an estimate of detailed cost which we have prepared on H. R. 2512 and which gives a break-down of both World War I and World War II veterans who would benefit from the legislation if the bill is enacted into law and goes into operation for the year 1950. I think a careful study of the attached exhibits will reveal that our compromise bill is completely realistic and will reach the target in caring for that group of World War I and II veterans who are unable to find and hold gainful employment and yet are unable to qualify for a pension under the existing part III benefits law as shown in exhibit A.

If the Congress desires to enact a realistic pension program that will take care of those World War I and II veterans who are desperately in need of assistance from their Government, may I again recommend that the provisions of H. R. 2512, or H. R. 2379, be substituted for the provisions of H. R. 2681, which is presently pending before the Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director.*

EXHIBIT A

Comparative analysis of World Wars I and II pension systems—existing (pt. III), Rankin and VFW plans

	Existing law	Rankin bill (H. R 2681)	VFW compromise plan (H. R. 2379, H. R. 2512)
Eligibility	90 days or more service or discharge for disability incurred in line of duty. Active service before cessation of hostilities.	Same	Same.
Rates	Permanent and total, $60; rated permanent and total for continuous period of 10 years or reach age 65 years, $72; nothing additional where aid or attendant required.	Age 65 years, $90; where aid or attendant is required, $120.	Age 65 years, $90; permanent and total, $90; 75 percent disability, $7 ; 50 percent disability, $50; where aid or attendant is required, $120.
Income limitations	$1,000 if single, $2,500 if married or have dependent minor children.	No income limitation	$2,000 if single, $3,000 if married or have dependent minor children.
Discharge requirement	Other than dishonorable	Other than dishonorable.	Other than dishonorable.
Disability due to misconduct.	Will bar pension	Will not bar pension	Will not bar pension.
Cost estimate (first year).	$119,823,781 [1]	$62,411,000 (cost of pension features only).[2]	$514,000,000.[3]

[1] Actual cost 1948.
[2] Actual cost in addition to cost of pt. III.
[3] Absorbs and includes cost of pt. III pension.

EXHIBIT B

Estimated cost for 1950 on H. R. 2512 as prepared by Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States

1950—WORLD WAR I, AGE 65, TOTAL AND PERMANENT

World War I, 65 or over	104,039
Will never apply (percent)	5
Will never apply	5,201.95
Remaining over 65	98,837
Income limitation bar (percent)	40
Barred by income limitation	39,534.80
All-round eligibility	59,302
Per month	$90
Per month cost	$5,337,180
Months	12
Yearly cost	$64,046,160

1950—WORLD WAR I, TOTAL AND PERMANENT, UNDER 65

Under 65 years	3,483,423
Will never apply (percent)	5
Will never apply	174,171
Remaining under 65	3,309,252
Eligible total and permanent (percent)	8
Eligible total and permanent	264,740
Income limitation bar (percent)	50
All-round eligibility	132,370
Per month per person	$90
Per month	$11,913,300
Months	12
Per year	$142,959,600

1950—WORLD WAR I, 75 PERCENT DISABILITY, UNDER 65

Under 65 years	3,044,512
Eligible 75 percent disability (percent)	7
Eligible 75 per cent disability	213,116
Income limitation bar (percent)	50
All-round eligibility	106,558
Per month per person	$75
Per month	$7,991,850
Months	12
Per year—1950	$95,902,200

1950—WORLD WAR I, 50 PERCENT DISABILITY UNDER 65

Potential for 50 percent	2,831,396
Eligible for 50 percent (percent)	20
Eligible for 50 percent	566,279
Eligible under income limitation (percent)	40
Total eligible for 50 percent	226,512
Per person per month	$50
Per month	$11,325,600
Months	12
Total cost, 1950	$135,907,200

1950—WORLD WAR I COST

Age 65	$64,046,160
Total and permanent	142,959,600
75 percent disability	95,902,200
50 percent disability	135,907,200
Total	438,815,160

NUMBER OF VETERANS

Age 65	59,302
Total and permanent	132,370
75 percent disability	106,558
50 percent disability	226,512
Total	524,742

1950—WORLD WAR II, AGE 65, TOTAL AND PERMANENT

World War II, 65 years or over	9,000
Will not apply (percent)	5
Will not apply	450
Potentially eligible	8,550
Eligible under income limitation (percent)	60
All-round eligibility	5,130
Per month per person	$90
Per month	$461,700
Months	12
Cost for 1950	$5,540,400

1950—WORLD WAR II, TOTAL AND PERMANENT, UNDER 65	
Potential under 65	15,895,000
Will never apply (percent)	5
Will never apply	794,750
Potential to apply	15,100,250
Eligible, total and permanent (percent)	.25
Eligible, total and permanent	37,751
Barred by income limitation (percent)	50
All-round eligibility	18,876
Per month per person	$90
Per month	$1,698,840
Months	12
Cost in 1950	$20,386,040
1950—WORLD WAR II, 75-PERCENT DISABILITY	
Potentially eligible	15,062,500
Eligible to 75 percent (percent)	.20
Eligible to 75 percent	30,125
Barred, income limitation (percent)	50
All-round eligibility	15,062
Per month per person	$75
Per month	$1,129,650
Months	12
Cost for 1950	$13,555,800
1950—WORLD WAR II, 50 PERCENT DISABILITY	
Potentially eligible	15,032,375
Eligible to 50 percent (percent)	.01
Eligible to 50 percent	150,032
Eligible under income limitation (percent)	.40
All around eligibility	60,013
Per month per person	$50
Per month	$3,000,650
Months	12
Cost for 1950	$36,007,800
1950 WORLD WAR II COST	
Age 65	$5,540,400
Total and permanent	20,386,040
75 percent disability	13,555,800
50 percent disability	36,007,800
Total	75,490,040
NUMBER OF VETERANS	
Age 65 years	5,130
Total and permanent	18,876
75 percent disability	15,062
50 percent disability	60,013
Total	99,081
TOTAL COST, WORLD WAR I AND II	
World War I	$438,815,160
World War II	75,490,040
Total	$514,305,200
NUMBER OF VETERANS	
World War I	524,742
World War II	99,081
Total	623,823

Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, while figures are normally dull and uninteresting as quoted, I have available here some which should prove of interest to all Members of this body, and to the citizens of this great Nation.

We all realize that production of consumer products and essential consumer services are the economic backbone of our country. Without this area of enterprise, our system would collapse and government as we know it could not function.

Nonproducing employment, on the other hand, must be subsidized from the labor of the producer in the fields mentioned. Government employment, therefore, falls into the category of subsidized labor, in that no product or service of monetary return is performed.

The Washington Times-Herald of last night, February 28, quotes the Civil Service Commission as stating that Federal employment in the Washington area increased by 1,200 during January, and that the national increase during this period was 1,700.

Of considerable interest would be the employment figures in private employment in one of our greatest industrial States, Connecticut, and in a highly industrialized area within Connecticut, that of Waterbury and surrounding communities.

In the Waterbury area alone, unemployment during January reached the discouraging total of 4,900, an increase of 1,000 over December, and 3,100 above September, 1948. Of the January total, 800 were veterans who relinquished their jobs involuntarily because of decreases in business. The total number between February 14 and February 19 had risen to 6,048, and the number of jobless veterans to 835.

The over-all picture in the State is comparable in that 55,863 were unemployed during this period in February, 10,090 of whom were veterans. These figures apply only to those who have filed unemployment compensation claims. It may be safely assumed that the total is greater.

This is a severe indictment of the present administration. Is this the fair deal which the working men and women of America were to receive? With private employment shrinking, the administration increases its governmental pay roll so that there are now 1,900,900 Federal employees who must be supported by a diminishing number of employed citizens. How far can we expect the administration to go in its quest for political power? Are the people to be saddled with ever-increasing public pay rolls? This increase cannot be attributed to increased social benefits granted by the Eighty-first Congress, because to date there have been none.

We might far better seek measures of decreasing the tremendous Federal bureaucracy which has been built up by a succession of deals, either new or fair, and thus lighten the burden of our taxpayers.

Potato Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 25, 1949:

POTATO BUSINESS RIDICULOUS

The Government will spend $200,000,000 this year to maintain potatoes at their parity price—that is, to keep the price of potatoes up. This is about $1.35 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. For an average family of four it amounts to $5.60, in the form of taxes paid to the Government.

The Government had two parity prices for potatoes. The higher price was for the best grade and the lower price for the poorer grades. When the best grade prices dropped below parity, potato growers unloaded their best potatoes on the Government. The price of poorer grades did not drop to parity, so growers sold these on the open market for the market basket. Thus the best grades of potatoes went to feed cattle and the poorer grades showed up on the store shelves for the dinner table.

To make this possible—to insure you getting the lower grades for your dinner table—the average family of four paid $5.60 to the Government.

Ridiculous, isn't it The Government admitted recently it had made a mistake and will do it differently next year. But this year you're eating the poorer grade potatoes, and paying $5.60 for the privilege, if you consider it a privilege.

Let's hope this situation—silly as it is—does not extend to the whole parity program of propping up prices this year. The Government has just announced that it will spend $2,250,000,000 on its farm support program this year. This represents $15.50 for every man, woman, and child. For the average family it means taxes of $62.

We aren't going to like paying $62 in taxes to prop up all these prices if it's going to give us the poor end of the deal, as it did with potatoes.

Steel Scrap Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from the Editor's Point of View section of House Furnishing Review, the national business magazine of housewares and appliances, whose distinguished editor is Mr. Julien Elfenbein, which reads as follows:

STEEL SCRAP SCANDAL

Recently the Advertising Council, Inc., assumed responsibility at the request of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer for conducting a Nation-wide advertising campaign to salvage steel scrap from industrial sources in our country.

The council picked the business papers of the country for this campaign and brought together a large group of business-paper editors last December in New York at the Hotel Pierre, and later appeared in Washington at the January session of the National Conference of Business Paper Editors, to help them get started. I pointed out at the Hotel Pierre that Congressman KINGSLAND MACY (N. Y.), chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Questionable Trade Practices, and other Government experts claim it is not possible to improve our scrap position from domestic sources alone. In other words, we need more scrap to increase steel production

than our industrial sources can salvage. Perhaps you wonder why producers of housewares and appliances pay high prices for steel and often have to get it in the black market. The experts point out that worse than this, our scrap shortage is a serious threat to our national security. Somebody is stock-piling scrap and it isn't the United States. Let's see who it is.

Congressman MACY wrote me on December 1, 1948:

"Our local scrap is already in a sense stockpiled in that it is in the country and can always be secured, better under an emergency than under stimulated advertisement at this time. Besides, in stock-piling our own scrap, we may be lulled into a false sense of security and thereby fail to take advantage of bringing back the quantities of this important ingredient from abroad when our ships are coming back empty.

"You will recall that when we were together I pointed out that during all the fine swimming weather this summer, there was an embargo on the German Ruhr scrap, due to conflict of ideas between various United States Government Departments and their representatives on the other side. While it is United States money that is being used all over abroad, in this case we found it used to bid against our own merchants in the purchase of this German scrap, with the result that this may have been responsible for the embargo. It would seem that some interdepartmental conference at top levels could be developed in this country that would adequately solve so important a question to our peace and war economies as a comfortable stock pile of scrap steel suitable for maintaining the high level steel production now prevailing. Yes, to answer your question General Clay has lifted the embargo and ships are on the high seas returning with steel scrap, which is why our mills here are now running at record capacity. The flow is not nearly as great as it should be, nor was the allocation agreement with Great Britain anything like fair since that country has already taken free over 800,000 tons of booty scrap."

Our Government admits that out of 10,000,000 tons of rubble scrap surplus in the western zone of Germany, Britain got 800,000 tons free for nothing. Under pressure General Clay finally allotted 440,000 tons for United States buyers in June 1948. In July, United States got 9,500 tons, in August 24,000 tons, in October 51,000 tons. Then a stalemate ended the flow of scrap to United States from Germany. After General Clay lifted the embargo in November 1948, United States steel producers paid a fancy market price for German scrap.

United States buyers have to bid against Germans, English, and Italians who use United States money (Marshall plan) to outbid United States buyers for German scrap. Much of this German scrap finds its way into Russia. We have paid as high as $50 a ton for scrap worth $20 a ton. The price is now about $28.50.

Alex Miller, vice president of Columbia Iron Metal Co. (scrap dealers), is a special consultant to the Department of Commerce. Mr. Miller told business-paper editors at the Hotel Pierre that the United States steel industry last year lost 3,000,000 ingot tons of steel due to the lack of scrap.

American scrap dealers have driven a hard bargain with the steel industry. Many have traded scrap, not for money but for sheet steel which they sold in the gray market at unbelievable profits. The Macy committee described the profits of the gray marketeers exploiting the steel shortage and the demand for scrap as fantastic profits running into millions of dollars. The committee reported that from 10 to 12 percent of strip and sheet steel was diverted from the Nation's total steel production into the gray market. So now you know.

Some irate folks in the housewares and appliance industry tell us that Paul Hoffman should trade Germany food for scrap and should cut off all countries that use our ECA money to exploit us. Our answer is, tell it to Mr. Truman, who threatened in his state of the Union speech to put the United States into the steel business if production did not increase.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, permit me to direct the attention of my colleagues to the action taken by the board of directors of the Brooklyn Jewish Community Council on February 14, 1949, with reference to Cardinal Mindszenty. At that meeting the council adopted the following resolution:

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council expresses its concern over the threat to religious freedom involved in the trial and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of the Roman Catholic Church in Hungary, and Bishop Jajos Ordos of the Lutheran Church in Hungary.

The Brooklyn Jewish Community Council, which is dedicated to the American democratic concept of full religious freedom for all men, takes this occasion to register its protest against any form of religious persecution, no matter against whom directed. We express our abhorrence of so-called totalitarian justice which disguises religious persecution as prosecution on political grounds.

Regulation W Should Be Relaxed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, regulation W as applied to sales of new and used automobiles is creating a widespread hardship on prospective buyers, and has already caused a rapid decline in the sales of cars because of the stringent credit restrictions it imposes.

I am receiving many letters from my constituents who find the monthly payments are too high under regulation W and they cannot buy the car they need. The present restrictions imposed on the purchase of automobiles discriminates against many persons of good character with good credit who need cars for transportation, but cannot purchase them with the high monthly payments required under regulation W.

When the Eightieth Congress reinstated authority to the Federal Reserve Board to issue regulations for credit control, the act provided elasticity of authority so that the Board could alter consumer-credit controls in keeping with the changing times, and it was my understanding that the Federal Reserve Board would relax these controls when supply caught up with demand.

In the automotive industry this status is now being reached, but in spite of this fact, the Federal Reserve Board has not indicated any intention of considering a change in regulation W as it applies to the sale of automobiles.

Since the Federal Reserve Board has failed to act to alleviate a credit squeeze in the automobile industry caused by regulation W which will have a depressing effect on business in general and may cause further declines in the automotive market which would lead to widespread lay-offs and business failures in that field, I have introduced H. R. 1552, a bill which would eliminate the drastic credit restrictions imposed on the sale of automobiles under regulation W and would permit prospective buyers to purchase cars with a monthly payment within the limitation of their monthly budgets.

I believe there is an urgent need for immediate relief from the restrictions imposed on automobile sales by regulation W for the car purchaser and the dealer, and I ask that the Members of the House give early consideration to legislation for this relief.

The following is a copy of my bill, H. R. 1552, and a copy of my letter to Chairman Thomas B. McCabe of the Federal Reserve Board requesting that his Board act to amend or remove regulation W as it applies to automobile sales:

[H. R. 1552, 81st Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill relating to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to impose consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles.

Be it enacted, etc., That in the exercise of consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall not require a minimum down payment of more than 25 percent and shall not limit the maximum maturity (irrespective of the principal amount of the credit) to a period of less than 24 months.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1949.

THOMAS B. McCABE,
Chairman, Board of Governors,
Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCABE: I am receiving many letters from my constituents who are appealing for relief from the stringent restrictions of regulation W as it applies to the purchase of new and used automobiles. Consequently I have introduced H. R. 1552, a copy of which is enclosed, which has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and may be referred to your Board for an opinion.

Prospective purchasers state that the monthly payments under regulation W are too high, and they, therefore, cannot buy cars now. The dealers in both the new- and used-car fields are in turn finding their market drastically curtailed.

The reinstatement of authority to the Federal Reserve Board to issue regulations for credit control by the Eightieth Congress provided elasticity of authority so that your Board could alter consumer credit controls in keeping with the changing times, and it was my understanding that the Federal Reserve Board would relax these controls when supply caught up with demand.

In the automotive industry this status is being reached, but regardless of this fact your Board has not indicated any intention of considering a change in regulation W as it applies to the sale of automobiles.

Because of the obvious present hardship in the automobile industry under regulation W which is creating a credit squeeze which, if not alleviated, will have a depressing effect on business in general, I believe your Board should give this matter immediate attention. I sincerely urge you to take whatever steps are necessary to amend or remove regulation W as it applies to automobile sales to prevent further declines in the automotive market which would lead to widespread lay-offs and business failures in that field.

Very truly yours,

GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
Fifteenth District of California.

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 18, 1949]

THE QUESTION OF REGULATION W

The Federal Reserve Board restrictions on installment buying—known as regulation W—are coming increasingly under fire, particularly from those who believe a slackening off of business is under way. These people argue that if this restriction were done away with, the market for automobiles and for other items customarily bought on time payments would widen, and a depression might thus be avoided.

There is force in the argument. But additionally there is the grave question of whether such restrictions ought to be imposed at all in time of peace, since they are obviously incompatible with a free-enterprise system.

Regulation W was reimposed last September 20 as an anti-inflation measure. Restrictions on credit had been imposed during the war for quite a different reason: to divert production away from civilian goods and toward war goods, and whether or not they were justified or necessary, they were accepted by the public as part of the war set-up. They faded away at war's end and were put back on the theory that too easy credit led to too much demand in certain categories of goods and hence boosted prices.

Now, it is contended, any justification for their continuance has evaporated. There are lots of radios, phonographs, television sets, washing machines, refrigerators, and the like in the market and even the automobile makers are catching up with demand, and the restrictions should be lifted to enable them to be sold more readily.

While most economists think the possible effect of easier consumer credit toward warding off a depression has been exaggerated, there does not seem to be any good reason for continuing regulation W.

One of the main reasons for its abandonment is that it rests on a false assumption. This assumption is that the Federal Reserve Board knows more about what is good for the public than the public does. The merchant, who is on the ground and has the most immediate information, or the local banker or credit manager, knows more about what a particular customer can or cannot afford than any board in Washington or elsewhere can possibly learn. Furthermore, a rule which may accurately fit the average situation of the average individual cannot justly apply to everybody, since very few persons will be average.

The regulation does not take into account what may be the individual's particular requirements. He may need a car desperately to enable him to earn a living, yet can't rustle up the down payment. If credit were a matter of private arrangement such a man could no doubt find someone who would sell him a vehicle on relaxed terms; under regulation W he is cut off at the pockets.

Regulation W insists that the down payment on a car be at least one-third and that the remainder be paid in 18 months. On furniture the payment may be one-fifth, the contract to be paid off in 15 months, unless it is more than $1,000, in which case 18 months are allowed. Usual contract terms before the war allowed 24 months on practically all purchases, with smaller down payments.

That some foolish individuals will buy what they cannot afford, and some foolish merchants will extend credit to the wrong people, if there are no restrictions, is true enough. But who in Washington is wise enough to set the restrictions at the correct level?

In the case of housing, where people are much more apt to go in beyond their depth, credit terms are much more liberal. Some houses can be bought for as little as 5 percent down with the balance running for 30 years. Regulation W is being circumvented in some cases of household appliances, where a washing machine or refrigerator or range is furnished as part of the house and included in the housing loan.

It is very doubtful if regulation W is accomplishing any desirable purpose, at least under present conditions. If it is not abolished outright, at least there should be some relaxing of the restrictions.

George Washington Is Our True Guide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have not only made it a practice each year for the last 30 years to listen to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address in the House of Representatives but I have read it and pondered over it many times each year. The principles which he enunciates and the advice which he gives to the people who wish to enjoy and retain liberty under law are requisite to the perpetuity of our form of free government.

We are the trustees of a great heritage which it is our privilege to enjoy and our duty and responsibility to protect and ultimately transmit to the next generation stronger, better, more virile than it was transmitted to us.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a recent editorial by William Griffin, editor and publisher of the New York Enquirer:

WILLIAM GRIFFIN SAYS GEORGE WASHINGTON IS OUR TRUE GUIDE

The parting words of Washington concerning our domestic affairs and our relations with the rest of the globe resound in the National Capital each year when Members of both Senate and House listen to the recital of his Farewell Address in celebration of the birthday of the greatest of all Americans.

In view of the fact that our lawmakers stubbornly refuse, year in and year out, to conform to the standards of statecraft and patriotism enunciated in that immortal pronouncement of the Nation's first President, its annual recital in House and Senate only serves to emphasize the gravity of their infidelity to its teachings.

The Father of his Country was a nationalist.

He gloried in the American name.

It was his heart's desire to see America stand on her own feet at all times, confident and self-reliant, working out her destiny in her own way, and demonstrating to the Old World and the New the manifold blessings to be derived from life as lived in this land of liberty and opportunity for all.

Congress has long ceased to be the nationalist institution which Washington so ardently hoped it would always be. It is now the most powerful internationalist body in the world.

The man to whom the Republic renders homage every year on February 22, was the military commander who led the nationalists of 1776 in their triumphant revolt against unjust taxation at the hands of a European power.

He and they confidently thought that they had forever freed our country from the servitude of unwarranted imposts.

Were they here today they would find that we are the tax slaves, not of one European country, but of the whole world.

Who is responsible for this appalling state of affairs? None other than the Congress of the United States of America, whose duty it was and is and ever will be to protect and perpetuate the multiple boons won for this Republic by George Washington and his fellow nationalists of the War of Independence.

In dissipating the resources of our country for the advantages of other nations, Congress cannot justly plead that it is promoting the cause of liberty abroad.

Take the case of Britain, the land from whose exploitation George Washington's leadership was supposed to have liberated us for all time.

A Socialist regime was established there by popular vote in 1945, after socialism had been crushed in Germany at an unprecedented cost, in blood and wealth, to the American people.

Since then Congress has voted huge sums of taxpayers' cash for the purpose of sustaining Britain's Socialist Government. That Government, according to no less a Briton than former Prime Minister Churchill, detests our American way of life while cheerfully accepting the billions of American dollars handed over to it by acts of Congress.

This is a proud boast for our Legislature, which listens once a year to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address and spends the rest of its time violating its precepts.

But Britain is not the only land wherein Congress is buttressing socialism by levying heavy imposts upon the earnings of Americans.

Socialism is the dominating force in that part of Europe enjoying the benefits of the Marshall plan, while millions of our people are suffering from privations that are a disgrace to the American name.

A recent statement of the president of the University of Illinois, Dr. George D. Stoddard, discloses that the Marshall plan is providing some regions of Europe with houses and school buildings superior to those of many communities here at home.

This is a thought-provoking example of the manner in which our tax-levying body discriminates against Americans in carrying out its program of bankrupting the Republic so that socialism, one of the leading foes of mankind's well-being, can have its authoritarian way abroad, while it insidiously exerts itself within our own land.

Our "rulers" in the city named in honor of America's greatest nationalist tell us that it is necessary to resort to extraordinary measures and expenditures in order to give encouragement to foreign nations. They are trying to do, what George Washington warned against their attempting, namely, to purchase the friendship and cooperation of other governments and peoples.

Three and a half decades of costly internationalism have gained for our country nothing but contempt and hatred. Today the American name is detested abroad as never before and the rights of man, for which Washington and his fellow nationalists sacrificed so much, are imperiled as never before.

Nothing could be more groundless or un-American than the internationalist plea that circumstances have fundamentally changed since Washington's day, and that consequently the standards which he prescribed for us are no longer applicable.

Those standards, like truth itself, are immutable and eternal.

Equally fallacious are the internationalist arguments that we are living on a shrunken globe and must accommodate ourselves to it by embracing one-worldism if we are to survive. The world is as large today as it ever was, and American citizenship is as proud and precious and indispensable for Americans as it ever was.

It is precisely because the standards prescribed for America and Americans by George Washington have been abandoned that the Republic is imperiled and disheartened as it is in 1949.

The American people deserve encouragement from their "rulers." All they are getting is heavy taxation and promises of still heavier taxation, in order that the socializers of the land of Washington can transform them into robots of their Government, instead of their being its governors as the Father of his Country intended they should always be.

Our greatest worry is, not what is going to happen to foreign lands, but what will be the fate of the land which gave America and the whole world the man known as George Washington.

The American Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press for February 23, 1949:

THE AMERICAN DISGRACE—OUR GREATEST DANGER: FINANCIAL ROCKS AHEAD

This country is faced with the gravest danger in its history.

It is a disaster worse than war.

For we have always been able before to rebuild after war and to grow mightier.

That time has gone.

The imminent danger with which we are confronted transcends all political differences.

It is not a question of Republicans against Democrats or New Dealers against Old Dealers. It is not a conflict between unions and management. It has nothing to do with the progress of social security, national health or any other controversial question.

The cold stark ugly fact is that the United States is rapidly drifting into national bankruptcy.

Unless something is done to stem the tide we will be, within a very few years, no better off than the nations of Europe.

It is this condition for which the Moscow Communists are patiently and hopefully waiting.

They know what is coming unless we wake up. They can well afford to wait.

Who will be reponsible for this national collapse?

Let's be honest about it. We have all been guilty.

No party, no class, no group has brought these conditions about.

We have drifted into it from generation to generation.

The insidious enemy which is serving Moscow as the deadliest of fifth columnists is mismanagement.

It is bitterly ironic—but a great laugh for Stalin—that America upon whose altars we have placed the god of efficiency is dying of dry rot because of gross and stupid inefficiency.

The most powerful business corporation in the United States would go into bankruptcy within a year if it were so wretchedly managed as is the business of our Federal Government today.

There is this difference, however: The private corporation, mismanaged and criminally extravagant, would pay for its own sins and go broke; but the Government does not go out of business. It simply borrows more money which has to be paid through taxation until all business ceases, the factories remain idle, and the people starve.

That is the history of all mismanaged nations since civilization began.

We are now rapidly coming to that period.

Only courage and vision can save us.

Again, this newspaper states as emphatically as possible: This is not a party issue.

We are the victims of our own follies and the follies of past generations.

The guilt rests with both parties and all classes. We thought our wealth would never end.

Today the President of the United States, a Democrat, is working shoulder to shoulder with the only living ex-President, a Republican, to save America.

Never in all our history has there been a more completely nonpolitical approach to the prevention of so great a tragedy. Here, in brief, is the picture:

Eighteen years ago it cost $4,600,000,000 to run the Federal Government.

Today it costs $41,858,000,000.

Under President Hoover there were 300 agencies.

Today there are 1,800.

The reason for this?

Lack of organization and the fight of the bureaucrats of both parties to block reform.

In 1931 Hoover begged Congress to give him authority to get the Government on a working basis. Both Republicans and Democrats rejected the proposal for just one reason:

It might affect the soft jobs of political parasites of both parties.

Ten times Hoover pleaded and 10 times was he refused.

Red tape was killing the Nation.

When Roosevelt came in he was granted powers to meet the depression emergency, but when he asked for power to reorganize he was met with the same stone wall of personal selfish opposition.

With the second war over in 1945 it was obvious to everybody regardless of party affiliations that something had to be done.

President Truman and the Congress agreed.

To eliminate politics it was also agreed that there should be six Democrats and six Republicans on a commission to draw up a plan of reform.

It was unanimously agreed that Herbert Hoover was the one man in all the United States best qualified to head the group.

Mr. Hoover is 73 years of age. He has no political ambitions of any kind. Regardless of party lines he has served the Nation under President Truman faithfully and brilliantly both in war and peace.

The Commission has drawn the best brains from all walks of life in the United States.

Never before, not even in time of war, has there been such a galaxy of experts on management.

For 2 years these experts have studied our Government. Now they have ready 15 separate reports. All of these mesh into one magnificent presentation of what is needed to save us from national bankruptcy and to meet Moscow.

No American of intelligence can read these reports without gasping in horror at our dangers.

Yet there is a grave possibility that the greatest task of its kind ever accomplished in the history of America will go for naught.

The mean and petty politicians of both parties are seeking to destroy it for their own selfish ends.

As Hoover stated to the Senate committee, the danger is as it was in all other such efforts, "They died of grasshopper bites."

Here, then, is the call to the American people of every honest shade of political belief.

Here is the challenge to save us from the fate for which Moscow is waiting.

Shall we continue to drift?

Or shall we be aroused in time by a mighty outburst of public sentiment?

The people of America have crusaded for war bonds, for Red Cross, for Community Chests, for every worthy effort devised by the mind of man.

Twice in one generation they have gone to war to fight for human liberty. They have poured forth the lifeblood of their youth and their treasure. They have willingly and without protest taken upon their backs the most staggering burden of debt history has ever recorded.

Has all this been in vain?

The Bible has said that where there is no vision the people perish.

Will the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the AFL and the CIO, the church leaders of all denominations, every civic-minded group, every noonday club, every individual citizen, unite as we have always done in war, to campaign against the evil which is destroying us?

Will there come a clarion call for battle?

Only public opinion can save the United States from the bureaucrats who stifle us.

The politicians of neither party will move unless they hear the mighty roar of an aroused populace. That is what they dread, the only thing they fear.

"Public sentiment is everything," said Lincoln. "With public sentiment nothing can fail. Without it nothing can succeed."

Our one hope is the people themselves.

Facing the Communist horde, surrounded as we are by darkness and chaos across the world, this must be a holy crusade, a fight for God, for country, and for humanity.

One Escape Still Open From Civil-Rights Deadlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Louisville Courier-Journal is one of America's outstanding newspapers. Its editorial columns have repeatedly contained strong endorsements of the civil-rights program. Now the editor, Mr. Barry Bingham, urges acceptance of my proposed compromise. His statement of February 24 is a significant one, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include his editorial of that date:

ONE ESCAPE STILL OPEN FROM CIVIL-RIGHTS DEADLOCK

Congress is building up to another filibuster fight. The thunder of the approaching storm is already heard rolling across the congressional halls, and the Nation stands poised, and helpless, waiting for the unhealing, destructive rain of oratory. Is there any way to avoid this deluge of bitterness?

The only escape would lie in finding a quick and respectable compromise on the civil-rights issue. If is this issue, of course, that inspires the filibuster. If the administration's program on civil rights continues to confront Congress in its present form, a filibuster is inevitable. Nobody will gain from it, everybody will suffer discredit. The South will be blamed for stalling important legislation and for maintaining the hard tyranny of a minority through a parliamentary device. Such isolation can only be deeply damaging to the South. The rest of the Nation will present a picture of helpless anger and frustration. The Democratic Party will be revealed as hopelessly divided. Even the Republican Party stands to gain no credit, for its record on civil rights has been long on promises, short on performance.

Is a compromise still possible, before passion completely takes over the congressional scene? The only possible proposal would have to come from the South, and from the ranks of the more liberal southern Democrats, who know the full force of tradition in race relations, but who still hate to see the South reduced to angry resistance against the rest of the Nation. Such a liberal southerner is Representative BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas. He has made a specific proposal for a compromise on civil rights.

Reduced to its barest outlines, his proposition takes this shape: First, Federal action on segregation, limited only to interstate movements; second, repeal of the poll tax by constitutional amendment, not by statute; third, antilynching legislation, placing full responsibility on the governor and attorney general of any State in which a lynching occurs, and providing for Federal intervention only if these officials fail in their duty; and fourth, provision of a counseling service in the Department of Labor on fair employment practices, in place of a permanent FEPC.

Nobody will agree with every detail of these proposals. Southern traditionalists will insist that the least surrender will open the way to full social equality for Negroes. Agitators will scream against any compromise that might work to reduce tensions between the races, since they want continued agitation, not a settlement. Many sincere liberals, both white and Negro, will argue that the full civil-rights program is a moral principle and that justice cannot be divided.

This newspaper is not happy over every aspect of the Hays program. We stated our conviction some weeks ago, however, that half a loaf of civil-rights legislation in the Eighty-first Congress would be better than no loaf at all. We asserted our belief that Congress would not pass a full antisegregation law or a permanent FEPC in the present divided state of American opinion, and that such statutes could not now be enforced in the South if passed.

We believe, on the other hand, that Federal legislation against the poll tax and lynching is essential to our position as the leading democratic nation of the world. We would be willing to accept the constitutional amendment method to end the poll tax. It would be somewhat slower than direct legislation, but it would be sure, and it would save southern "face" on an issue which many southerners would like to be rid of.

It is possibly not too late to win support for such a compromise as Representative HAYS suggests. Before the hopeless and purely negative battle is joined on the Truman civil-rights program, there might still be time to win concessions from the less violent southern Democrats. What is needed is a positive approach. If liberals throughout the country would now rally to general support of the Hays compromise, they might lift the issue right up out of the mire into which it is sinking.

Nobody likes to surrender, but it is easier when both sides in a fight surrender something. The alternative is a battle poisoned with sectional bitterness, no legislation on civil rights of any kind, and exposure to the world of a United States grievously disunited.

Railroad Freight Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith copy of a resolution introduced in the New York State Assembly by Assemblyman Richard H. Knauf, of Binghamton, N. Y.:

Whereas the number of employees recently laid off by railroad companies throughout the country is reaching alarming proportions; and

Whereas the reason advanced by the carriers is the reduced revenues, particularly from the hauling of freight which is alleged to have drastically decreased since the beginning of the year; and

Whereas the unemployment of a vast number of railroad men, causing undue hardship to their families is of great concern to the Nation as well as to the people of the State of New York; and

Whereas the entire problem of railroad freight charges has been a troublesome question, and if conditions are permitted to continue additional unemployment will result and the transportation system of the country will be seriously impaired: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to appoint a congressional committee to thoroughly investigate and make a study of the conditions in the railroad industry in general and the question of railroad freight charges in particular, to the end that appropriate legislation may be enacted by Congress to remedy the present unsatisfactory situation; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate, the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.

Let the Record Be Kept Straight on Graeme K. Howard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, there was recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, which contained slurring references concerning one of America's foremost industrialists, a man of proven patriotism.

I refer to Mr. Graeme K. Howard, vice president and general manager, international division, Ford Motor Co., and recently named president of the new Ford International Co.

Mr. Howard has sent me a statement concerning that article. I include it in the RECORD in order that the full facts may be known by all:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2 contains an article inserted by Representative GEORGE SADOWSKI, of Michigan, in which the following paragraph appears:

"The history of General Motors' activities in Germany is indeed a book in itself * * * as far back as 1945, when the Foreign Economic Administration was working on the problem of Germany, the man who fought most vigorously on behalf of the German industrialists was Graeme Howard, General Motors representative in Germany during the Hitler regime. Most Americans are not aware of Howard's pro-German activities, but the FEA was, and it was only through constant pressure on the White House and the Army that Mr. Howard was finally relieved of his position."

There is no foundation whatsoever for this statement.

The facts are as follows:

I went to Washington at the request of General Frink, Chief of the Motor Transport Division, on or about January 1, 1942, as a consultant. At that time I was vice president of General Motors in charge of their international operations. I agreed to come to Washington for 60 days, taking a leave of absence without pay.

At the end of 60 days, however, I found myself so involved that I felt I could not in good faith leave the job on which I had started to return to General Motors. In view of the General Motors rule that a leave of absence without pay could not extend beyond 90 days, I resigned from General Motors Corp. March 31, 1942. This was after some 25 years with that corporation. I was appointed Deputy Chief, Motor Transport Division, with the rank of colonel in the Army of the United States.

Between that time and October 1944, I served in the following posts: Chief of the Control Division of the Tank Automotive Center, Detroit; Director of Spare Parts, Ordnance Division; Deputy Chief, Tank Automotive Center; American head (Civil Affairs), SHAEF mission (Norway).

In October 1944 I became Chief, Economic Division, United States Control Council (Germany). In this capacity I was responsible for military government planning in the economic sphere.

About January 1, 1945, I came to Washington from my European headquarters on official business. The day following my arrival at the Pentagon Building, I requested General Hilldring, G–5 on General Marshall's staff, to accept my resignation at his earliest convenience. That same day in conference with Assistant Secretary of War, John Jay McCloy, I likewise requested that my resignation be accepted.

I submitted my resignation for the following reasons:

1. My wife's health was a source of real concern.

2. As a consequence of my long military service, my personal situation compelled me to look ahead and plan for the education of my three children and the maintenance of my wife.

3. By the time my resignation could be processed, I would have served almost 4 years with the armed forces.

4. Finally, I found myself in disagreement with JCS Directive 1067 (embracing many

elements of the Morgenthau plan). It seemed to me desirable that someone sympathetic to this policy be named to my position.

Both General Hilldring and Secretary McCloy then and for several weeks thereafter declined to accept my resignation.

Secretary McCloy and General Hilldring agreed finally to accept my resignation provided I would assist in arranging for a suitable successor.

Col. W. H. Draper (subsequently major general and recently Under Secretary of War) was eventually persuaded—by me, among others—to accept the appointment as Chief of the Economic Division, United States Control Council (Germany).

This information was relayed to the European theater with the suggestion that I remain in Washington to brief Colonel Draper and to assist him in the procurement of personnel.

A cabled reply was received the same day over the signature of Gen. W. Bedell Smith, Chief of Staff, declining to agree to the proposal and ordering my immediate return to the theater. I flew back the next day.

On return to the European theater I again pressed for acceptance of my resignation but was not able to secure acceptance until some 2 months later. I returned to Washington by air sometime on or about April 1, 1945.

Coincident with my return to the United States, Gen. Lucius D. Clay was appointed Commanding General, United States Control Council (Germany). General Clay urged me to agree to continue in the service, and successively proposed the following assignments:

His representative on the Reparations Commission at Moscow. (Estimated time, 3 months.)

Assistant to then Colonel Draper and himself for a period of 6 months (Berlin).

Service in General Clay's rear echelon in Washington where there was a problem of coordination of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Department of State, FEA, and Treasury all of which had a hand in the German occupation situation.

For the reasons already given to Secretary McCloy and General Hilldring, and despite my strong personal admiration for General Clay, I regretfully declined.

However, I did agree to continue in the service to assist General Clay and Colonel Draper in securing suitable personnel to staff the Control Council for Germany which, up to this point, had been a planning rather than an operating group. In this capacity I assisted in the recruitment of some 200 civilians and officers. My official resignation finally became effective August 25, 1945.

Summarizing, it is quite patent that Representative SADOWSKI has been grossly misinformed.

From the foregoing record it is obvious that it was I who initiated action to be relieved of my position as Chief of the Economic Division, Control Council for Germany, and that this was granted only after persistent and repeated requests.

With reference to the assertion that I advocated the restoration of German industry, it is quite true that I believed such restoration was necessary for peaceful purposes not only on behalf of the German people but, more importantly, for the benefit of Europe and for the relief of the American taxpayer. It is gratifying to note that current United States policy supports this view.

However, in my opinion, the restoration of German production must be accomplished in such manner as to insure against disturbing the peace of the world for a third time. The problem of the revitalization of German industry and the political problem of insuring peace are not mutually exclusive; on the contrary, it is my belief that the harmonization of both of these ends not only must be, but can be, effected.

GRAEME K. HOWARD,
Vice President and General Manager, International Division, Ford Motor Co.

The Nasty Head of Scurrility Shows Through AMA Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under consent I am inserting in the RECORD another brilliant editorial from the New York Post which exposes the bad faith and low ethical standards of some of the most rabid opponents of an intelligent and comprehensive approach to national health and welfare, and by implication exposes equally the presence of active and virulent discrimination in organized medicine. Many of us have long been aware of the fact that the AMA has imposed un-American quota systems on admissions to schools under the monopolistic control of the AMA.

Today their bias is showing.

As this editorial states, continued relentless sabotage of the President's proposal for national health insurance by the American Medical Association may eventually lead to real socialized medicine—a scare term the AMA now erroneously uses to characterize all-inclusive, prepaid medical care. Under actual socialized medicine, all United States physicians would become salaried, Government employees, subject to complete Government control. Under the proposed system of national health insurance, no doctor is compelled to join the program if he does not desire to do so.

I believe that in order to maintain the high quality of our medical profession and still extend its benefits to all our people, a system of national health insurance is essential.

IS THE AMA ASKING FOR IT?

In some quarters, the fight against President Truman's proposed national health-insurance program is leaning heavily on veiled appeals to religious bias, rather than reason.

According to Albert Deutsch and Oliver Pilat in yesterday's Post Home News, the once-discredited National Physicians Committee (largely financed by drug firms, not M. D.'s) has crawled out from under a rock to engage in a vicious mail campaign against any Federal health-insurance plan.

The NPC is sending Protestant ministers, dentists, and physicians a particularly noxious sheet, known as Dan Gilbert's Washington Letter.

Mr. Gilbert begins his letter with "Dear Christian American" (we never knew the word American could be religiously qualified) and falsely implies that the insurance program would force Americans to practice birth control and yet would somehow compel American women to produce bumper crops of children, at the same time.

A difficult feat, indeed. Particularly if Margaret Sanger's methods were made to prevail, which would not be the case.

The National Physicians Committee is directed mainly by ex-presidents of the American Medical Association and once received the AMA's endorsement.

The committee's recourse to biased and completely nonsensical attacks may indicate that after the AMA has smeared Federal health insurance by mislabeling it socialized medicine, it has nothing more to say.

And, unable to think of valid objections to the Truman plan, the AMA apparently sits by, unprotestingly, while an outfit which has received its approval, tries to floor the program with foul blows.

Needless to say, many doctors are thoroughly disgusted with the AMA's attitude and its recent decision to raise $3,500,000 to fight national health-insurance legislation.

On the surface, it may be difficult to understand why the ruling clique within the AMA has declared war on Truman's health plan. Particularly since Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing has stated that at least 325,000 deaths a year could be prevented by better medical care.

No doctor would be compelled to join the program.

And, financed by a negligible pay-roll tax on both employer and employee, the proposed program would make only two changes in the customary doctor-patient relationship.

First, after finding out which doctors, hospitals, and druggists in his community had agreed to practice in the system (at fixed fees contracted between themselves and the Government), a patient could freely choose to use any or all of the services offered.

Second, participating doctors would receive their checks from the Government, rather than the patient.

Under socialized medicine all United States physicians would become salaried Government employees, subject to complete Government control.

The Truman-Ewing program obviously is not socialized medicine.

It is simply a humane method by which American wage earners could repay for complete medical care.

Moreover, the program, by making adequate medical attention available to most Americans, would help to cure the conditions which—if allowed to fester—might eventually force the United States to socialize medicine.

The AMA officials probably don't really oppose national health insurance because they think it would bolshevize medicine. They must know better than that.

They may be fighting the plan because it could offer young doctors a chance to build their practices without being overly ruled by the arbitrary demands of some older doctors—who would turn their profession into an exclusive club where they wield strangling power.

But if the AMA succeeds in pigeonholing health-insurance legislation; if it continues to sanction with its silence the NPC's antidemocratic diatribes; it will be foolishly asking, even pleading, for nationalized medicine.

Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association has consistently opposed virtually every progressive step in the organization and distribution of medical services in the past generation. Concurrently, they are trying to raise three and one-half million dollars from their membership to use in preventing passage of the proposed health-insurance plan.

Mr. Albert Deutsch has written an excellent column on this subject which ap-

peared February 1 in the New York Post and Home News, which I am also inserting under the same consent:

WAY OF THE AMA

(By Albert Deutsch)

Dr. Morris Fishbein, factotum of the American Medical Association, has not only decried national health insurance as a Red conspiracy, he has denounced old-age and unemployment insurance as "a definite step toward either communism or totalitarianism." When United States Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER in 1939 introduced a bill authorizing Federal aid for hospital construction—a principle adopted 5 years later when Congress passed the Hill-Burton Act with AMA approval—Dr. Fishbein applied a thick coat of "red" paint to it.

In an address delivered to a conference of State medical society officials on behalf of the AMA board of trustees, Dr. Fishbein warned:

"The introduction into this Nation of a Federal security plan whereby the Nation itself, as a Federal agency, will step intimately into the sickness and life of every person in the country will be the first step in the break-down of American democracy. Indeed, all forms of compulsory security, even against old age and unemployment, represent a beginning invasion by the state into the personal life of the individual, a weakening of national caliber, a definite step toward either communism or totalalitarianism.

Both Dr. Fishbein and the AMA would now be enjoying a far more respectful lay audience if they hadn't cried wolf at virtually every progressive step in the organization and distribution of medical services during the past generation.

Organized medicine opposed workmen's compensation laws as inroads on medical freedom when they were first introduced in State legislatures. Now the medical societies not only accept workmen's compensation, they control the medical end in most States.

In 1932, when the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care—headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, a former present of the AMA and Secretary of the Interior in Herbert Hoover's administration—released a report favoring voluntary (private, nonprofit) health insurance for the American people, Dr. Fishbein printed an editorial in the AMA journal denouncing the report as representing socialism and communism—inciting to revolution. When the same distinguished committee advocated group medical practice—where general physicians and specialists pool their skills and equipment under one roof, as at the Mayo Clinic—the AMA charged it with trying to set up medical soviets.

Now, of course, the AMA hierarchy not only enthusiastically advocates voluntary health insurance but it talks as if it fathered the idea. Group practice, too, has become quite acceptable to the hierarchs.

And so it goes. Rarely has a progressive step in medical economics been proposed without the AMA attacking it as certain to deteriorate the quality of medical care, enslave the American physician and dupe the American public. Time after time, following the adoption of a plan thus opposed, the AMA has embraced it as its own and proudly proclaimed that American medical care is the finest in the world.

The test of a truly scientific attitude is its powers of predictability. When the AMA and its State and local satellites have been proven so wrong so often in the past, they lose claim to scientific objectivity in the field of medical economics. Their present attacks on President Truman's health insurance program can be understood properly only in the light of their past mistakes. The medical bourbons never learn and they never forget.

New York Medicine, official organ of the AMA's biggest local affiliate, the New York County Medical Society, broke out in a rash of unaccustomed editorial candor in its January 5 issue when it confessed:

"Ten years ago there was in the medical profession an indiscriminate condemnation of any participation in nonprofit, voluntary prepayment medical care insurance plans.

"Twenty years ago, the same standard attitude was taken when Governor Smith advocated the medical provisions of the workmen's compensation law. In both instances, the medical profession, as is to be expected, incurred public suspicion of self-interest. Allowing for a reasonable number of exceptions, this generalization is a safe one."

Substitute for "medical profession" the more accurate term "organized medicine"—and there you have it.

Resolution by Alabama State Board of Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Alabama State Board of Public Welfare has passed three significant resolutions. In order that these decisions may be given the proper attention I include them as a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Whereas the Federal grants-in-aid program provided by the Social Security Act does not take into account the relative fiscal ability of each State to finance the public assistance program; and

Whereas the Federal Government now participates in the cost of payments to only certain specified groups—the aged, the blind, and the dependent children; and

Whereas there is need for a public assistance plan whereby all persons in need may receive equitable treatment regardless of where they live; and

Whereas Federal legislation is now pending which, if enacted, would reduce many of these inequities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State board of public welfare, That the commissioner is directed to call to the attention of the Alabama congressional delegation the desirable principles contained in H. R. 2645 (introduced by Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island) and to work with appropriate groups, to the end that necessary changes are made in the Social Security Act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Alabama congressional delegation, to other appropriate groups, and be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

Whereas the social-insurance phases of the Social Security Act provide limited coverage of employees, both as to numbers and as to amounts of benefits; and

Whereas the farmer, self-employed, and other uncovered employees should be insured by old-age and survivors insurance and unemployment insurance; and

Whereas the exclusion of certain types of workers from building up benefits under this program results in a heavy burden of providing assistance to large numbers of people as a result of this limited coverage; and

Whereas the proportionately heavier burden falls on States which are predominantly rural and usually have lower per capita income and consequently fewer resources for providing public assistance; and

Whereas only about 102 per 1,000 of Alabama's population 65 years of age and over are receiving old-age and survivors insurance as compared with 227 per 1,000 in Rhode Island, a highly industrial State: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State board of public welfare reiterates its belief that the social-insurance phases of the Social Security Act be extended both as to persons covered and as to amount of benefits and directs the Commissioner to work with the Alabama congressional delegation and other appropriate groups, to the end that needed changes are made in the Social Security Act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Alabama congressional delegation and to other appropriate groups and be spread on the minutes of this meeting.

Whereas the board has reviewed the needs of people who are the responsibility of the department in relation to present conditions and funds available for public-welfare purposes as well as the way in which these funds are made available under current legislation; and

Whereas the lack of adequate medical care facilities in the State is reflected by the fact that illness or disability of the applicant or some member of the family was the primary reason why more than one-half of the cases approved for aid last year were approved; and

Whereas only about 102 per 1,000 of Alabama's population 65 years of age and over are receiving old-age and survivors' insurance as compared with 227 in Rhode Island, a highly industrial State; and

Whereas the aged population is increasing more rapidly than the total population—an estimated rise of about 10 percent in the aged population as compared with only about 1 percent in the total population in Alabama between 1940 and 1948; and

Whereas despite recent increase in per capita income payments in the State—to $837 as compared with $1,323 for the Nation in 1947—Alabama still ranked fourth from the bottom; and

Whereas the method of financing the public-welfare program both by the Federal Government and within the State results in inequity of treatment of needy individuals as between States and as between localities within the State; and

Whereas the board has adopted resolutions in support of needed amendments designed to broaden and strengthen both the public-assistance and social-insurance phases of the Federal Social Security Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Board of Public Welfare endorses the department's proposed budget for the next biennium and urges that the method of financing within the State be simplified and changed in order to provide a more stable and equitable public-welfare service; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Alabama Legislature and to other appropriate groups, and be spread upon the minutes of this meeting.

GOV. JAMES E. FOLSOM,
Chairman.
Senator BROUGHTON LAMBERTH,
Vice Chairman.
Mrs. GEORGE ADAMS.
Mrs. BESS BAINS.
Mrs. JAMES A. SIMPSON.
Judge WILL O. WALTON.
Senator OLIVER E. YOUNG.

Adopted February 17, 1949.

Selling Oleomargarine as Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the propaganda being spread for the benefit of the oleomargarine monopolies may be fooling millions of people who are not properly informed as to the relative merits of butter and oleo, but those who are being misled will learn the facts later on.

One of the valuable publications which is defending the cause of the farmers and at the same time enlightening the consumers as to what they may expect if the oleo propaganda shall gain the ends of the monopolies, is Hoard's Dairyman, published at Fort Atkinson, Wis. For 64 years that publication has been one of the leading proponents of the great dairy industry of our Nation.

It is with pleasure that I am inserting in the RECORD the comments of W. D. Knox, of the editorial department of Hoard's Dairyman, upon the repeal of the taxes on oleomargarine. His letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1949.

Hon. MERLIN HULL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HULL: In the near future you will be passing judgment on one or more of several bills affecting the dairy and oleomargarine industries. As the only national dairy farm magazine, we feel a deep responsibility to our readers as you feel your responsibility to your constituents. For 63 years we have attempted only to seek out the truth, promote it and defend it, regardless of its popularity.

We have but one request of oleomargarine manufacturers. We ask them to sell their product in its own clothes and on its own merits. They have never agreed to adopt such a policy. In H. R. 1703, we believe you have a most realistic and fair solution to the controversy. All license fees, taxes, and other restrictions are removed. The manufacture and sale of yellow oleo is prohibited.

If the manufacture and sale of yellow oleo is not prohibited, we have concrete evidence of the injustice that will be perpetrated upon American consumers and 2,500,000 dairy farmers. In an El Paso, Tex., grocery, butter and yellow oleo are selling at the same price. White oleo is selling 30 cents cheaper. The tax on yellow oleo is only 10 cents. Where did the other 20 cents go? And where in the future will the housewife find a cheap spread for bread? It appears to us that the 28 oleomargarine manufacturers have every reason to justify their $6,000,000 advertising and public relations expenditure for 1948. Their investment may be returned many times.

In a recent spot check by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, 78 establishments out of 300 were selling yellow oleo as butter. In another impartial survey, 53 restaurants out of 159 in 8 States served yellow oleo as butter when a customer requested butter. Here is clear evidence that the present law is inadequate and that more realistic legislation is needed.

We shall sincerely appreciate your consideration and evaluation of our editorial position. If we can be of any further assistance in providing additional information, please advise us. With kindest regards,

Respectfully yours,

HOARD'S DAIRYMAN,
W. D. KNOX,
Editorial Department.

Economic Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Connersville (Ind.) News-Examiner, issue of February 19, 1949:

IF WE ARE TO HAVE PLANNING IT MUST BE DONE CORRECTLY

A short while back President Truman made a speech in defense of economic planning. He granted that planning was a word that scared certain people. But his contention was that these frightened people were confusing planned economy with controlled economy. The President himself, unless we misread him, seems to see a sharp division between the two.

Yet planning implies a preparation for action. And in a planned course of action there are components that must be directed in such a way that the action comes out according to plan. Otherwise there wouldn't seem to be much sense in planning in the first place.

It may be that Mr. Truman meant that a planned economy is one in which the Government draws up a blueprint and private business voluntarily undertakes the action, with its accompanying controls. A controlled economy, by Mr. Truman's definition, might be one in which the Government would guide the course of action only if business refused to cooperate or failed to achieve the Government's economic goal.

This might explain the stand-by controls that Mr. Truman requested in his state of the Union message. These are part of his economic planning, but apparently are only for use in emergency.

At any rate, we imagine that a planned and controlled economy might be acceptable to the great majority of Americans under certain conditions. If Government planners could somehow guarantee that they could control the business cycle and prevent depressions, and if they could also guarantee that there would be no unfair discrimination against private business, we doubt that the most rugged champion of laissez-faire economics would raise serious objections.

Nobody wants a depression, of course, because nobody gains anything by it in the long run. But can the Government guarantee a preventive? At present, the answer would certainly be no. Government means not only the executive branch but also Congress, which writes the laws and doles out the money. And the last time we looked, there were several divergent economic viewpoints in both these departments.

Some Government economists are worrying about a depressing drop in prices and employment. They produce figures to justify their fears. Others say the danger is still inflation. They also cite figures to prove their point.

To some people planning, like nationalization, is a sort of magic, cure-all word. But planning is simply the opinion of an individual or group of individuals.

There are all sorts of economic planning going on in Government today. But who are the planners? How have their other economic prophecies panned out? What is their objective now? What is the evidence that it is the right one? Mr. Truman and Congress will have to agree on the answers to those questions. It obviously isn't enough just to have a planned economy. It must be correctly planned.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 24, 1949:

UN-AMERICAN ACTION

The House Un-American Activities Committee, butt of much abuse at the hands of President Truman during his campaign last fall, will be continued. There lies before this group a great amount of investigating, and it could even develop, in order to protect the future security of this land over a long period of years, that such a committee would have to be maintained—so that it will become a fixture in the lower House of the Legislature.

Recently, Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS called for appropriations to continue the Un-American Activities Committee. Her inquiries came after she had received a threatening letter, which is only one in a series of incidents over the years that have threatened her.

It is natural that agencies that are working to destroy the American system would choose Congresswoman ROGERS as one of its marked victims, since she represents the finest and best traditions of the country's democratic way of living. She is constantly championing all measures that will guarantee the security of the United States.

She has been threatened by anonymous letters and telephone calls on many occasions; two attempts have been made to poison her, and, it may be recalled by all residents of her fifth district, the communistic elements in this area, although not powerful, were nevertheless lined up solidly in an effort to defeat her reelection.

Other Congressmen of her caliber must receive the same threats and warnings of violence.

If that is the case, the House Un-American Activities Committee should not only be continued, but it should be fortified in many ways so that the Government may be protected, and, as well, those within the Government who are doing their level best to protect this country from subversive forces, controlled in foreign capitals.

Security in Old Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered before the Massachusetts Society of Old-Age Pensions, Salem Branch, Friday, February 18, 1949, at the VFW Hall, 41 Church Street, Salem, Mass.:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, your organization has done much to bring home to Americans the need for providing old-age pensions.

By patient and persistent effort, you have sowed the seeds which are beginning to bear fruit.

It is no exaggeration to say that this is the foremost domestic problem facing our Nation today. Both major political parties are pledged to the goal of complete coverage through social insurance and a higher level of benefits.

Such antagonists as the United States Chamber of Commerce and the big labor unions are not so far apart on this issue, as one might suppose.

Last year Clarence R. Miles, manager of the department of governmental affairs of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in a letter addressed to the Senate committee considering such legislation, said, and I quote: "In particular, the chamber favors an extension of coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, insofar as feasible, to all employees and self-employed persons not now covered thereunder. With substantially complete coverage, the program will approach its objective of providing a basic floor of protection for all against the hazards of old-age dependency and of the premature death of the family breadwinner."

The chamber believes in contributory plans. Other groups favor old-age assistance programs also. Various others want special legislation, such as the veterans, for instance. Even within industry we find some plants which provide pensions for their employees and others which do not. But the point is that there is a steady and increasing demand from all quarters to provide old-age pensions in one form or another.

The original Social Security Act was passed in 1935. This marked the first recognition by our Federal Government that the problem of financial security in old age was one of national concern.

When President Roosevelt signed the act he said, and I quote: "This law, too, represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built, but is by no means complete. It is a structure intended to lessen the force of possible future depressions. It will act as a protection to future administrations against the necessity of going deeply into debt to furnish relief to the needy. The law will flatten out the peaks and valleys of inflation and deflation. It is, in short, a law that will take care of human needs and at the same time provide for the United States an economic structure of vastly greater soundness."

Through old-age insurance it was planned that all Americans would contribute toward their own retirement protection. Employer and employee, through pay-roll taxes, would build up the account. Benefits would be paid as a right which the worker had earned. There would be no need for the aged to swallow their pride and beg help from their relatives or from the local government. Every aged person would be protected against want and humiliation.

In that first year, 1935, there were more than a million aged people who would never again be employed. They could not contribute through pay-roll taxes and thus qualify for insurance.

To take care of this passing situation, old-age-assistance provisions were included in the bill, as distinguished from old-age insurance, to help those already over 65 years of age who were proven to be in need.

Some of the States had old-age-assistance laws, but even these were woefully inadequate. Besides, the States, in the 1930's, did not have the revenues to support such a program. The cities, in turn, were worse off. Old people in desperate circumstances could only apply for that miserable pittance called relief. It was a shameful state of affairs which bothered young and old alike. The dignity of the individual was pauperized. The United States was not prepared to meet the problem. It had to start from scratch.

Through the Social Security Act, Federal funds were provided to increase the resources of the States, the cities, and the towns. This was a revolutionary break with the past, which believed that relief for the aged and others was a local responsibility. But the depression taught us at a heavy price that we are all interdependent. The crisis was individual, magnified a million times, until it became a national tragedy. The Federal Government had to move in to save the day.

Washington matched State payments to needy, aged persons on a dollar-for-dollar basis up to a maximum of $15 of Federal money per recipient per month.

Old-age insurance and old-age assistance were intended, under the act, to ward off the flat, noncontributory pensions of $200 a month proposed by Dr. Townsend and others with similar plans. It succeeded for the time being. In the years since 1935, however, the act itself has been transformed. The formula for old-age-assistance grants has been increased three times, but every proposal to liberalize old-age and survivors insurance has been rejected. Even the States themselves, through legislation and a change in administrative practices, have moved slowly toward the Townsend-like pensions determined by mass-production techniques. This trend is apparent in some of our Western States.

The average assistance payment to a needy person was $38 per month even before the last liberalization of the Federal law. This is two-thirds greater than the $22 average monthly benefit for an aged person under contributory old-age insurance. The spread between the two has steadily widened in favor of the assistance program.

I am certain that the present Congress will increase both coverage and payments under the Social Security Act but the emphasis on old-age assistance cannot be overlooked. Social workers wonder whether this will eventually overwhelm the insurance program and finally result in a flat, general pension for the aged without means tests of contributions.

In 1947, over 200 Congressmen, of which I was one, signed the discharge petition for the latest pension bill. Two hundred eighteen signatures would have forced the bill out of the Rules Committee and to a vote which would decide whether such a bill would become law or not.

Since that time, the power of the Rules Committee to hold up a bill, has been curtailed. Now, the chairman of the committee which favorably reports a bill to the Rules Committee can, after the expiration of a certain time, request that the bill be released and voted upon by the House of Representatives. Under such circumstances, a bill cannot be pigeonholed.

The first major test of this new procedure may come on the bill to provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II. Heretofore, a bill of this nature would never see the light of day. It was easy for some legislators to give lip-service to such a proposition, knowing that it would never come to a vote. Now they may experience embarrassment because they cannot evade the issue. They will be called upon to prove where they stand, and back up their promises by performance. You will be able to see the voting records on some measures which many legislators do not care to face. A controversial issue, like old-age pensions for all, appears to be headed for a show-down.

Believe it or not, but there are some people in Washington who are less concerned with raising the floor of pensions than they are with putting a ceiling on them. Their argument runs something like this. With new social-security legislation coming up, and with labor pushing demands for private pension plans, there is a need for interrelating the two systems. If the present trend continues, the time will come when many workers will receive more in retirement income under combined social security, veteran benefits, and private pension plans than they did when they actually worked. A tax-free Federal pension of $120 a month, with an additional $120 from a union-won pension plan, would yield the worker an income of $240 a month. There are planners who want to establish a ceiling of $200 a month for joint private-public aid. Thus, if a worker received $150 from a private fund, Federal payment would be limited to $50. On the other hand, if his private pension exceeded $200, there would be no Federal payments at all.

It strikes me that this is going far afield. They are ignoring the immediate problem facing you under today's high cost of living.

We know that by 1960, the number of persons 65 years old and over will probably number 18,000,000, or almost 8,000,000 more than today. We appreciate the fact that some planning ahead is necessary. But our problem is of today and tomorrow. Not too many of us will be present to enjoy the solutions of 1960.

The need for old-age assistance is growing, in spite of the insurance benefits. A survey conducted in Boston last year revealed that 17 percent of the men and 26 percent of the women receiving old-age insurance could not make both ends meet. They had to apply for assistance, as well.

Eventually, pay-roll taxes will be raised, and other adjustments made to lift insurance benefits to a decent level. In the meantime, what is to happen to those who must depend upon assistance exclusively?

Perhaps we shall arrive at a system whereby we have an adequate pension floor for everyone, with increased benefits for those who build up additional insurance credits.

That is for the future. Today, we are up against the fact that we are supplying too little, and too late.

It is time for the old-age-assistance program to mature and give our senior citizens a pension that is worthy of the name. Worthy of our human fellowship and worthy of that widespread purchasing power which is necessary to maintain and increase the flow of goods and services which make our economy dynamic.

In keeping with my personal interest in this matter, I have introduced several bills this year which have been referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for consideration.

One, identified as H. R. 460, would amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Another, known as H. R. 462, would amend the act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries.

The third, called H. R. 486, is intended to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation. Revenues to finance such a program will be raised by a 2-percent tax upon the gross dollar value of all business transactions consummated for profit within the United States. In no case shall the pension be less than $75 per month or more than $100 per month. In case the tax revenues for any month are not sufficient to pay the minimum pension, the difference will be adjusted from the United States Treasury. Should the tax returns under this plan be more than sufficient to pay the maximum pension plus administration costs, the surplus shall be turned back to the Treasury. Pensioners will be barred from any employment that brings them within the provisions of the present Social Security Act. The purpose of this restriction is to afford job opportunities for the younger people who will be paying the tax.

I believe that this is largely a Federal responsibility, which would operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, without financial risk to the country at large.

I believe that it is necessary to remove want and fear from the age of retirement until the end of life's journey and confer upon old age the serenity and the dignity to which it is entitled.

I believe that it is national insurance, paid out of the work and wealth of a nation in which all have participated in varying degrees as partners—insurance against poverty and despair.

In foreign affairs our major purpose is to outlaw war so that the world may have security.

At home we can do no less. The uncertainties and the hazards of economic life, over which the individual has little control, is no excuse for penalizing the aged. In countless ways they have contributed to the growth and well-being of our Nation.

We must first put our own house in order. Respect for old age is rank hypocrisy if it exists only as a pious thought. It will have meaning only when we provide the basic security which proves our good intentions.

The message I have tried to bring to you is that the United States is pension-conscious as never before. And this desire is not limited to a particular group.

Senior citizens, middle-aged veterans, younger members of labor unions, all are seeking pensions to provide for present or future needs, as the case may be.

Some are seeking Government pensions; others want industrial pensions.

From our experience with the Social Security Act, we note the growing demand for assistance in old age, rather than insurance for old age.

Without going into the complex factors involved, it is nevertheless clear that we cannot solve the problem in a piecemeal fashion. Whatever voluntary pension systems may be set up on the side are all to the good. Our primary concern must be for over-all coverage, to guarantee individual security in the national interest.

To my mind, a flat pension, available to all at the age of 60, financed by a modest general tax on business transactions, and administered without red tape, is the most practical solution.

And when it comes, the credit for it will be due in no small measure to the patient efforts of organizations such as yours, which never gave up the fight.

For that we can all be grateful.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Shelbyville (Ind.) News dated February 22, 1949, entitled "Aid Means Control":

AID MEANS CONTROL

Now under consideration by the Congress of the United States is a measure which would provide Federal aid to the various States for expansion and maintenance of schools. Such a bill, reviewed "once over lightly," might appear to be a fine thing to many citizens. It contains, however, the same pitfalls which are likely to fool any citizen who is sufficiently naive to believe that Federal aid is "something for nothing."

The News is strongly opposed to any Federal measure which, in operation, calls for putting $100 into the "kitty" and receiving $50 in return. That, in brief, is what most so-called Federal-aid measures actually mean.

Federal aid for schools naturally is favored by those States which find it impossible to keep up with others in providing public education. Those poorer States are in the minority. Perhaps they do need help if they are to maintain their educational systems on the same level as those with more wealth. But under a Federal-aid arrangement, if a certain State needs a million dollars, it may well cost two million by the time the funds collected from other States are channeled through Washington bureaucracy.

There is no such thing as Federal aid without Federal control, and all Federal control tends toward a further removal of government from the hands of the people to the hands of a very few persons.

Many well-meaning people say "Yes, we are for Federal aid, but we are against Federal control and there are no Federal controls in the present proposal in Congress." No controls? Don't be foolish. Federal aid and Federal control go hand in hand. One does not exist without the other.

What do some of our responsible educational leaders think of Federal aid? Well, they think plenty, and what they have to say is most interesting. For instance, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, president of Columbia University, declares that: "The concentration of too much power in centralized government need not be the result of violent revolution or great upheaval. A paternalistic government can gradually destroy, by suffocation in the immediate advantage of subsidy, the will of a people to maintain a high degree of individual responsibility. And the abdiction of individual responsibility is inevitably followed by further concentration of power in the State."

A Shelby County man, Franklin Bobbit, of Waldron, professor emeritus of the University of Chicago, said that: "When the Federal Government takes charge of education with its invisible methods of getting the people's money and its showy ways of exhibiting its generosity in using a part of that money, there probably can never be any turn back to the people control of the people's schools."

Dr. Frank H. Sparks, president of Wabash College, has this to say about Federal aid for education: "Anyone who believes that a State or city can draw Federal funds for the support of its schools and still keep its schools shielded from meddling by Federal bureaucracy runs contrary to the record of experience. Federal aid to schools is a step toward central control of matters that our forefathers saw should be left in the hands of local communities and in the hands of the individual sovereign States. To expect the Federal Government, which has a debt of over $250,000,000,000, to contribute Federal aid to the States which have balanced budgets and most of them surpluses, is an absurdity."

Another big measure to provide more Federal "aid" to the States is another move toward additional centralization of government. Great centralization of government is a mark of the slave States of the past and the present. There are millions of people in the world today who are wearing the chains of dictatorship. Many of them once said, "It can't happen here."

Peace in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of February 25:

PEACE IN PALESTINE

The Governments of Israel and Egypt signed formally at Rhodes yesterday a permanent armistice agreement amounting to a nonaggression pact. This puts an end to the war between them and clears the path to permanent peace in the Holy Land and the whole Middle East. The state of Israel has established itself as a new power whose further existence is now beyond challenge, and Egypt, which was most determined on destroying this new state, has taken the lead among the Arab states in recognizing it by virtue of this compact. The other Arab states can now be expected to follow Egypt's example. All of them have already expressed their willingness to conclude, or to accept, armistice agreements along similar lines.

The Rhodes agreement is primarily a victory for the United Nations, which in the face of all difficulties and disappointments continued to work for peace until the main outlines of its proposals were accepted by both sides. It is also a tribute to the courage of the Israeli army, the moderation of the Israeli Government, and the realism of the Arab states. But in a very special sense it is a tribute to Dr. Bunche, who took over the work of the murdered Count Bernadotte at a critical moment and by his patience, skill, and resourcefulness advanced it to a point which promises a triumphant conclusion.

Much remains to be done to solve the many territorial, political, and economic problems between Israel and her Arab neighbors before peace can be signed and sealed. But, barring outbreaks by extremists on either side, there is every hope that these problems can now be solved by peaceful negotiation instead of the arbitrament of arms. That is all the more necessary because neither Israel nor the Arab states can hope to develop and flourish unless they find ways and means of alleviating the dangerous fragmentation of the Middle East by a firm peace and the closest kind of political and economic cooperation.

Richly Deserved Tribute to Dr. Ralph Bunche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Friday, February 25, carried an editorial tribute to Dr. Ralph Bunche, the mediator appointed by the United Nations to bring peace to the Middle East.

Dr. Bunche was formerly a resident of Washington, and many now in this House knew and liked and admired him in his various official positions.

It makes me especially happy to insert this editorial in the RECORD because the Post, with a civilized and democratic attitude which all of us could emulate, made no special mention of the fact that Dr. Bunche is a member of an American minority frequently assailed, oppressed, and exploited in our country. I am making mention of Dr. Bunche's racial antecedents, not to stress the fact, but to accent the graciousness of the Post tribute and to show that Dr. Bunche's eminence and recognition are doubly deserved.

The editorial follows:

BUNCHE'S ACHIEVEMENT

The armistice signed at Rhodes is, as President Truman said yesterday, a tribute to the restraint and statesmanship of the governments of Israel and Egypt. It is also a proof of rare qualities in Dr. Ralph Bunche, whom the U. N. had the good sense to name as acting mediator when Count Bernadotte was murdered. Without Dr. Bunche's tact and persistence, and his sense of timing, the negotiations at Rhodes would have collapsed, with disastrous results for the whole of the Middle East.

It is too early to say that the armistice will bring lasting peace to Israel and the Arab world. The other Arab states will have to join in the armistice, and the U. N. conciliation commission will have to produce a long-term agreement before one can be sure that a new chapter in the Middle East has begun. The Rhodes agreement has made it possible, however, to start thinking and talking of a new chapter.

The President rightly called attention to the possibilities of economic development in the Middle East, perhaps with American help, after peace has come. The sooner peace is made, the sooner Arabs and Jews can get busy with the cooperative projects on which the future of the whole area will depend. It is time to sweep away the hatreds of the past and concentrate on the future. It is high time, as President Truman suggested, for "freeing the talents of these Near Eastern peoples for constructive work in the development of their respective countries."

The Rankin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Post Home News, on Wednesday, February 16, 1949.

This editorial states the position of the AVC on the Rankin bill and points out expertly the methods, and apparent intent, with which the author has been promoting the measure.

THE RANKLING RANKIN

Poor Representative JOHN RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi).

Mr. RANKIN is apparently rankling because the Administration wisely denied him his chief delight—membership in the Un-American Activities Committee, where once he strutted in furious headline opposition to those who did not square with his deep-south definition of Americanism.

But Mr. RANKIN has ways of getting even. As chairman of the House Veterans Committee, he is sponsoring a pension bill which seems calculated to embarrass the administration.

The Rankin bill would hand all veterans a monthly $60 check when they reach the age of 60 and $90 when they are 65, plus compensation for disability not incurred in service.

Experts estimate that in its first year alone, the Rankin bill would cost the United States nearly $2,000,000,000. They respond with shudders when asked its total price tag.

Mr. RANKIN, however, is probably not one to be dissuaded by a multi-billion dollar sign. Particularly if he realizes that his bill could accomplish the double deviltry of a vote-getting political handout plus the unstringing of Mr. Truman's budget.

Imagine, then, his dismay when the American Veterans Committee was permitted, over his protests, to testify on the bill.

The ungrateful AVC, speaking for 100,000 men and women, said in effect, "Thanks a lot, Mr. RANKIN, but no, thanks. Veterans don't want special consideration at the expense of the total social security needs of the American people. Veterans themselves would suffer if the nation, as a whole, were deprived."

Since we're all inclined to go a little soft with gratitude when veterans are discussed, we'll let the veterans themselves state the compelling case against the Rankin pension bill.

The AVC helpfully points out that there are problems which beset the veteran exclusively. It agrees that adequate national aid must be extended to the war wounded and disabled, to the widows and orphans of soldiers, to ex-servicemen who need help in readjusting to civilian ways.

But, the AVC remarks with philosophical accuracy, old age is not a problem which plagues the veteran, alone.

And old-age benefits should not be ladled out to a favored group just because it happened to be of fighting age and performed its duty when the United States was at war.

Reminding Mr. RANKIN that our ex-servicemen should consider themselves United States citizens first and veterans only when their war-engendered needs are concerned, the AVC turns down his handout to make a citizenly request.

It asks for a broadened Federal social-security program under which adequate financial support is provided the aged of our country—and the veteran takes his democratic place in line along with the rest of the Nation's old.

Finally, if Representative RANKIN succeeds in propelling his bill through Congress, the AVC warns that veterans could be hurt, rather than helped.

Multibillion-dollar expenditures on pensions for veterans alone could short-change the Federal spending necessary to promote economic stability at home and overseas. If the world crashed around his ears, the veteran would find small security or consolation in a $60 pension check.

Eloquently summing up its case against the veterans' pension bill, the AVC says, "The average ex-serviceman is not a professional veteran * * * He is a citizen, interested in assuring that his Government gives consideration to the problems of all citizens who need the protection of Government in illness, in old age, in the absence of employment. His reward is a prosperous free America and a stable world."

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including a resolution concerning the imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty which has been adopted by the Knights of Columbus of Monessen, Pa., a prominent city within my congressional district.

I feel this resolution deserves introduction into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because there are so many people of Hungarian descent living in my district, and especially in Monessen, who are grief-stricken that this thing has happened in their native land, although fully realizing that that land is now dominated by a brutal master. It is a matter for concern not only to people of Hungarian descent but to all liberty-loving people in the world, and their pain is mor· acute at the realization that the liberty of large groups can be lost to such a satanic master as the Politburo.

The following resolution on the imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was adopted by the Knights of Columbus, Monessen (Pa.) Council No. 954, on February 16, at a regular meeting held on that date:

"Whereas the conscience of our membership and of liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked and outraged by the imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal

Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, whose only offense is his courageous espousal of truth and justice and his fearless resistance to the dictates of Red Russia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Monessen (Pa.) Council, with a membership of 200 Catholic men, earnestly entreat you, our elected representative in the Federal Government of the United States, do all within your power to secure the release of this shepherd of millions of Hungarian people and to protest against the repetition of such iniquitous action so revolting to our civilization.

"It is the firm conviction of the membership of our council that failure by our Government zealously to explore all channels through which remedial action may be taken in behalf of the innocent victim of this travesty on justice will damage beyond measure the cause of human liberty everywhere and will make a mockery of the affirmation of faith in fundamental human rights which is written into the preamble of the United Nations Charter."

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD J. DEAN,
Lecturer, Monessen Council No. 954, Knights of Columbus.

Improved Forestry Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Granger subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, February 24, 1949, in support of Federal legislation to provide for improved forestry practices:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I wish to make a brief statement in behalf of greater Federal participation in the field of forestry. I have studied the several bills introduced in the Eighty-first Congress concerned with the subject and am happy to lend my endorsement to measures designed to assist in returning our fast depleting forest reserves to a sound basis.

I recently had the opportunity to study a report prepared by Mr. Lyle F. Watts, Chief, United States Forest Service, which proved to be very enlightening. Some of the facts and figures presented in Mr. Watts' report are well worth the attention of any group studying the aspects of improved forest practices.

A charting of United States timber reserves revealed that in 1910 we had a reserve of 2,900,000,000,000 board feet; through the twenties and thirties our reserves dropped to the danger line of 1,700,000,000,000 board feet; and today that reserve is down to 900,000,000,000 board feet.

The importance of lumber is readily perceived when we glance about us. Twenty-three million of the Nation's 28,000,000 homes are made of wood, and wood figures importantly in some way in practically everything we use. One-third of the surface area of the United States, or 624,000,000 acres, is in forest lands, and 461,000,000 acres of the six hundred twenty-four million are classed as commercial timber lands.

Worthy of serious attention is the fact that saw timber is disappearing one and one-half times faster than it is growing and we cut or lose enough timber annually to build nearly 4,000,000 homes. Statistics reveal that our wood reserves have been reduced 43 percent in the past 36 years and that another 20 years at this rate will practically deplete our timber reserve.

Today we are growing annually only about one-half of the sixty-five and seventy-two billions of board feet we need to produce a safe margin of timber.

The crux of the problem lies with private land owners, tracts comprised of less than 5,000 acres, as their lands make up 75 percent of commercial forests and 71 percent of the cutting there is classed as poor or destructive.

In my own State of Louisiana a traveler can drive for miles through certain sections of barren land denuded of timber except for sparse, scrub-oak bushes. In many sections one can see with satisfaction that progress has been made toward the reforestation of many acres, yet the over-all picture leaves much to be desired. I am sure the same condition exists in most, if not all, of our other States.

Fire losses today total $35,000,000 or more annually, while insect and disease losses equal or surpass fire damage. Reports reveal that 136,000,000 acres of United States forest lands are without organized protection from fire.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of measures that are designed to provide for the completion and continuation of a comprehensive forest survey and for a more adequate program for forest-fire control, reforestation, wood-use research and for the dissemination of useful forestry information through the land-grant colleges. I favor the establishment and maintenance of services and facilities for furnishing technical guidance and assistance to private timberland owners and for the proper management of federally owned lands administered by the States.

Let us bear in mind that our Nation's greatness is based on its abundant natural resources. Wherever possible, it behooves us to see that those natural resources are not depleted, and that every effort be exerted to restore losses made on our reserves by the advance of our civilization.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, for your kind attention to my remarks.

Real Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a brief but excellent editorial that appeared in the February 28, 1949, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

President Truman's proposal to raise the payments of old-age insurance to retired workers under the social-security system should give the needed impetus to an overdue reform. The monthly benefits of the Government's old-age and survivors' insurance have been allowed to slip far too low in buying power. No change has been made by Congress since 1939.

The average retirement benefit to a recipient of the old-age payments is only $25.28 a month, according to the latest figures. To get this, both the worker and his employer had to pay taxes for a number of years. These contributions were very low; still, they were taxes. Yet the average of old-age assistance—not available to those under the retirement plan but given on a claim of need—ran $16 more. In Colorado it reached $78.29, in California $61.25, in Washington $60.33, and in Massachusetts $58.74.

The way the social-security program has carelessly been allowed to work out, it often pays not to save—you can get so much more for having inadequate resources. The recipients of relief now exceed by nearly 1,500,000 the insured workers who are drawing benefits. The number granted cash on the basis of need totaled 2,469,372 in October, against 1,016,303 retired workers receiving old-age insurance. This is just contrary to what was planned when the social-security program was adopted in 1935.

The taxes may have to be raised to justify an increase in the benefits. In any case, the payments must be increased to make the social-security system live up to its name.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Ohio State Journal for February 4, 1949:

HOW MUCH FURTHER

Twelve years ago the total Federal income taxes collected from the people of the United States amounted to $7,900,000,000. This amount was equivalent to the total income of all the people living in two great States, Pennsylvania and Missouri.

In 1947, just 10 years later, the total income tax collected to run the Federal Government had skyrocketed to $42,505,000,000. That amount was equal to the total income of all the people living in 25 States. Imagine it—the total income of all the people living in Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Louisiana, Maine, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Idaho, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Indiana. The total income of States having an aggregate population of 42,000,000 people.

Again this year, the President submitted a $42,000,000,000 budget to Congress—and it did not contain everything he has asked for, let alone everything he has outlined in subsequent and earlier speeches and messages. His proposal for expansion of the social security program alone calls for $2,000,000,000 in addition to the $42,000,000,000 asked for earlier. No one knows how many billions of dollars will be added in the program to provide western Europe with military supplies and equipment under the proposed North Atlantic security pact and to meet other like commitments.

How much further can this go before the Government takes over everything and everybody? That's the question recently propounded by DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association. Commenting further, Mr. Emery said:

"Creeping paralysis? It certainly is, and if the cost of our Federal Government continues to increase year after year as it has in the past, in another few years—I don't believe it will take more than 3 or 4—there won't be any freedom of enterprise left in the country. And if we lose freedom of enterprise, we shall soon thereafter lose all our other freedoms: Freedom of speech,

freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of opportunity, and all the others. * * *

"It's absolutely impossible to overestimate the importance of this great and grave danger. It's absolutely essential for the people of this country to know what is happening and that if this trend continues, the only thing you can look forward to is complete and absolute regimentation, that is, being told by the Government what you'll eat and wear, where you'll live, where you'll work, and how much you'll be paid. It means also getting permission from a bureaucrat before doing any traveling in your own car, or otherwise, and full and complete governmental control of newspapers, magazines, radio programs, and motion pictures. * * *

"It can't happen here? It is happening here—I almost said it has happened here—but there is still time to stop it if you and I and millions of others like us, want it stopped. We can force our representatives in Congress to make the drastic reduction in the cost of our Federal Government, which is the only thing that can save the situation.

"I've said before and I say again with all the emphasis at my command, it's up to you, and I do mean you."

Can there be any doubt as to the logic and truth of Mr. Emery's observations? All history points up his argument. Huge taxes go hand in hand with increasing autocratic or bureaucratic power and ultimate ruin for a nation.

Yet, how long has it been since a President of the United States took any notice of these well-known facts? In his campaign in 1932 Mr. Roosevelt promised a reduction in the budget—and that's the last anyone has heard of cutting down the cost of Federal Government, except the comparatively feeble reductions which Congress has been willing and able to force through against tremendous pressures from the Federal spenders, from the White House down through all the departments and bureaus.

No, the trend for 16 years has been and continues to be—tax and spend and elect; promise more, tax some more, spend a great deal more and reelect.

This year Federal spending will require an amount of money equal to considerably more than the total income from all sources of all of the people of 25 States. It may take an amount equal to the income of 30 States, perhaps 35 States. That's getting pretty near the cracking point between the upper millstone of heavier taxes and the nether stone of increasing Federal controls. It should be a matter of first concern not merely of big business and small business but of every wage earner and every citizen of the United States.

AMA and the Christian Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Catholic weekly America on December 18, 1948, entitled "AMA and the Christian Conscience."

There is great need for intelligent discussion of this important problem.

The editorial follows:

AMA AND THE CHRISTIAN CONSCIENCE

Christian social philosophy teaches that the security and temporal prosperity of society and its members is the responsibility of the State. When a problem such as the Nation's health exceeds the powers of individual or group action, intervention by the Government becomes not merely justified but morally imperative.

It is the incorrigible opinion of the American Medical Association, on the contrary, that the Nation's health concerns merely the sick man and his doctor—provided he can afford one. On the findings of the association itself, half the families of America cannot meet the expenses of a serious illness on the fee-for-service system now prevailing. Yet they stubbornly oppose the adoption of compulsory health insurance to put medical services within the reach of half the families of America.

The program of public-health insurance which Congress will be asked to consider will undoubtedly be a controversial measure. The bill will demand careful scrutiny to make sure that policy-making and administration are preserved in professional hands, that decentralization—along the lines of the Federal Housing Agency—is maintained, that voluntary, cooperative health-insurance plans are protected and encouraged while universal coverage is achieved. There will be need of open, informed discussion of the legislation—starting from the verdict of the Christian conscience that the Nation's health falls within the scope of the Government's proper sphere.

Such a debate is democracy acting responsibly.

How, then, are we to characterize the activities and conclusions of the convention of the American Medical Association, which met in St. Louis the first days of December? A private national health-insurance plan covering hospital and medical care, proposed as a means of combating health insurance, was rejected. The resolution was not made available to reporters, who were barred from the closed sessions of the house of delegates. "We're lucky we didn't get a kick in the teeth," was the wry observation of Dr. Paul R. Hawley, executive officer of the commission, originally sponsored and financed by AMA itself, which made the proposal. The commission was censured for intruding in the policy-making function of the association.

To carry out its own policy the association voted an assessment of $25 on each of its 140,000 members. The $3,500,000 fund will be used to fight "socialized medicine," a stereotyped phrase in the loose idiom of AMA for any plan of compulsory health insurance. In a statement of policy the convention declared that the Nation's health is robust, as a result of the free-enterprise system in medicine. It proclaimed that wherever the Government has interfered, the care of the sick and needy has suffered. It announced ambiguously that any scheme of "political medicine would be a catastrophe for the American people." It warned that compulsory health insurance would lead to complete state socialism and unctuously promised to continue to make medical care available to all our people.

These are sentiments that read like the fervid condemnation of the workingmen's compensation acts at the turn of the century. They recall the protestation of beneficent employers against jeopardizing personal freedom. There is ample evidence that AMA is no more representative of medical opinion than the NAM is of the current thinking of businessmen. Few doctors would repeat the statement Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association, made on November 16 at the health forum at Harvard, that those who favor compulsory sickness insurance "are leading the American people toward communism." Some might inquire about the 32 countries that have such legislation. Ireland, for instance. Is Ireland Socialist?

Is Group-Libel Law Practicable?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD the text of a guest column written by me which appeared in the New York Day, one of the oldest and largest Yiddish dailies in the world, in the issue dated February 24, 1949, on the subject of the group-libel bill, H. R. 2270, which I introduced on February 3. Four other Members of this House introduced identical bills at the same time.

The article follows:

I am proud to be one of the authors of the proposed legislation to outlaw the dissemination of literature-libeling groups.

Our first problem was to decide whether it is possible to legislate wisely and effectively in the field of words and thoughts; whether it is possible to write into the statute law of the land a new act establishing a clear and enforceable principle of group libel.

When we had decided that question in the affirmative, we were faced with the very concrete question: How?

This is a problem that cannot be solved by hysteria, resentment, or name-calling; and it cannot be approached with levity or with casualness. There are vitally important principles of democratic liberty at stake.

Lawyers who specialize in constitutional law are themselves divided in opinion. Many hold that no effective group libel statute can be framed which does not invade some precious right of individual freedom guaranteed by the American Constitution.

Others hold that a whole category of individuals can be given the protection of the law against calumny and scurrility by a properly drawn law without depriving any one else of any right of free expression of honest opinion or of genuine facts.

The group libel bill, H. R. 2270, which I introduced in a distinguished company of other Members of the House cutting across all political lines, represents the distilled thinking of a great many people who have long been interested in this field.

My colleagues who introduced this bill simultaneously with me (and let me explain that under the rules of the House we cannot introduce bills jointly as in the Senate) were: Representative JACOB JAVITS, a Jew and a Republican; Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of up-State New York, a Protestant and a Republican; Representative EUGENE E. KEOGH, a Catholic and a Democrat; and Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, a Protestant, a Democrat, and a Negro.

Tentative efforts have been made toward framing legislation which can be called a group-libel law over a long period of time. Many of these have been prepared as bills and introduced in Congress; some were very good as exploratory measures to stimulate debate and thought, and some were pretty hopeless. Very substantial progress has been made in the more limited field of political campaign literature, both in National and State legislation, directed toward full disclosure of responsibility; and, as a matter of fact, several States have adopted laws which operate in the broad field of group libel.

Indiana and Massachusetts have laws prohibiting distribution of material libeling any racial or religious group; but they have not yet been tested in the courts. Other States

have more limited statutes which still pave the way for Federal action.

It is worth while to mention that not only is there no Federal law to prevent or punish the distribution of the grossest libels against religious or racial groups, no matter how strongly such material may endeavor to stir up trouble and even physical strife; but, in effect, the publishers of such matter are, if otherwise qualified, entitled to the Federal subsidy of a second-class mailing privilege.

Naturally, I get a great deal of abusive and anti-Semitic mail; for instance, when Walter Gieseking decided to return to France rather than face a full investigation of his past and present by the Department of Justice, my office was flooded for several days with violent letters and post cards denouncing the Jews generally and me in particular for running this Naziphile out of the country. I did not even have the basis of a complaint to the Post Office Department; unless one of these bigots scrawls some obscene message on a post card or an envelope, he is free to make the most violent statements.

However, in the previous efforts to prepare a Federal group-libel bill, none of the previous proposals have been able to overcome the tests of constitutionality; that is, they have clearly invaded rights of free speech or thought.

The constitutionality of our group-libel bill would rest chiefly on the thesis that such defamatory utterances are of such slight social value as a step to truth that any benefit that may be derived from them is clearly outweighed by the social interest in order and morality as the Supreme Court phrased it in one decision.

Another valid but subsidiary argument would be that the first amendment to the United States Constitution (which guarantees the rights of free assembly, free press, and free conscience) does not prevent punishment of individual libels, and should not protect group libels. In at least three instances the Supreme Court has held that only truthful statements are protected by the constitutional guaranties.

For years good lawyers and laymen of good will have been trying to devise national legislation which would protect our country, our citizenry, and our democratic processes against the assaults of bigotry and racism within the framework of our constitutional freedoms. The search has been to find a way of punishing deliberate and intended lies about whole groups of people without limiting the free expression of facts and opinions, no matter how distasteful those facts and opinions may be.

Because the Jewish community, collectively and individually, is a frequent object of scurrilous attacks from the believers of the Hitlerian lies, it is natural that Jewish groups should have been among the most active in the efforts to devise such a law, meeting the tests of constitutionality, common sense, and enforceability, not easily perverted to prevent free speech, and clearly acting toward the end desired.

I am glad to give credit to the Commission on Law and Social Action of the American Jewish Congress for the draft upon which our bill was based.

That the language will be criticized by extremists of both sides goes without saying.

The racists will call it an invasion of their right to tell lies.

The extremists on the other side will call it innocuous.

In my belief, the bill goes just as far as is safe; and its adoption by the United States Congress will of itself have a salutary effect on the mouthpieces of the myths of hatred.

The offense defined by this proposed act is clear and specific.

The bill would make it unlawful maliciously to mail or otherwise send into interstate commerce, or to import into the United States, any printed or otherwise duplicated material containing any false statements concerning a person or a group of persons identified by race or religion which tends to expose him or them to hatred, contempt, or obloquy.

A person charged with the dissemination of group defamatory matter could not be convicted if the statements were true, or if, on reasonable grounds, he honestly believed them to be true, nor could he be convicted if, although the statements were untrue, there was no malice or intent to libel a particular group. This would protect a newspaper or magazine or even an honest pamphleteer.

Violation of the act is made a misdemeanor rather than a felony. Maximum punishment would be a $1,000 fine or imprisonment for 1 year. That is to encourage juries to convict, where a higher penalty might make them reluctant. However, to guard against any abuse of the statute, no prosecution could be commenced without prior approval of the Attorney General in Washington.

We can see no reason why the laws of libel cannot be made to apply to the willful and malicious defamation of a group, as long as truth is made a defense. The omission of such provisions from the common law is explained by the historical accident that when the law of libel was developing the law generally did not recognize multiple entities such as associations and ethnic groups.

There is no particular logic to the omission beyond that explanation; yet under cover of the absence of a group-libel law bigots can peddle their poison with immunity.

Any effort to legislate in the field of opinion or ideas is fraught with peril. I have never been opposed to the full-disclosure laws ably advocated by many of my friends and colleagues; yet I must recognize that publicity alone may inhibit freedom of thought, action, and words.

What the arguments of the advocates of our group-libel bill, H. R. 2270, boil down to is this: The bill would, if it becomes law, protect members of minority groups against open and wholesale defamation; but it would not in the least limit the right of free expression of honest opinion and facts.

I am inserting also the following interesting discussion of the bill, prepared prior to introduction, by the American Jewish Congress:

PROPOSED FEDERAL GROUP-LIBEL STATUTE

1. WHY A GROUP-LIBEL LAW

Although the evil effects of racist defamation are almost universally acknowledged, the law of libel, civil or criminal, does not apply to such defamation of groups. This omission is explained by the historical accident that at the time the law of libel developed, the law generally did not recognize multiple entities such as associations and ethnic groups. This anomaly has made it possible for anti-Semites and other race-hatred mongers to peddle their poison with complete immunity.

2. WHAT THE PROPOSED BILL WOULD DO

The CLSA drafted bill does not attempt to meet the whole problem but attacks it on a limited front. There are several reasons for this, the most important being that the courts and public opinion in the United States are not yet ready for a more comprehensive approach.

The CLSA bill deals only with group libels disseminated through the mails or in interstate or foreign commerce. In this field the powers of Congress are not open to reasonable question. The bill sets forth the finding that such dissemination of false and defamatory statements concerning racial and religious groups constitute a danger to the Nation's welfare by creating intergroup conflict and tensions. The bill then announces a policy to prevent the spread of such defamatory material.

Section 3 of the bill makes it unlawful maliciously to mail or otherwise send into interstate commerce or to import into the United States any printed or mimeographed material containing any false statements concerning a person or group of persons identified by race or religion which tends to expose him or them to hatred, contempt, or obloquy. A person charged with dissemination of group defamatory matter cannot be convicted if the statements were true or if, on reasonable grounds he honestly believed them to be true.

Persons violating the law are subject to punishment up to $1,000 fine and imprisonment for a year, but to prevent any possibility of abuse, no prosecution can be commenced without the prior approval of the United States Attorney General.

3. IS THE PROPOSED BILL CONSTITUTIONAL?

There is no case in which a carefully drafted group-libel statute has been declared unconstitutional. Laws making it criminal to libel an individual person have uniformly been held constitutional. We believe that there is no reason a similar law aimed to protect racial and religious groups should not also be held constitutional, so long as it makes truth a defense.

4. WILL IT INTERFERE WITH FREE SPEECH OR PRESS?

The purpose of the guaranty of speech or press is to facilitate the free traffic of knowledge and ideas. We do not believe that to prohibit the dissemination of false, defamatory statements, such as ritual murder libels, interferes with such free traffic, any more than prohibiting traffic in impure or poisonous foods and drugs interferes with the free movement of goods in commerce.

5. WILL A GROUP-LIBEL LAW ELIMINATE RACISM?

We do not suggest that our proposed law, or any group libel law will solve the problem of prejudice or discrimination. We do believe, however, that it may be a valuable weapon in the arsenal of democracy to be used, along with many other weapons such as antidiscrimination laws, in the struggle for ethnic equality and dignity.

My discussion of this bill would not be complete without the insertion of an amusing, interesting, and instructive letter I received today from Mr. Will Maslow, which is followed by the text of the bill:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS,
COMMISSION ON LAW AND SOCIAL ACTION,
New York, N. Y., February 28, 1949.

Hon. ARTHUR KLEIN,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I know you will be amused to learn that the Freiheit, the Jewish organ of the Communist Party, has come out against your group-libel bill.

They object on three grounds:

(a) The bill does not specifically outlaw anti-Semitism.

(b) Truth is made a defense.

(c) The bill, they state (erroneously), can prevent attacks on nonethnic groups, such as capitalists.

Sincerely yours,

WILL MASLOW.

H. R. 2270

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal

Procedure) is amended by adding a new chapter 28 thereto as follows:

"CHAPTER 28—TRANSPORTATION OF DEFAMATORY MATTER

"SEC. 562. The Congress finds:

"(a) The channels of interstate and foreign commerce and the United States mails are being used to disseminate false and defamatory statements designed to arouse conflict among the racial, religious, and ethnic groups, which together have contributed to the growth and prosperity of this Nation. Such dissemination constitutes a danger to the welfare of the Nation.

"(b) The malicious dissemination of false and defamatory statements tending to arouse intergroup conflict interferes with the national policy of fostering the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms by all, without distinction as to race, language, or religion, interferes with free communication of ideas and serves no public interest.

"(c) The malicious dissemination through the channels of interstate or foreign commerce or the United States mails of false and defamatory statements tending to arouse intergroup conflict must be prohibited to preserve the unity of this Nation, to prevent discord among our people, to prevent disruption of the normal channels of trade and commerce and dislocation of the economic life of the country, to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, or religion, to promote the healthy interchange of ideas and opinions and to preserve the republican form of government.

"SEC. 563. In the exercise by Congress of its powers to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to establish post offices and to fulfill the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to prevent the spread through the channels of interstate and foreign commerce or use of the mails of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict.

"SEC. 564. It shall be unlawful for any person, with intent to create ill will against a racial or religious group within the United States or any of its Territories, knowingly to bring or cause to be brought into the United States or any place subject to its jurisdiction, or to send by common carrier or other agency, or to deposit or cause to be deposited in the United States mails for mailing and delivery, from one State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia or from any point within any Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia to another such point, any publication or material which is printed, mimeographed, or otherwise reproduced in multiple form by mechanical process, containing any statement concerning any person, persons or group of persons, designating, identifying, or characterizing him or them directly or indirectly by reference to his or their race or religion, which exposes or tends to expose him or them to hatred, contempt, or obloquy or causes or tends to cause him or them to be shunned or avoided or to be injured in his or their business or occupation: *Provided, however,* That no person shall be convicted under this section if such statement is true or was honestly believed by him, upon reasonable grounds, to be true. The burden of coming forward with evidence upon the issues of truth, honest belief, reasonableness of belief and lack of intent to create ill will shall be upon the defendant, but the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt upon the entire case shall be upon the prosecution.

"SEC. 565. Any person violating any of the provisions of section 3 of this act or who conspires or acts in concert with any other person or persons to violate any of the provisions of section 3 of this act shall for each such offense upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year or by both.

"SEC. 566. No proceeding for violation of section 3 or 4 of this act shall be instituted by any district attorney without the prior approval of the Attorney General. The prosecution of any such proceeding by a district attorney shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General.

"SEC. 567. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, or part of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall for any reason be adjudged to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this act or its application to other persons or circumstances."

St. David's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN F. JAMES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, by the calendar this is the day of March 1 but in the hearts of all who descend from the sturdy men of Wales—this is St. David's Day—and St. David is the patron saint of the Welsh. As to the saint himself, his works and the manner of his becoming a Welshman, little enough will be said at the many festivities to be held in his honor this day. The saint is a good topic for other occasions, so able orators will devote their talents to proving that King Solomon, Christopher Columbus, Napoleon, Franklin, Washington, Lincoln, and all good and great men down to and including Adam were Welshmen, and they will be right.

A preview of the celebration in Philadelphia of St. David's Day has been written by Mr. John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer. It is both entertaining and informative and is offered here for your pleasure and enlightenment:

ST. DAVID'S OR ANY DAY WELSHMEN WILL SING OUT

(By John M. Cummings)

If you were around and about on February 25, 1729, you no doubt will recall reading the following item in the Pennsylvania Gazette:

"We are informed that several Gentlemen and other Persons of Reputation, of the honorable Stock of Ancient Bretons, design to erect themselves into a Society to meet annually on the first day of March, or St. David's Day, so-called. In order thereto, on the first of the next month, there will be a Sermon preached in the ancient British language by Dr. Wayman in this city, and a Psalm set to the organ; from thence the Society are to go and partake of a handsome Collation at the House of Robert Davis, at the Queen's Head in King Street."

It will be 220 years, come St. David's Day on March 1, since the Welsh Society of Philadelphia was founded. It was not incorporated under its present name until 1802, but chartered or unchartered it has never failed in its yearly observance of the day named in honor of the patron saint of the little chunk of Britain.

Philadelphia and its environs form a section of the State rich in the lore of the Welsh. Here we know as household words such names as Cadwallader and Meredith, Wister and Clymer, Meigs and Owen, not to mention ancient stand-bys such as Jones and Roberts, Griffith, Wayne and the like.

The Welsh Society, originally organized to extend financial aid to emigrants from Wales, is, you read in a brief history compiled by Howard Benton Lewis, the oldest social and benevolent institution in the city. It antedates the St. Andrew's Society, founded in 1749 and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick which dates from 1771, and the Sons of St. George, which had its beginning 1 year later.

From this it would appear we in the Philadelphia area are provided with a variety of patron saints.

We once had in these parts a Welsh barony. It comprised some 30,000 acres adjacent to the old city of Philadelphia and it embraced such Welsh name places as Bala, Cynwyd, Merion, Haverford, Bryn Mawr, St. David's, Berwyn. The early Welsh who established the barony later acquired holdings which we now know as Gwynedd Valley, Penllyn, and North Wales.

This year, God willing, and with David J. Jones as our host, we shall attend the annual St. David's Day round-up. We know there will be singing, for the Welsh are born with music in their hearts. Dr. Ivor Griffith will be there, and Ronald S. Drysdale and John F. Davis, the Welsh Mayor of the Pennsylvania Dutch town of Reading.

Gladly we shall join in singing "The Men of Harlech," and "Hen Wlad Fy Nhadau," which, if you Irish insist on knowing something of the secrets of the ancient Breton tongue, means "Land of My Fathers."

It's our recollection this number was written by Brechen Powell, the managing editor of the Scranton Tribune, an old friend of our'n. His brother Ed and this reporter pulled out of Scranton (a paper collapsed) many years ago and headed for Philadelphia. Ed Powell wrote sports on the old Philadelphia Press. He was killed in action in the First World War.

Land of My Fathers we heard sung by some 5,000 Welsh, men and women, and three Irishmen at Lakeside Park in Schuylkill County last summer. At this big "sing," as distinguished from an eisteddfod, we heard for the first time Land of My Fathers. While there singing and playing around with Harold Watkins and his frau, called Nellie, we ran into Ed Powell's brother and it's our impression he corroborated a report he was the author of the number.

It would be a fine thing for this town if the Welsh, of a pleasant summer day, would assemble in Fairmount Park and let go with an afternoon of singing such as the one the Welsh of Schuylkill and nearby counties staged at Lakeside Park. The nice thing about these assemblies is that they need no great preparation.

Give a Welshman a songbook and he's as happy as if you gave him a dish of faggots. And if you give 5,000 Welshmen 5,000 songbooks and have a man with a baton stand on a chair and say, "Now, all together," you've got something to make your pulse pound and your heart beat faster.

We don't know how long the old barony lasted. Certain it is, however that it embraced a large portion of what is now Fairmount Park. It would seem like something in the nature of poetic justice, therefore, for the park commission to invite the descendants of those early days, together with those who arrived here in the meantime, to take over the park for a day so that all Philadelphia might know the spirit and the fullness of the Welsh when they raise their voices in song.

The idea of the barony, apparently, was to establish a bit of Wales in this country. Welsh customs were to prevail; Welsh justice administered and, above all, the Welsh

language preserved. It was a nice dream. But the project was foredoomed to failure.

Philadelphia grew and it spread out. Here and in Montgomery County the barony was overrun by people representative of all the nations of Europe. The Melting Pot was boiling.

So the Welsh of today, like the Irish and the English and the Scots, remember the land of their fathers by social functions, dinners and the like, generally on the day of a patron saint. We shall begin tonight to brush up on the pronunciation of the few Welsh words in our vocabulary. We know Penllyn means the head of the lake—Dr. Griffith told us so. And we know Bryn Mawr means something about a hilltop.

And if there's anything else you'd like to know about the Welsh come around and see us on St. David's Day in the morning.

Civil Rights: Truman's Move Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention of the Congress to the recent article in the Christian Science Monitor by Roscoe Drummond regarding the proposed compromise on civil-rights legislation offered by my colleague, Hon. BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas.

No one can deny the need for full study and consideration of all plans which will help extend civil rights in the way that will genuinely benefit those who are now adversely affected. Congressman HAYS has performed a great service in offering a basis for discussion and consideration of alternate plans designed to accomplish much of the objective sought in this program.

The splendid article by Roscoe Drummond, chief, Washington bureau, the Christian Science Monitor, is as follows:

CIVIL RIGHTS: TRUMAN'S MOVE NOW

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Truman and his political advisers thus far are turning the cold stare upon any offer of the southern Members of Congress to work out a middle-ground compromise on civil-rights legislation.

Such an offer has been made by one of the most respected Members of the House of Representatives, BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas. Mr. HAYS has the support of numerous of his southern colleagues. And he has full credentials as a loyal party Democrat.

Mr. HAYS is offering a significant compromise in good faith. His purpose is not merely to avoid a continuing split within the Democratic Party but, more importantly, to avoid an acute and long-enduring breach within the country.

The President is leaving Mr. HAYS' offer dangling in mid-air. If Mr. Truman doesn't grasp it, it can't remain there for long. In ignoring it he is admittedly pursuing a course attended with risk.

The administration is courting the risk of getting no civil-rights legislation at all by rebuffing even an examination of compromise in good faith.

The administration may well be playing into the hands of extremists on both sides by refusing to give a responsive hearing to the counsel of the most progressive southerners.

There are some southern politicians who, for their own expedient reasons, want the Federal Government to do absolutely nothing at any time to help insure further civil rights to minority groups. They will like nothing better than to have the administration ask for so much that they will be in the best tactical position to block it all.

There are some nonsouthern politicians who, for their own expedient reasons, want the Federal Government to do everything at once on civil rights. They may well find it to their political advantage to have everything rejected at this session rather than to have a good beginning made. A hot civil-rights controversy in the 1950 elections would be to their liking.

These are the extremes which alone would benefit by a wrangling, divisive fight, ending without any civil-rights legislation of any kind.

Conceivably, Mr. Truman may feel that he first must try for everything, testing the ability of the administration forces to end the filibuster and put through at this session his full program.

But a strong argument can be made—and Mr. HAYS has made it to a most attentive audience in the House—that it will be better for the country and better for the Democratic Party to welcome progressive southern initiative and proceed on the maximum area of agreement.

The President's civil-rights program deals with four subjects of dominant concern to the South: Segregation, poll tax, antilynching, and the FEPC.

Representative HAYS believes the southern Members of Congress should and would join in accepting a constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax, and in enacting a Federal statute which would center responsibility upon the governors of the States for dealing with lynching and would empower the Federal Government to intervene in event of the failure of the governor to act. Mr. HAYS advocates a nonpenalty Fair Employment Practice Committee with a counseling service to work for nondiscrimination in industry. He holds that the Supreme Court decision banning segregation in interstate travel gives the Federal Government adequate power in this field.

These are significant proposals to come from an influential southern Congressman. They make a valid distinction between civil rights, which should not be compromised, and social aspirations, which cannot be waved into being by a law.

Can Representative HAYS bring his southern colleagues to support his middle-ground position? He never will know unless the administration invites serious consultation. If the southerners substantially back Mr. HAYS, the basis of a constructive compromise can be laid. If the southerners substantially reject Mr. HAYS, the administration, by having tried a constructive compromise, will be in a better position than it now is to press its program over totally recalcitrant southern opposition.

Advance Planning of Non-Federal Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to stimulate the advance planning of non-Federal public works—exclusive of housing—by authorizing the Federal Works Administrator to make advances to States and local governments for the purpose of preparing plans and specifications. Each advance would be repayable to the Federal Government, but without interest, out of money available for the construction of the project whenever the State or local government actually commences construction. The bill is very similar to title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, which expired on June 30, 1947. The advance-planning program under that act was widely approved by State and local officials, engineers, architects, contractors, economists, and the general public. Under it the Federal Works Administrator advanced $56,000,000 to State and local governments, which was sufficient to set in motion the blueprinting of projects with an estimated construction cost of $2,100,000,000. But already over $300,000,000 worth of the planned projects have been placed under construction. There remains about $1,700,000,000 of projects as a reserve which will shrink rapidly as projects pass from the blueprint to the project stage.

This is a pitifully small figure. The total value of new construction during 1948 was $17,700,000,000, $13,700,000,000 private and $4,000,000,000 public. Of the public portion, $2,700,000,000 was State and locally financed. Thus it may be seen that the reserve shelf under the FWA advance-planning program is only about two-thirds the amount of State and local public construction expenditures for the year 1948 alone. And that was a year in which private construction was very substantial.

In a recession the volume of private construction declines sharply. If that undertaken in 1948—$13,700,000,000—were to decline by 50 percent—and in the past it has fallen much more than that—we would need $10,900,000,000 of public construction to maintain the construction industry and employment on an even keel. The present reserve could not begin to tackle the problem. It is therefore vital that we start again to build up an adequate reserve shelf of sound non-Federal public works upon which construction can be started as economic conditions warrant. The existence of such a store of plans will promote confidence in our national economy because both industry and labor will know that a vast program of public works is available for construction at any sign of faltering. And these projects will not be made work, ill-conceived and hastily designed in order to cope with unemployment. They will be soundly devised so that they will return to the people lasting and worth-while capital improvements. The ultimate cost to the Government of the previous reserve shelf program will be relatively small and mainly confined to administrative costs. This type of program provides far more economic insurance for every dollar put out than any other that could be devised.

Section 1 of the bill, in order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to maintain a continuing and adequate reserve of fully planned

public works—exclusive of housing—readily available for use when the economic situation may make commencement of construction of such public works desirable, authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to make advances to the States, their agencies and political subdivisions to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specification, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of public works—exclusive of housing. This section also contains a provision to the effect that the making of advances thereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake the construction of any public works so planned.

Section 2 of the bill specifies that the Federal Works Administrator shall allocate the funds appropriated for the making of advances in the following proportion: 75 percent in the proportion the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest Federal census; and 25 percent in accordance with the needs of the States as determined by the Federal Works Administrator.

This section also provides that if said Administrator determines that any funds so allocated to a State cannot promptly be utilized in effecting the purposes of the bill he may reallocate such funds to any other State or States requiring additional allotments.

Section 3 of the bill prohibits the making of any advance for a particular project unless the project conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by a competent State, local, or regional authority.

Section 4 provides that the advances made shall be repaid, without interest, as and when the construction of the public works is undertaken or started. The sums so repaid are to be covered in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 5 authorizes the Federal Works Administrator to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Section 6 authorizes the annual appropriation of such amounts, not to exceed $50,000,000, as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the bill. It also provides that funds appropriated are to remain available until the end of the fiscal year for which the appropriation is made.

Section 7 defines the term "State" to include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Invention Through the Ages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at a recent dinner sponsored by the American Patent Law Association it was my privilege to hear Mr. Crosby Field deliver a most informative address on the subject, Invention Through the Ages. In order that others may have an opportunity to read and understand more about patents, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Mr. Field's address:

INVENTION THROUGH THE AGES

(By Crosby Field, president, Flakice, Corp., Brooklyn, N. Y.)

We are living in an age of rapid mechanical advancement. Our daily problems evolve largely about the question of which new improvement we should buy, or whether we should wait and save to get something perhaps a little better a little later. This applies to our consideration of most everything, from automobiles to household utensils. It is hard, therefore, for us to conceive of a civilization in which the average man, such as you and I, could live an entire lifetime in exactly the same way that had lived his father, his grandfather, and his ancestors up to 30 generations. Yet that was the fate of the average man most everywhere in western Europe for a thousand years.

Not only was this the fact amongst those the Romans called barbarians, but more particularly within the higher types of social organizations of the times. Then the common man was wholly ignorant of mechancal invention, and his life was unchanged by it. Let us have a brief glance at inventions through the ages, and discuss their effect, if any, upon the life of the common man.

This would appear to be a rather large subject for a short talk were it not simplified by two facts. The first is that the physical surroundings of the common man were not noticeably improved for centuries. The second is that increasing mechancial improvements enjoyed by the common man always eventuate into the abolition of slavery. By slavery I do not mean the rhetoric bleatings of rabble rousers, but legal slavery in which one man actually becomes the property of another, or as the property of the state he is put at the disposal of another man. Where slavery exists, mechanical progress is negligible; where it increases, invention dies.

We have difficulty in conceiving the barrenness of the life of the common man until most recent times. It comes as a still greater shock, moreover, to realize that an average man of, say, the year 400 A. D. would have found himself entirely at home a thousand years later. Could he have been instantly transplanted from the year 400 to the year 1400, he would have found his physical surroundings almost identical. He would have found the same housing, the same food, the same methods of preparing and cooking it, the same personal utensils, the same field tools, the same roads, and very similar, although possibly not identical, clothing. In some parts of the western European world he would have been embarrassed by changed speech and perhaps by foreign-speaking kings and officials, but otherwise he could hardly have known that the interval had been 1,000 years—it would have seemed more like a day.

Worst of all, he would have found himself no better off in facing his real problems, how to get enough to eat and how to keep warm. Famine still would claim its huge annual toll, and the king still owned the trees from which, "by hook or crook," a pitiful fuel supply might be extracted for absolute essentials. Disease, of course, was a most proper punishment direct from the Deity.

Those of us in this room, old enough to have applied to us the euphemistic term of middle age, have in our own lifetime seen changes in our physical surroundings a thousandfold greater than could have been found by the common man in the thousand-year period mentioned. For most of the world the specter of normal peacetime starvation has been removed, health has been improved, the usual diseases causing death held under control or even eliminated, death from old age pushed a little further back, and our average American common man has become accustomed to a standard of living so high that it is the envy of the world.

What is the reason for this great change in tempo of improvement of the average man's physical lot? Many have asked this question, some have come up with plausible answers, most of which do not stand up under scrutiny.

There are those who suggest that it is all a matter of natural resources; that the American workingman lives high because of nature's bounty to our countryside. But other nations, such as Russia, China, India, have the same resources, perhaps not developed, and yet they have extremely low standards of living.

There are those who suggest that the answer is to be found in the climate, or in the agglomeration of racial cultures, or in the emancipation of women, or in the desire of our population for amusement to occupy constantly increasing idle time, etc. In fact, there are innumerable similar explanations, none of which seems to stand strict examination.

There are others who ascribe our success entirely to the fact that we have produced a new race, within ourselves, called the Ingenious Yankee, who, upon settlement of the colonies, sprang forth as a mechanically minded Merlin. If we find the genesis of this marvel to be the forces of freedom culminating in the Declaration of Independence, there is an element of truth in this theory, but much as I would like to take a bow for this phenomenon, I'm afraid the historians won't let me.

It is only relatively recently that the history of invention has received much attention but now a large number of interesting facts are being unearthed. These indicate that many inventions believed new were in reality well known long, long ago in one or the other parts of the world.

The authors of works on specific industries almost always devote at least a few words to their origins; in each case one or two dates in antiquity are mentioned, then a couple in the Far East or in Arabia during the Middle Ages, and then a constantly increasing number of inventions in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

GENERAL SUMMARY OF INVENTIONS

The following general summary is believed to be acceptable: (2) Technics before the tenth century: Fire, its application in furnaces, ovens, kilns. The simple machines, such as planes, screws, cranes. Thread, cord, rope. Hand spinning and weaving. Advanced agriculture, including irrigation, terrace cultivation, and soil regeneration (lapsed in northern Europe). Cattle breeding and the use of the horse for transportation. Glass making, pottery making, basket making. Mining, metallurgy, and smithing, including the working of iron. Power machines: water mills, boats with sails. Machine tools: bow drills and lathes. Handicraft tools, tempered metal cutting edges. Paper. Water clocks. Astronomy, mathematics, physics, and the tradition of science.

Inventions of the tenth century: Painted glass windows in England.

Inventions of the eleventh century: years 1041–49, movable type (Pi Sheng); 1050, first real lenses (Alhazen); 1065, Oliver of Malmesbury attempts flight.

Inventions of the twelfth century: The magnetic compass, known to the Chinese 1160 B. C., comes into Europe via the Arabs and reached England about 1195; 1105 first

recorded windmill in Europe (France); 1118, cannon used by Moors; 1144, paper (Spain); 1147, use of wood cuts for capital letters (Benedictine monastery at Engelberg); 1180, fixed steering rudder; 1188, bridge at Avignon, 18 stone arches, 3,000 feet long; 1190, paper mill (at Herault, France).

Inventions of the thirteenth century: Mechanical clocks invented; 1232, hot-air balloons (in China); 1247, cannon used in defense of Seville; 1269, pivoted magnetic compass; 1270, compound lenses (Roger Bacon); 1272, silk-reeling machine (Bologna); 1285-99, block printing; 1289, paper mill; 1298, spinning wheel.

Inventions of the fourteenth century: Year 1300, wooden type (Turkestan); 1320, water-driven iron works, near Dobrilugk; 1322, sawmill at Augsburg; 1324, cannon; 1330, crane at Luneburg; 1338, guns; 1350, wire-pulling machines; 1390, metal types (Korea); 1390, paper mill.

Within a hundred years after the year 1400 we have authenticated manuscripts of Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), which contain a large number of descriptions of machines, many well illustrated. At first believed to be his invention notebook, the general opinion now is that the manuscripts contain not only his inventions but also a compendium of the state of the art at this time and also include the inventions of many other people. He was, if you please, not only artist, inventor, engineer, but also a professor of each of those subjects and these manuscripts were the textbooks he and his associates used in teaching.

Amongst his notes are: Centrifugal pumps; dredges for canal building; polygonal fortress with outworks; breach-loading cannon; rifled firearms; antifriction roller bearings; universal joints, conical screw; screw with square threads; hydraulic presses; steam cannon; rope-and-belt drive; link chains; submarine boat; bevel gears; spiral gears; compasses; silk doubling and winding apparatus; spindle and flyer; lamp chimney; ship's log; standardized mass-production house; wool spinning; printing press; pile driver; coin-making machinery; and parachutes.

Why did not the common man benefit substantially from this great fund of knowledge?

In the first place, few of da Vinci's inventions ever progressed beyond the sketch-book stage, and when they did, their application was very limited.

Next, was this fund of knowledge really great? The words describing the inventions may have the same denotation as given them today, but the connotation was far different.

For example, take the word "gear." The ancient Greeks had the theory of the cycloidal gear tooth, da Vinci shows not only spur gears but spiral gears. Yet few gears were actually used and these generally were pins driven into wooden wheels; all were made by hand, sizes were few and materials were scarce, although the metal gears of Swiss and Italian clocks were just around the corner of time's corridor. The word "gear" today represents a multitude of sizes, several generally used shapes, made of hundreds of kinds of materials on special machines, each of which is the descendant of a long line of inventions, and obtainable by telephone call to the nearest distributor. Let us not be deceived by words; it is true the ancient and the medieval civilizations had gears, but from our viewpoint, or from the viewpoint of the common man of that time, the gear they had was a most inferior thing of most infrequent occurrence, and its effect on everyday life was almost nil. In those days gear meant a single or a very small number of inventions, today the word "gear" means a flood of inventions—as does the name of almost any other mechanical device. Out of this selection any common man can provide for his needs, usually already incorporated within one or more of the still hundreds of other inventions he desires, and which are complete and on the sales counter.

The history of another invention will also illustrate the difference. The rifle was a fifteenth-century invention, and was dutifully made for the king's armed men in a certain country until the nineteenth century in pretty much the same way its inventor originally made it. In the seventeenth century certain of the gun makers fled their country and settled in the Colony of Pennsylvania. In order to sell their guns, these gunsmiths had to keep changing and improving them to meet the needs of their customers, the common men. So when the American Revolution came, the rifle, thus improved, had a great part to play in winning the war. Its superiority was proven even when the Colonial riflemen were confronted by the only European troops carrying the rifle, made in accordance with tradition and the directions of their kings.

But this wasn't all. The Revolution brought the American patent system, and the rifle stepped into the flow of invention to give us not only improved weapon after weapon but also helped to induce interchangeable manufacture, mass production, the machine-tool industry, much of the chemical industry, and thousands of products.

In this steady stream each invention in turn begets other new and useful inventions; thus a new design may require a new material to be compounded, and the new material make possible other inventions.

THE MARKET OF 1400

Had you or I lived in those days, that is, before the year 1400, and had we come upon an invention, not necessarily conceived by either of us, I am certain that before exploiting it we would have made an attempt at what we do in such circumstances today—that is, make a market survey. And what would we have found?

Our market survey at the very outset would have stumbled upon a fact hard for us to believe, but nevertheless one of the greatest obstacles to progress of any kind that ever existed. That most stupid fact was that no man had a natural right to go into business. The free enterprise system just didn't exist. All business was owned by the sovereign. He could, and sometimes did, operate it himself. From the earliest times, however, state-operated businesses have been unprofitable—even the salt mines of ancient Attica, owned by the Athenian state had finally to be operated by private contractors—so the sovereign most usually sold or gave his monopoly to a man or a group of men. To engage in a business was a state-conferred privilege.

Jail or even head-felony awaited us were we to try to sell our invention to others than the holders of the monopoly, so automatically the multitudinous common man was eliminated as a sales prospect.

The usual ancient and medieval holders of these monopolies were guilds chartered by the crown, and given wide powers over the public, limited only by the product or service named in the grant. The guild had absolute authority over the making, selling, and even use of its product, and controlled rigidly the activities and even the private lives of those engaged in the trade. For example, the Blacksmiths' Guild in 1605 fined and even expelled members because of their holiday lady companions. This latter deprived them of their means of livelihood—almost a death sentence.

So if we are to sell our invention we must go to our only customers, one, or in the most fortunate event, two or three guilds. But what sales argument could we use to them?

As the guild was a monopoly, why should it improve its product or reduce its prices? The answer is, it didn't, and all through history prohibited invention among its members. For example, a cooper in Florence in 1286 complained of being boycotted by his guild because he bent the staves for his barrels by means of water which, he claimed, was an advantage to all who bought them.

Similarly, invention could not come in from outside the guild because of its monopoly. In this fashion invention to benefit the common man was almost completely prohibited for centuries.

As an example of what were considered perfectly natural methods of control under monopoly, which are not completely forgotten today, was the limitation of the number of admissions to membership in the guild. In fact, for centuries there were only two recognized ways of getting into a trade: First, by properly selecting your father, so as to be his first-born boy and inherit his guild membership; secondly, by apprenticing yourself to a member of the participating guild of the craft you desired, which master should have the further qualification of having no sons and only one daughter, preferably homely. Amongst the few authentic records of William Shakespeare was his affidavit in such a case.

What became of the other boys? There wasn't much chance for them. Either they went into the king's army, or his navy, or his merchant marine, or crowded onto the already overcrowded farm. In any event, they didn't make much of a market for inventions of any kind. Labor was cheap, and forced labor because of conviction for the inevitable poaching or private robbery cheapened it further. And, finally, the king's victorious arms would be counted upon to bring in captives for a short-lived slave life at the harder work, such as the galleys.

Where, then, was our market? The sovereign or his immediate subordinates, charged with following out his directions.

What kinds of invention would the sovereign buy? Only two: expensive toys, including the means of black magic, which were very limited market-wise, or aids to the less-limited demand of his usual occupation, war.

Aggressive war was the only way he recognized as having a chance to improve the standard of living of a favored few of his subjects who might survive the war. They would receive direct or indirect benefit by the loot, and the hardest work of the state could be performed by enemy personnel suddenly become slaves.

As the result, inventions aiding war have ever been pushed at a somewhat higher rate because there usually was some sort of market for them. An inventor could even travel from one prince to another offering his wares, and it may not be wholly coincidence that Italy, the small nation of many independent princes and therefore many prospects for inventions, forged ahead relatively fast during the Renaissance and was the home of the da Vincis, the Cellinis and their many contemporaries. Nevertheless, the lack of a truly universal common-man market made this rate of pushing war material approximate zero when compared with our own rate of progress. This situation explains the reason for the universal practice of keeping inventions in absolute secrecy, when they were of a nature that permitted that type of exploitation. If not checked, some present day trends in American legislative and judicial attitudes will result in a return to the use of secrecy instead of public disclosure.

And so in the Middle Ages we find our average European man starving for invention, with inventions all about him! All for the reason that there was no way of making him the market for inventions! The educated and many of the elite knew about these numerous inventions, at least those on paper, but their wide natural market was forbidden by law.

The more civilized states had the machinery well oiled for promulgating promptly new laws forbidding invention. Even when the invention had been adopted for centuries

somewhere else, it would still be squelched immediately it showed itself within the well-ordered economy of a civilized State. For example, trousers, a barbaric invention, were forbidden in Rome by decree in 397 A. D. and again fur garments received the benefit of such a decree in 416 A. D. Moreover the blight of Roman law accompanied by Roman arms stamped out invention in the conquered peoples, as for example the automatic harvester of Ancient Times, so well described by Pliny and Palladius.

Many authors believe that in the tenth and eleventh centuries waves of invention came from the east. More recent investigations indicate that many of these eastern inventions were in reality western-born, were taken to the east in search of market, and then forgotten in the land of their origin.

INCENTIVE FOR INVENTIONS LACKING

This calls our attention, however, to the fabulous Saracen Empire, that flourished from the sixth to the fifteenth centuries, which collected and preserved the arts, sciences, and the machines of the west and Far East and then gave them back to Europe long after their origins had been forgotten. Comparisons of the Saracen and the American civilizations show many similarities in scientific and mercantile achievement, and what is most important, individual freedom. This last is stated to be the reason for the greatness of both nations.

Although the Saracen Empire with its freedom to use invention was a great advance over the Roman Empire with its prohibition of invention, yet it lacked the one essential preservative of a civilization: A method of ensuring a perpetual steady flow of invention. It was this lack that has caused the breakdown of the great empires of the past, for it is only by perpetual flow of inventions into daily use that a people in a widespread nation can keep in strong daily contact and bonds of economic and military defense be forged.

For example, it is often stated that steam railroads alone made the United States possible. Others have pointed out that had the Roman Empire a system of steam railroads, it could have survived the onslaught of the barbarians. Why didn't Rome have the steam railroad? Steel, concrete, wood, bronze were available; wheels, bridges, and many other inventions and needed skills were present. Hero of Alexandria had a small steam turbine in operation. Hero could by law, however, use the turbine only for purposes approved by his own guild, the priesthood. He also apparently valued his head. So the power to save Rome was restricted by superior planners solely to the task of making an idol's face grimace.

Missing was that great flow of invention needed to produce not one type of each of the essential components of a railroad, to adapt it to all the varied uses even then needed to make the railroad a success, and to induce the thousand other enterprises based on invention needed for improvement and further adaptation.

Similarly, the Saracen Empire, a great improvement over the Roman in the matter of individual freedom, nevertheless missed the great flow of invention, for there was no method of inducing it.

Applying our standard of comparison, the existence of slavery, we find it in both Roman and Saracen Empires.

ATTEMPTS TO PROVIDE AN INCENTIVE

Changes come gradually, as a result of conflict, and I must not leave you with the impression that struggles against the idea of a regimented sovereign-owned business life did not occur. In fact, there was a nearly continuous struggle with little success until the reign of James I of England whose jurists began to rule for the first time that the guild's regulations could not be applied to nonmembers of the guild. This was based upon Queen Elizabeth's proclamation of November 26, 1601, and was indeed a most revolutionary doctrine, for it took away most of the incentive to belong to the guilds and they rapidly disappeared as an economic force.

More particularly as regards innovations including invention and the attempt to provide an incentive for them, sporadic outbreaks against the prevailing apathy took place from time to time.

There was the Greek city state of Sybaris, founded 720 B. C. and flourished for 2 centuries, which, it has been said, "gave patents of 1 year's duration to cooks and confectioners who could concoct new tasty dishes or confections."

Edward III in 1331 A. D. gave letters patent to John Kempe, a Fleming, to come to England, to establish a weaving industry and to John Delft a patent to bring clockmaking to England, probably water clocks. Henry IV in 1440 gave patent protection to John of Schiedame to bring salt making to England.

Edward III was really 600 years ahead of his time. He issued a patent for the philosopher's stone, to transmute lead into gold. What he knew not was that the invention he wanted could not be obtained at a single jump—it could come only at the triumphal climax of a steady flow of inventions, great and small.

During Elizabeth's reign, the granting of time-limited monopolies to induce enterprisers to bring new trades into her realm began to be extended to inventors for inventions—the very beginnings of the small trickle that 3 centuries later was to become the perpetual steady flow so necessary to real mechanical progress.

This novel step was taken with great caution, and the age-old methods of prohibiting progress remained in nearly full power during her reign. For example, the Rev. William Lee, an Anglican curate of a little town near Nottingham, England, moved by the plight of his shivering parishoners, invented and built a knitting machine about 1589. The chartered guild of London Knitting Women prevailed upon Elizabeth to ban the machine for it might throw many of their members out of work.

(Parenthetically, in 1753 the statutes of the stocking makers were abolished as "against all reason and opposed to the liberty of English subjects.")

Elizabeth's most momentous triumph was due to her father's acceptance of an invention centuries old and yet trampled out by Rome and all forgotten save in the East and Far East, and her management of it. This invention placed in the dramatic naval action of the ages, freemen with the resurrected invention on one side, facing on the other side the Spanish Armada, at the oars of which were slaves in chains. I refer, of course, to the fore and aft rigging, which enabled ships to be tacked effectively against the wind, eliminating the galley slave. It increased the average speed of ships, and it reduced the size of the crews, thus increasing the range of ocean voyaging. It also created truly naval warfare, distinguished from the previous type which was merely land warfare on water.

Henry VIII is said to have been sold this idea for his navy by Shipwright Fletcher of Rye, but Elizabeth's volunteer navy of freebooters that shattered sea slavery were freemen who could and did use any rig they wanted. They chose the fore and aft for use primarily on the Spanish Main.

During the reign of the James I, already mentioned, a great movement against monopolies of every kind culminated in the statute against monopolies in 1624. All monopolies were abolished, except letters patent to inventors, even then apparently recognized as being one of the very few beneficial to society as a whole. (In passing it may be noted that under James I the term of a patent became 14 years, a term which lasted 250 years.)

Again may we remember that the Constitution of the United States provides: "To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries."

The general ideas held by the free Americans of that day were well summarized by Thomas Jefferson who wrote from Paris in 1787, "Every discovery which multiplies the subsistence of man must be a matter of joy to every friend of humanity." In a letter to Oliver Evans in 1807 from Monticello, Jefferson wrote, "Certainly an inventor ought to be allowed a right to the benefit of his invention for some certain time. * * * Nobody wishes more than I do that ingenuity should receive a liberal encouragement."

To summarize, in civilizations of little individual freedom, inventions can rarely be made, and can be introduced from other lands only by governmental permit, and then not primarily for the benefit of the common man. If made, inventions rarely develop beyond the sketchbook. In those most rare incidents that they do they are very limited in their application. In civilizations of much individual freedom, inventions can be used, but their advent is only occasional and then they are used almost exclusively for the elite. In civilizations which have not only individual freedom but also the means of inducing a perpetual steady flow of invention, the benefits of invention reach practically the entire population. The only means yet discovered for inducing this flow is the limited time protection of a patent system similar to the American. The multitude of separate inventions thus induced soon join to produce a steady stream of mechanical progress which, excepting for short termed monopolistic small tributaries, is entirely in the public domain.

Great as are the material everyday benefits the common man receives from this induced flow of invention, and the freedom of the inventor or his agent to exploit each invention, the greatest is the self-perpetuation of the society permitting and encouraging them. We have seen empires and nations come and go, none had this induced flow of invention. We ourselves have passed through great crises, individual freedom and this induced flow of invention have been of the utmost value in saving us. The American patent system is the only true inducer of the invention flow so far discovered. Its abolition or emasculation, therefore, is not merely a matter of slowing down our material benefits; it is actually a step toward national suicide.

Air-Mail Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 25, 1949:

BILL ASKS PLACING AIR MAIL ON OWN—KENNEDY, CITING HOOVER BOARD, WOULD SEPARATE SUBSIDIES FROM SERVICE PAYMENTS

WASHINGTON, February 24.—Representative JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, introduced a bill today to separate air-mail payments from the subsidies now paid

to certificated air lines as part of this compensation.

He asked that separate accounting be kept of the different types of payments, to show which is which in Government payments now involving about $100,000,000 a year. Under current procedure, the Civil Aeronautics Board establishes the air-mail compensation for each certificated air line and directs the Post Office Department to write the checks. The CAB determines this rate on the cost of maintenance of required service in comparison with the normal revenues available from passenger and other services.

"The Hoover commission," Mr. KENNEDY said, "is endorsing the principle of separating subsidies from actual payment for services rendered in carrying the air mails, and I, having been preparing for some time legislation covering this point, am naturally pleased at this endorsement.

TOTAL IS $100,000,000 A YEAR

Since the combined expenditures total about $100,000,000 a year, it is high time a good system of accounting was set up, so we will all know how much is subsidy and how much is air mail.

Representative KENNEDY introduced six measures relating to civil aviation today. They represented broad suggestions for revamping current supervision and encouragement of airline development, as well as proposals for strengthening the air services as arms of national defense.

One of the bills proposed revocation of all taxes on transportation and communications, paid alike by the airlines and surface carriers, so as to take this impost from fields that Mr. KENNEDY considers vital to our defenses.

Two of the bills would provide both for lower air postage rates and for postal economies through special contracts for the carrying of bulk air mail.

Mr. KENNEDY proposed that the air mail letter rate be returned to 5 cents, from the present 6. As for bulk carriage, he proposed authorizing the Postmaster General to make special arrangements for the transportation in air commerce, at low rates, of large shipments of air mail and parcel post, where such arrangements would result in savings to the public or to the postal service.

BILL ON OCEAN CARRIER RATES

Another bill, which would carry out recommendations previously made by the President's air policy commission and the congressional Air Coordinating Committee would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the rates of air lines operating abroad from the United States, as it now regulates the rates of domestic carriers.

The final proposal in Mr. KENNEDY's series would relieve foreign air carriers of the payment of overtime rates, as at present, to customs officials who meet airplanes arriving at United States airports at night or on week ends, an item, he said, that ran to $800,000 a year.

Mr. KENNEDY said that his air-line legislative program was based on suggestions from representatives of all interested parties in aviation as well as from private citizens.

Must We Hate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Milton Mayer which appeared in the March 1949 issue of the Progressive. This article carries a message for all of us:

American democracy has just been saved—again—by the American Veterans Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish War Veterans, the Antidefamation League of the B'nai B'rith, and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. May their tribes decrease.

The enemies of American democracy consisted, this time, of two aging male musicians, one of them, Wilhelm Furtwaengler, the third, or perhaps second, greatest living conductor, the other, Walter Gieseking, the third, or perhaps second, greatest living pianist and by all odds the greatest living interpreter of Mozart and Debussy. Their weapons consisted of a wand and a piano. They have both been repulsed by the saviors of American democracy, and they will both continue to perform in France and England, where they are welcome.

The French and the English suffered less, presumably, at the hands of Furtwaengler's and Gieseking's Nazi friends than we did. Or maybe France and England are antidemocratic and pro-Nazi. Or maybe our democracy is so enfeebled that the invasion of a conductor and a pianist would destroy it. Or maybe the United States has been made a fool of by the AVC, B'nai B'rith, et al.

Furtwaengler, the conductor of the Berlin Philharmonic since 1922, was invited to conduct the Chicago Symphony Orchestra next year, and he withdrew his acceptance after some of the blood drinkers listed above threw the whole book of Nazi horrors at him. Gieseking arrived to conduct a sell-out concert tour and left with a "Vive la France" when the pack turned on him.

Neither of the men was a Nazi, both of them had been cleared of nazism by the American military government fumigators, and both of them had been certified as harmless by the State Department. The testimony that Furtwaengler actually saved the lives and the freedom of Jewish musicians under the Nazi heel was uncontradicted.

But let's say they were both Nazis, just to make it easy for the blood drinkers. The American State Department and the American military government are both so asinine in these matters that we should not be impressed by their seals of either approval or disapproval. Let's say that Furtwaengler and Gieseking, instead of being dumb, compliant, and weak-kneed musicians, were full-blown Nazis who actually thought that Hitler was Wotan and who condoned the unspeakable bestialities committed by the Nazi regime.

What then?

What did we gain by letting the blood drinkers repel them from our shores, and what did we have to lose by letting them in, the one with his wand, and the other with his piano?

In the gain account, I find not one item. Not one. Two Nazi musicians—we're saying they're Nazis, mind you—who do not make speeches could not in any way imaginable have injured American democracy, American morals, American freedom, or American culture. The war is 3 years over, the Nazi regime has been destroyed and deracinated, insofar as force can destroy and deracinate, and Furtwaengler and Gieseking are Nazi musicians who were musicians before they were Nazis and were never engaged in any other occupation than music during the Nazi regime.

In the loss account, I find, first, that American democracy has testified to the world that its fabric is weaker than that of England and France; second, that America has repudiated both its Judaic principle of equal justice before the law and its Christian principle of redemptive love; third, that those Americans who wanted to hear it have been deprived of hearing some of the best music in the world, and that all of America has been deprived of a serious contribution to its culture; fourth, that, by treating as monsters two Germans who are adored by their countrymen, America has played into the hands of the Russians.

This is the gain-and-loss account in the Furtwaengler-Gieseking matter, and none of the blood drinkers listed above can, nor will any of them try, to maximize the gain or minimize the loss. What they want is more blood, and whether or not a liquid diet is good for them they are too drunk on blood to care.

Instead, they will reply by reciting the list of unspeakable bestialities committed by the Nazi regime, under which Furtwaengler and Gieseking were compliant musicians, and, while they deny they hate the two musicians for being Germans, they will crucify them for the same crime, namely, weak-kneed compliance, that was committed by nearly all the Germans in Germany.

Furtwaengler and Gieseking were not heroes, though there may actually be a trace of heroism in their refusal to join the Nazi Party. Germans are not heroes, although there may have been traces of heroism in untold millions of them who, while they did not dare open their mouths, dared to smile a friendly smile on the open street at Jews whom they had loved. Americans are not heroes, though there may be a trace of heroism in the feeble protest of millions of them against the bestial atrocity of Hiroshima.

Men, as the Reverend Donald Harrington said on this subject in the Community Church of New York, are not heroes. Would that they were. Would, if we would that others were, that we were first.

The spokesman-in-chief of the blood drinkers, just for the record, is Walter Winchell, the darling-in-chief of the original and persistent native American Fascist, William Randolph Hearst. When American democracy is saved by Winchell, the rights of the workingman will be saved by Pegler.

Apart from Winchell—the most scurrilous figure in journalism—the blood drinkers appear to have found few confederates in their effort to keep the wheel of hate turning, with all of mankind chained to the rim. Newspaper opinion—such as I saw—was almost uniformly against the pogrom. The New York Herald Tribune was eloquent, and the Chicago Daily News rose to mournful beauty:

"Many Germans who were not vicious men acted like Furtwaengler. Sometime, the rest of the world must reestablish relations with them. It is important that those who can be brought actively to share in the common culture of civilized humanity should do so. If they will share in its common political and ethical traditions, so much the better. It will not be wise always to cry 'untouchable' to those who are willing."

The single disappointment among the newspapers I saw was what once was unquestionably the Nation's greatest newspaper, if the Christian Science Monitor is excepted. It was saddening to see the St. Louis Post-Dispatch say, in illogic no less than in illiberalism: "And to give him [Gieseking] the freedom of the Nation's concert stages is to accord him a personal eminence and honor that go beyond his status as a piano player."

About once every 10 times, the world's most frightful newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, is right. And when it is, it is superbly right. In answer to the letters presenting the particular policies of hate of the American Jewish Congress and the Anti-Defamation League, the Tribune made the repeated point that the Furtwaengler-and-Gieseking-haters should be free not to patronize them while the music lovers should be free to patronize them. If the American people agreed with the haters, they would keep away from

the concerts, and the two musicians would starve.

The blood drinkers weren't taking any chances on the American people. Carnegie Hall was sold out for Gieseking's first concert—which was canceled 2 hours beforehand—and Orchestra Hall in Chicago would have been sold out for Furtwaengler. The blood drinkers didn't care whether the American people agreed with them or not. They did not want democracy; they wanted German blood to drink.

The Anti-Defamation League, whose single function, so far as I have been able to discover, is defamation, explained to the Tribune that the league had gone to work on Gieseking out of a sense of duty. The Tribune asked: "Duty to whom?"

The question went to the heart of the matter. And of course it went unanswered, because the answer is, "Duty to hatred."

II

Now, we can understand, without justifying, the hatred that Artur Rubenstein has for his fellow Germans, and his refusal to appear in concert with Furtwaengler. Five members of Rubenstein's family were murdered by the Nazi regime. We do not expect him to behave normally toward his fellow Germans for a long time to come, if ever. What is more, he and the rest of the Jewish soloists who said they would not appear with Furtwaengler are exercising the same right as those Americans who, for any reason or for no reason, would not attend a Furtwaengler or a Gieseking performance. If a Jew does not want to associate with a German in activities that do not involve the common good, there is no reason why he should.

But nonassociation is not the same thing as segregation, and segregation is a form of p rom. The Jews have been on the receiving end of so many pogroms that you would think they would not want to have anything more to do with them, but the smell of one's very own blood seems, in this instance, to whet the appetite for another's. And so they keep the wheel of hate turning, ignoring the fact that the one way not to save the Jews—or any other small minority—is force. What Morris Cohen said long ago is still true, "Bashing in heads is for the 96 percent, not for the 4 percent."

If you ask the American Veterans Committee, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Jewish Congress, the Anti-Defamation League, and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions whether they want to keep Nazis out of this country, they will say "Yes." If you ask them whether they want to keep Nazis off the United States Government pay roll, they will say "Yes, indeed." But if you ask them why they don't get up on their hind legs to protest the importation of Nazi scientists and engineers to work on bombs and rockets for the United States Army, they will tell you that is different. Nazi musicians produce music, but Nazi scientists and engineers produce bombs, and bombs and rockets produce blood.

The doctrine in the counterpogrom against Furtwaengler and Gieseking combines the pernicious fallacy of collective guilt, the fallacy on which the Nazis slaughtered the Jews, with the pernicious infantilism of revenge. When the unspeakable bestiality of the Nazi regime has been avenged on all the Germans where shall we be?

The wheel of hate was turned at Potsdam; then, in spite of MacArthur's great words on the *Missouri*, at Manila in the hanging of Yamashita, then at Nuremberg, and then at Tokyo. In our duty to hatred, we manufactured a fraud called international law, in the prosecution of which we have thrown out the window the very first principle of Anglo-Saxon law, namely, that no man shall be a judge in his own cause; the Constitution of the United States, which forbids the passage of an ex post facto law; the Declaration of Independence, which asserts that Government rests upon the consent of the governed; and, just in case it, too, should turn out to be an American document, the Holy Bible, which enjoins us to forgive those who trespass against us.

The tragedy of the Jews is their imitation of the gentiles, who have sacrificed Christianity and the Constitution to the duty to hate. A Jewish musician like Yehudi Menuhin, who pleads for Furtwaengler, goes unheard and himself goes into the blacklist of the pretended Jews who will not remember that Job asked God to grant him consideration for the fact that he never gloated over his fallen enemy. The Jews learned the counterpogrom from the gentiles. The gentile answer to Chancelor Hitler's Nuremberg laws was Justice Jackson's Nuremberg laws, both based on force without justice. In this perpetuation of hatred, in this increase of sorrow and suffering, in this Hitlerism turned inside out, the American gentiles who engage in destroying Furtwaenglers and Giesekings are destroying American liberty and love, and the Jews who join them are destroying themselves. When American liberty and Christian love are gone, then the Jews are finished.

III

Some years ago I read an article in the Saturday Evening Post which said all this better. I've forgotten its title and the name of the author, a Jew himself, who was trying to persuade the Jews not to sink to the level of the gentiles. But I haven't forgotten the closing lines of the article, and I pass them on to the American Jewish Congress, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Antidefamation League, who seem to have missed that issue of the Post:

"The Jew who wants to be saved cannot wait for the gentiles to turn Christian. The Jew who wants to be saved will have to save himself. And the suddenly crowded temples won't save him. The denouncing of Coughlin won't save him. The destruction of Hitler won't save him. All these fallacious faiths are based on the grand fallacy of adjustment. The Jew will be saved when he saves his own soul."

A Clevelander Considers G. Washington, Father of His Country, and Suggests He Would Not Know His Erring Child Headed Down Hand-Out Boulevard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by one of Cleveland's most important and able columnists, Philip W. Porter:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of February 22, 1949]

(By Philip W. Porter)

George Washington had another birthday this week, and instead of listening to the usual radio and luncheon guff about the father of our country, I took a half hour out to meditate sourly on what old George would think of this country today (and what certain of his countrymen would think of George). He is probably churning in his grave over these phony womb-to-tomb security panaceas, particularly the latest little gem at which Mr. Truman gave us a look on February 22.

Of course, to start with, Washington today would be discredited in Washington. He was a man who had accumulated some property, a fair amount of it, including a country place called Mount Vernon. He had made some money and also married some. That would make him a glutton of privilege and put him in the doghouse of Senator PEPPER and the CIO. He would be a proper target for insult.

Having been a successful general, he would also be fair game for ridicule, and of course could not serve in a cabinet or as an ambassador. To the column writing snipers who extol the hand-out state, he would be big brass, and undoubtedly in league with Wall Street. (As a matter of fact, I seem to remember that a banker, Robert Morris, at one time financed the American Revolution for a time, all by himself.)

But let's skip that and get back to what George might think of some of the things now being advocated as national policy by his successor as the great white father, Mr. Truman.

TAXES PROVOKE WAR

Mr. Truman is advocating higher taxes, for instance, higher pay-roll taxes, higher income taxes. Washington and his associates went to war against King George because of unjust taxes—the stamp tax, tea tax, etc. They refused to pay, and finally rebelled outright.

Mr. Truman is advocating rent control. Washington and his contemporaries believed that the owner of a house, bought with his savings, had a right to get fair market value for it, if he chose to rent it. He would have shuddered at the idea of a Government clerk fixing the price, and an unevictable tenant living in it indefinitely at the same rent, as if he actually owned it.

Mr. Truman is telling people they can get free medical and dental care if the Government socializes medicine and dentistry. Washington wouldn't have understood this at all. In his day, the Federal Government merely coined money, carried the mail, maintained a small Army and Navy. Herding doctors into line and fixing their fees was not considered a field of government.

Mr. Truman is giving people the idea that when they reach 60 or 65 the Government is under an obligation to support them. In Washington's day, citizens had the quaint idea that people were supposed to provide for their own old age, and if they hadn't saved up enough, their kids would take care of them.

PITCHFORKS FOR BRIBES

Mr. Truman thinks the Government should guarantee the prices of crops to farmers. In Washington's day, a Government agent who would offer any such bribe—or suggest that an independent farmer restrict or control his acreage—would have been driven off with a pitchfork.

Mr. Truman has advanced the idea, which many unthinking people have fallen for, that the Government is a crutch for citizens to lean on, a big cornucopia from which to extract dollars, without any particular sense of obligation to furnish those dollars. He has advanced the parallel idea that the Government has the right to tell its citizens in peacetime at what prices they can buy and sell and how much profit to make. He apparently thinks of Government as primarily the manager of citizens, rather than their servant.

This would have been a strange concept to Washington—and to Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence. (Incidentally, he, too, must have been an evil fellow, for he accumulated property, including a big home, Monticello, on a hill in Virginia.) They and their contemporaries regarded government as a simple device for

making, enforcing, and adjudicating a few laws which would permit the citizens to enjoy the liberty they had risked their necks to gain from the British King. They didn't conceive of it as a cure-all, a vast, paper-shuffling Santa Claus, giving jobs to millions and interfering with and arranging the lives of other millions, printing rubber dollars, and promising the moon to the shiftless and the unhappy.

Perhaps this comparison is fantastic; the 13 small colonies of Washington's day are a far cry from 145,000,000 industrialized Americans today, and many new problems have arisen. Nevertheless, the citizen of 1949 had better think more about the freedom and self-reliance of his forefathers, and less about trying to get something for nothing, or we're headed for a social and financial crack-up.

Under the sleeping pills of the hand-out state, the boy who once read Horatio Alger, Jr., and had visions of rising from bootblack to bank president, today aspires to a civil-service soft snap at 25, a pension at 45, and free mush at 65.

Public Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the question of public housing is one which affects not only the people of the district which I am proud to represent, but all the people of America, as well. During my campaign for election to Congress, I brought forth before the people of my district the frightful situation of housing. The people elected me believing that I would lend my voice in support of a program for public housing.

We cannot lose sight of the fact that in these great United States of America, many of our people live in horrible slum conditions, because of the inaction of our Government.

Mr. Raymond Foley, of the National Housing Authority, has stated that the city of Newark, of which I am a resident, suffers more from slum conditions and improper housing, than any other city in America, with the exception of Boston. It is indeed a frightful situation for a city with a population of over half a million people.

The honorable mayor of the city of Newark, Vincent J. Murphy, recognizing these conditions has been fighting for a program of slum clearance and public housing. On February 17, 1949, he submitted the following statement before the House Senate Banking and Currency Committee, I believe that the statement is certainly enlightening and should prove conclusively the need for slum clearance and public housing. The statement follows:

I am appearing before you today to urge the adoption of a program of low-cost housing—a program large enough to permit our lower-income families to live in decent surroundings, and to enjoy some of the benefits that are associated with what is known as the American standard of living.

During the recent war, it became clear that far too large a percentage of our American youth were physically incapable of serving their country in the armed forces. There were undoubtedly many causes of this most unfortunate condition, which only recently has been strongly emphasized by the amazing percentage of physical rejections in the present draft. But it must be plain to anyone that the major cause is the existence of our city and rural slums, and the resulting crime, vice, filth, and disease. No one truly interested in the welfare of our people can close his eyes to this shameful situation or fail to take the necessary steps to correct it.

Although it is very well to be concerned about our system of private enterprise and insist that it must continue, we must realize also that private enterprise is not a one-way system, dedicated solely to economic profit.

I believe in private enterprise. I hate communism and dictatorship of all kinds, but I believe that the system of private enterprise, with all its great advantages, carries with it certain definite obligations. Society owes obligations to the people who made the system of private enterprise possible—the working people, without whose work, free enterprise would not exist in any form. In our system, each group is dependent upon all others, and through their mutual representative, the Government, they owe a moral, as well as economic obligation to meet a proven need for which private enterprise has been unable to provide. I believe, and I hope the members of this committee will agree, that every American who works for a living is entitled to raise his family in a decent home, in decent surroundings, and with decent facilities to maintain health. But it is a fact that millions of our people are unable to do so, first, because there are not nearly enough decent dwellings, and second, because the cost of building these dwellings is too high for the average American to pay.

In this country, at this time, and especially in our industrial cities, an unbalanced economic condition has developed. Too many of our people are denied their right to enjoy the American standard of living because the increased cost of housing is beyond their ability to pay. That is true in all of our lower and middle class income brackets. Just think of the man and his family who barely are existing on the wages paid for unskilled physical labor. The day laborer, with his pick and shovel, is just as important to the success of the industry that employs him as is the president of that industrial corporation. Can you imagine the feelings of that laborer earning $30 a week, when he reads in the daily newspapers that private enterprise is willing to provide low-cost housing at a rental return of $20 per room, provided they get tax concessions from our municipalities? That is what they are calling low cost in my city—yes, and in the entire metropolitan area of New Jersey and New York. Private enterprise considers that it is doing the municipality a favor by providing this low-cost housing at $20 per month per room. How can the average worker afford to pay $80 per month for a four-room unit? His earnings in thousands of cases can justify no more than $25 a month.

I do not believe that the American people will permit this condition to continue.

But entirely aside from the moral point of view, our failure to eliminate the slums and provide decent low-cost housing is a criminal economic waste as well.

Private enterprise, in the final analysis, pays the tax bill for our Government whether that government be national, State, urban or rural. Private enterprise, therefore, is paying millions of dollars a year to continue the slum conditions and the attendant vice, crime and disease. It is paying far more than it would cost to remove these conditions and create the satisfactory living conditions that would make our American working people comfortable.

Let me give you some figures to prove this. These figures were gathered in the city of Newark, N. J., a city that Mr. Raymond Foley, head of the National Housing Authority, has testified suffers more from slum conditions and improper housing, than any other city in America, with the exception of Boston. Newark is the largest city in New Jersey, having a population of almost a half million persons—with another 1,000,000 living in its immediate suburbs.

Newark is primarily an industrial city because of its great transportation advantages, and its immediate access to the great markets of the world.

Newark is also an old city—one of America's oldest. In fact, it will be 283 years old in May of this year.

It has a cosmopolitan population, which, because of the industrial character of the city, has a relatively low average income.

It is a city of renters. As a matter of fact, the studies on which we based our official master plan, show that there were 118,550 dwelling units existing in Newark in 1945 (there has been little or no change in this figure up to the present time because what little housing construction has taken place in Newark in the last 4 years has been neutralized by housing destruction through fire and other causes). Only 17.3 percent or 20,209 of these dwelling units were owner-occupied. In other words, for every Newark family owning the dwelling unit in which they live, five Newark families are renters.

Sixty-eight and seven-tenths percent of our residential structures are over 30 years of age, 27.6 percent having been built before the year 1900.

Thirty-eight thousand four hundred and twenty-three, or 30.8 percent, of all Newark dwelling units are below the minimum standards for health and decency, because they either need major repairs, or lack private baths, private toilets, or private water supplies.

A real property inventory made by the New Jersey State Housing Authority in 1935, found that 10.9 percent, or 4,718, of Newark's residential structures were unfit for human occupancy. Those figures were compiled 14 years ago. The situation has grown worse since that time.

In 1940, the average monthly rental for the entire city of Newark was $33.36 per month. Nineteen percent of all housing units rented for less than $20 per month, while 31.6 percent rented for between $20 and $30 per month.

That our people cannot afford to pay the rents required by private enterprise for decent housing is proved by the fact that an average of only 244 dwellings have been constructed annually in Newark since 1929.

Stated in another way, 22.2 percent of our 1940 population lived in 26,000 substandard dwelling units. Those figures are even higher today. Approximately 1,200 acres of residential housing in Newark must be demolished and entirely rebuilt. This situation exists in a city that is one of America's leading industrial cities, and vitally important to our national economy. Our manufacturing importance is so great that the city of Newark can be said to be indispensable to any war effort or national emergency. We cannot continue as a great industrial center unless we can continue to supply large numbers of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled labor to our factories, our foundries, our mills, and our service industries. Such workers simply do not, and cannot come from slum areas.

Let me add a few more facts as proof of the present economic unbalance. In 1940, the last official census year, we had 116,550 families in Newark; 6,870 of these families had an earned income of less than $1,000

annually; 17,850 families had an annual income of between $1,000 and $1,500; 40,510, the largest group, had an income between $1,500 and $2,000 annually. These figures mean that 56 percent of all Newark families had an income of $2,000 per year, or less, in 1940. This condition still holds relatively true today, because while incomes have risen, living costs have increased to an even greater degree. The wage earners have an even greater problem when it comes to the payment of the inflated rentals.

Our Government has done something for us in the way of creating decent living conditions in the city of Newark. It has created, through its public-housing projects, 3,036 living units. But this is grossly inadequate. Not all of these families were taken from slum areas, since not more than 200 of Newark's slum dwelling units were demolished to create this public housing. This was unfortunate, but the slum housing, as bad as it was, was needed for occupancy. In fact, there is still a need for at least 10,000 to 15,000 units.

However, case studies have shown a remarkable result, from both a social and economic standpoint as the result of this public housing. Comparing public housing facilities with families still living in slum areas, it was found that contagious diseases in public housing amounted to 114.2 per 1,000 children under 15, whereas in the slums, the ratio is 158.8. Tuberculosis, per 10,000 persons, from 15 to 40, is 29.2 in public housing, but 58.8 in the slums. Crime, vice and truancy all show comparable decreases among those fortunate enough to be housed in Federal low-income projects. The human suffering, and loss of life, caused by slum conditions is beyond computation. It is, and long has been, either overlooked or ignored by too many of our leaders. Somehow they do not seem to overlook as easily the economic waste caused by these slum areas.

May I present to you a pamphlet entitled "The Cost of Slums in Newark," prepared by recognized experts employed for the purpose, under direction of the housing authority of the city of Newark. This pamphlet clearly exposes the human and economic waste resulting from slum conditions in America. There is a wealth of information contained in it, but, briefly, the conclusion reached on page 21 is that the net cost of slums to the city of Newark, each year, is over $14,000,000. This startling figure is arrived at by an analysis of the cost of municipal services in slum areas, and also in the better residential districts. This study shows that municipal services in the slums cost 3.2 times as much as the city revenues derived from the slums, while in the better sections, tax revenues are 2.2 times greater than the cost of municipal services.

Now, I do not say, and I do not believe, that eliminating all of the slums in Newark would mean an immediate saving to the city of $14,000,000 per year. However, it must be clear that if trained experts arrived at such a figure after careful study, then the ultimate savings from slum clearance would be enormous. Even if only one-half of that amount, or $7,000,000 per year could be saved, in Newark alone, it could, itself, on the basis of bonds issued at 2½ percent interest return, over a twenty-five year period, provide about $100,000,000 for slum clearance. But the slums must first be eliminated before the city could save that money. With our limited tax base and capacity for the issuance of bonds, we cannot engage in this vast project without your help. If you will give us, and all American cities, a substantial start, our ultimate savings will enable us to finish the job. There is only one possible solution—action at the federal level for the good of all of the people of the United States.

Private enterprise can never build and rent adequate housing for our lower-income groups, even with partial subsidy by the city or the State. Take, for instance, the 24,720 families living in the city of Newark and earning $1,500 or less a year. These families need a four-room dwelling unit, and yet they cannot pay more than $30 per month for such a dwelling unit. Private enterprise in Newark has made its best offer—an offer of low-cost housing at $20 per room, per month, or $80 per month for a four-room apartment. It must be plain that some form of subsidy must be given if these people are going to live as citizens of the United States should live. That subsidy must come from the Federal Government, not only because the Federal Government takes the greater portion of the tax dollar, but also because the basic wealth of the country is its people. The health, morals, and welfare of these people must be protected at all costs.

On the basis of pure economics, it would be wise for our Government to undertake a complete program of slum elimination. On the basis of simple decency, this program should begin at once.

The neighborhood is the proper extension of the home. The State is the natural extension of the neighborhood. The protection of the neighborhood is vitally important to the security of the State. Slums are destroying the neighborhood, and, if not eliminated, will destroy our Government.

I urge you, do not delay too long. The actual work will take decades, but a start must be made now.

Permit me to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and to express, not only my own views on this vital subject, but views which I know are shared by my fellow mayors throughout the country, as has so clearly been demonstrated, year after year, by the United States Conference of Mayors.

Need To Equalize Annual and Sick Leave for Postal Field Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I introduced into the House yesterday H. R. 3030, to which I respectfully direct the attention of all Members of the House.

H. R. 3030 provides for an amendment to existing laws, so that field employees of the Post Office Department will be granted annual leave of 26 days and sick leave of 15 days per year.

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet found any Member of this House who does not agree that our postal employees are among the most loyal, efficient, and necessary Federal public servants. By their ability and their devotion to duty they have built for themselves a reputation of which they may all be very proud.

In view of the Nation's respect and high regard for postal employees, it is difficult to understand why our present laws provide only 15 days' annual leave and 10 days' sick leave for postal field employees, while all other Federal civil service employees are granted 26 days' leave and 15 days' sick leave.

Although I have been unable, Mr. Speaker, to obtain any explanation of this difference as it applies to sick leave, I have been told that the difference in annual leave may go back some 40 or more years ago to the time when it was considered necessary to give more extended annual leave to other Federal employees because they needed the additional time for transportation to their homes, whereas postal field employees worked in their own respective home communities. There was perhaps some validity to that line of reasoning in years gone by. However, with transportation facilities being what they are today, it appears to me that no such justification continues to exist.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 3030, and it is my sincere hope that early and favorable consideration may be given to this bill, so that our field employees of the Post Office Department may enjoy the same rights and the same privileges as all other Federal employees, including departmental postal workers.

Sam Rayburn, the Untalkative Speaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Mr. William S. White of the Washington staff of the New York Times is a native Texan, born at DeLeon, Tex. He is an able journalist, writing for a great newspaper. On Sunday, February 27, an article by Mr. White about one of the great men of our generation, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, was published in the magazine section of the New York Times.

I ask consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for today, because Texans are proud not only of the subject of the article, Speaker RAYBURN, but we are also very proud that Texas has produced such an able and talented journalist to write such an article as Bill White has written.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAM RAYBURN—THE UNTALKATIVE SPEAKER
(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—The time of glory has returned in a kind of bright autumnal sunburst for SAM RAYBURN, of Texas. His new era has made him the most powerful Speaker of the House since the days of "Czar" Joe Cannon, and the most influential elected man in the United States apart from his friend Harry—Mr. Truman.

He stands at the President's shoulder, closer even, in the personal sense, because of old affection and old similarities between the two men, than Vice President BARKLEY. More than any one, excepting only the President, SAM RAYBURN will have it in his hands to determine the general course and record of the Eighty-first Congress.

For him, then, the present is brilliant, but there have been other times, other days.

In the late afternoon of April 12, 1945, a sturdy, blocky, somewhat saturnine man—a not very gentle man upon whose tongue the sharp phrase was ever more at rest than the sweet—wept silently in the Capitol.

SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who is now doing what no other man has ever done in entering upon the fifth Congress in which he has served as Speaker of the House, had just been visiting with Vice President Harry S. Truman, of Missouri. Mr. Truman had suddenly been called to the White House. Franklin D. Roosevelt was suddenly dead. Mr. Truman hurried out. Mr. RAYBURN, the Speaker in a Democratic Administration that had seemed to many already to be slowly dying in the weight of the years and their bitterness, sat at his desk in the semidarkness. No one thought to turn up the lights.

His heavy and very nearly immobile face was still in the shadows and the only movements upon it were the small and barely visible traces of the tears. He swept them away roughly. For a long time no one said anything at all. Then Mr. RAYBURN hunched his shoulders and, looking out unseeingly into the dusk, he spoke slowly in short, hard phrases as though talking to himself.

There, before friends, in words that are yet under the seal of that room (in which this correspondent was among those present), Mr. RAYBURN took an oath for the future. Its substance was that SAM RAYBURN—southern Democrat and all—had followed Franklin Roosevelt in life, and that SAM RAYBURN would follow Franklin Roosevelt in death.

It was, at least to some of those who stood and looked, a scene with a certain touch of elegy for more than one man. Mr. RAYBURN was in his fourth term as Speaker; already, if one looked at history, his power was running on borrowed time, for another Democratic capture of the House, in the election of the following year, looked most unlikely. The elegiac view was, so it turned out, the correct one—for the time being.

For the months ahead were hard and certainly anything but good for Mr. Truman's shaken leaders and his shattered forces in Congress. And then, in the next year, in November, Mr. RAYBURN took a train with the President to Missouri and there two of the biggest men in the Democratic Party went about clamoring loyally, but with not much heart for the ear of the voters in an hour of foredoomed disaster for the Democrats.

When the returns were in, half a generation of Democratic rule of Congress was swept aside; and swept aside with it, it seemed, was all the future for SAM RAYBURN.

Never a notably sunny man, he surveyed the future without enthusiasm and he would not have accepted the post of minority leader for the Democrats—a dismally far rung down on the ladder from the exalted speakership—but for Harry S. Truman. Accept it he did, however, and with such of those as he could rally from his broken party he stood stolidly in the House for 2 years, fighting with a melancholy skill against a Republican tide that few thought would ebb for years.

He had come, as he himself had used to say, "a far piece from Flag Springs" (the town which was his first Texan home, and the first home of his Tennessee-bred father and mother), but it rather looked now that it was to be back to Flag Springs, in every sense except the most literal one.

Then came one of those recurring miracles which demonstrate the unbelievable vitality of the two-party system and the vitality of such responsible, and able, politicians as SAM RAYBURN—the elections of November 2, 1948.

So SAM RAYBURN, whose sun had been a long time burning in four Congresses as Speaker and who could not in any other profession have been thought to have much of a future—SAM RAYBURN sits at the top again, more powerful and influential than ever. But he is still unhurried, still laconic in speech and manner, still the most unpolitical politician of one's acquaintance.

It is possible that in the rare extremities of the political situation in his home district centering about Bonham, Tex., he has kissed a baby or two. It is conceivable that, in moments of the August heat upon the rural hustings, he may even have "made the eagle scream."

But it is inconceivable that he ever, in his life, slapped a single back, except the back of a genuine friend—all of whom he does not lightly choose nor lightly discard—and it is quite certain that his own back is very rarely slapped to his pleasure.

In this sense he is a maverick in his profession. And even more so when measured against the folkways of professional Texans.

Here is no Texan as that character has been personified of late years to the East by some of the State's more booming extroverts among the oil and cattle and sulphur millionaires. Mr. RAYBURN wears no 10-gallon hat, he wears boots in the privacy of his ranch-farm home when they are sensibly indicated, and only then, and has absolutely no cowpoke drawl. He handles the king's English quite well, in fact, and with an economy that is without parallel in Congress. It is not his habit, even on the most desperate of issues, when he may be speaking for the highest hopes of a Democratic administration in the House, to beat his breast or loudly to raise his voice.

His method, perhaps, is extremely good largely because it is so rare. He does not rise to lead the entire Democratic array in furious action against every little disputed item that comes up, or every "little old ticky bill." Nor does he signal for the heavy artillery every time desultory Republican firing breaks out across the aisle.

He keeps his eye, and his interest, always on the major objectives, the big political issues, and refuses to waste his own efforts and ammunition, and those of his party, in diversionary actions the outcome of which doesn't really make much difference.

Thus, when a major battle does come, he rises quietly in the House and the simple motion has something of the spectacle about it, for it is realized by all who watch that something big is at stake. The commanding general has come forward into the line. The party whips rush out to bring in Democratic stragglers; even the Republicans summon the laggard; mutters run through the Members' lounges and shouts through the press gallery: "RAYBURN is up."

The effect, whether or not the Speaker realizes it, is one of high drama, however restrained, and the House—Republican and Democratic side alike—falls silent as for no other man except the President of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN then takes a firm stance, either at the leadership table or down before another microphone in the well of the House. For a moment he surveys the House in silence, his face calm but his brown eyes sparkling and darting about. Then, conversationally, he begins to speak, and it is as though he edited the words before they left his mouth. There is no extravagance of phrase; there are no threats or shouts.

"Before you go on here," he may say to his opposition, when the position is difficult, "I want to tell you this—you are about to make a big mistake here, a very big mistake."

In the Eightieth Congress, when the Taft-Hartley bill was before the House, he made, in about two paragraphs, one of his characteristic speeches.

After accusing the Republicans of having given the Members too little time to study a much-revised draft, he went on to this effect:

"I do not know all that is in this bill. Few do, or can. But, from what I know of it, I know that what you are doing here is not fair. The bill is not fair. I'm not going to vote for it."

It may seem odd that so calm a statement could be so effective. But it is not so strange when, for days, one has heard the high and purple exaggeration that is so ordinary to big congressional debates. It is, as the theatrical profession is understood to use the term, a case of underplaying a scene until all the other actors somehow seem trivial or insincere.

It is this fugitive quality of reserve and restraint that makes Mr. RAYBURN so useful a leader in what most people here consider to be—the Vice Presidency notwithstanding—the second highest position in the United States.

This strange quotient of leadership is not really so very different in a constructive legislative politician than in a military commander: The essential is the capacity to suggest a certain withdrawal, if a benign one, from the crowd; an awareness of much that is not immediately before the eye and hand; an ability to cope, with due but not excessive concern for the safety of the participants, with obstacles that are only vaguely formed in the minds of the followers.

All this makes Mr. RAYBURN, in the almost universal judgment of Washington, a vastly effective congressional leader when the necessities of the situation are affirmative, call for forward motion; that is, to pass a bill, or many bills, or a whole program. He is not, one believes, quite so effective when it is necessary simply to hold on in some grim defensive action, although he is not at all bad at this.

He is a man who, in his complex personality, inspires confidence more by what he does not do—the mistakes he does not make—than in what he does do. The power of his silent example is very great. For example, last spring he never said a public word about the movement to bolt President Truman which was then sweeping strongly through the southern delegations in Congress. (What he said in private then and at the Philadelphia Democratic Convention was said in the explosive monosyllables of an old Anglo-Saxon glossary of epithet.)

So freezing, however, was the bleak aura of disapproval emanating from his office that protesting "Dixiecrat" groups, meeting almost under his nose to plan "revolts" against the regular Democratic tickets, walked in and out looking over their shoulders, sometimes audibly worrying what SAM would think.

His relations with President Truman are very close, politically and personally, and whenever the President comes to the Capitol he makes it a point to drop in on the Speaker for a chat as intimate and unreserved as any talk between two close and loyal friends. These are not conferences; they are exchanges of confidences.

It was no accident that Mr. Truman was called from Mr. RAYBURN'S office to become President of the United States. The President could often be found there in the old days when he was "the VP," and it would not be different now but for the necessities of the President's new life.

Mr. RAYBURN'S responsibilities, therefore, are much beyond those of the average Speaker of the past. He is a trusted and frequent adviser upon the very highest matters to the President of the United States. Officially his job is in many respects comparable to the job of heading any great corporation or enterprise. He is the ultimate chief of everything in the House, from the nature of its legislative program to the conduct of its dining room, and the direction of its personnel—hired and elected—is his endless concern.

He performs his job with economy of motion, with scant and infrequent but heady

praise to those about him, with a ready and easy delegation of authority, and with a somewhat amused deference to perhaps the most temperamental of all men—the politician at work.

As the Speaker of the House, he has three main functions:

(1) To perform as the responsible presiding officer (and in nearly every real sense the outright boss) of a parliamentary body.

(2) To act as the head of the Democratic Party in the House; its general manager, umpire, and, occasionally, in a rather hard-shelled way, as a paternal counselor to whom many in the fold bring their troubles and ambitions. In this, he has also, and always, to keep a critical eye upon all the vast legislative mechanisms of the House, spurring on this laggard committee, reining in that overzealous one—in short, taking personal responsibility for all the important business of the House.

(3) To advise the highest personages in Washington—from President Truman on down—on all manner of topics, at all times.

It is in this last capacity, and one that is not necessarily in the book, that he operates the rather well-known Rayburn "board of education." This board of education meets, at the will or whim of the Speaker, of a late afternoon now and then in one of his smaller offices. Its sessions are friendly, and very informative, and by no means resemble a meeting of the boys in the back room.

One could take there without fear of embarrassment a reasonably worldly maiden aunt—except that Mr. RAYBURN wouldn't like it. What goes on in the board of education, where the trustees are assembled—for example, it might be Chief Justice Fred Vinson, Associate Justice William O. Douglas, and perhaps some officer of Cabinet rank—is utterly "in the room." There is shop talk there, but of awfully important things.

Mr. RAYBURN, formerly of Flag Springs, goes through it all with a brisk, slightly absent-minded geniality, neither "cottoning" to his fellow "great"—as it used to be put in the South—nor standing too much apart from them. His advice is quick, pungent, and clear.

Here, as on the floor and everywhere, he detests the pompous, the precious, and the sentimental. When, on rare occasions, the House falls into the mood for passing out extravagant encomiums, he always, of course, gets a full share. In the throbbing rhetoric, he sits, somewhat slumped in his chair, a hand across his face. One suspects, with some cause, that sometimes the hand hides a strongly deprecating grin.

When, of late, Congress was passing a bill to raise the pay of the President and Vice President and the Speaker of the House, Mr. RAYBURN never rose to declare that he felt honored, etc., but really wasn't worthy. He could use the extra money and, in the opinion of his colleagues in both parties, he was worth it. So he simply said nothing at all.

He took a similar line when the House, in curbing the privilege of its ancient Rules Committee to smother legislation, gave to him powers not held by a Speaker in a long time—powers to let bills come up, in certain circumstances, notwithstanding the committee. This meant, so his critics said, a return to czarism, for in cutting down the Rules Committee, the Members, so it was contended, had simply left it all up to 1 man's yea or nay, rather than to 12.

Certainly, SAM RAYBURN had received an extraordinary mandate, to state it in the most conservative way. He never suggested that he would reject these new perquisites. He said he thought them adequate. Privately, however, he stopped the House from going even further in its regard for him.

An extreme individualist, he is a living refutation of the filing-case system of categorizing men. No man living did so much, so long, for what were then often called the radical programs of Franklin Roosevelt—from the holding-company "death sentence" on down through the years—but SAM RAYBURN is no New Dealer in the common use of that term.

He does not foregather with the ex-Harvard bureaucrats in Georgetown and lament over the little cups for a past era. He has profound reservations about such things as the so-called civil-rights program. He never uses the word "liberal" in reference to himself. And some of his best friends are as conservative as John Stuart Mill and as traditionalist as Lord Macaulay.

He is a perfect member of a small but intelectually tough and long-lived group of elderly men from the inland reaches of Texas, with whom it happens that this writer is intimately familiar.

They are descended from those who suffered, at arms or at home, in the War Beteen the States, and, in or shortly after the reconstruction, picked up what was left of an easy and vanished life and went West, to Texas. For the most part, they are of English and Scottish descent, with the Scottish the stronger in them, and their settlements in Texas still feel the Calvinistic influence of long ago.

They believe—Mr. RAYBURN believes—first of all in a fairly rigid Constitution, but not an unchangeable one; in order, in self-discipline, in a rather hard but fair justice; in the utmost of personal freedom wherever it is accompanied by personal responsibility—and personal responsibility is the greatest article in the credo. They take no great stock in money for itself, or property for itself, except for the proper maintenance of one's family and connections and a proper station in life, and therefore they do not really fear economic reform, not even sweeping economic reform.

Instinctively they question—Mr. RAYBURN among them—any social reform which seems to abridge innately personal rights, even the not very pretty right to be a little prejudiced, as opposed to mere money rights. They are strong in the works of mercy, but very weak in the sufferance of those they may consider to be fools.

Mr. RAYBURN, at 12 years of age, walked several miles into Bonham, Tex., to hear Joseph Weldon Bailey, a Representative and later a Senator, and his magnificent nineteenth century prose. He was a country boy, from Flag Springs, and he was timid. It was raining, but he would creep only to the edge of the covered tabernacle, as rural evangelistic arbor churches were then called, and he stood there, listening, for 2 hours with water trickling down his neck.

It makes almost too good a story, but it is a fact: he went home and vowed to be Speaker of the House some day. At 28 he was speaker of the Texas House of Representatives. Thirty-five years ago he was elected to Congress and never has been defeated since.

He is a bachelor and has a small apartment here; a driver for his limousine, and many more social invitations than he cares to accept. He is 67 years old now and profoundly believes that most things younger men worry about are damned nonsense. He is no rich man and no poor man. He has a 300-acre farm and ranch near Bonham and another little place of 80 acres, with bunks on the wall and pots of coffee in the kitchen.

He does not live with special care for his health, but it is his habit, barring State dinners or the like, to sleep exactly 9 hours a night. He has a theory that his splendid health, under really crushing burdens, may be explained by his breakfasts.

"I never eat in the morning," he told me recently, in the most earnest way, "without one thing: honey. Honey's very good for you."

Axioms of Global Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Miss Dorothy Thompson at a meeting sponsored by the United Service to China at the United States Chamber of Commerce on February 27. Many of us in Congress feel that the State Department's policy toward China should be reconsidered and restated. Miss Thompson's discussion of our foreign policy deserves consideration.

I have obtained from the Public Printer an estimate as to the cost of printing this address. The estimated cost is $248.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AXIOMS OF GLOBAL POLICY

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The aim of American foreign policy is to defend the United States, without war if possible, with war if there is no other way. The aim of foreign policy is not to establish the "four freedoms" all over the world; it is not to "make the world safe for democracy"; it is not to make it assured that every child on earth will have the equivalent of a quart of milk a day. All these things are desirable; all can enter into or derive from, the success of a foreign policy. But they are not its aim. Its aim is the security of the Nation.

The security of a nation such as ours rests on four axioms.

These are: Observe the advice of Washington—to have no "inveterate antipathies," and to cherish no "permanent passionate attachments" to any nation, but to seek to live on good, equal, and reciprocal terms with all. Reciprocity is the sine qua non of good relations.

Second. Friendly relations with other states cannot be based on their interior policies except as these affect their exterior policies, which alone determine the relations between powers. In foreign policy the first requirement is the ability to distinguish a friend from an enemy.

Third. A great power, like our own, which has no expansionist ambitions, can hold her place in the world only by using the weight of her diplomacy and power to support those nations who, through weakness, may easily become the prey of others who do have expansionist aims, and who, through the absorption of weaker nations may put themselves in a position successfully to challenge the United States.

Fourth. Prestige equals a reputation of absolute fidelity to commitments.

The objective to be achieved by these four axioms is to create, hold, and maintain such a world position that no foreign state can, at any time, venture to challenge the United States in war with any expectation of success. Never should the United States allow a situation to develop in which the preponderance of power is so decisively on the side of another state or combination of states that the United States is unable successfully to fight if challenged or defend herself if attacked. Once such a condition exists the choice is not between peace or war, but between slavery or suicide.

I speak in terms of power politics because there is no other form of politics existent. The time may come when all the states of the world, living in equal freedom for their interior development, may enjoy equal security through the rule of enforceable law. But if it comes it will only be because the overwhelming preponderance of power is on the side of the states desiring so to live. Assuming that such is the ultimate goal of the United States, the possibility diminishes with every loss of power to nations or states with other aims.

WHY WE FOUGHT THE AXIS

The aim of the German-Japanese Axis was to conquer Europe under one hegemony, and Asia under another, and isolate the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Had that succeeded the United States would have been compelled to live on the terms of others or fight at overwhelming disadvantage. Germany and Japan would have controlled the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and together have dominated the Eastern Hemisphere.

The geographic terms we use are misleading. A generation ago Sir Halford Mackinder, the British geographer, attempted to reeducate his countrymen in the realities of geo-politics, calling their attention to the fact that the terms Eastern and Western Hemisphere are incorrect; that the western half of the globe, if a circle be drawn around the poles, is mostly water; that what we call the Western Hemisphere are rather islands off the coast of the "great island," constituting only one twenty-sixth of the world's area, while the vast land mass of Europe, Asia, and Africa—Africa separated from the latter only by an inland sea: the Mediterranean—contains seven-eighths of the world's population and resources. In that land mass he saw Russia as occupying the central position, and he warned back in 1917 that a strong federation of states should be constructed to keep Russia separated from Germany. His thesis was: Who rules the heartland, can rule Eurasia, and who rules Eurasia is master of the globe. Mackinder's geo-political theories were adopted by the German general staff and by the Russian general staff as well.

We went to war against Japan and Germany precisely to prevent the establishment of a joint Japanese and German domination of Eurasia. The cause of the war with Japan lay in China. The framers of our foreign policy, under President Hoover and Mr. Stimson, and later under President Roosevelt and Mr. Hull, were clear that a free and independent China was essential to a world balance, in which the United States could continue to be secure. In those days all four of the axioms I have stated governed our attitude toward China. We could not afford to have an expansionist power, allied with another expanionist power, joining hands across Eurasia and the Middle East from ocean to ocean.

I know it is said that we went to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. That is childish. The attack at Pearl Harbor did not precede but followed the breakdown of peace negotiations opened by the Japanese in Washington. We could have had peace with Japan had we been willing to recognize Japanese conquests in China. Japan drew the logical results from our refusal. I am no major prophet, nor minor prophet either, but I stated a full week before Pearl Harbor that we would be attacked by Japan, since the break-down of the Washington negotiations indicated war, and the predictable Axis tactic was undeclared attack.

Now, either we were justified, in 1941, or we were not justified. If we were justified, then we confront today the same situation and problem. If we were not justified, and are therefore justified today in reversing the policy of 1941, then our authorities owe the American people an explanation for the tens of thousands of casualties in the Pacific.

THE ALWAYS POTENTIAL DANGER FROM RUSSIA

Before the war the Russian Empire already embraced one-sixth of the surface of the globe, and over 160 nationalities, all ruled from the most centralized government on earth. The freedom and security of the United States and the premise of peace demanded that no one of the victorious belligerents should use the war to expand its imperium and unbalance the whole power-political structure. The Atlantic Charter was not, as it was afterward described, an idealistic document. It was the only realistic document put out in the whole course of the war. How could it conceivably be forgotten that the Soviet Union originally entered the war as a nonbelligerent ally of Hitler, and for imperialist reasons; that during this alliance the Soviet Union annexed part of Finland, part of Poland, part of the Baltic States, part of Rumania, and how could it have been accepted that these expansions made in cahoots with Hitler were to be recognized as permanent by the western allies?

The western allies must surely have asked themselves why the Russo-German pact broke up, for surely Hitler and his general staff desired least of all a two-front war. Obviously, the pact must have broken up because Hitler's imperialism was clashing with Stalin's. Now we know, from documents of the German foreign office, that the rupture came because Stalin was claiming the Balkans as his share of the loot. Yet it remained for the western allies to give Stalin not only what he had won together with Hitler but everything and more than he had ever asked of Hitler, and make him heir to all of eastern Europe from the Baltic to the Adriatic—the greatest expansion of power ever achieved by any state in any single war in the course of human history.

If, in this discussion of China, I speak of eastern Europe, it is because the Russian strategy is global and identical with the strategy of the Axis, except for the fact that in the Russian plans the Soviet Union is, itself, the entire axis. Here is no coalition, like the German-Japanese, in which the two imperialists might, at some future time, fall out. The Russian geographical position enables her to play the role of both Germany and Japan in subjecting Eurasia. She has a frontier on the whole eastern line of Europe, which has now been pushed some 100 miles west of the River Elbe. Behind this frontier the historic centers of European defense against the east have all fallen under Soviet control. The Baltic is a Soviet lake; Warsaw and Budapest, where, in the past, many an army has stood against eastern inroads, are gone. Italy is laid wide open on the Guilian Plain and there is no geographical hindrance to armies marching westward, short of the French Alps.

The Soviet Union, whose leaders are much smarter than Hitler, would never undertake a two-front war. For success in western Europe, the Soviets need a secure rear. And that rear is China, which covers the Soviet war industries in Siberia, and beyond China India, Afghanistan, and Iran. Therefore, in the long run, the safety of Europe depends on Asia, while the safety of the United States depends upon Europe and Asia, lying as we do between the Atlantic and Pacific.

These observations are banal to the point of being childish, but they do not seem to have been consistently taken into account in our policies.

THE PASSIONATE ATTACHMENT TO RUSSIA

We suffer—apropos axiom 1—from the fact that 30 yeras of international Communist propaganda have created in the minds of a certain number of people in all countries, a passionate attachment to the Soviet Union, as an especially privileged nation, the center and direction of a progressive social revolution, therefore the object of protection for all progressive-minded men. The extent to which this attachment has infected the minds of normally patriotic persons is quite immeasurable. That the picture they have built up of the Soviet Union has no correspondence to reality, is beside the point. That the Soviet Union is, in essence, a slave state, that its economic system is one of total monopoly state-capitalism, in which every human being is chained to the machine, the factory, or a specific spot of land, or subject at any time to transportation elsewhere, individually or en masse, in which all are reduced to the lowest proletarian status, or enjoy bureaucratic privileges constantly jeopardized by the chance of denunciations and purges—all this is, perhaps, beside the point. The greatest success of Soviet propaganda has been to present the Soviet Union as a peace-loving nation threatened by imperialists.

Russia, and the nations that constitute her empire, have been, through the whole of their history, expansionist. From the plains of Central Asia originated the armies of the Golden Horde of the Khans, that overran large parts of Europe and all Asia, subjected slavic Russia, and later were subjected to Moscovite Russia. Ideologically, Russia was always expansionist. Any study of Russian literature prior to the Bolshevik revolution reveals a mystical and messianic dream that some day all the world will be Russian. It was not a Bolshevist but Dostoevski who wrote, "The only God-begetting people in the world today are Russians, the only people destined to renew the world and save it in the name of a new God."

This concept creeps into most Russian political literature of the nineteenth century. The Russian mind is limitless, like the Russian steppes. Russian history is a history of ever-extended borders, gigantic colonizations moving outward from the center, never satisfied with what existed, nor troubling to build and create stable forms within accepted limitations. Indeed, without the acceptance of limitations no form-creating, culture-creating activity is possible. No one can go to Russia without being struck by the absence of anything that could properly be called a Russian culture—in the sense that we can speak of a British, French, Chinese, or Indian culture. In Leningrad one sees pure importation from western Europe; elsewhere one can trace, in buildings and architecture, a straight line to the Byzantine Greeks or non-Slavic peoples from central Asia. The Russian countryside is notable chiefly for filth and formlessness. What is Russian is precisely this unsettled nature of the country, the terrific biological vitality, the hordelike quality of the herd armies and herd organization, and the ever-present vision of an all-Russian world, which must be created by the smashing of all other cultures.

It is not a matter of mere chance that the Messianic dream and a dyspeptic Prussian, Karl Marx, should be kicked about in Europe for a century only to strike its first real roots in Russia and furnish her in the twentieth century with the long-awaited new god, destined to overthrow all previous religions, encompass the destruction of all previous social orders, and make the Soviet Union the arbiter of all men's destinies. Only in Russia could such a universally form-destroying idea find a natural reception.

THE COUNSEL OF PRUDENCE

All this is known to men with an historical sense. Prudence should have counseled our wartime leaders to keep ever in mind the danger that through the war victorious Russia might be tempted to spread in all directions. There was warning of this even during the war. The Partisan movements from Europe to China, their leaders trained in Russia and loyal to Russia, all fur-

nished abundant proof that the Soviets believed the time had come to apply the axiomatic tactics taught in Communist theory for over a generation: Every international war must be turned into a civil war. Nowhere—neither in China nor Albania nor Yugoslavia nor Greece nor Poland—did the Communist partisans loyally cooperate for the defense of the nation. For them the war was an opportunity to obtain arms to organize military cadres and to prepare for the seizure of total power. The absolute uniformity of the pattern, from Europe to the outermost islands of the Pacific, indicated a centrally directed discipline. Thus, civil wars started before the international war was won, and in every country the civil war was actually an international war of a new type. Russia's new war was begun against her western and Chinese allies with the cannon fodder of the populations of the allied nations.

THE INTELLECTUAL FAILURE OF ALLIED STATESMEN

Western statesmen failed to realize this and therefore failed to uphold what I have called the second axiom of foreign policy, namely, to be able to distinguish a certain friend from a probable enemy. Probably never has there been so colossal an intellectual failure. Every conceivable element was introduced by interest aided by ignorance to confuse this issue. American reformists demanded that every government of the resistance be measured according to some impossible standard. We must not support monarchy, so ran the argument. We must not support Fascists, cried the reformers, and swallowed whole hog the Marxian definition of fascism as merely a normal development of capitalism, chiefly distinguished by its opposition to communism. Like the Marxists, our reformers swept into a single kettle and labeled them Fascist, kings, conservatives, landowners, nobility, industrialists, practically the whole of the middle classes, in fact, all anti-Communists. They were all reactionaries. A crop of new kinds of Fascists were invented—crypto-Fascists, monarcho-Fascists, clerical Fascists.

By this process of confusion confounded, the Kings of Yugoslavia and Greece, the Chetnik leader Mihailovich, the Government in exile of Poland, pro-western resistance movements in Axis satellite nations, and the national Government of China all became Fascist. That these governments and movements were our proven friends, that there was no record of a lasting and profitable friendship between Communist and non-Communist governments; that communism is, by its own repeated declarations, the uncompromising enemy "of the whole bourgeoise world"—all this was overlooked.

By some strange wartime metamorphosis the future new era was to be based upon a permanent alliance of three great powers, dividing the world into spheres of influence, and setting up a series of coalitions with Communists in every single country to whom the Big Three could dictate. Thus Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and the Axis satellites were all compelled by great power pressure to extend their governments to include Communists. Oddly enough, it did not occur to any of the Big Three to take their own prescription. Stalin did not "broaden" the government of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, a purge began in Russia. Neither President Roosevelt nor President Truman took their own medicine. Neither Mr. Churchill nor Mr. Attlee decided that peace necessitate the inclusion of Communists in the British Government.

In less than 3 years not a single one of these coalitions existed. Every government had fallen completely to the Communists and every one of these countries had become a political, economic, and military colony of the Soviet Union.

THE ERROR REPEATED IN CHINA

The same prescription was offered to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, of China. To the merit of his intelligence, he refused to accept it. Chiang knew that there is no way of compromising with Communists nor of compromising a civil war backed by the Soviet Union. There is only one thing that can be done in a civil war, where one side, backed by a great power, is fighting for a totalitarian solution, and that is to win or lose.

The Chinese-Japanese War was the accepted moment for Russia to begin preparation for the victory that has been a Soviet aim since the Bolshevist Revolution, and for the realization, for that matter, of a goal of Russian foreign policy far older than the Bolshevists; as old, indeed, as modern Russian history. In Russian strategy North China and Manchuria, which furnished more than one-third of all Japanese war production, must become a Soviet appendage. For only from North China could a united China and her allies defend themselves from a position where the Soviets themselves were highly vulnerable.

There should, therefore, have been but one policy: to protect the freedom and independence of all China. But our wartime policy under Gen. Joseph Stilwell was less based on this concrete objective than on General Stilwell's likes and dislikes. When, however, General Wedemeyer succeeded him, the objective was firmly in his mind.

When Japan collapsed the generalissimo's armies were in south and western China, far from the vital ports and industrial centers held by the Japanese. But the United States provided the airlift that made it possible for the Nationalist armies to leap across the Communist forces in their path and occupy the key cities, while naval transports began moving Chinese national divisions to the Manchurian ports. According to Major General Chennault, General Wedemeyer worked out a complete plan for the defense of China and put it in a report to this country which has never seen the light of day.

When the civil war broke out in force in October of 1945 the generalissimo's armies still had American equipment, and with it they began mopping up Communist forces. The offensive was under way when General Marshall reached China a month later to carry out a policy set for him by the American Department of State. That policy was to end the civil war and stimulate a coalition government between the National Government and the Communists. The Marshall mission forced a truce in China, exactly when the nationalist forces were gaining the upper hand. The generalissimo balked but was compelled to it when military aid to China was suddenly cut off, including—according to General Chennault—war surpluses bought and paid for by the nationalists. At the same time an America-China agreement was scuttled, under which the United States had agreed to supply planes and equipment for an eight and one-third air force. The generalissimo was forced to agree not to use the existing air force against the Communists. And it was suggested that unless the truce were effected the loan promised China would not be forthcoming.

Tens of thousands of Communist troops who had been surrounded by nationalist armies—a pocket of 70,000 of them north of Hankow, and another pocket of 100,000 near Canton—were released from their traps by a truce commission headed by American generals. All these released Communist troops marched to Bias Bay and promptly embarked for Shantung.

Again, according to General Chennault, the worst catastrophe occurred at the Kalgan Pass, the gateway between China and Manchuria. When the war ended there were no Communist troops there; there were Russian troops. When the first Chinese Communists got there they found Manchuria stripped of its equipment, its industries scuttled, and the arsenals of the Japanese Kwantung Army empty.

Early in 1946 a Government offensive captured the Kalgan Pass, trapping nearly a million Communists who were moving into Manchuria from northwest China. These Communists wailed that they were merely attempting to return to their homes. General Marshall succeeded to persuade the generalissimo to open the pass. The Communists, having passed through, promptly fortified it—thus breaking the truce. And 6 months later these same Communists were again in battle, this time armed to the teeth with the entire equipment of the Kwantung Japanese Army, estimated as sufficient to keep a million men fighting for 10 years.

Meanwhile there had been a 10-months' American embargo on military supplies to nationalist China, and the great offensive into north China had begun its sweep, not halted to this day.

The apologists for this American policy maintain there is no evidence of Russian aid or intervention in China. But the Russians armed the entire Communist forces, while America disarmed the nationalist forces. It is said that the morale of the nationalist forces is low, that of the Communists high. The Communists know they have a great nation backing them. The nationalists know that a great nation has let them down. In the spring of 1948, Congress, belatedly alarmed, offered the nationalists $125,000,000 worth of aid but not until 7 months later did munitions even begin to trickle into Chiang. Meanwhile the Communists had all Manchuria and most of northern China. And in war success is nine-tenths of morale.

Now the attitude is—the attitude in the State Department—that it is too late anyhow, maybe the Chinese Communists will turn out to be Titos. Only the other day I read in an inspired article reflecting State Department views, that Mao Tse Tung never was a really indoctrinated Communist agent. I do not know who gives the State Department such remarkable information.

The central committee of the Chinese Communist Party, which Mao Tse Tung heads, is tied hand in glove with Soviet policy. For 25 years the Soviets have conducted a training school, military and political, for Chinese Communists in Moscow. At the seventh congress of the International Communist Party, greetings were brought to Moscow from Mao Tse Tung by his comrade of the central committee, Chow-Ho-Sin. These greetings said, among other things:

"The militant Chinese Red Army sends greetings to the all-union Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. and to the leader and teacher of the workers of the world, Comrade Stalin.

"This congress will facilitate the preparation for the decisive barricade fight for Soviet power throughout the entire world."

It is said, "Oh, well, the Communists also will be unable to organize China."

What wishful thinking. Certainly they will be unable to organize China as a settled culture, uniting the traditional concepts of Confucius with modern education and techniques. That is not their purpose. Their purpose is simpler—and easier.

They will cut off the heads of every Chinese patriot. They will tear up the population and move the people hither and yon, dragging them up from the roots that nourish Chinese culture. They will organize them as a militant horde, and herd. They will give the poorest peasants land but their ownership of every scrap of ground will be dependent on implicit obedience.

The analogy with Tito is false—even if we could predict the outcome of that story, which we cannot. Tito's quarrel with the

Cominform is possible because of his geographic position. Yugoslavia has no frontier on the Soviet Union and thus is not covered by Soviet Red armies. But China has a 4,000-mile frontier on the Soviets. When one considers the Russian pressures being brought now upon Yugoslavia, and asks what Russia would do in case of a revolt by Mao-Tse-Tung, the answer is obvious. Russia would pick another leader, and if necessary start another civil war. In that case what would be the policy of the United States? Would we arm one Tito-Communist army against another Communist army? Would we do for Mao what we will not do for the generalissimo?

OUR POLICY IS INCONSISTENT

It is said we must not and cannot intervene in a civil war. This despite the fact that we are intervening in the civil war in Greece, recognizing that that civil war is an international war, fought with domestic armies.

The guerrillas of Greece are fighting for a Russian Europe.

The Communist armies of China are equally fighting for the triumph of Russia in Asia.

True, these armies are not composed of Communists. But, as General Marshall testified before the foreign affairs committee of the Senate, a political commissar is attached to every cadre of troops. And these are thoroughly indoctrinated Communists.

Communist armies in China are impressed into service, trained in an iron discipline, and over the heads of every member hangs the threat of death for any breach of discipline—and the even worse threat that for the indiscipline of any individual his whole family may be exterminated. Russian officers and technicians are monitoring the Chinese Red armies. When the Nationalists withdrew from Mukden and the Communist armies moved in, they had with them 30 or 40 Russian advisers. Why should they not? There has been an unbroken military liaison between Moscow and the Chinese Communists for nearly a generation. It was active and visible in Moscow in 1928 when I was there.

Communist armies are everywhere the same, kept intact by unremitting indoctrination, the most effective propaganda machine the world has ever known, and a most effective combination of persuasion and terror. Their victories preface a systematic extermination, not only of the opposition but of all potential opposition. Thus, the Communists first spoke softly to the populations of Tientsin and Peiping, but when they were secure in these cities, thousands of persons were rounded up and disappeared. Refugees have reported that children were taken from their parents and sent to collective institutions—a first step in destroying the social unit of the family which is basic to Chinese civilization.

The Chinese Red army is, in fact, as much an instrument of Soviet power as any other Red army. It is well to remember that there is no single Red army of the U. S. S. R. Soviet military forces are a series of armies, physically decentralized to the peripheries of the Union and throughout the satellites, each force being trained for a specific tactic, each autonomous, but all under absolute central control, and all instruments of a global strategy.

The Soviets believe that war is inevitable. For 30 years the Soviets anticipated the Second World War—and the third. In Soviet theology there is no remote possibility that Communist and anti-Communist states can permanently live together in the same world. Were there time this afternoon, I could copiously prove this by quotations from Lenin to Stalin. Russian peace propaganda, like Hitler's peace propaganda, is merely a Russian defense measure to keep the victims asleep until the correct moment. The Soviets are not impulsive. They do not, like Hitler, indulge in clairvoyant visions. They are scientific—and systematic. Everything, they are convinced, will fall into their hands, but only by carefully calculated steps.

And at all times there is a complete integration of political and military strategy on a worldwide basis. The political effects of a total Communist victory in China will be immeasurable. Already India trembles, and the highly tolerant government of Pandit Nehru rounds up thousands of Communists, having discovered plots to sabotage Indian communications, disrupt public services, and establish liaison between Indian and Burmese Communists. Chinese colonies exist within all the nations of eastern and southern Asia, where, with a Chinese victory, they will become sources of agitation and sabotage. It is the wildest wishdream to believe that the conquest of China will not eventually fan the entire Far East into unquenchable flames.

THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTHERN CHINA

Therefore, the necessity to hold Southern China would seem patent * * * as well as the fact that the United States cannot forever go on throwing its friends to the dogs, if we want to keep a scrap of prestige. In place after place and time after time, the reward of our friends has been to be hanged as war criminals, while government after government whom we have originally backed, eats the bitter bread of exile if its members are lucky enough to have escaped the gallows or the slave camps of the Soviet Union. People draw deductions from this: It is unsafe to be a friend of the United States.

The Nationalists still hold China south of the Yangtze and to Formosa. To be sure, the present acting president, Li-Tsung-Yen, apparently wants peace at any price. To be sure, he has warned the Communists that if they cross the Yangtze or attempt to take Nanking, peace negotiations will be off. And, of course, the Chinese Red armies and their political leaders would prefer peace by negotiation to further bloodshed and would love to classify resistance after a negotiated peace as aggression. But if there is a real peace of compromise between the Nationalists and the Communists it will be the first time that has happened in history. The Russians may prefer to use Li-Tsung-Yen, rather than Mao. They also preferred to use Fierlinger in Czechoslovakia.

The Generalissimo, however, is in Feng Hwa, with part of his army. Other Nationalist forces are in Shenshi Province and Formosa. They are, to be sure, surrounded by enemies and traitors. So was George Washington at Valley Forge. Chiang is still willing to fight; in fact, itching to fight. He, and the few Nationalist military leaders left, cannot reconquer all China. But it is conceivable that they could hold southern China, provided they were given first-class equipment of all kinds and first-rate military advisers, as competent as General Wedemeyer and it is also likely that Communist brutality, as gains are consolidated, will inspire revolts, provided there is any force to revolt to, as eastern European cadres of soldiers would revolt to anti-Communist forces today if there were any left.

From a global viewpoint an Atlantic Alliance is preposterous. We should offer eastern-western alliances to all who will stand for their liberty.

Our foreign policy is theoretically to contain the Soviet Union. One may logically ask, at what point in the Pacific will we contain it? Where shall we encourage our friends to take a stand? In French or Dutch Indonesia? In southern Korea? In India? In disarmed Japan? Or shall we let Asia go entirely? And if so, why did we fight the Pacific war?

THE GLOBAL DANGER

Do we actually think that a Russian imperium in Asia would be less dangerous to America than a Japanese?

It would be more dangerous. The Russian geopolitical situation is more advantageous than the Japanese. The manpower and resources of Russia excel those of Germany and Japan combined, if we exempt the Japanese holdings in China, from which she drew a third of her war materials. Russia sits in the heart of Eurasia, with adequate internal resources to arm and equip her million-numbered armies, already distributed at all the peripheries and beyond. In Europe she is at the Danube and the Elbe; in Asia she is at the Yangtze. Everywhere her agents are spying and undermining morale. In some places their impudence is boundless. In France, Maurice Thorez, Communist member of the French Assembly, dares publicly to invite the Russian armies to enter France as liberators, in case of conflict with the Soviets, and to lay down the thesis that "by definition, the Soviets are never the aggressors." He is backed up by Togliatti in Italy. The French hesitate to try Thorez, twice a traitor, lest they make him a martyr. The Russians, however, are not afraid to make martyrs.

CONCLUSION

It would seem from the facts of our vast strength and wealth, in the service of a nation dedicated as no nation ever was to human liberty, that America's destiny was to lead the world. So the whole world has thought. But wealth and strength are not power. Power is will and direction.

And a nation not perpetually jealous of its own security cannot lead the world. In the end, it cannot even lead itself. Backing and filling, its leaders afraid, even, to tell their own people the truth, it will gradually find itself pushed off every political and military beachhead, until, at last, isolated, and without allies, it will be forced to take a stand as hazardous as any stand that might today be made by the Chinese Nationalists, risking its very life against the alternative of passing, for generations, and perhaps forever, out of history.

Every state that falls in Europe or Asia brings that terrible dilemma closer. And every state that falls brings closer, also, the danger that, having sacrificed the liberties of others for our own peace, we shall finally have to give up all our own liberties for the sake of our fundamental security.

Armistice Negotiations Between Egypt and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the very able and successful part played in the recent armistice negotiations between Egypt and Israel by the American acting United Nations mediator, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, deserves to be brought to the attention of all our people.

I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that the attached statement commending Dr. Bunche be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, OF MARYLAND

The welcome news of the accord reached by Israel and Egypt, which marks a long step toward peace and progress in the Middle East,

is particularly gratifying to people of the United States because of the leading part played in the negotiations by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, of this country, as acting United Nations mediator.

Too much praise cannot be given Dr. Bunche for his tact and diplomacy in thus bringing to a successful conclusion these negotiations which, now that Lebanon and Transjordan have indicated a willingness to confer, undoubtedly will be the forerunner of similar peace agreements with all the Arab states.

Taking over this diplomatic post almost at a moment's notice as he did following the assassination of Count Bernadotte, Dr. Bunche has exhibited the utmost statesmanship, patience, and persistence and is generally reputed to have been one of the leading factors in arriving at agreement proposals satisfactory to both Israel and Egypt.

Dr. Bunche deserves, and I am sure will be accorded, full recognition when the story of Israel's first troubled days is recorded. The agreement in which he figures so largely is one of the most significant achievements to date of the United Nations, and demonstrates the potentials for peace inherent in the objective efforts of this world organization when applied to any and all problems between states the world over.

Civil Functions of Army Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am very much opposed to the efforts now under way to remove the prosecution of our flood-control and river-and-harbor program from the capable hands of the Army engineers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on this question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. RUSSELL B. LONG, OF LOUISIANA, ON PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF ARMY ENGINEERS

The Army engineers have been the leading engineering arm of our Government since the founding of this great Republic. For many years after their establishment by George Washington, they did all the engineering work for the Federal Establishment, since they constituted the only organized technical service in the Government.

In the early days of the nineteenth century, under congressional authority, they began to survey our great inland rivers for navigation purposes. A great city in Louisiana, Shreveport, is named for Captain Shreve, the originator of the snag boat, who worked on Red River before the Civil War in an effort to make it navigable.

Through the years, the Army engineers have remained true to their trust. They have, in war and peace, reflected the great traditions of honor and integrity which have been handed down to them by their distinguished predecessors—Robert E. Lee, George E. Meade, George B. McClellan, Joseph Johnston, and George W. Goethals.

In Louisiana, we like the Army engineers; our relationship has been harmonious through the years and particularly so since 1928, when, under congressional authority, the engineers began construction of the greatest engineering project in the world—the control of the lower Mississippi River. Since that work began, the great levees built by the Army engineers have not been breached by floodwaters. We still have many flood problems in Louisiana, since we must take the floodwaters of nearly one-half of the continental United States, and our State is coursed with several large and troublesome tributaries; but we believe we can solve our problem best working in cooperation with a group of men who know and sympathize with our problems, who are nonpolitical, who are able in their technical knowledge and who, above all, can be depended upon to go about their tasks with a high sense of honest devotion to duty.

We in Louisiana want no part of a grandiose, politicalized public-works agency. I shall work in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member, to provide reorganization exemption for the Army engineers. I shall continue to fight to preserve their civil-functions activities from whatever quarter the attack might come.

Washington's Birthday Address by William E. Leahy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT McCARRAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very able address delivered by the Honorable William E. Leahy, of the Washington, D. C., bar, on the occasion of the celebration of Washington's Birthday at the annual meeting of the Society of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia on February 22, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members of the society, ladies and gentlemen; this gathering of the Society of Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, in thus joining with Americans everywhere to commemorate today—the birthday of George Washington—is a satisfying demonstration of the genuine patriotism of this organization. Characteristically, and in traditional habit, this Society has never failed carefully to notice those great spiritual events which, like gleaming beacons, light the highway of our progress and indent gloriously the paths our country has traveled from that quiet stream which flows so silently beneath the bridge at Concord to the present storm-tossed waters that lash so harshly now upon the shores of time and of nations. Congregations such as this cannot be summoned too frequently. Neither can our citizens be charged too often that still in eternal vigilance lies the security of our liberty and our happiness. Today we perpetuate the name of him whom we honor. We salute his memory in humble and in grateful tribute. Today we take added strength in that indefatigable determination which was the aegis of his strength, with which he so guided his course and compass that he never swerved from the objective pole he had set for his final achievement. Today we pledge our renewed devotion to the Republic he did so much to create. We cherish the unselfish leadership he assumed to make its existence an accomplished fact. Here and now we rededicate ourselves anew to the preservation of that nation and its ideals, a Nation and ideals to which he gave the promise of potential fellowship in the family of nations when at last he attained the victory he so richly deserved in the Cornwallis debacle at Yorktown. In spirit let us graciously give thanks that the sheer pertinacity of his uncompromising fortitude ultimately procured for a recipient posterity an inspired modification, if not a complete change, in the age-old materialistic conception of man's ability to govern himself, by giving place in man's government of himself to the recognition of the full stature of his dignity as man and his allegiance to Almighty God.

Volumes have been written of Washington. They are at one and the same time the undeniable assurance that he was great and the price he paid for being so. Some are good. They fairly evaluate the imprint he made upon that ribbon eternity drawn across the face of time and which men read. They call it history. Others in admiration of the man have dipped their pens deeply in wells of fancy, imagination or willing exaggeration. They have fallen before the image of their own creation. They kneel reverently in adulation, overwhelmed by their assessment of the tremendous credit he loaned a bankrupt revolution—in the stalwart courage he showed best when the hour was darkest and the burden most oppressive. One readily excuses their fault and accepts their unnecessary flattery. For Washington commanded respect always, almost a hushed respect of awe when he was present. But he was human. He was intensely human. Those frailties and foibles which, in lesser men, usually detract heavily from the heritage man's nature is heir to, he so caused to be submerged and controlled that, notwithstanding the commerce of his life lay in waters of unprecedented storm and its tonnage weighted with cargoes of the heaviest and most exacting responsibilities, he has come down to us in recollection and affection as a human man, one of us and for us, typically American and a human one, who fought, struggled, dreamed, hoped, planned, lost, but who always rose, to fight again, and struggle, to dream, hope and plan again, never once losing confidence in the sublime purpose which drove him on to create the United States of America. His method needs no adulation. The concept of his soul repels apotheosis. The profound love with which we embrace his memory is richer and purer because we know he was human, not just some Greek god, loaned to us by Olympus for a time in the critical decades of our difficult birth and tumultuous infancy. Young Americans will profit most when told the truth: that an insatiable thirst-demand for freedom and liberty molded this man in the frame of his greatness and that America supplied him with the opportunity to gain both. And all Americans can find inspiring courage to carry on in the lesson of his life and the persuasion of its constancy and its action. America holds open now and will continue always to hold open the opportunity for development of individual ambition just so long as we Americans maintain the institutions he helped to construct in the same shape he helped to make them, and just so long as we retain free enterprise and man's right to work beneath the sun in an atmosphere of free government and individual liberty.

Personal freedom was not won where the sun rises. At that horizon man lives in darkness. The darkness of degrading bondage, the night of dishonorable toil. Serfdom still presses heavily upon him and there seems little hope of a short termination to the regrettable condition of his servitude. Historically, the Far East has been the dark east for man in his struggle for life. There the human family has groveled long upon a lowly level. For a time, as the sun

rose, its rays reflected brightly against the white temples of Periclean grandeur that once crowned the Acropolis when Athens thought its people free. They fought valiantly in leadership against the enslaving hordes of Persian revenge and invasion. But they oiled the marble of Paros and liked best slabs riven from the thighs of Pentelicus. Nature had mellowed and yellowed their sheen. The pupil of the Grecian eye suffered in its inability to adjust to the glare of the sun. And night came again. Apollo passed on. Culture still mourns the episode. Now an occasional battle or a shot against guerrilla bands echoes a faint call for the freedom that was, a ghost call from mountains where once the pipes of Pan played joyous music and imperial Jove once hurled his roaring thunderbolt. Even the peace of Augustus was a compelled peace. The concept of the right in the individual to live within the law as he thought best and with'n the bosom of his family without obtrusion and in security, never burgeoned into the bloom of full enjoyment under Roman rule or the Roman invention of government by world conquest and municipal franchise. And when Rome fell the only light that shone through the almost absolute blackness of the ensuing centuries was that which came through the window of some monastery where monks still kept burning industriously for its emergence in the renaissance a flicker of that classical culture which survived the death gasp of Athens, which Rome never destroyed but which captured Rome and which, as a remnant all too small, finally took fire again in the rebirth of learning and the resurgent blessing of the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. The sun had left the eastern horizon. It had risen. It was then when man began to rise erect to the full height of his manhood. It was then that the dignity God had put about him as a rich garment of his sonhood of God caught unwilling but demanded recognition. It was then man's exploitation of his fellow man engaged resistance and spiritual values found acceptance. They reached back to Golgotha and Calvary. They had been tempered in the blood bath of centuries. They had been asserted, preached, defended—but selfishness, greed, pride, ambition had denied them, ruthlessly relegated their possession and enjoyment to the forge of battle, death, disease, waste, want, poverty, and suffering. The anvil upon which man's liberty and freedom were fashioned was a hard anvil. Its ring, when struck, was the ring of justice. But mighty hands and sinews of superior strength struck often against the plane of its hard surface before form took shape and man became free. The sweat of ages has fallen on it. Bursting veins of drawn muscles in stout arms and legs have attested to the toughness of the job at hand. But rust never left a particle of stain upon it and blood only burnished it. The altar of man's liberty is the mountain of his hope. Its altar stone has been sanctified and made holy by the lives of those whose bones in death have whitened so many battlefields that little children at their knees might drink a sweeter cup when thirsty and eat of more bread when hungry.

The sun is still passing. Inexorably it follows the groove of its orbit. We are living in the beneficent splendor and benign invigoration of its recurring warmth and strength. Like Athens, will America lose its power of eye accommodation to the brightness and the glare? The answer is, Beware. Already upon the horizon there appears a curtain, a curtain of darkness, the darkness of the redegradation of man and the second night of his serfdom. A curtain is descending, again from the east, a curtain of iron. A curtain drawn by the relentless fist of a cruel beast, molded in the shape of a seductive philosophy. A philosophy of misrepresentation, deceit, avarice, and lust. Lust for power, lust for domination, complete domination, absolute power. Power over the lives, the thoughts, the hearts, the prayers of everyone, of every people, of every nation, of the world. It would take the glory of his God from the Jew; and the cross, the exemplification of his redemption, from the Christian. Its creed is hate. Its strength is deception. The virility of its motion is the insane obeisance of its adherents to tenets detested by freemen and destructive of all freedom. Already its teachings infect our colleges, universities, schools, our public and our private institutions, with the metastasis of its foul disease. It respects no man or principle. It condemns law and despises order. It breaches harmony, quiet, and peace. It thrives on confusion and promotes discontent. It rears its arrogant head in our legislative halls and insults the chosen representatives of our people in order to destroy the confidence of our people in the government of our choice. It insolently usurps the functions of our courts in order to make a mockery of justice. It knows no justice. It is a bullying throwback to the savagery of the Mongolian Steppes and it parades hypocritically as the friend of man. It is the reincarnation of the rape of civilization, intensified in the consuming heat of its passion because its passion admits no restraint. It cringes when caught, and suppliantly cries for the protection of those inalienable rights which it is determined to destroy—rights which it knows we recognize as inseparable and unseverable from freedom.

Its purpose is clear. There is no difficulty in prying off the thin veneer of its time-serving protestations. Its aim is against America—against us. Its goal is the complete destruction of our moral, economic, and governmental ideology. Its frontal attack is now aimed against religion—all religion. The Mindszenty conviction, in its sham and hypocrisy, not only followed the pattern long set for trials by minions of that philosophy but forecasts the sorrowful state of our other ministers of the cloth now incarcerated as criminals of the state. Unless saved, they, too, probably will gain each his crown of martyrdom for the only crime he ever committed—that of trying to bring the love of God into the hearts and the souls of a people. Once religion is destroyed, communism is then ready for its coup de grâce. Then the tools of that philosophy will begin their subtle operations as they have in every country they have enslaved, and the common man, whom communism brazenly pretends to protect, will find himself utterly expendable in a labor camp or on a battlefield, or wherever the ruthless clique of its sadistic leaders may capriciously wish his liquidation.

Today, then, as we foregather, we may just as well admit the fact that we, as Americans, are standing at another crossroads in the transition of dynamic forces. As Washington turned his face toward Cambridge, he knew that he could return to the Mount Vernon he loved only if he came back with victory and his work completed. He had to win liberty for us then in the blood and sorrow of a long war. Ours is the job now to maintain what he won for us. As he faced enemies from within, so we know that already agents of destruction are working secretly and subversively in every department of our National Government and economy to sabotage and break down the greatest measure of liberty and freedom man has ever devised or known in the annals of time. There is this difference, however, which signifies importantly between the revolution Washington successfully waged and this now being waged coldly against us: Washington knew his enemies. The loyalists were open in their loyalty. Washington called them the most despicable pests of society, but they were unorganized and undirected. We do not know the underground traitors now working against us. They are organized. They are directed. But we know this: When Washington dealt with those needing discipline, he knew how to administer it. And he administered it. When he faced mutiny, he put mutiny down and he made no silly excuses, either for the mutineer or for himself, in quelling the mutiny. When a slave or a soldier needed the lash for discipline, he ordered the lash. He was a stern disciplinarian, but a just one. He demanded obedience. He got it. He was the responsible leader in a critical fight to the end. He expected no quarter, but he courageously dealt with every crisis as it arose. The lesson of his conduct of the war and his assistance in the final formulation of the Constitution is a gospel for attention for us in the cold war which is now upon us and which lies ahead. This time we stand in leadership alone, as he did. But there is no cause for discouragement. Caution and prompt action, however, are indicated. Somehow, if we cooperate, there is a divine guidance which will bring us through. And that America will still continue to carry on as the last refuge of freemen under God, in the right as He gives us to see the right, is the benediction in which we all fervently join on this the birthday of George Washington.

Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, soil conservation is a basic problem of our economy and one of the greatest responsibilities of the Congress. We must preserve the fertility of the soil which still exists and replace the fertility which we have taken away by years and years of exploitation.

Among the leaders in soil-conservation work is the Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I wish to insert the annual report of that association for 1948. It follows:

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BENTON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, 1948

INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared in an effort to give you a better understanding of the aims and accomplishments of the Benton County Production and Marketing Administration, commonly known as triple A.

PMA embraces several programs of the Department of Agriculture such as price supports, marketing quotas, crop insurance, and the agricultural conservation program. Since the agricultural conservation program is the major program in this county more space has been devoted to the activities of this program.

As elected representatives of the farmers of Benton County we wish to express our appreciation to all persons who have helped make this program a success. We sincerely solicit your cooperation in future programs.

SCOTT EVANS,
C. R. BROADHURST,
D. B. BLAIR,
Members, Benton County Production and Marketing Administration Committee.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The agricultural conservation program in Benton County is carried on through the

Benton County Agricultural Conservation Association. The conservation program is open to every farm operator or owner in the county and each and every one is invited to participate regardless of the size or type of farm.

This program is one of Government-farmer cooperation in the field of conservation. Each year Congress appropriates money to be paid out to farmers as an assistance in carrying out needed soil- and water-conservation practices on their farms. Money thus appropriated is allocated to States on the basis of conservation needs and on down to the counties and to the individual farms. It represents a public investment in the maintenance and restoration of our soil. In every instance the farmer has invested two or three dollars for every one received.

The agricultural conservation program provides for a national program of soil and water conservation under the direction of farmer-elected farmer committees. With local farmer committees directing the program the public is assured of getting the most conservation for the money spent. Local farmers acquainted with local needs and conditions see to it that money appropriated for payments is spent on practices adapted to their individual counties.

This national soil-conservation program not only concerns itself with the needs of individual farmers but with the needs of the Nation and the world as well. As the fertility of our farms is restored and maintained the entire Nation can be assured of a more plentiful supply of better quality farm products. Every individual, whether landowner or not, depends upon the products of the soil for the necessities of life and has a vital interest in maintaining its productivity.

Some of the things that have been accomplished by the triple-A conservation program in Benton County are pointed out in this report. Much progress has been made in the field of conservation but much more remains to be done.

PARTICIPATION

A total of 2,507 farmers participated in the 1948 triple-A conservation program. This means that at least one approved conservation practice was carried out on each of these farms and that 59 percent of the cropland in Benton County was included in the conservation program.

Fifty-eight thousand five hundred and forty-three dollars was available as assistance to farmers for carrying out conservation practices in 1948. The total value of all practices carried out was $103,751.59.

1948 CONSERVATION PRACTICES

Practices for which assistance was offered in Benton County in 1948 were recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee on the basis of:

1. Those that would fill a definite need in the soil and water conservation for Benton County.

2. Those that were needed by a majority of the farmers in this county.

3. Those that would obtain the most conservation for the money spent.

4. Those that could be administered in a practical manner.

APPLICATION OF MINERALS

The application of limestone, potash, and superphosphate is an important triple-A practice. By promoting a rapid and heavier growth of grasses and legumes their application serves as a good conservation practice. At the same time they result in better nutrition by aiding in plant growth rich in body-building minerals.

In 1948 Benton County farmers applied 4,326 tons of ground limestone, 133,598 pounds of potash, and 4,638,482 pounds of 20-percent equivalent superphosphate to pastures, meadows, green manure, and cover crops.

PASTURE DEVELOPMENT

Farmers of Benton County established or improved 16,650 acres of pasture by seeding 333,127 pounds of adapted pasture grasses and legumes and controlled noxious weeds by mowing on 32,096 acres.

About 65 percent of the phosphate, limestone, and potash was used on permanent pastures.

COVER CROPS

In addition to preventing erosion and conserving water the use of legumes replaces nitrogen in the soil.

The triple-A program assisted farmers with this program by paying a part of the cost of such seeds as vetch, crimson clover, cowpeas, and soybeans.

In 1948 Benton County farmers seeded 61,032 pounds of winter legumes and 29,276 pounds of summer legume seed. This provided protective cover for approximately 4,500 acres.

PONDS FOR STOCK WATER

The construction of ponds for livestock water has been a big factor in developing the livestock program in Benton County. Much land that was of little use has become valuable as permanent pasture when water was provided.

Eighty ponds were constructed in 1948 bringing the total for the last 4 years to 438.

The amount of money available for assistance had a marked effect on the extent of practices for 1948. Compared with 1947 the value of practices carried out in 1948 was in proportion to the amount of assistance available.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Administrative funds

County and community committeemen	$1,375.80
Office and field personnel	6,577.40
Travel	250.94
Miscellaneous	296.93
Total operating expense, 1948	8,500.53

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

The price-support program is another branch of the Production and Marketing Administration and is administered by the same personnel responsible for the agricultural conservation program.

Price supports provide that the prices of farm products be supported at rates fair to both farmers and consumers because of the importance of good farm prices in maintaining national prosperity.

Support levels for various commodities are represented as a percentage of parity. Parity means that the prices farmers receive for their products are comparable to the prices they have to pay for the things they buy. This allows support prices to vary up or down depending on the price of nonfarm commodities.

Following is a brief summary of present price-support legislation:

1. The basic commodities—corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, cotton and peanuts—will be supported at 90 percent of parity through June 30, 1950.

2. The major nonbasic commodities will be supported at 60 to 90 percent of parity through December 31, 1949—except that milk and its products, hogs, chickens, and eggs are to be supported at 90 percent of parity for that period.

3. Beginning January 1, 1950, the provisions of the long-range price-support program will go into effect. It provides that the basic commodities will be supported at 60 to 90 percent of parity, depending on the level of supply. All other agricultural commodities (this includes eggs, milk, chickens, and hogs) may be supported at 0 to 90 percent of parity depending upon the importance of each commodity to the national economy, its degree of perishability, the level of supply, and other factors.

ACTIVITIES

Blanket of green program

The county triple-A committee cooperated 100 percent in the program to get Benton County covered with a blanket of green in the fall of 1948. Two of the 1949 practices approved during the latter part of 1948 were meant to encourage farmers in this program. They were the establishment of a cover of small grains or ryegrass for soil protection and improvement.

Educational program

The county committee cooperated with the county agent in carrying on an intensified educational program during 1948. Forty-five community meetings were held at which time motion pictures were shown and provisions of the triple-A program explained.

Radio programs

During the months of October, November, and December a total of twenty 15-minute radio programs were presented dealing with the various phases of the program.

Community committee meetings

During the year three county-wide meetings of community committeemen were held to discuss various problems having to do with the conservation and price-support programs.

Election of committeemen

The election of 1949 county and community committeemen was held during the months of November and December. Voting was carried on by mail and at 14 polling places throughout the county. A total of 950 votes were cast in the election.

PERSONNEL

County committee

A county convention, at which representative farmers from all sections of the county were present, met in December 1947 and elected the following men to serve as the county committee during 1948, C. R. Broadhurst, Pea Ridge, chairman; Scott Evans, Maysville, vice chairman; Dan B. Blair, Route 1, Bentonville, regular member; Joe Douglas, Route 2, Bentonville, first alternate; Orville Austin, Maysville, second alternate; P. R. Corley, county agent, ex officio member.

The county committee held two regular meetings each month and in addition several special meetings as the need arose. Each member was practically 100 percent in attendance.

The following list covers part of the duties performed by the committee during the year:

1. Recommended program practices, methods of establishing farm allowances and rates of payment for practices.

2. They designated the most-needed practices for the county and recommended the materials and services to be furnished on purchase order and the fair price for these materials.

3. They reviewed and passed upon farmers' performance reports and approved applications for payment.

4. They hired the necessary field and office personnel and set their salaries.

5. They approved association budgets and certified monthly expense accounts.

6. They cooperated with the Extension Service in holding educational meetings in an effort to keep farmers informed concerning the objectives, provisions, and progress of programs.

7. They arranged for the annual election of community and county committeemen and encouraged farmers to participate in the elections.

8. They put forth every effort to obtain an adequate supply of conservation materials such as lime, phosphate, and winter cover crop seed.

9. They kept the State committee informed on the progress of the work and on farm problems peculiar to Benton County.

Community committeemen

The community committeemen who served during 1948 were elected in November 1947. Fourteen polling places were open and every person who participated in the 1947 program was eligible to vote for these committeemen. Balloting was also carried on by mail. Regular ballots were provided and the election conducted and results certified by community committeemen. Benton County was divided into 14 communities for convenience in administering the program and three regular members and two alternates were elected from each community. The following committeemen served during 1948:

Community 1—Logan, Ball, Yell, and Hico Townships: C. M. Nokes, W. A. Braden, Walter Bruner, J. D. Mason, Ira Leach.

Community 2—Flint, Felker, Gentry Townships: Ernest Slocum, Harlan Wasson, Ernest Butler, M. O. Winningham, Vol Wasson.

Community 3—Round Prairie, Cherokee Townships: Cecil Hartley, Stanley Berridge, E. C. Scott, S. N. King, T. C. Barney.

Community 4—Beatie, Eldorado Townships: George Haley, John Rodgers, Maurice Loux, Raymond Tucker, Joe Rodgers.

Community 5—Decatur Township: Lee Shook, Fred Gilbert, E. C. Fairless, C. E. Reed, W. H. Bush.

Community 6—Apple Glen, Sulphur Springs, Wallace Dickson Townships: Paul Belts, Elmer J. Kelley, Nick Hendren, J. W. Kelley, Frank Edwards.

Community 7—Garland, Mason Valley, Anderson Townships: Joe Douglas, A. F. Weiser, Glen Rakes, Gid True, Horton Harral.

Community 8—Hoover, Wager Townships: W. B. Sullivan, Mac Givens, Barney Douglas, Hugh Evans, Frank Douglas.

Community 9—Colville, Washington, Big Springs Townships: Asa Garrett, Glen Johns, Glen Brainard, Harvey Graham, Feaster Carter.

Community 10—Exculapia, Brightwater Townships: Lawrence Brush, R. W. Davis, W. D. Hall, Jess Howell, E. N. Adams.

Community 11—Osage Township: Harley Featherston, Charles Follet, Don Cloe, Bill Gregory, Carl Tromble.

Community 12—Mount Vernon, Sugar Creek Townships: Mitchell Webb, John Schell, Finis Hall, Sam Evans, Herbert Ross.

Community 13—Rollers Ridge, Pine Log, Garfield Townships: Ted Schnitzer, Leland Gann, W. C. Allen, Ray Hurd, Mary McGaw.

Community 14—Walnut, War Eagle Townships: J. L. Agnew, R. G. Churchwell, E. L. Marrs, Arthur Bland, Green Sharp.

None of the farmer-elected committeemen, county or community, draw a salary but are simply paid for the time actually spent on business for the association. The pay they receive only serves to pay their travel and other expenses in connection with meetings they attend.

These farmer committeemen represent the grass-roots thinking in their community and are an important factor in keeping the control of the program in the hands of local people. Their biggest job is to keep the farmers in their own community informed about the program. In addition they make recommendations to the county committee concerning conservation needs and the practices and conservation materials necessary to meet these needs. They also assist in arranging for community elections and in holding the elections in their respective communities.

Office personnel

Carl T. Casand, County Administrative Officer, Bentonville; Virginia Jackson, clerk, Bentonville; Irene Webb, clerk, Pea Ridge; Dorothy Patterson, part-time clerk, Pea Ridge.

Persons who work in the county triple-A office are employed by the county committee. Two full-time clerks and an administrative officer were employed during 1948. One part-time clerk was employed for about 8 months.

These folks perform all of the office and field work and are directly responsible to the county triple-A committee.

Harry S. Truman, President; Man of the People—Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the North American Labor magazine for January 1949, by George M. Harrison, an outstanding American labor leader, grand president of the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, who played an important part in the mobilization of organized labor in support of the Democratic ticket last November. The article is entitled "Harry S. Truman, President; Man of the People—Man of the Year."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRY S. TRUMAN, PRESIDENT; MAN OF THE PEOPLE—MAN OF THE YEAR

(By George M. Harrison, grand president, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks)

As a result of the election of President Harry S. Truman and a Democratic Congress, 1949 promises to be a banner year in general social and economic progress.

The great program of social reform launched by Franklin D. Roosevelt, which brought such great benefits to wage earners, farmers, and working people in general, was arrested by the war and then completely stymied by the reactionary Eightieth Congress, elected in the fall of 1946, when it appeared that progressivism had run its course. Confident that big business was again firmly in the saddle; that the people were tired of reform and once more willing to entrust their welfare to their economic overlords and their political hatchetmen, the Eightieth Congress not only blocked every effort toward further social reforms but narrowed the base of our social-security program, reduced taxes for the rich, turned its back on the problem of housing, got set for a raid by giant corporations upon our natural resources, tore up the National Labor Relations Act under which the labor movement had grown from less than 3,000,000 to 16,000,000, and imposed upon wage earners the iniquitous Taft-Hartley law.

But big business and its political stooges reckoned without their host—the labor movement. They made the mistake of assuming that a new and vigorous labor movement, a labor movement which is now in truth representative of the wage earners of this country, would take the political setback of 1946 lying down like they did in the early 1920's when their powers of resistance had all but been destroyed by the open-shop drive.

And they made another blunder. They thought Harry S. Truman was a "dead duck" politically. The election proved him to be one of the ablest political leaders of our times.

Rallying to the support of the President, because his program embodied the social reforms which it has stood for and fought for for a generation, the labor movement contributed mightily to bringing to the polls on November 2 a majority of over 47,000,000 like-minded people, and today the New Deal and all it stands for in social reform, in the use of the power of Government to provide economic security for the masses of the people, is again a vital, driving force in American political life.

President Truman's liberalism is grounded in the basic philosophy of the American people. He, in common with most Americans, holds the conviction that the purpose of government is, (1) to protect the weak against the strong; (2) to help the people accomplish those things which they cannot do for themselves; and (3) to channel individual activities for the achievement of generally agreed national objectives.

His domestic program concerns itself with matters close to the hearts of the people—repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and returning to workers the right of self-help through free labor unions, the housing shortage, extension of social security, river valley developments, price support for farmers, Federal aid to education, and a system of taxation that will place the expense of government largely on those who profit most from our economic system.

His foreign program calls for the application of our collective wisdom to our collective problems. It includes among other things, a continuance of the European recovery program, the development of world trade through the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and approval of the International Trade Organization and the International Wheat Agreement.

President Truman is the man of the year, because he confounded the cynics by proving he understood the willingness of the American people to act with daring in an attempt to solve the problems of our Nation.

He is the man of the year, because to him must go the credit, in a large measure, for the leadership that defeated so many reationary Congressmen.

He is the man of the year, because he has reversed the trend toward reactionary government in America and placed the Nation back on the path of liberalism—the only true course for a nation whose people are concerned with the extension of democracy and easing the burdens of humanity.

Assessment by American Medical Association To Combat Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I know that many Members of the Congress are receiving letters from physicians asking about their rights under the American Medical Association's compulsory $25 tax on its members. They are also receiving inquiries about the AMA's widely publicized so-called 12-point plan. I

do not want to comment on these matters at this time, but I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an article from the New York Herald Tribune and one from the Washington Post, which set forth the answer of one of the country's largest medical societies to these questions. I am sure the Congress will find them most enlightening and important.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 1, 1949]

The New York County Medical Society, largest member group of the American Medical Association, last night withdrew its support of the AMA's plan to combat compulsory health insurance. The AMA plan calls for a $25-a-member assessment to raise $3,000,000 for an additional campaign in behalf of various voluntary prepayment systems. At its last meeting on January 24, the society passed a resolution which approved the assessment and, in general, backed the AMA's stand on the matter. Approval was carried by a clear majority, but only after bitter debate. It was then voted to reconsider the motion at the next meeting.

That meeting was held last night and the resolution was defeated, 432 to 333. The meeting was held at the New York Academy of Medicine, 2 East One Hundred and Third Street. Also defeated in last night's session was another resolution offered by the society's executive committee to approve a 12-point program that has been offered by the AMA as a constructive answer to the Government's proposed compulsory insurance plan. This resolution, however, will be reconsidered at the next monthly meeting of the society, March 28, and could be adopted or amended at that time.

Opponents of the assessment accused the AMA of consistently fighting change and charged that the educational plan was merely propaganda for maintaining the status quo. Proponents answered that they were in favor of voluntary health insurance plans because they have proved workable. They said they were opposed to Government control of medicine because such a plan had been tried in other countries and had led to the demoralization of medicine. In some cases, the speakers resorted to invective, and often ill feeling was obvious. Both sides charged at least once that the other was trying to slip something through by unethical parliamentary procedure.

LARGEST UNIT QUITS AMA HEALTH PLAN—NEW YORK COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY WITHDRAWS ASSESSMENT SUPPORT

NEW YORK, March 1.—The largest member group of the American Medical Association has withdrawn its support of the AMA's plan to fight compulsory health insurance.

The New York County (Manhattan) Medical Society took the action last night.

The group also defeated a resolution, offered by the executive committee, to approve the 12-point program the AMA has offered as a constructive answer to the Government's proposed compulsory health-insurance plan.

This resolution, however, will be reconsidered at a meeting March 28.

The vote at last night's meeting was 432 to 333 against the AMA's $25 per member assessment to raise $3,000,000 for a campaign in behalf of voluntary health systems.

At its January 24 meeting, the county society adopted a resolution approving the assessment and generally backing the AMA stand. Approval at that time was by a clear majority after spirited debate, but reconsideration was scheduled for last night. Debate again was heavy.

The Role of Intelligent Politics in Party Triumphs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Harrisburg Patriot, published in the capital city of Pennsylvania, earlier this week published an editorial entitled "Smarter Politics," dealing with the failure of the Republican Eightieth Congress to provide adequate storage facilities for our farmers for periods of abundant harvest such as we had last year.

This editorial correctly points out that the Democratic Eighty-first Congress plans to "pick up the ball the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress muffed," and says this is typical of the smarter politics which has characterized Democratic activities.

If the science of government is administration of public affairs with a side line of intelligent politics, then there is no mystery in the recurring triumphs of the Democrats—

The editorial declares—

"Santa Claus" is not the only explanation for party triumphs.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a reminder to our Republican friends that good politics—the most effective politics—is government in the public interest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMARTER POLITICS

One reason why the Democrats have been topping the Republicans in national elections is because of smarter politics. If the science of government is administration of public affairs with a side line of intelligent politics, then there is no mystery in the recurring triumphs of the Democrats. "Santa Claus" is not the only explanation for party triumphs.

Right now, the Democrats in Congress are picking up the ball the Republicans of the Eightieth Congress muffed—adequate grain-storage facilities for the farmers. The present plan is to provide storage space for from 250,000,000 to 350,000,000 bushels of surplus grains.

That same situation was faced by the last Congress dominated by Republicans. Whether or not it was sound economics is another question but it is doubtful if that was an inhibition to a party which was yearning for the White House after 16 years in the barrens. Furthermore, the party leaders knew the farmers wanted this grain-storage program.

It is too much to think that conscience prevailed over political conquest which lay in the direction of wooing the farm vote. The Congress disregarded the plain political, if not economic, mandate of the hour, discarded the storage program and woke up the morning after election to find they had lost the great farm States.

Democrats do not intend to be guilty of that political blunder. Nor is it likely that the Republicans will be a second time.

Dogs and Children Not Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the January, 1949, issue of the Woman's Home Companion:

DOGS AND CHILDREN NOT WANTED

I never realized how unpopular children are—how discriminated against, even how hated—until I went across America in search of apartments to rent. My mind still echoes with "No children," "Adults only," "No dogs or children." Discrimination against children would be bad enough any time. It's fantastic in the worst housing shortage in American history.

"They've made us feel it's a sin to have children," said a Detroit mother. "What do they want us to do, drown our kids?" asked a Boston father. "Maybe we wouldn't have them—if we could make the choice over again," said a young Pittsburgh couple.

It is reliably reported that three to five million families are desperately in need of places to live. How many could be housed if we used existing housing to full effectiveness—instead of filling five-room apartments and two-family houses with childless adults? Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, of the National Public Housing Conference, estimates 25 percent of all our rented housing space—especially in larger cities—is under-occupied due to discrimination against children.

Acting the house-hunter in cities throughout the Nation, I have felt the stab of child-discrimination a hundred times. In Detroit brusque voices said over the phone, "Sorry, no children," and clicked down the receiver. In Chicago, after dismal plodding, I was offered only two places to live—provided I boarded out the children. In a small Missouri town a professor's wife denied me even a trailer which she had advertised for adults only.

I spent hours over the classified ads—the blatant ones: "No children," "No pets or children"; the subtler ones: "Business couple preferred," "Suitable for adults." Out of 43 ads in a Cincinnati paper, 22 openly barred children. In a Pittsburgh paper, 17 of 26. In Columbus, Ohio, the total reached 87 percent—13 out of 15.

Discrimination often wears kid gloves. "The apartment is on the third floor. That's too much for children to climb," insisted a Philadelphia renting agent. A Brooklyn landlord refused to rent because there was no place to keep a baby carriage.

Solicitude for other tenants was remarkable. I was turned away from a dozen buildings "because we've got old people and you know how they are about children," or because "I owe it to the others to keep children out but I love children myself."

This bluff was repeated so often I finally said to a Pittsburgh landlord, "Suppose I give you a bonus—on account of my two children. Fifty dollars per child?" He hesitated. There was that electrician who worked nights and that invalid old lady. "All right," I said, "I'll make it a hundred a piece. Two hundred dollars for the children." The landlord began telling me what a nice place I was getting, how he liked to deal with a reasonable fellow like me and—to my disgust—how he was just crazy about kids and had three himself.

Worse than extortion was the indignity I was made to feel for all of us who have children. In a Boston suburb, a landlady said commiseratingly, "I'm so sorry you have children." I stopped being a journalist right there and answered, "I'm not sorry. I'm mighty glad I have children. I'm sorry for you," and walked away.

But I was aghast at the number of couples who have apparently been convinced that somehow it is a crime to have children these days. One father walked into the Los Angeles Housing Authority and said, "Every time I find a vacancy I know there is no use because I have two little children I shouldn't have had." In Columbus, Ohio, a Mrs. Healy plaintively advertised, "We have a 5-year-old daughter. Please don't hold that against us."

Many landlords try to evict couples who dare have babies after moving in. One landlord called it misrepresentation. The thinking is simple: If they're childless when they rent, they should stay childless. Today, to avoid being tricked, some landlords insist on observing the wife before closing the deal. They want to see if she is visibly pregnant. Mrs. Ruby Bower, of Madison, Wis., remarked, "The prejudice against my baby started even before he was born. I was honest. I admitted I was pregnant. In return I got, 'Sorry, no children.'"

How about smuggling children in? This is done, too. A Missouri woman became infuriated at a landlord who permitted dogs and banned children. She said she had only two nice little puppies. Then she moved in with her two children instead and defied the owner to evict her. Smuggling is commoner as the pinch gets tighter. "We hate to do it," said a Buffalo house-hunter. "But there is a temptation to say nothing about the children and move them in a few days later, after dark."

The New York City Housing Authority maintains a vacancy-listing bureau. In its sparse files 88 percent of the listings contain a ban against children. Many of those which admit children are either priced sky high or far removed from working centers.

Yet at this agency, virtually a last straw for discouraged parents, I watched a young man whose wife was pregnant. "We live in a furnished room. The landlady says the door gets locked when my wife goes to the hospital." A mother who had farmed out her 7-year-old daughter in North Carolina since 1946, "My child won't know me when we get together again," she sobbed.

I began to doubt that compassion exists after visiting Castle Shannon Borough, outside of Pittsburgh. There 45 families were living in condemned houses with smoldering slag fire eating its way through the slate heaps underneath. They received eviction notices a month before. But they could not move. They had children. And so they were still there, while smoke came up through the floors of their houses. "We've gone through card after card in our vacancy listings," said the Pittsburgh Housing Association, but inevitably the owners insist, "No children."

Compassion for a group might be too much to expect. How about an individual? In Chicago Mrs. Emelio had just buried her husband, killed in action on Leyte on October 28, 1944. Mrs. Emelio and her two children were being evicted at the very time his body was returned for reburial. "The landlord is remodeling the building," she explained. Mrs. Emelio had been looking for a long time. Once she choked up when she was pleading with a landlord and said, "You say no children, but do you realize that these are the children of a man who gave his life for you?" "I'm sorry, lady," he replied. "If I break my rule for you I'd have to break it for everybody."

And that's the story of compassion.

Why do they discriminate against children? The first answers are obvious: "Children are destructive." "They mark wallpaper." "They run up and down the stairs—they break the banisters." In these attitudes it is easy to see the vicious hallmark of all social discrimination. To slander a group, take the worst characteristic of any individual and smear the entire group.

What are the facts? The Federal Public Housing Authority conducted a damage survey in a hundred and seventy-three thousand housing units. Only two common types of damage could be attributed to children—the marring of doorways and baseboards by bicycles, scooters, and carriages; and the defacing of walls by smearing. Adults, on the other hand, were responsible for eight major damage categories. Grown-ups, concluded the Housing Authority, are the apartment wreckers—not children.

When stripped of masquerade the basis of child discrimination is largely a greedy axiom: Get the most money for the least occupancy. That philosophy certainly does not fit the American dream: the eager parents and the happy, bright-faced children.

What can we do about it? Can we legislate child discrimination off the face of the land? A few attempts have been made. The New York State Legislature in 1946 made it a penal offense for a landlord to demand by lease that the tenants shall remain childless. These laws attack only fragments of the problem. Most experts doubt that laws can do much more. As one of them put it, "You can't legislate decency." The landlord has too many ruses.

You and your neighbors can do more than all the fine print in legaldom. Let's have women's club resolutions, men's club campaigns, a proclamation by the mayor, editorials in the papers, speeches in the town hall, and lots of talk over the cracker barrel and back fence. No law in the world has the awesome power of honest public opinion. As one housing expert put it, "You don't have to drop a ton of bricks on the landlord. All you have to do is make him feel like a heel."

Real-estate boards can help. Small property owners seem to be the worst offenders. It is up to the real-estate boards to educate them. A few are doing it. A vice president of the Real Estate Board of New York, speaking for the large management company of which he is an executive, declares: "We have educated the owners of our 125 buildings not to discriminate. We have shown them that families with children stabilize a neighborhood, that in the long run they are more responsible tenants, healthier for community life."

We need a whale of a lot more of that kind of education. A small landlord can be painfully ignorant. He doesn't see his one or two buildings as part of the national housing scene. He hasn't been educated to the basic tenet of the free-enterprise system—a profit motive conditioned by the public good.

A young New York couple recently was being evicted because the wife was pregnant. A Christian minister, a Jewish rabbi, and a delegation of neighbors called on the landlord and helped him see the light. He let the family stay.

The ultimate problem is one of human decency and conscience. It is a sad civilization which throttles its own offspring. St. Matthew 18: verses 2, 5, and 6 read:

"And Jesus called a little child unto Him, and set him in the midst of them, and said * * * whoso shall receive one such little child in My name receiveth Me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in Me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, no obligation on the Congress is more pressing than the need to fulfill our promises to make social security a reality for all people. It is especially important that we act at once to extend the old-age and survivors insurance program to all working people and to lift the benefit level. The agricultural States particularly have good cause to complain about the failure of past Congresses to extend this program since they are obliged to pay the cost of insuring industrial workers in the price of manufactured goods and then tax themselves heavily to support disproportionate assistance loads for their own people. It is little wonder that various segments of the American people are showing discouragement with the failure of Congress to provide real social insurance for their old age and seeking their security through other measures like veterans' pensions, old-age pensions, union health and welfare funds, and a wide-open assistance program. Our answer to these demands must be a real social insurance program affording to everybody the security that can only come with adequate benefits based on the equity rights resulting from individual contributions made by the worker and in his behalf by his employers throughout his working life.

The Washington Post of February 25 carries an editorial on social security which stresses this point. While I do not agree with the suggestion that the benefit level proposed by the Administration may be too high and certain other reservations indicated in this editorial, I believe its main contention deserves careful study by all the Members of Congress. I am, therefore, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, including this editorial at this point:

SOCIAL SECURITY

The administration's social-security program is tripartite: (1) Extension and liberalization of old-age insurance; (2) disability insurance; and (3) a liberalized system of Federal grants to supplement State outlays for the needy. The important thing to remember is that the welfare and insurance bills designed to carry out the administration's proposals are intimately related. Further increases in the size of Federal-aid contributions and use of Federal funds for general assistance purposes can be defended much more effectively if the Federal old-age insurance system is at the same time extended to cover millions of uninsured workers and if insurance benefits are increased to reasonable levels. For given an adequate system of social insurance covering most employed workers, the great majority of the people will be protected by their insurance benefits from becoming public charges. Comprehensive insurance coverage would reduce permanently and progressively the financial burdens of caring for the needy. And the Federal Government could, as a

result, gradually withdraw from the field and let the States assume full financial responsibility for the care of the needy.

Considered only as a temporary transitional means of assisting the States to discharge more effectively their obligation to take care of the needy, the administration's public-welfare bill has much to commend it. For many of our poorer States are at present extremely hard pressed. By varying the proportion of Federal aid contributed with reference to State per capita incomes, the poorer States will be encouraged and assisted to make more adequate relief payments. And by insisting on State compliance with certain minimum administrative standards the Federal Government can do a great deal to improve the efficiency of State-aid systems. Moreover, there is no logical reason for limiting Federal grants-in-aid to the aged, the blind, and dependent children. On the contrary, as the Advisory Council on Social Security says, the present limited system encourages some State and local governments to put an undue proportion of their own funds into those welfare programs that are augmented by Federal funds, with the result that other needy persons are deprived of adequate help from State and local funds.

Conceding the strength of these arguments, it would, nevertheless, be most unfortunate for Congress to step up the aid program at this juncture unless it acts at the same time to bring into the old-age insurance system millions of uncovered workers and to increase the scale of insurance benefits. For the present trend toward reliance on aid instead of insurance has already resulted in bringing the average level of relief payments to the aged far above the average of insurance payments. In an article appearing recently in a publication of the United States Chamber of Commerce, John J. Corson emphasized the dangers of this tendency. "The formula for Federal old-age assistance grants," he said, "has been increased three times since 1939. Meanwhile, every proposal for comparable liberalization of old-age and survivors insurance has been rejected. Simultaneously legislative action in various States, and changing administrative practices, outline a trend in old-age assistance away from precise case-work determinations of individual need and toward Townsendlike flat pensions determined by mass-production techniques."

Most Americans do not want that kind of prop for their old age. They prefer pensions which they have earned as a right, not doles based on evidence of need. Yet for the millions still denied rights of participation in the insurance system there will be no choice in the matter, unless Congress consents to bring them into the system. The longer action is delayed, the greater will be the number of the aged dependent on relief payments.

Objections to expansion of the insurance system on the ground of its cost to industry lose sight of the fact that relief payments are likewise costly and have to be met by taxes that also burden industry. Moreover, generous Federal participation in State relief programs carries with it the danger that State and local governments will become careless or unnecessarily lavish in disbursing relief funds. There is no such danger from an extension of an insurance system financed by contributions from employers and employees.

There are legitimate grounds of objection to the proposed payment of short-time sickness insurance benefits since this type of disability can best be determined by local organizations. The proposed scale of old-age and survivors insurance benefits may also be somewhat higher than warranted, in view of the cost of the insurance system. Insured workers not only have to meet part of that cost through direct contributions, but, as taxpayers, they may eventually have to supply the Government with funds to supplement contributions to the insurance trust fund. However, these are details; the administration program, viewed as a whole, involves no departures in principle from the system now in force. It merely aims to develop it along lines already laid down, and, above all else, to establish a comprehensive kind of insurance program that will reduce the need for public assistance while making relief payments in the poorer sections of the country more adequate than they now are.

Palisades Project of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the Senate of the thirtieth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho. This joint memorial by the irrigation and water resources committee calls attention to a serious problem in eastern Idaho. In 1941, Congress authorized the construction of what is known as the Palisades project to be built near the Idaho-Wyoming border on the Snake River. However, to date there has been little more than preliminary survey work done on this project. Eastern Idaho needs aditional water for irrigation, more power for industrial and commercial use, and urgently needs the Palisades to bring the devastating spring floods of the Snake River under control.

Senate Joint Memorial 6

A joint memorial to the Honorable Senators and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent, that:

Whereas millions of acre-feet of the water of Snake River are annually running to waste into the Columbia River and Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas such wasted waters are urgently needed: to supplement the water rights of water users of the Snake River Valley in Idaho; to irrigate new desert lands in the Snake River Valley of Idaho; and

Whereas the conservation and storing of such waters will control the flooding and washing of thousands of acres of valuable farm lands in the upper Snake River Valley and will provide water power for the production of hydroelectrical energy, which is urgently needed in the Intermountain States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that it appropriate the necessary funds and proceed at once with the early and speedy construction of the Palisade Dam project in Idaho; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senators and the Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 5th day of February 1949.

DONALD S. WHITEHEAD,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 16th day of February 1949.

JOHN HOHNHORST,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial No. 6 originated in the senate during the thirtieth session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

JOHN C. PORTER,
Secretary of the Senate.

Facts About the National Health Insurance and Public Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

FACTS ABOUT THE NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE AND PUBLIC HEALTH ACT (H. R. 783)

1. What is this act? This measure would provide health insurance for our people regardless of residence, race, creed, color, or economic status.

2. What medical care would I have? Preventive (check-ups, inoculations, etc., to keep you from getting sick unnecessarily); diagnostic (to find out what is wrong with you when you are sick); and curative (to cure you after you are sick).

This means services by a family physician, services of specialists when required, hospital care (60 days hospital care, except for tuberculosis and mental diseases); laboratory and X-ray services; unusually expensive medicines; special appliances and eyeglasses; dental care and home nursing to limited degree.

3. Will I be eligible? Yes; you and your dependents (wife or disabled husband, parents, children if dependent and under 18 years of age), if you are (a) employed or self-employed; (b) receiving old-age or survivors benefits; (c) receiving civil-service benefits; (d) a needy person whose contributions to the insurance fund are paid by a public agency.

4. How much will I have to pay for these services? One and one-half percent of your earnings up to $3,600; your employer would contribute another 1½ percent up to $3,600. If you are self-employed, you would pay 3 percent up to $3,600 of your own earnings.

5. Will I have free choice of doctor and hospital? Yes, you can choose your own doctor, hospital, group clinic, specialist, dentist, or nurse from among all the practitioners and institutions in your community that serve under the act.

6. Will doctors choose their own patients? Yes. Doctors will be free to accept or reject patients, just as they do now.

7. Must doctors serve under the act? No, not if they do not wish to. By merely declaring he does not want to serve patients under the National Health Insurance Act, a doctor can remain outside of it.

8. Will my medical records be open to public inspection? No, of course not. Your medical records must be held confidential, just as doctors hold such information confidential now. Statistics may be compiled from the records, but the identity of any individual may not be revealed.

9. How will doctors be paid? They will be paid by the method a majority of the doctors in a given area or locality prefer. Doctors will be paid by a fee-for-each-service, by salary, or on a per capita (so much for each person on the doctor's list) basis; or by a combination of these methods, as the majority may determine.

10. What happens if I belong to a voluntary health insurance plan? Voluntary health insurance plans could continue to provide you with services under this act, and be reimbursed from the Health Insurance Fund.

11. How will this act help me if I live in a rural community? You would have more doctors at your disposal. The act will make it possible, through added financial aid from the Insurance fund, for more doctors to go to rural areas. It will also help to expand local public health services, rural hospitals, and ambulance service.

12. How will this act be administered?

(a) The funds will be collected by the Federal Government along with other social-security payments.

(b) Each State government will divide the State into local service areas and appoint local committees and officers.

(c) Doctors and laymen in the localities where the services are rendered and received will run the program.

(d) The local set-up will consist either of a local administrative committee or of an administrative officer working with an advisory committee. Such local committees will include both lay and professional people, appointed by the State.

(e) National and State advisory councils will have similar representation.

(f) At the Federal level, administration will be by a board (within the Federal Security Agency) of five full-time officials.

13. How will the health of our country be improved?

(a) (1) Everybody will be able to get preventive medical services to keep away sickness.

(2) You will get all physican and hospital services when you are sick, without worry about expense. You pay as you go, a little every month, sick or well. When you get sick, you will have prepaid your doctor and hospital bills.

(b) Doctors will be able to practice in rural and poor areas with assurance of adequate income.

(c) There will be more money for more hospitals, needed now in many places.

(d) There will be funds for grants-in-aid to proper agencies for medical research, for better treatments and cures.

(e) Properly qualified persons will be able to get more and better professional training, ending the present shortage of doctors, nurses, and other medical workers.

Admission to United States of 2,500 European Physicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Hazleton Plain Speaker reporting the proposal of Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars officials that 2,500 European doctors, many of them in displaced persons camps, be invited to this country to help alleviate the shortage of medical personnel in this country, particularly in some of our veterans hospitals.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VETS ASK FOR ADMISSION OF 2,500 EUROPEAN DOCTORS

HARRISBURG, February 5.—The State Veterans of Foreign Wars today urged relaxation of immigration restrictions so that 2,500 European doctors can come to America.

"Only our apparent disinterest and an entry permit separates thousands of displaced doctors and thousands of American war veterans and others who urgently need their skilled medical and surgical services," declared H. V. Hartman, State VFW commander.

Hartman made his plea after he said a survey showed that five hospitals for veterans in Pennsylvania "are jammed, have long waiting lists, and are understaffed."

He said that although 1,529 former servicemen are awaiting admission to the hospitals, 57 beds at the Lebanon Veterans Hospital "are unoccupied because the Government cannot find doctors and other hospital personnel to staff properly the institution."

Hartman added "someone in Washington should slash through the lengthy immigration procedures and invite hundreds of the 2,500 doctors now in displaced persons camps in Europe to start life anew in this promised land of ours.

"Let us give them priority, within the present quotas. It would give them new hope and at the same time alleviate our medical situation that is admittedly acute."

Newspapers, North and South, Endorse Arkansas Plan for Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I fear that the Eighty-first Congress is permitting the rapid dissipation of an atmosphere in which there can be a calm and judicious consideration of legislative proposals. The recapturing of this atmosphere would be the most effective way to inspire the people of the United States with greatest confidence in our ability to legislate wisely even in the midst of tension and disagreements. The fact that there are disagreements is not of itself significant, for that is an element in democracy, but the reluctance to make some sacrifices for the sake of national unity is something to give us all great concern.

The Congress cannot discharge its obligations by transferring responsibility to the President, even though the key to the difficulty is the civil-rights program sponsored by the President. All over the country there is a growing awareness of the need for finding common ground. Without reference to partisan advantage, editorial writers everywhere are beginning to point out the necessity for abandoning the unyielding positions which both sides have held. The Minneapolis Tribune, for example, commenting on the Gallup poll showing that in the United States only 27 percent of the people interrogated favor the program as a whole, with 22 percent replying in the negative, said:

The Truman program may run into serious difficulties if it is passed in its entirety, but a compromise plan embracing certain features of it is certainly desirable.

The Birmingham News, referring to the Tribune's statement, said:

This comment, coming from the far north of our country, typifies a developing sentiment in the Nation as a whole, in favor of new efforts to find a constructive common ground in this controversy. Failure to do so, of course, would work heavily against national unity and the general good.

In an editorial entitled "A Sane Compromise Would Clear the Air," the Louisville Courier-Journal pleads for the elimination of passion and confusion from current debates in the Congress and referring to my recent outline of logical concessions to be made by both sides, states:

It is obvious that Arkansas' Representative BROOKS HAYS has this in mind, among other considerations of national unity and accomplishment, when he pleads for a compromise of moderates on the civil-rights program.

The Need for National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following:

THE NEED FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

1. HOW MANY AMERICANS CANNOT MEET SERIOUS SICKNESS COSTS WITHOUT ASSISTANCE?

Four out of every 5 persons—about 117,824,000. In 1939, the American Medical Association estimated that families with incomes under $3,000 need help to meet the cost of serious illness. The present equivalent in purchasing power is about $5,000—nearly 80 percent of our families earn less than $5,000.

2. WHAT DO SICKNESS AND DISABILITY COST ANNUALLY?

In terms of production: More than one and one-half billion man-days are lost annually.

In terms of money: $27,000,000,000 annually is the total cost of sickness and disability, including direct wage losses, direct business costs, plus hidden costs of loss of future earnings because of premature death and disability.

3. HOW WOULD THE COST OF NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE COMPARE WITH PRESENT EXPENDITURES FOR MEDICAL CARE?

In 1946, over $5,600,000,000 were spent by the people of the United States for medical care, including medical and hospital services, medicines and supplies, and health and acci-

dent insurance. In 1941, the total amount spent on medical care was over $3,400,000,000.

The amount spent for medical care by families varies with the various income levels.

In 1941, the average family with a yearly income of $1,250 spent $43 for medical care.

In 1941, the average family with a yearly income of $2,500 spent $74 for medical care.

In 1941, the average family with a yearly income of $3,600 spent $143 for medical care.

(These figures exclude expenditures for dentistry and home nursing.)

The annual contribution proposed under national health insurance would be 3 percent of earnings, but in the case of employed persons half of this would be paid by the employer. Thus:

An employee earning $1,250 yearly would contribute $18.75.

An employee earning $2,500 yearly would contribute $37.50.

An employee earning $3,600 yearly would contribute $54.

Comparison with the above figures shows that the payments required of employed persons under national health insurance would be much less than these people spend at present for medical care.

4. DO AMERICANS WANT NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE?

A Nation-wide poll by the National Opinion Research Center in 1944 showed: 82 percent thought something should be done to help people pay for medical care; 85 percent thought social security should include doctor and hospital care; 58 percent were willing to pay a 2½-percent deduction for this care.

Histadrut, a New Force of Historical Impact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my own city of New York is celebrating Histadrut Week, honoring an organization which has demonstrated a new cooperative force in contemporary history. To all Americans with faith in democratic processes, the role of Histadrut will be of deep interest; and to the Jewish community, whether Zionist or anti-Zionist, the miracle of Histadrut is crucial.

I am inserting in the RECORD with special pleasure a tribute to Histadrut, written by I. F. Stone, as it appeared in the New York Post and Home News dated Tuesday, March 1. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you and other members will find this column interesting, enlightening, and heart warming.

HISTADRUT WEEK
(By I. F. Stone)

Imagine the United States, if AFL, CIO, the railroad brotherhoods, the miners, and the machinists were united in one big union; if three-fourths of American mixed farming were done by cooperative and collective farmers who also belonged to this union; if this union's members and their families made up virtually half the population of the United States.

Imagine that this one big farmer-labor union through subsidiary cooperatives played a major role in the country's transport, banking, marketing, wholesaling, fishing, water supply, aviation, merchant marine, building, and publishing; owned in terms of output a tenth of the country's manufacturing industry; and was able to command the devotion and energies of American-style go-getting businessmen as executives of these enterprises but at moderate trade-union salaries.

Imagine that this one big union had just emerged successfully from a period in which its resources and members had played a major part in rescuing Americans abroad from a dangerous enemy; secretly helped train and arm a people's militia for resistance to an occupying power and mobilized the Nation's workers, farmers, and productive capacity in a successful war of independence against this power and neighboring enemies allied with it.

Imagine that the leading figure of this one big union, its John L. Lewis, had also become the country's Churchill, directing what had seemed a hopeless war effort to victorious conclusion as prime minister of the newly freed state.

Imagine this and you get some conception of what the Histadrut means in Israel; the one big Jewish farmer-labor union whose foremost leader, David Ben-Gurion, is also Israel's new chief of state.

The city of New York has declared this to be Histadrut Week. In so doing it is honoring the institution which more than any other explains Israel's ability to win its war of independence; the institution which gives Israel its fascination as a tiny laboratory experiment in a new kind of state, a mixed economy with a Socialist core based on trade-unionism and rural communes.

Ben-Gurion once said that the Histadrut was intended to be the workers' instrument for the founding of a state, for the building of a land, for the liberation of a people.

No other union trade movement anywhere has played so crucial a role as the Histadrut. The recruiting abroad of Zionist pioneers and the establishment of new collective and cooperative farm settlements in the battle against Palestine's malarial valleys, craggy hills, and lonely deserts are both among the functions of Histadrut.

Certain fundamental questions of our time may be answered by the Histadrut in Israel. How link worker and farmer together? How combine the collective and cooperative life with a maximum of freedom for development of the individual? How tap the creative possibilities of labor by giving its organizations something bigger than collective bargaining as their task? How build socialism without the often cruel and clumsy hand of an all-powerful centralized state?

Something of the free society of which Kropotkin dreamed, a network of collective and cooperative organizations based on the organized power of workers and farmers, held together by voluntary agreement rather than the state's compulsions—this is what one glimpses who has seen the Histadrut in Israel.

Slum Clearance and Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, in common with most other urban communities in our country, the city of Milwaukee faces a housing crisis which grows more serious every year. The city government and private enterprise are doing their utmost to meet the needs of the people, but they cannot approach success without Federal aid. The number of living units constructed in the past 40 years is 40,000 behind the number of new families in the community.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert in the RECORD testimony by the Honorable Frank P. Zeidler, mayor of Milwaukee, before another body detailing the housing situation in Milwaukee, the efforts made by the city to meet it, and the great volume of needs which must remain unmet unless greatly increased Federal aid is forthcoming from the Federal Government:

STATEMENT OF FRANK P. ZEIDLER, MAYOR OF MILWAUKEE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Seventeen thousand living units for veterans are needed in the city of Milwaukee. This is the number of unduplicated applications of veterans for homes now on file with the Red Cross Housing Bureau in Milwaukee. How many nonveteran families are in need of living units, Milwaukee authorities have no way of knowing, but the real-estate department of the city of Milwaukee, which department handles temporary units for the city, tells me that the usual day brings 50 to 70 telephone requests for housing which have to be turned down. The personal distress of the applicants faced with the impending break-up of their families is no easy sight to observe, and it has stirred our city to action of its own to meet the continuing crisis.

Before describing what actions both the city and county of Milwaukee have taken to meet the housing needs, let me say that records of the Milwaukee building inspector reveal that the number of living units constructed in the past 40 years has been nearly 40,000 behind the number of new families created and that the greatest lag has occurred in this respect since 1929. For obvious reasons, first the depression and then the war and now high costs have curtailed home construction.

The city's building department also estimates that approximately 40,000 families in Milwaukee now live in substandard homes ranging from badly blighted structures to homes in grave need of repair and upkeep.

In common with other cities and counties, both the city and county of Milwaukee attempted to meet the housing shortages by taking people out from under the cold sky and putting a temporary roof over their heads.

Some 2,500 temporary structures were provided in the form of prefabricated houses, 24-by-20-foot "Wingfoot Homes," about 240 square feet, quonsets, trailers, barracks, and converted public buildings. The facilities are far from adequate for growing families and some of the temporary structures have undue fire hazards. These conditions, plus the rentals charged, are potentially demoralizing to the veterans' families living in them. All of these families are in hopes of finding better quarters, but what started as a temporary expedient for these people promises to become a permanent part of community life unless our city gets Federal assistance for housing these people.

About 1946 the city of Milwaukee bought 100 demountable houses from a war project in Indiana, placed them on basements and gave them permanent siding, and sold them at cost to veterans for around $6,000. We now wish we had bought 1,000 instead of 100.

In 1947 the city took the first steps to eliminate blight by a two-block project of 232 low-rent slum-clearance units. One hundred and thirty-three units are in the final stages of completion; the next 99 will be under way shortly. One million dollars of the city's funds are already invested, and the 1949 budget includes an item of $432,000

more to meet the cost of building which has risen since the contract for the first 133 was let.

Incidentally, to give you some standard of measurement by which to judge our achievements, we are a city one-tenth the size of New York. Two hundred and thirty-two units in our city would be approximately 2,300 in New York.

In April of 1948 the voters of Milwaukee voted to provide $3,500,000 for veterans' housing; $2,500,000 for blight elimination. On the basis of the $3,500,000 the city of Milwaukee developed a plan of financing 580 units, the so-called "Neewaukee" plan. The city provides toward a project one-third of the capital cost as a grant and the Milwaukee Housing Authority receives two-thirds on the sale of its lands. In this way an average rental charge of $55 a month is obtained.

The 580 units are in two projects called Northlawn and Southlawn, and first units are well under way toward occupancy. Architects' drawings of the projects are submitted herewith.

A third project of 380 units called Berryland is ready for the letting of bids. Hence nearly a thousand units will be under way by spring.

In addition to this building done by the city of Milwaukee without Federal aid, the city taxpayers raised $1,000,000 more in the 1949 budget. Three hundred thousand dollars is committed toward a cooperative housing association organized by veterans. The rest of the $700,000 will be used in 1949 for an addition of an undetermined number of units which may number as much as 560.

The Milwaukee Housing Authority now has scheduled an additional 6,750 units for building over a few years' period, but this program needs Federal aid.

It is obvious, however, that our scheduled program is tackling but a small chunk of our housing needs considering that 2,500 units of the program must take in veterans' temporary housing.

The observation may be made that somewhere along the line that some veterans should take care of their own housing. This is true in part, but the continued high cost of dwelling units and the fact that serious lay-offs are occurring will not make the problem of veterans' self-help any easier.

Tied up with the problems of low-rent veterans' housing and slum clearance is the need for community development. The Milwaukee Housing Authority in its 7,260-unit program intends to build 3,500 units on new land in order to relieve population pressure in the blighted areas. A program of this size, supplemented, we hope by private builders, calls for community development.

Community development means costs for new schools, roads, sewers, water lines, fire stations, and similar structures. Federal aid contemplated for community development might well also consider these factors. Unplanned and uncontrolled growth of the American city is the principal factor in urban blight.

We in Milwaukee, on the basis of our past experience, believe therefore that we have some estimation of the housing situation. Our experience summed up leads to the following conclusions:

1. Federal aid must be forthcoming to help cities since the housing situation is not nearly met.

2. Federal aid must be forthcoming for both low-rent and middle-group housing. The low-rent group need must be met with Federal grants; the middle-income group need through cheaper loans.

3. Both low-rent housing and middle-income housing require Federal assistance for clearing of blighted land. Clearing of blighted land calls for assistance for community development in order to have some place to move relocated persons. Community development in turn calls for assistance for utilities and public buildings.

4. Housing authority lands should be tax exempt.

5. Payments by federally owned projects to cities in lieu of taxes should equal 10 percent of shelter rent.

6. Construction on housing projects must be of such soundness as to attract private investing capital. Sound construction is the cheapest construction even if initial costs are higher.

In conclusion, let me say the hopes of many hundreds of thousands Americans for decent homes are tied up with this Congress. I am confident, personally, they will not be disappointed.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Sunday, February 27, 1949:

JAMES FARLEY'S POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY TOLD IN ADDRESS

FOREWORD BY CHARLES H. M'GLUE

Recently I received a letter from my old friend and political associate, the Honorable James A. Farley, of New York. In the letter there was a copy of a speech made by former National Democratic Committee Chairman Farley. Naturally I read it, as I like Farley and delight in his political concepts. However, this article on government, politics, and people was so fascinating and intriguing that I felt more persons should have the opportunity to get a better picture of the importance of politics in their daily lives.

Publisher Frederick W. Enwright, of the Lynn Telegram-News, agreed with me and kindly offered to publish this speech by the "Old Master" himself. So today you should avail yourself of the opportunity to find out just what politics is all about from one of America's best loved citizens as well as one of America's outstanding businessmen, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. This address was delivered by him at Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., at the opening of the university's 1948 series of lectures in human relations.

For more than a quarter of a century I have carried in my pockets a definition of politics which has been an inspiration and a comfort in hours of striving and stress. I am not certain of the identity of the author beyond the fact that his name is Oliver. I believe that the sentences are the product of Andrew Oliver, the younger, scholar and founder of the Political Journal, rather than of his father, Andrew Oliver, the colonial political leader, who was hanged in effigy on his appointment as stamp officer for the Crown, at whose grave in Boston 1774 patriots cheered when his coffin was lowered into the ground. Both father and son had postgraduate courses in the hard school of practical experience, which would have given either of them the background for the lines I quote:

"POLITICS MOST HAZARDOUS

"Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures, neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do widespread harm—nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul—nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career that any man can choose."

As they say in the precise language of academic halls, Mr. Oliver said a mouthful. I can attest to that out of instructive, if at times trying, experience gathered in 35 years of active political life. For the past 4 years I have been an interested observer on the side lines where I have learned much that escaped me when I was in the rough and tumble of town, county, State, and National arenas. In these later years I have been urged, now and then, to expound my political philosophy. While I am not a philosopher, except as the passage of years promotes contemplation and reflection on one's way of life, I do have some knowledge of politics.

KNOW-HOW OF POLITICS

If you would know politics, look about you. I do not entirely subscribe to the dictum that the proper study of mankind is man; I would raise our eyes higher to the contemplation of a divine and beneficent providence, but for the politician there is no study more rewarding than the cultivation of his fellow men in each and every walk of life. Only through knowledge of his fellows can a man hope to lead or influence them. A love of his fellow men helps, but it is to be regretted is not essential since it can be so readily simulated.

THE HAZARDS OF POLITICS

The hazards of politics, I have often thought, are not campaigns and elections, as might be commonly supposed, but rather the human element, the very nature of the animal that engages in politics. Ambition, love, jealousy, hate, and the many emotions and reactions man is heir to frequently affect the course of the Nation and of the world more than principles or circumstances or events. This was so from the dawn of time, is true today, and will ever be in the history of man's search for perfection.

MOSES A GREAT LEADER

Moses, first of the great leaders, had the wisdom of a statesman and was perhaps the only political leader who kept all his campaign promises, as Pharaoh learned to his sorrow. Yet, he was not without opposition even from within his own family. Miriam and Aaron, his sister and his brother, spoke against him. He saw other tribes bitter with jealousy against his tribe and his own tribe envious of his preeminence. He knew the worldly considerations by which some of his followers were moved as told in the story of the children of Reuben and Gad, who sought permission to remain in the land of Gilead because the country was well suited for the raising of cattle, instead of passing over the Jordan, into the promised land with other children of Israel. He was disturbed over the lack of faith in the people and their readiness to lapse into idolatrous ways. Frequently he meditated on these weaknesses and pondered on ways of combatting these threats to national existence. One of his ways was the preparation of a farewell address, which precedent undoubtedly influenced that great Moses of the west, George Washington, when he closed his career by offering a political valedictory for the instruction of his countrymen.

MAIN WEAKNESS OF MOSES

Moses was not without weakness of his own, not the least of which was vanity. It will be remembered that at the encampment at Kadesh, where Moses and Aaron were bidden by God to speak to the rock, Moses said to the murmuring people, "Here

now, ye rebels: shall we bring forth water out of this rock?" and he smote the rock twice with his staff so that it gushed forth water. Like many a politician who has followed them, the brothers failed to recognize their subordinate position. At that moment they felt they were the leaders of the people, forgetful that it was God who led the tribes out of Egyptian bondage and fed them in the wilderness for 40 years. Moses and Aaron paid dearly for his sin, being denied the honor and privilege of leading the children of Israel into the promised land.

POLITICIANS AND VANITY

Vanity, the insatiable sixth sense common to man but most highly developed in politicians, has ruined many a political career, as the vaulting ambition. Reluctance to relinquish power, particularly where the hand is feeble and the mind is tried is fraught with danger to parties and to the Nation. This weakness is often the salvation of courtiers and coat-tail riders. In the vital relay of politics, every lap of which measures the progress of man, the torch of leaders must be passed on to trained younger men. If younger men are not trained to take over leadership, the party and the Nation are weakened, with the danger that the race may be lost.

POLITICS NOT FOR TIMID

Politics is no place for the timid man; he who hesitates will lose the election. Frequently the man in public life who is called upon to make split-second decisions too long finds his career crushed by the weight of the accumulated heap. And politics is no place for the corrupt or dishonest. Sooner or later, evil deeds rise to confound the guilty. In my time I have been criticized for helping men who have betrayed their trust. Somehow I could never feel anything but pity for them. I have no capacity for hate and but little for censure. I feel that a man found wanting in political honesty suffers enough in standing revealed as a weakling, unworthy of the reliance placed in him by his friends and the electorate. I have sympathy for him as one has a sympathy for the afflicted, but without any trace of the admiration that goes for the latter.

THE VALUE OF VERACITY

In the final analysis, the politician has nothing to offer but his word. If he tells the truth and keeps his word, he gains the devotion of his friends and the respect of his enemies. Men may and do have honest differences. More often than not there is something to be said on both sides of a question. Compromise is the usual measure of political progress. This does not mean that principles or ideals are to be raised or lowered in any skirmish; they can and should be nailed to the mast.

The man who does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. There are those whose first instinct is not to tell the truth even when it best serves their own purposes just as there are those in whom the dog of ambition is pursued by a rabbit of conscience. Truth is by far the easier as well as the most respected course.

TAMMANY LEADER MURPHY

I had an early lesson in this from Charles E. Murphy, leader of the Tammany Hall, whom many of you might regard as a strange preceptor. I approached him after Alfred E. Smith was first elected Governor of New York, after a campaign in which I played a small part. I felt entitled to the post of secretary to the State Industrial Commission. My sights were not, I modestly felt, fixed too high. Mr. Murphy told me that while he was impressed by my earnestness and ability, he felt I lacked experience for the place, and that it should go to someone else. I was a bit bitter for a time, but as disappointment died, the more reasonable Mr. Murphy's attitude seemed to me. As a result I have never concealed the truth from an applicant for a position. In the end I always found him grateful as I was.

In the rare instances where one cannot tell the truth, because he is bound by his word not to reveal confidence or advance information, it is not necessary to become involved in complicated evasions or falsehoods. Again the easier method is to acknowledge that you are sorry but just can't answer the questions. The passing of one's word is the execution of a sacred bond. It is so with most men in political life as it is with the great majority of men everywhere.

TECHNIQUE OF POLITICS

In politics, it is well to start at the very bottom rung of the ladder, because each rung gained has its delights, and the loftier the climb, the more gratifying the view from above. The usual first step is bringing voters to the polls. There is no better way to meet people in the district than by offering them a favor. This develops courtesy and ability to most people. The second step is ringing doorbells to solicit votes for a candidate or party. Here salesmanship and personality are developed. If the young man attracts the notice of his superiors he is given greater responsibilities either within the party organization or in public service or both. He may rise in responsible but appointive administrative posts; he may work into the ranks of the king makers, or he may travel by the elective rung to the highest office in his city, county, State or Nation. In mention of the highest office within the gift of our fellow countrymen, I am glad that each passing year brings us nearer to the ideal where any American mother, regardless of race or creed, can look into the crib holding her child and say to herself, "Some day he may be President of the United States."

SERVICE SOURCE OF JOY

Where the opportunities are limitless so are the capacities for service. Nothing has given me greater pleasure in my years in politics than the services I was able to do for the people as a whole or as individuals. To this day I find, wherever I go, someone is always taking my hand to thank me for a service I have usually forgotten. The services I have given will ever be a source of pride to me. Those in academic life among you know too well that money is not the highest reward; that the metal of service outshines gold.

INDIVIDUAL VERSUS PARTIES

Heretofore, for the most part, I have confined myself to approaching politics from the viewpoint of the individual. I now propose to consider politics from the viewpoint of groups of individuals or parties. From the dawn of self-government in Greece it was natural that political parties should vie for the management of the government.

It is not surprising that parties should take color and appeal from their leadership. However, it should not be forgotten that parties have basic principles which differ sharply. These basic principles are constantly being renovated by the play of social and economic forces and by the interplay of conditions and events within the party and within the country.

UNITED STATES HAS TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

In our country we have two parties with more or less fixed ranks of the party faithful and a large number of independent voters who swing from party to party under the attraction of personalities or party platforms, or the pressure of forces or events, but often out of disappointment with the performances of the party in power. This is, I am convinced, as it should be. As a lifelong Democrat, I am a firm b liever in the two-party system and feel it would be a tragedy if either the Democratic or the Republican Party were to pass from the national scene.

PARTY VERSUS PERSONALITY

I believe that men and women should seek to correct what they dislike in the party from within the party. In my case I strongly opposed the majority of my party on the issue of a third term. I am still opposed to a third term. But I am not opposed to the Democratic Party. I participated in the national convention that voted for a third term and by that participation bound myself to accept the will of the majority. While I resigned from the Cabinet, not wishing to embarrass the administration by remaining in a high position, I voted the Democratic ticket. Again in 1944, when my opposition had increased rather than lessened, I voted the Democratic ticket because I had once more participated in the national convention where I and others like me were overwhelmingly voted down.

NO ROOM FOR THIRD PARTY

I was not then happy in the Democratic Party, but I could not bring myself to enter the Republican Party for the sole purpose of defeating the party to which I owed so much and which I had helped to put in power. Nor could I form a third party merely to have a yard of my own to play in because the big boys wouldn't play my way. We have a third party today, formed by one who wouldn't play according to the rules in the Republican or the Democratic Parties. I, for one, don't want a third party in this country. The two great political parties help our Nation by promoting minority rule and tend to leave the country the prey of demagogs and malcontents.

CYNICISM AND ITS DANGERS

Disappointment and discontent should not promote cynicism, for the bitter cynic loses his friends and damages his soul. Not all aspirants can win nomination and only one candidate can win the election. While defeat is not pleasant, it is seldom fatal and there is always another election on the horizon. Those disappointed over failure to gain an appointment should remember office-holders are mortal.

I am reminded of the story of the persistent office seeker who rushed to former Senator, the late Pat McCarran, on learning of the death of an official "Can I take Flanagan's place?" he pleaded. The Senator, wearied by previous entreaties, snapped, "It's all right with me if you can square it with the undertaker."

DISCONTENT BAD DISEASE

Discontent is a more virulent disease. Its invasion of the pride is far more serious. Often it is the harder to bear because it entails ostracism of a sort. Once a man strips himself, or is divested of the powers of his office, he frequently finds those he regarded as friends pass him by and those for whom he did most know him not. It is not a pleasant experience, although there are some who hold it to be a great developer of character. In my own case I was saved from cynicism by the firm knowledge I was right and by the kind words of the many who sought me out in my travels to commend my action or to give thanks for services I had rendered, I shall ever be grateful to them.

PARTY SERVANT NOT MASTER

As I favor the two-party system, so am I opposed to the one-party system in vogue in some nations where it is proclaimed as true democracy. I do not want to confine my participation in government to voting "ya," "yes," "aye," or "da" to the whim of any totalitarian overlord. The party should be the servant of its members, not their master. It should be open to all who wish to join it, not exclusive society of assassins. And it should be competing for national good will, not dictating the way of life.

JIM FARLEY'S PHILOSOPHY

In concluding I should like to dwell on Oliver's statement that politics, with all its

faults, is still the noblest of careers. It may appear, as Robert Louis Stevenson said, "Politics is perhaps the only profession for which no preparation is thought necessary." Yet no other is so essential for the distribution of temporal happiness and the preservation of the freedoms and liberties that make our way of life.

POLS, PLATO, AND ARISTOTLE

Plato and after him Aristotle held the good politician in high esteem. In fact, the latter placed him at the topmost step of a graduated sort of heaven. It may be that the highest step is not crowded or even empty as has been suggested to me. If so, then let it be said of us we are reaching for the ideal state and coming ever nearer. I am supremely confident man will solve his problem; that the future is bright though the day be dark.

FARLEY'S FINALE ON FAME

He who chooses politics as a career will have the experience of ages to guide him in reaching for higher if unattainable goals. In extending his grasp he may give his name to an age where it may shine brightly for all time. For those to whom such fame is denied, there is comfort in knowing that we are providing experience to be drawn upon by those to come. We are the progenitors of the perfect rulers of the future, men in whom thought and action are delicately balanced and from whose rule political blessings will flow.

Protest Against Treatment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of protest of Assumption Circle No. 74, Daughters of Isabella, of Fall River, Mass., against the treatment accorded Josef Cardinal Mindszenty:

ASSUMPTION CIRCLE NO. 74,
DAUGHTERS OF ISABELLA,
Fall River, Mass., February 23, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: As representative of 250 members of Assumption Circle, No. 74, Fall River, Mass., National Circle, Daughters of Isabella, I should like to urge you to protest against the treatment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary, follows another outstanding prelate, Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia, into the gates of prison by orders of the Soviet Union. It appears that because he would not submit meekly to the absolute rule of a tyrannical government under which no man dares call his soul his own, this cardinal is to be a living example of death to any one who would dare reproach those who claim that man has no inherent rights granted to him under the laws of Almighty God.

If true freedom is to remain in the world, if the rights of man are to be recognized and respected, then every free voice must be raised, every free voice must speak up now to condemn this latest Soviet atrocity that strikes at the very heart and soul of freedom. Therefore, we believe that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Congress use their full force of diplomatic pressure and our influence in the United Nations be used to demand and obtain the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty and the other clergy unjustly imprisoned.

Yours very truly,

MARY I. RIGBY,
Regent, Assumption Circle No. 74.

Suggested One-Man Defense Control Seen Leading to Disunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article of David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1949, entitled "Suggested One-Man Defense Control Seen Leading to Disunity":

SUGGESTED ONE-MAN DEFENSE CONTROL SEEN LEADING TO DISUNITY—WRITER BELIEVES IT WOULD GIVE TOO MUCH POWER TO NONELECTIVE OFFICIAL

(By David Lawrence)

The proposal by the Hoover Commission to do away with the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, and concentrate full power in the Secretary of Defense clears the air and puts before the American people concretely the issue that supposedly has been retarding the much-talked-of unification of the armed services.

If adopted, it could make the President a figurehead and put the exercise of all military and economic power into the hands of one man who is not directly responsible to the people at the polls.

The argument is advanced that, as long as the President has the power to remove a Cabinet officer, a sufficient check has been applied. But the experience of history shows that in a national crisis whoever controls the Army and Navy—to which nowadays must be added the Air Force—in any country, that individual has the potential authority to maintain himself in power.

The proposal is one of those curious rationalizations which emanate from the passion for organization-chart efficiency. It is not one that has been thought through. Far from promoting unity in the armed services, it is likely to bring disunity.

Again and again in a democracy it has been demonstrated that where there are honest differences of opinion, the best results toward agreement or a compromise formula are not obtained by the presumably simple device of knocking heads together. It is much better to devise a way for differences to be aired, for the conflicting viewpoints to be thoroughly explored.

ASTONISHING ARGUMENTS

With recollections fresh as to how the last war was fought, it is astonishing to find zealous advocates of one-man control implying, in effect, that the American system lost the last war and Germany won it. For the Nazis had the one-man system and the United States, as well as Great Britain, had Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Hoover Commission has heard a good deal of testimony from all sides and has come up with the same solution that the War Department and the Air Force advocated shortly after the ending of the war. The Navy viewpoint, which was expressed by Secretary Forrestal at the time, has now been sidetracked and Mr. Forrestal is recommending a one-man control.

This no doubt proceeds from his exasperating experiences with bureau chiefs and primarily from the fact that the Air Force went over his head to Congress to ask for more appropriations than had been stipulated by the Secretary of Defense. Instead of defining more closely the responsibilities of the heads of the three armed services and instead of putting an end to the lobbying that goes on for congressional appropriations for the armed services, it is unfortunate that a solution is sought by means of a system of one-man discipline.

There are good reasons why the Army, Navy, and Air Force viewpoints differ. Each service knows its own history and accomplishments best. To superimpose a new Department of National Defense, with an Under Secretary and a host of staff officers, would mean a new bureaucracy and further confusion.

PRESIDENT HELD RESPONSIBLE

The recommendation that a chairman for the three-man Joint Chiefs of Staff be appointed is not as good as the plan that was in effect during the war when the Chief of Staff to the President acted as presiding officer. The President must at all times retain control of both the military and civilian agencies related to preparations for war. It is far better that the President appoint a Chief of Staff to sit with the Joint Chiefs than to make the chairman of a staff of three responsible to the Secretary of Defense.

If it is decided to have three top men from the Army, Navy, and Air Force constituting the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it is better that they select their own presiding officer and that all three have direct access to the President in the event that they cannot agree or in the event that the mediation services of the Secretary of Defense are of no avail.

The American people must always be in a position to hold the President of the United States responsible for any errors that could conceivably imperil the safety of the United States. He is the Commander in Chief under the Constitution. He cannot delegate that responsibility to anyone.

The Congress of Labor

REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, on this particular occasion, it is my desire to speak on the principal problems in the field of labor that have so much to do with our economic welfare and well-being.

Working men and women who constitute America's labor force of some sixty million have three principal concerns in their lives, namely:

First. Their standard of living.

Second. The security of their jobs.

Third. The dignity of their place in the community.

Whether a worker's standard of living is fair or not depends on the relation of his standard to that of the community as a whole. Over the long haul, the American standard of living has been rising steadily, and working people expect to see their standards rise at least accordingly. Hence, their concern for their right to organize and bargain collectively with their employers, for fair labor

standards, for measures to secure economic stability, for old-age pensions, unemployment compensation, health insurance, sick benefits and for fair employment practices.

Job security is the prime concern of people who make a living by working for somebody else and not by having someone else work for them. Hence, their concern for being protected against arbitrary dismissal from a job they hold, and for being able to find another job if the one they hold is wiped out by economic forces beyond their control. If private enterprise cannot provide jobs, they expect the Government to take remedial action.

For centuries workers were treated as a commodity—not as human beings. Existence and growth of trade-unions cannot be explained by economic reasons alone.

People will not stand for being excluded permanently from determining what shapes their daily lives. Twentieth century mass production methods make it impossible for individual workers to participate in directing the economic operations in which they are engaged. But as a group, acting through representatives of their own choosing, they expect to have some influence on decisions which affect their lives and those of their families. Hence, their concern for the position which their organizations occupy in the economy of the country and in the community as a whole. To be forced on relief, to fall back on charity in times of economic adversity hurts the pride of every American worker. He despises the means test; he wants to have a legal right to minimum subsistence during unemployment or sickness. Hence, his concern for systems of social insurance as opposed to public relief.

Because of the magnitude of the group—almost half of the entire population—the well-being of the wage earner is of paramount importance to the Nation as a whole. Last year wages and salaries constituted 63 percent of our total national income. Wages and salaries which our working men and women receive are the purchasing power which buys the output of our industries and the produce of our farms. We cannot maintain full production and full employment on the luxury expenditures of a few wealthy families. When working people strive constantly to improve their standard of living, they serve not only their own interests but serve, at the same time, those of the Nation as a whole.

When the Democratic Administration moved into Washington in 1933, it found the country in the depths of the worst depression in American history. As in every depression, labor was bearing the brunt of the economic collapse. Out of the total labor force of 51,000,000, only 39,000,000 were gainfully employed. Over 12,000,000 were unemployed. Average hourly earnings were 45 cents; average weekly earnings were $17.05. There was no floor under wages. The laborer who sold himself for the lowest wage got the job.

And labor was not able to fight back. The Republican administration of the 1920's fought labor. Theirs had been an era of the open shop and the yellow-dog contract. The embattled labor unions had a mere 3,000,000 uncertain members. Less than 1 worker out of 25 was organized. There was no unemployment compensation, no public assistance, and no work relief program. There were soup kitchens and Hoovervilles.

To provide the Nation with the means to recover from the depression, the Democrats went to work on many fronts. They reopened the banks of America and created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to guarantee the deposits of the people. Homes were rescued through the Home Owner's Loan Corporation. The farmers were rescued from bankruptcy by the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

The youth of the Nation were taken out of the loafing joints and off the box cars and put to healthy, useful work in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Business was saved from ruin by the expansion and the intelligent administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The unemployed were taken out of the soup lines and given constructive employment under the Public Works Administration. These, my friends, were the foundations of our recovery—as vital to labor as to the entire Nation.

Prior to 1933, and under the Republican regime, no laws were in existence safeguarding the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively and providing orderly procedures for workers to exercise this right. As an emergency measure, the Democratic Congress passed, on June 16, 1933, the National Industrial Recovery Act. The act provided that each industry, through its trade association, would write for itself a "code" prescribing maximum and minimum wages and rules of fair competition for that industry, subject to the approval of the Government. The codes were exempted from the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and, once approved, enforced by appropriate penalties. Thus, under the symbol of the Blue Eagle, the first steps were taken to eliminate the ruinous competition of sweatshop wages which had been primarily responsible for the destruction of the workers' purchasing power under Republican rule.

In order to give employees of industry a proper share in the drawing up of these codes, Congress, at the recommendation of the Department of Labor, wrote into the act the famous section 7A, which stated:

> Employees shall have the right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and shall be free from the interference, coercion, or restraint of employers of labor or their agents.

This section had to be included in every industry code before the code could be approved by the Government. The Democratic Party believed in preserving the integrity of the human soul.

On July 5, 1935, Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act, popularly known as the Wagner Act. This statute became the Magna Carta of labor in the United States. It guarantees the right of workers to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers and sets up procedures to enable them to exercise these rights. The act was specifically designed to protect workers against unfair labor practices. Under this act came the National Relations Board, which the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce fought against every inch of the way. Passage of the act did not end the fight of big business against the recognition of bona fide trade unions. Gigantic efforts on the part of the labor organizations were needed before General Motors recognized the UAW and before U. S. Steel recognized the Steelworkers Organizing Committee in February and March of 1937. Throughout the Democratic regime up until the notorious Eightieth Congress went into action, organized labor has grown and made many desirable gains. The dignity of labor has been enhanced and respected. The laborer has been privileged to respect and a fair share of the wealth he creates, and he does not propose to go back to the conditions that prevailed under the "old deal."

In 1946 only 32 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls to vote. And we may safely say that 20 percent of the people gave us the Republican controlled Eightieth Congress to rule the other 80 percent. Big business, special interests, power trusts, and the adversaries of organized labor took over. Pressure government came into action and the policy designers of the Republican Party started their senseless drive against both labor and farmer. They voted for reduction in appropriations for the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, soil conservation, flood control, rural electrification, and started destructive action on farm organizations. They partially butchered the Labor Department and, if they had been given another chance at stewardship, they would have completely liquidated it. They ushered in the Taft-Hartley Act of 20,000 words moulded into ambiguous phrases and clauses in their desperate drive to deprive the workingman of his inalienable rights under the Constitution of the United States. The Taft-Hartley Act is the most confusing, deceptive, atrocious, and abominable piece of class legislation that has ever been placed upon our statute books. It is so designed that no two men of legal talent will agree as to the exact meaning of any portion of it. Anything can be read into its implications. We may say that it is a "Full Employment Act for Labor Attorneys" and we can safely say that it was designed to break the backbone of organized labor so the agents of exploitation may once again take over, also to liquidate the Department of Labor.

This Congress is not just an ordinary one; it is a crucial session. It is a session to restore representative democracy to the people. The prosperity of our Nation depends upon the economic security of the farmer, labor, and small business. Their many gains under Democratic rule must be sustained, reinforced, and supplemented. We must not permit the common man to be sacrificed on the altar of special privilege. The Labor Department must be rebuilt

and strengthened, restoring to it the units, including the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the United States Employment Service, which the Republican Eightieth Congress stripped from it over the veto of President Truman.

The only way to save our gains and assure continuous prosperity, American economy, and the integrity of the human soul is to carry the Truman program to an early and successful conclusion. Every Democrat in this Congress well knows the past action of his party saved our country in times of grave emergencies and it stands ever ready to further promote similar programs dedicated to the general welfare of all our fine people. May we never falter in our sacred obligations. Let us discard our selfish interest and grow more concerned with the welfare of our citizens and Nation.

Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, some people have expressed concern over the heavy burden of taxation which they fear the administration's social-security program will fasten upon the people. I want to call your attention to an article from the Milwaukee Journal of February 23, which points out that passage of this act, instead of increasing the tax burden on the individual, will actually decrease it in many cases, by easing of the realty tax which now goes in many places to meet costs of relief and welfare. Under leave to extend my remarks I include this article in the RECORD:

BIG BENEFITS SEEN HERE IF TRUMAN PLAN WINS—EASING OF REALTY TAX HELD POSSIBLE—100,000 WOULD BE ADDED TO SOCIAL-SECURITY ROLL

President Truman's request for an expanded social-security program, including a home relief system, could result in lower property taxes to the Milwaukee home owner and definitely would bring social-security benefits to thousands of additional persons.

County and Federal officials generally expressed approval and interest in the proposals. They explained, however, that in the absence of specific legislation, it was impossible to predict all the results of such a program.

About 100,000 workers in Milwaukee County would be added to the approximately 250,000 now covered by Federal social security if the expanded program proposal were adopted, according to Karl A. Albrecht, manager of the Milwaukee field office of the Social Security Administration.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND DRAW BENEFITS

There now are slightly more than 15,000 receiving benefits under Federal social security in Milwaukee County. Albrecht said that the number probably would increase to 50,000 in 10 years if the present law were unchanged and to 75,000 if the proposed changes were made by Congress. The President suggested, among other things, that many lines of work not now covered be included under the social-security program.

Individual benefits would jump considerably under President Truman's program, but so would the pay-roll deductions to pay for them. The average worker's benefit in Milwaukee is about $26.70 a month now, Albrecht said. It is higher, however, in the cases of workers now becoming eligible because they have worked longer under the act's coverage than did those who reached the age of 65 soon after the act became effective. Those retiring now are getting between $35 and $37 a month, Albrecht reported.

LIMIT NOW IS $85

The maximum that anyone can now receive is $85 a month. That amount is paid a worker if he has a wife at least 65 and two minor children. President Truman's proposal calls for upping that maximum to $150 and the present $10 minimum to $25.

To pay for social-security benefits, a 1 percent tax is being levied on the salary of covered employees and on the pay rolls of the employer. That tax amounted to exactly $34,662,372 in Wisconsin during the fiscal year ended last June 30, Albrecht said. It amounted to approximately $10,250,000 in Milwaukee County. The amounts would be much greater under the President's proposal for expanded coverage and an increase in the tax to 1½ percent next July 1 and 2 percent each next January 1.

The amount of income taxed would be increased from $3,000 to $4,800.

TAX RELIEF POSSIBLE

The saving to the Milwaukee home owner would come in a reduction in the amount of property taxes which the county board would have to raise to pay its relief bills. The 1949 budget for general public assistance to the needy is $1,576,000 in Milwaukee County. The county's share of the cost of old age, blind and dependent children aids will be roughly about $1,400,000 this year according to Joseph E. Baldwin, director of the county's public-welfare department.

If the Federal and State governments were to assume the entire cost of those relief items, as some observers believe they may as a result of the President's proposals, the burden on the Milwaukee property taxpayer would be greatly alleviated.

For example, the owner of a home assessed by the city of Milwaukee for $5,000 conceivably could save about $10 in taxes if the county were relieved of the burden of raising taxes for general relief and its share of aids for the blind, aged, and dependent children, according to Robert Boos, acting county auditor.

The saving may even be more, if the general relief load increases. January's cost for general assistance to the needy was $122,459, an increase of 3.6 percent over December and of 33.1 percent over January 1948 according to Stanley White, acting superintendent of the department of public assistance.

DIFFERENCE IN RATES

The theory is that every million dollars added to or removed from the tax levy makes a difference in the tax rate of 68 cents for each $1,000 of assessed valuation, Boos explained.

It is questionable whether the President's program would result in any higher payments to persons on relief here. The amount received from the Department of Public Assistance depends upon many factors, such as rent, utilities, heating, and food costs, WHITE explained.

He said, however, that the average paid last year to a man and his wife was $55.74. Some couples, nevertheless, received as much as $100 a month, which is the amount suggested in the President's program.

The President also suggested an additional $20 for each child. In Milwaukee County, the standard budget for a child of 10 years is $25.50 a month, WHITE pointed. It is $13.35 for a child 1 to 3 years old, he said.

SAVINGS IN DEPRESSION

Tremendous savings to the county might result if a major depression were to strike. Milwaukee County had a peak relief load of 41,394 cases, involving 168,684 persons, in March 1933. The relief load last month, despite a large increase over 1 year ago, was only 2,197 cases, involving 5,446 persons, White reported.

The President's proposals were endorsed by Baldwin. He said that the extension of social-security coverage is very important and is the answer to the problem of how to handle the aged successfully. He asserted that this would be a better system than the pension boons that have been set up in some Western States.

The theory of including all needy persons in the national public welfare program instead of just the blind, aged, and dependent children is sound, Baldwin declared.

At present the Federal and State Governments contribute about 80 percent of the cost in Milwaukee County of benefits to the aged, blind, and dependent children. The county raises the balance.

Essence of Current Crisis Is Political, Not Economic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able article entitled "Essence of Current Crisis Is Political, Not Economic," written by William J. Carleton, professor of political science at the University of Florida, and published in the December 1, 1948, issue of Vital Speeches of the Day.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESSENCE OF CURRENT CRISIS IS POLITICAL, NOT ECONOMIC—SPECIFIC MEASURES TO STRENGTHEN OURSELVES IN THE CURRENT DUEL

(By William G. Carleton, professor of political science, University of Florida)

I

Tonight I am going to do what some will consider a rather bold thing. I am going to attempt in a public address to deal with the most important issue of our time in a realistic, in perhaps even a philosophic, spirit. The spirit in which I shall approach this rather terrifying subject will not be the spirit of Gov. George H. Earle or William C. Bullitt or even James Burnham. Neither will it be the spirit of Henry A. Wallace.

The most important issue of today, of course, is the diplomatic duel between the United States and the Soviet Union. Every other issue—political and economic, domestic and international—is subordinate to this world-wide conflict.

We are in the midst of a Presidential campaign, yet what the Presidential candidates are saying about the United Nations, about atomic energy, about armaments, about universal service, about labor-management relations, about inflation, about how to prevent a depression, about taxation, and so forth has a ring of unreality and irrelevancy about it—as though these things had come to be

outside our control. For in truth every one of the questions of today is dependent upon the outcome of our duel with the Soviet, and at the moment no living man knows what that outcome is to be.

There are only two great powers left in the world today—the United States and the Soviet Union. These two great powers are busy dividing the world into two great spheres—two distinct worlds—and they face each other in a mood of growing suspicion and hostility.

What is the basis for this gigantic duel between the United States and the Soviet Union? What has produced it? Let us examine the causes, both from the point of view of the Soviet Union and from the point of view of the United States.

II

The Soviet Union fears that the United States will upset the balance of power. It fears that the United States wishes to impose its own political and economic system on the rest of the world. For years now the Russians have been taught the Marx-Lenin doctrine that capitalism is predatory and imperialistic and that capitalism will attempt to uproot communism everywhere in the world. The interventionist policies of the western powers during the Russian Revolution, the appeasement of fascism during the 1930's, and today's encouragement of reactionary governments in Greece, in Spain, and in China are used to give point to this contention. Moreover, the Soviet believes that the American plans to restore economic life to Europe—the Marshall plan and its accompanying measures—are attempts to restore an international economy based upon capitalism and free enterprise, an economy into which Communist nations feel they could fit themselves only with the greatest difficulty. Again, the Soviet suspects that the United States, having the majority of votes in the United Nations, is using the United Nations for its own national purposes. So the Soviet answers by using the veto. (Those in the minority are always the ones to avail themselves of a veto; after all, in the days preceding our Civil War, it was South Carolina, not New York, which availed itself of nullification, the veto of that day.) Finally, the Soviet fears the American plan of international atomic control, fears that since the Soviet Union would be in a minority inside the international control agency that it could not trust inspection by that agency or that agency's judgment and fairness in locating atomic plants.

On the other hand, the United States fears that Russia plans to upset the balance of power. Americans fear that the dynamic revolutionary character of the Soviet state constantly makes for Soviet aggression. They fear that the Russians want to force their economic and political system on the rest of the world. They see in Communist parties the world over powerful fifth-column instruments of Soviet imperialism. They view Communist opposition to the Marshall plan as a Soviet plot to sabotage economic reconstruction and produce economic collapse—and thus prepare the way for Communist revolution in the west. They view repeated Soviet opposition to United Nations measures and to the American plan for the international control of atomic energy as premeditated designs to the same end—to bring confusion and chaos to the west and thus facilitate Communist revolution.

These fundamental conflicts are frequently localized in certain geographical places—in the Middle East, in Iran, in Constantinople and the Straits, in Greece, in Trieste, in Austria, in Germany, in Korea, in China—particularly in Germany and China, for Germany is the pivot of the balance of power in Europe, and China is the pivot of the balance of power in Asia. The current struggle over Berlin is a symbol, a symbol of the deeper conflict over the future of Germany.

At bottom, then, the basic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union is political, not economic. There is no economic reason why the United States and the Soviet Union should not get along in this world. American production and Soviet production could cooperate economically to put the world back on its feet. True, it might be difficult for countries with free economies to trade with countries with controlled economies, for American private firms to trade with the huge Government trusts and syndicates of Communist lands. But the trading could be done. We must not confuse the mechanics of trade with the flow of trade; we must not confuse the methods of trade with the volume of trade. (Indeed, some of the same difficulties also exist between capitalist and socialist countries, but capitalist and socialist countries do not find these difficulties insuperable because there is the will to trade, because there is an absence of political differences. In his celebrated London speech, Secretary of State Marshall pointed out that capitalism and socialism were quite compatible and could get along together in the same world.) If on the part of the United States and Russia there was a mutual desire and a will to trade, the trading could be done, and the world would benefit by the increased flow of goods and services. But trading communications, like other communications, are closed by political fears—fears over the balance of power, fears on the part of each of the two big powers that the other wishes to force its economic and political system on all countries and to dominate the world.

III

Let us not minimize the strength of the Soviet Union. It is a vast land with vast resources. It is in a feverish state of industrial development. It bestrides the great Eurasian land mass, sending out its influences to both Europe and Asia. Its resources are concentrated in one vast area, and not scattered over the ends of the earth. It has tremendous distances and space, well adapted for defensive warfare; it was sheer space that defeated both Napoleon and Hitler. It appears to possess a high degree of ideological unity. It has the advantages autocracy always has in time of crisis—the capacity for secret, swift, and decisive action. Communist parties in countries widely scattered over the world, even where their primary purpose is to help their own peoples, in effect are frequently the fifth-column allies of the Soviet Union. And then there is the attraction of communism to the colored, the colonial, the backward peoples of Asia. In the struggle over the balance of power, this may become the most significant factor of all.

Why do the oppressed peoples of Asia—of China, of Burma, of Malaya, of Indonesia—turn to communism? Because these backward peoples want modern technology and the standard of living modern technology brings. They want modern technology now—in a hurry—and they want to own it and to derive its benefits for themselves when once it is built. They do not have a sufficiently large native middle class or native capitalist class to build this modern technology. They do not want its benefits syphoned off by foreign capitalists. Therefore, they increasingly desire to build it collectively, to raise themselves by their own bootstraps like the Russians appear to have done, to move from medieval feudalism to twentieth century industrialism in a single generation. It is no answer to say that under such a system they will have no freedom. They reply that they have never had either bread or freedom, and at least they intend to have bread, immediate bread, bread that they can make themselves. They will admit that they would like the American standard of living, but that standard of living seems beyond them. (The American system is the product of many generations of growth, and its free enterprise way of development had its origin in the period before the expensive technology of today.) But the Russian way seems within their reach—now—in this generation.

But we Americans have tremendous advantages, too, and a wise policy on our part will maximize them. We have modern technology developed to its highest level and we have a phenomenal capacity to produce goods and services. We have the atomic bomb. We have superiority in the air. We can draw upon the scientists and the scientific thinking of western Europe, where theoretical science is most highly developed. We control the seas and most of the strategic ocean narrows throughout the world. We have access to the world's strategic materials. We are in alliance with the world's third power, Britain, and with the peoples of western Europe. We have the majority support in the United Nations. We have behind us the cultural heritage of the west with its spiritual appeal to Europe and to the Americas. And most important of all, we have behind us the yearning of modern men to be free.

Except among backward peoples who have experienced neither bread nor freedom, this magnetic appeal of freedom should be an unbeatable one. The fear of the west is the fear of totalitarianism, the fear of a police state, the fear that freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of movement, freedom of the mind, freedom of expression, freedom of religion, and freedom of elections will be suppressed and superseded by a self-imposed and self-perpetuating dictatorship. This fear is shared by all who are not Fascists and Communists—by the vast majority of the peoples of the west. It is shared by capitalists and Socialists. It is shared by conservatives, by liberals, by social-democrats. Indeed, the Socialists of Britain and western Europe—those ardent believers in democratic socialism—are among the most outspoken foes of totalitarianism in all its forms. The battle cry of the west is not capitalism; the battle cry of the west is freedom. The supreme issue of our time is not economic; it is political. What divides and unites men is not the economic conflict of capitalism versus collectivism; what divides and unites them is the political conflict of freedom versus totalitarianism. It is this will to freedom which is uniting the peoples of the west behind the United States.

IV

Will there be war? No living man knows the answer to that question. Those of the west who think war is inevitable say the sooner war comes the better. Time, they say, gives Russia opportunity to recover, to grow strong technologically, to acquire the atomic bomb, to win the peoples of Asia to the cause of communism. We of the west are relatively stronger now than we shall ever be, observe those of this school of thought. On the other hand, we are dealing with some imponderables, and war may not be inevitable. Those who would precipitate a preventive war and unloose the horrors of atomic warfare on the world are on shaky moral ground and they are underestimating the moral feelings of the peoples of the world. A war that appeared aggressive could not be justified morally, it would be a hard war to win, it would be followed by a difficult and an unresponsive peace.

Yet war may come. It may come because those who favor a preventive war may get the upper hand in our counsels. Or, more probable, it may come because of the aggressions—the dynamic revolutionary nature—of the Soviet state.

A Soviet-American war could have three possible outcomes. It could result in a Soviet victory to be followed by some kind of a Soviet world empire, which might or might not evolve into genuine international communism. Far more probable, it could result in an American victory, to be followed by some kind of an American empire, which might or might not evolve into genuine United Nations internationalism. Finally, it might result in a stalemate of exhaustion, in a hopeless situation in which neither side could win, in a long drawn out purgatory for suffering humanity—a kind of Thirty Years' War. The glib ones say this might be a desirable outcome, but wise men know better. Do you remember back in the 1930's when in some circles it was fashionable to predict knowingly that Germans and Russians would be at each others' throats and that such a situation would be a good thing because a war in which Germans and Russians killed each other off would be beneficial to the west? Well, that was always pretty specious doctrine, even though in that case there would have been an America to pick up the pieces and proceed with the game of life. Today, a war in which east and west killed each other off would leave the world maimed and helpless. There would literally be no nations left strong enough to pick up the pieces and proceed with the game.

V

War, of course, may be avoided. The chances are still that it will be. How? By a counterrevolution winning in Russia and reestablishing a capitalist regime, thus giving the United States a victory without war. This is not likely. By communism sweeping over the west, thus giving Russia a victory without war. This, too, is not likely. The high tide of communism seems to have been reached in Europe, and even a prolonged economic depression would not bring communism to Britain or the United States. How, then, may war be avoided? By stabilizing the American and Russian spheres now being built. By frankly recognizing the existence of two worlds. And what are the forces making for the peaceful stabilization of these two worlds?

First, physical limitations and fears: The devastation of the last war, from which Russia has not recovered; the sense of war weariness in all parts of the world; mutual fears of the atomic bomb and the other cataclysmic weapons of our day.

Second, the growing sense of unity in the Western World and rising determination not to appease the Soviet.

Third, the need of western Europe for the raw materials of eastern Europe, and the need of eastern Europe for the manufactured goods of western Europe. There is a growing realization that the peoples of the Balkans must have the tools, the implements, the machines, and the clothing of the west, while the peoples of western Europe must have the food and raw stuffs of the East. Trade has a way of breaking down political and ideological barriers.

Fourth, the probability that time will accustom us to the strange and novel political situation existing in the world today—the existence of only two great powers with widely different political and economic systems. As each reaches the more apparent limits of its expansion, as the probings of each encounters firmer resistance, as communism reaches its crest and comes to be contained, as the borders are more closely drawn, as the spheres of the two great powers are more clearly delimited, then the United States and Russia may settle into a modus vivendi, into a long period of uneasy but growing stability. Time may teach each that the world is big enough for both the United States and Russia, for both capitalism and communism.

Fifth, if once some sort of stability is reached—even an uneasy stability—there may be some relaxing of tensions in the Soviet Union. This relaxing of tensions may lead to some increase in freedom within the Soviet Union and may also lead to the raising of the iron curtain, not much but some. If western Europe should move in the direction of more socialism and the Soviet Union in the direction of greater freedom, the vast differences between east and west might gradually be bridged. In any event, this is a long-time development and may not come soon enough to help appreciably in the achievement of peace during the current critical period.

Sixth, and most important, communism might turn out to be nationalistic, independent of Communist internationalism and Russian imperialism. Up until this time we have been taking communism at the valuation of its own thinkers and leaders. We have assumed that it would be internationalistic. We have thought of it as an appendage of Russia, the first Communist state; as the possible basis of a world Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This is what has made us fear it so much. We saw it as a gigantic instrument for the upsetting of the balance of power. But what if it should turn out that the wishes and predictions of Communist thinkers and leaders were mistaken? What if it should turn out that a country's going Communist did not necessarily link it with Russia? What if even Communist countries had to yield to other historic circumstances, to nationalist traditions, to economic needs different from those of Russia? We have seen the Communist leaders of little Yugoslavia identify their national interests as different from those of Russia. Many Polish Communists are taking a similar position. If the Communists of little countries like Yugoslavia and Poland take such a position, might not the Communist leaders of big Germany and big China do the same, should communism win in their countries? Now if communism turns out to be nationalistic and no mere adjunct of Russian policy, then our fears will relax. Russia might become less interested in pushing communism in other countries, and we certainly would be much less fearful of the balance of power being upset. Instead of dealing with an ever expanding Russia (or an ever expanding Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) we would be faced with the infinitely easier task of dealing with a new, a multiple, a more divided, a more flexible balance of power. We are here considering one of the most important historical possibilities of our time: Will communism turn out nationalistic or internationalistic, independent of Russia or dependent upon Russia? We do not yet know the answer. It involves imponderables, and only time and subsequent history can supply the answer. But if we wait long enough (being firm and vigilant all the while), if we gain sufficient time, we may know the answer, and the answer may mitigate our fears. But will we be allowed the time?

VI

Meantime, what can we do to strengthen ourselves in our current duel with the Soviet Union? Let us enumerate some of the specific measures.

First, let us strengthen the United Nations as best we can and continue in our attempts to weaken the veto. Constitutions and written charters have a way of developing organically and in actual practice of obviating and amplifying the written words.

Second, let us continue economic aid to the stricken peoples of Europe—until those peoples restore a working economy.

Third, let us reconsider our tariff policies with the view to providing markets for the goods of western Europe which formely found markets behind the iron curtain.

Fourth, let us help western Europe coordinate its currencies, its monetary systems, its transportation, its industrial production. Let us encourage the development of across-the-border industrial concerns in western Europe. In this connection, Barbara Ward's recent The West At Bay has many valuable suggestions. Incidentally, such measures will also help merge the economy and the industry of western Germany into a general European economy, thus making a future Germany less dangerous.

Fifth, let us encourage the nations of western Europe to build a military and a political federation.

Sixth, let us by all means avoid a major depression in the United States. A major depression in the United States would pull down the entire economy of the west. The resulting economic misery would lead to a renewed spread of communism in western Europe. A renewed spread of communism would lead to civil wars in western Europe. Civil wars in western Europe would lead to intervention by Russia on one side and by the United States on the other. Out of these interventions would come a third world war.

Seventh. Let us take care that we do not alienate the liberals, the social democrats, and the democratic socialists of western Europe by encouraging reactionary and crypto-Fascist groups in Europe. Let us be realistic and recognize frankly that the democratic socialism of western Europe may represent the middle way for Europe, the middle way between fascism and communism.

Eighth. Let us take measures to build a people's program in Asia that can match in mass attraction the promises of communism. Let us use every opportunity and every non-Communist movement of a genuinely popular kind to build a middle way in Asia, a way between feudalism and communism. The democratic socialism of Nehru may represent such a way.

Ninth. Let us never forget that we no longer speak merely for America, that we speak for the entire non-Soviet world. The public utterances of too many of our leaders are still provincial, narrow, shrill, where they ought to be broad, inclusive, urbane. We are thinking of democracy and freedom too often in terms of the American system—in terms of a written constitution, federalism, separation of powers, a two-party system. We must remember that many of our allies and associates have found democracy and freedom in unwritten constitutions, in unitary governments, in cabinet and parliamentary governments, in multiple-party systems. Again, we are talking of democracy and freedom too often in terms of American capitalism and American free enterprise. We must remember that many of our allies and associates are finding democracy and freedom in economic cooperatives, in social democracy, in democratic socialism. In this great duel with the Soviet Union we speak for the conservatives, yes; but we also speak for liberals, for social-democrats, for democratic socialists. We speak for the world of Winston Churchill, yes; but we also speak for the world of Attlee, Bevin, Cripps, Morrison, Laski, Crossman, Blum, Negrin, Prieto, and Nehru. We speak for America, yes; but we also speak for all of western civilization of which America is only a part. More, we speak for all men everywhere who seek both freedom and the social security modern technology ought to provide.

No modern nation has ever been called upon to give direction to such a widely gaged mission. We have yet to prove that we possess the breadth and the maturity and the wisdom to measure up to that mission.

Georgia Catfish and Hush Puppies

REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 7 in the course of a speech which I made to the House while H. R. 2361 was being read for amendments, I referred incidentally to a southern dish, fit for the gods, to wit, catfish and hush puppies.

I later received from a Connecticut Yankee, Mr. N. Farmer Murphy, a letter admitting that they were frightfully ignorant in his part of Connecticut and asking for more light on the question of hush puppies.

With the collaboration of my good friend, Bill Edens, secretary to my colleague, Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, and my secretary, Mrs. John D. Penn, I sent this Connecticut Yankee a recipe for the making of hush puppies.

The correspondence with Mr. Murphy caused quite a bit of comment in the newspapers. The result was that my good friend, Judge James Maddox, of Rome, Ga., sent me for Mr. Murphy, ready-prepared ingredients for hush puppies which I have in turn sent to Mr. Murphy.

In the belief that many other Members of Congress are as unenlightened on the epicurean delights to be gotten from the eating of the succulent catfish and savory hush puppies, I am including with the extension of my remarks a recipe for the preparing and cooking of this southern delicacy.

I am including also an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Atlanta Journal on Sunday, February 27, and another from the Atlanta Constitution on Monday, February 28:

RECIPE FOR HUSH PUPPIES

Three cups of corn meal.
One cup of plain flour.
One very finely chopped onion of medium size for each cup of dry ingredients.
One-quarter teaspoon salt to each cup.
One teaspoon baking powder to each cup.
Enough sweet milk to make the batter about as stiff as putty. It is very important that the batter be stiff.
(I am told that you can substitute beer for milk and leave the baking powder out.)
When mixture has been thoroughly mixed, drop from a spoon in very hot, deep fat where the fish have been fried.

[From the Atlanta Journal of February 27, 1949]

NOW MORE PEOPLE MAY LEARN HOW TO LIVE

Georgia owes a deep debt of gratitude to its zealous Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM and to Judge James Maddox, of Rome. Those gentlemen have cooperated to perform a public service calculated to make life happier for a lot of people in the culinary hinterlands who otherwise might never have known what they missed. On instructions from Judge Maddox, Congressman LANHAM is dispatching to a Connecticut Yankee who asked how to make hush puppies, not only the recipe but a box of ready-mixed ingredients.

The whole matter arose after Mr. LANHAM had told his colleagues in the House of Representatives a few days ago that a man who has never eaten hush puppies with channel catfish has never lived. Truer words were never spoken. You can have your pompano gracing an elegant table. You can delight in your flounder and cast aside worries about getting a bone stuck in your throat. But, together with Congressman LANHAM, we proclaim that unless you've eaten channel "cat" and Georgia hush puppies, you don't know what good eating is!

If, as a result of Mr. LANHAM'S remark and Judge Maddox's gracious gesture, this delectable combination of hush puppies and channel "cat" attains the publicity it deserves, then a lot of Americans may learn how to "live," and the fame of the soul-satisfying Georgia dish may attain the proportions it deserves.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of February 28, 1949]

CONGRESSMAN LANHAM TO RESCUE

HENDERSON L. LANHAM, of Rome, is an estimable gentleman who as Congressman from Georgia's Seventh District is serving well both his constituency and his country.

On more than one occasion he has risen above party and provincial levels to vote for what he believed was the national good.

Recently, before the House, Representative LANHAM declared that a man has never really lived until he has eaten channel catfish and hush puppies.

Thereupon a Connecticut resident wrote asking the Georgia solon to "describe those hush puppies which are so good with catfish."

"We are frightfully ignorant up here," the man added.

Whereupon Representative LANHAM got busy toward sending the hush-puppy recipe to this poor man who "hadn't lived."

In thus sharing this southern secret with a Connecticut Yankee, the gentleman from Georgia's Seventh has furnished further proof that as a Representative he can be unselfish and unsectional.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the Journal of the American Medical Association, edited by Morris Fishbein, is largely responsible for the fact that so many physicians have a complete misconception of the proposed national health-insurance legislation, and the issues surrounding that legislation.

One of the misconceptions that Mr. Fishbein has planted in the minds of most doctors is that the British medical program is a complete failure and that its failure proves what would happen in this country if we adopted President Truman's health-insurance plan.

This line of propaganda has two errors. First is the fact that there are fundamental differences between the British plan and the American proposal. The second is that the British plan is far from the failure it has been pictured by the AMA.

The AMA Journal has constantly tried to persuade American doctors that the British program has resulted in deterioration of medical service. Last September, for instance, it said that doctors in Great Britain were compelled to write formulas and prescriptions and reports many hours in advance of the time when they see the patients.

It is interesting to note in the Journal dated January 22, 1949, a letter from Charles Hill, Secretary of the British Medical Association, flatly denying this charge. Apparently Mr. Hill has had some difficulty getting the Journal to print his denial, as an editor's note indicates it was only printed after Hill had repeated his request for its publication.

Dr. Hill, as secretary of the British Medical Association, could not be expected to be a partisan of the British medical program. But his letter to the Journal said that the Journal's charge about the practice of medicine under the British program was untrue and could be described as a libel on a profession which is proud of its traditions of service to its patients.

That the AMA Journal has constantly misrepresented the British program and the way it is working is indicated by many independent reports from American journalists who have submitted much more favorable reactions to the plan. One such report came recently from Frederick Kuh, London correspondent of the Chicago Sun-Times. Under unanimous consent, I include Kuh's two recent articles printed in the RECORD to show doctors and the public generally, that the British program is working much more successfully, despite growing pains, than the AMA Journal would have you believe.

BRITISH MEDICAL PLAN AIDS POOR
(By Frederick Kuh)

LONDON, January 14.—Legends have been spun around socialized medicine in Britain since its introduction on a nation-wide scale 6 months ago. It is as untrue to suggest that the scheme has been running without a hitch as to infer that it is breaking down.

Even more misleading are reports in American newspapers, describing this immense venture as communistic. The facts refute such propaganda. Doctors remain free to engage in private practice. Every citizen is at liberty to choose his own physician, dentist or oculist.

Only a foolish commentator at this early stage would label the national health service a success or failure. It has shown some defects and abuses, which will be discussed later in these articles. Considering its vast scope, it is working more smoothly than expected.

There has been a temptation to judge results more from the standpoint of a comparative handful of doctors than from the impact on 50 million Britons. An honest effort to sum up the effects on the British public leads to these conclusions:

The poorer people have gained. Besides free maternity care, free dentistry, free spectacles, they can now also obtain medical appliances, surgical shoes, wheelchairs, artificial limbs, and in exceptional cases even wigs—all for nothing.

POSITION OF RICH UNCHANGED

It should be remembered that before the health service began last July 5 almost 20 million British, in return for small insurance payments, were given gratis state medical treatment and sickness benefits in cash. Everyone who earned less than $34 a week was compelled to join the state insurance scheme and enjoyed most of the advantages which the new health service has now extended to a much broader section of the population.

The lower middle-class people with weekly incomes between $35 and $80, who did not come within the state insurance system, now get free medical and dental treatment, free medicines and are shielded against heavy hospital costs.

The health service has left the position of the rich unchanged. By paying high fees they can still go privately to specialists, summon them, or occupy private rooms at hospitals or sanitariums.

Considering the truly national size of the health service it is astonishing that it has been working so well in its first half year. More than 95 percent of the population of 50,000,000 are getting free medical service. The state has taken over 2,587 hospitals with 288,000 staffed beds. Of a total of about 23,339 general practitioners, approximately 20,400 have entered the health service. Of 10,000 practicing dentists, 8,750 have joined the service.

On visiting the head offices of the British Medical Association, which bitterly fought the scheme before it was launched, I was surprised to learn on talking to the association's spokesman that the BMA has turned strongly in favor of the national health service.

DOCTOR A FREEMAN

"The doctor has remained a freeman," the BMA said. "He is not a state employee. He treats the patient as he likes, while the public keeps its right to select its own doctor."

Some stories published in America suggest that droves of British people have turned into hypochondriacs since they can visit doctors and let the state foot the bill. There are such cases. A woman with a scratched finger may, without payment, enlist a physician's attention. A man with a headache, instead of buying aspirin at the local drugstore, can run to a doctor.

This nuisance aspect of the doctor's life existed before and has been slightly worsened. Most hypochondriacs in former days, however, were willing to pay $2 or $3 for the pleasure of a trivial or imaginary ailment.

Against this the doctors themselves say that socialized medicine has made the public health-conscious rather than disease-conscious. Poverty or modest means used to deter many, especially housewives, from calling a physician. Such neglect is disappearing. People are now going to their doctors earlier than formerly and, in such illnesses as tuberculosis, this improves the chance of swifter diagnosis and prompter treatment.

Mothers nowadays tend to make calls on the doctor more of a family affair.

"While I'm here, please look at Willie and Nellie."

However, doctors agree that it aids medical care if they are able to treat the family as a unit.

BRITISH HEALTH PLAN PROVING ITSELF DESPITE FLAWS

(By Frederich Kuh)

LONDON, January 16.—The first months of the new national health service have disclosed weaknesses in the system along with many advantages. Problems of optical care and dentistry have been especially worrisome.

For instance, there has been a nationwide rush for free spectacles. The Government estimated a demand for 4,000,000 spectacles a year, but the claims are running at the rate of 7,000,000. British industry lacks the capacity to manufacture enough spectacle frames. Before Christmas, 4,000,000 persons had had their eyes tested under the new scheme and 1,500,000 spectacles have been supplied gratis.

Many people who needed glasses are getting them. Poor persons who wore "specs" without ever having had their eyes examined are receiving tardy care. Others who wore the same spectacles for 10 to 20 years are obtaining new, adjusted lenses without paying for them. The run on opticians often means a delay of eight or more weeks before delivery and, worst of all where a doctor's certificate is required, much time is being lost in paper work.

It ought to be said at once, however, the tales of an enormous bureaucratic apparatus to cope with the new health service are untrue. Administration of the whole service has involved a Ministry of Health staff of a little over 800, including clerks and typists.

Doctors have been complaining, with reason, that they are obliged to waste too much time in form filling. A good deal of paper work has been added to the physicians' occasional issuance of birth, death, or lunacy certificates. A Government committee has been set up to reduce this evil.

It is in the field of dentistry that the Government is having unexpected teething troubles. Dental health in Britain has been notoriously bad. Now, it is said, too many teeth are chasing too few drills. About 1 in 10 persons regularly went to the dentist. Today, frequency has risen to 1 in 6.

The Government has decided that it erred in overgenerosity in fixing state fees to dentists for their treatment of patients. A Government committee had calculated that a dentist, spending 33 hours weekly at the chairside, would earn $15,200 gross, or $7,600 net a year. Many dentists, working overtime or shortening the time allowed each patient, have been earning far too much to suit the Government. Some are making $48,000 gross, or $24,000 annually, besides their private practice.

AID FOR RURAL DOCTORS

One unwanted result is that the state's fees are attracting dentists from public clinics to their private surgeries, and that has meant less care for the teeth of school children and expectant mothers.

The Government has ruled that the state shall tax away half the dentist's income over a gross of $19,200 yearly.

From the profession's viewpoint, the most conspicuous hardship has fallen upon country doctors. Distances to be covered limit their number of patients and lower their earnings. Few attain the legal upper limit of 4,000 patients on their lists. The Government is preparing to ease the rural doctors' dilemma by granting them a larger mileage allowance to pay transportation.

The entire health service is more expensive than the Government had supposed. The original estimate of $608,000,000 for the first year was raised to $960,000,000 before the scheme was launched in July. It may reach $1,120,000,000, a large part of which goes to run state-owned hospitals.

Are doctors better or worse off financially? Some say worse. But the Ministry of Health says general practitioners have won a 60-percent rise in their total income, compared with prewar years.

Whether the British doctor is overworked under socialized medicine varies from doctor to doctor and dentist to dentist.

Many physicians are overburdened; this was true of some in pre-health-service times. Partly because more people are getting medical care and partly because others now run to a physician to obtain free attention, the strain on the profession has grown.

Under the former state sick-insurance system only the insured person, usually the man at the head of the family, benefited. Now state-insured people have been absorbed in the national health service. Mothers and children, often neglected under the old scheme, are receiving more medical care and the whole family now normally gets attention from the same physician.

Shortage of doctors in Britain (there is 1 for every 2,000 inhabitants) remains.

Overcrowding of hospitals was a sore spot in Britain and it has not been relieved; in some instances it is aggravated. This affects maternity cases among others.

Britain's birth rate has risen from 14.8 per 1,000 in 1939 to 20.6 in 1947 without a corresponding increase in hospital accommodation. Before the war 1 of 3 babies was born in a hospital; now it is 1 of two.

Britain needs a big investment program for building new hospitals and modernizing old ones. Yet any such enterprise is out of sight, owing to shortage of building materials.

PURCHASE OF PRACTICE ILLEGAL

Introduction of the health service seems to be attracting more students into medical colleges, indeed too many to be accepted. Before the era of socialized medicine, the young doctor usually began by buying a practice for about $12,000 from another physician who was retiring or moving elsewhere. Purchase of practices is now illegal.

After their earlier fight against socialized medicine, doctors have been showing remarkable good will toward the new system and cooperating fully. Of course, there are complaints, some reasonable, others exaggerated or unfounded.

When allowance is made for the health service's own infancy, an ample balance remains in favor of the system.

Socialized medicine here has not yet met the test of a hard winter with its familiar increase in illness. Nor has it had to cope with a severe flu or other epidemic. In the short experience of its first half year, however, it has been accepted as a desirable addition to the British way of life.

National Children's Dental Health Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution authorizing and directing the President of the United States to issue annually a proclamation setting aside the first Monday of February as National Children's Dental Health Day and to invite all agencies and organizations interested in child welfare to unite upon that day in the observance of such exercises as will call to the attention of the people of the United States the fundamental necessity of a continuous program for the protection and development of the dental health of the Nation's children.

We recognize that a higher level of dental health for the entire population can best be achieved by concentrating on the needs of children. Many communities have observed a Children's Dental Health Day for as long as 8 years, with scientific meetings for dentists and edu-

cational activities for the public. These observances have resulted in a great deal of public good and provide convincing proof that a National Children's Dental Health Day will greatly multiply the benefits of dental health for children. All State and component dental organizations, together with civic, educational, and health groups, have expressed their willingness wholeheartedly to support this program.

A proclamation by the President of the United States designating the first Monday in February as National Children's Dental Health Day would contribute immeasurably in focusing public attention on the need for a higher level of dental health for our children and would, indeed, be beneficial to the health and welfare of our Nation.

State Library Service Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL J. KILDAY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial which appeared in the San Antonio Express of March 1, entitled "State Library Service Bill Before the Legislature," The Express has been a consistent supporter of the library program embodied in a number of bills pending before the Congress. This editorial indicates its support of State legislation on the same subject designed to implement the program outlined in the bills pending before us:

STATE LIBRARY SERVICE BILL BEFORE THE LEGISLATURE

Though the Texan may point boastfully to his State's thriving cities, paved roads, oil fields, pedigreed cattle and sheep, and the giant industries rising along the Gulf coast, he cannot say much for the State's rank in public libraries.

The latest tabulation showed Texas standing thirty-sixth among the States in per capita expenditure of public revenue for library service. What is worse, Texas has to report more persons than any other State (3,500,000, or about half its population) who entirely lack such book-borrowing privileges.

Thus Texas spends many millions annually on its schools, State colleges and university—and, under the Gilmer-Aiken plan, would spend added millions—in teaching its future citizens how to use books, and yet, by contrast, provides but a pittance for supplying those citizens with the books they need for guidance and after-school self-education.

A bill before the legislature, if enacted, would represent an important step toward remedying that anomaly. At its hearing in Austin today, a house appropriations subcommittee will hear appeals by State Librarian Francis H. Henshaw and other friends to the libraries for a $200,000 grant to be used during the next fiscal year for taking books to the people.

The money thus voted would extend library service to those communities whose need of it is greatest. For demonstration purposes, it would establish five regional libraries—each comprising a bookmobile, driver, and librarian—each to serve 10 or 15 counties. The State would spend $25,000 on each outfit, or $125,000 on the five units. With the other $75,000, the funds would create a model library on wheels to go anywhere in the State where it could be of service to local libraries and, at the same time, increase the State library's stock of books to lend.

What the State library proposes is essentially such a demonstration program as the Hill-Madden and Patman bills pending in Congress contemplate.

In that regard, Milton E. Lord, president-elect of American Library Association, has a commendatory word for the Texas State Library's extension program. Mr. Lord—who directs Boston Public Library, one of the world's greatest, that is rich in gifts from men and women whom it has served—points out that the Texas proposals fit in well with the Federal Library Demonstration bill.

Should both the Federal and State bills become law, Texas would be in line for an outright Government grant of $40,000 a year plus $100,000 a year to be matched by State funds. Maintained through 4 years, such a program would go far toward giving Texas public library service. When the people discovered what books could do for them, they would carry on from there.

California Faces Drought Conditions as Serious as Those of a Year Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD J. WELCH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent granted me to insert in the RECORD a United Press story from the California State Capitol at Sacramento, I desire to refer to the fact that there is a critical shortage of water and power from one end of the State of California to the other. The Shasta Dam reservoir is the principal water storage for the great Central Valley. It has a capacity of 3,714,000 acre-feet. On Tuesday, February 22, 1949, there was only 2,257,000 acre-feet of water in the reservoir compared to 2,802,000 acre-feet a year ago or 245,000 acre-feet less than at this time in 1948.

The article follows:

STATE FACING DROUGHT CONDITIONS AS SERIOUS AS THOSE OF A YEAR AGO

SACRAMENTO, February 24.—California faces as serious a drought situation now as it did a year ago, State and Federal officials warned today.

E. L. Christian, assistant Central Valley project water master, declared the situation was "now getting to the point where it should be viewed with quite a bit of concern." He said rainfall throughout the State generally was below normal and in many cases was lagging behind last year.

George A. Scott, chief of the State crop and livestock reporting service, warned that unless spring rains and snows are heavy and well distributed, agriculture may suffer for lack of sufficient water. He added:

"Below-normal seasonal rainfall this year, following recent successive dry years, would present a serious situation for agriculture in parts of the State."

Mr. Christian said he was in complete agreement. "Prospects of a drought at this time are just about as serious now as a year ago," he declared.

On rainfall, Mr. Christian pointed out that precipitation in the northern Sacramento Valley area was only slightly better than 50 percent of normal. Seasonal rainfall at Shasta Dam, he said, was only 14.47 inches on February 1, compared with 26.29 inches at the same time a year ago. He said February rains had made up a few inches of the difference but still were considerably behind the 28.95 inches recorded at Shasta March 1 last year.

The situation was not much better in the San Joaquin Valley and mountain areas, the water expert said. He reported rainfall in the Fresno area was only about 60 percent of normal and mountain precipitation which will produce summer flows for irrigation purposes is not much over 60 percent.

Summer run-off, he explained, normally is slightly below the rainfall level.

Fred Paget, engineer in charge of State water resources snow surveys, already reported that the mountain snow pack was deficient as of February 1.

"From the Yuba River to the southern end of the Sierra, the water content of the snow pack averaged 75 percent of normal; while to the north, in the watersheds of the Feather, Pit, and upper Sacramento Rivers, it averaged 60 percent of normal," his report stated.

On the brighter side Mr. Christian said water storage in several of the State's reservoirs was slightly above last year, but still presented no reason for optimism. The 520,000 acre-feet Millerton Reservoir behind Friant Dam on the San Joaquin River contained 186,000 acre-feet of water compared with 140,000 acre-feet this time last year, he said. Most Pacific Gas & Electric Co. reservoirs also were a little fuller than a year ago.

On the other hand, Mr. Christian pointed out that water stored in the reservoir behind Shasta Dam was far below last year's level. He said, as of midnight Tuesday, there was only 2,257,000 acre-feet of water in the reservoir compared with 2,802,000 acre-feet a year ago. The dam's capacity is 3,714,000 acre-feet.

Fortify Alaska Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, despite all our wartime building in Alaska, despite the postwar building there, our guard on the Nation's front is weak. It must be fortified. This must be done quickly. To do half a job, as we have done, is perhaps worse than to have done nothing at all because the war installations which have been constructed make Alaska a greater prize than ever. Only a few days ago a press dispatch from Tokyo contained an evaluation estimating that Alaska and the Aleutians might be captured but that would not mean an enemy power could descend upon the States. That is nonsense. Once the airfields of Alaska were in enemy hands the industrial heart of the United States could be bombed from bases there.

Last summer following publication throughout the Hearst press of articles in which Fergus Hoffman, Alaska expert of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, described the neglected Alaska defenses at Kodiak and Adak, he made a tour at Mr.

Hearst's direction of the entire Territory and reported at length on conditions relating to national defense.

That report showed that any base in the Territory could swiftly be taken by a surprise military attack. This did not come under the heading of news to informed military men—including those of the Red Army—but it awakened Nationwide response from civilians throughout the United States who had assumed that Alaska, after World War II, was a vast and well-armed fortress capable of immediate defense or offense.

Following this series, Fergus Hoffman wrote a summarizing series of the five articles presented here. Of particular importance at this time when a radar picket line is being considered for the continental United States is his disclosure of how easily an enemy could slip undetected into Alaska without radar warning.

Mr. Hoffman has a wide experience in Alaska, dating from World War I days when he and his twin sister were the only white children in the copper-mining camp of Latouche, on the island of the same name in the Gulf of Alaska. He has worked for Alaska newspapers, three of the largest in the Territory, from time to time; covered Alaska in World War II for a national newspaper, and has been a frequent visitor there since VJ-day.

His report follows:

(By Fergus Hoffman, Post-Intelligencer staff writer)

Alaska, the obvious prime target of America's only obvious opponent, today is almost as vulnerable to a surprise attack as it was before Pearl Harbor.

The most casual traveler in the northland cannot help but recognize the ease with which any of the skeletonized sub-Arctic, coastal, and Aleutian bases could be taken by a determined attack.

The situation is closely parallel to the pre-Pearl Harbor days, when 300 soldiers manned the Army's sole northern outpost and the Navy's defenses consisted of a small base at Sitka and two other bases under construction.

MILLIONS OF DOLLARS POURED INTO ALASKA DEFENSE PROJECTS

War's impetus saw millions of dollars poured into Alaskan defense construction. Landing fields were constructed; hastily selected islands were occupied in secrecy and swiftly converted into supply bases, depots, garrison centers.

The concrete airstrips are still there. The Quonset huts are still there. On many a base long rows of wartime living quarters stand vacant, racked by weather and quickly deteriorating. Entire installations, built in haste with war materials, are useless today. The military has even sold many airfield hangars as surplus because they cannot qualify for permanent use.

But the chief difficulty faced by the present planners of Alaska's defenses is that the wartime installations not only were designed for temporary use—but also were put in the wrong places for present purposes.

That is why the Army engineers estimate it will require at least $1,000,000,000 to make the northland impregnable.

That is why the Eighty-first Congress will face renewed pleas from Alaskans and their military leaders for increased construction appropriations for the Territory.

Although there is not complete agreement among the various military services as to the relative importance of the huge variety of needed additions to our Alaskan defenses, this is the primary objective: A fortified Alaska ready to challenge any enemy seeking to strike at the United States by striking down Alaska.

In World War II, Alaska served two purposes. It provided the route by which Russia was supplied with American warplanes and it provided the northern pincer of the iron claw which finally dragged Japan down to defeat.

All wartime military construction was aimed at these objectives. As a result, when VJ-day arrived, the Russian Air Force had a thorough knowledge and complete experience of Alaskan flying conditions and America had a northern bastion oriented only against a defeated enemy.

Today, with only one dangerous enemy on the globe, Alaska must be refitted with an armor impervious to transpolar stabs, to Bering Strait attack or to island-hopping tactics which might originate in bases as far away as Communist-occupied China. Realization of these objectives simultaneously will give America the offensive bases it would need to retaliate against attack.

Alaskan military commanders point out the armor cannot be provided overnight.

WEATHER CONTROLS WORKING SEASON

The annual construction season, at best, lasts only from March to November.

However, if Congress will guarantee the money, the military planners can establish a progressive construction program which will implement the defense needs. The big trouble is the one faced by many Government agencies at every session of Congress—wavering congressional policies. The military would like to see Congress commit itself to fulfillment of a long-range Alaskan defense blueprint, thus enabling the engineers to sign contracts with civilian builders for long-term projects.

Instead, Alaska's defenses are being rebuilt piecemeal as Congress doles out reluctant annual appropriations. Such was the pattern in the pre-Pearl Harbor years, with the result that on December 7, 1941, the entire Territory of Alaska was defended by less than 10 fighter planes. If the Japs had elected to strike to the north instead of the south, Kodiak probably would have become the Corregidor of the North Pacific and Jap bombers would have raked the United States from mainland Alaskan bases.

Dutch Harbor, the first base the Navy built in the Aleutians and the first one the Japs attacked, has been quietly abandoned by the United States.

Theoretically, the huge air and submarine base is on stand-by status.

Its only defense consists of a handful of marines, too few to repel an attack of any kind.

NAVY, ARMY, AND AIR FORCE UNITS WITHDRAWN FROM MANY OTHER ISLANDS

Typical of the postwar fate which has befallen most of America's defenses in the long Aleutian chain, Dutch Harbor is a virtual ghost town.

The tiny leatherneck garrison is provisioned once or twice a month by a Coast Guard patrol bomber from Kodiak which lands at the deserted air base en route to supply a Coast Guard detachment on the Pribilof Islands in Bering Sea.

Navy, Army, and Air Force units likewise have been withdrawn from many of the other islands which played so important a part in the Aleutian campaign. Many islands which supported full military bases in wartime are now nothing but weather-observation posts or airways communications centers manned by a few technical troops.

Even bloody Attu, at the tip of the curving Aleutian barricade, is virtually useless for either defensive or offensive purposes now. Only a small naval weather-observation crew and maintenance outfit is stationed there. A Navy transport plane wings its way from Adak twice a week to supply Attu.

In the middle of the chain is Adak, the only remaining major installation still operating in the Aleutians. Even this base, established originally to give Uncle Sam's bombers a base for bombing Jap-occupied Attu and Kiska, is a grim monument to the reluctance of American taxpayers to maintain military protection in peacetime.

The Navy at Adak has only one permanent building unit—a group of barracks for enlisted men.

Neither the Army nor the Air Force has any permanent construction under way on Adak. Army engineers responsible for their post say they will be grateful if they can retain their civilian maintenance workmen The Army budget for Adak has been pared so much that little attractive overtime pay can be offered to workmen who can just as readily find employment elsewhere.

HOUSING AT ADAK IS MAJOR PROBLEM

Except for the fortunate enlisted men slated for the new Navy barracks, housing is a major problem for every officer, enlisted man, and civilian on Adak. The huts and shed-like dormitories erected during the war were not built to last; they are falling to pieces almost as fast as they were constructed.

Due to hasty, faulty electrical wiring with inferior substitute materials, fires are in almost daily occurrence on Adak in the wartime buildings. Blasted by gusts of wind that sometimes exceed 100 miles an hour tarpaper peels from roofs like ribbon.

Nevertheless, by utilizing material from unoccupied buildings, the garrison manages to keep itself housed. Men with dependents exercise plenty of ingenuity in off-duty adaptation of wartime supplies to the housing needs of the moment. There are no troops to spare for domestic carpenter work or other repairs, but each man does what he can for himself.

SUPPLY MAINTENANCE CALLED DIFFICULT

Yet from Dutch Harbor to Attu, along the entire island route followed by America's trans-Pacific commercial air liners and military transport planes flying between Japan and the United States, Adak is the chief defense base—in temporary quarters.

There is a definite clique of military men who question the value of maintaining heavy static defense bases in the Aleutians, contending that such bases might easily be cut off and isolated in case of a widespread attack against the United States. They emphasize the difficulty of maintaining a supply line to such a distant, isolated point as Adak in wartime.

The answer, of course, is that without defenses in the Aleutians, the rimlike guardians of the North Pacific simply would be occupied by the enemy and used for stepping-stone supply and bomber bases against inland Alaska itself. Once established in the Aleutians, the enemy could control both surface and air operations in the North Pacific.

Russia's military machine, vastly more experienced in Arctic maneuvers ashore and afloat than is America's northernmost garrison, undoubtedly has complete information about the location and strength of all United States forces in Alaska.

By the same token, American knowledge of what goes on in the mushrooming Siberian towns and defense bases across the narrow Bering Strait from Alaska is almost nil.

Until last autumn, when a long-standing agreement between the two countries was repudiated, Siberian Eskimos crossed the strait annually to visit relatives in Alaskan coastal villages and on the American islands. American Eskimos frequently reported the curiosity displayed by the visitors, particularly about military matters.

When the American Eskimos journeyed in their skin boats to visit their Siberian cousins, they frequently met with harsh, abrupt greetings by Russians living at the Siberian coastal villages. Frequently, the Russians demanded that the visitors surrender their hunting equipment and other gear during their visit.

Growing hostility to the visiting American Eskimos, which included confiscation of their goods on several occasions, finally led many of the Eskimos to forego their annual trips. The entire system by which the Eskimos were permitted to exchange visits ended with repudiation of the international agreement.

Word of the repudiation, however, failed to reach a group of American Eskimos on Little Diomede Island, in the throat of Bering Strait, and they sailed the 3 miles to Big Diomede Island to pay their usual summer calls.

LANDING FIELD FOUND ON BIG DIOMEDE

They found a Russian landing field in operation on Big Diomede—and "hospitality" in close arrest.

Held for more than 2 weeks, during which they were grilled in detail about Americans and American activity, the Eskimos finally were released and allowed to return home.

Other Eskimos on St. Lawrence Island told this reporter of Russian activity along the Siberian coast, including icebreakers and merchant ships making their way north to the Russian settlements in the Arctic. A missionary said she was awakened one night by Eskimos who reported finding the wheel tracks of a heavy airplane on a flat plateau on the island.

Two boatloads of St. Lawrence Eskimos, hunting seal, reported to American intelligence officials that they sighted a submarine near St. Lawrence Island.

"We thought it must be an American submarine and we paddled toward it, but it went down below the water right away," they said. "The men on deck saw us and run below and it went away."

A veteran white ice pilot who traded in Siberia for several years following World War I said there is no doubt that Siberia is now being fortified as fast as the Russians can build.

Many of the best sites for air bases in Siberia are within easy bombing distance of Alaska's two major Air Force bases—Fort Richardson at Anchorage and Ladd and Eielson Fields near Fairbanks.

Persistent Russian effort to gather data about Alaska probably began long before World War II. In the summer of 1941, a Coast Guard patrol plane reported Russian merchant ships operating on the American side of the Bering Sea.

Then, when the United States entered the war, the Russians were given a virtually formal tour of Alaska by our own armed forces.

RUSSIANS HAD FREE ACCESS TO UNITED STATES PORTS

The Russians operated many of their own merchant ships between Siberian ports and the west coast of the United States, as well as calling regularly at an American base on the Alaska peninsula to receive ships being turned over to them under lend-lease agreements.

Refusing to let American mariners get a glimpse of their Siberian activities, the Russians not only boarded their new, American-made vessels in American waters—they also insisted on ferrying the thousands of American warplanes which were turned over to them in Alaska. American pilots flew the planes to Alaska and the Russians took them over to Siberia.

If the Russians don't have a complete picture of Alaskan defenses now, it is only because they didn't use the American cameras they purchased so avidly wherever they could find them on their Alaskan visits.

From the ice packs of the Arctic to the jagged green fjords of the inside passage, the territory of Alaska is the perfect objective for an enemy looking for attack bases.

And unless Alaska is fortified to protect every potential base, the United States should abandon military effort in the north, establishing defenses farther south.

So says Ray Petersen, one of the veteran, Alaska-wise civilian bush pilots, who time and again saved the military's bacon in the north in the early days of World War II.

Petersen, heading his flying service with headquarters at Anchorage, is a typical young American businessman—with this exception: His business is in Alaska.

HE WANTS SECURITY FOR HIS FAMILY

It is a thriving business, a combination of four bush air lines now operating on scheduled service as Northern Consolidated Airlines. It will make Petersen and his associates wealthy.

But money isn't enough for Petersen.

"I want security for my children," he said during a Seattle visit. "Security for them and all Alaskans will come when every piece of concrete runway which is more than 3,000 feet is either blown up or adequately defended."

The map of Alaska, the flyer pointed out, is dotted with big, now useless, airdromes constructed during World War II. Many of them are on stand-by status, not a plane on the field.

In all Alaska this winter, for that matter, the Air Force has only 75 fighters and 5 B–50s.

"We poured millions of dollars into building big fields throughout Alaska during the war," Petersen pointed out, "but now those fields are abandoned. Those big vacant bases are just sitting there, undefended, an open invitation for an enemy to sneak in, base his bombers there, and launch sudden surprise attacks on the United States."

SAYS ALASKA LIKE SITTING DUCK

"The people at headquarters of the Alaskan command realize this, but they don't have the money to do the job. They won't get the money until the American people realize exactly that Alaska is as vulnerable today as a sitting duck."

Describing Alaska as the "No. 1 military target in the world," Petersen said there is little doubt in his mind that the Territory would fall before a well-planned attack if the enemy moved now.

"We ought to blow up all the attractive military fields if we aren't going to defend them," he said. "It would take thousands of tons of steel and concrete to rebuild them, and that would block any enemy eyeing Alaska.

"The economical, strategic move, of course, is to man these bases and equip them with fighters and bombers. No enemy on the face of the earth would dare jump us in Alaska if the word got around that our bases were defended."

The actual picture today is almost the exact opposite—almost an identical situation to that which found Alaska unbelievably defenseless on Pearl Harbor day. Petersen has grim cause to remember those days, because he, like other civilian pilots, had to do the military's job.

"They didn't have the planes to spare, so we flew missions throughout Alaska," he recalled. "On December 10, 1941, I flew the first antiaircraft equipment to Kodiak. Our biggest navy base had no antiaircraft devices until the bush pilots arrived."

As Petersen taxied to a hangar he counted six slow Navy patrol bombers on the field. That was Kodiak's air armada. The Navy pilots came running to his plane, clamoring for information about the fighter protection they had been promised.

"They were certain that Fort Richardson, on the mainland, was flying patrols and would protect Kodiak from attack if the Japs moved in," the bush pilot said. "I patted one of those young Navy boys on the shoulder and told him, 'Don't worry about it—Fort Richardson will protect you.'"

COULDN'T PUT SIX FIGHTERS IN AIR

That's what Petersen said. But he knew that Fort Richardson, headquarters for all Alaska, couldn't put six fighters into the air. A full colonel at Kodiak asked Petersen not to discuss the poor Kodiak situation when he returned to Fort Richardson. This would keep the civil population from alarm, Petersen was instructed.

"I didn't want to alarm the military!" Petersen exclaimed. "I didn't dare tell Fort Richardson that Kodiak could offer no assistance."

Today, the flyer emphasized, the picture in Alaska is little different.

"Alaska is vulnerable again," Petersen noted. "The American people have been warned; I hope they act while time enough remains."

Alaska, an open door to aggression could be penetrated almost anywhere along the 30,000 miles of coast line before American defenders could detect the invader.

So poorly defended is our huge northern rampart that the armed services cannot spare patrol planes for regular surveys of some of the most vital sections where an invader might land.

Some easily accessible landing areas are so remote and seldom visited by American reconnaissance planes that days might pass before the presence of any enemy there could be reported.

RADAR POSTS SCANT

Despite the pleadings of military authorities, radar installations are so scant that an enemy could filter into a number of bases without the slightest chance of being discovered.

All this, says E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, Alaska delegate to Congress, adds up to almost total unpreparedness for war in Alaska.

BARTLETT has warned the Congress persistently of Alaska's inadequate defenses, pointing out that even vital Point Barrow where millions are being spent in a Navy search for oil is without defenses of any sort.

Essentially an Air Force command, with Army and Navy components theoretically subsidiary to Lt. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Alaskan commander, Alaska is supposed to be one huge defensive-offensive air base for the next war.

At mile 26, near Fairbanks, the Air Force has recently completed construction of Eielson Field, capable of taking the biggest bombers known to the United States. Here transpolar flights could be serviced and launched in case of war.

But Eielson Field is undefended.

The troops at the field are crew men, clerks, maintenance workers.

COMBAT TROOPS LACKING

The combat troops necessary to defend an installation such as Eielson are not present—anywhere in Alaska. Not a single Army, Navy, or Air Force unit in the territory has enough combat forces to drive off an air attack and quell enemy ground troops landing by parachute or glider.

General Twining has ordered integration of all units at every installation. Every typist and every carpenter has his assigned combat post in case of emergency. Further, practice alerts have been held frequently to train the garrison troops and instruct the civilian populace in emergency measures.

"Our last alert was like a dress rehearsal for disaster," one Alaskan flyer commented recently. "It is a mockery to think we could repel any kind of attack these days. I'm just going to load my family in my plane and take off pronto when war comes to Alaska."

TERRITORY STRIPPED

With Alaska an obvious base for our own attacks across the top of the world, it is essential that America keep her guard up, up North.

Instead, the territory has been stripped of military manpower. This winter at Alaskan headquarters at Fort Richardson, bare, unfinished barracks rear against the skies. Other barracks at other bases are only in the blueprint stage, while troops live in flimsy wood and tarpaper huts built for short wartime use.

And these troops are only a remnant of Alaska's military manpower. The combat troops who should be in winter training are in the States because of the lack of housing.

TO BUILD IN SPRING

This spring construction will start on several more permanent barracks.

Then, if work goes according to schedule, there will be housing for approximately one-third of the troops necessary to defend Alaska. This will be, at the earliest, about Christmas of 1950.

In the meantime, America's attic door is open.

St. Lawrence Seaway Action Urged by Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Michigan CIO News of February 24, 1949:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY ACTION URGED BY UNIONS

WASHINGTON.—Urging immediate congressional action on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, Walter Reuther, UAW-CIO president, and Emil Rieve, chief of the Textile Workers Union-CIO, stressed the necessity of such a plan for national full employment programs.

Addressing the St. Lawrence Association last week, both union heads told members that the entire northeast was losing out by not having low-cost power and would continue to do so unless the proposal now before Congress was passed.

Pointing out the effect of a power shortage on aluminum and steel production, Reuther urged congressional passage so that the shortages might be relieved within 4 years.

In describing the situation, the TWU head declared that New England needs at least 20 percent more electrical power to win new industries.

"No industrialist in his right mind could expand his operations under the present scarcity conditions," and "a good reason is provided for existing plants to move out of New England," he added.

Asking the association to "give the same help to other projects when the St. Lawrence project has been won, not as substitutes but as supplements to it," Rieve indicated the Connecticut River development as a possible project.

At the same time Reuther expressed the need of the Central West for a waterway to the Atlantic.

"The whole Midwest industrial region is threatened by exhaustion of ore resources in the Mesabi Range. Ore from newly discovered deposits in Labrador and elsewhere could be moved to steel centers at a cost approximately one-tenth of rail," he stated.

States' Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the February 6 issue of the Idaho Statesman. This editorial points up the threat of an overpowering authority of the Federal Government to take away the fundamental rights of the State of Idaho.

I urge my colleagues to consider this editorial and remember that who controls the water in the State of Idaho controls the land and who controls the land controls the people.

IDAHOANS MUST REMAIN EVERLASTINGLY ON GUARD AGAINST FORMATION OF AUTHORITY POWER OVER STATE

In Washington last week they held hearings on the Columbia Valley Authority. The Senate Interior Affairs Committee was studying the plans of the Interior Department. A bunch of trained seals were attempting to lay the groundwork for the establishment of CVA.

C. Girard Davidson, an assistant secretary of the Interior, answering a direct question of whether or not he favored an extension of the principles of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Columbia Basin, said "(it) would be of great benefit to that area."

No one would expect anyone connected with the Interior Department to say anything else, unless we are to forget the activities and statements of Secretary of the Interior Krug when he came to Idaho during a recent political campaign. Mr. Krug came to Idaho ostensibly on Department business, but he ended up exposed on a purely political mission, at Government expense, and in behalf of CVA.

The important matter to all Idahoans, and to all residents of the Northwest for that matter, is that we do not have an authority established for the development of the Columbia River Basin or any other part of the Northwest. Certainly we want the Columbia River Basin developed, but we want it done the American way, done without any supergovernmental authority which can tell our courts to go bury their heads in the sand.

In the past Idahoans have been successful in assisting the opposition to the establishment of this authority. One election, when the matter was termed the only issue by Senator GLEN TAYLOR, Idahoans voted overwhelmingly against candidates who made CVA their platform. But one election, several years ago, will not carry the battle in the era of another New Deal. Opponents of the authority form of local government must bombard their Congressmen with vigorous statements in opposition to Columbia River Basin development under an authority.

And Idaho's congressmen, all of them, if they are to represent the will of the people of their home State, will fight the establishment of an authority over the State to the last ditch. There is no hope of Senator TAYLOR giving any consideration to the fact that Idahoans voted against an authority. He is not the kind of man to follow public opinion in his home State. He has no regard for an obligation to follow the wishes of the majority of Idahoans. But, fortunately, our other three representatives in Congress, Senator BERT MILLER and Congressmen COMPTON I. WHITE and JOHN SANBORN are men of higher honor and better caliber.

These three men, we are sure, will hold fast to their obligation—the respect for Idaho opinion that it opposes, without qualification, the authority form of government.

The Late Very Reverend Lawrence M. Cyman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 1, 1949:

TRIBUTE TO A PRIEST

The city of Chicopee has just paid a stirring and significant tribute to the memory of Very Rev. Lawrence M. Cyman, provincial of the Province of St. Anthony of Padua of the Friars Minor Conventuals, whose death was a severe loss to the community which he served so long and well.

Before Father Cyman's elevation to the important position which he held in recent years, he was for more than a quarter of a century pastor of St. Stanislaus Church in Chicopee, during which time his splendid personal qualities, no less than his excellence as a spiritual leader, endeared him to thousands of people throughout this region, including many persons not affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church.

The affection which this servant of God inspired in the hearts of all who knew him received eloquent testimony in the large outpouring of people who took part in the solemn memorial exercises of Sunday and yesterday. Yet, in a sense, this impressive demonstration was even more than merely a tribute to Father Cyman as an individual. It was a spontaneous public acknowledgment of the great influence for the common welfare which clergymen of many creeds exercise in our democracy.

Dedicated to the service of God and humanity, denying themselves the material pleasures of life in order that they may more dynamically devote themselves to leadership in the spiritual realm, these self-sacrificing men and women in religious orders all too often fail to receive the public recognition which they so richly deserve. In the hustle and bustle of modern times, we are too prone to overlook their vital contribution toward keeping vigorously alive the forces of faith, hope, and charity which form the very foundation of our democratic freedoms.

It is scarcely too much to say that Chicopee's municipal manifestation of love and esteem for a former parish priest was, in its essence, symbolic of a spirit that has an important world-wide application at the present time. It was an impressive public demonstration of the fact that here in America, as in all lands where people are yet free to give expression to their innermost feelings, mankind still holds most precious the principles of simple faith, human kindness and brotherly love which were so well exemplified in the career of Father Cyman.

Far across the sea, in lands from which so much of America's present strength has been drawn, people who dare to confess their faith in God are being savagely persecuted by a gang of civilization-wreckers whose object is worldwide extinction of all human freedoms—religious, political, and economic. But between the Reds and their satanic goal there is interposed a barrier that they never will

be able to surmount. It is a wall of divinely inspired men and women, including many religious leaders of the creed which Father Cyman served so devotedly throughout his life. Armored only in righteousness and armed simply with their faith, these heroic followers of Christ stand as a mighty fortress, against which the diabolic minions of atheistic communism will dash themselves in vain.

As long as our country, and the world at large, has spiritual leaders like Father Cyman, and as long as we truly follow with courage and devotion the pathway that they illuminate for us, we need have little doubt of our ultimate triumph against the evil forces that seek to tear down the foundations of human decency in all quarters of the globe.

To the Victors Belong the Spoils

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the protestations of liberalism and progress that one hears on all sides these days, as a matter of fact we seem, in many ways, to be slipping back rather than carrying forward. The following editorial which appeared yesterday in the Baltimore Sun touches upon another example of progress backwards:

GOOD-BY TO THE IDEA OF A CAREER SERVICE FOR CONGRESSIONAL EXPERTS

Mr. J. C. Shanks, a disbursing clerk of the House of Representatives, has just been fired after 21 years of excellent service because a Buffalo carpenter with more political influence coveted his job. Here is a painful exercise in the seamier kind of patronage politics.

But it is not the only offense of the kind attributable to the Democratic leadership of the Eighty-first Congress. For this Congress has already wrecked the promising new plan to work up a permanent corps of disinterested congressional experts able to release Congress from its long dependence on experts from the executive branch.

The rise of the executive branch brain trusts was just one detail of the long process of executive aggrandizement over the years. Congress' reliance on these executive-branch people did not help the Legislature in its effort to retain the coordinate authority set out in the Constitution.

So in the Legislative Reorganization Act an attempt was made to establish a congressional brain trust. Tenure was to be assured, and good salaries, so that sound men would be attracted to these jobs as a lifetime career in the public service.

Because of the date of the Reorganization Act, this particular reform happened to begin in the Eightieth Congress, which was under Republican control. But no one would have been bold enough to say that all the very good men recruited for the infant congressional corps of experts were Republicans. So it was hoped that the new Congress would preserve the new system.

But that hope has been dashed. There have been wholesale firings of the first crop of experts.

Trained men in economics, in the law, in the sciences are thus put on notice that a job in the new congressional corps is just another political job, subject to the fate which always menaces patronage takers. Only last Monday the Senate completed one of the legislative details needed to rip the original idea out of the Reorganization Act.

It was not a pleasant spectacle to those who see how many modern tendencies threaten the Legislature in its historic effort to represent the whole people in all its shades and nuances of opinions against the Executive and his friends.

Why We Face State Medicine—AMA Hierarchy Rebuffs the Progressive Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting editorial that appeared in the Detroit Free Press of February 28, 1949:

WHY WE FACE STATE MEDICINE—AMA HIERARCHY REBUFFS THE PROGRESSIVE DOCTORS

Is the United States to be saddled with a system of Government-controlled, bureaucracy-operated socialized medicine?

Is this country, by adopting the scheme being offered by the Truman administration, to go one step further along the road to economic and political serfdom which has been blazed by totalitarian countries, and followed by Great Britain?

Our future course in this respect depends upon the answer to one big question which the man in the street is asking. The question is:

"How can I obtain for myself and family adequate medical care at a cost which my circumstances permit me to pay?"

Up until now, he has listened in vain for a satisfactory reply from the medical profession.

The issue of socialized medicine was projected by Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing. As spokesman for the Truman Administration, he proposed a 10-year plan, based on compulsory health insurance, to provide not only increased medical facilities, but full medical care and hospitalization to be paid for out of a joint employee-employer tax and Federal subsidy.

Actually, Ewing's health program is a cleverly camouflaged blueprint for State socialism.

But it has a plausible ring to it. The average person, harassed by rising medical care costs, is unable to analyze it carefully. He will see in it only a way to relief from his difficulties. Therein lies its danger.

No reasonable or workable substitute has been offered to counteract the Ewing plan in terms which will appeal to the people, and which they can understand.

Economists of the Brookings Institution have successfully demolished all of Ewing's fallacies. This was done by a coldly analytical study based on scientific observations. But it offers no comprehensive alternative.

The mother, desperate for a physician to attend her sick child in the middle of the night, or the wage earner, watching his lifetime savings vanish under a long siege of illness, will not be impressed by the impersonal statistics which Brookings has compiled.

We face the threat of getting socialized medicine in lieu of something better.

The medical profession, through the American Medical Association, has failed in counterattacking the Ewing plan with a positive program of its own.

All that the AMA has offered is a 12-point, "me too," policy which admits the faults which Ewing purportedly would correct. Reactionary leadership within the AMA says, in effect, "Give us the Federal money and let us, in our own way, do what Ewing says he can do."

That is not an acceptable alternative to the American people. Large numbers of AMA members are spurning the program of their association's heavy-footed leaders.

On Saturday, February 12, the AMA called a meeting of representatives of State medical societies at its headquarters in Chicago to define its 12-point program.

Officers of the Michigan State Medical Society attended, armed with a list of questions, forthright answers to which would have clarified the AMA's position.

The Michigan society's queries would have done more than that.

Although propounded as questions, they were in reality the outline for a positive program. Translated into action, they would allay the demand for socialized medicine.

It was entirely fitting and proper that such an outline for action should emanate from this State where the leadership provided by the State Medical Society and the Wayne County Medical Society is nationally recognized by the medical profession.

It has been said that in formulating policies pertaining to scientific and economic aspects of medical practice, the Michigan societies have generally been from 5 to 7 years in advance of the AMA.

It was Michigan which pioneered the Blue Cross and Blue Shield systems of prepaid health and hospital insurance when the AMA frowned upon anything so radical.

It was the profession of this State which first established rheumatic fever control centers to combat one of the most distressing afflictions of childhood. It was Michigan which first took postgraduate facilities to the doctors in their own communities; which pioneered in the care and treatment of epileptic children; which set up the first central blood bank to make plasma available to communities which had no facilities for storing it.

It is no wonder, then, that professional ears pricked up at the Chicago meeting when the Michigan delegation offered its list of questions.

Pointing to the lack of a positive program under the AMA, the Michigan State Medical Society called for a statement of policy to settle the following questions:

1. Should voluntary health and hospital insurance premiums be paid by Government during periods of unemployment?

2. What is our policy for financial assistance to families during sickness of the wage-earner? Should he have insurance? If so, who is to pay for it, and for how long?

3. What is the policy for medical care to areas unable to support a physician? Are we in favor of assigning doctors to these areas?

4. Do we favor building of health centers for treatment in blighted areas?

5. Do we favor State financing for building small health centers and hospital facilities in areas unable to attract a doctor? To what extent do we favor Federal assistance?

6. Do we favor medical benefits for the aged and chronically ill, in addition to old-age benefits?

7. Do we favor home-town care of the medically indigent by physicians of their own choice, using the same technique for care as the Blue Cross and Blue Shield have used with veterans?

8. Do we favor return to an individual of all money spent for medical and hospital care, which exceeded 10 percent of his net income, same to come from the general fund, thus guaranteeing that no man would be forced to spend more than 10 percent of his income for catastrophic illness?

Here was the outline for a humane, liberal, and workable national health program.

How did the hierarchy of the AMA receive it?

It refused to allow the Michigan delegates to explain it, or to permit discussion from the floor, although a majority of those in attendance signified their desire to discuss it.

Asked if the AMA hall could be available the following day for a meeting for that purpose, AMA officials curtly stated that their building was closed on Sundays.

Despite that rebuff, however, the general membership was so eager to talk over the Michigan program that 46 delegates from 22 States canceled their train reservations and stayed over in Chicago to attend a discussion meeting in a crowded hotel room on Sunday.

The autocratic leadership of the AMA has its eyes and ears closed to new ideas to strengthen the strained relationship between doctors and the public.

The practice of medicine in the United States, the advancement of medical science, is without equal in the world.

But the slow-moving, slow-thinking AMA, which has been delegated the sole voice of medicine, has been unable to keep up, either with public opinion or the progressiveness of its own rank-and-file.

It bitterly resents any suggestion of change which does not originate in the hoary councils of its own hierarchy.

That is why the aggressive, pioneering leadership of the medical profession in Michigan finds no favor in its eyes.

It is the reason that the United States is being pushed toward socialized medicine.

The AMA has given the people of the United States no other choice.

If the practice of medicine is to continue a part of the private-enterprise system, with the privilege of the patient to choose his own physician, and of the physician to choose his own patients, America must turn to the progressive elements of the profession for guidance.

The big question is still unanswered by the AMA.

Michigan has shown that the doctors themselves can furnish a satisfactory answer.

Will they now be permitted to take the lead which the AMA has so dismally failed to provide?

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting to note that the largest member group of the American Medical Association has withdrawn its support of the AMA's plan to fight compulsory health insurance. The New York County—Manhattan—Medical Society took that action, and it also defeated a resolution offered by the executive committee to approve the 12-point AMA program. At the meeting of the New York County Medical Society held on February 28, the vote was 432 to 333 against the AMA's $25-per-member assessment to raise $3,000,000 for a campaign in behalf of the AMA program.

Something About Special Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article by Dorothy Thompson appearing in the Washington Evening Star yesterday, March 1, 1949. It is refreshing to anyone who desires the truth.

The President's attack on special interests was just as unfounded as his socialistic program is dangerous.

The article follows:

TRUMAN SEEN USING OLDEST DEMAGOGIC FORMULA IN ATTACKING SPECIAL INTERESTS

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The oldest demagogic formula is to present the Nation as divided into special interests, representing the privileged few—and wickedness—and the people, representing everybody else and virtue.

The President, who is encountering in Congress opposition to uncritical acceptance of his legislative proposals, pulled out this formula at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

"The special interests are fighting us just as if they never heard of November 2. For them campaigns and elections are just preliminary * * * matches—the fight in the Congress is the main issue with them. These special interests * * * work through their lobbies and pressure groups, through the editorial pages and columnists and commentators they control, while all we have on our side is the people."

When, however, one tries to identify these special interests versus the people, a few facts interfere with so simple an alinement. The people didn't speak in unanimous chorus November 2. In fact, not quite half of them voted for President Truman and the Democratic Party—to be exact, 49½ percent—and 44.11 percent voted for Governor Dewey, while the rest voted for minor candidates. There is nothing in the American governmental system which disfranchises for 4 years the people whose candidates and parties lost in the election.

TOTALITARIAN PATTERN

The disfranchisement of political minorities is a pattern, not for democratic government but for totalitarianism. In the American system, campaigns and elections are preliminary matches. The legislative power remains in Congress, where alone the people are more or less proportionately represented. And since all the people did not vote for the President, his party, or his program, it is not likely that in Congress, where they are proportionately represented, his program will go through without modification.

The special interests boil down to those people who don't agree with the President.

Actually, the President waged his campaign by as calculated an appeal to special interests as we have ever seen. Organized labor, which also maintains powerful lobbies (or are we misinformed?) and also prints full-page ads (or have our eyes deceived us?) voted for President Truman in order to have all definitions of the rights and responsibilities of trade-unions repealed. That is not the attitude of the people, but of a powerful and numerous section of them.

The farmers, by and large, voted for the President because under a system of supported prices they are enjoying exceptional prosperity. They, too, voted according to a special interest.

All groups identify the national welfare with their own interests and democracy works out as the balance between pressures. Nobody ever quite gets his own way.

CONTROLLED EDITORIALISTS?

The concept of controlled editorialists also fits in with no picture I recognize from nearly a generation of journalism. The President has just had a run-in with Drew Pearson. What special interests control Mr. Pearson? What special interests appear at the editorial conferences daily held in every newspaper?

Actually, of the pressure on the political writer—apart from his own limitations, convictions, and prejudices—the greatest is the risk of unpopularity. In an age of organized pressure on newspapers from groups in the public, the temptation to the columnist or commentator is to intellectual and moral timidity. Offend a single powerful group, oppose some popular fallacy, and the ax will fall. The people are the arbiters, but the people, in effective action, are by no means disinterested.

Nor is the Government disinterested. Its interest is to turn writers into its own propagandists, and break the necks of its critics by exposing them as instruments of special interests.

These interests, however, are always curiously, unnamed. They, too, have votes.

Congress Has a Mandate, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, once again from the facile pen of Hermann B. Deutsch, associate editor of the New Orleans Item, has come a forceful editorial.

Mr. Deutsch's ability to put on the printed page what so many million Americans are already thinking, is an important contribution to our times.

There will be nobody to dispute the fact that I know from personal experience the desire and determination on the part of some individuals in the present administration to eliminate any contrary opinions, no matter how honest and sincere those opinions happen to be. My arbitrary removal from the Committee on Un-American Activities because I dared speak out my convictions is an example at point. There is not a day that passes that the repercussions of this action are not heard by me. The condemnation of this punitive action is just as vigorous today as the day on which the conspiracy was spawned in the minds of the vindictive and given an indecent birth through means of collective anonymity.

It seems rather strange that individuals who never miss an opportunity to say how much they believe in fair play and who welcome each chance to announce to the world that they believe in free and open discussion, by their actions live contrary to their sanctimonious mouthings. This administration cries from the mountain top the necessity of protecting the rights of minorities. They want to protect the rights of the minority only if the minority agrees to their way of thinking, but heaven help the minority if it disagrees. That's a different proposition.

I would still be on the Committee on Un-American Activities if I had meekly and weakly kowtowed to the whims and directions of individuals who place party discipline above personal principle. If I had done that it would not have mattered whether I was a lawyer, a butcher, or a candlestick maker. If I had remained silent and followed in the direction of

least resistance everything would have been peace and harmony and nothing would have been said about only lawyers being able to serve on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The entire Congress is now getting a taste of this philosophy of conduct from no less a person than the President of the United States himself. It is this philosophy of thinking which Mr. Deutsch so ably discusses in this editorial which appeared in the New Orleans Item today. It is this policy of damnation against those who dare disagree that Mr. Deutsch exposes in this editorial.

It is a policy of you either do as I say or I will not let you do anything at all. It is a policy of you either take your orders from me or I will beat your brains out. It is a policy of absolute submission to the will of the self-annointed master or be subject to public chastisement and tongue lashing.

There's an old saying that none of us realize the effect of death until our own home is visited by death. The same thought can be applied in this game of reprisals and denouncements. I had my own taste of it early in the session. Others are starting to get it now when it becomes apparent that they are determined to think for themselves and will not be whipped into line by threats and intimidation.

I agree with Mr. Deutsch in his editorial to the dotting of the last "i" and the crossing of the last "t."

To hark back to the days when courageous men were not only preaching liberty and the right of free expression but also practicing and respecting it: "If this be treason—make the most of it."

I hope everybody in this body, on both sides of the aisle, takes the time to read this editorial from the New Orleans Item:

CONGRESS HAS A MANDATE, TOO

Many queer contradictions appear in the series of outbursts which made up the bulk of President Truman's Jefferson-Jackson Day speech at Washington. For example, there was his threat to tour the country again and crusade against pressure groups which twist and misrepresent the measures the people voted for.

That sounds promising, until it becomes very evident that the labor lobbies (some of which have gone so far as to propose subsidizing their Congressmen by additional cash payments from labor organization treasuries) were nowhere mentioned as among the pressure groups. Neither were the various agricultural blocs with their farm subsidy programs. Neither were the divers Leftist movements, cults or Fronts.

Quite obviously, in the Truman vocabulary pressure groups means all individuals and associations, in or out of Congress who do not jump to the President's command, or who venture to oppose any fraction of the reversible Truman Program, or who supported some other candidate last year.

And there is that part about the measures the people voted for. The people didn't vote for any measures. They voted for candidates—or against them. More of them voted for Mr. Truman than voted for any other candidate, but more of them voted against him than for him. That is a matter of official record. Most illuminating instance of the fact that those who voted for Truman were not voting for specific measures in the recent declaration from the farm States to the general effect that we did not vote to have the Taft-Hartley Act repealed. We want it kept on the books—and we're the folks who swung the agricultural areas of the Middle West for you.

Again, it is a bit confusing to find Mr. Truman declaring that "your government is pledged to use all its resources to maintain the economic health of the country and prevent depression." As we recall the presidential campaign, Mr. Truman was pledging that his administration would use all its resources to halt or curb or otherwise do something constructive about inflation and the high cost of living. Can he possibly be serious in declaring that the same measures he advocated to keep prices from going higher should now be applied to keep them from going lower? Can he really pour the proper medicine for overeating and malnutrition out of the same bottle?

But strangest of all the contradictions in the President's Jefferson-Jackson Day pronouncement is his continuing misapprehension about the scope of his own job.

"Despite (the obstructionists') efforts to confuse * * * we can and will provide a better life for our people."

Government is properly concerned not with individual lives but with general public welfare and all that pertains to it. At least, in a free democracy that is what government should be. In a fascist, sovietized, or other totalitarian type of state control, individual actions are subject to government supervision, direction, and interference. That is the fundamental difference between such systems and that which this Nation's founding fathers wrote into our Constitution.

A free government can, and should, guarantee to every individual equal opportunity to create for himself, by his own efforts, and without official interference, as rich and full and rewarding a life as it lies within his power to provide. But until and unless ill fortune makes an individual a public charge, or he makes himself a public menace, the government has no more right to regulate his life for what it regards as a better one than it has to make it worse.

Mr. Truman was elected to be Chief Executive—not ruler—of his country. It is his job to carry into execution the popular will. His notion that it is now the people's job, through the people's Congress, to carry out Mr. Truman's will is putting the cart before the horse with a vengeance.

He appears blandly unaware of the fact that the present Congress was elected by the self-same voters who elected the President. That election gave Mr. Truman not one scintilla more in the way of a mandate than it gave the Congressmen. If he and the Congress now differ as to what that mandate was, the issue lies between him and the Members of the Senate and House. It is very definitely not a matter to take to the country in a special train with a look-what-those-bad-boys-on-Capitol-Hill-are - doing-to - me sketch.

Mr. Truman had a right to smite the Eightieth Congress hip and thigh with campaign oratory. He was on logically solid ground when he said "See what comes of having a President who represents one party and a Congress whose majority represents the opposite party. This Eightieth Congress, dominated by Republicans, is the worst in the history of the country. Elect me and a Democratic Congress and we'll show you how to get things done."

But he has no right to complain of this Congress to the people unless he concedes this Congress the same right to complain to the people about him. He and this Congress were elected to work together for the good of the country. If it is his idea that the only way to work together is for the Congress to be obedient to his every command, he stands in need of enlightenment about certain fundamentals of the American system of government.

Hon. William H. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent article by Mr. Westbrook Pegler, concerning the late Honorable William H. Lewis, of Boston. A friend of mine has asked me to insert this article in the RECORD, and I am very much pleased to comply with his request, because I knew Mr. Lewis for many years and held him in high esteem.

His career was not only distinguished, but it symbolized the opportunity afforded to every young man in this Nation of ours who is possessed of ability, ambition, and determination, regardless of his origin or racial derivation, to rise to high public and professional position.

As the article states, Mr. Lewis was a unique figure. An outstanding athlete in his youth, he steadily advanced in his chosen career in the law until he was recognized as one of the leading lawyers of New England. He was especially well known as a successful trial lawyer and shortly before his death gained a brilliant victory in a difficult and prominent case. If he was ever handicapped in any way by reason of his race, that fact was never acknowledged by him or apparent to his friends and followers, which were legion.

He not only made a great record for himself, rising as he did to high station in his life's work, but he also made a great and lasting record of brilliant achievement for the fine race from which he was sprung. He served the Nation faithfully and well. He adorned his profession. He enjoyed the respect and esteem of all who knew him. The example of his life and accomplishments will serve as a deep and lasting inspiration for his fellow citizens of every race and creed, but particularly for his fellow citizens of the Negro race for whom he furnished such strong, constructive leadership. He was a gentleman through and through; a credit to his profession, his race, and country. I join with his family and friends in mourning his irreparable loss.

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

William H. Lewis, of Boston, was a Negro son of Virginia slaves who became one of our great citizens by force of character. A good body helped him along, to be sure. A puny young man could not have played football at Amherst and Harvard as he did, being captain for a year at Amherst and for a day at Harvard, in the barbarian era when casualties ran so high that Columbia and other schools took up quoits and beanbag instead.

Mr. Lewis made every inch of the way the hard way and in football it was the harder because he played center at both schools.

Center was then called center rush, for the open game had not been developed and the forward pass was not even a gleam in the eye of Jesse Harper, the coach who unveiled

the Notre Dame passing combination of Rockne and Dorais at West Point in 1913.

Football was a game of strength and courage divided into 30-minute halves, and a coach who took a man out for anything less than a broken leg humiliated him and made an enemy to be met behind the signboard.

The tackles and guards and the center wore wide belts with handles on them which the back grabbed, to be pulled or towed through the mischief, and the newspaper artists depicted these giants with haystack haircuts sprouting through lattice-work head guards.

Harvard, Yale, and Princeton were the big three of American football, and the All-America selections by Walter Camp, which began after Mr. Lewis' playing days were over, were confined to those three until along toward 1910.

Then Camp put Lewis on his theoretical all-time All-America out of respect for his play at Harvard after his Amherst career.

I read occasionally an earnest, pious, often angry little paper now known as the Catholic Inter-Racialist, formerly called the Harlem Friendship House News. It has only recently come forth on newsprint after a clumsy start on mimeograph. It expresses the effort of a group of priests and laymen in Harlem, one of the worst slums in the world, to awaken hope and confidence in the Negroes of this New York ghetto where vice, squalor, discrimination and communism have made terrible progress, and religion often is only a front for some further mockery by the Communists.

Unlike some other appeals to the Negro, this one seems to me not to condone the extravagance in liquor, gambling, and other frivolities which are overlooked or excused as escapes by the sordid professionals of the political field of welfare work.

It appeals to his dignity and faith or a latent instinct for religion and it fights for his right to a decent job according to his ability, neither overrating nor low-rating him because he is a Negro.

Mr. Lewis came up when the Civil War was still a bitter feud and the ashes of Southern ruins were still warm.

There may have been a little more cordial welcome to a homeless Southern Negro boy in New England then than there is today, although things seem to be about even.

To be sure, New England had led the Abolition movement, but New England was full of hypocrisy and the North easily fell into the habits of discrimination.

Mr. Lewis probably had about the same problem that a Negro boy from Berkeley, Va., across the water from Portsmouth, would face today if he landed in town broke to earn his first year's tuition at Amherst, washing dishes in hotels and restaurants.

This young Negro not only made the Amherst varsity, apparently in his freshman year, 1888, and played on through until he went to Harvard in 1892, but won prizes in oratory at Amherst and was football captain and class orator in his senior year.

The records are vague, but he is believed to have been captain of Harvard for one game against either Penn or Penn State.

If so, he was a Negro captain in the Ivy League a half century before Levi Jackson, now captain of Yale.

Lewis was a big man of reddish or copperish tinge, with splayed ears the size of your palm that lay flat against his big head, and he had a pipe-organ voice that could do the business in his practice of criminal law.

And, although, as most lawyers admit, criminal practice tends to lower a man's reputation, Mr. Lewis died exalted in the esteem of most of the Massachusetts bar.

His funeral, from St. Cecilia's Church, in Back Bay, was attended by men whose names are a roster of the leadership of our most cultured community.

It is not disparagement of Joe Louis, Bill Robinson, and a number of other respected Negroes of the present to call attention to the dramatic magnitude of Mr. Lewis' success and his conquest of handicaps, including prejudice.

Fine as they have been, he was greater, and he died comparatively unknown.

If Joe Louis came from a cabin in a cotton field, William H. Lewis came from circumstances much worse. He was born in the worst turmoil of the reconstruction days if not during the war itself.

And if the Negro was a rarity in those days in northern cities, he was also expected to be a buffoon and to keep his place, and the humor of the day ridiculed and classified him.

Mr. Lewis went to the city council of Cambridge in 1899, only 12 years after he landed in Boston, just a boy, busted, a Negro, and still to get his learning.

After 3 years of that he went to the legislature for three terms, starting in 1903.

Theodore Roosevelt made him assistant United States attorney over a hellish row by the opposition, and in 1911 Taft made him Assistant Attorney General.

Mrs. Lewis, a Wellesley graduate, whom he married in 1893, died of cancer in 1943 and in her last days called to her side a nun who had shown her great devotion.

She embraced the Catholic religion on her deathbed and Mr. Lewis became a convert in 1944. His father had been a Baptist minister.

I write of Mr. Lewis not from the clips from the morgue, but as one who had known and silently admired him since a first meeting in 1915.

I have met many of the great men of my age and he was really one of them.

Ruhr Trustees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post:

RUHR TRUSTEES

General Clay would be perpetrating a fraud if he approved the list of 12 Germans just nominated to form the new Steel Trustee Association in the Ruhr. A trustee, as defined by Webster, is one entrusted with property for another. At least half the names submitted to the American and British military governors by Dr. Hermann Puender, chief executive of the bizonal economic administration, are those of men representing the old Nazi ownership of Ruhr industries. By approving them as trustees, General Clay would be entrusting the property of the old owners back to themselves. We cannot believe that the general would deliver such an affront to the allied peoples who suffered twice in a generation from the warmaking power of Ruhr industries.

The trusteeship plan was outlined in the military government decree of November 10, designed to put the coal, iron, and steel industries back under German management. The former Nazi assets, held by the occupying authorities since the surrender, were to be turned over to a Steel Trustee Association of 12 Germans named by the military governors. This group was to draw up plans for dividing the steel industry into smaller units than those of prewar days. Ultimately each of the new companies would get its share of the old assets under its own trustees, and the 12-man group would become a trade association.

The procedure makes sense; it is like that of a bankruptcy proceeding here. But a bankruptcy court in its right mind does not usually appoint as trustees the very men who brought the enterprise in question to ruin. One of the 12 proposed Ruhr trustees, Guenther Sohl, was a director of Krupp's, and was active in managing much of the wartime steel industry of Hitler's Reich. Another, Henrich Dinkelbach, was one of Hitler's chief advisers on tank production before and during the war and is on the books of the occupation authorities as a former member of the Nazi Party.

Clearly the job of reorganizing the vast and complex German steel industry will require experts, but expertness is not enough to fit a German for power. In the six-nation London agreement of December 28, the Western Allies promised to prevent persons who furthered the aggressive designs of the Nazis from acquiring ownership interests or positions of direction and management in those industries. General Clay cannot approve the 12 names submitted to him without defying and flouting this solemn commitment. It would be a godsend to Communist propaganda all over Europe if we gave power back to those who misused it more than once and who will misuse it again if we give them half a chance.

The Drive for Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times for February 21, 1949, entitled "The Drive for Pensions," and an article by Frank Smith which appeared in the Sun-Times for February 20, 1949, entitled "Only AVC Against Vet Pension Plan":

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of February 21, 1949]

THE DRIVE FOR PENSIONS

From its beginning the American Veterans Committee has sought to represent veterans as citizens rather than as members of a special class. You have to hand it to AVC for following that line through the most difficult trials. AVC is the only major veterans' organization which is opposing the principle of general veterans' pensions.

A bill to pay $90 a month from age 65 to all veterans of World Wars I and II has been reported favorably by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. Passage at this session is unlikely, but it's going to be a live issue for some time to come. The AVC position is worth attention.

AVC opposes the bill, not because it opposes public responsibility for old-age security but because it considers this to be broader than a veterans' problem. Men who have been disabled by war service, and widows and orphans of servicemen, deserve aid, it holds, since war has deprived them of the full means of support.

But general pension legislation, says AVC, amounts to a demand for social security for a special group, singled out not on the basis

of special need but because it is composed of men and women who, being of a certain age at certain times in their country's history, were able to fulfill the duty of every citizen to defend his Nation.

An expanded social-security program is urged by AVC to provide adequate support for the aged. But it should apply to all who need help, and not only to veterans.

Veterans' pensions would cost between two and three billion dollars a year for the next 70 years. That annual outlay is far more than the entire Federal expenditure last year for social welfare, health, and security.

The Government already is spending more than $5,000,000,000 a year on veterans' benefits. That's a lot of money. Any substantial additions to it must be judged by what is wise national policy for all the people.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times of February 20, 1949]

VETERANS' NEWS—ONLY AVC AGAINST VET PENSION PLAN

(By Frank Smith)

The proposed general pension bill for veterans, which was reported out by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee during the week, has met open opposition from only one ex-servicemen's group, the American Veterans Committee.

Testifying before the committee, Joseph A. Clorety, Jr., AVC national vice chairman, said that members of his organization strongly favor a broadened social-security program for all citizens approaching the end of their lives, and declared security for such was a public responsibility.

"The proposed pension bill," he added, "is in fact a partial program of social security, with the distinction that it asks for social security for a special group, singled out not on the basis of special need, but because it is composed of men and women who, being of a certain age at certain times in their country's history, were able to fulfill the duty of every citizen to defend the Nation."

Clorety quoted figures of Veterans' Administrator Carl R. Gray, based on the original Rankin-American Legion $60-at-age-60 bill, which subsequently was amended to provide $90 a month to all veterans of the two World Wars when they reach 65. He pointed out that the then contemplated first year's cost of $1,839,000,000, would be considerably more than the 1948 cost for old-age assistance to 2,498,259 recipients.

Under the compromise bill, the initial yearly cost would be approximately $129,000,000, but would rise eventually to an estimated $6,000,000,000 at its peak.

Clorety ended his testimony by declaring the country owes veterans a right to readjustment, adequate care for the disabled and liberal support for widows and orphans of veterans, but not a hand-out which has the effect of a boomerang endangering the stability of our economy as a whole.

The average ex-serviceman, he said, is a citizen, interested in the problems of all citizens who need protection of Government in illness, old age, and in the absence of employment. In other words, he said, the veteran's interests are identical with those of the country.

News of the proposed pension got a different reaction from a Chicagoan who served in the Philippine Insurrection. Abraham H. Merar, 1263 Pratt Boulevard, auto accessories manufacturer, who served with the old Eighth Cavalry in the islands during 1905–07, has written his Congressman and Veterans Administrator Gray asking why the pension bill isn't written to include overseas veterans of all wars and campaigns. Merar, who is only 62, says he is not interested in payment for himself, but claims there are many needy vets from combat days in the Philippines who are shut out from such benefits.

Pension Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from Sunday's edition of the Wisconsin State Journal, published at Madison, and which is one of Wisconsin's best-known and most widely read newspapers:

JOHN RANKIN, the Democratic Congressman from Mississippi, has placed the entire National Congress on the spot. He has introduced a bill—and jammed it through his own committee—calling for a $90-a-month pensions at age 65 for the 18,000,000 American veterans of both World Wars.

President Truman has let it be known there is no place in the administration budget for veteran pensions.

Most economy-minded Members of Congress are against it.

But most observers believe the bill will pass the House of Representatives, whose Members are up for election every 2 years. The measure may have a rougher time in the United States Senate, where only one-third of the membership must try for reelection in 1950.

It is a tragic reality that Congress will not consider the veterans' pension question on its merits. Most of the men who are elected to the jobs in Washington will look at this from the point of view of men who want to be reelected. It is unfortunate, but under our system things work out that way. Few men ever have won elections by shocking and irritating voters with repulsive reality.

This newspaper has spoken out before against a veterans' bonus, and this pension-for-all-veterans proposal is much the same as a bonus. It still is our view that a blanket proposal like this is a bad thing for the Nation as a whole, and is a particularly poor deal for the veterans of World War II.

The worst part of Mr. RANKIN'S bill is that to collect at age 65, an American merely must have served at least 90 days in the armed forces. There is no other criterion, or standard of eligibility. A millionaire would get his $90 every month, just the same as the veteran who is penniless. President Truman would collect for his service in World War I. So would Congressman RANKIN. The bill does not specify that the veteran must be suffering economic hardship before he can collect. The $20,000-a-year man and the $2,500-a-year veteran would get the same amount.

Because of this, the Government of necessity would have to scrimp, and cut down on aid to veterans who really need and deserve Government help regardless of their age. We believe that to be wrong.

A basic flaw of the Rankin pension plan is that it puts a certain group of Americans into a separate class. It excludes from that favored group the man who might have had infantile paralysis as a boy. It excludes others because they had a heart murmur, or poor vision, or the kind of mind that put them in an atom laboratory rather than a uniform. It sets apart—for a special reward—those who for the most part had nothing to say about going to war.

These remarks in no way indicate a lack of appreciation for the hardships and service given by the young Americans who were in the armed forces. This newspaper has fought and will continue to fight for adequate educational aids, vocational training, and loans for housing for veterans of World War II. We believe that veterans who suffered physical disabilities are entitled not only to the very best hospitalization, but also substantial financial remuneration. We believe widows and orphans of veterans should be granted the financial protection they would have had if their breadwinner had not been taken from them. We believe that no worthy veteran ever should be allowed to be in want or distress.

But a cash hand-out to all veterans of all wars is an economic and political mistake.

One important thing to remember about the Rankin bill is that the biggest beneficiaries would be the veterans of World War I. They are the ones who now are passing the 65-year mark. The money for those pensions would have to be provided by taxes upon all of us—including World War II veterans, who won't be eligible for benefits for some 40 years.

The cost of this program is staggering, and estimates of the eventual total cost are astronomical. Another war, with more names added—indiscriminately—to the pension lists would be a body blow to our economy, and to our very form of government.

In the event of another war, incidentally, America could expect to have thousands upon thousands of civilian casualties, from bomber raids and guided missiles. Should these war victims, too, be added to the pension lists?

It is our view that worthy veterans of all wars who need Government help should get it, regardless of cost.

But we are opposed to a political hand-out, forced by a high-pressure campaign. Passage of the Rankin pension bill in its present form would be bad news for America.

Chinese Art Objects Belong in the Peiping Palace Museum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received a letter signed by various Chinese students and alumni associations protesting against the proposed shipping of priceless Chinese art objects to this country. I saw the United Press dispatch several days ago stating that the Nationalist Government proposed to send this priceless collection to the United States.

I do not think that we should become a party to this deal. This art collection represents Chinese culture over the centuries and belongs to the Chinese people and not to any group of Chinese politicians.

At this point I wish to include the letter which I received:

FEBRUARY 27, 1949.

The Honorable GEORGE SADOWSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A United Press dispatch from Shanghai on January 28, 1949, reported that a collection of 8,600 priceless Chinese art objects from the Peiping Palace Museum are being shipped to this country and are to be housed at the Library of Congress. Shocked by this news, we hasten to point out the consequences which this shipment will engender.

The national art treasures of China have been pilfered many times. The warlords used to trade them for material support from foreign powers. When Japan invaded China, many of these treasures were taken as war booty and shipped to Japan. Each time, such pillage has caused deep resentment in the Chinese people.

We do not know whether the United States has sponsored the present shipment. We loathe to think so. But in any case, it will be resented by the Chinese people just the same. For the sake of the traditional friendship between China and the United States, we sincerely hope that you will see to it that these art treasures of China are not shipped to this country.

We are aware of the vigilance with which you safeguard your national treasures. We think that it is within reason for us to ask you to respect the vigilance with which we safeguard our national treasures.

Respectfully yours,

Chinese Learned Society; Chinese Students Christian Association in North America, New York Chapter; Association of Chinese Scientific Workers in America, Chicago and New York Chapters; Tsinghwa University Alumni Association in U. S. A.; Nankai University Alumni Association in U. S. A.; Yenching University Alumni Association in U. S. A.; National Peking University Alumni Association in U. S. A.; National Peking Normal University Alumni Association in U. S. A.; University of Shanghai Alumni Association in U. S. A.

What Makes a Good Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish every Member of Congress would take the time to read the article on the subject What Makes a Good Politician, which appeared in the Civil Service Leader on February 22, 1949, by the former chairman of the Democratic National Committee and former Postmaster General, James A. Farley, who is a great American. The article is timely and is full of sound advice to anyone in political life. I had the pleasure of being associated in the Post Office Department with Mr. Farley while he was Postmaster General and I admire his wonderful traits and qualities. He is a true patriot, an outstanding citizen, and an able, conscientious, truthful, successful politician.

The article follows:

DON'T REPEAT THIS—FARLEY TELLS WHAT MAKES A GOOD POLITICIAN

What makes the good politician?

Is there any grouping of personal qualities and set of rules which characterize the good politician?

What is it that men like Roosevelt, Al Smith, LaGuardia, Tom Dewey have which captures the imagination and support of people?

To get an answer to this query "Don't Repeat This" went to the old master himself—former Postmaster General James A. Farley, now head of the Coca-Cola Export Corp.

WHAT IS POLITICS?

Big Jim sat back, feet on his desk. He thought carefully. Then he said, "Let me first give you a definition of politics which I have carried with me for a quarter century. It was written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago." It goes like this:

"Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—neither is there any in which by a mere loss of nerve he may do widespread harm—nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul—nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

THE 10 RULES

The astute Farley then gave his own rules—10 of them—for the making of a successful politician.

1. He must have a good personality.

A primary requisite of the politician is that he must attract people. The wishy-washy, the forbidding, the unsparkling character cannot get far in politics. Al Smith's smile captivated people, and they loved him. Franklin D. Roosevelt's charm was legendary, and he had the ability to disarm almost anyone with his smoothness. Even Fiorello LaGuardia, in a different way, had a vibrance that got under the skin of people and made them admire and like him.

2. He must have what we call character—that is, he must be a substantial human being.

Only a man who can impress his constituents with his character can continue to build up confidence. And he can sometimes do this even when certain other qualities are lacking. Senator Robert A. Taft is an example.

3. He must work hard.

Things don't just happen. The successful politician works hard at his tasks, makes sure that he has left no job undone. Sometimes the job is understanding and fighting for a tough piece of legislation; other times it is doing small favors for little people. Politics is a field in which idlers cannot last long.

4. He must be able to get other people to work for him and with him.

The best politicians build up corps of aides who will go through hell for them. Governor Dewey's team has stuck with him since he first entered government, and so strong is its loyalty that not even successive defeats have alienated its members from him. Politicians who haven't this particular quality may go a certain distance, but rarely very far.

5. He must be truthful.

Jim Farley places this characteristic high among the qualities needed by a successful politician. The politician who says one thing to one man, and an opposite thing to another, the officeholder whose word cannot be relied on, the political leader who tries to gain his ends by other than honest means—these types create resentments which fester long and rarely heal. Big Jim admits that some untruthful men have gone far in politics, but they are the exceptional personalities whose other characteristics are so outstanding as to overcome completely this defect.

6. He must have native ability, and he must be able to see and use ability in others.

Hacks and even nincompoops are common in politics. They get there because they have done the party chores or know how to take orders from their stronger sponsors. But such men cannot be classified as successful politicians. The successful practitioner must be a man of ideas, must have the intelligence to meet new and unique situations, must be able to direct his subordinates so as to get the best out of them.

7. He must be aggressive—but not to the point of being offensive.

This requires intuition. The good politician will know just how far he can go in attack before it boomerangs. Like the salesman, he knows intuitively if his story is getting across. Shyness is death to a politician.

8. He must have a feeling for what people want.

The politician must be able to sense a situation, like a doctor administering to a patient or a reporter sniffing after a news story. LaGuardia was an example of this quality. He know how to capitalize on the housewife's needs, how to scream at corruption effectively. F. D. R. had it, too, in great measure.

9. He must be able to make decisions.

Truman turned things his way at the Democratic Presidential convention when he took the floor late at night after his nomination, when the party seemed at low ebb, and made a fighting speech which set his course. From then on, with solid resolve, he was able to speak clearly and decisively. The ability to make decisions is one of the most important in politics, because events won't wait for him who can't make up his mind.

10. He must understand the meaning of the word "compromise."

Never compromise a principle, says Big Jim, but in politics one advances one's principles often by accepting less than one had tried to get, and then moving forward from there. But compromise is a delicate thing—"an individual has to live with himself," says Big Jim. And if the compromise means one isn't going to be able to sleep nights as a result—then don't do it, he advises.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

The man who steered F. D. R.'s political course through two Presidential elections talked about some of the general principles he had learned during his long career in politics.

"People go into politics for lots of reasons," he ruminated. "Some of the best do it not for business or for personal advancement, but because they like it. Some like baseball, some like cocktail parties, some like politics—call it a hobby. * * *

"One of the great attributes of politics is showmanship. The politician who has showmanship can get away with a lack of many other qualities. * * *

"Examples of successful politicians are Al Smith, Jimmy Walker, Franklin D. Roosevelt. All of them were sympathetic to the underdog, all of them had personal charm.

"Smith was a great story-teller, extremely approachable, gave people a feeling of confidence, created the impression he was their friend.

"Jimmy Walker, too, was a great story-teller. Moreover, he had what few people realize he had—a great mind. He could hear a case, grasp the core of it, and then present the points better than the man who was expounding it. Jimmy's weaknesses were in other directions."

And Don't Repeat This adds that Jim Farley himself is an example of the good politician. Here are some of his secrets: He keeps everything completely organized, so that he is able to make the most effective use of his time; he answers every letter; never neglects an appointment—and always keeps it on time; remains available to as many people as he can; never acts "uppity"; always tells the truth, and tells it straight—this is an important principle with him.

TRUTH IN POLITICS

Jim Farley's ideas on the importance of truth in politics:

"The man who does not tell the truth is distrusted and shunned, and rightfully so. There are those whose first instinct is not to tell the truth even when it best serves their own purposes, just as there are those in whom the dog of ambition is pursued by a rabbit of conscience. Truth is by far the easier as well as the more respected course.

"I had an early lesson in this from Charles F. Murphy, leader of Tammany Hall, whom many might regard as a strange preceptor. I approached him after Smith was first elected Governor of New York, after a campaign in which I played a small part. I felt entitled to the post of secretary of the State Industrial Commission. My sights were not, I modestly felt, fixed too high. Mr. Murphy told me that while he was impressed by my earnestness and ability, he felt I lacked experience for the place, and that it should go to someone else. I was a bit bitter for a time, but as disappointment died, the more reasonable Mr. Murphy's attitude seemed to me. As a result I have never concealed the truth from an applicant for a position. In the end I always found him as grateful as I was.

DON'T GET INVOLVED

"In rare instances where one cannot tell the truth, because he is bound by his word not to reveal confidences or advance information, it is not necessary to become involved in complicated evasions or falsehoods. Again the easier method is to acknowledge that you are sorry but just can't answer the question. The passing of one's word is the execution of a sacred bond. It is so with most men in political life as it is with the great majority of men everywhere."

General Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a resolution accepted and adopted by the Common Council of New Britain, Conn. This resolution memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending before us. Since Friday, March 4, 1949, marks the two hundred and first anniversary of the birth of the renowned Polish-American hero, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, this resolution is a most timely one and the Common Council of New Britain, Conn., should be commended for its awareness and interest in the service this great man rendered our Nation.

After all, this hero who died on October 11, 1779, from wounds received in fighting for American freedom should be especially remembered. It was not his fight. He was not an American. Yet, there coursed through his blood a love of liberty and freedom that brought him to the side of our great patriots in their struggle to establish this great Nation.

The memory of this great Polish hero who made the supreme sacrifice for American freedom and liberty will ever be revered by the people of America.

It is only proper that Congress recognize his sacrifice and pass the resolution when it comes before us.

The resolution by the Common Council of New Britain is as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1949.

Mr. ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is called to the following resolution, accepted and adopted by the common council at its meeting held Wednesday evening, February 16, 1949, on motion of Alderman Kotowski. Motion seconded by Alderman Zapatka. Returned to the city clerk, February 24, 1949, without the approval or disapproval of the mayor.

"Resolution 95

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brigadier General Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11th of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislature enactment designated from October 11, 1929; to October 11, 1946; to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of New Britain, and State of Connecticut:

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Connecticut."

I. K. WERWINSKI,
South Bend, Ind.

Attest:

H. E. SCHIEF,
City Clerk.

Celler Bill, H. R. 1344, Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Immigration Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on March 2, 1949:

I offer my bill as one who has lived with the DP problem since its inception, who served through many months of wearisome hearings on DP bills, and who struggled through many sessions of the Immigration Subcommittee during the Eightieth Congress, as one who helped pilot the Fellows bill past many shoals and through the House, and as a member of the committee of conference of both Houses on the Fellows and Revercomb bills.

The question before us no longer is whether we are to have legislation to meet the displaced-persons problem. That question was answered first by the Eightieth Congress with the enactment of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; secondly, by the displaced-persons plank in the Democratic platform of 1948; and, thirdly, by the President's statement in his state of the Union message, wherein he stated, "We should also open our doors to displaced persons without unfair discrimination."

What confronts us now is the necessity to enact DP legislation that will be adequate, fair-minded, nondiscriminatory, and workable, none of which requirements is met by the existing law.

When on June 25, 1948, the President signed the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, he stated that he did so "with great reluctance." He stated that the bad points of Senate bill 2242 (Revercomb-Wiley bill) "form a pattern of discrimination and intolerance wholly inconsistent with the American sense of justice," and concluded with the sentence: "I have signed this bill, in spite of its many defects, in order not to delay further the beginning of a resettlement program and in expectation that the necessary remedial action will follow when the Congress reconvenes." With good reason, the President singled out such defects as the dateline of December 22, 1945, the provision for the mortgaging of future quotas, the 40-percent preference to displaced persons from "de facto annexed areas," the requirements of assurances of employment and housing.

The defects of the bill worked out in conference between the House and the Senate were patent from the outset. It was obviously unworkable and unashamedly discriminatory and I did not hesitate to say so when the conference report came to the floor of the House though I was one of the conferees. All these misgivings have been amply borne out by the experiences of the Displaced Persons Commission, charged with the responsibility of administering the act. More displaced persons could and did enter the United States under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, than under the so-called Revercomb bill. Under the President's directive of December 22, 1945, approximately 42,000 displaced persons were admitted to this country. (That directive was terminated by the Revercomb bill as of June 30, 1948. Although assurances were validative for 27,667 families (55,000 to 60,000 persons)). Under the present act as of December 31, 1948, there had been admitted into this country 2,499 displaced persons, after one-fourth of the life of the act had already expired. I would hardly call this "a fair share" when England for one example has taken 100,000 and Canada for another 43,000. It is estimated that a total of 400,000 were resettled up to January 1, 1949. Also it is estimated by the State Department that as of January 1, 1949, there were 770,000 displaced persons in Italy, Austria, and Germany; 502,000 of these displaced persons were in camps and assembly centers.

Briefly, the administration bill which I introduced calls for:

1. An increase in the number of eligible displaced persons from 200,000 to 400,000, over a 4-year period.

2. The moving forward of the cut-off date from December 22, 1945 to April 21, 1947.

3. The 40-percent limitation for de facto annexed areas be eliminated, and in lieu thereof there be a provision to assure the

selection of displaced persons without discrimination as to race, religious, or national origin.

4. The elimination of the 30-percent preference for agricultural pursuits with agricultural pursuits remaining within the occupational preferences.

5. The deletion of the assurances for employment and housing, using the sufficiency of assurance against becoming a public charge.

6. The discontinuance of charging visas to future quotas.

7. The removal of in-camp priority.

8. The amendment of the provision relating to adjustment of the status of displaced persons already in the United States to cover those arriving by January 1, 1949, and to make final the Attorney General's action in such cases.

9. A revolving fund to be established for loans to recognized voluntary agencies to meet the expenses of reception and transportation of immigrants from ports of entry.

10. Provision to be made for recent political refugees, 15,000, within the cover of the 400,000, whose admission into the United States is in the national interest.

11. No issuance of visa to anyone who advocated or assisted in persecutions of others for race, religion, or national origin.

I would like to discuss these points briefly.

1. Increase of number: Four hundred thousand has been the estimated fair share of the United States. If we are to attack the whole problem, not piecemeal, if we are to encourage other less fortunate nations to aid in the dissipation of this problem and if we are to eliminate a burden now resting heavily on our occupation forces, and, at the same time, while acting in true humanitarian fashion, eliminate the cost of maintaining these camps carried by the American taxpayer, then it is essential that we extend the life of the act to cover a 4-year period and increase the number to 400,000. If we don't, we will find it necessary to act again and again. If we retain the 200,000 figure, we have merely narrowed the problem; we have not dissipated it. Remember 770,000 still remain displaced in Italy and the western areas of Germany and Austria.

2. The cut-off date: If the date were advanced, at the very least, to April 21, 1947, it has been estimated that 95,000 more displaced persons would become eligible. It penalizes certain religious and national groups, particularly those of the Jewish faith who fled from the eastern European countries, primarily Poland, into Germany and Austria in 1946 and 1947, and those of the Catholic faith who fled Communist-dominated countries. The International Refugee Organization, as well as the Army authorities, accepted these people as refugees and gave them in-camp care and maintenance. To withhold eligibility from these groups is not only unfair, but hinders the work in clearing out these camps. It must be remembered that only the most desultory records were kept prior to April 1947 and it has been a most difficult administrative tangle for the Displaced Persons Commission to unravel to determine time of entry. The result has been greatly unjust. I would not be adverse to advancing the date to January 1, 1949.

3. The 40-percent limitation for de facto annexed areas: Nobody has been able to determine precisely what the language of the act means when it states that not less than 40 percent of the visas issued must "be available exclusively to * * * persons whose place of origin or country of nationality has been de facto annexed by a foreign power." It can be interpreted to cover more than the Baltic countries and Poland, east of the Curzon line. Again, does "place of origin or country of nationality" refer to "national origin," as used in our immigration law, or does it mean place of residence at the time of first becoming displaced, or the country of present nationality? None of this is clear. But, more than that, it has placed the whole program out of joint. Forty percent of the visas must be withheld from all other groups, no matter how many there are otherwise eligible. There have been nowhere near 40 percent applying from these areas for these exclusive visas. That means that a certain percentage of visas are going to waste and the whole program retarded while a search is made to put this exclusiveness to the use called for by the act. Again, here is a discriminatory advantage being given to certain national groups to the detriment of other groups equally deserving.

4. The 30-percent preference for those engaged in agricultural pursuits: Like the limitation just mentioned, this preference retards the issuance of visas on the whole. It means again a search for persons qualified under this preference. Actually, during October and November of 1948 only 11 percent of all visas issued went to agriculturists. Thus, we have a preference all out of proportion to either the need or demand. We take these two preferences, 40 percent to those of the annexed areas and 30 percent to the agriculturists, and it is not difficult to see how unbalanced the proportions are to the detriment of otherwise eligible displaced persons. While not denying the value of agriculturists to our Nation, there are other occupational pursuits that have contributed richly to our development.

5. Employment and housing assurances: Job and housing restrictions have never before been placed on those seeking entry into the United States. The assurance that they will not become public charges has been heretofore deemed sufficient. Yet, it has been seen fit to impose these conditions on the most hapless group of people contemporary history has seen—people who have been buffeted about by the currents of malicious and inhuman political creeds. The job assurances because of general applicability affect most seriously housewives, elderly people, and school-age children over 16. The existing law does not call for job assurance for only the head of the family but for each applicant individually. It is necessary, therefore, even for a grandmother of 75 to have a job assurance. This carries the job assurance to the point of absurdity. It has resulted in splitting families, which is certainly contrary to the general immigration policy of the United States. It has, again, retarded the program, since many have refused to accept visas if threatened with separation from the family—a refusal most human and understandable. Moreover, it has been found that many employers, though anxious to fill labor shortages with displaced persons, hesitate to make such sponsorship for people unknown or unseen. Moreover, the assurance of transportation from port of entry to the point of resettlement has likewise made small-business men and farmers reluctant to undertake sponsorship. We know that the job-assurance provision was dictated by fear—fear that our expanding economy could not absorb additional workers—a fear entirely unwarranted. Every worker, be he native or immigrant, is a consumer as well, and, in that sense, a creator of more jobs. He takes a job in one specific field, but his earnings inure to the benefit of numerous industries. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, stated in his testimony before the Immigration Subcommittee on H. R. 2910 (Stratton bill): "We do not believe that the admission of as small a number as 400,000 over a period of 4 years will seriously affect our employment or unemployment problem."

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, presented his viewpoint on the same bill, stating: "Let me say for the record that we in the CIO can find absolutely no basis in fact or reason for the fear that admitting 100,000 immigrants a year for 4 years would jeopardize the jobs of American citizens. * * * I do not think it is the true friends of labor who will argue that our economy cannot stand the addition of less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the number of our population annually for 4 years without creating unemployment."

Let me say here and now it is a poor advertisement of the United States we broadcast to the world if we so belittle our strength, our vitality, and our resources. I wish to point out as well that we have more to fear from short labor supply of bricklayers, plumbers, pipefitters, and electricians, all of which categories can be supplied by displaced persons, in meeting the critical housing situation than from the occupancy by displaced persons in existing housing. Most displaced persons find living space with relatives, others on farms where they room and work, others in rooming houses, the availability of which testify to no displacement of our citizens. The wide distribution of displaced persons over the whole of the country, a fact I shall come to in a little while, places no strain on available housing. I say it is unfair to place these restrictions on one group of immigrants when no other immigrant is required to meet these conditions.

6. Charging visas to future quotas: I object to the mortgaging of future quotas. There are many refugees outside of the DP centers in many parts of the world—in Lisbon, in Habana, in London—who have waited many years for quota numbers. Why these should be penalized while waiting in line, while we treat with an emergency situation, is more than I can understand. The specific DP problem with which we are concerned has no relevance to the annual quota system and should not be tied together. This is a special problem and should not be solved at the expense of other people. Under this provision, the small-quota countries find their pitiful allotments further reduced to the extent of 50 percent for as much as a hundred years, and in some instances, more than that.

7. In-camp priority: Under the present act, those who were located in a displaced-persons camp or center on January 1, 1948, are entitled to a second priority within the preferences. This discriminates against those who sought to support themselves in the local economy rather than depend upon the United States and the International Refugee Organization. The removal of this priority would be an act of justice to those who left the camps in reliance upon the assurances of responsible United States military authorities that they would not be penalized in resettlement opportunities. It must be remembered that many left to search for lost relatives, children, and spouses.

8. The status of displaced persons already in the United States. Under existing law an alien who entered the United States prior to April 1, 1948, can apply to the Attorney General for an adjustment of his immigration status, if otherwise admissible and is deemed a displaced person. The number has been fixed as 15,000. To date, the number of applicants for adjustment of status has fallen far below that of 15,000. It is, therefore, proposed that the eligibility date in that regard be moved forward to January 1, 1949, making a far greater number eligible, yet keeping the over-all figure of 15,000 intact. My bill further proposes that the Attorney General's action be final in such cases, thereby eliminating congressional action on each case. For this committee to process thousands of individual cases and then present them to the floor for consideration with a report on each one would not only entail the hiring of additional skilled help, but might very well hamper seriously the consideration of general legislation on the floor. This provision is a curious mixture for Congress to swallow. It can hardly be called a legislative function or the most efficient manner of approach.

9. A revolving fund of $5,000,000 to be established for loans to voluntary agencies for resettlement purposes: This is intended to aid those voluntary agencies which have not highly organized backing and which have recently entered the field of aiding the resettlement of displaced persons admitted to the United States. Many of these agencies have been handicapped in taking their sponsored groups from point of entry to the point of resettlement in and out of continental United States. This will aid in the wider distribution of DP's throughout the country. Such loans, you will note, are not to mature later than June 30, 1953. The $5,000,000 is to be advanced temporarily by the RFC pending suitable appropriations by Congress.

10. Eligibility of political refugees to enter the United States in the national interest: This section (f) is an addition of 15,000 within the 400,000 ceiling. This provision has been included upon the recommendation of the Department of State so as to enable the Department to avail itself of the special skills and intelligence of persons who fled from Communist-dominated countries since April 21, 1947.

11. The provision which permits no issuance of visa to anyone who advocated or assisted in persecutions of others for race, religion, or national origin is self-explanatory.

One further change has been made. That provision of the present act making 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin is transferred to the regular immigration laws on recommendation of the Displaced Persons Commission. The present act calls for the use of the German and Austrian quota for such purpose for the period of June 30, 1948, to July 1, 1950. Efforts will be made, I understand, by those favoring the provision to extend the time to July 1952. As I have indicated before, on the floor of the House, I firmly oppose this provision in its entirety. I would like to quote the opinion of the Department of State on this provision:

"Officers of the Visa Division of this Department had conducted considerable research in an effort to ascertain whether the term 'German ethnic origin' could be construed or defined in an administratively feasible and workable definition of practicable use in issuing or refusing visas. The results of that research indicated that any definition based exclusively on a common understanding of the word 'ethnic' would be neither administratively nor politically feasible."

I believe I have covered all the changes called for in my bill, H. R. 1344. At this point I want to stress the tremendous interest existing all over the country in this legislation. If the impression has been spread that the displaced persons are unwelcome and unwanted by the American people, that impression has no basis in fact. Assurances from State and voluntary agencies for named displaced persons at the rate of approximately 3,400 families per week. So widespread is the interest and the demand for the displaced persons that governors of the following 18 States have established commissions or committees for the resettlement of displaced persons: California, Connecticut, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Moreover, displaced persons have gone to and settled in 34 States, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. In many cases immigrants listed New York and other eastern cities, which were merely forwarding points to their ultimate destination.

I have no wish to make an emotional plea for these helpless people. I believe the record and the facts speak for themselves. We are committed to a liberalized, nondiscriminatory Displaced Persons Act. To provide otherwise would be to deny the record, the facts, and our pledges.

I believe H. R. 1344 to be a good base from which to proceed to that end. I do, however, propose additional amendments.

1. A provision to make eligible as displaced persons 7,000 Shanghai refugees. With the Communist victory in China, I need not stress the urgency of this situation. The IRO has undertaken a program of rescue, fully aware of the emergency. There were some 13,000 refugees in Shanghai, approximately 5,000 refugees of World War II, mostly of the Jewish faith and about 8,000 White Russians who had fled from Russia after the revolution. With the threatening dangers of the Communist incursions, the IRO set to work to save them. Some 3,000 were given visas to Israel and are now on their way to the new Republic. Four thousand seven hundred and fifty Shankhai refugees, mostly White Russians, have been given temporary refuge on the Philippine Islands under an agreement between the IRO and the Philippine Governernment which provides for a 4-month refuge for not more than 6,000 refugees. About 5,000 still remain in Shanghai. It is estimated that of these 5,000, about 1,000 will refuse to leave and about 500, because of illness, cannot be moved. Among the some three-thousand-odd still to be rescued some 400 have close relatives in the United States. The 4,750 now in the Philippines will have to be permanently resettled elsewhere. The United States will be called upon to take a share of these. I am, therefore, offering an amendment to H. R. 1344, the Celler bill, to permit 7,000 Shanghai refugees to enter the United States as eligible displaced persons. These 7,000 are not in addition to the proposed 400,000. They come within that ceiling. It would be immoral to ignore the plight of these dispossessed human beings.

2. I, likewise, offer another amendment to H. R. 1344 the Celler bill which provides for the issuance of not more than 15,000 visas to those who after September 1, 1939, and before January 1, 1949, entered an area outside Italy, the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna or the American, British, or French zones of either Germany or Austria, persons of predominantly European national origin displaced from the country of their birth, or nationality, or of their last residence as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II, and who cannot return because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

My daily mail is heavy with these stories of personal tragedy where political and religious refugees live in great insecurity in countries of Europe or the Americas with no right of permanent entry, thus deprived of the opportunity to grow new roots or earn a livelihood. For obvious reasons, they fear the deportations that threaten them daily. From France, from Spain, from Portugal, from Cuba, I get these stories of uprooted humanity. Again, I want to make this clear. This does not increase the over-all number of 400,000. Under my bill, H. R. 1344 and my proposed amendments, this would be the break-down in figures:

Czechoslovakians	2,000
Orphan children	3,000
Eligible DP's in the national interest	15,000
Shanghai refugees	7,000
Refugees outside DP zones	15,000
Total	42,000
Leaving for DP's in the zones as of Apr. 21, 1947	358,000
Total	400,000

In closing, I wish to quote from the President's message to Congress, delivered personally, at a joint session of the Eightieth Congress on July 27, 1948:

"In our relations with the rest of the world, action is also needed at once, and can be taken quickly, to afford additional proof that we mean what we say when we talk about freedom, humanity, and international cooperation for peace and prosperity. Three measures are involved:

"First, the Displaced Persons Act in its present form discriminates unfairly against some displaced persons because of their religion, land of origin, or occupation. These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out these discriminations. Furthermore, the present act permits the entry of only 200,000 persons and charges them against future immigration quotas. I believe strongly that the act should provide for the entry of 400,000 persons over a 4-year period, and they should be outside the normal immigration quotas. The act can and should be amended promptly."

There was some talk about abolishing the DP Commission and setting up a one-man administration, regardless of its merits or lack of merits that would entail delay and confusion and would be most inexpedient. One does not swap horses crossing a stream.

This is an emergency—an emergency that is costly. We want to dissipate the problem as quickly as possible. Changing the type of administration set-up would only hinder and delay.

Following are the texts of the three proposed amendments to H. R. 1344, the Celler bill:

AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 1344, SUBMITTED BY MR. CELLER

"Amendment No. 1:

"Page 3, line 18, substitute 'subsections' for 'subsection' and after '(f)' add '(g)'; substitute 'are' for 'is.'

"Page 4, after line 19, add the following:

"'(g) "Eligible displaced person" shall also mean a displaced person or refugee as defined in annex I (except paragraph 1 (b) of section A of part I thereof) to the constitution of the International Refugee Organization who on or after January 1, 1938, entered the city of Shanghai, China, as a displaced person or refugee, and (1) who was residing in such city as a displaced person or refugee on July 1, 1948, and (2) who is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission into the United States for permanent residence, and (3) for whom assurances in accordance with the regulations of the Commission have been given that such person, if admitted into the United States, and the members of such person's family who shall accompany such person and who propose to live with such person, shall not become public charges, and such assurances shall be sufficient for the purposes of all immigration laws of the United States. The spouse and unmarried dependent child or children under 21 years of age of such an eligible displaced person shall, if otherwise qualified for admission into the United States for permanent residence, also be deemed eligible displaced persons.'

"Amendment No. 1-A: On page 5, line 13, substitute a comma for the period after the word 'act' and insert the following: 'and not more than 7,000 visas shall be issued to eligible displaced persons as defined in subsection (g) of section 2 of this act.'

"Amendment No. 2: Page 9, line 6, insert the word 'hereby' after the word 'is'; substitute a period for the comma as it appears after the word 'repealed'; strike out the balance of line 6 and the language appearing on lines 7 through 14, inclusive.

"Amendment No. 3:

"Page 10, after line 21, add the following:

"'SEC. 12. A section is added to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, to be numbered section 14, and to read as follows:

"'"SEC. 14. Not in excess of 15,000 visas issued pursuant to this act shall be made available to applicants for immigration visas who (1) on or after September 1, 1939, and before January 1, 1949, entered an area or country outside Italy, the American sector, the British sector, or the French sector of either Berlin or Vienna, or the American zone, the British zone, or the French zone of either Germany or Austria; (2) establish that they are persons predominantly of European national origin displaced from the country of their birth, or nationality, or of their last residence, as a result of events subsequent to the outbreak of World War II; (3) that they cannot return to any of such countries because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions; and (4) that they have not acquired the right of permanent residence in any other country. The spouse and the unmarried dependent child or children under 21 years of age of any person who establishes his eligibility for immigration into the United States under the provisions of this section, shall also be granted such eligibility: *Provided*, That assurances in accordance with existing immigration laws and regulations have been given that such persons, if admitted into the United States, shall not become public charges."

"'SEC. 13. Section 14 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 is hereby renumbered to section 15.'"

Tax-Free Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by J. M. Eleazer, extension information specialist, Clemson College, S. C., which appeared in the State newspaper of Columbia, S. C., on February 27.

This article is entitled "Consumers Aware of Need for Tax-Free Margarine."

Mr. Eleazer, a brilliant writer of beautiful and simple prose, has been selected as the outstanding agricultural journalist in the United States for the past 2 years by the American Association of Agricultural Editors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMERS AWARE OF NEED FOR TAX-FREE MARGARINE

(By J. M. Eleazer, Clemson extension information specialist)

A soybean that does not shatter. We have that now.

Cottonseed, an unsung major food product. We have had that a long time.

Producers of nutritious protein feeds and vegetable food fats, these oilseeds grow in importance as populations thicken.

Years ago, when it didn't matter, taxes, thought to be prohibitive, were levied against one of the chief products of vegetable oil, margarine.

That rocked on for a long time with little notice. For we were a young and rich country. We were still in that fabulous era during which we as a country lived by animal fats and proteins almost entirely. And when this lowly margarine from a plant threatened lordly butter from an animal, we would have none of it and slapped multiple taxes upon it. The vegetable oils from which it was made was largely imported then, so who cared?

That went on for about two generations. The cry against the inequity grew among those who must eat until at long last it looks like this unjust tax against a wholesome, nutritious, and plentiful food will soon be removed. We grow practically all of the oil going into margarine now.

In the meantime, we have had a great war. Butter has been so scarce at times that we couldn't get it, even if we could pay for it, twice the price of margarine, its full equal in every respect. Milk is a great food. And we are told that all we produce and more is needed as such for drinking, ice-cream making, evaporating, drying, etc. And despite the very high price that butter has been its production continues to go down in the country. And that despite the fact that the multiple taxes on margarine still hold.

Artificial coloring is put in both butter and margarine. Pound for pound, the scientists tell us that they are identical in food value. Yet to get a pound of wholesome colored margarine, do you know the taxes that you pay? In fact, you pay all of them, for such taxes are usually passed on to the man who eats it.

To start and go backwards with it, you pay 10 cents tax on that pound of colored margarine. The retailer you buy it from has to pay a retail license of $48 a year. The wholesaler he got it from has to pay a license of $480 a year to supply it. And the fellow who makes it has to pay $600 a year for that privilege. All of this goes to the Federal Government. And, on top of that, many States have additional taxes on it. And in 19 States they won't allow it to be sold at all.

No wonder the consumers in this country are waking up and asking that this gross discrimination against a good and needed food be removed. For the leading scientists of the country have declared the fortified margarine, that's on your grocer's shelf, to be the full and complete equal of good butter in every nutritional respect. And it has been selling for about half the price of butter, despite these taxes.

Once margarine was made largely from low-grade animal fats, oleo oil principally. It was then that folks started adding the oleo to the word margarine. Now it is made almost wholly from clean, sterile vegetable oils, and there is no room for the prefix oleo. It is margarine, and nothing else. Webster's dictionary defines "margarine" as "artificial butter." And Congress in the Margarine Act of 1878 wrote out the following: "The word 'margarine' shall mean all substances, whether compounds or otherwise, prepared in imitation of butter, and whether mixed with butter or not."

Rayon and wool imitate cotton in that they often carry the same color and serve the same purposes. Yet we in the cotton country, nor anywhere else I know of, don't tax rayon and silk. Vegetable fats imitate hog lard in that they serve the identical purpose of lard and are made to look like it. Yet the hog growers do not have an unfair advantage over those vegetable fats in the form of taxes because the product looks like lard.

In this world that needs food, it is high time to remove this tax on a human food source that is easily capable of enlargement as fast as humanity needs it. And the growing needs for dairy products will likely take care of them in any volume of production that now seems possible.

And to bring it home to us here, that margarine you buy at your store no longer comes from low-grade oleo oil nor from foreign vegetable oils. It comes from your own cottonseed oil grown in your county and from soybean oil perhaps grown in Calhoun, Orangeburg, Beaufort or Edgefield Counties.

And Dr. Wilds at Hartsville says the oil content of cottonseed can be increased by breeding. And he and John Wannamaker at St. Matthews and others are breeding better-yielding soybeans that don't shatter. The future is interested in this thing. For, remember, the voice of history says, as populations thicken in a country, it becomes necessary to eat more and more plant fats and proteins and relatively less from animal sources. So why continue to tax the things that must sustain us more and more?

Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 2 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD an editorial column from the Kelso (Wash.) Kelsonian-Tribune of February 24, copies of several letters which were written to members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and several letters which have recently been received by the junior Senator from Washington, all of which bear on the question of confirming Mr. Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which is presently before the Senate Armed Services Committee. The documents are similar in vein and point of view to several thousand others which have come to my desk.

There being no objection, the editorial and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kelso (Wash.) Kelsonian-Tribune of February 24, 1949]

IN LITTLE OLD KELSO AND ELSEWHERE

(With the editor)

Mon Wallgren, rejected by the Democratic voters of this Democratic State at the last election, has been named by President Truman to head one of the most powerful and important boards of the Nation, the National Security Resources Board.

The appointment must have Senate approval, and Senator HARRY CAIN, who knows well the reasons for Wallgren's rejection at the hands of the voters in his own home State, is raising his voice against that approval.

Wallgren's appointment, in the opinion of this humble writer, will be a tragedy. Not that he is a sympathizer for a foreign government; not that he has ever been proven dishonest; not that he is necessarily worse than other politicians before him. But his appointment will add another deep crack to that great cornerstone upon which democracy is built: Confidence in Government.

Through wars, civil and foreign, through strife and economic confusion, this confidence of the American people in their Government has carried the Nation through. It is the very thing upon which our Government is founded and without which this, or any government, cannot survive.

At no time in our national history has there been such crumbling and cracking of this rock of national confidence as we of this generation have seen in the past decade and a little more.

When did it begin? Each man has his own answers. Possibly proposed packing of the Supreme Court, that move to inject partisan politics into the very heart of our constitutional democracy marked the beginning of the crumbling of confidence for some. Possibly, it was Pearl Harbor. There the confidence of each of us was dealt a blow. Government had failed us, somehow. The national security had been jeopardized. Errors in judgment? Or the inefficiency of little men in jobs too big for them? Little things, big things, some doubly clear in retrospect. Henry Wallace, once almost our President, still crying the virtues of the nation that is threatening the peace of the world.

The wealth of the Nation only recently going in trainloads, boatloads over our own port dock to build the Russian machine with which we may some day be forced to cope.

Secret pacts, secret promises, secret treaties. Presidents paying their respects at the funerals of the heads of proven corrupt political machines.

Many things have undermined our confidence in government in recent years, but most of them point up to a single weakness; small men in jobs too large for their capabilities.

The appointment of Mon Wallgren to the Security Resources Board will be a tragedy. Not just because he may have built up a questionable fortune on a $6,000 a year salary, or yet because he tolerated the John Coffee's, the Hugh DeLacy's, or the Jerry O'Connell's—but more because he was tried by the people of the State of Washington and found wanting; singled out by the Democratic voters of this State in a Democratic year as a man who should be purged.

His appointment by President Truman will brand Truman as a small man willing to go against the wishes of an entire State, even to trifle with the national security, that his personal friend might continue to feed at the public trough.

Confidence in Governments. A little—as long as there are Senators in Washington who will raise their voices in championing a rightful cause.

CLARKSTON, WASH., *February 25, 1949.*
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Your deliberations concerning the approval of the appointment of our former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren has been watched with considerable interest by me.

Since the press indicated your desire for any information that will assist your committee in arriving at a fair and impartial conclusion, I feel it my duty to put in my two bits' worth.

I am an ex-president of the Asotin County Young Democratic Club and, of course, supported Mon while he was in the Senate and for his first term as governor of our State. However, almost from the start of his term as governor Mr. Wallgren applied his Capitol Club program against about 800 State employees, and don't let anybody fool you that this was for entertainment only. A State employee with the horticultural department occupied a section of my office for many years, and we know the score. If you cared to bother, you can undoubtedly secure 800 affidavits from most of these State employees verifying the Governor's racket.

Much as I dislike to go back on Mon, my conscience compels me to do so. The Democrats of the State of Washington elected nearly all other State officials last fall except that of governor. They chose the lesser of two evils and picked Langlie. What do you think? Anything the State Democratic Committee may have told you does not express the sentiment of the Democrats of Washington as a whole.

Personally, I do not think Mon is qualified for the position he seeks, much as I would like to see a man from our State get it. Had President Truman known all the facts, he would not have made the appointment.

Sincerely,

A. N. ROGNSTAD.

RICE, WASH., *February 25, 1949.*
Senator HARRY CAIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Although I am a Democrat I want to commend you for your fight to prevent the appointment of Wallgren to the high office for which he is totally unfitted. He just doesn't know enough and, in my opinion, is not to be trusted. Our party turned him down for governor, and if Truman had any sense, he wouldn't appoint a dead duck to any high office. So, Senator, give him what Truman said he was going to give the Republicans—h—.

Yours very truly,

W. A. HARRIS.

P. S.—I don't think any more of Truman than I do of Wallgren, both are unfit for the offices they hold and have held.

PUYALLUP, WASH., *February 24, 1949.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your attack against the appointment of Wallgren to the chair of the NSRB meets with my relieved and most hearty approval. But I am shocked and disgusted that you must fight alone such a glaring affront to the best interest and security of the country.

Having left my health and blood in the Philippines, I had earnestly hoped, with 140,000,000 others, that Pearl Harbor was a lesson learned. But it seems you're virtually alone in Congress in recognizing where stabs in the back start.

Brother, it may be lonesome and some people may tell you it isn't politic, but stick by your guns and there will be many others, beside myself, who won't forget. Your courage right now means more to the security of our country than the UN.

I am taking the liberty of addressing some pointed questions to your inert senior colleague who seems more intent upon nullifying your vote (and thereby effectively denying this State representation) even than upon contemplating the mildew on his political bread and butter.

Permit me also to express myself to you, under separate cover, on an astounding set of facts and conditions which may, under pressure of congressional duties, have escaped your notice. They are immediately concerned with our national security and present a grave doubt that sufficient time remains to prevent the tragedy of their present course. I feel I can rely upon your demonstrated courage and determination to effect early action.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK C. JACKSON, Jr.,
Veterans' Instructor,
Vocational Agriculture,
Pierce County School District No. 3.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 25, 1949.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Like thousands of others, we are following very closely your most commendable actions in making your fight against ex-Governor Wallgren.

I am a laboring man, was employed in machine jobs and shipyards on the waterfront in Seattle during the entire war period, as well as before and after, and as such associated with all kinds of people, and I wish to assure you that you are correct in your accusations and your thoughts about Wallgren catering to and favoring to a large extent fellow travelers and undesirable citizens.

I am sorry I am unable to give you more definite facts, figures, dates and names, because all those fellows work pretty much under cover. In all the gangs in which I worked, however, there was that element who had under discussion a great many times the name of Wallgren and Coughlin, and others of that kind.

I am a Seattle citizen and have been such for over 30 years, and have always been steadily employed in various activities, usually that of a machinist.

Yours very truly,

B. P. DONCETT.

W. R. ROWE FARMS,
Olympia, Wash., February 27, 1949.
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAIN: The enclosed clipping by Associated Press News Service gives me grave concern in the matter of the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren to the office of Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

As just an ordinary citizen, a taxpayer and a voter, I should like to ask how Mr. Wallgren, who started his political career as a poor man is able to spend $60,000 or more in building a luxurious home in California as described in this press release. You undoubtedly know that, as Governor of the State of Washington, Mr. Wallgren received a very modest salary, indeed.

Income tax and present-day living expenses being what they are, it is difficult for those of us who are struggling through an ordinary existence to understand how Wallgren, whose known career is that of political office, has $60,000 to fling about in just one interval of sumptuous living.

One can possibly ignore and discount current and noticeably repeated rumors of graft connected with Mr. Wallgren's immediate past as governor of this State, but it is asking too much of a voter to fail to question how a modestly paid political office can enable a public servant to spend several times his known legitimate income on such evidences of wealth and luxury—particularly when that man—Mr. Wallgren—is being proposed as administrator of the task of governmental purchasing and stock piling of strategic materials running into a value of millions of dollars—an opportunity for private gain "on the side" if there ever was one.

Mr. Wallgren owes it to the American public and to the faith which Mr. Truman apparently has in his integrity to provide public accounting of such evidences of wealth acquired during his reign in political office. If the information carried in the news report referred to herein is false, that too—in fairness to Mr. Wallgren—should be a matter of public record.

You are to be strongly commended for your attitude in scrutinizing the qualifications of Mr. Wallgren for as strategic a national office.

The time is long since overdue at which the best interests of the American people will be put above private friendship and political expediency in the selection of high public officers.

Respectfully yours,

KENNETH MCCLARTY.

[From the Olympia (Wash.) Daily Olympian of February 26, 1949]

WALLGREN DESERT RANCHERO TO BE READY FOR USE SOON

PALM DESERT, CALIF.—The new home of Mon C. Wallgren, former governor of the State of Washington, will be ready for occupancy within a month in this winter resort.

The swimming pool, 20 by 50 feet, is completed and a crop of dates is ready to be harvested. Producing palm trees, 35 feet

tall, were moved in from groves in the Coachella Valley and replanted about the home site.

Construction started December 1 and work is being rushed, 7 days a week and almost around the clock, to finish the house in time for use this season.

Gossip at this new desert resort is that one of the first guests in the Wallgren home will be President Truman.

The home is of ranch style, with approximately 3,000 feet of floor space. Cost will be in the neighborhood of $60,000.

It has a large living room with Arizona flagstone fireplace. The left wing has a large master bedroom, with private bath, and the guest bedroom, also with private bath. The right wing consists of dining room, kitchen, utility room, maid's quarters, and car port. The living room will have a plate-glass bar.

The building is of frame and stucco construction.

Flagstone planting areas surround the home and there is a large quartered concrete patio in the rear. It is only a block from a popular club.

Two years ago Palm Desert—12 miles south of Palm Springs on the road to Indio—was sun-baked wasteland. General Patton trained his tank forces in the area before going overseas. Sixteen hundred acres were subdivided and several hotels and about 25 homes built.

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 28, 1949.*

Senator KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: On Thursday, February 24, you were quoted in the newspapers as stating that the confirmation of Mon Wallgren's appointment hinged upon whether or not he had been "soft" with Communists in his State administration by allowing their infiltration.

First of all, sir, please let me assure you that northwesterners are more concerned about the corruptions to follow upon this man's appointment than they are about the infiltrations so often mentioned. For as to the infiltration of Communists in Washington's politics the word is abused—many of them just took over. It is common knowledge in this part of the country that the Communists enjoyed real and substantial power in the State of Washington during Wallgren's administration. While that is true, it is also possibly true that many of those early-day Communists lost their relish for that doctrine after they had gained their great power and new revenues.

But this letter, Senator, is motivated by the faint hope that you and Senator CAIN might really "take the wraps off" the whole matter and expose the real matters of abuse rampant in Wallgren's State administration, to show how his new Board's functions will be operated. People from the State of Washington, if able to be present at your hearings, could testify at length of first-hand knowledge about the spoils and depravations worked upon the people of Washington during his administration.

If it is not already too late, I should like to urge that Senator CAIN be encouraged to display the facts known to many about the following matters:

(a) Pay-offs to the then-governor's personal representatives stationed in State departments, by citizens who were willing to buy extra privileges, or to pay for legal privileges to be otherwise withheld from them. This would include the revenues taken in by these personal representatives of Wallgren for licenses to be issued under legal process of various regulatory bodies of that State.

(b) Kick-backs by State employees who were paid large salaries with the express understanding that certain percentages were to be returned to the proper persons.

(c) The appointment of teamsters' representatives to high State offices, resulting in a Beck administration of much of the State's authority.

(d) State purchases, especially of liquor, at premium prices, from many liquor companies with the express understanding that the premiums were to be returned to the governor himself.

(e) Participation by Wallgren in the financial interests of the racing industry. He should not deny his association and participation in these affairs with one Joe Gottstein.

(f) Efforts to steal the Metropolitan Building properties from the State university.

If the committee considering this appointment is more serious than the newspapers would lead one to believe, it is certain that it can easily secure all of the evidence it may need to assure itself that this man is not fit for the important position to which he has been appointed by the President. If it is only interested in Communist infiltration, the committee should rest, for the Communists were more successful than they had hoped to be, and it will require more time than he will have for Governor Langlie to get them out of the State's administration.

It is hoped that Senator CAIN will be urged and assisted by his colleagues to go into other important matters, such as those mentioned above, so that the people can be fully apprised of what they may reasonably expect to follow in Wallgren's administration of the National Resources Board.

Yours very truly,

JEFFREY P. BROWN,

(Copies to: Senator HARRY CAIN, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Senator GUY CORDON.)

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Your opposition to the appointment of Mon C. Wallgren, repudiated Governor of the State of Washington, as Chairman of the National Resources Security Board, meets with our wholehearted approval.

It is an insult to the intelligent voters of the State of Washington for the President of the United States to choose a man for this important post of stock piling and conservation whose 4 years as Governor were characterized by extravagance and a marked desire to waste natural resources—as witness his efforts to control school timber free of any check on its sale. The latter program was nipped by alert Washington voters who by initiative action effectively stopped this bold attempt to remove safeguards set up to conserve this valuable and important part of our State school system.

Although it is true that our type of Government has always lent itself to the spoils system and a desire to reward party wheel horses in this instance particularly, the complexity of this position requires far more than the ability to remain on the public pay roll as qualification.

While we of the West are always eager to see western men appointed to Government positions, we are also jealous of the integrity of the men so appointed. We feel that confirmation of Wallgren to this office certainly cannot add to the efficiency of Government which we are hoping to achieve.

Please continue your fight to block this appointment which is obnoxious to the people who have lived in Washington State with Wallgren as Governor.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY D. DICKINSON,
GEORGE L. DICKINSON,
(Mr. and Mrs. George L. Dickinson).

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 22, 1949.*

Hon. MILLARD TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: As chairman of the committee holding hearings regarding fitness of former Governor Wallgren for the position to which President Truman appointed him, you have a very real responsibility to the citizens of this country.

The simple truth of the matter is that Mr. Wallgren, through politics, has risen to positions of prominence far beyond his mental capacity to handle the work in a satisfactory manner.

As Governor he was absent from the State a great deal, but tried to give the impression that he was busy about matters pertaining to the welfare of this State.

On the mere matter of his acquiring considerable wealth during his years in office, you have ground enough for a very far-reaching inquiry. The stories we hear cannot be without foundation. Most of the citizens of this State whom I know, feel that you would not have to scratch very hard or very deep to turn up plenty which would show that he is not a suitable man for the office for which he has been named.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH P. BRADY.

(Copy to Senator HARRY P. CAIN.)

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to rent control. I am opposed to it—

First, because I think it is doing more harm than good to the American people.

Second, because it was originated as a war emergency—the war is over and the necessity for rent control has long since passed.

Third, because I firmly believe that if rent controls are removed, there will be thousands of rental properties immediately available which have not been placed on the market before because of rent-control difficulties.

Fourth, because I believe the removal of rent controls will stimulate the building industry and innumerable new housing units will be built at once.

Fifth, because the resultant number of housing units available will take care of the rent-control problem through the old policy of supply and demand.

Sixth, because I am opposed to Government controls of any kind which interfere with the free-enterprise system which made this country great.

Seventh, because I believe the property owner has a right to a fair return on his invested capital, free and unhampered by Government red tape and rent controls.

The property owner is today suffering from a tremendous economic disadvantage. In relation to the rest of the economy his income has dropped approximately 6 percent since before the war.

Let us for a moment look at the income of an aged couple who invested their life savings in order that they might have an income for their old age. Rentals have remained practically frozen since 1941 while repair and maintenance charges more than doubled. The over-all increase in rents on residential properties since 1941 is 4 percent—living expenses have risen 64 percent. The average weekly wage increase for industrial workers is 70 percent higher than in 1941. Food costs have practically doubled, clothes are 74 percent higher, coal and oil 33 percent, fuel and utilities combined, 15 percent, and still the property owner is expected to meet all of these rising costs on only 4 percent increase in his income on rental property.

I am told that about a half-million rental housing units in this country have been withdrawn from the housing market by owners. They have been discouraged by the unfair competition of the Government against them and have decided not to rent rooms or apartments which were formerly occupied.

Approximately 50 percent of the houses which were rented prior to 1942 have been forced into sales by owners who are no longer able to bear the increased costs and who have decided to abandon the field.

Hundreds of thousands of new construction projects, planned since the war, have been abandoned because of the Government policy of increasing costs of everything the property owner buys and yet, freezing his income.

Per capita occupancy of living space has decreased because it is now possible to buy a considerably greater amount of living space with the same share of income than was possible in 1941.

Free economy in this country, as well as anywhere else, is governed by the law of supply and demand. The point of equilibrium is reached when the desire to buy and the desire to sell are equal. But equilibrium can be disturbed by a number of things, including change in the demand pattern because of a change in income. If incomes go down while prices stay fixed, the demand will decrease; if incomes go up, while the price stays constant, the demand will increase. In other words, people will be willing and able to buy more of a commodity which stays cheap, if their incomes are going up. That is exactly what has happened in the rental housing field. The price of rental space has stayed practically fixed since 1941—wages and other items have increased by leaps and bounds. It has been possible, therefore, for consumers of rental housing to occupy more space. As people left to enter the war or move to production centers, the remaining population absorbed the housing that was thereby made available. That resulted in an artificial shortage of rental properties. We have built more new housing since the end of the war than the rate of our population increase. There is today a surplus of rental properties all over this country. In other words, the supply exceeds the demand, so why should there be further necessity for rent control? I, for one, do not believe there is such necessity and I intend to vote against further extension of rent control when this bill is presented to the House for a vote.

Home for Every Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Home for Every Family," published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1949. The editorial, which relates to Senate bill 1070, is a most excellent one, and I hope it may be read by every Senator.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOME FOR EVERY FAMILY

Seldom has a bill gone before the Senate with such impressive endorsement as the new housing measure carries. It was introduced by Senator ELLENDER for himself and 21 other Senators of both parties. Apparently it reflects a consensus of constructive thinking in Congress. If so, that is a fact of great significance, for the bill lays down a national housing policy that is at once sound, practicable, and forward-looking.

In the present bill the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has abandoned the effort to deal with all phases of housing legislation. That is a logical consequence of the failure of last year's all-inclusive bill. This time the committee is concentrating on a declaration of national housing policy, authorization of Federal assistance to local communities for slum clearance and low-cost housing assistance for low-cost farm housing and a comprehensive program of research. We think farm housing also might well have been left for separate consideration, since it has very little relation to urban housing. But that detail scarcely detracts from the appealing nature of the bill as a whole.

The objective at which the bill aims is a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. Of course, this does not mean that Congress intends to provide homes for every family now inadequately housed. The primary reliance is upon private enterprise. Private industry will not only be encouraged to serve as large a part of the population as it possibly can. Government assistance is to be given, notably through sound financing and research in building materials and methods, to enable private builders to satisfy a larger share of the total demand for housing. But the bill also clearly recognizes the public responsibility for clearing slums and blighted areas and providing good low-cost housing for families who cannot afford to live in decent privately owned quarters. Public housing with Federal assistance is to be undertaken, as in the past, only when local communities demonstrate the need for it and devise appropriate plans. In every instance the initiative will have to come from the communities themselves.

This is necessarily a slow process, but in our opinion it is the only sound basis on which a public housing program can rest. We think the committee has done well to give first emphasis to a long-range attack upon the slums and to the housing of families that will necessarily be displaced when the transformation process begins. In some instances, indeed, as in the District of Columbia, new housing will have to come first to avoid the overcrowding of existing insanitary shacks beyond the danger point. If the general policy outlined in this measure is properly understood, we surmise that it will draw overwhelming approval.

Assessment by American Medical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Doctors' Revolt," published in the Washington Post of March 3, 1949. This editorial deals with the action of the New York County Medical Society in regard to the compulsory assessment of the American Medical Association.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTORS' REVOLT

Reversing a vote taken at its January meeting, the New York County Medical Society voted last Monday against the $25 assessment levied by the American Medical Association on each of its 140,000 members. As the Manhattan group is the largest local affiliate of the AMA, this move, though it is not the first of its kind, may have wide repercussions. It reflects the growing dissatisfaction within the rank and file of M. D.'s over the generally standfast policies of the AMA leadership, and incidentally proves to the hilt, as Dr. Frothingham has contended all along, that the $25 levy is not compulsory.

To be sure, the New York body was probably moved in considerable part—and rightly—by indignation over the infamous Dan Gilbert letter of last December. Copies of this vicious attack on the national health insurance plan were sent to all doctors by the National Physicians Committee, a lobby group that has no official connection with the AMA but has been several times endorsed by it. The letter was addressed "Dear Christian American" and contained a number of veiled appeals to religious prejudice. The National Physicians Committee covering letter called it one of the few really vital pronouncements of an age.

This is the kind of propaganda the doctors would be better off without, and we think the AMA would serve the medical profession best by unequivocally repudiating the National Physicians Committee for this blunder. Such an action would reinforce the testimony of the AMA's own 12-point health plan that the organized medical profession is not wedded to deep reactionism but realizes that in a changing world there is need to find new and better ways of dealing with old problems. Doctors should have open minds on human affairs as well as on scientific developments.

Labrador-Quebec Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an advertisement of the M. A. Hanna Co., which appeared in the Washington Post of March 1, 1949, under the heading "Labrador-Quebec iron ore."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABRADOR-QUEBEC IRON ORE

The iron-ore tonnage shown by exploration and drilling so far is about one-third in the Labrador concession and about two-thirds in the concession in Quebec. However, the Labrador concession covers a total of about 18,000 square miles, while the Quebec concession covers about 3,800 square miles, and there is much more territory in Labrador than in Quebec which is entirely unexplored. Explorations to date have proved with reasonable accuracy the existence of about 300,000,000 tons of very good grade direct-shipping open-pit iron ore and manganiferous iron ore. It is located about 300 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and requires the construction of 360 miles of railroad with transshipping docks at Seven Islands, Quebec, on the St. Lawrence River.

It is a big undertaking and may involve the expenditure of as much as $200,000,000 for mining and railroad equipment, power development, railroad and dock construction, town sites for the large number of people involved, etc. This will take a number of years, and progress is slow, but we believe that the discovery is of sufficient importance and the ore possibilities of such magnitude that eventually this will become an important source of iron-ore supply for some of the blast furnaces and steel plants of Canada and the United States. Additional exploratory work will be continued, and as the properties develop plans for the future will be made.

One important item of consideration is the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. The distance by water from Seven Islands to Erie, Pa., on the southern shore of Lake Erie, is almost the same as the distance from Duluth, as our Lake Superior ores now move. The entire distance from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to any lake port is now available for transportation in our regular standard lake vessels, except for about 90 miles of intermittent rapids. If these rapids can be made navigable by the prompt completion of the St. Lawrence waterway project, the ore can be moved economically and competitively to the central industrial districts of Canada and the United States.

Through our various connections, we are interested in the ownership of large reserve tonnages of Lake Superior iron ore. We are not unmindful of the importance of such reserves nor do we contemplate the early exhaustion of shipments from that district, but continuation of the declining trend of shipments of high-grade direct-shipping ore from Lake Superior is inevitable. Expensive underground mining must be increased and even more expensive beneficiation processes must be developed to make a useful product from lower-grade Lake Superior reserves. They will be required as a source of iron-ore supply for the future, but they can best be supplemented by shipments of high-grade open-pit direct-shipping ore from Labrador and Quebec to fill the needs of the great iron and steel businesses of Canada and the United States now located in the Great Lakes Basin area.

This district is the heart of the greatest industrial area on this continent, and it is to the interest of every business and every citizen of both countries that it may continue to have an ample supply of iron ore cheaply transported to it by water to supply the many industries dependent upon iron and steel. The Great Lakes waterway will continue to serve this important district, but now that this new source of direct-shipping high-grade iron-ore supply has been definitely established the St. Lawrence waterway should be undertaken promptly to make it equally available. It is essential for business in times of peace and it would be indispensable for both countries in the unfortunate event of another war.

G. M. HUMPHREY,
President, the M. A. Hanna Co.
CLEVELAND, OHIO, *February 15, 1949.*

Internal Revenue Collections in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1949.

Hon. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FARRINGTON: In reply to your request we are presenting a statement of the relative position of Hawaii and the various States in respect to internal-revenue collections. Two tables are enclosed, one shows total collections and the other per capita collections in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

Total collections from all States and Territories in 1948 increased 7 percent from fiscal 1947; total collections from Hawaii increased 2 percent. In 1948, collections from Hawaii accounted for about .3 percent of the United States total. Collections in Hawaii increased for all classes of revenue except miscellaneous revenue which includes excess-profits taxes.

The total revenue collected in Hawaii in 1948 exceeded that collected in 12 States and Alaska. (See table 1.) The States are: Arizona, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming. Hawaii also ranked above these States in revenue collected in the fiscal years 1944 through 1947.

Collections of revenue on a per capita basis were greater in Hawaii than in 24 States during fiscal 1948. Hawaii maintained the same relative position held in the previous year.

The States in which per capita collections were smaller than those in Hawaii are: Alabama, Arizona*, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho*, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi*, Montana*, New Hampshire*, New Mexico*, North Dakota*, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota*, Tennessee, Texas, Utah*, Vermont*, West Virginia, and Wyoming*. (An asterisk indicates that both total and per capita collections were smaller in the State than in Hawaii.)

Sincerely yours,
ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

TABLE 1.—*Total collections of internal revenue by the United States in each State, the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1948*

Alabama	$276,943,829
Arizona	83,813,698
Arkansas	121,751,193
California	3,103,679,127
Colorado	291,848,649
Connecticut	664,939,280
Delaware	308,240,962
Florida	393,355,704
Georgia	439,034,000
Idaho	79,868,936
Illinois	3,785,815,371
Indiana	1,011,921,119
Iowa	446,799,962
Kansas	406,084,637
Kentucky	780,530,271
Louisiana	354,272,183
Maine	130,747,192
Maryland	751,962,415
Massachusetts	1,347,084,093
Michigan	2,252,280,552
Minnesota	706,239,359
Mississippi	106,838,131
Missouri	1,114,993,503
Montana	85,184,257
Nebraska	323,448,439
Nevada	41,838,676
New Hampshire	85,443,960
New Jersey	1,272,223,662
New Mexico	55,320,140
New York	7,975,513,716
North Carolina	1,238,661,994
North Dakota	69,240,059
Ohio	2,665,707,099
Oklahoma	368,486,098
Oregon	316,843,556
Pennsylvania	3,222,789,299
Rhode Island	236,234,083
South Carolina	207,471,907
South Dakota	76,211,984
Tennessee	359,088,286
Texas	1,285,123,045
Utah	92,246,134
Vermont	46,900,540
Virginia	768,646,377
Washington	514,234,883
West Virginia	236,727,120
Wisconsin	799,502,105
Wyoming	38,988,288
Hawaii	108,177,887
Alaska	18,891,145
District of Columbia	394,273,739

Source: U. S. Bureau of Internal Revenue release of Aug. 26, 1948. (Jean C. Curtis, General Research Section, Feb. 18, 1949.)

TABLE 2.—*Per capita collections of internal revenue by the United States in the States and Territories, fiscal year 1948*

Alabama	$97
Arizona	126
Arkansas	63
California	309
Colorado	251
Connecticut	331
Delaware	1,105
Florida	167
Georgia	140
Idaho	151
Illinois	437
Indiana	259
Iowa	170
Kansas	206
Kentucky	277
Louisiana	138
Maine	145
Maryland	350
Massachusetts	286
Michigan	364

Minnesota	$240
Mississippi	50
Missouri	282
Montana	167
Nebraska	249
Nevada	295
New Hampshire	156
New Jersey	269
New Mexico	97
New York	554
North Carolina	333
North Dakota	124
Ohio	342
Oklahoma	156
Oregon	195
Pennsylvania	302
Rhode Island	316
South Carolina	104
South Dakota	122
Tennessee	114
Texas	178
Utah	141
Vermont	125
Virginia	254
Washington	207
West Virginia	124
Wisconsin	242
Wyoming	142
Hawaii	199
Alaska	141
District of Columbia	439

Source: Computed from data contained in press release of Bureau of Internal Revenue dated August 26, 1948. Population estimates used were the latest issued by the Bureau of the Census (July 1, 1948, for all States; July 1, 1947, for Hawaii; July 1, 1945, for Alaska). (Jean C. Curtis, General Research Section, February 18, 1949.)

Revision of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House by Mr. J. Milton Patterson, director, Maryland State Department of Public Welfare, in reference to the pending revision of the Social Security Act. Mr. Patterson, an outstanding citizen of Baltimore, has been director of the Maryland State Department of Public Welfare for 15 years and during that time has built up our welfare system in Maryland until it is one of the finest in the United States. His statement is as follows:

At the outset I want to emphasize my belief that among the most important legislation before the Congress is the extension of the old-age and survivors insurance system. I hope the day will come when we will have an insurance program that will almost wipe out the need for public assistance except in the way of services and temporary financial assistance.

The Maryland Legislature has been very explicit about granting assistance to able-bodied persons able to work, and funds have not been provided for this purpose except on a very temporary basis. I think there is a feeling in my State that employable people should be provided with employment, and that in our democratic way of life, they should not have to receive any part of their living from public assistance. That is the reason I believe in the extension of the insurance program, and I am hopeful that the leaders of this country in industry and in Government will never permit the American system again to go back to the granting of doles to people who want to work.

In relation to the propositions that are before the Congress for the improvement of the public-assistance programs, I would like to state that I have been a member of several committees of the American Public Welfare Association that have been working on this problem for several years. The recommendations that have resulted from that work are embodied very largely in the Public Welfare Act of 1949, incorporated in H. R. 2645, introduced by the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island.

In practically all of the studies that have been made it has been shown conclusively that a mistake was made in the original Social Security Act in making no provision for dependent children needing care in foster homes and for persons between the ages of 16 and 65 who are incapacitated or who for other valid reasons are not able to provide for themselves. These groups are just as much in need as those receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children or public assistance to the needy blind. It is for this reason that I have been one of the advocates of correcting this discriminatory situation by provision for those outside the realm of the present law.

Today I am presenting my views as director of the Maryland program and in relation to the laws that are on the statute books of Maryland which furnish the framework within which we operate our welfare program.

At the 1945 session of the Maryland Legislature a resolution was passed requesting the Maryland Representatives in the Congress to urge certain amendments to titles I, IV, and X of the Federal Social Security Act:

1. To make provision for general assistance to those in need who were not covered under the three categories now provided in the law.

2. To remove the maximum amounts that put a ceiling on grants to those receiving aid to dependent children.

3. To provide for uniform residence requirements.

4. To provide for reimbursement to the States for direct payments to doctors or hospitals for medical care.

5. To make uniform Federal matching of administrative costs by providing 50 percent of the cost of administration for all of the programs administered under titles I, IV, and X of the act.

Since that time the Maryland laws have been amended to provide that in the event that future Federal legislation shall require as a condition for Federal matching that the State plan include the items mentioned above, then the State would be able to take advantage of any such Federal changes with the effective dates of such Federal enactments.

There are two or three provisions in H. R. 2645 on which I would like to comment in relation to the Maryland program.

Section 1404, subsection (a) (4), if I understand it correctly, would make it mandatory that a State plan include "standards directed toward enabling each recipient to secure the essentials of living, including necessary expense for seeking and maintaining employment through assistance and his other income and resources." I believe that a lot of unnecessary work would have to be done at the Federal level to interpret these words, instead of leaving to the States the responsibility for setting standards for the basic items that should be included in any budget.

Subsection (a) (9) (A) of the same section requires the plan to include "methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis." I believe in the requirement of a good merit system as conducive to efficient administration of the program. I believe, however, that the Federal requirements should be established and used in order to recognize the existence of a good merit system that may already have been developed over many years covering all State departments within a given State; and that such a merit system can be tested in order to determine whether it does or does not essentially measure up to acceptable standards. I believe in the training for personnel necessary for efficient and effective administration of a program to carry out its full intent and purpose. I think, however, that a State should have freedom as to the way in which it carries out such training, so long as it is shown that the program is carried on efficiently and effectively by the persons who are employed therein.

Coming from a State that pays into the Federal Government considerably more money than it receives, I attach to this statement a chart showing the amount expended per inhabitant for public assistance payments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948. For instance, the United States average for old-age assistance was $7.20 per inhabitant. In Colorado it was $30.98, whereas in Maryland it was $2.12.

If the present law does not give the Federal agency some right to control these expenditures, then there should be authority vested in the agency to see that there is more uniformity in expenditures in order to control so much of the Federal money going into so few States because of the liberality of the program. There should be some middle ground. There is a question whether we can afford in this country a national program of public assistance for the aged at the rate it is administered in some of the States.

I am glad that the Congress is taking up immediately this very vital matter that affects the welfare of so many of the people of our own country. There are many who feel that it would be much better to spend more money that will result in a better way of life to human souls, than to spend more for destructive purposes or for the building of a superman that might destroy the American way of life.

Category	Maryland	National average
OAA	$2.12	$7.20
ADC	2.18	2.26
ATB	.09	.27
GPA	.89	1.27
Total	5.28	10.80

Our Social-Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial from the New Castle (Ind.) Courier-Times, issue of February 26:

OUR SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

In spite of all the criticism leveled at our social-security laws on the one hand and all of the attempts being made to extend them on the other, on the whole we have a rather sound, effective, and just set of laws on the subject.

The Courier-Times was a pioneer in the matter of social-security legislation. We were talking about the need of the country for social-security laws when the whole idea seemed as speculative as rocket service to the moon.

The intent of social-security legislation from the start was that the orphaned, the aged, the blind, those unemployed through no fault of their own, and others who were helpless might find aid; and that through the giving of such aid the economy of the Nation might be balanced in such a way that depressions would be forestalled.

Many of the present proposals to extend compensation under social security to unreasonable limits can be regarded only as an attempt by another pressure group to raid the Treasury. The truth about the social security set-up today is that compensation for the unemployed has gone as far as it can without encouraging idleness, while the aged and the orphaned who are truly our helpless, receive less than enough upon which to exist.

Our country can be strong and our standard of livin_ high only as we produce. If we are to produce, we not only must leave the incentive that will cause us as individuals to give back to society in service full value for what we receive, but there must be encouragement to invest savings to provide the means and machinery by which our production is kept at a high level.

Our social-security program is one of the soundest parts of our Nation. It has not yet undergone the supreme test of a depression. For the good of the country and our welfare as individuals, it ought not to be pushed to the point that the Nation is impoverished trying to support it, and the structure becomes so immense that it is weakened by its own weight.

A Union Man Looks at Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including a copy of a letter received from a constituent and an outstanding labor leader in my district. He discusses rent control and his ideas should be considered in any approach to imposing a continuance of rent control upon the American people:

FEBRUARY 23, 1949.

RACINE JOURNAL TIMES,
Racine, Wis.:

Within the past few days Federal Housing Expediter Tighe Woods has asked Congress to legislate a rent-control formula that would give landlords a fair return. There just ain't no such animal.

Bureaucrats, instead of dreaming up insoluble problems for Congress, ought to quit trying to perpetuate these miserable rent controls that are keeping 2-person families in 10-room homes and 10-person families in 2-room homes. The best way I know of for a bureaucrat to expedite housing is to go buy himself a saw and a hammer and start expediting.

There is no such thing as a legislatable fair price, a legislatable fair wage, or a legislatable fair rent. Fairness is not a matter of laws or averages, but of opinion—opinions of buyers and sellers. Hence there will be as many different opinions as to just what constitutes a fair price, a just wage or a fair rent as there are buyers and sellers and renters. Trade thrives best and a community is most prosperous when in its market place there is no irresistible compulsion against buyers and sellers. The only compulsion that is really irresistible is the force of government.

I should think that anyone, whatever his work may be, if he has any sense of fairness or justice at all, would agree that no one should be irresistibly forced to sell against his will.

Locally, as elsewhere, there are certain alleged labor leaders who want Federal rent controls continued. They are therein subscribing to the notion that it is proper for the government to force someone to give up his services for a government-set price. Would these same New Dealers protest if their dear Mr. Truman should use his inherent powers to set all union wage scales to, say, 50 cents an hour? Suppose that after you put up a squawk, Mr. Truman still declares that 50 cents per hour is a fair price for your work. Would that be fair?

We are all buyers and we are all sellers. Those who are wondering about rent controls ought to think that over carefully.

F. LEE DECHANT.

The Forgotten Man: The Small-Business Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, yielding to requests—and I am not too unwilling—I am putting into the RECORD, under consent heretofore granted, what I said about and to the forgotten man, the small-business man, who has made this country great.

In this speech, made on December 8, 1948, to a group of small-business men in Stowe, Vt., I was thinking out loud about the problems besetting the small-business man today. On March 1 the Bennington (Vt.) Banner carried an editorial commenting on and quoting my speech, and I am including that editorial herewith:

SOAK THE RICH

One of the unfortunate developments of the present day and generation is the widespread desire to get the best of anyone supposed to have money. In courts the juries almost always assess a heavier verdict against an insurance company than they do against an individual. The insurance company is supposed to be rich and has no friends. Of course the theory is wrong, but it is prevalent everywhere and affects the sale of real estate in a country town.

Small business is hit by the same theory. Folks have read in the newspapers about the vast profits made by some of the great business firms and get the idea that nearly all business is profitable, and that stores and factories make a lot of money. The reverse is true. Actually a few concerns make a lot of money and may be smart enough to prevent the Government getting the money away from them in taxes; but according to alleged experts, the net profit of business is less than 3 percent and, if railroads are included, the net profit is around 1½ percent.

A group of small-business men in a meeting in Stowe recently were addressed by Congressman PLUMLEY, and the following is a part of his brief talk:

Never before have the American people been so small-business conscious. This is an outstanding fact of wartime America, shared by those at home and in our armed services. Such widespread understanding of the role of small business in winning the war and in achieving a prosperous economy afterward, is our surest safeguard for continuing and perfecting our free, competitive enterprise system—the American way of life.

Reaching such a conviction is no wartime accident. Nor is it a passing fancy. Its roots are firmly embedded in the historic traditions and developments of these United States. It expresses the yearning of our people to make their own way independently, accorded by their government that equality of opportunity which is their birthright, under whose rules of the game they may become economically strong, even in an age of increasing concentration of economic power expressed in the form of giant corporations and mass production. It recognizes the tremendous social and economic force which small business has become in America. It demands that small business be preserved and strengthened by freeing it from all uneconomic hindrances, all unfair coercive practices, all unsound Government restraints.

Small business, as with other concepts which are universally understood and accepted in American thinking, eludes precise definition. Yet, whether measured in terms of sales, number of employees, assets, or type of management operation, people easily distinguish between small and large business. To them small business means a particular combination of social values, a pattern of civil life, a growing, free society, a healthy competitive business community. It is the small-business man, the individual enterpriser, the owner-operator who has become so closely identified with the many hundreds of villages and cities of this land that he is the very foundation of the home town's growth and development. He it is who starts from scratch to found a business, borrows and puts money into the local bank, develops the know-how and does the pioneering which generates so many of the plans upon which our phenomenal industrial structure has been reared, employs his fellow townsmen, supports the schools, churches and civic institutions. The whole community is traditionally stamped for good or ill by its small-business men—the town takes its character from their enterprise, thrift, and civic-mindedness.

So I am glad of this opportunity to talk to you representative small-business men of Stowe, and of Vermont, today.

I am not a pessimist nor an alarmist but I know as do the businessmen of America that no nation, no more than any individual can spend itself into a prosperity that is not unreal, effervescent, ephemeral, and self-destructive. A nation is but the aggregate of the individuals of which it is composed. That increased prosperity under and by virtue of which this Nation over the years became what it was prior to the New Deal did not originate in economic governmental planning nor enforced governmental regulation. The theory that relief and doles and farm subsidies produce genuine or lasting prosperity has been tested and failed so many times in days gone by as to have been exploded. No people ever did or can spend itself into properity, I say again.

Genuine prosperity stems not from increased consumption, superinduced by grants, of the taxpayers' own hard-earned money, to himself, but by increased production, which is to say, by the encouragement of private enterprise, individual initiative and the growth of small businesses.

The sound and continuous growth of this country, which made it great finds the reason for its being in the constant influx into the economic system of new enterprises which put one man to work, then two men, then hundreds of men—then hundreds of thousands of men, not in governmental in-

terference with a man's business from the "diaper to the shroud."

There is nothing which so completely discourages and retards the growth of private business as government interference, competition, regulation and the incident strangulation of the individual who would gladly risk his capital to furnish employment, to pay wages, to distribute the proceeds of the pay envelope to all worth-while causes.

The Government under New Deal policies with its unnecessary restrictions, its red tape, its persecutory programs, has retarded the investment of money in private enterprise in the development of new industries, the while it has insisted there should be no relief of or from the tax burden the people bear.

That which gives me greatest concern looking forward to a continuation of the New Deal program is the outspoken hostility, in many Government departments, to the development of private industry. There are too many men in high places whose real intent and purpose and desire is to change our system to a form of State socialism, while they spread a doctrine of hopelessness about the future of private enterprise, condemn those who have insisted upon the continuance of the policies which have made the country great; call themselves liberals—when in fact their program is as radical, iconoclastic and anarchistic as any of those which in days of old buried five civilizations, which followed substantially the program they outline for us to undertake—to continue to our own destruction.

The Government should keep out of business to the limit.

Regulation of private business should be reduced to a minimum.

The wage-hour laws should be continued substantially as set up in the Taft-Hartley Act. There should be no repeal of it. There should be no return to the Wagner Act under which little business cannot survive.

The idea of Government regulation of wages is repugnant to our theory of government and contrary to any collective bargaining theory. There should be plenty of head room between the floor and the ceiling for the initiation, development, and growth of new industries and small business everywhere in these United States. The law, with slight amendments, provides such room today.

Small business asks for no subsidy; contemplates no raid on the Treasury; demands no special favors, privileges, or advantages. It asks to be let alone.

It asks for just consideration, equal opportunity, reasonable credit facilities, fair taxation, fair competitive standards, the elimination of the unfair and unequal methods of competition and monopolistic practices the small-business man, under the New Deal, has been compelled to face, and some certain definite assurance that it shall have a fair return for the risk it assumes, that is to say a right to operate at a reasonable profit.

All these it should have. All these it must have, and soon.

It is strange but too true that the neglect of the problems of the small-business enterprises contributed very largely to the wrecking of the economic situation and democracy, as it is known in Europe.

We should not tolerate the same mistake. We must not let such a catastrophe happen here.

However, "the question forever arises," said Froude, "how far the unwise should be governed by the wise; how far society should be protected against the eccentricity of fools, and fools be protected against themselves."

One answer to the question Froude asks is found in the historic statement of Abraham Lincoln to the effect that "while you may fool all of the people some of the time, and some of the people all of the time, you cannot fool all of the people all of the time." The quicker all of the people realize, as some 22 million of them did at the recent election, that they are being led into a fool's paradise, the sooner the problems which now confront, confuse and confound small business, will be satisfactorily solved.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 3 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, chairman of Spokesmen for Children, Inc., dealing with the school-lunch program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPOKESMEN FOR CHILDREN, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 17, 1949.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: We understand the usual amount of $75,000,000 for school lunches will be included in the agricultural appropriations bill when it comes before the Senate this spring. In view of the increased enrollment due to the thousands of war babies who entered school last autumn and those who will swell the ranks this autumn, we believe the grant should be increased to $100,000,000.

We prepared the enclosed fact sheet to show what percentage of the children benefited by school lunches a year ago and how great a share of the cost was borne by the people voluntarily. Although the law at the present time only requires funds to be matched dollar for dollar, almost every State is contributing more, some States six times more. With several hundred thousand more children entering school this autumn the need will be much greater and it is apparent that an increase in the appropriation to $100,000,000 will be necessary, if the need is to be met adequately.

The popularity of school lunches is due to the desire common to most of us to see American children well-nourished or at least assured of one square meal a day.

The Senate has always supported this popular program and we ask that you give serious consideration to the need for a larger appropriation.

We are interested to know your thinking on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MARY H. OXHOLM, *Chairman.*
(Mrs. Theodor Oxholm.)

Facts about the national school-lunch program, 1947–48

[All figures from the U. S. Department of Agriculture]

State	Percent of children participating	Percent of schools participating	State appropriation	Matching funds from sources within State[1]	Federal indemnity	Number of schools aided by sec. 32[2]	Number of schools aided by sec. 6[2]
Alabama	29.2	29.5	$130,000	$6,199,759	$2,185,523	1,723	1,233
Arizona	27.0	28.7	17,525	1,485,406	323,497	203	165
Arkansas	29.7	20.6	24,550	3,395,512	1,431,269	869	554
California	19.0	37.4	99,271	9,309,631	1,970,097	1,201	1,039
Colorado	18.8	13.9	14,650	1,010,220	436,517	309	313
Connecticut	17.5	29.9	12,440	1,461,830	448,492	28	98
Delaware	22.4	23.7	4,400	1,123,079	78,464	66	59
Florida	33.3	31.2	[3] 32,320	3,508,893	880,943	829	759
Georgia	32.6	27.7	48,000	6,464,864	2,179,467	2,154	1,111
Idaho	27.0	20.6	7,500	696,655	219,552	237	237
Illinois	22.5	19.1	1,347,000	12,697,703	2,122,655	1,709	1,188
Indiana	20.4	25.8	67,500	2,708,481	1,216,597	822	708
Iowa	22.8	9.3	37,000	2,329,295	855,517	665	660
Kansas	15.0	9.3	19,372	1,638,879	632,398	575	567
Kentucky	27.7	16.2	16,800	3,714,651	1,847,063	1,356	1,515
Louisiana	28.3	35.4	513,734	3,090,422	1,505,867	1,036	1,010
Maine	18.8	23.0	14,250	1,102,996	332,939	270	304
Maryland	24.8	38.9	16,980	2,708,232	617,304	699	439
Massachusetts	25.8	57.1	65,000	6,789,608	1,106,543	542	511
Michigan	19.9	14.3		7,045,093	1,833,812	855	751
Minnesota	26.1	14.7	25,000	3,040,234	994,184	820	662
Mississippi	26.0	20.8	[4] 63,435	3,775,397	1,740,903	1,128	1,146
Missouri	19.8	16.0	20,000	4,123,673	1,347,876	888	755
Montana	19.3	10.1	[4] 20,000	526,082	179,347	171	161
Nebraska	16.7	5.7	19,000	980,029	454,044	316	266
Nevada	18.6	18.7	[4] 18,500	151,268	43,436	52	48
New Hampshire	25.4	17.4	8,731	435,361	190,656	44	55
New Jersey	17.6	43.9	22,300	3,254,105	1,106,752	572	553
New Mexico	16.1	21.7	18,437	552,090	278,168	308	191
New York	23.1	26.7	2,500,000	19,867,350	2,850,867	1,946	2,060
North Carolina	27.4	25.7	71,852	7,010,909	2,584,366	1,378	1,200
North Dakota	23.3	13.4	10,320	370,053	219,055	158	199
Ohio	16.5	22.5	32,500	10,419,030	2,119,875	1,391	1,140
Oklahoma	22.8	31.8	185,500	3,368,029	1,138,814	1,429	1,461
Oregon	23.0	27.2	18,045	1,960,270	348,815	518	459
Pennsylvania	12.4	17.9	[4] 90,000	5,661,264	2,230,421	640	552
Rhode Island	16.3	39.6	90,000	723,890	214,436	78	69
South Carolina	33.0	34.4	258,780	5,394,245	1,596,273	3,076	1,208
South Dakota [5]							
Tennessee	25.4	27.4	35,000	5,425,759	1,756,409	1,891	1,623
Texas	19.8	24.5	27,380	9,505,103	3,333,157	2,377	1,982
Utah	32.7	52.7	200,000	2,149,553	301,606	274	274
Vermont	25.1	28.0	16,300	520,299	139,493	335	376
Virginia	23.6	24.1	40,000	5,362,033	1,521,067	1,057	912
Washington	24.4	41.8	[6]	3,187,108	507,800	701	692
West Virginia	21.8	27.2	105,500	2,648,948	1,165,312	1,264	1,264
Wisconsin	19.8	16.5	42,000	2,557,239	1,086,286	808	721
Wyoming	23.1	23.0	11,500	353,167	100,292	98	100

[1] "Matching funds from sources within State" indicates penny milk, lunchroom sales, contributions by organizations and State appropriations. While figures for 1946-47 are latest available, provisional reports indicate States did equally well in 1947-48.

[2] Secs. 6 and 32 of the Agricultural Act allow for distribution of fresh and dried fruits, fruit juices, canned fruits and vegetables, fish flakes, cheese, peanut butter, jam, dried eggs, nut meats.

[3] Local, $475,000.

[4] Biennial appropriation.

[5] Not in program this year.

[6] Amount unspecified.

The Vegetable Kingdom Versus the Mineral Kingdom in the World of Finance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in response to a unique and interesting brochure that has come to the desk of the Members of Congress entitled "Americanism Honest and Free," I include the first paragraph here with my reply:

AMERICANISM HONEST AND FREE

FARMINGTON, CONN., *February 12, 1949*

FELLOW AMERICANS: Your money or your life? Which? What good is your money? The more you make, the less of it you can keep. If you save it, you lose it. Your Government, like a thief, while you sleep, steals it by Marxist taxation, steals its value by inflation, steals your freedom by socialization. Can we ever make government honest again? Yes, we can—but you will have to help.

Yours, in truth,

E. S. HALL,
Connecticut Yankee in King Harry's Court, Working for You and the Vast Majority.

REPLY

TO A CONNECTICUT YANKEE AT KING HARRY'S COURT, INCLUDING ALL THE FINANCIAL BARONS THAT SEEM TO HAVE GOVERNMENT FAVOR:

DEAR CONNECTICUT YANKEE: When the Yankees of Connecticut came into the Union the United States of America had good money, current with the merchant and acceptable all over the world. There was no price on gold and no price on silver—27 grains of standard gold was a dollar and 416 (that ratio was later changed) grains of standard silver was a dollar, both gold and silver were legal tender in payment of all dues, public and private—the price of all other commodities, including labor and service, adjusted themselves to the value of the dollar—the price level of that day was stable because the continued increase in the volume of gold and silver coined into money by the mint kept pace with the growth of population and commerce, estimated to approximate 3 percent annually. There never has been a better money system devised in any country—it is true using the paper equivalents of the gold and silver coins for circulation purposes was safe, stable, and more convenient. In later years competition grew up in the money world between the vegetable and mineral kingdoms. The inflow of paper currency manufactured by the Bureau of Engraving from an unlimited supply of vegetable fiber and green ink controlled in volume by the exigencies of the Government and the demands of the banks under a managed currency system with limitless possibilities of inflation and interest yield to the banking concessionaries. This new kind of money came into competition with the old tried and true money system embracing the coinage of the precious metals, gold and silver, that supplied a volume of money in circulation automatically regulated by the inflow of new dollars coined from mine output of the precious metal.

The answer to your question, "Can we ever make our Government honest again?" is "yes," by returning to the money system our country had when your State of Connecticut came into the Union—bimetalism that provided for the unlimited coinage of all the gold and silver brought to the mint will give to the people an honest monetary system, the foundation of honest government dealings.

Protection Against Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, most timely now as committee hearings on the oleo bill proceed is the following letter which I have received. It comes from Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, and I believe it clearly points out the necessity of legislation along the proposal of the Andresen bill, rather than the Rivers and Poage bills. So that my colleagues too may read the views of Mr. Button on this important subject, I include the following letter in today's RECORD:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., February 28, 1949.

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: Efforts now being made to repeal all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine present extremely serious implications to the consumer, to the dairy industry, and to all citizens of the Nation.

Those who are interested in the long-range aspect of the matter, question the logic of a Congress that appropriates many millions of dollars for a program designed to preserve the priceless heritage of soil fertility, and simultaneously considers the adoption of legislation that will change our Nation's agriculture from a grassland animal-husbandry structure, to a row-crop soil-depleting type of agriculture that will inevitably destroy our irreplaceable top soil. The problem is basic and serious, and it must be given major consideration by all statesmen of Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is charged by statute with the duty of protecting consumers against fraudulent advertising and imitations. In this capacity it is our contention that the advertising of yellow oleomargarine with pictures of cattle, dairy barns, and pasture scenes, accompanied by phrases and slogans designed to make the consumer believe oleomargarine is a dairy product is a direct, intentional, and flagrant violation of the fraudulent advertising statute.

The United States Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have refused to give attention to this problem or are powerless to cope with it.

The oleomargarine industry has sought and received permission to imitate, synthetically or otherwise, the desirable qualities of butter. They are now imitating the distinctive butter flavor and texture, they are adding synthetic vitamins, they are packaging their product in cartons similar to those used by the butter industry, and have appropriated for themselves the age-old butter trade-mark, its yellow color. These facts indicate that oleomargarine was developed and is being marketed as an imitation product. Historically, this Nation has protected consumers against such deceptive imitation.

For many years new legislation has been designed to provide additional protection against fraud and imitation to the consumer. This policy has been extended to include the interests of the producer and manufacturer.

Now great forces are at work to destroy this protection that we have taken for granted. The oleomargarine industry is asking that the controls against imitation and fraud that now exist in other industries be removed from its particular product.

In the main, other nations of the world maintain the consumer controls that the oleomargarine industry is attempting to avoid in the United States. Some nations maintain a tax or fee as we do. Some enforce the statutes relating to fair trade practices in labeling and advertising. Some require the addition of ingredients that will make identification immediately possible for the consumer. Some have controlled the matter through the establishment of a State monopoly which has removed the opportunity for unreasonable profits. Some do not permit the manufacture of yellow oleomargarine. Still others protect the consumer by rigid and arbitrary price-fixing schedules.

To summarize, the methods vary but other nations do afford consumer protection. We are looking to you and your associates in the Eighty-first Congress for legislation that is in keeping with the principles and traditions of consumer protection.

Sincerely yours,

MILTON H. BUTTON,
Director.

The Rankin Pension Bill

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, how much will the Rankin pension bill cost?

The answer to this question is of concern to Members of this House—equal concern to veterans.

After some difficulty, I have managed to obtain an estimate from the Veterans' Administration. They advise me that the total cost, during the next 50 years, will be an approximate $109,000,000,000. Their figures take into consideration, rather generously, the fact that 10 percent of the eligible veterans are not expected to apply and make allowance for the duplication of existing and future disability claims.

It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the committee, and particularly the chairman of the committee, which reported this legislation has done more to confuse the issue of total cost than it has to clarify it.

The printed hearings, for instance, contain not one word concerning the cost of H. R. 2681. The committee report, for instance, contains only a short statement concerning the estimated first

year's cost of two sections of the bill. We have no evidence to show that the committee which reported this measure had any idea as to its total cost.

On the contrary, a week after the bill had been reported, the chairman of the committee took the floor to present the official estimate of the Veterans' Administration. During the course of his remarks, the chairman was careful to minimize the official estimate by a series of statements which fail to stand up when the footnotes to the official estimate, which he failed to insert, are taken into consideration. The next day, the committee issued an analysis of the bill, including the table and its footnotes, but again failed to provide an estimate of total cost.

In view of the chairman's constant attempts to belittle the total cost of this measure, and in view of the committee's reluctance to give us a clear constructive analysis of the cost of this measure, I am including as part of my remarks a clarifying correspondence I have had with the Veterans' Administration, as well as the complete table referred to earlier:

FEBRUARY 25, 1949.

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.
Administrator of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.

Re analysis of H. R. 2681.

DEAR MR. GRAY: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24, on page 1498, there appears a projected cost estimate of H. R. 2681, prepared by your Department. It is included as part of the remarks of Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. A copy is enclosed for your information.

I would sincerely appreciate receiving from you the following:

1. A copy of the report of your Administration concerning the projected cost of H. R. 2681 as it was submitted to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2. An explanation of the factors taken into consideration in arriving at your projected cost estimate.

3. An analysis as to the accuracy of the following remarks of Mr. RANKIN in reference to your cost analysis:

"When you deduct * * * the amount some of these veterans would receive under old-age pension laws in the various States and the amount many of them would be receiving under other veterans' laws for various disabilities, the amount would be reduced far below the estimate of $2,000,000,000 for the year 1980."

"In 1995 the total number of veterans living, it is estimated, will be only 5,810,000."

"The peak cost will be reached in the year 1990 when the cost, it is estimated, will be not more than $4,446,000,000. And this is not taking into consideration the deductions just referred to from State old-age pensions and disability compensation."

"Then let me remind the House again that from these totals must be deducted the amounts that would be paid these men in old-age pensions in the various States, and also the compensations that would be paid to disabled veterans under other pension laws.

4. An estimate of the total cost of the measure for the years 1950 through 2000. This is to establish the accuracy of the following remark of Mr. RANKIN:

"The total cost of this measure will, of course, nowhere approximate the reckless figure of $150,000,000,000 given by the so-called American Veterans' Committee. That exaggerated estimate appears to have been manufactured for propaganda purposes."

5. Any revised estimate or other information pertaining to the projected cost of H. R. 2681.

If the computation of any of the above information which I have requested will seriously delay the forwarding to me of a substantial part of the remainder, I would sincerely appreciate receiving the information requested as it becomes available rather than in its entirety.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 1, 1949.

Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: This is in reply to your letter of February 25, 1949, requesting information concerning estimates of cost furnished the Committee on Veterans' Affairs by the Veterans' Administration on H. R. 2681, Eighty-first Congress, "A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes," and an analysis as to the accuracy of certain statements made by the chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, page 1498, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 24, 1949.

The information requested is furnished in the categorical form presented in your letter.

"1. A copy of the report of your Administration concerning the projected cost of H. R. 2681 as it was submitted to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

Comment: The projected cost of H. R. 2681, as furnished the committee, is identical as to dollar amounts with the tabulation (including footnotes) of estimated cost appearing on the reverse side of the enclosed committee print. In this connection reference is made to columns 2 and 4 of the printed tabulation which has to do with the number of veterans. It should be stated for the year 1950 the figures 69,700 veterans of World War I and 5,300 veterans of World War II represent the estimated number of veterans affected in the estimated cost. However, the remaining figures as to numbers of veterans in columns 2 and 4 represent the estimated number of eligible living veterans and not the estimated number of veterans affected in the estimated cost given. In other words, columns 2 and 4 were added by the committee from previous statements furnished them, but the Veterans' Administration gave the estimated numbers affected only for the year 1950. The numbers of veterans, therefore, appearing in columns 2 and 4, with the exception of the year 1950, would be reduced by the factors indicated in the footnotes to the table.

"2. An explanation of the factors taken into consideration in arriving at your projected cost estimate."

Comment: For an explanation of the factors taken into consideration in estimating the cost, reference is made to the footnotes following the printed table of estimated cost.

"3. An analysis as to the accuracy of the following remarks of Mr. RANKIN in reference to your cost analysis."

First quoted paragraph reads as follows:

"When you deduct * * * the amount some of these veterans would receive under old-age pension laws in the various States and the amount many of them would be receiving under other veterans' laws for various disabilities, the amount would be reduced far below the estimate of $2,000,000,000 for the year 1980."

Comment: The cost estimate includes only the additional benefits provided by H. R. 2681 in excess of the estimated compensation, pension and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration under existing legislation.

Second quoted paragraph reads as follows:

"In 1995 the total number of veterans living, it is estimated, will be only 5,810,000."

Comment: The figure of 5,810,000 is the estimated total living veterans age 65 or more with sufficient service to be entitled under proposed legislation (total estimated living veterans in 1995 is approximately 11,979,000). Some of the 18,800,000 veterans referred to would not live to age 65 to benefit under proposed legislation, others would benefit at one time or another yet pass away before 1995, others would lack requisite service for entitlement, and still others would probably elect to benefit under other legislation instead of under proposed legislation.

Third quoted paragraph reads as follows:

"The peak cost will be reached in the year 1990 * * * when the cost, it is estimated, will be not more than $4,446,000,000. And this is not taking into consideration the deductions just referred to from State old-age pensions and disability compensation."

Comment: As indicated above, the cost estimate—approximately $4,446,000,000 in 1990—has already taken into consideration the deductions for disability compensation, but not any deductions from State old-age pensions.

Fourth quoted paragraph reads as follows:

"Then let me remind the House again that from these totals must be deducted the amounts that would be paid these men in old-age pensions in the various States, and also the compensations that would be paid to disabled veterans under other veterans' laws."

Comment: As indicated above, these totals have already had the deductions made for the compensations or pensions that would be paid to disabled veterans by the Veterans' Administration under other laws.

"4. An estimate of the total cost of the measure for the years 1950 through 2000. This is to establish the accuracy of the following remarks of Mr. RANKIN: 'The total cost of this measure will, of course, nowhere nearly approximate * * * the reckless figure of $150,000,000,000 given by the so-called American Veterans Committee. That exaggerated estimate appears to have been manufactured for propaganda purposes'."

Comment: It is not possible in such limited time to prepare an exact estimate of cost of proposed measure for the years 1950 through 2000. However, the sum of the cost for each fifth year as printed on page 1530 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 24, 1949, if multiplied by five would give the approximate magnitude of the total cost from 1950 through 2000. Such calculations would result in an approximate cost of $109,000,000,000. It would therefore appear that the quoted figure of $150,000,000,000, as the total cost of the measure, is high.

"5. Any revised estimate or other information pertaining to the projected cost of H. R. 2681."

Comment: No revisable estimate or other information, except as follows, is available.

With reference to sections 3 and 6 of the bill which would liberalize the income limitation for death pension purposes, World War I and World War II, and as to World War II death pension, remove the requirement of service-connected disability at time of death, no estimate of cost has been made.

Sincerely yours,

CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrator.

Estimated cost

[Prepared by Veterans' Administration]

Year [1]	World War I		World War II		Total cost
	Number of veterans	Cost	Number of veterans	Cost	
1950	69,709	$56,813,000	5,300	$5,598,000	$62,411,000
1955	413,069	330,697,899	11,246	9,296,234	339,994,133
1960	1,270,920	993,832,644	29,271	25,089,622	1,018,922,266
1965	1,915,653	1,472,603,256	132,889	109,775,942	1,582,379,198
1970	1,350,804	1,004,418,166	345,619	280,880,444	1,285,298,610
1975	771,192	555,336,245	970,026	779,337,251	1,334,673,496
1980	343,248	246,495,914	1,919,059	1,508,131,052	1,754,626,966
1985	110,617	79,437,406	3,661,047	2,844,203,127	2,923,640,533
1990	23,240	16,688,484	5,757,437	4,429,355,363	4,446,043,847
1995	2,567	1,842,343	5,807,926	4,389,880,795	4,391,723,138
2000			3,694,425	2,697,919,441	2,697,919,441

[1] Figures are for the year specified and not 5-year totals.

NOTES

1. This estimate includes cost of:
   (a) Cases of veterans age 65 or more not otherwise entitled.
   (b) Increase in payments to veterans age 65 or more entitled under existing legislation to non-service-connected pension.
   (c) Increase in payments to veterans age 65 or more entitled under existing legislation to service-connected compensation.
   (d) Payments to those veterans in need of regular aid and attendance.
2. This estimate is based upon the following assumptions. (These assumptions cannot be proved, but are believed most valid as a basis for presenting a long-range estimate):
   (a) The number and age distribution of living veterans is based upon official Veterans' Administration estimated living veterans.
   (b) Data in 1948 revealed that of the estimated living World War I veterans aged 75 or more, 26 percent of them were on the non-service-connected pension rolls; aged 70 to 74, 20 percent on such rolls; aged 65 to 69, 17 percent; and progressively lower percents at lower age groups. It is assumed that basically the same percents of the living in each age group will, for both World War I and II, be entitled at future dates under existing legislation.
   (c) Based upon World War I and World War II history to date, it is assumed that 8 percent of the living World War I veterans, and 10.5 percent of the living World War II veterans will be on the service-connected compensation rolls at future dates, and their age distribution will be the same as that for all living veterans of that war.
   (d) It is assumed that 7 percent of the World War I veterans on the non-service-connected rolls will be entitled to the $120 rate for regular aid and attendance. It is assumed that by 1975 the World War II proportion so entitled will also be 7 percent, with lower percents so entitled in earlier years.
   (e) It is assumed that because of an unusually high degree of patriotic feeling, or because of unwillingness to accept a gratuity, or because of lack of knowledge of their entitlement, that at all times, 10 percent of the eligible veterans will not apply for nor receive any benefit to which they would be entitled under proposed legislation

The Farmer and the Planned Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in Human Events on February 23, 1949, written by Mr. James A. McConnell, a farmer of up-State New York, who is general manager of the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation, Inc.:

THE FARMER AND THE PLANNED ECONOMY

(By James A. McConnell)

Out on the farms, we hear the echoes of a rumbling debate in Congress. One group of legislators is for price supports at straight 90 percent of parity. Another is for a flexible system of price supports at a lower range. All of this is sharpened by the recent breaks in the commodity markets. But the real question is far broader than merely the size or range of price support for a given crop.

After World War I, beginning in 1920, the bottom fell out of prices and the farmers of this country slid down into a nightmare of distress and bankruptcy. Nor was that the first such experience. They had been through it three times before, each time following a great war. Deflation invariably hits the farmer first and hardest.

When World War II broke out, recollection of the last postwar agricultural trouble was fresh in mind. So when the Government again called upon the farmer for all-out production, Congress took pains to assure him of stop-loss price supports which should be in force for at least 2 years after the war.

Moreover, the Government arbitrarily held food prices down, during the war, at the same time subsidizing consumers. So the wartime origin of price supports seemed to have double-barrelled justification. Then, too, people say that we can't afford to jeopardize the national food supply by allowing unduly low prices to discourage production.

By last year the policy had gone beyond a mere matter of wartime or postwar insurance. Farmers looked about the world and noted the system of subsidies building up on all sides. The really efficient producers saw themselves being penalized by economic arrangements that put a premium on inefficiency and on curtailed production. They had seen labor and business and industry beginning to orient themselves within a kind of socialistic system—large groups even voting, time after time, for more of the same. And now the mass of farmers, too, had enjoyed a real taste of manna from Washington. It tasted as good to them as to others.

To make a long story short, the farmer—for all his individuality—began to get thoroughly entangled in the system of bureaucratic dispensation, whereby the Government extracts wealth from the people and redistributes it to producing groups in accordance with plans and formulas of its own devising. It is the managed economy, so-called, but it is actually modern camouflage for a despotic system as old as time.

II

It is only fair to note that the farmer's part in this picture is not entirely of his own choosing. He is now in a small minority.

There are some five and one-half million farm operators, all told, in this country today, against 16,000,000 labor-union members, for instance. There are some 2,000,000 heavily producing, efficiently operated farms which produce about 85 percent of the marketable food of the Nation. There are some three and a half million other farms. So the producers of food for market are really a minority within a minority. Labor and industry and other large groups rule the roost and the farmer figures that he has to come along, if he is to survive.

But the very fact of his minority position gives the farmer something to ponder, as he sees himself being drawn into a socialistic system. And the American farmer is doing considerable thinking right now. He is slowly discovering certain facts about the controlled economy which rightly make him dubious, notwithstanding the temporary purse appeal of these hand-outs from Washington.

The farmer has discovered, among other things, that governmentally planned economy is always the enemy of the efficient producers. Its efforts, under pressure of the greater numbers, usually penalize the efficient; are usually exerted in behalf of the less efficient. The dictators of the managed economy would certainly gage their decisions with an eye to the three and a half million rather than the 2,000,000.

The managed economy is a system governed by political pressures rather than by the rational influences of free markets. Government officials are responsive to pressure groups. Their decisions must be trimmed at all times to please the largest group or the heaviest pressures. With his farm business at the mercy of pressure-group politicians, the efficient farmer finds himself stripped of the rightful advantage given by skill and good management. One recalls that the Russian despots liquidated their best farmers and started over.

By this same token the bureaucratic system itself is inefficient. The official, or the planning committee, can never act with as good judgment as comes from the composite decision of millions of farmers, expressed through free markets. There, mistakes of judgment constantly occur, but are almost instantly corrected. When the bureaucrat makes a mistake it may take months and an overwhelming protest sentiment to get it corrected. The controlled market is often deliberately disadvantageous to the producer, because consumers have more votes.

Eventually it becomes necessary for the bureaucrats to employ coercion against producers. In every piece of legislation brought forward to implement a system of this kind, the coercive powers of government are written prominently into it. The police state is never more than one jump behind the planned economy.

III

The managed or controlled economy is the enemy, not only of all independent production, but also of all private handling of either crops or supplies by the individual farmer. If the farmer can dispose of his own products as he sees fit, or can buy his own supplies where and as he chooses, the principle of central control cannot be maintained. So the bureaucrats take the farmer's product, do all the storing and handling of it and allocate machinery, feed, fertilizer, and supplies. That's substantially the way it works today in democratic England.

The moment central control is substituted for the decisions of the free market, regulation of production becomes a clumsy alternation of stop and go. One moment the bureaucrat uses the taxing power to offer a subsidy to stimulate production. The next moment he is employing the coercive powers of government to put the brakes on production. Either way the people foot the bill.

There simply is no substitute for free prices as the efficient regulator of production and consumption. Rising prices automatically stimulate production and curtail consumption. When prices fall, the effect is just the opposite. A great function of the price mechanism is to guide production and consumption. Subsidies destroy this function. Then the planners step in and substitute their own judgment, using more subsidies and coercion to carry out their will. Meanwhile, the real equating of supply and demand goes on in black markets. In every regimented economy the black market is standard equipment.

Can American farmers, on purely economic grounds, afford a system that is governed, in the last analysis, by pressure groups? Agriculture has only 19 percent of the population now and its relative position is declining. Great industrial and labor groups are rapidly becoming dominant. Already the farmer is in danger of a permanently tighter squeeze on the costs side than ever before. In free markets he can fairly well protect himself, in normal times.

But under a Government-controlled system, the farmer is bound, by reason of his minority status, to get the short end of the stick.

IV

We who live in the Northeast are aware that this minority position becomes double precarious for farmers in our region. We are only a segment of a minority. Northeastern farmers do have the great advantage of nearness to big markets. In free and open competition that fact alone is a strong bulwark. But with a Government-controlled agriculture, the location advantage of northeastern farms could quickly be wiped out by a readjustment of freight rates and other differentials. And by the same means other regions might just as easily find themselves injured.

But the stakes, East or West, North or South, are higher than the dollar sign. The American farmer for over a century and a half has been one of the truly free men of the world, and it is as such that he has become the most efficient producer of food and fiber in all history.

Our farm tradition is one of independence, of individualism, of unshackled personal and intellectual vigor. This is not a heritage easily come by, nor one to be lightly tossed away under the inspiration of some smart partisan of totalitarian government.

A wonderful measure of individual liberty and of the personal dignity that goes with it have been attained in this country. They represent the fruits of centuries of struggle by our forefathers against despotic systems. We would do well to think long and hard before we yield an inch of this hard-won achievement.

This is the social stake. The moment we allow government to put our economic system under full bureaucratic control, that moment we turn back the clock of progress within our society. The drift toward statism is an easy road, a pleasant one in the early stages, of public hand-outs and promises. And as surely as we follow it, our children's children will be serfs of the state.

Farmers can tolerate minor distortions of the free economy and live with them. Moderate price supports which operate as stop-loss insurance during abnormal readjustment periods—as after a great war—may even steady the ship and be helpful. But if regimentation were fastened upon us as a permanent system it would be intolerable. If we are to have price supports, they should be flexible and moderate. They must not be made the excuse for a system of controlled production, which is the stepping stone to despotism.

For a Mess of Pottage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am including a newspaper report of a statement I made on November 14, to which some folks who had fooled the farmers with promises took forceful exception.

The truth is it took no prophetic vision to foresee what was going to happen and, in fact, has happened, as appears from the following statement of J. A. Livingston, in the Washington Post of February 11, 1949.

The account of the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of my warning to Vermont farmers follows:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of November 15, 1948]

PLUMLEY WARNS FARMERS TO PUT HOUSE IN ORDER—TELLS WASHINGTON COUNTY GROUP PRICES ARE GOING TO DROP

NORTHFIELD, November 14.—Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY last night warned Washington County farmers that there is a growing feeling among nonagricultural groups that "agriculture is largely responsible for high prices." He urged each to "put his house in order against the storm that is brewing."

Representative PLUMLEY was speaking at an informal meeting of farmers. He said he was unable to take so optimistic a view of the immediate future for farmers as does Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN.

SAYS PRICE TO FALL

Figures submitted to him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for Agriculture, he said, indicate that "farm prices are headed downward from 20 to 40 percent, incidentally involving the lowering of the parity level now flexible between 60 and 90."

The proposed Truman program, he continued, "contemplates amendments to the Aiken-Hope bill which will have it hardly recognizable by its authors, and will do agriculture no good."

ISSUES WARNING

"Those folks who voted for Truman in order to enjoy present prosperity are liable to realize that subsidies and support for prices come out of the people who are already bled white and cannot always supply the wherewithal. That day is not so far off as some think it is."

Representative PLUMLEY said, "The nonagricultural groups are already charging that agriculture is largely responsible for high prices, maintained and sustained by the subsidies and supports of which they complain. Right or wrong, if that theory assumes tidal-wave proportions, and it is gaining size and force every day in spite of everything said to the contrary, it will make it necessary for farmers to be very cautious about overextension and overexpansion, to say the least.

"The figures I have examined and accompanying statements definitely show a trend toward a day of reckoning involving the necessity for every wise farmer to put his house in order against the storm that is brewing."

"That is the way I see it," PLUMLEY concluded. "I may be wrong, but I am afraid I am not."

I quote Mr. Livingston's article below:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of February 11, 1949]

BOOM SERVED FARMER FIRST, DEFLATION SERVES HIM DITTO

(By J. A. Livingston)

The breaks in wheat, corn, hogs, and other commodity prices make this much clear: The farmer's postwar boom is over. And, as a corollary, his squeeze is on.

Already, seven major agricultural products are down 35 percent from their postwar highs. And even if the decline goes no further, the net income of farmers in 1949—the money farmers will have to spend on tractors, combines, automobiles, electrification, housing, clothing, and other of the gentler things of living—will shrink perhaps 17 percent.

High postwar costs began to close in on farm prosperity last year. Because of bumper crops and high prices, gross farm income was up $900,000,000 to a record high of $35,600,000,000. But farm expenses went up more—from sixteen and nine-tenths to eighteen and two-tenths billion dollars or one and three-tenths billions. Result: Farm operators ended up with $400,000,000 less net income—seventeen and four-tenths billions as against seventeen and eight-tenths.

The rush of selling has carried an important cash crop, such as wheat, as much as 33 percent from its postwar high; steers, 40 percent; cotton, 19 percent. The following table makes clear that the record-breaking cash receipts of 1948 are improbable in 1949:

Product	High price	Recent price	Percent decline
Wheat (bushel)	$3.115	$2.080	33.2
Corn (bushel)	2.808	1.129	59.8
Hogs (hundredweight)	31.200	20.000	35.9
Steers (hundredweight)	36.375	21.500	40.9
Cotton (pound)	.394	.318	19.3
Barley (bushel)	2.755	1.310	52.5
Wool (tops) (pound)	2.015	1.640	18.6

Causes of the declines vary. In corn, lack of storage space caused liquidation. In wheat, most of the 1948 harvest had been sold or borrowed against, so Government support of the market was not heavy. In hogs and cattle, prices had been high—relative to consumer purchasing power. Now, the wholesale price and the retail pocketbook for meat will be in closer alinement and Government support buying is likely to check the drop in cotton.

Prices now prevailing in the cash and future markets for major products are not indicative of what the farmer will receive during 1949. Government support suggests an upswing before the marketing season gets under way—unless, of course, weather is superfavorable, and harvests are unusually big. But at the moment, over-all farm production is expected to be somewhat below last year.

That will squeeze the farmer. For prices will be down, too, and gross farm income could easily shrink 10 percent. To be sure, production costs will be off. A smaller volume of crops and livestock requires less hired manpower, less fuel, and so forth. And, of course, as income slips, farmers will tend to spend less on maintenance. But costs are not likely to drop as fast as gross receipts. Perhaps expenses might be pared to seventeen and five-tenths billions from eighteen and two-tenths. On those assumptions,

here's what agriculture's profit and loss account in 1949 will look like:

	1949	1948	Decline
	Billions	*Billions*	*Percent*
Gross income	$32.0	$35.6	10
Product costs	17.5	18.2	4
Net for farm operators	14.5	17.4	17

Even with that reduction farmers will be relatively well off. This seems likely to be the fourth best farm year dollarwise, surpassed only by the years 1946, 1947, and 1948. Net income will rise to three times 1939 level and twice 1929.

Moreover farmers are still strong financially. Total assets as of January 1 amounted to $130,000,000,000, against which were claims of $5,100,000,000 in mortgage debt and $6,100,000,000 in miscellaneous debt. Thus proprietors' equity amounted to $119,000,000,000 as against $113,000,000,000 on January 1, 1948, and $44,000,000,000 in the beginning of 1940.

The reversal in farm income fits an economic pattern. After the war farm prices went up first and fastest. Now they're going down first and fastest. The resultant squeeze on earnings of farmers is likely to be more severe than the squeeze on industry generally. Because industrial prices didn't go up as fast as farm prices they may not come down as fast either.

The Late James Stuart Douglas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Arizona Daily Star of January 3, 1949:

JAMES S. DOUGLAS DEAD—FATHER OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMAT—PIONEER ARIZONA MINING MAN SUCCUMBS AT HOME IN MONTREAL—SERVED RED CROSS IN FRANCE IN WAR—AMBASSADOR ARRANGES RITES

MONTREAL, January 2.—James Stuart Douglas, 80, father of Lewis W. Douglas, United States Ambassador to Britain, died at his home in Montreal.

James Stuart Douglas was born at Harvey Hill mine, Magantic Township, Quebec, Canada, June 19, 1868. He was a son of Dr. James and Naomi (Douglas) Douglas. His father, a distinguished mining engineer, prominently identified with early copper-mining developments in Arizona and the Southwest, brought his family from Canada to the United States in 1875.

The son attended school at Phoenixville, Pa.; Toronto, Canada, and New York City. He farmed at Manitoba, Canada, until 1889.

MOVES TO BISBEE

James Douglas moved to Bisbee in 1890, intending to farm, but soon turned his attention to mining and became an assayer for the Copper Queen Consolidated Mining Co.

In 1891 he became assayer and timekeeper for the Commercial Mining Co., in Yavapai County, and for 8 years thereafter was superintendent for the same corporation at the Senator Copper Basin and Big Bug mines.

From 1900 to 1909 he was superintendent of the Picacho mine, a Phelps Dodge subsidiary in Sonora, Mexico. This mine produced a considerable tonnage of high-grade gold ore. At the same time he was superintendent of the Montezuma Copper Co. at Nacozari, Sonora, Mexico. There, through his efforts, great improvements were made in mining and metallurgical practice.

RESIDENT OF DOUGLAS

He moved with his family to the border town of Douglas in 1909. Here he maintained his residence until 1938.

Earlier, in 1902, he had organized and become president of the Bank of Bisbee, later holding the same position in the Bank of Douglas, which he also established.

During the Carranza revolution in Mexico in 1913 he was manager of the Cananea Consolidated Copper Co., at Cananea, Sonora, Mexico. The previous year he investigated the development work on mining properties in the Verde mining district of Arizona.

With George E. Tener, of Pittsburgh, and others, he furnished the money for development purposes to the United Verde Extension Mining Co. This acquired ground contiguous to Senator Clark's United Verde copper mine.

MINE PROVED BONANZA

The United Verde Extension Mining Co., of which Douglas remained president from the time of its organization by himself and Louis E. Wicher in 1912, produced more than $150,000,000 in gross copper, gold, and silver values and paid more than $50,000,000 to its stockholders. The mine ceased operations in 1938.

In September 1917, as a dollar-a-year man, Douglas went to France for the American Red Cross to be in charge of stores the Red Cross had throughout France. In recognition of his services to France during World War I he was decorated by the French Government as a chevalier of the Legion of Honor. This decoration was awarded in 1927.

Following his war service, and for years thereafter, Douglas was a close personal friend of Georges Clemenceau, the French wartime Premier, in whose honor the United Verde Extension smelter town in the Verde Valley was named.

BECAME CANADIAN AGAIN

Douglas had received his final papers as an American citizen at Prescott in 1896. When he retired from active business in 1938, he resumed his Canadian citizenship and took up residence in Montreal, where he had lived since.

He was a member of the Episcopal Church. In politics he was a Democrat.

Douglas was married November 11, 1891, to Miss Josephine Leah Williams, daughter of Lewis Williams, metallurgist and superintendent of copper-smelting operations at Bisbee. Mrs Douglas died in 1941.

Mr. Douglas was much more than a miner. He was a banker. He took pride in doing a good job of banking. His banks never borrowed a dime during the depression. When the bank moratorium was declared, he kept his banks open. Not until Governor Moeur threatened to send the National Guard to close them, did he finally close for the period of the bank moratorium.

As his fabulous mine was liquidated, and old age came on, Mr. Douglas closed out his interests in Arizona and retired to Montreal, near his birthplace in the province of Quebec. A year or so ago he returned to Arizona for a visit. And now his son, Lewis, on leave from his duties as ambassador in London, returns to the State of his birth to take a brief rest on his ranch near Sonoita. The homing instinct seems to work toward birthplaces.

Mr. Douglas' personality was unique. He was rough and gruff, but kindly. He would carry his passion for avoiding waste to the point where he saved the envelopes of the letters he received, slit completely open on all sides and then use the backs of the envelopes to write notes to his friends. He would send Christmas greetings in printed form, so they would go at second-class mail rates. At times he would ride the day coach between Tucson and Phoenix, rather than go in a Pullman. "Why should I waste the money," he would remark.

One of the classic stories about him, which he later said was true, and which he was prouder of than any other story, dealt with his long-time right-hand mining executive, George Kingdon. At the time of the story Kingdon was manager of the railroad running between Douglas and Nacozari, Mexico. Mr. Douglas was manager of the Phelps Dodge mine there.

The story tells about how Mr. Douglas was waiting for the train to come in. While he waited, he took a short walk along the tracks and found a stray spike. Picking it up, he walked back to the railroad station. When the train came in from Douglas, George Kingdon was aboard. When he alighted, Mr. Douglas met him, and holding up the spike, said to Kingdon, "See how wastefully you are running this railroad, when you allow a spike to be wasted."

Not to be outdone, Kingdon replied, "Why, boss, I sure am glad you found that spike. I have had six men out on the track for a week looking for it."

Economy and avoidance of all waste was Mr. Douglas' pleasure. He had fun out of it. And that is why he is still called, "Rawhide Jimmy." That means he lacked bailing wire and used rawhide to tie things together. And so as long as the romances of mining in Arizona are told, James S. Douglas, "Rawhide Jimmy," and his fabulous United Verde Extension mine will be a part of them.

What Are We Doing About Cancer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 21, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following statement:

WHAT ARE WE DOING ABOUT CANCER?

I. HOW MANY PEOPLE DIE OF CANCER IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. The No. 2 killer of our people in 1947 was cancer.[1]

2. One out of every eight people who died in 1947 died of cancer.[1]

3. Nineteen million, thirty-eight thousand, five hundred people now alive will die of cancer unless new treatments and cures are found.[2]

4. One hundred and eighty-nine thousand eight hundred and eleven persons died of cancer in 1947 in the United States, or 1 out of every 8 deaths.[1]

II. HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE SUFFERING FROM CANCER IN THE UNITED STATES?

1. In 1937 it was estimated that 930,000 people were suffering from cancer and other tumors.[3]

2. About 555,000 people are under treatment for cancer at any one time.[4]

(a) About 325,000 new patients develop cancer each year.[5]

3. About 1 out of every 5 people now alive in the United States will have cancer at some time in his life.[6]

Footnotes at end of speech.

III. WHAT IS BEING DONE TO HELP CANCER SUFFERERS?

1. Only about 1,834 special cancer beds are available in both private and public hospitals in the United States, for the estimated 555,000 patients under treatment.[7]

(a) In contrast with this, 86,429 special beds are available for tuberculosis patients;[8] tuberculosis killed 48,064 people in 1947, while cancer killed 189,811.[1]

2. We have only about 150 cancer-detection clinics, for people with no apparent symptoms, in the United States; or 1 detection clinic to every 935,000 people.[9]

3. We have only about 404 registered cancer treatment and diagnostic clinics, of which 32 are cancer diagnostic (only) clinics in the United States.[9]

(a) This is in contrast with the fact that there are 3,069 counties [10] in the United States, and a large majority of counties should have some type of cancer clinic.

4. There are only 10 public hospitals, having 1,159 beds, which are concerned only with cancer.[11]

IV. HOW MUCH MONEY IS AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH TO FIND NEW TREATMENTS AND CURES FOR CANCER?

1. About $10,487,000 for research and $8,000,000 for construction of research facilities, divided as follows (appendix I):

(a) Government funds: Congress has appropriated approximately $6,060,000 (exclusive of Atomic Energy Commission figure, which is not available but not exceeding $5,000,000) for cancer research, plus $8,000,000 for construction of research facilities at various institutions, during the fiscal year 1948–49 (appendix I and footnote 12).

Non-Governmental funds: Voluntary agencies spent approximately $4,402,000 (appendix I).

2. This means that we are spending about $55.25 per cancer death annually, or $19.07 per known case.

(a) In contrast, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis allotted $1,779,576.81 for research in 1947, or nearly $1,000 per death.[13]

(b) Congress appropriated $29,716,877 for the Department of Agriculture in 1948, for research in the control and cure of plant and animal diseases.[14]

3. In a Nation-wide poll, 82 percent of the people questioned said they believed that $200,000,000 should be spent by the Government for cancer research.[15]

V. HOW MUCH MONEY HAS THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY RAISED FOR EDUCATION AND SERVICE TO CANCER PATIENTS, AND FOR LAY AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION IN THIS FIELD?

1. The American Cancer Society and all its State and local divisions raised about $10,021,000 for this purpose in 1948, over and above the amount raised for research.[16]

(a) This is in contrast with $832,862 raised nationally by the society in 1944, and $372,057.17 in 1943, when no funds were allocated to research.[16]

VI. HOW MUCH IS THE GOVERNMENT SPENDING FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CANCER CLINICS AND SERVICES?

1. The National Cancer Institute, United States Public Health Service, has about $2,500,000 for the year ending July 1, 1949, for grants-in-aid to States for establishment of clinics and services to cancer patients.[12]

(a) This makes a total of about $12,500,000 for service and education in this field, from both voluntary organizations and Government funds, to be spent over a 14-month period.

2. In contrast to this, the United States Public Health Service alone has available for grants-in-aid to States to establish clinics and services—$15,008,507 for control of venereal diseases, and $6,790,000 for tuberculosis control.[14]

Footnotes at end of speech.

(a) Twelve thousand six hundred and seventy-one deaths were attributed to syphilis in 1947 and 48,064 deaths to tuberculosis; but cancer killed 189,811 people in the same year.[1]

VII. HOW DOES THIS COMPARE WITH WHAT WE SPEND ON OTHER THINGS?

1. In contrast with the total of about $10,487,000 which is available from public and private sources, for cancer research:

(a) We spend approximately:

(1) One hundred and sixty-five million dollars for phonograph records.[17]

(2) Two hundred and eighty-seven million two hundred thousand dollars for flowers, seeds, and potted plants.[18]

(3) Eighty-five million dollars in nonvending coin machines (receipts minus pay-off).[18]

(4) Thirty-two million four hundred thousand dollars for veterinary service and purchase of pets.[18]

(5) Sixty million six hundred thousand dollars for monuments and tombstones.[18]

VIII. HOW DO DEATHS FROM CANCER COMPARE WITH DEATHS FROM OTHER DISEASES?

1. The No. 2 killer of the United States is cancer. Only diseases of the heart and arteries cause more deaths.[19]

(a) Nearly four times as many people died of cancer as of tuberculosis in 1947.[19]

(b) Nearly 330 times as many people died of cancer in 1947 as died of infantile paralysis in the same year.[19]

(c) Two and a quarter times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in the armed forces.[20]

IX. IS CANCER PRIMARILY A DISEASE OF OLD AGE?

1. No. Of 182,005 deaths in 1946 from cancer and other malignant tumors [1]—

(a) Ninety-two thousand two hundred and ninety-five, or over half, were under 65 years old.

(b) Fifteen thousand five hundred and seventeen, or almost 9 percent, were under 45 years old.

(c) Two thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight, or about 2 percent, were under 25 years old.

X. WHAT ARE THE LEADS IN THE FIELD OF CANCER RESEARCH?

1. There are leads in cancer research in many directions, including:

(a) Uses of radioactive materials, both as methods of treatment and as research tools.

(b) Use of nitrogen mustards in the treatment of leukemia and Hodgkin's disease.

(c) Antibiotic substances and chemical compounds which affect cancer tissue.

(d) Use of hormones, particularly estrogens and androgens, in the treatment of several types of cancer.

(e) Study of nutrition.

(f) Improved methods of surgery, new methods in the use of X-ray, and many other specific studies.

APPENDIX I

FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CANCER RESEARCH

Government funds:	
1. National Cancer Institute, U. S. Public Health Service for fiscal year 1948–49: [12]	
(a) Intramural research	$2,760,000
(b) Research projects (grants-in-aid)	3,000,000
Total	6,060,000
2. Medical Department, U. S. Army (annually, approximate) [21]	25,000
Total Government funds	*6,805,000
Nongovernmental funds:	
1. American Cancer Society for fiscal year beginning September 1, 1948,[16]	$3,200,000
2. Damon Runyon Memorial Fund (for 1948) [22]	702,000
3. Other voluntary agencies throughout the country, annually, amount [16]	500,000
Total nongovernmental funds	4,402,000
Total all funds (approximate)	10,487,000

Footnotes at end of speech.

*Exclusive of Atomic Energy Commission figure, which is not available, but not exceeding $5,000,000.

[1] U. S. Bureau of Vital Statistics (1 out of 7.61 in 1947; 1 out of 7.66 in 1946).

[2] 13 percent of the total deaths in 1947 were caused by cancer; 13 percent of 145,000,000 (estimated United States population) is 19,038,500.

[3] George St. J. Perrott, Chief, Division of Public Health Methods, U. S. Public Health Service.

[4] Based on figures from John R. Heller, Director, National Cancer Institute, U. S. Public Health Service, October 28, 1948.

[5] Illness from Cancer in the United States, by Harold V. Dorn, U. S. Public Health Service, p. 37.

[6] The U. S. Fights Cancer, published by National Cancer Institute, 1947. Based on estimate by U. S. Public Health Service.

[7] Journal of the National Cancer Institute, April 1946. Beds are located as follows: Georgia, 114; Massachusetts, 170; Missouri, 125; New York, 1,267; Pennsylvania, 158.

[8] Hospital bed census conducted by U. S. Public Health Service, Tuberculosis Control Division; includes beds in United States and Territories.

[9] Dr. Charles S. Cameron, American Cancer Society, February 18, 1948.

[10] World Almanac, 1948, p. 224.

[11] Bulletin of American College of Surgeons, December 1947.

[12] Distribution of U. S. Public Health Service Funds, National Institute of Health, Division of Research Grants and Fellowships, fiscal year 1948–49, National Cancer Institute:

Research projects (grants-in-aid)	$3,300,000
Intramural research	2,760,000
Research facilities (construction)	8,000,000
Research fellowships, teaching and aid to medical schools	2,995,000
Grants-in-aid to States	2,500,000
Other	2,445,000
Total	$22,000,000

[13] National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, 1947 annual report.

[14] Budget of the United States, fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

[15] Report of Gallup poll in New York World-Telegram, June 12, 1946.

[16] American Cancer Society.

[17] Department of Commerce (New York Times, March 31, 1947).

[18] America's Needs and Resources, published by Twentieth Century Fund, 1947.

[19] U. S. Bureau of Vital Statistics. (Tuberculosis, 48,064; heart and circulation, 624,176; infantile paralysis, 580), 1947.

[20] Killed in action in World War II, 271,164 (World Almanac, 1946). Cancer deaths for same period, 614,884. (U. S. Bureau of Vital Statistics.)

[21] Frank A. Cannon, Chief, Information Division, Office of the Surgeon General. (Letter dated April 2, 1947.)

[22] American Cancer Society, research report, December 31, 1948.

The Blizzard of 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a report by W. A. Johnson, secretary-treasurer of the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association, on the blizzard of 1949.

Mr. Speaker, western livestock men have been taking it on the chin this winter in more ways than one. There has been a big loss of livestock from the storms. There have been losses from the shrinkage in the cattle. There will still be losses because the calf crop will certainly be diminished. These losses have all hurt, but the big loss comes from the sharp drop in livestock prices. The price of all livestock has been on the skids. The operating costs have not come down with the lowering of prices. They have actually gone up because of the high cost of feed, labor, and other costs.

Mr. Speaker, I would call your attention to the fact that different Government agencies have bought huge amounts of fresh meat from Argentina to be used in Japan and Europe. I would also call your attention to the fact that this country is obligated to take about 150,000,000 pounds of canned meat from Mexico. The Government agencies have not used the powers they now have to prevent a disastrous price decline in all livestock.

When the story is finally told the winter of 1948–49 may turn out to be the period of the fastest reversal of agricultural good times in our history.

The report follows:

THE BLIZZARD OF 1949

(By W. A. Johnson, secretary-treasurer, the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, Alliance, Nebr.)

The blizzard of 1949 will long be remembered as the worst storm to hit Nebraska. Many people have called this blizzard the State's greatest catastrophe. Seldom, if ever, has such a storm played such havoc with the economy of a great livestock-producing State.

Realizing the inadequacy of individuals, counties, and even the State to meet such an emergency, the office of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association spent several days appealing to the Governor, Senators, Congressmen, stockyard companies, and many others for immediate help for ranchers. It was emphasized over and over that the problem was too big for any county or State to handle—that it needed national attention on a big scale.

During many telephone conversations, taking hours and hours, the association stated that it viewed the situation as extremely grave and felt that it should be turned over to the Army in order that all available equipment be rushed into the ranching areas as quickly as possible to open blocked roads and to open ranch trails—in fact to cut a checkerboard of life-lines through Nebraska's snowbound cattle country—to avert a major catastrophe for the State.

The association was calling for speed and more speed when President Truman directed the Army to take over and to send "all-out" aid to the disaster area. General Pick was placed in command to head the Fifth Army operations and "Disaster Operations Snowbound" became a reality.

Immediately an army of bulldozer equipment, operators, truckdrivers and mechanics began moving into the snow-blocked cattle country of Nebraska to assist in every way possible to avert a calamity from reaching tragic proportions.

Operations Snowbound has moved ahead rapidly and hundreds of miles of roads and trails have been opened, including trails to haystacks and trails for moving cattle, making it possible to provide thousands of cattle with feed. Ranchers have been guiding the tractor operations to the area where the cattle are and then the crew opens paths for the cattle and to the sources of feed.

Tractors, bulldozer equipment, of all types and sizes, moved in massed assault in every direction across Nebraska's cattle country, battling one of the worst winters in history.

Death losses which, as measured by the direct effect of the original storm, were fairly light, are mounting daily. But still more serious is the increase in the potential loss caused by subsequent storms. Today the primary question is not: "How great has the livestock toll been?" but rather, "What will be the final loss?" Ranchers frankly fear a serious cut in the spring calf crop.

Usually the effects of a catastrophe are exaggerated at the outset, but in this case, the situation became steadily worse as one costly storm followed another. The storms and repeat storms, the frigid days and nights continuing week after week, means the loss of dollars upon dollars in economic livestock operating units.

The loss to stockmen not only comes from the thousands of dead cattle but the effect of the blizzards will be even more devastating in the terrific shrinkage of livestock, the weakened condition, and resultant disease and death. No amount of money can repay the stockman for the swath these storms have made in his herd.

People can count on a general effect on the industry, an effect that cannot be measured until the spring thaws reveal the number of cattle now under drifts and the number of cattle that will make it through the winter after suffering a heavy shrinkage and weakened condition.

The seriousness of the situation emphasizes a fact that is not often appreciated by the general public. The business of livestock production is hazardous. A man may spend a lifetime of work and investment, improving his product and making his operations the most efficient possible; only to have all of his accomplishments virtually wiped out by the vagaries of nature. At the same time, the stockman has little control over the market for his product—as has been demonstrated the past few months.

Yet, the rancher or the farmer, the feeder, or the breeder, stays at the business year in and year out, taking the good with the bad—cussed and maligned by part of the public when the stockman fights back against anything he believes is aimed at his individualism.

The Fifth Army's Operations Snowbound in the battle of the drifts made wonderful progress. The work of the tough bulldozer has made many snakelike paths to haystacks and erratic cross-country meanderings of trails to ranch homes. These trails have meant life to thousands of stockmen—it meant the saving of thousands of head of livestock. Now, Operations Snowbound is rapidly being terminated in Nebraska, having accomplished its mission of opening up a vast snow-blocked area. It has been a big job, well done—thousands of miles of trails opened by bulldozers to feed supplies and farm and ranch yards and thousands of cattle liberated and given access to feed and water supplies.

Only the efforts of a number of people prevented a major catastrophe. It is almost an impossible feat to give to those men, who fought the blizzards with every tool at hand, through the long hours of blinding snow and freezing cold, the credit to which they are entitled.

Air travel, considered by many as a luxury, proved its worth during the storm. By reason of air travel, ranchers could be notified of the whereabouts of isolated cattle and were able to proceed directly to them to provide feed and water. Telephone operators are to be commended for their splendid work and wholehearted cooperation in meeting many emergencies.

Mercy trips to carry food, supplies, and medicine to isolated individuals were made. At the same time many hundreds of pounds of needed commodities were delivered by weasel, truck, and airplane; to say nothing about the number of sick people who had to be removed by snow-traveling equipment to points where medical aid was available.

The governor of Nebraska and the State legislature are to be commended for their assistance regarding the emergency which existed, and for taking the necessary steps to abridge the emergency until the President declared this is a disaster area and put it in charge of the Fifth Army.

The words of appreciation by the people of Nebraska for Operations Snowbound and for the efforts of the Fifth Army engineers and their personnel are those of praise and credit for having done a good job. Many stockmen are of the opinion that the relief efforts of the Army have saved the country from an otherwise impossible situation with disastrous economic losses. The willingness of officers and other personnel to cooperate fully with local officials in different areas in accomplishing the huge task has been highly complimentary.

In the opinion of the officers and members of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association, the Army under the capable direction of General Pick has done an outstandingly fine job in Nebraska. Its work has been done rapidly and efficiently. When people have been asked for their opinions on Operations Snowbound, it has been a "swell job, we never could have handled the situation without the speedy, efficient, and complete action of Major General Pick and the personnel under his command."

"Voice of America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a transcript of a radio broadcast entitled "Living Conditions in the U. S. S. R. Through Norwegian Eyes" over the Voice of America which is typical of the program now being sent out over this station and is a striking contrast to the type program sent out when the radio industries controlled or participated in

the preparation of the program. Mr. George Allen, Director of the Voice of America at this time, has done a commendable job in this respect.

LIVING CONDITIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.—THROUGH NORWEGIAN EYES

NARRATOR. Recently—on February 10 to be exact—the Soviet labor paper Trud strongly attacked a report made by six Norwegian trade-union officials who had visited the U. S. S. R. at the invitation of the Soviet Federation of Trade-Unions. The report was called out of focus, shocking, and slanderous. Equally violent criticism has been heaped upon it by the Norwegian Communist press.

The report which has provoked such heated reaction is a factual eye-witness account of a visit which took place last August and early September. The Norwegian delegation included three union officials, the secretary of the Norwegian Federation of Trade-Unions, the chairman of the Norwegian Chemical Workers' Union, and the secretary of the Norwegian Seaman's Union. In addition there were three representative workers, a seaman, a crane driver, and an iron worker. The editor of the Norwegian labor paper was asked to serve as secretary to the delegation.

According to their report, these seven labor leaders had a very interesting tour, which took them to Moscow, from August 19 to 21, to workers' rest homes in Sochi on the Black Sea for 3 days, to Stalingrad for 2 days, back to Moscow for a week, then to Leningrad, and then home again. The 3 weeks' tour was packed with the usual experiences of official tourists—receptions, visits to sports contests, to the theater, the opera and the ballet, to hospitals and rest centers, and of course numerous visits to factories. Time was also given for sightseeing and window shopping and for conferences with government officials.

In summarizing their impressions, the Norwegian labor leaders naturally commented on the matters of special interest to workers everywhere—union organization and conditions of work, social and cultural benefits, prices and the general standard of living.

The report describes the Russian trade-union organization in these words:

VOICE. "The Soviet trade-union movement is organized on the basis of industrial unions. But the Russian trade unions cannot carry on a wage dispute because the whole wage system is fixed in connection with the state's economic planning. The trade-union organization, therefore, with its great financial resources, concentrates on social, health, and cultural matters."

NARRATOR. With regard to these health and welfare activities, the Norwegian delegation reported that the customary annual vacation is 12 days. Allowances are given for illness, disability, and pregnancy; old-age pensions are paid at a fixed age, 60 for men, 55 for women. Both allowances and pensions are dependent upon seniority. "Together with many other activities," the report states "this serves to bind the workers to certain trades."

And the report continues:

VOICE. "The delegation obtained a very good glimpse into health-resort activities when it visited Sochi and its surroundings. The health resorts, most of them built in the 1930's, were magnificent. The stay usually lasts 28 days and the charge is from 900 to 1,800 rubles. Usually anyone who visits the resort pays 30 percent of this amount, while the rest is paid by the trade-union organization or by the state. The demand for such resorts is, of course, very great and very few are able to enjoy them compared with the total number of wage earners. It is stated that in the last season visits to health resorts amounted to 512,000 and in other vacation resorts to 1,000,000, while the number of trade-union workers is 25,000,000.

NARRATOR. On the subject of wages the Norwegian labor delegation has this to say:

VOICE. "All wage earners are divided into 30 different wage groups according to their work. Within each group there are several wage categories. Thus in the metal industry there are eight categories with a prescribed wage of 1½ rubles in the first, to 4½ rubles in the eighth.

"These are the wages paid for filling a certain norm. The whole wage system is, however, built on the principle of individual piece rates. In addition there are bonuses. The bonus system is highly developed and leads to great differences in pay. At a concern where workers receive an average wage of about 800 rubles a month, wages of about 2,000 to 3,000 rubles are also paid, and some even up to 10,000 to 14,000."

NARRATOR. Consideration of wages naturally leads to a discussion of the general standard of living. How much does the average wage of 800 rubles a month buy? The Norwegian labor leaders noted official prices for bread, macaroni, sugar, meat, eggs, tea, coffee, beer, vodka, clothing, cigarettes and similar commodities. These observations led the delegates to the following conclusion:

VOICE. "If the Norwegian standard of living is set at 100, the Russian standard cannot be set higher than 60."

NARRATOR. In greater detail, the members of the delegation observed that:

VOICE. "Food supplies are now ample so that the greater part of the population surely gets sufficient nourishment by bread, potatoes, and vegetables. But prices on meat and meat products, butter, cheese, fish, canned foods, and so forth are so high compared with wages that only very few can afford to buy such articles. Little is left for clothing and footwear and these are especially expensive. The population seems to be physically fit and sufficiently nourished but poorly dressed and as regards footwear, the situation seems to be exceptionally bad.

"The greatest problem so far as the standard of living is concerned is probably the shortage of houses. Overcrowded houses, old, dilapidated, and badly maintained houses are seen everywhere and not only in war-damaged areas. These bear witness to a housing situation which must be a very important social problem."

NARRATOR. And the report continues:

VOICE. "At present there is no rationing of ordinary consumer goods and shops in cities like Moscow and Leningrad are well supplied. The prices however are high.

"One consequence of these high prices is that an ordinary family cannot live on the husband's earnings alone. Women are employed in labor to an extent which is quite unknown in Norway. They can be seen in great numbers in street and construction work, doing heavy labor at construction sites, and as dock workers and in industry.

"There are of course groups with a high income, which can enjoy quite a solid standard of living. But not the great masses of population. Besides, several of the most-needed consumption articles cannot be obtained in sufficient quantities."

NARRATOR. Another observation was made with regard to taxes. In the U. S. S. R. most all taxes are paid by consumers when they buy goods in the stores.

VOICE. "Direct taxation is low because the big state expenditures are covered by indirect taxation in the form of high prices. Of a total state budget of 420 milliard rubles taxes on industry amount to 100 milliard rubles and sales taxes provide another 280 milliard."

NARRATOR. The delegation followed its analysis of current living conditions with some observations on the general state of recovery in the U. S. S. R. The delegation was greatly impressed by the recovery accomplishments in such cities as Stalingrad and Leningrad. In their own words:

VOICE. "On the whole recovery has been concentrated on production and on the erection of public buildings. As far as we can understand, big results have been achieved in these fields. As an example may be mentioned the large tractor factory at Stalingrad which had been completely razed but which has now been rebuilt with greater production than before. Public buildings, schools, and hospitals have also to a great extent been rebuilt. People live in ruins and very primitive temporary houses, and in Stalingrad even in regular caves and trenches.

"The population has to put up with hard toil and low-living standards during the recovery period. It has no opportunity of demanding a higher standard. Hardly any country exists where the authorities so firmly keep the standard of living low in order to insure quick recovery as in the Soviet Union."

NARRATOR. The final section of the Norwegian trade-unionist's report deals with what the delegates call a "few scattered impressions." With regard to art, the Norwegian labor leaders say:

VOICE. "Little is to be seen of modern art production. Both the public and the artists themselves evidently value more highly Russian and foreign art from the times preceding the First World War. The same applies to architectural style. All these style elements from Russian and foreign architecture often have a pretentious effect. This applies to public structures as well as to living houses. Obviously, this highly increases the costs of building activities. Members of the delegation repeatedly suggested that the Russians should concentrate more on the building of good, simple houses instead of wasting their time in embellishments that enhance the costs and retard house building by perhaps 50 percent. But there was little understanding for such views."

NARRATOR. With regard to productivity, the Norwegian labor leaders say—

VOICE. "Working ability varies immensely. At some places of work accomplishments of the highest order may be discerned. But on the average the output is lower than the ordinary output in a number of Norwegian trades. This is one of the reasons for the frequently fantastic figures cited for accomplishments surpassing the ordinary by the so-called Stakhanov workers.

NARRATOR. With regard to war psychology——

VOICE. "A great fear of war is dominant, and this is in many ways evidenced in the life of the community. The uniformed population is a common feature in the streets and uniformed cadets of 14 and 15 years of age are even to be seen. In many concerns it was forbidden to give information that otherwise would be ordinarily given. Thus, the tractor factory at Stalingrad refused to give figures for the number of workers and the amount of its production. In planes, it is prohibited for the passengers to study the landscape by means of maps."

NARRATOR. With regard to contact with foreigners——

VOICE. "The isolation toward the outer world is dense and thorough. Foreign influence in art and science is discouraged. The Russians endeavor to prove that the honor of the greatest progress in various fields is due to them, that for instance not Edison but a Russian invented the first electric lamp. In the history of the Russian revolution the role played by such oppositionists as Trotsky, has been completely obliterated, and the role of the western Allies in the Second World War has been completely eliminated.

"All relations with foreigners are viewed with deep distrust by the authorities. In

the beginning of 1948 a law was enacted prohibiting Russians from receiving visitors in their homes or calling on foreigners."

NARRATOR. With regard to domestic police——

VOICE. "In addition to the military, the various police bodies are a very prominent feature in the streets. In the big towns they are seen everywhere and in great numbers, at public buildings, in squares, streets, museums, on every subway station, railway station, and even at football games.

"The biggest assembling of military and police was seen by the delegation in Moscow at Zhdanov's funeral. The procession crossed the big square in front of the hotel and up to the Red Square. Behind the casket walked the Polit Bureau of the Communist Party, headed by Stalin and Molotov. On the big square facing the hotel there was not one single civilian but big detachments of soldiers and police. The delegation had a very good view from the hotel but it was forbidden to step out on the balconies, and doors and windows were ordered to be kept closed.

"We know nothing corresponding to this apart from conditions in an occupied country during war. No doubt this can partly be ascribed to the fact that there still are a couple of hundred thousand German PW's in the country."

NARRATOR. In conclusion, the Norwegian delegates warmly praised the individual Russians with whom they had come in contact. They said that practically all were simple and sympathetic people, who contributed powerfully to the belief that if nothing unforeseen occurs, the Soviet Union will gradually attain a more felicitous phase of development than the one existing there today.

Tax Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Mobile Register, Mobile, Ala.:

TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION CLAMORS FOR ALL MANNER OF TAX-RAIDING

The Truman administration is striking out in every direction for more taxes of one kind and another.

At the moment the administration is trying to persuade Congress to increase postal rates and social security taxes. It took both these proposals to Capitol Hill at the beginning of this week.

And, of course, the President had already called on Congress for an outright direct tax increase of $4,000,000,000.

The American people are being put on notice by many sources that the tax-raiding involved in the Truman program would hit them hard.

In Cleveland, Ohio, Monday night, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, Republican, Ohio, estimated that the Truman legislative program would lead to a $50,000,000,000 Federal budget immediately and a $60,000,000,000 budget within 5 years.

Are the American people able to foot an annual tax bill of that enormous size in order for the Truman administration to engage in a lot of folly?

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican of Massachusetts, leveled recent sharp criticism at the tax treatment the people are receiving.

He said: "We are still paying the burdensome excise taxes at the full wartime rates—25 percent for cable and radio messages, 25 percent for leased wires, 20 percent on telephone messages, 20 percent on electric light bulbs, 20 percent on jewelry and luggage, 10 percent on toilet articles. These are wartime tax rates. * * * They should be rolled back at once to the prewar rates."

That isn't all Mr. MARTIN had to say about taxes.

In view of the fact that the Truman administration is calling for an increase in social security taxes on employees and employers, Mr. MARTIN'S remarks concerning revenue from these taxes should hold more than casual interest.

"Besides the budget receipts," he said, "the Federal Government takes in about $2,000,000,000 a year in old-age pension and retirement taxes.

"Those taxes are not in the budget—but the money is spent as fast as it comes in, for the routine expenses of government—and all the social security fund gets is a Treasury I O U—a special form of Government bond, for the social security trust fund.

"That trust fund now amounts to more than $10,000,000,000—and there is not one penny of cash in it—just Government bonds.

"When funds are needed to pay the pension contracts the money will have to be taken from the people a second time—either in additional taxes or in new forms of Government debt.

"So the social security liabilities will be paid twice by our people—once in the direct pay-roll taxes and a second time in the conversion of the bonds now in the trust fund to make cash available for the pensions."

Mr. MARTIN went on to take this whack at the repeated tax-raiding demands heard in Washington.

"The people get no opportunity to put their own financial houses in order at home, because the Federal tax collector is always standing at the door, for more, more, more."

Mr. MARTIN spoke a mouthful.

The Truman administration is clamoring for more tax money on every hand.

It wants to raise the social security tax rate by 50 percent on employes and employers alike, beginning next July 1, and then, effective next January 1, it wants to double the rate.

Mr. MARTIN says his view is that "we already are skimming off too much of the national income for Federal taxes," and many an overburdened taxpayer must feel the same way about it.

But there is no sign that the Truman administration shares that view.

What Will the Pacific Northwest Do?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg.:

WHAT WILL THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST DO?

The battle is on to decide whether or not Pacific Northwest resources will be laced into the strait-jacket of Federal bureaucracy: Will a Columbia Valley Authority be established?

The position of the Capital Journal has been made repeatedly clear on this question of the moment. This newspaper fears big government and the bungling bureaucracy that goes with it. It believes in the Jeffersonian theory of delegating only as few powers to the Federal Government as is possible.

This reasoning is based on the theory that what eventually destroys rights and liberties is an all-powerful national body. Each power relinquished by a State or region to the Federal authorities is one more added to the colossus of big government.

In this connection, it is to the point to quote Thomas Jefferson:

"What has destroyed liberty and the rights of man in every government which has existed under the sun?

"The generalizing and concentrating of all cares and power into one body, no matter whether the autocrats of Russia or France or the aristocrats of a Venetian senate."

The best intentions of a federal power can break down through the years so that chaos and incompetence take the place of the grandiose promises to come originally from the paternal government.

While realizing what a supergovernmental control means in the long run, the Pacific Northwest cannot spend its time throwing rocks at the idea of a CVA. An alternative regional program, administered and controlled in the Pacific Northwest, must be offered—or a CVA is inevitable.

This is the responsibility of the moment in our region. The leadership can be found in one of several places, including either one of the governors of the States of Oregon or Washington.

Will the Pacific Northwest respond to the challenge and threat of a CVA with a constructive, regionally operated program? Or will this area submit to a growing colossus of big government?

Russia Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a brief article which I wrote several days ago for the newspapers of my congressional district, under the column Congressional Sidelights, which may prove of interest to others. The article follows:

RUSSIA AGAIN

News was permitted to pass the iron curtain of Russia this week to the effect that Anna Louise Strong, the American writer who embraced communism sometime ago and has spent the last several years in Moscow, has been arrested by the Russian Government as a spy. There is more behind this, I am sure, than the brief news article discloses.

I met Anna Louise Strong in the American Embassy at Moscow in the early fall of 1945. My committee had just arrived in Moscow. The American Embassy officials advised us that the foreign correspondents in Moscow would like an interview, at a press conference. As chairman of that committee, I agreed to this interview. We had scarcely gotten seated in the conference room when an

American newspaperman, whom I had known in Washington, came up and whispered to me to be on the alert. That a number of these members of the press there were pro-Communists. He particularly warned me against Miss Strong, telling me that while she was a native American, she was, in fact, a Communist. And, therefore, I should be careful in answering her questions. Miss Strong demonstrated, by her line of conversation, that she was thoroughly sold on communism. In fact, she has made repeated trips back to America since that time to try to spread the doctrine of communism.

With the knowledge that I have of Miss Strong and of the Russian Government, this arrest of her by the Russian Government is proof to me of the doctrine which I have been preaching since my stay in and study of conditions in Russia more than 3 years ago. And, that is this: Russia preaches but does not practice communism. Communism is a front for the present Russian dictatorship government, just as fascism was a front for Hitler's dictatorship of Germany. Russia is one nation that does not practice communism. Communism is more in the nature of an idealism, a religion with a real Communist. Genuine Communists are crusaders. There are more sincere Communists in France or China, for instance, than in Russia. Russia is a police state whose citizens are taught communism but are not permitted to practice it extensively.

Louise Strong was an idealist. She believed in communism, she believed in the communism of Marx and Lenin. Evidently, she realized that her faith in communism and in Russia was being betrayed. Being an idealist, a crusader who was willing to fight for her ideals, she ran into trouble with Mr. Stalin's politburo. Mr. Stalin preached communism but failed to practice it. Hence, Anna Louise Strong has learned what other idealists and crusaders have learned when they came face to face with the Government of Russia. That, if you believe in practicing communism as well as preaching it, you will soon find yourself the victim of the secret police of a great police state.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FOSTER FURCOLO

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication:

Hon. FOSTER FURCOLO,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FURCOLO: We respectfully urge you to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain statements that we believe to be the foundation for old-age retirement and America's program of security for everyone.

We believe that individual rights should be checked with the United States Constitution and that all Government issues concerning problems from the cradle to the grave, covered by income taxes beneficial to the health, relief, insurance, retirement, pensions of the aged, blind, veterans, disabled, professionals, industry, business, labor, unemployed, and 165,000 systems as shown by the United States census report.

We believe that all issues present or future concerning the above-listed may be handled as one unit and that we the people as a whole may have the same security of equal rights.

The Declaration of Independence tells us that governments were instituted to secure these rights. We believe:

1. The Social Security Act should be amended by changing the name to America's Security Act, and the obligation should be made national without depending upon the State legislature or any State administration.

2. Financial security and rights of the people are not matters of charity. The aged are among those who made America the great country it is today. They helped create the high standard we enjoy in the United States today. The fact that the young people will have economic security is a debt this country owes to many of the people who today are the aged. That is why the aged themselves must have security as a matter of right and not as charity.

3. Security should not be based on need or a person's resources, because everyone is tax collected for protection from the cradle to the grave.

4. All relief, assistance, insurance, retirements and pensions to become equal and constitutional must come under the same name and security.

5. All individual security which has been ruled by the United States Supreme Court to be a national obligation should be paid direct from Washington to eliminate overhead costs of State and local governments. This will help make the plan become self-supporting in the near future, will save double taxation and reduce all taxation and the many campaigns of the heart, cancer, Red Cross, Community Chest and other drives.

6. Every person wants to be independent. Funds that were provided to relieve want and fear have not been used for that purpose but have been used to provide jobs. Under the States handling grants are made and then taken away overnight, but the income tax doesn't stop.

7. Privacy guaranteed by the Constitution is violated when bank accounts or savings are gone into or other attempts are made to restrict ownership of property. Relatives are questioned and threats have been made of court proceedings if relatives would not help provide support. This has been true even where both the applicant and the relative were paying income tax. Case workers and investigators spreading the fear of charity, welfare, and pauperism and every other means deprive all the people of equal rights. As a result, many thousands who have never applied for their protection are entitled to back pay or a return of income taxes collected.

8. Under the first amendment of the United States Constitution, the States and local governments have obstructed justice due individuals.

9. The above declared rights are the basis for which governments were instituted, as we know from the Declaration of Independence.

The above statements are subscribed to by Dr. Ralph H. Clark, president, Northampton, Mass.; Mrs. Lena Purnell, trustee, Amherst, Mass.; Mrs. Rossana C. Faulkner, director, Springfield, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Fred Farr, directors, Holyoke, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Eugene O. Lampron, directors, Northampton, Mass.; Mr. Chich West, national organizer (blind), Palmer and Holyoke, Mass.; Mr. George H. Douglass, treasurer and director, Springfield, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. DellaPenna, national organizer, Holyoke, Mass.; Mr. and Mrs. Claude A. Blair, chairman on State and national affairs, Springfield, Mass.

Veterans' Hospital Construction Program Endorsed by Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the Veterans' Administration announced the cancellation of the construction of 16,000 veterans' hospital beds which the VA had previously recommended to be constructed and which recommendation had been approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States. Now, the order for cancellation adversely affects the construction program in 18 or 20 States and if the order stands it will mean that badly disabled veterans in need of hospitalization cannot receive hospital care from their Government.

The State of Michigan particularly will be hard hit. We are desperately in need of facilities to take care of tubercular and mental cases. I am very pleased to see that the National Welfare and Service Committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has full cognizance of this situation and has unanimously passed a resolution on February 18, 1949, at a meeting held in Washington requesting that the cancellation order be rescinded.

The same selfish groups that tried so hard to sabotage the veterans hospital program after World War I are active again peddling misinformation and evidently they have been successful in reaching the President of the United States. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the veterans' hospital construction program was gone into very thoroughly, and was approved after full hearings and careful deliberations. Both the House and the Senate approved the program, and likewise, as I have previously stated, the construction program was approved by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans' Administration, and the President of the United States.

We have made a solemn pledge to the veterans to take care of them when they are sick or disabled. This pledge must be kept. At the national convention, the Democratic Party had come out for a broad and generous program to give hospitalization and medical assistance to all of the citizens who are in need, and then 6 months later the VA recommends the cancellation of the veterans' hospital construction program. Does this make any sense? Let us smoke out these boys who are always so eager to balance the budget by taking it out of the hides of the veterans. These same budget balancers never say a word when it comes to dumping billions of dollars into Europe and Asia as they have done in the last couple of years and as they intend to do in this session of Congress. Our first obligation is to the citizens of our country, and particularly to our veterans who hold a

unique and warm spot in the hearts of our people, and our people will never wish to see a man or woman, who has served our country in the hour of need, be compelled to beg for hospitalization or medical attention.

I wish to include the resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars as a part of my remarks. It follows:

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has announced the approval by the President of the United States, of a reduction of the veterans' hospital-construction program to the extent of 16,000 beds located in various sections of the United States; and

Whereas all of these beds were found to be needed and were recommended by the Veterans' Administration after a thorough study of the entire country; and

Whereas the previous recommendations of the Veterans' Administration for the construction of these beds received the approval of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President of the United States; and

Whereas there is even a greater need for these beds today than there was at the time they were recommended and approved by the United States Government officials; and

Whereas it is impossible in most sections of the country to secure adequate hospitalization for the veterans now seriously ill and needing hospital care; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the 16,000 beds recently eliminated from the construction program and additional beds for veterans in the various sections of the country are greatly needed to insure adequate hospitalization of those men who have offered their lives for our country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national welfare and service committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, request and urge the President and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to cancel the order recently issued for the elimination of these 16,000 beds; and further that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be urged to expedite the construction of these and any other beds required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to appropriate committees and Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

The UN Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raphael Lemkin:

THE UN GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Raphael Lemkin)

On the 9th day of December 1948 the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris adopted unanimously the convention to outlaw genocide. Shortly thereafter, 21 states, including the United States, signed the convention at a solemn ceremony in the Palais de Chaillot. This action of the United Nations was hailed by the Assembly's president, Dr. Herbert Evatt, as a significant advance in the development of international criminal law. Prompt ratification of the convention by the parliaments of the world was urged by many of the delegates.

Genocide is both a new name coined by the author from the Greek "genos" meaning tribe or race and the Latin "caedere," to kill, and a new legal formulation for the ancient crime of mass annihilation of religious, racial, national, and ethnical groups.

History is full of genocide cases. The destruction of Carthage, the attempt to destroy the early Christians by the Romans, the massacre of the Slavs by the Teutonic knights, the pogroms of the Christians in the Balkans in the nineteenth century, the murder of more than a million Armenians in the First World War, and the destruction of more than a million Moslems in 1947 in India are a few examples. In the last war, more than 3,000,000 Poles, a great number of Czechs, Yugolslavs, more than 6,000,000 Jews, and almost all Gypsies were destroyed by the Nazis.

The Nuremberg Tribunal dealt with this problem, but in its judgment took rather a restricted stand. Only crimes committed in connection with or during an aggressive war were punished. The Tribunal failed to give a legal formulation for the crime of genocide and to establish a precedent for a new international crime applicable in war and peace. Therefore, the United Nations had to take the initiative in declaring genocide an international crime, and in establishing its legal structure so that it may be applicable not only in relations between an occupant and a defeated enemy, but also in normal conditions among sovereign states.

On the 11th of December in 1946, the General Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution sponsored by Cuba, India, and Panama, declaring genocide an international crime and calling upon the United Nations to enact an international convention for the prevention and punishment of this crime. The United States delegation took a leading part in the work on this resolution. Mr. Adlai Stevenson of the United States delegation moved for the inclusion of the genocide issue on the agenda of the Assembly and Mr. Charles Fahy served as rapporteur of the subcommittee on genocide.

According to this resolution, a draft convention of genocide was prepared by the Secretary-General of the UN with the assistance of three experts in international and criminal law and then after submission and discussion by various organs and by the 1947 Assembly, this draft was revised by a special subcommittee of the Economic and Social Council under the chairmanship of the United States delegate, John Maktos. This draft was again discussed by the Economic and Social Council in July and August of 1948 in Geneva and then for more than 2 months in the Legal Committee of the Assembly in Paris, where again the United States delegation headed by Mr. Ernest Gross played an important role in the final formulation of the Convention.

DEFINITION

Genocide is defined in Article II of the Convention in the following manner:

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, as such:

(a) Killing members of the group;

(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of this group;

(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group, conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;

(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

This article consists of a general part which defines intent and enumerates the groups protected and a second part which enumerates the specific acts used for the commission of genocide.

The Genocide Convention deals with crime and, therefore, the general principles of criminal law apply. In criminal law the intent is of paramount importance. Article II requires that intent should be a specific one, namely, to destroy a racial, religious, or national group as such in whole or in part. It is not enough to kill persons belonging to a different race or religion, but these murders must be committed as a part of a plan to destroy the given groups. For example, those Turks who participated in annihilation of 1,200,000 Armenians are guilty of genocide because they acted with the intent to destroy the Armenian Nation.

Every act described in article II of the Convention must be read in conjunction with and interpreted in the light of the specific intent to destroy the group. In particular, this applies to the killings (point a) and to the mutilations and mental disintegration (point b) as caused by imposing intoxicants (as the Japanese did in China). Point (c) of article II deals in a general manner with such conditions as were prevailing in concentration camps or in deportation procedures when people were transported in winter in unheated cattle cars and died or were mutilated on the way. Point (d) deals with sterilizations or compulsory abortions. It should not be confused with birth-control measures undertaken in certain societies with the intent to raise the economic or health standards of the population. Obviously, in this last case, the intent is not to destroy. Point (e) deals with stealing of children such as practiced in the Middle Ages against families of heretics or on Christian populations in the Balkans in the nineteenth century or by the Nazis in the last war. Last year the UN Special Committee for the Balkans received a charge of genocide from the Greek Government against guerrillas who were accused of stealing children from villages in Greece.

The above analysis shows that every act of genocide must be interpreted in the light of a specific intent to destroy a nation, a race, or a religious group as such. Where such specific intent is lacking there is no genocide. Lynchings obviously are not within the scope of genocide because of lack of specific intent to destroy the respective group.

It was agreed that legal intervention must not come too late after great and irreparable damage has been done. Therefore, article III provides that attempt or conspiracy to commit genocide or direct and public incitement to genocide is also punishable.

IMPLEMENTATION

The authors of this Convention were cognizant of the fact that the process of implementation should be moderate and practical. Therefore, existing institutions of law which are recognized and familiar to all civilized nations have been designated for implementation. The only departure from this point of view relates to the international criminal court as mentioned in article VI. However, the matter of this Court has not been settled definitely and is left essentially to future decisions of the United Nations.

Specifically the following ways of implementation have been adopted: Every member state undertakes to punish genocide by its own courts. Genocide will not be treated as a political crime and states will cooperate in extraditing such criminals to the countries in which the crime has been committed. Here the existing institution of extradition has been applied to a new crime.

The international controls of implementation have been taken from existing institutions because the General Assembly wanted to use such instrumentalities on which states had already agreed in relation to other matters. Thus, for example, the International Court of Justice at The Hague will be called upon to settle disputes between the contracting parties in cases of violation or interpretation of the Convention. This is a practical measure known to many international treaties.

Article VIII provides that any contracting party may call upon the competent organs of the United Nations to take such action as they consider appropriate for the prevention and punishment of acts of genocide. Here again reference is made to the existing legal commitments of the Charter and any action of the United Nations must be within the scope of the Charter. It should be noticed that the General Assembly rejected Soviet proposals to limit United Nations intervention to the Security Council. It was felt that in a matter of such great humanitarian and moral importance all organs of the United Nations should be free to act in order to reestablish civilized standards in a given area.

The unanimous adoption of the genocide convention shows that this is a matter of really universal human conscience and that it will be a law which will serve progress and peace.

Streamlining the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following copy of my radio talk over WMEX, Boston, Mass., Thursday, March 3, 1949:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, one-third of all that you earn goes to the support of not yourself or your family but to maintain the various levels of Government that constitute the United States.

Our country is no longer isolated from the world and its problems. The other day there was a small news story on the front page of most newspapers which did not attract the attention which it deserved. It told of an Army bomber which flew across the United States in 3½ hours. Science is making tremendous progress, but are we making the necessary spiritual, intellectual, economic and social adjustments to keep up with it?

We are trying to but the process is costing us much money. The modern crisis is further complicated by a cold war which requires that we maintain a strong military establishment and pour out vast sums to help other free nations to become self-supporting.

If we did not have to deal with fanatical communism, our people would have more money in their own pockets for their own use. That day will come if we persevere. In the meantime we are faced with the unpleasant but realistic menace of communism. It must be met and mastered by a constructive program which will prove beyond all doubt that a free society, able to make voluntary adjustments, can provide more security with opportunity than any totalitarian state.

We must eliminate the poverty and the despair upon which communism thrives.

We are trying to accomplish this in our own country by a broad program of social security, and by various measures which will keep our economy going forward on an even keel.

We are giving to other nations the tools with which they also can make progress.

These expenditures are necessary for our individual and our national security. This is all the more reason for taking stock to see where we can effect savings. There is no excuse whatever for wasting money through poor organization and poor administration of the vast, sprawling, and overlapping agencies of the Federal Government.

Twenty years ago it cost $4,000,000,000 to run the United States Government. Through depression, war, and recovery the cost has grown until it has reached nearly $42,000,000,000 today. Twenty years ago there were 800 agencies; today there are 1,800.

The following table will give you some idea of bureaucratic duplication: Lending Government funds, 29 different agencies; insuring deposits, loans, 3; acquisition of land, 34; wildlife preservation, 16; Government construction, 10; credit and finance, 9; home, community planning, 12; welfare, 28; forestry, 14; examination of banks, 4; gathering statistics, 65.

Need I go on? It would take a week to describe this traffic jam. Many of you who have had dealings with a Federal agency are veterans of the struggle against entangling red tape, exhaustive delays, and sheer bewilderment.

I wish to make it clear that the Federal employees are not responsible for this, for they, too, are the victims of a Government that just grew like a criss-crossing jungle vine until no one knows where it begins or where it ends.

The emergencies of depression and war, requiring immediate action to meet new problems, spawned this chaos. It has reached a point, however, where we must do a little pruning before we are swamped by this growth.

In 1947 it dawned upon Democrats and Republicans alike that surgery was imperative. The tax-burden once fell upon the rich. But even they didn't have enough to pay the freight. Just look at your withholding receipt to figure how fast and how far Federal taxation has grown in order to meet the appetite of an enormous Government. At $601 of your income the bite begins. Excuse my mistake. It begins with the first package of cigarettes that you buy.

I repeat, much of this program is necessary if we are to survive as a Nation. I also repeat that the proportion of waste and inefficiency in the carrying out of that program is inexcusable.

In June 1947, throwing partisanship aside, the Eightieth Congress voted to set up the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, to make an over-all study of Federal bureaucracy and to write a prescription to cure it.

Congress provided that 6 of the 12 members of the Commission should be Democrats, and 6 Republicans, so that no one could say that the investigation was aimed at either of the two major political parties in our two-party system of government. To further accent this point, it provided that no report should be issued until after the election.

For further emphasis on its nonpartisan character, it was decided to name Herbert Hoover as chairman. As the only living ex-President and the first to meet up with the problem of bureaucracy during his term, he could measure its growth since then. As an experienced administrator, he knew the difficulties facing President Truman. He knew that the situation would become worse for future Presidents and for the Nation if we failed to bring this cancerous growth under control.

As chairman, he set up 22 task forces, each to study a particular branch of the Government. Three hundred experts from business and from the universities were called in to help. For 19 months they worked. Two weeks ago, the first 5 of the 15 commission reports were made public.

If all the recommendations were adopted, we could save $3,000,000,000 a year, and of greater importance, we could have a more efficient Government. Could any sane American object to this? Only those who put self-interest before national interest. For this is the biggest business on earth. We are all partners in it. If it becomes bogged down in a labyrinth of contradictions, all, all of us will suffer.

There are healthy indications to the contrary. Even though the complete and comprehensive report costs $10 per copy, there has been a rush to buy them from the Government Printing Office. The rank-and-file of American citizens have a conscience. They know that there are jobs which only the Government can do, but they want to see those jobs done right.

One of the principal aims of the report is to save the Chief Executive the time and effort consumed in wading through conflicting reports and recommendations on identical subjects. The purpose is to free him for the truly executive, policy-making responsibilities of the world's biggest job.

It would set up in the Nation's chief office that division of labor and that clear line of delegated authority that is found in every well-run business.

In the maze of bureaucracy that crowds Washington and spills over to all sections of the country, one finds many quaint practices which literally consume money.

An analysis of 600,000 purchase orders issued by 19 civilian agencies revealed that 90 percent of the orders represented only 10 percent of the dollar value of expenditures. It is estimated that 3,000,000 purchase orders are issued annually by Federal buying offices and that half of these orders average less than $10 in value. The multiple forms and red tape involved in putting through such purchases of $10 and under cost more than the purchases themselves.

Why should a female salmon on her way up the Columbia River to perform her maternal functions need the supervision of 12 different Federal agencies? She shouldn't, but she has no say about it. Even the fish are being crowded by a multiplicity of nursemaids who get in one another's way.

Let's turn to the system of cataloging or identifying Federal supplies.

One manufacturer of steam turbines furnished a bearing liner assembly to the Navy at a cost of $63. Catalog research revealed that another supplier furnished the same item, as a replacement part, at a cost of $25. This research also revealed the identity of the prime manufacturer from whom the bearing liner assembly was later obtained for $9.06.

Procurement savings of $115,000 were effected in one Navy bureau through the cataloging analysis of oil seals, which resulted in the determination that 4,500 supposedly different items were actually only 879 different seals.

Extensive identification research on antifriction bearings revealed that bearings identified by 300,000 different numbers were actually only 9,000 different bearings.

The magnitude of the problem is evident when we consider that the Federal Government spends more than $6,000,000,000 a year for supplies, materials, and equipment, and that trend is still on the upgrade. Government spending on this huge scale should not be allowed to continue without more effective control for full utilization of property already owned.

United States agencies, including the military services, own and operate approximately 1,000,000 automotive vehicles. It is clear that effective use of this one type of property alone presents a management problem unequaled in private industry, and almost beyond the comprehension of the average individual.

After poring over the pages of the Commission's huge and startling report, let us pick another example of overlapping at random. Here it is. Forty-seven employees attached to seven separate field services of the Agriculture Department have been working with 1,500 farmers in one county of Georgia. In one Missouri county, a farmer recently received from five different agencies,

"varying advice on the application of fertilizer on his farm" the report says. It adds: "Farmers are confused and irritated."

The size of Federal bookkeeping is such that it sometimes gets out of control. There was one occasion when the Army lost 9,000 tanks and never missed them. They were simply overlooked.

The standard application form used by a person who seeks a job with the Federal Government is No. 57. What about the persistent individual who had to fill out 32 of these identical forms before he was appointed?

Why couldn't one application have been sufficient?

Or the veterans who receive notices that they had been overpaid while in service and would they kindly pay it back as soon as possible. Why do these major mistakes happen so often?

Many businessmen are reluctant to do business with the Government because they have to wait so long for their money. Not that they won't get it if they are patient enough. It's the red tape that sufficates them. Pity the poor Government worker, however, who has to fight his way through this never-ending sea of forms, letters and papers. He is the heroic David battling a Goliath.

Every President since 1902—Teddy Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt—have tried to organize this mass into something resembling an orderly and efficient business. In each case, the reform fizzled out because one agency head would insist that his unit was indispensable and all the others followed suit. What had started out as a necessity, was soon paralyzed by exceptions.

Never before have we had such a complete, nonpartisan, and scientific analysis of our Federal Government. The reports of the exhaustive survey are still coming in. They point clearly to the need for consolidating the repetitious agencies, for improving the methods of handling personnel, and for establishing a clear line of authority from the President down.

Not simply to save $3,000,000,000, which is nothing to sniff at even in these days, but to insure prompt and efficient service by Government.

The medicine of reform may be hard to take for the few, but it will be good for the many. Bureaucracy will grow and grow until it finally overwhelms us, unless we lop off the deadwood and reorganize Government to conform to sound administrative procedures.

The blueprint is at hand. What are we going to do about it?

You may answer that the responsibility lies with Congress. But Congress is being bombarded even now with telegrams, petitions, and various other forms of pressure to exempt this agency or that agency from the streamlining recommendations.

Congress needs to know where you, the citizens of the United States, stand on this matter.

You will get better Government, and at a price which you can afford to pay, if you speak up in support of those who favor reorganization.

Lithuanian Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the resolutions which were unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held by Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Society, on February 13, 1949, at the Lithuanian naturalization club hall, on Vermont Street, in Worcester.

The resolutions follow:

Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the Republic of Lithuania, to deport and imprison Lithuania's nationals, to commit atrocities against the Government and civil population of Lithuania, to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government: Be it

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful by-force-of-arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against Russia's deportation and imprisonment of Lithuania's nationals, against Russia's commitment of atrocities against the Government and civilian population of Lithuania, against Russia's systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; further

Resolved, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do hereby most fervently petition Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost the influence of the Government of the United States of America, to the end that all Russian military forces and government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and that Lithuania and her people be liberated and Lithuania be restored as a free and independent republic among the nations of the world, according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America; the Secretary of State, Hon. Dean Acheson; the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts; and to the press.

MICHAEL ZEMAITAITIS,
Chairman.

Our Place in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of permission granted, I am including a letter I wrote the State Department and the answer thereto.

I am putting this correspondence into the RECORD as a matter of protection.

Some years ago while a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I protested the shipment of iron scrap to Japan. I insisted upon the building of stockpiles of necessary material. While I made my position perfectly clear with regard to those two matters, I did not at that time make any statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This time, however, I wish my position to be a matter of public record.

For some time I have disagreed with the State, Army, and Navy Departments relative to the policy we have pursued with respect to China.

While chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent around the world one very well qualified to make a report to me relative to our situation in the East, for the use of the subcommittee.

I have repeatedly announced my layman's opinion with regard to what should be done by us to maintain a world position we did not seek but which we must either sustain or quit.

Here are the letters which briefly outline my position concerning the present situation in the Far East. I am still compelled to think we are making the greatest mistake possible unless and until we assume the burden of our responsibility.

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Some time ago I informed the Secretary of Defense as to my intense interest in the matter of our lack of proper consideration of what our situation in China soon will be.

Last fall, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent a qualified representative to China to make an inspection and to report to me the result of his investigation. I have transmitted the substance of the report to the Secretary of the Navy.

I desire to be informed what has been done by the State Department looking toward the acquisition, under some kind of lease arrangement, of Tsingtao.

Tsingtao, German planned and built, "has almost everything to recommend it as a base for military and naval operations. As you know, it is situated on the coast of the strategic Shantung Peninsula and possesses one of the world's most excellent harbors. Here the Germans builded well and their handiwork remains in use even today. The topography of the area with rugged mountains surrounding it ideally recommends itself to military defenses. This fact was patently shown by the first German defense of Tsingtao during the First World War.

"The plain facts are that we are spending limited amounts of money here in the maintenance of our garrison on invitation of the present Chinese Government. Expenditures are made, however, only to that extent which is necessary to maintain it as a temporary makeshift base of operations with no real control over the area. This place has great possibilities for development but as previously indicated we are here merely on invitation and common sense would dictate that it would be foolhardy to expend large sums to install those permanent installations so necessary for the creation of a modern naval establishment unless there were assurances forthcoming that we alone would be the recipients of the benefits of our own handiwork. In my judgment the acquisition of Tsingtao under lease arrangement should be attempted. It would require hard work and delicate diplomacy but it is well worth that try. Such an accomplishment would be of tremendous benefit to the United States of America.

"Tsingtao definitely lies across the Russian path southward down the coast of China. Developed it would stand as a powerful checkmate to Russian communism at Dairen, Manchuria, and Vladivostok. Most important of all is the fact that it would be a toehold for America on the China coast in the event that all of China falls into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I am not one who believes that Russia will absorb China if this should take place. I do believe, however, that the Chinese Reds will, if they obtain the ascendency, need economic aid and that should we be so located we would still be in a position to approach them—and they approach us—in the channels of trade. I am also not so sure but what this Chinese brand of communism in due time if properly

handled could be changed to something less than Red. It is well worth noting that past events indicated that millions of Chinese are susceptible to the persuasion of economic conditions. At least the chances of modification or conversion of Chinese communism would be far greater than if we were nonexistent on the China coast.

"Most diabolical would be the withdrawal of American forces from China and the subsequent establishment of leased Russian bases along the Chinese coast provided by a Chinese Government friendly to and in obligation to Red Russia. To face such a situation, the United States as I see it would be forced to expend untold billions in Japan, Okinawa, Guam, and the Philippines or else be reconciled to a withdrawal from the Western Pacific. The latter would be a most dangerous step."

We should, if it now be possible, negotiate a lease of the old German base at Tsingtao, rebuild and modernize it, and that at the earliest possible moment.

We should not continue to be so inconsiderate of our own welfare as we were when, against the protests of many, we continued to ship scrap iron to Japan, neglected to afford ourselves a second waterway route from the Atlantic to the Pacific transisthmus, anchored our fleet in the harbor of Oahu as a target and an invitation to the massacre which occurred.

I feel very deeply about the matter of the lease of the fortifications at Tsingtao, as I have felt concerning the other matters to which I refer, and I am writing this letter as and for a matter of record in that respect.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

The Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 24, 1949, indicating your interest in the acquisition by the United States of the city of Tsingtao under a lease arrangement with the Chinese Government and asking that you be informed regarding the steps which the Department of State has taken to that end.

The Department of State had not previously been aware of your deep concern in this problem and your views have been received with interest. They have been made available to the immediately concerned officers in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs who are available for consultation with you at any time about the problems involved in your suggestion that this Government acquire Tsingtao under a lease arrangement. This Department has not been informed by the National Military Establishment that such action is desirable for military purposes and has taken no steps looking toward the negotiation of such a lease. Thank you for making your views available and be assured of this Department's interest in receiving them.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor.
(For the Secretary of State.)

Unemployment Claims Personnel

REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on February 15 and 16 when we were considering the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949, I called to the attention of the House and urged the need from the well of this House for a larger appropriation to provide the necessary personnel to handle the unemployment claims that were being filed by the many persons who had to wait in long lines before reaching the desk of the one to whom such were to be submitted.

I expressed then, and I renew that hope as fervently now, that the growing unemployment, particularly as it was increasing in my district, the State of Connecticut, was not a definite trend toward long and extended lay-offs. Nonetheless, I would be derelict in my duties and obligations if I did not at this time bring to the attention of my colleagues notice to the fact that the figures submitted on February 16, namely 54,451 unemployed in Connecticut now, as of March 1, continued upward to 56,120, substantiating further my assertion that more people are needed to handle these claims and more of the money should be immediately sent back to the States because it was originally assessed and collected for the purpose of providing the necessary personnel to handle these claims.

I trust that the membership of the House and particularly the members of the Appropriations Committee will be mindful of these facts when the first deficiency appropriation bill is returned by the other body for conference and acceptance in the House. Mindful, also, of the fact that our failure to provide sufficient funds to handle the claims is resulting in hardship for the many unemployed who cannot afford to wait from 5 to 9 weeks before they commence to receive unemployment checks.

Your attention and consideration is invited to the latest report of the Department of Labor, Employment Security Division, State of Connecticut, prepared for research and statistics as of March 1, 1949. Also, to the excerpts from the Hartford Times of Tuesday, March 1, entitled "For Job Benefits," stressing the point that I made during the discussion of the bills that as much time is necessary for the processing of partial claims as is required for the handling of full claims, together with one more excerpt from the New Haven Register of Tuesday, March 1, confirming the fact that unemployment keeps rising in New England.

[From the Connecticut Department of Labor, employment security division]

JOBLESS CLAIMANTS REACH 56,000

The number of jobless claimants for unemployment-insurance benefits in Connecticut continued upward to 56,120 during the week ended February 26. This is the highest total since the end of the war reconversion lay-offs which reached a peak of 67,467 during the week ended January 26, 1946. The claim load was 110 percent more than the corresponding week a year ago and 161 percent over mid-October when the present upward trend began.

Partial continued claims numbered 2,834, which is 6 percent of the continued claims taken during the week.

Initial claims, which represent new unemployment, totaled 6,909 as compared with 7,004 for the previous week and 2,779 a year ago.

New Haven with 9,172 claimants surpassed Bridgeport with 8,770 for the third straight week. Hartford was next with 7,073 followed by Waterbury with 6,274. The other 15 offices were each under 3,000.

Lack of work lay-offs in 7 textile mills totaled 1,000 and in 2 electrical appliance concerns 600. Other lack-of-work lay-offs of over 50 were reported in the machinery, hardware, bearings, and paper-box industries.

The Ansonia office reported a lay-off of 35 by a pocketbook plant and 50 by a rubber-products concern due to lack of work.

In the Bridgeport area, an electrical appliance manufacturer laid off 200 due to lack of work.

A Danbury hat company laid off 30 due to lack of work.

In the Danielson area, 1 textile company laid off 375 and 3 other textile mills a total of 115 with lack of work the reason in each instance.

The Hartford office reported a lay-off of 25 by a meter manufacturer due to lack of work.

In the Meriden area a bearings factory laid off 80 due to lack of work.

A Middletown hardware plant laid off 30 due to lack of orders.

In the New Britain area an electrical-products company laid off 400 and a machinery manufacturer 150 due to lack of work.

The New Haven office reported a lay-off of 275 by a boat manufacturer due to reorganization.

A New London printing-press concern laid off 65 due to lack of work.

A Norwalk footwear concern laid off 100 because of fire.

In the Norwalk area a woolen-textile mill laid off 300 and a cotton-textile mill 200 due to lack of work.

A Stamford chemicals concern cut production and laid off 25.

In the Thompsonville area an air-lines concern reduced operations and laid off 40.

A Torrington sporting-goods manufacturer laid off 75 due to lack of work.

In the Waterbury district a clock company hired 50. A paper-box company placed 50 on a week-on week-off basis. A rubber-products factory laid off 35.

[From the New Haven Evening Register of March 1, 1949]

UNEMPLOYMENT KEEPS RISING IN NEW ENGLAND—245,000 NOW IDLE—GENERAL TREND IN CONNECTICUT IS UPWARD

BOSTON, March 1.—Unemployment has been on the increase generally in New England since October and there are approximately 245,000 persons out of work in the six-State area, a survey showed today.

Month by month unemployment has increased up to January in all States, and there has been a leveling off during February only in Massachusetts.

Since July of 1947, the highest amount of workers seeking unemployment compensation in Massachusetts was 129,000 in January. A representative week in February indicated 126,489 persons idle, an increase of 43.54 percent over the comparable period of 1948.

The general trend in Connecticut has been upward from an October figure of 25,500, to a February 15 mark of 58,300.

Rhode Island reported about 18,000 fewer persons working in production jobs compared with a year ago. Of this total, 13,309 lost jobs in textile plants, the State's principal industry. February lay-offs were announced in a rubber footwear plant as well as textile shops and the New Haven Railroad.

MAINE REPORTS RISE

The Maine Unemployment Compensation Commission says 24,381 persons sought benefits in the week ending February 19. This compared with 16,516 for a like period a year ago. Maine figures indicated an increase of 1,841 unemployed over January.

In that State shoe and textile industries were heavy contributors, but shoes and cottons were reported as picking up again. Lumbering was perking up too and greater employment in this field was expected with the arrival of spring.

New Hampshire reports a 18,500 figure for February unemployment compared with 17,000 for January and 10,500 for February last year.

Vermont officials said 6,520 persons were paid unemployment compensation in a representative week last month. The number of persons out of work in Vermont a year ago was about 3,925, according to compensation figures, indicating a sharp increase.

[From the Hartford Times of March 1, 1949]

FOR JOB BENEFITS

The advent of "short time" in many factories in Connecticut has resulted in a great increase in claims for partial unemployment, Commissioner of Labor John J. Egan announced today.

Workers are considered partially unemployed when their weekly earnings are less than their benefit rate plus $3. A benefit rate is approximately one-half a normal week's wages up to a maximum of $24. Workers who do not earn $3 more than their benefit rate and who are employed less than the full workweek, should file claims at their local unemployment office.

Workers on part time who do not know their benefit rate should wrie to the Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Department, 285 Broad Street, for this information.

Partial payments are provided for in the Unemployment Compensation Act and are arrived at by deducting a worker's short-time earnings from his benefit rate. In making the deduction, $3 and any fraction of a dollar of earnings are disregarded, thus giving a bonus to the partially unemployed worker. In addition, dependency benefits may be claimed, the same as if the individual were totally unemployed.

Partial payments are designed to relieve the distress caused when factories are forced to go on "short time."

Workers on a week-on week-off basis will also be eligible for unemployment compensation.

Food for Thought on Veterans' Pension Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are some who are critical of veterans' pension legislation. While they may be sincere in their opposition, I am calling to their attention the Washington Newsletter distributed this week by Representative PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan.

Congressman SHAFER's statement on the veterans' pension issue provides much food for thought on the part of all of us.

Congressman SHAFER's Newsletter follows:

This week let us take up the issue of the veterans' pension legislation which will soon be considered by the Congress.

So far as can be recalled, very few Americans have ever been against pensions for our veterans. Certainly, voting pensions for veterans is an old American custom. Congress voted pensions for veterans of the Civil War, and so did most Southern States provide pensions for the boys in gray who fought on the wrong side of that conflict.

Congress voted pensions for veterans of the Spanish-American War.

Now that Congress is being asked to vote pensions for men and youth who fought in World War I and World War II, President Truman has the temerity to come out and say there is a limit to the amount of money the Federal Government can spend.

No one ever heard him say that about the huge sums voted for Europe in the years since the late war ended. On the contrary, he has consistently supported the highest figure mentionable when it came to funneling money to the nations of the world, much of which, we now learn, has found its way into Russia, with whom we are fighting a cold war.

Mr. Truman never mentioned that there was a limit to the funds in the Treasury when he plunked for the British loan, which, incidentally, has been spent, forgotten, and never considered for repayment. He never mentioned any limit on Treasury funds in connection with spending in Greece and Turkey or in connection with his not-yet-unveiled bold new program for throwing American dollars to the wind in Asia, Africa, and South America.

Mr. Truman has never mentioned that there is a limit on Federal money to be thrown into the South to build up schools for people who refuse to pay taxes to construct their own schools, or that there is a limit on Federal money that can be wasted in huge boondoggling projects throughout the West and far West.

Yet when the veterans of World Wars I and II want pensions, President Truman voices his opposition and, for the first time during his service as United States Senator, Vice President, and President, he has intimated that he might believe there is a limit to the amount of money the Government might spend.

It is refreshing to hear of Mr. Truman's awakening, to say the least, but it does seem strange to many Members of Congress that he should wait until a veterans' pension bill is to be considered to make his pronouncement.

The pension bill now before Congress is admittedly far from what it should be, but it is freely predicted in Washington that it will be amended in line with suggestions of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other service organizations and will be passed by the House.

Those who quarrel with Congressmen who vote for the pension bill will expect to be reminded of the billions of dollars that are being wasted throughout the world, and that possibly there might be less global spending if some of those dollars are funneled into the pockets of the American veterans and thence into the economy of the country.

PAUL SHAFER.

Increase in Vehicle Accidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURIE C. BATTLE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I received from Mr. Vernon Whitt, of Fairfield, Ala., concerning the inexcusable and rapid increase in vehicle accidents in this country. This is a condition which should and must be corrected. The figures are appalling. I want to call this tragic state of affairs to the attention of all the responsible leaders in Congress and all responsible citizens throughout the country. I urge each of you to give serious consideration to this shocking traffic situation with this thought in mind: These deaths are avoidable.

The letter follows:

FAIRFIELD, ALA., *February 17, 1949.*

Hon. LAURIE C. BATTLE,

Congress of the United States, Ninth District of Alabama, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am very much distressed at our rapid increase in the vehicle accidents occurring in our State and throughout the country, and thought I would write you concerning thic matter.

In the interest of safety on our highways and to help curb the fast-mounting list of accidental deaths it seems to me that some drastic steps should be taken immediately on this subject. I wish to give you the following comparative figures on the number of persons killed by vehicles (supposedly on our national highways), for the period 1941–47.

1941	39,969
1942	28,309
1943	23,823
1944	24,282
1945	28,076
1946	33,411
1947	32,300

You will note from the above that our vehicle deaths were low during the war years, and while it was true our rubber for tire manufacture for civilian use was limited and tires were recapped again and again, and our automobiles were old and parts were hard to get, etc., but during that time we had a "war speed" limit which I personally feel was a large contributing factor to the decline in our vehicle deaths. Everyone felt it their patriotic duty to stay within the law and conserve the rubber, for we had a war to win. Now we have a fairly good supply of rubber but yet we are allowing our vehicles to speed much too fast for the safety of all concerned, and continue murdering our people on our highways, at a much higher rate apparently than during the time we were in war, and at a faster rate even than in the thick of the war itself.

While I realize that in many instances emergencies arise which require fast speeds, but in cases where emergencies do not exist, it seems to me that a maximum speed limit should be set for say 50 miles per hour, on our highways and a reasonable and safe speed for our residential city-limit areas. I frankly believe that if the public were told that a heavy penalty would be placed upon the violators, who had no reasonable excuse for such fast speed, that it would have a very good effect and certainly a decided change would be effected in our vehicle deaths.

While statistics are not yet available for 1948, it is my understanding from highway officials that the number of deaths will be higher than 1947.

I merely bring this to your attention in the hope of bringing about some reduction in our serious accidents which are currently occurring here in our State and elsewhere, and trusting that some measures can be taken at an early date which will create more interest and action in the States' safety programs, and get the State and local officials to help bring about an appreciable reduction in the precious lives lost on our highways. This has been a matter that has been of deep concern to me for the last several months, as I narrowly escaped serious injury or death and I have seen some very serious accidents and deaths resultant to fast-speeding cars, and blind-curve passing, and intoxicated drivers.

Yours very truly,

VERNON WHITT.

The Give-Away State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer for February 23, 1949:

THE GIVE-AWAY STATE

The utopian dream of a land in which nobody is under compulsion to work and plan for his own future or that of his family runs through the expanded social-security program which President Truman has submitted to Congress.

In this happy land, half the people will be receiving Government checks for one thing and another, while the other half will be on the Government pay roll, supervising the distribution of welfare funds.

The old-fashioned virtues of thrift, perseverance, and hard work no longer will be necessary in order to enjoy the more abundant life.

Work? No one need work at all. The Government will take care of those who are needy and in want. Of course the amount of Government aid now proposed is comparatively small—$50 a month for one person, $50 for the first dependent, and $20 for each additional dependent—but that can be increased.

Some people may insist on working to avoid boredom. The Government will tax them a maximum of $96 a year to begin with—more later—and when they are 65 they will be able to retire on a maximum pension of $150 a month. In the case of women, retirement pensions would begin at age 60. Later, of course, retirement ages could be lowered and pension payments increased.

In the long run this might be more expensive than private insurance, but why should anyone bother to take out insurance any more. The Government will do all the insuring.

No longer will it be necessary for anyone to save anything for a rainy day. The Government will compensate everyone who is sick and disabled, and under the provisions of another measure, which is still to come, the Government will pay all hospital and medical bills; and if the precedent established in England is followed in this country, the Government will even supply everyone who is baldheaded with two wigs a year, and pay the cost of dry-cleaning them.

The farmers will just love the Truman social-security system. It will be better than Henry Wallace's scheme of destroying the little pigs and plowing under the corn and cotton. It will be even better than the program of paying farmers for not raising crops, or the existing arrangement of price supports.

All the farmers will have to do is to pay 2½ percent of their incomes every year to the Government—at the start, that is. In a few years the rate will have to be increased. But what difference will that make? No longer will the farmers have to worry about prices or markets or droughts or storms. The Government will take care of them when they get to be 65 years old, provided they quit work at that time.

Doctors, lawyers, small-business men (it doesn't say how small they have to be), and everybody else is to have the benefit of this Government insurance. All they will have to do is to pay part of their incomes to the Government in taxes. Nobody will have to worry about anything again. The Government will take care of everything.

The cost? A trifling $6,000,000,000 a year for the first 5 or 10 years. After that it will be more. Then the Government will decide whether to raise the rates or just take the extra money out of general taxes. It won't make much difference. The only question will be whether the Government should take money away from some of the people all of the time or from all of the people some of the time in order to give it to all of the people all of the time.

There may be a few difficulties still to be ironed out. For one thing, President Truman said at his news conference last Thursday that he had never heard of a proposal to extend Federal aid to all poor people, but that provision is in one of the bills he submitted to Congress.

Before passing the bills Congress ought to make sure there isn't anything else in them that the President doesn't know about.

This program is supposed to constitute social security. Social disintegration would be a more accurate name for it. It has been dreamed up to bring into existence the human-welfare state. The give-away state would be more appropriate.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, Leo A. Lerner, the editor and publisher of the newspapers owned by the Myers Publishing Co., has long held an enviable reputation as one of the most respected citizens of the city of Chicago. Under his guiding hand the 23 north and northwest side community newspapers of the company have consistently carried out high standards of public service and established themselves as a force for the cause of truth and justice in the city.

In 1946 Mr. Lerner was given the national merit award of the Decalogue Society of Lawyers, an award which had previously been won by the late Wendell Willkie, Marshall Field, Frank Knox, and Bishop Sheil, giving recognition to the intense devotion to and accomplishment for the good of the community.

Mr. Lerner's editorials are widely read throughout Chicago. They are characterized by power and keen analysis of public affairs, for Mr. Lerner has an unusual capacity to simplify even the most complex issue.

I believe Mr. Lerner's recent editorial on the need for health insurance, which appeared in the February 27 issue of the Lincoln Belmont Booster, is particularly interesting. The article follows:

THE FIRST COLUMN
(By Leo A. Lerner)
THE STORY OF A PEANUT

Doctors are always asking me why it is necessary for the country to have medical health insurance when there is no proposal to nationalize other kinds of private enterprise. One doctor wanted to know why we don't nationalize the steel mills, or the power industry, or the telephone company. Why, he asks, are we picking on the poor doctors?

He even asked me how I would like it if the Government were to socialize the newspaper business. I think part of the answer can be given in the story of a peanut.

On Christmas Day of last year a little boy less than 2 years old, named Stewart Lawrence, swallowed a peanut in his home at Cleveland. Stewart's father, Conrad, aged 20, was the owner of a retail appliance business there.

Papa Conrad was called home when Stewart started choking over the peanut. Of course, the doctor was also called immediately and little Stewart was rushed to the hospital and operated on.

The peanut was removed, but Stewart didn't recover so rapidly as expected. He stayed in the hospital, he had to have special nurses, and his folks had to pay the doctor bill, the hospital bills, the medicine bills, and the nursing bills.

A few days ago, because Stewart's condition did not improve, it was decided that Stewart must have a second operation—the outcome of which his parents are anxiously awaiting.

But here is the pay-off: Since the day that Stewart swallowed the peanut, his father has gone broke trying to keep up with the medical costs of saving his little son's life. He has lost his appliance business, he is $1,700 in debt, and whether baby Stewart lives or dies it will probably be many years before the young parents will be able to pay off the costs of the tragedy that started with a peanut.

This is a true story. The picture of baby Stewart and his mother appeared on the back page of the Chicago Daily News recently. But the story is not untypical of thousands of such cases that are happening around us all the time.

A very close friend of mine lost a $200,000 business and is now working as a hiker in a parking lot because of the illness of one of his children. The boy is still sick, but the doctors, the hospitals, and all the other beneficiaries of medical costs have eaten all the money that my friend could gather, beg or borrow.

If the doctors want to prevent what they call socialized medicine their problem is to figure out how to save the American people from the threat of financial ruin when illness strikes the family.

The phone company may be a monopoly, but the average phone bill is only $4 or $5 a month and seldom breaks anybody.

The railroads may give poor service and need to be vastly improved, but you can still go to New York for $40 or to Milwaukee for $1.80.

United States Steel may hike the prices and thus add to the cost of living, but each individual can decide for himself just how much he can afford to buy of things made of steel, and the steel monopoly never confronts him with any emergency that will put him in the poorhouse.

If you need one of our newspapers you can buy one for a few pennies and you can place an ad in it for around $1.50.

But should your baby swallow a peanut you suddenly find yourself at the mercy of a system where everybody is nice and kind and decent and friendly, but where the total costs practically eat you up alive.

I have recently seen four-bed rooms in hospitals so crowded that it is impossible for visitors to walk between the beds. Yet the patients in those beds are paying $8 a day and many of them do not have hospitalization insurance and cannot get it.

It is not unusual for a man of modest circumstances to be charged as much as $1,000 for an operation. When the doctors say he needs the operation, what can he do but promise to pay and thus mortgage his life and future?

Some surgeon who is not the family physician, but an impersonal operating surgical machine, may do three to four such expensive operations in a single day.

The point we all seem to be missing in discussing medical insurance is that illness comes unexpectedly like an accident, and that when it comes, people are unprepared for it. Illness used to be thought of as an incapacitating phenomenon, but in modern social terminology it must be considered a catastrophic phenomenon. Even a mild heart attack, or some sickness that can be controlled in its physical aspects, may create an uncontrollable economic shock.

The solution obviously is to set up insurance on the accident of illness, the way we set up insurance for the accident of fire, or a tornado, or flood, or an auto mishap.

In that way we will take the element of desperation out of the results of any accidents to the human body, the same as we now do for plate glass.

What's good enough for plate glass ought to be good enough for people.

When the American people say they want a medical insurance system (five polls taken in the last few years say that a majority of them do), they are not expressing any disrespect for the doctors or for the splendid men in the medical profession. They are merely saying, "What can we do to protect ourselves against the poverty that might strike us if we or our loved ones should get sick?"

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to a resolution adopted unanimously by an association representing 26 private colleges in the State of Indiana, of which Dr. O. P. Kretzmann, of Valparaiso University, in my district, is the president, wherein they express their views on the proposal for rendering Federal aid to education. This resolution, which was adopted during a series of meetings held in Indianapolis, concluded in January 1949, is as follows:

We, the members of the Indiana Association of Church-Related and Independent Colleges, consisting of 26 colleges and universities throughout the State, reaffirm our belief in the present American system of education, consisting of State-supported, church-related, and privately endowed elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities, each complementary to the other, with their diversity and competition maintaining the freedom which is the chief ornament of all.

We hold that this freedom would be threatened by any general Federal subvention of higher education, which would involve a great immediate financial burden, and, we believe, ultimate regimentation and control.

We, therefore, unite in supporting the following specific propositions:

1. We advocate adequate financing of State-owned colleges and universities through State taxes.

2. In general, we oppose Federal aid to all institutions of higher learning. Any financial support of education from the Federal Government should be for specific purposes, for individual scholarships, or granted on an outright single-gift basis.

Properly administered, this would not involve regimentation or control.

3. We believe that private institutions of higher learning should continue to look to churches, foundations, individuals, business corporations, and other nongovernmental sources for financial support.

Murray-Wagner-Dingell Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hugh Thompson on the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill at the Amherst Central High School, Snyder, N. Y., February 24, 1949:

Gentlemen, every year 325,000 people die unnecessarily because of inadequate medical care or because they are unable to pay for a doctor. Every year the Nation loses 4,300,000 man-years of work through bad health. Every year the Nation loses $27,000,000,000 in national wealth through sickness and partial and total disability. During the war 5,000,000 men were declared physically or mentally unfit for the armed services. No nation can allow these conditions to exist if it has the means to correct them. Our prosperity and our national physical well-being depends heavily upon maintaining our health at the highest level. Any attempt on our part to reduce sickness and premature death and promote individual and community welfare will certainly be worth the effort.

Through the years we have lengthened the life of every individual born by 20 years through preventive medical care. And the most important single reason for this improvement has been through the development of modern medicine. Scientific medicine is newer than electricity.

Not too many years ago many hospitals were little better than pesthouses and filthy—not anything like the modern, clean, scientific workshops they are today. But this record good as it sounds leaves plenty of room for improvement. Of the more than 3,800 deaths that occur daily in the United States nearly 900 or 23 percent are preventable. Do you know that each year 1,400,000 people die in this country? Certainly most of these deaths could not be prevented. They have either reached old age or they die because of unavoidable accidents or catastrophies, or the largest group because medical science does not have the means to save them. However, some of these deaths do not have to occur if we had enough medical manpower and hospitals available and a better system of financing the care for these patients. Our present total of 1,400,000 deaths could certainly be reduced. However, we cannot arrive at any exact estimate of the number of lives that could be saved each year but certainly we could prolong the lives of several hundred thousand each year. For example: It has been estimated that out of 170,000 deaths from communicable disease, which includes pneumonia, that occurs every year, we should be able to save about 120,000 with the knowledge and skill we now have. Of the more than 600,000 deaths from cancer and heart disease each year we should be able to save 115,000. The fuller use of safety measures and better education would permit us to save perhaps 40,000 of the 100,000 deaths yearly from accidents. Of all infant deaths that occur we have some evidence that at least from 30,000 to 110,000 who now die every year could be saved. And the 400,000 who die each year from the several hundred diseases which claim these lives we could probably save in the neighborhood of 20,000. These are some of the lives we could save if we were able to assure every person in the country that he would receive the health and medical service that he needs, regardless of the level of his personal income.

At the present time less than 20 percent of our people are able to afford all the medical care they need. About half of our citizens whose incomes are $3,000 per year or less find it almost impossible to pay for even routine medical care. Another 30 percent of our families with incomes between $3,000 and $5,000 would have to make sacrifices or go into debt for one severe or chronic illness. And remember this condition helps to limit the number of doctors who will go into the profession. It also places high barriers in the path of building adequate facilities. This is what we are confronted with as a nation through our inadequacies in health facilities, their results, and the cost in needless deaths and suffering. We must make a decision.

We can continue the present system which is slowly eating away the vitality of our Nation or we can strike out boldly with a plan to bring ourselves around quickly into line with our national and individual needs.

To us there can be but one alternative, and that is the establishment of a national health-insurance program which will increase the facilities for hospitalization and the personnel to man these hospitals. A program of education to bring about the increase of from 190,000 active doctors today to at least 240,000 and from the present supply of dentists, which is 75,000 to approximately 100,000, increase our present supply of nurses from 318,000 to at least 500,000, and increase our hospital beds from the present capacity of 900,000 beds to at least one and a half million. These are staggering assignments for any nation, but this is the minimum need required to give us proper medical attention. The bill that is proposed, known as the Murray-Wagner-Dingell-McGrath bill, will do just this. That is why it is so necessary to have it passed at this time.

I cannot pass up this opportunity of also going into the question of mental health. This is one of the diseases which is always hushed up. But—do you know that over half the patients in our hospitals on any given day are mental patients? Approximately 600,000! Do you know that every year there are 150,000 committed to mental hospitals in the United States? Do you know that over 2,000,000 men were turned down during the war because of mental disorders? Do you know that there are 8,000,000 people in the United States suffering from mental illness?

These figures are appalling, nevertheless, they are true, and we must face the facts. And we can expect these figures to go up since mental illness increases with age and the average age of our population is continually rising. So this problem also must be tackled, and since it is included in the legislation proposed in the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill, then it becomes more necessary for us to press for the enactment of this legislation.

Now after explaining the needs for such legislation and the inadequacies of our present system for caring for the sick you get to the point of how much it is going to cost. Well—as I stated it cost the United States in man-hours lost $27,000,000,000 yearly in national income. Then let us compare what the cost would be to ourselves as individuals remembering that none of

the moneys expended under this program would come out of our general tax program. The system of collecting the moneys would be incorporated in the social-security program which collects 1 percent of our earnings to protect us and give us a pension after 65. Well, the cost of a program to protect us while we are healthy and extend our lives so that we may enjoy the benefits of social security by living longer would cost each individual 1½ percent of our earnings. More than that it gives the protection to every member of the family, and the services include hospitalization for any sickness, the best of surgical or medical care that could be provided, the best in medicine, dental care, eyeglasses, and hearing aids. This is what you would buy for 1½ percent of your annual earnings. To me it is well worth it.

The charge by the medical profession that this is socialized medicine is entirely false and a misrepresentation. Under socialized medicine or state system the Government owns and operates all hospitals and the practicing physicians are employed by the Government on a salary basis like the firemen and policemen and they come under Government supervision. Clearly, no such system is proposed under this plan. Freedom of choice is left open to the doctors and to the hospitals as to whether they will participate. The method and rate of payment is left up to the community organization which they belong to like the Erie County Medical Society. The only charge proposed or advocated by this program is that instead of the patient paying as he has, the doctor would be paid out of the insurance system at a rate and by a method to which he agreed. This is thoroughly American and it is upon the same principle that he presently collects from the Blue Cross or the Blue Shield for his services. The funny thing about this is the doctors forget to mention that they are performing the same kind of services today in the administration of immunization treatment or venereal-disease therapy.

The doctors talk about this plan being compulsory. It is only compulsory in one aspect, and that aspect is that all persons would pay a stipulated percentage—1½ percent—for the services and the benefits under the system. It is only compulsory in the same form as the unemployment insurance and the old-age and survivors' insurance and who would want to destroy that system today and who would say that is socialism?

The old argument of the doctors is that the power is left in one man. Under this bill no such system is proposed and the actual administration of the program would remain clearly with the citizens and the localities as to the method of handling finances.

The doctors argue that it would cost a lot of money. At present the expenditures for national health are somewhere between five and five and a half billion dollars, but only those who are sick pay this bill. Wouldn't it be much easier even if the expenditures were twice that amount to have all the people pay their share on the basis of their ability to pay? The most that any family head earned, $4,800 per year, he would have to pay $1.40 per week or $72.80 per year. The average working man would pay $39 per year which would give full coverage. Each individual would have free choice of doctor and hospital and the doctor would have free choice of the patient to reject or accept and to determine the fee to be charged.

But let us consider the statement of the medical profession against this bill. They say the individual would not have the free choice of the doctor. It is a very ridiculous charge, but it is more ridiculous when you consider that many people today do not have a free choice of physician for two reasons: (1) In many sections of the country there are not enough doctors to meet the needs, and (2) many millions of people do not have the money to pay doctors. Where is the freedom of choice for these people? In those areas where they have few if any doctors and those who cannot afford to pay, in one case they must choose the doctor that is available and the other must choose the doctor that charity provides.

A plan such as is contemplated in this bill would certainly provide greater freedom of choice because it would help assure a better supply of physicians in underprivileged areas and prepayment would entitle millions who cannot pay to have the services of a doctor of their choice.

Another argument the doctors raise is that this bill establishes a program under the dictatorship of a Surgeon General. Well, who is better qualified to direct this program than a doctor which the Surgeon General must be?

Doctors Resent AMA Levy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 22, 1949:

DOCTORS RESENT THIRD BALLOTING ON $25 AMA LEVY—BROOKLYN GROUP DENOUNCES COUNTY SOCIETY ACTION AS UNAUTHORIZED BY MEMBERS

The Kings County Medical Society started a third balloting on the $25 assessment of the American Medical Association yesterday to the resentment of many Brooklyn doctors who have twice voted it down.

In post cards received yesterday morning by the society's 3,600 members, Dr. Irwin E. Siris, asked not only for a vote on the $25 levy but sounded out doctors' feelings on socialized medicine. The cards also required that the physicians list their names and addresses at the bottom.

The society's members rejected the assessment January 18 by a vote of 148 to 131 in a show of hands, and February 16 with secret ballots, they turned it down again with a vote of 861 to 755, said to be the largest vote in the society's history. The Kings County vote was a glaring departure from the Nation-wide vote of AMA members, which went 85 percent in favor of the levy.

Dr. Herman Bolka, chairman of the physicians committee against the $25 assessment in Brooklyn, said the post-card poll had not been authorized by the membership, that it brought up subjects never previously discussed at society meetings and that the requirement for signatures might possibly lead to intimidation of doctors who were not 100 percent in line with AMA policies.

Dr. Siris said, however, he had authorized the poll himself, "to determine the membership's sentiments so I can guide myself accordingly." He asserted that the cards would be counted Friday by a group representing all factions and that they would be destroyed as soon as it was clear that the tabulation would not be contested.

The post cards carried the following questions: (1) Do you approve of the assessment of $25 levied by our house of delegates? (2) Are you in favor of compulsory health insurance? (3) Do you approve of the 12-point program for the advancement of medicine and public health offered by the AMA on February 13? (4) Have you any constructive suggestions for the improvement of medical care?

Questions (2) and (3) have never been discussed on the floor of the society, and Dr. Siris has no right to ask them, especially in an open ballot, Dr. Bolka asserted. Question (1), he said, immediately destroys the secrecy of the previous ballot.

Dr. Bolka said his group represented doctors who are both for and against compulsory health insurance but who are unanimous in their disapproval of the absence of democratic techniques in the county society and the AMA as a whole.

The Calumet-Sag Channel, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me on March 2, 1949, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions:

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, I am NEIL J. LINEHAN, an electrical contractor and Representative in Congress from the Third District in Illinois, in which is located some of the area of the Calumet-Sag channel project, and all of which will derive much benefit from this development. I have been requested to appear here, with Congressmen O'BRIEN, BUCKLEY, and O'HARA (all of Illinois) by the South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly, an organization of business and labor leaders who are foremost in championing worthy civic improvements calculated to advance the welfare of the people of the district they serve.

In a larger sense, I am here as spokesman for every man, woman, and child of understanding age in my district, all of whom are united in the earnest desire that work on this great project should at once be resumed. I might mention here a few of the leaders in our community who have written and wired me to include their names as sponsors of the request for an appropriation for the immediate start of construction in Sag channel permitting vessels on this waterway to pass as they go to and from the dockage at Lake Calumet. Among these sponsors are:

Alderman Thomas J. Corcoran, eighteenth ward; Committeeman John M. Lee, eighteenth ward; Alderman John J. Duffy, nineteenth ward; Committeeman Thomas Nash; Alderman and Committeeman William Murphy, seventeenth ward; Alderman Paul Sheridan; and Committeeman T. J. Moran; County Clerk Michael J. Flynn.

I was born and reared on the east side of Lake Calumet; I have known the area for over 40 years. As a boy playing on the shores of Lake Calumet I envisioned the day when the ships of the world, flying the flags of all nations, would dock in this inland body of water to receive from a network of railroads the products of a great middle western industrial center and locality, and to transport to the Atlantic and from the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico. As a Member of the Eighty-first Congress I can conceive of no greater thrill of satisfaction than that which would come to me in being permitted to vote for an appropriation approved by your committee for the beginning of actual work on the project, after the long halt of the wartime years.

We people of Chicago have long favored the development of Lake Calumet and its tributary waterways. As a matter of fact, the Calumet area is the only greater Chicago area available for industrial expansion.

We recommend that area particularly for the location of large heavy industries requiring considerable space. It lends itself exceedingly well to such industry because most of the major railroads pass through that territory, therefore, the changes from rail to water transport has excellent possibilities.

The plan would enable Chicago to take full advantage of increased shipping on the Great Lakes.

The Calumet project would develop unused opportunities for docking space and industrial development along the Calumet-Sag Channel and would establish an interchange harbor in Lake Calumet for deep water and inland vessels.

The Calumet-Sag Channel, which is 9 feet deep, will be widened from its present 60 feet to 225 feet for 16 miles from the junction of the channel and the sanitary and ship canal.

Army engineers plan to widen the Grand Calumet River to 225 feet from its junction with the little Calumet River to the Indiana Harbor Canal in Lake County. From there to Clark Street in Gary, Ind., the limit of the project will be widened to 160 feet.

A channel into Lake Calumet has been dredged as a start toward development of the lake into an interchange harbor. At present the channel is 3,200 feet long, 700 feet wide, and 21 feet deep.

It has been estimated that the volume of shipping now handled on the Calumet-Sag Channel would increase from 1,000,000 to 9,000,000 tons in 5 years after the completion of the project, and will expand to 18,000,000 tons in an additional 10 or 15 years.

In closing I desire to express my appreciation for the opportunity extended me to voice the desire of the people of my district for the resumption of work on this great project. May I emphasize the importance that the appropriation should be available and adequate for the start of actual construction. If the hope of the Middle West is to be realized, it is essential that action not alone be taken but that the action be immediate.

We feel strongly that there is an urgency. Respectfully we petition you to start the long-hoped-for call. Let us start digging.

Lithuanian Liberation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the resolutions which were unanimously adopted at a mass meeting held by Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., on February 16, 1949, at our Lady of Vilna parish hall.

The resolutions follow:

Whereas in violation of the principles expressed in the Atlantic Charter to which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics officially subscribed, Soviet Russia by military force occupied the Republic of Lithuania, and now deprives this Republic of its independent political life, democratic self-government, and membership in the community of nations of the world; and

Whereas since this predatory occupation of Lithuania, Soviet Russia pursued, and continues to pursue, a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, imprisonment, deportation, and dispersion of Lithuania's nationals and the destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government: Be it

Resolved, That we petition the Government of the United States to initiate proper and firm measures for the purpose of compelling Soviet Russia to conform to the Atlantic Charter and other international agreements and covenants; that the U. S. S. R. armed forces, puppet regimes, and terrorist police forces be withdrawn from Lithuania and the other invaded countries, that their deported nationals be returned to their homelands, that Lithuania and all other occupied countries and their peoples be liberated and that Lithuania be restored as a free and independent Republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Harry S. Truman, the President of the United States of America; the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts; and to the press.

C. A. VASYE,
Chairman.
CHARLOTTE MITCHELL,
Secretary.

Address by Hon. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland, Before Pennsylvania and Atlantic Seaboard Hardware Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] before the Pennsylvania and Atlantic Seaboard Hardware Association at Baltimore, Md., on March 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The most gratifying aspect of such a meeting as this, under the sponsorship of the Pennsylvania and Atlantic Seaboard Hardware Association is that busy men handling important matters are willing to listen to a discussion concerning the problems of their Government at the very time when governmental processes are under criticism for lack of efficiency and for wastefulness, it is reassuring to observe that successful businessmen are ready to give attention to these timely questions. And it might be added, untold benefits come to those of us who are entrusted with responsibilities in the functioning of government and who desire counsel and advice which can be gained from first-hand contact with those whom we represent. Of course, there is no reason why a group such as this should not be entitled to demand a report from those who are their servants in governmental posts. You pay the bill and it seems only proper that you have voice in the way that your governmental machinery is operating. We are striving for a reduction in the cost of government and to avoid unnecessary interference by government in private affairs. How better can we learn how to attain those ends than to exchange ideas with the outstanding leaders whose experience and sound judgment ought to be sought most frequently.

It is astounding how different are conditions today than were anticipated only a short period in the past. Five years ago, in the critical days of the war, everyone looked forward to the days of peace which, it was hoped, would follow the war's end. We who had been through the aftermath of World War I should have known better. We all know better now.

These war days of 1944 witnessed a spirit of unity and cooperation among many nations such as never had been known up to that time. Ironical though it seems now, when nations find it so difficult to agree on a way to peace, the peoples of the world then were able to forget their own national ambitions, their inherited dislikes, and to give their unstinted help in friendly cooperation, toward the common goal of victory.

Now, with peace within our grasp, a peace that could bring to all the world freedoms and economic blessings without number, the unity of wartime has given way to a cleavage of ideologies that threatens to split the whole of Christendom. Where, during wartime, national aims were subordinated to the common good, they now run riot. Where once friendliness marked the assemblages of soldiers from all the Allied Nations, today there is an iron curtain that splits Europe as effectively as if there were a gigantic fire door spanning the heart of the Old World, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean.

This communist-spawned division of the world into two armed camps has posed new problems for the United States that call for all the wisdom we can muster if our country, and the whole world, are to find that security against war and violence which all desire so thoroughly. For we find reflected here in America that same disunity of purpose and of aims that marks the world-wide scene.

At home here during the war there was evidenced a spirit of unity that matched the unity of the Allies. Industry and labor forgot their quarrels, agriculture turned to the war effort with a will, and, between them, they enabled America to achieve a record of production of both war material and food that amazed—and saved—the world. Businessmen made the most magnificent contribution of their time, of their energies and of their resources in the interest of our country.

As Chief Executive of a State before Pearl Harbor, during the entire period of the great emergency, and during the early postwar period I was privileged to observe at first hand and at close quarters the magnificent record amassed by labor and management on the war-production front, and by the farmers of our Nation who overcame shortages of equipment and lack of manpower to astound the world while they fed countless millions who otherwise would have had nowhere to turn for sustenance.

Now, back to normalcy as we are, that unity seems to have disappeared, and the old problem of striking a balance between labor and management on the one hand, and between the two and agriculture on the other, threatens to bring chaos upon the national economy. All this despite the fact that the national economy seemed geared to earn for our people a period of prosperity, and of enjoyment of the finer things of life, such as could be imagined in an atomic age where this miracle of achievement could be turned to man's enjoyment rather than to his destruction.

As a result of the disunity throughout the world, therefore, we have vast problems of

war preparations financing. Within the Nation there is further unceasing demand for financing business and governmental facilities so huge as almost to defy accurate conception. All these are superimposed upon the most comprehensive and costly program of veterans' benefits any nation on earth ever dared venture upon.

The thought one cannot escape is this: If we cannot balance our budget in a year of record-breaking national income, what chance will we ever have to strike a balance between national income and outgo? If the budget difficulties were confined to the National Government, it would be bad enough. But the situation is no different on State, county, or municipal levels. Everywhere the story is the same—larger budgets, with constant searching for new and increased tax revenues.

What is the answer? It appears inevitable that the solution will have to include at least two departures from common practices. First, we must put government—all government—on a more businesslike basis. As businessmen, you know how costly and destructive uncontrolled, wild competition can be, yet we have such uncontrolled, wild competition within government, and among the different levels of government. And it adds up to continuing annoyances for businessmen like yourselves, plus, of course, vastly larger taxes than would otherwise be necessary.

I have been a constant advocate of lower taxation because I am firmly of the opinion that the more we eliminate the heavy hand of taxation from private enterprise, the greater will be the incentive for business and industry to redouble their efforts for greater productive effort. By increasing taxation to the highest possible percentages, the Government has discouraged individual initiative. How many times have we heard from indiviuals the understandable statement that after they have earned so much in a given year it is foolish for them to work for additional income because Uncle Sam is ready to take the lion's share of it. Such an attitude is damaging to the economy of this country. America became great through the efforts of private enterprise, because of venture capital, because of the profit motive, and the best thing that can happen for America is to give full play to these laudable American tendencies.

There is competition within Government—different agencies competing in the same field, rendering similar services, maintaining expensive duplicate organizations—and, incidentally, running the taxpayer ragged trying to find out just where to go to get the particular services he needs. Between governments, also, there is duplication and overlapping of services. And, what is much worse and annoying, there is overlapping and duplication of taxation, with two, three, and sometimes more levels of government reaching into the same taxpayer's pocket to share in the same tax moneys.

There is hope, let it be said, that the Federal Government is in for some improvement in its structure and administration. The Senate Expenditures Committee, of which I am a member, right now is passing on legislation for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, as the result of extensive studies made over the past 2 years by a commission under the leadership of former President Herbert Hoover.

Sweeping recommendations for reform have been made. Undoubtedly many of them would bring more efficient administration, at less cost. Each one of them, naturally, treads on someone's toes, and would entail loss of position for certain numbers of persons—so therefore there is opposition, and undercover pressure to resist adoption of some of the proposed changes. But you cannot consolidate activities and agencies without unfavorably affecting a certain number of people. And you can never reduce the cost of Government without curtailing activities or reducing employee totals.

Every business executive here knows just how such a situation would be handled in his own business. When costs have to be reduced, less important functions are curtailed or eliminated, and unneeded employees are dropped. Government, however, doesn't always work that way. No matter how strong the sentiment for reducing costs, every time some project is omitted or curtailed, every time there is a reduction in force, Congress is swamped with urgent appeals that "my project be not disturbed" or "my friend or relative be retained on the rolls."

Which leads me to the second of my two "musts," if Government costs ever are to come down. Nothing will ever be done to relieve you or taxpayers generally from the current overwhelming burden of taxation until you, the general public, begins to think in terms of less rather than more Government services.

Further, nothing in the way of cost or tax abatement will ever be achieved unless and until we all, as individuals, are willing to see something or someone in whom we are particularly interested eliminated from the budget without trying to make "just this one exception." Am I proposing a major revision of the human equation? Perhaps. But nevertheless I repeat—you can't cut the costs of government without denying to some people something that means much to them.

One essential requisite of any change in attitude toward government is a changed viewpoint on the part of both people and officials of the various States with regard to funds from Washington. The custom has always been to accept grants from Washington somewhat as if they were manna from heaven. They have been looked upon as a gift from out of the blue, so to speak.

But they aren't. They're right out of your own pockets, and think in such terms, particularly you businessmen from the more prosperous eastern section of the country. Any time your State secures funds from Washington for hospitals, for schools, for roads, or for any purpose, you can bet your last dollar that it would have been far less costly for you to have the State levy the necessary funds. Then you would have avoided paying part of the administration costs of some Federal agency. And possibly you would have avoided some annoying—or worse—regulations which practically always accompany the grant of Federal funds.

Yes, we stand at an epochal moment in the world's history. The poet Tennyson aptly expressed it when he wrote: "The old order changeth, and giveth place to new." All over the world today, peoples have served notice that they no longer will be satisfied with conditions of the past. World War II brought to the surface all the yearnings nurtured through years and centuries of submission to an economic order in which many were denied benefits now considered deserved by the great mass of people.

In England, somewhat to our surprise, we have seen the laboring classes decide to forego their cherished individualism for the promised greater security of a socialist regime. In India, Indochina, and throughout the Far East, this striving for improved conditions has occasioned bloody revolution and class struggles. Here in our own country, the unprecedented prosperity of the past 10 years has suggested to our people that poverty and deprivation in the midst of plenty need not be an integral part of the free-enterprise system. As a consequence Americans, too, are raising their sights in the matter of living conditions.

All of us have taken great pride in the vast progress made by America and her citizens under the justly prized American system. But 'way back in our minds there was the tacit recognition, although we did not like to discuss such matters too openly, that there was poverty, degrading poverty, in our midst. We all knew that little children were growing up into frail, sickly adults because of lack of proper food and of adequate medical attention, and that a far too large segment of our population was finding it next to impossible to assure their children of even a minimum education, because facilities, in many areas, had by no means kept pace with increased requirements.

In the matter of public health our people were shocked at the reports from Selective Service headquarters during the war of the inordinately large proportion of selectees who could not be accepted for service because they were not physically fit. Approximately 6½ million men out of less than 18 million physically examined under selective service were rejected as being physically defective. This is more than 35 percent, a shockingly high percentage. And there was little to console any of us, during those war years, in the accounts of vast numbers of teachers who left their high profession because the pitifully small wages they were receiving, compared to the higher wage inducements on every side, left them no alternative, and left the children, who had been dependent upon them, with less and less opportunity for educational opportunities.

Yes; we knew all these things, and therefore there is little reason to be surprised now, when they rise up to plague us, in the form of demands for better health facilities, for increased security, and for improved educational opportunities for all.

The pending legislation now before the Congress of the United States leaves no room for doubt as to the temper of our people with regard to demands for social advancement. There are measures to expand the coverage of social security and to increase benefit payments to a point more in keeping with today's living costs. There are bills to provide improved health facilities in every section of the country, and to make these facilities, as well as the services of the country's medical, dental, and other health professions, available to individuals and families of lowest income everywhere. Not to mention legislation that would seek, through Federal aid to the less wealthy areas, to guaranty to every child, in every section of every State, educational opportunities without which he or she will be cruelly handicapped in life, with our country the great loser thereby.

What are we going to do to meet the challenge which has been thrown down? Equally important is the question, "How are we going to meet it; through what method? We must not sacrifice Constitutional principles to attain an end, regardless how appealing it may be. Our enduring system of democratic, representative government is the last remaining bulwark in a world where dictatorships are the order of the day.

We should be careful not to scrap our basic principles to meet a present emergency. While we should not shirk any responsibility to our underprivileged citizens we must formulate programs within the spirit and meaning of our great Constitution. By such procedure our national resources can be spread more evenly, for the benefit of those who otherwise would be denied basic rights and privileges which are their heritage as American citizens.

It is incumbent upon the lawmakers today, whether on the Federal, State, or local level of government, to have a liberal, sympathetic approach to the consideration of proposals for social betterment. But—and I think it well to lay the utmost possible emphasis upon this point—the legislation as finally developed must be in accord with the constitutional provisions regarding national and State authority. It must safeguard completely the authority of State governments with regard to the purely local matters that are their rightful concern, and not give way to centralization in Washington.

Unless we are careful to recognize the necessity for such a policy and to guard zealously the balance between Federal and State authority in all fields, there is a possibility of waking up some day—and it could be uncomfortably soon—to find ourselves keeping company with England in the field of state socialism. From such a development, may Divine Providence preserve us.

In their far-sighted wisdom, born in large measure of sad experiences suffered in other lands, the framers of our Constitution delegated to the Federal Government these concerns of government which could be handled only upon a mutual basis—defense and foreign relations and trade foremost among them. To the several States were reserved, however, such matters as more closely affected the lives and well-being of their residents. Such everyday affairs, they reasoned wisely, required for their successful handling, an intimate understanding of local and individual needs that could never be met by administration from some remote seat of government.

Thus, in the field of social security, with the Federal Government participating in welfare grants for the aged, the needy, and the blind; and most certainly in the field of education, any legislation passed must, and I emphasize, must, give full recognition to the competence and the authority of the State and local governments. Too many instances are at hand of waste and inefficiency in Federal handling of purely local matters, to permit of any further encroachment by Federal officialdom in local activities.

It is a well-founded theory that the best government is the government that is closest to the people. Conditions vary so greatly from one State to another, from North to South, and as between the East, the West, and the vast sections intervening, that no one set of national regulations touching the actual effectuation of any law's purposes, could be really effective. To attempt to say, from Washington, what must be done in particular cases here, there, and everywhere, is absurd, as well as usually overly costly.

To set up standards of administration is one thing, and where Federal funds are to be supplied, there must be an understanding between the responsible Federal agency and State authorities as to basic handling of such funds. But there the line should be drawn. From long experience in the executive branch of a State government, I say that further intrusion by Federal authority into State functioning is not only unwise, but a constant threat to the prestige as well as to the actual stability of the State government.

Speaking of public health many will agree that there is need for humane treatment of many of our people who do not have the means to avail themselves of medical care with the new techniques and discoveries that should be available for the benefit of the general citizenry.

But let us not make the mistake of adopting a plan by which our medical profession would be regimented. I am unalterably opposed to socialized medicine. While I agree that a better system should be devised I think it can be done without discarding all the advantages which an honorable profession has offered to the country after decades of faithful family physician practice.

Likewise in the field of social security I believe we should extend the coverage and modify our scale of payments to bring them within range of present-day realities. Particularly do I believe that we should proceed on the basis of insurance protection rather than on the basis of a dole for these people. The self-respect and independence of every man cause him to prefer to live under a system whereby he will receive protection in his time of need, not as a beggar, but as the recipient of insurance which he has helped to buy during his working years.

In conclusion, may I invite your continuing interest in matters of national defense so that America can be kept secure from attack either from outside enemies or those from within.

As the world situation is today, the one and only barrier to war is America's armed strength. We must keep that strength at all times equal to, and if possible, superior to the armed strength of any potential aggressor nation. In the air, on the sea and under the seas, and in the mighty scientific weapons of war which have been developed, America must maintain superiority if the civilized world is to be saved from destruction.

We must not be caught napping again. Good will was never a sufficient protection against selfish aggression. We can, and we must work with all our capabilities, through the United Nations, to establish and to make effective every instrument for peace. But until the long-sought day of peace among nations arrives, America must have more and better atomic bombs, more and faster planes, more powerful ships, swifter submarines, more of all the mechanical aids to war than a potential adversary can muster. And we must not disclose the confidential information as to atomic data to any country which has not been willing to meet us half way.

Only by keeping herself so strong that no one will dare to attack her will America keep faith with her gallant sons who lie beneath the white crosses on Flanders field, on sandy beaches of the far Pacific, and in hallowed resting places throughout the entire world.

Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding funds for flood control and rivers and harbors work made by me before the Senate Committee on Appropriations in connection with the first deficiency appropriation bill of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My purpose in addressing this statement to the subcommittee considering H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill in this session for the fiscal year ending June 30, is to request that the committee use this bill as the vehicle for correcting the false economy of the Eightieth Congress on the Civil Functions Appropriations Act for the current fiscal year.

My request is that, insofar as it is possible to do so and to the extent that the Corps of Engineers can use the money efficiently in the months between now and June 30, funds be included in this deficiency bill to make up the reductions by the Eightieth Congress on budget requests for specific rivers and harbors and flood-control projects and for planning activity and other functions related thereto.

I am, of course, primarily interested in those projects in Pennsylvania which were cut by the Eightieth Congress last year in preparing the appropriation for the current fiscal year. At the same time, however, I realize that unfair reductions in the budget requests on rivers and harbors and flood-control projects were not restricted to Pennsylvania projects and I, therefore, would not request any special treatment for my State in this respect, but, instead, suggest that a uniform policy be followed on all projects in which the budget recommendations were ignored or reduced substantially last year.

My testimony will be restricted to the Pennsylvania projects for the reason that I am most familiar with them. I think the subcommittee would be safe in assuming that our experience on some of these budget cuts has been duplicated on other projects in other States. It perhaps might be advisable for the subcommittee to devote a few additional days to this bill in order to investigate the status of all of the projects which were cut in the appropriation bill passed last year.

In this connection, I might point out that you will have before you representatives of the Army's Corps of Engineers to discuss certain of the multiple-purpose projects for which the Budget Bureau has requested additional funds for this fiscal year, and I am sure these representatives are prepared now or could quickly prepare themselves to discuss various other projects in the same category as those in Pennsylvania in whose behalf I am making this appeal.

The particular flood-control projects now included in this deficiency bill were selected, I gather, because of their importance in respect to alleviating the present widespread electric-power shortage in the country. My concern today, however, is primarily with the lives and the safety of our people and with the protection of our industrial plants and other facilities subject to flood damage.

At this point, I think it is relevant to point out that the budget requests appear to be conservative in this deficiency bill for the reason, apparently, that the administration fears a deficit in this fiscal year because of the action of the Eightieth Congress in reducing our tax revenues so substantially in the face of so many compelling foreign policy and military expenditures which we dare not deny. I assume that it was because of this fear of a deficit at a time when our national income is at the highest level we have ever known in our history that the Budget Bureau did not recommend what I am recommending here, and that is the restoration of these cuts—or that part of them which can still be efficiently used in this fiscal year—for flood control and rivers and harbors.

I would like to make two comments in that connection. First, we must all recognize that if a deficit impends, or even if we have no deficit, but have only a very slight surplus to apply to the national debt at a time such as this when our national income is so very high, then we must do something affirmative about it, and that is, raise taxes sufficiently not only to cover Government expenditures but to provide a substantial payment on the national debt. Thus, although any reduction in Federal expenditures can have a favorable result in lessening the possibility of deficit or in increasing the possibility of a small payment on the national debt in this fiscal year, the reductions which could be made are picayune in relation to the gigantic extent of the fiscal problem we face of retiring this simply astronomical public debt resulting primarily from World War II and its aftermath.

My second point is that if the budget recommendations for civil functions activities in the 1949 fiscal year which ends this coming June were realistic and careful estimates, based on thorough investigation and weighing of all of the factors involved—and I believe they were at the time they were prepared and submitted to the Congress—then they must still be regarded as careful and realistic estimates. Thus, I think the

Budget Bureau should have stood behind those recommendations of last year when it prepared the estimates for this deficiency bill. I would have no hestitation in voting to support a deficiency bill which reflected generally the original appropriation requests of the agencies and departments last year on those functions which are included in this bill. Those of us who were in the minority in the Senate last year supported those original estimates and fought for them and, to a large extent, the Senate as a whole approved them. But, unfortunately, the false economy views of the House too often prevailed in the final bills. I should think that all of us who went down the line on the need for these appropriations last year still believe the requests were justified.

It is an altogether different House of Representatives we are dealing with this year from the one we had to deal with last year in regard to the need for adequate appropriations for vital functions of the Government such as flood control and rivers and harbors improvement and maintenance. Therefore, I think that if the Senate committee will proceed to remedy as much of the damage as can be remedied at this date on these projects which were cut last year, the Senate will approve and the House will concur. I certainly think it is worth the effort.

Now, as for some of these projects in Pennsylvania:

FLOOD CONTROL

Williamsport dikes: The budget recommendation for the 1949 fiscal year on this project was $2,244,400. The House last year allowed only $1,900,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee, at my request, restored the full amount of the cut in the appropriation bill when it was before us last spring. Unfortunately, however, the conferees from the House refused to accept the Senate figure, which was the budget figure, and insisted upon the amount passed by the House originally, representing a reduction from the budget of $344,400, or about 15 percent.

Absolutely no explanation was given by the House committee for making this cut originally or for insisting upon this reduction in conference. Several other projects which were cut in Pennsylvania and elsewhere by the House and on which the Senate insisted upon restoration, were restored. Thus, it can be seen that the House did not follow a uniform policy in insisting in conference that some reductions be kept and that others be abandoned.

I do not know, I cannot for the life of me figure out, why the Eightieth Congress House Commitee on Appropriations continually discriminated against Williamsport. This project is a vital project to that community. It was started before the war caused a shutdown in flood-control work. The partially completed dikes were, therefore, of no value at all in combating a disastrous flood in May of 1946 which swept around these uncompleted walls into the heart of the community and caused a flood almost as tragic as the terrible Williamsport flood of 1936, a flood which was so devastating as to have put Williamsport on the Army engineers' list of top priority projects in the early flood-control program.

The House cut this project in 1947 by $600,000 in the so-called economy drive of that year, but the Senate agreed with me to restore the amount and we saved the project's normal speed of operation. It will be recalled that at the time in 1947 when that appropriation bill was before us, there were tremendous floods in the Midwest and the House found it difficult to hold out for its foolish economies on flood appropriations. Last year we were not having so many floods at the time the bill was in conference, and so House economies in some projects were sustained.

The Senate committee and the Senate were convinced last year that this was a good project, a worthy project, a vital project, and that the budget request for it was reasonable and practical. I ask now that this committee stand by the judgment of the committee of last year and of the Senate last year and make it possible for the Engineers to complete by June 30 as much as possible of the original work it had planned to do in this fiscal year. The construction season is still before us and if the full amount of $344,400 is restored to this project, I confidently expect it can be used to achieve the work originally planned in this fiscal year.

The people of Williamsport are vitally concerned about this project. To them it is virtually a matter of life and death, not only for individuals in the flood path, but for the community as a thriving industrial and metropolitan center. When I visited there last month to make a political speech to fellow Democrats, at a Democratic dinner, some of the Republican leaders of the community, including the mayor, came to see me because they knew I was going to make some references to their flood-control project and they wanted to discuss it with me and to express the appreciation of the community for the efforts I have made in behalf of their project and for the generally fair way in which the Senate of the United States has treated them on this project.

If this money is not restored now, it will be very difficult to make up the work which would be lost in this fiscal year. The President's budget on flood-control appropriations for the coming fiscal year starting next July hews rather closely to the original long-range estimates submitted last year by Army Engineers. The total budget for the coming fiscal year is a very large budget, much larger than the one of the current fiscal year, and it may be difficult to try to make up in the next fiscal year for deficiencies in this year resulting from the false economy of the Eightieth Congress. That is why I urge so strongly that this money be appropriated during the current fiscal year as part of the budget of this year.

East Branch Clarion River Reservoir: The circumstances on this project are substantially the same as those in the case of Williamsport. For 2 years in a row the House in the Eightieth Congress cut this important project by substantial amounts; as a matter of fact, the project was eliminated completely by the House 2 years ago in the 1948 fiscal year appropriation. The Senate, fortunately, wrote in a million dollars for it at that time and the money was provided. Last year, when the current fiscal year appropriation was up before the Congress, the engineers asked for $2,000,000, but the House provided only $1,700,000, or a reduction of 15 percent. I came before this committee last March to appeal from this cut and I am appreciative of the fact that the Senate committee and the Senate voted to restore the $300,000. As in the case of Williamsport, however, the House conferees refused to accept the Senate figure and the cut stood.

For substantially similar reasons to those I cited above in the case of Williamsport, I urge that that $300,000 now be made available for the period between now and June 30, or at least as much of it as the Army engineers sincerely believe they can use efficiently in these months to accomplish the work originally planned in this fiscal year on this very important project for the defense of Ridgway, Johnsonburg, St. Marys, and the Elk County flood area generally. If this is done this reservoir should be well on its way toward 50 percent completion, so that completion would be possible perhaps by mid-1951, at the end of the 1950 fiscal year. That, indeed, would be a great barrier in our defense against the devastation of floods and their attendant destruction of human lives.

Flood-control planning: One of the serious blunders of the House in the Eightieth Congress in both 1947 and 1948 was to cut the funds available for planning work on authorized flood-control projects which are not yet in the construction phase. In 1947, for the 1948 fiscal year, the Senate reversed a 50-percent cut in planning funds voted by the House and succeeded in providing the money for a reasonable degree of advance planning work on the Bear Creek Reservoir, the Turtle Creek Reservoir, Tyrone, and the Lackawaxen River Basin. Last year, however, when the House again cut planning funds, this time by 25 percent, the Senate was unable to obtain full restoration of the cut. This has meant substantial reduction in the amount of work which had originally been recommended by the engineers on Turtle Creek and Tyrone and also the Shenango Reservoir and the Lackawaxen system. This money should be restored. It represents comparatively small amounts of ten and fifteen thousand dollars, at the outside, in each case. All of these projects are important ones and it is important that the Congress permit the engineers to proceed expeditiously with the advance planning work so that at the moment appropriations are available for construction, this work can get under way promptly. There is recurring talk of the need for a shelf of public-work plans ready to be put into use in case of a decline in employment, and I subscribe to that theory and I always have. Preparations of this kind prevent the distortion of public-works activity in time of economic recession into made-work and leaf-raking undertakings.

In the case of these particular projects, they are not merely desirable public works in times of unemployment, they are urgent programs for the safety of our people and of our communities and will, no doubt, be put into construction in the years soon ahead, regardless of whether we have to engage in any public-works activity for employment reasons. Thus, I earnestly urge that these planning funds be restored.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Delaware River improvement: This long-range continuing program for the widening and deepening of Delaware River channels to provide for the newer-type cargo vessels and also to provide sufficient anchorage space to accommodate the vast amount of tonnage moving in and out of the port of Philadelphia, is of vital importance to the Nation's third largest city. Yet, the House, both in 1947 and 1948, refused to provide any money for this work, and in both years the Senate had to come to the rescue of Philadelphia and its maritime industry by providing the full budget amount. A cut of a little more than a half-million dollars, however, was made in the final approval for the current fiscal year, and I ask that this money be restored.

I have numerous letters from Philadelphia business interests describing the difficulties at the port and the anchorages and urging corrective action. Not only have we not gotten sufficient money to continue this widening and deepening program, but the maintenance funds for the engineers were cut rather severely last year and shoaling is taking place at an alarming rate.

This is an urgent project and I sincerely urge that the Senate stand by its original judgment of last year and restore this half-million-dollar cut, or as much of it as the engineers can use efficiently to carry out their original program in the remaining months of this fiscal year.

In this connection, I think consideration should also be given to providing additional maintenance funds to the engineers for the rest of this fiscal year.

I discussed this project in great detail when I appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Functions March 19, 1948. If any supplementary information is needed, I shall be happy to provide it.

Erie Harbor: Also in connection with the maintenance appropriation, I would appreciate it if the committee would determine from the engineers what additional work could be done on the Erie Harbor in this fiscal year if additional maintenance funds are provided. The budget originally provided $139,000 for Erie, but my information is that only about $70,000 or $80,000 could be allocated out of the final appropriation for work which is of great importance to Erie.

CONCLUSION

I have repeatedly stated before this committee in past years and on the Senate floor, and most Senators, I think, have agreed with me, that our flood-control and rivers-and-harbors programs are among the most important domestic activities of the Federal Government, are essential to safety and commerce, and are in no sense whatsoever boondoggling or made-work. From my knowledge of the Pennsylvania projects there is no "pork" in any of them; they are vital to the communities which they serve and to the State and its economy.

Since Pennsylvania provides such a large share of the Federal revenues, and since losses from floods are legitimate deductions from income taxes, thus reducing those revenues whenever a sizable flood strikes any part of the State, and since so much of our heavy industry is in flood-vulnerable areas, these expenditures are as sensible as any investments the Federal Government can make.

Address by Hon. W. John Kenney Before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the Under Secretary of the Navy, Hon. W. John Kenney, before the Hampton Roads Maritime Association at Norfolk, Va., on February 24.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman Hardy, Mayor Darden, President Seawell, of the Hampton Roads Maritime Association, members, and distinguished guests, as my plane descended today I was again impressed by the glorious sight of the ports of Greater Hampton Roads; the storage, terminal, and handling facilities; the piers, warehouses and grain elevators; the Army, Navy and Air Force installations; the drydocks and the shipyards and the ships—Naval ships and Merchant ships; ships at anchor, under way, and in reserve.

No American can gaze down upon this composite symbol of industrial and commercial achievement without pride and without confidence in our country's might. The emotions which Virginians must experience, particularly those who have taken part in the planning and developing of this area, I will not attempt to define.

The wartime record of the ports is so well known that I need pay only collective and passing tribute to their vital contributions to the winning of World War II. Their war and postwar accomplishments have been impressively set forth in terms of facts and figures in the Maritime Association's Annual for 1949.

But from where I sit in the Navy section of the Pentagon, the ports take on a significance outside the scope of cold statistics. From a Navy viewpoint, strictly from the point of view of national defense, I visualize them as a great reservoir of sea power, actual and potential. I do not refer to the present only. I am looking back to both world wars and ahead. The ships built here, whether carriers, cruisers, or destroyers; whether cargo vessels, oil tankers, or passenger ships, all are essential both to the peacetime and wartime needs of our country.

The great new aircraft carrier, the U. S. S. *United States*, about to be built in nearby Newport News, will be a great advance from the 200-foot frigate which bore the same name and which was launched 151 years ago.

Although the designers of this mighty carrier drew upon the lessons of World War II, they did not fall into the error of designing a ship to fight the same kind of war all over again. They looked back only so that they could better see ahead.

Carrier-based air forces take with them all necessary components for immediate action and sustained air operations. The great extra range for naval aircraft is built into the carriers themselves. Their planes arrive at combat zones—no matter how far distant—with tanks full and flyers fresh.

No other nation has this form of air power. It gives our country great advantage, not only in event of war but in the support of our national policies anywhere.

In the initial and highly critical stages of a war, the Navy's air power can buy time during which the weight of the Air Force and the Army can be brought forward. This modern power—more correctly, air-sea power—is not a duplication of the land-based air power of the Air Force. It is additional air power, tailor-made to sea and amphibious operations. In short, naval mobile air power is the other arm of our national air power.

Our minds are storehouses of impressions of the wartime devastation of air power. Current headlines, photographs, news reels, and spectacular air shows contribute to mass respect for, and appreciation of, its potential fury. The sight and sound of our planes flashing across the skies fill us with pride, fill us with confidence, and with a vague and pleasant sense of security; and this is certainly proper. But, the accumulative effect of this should not lull us into a false sense of security.

Today Americans are searching for simple solutions and easy roads to victory—victory without pain and sorrow—victory without denial of the comforts and without the loss of life—that have always accompanied, and will always accompany wars. This search has led in some cases to extreme views.

As General Bradley, Chief of Staff of the Army, recently stated: "If we construct air power at the fatal expense of ground and naval arms, then we may foolishly be forced to desert our allies and foresake our capacity to wage a sustained blow."

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Vandenberg, has also said: "It has always been, and is now, our belief that the security of our Nation depends on the proper combination and employment of our land, sea, and air arms. We do not believe that a strategic air offensive alone will win the next war, if it comes."

In spite of our great technological advances since VJ-day, war within our lifetime is not going to be a push-button struggle. War will require the concerted efforts of all three services—in fact, all of us, man, woman, and child.

And in our preparation for war we must never forget the merchant marine. It is essential not only to our Nation's economy but to its national security. This country is wholly dependent on imports for many of its essential materials—manganese, chromium, tungsten, iron and copper ores. These materials are vital to our existence and they must constantly be brought to us across the seas—in ships. The merchant marine is the backbone of the logistic support of our land, sea, and air forces. The armed services cannot carry out their assigned missions without sufficient troop transports, cargo vessels, and oil tankers. These vessels must be appropriately designed, readily available, and capable of being swiftly produced.

In World War I, $3,000,000,000 in emergency ship construction were required and the program was not completed until after hostilities ended. World War II required an outlay five times greater and did not reach its peak for 3 years. It would be folly to assume that we again will have as much time to prepare for war.

In both world wars friendly maritime powers furnished us with greatly needed ships. Although these nations today are building better and faster merchant vessels in quantity, there is no guaranty that they would be available for our use in the event of another war, and especially so if these nations were overrun by enemy forces. Therefore, we should not rely on others to provide the ships that may mean the difference between victory or defeat.

In our planning, the menace of the high-speed, long-range, and deadly "schnorkel" submarine of today must be taken into account. Despite improved antisubmarine equipment, weapons, techniques, and tactics, ships inevitably would be sunk by underwater attack. How many is anyone's guess. For a long time after the start of World War II, ships were being sunk more rapidly than we could build them.

Consequently, next time, if there be a next time, we must have faster cargo ships, faster tankers, faster troop ships, and plenty of them. The Maritime Commission already has taken a realistic and forward-looking step toward this objective. It is a step which also may provide a possible answer some years hence to the worrisome problem of the block obsolescence of our Liberty and Victory ships of the last war.

The step I refer to is the building of two prototype cargo ships by the Maritime Commission to meet requirements based upon the wartime experience of the Navy. One of these ships is designed to meet the general cargo-lift needs of any future emergency; the other will represent the commercial version of a wartime auxiliary vessel used by the Navy as attack cargo ships and attack transports. Both should have peacetime commercial uses, particularly the strictly cargo-type vessel. Private industry already has expressed interest in it. The President and the Congress have given this prototype project enthusiastic approval and support. It is hoped that actual construction of these two vessels will get under way this summer, and that eventually they may be turned out on a large scale by private shipbuilding firms.

Other important steps also have been taken to revive our merchant marine and to keep it vital and flourishing. Chief among them are the recent and pending congressional appropriations totaling several hundred millions for the construction of a substantial number of high-speed tankers, passenger, and combination passenger-cargo vessels.

Among such ships to be built is one of particular interest to the Navy, the 48,000-ton liner ordered by the United States Lines. Her special defense features will, in time of emergency, make her invaluable as a troop transport.

The bid opening of last December 1 indicates that this outstanding ship will be built in this vicinity. Negotiations are go-

ing forward and it is hoped they soon will be consummated. The building of this liner will be a 3-year project and should afford a great measure of employment for this area. More passenger liners are greatly needed to meet our military needs.

Obviously, all the needs of our Military Establishment cannot be met through the medium of ships build by private interests. Nor can private industry be expected to bear the full financial load. Appropriate construction and defense-feature differential subsidies as well as operation-differential payments have been and must continue to be provided by the Government. They are key incentives to attracting private capital and to convincing the American investing public that the upbuilding of our merchant marine is not only essential to the security of this Nation, but also a good business risk.

Private industry appears ready and willing to assume its share of the burden if the Government will extend a fair and reasonable amount of construction-subsidy assistance and assume the total cost of any national defense features incorporated into the design of ships. In fact, practically every major American ship operator seems willing to further the extension of the current ship-construction program.

The current level of employment in both naval and private shipyards throughout the country is far below the level at which emergency shipbuilding expansion could be rapid enough again to meet defense requirements. The Navy estimates that safety level at from 80,000 to 100,000 workers. Today it is in the neighborhood of 50,000.

If a strong and effective nucleus of both ship design and shipbuilding workers is to be a reality, there must be reasonable assurance of definite periods of employment. Our shipbuilding industry cannot develop properly through an occasional shot in the arm. There must be a long-range program.

The ship construction and conversion program of the Navy is a part of this over-all program. At this time it involves a total of 49 ships, of which about one-third represents new construction. To provide the necessary and continual maintenance work on the reserve fleet vessels—laid up at a time when adequate repairs could not be made upon them—a 5-year overhaul program was initiated. In 1948 20 percent, or approximately 400 vessels, were thoroughly overhauled. The same percentage is scheduled for the fiscal year 1949. This program will be continued under the new Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Rear Adm. David H. Clark, who, from his days spent in Norfolk, is well known to all of you, and who succeeded Vice Adm. Earl Mills, retired.

Since the surrender of Japan, our merchant marine has shrunk to less than one-third its wartime size. Coastwise shipping is virtually nonexistent. How it best can be restored is not yet clear, but it is clear that something must be done—and soon.

I have touched upon a few steps that have been taken toward the revival of the merchant marine so necessary for our defense requirements, and for our Nation's economy. These steps are only a beginning.

The sum total of the efforts to date is to reverse a down-hill trend. The climb back will be long and hard. Many obstacles will have to be overcome.

However, because the survival of our merchant marine and a vigorous shipbuilding industry are so essential to our national defense, the National Military Establishment, along with the Maritime Commission, has put its shoulder to the wheel. It intends to keep it there until the job is done.

With the help of all hands, I am confident that it can be done and that it will be done—because it must be done.

Statement by 14 Washington Jurists and Deans of Law Schools on the Trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in an unprecedented reflection of outraged public sentiment, 14 leading Washington jurists and deans of law schools have joined in a public statement in condemnation of the recent so-called trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary.

Among the signers of the document were the deans of the Schools of Law of Columbus University, Washington College of Law, and Georgetown University; the heads of the Columbus University School of Law and of the Catholic University School of Law; a former Associate Justice of the United States Court of Appeals, a former judge advocate general of the Army, a former Solicitor General of the United States, a former United States chief counsel for the prosecution in the trials of Japanese war criminals, the president of the Women's District Bar Association, the former president of the District of Columbia Bar Association, a former assistant United States district attorney, a former dean of George Washington University Law School.

The statement deserves the studious attention of all citizens in view of the tragic miscarriages of justice which have occurred, and the implications contained therein for religious security everywhere.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Protests have been made by representatives of church and state throughout the world, against the religious and political injustice of the simulated judicial proceeding, known as the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. Further comment is justified upon its legal and juridical injustice, and the extent to which Communist corruption has affected Hungarian law and procedure. Accordingly, we, the undersigned, American citizens and members of the legal profession, mindful of our obligations as ministers of justice, denounce this so-called trial as a brazen attempt by the Communist Party, to prostitute the judicial process for the unjust purpose of fastening guilt upon Cardinal Mindszenty, in order to gain totalitarian domination in Hungary, to destroy religious freedom and influence, and incidentally, to discredit the United States of America.

We propose to point out the appalling conflict between the universal justice of civilized nations and Communist justice in Hungary as exemplified by this trial. The Cardinal Mindszenty case demonstrates the fierce clash between international law and what the Hungarian Communist Party would like it to be; and between the substantive and adjective law of the Hungarian Communist legal order and that of nations belonging to the enlightened portion of the world community. The judicial issues implicit in this case transcend the administration of justice insofar as it involves an individual, a nation, or a church.

International law imposes upon every nation the duty of securing the enjoyment of certain fundamental, inalienable rights of human personality, such as freedom of religious worship, of political opinion, of speech and publication, and of public meeting. These rights are recognized by the preamble and article I, of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as by the Hungarian Peace Treaty, part II, section 1, article 2, and by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, recently adopted by the General Assembly. But an analysis of the facts connected with the Cardinal Mindszenty case shows that the Hungarian Communist Party has flaunted these essential freedoms.

In the summer of 1948, the Hungarian Communist Party communized the schools. A framework of education was imposed by the introduction of new textbooks and the like, so that the youth of Hungary might be indoctrinated with the destructive principles of godless Marxism. This was a strangulation of the right of religious liberty. It may well have been intended as the first step in an all-out religious persecution.

Civilized nations administering justice under universal concepts of right and wrong recognize the necessity for the existence of constitutional law, written or unwritten. Such law means that no man nor political party is identical with the state, which is subject to a moral order, however legally omnipotent the state may be. Constitutional law protects the individual against the unreasonable exercise of the power of sovereignty possessed by the state.

But the Hungarian state has been unlawfully deprived of its sovereignty by the influence of Soviet arms and made a captive by the Soviet-dominated Communist Party, which has identified itself with the Hungarian state. The Communist Party polled only about 17 percent of the vote in Hungary at the last free election, but it controls the Hungarian state by measures of force and by means of the Soviet Army. Since the Communist Party regards itself as the Hungarian state, there can be no constitutional law so that any opposition to the Communist Party, however reasonable, becomes punishable as criminal. This Communist legal doctrine was a significant factor in the Cardinal Mindszenty case.

It should be observed that the reported plea of guilty or partly guilty by Cardinal Mindszenty, as reported in the press, did not mean an admission of criminal guilt as would have been the case under Anglo-American law. After the report of this plea, evidence was thereafter introduced by the prosecution to prove its case whereas under Anglo-American procedure, sentence would have automatically followed a plea of guilty, though evidence might have been received on the sentence.

The following are data which we deem material and relevant and which have been reported in press releases.

Cardinal Mindszenty was charged with having made a secret agreement with Otto von Hapsburg, next in male succession to the Hungarian throne. He is charged with having met him on June 21, 1947, in a monastery near Chicago, whereby, "after the third world war which was expected soon, the United States would support a Federated Central European Kingdom." Actually Cardinal Mindszenty was seen by thousands in Ottawa on the above-mentioned day, where he attended the Marian Congress. On the evening of June 21, 1947, the Cardinal had dinner with a number of Canadian dignitaries, including Mr. St. Laurent, now Prime Minister. On the basis of the evidence thus far made known, and the Cardinal's denial of any plot to overthrow the Government, it

is not to be believed there was adequate basis for a conviction on the theory of the Cardinal's breach of allegiance to the Hungarian state and people, notwithstanding the Cardinal's opposition to the Government.

The indictment charged Cardinal Mindszenty with the crime of espionage. It was alleged that information was found in a box in his cellar, prior to his arrest, concerning the movement of the Soviet Army in Hungary, Soviet-Hungarian economic relations, and summaries of Hungarian Cabinet meetings. But the bulk of this evidence related not to the Hungarian state, but to a foreign foe, which according to international law is unjustly depriving the Hungarian nation of its right to hold free elections, and to adopt a form of government and establish an economic regime desired by a majority of the people. No proof appeared in the news reports that any illegal use was made of these summaries.

Cardinal Mindszenty was charged with having written a "letter to the envoy (Mr. Selden Chapin), (parentheses added) of a western great power, in which he asked this envoy not to return the Hungarian Crown (of St. Stephen) which was in possession of the American authorities to the Hungarian state." It is possible that the Hungarian Communist Party did not intend to preserve for posterity this famous religious relic which had been given to St. Stephen, the first King of Hungary, by Pope Sylvester II. It is possible that the Communists intended to destroy it. Until ownership of this crown, so cherished by the Hungarian people because of its national and religious association, has been adjudicated by an impartial agency in conformity with law, every individual is legally entitled to advocate whatever disposition of it may seem just to him.

The final charge against Cardinal Mindszenty was that he sold gifts of American dollars, receiving therefor Hungarian forints in excess of the legal currency rate. The cardinal appears to have stated during the trial that members of his household did so; that he assumed responsibility and would make reparations. Surely no one can believe that these facts justified or motivated this trial.

The contrast between the so-called Communist justice and the justice of the civilized world, in relation to the Cardinal Mindszenty case, is also irreconcilable in the sphere of the general setting and spirit of the proceeding, the personnel of the court, and the character of the adjective law followed. Any representatives of news services and diplomatic observers present were allowed only a controlled access to the facts, the defendant, and the court. Secrecy surrounding the trial lent color to the accusations that third-degree methods, or worse, were being used by the Government in preparing its case.

The court, as reported in the press, was made up of five judges, but only one, the presiding judge, was an expert in the judicial process. The other four were chosen without reference to legal education or training, or professional capacity to weigh and evaluate evidence. They were professionally incompetent and politically biased. The report of the conduct of the trial showed that no standards existed for evaluating the weight and sufficiency of the evidence, or of determining its probative value.

Imprisoned by the Nazis for his resistance to their tyranny, and now by the Communists, Cardinal Mindszenty is a martyr to the cause of justice under the law of right reason, as administered by men of good will. Of peasant stock, devoid of wealth, dedicated to an ancient philosophy which proclaims the right of every people to choose its own political form and economic structure, as long as man is acknowledged to be something infinitely above brute creation, Cardinal Mindszenty has never descended to the level of mere Hungarian politics or economics. He was not an active partisan as to the issue of the restoration of the Hungarian monarchy, or of the continuation of the recently enacted agrarian reform, or of any other political or economic question.

In bringing about the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, by disregarding moral and penal values, and by rejecting the principle of cause and effect, the Communist Party in Hungary, and its Soviet master, have committed a crime against international society, against the Hungarian people, and against the administration of justice.

As the President of the United States has stated, Cardinal Mindszenty was the victim of a kangaroo court.

Brendan F. Brown, Myron C. Cramer, Horatio R. Rogers, Mary Frances Glenn, Vladimir Gsovski, Milton W. King, Charles J. Fahy, William C. Van Vleck, William E. Leahy, William H. Collins, James J. Hayden, Hugh J. Fegan, Joseph B. Keenan, Thurman Arnold.

Neither Race Nor Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Neither Race Nor Creed," from the New York Times of March 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEITHER RACE NOR CREED

When the House Committee on the Judiciary was holding hearings on the bill to lift the barriers to immigration for 250,000,000 Asiatics—the bill which passed the House by a large margin on Tuesday—one of the witnesses was Mike Masaoka, a native-born American of Japanese ancestry whose mother was ineligible for citizenship under the old restrictions. Mike fought in Italy with the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team, made up of Nisei like himself. They talked of many things in the fox holes outside Cassino, he said, but the No. 1 topic was this: Sure, we wanted America to win the war, but we also wanted America to be the kind of America that it professed to be, and that kind of America would not discriminate against people like my mother, who came here early in the 1900's.

It took a war to break down the artificial barriers of race that were raised years ago under the hysterical spur of the yellow peril. First came the amendment in 1943 to admit Chinese, then in 1946 the lifting of restrictions against Filipinos and Indians. The present bill, which now goes to the Senate, goes the rest of the way to provide for quota entry of Japanese, Koreans, and the island peoples of the Pacific, and to permit naturalization of those already resident here.

No flood of Asiatics is permitted under the provisions of the bill, or the previous ones. The largest quota is 100 persons a year. Its chief first effect will be to permit naturalization of people like Mike Masaoka's mother, who told her sons when war came: "Boys, your job is to go out and fight for these United States, because it is my country." The good effects of the bill hardly are calculable. Despite the low quotas, at least the restriction that implied an inferiority of race will be removed if the Senate follows the House, as it is hoped it will, and passes the bill. Who knows how Japanese-American, Chinese-American relations might have developed had not the people of those two countries had raised against them this bar sinister of color? It is good to have it removed, to return to the principle that our neighbors are as good as we are. The House of Representatives by its action has lived up to the best American traditions.

Armistice in Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Armistice in Palestine," published in the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMISTICE IN PALESTINE

The armistice between Egypt and Israel came almost as an anticlimax. The basic conditions for this step toward permanent peace in the Holy Land had long been established; already the political problems of the peace were overshadowing the military questions which the armistice was intended to answer. As Israel's Foreign Minister, Mr. Moshe Shertok, remarked, there is a "considerable distance from this first armistice to the last peace treaty." Nevertheless, while troubled Palestine has not been rendered tranquil by a stroke of the pen, the armistice signed yesterday at Rhodes remains the most hopeful event which has brightened the horizon of the shadowed Near East. Its essential drama may be measured, not by considering the distance to a final peace, but by contemplating the long road that has been traversed since the independence of Israel was proclaimed, a little less than a year ago.

Then the new state was virtually unacknowledged and untested; it confronted an Arab coalition which seemed implacably opposed to any settlement that Israel could possibly accept, and which disposed of forces far greater and far better trained than the Israel levies. Opinion in the world at large was confused and diffused; Israel's fate was enmeshed in complex decisions of power politics, and no one could predict what vaster storm might sweep over Palestine's little war and wreck the brave experiment of Israel in the process. Yet a band of steadfast men and women held to their ancient homeland and now have seen their faith confirmed.

The armistice between Israel and Egypt is not political. It does not settle finally the southern boundaries of Israel nor the fate of such a strategic point as Beersheba. Jerusalem and the eastern boundaries must still be debated in the negotiations with Transjordan which open Monday, and, so far as Jerusalem is concerned, the United Nations is an interested party. But by signing any formal agreement with Israel, Egypt made a political decision of primary importance, one which substantially reduces the significance of the outstanding questions. And since Transjordan and Lebanon have indicated their willingness to do likewise, while Saudi Arabia and Iraq are content to abide

by the decisions of Israel's immediate neighbors, the Arab League (Syria alone is recalcitrant; Yemen has not been active in the war) has yielded on the main point—the existence of an independent Israel.

The American role in the drama of Israel's rebirth has not always been one in which this nation can take much pride. But one individual at least, Dr. Ralph Bunche, the acting UN mediator, has deserved well of his country and of the great organization he represented. Both the Israeli and the Egyption delegations have paid tribute to his unfailing optimism, his kindness, patience, and constructive ideas in the difficult task of reducing the armistice to terms which would be agreeable to both parties. Many forces, rational and irrational, and many persons, contributed to the great event at Rhodes, but for Dr. Bunche it is the climax of a career devoted to peace.

Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper editorials and letters dealing with the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

There being no objection, the editorials and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tacoma (Wash.) News-Tribune of February 28, 1949]

THE TRUMAN-WALLGREN CASE

Mr. Truman has no patent on lame-duck appointments—the practice of naming defeated candidates to well-paid posts. It has long been indulged in by Presidents of both parties and is also popular in State governments. Actually, however, there are very few Republican lame ducks, it having been so long since the GOP had control of the White House. The custom has been lightly condoned, though never enthusiastically accepted, as among the care-free vagaries of the American way.

Why, then, the fight against the appointment by Truman of former Governor Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, which has been carried on almost single-handedly by Senator CAIN? Is it purely politics, as the Democrats charge, or is the post of such vital importance that the Tacoman is justified in his objections?

From the name, National Resources Security Board, the average citizens can't differentiate it from many governmental agencies long accepted as affording a congenial asylum and cushioned refuge for pleasant politicians of undistinguished record, each currently out of a job.

What is the National Resources Security Board? It is a far-reaching agency looking to the integration of the whole of American industry for national defense. The chairmanship calls for an outstanding American whose qualifications for the great post are at once manifest and monumental. According to Marquis Childs, writing in the Washington (D. C.) Post, the Board has been given extraordinary authority by Congress to use Federal money to develop and acquire natural resources and relocate and reorganize industry for the Nation's security. The Chairman, according to this same writer, to show one example of his power, can authorize a contract with a mining company or mine on the representation that important mineral resources are to be exploited. Then the company or the mine can get a loan from RFC for the development.

Actually, the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board should call for the appointment of a man of the universally recognized caliber of a Dwight Eisenhower, Bernard Baruch, or William P. Jeffers who did such an outstanding job in 1942-43 cleaning up the synthetic-rubber mess and reorganizing it so that it contributed to the war effort in an outstanding degree. Indeed the chairmanship of this Board is considered by many who recognize its importance as comparable to the Presidency itself.

It seems probable that Mr. Truman could have found some innocuous job for his old friend which would have brought quick confirmation, although it seems doubtful if it could have been made to fit so he could occupy his new $60,000 Palm Desert mansion. When national security is involved it is something else. It belies the cry of "politics" hurled against those who ask for a thorough, dispassionate examination of the qualifications of the man in whose hands it would be placed.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 25, 1949]

QUESTIONABLE APPOINTMENT

Put aside the charges brought by Senator HARRY P. CAIN, Republican of Washington, against Monard C. Wallgren, former Senator and former Governor of the same State, and there is still reason to question the appointment of President Truman's friend and companion to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board.

The Board is the vital element in our policy of peacetime preparedness. In it are lodged all of the powers of national defense which are not strictly military in character. It is charged with the responsibility of making our civilian M-day mobilization plans.

It can shape the course of industry to a tremendous extent. It can play favorites or not as it chooses. And yet it will be difficult to tell until the hour of danger strikes whether or not the Board and its chairman have lived up to the responsibilities entrusted to them.

The Board needs a big man, with business experience, at the head of it. It is strictly that sort of a job. The last occupant of the post was criticized on the ground that although he had had experience in big business, it was in a narrow field; that in consequence he was not on intimate terms with enough of the Nation's top industrialists to get the best results for the Board.

How does Wallgren fit into the big-business picture? He was an optometrist until he entered politics. His political career was not distinguished in his home State. He was the only Democrat on the Washington State ticket defeated last fall. He is now supposed to be fitted by training, character, and experience to foresee and anticipate our needs on a scale that will run into hundreds of billions of dollars if the need ever arises.

It is hard to believe that his service as a member of the Truman committee while he was in the Senate, ability as a billiard player, and his intimacy with the present occupant of the White House, invest Mr. Wallgren with the qualifications that he will need in his new post.

[Excerpt from the March 1, 1949, newspaper column of Hedda Hopper, entitled "Looking at Hollywood"]

Raising cain: ex-Senator Mon Wallgren isn't faring so well in Washington since Senator CAIN has put him on the spot, but he's sure making strides with building a home at Palm Desert. Workmen are busy even on Sundays. It's quite a place, and the scuttlebutt down there is that his first house guest will be President Truman.

[From the Walla Walla (Wash.) Daily Union-Bulletin of February 22, 1949]

WHAT ABOUT WALLGREN?

There has been some disposition to regard Senator CAIN'S one-man battle against Mon Wallgren's appointment as chairman of the National Security Resources Board as a personal affair, and little more. Some people in this State have taken the attitude that Wallgren will probably get some political plum anyway. Why not this $14,000-a-year job?

The answer is to be found, partly at least, in the duties he would assume. Because this is a comparatively new agency, the far-reaching importance of the Chairman and the Board he heads are little understood. But the act creating the Security Resources Board spells out extraordinary authority to use Federal money in a variety of ways to develop and acquire natural resources, and relocate and reorganize industry for the security of the Nation.

Take one example of the power of the Chairman. He can authorize a contract to any mining company or individual mine on the representation that important mineral resources are to be exploited. That company or mine can then go to the RFC and get a loan for the development.

Besides the Chairman, the Board is made up of the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. These are extremely busy, overworked men and the chances are strong that the Chairman, as the only member without other duties, would run things pretty much as he chose. It has been said that, next to the President's own job, this is one of the most important assignments in the Nation. The future security of the country might well turn on how the assignment is carried out.

As CAIN has pointed out repeatedly in statements to the press and to the Senate committee investigating the appointment, nothing in Wallgren's past would appear to equip him for this important task. He is an amiable companion, a fine fishing-trip companion, and a first-class billiard player, But his work as a Congressman, Senator, and Governor of Washington failed to indicate the sort of ability called for in heading this Board. And there are other disqualifications that may be considered equally important.

Among these are the rather sensational charges made during the last election campaign, by members of Wallgren's own party, concerning the operations of the State liquor law. He was accused of favoring a clique of Democratic lawyers who were influential in obtaining licenses for so-called private clubs where liquor could be sold by the drink. He was also questioned by a former Democratic Governor, in large ads appearing throughout the State, about transactions in which the liquor board was alleged to have purchased a large block of whisky at a price reported to be $7.50 to $10 a case above the market quotations on other better known brands. The extremely important issues raised were never satisfactorily answered.

There was also the matter of the Howard Hughes airplane contracts. When the Senate investigation into those contracts was being made in 1947, Wallgren was listed as one of those attending parties given by Hughes' publicity man, John Meyer. Those parties were charged to the Government as expenses under the cost-plus arrangement, and Wallgren was reported to have attended sessions in New York, Hollywood, and Palm Springs. But only a part of Meyer's expense accounts were available and the public never heard the entire story.

These are things which might be disregarded were Wallgren being named to a less important post, but which can scarcely be called inconsequential in view of the tremendous powers the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board will exercise. The job should not be given to a man concerning whom so many questions as to fitness and background have been raised. Senator CAIN, in spite of the jibes he has taken, is doing a significant service to the country in opposing Senate confirmation.

[From the Arlington (Wash.) Times of February 24, 1949]

POLITICAL PROFITS

We are not too impressed with the evidence produced by Senator CAIN in his attempt to prevent the appointment of former Gov. Mon Wallgren to high Federal office.

What does impress us, however, is the announcement that Mon's new $60,000 home at Palm Springs, replete with swimming pool and transplanted date-bearing palms, is about completed and ready to entertain the President.

A little over a decade ago we met Mon when he was a golf instructor. That fall he was elected to Congress. That was the beginning of the era when profits earned by a legitimate business began to be viewed as loot by the New Dealers in Congress and elsewhere.

We are not accusing Mon, nor do we begrudge his good fortune, but we would like to read the success story of how he amassed such a fortune while still the servant of the people and a member of that group that frowned on profits.

GOP Comes Up Again as Champion of Tax Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, from the columns of the Washington Evening Star Thursday, March 3, 1949, the following column by Gould Lincoln is a timely observation on the tax policy of the present administration.

When one recalls the accomplishments of the Eightieth Congress in reducing taxes, there are many reasons to be proud of the Republican Party's record of relieving the overburdened American taxpayer.

Mr. Lincoln's column follows:

GOP COMES UP AGAIN AS CHAMPION OF TAX CUT—DEMOCRATS SEEN LABELING PROPOSAL AS ANOTHER RICH MAN'S BILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

Republicans in Congress have again put themselves forward as the champions of tax reduction. Their attitude is in direct opposition to that of the Truman Democrats. This time the Republicans are proposing to reduce the so-called excise taxes—which in reality are sales taxes although the Democrats would die before admitting as much.

These taxes fall on the poor those in moderate circumstances and the wealthy alike. They are the taxes which the people pay for telephone service, local and long distance, for telegraphic, cable, and radio service; taxes which they pay every time they travel by train, or buy toilet goods, jewelry, luggage or films, plates, cameras or electric light bulbs; taxes which they pay for admission to the movies and other entertainments. The Republicans propose to educe also the taxes on bowling alleys and billiard tables, and on purchases of furs.

All these taxes are a burden, and the burden is particularly heavy on the little fellow who wants an electric light bulb, or a railroad ticket or a telephone. The Republicans are not proposing to wipe out these taxes entirely, but in most instances they would cut the tax in half or to one-quarter.

A RICH MAN'S BILL

Undoubtedly the Democrats will label the new tax bill a measure to relieve the rich—just as they labeled the Republican income-tax-reduction bill enacted by the Eightieth Congress a rich man's bill. The fact is, however, that 7,000,000 taxpayers who shelled out to the Federal Government under the Democratic income-tax law—all in the lowest bracket—now pay no income tax at all because of the Republican tax-reduction law.

Also, other millions of taxpayers in slightly higher brackets have been relieved of a considerable part of their income-tax burden. And had it not been for the action of the Republican Congress—that "worst of all Congresses" according to President Truman—it is now perfectly clear there would have been no tax reduction at all. Mr. Truman is asking an increase of $4,000,000,000 in tax revenue—not a reduction in taxes. How long the Democratic administration can get away with the idea it is the protector of the pocketbooks of the people is anybody's guess.

Mr. Truman's program calls for billions more in taxes and billions more in Government expenditures. The Democrats argue that the tax money taken from the people will be expended for their benefit. The whole question is whether the people prefer to have their money spent for them as the Government sees fit, or whether they prefer to spend it themselves.

Ever since 1917 and the beginning of World War I, when the Democrats were in power, taxes have been increased except when the Republicans were in power. It was under the Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover that income taxes and other taxes were cut.

TAXES RISE UNDER DEMOCRATS

They started soaring again when the Democrats, under Franklin D. Roosevelt, took over the Government. They kept right on upward until they reached the highest point in history, and no material step was taken to reduce them—especially the income taxes, until the Republicans regained control of the Congress in 1946. Incidentally, President Truman vetoed the Republican tax bill and it was passed, with the aid of Democratic votes, over his veto.

That's a long high-tax record for the Democrats—extending 32 years. It is true that they faced depression and war—and increases in taxes were necessary. But the real point is that once they got taxes up, they didn't move to bring them down again—even when depression lessened and war ceased. It points up the old New Deal slogan: "We'll tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect." And so far the Truman administration has done nothing, taken no step whatever to lower any taxes on poor or rich. Indeed, the program of the Truman administration looks to such great spending that there is no possibility whatever of tax reduction if the program is carried out.

Furs and jewelry are considered luxuries. There will be no great sympathy for any man or woman who pays $5,000 for a fur coat or $25,000 for a diamond necklace—and is compelled to pay a high sales, or excise, tax on the purchase. The Republicans can easily amend their bill to remove from it any vestige of preferential treatment for the rich who make such luxury purchases. All they have to do is to make the excise-tax reduction on only the cheapest furs and jewelry—the kind of things that are regarded almost as necessities in families of the most moderate means or even less than moderate.

California Propaganda Technique Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the much-discussed waters of the Colorado River have caused numerous articles to appear on the subject. Arizona and certain water agencies in southern California have been the principals in this discussion. A great deal that has been written has been misinformation, or of doubtful accuracy. The members of this body from Arizona have seldom used articles from Arizona papers refuting statements of questionable accuracy because the legislation has not yet been taken up by the appropriate committee for consideration. However, the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson made a reply on February 24 editorially to an editorial appearing in the Oceanside (Calif.) Blade-Tribune on January 25, to which I want to call attention. This editorial in the Arizona Daily Star completely refutes the points stressed by the California papers. The editorial is as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S FROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES

An article appearing in the Oceanside (Calif.) Blade-Tribune on January 25, discussing the proposed Central Arizona project, reveals the sort of misinformation special-interest groups in California are spreading among the people of that State concerning the Colorado River controversy.

To show how glaring some of these exaggerations are, we will quote a few passages from the article, then follow each with a statement of fact, not only for the education of Arizonians, but in the hopes that a few fair-minded Californians can be taught the truth about the issues in the controversy.

For example, the opening sentence of the article states:

"Arizona's renewed attempts to promote the huge Central Arizona project in the Halls of Congress may dry up a water supply which could support an additional 5,000,000 southern Californians, and seriously jeopardizes a $550,000,000 investment in Colorado River projects."

The answer to this is that Arizona is not seeking one drop of water to which California is entitled. California, by an act of her own legislature in 1929, limited her use of main-stream Colorado water to 4,400,000 acre-feet of water annually, which is her allotment under the Boulder Canyon Project Act of 1928. The water Arizona seeks would in no way hamper California's use of her full share, which, incidentally, she is not today using.

Another point is that the water Arizona is seeking would be used to save proven agricultural land from ruin. California is seeking additional water to develop the East

Mesa, out of whose 225,000 acres only 5,350 could be economically farmed, according to a report by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the University of California.

Now look at this statement:

"Water for this speculative land-development scheme can be obtained only by taking it away from California's contracted water."

Arizona is entitled to 2,800,000 acre-feet of main-stream water annually under the Boulder Canyon Act. She is using a mere 400,000 acre-feet of main-stream water. She is asking some 1,200,000 additional acre-feet for the Central Arizona project. If she gets the water, her total use will still be over 1,000,000 acre-feet short of her allotment. Arizona is entitled to use her full allotment of 2,800,000 acre-feet of main-stream flow, and California her allotment of 4,400,000, before any surplus is divided equally, as provided in the Boulder Canyon Act. The water Arizona seeks will not be used speculatively, but to save proven farm land.

As to any water shortage, a total of 5,394,040 acre-feet of water flowed into Mexico, and hence into the Gulf of California, from the Colorado during the 12 months from October 1945, through September 1946, according to a report from the United States Geological Survey. Anyone who has recently visited the portion of Mexico through which the Colorado flows, as we did last month, can testify to the fact that land, once farmed, is being flooded because of the overabundance of water in the Colorado.

Here is another statement from the article:

"Arizona is now using and has authorized projects which will use 3,300,000 acre-feet."

There is no basis for this statement. It is an attempt to misinform Californians in an effort to unite them against Arizona's water plea. Arizona is using 400,000 acre-feet of main-stream water annually. No additional water is being used from the main stream, and no additional use is authorized.

The article also says:

"There just isn't any water left for this costly project."

As pointed out above, the water is available, and Arizona is entitled to twice the amount she is seeking. The demands for the Central Arizona project amount to only about one-quarter of the water passing annually into Mexico, or about equal to the amount that California is wastefully dumping into the Salton Sea each year.

Finally, inspect this remark:

"If Arizona were to get this water, it would be a financial windfall to a few land speculators and would benefit about 25,000 people, as compared to 5,000,000 in this State."

Another example of the gross misinformation being handed the people of California by a small special-interest group.

The land for which Arizona seeks water is owned by thousands of farmers. It is the key to the economy of a valley in which 300,000 people reside. The economy of Arizona and California are closely interrelated. We import manufactured goods from California, and she imports food from our farm land.

Any threat to the economic life of our greatest farming area is a threat to the economy of California.

In all fairness to the Blade-Tribune, it should be pointed out that the facts in the article, quoted in part above are based on an interview with, or news releases from, Ben P. Griffith, secretary of California's Colorado River Association. The Blade-Tribune did not make them up. They are part of a carefully planned propaganda campaign being conducted by a small, special-interest group, and designed to cloud the issues in the river controversy.

Californians, as well as Arizonians, should be better acquainted with the true facts of the controversy.

Another Hidden Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Columbus Evening Dispatch of February 23, 1949:

ANOTHER HIDDEN TAX

In spite of repeated explanations and proof to the contrary, millions of Americans faithfully believe that the regular deductions from their earnings, in the name of social security, represents money that is put aside and placed in trust for them, to be repaid in their old age in the form of social insurance. That is not so. The money is withheld from their pay all right but it is not cached away for the rainy day of old age. It is spent by the Government and only Government obligations remain where this money once was. Social security, in this light, is but another form of taxation, a hidden, but nevertheless real, tax.

This paramount fact should be kept in mind in any consideration of the Truman administration's latest proposal to broaden social security and to increase the amount of money withheld from workers' wages and salaries. If the President's proposal becomes law, the sums withheld will have doubled by next January 1. There is no reason in the world to expect that this added taxation will be treated any differently than it has been in the past. In other words, it, too, will be spent by the Federal Government and replaced with Government obligations—the payment of which remains a matter for future worry and conjecture.

The spendthrift policies of the Federal Government over the past 16 years have been such that even the astronomical taxes now collected cannot keep up with the rate of Federal spending. There is every reason to believe that the people will tolerate no appreciable tax increases. Yet the money to spend must come from somewhere. How convenient a vehicle is the social-security system. In the name of social security, old-age assistance, and so on, as much as $6,000,000,000 a year can be raised, compared with the current less than $2,000,000,000.

If the people accept this disguised tax, more than threefold greater than what they now pay (thinking it's being saved for them), they will have indicated a sublime indifference to whatever their leaders choose to do to them. Indeed the Fair Deal spenders may be pardoned for thinking that they can get away with almost anything.

One cannot but ponder, parenthetically, what the Federal Government would do to an insurance company which accepted regular payments over the years toward an endowment policy for an individual and promptly spent each premium payment as it was paid in with nothing left to show for it but the company's note. What would the Government do to such a company which blithely spent such premiums and as much as announced that it would worry about paying off when the insured reached age 65—if he ever did.

And then what would the Government do to such a company, with such a record of misappropriation of premium funds, if the company blandly declared that it was doubling its premiums with no guaranty that the doubled amount would not be spent just as in the past.

Facts and Fictions About Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert some comments by one of the most competent mining research men in the country, Mr. Frank Lilly, of Spokane, Wash. I think his closing paragraph in his discussion of facts and fictions about gold is most important and worthy of the note of every Member of this body—a statement that failure on the part of our Government to use properly the monetary might inherent in gold in an honest hard-money monetary system involves a greater danger to these United States than the atom bomb would be in the hands of a European enemy. His statement follows:

SOME FACTS AND FICTIONS ABOUT GOLD

(By Frank Lilly)

Most widely known of all the metals and the first material thing mentioned in the Bible (Genesis ii: 11), gold is the least understood in the mystery of the power it exercises over mankind.

It is not the rarest metal; it is not the most valuable; it is not the most useful. Cheap brass and burnished copper are just as beautiful.

But gold is the metal which throughout history has been sought above all others. At the mere report of a gold strike men will rush to any part of the world, risking every danger of land and sea.

For gold man has fought and enslaved his fellowman—sacrificed his honor and his life.

It has been cursed as the root of evil.

And yet gold as man takes it from nature's vaults makes the owner richer without making anyone else the poorer.

It is worth as much in the hands of the weak and ignorant as in the hands of the strong and educated.

Its value increases proportionately as the value of all other things decreases.

It has been blessed by charity and used by man to adorn the fair sex and the churches and temples consecrated to his God.

What is the explanation of the tremendous force and scope of gold's power?

The answer can be found only in the historical facts about gold—not in the fictions of uninformed popular opinion fostered by money manipulators and selfish political interests.

What are these facts and fictions? Here are some of them:

It is a fact that throughout recorded history gold is the one thing of which no country or individual has ever had too much—the Midas story is mere fiction.

It is a fact that gold wins wars—it is fiction that they are won by manpower. If the fiction were a fact, either China or India would have dominated the world long ago.

It is a fact that the nation that controls the largest part of the world's monetary gold has throughout history dominated in commerce and maintained the highest culture as long as it had the gold—it is fiction that dominance in either commerce or culture can be maintained merely by a high level of intelligence and education.

It is a fact that the United States now owns by far the largest proportion of the

world's monetary gold—it is fiction that we have too much because actually we now have less gold in proportion to our national debt than when we had only one-tenth as much as we now have.

It is a fact that some of our gold can now be redeemed with paper currency or owned by a United States citizen except those in trades where gold is converted into an article which is sold to Mr. and Mrs. United States at prices which put a value of as high as $500 an ounce on the gold—it is fiction that our paper currency is as good as gold although it should be and must be if we are to maintain our position in world commerce.

It is a fact that international commerce is now conducted on a gold standard basis; it is fiction that we can buy anything anywhere in the world with our paper currency.

It is a fact that gold commands a premium in every free market in the world and, in fact, via the black market, in every country in the world—it is fiction that this market is small because over $4,000,000,000 of gold produced during the last 5 years has not as yet shown up in the world's monetary gold holdings.

It is a fact that natural gold can under a recent ruling of the United States Treasury be bought and sold within the United States—it is fiction that this gold promotes inflation, for it does not circulate as money.

It is a fact that no country whose monetary gold exceeded or equalled its paper currency has ever had either inflation or deflation—it is fiction that gold coins would be wildly spent or miserly hoarded.

It is a fact that gold is the only metal and probably the only commodity that has not increased in price since 1934—it is fiction that the price of $35 an ounce for gold is high because it was formerly priced at $20.67.

It is a fact that President Roosevelt reluctantly and gradually increased the price of gold following increased prices in foreign countries—it is fiction that he was the leader in increasing the price.

It is a fact that both President Hoover and President Roosevelt believed that the gold clause in our Government bonds and currency precluded a possible increase in the price of gold—it is fiction that this clause is still a stipulation in any of our Government bonds.

It is a fact that President Truman has estimated Russia's monetary gold holdings at no more than about $2,500,000,000—it is fiction that Russia has an enormous amount of gold or that it is producing anything like the amount credited to it by skillful propaganda unwisely circulated by a credulous press.

It is a fact that gold production, except for a short period following the discovery of gold in California, has not kept pace with the increase in population—it is fiction that the gold output has really been great.

It is a fact that because there has not been enough gold to go around the value has been legally increased 10 times since 1934 when the price was $4.26 an ounce on the basis of the English pound at $4.87—it is fiction that the price of $20.67 an ounce had prevailed for centuries.

It is a fact that gold sold as high as $165 an ounce in terms of graanback currency in a free market following the Civil War when the currency was, as it now is, irredeemable in gold—it is fiction that this price of $165 was due solely to manipulation by gold traders.

It is a fact that gold, machine guns, and narcotics are the only three things that cannot be freely bought and sold by United States citizens—it is fiction that ownership of gold is dangerous either to the individual or society.

It is a fact that if a citizen were permitted to sell abroad gold produced in the United States, he could at present obtain a substantially higher price than his own Government will pay him—it is fiction that in making a sale abroad one would be paid only in foreign currencies of questionable value.

It is a fact that Senators McCARRAN, of Nevada, and JOHNSON, of Colorado, and Representative CLAIR ENGLE, of California, have introduced bills in the present Congress that provide for a free market for gold—it is fiction that a free market would hamper or endanger our monetary system in any way.

It is a fact, although not generally realized, that gold is the one most important material thing in the life of every man, woman, and child, because, believe it or not, gold is intimately associated with almost every action of our lives—it is fiction to think that it functions only in bank vaults.

It is a fact that no real substitute for gold has ever been found, because gold is to commerce what blood is to the body—it is fiction that anything else is as good as gold.

It is a fact that the poor man's "pocket gold" is silver and that silver has throughout history been prized next to gold—it is fiction that silver is merely a commodity and not an important monetary metal.

It is a fact that the depression of the early thirties would have been prevented if our gold holdings had been promptly revalued in line with world values when the deflation set in during the latter part of 1929—it is fiction to believe that we must wait until deflation again wrecks our Nation's economy before applying the gold cure.

It is a fact that another depression is inevitable unless gold is revalued before disastrous deflation sets in again—it is fiction, as the history of every nation shows, that a bust can be prevented by legislative fiat and a managed I O U type of currency system.

It is an encouraging fact that our leading statesmen and most of the best informed monetary experts of the United States realize that this country must now revalue its gold upward and sooner or later return to the gold standard, the sooner the better—it is fiction that the United States can avoid the ruin that has been the result of every attempt to maintain an irredeemable printing-press currency.

These are some of the many facts and their correlative fictions which so conclusively show the far-reaching ramifications of gold. The metal, therefore, must not be considered lightly either in its relation to money or as the one form of wealth that for over 50 centuries has proven its transcendent power over nations, industry, and man-made laws. To disregard these truths and to fail to use properly the monetary might inherent in gold in an honest hard-money monetary system, involves a greater danger to these United States than the atom bomb would be in the hands of a European enemy.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the civilized world today stands aghast at the mock trial held in Budapest by the Red leaders of Hungary. I do not believe anyone was surprised at their audacity in sentencing Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment, because it was a foregone conclusion that he would be found guilty under the standards set by his Russian persecutors. Russia's heavy hand, having first silenced the Calvinist and Lutheran Churches in Hungary, moved a step further and decided to silence the Catholic Church as well. Methinks, Mr. Stalin has bitten off a larger piece than he can chew in his latest blunder. Let us not condemn the Hungarian Magyars—they are as innocent of wrongdoing as you and I, but, driven by the Red army, with guns at their backs, they have been forced to accept this shameful decision on the part of the Russian barbarians without protest.

We, however, are not under the domination of the Russian hordes, and, please God, we never shall be. We can do somethink about this shocking debasement of human liberties. The United States was a signatory to the Yalta Agreement, and we are morally obliged to see that no cause for further wars be tolerated. We are bound to act in self-defense. We must see to it, through the framework of the United Nations, that this outrage is not repeated in Hungary or elsewhere. If the United Nations cannot stop this sort of thing—what good is it? Is there anything closer to the hearts of men than their religion? How would we, in America, react to the confiscation by an enemy horde of our church properties and educational facilities? The Budapest papers recently carried headlines saying that Julian Huxley, UNESCO delegate, gave his blessing to the Russian confiscation of all Catholic and Protestant church school properties. No one with any judgment believes that Mr. Huxley did anything of the kind, but this is the sort of propaganda which the Russians are broadcasting to the world. The New York Communist daily recently had the nerve to say "whatever happens to Hungary's schools is of no concern to anyone else but those in power." I am afraid the editor of that Red sheet overlooked the fact that it might be of interest to the people who built and paid for those schools.

The recent shocking trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty is only one example of the persecution of the Hungarian people. Persecuted persons by the hundreds are arriving at the Austrian border every day to escape imprisonment or deportation, if not death.

Catholics the world over, as well as millions of others of every faith, were shocked when Cardinal Mindszenty was brought to trial on charges trumped up by the Red leaders but their sense of decency and fair play was outraged at the manner in which the trial was conducted.

We are now witnessing the mock trials of a number of Protestant leaders in Bulgaria, just a repetition of the Mindszenty trial. They were forced by intimidation and threats to sign so-called confessions. Thank God, five of them had the courage yesterday to repudiate those confessions. The daily papers carried a small item on Monday of this week in which it was stated that the Russians had warned the clergy in Germany against entering into political activities.

This is not a war on Catholics or any particular race or religious group; it is an

effort on the part of the Kremlin to destroy religion, to destroy hope, to mold into a pattern described by the Kremlin, all of the downtrodden nations of Europe. I do not fasten the blame for this outrage on the weakling who acted as judge in the cardinal's trial nor those who are trying the Protestant leaders in Bulgaria. Let us put the blame where it belongs: on the shoulders of Joseph Stalin and the members of the Politburo, who issue the orders to their puppets.

I raise my voice in protest, as an American citizen who firmly believes in the Declaration of Independence wherein it states:

That all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights and among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It will be interesting to see what the United Nations does about this matter, and I, for one, will be anxiously awaiting their decision.

Federal Gasoline and Oil Tax Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include House Concurrent Resolution 3 of the South Dakota State Legislature, which was sponsored by my friend, Louis Johnson, of Labolt, S. Dak., and which I endorse:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a substantial sales tax on gasoline, averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1948 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $3,000,000 which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to approximately 10 percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

Whereas the Federal lubricating oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax on a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type, which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should discontinue the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committee in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation.

Gen. Mark W. Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the city of New Orleans was pleased to have as its guest Gen. Mark Clark, one of the great leaders in World War II.

In this connection I am including in this insertion the splendid introduction of General Clark at a dinner of distinguished citizens of New Orleans by Col. Eberhard Deutsch, who served with the general in World War II.

I am also enclosing an editorial from the New Orleans Item.

INTRODUCTION OF GEN. MARK W. CLARK BY COL. EBERHARD DEUTSCH

Colonel Lyman, distinguished guests, companions, in October 1942 a small British submarine put out from Gibraltar, and headed southeast across the Mediterranean. Aboard was a little group of Americans, under the command of one of the great military figures of our history.

On the next night, as this vessel lay off a remote spot on the coast of Algeria, these men made their perilous way ashore in tiny collapsible canvas boats over the dark water. There they crept to a little house, kept a rendezvous with a group of French officers, arranged the landings of the American forces in north Africa, hid in a cellar for a day and a night, and finally escaped.

On the 9th of November—the day after the invasion—that same great military leader flew to Algiers, personally took into custody Admiral Jean Francois Darlan, effected an immediate cessation of all French resistance in western north Africa, and became the man of the hour.

Later, as commander of the Fifth Army, he landed his forces at Salerno, captured Naples, crossed the Volturno, established beachheads at Anzio and Nettuno, levelled and ultimately beat down the theretofore impregnable bastion of Cassino, and liberated the eternal city of Rome.

Placed in command of all Allied combat forces in Italy, this indomitable soldier continued his northward sweep. Sienna, Florence, Pisa, Leghorn, Bologna, Verona, Mantua, Genoa, Padua, Cremona, Parma, Como, Milan, Turin, Venice—all fell before him and acclaimed him. And when he reached the Alps, the enemy forces in Italy and Austria under Field Marshal Kesselring, surrendered to this magnificent American leader 5 days before the close of hostilities in western Europe.

He was next appointed military commander in chief of the United States Forces in Austria, and diplomatic High Commissioner of the United States for that country. The fact that, despite the unhappy state of affairs which developed in Berlin, no impasse was reached in Austria, is attributable to the genius of this man of the hour—soldier turned diplomat—who, for his firm and brilliant statesmanship, was now acclaimed man of the year.

It is with a sense of real reverence that I take the privilege of presenting to you that man of the hour and of the year, whom it is my firm conviction history will record as one of the greatest Americans of our generation, Gen. Mark Wayne Clark.

[From the New Orleans Item of Tuesday, February 22, 1949]

GENERAL CLARK

Quite on his own account, and not merely as an outstanding American whose fabulous wartime achievements have made him something of a legendary figure, Gen. Mark Clark is a very welcome visitor to New Orleans. Unassuming and modest, with an unquenchably boyish personality, he is about as far as possible from the accepted type of a saber-rattling swashbuckler.

For this reason, as well as because of his professional attainments, any opinion he may express on matters involving the military situation of the United States in its relations with other lands during a troubled era in world history has a valid claim on thoughtful public attention.

His conviction that the United States must be militarily strong, and must remain so until the uneasy tensions of the moment are relaxed, represents an almost universal military habit of mind. That is only natural. But it is encouraging, indeed, to note the leaven of introspective realism in his conclusions. For example, in discussing the current $15,000,000,000 appropriation for the armed services, he concedes that "this will go a long way if we squeeze out waste and duplication and get the unification we need."

Again, although strictly an Army man, he unhesitatingly expresses the belief that "we need a balanced force composed of Army, Navy, and Air Force. I can't subscribe to the theory that any one of them can do it alone."

That is a refreshing departure from the rigid channeling we have come to associate with the thinking of armed-services professionals or with the notion so prevalent in these days of government-by-gimme that spending for this and that is the all-important desideratum, without thought of the restraints of economy suggested by sound business practice.

In joining the welcome extended to General Clark and his family by New Orleans, we express the hope that he will find his stay here both pleasant and relaxing, as a prelude to his vacation in Brazil.

Mine-Fire Control in Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I have the highest regard for the United States Bureau of Mines and I am deeply appreciative of the service which that organization has rendered in helping effect mine-safety measures throughout the various States having mining activities within their borders. A short time ago I requested the Chief of the Bureau of Mines to have his investigators make an inspection of a coal-mine fire which was reported to be burning in the vicinity of Sand Run, Hocking County, Ohio.

Just recently I received a detailed report which was compiled by the engineers of the United States Bureau of Mines, and naturally I submitted this report to the daily newspaper at Logan, Ohio, which serves the area in which this mine is located. For the information of all residents concerned and living in this area, the Logan Daily News quoted quite extensively from the report issued by the engineers of the United States Bureau of Mines. This morning I noticed a reply to that report in the Logan Daily News signed by Mr. J. E. Matheny, deputy mine inspector for Ohio.

I have personally known Mr. Matheny for a good many years and can say with authority that he is one of the most conscientious and informed mining inspectors which the Stat of Ohio has ever had. His report will carry much weight with the citizens of this affected area, and since it is so diametrically in conflict with the report of the United States Bureau of Mines regarding this particular mine fire, I feel that it should be published and that the United States Bureau of Mines should reply to Mr. Matheny's statement. Either the United States Bureau of Mines should retract some of the statements issued in their findings or they should get together with Mr. Matheny and after thorough investigation submit a subsequent report.

The citizens living in this area are entitled to a full, factual report.

Mr. Matheny's article addressed to the editor of the Logan Daily News, at Logan, Ohio, follows:

EDITOR, DAILY NEWS:

It is believed that a little further consideration should be given to the article in a recent issue of the Logan Daily News, entitled "Six Mine Fires Burning in Hocking County and Vicinity.". According to the news item, this report was prepared by the United States Bureau of Mines and released to the Daily News by Congressman WALTER E. BREHM.

Early in the report they mention several fires, both active and inactive, but do not explain why some are no longer active. I think that if they investigate far enough they will find that the ones referred to as the "Coal Cut fire" near Kimberly and the 1933 fire at Sand Run finally died out by the aid of nature smothering them with top soil and shale.

In reference to the present Sand Run fire, the report states that this fire can eventually affect an area of eight to ten thousand acres of worked out or partially worked out coal lands, with the United States Forest Service being the owner of the surface. This is a little misleading as the United States Forest Service owns but a very small percent of the total area involved, and the paragraph hinting that the coal is only partially worked out is slightly exaggerated as practically the entire area has been mined over and most of the pillars and crop lines removed.

At present, there are approximately a half dozen small domestic mines working in the area that can eventually be affected by this fire, and none of these mines is closer than three-quarters of a mile to the fire. With the exception of one or two mines, all of them are pillar and crop-line mines and their combined daily production averages approximately 150 tons, and none of them has anything to look forward to so far as future development is concerned, and without a doubt all of them will be worked out and abandoned before the fire can ever reach their workings. If there were any other prospective mining sites in this area they would certainly have been taken up long ago as the small mining companies are constantly looking for suitable mining sites.

Plans and costs are submitted for extinguishing the Sand Run fire. Why not submit the same for the other fires mentioned, especially the one at Carbon Hill, which the report states will eventually threaten the city of Nelsonville? I have every respect for the engineers in the United States Bureau of Mines, with whom I am acquainted, but I doubt very much if they or other such highly trained persons can accurately submit proposed costs of extinguishing such fires, especially where examinations cannot be made of the underground areas affected. However, since the miners in this area have been so hard pressed for employment in recent months, and this may be the forerunner for another WPA fire project which could help relieve the unemployment conditions, I am heartily in favor of it, provided the taxpayers are willing to assume the cost of such a project and the miners are willing to again resort to that sort of wages and employment.

Specific mention is made of the fact that all the vegetation has been destroyed in the area and the smoke and fumes evolved are a definite health hazard to the residents of the community. The vegetation consists mostly of thorn bushes and second-growth scraggly trees that have long ago been damaged by the forest fires that used to occur regularly during dry spring and fall seasons. It would be most interesting for uninformed persons to go view this highly publicized fire and determine for themselves the definite health hazards referred to, and then travel to some of the large mining communities in this and other States and view the mountainous high stone and "gob" dumps that are sometimes located right in the centers of the towns. These waste dumps are constantly burning and discharging much larger volumes of poisonous smoke and gases than can ever be liberated by the Sand Run fire and at the same time there are hundreds of citizens in each such community as compared to about a dozen families in the town of Sand Run.

The dangers to domesticated animals and persons traveling in the vicinity of the fires is also mentioned in the report. It would certainly be interesting to have a count made of the number of domesticated animals (including a few mongrel dogs) owned by the residents of Sand Run. It might be well to mention also that there is no reason for anyone to be traveling in the area affected by the fire.

The article further states that if the fire is allowed to continue to burn uncontrolled, that most if not all the remaining coal in the area will be destroyed together with the reforested area. Before too much emphasis is placed on this, I feel that the Forestry Service should inform the public as to just how much reforesting has been done in the area. This will be found to be rather small. Also the fact should be disclosed that the remaining coal that is endangered represents approximately 30 percent of the original deposits, and is known as pillars that were left during the original mining operations to support the roof while active mining was practiced. Up to the present day no practical or profitable methods have been discovered whereby such remaining coal can safely be recovered.

Emphasis is placed on the success of the famous New Straitsville fire barriers, and the fact that mining operations have been carried on both inside and outside the limits of these barriers. I do not know of a single instance where there is evidence to prove that these barriers have slowed up or stopped the progress of the New Straitsville fire, and as to the mining operations, some of these were in progress prior to the erection of the barriers. Some of them have exhausted their supply of coal, others have opened both inside and outside the barriers, and during the recent great demand for coal considerable crop line coal was mined by strip methods, which is the only method of safely recovering such coal. I personally know of a couple of instances where mining operations have penetrated the fire barriers, and at these points it was found that the noncombustible backfill in the excavated area was very shallow and men were able to step up on the fill and walk great distances with no difficulty. What will happen if and when the fire reaches such points can be left to the judgment of the public.

The article is closed with an apparent effort at trying to blacken the public's opinion toward landowners, coal companies, the State mining department, and others, by stating that they are doing nothing to extinguish mine fires, or minimize the chances of other fires being kindled. Certainly the State of Ohio is doing nothing at present to futilely fight such old fires, as there are no appropriations set up for such work, and I doubt if at any time the State legislature will ever place themselves in such an absurd position as to appropriate such exorbitant fees as would be necessary to carry on such work on wasteland areas. No mention was made of the fact that Ohio's mining department was among the first, if not the first, to equip itself with the most modern equipment available for fighting mine fires where lives and valuable property are concerned. As evidence of this I might mention that about 2 years after Ohio purchased such equipment the chief of the Department of Mines of Pennsylvania traveled into Ohio to view this equipment, with the idea of equipping that State's mining department with similar equipment. In the past few years I have helped to successfully combat several mine fires, both large and small. Some of them locally were the ones at the F. H. Wolfe Mine, McVey & Rosser Mine, and Tropic No. 52 Mine. These and many other fires were extinguished with no help from Federal agencies, therefore they received very little newspaper publicity.

When such fires occur in underground active workings the operators, their employees, and members of the State division of mines combine their efforts to quickly combat such fires with no thought of praise or publicity, as such work is considered in line with their duties and responsibilities.

Ohio can console itself with the fact that it is not the only State plagued with such fires, as many other States have the same

conditions. As evidence of this a person needs to do nothing more than read the February issue of Coal Age magazine. One article in this magazine tells of the troubles encountered by a Pennsylvania anthracite stripping company, while stripping coal in an area where an uncontrolled fire has been burning for the past 16 years.

J. E. MATHENY,
Deputy Mine Inspector.

A-Day, January 1, 1953

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Marvin Miles in his column Skyways, printed in the Los Angeles Times, Sunday, January 23, 1949:

SKYWAYS
(By Marvin Miles)

Lost somewhere in tangles of Washington red tape is a vital date—January 1, 1953. Or perhaps ignored is the word. For certainly that New Year's dawn will show up as the days race into weeks and months and years.

For those who have forgotten, January 1, 1953, was labeled A-day by President Truman's personally appointed Air Policy Commission just 1 year ago.

It's the day that divides the future into two clear-cut phases for strategic purposes, the target date (the Commission warned) by which the United States should have an air arm in being capable of dealing with possible atomic attack on this country.

The Commission reported it would be an unreasonable risk * * * a reckless course to rely on other nations not having atomic weapons in quantity by the end of 1952.

CAREFUL RESEARCH

And it pointed out further it would be unwise to assume * * * that other nations will not have the planes and missiles capable of delivering a sustained attack by that same date.

The Commission's study was no haphazard work. For 5 months its members consulted with the highest qualified Government and private sources in an objective inquiry to assist the President in formulating an integrated national aviation policy.

By A-day, the Commissioners agreed unanimously that the United States must have ready for immediate action a counteroffensive force built around a fleet of bombers, accompanying planes and long-range missiles which will serve notice on any nation which may think of attacking us that if it does, it will see its factories and cities destroyed and its war machine crushed.

The strength of the counteroffensive force must be such that it will be able to make an aggressor pay a devastating price for attacking us.

It must, if possible, be so strong that it will be able to silence the attack on the United States mainland and give us the time again to build up our industrial machine and our manpower to go on to win the war.

But such a force does not grow overnight, and the Commission recommended a gradual build-up, starting with 34,000,000 pounds of air-frame weight in the calendar year 1948 and 56,000,000 pounds in 1949 as the first steps in the 5-year program.

WHY THE SLASH?

Now President Truman has recommended but 37,000,000 pounds for fiscal 1950.

Perhaps the Commission was out of line, you say?

Not according to other surveys. The Air Coordinating Committee in 1945 advised 60,000,000 pounds annually to cooperate in the maintenance of world peace. The Congressional Aviation Policy Board recommended 63,000,000 pounds to prevent the loss of a war and 111,000,000 pounds toward the initial strength to mount a successful air offensive. The Stanford University survey set its annual minimum as a base for expansion at 80,000,000 pounds.

What's the reason for the slash?

Has the President learned to his satisfaction that the danger cited by the Commission no longer exists?

If so, why did he scornfully label communism as a breeder of war in his inaugural address last Thursday?

Will his bold new program to help the world's needy areas in any way sidetrack the foreign development of atomic energy and the means of transporting it?

We think not.

It seems to us that adequate air power is as essential in the crusade to save the world from communism as the plan to ease the suffering of poverty-ridden millions.

Yet the budget recommendation would cut America's air strength to a nucleus of a nucleus and toss out the carefully considered recommendations of the various surveys.

We believe the Commission's study still stands as the most clear-cut analysis yet made. The soundly based expenditures it advocates would be infinitesimal against the cost of a total war they might well prevent.

A New Low in Muddy Journalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD two press releases which I sent to the House Press, Radio, and Periodical Galleries yesterday:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR G. KLEIN, MARCH 3, 1949

Westbrook Pegler yesterday struck an all-time journalistic low.

With a scatological skill which could spring only from a sick mind and soul, he dripped his brush of corruption across almost every institution revered by Americans.

In less than 1,500 dirty words, he succeeded in spattering with filth American democracy, patriotism, the Roman Catholic Church, motherhood, marriage, the Jewish community, the brave men living and dead who have defended this Nation against foreign danger and internal corruption, the Irish Nation, and every basic principle of human dignity and decency.

If Pegler proved anything, it was that only the American tradition of a free press would provide an outlet to his vileness.

There was a time within the memory of men and women still living when the Hearst newspapers championed human rights. If William Randolph Hearst has left a shred of that love of humanity which once brought his news empire into being, this ancient and outworn plug called Pegler will be retired to his fouled senescence.

All that remains of a once great sports writer is a lethal capacity for throwing foul balls. Yesterday was a day which will live in journalistic infamy.

To true Americans, the three people who suffered most at the viscid hands of this depraved scavenger need no defense or praise at my hands. Certainly Franklin D. Roosevelt lives in glorious memory, enshrined in the hearts of the people of the whole world, and Mrs. Roosevelt occupies a niche of affection in the great heart of the universe which no Pegler can besmirch.

As for the Honorable HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS, she has proved herself, in a life more useful than that of her detractors, a successful wife, a successful mother, a successful politician and liberal leader, a successful actress and singer, a great lady, and a great American. There are many Members of the House of Representatives who disagree with Mrs. DOUGLAS politically; I know of none who does not admire and like her. The putrid drivel of the Peglers cannot hurt her; it can only bring to her defense every decent-minded man and woman of this country.

Neither does Melvin Douglas, who at the age of 42 enlisted in the Army of the United States and served 6 months in the ranks before winning his commission, need defense, and Melvin Douglas sacrificed his career. Pegler has sacrificed nothing but his honor.

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE ARTHUR G. KLEIN, MARCH 4, 1949

I am sending to the floor when the House next convenes a concurrent resolution which answers Westbrook Pegler's vicious slurs in the only language he seems to understand, with apologies to my colleagues and to the press for stooping to Peglerism. The text of the resolution follows:

"*Resolved*, That there is hereby created the Joint Commission on the Westbrook Pegler annual award of journalistic infamy. The Commission shall consist of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules, the chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the chairman of the standing committees of the press, radio, and periodical galleries of the Senate and of the House, and the poundmaster and the chief plumbing inspector of the government of the District of Columbia. The chief plumbing inspector shall be ex officio secretary of the Commission, and any interested person may submit to him the name of any nominee for the Westbrook Pegler annual award of journalistic infamy, together with any relevant testimony, evidence, exhibits, or remarks, between April 2 and April of the following year.

"2. The Commission shall meet at 11 o'clock antemeridian on the 1st day of April of each calendar year in that part of the Capitol known as the crypt, and shall by open voice vote choose by majority vote the name of the recipient of the Westbrook Pegler annual award of journalistic infamy; provided, that the 1949 recipient shall be Westbrook Pegler.

"3. The Commission may, at its discretion but without cost to the United States, cause a plaque to be manufactured to symbolize the award; and if it elects to do so the following suggested design shall have due consideration: A rectangular shield transversed by a double cross, surmounted by a turkey buzzard rampant on a field of ord, with jackal couchant in the left upper quarter and the symbolic figures of Truth and Decency outraged supine in the lower right quarter.

"4. No member or employee of the Commission shall receive any compensation or reimbursement for his services or for any funds expended, as it is recognized the pleasure of the service will be sufficient reward."

Mr. Speaker, I was warned in advance that I would suffer for these releases. I was told that Westbrook Pegler would

shadow me, investigate me, denounce me, embarrass me, defame me.

I was told he would plant spies in my office and in my home, magnify every fault in my being, and pour out upon me the venom of his ingrown, hate-consumed personality. I was told that I would be made the peg for more and worse attacks against my religious faith.

I was warned that newspapers would not print my rebuttal to the Peglerism which was directed against the privilege and dignity of this honored House.

Nevertheless there are times when a man cannot remain silent if he wishes to keep on speaking terms with himself. This is one of those times.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am herewith including excerpts from a speech which I delivered last evening at the Jackson Club of Huron County, Ohio, Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet in Norwalk, Ohio:

The Democratic Party has taken great pride for over a century in commemorating the memory of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, two great American statesmen and patriots, who constructed the foundation for a permanent people's party. We Democrats love to recall and narrate the great deeds of these men and other leaders of our party back in the pioneer days. It is well that on occasions we review the fight our party has made for over a century and a quarter in behalf of the people.

Today we cannot refrain from our enthusiasm to inculcate in the minds of every American the deeds and progressive accomplishments of our party under Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman.

Our political history for generations reveals that whenever our National Government becomes submerged by reason of the powerful tentacles of special interest, the people call upon the Democratic Party for leadership. Also when our national economy is destroyed by reason of Republican misfeasance and nonfeasance, the American voter has always summoned a Democratic administration to revive prosperity and insure employment.

The numerous failures and disappointments of Republican leadership in the past have placed the American people on guard. In proof thereof I submit the last five Presidential elections, which testify that the people have learned a great lesson about the operations of their National Government in the last 18 years.

In spite of costly and well-organized political propaganda campaigns, the American people seem to have a way of sifting the chaff from the wheat and voting for the welfare of the masses.

In spite of misrepresentation and false information disseminated during the recent campaign by a great majority of newspapers and radio commentators, the American people demonstrated on November 2 that they were better informed on the operations of our National Government than the "experts."

In the 1948 campaign I told the people of my district and throughout Indiana on numerous occasions that the election of the Republican Eightieth Congress was a blessing in disguise. During the 2-year period of 1947 and 1948 the Republican Eightieth Congress brought back sad memories of the reactionary, regretful 1920's. Millions of young voters who were less than 15 years old in 1930 knew nothing of the sorrow, unemployment, and economic devastation brought on during the last years of President Hoover which culminated 12 years of Republican misrule. That period of reaction was recalled to the older voter and practically demonstrated to the younger voter by the Eightieth Congress.

In one of the greatest demonstrations of political salesmanship in the history of this Nation the Republican record was brought to the minds of all voters on every farm and in every town and city in the Nation by the plain people's advocate, President Harry S. Truman.

President Truman realized that victory was at hand if the people knew the plain facts about their Government. He knew that the forces of special privilege could not win if the people were awakened. The President was greatly aided in his Nation-wide fight by that Democratic stalwart, one of America's greatest statemen and orators, Vice President Alben W. Barkley. The platform adopted at Philadelphia was endorsed November 2 because the people knew Truman and Barkley would fight to enact it plank by plank, and all true Democrats would cooperate with our leaders in the Eighty-first Congress.

The farmers of America knew that President Truman would fight for agricultural price supports and also to continue the program which has given the American farmer his greatest prosperity. No group in our Nation took a more severe beating than the farmer during the "good old Republican days" under Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. In the dark days of economic reconstruction, immediately after Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress assumed control in March 1933, the leaders of all farm groups were called to Washington for consultation to recommend a legislative program destined to pull the farmer out of the rut of bankruptcy and start agriculture on its gradual rise to its present-day prosperity. We now know that one of the most contributive causes of the 1929–33 depression was the unbalanced agricultural economy. The cost of producing farm products exceeded the market value. This greatly curtailed America's buying power.

The Republican leaders in those days—and also today—abhorred the idea of farm price supports. Appropriations for rural electrification, reclamation, soil conservation, storage granaries, and farm loans are all creatures of the Democratic Presidents and Democratic Congresses. When these facts were brought to the minds of the farmers of Ohio, it explained why Ohio and other farm States turned down Tom Dewey last November.

The other great factor in our victory was that the Democratic Party in the last 15 years knew that labor and the wage earner must have buying power to continue American prosperity.

In 1935 the Democratic Party passed the Wagner Act which gave organized labor and the wage earner a magna carta of freedom enabling them to lawfully organize and collectively bargain with their employers and improve their wages and working conditions.

When the Republicans took control of Congress in January 1947 steps were taken immediately to nullify practically all the progressive legislation that was passed for labor during the Roosevelt-Truman era. Volumes of misinformation and false propaganda were circulated 2 years ago by the National Association of Manufacturers and other special-privilege groups to enact the unfair Taft-Hartley law. These same sources are now repeating this propaganda by means of the press and mails in order to retain the Taft-Hartley Act on the statute books of our Nation.

Last June I distinctly remember hearing Republican leaders of the Eightieth Congress, both on the floor of the House and over the air, challenge President Truman and the Democratic Party to make an issue of the Taft-Hartley Act in the 1948 campaign. President Truman and the Democratic platform, adopted at Philadelphia, accepted the challenge. The people on November 2 spoke emphatically that the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed. In the Eightieth Congress, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I opposed the enactment of this legislation. The operations of the Taft-Hartley law after its enactment, convinced me that I was correct. President Truman in his veto message said the Taft-Hartley Act would be unworkable—promote chaos and confusion and produce labor-management bitterness. He was correct.

Even Cyrus S. Ching, Chief of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, recently declared in a report to Congress that certain major features of the act have failed dismally in their supposed objective of maintaining industrial peace. Mr. Ching stated that the 80-day injunction period has tended to "delay, rather than facilitate settlement of a dispute." He also said that "the 80-day lid proved to be a warming-up interval for a strike rather than a cooling-off period."

Mr. Ching, a former executive of rubber and transit companies, further said, and I quote: "Fact-finding boards have likewise been a 'flop.' Interjection of such boards has had the effect of interfering with collective bargaining of the parties, particularly in relationships in which it is traditional not to reach a settlement until the eleventh hour."

Further, Mr. Ching stated that the requirement of the Taft-Hartley Act, that in emergency disputes, workers must be polled on the employers last offer, has proved a failure. Workers almost invariably have voted "No" in such cases and the elections, expensive to conduct, have done nothing to promote settlement of disputes—to the contrary, they are a disrupting influence in collective bargaining and mediation.

These criticisms of the act are all the more remarkable because they come from a veteran employer. I mention these facts because the organized propaganda now being circulated to retain the Taft-Hartley Act would have the public believe that union leaders were the only ones in favor of its repeal.

Let me read just one line from Business Week, a magazine not overfriendly to labor, in an article of December 18, 1948, quote:

"Most businessmen are realistic, few are wasting time deploring the imminent doom of the Taft-Hartley Act. To be sure, they worry about the legislation that will replace it, but most businessmen are getting ready to work with a new set of labor-relation rules. The Taft-Hartley Act did fail on one of the most important grounds, by which a law must be judged in a democratic society. That ground is consent. Only the police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects."

Time is too short, in my few remarks to review and analyze the numerous restrictive provisions of this antilabor legislation.

One of the great problems facing the Congress and the American people is the increased tax burden brought about by reason of World War II. I think the American taxpayer is entitled to know that 74.6 percent of his tax dollar is spent by his Government for cost of past wars and preparedness against future wars. This cost includes interest on the war debt, veterans' benefits and pensions, and billions which are being invested to curb communism, with the hope of preventing future war; and additional billions that the Government is now spending to maintain an adequate military and air force to protect

our country in case of attack. The American taxpayer cannot avoid his financial obligation caused by past wars. We know that the price of liberty is overlasting vigilance. If the American people want preparedness, which I am satisfied they do, it is going to cost billions, and that cost must be borne by the taxpayers.

There has been, and is, a great deal of demagoguery about the high cost of Government by radio commentators and politicians. I have in mind two radio commentators in particular who constantly compare the cost of Government in 1948 with 1939. At no time do they, in fairness to the Government and the people, inform them that World War II is the true cause for this increase. They carefully avoid informing the public that over five billion of this cost was appropriated by the Congress in 1948, by unanimous vote of Democrats and Republicans, to pay the annual interest on the war debt. They also fail to reveal that in 1948 this same Congress voted unanimously to appropriate over $8,000,000,000 to our Veterans' Administration under the GI bill of rights. This is a $13,000,000,000 expense which we did not have in 1939 which should be taken into consideration in comparing the high cost of Government with 10 years ago. When the politically minded commentators deplore the great number of Government employeees, they fail to inform their listeners that over 500,000 Government employees are in the postal department which is at present under-manned. Another 202,000 employees are in the employ of the Veterans' Administration which administers to over 18,000,000 veterans of World Wars I and II.

The Democratic Party has been the sponsor of social-security legislation. Both parties promised in their 1946 and 1948 platforms that social security should be expanded. The Eightieth Congress failed to carry out its party platform in this regard and it is my earnest hope that the Eighty-first Congress will pass legislation calling for practical expansion of social security.

The record of the Democratic Party since March 4, 1933, has been replete with progressive legislation which has had for its purpose the improvement of our economy, which has adhered to the benefit of untold millions who formerly were classified as the forgotten men.

The Republican leaders have criticised this legislation in every campaign, but they dare not advocate its repeal.

It has been this record of performance on the part of the Democratic Party which has brought five successive Presidential election victories. Our party should not fear the future if we continue to carry out our platform promises and legislate for all segments of our economy fairly and equitably.

The Democratic policies since March 4, 1933, have literally lifted our Nation by its bootstraps from 14,000,000 unemployed to a Nation of over 61,000,000 employed in 1948. Lifted us from despondency to the greatest prosperity in our history. Republican leaders are still gazing into the future through smoked glasses, and in every Presidential election since 1936 have been predicting that these policies would lead us into financial ruin and economic bankruptcy. The American people have gone to the ballot boxes and served notice to the selfish interests of this country that they no longer fear threats or submit to scare psychology.

We find strong evidence that in the Eighty-first Congress these unseen forces are again working in Washington to retain the damage inflected upon the American rank-and-file by the Eightieth Congress; through legislative tricks and connivance and vast expenditures of money they are trying to curtail and impede President Truman's square deal and the Democratic platform of 1948.

In this effort I believe American public opinion will bring pressure upon the forces of reaction in this Eighty-first Congress and enable the President's recommendations to be enacted into law before adjournment.

Let us continue to carry the torch of liberty and progressive government to the homes of all the people in our land.

We are proud of our historic background of fighting for the people's rights under leaders like Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman.

Inland Waterway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I have spent all of my life in the valleys of the great rivers of Louisiana. I was born behind the levees of the Mississippi River, and the first recollections of my childhood were those of high water, floods, and destruction. The cry of "run, crevasse" still echoes in my mind as I think back over the years. The term "Morganza floodway" brings back vivid recollections of a terrible flood which broke through the levees of the Mississippi at Morganza and followed largely the course of the floodway presently being constructed, until it found its way into the Gulf of Mexico.

Of course, years have gone by since then, and the great Mississippi River is being developed for flood control and for navigation. It is extremely important, this year especially, that the work of flood control and river development in the lower Mississippi Valley be carried on to its maximum degree. Seventy-five million dollars is really needed for this work.

From almost every source we now receive predictions that the river systems of this country may be tested sorely within the near future. The unprecedented snows which have piled up successively, the one upon the other, in the Midwest and Rocky Mountain States, hold out dark forebodings of record high-water stages and floods. It is therefore extremely important that the lower Mississippi, which includes parts of the Red River, have available for use in the coming fiscal year the full amount of money to complete the levees along the Red, the back-water areas, and generally to work along the Mississippi.

The Mississippi and its tributaries has now developed into a major carrier of water-borne traffic. This is true of other great streams which, under the careful planning and supervision of the United States Army engineers, have been developed for navigation. It is true that the lush pre-Civil War days of river transportation have gone. It is true that the glamorous days of the side-wheeler and the river packet have left—perhaps never to return. This does not mean the disappearance of navigation from the Father of Waters or from other navigable streams throughout the United States. On the contrary, the expansion of activities along our inland waterways continues to increase and to gain momentum with the passing of years. It has been a gradual expansion, and not a sudden upsurge. The increase in navigation is most gratifying to those of us who have devoted time and talents to a struggle to provide an additional means of transportation to cities and hamlets located throughout the country.

Beginning with the year 1927, the country has witnessed an expansion of the use of our inland waterways which is truly phenomenal. In this year, slightly less than 9,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight were hauled along our waterways, excluding, of course, the Great Lakes and the oceans. In 1937, this figure had risen to almost 16,000,000,000 ton-miles and, by 1947, it had reached the astronomical figure of 31,500,000,000 ton-miles.

To show the vital influence of inland waterways upon our national defense, we have but to look at the figure for the year 1941, the year in which war came to America, and we find in excess of 22,000,000,000 ton-miles of freight were carried in our inland waterways, excluding, of course, the Great Lakes. The war, concluded in 1945, showed that our inland waterways were carrying the huge burden of 29,700,000,000 ton-miles of traffic.

I am setting forth a chart showing the traffic haul along our inland waterways over a 20-year period, beginning in 1927. This chart indicates clearly the wisdom of our national policy of developing our waterways.

This chart is as follows:

Year:	*Ton-miles*
1927	8,961,000,000
1928	9,214,000,000
1929	8,659,000,000
1930	9,088,000,000
1931	7,826,000,000
1932	7,905,000,000
1933	10,232,000,000
1934	9,423,000,000
1935	13,406,000,000
1936	15,387,000,000
1937	16,883,000,000
1938	17,743,000,000
1939	19,937,000,000
1940	22,412,000,000
1941	26,815,000,000
1942	26,398,000,000
1943	26,306,000,000
1944	31,343,000,000
1945	29,709,000,000
1946	27,951,000,000
1947	31,500,000,000

These figures indicate that this country should proceed further with its policy of developing its waterways for navigation purposes. I have in mind the Red River as in need of development. Several years ago, Congress authorized the sum of $42,000,000 for the purpose of building a lateral canal along Red River from Shreveport, La., to the mouth of the river below the city of Alexandria, La. Perhaps it will be possible to start construction of this new waterway within the near future. Such a waterway will be of immense advantage to the Nation in the normal movement of its freight to the great Southwest.

Congressmen Define a Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND E. BALDWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Herald Tribune containing comments by various Members of the Senate and other citizens regarding the meaning of the word "liberal."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMEN DEFINE A LIBERAL

COMMENTS FROM THE CAPITOL ON THE MUCH-USED WORD

(This newspaper recently asked its readers to define a liberal. We printed, so far as space permitted, the many replies received. Because we thought it of special interest to know what the controversial term might mean at Washington, we invited the following expressions from Members of Congress.)

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A liberal is a person who is commonly regarded as broadminded. He needs a conservative base to keep him anchored to the eternal verities and a genuine impulse for exploration and experimentation to give him the broadest viewpoint and perspective his anchorage will permit.

He needs imagination without being a daydreamer and vision without being a visionary. With him prejudice is at a minimum and tolerance at a maximum. He faces forward, but finds an occasional backward turn of his gaze to be generally profitable.

He does not reject the old merely because it is old, nor does he hesitate to accept the new because of its newness. When he tries out something of importance which has been untried, he wants to be reasonably sure that his effort will meet with success. Intellectually he is neither a daredevil nor a stuffed shirt.

Constantly seeking after truth, he is open to conviction on controversial questions until satisfied that he possesses sufficient evidence for decision. Having made a decision, he has the courage of his convictions.

Realizing that ours is a dynamic and explosive society, he recognizes that application of basic principles must vary with the changing conditions of that society. Instead of resisting social progress and opposing effort to improve the lot of mankind, he seeks to aid such progress and to contribute unselfishly to the betterment of his fellow man. His is a personal philosophy which contains a well-balanced mixture of idealism with realism.

Much as I would like to, I probably do not measure up personally to this definition of a liberal. However, it is my sincere aim to do so.

IRVING M. IVES.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1949.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

To me a liberal is one who "believes in the value of human personality." That is the definition given in the Encyclopedia Brittanica and I think it is a good one.

I hold that this is the goal to which the Republican Party first dedicated itself when it was born in the heat of the slavery issue. This, I think, must be its goal if it is to have a real future of national service.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 23, 1949.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

Liberalism is a popular word. Most men in public office label themselves with it, but like the pantaloons offered by the Yankee peddler in Lincoln's story, liberalism can be made "large enough for any man, small enough for any boy."

Am I a liberal if I defend the rights of the factory worker, but something else if I also defend the rights of the company president?

I am particularly concerned about American liberalism, which implies liberalism under our system. We cannot accept a foreign part in our machine. I believe a liberal is one who recognizes the peculiarity of his own age and thinks of tomorrow—one who knows the needs and the hopes of those who live around him and seeks to improve the average lot. An effective liberal goes even further—he has a practical, workable plan for improving that lot. A liberal is one who recognizes that undue emphasis must not be placed on any given issue—that special privilege must not exist.

There are so-called liberals who believe it wrong to conserve, and regard the speed with which they can spend or appropriate a dollar a measure of their liberalism. Any thinking man knows that that kind of liberalism can only lead to poverty. Liberalism must concern itself with creation as well as with distribution.

A true American liberal believes in preserving the system that can provide the most to divide. He thinks first of creating the wealth and strength. Then he proposes a just and proper division of it—a division that provides a wider opportunity to create more. A false liberal first divides what he finds and then hopes somebody will create some more.

A true American liberal recognizes the problems of all Americans in order of their importance. He does not deal with them in order of political expediency. In solving them he seeks to preserve the economic system capable of providing the greatest total wealth and strength so he will have the greatest possible total to apply to the public need. He is not concerned solely about security, for he knows that a quest for security alone shows weakness and fear. He seeks, rather, to create greater opportunity in order to provide the means for greater security. He is concerned with the health, the welfare, and the worries of all, but the true American liberal knows he cannot help any one of those by only providing a quicker or a more equal distribution of poverty.

He understands honest differences and recognizes there are problems other than his own—and is willing to deal with them.

Too often, today, unscrupulous enemies of our system steal that popular label of liberalism, put it on shoddy merchandise, and try to sell it as democracy.

Liberalism is necessarily based on "government of the people, by the people, for the people." American liberalism is necessarily based on a competitive-enterprise system for a practical reason. Any real liberal knows that this is the only system now—or in history—that has proved itself capable of providing the means with which to raise the social, educational, or health level, or the political freedom of its people.

Liberalism cannot be measured by which special privilege is attacked, but by whether special privilege is attacked. Liberalism cannot be measured by what security it buys, but by what security it creates. Liberalism cannot be measured by what opportunity it limits, but by what opportunity it offers. Liberalism cannot be measured by what equality it promises, but by what equality it makes possible. Liberalism is not a philosophy of division; it is a philosophy of addition.

RAYMOND E. BALDWIN.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1949.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In the current discussion on "What Is a Liberal," I believe it important to emphasize that we are talking about a liberal in political and social thought and action, and not about other fields. Such a liberal, in my view, believes first and foremost in democracy with constitutional guaranties for the liberty of the individual and for minorities—he is against the monolithic state and the enslavement by it of the mind and efforts of the individual. The liberal believes that our society in the United States is capable of affording well-being and security to all our people, and that our shortcomings are attributable to our own lack of organization or ability to utilize effectively our resources of men and materials. A liberal believes that government can go far to help in achieving this objective. A liberal believes that when the Government—as distinguished from the people—owns a preponderant number of the jobs, freedom is on its way out, but a liberal also believes that we are far from this situation now and that broad measures of improvement in health, social security, education, housing, youth assistance, child care and similar activities are not jeopardizing this principle.

A liberal in international affairs believes in the unity of interest of the world, and that peoples generally, as distinguished from aggressor governments, are interested in the same basic elements of freedom, prosperity, and security. Accordingly, a liberal, though realistic in terms of national security and its defense, is constantly striving for better world organization—whether through the United Nations and regional federations, or through world federation, or both, through regional recovery programs and similar efforts—to keep to the main idea of the interdependence of one world and all its peoples.

In all of these activities, a liberal also seeks a rule of law rather than a rule of men, and is against discrimination due to race, creed, color, national origin, or other arbitrary standards.

J. K. JAVITS.
WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 18, 1949.*

To the New York Herald Tribune:

It is of more than passing interest that "liberal" and "liberty" are only a few words removed from each other in the dictionary, for the two are actually kindred in application. As there can be no liberty without liberalism, so there can be no practical liberalism without considerable freedom for the individual.

All manner of self-professed liberals have endowed the word with interpretations of their own. Cloaking the most nonliberal purposes with the bright garment of human dignity, they have succeeded only in bringing one of the greatest words in our language into general disrepute.

The Latin "liberalis" means free, and thus the word in its basic source means freedom as opposed to slavery. Thus, by definition, a liberal must first of all be an advocate of freedom for the individual under a system of free government. It follows that the slave states, Communist and Fascist alike, can hardly square their status with the philosophy of life practiced by a true liberal.

When the pseudo-liberal advocates systems of government which would place chains upon the hands and minds of men, he does it out of deliberate malice or from the depths of unbelievable ignorance, either of which constitutes an offense against mankind.

The liberalism of the true despot and his dupes had its ultimate expression in the concentration camps and the cremation ovens of Adolf Hitler only a few years ago. Today millions of slaves in the Soviet Union bear grim witness to another great tragedy. The liberal apologists for this crime against humanity do nothing to restore its proper dignity and station to a magnificent word.

DONALD L. JACKSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 25, 1949.*

South's Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Hubert F. Lee, entitled "South's Man of the Year." The article, which relates to C. Hamilton Moses, of Little Rock, Ark., was published in the winter edition of Dixie Business.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH'S MAN OF THE YEAR

(By Hubert F. Lee)

C. Hamilton Moses, of Little Rock, Ark., has been selected by the editors of Dixie Business as the 1948 South's "man of the year."

In a group of outstanding leaders of the South, from Virginia to Texas, Mr. Moses received the most votes from editors, publishers, industrialists, business leaders, many of whom have worked with him in making his Arkansas plan, one of the greatest programs for State development ever formulated, a tremendous success.

In honoring Mr. Moses, the editors of Dixie Business honor the distinguished men of the South who are doing so much for its industrial revolution. Their forceful leadership may be confined to a single town or to a wider area—for the gage of measuring greatness depends upon the point of view—and just tribute is paid them by selecting one among them who has done the most.

It was his distinguished leadership that brought him an honorary membership in the Chamber of Commerce of the South, the honorary invitation organization founded in 1931 by the editor of Dixie Business to honor notable men who are interested in the South.

For developing a casual public utility into a widely recognized "corporation with a soul," he has set a precedent for the highly valuable electric industry. In formulating and directing for his State also a program designed to develop both the cultural and the economic balance to appropriate aggressiveness, he has given to the great South an economy for which it has long been searching.

His has been a leadership that was born of a sincere desire and determination to help his fellow man.

From the modest ranks of a mere country lawyer he has risen in stature to the man of the year in his native State of Arkansas, and now to the enviable position of the South's man of the year.

C. Hamilton Moses is better and more widely appreciated simply as "Ham" Moses. Through his conscientious concept of corporate responsibility—a concept that recognizes first duty as being to an entire State—he has elevated himself and his company into an enviable position in modern business economy.

Seldom in the history of any State has a native-born son chosen to remain within his own borders and, through personal sacrifice and personal effort, done so much for its development as has C. Hamilton Moses.

Truly an outstanding citizen—a cavalier of commerce, a captain of civic enterprises, and a champion of the common man's cumulative causes—his leadership looms above the accolade of endorsements given him by the many who presented his nomination for the 1948 South's man of the year.

Mr. Moses is president of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., the only domestic corporation in his State that has risen to the enviable position of being a $100,000,000 concern. But his role as chief executive of this community-minded corporation is almost dwarfed by his boundless activities in behalf of his fellow Arkansas and his fellow Dixie dwellers.

But it has been his services as founder and leader of the now widely publicized Arkansas Economic Council-Chamber of Commerce that have won for him the highest honors of a long leaderless people who now have their sleeves rolled up and are definitely on the march forward.

To understand fully just how extensive his endeavors as a citizen and a leader have been, it is necessary to go back to the beginning, and trace, step by step, his rise to his present place of eminence and esteem.

Coulter Hamilton Moses was born in Arkansas, on a farm near Hampton, in Calhoun County. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Moses, wanted him to become a lawyer, and they planned his early education along these lines. He proved true to their expectations, rising to the pinnacle of prominence, not only in legal circles of his own State, but in his entire profession.

Trudging 3 miles to school daily, he completed his elementary and high-school education at Hampton, and then went on to win high honors at Ouachita College in Arkadelphia. Realizing that public speaking would be one of the essentials of a good lawyer, he mastered this art, and today is known far and wide for his ability to hold and sway audiences. He won all of the oratorical medals his college had to offer. On his graduation day he delivered both the baccalaureate address and the college oration, and so impressed Edwin Booth Craighead, then president of Tulane University, who was attending the exercises, that he was awarded a full scholarship to that institution. Here he received his master of arts degree, and won further fame for his elocutionary eloquence.

Returning to his native State of Arkansas, in 1909, he entered the University of Arkansas School of Law at Little Rock, working during his spare time for Guy B. Cook, commissioner of mines, manufactures, and agriculture, and George S. Cook, commissioner of education.

It was here that he received his initiation into the field of practical politics. In his job with the education department his principal duty was to go about the State making addresses to high-school groups. Through his sound logic, his polished phrases, and sincere tone, he lent encouragement to thousands of young men and women, and inspired them to higher things.

He completed his work in the School of Law in 1911, receiving his bachelor of law degree that year with high honors.

It was not long before George W. Donaghey became Governor of Arkansas for the second time. Having seen and heard about the sincere devotion of this young lawyer to his native State and its people, and impressed with his outstanding qualifications, Governor Donaghey selected him as one of his secretaries.

In 1913, the late Joseph T. Robinson defeated Governor Donaghey, and young Hamilton Moses moved to Monticello, to start his legal career as a partner of the late R. W. Wilson. Here he continued to impress the legal profession with his inborn ability as a trial lawyer as well as a student of fundamentals.

Soon after Governor Robinson took office, United States Senator Jeff Davis died, and Governor Robinson was named to succeed him. George W. Hayes of Camden entered the race for governor. Young Hamilton Moses left his law office in Monticello to help direct the successful campaign of Mr. Hayes over Stephen Brundidge of Searcy. Within a few weeks Mr. Moses was back in the Capitol again, this time as secretary to Governor Hayes, but not for long. He returned to Monticello to resume his law practice. But in 1915, after Wallace Davis, son of the late Senator Davis, was appointed attorney general, he immediately appointed Hamilton Moses as his assistant. He remained in this position until 1917, when he was appointed secretary to a third governor, Charles Hillman Brough.

During his tenures as secretary to three governors he came to know his State intimately, its people personally, and he recognized the countless problems faced by both. But more than this, he realized the vast opportunities that awaited development and exploitation, and he resolved to do what he could to advance them. His life since then has been devoted to this end.

After 2 years with Governor Brough he became an attorney for the State corporation commission.

It was while serving in this capacity that he received his first opportunity to begin selling Arkansas outside of the State. Businessmen of the State organized a special train of exhibits to be sent throughout the East to advertise the State's resources to capitalists. Unable to make the trip himself, Governor Brought sent Mr. Moses along as his representative. He became the official spokesman for the trip, and his ardent eloquence about Arkansas won the State countless admirers.

On that train was another super-salesman from Arkansas—the late Harvey Couch, then developing what has since become the Arkansas Power & Light Co. It may have been fate or mutual recognition of abilities that caused Hamilton Moses and Harvey Couch to become attached to each other. By the end of the trip Mr. Moses had decided to forsake politics for an association with Harvey Couch. And in the years that followed they developed the closest friendship and business association between these two great sons of Arkansas. Soon after the completion of the trip Mr. Moses resigned his position with the corporation commission to enter the practice of law in Little Rock, taking over the legal business of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and of Mr. Couch.

This was in 1919, during the depression that followed World War I. Not only did the power company's new lawyer draw no salary for his work, but he paid his own expenses. Fortunately, however, he and Dwight Crawford were selected to make a digest of the State's laws, and for about 20 years the Crawford and Moses digest was the bible of Arkansas legal circles.

Those were trying days in Arkansas, and particularly for businesses that were seeking to expand and increase their services. With the vision and energies of Harvey Couch, and the keen analytical mind of Hamilton Moses to guide it the Arkansas Power & Light Co. weathered the storm.

Because financing in Arkansas was limited, it became necessary to seek outside capital. Through the combined efforts of Mr. Couch and Mr. Moses, the story of Arkansas and its resources and its potentialities was told throughout the Nation's money marts. Mr.

Couch often said that had it not been for the fine and fluent oratory of Mr. Moses, the great selling job that was done could not have been accomplished.

A few years after he joined with Mr. Couch, the strange antics of politics reentered the life of Mr. Moses. United States Senator Joseph T. Robinson, who had defeated Governor Donaghey and discharged his secretarial staff asked Hamilton Moses to become his law partner. Thus was formed the partnership of Robinson, House, and Moses.

In the early twenties, when Mr. Couch began to expand his operations in the electric field into the States of Louisiana and Mississippi he persuaded Mr. Moses to become general attorney for all of his interests. And later, when Mr. Couch entered the railroad field, merging the Kansas City Southern and the Louisiana & Arkansas Railroads, he persuaded Mr. Moses to serve on the legal staffs of these roads.

Alabama-born W. M. Deramus, is president of the railroad, having served it in various capacities since 1909.

It was only natural that one so familiar with the visions and ambitions of Harvey Couch should be chosen his successor following his death in 1941. Since September of that year Mr. Moses has served as president of the Arkansas Power & Light Co.

Although serving as friend, adviser, and associate of a man as busy as Harvey Couch required much of his time, Hamilton Moses always found time to participate in civic, fraternal, religious, and other industrial activities.

Few, indeed, are the new business undertakings in Arkansas during the last two decades that he has not been asked to aid in launching. Practically all of the new businesses of any consequence in the State during this period have been organized or set up with his legal advice and assistance. And he has been personally interested in many of them.

He has found time to serve long and faithfully as a Rotarian. He served the Little Rock Club as president and then assumed the responsibilities of district governor for a year.

He has long been interested in the advancement of all higher education in the State, having served as a member of the board of trustees of Ouachita College for many years. He has aided this institution in its planning, in its financial programs, and in many other ways. He is a thirty-second-degree Mason and a Shriner.

In his Baptist church at Little Rock he has devoted many years of unselfish service to one of the largest Bible classes for men in the South.

He has been awarded honorary degrees and various other forms of recognition from numerous institutions.

But it has been his concerted efforts in recent years in behalf of his native State that have brought him the greatest pleasure and have profited Arkansas the most.

About 1943, when it appeared that World War II would be over in a year or so, he determined that Arkansas would not pass through another depression like the one he had suffered through at the close of World War I.

"We must not have any apple sellers in Arkansas," he repeated over and over. "We must have a postwar plan ready when the war is over."

He was not satisfied to give mere lip service to the plan. He packed up his suitcase, reviewed some of his more appealing phrases of the past, and set about to organize Arkansas.

Making three and four talks a day, week after week, he visited every county in the State, talking to large groups and small groups of local leaders urging them to organize for business.

He set the machinery into operation and perfected the organization of the Arkansas Economic Council—something new in the State. He did what few other could have done; he brought business and government of the State together on a common ground. He sold them on the idea that each was dependent upon the other, that the success of one meant the success of the other, and the failure of one the failure of the other.

C. H. Moses was the logical choice for president of this new organization; he readily assumed the responsibilities of this office. He has devoted his time, effort, and talent to directing the work of the new organization since. Early in its existence, he guided the new organization into stronger fields by merging into it the long dormant Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce.

A brief summary of Arkansas accomplishments under the pushing, pulsating, and progressive program put in effect by Mr. Moses reveals an amazing accomplishment list.

A loss of about 262,000 people during the war has been completely regained.

There have been more than 1,500 new or greatly expanded industries for the State with new capital of $115,000,000, new pay rolls of $65,000,000 and employment for more than 40,000 people.

Agriculture income has zoomed, lumber production has gained greatly, and manufacturing output has increased over $100,000,000.

Per capita income that was $242 in 1940 has jumped to $750, one of the largest percentage increases in the Nation.

And greatest of all, a new Arkansas resource has been utilized—the spirit of the people.

Everywhere the Arkansas story—the amazing chronicle of a State on the march is attracting attention.

Latest in the series of successful undertakings launched by Mr. Moses has been the build-your-home-town program, now under way. Aimed at developing comprehensive long-range plans by which each city, town, or community can pull itself up by its bootstraps, this program is now in full sway. So convinced is Mr. Moses of the necessity of such planning that he has authorized the lending of two employees of his company to full-time participation in this program, which is being sponsored through the Arkansas Economic Council-State Chamber of Commerce and the State resources and development commission.

All of these activities on the part of Mr. Moses have been outside the scope of his own company's operations. As chief executive of the Arkansas Power & Light Co., he has set into motion the machinery by which his company can and is playing an important part in the State's economic development.

Through his efforts, his company is nearing completion of a rural-electrification program that places Arkansas near the top in the percentage of farms having electric service available.

He is spark-plugging a plant-to-prosper program in cooperation with the Arkansas Press Association, designed to bring about higher farm income and higher standards of life in the State's areas. He is directing cooperating moves with various agricultural agencies aimed at providing increased opportunities for farm youth through assistance to 4-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America, the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, the State extension service, and like organizations.

Probably his most demonstrative display of the sincere confidence he has in his State's future is the $88,000,000 expansion program he has developed for his own company. Deciding years ago that his company would be "The best utility in the Nation" he has worked long and hard toward this goal, and has won national recognition with his efforts.

His latest venture has come in taking the leadership in the Middle South Area Development Program. Under this plan he has aided in bringing together the chief executives of his company, the Louisiana Power & Light Co., the Mississippi Power & Light Co., and the New Orleans Public Service Co. A. B. Patterson is president of the New Orleans Public Service, Inc.; Rex I. Brown, president of the Mississippi Power & Light Co., and W. O. Turner, president of the Louisiana Power & Light Co. The combined efforts and energies of these four service companies are now merging in a Nation-wide promotion program that will result in Arkansas receiving millions of dollars worth of advertising throughout the rest of the Nation.

The results of the inauguration of this unprecedented program at Greensville, Miss., on April 2 indicate that tangible effects will be achieved that had been originally expected.

One of the more recent recognitions of his endeavors came last June, when the Arkansas State Junior Chamber of Commerce named him as the State's outstanding citizen and presented him with the coveted C. E. Palmer Trophy.

His selection for the broader honor of the entire South's man of the year comes as a fitting climax and reward for his achievements.

The Tax on Places Furnishing Entertainment in Connection With the Serving of Food May Mean More Loss Than Gain to Government

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, many bills have been introduced dealing with the Federal sales taxes which are now imposed under the title of excise taxes.

I have expressed the view in remarks accompanying the introduction of such legislation that primary consideration should be given to those taxes which are imposed on necessities of life, rather than luxuries. These are the ones which hit hardest those least able to meet the charge.

There is another class of these levies, however, the removal of which cannot be justified on this ground. Yet they equally deserve our study since they raise the serious question whether the revenues derived justifies the economic loss sustained by imposing the tax.

Chief among these is the tax of 20 percent imposed on places furnishing entertainment in connection with the serving of food.

The Central Trades and Labor Council of Rochester, N. Y., has advised me that this levy is causing widespread unemployment among musicians, waiters, and other workers.

This is a significant illustration of the meaning of the expression that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

This additional 20 cents on every dollar which a patron must pay to eat in a place where entertainment is furnished is apparently having the effect of driving people away from such hotels or restaurants.

This is a tendency which, of course, will snowball in time of depression, recession, or disinflation, at the very time when the impact of increased unemployment will be most serious.

I am informed that the estimated revenue derived from this tax is about $53,000,000 a year. In my mind, there is a very serious question whether the economic upheaval among a large group of faithful workers may not constitute a greater drain on the resources of Government than is offset by this income.

Today, I have introduced a bill to repeal this tax. It seems to me a thorough study should be made of this problem. It may develop that this levy represents a short-sighted policy. Perhaps the Treasury is the loser, rather than the gainer, by the imposition of this tax.

Dishing Out Insecurity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New Orleans Item, by Harmann B. Deutsch, associate editor, on the subject of government-by-gimme.

Perhaps this editorial, also from the New Orleans Item and also written by Mr. Deutsch, can be called a supplement or appendix to the editorial to which I have referred.

Direct, to the point, sound, logical, and irrefutable are the attributes of these observations.

It is indeed about time that we start taking stock of what security really means.

At the rate we are going we will wind up with the hollow Dead Sea fruit of insecurity instead of the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow security some people would have us believe we might get.

Remember, whatever we do get we will pay for.

DISHING OUT INSECURITY

President Truman's latest proposal to dish it out, boys, there's more where that came from, is simply another manifestation of his zealous allegiance to gimme-more belief that the country's tax resources are inexhaustible, and that the Government's tax take must be high. It is referred to as a social security program. That is a misnomer. Social insecurity would be a better term.

What it proposes is to take still more money out of circulation in order to confer benefits—and where have we heard that word before—on still more people. Instead of continuing a straight Federal insurance program, financed jointly by employers and employees through pay-roll and pay-envelope deductions, he proposes to up these taxes in order to—

Increase old-age insurance payments.

Reduce the age at which women begin to collect such insurance from age 65 to age 60.

Make direct-assistance payments for all needy persons whether or not they have paid anything into the fund from which this money is drawn.

Make direct temporary financial assistance payments to those disabled by accident or illness.

Include in the old-age insurance group farm laborers, domestic servants, doctors, small-business owners, attorneys, and other self-employed workers, and so on and so on, raising the number of beneficiaries from the present 30,000,000 to 50,000,000.

And—of course—increase the taxes now deducted from pay envelopes and levied against pay rolls to finance it all.

The basic infirmity of any theory which penalizes thrift in order to reward lack of thrift is obvious. The industrious worker is called on to give up still more of what remains in his pay envelope in order that the Great White Father in Washington can henceforth say to the man who has played grasshopper with his earnings: "Never mind, old boy, the Government will take care of you from now on."

Money that might go to the creation of new industries, new production, new pay rolls, and new earnings will be siphoned off to a still greater degree into a Government jackpot, to be distributed—by the Government, of course, the good, kind, generous "gimme" Government that says: "Dish it out, boys. Dish it out in big chunks. Dish out $50,000,000 to finance Latin-American aid so as to extend the Institute of Inter-American Affairs for another 5 years. Dish out some more money—billions, this time—for compulsory national health insurance. Dish it out for Marshall plan aid. Dish it out for China. Dish out $4,000,000,000 more for the general budget than you did last year, while you're at it. Dish it out, boys, there's plenty more where that came from."

Naturally that isn't even half the story. The housewife who will have to make deductions from the weekly pay she gives her cook, and send these to Washington through channels, the harried farmer who will have to do the same thing with his hired help, including such seasonal employees as harvest hands, the surgeon, the lawyer, the engineer, the salesman, the small-business man—all these will have to make deductions and fill out forms in triplicate and keep additional records. And, oh, yes. There will be a new army of clerks, tabulators, accountants, bureau chiefs, chart makers, stenographers, statisticians, and whatnot to keep track of all the returns. To be sure, there will have to be additional appropriations to take care of their salaries, stationery, filing cabinets, office space, blond mahogany tables for conference rooms, and the like.

For this is "government by gimme," which is no longer merely a small group of outstanding leaders and statesmen, chosen to enact laws and render essential public service in assuring peace, tranquillity, and the proper functioning of everything connected with public administration. This is "government by gimme" which, if it is not yet concerned with each sparrow's fall, is at least going to make sure how much Mrs. J. Doakes pays her cook or her laundress. This is "government by gimme" which is stanch in the faith that there's no bottom to the tax barrel, from which blessings and benefits can be dished out for ever and ever amen.

Quite a number of rather shadowy figures must be watching this latest development with something like amused wonder. The shade of old Ben Franklin, for example, looking up from the almanac page where Poor Richard had just inscribed the words: "A penny saved is a penny earned"; Thomas Macaulay, who once wrote: "Nothing is so galling * * * as a paternal, or, in other words, a meddling government which tells (the people) what to read and eat and say and drink and wear"; Ralph Waldo Emerson, who declared that "the less government we have, the better."

Laughing more loudly among the shadows, however, one can discern the figure of a camel—the one whose back was broken by a last straw; a horse, which in life had been so willing that its owner worked it to death; and a goose which laid golden eggs until its greedy master slew it because he was convinced he would not have to wait for riches until these were earned by giving the goose proper care and sustenance, but could come into it all at one time without further ado.

Wealth must be produced before it can be enjoyed, and Government produces none of it. Take away the natural human incentives for production—the opportunity to enjoy some of the fruits of one's individual labor—and the inexhaustible tax stream will dry up at its source. Carried on and on, the insatiable demand of a "gimme government" for more and more and more, so that more and more and more can be dished out, will drain the reservoir. That is why the President's latest proposal should be labeled the expanded insecurity program.

Erasing College Color Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 1, 1949. I particularly commend it to the attention of those who constantly infer that joint attendance of Negroes and whites in the same educational institution would result in race riots. Evidently, young Americans do not share the prejudices of some of their elders:

ERASING COLLEGE COLOR LINES

Racial tolerance is making gradual but certain gains on the college campuses of America. Nation-wide attention was attracted by recent cases where the United States Supreme Court decisions struck at segregation practices in two State universities. But there are other signs of breaks in the barriers that have kept Negroes from many college campuses.

A few days ago, the students at the University of Missouri voted, 4,156 to 1,847, in favor of abolishing the color line there. This was no isolated instance of increasing willingness of students to accept Negroes in colleges that have been for whites only.

The University of Arkansas has just been honored as the first State university in the South voluntarily to admit Negroes without segregation.

A year ago, some students at the University of Oklahoma burned a copy of the fourteenth amendment in protest to the ban against Negroes at that institution, a ban now partially lifted under United States Supreme Court mandate.

A student leader at the University of Texas has said that his fellow students are willing to see Negroes admitted there.

Nearly 65 percent of the graduate and professional students at the University of North Carolina voted last spring that they would have no objection to having Negroes in their classes.

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at Washington University, St. Louis, was opened to Negroes last spring. St. Louis University, a Catholic institution in the same city, has accepted Negro students since 1944 and now has 268 of them enrolled.

It is from the intelligent people of America, and especially those who have had the high privilege of college training, that we should expect an example of good sense in interracial relations. So instances of growing sentiment against racial discrimination on our campuses give great hope for accelerated progress against prejudices.

Arkansas Plan for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 24, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly being asked, "What is the reaction to your proposed compromise on civil-rights legislation?" For the information of the Members who are evidencing this interest in my effort to help define a reasonable and logical basis for reconciling the differences over civil rights, I include the following excerpts from letters and editorials endorsing my plan:

Gov. Sidney McMath, of Arkansas: "I think that you have submitted the best solution to this problem which has been thus far advanced. Our State press has almost without exception supported the plan. * * * I hope that you can win congressional support for your views. I certainly agree that this issue must be settled quickly with a reasonable, workable formula such as you have proposed."

William W. Leigh, Little Rock insurance man and Presidential elector on the Thurman-Wright ticket: "I wish to commend you for your efforts toward bringing about a compromise of the so-called civil-rights issue. I think that it should be perfectly obvious to everyone that there is very little hope of this issue being settled on any other basis and if your efforts meet with any degree of success you will have done your country and your State a distinct service."

A. D. Stewart, Amory, Miss., farm implement dealer: "Your proposal, in my opinion, could not be considered a matter of expediency, but a fair, just, and sensible solution of a problem that should have been solved many, many years ago. It is not fitting nor proper to expect the South or even the Nation as a whole to go along with all phases of Mr. Truman's civil-rights program. The FEPC as written would be abominable."

Frank H. Parke, president of a Little Rock printing company: "I have just read the report of your proposals on the race question and wish to compliment you on suggesting what I hope will be a practical way out of a very dangerous situation. Unfortunately, most southerners do not stop to think of the change that has taken place during the 80 years since the Civil War, nor do they realize that this change will continue to take place regardless of anything that they can do about it. No intelligent person can argue against all this in theory, but from a practical standpoint it simply cannot work if pushed faster than people's minds can adjust themselves to it. I certainly hope you have something."

Frank Cantrell, managing director, Arkansas Economic Council, State Chamber of Commerce: "This is a fine and broad-gauged effort on your part and you richly deserve the many expressions of praise which I am sure you have received."

Hon. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE, Member of Congress: "I only hope that everyone on both sides of the issue will be as moderate and intelligently tolerant, and then we will bring out a program of which this Congress and the President can well be proud."

Wallace M. Milton, Ozark, Ark., manager of rural electric cooperative: "I think your compromise plan is an excellent one and it is refreshing to know that we at least have a few Representatives in Congress who are not narrow-minded bigots. Regardless of how we have been taught, the colored minority in our country deserves better treatment than we have accorded them in the past."

Joshua K. Shepherd, Little Rock, insurance executive and Masonic leader: "If the Congress will adopt this method, it will result in a great strengthening of the bonds of friendship between the white and colored races. I congratulate you on the persuasive reasoning and the thoroughness with which you are dealing with the problem and I hope that you and your associates will continue your earnest efforts to the end that we may both heal sore spots and promote further economic and social development of our Nation."

Elmer J. Rauschkolb, Little Rock businessman: "I venture to predict that it (the compromise) will go down in history as the finest and most Christian-like approach to one of the most vexing problems of this era."

Tom Johnson, University of Arkansas student: "I personally am in accord with your views on the civil-rights program and congratulate you on your efforts to compromise. I hope others will become aware of the wisdom of such a move."

Ed McCuistion, director, division of Negro education, Arkansas Department of Education: "(The address is) one of the outstanding statements coming out of Washington in the last 2 or 3 years."

Charles A. Stuck, Jonesboro, Ark., owner of a large lumber mill: "I find it difficult to express in words my appreciation for the fine spirit and wonderful message you brought to the House yesterday. When the sober, serious-minded, and intelligent people of our country come together to discuss any controversial question they can settle it sooner or later. I commend you again for your spirit and unusually fine presentation."

San Francisco Chronicle: "The Arkansas proposal is a piece of combined idealism and realism which we commend to Congress' attention as compared with legislative proposals which may or may not contain idealism but are not realistic enough to have a chance of enforcement even if passed."

Atlanta Constitution: "We recommend this plan to thoughful Southerners as reasonable and being possible of enforcement and productive of excellent results. At least it is a starter and it offers positive action. We will be offering something that we are 'for' and not appearing as merely 'against' something, a role which has brought the South much of its present trouble."

Arkansas Gazette: "It (the address) was a far cry from the ranting debates which have been touched off all too frequently by civil-rights legislation. Mr. HAYS presented a calm and closely reasoned defense of what he called the South's traditional attitudes. And, by offering a positive counterproposal aimed at admitted inequities, he took the offensive for the settlement of the continuing differences in Congress, a welcome change from the stand-pat attitude which has generally characterized the Southern reaction in the past."

George S. Mitchell, executive director, Southern Regional Council, Atlanta, Ga.: "On lynching, you have come out with what is to my mind the very best idea brought forward in recent decades. Putting the responsibility on the chief executive of each State is a fine thing to do. For my own taste I would ask a considerably stronger Federal power of intervention than what you are proposing, but I think we would all be a good way ahead if the principle you propose does get into State law."

Herbert L. Thomas, life-insurance executive, Little Rock, Ark.: "I know from my experience with the racial questions that have arisen in the university that our people can be sold on reasonable compromises that mean a progressive solution of some of these problems."

Arkansas Democrat: "Congressman BROOKS HAYS is thinking along sound lines in proposing a compromise on civil rights."

Dr. Robert A. Leflar, dean, School of Law, University of Arkansas: "The sort of compromise which you discussed must be recognized by everyone as a bona fide effort to take a forward step. I want to congratulate you."

Hon. Chauncey Sparks, former Governor of Alabama: "It is one of the best and fairest discussions of these vexing problems that I have seen or heard come out of the South."

Dr. John H. Buchanan, pastor of the Southside Baptist Church, Birmingham, Ala.: "I believe that you have offered the only solution to the difficult problem. While there can be no compromise on the principle of the right of the States to handle their own affairs, yet I think that the suggestions you make on each of the four issues are sound and feasible."

Dr. J. M. Dawson, executive secretary, public relations committee, Baptists of the United States, and former pastor of First Baptist Church, Waco, Tex.: "In regard to the antilynching plank, I am pleased to see you speak out so strongly. I have never been able to see any objection to an act of Congress in regard to lynching, for while past lynchings have been largely confined to the South, such a law would apply to the whole country, and as such should not be thought of as striking specifically at the South."

Tupelo Journal: "Mr. HAYS' approach to the civil-rights controversy is a display of statesmanship which offers the South its only hope of preserving freedom of action at the State level without Federal dictation. * * * And if our southern Congressmen are smart, they will see to it that the amendments to the President's civil-rights program are written by themselves along lines Congressman HAYS proposes rather than by northerners, who seek to make the Federal laws even stiffer."

Gould Lincoln, in Washington Evening Star, February 2, 1949: "Mr. HAYS has come forward with a well-reasoned compromise. It is certainly worthy of consideration."

Gladstone Williams, Atlanta Constitution, February 7, 1949: "It will probably offer the test of whether the extremists are interested in seeing a constructive program adopted or whether they merely prefer to keep the issue alive for its political effect."

Memphis Press-Scimitar, February 10, 1949: "But, meanwhile, an outstanding Congressman from the Democratic South, Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, has proposed what appears to us to be a good, sensible compromise that would settle the issues and not sacrifice principle."

New York Herald Tribune, February 8, 1949: "The momentary value of Mr. HAYS' remarks in Congress is that an intelligent southerner admits the need for action and draws what he considers the impassable boundary. No program, or part of a program, will succeed without at least moderate quantity of southern acceptance. The rest of the Nation, at least, can listen."

Dr. Doak S. Campbell, president, the Florida State University: "It is sound to the core and we are very proud of it."

Some Facts About Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 3, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, since the Committee on Ways and Means is this week starting hearings on legislation suggesting drastic changes in the social-security law, this seems like an appropriate time to refer to a few facts. It is more than likely that they will not be stressed by the spokesmen for the administration.

In the 12 years since its inception there has been paid into the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund $12,200,000,000. This has been contributed equally by employees and employers.

How many working men and women in this country who have contributed this sum realize that there has been built up an accumulation amounting to $10,700,000,000, or how many employers are aware of this fact?

Also, how many of these contributors know that, although these are designated trust funds, the money is not there at all, except for the insignificant amount of $150,000,000? This money collected from the working people of this country and their bosses over a 12-year period has simply been spent for other purposes through the device of substituting Government bonds in the trust fund for the hard-earned dollars and pennies which people thought they were paying for future benefits.

Of course it can be said the Government bonds are in the fund which are as good as the Government itself. This is true, but the only way any benefits can be paid is by selling those bonds, making new appropriations, or tapping future pay rolls still more to raise available cash.

It is necessary, of course, that there be built up a substantial balance on the credit side of the ledger in this fund to meet future benefit payments. Nor should it be required that funds more than necessary to meet operating expenses and normally anticipated benefit payments be held in cash.

It is not the method of administering the fund but the failure fully to inform the public to which I object. Staggering sums have been collected from pay envelopes to run the Government on the pretext and the representation to the workers that this is an insurance fund from which they will get back many times their payments in later life.

Those who feel the pinch of inadequacy most severely are the employees who have already reached the 65-year-age limit for retirement or their widows. The provision for them under present law is pitifully small. They have every reason to feel, as I know from my mail many of them do, that social security partakes more of the character of lofty promise than of tangible fulfillment. In making legislative provision for a substantial increase in the benefits, let us give first consideration to those now retired or about to retire from employment. Let us face realistically and sympathetically the plight which they face in these days of high living costs. Let us do nothing further to jeopardize their investment in this fund. They have already paid into it 80-cent to 100-cent dollars and now face the prospect of drawing out 50-cent dollars.

Above all, let us discontinue the practice in the Government of collecting money for one purpose and using it for another, or, if we are going to follow that questionable practice, let us tell the people who put up the money frankly and openly what we are doing.

State Department's Left Wing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, March 2, 1949:

STATE DEPARTMENT'S LEFT WING

Roger Lapham, American economic cooperation chief for China, has told Congress $240,000,000 will be required to continue civilian relief for those areas of China still under Nationalist control.

This is little enough help for a loyal ally, in dire straits after 9 years of war. Refugees from the Communist advance have caused acute food shortages in China's coastal cities, and only outside aid can avert widespread starvation.

But if what remains of Nationalist China is to be saved from Communist occupation, money must be advanced to finance armed resistance.

Mr. Lapham, however, has gone as far as he can without a change of State Department policy; and there is no promise of that.

Congressmen who have discussed the Chinese situation with Secretary of State Acheson gained the impression that he has accepted, hook, line, and sinker, the appeasement policy of the leftist underlings in his Department's Far Eastern Division.

That policy reduced nationalist China to its present helplessness before the Red onslaught. Instead of changing it, Mr. Acheson apparently defends it. Instead of ousting the appeasers, he seems to be influenced by them, as his recent predecessors were.

Meanwhile, the Chinese Communists have ordered foreign correspondents and the United States Information Service in Peiping to cease activities. There has been no word from our Mukden consulate for 3 months. But these things apparently haven't impressed Mr. Acheson and his advisers.

Much that Mr. Acheson is reported to have told the Congressmen in defense of his position did not square with the record. Some of them took exception to his assertion that his wait-and-see policy had the support of our best-informed military men. If that is true, he was asked, why doesn't he release the long-suppressed Wedemeyer report?

Mr. Acheson answered, lamely, that this would not be in the public interest. It is known, however, that the Wedemeyer report did not support the State Department's policy, and this policy is at variance with General MacArthur's cabled message to the House Foreign Affairs Committee a year ago. It said:

"The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety. * * * It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all."

We have pursued this utterly fallacious policy for 3 years.

When President Truman proclaimed his general policy against Communist expansion, in announcing his Greek-Turkish program, the State Department's Far Eastern division was influential enough to make an exception of communism in China. As a result, on that one of the major frontiers of freedom, a decisive breach has been made.

And the whole Asiatic front will be exposed to Red attack unless the President and Mr. Acheson bring State Department policy toward China into harmony with the Truman doctrine.

Harry Truman, Come Down to Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following letter addressed to President Truman by Mr. Robert S. Burns, president of the Standard Steel Corp., of Los Angeles, Calif.:

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HARRY: This is just a voice from the wilderness, and maybe I shouldn't address you so familiarly, but if you can publicly address a fellow American as an S. O. B., I am sure you won't mind being called by your Christian name.

Anyway, Harry, the reason I am writing to you is that I listened to your Jackson Day address. I didn't pay $100 to hear you, but I listened to you on a prewar radio, and, Harry, I got the feeling you were losing your common touch. We have a saying that every once in a while a man should sit back and count himself just to see how many he is. I would like to help you count.

Do you know, Harry, you are one of the very few Presidents of these United States who was elected by less than a majority of the popular vote? With all this talk about a mandate from the people, it must be hard for you to remember that you got a quarter million votes less than 50 percent of the total votes cast for President at your election.

Do you know, Harry, that you are one of the few Presidents of these United States who, prior to election to public office, had a less-than-mediocre business career? I hope your attitude towards business is not engendered by bitterness, but it must be hard for you to treat business fairly when the haberdashery business treated you so poorly.

Do you know, Harry, that you are the only President of these United States who so forgot the dignity of his high office that he resorted to name calling when publicly refuting the opinion of a fellow American?

After all, Harry, the average American likes his Presidents to be men of the people, and even men of the streets, but never men of the gutters.

Do you know, Harry, you have an utter misconception of why you were elected? You were elected because you promised a neat trick of keeping the cost of food up and the cost of living down. You were elected by the apathy of the people to the matters placed in issue by the campaign. You were elected by the people who stayed away from the polls. You were elected by the poor tactics of your principal opponent. Let's face it, Harry, you were elected by a fluke—you were not given nor do you have a mandate.

Tell me, Harry, why do you so tenaciously hang to your campaign promise to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, while brushing aside more vital promises? Do you think the voters took you more seriously regarding the Taft-Hartley Act than they did when you promised to cut the high cost of living? Do you think a man who is struggling to educate and feed his children is more anxious to have a closed shop and pay union dues than he is to have the price of food decline? Do you think the voters took you less seriously when you damned the do nothing Eightieth Congress for doing nothing about the high cost of living? And incidentally, Harry, did I hear you right when you now damn them for having done nothing to prevent the cost of food from going down?

Sum it all up, Harry, and start counting yourself.

Of course, you'll pay no attention to this letter because it comes from a special interest. I must be a special interest because I don't fit into your pattern any other way. I am not being subsidized like the farmer nor patronized like the labor leader. I am not on relief nor eligible for a pension. I am not on the Government pay roll nor lobbying against the Taft-Hartley Act. So who am I—I must be a special interest—a businessman, an employer, a taxpayer. That's right, Harry, but let me tell you something about that.

The business I run is small potatoes (oh! oh!) as businesses go. Our total assets are less than a million dollars, a meager sum from a Government viewpoint. We have good years and we have bad years, and we manage to survive, but on the over-all our stockholders net less after taxes than they would with an equal investment in tax exempt bonds. Over 30 percent of our gross income goes to pay rolls and less than 5 per cent for dividends and surplus. The rest is spent for raw materials, Federal taxes, State taxes, county taxes, and municipal taxes. There are income taxes, franchise taxes, State sales taxes, city sales taxes, pay roll taxes, personal property taxes, real property taxes, and numerous hidden and miscellaneous taxes—a burden on business you take far too lightly.

Prior to the Wagner Act we got along just fine with our labor relations. Our employees had their own independent union and were contented. Under the Wagner Act we went through a period of turmoil in our labor relations, resulting in an election favoring the CIO. Subsequently we had our first strike called by the national organization. We were struck because United States Steel was struck. Don't ask me why. We don't make steel—we buy it. We buy it and fabricate it into machinery. Why a buyer of steel must pattern his labor contract after the contract of a seller of steel is beyond me. Ask Philip Murray—he called the strike. Under the Wagner Act we were pushed around by so-called United States conciliators, whose directive to employers to bargain was tantamount to a directive to concede.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act we are getting along fine again and our contract negotiations last year were the most pleasant we ever had. Although we again gave a substantial increase to our men, the negotiations were conducted in a calm, businesslike way. Both sides recognized the other had rights. Both sides recognized the other was a responsible party and was taking those responsibilities seriously. Why do you now want to shake up the apple cart? Is it just for the purpose of harrying business? Or are you being kept under the impression that labor was the cause of your election and you must now pay for the votes? Two things are wrong with that delusion, Harry. First, you didn't get a majority of the labor vote, and second, the laboring man likes the Taft-Hartley Act. Don't let the labor leaders tell you otherwise. Ask the laboring man what he doesn't like about the Taft-Hartley bill and in what way he's injured by it. His answers will surprise you—that is, they will surprise you if you expect him to criticize the act.

In conclusion, Harry, I don't presume you'll get this letter. I presume the same people who are deluding you regarding a mandate from the people, and apparently keeping you out of touch with actual facts, will intercept it, so I am sure you will have no objections to having copies of it sent to Congress, who, after all, are the real representatives of the people. But in case you do read this letter, Harry, just remember you're a likable fellow and a good campaigner, but we want you to come back down to earth. Let us remember you as "Harry the campaigner," not as "Harry the harrier."

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. BURNS,
President.

We Should Get Rid of Our Excise Taxes on Necessaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Policy Committee has made a wise decision in determining that an all-out drive should be made to reduce and, in some cases, eliminate Federal sales taxes which have been imposed upon our people under the fancy name of excise taxes.

Such is the objective of the Martin bill, H. R. 2100. Both its content and authorship commend it to our serious study. Certainly our efforts in this general direction should be concentrated on those items which are properly classified as necessities, rather than luxuries.

For additional consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means, along with the bill introduced by the distinguished minority leader and measures proposed by others, I am offering today legislation to terminate certain excise taxes.

The first of these has to do with the 20-percent tax on handbags, purses, pocketbooks, toilet cases, and luggage of all kinds. Admittedly, some of such items fall in the luxury class but certainly a handbag or piece of luggage which retails for $15 or less cannot be considered a luxury. A girl who is working, or a housewife shopping, must carry a handbag. Most everyone must have a modest piece of luggage, even if he or she infrequently takes a trip. Almost every man must carry a wallet or a billfold. By no distortion of language can such articles be classed as luxuries. I have therefore provided that if they sell for $15 or less they shall be exempt from tax.

The next provision has to do with the 20-percent tax levied on toilet preparations of all kinds. Cosmetics have become almost as much a part of a woman's budget as her clothes. Time was, perhaps, when these preparations fell in the luxury class and were the badge of fashion or the theater. Those days, for better or for worse, went out with the gas lights.

Toilet preparations are today a necessity for nearly every woman, no matter what her economic status may be.

It is a hardship and an imposition to ask her to contribute 20 cents to the cost of Government every time she spends $1 for the altogether praiseworthy purpose of adding to her attractiveness.

Another imposition, perhaps the most flagrant of all, is the 20-percent tax on electric-light bulbs. The amount is not great in any single instance but it seems to me a simply inexcusable levy. No one would even contend in this country today that an electric-light bulb is not a necessity.

Estimates of the loss of revenue to the Government from the elimination of the items I have discussed are placed at $175,000,000.

Now we come to the tax of 15 percent on local telephone service. This is perhaps open to greater possibility of argument, but it seems to me the case is conclusive for the proposition that normally a telephone can no longer be considered a luxury.

My bill does not deal with the 20-percent tax on long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, or cables. I am extremely sympathetic, however, to the argument advanced with considerable force that the great bulk of such messages are sent for business purposes, in the event of emergencies, and only infrequently for purposes accurately described as luxuries. Some reduction at least in this levy seems indicated.

Even stronger is the case for reducing the telephone bills of our people by relieving them of the 15 cents on every $1 which they pay for local service. To our grandparents a telephone may have been a luxury. Today it is part of a normal budget.

The revenue loss on this item is estimated at $216,000,000. If the size of this figure, coupled with such action as may be taken in adjusting the tax on telephone tolls and telegrams, does not justify complete elimination of the tax, certainly sharp downward revision is in order along the lines suggested in the Martin bill.

Finally, in the measure I have introduced effort has been made to meet the problem of the reduced recreation while a workingman and his family cannot now enjoy because of the expense involved. Now every time he passes 50

cents or $1 through the window for a ticket to the movies, or buys an admission ticket to any other form of entertainment, along with it must go 20 percent for the tax levied by the Federal Government.

There are forms of entertainment in the theater, on the concert stage, or in night clubs, where those attending suffer no particular hardship through this contribution to the cost of government. For many such diversions may be more routine than adventure.

For the great mass of our citizens, however, it is necessary to scrutinize very carefully the item in their budget for recreation. Too often this essential diminishes almost, if not quite, to the vanishing point. This problem has previously been before this Congress, but under quite different circumstances. I then opposed the elimination of the admissions tax on $10 tickets to the inaugural ball and parade. Fortunately, the Senate prevented this raid on the Treasury for the privileged few.

Certainly those who attempted to put over this deal to exempt $10 tickets have no legitimate ground for objecting to the proposal to free tickets costing $1 and less from this burden. The majority party controls both situations. It will be interesting to observe whether they are handled on the same basis.

My proposal is to exempt from an admissions tax all tickets costing $1 or less. The estimated loss of revenue resulting therefrom, I am informed is about $350,000,000. Here again fiscal considerations may require some modification in the plan I proposed. I strongly urge, however, that particular consideration be accorded those who pay a few cents, rather than several dollars, for admission tickets.

The estimated loss of revenue from all of the provisions in my bill is about $740,000,000. This is, of course, a large sum. Anyone familiar with official Washington, however, can refer to several spots where savings can readily be effected to offset this revenue reduction. This is the way it should be done, not by adding on taxes elsewhere as a substitute.

I hope arrangements will be made for early hearings on the Martin bill and the other measures, including my own, which have been offered to deal with this important problem affecting the daily lives of every citizen in our land.

Tribute to a Martyred Symbol of Democracy, Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me double pleasure to introduce into the RECORD the text of the proclamation of March 7, which is next Monday, as Masaryk Day in New York, as promulgated by the Honorable William O'Dwyer, mayor of New York.

I say a double of pleasure; but I should say a treble pleasure: First, because of my reverence for Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the first president and one of the founding fathers of the Republic of Czechoslovakia; second, because of my warm friendship with Mayor O'Dwyer; and third, because the editor of what is probably the largest daily newspaper in the United States, perhaps in the world, printed in the Slovak language, Mr. Andrew J. Valucheck, was thoughtful enough to bring this to my attention.

Prior to the fall of democratic Czechoslovakia to the present regime, there was no country in the world closer to ours in form of government, industry, topography, and temperament of the people. I know that nothing can change the great majority of the people of the Republic from their firm love of freedom and human dignity, and nothing can sever the bond of sympathy which exists between the people of the two nations.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas Americans of Czechoslovak descent have traditionally celebrated the birthday of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk; and

Whereas Masaryk has more than ever become a symbol of freedom and democracy to all people of Czechoslovak descent now that the land of their ancestors has lost its freedom for the second time in a generation; and

Whereas the name of Masaryk has added meaning because of the recent course of history:

Now, therefore, I, William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, do hereby proclaim March 7 as Masaryk Day in New York City, this being the ninety-ninth anniversary of Masaryk's birth, and I urge all our citizens to participate in the various programs on this day, and to pray that another such liberator may come to Czechoslovakia.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the city of New York to be affixed this 1st day of March 1949.

WILLIAM O'DWYER,
Mayor.

By WILLIAM J. DONOGHUE,
Executive Secretary to the Mayor.

Neither War Nor Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 1, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following thought-provoking article from the New Leader of February 19, 1949:

NEITHER WAR NOR PEACE

(By Boris Souvarine)

(Boris Souvarine is a veteran European political commentator. His articles on communism and Russia have appeared in scores of publications here and abroad. He is the author of a massive biography of Stalin.)

"It is obvious enough that some people—Mr. Churchill among them—believe that war will break out in Europe in August or September." So said the London Newsletter of July 13. This journal finds in Churchillian thought, moreover, portents of things to come. "There is a clear indication in both these speeches," says the Newsletter, "that Mr. Churchill's mind is thinking along these lines: First, that there will be a war; second, that he will be the man the country chooses to lead the coalition necessary to fight it; third, that he is already announcing the reasons for rejection of some and inclusion of others from the present cabinet in the wartime administration he will be compelled to set up."

The same copy of the paper contains other notes which point in the same direction. There are, for example, the voyage of Marshall Montgomery to Paris and Vienna and the stationing of units of the fleet in the Mediterranean. To these items should be added many of similar import reported from America. For several months the inner military circles of Washington have exhibited a growing sense of alarm. American rearmament having been decided upon, it was held by the experts that Moscow would have no further reason for postponing decisive moves. America's increasing preparation was considered a reason for Russian speed in beginning operations.

Anyone who had the desire could find plenty of support for this thesis. Mr. Truman urged his reelection on the plea that "one does not change horses in the middle of the stream." His calling of a special session of Congress in the midst of a vacation was thought to be only secondarily to take care of domestic affairs. Then there was the break in the Wall Street market. The sending of flying fortresses to England was an obvious recognition of a dangerous situation. The mysterious trip of General Clay to Washington obviously had parallel significance—despite the official optimism with which Washington endeavored to clothe it. It is evident, moreover, that in the highest political circles in America the opinion gains ground that the militant wing is gaining control of the Politburo and that, consequently, we are on the eve of another war.

This impressive accumulation of "official" opinions and disquieting signs give support to the theory that war with Russia is inevitable. Must Soviet tyranny inevitably seek expansion through immediate war or can it restrain itself within the confines of peaceful methods? Must Stalin follow through to the bitter end the pattern of Hitler?

The 30 years of Soviet history do not justify complete acceptance of the theory that war is imminent. Not that the Bolsheviks are burdened with any philosophy of pacifism. In their vocabulary this is one of the lowest and meanest of words. The important fact is that they are realists and that to them their power is the most precious thing in the world. They are dominated by concern for their political security. Since the stabilization of their regime after the march on Warsaw in 1920, they have consistently taken great care to undertake nothing which lies beyond their means. If possible, they will never run a risk.

They never gave more than token assistance to the Chinese Nationalists or the Spanish Republicans. Their attack on Finland—a movement of 100 against 1—could not be regarded as an uncertain adventure. The stab in the back of Poland, the invasion of the Baltic countries and of Bessarabia, all, though infamous, certainly could not be regarded as risks. The Hitler pact, misjudged though it turned out to be, was entered into as the lesser of two dangers.

There is no reason at all for supposing that the Politburo has adopted a new policy in regard to this matter. All initiative remains with Stalin. The other members are nothing more than hands ready to carry out his orders. The Politburo is a mere extension of Stalin's personality, built by him over a period

of 20 years through the sacrifices of his comrades. In this body there are no such things as tendencies or differences of opinion about matters of life and death. Any apparent disagreement is nothing more than a well-regulated scene staged for the deception of outsiders. All of the current speculation—about the age or physical ailments of Stalin, about his ambitions, about his nationalism or internationalism, about the intentions of his acolytes—all of these arguments pro and con rest upon no substantial basis.

Stalin's political structure is built of prudence, patience, good management, and the exploitation of human weaknesses. He will never risk everything by an open attack until he is sure of the result. The cases cited above prove this with regard to his behavior in the field of foreign affairs. But he sticks rigidly to the same pattern in dealing with his own people. Even in undertaking agricultural collectivization and the destruction of his political opposition—both movements carried out against groups which could not defend themselves—he did not move until he was sure of his ground. Never has Stalin openly and courageously taken on an opponent of his own size. Before he moves he must have an immense margin of advantage. He did not fight Germany until he was forced into action by Hitler's attack.

Harry Hopkins, special envoy sent to Stalin by Roosevelt in 1941, wrote an interesting account of his interview (American Magazine, December 1941). Despite the reserve imposed upon a man in the position of Mr. Hopkins and the secrecy necessitated by the war, this revelation has great significance.

"When Hitler invaded Russia," he reports, "he did so without a word to Stalin, not a hint. In Moscow, in the Kremlin, it aroused a hatred of Hitler that nothing but the death of the German Chancelor could lessen. As Stalin made clear to me, this was not a hatred of the German people nor of the German general staff. The invasion was regarded in Moscow as the treachery of a partner who had suddenly revealed himself as a rabid dog * * *.

"A trade and peace pact had been negotiated between the two countries, and whatever your personal feelings about the U. S. S. R. may be, it is to Russia's credit that she observed her commitments and treaties to the letter. Stalin told me that he had no intention of doing anything but be straightforward in his dealings with Germany. But now the pact had been destroyed—not by Germany, not by the German General Staff (perhaps in spite of it), and not by the Reich as a body politic. Hitler had torn it up without a word from or to anyone." If, then, Stalin was a part of the anti-German coalition, it is to Hitler that we owe this fact, not to Stalin or to the Politburo.

Precisely to avoid being dragged into a war against Germany, or to establish a pretense of his opposition to such a war, Stalin coolly planned and carried out the massacre of the companions of Lenin. He accused these non-Stalinist Bolsheviks of plotting an entente with Hitler of the very sort which he himself later carried through. This disgraceful performance is known as the Moscow trials. It is necessary to know the sinister history of yesterday in order to understand the tortuous politics of today and tomorrow.

Stalin operates with the means which he has at hand. He has no motive for changing his policy, at least none that one knows of, unless there is a change in the existing relations of force. His armies are on the Elbe, not by virtue of any military superiority, but in consequence of ill-considered agreements made at Tehran and Yalta. His annexations are not necessarily a source of strength, as a vain people have been persuaded to think. They are, far more, a source of weakness. Stalin needs at the present time not territory, but time. And the unalert men of the west are giving him precisely what he requires.

The time placed at his disposal he utilizes to carry on persistently the sort of war which he understands best, the cold war, the war of nerves, the war of intrigue and infiltration, the war of corruption and intimidation, the war of sapping and mining which may shatter European civilization. In this strategy troops and arms are assigned to a minor role. The main tasks are executed by politicians, bureaucrats, puppets, and the secret police. And we have during this long and painful period no declared war and no real peace.

Stalin is not wrong within certain limits in thinking that time works for him. His adversaries fail to see through his game and expend their principal energy fiddling about relatively minor matters. His mistake lies in supposing that things may be expected to go on forever the way they have been going recently—especially in the Far East. There it is impossible to proceed in the current manner for long without arousing American opposition. When this happens, success or failure will not depend exclusively on Russian initiative but on the possibility of counteracting efforts conceived and carried out by the Americans.

In the meantime we have in Europe and Asia what in Russia used to be described as times of trouble. It is useless to inquire who benefits from the trouble. Pretexts of war are not lacking, points of friction multiply from the Adriatic along the long line through the Dardanelles and the Gulf of Persia to the China Sea. But pretexts of war do not lead to actual conflict unless the principal protagonists have sufficient reason to believe that it will be advantageous for them to challenge the fates of war. There is no probability of our arriving at this state of affairs at any immediately foreseeable time.

In the historical process there is a margin of uncertainty without which the whole structure of events could be described in advance. We must, therefore, resign ourselves to the impossibility of rationalizing the irrational. As Valéry said: "Cold reason which, in the past, was able to speculate on the benefits of a bloody encounter should be willing to admit today that it is forced to waver between various possibilities which it may foresee. The one thing certain is that now there can be no localized conflicts, circumscribed duels, closed systems of military conflict. He who enters upon a war cannot foretell against whom or beside whom he will finally stand. He plunges into an incalculable adventure against undetermined forces and for an indefinite time."

But in order to face the uncertainty of future events one should grasp firmly a set of clear and constant ideas. Thus one cannot attribute to Stalin the intention of conquering Europe by force of arms without misinterpreting all that distinguishes him from Hitler. Anyone who foresees such a course underestimates his coolness and good sense. Intellectually Stalin has nothing in common with Valéry. But his innate astuteness, his political maturity, his experience as a civilian in control of a great war machine have enabled him in his way to arrive at the verities expressed by the French thinker of whom, I am sure, he has not read a single line.

But the disproportion, so much commented upon between the human and material resources of great Russia and disunited Europe—this is no novel circumstance. And the interdependence of continents and the internal deficiencies of the Stalinist empire—these, too, are things long understood by political observers. The pretended Slav bloc, less rich in Slavs than is believed and more poor in Slavism than is reported, may make a great impression on the outside world; but it deceives no one on the inside. Its future depends upon its ability to remain a viable complex; and that, in turn, depends upon the maintenance of world peace.

As to the supreme "nerve" which Stalin exhibits, it is evident that Roosevelt and his colleagues and successors dealt with him in such a way as to persuade him that he could permit himself practically any extravagance. The responsibility for allowing the Russian dictator to become so puffed up must be divided between the naive and the cynical, the deceivers and the deceived. It is as idle to speculate on who started the process as start the old argument about the chicken and the egg. After so many mistakes, so many false moves and countermoves, Moscow will not begin to retreat except in the face of an unconquerable obstacle. But Washington will never be taken seriously until it faces Stalin with acts, not words. If acts other than war are inconceivable to the men who believe themselves in charge of the planet, silence would, at least, be preferable to empty words which serve no purpose but to reveal too openly our disorganization and impotence.

China—Our Crumbling Ramparts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are not aware of the true situation existing in China and the real threat to our security in the Pacific. We have billions of dollars for the Marshall plan and it appears also for a military alliance all on the theory that communism must be stopped in western Europe. Yet Paul Hoffman of ECA, said that we will do business with the Communists in China if they succeed in establishing a government there. What kind of consistency is this?

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, writing in Plain Talk for January, very clearly points out the fallacy of our present policy in China and the Far East. I commend it to the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States:

OUR CRUMBLING RAMPARTS

(By Alfred Kohlberg)

The Washington grapevine has been buzzing with a rumor that Soviet Ambassador Panyushkin had served notice upon President Truman or, according to some, upon Secretary Marshall, that further aid to the Nationalist Government of China would be considered an unfriendly act.

We have no way of ascertaining how much truth there is in the report, but the Homeric American tragedy being enacted across the Pacific is a fitting illustration to the insiders' talk in Washington.

The redoubtable Panyushkin measures up to the role, for he is the only surviving Soviet ex-Ambassador to China, no mean achievement for a Kremlin diplomat. Without exception all his predecessors as envoys to China have fallen under Stalin's ax upon their recall home.

The promotion of the surviving Panyushkin to the supreme assignment of doing a little pushing around of the Tarzan-like Uncle Sam could not have been a mere acci-

dent on the part of the wily set in the Politburo.

Having shoved China into signing away Outer Mongolia, Ambassador Panyushkin practiced the art of pushing around in the maneuvers which led to the Communist conquest of Manchuria and the penetration of Chinese Turkestan, with our tacit blessings.

It seems hardly likely that even so offensive a Soviet grenadier as Panyushkin would present something like an ultimatum to the heads of the Government of the United States, especially after the ill-fated Soviet ultimatum to us in Berlin.

But then there are those in the know who have long suspected that certain pipe lines connected the Soviet Embassy in Washington with the far eastern policy makers in the State Department. Anyway, Ambassador Panyushkin could have no difficulty in discovering that there is no Lucius Clay among President Truman's advisers on our "bipartisan no-foreign policy" in the Far East, as Alf Landon so aptly described it.

On one point there can be no division of opinion: Our course in China is in the best tradition of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, a course originally charted for us by Stalin and Molotov and the Panyushkins.

Remember Tito? We had for years tried to force Chiang Kai-shek into a Titoesque mold through the lofty stratagem of a coalition government. We succeeded in Yugoslavia, but Nationalist China resisted our pressure.

Remember Mikolajczyk? Falling in line with the dictates of the Kremlin, we had carried out a coalition policy in Poland which seemed to us to suit ideally the generalissimo of another valiant ally of ours. Unlike our Polish protegé, the head of the Republic of China continued to balk at our suasions and proddings.

Remember Czechoslovakia and Rumania and Bulgaria and Hungary? We backed the magic motto of coalition government, coined for us by the avowed and secret dupes of Moscow. The iron curtain has enfolded and garroted our friends—the friends of democracy and freedom—in all those countries. That has not prevented us from pursuing the same old will-of-the-wisp in China where our ramparts are a matter of life or death to American security in the Pacific.

These ramparts have been crumbling under the propaganda drills of those who have been telling us that "you can do business with the Chinese Communists." (It worked with Hitler, it is still working somewhat sluggishly with Stalin, why not with Mao Tse-tung?)

It is a familiar song: The Chinese Communists need us—for $5,000,000,000 we can secure their friendship. It was only yesterday that good old Joe's friendship was to be had for $10,000,000,000.

The theme of this song burst upon the front pages of our press when Paul G. Hoffman, head of the ECA, reversed himself after a 3-day visit in Shanghai and announced that the United States would continue aid to China if the Communists or a coalition government should overthrow Chiang Kai-shek.

Who can measure at this date, in billions of dollars or millions of lives, the full value to Stalin and his Panyushkins of this stab in the back delivered by our traveling envoy to our ally against Japan?

The American correspondents in China recorded the Hoffman venture into the realm of higher diplomacy as a devastating psychological blow to the government of the Republic of China, the same government which we had solemnly sworn to uphold at Cairo and Tehran and Yalta—in the treaties designed for public consumption only.

In the secret agreements, designed to be kept from the forgotten man, we had delivered anti-Communist China into the clutches of Communist imperialism, an undertaking which could not be consummated without getting Chiang Kai-shek's head into the noose of a coalition government. Secretary Marshall failed in his mission to mate the Nationalist tigers with the Red vipers. Paul Hoffman has carried on the fatal errand of his illustrious master with a sublime sense of irresponsibility.

Well may Panyushkin play the role of a bully in our diplomatic house of glass. How fragil are our rudders, how pompous our captains of the ship of state, and how blind.

Must all our ramparts in Asia crumble into dust before the eyes of America can be opened? Is it our destiny to fight for our life with our back only against Canada or Mexico as bulwarks in the race for the survival of civilization?

Anthracite Mine Safety Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times Leader Evening News:

ANTHRACITE MINE-SAFETY RECORD IS HAILED BY WALSH

The State mines department reported today 353 anthracite operators worked all of 1948 without a single fatality, a new safety mark for the hard-coal region.

Deputy Secretary Joseph J. Walsh described the record as exceptionally splendid. The operators turned in 28,754,612 man-hours during the year.

The 131 fatal accidents in the hard-coal fields in 1948 occurred at 39 other operations. But the over-all record of 0.87 fatalities safety mark for Pennsylvania, Walsh said, is apparently destined to be one of the finest records in the Nation.

"The perfect operators," he said, "have materially helped the industry to more nearly approach safety perfection."

Ten Great Truths About the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ten Great Truths About the Constitution," written by me and published in the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine for March 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN GREAT TRUTHS ABOUT THE CONSTITUTION

By the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, United States Senator from Wisconsin)

The Constitution of the United States is the civic bible of every American. Next to the Holy Gospel itself, it merits our study, our respect, and our fulfillment more than any other piece of literature. Unfortunately, far too many of our citizens take it for granted and think that the only time in our lives that we should really be interested in it is during our school days, when we have to study it—its history, its development, and its meaning. But the Constitution, on the contrary, is living literature in the sense that it has meaning to us every single moment of our days. Every second that we enjoy freedom of speech, of press, of worship, of assembly, is a moment of liberty that we owe to the Constitution of the United States.

Love of the Constitution is the very embodiment of American patriotism just as disrespect and subversion of the Constitution is the very epitome of disloyalty to our way of life. The enemy of the Constitution is the enemy of America. Its upholder is the loyal servant of America.

A feeling of gratitude alone is not enough to bind our hearts to this miraculous document. Each of us knows that the Constitution gained vitality through the blood of American martyrs who paved the way for its creation by sacrifice of their very bodies in the War of Independence. So, too, the countless heroes who have served America's flag in our later wars have preserved the Constitution for us. We are the heirs of generations which shed their blood and tears on behalf of us and on behalf of this immortal document.

Not only, however, should we feel gratitude for those who battled for God, country, and Constitution in war, but for those who fought the bitter battles of peace in order that the Constitution might be created and might survive. We remember that it was only after the bitterest of struggles that it was written, let alone preserved.

The Constitution was, of course, not the first but the second written form of government of the United States. In 1777, just 1 year after the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation which had been drafted were adopted by the Convention chosen by the Continental Congress to frame them. It was not, however, until 1781 that the final State ratified these articles. Within 4 years the Articles of Confederation, however, proved so inadequate that plans were originated at Mount Vernon to remodel them. Washington and a group of statesmen suggested the calling of a convention in 1786 at Annapolis, but because of inadequate attendance that Convention adjourned to the next year at Philadelphia, when all the States but one sent delegates. This Convention, which had been called to remodel the Articles of Confederation cast them aside and drafted an entirely new instrument. The Constitution was adopted on July 2, 1788, and was placed in effect on March 4, 1789.

So many were the problems of the new Nation, so great was the doubt that the Constitution would last, that every American might thank Almighty God each day of his life that somehow this document did survive.

What, then, are some of the great truths about this Constitution in terms of its meaning to us?

Here are a few:

1. The United States Constitution is the most miraculous document in the history of mankind. This basic fact proven by our own and other nations' history commands our unyielding respect. It was no overstatement when William E. Gladstone, Prime Minister of Great Britain, remarked:

"The American Constitution is, so far as I can see, the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Thomas Jefferson, in spite of his doubts arising out of the terrific struggle for the Constitution, wrote to David Humphreys, in March 1789:

"The Constitution * * * is unquestionably the wisest ever yet presented to men."

The very survival of the United States Constitution is proof of its value. It is a miracle in itself to think that any document almost 170 years old should have survived with a mere 21 amendments. In the course of this time the entire economic, political, and social pattern of American society has changed. From 13 weak colonies of less than 4,000,000 souls living in an almost wilderness civilization, we have emerged as the greatest power on earth, with the highest standard of living, leading all the 2,000,000,000 inhabitants of mankind in technology and in every other field and commanding the universal respect, if not the admiration of all men.

It is comparatively easy for us today to revere the strength of the Constitution, and yet when we turn back the pages of history to the time of its founding we note that the air was black with woeful predictions of the Constitution's collapse. It is said that Aaron Burr wrote:

"When the Constitution was first framed I predicted that it would last 50 years. I was mistaken. It will evidently last longer than that. But I was mistaken only in point of time. The crash will come, but not quite so quick as I thought."

T. B. Macaulay criticized the Constitution, as follows:

"Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor."

Even in modern times there are those who have attempted to disparage it either in attempted sarcasm or in malicious subversion. The cynical George Bernard Shaw, master of irony and sarcasm, said in an address on April 11, 1933:

"When you came to examine the American Constitution you found that it was not really a Constitution, but a charter of anarchism. It was not an instrument of government; it was a guaranty to the whole American Nation that it never should be governed at all. And that is exactly what the Americans wanted."

The miracle of American Government is the complete refutation of Mr. Shaw's words.

2. The United States Constitution is the perfect match for the American people. Never in all mankind has a governing instrument been so perfectly adapted to the pattern of the people governed as is the Constitution of the United States to the American people. We here on this continent are a new breed of men, blended from all peoples into a new people. Our Constitution has been emulated in other countries by virtual copying of its outline and of its clauses, but with varying success. Canada, Mexico, five Central American Republics, nine South American Republics, Australia, and South Africa all adopted constitutions patterned to greater or lesser degrees after our own. In addition, the Constitutions of France, Belgium, and Switzerland contain many provisions that are to be found in our Constitution. So, too, the so-called Weimar Constitution of Germany after World War I was patterned after our own.

Why, then, have we succeeded with our Constitution whereas some of the other nations in the list above have obviously not succeeded as well with theirs? Because the genius of America is such that it functions best in a constitutional Republic such as ours, whereas other peoples are by history and culture apparently less adapted to our form of government, although it is our prayer that they may someday enjoy the blessings and freedoms which we ourselves enjoy.

3. The strength of the Constitution is that it embodies eternal laws and principles. Wendell Phillips in 1861 well said:

"All that is valuable in the United States Constitution is 1,000 years old."

It is basic to our Constitution that man (although made in God's image) must not be given too much power or else he may tend unfairly to control other men. That is why the basic principle of the Constitution is a system of checks and balances whereby each of the separate coequal branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—cannot infringe upon the other. If ever this system of checks and balances is upset and if ever power unduly gravitates to one branch, then the liberties of all Americans will be threatened. The Constitution by its provisions separating power has thus far successfully forestalled the abuse of power.

4. The Constitution is the ultimate guaranty of American liberties. Since ours is a government of laws rather than of men, the supreme law of the land is the guaranty of our freedom rather than having the promise of any one man or group of men guarantee our freedom. In June 1933, in an address at Harvard University, Alfred E. Smith stated:

"Keep your eye on the Constitution. This is the guaranty that is the safeguard, that is the night watchman of democratic representative government—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the right of public assembly, and the right to petition the government."

5. The Constitution preserving the heritage of the past is a guaranty of progress for the future. In these times there are folks at every hand who try to imply to us that, although the Constitution may have been well and good for the past, it is not dynamic enough for the complex challenges of the future. Nothing could be more insidious than this alien philosophy. The adequacy of the Constitution in the past is proof of its adequacy in the future. On February 6, 1850, Henry Clay, in a speech in the United States Senate, said:

"The Constitution of the United States was made not merely for the generation that then existed but for posterity—unlimited, undefined, endless, perpetual posterity."

Just 3 years previously, Daniel Webster, speaking in Springfield, Mass., gave the lie to those who imply that the Constitution is not adapted to America's future when he said:

"We may be tossed upon an ocean where we can see no land—nor, perhaps the sun or stars. But there is a chart and a compass for us to study, to consult and to obey. That chart is the Constitution."

6. One of the greatest menaces to the Constitution is usurpation. What are the other threats to the Constitution? Perhaps the principal threat can come from the ambition of any one branch of government, as previously indicated, to control the other branches of the Government in order to meet some emergency. Many times in American history the siren voice of some would-be fuehrer has pleaded for extraordinary powers outside the Constitution in order to meet crises. One of the finest answers to such appeals came from a Supreme Court Justice in 1866, when Mr. Justice David Davis stated:

"The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government."

We need look no further than to the Father of His Country for another opinion about the danger of usurpation:

"If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation."

7. However miraculous the Constitution, it must be dynamically interpreted and implemented. The fact that it has proven so perfect for the American way of life does not, however, gainsay the fact that changing times require new interpretations of its clauses. Always throughout American history, in times of peace and in times of war, when the public welfare has been endangered, clauses of the Constitution have been interpreted in such a manner as to give the respective branches of Government the necessary power to meet real (not fictitious) emergencies in accordance with the Constitution.

The key concept to bear in mind is that always these interpretations and implementations must be in full keeping with the true spirit and insofar as possible with the letter of the Constitution. We have as much to fear from the man who would scrap it entirely as from the man who out of mistaken loyalty, proves completely a "stick in the mud," refusing to interpret the Constitution in accordance with the changing requirements of our system. Again it was Thomas Jefferson who provides us with the key to use along this line:

"Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the ark of the covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the men of the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment * * * We might as well require a man to wear the coat that fitted him as a boy, as civilized society to remain ever under the regime of their ancestors."

8. A basic test of loyalty therefore is respect for the Constitution. If you and I would recognize the enemies within our midst of which Lincoln warned, then we must be ever alert against those who would defame it and nullify its intent. The true American patriot, the good American citizen, the American-thinking American, fulfills the American's Creed as adopted by the House of Representatives on April 3, 1918, in the words of William Tyler Page:

"I * * * believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to observe its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

9. Still another great truth about the Constitution is its interrelationship with other great documents of American freedom. It should be read and understood together with the Declaration of Independence, the Gettysburg Address, and the other perpetual landmarks of American liberty. The spirit of these guideposts is one, the meaning is one, loyalty to them is one and indivisible.

The strength of the Constitution is, of course, found in the strength of the American people—in their loyalty to the heritage of the past, in their desire to pass on that heritage vital and unimpaired to the generations which follow us. It is up to each citizen, therefore, to know and understand these basic truths of the Constitution. It is up to each citizen to have readily at hand in his home, in his office, wherever possible, a copy and to refresh himself with it, to gain inspiration from its contents, to gain directions as to his role as a citizen.

We should take little journeys to the Constitution in the same way we take little journeys to the Bible, going to the source of wisdom and understanding and direction in order that we may be adequate for our role in these dynamic times.

President Cleveland stated:

"Millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of their Constitution."

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, at Howard University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Howard University on March 2, 1949?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to have been in Washington 82 years ago. I would like to have met your academic forefathers who created from dust and from poverty—and, yes, from nobility of spirit—a school, humbly, called a university, for the elevation of freedmen. Howard University was not dedicated to the cold obscurities called truth and enlightenment. It was born of dire need, dedicated warmly to humanity.

Thousands of freedmen migrated to Washington after the Emancipation Proclamation. They squatted in abandoned barracks and in vacant houses. They needed moral and spiritual leadership to interpret their new freedom. They needed doctors to tend to the sick. They needed lawyers to advise them of their rights, and they needed teachers.

Your founders had a rare combination of practical insight and imagination and benevolence. They saw the immediate needs of the growing community. They saw the destiny of a liberated people, and the responsibilities that went with freedom. Four years after the Emancipation Proclamation your founders had the courage to initiate a new concept of brotherhood within the walls of their school. They opened their doors to all who came, and the privileged came to learn with the sons of slaves and the daughters of the trustees, and the poor came, and the men came with their wives.

The missionary founders envisaged an institution that would grow and develop and mature with its students. They had an indomitable faith in men. They knew them, as we know now, that freemen justify their freedom. Their faith has been vindicated by countless men whom Howard University built and molded and developed and sent out into the world to make invaluable contributions to humanity. Governor Hastie has vindicated their faith, and Dr. Drew, Dr. Just, and Dr. Frazier. Your president, Dr. Johnson ennobles that faith.

Freemen do indeed justify their freedom. The eyes of the entire world have been focussed on Howard University's Dr. Ralph Bunche. His efforts toward peace with justice in the Middle East, and the respect he has earned from people the world over, epitomize society's stake in the freedom of men. Freedom is a dynamic force. It gathers increased momentum with every liberation. It crosses oceans and deserts and it penetrates jungles and scales mountains.

When the Negroes in Mississippi can freely go to the polls to vote the iron curtain in Europe is ripped; and millions of Indonesians and Chinese take hope. Their newly found opportunities will undermine totalitarian propaganda just as surely as they will inspire the lives of the Chinese coolies. It is an international principle that is at stake. Those who would enslave men are destined to failure when the most powerful nation in the world rededicates its faith in freedom. Already the rumblings are being heard. There are vociferous cries of emancipation in Indonesia. The democrats of Asia have awakened to their responsibilities to assure freedom from tyranny in their vast area. The Chinese are agonizingly struggling for liberation from a feudal economic system. And even from behind the iron curtain we have heard Marshal Tito's voice raised against the bondage of Moscow.

There is a restless world-wide search for liberation. Whole nations of individuals are groping for the freedom to find themselves, and to recognize their capacities and fulfill their destinies.

We in the United States are in a unique position to chart the future. Too often do we here tend to limit our vision as we view the picture of our national life. There are shadows in the scene. The Ku Klux Klan does still ride. Fear of insecurity is still with us. Poverty and privilege still victimize us. But we ought not forget that these shadows have sharpened the light.

In our slow trial and error democratic manner we have steadily moved toward greater democracy and the enlargement of the area of human freedom.

The franchise has been extended. Our workers, both white and Negro, were liberated from slavery in 1863.

Sweatshops have been destroyed. Yellow-dog contracts have been outlawed; other freedoms have been recognized. In spite of temporary set-backs the trend has been toward liberation, liberation at a geometric speed.

As I stand here this moment there are men in the United States Senate planning a last desperate resistance against the age-old drive toward full civil rights for every citizen of our country regardless of his color or religion or nationality. Those men would ignore the Golden Rule so that they can keep a Senate rule. They tamper with the morality of a determined nation of people. The people of our country carried a great moral burden for too long a time. We cried out for democracy in other nations at the same time that we denied democracy at home. This hypocrisy developed a national moral guilt. Americans realized that discrimination clashed with our credo, that it was wrong—dead wrong. The new thoughts played upon the old during the years of our indecision. We were a nation plagued with guilty consciences.

We made an auspicious step toward absolving ourselves of this sense of guilt with the publication of the precedent-breaking report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, organized labor, business, all religious groups—almost all sections of our public life were represented in this report which called—in ringing words—for an end to discrimination, the right of all citizens to live free of terror and oppression and to participate fully in the responsibility and benefits of their Government. This was a landmark in our march toward the realization of genuine democracy. The next step, and the step we now face, is the implementation of the committee's recommendations.

Last summer at the convention of the Democratic Party, the decision was abruptly made. When the delegates were challenged to get out of the shadows of States' rights and to walk forth in the bright sunshine of human rights, they voted to relieve themselves of their guilty consciences. They voted against discrimination and against bigotry. They justified the freedom of freemen.

Again on last November the second, our faith in the American citizen was tested and affirmed. There can be no doubt now about the American people's passion for liberation. They voted to liberate themselves from their guilt as well as to liberate minority groups from their displacement. The American voter showed to all the world that he had the courage of his convictions.

In spite of that great demonstration in November, a minority in the Senate of the United States withstands the national tide. They will fail, because history is against them, the people are against them, the times are against them, the President of the United States is against them. Our President risked his political career to bring the issue of civil rights to the people. He traveled many miles to proclaim his vigorous views on this issue. He has broken all precedent in the degree of his strength and leadership to the end that man's inviolate dignity shall be accorded to all men equally. President Truman has truly shown that he would rather be right than be President.

No, a minority of men in the Senate of the United States cannot frustrate a nation. A nation is awakening. Communities are coming alive. A groundswell is developing. Brotherhood is on the march. People are beginning again to feel democracy. In their communities they are talking and acting for democracy.

Here on the ground level, in the neighborhoods where Negroes and whites, Japanese and Indians, Christians and Jews live their lives and go about their daily business, here is the area in which understanding and justice and equality must take root. In the stores and the factories, in the schools, and the universities, the bus terminals and the railroad stations.

Many of you will go back to your homelands in the South within the next few years. Your education is awaited and needed there. And your initiative. The task of fulfilling your destiny lies in the communities of the South. You will need to share your education with your neighbors, and you will need to join with the groups that are already working to liberalize the South. Your efforts in home communities will come to fruition when you can send to the Congress of the United States men who will represent the new surge to freedom in your area. It is in the roots of your communities that you will solve the American dilemma. When a minority of men who represent a minority of the public can no longer hamper the Congress by their filibusters and by their derision of justice, then the American dilemma will be a thing of the past, a hardship conquered in the development of a great nation of freemen.

Resistance in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Resistance in Indonesia," by George T. McKahin, published in the Far Eastern Survey of February 23, 1949, and an article by Quentin Pope from the Chicago Tribune of February 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Far Eastern Survey of February 23, 1949]

RESISTANCE IN INDONESIA

(By George T. McKahin)

BATAVIA, January 22, 1949.—The Dutch attack launched on December 19, 1948, against the Republic of Indonesia was designed to impose a speedy settlement of the Dutch-Indonesian dispute along lines dictated by the Dutch. Enlisted men and officers of the Dutch Army were indoctrinated with the idea that once the principal Republican leaders and Republican cities (Jogjakarta in particular) were captured, resistance to the Dutch would collapse. They were told that their purpose was the release of the Sultan of Jogjakarta from 3 years of captivity within the Republic. Their marching order was "On to Jogja to free the Sultan."

All the principal cities of Java are now in Dutch hands. But Republican resistance has not collapsed—indeed, it has reached unprecedented proportions. The Sultan of Jogjakarta, who during the past 3 years has not only been free but has also been one of the most energetic and esteemed leaders of the Republican Government is now a voluntary prisoner in his own palace, refusing to have any contact with the Dutch.

The Dutch did succeed in capturing many of the top Republican leaders: Sukarno, Hatta, Sjahrir, and half the Cabinet. (The seven ministers captured are Hadji Agus Salim, foreign affairs; Mohammed Natsir, information; F. Laoh, public works; Djuanda, transportation; Dr. Leimena, health; Dr. Ali Sastroamidjojo, education; and Kusnan, social affairs.) Six Cabinet members, however, are now in Republican-controlled areas. Aside from Sjafrudin Prawiranegara, Minister of Economic Affairs, who was in Sumatra at the time of the attack and who was appointed head of the Emergency Republican Government by Sukarno and Hatta shortly before the latter was captured, these escaped leaders include Dr. Sukiman, Minister of the Interior and chairman of the Republic's largest political party (Masjumi), and Supeno, Minister of Youth and Reconstruction. (Kasimo, food; Susanto, justice; and Maskoer, religion, are in Republican-controlled territory, while Maramis, finance, is outside the country.) Many other outstanding political leaders likewise escaped, among them Tan Malaka of the anti-Muso Communists, and the heads of the Indonesian Nationalist Party, the Indonesian Socialist Party, the Proletariat Party, and the Indonesian Islamic Youth Movement.

The thousands of Dutch soldiers with more than 2 years' service in the Indies who were due to be sent home several months ago are particularly bitter. Told that they would be sent home once Jogjakarta was captured, they now find that the fighting has just begun, and their feelings toward the "brass" in Batavia are not kindly. (Conclusions as to the indoctrination and present outlook of Dutch soldiers were reached after personal interviews with many of them, and are reinforced by the experiences of other interviewers in the combat areas.) Java, Sumatra, and even southeast Borneo are surging with resistence. Although their armored columns continue to attack concentrations of Indonesian troops, the Dutch are in general on the defensive. They are losing control of towns to Indonesian forces; plantations are being abandoned, motor roads becoming impassable, and most railroad lines going out of commission. Sea and air are the only safe routes for travel between major cities. The cities of Malang, Bandjanegara, and Tjikampek are frequently reported to have been attacked heavily by Republican Army units. The Dutch posts around Jogjakarta and Surakarta are attacked almost nightly. The situation is so critical in the Madiun area that the Dutch are forced to supply that garrison by air. Republican troops are operating close to Cheribon and have made repeated attacks on towns within 10 miles of Surabaya, where the Dutch have been unable to garrison the city itself for lack of troops.

JOGJAKARTA: 3 WEEKS LATER

The situation in Jogjakarta 3 weeks after its capture by the Dutch can be reported on the basis of the writer's own observations. (After having left Jogjakarta on December 19 following its bombing and invasion by the Dutch, the writer revisited the city from January 6 to January 10 as a correspondent for Overseas News Agency. The Dutch originally authorized him to remain until January 13. He was apparently finding out more than they wished him to know, for on January 9 he was placed under house arrest in his hotel by the chief intelligence officer in Jogjakarta, and on the following day was forced to leave by plane for Batavia.) It has become for the most part a city of women, children, and old men. A majority of the young men had gone to the countryside to fight from there; many of the remainder were Chinese. Few people ventured outside their houses.

Jogjakarta is not under complete Dutch control. Its central area and its eastern and northern suburbs are Dutch-occupied, with a garrison whose strength is estimated to consist of 1,000 troops, 10 Stuart tanks, and a large number of armored cars and Bren carriers. But much of the periphery of the city is either no-man's land or actually occupied by Republican troops. The Dutch informed the writer that several areas of the city to which he wished to go were not safe. Both Dutch and Indonesian sources affirmed that, in a major attack on the night of December 29, Republican troops penetrated to within 4 blocks of the city's center. On January 9 the Kemal battalion of the Republican Army's Siliwangi Division launched a 4-hour attack (supported by mortar and heavy machine-gun fire) which penetrated to the very center of the city, where the battalion continued to fight for 2 hours before Dutch tanks and armored cars finally forced it to withdraw.

Despite the impressive amount of Republican troop activity, the writer was told while in Jogjakarta that the area around that city and Surakarta are not considered guerrilla areas. Two reasons have prompted Republican leaders to make this decision. First, they do not want the civilian population of these cities to suffer more than is necessary. Second, the Jogjakarta and Surakarta plains are deficit food areas, unable to support large numbers of Republican troops. Most of the troops formerly stationed in these areas have gone to the east and west, where they are now waging intensive guerrilla warfare against the Dutch. Indeed, the crack divisions of the Republican Army are now operating in areas which before December 19 were known as Dutch-occupied Java. (The Sungkono Division of 27,000 men has crossed into east Java, while the somewhat larger Siliwangi Division, except for its Kemal battallion, has crossed into west Java.)

Although the writer himself was not allowed to visit the environs of Jogjakarta, he talked with Indonesians who had been there. All of these Indonesians reported that a great many villages in the area have been burned by the Dutch, apparently because they have housed snipers who fired on Dutch patrols. On January 7, a day during which Indonesian units made no attack on the city, a Dutch officer informed the writer that nine Dutch soldiers were killed in the vicinity.

EXTENT OF CIVILIAN CASUALTIES

Civilian casualties have been extensive, particularly in the suburbs, according to the Indonesian Red Cross. The Red Cross, however, has no means of contact with these areas. Its one ambulance was destroyed by the Dutch in the December 19 attack; the Dutch have refused to grant them any replacement. The Central Hospital of Jogjakarta alone reports having treated 108 civilian casualties during the week of December 19–25, and 61 of these were treated after the Dutch had officially occupied the city. On December 27, 25 civilian casualties were treated at this one hospital, 12 of whom died of their wounds. On January 4, the last day for which the writer could secure such data, 6 civilian casualties were treated, and all of them died. (On January 9 the two principal hospitals in Surakarta reported that they were treating 197 civilian casualties, most of whom received their injuries well after the Dutch had officially occupied the city.)

FOOD AND COLLABORATION

Before the Dutch attack one was accustomed to seeing large numbers of ox carts driven by peasants from the surrounding countryside, bringing food to Jogjakarta. The writer saw not one of these carts during the period of his last visit. This single fact is the best index both to the peasants' fear of the Dutch and to the status of the city's food supply. According to Mr. B. J. Muller, head of the Dutch Economic Administration in the Jogjakarta district, the food situation is extremely critical. The Dutch, he said, give food only to those who work for them; noncollaborators get nothing. Twenty tons of rice are being imported daily by the Dutch, via convoy from Semarang. Mr. Muller stated that of Jogjakarta's half-million inhabitants, only 6,000 persons are working for the Dutch. He estimated that the amount of food coming into the city has dropped 50 percent since the Dutch attack.

Those few peasants who are willing to carry a little rice into town on their backs refuse to accept Dutch currency and will sell only for the Republican rupiah. The few city dwellers who venture through no-man's-land to the countryside in search of rice carry only Republican money. The shortage of rice in the city has forced up its price. This factor, plus the refusal of many Chinese merchants to accept Republican money during the first days of the Dutch occupation, greatly inflated the Republican currency. But the peasants' attitude and the general confidence in the Republic's survival, a result of the continuing guerrilla warfare, have reversed the inflationary tendency. Most Chinese shopkeepers must accept Republican money in order to buy rice. Whereas shortly after the Dutch attack on Jogjakarta the rate between the Dutch guilder and the Republican rupiah was 1 to 500, it now averages about 1 to 130. (Before the Dutch attack the rate was 1 guilder to 50 rupiahs.)

The Dutch had counted on securing the collaboration of a large number of Republican leaders once they had occupied Jogjakarta. Their expectations have totally miscarried. Not one of the Republican leaders there has consented to work for them. The Sultan has refused to deal with the Dutch, as has been noted above. On January 1 he resigned as head of the Jogjakarta district civil service. Out of about 10,000 civil servants formerly working in the district, Mr. Muller estimates that at most 150 have agreed to work for the Dutch.

Dutch treatment of the population has certainly done little to increase collaboration. On December 19 a Dutch major lined up nine civilians and shot and killed them with his own pistol. Among them was Dr. Santoso, secretary general of the department of education. (These facts were obtained from an eye-witness. Data as to the number of deaths and manner of shooting were corroborated by the Indonesian Red Cross.) Two weeks thereafter the Dutch offered Dr. Santoso's wife, formerly a minister of social

affairs in the Republican Government, a cabinet post in the new Dutch-sponsored government in West Java. She refused the offer.

It is unlikely that Abikusno, leader of the second largest Mohammedan political party in the Republic (the Indonesian Islamic Union Party), will feel inclined to cooperate with the Dutch. On December 25 three Dutch soldiers came to his house, demanded that his two sons hand over pistols which they did not possess, beat them, and carried them off to jail. The next morning the Red Cross informed Abikusno that the bodies of his sons had been found. (Interview with Abikusno, January 8, 1949.) The official Dutch explanation of this affair is that the two boys were shot because they were out of doors after curfew.

A number of other prominent Indonesians in Jogjakarta have been shot, including Masdoelhak Nasutian, adviser to Prime Minister Hatta; Dr. Hendromartono, a former cabinet minister; and Sumarsono, a high official of the ministry of the interior. The latter three were shot in their homes.

[From the Chicago Tribune of February 18]

TWENTY THOUSAND SLAIN BY DUTCH POLICE ACTION IN JAVA—INDONESIA IS SWEPT BY GUERRILLA WAR

(By Quentin Pope)

BATAVIA, JAVA, February 17.—A hit and run war is raging through the villages and plantations of stricken Indonesia as the UN nations which condemned the Dutch military action wait for the Netherlands to decide whether or not it will accept the United Nations Security Council's terms.

Official admissions disclose that the Dutch have killed 20,000 Indonesians since they initiated what are termed sercuity actions last December. Dutch army sources have told the UN Commission that they have killed 10,000 Indonesians.

These figures do not cover the many civilians killed or wounded during the Dutch attack, hundreds of whom were seen by this correspondent in Republican city hospitals as soon as the Dutch permitted newsmen to travel.

DUTCH HAVE CASUALTIES

Many of these were slain during the period in which the Dutch have claimed that the Indonesian Republican army has ceased to exist and that military operations have ended. That they have not died without fighting is shown in the latest casualty list, which gives one week's Dutch losses as 29 killed in action and eight missing. Perhaps significantly, the majority of these were from the Netherlands Indies army, comprising conscripted Eurasians and volunteer native troops.

Java, which was quiet before the Dutch began their attack, is being swept by murder and destruction. The Dutch news agency today reports a 70-man attack on a Lembang estate during which the administrator was killed by automatic fire, an estate guard routed, and the property looted. Another estate at Pegoendangan was razed and the planter killed.

In addition, the agency reports a series of hold-ups on the Malang-Batu Highway in which two automobiles were burned. The water main to Batu also has been destroyed.

A check with the major estate corporations today disclosed that some are considering closing their estates, and all rejected the idea of planning to spend any money on rehabilitation of their properties because they assert that the Dutch lack enough troops to maintain order even in territory seized before the latest army action.

JOIN TO GET GUNS

One British company said the strain on estate management now was so great that it was impossible to predict how long the managers could be kept in areas lacking any real defense. The spokesman said the situation has been worsened by the fact estate guards now were being suspected of being Republicans who have been taking these jobs merely to obtain arms and then rejoin the guerrillas. Another foreign company said only 5 of its 20 estates at present were in operation.

From east Java, official reports said another whole group of estates in the previously peaceful Loemadjang area has been closed except for two properties. The Republicans now have dynamited a bridge to these estates and they are isolated, the informant said.

Guerrilla warfare now is raging throughout Java. Estate companies named the east corner beyond Soerabaja, Mount Ungaran, south of Semarang, and the Tasikmalaja areas as among the worst hit.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an item which may be useful to teachers and students of journalism who desire to study techniques of slanting the news and headlines.

It is a clipping from the Denver Post, reporting action of that State's house of representatives on a resolution urging the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority.

The headline on this article reads: "Proposal urging MVA unit fails."

Most readers, who just scan the heads, would be under the impression that a majority in the Colorado Assembly are opposed to the Missouri Valley Authority.

Even those who glanced through the first paragraph would believe the same thing. It read:

A resolution urging Congress to create a three-member Missouri Valley Authority failed to pass the house of representatives Wednesday.

Only those readers who pursued the story to the next paragraph would learn what really happened. That paragraph tells the story, finally. It read:

The vote on the measure, House Joint Resolution 6, introduced by Representative Marshall Quiat, of Denver, received a majority vote of 30 to 25 but failed to obtain the 33 majority vote of the entire house membership required for legislation of this nature. Ten members were absent.

The thing I want to point out to the teachers and students of journalism is the careful, technical accuracy of the headline and the first paragraph, while leaving the reader with a very wrong impression. It was a very neat little job. I am sure the Post will defend its handling of the story as technically without flaw.

While preserving this little gem for those interested in journalism, I thought that it might also have a byproduct of value to us here in the Congress, namely, to read beyond the headlines, and even the first paragraph, of any stories about people in the Missouri Valley opposing a Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL URGING MVA UNIT FAILS

A resolution urging Congress to create a three-member Missouri River Valley Authority failed to pass the State house of representatives Wednesday.

The vote on the measure, House Joint Resolution No. 6, introduced by Representative Marshall Quiat, Democrat, of Denver, received a majority vote of 30 to 25 but failed to obtain the 33 majority vote of the entire house membership required for legislation of this nature. Ten members were absent.

Proponents of the measure contended the creation of a Missouri Valley Authority would aid Colorado in soil conservation and agricultural development, while opponents declared that the Nation is already too hamstrung with national boards and bureaus.

Other measures slated for debate in the house Wednesday afternoon included a bill which provides for a $25,000 loan from the State's general fund to a fund for the Colorado Racing Commission until the commission begins to realize revenue from the newly enacted State law authorizing horse and dog racing with parimutuel betting.

ON THE AGENDA

Other bills to be considered include:

A bill appropriating $500,000 as a deficiency appropriation for the State hospital at Pueblo. This is the third largest deficiency appropriation to come before the current legislature and officials of the hospital contend this amount is necessary to operate the institution until the beginning of the next biennium July 1.

A bill authorizing boards of county commissioners to make payments to families of honorably discharged hospitalized veterans under needy circumstances.

Another bill designed to strengthen mortgage laws pertaining to motor vehicles was introduced in the house Wednesday morning. Under the proposed bill, mortgages on such vehicles would be recorded on vehicle title, not required under present law.

Sponsors of the measure contend that this procedure, which is in force in a number of States, would make it virtually impossible for a motor-vehicle owner to obtain more than one mortgage.

The Watchdog Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Watchdog Committee," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

There is one provision in the Taft-Hartley law which is conspicuously missing from the administration's proposed successor legislation, the Thomas bill, and whose retention is in some respects perhaps more important

than that of many of the sections that have been much more widely debated. This is to be found in sections 401–403, which create and set forth the functions of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations (the so-called watchdog committee).

This committee, whose official life ended yesterday, consisted of seven members from the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and seven from the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was authorized under the 1947 legislation to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of labor-management relations, and was instructed to make what were the equivalent of two annual reports to the Senate and House of Representatives. The first of these was due not later than March 15, 1948; the second on or before March 1, 1949. These reports were to contain the results of the committee's study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable. In short, the function of this committee, speaking broadly, was to study the Taft-Hartley Act in operation and, on the basis of its own observations and testimony submitted by others, to offer any suggestions which seemed to be in the general public interest for changes in the law.

In the course of its life of nearly 2 years the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations has assembled much valuable information. But if the proposed new legislation differs, as it well may, in numerous important respects from the Taft-Hartley law, wisdom suggests the desirability of reviving the committee in connection with the successor measure. Controversies over the proper approach to many important labor problems would in this way be transferred from the area of purely academic debate to one of more or less judicial observation and study.

There is one thing in particular that favors inclusion of this provision in any new labor legislation. Unlike such questions as the closed shop, the use of injunctions in national emergency work stoppages, or the independent conciliation service, it is not, or should not be, a partisan issue. It is a provision which not only the public but everyone who is genuinely interested in equitable legislation in this field should welcome. Neither management nor labor spokesmen, it seems to us, can oppose its inclusion, without raising serious questions as to their open-mindedness or their confidence in the American legislative system.

While the idea of providing for continuing or periodic review of the labor law may have been arrived at independently by the framers of the Taft-Hartley Act, the concept is by no means new. One well-known American statesman who realized that in the Wagner Act the pendulum had swung too far in the direction of labor, touched on the desirability of some such procedure as far back as 1938. Said he:

"The Wagner Act ought to have various amendments made to it, but we are a funny people over here. We at once go to the extremes both on the side of labor and on the side of the employer. Now in England when they put social legislation on the statute books they do it with the knowledge that every year or so they will amend it. * * * Now, how do they amend it? They have a Royal Commission that looks it over. The commission is nonpartisan. There are business people on it and there are labor people on it. They decide that the thing needs certain improvements. The Royal Commission makes a report to Parliament, and the thing goes through almost automatically, without fuss or feathers."

Those union leaders whose efforts have been confined largely to achieving a law with a minimum of restrictions on labor and to limiting the time for consideration of such legislation may be interested to know that the author of this quotation was none other than the late Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several editorials, telegrams, and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The letter from Maude M. Biederman, an aged Civil War widow whom I have never met, is worth thinking about. She expresses a sincere grassroots opinion.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Longview (Wash.) Daily News of February 22, 1949]

NEWS AND VIEWS

(By J. M. M. Jr.)

CAIN'S PROTESTS

Senator CAIN is giving ex-Gov. Mon Wallgren a very bad time in the Senate even though he can hardly expect to bring about a refusal to confirm Wallgren's appointment as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. He is bringing to light all the faults and weaknesses that were the cause of Wallgren's defeat when he tried for reelection as governor. CAIN hasn't missed a thing. He told how Wallgren operated a pool hall in Everett before going into his father's jewelry business. He even said the ex-Governor was expelled from high school in his sophomore year. But the most serious of CAIN's charges was this:

"Since 1932 Mr. Wallgren has prospered in and through politics. He owns, I am told, 12,250 shares of common stock in the Queen City Broadcasting Co. of Seattle (reported to be worth $17 a share.)

"* * * Wallgren is said to be a man of means, with property holdings in and out of Washington State."

CAIN was certainly right about Wallgren being a man of means, for yesterday the story broke in Palm Desert, a winter resort in southern California where he spent a lot of time during his term as Governor, about the luxurious home he is building. It is almost finished. The swimming pool is 20 by 50 feet. Mature palm trees have been brought in and replanted. The living room will have a plate-glass bar, whatever that is. One can only guess what such an establishment will cost, but what makes more interesting guessing is where this politician got the money to build it. His salary as governor was $6,000 per year.

Is it any wonder that Senator CAIN is protesting the appointment of such a man as this to so responsible a job?

MARYSVILLE, WASH., *February 28, 1949.*

Senator CAIN: I am so glad you have taken up the case against Wallgren. Surely people can see by the last election. We did not consider Wallgren as governor. How he ever got in, in the first place, I can't see. You see I came to Everett in '99 so I was living there before Wallgren was there. He is no good and it is not politics with me. I vote for the man or woman I consider best and I have several friends who vote as I do. Reading of your expenses in this case in the Times yesterday, I am enclosing $2 to help. Wish it was $200 but I am only a Civil War widow so the pocketbook is flat, but I am a tither and am very glad to send this and wish you every success.

MAUDE M. BIEDERMAN.

[From the Yakima (Wash.) Herald]

PLEASE, MR. TRUMAN

If Members of the United States Senate want more information than Senator HARRY P. CAIN has given them on Mon C. Wallgren's qualifications for the Chairmanship of the important National Security Resources Board, let them send a trusted colleague into this State for a week's investigation.

The Cain-Wallgren clash before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Thursday, had the earmarks of a political brawl, tending to divide members of the committee and perhaps Members of the Senate itself into party sides on the question of Mr. Wallgren's confirmation. That may have been inevitable, although we think Mr. CAIN's line of objections played into the hands of the adroit ex-governor, who is not inexpert in political free-for-alls.

Mr. Wallgren is defending himself and asserting his capability for the position on grounds of his experience as a Representative, Senator, and governor. During the period of his service in Congress, his contributions were in no way unusual. Indeed it was said by even his friends that his brains were in the person of his secretary and administrative assistant, HUGH B. MITCHELL, who succeeded him by appointment in the Senate and is now a Member of the lower House.

After a single 4-year term as governor, during which he was on his own and without the comforting coattails of Mr. Roosevelt for the first time, Mr. Wallgren was dumped from office in the midst of what amounted to a Democratic sweep of his own State. He became lame duck No. 1, only to have his old pal, President Truman, nominate him for one of the critical positions in governmental service.

Now there are jobs and there are jobs in the Federal structure—millions of jobs, in fact. Surely Mr. Truman could be persuaded to steer Mr. Wallgren into something else of comparable plush if not of equal importance to the welfare and security of the Nation.

We hope the necessity of this can be made clear in an atmosphere of calm reason and deliberation, and before "l'affair Wallgren" becomes another Pauley case which could make a martyr of our unlamented ex-governor.

[From the Astoria (Oreg.) Evening Budget of February 25, 1949]

OPPOSITION TO WALLGREN

Senator CAIN of Washington, is calling a lot of attention to the appointment of his fellow Washingtonian, ex-Gov. Mon Wallgren, as Chairman of the National Resources Board.

The Washington Senator has called Wallgren unfit and has even invoked the tradition of senatorial courtesy by declaring Wallgren personally obnoxious to him. Under senatorial courtesy Senators have refused to confirm an appointee from a Senator's own State whom he has designated personally obnoxious.

Senator CAIN seems likely to get nowhere with his objections, because Wallgren is an old friend of President Truman. The Sen-

ate is going to go along with the President rather than a Republican Senator in this matter.

President Truman definitely could have done a lot better than pick Wallgren, a lame duck repudiated by his own State in the face of general Democratic triumph at the polls last November, a man, too, without qualifying experience for his job.

The Wallgren appointment is a flagrant example of the bad political practice of naming a defeated condidate to public office, a practice in which both parties have indulged too often.

About the only qualification that Wallgren can present for his new job is that he is a Democrat.

[Excerpt from the letters-to-the-editor column of the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review]

SENATOR CAIN CONGRATULATED FOR WALLGREN ATTACK

To the EDITOR OF THE SPOKESMAN-REVIEW:

If there were more men such as Senator HARRY CAIN who would stand against such appointments as that of Mon C. Wallgren, who was recently made chairman of the National Securities Board, the United States would be in a much safer position.

Anyone who has followed Wallgren's career knows that he certainly isn't any brainstorm. As Governor of the State he left the finances in a precarious condition. During his 4 years communism has flourished. The population has grown, but with such a generous social-welfare set-up, why shouldn't it?

Senator CAIN is a Washingtonian, has followed Wallgren's career carefully, and isn't just making idle, erroneous statements.

The fact that Wallgren is a personal friend of President Truman spells nothing—so was Tom Pendergast.

Therefore before such a responsible post is filled, the President should search the land for a man who possesses great character, courage, capacity, and knowledge, as Senator CAIN stated.

IRIS B. GUTHRIE.

YAKIMA, WASH.

SEATTLE, WASH.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am an ordained minister and look at everything from the Christian viewpoint. Have known Wallgren 20 years. The papers are carrying headlines that he is not big enough for the job Truman is giving him.

Not only is he not good enough, but he is not honest enough.

I consider Wallgren a liar and a cheat and one void of principle and destitute of honor. Of all the Christian forces in this State I doubt if one—just one—will approve this appointment.

I have met ELLENDER, EASTLAND, PEPPER, TAFT, and GEORGE. Please convey this message to them and teach Pendergast's boy wonder to appoint real men.

DALE J. BENJAMIN.

TACOMA, WASH., *March 4, 1949.*

Senator HARRY CAIN:

I hope you can make it plain to the Senate that the upheaval in this State against Mon Wallgren was a moral upheaval. It was not a petty political one.

P. M. SNIDER.

PUYALLUP, WASH., *March 4, 1949.*

United States Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I admire greatly your fight against Wallgren's confirmation, this is not a political matter since right thinking people of both parties have repudiated him and are disgusted with his incompetence and low moral standards.

PAUL W. MILLER.

TACOMA, WASH., *March 4, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The moral forces of the State wish you success in your fight against confirmation of Wallgren.

HENRY G. SHAW,
President, Shaw Supply Co.

TACOMA, WASH., *February 27, 1949.*

Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: We are watching with interest your fight against the confirmation of Mon C. Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Informed people in the State of Washington are appalled that the President should seek to appoint a man so totally unfitted by education, experience, and general qualifications to a position affecting the future security of every American.

We, the undersigned, wholeheartedly support your fight to defeat this appointment.

Very truly yours,

Salem A. Nourse, Margaret B. Nourse, Tacoma; Dagny Norstrom, Seattle; Maude R. Skinner, Bertha M. Burge, Fred S. Henricksen, George O. Swasey, Clara S. Woodberry, Tacoma; C. J. Hertel, Ruth F. Hertel, Seattle; Frank M. Skinner, Tacoma.

TOPPENISH, WASH., *February 26, 1949.*

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I wish to add my protest to that of Senator HARRY CAIN re appointment of our former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren as chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

In my opinion he certainly demonstrated his unfitness and his lack of capacity to be Governor of this State, and he will be equally unsatisfactory in the post for which he has been appointed.

The test of his fitness for the job should not rest alone on his loyalty and friendship for the President, or on senatorial courtesy, but on his general ability and character. Many from this State will tell you he is sadly lacking in both.

Your committee wil best serve our country by refusing to endorse his nomination.

Sincerely,

B. R. STURM.

(Copy to Senator CAIN.)

FEBRUARY 28, 1949.

Senator HARRY P. CAIN.

DEAR SENATOR: In regard to your fight against the seating of Mon C. Wallgren for the important office which Harry Truman is appointing him, I, as a heavy taxpayer of the State of Washington, know what he has done to our State. We are paying $60,000 for the playhouse he is building in California and it is not of his salary either.

I know how every worker paid to his club so here is hoping you will have success in your fight.

I remain,

GEORGIA B. CLAY,

Tacoma, Wash.

LYNDEN, WASH., *March 1, 1949.*

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Congratulations on your exposure of Mon Wallgren. You have done your country a service in showing him as he really is—and, even though he should be appointed—the spotlight of public opinion has been turned in his direction. That in itself makes the investigation worth while

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE SUSSEX.

PORT ANGELES, WASH., *March 1, 1949.*

The Honorable HARRY P. CAIN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: It so happens I am just another of the thousands of voters from this State who are with you in your fight against confirmation of Mon C. Wallgren to so high a Government position, and which we feel he is utterly unqualified to fill. If we are to put such men in the highest positions of trust and responsibility in our Government, we must concede we have been in error in the thought that great an i good men should be elevated to such high position, and must now admit that just anybody is good enough to run the Government of these United States. If you fail, we have failed, and may the Lord help us.

Very truly yours,

GEO. H. NORTHUP.

WAPATO, WASH., *Sunday.*

To Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: I am watching your fight to keep former Governor Wallgren from being appointed as head of National Security Resources Board. I feel that everything you have brought up about him is true. Why should we have that type of man on the Government pay roll? He should be in the movies—good looking, well-groomed, polished in his manners, a good talker and pleasing to the ladies. Maybe Howard Hughes will give him a job as I noticed in some papers he attended some Hughes' parties during the war. This other job is entirely out of line, too big for him, as so many in the State of Washington realize. I do hope that you, Senator CAIN, are able to make the committee with Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, as chairman, realize it also.

I am enclosing some clippings cut from the editorial page of the Yakima Republic and the Seattle Times.

I am wondering if President Truman wouldn't be thankful to the committee if they voted "No." I think Mon is hanging on to his coattail. Why not send him to the Philippine Islands with very little money to spend.

In haste,

M. L. COLENSO.

Proposed Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article which appeared in the North Dakota Union Farmer published at Jamestown, N. Dak., February 21, 1949, dealing with the House concurrent resolution of the North Dakota State Legislature on MVA.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS BACK MVA

Governor Aandahl, the military brass hats, and the fat boys of the Power Trusts, have all but lost their fight to block a Missouri Valley Administration.

For nearly 5 years the governor has used his official position to put North Dakota in the anti-MVA column of Missouri Valley

States. For 5 years he has championed the Power Trusts and upheld the mud-plug construction program of the Army.

Last week nearly two-thirds of the senators and representatives of the thirty-first North Dakota Legislative Assembly told the governor how blatantly he has misrepresented the wishes of the people.

By a vote of 100 to 56 the two houses of the legislature completely repudiated the governor's stand on MVA.

A house concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the President to establish a Missouri Valley Authority was passed by the house 77 to 31. Then the measure went to the senate.

There the governor turned the political screws on the unhappy ROC senators and managed to kill the resolution 25 to 23. The governor managed to save face—but he lost the battle because the people of North Dakota, through their chosen representatives, have made it clearly understood that they demand an MVA.

In a telegram to the President last week, NDFU president, Glenn J. Talbott, pointed out these facts which prove that North Dakota is overwhelmingly in support of the proposed MVA bill now before Congress.

Talbott also pointed out that both North Dakota Senators have recently reconfirmed their clear and unmistakable support for MVA—and that one of the two Congressmen concur with the Senators.

Following is a text of Talbott's wire to President Truman:

"Overwhelming majority in thirty-first legislative assembly, now in session, voted last week in favor of establishing a Missouri Valley Administration. Recorded vote in journals show that 100 senators and representatives favored MVA, and only 56 opposed it. In the house, over two-thirds supported the resolution—the vote was 77 to 31. The senate killed the resolution by a mere 2 votes only after the Governor used extreme pressure and had made public his telegram to you requesting your support of the Pick-Sloan plan. This decisive vote in our State assembly, in addition to the support already given to MVA by both our United States Senators and one Congressman, completely repudiates the position taken by our Governor, Mr. Aandahl, who has long used his official position against a Missouri Valley Administration. In my opinion, this proves conclusively that North Dakota is behind you if you ask Congress at this time to pass the proposed MVA bill.

"GLENN J. TALBOTT,
"President, NDFU."

Senator MILTON YOUNG, the Governor's appointee, has never been able to stomach the Aandahl plan of selling out the Missouri River Valley to the brass hats and power boys. Last week, in a letter to the Farmers Union, Senator YOUNG reiterated his support for an MVA.

Thus it appears in North Dakota that Aandahl has lost and the people have won.

Labor-Management Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, March 5 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement on labor-management relations which I made on February 26 for publication in the Trainmen's News, official publication of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was enacted, I voted for its adoption, both on the original passage and to override the veto of the President. I felt then, as I feel now, that legislation was needed to strengthen the Wagner Labor Relations Act and to establish a proper balance between labor and management in seeking stable and peaceful industrial relations.

I did not then, and I do not now, favor all of the provisions of the so-called Taft-Hartley Act. I opposed certain rather extreme amendments offered on the floor of the Senate and which seemed to me to border on the drastic proposal once made by President Truman for drafting striking workers into the Army.

Many of my friends in labor disagreed with my support of the Taft-Hartley Act. I specifically stated to them at that time that "if experience shows that changes are needed, I am confident that there are enough reasonable and fair-minded Members of Congress who will make certain that such defects as time may reveal will be corrected." I am sympathetic to amending the act to bring about a better foundation of acceptance and understanding of the basic law.

It is my opinion that this is the situation in Congress today among temperate and reasonable Senators and Congressmen, notwithstanding the atmosphere of pressure and political expediency which appears to surround consideration of this vital legislation. I predict that a bill will be brought out of committee and adopted, possibly with some amendments on the floor, that will reflect the effort of Members of Congress, of both parties, to enact legislation that is fair to the workingman and to the employer and that is in keeping with the public interest.

In building the splendid industrial-relations record which we in Minnesota have enjoyed for the past 10 years, we learned that neither a law nor its administration, however good each may be, will alone create workable labor-management relations or assure industrial peace. A far more important factor is the attitude of members of these great groups of our economic life toward each other and toward their common responsibility to the public. In our complex society laws are essential. Good administration of just and reasonable laws is necessary. Yet it is the human factor which in the last analysis will determine the issue.

Unless we are ready to admit that our economic and social problems are beyond solution, and that we cannot solve our differences short of violence, we must strive to find the common ground upon which to stand. That is the task. It will not be met in one legislative enactment. It involves a continuous struggle for justice. It needs the wisdom born of experience.

However spirited and vigorous our differences of opinion may be, we in Congress face the supreme obligation of developing a pattern of laws conceived in that spirit.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Luther Burbank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on March 7, 1949:

It is an extreme pleasure for me to participate in a program honoring the one hundredth birthday of Luther Burbank and to congratulate the citizens of Santa Rosa for their interest in paying respect to one of its most widely known and respected former citizens.

My duties in Washington make my physical presence in Santa Rosa impossible to join with you in this program. Thanks to the radio, however, I am privileged to lend my voice to express my sentiments to the memory of one I honored and respected.

I knew Luther Burbank. I knew his foreman, Robert Gaylord. I worked as a youngster after school and during vacation, pulling weeds at his experimental farm located at Sebastopol. I saw this kindly, friendly, patient gentleman walking through rows of flowers, pollenizing, inspecting, selecting the improved species. His art to cross-pollenize plants and trees has never been excelled. His contribution to civilization transcends any credit that has ever been given him. His work had many disappointments. I recall his working several seasons to develop a pumpkin. When the plant matured, the pumpkins were about the size of an apple, but the leaves were the most beautiful variegated specimen you could expect to see.

Luther Burbank was born March 7, 1849, and came to Sonoma County from his eastern place of birth because of the fine soil conditions and the mild seasonal climate, a place where he could use his skill and professional aptitude to work with the trees, vines, and flowers that could be raised under normal climatic conditions.

His early work was fraught with hardship, financial difficulties, and a reluctance to accept his achievements. Those were times when financial assistance was difficult to secure, when only things of proven worth were accepted. Luther Burbank rose above those obstacles and continued with a fervent desire and a will to accomplish which carried him through to success and renown. When once his worth was established, many came to his assistance, which permitted the product of his work to be universally accepted and made available to the peoples of the world.

The works of Luther Burbank will live in the minds of countless generations to come, for his contributions to our civilization, such as the development of the Burbank potato, the resistant grape root and the hundreds of varieties of fruit. The untold varieties of flowers have given to the world many of the beauties we enjoy.

Luther Burbank has been signally honored on many occasions. As a member of the California State Legislature, it was my privilege to pay honor to him in assisting in the enactment into law of Arbor Day in California, which is his natal day. The Federal Government of the United States also acted by issuing a special Luther Burbank postage stamp with his portrait a few years ago.

It is altogether fitting and appropriate that we today honor this great man. I am proud to have personally known Luther Burbank and am honored to add my humble remarks to those of many others at this time.

May this custom by his fellow townsmen continue to keep alive the memory of Luther Burbank—our distinguished Sonoma County citizen and the benefactor of all humanity.

LUTHER BURBANK, THE PLANT WIZARD

(By Aubrey Drury)

March 7, 1849, was Luther Burbank's birthday; and the date is worthy of remembrance, for March 7 in California is now Arbor Day, set aside for the planting of trees. It is likewise Conservation Day, the beginning of Conservation Week—March 7 to 14—and this year the observance of the centennial

of Luther Burbank's birth will add even greater public interest to the occasion.

Burbank came to California from his native New England in 1875 settling in Santa Rosa, and here his work in hybridization, propagation, and development of new flowers, fruits and vegetables attracted wider and wider attention.

For 50 years this creative gardener labored in his Santa Rosa nursery. It was a work-garden, not a show garden; but the great of the earth come hither to visit him. He and Thomas Edison and Henry Ford were cronies, and the three enjoyed a series of memorable meetings. Burbank was recognized not only as an experimental botanist of high genius but was looked on also as one of the leading citizens of his time. Many public movements received his support, such as the preservation of the representative groves of the giant California redwood, which he termed "the most perfect vegetable growth."

His countenance had a sweetness of expression, combined with a keen-eyed intelligence. "Cultivate kind, gentle, loving thoughts towards every person and animal," he had advised schoolchildren, "and even plants, stars, oceans, rivers, and hills. You will find yourself growing more happy each day, and with happiness comes health and everything you want." What wonder that Luther Burbank was a lasting inspiration for America.

He passed away in 1926, and at his request he was buried beneath a towering two-branched Cedar of Lebanon in his gardens. Burbank himself planted the seed, sent to him from the Holy Land.

Of Luther Burbank, one who knew him loved him well, wrote: "Nature seems to have chosen him to be her schoolmaster for the training of the lowly plant and leading it to a higher life. I cannot conceive of a more useful man nor of a better example of the highest type that has as yet been reached by the Aryan race of men." That was the tribute of Thomas A. Edison.

[From the Humboldt Times of Eureka, Calif.]

LUTHER BURBANK REDWOOD GROVE

Californians, each year, pay honor to the memory of Luther Burbank on March 7, which date is observed as Arbor Day in the State by act of the State legislature. It is significant, also, that Arbor Day in California each year marks the advent of the opening of Conservation Week, the observance through which Californians join in emphasizing the importance of conserving and protecting our great natural resources. And in many other ways, particularly in the northern sector of California, the State honors this great horticulturist whose genius contributed so much to the industries associated with the soil and its fruits.

Thus it is that residents of the redwood empire are expected to unanimously endorse a new movement which would further enshrine Luther Burbank's name and achievements for all time, through the establishment of a Luther Burbank Redwood Grove somewhere in the vast redwood forests of the north coast country.

As all California people know quite well, Burbank for a great many years made his home in Santa Rosa, where he carried on the innumerable experiments that have made his name a symbol for research and experimentation in the agricultural industry. His home still remains standing in the Sonoma County seat, proudly acknowledged by the people of that city as one of their civic shrines. In addition, Santa Rosa has created a public park bearing the name of the great scientist, one of the beauty spots of a beautiful community.

Throughout his lifetime and during his long career as a scientist, Burbank entertained a deep and enduring love for the redwoods, and a keen interest in the species and its preservation. Terming the redwood tree as "the most perfect vegetable growth," Burbank was among the first to urge saving of at least some of the finer groves for the enjoyment of future generations—long before sentiment on that score began to crystallize on a wide scale.

It is, therefore, most appropriate that his memory be kept alive, along with the redwoods he loved so dearly, through the medium of a memorial grove. The surprising thing is that this has not been done long before this time.

Throughout the State-park system in Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties there are, of course, a great many memorial groves of the type and character embodied in the present movement. By way of information, these memorial groves have been set aside, for the most part, through contributions from private persons or agencies, the funds being matched by the State of California. It is through this method that the park system has been able to acquire a great many of the fine tracts now set aside as parks, largely through the planning and effort of the Save-The-Redwoods League. In this particular instance, it may be properly pointed out that there must exist many fine groves, not yet designated as memorials, which could be utilized for this purpose even without the creation of a joint memorial fund for this specific purpose.

In any event, regardless of the financing plan employed, the proposal certainly strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of all northern California people, and one that is singularly significant in view of the close associations involved.

Cardinal Mindszenty and John Paul Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, James Patrick McGovern, of the District of Columbia bar, a captain in the American Expeditionary Forces during the First World War, and the special Washington representative of the Arizona Daily Sun, has written a poem, released recently, which he has dedicated to every patriot who defends his altar and his hearth and the land that gave him birth. I include same and a statement made by him on Capt. John Paul Jones in my remarks:

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND JOHN PAUL JONES

The cardinal and captain, martyrs both,
Seem realms apart, and yet reveal the same
Grim fate as spokesmen who in freedom's name
Unveil the Russian guile their spirits loathe.
Jones, the fighter, won by Catherine's gin,
Went as admiral to fight the Turks,
While she and all her pack, as if with dirks,
Slandered him with lies of their own sin.
Stalin as well as Catherine must fear
The truths from men iron curtains cannot seal;
He most must shun Christ's servants who reveal
What their hearts prompt as to the life-blood dear.
And if such martyrs, crucified, look back,
Their bodies, not their souls, cry on the rack.

In making public his sonnet, Captain McGovern said:

For those Americans who know the history of John Paul Jones in Russia, the fate of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and of other religious leaders in satellites of the Soviet Union should be wholly understandable as reflecting a ruthless despotism equally native to both czarist and communistic Russia. The lust for power and the relentless means to achieve it, including every method of guile and hypocrisy, remain the same. That we are often indifferent and sometimes blind in the face of basic parallels of history, obscured by external variations, is an ironic commentary upon the millions of students in our colleges and upon many of our leaders in industry, science, and politics who still live in the tradition of Henry Ford and his smug statement, "History is bunk."

Jones was lured to enter the service of Russia under every promise of an independent command and of support by the Empress Catherine and by her commander in chief, Potemkin. In no way were such promises kept. The truth of his naval services was perverted into lies by an iron curtain which resulted in the confiscation of his letters to and from Thomas Jefferson, our Minister to France, and by the propaganda of Potemkin and others which showed malice and unscrupulousness beyond conception. And to crown professional by private calumny, the enemies of Jones, with the connivance of the Empress, fabricated against him a fantastic tale of a moral lapse, which, in view of the utterly unmoral character of Catherine and her court, clearly had only slander for its purpose as one of the tricks in the bag employed by her—as she later confessed—to remove him from the Russian scene. Brought to trial, Jones was denied a lawyer; and the charges were made by disreputable witnesses and were garbled to suit the court. When the French Ambassador interceded for Jones, Catherine stopped the trial in her fear of international repercussions. In short, the private as well as professional life of John Paul Jones in Russia was a travesty of justice; but this aspect, often so ridiculous as to be comic, cast a tragic shadow upon his last years.

"The first duty of a man is to respect his own character," said Jones. Truth and honor, for which both Cardinal Mindszenty and John Paul Jones stood in their separate spheres of life, have suffered comparable hate at the hands of Russian enemies. An iron curtain prevented them from speaking to the outside world. On the other hand, intensive propaganda blazoned lies about them. Their court trials were a mockery. The fabrication against them has been such that even what they are supposed to have said and written cannot always be counted upon as authentic. The religious leader and the naval officer bear the same evidence, in the perspective of Russian history, of martyrdom to truth and freedom.

Settlement of Industrial Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT M. COLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following

article by Mr. Harry A. Nightingale, of Topeka, Kans.:

In many of life's experiences valuable lessons may be learned if we keep our minds in a receptive mood to adequately appreciate their value.

Quite recently I had the experience of serving as a juror in the United States District Court for the District of Kansas, presided over by Judge Arthur J. Mellott. As I listened to the learned judge in his advice and instructions to the jury I was deeply impressed by his wisdom, sincere sense of justice, and generous amount of good common sense. The thought that occurred to me as I sat in the courtroom follows:

Surely there must be some way to avoid the costly strikes that are taking place in this country. They are nothing more nor less than cold wars with Americans on both sides fighting each other, and in a democracy such as ours this is inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our Government. It is as if brothers were fighting each other. Industry and labor bear almost the same relationship to each other as husband and wife. A happy harmonious atmosphere cannot exist when the principals involved are constantly harboring deep hatred and bitterness toward each other. A continuance of this emotional disorder eventually leads to disturbing and frequently tragic consequences. These conflicting differences can and should be adjusted by wise and conscientious umpires; men like Judge Mellott and Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, of whom we have goodly numbers in this country.

What I have in mind is the creation of arbitration boards throughout the land, consisting of men and women who bear the highest reputations for intellectual capacity, sound wisdom, unquestioned integrity, and moral characteristics that we expect to find in people who have proved themselves to be outstanding in the field of human relations.

It should be the law of the land that strikes are illegal, that all differences between labor and management must be settled by arbitration.

Unless we are willing to concede that human relations cannot be improved and that reason has no place in our lives, then we must be ready and willing to find a remedy for the disease (strikes) that has taken such a heavy toll in injuries, economic loss, human suffering, and the many other disturbing factors that accrue as a result of strikes. Let's use the intelligence with which America has been so richly endowed in the interests of those (labor and management) who are so important to the continued progress that has made us the leader among nations. As Abraham Lincoln so wisely said: "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

HARRY R. NIGHTINGALE.

Extension Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Dean Lippert Ellis, of the University of Arkansas, is doing a masterful piece of work for soil conservation and the Extension Service at the university. A few days ago I received a letter from him outlining the program and making suggestions. Under unanimous consent, I insert his letter and the analyses as a part of my remarks:

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE,
Fayetteville, February 25, 1949.

Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE TRIMBLE: At an early date you will no doubt be giving consideration to appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1950. Among others, the President's budget includes items for Federal grants-in-aid for research at the State agricultural experiment stations.

One item in the budget is of particular interest to us at this time. I refer to the item under title I, section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act in the amount of $5,000,000. This is an increase of $1,750,000 over the appropriation for the present fiscal year and represents the full amount authorized for the second year of the act. You will remember, however, that next year will actually be the third year in which appropriations have been made under the Research and Marketing Act.

It occurred to me that at the time you are considering this item in the budget you might be interested in having at hand some information with respect to the program of research carried on at the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station with research and marketing funds and also of the proposed new work which we would carry on if additional funds were appropriated under title I, section 9 of the Research and Marketing Act. During the current fiscal year (1949) the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station will receive $64,190.55 under that act. If the proposed increase of $1,750,000 is voted, the Arkansas station will receive an additional $34,564.15 or a total of $98,754.70 for the fiscal year 1950.

We believe that we have been able to make excellent use of these funds up to date and we also believe that we could make excellent use of any new funds which might be made available to us. For your information I am enclosing a table listing the projects supported under research and marketing funds during the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, as well as the projects which we propose to undertake if additional research and marketing funds are made available to us for use in the fiscal year 1950. This same information has been furnished to Mr. R. W. Trullinger, Chief, Office of Experiment Stations, who is assembling information for the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I trust that you are able to find the time to read this material.

I wish it were possible to review each of these projects with you personally, but since that is not possible, I want to call your attention to a few projects which are particularly significant. You will note that projects 273 and 276 have to do with two aspects of the broiler industry which is so important in northwestern Arkansas. The farm income from that source in 1947 was $14,112,000, and we believe the figure will be somewhat higher for 1948. Our research program needs to anticipate problems with which producers will be faced if we are to fulfill our obligation to farm people.

One might dwell at length upon the benefits which may accrue to the dairy industry of Arkansas as a result of the work on project 296. If we can succeed in improving methods of handling dairy-sire semen to insure its livability, the value to the dairy industry will run into millions of dollars.

Finally, may I call your attention to the proposed project on supplemental irrigation in Arkansas. As you know, farmers have already expressed a great deal of interest in this subject and many are trying it on their farms. Last season at the Rice branch experiment station at Stuttgart we produced 133 bushels of corn per acre with irrigation and fertilization while the production on the nonirrigated plots was 53.6 bushel per acre. Varieties adapted to irrigation, fertilization for maximum yields, and time and rate of application of water for efficient use are unknown and need to be given thorough study under Arkansas conditions.

If after going over this material you have any questions, I want to assure you that we would be glad to answer them and furnish any additional information which you would like to have.

Sincerely yours,

LIPPERT S. ELLIS,
Dean and Director.

Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station research program under research and marketing funds (Secs. 9b1 and 9b2)

Project title and justification	1948 expenditure	1949 allotment	1950 estimated allotment
S-4, -275. Family food consumption in typical cotton communities of Arkansas. A record of the food consumed by 125 farm families for a week has been secured. These data will be used to determine food habits and nutritional value of diets in order to make recommendations for the improvement of diets.	$4,334.62	$1,550.00 5,100.00	$3,000.00
SM-1, -277. Marketing cotton from 1 variety and nonorganized communities in Arkansas. Cotton accounts for approximately one-half of the Arkansas cash farm income. The manner in which cotton is marketed, therefore, means much to Arkansas farmers. The marketing of cotton from organized and unorganized communities is being studied to determine improvements which may be made in the cotton-marketing system.	1,719.35	2,713.00 3,050.08	3,500.00
SM-6, -278. Egg-marketing problems with special emphasis on the handling of seasonal surpluses. Eggs represent a source of cash income for nearly all Arkansas farmers. This project seeks to describe and seek solutions to egg-marketing problems. Such problems, as brought out by the study to date, include complete disregard of variation in quality as measured by prices paid farmers, lack of proper equipment for handling eggs by local buyers, and the lack of proper storage facilities for eggs by both the farmer and first buyer.	3,402.71	3,888.00 4,225.00	4,000.00
SM-3, -279. Regional central market and consumer preferences for tomatoes, in relation to varieties, grades, preparation, pack, methods of transportation including refrigeration, and condition. Certain areas of Arkansas are well adapted to the production of tomatoes, but little is known with respect to consumer preferences or other marketing factors. A field study of the St. Louis market has been completed and the data are now being analyzed. It should indicate the type of recommendations that should be made to Arkansas producers.	511.36	2,486.50 2,486.50	500.00

Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station research program under research and marketing funds (Secs. 9b1 and 9b2)—Continued

Project title and justification	1948 expenditure	1949 allotment	1950 estimated allotment
S-5, -281. The effects of wide variations in soils and weather conditions on the nutritive value of vegetables. The object of this project is to determine the influence of soil and weather conditions on the vitamin and mineral content of vegetables. Information secured in this study should enable experiment-station workers to recommend farm practices that will be likely to produce vegetables of the highest nutritional value.	$4,633.54	$5,100.00 6,400.00	$3,400.00
S-8, -282. Farm home improvement through practices and methods for obtaining adequate farm housing at low cost. The engineering phases of this project have not been activated because it has been impossible to hire personnel. However, a well-trained engineer has been hired and he will report for duty July 1, 1949. Work will be carried on by both agricultural engineers and home economists. Four experimental houses have been designed and are to be built at our branch experiment stations to determine the best and cheapest construction under Arkansas farm conditions. The home economists have studied or will study 250 farm homes in an effort to determine the best functional type of home for farm conditions.	199.56	10,088.00 10,088.00	10,305.62
271. Control of weevil injury to beans and cowpeas. To find practical control and preventive measures, insecticidal or cultural, for pea and bean weevils. Peas and beans harvested by market gardeners in Arkansas are rather generally infested when the crop goes into storage. This necessitates prompt and frequent fumigation. Ways and means of preventing the infestation in the field are needed.	1,600.00	800.00	800.00
272. Biology and control of the plum curculio. To find effective control measures for the plum curculio to enable peach growers to produce a high-grade marketable product. The yield and quality of peaches, a major crop in certain areas of Arkansas, have been greatly lowered by the plum curculio. A need exists for a satisfactory control of this insect to diminish losses of income.	3,639.26	2,800.00	3,000.00
273. Nutrition of chickens for efficient commercial broiler production. To increase the efficiency of commercial broiler production through more economical feeding practices. Newly developed rapid-growing strains of chickens have introduced a new problem in poultry nutrition. This problem is of prime importance in commercial broiler-producing areas, such as northwest Arkansas. Rations which adequately supply the growth requirements of egg-production strains are definitely deficient for newly developed meat-type strains.	9,168.49	3,200.00	4,200.00
274. Development of forage and grain types of sorghum. To develop for Arkansas conditions high yielding, heat resistant varieties of grain sorghum adapted to mechanical harvesting. The continued diversification of agriculture in the State, with emphasis on livestock enterprises, is dependent upon the production of increased quantities of forage and grain. At present, Arkansas is a big importer of livestock feeds and the development of sorghums adapted to the State would materially increase the feed supply.	6,700.00	6,700.00	6,700.00
276. The etiology and control of a new disease of young broilers. To determine a new disease which has appeared in young broilers and to develop methods of control. A multi-million-dollar broiler industry is threatened with extinction by an unknown disease which has infected young broilers. A control measure is needed to prevent large losses in farm income.	3,227.85	2,700.00	4,718.60
291. Marketing milled rice with emphasis on costs, margins, and trade and consumer preference. To analyze costs for the various methods of marketing milled rice from mill to consumer; to determine consumer preferences for rice in relation to grain type and type of milling; to determine trade and consumer preference in relation to income and trade services. Rice acreage and production increased in Arkansas upon anticipated outlets as a result of food requirements for World War II. Unless consumption can be increased through new outlets, the rice farmers and industry face an unfavorable future for profitable production.	2,348.48	3,855.00	3,500.00
292. Planning cooperative research under title I of the Research and Marketing Act. To permit travel where expenditures from usual sources would be inappropriate. Regional approach to the solution of agricultural problems affords the most efficient utilization of funds. Restriction on travel would hinder the development of the regional approach.	373.25	500.00 800.00	500.00
293. A study of the need for and development of plans for farmer and wholesale producer market facilities in Greater Little Rock, Ark. To appraise existing marketing facilities in Greater Little Rock and to determine the additional facilities needed. As a result of the above situation, civic and trade interest of Little Rock requested the services of various agencies, including the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, in making a survey of existing conditions and to develop plans for a market.	935.30	350.00	None
296. Effects of processing, shipment, and storage on the livability of dairy-sire semen under Arkansas conditions. To study the factors affecting quality during collection, processing, and shipping of dairy-sire semen and develop new and improved methods to increase the efficiency of artificially inseminating dairy cows on Arkansas farms. It has been determined that the quality of semen is affected by transportation. Mechanical methods with temperature controls have been developed to duplicate shipping conditions as nearly as possible. The results show that the bulls producing semen of poor shipping ability as determined by the laboratory mechanical vibrations, also have low conception rates in dairy herds when the semen from which samples were taken was used by inseminators.	2,288.89	2,292.00	3,292.00
304. A histological and bacteriological study of the effects of various diets on pigs. To determine causes of death in pigs fed various diets. In experiments on swine nutrition at this station, pronounced morphological and physiological disturbances were observed. In some cases death resulted. These studies will contribute information upon which the producer can base his selection of the most economical feeds for maximum production, growth and finish.		1,900.00 2,400.00	4,400.00
306. Nutrition of swine. Objective is to determine the unknown nutritional requirements of pigs in the various stages of growth and in later life during reproduction. Almost 50 percent of the pigs farrowed never reach market. The greatest loss occurs during farrowing and suckling time and the financial loss to swine producers is millions of dollars each year. Malnutrition plays an important role in this great loss. During the early studies of this project, it has been found that certain sugars or sources of sugars when used in the rations of very young pigs cause death within 7 days. Continued studies may find other causes or contributing factors to the loss of millions of dollars in the swine herds in the United States.		5,700.00	5,700.00
Dairy breeding (project to be submitted). To develop 2 new highly efficient producing strains of Jersey cattle and 1 Holstein especially adapted to conditions in Southern States. This work will be part of the southern regional dairy cattle breeding project, which is to help take advantage of the favorable climatic conditions for dairying in the South so that dairy enterprise can be made part of the agriculture enterprises used in diversification to replace income formerly obtained from cotton.		None	8,000.00
Irrigation to supplement rainfall in humid areas (project to be submitted). To measure and evaluate the production of maximum yields through supplemental irrigation, applications of fertilizers, and soil-management practices in humid areas. Preliminary work gave large yield increases for irrigation under humid conditions during frequent drought periods. Maintenance of soil moisture with good soil fertility practices should permit maintenance of large yields of food, feed, and fiber crops needed for the national welfare, such as future population expansion, without impairment to the productivity of soils.		14,508.00	15,000.00
Broiler marketing—margins and costs in marketing broilers (project to be submitted). To analyze the components of the demand for broilers in order to eliminate wide fluctuations in price and insure stable agriculture enterprise. Increased production from 6,000,000 to 16,000,000 broilers in 10 years has created marketing difficulties. Since broilers are handled through specialized outlets, a need exists to determine the components so that fluctuations in price and demand can be eliminated.		None	2,000.00
Dairy marketing—seasonality of milk prices and supplies (project to be submitted). Object is to determine factors causing seasonal fluctuations in milk supplies and price and to determine methods of reducing wide fluctuations. Alternate periods of surplus and scarcity of milk supplies in the South contribute to unstable business relations between producers and plant operators. Idle assembling, processing, and distribution facilities result in lower prices to producers and unsatisfactory market relations.		1,000.00	5,000.00
Livestock marketing—outlets, practices, and comparative costs (project to be submitted). Object is to determine methods of improvement of marketing livestock in Arkansas. With increased emphasis placed on production of livestock in Arkansas, some means of eliminating the problems and improving the present market structure and practices are needed to provide a satisfactory market outlet for livestock producers.		None	2,238.48
Spoilage in the processing of frozen foods (project to be submitted). To determine the influence of biological activity during processing and in storage on quality of frozen foods. Low quality of home-processed frozen foods and inferior quality in some commercial packs may be associated with biological activity. Means of preventing off-quality resulting from this cause may stimulate conservation of food and provide new source of farm income.		None	2,000.00

Air Academy Should Be Located in Southern California

REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I notice in the press that Defense Secretary Forrestal has recommended that the proposal for an Air Academy for the training of air officers be given serious consideration, the same as the training we give the boys in Annapolis for the Navy and in West Point for the Army.

In that connection, may I state that one of the first bills I introduced in this Congress, H. R. 80, was for an Air Academy, and I specified that it should be located in southern California. I said that for the reason that I believe it is the most desirable location, because of the year-round flying facilities, because of the advances made in aviation in southern California, because of the technical studies that are being conducted by the institutions in southern California, and because of the great production of aircraft in southern California during this last war.

I think we do need an Air Academy, especially now that we are advancing into greater air protection for the Nation. We cannot train these men properly in the two Academies, at West Point and Annapolis, because of the highly technical character of their training.

I hope that when the bill comes before the Committees on Armed Services of the House and Senate, they will give serious consideration to southern California as the location of this very necessary military institution as part of our armed forces and our national defense.

At the present time the Air Force has requested that a percentage of the graduating classes of both Annapolis and West Point be permitted to enter the Air Force to supply necessary officers for that service. However, with the demand for more officers in both the Army and the Navy, this plan could only serve as a temporary measure to obtain Air Force officers.

It is, therefore, evident that an Air Force Academy is necessary since the Air Force has been established as an independent branch of our armed services for the training of its officers. I have introduced H. R. 80 for this purpose, and my bill would create an academy to be operated on the same general lines as the other two service academies. The Air Force Academy would provide a 4-year course which would confer the degree of bachelor of science upon each graduate, and would give training to develop in the cadet the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continued development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Air Force including the special training to develop skills in the field of military aviation.

Modern warfare requires intensive training for the men who are to assume the responsibilities of officers in the United States Air Force, and we need an Air Force Academy which will furnish the necessary comprehensive training for aviation cadets.

In my bill I have indicated that the proposed Academy should be located in southern California where the ideal climate can supply more hours per year suitable for flight training on land and over sea than any other section of the Nation, and has many sites which would be suitable for the Air Force Academy.

The following are the provisions of my bill, H. R. 80:

A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Department of the Air Force the United States Air Force Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") for the purpose of training candidates for commissions as officers of the United States Air Force. The Academy shall be located in the southern district of the State of California.

SEC. 2. Applicants shall be selected for admission to the Academy in the same manner as applicants are selected for admission to the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 3. Cadets at the United States Air Academy shall receive the same pay, allowances, and perquisites as are now provided for cadets at the United States Military Academy.

SEC. 4. The instruction and training program for each cadet shall extend over a 4-year period and shall be designed to develop in him the qualities and attributes essential to his progressive and continued development throughout a lifetime career as an officer of the Air Force. Courses shall be of such scope and content as the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine, and shall be designed to provide a balanced and liberal education in the arts and sciences and a broad basic military education, and to develop special skills in the field of military aviation. Any cadet may be dismissed from the Air Force at any time he is found by the Superintendent of the Academy to be unsatisfactory in either studies or conduct, or not adapted for a career in the Air Force.

SEC. 5. The Superintendent of the Academy may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Air Force may prescribe, confer the degree of bachelor of science upon each graduate of the Academy, from and after the date of the accrediting of the Academy by the Association of American Universities.

SEC. 6. The Academy shall be under the command of a Superintendent, to be selected by the Secretary of the Air Force from among the officers of the Air Force. The instructors at the Academy shall be officers of the Air Force detailed to such duty. Such other officers and enlisted men of the Air Force as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act shall be detailed to duty at the Academy.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to establish and maintain such Academy.

Dollars and Cents

REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, groups are continually asking the Congress for more and more salary increases, even at a time when the people in general of the United States are taking a cut in their incomes and while other millions are losing their jobs. Let us keep in mind the facts as to the annual income of our people.

In the New York Times of Sunday, February 13, 1949, appeared an article by Mr. C. F. Hughes, which quotes the Census Bureau as follows:

The gist of the present business situation appears to be found in a routine report of the Census Bureau, and not in the many high-sounding explanations offered elsewhere. This report revealed last week that the average income of families in this country was $3,000 in 1947. The distribution of this income among some 37,000,000 families, however, was as follows:

Families:

4,000,000	Under $1,000
6,000,000	$1,000–$2,000
8,000,000	$2,000–$3,000
8,000,000	$3,000–$4,000
4,000,000	$4,000–$5,000
3,000,000	$5,000–$6,000
3,000,000	$6,000–$10,000
1,000,000	$10,000 and over.

These are figures covering families and not individuals.

The average for 68,000,000 individuals was $1,800 a year.

The male average was $2,200 as against $1,000 for women.

Further, let us analyze the following editorial by Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange, that appeared in the February issue of the National Grange Monthly, and captioned "Complex farm problems":

COMPLEX FARM PROBLEMS

(By Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange)

One of the complexities of the farm problem which is too little recognized lies in the wide diversity of farm units. The Agricultural Census of 1945 developed some figures which emphasize this point.

Annual income per farm	Economic classes of farmers			
	Number of farms	Farm population	Farm acreage	Gross value of farm products
	Per cent	*Per cent*	*Per cent*	*Per cent*
Over $20,000	1.7	3.7	25.8	21.9
$8,000 to $19,999	7.0	8.5	18.3	23.5
$3,000 to $7,999	20.0	21.3	24.1	30.0
$1,200 to $2,999	28.4	28.5	18.1	17.1
Subtotal	57.1	62.0	86.3	92.5
Less than $1,200	42.9	38.0	13.7	7.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

It will be seen that a little over half of our people produced 92.5 percent of our farm products. The problem lies with the other half, where 42.9 percent of the people produced only 7.5 percent of the products. It is true that many of these are part-time farmers or nominal farmers, but a great many of them are dependent solely on farming for a livelihood, and in tough times probably most of them are thus dependent. Roughly, it can be said that in the case of half our farmers the problem is an economic problem which can be met by assuring a fair price for the products of the farm. Most of the other half produce so little that a reasonable farm price is still insufficient to give them a satisfactory standard of living, so their problem is a social problem which must be met in

some way quite different from that of the top half.

If we assume that a fair price will meet the problems of the top half, we have the problem only half solved. The more difficult part of the problem is how to meet the needs of the bottom half. This, generally, is a neglected field in the search for farm relief.

There are two general lines of approach to the problem in this low-income field. The first approach is to find ways of increasing the income from farm production, and the second approach is to find the means of securing income from other than farm production.

In the first class will be found those farmers who could increase their production on their present holdings if they pursued the best farm practices and had adequate stock and equipment. Education and credit accompanied by a certain amount of supervision are the best remedies in this field. Very frequently the need is for more land. Often this can be met by the extension of supervised credit, but where it cannot be so met, the case distinctly falls into class 2, requiring supplemental income.

Class 2 cases, defined as those requiring outside income, are by no means all distress cases. Many part-time farmers enjoy stable and substantial incomes and would much prefer their diversified occupation which permits both indoor and outdoor work. Unfortunately, adequate statistics are not available indicating the economic status of part-time farmers. There is, however, a group of substantial size who are essentially trying to make their living from farming on units so small that they have to seek outside work in order to obtain even low living standards. The establishment of small industries in rural areas not only frequently proves a blessing to such, but also often solves the labor problem of the industry so established.

In this field probably lies the greatest opportunity for relief from poverty in the general field of agriculture. Here lies the little used opportunity for betterment through some private or public agency that will assist in locating industries in areas which would be mutually profitable to the industry and to the part-time farmer, and which will undertake as a part of such a program the readjustment of farm acreage reducing the undersized farm to a yet smaller farm, but one adapted to part-time farming, and adding to other undersized farms to make of them practical-sized farm units.

Such readjustment requires not only skillful planning, but the skillful use of vocational education and supervision, credit and real salesmanship. We repeat this is an altogether different problem from the problem of price stabilization which concerns chiefly about half of our farmers who produce over 90 percent of the Nation's food products.

It should be apparent to any thinking person that with the above facts in mind, that, first of all, we should not be raising Federal salaries for those already in the higher income brackets, and, secondly, we should not be adding to the costs of the Government at a time when the net income of the people is being drastically reduced. Many of the people who feel that they should be skyrocketed into the higher income class never earned a comparable income in private life. Do you know of anyone who can convincingly maintain that many of the beneficiaries of the Federal pay increases can secure equal salaries outside of Government? This also applies to members of the President's Cabinet.

We should keep in mind that people with $600 incomes are not only asked to pay Federal taxes, but are also compelled to pay the same excise taxes as the high-income groups pay. When it is all said and done, the man who works and makes a contribution to society, is also the one who carries the tax burden.

BY WHOM ARE FEDERAL TAXES PAID?

According to a United States Treasury report the fiscal year 1948 showed:

Direct taxes on individuals:	
Income tax withheld	$11,436,000,000
Income tax not withheld	9,560,000,000
Estate and gift taxes	899,000,000
Total	21,896,000,000
Direct taxes on corporations:	
Income tax	9,852,000,000
Excess-profits tax	305,000,000
Declared value excess-profits tax	18,000,000
Total	10,174,000,000
Excise taxes	7,402,000,000
Employment taxes	2,396,000,000
Customs	422,000,000
Miscellaneous receipts	4,072,000,000
Total	14,292,000,000
Total receipts	46,362,000,000
Deduct appropriation to Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund	1,616,000,000
Net budget receipts	44,746,000,000

There are many interesting facts revealed by these figures. Among them is the fact that $21,896,000 represents the direct tax on individuals.

HOW ARE THE TAXES SPENT?

A large percentage of these billions is spent to pay for past, present, and future wars, that is, between 75 percent and 80 percent of the total amount collected is being used for this purpose. While some economies may be made, many of these expenditures are fixed by law. However, beyond a doubt, there is an opportunity to reduce Federal expenditures in the nondefense activities of the Government. These expenditures for nondefense purposes represent 20 to 25 percent of the total tax collected, and could beyond a doubt be reduced without any hardship to the public.

We, at least, should not be misled into increasing Federal salaries at this time, especially the high salaried group in the Government. We most assuredly should not do so while millions are being added to the unemployed rolls.

Our objective should be to keep our country strong by encouraging employment. We should do something to increase employment, and not spend more of the Federal funds for the benefit of the few in the higher brackets at the expense of the many.

So long as groups receiving $10,000 to $15,000, are now asking for $25,000 it should be borne in mind that they now belong to the group of the million families in the top bracket, and that the other 36,000,000 families in the lower brackets will be doing much of the paying.

The Eighty-first Congress has already doubled the President's take-home pay. Let us not follow up with still more legislation benefiting the few at the expense of the many.

Why, may I ask, should any congressional committee be spending its time on legislation to increase salaries from $15,000 to $25,000 per year when the increase asked is more than three times the income of the average family in the United States?

Why, may I ask, should any congressional committee be spending its time on legislation to increase the salaries of Government employees in the higher income bracket of $10,000 per year, and an amount which is eight times that received by 42 percent of the farmers of our Nation?

The Communist Party

REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, the die has been cast. The Communist Party in the United States has declared itself. It is now evident that every member of the Communist Party is pledged to the overthrow of the American Government. This outright declaration of intention must determine us to tighten our laws to curb subversive activities.

Are we to have continued cases of treachery such as that allegedly committed by an employee of our Government?

The American people will not stand for Soviet destruction of our laws of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include the following editorial, which appeared in the Evening Star on March 5, 1949, entitled "Communism Takes Its Stand."

COMMUNISM TAKES ITS STAND

The world has evidence again of the fifth-column nature of the world-wide Communist conspiracy which has its roots in Moscow. When Moscow pulls the strings, the puppets respond as the party line of the moment dictates. This time, for not too obscure reasons, the party line requires concerted warnings that in event of a war between Russia and the capitalist nations, the Communists will take their stand with Russia. The warnings have echoed around the globe within the past few days, with the American Communist Party joining in the refrain in obvious obedience to the orders sent out from Moscow.

There will be some fellow travelers and some other admirers of communism who will be embarrassed and even alarmed by this turn of events. Henry Wallace is reported to have indicated disapproval and surprise. But no one who has taken the trouble to inform themselves on Communistic doctrines and history should be surprised to learn that true Communists, whether they are in France, Italy, Canada, South America or the United States, owe an overriding allegiance to Russia, mother country of communism. The only really surprising aspect to the current parroting of the warning first voiced by Maurice Thorez in France is that the Communist Party of the United States should have made its long-standing attitude public. Perhaps it had no alternative but to obey. But the

blunt, though somewhat equivocal, admission of party leaders that American Communists would be on Russia's side if Wall Street should succeed in plunging the world into war is bound to stimulate demands for drastic anti-Communist legislation. The chances of passage of stronger antisubversive and spy laws are greater now than they would have been if the Communists had kept their plans to themselves. And if the timing of the threats was intended to disrupt efforts to negotiate the Atlantic pact, they seem destined to fail, if the reactions of Norway and Denmark are any criterion.

Communism at last is in the open. The American Communist Party no longer can expect anyone but the most naive to believe that this organization is just a domestic political party, devoted to the welfare of the little man. It has put itself on record for what it is, a foreign-dominated Marxist organization whose loyalty is not to the United States but to the Soviet Union.

The Peach Crop in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, we are profoundly grateful that the chilling winds coming down to us from the North have been tempered to the degree that we still have the promise of an abundant peach crop in South Carolina.

From the current issue of the publication South Carolina Business I attach the following article:

SOUTH CAROLINA LEADS IN PEACHES

The National Peach Council meeting in St. Louis estimated that South Carolina has arrived as the Peach State, with a prediction that should all go well between now and the last frost date, this State should produce 6,500,000 bushels of peaches, as against Georgia's 5,000,000. Other States in the East fall behind South Carolina and Georgia, but in California, where they can dry, and otherwise dispose of their peaches, it is estimated the crop will be 33,000,000 bushels.

However, South Carolina is now finally and officially recognized as the Peach State by the supreme authority, the National Peach Council.

It is realized, however, by the peach council that the crop just now breaking into premature buds and bloom is in a precarious situation, with a lot of days ahead in which the weather can still be a determining factor in what happens.

Southern Sociologist Views Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding sociologists is Dr. Howard W. Odum, of the University of North Carolina. He is an undisputed authority on the South, his book Southern Regions, being a monumental study of social problems.

Recently, Dr. Odum, writing in the Southern Packet, published at Asheville, N. C., addressed himself to the South's racial problems in what he calls this period of transition. While I do not agree entirely with all of Dr. Odum's views I recognize their great value in our current discussions. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excerpts from Dr. Odum's splendid article:

From all walks of life in the South—old and young, men and women, white and Negro, rural and urban—people are asking, as never before, soul-searching questions about what is best for the South to do in this time of crisis and conflict in the Nation. They are searching with equal earnestness for responsible answers to their inquiries as to what are the actual facts of this staggering dilemma and what is the relation of these facts to the inescapable issues to be faced. They not only want answers but they want to have a part in determining the right answers.

So, too, all over the country, in all the other regions, millions of other people are asking the same questions and insisting on having a part in answering them; for after all, the participants and the programs of actions are broadly regional and national rather than narrowly sectional and partisan.

Our regional approach, therefore, constitutes in reality an appeal for the creative South to work out its own positive, practical adjustment to today's crisis rather than to be driven, coerced and politically patronized into a negative defense to meet the letter of constitutional decisions. The appeal is for scientific and statesman-like ways of achieving a powerful and enduring reconversion program within the framework of a stable culture, a sound economy, a just morality, a changing folk psychology, a workable political democracy, and all set in the framework of an America of sanely balanced natural geographical regions.

This is an extraordinarily difficult task, worthy of any people and worthy of the challenge of world dilemma in which survival and welfare are at stake. Yet the challenge for the creative South to achieve such mastery is more specific. Here is not only the hope for positive and noble attainments, but for the emergence of an articulate South that will substitute for much of its fears and frustration a new faith in itself. It promises to make the South a more useful part of a great Nation.

And it is an appeal to the Nation for a larger measure of understanding, sympathy, and wisdom and a willingness to reconsider some premises of its crusade which have special sectional meaning.

Below we give one set of answers:

1. First, to abide by the decisions of the United States Supreme Court on these matters as on all others.

2. To adjust our culture and economy to national civil-rights legislation for which apparently a clear majority of the people of the United States have voted and to do it in such ways as to reduce outside interference to the minimum.

3. To stop, at all costs, prevailing lawlessness by violence and by evasion. This means in every community and in every State sharp warnings, strict law enforcement, severe penalties within the law.

4. To continue the sure and steady progress which the South has made toward increasingly great opportunity for all people to have access to resources and work in the South or to migrate to other regions where nearer equal opportunities may be guaranteed.

5. To accelerate the prevailing southern processes of improving race relations and of increasing and equalizing educational facilities for all the people.

6. To provide professional and higher graduate instruction for qualified individuals of both races in the same institutions.

7. To continue progress in agricultural, economic, and industrial development and in the conservation and use of resources.

8. To continue progress in public services, as in public education, public welfare, highways, conservation.

9. To help all southerners see the justice of today's normal wants of Negro people.

10. To help the whole Nation understand the problems—human, political, and economic—in changing a biracial civilization rooted in two centuries of growth.

11. More specifically, to convert from segregation to nonsegregation in many practicable areas such as transportation and other public services.

12. To guarantee opportunity for all citizens to vote without hindrance, and to eliminate the poll tax.

13. To work for effective legislation toward the sure elimination of lynching.

14. And to do all of these things calmly.

15. Again, to undertake a comprehensive and a scientific inventory of the South and the Nation so as to provide specifications for the future, in which the promise and costs of conversion from general segregation to attainable programs of nonsegregation may be examined, revised, and adopted.

16. And this calls for a greater degree of cultural and political maturity than the South now has, and by the same token a striving for that maturity which is the goal of the good society.

17. Still more, willingness to reexamine the basis of the southern credo as a substitute for protest, bitterness, and secession-mindedness.

18. In the face of bitter attack and vested frustration by many irresponsibles, isolated from the reality of living democracy, to protect the great mass of Negroes from outsiders who would weaken or destroy their extraordinary systems of schools, churches, industry, and self-developed programs which have amazed the world by their mastery and by the effectiveness of their training grounds for progress and leadership.

19. In this transitional era to stop, through wholesome methods, the almost universal trend toward frustration of Negro youth growing from ideologies of despair, bitterness, hate, and aggression; and through interracial cooperation to substitute hope based on both promise and actuality.

20. To stop being afraid of democracy. Thousands and hundreds of thousands of southerners are saying in substance, "Let's try some of these things out; maybe they will work, but if not we will keep on trying."

21. And finally, somehow to stop this intersectional bitterness and to do the job before us in spite of all the complexities and cultural immaturity of many groups; to take the controls away from partisan extremists; to guard against those ideas and acts which seek to inflame and divide the people through irresponsible agitation and violence.

Dairy Industry in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, recently our Committee on Agriculture had the op-

portunity of hearing the testimony of a Fort Collins, Colorado A. and M. College, graduate, now dean of agriculture at the Texas A. and M. College, Charles N. Shepardson.

Mr. Shepardson gave a very interesting and instructive discussion on the dairy industry in Texas and the importance of this agricultural program as a stabilizer and balance wheel in our economy. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD his testimony:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES N. SHEPARDSON, DEAN OF AGRICULTURE, TEXAS A. AND M. COLLEGE, COLLEGE STATION, TEX., BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, MARCH 3, 1949

My name is Charles N. Shepardson. I am dean of agriculture at the Texas A. and M. College, College Station, Tex. I am appearing before your committee under the sponsorship of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. The facts I present are of record, and the views I express are my own.

Dairying is of major importance in the agricultural economy of Texas from two angles. First, it represents an important part of our agricultural income. Out of approximately 385,000 farms in the State, over 80 percent receive some income from dairying and on 30 percent dairying is one of the major farm enterprises. In 1947 it contributed a cash income of $119,000,000 compared with $562,000,000 for cotton, and $512,000,000 for meat animals. If we add to the cash income from dairy products, the value of milk products used on the farm and the value of dairy beef, we have a total of approximately $215,000,000—and this in a year when the price relationship between cotton, cattle, and dairy products was most unfavorable to dairying. For example, in 1938 the gross income from dairying, including dairy beef, was approximately $100,000,000 which equaled the income from beef and was two-thirds of the cotton income for that year.

Notwithstanding the importance of the dollar value of an industry of this size in the total agricultural income of Texas, the second point to consider is that dairying plays a still more important part as a stabilizer and balance wheel in our economy.

Thirty years ago, the people of Texas were becoming increasingly aware of the evil effects of a long-continued one-crop agriculture. Soils were eroding and wearing out, yields were dropping, buildings were falling into disrepair, and Texas, together with the cotton South was rapidly becoming what was frequently referred to during the 1930's as the problem child of the country.

After nearly a century of one-crop cotton farming, this condition had become so bad that bankers and businessmen, as well as farmers, began to realize the cost of soil depletion, seasonal unemployment, and high credit costs. They recognized the need of a diversified program that would permit crop rotation, soil conservation, and restoration of soil fertility. They also recognized the need of an enterprise that would provide more regular employment and a regular cash income.

Dairying fills these needs, and since Texas had never produced her needs for dairy products a dairy development program was started. Creameries, cheese factories, and milk condenseries were built, and communities that were on the brink of disaster became thriving dairy centers. Creamery butter production increased from an average of 27,000,000 pounds in 1928–32 to 37,000,000 pounds in 1939–43. Cheese production increased from practically zero in 1928 to over 20,000,000 pounds in 1938.

During the worst of the depression the milk and cream checks kept many of our farmers solvent. According to the Federal land-bank office in Houston, at a time when farm mortgages were being foreclosed all over the State there was a noticeable absence of foreclosures on farms that had a regular milk or cream check income.

Counties in the Panhandle and in East Texas that had seemed to be in hopeless condition began to come back. These two areas became prosperous dairy areas. Land improved in fertility, erosion was controlled through pasture development, roads were hard surfaced, county and city indebtedness was reduced, and schools were improved.

Cow population increased from 1,202,000 in 1930 to 1,458,000 in 1939 and to 1,514,000 in 1946. Since that time the trend has been reversed and on January 1 this year our cow population was estimated at 1,351,000. This is in spite of the fact that we have a tremendous shortage not only of manufactured dairy products but also of fluid milk. During the past winter thousands of gallons of milk were shipped into Texas daily from northern production areas. At the same time, our cheese production dropped to less than 10,000,000 pounds, butter to less than 20,000,000 pounds, and two-thirds of our condenseries and powdered milk plants closed their doors.

This means that more and more of our remaining cows have been and are being concentrated in commercial grade A dairies in our city milk sheds, which is all right for those areas. But it also means that the loss of a favorable outlet for cream in the more remote areas has brought about the dispersal of their dairy herds and the loss of the stabilizing and land-improving values mentioned earlier. This is especially noticeable in the Panhandle area where dairy production has given way to field crops and a return to the same type of cultivation that brought on the dust-bowl conditions of the early thirties.

One other factor should be mentioned. With the development of mechanized cotton production which is absolutely essential if cotton is to remain a competitor in the textile and fabric field, it is becoming more and more of a large-scale, industrialized operation. This means that the small farmer must look to other farm enterprises that will provide a satisfactory farm-labor income. Dairying is essentially that, providing a much higher labor income per dollar invested than either beef production or mechanized cotton production.

And so it is to dairying and more particularly cream and manufactured milk production that the farmers in two-thirds of our Texas counties outside the city milk sheds must look for their future, since these farmers are too scattered and remote for a milk market. Anything that depresses the outlet for butter has a direct bearing on our ability to develop and continue a type of farming that is inherently soil-conserving and soil-building and that provides the regularity of farm employment and farm income so essential to a stable, prosperous agriculture. And certainly there is no need to remind this committee of the importance of a prosperous agriculture in the total economy of the country.

In my opinion the conditions in Texas are not materially different from those in other States throughout the cotton South.

For these reasons it is my personal conviction that the interests of Texas and all southern agriculture and of our people as a whole will be served best by legislation that will prevent the manufacture and sale of colored oleomargarine in the semblance or imitation of butter.

The Farmers' Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Farmers Own Ditch Co., of Ashton, Idaho. This letter is a good sample of the thinking of the people who are looking to their headgates and wondering if the Federal Government is going to take over their water rights:

FARMERS OWN DITCH CO.,
Ashton, Idaho, February 25, 1949.

HON. JOHN SANBORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are fearful that bills may be introduced in the Congress, perhaps under different names, and claiming to be different while still containing most, if not all, of the objectionable features of past CVA bills. Furthermore, a modified bill, if passed by the Congress now, could at a later date easily be amended and became most objectionable.

Do not commit yourself to any CVA or similar legislation.

The board of directors and our association consider the matter of vital importance. We are against CVA in any form.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD BONNERU,
President.

ROSE M. HANSEN,
Secretary.

Restoration of Red Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by my friend, Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va., who writes regularly as the Country Lawyer in the Northumberland Echo and other live Virginia papers.

Mr. Johnson ably discusses the proposed restoration of Red Hill, which was the home of Patrick Henry. Though from Ohio, my State was a part of Virginia in 1775 when the voice of Patrick Henry hurled defiance at tyranny in St. John's Church in Richmond.

The effort to restore Red Hill through private subscriptions instead of coming crying to Government for aid is most commendable and discloses the sturdiness and independence of Virginians.

The article follows:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson)

A well-organized meritorious movement is afoot to restore Red Hill, home of Patrick

Henry, which is located on the Staunton River in Charlotte County some 25 miles from Lynchburg, Va.

The land has been acquired and funds are now sought to restore the house and grounds. This is a splendid movement and it merits the support not only of Virginians but also of persons all over the world who adhere to the ideals of the noble founding fathers.

In the days before the advent of the political machine in Virginia with its stultifying effect on the minds of men the State produced men of truly magnificent stature; men whose names and ideals are held in reverence wherever mankind dares to think in terms of freedom and dignity of the individual.

Among those great Virginians were George Washington, the executive and leader of men; Thomas Jefferson, the philosopher on government and founder of the two-party system; Patrick Henry, the orator, lawyer, and legislator; and John Marshall, the incomparable jurist.

Today we can go to the Washington home at Mount Vernon and to his birthplace in Westmoreland County, and we can go to the Jefferson home at Charlottesville. There, where these great men walked and talked, every person may acquire renewed reverence for these patriots and the things they stood for. That is good for all and particularly youth.

The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States serve as a monument to John Marshall. Therein one may read the very words he wrote in the important decisions which put to practical use the Constitution of the United States.

But there has been no place set aside as a shrine to Patrick Henry and his great principles and restoration of Red Hill will supply that need.

Born at Studley in Hanover County on May 29, 1736, Patrick Henry entered the practice of law there in 1760. It was his gift of oratory supported by sound and compelling logic and the forcefulness of his personality that made him so outstanding.

He participated in the writing of the first Constitution of Virginia in June 1776, which later served as a pattern for the Constitution of the United States. He served as the first governor of Virginia when it became a sovereign State.

On March 20, 1775, at St. Johns Church in Richmond he, with magnificent courage, hurled these words at the proposition of tyranny.

"Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

Those words, so fine in 1775, are just as fine today. The principle Patrick Henry so eloquently uttered in 1775 is as important today as then. Whereas Henry and his associates wisely separated the powers of government in 1775 to the end that men could enjoy freedom and self-government, today our legislators, both Federal and State, are merging those powers together again into what we call bureaucracy which is fraught with tyranny.

Restoration of Red Hill is needed as is a full reexamination of the concepts of Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and John Marshall. Though physical things change as science improves our methods, transportation and communication there is no change in the fundamentals of government. Exactly the same things constitute tyranny today as in 1775. Exactly the same protection is required if we would remain free.

States' Rights Superseded by Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SANBORN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from the board of directors of the New Dry Creek Ditch Co., Ltd., of Eagle, Idaho.

This unsolicited letter calls attention to one of the most dangerous provisions of an authority bill. Proposals for river authorities are attempts to create Federal agencies having the powers of State governments in regard to water matters. A situation wherein there exists dual administration of water resources not only unworkable but also utterly foreign to our system of government. It should be obvious to all that it is no solution of the problem to create an instrumentality of government having in water matters the powers and responsibilities of State governments, in addition to the Federal powers properly exercised under the Constitution, and at the same time to preserve the recognized quasi-sovereignty of the States.

The letter follows:

EAGLE, IDAHO, *February 25, 1949.*
Hon. JOHN SANBORN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We, the board of directors of the New Dry Creek Ditch Co., Ltd., hereby petition you to use your influence in an effort to defeat the CVA bill when it is introduced. We object especially to the following features:

1. Turning control of all resources in the Columbia Valley over to a Board of three men appointed by the President and responsible only to the President.

2. Taking jurisdiction away from Idaho courts and giving it to the Federal Courts.

3. The unlimited power to condemn property rights with no right of appeal for the property owner.

We believe our water rights should remain under State control and that the development of our water resources should be continued by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers.

We, therefore, respectfully urge you not to vote for any CVA bill or similar legislation at least until the people of Idaho have had an opportunity to study such proposed legislation thoroughly.

Sincerely yours,
NEW DRY DITCH CO., LTD.
By O. L. GREER,
President.

Col. James Perry Alvey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of James Perry Alvey the Federal Government in general, and the Department of the Interior in particular, has lost a most valuable public servant.

He was one of the most valuable public servants I have ever known. He was a man of unimpeachable character, his integrity was unassailable, his ideals were of the highest quality, and his devotion to duty was beyond question.

Perry Alvey, as he was known to all of his friends, was born in Galveston, Tex., on December 1, 1885, and died in Boston, Mass., March 2, 1949. He was graduated, as an engineer, from the University of Texas in 1906, and from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as a hydroelectric engineer in 1907. His entire adult life has been devoted to his chosen profession.

During the First World War, he served as captain in the Corps of Engineers, in the United States Army Expeditionary Forces in Europe, and was staff officer on the staff of Gen. Edgar Jadwin.

Because of his deep interest in the conservation and development of our natural resources, he devoted a great part of his life to this general subject, especially to the development of our hydroelectric resources. He realized the tremendous contributions of low-cost electric power, not only to our economic welfare, but also to our national security.

With his vast knowledge and experience, he was a tower of strength to those of us who were interested in the development of the hydro resources of the Nation—and especially of the Columbia River, which resulted in the passage of the Bonneville Project Act of 1937. Since then he has been actively engaged in the administration of that act as the Washington representative of the Bonneville Power Administration.

He gave unselfishly of his time and effort to the cause he had espoused, to the very end of his days. It can be truly said that he died in the service of his country.

Every person who turns an electric switch anywhere in the West, if not in the whole country, owes him a lasting debt of gratitude.

He was my personal friend, as well as the most effective and useful aid I have ever had in my fight for justice for the power consumers of the Nation.

My heart goes out to his bereaved widow. She has lost a noble and loving husband; and our country has lost one of her most useful and valuable citizens.

There Can Be Only One Kind of Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following edi-

torial which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on Tuesday, February 15, 1949:

THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE KIND OF AMERICANS

The menace of the veterans' pension proposal advanced by the American Legion and introduced into the House by Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, is that it sounds like something fine for the boys, and nobody wants the Nation to seem ungrateful to those who defended our democracy.

We don't want to seem ungrateful either—as a matter of fact, a great many of us of the Chronicle went out and did what we could to defend that democracy, and would stand to reap any benefits under the bill to start paying veterans $60 a month at age 60. But we're still, as civilians, deeply concerned with preserving the democracy that was defended in 1917–18 and again in 1941–45, and that concern compels us to oppose this and every proposal that would make one class of people of veterans and another of the rest of the Americans.

In treating recently of a bonus proposal advanced by another veterans' group we undertook to make clear the distinction between bonuses and blanket pension plans, on the one hand, and existing veterans' benefit programs on the other.

We agreed that every effort should be made to relieve hardships suffered by servicemen as result of that service; we approved of physical and financial care for the disabled, educational benefits for those whose education was interrupted by the war; Government aid to secure housing for ex-servicemen; vocational guidance and placement for veterans. For the Nation to have done less would have been ungrateful and unfair.

But the multibillion-dollar bonus proposals and now the multibillion-dollar pension proposal are not aimed at the relief of hardship, because evidence of hardship is not a prerequisite for enjoyment of their benefits. Almost 20,000,000 veterans could look forward to special benefits under the Legion's pension program—to be supported, at a cost sloping upward from an initial $2,000,000,000 a year, by the rest of the Americans. That would mean that an able-bodied, 60-year-old veteran with $50,000 a year would be entitled to this special bounty whereas a 60-year-old nonveteran without so much as the price of tomorrow's breakfast would not. It would also mean that the Federal benefits for the blind, ill and helpless would have to be curtailed to make these blanket benefits available to veterans. Indeed, it could very well mean that the defenses of the Nation would have to be hamstrung so all veterans, rich, poor and middling, could enjoy the $60 per month at 60 and $90 per month at 65.

The proposal, it seems to us, crumples under the hard light of common sense alone.

But there is one other aspect of the proposal that deserves the careful attention of the members of the American Legion.

The Legion has resolutely opposed statism in many forms—Nazi, Communist, or whatever. Notwithstanding, this pension proposal is exactly up the alley of statism. It sets apart one group of Americans as deserving of arbitrarily assigned special privilege; it would make this group politically beholden to the Government for the maintenance of its special financial status, and it would saddle the Nation at large with an inflationary burden ponderous enough to jeopardize the economy. All of those roads lead toward totalitarianism. The rank and file of veterans can serve themselves and their country by recognizing these facts and avoiding the trap that always lies under the bait of a something-for-nothing proposition.

H. R. 1582

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, early in the session I introduced H. R. 1582 to provide a simple, direct method of making funds available to the several States for education, with absolutely no Government control of the State's educational program, present or future.

In substance, H. R. 1582 provides that the collector of internal revenue shall, each quarter, remit to the treasurer of his respective State, a sum equal to 1 percent of the corporate and individual income tax collected that quarter, such money to be used by the States for educational purposes only.

The text of the bill and my comments thereon appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD, pages A204 and A205.

On the basis of corporation and individual income taxes collected during the fiscal year 1948, the gross sum made available to the States under H. R. 1582 would not differ greatly from the $300,000,000 proposed under S. 246 to initiate the administration-sponsored plan of Federal aid to education. The distribution to each State would, however, be considerably different. Under H. R. 1582 each State would receive for its use every cent paid in by the taxpayers of that State to be applied to the educational program. Since there is always some fluctuation in tax collections, benefits under H. R. 1582 would vary with such fluctuation.

For more detailed information for the Members, the following comparative tables will show the estimated annual cost in taxes to each State under each proposal, and the estimated amount each State would receive annually in funds which it could apply to improving its educational program:

	Under H. R. 1582: Amount each State will pay and receive, each year, based on tax collections, fiscal 1948	Under S. 246	
		Estimated annual tax cost to each State, on basis initial authorization of $300,000,000	Estimated amount each State will receive each year, basis of initial authorization
Alabama	$2,318,000	$3,734,000	$19,390,000
Arizona	714,000	1,111,000	1,750,000
Arkansas	974,000	2,211,000	12,390,000
California	24,128,000	25,230,000	7,260,000
Colorado	2,246,000	2,389,000	1,255,000
Connecticut	5,287,000	5,469,000	1,705,000
Delaware	2,818,000	330,000	285,000
Florida	3,089,000	4,288,000	2,260,000
Georgia	3,380,000	4,476,000	17,745,000
Hawaii	940,000	(1)	(1)
Idaho	700,000	1,014,000	1,010,000
Illinois	24,622,000	29,893,000	7,520,000
Indiana	5,928,000	7,932,000	3,645,000
Iowa	3,650,000	4,914,000	2,505,000
Kansas	2,861,000	3,741,000	1,860,000
Kentucky	2,665,000	3,595,000	16,120,000
Louisiana	2,724,000	3,794,000	11,075,000
Maine	1,106,000	1,171,000	1,060,000
Maryland	4,880,000	5,349,000	2,135,000
Massachusetts	10,869,000	11,280,000	4,160,000
Michigan	15,632,000	13,992,000	5,980,000
Minnesota	$5,422,000	$5,130,000	$2,820,000
Mississippi	899,000	2,262,000	16,985,000
Missouri	8,336,000	7,422,000	3,755,000
Montana	741,000	1,120,000	545,000
Nebraska	2,259,000	2,526,000	1,350,000
Nevada	358,000	416,000	135,000
New Hampshire	721,000	360,000	640,000
New Jersey	9,849,000	11,880,000	4,025,000
New Mexico	482,000	797,000	3,390,000
New York	62,560,000	39,210,000	12,010,000
North Carolina	4,083,000	4,884,000	22,825,000
North Dakota	640,000	1,125,000	1,655,000
Ohio	19,779,000	17,790,000	7,090,000
Oklahoma	2,614,000	3,438,000	9,195,000
Oregon	2,745,000	3,210,000	1,125,000
Pennsylvania	22,852,000	22,335,000	10,410,000
Rhode Island	1,999,000	1,980,000	720,000
South Carolina	1,813,000	2,444,000	13,855,000
South Dakota	679,000	1,090,000	1,445,000
Tennessee	2,983,000	4,268,000	14,785,000
Texas	10,491,000	12,060,000	18,675,000
Utah	728,000	1,278,000	1,535,000
Vermont	381,000	639,000	615,000
Virginia	3,700,000	5,496,000	8,070,000
Washington	4,520,000	5,832,000	1,820,000
West Virginia	1,995,000	2,784,000	10,405,000
Wisconsin	5,988,000	6,630,000	3,300,000
Wyoming	336,000	541,000	280,000
Alaska	161,000	(1)	(1)
District of Columbia	3,305,000	2,500,000	720,000
Puerto Rico	----------	(1)	(1)

[1] Not estimated.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very important development in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway project. As a result of growing realization that our iron-ore resources are being rapidly used up and new sources must be found, both labor and management in the steel industry have now come out strongly for the construction of this project. They realize that industry in the Middle West may gradually be strangled unless ample new sources of iron ore are made accessible.

I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a statement from Mr. Otis Brubaker, director, Research Department of the United Steel Workers of America, which describes the position of the national CIO and of the steel workers in support of the St. Lawrence project. I also wish to place in the RECORD an excerpt from the annual report of the M. A. Hanna Co., of Cleveland, explaining their activities in the development of iron ore in Labrador and Quebec and the reasons for their shift of position from opponents to supporters of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

The matters follow:

UNITED STEEL WORKERS OF AMEPICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 9, 1949.

Mr. N. R. DANIELIAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DANIELIAN: As I have previously indicated to you, both the United Steel Workers of America and the National CIO have publicly announced their suppor of the St. Lawrence project. The last St l Workers convention was held on May 11–15, 1948, at Boston. There the union adopted an economic program which, among other things, encouraged the Congress to establish a St. Lawrence seaway and other needed river valley authorities similar to the TVA. The convention also passed a resolution in support for water power and waterways projects. Although the St. Lawrence is not specifically referred to here, it plainly is included as indicated by the direct reference in the economic program. Following is the text of this resolution:

"We believe that a closer integration between navigation upon our great inland waterway system and other beneficial water uses such as flood control, stream purification, soil conservation, and hydroelectric generation is essential to our national economy.

"No nation can attain full economic stability except by the full conservation and proper utilization of its natural resources.

"America has been generously blessed with natural resources, and especially rivers and harbors.

"These natural gifts have been a predominant factor toward its growth and prosperity: Therefore be it

"*Resolved:*

"1. The United Steel Workers shall with the utmost vigor seek Federal authorization necessary for the canalization and improvement of our natural waterways such as the proposed Ohio River-Lake Erie waterway.

"2. Continue to lend full support to the further implementation of the Tennessee Valley Authority and Missouri Valley Authority and all water-utilization and flood-control projects that may give the people of America a more equitable share in their heritage of America's boundless resources.

"The committee recommends approval of this resolution.

"The recommendation of the committee was adopted."

In November of the same year the national CIO held its convention in Portland. Here, too, the St. Lawrence seaway and power project received endorsement. Following is a quotation from President Philip Murray's report to the CIO:

"The CIO also supported the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, a resolution which would have approved a 1941 executive agreement between the United States and Canada providing for completion of power works and navigation features along 119 miles of the St. Lawrence River."

I might point out that the legislative program, outlined in the same report, includes support for river valley developments.

On November 25, 1948, the question came up on the convention floor. A resolution urging regional development was passed unanimously. This included the following sentence:

"We likewise reaffirm our support of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project."

Sincerely yours,

OTIS BRUBAKER.

EXCERPTS FROM 1948 ANNUAL REPORT, THE M. A. HANNA CO., CLEVELAND, OHIO

FINANCIAL RESULTS

Our consolidated net profit for 1948, after all expenses and taxes, was $9,087,574. This compares with $7,282,506 in 1947 and $5,611,654 in 1946, and is a new high record.

Dividend distributions during the year aggregated $5,551,839, also a new high record. Preferred stockholders received the regular dividends of $4.25 a share ($399,519) while a total of $5 a share ($5,152,320) was paid on common stock, comparing with $3.20 a share ($3,297,485) in 1947. The excess of earnings over dividends, amounting to $3,535,735, was added to surplus.

At the year-end our current assets were $23,117,716 and current liabilities were $7,490,268, so that working capital was $15,627,448 compared with $9,293,037 the year before.

Our quoted securities had an indicated market value of $111,681,044 at December 31, 1948, compared with $109,920,547 at the end of 1947. Their book values on our balance sheet were $51,240,483 at the close of 1948 compared with $50,301,808 the year before.

OPERATIONS

Our operations in 1948 included the following:

Iron ore shipments	tons	11,828,000
Lake coal shipments	do	11,234,000
Anthracite coal production	do	2,691,000

The Hanna fleet of 13 vessels operated at capacity throughout the shipping season.

LABRADOR-QUEBEC IRON ORE

The iron-ore tonnage shown by exploration and drilling so far is about one-third in the Labrador concession and about two-thirds in the concession in Quebec. However, the Labrador concession covers a total of about 18,000 square miles while the Quebec concession covers about 3,800 square miles, and there is much more territory in Labrador than in Quebec which is entirely unexplored. Explorations to date have proved with reasonable accuracy the existence of about 300,000,000 tons of very good grade direct shipping open pit ore and manganiferous iron ore. It is located about 300 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence and requires the construction of 360 miles of railroad with transshipping docks at Seven Islands, Quebec, on the St. Lawrence River.

It is a big undertaking and may involve the expenditure of as much as $200,000,000 for mining and railroad equipment, power development, railroad and dock construction, townsites for the large number of people involved, etc. This will take a number of years and progress is slow, but we believe that the discovery is of sufficient importance and the ore possibilities of such magnitude that eventually this will become an important source of iron ore supply for some of the blast furnaces and steel plants of Canada and the United States. Additional exploratory work will be continued, and as the properties develop plans for the future will be made.

One important item of consideration is the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. The distance by water from Seven Islands to Erie, Pa., on the southern shore of Lake Erie, is almost the same as the distance from Duluth, as our Lake Superior ores now move. The entire distance from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to any lake port is now available for transportation in our regular standard lake vessels except for about 90 miles of intermittent rapids. If these rapids can be made navigable by the prompt completion of the St. Lawrence waterway project, the ore can be moved economically and competitively to the central industrial districts of Canada and the United States.

Through our various connections, we are interested in the ownership of large reserve tonnages of Lake Superior iron ore. We are not unmindful of the importance of such reserves nor do we contemplate the early exhaustion of shipments from that district, but continuation of the declining trend of shipments of high-grade direct shipping ore from Lake Superior is inevitable. Expensive underground mining must be increased and even more expensive beneficiation processes must be developed to make a useful product from lower-grade Lake Superior reserves. They will be required as a source of iron ore supply for the future, but they can best be supplemented by shipments of high-grade open-pit direct-shipping ore from Labrador and Quebec to fill the needs of the great iron and steel businesses of Canada and the United States now located in the Great Lakes Basin area.

This district is the heart of the greatest industrial area on this continent and it is to the interest of every business and every citizen of both countries that it may continue to have an ample supply of iron ore cheaply transported to it by water to supply the many industries dependent upon iron and steel. The Great Lakes waterway will continue to serve this important district, but now that this new source of direct shipping high-grade iron ore supply has been definitely established the St. Lawrence waterway should be undertaken promptly to make it equally available. It is essential for business in times of peace and it would be indispensable for both countries in the unfortunate event of another war.

G. M. HUMPHREY,
President.

Federal Tax on State Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement issued by Senators ELLENDER, WAGNER, MAYBANK, SPARKMAN, MYERS, HILL, PEPPER, and LONG, which favors striking the provision from the national housing bill which would withdraw the tax exemption now accorded the obligations of States and their political subdivisions.

The greatest security against concentration of power is our dual form of Government, State and Federal, and our three coordinate branches of Government. Each must be preserved in its full integrity. To permit the Federal Government to impose taxes on securities issued by the State or its subdivisions would concentrate power in the Federal Government and weaken that of the States, for the power to tax is the power to destroy.

The provision—section 505—will be stricken from H. R. 933 when the Banking and Currency Committee takes up the legislation.

Statement of the Washington Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action, at the Hearing of the District Commissioners on the Extension of Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I wish to insert the following statement of the Washington Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action, which was given before the District Commissioners at the hearing on the extension of rent controls for the District of Columbia, Friday, February 11, 1949:

The Washington Chapter of ADA welcomes this opportunity to present its views on H. R. 1757, a bill known as the Harris bill which amends and extends the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act. There still exists in the District of Columbia an extremely critical housing shortage, particularly for persons of middle and low incomes. The recent report of the National Captial Housing Authority indicated that there are 18,000 low-income families now on the waiting list for low-rent housing. Many District families are living doubled up. The rate of new construction of rental housing is insufficient to meet the current demands and the rents of most of this housing are above that which middle and low-income groups, ineligible for public housing, can afford. Since rentals constitute a major drain upon the budgets of families of fixed or limited incomes, we have a deep interest in the continued control of rents in such a manner as to safeguard adequately the economic position of the vast majority of Washington residents, until such a time as the current demand for rental housing has been met.

SUMMARY OF ADA POSITION

We strongly recommend the extension of rent control for at least a 2-year period since there is no indication that the rental-housing shortage will have been relieved before that time. The Harris bill would serve to extend the present District rent-control system and strengthen it in certain respects but we do not believe that it would correct most of its principal weaknesses. Those weaknesses are, however, substantially corrected in H. R. 2291, known as the Douglas bill. This bill would include the District of Columbia in a national system of rent control. We, therefore, respectfully urge the District Commissioners to oppose the enactment of the Harris bill (H. R. 1757) and to recommend to the Congress, the passage of the Douglas bill (H. R. 2291).

REASONS FOR ADA POSITION

We believe that existing rent controls for the District are inadequate. At present, there are no controls over rents charged for additional housing units created by conversion of existing buildings. There is also no protection for tenants threatened by eviction from apartments which are put up for sale as cooperative housing. The Harris bill corrects these weaknesses to a large measure. But there are several additional defects in the present District rent control act which are not corrected by this bill and which we believe are serious enough to require legislative action. These defects are the following:

1. The lack of controls on newly constructed rental housing.

2. The lack of controls on nonhousekeeping furnished rooms in private homes.

3. Inadequate safeguards to tenants with respect to evictions.

4. The lack of a local advisory rent board, representative of affected interests of the District, which would make recommendations to the administrator of rent control concerning such matters as the adequacy of the general rent level in the area.

5. The lack of adequate sanctions against persons who violate rent-control legislation and regulations. (The present law does not provide criminal sanctions against such violations and the amount of damages a tenant may collect is negligible. Moreover, no action may be taken against such a violator if the tenant affected does not institute action himself.)

The Douglas bill corrects the weaknesses outlined above, as well as those covered in the Harris bill. The Douglas bill provides controls on newly constructed housing, housing created by conversions and nonhousekeeping furnished rooms in private homes. It provides for local representative advisory boards and also a national advisory board. This bill contains criminal penalties for violations of rent control legislation and regulations; increases the amount of damages a tenant can recover in case of excessive illegal rent charges; and permits the administrator to institute action when the tenant fails to do so. These latter measures will not only ease enforcement of rent controls but will also act as deterrents against violations of such controls.

The Administrator of the Office of Rent Control under the Douglas bill is given broad discretionary powers to regulate evictions. We believe that this provision is desirable since it will permit the administrator to establish any regulations necessary to protect tenants in accordance with the purpose of the act, including prompt action against evasions of the purpose of rent control such as those evidenced by the mass evictions in Tulsa, Okla., and the numerous conversions of old apartments to cooperative housing in the District of Columbia.

For the reasons outlined above, we urge the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to recommend to the Congress the passage of the Douglas bill rather than the amendment and extension of the present District Rent Control Act by the Harris bill. In addition to strengthening the present rent control system of the District, the Douglas bill would provide the District with the same type of rent control as that for the rest of the country. It has been asserted that the present separate system should be maintained because of the cost of changing over to the national system. We do not believe that such a cost is sufficient reason for the continuance of a dual-control system and that the important consideration is that of providing the District of Columbia with adequate rent controls, on an equal footing with the rest of the country.

Soviet Intentions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 4, 1949:

SOVIET INTENTIONS

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The scene was a rather bleak government office in Belgrade. The speaker was a high Yugoslav official, who had worked intimately with Molotov. His subject was the unpleasant situation of any small country in the no-man's land of the world struggle between the Soviet empire and the west. He spoke almost wistfully, as many Europeans will, of the desirability of a settlement between Moscow and Washington.

Fear of western aggression, he said, was the whole mainspring of Russian policy. From personal experience, he emphatically described Molotov as genuinely afraid that the United States would attack Russia.

To reduce the conversation to practical terms, he was asked one or two questions. In order to achieve the mood described, must not Molotov have ignored all the visible facts of the first two postwar years, when Washington went so far to appease Moscow? In truth, must not the Soviet Foreign Minister simply formulate his theories by combining rigid Marxist theology with his own knowledge of what the Politburo would do with American resources at its disposal? The Yugoslav laughed and nodded.

QUESTIONED ON SOVIET FEARS

Then he was asked, What will calm these Soviet fears? Would not this appeasement entail giving away so many vital strategic positions that the Soviet Union could safely begin the career of aggression now imputed to the United States? And if the Politburo were thus enabled, by a delusive settlement, to expand the Soviet sphere by easy conquest, what would be the result? This time the Yugoslav nodded glumly and stopped talking about settlements.

The story is worth telling, because its pattern was repeated in every other capital of Europe visited by this correspondent. A good many responsible European leaders even spoke wistfully about settlements. But the slightest inquiry about practical details is enough to reveal what they know in their hearts, that any settlement likely to be accepted by Moscow would spell the end of Europe.

The question now, in fact, is not how to make a settlement but how the Kremlin is going to deal with the stalemate that is emerging in Europe. No one can speak positively about such an enigma as Soviet policy. But the following analysis is the consensus of the many informed officials and expert observers with whom this correspondent talked in France and Italy, Yugoslavia, Britain and Germany. All agree that the Kremlin does not want war now and will not take the risk of war, even for great ends, for some time to come. Even the talk of an attack on Finland and other violent reactions to Norway's joining the Atlantic Pact, with which Soviet diplomats have been making Swedish flesh creep, have failed to carry conviction except in Stockholm. All agree also that the Kremlin's plans for Europe have been at least temporarily frustrated, and that this frustration has forced the Kremlin to elaborate a new program. Finally it is the consensus that this new program has three aims.

The first aim is to establish total, ruthless, unchallengeable control over the Soviet Union's new wartime conquests. (Hence the Czechoslovak coup d'état and the attempt to liquidate the island of western freedom in Berlin. Hence also the constant purges in all the satellite countries, which are always going on, and are hardly noticed except when they involve such dramatic episodes as the Mindszenty trial.)

The second aim is to take immediate advantage of the American concentration on Europe, and of the feeble or nonexistent defenses of the vast regions of the Middle and Far East. (Hence the drive into China, the even more significant drive into southeast Asia, and the signs of renewed Soviet interest in the Middle East. If Asia is allowed to fall into the Soviet sphere by default, the attack in the Middle East will surely be launched at once. And it may even begin much sooner.)

The third aim is to prepare the Soviet Empire for war with all speed. (Hence the militarization of the Soviet economy now almost as complete as the militarization of the German economy by Hitler. Hence, also, many other phenomena, from the creation of an embryonic German Army to the terrible fate of the tens of thousands of men groaning in the uranium mines of the Erzegebirge.)

A PRACTICAL PROGRAM

There are two things to note about this program. It is a practical program. There are no obvious miscalculations, such as the misreading of the United States that caused

the Kremlin's first grandiose plans to miscarry. In fact, such events as President Truman's reduction of American rearmament have already given the Kremlin every reason to believe that America is relapsing into a mood of business-as-usual. As the stalemate in Europe continues, the American opposition is undoubtedly expected to decrease.

On the other hand, this is not a program which can be countered by a mere Atlantic pact in which no member nation is genuinely strong. The Kremlin's conscious aims may be defensive, even for the long run. The Soviet program may take 5 or 10 or 15, or even 20 years to fulfill. But if this program is ever fulfilled, their new might will deeply influence the men of the Kremlin. They will be almost irresistibly tempted to use force to assist the spread of the "truth" of their new religion. And just because this time of great danger is still distant, the United States cannot afford relapse into drugged enjoyment of a false peace.

State Department's Left Wing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of David Taggart Clark and editorial from World-Telegram of March 2, 1949:

FEBRUARY 25, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT HALE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

May I express most fervent approbation of your most cryingly needed endeavor to obtain before fatally too late, a pro-American policy for China?

The near danger seems to me not pseudo-coalition but actual Communist government of all China. This would create such formidable peril to American security and future world peace that American Government ought forthwith to make unequivocal declaration, whether public or otherwise conveyed, that acceptance of such situation would be impossible. Although tolerating provisionally Mao's control north of Yangtze, it should immediately assure all necessary aid to whichever Nationalist leader, Chiang, Hsueh-Yueh, or other might seem best bet to contain Communists at or near Yangtze.

It should then again try to terminate civil war, perhaps offering Mao something for definite promise to install genuine parliamentary democracy in his area. We should then watch vigilantly the trial. It was a major blunder failing to follow English recommendation to divide country provisionally between the two forces.

Sole relevant question for American policy is this: In possible future clash, or threat of clash, with our Russian friends, in their own good time for attacking us, would Communist dictatorship in China side with them, with us, or stay neutral?

It is difficult to imagine Chairman Mao rallying to our side to save free capitalist democracy from Stalin's crusade. Had we caught him young enough, I incline to think, we might have made him one of the best Americans. Now, I fear, is much too late.

Although peasant revolution to emancipate a proletariat might appear topsy-turvy Marxism, Mao remains a social revolutionary convinced, sincerely as ever Lenin, of the holiness of his cause. We should have to take him on against us, beside whoever then were lord of Moscow. Very best we could hope, initial neutrality, would fail completely our real desideratum, preventing the war.

General Chennault's argument is incontrovertible. So long as we, with a friendly China, remain able to threaten Moscovites with a two-front war, they will never start it. But if Stalin should achieve his wish to replace the recent capitalist encirclement of communism by a counter encirclement of ourselves, capitalist stronghold of freedom, we may look for trouble should ever miscalculating Russians entertain motive to start it, to save their cause and their place in history.

Thus debacle in China, already major disaster for American people, holds potentiality of unparalleled catastrophe for them for freedom, and for all humanity. It increases whatever chances there may be of a third war and gravely diminishes our chances of winning it.

Earnestly I hope you and your group in Congress can successfully warn of our danger, and reverse recent dumbbell policy, or worse, in Asia of selling United States down the river.

Yours with greatest respect,
DAVID TAGGART CLARK,
Associate Professor of Economics,
Retired, Williams College.
GOSHEN, CONN.

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 2, 1949]

STATE DEPARTMENT'S LEFT WING

Roger Lapham, American economic cooperation chief for China, has told Congress $240,000,000 will be required to continue civilian relief for those areas of China still under Nationalist control.

This is little enough help for a loyal ally, in dire straits after 9 years of war. Refugees from the Communist advance have caused acute food shortages in China's coastal cities, and only outside aid can avert widespread starvation.

But if what remains of Nationalist China is to be saved from Communist occupation, money must be advanced to finance armed resistance.

Mr. Lapham, however, has gone as far as he can without a change of State Department policy; and there is no promise of that.

Congressmen who have discussed the Chinese situation with Secretary of State Dean Acheson gained the impression that he has accepted, hook, line, and sinker, the appeasement policy of the leftist underlings in his Department's Far Eastern Division.

That policy reduced Nationalist China to its present helplessness before the Red onslaught. Instead of changing it, Mr. Acheson apparently defends it. Instead of ousting the appeasers, he seems to be influenced by them, as his recent predecessors were.

Much that Mr. Acheson is reported to have told the Congressmen in defense of his position did not square with the record. Some of them took exception to his assertion that his wait-and-see policy had the support of our best-informed military men. If that is true, he was asked, why doesn't he release the long-suppressed Wedemeyer report?

Mr. Acheson answered lamely that this would not be in the public interest. It is known, however, that the Wedemeyer report did not support the State Department's policy, and this policy is at variance with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's cabled message to the House Foreign Affairs Committee a year ago. It said:

"The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety. * * * It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all."

When President Truman proclaimed his general policy against Communist expansion in announcing his Greek-Turkish program the State Department's Far Eastern Division was influential enough to make an exception of communism in China. As a result, on that one of the major "frontiers of freedom" a "decisive breach" has been made.

And the whole Asiatic front will be exposed to Red attack unless the President and Mr. Acheson bring State Department policy toward China into harmony with the Truman doctrine.

North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein, by request, an article by Mr. Blair Bolles on the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. Bolles is director of the Washington bureau of the Foreign Policy Association and is a writer on international questions and has conducted various studies in the field of foreign relations.

The article follows:

WILL THE PACT SAVE PEACE?—BEHIND THE PLAN FOR A NORTH ATLANTIC ENTENTE LIES A LONG STORY OF TRAGIC FAILURE TO HALT WAR THIS WAY

(By Blair Bolles)

(The North Atlantic Pact, which involves one of the most fateful decisions in American history, is being discussed in a series of articles in the New Republic. Last week Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart, noted British military expert, analyzed the defensibility of western Europe, and in an editorial we gave our reasons for believing that the North Atlantic Pact deserves support. The article below, by Blair Bolles, offering an argument against the plan, is published for its intrinsic interest. The author is director of the Washington Bureau of the Foreign Policy Association and a well-known specialist in the field of international relations.)

The twentieth-century diplomatic boneyard is littered with dead defense treaties that failed in their purpose. They did not prevent the outbreak of war and, once war came, they did not always insure victory. The Triple Alliance, the Locarno Pact, and Hitler's mutual-assistance treaties were all slaughtered by gunfire along with the Entente of Britain, France, and Russia of pre-World War I and the guaranty of military support that Britain gave Poland on the eve of World War II.

Ignoring that disappointing record, President Truman is now recommending American participation in a North Atlantic defense pact, on the grounds that its existence might prevent an armed attack endangering our national security from ever taking place.

Such a treaty has great superficial attractions. Its supporters, like the drafters of previous defense pacts, assume that the show of intercountry solidarity will smother the aggressive tendencies of Soviet Russia. But the inevitable consequence of this kind of treaty making is to provoke the other side to make treaties of its own. The Triple Alliance was the direct cause of France and Russia making their military convention in 1894. And the psychology of nations today

is as it was 50 years ago. Nobody keeps the peace by an alliance race. Alliances simply inflate suspicion.

While past alliances have not staved off war, they sometimes have been useful in war when the pacts creating them called on the signers to give armed help at once to a partner when attacked. France supported Russia in 1914, and Britain declared war when Hitler attacked Poland in 1939. On the other hand, Italy not only ignored the Triple Alliance when World War I broke out, but joined the enemies of the Triple Alliance in 1915. Some pacts simply fade away like the treaties France signed with the Little Entente powers during the 1920's; either they represent no enduring common interest or they do not create the stability in international relationships that their sponsors seek.

The negotiation for the North Atlantic defense pact is the most questionable piece of unfinished business that Secretary of State Dean Acheson inherited from George Marshall. Although Marshall has gone, the administration is committed to it. President Truman espoused it both in his budget message and his inaugural address, where he announced his intention to "provide unmistakable proof of the joint determination of the free countries to resist armed attack from any quarter." Determination to resist attack is the basis on which the defense pacts of history have usually rested.

An apparently irreconcilable conflict between the powers of Congress and the wishes of Europeans blighted the conversations aimed at the creation of the new alliance which opened at the State Department on December 10 among Robert A. Lovett, then Under Secretary of State, and representatives of Canada and the signers of the Brussels Treaty of last March 17—Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. These negotiations are still far from their end. The Europeans want an absolute guaranty that America will go to war the moment any of them is attacked. But since the Constitution authorizes Congress alone to declare war, leading Senators have advised the State Department that they will not stand for an automatic guaranty. We can give Europe assurances of interest but no promise to fight.

A series of deeper questions overshadows that practical difficulty. Considering the inability of America to go to war automatically, does the prospective treaty's capacity for exciting the Soviet Union to countermeasures exceed its ability to strengthen the west to resist the Soviet Union? Can it bind us to support of reactionary colonialism which strengthens the Soviet's appeal? Since the Dutch would surely be our colleague in the treaty, one may ask whether we would be urged to go to war to save the Dutch from the consequences of some imperialistic stupidity like their attack on the Indonesian Republic. One may ask also whether the draft articles would be fatal for the United Nations, although they are rich in references to that institution. Above all, would the treaty make the cold war a permanent feature of world politics, by creating an insuperable barrier to the eventual establishment of east-west tolerance?

The outline treaty which Lovett handed on to Acheson has a novel feature missing from the useless defense treaties of the past. Following the wartime pattern set by Britain and America in the Combined Chiefs of Staff Committee and adopted by the Brussels treaty powers in their Chiefs of Staff Committee, the treaty would set up a small bureaucracy of international committees, through which the Allies could make political and military plans against every conceivable eventuality and adjust themselves jointly to day-to-day developments in international relations. Thus the treaty not only calls upon the signers to support one another in emergencies but to cooperate intimately with one another in peace and war. It implies economic as well as military cooperation, for no chiefs of staff can plan a war without planning the use of the resources available to them.

The treaty is modeled also after the Inter-American Defense Pact signed at Rio de Janeiro in September 1947. That treaty has a look of strength and the quality of weakness. It provides that an armed attack by any state against an American state shall be considered an attack against all the American states—a thesis taken over wholesale for the North Atlantic alliance. Yet no signatory of the Rio Pact is required to use armed force without the consent of its national legislature, although the treaty states that decisions reached by two-thirds of the members concerning any breach of the peace are binding. The Rio Pact requires its signers to consult, and no more.

Like both the Rio and the Brussels treaties, the text of the pending pact states that the alliance depends on the United Nations for its existence. As a regional treaty, its framers invoke articles 51 and 52 of the UN Charter which authorize member nations to make regional arrangements and set up regional agencies and to defend themselves collectively if attacked. Article 51 exists in the Charter because the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference in 1945 put it there. Their thoughts dwelt then on the American Republics.

But last June in a speech to the Senate, ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, recommending a regional pact, complained that we had been too often stranded on the veto rocks of the United Nations. If the alliance is intended to circumvent the veto power in the Security Council, its sponsors cannot be taking seriously the requirement of the Charter that members of regional alliances clear their actions and decisions with the Security Council. Actually the Charter makes the old-fashioned defense alliance futile, since, to quote the State Department as of 1945, "no enforcement action may be taken under regional arrangements without specific authorization of the Security Council." The alliance can operate only by defining the powers of the UN to suit itself.

The treaty differs from its predecessors also in that it encourages standardization of the weapons of the alliance members and provides for the distribution of arms to the members at American expense. Thus it embodies features of lend-lease and the Marshall plan. A number of western European countries have asked America for weapons during the past year on the ground that inadequate military strength prevents the development of the sense of national confidence which encourages investors to put money into capital enterprise and thus get on with the Marshall plan. Some of these requests, as that of the Norwegians, are certainly sincere.

Yet this military effort to make the Marshall plan work might harm the plan unless the administration can control the American economy more strictly than it does now. America lacks material to equip her own armed forces at authorized strength. Despite its hullabaloo over the need for an air force of 70 groups, the Air Department is able to arm adequately only 34 of the 55 groups that now comprise it. The need for steel in peacetime industries is so much greater than present production that President Truman, in his message on the state of the Union, threatened the industry with his plan to have the Federal Government set up steel mills. Congressional approval of the St. Lawrence seaway agreement and construction of the power plant at International Falls would enable Canada to manufacture some arms for Europe. But the plant would not go into operation for 5 years.

The scarcity of arms gives the European governments with whom the United States has been negotiating the character of heirs to a moderately wealthy man. Each heir hopes the beneficiaries of the legacy will be limited in number. If there is not going to be a mountain of weapons, the Brussels-Pact powers want what is available for themselves alone. This again produces conflict. The United States is said to want the membership of the alliance to be wide, to embrace, now at least, the Scandinavian powers (including Iceland, and probably excluding Finland) and Portugal, and perhaps in time to extend over the whole of non-Soviet Europe, taking in Yugoslavia, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Spain (if this can be wangled over the sensibilities of France and the British Labor Party), and western Germany, besides the countries which have signed the Brussels pact.

To dissuade Norway, Denmark, and Sweden from organizing their own regional alliance separate from the North Atlantic Pact, the State Department has announced that nonmembers of the Atlantic alliance will not receive arms. But Washington has been giving planes, tanks, machine guns, and artillery for 2 years to Greece and Turkey without benefit of alliance, and the conclusion of the North Atlantic Pact, if it ever is concluded, would not mean cutting off Greeks and Turks without another bullet. Those who get the weapons may be asked to give up bases in return, but at the moment we have rights in Portuguese bases, while we have not given Portugal arms for the privilege. If America assumed an obligation to furnish every member of the alliance with arms by signing the pact, she could not live up to it. At that point we would have given the Soviet Union justification for the complaint that it was being encircled, without having strengthened ourselves to cope with the policies the U. S. S. R. might adopt in reprisal.

The belief that the United States should ally itself in a military treaty with western European powers is a hang-over from the war scare last winter and spring which led to the demand for a permanent universal military-service program, a draft act, and big appropriations for the Defense Department. President Truman's new budget, limiting the military agencies to $15,000,000,000, has signaled the end of the hysterical period during which Washington seemed to believe that national military power provided the main assurance of national survival. Having rejected that notion at home, we seem to be proffering it abroad.

The administration began to think seriously of the pact after the Communist coup d'état in Czechoslovakia at the end of last February. Bernard Baruch and John Foster Dulles had proposed such a treaty during the early days of the congressional hearings on the Marshall plan, and the State Department publicly expressed interest when Ernest Bevin told the House of Commons that the British Government intended to negotiate a defense alliance with the Benelux powers and France. That negotiation for a 50-year compact led to the signing of the Brussels Treaty on March 17, the same day President Truman addressed Congress and asked for a peacetime draft in order to give America what Secretary Marshall called a "military posture." Noting the action in Brussels, the President said:

"This development deserves our full support. I am confident that the United States will, by appropriate means, extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them do so."

The pact thereupon became a dead subject for President Truman until his budget message of last January 10. All others directly concerned with the treaty idea have maintained an attitude of secrecy, with the result that the American public is uninformed and confused about one of the most momentous undertakings in foreign policy

which a President and a State Department have ever seriously entertained.

Inspired stories about the pact appeared in a few large papers between March 1948 and January 1949. They served only to befog the issue. Those who read the stories grew bored with the subject before it came to a boil, and those who did not read them have not been stirred to excited interest by the State Department's one comprehensive statement on the subject, issued less than a week before the inaugural address.

A good deal of activity has taken place behind that screen of secrecy, for which the American Government is not primarily responsible. Secretary Marshall in the middle of last spring recommended to Senator VANDENBERG and his colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that they push through the Senate a resolution encouraging the administration to negotiate a regional-defense treaty. From the suggestion was born the Vandenberg resolution, which the Senate passed on June 11 by 64 to 4. The administration took that vote as America's repudiation of her traditional opposition to balance-of-power arrangements, but the statements during the debate on the resolution by even the most ardent advocates of regionalism and anti-Sovietism, including Senator VANDENBERG, hardly bear such interpretation.

VANDENBERG told the Senate that a pact negotiated under the prod of his resolution would not step outside the final authority of Congress to declare war. And Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, Republican, of Massachusetts, said that "the purpose of the resolution is to show that we are in sympathy with the broad trend of strengthening the freedom-loving countries, but it does not commit us to do anything definite."

Despite that vagueness, the State Department after June 11 arranged for conversations with Canada and the Brussels powers about ways and means of creating an Atlantic alliance. The Defense Department assigned an observer to the military committee of the Brussels powers, and early in the summer the observer, Maj. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, became an active participant in the committee's discussions. After those preliminaries, the serious negotiations began on December 10. On January 14 the State Department admitted the public to the secret with a long argument about the desirability of the pact.

Assuming that the need for armaments in western Europe is real, the United States could choose between two courses each of which would more effectively keep the peace than a treaty of regional defense especially a treaty which cannot guarantee American action at the moment a treaty member is imperiled. The heart of the security problem is to find a policy which will enhance security and at the same time provoke the least possible counterpressure which endangers security. The conclusion of a North Atlantic pact would at once invite the Soviet Union to establish a competing system, probably including China if a Communist Government becomes supreme there.

The first alternate course is to distribute weapons from America to individual countries after making agreements for the standardization of arms and after broadening the existing Anglo-American Combined Chiefs of Staff Committee to include representatives of all the arms recipients. That would strengthen our friends militarily and enable the friendly western powers to consult continuously about military problems without formally creating an impervious bloc that would barricade future progress toward the resumption of world-wide cooperation. It substantially safeguards the purpose of the pact without burdening the West with the weaknesses of the pact.

The second alternate course is to negotiate a pact which provides for universal membership, following the recommendation of Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs. A pact of limited membership would be in effect only an extension of the Truman doctrine. But a wider instrument would lose the character of a political weapon aimed at some portion of the world. It would stand instead as the foundation for the system of world-wide peace enforcement which the authors of the United Nations Charter intended to create but which they have never been able to achieve.

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations is holding hearings on a measure to provide funds for flood-control matters. Flood control, soil conservation, and erosion are, or at least should be, considered essentially related. These are important national problems. They are so vital to my State and district that I take this opportunity to quote from the following statement which I made before the subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is no State in the Union which has the problem of waterway improvement in such varied aspects as does the State of Louisiana. We are on the one hand wonderfully blessed with a great asset and on the other hand we live in almost constant dread of the fury which flood can heap upon us. Water is, at times, our servant, and, at other times, our master. To the extent that our waters are abundant with fish, shrimp, oysters, and other resources, and our rivers, bayous, and other streams are invaluable channels and provide natural traffic for commerce, such waters are a blessed servant; but when, because of inadequate planning, the waters get out of control they become our master, heaping upon us untold misery and damage.

Again, perhaps, in no place within the State of Louisiana, is our water problem more varied than within the Third Congressional District, which I have the pleasure to represent in Congress. If, in the Third District of Louisiana, we had simply the problem of flood control, its solution could probably be fairly easily coped with; but when we add to our flood problem the needs of navigation, the necessity for exclusion of salt water, the great need for irrigation, and our problems of public health, then our situation becomes extremely complex and the solution is not an easy one to work out, either from an engineering or from an economic standpoint.

Mr. Chairman, Louisiana is the dumping ground for the floodwaters of 31 States of the Union. A vast area of the Third District of Louisiana borders on the Gulf of Mexico. It may fairly be stated, therefore, that the problems of the lower Mississippi Valley, especially in Louisiana, are many times greater than those of any other single one of the 31 States whose floodwaters pour through Louisiana, thence to the Gulf of Mexico; and, because of its proximity to the Gulf, the problems in my district are more acute than those in the other districts of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, your duty is to recommend to the Congress the appropriation of adequate funds for flood control and related matters to meet the needs of the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. I know that you are sympathetic with our problems, and the question is what amount should be appropriated. Your task in finding a solution is really very simple. The Corps of Army Engineers has recommend the sum of $104,000,000, while the Bureau of the Budget has placed a limitation of $70,000,000 for construction and maintenance on the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. The Corps of Army Engineers has had vast experience in this field, and based upon its splendid performance for over a century it seems to me unthinkable that you would not follow its advice instead of the advice of the Bureau of the Budget.

In the Flood Control Act of 1944 and in the River and Harbor Act of 1945, the Army engineers were directed to make preliminary examinations and surveys of all streams in Louisiana south of the latitude of Boyce, for all beneficial uses of water. These called for investigations of all such streams and bayous for flood control, rice irrigation, navigation and drainage, and for the prevention of stream pollution, and salt-water intrusion. Under their general authority, and in particular under the provisions of these acts of Congress, the Army engineers have held public hearings and have made preliminary examinations and recommendations for numerous needed projects in my district, and other projects are contemplated. Unless this committee adopts the recommendations of the Corps of Engineers and sets in motion the appropriation of $104,000,000 many projects through the lower Mississippi area, and in particular in my own district of Louisiana, which the people have been led to believe will be undertaken and completed, will be seriously jeopardized.

I, therefore, associate myself with the proponents of this measure and urge you with all there is in me to favorably report it to Congress.

I thank you for the privilege of allowing me to give my testimony on this most important piece of legislation.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, when this measure reaches the floor, that it will command the careful consideration of the House and receive its unanimous approval.

Fearmongering With the Nation's Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis.

On March 1 the well-known liberal editor of that paper, William T. Evjue, very ably exposed the tactics of the American Medical Association in the current discussion on national health insurance. His editorial follows:

FEARMONGERING WITH THE NATION'S HEALTH

The politicians of the American Medical Association are making the same mistake that the entrenched financial interests have always made in this country whenever a political reform is discussed. They are trying to scare the American people away from compulsory health insurance by yelling "Socialism and regimentation."

Their chief propagandist, Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the AMA Journal, is going up and down the country telling bogy stories of what will happen under President Tru-

man's health program. Not satisfied with Dr. Fishbein's production of hair raisers, the AMA has hired a San Francisco public-relations firm to help curdle the public's blood. It is expected that this advertising campaign will cost upward of $3,000,000, one of the biggest selling jobs ever staged.

The AMA is having trouble convincing many of its members that they should invest in Fear, Inc. The $25 assessment voted against the membership is meeting with considerable resistance and would meet with a lot more if more of the doctors had the courage to defy the organization and stand by their personal convictions. The other day the Brooklyn Medical Association, the largest local chapter in the Nation, voted against the assessment.

The AMA has also endorsed the work of the National Physicians Committee, a propaganda organization that floods the country with horrible tales of how national health insurance will mean that precinct committeemen will replace the doctors in the operating rooms of the hospitals. NPC's idea of discussing the issues involved is to call the proponents of health insurance stupid and then rush into a shrieking declaration that health insurance means communism.

It would seem that the AMA would have learned by now that the American people don't scare easily. Millions of dollars were spent to convince us that the Social Security Act would mean regimentation and a loss of individual freedom and expression. Americans still remember the dire warnings that social security would deprive them of their names and substitute a number on a dog tag to be worn around the neck. Similar fearmongering marked the attempts to defeat measures against child labor, to insure the right of collective bargaining, to establish the REA, and other reforms.

The scare technique may work for a time, but ultimately the people see through it. The majority of the American people know that our present methods of providing medical care are inadequate. And they don't need to be told by any Government official or anybody else. They know from their own experience.

Compulsory health insurance will not, as the AMA fear mongers say, mean the regimentation of doctors or political medicine. No doctor need belong to the plan if he doesn't want to, no more than he need accept a patient under a voluntary health-insurance program. And a doctor who is under the plan can still carry on private practice.

Health insurance merely provides a different method of paying for medical, hospital, and dental care—a method based on the sound insurance principle of pooling the funds of all of us to protect the individual who suffers a loss. It is the same principle we use in establishing fire protection by taxes collected from everybody.

Compulsory health insurance is a vital and revolutionary step in our social development. It is one that requires sober consideration and lengthy discussion. Hysterical name calling on either side will benefit no one.

State Rights and State Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of an address given by me before the Nebraska Legislature at Lincoln, Nebr., on Friday, February 18, 1949. The address is as follows:

Mr. President, there is a passage of Scripture which says that the wicked shall continue in their ways. Mark Twain, once called upon to explain that passage, replied it probably meant that they would study law and eventually go to some legislative body.

I am not here to jest about legislative bodies, but rather to praise them. I do not agree with Mark Twain. The high quality of the Nebraska Legislature is something that has been most impressive to me. The vast majority of the men and women who have served in this chamber have been a credit to our great State. It has been a group of individuals of integrity, character, and intelligence. The number of times that this legislature has said "No" to proposals that are not for the common good is far, far greater than many citizens realize.

We always need to remind ourselves of the importance of the sovereign States in our Federal Union. Local self-government is essential to the maintenance of liberty. If a function to be performed is necessarily a governmental function, it should be handled on the State level rather than on the national level, if that is reasonably possible. Likewise, the State should not assume the responsibility for a matter that can be handled by our local communities. This means better administration, less waste, and lower cost, fewer rules and regulations. It means matters must be handled with due regard for the peculiar situation of the people who pay the bill and who must live under that government.

A government that is close to the people means not only economy but honest and understandable administration. National legislation in any field often means not only greater cost but cumbersome and sometimes oppressive administration because of the very diversity and complexity of this Republic of 48 States. Laws and regulations suited to fit the needs of New York City or Los Angeles may not be suited to Auburn, Beatrice, Hastings, McCook, or Lincoln.

The founding fathers, in designing our Federal system, very wisely provided for the continuance of sovereign States with residuary powers and a national government of delegated and limited powers. We must never lose sight of the fact that while Federal jurisdiction means Federal responsibility, likewise State rights mean State responsibilities.

If, for instance, it is determined that the education of our children is to be controlled by the parents, the local communities, and the States, the responsibility follows. Our schools should be improved. The salaries of our teachers should be sufficient to enable them to maintain a dignified leadership in our communities. The close tie between home and school should not be loosened by the hand of the Federal Government. This can be achieved best through local control under which we have made such remarkable progress during the last 150 years.

Failure of the National Government to assume a fixed responsibility shifts added burdens to the States, and vice versa. To illustrate, the first responsibility of the National Government is to provide for the common defense. But if that were not assumed by the Government in Washington, protection against invaders and turmoil within would be a large item in the budget of all the States, more especially would it be an item for those States on our borders and seacoasts. It is not conceivable that such an extreme situation would prevail; of course, I use it merely as an example.

We recognize that the jurisdiction of the National Government extends beyond those activities that are specifically mentioned in the Federal Constitution. Our interstate rivers, for instance, know no State boundaries. Flood-protection works in one State may bring protection to the citizens of many other States. Land in one State may have to be sacrificed for the exclusive benefit of other States. Hence, the Federal Government must enter the picture and usually pay all or part of the cost of these projects. However, it should not follow that because the National Government must assert jurisdiction over those aspects of such developments that are definitely interstate, that the hand of the National Government should extend to all of the activities, local in character, emanating from such development or that the States should abandon their jurisdiction over such matters. The fact that the National Government has had to assume a wider and greater jurisdiction throughout the years is no reason why we should abolish the States or enlarge the jurisdiction of the National Government unless it is absolutely necessary.

The influence of the National Government is felt within the walls of this State capitol in the administration of joint Federal and State programs. Without a doubt, many of the Federal regulations imposed in such programs require a greater expenditure by the State than would be necessary if the State were given a freer hand. This problem has its repercussions in activities handled solely by the States also. As a member of the Congress I always appreciate the detailed suggestions of State officials on these problems. Inasmuch as national legislation must meet the conditions prevailing in all the States, those suggestions cannot always be translated into results, but they always merit the fullest exploration.

The burdens resting on the National Government in our time are most heavy. Huge outlays, running into billions of dollars, are necessary to provide for the defense, to care for him who has borne the battle, to implement our foreign policy, to carry on in the many fields where the National Government has already entered, to systematically pay the national debt, and to pay the interest thereon. The President of the United States has asked the Congress for $42,000,000,000. We hear a lot these days about legislating for the welfare of the citizens and to provide for their security. I believe in that, and I further believe that the solvency of the United States Government is the most important factor in such a program. Bankruptcy and repudiation on the part of our National Government would bring about the greatest degree of insecurity for every individual that the human mind can conceive.

No greater service can be rendered to our beloved Republic by those connected with the State government than the championing the cause of State rights and State responsibilities. By the same token, the Congress of the United States, in view of these heavy burdens, should certainly go slow in extending the jurisdiction of the National Government for the sake of social reform, even though the objectives of those reforms are most laudable.

I propose a closer liaison between State and National legislators. Efforts should be directed toward—

1. The simplification of the administration of already established joint Federal and State programs in order to promote economy and efficiency and lessen the burdens on our citizens.

2. The determination in as much detail as possible of just where the responsibilities of the State government shall end and where the National Government's responsibilities shall begin in any given field.

I believe that these efforts would promote much worth-while public discussion and bring about better government under this, our Federal system.

John Nicholas Brown Leaving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to the resignation of John Nicholas Brown, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air. All Americans interested in national defense feel that we have lost one of the finest executives this country has ever known. Great of stature, great of mind and heart, his cool, calm judgment will be sorely missed in our councils of defense.

The following is an excerpt from an article written by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of Sunday, March 6, 1949:

BROWN GOING QUIETLY

The third of the Pentagon trio is leaving quietly, of his own volition, with no critics in evidence. Yet, John Nicholas Brown, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, entered on his duties when the struggle over unification was at its height. Because naval aviation was the core of that struggle, his calm temperament and objectivity led to many of the compromises that were adopted. He effectively supported the Navy's building program of jet aircraft for carrier use, encouraged all-weather flying, enthusiastically developed the Naval Air Reserve and, as chairman of the Board for the Correction of Naval Records, employed his deep humanitarianism against injustice.

Admission to United States of Parents of American Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, on his bill (S. 1163) to amend the Immigration Act to facilitate the entrance into this country of parents of American citizens if the parents are otherwise eligible for admission, which reads as follows:

This bill merely extends to fathers and mothers of American citizens the same opportunities for reasonably expeditious immigration into the United States which are now accorded to minor children and to wives of American citizens and, in certain cases, to husbands.

The present statutes permit the immigration outside of quotas of minor children and wives and, in marriages occurring before January 1, 1948, of husbands, providing these relatives are otherwise eligible for admission to this country. The present statutes also provide a preference status for parents to come to this country, but the preference, of course, is under the quota regulations.

According to testimony of high officials of the State Department's Visa Division before a staff committee on immigration and naturalization last July, the parents of citizens residing in a number of foreign countries which have low quota allowances, even with their preferential status, are required to wait 7 or 8 years before they can be reached.

This situation has been made even more acute by virtue of the fact that during the war, immigration virtually ceased and even the few quota numbers provided under present laws were not used and subsequently expired—thus extending for additional years the period of delay so agonizing to those who yearn to join their families in this land of freedom.

From the testimony taken at that committee staff hearing on July 15, 1948, I am inclined to believe that the State Department would be willing to support legislation of this sort.

I have been urged, as I know many other Members of Congress have been urged, to introduce legislation to increase the quota of a particular nation. The desire is based primarily on the difficulties of American citizens in bringing to this country various categories of close relatives, but particularly fathers and mothers.

Due to the pattern of our immigration experience over the past few decades I believe this bill would accommodate a reasonable number of worthy cases so as to serve a meritorious cause without causing any strain on the housing or employment opportunities for American citizens.

Most of those who would be eligible to be admitted under this bill would undoubtedly live with their sons or daughters in this country, and it is a safe assumption, I believe, that many would be at that stage of life where they would not be competing for employment with Americans. It is taken for granted, of course, that there would be full provision made for their care by the families involved.

I am in hearty accord with the provisions of this proposed legislation, and I have just introduced a similar bill in the House, upon which I do hope early and favorable action will be taken.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, by request, the following address by Prof. Frank Nowak over the Justice for Poland radio program sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress, Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass.:

Fellow Americans, twice in a single generation the people of America have been called upon to wage a world war for the cause of humanity. Their generous response and great sacrifice on each occasion brought overwhelming victory, yet in each case we lost the peace and failed to gain the objective sought.

We, who were inspired to wage a just war for the peace and security of all mankind as solemnly outlined in the Atlantic Charter, were in the course of the war troubled and perplexed by our leaders who on the eve of victory dared to betray our war aims and to play fast and loose with the conscience and honor of the Nation.

In the First World War we lost the peace when our leaders failed to use the League of Nations for the purpose intended.

In the Second World War the record was even worse. Hardly had the principles of the Atlantic Charter been proclaimed in 1941 and accepted by 22 nations including the Soviet Union, when they were flagrantly violated by Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt in the very first test case of Poland. The people of this gallant country, who were the first to fight Adolf Hitler and who suffered heavier losses in men and material than any other country in proportion to population, were secretly and then openly betrayed by their allies.

The fate of Poland became the touchstone of the validity of the principles of the Atlantic Charter and at the same time demonstrated to the world that Stalin, like his former colleague in arms, Adolf Hitler, signed treaties for the purpose of deceiving friend and foe alike. By insisting that he wanted a strong and independent Poland, Stalin convinced his gullible allies at Tehran and Yalta that the best way of maintaining a strong and independent Poland was to cut the country in two along the Ribbentrop-Molotov lines of 1939. What is more, he induced Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt to subscribe to this shameful deal with Hitler in defiance of our professed war aims.

No doubt the democratic leaders imagined that for a price they had converted Stalin to their point of view. Even at Yalta they did not realize that they were being taken into the Russian camp. Wishful thinking had brought us to another Munich. The greatest military and naval power in the world betrayed an ally to appease Stalin. Poland at Yalta, like Czechoslovakia at Munich, became a tragic symbol of the failure of American diplomacy to achieve peace in our time. But the rape of Poland was but the beginning. Other countries, including China, were soon to suffer the same fate. Yalta was, indeed, a colossal blunder that lost for us the peace.

The attempt to whitewash our leaders by adducing military necessity as the cause of our blundering policy is plausible but not convincing. The labored argument is weak and apologetic. It will not convince any man of sense and it will not conceal from the American people the total failure of our diplomacy to achieve a lasting peace.

Robert Sherwood, in his book Roosevelt and Hopkins, An Intimate History, reveals the close collaboration of these two men in directing American policy. There is abundant evidence to show that Harry Hopkins was largely responsible for President Roosevelt's complete misapprehension of the character of Joseph Stalin and the trend of Russian policy.

The President never tired of repeating that "Harry got along with Stalin like a house-afire" and he trusted Harry's judgment. The stature of Harry Hopkins as a statesman is revealed by his own estimate of the achievements attained at Yalta. Said he:

"We really believed in our hearts that this was the dawn of a new day we had all been praying for and talking about for so many years. We were absolutely certain that we had won the first great victory of peace. * * * The Russians proved that they could be reasonable and farseeing, and there wasn't any doubt in the minds of the President or any of us that we could live with them and get along with them peacefully for as far into the future as any of us could imagine. * * * We felt sure that we could count on him (Stalin) to be reasonable and sensible and understanding."

When a well-informed American Ambassador to Moscow, William Bullitt, in 1941,

tried to warn President Roosevelt regarding the true character of Joseph Stalin and insisted on written agreements regarding lend-lease to Russia, the President replied.

"Bill, I don't dispute your facts. They are accurate. I don't dispute the logic of your reasoning. I just have a hunch that Stalin is not that kind of man. Harry says he's not and that he does not want anything but security for his country, and I think that if I give him everything I possibly can and ask for nothing in return, noblesse oblige, he won't try to annex anything and will work for a world of democracy and peace."

The gullibility of Harry Hopkins and a hunch of President Roosevelt that Stalin could be honest and decent if overwhelmed with favors brought us on the road to Tehran, Yalta, and ruin. When it seemed reasonable that Stalin should take half of Poland and all of Manchuria, Soviet aggression and expansion had been given the green light and was not to stop until it encompassed one fifth of the earth's surface, extending from Berlin, Germany, to the Yangtse River in China. Nor is the end yet in sight.

The supreme irony of our position today is that while we scrupulously continue to respect the terms of the agreements reached at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, Stalin has broken every one of the agreements. Surely the time has come to put the record straight and return to first principles. These agreements are but a snare and a delusion. They are a dishonorable betrayal of democratic tradition and have lost for us the confidence of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

If the denunciation of these agreements, already broken by Stalin, is termed Utopianism and Idealism, what, may we ask, is the meaning of the word Realism? If we can not convert Stalin who believes might is right and that power confers authority without responsibility, is it realism to deny our democratic birthright and accept the philosophy and frame of reference of a totalitarian dictator? That was the tragic mistake made at Munich, Tehran, and Yalta. That is the road to further appeasement, dishonor, and disaster. Such a policy is not realistic and it can never insure peace.

By returning to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and insisting upon a policy of firmness, we may yet convince Stalin of the futility of aggression and war. If he is still unconvinced, the challenge will be met. It is a calculated risk based on realism of a high order. By repudiating the errors made at Tehran and Yalta, America can once more regain her position of moral leadership among the nations of the world. In time of crisis, there will be no hypocrisy in our appeal for friends and allies. Our appeal will have a sound moral basis and will take into account those indefinable imponderables which inspire men inside and outside the iron curtain to continue the fight for a permanent peace based on the rights of man and respect for law.

Who will deny that at the present time the influence and power of the United Nations organization is also primarily based on moral leadership? It will deserve the homage of mankind only so long as it stands firm on questions of principle outlined in the preamble of the statute of organization. The United Nations is the hope and symbol of world organization based on respect for law; a public forum where all states, great and small, can obtain a hearing. But here also, Stalin has sought to impose his view that power confers authority without responsibility. His 29 votes in the Security Council have prevented effective action by the United Nations organization, although the Soviet Government has failed in its attempt to choke off honest criticism and expression of opinion. Debate in the public forum, however acrimonious, has clarified the issues in the ideological and political struggle between the east and west. World opinion is being crystallized, even when the United Nations lacks the power to enforce its decisions.

The world is becoming convinced that Soviet aggression can be stopped only by a show of superior power. Most men agree that if America is strong, the risk of war will be lessened, the United Nations will be immeasurably strengthened, and the nations behind the iron curtain can hope for survival. Once more the greatest military and naval power in the world, the United States is in a position to correct the mistakes made at Tehran and Yalta by uniting the liberty-loving nations of the world in a concerted effort to achieve a permanent and a just peace.

Farmers Union Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union was held at the city of Eau Claire from February 18 to February 21. It was one of the best conventions held by the farmers union since its organization. The farmers union has been steadily growing in both local unions and other membership and now has an enrollment of over 20,000. The convention was addressed by many prominent speakers, and various topics of interest to Wisconsin agriculture were ably discussed by the delegates present as well as by the guest speakers.

Through the courtesy of K. W. Hones, who has long been the president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, I have received a copy of the resolutions adopted at the Eau Claire convention, covering many of the topics of discussion. They are well worth the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives and others interested in the welfare of agriculture and of the great dairy industry of the Northwest.

The resolutions adopted are as follows:

Resolution on support price on butterfat

Whereas the only present governmental support price on dairy products is on butter; and

Whereas fluid milk is sold on the basis of butterfat content and butterfat is used or contained in many other products such as cheese, powdered milk, condensed milk, ice-cream mix, etc., and the support price on butter alone does not react to the benefit of many dairy farmers and communities in which butterfat is used for such other products, and the support price should, therefore, be upon butterfat instead of butter for the support of dairy industry in general; and

Whereas the dairy farmer is facing increasing costs of production, including taxes, insurance, cost of machinery, repairs on machinery and buildings, tractor and automotive fuels, building material, fertilizers, hired labor, and feeds, such costs having increased from one-third to one-half during the past 3 years; and

Whereas in addition to previously enumerated conditions that have affected all dairy farmers, many have faced great losses due to dairy plant financial difficulties and closings caused by decreasing market trends or shifts in comparative prices as between various dairy products competing for butterfat market; and

Whereas many dairy farmers have had a great loss in dairy herds due to various diseases such as Banks, mastitis, shipping fever, etc.; and

Whereas for the past 2 years there have been serious drought conditions in northern Wisconsin which have caused great losses of new seeding, crops, and feeds necessitating many dairy farmers to cut down on herds by reason of exorbitant costs of shipping in out-of-State hay and feeds; and

Whereas by reason of all of the foregoing conditions, the Wisconsin dairy farmer is in desperate need of adequate support price for his products; and

Whereas by reason of the foregoing conditions, the present support price on butter is too low and does not solve the problem of the general dairy farmers as well as would a reasonable support price on butterfat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the nineteenth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, meeting in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do go on record in favor of the National Farmers Union program for full parity; and be it further

Resolved, That milk and dairy products be made a basic commodity in the Government's price-support program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Farmers Union officers, the United States Secretary of Agriculture, and to Wisconsin United States Senators and Congressmen.

Resolution on Federal oleo tax

Whereas according to press stories the Eighty-first Congressional session will consider bills to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine; and

Whereas the enactment of such repeal legislation will jeopardize the economic welfare of dairy farmers in Wisconsin and other States; and

Whereas dairy farmers are being hard pressed now because of increased costs and lower prices for their products; and

Whereas the dairy farmers of the Nation have a tremendous investment of capital in their farms which will be jeopardized through unfair competition from the oleomargarine industry; and

Whereas the oleomargarine industry has been attempting for years to seduce the consuming public to buy their products by imitating dairy butter in color and through artificially fortifying their products with vitamins; and

Whereas dairy farming is one of the soundest methods of promoting soil conservation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the delegates attending the nineteenth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held at Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do petition our congressional representatives to vote against the repeal of the Federal oleomargarine tax; and be it further

Resolved, That we hereby request our congressional representatives to introduce legislation which will prohibit the use of yellow or allied yellow colors in the use and sale of margarine, and butter substitutes.

Resolution on tariff on imported butter

Whereas announcement has been made that the United States State Department is recommending that the present tariff of 14 cents per pound on butter be cut in half to permit increased importation of Danish butter; and

Whereas at present the tariff on the first 50,000,000 pounds of butter imported from Denmark during the months of October through March is only 7 cents a pound; and

Whereas this proposal by the State Department, if adopted, would seriously harm the American dairy industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the nineteenth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do go on record as opposed to the recommendation of the State Department to cut tariffs on imported butter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of State Dean Acheson and our congressional representatives.

Resolution on protection against losses from weather

Whereas present Nation-wide weather elements have created conditions that will wipe out many farmers, especially younger farmers, including many GI's; and

Whereas droughts, floods, unprecedented frost, and snow, particularly in 1948, have seriously endangered agriculture in the areas affected: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the Nineteenth Annual Convention of the Wisconsin Farmers' Union, held in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do petition the first session of the Eighty-first United States Congress to create a special bureau under the Agricultural Department to do the following: To insure areas for all losses incurred by farmers other than those which are man-made. The farmers in the affected areas should be subsidized until they are self-sufficient. And be it further

Resolved, That Congress take immediate steps to help out the affected areas by providing a Federal agency to float long-term low-interest loans to save stricken farmers from coast to coast.

Resolution on excess-profits tax

Whereas profits of big business and monopolies are reaching an all-time high; and

Whereas high profits will, if left to continue to rise, endanger the buying power of the average consumer; and

Whereas our public debt continues to rise from year to year: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the delegates assembled in annual convention at Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, go on record in favor of reenactment of the excess-profits tax; therefore be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators from Wisconsin and to our Congressman.

Resolution to abolish electoral college

Be it resolved, That the Wisconsin Farmers Union, at its annual convention at Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, go on record as being in favor that the President and Vice President of the United States of America be elected by popular vote rather than by the electoral college system.

Resolution on Federal housing program

Whereas the housing shortage is still critical and many people are housed in homes that are considered unfit for human habitation; and

Whereas we need a more adequate housing program to furnish homes for people in low-income brackets and for slum clearance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates attending the nineteenth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union at Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do go on record in favor of a more adequate Federal housing program: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators from Wisconsin and to our Congressman.

Resolution on full parity

Whereas the Eightieth Congress passed the Hope-Aiken bill supporting farm prices on a sliding scale of 60 to 90 percent of parity; and

Whereas this program will tend to bankrupt family-type farmers; and

Whereas the National Farmers Union has taken a definite stand for 100 percent of parity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the nineteenth annual convention of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, meeting in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do petition our Congressmen and United States Senators to support a change in the present law to provide for 100-percent price supports; and be it further

Resolved, That we favor a new parity formula to give farmers their fair share of the national income; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin Congressmen and United States Senators.

Resolution on compulsory military training

Whereas the Wisconsin Farmers Union believes that the United States should have an adequate program of defense based on voluntary enlistments for its manpower needed; and

Whereas we are opposed to the establishment of any system of compulsory military training on the grounds that every country which has had military conscription has lost its wars through its lack of production of foods and manufactured goods: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates to the nineteenth annual convention meeting in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, go on record as being opposed to compulsory military draft and training; and be it further

Resolved, That when it becomes necessary to draft men that wealth and industry also be drafted.

Resolution on Federal aid to education

Whereas thousands of rural communities in the United States are unable to finance a sound system of public education; and

Whereas education is the keystone of democracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delgates to the nineteenth annual Wisconsin Farmers Union Convention, meeting in Eau Claire, Wis., February 18–21, 1949, do go on record in favor of increasing Federal aid for education; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Wisconsin congressional Representatives.

Who Pays the Taxes and What Effect Do Burdensome Taxes Have on the Prosperity of the American People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party has had control of the executive and legislative branches of this Government for the past 16 years with the exception of the 2 years, during the Eightieth Congress. They fooled and deluded the people by their slogan of soaking the rich with taxes. The real true facts which the American people ought to know and understand are that the 2 years the Republican Party controlled the tax-fixing body, the House of Representatives of the United States, is the only time that the poor or small man received any reduction in taxes during this entire period.

Seven million little fellows were taken off of the income-tax list altogether. During all this time the Democrats were claiming to soak the rich with taxes, and we have heretofore let them get away with it. The facts are the people, the small wage earners of America, paid most of these enormous Federal taxes during the periods of time that the Democratic Party was in control.

Even now, after the Republican Party relieved millions of small taxpayers of Federal income taxes, approximately 43 percent of all the Federal taxes comes from the individuals and not from big business or not from the rich. Nineteen percent more come from customs, excise taxes, and other taxes that might be justly called sales taxes and most all of these sales taxes come out of the pockets of the plain ordinary people when they buy the things which they need and have to have. A reduction of these taxes, and the Republican Party is now sponsoring such a program, would give further direct relief to millions of people that are in the low-income brackets.

The thing the American people ought to understand in making up their minds which party has the soundest tax philosophy is that only 28 percent of our present Federal taxes come from corporations. That leaves 72 percent of the great fund of Federal taxes coming off of the people themselves. If President Truman carries out his many promises he will need several billions of dollars more in taxes besides the billions which the Federal Government now exacts from the people. If he gets this additional tax money, about 70 percent will come out of the pockets of the people that work in one way or another. That is the farmers, the laborers, and wage earners, the small-business man, and the professional men will have to pay. The Republican Party wants to protect these people. The Republican Party was criticized for the Eightieth Congress, yet there was enough confidence engendered among the people of America during this period of time until America went ahead and invested its money and expanded its business. We produced more, made more, and had more prosperity during the Eightieth Congress than ever before in the history of this Nation in peacetime.

What is happening now? Under the wild promises of the Democratic administration, with the black threat of more taxes, unemployment is beginning to stalk the streets. Over 3,000,000 men and women are now out of jobs and more people are being added to this discouraged group of American citizens every week. Business has largely stopped expanding. If this process of discouragement to American business and to the American people is not stopped, if we do not get back to the sound principles of taxation as advocated by the Republican Party, America will soon be mired up in a Truman depression.

The Republican Party, in my opinion, is the only hope of the American people for continued prosperity and stopping

Government waste. Our experience has taught us, and it is a simple proposition to understand, besides 70 percent of Federal taxes coming from the people, if we, in addition to loading more taxes upon them, exact more taxes from business, then business cannot expand, it cannot furnish employment to millions of needy workers, unemployment will spread, the people generally will have little to spend, the farmer cannot sell his products at reasonable prices, the manufacturer cannot sell his goods, the national income will greatly decrease, and even though the Democratic Party may succeed in placing more taxes on the overburdened people of America, yet the end result and the net take of Federal taxes under this unsound policy will bring into the Federal Treasury a smaller sum than if the philosophy of the Republican Party is adopted and we allow America to go forward with working and producing and creating income and wealth from which to derive our Federal revenues.

The burdensome and excessive and unreasonable excise taxes upon many articles that are used every day in the homes of the American people has caused many American businesses to be removed from the class that makes money and can pay taxes. In addition to this, it has added many thousands of workers to the unemployment roll. While it is true that some articles are luxuries and should be taxed, there are many other articles needed by the common people of America that are now taxed and this adds to the cost of living besides creating unemployment and drying up the prosperity and the taxpaying ability of the American people.

There is a situation where taxes can be legitimately and sensibly applied for the purpose of producing the tax revenues that our Government needs. There is another theory where you can carry the taxing power to such an extent as to destroy. We must find where this line of demarcation exists. The experience of the American people when we read the history of this Nation will, I think, convince the thinking people of this great Nation that the Republican Party is sound in the position that it is taking on the question of Federal taxes.

One thought which the American people ought to keep in mind is that the farmers, the working men and women, and the people who are in business have a common interest in this question.

The sound approach is, there ought not to be any disagreement among any of our classes of people. The truth is, what is good for America is good for all of them. A tax program can and should be worked out that would add to the prosperity and the income of all the American people. This would make the American people, by their producing power and increased earning power, better able to pay Federal taxes. This would be accomplished, not by a higher rate as the Democratic Party proposes, but by having a greater income under a prosperous Republican administration more Federal revenue could be derived out of a larger income, received by everybody, and with a less percent of everybody's income taken for Federal taxes.

The question may arise, Can this be accomplished?

The answer is, "Yes." The Eightieth Congress enacted legislation carrying out the thoughts expressed above and accomplished this wonderful good for all the people. For the first time in many years everybody's taxes were reduced. Everybody's income increased and millions of taxpayers were taken off the tax roll. Best of all, the Nation was prosperous and business hummed. Jobs were plentiful and the Republican Party balanced the budget.

They spent less of the Federal income than was collected through Federal taxes. They reduced the taxes on the people approximately $4,000,000,000. They had money left to pay on the national debt. They allowed a man and his wife to pool their income, file a joint income tax return, and divide it by two, thus greatly relieving the families of America from burdensome taxes. They encouraged business and they encouraged the people. The threat of increased taxes as proposed by the Democratic Party has cast a gloom over American business and over the working people who know that business has to be prosperous if they are to have jobs, and over the American farmer who knows that all the people must be prosperous if he sells his products for a good price. This question is vital to the American people, and the Republican Party has proved itself able to best manage the country's affairs.

A Growing American Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the tremendous strides we are making in this country for better interfaith relations is the following article which appeared in the February 1949 issue of the bulletin of the Hebrew Union College.

A GROWING AMERICAN TRADITION

President George Washington proclaimed the first Nation-wide Thanksgiving Day in 1789, and on Thursday, November 26, of that year the first sermon marking the occasion in New York State was delivered by the Rev. Gershom Mendez Seixas at the Jewish Synagogue in New York City.

EXCHANGE SERVICES

Since early in the last century, rabbis and Protestant ministers have been conducting exchange services in synagogues and churches. Joint services have become increasingly common during the holiday season from Thanksgiving through New Year's Day. This custom was practiced often by Rabbi Gustav Gottheil during his long association with Temple Emanu-El in New York City in the last half of the nineteenth century. The tradition was strengthened further by congregations in midwestern States during the 1870's.

In recent years exchange services have been growing in popularity with a broadening of the concept of brotherhood and democracy. There have been increasing evidences, too, of a genuine tendency in every section of the United States to implement this greater understanding with more instances of actual cooperation to translate the American creed into concrete terms.

In San Francisco such services have been held alternately at Temple Emanu-El and the First Unitarian Church since the 1860's. On November 25 last Unitarians and the congregation of Rabbi Alvin I. Fine gathered in Temple Emanu-El to render thanksgiving to God.

The good-neighbor policy of K. A. M. Temple in Chicago goes back to Thanksgiving Day in 1871, when the Universalist Society asked and received the use of the synagogue for its services because the society's own building had been destroyed in the Chicago fire.

During the past year several Jewish and Christian congregations, temporarily homeless, found shelter in houses of worship dedicated to different traditions but serving the same God.

An eloquent letter, accompanied by a gift of $1,500, was sent during the holiday season by Mr. and Mrs. L. A. Nordan, members of the Central Christian Church of San Antonio, Tex., to Rabbi David Jacobson, of Temple Beth-El, as an expression of gratitude for the hospitality of the Jewish congregation while the church has been without a building of its own.

In Roslyn, N. Y., young Alvan Rubin, Huc-Jir student rabbi, has been conducting Jewish community center services in the Roslyn Presbyterian Church, its Sunday school classes in a Catholic day school, its Hebrew classes in the town firehouse, and general meetings in the Odd Fellows hall.

HOSTS TO OTHER FAITHS

Temple Israel in St. Louis has been host during the past year to the congregation of the First Church of Christ, Scientist. On January 7 last, the Village Presbyterian Church in New York offered its facilities to the newly formed Village Temple. And in Cortlandt, N. Y., Rabbi Victor Eppstein soon will be conducting services for his congregation in the Boscobel Baptist Church.

In the heart of the country, in Chicago, Jewish and Christian residents of the Hyde Park area participated in a community service in the Rockefeller Chapel of the University of Chicago, as they have been doing for a number of years during the holiday season. The sermon was preached by Rabbi Louis L. Mann of Sinai Congregation before an assembly of all faiths.

Under the auspices of the Rabbinical Association of St. Louis, Mo., Methodist Bishop Ivan Lee Holt delivered a sermon at the United Hebrew Temple of Rabbi Samuel Thurman, who was ordained at HUC.

Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, of Temple Israel, Hartford, conducted annual joint services for his congregation and that of Emanuel Methodist Church at the church. And the members of Beth El Congregation in Corpus Christi, Tex., met in the Church of the Good Shepherd to hear Rabbi Sidney Wolf preach the sermon at the fourteenth annual joint observance during the holiday season in that city.

DEEPER UNDERSTANDING

There were many other demonstrations of good will by men and women of different traditions, stressing qualities of heart which eventually will lead all mankind to brotherhood.

Beginning with the time when men of a common heritage express gratitude to God for His bounty of food and freedom, and continuing through Hanukah and Christmas, when the Jew through his tradition, and the Christian through his, kindle tapers that light up the world, we see the development of greater faith and deeper understanding among men.

Socialism—Now Is the Time To Fight It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks the following article by James H. McGraw, Jr., president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., on a subject which should have the attention of every citizen in this country:

Do we want to follow Britain down the economic skids?

We Americans face that question today. For we are being advised by administration economists in Washington to take the course which destroyed Britain industrially. It is the temporarily easy course of cutting down expenditures for tools in order to have more things to consume right away.

The President's Council of Economic Advisers tells us we are spending too large a part of our national income on new tools and equipment. A larger share, they say, should go for goods and services used directly by consumers.

Before we take that advice, let us look at Britain. When the British once allowed their industrial plants and equipment to run down—they started down a dreary road to industrial stagnation and decay.

British industry once ruled the world. Low production costs enabled it to undersell all competitors. Efficiency gave British workers the highest living standards anywhere.

Now all that Britain has between it and economic disaster is pluck and American aid through the Marshall plan.

The British people are living poorly—still on rations and in austerity. With practically everyone working, and working longer hours than we do in the United States, they cannot produce enough to pay for the raw materials and food they must import.

How did Britain get in this fix?

The story is complicated British sacrifices in two wars play a tragic part in it. But another fact also stands out:

Britain began to go downhill even before World War I—when British industries allowed their plants and equipment to grow obsolete.

Once that process started, it grew steadily worse. By 1929 the share of Britain's national income being plowed back into capital investment had shrunk to less than two-thirds of what it had been 20 years earlier. We were putting twice as big a share of our national income into capital goods at this same time.

Skimping on capital equipment—on new plants and new tools—put the skids under industrial Britain.

World War II only speeded up a process already well under way.

British industry today shows the results of its failure to keep up to date. Here are three examples found by Dr. Laci Rostas, Britain's leading authority on measuring workers' productivity:

An American produces four times as much pig iron as his British counterpart.

He produces more than four times as many tires.

In all industry, on the average, an American produces almost three times as much.

The real reason is the American's better tools. The British are struggling with equipment that is, on the average, 40 years old.

Britain once had a big head start in industrial equipment. But she let it slip away. And as it went, Britain's industrial and political leadership slipped with it.

How could British leaders have slept while all this happened?

This, too, is a complicated story. But parts of it stand out clearly:

1. British businessmen put in more time perfecting cartels to avoid competition than they did in improving their plants and equipment to meet it.

2. British labor leaders concentrated on sharing the work and sharing the wealth—rather than doing the job necessary to have enough wealth to make the sharing worth while.

3. British governments taxed away the means to buy new equipment. By steadily increasing personal taxes, they undercut the ability of individuals to invest in new equipment. Finally, they took away the incentive to get new equipment by progressively taxing away any returns on it.

4. Far-seeing Socialists smiled all the while, knowing that as private industry more and more lacked the tools to do a progressive job, they would have their chance to run the country.

Now, with Britain's fate in their hands, the Socialists are trying desperately to stem the nation's economic decline by rebuilding its industrial plants and equipment.

They are making a little headway, but not enough. There are several reasons. One is that Britain must export most of the new equipment she can make. Another major reason—increasingly important for her future—is that money needed to renovate Britain's run-down industry is taxed away to support welfare programs. The (London) Economist grimly puts it this way:

"The importance of the function of saving has only been discovered now that the means of saving have largely been destroyed."

Our own Federal and State Governments, too, have dangerously whittled away incentives. They have more than tripled tax rates on personal and corporation incomes in the last 20 years. Now, the President proposes to do more whittling.

If the United States is not to go Britain's way, we must preserve our incentives to save and to invest in industry.

If the United States is to progress, we must continue to build up our industries.

The President's economic advisers say we can slow down. But the McGraw-Hill survey of "Business' Needs for New Plants and Equipment," reported in the previous editorial in this series, produced facts to the contrary. It showed that industry now plans—if it can get the money—to spend $55,000,000,000 in the next 5 years for new plants and new tools. Moreover, it showed industry's needs for new facilities are large.

By cutting down the incentives to save, by giving soothing advice that we do not need to save so much, Washington is pushing us toward Britain's way—the route via industrial stagnation to socialization.

Before we skid too far, we should pull up short and ask ourselves: Do we want to go Britain's socialistic way?

There still is time to say "No."

Communism in This Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following are two editorials which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of March 4, 1949, both of which deal with the subject of communism in this country:

THREATS OF FOSTER AND DENNIS BARE THEIR TRAITOROUS AIMS

William Z. Foster, national chairman, and Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in America, have reiterated treasonable purposes expressed earlier in the week by Maurice Thorez, of France, and Palmiro Togliatti, of Italy These latter two Communist leaders have proclaimed to the world that they will commit treason against their own nations if war should come with Russia. In somewhat more cautiously couched terms, Foster and Dennis have cast their fortunes and those of their party in America with the Kremlin.

There is the familiar specious justification for such a treasonable course. A war between Russia and the United States would necessarily be an imperialist war, initiated by Wall Street, and as such it would be unjust and destructive of the deepest interest of the American people and all humanity. This sophistry will fool no one.

On the contrary, these recent rash revelations of Communist leaders are producing and will continue to produce an effect which could hardly have been included in their calculations when they initiated their bold policy of telling all. They have brought their cause into the open, where it can be dealt with most effectively. They have themselves provided authoritative confirmation of suspicions and fears.

It is no longer possible for a Communist to say that he is a loyal Frenchman, Italian, or American. He has established his status as a citizen of the Kremlin who is in America or some other country for two purposes—enjoyment of the privileges of democratic government while conspiring for its destruction. The constitution of the Third International permits of no divided loyalties.

"Every branch and member of the Universal Communist Party," it says, "is pledged to indulge in national treason in case of war with the Soviets, no matter who, in such a war, should be the aggressor." They are prepared to follow this line to the letter, which is a good thing to know. Knowledge of the plans of the enemy is a major advantage in any conflict. It must be utilized fully.

Communists, through the authoritative word of their leaders, have divested themselves of all pretense of being merely a political party. They are a fifth column, traitors and potential saboteurs. Through their orgy of self-revelation in Europe and the United States, they have given the governments under which they live, including our own, reason to watch them at every hour of the day and night and to strike at them quickly and mercilessly when there is the slightest sign that treason is brewing.

Unfortunately their presence in the country must be tolerated. But there must be no tolerance of sabotage and betrayal.

DE WOLFE OUSTER OF MELISH DOES A SERVICE TO RELIGION

No one who has followed the strange case of Dr. John Howard Melish and his son in Brooklyn can fail to recognize in the ouster decision of Bishop James P. De Wolfe the judgment and determination of a mind seriously intent upon protecting the best interests of his church and the faithful.

The official act of Bishop De Wolfe in relieving the elder Dr. Melish of his pastorate was in no way a hasty, precipitate, or arbitrary action. Every legal and canonical step was taken to insure the proper and full measure of justice for the two clergymen whose activities and attitudes were under question. But even before the juridical procedures of the church were brought completely into play the bishop, with sincere paternal solici-

tude, had made every effort to dissuade the erring father and son from the dubious paths they trod and to sway them to retrace their steps and follow in the traditional ways of the ministry.

The bishop expressed the crux of the issue when he wrote: "Questions have arisen regarding the effect upon the church as a whole and upon the parish in particular of the activity on the part of one of the church's priests, in good standing, exercised among reputed atheists, Communists, agitators of world revolution, totalitarianism, and almost every article which denies the Christian doctrine of man. * * * The question well may be raised, 'Why does the church allow one of her own priests to engage in such activities without protest or condemnation?'"

Dr. Melish's spiritual superior had answered that question, by anticipation, in a previous paragraph of his official statement when he wrote: "I believe the Rev. William Howard Melish, assistant minister, to have been, and that he continues to be, most mistaken in what he supposes to be the pastoral application of his ministry. He has allowed himself, I believe most unfortunately, to become involved with 'outside activities' of such a nature and to such an extent as to incite doubt and confusion in the church as to whether he is indeed living up to his ordination vows as a priest in the church."

The issue in this local case is the same as in every similar case everywhere. Communism and Christianity are opposites. The one is the negation of the other.

The Founder of Christianity mingled with sinners, atheists, and what not. But it was done with the thought and hope of winning them away from their evil ways. The Communist sympathizer consorts with atheists, agitators, and the like, as Bishop De Wolfe specified, but as a collaborator and a promoter of their activities.

An enlightened clergyman should know and understand that Communist fronts are meant to be just that—external displays of innocence which hide evil purposes. If he does not realize this, and still refuses to follow the advice and counsel of those who do, especially when the counselor is his own ecclesiastical superior, there is no alternative but the action which has been taken in this case.

Bishop De Wolfe has done a great service to his church, the community, and the cause of religion both in the decision he has made and in the manner in which it was made.

Social-Security Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial, entitled "Huge Package," which appeared in the Niagara Falls Gazette, Niagara Falls, N. Y., on February 28, 1949:

HUGE PACKAGE

Administration social-security bills, on which hearings are now starting, are overwhelming in their scope. If adopted, they will raise many practical problems that will not be easy to solve, and they will entail increased pay-roll taxes. The total effect is, therefore, difficult to evaluate.

The bills provide for extension of present and proposed social-security benefits to an additional 20,000,000 persons, including the self-employed, farm and domestic workers, employees of the Federal Government, and of nonprofit corporations, and State and local employees in States that contract for this coverage. This would boost the number of persons included to 50,000,000 and their dependents.

Benefits would be raised to nearly twice the amounts provided in the present law. For women, they would start at age 60 instead of 65. Beneficiaries would be permitted to earn up to $50 a month (the figure now is $15) before losing any benefits.

New benefits not now available would be paid. There would be disability insurance for limited periods, ranging from $8 to $45 a week, according to income and number of dependents. Federal payments to the needy are another new proposal.

Costs would mount. After the program had been in effect 6 months, they would reach double the present social-security pay-roll deductions for persons making less than $3,000 a year, and more than triple present deductions for persons making more than $4,800. Employees' matching contributions, which have some inhibiting effect on wages, would keep step.

Within 5 to 10 years, the bills anticipate, the number of beneficiaries reaching 65 would become so great that further increases (either in pay-roll deductions or in general taxes) would be necessary.

Hearst Newspaper Prints Front-Page Apology to Congressman for Red Smear Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCK R. HAVENNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Members of the House and, indeed, all of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be interested in the following anthology of a political smear attack.

On October 27 last, just prior to the 1948 national elections, the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst newspaper, published a front-page editorial entitled "A Vote for HAVENNER Is a Vote for Bridges."

This editorial contained the following statements:

HAVENNER again is a candidate of the Communists and of all factions the Communists and Bridges represent. * * * A vote for HAVENNER is a vote for Bridges and the Kremlin.

On that day my campaign manager, Mr. Elmer P. Delany, a prominent San Francisco attorney, served notice upon the attorneys for the San Francisco Examiner that it was his intention to file a suit for libel in my behalf against that newspaper. In accordance with a provision of the California libel law, Mr. Delany demanded an immediate retraction of the libelous editorial. On the same day the attorneys for the San Fransciso Examiner notified Mr. Delany verbally that the newspaper refused to publish a retraction.

Accordingly Mr. Delany proceeded to file a suit for libel in my behalf against the San Francisco Examiner.

Despite the libelous attacks of the San Francisco Examiner, I was reelected to Congress at the national election on November 2, 1948.

On November 17, 1948, the following announcement was printed on the first page of the San Francisco Examiner:

A RETRACTION OF HAVENNER EDITORIAL

On October 27, 1948, this paper published an editorial entitled "A Vote for HAVENNER Is a Vote for Bridges."

Insofar as this editorial could be interpreted as questioning Mr. HAVENNER'S loyalty to the United States, or labeling him as a Communist, or a Communist sympathizer, or Communist supporter, it is hereby retracted.

I had received no advance notice that the above retraction was to be published and had no knowledge of it until I saw it in print. Of course, the purpose of the libelous editorial was to defeat me for reelection by persuading the voters of San Francisco that I was the candidate of the Communists and a supporter of the Kremlin. The retraction of this false and libelous editorial was not made until 2 weeks after the election was held—obviously too late to repair the damage intended to be done to me on election day.

On Sunday, February 27, 1949, the following letter, signed by the publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, was printed on the first page of all editions of that newspaper:

SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER,
February 24, 1949.

Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAVENNER: As part of the amicable settlement of the libel suit brought by you against us, we are pleased to address this letter to you publicly.

Your suit was instituted as a result of editorial and articles appearing in the San Francisco Examiner.

We are convinced that you are not a Communist nor in sympathy with communism.

We are convinced that you are a true American in the American tradition. We are sorry that we attempted to cast a doubt on your Americanism during your various campaigns for public office.

It is not necessary to reserve the right to differ with you in the future on specific issues, but we do not wish this apology to carry the implication that any promise has been made to support you. As a real American, we know you wish us to assert an independent judgment on all issues.

Very truly yours,
CLARENCE R. LINDNER.

Public Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I invite the attention of the House to a resolution recently adopted by the committee on welfare policy of the American Public Welfare Association, stressing the urgency of liberalizing and extending the

old-age and survivors insurance program as a means of preventing dependency and reducing the assistance loads. With the hearings now being held by the Ways and Means Committee on needed social-security legislation, I think it is particularly interesting to observe that those officials in this country who administer assistance are taking the lead in urging upon Congress that constructive action to reduce the number of people coming to their agencies for aid be taken at once. A similar resolution was passed in December at the meeting of the State Council of Public Assistance and Welfare Administrators.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the cost of public assistance financed from general tax revenues of all levels of government is unnecessarily high because millions of persons are not included under the old-age and survivors insurance program; and

Whereas the exclusion from coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program of the self-employed, agricultural workers, domestic workers, employees of nonprofit organizations, and public workers is not only discriminatory toward persons in these occupations but places a disproportionate financial burden in terms of assistance costs on certain States; and

Whereas the present old-age and survivors insurance program benefit payments are too low to provide economic security to many persons with the result that supplementary public assistance grants are necessary in these instances; and

Whereas insurance benefits based on a work record and available to the individual for his basic economic security without a needs test are preferable to public-assistance payments from general tax funds; and

Whereas it is in the public interest to reduce the need for assistance by preventing dependency through contributory social insurance: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the welfare policy committee of the APWA recommends that the old-age and survivors insurance program be immediately extended to all gainfully employed persons now excluded; and be it further

Resolved, That the old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments, which are now computed on a formula adopted by the Congress in 1939, be increased in accordance with the rise in the cost of living.

Jack Kapp Symbolizes the American Answer to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the clichés which I am never ashamed to repeat is that the right way for America to avoid the dangers of communism—or of fascism—is to make our own democracy work.

Jack Kapp, the president of Decca Records, is a living symbol of what I mean.

Jack Kapp is the boy Horatio Alger wrote about. He is the hero of the unending American saga of rags to riches. He is the man who symbolizes competitive free enterprise.

I do not want to be overly eulogistic. I am not trying to suggest that Jack Kapp is without fault. What I am trying to say is that his rise from a poverty-stricken beginning to his present position—in which I can find a parallel to my own youth—is another illustration of the opportunity that lies around us in America.

It is no wonder that Life, in its March 7 issue, chose to write an editorial around his career and his philosophy, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD:

NO FRONTIERS?—MAYBE THE CLOSED ECONOMIC FIELD OFFERS A REALLY SOFT TOUCH

Jack Kapp, president of the Decca Records Co., has been having an interesting time talking to college students. On every campus, says Mr. Kapp, the questions are the same: "What chance have I got in this system?" The students are plaintive; they couple their skeptical questions with such wistful remarks as, "Everything is in the hands of a few people."

Well, college students have always been skeptical before diving into the somewhat disconcerting whirlpool of that first job hunt. It was more or less the same in 1925 as it is now. But not quite the same. For the disbelief of a generation ago was the purely psychological reaction that occurs when anyone stands face to face with the unknown. Today the disbelief is deeply philosophical; it is part of a world weariness that afflicts even those who have good jobs and secure niches in adult society. Undergraduates can hardly be blamed for reflecting a philosophical attitude that is cultivated not merely by the young but by practically everybody, even some of the professors.

There is a peculiar irony, however, when disbelieving questions are addressed to Jack Kapp, of all people. For Mr. Kapp is living proof that no man in America is destined by circumstances to spend his life behind a large and immovable eight ball. Mr. Kapp was born in Chicago in 1901, the son of a house-to-house canvasser for the old Columbia Phonograph Co. He worked his way through high school by taking errand-boy jobs. In 1926 he was in charge of the Brunswick Co.'s race-record division, meaning that his business was to go around the country making recordings by Negro talent.

All of this was background for what was to come later. In 1934 Mr. Kapp decided the time had come to use his background in his own behalf. What chance did he have? The record business was near the all-time low. Radio had forced the bankruptcy of hundreds of record companies; only two remained. Everything was in the hands of a few people.

What Mr. Kapp proceeded to do was to prove that a closed field is the softest of touches. As Mr. Kapp himself puts it, any company which casts itself in the role of "custodian of the status quo" is destined to die. With the record business on the rocks because of status quo custodians, Mr. Kapp hived up in the public library for a week to study old record catalogs. He discovered that the business was oriented toward Europe; there were 1,200 recordings of Chopin to few of Irving Berlin. You could get plenty of foreign voices, but United States singers, such as Bing Crosby, were considered infra dig.

All of this gave Mr. Kapp an idea that soon burgeoned into a relevant philosophy of business. Pursuing his idea, he made Bing Crosby a rich man. Bucking the rest of the industry, which considered it foolish to put entire musical comedy scores into album form, Mr. Kapp made thousands of dollars by selling Gershwin scores complete.

Mr. Kapp likes to repeat the words from Emerson's The American Scholar: "We will walk on our own feet; we will work with our own hands; we will speak with our own minds." Emerson isn't much favored these days, and the modern American scholar might insist that Mr. Kapp is a monopolist in four-leaf clovers. But the Dartmouth student who has spent the winter week ends riding up a few of America's 1,000 ski tows might stop and reflect on the fact that in 1932 there wasn't a single ski tow in the whole United States. Maybe it is impossible to start a new automobile company today, but General Motors is going to need a new president in a few years, and it is certainly going to need new production men. According to a recent survey this country needs to train 15,000 new doctors; indeed, if present trends continue we will, so says Dr. Thomas Parran, be faced with a doctor shortage of 30,000 to 50,000 by 1960.

"What chance have I got?" In the light of the world's hunger for services and moving ideas, the chances would seem to be as manifold as the inside of the human skull can make them. When someone asks Mr. Kapp a wistful question the next time, he might counter it with another question. We suggest that he put it this way: "What's stopping you?"

Sally Pitcher Letter to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on effects of excessive excise taxes inserted by Sidney Fields in the New York Daily Mirror of Monday, February 21, 1949:

DEAR MR. CONGRESS: Right now I am doing a slow burn because I've discovered (in my pocket where it hurts) that taxes are a daily brain breaker and not just something I chew my nails over around midnight every March 14. I honestly don't know all the answers and I'm writing you to find out.

It all started when I dropped into a store the other day to buy a handbag and the price tag plainly read $12.50, but the saleslady said that will be $15 please. I got a little annoyed, though she was a very nice saleslady. Her first cousin through marriage went to the same junior college I did. Anyway that extra $2.50 got me mad.

The saleslady said that was an excise tax. I said an excise tax? And she said you know the luxury tax. Well, I didn't know because you don't call a handbag a luxury. She said she didn't call it a luxury either, but the Government did. Now, you're the Government and I'd like to know what's a luxury about a handbag? It's my pocket. And if you tax my pocket why didn't you tax every man's pocket, including your own?

WHY PICK ON WOMEN?

Now, for the past 4 years I've been working as a secretary-assistant to an account executive in an advertising agency, and after I got through talking to that nice saleslady about these luxury taxes I talked to my boss about them. He rattled off some pretty staggering figures: For instance, you collected $525,000,000 in luxury taxes on furs and leather and toilet goods and jewelry just for 1947, and over $90,000,000 of that was collected right here in the city. Women pay all or most of that money. Why do you discriminate against us?

I earn an average salary, average, that is, until you get through with it. Like any other girl I have to budget half my salary for clothes, $6 a week for lunches and carfare, about $1 for personal cosmetics, and about $7 for amusements and gifts and trifles come Christmas and birthdays and such. That leaves me a big $6.75 for big things like a fur coat or a vacation. I'm still paying back the money I borrowed for the last 2-week vacation I had. Did you borrow for your vacation?

And don't you dare tell me my fur coat is a luxury. I can't afford a fancy cloth coat every year. Besides, it isn't as warm as fur. And I can wear fur day or evening. I paid $375 for my kidskin coat and got hit with a $75 tax. Hear that? $75!

Within the past year I bought a wallet for $7.50 and an overnight bag for $20 and some earrings and a bracelet for $10 and paid $7.50 in luxury taxes. And if you ask your wife she'll tell you that earrings and a bracelet aren't luxuries. You're not dressed without them.

Now, let's take up this business of personal care. Your own Labor Department got out a little pamphlet called Government Girl Budget a couple of years ago and said that it's reasonable to put aside $56 a year for personal care, if your take-home pay is $1,610. Now, I do my own hair and nails (does your wife?) and I pay that 20 percent every time I buy lipstick, powder, talc, shampoo, hand lotion, powder base, nail polish, or deodorant.

A DISTAFF REVOLUTION

You may not know about these things, but just ask your wife or the nine ladies in Congress. You can bet me right now that they won't call them luxuries. They're absolute necessities for health, cleanliness, and appearance.

Can you imagine if I walked into work any morning without my nails done, my hair groomed, my eyebrows neat, and no lipstick and powder? My boss would very probably shriek with fright and tell me to go right home and get dressed—if he didn't fire me first.

Please remember that besides your 20-percent tax the city gets an additional 2 percent. I didn't mind paying your old luxury taxes during the war when everybody had to try. But the war is over now. Or haven't you heard?

Your 20-percent tax is against us women; it's unfair and just plain nasty, and there are 16,000,000 women in business who I'm sure feel just the way I do about it. That's a lot of votes, Mr. Congress. A lot of votes.

I know one way we could get rid of this nasty 20 percent: Until it's lifted let every woman do without any cosmetics. Know what that would do? Just imagine your wife at breakfast without any powder or lipstick on. Such a movement would create a deluge of divorce and bankruptcy. Why, it's as great a menace as the atom bomb.

Respectfully yours,

SALLY PITCHER.

Remember Colombia?—It Could Happen Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under authority to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit a copy of an editorial from the New York Times of date March 6, 1949, entitled "Communism Drops the Mask" as follows:

COMMUNISM DROPS THE MASK

The American Communist leaders, William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, have given us an opportunity to clear our minds as to just what the Communist movement in this country means. Not that there is much that is new in the statement issued by Messrs. Foster and Dennis on March 1. Its real significance is that it follows similar and less cautious statements made in Paris on February 22 by Maurice Thorez and in Rome on February 26 by Palmiro Togliatti. American communism now explicitly reveals itself as an international movement tied to the interests of Russia. The assumption made in all three of these recent statements is that Russia cannot do wrong. This being the doctrine, Communists in any country attacked by Russia must side against their own country and with the Russians.

Any discussion of this question is unpleasant because it involves the discussion of a war that might destroy civilization. If Mr. Foster or Mr. Dennis can find one Wall Street broker who wants such a war, he will surprise Wall Street as well as the rest of us. But since the talk has proceeded in terms of war and has raised a question of how certain citizens would behave if war came, it is necessary to ask just how far such citizens could go without being traitors. Messrs. Foster and Dennis cite Lincoln's opposition to the Mexican War. Lincoln did oppose that war. While in Congress he voted for a Whig resolution that declared it to have been "unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President." But Lincoln also said, "When the war had begun and had become the cause of the country, the giving of our money and our blood * * * was support of the war." The Communist spokesmen might have mentioned the case of the elder Senator La Follette, who voted against our entrance into the First World War, but Senator La Follette had this to add: "There is, and, of course, can be, no real difference of opinion concerning the duty of a citizen to discharge to the last limit whatever obligation the war lays upon him." When the pinch came, it was easy to tell the difference between those who exercised their legitimate right of opposition and criticism and those who attempted treason. Lincoln in 1849, La Follette in 1917 were not kinsmen of Benedict Arnold.

For those who look back over the history of American protest movements, the moral corruption which is represented today by the Communist Party of America is appalling. We have had our protest movements since colonial days. A strain of humanitarianism, of idealism, of aspiration for greater liberty has run through most of them. Workers fought and sacrificed for the right to organize. Farmers rose against what they considered the tyranny of the cities. Common men and women struck out against injustices that they attributed to monopolies or to political corruption. But not until this generation was there ever heard in this country the harsh and perverse sort of doctrine that we now hear preached by the self-styled exponents of a better world. Cynicism and despair direct the course of these so-called radicals.

We may thank our own Communist spokesmen for making this issue plain. We no longer are called upon to think of Communists as domestic reformers. They have shaken off such disguises. They speak from now on purely and simply in the interest of a foreign power, purely and simply against the interests of their own country, when there is a conflict, military, or otherwise, with that foreign power.

We have two dangers to avoid. One is the danger from these enemies in our midst. Now that they have proclaimed themselves as such, that danger is diminished. The other danger is that in our revulsion against this betrayal we turn away from the basic freedoms. We must cling to those freedoms all the more, as we cling to democracy itself. The only freedom that we must refuse is the freedom of the conspirator, in peace or in war, to strike at the country that has nurtured him. And, having discussed this question in terms of war, let us not develop any form of war hysteria. We believe that the Communist spokesmen in France, Italy, and the United States have spoken out of weakness, not out of strength. It is because democracy is strong and growing stronger that they have given way to this madness.

Mr. Speaker, I also include a copy of a news release from the Washington Post dated March 5, 1949, quoting Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, of Canada, stating that "One would have to be lacking most elementary realism to consider war an impossibility."

ST. LAURENT ASKS REALISM

MONTREAL, March 5.—Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent said today a person would have to lack the most elementary realism to consider another war an impossibility.

"There is no doubt that war is avoidable—I am sure that if we follow our present firm policy we can avoid war," he said. "But one would have to be lacking most elementary realism to consider war an impossibility."

St. Laurent made the statements in a speech at a Richelieu Club luncheon.

In the speech, largely devoted to an outline of Canada's reasons for supporting the North Atlantic alliance, the Prime Minister blamed Russia for the current international unrest.

Christian nations have not lost hope that the United Nations will work, but pending that time they are conscious of the necessity for them to assure their own security through regional pacts, such as the North Atlantic pact, he said.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, without any desire to alarm our people, I feel it is my duty to suggest that the Communist threat is serious in these United States.

Does the State Department and any other Department of our Government know how many Communist agents, fellow travelers, and others in this country, at this time, such as William Z. Foster, Eugene Dennis, and others in this country.

Mr. Speaker, your former distinguished colleague from Texas, Martin Dies, when chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, exposed these traitors many years ago. Our Government did not heed his warning. They are still here. Thousands more, in my opinion, have infiltrated into this country since that time and are ready to sabotage our Government and country.

Mr. Speaker, we must not forget the plan—General Marshall was lucky, in Colombia, to save his life.

The Late S. Wallace Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my

remarks, I include the following editorial from the Lockport Union Sun and Journal, Lockport, N. Y., concerning the late Stephen Wallace Dempsey, former Representative in the House of Representatives for the Fortieth District of New York:

DISTINGUISHED LEGISLATOR

The congressional career of the late Stephen Wallace Dempsey shed a glow of considerable prestige over Lockport in the 16 years that the distinguished attorney represented the Fortieth District in the House of Representatives.

As chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, Mr. Dempsey combatted with all energy and skill proposals to construct a St. Lawrence ship canal. His contention, in favor of an all-American canal to traverse New York State, never materialized but neither did the St. Lawrence canal. The controversy still is timely for residents of western New York.

Mr. Dempsey was admirably fitted for congressional duties. He was universally recognized as a lawyer of extraordinary ability and he brought to the office a dignity of person which matched his legal talents. Admitted to the bar without benefit of formal legal education, he made himself prominent by the astuteness with which he conducted for the Federal Government its case against concerns charged with violations of freight-rate regulations.

Such a long and distinguished career, based upon ability and enterprise, should serve as an inspiration to the rising generation.

Britain's Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there is much discussion abroad today with reference to our national health program. Many people are comparing it with the national health program now in force in Great Britain. For the benefit of those who are interested in how the plan works in Britain, I am submitting an article which appeared in the February 28, 1949, issue of the New Republic. The author, Stephen Taylor, is a practicing physician in London and a Labor Party member of Parliament.

BRITAIN'S HEALTH SERVICE

(By Stephen Taylor)

THE ENEMIES OF PLANNED MEDICINE HAVE BEEN CONFOUNDED IN ENGLAND, WHERE THE NEW SYSTEM IS WORKING SMOOTHLY

Those who had been campaigning for a National Health Service in Britain confidently expected that it would begin with a period of administrative chaos. They had not hoped for anything like full cooperation from the British medical profession and they anticipated a swamping of whatever facilities might be available.

In fact, nothing of the kind has occurred. Journalists in search of failure stories to damn the Labor Government have returned empty-handed, except to write that opticians are dispensing unparalleled numbers of spectacles to those who for years have been unable to read the newspapers.

There were two reasons for the smooth transition from private to socialized medicine: the extensive preliminary planning; and the full cooperation received from private medicine. Planning began long before the health bill was finally enacted. During the war, the medical profession itself did much exploration into possible forms for a national health service. The British Medical Association, through its medical planning commission, produced a series of proposals, many of which are now incorporated into law. The younger doctors organized their own inquiry under the title, "Medical Planning Research." The Ministry of Health produced a plan of its own, as well as a valuable group of surveys of British hospital resources. Therefore, when Aneurin Bevan entered the Ministry of Health he found a complete set of blueprints outlining every possible alternative. He found, too, that public opinion was well aware of the pros and cons of each proposal.

His own planning was carried through with a magnificent disregard for Labor Party preconceptions. In place of a municipal hospital service, he set up a regional service based on natural hospital areas and financed entirely by the treasury. Private hospitals were allowed to admit paying patients. He turned down the idea of a salaried-general-practitioner service, but he stood by the 100-percent coverage of the population, the abolition of sale and purchase of medical practices, and the closing of overdoctored areas to new entrants. Above all, he insisted on making the service noncontributory, so that every resident of Britain has the right to use it.

Thus, many of the views of the medical profession were incorporated in the bill as presented to Parliament. Other of their proposals—for example, the continuance of the sale and purchase of practices—found no support from any of the political parties. Consequently, when Bevin proved reasonable about minor concessions, the profession finally swung from opposition to support. The knowledge that only those who had entered the plan by July 5, the date it went into effect, would receive their share of the $265,000,000 compensation to cover the loss in capital value of their practices made it certain that doctors would rush to join. More than 19,000 general practitioners opened their waiting rooms to all who cared to come.

The regional hospital boards were in operation nearly a year before the appointed day. Their members had inspected the hospitals they were soon to run; the hospitals themselves had been grouped so that small units were linked with larger ones for specialist services and management purposes; and the individual hospital management committees had held their first meetings well in advance.

Local executive councils, responsible for the general-practitioner side, had been in operation for a similar time; and, strangely enough, British Medical Association members of these councils were cooperating fully at a time when the BMA itself was denouncing the whole scheme.

Although the service has now been in operation for only a short time, the administrative machinery has taken the strain well. Complaints from doctors and patients have been minor.

The number of patients going to a doctor's office has definitely increased, especially mothers and children with minor ailments. Such patients formerly made use of the voluntary-hospital clinics when they could not afford doctor's fees. Almost all have genuine reasons for consulting the doctor, although a few are going to him to get their favorite laxative or aspirin without charge.

Home visiting has increased much less than was expected. Especially in the working-class areas, patients are being extraordinarily good about it. They apologize when they have to call the doctor to their homes, and it is far more usual for people to come to the doctor's office when they should be in bed than vice versa.

Druggists report an increase of between 30 and 60 percent in the number of prescriptions they are filling. This is due partly to the abandonment under the scheme of dispensing by city doctors. But there has been some real increase which will bear watching. Any attempt to make the British abandon overnight their love of a bottle of medicine would certainly end in failure. Health education still has a big job to do in this field.

More than 92 percent of the public registered early with doctors, and as the winter brings its usual crop of coughs, colds, and influenza, we are seeing further encroachments on the 4,000,000 people who still remain outside the scheme. The health program started at the same time as the national insurance plan, which provides cash benefits to cover sickness, unemployment, and old age. In consequence many people regard the National Health Service, which is free, as the most obvious tangible return for their $1-a-week contribution to the insurance plan. The spectacles or false teeth they receive without charge are regarded as having been paid for by the weekly payment, and are considered good value.

The backlog of people needing spectacles is enormous. Surveys have shown that, among people over 65, 90 percent are wearing spectacles. Of these, one-sixth have never had their eyes tested, having borrowed or inherited the eyeglasses, or bought them off a shop counter. A further third has had no eye test for 5 years or more. As a result the opticians have been working overtime. Ten varieties of frames are free, and some others may be had for a small extra charge—up to about $1.40.

The dental position is more difficult. For many years, Britain has been short of dentists, and even if they all entered the new service, demand would far exceed supply. Dentists are paid for according to the work done on the patient. A quarrel about details of remuneration has led the British Dental Association to refuse to cooperate. Nevertheless some 7,000 out of 10,000 eligible dentists have joined the service and the number is growing.

Indeed, the scales of pay are so good that many dentists are giving up salaried work in the school dental service to join the new plan. Consequently, something of a crisis over school dentistry has arisen, and new salary scales are under consideration. Britain's dental health is bad. More than 90 percent of recruits during the war needed dental attention; something like 12 percent should have upper and lower dentures.

The hospital service is functioning smoothly enough, but outstanding problems include the need for nurses, more beds for patients with tuberculosis and chronic illnesses, and new buildings. Because of the necessity to divert labor and material to houses and factories, work for the moment is largely confined to renovations and small extensions. Thanks to plenty of paint in a wide variety of colors, many former public-assistance institutions are already putting on a bright new look.

Specialists have been granted interim contracts until next month. In the meantime, salary scales have been negotiated on the generous basis provided by the report of an independent tribunal set up by the Government, the Spens committee. It looks as though the specialist who decides on full-time service can hope for $10,000 to $12,000 a year at the age of 45, with higher figures for the exceptionally able.

Nine years ago the writer of this article contributed a plan for British hospitals to the Lancet. Had he then been told that his plan would be in full operation 9 years later, he would have been frankly incredulous. Now he finds himself a member of the Parliament responsible for this great reform. The job which remains to be done of translating blueprints into actuality is a job for

a lifetime. However, for the future, the only barriers to progress are manpower and materials. No financial or administrative obstacles stand in the way of Britain's ambition to produce a health service that will guarantee every citizen the best that medicine can offer.

Dangers of Too Much Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just voted for H. R. 2663 without vocal protest but with great inward misgivings and trepidation, not because of the intent and authorization of the measure, but because of the bad precedent which it sets in secret legislative consideration.

My affirmative vote was cast only because of my confidence in members of the Committees on Armed Services and on Rules whom I know well. Their assurance that the secrecy which surrounded committee consideration was only to safeguard our national security persuaded me, and at the last moment, not to oppose the bill on grounds of inadequate consideration and dangerous secrecy.

I do want to go on record that I regard this kind of legislative proceeding in the United States as dangerous and subversive to our form and philosophy of government.

We have a wonderful tradition in the United States of open debate on all legislation.

I am fearful that the secrecy of consideration of this measure, the so-called "spy" bill, sets an example which we will regret. This country must, as a matter of reality, have its own espionage network, whether we like the word spying or not; but even after my vote, I dislike this kind of dark-room process, and hope it will not again be necessary.

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Discriminates Against American Worker and American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter from a Wisconsin firm on the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements. This is just another bit of evidence from which we can conclude that ultimately the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will put legitimate industry out of business and American labor on the unemployment rolls.

MARCH 5, 1949.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We have followed with a great deal of interest the discussions in Congress relating to extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements law. Our company is engaged in the manufacture and distribution of patent leather, which is a staple in the domestic market, and which we have also exported to various countries. This product is a glaring example of the inequity to which American industry has been subject under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and we want to call it to your attention as an instance of discrimination and injustice.

Through progressive tariff reductions in prior years, the United States duty on patent leather has been lowered until it is only 7½ percent. The result of these cuts in duty has been to stimulate shipments of patent leather into the United States from Canada. We might grit our teeth and bear this if it were not for the extraordinary injustice represented by the fact that Canada maintains a duty of 17½ percent on imports of patent leather from the United States.

This is our situation then, absurd and incredible as it may seem. Tanners in Canada can ship patent leather to our customers in the United States at a duty of only 7½ percent, whereas we are prohibited from seeking exports in Canada through a tariff barrier of more than 17½ percent.

There are further ramifications which have added to our miseries. Most of our markets abroad have been restricted because dollars are supposedly not available for the import of patent leather. However, Canada can ship abroad to the sterling area, to the United Kingdom which used to be one of our principal customers, so that we are hurt in two ways. First, leather comes into the United States from Canada to cut down our sales domestically and second, we are not permitted either by prohibitive duties or by trade restrictions from shipping leather abroad.

If the reciprocal-trade law is to operate logically and fairly, one of two things must be done immediately. Either our duties should be raised up to the level of the Canadian duty on the same product, or else the Canadian duty cut down to ours. Why don't we deserve the same benefits and treatment that foreign producers get?

Our trade association, the Tanners' Council of America, has discussed this matter with the Tariff Commission. In substance the reply they get is that there may be some inequity in the comparative United States and Canadian duty on patent leather, but this is only a small matter in relation to the general objectives in our treaty with Canada. However, it is not a small matter to the patent leather tanners of this country, and in my opinion no law is successful that condones small inequities for the sake of vague, general objectives.

We shall appreciate your assistance in the matter and trust that you will urge the Tariff Commission to take the necessary remedial steps or that the Senate, in acting on the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will seek to incorporate provisions that will protect us against discrimination.

Very truly yours,

GUSTAVE SOKOL,
Vice President, Colonial Tanning Co., Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.

A Baby Is a Luxury—If You Ask Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on effects of excessive excise taxes by Sidney Fields in the New York Mirror of Wednesday, February 23, 1949:

A baby is a luxury—if you ask Congress. And like any average New York family the Websters want to know why. They're writhing under the congressional conspiracy against their hard-earned buck, which slaps them with a 20-percent tax every time they buy a bottle of baby oil or a can of powder for their infant son Jimmy and their daughter Judy.

The other day Mrs. Webster spent $6 in a drug store for things she considers necessities: baby talc, oil, and cream, some hand lotion, shampoo; and for the thousandth time she was ready to explode when the drugstore man, in embarrassment, asked her an additional $1.32 in taxes.

"And that's just the beginning," she says. "How about my cosmetics, my handbag, fur coat, my husband's wallet, or the little pleasure we get out of a movie or a show? It's more than a 20-percent death. It's 20-percent murder!"

"It's a tax assault against my family," adds Bill Webster. "It discourages the idea of raising a family."

Now, the Websters aren't rich people. Patricia Webster worked as a lab technician before they were married. Bill is an engineer and earns just a modest salary. He says if he didn't do a little outside work at night for some badly needed extra money he couldn't call his family his own.

THE VETERAN IS THE TARGET

During the war Bill entered the Coast Guard as a second-class seaman and emerged as a lieutenant, junior grade. He spent 3 years on destroyer escort duty in the north Atlantic which wasn't exactly a holiday. He has the usual veteran's headaches.

"A one-room apartment with two kids. Great. I can't choose my home and the taxmen choose the way I spend my pay. It's a good thing my wife can knit and sew."

"You're allowed a dog when you look for an apartment," Mrs. Webster boils, "but you're supposed to drown your kids. If we want to go out, we're lucky if we can get a baby sitter. Good Lord, we can't even go out on our anniversary because the tax stops us. So we just sit home."

On their last anniversary Mr. Webster bought his wife some perfume for $10 and a handbag for $15 and paid $5.50 in taxes. Mrs. Webster got her husband a wallet, belt, and briefcase for another hard-saved $25, and shelled out another $5.50 in taxes.

"That $11 could have bought a lot of groceries or shoes for the kids," she says. "I budget myself carefully and figure and figure, but I find myself buying less and less each year.

"I could save by using one basic dress and changing the accessories. But there's that 20-percent death against accessories too. So I'm trapped."

Mrs. Webster would like to go to Washington and present the housewife's case to Congress this way:

"Your excuse for the 'luxury tax' is gone. The war is over.

"Your definition of luxury is about as stupid as your idea of what a dollar can buy.

"Your 20-percent tax is directed against women and children. It prevents everybody from buying, which kills business, causes unemployment, and ferments Government hostility.

"Just why aren't we allowed to deduct these luxury taxes from our income taxes? I thought you said we'll never pay a tax on a tax. We do and it's ridiculous and immoral."

EVERYTHING TAXED EXCEPT THE AIR

Mr. Webster would like to take the trip to Washington, too, and his arguments would be just as biting:

"You rationed and taxed such materials as drugs and leather during the war. But the war is over. You promised to repeal those taxes when it ended. You haven't. That's not right.

"Both you and I would think our wives strange animals if they gave up using their cosmetics. I'd beef, and I'm sure you would. Yet, you call them luxuries.

"On one hand you smack us with those luxury taxes and on the other you allow any person leaving America for more than 12 days to bring back $400 worth of perfumes, furs, jewelry, or cosmetics without any taxes on them. He can do that once every 6 months. If he's in Canada for 48 hours he can bring back $100 worth of stuff tax free. That makes little sense.

"I figure out that I pay more than $200 a year just in these luxury taxes, and that doesn't include important things like a fur coat for my wife. It seems you're taxing us just to live. How soon will you put a tax on the corner we pick to die in?"

Veterans' Hospitalization in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
AND
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
AND
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Messrs. ENGEL, POTTER, and FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 we jointly sent a letter to the Federal Board of Hospitalization, heretofore the top group in location of veterans' hospitals, protesting the astonishing degree to which Michigan's 788,000 war veterans have been discriminated against, in comparison with other States, particularly those in the South, in the matter of veterans' hospitalization. The letter was based on a study by us, from figures furnished by Veterans' Administration, showing the number of beds per veteran in each of the 23 States having the greatest number of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities. In that list Michigan was No. 23, in last place.

A copy of the February 17 letter was sent by Representative ENGEL to Carl R. Gray, Jr., Veterans' Administration administrator, with a request for his comment and suggestions.

Subsequently we were informed by the Bureau of the Budget that the Federal Board of Hospitalization has recently been disbanded by the President, its fiscal functions having been transferred to the Budget Bureau. The letter stated Veterans' Administration is now solely responsible for veterans' hospital locations.

On February 28 we received a reply from Administrator Gray enclosing veterans-per-bed figures for each of the 48 States, but otherwise making no comment on the Michigan situation, other than a closing statement to the effect that, in view of the President's curtailment order in January, eliminating 16,000 beds from the Nation-wide proposed construction program, nothing could be done to restore two cancelled projects in Michigan—one at Grand Rapids, another at Detroit.

This response is, of course, unsatisfactory to us, especially in view of the shocking fact that, by Veterans' Administration's own comparative figures for all 48 States, Michigan—ranking seventh in veterans' population—with 788,000 veterans, is thirty-ninth among the 48 States in VA hospital facilities.

Since Veterans' Administration is now exclusively in charge of veterans' hospital locations, we insist on knowing its exact attitude toward this astonishing situation in which, by its own figures, Michigan ends up in thirty-ninth place among the 48 States in veterans' hospital facilities. Hence we are attaching a second joint letter which went forward to Administrator Gray yesterday. We hope by this letter to learn specifically what that agency, since it now does have sole responsibility, will do to correct the Michigan situation, now and in the future. The March 4 letter:

CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR GRAY: We have the February 28 letter signed by O. W. Clark on your behalf, in reply to Congressman ENGEL'S February 17 letter to you in regard to the veterans' hospitalization situation in Michigan.

Since the original statement, submitted to the Federal Board of Hospitalization, was prepared jointly by us, we are in turn presenting this joint reply to you.

Mr. ENGEL'S February 17 letter enclosed a report prepared by us showing Michigan to be in twenty-third position among the 23 States having the greatest number of VA hospital facilities. We used the study to show first that proper veterans' hospitalization is neglected in Michigan in comparison with other States of similar size, and, secondly, to seek reauthorization of two hospitals, one at Detroit, the other at Grand Rapids, that were deleted by you under the President's curtailment order in January of this year.

We are not trying to trump up a justification for reinstatement of the two Michigan hospitals, irrespective of need. For it is clear to us that, by your figures or ours, such a need does exist; that Michigan is seriously out of line in veterans' hospitalization. If your agency feels otherwise, we believe a hearing should be arranged so that the case of the 788,000 veterans in Michigan can be presented.

The February 28 reply signed by Mr. Clark enclosed Veterans' Administration's own statistical analysis of the hospitalization situation in each of the 48 States. By referral to it you will find that, according to your own analysis, Michigan ranks thirty-ninth among the 48 States in beds per veteran, the 9 States below Michigan being Connecticut, Idaho, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Vermont, all States with far fewer veterans than Michigan.

In short, by your study as well as ours, Michigan, ranking seventh in veterans' population, with 788,000 veterans, is thirty-ninth among the 48 States in VA facilities.

We think you will agree there is something radically wrong in that condition.

Your February 28 letter offers no comment whatever on that situation nor does it suggest any prospect of improvement.

It is understandable that Veterans' Administration cannot offset the President's curtailment order. But Veterans' Administration must have views of its own on the Michigan situation, along with suggestions as to what may be done in the future to bring Michigan in line with comparable States.

These views and suggestions we want to have, so we may answer the many inquiries from veterans in our State. We would like your specific views and recommendations on the Michigan situation as it compares with that of the other States. Further, we would like to be informed whether Veterans' Administration has, or will in the reasonable future have, any hospitalization review board, or other hearings before which we may appear on behalf of the 788,000 veterans of our State.

Since Veterans' Administration, with discontinuance of the Federal Board of Hospitalization, is now sole authority on location of veterans' hospitals, we want to know specifically what your agency can and will do now and in the future to correct the unfair Michigan situation. May we please have your reply as promptly as possible?

Most sincerely,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.
CHARLES E. POTTER.
GERALD R. FORD, JR.

The Wages and Hours Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Monroe (La.) Morning World of February 27, 1949:

A THREAT TO THE SOUTH'S ECONOMY

Chief discussion of controversial administration measures in Congress has centered around repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, civil rights, socialized medicine, the filibuster, etc. We have heard occasional rumblings from certain sources on protest against H. R. 2033, the so-called Wage-Hour Act, but if there's been any real, effective, concerted action on the part of the South in this direction, we are unaware of it. And it's high time the South woke up to the fact that passage of this bill will be a stiff blow to this section's economy.

Despite the fact that industry has become an important factor in the welfare of the South during the past few years, the area below the Mason and Dixon's line is still largely dependent upon agriculture. And cotton is still our biggest money crop.

It has been argued by some persons who have not read the bill closely that the minimum wage of 75 cents as proposed will not apply to farm labor. That is not correct. The act is practically all-inclusive.

In general, the farm wage rates in the United States have increased about 300 percent since 1910–14 while rural living costs have increased only about 150 percent. The

average hourly wage rate of farm workers ranged from a low of 11.1 cents an hour in 1933 to a high of 52.5 cents an hour in 1948. The hourly rates of farm laborers have been very flexible and are closely related to changes in economic conditions. That will not be the case if H. R. 2033 is passed.

In this connection, an interesting observation was made by a large Ouachita Parish planter—a man who operates his holding in a most efficient manner and who has made a success of farming for many years. He said, in commenting upon the 52.5 cents an hour present wage and the proposed boost to 75 cents: "The minute my labor cost goes over 56 cents an hour, I go bankrupt."

In brief, the proposed bill would—

1. Raise the minimum wage from its present 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, provide for industry committees to set higher minima, industry by industry, up to $1 an hour.

2. Give the responsibility for administering the Wages and Hours Act to the Secretary of Labor and reduce the Wage-Hour Bureau to a mere bureau under his control.

3. Extend the scope of the act to virtually every business in the country by (a) extending coverage to activities affecting commerce or competing with any activity in commerce and (b) by drastically narrowing the present retail and service trades exemptions. It would include any retail or service establishment that operates more than four such established (chain stores) or that has a total annual volume of sales or servicing of more than $500,000.

4. Give the Secretary of Labor power to make binding regulations, and permit him to sue for employee back wages due in case of violation of the act.

5. It would increase the 2-year statute of limitations of the Portal Act to 4 years.

Good wages make for a prosperous community, but there's a limit to what the traffic can bear, and we believe that figure is best determined by employee and employer together and not by a blanket pattern set by the Government. If the administration insists on pushing through its proposed measure, then it should amend the bill so that the Nation would be zoned according to economic conditions and the ability to pay.

This important act should be given serious consideration, and then your views should be communicated to your Congressman and Senators. Time is running out; your wishes should be made known at once.

Luxuries or Necessities?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on effects of excessive excise taxes by Sidney Fields in the New York Sunday Mirror of February 20, 1949:

DEAR CONGRESS: LUXURIES OR NECESSITIES?

Once, back there in history, when the henchmen of a tyrant suggested a mess of new taxes to be piled on a mess of old ones, the tyrant shrewdly replied: "Boys, let's just shear the lamb, not kill it." This concerns 140,000,000 lambs known as Americans, who are being shorn right down to the skin by a mess of silly taxes, and the silliest of them is the 20-percent sock against fur coats, leather goods, toilet articles, jewelry, and amusements.

Congress calls it a tax on "luxuries." In effect, it's a tax against necessities. The bumbling legislators didn't intend the tax to discriminate against women and children, but it does. And since 1944 it's become a slowly tightening noose contributing to unemployment and a frightening number of bankruptcies in the industries involved, especially in New York.

TAXING BABIES

Nobody has yet figured out by what process of reasoning Congress slaps a 20-percent luxury tax on a bottle of baby oil and a jar of baby powder, and omits the same tax on a $1.50 cake of perfumed soap. A lady's handbag is a lady's pocket. There's no tax against a man's pocket. There is a 20-percent tax against any handbag.

Congress would have quite a time convincing a boss and his secretary that her lipstick, powder, shampoo, nail polish, and so on are luxuries. She pays the 20-percent death tax on all of them. But anyone buying a $500 ready-made bar or a fancy billiard table pays no luxury tax.

That same secretary, or her father, or her brother, needs an alarm clock. There's a luxury tax on alarm clocks. But some joyful gent on a hunting trip buys $1,000 worth of hunting equipment and pays no 20-percent tax on it.

About 80 percent of all fur coats sold in the United States retail at $300 or under. Tell five females their fur coats are luxuries and four of them will glare at the first man's coat they see and snap at you that a fur coat is a practical necessity: It's warm, durable, and can be worn day or evening. She pays 60 hard-earned bucks in "luxury" taxes for her $300 fur coat. But a $500 evening gown or a $1,000 cloth coat trimmed in ermine is tax-free.

BILLION-DOLLAR BITE

Of course, there's an added bite: The 2-percent sales tax in New York, on any of these luxuries.

The 140,000,000 lambs known as Americans were sheared for almost a billion dollars for the fiscal year 1947 in excise taxes on furs, leather goods, jewelry, toilet articles, amusement, and movie and theater admissions. New Yorkers were squeezed for $153,000,000: about $20 for every man, woman, and child in the city.

Since 1944, when the tax was boosted from 10 to 20 percent, there have been 4 bankruptcies in the luggage business, 9 in toilet goods, 108 in jewelry, and 334 in furs. All the bankruptcies listed more than $32,000,000 in liabilities.

Of the 334 fur failures 218 were in New York City. Usually the industry employs 40,000; over 13,000 of them are now jobless. New York is the world's first fur market fed with skins from all over the world: Alaska, China, Afghanistan, plus 2,500,000 American trappers and 7,000 American fur animal farms.

These farmers are in a screwy nutcracker: Congress appropriates money to help them, then taxes the life out of them.

Of the 500 handbag manufacturers in the country 400 have their factories or offices in the city. Since 1947 some 35 firms went out of business, and another 60 are on a part-time basis, throwing about 5,000 people out of work.

Movies are the poor man's entertainment and he finds it in the neighborhood theater. Ordinarily a family of four spends about $25 a year just on admission taxes. Right now pop is trying to save half that sum, which means admissions are down 50 percent. Film rentals have decreased at least 10 percent under last year. Any little theater owner tells you he's getting along with less ushers, cleaners, box-office help, and is even cutting down his manager's salary.

POWER TO DESTROY

In its itchy desire to tax and tax, Congress would call a hallway with a jukebox in it a night club, and slap the 20-percent plague on it. The city's 1,200 cabarets ordinarily do a business of $70,000,000 a year. They do less than half that now. In the last 6 months at least 10 major spots have shut down. Over 1,000 people were thrown out of work.

"We're only hiring full staffs for week ends now," one night-club operator wailed. "This once was a 7-night-a-week business. It's just a week-end affair now."

Then he added with a shudder: "I see one-time owners now working as headwaiters, and I know one of them who is a dishwasher in a restaurant."

One man who had his little fur shop knocked out by the luxury tax summed up the plight of all the shorn lambs this way: "Congress needs a lesson in simple arithmetic. They can collect a lot more in income and corporation taxes from flourishing factories and their workers than from ghost factories and the unemployed. This 20-percent death proves that the power to tax is the power to destroy."

PROMISE RENEGED

When it was first passed in 1941, the so-called luxury tax was 10 percent. No one complained when it was boosted to 20 percent in 1943 as a wartime measure. Congress then said it would be lifted 6 months after the emergency. The war ended in 1945. The President officially declared hostilities at an end on December 31, 1946. That same month Congress reenacted the 20-percent death and omitted any mention of a termination date.

Airports and Facilities in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorial from the Legislature of Oregon:

Senate Joint Memorial 6

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the west coast during World War II was vital to the defense of the entire United States; and

Whereas this defense required the construction of large airports and extensive facilities for the operation of long-range aircraft and for the training of large numbers of air-force personnel at strategic locations in Oregon; and

Whereas these strategic airport and training facilities must be maintained so that our western defense front is held in a state of readiness; and

Whereas the maintenance of these strategic airports is beyond the capacity of the present finances of the municipalities affected; and

Whereas the Oregon cities owning these strategic airports are faced with increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly

concurring therein), That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memoralized, and this forty-fifth legislative assembly of the State of Oregon hereby does petition the Congress to make available funds for the purpose of maintaining, on a defense standard, the airports and facilities which have been either constructed or taken over by the armed forces and which are of primary strategic value to said forces; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to transmit copies of this memorial to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative therein, representing the people of the State of Oregon.

Adopted by senate February 9, 1949.

WM. E. WALSH,
President of Senate.

Concurred in by house February 25, 1949.

FRANK J. VAN DYKE,
Speaker of House.

Where's the Promise?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article on effects of excessive excise taxes by Sidney Fields in the New York Daily Mirror of Tuesday, February 22, 1949:

Just a few years ago Arthur L. Krassny was a handbag manufacturer with a thriving business that employed about 60 people and grossed half a million a year. He helped build that business himself. Today he's pounding the streets as a salesman. And it isn't because he didn't know how to make or sell handbags.

It's because of a death penalty called a luxury tax which gets the customer sore at the storekeeper and the storekeeper sore at the handbag maker.

Krassny's is no ordinary tragedy, though it is a common one. If you don't share it with him, you feel it. You meet the luxury tax every day, and pay it. Since the luxury tax was boosted from 10 to 20 percent in 1944 there have been 455 bankruptcies in the fur, leather, toilet goods, and jewelry industries. Since 1947 some 35 handbag makers shut down completely, and another 60 went on a part-time basis, throwing over 5,000 people out of work. Congress may still figure on collecting luxury taxes, but it's losing a lot on income and business taxes.

With Krassny the idea wasn't a hunger for power or great wealth. He's the little guy who worked out a promise. A promise that we all search for. His is shattered now. Twelve years ago he was selling handbags, on the street, like any salesman. He did pretty well; so well that he bought into the firm he worked for. Three years ago his business started skidding.

YOU DON'T SELL, YOU DON'T EAT

"Before, I or any one of the six salesmen could easily sell 150 bags a day. Then we all learned we couldn't sell a dozen a day. It was mostly the consumer resistance set up by the luxury tax."

It got so bad 3 years ago he couldn't cover his overhead. So he paid off all his employees and all his creditors and just folded up, and went back to work as a salesman * * *.

"Oh, I make a living now, if you want to call it that. I'm earning about a third of what I did when I was on my own. Maybe my relatives will stay away if you put that in print. But do you know what it is to be a businessman, on your own, and then."

His eyes weren't happy when he said it.

Every day now he lugs his sample cases and calls on about 30 retailers. Sometimes he takes a trip through New England, to Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington. He has to pay his own expenses for the trips, and he works on a straight commission. If he doesn't sell, he doesn't eat.

And his whole industry isn't getting any better: It's not uncommon for him to see an indignant lady customer froth at the $2.50 tax on a $12.50 bag, demand that the storekeeper pay the tax himself, and storm out when he refuses to do it.

"The retailers say that the customers aren't buying and 85 percent of it is due to the tax. When a woman has to pay $6 for a $5 bag she screams that the war is over, what's the tax for. And she's right. Working people buy $5 bags. She has a right to scream after the butcher and baker and grocer get through with her dollar."

RETREAT OF THE KRASSNYS

In the past few months Krassny has encountered at least 12 specialty shops who just threw out their handbag line completely. There's so much customer resentment against the 20-percent tax the specialty shop owners feel it hurts the sales of other things they carry. And that's true all over the country.

"The craziest experience I've had was watching a woman buy a $75 hat, and she wanted a bag to match. The $75 hat had no 20-percent tax on it, but rather than pay $5 tax on the bag, she bought the hat and left the bag. Does it make sense?"

Back in the bright days the Krassnys, Mr. and Mrs. and their 14-year-old daughter, would eat out a couple of times a week, and go to the theater and movies maybe twice a week. They stay home now. Miss Krassny won't go to camp this summer. Mrs. Krassny has to do all the housework herself now.

"None of us is weeping. But our sense of security is jolted. My savings are almost gone. I'm changing. I find myself cussing out people. And at my age. Lugging grips around the streets, and waiting in offices and foyers. Oh, the damn waiting. This luxury tax can get very personal can't it?

"My father was in business for himself and I always dreamed of being on my own. In business. That's the promise. This whole idea we have here, this America, what is it except promise? I was born here and always felt I could work out the promise. That's my birthright. Why is it that your own government won't let you work out your own promise?"

Bock Beer Time Is Here Again as Brewing Industry Celebrates Seven Hundredth Anniversary of Famous Brew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the brewers of the United States this year are celebrating the seven hundredth anniversary of bock beer, that rich dark brew which traditionally heralds the approach of spring.

Since the year 1249, when the first kegs of bock were tapped in the manorial village of Einbeck in Germany, this beverage has traveled far and wide to delight appreciative generations of beer drinkers all over the world. In the United States, which today is the No. 1 producer of beer, the art and science of brewing bock have reached fruition. We produce the most and we produce the finest.

On this occasion, it seems both proper and fitting that we pause for a moment to salute the industry which not only tickles the palate but which also contributes a good part of the money required to run the Federal Government. Last year the United States Treasury collected almost $700,000,000 in taxes from the more than 85,000,000 barrels of brew produced. Approximately 80,000 men are employed directly in the production of beer, and many times that number make their living from the distribution and sale of this beverage of moderation.

Now, as the brewers of my home city prepare to celebrate this occasion with a gigantic bock-beer festival for the benefit of the American Red Cross, I hope you will join me in extending congratulations to them and to the brewers of America.

Under leave, I am including as a part of my remarks an article which appeared in the New York Times magazine for February 27, 1949:

BACK COMES BOCK

THE FAMOUS BREW WILL SOON RETURN AS A CONGENIAL HARBINGER OF SPRING

(By Morris Gilbert)

After 7 years' scarcity, bock beer will again inundate taprooms in the metropolitan area beginning on March 10, bringing satisfaction to many gourmets and reviving a brewing practice 700 years old this year. It will take 5,000 truck drivers to distribute the 4,500,000 gallons specially laid down for the bock season, according to the New York Brewers Board of Trade and the New Jersey Brewers Association, "fomenters" and "fermenters" of this occasion.

The brew

Bock beer is a rich, dark brew, traditionally produced from the finest grains and hops of the autumn harvest. Its malt is kilned—roasted—longer than usual, which gives it an exceptionally vivid flavor and deep mahogany color. Brewmasters lay down the seasonal supply around December 1. The ensuing period of winter is the brewer's slack season, so more space for storing this brew is available than at other seasons when consumption of beers is brisker. Therefore the bock and lager—age—a full 3 months, an exceptional period of growth and development. That allows it to be launched in all its stored maturity just ahead of the vernal equinox. Consequently bock, in beer-drinking lands, has become as symbolic of springtime as the robin, the daffodil, or the umpire's shout, "Play ball!"

The origins

To a small village near Hamburg, according to legend, belongs the distinction of having originated bock beer. The village was Einbeck; the year, 1249. The autumn before its brewers, already celebrated in the vicinity for the quality of their product, had compacted together to make an unusually superior beer against the arrival of spring. They chose their cereals for the malt with greatest care, selected the best available hops, brewed the mixture with devoted skill, and laid it down in their caves.

In March, when birds were twittering, ewes and rams and goats were frisking, and a festival honoring the return of the sun was at hand, they tapped the brew. A new wonder had, it seemed at that moment, come into the world.

The name

The christening of the brew is also attributed to Einbeck. It was so good, and its local fame spread so fast, that discriminating drinkers of the region were soon calling for "ein Einbeck bier." Soon their command was for "ein Einbeck," then for "ein Beck." And, presently, what with the little kids butting their impetuous way among merrymakers at the open-air spring frolics—goats being already identified with the revels of Gambrinus, the inventor of beer, a sort of Teuton Pan or Bacchus—the order became "ein bock"—a goat.

The spread

The tides of commerce floated bock beer to many lands, along with other important commodities, beginning in the Middle Ages. Einbeck became a member of the Hanseatic League in the thirteenth century. This collection of German trading cities sent its exports to Scandinavia, to Russia, to Britain. Bock beer is reported to have fetched up in places as distant as Jerusalem. The goat became the label of the brew.

A learned chronicler, Letzner by name, wrote in the sixteenth century of this delicious, palatable, subtle, extremely sound, and wholesome beer, which because of its refreshing properties and wholesome taste is exported to far-away countries. * * *

Modern bock

Einbeck was almost wiped out by fires 400 years ago, and the Thirty Years' War ruined its industry. But the practice of brewing bock beer survived in Germany. German brewers, making their way to this country a century and more ago, brought with them the habit of producing the exceptionally masterful springtime beer each year. In German communities here—and then quite generally—signs in barrooms displaying prancing goats became the accepted and welcome announcement that bock was on tap again.

The production of bock beer has not been unimpeded over the years here. First prohibition, then World War II, interfered with conscientious production. Small quantities of bock have been produced in the years since. But now the venerable practice is being renewed in a big way. More than a score of local breweries have combined to make this year's bock revival a notable event for the disciples of Gambrinus.

A Forty-ninth State in '49

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a copy of an editorial from the New York Times of March 6, 1949, entitled "A Forty-ninth State in '49."

Mr. Speaker, I think this editorial is eminently apropos at this time, and since the House has already indicated its approval that the Senate will in the national interest likewise discharge a moral and legal obligation, and join in making Hawaii a forty-ninth State in '49.

The editorial follows:

A FORTY-NINTH STATE IN '49

The first step in the legislative process that should make Hawaii the forty-ninth state this year has been taken with unanimous approval by a subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee of H. R. 49, the appropriately numbered bill of Delegate JOSEPH FARRINGTON. The question has been investigated so many times that the subcommittee spent little time on its hearing. Similar quick and unanimous action was taken on an Alaskan statehood bill.

There seems to be little question that the House again will approve statehood for Hawaii, as it did in the Eightieth Congress in 1947. It is to be hoped that the Senate also will find time this year to consider and approve. There is no valid reason why it should not. All the old arguments against statehood for the lovely islands that lie 2,400 miles off our west coast and over which the United States flag has flown for over 50 years have long since been worn threadbare. The new one of communism is no more valid against Hawaii that it is against any present State. There may be some Communists in Hawaii. Senator CORDON's investigation last year failed to show that the movement had any importance in Hawaiian affairs.

By every known standard Hawaii and its 520,000 inhabitants are well qualified to become the forty-ninth State of our Union and to have in Congress spokesmen for their interests. Further delay would be an injustice to them that cannot be defended. The question as to Alaska is not so clear, but it also merits consideration.

Address of Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Tom C. Clark, Attorney General of the United States, prepared for delivery before the Jewish Labor Committee Convention, President Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., Friday, February 25, 1949:

It is a pleasure to participate in this second postwar national convention of the Jewish Labor Committee, which is devoting its energies to the happiness of mankind.

Since the dawn of history man has been constantly struggling upward toward the peak of individual liberty.

In the Book of Genesis we read that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."

This unbreakable link with the Divine has inspired freedom-searching peoples of all creeds and all races throughout the centuries in their ceaseless quest for freedom. Out of the longings, the sufferings, the hopes of the ages, a nation, dedicated to the principle of individual freedom was born and established 170 years ago on this continent.

When this glorious country, this haven of liberty was being formed, the founding fathers sought to secure once and for all a firm and enduring basis for human liberty. They wanted and demanded guaranties for the sacredness of human personality against the hand of dictatorship and tyranny—they wanted most of all and demanded guaranties of religious liberty, the right to worship God, and to worship Him as they pleased.

First the founding fathers looked to England for their model of individual freedom. In that nation, rights were rooted in Parliament. They rejected the English concept because if a Parliament could grant liberties and rights, then likewise, a Parliament could take them away at will. The guaranty was worthless.

Next they looked to France, where the rights of man rested on the will of the majority. They rejected the French theory of government because, if rights are the gift of the majority, then that majority can take away the rights of the minority—and this guaranty, too, was worthless.

After surveying the different systems of government our founding fathers realized that the rights of man stem only from Almighty God, not from any human power.

And thus with their recognition of this great truth, the sacredness of human personality—the inherent, inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of human happiness became a fundamental part of the basic law of the land.

Originating in the divine, it shall never be taken away by any human power—here at home or abroad.

Since our beginnings as a nation Americans have worked, prayed, fought, and died to attain and maintain her ideals. We Americans today stand steadfast in our determination not to swerve 1 inch from this noble course.

It is difficult to realize that within only one generation we have fought two world wars that we might pass on to our children and our children's children the freedom we have enjoyed. And also to hold high the torch of liberty to light the way for peoples in darkened areas of the earth.

Natives of all the world have landed here in their search for liberty.

One such citizen, through whose efforts the dignity and worth of labor has received more fully the recognition it deserved, came from Great Britain. The spirit of that dauntless champion of the rights of man in the world of labor is here with us tonight—it is the spirit of Samuel Gompers.

It is comforting to all of us to know that William Green, Philip Murray, David Dubinsky, Matthew Woll, and a host of other labor leaders, backed by millions of workers, are holding high the banner for those who toil—and are fighting and defeating evil forces than would destroy the very things upon which the worth and dignity of labor depend and prosper.

It is especially encouraging and heartwarming to meet with organizations such as the Jewish Labor Committee. Your organization gives aid to Jewish and non-Jewish labor institutions overseas. It assists the democratic labor movement in Europe, provides relief for victims of oppression and persecution, and combats racial and religious intolerance here and abroad. Dedicated to these worthy purposes, you recognize the interdependence of peoples, and the need to keep liberty's flame burning all over the globe. All of us have learned that if the flame is snuffed out in one place, the lights can go out in other places.

We live, move, and have our being under the Eternal God whose fatherhood doth encompass us all. We share joy and sorrow, prosperity and poverty. Together we rejoice in the blessings of liberty, or suffer the burdens of slavery. We in this world are all brothers under God.

Labor's educational program, both here and in Europe, to alert its members against every totalitarian ideology, together with your efforts to promote racial understanding and good will, furnish a patriotic example for all of us to follow—here at home as well as in

foreign lands. Yes, the totalitarian would destroy everything dear to us. In essence, this vicious ideology would, if it could, smash our precious American heritage.

Our democratic form of government, functioning in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, and of the Constitution with its Bill of Rights, has made it possible for our Republic to achieve the highest standard of living known to civilized man, and to become the wealthiest and most powerful nation on the face of the earth. In saying this, we do not point it out in a spirit of exaltation—or braggadocio, or in an attempt to overlord other peoples and other nations.

Yet, day and night, subversives are circulating over the earth's surface, attacking the liberty of the people.

It is appropriate, therefore, since we are celebrating Brotherhood Week and National Security Week, as well as the birthday of the Father of our Country—that we stress the need for a strong citizenship that will make us safe on all fronts.

In his day, Washington recommended such defenses.

Today, with the same thought, President Truman, our great human-rights President, says:

"We can fulfill our obligation of service in the cause of peace only by maintaining our strength. The will for peace without the strength for peace is of no avail."

The time of this great meeting also comes close upon the birthdays of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, those two famous exponents of democracy and brotherhood. The efforts which you are making to promote racial understanding and good will would, I believe, have brought heart-warming satisfaction to our first President as well as to his successors, Jefferson and Jackson.

By written and spoken word, the father of our country missed no opportunity to contribute to the preservation of the civil and religious liberties of the American people.

To the Hebrew congregation at Newport, R. I., he sent a message which, ever since that time, has seemed like a benediction and a protection. Included in the ever-living words were these: "The Government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

This bears emphasizing today, especially when we consider our displaced-persons program. Some advancement has been made in this humanitarian cause, but much better results must be and will be achieved. It is regretted that up to now only a few thousand displaced men, women, and children have landed in the United States. But it is a start. That is a far cry from the 200,000 that are permitted to enter under the law and a much farther cry from the 400,000 that we hope will find a haven on our soil.

Labor is to be commended for the aggressive fight it has made in behalf of those needy persons who were innocent victims of dictators' tyranny. And Mr. Dubinsky and the garment industry deserve high praise for furnishing employment to over 100 skilled workers who were among the first arrivals. I understand the industry seriously needs more of such skilled workers and about 1,000 others are now being processed for this employment.

Labor organizations make the best answer to the distorted anti-American propaganda abroad to belittle the notable achievements of great American trade-unions. The Communist falsehoods cannot take hold among the peoples of Europe because your magnificent deeds expose and refute their claims.

American labor's support of the Marshall plan was proof to the worker in western Europe that Communist propaganda was all wrong. Your establishment of an orphanage in Palermo and 12 projects in France, the loaning of generous funds to the Dutch transport workers so that they could re-equip themselves, your contribution to the labor league for human rights, all have combined to bring hope to a forlorn world. Your help has been spiritual as well as material, and your good-neighbor influence has been felt all over Europe. Your answer to communism is immeasurably better than bombs and bullets.

As we seek to help the displaced persons we must also be unceasing in our efforts to safeguard the civil rights of individuals in our own country. Thus far, we have had to rely upon only a thin thread of statutory authority, consisting of the scattered remnants of civil-rights legislation of the post-Civil War period. This law is so vaguely worded that the courts have frequently been reluctant to see it applied to specific situations. Notwithstanding the legal and constitutional difficulties which have confronted the Department, to say nothing of the force of local prejudice when prosecutions have been undertaken, the department has on many occasions sought to obtain for these statutes, through the courts, both in matters pertaining to individual rights and the rights of labor as a group, a broad interpretation of their application.

The report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, based upon an exhaustive case-by-case review of the work of the civil-rights section, has emphasized the weak statutory tools with which, in this field, the Department has had to work. It recommended, as you know, clarifying and enlarging enactments in respect to the coverage of the civil-rights statutes and the machinery for their enforcement, the more important of which have been urged upon Congress by President Truman in his state of the Union messages to the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

Some of you present at this convention have fought recently on the battlefields of freedom. There you learned that no artificial barriers separated men on the fighting front.

You fought to advance the cause of universal brotherhood and to extend the spirit of the good neighbor to all mankind.

You proclaimed America to the world as an example of what a free society can do for the individual and for a nation.

Never in the history of our country has it been so important that we live up to that example, and point the way to a better world—one filled with understanding and friendship among men.

In peacetime or wartime, the godless termites of democracy must find no hiding place in the hearts of our citizens. Our citizens want to send forth into the world rays of good will and happiness for all.

When the liberty and dignity of the individual are everywhere respected and protected, then we will have approached universal brotherhood.

In ancient days, gallant souls in noble succession were unjustly accused, and suffered for their faith. Today, in 1949, not in the distant past, freedom weeps as falsely accused individuals stand before courts—courts supposed to be tribunals of justice—from which they receive no justice—only brutal injustice.

May God grant us the courage and the wisdom to combat these menacing godless trends and to lead the stricken peoples of the world to justice and lasting peace.

The members of our armed services, who went forth to battle tyranny during the recent world conflict, came from all walks of life.

They were freemen fighting for freedom.

We thought they won that fight.

But no, the battle is not ended. All of us must be determined to remain free. Religious faiths, without armaments, will never be supplanted by tyrannical forces bearing arms.

We must never allow communism, or any other subversive activity which makes criminal mockery of individual rights, to get authority over our liberties. Should we do so, freedom would vanish from the earth. And that will never happen as long as freemen guard freedom's ramparts.

Yes, we are living in the most tense time in world history.

But we also are living in the most dynamic period of human experience.

History's pages are filled with accounts of nations crumbling in the dust. They took the lower road—the route that detoured them from God.

We must take the upper road—the high road that leads to a more abundant life for all mankind—that road leads to God.

In following the right way, we will reach an era of personal security and abundance such as mankind has never witnessed. We will also have international peace and world happiness.

The technology of this modern age—this wonderful challenging age—must advance and serve humanity, not wreck it. Your officials in Washington are determined that atomic energy shall be used for humanity's sake, and hope and pray that it shall never have to be used otherwise.

Builders, not destroyers, Americans will not fail a world yearning for harmony and peace.

With God's help, we will make the land in which we live better and more beautiful because we have been in it. We will make a growing America, full of golden opportunities, become a country in which those opportunities are realized.

I, too, pray and urge: "Let us keep America the refuge of the oppressed, the hope of the despairing, and the land of justice and opportunity for all."

Reduction in World Trade Volume

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Total World Trade Volume at Scant Prewar Level," written by Robert H. Patchin, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co. and published in the Grace Log for January-February 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTAL WORLD TRADE VOLUME AT SCANT PREWAR LEVEL

(By Robert H. Patchin, vice president, W. R. Grace & Co.)

The fact that when the figures are completed, the total volume of world trade, as distinct from its value, for 1948, may turn out to have been smaller than in 1938, suggests that the effort to restore nondiscriminatory, multilateral world-trade relations needs a more powerful impetus than it is getting.

A dazzling total world trade value of forty-four or forty-five billion dollars is likely to blind us to the truth that the combined barrels, boxes, bundles, and bulk of goods internationally bought and sold would be worth substantially less than half of that amount at average 1938 prices. That's the way the comparative trade volume is determined. So much for inflation. But men everywhere live by things not money. And things are not moving very freely in world trade today.

This renders important and urgent the proposal of Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, to move early in the new Congress for prompt extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in its original strength.

The Eightieth Congress, by extending the act for only a year with a confusing, if not crippling, amendment, raised doubts as to the future and vigor of the policy inaugurated by Cordell Hull in 1934. The policy has produced a network of 42 trade agreements between the United States and other countries. As all are based on the nondiscriminatory multilateral principle, it is a far-reaching factor in the world economy, even though, for the time being, bilateral trade agreements are widely prevalent.

Early extension of the Trade Agreements Act for an adequate period and vigorous administration, not only in adjusting tariffs, but in positively combatting discriminations, should be a powerful encouragement to multilateral expansion of the volume as well as the value of world trade, and should arrest any further decline. Moreover, the broad and tolerant philosophy of this policy should be mustered full strength in support of the President of the United States in the bipartisan purpose of surmounting the world political and economic crisis.

Nondiscriminatory and multilateral are mouth-filling words. They fall heavily upon the ear. But in world trade they mean simply liberal trade relations, fair to all, in which cruel and unusual barriers are out, and monetary exchange is convertible. Convertible, in turn, means that if you sell something somewhere for pounds, francs, or whatever else, you can buy any other currency with the proceeds.

This seemingly simple state of affairs used to be the rule in international commerce. However, it was widely broken down by trade and exchange controls established during World War I. Some were carried over and even intensified in the period between the two world wars. Most of them were reestablished in practically all the belligerent countries, except the United States, in World War II, and they prevail widely today.

In fact, probably half of world trade today is trussed up, hand and foot, with import restrictions, quotas, exchange controls, and the like, with a heavy infiltration of state trade and managed economy. Controls can be more stifling than the highest tariffs.

Practically every government in the world subscribes to the principle of nondiscriminatory multilateral trade. But—and this word "but" is heard everywhere—many feel obliged for one or another emergency reasons to practice the various controls which the peace-loving nations wanted to bring to an end, after a transition period by the creation of the International Monetary Fund.

This period has 2 or 3 years to run. The control countries are technically within their rights as they contend that this way they trade more than they could if controls were lifted and currency allowed to find its own level. However a fundamental question arises: Is the world getting anywhere? Or, is it getting there fast enough for the welfare of the greatly increased world population which is demanding the better standards of life which these same peace-loving nations collectively promised in all the joint agreements of war, with the United Nations, and so forth?

The year 1938 was a none too prosperous prewar period. The seeds of want and war were germinating rapidly. There has been wide acceptance of the conviction that should total world trade revert to the prewar level there would simply not be enough trade to go around, and nobody would be very happy. The ground would be fertile for things we do not like. But we are back there right now. For while total world trade (the sum of everybody's exports to everybody else) reached a value of $46,000,000,000 in 1947, the volume of goods thus traded in that year was only about 5 percent more than in 1938.

But in 1948 the exports of the United States, which had been about one-third of the world total compared with one-seventh before the war, appeared to have declined about 20 percent in value. The combined exports of all other countries were rising but the net result appears to have been a dip in the total volume to a point slightly under that of 1938. Some may consider this pretty good for a war-scarred world but if the various forms of relief and outright aid, such as in the Marshall plan, are deducted, the volume of private self-sustained trade would appear to have been substantially smaller. The Marshall plan, projected for 4 years, cannot continue indefinitely.

Moving into 1949, it remains to be seen whether the $5,000,000,000 voted by the American people in the Foreign Assistance Act to make the European recovery program (Marshall plan) work for the first of 4 years will stimulate sufficiently the latent forces of recovery in world trade on a growing multilateral basis, as well as the recovery of the individual production and trade of the nations aided.

In the September-October issue of The Grace Log I pointed out that the Marshall plan was conditioned upon resolute and effective measures of self-help to be taken by the nations of western Europe. This recognized that economic recovery could not be assured solely by aid from without, but must be generated from within. Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG has given notice repeatedly that at the end of the first year of operation of the act the results will be realistically appraised.

This appraisal will not be complete unless it extends to the total effect of the restrictive trade and currency controls which enmesh so much of world trade. Sympathy is not lacking for the nations which have resorted to and are clinging to such methods in their search for economic security. However, the question confronts the world: Does the overall restrictive effect of such controls on the recovery and expansion of world trade outweigh the benefits of the security sought by various nations? The trouble with trade and exchange controls is that they frequently bolster highly artificial situations; they become embedded and defy termination.

To quote Cordell Hull when he launched the reciprocal trade agreements against the world tide of rising tariffs and trade and exchange controls: "Let us not deceive ourselves. We must awaken to the fact that we are at a parting of the ways. In one direction lies the road of fair and practical cooperation among the nations in the field of their commercial relations, the road of expanding international trade. It leads to increasing employment, rising standards of living, international political and economic stability, and durable peace.

"In the other direction lies the road of economic warfare inherent in the policy of national self-containment, the road of contracting and vanishing trade. It leads to a progressive economic impoverishment everywhere, political instability, and constant fear of armed conflict among nations.

"Which way shall we go?"

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, financed more largely by the United States than by any other power, are dedicated to this task also. Their responsibility is world wide, by no means limited to Europe. While it may well be argued that dollars cannot save the world it is likewise apparent that the world cannot be saved without dollars, particularly if the dollars are so employed as to energize the latent forces of economic recovery wherever found. The world needs a new set of spark plugs but they should be of the well-tested and sound variety.

Since everything nowadays has to be "sold," how about the following for a slogan to speed the return of nondiscriminatory, multilateral trade relations: "Multifair, the economic spark plug."

Obviously there is no uniform pattern of trade and exchange control. They vary from country to country. Sometimes they relate to the maintenance of currency areas. On occasion, as recently in South Africa, sudden administrative changes abruptly halt orders in process between factory and overseas buyers. Desirable investment of United States capital in Latin America is frequently impeded by doubt as to obtaining regular remittances, in dollars, of the earnings thereon.

Of course, a pretty good case can be made for exchange controls under conditions where a flight of capital into the supposed refuge of stronger foreign currencies might otherwise result. Countries in the smaller economic category are not likely to adopt a bold fiscal course when key nations of Europe, long looked up to, cling to drastic controls and a wide variety of managed economy.

This is one reason why the United States, in addition to a vigorous revival of the trade-agreements policy, should assert the inherent merit of uncontrolled currency of which the United States dollar is the chief example. Anyone selling anything to the United States can convert it into foreign currency at will but the reverse is not true in many other countries. The result is a clogging of the channels of world trade which it is the responsibility of the European recovery program, developed pursuant to the Marshall plan, and directed by the ECA, eventually to clear away.

Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time for Good, Hard Look," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR GOOD, HARD LOOK

A bill of laudable purposes—the purposes of examining the results of the steady centralization of power in the Federal Government, of ascertaining how much of this centralization has resulted from necessity and how much from political design—has been introduced in the United States Senate by Senator JOHN W. BRICKER, Republican, of Ohio.

The bill by the former governor and the present junior Senator calls for the creation of a national commission on intergovernmental relations. The commission, which would be somewhat comparable in scope of authority to the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, would be composed of representatives of the national administration, Congress, State government, municipal government, and the taxpaying public that foots the bill for the oppressive snarl of Federal-State-local taxation and the wasteful, confusing jumble of jurisdictions of the three levels of government.

As Senator BRICKER accurately points out, not since the adoption of the Constitution, the framers of which believed they had stipulated a "proper division of powers and functions between the Federal and State Governments," has a thoroughgoing inquiry into

intergovernmental relationships been conducted. Senator BRICKER is deeply concerned, and rightly so, with the way in which the three levels of government, Federal, State, and local, have crisscrossed the jurisdictional lines—and with the enormous concentration of governmental power in Washington.

In presenting his bill to set up a commission to determine the best allocation of functions between the Federal and State Governments, and mark out appropriate fields of taxation in harmony with its proposed allocation, Senator BRICKER made some remarks that should be soberly pondered by the American people generally, and by the Republican Party leadership particularly, if that party is to be the party which the senior Senator from Ohio, ROBERT A. TAFT, believes it should become—the party militantly protecting human liberty against the steady encroachment of government.

"I believe the Congress should find out, if it can," said Senator BRICKER, "what factors have contributed to the centralization of Government in Washington, and the degree of contribution of each."

"I believe the Congress must carefully examine the ultimate result of the trend toward centralization. Are we faced with an irresistible rush toward centralization—then state socialism—then dictatorship? I do not believe we are. I do not believe that this trend, which to my mind will certainly lead to the eventual destruction of the Federal form of government, is irreversible. Again it is high time the Congress stop and take stock—high time to find out where we are going.

"It may be," Senator BRICKER said later in explanation of his bill, "that State and local governments are expensive, archaic manifestations of a bygone day and should be dissolved. Heaven forbid such a finding—but if they are, let's find it out and stop paying lip service to the Federal system."

Senator BRICKER is quite right; it is time to take a good, hard look and see what time, a vastly changed economy, and the dreamers of a welfare state have done to the handiwork of the creators of the Federal Government who delegated what they thought were carefully enumerated powers to that Government.

The North Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Atlantic Pact or Union?" published in the February 7, 1949, issue of the Providence Evening Bulletin, and an editorial entitled "Partners or Allies," published in a recent issue of the Washinton Post. The editorials deal with North Atlantic security.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of February 7, 1949]

ATLANTIC PACT OR UNION?

Two of America's oldest and most cherished political maxims are: "In union there is strength" and "No entangling alliances." In modern times there may seem to be an inconsistency between them, yet both still have validity. Our own history has taught us the inestimable benefits of the bond among our States and the disastrous results of any effort to break it. European history has shown us the dangers of committing this country to fight in wars which may be undertaken by other nations for interests quite foreign to our own.

In the context of today's news, the riddle posed by these two truths might be stated this way: How can America gain the strength promised by the proposed Atlantic security pact without incurring the risk of being drawn into war by the action of allies beyond our control? A practical answer to that riddle, it seems to us, may be found in the proposal of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, that the Atlantic defense pact take the form of a genuine union of the free democracies.

A federal union of free peoples even on the limited basis Senator KEFAUVER suggests would, we believe, have other important advantages, notably economy in defense expenditures and the ability to provide mutual defense against internal as well as external aggression. But its great and basic merit from an American viewpoint is the promise it holds of solving our ancient riddle of how to gain the strength of unity without encouraging economic, diplomatic, or military irresponsibility. We strongly support Senator KEFAUVER'S call for a convention of free nations to study this approach to the forthcoming Atlantic security pact.

If the negotiations now under way among the United States, Canada, and several nations of Western Europe produce only another alliance along these lines, the same flaws may reappear. But if the effort is turned toward the creation of a real union, in which the member nations sacrifice a degree of sovereignty to a central parliament representing the free peoples in proportion to population, we might achieve the world's first international organization based on law.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post]

PARTNERS OR ALLIES

However, the occasion might be taken to reexamine the nature of the particular kind of Atlantic association under discussion. Why limit the association to a military alliance providing for the acquisition of bases, for arms consignments, and for a pledge to wage war together? If we feel a sense of association with western Europe, why not offer an association for peace as well as for war? Metternich said after the Napoleonic wars that a unifying idea was the foundation of postwar reconstruction and pacification. The unifying idea of his day was legitimacy of government. Today it is freedom and union—as the free peoples all recognize in their dreams, though their governments are not guided by it. Specifically, before this country sets its hand to a military alliance, and embarks on a course that all history teaches will infallibly lead to war, let us issue a call for a constitutional assembly for the consideration of a grand Federal union.

Such a call from the United States—the music maker for the free world—would lift the present discussions onto a new plane. It would reach peoples as well as governments, and inspire them to lift up their voices in an irresistible demonstration. In their hearts they want to relate themselves to other peoples. They know that distance has been annihilated, that what affects one affects everybody; yet they see their governments building up vested and nationalistic interests in such things as fighting currencies, state trading systems, and other forms of anarchy. It must seem to them defeatist as well as senseless. They cannot be encouraged either by the spectacle that this reversion to pathological nationalism is being financed under ERP, though to be sure, the ERP ideal is eventually to create interdependence out of a sturdier independence.

Is it not remarkable that the first thing to be forgotten in time of peace is our war aims? Cannot we see that in all the postwar schemes of pacification and reconstruction, we have undershot the mark? Partnership is the effective alliance, and the only one. Before the reaction to a mere military alliance gets altogether crystallized, an effort to realize the aspirations of the men who have had to fight a couple of world wars in the last 35 years ought to be explored, and the idea of a great community taken out of the hearts of mankind and given some form and substance.

Representative Hays' Compromise Proposal on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent editorial concerning Representative BROOKS HAYS' proposal for a compromise respecting civil-rights legislation, published in the March 1, 1949, issue of the Arkansas Gazette.

There beng no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MR. HAYS' COMPROMISE

The area of compromise on civil-rights legislation defined by Representative BROOKS HAYS in a recent address before Congress has attracted attention across the Nation, and has won praise from moderates on both sides of the central argument. For instance, it impresses Roscoe Drummond of the Christian Science Monitor, one of the ablest of the Washington correspondents, as "a significant compromise in good faith." Mr. Drummond wrote:

"These are significant proposals to come from an influential southern Congressman. They make a valid distinction between 'civil rights' which should not be compromised and 'social aspirations' which cannot be waved into being by a law."

But if the compromise has made a favorable impression in many quarters, it apparently hasn't registered with the administration. Mr. Truman has publicly ordered full steam ahead on the effort to divest the Southern Senate bloc of the filibuster. No member of the administration has openly taken any notice of the compromise proposal offered by Mr. HAYS and that, as Mr. Drummond sees it, leaves it dangling in the air where it can't remain for long.

If the compromise is thus rejected without serious examination, the administration will allow the civil-rights argument to revert to the extremists in both camps who have waged it with increasing bitterness in recent years. It may be possible for the administration to muster sufficient strength to push through major civil-rights bills—although that is doubtful. But at the same time the administration will have created an atmosphere of bitterness which will make enforcement impossible.

Mr. HAYS offered a possible solution that goes beyond a mere settlement of political differences, and holds some hope of restor-

ing the atmosphere of tranquility and cooperation in which enduring solutions to the race problem may be—as they must be—mutually achieved. If Mr. Truman finally and flatly rejects in favor of the all-or-nothing demands from the left wing of the Democratic Party he will only strengthen the opposition to his whole program that is already forming in Congress.

Editor Chides the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 14, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Jack Sinclair, the wide-awake young editor of the venerable Hartford Day Spring, published at Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich., recently took occasion to remind his subscribers and others that you can't have your cake and eat it too.

He recently wrote and printed an editorial which calls attention to a fact well known by most public-office holders, that is, that folks sometimes vote for candidates who promise the most, even though they are fully aware that the promises, if fulfilled, may in the end give them something that they do not want.

Farmers in Michigan listened to Harry S. Truman's promises and to his threats that, if Republicans were elected, they would, figuratively speaking, starve to death. Being so interested in Harry's story about what the Democrats had been doing for the farmers, they forgot to listen to his promises of what he had done and would do for the workers.

Now, realizing that the administration is proposing a 40-hour week and a minimum 75-cents-an-hour wage for farm workers, they are beginning to wonder where that leaves them; they are beginning to wonder who is going to milk the cows Saturdays and Sundays, or whether Harry has some storage plant he can hook on to the cow which will help her hold the milk until Monday morning or evening.

They are also doing a little thinking about the 75-cents-an-hour proposition and wondering why it is that, if they must pay the hired man 75 cents an hour, they must also furnish him and his family, if he has one, with a home to live in, pay the electric light bill, and give him off the farm a half or a whole steer, a hog or two hogs, depending on the size of the family, together with butter, eggs, and milk, and whatever vegetables he may wish to grow, using the farmer's machinery, gasoline, and getting pay for his time while planting, cultivating, and harvesting the garden crop.

The editor puts it this way:

UNHEEDED WARNING BEARS FRUIT

One of the partial explanations for President Truman's surprise reelection last fall was that he received a large farm vote, that receipt of Federal subsidy checks over the years was a major consideration that led many farmers to cast their votes for him.

Truth of that conclusion was reflected in the voting in this area as well as in many other places throughout the country. In Hartford Township, which in recent years hasn't been able to muster enough Democrats to hold a township caucus, there were 286 votes cast for Truman. In Keeler township there were 207 votes for Truman out of 528 total votes cast.

Now comes the irony. These same farmers, who at election time could not see past their subsidy checks to read the warnings that reelection of the New Deal would mean more of the same, now are screaming against a proposed 40-hour week and 75-cents-an-hour minimum wage for farm workers.

Maybe some of those normally Republican farmers who switched their votes to the gravy train will be convinced now that they can't sell their crops and store them, too.

Have been getting quite a few letters from farmers who wish to know whether 75-cents-an-hour minimum wage must be paid in addition to the other things, like rent, food, and sometimes fuel, which I have just mentioned.

Sometimes we learn that legislation is not just as simple and workable as it appears at first glance.

Unlimited Debate a Weapon for Minorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Unlimited Debate Is Fine Weapon for Minorities," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNLIMITED DEBATE IS FINE WEAPON FOR MINORITIES—POLITICAL WRITER HOLDS ENDLESS TALKING IN CONGRESS HAS NEVER INJURED UNITED STATES OR CAUSED DISASTER IN CRISIS

(By Gould Lincoln)

The drive to make the United States Senate just another legislative body is not new. Such a drive has arisen frequently in the past, when under the stress of passion some particular piece of legislation has been demanded. Today there would be no pressing demand for a change in the Senate rules, clamping a closer cloture provision on the individual Senators, were it not for the outcry to have the Federal Government compel individual States—those in the South particularly—to accept the so-called civil-rights program.

And today the chances for success in this drive to strip the Senate of its unique qualifications—as a great reviser and compromiser of legislation and as a final and effective check on intemperate demands of the executive branch of the Government, or demands of minority groups—appear better than they have at any time in the past. At the insistence of President Truman and the Democrats outside the solid South, and the insistence of the Republicans, the civil-rights program has been given the right-of-way in the Senate over all other measures. And to make the drive for the enactment of this antiracial discrimination legislation run more smoothly, it is now proposed to amend the cloture rule of the Senate—to fill the loopholes and make it possible for a two-thirds vote in the Senate to limit—and so close—debate in the Senate at all times and on all matters.

DELAYS IRRITATING

The present demand to make two-thirds cloture ironclad is frankly only a step toward majority cloture.

President Truman has declared himself for closing debate by a simple majority of the Senate. Under the President's proposal, 25 Senators—a majority of a quorum of 49—could put an end to discussion of any subject before the Senate, if only a bare quorum of the Senators were attending a session.

A number of Senators, during the recent hearings on the amendment to the cloture rule and during the present debate in the Senate, have stated they desire majority cloture. Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, Democratic whip, is proposing to offer an amendment to the pending resolution, providing for majority cloture instead of two-thirds, and so is Senator MORSE, Republican, of Oregon.

To partisans the tortoise-like slowness of the Senate, the constant and continuing delays arising because of the rule of unlimited debate, have been tremendously irritating. Invective leveled at the Senate has been harsh in the extreme. Others have attempted to ridicule the upper house of Congress and its individual Members. The boast of the Senate—and it is a proud one—has been that it alone provides a forum of completely free debate and free speech.

The rule of unlimited debate has prevailed in the Senate since 1806—143 years. The only checks upon it have been a temporary rule, adopted during the Civil War, restricting debate on war measures considered in secret sessions of the Senate, and the present two-thirds cloture rule, adopted in 1917 when this country was on the verge of another war. Prior to 1806 the previous question could be moved in the Senate—a motion designed to end debate and bring a vote on a pending question—but even then the previous question was subject to debate. The Senate rules themselves provide exceptions to the general rule of unlimited debate—for example, a motion to adjourn is not debatable, nor is a motion to lay on the table any question or measure before the Senate.

ADVANTAGE AGAINST WEAKNESS

The test of the value—or lack of value—of unlimited debate lies, of course, in its practice. The advantage of the rule of unlimited debate must be weighed in the balance against its weakness. Has the rule of unlimited Senate debate ever proved injurious to the country? Has it ever caused disaster in an emergency? The answer is, "No." It has, to be sure, caused delay, compromise, and defeat of measures which a majority has desired—measures that have had merit. But such delays, compromises, and defeats must be weighed against the tremendous value of free and unlimited discussion of measures upon which the people of the country have needed to be informed, far more fully than a limited discussion permits.

So strong has been the feeling against limiting free debate in the Senate that efforts to invoke the present two-thirds cloture rule of the Senate, since its adoption, have been very, very rare. Take a look at the record. In all that time, the Senate has actually voted on cloture only 19 times. And cloture has been invoked only 4 out of those 19 times on which it came to a vote.

TWO LOOPHOLES FOUND

The two-thirds cloture rule was adopted by the Senate as a result of a filibuster in the Senate which prevented the passage of the

so-called armed merchant ship bill at the close of a short session of Congress in 1917. President Woodrow Wilson had asked for legislation permitting him to arm American merchant vessels, as an answer to Germany's submarine attacks upon American vessels sailing for belligerent ports. President Wilson denounced the filibusterers—calling them a little band of willful men. The House had already passed the bill by a huge majority. Because the session of Congress ended arbitrarily on March 4—a small group of Senators was able to talk the bill to death. President Wilson afterward found authority and armed the merchant ships notwithstanding. Since that time, the twentieth amendment to the Constitution has been adopted, doing away with the short sessions.

The immediate fight over the Senate rules is to make two-thirds cloture operative at all times. Two loopholes have been discovered in the rule that states specifically that the cloture rule may be invoked on any pending measure. In 1922 it was ruled by the Presiding Officer of the Senate that the cloture rule was not applicable to debates upon amendments to the Senate Journal—the official record of the previous legislative day of the Senate. Still later it was ruled that the cloture rule was not applicable to debate upon a measure to take up a measure for consideration by the Senate. This latter ruling was made by Senator VANDENBERG.

Both these rulings were made when efforts were under way to bring to a close debate on so-called civil-rights bills. In 1922 the Senators from Southern States so rang the changes upon debate of the Senate Journal that the bill had to be laid aside in order to take up other pressing legislation.

POSSIBLE PROCEDURE

While the Vandenberg ruling was challenged when it was made last August 2, the consensus at the time—and since that day—was that he had ruled correctly on the language of the cloture rule itself.

Under the amendment to the rules now pending before the Senate, the cloture rule would be applicable to any matter under debate, whether it were the Journal or a motion to take up a measure for consideration.

If this amendment to the rules is finally adopted it will be far easier to move to invoke the cloture rule. But even should it be adopted, there still remains the necessity of obtaining a two-thirds vote of all Senators present and voting to limit debate.

Ordinarily a two-thirds vote of the Senate would require a combination of Senators representing both the major political parties—and such a combination will undoubtedly be exerted to bring the limitation of debate and a vote on civil-rights bills as they come before the Senate in the future. It is entirely possible, however, that the political make-up of the Senate may in the future—as it has in the past—show two-thirds or more of 96 Senators belonging to the same political party.

GUARDIAN OF STATES

The issue before the Senate today ultimately is whether the Federal Government shall force its will upon individual States of the Union, notwithstanding the opposition of the people of those States. Today the States involved in this drive for Federal control lie in one section of the country—the South. Federal encroachment, however, is driving in every direction and the probabilities are it will not confine itself to any particular section of the country in the future.

The benefits derived from the rule of unlimited debate in the Senate have been frequent. For example, in 1937, when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt stood at the very summit of his power politically, Mr. Roosevelt proposed a plan to pack the Supreme Court of the United States with justices who would carry out the bidding of the administration. Had it been possible to force an early vote in the Senate on this proposal, the legislation giving the President that authority would, in all probability, have passed. A full and free debate—lengthy also—brought so much opposition to the measure that it was dropped.

On another occasion, in 1946, when President Truman came to the Congress and demanded legislation empowering him to draft railroad workers into the armed services—as a measure to prevent a Nation-wide railroad strike, the House, with rules that permit quick and immediate action, passed the bill within a few minutes after it had been proposed. In the Senate, however, where the rules do not permit such immediate cloture, the bill was forced over—and never was passed.

Economy! Just Talk?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, is the administration really desirous of economy, or is it just talking—just trying to fool the folks?

If the Veterans' Administration, which apparently has found it advisable to close certain hospitals in the interest of economy—and no one has any fault to find with the program if it will give economy without impairing a needed service to the veterans—is really interested in economy, unless it has some satisfactory answer to the following letter, can really bring about a worth-while saving in this one little item.

The letter to which I refer reads as follows:

STURGIS POSTURE CHAIR CO.,
Sturgis, Mich., February 22, 1949.

The Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Representative in Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your desire to effect savings in the cost of Government, eliminate unfair practices, and assure unhampered competition is well known. Therefore, I do not hesitate to bring to your attention certain restrictive and discriminatory bid invitations now being issued.

The Veterans' Administration has issued a bid invitation No. F-67, dated February 11, 1949, to be opened February 28, 1949, at the Veterans' Administration Building in Washington, for over 4,000 chairs to meet Federal Specification 340. Chairs to meet this specification must be aluminum and, to the best of my knowledge, are made by only one manufacturer, namely, the General Fireproofing Co., of Youngstown, Ohio.

Recently the Army Quartermaster Purchasing Office in Chicago issued an invitation for bids on chairs to meet this specification 340, with the result that steel chair bids were automatically disqualified and the award made to General Fireproofing Co. at prices about double the amounts bid on our chairs. The actual quotations were as follows:

Bidder	Chair	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
Chas. G. Stott & Co. Inc.	Sturgis..	$31.48	$17.17	$45.45	$28.80
General Fireproofing Co.	G. F....	57.94	46.30	73.88	46.81

One each of the above General Fireproofing chairs totals $224.93. One each of the Sturgis chairs totals $122.90, or about one-half that of the aluminum chair bid. You can readily see the amount of savings which could be made in large quantities of these chairs.

For some time various agencies of Government have been purchasing aluminum chairs at a much higher price than steel chairs. The fact that a slight weight factor may be involved should certainly not be controlling in the consideration of a suitable office chair. While it is true that aluminum will not rust, the parallel to this would be a steel chair bonderized to inhibit oxidation. Since the volume of aluminum necessary to obtain the same strength as steel must be 1⅝ times the volume of steel, you can easily see the weight difference would not be as much as is inferred by the proponents of aluminum. I very much doubt if you or any of your colleagues ever worried much about whether your swivel chair weighed 36 pounds or 42 pounds as the weight is immaterial in any case.

It so happens that the three largest producers of steel office chairs are located in Michigan; namely, the Sturgis Posture Chair Co. of Sturgis, Metal Office Furniture Co. of Grand Rapids, and the Harter Corp. of Sturgis. Because of the discrimination against steel, none of the above Michigan manufacturers have any chance to get any of this Government business. This, even though they offer metal chairs of equal value at approximately one-half the cost to the Government. If manufacturers of steel chairs of equal value were given an even opportunity in the bidding, the cost to the Government would be drastically reduced and Michigan industry would be able to get its rightful share.

Your early attention to this situation is respectfully requested.

Very truly yours,

T. H. VAN BUREN,
President.

To my knowledge, the Sturgis Posture Chair Co. is a reliable manufacturing company. It produces a worth-while product at a reasonable cost.

Is the Veterans' Administration permitting someone to draw specifications to favor a particular firm? If it is, it would not be the first time in the history of this Government—and that in recent years—when some fellow who was on the inside channeled orders into a source where he had a friendly or financial interest.

I have asked the Veterans' Administration to give me the low-down; for the folks back home, who pay the taxes to pay the salary of the boy who draws the specifications, want to know what he is up to.

Health Insurance or Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Porter on Health Insurance," written by Philip W.

Porter, and published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 8, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTER ON HEALTH INSURANCE—IT'S A FINE THING AND WILL REMAIN SO UNTIL GOVERNMENT GETS HOLD OF IT

(By Philip W. Porter)

In President Truman's recommendations to Congress, one of them stuck out like a sore thumb—Government health insurance. Nothing sounds better or would turn out worse than this. Before you swallow this sugar-coated pill you had better examine it carefully.

There is nothing wrong with health insurance as such. In fact, it's a fine thing when privately and efficiently operated. We have in Cleveland one of the finest cooperative hospital care plans in the country. We also have a medical-mutual plan which ties in with the hospital plan. The Cleveland Hospital Service Association has been in existence here for a dozen years or so, and the medical-mutual plan for a couple. They are so widely used by Clevelanders that there is not enough hospital space to care for all those eligible to use them.

But get this—no one is required to pay the small monthly fee unless he wishes to. He is not taxed, and his employer is not taxed. The managers and clerks of the association are not subject to political hiring by the Government nor injected with the deadening influence of civil service. The association makes no profit and operates efficiently in the public service—or else. You squawk directly to its office, not to your Congressman or some buck-passing bureaucrat.

GOOD INSURANCE

The thing is a huge success and performs a marvelous service. If you remain well, the small fee is good insurance. If you fall ill or have an accident, the 30 days' free hospital care and 60 days' half fare is a godsend.

The Cleveland hospital plan is not the only one. The Blue Cross plan operates in central Ohio and elsewhere, and all over the country there are numerous such organizations.

What would happen to them if the Government took over? Just what you think. These plans would either be gradually absorbed by the Government scheme or would be forced out of business, because most people would not subscribe to them and pay the Government insurance tax too. Since they'd be forced to pay the Government, they would drop the private plan. I don't care what assurances the Government gives that the present plans would continue, sooner or later they would disappear into the clutches of the bureaucracy. And when that day came, then you'd get just what you get in every attempt by Government to manage a public service—inefficiency multiplied, surly employees, political appointees, poor planning, and all-around snafu.

IT'S A FRAUD

This proposed health insurance, like so much of the rest of politically inspired welfare, is a lot of pap, designed primarily to promote jobs for and produce votes for the self-perpetuating New Dealers. It sounds great, but it works awful. It is based upon the prevalent philosophy of something for nothing. The promoters of this fraud will contend that it is necessary to impose it upon us because thousands are not covered by health insurance and they suffer medically and financially thereby.

Well, chums, health insurance has been sold by insurance companies for heaven knows how long, and what is to prevent any community in the country from organizing its own hospital service plan, just as Cleveland and other cities have? All they have to do is begin—they'll get the customers. It's definitely not a function of government, any more than running a grocery store or putting diapers on babies.

There isn't space today to discuss socialized medicine—which would come later if the political-job producers should have their way—but if the time ever comes when that one is slipped over, God help us. You don't have to listen to the perfectly legitimate objections of doctors and dentists on this score; all you have to do is to see the way it is working out in Great Britain.

HOW SOCIALIZATION WORKS

I lived over there and saw it function. Thank the Lord, I didn't have to depend on it, for I could go to competent army doctors. But I had plenty of friends who were forced to depend on it, for they had deductions for it taken out of their slim pay and couldn't afford to hire Harley Street specialists.

If what they got under socialized medicine was medical care and competent treatment of illness and disease, then I'm a Tanganyikan rhinoceros. The panel doctor's office was an assembly line of 50 patients crowded into the time and space it should have taken him to handle 10. He gave each of them scarcely more than a look and a promise—and often they got the wrong medicine in the rat race. Some of the offices were even unclean and some of the doctors were smelling high of drink, but what did they care? Their fees were guaranteed by the government at so much a head.

And the poor patient, if dissatisfied, couldn't change doctors once he had signed up, without the permission of the doctor he didn't like or without 3 months for a government board to make up its mind. Meanwhile, he could make a choice between paying a competent specialist a stiff fee or dying slowly. One thing for sure, the socialized doctor would never cure him.

Military Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to present the views of Maj. Paul S. Davis, JAGD Reserve, who has contributed a very interesting article which appeared in a recent edition of the Evening Star.

I am inserting this article in the RECORD under leave to extend heretofore granted:

MILITARY JUSTICE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

As a Reserve officer in the Army with several years' wartime experience in the Judge Advocate General's Department, I should like to comment on the proposed uniform code of military justice recently introduced in Congress (S. 857 and H. R. 2498). Your recent editorial (February 12) suggests that it combines the best features of existing laws in each branch of the service, and some other current comments give the impression that it would improve court-martial procedures throughout all the armed services and benefit accused personnel. In fact, however, this bill, if enacted, substantially would curtail the rights now given by law to accused personnel of the Army and Air Force. It would discard many of the constructive changes made in the Army court-martial system since 1916 and particularly in 1948.

Specifically, the following changes would restrict the rights now given to the accused in the Army and Air Force:

1. Under the present law a general court-martial must have a trained lawyer as law member who rules on all legal questions. Under the proposed code the law member would no longer sit as a member of the court but would be limited to ruling on evidence and other matters during the trial and advising the court on legal questions. Thus the accused would lose the important safeguard of having an informed lawyer present at all times during the deliberations and voting of the court in closed session.

2. The power of immediate commanding officers to impose so-called company punishments would be vastly increased. In the Army and Air Force a commander now can impose only minor punishments such as extra fatigue, reprimand, or restriction or hard labor without confinement for not more than 7 days. Soldiers and airmen need not accept such punishment. If they do not believe themselves guilty, they may demand trial by a court-martial. The proposed code would authorize commanders to impose on enlisted men forfeiture of one-half month's pay, confinement for 7 days, confinement on bread and water for 5 days, or reduction in grade. Furthermore, unless specifically authorized by departmental regulation, a soldier would no longer be able to refuse punishment and demand trial.

3. The right of a soldier to have enlisted men sit on the court trying him, conferred by the 1948 amendments, would be made subject to decision of the commanding officer as to "physical conditions" or "military exigencies."

4. A summary court-martial (consisting of one officer) would have complete power to try any noncommissioned officer, even one of long service with the highest rating, and could reduce him to the lowest grade. As the law now stands the higher grades of noncommissioned officers can request trial by special court-martial and thereby insure that the case be heard by at least three officers and an adequate record made.

5. Reserve personnel during inactive duty training periods might be subjected to courts-martial for absence, tardiness or other alleged offenses during training periods and could be placed on active duty without their consent in order to stand trial and suffer punishment.

6. Under the present Army and Air Force law, soldiers may be confined in a penitentiary only for very serious offenses, such as wartime desertion, mutiny, or crimes of a civil nature for which penitentiary confinement is authorized by other Federal laws. The proposed code would authorize penitentiary confinement for any offense, no matter how minor, thus potentially branding a soldier with a penitentiary record even for an insignificant military offense.

Apparently the proposed bill adopts many provisions of the Naval Code of Justice, which has not been substantially revised since 1862, and attempts to impose them on the Army and Air Force. The 1948 amendments to the Army system were made after 3 years of careful consideration by Congress during which hearings were held and all points of view considered. The new Manual for Courts Martial has just gone into effect, and the Army and Air Force should have a chance to give the new law a fair trial. If more changes are desirable, they can then be made in the light of experience.

I am not sufficiently familiar with naval problems to know whether the Army system could or should be fully applied in the Navy or to express an opinion as to what changes, if any, should be made in the present Navy Code. But whether or not uniformity of procedure between the services is an ultimately desirable goal, it certainly should not

be achieved at the cost of destroying wholesome safeguards now existing in the Army and the Air Force system of military justice.

PAUL S. DAVIS,
Major, JAGD Reserve.

Union Man Wants Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 28, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter received from a member of a union who after paying union dues for 38 years, sees the need for a continuation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Let the letter tell you why:

FEBRUARY 22, 1949.

Senator TAFT of Ohio,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The eyes of our Nation are placed upon you in regard to the Taft-Hartley bill. This bill is the only salvation of saving the laboring class of people of our Nation and the manufacturers. It may be that there should be just a few changes in this bill—if we are to save our Nation we must have some bill, if not this one, to do so.

The writer is only speaking after paying dues for 38 years to the ORT, which is an A. F. of L. part of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, but turned out to be a company union. It gives no protection to anyone, even though the Government has set up the Labor Board to hear its cases. One cannot go to these Boards alone or through a lawyer. It has to be through the union, which will not do anything for its members.

For instance: Let's take the big packers' strike in South St. Paul, Minn., where the laboring people would not have gone on strike if it were up to them to take a vote on it, and not up to the heads of unions. They all would have accepted the companies' offers and all would have kept working, but the union officials told them they would get 15 cents or more raise per hour, and that it would only be a week or two until the strike would be settled. They struck and were out 13 weeks and had fights at the picket lines and all over. The strikers thought the union would back them, so they went and damaged some of the machinery. However, after they were arrested and sent to Stillwater to the Minnesota State prison the strikers discovered that they had no one backing them. They all suffered in every respect and will always have this record. They can never have any Government job whatsoever on account of their record, even though they are not criminals in one sense of the word.

Many of the strikers' families suffered so that their children never had a Christmas present and many went hungry due to this strike. Nevertheless, the union official, or rather their field man, Mr. Segal, did not lose any money. He got paid for all his time, and although he was convicted, he never served any time like the poor laborers did. Why?

Lets take another machine shop here where their field man came around and told them they would have to have 15 cents raise per hour, or strike, and their foreman told them to take it up with the manufacturer and see what they would offer. They went to the manufacturer and told him their demands and they wanted him to figure out just what the manufacturer could pay. The manufacturer came and told them they could pay 7½ cents raise per hour at present, but could not pay them the 15 cents, which they asked for until they could make other arrangements to increase the price of their products. The field man of the union was provoked at the foreman for accepting the 7½-cent raise, and he told him that he was not accepting it and that the men all will take a vote on this. He wanted a 25-cent raise for himself and the manufacturer was also kicking the foreman for not accepting it. They took a vote the next evening and only one of them voted to strike among the whole group, and everybody was happy. They all had a merry Christmas and presents for their kiddies, too.

Another instance was the Minneapolis Honeywell Regulator Co., which also was threatened with strike, but when the company's election was held, the majority voted to stay and take the raise which was offered by the company. This in turn goes to show just what can be done if the men have a right to speak for themselves.

The voting of any union should be an American's privilege. However, many times they have been cut out by the officials of the unions. We should have a law to give them this privilege.

The writer is sure that there is not any man in the Senate or Congress who disagrees with this, and would make laws to give them this privilege. We have also got to have the open shop. This would win our Nation, if we did not. All Americans would vote the same way, or if not, it will keep a lot of laboring men from good jobs.

My attention has been called to the fact that the United States Chamber of Commerce is also asking that they be an open shop to protect our Nation.

As previously stated, the writer is only speaking after paying dues for 38 years and learning that I was only throwing my money away. Had I been paying life insurance, I would have been drawing $200 per month, instead of being let out to starve by the union, as far as the officers of the union are concerned.

Very truly yours.

Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 3, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Hervé J. L'Heureux before the Last Man's Club, William H. Jutras Post, No. 43, American Legion, Manchester, N. H., October 28, 1948:

I am glad indeed to be here tonight particularly since, owing to my having been stationed outside of the United States 20 out of the past 22 years, this is the first of our annual banquets I have been able to attend.

Earlier this evening, I related to you some of my experiences in the American Foreign Service, 10 years of which were acquired in several countries of Europe and North Africa in the years immediately preceding, during, and following the Second World War. Those were some of my more pleasant experiences, of amusing incidents. But now I wish to speak to you in a more serious vein. I want to give you my impression of how other people regard us and the efforts we are making to assist them, and to suggest a means of correcting erroneous impressions and of restoring the faith of all the peoples of the world in the spiritual values rather than in the apparently prevailing materialistic values.

In spite of the great sacrifices we have made, in two world wars, to preserve the liberties of the people throughout the world, and notwithstanding the tremendous financial and economic assistance we have rendered to them during and following the last war, the true character, ideals, and purposes of the American people are, unfortunately, little understood by the peoples of Europe. Many of them have gained a very bad impression of us as a result of wide and exaggerated publicity given to the exploits of our gangsters, for instance, and to the growing rate of divorces in this country. We are regarded by them essentially as capitalists, addicted to luxurious living. This unfavorable impression of us is strengthened by the insidious propaganda, now being disseminated, that we are imperialistic and warmongers, that the financial and economic aid we are giving the free peoples of Europe is inspired by ulterior motives. It is difficult for the peoples of Europe to grasp the fact that the American people are essentially Christian, God-loving, God-fearing and peace-minded. As a result, an American abroad who follows his religion and who is not afraid to mention publicly the name of God makes a deep impression.

In this connection I recall an incident when several hundred persons had gathered at the grave of a group of patriots who had been tortured and put to death by the Germans for work they had done in the resistance. Speakers praised the patriotic services of the dead and promised to erect an elaborate monument in memory of their heroic deeds. And yet, not a single prayer was offered, not a moment of silence was observed. When my turn to speak came, I recalled how these men had paid the supreme sacrifice in order that those of us assembled might live freely and continue to carry on the work of God here on earth; that, reciprocally, there is nothing we can do more effectively than pray for the repose of their immortal souls. I then requested all of those gathered to pause in silence and pray for these acknowledged heroes. Many commended me for this gesture and expressed astonishment that I dared invoke the name of God without fear of consequences from my Government. I also recall the great surprise and deep impression which was made on an outstanding French industrialist when he witnessed the opening, by a prayer, of a daily session of our Senate in Washington. I told him the House of Representatives follows the same custom. He talked incessantly about this during the remainder of his stay in the United States, and he has related this commendatory custom many times since his return to France. Some of his incredulous listeners have written to me to confirm it.

We in this country have a rich inheritance. Before God and men we have the responsibility of sharing it with others, of enriching others from the treasures we possess—financial, economic, intellectual, and spiritual. Seldom has the world been so spiritually beggered as it is today, seldom has it been so destitute and in such dire need of the riches we can offer. I can say without fear of challenge that the Christian way of life has never been menaced by greater danger than that which threatens it today. For never before have the forces of evil been marshaled against it with such strength and such sinister strategy.

When I speak of this new crisis I am not raising false alarms nor appealing to baseless fears. For generations our spiritual leaders have seen this conflict growing. Their warning voices went unheeded by the statesmen of the west. But at last these statesmen are convinced, awakened by the harsh realities of the international scene. They may speak

of the conflict as a struggle between western democracy and eastern despotism—a struggle for the freedom of the individual or his enslavement. But this is merely a superficial view, for in reality the struggle is between the Christian way of life and the apostasy of communism. It is a conflict between belief in God and the dignity of men as the sons of God, as against atheism and the concept of man as a mere material force, without power to survive the grave's corruption, without a supernatural destiny. This denial of the supernatural is the basic doctrine of those who, in the name of the Communist philosophy of government, have subjected millions to their ruthless and cynical domination.

Let us pause for a moment and think of the millions who enjoyed, for a brief space after the cessation of hostilities, the illusion of liberty but who now, instead of building their lives in security and peace, look to the future with dread, of how discouraged and confused they must be as they witness so many of their fellow citizens being converted away from the basic principals of natural law which they had inherited. In addition to financial and economic aid it is my humble opinion that the thing the bewildered peoples of Europe need more than anything else is moral encouragement. The conviction that the people of the United States are not wavering, that they are holding fast to the principles expressed in their Bill of Rights, that they ardently desire peace but are unwilling to compromise with justice would, I believe, bolster the morale of the European peoples tremendously.

In my commencement day address at Rivier College on June 6 I pointed out what a wonderful thing it would be, at least until peace shall have been secured, if a custom sprang up in every town and city in the United States whereby at 12 o'clock noon each day, for instance, all traffic and industry should come to a halt for 1 minute and simultaneously every man, woman, and child in the United States should lift his mind and heart toward God in a silent prayer for peace—if everyone should ask God to bless our statesmen in order that their negotiations for a righteous peace might succeed.

Aside from the well-recognized efficacy of such prayers in themselves, think of the tremendous moral force such a voluntary, spontaneous, and unanimous manifestation would have upon the peoples of the earth, particularly upon those of the incredulous nations and those of the Christian nations who are presently abandoning Christianity and the fundamental rules of the natural law as their life guide. It would go a long way toward dispelling the propaganda that we, Americans, are war-like and imperialistic. At this time, when we are giving the world encouragement by rendering astronomical financial, and material assistance, why should not our Nation also become a moral leader in the world? It would cost us little effort and it would pay liberal dividends.

The preamble to the constitution of the American Legion calls attention to our association for God and country for the purpose, among others, of promoting peace and good will on earth. As members of the American Legion and war veterans, I believe it is most befitting for this group to be the first to resolve to implement the contemplated 1-minute daily peace prayer custom in the United States. With this end in view, and as a member of the Last Man's Club, I offer the following resolution:

Having complete confidence in the ability of our fellow men, with the aid of Almighty God to establish a just and enduring peace in the world.

We, the members of the Last Man's Club, William H. Jutras Post No. 43, American Legion, do hereby unanimously resolve to pause for 1 minute in the midst of our daily task, at 12 o'clock noon each day, and, raising our heart and mind toward God, ask Him to help us adjust our international differences to enable the nations of the world to secure an equitable and abiding peace; further,

We urge that this movement be endorsed by all the spiritual, civic, and business leaders in the United States, and that a similar resolution be adopted and implemented by every organization in our country to the end that this custom may become universal in effect.

Committee for Kentucky To Draw a Blueprint for a Better State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Paul Hughes which appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, February 6, 1949:

COMMITTEE FOR KENTUCKY TO DRAW A BLUEPRINT FOR A BETTER STATE

(By Paul Hughes)

The drafting of a long-range blueprint for a greater Kentucky has been launched by a group of 45 top-flight experts and leaders representing a broad cross-section of the State's activities, interests and institutions.

The general committee, made up of 13 groups, includes a tremendous wealth of experience, prestige, and versatility. Probably no such galaxy has ever before been drawn into a single effort of so great a magnitude and significance in Kentucky. It met in Louisville Friday night at the instance of the Committee for Kentucky to shape preliminary plans that will, it hopes, result in an epoch-making, eye-opening guidebook to steer the State into a high level of health, welfare, education, and prosperity.

President Harry W. Schacter, looking to the blueprint as the committee's final and crowning achievement, asked the subcommittees to spend the major part of this year in research and planning for the goal—the raising of Kentucky's social services to the national average. The response was heartening, in that every one of the committees agreed to the program.

LONG STUDY MADE

"Our achievements need be limited only by the scope of our imaginations," Schacter said, adding that "if we think in piddling terms we will get piddling results, but if our plans are bold and courageous, the results will be the tremendous success the people of Kentucky deserve."

The committees are agriculture, farm housing, education, health, welfare, urban housing, manufacturing, labor, natural resources, taxation, transportation, community life and government. They were chosen by committee directors after weeks of study of the available brains in the various fields, and as each chairman and the various members stated their views at the organization dinner it was made clear that, in their opinion, the people of Kentucky could raise their standards of living if they willed to do so. The new committees' jobs were to show how.

Al Whitehouse, Covington, member of the labor committee, summed up the problem and its solution this way: "We ourselves, sitting here tonight, are getting an education in democracy. If we can get this message to the people, I know they will accept this challenge. What it will cost, and nobody yet knows, will be a dividend-paying investment, because our plan will consider only the increased ability to pay and the resultant raising of the entire level of our State's economy—the people's economy."

PROJECT OUTLINED

The thinking behind the project stemmed from a determination to get at the very core of Kentucky's basic problems and was based, fundamentally, on these salient points:

1. Kentucky is not providing adequate social services for its people, a fact that has helped to make it a backward State.

2. It is important that the people know what it would take in capital expenditures and in annual budgets to provide such services on a par with the progressive States of the Union.

3. It is important that the people, once they know the total needs, be given a plan for raising the capital and developing the annual budget to meet the needs.

4. Since the inadequacy of the social services is for the greater part due to lack of sufficient tax money, it is important that the people know the various possibilities for increasing the revenues of the State.

Determination of what it would cost in capital improvements and anual budget outlays to provide social services to meet the national averages would probably be the responsibility of the experts who have developed the original reports on such services. These estimates, arrived at with the aid of research staffs, should give the people of Kentucky a reasonably accurate dollar-mark picture of the total needs.

Once that important and significant figure is arrived at, taxation and revenue experts could go to work on the task of finding out where the funds should come from. These may suggest and discuss various methods, a long-term bond issue, a tax revision procedure, a program of improved administrative efficiency as a means to economy, reassessment of property for an equitable distribution of the burden or (perhaps and/or) even as hot a potato as consolidation of counties.

But whatever the ultimate recommendation, the study would be expected to go a step further and develop a plan by which the legislature could, over a 10- or 15-year period, progressively build up the State's annual budget to care for increased social services in tune with a gradually increased ability to pay.

KENTUCKY RFC

What may emerge as the keystone of the entire plan, in the light of later planning, is the suggestion for a corporation tentatively referred to as the Kentucky Development Co. with paid-in capital of $10,000,000 subscribed by private individuals and business concerns and administered by a board comprising "the ablest businessmen in the State." It would, in effect, function as a Kentucky Reconstruction Finance Corp. and not unlike the Louisville Industrial Foundation.

There would be four divisions of effort—finance, research and engineering, industrial development, and sales promotion and distribution.

The first task of the company would be to determine the location of the most important of Kentucky's natural resources and what industries might best be established near these resources. For instance, in the Paducah region are found some of the best clay deposits in the country. At present, these clays are shipped to other States for processing. It could be that the proposed company's research might show that it would best serve Kentucky's interests to set up a pottery plant near the clay deposits. Also, there is a market in Kentucky for glass products to meet the needs of bottlers, dairies, and food packers, as well as the building industry. Yet there is no glass industry

in the State, although Kentucky has sands suitable for such a project.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

Once the research has been done, the division of industrial development would take over, calling, for example, a meeting of Paducah area citizens to suggest to them the establishment of a pottery and presenting them a carefully prepared plan for the building, equipment, personnel, and operation. Next step would be for the finance division to present its cost estimates and plans for raising the necessary capital. The sales and distribution people would, in turn, work out the sales potential of the products contemplated and, with all phases of the problem thus packaged, the company would invite the citizens to subscribe to the necessary capital stock. If the subscriptions fell short of requirements, the Kentucky Development Co. could step in and subscribe to the balance.

In explaining the proposal, Schacter stressed that activities would be carried forward in close cooperation with existing agencies, both public and private. Not only would the cooperation and facilities of the new Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, a nonofficial group, and of the State's own agricultural and industrial development board be solicited and utilized, but local chambers and civic organizations would be invited to assist.

Beginning tomorrow, each of the 13 committees will set to work preparing its portion of the comprehensive report.

By next July 1, each committee chairman is expected to submit to Schacter the draft of his report and Schacter then will begin to prepare a rough summation of all 13 reports. About October 1, Schacter plans to meet with each chairman to read to them his portion of the report and then hold a thorough critical discussion. Shortly thereafter, he plans a meeting of Committee for Kentucky directors and all the experts for a final reading and discussion of the entire findings, which will contain the 13 reports and the Schacter composite. Later a meeting of all members of all committees will be held for reading and a vote of approval.

The accepted final draft then will be printed as speedily as possible for presentation to the members of the 1950 legislature.

The fullest possible publicity will be given the blueprint, meanwhile, by local and district meetings attended not only by the public but by their own elected legislative representatives. And it will be distributed in pamphlet form to thousands of high-school and college students, to parent-teacher groups, to civic and luncheon clubs and to as many individuals as can be reached. Radio stations are expected to present dramatizations of the reports and newspapers will be offered serializations.

Schacter, anticipating that the Committee for Kentucky will wind up its work in 1950, said that it is fitting that the committee, the essence of whose spirit is cooperation, should have as its last report the result of the cooperative effort of some 45 persons, plus their staffs and associates.

Grouped around the Committee for Kentucky's conference table, with President Harry W. Schacter presiding (he's also a Louisville department-store president), are the other Kentuckians who accepted assignments to help draft a master plan for the State's future. Courier-Journal Artist George Joseph has provided places at the table for the chairman of the 13 subcommittees, and ranged about them the other experts in fields into which the explorations reach.

The drawing includes these, listed by committee assignments:

Agriculture: Dean Thomas P. Cooper, University of Kentucky College of Agriculture and Home Economics; J. E. Stanford, executive secretary, Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation; and J. W. Jones, North Middletown, president, Burley Tobacco Growers Cooperative Association.

Farm housing: J. Allan Smith, publications editor, College of Agriculture; J. B. Kelley, agricultural engineering section, College of Agriculture; and Miss Myrtle Weldon, State leader of home demonstration agents, College of Agriculture.

Education: John W. Brooker, executive secretary, Kentucky Education Association; President Rufus B. Atwood, Kentucky State College, Frankfort; and Dean Maurice F. Seay, University of Kentucky.

Health: Dr. Bruce Underwood, State health commissioner; Dr. Emmet F. Horine, Louisville heart specialist and author; and Dr. Charles A. Vance, Lexington, president, Kentucky Medical Association.

Taxation: Wilson W. Wyatt, former Louisville mayor; Clyde Reeves, State commissioner of revenue; Paul G. Blazer, board chairman, Ashland Oil & Refining Co.; and James W. Martin, director, bureau of business research, University of Kentucky.

Housing: Nicholas H. Dosker, administrator, Louisville Municipal Housing Commission; Robert I. Kutak, head of University of Louisville department of sociology; and Clarence C. Hieatt, Louisville, former president, National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Manufacturing: H. Fred Willkie, executive vice president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Louisville; and W. Scott Hall, department of economics, Transylvania University, Lexington.

Labor: Ernest Greene Trimble, University of Kentucky professor of political science; Edward H. Weyler, Louisville, secretary-treasurer, Kentucky Federation of Labor (A. F. of L.); and Al Whitehouse, Covington, president Kentucky State CIO Council.

Natural resources: Tom Wallace, editor emeritus, Louisville Times; Arthur C. McFarlan, head, University of Kentucky department of geology; and Henry Ward, State conservation commissioner.

Welfare: Howard W. Beers, head, department of rural socialogy, University of Kentucky; Miss Oscie Sanders, president, Sue Bennett Junior College, London; and Miss Louise Diecks, Louisville welfare director.

Transportation: Guy A. Huguelet, Lexington, president of Southeastern Greyhound Lines; Rodman Sullivan, University of Kentucky College of Commerce; P. G. Vondersmith, Covington, president, Cincinnati, Newport & Covington Street Railway Co.; E. J. Buhner, Louisville, Silver Fleet Truck Lines; Al Near, director, Louisville & Jefferson County Airports; John E. Tilford, executive vice president, Louisville & Nashville Railroad; Patrick J. Calhoun, Jr., Louisville, president, American Barge Lines; and J. Lyter Donaldson, Corrollton, former State highway commissioner.

Community life: Irwin T. Sanders, head, University of Kentucky sociology department; Ralph H. Woods, president, Murray State College; and Merton D. Oyler, Berea Collece sociology department.

Government: Philip Ardery, Frankfort, attorney; J. E. Reeves, University of Kentucky political science department; and Eli H. Brown III, Louisville, former United States district attorney.

Address by Hervé J. L'Heureux, Chief, Visa Division, Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I herewith submit for insertion in the RECORD a speech made by the Honorable Hervé J. L'Heureux, Chief of the Visa Division of the Department of State, before the Jewish Labor Committee, Atlantic City, N. J., on Saturday, February 26, 1949.

I have always been impressed by the fine work done by Mr. L'Heureux, and anything that he has to say is of interest to me. However, in this particular instance, my offering his speech does not imply that I approve or subscribe to all that is contained in his remarks. Nonetheless, I commend those remarks to all who are interested in the program of the displaced persons now in camps in Europe and elsewhere:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to appear before a group of people associated for the accomplishment of such lofty purposes as those for which the Jewish Labor Committee is organized. Your committee has consistently been favorably regarded by us in the Visa Division of the Department of State who appreciate your continual assistance, your patient understanding of our problems and those of our consuls abroad, your excellent cooperation at all times, and the noble efforts you have made to alleviate the suffering and to better the living conditions of the thousands of displaced persons abroad. To my knowledge your organization has never made an unreasonable request of us nor been motivated by any selfish purpose. Your patriotism and Americanism is unchallenged.

Although the Displaced Persons Commission is primarily responsible for processing cases of displaced persons under the act of 1948, other agencies of the Government are required to exercise independent judgment and responsibilities under the law. It is the consul's responsibility, for instance, to issue or to refuse a visa, depending upon the displaced person's ability, after he has been selected, screened, and classified by the Displaced Persons Commission, to establish that he is not admissible under any excluding provision of the immigration laws. This requirement is specifically provided in section 5 of the act of 1948 which reads: "No eligible displaced person shall be issued an immigration visa if he is known or believed by the consular officer to be subject to exclusion from the United States under any provision of the immigration laws" with two exceptions—the contract-labor clause and that relating to persons whose passage is paid by means other than the visa applicant's, which are contained in section 3, act of February 5, 1917.

The Department of State has taken appropriate steps to work in close collaboration with the Displaced Persons Commission, to eliminate, so far as possible, consistent with the law, any procedure or documentary requirement which would not be conducive to expediting the issuance of visas, without jeopardizing our security or our national interest, and to staff our consular offices with the maximum available personnel so as to reduce to a minimum the time required to issue or refuse a visa after the Commission has completed the processing of a case.

Last fall the Department detailed to the Visa Division a foreign-service officer as program coordinator to keep in close and constant liaison with the Displaced Persons Commission, and to coordinate to the fullest extent possible policy and procedure between the Division and the Commission with respect to the issuance of displaced-persons visas abroad. This officer had been stationed at one of our larger consular posts in Germany for over 2 years and has had first-hand experience during that entire period with regard to the issuance of visas to displaced persons under the President's directive of December 22, 1945.

The Department has thus far assigned 42 consular officers and 53 American clerical employees to the current displaced-persons program in Austria and Germany, including

foreign-service personnel who were transferred from other posts and new personnel specially hired for the purpose. Additional personnel are being either transferred or hired for the program as the situation requires. Furthermore, a large number of alien clerks are employed to assist the American personnel abroad.

In order to prevent undue delay in the processing and issuance of visas to displaced persons, the Department has waived the foreign passport requirement for such visa applicants who do not have and are unable, without too much difficulty, to obtain such a passport. Furthermore, the Department has instructed its consuls that certificates of identity or personal affidavits in lieu of passports are not to be required of qualified applicants. The Department has also instructed its consuls not to insist upon displaced-persons visa applicants submitting formal birth certificates or police certificates or military records if, as is so often the case in Europe today where so many records have been lost or destroyed, they are shown not to be reasonably procurable and where undue hardship would ensue were applicants required to spend considerable time in a fruitless search for unavailable documents. Even if such documents could be obtained, they would be of doubtful value in many instances.

So far as the presentation of evidence to satisfy the public-charge requirements in section 3, act of February 5, 1917, is concerned, a very effective short cut was achieved by the issuance of an instruction to consuls advising them that they may properly accept the assurances of specific employment and safe and sanitary housing, submitted to and approved by the Commission, as sufficient evidence of that nature, unless the applicant is found upon medical examination to have a physical defect which may affect his ability to earn a living.

The Department has, at all times, taken steps to insure that a steady flow of quota numbers to its Immigration Coordinating Office at Frankfort is maintained for issuance to eligible displaced persons.

The delay in commencing the actual issuance of immigration visas and the apparently limited number thus far issued—approximately 11,000—was caused by legally required technicalities and a chain of circumstances beyond the control of any one agency of the Government concerned with the program. You may be assured that there have been wholehearted cooperation and a great deal of efficiency shown by all the agencies concerned. With the early obstacles resolved and the means for carrying out the program well established, it is expected that immigration visas will shortly be issued to displaced persons at the rate of 12,000 per month.

Under the German-ethnic-origin provision in the Displaced Persons Act the Congress has set aside one-half of the German and Austrian quotas for this year and the next for the exclusive use of persons in that category who were born in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, or Yugoslavia. This provision of the act was introduced in the closing days of a session of Congress, and there was no hearing, debate, or other recorded legislative history of it to show clearly what the Congress intended. After considerable research and consultations with the Members and committees in Congress I believe a solution of this problem should be reached shortly which may enable us to proceed with this program in the near future.

Section 13 in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 has been interpreted as applying only to persons who derive some benefit under the act, such as eligible displaced persons and persons of German ethnic origin referred to in section 12. It is considered that section 13 has no relation to aliens applying for visas, in the normal way, without any relationship to the Displaced Persons Act, but under the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and the general immigration laws.

With the resumption of general visa services in Germany and Austria July 1, 1948, and the beginning of the actual processing of nonpriority, nonpreference quota cases by our consular officers in those countries on January 26, 1949, some interest has been aroused by persons in this country regarding the admissibility into the United States of former members of the German Army and of the Nazi and Fascist Parties.

It must first be understood that such persons, as such, are not barred from admission into the United States under any of the excluding provisions of our immigration laws. Under the wartime visa regulations, which are still in effect, and the Public Safety Act of June 20, 1941, which is a permanent peacetime law, former members of the German Army or of the Nazi or Fascist Parties may be denied visas only if their admission into this country would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or endanger the public safety. During the period of hostilities, mere membership was considered sufficient to bar such an alien from admission into the United States.

Shortly after the cessation of hostilities the following criteria were applied in dealing with such cases:

"Membership in the Nazi or Fascist Party, or service in the German or Italian Army, was considered prima facie evidence that the alien's entry would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States in accordance with the wartime visa regulations. If, however, the visa applicant could establish by positive evidence from reliable sources that he did not voluntarily join the Nazi Party or that he did not voluntarily serve in the Wehrmacht against the Allies, that he had consistently been and continued to be anti-Nazi, and that he believed in democracy in the American sense, it could be determined that the alien was eligible, if otherwise qualified, to receive a visa."

Early in 1948, the criteria were modified to meet changing conditions and to deal more realistically with cases of former nominal members who were the aged parents, or the spouse or the fiancée of an American citizen, particularly if the citizen were a serviceman or veteran of World War II. After having examined many of these cases, and in order that appropriate consideration might be accorded on a uniform basis, under the wartime visa regulations, to all visa applicants who served in the wehrmacht, or who were members of the Nazi or Fascist Parties, or of other similar proscribed organizations, consular and diplomatic officers were informed April 23, 1948, that the Department considers that mere voluntary enlistment in the German Army, or joining the Nazi Party, should no longer be regarded as sufficient in itself to conclude that an alien's entry would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States. People in all countries join all kinds of organizations, often without fully realizing what they are joining. The consuls were then advised that—

"The true criteria in cases of the kind under consideration should be that, in the absence of evidence that an alien has engaged in more than nominal activity against the United States, which presumably was the minimum expected of all Germans while their country was at war with the United States, the alien should not be regarded as inadmissible under the regulations because of his wartime activities. On the other hand, an alien who is, or was, an ardent Nazi at heart, or one in whose case there is evidence of having actively adhered to the Nazi Party and its ideology beyond mere nominal requirements, should be refused a visa under the wartime visa regulations. In a borderline case consideration should be given to the factor of the alien's prospective environment in the United States. An alien who has had only slight leanings toward the Nazis in Germany would not be likely to develop further Nazi ideology, for example, as the wife or parent of an American citizen in a home where the Nazi ideology is not favored, and in such a case the conclusion might reasonably be drawn that the alien's entry would not be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

"Similar consideration should be accorded the cases of aliens who served in the Italian Army or joined the Fascist Party.

"The above standards are not, of course, to be considered as determinative of the action to be taken on the visa applications of aliens who are mandatorily excludable from the United States under the general immigration laws, particularly the act of October 16, 1918, as amended, or the act of June 20, 1941, prohibiting the issuance of visas to aliens coming to the United States for the purpose of engaging in activities which would endanger the public safety."

The subject of immigration, as we all know, is one that is highly controversial. Few people take an entirely objective view of this subject. They either want more restriction or less restriction; they want the consul to be lenient in those cases in which they have an interest, and strict in other cases. In short, many American citizens are against immigration in the abstract, but are for it when we get down to individual cases.

This reminds me of a remark made some time ago by a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee. He was talking about whisky, another controversial subject. "Whisky" he said, "has more public enemies and private friends than anything I know of." Isn't it almost equally true of immigration?

From my 20 years of visa experience in the Foreign Service, and the 18 months I have spent as Chief of the Visa Division, I feel that our consular officers and the personnel in the Visa Division are discharging their responsibilities earnestly, efficiently, and to the best of their ability under most trying circumstances. It is our consistent objective to seek all possible information regarding the circumstances of each case, to examine and evaluate carefully all the evidence and information available, and then to apply the factual conclusions to the law objectively, without bias, without prejudice. We are not infallible; we may err in judgment; we do not expect to please all the people all of the time. All I can say is that we do the best we can. We welcome suggestions; we welcome objective criticism. These help us evaluate public opinion and enable us to do a better job.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, shortly after being appointed to the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, I began to inquire into the various problems which were confronting our subcommittee and concerning which I needed to supply myself with information.

It was immediately apparent that far-reaching plans are on foot to alter the present Canal and to improve it to care for the continually increasing tonnage which makes use of the facility. There are two diametrically opposed points of view; one of which is committed to a sea-level canal. The other would improve the present Canal by making some

changes in the system of locks and by the addition of a terminal lake and various other comparatively simple improvements.

In the course of my investigations, I attended a meeting on the evening of February 24, 1949, held under the auspices of the Engineers Club of Washington, D. C. There, I heard an unusually able address by Capt. Willis W. Bradley, a retired naval officer of distinction and a former Member of the House of Representatives. He is presently assistant to the president of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. with offices in Washington. His speech was objective and authoritative. His approach was from the point of view of an experienced seaman and not especially as a naval officer.

Captain Bradley's statements shed unbiased and important light on one of the most urgent problems confronting those who are charged with the responsibility of the present problems and future destiny of the Panama Canal.

The entire proceedings, including the opening remarks by Mr. Frank J. Hanrahan, president of the Engineers Club, together with those of a former Member of Congress and a former member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, in introducing Captain Bradley, and those of the captain himself follow:

OPENING REMARKS BY FRANK J. HANRAHAN, PRESIDENT OF THE ENGINEERS CLUB OF WASHINGTON, AT THE CLUB MEETING ON THE PANAMA CANAL, MAIN AUDITORIUM, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BUILDING, FEBRUARY 24, 1949

Members of the Engineers Club and guests, for the information of our guests, the Engineers Club of Washington is composed of engineers, architects and those in allied professions, most of whom are located in metropolitan Washington. Our clubrooms occupy the second floor of the National Theatre Building. One of the major activities of the Engineers Club is educational in scope. Although the Engineers Club of Washington will not take either a pro or con stand on any recommendations which may develop this evening, the club is pleased to provide the facilities for an open discussion of this important subject.

For many months we have been hearing of the Panama Canal. As both engineers and citizens, we are very much interested in obtaining the best solution.

Those of you who have been following the activities of Congress with respect to the Canal know that, during the present session, two resolutions which call for a study of the Panama Canal have been introduced—H. R. 44 by Chairman BLAND of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, dated January 10, 1949, and Senate Resolution 65 by Chairman E. C. JOHNSON of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dated February 7, 1949. These resolutions indicate a desire on the part of Members of Congress to get the facts. Our discussion tonight will supply at least some of them.

We are honored tonight, not only by the many guests from various parts of the Nation, but also by having in our midst a man who, for several years during the building of the Panama Canal, was a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone. He also was Congressman from the Louisville district of Kentucky for five terms. I now have the privilege of introducing Gov. Maurice H. Thatcher, who in turn will introduce the speaker of the evening.

REMARKS OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN MAURICE H. THATCHER INTRODUCING CAPT. WILLIS W. BRADLEY

This evening I am honored by the request to introduce the speaker for this occasion. It is not possible to tell all of the fine things he has done during his active career, but a few of his outstanding experiences and achievements may be indicated. Graduating in 1906 from the United States Naval Academy in the first section of the class of 1907, he specialized in naval gunnery, and, at the Naval Post-Graduate School and George Washington University, he took post-graduate instruction in advance engineering, and was awarded by the latter institution the degree of master of science.

Afloat, he has served with distinction in subordinate and command capacities of both ships and units of ships which navigated the waters of the scattered seas. These assignments gave him unusual opportunity to observe the problems of navigation in restricted waters and under severe weather conditions.

During World War I, he served as gunnery officer of the U. S. S. *Pittsburgh*, and was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism upon the occasion of a magazine explosion on that vessel when he saved the lives of a number of men. During the latter part of that conflict, he was Chief of Ammunition and Explosives in the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy Department. Also, it may be stated, he was especially selected for duty as Governor of Guam; this during a critical time, 1929–31. In that lone outpost of the far Pacific, he saw what the local needs required and he proposed basic reforms which were adopted by the United States Government. He is responsible for the form of the first representative civil government of Guam, and he is the author of its bill of rights. Parenthetically, I may say that years ago when I was a member of Congress, I visited Guam and one of the most interesting experiences which came to me on that island was to meet—together with some congressional associates—the Chomorro Congress, made up of about 40 native men who then served in an advisory capacity to the Governor.

In World War II, our speaker commanded a squadron of destroyers operating in the Atlantic on neutrality patrol; after which he served on the Board of Inspection and Survey on the Pacific coast until he retired from active duty in 1946. This latter assignment brought him into intimate contact with the United States merchant marine and its problems.

In 1946, he was elected to the Eightieth Congress from the Eighteenth California District, which includes the city of Long Beach.

In Congress his career was unique. He was assigned to the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and made chairman of the subcommittee dealing with ship construction and operation, and maritime labor. He quickly became a leading spokesman on the subject of the merchant marine in Congress; and perhaps its greatest authority on the operational problems of the Panama Canal. Many Members of long congressional service have stated he has one of the most outstanding records of achievement of any single-term Member who has ever served in the House.

Today, he is assistant to the president of the Pacific Coast Steamship Co. which is developing the new method of freight transportation by conveying loaded trucks and trailers on high-speed ships. In this capacity, he is continuing his fight for the best interests of the American merchant marine, the restoration of coastwise shipping, and the practical modernization of the great Isthmian waterway. Thus, in this well-known American, there have been combined in one person, not only the distinguished naval officer and scholar, but also the navigator and ship operator, the engineer, the colonial administrator, and the statesman.

As one who served as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission during construction days of the Panama Canal and especially charged with the administration of civil affairs of the Canal Zone during that tenure, I am, naturally, very much interested in any discussion which relates to the Canal; and in the presentation of the various plans for increased capacities and protection of this great ocean link, I am glad to hear all the arguments which may be offered touching any plan or suggestion which may be offered; and, I am sure, that this is true of the American public. Because of the questions at issue—and there is a strong variance of opinion concerning them—the fullest up-to-date investigation, discussion, and consideration should be had before final decisions are made. In the Eightieth Congress, our Speaker was the author of a measure providing for the creation of an Interoceanic Canals Commission, charged with the duty of making an exhaustive study and report as regards increased facilities of the Panama Canal, and alternate plans and canal routes. No action was taken on the proposal; but, because of the vast importance of the problems involved, many who are conversant therewith, believe that such legislation should be enacted. On the other hand, there are distinguished students of the subject who favor the construction and operation, at Panama, of what is known as a sea-level type canal in place of the present lake-lock plan; and to this effect an exhaustive official study and report has been made in pursuance of congressional authorization.

The consideration of the issues should certainly be free from passion and prejudice, above any personal considerations, and motivated alone by the highest degree of patriotism and a most earnest desire to have done what seems to be best. In the address which is to follow we shall hear—I am sure—a very able and informative statement of views touching these matters. The speaker has indicated that, after he has finished, he will be glad to answer, or attempt to answer, any questions which may be asked.

I am very happy, indeed, to present a gentleman who is known and admired by many of you, and who, in reputation, is known to all of you, Capt. Willis W. Bradley, of California.

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIS W. BRADLEY, OF LONG BEACH, CALIF., BEFORE THE ENGINEERS CLUB OF WASHINGTON

THE "WHYS" OF THE PANAMA CANAL

I. Introduction

Members of the Engineers Club, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate this opportunity to talk to you about the "Whys" of the Canal at Panama, a subject which should be of great interest to every American at the present time, as the future of the Panama Canal affects not only the security of his country but also the contents of his pocketbook.

Ages ago—I can't say how many because I am not a geologist—when the earth was cooling and getting set to be fit habitation for 100-foot lizards and birds without feathers—a big wrinkle on its surface developed into an irregular ridge extending almost the entire distance between what we now call the North and South Poles. The basic material of this ridge was hard, and as erosion of the passing centuries has worn it down we have had revealed that great mountain chain which, except in polar seas, divides the Atlantic Ocean from the Pacific Ocean, and which we call by such names as the Rocky Mountains, the Andes, or the Cordilleras. In the vast length of these mountains, approximately 10,000 miles from the Bering Sea shores of Alaska to the tip

of Cape Horn in far southern Tierra del Fuego, we find mighty mountains, great plateaus at lofty elevations, and also that stretch between North and South America where in certain places the height of land between the ocean is a mere thousand or less feet above sea level.

Prior to construction of an isthmian canal, there were just three basic routes by which a vessel could pass from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or vice versa. One was to go via the waters surrounding the Eurasian continent, traveling perhaps nine-tenths of the circumference of the globe to arrive at a destination only a few thousand, or even a few hundred, miles from the starting point. Another, was to go around the South American continent, passing either through the Strait of Magellan or around Cape Horn, a voyage for many thousands of miles extending into cold waters on the border of the Antarctic Sea. The third, not used because impossible except under very special circumstances, by traversing the Arctic Ocean along the north coasts of Canada and Alaska. It took many decades to prove that this Arctic voyage could be made, but in the end the little ship *Fram* got through by drifting with the ice for several months, and I should not even list this route except in a desire to be accurate and because I cannot foresee the future so clearly as to say that it will not be used some day for certain waterborne traffic.

II. Historical interoceanic trade routes

Let us step back into the past, and then follow down through the centuries, to see how traffic between the two oceans moved before the opening of the Panama Canal.

The first interoceanic trade of any importance in this Western Hemisphere was that of the empire of the Incas, situated in what is known now as Peru, with Spain, the home of Pizarro and his conquistadores. This traffic was solely for the enrichment of Spain and consisted almost entirely of precious metals and other materials of small bulk but great value being sent from the vice royalty of Peru to the Spanish Crown. The cargoes were sent up the west coast of South America to Panama, there loaded on the backs of Indians or burros and carried through jungle trails across the mountains to Porto Bello on the Atlantic side, where they were once more put in ships to continue the journey to Spain.

Somewhat later the wealth of the Philippine Islands and the Far East began to cross the Pacific bound for the coffers of Spain. One found included in these shipments many articles from the Kingdom of Cathay (now China) and the Spice Islands (now known generally as the Netherlands Indies). Cargoes were boiled down to get maximum value into minimum space as only one galleon with its cargo of tribute was permitted to cross the Pacific each year. The eastbound galleon made its landfall on the coast of California and then skirted the land to the south, finally arriving at the port of Acapulco in Mexico. Here the galleon was discharged and the cargo sent overland by man and beast to Mexico City, and thence to Veracruz, where it was reloaded into ships to continue its eastward travel.

As time went on, citizens of the United States became awakened to the great possibilities in commerce with China, and ships under the American flag began to make the long voyage from our east-coast ports, around the Horn and across the Pacific to the Asiatic mainland. There they loaded tea, sandalwood, spices, and other oriental products before making the passage home. This trade, a two-way commerce, but chiefly from west to east, made the fortunes of many a family of early American shipmasters or traders. This was the real heyday of the American clipper ship, a type which became famous throughout the world for speed and reliability, but which was doomed to virtual extinction by the coming of the steamship.

The fourth distinctive happening in this ocean-to-ocean commerce came with the discovery of gold in California—an event which had a tremendous effect not only in the area in which it occurred, but literally on all the civilized world. Here for the first time we have the major traffic moving from east to west as the migration of men and materials moved from our eastern seaboard to Mexican and Panamanian ports, thence across the Isthmus of Panama or of Tehuantepec, and then up the Pacific to San Francisco. Though this was a comparatively short-lived episode in transportation, it brought home to the United States the pressing need of an interoceanic canal somewhere between the two American continents.

The next striking event in the long history preceding actual construction of the Panama Canal was the picturesque voyage of the battleship *Oregon* from the Pacific to the Atlantic during the Spanish-American War. The American people were at fever heat with war excitement and war fears. The Spanish Fleet was coming across the Atlantic, and, if current reports were to be taken at face value, it was probable that it would destroy New York, bombard Washington, devastate the cotton crops of the Carolinas, and lay waste the orange groves of Florida. The battleship *Oregon* was in the Pacific and was needed most urgently in the Atlantic. She made the run around South America at her best speed and arrived in the Caribbean in time to participate in the complete destruction of the Spanish Fleet off Santiago de Cuba. Now, with our modern propulsive machinery and oil fuel, we should hardly consider this feat worth headlines in a country newspaper, but in 1898, in the strained and excited condition of the American public and with the machinery then existing, it bordered on the heroic and was a tremendous influence in the drive toward the immediate construction of an interoceanic canal.

So, considering the happenings of the past, the then normal commerce between our East- and Western States, and the certain great future ahead of this Nation, the American people determined to have a canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific post haste. But just where was it to be?

III. The Isthmus of Panama was chosen

Three routes were given deep consideration—across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in Mexico; across Nicaragua, utilizing Lake Nicaragua as a part of the route; and across the Isthmus of Panama, then a part of the Republic of Colombia.

The French had commenced the construction of a canal across Panama, but had been compelled to abandon it due to financial and other difficulties. This route was most attractive to the United States, but we could not reach any kind of a satisfactory agreement with Colombia, even though we did arrange to buy out the French canal company.

Quite naturally, the people of the Province of Panama wanted desperately to have the canal cross their territory as they knew full well that such a canal in their midst would advance their land in almost every way. Yet their overlord—Colombia—dickered with the United States and refused to meet any terms acceptable to us. The inhabitants of the Province of Panama then rebelled against Colombia and declared their province to be an independent and sovereign state. Under normal circumstances it is probable that Colombia would have subdued this rebellion without difficulty, but our urgent need of a canal across Panama had made conditions abnormal to such a degree that, almost without delay, the United States recognized the Republic of Panama as a sovereign state and entered into a treaty guaranteeing her independence. That made intervention by Colombia out of the question, and it also laid the foundation for damage claims against the United States, caused bad blood for many years, and finally cost the United States a neat sum as an indemnity.

Shortly thereafter the United States commenced the construction of the Panama Canal, midway in a zone of land 10 miles wide granted to us for canal purposes but not ceded to the United States; in other words, while the United States obtained the use of the zone in perpetuity, in return for a very definite yearly consideration, and while it exercises the prerogatives of government in the zone, yet it is not sovereign insofar as title is concerned.

One might go into an interesting technical discussion of the reasons for building the present lock type of canal instead of some other type, such, for example, as sea level, but I am trying to keep these remarks as far as possible from the technical aspect—I am trying to make them interesting to all of you, regardless of your degree of mechanical knowledge—so I shall merely say that the canal actually constructed is one of three levels, rising at the Atlantic end by three lifts, from sea level some 85 feet to the surface of Gatun Lake, and on the Pacific side from sea level two steps to the surface of Miraflores Lake, and then one step at Pedro Miguel to the level of Gatun Lake, there represented by the southern end of the channel through Gaillard Cut.

IV. The present Canal

For some years after the Canal was first opened there was a great deal of trouble due to slides in Gaillard Cut—the bottom of the channel rising in places until it was above water and the Canal was effectively closed to traffic. In the end, this trouble was overcome so the present Canal has given many years of reasonably satisfactory service. However, it has had its major difficulties. As we have gained experience through actual operation, we have learned that the arrangement of locks at the Pacific end is poor for operational purposes.

At the Atlantic end, where the three-step lockage is performed, there is a lake of considerable size formed at the high level by the waters held in check by Gatun locks and Gatun Dam. This lake, known as Gatun Lake, provides good anchorage for ships waiting for transit down and for Pacific-bound traffic held up by fog or other reasons. It also provides a large enough body of water immediately adjacent to the locks so that filling the upper lock chamber does not cause any noticeable disturbance of the water in the lake. But at the Pacific end conditions are quite different. There we have a small intermediate-level lake at Miraflores (55 feet elevation) just above the two-step lock structure, and then we have the one-step Pedro Miguel lock to raise the level to that in Gaillard Cut. Anchorage space above Pedro Miguel is nonexistent and, since there is no considerable body of water at this point, to take up the slack, one might say, a nasty surge is set up in Gaillard Cut when Pedro Miguel lock is filled. This surge has an amplitude of as much as 3 feet at times and, as it travels back and forth through the cut, it may reduce the maximum depth of water in the channel, during the dry season, to 40½ feet, thereby endangering a heavy-draft ship. Also the fact that there is no anchorage above Pedro Miguel makes it impossible to utilize the Pacific locks to their full capacity when there is fog in the cut and ships are not able to proceed after getting to the upper level.

These difficulties can be corrected by an arrangement now known as the Terminal lake plan. The essential features of this plan were originally conceived in 1879 by the eminent French engineer, Adolphe Godin de Lepinay. It was authoritatively developed in 1943 by Capt. Miles DuVal, United

States Navy, now Panama Canal liaison officer of the Navy Department, while he was serving as captain of the port at Balboa. This plan would remove the Pedro Miguel locks entirely, raise the level of Miraflores Lake to that of Gatun Lake, and place all the Pacific locks in three lifts at Miraflores. This modification would provide a lake at the upper level of sufficient size at the Pacific end of the Canal to eliminate many of the navigational difficulties now encountered.

When it became apparent that the size of the present locks (110 feet by 1,000 feet) was becoming too small for the largest naval vessels, the construction of a third set of locks (140 feet by 1,200 feet) was authorized and construction of them was begun under the title of the "Third Locks Project." However, shortly after World War II commenced all work on this project was abandoned due to need of labor and material elsewhere and also to the realization that locations of the third locks were not all that could be desired. After the war, due to many opinions that the Third Locks Project would not provide the answer to our problems in relation to a satisfactory interocean canal, the Governor of the Canal, under the supervision of the Secretary of War, was authorized by the Seventy-ninth Congress to investigate the means for increasing the capacity and the security of the Canal to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and national defense.

This investigation was held during the years immediately following and was conducted on an elaborate scale with the use of an ingenious model of the canal, by studies of current conditions at the Cape Cod Canal, by studies and experiments at the Navy's Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md., and by extensive research work elsewhere. The report of the Governor of the Canal was submitted to the Eightieth Congress. It recommended that the present Canal be converted to one of sea level at approximately the same location.

Now, many have asked, Why Panama? Why not some other trans-Isthmian route? So let's look them over in the light of today.

V. The alternative routes

During years of studies and investigations, three basic routes have been seriously considered—Panama, Nicaragua, and Tehuantepec—while a fourth, through Colombia, has been somewhat of an idea which has been in the background until recently.

The Nicaraguan route has long been a favorite of some promoters, and the United States now has a treaty with Nicaragua which would permit of the utilization of that route. The plan there is to follow the San Juan River from the Atlantic as far as Lake Nicaragua, cross the lake for some 70 miles, and then cut an artificial channel to the Pacific. As the surface of Lake Nicaragua is about 110 feet above sea level, this would not reduce the hazards of locks, for such a canal would require a minimum of three steps up and three down, each with a somewhat greater lift than those at Panama. The length of the proposed Nicaraguan Canal would be 172.8 miles as against 51.2 for the Panama route. Certainly, except for the possible additional safety of having two canals between the oceans, there would seem to be no reason to construct another lock canal there.

Some publications advocate a sea-level canal across Nicaragua, utilizing the same general route as mentioned above. I think this is out of the question, as it would involve either draining Lake Nicaragua—something that I cannot conceive of the Nicaraguans permitting—or digging a channel at terrific cost through mountainous territory just south of the lake.

When we consider the supposed additional safety of having two canals instead of one, we hear arguments on both sides of the problem. Many believe that far greater safety is attained by pooling all available defenses at one location rather than by dividing them. We all grant that if one could provide maximum defense at both sites there could be no question as to the desirability of having two canals, but every realist knows that even the United States cannot afford such a luxury. So it seems to me that the Nicaraguan route should be dropped from consideration under present circumstances.

Now one of the oldest proposed routes is across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in Mexico. This route has accommodated hundreds of thousands of tons of cargo via the Tehuantepec Railway, between the Pacific port of Salina Cruz and the Atlantic port of Puerto Mexico. It was a route heavily used just prior to the opening of the Panama Canal and the great terminal structures then utilized are now mostly idle and badly deteriorated.

Of late, there have been three proposals for a revival of commerce across Tehuantepec—a ship railway, a canal, and a railway-special terminal set-up designed to transport huge cargo containers which would be moved from ship to flatcars, or vice versa, in a matter of only a few minutes without manual stevedoring. This latter has been called a trailer body system as the containers might well take the form of truck trailer bodies so as to be adaptable to all three forms of transport—ship, railroad, or truck. It is not a fantastic scheme by any means—but rather it is entirely practicable if anyone is willing to put up the money for all the special equipment needed at ports of call, in rolling stock and in specially designed ships.

The idea of a ship-railway across the isthmus has some supporters. This group would provide multiple tracks to carry immense ship cradles across the land. The cradles would be run into the sea, something like a marine railway drydock, the ship would be placed therein, and then the whole would be hauled over the isthmus and run into the ocean on the other side, where the ship would be floated out to proceed on its way. The idea may seem utterly fantastic—but it is possible. However, the expense would be great and the safe handling of even medium-sized ships on the overland jaunt would present some mighty knotty problems for both engineer and operator.

The proposed sea-level canal across Tehuantepec has been developed as a combination of open ditches and tunnels. Where land elevations permit, an open ditch would be provided. Where surface elevations are too great, the promoters would dig a tunnel through the mountains so big that a heavy ship could steam right through. As I recall, the length of the tunnels would total about 60 miles and the proposed channel width in the tunnels would be 175 feet. On my part, I believe the difficulties of safe handling for ships of any size through tunnels such as these would make the proposed canal of little use for anything except small craft, even though other great problems concerning national sovereignty, stability of overhead rock or earth in the tunnels, and tremendous cost could be overcome. The fact is, that I do not consider the Tehuantepec Canal project feasible at this time.

Now let's go south of the present canal, into the territory of Colombia where we find the proposed Atrato-Truando route. This would utilize the Atrato and Truando River Valleys from the Atlantic, thence a cut through the Continental Divide to the Pacific, involving considerable excavation throughout almost its entire length. The maximum elevation of land to be cut on this route is some 932 feet so this would make the deepest canal cuts for sea-level channel about 1,000 feet from the summit to the bottom of cut. The estimated cost in 1947 was $4,834,000,000. Experience indicates that this figure would be exceeded greatly before the project could be completed. So it would seem that unless there is some reason other than the need of an efficient and safe canal, the Atrato-Truando route may well be disregarded.

I have given you only the very briefest picture of these alternative routes and I realize that you couldn't draw any just conclusions from the facts presented, but I have indicated that I feel the logical location—in fact, the only justifiable location—for an isthmian canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific is across the Isthmus of Panama on approximately the present site. This far, I agree with the Report of the Governor of the Canal.

VI. The sea-level proposal

The Governor's report estimated the cost of a sea-level canal at Panama at $2,483,000,000 and utilized possible danger from atomic bombs as justifying this huge outlay in the name of national defense. The proposed canal would intersect the present one at some five places and it would be, in fact, a new canal, not a modernization or a modification of that now existing. It would be provided with a mammoth tidal lock near the Pacific, together with a bypassing channel having a sliding gate which could be withdrawn so as to offer unobstructed passage through the canal when tidal conditions permit. During the greater part of each day, the difference in tidal levels between the Pacific and the Atlantic (about 12 feet maximum) would make use of the tidal lock advisable, although sea-level advocates maintain the maximum currents to be expected in an open waterway would not be such as to make a full-powered ship unmanageable, and that disaster to the tidal lock would not render the canal unusable.

Now here we come into the battle between the sea-level advocates and the terminal lake proponents. Strange to say, I seem to have gotten myself right in the midst of this turmoil for, as a Member of the Eightieth Congress and as a tax-paying citizen, I took it upon myself to try to determine in my own mind if this vast expenditure of the American taxpayers' money is really necessary. The official estimates are about $2,500,000,000. I have repeatedly stuck my neck out by saying that I believe the sea-level canal would cost five billions, and for this I have been roundly castigated by engineers who think I am talking out of turn. Yet I invite you to consider this matter of expense from the long-range viewpoint, and also to ask yourselves if it would not divert funds and resources from other programs and projects, within the continental United States, even more vital to the national defense than a new sea-level canal.

First, who ever heard of the Government completing a job of great magnitude within the first estimated cost. I suppose it has been done, but, having watched Government work for many years, I believe I am entirely safe in pushing up the estimates by at least 25 percent. Then we have the unexpected things that may happen, such as great slides or upheavals. I know the present engineers believe they have this problem licked but the older engineers—those who constructed the present canal—say flatly that it is not licked and that considerable trouble will be encountered if the bottom of Gaillard Cut is to be lowered 100 feet. I don't know which group is right, but it is safest to assume that trouble would be encountered from earth movements of considerable magnitude.

Then we must think of further inflation of the currency if we are to be realists. Proponents of the sea-level idea tell me that this is not fair, but I am trying to figure out what the canal would cost the taxpayers in hard cash, not what is fair to the estimators, and I think it only logical to believe that further inflation will occur due to prospective budgets—Federal, State, and local.

But the biggest item of additional expense is in interest on construction costs. Let us use some real common sense here. There is little reason to believe that a project such as this could be financed with current income, and even if it were the money so used could have been applied on the public debt and thereby reduced interest payable by the Government. No matter how you figure it, or how you camouflage it, the costs must be added to the public debt, and interest must be paid on them until the bonds are retired or otherwise disposed of. Suppose the sea-level canal could be constructed for $3 billions in cash, obtained at 2½ percent interest. That means an interest payment of $75,000,000 a year, or $750,000,000 in 10 years. And is there anyone living who has the least expectation that any payments on canal costs, piled on top of the present debt, could be commenced in even 50 years? If you can find any such person, he is rather naive to put it mildly. You may say that figuring such as this would stop all public works but that is incorrect. The fact is that public works cannot be justified in normal times unless they give an adequate return on the investment involved. This return may be in money, as in electric power projects; in greater agricultural production, as in reclamation; in lessening of human drudgery, as in rural electrification; in better health as in school lunch programs; or in safety from floods, as in flood control works. Here at Panama we have just two legitimate fields in which a return to justify the costs and interest are visible—the first, merchant marine; the second, national defense.

VII. Conclusions

The Panama Canal is a subject which grows on one. As a Member of Congress, I considered it from many angles. A full discussion of these many angles here is out of the question but I do want to summarize some of my conclusions.

First in importance is the effect of the atomic bomb. This has been persistently emphasized as the controlling factor by the advocates of the sea-level project on the ground of alleged greater security against destruction by atomic attack when compared to the high-level-lake type canal. As far as I have been able to ascertain, leading atomic warfare authorities hold that any type of canal would be seriously vulnerable to atomic attack beyond hope of early restoration for service. My convictions, first set forth in an address before the Cosmos Club of Washington, on April 19, 1948,[1] have been strengthened greatly by subsequent publication of additional authoritative information as to the destructiveness of the atomic bomb.[2] A careful reading of these papers has served definitely to confirm my earlier conclusion—that the devastation to be expected from an atomic attack would be catastrophic to any canal regardless of type.

And while on this subject of national defense, I want to point out that the Panama Canal is not the only defense project of the United States. It is merely one of a considerable number of industrial and defense projects some of which seem much more essential to our national security. Nor should we ever lose sight of the fact that the security of any type of canal depends more upon the military and industrial might of the United States than upon the characteristics of canal construction.

An additional important angle of the sea-level project is that it would necessitate the negotiation of a new canal treaty with the Republic of Panama, as some Panamanian territory, outside the present zone, would be affected by new developments. Our fairly recent difficulties in regard to defense bases outside the zone would lead one to believe that a new treaty, granting additional privileges to the United States, probably could not be negotiated without paying a large indemnity and incurring substantially increased annual payments to Panama—payments which must be added to the estimated cost of the sea-level project both during construction and in perpetuity.

Once the atomic-bomb phase and certain other relatively minor confusions of developed plans are removed, the true criterion becomes just as it was in 1905 when Gen. Henry L. Abbot, an advocate of the lake-lock canal, wrote, "The true criterion is ease and safety of transit, and that test leaves no doubt as to which type of canal should be preferred at Panama."[3]

The Terminal Lake plan would not require a new treaty with Panama and, therefore, would not involve an increase in annuities to that state. When freed from many seemingly unjustified defense items included in the estimates of the Governor of the Canal, and also of the excessively large locks suggested therein, I believe the plan could be accomplished for less than $750,000,000, in first costs—for what is probably 20 to 25 percent of the sea-level figure.

As a navigator and ship handler who has actually practiced these arts in many parts of the world over a considerable number of years, I have no hesitancy in stating my firm conviction of the navigational superiority of a canal consisting largely of fair-sized lakes rather than of long and restricted channels such as the sea-level plan would provide. What the maritime world needs is the best canal to get ships from one ocean to the other at a cost which ship operators can pay and stay in business. I believe the Terminal Lake plan provides that best canal.

Certainly this canal problem calls for a clear-cut decision in the near future—for a decision which will affect commerce and defense for many years to come. While the problem is distinctly our own, what we decide to do will be of intense interest to most of the civilized world. Therefore, to ascertain the facts concerning the needs of both commerce and the national defense, to protect the income and property of every American from needless taxation, to keep from fooling the people with the idea that we can construct an impregnable canal at Panama and can defend it successfully against atomic attack, I strongly urge the creation of a strictly American, civilian and military, Interoceanic Canals Commission to study the problems involved and to recommend the solution best suited to the interests of the people of these United States.

[1] Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A2449.

[2] Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. A169 and p. A755.

[3] Problems of the Panama Canal, by Henry L. Abbot, p. 224.

Counting of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on March 9, 1949, on Senate Joint Resolution 2, which proposes a constitutional amendment to change the method of counting the electoral votes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to do so I would like to make for the record a brief statement with regard to my present position on Senate Joint Resolution 2 which is before us as a proposed constitutional amendment to revise the electoral college.

Any proposal for a constitutional amendment carries with it grave implications. It is a revision of the basic law of the land. When it goes to the method by which the Chief Executive is to be chosen it becomes an even more vital concern to every citizen.

Any such matter as this is not a question of political partisanship, and it is not a matter of personalities. Preservation and protection of the political system under which we have flourished for more than 150 years is above such considerations.

I have great respect for the sponsors of this amendment and most sincerely I compliment them for their desire to perfect the machinery of representative government. But without prejudice whatsoever for the thinking of the measure's sponsors I believe the questions here involved are so fundamental they demand the utmost exploration to the satisfaction of every Member of Congress who will pass upon them.

It is in that spirit and I can assure you with no other predisposition on my part that I believe we should continue these hearings.

I recognize that the present electoral college is obsolete and inconvenient. It involves the risk of throwing a presidential election into the House. It contains glaring inequalities and it fails to reflect with absolute accuracy patterns of voting behavior. But it has served us well. And before we abandon it I believe that we should know exactly what any substitute would signify.

A principal argument advanced on behalf of this constitutional amendment is that it will strengthen the two-party system in the United States.

I think the two-party system is the great genius of the American political organism. By vertical alinement it isolates the lunatic fringes, as one keen observer has stated, and it permits the joining of more closely alined elements into an efficient working machine, although delicately balanced. I think we may reasonably require every assurance that such a mechanism will not be upset before we embark on any departures from the present scheme.

There are further questions on which I believe we should have some penetrating and original thinking, and I will list some of them. In the interest of fullest exploration I hope that we may have responses on them from the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2, and from our other witnesses.

QUESTIONS

1. If a constitutional amendment were adopted, guaranteeing electoral votes to every candidate according to popular votes, would candidates be likely to argue that States must put them on the ballot since presidential elections are now Federal and not State contests? In short, would Federal regulation of presidential elections be likely to follow, to protect the right of the candidate to his share of the popular vote? Why grant him an electoral share if States can keep him off the ballot?

2. Are presidential campaigns likely to be more costly under the proposed change? Or, would less money be spent in the big States and more in other areas, without increasing the total cost? Would we have different campaign techniques and what would their change mean to different areas and to individual voters?

3. By offering an incentive to see power grow in the electoral vote, would multiple

parties be encouraged? Formerly, splinter parties were stopped at the State and regional level; would they now retain their identity, resist being swallowed up in the major parties and bid for power on their own? Is the incentive of electoral vote too weak to encourage splinter parties or will it have a tendency to encourage them?

4. What has been the experience in other countries with regard to multiple parties?

5. We have had a number of minority Presidents. Will this tendency increase under the new proposal?

6. By translating popular votes into electoral votes under the unit rule, the tendency was to cancel out smaller candidates having less than a plurality and to give the winning candidate a national character by a larger electoral vote. Would the new proposal change this by accentuating the minority status of a winner?

7. Which is the greater threat to the American system: nuisance minorities under a two-party umbrella or multiple parties in their own?

8. If multiple parties could develop under the new system, could they bid for a share in national government power even though they do not succeed in electing a President? Today we have many bipartisan boards and commissions in the Federal Government; might the new proposal send this into the direction of multipartisan boards with block pressure for concessions? Would not multiple parties, even if they failed to elect their Presidential candidate, be expected to elect Members to Congress, and what would that effect have on congressional organization?

9. Would the new proposal push the representative system in the direction of national popularity contests and thus into "bread and circus" politics?

10. Would the new proposal lead to the setting up of puppet parties in States solid to one party or another for the purpose of drawing off electoral votes from the major parties? Minor parties do this now; would the tendency be encouraged?

11. There is general agreement that the new proposal would break up the South. Do reason and history support the view that the Republican Party, as the existing alternate party, would move in and get a strong share of southern votes to revivify the two-party system, or would the break-up lead to third parties in the South?

12. Would electoral votes under the new system be free of voting inequalities such as now prevail?

13. The amendment proposes to compute fractional electoral votes only to one one-thousandth unless a more detailed computation would change the result of the election. Is this intended solely to apply in case of a tie? Is it possible that a peculiar breakage of fractions might, by a further projection, change the results? If so can these breakages be anticipated, and how should projections be treated?

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that after today's session these hearings not be closed, but held open and an interim report issued, stating findings to date and posing some of the questions that have arisen.

I believe that such an interim report should be circulated widely, among men of public affairs, students of government in our universities, representatives of the political parties, and Members of Congress.

I believe reactions and penetrating thought on the interim report should be invited from all those people, so that at a future date we may have the benefit of their expressions in the form of a full, clear picture of the present proposal and its possible consequences.

The question before us is not one that goes just to the obsoleteness of the electoral college. On that there is general agreement. The question goes to what an alternative might bring, and on that question we need all possible light.

The Equal-Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the equal-rights amendment by Dr. Louise Pound, renowned author, and professor at Nebraska University.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I surely favor the equal-rights amendment. Times have changed since the individual States have passed their laws concerning the status of women. Relief in their unavailability in industry, because of their uncertain health and inadequate endurance, is not what it was. The inch-by-inch method of bringing legal revision needs to be speeded up.

I believe it was Helen Rogers Reid, of the New York Herald Tribune, who remarked on how beautifully women workers got on during the war period without the protection that is so emphasized. Limitation of their hours of work and prohibition of occasional overtime work and of night work are really handicaps. The protection that men workers have today would be adequate now for women also and would serve them better. Greater possibilities of self-support, mothers' pensions, institutions for children, and other helpful innovations make a difference, too. Some States still award a wife's earnings inside or outside the home solely to the husband, and possession of the children as well; but no doubt there are other States (Nebraska may be one, in a few instances) in which men might well treat themselves somewhat more leniently than they did when they framed their laws. For the benefit of both men and women, legal provisions should be examined and brought up to date. The best and quickest way to do this would be by passing the equal-rights amendment.

Some women, of course, confirmed in tradition, oppose the equal-rights amendment and they do so conscientiously; but they are women of the same type as those who a hundred years ago opposed the admission of women to higher education in colleges and earlier in this country opposed votes for women. Progress had to come without them.

Importation of Japanese Fabrics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the New York Times of March 9, 1949, dealing with Japanese importations into our country.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMBARGO IS SOUGHT ON JAPAN'S FABRICS—PATERSON GROUP OPENS DRIVE CHARGING DUMPING IS THREAT TO INDUSTRY HERE

PATERSON, N. J., March 8.—A national drive to have Congress place an embargo on Japanese woven silks, rayons, and labels was launched here today by a committee of local textile manufacturers in an effort to eliminate what they describe as the "ruinous competition forced upon American industry" by the military occupation government in Japan.

Speaking for the committee, David E. Hand, president of John Hand & Sons, one of this city's larger textile companies, said that 6 more months of the Japanese occupation government's practices in dumping millions of yards of woven Japanese textiles on the American market would bring about an almost complete collapse of the textile industry here.

He asserted that already the results of a governmental agency pitting "coolie labor against the high standards of American workmen" can be seen in this city, and that the matter will be taken up with Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson.

Mr. Hand said that following the war the military occupation authorities in Japan set a quota price on raw silk which was purchased by American manufacturers. When the American manufacturers were ready to release their woven products on the market, he said, occupation authorities dumped 8,000,000 yards of Japanese woven silk into this country, "driving the American manufacturer to the wall."

The committee, which has the backing of the Paterson Chamber of Commerce and the Paterson Industrial Commission, plans to contact United States Congressmen and Senators not only to urge them to institute an embargo on Japanese manufactured goods but also to compel Japanese manufacturers to place a "fabric woven in Japan" label upon every garment which is made from Japanese fabrics.

Mr. Hand said that it was a picture of the Government first setting the price of a material by maintaining price levels for the sale of raw materials and then underselling its own manufacturers by dumping finished material on the market.

"A comparison of silk piece goods prices," he said, "indicates that a difference of 20 cents to 30 cents per yard existed between American-made silk fabrics and the Japanese equivalents.

During the year 1948 the American silk weaving industry was going along on an even keel, it was said, until millions of yards of Japanese silk were thrown on the market and thereby created a panic situation in what would have otherwise been a stable market, due to the well-adjusted balance between supply and demand in a specialized field.

Charles H. Romere, a member of the Paterson Industrial Commission, asserted that the military occupation government in Japan is favoring an enemy country at the expense of an American industry. Pointing to the fact that American textile mills supplied the armed forces with millions of yards of parachute silk, Mr. Romere said that "the Department of Defense should know that this segment of the textile industry will be called upon to meet any national emergency if one should arise. We certainly can't permit Japan's occupation government to destroy the American silk industry and depend on Japan for cloth."

KNIT GLOVE PROTEST DUE—ASSOCIATION TO DEMAND MAC ARTHUR TAKE ACTION AT ONCE

The Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers will send a protest to General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo as the result of press reports that "cheap Japanese goods are going on world markets," it was announced yesterday by Joseph A.

Milstein, president, following a meeting in the Governor Clinton Hotel.

Domestic manufacturers of knitted gloves, Mr. Milstein said, are not opposed to trade between nations, nor are they opposed to imports from Japan or any other nation. "We definitely favor rehabilitating Japan's economy and putting the country back on its feet," he added, "and we welcome fair competition from any quarter. But the product of American labor can never begin to compete with a product made by Japanese labor receiving in a month what an American worker receives in 1 day.

"We ask the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) to give an American evaluation to wool gloves in Japan before flooding our home market with them. We would then be more than willing to compete on the basis of styling, value, and quality."

Proposed Establishment of War Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from Francis M. Sullivan, regarding the proposed establishment of a War Claims Commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1949.

Mr. ROBERT D. CASTNER,
Commander, Department of New Mexico, Disabled American Veterans,
Santa Fe, N. Mex.

DEAR COMMANDER: Our organization, and particularly the Department of New Mexico, is very much interested in the proposed establishment and administration of the War Claims Commission authorized under Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress. While the act of authorization is now on the statute books, no funds have been provided as yet for its establishment. President Truman requested such funds from the special session of the Eightieth Congress and again in his budget message requested the sum of $100,000 for establishment of the War Claims Commission.

A deficiency appropriation bill was reported to the House of Representatives and passed by that body, but it did not contain the necessary funds for the Commission. Therefore, upon the initiative of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee held a hearing this morning to consider the inclusion by the Senate Appropriations Committee of the necessary $100,000 to provide for the establishment of the Commission so that it may commence to function immediately. This $100,000 is for administrative costs for the balance of the current fiscal year to July 1, 1949.

Senator CHAVEZ, as you know, was one of the outstanding advocates of the bill which became Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, and he spearheaded the drive for the inclusion of the necessary funds for the establishment of the Commission. This morning he made a stirring appeal and upon conclusion of his presentation introduced the representatives of the American Legion, AMVETS, DAV, and VFW. While I was present at the meeting, Charles E. Foster, assistant national legislative director, made the presentation on behalf of the DAV. Comments made by members of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee leave Mr. Foster and me to believe that the Senate Appropriations Committee will vote to include the necessary funds. When the bill has been passed by the Senate it will be necessary that the measure go to conference. We are hopeful the House conferees will agree to retain this item in the pending appropriation bill.

Because of the DAV's interest and because of the large number of prisoners of war from New Mexico, we in this office thought you would be interested in having this information.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the people of the district which I am honored to represent are taking a great interest in soil conservation. The local soil-conservation districts throughout our section are doing great work in the field.

Today I received a report from T. S. McNeil, chairman of the Benton County soil-conservation district, showing what they have done in the past year. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert that report, as follows:

EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT OF BENTON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

(Board of supervisors: T. S. McNeil, chairman, Rogers, Ark.; Harry F. Stitt, secretary, Siloam Springs, Ark.; Mac Givens, Gentry, Ark.; E. S. Graham, Lowell, Ark.; Wayne Shields, Gentry, Ark.)

The supervisors of the district had a very outstanding year of attendance in quorums for performing work, there being only one meeting where there was not a quorum. There were two supervisors in this meeting. At all of the other 11 meetings a quorum was present to perform any and all business. There were 7 of the 12 meetings where all of the supervisors were present.

At the April meeting the supervisors took a very active part in placing out the materials for the Soil and Soul Sunday Conservation Day. Material was given out to the different ministers of practically all denominations in the district, and we believe that much good resulted from these sermons.

One member of the supervisors, namely, E. S. Graham, who is a member of the executive committee of the State association of supervisors, has attended three executive meetings during the year.

The annual meeting of supervisors of the State association at Little Rock on December 4 was attended by Mr. Graham and Mr. Stitt. This meeting was of much value and the talk by the president of the national association, Mr. Kent Leavitt, was the keynote of the meeting.

The annual Soil Conservation Day jointly held with the Washington County supervisors was not held this year on account of so little technical personnel. It may be resumed in 1949.

The outstanding meeting of the year was the annual soil conservation leaders training day held at the Royal Theater in Bentonville on February 17 when the supervisors had as their guests the conservation leaders of the district. A copy of the program is shown at the close of the report as exhibit A. We, the supervisors, think that the conservation leaders training day is an outstanding accomplishment.

The district and Soil Conservation Service technicians took part in the pasture development campaign sponsored by the chambers of commerce of the towns of the district, and it is hoped that this will be continued as we believe much good can be developed from these pasture contests.

We all realize the tremendous need of sufficient seed to secure added vegetative cover on our lands to minimize erosion hazards. A very comprehensive survey was made of seed harvested in 1948, and the following figures are very worth while and accurate. District cooperators harvested 711,744 pounds of small grain while noncooperators harvested 652,160 pounds. District cooperators harvested 243,925 pounds of legume seed, and noncooperators harvested 374,600 pounds. District cooperators harvested 51,920 pounds of grass seed, and noncooperators, 24,000 pounds. This is very clear evidence of the value of the seed work that has been done with cooperating farmers which we realize is necessary if we expect to have sufficient seed for our vegetative cover. Several thousand pounds more seed were produced that were lost by all individual farmers due to the unusually large amount of continuous rain during the normal dry, favorable harvesting season which we generally have. A large amount of shocked grain was never thrashed, because it sprouted in the shock. Older natives report they cannot remember a season like 1948 for harvesting of seed crops. We had more vegetative cover than possibly we have had for any period in the last 40 or 50 years. Previous grass seed harvests have run from three to six times the amount shown above for 1948. This is due to the unfavorable conditions. We do not expect to relinquish our efforts to continue encouraging our farmer cooperators to harvest seed in abundance to secure vegetative cover.

STORIES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT IN THE BENTON COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT DURING 1948

Farming, like other sciences, is improving as new discoveries are uncovered. The sad fact is that too many farmers do not use the present known principles of good farming.

Mr. and Mrs. Harvey Graham of the Accident community near Lowell, Ark., are using good farming practices on their farm.

"I had rather take a farm that is rundown, but not too badly washed, and build up the fertility than to clear timberland for cultivation," says Mr. Graham. He is proving this statement by building up a 117-acre farm that has not been cultivated for 20 years. The entire farm was covered with sage grass and brush.

The run-down farm was bought in the fall of 1947. Bad gullies were his first problems. With the assistance of Soil Conservation Service technicians a pond was located across one of the worst gullies. This pond not only prevents a further washing but also is used as an outlet for two terraces.

After the terraces and ponds were built, Mr. Graham plowed the field on the contour turning under all the sage grass and other vegetation.

"Organic matter is very important," says Mr. Graham. A fire burning over a part of the farm destroys much organic matter and plant food. Soil erodes much faster where it is bare because of fire.

Beans and tomatoes were planted on some 56 acres in the spring of 1948. The beans were not harvested even though he had applied 4-12-4 fertilizer at the rate of 200

pounds per acre. A poor crop of tomatoes was harvested where 600 pounds of 4–12–4 fertilizer per acre had been applied. Unfavorable weather was partly responsible for the poor yield.

A cover crop of small grain and vetch was seeded on 46 acres following the beans and tomatoes. Phosphate and lime as needed were applied. A good crop of grain and vetch was grown; however, only a few acres were harvested because of weather conditions. A good stand of grain and vetch came back by natural reseeding. Oats were planted on 10 acres following the beans and tomatoes, and 60 bushels per acre were harvested. Using the above rotation, Mr. Graham expects to bring the entire farm back into continuous profitable production. The more sloping area will be seeded or sodded to grass for pasture.

Mr. Graham expects to harvest small grain and vetch again in 1949 from the volunteer and seeded fields. These seeds will be used to seed the balance of the farm.

Many recommended soil- and moisture-conservation practices are being carried out on this farm. These are contour cultivation, cover crops (used for green manure or seed), mulch farming, terracing, fertilizing, fire prevention, and other good farming practices. Mr. Graham is cooperating with the Benton County Soil Conservation District where a farm plan was worked out with the assistance of a soil conservation service farm planner.

No farmer can make a success without the assistance of an understanding farm wife. Mrs. Graham is a leader in her community in home-demonstration work. When any undertaking is considered, the husband and wife talk things over before a final decision is made. Only a few minutes talking to Mrs. Graham is enough to convince anyone that she knows farming and is a good farm wife. She likes the farm as is shown by her statement, "I just like to get out and see things grow and to see the land improved."

The Graham family is now planning to use irrigation if water can be made available. Other farm families in this community are doing a good job farming. The Accident community is one of the outstanding farm neighborhoods in Benton County. More cover crops and other good farming practices are used in this community than in most other communities.

The successful growing of alfalfa depends on several factors: type of soil, organic matter, water-holding capacity, fertility, and the necessary minerals. If these factors are not met, alfalfa growing will be a failure with money for seed and labor lost.

Mr. Orville Graham, in the Accident community, 4½ miles southeast of Lowell, is growing alfalfa successfully by using good conservation practices. Mr. Graham has a 6½-acre field of alfalfa that produced 21 tons of alfalfa the first year.

This is how he prepared the soil and seeded the alfalfa. In the spring of 1946 he seeded oats (2½ bushels) with sweetclover (30 pounds). He applied 200 pounds of 4–12–4 fertilizer per acre to the oats and sweetclover. Lime had been applied sometime before; therefore, more lime was not needed.

The oats and sweetclover (clover was as high as the oats) were cut for hay. "Oats and sweetclover is the best kind of hay," says Mr. Graham. The sweetclover was pastured the following fall. The next summer (1947) near the middle of June, the sweetclover was turned under for green manure. The green manure added much nitrogen and organic matter to the soil. The field was fallow cultivated until fall when alfalfa was inoculated and seeded about October 10 at the rate of 25 pounds per acre. This should have been done about September 10. After a good stand of alfalfa was up, 800 pounds of 33 percent phosphate was added per acre. "I think 4–12–4 fertilizer would have paid if added with the phosphate," stated Mr. Graham.

As stated above, Mr. Graham cut 21 tons of good alfalfa from the 6½-acre field. This is not the first time Mr. Graham has used this rotation. He thinks this is one of the best methods to prepare for alfalfa.

Mr. Graham is one of the successful farmers in the Lowell community who is carrying out good conservation farming. He is cooperating with the Benton County Soil Conservation District and calls on the soil conservation service technicians when help is needed.

The feed cost of dairy cows is being kept down by Mr. J. S. Gilbert who lives 3½ miles southwest of Bentonville.

Mr. Gilbert buys very little sack feed. He has high protein feeds in the form of soybeans, sericea lespedeza, and head feed. These high protein feeds are ground together one-third soybeans, one-third sericea hay, and one-third head feed. Mr. Gilbert states, "The cows will run over you getting to their feed."

The reasons these feeds are so good is because they are cut at the right time. The sericea lespedeza is cut when about 10 inches high. The sericea will make a good palatable feed at this time. Sericea will grow on almost any land. It is a perennial and has been grown for 15 years on the same kind of land and with the same fertilization as the alfalfa.

The soybeans are cut before the beans have matured. This gives a higher protein content in the vines.

The head feed is cut stack and all when the seed is a heavy dough. You can see why the cows are so anxious to get to such feed.

Feed for the nine cows is grown on 25 acres—6 acres soybeans, 3 acres sericea lespedeza (10 tons harvested this year), and 16 acres head feed. This is less than 3 acres per cow.

Mr. Gilbert is establishing a complete soil and moisture conservation program on his farm with the cooperation of the Benton County Soil Conservation District. Strip cropping, contour cultivation, drainage ditches, and crop rotations are some of the practices used on this farm.

WORK RECORD

District: Benton County (AK–SCD–25). State: Arkansas. Headquarters: Bentonville, Ark. Period from January 1 to December 31, 1948.

Farm and ranch conservation plans and treatment

Conservation plans	Number		Acres	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
1. Applications received	147	1,404	14,719	137,976
2. Active applications	-------	486	-------	53,657
3. Plans prepared and signed	115	849	10,275	76,343
4. Plans canceled (−)	17	133	2,086	10,711
5. Amended plans, (+) or (−) acres	4	6	133	−173
6. Active conservation plans	-------	716	-------	65,459
7. Plans on maintenance	12	62	1,109	3,788
8. Plans being applied	194	614	-------	-------

Major soil and water conservation practices, farm and ranch plans

Practices	Planned		Established	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
Contour farming—acres	1,178	10,205	870	5,421
Cover cropping—do	3,549	16,085	2,143	11,390
Crop residue management—acres	2,632	9,571	1,260	4,517
Strip cropping—do	23	1,976	67	657
Pasture improvement—do	5,715	36,056	1,909	20,988
Seeding of pasture—do	5,533	34,835	3,127	17,989
Wildlife area improvement—acres	5	5	0	0

Major soil and water conservation practices, farm and ranch plans—Continued

Practices	Planned		Established	
	This period	To date	This period	To date
Woodland management—acres	663	2,796	114	745
Tree planting—do	0	25	0	10
Farm and ranch ponds—number	47	374	30	213
Terraces—miles	9	98	4	27
Field diversions—do	2	12	1	6
Farm drainage—acres	143	662	106	260
Open drains—miles	2	26	23	16
Water facilities—number	74	348	22	97
Collective terrace outlets—number	4	40	1	18
Terraces served by outlets—miles	33	87	3	12

Annual report of educational activities

Activity	This period		To date	
	Number	Attendance	Number	Attendance
Educational meetings	19	1,540	195	14,483
Tours	4	209	16	717
Demonstrations	0	0	18	592
Training-school meeting	4	308	24	926
Application and maintenance	19	1,059	119	5,031
Planning meetings	0	0	12	321
Exhibits	0	-------	0	-------
Radio talks	0	-------	0	-------
News articles	63	-------	63	-------

Annual report of receipts and expenditures

Receipts (by source): Balance brought forward	$3,340.11
Expenditures (classified):	
Envelopes and postage	10.00
Expenses of Conservation Leaders Trg. Day	4.00
Plates for Bermuda seeder	14.09
Expenses of supervisors election	22.15
Total	50.24
Balance carried forward	3,289.87

RESOLUTION

Motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed that the foregoing material as herewith submitted be adopted as the annual report for the Benton County soil-conservation district supervisors for the year 1948 and that copies of the report be distributed as indicated by Mr. D. D. Terry and to other individuals and agencies who are cooperating with the soil-conservation district and whom the supervisors shall name.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY F. STITT,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Approved:

T. S. MCNEIL,
Chairman.
E. S. GRAHAM.
MAC GIVENS.
WAYNE L. SHIELDS.

Counting of Electoral Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 9 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by Basil Brewer, publisher of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard Times, on Senate Joint Resolution 2, proposing to abolish the electoral college and to divide the electoral votes of each State in proportion to the popular votes in presidential elections.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I would like to say I am appearing before this committee from California, voluntarily and at my own expense, at the invitation of Senator FERGUSON, to oppose Senate Joint Resolution 2, the so-called Lodge-Gossett bill to amend the electoral system. I am appearing as a patriotic duty and in no sense as a partisan, nor am I concerned with personalities.

Lincoln said at Gettysburg the Civil War was testing whether this Nation, or any nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal, can long endure. This testing process of democracy will endure as long as democracy itself exists.

At no time in history has our democratic Government been more severely tested than it is today. This applies equally to every other democratic system in the world, wherever and to whatever extent it exists.

Beset with the great problems of restoring an economy from the greatest destruction in history, we face the equally great problem of trying to help onto their feet the other free peoples, including the victims of our own effectiveness in war.

Grappling sternly with these problems, we face our late ally, who, purloining the word "democracy" makes every effort to balk our attempts to assist recovery of friend and foe, as she puts shackles on and makes slaves of one-half the world.

Standing almost alone is America, strong, courageous, always willing to help, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle that all men are created equal, founded on a governmental formula conceded to be the soundest conceived by the mind of man and buttressed by 160 years of experience in living under and practicing successfully the policies of free government.

Not only is the great American experiment in self-government the most successful in the world's history, but it is safe to say it has brought more health, happiness, prosperity, and spiritual and social progress than ever came to one people in the world's history.

In such circumstances it would hardly seem to be necessary to state we should not only proceed slowly and carefully, but humbly, and even prayerfully, about making any change in the fundamental law, and, need I say it, particularly in making any change in the method of popular expression of the people's voice in choosing whom they wish to represent them in government.

Yet I am astonished to find the Congress in process of considering changing the election system of the country without thorough study of its implications.

This is the election machinery which on the whole has worked well for 150 years and has been the instrument of making American elections generally freer and more representative than those of any other nation, and under which, as I have said, we have enjoyed more freedom than any nation in history.

Is our governmental process becoming too complicated, is the demand on the time of our Senators and Representatives so great that they no longer can give due and necessary study to even important measures?

There is some ground for thinking so when we consider the history of Senate Joint Resolution 2, the Lodge-Gossett proposal to amend the election process for choosing the President and Vice President.

The Senate Judiciary Committee on May 3, 1948, made its report merely by lifting verbatim a report that had been made by the House Judiciary Committee on March 26 of that year. In its turn, the House Committee had drawn heavily on a report made in 1934, and that report was indebted for its basic material to a speech made by Representative Clarence F. Lea, Democrat of California, 21 years ago.

In all these instances the evidence presented was predominantly concerned with what were called defects of the existing electoral system. There was presented no original search into the implications of the proposed new system.

I am informed that to date the testimony before this committee has been confined to a presentation of the sponsors' side only, with the exception of comments made by Senators FERGUSON and LANGER and by Congressman PATMAN.

The country's founders did their work well. Being wise, they knew they were not infallible. They knew the Constitution must provide within itself the means for change necessary to meet new conditions and to reduce to a minimum temptation to violate its provisions.

But, in providing for change, the founders made amendment difficult. A majority vote with Presidential approval is provided for legislation, but a two-thirds vote was made necessary for changing the fundamental law. Twenty-one amendments have been passed in 150 years, 10 of which were the Bill of Rights. It has been necessary to repeal only one amendment, the prohibition amendment, passed under the misconceptions of war.

Implied, if not explicit, in the fundamental law is a warning not to tamper with the fundamental law unless it is necessary.

Equally implied is the warning to make no amendment unless the implications are well known; unless, as Senator RUSSELL said on March 2, 1949, quoting Herbert Spencer, noted philosopher and sociologist, "The change caused by his (the legislator's) measure will stop where he intends it to stop."

Or, putting it differently, there should be no room for speculation in amending the Constitution.

When in doubt, don't; that is the warning of the founders.

That is the meaning of the difficulties put in the way of amendment.

In these circumstances, should it not be the duty of Congress to make the most searching investigation into the future implications, as well as the immediate effects, of proposals as fundamental as this?

Senator LODGE's statements in behalf of his amendment are full of inferences and speculation, which will be dealt with later in this presentation.

Senator LODGE says that Senate Joint Resolution 2 will reduce or eliminate the possibility of a candidate getting an electoral vote majority despite receiving only a minority of the popular vote.

On the contrary, his amendment would make this possibility, which has occurred only three times in the Nation's history—in 1824, 1876, and 1888—a probability, if not a certainty.

It also will destroy the Republican Party, of which Senator LODGE is a member, and the two-party system, which is the foundation of the Government, replacing it by a multiparty system.

The Lodge amendment trades large blocks of electoral votes in States other than the solid South, commonly carried by Republicans, for almost negligible electoral votes gained in the Southern States.

Each electoral vote won in the South represents an average of 40,000 popular votes against an average of 110,000 votes per electoral vote in the remaining 37 States of the North and Central States.

To all practical purposes, this will make a Republican Presidential victory impossible as long as the solid South remains solid in its voting habits.

Striking evidence as to the operation of the Lodge plan is shown by applying the formula of the pending resolution to the four elections of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932, 1936, 1940, and 1944.

In 1932, under the Lodge plan, Hoover would have been 84 electoral votes behind Roosevelt in the 11 States of the South, each electoral vote that year representing an average of 30,260 popular votes.

To overcome this Roosevelt electoral vote lead in the South and win the election, Hoover would have had to get a lead of 85 electoral votes in the remaining 37 States, where each electoral vote that year represented 85,580 popular votes, on the average.

In other words, to be elected under the Lodge plan, Hoover would have had to pile up a popular vote lead of 7,274,300 votes in the 37 States of the North for a North-South plurality of 4,925,652 votes.

Two electoral votes less (100,000 to 200,000 popular votes) would have meant defeat.

Under such conditions, Hoover, with a popular vote plurality of almost 5,000,000, would have been defeated by Roosevelt with a majority of the electoral vote. Never in the history of the country were such wide discrepancies between popular vote and electoral vote possible.

The elections of 1936, 1940, and 1944 show the same possiblities.

In 1936, under the Lodge plan, Roosevelt would have had a lead in the solid South of 84 electoral votes over Alf Landon, a year when an electoral vote in the South represented 33,570 popular votes.

To overcome this lead, plus one, and win the election, Landon would have had to gain a popular vote lead of 8,352,100 in the remaining 37 States, for a North-South popular vote lead of 5,783,442.

Two electoral votes less (100,000 to 200,000 popular votes) would have given Roosevelt the election by an electoral vote lead of one, and with Landon having a popular vote lead of more than 5,500,000, under the Lodge plan.

Similarly in 1940, under the Lodge amendment, it would have been possible for Roosevelt to have had an electoral vote lead and been elected, with Willkie having a popular vote lead of more than 5,500,000.

In 1944, under the Lodge plan, Dewey could have had a popular vote lead of approximately 5,250,000 and been defeated by Roosevelt having a lead of one in the Electoral College.

Thus, by his plan, Senator LODGE would tie a noose around his party, which inevitably would bring defeat, discouragement, and disappearance.

Senator LODGE speculates that his plan would lead to more party activity of the Republicans in the South, and in this hope he is somewhat encouraged by his colleague, Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, who says he would welcome more Republican votes in the South, meaning, I am sure, so long as there were not too many of them.

Realism says plainly, however, it would take more than campaigning to increase materially the Republican vote in the South, where restrictions on voting have created, in part at least, so wide a discrepancy between population and voting figures as to make an electoral vote in the 37 States represent more than 100,000 votes on the average, against less than 40,000 in the solid South.

This is no proper place to discuss the voting problems of the South, except to point out the 11 States of the South are electing 127

Presidential electors with approximately one-third the popular vote required for the same number elsewhere.

As one of 100 percent southern blood, I think the South would be well-advised to forget the Lodge amendment and let well enough alone.

The Associated Press quoted Senator LODGE on February 23 as arguing his amendment would make the popular vote count, by abolishing the electoral college's traditional unit voting rule.

How about the 5,000,000 popular-vote majority by which Senator LODGE's own party could conceivably lead, only to be defeated by another party's lead in the electoral vote spearheaded by an irreconcilable solid South, as previously discussed?

Would not these 5,000,000 votes be lost?

As a matter of fact, the expression, "lost votes," is a complete misnomer. In the functioning of democracy, no vote properly marked and cast is ever lost, whether or not the party voted for wins. To cast a vote is to exercise the great privilege of suffrage in democracy and, win or lose, like the exercise of the arm, it strengthens the true citizen.

Moreover, in every election where one man is concerned, such as the election of a President, no votes cast, except for the winner, count, and all others are in that sense lost. The Lodge-Gossett plan merely transfers the wasted votes from the State to the national level.

Apparently completely overlooked are the unexplored psychologies involved in the Lodge plan in small States like Senator MCCARRAN'S State, Nevada, which has 60,000 voters and 3 electoral votes, and is traditionally Democratic by a narrow margin.

In a normal Presidential year, Nevada's electoral vote would be divided under the Lodge plan 1⅜ Republican and 1⅝ Democratic, for a Democratic electoral vote lead of one-quarter.

In a Roosevelt or McCarran landslide, the Democratic lead might be one-half an electoral vote. Would the distinguished Senator from Nevada argue this would bring out a full Nevada vote? Would the Nevada voter figure this would make his vote count?

As a part-time resident of Nevada, I know something of Nevadans, who feel three electoral votes are very few for a State so large. It is possible both Democrats and Republicans might be discouraged in voting if success either way meant a lead of only one-half, one-quarter, one-eighth, or one-sixteenth of an electoral vote.

And, finally, Senator LODGE, cosponsor of this bill, argues his amendment will eliminate the possibility of a President being elected by the House of Representatives, when no candidate gets a clear-cut majority of electoral votes.

I am a little surprised at the Senator urging this point, for the way the Senator's plan eliminates the possibility of action by the House of Representatives is to give the election to whoever has the electoral vote plurality, bypassing the House, no matter how small is the electoral vote or plurality.

This is something for future generations to worry about, if not ourselves—minority elections, minority parties, splinter parties, coalition government—the face of western democracy looking east.

Under the Lodge plan, every party to an election is allowed that party's share of the electoral vote, Democratic, Republican, Prohibition, Socialist, Communist—first at the State, then at the national level. No votes are lost in the Lodge sense at the State level; no parties are lost sight of, at State or national level.

Unquestionably the Lodge plan would first eliminate the Republican Party. Then would go on in real earnest the attrition of the Democratic Party, as cleavage after cleavage followed the inability of that party to satisfy the demands of widely-conflicting ideologies and interests.

Without the benefit of the Lodge amendment, according to Cortes A. M. Ewing in Congressional Elections, "Three-way fights determined the control of the House in 10 of 25 elections since 1896."

There have been 73 parties electing one or more members to Congress, or which have nominated a Presidential candidate, in a total of 105 splinter parties, says Representative Patman, quoting the Legislative Reference Service.

The spectacle of democracy in France struggling with a multiparty system is well known.

There are nine principal parties in France, of which all have one or more affiliates. In the December elections, the most any one of these parties won was 79 seats and the least was 12. Until 1900 no French political party had a platform.

Said A. Lawrence Lowell, former president of Harvard and political expert: "Such a government, moreover, is essentially weak, for it cannot afford to refuse the demands of any group whose defection may be fatal to its existence.

"Division of a Chamber into two parties and two parties only is necessary in order that the parliamentary form of government may prosper.

"Among Anglo-Saxon peoples, who have had a far longer experience in self-government than most other races, there are usually two great parties which dispute for mastery of the state."

Gentlemen, the issue raised here is greater than politics or party. It is, of course, beyond personalities.

You cannot destroy the Republican Party without destroying the two-party system. You cannot destroy the two-party system without destroying ultimately the Democratic Party or reducing it to a minority position, surrounded by other minority parties maneuvering and trading with one another in the well-nigh hopeless task of trying to establish workable coalitions.

It is true the Lodge amendment affects immediately only the election of President and Vice President, that multiparties and minority elections are for the moment held at the President and Vice President line.

But no one needs to be told the importance of precedent in democratic government. The Lodge-Gossett bill starts proportional voting at a high level, the highest office in the country, held by some authorities to be the highest office in the world.

When, under the Lodge plan, a minority party has grown to the stature of a substantial electoral vote, will such party be satisfied to be without legislative representation or with only such representation as it may acquire here and there where local strength may give it a Member of the House of Representatives?

Or will some intelligent and ambitious politician see in the strong minority party, represented only by electoral votes, a chance to win distinction and position by championing its cause, and make a fight to secure legislative representation by the same formula which enabled it to obtain electoral vote representation, by proportional voting?

Under the Lodge plan the voting for President becomes federalized. There no longer is voting by States, as has existed for 160 years. Will the State still be allowed to determine the qualifications of its electors as specified in the Constitution?

Or will the courts conclude that this amendment, which guarantees each party its share of the electoral votes at the State level, by the same token must guarantee this party the right to appear on the ballot of the State, regardless of the action of the State?

Again looking toward our friends of the South, having determined that the right to a share of the electoral vote automatically carries with it the right of each party to be placed on the ballot, regardless of the decision of the State, how long a step would it be for the courts under this amendment to authorize complete Federal control of elections within as well as without the State?

Senator LODGE says his bill will enable the Republican Party to invade the Southern States and increase the Republican vote. It is by this plan he hopes to offset the handicap of his party, to some extent, in the solid South, where on the average an electoral vote represents some 40,000 or less popular votes, as against an average of 110,000 in the remaining 37 States.

Obviously such Republican votes cannot come from the tight Democratic majority in these States, which, facing the Truman civil-rights program, still refused to vote Republican. Such votes then could come only from the nonvoting population of the South.

Already the Constitution, in article XIV, section 2, provides "when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation (Representatives in Congress and electors) therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State."

Do our friends of the South wish to face the additional pressure for enforcement of this provision which the Lodge campaign for votes in the South would insure, as well as the very real risk the electoral college reform might lead to Federal control of elections?

Gentlemen, we are all, as Americans, in the same boat.

There is here no room for Democrat or Republican, for North or for South.

Our formula of government of 160 years is at stake. You are considering, in this amendment, breaking down barriers without which no one can determine where we can stop.

And all this is to correct evils in the electoral system not much above the level of inconvenience and which readily might be cured with minor, and without fundamental, change.

Again I repeat the warning of the founders. When in doubt, with reference to the wisdom of constitutional amendment—don't.

That is the reason amendment was made so difficult.

Finally, in your deliberations, listen to the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin:

"What kind of a government have you given us?" asked the Constitutional Convention.

"A Republic, if you can keep it," answered Franklin.

Arkansas Plan Offers Basis for Honorable Settlement of Civil-Rights Controversy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, most Members of the House are familiar with a compromise proposed by my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] for the settle-

ment of the controversial and divisive civil-rights issue. His plan has been enthusiastically endorsed by newspapers in all sections of the country as the basis of an honorable agreement on these basic problems.

Marquis Childs, well-known columnist, stated in a recent column what we of the South have long contended, namely, that southerners have shown more of a willingness to compromise than the pro-civil-rights groups. He said:

> Many Senators believe that a proper approach by the President to moderate and progressive southerners would have resulted in acceptance of 60 to 70 percent of the civil-rights program. A definite social gain would have been achieved with little bitterness or rancor.

The plan proposed by Mr. HAYS covers all areas of civil-rights legislation included in the President's message. It is a reasonable, sane, and workable program. While it recognizes that the Federal Government has a definite role to play in protecting minority groups, the Arkansas plan insists that the problem cannot be solved exclusively by Federal legislative fiat without injury to the rights of the several States.

In light of the urgent necessity of bringing about a settlement of the civil-rights controversy, I recommend to the attention of Members of the House a careful study of the Arkansas plan for civil-rights legislation offered by Mr. HAYS in an address on February 2.

Oleo Threatens Great Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin, the greatest dairy State in the Union, are alive to the disaster which threatens its biggest industry in the enactment of any of the 40 or more bills which have been presented to the House of Representatives with the principal purpose of repealing the Federal tax of one-fourth cent per pound on uncolored oleo and 10 cents per pound on colored oleo.

They will realize that there are powerful domestic monopolies as well as the international cartels, of which they seem to be part or portion, which have been working for years and very evidently spending millions of dollars to foist their synthetic products upon consumers while destroying the markets for butter.

The taxes on oleo were levied as protective taxes against the frauds which were perpetrated before the Federal enactment occurred. Those taxes stand as the only substantial barrier against the schemes to defraud consumers and the dairy farmers. Their repeal will open wide the doors of interstate commerce and make moonshine oleo a still more profitable industry. To accomplish such a result, the oleo monopolies have spent their millions, and they now want to cash in on their lobbying.

The methods brought into play to prejudice public opinion against all farmers by allegations of profiteering are only part of the program.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture has sought in vain to prevent the misleading advertising rograms of oleo interests which have served and still serve to confuse consumers into believing that oleo is as good as butter and that it has the background of the dairy cow and of the dairy barn.

Mr. Milton H. Button, director of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, sends to me the following information as to the endeavors of his department to procure the assistance of the United States Food and Drug Administration and the Trade Commission in stopping such false and misleading advertising. It emphasizes how little can be expected of such Federal agencies to help protect our dairy farms and farmers once the taxes on oleo are repealed.

The letter from Director Button is as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, STATE CAPITOL,
Madison, Wis., February 28, 1949.

Hon. MERLIN HULL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HULL: Efforts now being made to repeal all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine present extremely serious implications to the consumer, to the dairy industry, and to all citizens of the Nation.

Those who are interested in the long-range aspect of the matter, question the logic of a Congress that appropriates many millions of dollars for a program designed to preserve the priceless heritage of soil fertility and simultaneously considers the adoption of legislation that will change our Nation's agriculture from a grassland animal husbandry structure to a row crop soil-depleting type of agriculture that will inevitably destroy our irreplaceable top soil. The problem is basic and serious and it must be given major consideration by all statesmen of Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture is charged by statute with the duty of protecting consumers against fraudulent advertising and imitations. In this capacity it is our contention that the advertising of yellow oleomargarine with pictures of cattle, dairy barns, and pasture scenes accompanied by phrases and slogans designed to make the consumer believe oleomargarine is a dairy product is a direct, intentional, and flagrant violation of the fraudulent advertising statute.

The United States Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have refused to give attention to this problem or are powerless to cope with it.

The oleomargarine industry has sought and received permission to imitate, synthetically or otherwise, the desirable qualities of butter. They are now imitating the distinctive butter flavor and texture, they are adding synthetic vitamins, they are packaging their product in cartons similar to those used by the butter industry, and have appropriated for themselves the age-old butter trade-mark, its yellow color. These facts indicate that oleomargarine was developed and is being marketed as an imitation product. Historically, this Nation has protected consumers against such deceptive imitation.

For many years new legislation has been designed to provide additional protection against fraud and imitation to the consumer. This policy has been extended to include the interests of the producer and manufacturer.

Now great forces are at work to destroy this protection that we have taken for granted. The oleomargarine industry is asking that the controls against imitation and fraud that now exist in other industries be removed from its particular product.

In the main, other nations of the world maintain the consumer controls that the oleomargarine industry is attempting to avoid in the United States. Some nations maintain a tax or fee as we do. Some enforce the statutes relating to fair-trade practices in labeling and advertising. Some require the addition of ingredients that will make identification immediately possible for the consumer. Some have controlled the matter through the establishment of a State monopoly which has removed the opportunity for unreasonable profits. Some do not permit the manufacture of yellow oleomargarine. Still others protect the consumer by rigid and arbitrary price-fixing schedules.

To summarize, the methods vary but other nations do afford consumer protection. We are looking to you and your associates in the Eighty-first Congress for legislation that is in keeping with the principles and traditions of consumer protection.

Sincerely yours,

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director.*

Golf Courses in the District of Columbia

REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make a full and complete investigation of all the facts and circumstances surrounding the making or renewing of leases and contracts relating to the control, operation, and maintenance of golf courses and facilities incident thereto in the District of Columbia.

My resolution also gives to this committee subpena power to compel the attendance and testimony of needed witnesses to insure the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, and any and all figures needed in such investigation.

It will be noted that the committee is required to report back to the House, or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the result of the investigation with its recommendation.

Numerous and various columnists and radio commentators have made statements and observations on the laxity with which this three-quarter million dollar business is operated with its attendant value in excess of $50,000,000, all of which is maintained and sustained by the some 60,000 golfers who played 700,000 rounds of golf last year on these courses. In addition to all this, miniature golf courses and at least one driving range are likewise included in the concession.

It is a matter of anyone's conjecture how much money passes through the hands of the concessionaire. Some fabulous figures have been suggested.

I have been reliably informed that the Department of the Interior is very lax in the auditing of the books of this gigantic enterprise. I have been further informed that the supervision of the Government's income from these courses has been practically nil. I am also informed that generally the figures submitted by the concessionaire is taken without much ado.

If the many stories which have come to my attention even contain a scintilla of truth, it appears that a sweeping investigation should be made immediately so that those who are compelled to utilize these courses in the District of Columbia are given value received. It looks like the right to operate the golf courses in the District of Columbia is more valuable than an interstate license to steal.

I am enclosing, Mr. Speaker, numerous articles I have clipped from the various newspapers and I ask unanimous consent that they be included with my remarks.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Daily News of February 9, 1949]

HOW COULD PUBLINX LOSE MONEY?—SALARIES ALONE WERE $210,624 IN 1947

(By Dave Reque)

Washington's public golf course concessionaire paid out $210,624.10 in salaries to course managers and employees during 1947, Interior Department revealed today in partial explanation of high costs that dunked Severine Leoffler's operating company into the red last year.

Interior yesterday announced that Concessionaire Leoffler lost $6,000 in 1948 due to rainy week ends and increased cost of materials and labor.

The Department stated today that it doesn't know how much Leoffler's pay roll climbed last year, as it is still waiting for the complete annual report. But it has been told by Leoffler that the company lost that amount, and that receipts dropped off by an estimated $32,000.

PROFIT, NEVERTHELESS

Despite the hefty $210,624.10 pay roll, 1947 yielded a tidy net of $56,325.45.

Leoffler's 1947 pay roll was for the operation of four courses. Last year the new Fort Dupont course was constructed and put into operation, supposedly causing more hiring.

The Leoffler Co.'s 5-year contract expired last December 31. A new contract is expected to be awarded Leoffler soon, though a rival, the Cleveland Concession Co., has filed a bid. Interior says Leoffler advanced about $70,000 of the $190,000 cost of Fort Dupont with the understanding that he would be reimbursed from future receipts.

Thus Leoffler is anxious to continue operating the courses, even though last year was a loser. It is reported that a hike in green fees is in the works, to insure the repayment of the debt.

TURN IT BACK

Leoffler's old contract provided that he split profits 50–50 with Uncle Sam after Leoffler collected a $3,500 priority profit. The new contract is expected to contain the same arrangement, with Interior handing back its half until the debt is canceled.

The old contract allowed the Government to waive its 50 percent and plow it into an improvement fund. It did so during the 5 years. This money, along with a 5 percent of gross receipts provided by the contract for an improvement and expansion fund, was spent last year to pay the balance of the Fort Dupont construction bill.

The condition of the public links was loudly criticized by the golfers last year, a possible explanation for the falling off of receipts. The gross income dropped from $546,065.07 in 1947 to an estimated $514,000 last year. However, costs jumped over the half-million mark; from $490,000 to $520,000.

Of this half-million-plus, well over $200,000 is for salaries.

The 1947 pay roll of $210,624.10 includes Leoffler's own salary as head of the company, as stipulated by the contract, $8,500. That left $202,000, enough to pay 40 employees $5,000 each.

Next to salaries, highest expense in 1947 was cost of the goods sold in the clubhouses. This came to $188,887.90. The stuff was sold for $280,051.19.

For rehabilitation a cost of $27,332 was listed. Depreciation accounted for $10,184.19.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post of February 9, 1949]

SEVENTY-THOUSAND-DOLLAR PROFIT MADE SINCE 1944 BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LINKS CONCESSIONAIRE

The Interior Department yesterday handed over figures to the District Recreation Department disclosing the concessionaire who operates the District's public golf courses has made a total profit of approximately $70,000 from 1944 through 1948.

The figure was included in a report on golf courses, operated by the S. G. Leoffler Co. for the Interior Department. This report was submitted to the District Recreation Board at its monthly meeting by Irving C. Root, superintendent of National Capital Parks, and the Interior Department's representative on the Recreation Board.

Data on operations of the golf courses, and of other District recreation facilities run for the Federal Government by contractors, has been demanded repeatedly by the Recreation Department which wants to control these facilities.

Following receipt of the report, the Recreation Board adopted a resolution asking for a conference between Recreation and Interior Department officials on the operation of the golf courses.

In its resolution, the board asked the Interior Department not to renew the 5-year golf contract, which expired December 31, 1948, until after the conference is held. It asked, in addition, that the Interior Department, consider extension of the contract for only one year "in the event that it becomes necessary to sign a contract."

SIX-THOUSAND-DOLLAR DEFICIT IN 1948

The Interior Department's report pointed out that although Loeffler's profits over the 5-year period averaged $14,000 yearly, the company suffered a deficit of approximately $6,000 for the year 1948. Rainy week ends, and increased cost of materials and labor were cited as the reasons for the deficit.

Gross receipts for the 5-year period totaled $1,877,723, the report stated, and expenses, exclusive of a new development at Fort Dupont Park, totaled $1,747,960.

Under terms of the recently expired contract with Leoffler, the Government and Leoffler split the net profits evenly. Losses are not shared by the Government, however, Park Superintendent Root explained.

The Government has been plowing back its 50 percent share of the profit for improvement and extension of facilities, Root said.

ABOUT THREE PERCENT PLOWED BACK

In addition, a yearly fund, not to exceed 5 percent of the gross receipts is provided in the contract for rehabilitation of existing facilities. Root told a reporter later that the Government had required only about 3 percent of the gross receipts to be plowed back in 1948.

A total of $183,000 has been spent in improving golfing facilities in the National Capital Parks over the past 5 years, Root said. This figure includes the Government's contribution through plowed back profits, and about $118,000 advanced by Leoffler for construction of two miniature golf courses and a clubhouse at the Fort Dupont course, according to Root.

Root said about half of the money had been repaid to Leoffler over the past year, but that he was still owed about $70,000 which would be paid out of profits we hope to make.

NOT RULED OUT

Asked if the Cleveland Concession Co., which has asked to operate the courses is ruled out by this indebtedness, Root said "no—they would just have to repay the Loeffler people out of their receipts."

James E. Schwab, vice chairman of the recreation board asked during the meeting why figures on the value of equipment on the golf courses were not included in the Interior Department report.

He was told by Root that only approximate figures were available on the equipment, but that all the Interior Department's figures on the golf courses were available anytime you want to come down and look them over.

In other actions yesterday, the board adopted a resolution recommending that a drinking fountain at the Bundy School Playground, funds for which are not now available, be installed during the next fiscal year.

It indorsed a bill introduced in the House of Representatives which exempts facilities operated by the Federal Government from the admissions tax on recreation facilities.

The board also approved plans for the Fort Chaplin Playground, and for revisions to the Park View Shelter Building.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York World-Telegram of March 8, 1949]

IN THE ROUGH

(By Robert C. Ruark)

WASHINGTON, March 8.—As any golfing widow can tell you, the man who spends his Saturdays pummeling a little ball through cow pastures is apt to be irritable, according to the state of the greens, the violence of his slice, or the accuracy of his chip shots. In Washington about 60,000 week-end clubswingers maintain a state of steady fury.

The United States Government in the form of the Department of the Interior owns Washington's five municipal courses, and leases them for operation to a private concessionaire. Potomac Park, a lowland links, sometimes gets so wet they have to call the city fire department to pump it out. The sight of a duck swimming in the fairway is not unusual.

In summer, Rock Creek Park's fairways grow hip-deep in hay. The bald spots and driving tees are iron-hard. I have actually seen players carrying hammers to sink the tees. Washington golfers have been cursing the courses, the Government, and the concessionaire, a portly man named Severine G. Leoffler, for as long as I can recall. Mr. Leoffler, a man with several golf-club flops behind him, has leased the links from Uncle Sam since 1921.

Interior Department Secretary, Cap Krug, a man of assorted troubles, now adds golf to his hungry Navajos and tideland-oil problems. He is currently stuck with the task of resolving a hearty squabble over Mr. Leoffler's right to continue as concessionaire. It is an odd story of government entangled in outside industry.

Mr. Leoffler's contract ran out last December 31. He has offered no new bid, but still remains in control of the courses by virtue

of a tacit understanding with Irving Root, an Interior executive. This understanding came about peculiarly—Mr. Leoffler lent the Government money. Interior wanted a clubhouse for the Fort DuPont course. Congress wouldn't O. K. the expenditure. So Mr. Leoffler lent $57,000 to Uncle Sam out of accrued profits, with his personal cinch for contract extension as security.

Uncle Sam's golf courses do an annual half-million-dollar business, out of which Mr. Leoffler has taken big profits in past. On that gross figure, however, he says he has lost $6,000 last year—a rather neat trick. Mr. Leoffler has no professionals, provides no caddies, and has always been cavalier about upkeep. He also employs many relatives. He works under no bond, and there is no official audit on income available since 1945. Even his 1948 statement, due at the end of the year, was only turned in last week.

As Mr. Leoffler's contract expired, a big Cleveland firm of concessionaires shot in a bid for the courses, a bid which bettered Mr. Leoffler's proposition on all counts. Even in 1948's losing year, the Government would have made $45,000 after improvements under the Clevelanders' terms. Oddly, again, the bid was shelved, although nobody else, not even Mr. Leoffler, had offered a counter-bid.

A thriving tempest has cooked up around the conflict. The Cleveland firm is represented by noisy little Ray Alvis, a former fight promoter, who is expert in ballyhoo. Ray has swept some Congressmen into the deal, and spends his time baying ominously at the Interior Department and shouting for Mr. Leoffler's scalp. He is joined, to a milder degree, by the local press, and to a heavy extent by the golfers, who scream for Mr. Leoffler's dismissal.

The Department has now officially clammed up, pending Cap Krug's decision. The District dubs were hopeful, but cynical, about the outcome. Mr. Leoffler's greens may be scabby and his fairways unkempt, they said, but he had been around a long time, and had a full quota of friends at court. In final analysis, they feared, Government-operated golf was like so many other Government ventures—the race was not always to the swift.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Washington Post of February 25, 1949]

THE DISTRICT LINE—GOLFERS COULD ALSO USE SOME RENT CONTROL

(By Bill Gold)

Since my column on the administration of the Interior Department's public golf courses, several District liners have complained that I overlooked an important point.

Public links are used by two general categories of players: the beginner, and the golfer who cannot afford the expense of a private course.

The beginner (I'm reminded) usually rents clubs for each round of play, because the golf bug has not yet bitten him hard enough to cause him to buy an outfit of his own.

The private concessionaire who has the inside track at Interior charges 20 cents per round for each club (and bag) he rents out.

Even a beginner needs a midiron, mashie, niblick, putter, brassie and bag. That's six items; the rental for 18 holes is $1.20.

Irate players point out that many brands of clubs retail for as low as $4 each, and that anybody who buys in large quantities can undoubtedly get a substantial discount.

So, if the clubs cost the concessionaire $3 each and he gets 20 cents per round for renting them out, they're paid for by the time the sixteenth customer shows up.

However, the rusty condition of most of these sticks attests to the fact that they've been in service for years, and are still earning their owner a juicy profit.

But the present concessionaire claims that he is losing money, and will have to raise his prices this season.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL BROWN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1949, the FDIC completed its fifteenth year of successful operation. During this relatively short period a tremendous change has occurred in depositor psychology. Prior to the advent of deposit insurance the slightest rumor of trouble in a bank was sufficient to cause near panic among its depositors which resulted in runs that almost universally hastened the closing of the bank.

It is most remarkable that depositor panic is no longer a factor in bank difficulties. The 90,000,000 depositors in insured banks rest secure in the assurance that Federal deposit insurance protects their funds.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Journal of Commerce, of New York, of March 8, 1949, as follows:

KEEP THE FDIC INDEPENDENT

The proposal to place the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is unsound. Advanced in the name of governmental reorganization and more effective credit control, this suggestion should be rejected outright if brought before Congress.

The objectives of the Federal Reserve System and of the FDIC are radically different in character. The Federal Reserve is concerned primarily with over-all credit control. The FDIC's main job is to minimize bank failures, and to pay off depositors of failed banks up to the $5,000 maximum that is insured where payments are suspended.

Obviously, there are going to be times when the two agencies will be pursuing radically different policies. The Federal Reserve may be favoring aggressive credit expansion to check a depression and price deflation. The FDIC at such times would doubtless be putting pressure upon banks to hold down the volume of risk assets acquired, because of a growing danger of failures.

Were the FDIC under the jurisdiction of the Reserve Board, it is obvious that it could not pursue effectively a program of minimizing bank failures that would conflict directly with a credit expansion policy of the top agency.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is in a very strong position today. It possesses upward of a billion dollars of liquid resources with which to pay off depositors of closed banks, or to prevent failures by assisting the merger of weak banks with neighboring stronger institutions.

But the experience of the FDIC in the first 15 years of its existence has been exceptionally favorable. There have been very few bank failures. Moreover, assets of insured banks have come to consist mainly of Government securities, which minimize the risk that a deposit insurance agency assumes.

In the past 3 years, however, banks have been acquiring increasing amounts of loans that are classified as risk assets. Should this trend persist, we would again have to face the possibility of banking difficulties. At the same time, the decline in the ratio of commercial bank capital funds to deposits that has occurred since 1939 could become a factor of weakness.

Strong as the position of the Nation's banks remains today by comparison with past experience, a continuation of recent trends could lead to less favorable experience with deposit insurance in the years ahead. It is vitally important, therefore, that the FDIC retain its full independence, so that it may continue to concentrate its efforts on maintaining a strong banking system, regardless of conflicting credit-control objectives the Federal Reserve System may be pursuing.

The argument advanced for placing the FDIC within the Federal Reserve System is that higher legal reserve requirements could then be imposed by the Board of Governors upon insured banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System.

If such an extension of the credit-control powers of the Federal Reserve System is desirable, it should be sought by separate legislation. Congress is understood to have the authority to pass legislation affecting reserve requirements of State banks, under the money power granted it by the Constitution. The desire to broaden application of higher reserve requirements ordered by the Federal Reserve Board is a very poor excuse indeed for ending the independence of the FDIC.

It is widely believed that Congress will refuse a simple request for powers to change reserve requirements of nonmember banks by Federal Reserve action. It is not straightforward to seek the same objective by confusing the issue with reorganization of the Federal Government, particularly since the future integrity of deposit insurance could be undermined in consequence.

The FDIC, so long as it continues to concentrate upon minimizing bank failures, has ample resources for its task, even with a reduction or elimination of the assessment on insured deposits. However, should banks continue to expand their risk assets aggressively, the fact that insured deposits are more than 60 times as large as the funds of the FDIC could before long put a different complexion upon the whole issue.

Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, and that freedom of religion is necessary in this troubled world have been profoundly shocked by the arrest, imprisonment, and sentence of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and the arrest and imprisonment of Bishop Lajos Ordass, of the Lutheran faith, by the Communist Government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for such arrest, imprisonment, and

sentence but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas Hungary, recently styled a people's republic, a satellite of Soviet Russia, has shown its utter disregard for freedom of religion in making the arrest and causing the imprisonment of these two men of God: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts desires to register an emphatic protest to the Government of Hungary in causing the arrest and imprisonment of these two churchmen; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to take appropriate action to convey to the Hungarian Government the demand of the people of this country that Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass be immediately released; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

In senate, adopted February 9, 1949.

IRVING N. HAYDEN, *Clerk.*

In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence, February 9, 1949.

LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Veterans Pensions Versus Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a report from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which deals with the subject of veterans' pension legislation now pending before the Congress as compared with other pending bills relating to expanding the coverage and increasing the benefits of the Social Security Act.

I trust that every Member will read carefully the report of the Director of the Budget.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CARROLL: This will acknowledge your letter of February 26 requesting a comparative analysis of the benefits and the cost to the Government of H. R. 2681, the veterans' pension bill, and H. R. 2893, the administration's old-age, survivors, and disability insurance bill.

There is attached an analysis prepared by staff of this office, which goes as far as time has permitted toward fully answering your inquiry. You will understand, of course, that the figures in this analysis are preliminary. They differ from those submitted to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in that they include estimates of the cost of H. R. 2681 in providing pensions for survivors of veterans. These estimates are approximations, but they are the best that can be developed in the time available.

The President's perspective on this problem, as presented in his recent budget message, seems to me to furnish the key to the appropriate course for this Government to follow. Under all of the circumstances indicated in the attached analysis, enactment of H. R. 2681 could not be regarded as in accord with the President's program. It is hoped that the Congress will see fit to move forward with an adequate and appropriate expansion of our social insurances to meet the needs of all of our citizens, including both veterans and nonveterans.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR., *Director.*

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2681 (THE VETERANS' PENSION BILL) AND H. R. 2893 (THE OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE BILL)

As reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H. R. 2681 would provide pensions at age 65 to all veterans of both wars in the amount of $90 per month; totally disabled veterans requiring continuous attendance would receive an additional $30 per month. Widows and orphans of World War I veterans would continue to receive $42 per month, plus additional allowances for children, if income from other sources were less than $2,000 for a widow or orphan alone, or $3,000 for a widow with children. (Under present law these income limitations are $1,000 and $2,500.) Widows and orphans of World War II veterans would for the first time receive these benefits without the present requirement that the deceased veteran also had service-connected disability.

To appraise H. R. 2681, it should be viewed in the context of our general welfare programs and our existing aids to veterans. An appropriate focus was given in the President's recent budget message to the Congress. His statement read in part as follows:

"The program of veterans' services and benefits should reflect the fundamental fact that our primary long-run obligation is to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes and to veterans disabled in the service. In the fulfillment of these obligations we have two basic purposes. The first is to alleviate financial hardship to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes. The second is to help veterans surmount the physical and economic handicaps of their service disabilities. At the same time, we should preserve and stress our basic objective of assisting the recipients of these benefits to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of our society.

"The necessity for new or extended benefits for veterans without service disabilities should be judged, not solely from the standpoint of service in our armed forces but in the light of existing social-welfare programs available to all, veterans and nonveterans alike. In recent years social-security protection, including unemployment and old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance, has been made available to a large percentage of our general population. Prior to World War I the lack of such general benefits was, of course, one of the main reasons for the enactment of special benefits to veterans. At the present time we seek to broaden and extend these social-security programs and to enact a comprehensive national health and disability insurance program for all our people, including veterans, who with their immediate families will soon constitute 40 percent of the population."

This analysis centers, therefore, on a comparison of H. R. 2681 with these general-welfare programs which are intended to provide for the bulk of the population the kinds of assistance which H. R. 2681 proposes for veterans alone. The administration's general program is embodied in the President's recent proposals for expanding our old-age and survivors insurance system and extending its coverage to all persons not already included in an established Government retirement system. These proposals have now been placed before the House Ways and Means Committee for its consideration and are incorporated in H. R. 2893, recently introduced by Chairman DOUGHTON, as a basis for committee hearings. A comparative analysis of these two proposals involves the following points:

(1) Veterans of World Wars I and II are receiving better treatment than did veterans of preceding wars. With respect to World War I veterans, this was recognized in 1935 when the pension benefits repealed by the Economy Act of March 20, 1933, were restored to the Spanish-American War veterans. At that time President Roosevelt made the following statement:

"The Congress on many occasions has recognized that because of the complete absence of any system or policy initiated during or immediately following the Civil War, the Indian wars, and the Spanish-American War, and because of lack of adequate medical care from the point of view of modern standards, the veterans of these earlier wars could be compensated and taken care of only through some form of pension system.

"In the case of the World War, however, the Congress at the very beginning of the war adopted an entirely new system of care and benefits. This new system applied to all who fought in the World War, extended to them additional compensation if they had dependents, as well as insurance, hospitalization, vocational rehabilitation, and the adjusted-service certificates (the bonus).

"The veterans of the Spanish-American War, now approaching an average age of 62 years, had none of these advantages except hospitalization in recent years. Their case, therefore, cannot be compared to the case of World War veterans. For the same reason the approval of this bill establishes no ground or precedent for pensions for the World War group; theirs is an entirely different case."

Since 1935, when the Social Security Act was passed, this country has made great strides in building general programs for full employment, for increased health services, and to provide greater economic and social security for all the people. In addition, we have provided liberal programs of special benefits and services to veterans and their dependents. In particular, we have been successful in smoothing the readjustment problems of World War I and World War II veterans.

(2) In the special veterans' programs our primary obligation is to the service-disabled veterans and to the dependents of veterans deceased from service causes. For these veterans existing law provides liberal benefits. The basic compensation rate now ranges up to $138 per month for a veteran with permanent and total disability. Since last July, severely disabled veterans with dependents receive additional amounts up to $21 per month for a wife and $14 extra for the first child. Veterans with specific service disabilities (anatomical loss or loss of use, blindness, etc.) receive compensation up to $360 per month, in addition to allowances for dependents. Furthermore, free medical and hospital care is also provided to these veterans. The dependents of service-deceased veterans received an increase in benefits in July 1948. A widow of such a veteran now gets $75 per month with $25 per month extra for the first child and $15 for each additional child.

It must be borne in mind that such compensation even to veterans who are service-disabled is intended to assist, and the amounts paid generally are supplements to the income the veteran or his widow is able to earn.

Of the 2,000,000 veterans of World Wars I and II now drawing compensation for serv-

ice-connected disabilities, only 5 percent have ratings of permanent and total disability. A great proportion of veterans receiving compensation for service-connected disabilities can and do work.

(3) For veterans without service-connected disabilities, the present law already provides benefits. Veterans of World Wars I and II who have permanent and total disabilities not incurred in service can receive $60 per month, with an increase to $72 per month at age 65 or after receiving the pension for a continuous period of 10 years. In this connection, permanent and total disability includes any veteran who is 10 percent disabled at age 65. To be eligible, veterans must be unemployable and cannot have other income in excess of $1,000 for a single man or $2,500 for a man with dependents.

Thus, most veterans aged 65 or over who are in need can now qualify for a pension of $72 a month under existing law and regulations.

A widow of a World War I or II veteran who died of non-service-connected causes now receives $42 per month regardless of age, plus $12 more for the first child under 18 years of age. For a widow of World War II to qualify, however, the veteran must have had a service disability of some sort.

As the President pointed out in the 1950 budget message, the problem of the non-service-disabled veteran in obtaining economic security is the common problem of all our people. Nine-tenths of our veterans do not have service disabilities. The security of this vast group of veterans can best be increased by broadening and strengthening the social-security system and by a vigorous program to assure a continuing high level of employment and production.

(4) The expanded social-security system, as provided in H. R. 2593, would provide protection for nearly everyone, both veteran and nonveteran.

(a) All employees or self-employed persons would be entitled to old-age benefits at age 65 for men and age 60 for women. Persons in the active military or naval service of the United States would be covered in future for their period of active service unless they qualify for military retirement benefits. In this connection the Federal Security Agency is now studying the possibility of retroactive credits for military service during World War II as a basis for eligibility and benefits under the OASDI system.

(b) This is an insurance system. Therefore the amount of benefits would be determined by the length of time during which the beneficiary had been employed and contributing to the system. The upper limits of benefits would be set in relation to an average of the beneficiary's wages during the 5 years of highest earnings. However, the vast majority of veterans reaching age 65 will have been employed for sufficiently long periods to entitle them to full coverage and they will have received wages enough during any 5 years of their employment to entitle them to benefits which would compare favorably with the old-age pensions proposed in H. R. 2681.

(c) Temporary and permanent disability insurance, operating generally along the same lines as old-age insurance, would cover the great majority of both veterans and nonveterans. It would provide income during illness or other temporary disability and also during periods of extended disability. H. R. 2681 does not cover either temporary or permanent disability, except to raise to $90 the pensions now available under existing laws.

(d) The proposed social insurance includes an extensive system of benefits for survivors of insured persons. Widows and orphans of veterans and nonveterans alike who were covered by old-age insurance would be protected by survivors' benefits which are an integral part of the insurance system. In most cases these would be more generous than the survivors' pensions contemplated in H. R. 2681 and would, of course, be paid as insurance benefits without regard for income limitations.

Specific illustrations of the benefits which will accrue to individuals under the proposed old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system are provided for as an attachment to this analysis. These illustrations show that old-age benefits for most single men would be somewhat lower than the flat pensions in H. R. 2681. However, benefits for men with dependents would in general be very much better under OASDI than under the veterans' pension bill.

(5) H. R. 2681 will be exceedingly costly, and its costs will be superimposed on those for our present aids for veterans and our general social-insurance program. This legislation would commit our Government to billions of dollars of expenditures until the end of this century and well into the next. The cost of H. R. 2681 has been reported to be only $62,000,000 for the first year after enactment. But this is an incomplete estimate. It omits the increased cost of survivors' benefits. Moreover, this would only be the beginning of a steeply rising curve. Ten years from now expenditures due to the bill would reach $1,200,000,000, or more annually, as more of the veterans of World War I reach age 65. Expenditures would continue to increase, and would reach an annual rate of $5,500,000,000 or more by 1990, when the veterans of World War II reach age 65 in large numbers.

These expenditures break down into two components. First is the cost of living veterans. The Veterans' Administration has already indicated to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs that this cost is estimated at over $4,400,000,000 annually after 1990. This estimate appears to be based on conservative assumptions as to the number of veterans applying and qualifying for pensions.

Second is the cost of pensions for survivors of veterans without service disabilities. This cost has not yet been estimated by the Veterans' Administration. But in our judgment the information at hand indicates an approximate annual cost of at least $1,000,000,000 at the peak of the program.

In the aggregate, it is reasonable to assume that this bill would require expenditures of at least $125,000,000,000 in this century, and in the year 2000 expenditures would still be at an annual rate of $4,000,000,000. Approximately two-thirds of this annual total would be for benefits to living veterans. These expenditures would taper off over the next decade or two. But the payments to survivors of veterans would only have reached their peak at that time; they would continue high for several decades thereafter.

These costs would be added on top of the already large veterans' compensation and pension outlays to which existing laws commit the Government. These present programs—including compensation, pensions, and hospital care—are estimated at approximately $3,000,000,000 in the coming fiscal year and at the same level or higher during the rest of the century. Enactment of H. R. 2681 would thus mean $8,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 a year for veterans' benefits by 1990.

Apart from these exenditures for veterans' programs, the costs of the expanded social insurance system are expected to reach a peak of $15,000,000,000 to $18,000,000,000 annually by 1990. This includes anticipated outlays under present OASI legislation. These costs will be met out of trust funds built up through equal contributions by employers and employees, supplemented to some extent out of general revenues.

The costs of the expanded social-insurance system will thus be paid by its beneficiaries, either as contributors or taxpayers. In contrast, the costs of H. R. 2681 will be borne by all taxpayers for the benefit only of veterans and and their dependents.

(6) H. R. 2681 raises very serious questions for governmental fiscal policy when taken in relation to our other programs. The heaviest costs of H. R. 2681 would fall on the Federal Treasury at about the same time that it will be called upon to disburse out of trust accounts and to some extent out of general revenue the heaviest annual outlays under old-age and survivors insurance. This will be at a time when the costs of our present programs of assistance to veterans are still running high.

Advance commitments are justified for programs which will meet the basic needs of our population, needs which we can now foresee clearly and unequivocally. Indeed, advance commitments are an essential attribute of an insurance system where contributions collected over an extended period will finance the bulk of eventual expenditure.

But it is not possible to justify a commitment now to pay out of general tax receipts more than $125,000,000,000 for veterans pensions in the next 50 years, and many additional billions thereafter, when we have before the Congress a program which will meet the same needs on a broader basis.

Illustrative benefits payable under the proposed improved system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance with comparative amounts under the veterans' pension bill

I. RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Average monthly wage, best 5 years	OASI monthly benefits (H. R. 2893)			Monthly veterans' benefit (under H. R. 2681)
	Retirement before 1963, 12 years' coverage	Retirement in 1970, 20 years' coverage	Retirement in 1990, 40 years' coverage	
Man without dependents, retiring at age 65				
$100	$46.20	$49.50	$57.80	$90
200	63.00	67.50	78.80	90
300	79.80	85.50	99.80	90
400	96.60	103.50	120.80	90
Man, retiring at age 65 with wife age 60 or over				
$100	$69.30	$74.30	$80.00	$90
200	94.50	101.30	118.20	90
300	119.70	128.30	149.70	90
400	144.90	150.00	150.00	90

II. SURVIVORS BENEFITS

Average monthly wage, best 5 years	OASI monthly benefits (H. R. 2893) for dependents of covered worker		Monthly benefit under veterans' pension bill (H. R. 2681)
	Death in 1960, 10 years coverage	Death in 1970, 20 years coverage	
Widow alone, age 60 or over			
$100	$34.10	$37.20	$42
200	46.50	50.70	42
300	58.90	64.20	42
400	71.20	77.70	42
Widow with 1 dependent child			
$100	$68.20	$74.40	$54
200	93.00	101.40	54
300	117.80	128.40	54
400	142.40	150.00	54

II. SURVIVORS BENEFITS—continued

Average monthly wage, best 5 years	OASI monthly benefits (H. R. 2893) for dependents of covered worker		Monthly benefit under veterans' pension bill (H. R. 2681)
	Death in 1960, 10 years coverage	Death in 1970, 20 years coverage	
Widow with 2 dependent children			
$100	$80.00	$80.00	$60
200	124.00	135.20	60
300	150.00	150.00	60
400	150.00	150.00	60

III. EXTENDED LIABILITY BENEFITS

Average monthly wage, best 5 years	OASDI monthly benefits (H. R. 2893)		Monthly benefit under veterans' pension bill (H. R. 2681) [1]
	Disabled in 1960, 10 years' coverage	Disabled in 1970, 20 years' coverage	
Disabled man without dependents			
$100	$45.40	$49.50	$90
200	61.90	67.50	90
300	78.40	85.50	90
400	94.90	103.50	90
Disabled man with wife and 1 child			
$100	$80.00	$80.00	$90
200	123.90	135.00	90
300	150.00	150.00	90
400	150.00	150.00	90
Disabled man with wife and 2 children			
$100	$80	$80	$90
200	150	150	90
300	150	150	90
400	150	150	90

[1] A totally disabled veteran requiring continuous attendance would receive an additional $30 monthly.

Wasted Defense Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. COFFEY, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD an article by Gen. James H. Doolittle, entitled "Wasted Defense Billions," which appeared in the Air Force magazine for December 1948, and an article by George Gallup, entitled "Air Force Has Heaviest Backing," which appeared in the Washington Post of February 20, 1949:

[From Air Force magazine for December 1948]

JIMMY DOOLITTLE SCORES WASTED DEFENSE BILLIONS

(When AFA in convention adopted a statement of policy urging a single Air Force, Board Chairman Jimmy Doolittle was in Europe. When he got back, President C. R. Smith asked for his comments. The Doolittle answer, expressed in this letter, makes vital reading for everyone.)

DEAR C. R.: There are many aspects to the unification problem and all must be considered. The tendency in the past has been to deal with the relatively simpler and less important phases and side-step the fundamental question from which all major service differences evolve: Shall we have one integrated and coordinated Air Force or two competing and conflicting Air Forces?

The National Security Act of 1947, as finally passed, was a compromise—as it has turned out, an unfortunate compromise—between widely divergent, highly conflicting, and strongly held and expressed opinions.

The individuals responsible for the formulation and passage of the law were well aware of its deficiencies, but hoped that the normal processes of evolution would clarify, justify, and strengthen it.

Unfortunately, some of the compromises that were made violated fundamental principles of sound organization and modern military requirements. As a result of this, and also due to a lack of wholehearted cooperation on the part of the agencies involved, time has intensified rather than reduced the undesirable effects of the inherent faults and conflicts.

The time has now come to objectively analyze the results achieved over the past year, the law itself, and the changes necessary to provide a National Defense Establishment which will give us the greatest possible degree of effectiveness, efficiency, and economy—the greatest value in defense and, if necessary, offense, for each defense dollar spent.

Tremendous economies are possible through true unification. They have not been achieved under the present law and will not be achieved through minor modifications of the existent law. Great economies can be realized only through basic changes—through correcting a fundamentally erroneous concept.

As stated in the first paragraph, the present law is an unfortunate compromise. One side, represented by the Army and the Air Force, wanted:

One separate autonomous air force.

Complete coordination of the three armed forces—called unification.

A single Secretary of Defense.

A head to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Roles and missions designated by Executive order of the President and not by act of Congress.

The other side, represented by the Navy, was opposed to all of these things. The compromise follows:

The Army Air Force was made separate. The Navy retained its air force.

Unification, of a sort, was achieved.

A coordinating head for the Joint Chiefs of Staff was not authorized.

Roles and missions were designated by law.

The new law was hailed by different groups as: "A splendid compromise." "An unfortunate compromise of fundamental principles." "Fatal appeasement." "The greatest Naval victory since Trafalgar."

The important point is that after a reasonable period of fair trial, although some improvements have been made through this partial unification, we are not enjoying the economies possible through true unification. We are spending unnecessary billions on defense. And, what is more, no minor modifications of the present law will correct the situation and make or permit it to work. It can be made to work (and by working I mean give the taxpayer a fair return on his defense dollar) only by ruthlessly disregarding the selfish desires of the individual services and operating wholly in behalf of national security and welfare—by fearlessly removing the flagrant fundamental faults in the present law regardless of the effect on service pride or prestige.

There are three fundamental media in or on which modern war will be conducted—land, water, and air. We must therefore have three services, each one of which operates in, and whose personnel specialize in operations in, one medium. This means an army operating on the ground, a navy operating on and under the water, and an air force operating in the air. Each agency must operate in its own medium and all must be intimately coordinated. Each must be dependent upon the others for service in the other's particular element. There must be maximum mobility and flexibility to meet the rapidly changing conditions of modern warfare. It must be possible to use the whole or any part promptly and effectively where and when required. It is obvious that we cannot afford three self-sufficient services: An army with its own navy and air; a navy with its own army and air; and an air force with its own army and navy. It is equally clear that two self-sufficient, competing United States armies or two United States navies would be wasteful. We actually have two self-sufficient, competing air forces, each planning to win the air war in its own way. We have the United States Air Force and the naval Air Force. We cannot afford this luxury—this prodigality.

We also have one self-sufficient service. We cannot afford this wasteful extravagance. True, the Navy can do its own job better by having its own Army and Air Force, but so could each of the other forces if they were also completely self-sufficient. We cannot afford three self-sufficient forces and the essential need for maximum economy will not permit us to have even one. Preserving the self-sufficiency of one service reduces the over-all effectiveness of the three taken together, and substantially increases the overall cost in natural resources, equipment, facilities, and personnel.

We do not know what the eventual size of our Military Establishment must be in order to keep us out of war or enable us to win promptly if attacked. It is unfortunate, but true, that Stalin effectively determines our required defense budget. He hopes to bankrupt us; to make us spend so much money on defense that we will destroy our economy and eventually our form of government. Any inefficiency or waste plays into his hands. True unification, with the smallest Army, the smallest Navy, and the smallest Air Force that will assure us of a reasonable degree of security, operating under a sound, coordinated strategic plan and organized to give not only maximum efficiency but maximum economy as well, will substantially reduce our military budget and represent the minimum interference with our economy, our prosperity, and our manner of life. By putting all Air under one head, we can substantially reduce the total expenditure required and greatly increase the flexibility and defensive and offensive potentialities of our Air units. With land-based aircraft and carrier-based aircraft under the same head, they will no longer be competing with each other—one planning to do the entire job of defending the Nation or winning a war through the use of carrier-based aircraft and the other with land-based aircraft. One streamlined service, so organized as to most effectively utilize both types, would minimize size and resulting cost.

As long as it is completely separate from the other services, it doesn't matter whether our Air Force is called the United States Air Force or the Naval Air Force. It could well be the National Air Force, thus retaining the Navy designation of NAF. Personnel, equipment, and facilities would be pooled, and we would end up with one integrated Air Force. Not only could we get along with less of everything, including supporting forces, facilities, and services through combining the two, and thus billions, but the personnel, equipment, and practices remaining would be made up of only the best, hand-picked

from both; and therefore substantially increased effectiveness would be achieved through economy.

The carriers, which are merely mobile air bases, could still be operated by the Navy. Carrier-borne aircraft would be manned and serviced initially by former Navy personnel, and always with personnel specially trained in that type of work. One specialized branch of the Air Force would cooperate with the Navy just as a specialized branch, the Tactical Air Force, now cooperates with the Army.

The Marine Corps, as long as it remained a small, integrated, highly mobile, triphibious striking force, accomplishing the function for which it was originally conceived, could well remain with one of the basic services. If, however, the Marine Corps continues to grow, it must either become a separate service or be absorbed, retaining its identity, in the three basic services. To make four independent services, when there are only three fundamental media in which to operate, is obviously unsound both from the military and an economic point of view.

Am delighted that the Air Force Association came out at the annual convention for a single integrated Air Force. If we are instrumental in the prompt realization of this important objective, we will have made a very great contribution to national security and prosperity and to the establishment of a better and a peaceful world.

As ever,

J. H. DOOLITTLE.

[From the Washington Post of February 20, 1949]

AIR FORCE HAS HEAVIEST BACKING

(By George Gallup)

With the cold war entering its fourth year, a substantial majority of voters questioned on the subject of national defense think that the size of the Army and Navy should be increased, and an even larger majority want to see the Air Force strengthened.

Most of those who favor increases say they would be willing to pay higher taxes for the purpose.

Until the world learns to eliminate force, the hope of our statesmen is that American military strength will prevent war. As many have pointed out, the vital question is, What kind of strength?

To see what the popular conception of the problem is, the institute interviewed a cross section of voters on the questions given below. Obviously the voters are not military strategists. However, since they have to supply the manpower and foot the bill, their notions about defense planning are worth examining.

"Do you think the United States should increase the size of its Army? Navy? Air Force?"

The vote:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Increase Army	56	29	15
Increase Navy	57	27	16
Increase Air Force	70	17	13

Those who voted for increases were asked: "Would you be willing to pay more money in taxes to support a larger Army? Navy? Air Force?"

The vote:

	Army	Navy	Air Force
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes	44	45	54
No	9	9	12
No opinion	3	3	4
Total favoring increases	56	57	70

The high vote in favor of the Air Force is significant in the light of discussion over the size of the Air Force for the coming fiscal year. Air Force Secretary Symington advocates a force of 70 combat groups. President Truman's proposed budget envisions a cutback to 48 groups from the present 60.

Airpower became a major love of the American people even before military experts were willing to admit the importance of its role in warfare. One of the very first surveys ever conducted by the institute, in November 1935, used the same questions as those in today's survey. It showed a 70-percent vote in favor of a stronger Air Force.

The President's budget would cut appropriations slightly for the Air Force and Navy, as compared to present outlays, and would raise the amount slightly for the Army.

The number of planes on active service in the Air Force proper would be cut from 9,780 to 9,200. The number of men on active duty in the Navy would be reduced slightly, although the number of Reservists would be increased.

Army troops, on the other hand, would be increased in number, along with a substantial increase in Reserves.

Keep Uncle Sam Solvent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Henry J. Taylor:

KEEP UNCLE SAM SOLVENT

The Government is pouring out money these days, and some people feel they may as well ride the gravy train. But I think the gravy train will be our funeral train if we don't watch out.

If we want to keep our jobs, we've got to help keep this country solvent. Some place along the line we must do a little choosing. We can't spend everything, spend everywhere, be as blind as bats, and still not go broke.

Most politicians, left to their own devices, will bankrupt anything. That's the record.

I'd like to mention tonight some of their plans for spending, at our expense. You may find it difficult to believe these plans. But they should be revealed to the public. For, if America goes broke, the public goes broke. You go broke. I go broke.

NO WORLD POWER WITHOUT HOME POWER

Our Washington spenders and taxers say that they want to put the world on its feet. But unless some limits are defined, they will try to put so many people in the world on their feet that they will knock us all off our own feet here at home. Then what will happen to our security, and to world security? What will happen to world prosperity, and to world peace?

The future of the peace of the world depends, uniquely and entirely, on what happens inside the United States. Our world power depends on our home power. If our home power is lost, our world power is lost.

THE RUSSIANS' BET

What are the Russians betting on? They are betting we will knock ourselves out in our own gymnasium.

Listen to Lenin. He laid this important idea right on the line. Lenin said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

How can our political spenders be so blind as not to see that this is Russia's fundamental aim? They preach security, from the cradle to the grave, as well as unlimited taxing and spending to achieve it. But though we were cradled in liberty, we may well get a grave in bankruptcy.

UNCLE SAM EVERYBODY'S SANTA CLAUS

Although we have less than 7 percent of the world's population—and have already undertaken enormous military commitments to maintain world peace—we are now to charge right into even wider and wider plans, to give nearly everything to everybody, any place and every place, or go broke in the effort.

For example, the newest spending plan will reveal that we are to be taxed for (1) schools and highways in Cuba; (2) railway expansion in Mexico; (3) flood control in Brazil, a new global boondoggle on the Amazon River; (4) industrial development in Colombia, Peru. Ecuador, Bolivia, and Chile; (5) waterpower in the Argentine; (6) industry in Africa, India, Pakistan, along with Rhodes; and (imagine this) a beautiful belt of hotels. Apparently Uncle Sam wants to stop being called Uncle Sap and start being called Uncle Statler.

TAX RELIEF FOR OFFICEHOLDERS ONLY

Meanwhile, officeholders are still being added to the public pay roll here at home. The Federal pay roll al ne has reached $9,000,000,000 a year.

Moreover, top Government employees have voted themselves salary increases, along with amazing and highly questionable tax-exempt allowances. They've given themselves tax relief that separates their own tax burden from the burden carried by all other citizens.

But I, for one, think that there's a certain amount of immorality in this—to say that taxes must go up, then vote themselves enormous exemptions from taxes, and vote those taxes onto the backs of you and me.

What does the bill add up to? What does it mean to every man and woman who is working at a tax-paying job?

THEY CAN TAX THE UNITED STATES INTO A BUST

Assuming that the people give the tax-exempt spenders all they want to spend, the Government in the next 18 months will consume $66,000,000,000. Ten years ago the spenders broke all records when they spent $14,000,000,000 in the same period in which they now propose to spend $66,000,000,000.

This increase alone is at the rate of about $1,400 in new burdens against every American family in your land and mine. It comes on top of a burden we already carry—the largest mountain of debt ever placed on a people in the history of the world.

Do you wonder I say that our Washington spenders must watch their step or they will tax us into a bust? This country's present prosperity is a very touchy thing. It won't stand much more kicking around from Washington, D. C.

The proposed increase in taxes really amounts to $7,000,000,000. It's not $4,000,000,000 more—it's really $7,000,000,000 more, when the full charges are added. That's the simple truth. Yet, not 1 penny of tax increase would be necessary if waste were cut—as it should be cut, could be cut, must be cut.

PEOPLE EVERYWHERE ARE WORRIED

I have just been out in Illinois and Iowa and Kansas—in the heart of the farm country. I talked with farmers, storekeepers, country bankers, and a good many housewives. I talked with anxious workers in railroad yards, where railroads are now being forced to lay off a number of men. Saturday and Sunday I was in upper New York State, around Buffalo and Lockport, and tonight I'm here in Michigan. In all these sections, the same thing applies.

Whether Washington knows it or not, people are worried. Instead of a Roman holiday, this should be a day for very sober action in Washington, D. C., with respect to taxes, labor laws, and everything else.

The working people of the country foot the bill. They have a right to insist that the money they earn should not be thrown around like water.

TIME FOR COMMON SENSE AND PRUDENCE

Taxes should come down—not go up. This is something for public opinion to take hold of—and now. The politicians should be told that the party is over.

This is no time for any more "hey, nonny-nonny, and hotcha-cha." This is no time to be wasted into oblivion and taxed into a bust. Times are too serious for that. This is no time for global boondoggling, or for boondoggling at home, either. This is no time for anything but common sense and prudence on the part of our tax-exempt spenders and taxers.

TAKE HEART

As good citizens, we should be too proud of this country to preach our indifference about a matter of this kind, or to be outshouted. We are not indifferent—and we need not be outshouted.

The future of our homes is at stake. As the spending and taxing of this country go, so goes the country and so go we all.

But take heart. The great days of this country are by no means done. If our high-taxers sober up in time, and give the average working man a chance, we will find that we have not even glimpsed the borders of our individual and national achievement. We will still have a real chance to go ahead.

If we did not believe this, we could not be believers in America. Because that faith is America—and America is your land and mine.

(From questions received through the mail from listeners, Mr. Taylor selected the following for comment on this program.)

THE FLAW IN GOVERNMENT PLANNING

Question. We plan for our city building, and for other things, in a central way. Why not let the Government plan profits, plan prices, and plan production?

Answer. We have no single, unified business machine turning out profits or production as a motor turns out juice.

There are 9,000,000 different American men and women in business for themselves. What about them? There are more people in business for themselves in our country than there are members of either of the great trade unions.

Interwoven with this are the individual problems and hopes of the enterprises of this Nation, owned by 18,000,000 stockholders.

The Nation's whole complex enterprising method—the local bakery, the individual store, the big supplying companies, the mines and mills of our great land—cannot be directed and planned in a central manner.

THE SOCIALIZED APPROACH

That is one of the troubles with socialized medicine. The socialized approach to the problem is entirely political, and not practical.

You know Washington as well as I do. Look at the mess the Washington politicians have got their own bureaus into. It may not be entirely their fault, but Washington is probably the most inefficient locality per square inch, of any place in our land.

The job they should be doing in Washington, before they start running this whole country and the world, is reorganizing their own bureaus.

TAKING THE PROFIT OUT OF PROFITS

Question. You say present corporation profits are not as large as reported. If a company does not earn a profit, why must the company call it a profit, and pay a profit tax on it?

Answer. This is because of another wrong feature in our tax laws. Too low an allowance is made for depreciation—that is, for the wearing out of equipment which must be replaced.

Without being too technical, the general fact is that the tax law requires companies to show an equipment depreciation calculated on the basis of original cost, rather than on what it would cost to replace the original tool today.

Suppose, for example, a railroad purchased a freight car some 25 years ago for $2,500. That is about what a freight car would cost 25 years ago. Over a period of time, the railroad company can charge this $2,500 against expense. Then, when the car is worn out, the company, theoretically, is supposed to have the money in reserve to buy a new car and stay in business.

THE RISE IN REPLACEMENT COSTS

But today, when a car must be replaced, it costs $5,000 or more—twice as much. The bookkeeping has shown just half the cost of staying in business. The other half has been shown as profit, when there has been no profit at all. It has been taxed as profit. The money needed to replace the old freight car with the new car, and thus stay in business, is gone.

This is typical of all business using equipment and tools. It's the kind of thing that makes the reported profits look high, when in fact they are too low to support the capital needs for replacement costs, inventory costs, tax liabilities and concurrent risks of doing business today.

PUNISHING THE THRIFTY

Question. My deceased husband worked hard all his life, putting his small savings into shares in leading American enterprises. With each dividend check falling far behind my increased cost of bare living, I am filled with indignation that such a large share should be confiscated in taxes to support others at home and abroad who won't work long hours and sacrifice for savings, as my husband did. Why do so many so-called liberals call themselves liberals when they discriminate against the rewards of hard work and thrift?

Answer. All shareholders in American companies are being discriminated against shamefully—especially the elderly people who devoted their lives to trying to become financially independent. Eighteen million shareholders are getting an awful kicking around because they are silent and unorganized. Moreover, 75,000,000 owners of savings accounts and insurance funds are being mortally hurt by wild tax-and-spend policies.

We hear much about no discrimination against race, color, or creed. As this lady says, "What about no discrimination against thrift?"

Any man is a false liberal who ducks this issue, in your land and mine.

What Is the Fate of America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by the nationally known writer, Larston D. Farrar. I believe it is a penetrating analysis of the basic problems facing this Nation today and that it deserves consideration of every citizen possible.

WHAT IS THE FATE OF AMERICA?

(By Larston D. Farrar)

The proposals of President Harry S. Truman, embodied in his now famous state of the Union message to the Eighty-first Congress, are big news, in a certain sense, but not a single one of the proposals is new, in the sense that it represents any new thinking on the part of the President or his advisers.

Actually, every one of these proposals already has been enacted into law—in other countries. The so-called health and welfare services the President would have the Federal Government give to the Americans were given to the German people by Bismarck and his successors in Germany. The proposals didn't bring peace, stability, and prosperity to the German people and the same proposals, a half of a century later, will not bring peace, stability, and prosperity to the American people.

Alexander Hamilton wrote more than 175 years ago that "new errors appear as oft as new truths." If there is anything new about the Fair Deal program for America, it is that new errors are appearing in a new place under new sponsorship. We, the people, mostly do not have a vast knowledge of history, of government, or of economics. For these reasons, we, the people, without malice aforethought, frequently make terrific errors in judgment as to the people we support and the policies we favor.

No one can say definitely whether or not the people in the recent election gave the President a mandate to attempt to get enacted into law the socialistic program he has presented to Congress—a program that eventually would socialize the medical profession, socialize the housing industry, socialize the electric-power industry, and, eventually, socialize every phase and facet of our economy. But one thing is sure: If the people gave such a mandate, granting they still believe in individual liberty as I believe they do, they are mistaken. They must be shown the error of their ways. It is a thankless task, but not a hopeless one, to educate the American people.

Alexander Hamilton, who, with John Jay, James Madison, and other youthful and elderly leaders of his day, steered the American people into paths of governmental righteousness, recognized well this tendency of the people to be misled. Here is what he had to say about it: "It is just observation that the people commonly intend the public good. This often applies to their very errors. But their good sense would despise the adulator who should pretend that they always reason right about the means of promoting it.

"They (the people) know from experience that they sometimes err; and the wonder is that they so seldom err as they do, beset, as they continually are, by the wiles of parasites and sycophants, by the snares of the ambitious, the avaricious, the desperate, by the artifices of men who possess their confidence more than they deserve it, and of those who seek to possess rather than to deserve it.

"When occasions present themselves, in which the interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the guardians of their interests, to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection. Instances might be cited in which a conduct of this kind has saved the people from very fatal consequences of their own mistakes, and has procured lasting monuments of their gratitude to the men who had courage and magna-

nimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure."

NO MANDATE FOR SOCIALISM

The persons whom the people have appointed to be the guardians of their interests are the Congressmen of the United States. The President never was elected to be anything but an elected officer, to carry out the laws enacted by Congress. Therefore, if the American people, in the recent elections, gave a mandate to their guardians to take a drastic turn toward socialism, it is up to the guardians to withstand the temporary delusions of the people. The people can be wrong—and, if they gave a mandate to put state socialism into effect in this country, they were wrong.

Congress, thus, remains the only hope. We know that the President, most members of his Cabinet, and a small coterie of White House experts, are in favor of carrying this Nation into state socialism. That fact is written on the record. Their own speech betrayeth them. But Congress is not committed to any such program and the vast majority of the Congressmen would be opposed to such a program, if they were sure that the program would lead to totalitarianism. It is up to the people who can see beyond tomorrow to enlighten their Congressmen. It is up to the thoughtful men and women who have money invested in land, homes, stocks and bonds of any kind, and savings in any form whatsoever, to let the Congress know that this country was based on the capitalistic form of government and that, without capitalism, representative government cannot survive. We say that without capitalism representative government cannot survive because, on the record, without capitalism, representative government never has survived longer than a few decades. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. It is impossible to name a country where the people have lost their economic freedom to move about as they please, work when and where they please, invest as they please, take all the risks of society, and maintain that the people have retained their political freedom in the same country. The Russians claim such a development for their country, but only a fool or a knave can believe or maintain that the average Russian has the basic freedoms for which our forefathers fought and died.

There is evidence in virtually every news item that goes out of Washington that the President's program, as unfolded by himself personally, would vastly increase the powers, prerogatives, and personnel of the Federal Government.

Gould Lincoln, the nonpolitical reporter for the staid Washington Evening Star, pointed this out clearly in a recent article in which he stated:

"The recommendations contained in Mr. Truman's message, if enacted into law, will enormously increase not only the civilian personnel of the Federal Government but also will help to multiply the statutes which touch the lives of the people. Here are some of them:

"Public power lines, in connection with further rural electrification.

"More river valley developments, after the Tennessee Valley Authority model.

"* * * Federalized medicine.

"* * * Federalized public education.

"* * * Federal aid for public (subsidized) housing.

"* * * Continuation of rent controls.

"* * * Stand-by power to limit 'unjustified' wage increases. * * *

"These * * * powers, if and when they are used, will require many new employees and officers. No estimate is made by the President of the number of additional Federal employees all these recommendations would place on the Government pay roll. * * *

"The ever-increasing expenditure of Government money, with its drain upon the taxpayer, may result in driving industry to the wall. And if industry fails, the only step left will be for Government to take over.

"It could happen."

Mr. Lincoln might have been even stronger in his analysis. If all the measures recommended by the President for the electrical power industry and for all industry are enacted, private industry will be driven to the wall and will fail. There is no faint doubt about it. And the end result, of course, will be socialization, and, as night follows sunset, communism in effect in America. It not only can happen here—it is happening here.

THE WELFARE STATE

Dorothy Thompson, certainly no hidebound reactionary, foresees the same results of the President's program, if enacted.

"If he has a docile majority in Congress, we now are full steam ahead toward the 'welfare state' which, in modern times, President Roosevelt started here, Bismarck in Europe, and which has engulfed western civilization.

"This state tends toward a condition in which creative forces are drained out of society and paralyzed within the state; in which those who take no personal risks and suffer no personal losses become the master class; in which the earnings of the people are expropriated and returned to them (minus a high commission) in the form of services they may or may not want or need; in which independence is discouraged, and docility and emotional immaturity fostered in the people; and out of which, finally, dictatorship inevitably emerges as social vitality decays and the monster state is bankrupted through the anemia of society.

"The masses of the people will hail it because they cannot foresee the consequences, are unaware of what a departure it is from the political philosophy which made this country great, and because they will not link the welfare state with the decline and fall of Europe.

"* * * The program, in general, is the triumph of European state ideas—especially German state ideas—over the American revolution, and exactly when Europe is in ruins.

"The greatest contribution which America, especially, made to political science through Jefferson and on down through all the authentic American radicals, notably Henry George, was the clear recognition that the state is the enemy of society, and that when you extend the police power (which is the essence of the state) into overexpanding areas of social and economic life, stagnation sets in.

"Insofar as the state has a function in economic life—so argues the authentic American philosophy—it is to protect the widest liberties of the people in their spheres, and relentlessly prevent their encroachment upon the liberties of others, while holding and conserving the legitimate public domain.

"But when it extends its powers to assuming responsibility for the lives of all, it expropriates the people's liberties, for no matter how you cut the design, liberty consists of the right to make one's own bed and lie in it. Children are not free because they are not responsible for themselves. The welfare state reduces adults to semi-infantile conditions.

"It does not create opportunities for independence. It aggrandizes all opportunities to itself. And once the independence of the people is destroyed, it is never restored until the huge structure pyramided on their backs breaks down into anarchy, either through war or by its own weight—as it invariably has.

"There is nothing new about the development. The posthumous history of all great states shows this graph. It never has been a sign of youth but of senility, not of progress but of decay."

So saith Dorothy Thompson. No matter what else she may or may not have written, it is certain that in this analysis of the President's program, she is walking on authentic historical grounds. Note that she, too, leaves the final decision to Congress. The Congress always is the guardian of the people, but today, more than ever, it must be the guard of America's freedoms and of the liberties of individual Americans.

PLANS FOR BIGGER GOVERNMENT

The Washington Evening Star, long noted for its unbiased attitudes and nonpartisan stands on Government questions of national and international moment, hesitated not one moment in labeling the President's program "a long step in the direction of state socialism."

"The essence of this message is an appeal for big government—for a government that will get bigger and bigger as it takes over more and more new functions," the Star points out. "Repeatedly, the President uses such terms as the 'increasing responsibilities on the Government,' and 'the Government has still other opportunities,' to do one thing and another.

"Perhaps a continued expansion of Government is inevitable, and it may be that this is not, in and of itself, a bad thing. But the President ignores the consequences, and they should be made clear.

"The people should understand that bigger Government means more Federal employees and bigger Federal budgets. They should understand that the area of individual initiative and responsibility diminishes as that of Government expands. And it should also be made clear that, historically, the tendency of expanding Government is to feed upon itself, and to grow constantly larger in the process.

"Is it necessary that the Government take on ever-increasing responsibilities?

"Mr. Truman points out that since the boom year of 1929 there has been a population increase in this country of only 20 percent. In the same period agricultural production has increased by 45 percent and industrial production by 75 percent. So we have been making progress, although, in the President's judgment, not enough progress. He would go faster and further."

The Star's owners, obviously, benefit from more and bigger Government. They do business in the Nation's Capital, where Government is the principal industry and where, if Government pay rolls increase, their newspaper prospers more. But they are not as short-sighted, as, say, the businessmen of the Tennessee Valley, who have worked to augment the powers of the Tennessee Valley Authority and to increase its expenditures and appropriations because it means more money to them. The owners of the Star are in business for a profit, and to that extent can be labeled selfish businessmen. But they are not so selfish as to agitate for reforms, or benefits, that are purely illusory and last only for a limited period. The owners of the Star know that if Government continues to get bigger, Government will continue to look for new tasks for itself. One of these new tasks will be to take over the private power industry. When this is done, the bureaucrats will want to take over the steel industry and make it serve the "peepul" more efficiently. After that the railroads will be nationalized. Then the coal mines and the copper mines and all other mines. After that the big chain stores, then the independent stores, and, finally, we will be regimented and dominated by Government employees down to such details as to when to have our hair cut, when to visit the physician, when to have babies, when to buy and when to sell.

The process seems to work slowly. As Alexander Hamilton wrote, "schemes to subvert the liberties of people require time for their execution." But as the process continues, it works faster and faster.

Inevitably, as Miss Thompson points out, the welfare state reduces adults to semi-infantile condition, once the independence of the people is destroyed.

The one arresting fact which disputes the tragic inevitability of this process is that the United States has millions of citizens who are aware of the history of the decline and fall of other civilizations. These citizens are determined to do everything legitimately in their power to prevent a similar decline of this Nation.

For years, political barriers have separated many of these like-minded individuals. Race, religious, and class appeals have been made to divide them, many of these appeals being so cleverly camouflaged as actually to make it seem they were appeals to do away with such divisions. Now, if these millions, regardless of race, creed, color, or political party, can unite to work and talk against the process of socialization, there still is a chance that the process can be reversed and that we can walk again in the paths of political freedom. This country and these people, the early founders of our Republic said, seem to have been made for each other.

If that be true, it is time for the people once more to reveal their strength, to show a greater awareness of the drift, and to arrest the almost relentless march toward statism that seems to characterize our recent history.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter received from Mr. Arnold Schlossberg, of Roanoke, Va., which he has asked me to place in the RECORD:

ROANOKE, VA., *March 5, 1949.*

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: While I am obviously not a constituent, I am presuming to address you as one of your long-time admirers. I am prompted to write about the article, Dogs and Children Not Wanted, from the January 1949 Woman's Home Companion, which you had printed in the RECORD. I am a landlord myself and have always welcomed children where the quarters were adequate. In fact, I have even gone further and taken in families with children in one-bedroom efficiency apartments. Now, I find that the tenant class are much more unsympathetic to the plight of families with children than are most of the landlords today. In my apartments I have cases of single individuals occupying two-bedroom apartments next door to families with two children cramped into a one-bedroom apartment. Due to the arbitrary nature of our rent control adjustments, the two-bedroom apartment rents for little more than the one bedroom apartment so the occupant has refused my request to take smaller quarters and let the apartment be occupied by a family with children. I have many others who are doing the same and of whom I have made no formal request merely because I know I would be considered ridiculous. I, therefore, suggest that in your rent control bill you include a provision prohibiting the hoarding of space by tenants. Frequently, a family unit is broken by divorce, separation, or death. In every case, the survivor continues to occupy the family unit on the ground that it is no more expensive than a single room not subject to controls. This could be stopped by a simple provision in the law. In addition, there ought to be included my former suggestion taking away the right to occupy rent-controlled facilities from families of considerable means so that the landlord could take care of those who are in greater need, choosing from a list certified by the Expediter. Finally, let me say from my sad experience that all of the greed and selfishness in the world is not concentrated among the landlords. It is unfair to continue the constant vilification of the landlords as a group or class when so many are trying to do a good job and when the tenants as a class have proved in my experience to be no more considerate or unselfish.

Yours sincerely,

ARNOLD SCHLOSSBERG.

P. S.—Don't you think, as a matter of fairness, that this reply ought to go into the RECORD?—A. S.

Policy on Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Thomas L. Stokes that recently appeared in the Washington Evening Star, as follows:

POLICY ON GERMANY—CHANGE IN TOP COMMAND OF DEFENSE MAY BRING SHIFT IN STAND ON REICH

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

It is about time for us to recognize the cheerless fact that our war-born ideal to create a different sort of Germany, a truly democratic Germany freed from the strangle hold of the powerful financial-industrial clique that precipitated two world wars, has become badly tarnished.

Whether it is entirely beyond hope of redemption remains to be seen. This may depend on whether the change in the top command of our National Defense Establishment, which has been most influential in German policy, also will bring a change in the policy hitherto directed largely by James V. Forrestal, who is retiring as Defense Secretary, and William H. Draper, Jr., who retired a few days ago as Under Secretary of War.

Their withdrawal has been regarded at least as a necessary prerequisite to a shift of course. For what is needed is a change of mind and attitude. They represented the international finance viewpoint tolerant to such interests in Germany. It was only natural to their background. Both came from long careers as investment bankers, Mr. Forrestal from the presidency of Dillon, Read & Co., of New York, and Mr. Draper from the vice presidency of that same firm, which had interests in prewar Germany.

MAY NOT REVERSE POLICY

Any forecasts about what their retirement means, so far as Germany is concerned, would be premature. For the policy they evolved is the result of gradual steps which it may not be possible to reverse at this late date.

Germany cleverly has played off the United States and Russia against each other. How well she thinks she has done and what she regards as the established United States attitude are indicated in the latest development to attract attention here. In what otherwise might be labeled plain effrontery, German officials included half a dozen men identified with the old Nazi regime among the 12 recommended to us and Great Britain as trustees for the German steel industry, which, under a military government order of several weeks ago, is to be returned to German management along with Ruhr coal and iron industries.

They probably were emboldened to do this by other indications of leniency to ex-Nazis by the United States regime and by the almost complete abandonment several months ago of the anticartel program designed to break up big German monopolies that supplied Hitler's war.

The British, jointly responsible for policy, are reported surprised at our soft attitude; but they are hardly in a position to offer much resistance because of their obligations to us under the European recovery program.

REICH FUTURE IN OUR HANDS

The future of Germany is largely in our hands.

What is involved is a whole system that we fought in the war and pledged ourselves to change. Germany was at the core of it because Germany was, and is, at the core of Europe economically. She dominated Europe financially and industrially. The cartel system that she devised had tenacles in all of Europe—and beyond—so that she could influence other governments politically.

If this old system is resurrected in Germany then it will get new life all over western Europe, for it only remains to fit the old pieces back together again, and there is evidence of this already, notably in the reported rapprochement of French and German financial interests to resume prewar ties. Conversely, if democracy is to survive in Europe, then Germany, itself, must be really democratic. It is not a question of the economic restoration of Germany, which is recognized as essential, but as to who and what interests control it, whether it is democratically controlled, or returned to the feudalists.

Our policy has reflected an attitude not represented by our war aims. Big business influence has permeated our set-up in Germany from the start, though in five successive elections we have repudiated the predominance of that same influence in management of our own affairs here at home. We have exported abroad what we have rejected here. Able men drawn from our Government, men familiar with the problems presented in our original German objectives, were sent to Germany to help with policy, but they were shunted aside and most of them finally gave up in discouragement.

Wage-Hour Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled, "Notice to Farmers":

NOTICE TO FARMERS

Even as this is written efforts are being made to include farmers under the wage-hour law.

In the United States hired farm labor in 1948 numbered approximately two and one-

half million persons engaged as piece-workers, day laborers, weekly wage earners, and some by the month and year. Many receive free housing, free board, or some of the commodities they help to produce. Exceedingly few of them work on a straight hourly basis.

Think of the difficulty of paying a starting wage of 75 cents to $1 an hour, especially when crop prices are falling. Think of the complications of paying the equivalent of the compulsory wage in cash and board or lodging or other facilities. Think of the endless headaches of figuring and paying overtime if that is required—a feature that labor organizations will demand sooner or later.

If Congress removes the exemption of farmers from the provisions of the wage-hour law even to a limited extent, then every farmer is in for trouble. If this goes through, it is the entering wedge which might lead to doing away with the exemption of all farms from the burden of this troublesome and uneconomic law.

In any even, labor organizations will take credit for this amendment and then probably will organize farm labor.

HOW THE WAGE-HOUR LAW AFFECTS YOU

Maybe you do not know much about the wage-hour law. You have heard of it vaguely but no Government inspector has come around to see that you keep your pay-roll records and that you have paid overtime to your workers. No one of your hands has sued you for overtime. None of your hired help has put in a claim and asked the court to assess you for triple damages because you did not pay him for the time it took him to go from his sleeping quarters to the barn. You have not been bothered by the wage-hour law, which has caused so much trouble to manufacturers and other employers of labor.

But don't get the idea that the wage-hour law has not crept into your affairs silently and insidiously like the weevil that get into your grain.

Although you are exempt under the wage-hour law in its wording and phrasing, yet the law has got you whether you know it or not.

Here is how the wage-hour law affects the farmer:

1. It raises your labor costs.
2. It causes your hands to leave you.
3. It brings on inflation, which means that you pay more for fertilizer, implements, necessities, etc.
4. It is sowing seeds of trouble for the future.

Let us see how we arrive at these conclusions. Let us point out that you, too, are a victim of the uneconomic and ill-advised wage-hour law.

THE WAGE-HOUR LAW RAISES YOUR LABOR COSTS

Like the products of manufacture or of a mine, the big part of the cost of the produce of a farm is labor. Because the farmer and his family do much of the work and do not even get paid a salary, he does not always appreciate the value of his own labor. He does not think of it as cost. But every farmer has to hire help, and if he operates a farm of any size he must employ a good many hands to help him. If the wage-hour law forces up wages generally, then the farmer has to raise the wages of his hired help.

It is now proposed to raise the minimum wage rate from 40 cents to 60 cents or even 75 cents per hour. Farmers will be affected by such a rate increase because, if the workers in the towns nearby are getting this much per hour, the farmer will have to pay it too. And remember that when a factory worker works more than 8 hours a day, he gets a 50-percent increase in hourly pay, so that if the minimum wage is 75 cents an hour for 8 hours, 2 extra hours a day will cost the employer 1.12½ cents per hour or $2.25. In a 10-hour day the worker receives $8.25 or 82½ cents per hour.

THE MINIMUM WAGE CAUSES YOUR HANDS TO LEAVE YOU

It is hardly necessary to point out that high wages in the cities cause migration from the farms. Everybody knows what happened during the war. The young men and even the older men left for the big cities to work in the factories and shipyards. Many farmers were hard put to plant and harvest their crops. It is estimated that 10 years ago 8,000,000 more people were getting their mail RFD rather than city delivered as now. The minimum wage of 60 cents or 75 cents an hour will cause many more to leave the farms and go to the cities in the next few years.

THE WAGE-HOUR LAW CAUSES INFLATION, WHICH MEANS THAT YOU PAY MORE FOR FERTILIZER, IMPLEMENTS, AND THE OTHER NECESSITIES

If you buy fertilizer, a tractor, or even the overalls you wear in the field, the biggest part of the cost of these items is labor. Therefore, when wages are forced up by law, the cost of everything must rise. Inflation is an unseen force which you do not realize is there until it is too late. While farmers often are getting fair prices for their produce, they have to pay so much more for everything they buy, and sometimes in the swap they lose. Inflation gets the farmer as quick or quicker than anybody else.

THE WAGE-HOUR LAW IS SOWING SEEDS OF TROUBLE FOR THE FUTURE

The wage-hour law in its effort to establish a minimum wage by law is playing with dangerous forces. It seems to succeed when all is well and the goose honks high; but if prices begin to fall and business recedes, then the minimum-wage law will cause unemployment, a lower standard of living, and business failures for many people. When this happens, the farmer will be the first to feel it.

THE WAGE-HOUR LAW

The wage-hour law was enacted 10 years ago. Its purpose was a social one—that is, an effort to jack up wages so that certain few poorly paid groups of workers would be able to enjoy a higher standard of living. An important feature of the law, which does not concern a farmer except indirectly, is the limitation on the hours of employment—the 40-hour week with overtime for work longer than this. In other words, the law attempts to put a floor under the wages and a ceiling over hours of employment. Theoretically, the idea was to stave off unemployment by limiting the hours of work, thus spreading the work to more people. Actually, it has not worked out this way, as few concerns work two shifts, and their regular workers get paid overtime. This increases the cost of goods and services.

When the wage-hour law was enacted we were just coming out of a great depression and a period of unemployment.

Since the law was passed, because of increased-business activity, the stupendous war effort, and through the efforts of unions, the wages of skilled workers particularly have gone way up and far ahead of the minimum set by law. All wage rates have advanced accordingly. The effect of overtime payments, however, has been a serious one and undoubtedly has caused the high costs that helped to bring about inflation.

The wage-hour law is uneconomic and against the old American idea.

FARMERS SAID TO BE EXEMPT

The law particularly exempts farmers from the application of its restrictions and obligations. Farmers may be exempt from the wage-hour law, but they are not exempt from the law of economics. This means that the unseen forces which come into play in the production and distribution of the products of the farms, mines, and manufactories cannot be controlled by passing a law. The wage-hour law undoubtedly has produced effects all right—sometimes disastrous to some businesses—but the benefits of such laws are doubtful. The experience of several thousand years of recorded history proves that laws that try to dam up economic forces are sometimes futile, and often harmful in their consequences.

The farmer is exempt from the wage-hour law, but he is not exempt from the economic effects of it. When the rest of the community pays more for its help, he will have to pay more. The minimum wage and the overtime provisions not only increase the cost of farm labor, but they increase the cost of the necessities the farmer has to buy. A farmer is not only a laborer, but he is at the same time a capitalist, an entrepreneur or operator, and a merchant. Laws that affect the other sections of the community are bound to affect him. The claim that farmers will benefit by the act is a fallacy.

FORTY HOURS A WEEK

When farmers hear of people working 8 hours a day or 5 days and then knocking off, it is to smile. The farmer, who works from the time the light appears on the horizon in the morning until way after dark when he feeds the mules and cattle, must view with disdain the city worker who complains about getting up at 7 o'clock in order to get to work at 8, and who quits at 5. Someone has said, "Yes, a farmer works 8 hours a day—8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after."

While in the factories and manufacturing plants and the building trades workers are working short hours, getting high pay, and taking it easy, production is not increasing as it should, on the farms of the United States the hours are long, the production is high, and the net profits are small.

STICK TO YOUR HOEING BUT WATCH THE MEN AT THE CONTROLS

You have plenty of work to do, you are doing your part but take time off to look into what's going on at Washington.

If you don't watch out, the law-enforced inflation will lift you so high that you will have a great fall. And all the king's horses and all the king's men cannot lift you up again.

The proposed minimum wage of 75 cents or $1 will be bad for you if it goes into effect. If such a wage can be created by law, "Why," you ask, "Don't they make it $2 an hour or $5 an hour? Isn't that just as logical?"

Let us not try to make the country rich by inflation or by law. Let us do it by thrift and hard work. Therefore, while you are minding your own business and producing the elemental wealth that feeds and clothes the people of the United States—and a big part of the world—use your American right of petition and protest. Ask your friendly Congressman to go slow in passing foolish laws that attempt to make poor people rich, but which may make well-to-do people poor.

United States Unfair to Spies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a news letter called Washington Notes, which I am mailing to constituents this week. The letter follows:

UNITED STATES UNFAIR TO SPIES

The fifth semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission has just been released

by the Government Printing Office. This report contains the type of information which has been refused repeatedly to American newspapers and magazines and has been given the hush-hush treatment in congressional committees.

It is an impressive 213-page document, illustrated with photographs and charts which have stirred up deep resentment and anger on Capitol Hill. On page 17, for instance, is an air view of K–25, the gaseous diffusion plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., giving a very excellent foreground view of the K–27 auxiliary process plant. These Oak Ridge installations were built during the war for the purpose of extracting fissionable U–235 from normal uranium, and they are reported to be the largest such operations in the world today. K–25 has 60 acres under one roof, and the photograph clearly shows it as a U-shaped building, four stories high. An enemy bomber pilot could not ask for a better diagram of these Oak Ridge plants.

Another excellent air view shows the layout of the Argonne National Laboratory, situated in Du Page County, Ill., 25 miles from Chicago. Another shows Brookhaven National Laboratory near Patchogue, Long Island, N. Y.

On page 23 the report prints a map of the Hanford area, a tract of land in the State of Washington, approximately half the size of Rhode Island. This site was purchased by the Federal Government in 1943 as an ideal location for three reactors, chemical separation plants, and supporting facilities vital to the production of plutonium.

To make doubly sure that no error could be made in locating the Hanford area, the report indicates it in a diagram at the junction of the Yakima and Columbia Rivers, in the southwestern corner of the Columbia basin project. On the following page there appears an excellent aerial view of one of the reactor areas at Hanford, where large nuclear reactors transmute uranium into plutonium. The picture clearly indicates surrounding terrain, the mountainous background, Columbia River, and the exact positions of the power plants. Further along in the report, another air view shows the location of a remote-controlled separation plant which extracts plutonium from the materials discharged from the reactors.

To bring the identifying landmarks right up to date, the report produced on page 30 an enlightening air view of the construction camp at North Richland on the Columbia River in the same Hanford area which has been constructed since 1947. This camp houses 12,000 workers and their families. Gas tanks, supply and storage depots are plainly visible.

The text of this report tells exactly what the various atomic plants are doing and their progress to date. It gives general outlines for expansion. It informs the reader that at the close of 1948, fissionable materials production in the United States extended into 15 States and is now carried on in 30 separate plants at 25 locations. Throughout the report are references to the various plants and to the Atomic Energy Commission's contractors. On the whole, it is a very handy and compact reference for anyone looking for this type of information.

This report is available to one and all for the price of 45 cents. While on one hand it may be considered just another example of the ineptness and poor judgment of such left-wingers as David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Board of the Atomic Energy Commission, there is the provocative angle of the United States horning in on the livelihood and security of enemy spies. Granted that spies in the United States are sincere in turning in a day's work for a day's pay, they have been trained and taught to operate by infiltration, corruption, and deceit. They expect to steal or copy and photostat highly important and revealing United States documents and forward them via the usual devious routes to headquarters, let us say, ultimately to the Kremlin. Soviet Russia and her satellites would pay handsomely for such information as is contained in the Atomic Energy report. With such a haul, a good Soviet spy could retire for life. Instead of that, Lilienthal makes the stuff available to everyone for a pittance, and snatches the 1949 Red Star Award for distinguished service right out from under the nose of some deserving Russian espionage agent.

There isn't much point in ranting at the treasonable stupidity of the men charged with the security of this Nation. Despite the now undisputed fact that the Roosevelt administration had been warned months in advance of the Pearl Harbor attack, few Americans have been able to absorb the implications of that crime. Responsibility has been effectively shrugged off by the White House, State Department, and the armed forces.

History repeats itself. For years now, irrefutable evidence has been made public showing that the Federal Government is infiltrated with fellow travelers and Communist Party line followers. At the risk of boring, it has been pointed out time and again that these are by far more insidious, more vicious, and dangerous to the welfare of this country than the card-carrying Communist. They are protected by flannel-mouthed politicians who are beholden to them for votes and political support. Behind the protection of the tangled red tape of a swollen and unmanageable bureaucracy, they consciously or otherwise operate to undermine and weaken the structure of the American Government. Facts, charges, and corroborating evidence have been given to the public, but what has happened? The Administration has effectively throttled the Un-American Activities Committee for its pains in exposing many of these characters, it has smeared and degraded legislators who had the guts to publicize such findings, and more recently it has released an avalanche of propaganda to inform the public that Federal employees are 99 percent pure according to the standards set by the President's loyalty program.

With this as the tip-off to the administration's reaction to any and all exposés of its laxness and ineptness in safeguarding the national security, we merely make the following information available to those interested, knowing full well that nothing will be done to correct the situation.

Last year, under the chairmanship of Congressman JOHN TABER (Republican, of New York), the House Appropriations Committee, in the course of checking over the budget for the Post Office Department, looked into the vast distribution of Government reports, pamphlets, directories, etc. In response to an inquiry to furnish the committee with a list of authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, the Public Printer advised that no such official list is maintained. Only the 443 bookdealers who have deposit accounts with the Government Printing Office were listed and upon investigation it was found that among these were 163 bookdealers in 32 foreign countries. They were accorded a 25 percent discount on the purchase of all United States documents.

It was revealed that one of the most active accounts at the Government Printing Office was that of the Four Continent Book Corp., located at 253 Fifth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. This company is a subsidiary of the Amtorg Trading Corp., official Russian purchasing organization and listening post in this country.

During the year 1948, the Four Continent Book Corp. charged up $5,290 for United States Government publications, many of which were airmailed directly to Russian institutions by the Superintendent of Documents. These United States Government publications, at the discount rate, cost the Russian Government between 20 and 30 cents each and this would indicate that they had ordered approximately 21,160 in the course of that year.

Further probing revealed that the Bureau of Standards, under the direction of Dr. Edward Condon, finally got around to checking its mailing list in January 1948, and decided to drop certain Russian agencies which were getting the Bureau's technical reports and findings. This may have caused some inconvenience to the Russians, but it was quickly corrected by the Four Continent Book Corp. which merely ordered them through its account.

An examination of the subscriptions entered by the Russian book shop indicates a keen interest in all technical and research documents produced by the War Department, National Bureau of Standards, United States Weather Bureau, United States Bureau of Mines, United States Geological Survey, Departments of Commerce and Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Patent Office. The "Smyth Report," for instance, referred to by our Government officials as one of the most significant and revealing documents published in a decade, deals with the Development of Methods for using atomic energy for military purposes. As of August 1948, over 25,000 copies were sold by the Superintendent of Documents, who has no record of the purchasers.

Upon the receipt of the above information, Congressman JOHN TABER inquired about the courtesy list of embassies and legations to which the Government Printing Office sends free of charge any and all United States Government publications. This list is maintained and authorized by the Department of State. And here, Mr. TABER hit the jackpot. The Superintendent of Documents advised him that no embassy or legation had been withdrawn from the official list, which includes 67 foreign governments located in Washington, D. C., including the embassy of the U. S. S. R. and the embassies of nine Russian satellite nations.

It was further discovered that for 3 months after the declaration of World War II, the State Department continued to authorize the issuance of Government reports to agents of Germany, Japan, Rumania, Italy, and Hungary. Finally G-man John Edgar Hoover suggested that the Government Printing Office cease sending these official documents to diplomatic representatives of the Axis Nations. In a letter dated March 10, 1942, Hoover said:

"It has come to our attention that material published by the Government Printing Office is still being forwarded to the diplomatic representatives of the Axis Powers in the United States who are now being detained at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., and Hot Springs, Va. This pertains specifically to many diplomatic representatives of Germany, Italy, Japan, Rumania, and Hungary.

"It is noted that these individuals have been particularly interested in various reports prepared by the Government Printing Office relating to patents, the daily statement of the United States Treasury and other material relating to the economic and national-defense conditions and preparations throughout the Nation.

"In view of the fact that this material has undoubtedly been used in the past and may be utilized by these diplomatic representatives upon their return to their native lands in a manner detrimental to the national defense and safety of this Nation, it is suggested that you may wish to remove the

names of these individuals from the mailing list of your office."

Apparently Congressman TABER's investigation, plus the turn of world events, gave the Superintendent of Documents some qualms because on April 1, 1948, he wrote to the State Department inquiring about the status of the diplomatic courtesy list. After due meditation, the Department of State, on May 11, 1948, gave forth with the following words of wisdom:

"It appears from the information available to the Department of State at the present time that all the embassies and legations in Washington are entitled to receive documents and reports free."

The moral of this investigation? If you are an American citizen, you pay for United States documents. If you are a foreigner, you get them for free.

Resources and Resourcefulness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be considering the President's bold new program for aiding in the development of underdeveloped areas of the world. The words of his inaugural address have lifted the hopes of people everywhere and have placed in proper perspective our own role in working for world peace and security. The bold new program being a long-range one makes it necessary for us to think in long-range terms. In this connection, I would like to insert in the RECORD a summary of remarks made by someone who has given considerable thought to resource development, both in this country and abroad, and who has in this paper emphasized some of the reasons why a bold new program must be undertaken in our own interest and in the interest of the people of the world.

RESOURCES AND RESOURCEFULNESS

(By Arthur E. Goldschmidt, U. S. Department of the Interior. Summary of communication presented before the academy, January 12, 1949)

In celebration of the sesquicentennial of the publication of Malthus' Essay on Population, we are again engaged in speculating upon the problem of whether the natural resources of the earth can long support the human populations that are growing upon it; and, if not, what are we going to do about it?

Human resourcefulness is frequently a major ingredient in natural resources. For that reason, natural resources are necessarily changing and flexible. A substance—a river or an ore body—may become important natural resources or may dwindle in importance as a result of what men do about them. The forests of New England of 300 years ago were as often an obstacle to the utilization of the soil resources that were needed by our forebears as they were resources themselves.

We understand the truism that in order to use resources it is necessary to have them. But in an economic sense it is equally true that in order to have resources it is necessary to use them. My point is not merely that of the pragmatist—that you cannot really have your cake unless you eat it—rather that natural resources can often be enhanced and increased through proper use, and that they will be valuless and may deteriorate if they are not used. This must be taken into account in evaluating our resource position and in developing programs of conservation and utilization.

To be sure, if the two and a quarter billion people on earth today would simply drop dead, there would be no natural-resource problems. These current fears of population pressure upon food supply, which is assumed to result from mankind's agility for survival, would be dispelled, for the earth could amply provide for the more cooperative forms of life that seem to live and die in order to maintain nature's balance.

But this would hardly be a measure for the conservation of resources. For the very concept of conservation assumes that our species is here to stay, that we have a place here and that we have a future. For time and place and condition of servitude to man are as necessary to the idea of conservation as they are to a definition of resources. Conservation is not leaving things untouched—it is wise utilization, and it changes as circumstances and technologies change. It is concerned with the economic well-being of people through sustained-yield production.

While we may disregard the fanciful mathematics of Malthus, the fact is that we still do not know the answer to the question of how many people the earth can support at a minimum level of living—or any other level.

This fact provides, of course, a great temptation to the speculative mind. Any schoolboy can figure out the time when a given rate of increase in the world's population will leave us without standing room on our planet. From time to time eminent scientists, generally somewhat removed from their own particular field of competence, have engaged in this discovery.

Just 50 years ago Sir William Crookes based his inaugural address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science upon this theme of the world's population and food supply. According to the press, he produced a formidable array of statistics on the trends in the ratio between the supply and demand of wheat—all tending to show that, before many decades of the twentieth century would be past, the demand for wheat would be far in excess of the earth's capacity to produce this staple food.

One might wonder whether this eminent physical scientist might have been willing to speculate in one of the fields with which his practical work had made him more familiar, such as electricity, and, if so, whether Sir William might have guessed, for instance, that in these last 50 years we would be using electric power to the extent we use it today. Indeed, the total cropland of this country, including its wheatland, if given over to hay, could not support the horses that would be equivalent to the horsepower in use in our electric motors.

The fact that past speculations on population and food have not been exact does not detract from the seriousness of the present world problem of maintaining and developing resources adequate to its populations. Indeed, the current discussions of population pressure upon resources are doing a service in calling attention to the great need for vigorous and intelligent programs for meeting the problems of placing our own resources on a sustained-yield basis.

When these discussions lead to proposals to solve the resource problem by the elimination of people—other people, naturally—they seem not only premature in the light of our present limited knowledge, but assume an expertise that does not exist. Competent population studies present no basis for an assumption that it is to our national interest or that of the world's future to withdraw medical aid or relief from areas of the world where population and resources are not in balance or otherwise to take measures to raise death rates to conform to birth rates.

Indeed, quite the contrary conclusion might be drawn—that, by raising living levels, a more positive population control is developed. For certainly disease and starvation, where they have persisted, have not proved a cure for overpopulation. Higher levels of living resulting from balanced economic development, on the other hand, have resulted in more stable populations.

Though our knowledge may be too limited to embrace population control as a primary conservation measure, these things we do know: That there are more people on the earth today living at levels below minimum standards of health and well-being than above such levels; that a greater portion of the earth's surface devoted to agricultural production is producing at levels below optimum efficiency; that serious deterioration of soil, forest, water, and other resources is taking place through wasteful and improper use; and that there is presently a net annual gain in the world's population.

It is, therefore, obvious that we cannot continue to disregard our current resource problems, but must undertake programs for their conservation and development; programs of research in techniques of conservation and utilization; programs for protecting our soils, forests, and water from unwise exploitation and placing them on a sound sustained-yield footing; programs for investing in comprehensive river-basin developments to protect and build up our resources; programs for building up underdeveloped areas at home and abroad.

Our limited knowledge of the possibilities of hydroponics, of algae-fed yeast plants, of solar energy, of chemurgy and plastics, can help to fire the popular imagination and stimulate scientific research and discovery, but reliance upon ersatz optimism can become as dangerous as a guide to our resource economics as the dogma of despair.

We cannot rely upon wishful thinking that the natural scientist will invariably find substitutes for failing resources. Or that the social sceintist will find popularly acceptable measures for speedy reversal of birth rates and thus cut our population shoulder to fit our resource cloth.

Substandard living levels and inadequate resource utilization must goad us to the realization that we must take measures to achieve a better balance of resources and people. To this end, we must extend our research. We do not even have an accurate soils map of the world. We need to know more about the possibilities and problems of agricultural production in tropical and subarctic climates. Our knowledge of the world's mineral supplies is still in its infancy. We must develop new sources of usable energy. But bold programs of resource development, based upon known and proved techniques, must be initiated if we are to solve the resource crisis that we recognize here and abroad.

Let us look for a moment at our own resource situation. The last few years of unprecedented levels of production have stretched our resource requirements so taut that we have become acutely aware of our weaknesses and the need for taking measures to overcome them.

Our current economy is converting the labor, raw materials, and savings of our people into our annual gross national product of about $250,000,000,000. The natural-resource input required for this production is staggering and we must be prepared to increase these amounts substantially.

Can we maintain the stability and productivity of the soil under such heavy use? Already 110,000,000 of acres of some of our best croplands are being damaged at critical rates. And 115,000,000 more acres are eroding at a less rapid but still serious rate.

Among our most serious immediate resource problems are those in the mineral field. We are consuming iron ore at the rate of more than 100,000,000 tons annually, and the drain upon our best domestic ores is serious. We are producing only about two-thirds of our copper. Our dwindling supplies of lead make it possible to produce less than half of our requirements. We are deficient in the production of over 30 different metals and minerals which our economy requires.

Our productive economy is dependent upon an input of more than thirty-five quadrillion B. t. u.'s of energy, and our requirements are growing steadily. But only less than 10 percent of our energy is supplied by nonexpendable sources such as wood and water power. More than 90 percent comes from coal, oil, and gas assets that are not unlimited.

Energy is a basic factor in maintaining living standards. One might paraphrase Archimedes and say that with a large enough energy supply, we can raise the level of living of the people of the earth.

There is no question that the heavy utilization of our resources in our current high-level economy is producing problems that call for immediate action to preserve the basis of our national well-being and security. The scope of that action must be as wide as the subject of natural resources itself. And the action required must be taken by individuals and through their common institutions, particularly their governmental organizations.

The land resources of the country can be maintained and improved only through the cooperation of the nearly 9,000,000 individuals, upon whom as farmers, farm owners, and workers we are finally dependent for the protection of this basic asset. To be sure, researches of colleges, experiment stations, and other public and private agencies must aid in our gaining the knowledge necessary to this job. And Government programs are essential. Public funds for soil erosion work for improvement of conservation practices, for the irrigation of arid lands, and other efforts to prevent the waste of soil resources are investments of a high order.

The recent increases in farm production owing to improved technology were in the main results of true conservation measures. They reflect progress in mechanization, increased use of lime and fertilizer, use of superior seeds and planting stocks, more effective control of diseases and insects that destroy crops and livestock, use of cover crops and other soil- and moisture-conservation practices, increase in irrigation of land and the fuller electrification of rural areas that permit better utilization of the farmers' time.

Such conservation measures are also production measures and they depend upon the well-being of the individual farmer and farm worker. A farmer struggling to maintain his family may not be able to afford, in his individual capacity, to undertake the conservation practices that the Nation cannot afford to have him disregard. A poor farmer may not have the time and money to learn better ways of farming, to apply soil-building materials, to improve stocks and herds or to invest in check dams and terracing.

In other fields, programs of protection and improvement of our resources are similarly essential and possible, and they are linked to maintaining a high-level economy.

The problems of our nonrenewable mineral resources are particularly serious, for by their nature they are not subject to sustained-yield production. Here, to be sure, sound mining methods, that assure the use of all of the ores, instead of leaving half of them in the ground, are a primary conservation necessity. In addition, the utilization of lower grades of ores must be encouraged through the use of newer processes that have been developed to make this possible.

In the realm of nonrenewable resources more than in any other, our localized view of the resource problem must be broadened. For in this field our interdependence with other areas of the world is becoming more and more obvious. To be sure our interest in developing the undeveloped resources in the rest of the world is broader than our concern for raw materials, but this problem is pressing in the field of minerals. Such splendid isolation as we may have enjoyed in the past, on the theory of our unlimited natural resources, must be reconsidered in the light of our serious inadequacy to produce the ores for steel, copper, lead, and a host of minor metals that our economy needs. Even in petroleum our imports are beginning to match our exports.

The development of synthetics and substitutes and the utilization of lower grades of ores are dependent upon the availability of energy. If we are to beneficiate taconite to maintain our iron-ore supply, we must have energy. If we are to develop light metals as substitutes—aluminum, magnesium, or titanium—we must have an astronomical number of kilowatt-hours. If we are to irrigate arid lands for greater production of food, we must have energy to pump water upon them. If we are to increase production by the use of fertilizer, energy is a principal component of its manufacture. Indeed, in resource economics we laymen learn as surely as the atomic physicist that energy is matter.

In the unused powers of our rivers we lose nearly 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, or more power than we produce in all of our electric plants today. This waste is not only on the Missouri and the Columbia or the Colorado, a substantial portion of it is taking place right here in New England, where at least 13,800,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually are lost in the unused powers of your rivers. A pioneer in the use of water power, this region has developed less than a fourth of its potential.

In discussing our own resource problems and possibilities of solution, I have emphasized the close connection between economic conditions and conservation practices. This is not because I believe that conservation programs can be properly measured in dollars and cents, or that we can view so basic an asset as the soil, on which we and our children and theirs must live, in the same manner as we should the operation of a peanut stand. Indeed, we sorely need a new concept in bookkeeping—as fundamental as some of the newer concepts in physics—to assay resource problems and guide us to solutions. Were the terraces upon which the Andean Indians spent the equivalent of $20,000 to $30,000 per acre unwise investments? For hundreds of generations their agriculture founded the basis of a stable and highly developed civilization.

What is the value of a modern water-conservation project, like that in the basin of the Columbia River, that not only creates homes and livelihoods on a million acres of land, but that provides power for industrial developments and results in a balance of agriculture and industry? What are cities like Phoenix and Yakima and Spokane and Boise "worth"?

Recognition of the interrelationship of high levels of economic activity with conservation is also necessary to consideration of the world problem of natural resource development. The areas of the world that have been used merely as sources of raw materials, that have not been taken into partnership in the growth of world civilization through industrial and agricultural balance, are the areas where conservation practice has lagged most lamentably, and where the problems of population pressure upon resources are most evident.

In the development of those newer areas of the world, either for the addition to the land resources of the world, or for their mineral resources, attention to the balance of industry and agriculture is essential. In newer areas, such as the great untapped regions of Alaska, resources must be developed in combination—soils, water and forests, power and minerals must be considered together. Exploitation of one resource alone will lead to an unbalance that may take decades to undo, and will result in improper use and waste of resources.

We have learned the value of combined resource development in our own Tennessee Valley, and in our multiple-purpose river-basin work on our western streams. We have learned that river planning must include planning for watershed protection, adequate forest and grazing management, fish and wildlife preservation. We have learned that cheap power brings industry and raises the level of living of the farmer. We have learned that it makes possible the utilization of mineral and other resources of the area. Such combined resource development makes for the economic stability necessary for the full flowering of our democratic institutions and for the hopefulness for the future that will ever be the real drive behind proper conservation.

Other countries are also taking steps toward combined development: in Venezuela, resources from oil are being invested in programs for the conservation and development of assets that will create a balanced economy when oil supplies dwindle. In the Philippines, plans for the fitting of the resources of the islands into a balanced economic program are under way. In India, in Ceylon, in Pakistan, programs for multiple-purpose water developments to provide for irrigation, navigation, and power are a first order of business of these newer governments. These developments are motivated by the pressure for higher levels of living. Their encouragement will pay dividends in the struggle to achieve a balance of food and population and at the same time result in improved conservation practices.

The United Nations itself has concerned itself with the problem of resource conservation and development. Through its Economic and Social Council, a United Nations Scientific Conference on the conservation and utilization of resources has been called and will be held in the United States next summer to bring together engineers, economists, scientists, and other experts from the various resource fields to exchange experience.

The world's store of scientific and practical knowledge of techniques of resource conservation and development is itself one of the world's greatest resources and one that grows with use and is enlarged by sharing.

The postulate that proper resource conservation and utilization practices are dependent upon the maintenance of adequate levels of living provides a guiding principle for action. That action is to encourage the development of the world's resources for the benefit of its people. In his review of this Nation's resources position a year ago, Secretary Krug pointed out that "world-wide production and world-trade leading to an intelligently balanced use of the world's resources * * * is an essential to our own continued well-being and security. * * * Without a sound world economy, the United States cannot hope to provide the raw materials necessary for the peaceful development of its economy and cannot expect to be secure in its future."

Low living standards and depressions add immeasurably to waste and deterioration of the world's natural resource base. And low living standards and depressions are as catching as the common cold.

The task of this country, therefore, is not to seek an isolation that we cannot achieve, but to move against the disease of resource destruction and disuse. We can provide the knowledge and facilities that will bring un-

developed resources of the world into being. We can share the experience that will assure their conservation and proper utilization. Indeed, we are in the best position to provide the leadership to such necessary programs.

The problems are intermeshed and their solutions are interrelated. Proper resource conservation and development anywhere will profit the planet everywhere.

Great Child Hunt Is on—Host of Stolen Waifs Sought in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Theodore H. White that appeared in the Detroit News of Tuesday, March 8, 1949:

GREAT CHILD HUNT IS ON—HOST OF STOLEN WAIFS SOUGHT IN EUROPE

(By Theodore H. White)

STUTTGART, GERMANY, March 8.—Fifty international investigators are starting on the greatest child hunt Europe has ever known.

Backed by United States and British military governments, and financed by half a million dollars from the International Refugee Organization, the International Tracing Service will scan every adoption record and orphanage roster in Germany for the last 10 years to find an estimated 100,000 missing children.

Most are waifs seized from homes throughout Europe by Adolf Hitler's mass-kidnaping organization, the Lebensborn.

Children whose blond hair and blue eyes made them racially eligible were adopted into the German population.

Between 30,000 and 40,000 of these children were sent home by UNRRA and the Allied armies in the early postwar years.

How many are left, and how many can be found, no one now knows precisely.

LAST TRY IS MADE

Last year, cramped by lack of funds and blocked by local stubbornness, the ITS could locate only 1,000 children. This year's new dragnet will probably register half a million children adopted in Germany since 1939; from these records the tracing service hopes to pick up enough clues to locate another 10,000 children kidnaped from foreign lands. It is a last try.

At best, authorities guess that 50,000 children will be lost forever.

Looking for a child 6 years after it has been stolen, in a torn country where most records have been scattered if not deliberately falsified, makes finding a needle in a haystack easy. Investigators have to be linguists, detectives, and child psychologists. An 8-year old seized when he was 3, and who now speaks only German, can scarcely remember his origins.

AWAKEN MEMORIES

Sometimes the investigator relaxes the child by speaking soothingly in German, then casually drops a question in Polish, French, or Croatian into the conversation. The child answers casually in the same language, and his nationality is proved.

Occasionally a lullaby or snatch of Christmas song will kindle remembrance. Once his nationality is established, the investigators must go on to find his original name, his home town, his parents' names.

Sometimes the child's only memories are odd impressions—the color of the house next to the baker shop; his uncle's beard; the shrill voice of his aunt.

The nerve center of the child hunt is a loft in a wing of a woolen factory in Esslingen, in southern Germany. On cards are recorded the names of 75,000 children about whom inquiries have been made or information is available. There are 75,000 cards in the catalog—but there are only 18,000 case histories of children located.

GERMANS HOLD BACK

German cooperation has so far been cold and forced; Germans who have adopted foreign children are reluctant to give them up, and their officials shield them.

Merely locating a child is not enough. Frequently the complications begin only after the child is found.

Take the case of Marian Gajewy, a Polish boy born in Poznan in September 1935. He was seized by the Lebensborn and certified as fit for adoption by German couples. He was moved first to an orphanage in Kalisch, then to another in Austria, and finally was adopted by a German family.

The Lebensborn destroyed all records of his origin, but forgot to destroy the files of a company with whom they insured children under a group policy. In the office of the insurance company, an alert investigator discovered the boy's name, birthplace and ultimate disposition.

He had been taken in 1944 by an SS colonel who lived in a handsome gray stucco home right in Esslingen, two miles from the headquarters of the child hunt!

PARENTS MISSING

Checking the record further, the tracers found that the colonel, one Karl Denzler, was listed in category II of Nazi war criminals, was an unrepentant Nazi, had adopted the child in 1948 in Esslingen with documents of questionable validity and refused to give him up.

It is now up to the Polish Government, through diplomatic channels, to convince the United States military authorities that the boy should be handed back.

Meanwhile Colonel Denzler, who appears to be doing quite well, blusters and says no one can take the boy away from him.

In preparing for the big operation, the ITS ran an experimental dragnet through Esslingen itself.

When they checked Denzler's possession of the child against the Esslingen records, they found that local German officials had omitted the case entirely. How many other thousands of foreign children will remain hidden in undiscovered files no one will ever know.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune today reports that the New York County Medical Society, the largest constituent body of the American Medical Association, has turned down the AMA's $25 assessment to provide a fund for lobbying against the national-health-insurance legislation.

I want to call particular attention to the reasoning of those opposed to the assessment as reported by this Republican newspaper. It said:

Opponents of the assessment accused the AMA of consistently fighting change and charged that the "educational plan" was merely propaganda for maintaining the status quo.

Apparently the AMA's biggest group of members agreed, for the vote against the assessment was 432 to 333.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article from the New York Herald Tribune of March 1:

NEW YORK PHYSICIANS REVERSE STAND ON AMA LEVY—COUNTY SOCIETY, LARGEST IN ORGANIZATION, VETOES $25 ASSESSMENT, 432 TO 333

The New York County Medical Society, largest member group of the American Medical Association, last night withdrew its support of the AMA's plan to combat compulsory health insurance. The AMA plan calls for a $25-a-member assessment to raise $3,000,000 for an "educational campaign" in behalf of various voluntary prepayment systems.

At its last meeting, on January 24, the society passed a resolution which approved the assessment and in general backed the AMA's stand on the matter. Approval was carried by a clear majority, but only after bitter debate. It was then voted to reconsider the motion at the next meeting.

That meeting was held last night and the resolution was defeated, 432 to 333. The meeting was held at the New York Academy of Medicine, 2 East 103d Street.

Also defeated in last night's session was another resolution, offered by the society's executive committee, to approve a 12-point program that has been offered by the AMA as a "constructive" answer to the Government's proposed compulsory insurance plan. This resolution, however, will be reconsidered at the next monthly meeting of the society, March 28, and could be adopted or amended at that time.

Opponents of the assessment accused the AMA of consistently fighting change and charged that the "educational plan" was merely propaganda for maintaining the status quo. Proponents answered that they were in favor of voluntary health-insurance plans because they have proved workable. They said they were opposed to government control of medicine because such a plan had been tried in other countries and had led to the demoralization of medicine.

In some cases the speakers resorted to invective and often ill feeling was obvious. Both sides charged at least once that the other was trying to slip something through by unethical parliamentary procedure.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the City Commission of Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Whereas the city commission, under file 88239, has received a request for a resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Grand Rapids, and the State of Michigan in session assembled:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memoralize and petition the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending designating October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Michigan.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which has been directed to the President from Mr. Ernest H. Gaunt of the Andover-Gaunt Textiles, Inc., Lawrence, Mass.:

MARCH 4, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: May I respectfully suggest that if your advisers on tariff and reciprocal trade agreements have not apprized you of these facts, that you yourself take them into consideration. You can have their accuracy checked. I myself have checked their accuracy and believe them to be correct.

Greater Lawrence, which depends almost entirely on the manufacture of woolen-worsted cloth, now has 10,000 employees out of work. This has come about gradually, but the speed of displacement has increased very rapidly in the last 3 months.

This accelerated displacement of woolen-worsted wage workers is very largely the result of the reciprocal-trade agreements in the form they were before the now proposed further reduction which has passed the House.

During 1948, there were 8,000,000 yards of cloth, 2½ times as much as in 1947, imported from England. The British Board of Trade has announced that it expects to increase this by 80 to 90 percent during 1949.

This 8,000,000 yards of cloth, all of which can be woven here in the city of Lawrence, at high wages, would currently employ on three shifts the 10,000 unemployed for the first 3 months of this year.

On one shift this 8,000,000 yards will employ 10,000 for 9 months of this year.

Your advisers on tariff and reciprocal trade agreements can easily tell you what further disaster will happen to this area of Greater Lawrence (as well as to other textile areas in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania)—if the tariff rates are further reduced as proposed in the pending legislation.

From the point of view of small manufacturing establishments in the woolen-worsted industry, this exporting of 10,000 jobs to England, has also hurt many small woolen-worsted manufacturers. The woolen-worsted industry together with the clothing-manufacturing industry, is one of the two remaining industries which still have a large proportion of small plants.

This 8,000,000 yards of cloth would run 32 plants of my size for a full year; or 16 small plants employing 200 for one year; or 64 smaller plants employing about 50 workers, for 1 year.

I doubt if your advisers from the west and south, who have products to export, and those from Detroit who want to export automobiles, and those who want to export American office machines—will tell you how they are benefiting at the expense of the large woolen-worsted cloth manufacturing industry, the watch industry and other industries.

I doubt that your advisers have pointed out to you that the English and Italian and Japanese (and soon the French, Belgian and Czechoslovakian) woolen-worsted manufacturers—are not going to supply funds to the United States of America to pay the rapidly rising unemployment benefits to United States wage workers.

Nor can our United States Government tax the profits of English, Italian, Japanese, French, Belgian and Czechoslovakian woolen-worsted manufacturers.

How do your advisers propose to raise the vast sums necessary to pay these unemployment benefits during the approaching recession or depression?

And how do your advisers propose to raise taxes to replace those which your free-trade policies will make United States manufacturers unable to pay because they will have no profits to be taxed?

Under the principle of indemnification, as when land is taken by right of eminent domain, when a project is considered to be for the general welfare—shouldn't the wage workers in the textile industries and other industries affected by the reciprocal trade agreements, be fully indemnified for the export of their jobs?

And shouldn't the owners and stockholders of small textile and other industries who are now losing their assets, be paid from the general treasury on the theory that the reciprocal trade agreements are for the general welfare of the United States of America, and of the world?

I sincerely doubt whether in the short long-run, the lowering of tariff rates will benefit the general welfare either of the United States of America, or of the world.

But if I am wrong and your advisers are right—shouldn't this parity or indemnification be paid to United States displaced wage workers and United States displaced small manufacturers?

Yours respectfully,
ANDOVER-GAUNT TEXTILES, INC.,
ERNEST H. GAUNT.

Reed-Bulwinkle Act Hurts South—Relaxation of Antitrust Laws Not Proper Method for Solving Freight Rate Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include an article concerning the Reed-Bulwinkle Act, passed during the last session of Congress, which law exempts the railroads from the provisions of the Federal antitrust laws. This article has been called to the attention of the members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, and I commend its reading to the membership of the House and others interested in this subject.

The article is as follows:

The Georgia rate case in 1944 against the principal eastern and southern railroads was not just another lawsuit under the Sherman Act. It was an unprecedented appeal to the courts by one of the sovereign States to strike down the man-made discriminatory freight rate barrier to the development of the human and material resources of the Southern States. It was a major attempt to eliminate the poverty that was an evil in itself and the source of some of the gravest problems of this underdeveloped region. The suit by the State of Georgia gave the promise of better living standards for 25,000,000 people resident in 9 States.

In March 1945, the Supreme Court accepted jurisdiction in the Georgia suit. Over the next 3 years the financial interests controlling the railroads waged a determined fight to exempt the carrier rate-making organizations from the Sherman antitrust law and thus destroy the Court's jurisdiction. Finally, in 1948, the Reed-Bulwinkle measure providing for such exemption was enacted into law by the Eightieth Congress over President Truman's veto. The high purposes of the Georgia suit were swept aside. At the dictation of a powerful financial lobby the Supreme Court was deprived of jurisdiction. They demanded and retained their ability to extract monopoly profits even at the cost of lower living standards for millions of people in many States.

The basic contention in the Georgia suit is that the defendant railroads were linked in an alliance with northern manufacturing and financial interests to enforce a system of discriminatory freight rates against the products of southern industry. The conspiracy was designed to prevent the products of southern industries from competing with the products of northern industries in their rich and populous home markets. The rate discriminations had, over a period of years, brought widespread complaints from southern shipping and producing interests, Congressmen, and governors during the thirties without any remedial action by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TVA ATTACKS DISCRIMINATORY RATES

In January 1939 a Tennessee Valley Authority study of this problem, issued as a congressional document, held that high, discriminatory freight rates constituted a great handicap to the development of manufacturing industries in the South and West. In February 1939 a Senate committee held hearings on proposals to eliminate these discriminations by statutory enactments. Finally, in July 1939, after years of prodding by southern governors and Congressmen, the Commission launched an investigation to determine whether the existing system of freight rates caused undue preference and prejudice among the regions of the country. Five years later in 1944 the Commission had not yet submitted its report.

In this situation, the State of Georgia in 1944 attacked the principal eastern and southern railroads in the United States Supreme Court, charging the defendants with conspiracy to cripple the economy of the State of Georgia and the entire South. Destruction of this conspiracy would benefit not only Georgia but the entire South.

The Supreme Court took jurisdiction in March 1945. The defendants are charged with conspiracy to restrain trade and commerce by fixing arbitrary and noncompetitive rates for transportation of freight by railroad to and from Georgia. The rates are alleged to be fixed as "(a) to deny to many of Georgia's products equal access with those

of other States to the national market; (b) to limit in a general way the Georgia economy to staple agricultural products, to restrict and curtail opportunity in manufacturing, shipping, and commerce; (c) to frustrate and counteract the measures taken by the State to promote a well-rounded agricultural program, encourage manufacture and shipping, provide full employment, and promote the general progress and welfare of its people; and (d) to hold the Georgia economy in a state of arrested development." The complaint alleges also that the rates so fixed are approximately 39 percent higher than the rates for like commodities and distances between points in the North.

Justice Douglas expressed the Court's position with eloquence and force.

"If the allegations of the bill are taken as true, the economy of Georgia and the welfare of her citizens have seriously suffered as a result of this alleged conspiracy. Discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers. They may cause a blight no less serious than the spread of noxious gas over the land or the deposit of sewage in the streams. They may affect the prosperity and welfare of a State as profoundly as any diversion of waters from the rivers. They may stifle, impede, or cripple old industries and prevent the establishment of new ones. They may arrest the development of a State or put it at a decided disadvantage in competitive markets. Georgia, as representative of the public, is complaining of a wrong, which if proved, limits the opportunities of her people, shackles her industries, retards her development, and relegates her to an inferior economic position among her sister States."

MORE DISCRIMINATION: 1945–48

From 1945 to 1948 when the Reed-Bulwinkle proposal to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws was being urged on Congress important and authoritative new evidence on freight rate discrimination against the South was made public. The ICC in May 1945, a few weeks after the Court took jurisdiction in the Georgia case, handed down a decision and order on discrimination in interterritorial freight rates culminating the investigation begun in 1939. The order made a beginning toward correcting the discriminations.

The Commission's order was upheld by the Supreme Court which declared the inference of prejudice to the South and West to be irresistible and that its continued maintenance "preserve not the natural advantages of one region but man-made trade barriers which have been imposed upon the country."

The decisions by the Supreme Court in accepting jurisdiction in the Georgia case (1945) and in enforcing the order by the Interstate Commerce Commission (1947) indicated a very real possibility that the discriminatory rate practices against the products of southern industry by defendant northern and southern railroads would be held to violate the Sherman Act. Since they had no intention of surrendering their control over railroad affairs, the financial interests who controlled the rail carriers took the only course open to them. They coerced the Eightieth Congress into exempting the railroads from the Sherman Act thus denying the people of the South the right to have this issue decided in the country's highest court.

The combination was formed in 1934 in an effort to ward off indulgence in competitive business practices by the operating officials of the railroads. The depression of the early thirties genuinely alarmed the managers of industrial and railroad investments who came to believe that the only way of preventing a wholesale decline in the value of securities of railroads and other industries controlled by them was to preserve the high and discriminatory freight rates that made monopoly profits possible. The task of forming a new organization was entrusted in 1933 to a national steering committee of railroad directors. The members of this committee and their principal financial and industrial affiliations were:

Pierre S. du Pont—director, Pennsylvania Railroad, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, General Motors. Mr. du Pont was, of course, a powerful financial figure by virtue of his holdings in the various du Pont companies, including General Motors. According to Senate Document No. 206, Seventy-ninth Congress, Economic Concentration and World War II, the Pennsylvania Railroad is in the Kuhn Loeb & Co. financial interest group.

Under the leadership of Pierre du Pont and General Atterbury and associates of the Pennsylvania Railroad a plan for the private government of the railroads of the United States was evolved which was consummated on September 21, 1934, the new organization being known as the Association of American Railroads. The overlordship of the new organization by the railroad directors on the steering committee was provided by naming a member of the director's steering committee as financial adviser to the new association. While there was no provision for the systematic review of the AAR's decisions such as was provided under the western agreement by the committee of directors, the steering committee stood ready to compel "a subordination of individual initiative to the dictates of group interest." The Georgia brief charges that "gradually the financial groups came to regard the association as merely a convenient vehicle for carrying out the recommendations they arrived at in Wall Street."

The domination of the big northern railroads over the railroads of the South was affected through a maze of rate-making associations all of which were subordinate to the new AAR. The Interstate Commerce Commission conceded this control (235 ICC 329–1939), "we are persuaded that the northern carriers as a group actually do effectively control the rates within the North and also the north-bound interterritorial rates * * *."

The Georgia complaint charges that results detrimental to the South were brought about by some 60 private-rate bureaus, committees, conferences, and associations which were utilized by the defendants to fix freight rates; that no southern road could change joint through rates without the approval of these private agencies; that this private rate-fixing machinery which was not sanctioned by the Interstate Commerce Act and which was prohibited by the antitrust acts put the effective control of rates to and from Georgia and other States of the South in the hands of the defendant northern railroads and the AAR.

The complaint also charges that the defendants whose lines were wholly or principally in the South are "dominated and coerced" by defendant northern roads and that they cannot publish joint through rates because in many instances the northern carriers refuse to join in such rates. One of the means through which the coercion was executed was the joint conference of contact committees in which each of seven regional freight associations have one vote. Since the four freight associations in official territory usually stood united in opposition to the proposals by southern carriers for interregional rates equal to those in official territory the proposals would fail even where the two western associations supported the South.

AAR BOOSTS SOUTHERN RATES

At the height of the dissatisfaction in the South with interregional freight rates into the northern or official territory, Mr. Pelley, president of the AAR, in 1937 reminded the presidents of the southeastern railroads that the South lacked the "highly integrated system of filings, docketings, reviews, and appeals" used by the organizations in the East and West "to better control the rate situation and to avoid to the fullest extent consistently possible rate erosion." Mr. Pelley strongly recommended an organization substantially the same as was used in the East and West and the executives of the dominant southern lines readily accepted the proposal, one southern executive even reporting "that for several years it has been entirely too easy a matter to get on the docket propositions for reduction in rates."

The southern tariff executives devised a plan to "prevent improper whittling away of rates." The scheme followed the lines of the plan found effective in the North. Thus southern industry has been saddled with high discriminatory rates in shipping to the northern and eastern sections of the United States.

Lake Calumet-Sag Channel Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Chicago and especially in the sections on the South Side of that city is a keen interest in the Lake Calumet waterways development. This is a project which when completed will affect most beneficially the entire Nation. For the States of the Middle West, reaching out to share in the growing export trade which more and more is becoming a vital factor in our national economy, it is a project of urgent necessity.

During the war years progress on the Lake Calumet waterways project was necessarily halted. Now it is the universal sentiment among the people of Chicago, and I think rather generally among the people of the Middle Western States, that actual work on this project should be resumed with the least possible delay.

With this objective, a request has been made for an appropriation sufficient to do certain preliminary work and to deepen what is known as Sag Channel, one of the tributary waterways. In support of this appropriation arguments were made on March 2, 1949 before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations by Stuart Bradley, Esq., a distinguished Chicago lawyer representing the Chicago Chamber of Commerce and industry and by Congressmen Thomas J. O'Brien, James V. Buckley and Neil Linehan, the last two of whom represent districts in which the project is located. Responsive to the wish of my constituents, and in service to their interest, I accompanied this delegation and presented such argument in support of the appropriation as due regard for the time of a busy subcommittee of my colleagues seemed to me proper.

That the Members of the House may be familiar with the merits of this vitally important development, as seen by the people of the Second District of Illinois, and under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include my remarks before the subcommittee of the Committee

on Appropriations on the Lake Calumet-Sag Channel project:

Mr. Chairman, to the people of the district which I represent in the Congress no project of the Federal Government could hold greater interest than the development of Lake Calumet and the system of waterways connecting it on the one side with Lake Michigan and on the other side with the Mississippi River and the Gulf of Mexico.

For the 8 years of their distinguished service in the Congress the Honorable Raymond S. McKeough and the Honorable William Rowan, with vision of the tremendous benefits ahead for Chicago and indeed the entire Middle West, devoted themselves tirelessly and with fruitful efficiency to the advancement of this great project. By their efforts they brought the project to a place where but for the intervention of conditions arising from World War II the dream of our people for several decades surely would have been realized.

As the present representative in the Congress from the Second District of Illinois, so outstandingly represented by my predecessors, Mr. McKeough and Mr. Rowan, I could not do less than appear here today to urge upon this committee the provision for an appropriation adequate to do the work immediately required to be done and working toward the ultimate completion of a development of gigantic potentialities and upon which the hard and essential legislative spadework was so well done by the two gentlemen who for four successive terms brilliantly represented the Second District of Illinois.

Since that time there has been in Illinois a reapportionment of the congressional districts, and the area wherein is located this project is mainly in the district now represented by the Honorable JAMES BUCKLEY and in part in the district represented by the Honorable NEIL LINEHAN, who are here today to urge this appropriation more forcibly than can I, and with more particularity. To them, as properly I should, I leave the principal presentment.

But whether the project is in the Second District or, as is fact, in territory closely adjacent thereto, is of no moment. Every man and woman—I would say every child of high-school age—in my district is keenly alerted in enthusiastic championing of this great development. There is not, in my knowledge, a business or a labor group, or a women's club, or a post of war veterans, or indeed of any civic group in all the Second District of Illinois which is not for this project.

It is because the people in my district, having had the benefit of a discussion of the matter for several decades, are thoroughly familiar with it and the endless possibilities certain to be opened up when the ships of the world come to anchor and to load in Lake Calumet and for many miles will stretch the factories and plants of the greatest of all industrial districts.

For my own part I have believed in the future of Lake Calumet and the navigation project about as long as I have had adult years. To me it seemed inevitable that the improvement in all its fullness would come and with its completion Chicago, as the servitor of all the rich Middle Western domain in a new era of world and domestic commerce opened up, would surpass by far her marvelous growth from a village on the river to the great inland metropolis of the United States.

It is my well-considered judgment, shared in I am certain by many men and women of balanced minds and conservative sense in evaluations, that with the completion of the entire improvement there will come a metropolitan growth on the South Side of Chicago and extending to the Indiana line which will equal if it does not surpass in population the Chicago of today, all adding up to making the new Chicago resulting therefrom conceivably the first city of the world in wealth, territory and population.

It is natural, therefore, that the people of the district I represent, being so advantageously located to benefit directly from the marvelous expansion expected are looking with such keen eagerness to the Eighty-first Congress to clear the way after the halt enforced by the destructive years of warfare, to clear the way for the resumption of this great constructive work by making available the appropriation immediately needed in certain preliminary work and in deepening the Sag Channel to permit the free passage of vessels in their voyage to and from the dockage at Lake Calumet.

Of this, Congressman BUCKLEY and Congressman LINEHAN, who by diligent study and long periods of personal inspection and investigation, have acquired a broad and comprehensive technical knowledge and understanding of the subject, will speak at great length.

I wish to address myself briefly to the phase of how this improvement fits into the pattern of the modern America we are setting about to build in a changed and of-the-today world. Suffice to call to mind the trend, forced by modern developments in efficiency of production and of distribution, toward staggering industries and widely distributed areas of industrially employed populations. In times of peace and contented normal living, which devoutly we hope and pray will ever be our blessing, it is the trend which inevitably will continue. In time of war, which, while we stand united in our firm determination, must never come again, yet must we never in folly forget that in atomic warfare no nation with concentrated industries and population can hope to survive, it is much more than the following of a trend. It is the acceptance of the only rule of survival known to common sense.

This project contemplates that ultimately ocean-going vessels will come through Calumet Harbor from Lake Michigan and the Atlantic beyond, that ocean-going vessels will come through the Sag Channel from the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico beyond, that these vessels will discharge their cargoes on the docks at Lake Calumet from whence run a network of railroads servicing a vast territory.

With such facilities for the cheap and prompt handling of coal and other freight, made available throughout a wide range, it follows as day the night that industrial plants, not clustered together fighting for breathing space, but separated and well scattered, will dot this extensive area.

While the direct benefits of the development will go first to the territory in Chicagoland and in adjacent Indiana, and then generally to the States of the Middle West, the indirect benefits will be general throughout the Nation. That the prosperity, well-being and security of the country will be greatly advanced no one, I believe, will question.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generous allowance of the time of a very busy committee which you have granted me and in closing wish to remark that if any proof of the vital interest of the great city of Chicago in this project were needed such is furnished by the presence here of the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, distinguished and beloved member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and, in the esteem of his colleagues of Illinois and of the people at home, spokesman for all Chicago in matters of great importance and of deep concern to that city.

Stalin Tries To Undermine Slavic-Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, while Dictator Stalin is trying to distract us with his phony peace offensive, the agents of the Kremlin are working desperately to undermine the loyalty of the American people to the United States. This is part of the Communist scheme of conquest by fifth-column tactics, in exactly the same manner as it was part of Hitler's method.

Soviet propaganda has been directed chiefly at the 10,000,000 Americans of Slavic descent. The importance of this activity is evident if we recall that as much as 50 percent of the working force in many of our major industrial centers—such as Detroit and Pittsburgh—is of Slavic origin. The American Slavs were part of the sinews of our wartime industrial armament, just as they are a vital part of our peacetime prosperity.

The deadly parallel between Hitlerite and Stalinist propaganda methods was brought forcefully to our attention on November 18, 1948, when the Moscow propaganda radio network launched a "permanent weekly broadcast for American Slavs." The tactics and the purposes of this radio series are in every way identical to the Berlin wartime broadcasts aimed at the Nazi Bund. I am convinced that Stalin will fail in subverting the loyalty of foreign-born Americans as miserably as did Hitler.

During the weeks that the Moscow series has been on the air, the viciousness of the anti-American attacks has increased. Reminiscent of the defeatist broadcast of Axis Sally, is the constant emphasis on the invincibility of Russia and the weakness of our Nation and the invincible strength of the Soviet Union. On the very first program of the Moscow series, Comrade Mochalov, the secretary of the Soviet All-Slav Committee, set the keynote of the defeatism that the Communists hope to spread among us by telling American Slavs that the democratic anti-imperialist camp, headed by the U. S. S. R., is immeasurably stronger than the reactionary imperialist camp headed, of course, by the United States.

"There is no doubt," he went on, "that in the struggle between democracy and reaction, democracy will win." We all know that in the vocabulary of the Kremlin democracy is defined as the brutal terrorism of communism; and our free institutions—institutions under which individual rights are the paramount concern of the state—are described as reactionary.

The Slavic broadcasts from Moscow have been particularly emphatic in stirring our people against the foreign policy of their Government. "Progressive Americans of Slav origin" are constantly

urged to work for a "policy of collaboration with the U. S. S. R."

Equally emphatic has been the attempt to stir up discontent and to turn American Slavs against any firmness toward domestic Communist agents. Following the arrest of George Pirinsky, the executive secretary of the Communist-controlled American-Slav Congress, Moscow radio told American Slavs that the arrest of this well-known Communist "called forth not only your anger but the anger and indignation of the Soviet people."

On December 2, Gene al Gundorov, chairman of the Soviet All-Slav Committee, broadcast to this country a completely untruthful attack on the State Department which conveyed the false impression that Slavs had been discriminated against. Gundorov and other top Communists were sent to the United States 2 years ago to attend a meeting of the American Slav Congress in New York, and immigration authorities insisted that under the law delegates of foreign governments must register as agents of such governments. But Comrade Gundorov made a sensational falsehood out of the incident, asserting that the State Department "demanded that we register as enemy agents. In case of noncompliance with this order it threatened us with arrest and court procedure. We were not able to take advantage of your hospitality only because State Department officials failed entirely to take into consideration the desires of progressiveness—progressive in Soviet speech means Communist—progressive organizations."

Not a word of this tale is true, because Gundorov and the other Reds were permitted to attend the Slav Congress as guests and did so. The State Department insisted that they must register as foreign agents, not as Gundorov claims—"enemy agents"—only if they represented themselves as official delegates. Perhaps Comrade Gundorov was being truthful about his mission when he used the term "enemy agents." We all know that every Communist, whether he is here or abroad, is an enemy agent.

The current propaganda line of the Moscow American series is Stalin's latest "peace offensive." American Slavs are now being urged to intensify their opposition to America and to American foreign policy. They are urged to unite against the country which has adopted them and given them shelter and freedom. Already, the American Slav Congress—which has taken the place of the Nazi Bund in subversive activity—is trying to organize peace rallies among Americans of Slavic origin. Peace rallies which are intended to destroy the loyalty of people, to weaken our will to defend our democracy, to make us an easy prey to Communist domination.

Again I say, in this the Kremlin will be as disappointed as Hitler. Slavs, just as other Americans, are and have always been loyal citizens. They fought with equal valor in World War I and in World War II. If Stalin foolishly decides to plunge the world into the third world war, he will find American Slavs playing a heroic part in the victorious American armies.

What happened to Hitler and to Tojo should be a warning to Stalin. We cannot be destroyed by vicious propaganda. We stand ready, with God's help, to defend our liberties.

We will not surrender and we cannot be defeated.

Information About General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks an informative letter sent to the Members of the Congress by Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 23, 1949.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The other day two Members of Congress came to me seeking some information about the General Accounting Office, and the conversation broadened into a general discussion. They expressed amazement at some of the things I told them, and called my attention to the large turn-over in the Congress since my term began on November 1, 1940, and to the inability of so many Members to find time to inform themselves about the Office. They mentioned that the Annual Report of the General Accounting Office had not yet been printed, and that at best few Members have time to read such reports. They suggested that I tell other Members of Congress some of the things I said to them, and that is the reason for this letter.

The General Accounting Office is a nonpolitical agency. It is set up as the agent of the Congress and has always been a part of the legislative branch of the Government. Congress emphasized that in the 1945 Reorganization Act, and the same provision is now in the pending reorganization bill which has already passed the House. The Comptroller General is appointed for a term of 15 years and cannot be reappointed, and can only be removed by the Congress.

On April 15, 1946, we reached our peak employment of 14,904. On February 1, 1949, our personnel numbered 9,499, showing a net reduction of 5,405. This reduction was made without any instructions from the Congress, which has always given us the appropriations we have requested. For the next fiscal year we hope to have a still further small reduction in personnel. At the time I took office the annual appropriations made for the entire Government were about $17,000,000,000. They are nearly forty-two billion for the present fiscal year.

The General Accounting Office is one of the very few agencies in the Government that not only pays its way but in addition makes a substantial contribution each year to the Treasury and saves untold further amounts by the deterrent effects of its work. I am sure it will be interesting to you to know that in the last 8 years and up until January 1, 1949, the General Accounting Office has collected back and put back into the Treasury over $608,000,000. This money had been illegally or otherwise improperly paid out by various offices in the Government, and it is a fair statement to say that little of it would ever have been recovered except for the General Accounting Office. Our appropriation for the current fiscal year is $35,901,000. The latest pay raise amounted to $3,000,000 for the Office. I am happy to report that we will absorb $1,000,000 of this in our current appropriation. During the last five fiscal years the General Accounting Office has returned $13,000,000 of its appropriations, unused because we were unable to obtain the type of employees needed.

During the last fiscal year we audited over a year's payments by all the departments of the Government, with over half of our audit force working outside of Washington and on the site; we settled over 550,000 claims; settled over 62,000 fiscal officers' accounts; made 429 legislative reports to the Congress and its committees and handled 6,605 inquiries from Members of Congress; rendered over 12,000 decisions to the departments and agencies, claimants, and others; visited 1,166 different offices in 395 cities on inspections and surveys; examined over 800,000 contracts; and audited the multi-billion-dollar operations of the Post Office Department. We are constantly sending to Congress our commercial-type reports on audits of Government corporations.

Our methods and systems are under constant review to effect economies and improvements, wherever possible. We are continually lending assistance to agencies in the executive branch on legal and accounting problems, and are now carrying on with the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, with participation by all of the agencies, a joint accounting program which has met with enthusiastic reception. This program bids fair to produce outstanding accomplishments for better government.

The General Accounting Office is an office of law. Its duty is to enforce the will of Congress with respect to expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

As the General Accounting Office is one of the few agencies of the Government that does not have a press agent, I am sending you this information which I hope will be of interest to you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Can GOP Beat Truman?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an article by Ralph W. Page, which appeared in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, under date of March 5, 1949, entitled "Can GOP Beat Truman?":

CAN GOP BEAT TRUMAN?

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The President is certainly right in one statement. This is that the protagonists in Congress are engaged in rehashing all the issues and arguments battled up and down the land during the late campaign.

The hearings before committees, the roaring of the Senators on the floor, the fulminations of the party organs, the editorials in the partisan press contain hardly a new adjective or even a new syllable. Over and over and over the same stale, shopworn contentions are reiterated, precisely as if an election settled nothing at all.

As a matter of fact, practically every phrase and innuendo used during the campaign and now repeated in Congress were coined and broadcast to the saturation point by Landon and Roosevelt in 1936.

From that day to this the Democrats have been pursuing a consistent program which the Republicans castigate as socialistic, totalitarian, extravagant, and particularly ruinous to business with a capital B. Besides advocating their program, the Democrats charge that the Republicans are the minions of privilege and corporate combines; champions of retrogression, protection and isolation.

If there exists a man, woman, or moron in the country who doesn't know these recriminations by heart they are deaf, dumb, and blind. And everytime the issue is presented to the Nation the vote goes the same way.

The difficulty BOB TAFT and company face in this Rip van Winkle revival is the palpable fact that Truman looks about as much like a dictator as the corner grocer, and that this business whose ruin they have been predicting is incomparably bigger and four times as profitable as when they started their baleful prophecies in the dim past.

They seem to have an obsession that some sort of victory can be obtained by using the archaic procedures of the Senate to drag out and fritter away decisions and postpone or frustrate the administration's program by endless palaver and parliamentary legalistics.

"Look," they say, "the President is defeated."

They seem to fancy that this sort of negative success proves that public opinion has changed and so provides a hopeful background for the next campaign.

All this may be so. But there is nothing in recent history that supports such a conclusion. A steady policy of obstruction has not prevailed to garner them enough new votes to carry a township in the last 16 years. None of the voters who shifted jumped on this wagon. Those who did change wandered off after Wallace's moonbeams or the Ku Klux complex.

The Late J. "Perry" Alvey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last week when I learned of the death of J. "Perry" Alvey, who for many years has been in charge of the Bonneville Power Administration offices in the National Capital, I paid a tribute on the floor of the House to the memory of this courteous and able public servant.

I said that of all the public employees I have met during my 2 years here he had been to me one of the most helpful.

The high esteem which I entertained for Mr. Alvey was held by others who knew him even better than I did. Today, I had a letter from Dr. Paul Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, in which Dr. Raver pays a high tribute to the memory and work of Perry Alvey.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include Dr. Raver's letter to me in which he pays a high tribute to the memory of his friend and associate of many years. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1949.

Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MACK: The death of J. "Perry" Alvey, who was one of the first Bonneville Power Administration employees and helped draft the original Bonneville Act, is an irreparable loss to all of us.

Perry, as he was known to all of his friends, was not only widely known in engineering and utility groups of Washington, D. C., and the Pacific Northwest, but was an intimate friend and counselor of hundreds of Senators, Representatives and high officials in all walks of government. As the Washington, D. C. representative of the Bonneville Power Administration since his original appointment by the first Administrator, J. D. Ross, Alvey was a kindly, efficient and effective public servant whose integrity and honesty were never questioned. Having worked closely with him for the past ten years, his passing comes as a great personal loss. His life crusade and first loyalties were always directed toward furthering the sound basic policies of his government and of the Nation's public power development and the principles which were so firmly inculcated in him by the late J. D. Ross, father of Pacific Northwest power development.

The entire staff of Bonneville Power Administration would like to join you in extending its deepest sympathy to Mrs. Alvey in her bereavement.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

Completion of Processing of Visa Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 7, 1949, the House passed a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 160, with amendment. This was to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and the admission into the United States of certain alien fiancées and fiancés of members, or of former members of the armed forces of the United States; as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancée Act (60 Stat. 339), as amended.

I am very happy over the passage of this bill. During the past several weeks, a number of ex-GI's from my district called by attention to the fact that because of the expiration of the GI Fiancée Act on December 31, 1948—their prospective brides, who were still overseas, were unable to join them here in the United States. In every case, the reason cited was beyond the control of the GI or his fiancée. In all of these cases, which were brought to my attention, the pleas have been heartrending.

These men—our ex-GI's—felt that an injustice was being inflicted upon them. They asked me to intercede in their behalf.

In accordance therewith, on February 2, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2150, a bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of alien fiancées in cases where the failure to enter within the period heretofore prescribed was the result of causes beyond the control of the parties to the proposed marriage.

It was with a great deal of enthusiasm, therefore, that I joined in the passage of House Joint Resolution 160, which will accomplish the same purpose.

I am certain that not only will the ex-GI's of my district, who solicited my aid, be grateful for this action on the part of our House, but the many others who reside in the United States and who are in similar circumstances.

Virginia's Wildlife Haven Cited as Model for States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM B. FUGATE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the Richmond Times-Dispatch on February 20, entitled "Virginia's Wildlife Haven Cited as Model for States."

We of Virginia are proud of the fine work of conservation and propagation of wildlife through services of the department of game and inland fisheries. The last decade has seen the supply of game increase until nimrods are finding undreamed of hunting in our mountain and piedmont areas. Restocking and effective protection have provided the basis for a high level of maintenance.

The article follows:

VIRGINIA'S WILDLIFE HAVEN CITED AS MODEL FOR STATES

Hemmed off from the rest of the State by the towering wall of the Blue Ridge Mountains lies more than 1,500,000 acres of forested game lands which have gained for Virginia a Nation-wide reputation.

This haven for the angler and nimrod in the George Washington and Thomas Jefferson National Forests recently was singled out by the Wildlife Management Institute as a model for action in other States.

Here is what Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, institute president, had to say:

"A management plan for the Virginia national forests evolved by the State commission of game and inland fisheries and the United States Forest Service has produced startling results during the past 10 years.

"Under the Virginia forest-game management plan deer have multiplied tenfold and bear, turkey, squirrel, raccoon, and ruffed grouse are increasing steadily."

During the past decade the State's program in the two national forests has been directed toward habitat improvement and increasing wildlife resources, game commission officials explained.

Roughly, 1,000 miles of trails and wooded roads have been opened and improved for

game in the two forests. Hundreds of water holes have been established and thousands of food-bearing shrubs and trees planted in clearings along forest edges.

Old orchards have been rejuvenated and their grounds seeded. Clearings have been planted with wildlife food plants. In addition, some 1,700 white-tailed deer have been placed in the two areas.

So successful has been the restocking of many streams in the mountain counties that Virginia can now be said to have some of the best fishing in the East, game commission officials reported.

The program started back in 1938 when the general assembly authorized the State game commission to enter into a cooperative agreement with the United States Forest Service for the management and rehabilitation of the wildlife resources in the two national forests.

It also authorized a special $1 hunting stamp to cover the privilege of hunting and fishing on Federal property. This money reverts right back to the forests in the form of improved wildlife management practices, game officials explained.

When the plan was first adopted there was little hunting in the mountain counties of the State, C. S. Phelps, game official who serves as a coordinator between the State and Federal Government on national forest land issues, remarked. Since then, hunting and fishing in Virginia's vast game lands have been marked by steady improvements.

"This season hunting was better on the national forests than it has been in a long time," J. J. Shomon, publications division chief of the game commission, reported. "In fact, so sharp was the contrast between conditions today and those of one decade ago that many wildlife observers predict that Virginia may soon step out as one of the leading wildlife States in the Nation."

That the Commonwealth may move into the lead as a significant game State is not pure conjecture, State game commission officials point out.

It has all the necessary elements that make for a greater wildlife potential; ideal climate, long growing season, heavy rainfall, rich plant growth, a good interspersion of vegetation, and 3,000,000 acres of potential national forest land of good quality. Roughly 80 percent of the State is forested.

Right now it is believed by State game officials that Virginia has the largest acreage in game lands east of the Mississippi River.

How To Regiment the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Reporter of March 7, 1949, entitled "How To Regiment the Country":

HOW TO REGIMENT THE COUNTRY

The debate over price control, which dominated the news not so long ago, has slackened. The most apparent reason for this is that, in most lines, prices have leveled off, and in some lines there has been a distinct downward swing. That is reflected in the various cost-of-living indexes.

This does not mean that the issue has gone permanently out of the limelight. Strong inflationary factors—notably the enormous spending of the Federal Government—are still with us. It is possible that the upward trend in prices will again be resumed. Should that happen, political pressure for price controls of some kind will be turned on full blast. The public should keep in mind the issue involved, and what a dictated economy could mean.

The basic fallacy of price control is that people cannot be forced to produce goods and sell them at a price which allows no profit, or may entail a loss. Take meat for an example—it was the center of the price controversy some months ago. If farmers and ranchers saw that the Government was determined to fix the price at an unprofitable level, they would gradually stop producing it. The result would be scarcity and then an actual shortage. More and more of the available supply would go into channels which scoffed at the law.

Price control, by its very nature, would necessitate complete control of the entire economic system if it were to even partially succeed. It would be unworkable, for example, without ironhanded wage control. Thus, in time, it would create a regimented economy—which is the basic step toward the totalitarian state.

The Basing-Point Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the real danger of H. R. 2222 is a hidden one. The danger of this bill is that it dignifies a false issue. This false issue is that the antitrust laws need so-called clarification. Because of this alleged need of clarification it is claimed that it is necessary to amend these laws. H. R. 2222 proposes certain amendments which are claimed to be innocuous in their impact on the basic foundations of the antitrust laws. However, by proposing amendments at all, and by embracing this false issue of clarification, H. R. 2222 opens up the door for even the most vicious bill deliberately designed to scuttle the antitrust laws completely. At least this is my view of it.

Moreover, H. R. 2222, judged solely by its own provisions and entirely apart from the consideration that it may be used as an entering wedge for avowedly unfriendly proposals, is alarming to that part of our business community which is sincerely and naturally dedicated to antimonopoly principles. I have in my hands copies of three telegrams addressed to various Members of this House by the vice president in charge of the Washington office of the National Federation of Small Business. These speak for themselves and I respectfully commend them to the attention of the Congress and of the American public:

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Small business of this Nation will be amazed when they receive the word of the favorable action by House Judiciary on H. R. 2222, which we believe will place a moratorium until July 1, 1950, on the Supreme Court decision in the basing-point case. We look upon this action as another attempt to suspend antitrust laws. A year ago it was exemption for the railroads and other interstate carriers. Now for the cement and allied industries. The future of antitrust enforcement looks very bleak and another blow to destroy small business.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I recall your splendid remarks on the floor of the House when your Committee on Rules urged the adoption of the Patman resolution setting up the Small Business Committee. Apparently members of the House Judiciary paid no attention to your committee's recommendations in their approval of H. R. 2222 which means, if the House approves it, it is another death blow for antitrust law enforcement. In the Eightieth Congress exemption to antitrust laws was given to the railroads and other interstate carriers. Now, for a year or more, to cement, steel, and other allied concentrated industries. in the sole interest of independent small business of this Nation and for 100,000 or more members of this association, we urge you and your committee not to report out H. R. 2222. The Democratic platform pledged—one, intensive enforcement of antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations; two, strengthening of existing antitrust laws where gaps exist; three, a positive program to promote competitive business, independent trade. The Republican platform pledged aggressive antitrust action. We believe if the House approves H. R. 2222 both party platform pledges are repudiated and small business finds themselves sinking deeper into the quagmire of concentrated industry. It is beyond us to understand how career men in antitrust agencies have the courage and fortitude to carry out the mandates of Congress in the enforcement of antitrust laws when such bills as H. R. 2222 are introduced to make their task more difficult. We hope your committee, in the sole interest of small business reports "No" on H. R. 2222.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Democrats pledge themselves to:

1. Intensive enforcement of antitrust laws, with adequate appropriations.
2. Strengthening of existing antitrust laws where gaps exist.
3. A positive program to promote competitive business, independent trade. Do you believe the approval of H. R. 2222 is in keeping with your party's platform pledge? Our opinion is definitely "No." A year ago it was exemption for the railroads from antitrust laws, now it will apply to cement and other allied concentrated industries.

A real blow to small business of this Nation and a forerunner of total by-passing of antitrust laws. Hope Congress votes "No" on this bill.

Each of these three telegrams is signed "George J. Burger, vice president in charge Washington office, National Federation of Small Business, 714 Bond Building."

Resettling Displaced Persons in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like

to include a recent address delivered over radio station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on the Justice for Poland program, by Attorney Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress.

Mr. Rozmarek's address, entitled "Resettling Displaced Persons in America," follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to discuss the subject of displaced persons because today that problem is properly uppermost in the minds of all charitable Americans who feel the moral responsibility for the plight of these unfortunate people.

The displaced persons, as we know, are the people who have been uprooted from their homes by the Nazis and the Communists—and today find themselves living—or to use a more appropriate word—stranded in the displaced persons camps in western Europe, under the care of the International Refugee Organization.

Since the end of the war there have been many proposals for the solution of the displaced-persons problem. One was the vicious practice of forced repatriation of these refugees to homes that are no longer theirs; another was the cynical approach of liquidating the camps and letting the victims be governed only by the instinct of survival; and the third was the humane approach, that is in allowing them to resettle in a free world with an opportunity to earn their livelihood and spell out their own future.

The United States out of civic, moral, and political responsibility wisely adopted humanitarian legislation permitting some 205,000 of these displaced persons to resettle in this country. The legislation was supported by major civic, social, labor, and church organizations and gained general public approval, although it did contain certain discriminatory features. Currently the Congress is considering amendments which will liberalize some of the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act. We hope that of the several submitted amendments one will be approved which provides that "Visas should be made available to each group and element of the displaced persons in the proportion that each bears to the over-all total of displaced persons. This would apply to race, religion, and national origin."

The problem of resettling the displaced persons in America within the provisions of the displaced-persons law appeared relatively simple. The cost of transportation of displaced persons from the respective camps to the port of entry in this country was assumed by the International Refugee Organization, to whose fund our Government makes heavy financial contributions. The screening for determination of the eligibility of those displaced persons as to their moral, physical, and educational qualifications in accordance with the immigration provisions was to be done by qualified and experienced personnel. Upon their arrival in the United States the displaced persons—through the help of many American voluntary organizations and societies—would quickly assume their position in our dynamic society and become a cultural and economic asset.

However, in practice the resettlement program experienced a stumbling block. For the displaced-persons law, wisely or not, provides that any displaced person to be eligible for admission into the United States, having first met the general immigration requirements, must also be provided with an assurance, that he will upon arrival be given employment and a place to live. And thus the actual key to the solution of proper resettlement of these displaced persons is the need to secure assurances from amongst the American people.

It is apparent that if to date, after the displaced-persons law has been in effect for 6 months a relatively small proportion of displaced persons and even a frightfully smaller percentage of Polish displaced persons have arrived in this country—it is due to the seeming indifference or unfounded apprehension of us Americans to provide the requisite assurances.

Many well-meaning Americans eager to contribute their part to this great humanitarian project are reluctant to sign an assurance blank for fear they might assume some legal obligation. "Must I sign a bond in connection with such an assurance or pledge my bank deposit or my home as collateral?" they ask. "To what extent will I be charged with the responsibility of maintaing a sponsored displaced person in case he fails to find suitable employment?"

In answer to these questions I am happy to quote Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, one of the three members of the Displaced Persons Commission, who recently officially declared the following: Signing an assurance is not a legally enforced obligation so far as the sponsor is concerned. There is no legal obligation to hold a displaced person for 5 days, or even 2 days. Congress wanted only the assumption of a moral obligation, because no displaced person can come to the United States unless he has the necessary assurance from a sponsor.

It is plain, therefore, that signing such an assurance entails no material obligation. It is a mere formality to comply with the law. Unlike the requirement of the affidavits of support for general immigration, there is no requirement to list any real estate or to schedule any bank accounts.

The displaced persons represent many nationalities and many church denominations, but if I speak on behalf of the Polish DP's, it is because their plight appears most appalling, and because by ancestral background and blood ties the Americans of Polish descent feel their lot most acutely.

The Polish displaced persons are the thousands of survivors of Nazi concentration camps, disarmed veterans of the gallant Polish armies, and those who fled from Communist domination of their homeland. Today they can neither return to their homes for fear of liquidation by the Communists nor can they continue to subsist in the DP camps and look for daily handouts. They are proud people who did not forsake their God for false communistic ideologies and today seek only opportunity to eke out a living without charity or alms. They appeal and look to us overseas to give them a helping hand by submitting assurances.

The Polish-American Congress initiated and organized the American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons with headquarters in Chicago, Ill. This committee, headed by Judge Blair F. Gunther, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and many other members, representing large fraternal and civic organizations, has assumed the burden of soliciting the assurances and providing moral and material help to the displaced persons upon their arrival in this country.

Many distinguished American leaders volunteered as members of our advisory commission to offer assistance in our program of activity. Amongst others the advisory commission consists of Senator J. Howard McGrath, Congressman John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, Mayor James M. Curley, of Boston, Mayor Bernard J. Dowd, of Buffalo, N. Y., Mayor Eugene I. Van Anterp, of Detroit, Mich., and Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

Affiliated with the American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons are State district displaced persons committees in some 26 States. In addition new local committees are being established to cooperate in soliciting assurances for the Polish displaced persons.

I appeal to you all to do your share in helping the resettlement of displaced persons. I appeal to you to sign at least one assurance, offering a job and home opportunity for the Polish displaced persons. I know that for every assurance you will have saved the life of your fellow man to gain his everlasting gratitude. Let us all reflect the spirit of our great America and allow haven here for the oppressed, even as our forefathers founded theirs.

To get an assurance blank and for all information regarding displaced persons write today without delay to the American Committee for Resettlement of Polish Displaced Persons, 1514 West Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

Sixteen Years Ago Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an editorial from the Boston Post of March 6, 1949:

MARCH 6, 1949.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: This fine editorial in today's Post just caught my eye, and the thought struck me that you might have something to say about this subject in the House. If so, I thought you might quote this or, perhaps, have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Of course, if you think different, it is perfectly all right, as nobody knows anything about my sending this to you except myself.

With kind personal regards to Mrs. McCormack and yourself, I am,

Your friend,

JOHN MEADE.

SIXTEEN YEARS AGO TODAY

The strains of a popular song hit—"Happy Days Are Here Again"—were still echoing through Washington and the Nation 16 years ago this morning. Its lilting, catchy tune, and its carefree lyrics carried for gifted singer and nonmusical hummer alike something he wanted—something to help him forget days and months just behind; something to help him turn his eyes to the future with confident hope.

Then came the first of the amazing acts and decisions of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. On March 6, 1933, 2 days after he had taken the oath of office, not a bank door in the entire Nation opened for business. By Presidential proclamation the tiny savings depository in the smallest hamlet and the huge, marble-lined structure of world-famous banks in Boston, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles were dark and silent.

It was a bold move—a move unprecedented. The man on the street did not quite understand it—but he found no fault. He went right on singing or humming "Happy Days Are Here Again." He knew that presently the banks would open again, and he felt, with the confidence that only an American can know in America; that they would be stronger than ever before.

He didn't know he was standing on the threshold of a new, and startling era. Two months before he was only vaguely interested in the fact that a man named Adolf Hitler, who appeared to be something of a madman, had had himself named chancellor of Germany, where they were talking strange things about making guns instead of butter. He was only passingly interested that at Leipzig someone named Marinus von der

Lubbe had been condemned to execution by beheading because he openly admitted he was an adherent of a viciously, corrupt philosophy called communism.

In a few days, bank doors did swing open again. Some of the little savings banks had used the holiday to repaint their wooden walls; and workmen had made the marble glisten brighter than before in the big banking houses. Men, women, and children continued to sing "Happy Days." Professional comedians made poor jokes about the closings.

Out of Washington in the months that followed came strange alphabetical combinations, letters which ran close together with no periods to indicate they were initials, NIRA, AAA, HOLC, PWA. Out of Washington, too, came newly sounding names for American ears, names like General Johnson and Harold Ickes, William H. Woodin and Cordell Hull, Claude A. Swanson and Henry A. Wallace.

On the political stage at home things were moving fast as a great Nation flexed its muscles somewhat clumsily and uncertainly and dug itself out of the deep and muddied ditch of the worst economic depression the world had known.

On the international stage things were moving just as swiftly but with more deadly certainty toward a maelstrom that was to become known as World War II.

Yet, on March 6, 1933, Americans sang, Happy Days Are Here Again, and they knew that they had nothing to fear but fear itself.

Behind them that morning were the memories of the pitiful army which marched to Washington and demanded a bonus for veterans. Behind them was the shameful pictures of that little ragged army's final dissolution in the cold, swampy flats near the shadows of the Capitol. Forgotten was the bursted bubble of the golden days of the twenties.

March 6, 1933, seems a long way behind us today. Yet, as the sands of time are measured, 16 years is really only a brief period—nothing more than an interlude, even in the life of man.

Because he was singing, Happy Days Are Here Again, the way some happy author meant it to be sung, the average man didn't know it 16 years ago today—but as he stood on the steps of a closed bank in Caribou, Maine, or Coronado, Calif., he was also standing on the steps of an amazing era.

It is an era still unended—an era for which neither the Nation nor the world can yet divine the answer.

Yet, just as true today as the day they were first uttered are the words of 16 years ago—"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

Magnuson Plan Fails To Make Substantial Contribution to Discussion of Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, medical director of the Veterans' Administration, recently came out with a plan which was hailed in the press as a middle-of-the-road compromise between the American Medical Association's and President Truman's programs for extending medical care.

Because of Dr. Magnuson's reputation, I was much interested in his program, although I could not see how it proposed to solve the problem of medical care, because it seemed to apply only to the problem of diagnosis. Meanwhile, I have been waiting for a more authoritative analysis of the Magnuson plan.

That is now available in two columns recently written for the New York Post by Albert Deutsch, a noted medical writer, who finds the same weakness in the much publicized Magnuson plan that I detected. Mr. Deutsch points out that diagnosis is only a part of medical care and that Dr. Magnuson has proposed nothing to solve the problem of treatment for those who cannot afford it. The danger is that the public will be led to believe by such proposals as Dr. Magnuson has made that there is some easy middle-of-the-road solution to the problem, short of national health insurance. For those who may have been misled by the publicity given the Magnuson plan, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Deutsch's two columns from the New York Post of March 4 and March 7 as follows:

[From the New York Post of March 4, 1949]

MEDICAL PLANS

(By Albert Deutsch)

WASHINGTON.—As the controversy over national health insurance gets hotter, we are likely to be deluged with compromise plans aimed at resolving the bitter conflict between the stand-pat American Medical Association and advocates of the Truman program.

Many of these compromise plans will be the ill-conceived creations of crackpots and publicity hounds, certain to add to the current confusion. Others will be the thoughtful contributions of genuinely concerned experts which, even if they are not adopted, will help clarify an area densely clouded by irrational controversy.

To the latter group belongs the plan for Nation-wide medical care proposed last week by Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, medical director of the Veterans' Administration. Magnuson was a noted Chicago orthopedic surgeon before he went into the Federal agency.

Magnuson's plan is based on his belief that the weakest link in our chain of medical care results from the lack of diagnostic and public health facilities, particularly for people who are neither indigent nor wealthy.

The VA medical chief belongs to that group of successful specialists who are disgusted with the do-nothing attitude of organized medicine but who fear that governmental health insurance would introduce bureaucratic futility into medical practice. He offers his plan as a middle-of-the-road program, aimed at what he believes to be the heart of the medical-care problem.

The Magnuson plan may be summed up as follows:

1. The core of the proposed program is a Nation-wide network of community diagnostic clinics, which would provide complete medical check-ups for the sick and periodic health examinations for the well. These clinics could be established in existing hospitals, incorporated into new medical centers, or maintained separately.

2. The diagnostic clinics would be staffed by medical specialists, nurses, laboratory technicians, chemists, and other personnel. Since there is a serious shortage of these professional groups, Federal subsidized training would provide more doctors, nurses, etc., for these diagnostic clinics.

3. Patients would be referred to the clinic by the family doctor, military and veteran agencies, Government and voluntary hospitals. Individuals could obtain diagnostic services by direct application.

4. Patients would pay the clinic on the basis of income. Indigent patients would get free treatment.

5. The diagnostic clinics would be financed by a 50-percent subsidy from the Federal Government, with the remaining 50 percent being made up by the State, local government, and lay contributions—in addition to patients' fees.

6. Each State would have a State medical director to supervise the diagnostic services. This official would be appointed by the governor on recommendation of the medical school deans or of the State public health authority.

7. The diagnostic clinic or clinics in each community would be governed by a local board representing State, county, or local public health officials, the medical profession and lay contributors.

In addition to these diagnostic clinics, the Magnuson plan calls for extension of public health facilities throughout the country.

Its author points out that 40,000,000 Americans live in areas lacking the basic protection of full-time public health departments and that only 1 in every 10 local public health departments is provided with physical facilities "even approaching reasonable standards of decency."

The Magnuson plan probably will be widely discussed in the coming months as a possible alternative to national health insurance.

While I have the highest respect for Dr. Magnuson, personally and professionaly, I don't think his proposal constitutes a national medical plan at all. What the good doctor has given us is a fragmentary contribution which we advocates of national health insurance will be willing to incorporate as a part of our general design.

[From the New York Post of March 7, 1949]

MAGNUSON PLAN

(By Albert Deutsch)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, an outstanding orthopedic surgeon before he became medical director of the Veterans' Administration, is convinced that "solo" medicine, as practiced in the average general physician's office, is "lousy medicine."

That is one of the main reasons why he drafted his much-discussed "substitute national plan for medical care" as an alternative to national health insurance.

"Look," the big-framed orthopedic specialist told me, "you go to a family doctor with a backache. You don't know what's wrong; you just feel a pain.

"The doctor doesn't know for sure what's wrong, either. If he's one of those pill-doctors, he may give you fancy pills for anything and everything, in the hope that nature will do the rest. If he's looking for a sound diagnosis he'll probably send you to an orthopedist (a specialist in treating skeleto-muscular disorders).

"Then this specialist examines you. He doesn't find enough to make a sure diagnosis. So he sends you on to an internal-medicine man.

"The latter says you need some glandular check-ups, so he sends you to a diagnostic laboratory for tests. Before you're finished, you may be passed on to another doctor or two, and maybe sent back to laboratories for X-rays or what-not.

"By the time you've been through the medical mill, it may cost you from $120 up for these diagnostic services.

"The main trouble with present-day medicine, as I see it, is that the average solo physician (who practices alone) can't afford to equip his office with the expensive diagnostic devices needed for thorough check-ups, and the average patient can't afford to pay for really thorough diagnostic tests."

That's why Dr. Magnuson has presented a plan centered mainly around local diagnostic clinics, to be financed mainly by Federal and

State subsidies, with patients charged on the basis of their ability to pay.

"Before you can treat a patient properly," Magnuson said, "you've got to find out what's wrong with him. Diagnosis is the most important—and most expensive—part of modern medical care."

I spent several hours with Magnuson, taking up his plan in detail. These were my reactions at the conclusion of our discussion:

1. No student of the field would deny that diagnostic services are an important and expensive part of medical practice. But Magnuson, in his enthusiastic discovery of this fact, has mistaken the part for the whole. He has grossly minimized the importance of treatment, in terms of both finances and organizational structure.

2. Far better than Magnuson's tendency to separate diagnosis from treatment is the idea of group medical practice, where teams of medical specialists, general practitioners, and auxiliary professionals could provide both diagnosis and treatment as a unit under a single roof.

Magnuson's diagnostic clinics would return or transfer the patient to his family doctor or to a specialist or hospital for treatment. The organizational chart he has drawn up tends to divide diagnosis and treatment, functionally and physically.

3. Magnuson has solved only part of the patient's economic problem. It is small comfort to the patient to learn what's wrong with him at a diagnostic clinic, only to have to worry about getting treated for what ails him.

4. The Wagner-Murray-Dingell health insurance bill makes appropriate provision for diagnostic, as well as all other, medical services. It creates no artificial separation among different types of medical service.

5. Magnuson hasn't the faintest idea of what his plan would cost, if put into effect. He has formulated no clear answer, as yet, to the question of building up a huge diagnostic machine that might outrun treatment services and that might, indeed, result in grossly elaborate diagnostic tests for insignificant ailments that can be handled by the average physician.

6. Magnuson's network of diagnostic clinics would be supervised by a State medical director in each State, to be appointed by the Governor upon recommendation of public health or medical-school officials. When I asked Magnuson where organized medicine came into the picture, he answered:

"Who'd want to seek the advice of organized medicine (meaning the American Medical Association and its local affiliates)? What do those medical politicians know about good medical practice?"

Magnuson is right in his premise, but wrong in his assumption that organized medicine would stand complacently by while State medical officials were appointed without asking its approval.

"How did you come to draft this plan?" I asked Magnuson.

"Oh, I got to talking about this thing with friends, and kept trying it on my wife as it shaped up. Finally, she said: 'Why don't you put the thing on paper?'

"I took up her dare, and here's the plan."

Survey on Closed Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the Rogers Dunn survey and his analysis of the congressional view on the closed shop.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is the duty of Congress, when it considers the labor-management legislation, to make sure that the public has the proper protection. In all of these squabbles between labor and management, it is the public that always suffers. It is my judgment also that we should think of the little fellow in the labor unions. He also is entitled to protection. He is not organized in the big pressure groups like management and the labor leaders.

Every survey that has been made on the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law indicates that the laboring man and the public feel that most of the law should be kept. I feel there are some clarifications and minor changes that need attention and will support all constructive suggestions to that end.

The survey follows:

A CONGRESSIONAL VIEW OF THE CLOSED SHOP

We have just asked each Member of the House of Representatives, Republican and Democrat:

"In principle, do you favor continuing to outlaw the closed shop as a national policy?"

Of the 151 Members replying to date, 69 percent answered "Yes," and 30 percent answered "No."

Exactly 2 years ago, while the Taft-Hartley law was being considered, we asked each Member of the House:

"In principle, do you favor outlawing the closed shop as a national policy?"

Of the 152 Members replying, 75 percent replied "Yes" and 18 percent "No."

As a sidelight, 73 percent of the Members of the House voted for the Taft-Hartley law in 1947.

Rent Control in Idaho—A Typical Example of How Rent Control Is Functioning in Boise, Idaho, and in Other Cities of the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my letter to the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which is now holding hearings on rent control. The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1949.

HON. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to the rent-control bill now under consideration by your committee, and I want to express my vigorous opposition to it, at least so far as it concerns the State of Idaho, where we have no large cities, and where our housing problems can best be served through free competitive enterprise.

At the beginning of the war, many of our people left their homes to work at the shipyards and other war industries on the Pacific coast, and rented their homes at or below current rentals at that time. This is particularly true in the city of Boise, Idaho. Now that the war is over and most of the war industries closed, their homes are occupied at rentals much below a fair return on the property when you consider that during the interval the dollar has lost at least 40 percent of its value.

I would like to present for your consideration a typical case with which I am most familiar. For many years Mr. W. R. Kehrer was employed by the Union Pacific Railroad as a telegrapher and station agent. He saved his money, invested in a three-unit apartment, one unit of which he occupied, and with the hope that the income from the other two units would provide him a living for his declining years.

By the time war was declared he had retired because of age and service, but volunteered to return to railroad service during the war emergency, when there was an acute shortage of telegraphers and station agents. He was transferred to another city and rented his own apartment furnished for $35 per month.

In 1944 Mr. Kehrer needed some carpenter work done and at the request of his carpenter-tenant, employed the tenant to do the work at the then union scale of $1.25 per hour. In 1948 Mr. Kehrer again required the service of a carpenter and again employed his tenant.

But the union scale had advanced from $1.25 per hour to $1.87½ per hour—an advance of 50 percent. Other services and commodities that landlords must pay for have increased approximately the same amount, but the carpenter-tenant still occupies the afore-mentioned apartment at a rental of $35 per month.

Such a policy in my opinion amounts to a confiscation of private property and will discourage rather than encourage the building of more homes and rental units. There is no better way to dry up the sources of venture capital so essential to keep our economy and free enterprise going.

I would appreciate having this letter made a part of the record in your hearings and trust that your committee will give this matter your thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Nonstop B-50 Flight Demonstrates Need for Big Army and Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence, one of America's outstanding journalists, in his daily column in the Washington Evening Star, March 7, 1949, clearly defines the necessity for a well-balanced national defense.

While Mr. Lawrence's column deals with the nonstop B–50 flight around the world, he also points out the over-all lesson in global strategy to be derived by the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Mr. Lawrence's article is so interesting that I am inserting it at this point for the benefit of those who are interested in

a well-balanced and adequate national defense:

NONSTOP B–50 FLIGHT DEMONSTRATES NEED FOR BIG ARMY, NAVY—SEEN PROVING NECESSITY FOR BASES PROTECTED BY NONAIR SERVICES

(By David Lawrence)

There is an over-all lesson in global strategy for the Army, Navy, and Air Force to be derived from the round-the-world nonstop flight just completed.

It's a lesson which teaches more forcibly than all the debate that has gone on between the services that the Air Force, no matter how well equipped, is helpless without bases strategically located around the earth.

It teaches that unless the Navy and Army can take and hold those bases and occupying troops can maintain those bases against opposition, there can be no long-range bombing of a sustained nature.

The plane which made the round-the-world nonstop flight was refueled first at the Azores, then at Saudi Arabia, next at the Philippines and finally at Hawaii.

Portugal owns the Azores and submarines of a hostile navy could interfere with the landing of supplies at such a base, even if Portugal surrendered her sovereignty and allowed America to use the Azores.

NEAR EAST IN TURMOIL

Saudi Arabia is in the middle of an area of political turbulence in the Near East. Unless the United States were permitted to occupy bases there during peacetime with enough men and supplies to refuel our planes, there could be no use of such a base for a sudden defense by our planes against attack or for offensive operations if war came overnight.

The Philippines are a friendly country but in the last war a hostile navy actually wrested from the United States the bases there on which American strategy had counted for decades.

Hawaii is an American base, but unless the Pacific is made safe against submarine attack on the supply ships, gasoline required for refueling nonstop planes and the food and equipment for the troops stationed there cannot be counted on to be available when needed.

The fact that planes can stay up for 5 or 6 days while being refueled could be proved without leaving continental United States. Many such experiments in refueling on endurance tests have been successfully carried out before.

What, then, was the purpose of the round-the-world nonstop flight? Was it done to impress Russia with the speed and scope of our planes? Or was it done to give Congress the impression that it should appropriate more money or the bulk of national defense funds for big planes and that it can afford to forget about ground armies or a navy such as helped win stategic bases in the Pacific in the war?

The idea of airplane stunting to impress Congress is not novel but it would be a disservice to the cause of national defense and security if the impression were given that the round-the-world flight has introduced any element that was not known before or any element of strategic strength that permits neglect of either a strong Army or a powerful Navy.

NAVY ENDURANCE FLIGHTS

Actually, Navy fliers have flown longer without refueling than did the Air Force. The Air Force could doubtless fly just as long as any other service, but all this was pertinently disregarded because the Air Force fliers had to refuel where there were bases available. The approaches to three of the four bases used are today protected by the Navy, which is rapidly developing air defenses against submarine operations of all kinds, and this means escort carriers and supply ships to help keep the bases intact against interruptions to the flow of gasoline and food.

While theoretically long-range bombing from the continental United States is possible, it is not yet regarded as being as effective as bombing directly from strategically located bases. Such bombers cannot venture back and forth without the protection of fighter planes and nobody has as yet come forward with a fighter plane that can accompany bombers on long-range missions such as have just been dramatically portrayed by the round-the-world fliers.

Nobody, moreover, has arisen from any quarter, including the Air Force, to claim that long-range bombing can be carried on in sustained fashion from continental United States. The Russians are well aware of this, and it remains to be seen whether the peoples of any other countries will be misled by round-the-world flights, endurance tests, or similar stunts.

While bombing ranges have been increased since VJ-day, nothing is as yet available to change the fundamental concept of the need for bases away from our shores. Either fixed locations must be obtained by agreement ahead of time with friendly powers or else floating bases must be built in the form of huge aircraft carriers which can approach the seacoast of any potential enemy and launch for sustained operations planes carrying the atomic bomb.

Dynamite Our Monuments, Says McLemore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial appearing in the Post-Herald, Vicksburg, Miss., under date of March 6, 1949:

DYNAMITE OUR MONUMENTS, SAYS M'LEMORE

With amazement, we have read Henry McLemore's column on the Vicksburg National Military Park. To us, the article seems ill-mannered and in poor taste.

The column labeled "Vicksburg" was as follows:

"VICKSBURG, MISS.—It is high time that all memorials dedicated to keeping alive the memory of the War Between the States be abolished.

"Let the grass grow high over the headstones. Dynamite the monuments. Yank up the markers which show where, quite often, brothers fought face to face.

"It is high time, I say again, that the Department of the Interior quits spending taxpayers' money on things which only serve to keep the old hate alive.

"Thousands and thousands of dollars a year are spent to keep alive the embers which should long ago have died out.

"I got to thinking about this yesterday when I went on a tour of the Vicksburg National Military Park, a vast acreage which serves as a memorial to the siege of this city by Grant and Sherman and its capitulation after days and days of bloody fighting.

"What good does it serve? The Mississippi folk hate it because it is a constant reminder of defeat. The northern visitors hate it because wherever they look there is a headstone under which a Union soldier lies a-moldering.

"From the siege of Vicksburg, the Battle of Gettysburg, Chickamauga, and others, a great nation was born. The greatest nation on this earth. In World War I and World War II, southerners, and northerners fought side by side. They fought as brothers, not as men separated by an engineer's gadget. There was no Mason and Dixon's line when the Stars and Stripes was threatened.

"The upkeep of Civil War parks, is in my mind, a sign of national juvenilism. The same thing, in my mind, holds true for people who still talk about that war as if it happened yesterday. There is nothing more boring than a southerner who doesn't have sense enough to know that 1949 isn't 1863, unless it be a Yankee who feels the same way.

"Illustration of retarded mind: An elderly southern woman on visiting the park here for the first time, was taken to a high bluff just at sunset. The view was glorious. The Mississippi coiled and twisted for miles. The dogwood, azaleas, and camellias were in full bloom. The soft colors of the setting sun gave a gentle glow to the whole scene.

"So what was the elderly gal's reaction? She saw only the Union headstones and said:

"'We got a lot of 'em, didn't we.'"

That type of American should be denied the right to vote. Taken out, in fact, and hanged on the nearest cypress tree. No feeling. No thought of the southern and northern men who died only a few years ago so she could wear her velvet collar and spend an hour a day practicing slurring her "r's."

"Another example of retarded mind: This time it is a woman from Illinois. She took the tour of the park and when it was over complained that she had seen no graves of southern soldiers. It was explained to her that this was a national park, and only soldiers of the United States could be buried here, and as Confederate soldiers were not members of the Nation they had to find final resting places somewhere else.

"Good, good," she said, "Serves them right. Hope they weren't buried at all."

"She should be hanged on the adjoining cypress tree.

"Don't think I'm tough. All I want is Americans who are just that, and nothing else.

"I wasn't built to be patient with folk with small, tiny, undersize minds."

For the benefit of Mr. McLemore, and any others who may think in the some vein, the memorials at Vicksburg and Gettysburg, and at Chickamauga and Chattanooga; at Morristown and Saratoga; at Chalmette or the Alamo do not keep alive the animosities of the battles they commemorate.

We are stirred to sympathy for any man whose heart is so cold that he cannot be moved to a greater, deeper and more abiding love for our land, when he looks upon the scenes of conflict where lives were given for the ideal and hope of the new world.

We shudder that anyone would let the grass grow high over the headstones of any man who has died in preserving the heritage of America. The monuments, the markers even the ground whereon the battle raged, have been consecrated by the blood that spilled there. They are our legacy, our priceless heritage. It is unthinkable that we should cherish more the few dollars spent for their upkeep.

We are the Mississippi folk of whom Mr. McLemore speaks. We are offended that he has told other Americans that we hate this priceless heritage. We have never considered our park as a reminder of defeat. On the other hand, we cherish it as a symbol of a people who rose to magnificent heights in the defense of an ideal. If our northern visitors are not stirred to the same depth of feeling we are sorrowful. If they cannot eye the studded terraces of the cemetery without feeling a surge of pride in united America, then cold indeed are their sensibilities.

If the upkeep of our park is a sign of national juvenilism, then we feel privileged to be juvenile. If cherishing the highest, the

noblest, and the most sacrificial deeds of our forefathers is the sign of small, tiny, undersized minds, then we are happy to know in which category we belong.

We feel differently toward these things.

We feel that if our heritage of the past were removed, there could be no America as we know it. Vicksburg, Gettysburg, Valley Forge, the Alamo, Flanders Field, and Iwo Jima are the panorama of a free people. On these, and all that has transpired between them is anchored in the vision of the American ideal.

No nation has survived the desecration of its own heritage. To assume that America's tangible wealth is greater than its vision would be fallacious. It is unthinkable that we could trample the graves of men who gave their lives for us without losing our own faith in the new world.

We honor Mr. McLemore's right to say what he thinks. That privilege, to us, is as priceless as any heritage he would have us destroy. Yet, we cannot fathom his reasoning.

America, without its honored past, would be as dead as a church without God.

Ruhr Eased Back Under Cartel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Drew Pearson that appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, March 7, as follows:

RUHR EASED BACK UNDER CARTEL

(By Drew Pearson)

It's been squeezed off the front pages by other news, but certain things have been transpiring in Germany that may some day affect every United States citizen qualified to carry a gun.

The German Ruhr, from which sprang two world wars, is gradually easing back into the control of some of the big German cartelists who built up Hitler's war machine.

Twelve Germans have just been nominated to control the Ruhr steel industry, despite the bitter protests of German labor unions and the liberal political parties now struggling against German communism.

The man who selected the Ruhr cartelists—Dr. Herman Puender—is, himself, interesting. When Hitler first threatened to come into power, Puender was an adviser to Chancelor Bruening, the last democratic leader of Germany, and wrote a confidential memo advising Bruening not to oppose Hitler too vigorously.

After the war started, Puender served as lieutenant colonel in Division III,H, Abwehr of OKH, which made him the German equivalent of a Soviet political commissar. For the Abwehr was in charge of morale and ideology and had the job of suppressing Anglo-American propaganda in the Nazi ground forces.

It is this one-time trusted servant of Adolf Hitler who has now been permitted to choose the German steel barons who are to govern the vital industry of the Ruhr.

UNITED STATES STEEL IN RUHR

The man who helped set up this plan, Under Secretary of the Army William Draper, was a member of the Wall Street firm of Dillon, Read, which loaned millions to this very same German steel industry prior to World War II. Without these millions, Hitler probably could not have started war when he did.

Draper has now departed the Washington scene to rejoin Dillon, Read. And his banking partner, James Forrestal, who also helped loan money to the steel cartels, is on his way out as Secretary of National Defense.

These men justify the juggernaut they leave behind to govern the Ruhr on the ground that a committee of Allied steel moguls will supervise the 12 German cartelists.

However, let's take a careful look at this committee. The American members are: William J. Brinkerhoff, Werner P. Neumann, Ronald Clark, and Ian F. L. Elliott, all of the United States Steel Corp., together with Frederick M. Dillies of Inland Steel.

To get the full background, you have to look at the files of the Justice Department regarding United States Steel's secret conversations with the Nazis prior to the war. Especially important is one of the gentlemen on the above Ruhr committee, Ian F. L. Elliott.

For the United States Steel Corp. and other big American steel companies were playing hand in glove with the European steel cartel, including the Nazis, prior to the war, and Mr. Elliott was the chief go-between in organizing the deal.

SECRET STEEL DEAL

All this remained secret until the United States Army got into Luxemburg and took over the files of the steel cartel. At that time the Justice Department got its first good look at what the barons of the American steel industry had been doing with the Nazis right up to the war. A total of 4,000 documents were seized, showing that during 1938-39 various secret meetings were held in London, Paris, and Luxemburg to organize a world steel cartel.

The American representatives for this deal were none other than Tom Girdler of Republic Steel, who has had a virtual pipe line into Harry Truman through Truman's close friend, George Allen; Eugene Grace of Bethlehem Steel, and Ben Fairless of United States Steel, the company which now supplies four of the men supposed to keep an eye on the Ruhr.

The European manager for the United States Steel Corp. and the chief go-between for both the British and the Americans was Ian Elliott, who now sits on the board of governors for the Ruhr.

During the dates when this deal was organized—1938-39—Hitler had already marched into Czechoslovakia and was greedily eyeing Poland. American correspondents in Europe were constantly warning of war, and this columnist had categorically predicted it.

FEARED JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Despite this, the biggest leaders of American steel worked out a deal whereby they would not compete with Germany, though they admitted they could not control "little steel" in this country. Significantly, also, they refused to sign a written cartel agreement on the ground that they might incur Justice Department prosecution. Instead, they entered a gentleman's oral agreement which they said would be just as binding as a written contract.

Today, therefore, control of Ruhr steel, the key to war in Europe, will be under 12 German cartelists picked by a former Nazi officer, and under the supervision of four United States steel men whose boss made a secret deal with the Nazis even while Hitler was waving the big stick over Czechoslovakia and Poland.

CAPITAL CHAFF

The Hungarian Government is going after other religious groups besides the Catholics. The Hungarians have cut off Jewish emigration out of Hungary and closed down the offices of Jewish relief agencies in Budapest. The State Department has just received an encouraging report on the French political situation. Both the Communists and General de Gaulle are losing strength. The French middle-of-the-road group is steadily picking up influence—a great victory for democracy.

Cut Back the Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Traveler of Thursday, March 3, 1949:

CUT BACK THE EXCISE TAXES

The Republican policy committee, headed by Minority Leader MARTIN, has called for a measure that has the majority of Americans behind it. The GOP group is calling for a cut-back of excise taxes to the prewar level.

Excise taxes, often misnamed luxury taxes, were set at 20 percent in 1944, with the promise that they would end 6 months after the war. Three years and 6 months have passed, and we still are paying a 20-percent tax on such "luxuries" as ladies' handbags, babies' dusting powder, and tockets to the movies or the ball game. Or such further "luxuries" as telephone bills and railroad tickets, which also carry excise taxes.

Hidden taxes are bad enough, but these taxes do not have the decency to go into hiding. They are certainly discriminatory, since they are levied on articles just as vital to ordinary living as other articles not so taxed. With the rates as high as they are, it may well be questioned if they do not defeat their own purpose by discouraging the sale of articles bearing these excessive imposts.

The proper thing for the Government to do is to live up to its pledge and cut back the excise-tax rate to the prewar rate. The golden goose has been laying so fast of late.

AMA Versus Public Health—Medicine and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 4, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, America is full of people who need more and better care than they can get or pay for. Yet the doctors are willing to spend time and money they should be devoting to their profession in a fight against the only plan which will bring that medical care to the people who need it.

K. M. Landis, of Logansport, Ind., has written two excellent columns on this subject in the Chicago Sun-Times. I include these columns in the RECORD:

AMA VERSUS PUBLIC HEALTH

LOGANSPORT, IND.—Why is the American Medical Association assessing doctors $25 a head to fight national health insurance?

In my opinion it is doing so because it has a basic misconception of the role it should play in American life.

You would think offhand that the leaders of the medical profession would be interested primarily in bringing better medical care to more people.

Certainly there is plenty of room for improvement. It is known, for example, that we are the richest country in the world.

Yet before the war, the American death rate was higher than in eight other countries. Maternal mortality was higher here than in 21 foreign nations.

Is this anything to brag about?

When the war came, 40 percent of American men in the prime of life were rejected as unfit to serve their country because of mental and physical defects.

Is this something to explain away?

According to Government estimates, more Americans die each year because of inadequate medical attention than were killed in any year of World War II.

On this record, you would think that the doctor's union would be out in the street crying "Murder," and leading the fight for more and better medicine.

All over the country, the waiting rooms of doctors are filled with sick people. In rural areas the shortage of physicians has become a scandal.

Nothing is more obvious than the inadequacy and unevenness of medical care in the United States. But what is the attitude of the American Medical Association?

For more than a generation, it has used its power over medical schools to restrict rather than expand the training of new doctors. It has had the psychology of the glaziers' union.

Fewer doctors were graduated in 1940 than in 1905, although the population of the country had increased by 60 percent.

Now the AMA uses the scarcity of doctors as an argument against national health insurance. Isn't it about time we had more doctors?

Even when doctors are available, less than half the people in this country can pay for adequate medical care. Isn't it about time we had medical care for everybody?

Why is organized medicine fighting national health insurance? Socialism, it cries.

The sad truth is that the AMA looks upon sickness as a private field for exploitation rather than as a social evil to be attacked on a broad front.

MEDICINE AND FREE ENTERPRISE

LOGANSPORT, IND.—In the next few months, you are going to hear a lot about the dangers of socialism.

This is because the American Medical Association is assessing doctors $25 a head to build up a propaganda fund against national health insurance.

Our medical societies are hysterical on the subject of socialism. Way back in 1932, President Hoover's committee on the costs of medical care reported:

"Human life in the United States is being wasted, as recklessly, as surely, in times of peace as in times of war. Thousands of people are sick and dying daily in this country because the knowledge and facilities we have are inadequately applied."

The chairman of Hoover's committee was Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, a former president of the American Medical Association. He was not a radical gentleman.

Yet what did the Journal of the American Medical Association call the report? It described it as "socialism, communism—inciting to revolution."

Almost every proposal to extend better medical care to more people has been denounced on these grounds.

For many years organized medicine openly fought public-health vaccinations against diphtheria and other communicable diseases. Why? It was socialism.

When workmen's compensation insurance was first suggested, it was bitterly opposed by medical societies. William Green, now president of the AFL, was then a member of the Ohio legislature.

"I recall," he says, "when the medical profession came in in groups and the employers came in in groups, and said 'This will drive us out of Ohio. It will confiscate our property, destroy our profession. It is socialism in the most violent form.'"

In 1934, the AMA rebuked the American College of Surgeons for flirting with a voluntary health insurance. Why? It was a scheme for the "mechanization of medical practice."

Now the AMA has changed its mind, and is supporting some private insurance schemes in a desperate effort to head off a uniform system of compulsory health insurance.

Is it socialism? The first compulsory health insurance system in this country was approved by Congress in 1789 to take care of the medical needs of merchant seamen.

Today we have compulsory old-age pensions, compulsory unemployment insurance, compulsory workmen's compensation. We have free medical care at Government hospitals for Congressmen, war veterans, Indians, and idiots. Is this communism?

Of course not. Insurance or no insurance, we will still have free enterprise in this country in ovaries and tonsils.

Un-Christian Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following Justice for Poland radio broadcast, Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., entitled "The Infiltration of Pro-Communists into American Education," by Hubert Kregeloh:

A wave of cynicism is engulfing thinking people throughout the world. Most of us fight this condition. We do not want to be cynical, we should like to be idealists and optimists and believe in a glorious future for mankind. But all too often we cannot help ourselves. We hark back to the lofty slogans that spurred men on during World War I, and we remember all too clearly that it was not a war "to end all wars"; neither did it "make the world safe for democracy."

Something went wrong after 1918. And although we have since studied all kinds of learned explanations of what went wrong and why and how, the only important fact remains that the statesmen were incapable of creating that promised better world and that 20 years later, after an uneasy armistice, we found ourselves drawn into the whirlpool of another carnage, many times more frightful than the one which was to have given us lasting peace.

And again men were inspired to heroic deeds and patient suffering with another set of slogans promising them a great new world after victory. The democracies would smash tyranny. Men everywhere would enjoy freedom and dignity. Great plans were being laid—so they said—to alleviate promptly all the conditions which made human beings miserable, hungry, and dissatisfied. A new organization, much better than the defunct League of Nations, was being set up to build the peace and to watch over it. And from America came words thrilling millions of simple people—the words spelling out the noble promises of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms. Those who doubted that such sweeping promises could be kept, or expressed bewilderment regarding the sudden promotion to the rank of a fellow-democracy of totalitarian Soviet Russia, were dismissed as cynics, pessimists, defeatists—yes, even as Axis agents.

In those days it was definitely in bad taste to question the long-term intentions of the Soviets, who had become our allies by accident, not by choice, or to suggest that leopards do not change their spots even when attacked by tigers. The Nation was hypnotized into believing the excellency of the newly discovered Russian fellow democracy by the men in high places, some of whom were consistently pro-Communist, while others were simply naive, gullible, and inexperienced. I had always felt that the late President Roosevelt could not have studied the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Otherwise, despite his frequent flirtations with the political far left, he could not have pursued his tragically fatal Soviet policy, culminating in the unfortunate agreements of Tehran and Yalta, which sold Poland and China down the river and paved the way for the construction of the aggressive Soviet postwar threat in all its present urgency. We learned recently from Mr. Bullitt, former United States Ambassador to Russia, that President Roosevelt had indeed never read the writings of the Communist doctrinaires.

There is scant comfort in the knowledge that Mr. Roosevelt himself, in the last weeks before his death, had begun to worry about the integrity of Stalin. There is even less comfort in the fact that today the entire freedom-loving world again sees the Bolsheviks as they really are; of hindsight we have had plenty, but never apparently do we heed the bitter lessons we profess to have learned.

Let us suffice to note that the United Nations has been paralyzed by the Soviets who joined the Organization to make sure it would not interfere with Moscow's plans of aggression and expansion; that millions of betrayed and bewildered people were liberated from one form of oppression only to be placed under another—in some instances worse—type of tyranny; that more millions live in constant fear as they listen to the rumblings from behind the iron curtain; and that the Atlantic Charter is as dead and useless a scrap of paper as the one Neville Chamberlain once waved to cheering throngs of swindled Britons as he returned from Munich in 1938.

At Yalta, in proceedings which future historians can only describe as strictly dishonest, the brave and long-suffering Polish people were delivered into the custody of the Bolsheviks without their consent or even their knowledge; also, at Yalta, the Russians were given rights in Manchuria which probably made it inevitable that this region would be skillfully maneuvered into the hands of the Chinese Communists and lost to the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. This, too, was arranged without the presence of a Chinese representative and without prior consultation with the Chinese Government, which at the time was our fighting ally. However, so much has been said and written about the ethics of Yalta that to go into details would be redundant.

Important at this time is the fact that the poison of communism, with its rule by gangsters and its destruction of freedom and religion, which has already corroded so many foreign nations, is constantly launching subversive attacks against the United States, the only power with the strength to curb bolshevism's ambitious aspirations.

These attacks are the more dangerous since, with few exceptions, such as the Canadian spy case and the current spy sensation—they are carried out subtly, with less drama and directness than we witness in foreign lands; they are therefore less obvious and less disquieting to an indifferent and preoccupied public.

The assaults against the American way of life take the form of attempted thought corruption. The Bolsheviks set up front organizations with attractive names, such as that notorious outfit, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship or the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, to lure the innocent. Communists and fellow travelers worm their way into veteran, civic, and religious organizations, where they pose as liberals, influencing resolutions, volunteering to secure speakers, etc.—always skillfully exploiting the traditional American sense of fair play and also, alas, in many cases, the ignorance of Americans regarding the methods of communism. That tragicomical figure, the "Red Dean" of Canterbury and the Reverend Howard Melish, of Brooklyn, are only two of many examples to prove that propagandists of communism, the most un-Christian doctrine, are even to be found in pulpits. And Judaism and Roman Catholicism are not free from Bolshevik infiltration, either.

Above all, there is the fruitful field of education. Young people are impressionable, easily inflamed by ideals—real and phony—awed by the knowledge of their teachers, and inexperienced in ideological analysis. Not without good reason did Lenin specifically recommend that every effort be made to win youth over to bolshevism.

Lenin's disciples in America are carrying out his recommendation. We have, in the majority of our colleges and universities, teachers who, with the aid of complicated intellectual double-talk and armed with the flaming sword of academic freedom, consistently toe the Communist line. Examples are Prof. Frederick Schuman, of Williams College, and Prof. Dirk Struik, of MIT. The latter gentleman, who is Massachusetts State chairman of that Soviet-American Friendship Council, has a long record of affiliation with affairs sponsored by the Communist Party and its intellectual hatchery, the Jefferson School of Social Science. He has been written up warmly in the Daily Worker, and, together with Professor Schuman, is just one of many far-leftist teachers to whose deplorable influence American parents are forced to expose their sons and daughters. Dr. Struik, by the way, was also awarded a Soviet decoration. I have met many parents who expressed amazement and consternation that their sons and daughters returned from college with ideas which the parents could not associate with what they believed to be Americanism. In all such cases the parents need only scrutinize the faculty of whatever institution of learning is involved. They will be sure to find at least one or more professors whose names they also remember in connection with Henry Wallace rallies or as speakers for the various Communist-front outfits, clearly listed as such by the Attorney General. They should not be surprised that these men, so disdainful of capitalist society to which they owe everything they are, seek to corrupt the thoughts of young Americans.

Another case in point is the one involving Assistant Prof. Arthur P. Coleman who, after 20 years of distinguished service, resigned from the department of Slavic languages at Columbia University in protest against the acceptance by Columbia of $30,000 from the Polish Communist Government to set up a chair of Polish studies. The whole case was written up comprehensively on the last page of the Saturday Evening Post of November 6. The appointee for the new chair was Prof. Manfred Kridl, formerly of Smith College, who is regarded as not unsympathetic to communism. The head of the department at Columbia is Prof. Ernest J. Simmons, who has written articles for the pro-Communist publication, the New Masses, and for Soviet Russia Today and has long been regarded as friendly to the Soviet Union. The Saturday Evening Post, feeling that Professor Coleman got a very raw deal, writes that surely a gift from a government which only recently sponsored a congress of intellectuals at which everything American was lambasted in the crudest terms might be subjected to more suspicion than it appears to have aroused at Columbia. In the face of floods of public protests, including those by the Polish American Congress, the publication fears that Columbia and General Eisenhower, its president, have been dangerously indifferent to what could be the beginning of a new penetration by Soviet propaganda into Columbia's department of Slavic languages.

Entrance of Italy Into the Atlantic Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter to Senators TOM CONNALLY, WALTER F. GEORGE, and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, written by Generoso Pope and published in Il Progresso on Sunday, March 6, 1949:

To Senators Tom Connally, Walter F. George, and Arthur H. Vandenberg:

There have been recurrent reliable press reports in recent days that you, as members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are opposed to the entrance of Italy into the contemplated Atlantic Pact at this time. In view of your not issuing any statement whatsoever to the contrary, the American people are justified in accepting these reports as truly embodying your position. Hence, I must write you to urge with all my sincerity and strength that you reconsider your present position and drop your opposition to Italy's immediate entrance into the projected Atlantic Pact.

I have been doing much thinking trying to figure out what reasons you may have for your opposition to Italy. If these reasons attributed to you in the press are not the ones, I would appreciate it exceedingly if you would let me know precisely and definitely any other objections you may have.

It is inconceivable that any outstanding and authoritative leader of our country could oppose Italian entrance into the Atlantic Pact on the ground that Italy is not a member of the United Nations. You know very well that at Potsdam, our country, Britain and Russia agreed to consider favorably Italy's early admission to the United Nations. You know equally well that our country and its associated democratic powers have repeatedly urged and sought Italian membership in the United Nations. Surely you have not forgotten that it is only aggressionist Russia's opposition to Italian admission to the United Nations which alone accounts for Italy's not yet being a full-fledged member of the United Nations.

Under these circumstances it must indeed be clear to you that it is utterly unjust and dangerously unsound for any responsible democratic statesman to punish Italy further by now keeping her out of the Atlantic Pact because of Russia's reprehensible attitude. What sense of justice is there in keeping Italy out of the Atlantic Pact because Russia is keeping Italy out of the UN? As long as our country believes Italy is fitted to and deserves to join the UN, Italy is eminently qualified for immediate entrance into the Atlantic Pact. For our Government to pursue any other course is to play right into the hands of the Russian imperialists who want to divide and defeat the ranks of the western democratic world.

Nor can I get myself to believe that statesmen of your stature could oppose Italy's entrance into the Atlantic Pact on the ground that she is a Mediterranean and not an Atlantic nation. At a moment when our planes are making historic nonstop globe-girdling flights, it is inconceivable that anyone should draw such arbitrary and untenable lines of geographical and military demarcation. For some years, it has been true that there could be no effective control of the Atlantic without a secure hold on the Mediterranean. Britain, with its centuries of naval tradition and experience, has long ago realized that it would be sheer suicide to separate the Atlantic from the Mediterranean in any concept of effective defense or successful striking power against an enemy. This is the real meaning of the life-line of the British Empire and Britain's continuous concern for making the Mediterranean secure in order to keep the Atlantic clear. Precisely because of Italy's pivotal position in the Mediterranean, is it most vital to have her in the Atlantic Pact. Otherwise, we should be leaving wide open a most important flank as an inviting and unprotected target for an aggressor.

The argument that if Italy were to join there would not be enough American arms for the nations of the north, holds no water. Our country was able to provide more weapons and equipment to help win World War II—after it was started. Surely we can today provide an adequate—though really far smaller—supply of arms to prevent world war III and enable the freedom-loving nations to win the peace.

To welcome Italy into the Atlantic Pact today is to save millions of American and other lives tomorrow. But to spurn Italy's offer to join now is to discredit and discourage her democratic government which is our true friend and to help make Italy an easy prey for the totalitarian Communist savages operating there as Russia's fifth column. The frantic opposition of Togliatti to Italy's joining the pact and the threat of this chief Kremlin henchman in Rome to sabotage and defeat Italian assistance to the United States in the event of a conflict between our country and Russia should only strengthen our country's determination to take the lead in having Italy admitted immediately into the Atlantic Pact.

The Italy of today is a free and democratic Italy. Its leadership is a tried and true leadership of democracy. Its people are hard-working and liberty loving. They have shown it on the battlefield as our co-belligerents. They have shown it in the historical elections of last April. They have shown it in the encouraging progress in economic reconstruction. The Italians are forty-seven millions in number—far in excess of the total population of the Benelux and Scandinavian countries. Italy has many industrial skills and fine plant capacities which could be a great asset in strengthening the camp of world democracy and peace.

The American people have been extremely generous in helping the Italian people reach this stage of inspiring progress. We must not, we dare not, throw away, undo and destroy all our own achievements and all the successes of the long-suffering Italian people themselves—as worthy and valuable members of the community of free and peaceful nations. I earnestly appeal to your good sense and high patriotism, to your devotion to de-

mocracy and the cause of enduring world peace to do everything in your power to have our great country, our own America, take the lead in assuring Italy's immediate entrance into the Atlantic Pact.

GENEROSO POPE.

Missouri Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some questions I answered on a radio program in connection with the Missouri Valley Authority:

Question No. 1. What would an MVA propose, and how does it differ from the Pick-Sloan plan now in operation?

The Missouri Valley Authority, as proposed in the bill introduced by Senator MURRAY and others, would set up an over-all agency with a five-man board and directors to control all of the economic and social development of the Missouri River Basin. It would be a supreme authority over the present agencies now developing the basin. The agency would have exclusive and absolute control over the watershed. I believe that it would be an autonomous state, outside the reach of local and State governments and responsible to no one but itself. If they operate as they are now in the Tennessee Valley, they would have the right to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain roads, terminals, sewage disposal and water power plants, plus recreational facilities. I believe that under the broad authority of the Murray bill, it would be possible to engage in the banking business, operate grocery stores, establish schools, and run farms. The MVA would produce a planned economy, a super-duper board with no local control; one putting into effect arbitrary regulations, restrictions, and orders. The people of the Midwest would resent these controls because they do not like dictators, benevolent or otherwise.

Now, as to the Pick-Sloan plan. It follows States' rights. In its operation and construction, it would keep the controls close to home. It would assist our farmers in developing their water rights and the farmers are independent and good managers. The Pick-Sloan plan is helping to develop the Missouri River and contemplates 174 projects.

The Missouri River is 2,460 miles long. The basin has an area of 529,000 square miles. The Pick-Sloan plan came into being when the President signed Public Law 534 in the fall of 1944. This plan is a nucleus and has formulated definite comprehensive plans for the development of the Missouri River Basin. The plan includes flood control, drainage, irrigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, improved land uses, forestation, recreational facilities, fish and wildlife, industrial expansion, public health, and many other conservation and developmental measures.

Under the Pick-Sloan plan, there is an interagency committee, composed of the governors of the 10 Missouri River States, with two additional representatives from each State. They are working in unison, promoting closer cooperation and understanding between the States. It seems to me that the sole issue between an MVA or a Pick-Sloan plan should be which method of procedure in development of the river basin will do the greatest number the most good. Today we have the reclamation interests, the Army engineers, and the Agriculture people, who have resolved their differences and are making progress. Contracts for dams to store water have been let. The conflict over flood control, irrigation, and power has been resolved. The water rights of the irrigators from Scottsbluff to Grand Island are being protected.

I have never seen any argument advanced that the MVA or some unknown authority can do a better job in the Missouri Basin than will be done through the use of the dams and irrigation projects constructed through the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Question No. 2. Considering the initial support from both the Democrats and Republicans for the Missouri Valley Authority, what chance of passage has the measure at this session?

This bill was introduced in the Senate and has 17 sponsors, 15 Democrats and 2 Republicans. Of the 17 sponsors, only 5 are in the Missouri River Basin area.

Undoubtedly the bill will have a hearing. It will be controversial and studded with emotional outbursts. It promises to be quite a slugfest. There is a definite need for a common-sense approach to the whole problem of developing the valley. It is so controversial that there may indeed be more heat than light. Where name calling begins, their reason leaves off. I do not believe the bill will pass.

Question No. 3. What do the people of Nebraska say about the MVA, and is there a general demand for this agency?

In my opinion, there is a very small minority, representing the more liberal groups, who would like to see such an authority. I checked the hearings of 2 years ago, and found the following quotations from several witnesses from Nebraska, who appeared against the bill:

One witness said: "The MVA plan would destroy the century of experience held by the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation as it relates to the planning and operating of flood-control and irrigation projects."

Another witness said: "The MVA plan would destroy all State rights, and it should be remembered that all States have certain laws and regulations, governing their water rights."

Another witness said: "The MVA Authority could make effective and carry out their plans without approval by the Congress or the States involved. The employees of the Authority would be outside of the civil service and therefore subject to the spoils system. The bill would effect change in our form of government, totalitarian and socialistic in its trends."

Another witness said: "The creation of an MVA would amount to the welding of economic and political powers which would result in nothing short of an autocracy. It would mean the substitution of arbitrary power for democratic action. It would subject the social, cultural, and economic welfare of the Missouri Basin to the dictates and whims of a five-man board not responsible to the people and largely irresponsible to the Congress itself."

Another witness said: "It would challenge State sovereignty, and destroy systems of law, both State and Federal, under which western agriculture has grown and prospered. Yes, it would throttle, in the West, the reclamation program which has been carried on through the many years by an experienced agency."

Question No. 4. Since water and power is of primary concern in the farm area of the West, do you think that an agency such as the proposed MVA would serve to more adequately distribute irrigation and water power to the several States in the area?

We do lack adequate electrical energy. There is a real crusade on among our farm population for more REA lines. There is now a rapid expansion under present agencies. Dams are being built on the Republican River for irrigation purposes. The Randall Dam, in South Dakota, now under construction, will bring much electrical energy into the State. Construction is proceeding in Wyoming and Colorado, under both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The Pick-Sloan plan proposes power plants on the Niobrara, the Loups, the Platte, and the Republican Rivers. It proposes more irrigation in these areas, under State and local control. I truly feel that when we fully develop and use our resources we will see new population, new wealth, and new industries coming into our State. I do not understand how an MVA can do a better job than the agencies now in the field.

Question No. 5. Is there much dissatisfaction in Nebraska with the joint program sponsored by the Department of Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation?

I have found no general dissatisfaction. There are many people who feel the agencies move too slowly. I do believe that the threat of an MVA has caused the several agencies to work more in harmony.

There is a feeling in Nebraska that all plans of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers ought to be examined very closely by the State and local communities who will be affected. That is being done. Hearings have been held. Groups have had an opportunity to express themselves. No action will be taken until plans are approved by the State and the communities affected. This is as it should be.

It is my belief that under MVA the people will have little control over the authority. Under the Pick-Sloan plan all proposals must be studied by the State, and when the people involved want to form an irrigation district, they do so under State and Federal regulations. Nothing is forced upon them. Their own destiny and future is in their own hands. I cannot understand how a super-duper agency could do a better job than is being done by our own present experienced group of engineers and the Reclamation Service.

All but five of the sponsors of the bill are outside of the Missouri River Basin. I am sure that the people of Nebraska and of the basin do not want the bureaucrats and the yapping social uplifters from Washington and the East, imposing a socialistic theory which calls for regimentation and control of their lives. I am sure that Congress must protect not only State rights, but the rights of individuals already established. If we do otherwise, we would be derelict in our duty.

National Health Insurance and the AMA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, physicians throughout the Nation were shocked and dismayed a few weeks ago when the National Physicians Committee, which is fighting hand in hand with the American Medical Association against President Truman's health-insurance legislation, circulated a letter with anti-Semitic overtones by a questionable character known as Dan Gilbert.

The backfire was so strong that the AMA has finally come out with a statement disassociating itself from the Gilbert letter, which the National Physicians Committee sent out with the apparent approval of the AMA. But, as Albert Deutsch, the noted medical writer, pointed out in a column in the New York Post, Sunday, March 6, the AMA did not disavow the National Physicians Committee, which has used questionable methods in the past in fighting health-insurance legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this column by Mr. Deutsch:

(By Albert Deutsch)

The national physicians committee, stooge propaganda agency for organized medicine, last week got a slap on the wrist from the American Medical Association and a smack on the snoot from the AMA's largest component—the New York County Medical Society—for distributing the Dan Gilbert News Letter addressed to "Dear Christian American" and attacking national health insurance as "the monster of anti-Christ."

The significant action of the New York County Medical Society at its monthly meeting last Monday was eclipsed completely in the press by the news of its unexpected vote to disapprove the $25 propaganda tax levied on doctors by the AMA.

The local society's resolution on the NPC not only condemned the agency for circulating the bigot-slanted Gilbert letter, but officially announced the withdrawal of the society's previous endorsement of the NPC.

The American Medical Association, through its journal last week, declared that the Gilbert letter was sent out without the knowledge of any official of the AMA; that every official of the AMA joins in condemning the letter as an expression of medical opinion in this country, and that the AMA does not require allies of doubtful repute in its campaign for the maintenance of a high quality of medical care.

The AMA skillfully disassociates itself from the rabid Gilbert letter but refrains from condemning the NPC for circulating it and hailing it as one of the few really vital pronouncements of an age.

The local medical society notes the AMA's failure to rescind its approval of the NPC and reproves the parent body indirectly for not going far enough. The NPC, in a circular accompanying the Gilbert letter, boasted that it had been endorsed officially on three occasions by the AMA.

How can the AMA now repudiate its own brain child? It is known that the NPC was born in 1939 after weighty conferences of key AMA officials. It has been stated in official medical publications that the NPC was created as a propaganda and lobbying agency because the AMA would lose its tax-exempt status if it went directly into the field itself.

Dr. Morris Fishbein, AMA factotum, presided as "midwife" at the official launching of the NPC 10 years ago. Its roster of officers reads like a Who's Who of ex-presidents and trustees of the AMA. The present chairman of the NPC, Dr. Edward H. Cary, is an AMA ex-president. Another AMA ex-president, Dr. Harrison H. Shoulders, serves on the NPC board of trustees. Dr. F. F. Borzell, speaker of the AMA's house of delegates—a powerful post—is another NPC trustee. The other 15 NPC trustees are drawn from the top circles of the AMA—its board of trustees and house of delegates.

Nearly every State NPC chairman is an ex-president of the medical society in his respective State. The NPC is careful not to have current medical society presidents; that might betray the tie-up as too official.

A number of State and local societies have actually forced their members into supporting the NPC by imposing a special annual NPC assessment on them.

The false and often vicious propaganda emanating from the NPC has outraged many physicians—even among those who vigorously oppose national health insurance. But they have never succeeded in getting the AMA to withdraw its official endorsement of the stooge agency, which is headed by former newspaper executive, John M. Pratt, who used to run a physicians' free enterprise committee for Frank Gannett's committee on constitutional government when Gannett was nursing dreams of getting the Republican Presidential nomination.

The American Dental Association, last September, did what the AMA still refuses to do. The NPC had set up an auxiliary national committee of dentists which for years had the ADA's endorsement. The American Dental Association adopted a resolution at its annual meeting in Chicago opposing the policies and methods of the national committee of dentists and repudiating its previous endorsement of it.

The NPC, meanwhile, is in the middle of a campaign to raise a million-dollar-war chest to help the AMA's announced $3,500,000 campaign to fight President Truman's health-insurance program.

The NPC raised nearly $600,000 last year, including $122,000 from large drug manufacturing companies. Among the latter, Parke, Davis & Co., the Upjohn Co., and Eli Lilly Co. kicked in $15,000 apiece, while Hoffman-LaRoche and American Cyanamid contributed $10,000 each.

Arizona Combats Dust-Bowl Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, Arizona is so far away from Washington and the Atlantic seaboard, and it is so difficult for a voice from that distant corner to be adequately heard here, that it was a distinct surprise and pleasure when I saw on page 12 of the New York Times for Monday, March 7, 1949, a well-written article informing the great reading public of this outstanding newspaper something of the serious condition confronting the State of Arizona. Central Arizona has staged one of the most remarkable developments in this generation and has reached the apex of economic growth and agricultural production. And now having reached that apex, wherein that small area constitutes an oasis in the desert and contributes as much as $66,000,000 in income taxes annually to the Federal Treasury, it finds itself faced with an economic crisis. This is a curable crisis, but the great question is, Will it be cured? And that question can only be answered by the Congress of the United States. This article in the New York Times, in a relatively brief space, portrays the danger and pictures the situation better than the senior Congressman from Arizona has ever been able to do. I commend this article to my colleagues and urge a careful reading of it, not alone for Arizona's benefit, but for the economy of the entire Nation.

The article is as follows:

ARIZONA COMBATS DUST-BOWL THREAT—PUSHES TO GET WATER FROM THE COLORADO TO SAVE RICH LAND REVERTING TO DESERT

(By Gladwin Hill)

PHOENIX, ARIZ., March 6.—Confronted by a water shortage which threatens a drastic curtailment in agriculture, one of the State's main sources of income, Arizona leaders are marshaling renewed support for one of the most ambitious projects in the 47-year history of Federal reclamation work.

This is the $738,000,000 program by which water would be diverted from the Colorado River at Parker Dam, on the Colorado-California boundary 170 miles west of Phoenix, raised 985 feet and sent by gravity flow through a 235-mile canal, to be known as the Granite Reef Aqueduct, to the fertile but parched 1,200-square-mile farming area of central Arizona.

Congressional hearings on the project have been tentatively scheduled for this month.

By the project 1,300,000 acre-feet of water (an acre-foot is the amount necessary to cover 1 acre to a depth of a foot) would be provided to alleviate a deficit which is causing farmers to look anxiously at the 1,000-year-old ruins of an Indian civilization in the area supposedly extinguished by a similar water shortage.

RECORD OF RECLAMATION

A generation of reclamation work, leading to a system of eight impressive dams on the Salt, Gila, and Verde Rivers, which converge near here, has turned 725,000 acres of desert into some of the Nation's most productive farmland.

Since the construction of the Theodore Roosevelt Dam on the Salt River, the Government's first reclamation dam, the population of this central Arizona area, in Maricopa and Pinal Counties, has jumped from 43,500 to more than 387,000—half the State's population.

This area contributes the major part of the State's agricultural income, which last year hit a record of $200,000,000 and was nearly one-third of the State's income total.

The biggest chunk of this farm revenue was from cotton—a record 32,000 bales, worth $59,000,000. Beef and truck crops contributed nearly equal amounts. Central Arizona boasts that it now produces half the Nation's supply of winter and spring lettuce, 10 percent of the Nation's carrots, and 60 percent of its spring cantaloups. Its alfalfa production rate of 2.7 tons per acre is claimed to be the second highest in the country, twice the national average.

Pinal County, the cotton center, produces 550 pounds per acre, against a national average of 350 pounds.

GROWING SHADOW OF DROUGHT

But the picture of abundance is being darkened by a growing shadow of drought.

The central Arizona development, amounting to only 1 percent of the State's total area but comprising the bulk of its irrigated land, has been getting about half of its farm water from the dam system via channels and about half from natural underground reservoirs by pumping.

Exceptional aridity for two decades and the water demands of expanded wartime food production have sapped the dam reservoirs and brought critical depletion of natural underground reserves.

In only 3 years since 1927—1932, 1937, 1941—has there been good rainfall in the central Arizona watershed. By last December, the University of Arizona reports, seven deficit years in water supply had consumed more than 95 percent of the 1941 reservoir surplus, while the area's water tables fell from 5 to 50 feet or more.

In Pinal County, the cotton center, the underground supply was depleted by 3,000,000 acre-feet—the equivalent of nearly a year's water needs for the whole 725,000-acre area.

Melting snows last week filled dam reservoirs of the Salt River project, the main part of the central Arizona area, up to 412,995 acre-feet, twice the storage of a year ago and four times as much as was behind the dams in December, but still only one-tenth of the area's annual water needs.

WATER-DEFICIT FIGURES

The net result, according to the Central Arizona Project Association, is that in the face of a total annual requirement of 4,100,000 acre-feet the area has been getting on the average only 1,800,000 acre-feet from rivers and the same amount by pumping, leaving an initial deficit of 500,000 acre-feet. But the pumping itself is a deficit operation, depleting underground reserves by an estimated 800,000 acre-feet for a total deficit of 1,300,000 acre-feet a year.

The allotment of dam water to farmers this year as last is only 2 acre-feet per acre—about half the amount necessary for full agricultural production. Some key districts on very depleted dams received as little last year as .85 acre-foot. Pump farmers have been driving their wells down as much as 300 feet to levels where pumping is no longer economical.

Since you can't grow a crop on half enough water, farmers have just had to take part of their land out of production and concentrate available water on the rest. As a result fertile land has been reverting to the poison goldenrod, greasewood scrub and sage of the primeval desert.

Ten percent of the land, according to authoritative estimates, already has gone out of use this way, and Federal and State reclamation officials are agreed that the present course of water shortage can end only in the enforced retirement of at least one-third of the whole 1,200-square-mile central Arizona development.

WAR BROUGHT STIMULUS

Local observers acknowledge that there undoubtedly has been some improvement in expenditure of underground water resources and some speculative expansion of irrigation farming. But, they point out, this occurred largely during the war, when the Government itself was encouraging all-out production of food and other farm products, as it still is to a degree.

If the threatened one-third of the central Arizona land were all in one spot, solution of the problem might not be so complex, but because water is fluid, its lack is also fluid, and has spread throughout the area, without regard for ownerships or property lines.

Again, if only land were involved it might be dealt with summarily. But also involved are the livelihoods and lives of many thousands of persons—not only the ones on the 18,000 farms in the area but the multitude of others in the complex economy that has grown up around agriculture.

The pinch of the water shortage has been aggravated by falling agricultural prices—first cotton, late in 1946, grain a year ago, beef last summer and vegetables last fall.

"Another 20-percent drop in cotton and grain prices, with power costs staying up, and half the pump land in this area will go," William Rugg, a farmer in Casa Grande, in Pinal County, said today.

In Pinal County about 300,000 acres of land have been cultivated from desert by irrigation—100,000 acres on the San Carlos project, fed by the Coolidge Dam on the Gila River, and 200,000 acres supplied by pumping.

REPORT OF COUNTY AGENT

Kelvin K. Henness, the Department of Agriculture's county agent for 20 years, estimates that last year not over half of the 100,000-acre San Carlos project was worked and that around 35,000 acres of pump land were out of use.

Mr. Rugg, who came here from Worcester, Mass., 20 years ago, has a 2,000-acre farm. He is working only 1,200 acres of it, in cotton, alfalfa, maize and barley.

"I'd be working all of it if there was water," he said. "Ten years ago, with one pump and a reasonably good well, you could irrigate 320 acres. Today that same pump will irrigate only about half that. I used to pump from 125 feet. Now I'm down to 235."

Leigh Larue, who has a dairy farm in the same area, came here from Indiana 10 years ago, bought a 40-acre tract, and worked up from poultry raising to a 30-head herd of pure-bred Guernsey cows, expecting to feed them off alfalfa from the tract.

"The first year I got a reasonable amount of feed," he said. "But since then it's been going down steadily."

The growing water shortage has forced him to abandon half his tract and the rest has barely been paying its cost.

"Last year," he recounted, "I raised about $500 worth of pasturage, but it cost me just about that much to produce it, between feed, planting, water, and taxes.

"I've had to buy 75 to 80 tons of hay a year. I figure I'd be just as well off operating in the desert, buying all my feed."

Indications of a nascent dust bowl are on every hand.

"That's the Roy Johnson farm—35 acres," Mr. Henness pointed out during a tour of the district. "That cotton stubble's been there 6 years. He quit and went into carpentering.

"That 70 acres belongs to J. M. Norwood. He gave it up in the fall of 1946. Went to California, trucking vegetables. That place is owned by a man named Earl Weaver. He went to Oregon. Last I heard he was running a store."

A boost in the San Carlos project surface-water ration from last year's 0.85 acre-foot to 2 acre-feet has brought new attempts to cultivate some of the district's idle land on a restricted basis, since water rights, however small, are not to be spurned. But neither farmers nor officials are at all optimistic about long-term prospects under present facilities.

Federal and State reclamation officials are in agreement that the present central Arizona dam system, even with more favorable weather conditions, cannot be counted on to rectify the situation and that a supplementary supply is necessary.

Arizona's only hope at present for this supplementary supply is in the $738,000,000 central Arizona project.

The 235-mile canal from the Colorado is only one detail of the plan. The project calls also for the construction of a dam at Bridge Canyon on the Colorado 100 miles above Boulder Dam and 170 miles northwest of Phoenix. With a power capacity about three-quarters that of Boulder's, this would provide energy both for the pumping operation at Parker Dam and to help alleviate the general scarcity of consumer power in the Arizona-southern California area.

Supplementing both the Boulder and Bridge Canyon Dams on the Colorado would be additional ones on the tributary San Juan River at Bluff, Utah, and at Cameron, Ariz., on the tributary Little Colorado River, both of them for silt and flood control. That at Cameron would be called the Coconino.

Then down in the central Arizona area itself the project calls for four dams in addition to the present eight—the four being designated Buttes, Charleston, Hooker, and McDowell—plus aqueducts and other facilities to distribute the water.

SEVENTY-EIGHT YEARS TO PAY FOR ITSELF

The project is planned to pay for itself in power and irrigation water charges in 78 years. It has been approved by the Department of the Interior. But its authorization by Congress has been bitterly fought by the State of California. California contends that the diversion would take water on which it has a future legal claim under interstate agreements which have been subjects of heated controversy for 25 years.

Ironically, while the dispute rages the ancient Colorado, future claims on which by its seven basin States amount to more than 100 percent of all its water, continues to spew unused water into the Gulf of California, upward of 8,000,000 acre-feet a year.

Arizona is equally adamant in asserting its legal right to the needed water and, while California continues its long fight to get the issue into the Supreme Court, in pressing for enactment of the project.

Arizona's hopes, fruitless in the Eightieth Congress, plummeted a month ago when the Bureau of the Budget stated that the Central Arizona project was not on President Truman's program, but they rose again with subsequent indications from the White House to the contrary.

While proponents of the project have tried to keep it out of partisan politics, it is felt that the outcome of the November election was favorable to its chances rather than otherwise and that the forthcoming congressional hearings may further Arizona's cause.

The Central Arizona Project Association, a nonprofit organization of farmers, businessmen and civic leaders which has spearheaded the campaign for the project, opened over the week end a community drive for $100,000 to finance expenditures in connection with the hearing.

Causes of America's Failure in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it is popular nowadays for the architects and apologists of American foreign policy in China during the last few years to try to explain its catastrophic failure by laying all the blame on the inept, incompetent, inefficient, and corrupt Chinese Government and on the immoral Russians. It is not that simple.

It is not enough to announce that the Chinese have lost the will to fight. The important questions are: First, Why have they lost it after almost 20 years of valiant resistance against Japan and more than 20 against Communists; and, second, How can it be restored?

No one knows more about the basic factors that led to the break in Chinese morale than Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, who was the agent in China of President Roosevelt's successful policy of supporting the Chinese Government, and who resigned rather than be the tool of those who were determined to change that policy to one of forcing peace and unity with the Communist rebellion in China—a policy which led to conquest by the Communists in every country where it has been tried.

General Hurley has recently spoken frankly of the fundamental causes of our failure in China, the seriousness of which

for our own future cannot be overestimated.

It is to be hoped he will make further reports. Only as we learn more about what and who were responsible for the changed American policy in China, which led so directly to defeat of America's proper interest in the Pacific, can it become possible perhaps to retrieve the situation and save a free Chinese Government, if necessary in exile, as the foundation for eventual liberation of China and Asia from Communist tyranny.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following speech by General Hurley:

AMERICA'S FAILURE IN CHINA

(By Patrick J. Hurley, before the Georgetown University Foreign Service School, Washington, D. C., March 3, 1949)

America's failure in China today is the result of America's surrender of principles in the secret Yalta agreements.

Every domestic issue in the United States today is affected by our international policy.

Notwithstanding all this, the fundamental issue by which we are confronted internationally is not new. The basis of all our international conflicts is still the struggle for individual human rights and self-government. In the past this struggle has been described as the conflict between the divine right of kings and tyrants against the rights of individuals.

More than three-fourths of the people of the world today are still fighting for self-government and individual liberty.

Today we may define the issue as a conflict between the rights and dignity of the individual against collectivism, communism, imperialism, and the various forms of totalitarianism. The battle of the individual against oppression is world-wide today. Free enterprise, labor unions, freedom of religion, self-government, and justice cannot exist under any form of totalitarianism.

In the age-old fight for liberty, Socrates, a Greek philosopher, drank hemlock and died in defense of his right to express his own opinions. Socrates died nearly 500 years before the birth of Christ.

Christ taught the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. He promulgated the Golden Rule and emphasized the importance, the dignity, and the glory of the soul of the individual.

I will not attempt to follow for you tonight the signposts of the everlasting conflict throughout history between the individual and government for individual liberty. Let me, however, call your attention to a few of these signposts in the struggle for liberty in the United States.

The rights of the individual against tyranny were defined in Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty, or give me death"; in Thomas Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, which pledged Americans to support "governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." In the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States; in Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, in his Emancipation Proclamation, and in his second inaugural address; in Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points; and finally, Franklin Roosevelt's and Winston Churchill's Atlantic Charter.

Let us have a brief glance at a few of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

(We, the signatory nations) "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

(All the territory and all the nations given to or taken by Russia was a violation of that principle and that commitment by Russia, but all was done with the consent of our diplomats.)

(We) "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." (The people whose territory has been absorbed by Russia were not consulted—they were conquered.)

(We) "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." (That principle has been violated by the imperialist, colonial governments in their resubjugation of colonial mandated people. We furnished lend-lease equipment and weapons to the imperialists to resubjugate colonial people at the same time that we were liberating the Philippines.)

The promulgation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the objectives for which the United Nations were fighting, gave new hope to all of the oppressed people of the world. The Atlantic Charter was intended to secure for our cause the support of all people everywhere who were denied self-government, and individual liberty, and whose labor and resources were being exploited by more powerful nations.

Personally, I had occasion to know in more than 20 nations where I served during World War II that the ideals of liberty and self-government gave great strength to our cause long before the power of American men and munitions became effective on the battlefields.

These principles of the Atlantic Charter were quickly approved by 31 nations, including the 4 great antiaxis powers which later became known as the United Nations. The United Nations, as you know, were not united in fact; they were merely associated in the war. They represented ideologies that were in deadly conflict with each other.

After the Atlantic Charter had been finally approved by 45 nations, there were those who could see that the principles of liberty would be detrimental to imperialism, communism, to totalitarianism, and conquest. It was then that the Communists and imperialists who opposed liberty and self-government began to say that the Atlantic Charter had no binding effect as an international agreement; that many of the peoples of the world are not qualified for self-government; that the Atlantic Charter was just a press release. These objections were first voiced by the imperialists and later by the Communists.

I brought to the attention of President Roosevelt the dangers that lay in discarding the fundamental principles of liberty. At the President's direction I prepared for him what is now known as the Iran Declaration, which contains this statement:

"They count upon the participation of Iran, together with all other peace-loving nations, in the establishment of international peace, security, and prosperity after the war, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which all four governments have subscribed."

The Iran Declaration was signed at Tehran on December 1, 1943, by Stalin for Russia, Churchill for the United Kingdom, and Roosevelt for the United States. The Iran Declaration unquestionably reaffirmed the principles of the Atlantic Charter as the objectives for which the United Nations said they were fighting the war.

But every principle for which we told the world we were fighting as stated in the Atlantic Charter and reaffirmed in the Iran Declaration, was surrendered in the secret agreements at Yalta and in subsequent conferences.

WHAT HAPPENED IN CHINA

This brings us again to what happened to China. Remember that China relied upon us as her ally and upon the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

What is our policy in China? What is the cause of the failure of America's policy in China? Let us examine the history of our Chinese policy.

In 1787 our first Secretary of State, John Jay, expressed America's interest and America's right to trade in China. In 1842 Great Britain defeated China in war and exacted from China a treaty granting Britain extraterritorial rights and ports. Our Government immediately dispatched Caleb Cushing to China. In 1844 Mr. Cushing concluded a Sino-American trade treaty which gave America the same rights to trade in China as those being enjoyed by Great Britain. In 1899 it was evident that the imperialist powers intended to partition and dismember China. At that time the American Secretary of State, John Hay, sent notes to Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, and Japan, which countries at that time constituted the imperialistic powers in Asia, declaring the American open-door policy. Out of this background grew America's desire to support the territorial integrity and the political independence of China.

Only a few days before the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor, Secretary of State Cordell Hull on November 26, 1941, made a demand upon Japan. Historically speaking, I am sure that you will remember that Japan had invaded China and had set up puppet governments and control over large parts of Chinese territory. I will quote only one sentence from the Hull declaration:

"The Government of the United States and the Government of Japan will not support—militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government of the Republic of China with capital temporarily at Chungking."

In keeping with this outline of our policy in China, I now summarize for you the import of the directives that were given me at the time I was the personal representative of the President of the United States in the Far East, and later as Ambassador to China:

1. To prevent the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China.
2. To keep the Chinese Army in the war.
3. To sustain the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek.
4. To harmonize the relations between the American and Chinese military establishments and between the American Embassy and the Chinese Government.
5. To prevent the economic collapse of China.
6. To unify all anti-Japanese military forces of China.
7. To support the aspirations of the Chinese people to establish for themselves a free, united, democratic government.

I obtained the approval of the British and Russians for nearly all of this policy, specifically for item number 7.

Our traditional policy in China still supported the fundamental principles of individual liberty and self-government, and opposed imperialism and forceful territorial expansion.

The directives which were given me in China were not stated publicly as the policy of the United States by the State Department until after my resignation in November 1945. American diplomats and the imperialists and Communists who opposed self-government and liberty contended that the policy that I was making effective in China was my own policy and not that of the United States. Of course, that charge was untrue.

Remember, we made war against Japan to uphold the Government of the Republic of China. With China's aid we won the war. Why did the American policy in China fail? What is the cause underlying the Communist conquest of China? What is the cause of the failure of the Government of the Republic of China?

Clearly and unmistakably, the answer is that the fundamental principles that have made America the greatest unit on the face

of the earth, and on which our policy in China was based—individual rights and self-government—were surrendered in secret agreements at Yalta.

That part of the secret agreements made at Yalta pertaining to China and Japan is as follows:

"1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

"2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

"(a) The southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union,

"(b) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored,

"(c) The Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South-Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria;

"3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

The Yalta agreement surrendered the freedoms of three-fourths of the people of the world. But let us confine ourselves now to what the Yalta secret agreements did to China.

In violation of the Atlantic Charter, at Yalta, the United States agreed to the aggrandizement of Russian territory to include the Kurile Islands, half of Sakhalin, and the surrounding islands.

In violation of the territorial integrity of China, and in violation of the Atlantic Charter, a naval base was leased to Russia in China at Port Arthur.

In violation of the Atlantic Charter, and in violation of the territorial integrity of China, the United States agreed at Yalta to the internationalization of the port of Dairen. The United States also agreed to give Russia the "preeminent interest" in Dairen which Russia immediately translated into exclusive right.

The United States in secret agreement at Yalta agreed to give Russia a half interest in the Chinese Eastern and South Manchurian Railways. Again the United States gave Russia a preeminent interest which Russia immediately construed to mean an exclusive right to the control of the railways.

As if all these concessions to Russia, in violation of the Atlantic Charter, which had been reaffirmed by Marshal Stalin, were not enough, the United States further agreed that all these concessions to Russia by China would be concurred in by China and "the President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin."

The student of history and of diplomacy must see in these secret agreements by the United States the blueprint which has been followed by the Communists in the conquest of China.

At Yalta the United States surrendered not only the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but also every element of the traditional American policy in China. President Roosevelt was a sick man at Yalta. One of his chief diplomatic assistants has proved a complete alibi for what happened at Yalta. I do not know who was responsible for the American diplomatic debacle at Yalta.

Let us examine for a moment the arguments against liberty and self-government presented by the colonial imperialists. You will remember that in the Atlantic Charter the imperialists as well as the Communists agreed to "respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live."

When I raised the question of reaffirmation of that principle at Tehran, the colonial imperialists stated that the French, Dutch, and British are America's best friends as well as our nearest blood relatives. Of course, that is true. I suggested, however, that the German is the largest single blood stream in America and notwithstanding this close relationship we seem to have had a few difficulties with the Germans.

Our imperialist friends argued that they would be overpopulated, and impoverished at home without their colonial monopolies abroad. I think that argument is also correct. You will notice, however, that the arguments of both the Communists and the imperialists leave unanswered the question of the ages, which roughly is something like this: Do the ambitions, the greed, or even the dire necessity of one nation ever justify the transgression of the rights of weaker people?

In the Declaration of Independence America answered that question in the negative. For 168 years—up to the secret agreements at Yalta—America always answered that question in the negative. On the insistence of the imperialists and the Communists this fundamental American principle was surrendered at Yalta.

WHY THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA COULD NOT SURVIVE THE YALTA SURRENDERS

Let us not be misled into believing that the surrender of the rights of individual liberty, territorial integrity, and self-government at Yalta is the sole cause of China's present situation.

When the paternalistic, monopolistic monarchy was overthrown in China, Dr. Sun Yat-sen became the leader of a movement to establish "* * * a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

The wise leader said that it would take considerable time and training to prepare the 450,000,000 Chinese people for self-government.

To give some idea of the transition period that would be necessary we need but state that there is less than 10 percent literacy in China, compared to 99 percent literacy in the United States.

It should be realized that the Chinese must pass through a long period of education and experience in liberty before there can be real self-government in China. The totalitarians offer both security and self-government at once. They, of course, will not be able to deliver either. Individual liberty and self-government must be based upon integrity and intelligence. Communism is based on force.

Our Communists, both at home and abroad, have been shouting that the Government of the Republic of China is corrupt. Of course it is. The Republic of China is weak, inefficient, and corrupt, after nearly 40 years of revolution and civil war, illiteracy and poverty, oppression and exploitation, and including 7 years of war against Japan.

China has a corrupt system that is known as squeeze. We call it graft. We should remember that the squeeze in China has been rather "slim pickings" during the revolution and Japanese war. The disposition of the crooks was the same as it always has been, but the Chinese Government did not have very much that could be stolen. China was too weak to punish the crooks. A few got rich.

Our Government was strong enough to send the chairman of the powerful Military Affairs Committee and one of the distinguished generals of the Army to the penitentiary for graft. Our Communists and fellow travelers in the United States condemn the Republic of China because it is too weak after its years of vicissitudes to punish its malefactors.

Chiang Kai-shek is the successor of Sun Yat-sen and the leader of that element in China whose purpose it was to establish in China "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Chiang Kai-shek chose to sustain the ideals of individual liberty and self-government against imperialism and communism. It is true that Chiang Kai-shek could not create self-government in China overnight. That would have been a miracle. Those who know China know that China has a long, hard road to travel before arriving at self-government. The Chinese people are not prepared for self-government—either by education or by experience. An election of the kind we hold in the United States would be impossible in present-day China. China did want to emulate the United States. The followers of Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek prepared a constitution for China that is similar in every respect to the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights.

Chiang Kai-shek led our allies in China. With his aid we won the war in China. It was his purpose to build a self-government in China. We let him down. The Communists have won. We have lost China. We are now talking about how we can maintain a moral and military bridgehead in China that will not be inside of Russia's iron curtain.

We failed at San Francisco to evolve a workable Charter for the United Nations. We then set up the Council of Foreign Ministers for the purpose of bypassing the United Nations. Instead of building a lasting world peace through the United Nations, we began making treaties between nations that notoriously have never respected a treaty obligation. Instead of relying upon fundamental principles to which our associates in two world wars had agreed, we surrendered these principles and placed our reliance upon dollars and upon force.

We are now operating in a power bloc. There is but one thing certain about a power alliance, and that is that historically speaking, power blocs have always led to war.

It was encouraging to hear the President say in his inaugural address that we as a Nation are against both communism and imperialism and that we will endeavor to build peace for the world through the United Nations.

I remarked once before that there is a vast discrepancy between our announced foreign policy and our actual foreign policy.

I said in the beginning that our foreign policy affects every domestic issue in our Nation. Our give-away foreign policy that enables us to pay for our own surplus with our own taxpayers' money and give it away abroad, does maintain high prices, high national debt, high rate of depletion of our national resources, high rate of employment, high subsidies for our producers, high military preparedness, high taxes, and at least temporary prosperity.

Our policy in giving away money and supplies abroad is also intended to gain the favor of the nations which appear, just now, to be on our side against Russia. How long the American system of free enterprise can endure under such a policy remains to be proven.

We seem today to be relying upon dollars and force and the atomic bomb to overcome our mistakes in foreign policy and our surrender of fundamental principles.

We must remain strong and true to our own principles if we are to lend our strength to the weak and helpless in the everlasting battle for liberty against oppression.

Walter G. Andrews, Soldier and Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be present at the session when the death of Walter Gresham Andrews was announced in the House of Representatives. When I became a Member of the House, it was my good fortune to be assigned to the Military Affairs Committee of which "Ham" Andrews was the ranking Republican member. I came to know him intimately and the more I knew him and the more I knew about his work, the more I admired him.

He had a very interesting and colorful career. Apparently, in his early youth he became interested in national defense. He joined the National Guard of New York and went to the Mexican border in 1916, when Pershing was ordered to capture Villa.

When World War I broke out he became a member of the famous Seventy-seventh Division. He commanded a machine-gun company and participated in much of the combat of that famous division, of which the Lost Battalion was one unit. He made a distinguished record in combat, such a record in fact that he was recommended for and awarded the Distinguished Service Cross. I doubt if anyone can really understand the tough assignment that the doughboys in the Argonne had in 1918, unless he was there and knew personally what their mission was and how hard it was to accomplish. "Ham" Andrews lived through the rigors of that campaign. He knew what warfare was because of his experience in looking down the barrel of a machine gun toward the enemy lines. The tough outdoor life in October and November in France in 1918 required sturdy men to live through it and come back in good health. The Seventy-seventh Division took more ground than any other American division. The machine gunners and the infantrymen took the brunt of the attack.

I merely mention these matters as I think it helps interpret the conduct and the work of Mr. Andrews as a Member of Congress. From the time I first met him at the commencement of the Seventy-eighth Congress until the termination of the Eightieth Congress, I saw him almost every day when Congress was in session. In his conduct in the committee and on the floor of the House I have never once seen him take a partisan or selfish attitude on any matter involving our national security. He was indeed a statesman in his conduct in our committee and on the floor of the House.

When the Republicans captured the Congress in 1946, the committee structure of the House was reorganized pursuant to the Reorganization Act passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Mr. Andrews was the chairman of the new Armed Services Committee. It merged the two former committees of the House, namely, the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee. He had a difficult assignment, perhaps the most difficult of any chairman. These two strong committees were now merged into one. The so-called Unification of the Armed Services Act had also been passed. Mr. Andrews' job was to merge these two committees in such a manner as to make them work as a united team on the many problems confronting the committee. He set to work long before the opening of Congress to plan the committee program. He was an excellent administrator. He knew how to get along with and handle people. He understood how to get the most work out of the members of his committee. As others have said, he did a magnificent job; in fact, in my humble opinion he did the outstanding job as a committee chairman in the Eightieth Congress.

It was my great honor and pleasure to be chairman of a subcommittee by appointment of Mr. Andrews. It was a pleasure and an inspiration to work under him. We worked hard. We accomplished many useful things and some very useful legislation passed the Eightieth Congress, which was reported by our subcommittee. I do not want anyone to get the impression that I am taking too seriously the work which our subcommittee did as the others also had very important work and reported important bills. However, I wish to speak, in trying to present Mr. Andrews' characteristics, about the things of which I have personal knowledge. He gave us complete cooperation and encouragement in every way. He was tolerant and understanding of our problems. I think it is fair to say that Mr. Andrews molded the general shape of the policy which this committee will follow in the future. All of the matters considered by us were nonpartisan matters involving our national security.

I believe sincerely that the Armed Services Committee of the House and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate are the particular units of the Government that will have more influence in bringing about a real merger of the armed services than any other agency of Government. Before us are paraded the problems of th Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and in every instance that I know of, the subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee of the House and the main committee itself, are always trying to find ways in which unnecessary activities of either branch or duplicating facilities of the various branches may be avoided, and not only better administration be brought about, but more efficiency and more national security for the taxpayer's dollar.

Mr. Andrews did not spare himself in this work. He worked with the zeal of a crusader and a crusader he was in national security and also in unification of the services.

It was unfortunate that he became ill following the closing of the Eightieth Congress. Undoubtedly the heavy load which he carried had something to do with his illness.

Those of us who worked with him can look back with pleasure and also with profit because of our association with him. I believe it is not too much to say that he was indeed a gallant soldier and an eminent statesman.

Price Fixing Under Basing-Point System Held Illegal by FTC and United States Supreme Court—H. R. 2222 Proposes To Overrule These Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include two letters from officials of the National Federation of Small Business for the attention of the Members of Congress.

The letters are as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., March 8, 1949.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: Early in 1948 the United States Supreme Court rendered a momentous decision condemning the use of the basing-point system, an organized system, in violation of antitrust laws. Shortly after the decision of the Supreme Court a leading spokesman for the steel industry said that the industry would have to look to the Congress to amend the Court's decision or to give relief to these concentrated industries. Shortly thereafter a Trade Policies Committee was set up in the Senate to explore the decision of the Court. This committee held extensive public hearings and recently made a report of these hearings covering 1,400 printed pages.

Now bills are being proposed in both the House and Senate (the House bill is known as H. R. 2222) which will in substance place a moratorium which would last from 16 months to 2 years on certain portions of the Robinson-Patman Act and other antitrust laws.

The federation opposes any softening or weakening of the antitrust laws. In other words, to protect small business at the local level we must have all-out vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

I am herewith enclosing copy of a letter which went to all Members of Congress on March 4, 1949, from Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Small Business.

It is my opinion that you would be doing a great service to small business if you would find it convenient to insert the enclosed messages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that small business, not only in your State, but throughout the Nation would welcome such helpful action.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President in Charge Washington Office.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
San Mateo, Calif., March 4, 1949.

To All Members of Congress:

This is a protest against House bill H. R. 2222.

It is also a protest against the tactics employed to get this bill out of the House Judiciary Committee without hearings being held.

To small-business people this bill is extremely important because it is designed to break down the antitrust laws to a very great extent.

There can be no question in the minds of any Members of Congress about the importance of protecting the welfare of small business today as never before.

We are confident that if Members of Congress blindly enact this bill into law they might just as well scuttle the Robinson-Patman and the other antitrust laws entirely. This, of course, would mean, to a very great extent, eliminating small business from our economy. It would mean the rapid growth of monopolies.

The National Federation of Small Business, Inc., has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the world and our members have already cast their ballots and committed the federation with regard to the strict enforcement and strengthening of the antitrust laws. This, of course, includes the opposing of all such legislation as H. R. 2222.

In view of the importance of this issue, this organization intends to publicize the House action on same, not only in our bulletins going to federation members in every congressional district but through press releases to the large daily newspapers, as well as in our weekly coast-to-coast radio broadcasts.

We sincerely trust that you consider that your independent business constituents are entitled to your cooperation in protecting them by taking all possible action in opposing H. R. 2222.

The federation would appreciate knowing how you stand on this issue.

Sincerely,

C. W. HARDER.

Jack Nichols

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, the last remains of Jack Nichols, Member of Congress from the Second District of Oklahoma from November 1934 to July 3, 1943, have been brought back to the United States by the Government from Africa. Internment of the body will be made at his home town of Eufaula, Okla., on Sunday, March 13, at 2:30 p. m.

Jack was a graduate of the great school of experience without the benefit of any college or university degrees. Born in Joplin, Mo., August 30, 1896, he attended the public schools there and in Colorado Springs, Colo., and was enrolled for a short time in the Teachers College at Emporia, Kans. He came to Oklahoma with his parents in 1914 and lived in the little town of Hanna, in McIntosh County, the heart of the full-blood Creek Indian settlement in that country. He learned the ways and customs of the Creeks which aided him greatly in his future law practice in their behalf. He enlisted and served in the ranks of the Infantry branch of the Army during World War I.

After several business ventures, he entered his brother Clark's law office at Eufaula for study and practice. In 1926 he passed the State bar examination and entered the active practice. He developed into one of the best trial lawyers in the State, being especially successful in criminal cases and Indian litigation. His clients were mostly Creek Indians who had been made wealthy by oil production from their individual allotments and inherited land. This practice brought him before the Indian offices in Oklahoma and the Secretary of the Interior in Washington where he built an enviable reputation for vigorous and honest prosecution of matters in behalf of the property rights of his Indian clients.

When W. W. Hastings decided not to run again for Congress in 1934, Jack, who had never before run for public office of any kind, entered the primary race.

Although he was opposed by two powerful candidates from the biggest city in his district—Muskogee—and was from the extreme southern small county in his district—McIntosh County—he placed in the run-off. He was matched against a strong young candidate from Muskogee who had been prosecuting attorney for several terms. With the aid of members of his family and a few loyal friends, he made a remarkable campaign, based mostly on his own speeches and his own personal appeal. His main slogan in the campaign was "Jack Nichols, your fighting friend." The rank and file rallied to his banner and the voters from the forks of the creek overwhelmed the city centers to nominate him. This caused consternation in the ranks of some of the old-timers, who could only say, "Who is this fellow Jack Nichols?"

They soon found out, for he carried his fighting spirit into Congress with him, where his activities soon attracted attention. Speaker Joe Burns publicly dubbed him as "his seed corn." I have been told a warm personal friendship developed between this new Oklahoma man and Speaker Burns. During the perilous and turbulent days of WPA he weathered all the storms and was never defeated for his seat in Congress, although opposed at all times by those who attacked him for his support of Roosevelt's New Deal. He served under two other Speakers after Joe Burns—Will Bankhead and Sam Rayburn. Always in the thick of the fights on worthwhile matters, he gave special attention to the coming industry of civil aviation.

In 1940 he was appointed chairman of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, the other members of the committee being Richard M. Kleberg, of Texas, vice chairman; Herron Pearson, of Tennessee; Evart M. Dirksen, of Illinois; and Carl Hinshaw, of California. The report of this committee was printed and published in 1943.

The members of the committee adopted the following resolution:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

In the absence of Mr. Nichols, a special meeting of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents was called in room 516, Old House Office Building, by Hon. Richard M. Kleberg, vice chairman, at 10 a. m., February 22, 1943. Hon. CARL HINSHAW of California, thereupon offered the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

"Be it resolved, That we, as members of the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, wish to express our appreciation to Hon. Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma, for his sincere devotion, untiring efforts, and sound judgment as chairman of this committee. As members of the committee we are proud of the harmony which has prevailed and of the work which has been achieved under the leadership of Hon. Jack Nichols.

"R. M. KLEBERG, *Vice Chairman.*
"HERRON PEARSON.
"EVERETT DIRKSON.
"CARL HINSHAW."

Because of his keen interest in aviation and his thorough study of it, the Transcontinental Western Air, Inc., offered Jack a position on its staff as vice president. After serious consideration he decided to resign his seat in Congress, to which he had just recently been reelected, and devote his life to the advancement of this great new transportation industry. His resignation became effective July 3, 1943, at which time he was a member of the Rules Committee.

He established his office in Washington, D. C., where he advanced the interests of his company until August 5, 1945. On this date he started on a mission, entrusted to him by the TWA, to negotiate contracts with countries in Africa situated on either side of the TWA main-line route through that country.

He arrived at Cairo, Egypt, on August 9, 1945, where he established an office, from which he operated during the time he worked on his mission. His work took him to Iran, Iraq, Tehran, Alexandria, Asmara in Eritrea, Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, Jidda in Arabia, Saudi Arabia, Italy, France, Germany, and Belgium.

After conferences with the rulers of these countries he finally negotiated and executed a contract with Haile Selassie and his cabinet for establishing an airport at Addis Ababa and a route from there to the main lines of TWA. Other contracts were in process of negotiation with several other countries.

On November 2, 1945, two representatives from TWA here in Washington, D. C., Austin Naylor and Milor Campbell, who were to establish operations from Addis Ababa, arrived in Cairo. After briefing them on the situation the three took off in General Giles' B–25, piloted by a captain, with a crew of three, from Asmara, which is on a plateau of 6,000 feet elevation, and on which was an American landing field. As there was no refueling facilities at Addis Ababa, they had to take on enough fuel to make the round trip to Addis Ababa and back to Asmara. The take-off was slower than usual by reason of the extra load and the altitude. After a run, near the end of the runway, the copilot thinking they were airborne, drew up the landing gear. They were not airborne, however, and settled down until the propeller tips struck the ground. Immediately thereafter, however, they got airborne. The pilot, undoubtedly realizing the propellers might have been damaged, started to turn back to make another landing and check his damage. He turned the

wrong way, for there was a cable line strung on poles on which was operated a hoisting car from the top of the mountain to the valley below, on that side. The pilot lacked just a few inches of clearing this cable, and the plane plunged into the ground instantly, killing Jack, Naylor, Campbell, the pilot, and his three crew members. The ground crew of the airport arrived quickly so the bodies were not burned. All of the deceased were buried with military honors in the United States Government cemetery at Cairo, where they remained until they were brought back here on February 5, 1949.

Arrest and Trial of Protestant Clergy in Bulgaria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and an editorial from the New York Times:

DIOCESAN UNION OF HOLY NAME SOCIETIES,
Buffalo, N. Y., March 7, 1949.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAURIELLO: We have observed with deep interest the action of the Bulgarian Government in the trial of 15 Protestant Church leaders in Bulgaria.

We regard this action of the Government of Bulgaria as another attempt in the series of events to erase the name of God from the hearts of right-minded men.

Our sympathy goes out to all Christians and religious persons in this inhuman attack upon the God-given rights of mankind.

Upon the request of all the members of the executive board, duly authorized representatives of the more than 100,000 Holy Name men in the diocese of Buffalo, we protest most vigorously this diabolical attack upon religious freedom. We trust that you will use your good office to defend the fundamental principles embodied in our Bill of Rights so that those accused may be spared any further humiliation and miscarriage of justice.

Respectfully yours,
THE EXECUTIVE BOARD,
ROBERT K. DORAN,
President.

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1949]

SENTENCE IN SOFIA

Communism's latest attack on organized religion—the "treason" trials in Bulgaria—has ended with the sentencing to life imprisonment of the four principal defendants—ministers, respectively, of the Methodist, Congregational, Baptist and Pentecostal churches. Other defendants have received prison terms ranging from 1 to 15 years. Once more the outside world has been treated to a series of too pat "confessions" and asked to give credence to the spectacle of hitherto devout clergymen suddenly turned miserable black-marketeers and reckless speculators. And again, as in other similar trials, American imperialism has been portrayed as the real culprit on trial. For, among their other sins, these clergymen were accused of attempting to ferret out secrets about Bulgarian affairs for the benefit of the United States: though what the United States needs to know about Bulgarian affairs, beyond what appears on the surface of that nation's present abject bondage to Moscow, it would be difficult to understand.

The Sofia trial has been denounced by our Government as a blatant terroristic effort, in cynical disregard of the facts, designed to intimidate the small, respected Protestant religious denominations in Bulgaria and to discredit their sincere religious leaders. The British Foreign Office has carried the analysis a step further: "Communist governments in eastern Europe, having eliminated all democratic parties which might oppose their dictatorships, are in the process of a concerted assault on churches, the object of which appears to be to get a clear run for Communist ideology."

The peace treaty imposed on Bulgaria as a defeated enemy nation required that country to secure to all persons * * * the enjoyment of human rights and of the fundamental freedoms * * * including religious worship. The United States is one of the powers which imposed that treaty. It is this fact which gives us a special and legal right to hold Bulgaria to account for this new travesty of justice.

William Jewell College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, William Jewell College is the sixteenth oldest school among the 358 colleges and universities west of the Mississippi River. Although founded by an act of the State Legislature of Missouri and under a charter signed by Gov. Austin A. King February 27, 1849, the college has for a hundred years been affiliated with the Baptist denomination.

With 3 teachers and 137 students the college opened January 1, 1850. Today its students are drawn from practically every State of the Union and from foreign lands. And graduates from its "campus of achievement" have attained distinction in every profession and field of industry.

This month the various alumni chapters scattered throughout the Nation are holding formal exercises in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the institution.

The most notable of these was sponsored by the Missouri State Legislature, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE MISSOURI STATE LEGISLATURE

Whereas 100 years ago, February 27, 1849, Austin A. King, then Governor of Missouri, from Richmond, Ray County, signed the charter of William Jewell College, at Liberty, in Clay County; and

Whereas this college has had 100 years of rich ministry to thousands of students from all parts of the world; and

Whereas this college is at its peak of prosperity and success under the leadership of Dr. Walter Pope Binns and his splendid faculty and the efficient board of trustees; and

Whereas on February 27, 1949, Gov. Forrest Smith, also from Richmond, Ray County, will appear at the centennial celebration: Be it

Resolved, That this Missouri State Assembly join our felicitations and congratulations and well wishes for the future of this outstanding college of Missouri; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the president of this college and the press.

Unanimously adopted February 22, 1949.

The address on this occasion was delivered by Hon. Forrest Smith, Governor of Missouri:

ADDRESS ON FOUNDERS' DAY, WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE, FEBRUARY 27, 1949

Gov. FORREST SMITH, of Missouri. I am happy to join with you tonight, and thousands of others throughout the Nation, as you proudly celebrate 100 years of achievement by William Jewell College. You are to be congratulated on having, through the years, built a Christian college whose scholastic standing is recognized all over the world.

A few days ago I turned to page 232 of the Session Acts of the General Assembly of 1849 and read again the act granting a charter for what a few months later was to be William Jewell College. It was approved by Gov. Austin A. King 100 years ago today, just 60 days after he was inaugurated. While the act of the signing was ministerial on the part of the governor and in line with his official duty, I am confident that it was a great pleasure to him, as he had always been a strong advocate of higher education. Fifteen years before he became governor he was secretary of a meeting to establish Columbia College, the seeds from which grew the University of Missouri, and that same year he helped organize Columbia Female Academy, one of the first institutions of learning for young women in the State and the forerunner of Stephens College and Christian College.

Governor King was from Richmond, my home town, and it pleases me very much that 100 years later I can join with you in this service.

A brief review of conditions of a century ago compared with developments of the moment presents an amazing contrast. Those of us who remember the easy-going ways at the turn of the century and the decade that followed find ourselves caught in a fast-moving current of present-day activities. The progress of this age challenges the best that is within us in order to cope with the problems of adjustment our complex society presents.

A century ago Liberty was 20 years old. Pioneers from Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee were still coming in great numbers, some to remain and establish a homestead, others to join the forty-niners for that long trek across the plains to riches beyond the Rocky Mountains. Steamboats were plying the river in ever-increasing numbers, while the railroads were still 20 years away. Churches had already found a prominent place in settled communities and at the crossroads. When the year closed the first young men were arriving to enter William Jewell.

I consider it an honor to have the privilege of joining with you tonight to pay tribute to those stalwart Christian characters of a century ago who gave without stint that there might be a college on the wilderness frontier. For all of us know that it was to the efforts of those devoted early-day pioneer women and men and those of succeeding generations that we owe so much for formulating the cultural society in which we live today.

All of us can join with the college and point with pride to the many men and women who received their training here and have gone out into the world to become

leaders in every field of endeavor. I am confident that there is not a country in the world that has not felt the influence of those who received their training on the "Hill."

The official centennial statement by the president of the college, Dr. Walter Pope Binns, reviews the hundred years of William Jewell history:

President BINNS. For 100 years William Jewell College has maintained a place of leadership among the smaller colleges in the field of higher education. Her graduates who have achieved distinction in careers of useful service now look back with gratitude to this college as the source of their inspiration. This record is the natural result of the established policy of a limited student body chosen from a wide area, a highly trained faculty who give individual attention to the students, a consistent emphasis upon high standards of scholarship, a Christian atmosphere conducive to the development of character.

William Jewell is a liberal arts college, granting only the Bachelor of Arts degree, attempting to meet the need for broad liberal education as preprofessional and prebusiness training.

William Jewell is a Christian college affiliated with the Baptist denomination with a faculty of Christian teachers who believe that education should concern itself with values as well as materials, with the intelligent use of the things created by our hands and brains, with adjustment of the intricate relationships which have emerged from a complicated industrial age, with moral problems as old as the race, with the spiritual issues which have their source in man's eternal longing for fellowship with God.

The subtitle "The Campus of Achievement," is justified in the large proportion of William Jewell graduates who attain distinction in their chosen vocations. These graduates and their friends are celebrating the centennial in a series of regional meetings in principal cities throughout the country. These meetings and the centennial commencement afford opportunity for class reunions, the renewal of old friendships, rededication to the ideals inspired in college days, concerted thought upon the present program of the college and its plans for the future.

We look backward a hundred years to the period of limited facilities for higher education and of meager financial resources when the founding fathers exhibited courage and foresight in the boldness of their planning. The passing years have vindicated their wisdom.

We now look forward to the dawning century to see a world which needs more than ever the ministry of the Christian liberal arts college.

Supplementing Dr. Binns' statement I append the following chronology of the history of the college:

CHRONOLOGY OF WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

1789, January 1: Dr. William Jewell born in Loudoun County, Va.

1843: First offer of Dr. William Jewell of Columbia, Mo., to the Baptist General Association of $10,000 for a college.

1848: Offer accepted.

1849, February 27: Gov. Austin A. King signed the charter granted by the State legislature.

1849, August 21: At a meeting in Boonville, Liberty was selected for the site of the new college which was named in honor of Dr. William Jewell.

1849, November 12: First meeting of the board of trustees.

1850, January 1: Classes opened with J. S. Dulin as principal.

1852: Death of Dr. William Jewell. Jewell Hall completed.

1853, September 1: R. S. Thomas became president.

1853: Philomathic Literary Society organized.

1855: First graduating class with bachelor of arts degree.

1857, September 1: William Thompson became president.

1857: Excelsior Literary Society organized.

1861: William Jewell students enter the Civil War.

1861, June: College closed when Union troops occupied Jewell Hall.

1868, September 29: College reopened after Civil War.

1869, June 30: Thomas Rambaut inaugurated president.

1875: First intercollegiate oratorical contest. First student publication, the Jewell.

1881: Ely Hall erected.

1883: James G. Clark, chairman of the faculty.

1888. First football squad, M. D. Eubank, captain.

1890: Erection of the three dormitories.

1892, June: John Priest Greene became president.

1893: Vardeman Hall erected.

1894: First issue of the Student. Brown Gymnasium built (burned in 1927).

1896: Wornall Hall erected (burned in 1913).

1898: William Jewell students enter the Spanish-American War. First intercollegiate debate.

1899: First intercollegiate basketball. First intercollegiate track.

1905: President's house built. First college annual, The Tatler.

1906: Charles Hadden Spurgeon Library of 7,000 volumes added to library.

1908: Carnegie Library erected. Cooperative book store established.

1911: New Ely Hall built.

1914: William Jewell Press established.

1915: Marston Science Hall built.

1917: William Jewell students enter World War I.

1918: Ten girls admitted as students.

1920: D. J. Evans became president. First woman graduate, Mrs. Arthur O. Kresse.

1921, September 1: John Priest Greene became acting president.

1921: William Jewell College officially coeducational.

1923, March 21: H. C. Wayman elected president.

1925: Melrose Hall built.

1926: John Gano Memorial Chapel built.

1928, July 3: John F. Herget elected president.

1928: William Jewell's first national champion, Ted Malone. First woman member of William Jewell faculty, Mary Elmore. New Brown Gymnasium built.

1936, November 18: Louis Mertins' Holograph collection.

1938: Hubmaier collection.

1939, February 14: Ted Malone collection of poetry.

1939: Two William Jewell students represent all American colleges and universities in the annual international debates in England—Maurice Winger and J. B. Breckenridge.

1940, October 29: Centennial program for expansion adopted by the board of trustees.

1942: William Jewell students enter World War II.

1942–43: H. I. Hester interim president.

1943, January 6: Arrival of the first contingent of naval cadets for William Jewell College's naval flight preparatory school.

1943, July 1: Walter Pope Binns became the ninth president.

1944, November 20: First Achievement Day, Robert A. Millikan, speaker.

1945: Four dormitories for girls acquired.

1946, May 20: The President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, attended commencement.

1948: Modernization of Jewell Hall in honor of John F. Herget. New heating plant installed.

1949: John Priest Greene Memorial Administration Building erected.

1949: Centennial celebrated, November 15, 1948, to May 24, 1949.

In this connection, I include the program of events of the centennial celebration:

THE CENTENNIAL EVENTS OF WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE

1. Because of the widespread location of William Jewell alumni, a series of centennial dinners was scheduled for the year, to be attended by President Walter Pope Binns and other members of the college staff.

Chicago, November 15, 1948: Albert L. Reeves, Jr., speaker.

Denver, December 13, 1948: Judge E. V. Holland, speaker.

San Francisco, January 17, 1949: Dr. Alfred G. Fisk, professor of philosophy, San Francisco State College, and Dr. Sandford Fleming, president of the Northern Baptist Convention, speakers.

Los Angeles, January 21, 1949: Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Nobel prize winner, California Institute of Technology, and Dr. Rufus B. von KleinSmid, chancellor of University of Southern California, speakers.

St. Louis, February 14, 1949: Dr. C. Oscar Johnson, president of the Baptist World Alliance, speaker.

Boston, March 28, 1949: Dr. Kenneth C. M. Sills, president of Bowdoin College, speaker.

New York, March 29, 1949: Dale Carnegie, speaker.

Washington, March 31, 1949: East room, Mayflower Hotel, Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS, speaker.

2. Founders' day, February 25, 1949: Denominational day for the Baptists of Missouri. The city of Liberty's connection with the event—union services of Liberty churches. Speaker: Gov. Forrest Smith, of Missouri.

3. February 27, Centennial Founders' Day: Radio program, WDAF, Kansas City, Mo.; speaker, Gov. Forrest Smith, of Missouri.

COMMENCEMENT WEEK, MAY 21–24, 1949

4. The historic city of Liberty, incorporated in 1822, where the wagon trains outfitted for the California gold rush, has organized, through scores of committees numbering more than 200, to welcome returning alumni and their families for the centennial commencement. The general chairmen of this organization are Lewis B. Dougherty, Jr., and Robert H. Gadberry.

5. May 21: Fireworks pageant, stadium.

6. May 22: Baccalaureate Sunday. Aeons-Panaegis breakfast, 8 a. m. Baccalaureate sermon, 10:30 a. m., President Walter Pope Binns. Historical pageant, 8 p. m., Gano Chapel.

7. Liberal Arts Day, May 23: College and university presidents and delegates from more than 100 colleges in attendance. Speakers: Dr. Kenneth S. Latourette, director of graduate studies, department of religion, Yale University; and Dr. Elmer Ellis, dean of the College of Arts and Science, University of Missouri.

8. Alumni reunions: Monday, May 23, followed by the centennial alumni dinner; Herbert H. Schwamb, speaker.

9. Centennial Commencement Day, May 24: Dr. Arthur G. Coons, president of Occidental College, Los Angeles, commencement speaker. Centennial awards and conferring of centennial degrees.

10. As the climax of the centennial celebration, William Jewell College will be host to 2,500 people, including all returning alumni and their families, the graduating class and their families, and visitors to commencement, with a barbecue dinner prepared for the college by the Clay County Cattle Raisers Association.

Paying Britain's Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bristol (Pa.) Courier, of March 8, 1949:

PAYING BRITAIN'S BILLS

Socialism is bankrupting the British Empire. The Government is already insolvent, and going further in debt day by day.

Why doesn't it fold up?

Why hasn't the crisis led the British people to throw the bankruptcy-bound Socialists out of power, and put in some other government which will save what's left?

You ought to know!

It's your money that's meeting the English deficits.

It's your dollars that are keeping the English Socialists in office—creating the illusion to the British voters that the Socialist program is working out.

And it is your money the Socialists are counting on to fool the British people into giving them another 5-year term of power, in the crucial coming elections.

The American press is only faintly interested in the parade of deficits in England. The American people appear to be still less so.

Yet, they should be interested. They've been paying these bills—will go on paying them, if President Truman and his State Department have their way.

Every major step taken by the Socialists in their British program has been financed by the American people.

The first postwar British loan let the British cut their own taxes, and paid for setting up the Beveridge plan.

The first installment of the Marshall plan (about a third went to Britain, and hardly any to feed starving babies in mid-Europe) let the Socialists cut British taxes again, and also allowed them to set up the nationalized health program. You are paying for the vast quantities of eyeglasses, false teeth, and wigs being handed out by the Socialists to the British people.

The second installment of the Marshall plan, now being pushed through your Congress, is intended to furnish the British Socialists with a spot of cash with which to buy the coming election—buy it with gifts to voters which the Socialist government could never afford on its own steam.

Broadly speaking, the American gifts have checked off almost dollar for dollar against the British deficits.

The first loan, back in 1946, was for $4,000,000,000. If you deduct the large share of this money which went to pay for tobacco and movies to keep the British people in a good humor, the rest of it just about covered the big deficit of the first year of socialism.

The hidden gifts to the Socialists contained in last year's installment of the Marshall plan just about covered last year's deficits.

Now new deficits are piling up—and the Socialists are waiting impatiently for Uncle Sam (which means you) to foot the bill. Hence the rush to shove the Marshall plan appropriation through Congress without taking time to examine the program or what we are getting for our money.

The 9-month deficit of the British Government, for the home-front program alone, has recently been revealed. It is approximately $900,000,000. That's about one-eighth, or 12.5 percent, of the original budget appropriations.

A great deal of this comes because the nationalized health program of the Socialists is running hog-wild. The free false teeth and free eyeglass programs are each more than $40,000,000 in the red. Other free services have brought the health program alone into a deficit of some $250,000,000.

The Government is also far overboard in its food-subsidy program by which the voters are being kidded into thinking the Socialists are able to supply food at less than it really costs.

The Socialist scheme of paying a bonus for British babies is building a new financial problem for the future. Within 3 years it is expected that the school population, already far too great for the accommodations, will have jumped another million.

Here is another bill which eventually, on the present policy at Washington, will be handed along to you for payment. That's only fair. You helped pay for the baby bonuses of the Beveridge plan. Why shouldn't you help pay to send these extra babies to school?

In addition to paying for what the Socialists are doing, you are paying also for what they aren't doing.

The British Socialists have pulled England out of nearly all the responsibilities she formerly accepted as a world power. When the Britons walked out of the Greek situation, you began paying the bills as Uncle Sam took over. Likewise in half a score other parts of the world.

When the British pulled out much of their contributions to occupied Germany, your bills for American occupation there soared accordingly.

Now Uncle Sam is about to furnish billions of dollars' worth of arms to western Europe. Under former British standards, the British Government would have shared this burden. Now you will be paying for it all.

Observers in England declare that the issue in the coming election there, which will decide the future of British socialism, will be the issue of retail prices.

The British people, it is declared, are uninterested in world affairs, apathetic over whether they are headed for serfdom as a race and a tin-cup future as a nation.

They will stand for rationing, scarcities, inferior products, regimentation, restrictions, mass poverty—if only the Socialists will make it possible for them to buy food, clothing, and entertainment at cheap prices.

There's only one way under the sun by which the Socialists can do this. That's to make you pay part of the bill, every time a Briton buys a loaf of brown bread, or a bottle of skim milk, or goes to the movies.

The Socialists are all set to do this with a new and enlarged program of subsidies. The only thing they need is the money. That's where you come in. They want you to put up the money, so they can fool the British people, so they can be reelected, so they can finish the job of wrecking the British Empire's economy and future.

What do you think about it?

Sol Bloom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Evening News, Wednesday, March 9, 1949.

It is a fitting and eloquent tribute to our late colleague, SOL BLOOM:

SOL BLOOM

Representative SOL BLOOM, Democrat, of New York, dead at 78, had been a member of the Congress since 1923. His principal official distinction was attained when he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, a post which he relinquished to Representative EATON, of New Jersey, in the Eightieth Congress, but which he resumed when the Democrats regained control in the Eighty-first.

The President said of him, in a message of condolence to his daughter Vera, that Mr. BLOOM had been a tower of strength to his country in the most critical period of our international relations. Mr. BLOOM was devoted to the principle of American leadership in world affairs, and he made good that devotion through a series of attitudes and acts that won him the respect and admiration alike of his colleagues and his constituents.

But it was on the human side that Representative BLOOM had the widest appeal. Much to his surprise, he had made his first great financial success at age 19. He was a millionaire long before he entered politics. The son of Polish-Jewish immigrant parents, he liked to think of his career as one full of American characteristics, which it in all truth was, but he never ceased to marvel that this should be so.

This was Mr. BLOOM's modest side, which sometimes found compensation in the simple, frank delight with which he boasted of his association with the world's great and famous. He had been in show business and never lost the showman's touch, which he described with enormous gusto in an autobiographical account of his life published last October.

He had vigor; he had integrity; he had pride; he had the gift of friendship, and he was a patriot. Surely these are the qualities for which Representative BLOOM would have liked to be remembered.

Veterans' Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been, and understandably so, a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding about veterans' pensions, both by Members of Congress and by the general public, due to the pending legislation for additional benefits.

I shall not attempt to blame or criticize anyone for a lack of dissemination of news regarding fairly recent changes in the pension laws, but they do have a marked effect upon the proposed legislation and I believe it is imperative that every Member of this House should be familiar with the provisions of the present law before attempting to pass upon any changes in the statutes.

Insomuch as the general pension bill which is about to receive consideration

deals solely with those veterans who do not have established service-connected disabilities, I shall not touch upon the compensation—service-connected—rates now payable.

On October 7, 1948, 5 months ago, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Major General Gray, issued a regulation known as extension 5, of the 1945 Rating Schedule for Permanent and Total Disability Ratings.

This schedule applies to all pensions, World War I, World War II, and Spanish-American War pensions. However, the last-named category was not affected by the change because existing law provides payments in excess of those named in the schedule.

The basic law provides that a veteran with 90 days or more service, who was discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or less than 90 days if discharged on a surgeon's certificate of disability, can receive a pension of $60 per month if he is permanently and totally disabled. In the case of those veterans who have been in receipt of a permanent and total pension for a continuous period of 10 years or who reach the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is $72 per month.

The Administrator's new extension of this law broadened the provisions and facilitated entitlement to veterans who are suffering from non-service-connected disabilities, regardless of age, provided that they could meet certain restrictions that were clearly defined. I shall attempt to explain these provisions as simply as possible.

The principal provision, which is applicable to all of the classes described below, is that the veteran must be determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of his disability. Certain guides are provided and used in making such determination: Marginal employment, for example, on own farm, or in own business, or at odd jobs, at less than half the usual hours of work or less than half the usual remuneration will not be considered incompatible with a determination of unemployment and unemployability, if the restriction as to securing or retaining better employment is due to the disabilities. Also, the fact that unemployable persons meeting the percentage standards have also physical, mental, or personality defects of congenital or development nature, which may be a partial cause of the unemployability, will not preclude favorable rating.

It is fair to say that this determination of unemployability is made on a very liberal basis.

For the veteran who is under the age of 55, there must be a single disability of 60 percent or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent. When the veteran attains the age of 55 years, a 60-percent rating only is required, whether it be singly or in combination. At the age of 60 a 50 percent rating is required for one or more disabilities in combination. While at the age of 65 years only one disability rated at 10 percent or more is required.

The last sentence merits repetition. In other words, after a veteran reaches the age of 65 years, under existing regulations, all he has to show is a 10-percent disability and unemployability to receive a pension of $60 per month, and if he is permanently and totally disabled at that age he receives $72 per month.

There is one other factor that should be borne in mind in adjudging the above prerequisites, and that is the income limitations. In the case of a single veteran the limit is $1,000 a year, while it is $2,500 for a married veteran or one with children.

As a part of these remarks I would like to include in the RECORD a letter and a statement I have received from Mr. Guy H. Birdsall, Assistant Administrator for Legislation, Veterans' Administration. The letter outlines in departmental terms the provisions explained above. The statement defines the Veterans' Administration policy in dealing with character of discharges so far as they apply to eligibility for veterans' benefits:

The letter and statement follow:

MARCH 9, 1949.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In compliance with your telephonic request of March 8, 1949, I am submitting the following statement outlining the provisions of existing law providing pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II and also the provisions of extension 5 to the 1945 Schedule for Rating Disabilities, dated October 7, 1948.

Under existing law (Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), pt. III, as amended), veterans of World War I and World War II are eligible for pension benefits based on permanent total non-service-connected disability. This pension is payable to any veteran who served in the active military or naval service for a period of 90 days or more during one of these wars and who was discharged therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable, or who, having served less than 90 days, was discharged for disability incurred in service in line of duty. Such a person must have been in active service before the cessation of hostilities and the disability upon which the claim is based must not have been incurred as a result of his own willful misconduct or vicious habits. The rate is $60 per month, except that where the veteran shall have been rated permanent and total and has been in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is $72 per month. Pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceeds $1,000 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds $2,500.

Permanent total disability is defined by paragraph I (e) of part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, as any impairment of mind or body which is sufficient to render it impossible for the average person to follow a substantially gainful occupation where it is reasonably certain that such impairment will continue throughout the life of the disabled person. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, notwithstanding this definition, to classify as permanent and total those diseases and disorders, the nature and extent of which, in his judgment, are sufficient to justify such a determination.

The studies and experience of the Veterans' Administration over a period of years in rating claims of permanent total disability have resulted from time to time in certain liberalizations in rating such cases. At the present time, administrative regulations contained in the Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, prescribe certain minimum percentage standards applicable when the disabled person is, in the judgment of the rating agency, unable to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation as a result of his disabilities. These regulations provide that a permanent total disability may be assigned when the requirement of permanence is met and there is a single disability of 60 percent or more, or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent or more in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto. Although age alone is not considered as a basis for entitlement to such pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in arriving at a final determination.

Pursuant to extension 5 to the Schedule for Rating Disabilities, 1945, dated October 7, 1948, the aforementioned percentage requirements were reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities, with no percentage requirement for any one disability; at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities; and at age 65 to one disability ratable at 10 percent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

Inasmuch as it is the policy of the Veterans' Administration that all veterans who are basically eligible and who are unable to secure and follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of disabilities which are likely to be permanent, shall be rated as permanently and totally disabled for the purpose of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, as amended, the cases of all veterans who fail to meet the specific percentage standards will be referred to the central office for final determination.

Very truly yours,

C. H. BIRDSALL,
Assistant Administrator for Legislation.

CHARACTER OF DISCHARGE; ELIGIBILITY FOR VA BENEFITS

1. Sections 300 and 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 provide:

"SEC. 300. The discharge or dismissal by reason of the sentence of a general court martial of any person from the military or naval forces, or the discharge of any such person on the ground that he was a conscientious objector who refused to perform military duty or refused to wear the uniform or otherwise to comply with lawful orders of competent military authority, or as a deserter, or of an officer by the acceptance of his resignation for the good of the service, shall bar all rights of such person, based upon the period of service from which he is so discharged or dismissed, under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

"SEC. 1503. A discharge or release from active service under conditions other than dishonorable shall be a prerequisite to entitlement to veterans' benefits provided by this act or Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended."

2. The question of whether a discharge was under conditions other than dishonorable within the meaning of section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act depends upon the facts of each case. VA guides in making such determination are set forth in R. & P. R. 1064.

3. Section 1 of H. R. 2681, Eighty-first Congress, as reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on February 16, 1949, requires a discharge under conditions other than dishonorable in order to qualify for the pension therein provided. It will be noted that the qualifying type of discharge in such section 1 is the same as required under existing law by section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. Thus it would appear that the determination of eligibility under section 1 of H. R. 2681 would be made in the same manner and under the same guides as presently govern determinations under section 1503 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (see par. 2 above). Of course, section 300 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act would apply in determining eligibility under section 1 of H. R. 2681 because such section 300 is concerned with "rights * * * under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

Flood Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made March 3, 1949, before the Deficiencies and Army Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in the interest of flood control:.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for the benefit of the record, my name is OTTO E. PASSMAN. I represent the Fifth Louisiana District in Congress and have the distinct honor of being a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. I am here to testify, and insofar as I am able, to justify an increase in the amount provided in the budget for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries.

In the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say not only for myself, but I am sure for the people whom I represent, that the objective of economy and reduction of unnecessary Federal expenditures should be the chief concern of the Congress. However, I do not consider funds expended wisely for flood control as an expense. Rather, they should be considered as a capital investment because soil erosion and floods are costing the American people in excess of $1,000,000,000 annually. Certainly if we permit this waste to continue for many more years, then a large part of our rich farm land will have been washed into the oceans, never to be recovered, leaving us with hundreds of thousands of square miles of red clay hills and ugly gullies. If we will invest wisely in flood control, reclamation, and soil conservation, then the investment will pay great dividends to the people of America and to our Federal Government.

I make no pretense of being an expert in the field of flood control, but for many years as a businessman and resident of Louisiana, and especially since I became a Member of Congress 2 years ago, I have studied the problems of the lower Mississippi Valley and the problems of my district relative to the effects of the floods that fall upon us almost every year. It is indeeed true that Louisiana is the spigot of the national funnel comprising the middle section of the entire Nation, which, on account of Louisiana's geographical location must act as a reservoir for an almost incomprehensible volume of water.

On April 10, 1945, standing on the Mississippi River levee at Vidalia, La., I observed in excess of 1,000,000,000 gallons of water per minute passing a given point, as established by a scientific registering process, swiftly rushing between the two guide-line levees of the Mississippi River. Thirty-one of our 48 States must necessarily pour their floodwaters upon a good part of Louisiana, and in all cases, through Louisiana to reach the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore, we could assume that flood-control problems of the lower Mississippi Valley, especially in Louisiana, are 31 times greater than those of almost any of the 31 States whose floodwaters pour through Louisiana to the Gulf of Mexico.

I am sure that this committee would be interested in learning that the longest continuous levee line in the world lies between Pine Bluff, Ark., and Shaw, La., a distance of 389 miles, mostly through flat country; with a short gap at Shaw, this levee continues an additional 210 miles to the Gulf of Mexico, or a total of 597 miles. The millions of people living along the levee's path are almost in constant fear of the floodwaters of the unpredictable, mighty Mississippi, and in too many instances their homes and property, even their very lives are endangered. The lower Mississippi Valley is the oldest authorized flood-control project in America and the great majority of my fellow Louisianians feel that the progress in this area is falling behind that of projects authorized many years later.

I am confident that if you gentlemen of this committee could find time to study the problems of the lower Mississippi Valley, you would lend your support in helping to expedite completion of the flood-control project for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. If I could describe to you the conditions as they actually exist, then I am sure that your committee would increase the amount in the budget's recommendation for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries to $104,000,000, the minimum asked for by the Corps of Army Engineers. The Army engineers informed the Bureau of the Budget that any sum less than a very minimum of $100,000,000 would not be sufficient to maintain a fair schedule of construction. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget placed a limitation of $70,000,000 for construction and maintenance on the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries.

Mr. Chairman, I state, and the available information and the record will bear me out, that $70,000,000 is inadequate to keep the Mississippi and its tributaries on a workable schedule. Certainly the main river itself cannot be neglected, because to do so, may bring destruction to millions of people in the valley and cost hundreds of millions of dollars. I am sure that this committee has studied the tentative expenditure schedule of $70,000,000 recommended in the budget. For a break-down, the main stem of the Mississippi River will require a very minimum of $38,000,000, and maintenance on the main Mississippi River an additional $15,000,000. That makes a total of $53,000,000 of the $70,000,000 recommended in the budget, leaving only $17,000,000 for off-river work on the dozens of authorized projects on the Mississippi's tributaries. I believe this amount to be wholly inadequate if the mammoth and very necessary flood control authorized project is to be completed in our lifetime.

Mr. Chairman, obviously when an inadequate amount is appropriated for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries, it affects not the Mississippi River proper, but the river's tributaries. I make this statement because certainly I understand, and the gentlemen of this committee understand, that the main levees of the Mississippi River, including bank stabilization and maintenance, must be carried on at any cost, and certainly at the necessary expense of the off-river construction. In my candid opinion, just so long as the Congress fails to provide adequate funds to keep up a minimum schedule—just so long will my fellow Louisianians lose millions of dollars annually caused by overflows and backwater.

As I testify before this committee I am deeply concerned because at this very moment Louisiana is facing one of its greatest floods of all times. At this very moment over 200 square miles of rich farm lands in my own district are inundated. Many towns are under water, and families have had to be evacuated from Black Hawk, Shaw, Acme, New Era, Eva, and Monterey. Thousands of their cattle and it is estimated 15,000 hogs have been drowned. Five years out of the past seven, these people have experienced the unfortunate act of nature, aggravated by man. The condition in many parts of Louisiana is the unavoidable, but necessary result of what has been done in the general over-all flood control program. Even though the program in other States was necessary and proved of value in enhancing the properties of those States hundreds of millions of dollars, it has made the condition somewhat disastrous in Louisiana. In other words, cut-offs in the Mississippi River and the resultant raising of the levees moves great volumes of water more rapidly creating a backwater situation that should and could be corrected if the Congress would provide a minimum of funds to keep these authorized projects progressing.

I should like to call to the attention of this committee certain facts which may startle you. There are 10,268 square miles in my district alone, and at one time only a few years ago, 4,625 square miles of this total area were inundated, and it is now predicted that the present flood may equal or surpass that of a few years ago.

With an appropriation of $70,000,000, there is very little hope, if any, that my district would benefit materially. The Tensas-Cocodrie sector of the Red River backwater area and the Boeuf-Tensas River Basin projects rate high on the engineers' agenda, but without funds, additional contracts cannot be let. Certainly progress cannot be made on these projects unless this committee decides it is justified in increasing the amount recommended for the Mississippi River and its tributaries to $100,000,000, the very minimum by which the Corps of Army Engineers can carry on this all-important work so vital to the very existence of so many of the people residing in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the $100,000,000 urgently needed for the lower Mississippi Valley stands out like a beacon, but we should not forget that the mighty Mississippi River which accommodates floodwaters from 31 States and 2 Provinces in Canada, stands out as a constant threat to many millions of our fellow citizens, and will continue to do so until such time as we are given the minimum needed to keep this all-important project on a reasonable schedule toward final completion.

Mr. Chairman, with your indulgence I should like to make another brief statement relative to flood-control conditions as they exist in my district at this very minute. The Red Cross has set up emergency headquarters in three towns in my district: namely, Harrisonburg, Jonesville, and Ferriday, and are caring for over 200 families. The adjutant general of Louisiana informed me that the Fourth Army was flying in tents in preparation for further disaster which is anticipated. The adjutant general has alerted a duck platoon; also 600 motor vehicles, all standing by at Camp Beauregard. Two hundred and fifty tents have been sent into the Monroe area of the Fifth Congressional District. I am told that my fellow Louisianians have been informed by the Louisiana Secretary of State that in all probability there will be 20 per-

cent more water during this year than there was in the devastating flood of a few years ago, at which time 14,200 square miles of the 50,000 square-mile area of Louisiana was inundated.

Mr. Chairman, I have not attempted to present in detail all the information available on the lower Mississippi Valley because much of it is at the committee's disposal and much more has, or will be covered, by other witnesses, but I do want to plead with you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to increase the appropriation for the Mississippi River and its tributaries to $100,000,000, which is a figure that the Corps of Army Engineers states emphatically it must have if satisfactory progress is to be made on the lower Mississippi and its important tributaries.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention just one other project in Louisiana and that is the Jonesville ring levee. Last year the Congress provided $268,000 for this project, with the understanding that local interests would provide an additional $100,000. The $100,000 was delivered to the Army engineers in New Orleans. Later it was ascertained that the amount of money requested was based on an estimate made 7 years ago. Current estimates reveal that an additional $150,000 is needed to complete the project. It is my understanding this amount has been requested this year. From the State's total funds of $200,000 earmarked for such projects, the Jonesville ring levee received $100,000, and I do not believe the State of Louisiana will have sufficient funds available to provide an additional sum for completion of this project.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, for hearing my testimony.

You, Too, Work for Uncle Sam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the United States News and World Report of March 11, 1949:

YOU, TOO, WORK FOR UNCLE SAM—MANY A DAY'S LABOR NOW GOES TO PAY TAXES

(Taxes, despite 1948 cuts, make part-time Government workers out of nearly everybody. Few work entirely for themselves. Some work more than half the year for Government. In 1939, a $20,000-man put in only 17 days to pay his taxes. It takes a $2,500-man 18 days now. President wants to claim still more working time. Congress may shelve tax increases.)

Taxpayers, figuring their income taxes at this time, are finding again that they put in a sizable part of the year working for the Federal Government.

At that, most people worked less time for the Government in 1948 than in 1947. For some married persons, those earning $20,000 to $35,000 a year, 1948 tax cuts reduced the number of working days claimed by the tax collector by as much as one-third. Even so, people at these levels still work 2 to 3 months of the year for the Government, and a few at the top of the scale work more time for the Government than for themselves.

Pay-roll taxes for social security and excise taxes take additional portions of working time. So do State and local taxes, which are in a rising trend. In 1948, some people found that increases in State and local taxes offset the cut in Federal taxes.

How many days a person must work each year to pay his Federal income taxes depends upon how much money he earns. The more money he makes, the more time he puts in for the Government. The covergram and the table on this page give you a means of determining approximately how many days the tax collector claims out of your work year. Figures are for married taxpayers with no children. A 10-percent allowance is assumed for charity, interest and other deductions permitted under the tax laws.

At $2,500 of annual salary, a married man, at present tax rates, has to work 18 days to earn the money it takes to pay his Federal income tax. That is on the basis of a 5-day week. In other words, this man hands over to the tax collector his whole pay for 3½ weeks out of the year.

At $5,000, he works 28 days, or 5½ weeks, for the Government.

At $7,500, the tax collector's claim on working time rises to 33 days, or 6½ weeks, out of the work year. To put it another way, a man at this income level signs over nearly 1 day's pay out of every 8 to the Federal Government.

At $10,000 of income, taxes take the pay of 36 working days. Here, a man who starts out on January 1 to earn enough money to pay his tax does not finish until February 21.

At $15,000, a married man puts in 42 working days a year for the Government. That amounts to more than 8 weeks out of the 52.

At $20,000, the time a man gives the Government rises to 47 working days a year. This means, in effect, that from January 1 to March 8 he is working entirely for the tax collector.

At this level of income, a married man cashes in heavily on the privilege of income splitting. This was voted by Congress in 1948. In 1947, a $20,000 man had to work 70 days to pay his tax, 23 days more than in 1948.

At $25,000, despite a 1948 tax cut of more than one third, a married man still has to work 52 days for the Government, or a full day out of every week.

At $30,000, it takes 57 days to earn enough money for the Federal tax.

At $50,000, the Government takes all the pay a married man earns between January 1 and April 18. In other words, he puts in 76 days out of the year to earn his tax money.

At $100,000, a man works 104 days out of the year to pay his taxes. The Government claims the entire pay of this man between the beginning of the year and May 26. The year is nearly 5 months gone before he starts working for himself.

At higher levels, people work still more days for the Government. A $1,000,000 man pays the tax collector all the money he earns in 185 out of the 260 working days of the year. In effect, he works for the Government from January 1 to September 16, for himself the remaining 3½ months of the year.

This is the burden of big, high-cost Government after a 1948 reduction of $4,800,000,000 in personal taxes.

In prewar years, even after the New Deal brought rate increases, taxes were mild by comparison. In 1939, just 10 years ago, a man had to get into a fairly high income bracket before the Government claimed any substantial portion of his working time.

At $2,500, a man worked for himself alone in 1939, as he had no income tax to pay. At $5,000, he worked 3 days for the Government, and at $7,500 he could pay his whole tax with his pay check for 1 week. At $20,000, a high income in those days, a man worked less time for the Government than a $2,500 man today. A $50,000 man 10 years ago put in less time for the Government than a $15,000 man now.

In the future, if Mr. Truman has his way, people will have to put in even more time working for the Government.

In regular taxes, he asks an immediate increase of $4,000,000,000 a year, part to be taken out of corporate income and part out of the incomes of individuals earning $5,000 a year or more.

In pay-roll taxes to finance social programs, he asks even greater increases. This, again, would come out of the incomes of businesses and individuals, reducing take-home pay, adding to the amount of time people put in for the tax collector.

But Congress, watching the signs of a business downturn, is skeptical of new taxes. Rises in pay-roll taxes may not come as rapidly as Mr. Truman suggests. Rises in regular taxes may be shelved, at least for 1949. If business declines sharply, there will be demands for tax cuts.

But, whatever happens, taxes are to stay high by any prewar standards. Nearly everybody is to keep working part time for the Government.

TAXES AS MAN-DAYS

The table below shows how many working days out of each year it takes a married man, at various salary levels, to earn enough money to pay his Federal income tax. These figures assume a 5-day workweek.

Annual pay	Tax	Days worked to pay tax
$2,500	$174	18
5,000	548	28
7,500	964	33
10,000	1,400	36
15,000	2,433	42
20,000	3,649	47
25,000	5,041	52
30,000	6,588	57
50,000	14,610	76
100,000	40,067	104

Hon. Walter G. Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the Buffalo Courier-Express of Monday last in reference to the life and accomplishments of our departed colleague:

WALTER G. ANDREWS

Former Representative Walter G. Andrews, who died in Florida at the age of 59, achieved distinction as an athlete, a businessman, soldier, and Congressman. A civic-minded citizen, he occupied an important role in many organizations devoted to the interests of the community.

One of the few Congressmen to be awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Mr. Andrews saw military service on the Mexican border in 1916, and the First World War where his valor in leading an attack on the Hindenberg Line, an engagement in which he was wounded, brought him his high honor.

His experience as a soldier initiated an interest in military affairs, which continued throughout his life. As a Representative of the old Fortieth District and its successor, the forty-second, Mr. Andrews continually demonstrated this fact. During World War

II, he was ranking minority member of the House Military Affairs Committee, and there he exerted his influence to the utmost in behalf of the strengthening of the military power of the Nation. In the Eightieth Congress he served as chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee and later as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. His assignments in recent years included work on the peacetime draft and the Bikini test of the atom bomb. He was a member of the nine-man committee appointed by the President to observe the effects of the Bikini demonstration.

Mr. Andrews' devotion to the military interests of the Nation did not deter him, however, from exerting his efforts in behalf of his own constituents, and his accomplishments for his region were many. It may be said of him that he was the most distinguished Representative that the Niagara Frontier has ever sent to Congress.

The Birthday of Bock Beer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the brewers of the United States this year are celebrating the seven hundredth anniversary of bock beer, that rich dark brew which traditionally heralds the approach of spring.

Since the year 1249, when the first kegs of bock were tapped in the manorial village of Einbeck, in Germany, this beverage has traveled far and wide to delight appreciative generations of beer drinkers all over the world. In the United States, which today is the No. 1 producer of beer, the art and science of brewing bock have reached fruition. We produce the most—and we produce the finest.

On this occasion, it seems both proper and fitting that we pause for a moment to salute the industry which not only tickles the palate but which also contributes a good part of the money required to run the Federal Government. Last year the United States Treasury collected almost $700,000,000 in taxes from the more than 85,000,000 barrels of brew produced. Approximately 80,000 men are employed directly in the production of beer, and many times that number make their living from the distribution and sale of this beverage of moderation.

The brewers of my home State are celebrating this occasion with a gigantic bock-beer festival for the benefit of the American Red Cross. The following item from the New York Times of March 1 is of interest in connection with this celebration:

BOCK-BEER SEASON SEEN AID TO SALES—BIGGEST OUTPUT ON RECORD HERE WATCHED NATIONALLY AS POSSIBLE YEARLY PROMOTION

Opening of the bock-beer season here March 10 with the greatest output ever produced by local brewers is being watched nationally as a possible yearly promotion for the entire country, it was learned here yesterday. Pointing out that bock-beer season is the only promotion opportunity the industry has during the year, brewers believe that a nationally recognized festival would do much to stimulate sales.

The promotion here, which is being sponsored by the Brewers Board of Trade, Inc., and the New Jersey Brewers Association, is a joint undertaking of 18 leading breweries in the 2 States.

The fact that bock beer has not been available in quantities since 1941, plus the belief that heavy promotional emphasis may aid in stemming a general decline in beer sales, accounts for the all-time bock production of hundreds of thousands of gallons, it was explained. If public response measures up to present hopes, it is believed that other beer-producing centers will make similar moves next year.

It was explained that although during prewar years bock beer season always heralded the opening of the beer-drinking season, the industry never established a universal period for the promotion. Such a move would aid not only in focusing public attention on the brewing industry through unified promotions, but would also aid the industry and its outlets by establishing set delivery dates, it was believed.

Official opening of the bock festival here will take place at the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Regiment Armory at Twenty-fifth and Lexington on March 9, where the public may drink at various exhibits and listen to music by name bands. All proceeds from admissions and sales will be given to the Red Cross.

Local tavern associations reported that their members will back the promotion enthusiastically and at least one group is issuing point-of-sale posters to member bars. The two associations sponsoring the drive have prepared bus posters, with radio and newspaper advertising to be used by the brewers participating. Distribution will be both by kegs and bottles, it was said.

Federal Amusement Tax on Elementary- and Secondary-School Activities Curtails Educational Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, on January 13 of this year I introduced H. R. 1310, which provides for an amendment to subchapter A of chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code. The proposed amendment states:

No tax shall be levied under this subchapter in respect of any admissions all the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of elementary or secondary schools if no part of the net earnings thereof inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to direct the attention of all the Members of this House to H. R. 1310. I do so because the present application of the amusement tax on admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools is unfair and unnecessary, and works a distinct hardship upon the promotion of proper and desirable educational activities in our elementary schools and high schools.

Let us review first, Mr. Speaker, the history of the Federal amusement tax, especially as its relationship to admissions to elementary- and secondary-school activities is concerned.

I am informed that the first Federal amusement tax was enacted in 1932 and provided for a tax of 10 percent on admissions of 41 cents or more. In 1940 this law was amended, so that the tax was 10 percent on admissions of 21 cents or more. In 1941 it was furthermore amended to provide for a 10-percent tax on admissions of 10 cents or more. Finally, in 1943 the law was further amended to provide for a tax of 20 percent on all admissions of 5 cents or more.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out, however, that prior to the amendment of the act in 1941, all admissions to affairs or activities for the benefit of religious, educational, and charitable organizations, and all other nonprofit organizations, were specifically exempted from the amusement tax. While it is true that other factors were present in 1941 when this exemption was removed, it is also true that an important consideration at that time was the need for increased revenues to provide for our tremendous national defense activities.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the foregoing outline of the history of this tax, and in view of the fact that the war has been over for more than 3 years, there is real reason, even without consideration of other facts which I will present, for the removal of the amusement tax on the activities of elementary and secondary schools.

Since the introduction of H. R. 1310, I have received considerable correspondence from school administrators in support of this bill. In that connection, many of them have made statements which to my mind demonstrate quite clearly that the present tax on school activities is unfair, as well as unnecessary.

One such school administrator pointed out that extra-curricular activities in the schools are financed by admission charges and by public tax funds from State sources. He then went on to state:

It seems rather radiculous to tax the political subdivision of the State when they in turn must tax to pay the tax paid to the Federal Government.

In another letter which I received this thought was expressed:

To tax good entertainment for children is to encourage juvenile delinquency by denying such cultural influences to the very children who need them, and to penalize the very parents who are trying to bring up their children to be good citizens. This tax is one of the most undemocratic of all our taxes, bringing in only a trifle, so far as the Government is concerned, but making cultural plays a heavy burden to those interested in child welfare.

From the principal of a small rural school came this message in support of H. R. 1310:

Basketball is the only athletic activity which is self-supporting in our school. The tax which we have to pay on basketball games would go a long way toward paying for uniforms and proper equipment for other activities. It is seldom that we have a class where the ticket sales amount to $75. After we pay 20 percent tax, the balance seems a meager remuneration indeed for many weeks of night rehearsals.

The superintendent of another rural school wrote to urge that this bill be passed, and pointed out that small schools "have great difficulty in meeting their obligations for expenses incurred by student activities. To be free from the amusement-tax obligation would help to a great degree."

And another high-school principal writes, Mr. Speaker, to point out that "all revenue from school activities is used for the good of the school and its pupils, hence it is definitely of benefit to the public in general."

Following the same trend of thought, an elementary-school principal pointed out that the money which must now be paid as an admission tax "could be used by the individual schools to help finance the type of program essential to the best all-around development of its pupils. There are," he also pointed out, "many programs which schools could use as money-raising projects, but which are not used because the tax makes the profit so small that it simply is not worth the time and trouble to put them on."

Mr. Speaker, we discuss frequently the need for improving and increasing educational opportunities for our young citizens in the elementary and secondary schools. In my opinion, H. R. 1310 offers a splendid opportunity by which, at very little loss of revenue, we can actually contribute to the growth and development and improvement of educational opportunities of real value for our young students. Consequently, I urge that every consideration be given to the enactment of H. R. 1310.

Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following statement which I delivered before the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to go on record as favoring H. R. 2032, which is a bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes.

The climate most favorable to the real settlement of industrial disputes is one in which labor and management work out a compromise without interference.

This is the voluntary, mature, and responsible way, free from the heavy hand of government.

Some day we shall have to define the limits of government before it becomes the lord and master of all our actions and perhaps of our thoughts. We shall have to stress and encourage those voluntary groupings by which people compose their differences in order to forestall the encroachments of a government that just grows and grows until it chokes out all freedom of compact.

A true constitution has its roots in the people, developing from their traditions and customs, and they, through experience, have evolved practical ways of adjusting differences.

From this common law has come the written law of our statute books. This is the process of social organization, at least it is so, or intended to be so, in a democracy.

In a totalitarian state, by way of contrast, a constitution is imposed from above. There are forced solutions, accepted for the moment because there is no alternative.

Behind the lip service to arbitrary law, there is discontent. The people have not participated in the making of such law. It is not representative of them.

In the present discussion concerning the formulation of a labor-management relations act which will help the two principal parties of an industrial dispute to reach an understanding a third consideration, that of the public interest, has been injected.

Neither management nor labor is without conscience. From their experience of the past 20 years, both have learned that one cannot have progress without the other, and that one cannot prosper at the expense of the other. And the good will of the public is important to both.

In our efforts, as one nation, to find basic security for all our people without sacrifice of our fundamental liberties, we are adopting a voluntary form of collective bargaining.

To cry "havoc" at this statement is only to deceive ourselves.

Look at the various economic controls exercised by our Government today, and authorized by a Congress representative of the people.

Consider the range and meaning of the social-security program which will, in our time, embrace every American. To have mentioned such a possibility 25 years ago, would have been considered as heresy, and would have raised doubts concerning the sanity of the individual who dared to suggest such a revolutionary step.

Today it is regarded as a necessity. Both major political parties are pledged to increase the coverage and the benefits of old-age insurance and assistance.

Take another pressing problem, that of national health. It was not so long ago that the medical profession opposed voluntary health insurance. Now they warmly advocate such group cooperation to head off compulsory health insurance and Government control.

With these examples before us, we should go slowly on legislation which would lead to the compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes. If Government should acquire too much power in the determination of such problems, the freedom of management and labor to negotiate would be restricted, if not eliminated. Government would be the sole judge, and we would be on the road toward the all-powerful state.

I contend that the Taft-Hartley Act is a step in that direction. I am going to vote for its repeal. My present concern is that it may be repealed by name, but that its substance may be retained in another bill which purports to be a new and different bill but which is only a rephrasing of Taft-Hartley, couched in disarming language.

There is no basis for the argument that the Federal Government should intervene to stop a local strike by the exercise of arbitrary power. For work stoppages which constitute a national emergency, under the Taft-Hartley law, the President, after studying the report of a fact-finding board, can direct that the Government seek an injunction to block a strike, or decide against that course.

The injunction can stay in effect up to 80 days. It occurs to me that this is a one-sided restriction on labor, depriving it completely of its only recourse. There is no equivalent or balancing compulsion exerted against management.

Seeing the cards thus stacked against labor, it is likely that management, in some instances, will take advantage of it. Just by sitting tight, and going through the motions of the bargaining process, they can defeat labor.

When it happens once, there is injustice. When it happens several times, the whole process of collective bargaining breaks down.

Under such circumstances, the Government abandons its role of conciliator and, in effect, sides with management. Even before a dispute arises, Government says that it will bear down on labor singly and exclusively, by enjoining labor's right to strike. There is no thought of expectancy of management going on strike. The provision concerning injunctions is therefore aimed at labor, and labor alone.

Collective bargaining has no chance to function in such a prejudiced atmosphere.

It is a retreat from the development of that industrial democracy which is necessary if our way of life is to survive.

I maintain that we should encourage the collective-bargaining process with a minimum of Government interference, because this is consistent with the American tradition of individual and group responsibility.

By bringing labor and management together around the conference table, mutual suspicions tend to dissolve and old habits of thought are reexamined in the light of mutual interest. No longer is management solely concerned with the welfare of the enterprise. In turn, the horizons of union leadership have widened. Both are beginning to sense that they are partners in the business. Most unions now understand that the security of their members depends upon the welfare of the business. The action of the garment workers in deciding not to seek another wage increase is a case in point.

They realize that under present conditions such a move would weaken the competitive position of the clothing industry and result in unemployment.

Some management representatives believe in the continuance of management prerogatives. Others take a static view and prefer to maintain the present set-up. There are many others, however, who understand the fluid character of the collective-bargaining idea.

It is a living organism which must grow and mature to prove that democracy can make the necessary social and economic adjustments to a developing technology without reducing mankind to a machine-like existence as pawns of an all-enveloping state.

They have faith that collective bargaining will survive the passing uncertainties of its growth and develop to the point where trade-unions play an increasingly important part in areas which are presently considered as the exclusive province of management.

Instances of union-management cooperation in matters relating to the advancement or survival of the enterprise in which both have a real interest have not been given the recognition they deserve.

I refer to the 500 companies which have adopted the multiple-management experiment, or the setting up of three subordinate boards of directors, one a piece for junior executives, factory workers, and sales.

Ideas agreed upon unanimously by the junior boards have to be given serious consideration by the regular board. Management gets its problems across to the workers. The workers' problems, in turn, reach the management quickly, dissolving the artificial tensions of the past where management and labor were regarded as natural antagonists, instead of partners both necessary to the success of the enterprise.

I also refer to those occasions where clothing workers' unions have made financial loans to enterprises which were in difficult straits.

It is the voluntary nature of collective bargaining which develops the favorable climate of gradual understanding and cooperation without interference from a third party.

It is unfortunate that the many cases which prove this have not been given as much publicity as those instances where the parties have failed to reach an understanding.

We are fully informed concerning the sensational divorces in this country, but we are not given the positive and constructive story of the millions of marriages which are succeeding.

By way of analogy, I contend that the major and responsible virtue of the collective-bargaining process is that it provides an opportunity for the private parties immediately concerned to work out their own answers to their mutual problems.

The postwar hysteria engendered by strikes obscures the fact that the mass of union membership is a major element of the consuming public and overlooks the concern for the broad aspects of national welfare which is to be found in the conduct of collective-bargaining negotiations and in the legislative programs put forward and diligently supported by the CIO and the A. F. of L.

It is significant that the conduct of many negotiations has reflected public pressures. There is increasing evidence that management and labor consider the effects of their actions upon the public.

The Taft-Hartley law was brought about through the tendency of the public to place the burden for more responsible action on the unions, rather than management.

To counter this, the unions conducted a broad information program, designed to correct the imbalance. It is safe to say that this changed the composition of Congress to the extent that the Taft-Hartley law is now up for repeal.

The administration bill seeks to eliminate many of its provisions, including:

The ban on the closed shop.

The right of employees to refrain from union activities and be free from union coercion.

The ban on strikes by Federal employees.

The provision relieving employers of a duty to bargain concerning foremen.

The powers of the Labor Board's general counsel to have sole charge of the investigation and prosecution of cases and to seek injunctions in unfair-labor-practice cases.

The non-Communist provision requiring union officers to file affidavits for access to the Labor Board.

The ban on union political spending.

And the requirement for unions to bargain in good faith.

Steps for dealing with national-emergency strikes affecting the public welfare, under the administration bill, provide that:

1. The President would issue a proclamation saying the public interest is affected by a dispute, and asking that there be no work stoppage.

2. The President would appoint an emergency board to investigate. The Board would report its findings and recommendations in 25 days. The disputants would be asked to refrain from a work stoppage another 5 days.

3. The Government would rely on acceptance of these recommendations. There is no provision in the bill for forcing acceptance of or for a court injunction to block a strike.

This is in line with the Wagner Act, which should be restored, an act which, in the words of Leon Keyserling, and I quote: "Was pointed toward more than strengthening labor or bettering its economic position. It was founded on the proposition that the whole economy would prosper through a better distribution of the Nation's goods. It also evaluated collective bargaining as an essential attribute of a free society, and as the only alternative to an intensely centralized economy in the modern industrial state."

The Wagner Act was a simple law which restricted Government intervention to a minimum. The Taft-Hartley Act covers the whole field and pushes Government right into the middle of the collective-bargaining process, where it doesn't belong.

This is dangerous. It weakens that voluntary quality without which there cannot be collective bargaining, in the democratic sense of the word.

The Taft-Hartley Act, by prohibiting the closed shop, by dictating the provisions of a union shop, and by the limitation of health and welfare provisions, is an attempt to undermine progress by those who believe in feudalism.

The extensive use of injunctions, employed so often in the past to crush the labor-union movement, has the effect of giving to the National Labor Relations Board and the courts, a decisive role in the collective-bargaining process.

It must be repudiated, by repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and by reenactment of the Wagner Act.

Responsive only to public opinion, labor and management need the opportunity to work out the collective-bargaining experiment to its full realization. Through this they will fashion a free people's solution to the modern industrial problems which Fascists and Communists would solve with iron controls.

The issue is not one of labor versus management.

The issue is freedom or dictatorship, with labor, management, and the public, working for the American way.

Catholic Labor Alliance and Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, recently the commission on human relations of the city of Chicago presented an award in human relations to an outstanding citizen of Chicago, Mr. Edward Marciniak, which read as follows:

Commission on human relations, city of Chicago, award in human relations to Edward Marciniak, who as founder and leader of the Catholic Labor Alliance, has shown how religious groups may advance the principles of Christian behavior and universal brotherhood without racial discrimination among all men who work, and who, as editor of the magazine Work, constantly upholds these same principles, thus giving practical direction to democratic sentiments and faiths.

No more worthy individual could have been selected for this award. As head of the Catholic Labor Alliance, an organization composed of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, Mr. Marciniak has unceasingly worked for social reform to benefit all mankind. Aided by Father Daniel M. Cantwell, the chaplain of the Catholic Labor Alliance; Mr. John Loser, the president of the alliance, and other far-sighted assistants, the Catholic Labor Alliance and the magazine Work have recently brought outstanding speakers to Chicago, such as Bishop Francis J. Haas, of Grand Rapids, whose speech on essentials of social order, the first of the John A. Ryan lectures, was widely acclaimed. The alliance, through Work magazine, has continually brought to the attention of their readers valuable information on our present labor laws.

The March 1949 issue of Work magazine contains an editorial which brings together the opinions of leading Catholic clergymen writing on the subject of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, which I believe merits our most serious consideration.

The editorial follows:

IF WE WROTE THE NEW LABOR LAW, HERE'S WHAT WE WOULD AIM AT

Quite a few Americans are hot and bothered over the law which would replace the Taft-Hartley law. Should the law require non-Communist affidavits for both employers and union leaders? Should the law grant injunction-asking powers to the President in strikes that cripple the country?

Those are just two items that a lot of people in and out of Congress are debating. The controversial points get the X-ray treatment of two labor experts in the weekly magazine, America (February 19 and 26 issues). Father Benjamin L. Masse, S. J., and Charles W. Anrod wind up their article thus:

"The Wagner Act did not go far enough. The Taft-Hartley Act went too far."

Another man who knows his labor law, Father George G. Higgins, writes in the February issue of Catholic Action:

"The Wagner Act was a good law—as far as it went; but it didn't go far enough."

Both articles say that the Wagner Act "didn't go far enough," but they don't quite mean the same thing.

Father Masse and Anrod see labor legislation as a sort of pendulum which swings at one time too much in favor of labor, at another too much in favor of management. "Somewhere between these two extremes lies the kind of law that should be acceptable to labor and management and satisfy the general public," they write.

Under the present system, labor law (like most of labor-management relations) actually does work like a pendulum, with each side jockeying to see that things swing their way whenever possible.

But Father Higgins points out that, at least in the long run, we should eliminate this jockeying, or else we'll be up to our necks in the class struggle, which the Communists talk about but which we often practice. According to Father Higgins, the Wagner Act didn't go far enough to eliminate this struggle, and the Taft-Hartley Act fell far short even of the Wagner Act.

THREE VIEWS

To understand Father Higgins' view, we must look at the three predominant views toward collective bargaining, in which workers band together to assure themselves better wages, hours, and working conditions. Here are the three views:

1. Collective bargaining is just another one of those things which, like warts, you don't especially like but have to put up with. So you might make a concession here and there to labor, but this is only because you don't see any other way out, especially with labor getting strong politically. This is the underlying philosophy of many an employer. This view—in more velvety terms—is held by the National Association of Manufacturers.

2. Collective bargaining is fine, period. We need more and more unions, and these unions should try to get more and more for the workers. This view is held by the majority of labor unions, faced as they are with the pressing problem of meeting the needs of the workers.

8. Collective bargaining is fine, but it is really just a starting point for a good social order. In the industrial warfare of the thirties, the right to bargain was just about the best deal that workers could get. Such a condition is still not up to the ideal. This view is held by the editors of Work, among others, and by Father Higgins.

"The important thing now is to see to it that the new law * * * will look beyond the mere protection of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively," Father Higgins writes. "The new law ought to lift the sights of the Federal Government by encouraging the cooperation of Government with labor and business * * *."

"The organization of labor, management, agriculture, and the professions is absolutely necessary, but it isn't enough. It's only the first step toward the Christian social order. The all-important thing is to get these free organizations to cooperate among themselves and with the Government—'in companies, in industries, and in economic life as a whole'—for the general economic welfare."

Father Higgins says it's time that we move from the Wagner Act era of organized haggling (wholesome as that era was in contrast to what had gone on before). We should go into an era of organized cooperation for the economic welfare of the whole community and all its separate, but closely interrelated parts.

In other words, Father Higgins wants a labor law that seeks cooperation rather than conflict.

The new law should give most of its attention not to holding back either labor or management, but to pushing both of them forward to cooperation for the common good. The law should not ignore the rights of labor and capital, but should stress the duties of both to the community.

True, all this may sound like nothing more than so many slogans—like saying we're against sin. But the reason this sounds like a collection of abstract slogans is that we really haven't tried cooperation in everyday economic life.

People think you're a socialist if you talk about the free organization of capital and labor in permanent agencies (industry councils) of cooperation for the common good. That's what the Catholic bishops of the United States called for in their official statement of last November. We're still a long way from that ideal.

Fascism in Action To Be Available Free Through Members of the House and Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives today passed a resolution providing for the distribution of 100,000 copies of Fascism In Action, 84,000 to be distributed free by Members of the House and 16,000 to be distributed free by Members of the United States Senate. Heretofore it has been necessary for this book to be published through the Government Printing Office at 40 cents per copy.

The Congress has done a good job alerting the people to the evils of communism by distributing free, through Members of Congress, more than 500,000 copies of the booklet, Communism In Action.

Although no free copies of Fascism In Action have been available, approximately 370,000 people have purchased single copies directly from the Government Printing Office at 40 cents per copy.

When anyone reads the book, Fascism In Action, who is acquainted with present-day lobbying activities by certain groups, he will quickly discover earmarks of fascism in certain campaigns that are going on today. We must not permit fascism to become the only alternative for communism. Neither must we permit communism to become the only alternative for fascism.

Our own Government and type of government—the parliamentary system, a democracy—is the best government on earth, so it is becoming that we make it possible for the people generally to be advised about the evils of both communism and fascism.

The booklets will not be available until the resolution which passed the House today is also passed by the Senate, but usually the Senate concurs in matters of this kind and no trouble is expected in this particular instance.

World Government Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week, March 6–12, is being nationally sponsored as World Government Week by all organizations interested in world federation. The mayors of Orange, East Orange, and West Orange, N. J., and the president of the village of South Orange, N. J., have issued proclamations setting aside this week as World Government Week and calling upon their citizens to devote the week to consider and discuss how best to strengthen the United Nations into a limited world government with authority and power adequate to prevent war between nations. Under the sponsorship of the Oranges and Maplewood Chapter, United World Federalists, a varied program has been set in motion in these communities for the observance of World Government Week. The following editorial on the subject appeared in the Orange Transcript and West Orange Chronicle of March 3, 1949:

WORLD GOVERNMENT ON CITIZENRY BASIS

World Government Week opens this Sunday, having been proposed and promoted by the United World Federalists, an organization dedicated to the belief that there will be no permanent peace in the world until a world-wide government is set up to assure it. They would extend the type of government that has proved so successful in our country to the entire world, setting up an international government to supervise affairs that are world-wide in scope but leaving all other powers to the individual countries.

As an average local citizen asked to give some thought to world government during the next week, two thoughts of local application come immediately to mind. It is said time and again that wars are made by national leaders who have reached positions of power and yearn for even greater power while if it were possible for the ordinary citizens of the world to vote on a declaration of war there would be no more wars. The average families which must contribute members to the military service would go to all extremes to find means of preventing war. To them, the United Nations appears a step in the right direction, but it, too, appears far away from them and those who make its decisions are the same ones in power in the member nations. Here then, in the United World Federalists, is an organization in which everyone can participate, an institution based on the individual citizens.

Secondly, the average citizen, in reading the papers and fearing the Russian war menace, often wonders where its proponents, who invade other countries and attempt to establish the Russian system in that country, get their enthusiasm for the Russian Government. All reports indicate that life in Russia is something from which to escape. Russian behavior toward even its most enthusiastic proponents is so erratic and unpredictable that most of its representatives must realize that although they are in favor today they are likely to face a firing squad or be vacationed in Siberia tomorrow without even being given a fair hearing. Yet those protagonists will risk their lives in other countries to sell the Soviet system on a world basis. On the other hand there is hardly an American citizen who would not be happy to attest that he believes that our system of government is the finest the world has ever known, but how many salesmen do we have out on the international highways selling the American system? It is not our nature. We believe that every nation should have the right to determine its own type of government without any pressure groups attempting to influence it. However, if it works so well for us, is there any reason why it should not do so well for the citizens of the world? And, as any successful fighter will tell you, the best defense is a good offense.

Here is a very brief statement of the United World Federalists which merits serious thought sometime during World Government Week. They say: "In the town, in the county, in the State, in the Nation, we have learned that the difference between war and peace is government. When there is no other way to settle disputes, men will fight, but within a framework of law, differences can be settled peaceably. Now we must put this knowledge to use on a world scale. We must strengthen the United Nations and give it the powers of government—the power to make, interpret, and enforce world law concerning world affairs—the one area in which the law of the jungle still reigns.

As a means of achieving it, the Federalists say: "As the strongest member of the UN, the United States must take the lead in bringing about the transformation of the UN into a federal world government. This can be done at a general conference of the UN, called under article 109 of the Charter and followed by ratification by the various nations according to their constitutional processes. Fortunately, the United States is a democratic Nation, and as a citizen of that Nation, you can do a great deal. You can help carry out a definite program. You can make your voice heard. United World Federalists isn't interested in tea parties or in a social organization, we are aiming at political action within these next years—in the little time left us. For that, you need us, and we need you."

They ask three things of those interested in their ideas: Become a member so that you

can be counted when it is necessary to tell a Congressman how many in his district favor a certain stand, be available to write Congressmen regarding certain specific legislation that is favored, and also be available as a volunteer for the organization if needed. It is fundamentally an organization of the citizens of the world.

The Difference Between State Socialism and Freedom Under the Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article written by Edward F. Hutton emphasizing the difference between state socialism and freedom under the Bill of Rights. This article stresses the inestimable value of your American citizenship. Protect it by combating state socialism. The article follows:

To Mr. Vishinsky of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to all the people of the United States of America.

Mr. VISHINSKY: It is reported that at the UN meeting, Paris, you announced your country had acquired the atomic bomb, developed in the United States of America. This is the first time in modern history that a nation has admitted to acquiring a secret of another nation without its consent. That bomb was developed at an initial cost of $2,000,000,000, paid for by "we, the people" of these United States. It was not developed as a threat to Russia or as a threat to world peace. It was developed to save millions of lives as our contribution to winning a war in which you were our ally and we were yours.

If you have acquired the atomic bomb, you probably believe you have our greatest asset. But you haven't. You can, however, acquire our greatest asset without any spywork, without any underhanded techniques. We gladly hand it to you free, and with our blessing. That great asset of ours is the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

You, Mr. Vishinsky, with Premier Stalin, and 12 others of the supreme Soviet, hold in your hands the destiny, the lives, and the liberties of over 300,000,000 people. They, literally, are serfs of your Communist state. You cannot give them the atomic bomb. But you can give them the life, liberty, and freedom of spirit that all people can enjoy under our Constitution and Bill of Rights; and you can drop this upon your people and upon the world with greater effectiveness for world peace than the destructive power of our entire stock pile of atomic bombs.

You claim, Mr. Vishinsky, that the supreme Soviet in governing the lives, the thinking, and the activities of all the people of Communist Russia, desires only to free the world from its political, social, religious, and economic chains. You speak of world freedom as an endowment invented by communism. You seek world revolution for the people's freedom.

Mr. Vishinsky, have you ever studied the United States Constitution? It is not only a plan for government that has given us all we have, it is a logical pattern for world government because it puts government precisely where it belongs, at the source from which it must forever derive * * * the hands and minds of the people. Our Constitution, on which we have no copyright, makes government the servant and not the master of the people. It makes all people potential capitalists, but it puts capitalism in the hands of a free people and not in the hands of the state, which uses capitalism to keep liberty and freedom from the people. In all of your damning of capitalism, you damn only free capitalism when you damn the United States.

You must believe in capitalism because the Union of Soviet Russia is the only state on the face of the earth that monopolizes all capital.

Communism holds, Mr. Vishinsky, that man must be free from the chains of religion and the domination of God. It maintains that all religions for the worship of God are bad for the people and bad for the state. You have displaced God and have set up the state as the supreme authority.

Has your state, in any of its scientific laboratories, ever created seeds which would sprout into food to feed your people? Only God can do that! Have any of your state laboratories managed to upset a single natural law? Can the Kremlin lengthen a day, shorten a night, or change a climate? Can you stop blizzards or create them? Can you deal in any way with the forces of nature, and change them?

To eliminate belief in God, you must change man from a human being into an animal. You must reverse all the forces of evolution and reduce man to the equivalent of a unit in a herd, a hive, or a nest. You must stop man's progress in thinking and action. You must control his mind. You have had some success—temporary success—in this approach. So did Hitler. So did Mussolini. So did the warlords of Japan. So did Nero. They have passed.

Any effort to control the thinking of man is in opposition to all the laws of God and nature, and must fail. You cannot stifle man's inner desire to make personal progress, to increase in importance, to have knowledge, to have possessions, to have liberty of mind and freedom of spirit.

What would happen in Soviet Russia if you took the United States Constitution and Bill of Rights and gave them to your people? What would happen if you gave to all the people of Russia freedom to worship God in any way they pleased? What would happen if you reopened all the churches, permitted entry and activity of missionaries, and restored all of the religious rights and privileges of Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Greeks, Mohammedans, and all other religions?

All of your people would have an inward lift. Pravda, carrying the announcement as news, would be kissed on the streets of Moscow. You, who announced it, would be blessed by the people on their knees.

What would happen in Russia if you said to all your people, "You have complete freedom of speech without reprisal"? Your people would go wild with joy, and you know it. Imagine how your people would react to be told that they could work where they pleased, and at what they pleased, without any dictation by the state. What would happen if you offered your people the right of private enterprise, to create a telephone system, a new railroad system, a new broadcasting system, the right to produce all kinds of merchandise and services? And the right to build and use radios, to listen to worldwide programs and to uncensored programs of Russian stations? Your people would believe that at long last communism had become a heaven on earth.

You should like the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights for one particular thing: The United States Constitution provides, within itself, the means of change without revolution and without counterrevolution. We, the people, living under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, can change that Constitution, wholly or in part, and provide for ourselves any other kind of government we want—totalitarian, communistic, state socialism, or no government at all. The Constitution provides for amendment by vote of the majority of the representatives of the people in three-fourths of the States.

You could say to your people, "This bombshell of liberty and freedom is not a 5- or 10-year plan. It is yours for a day, and if you like it, it is yours forever, but with this proviso: if ever you don't like it, as a majority, you can vote it out of action and return to any other form you like, without war, without bloodshed, without revolution."

You have the atomic bomb, so you say. So do we. That makes us equal as to destructive power. But that is not establishing parity. You should be equal also in constructive forces, the only force that nature's God smiles upon and blesses those who use it. The constructive force, far more important than the destructive force, doesn't have to be stolen. It is yours, for all the people of Russia, free. Free! Free! Take it. We are only a people lucky enough to have it. We didn't invent it.

We have no copyright or patent on it. Yet it is the greatest force in the world because it frees the creative powers of every man and woman.

In our Constitution and Bill of Rights is the secret of all our productive success; all of the secret of our happiness, our high standard of living, our high wages, our short hours—everything we have, even the development of the atomic bomb.

EDWARD F. HUTTON.

Basing-Point Definitions—No New Law Needed in Form of Moratorium or Otherwise—Small Business Apprehensive—Any Change Devastating to Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the nomenclature of business is varied and ofttimes picturesque. Many of the terms used to describe a particular situation or type of transaction are interchangeable. In the several geographic sections of our country terms which may be synonymous become adapted to sales and deliveries of different products in slightly different ways. Generally, however, language which involves the transportation of goods or merchandise is understood throughout the country as meaning the same thing in every State, city, town, and village. For example, "freight rate" is understood by all to mean the charge or charges necessary to be paid to a public carrier for moving goods and merchandise from one part of the country to another. It is pretty generally understood, too, that these freight rates, truck rates, river, or other rates used by public carriers are rates approved by some governmental body. Such governmental body may be the Interstate Commerce Commission or the regulatory commissions and boards established under the

laws of the several States. It is understood that these rates, when charged by a public carrier, have been approved by such regulatory bodies and are published in such manner that any interested party may have quick access to them.

It is when shippers or manufacturers attempt to set up transportation rates which have no basis for a fair charge for service rendered that terms applicable to transportation become confusing, misleading, and misunderstood. Of course, the number of public-carrier transportation rates on the thousands and thousands of commodities, basic and manufactured, run into the millions. However, we are not concerned with these rates which every day are used throughout our country by thousands of consignors and consignees to carry on business and personal activities. We are concerned about the rates which have been devised to control prices, create monopolies, and unfairly place an enormous burden upon commerce and industry by "conspiratous" action.

What are these terms and what do they mean in simple business language, and why should there be confusion or misunderstanding in business as to their meaning? I shall cite a few examples:

First. F. o. b.: Certainly everybody understands f. o. b. to mean free on board. The shipper here loads the products in a railroad car or delivers it to a freight depot, river or lake dock, terminal warehouse, or other transportation facility where the shipper's responsibility ends and the receiver's begins.

Second. F. a. s.: This term, free alongside ship or vessel, has the same natural meaning as f. o. b., the only difference, as is indicated, is in type of transportation facility.

Third. F. o. b. point of origin: In other words, where the shipment originates, which may be a mill, factory, a warehouse, or a freight depot located in or at the point of shipment. Certainly no one can misunderstand this term.

Fourth. F. o. b., with freight allowed to destination: Businessmen understand this term, as I am sure most people do. It simply means that the shipper will allow freight charges to be deducted from the face of the merchandise invoice after payment of the freight by the consignee. If the destination is a prepay point where there is no station agent to collect the freight, then in that case the shipper would pay the freight and enclose with the invoice a receipted freight bill.

Fifth. F. o. b., with freight equalized to destination: To both the consignor and the consignee this term spells out the fact that the shipper is willing to pay part of the freight cost so that his price for goods is no more than that of his competitor who may be nearer to the buyer's destination. In other words, freight is equalized with the nearest competitive point from which goods and merchandise of a similar kind and quality may be purchased at an equal price.

Sixth. Delivered price: A great deal has been said about delivered price. What is a delivered price? It is simply the price with all charges included for goods or merchandise which has come to rest at the point of consumption. Now everybody knows that the elements which make up a delivered price are the costs of the merchandise f. o. b. point of origin, plus transportation charges and plus handling charges. There is nothing of a secretive nature about delivered price; it is the way in which the term is used for conspiratous purposes that often lends unnatural color to the term.

Seventh. Freight absorption: The term "freight absorption" is synonymous in effect with freight equalization. It is a term which is often a misnomer as well. In many transactions, particularly in basic commodities, freight is allegedly absorbed. I say allegedly, because any uniform system involving freight absorption is not predicated on that basis. The predicate is to counterbalance absorptions with overcharges not based on actual freight rates. So-called freight absorption rarely accrues to the benefit of the consignee. It is designed as a weapon to benefit the consignor and to assist in the control of prices.

Eighth. Phantom freight: This term arises from the basing-point system. It is, of course, an unreal freight charge which purchasers have paid to maintain an artificial price structure on cement, steel, and other commodities. As far as wholesalers, dealers, or consumers are concerned, it is a phantom freight charge they are paying. The only reality in the term "phantom freight" is the money—real money which the steel and cement trusts extract from the well-worn pockets of the taxpayer.

Ninth. Basing-point system, single and multiple: This is the system that surely everybody has now heard about. This is the system of pricing which small business has endured in one form or another for nearly 75 years. This is the system that for 25 years the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have sought to bring out into the open and call it by its right name, the right name being "coercion"—"monopoly"—"collusion"—take your choice; the effect is the same. This is the system which the general public heard little about until the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. Although the public heard little about the basing-point system, it has paid millions upon millinos of hard-earned dollars in the conspiratous maintenance of the system by certain large segments of industry engaged in the production and manufacture of basic commodities.

The simple explanation of the basing-point system, whether single or multiple, is that it sets up an artificial freight rate structure on the transportation of commodities by producers and manufacturers who use the system.

The term "basing point" is more or less self-descriptive. The single point system, of course, uses only one base as was the case in the steel industry for many years when it used the Pittsburgh base for shipments everywhere in the United States. No matter where another steel mill was located, whether it was next door or in the next country or the next State, the consumer or customer paid the mill f. o. b. price plus freight from Pittsburgh. Many illustrations have been made of the operation of the single point basing system so one more would not hurt. For example, a purchaser of steel located in St. Louis, Mo., purchased his steel requirements from a mill across the river at Granite City, Ill., yet this St. Louis concern paid the freight from Pittsburgh, Pa., to St. Louis, Mo. There is no doubt in my mind that under this method the steel trust was born and grew to its full maturity because of this immense added increment of cost to the consumer, which was pure velvet. In other words, it was unearned, an arbitrary and a fantastic charge—and a fraud upon the American people.

The multiple basing point system, as the term indicates, includes several points on which freight is predicated and charged to destination. It is frightening to think of the effect upon our economy had the multiple basing system been applied to all commerce and industry. Fortunately, by far the greatest tonnage of goods and merchandise is moved on an f. o. b. point of origin basis. The multiple basing point system, however, has been made applicable to every possible basic commodity, including steel, cement, and many others. But it is in the steel and cement industries that the system reached near perfection. If the people of this country could count the cost of the multiple basing point system as it has affected them, the trains would have difficulty carrying the mail addressed to their Representatives in Congress. These letters would voice disapproval of any legislation designed to weaken the antitrust laws, the Clayton Act, or the Robinson-Patman Act.

Total abolition of the basing-point system will, within a reasonable period of time and without serious readjustment, relocate the steel and cement industries. This does not necessarily mean that the plants now in existence will suffer, for the country is growing year by year and the demand for basic commodities such as steel, cement, and other materials increases day by day. My earnest hope is that the Congress of the United States will stop, look, and listen before it passes any stop-gap legislation undermining the antitrust or fair trades practices laws, and will look hard at any force which importunes for such legislation, and will listen to the still, small voice of its conscience—the people.

Address of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the appendix of the RECORD the text of the address of President Truman, given on the occasion of the conferring upon him the honorary degree of Doctor

of Humanities at Rollins College, in Winter Park, Fla., on Tuesday last:

Governor Warren, President Holt, distinguished educators, and all friends of Rollins College, this for me is a very happy day and a very solemn occasion. The Governor's address was a masterpiece. It covers the situation with which we are faced. It brings to realization a hope I have long cherished. I am deeply sensitive of the honor which this college has bestowed upon me.

Rollins College has served the State of Florida and the Nation faithfully and well through more than three sccre years. I shall always treasure the memory of this day and the parchment which admits me into the noble society of Rollins alumni. The men and women which this institution has given the world now for sixty-odd years have upheld the ideals of democracy wherever they have found their life work.

It gives me special pleasure by my presence here today to bear witness to the debt which we owe to the man who has guided the destinies of Rollins College for almost a quarter of a century.

Since he assumed the presidency of this institution he has made it a focal point in our effort to educate American youth in principles of freedom under true democracy. Dr. Holt has brought to his work distinguished leadership with a background of accomplishment in many fields. Although he will soon retire from active academic work, he will continue his labors for peace and international good will.

Never before has this country needed as it does today the leadership of thoroughly trained men and women. We must have leaders inspired from their earliest years with the ideals of democracy.

You know there isn't a word in the English language that has been so severely abused during the last 10 years as that word democracy. Some people make a travesty of that word. That is one of the greatest words in the history of the English language, and it should stand for just exactly what we mean when we say democracy, and not for a counterfeit.

Education is our first line of defense. In the conflict of principle and policy which divides the world today, America's hope—our hope—the hope of the world is in education. Through education alone can we combat the tenets of communism. The unfettered soul of free men offers a spiritual defense unconquered and unconquerable.

We may not know what is behind the iron curtain, but we do know that the intelligence of the people of the embattled democracies of Europe, who live in front of the iron curtain, is the world's best hope for peace today.

Education is the most important task before us. The Congress should enact legislation authorizing Federal grants to the States to assist in meeting the operating expenses of elementary and secondary schools. There is general agreement that such aid can be given without interference with State responsibility for the scope and content of the teaching.

If our country is to retain its freedom in a world of conflicting political philosophies, we must take steps to assure that every American youth shall receive the highest level of training by which he can profit.

A soundly conceived Federal scholarship program in our colleges and universities is a necessary step in attaining this goal.

Education has been defined as a bulwark against the acids of fascism and communism. Neither of these totalitarian forms of government can survive examination by educated men and women—men and women free to search for truth and imbued with the principles of liberty set forth in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, the greatest document of Government, in my opinion, that has ever been written by the hand of man. That Constitution gives us the ability to live together in peace. It gives us the ability to see that justice comes to every man, be he big or be he small, be he rich or be he poor.

If this great institution will continue to turn out leaders, I am not at all afraid of what the next generation in the world will bring forth.

We are working for peace. We want peace. We pray for peace all the time in the world. And to attain that peace, we must all learn how to live together peaceably and do to our neighbors as we would have our neighbors do to us. Then we will have a happy world, and that is what we want.

Civil-Rights Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, has focused the attention of the press and the Nation on a new approach to the bitterly contested civil-rights program. While I am not apprised of the details of the program which the gentleman from Arkansas has presented, and I do not know that I could subscribe to it, I am greatly interested in observing the reaction to this proposals, both in the Nation's press, and especially in the newspapers of the South. I attach herewith an editorial which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

HAYS' COMPROMISE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The preliminaries to a Senate filibuster on the civil-rights issue are in progress. The issue there now is a proposed change in the Senate's rules to permit filibusters to be more easily broken.

Southerners there cannot be blamed for trying their best to defeat legislation they are convinced will be bad for their section and for the Nation. In support of that conviction, their duty is to oppose changes in the Senate rules; and to use those rules to protect what they regard as their rights.

It looks now as if it's going to be another bitter fight.

But, meanwhile, an outstanding Congressman from the Democratic South, Representative BROOKS HAYS, of Arkansas, has proposed what appears to us to be a good sensible compromise that would settle the issues and not sacrifice principle.

Instead of repeal by law of the poll-tax requirements in seven Southern States, HAYS proposes the submission of a constitutional amendment. If the anti-poll-tax forces want action instead of a fight, they'd be smart to accept this proposal. We're convinced such an amendment would be ratified.

In place of the fantastic antilynching bill with its provision for finding whole masses of the people guilty, HAYS proposes that the Government declare lynching a Federal crime, but be restrained from going into a State to prosecute lynchers if that State, by law, makes adequate provisions for such prosecutions.

In the third place, he proposes to meet the problem presented by discrimination in industry by a sensible and useful procedure which would help toward education against discrimination, but not invoke any penalties.

If the President and his congressional leadership, especially in the Senate, are going to be adamant about the civil-rights program, they might as well recognize the fact that they thus will endanger all the remainder of their legislative program.

Congressman HAYS has, in fact, proposed a way to bail out the President. But, more important, he has suggested common-sense means of settling an old problem that has succeeded in dividing the Nation for years and which will continue to engender bitterness.

Cynics say there are those in national politics who would prefer to spend their time fighting over the civil-rights issue rather than settle it.

We'd like to believe there are none such.

But if Congressman HAYS' compromise program is not accepted as the good, middle-of-the-road way out, we'd be inclined to believe the cynics speak truth.

Enforcement of Antitrust Laws and Moratorium Provision—No New Law Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is said again and again by critics of the Portland Cement decision that it has introduced uncertainty into the law, that it is no longer certain whether or not freight absorption is or is not per se illegal, that therefore some kind of new legislation is needed to clarify the legal situation.

The reverse is true. The Portland Cement decision, a forthright decision with only one dissent, introduced certainty into the law by underlining the real issue—combination or conspiracy in violation of the antitrust acts. Freight absorption is not illegal in the absence of combination or conspiracy in violation of the antitrust acts and in the absence of bad faith. The general standards laid down by the Congress in the antitrust acts will be enforced by the courts, which will, as a judicial function, supply, on the facts of actual cases, clarification and delimitation to effectuate the intent of Congress.

That is what the Portland Cement decision does, and that is what any further court decisions on freight absorption and basing points will continue to do.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT IMPOSSIBLE

Congress chose long ago not to attempt the impossible and impractical task of describing in rigid detail all the specific practices forbidden by the antitrust laws. Such rigid specification would merely be a boon to monopoly-minded concerns which could then easily devise evasions. Congress made conspiracy, common planning, and intent the important thing.

The present demand for so-called clarification of the antitrust laws is simply a device for breaking down completely the whole philosophy and spirit of the antitrust laws, and to reverse judicial precedents patiently accumulated thereunder for years, regardless of the good intentions of the authors.

Sometimes these proposals for amendments to clarify the law are bold enough to leave no doubt in any reasonable mind of the real intent to sabotage the antitrust laws. Sometimes they are suave and subtle enough in their content to conceal their real purpose. Sometimes they are offered in good faith by persons who are misled by this false issue of needed clarification.

LAW CLEAR

Just the other day a bill was introduced in Congress which proceeds on the clarification theory but uses wording designed, apparently, not to whittle down the existing antitrust laws. Under the wording Congress reaffirms its antimonopoly policy but declares that "it has not been the intent of Congress to deprive individual companies of the right to use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight," provided such activities are carried on independently and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, as amended. It also provides that for a period of 2 years the Federal Trade and the Clayton Acts shall not be construed as restraining such activities. It further states that nothing contained therein shall affect pending litigation.

Now I say that no matter how carefully this bill may have been drawn so as not to whittle down existing antitrust legislation, it is a mistake. It is a mistake even if it does not directly impair existing legislation; this is because, by adopting the clarification theory, it opens up the door to much more sinister bills introduced on this theory. Secondly, I say it is a mistake because it does in effect whittle down existing legislation.

On the first point I say again that since the existing laws on the subject are declarations of standards and principles, Congress has already chosen to allow clarification and elucidation to come from the courts. The Portland Cement case is perfectly clear that delivered price and freight absorption systems are not of themselves illegal. If further elucidation is needed it will come from the courts, whether through the Rigid Steel Conduit case or other cases.

On my second point, I say that any language such as that used in the bill is bound to shake the structure of time-hallowed antitrust legislation and the existing court interpretations that already are erected on it. The lawyers for monopoly can find a weighty meaning for every new phrase, however innocently intended. When the bill, if enacted, states that there is now uncertainty of meaning, those lawyers will argue there always was uncertainty and therefore there never was any law capable of being fully enforced. The judges will be resentful because of the alleged intrusion of Congress into what they may regard as a purely judicial function of statutory construction.

However, the first point is the more important. The bill, even if never passed, nevertheless by predicating itself on the false issue of clarification, opens up the door to the introduction of more obnoxious bills based on the same false issue.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY L. TOWE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tell It to Jones," published in the March 1949, issue of Medical Economics:

TELL IT TO JONES

When John Jones hears that 9 doctors out of 10 oppose compulsory health insurance, he's likely to mumble something about vested interests—and go back to his sports section.

Why? Because we've failed to show him what his stake in the matter is. In 15 years of debating the problem, we've gotten too far away from the Jones'-eye view.

So let's forget, for a moment, about capitation fees and advisory councils. Let's talk about the new Wagner bill (S. 5) strictly in terms of what it would mean to Mr. Jones.

Consider, for example, what's good about compulsory health insurance. Some of us have become so embroiled in the argument that we fail to see what any intelligent layman can see—that the Wagner plan has definite points in its favor. For instance:

It would spread and space the cost of medical care. Since medical bills would be paid via pay roll deductions and other taxes, the WMD scheme would substitute small, periodic payments for large, unpredictable ones. Any insurance or tax scheme has this feature. The Wagner plan is no exception.

It would raise the volume of medical care and distribute it more widely. Knowing they were entitled to almost unlimited medical care without additional direct cost, people would visit the doctor oftener. So it's probable that, under compulsory health insurance, more people would get more medical care.

So far, so good. But now let's show Jones the other side of the coin. Are there logical reasons why, from his viewpoint, the good features of the Wagner plan might be outweighed by the bad? Let's see:

It would raise the cost of medical care. Jones will probably agree that the Government is not exactly famous for its efficient use of funds. Recently a Hoover Commission task force found that it cost twice as much to build hospital beds under Federal, as against private auspices—and twice as much to treat the patients in them.

A second item that runs up the cost of tax-financed medicine is the number of administrative personnel required. A Wagner plan, everyone concedes, would need plenty—at least 250,000, says Senator ROBERT A. TAFT. No special business acumen is needed to see that the salaries of such employees would boost the cost of medical care appreciably. This increment would, of course, have to be paid for through higher pay-roll taxes, higher income taxes, higher general taxes.

It would lower the quality of medical care. Here, from Jones' point of view, is the crux of the matter. He'd get a poorer grade of service because of (a) less time spent per patient, and (b) Government red tape.

Why less time? Because compulsory health insurance would raise the volume of medical care far faster than the supply of doctors could be increased. Nor is there any assurance now that supply would ever catch up with demand.

Thus, under the Wagner plan, time spent per patient might easily be cut in half. Rushed as he is, the United States physician today spends an average of 23 minutes per patient. In England, under socialized medicine, that figure is reported to be closer to 10 minutes.

The more conscientious a doctor was, in fact, the less he'd feel justified in spending extra time on individual cases. He'd be on the Government pay roll; it would be the Government he'd have to please, not the individual patient. So he'd give the best care he could to his whole panel and try not to let individual patients hold him up.

At the same time, he'd have extra records and forms to fill out—for no Government can dole out the taxpayers' money without demanding an elaborate accounting. This would reduce still further the time he could spend with Jones.

Government red tape would also hamper patients more directly. Inherent in the Wagner bill are limitations on switching doctors and on calling in consultants. Before John Jones could see a specialist, for example, his visit would have to be certified as necessary by his panel G. P. or by what the bill calls "an administrative medical officer." Similar restrictions would apply to hospital, nursing, and auxiliary service. They could easily hinder Jones in getting good quality medical care.

What's more, these restrictions would be only samples of things to come: According to Senate bill 5, a five-man Federal board could issue any rules needed to operate the Wagner plan.

All of which raises some basic questions: Is it a good thing to have more medical care if the quality turns out to be bad? Is it a good thing to space medical costs in such a way as to double the total expenditure? These are questions that every Jones must decide.

"But," he may expostulate, "how can we make medical care easier to pay for and more readily available?"

The answer: Voluntary health insurance, with premiums paid by the subscriber if he can afford them, by government if he can't. Stacked up against this combination, compulsory health insurance offers Jones almost nothing. It's high time we told him why.

H. SHERIDAN BAKETEL, M. D.

Centenary of Panama Star and Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, anything affecting the history of the Panama Canal or the Isthmus of Panama has a special appeal, I know, to our membership and the American people. Speaking for myself, I may say that I am greatly interested in anything on these subjects, as I have the honor to be a member of the House Merchant

Marine and Fisheries Committee, which has jurisdiction over Panama Canal legislation; and I am also a member of the subcommittee which deals with the Panama Canal.

On February 24, 1949, the Star and Herald, of Panama, celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of the Panama Star, with which publication the Panama Herald—founded April 14, 1851—became merged May 2, 1854, to form thenceforth the Star and Herald, the oldest English-language newspaper published throughout the length of the west coast of the two Americas.

The Star and Herald, together with its Spanish-language counterpart La Estrella de Panama—Star of Panama—located at the crossroads of the American nations, where east is linked with west—is one of the most influential sheets in the Western World. Its files teem with stories of stirring events of the American era; particularly with those which relate to the New World voyages of Columbus; the planting and maintenance of colonies on the Isthmus by the Spanish Crown; the trek of the Forty-niners to California during the days of the gold rush; the construction of the Panama Railroad; the attempt of the French to build the Panama Canal; the founding of the Republic of Panama; and the construction of the Canal by the United States, with its attendant, and all-important, sanitary achievements.

The editorial policy of the Star and Herald has always been ably and consistently exerted to foster better relations among the nations of this hemisphere; especially between our own country and Panama. It is a recognized authority, not only on pan-American subjects, but, as well, upon international affairs, in general. From time to time its editorial utterances have found lodgment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and have been quoted, with approval, by our membership.

To the end that something of the fine and interesting history of this outstanding Latin-American daily may become better known to the Congress and our people, under unanimous consent accorded, I am extending in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, an editorial published in the Star and Herald in its issue of February 24, 1949.

I believe that our heartiest felicitations and congratulations should be extended to the owners, publishers, and staff of the Star and Herald—and its twin mate, La Estrella de Panama—upon this centenary occasion. Notwithstanding the advanced age of this publication, it is yet young in spirit and in deed, and stronger, perhaps, and more influential than ever before. Let us hope that during the new century of its journalistic career—which has just dawned—the splendid service it has rendered its country, the Panama Canal, pan-Americanism, and the cause of peace, progress, and international good will, may continue with unabated strength and vigor.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

Today marks a milestone in the history of American journalism. It rounds out a century of publication of the oldest English-language newspaper on the west coast of the Americas, the Panama Star, which later merged with the Panama Herald to become the Star and Herald. The date also initiates a quartet of centennials achieved by the Star and Herald and its Spanish-language twin, La Estrella de Panama, between today and May 2, 1954, on which this newspaper will celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the merger of the Panama Star and the Panama Herald.

One hundred years ago today the first issue of the Panama Star was printed by a trio of Forty-niners for the specific purpose of recording the celebration of Washington's Birthday by some 3,000 Americans then on the Isthmus awaiting transportation to California. Despite their impatience at the delay in their quest for gold, then luring hundreds of thousands across the United States, these three newspapermen could not but write their story of the gold rush which was to initiate a century of travel and development across North America as they saw it reflected on this, till then, scantly known Isthmus of Panama, later to become the crossroads of the world.

To them the publication was an incident of their pilgrimage to El Dorado. But today's centennial proves the virility of the seed they planted, even as it marks the hundredth anniversary of the birth of continuous news publication on the Isthmus and along the entire Pacific coast of the Americas.

Thus, although our hearts are proud today on the attainment of our first centennial, we are reserving the official celebration for the last. The following brief history will explain our reasons:

The Panama Star, oldest west coast English newspaper from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, came first. It started as a weekly, increasing, in turn, from biweekly to triweekly, and ultimately daily publication.

The Panama Herald followed on April 14, 1851. It also has had an uninterrupted existence since its establishment 98 years ago. It started as a weekly, then became a biweekly and later a triweekly. It did not attain daily publication until after its merger with the Panama Star.

In third place comes La Estrella de Panama, the child of the Panama Star. It was created February 1, 1853, as the Spanish section of the Panama Star. It is today the third oldest Spanish language newspaper continuously published anywhere on the West coast of the Americas. It is exceeded in age only by El Comercio of Lima, and El Mercurio, of Valparaiso, Chile.

The fourth and last centennial will be that of the Star and Herald, representative of the merger of the two English language weeklies. This merger was decided between April 30 and May 1, 1854, when one-half interest in the Panama Star was sold to the owners of the Panama Herald. It was the suggestion of the departing half-owner of the Star that the Herald be suppressed entirely and that the combined effort of the staffs of the Herald and the Star be concentrated on the latter. However, the new owners decided that the same concentration of effort on one paper could be effected without loss of identity by either paper. Thus the Star and Herald made its bow on May 2, 1854.

The present owners of the Star and Herald have decided that it would be fairer to await the centennial of the Star and Herald in 1954 and in that way celebrate all four anniversaries at one time. This is the reason why there will be no official commemoration today.

Elsewhere in this issue we publish a brief sketch of the history of the four papers.

Today, as we view with pride and satisfaction the safe arrival of our paper at the century mark, our thoughts turn to those hardy men of the past to whose enterprise, devotion and industry its survival and success is due. We reverently invoke the memory of:

J. B. Bidleman, S. K. Henarie and J. F. Bachman, the three forty-niners who started the Panma Star on that far-away February 24, 100 years ago today.

Jose Angel Santos, in whose printing establishment both the Panama Star and the Panama Herald were born.

Peyton Middleton and Francis Rice, who rescued the Star from the state of orphancy into which it passed when its founders left for California.

Lewis A. Middleton, who joined his brother Peyton in launching the Panama Star as a regular newspaper of tabloid size and soon after endowed it with its own printing plant.

Archibald Boardman Boyd, who, as the successor of Peyton Middleton in the partnership, urged the publication of a Spanish section when the time came to make the paper a daily in 1853.

Col. Edmund Green and James H. Middleton (a brother of Peyton and Lewis) who founded the Panama Herald in April 1851, in competition with the Star.

Louis M. Booth and John Power, who successively joined James Middleton in the publication of the Herald upon the death of Col. Green.

Manuel Morro, Carlos Jorge Monsalve and Bartolome Calvo, who cooperated with Middleton and Boyd in launching La Estrella de Panama as the Spanish section of the Panama Star.

James Boyd, surviving brother of Archibald, who succeeded to the ownership and the editorial chair of the Star and Herald upon the death of Archibald B. Boyd in New York.

Samuel Boyd, who served as manager and editor of the Star and Herald after the death of James Boyd, when the publishing firm became the common property of his heirs.

Jose Gabriel Duque, who 56 years ago bought the effects of the publishing firm including the right to publish the two papers, and became the director of both.

Each of these men contributed his grain of sand to the firm and successful institutions the Star and Herald and La Estrella de Panama have become today. They labored so well that the fruits of their creation have endured despite the ups and downs of 100 years of existence.

Three of these men presided at the creation of the Star and Herald in 1854—Archibald Boardman Boyd, James H. Middleton and John Power—as owners and editors.

One Hundred and Fifty-eighth Anniversary of Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 people of Polish ancestry throughout the world will commemorate the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of Polish Independence Day which was established by the adoption of Poland's liberal constitution on May 3, 1791, during the time of Kosciusko and Pulaski.

This year the celebration in Poland, if staged at all, can only represent a hollow mockery with a Communist regime in control of the country.

Recognizing the contribution which persons of Polish ancestry have made to our own great Nation since they came to our shores in great numbers since the

eighteenth century and their stanch adherence to the principles of liberty and independence, the board of supervisors of Los Angeles County, Calif., have proclaimed May 1 as the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of Polish independence and will stage an appropriate ceremony in the Los Angeles Civic Center on that day to commemorate this memorable event.

The following is the resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas this Nation is composed of descendants from many lands who have contributed to our culture and economy; and

Whereas the people of one of those foreign lands, namely Poland, have come to our shores in great numbers from the eighteenth century to the present time to become an integral and integrated part of our Republic; and

Whereas among these Poles have been such stalwart patriots as Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski, who helped in the winning of the Revolutionary War, thus starting the United States on the road to becoming the greatest bulwark of democracy in the world today; and

Whereas the adoption of Poland's liberal constitution on May 3, 1791, during the time of Kosciusko and Pulaski is celebrated by Poles everywhere as Polish Independence Day; and

Whereas such a celebration in Poland today, which is under the sinister domination of a Communist regime, taking its directives from the Politburo in Moscow, would be a hollow mockery if staged at all; and

Whereas the spark and flame of liberty and independence symbolized by the Polish Constitution is still a rallying cry for millions of Poles residing in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors proclaim Sunday, May 1, as the one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary of Polish Independence Day in Los Angeles County, and that the board assist the Friends of Poland and the Polish American Congress in staging an appropriate ceremony in Civic Center on that Sunday afternoon to commemorate this memorable event.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on February 23, 1949, and entered in the minutes of said board.

[SEAL] W. G. SHARP,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of said County.
By RAY E. LEE,
Deputy Clerk.

New York Bar Association Proposals for a Better Procedure in Congressional Committees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no reasonable doubt of the right of Congress, or of either House, or of a committee duly established by either or both Houses of Congress, to investigate any matter relevant to legislation; and that places no practical limitations on the scope of any investigation.

Neither can there be any doubt of the right of the two Houses of Congress to establish principles of procedure for investigations, or to delegate that authority to the chairmen or the membership of the committees.

There are many powers of Congress which have not been delimited by law or judicial decisions, and the constitutional privilege of free speech for Members has occasionally led to flagrant abuse of privileges which exist in the absence of any contrary ruling.

Debate has raged for many decades as to what limitations exist on the right of committee chairmen and members to interrogate witnesses. There are a few quite obvious constitutional safeguards. Beyond that the discretion and taste of the chairmen have usually dictated procedure.

It has seemed to many of us that certain rules of conduct could be adopted by Congress which would in no way impede the discovery of facts but which would satisfactorily protect witnesses against flagrant abuse.

The Committee on the Bill of Rights of the Association of the Bar of New York, an organization held in the highest esteem by every student and practitioner of the law, has made recommendations to this end which I am honored to introduce in the form of a bill to amend the Reorganization Act. The chairman of the committee is Mr. Lloyd Paul Stryker, an eminent attorney of unblemished reputation, and the members of the committee are equally distinguished.

I feel sure that Members of Congress will find their recommendations moderate and useful, and I hope that my bill will be studied and reported on in timely manner.

The essence of the bill is to protect witnesses and innocent bystanders against reckless exercise of the proper powers of the Congress by providing that the purpose of the investigation shall be clearly and publicly stated; that witnesses may be accompanied by counsel, may read the stenographic transcript of their testimony and may obtain copies, and may make an oral or written statement in their own behalf; and that any person feeling himself damaged by testimony or remarks may have an opportunity of answering the charges. It would also prohibit the circus atmosphere of moving picture and television or radio broadcasting during testimony.

Under leave to extend my remarks, and because of the value of the report, I include the report on which the bill was based:

COMMITTEE ON THE BILL OF RIGHTS—REPORT ON CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

There has no doubt arisen in many quarters a strong feeling of resentment at the manner in which certain investigations have been conducted by committees of Congress, the methods employed, and the treatment to which witnesses and other persons have been subjected as a result thereof. When one comes to analyze the complaints, we believe that they will be found to fall into two main categories.

First, it is charged that inquiring into a witness's personal affairs, his affiliations, political or otherwise, or his previous utterances, violates some right of the individual to immunity from official inquisition or some right in the nature of a right of privacy, and that such inquiry is not only improper but unlawful and in contravention of some American constitutional guaranty.

Secondly, it is charged that in many instances the investigation results unfairly in serious injury to individual reputation—either the reputation of the witness, or of someone whose name has been brought into the testimony by a witness, by the examiner or by a member of the committee. This is true for numerous reasons: The fact that the hearings receive wide publicity; that the mere mention of a person's name in connection with a subject that has widespread news value may create a distorted and unfair public impression; that a witness may make irresponsible statements, knowing that his testimony is privileged and that he will not be called to account; that unfair questioning is frequently indulged in and hearsay evidence freely admitted; and, perhaps the most important charge of all, that the person defamed is not given an adequate opportunity to reply or defend himself.

There can be no doubt that much of this criticism is justified. Some of it, however, we believe is due to a misunderstanding of the fundamental right of Congress to conduct investigations on the one hand and as to the rights of the individual to be immune from questioning on the other hand. Some of the imperfections, moreover, are unavoidable and are inherent in the conduct of the legislative process in a democratic government. Many of them are due to the shortcomings of the particular individuals concerned in the conduct of the investigation—the lack of a proper sense of fairness and decency, the temptation to seek notoriety for political motives, and the sometimes total disregard of the fact that witnesses and others dealt with in the investigation are in reality being summoned before the bar of public opinion and ought not to be prejudged before they are found guilty. No rules can be devised to cure individual faults of this nature. It would appear, however, that certain rules could be adopted which would insure to a much greater degree the observance of ordinary principles of fairness and justice.

At the outset it should be understood that there is no doubt of the power of Congress to appoint committees and endow them with powers of investigation, including the conduct of hearings, the summoning of witnesses, and compelling their testimony. This power has been clearly upheld by the Supreme Court.

It will hardly be disputed that Congress may conduct such an investigation where the purpose is to obtain facts which will assist it in the enactment of legislation. Another legitimate purpose of congressional investigation may be to inquire into the conduct of executive departments for the purpose of exposing executive misconduct or inefficiency or of ascertaining the manner in which legislation by Congress is being carried out. Although the Court holding with respect to this type of investigation are not as clear, it is a right which seems to be rather generally recognized by text writers and historians. Thus, Woodrow Wilson, in his book on Congressional Government, says:

"It is the proper duty of a representative body to look diligently into every affair of Government and to talk much about what it sees. * * * The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function."

This type of investigation, as well as most other types, may so often be said to have as its purpose an inquiry as to what, if any, legislation is desirable that it can usually be also classified in the latter category.

We shall not attempt in this report to deal with the question of how far Congress may compel the disclosure by officials of the Government of what we may term "a State secret."

It has been recognized judicially that Congress may conduct investigations to decide upon the qualifications of its own Members. Others have asserted that there exists in Congress the power to conduct investigations merely for the purpose of disseminating information to the public, although we have not had called to our attention any judicial sanction of this view. It is clear, however, that we must start with the premise that Congress has, under our constitutional system of government, important powers of investigation, including the power to summon witnesses and require their testimony under penalty of contempt proceedings, and that these powers have been sanctioned by decisions of the highest court of the land.

So much for the power of Congress to conduct investigations. We now come to the question as to whether and to what extent a witness may be immune from being compelled to testify. One of the widespread complaints, as heretofore stated, which are being leveled at congressional investigations is that there is something illegal and improper in inquiring into the private affairs, beliefs, utterances, or affiliations of the private citizen. There seems to be prevalent a belief, although somewhat vague, that the individual American is endowed with some sort of a right of privacy which exempts him from inquiry into his private affairs. One hears it suggested that such an inquiry violates some protection afforded by the Bill of Rights. We know of no right of privacy or constitutional guaranty which makes a citizen immune to the giving of evidence where an inquiry is being made by a legally constituted congressional committee engaged in a legitimate investigation—any more than a citizen is immune from having to give relevant testimony in a trial before a court of law. The questions, of course, must be relevant to the subject under investigation, and the decisions of the Supreme Court already protect the individual from being required to answer questions which are not pertinent to the inquiry. But, assuming that the question is material and relevant to an inquiry in aid of a lawful purpose of Congress, we do not believe that the individual is immune from being required to answer merely because the question delves into his private affairs, his previous utterances or his affiliations, political or otherwise. It is not necessary for the purpose of this report to attempt to predict what the courts may hold with respect to the inquiry into an individual's privately entertained belief, except to say that at all events a court would probably insist that the relevancy of such an inquiry be clearly established and that this would be true only in rather exceptional circumstances.

Just as the courts will confine a committee's right to inquire into an individual's private affairs within the bounds of relevancy, so will the courts afford the protection of the fourth amendment in a committee's attempt to use the blanket subpena duces tecum.

Because the individual can only be required to answer questions which are pertinent to the inquiry, it would seem to be incumbent upon Congress or the committee to define with some precision and clarity the purpose of each investigation which is authorized. This criticism has particularly been leveled at the authority under which the Committee on Un-American Activities has been operating. In this connection it is to be noted that the usual method of calling to account a witness who has refused to answer a question before a congressional committee is to cause criminal proceedings to be instituted against him under the existing Federal penal statute which makes it a misdemeanor to willfully default or refuse to answer any question pertinent to the subject under inquiry (U. S. C. A., title 2, sec. 122). It has been argued that if the purpose of the inquiry is so vague and indefinite that it is impossible to tell whether a question is really pertinent or not, a conviction for failure to answer in such a case would violate the principle that a penal statute must be sufficiently explicit to inform the person who is charged with violation what conduct would render him guilty. It also appears that Congress itself has the power to punish for contempt without invoking the penal statute above-mentioned. Here again, through habeas corpus or otherwise, it might be urged that such a conviction should also be set aside if the resolution does not sufficiently apprise the witness as to the purposes of the inquiry so that the pertinency of the question may be readily determined.

It has been argued that the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States protects a witness from being interrogated with regard to any statements or other utterances that he may have made or any propaganda activities that he may have indulged in. Two theories have been advanced: First, that because Congress is prohibited under the first amendment from abridging the freedom of speech, it could not be pertinent to inquire as to what speech has been uttered; and secondly, that if a man knows that he may have to subject the words which he may speak or the views which he may expound to the cold white light of publicity resulting from a congressional inquiry, it will be an undue and unconstitutional restraint on his freedom of speech. One Federal judge, in a dissenting opinion in a recent case, has seemed to adopt both these views. It appears to your committee, however, that the majority of the court were right in rejecting these contentions and in holding that the constitutional guaranty of freedom to express one's views did not include the right to be immune from inquiry as to what one has said.

Of course, a witness always has the right to raise the privilege against self-incrimination. Under the existing Federal statute, his testimony could not be used against him in a subsequent criminal prosecution. It is also probable that under the decisions, he cannot be required to answer a question if he insists that the answer would tend to incriminate him.

So much for the alleged right of privacy. We now come to consider the protection of the individual, whether a witness or a person mentioned in the hearings, from unfair treatment or unfair and unjustified injury to his reputation. Of course, certain of the abuses of this character, such as the browbeating of a witness or unfair questioning by the examiner or the committee, are inherent in any investigation unless the tribunal or its members are imbued with a proper sense of judicial decorum, or a proper regard for fairness and decency. About the only remedy for this type of abuse is the development of a finer sense of the proprieties in the committee members themselves.

There are, however, certain measures by way of legislation or rule making which, it seems to your committee, could be adopted to insure greater protection to the individual. Numerous ones have been suggested.

First, it seems to be pretty generally the opinion that a witness should be permitted to have counsel present at any inquiry. The extent to which counsel should be permitted to participate is subject to differences of opinion. Certainly it would seem that counsel should have the right to advise the witness during the course of the inquiry of his rights.

One of the important abuses arises from the fact that neither the witness nor any person defamed during the hearing is given an adequate opportunity to protect himself by having his side of the story presented with equal prominence. To this end, several suggestions have been made: That he shall be given an opportunity to answer the charges by his own oral testimony; that he shall be given the opportunity to file a written answer to the charges; that he shall be given the opportunity to call witnesses to answer the charges; that he shall be given the right to cross-examine orally the witness who gave the testimony adverse to his reputation; that he shall be given the right to cross-examine by written interrogatories the witness who gave the adverse testimony; that a correct transcript be kept of the witness' testimony and that the witness be furnished with such a transcript.

In addition to the foregoing, various other suggestions have been made, such as that no committee report shall be filed until such report has been approved by a majority; that counsel for the committee must be a lawyer; that at least one other member of the committee must be present beside the interrogator; that questions of privilege raised on behalf of the witnesses must be decided by a majority of the committee; that a private person shall not be subpenaed except on vote of the majority of the committee; and that no photographs, motion pictures, television, or broadcasting be permitted while the witness is testifying, if the witness so requests.

Various bills have already been introduced into Congress embodying some of these suggestions. After giving careful consideration to the matter, your committee proposes that it be recommended that the association adopt the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That this association recommends to the Congress of the United States the adoption, by concurrent resolution or otherwise, of the following principles to govern the conduct of investigations by committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

"1. The subject of any investigation in connection with which witnesses are summoned shall be clearly stated before the commencement of any hearings, and the evidence sought to be elicited shall be relevant and germane to the subject as so stated. In cases of special investigations authorized by congressional resolution, the subject of the investigation shall be so stated in the resolution, and in the case of investigations initiated by the committee, the subject shall be so stated by the committee and announced before the commencement of the hearings.

"2. Any witness summoned at a public hearing and, unless the committee by a majority vote determines otherwise, any witness before a private hearing shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness while on the witness stand of his rights.

"3. Every witness shall have an opportunity, at the conclusion of the examination by the committee, to supplement the testimony which he has given, by making a written or oral statement, which shall be made part of the record; but such testimony shall be confined to matters with regard to which he has previously been examined.

"4. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of each witness, whether in public or in executive session. In either case, the record of his testimony shall be made available for inspection by the witness or his counsel; and, if given in public session, he shall be furnished with a copy thereof if he so requests, and if given in executive session he shall be furnished with a copy thereof in case his testimony is subsequently used or referred to in a public session.

"5. No photographs, moving pictures, television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings shall be permitted while any witness is testifying.

"6. Any person whose name is mentioned or who is specifically identified and who be-

lieves that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee or comment made by any member of the committee or its counsel tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation, shall be afforded the following privileges:

"(a) To file with the committee a sworn statement concerning such testimony, evidence or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"(b) To appear personally before the committee and testify in his own behalf.

"(c) To have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel; but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness unless the committee votes to lengthen the period.[1]

"(d) In the discretion of the committee, by a majority vote, to have the committee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf. The extent to which this privilege may be availed of shall be left to the discretion of the committee.

"7. These principles shall apply to investigations by all committees of either House of Congress, including standing committees, select committees, or joint committees of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing."

Respectfully submitted.

The Committee on the Bill of Rights of the Association of the Bar: Lloyd Paul Stryker, Chairman; Jonathan B. Bingham; Robert T. Bushnell; James Lloyd Derby; Thomas B. Dyett; Kenneth William Greenawalt; Richard K. Hines; David Kelly; Allen T. Klots; Alexander M. Lewis; Ephraim S. London; William F. Martin; Edward S. Pinney; Oren Root, Jr.; Stuart N. Scott; Harold Shapero.

NOVEMBER 22, 1948.

[1] A minority of your committee herewith submit a report recommending the insertion of the phrase "Unless the committee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise" at the beginning of subdivision 6 (c).

German War-Crimes Trial a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 143 which calls for an investigation and study of the facts and circumstances relating to the obtaining of evidence by American Army officers for the prosecution of Germans accused of crimes in the Dachau-concentration-camp affair. The resolution has been referred to the Armed Services Committee of the House. It is my earnest hope that the committee will consider the resolution favorably and proceed to a full and complete investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed through Government reports that the conduct of the prosecutors and investigators engaged in these trials has been brutal beyond description. Their actions are a national disgrace. Evidence has been obtained by beating and kicking the accused, by knocking out their teeth and breaking their jaws, by mock trials, solitary confinement, and many other bestial methods. Is this the spirit of American jurisprudence or the spirit of revenge by those who have an ax to grind?

We do not have to condone the acts of those who committed crimes at Dachau under Hitler, but we certainly should condemn American citizens who are today committing high crimes in the name of justice.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are on notice that justice has miscarried at Dachau. Lawyers and judges who have been to Germany will gladly testify about American atrocities in connection with war-crime trials. The Department of the Army is in possession of reports that have been made. Secretary Royall must know what is going on.

I have been informed, Mr. Speaker, that the United States Military Court at Dachau, set up by General Clay, tried 1,672 Germans and convicted 1,416 of them. Of those convicted 297 were sentenced to death. After a cursory review procedure, executions were ordered.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take more time now, but will conclude with the statement that the Army seems to be above and beyond the reach of law in these cases. There is a body, however, to which it must answer in the name of justice and humanity and that is the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include as part of my remarks an article by Judge Edward L. van Roden, which appeared in the Progressive of February 1949 and an editorial from the Christian Century for February 2, 1949:

[From the Progressive of February 1949]

AMERICAN ATROCITIES IN GERMANY

(By Judge Edward L. van Roden)

Edward L. van Roden, a Pennsylvania judge, served in World Wars I and II, in the latter as Chief of the Military Justice Division for the European Theater where he saw service in Normandy, Belgium, the Rhineland, the Battle of the Bulge, and in the Ardennes. In 1946 he was reassigned to active duty and served on several important court-martial trials in Germany. In 1948 Secretary of the Army Royall appointed him to an extraordinary commission charged with investigating the Dachau war crimes program.

American investigators at the United States Court in Dachau, Germany, used the following methods to obtain confessions:

Beatings and brutal kicking.
Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws.
Mock trials.
Solitary confinement.
Posturing as priests.
Very limited rations.
Spiritual deprivation.
Promises of acquittal.

Complaints concerning these third-degree methods were received by Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall last Spring. Royall appointed Justice Gordon Simpson of the Texas Supreme Court and me to go to Germany and check up on the reports. Accompanied by Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence, Jr., we went to Munich, Germany, set up offices there, and heard a stream of testimony about the way in which American atrocities were committed.

But first, a bit of the background:

Last Spring the Supreme Court refused the habeas corpus petition of Col. Willis N. Everett, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., an American lawyer, who had served as defense counsel for the 74 Germans accused in the famous Malmedy case. Everett is a very able lawyer, a conscientious and sincere gentleman. He is not a fanatic.

In his petition, Everett charged that the Germans had not received a fair trial. Everett did not claim that all the German defendants were innocent, but since they did not have a fair trial, there was no way of telling the innocent from the guilty.

The tragedy is that so many of us Americans, having fought and won the war with so much sweat and blood, now say, "All Germans should be punished." We won the war, but some of us want to go on killing. That seems to me wicked.

If Everett's shocking charges were true, they would be a blot on the American conscience for eternity. The fact that there were atrocities by the Germans during the war against Americans, or by Americans against Germans, would not in the least lessen our disgrace if such peacetime atrocities were to go unchallenged.

Our specific assignment was not only to examine Colonel Everett's charges, but also to examine the cases of the 139 death sentences, which at that time remained unexecuted; 152 Germans had already been executed.

The 139 doomed men who were still alive fell into three groups. They were accused of involvement in the Dachau-concentration-camp crimes, in the killing of American fliers, or in the Malmedy massacres. Let me say that I believe the crimes for which these Germans were tried actually took place, and that some Germans were guilty of them.

But we should not let the indiscriminate hate of all Germans that was generated during and after the war, blind us to the necessity of punishing the guilty ones only.

After this investigation, and after talking to all sides, I do not believe that the German people knew what the German Government was doing. I am convinced the German populace had no idea what diabolical crimes that arch-fiend Himmler, was committing in the concentration camps. From the atrocities we learned about, he must have been the very prince of devils.

But as for the Germans at large, they fought the war as loyal citizens with a fatherland to support, and a fatherland to defend.

Some American fliers, shot down on bombing raids over Germany, were killed by German civilians. These Germans felt that the American fliers were the murderers of their defenseless wives, mothers, and children who were in the bombed cities—just as the English felt that German fliers were their murderers. That's war.

I felt deeply about these fliers. I had two sons in the Air Force. Jimmy made 35 missions over Germany and returned safe, thank God! Dick made 32 missions and was finally shot down over Italy. He spent 12 months in a German prisoner-of-war camp and was fairly well treated. He is now in a sanitarium in Arizona recovering from tuberculosis he contracted in the camp.

II

The Malmedy massacres, in which a group of American prisoners of war were mown down after being captured during the Battle of the Bulge, actually happened. But can't we distinguish between the assertion that these atrocities did happen, and the assertion that they were committed by these 74 Germans who had been in or near Malmedy at that time?

Because some wicked, sadistic German individuals did it, are we doing the right thing by saying any and all Germans we lay our hands on are guilty and should be destroyed? I personally don't believe that. That's not the way of thinking I learned in my church, or you learned in your church.

On Russian insistence, the Americans couldn't retry these men. The Russian philosophy in these matters is that the investigators determine the guilt or innocence of the accused, and the judge merely sets the sentence. We accepted the Russian formula of no-retrial, but we won out on the presumption of innocence before trial.

The American prohibition of hearsay evidence had been suspended. Second- and third-hand testimony was admitted, although the Judge Advocate General warned against the value of hearsay evidence, especially when it was obtained, as this was, 2 or 3 years after the act.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellis and Lieutenant Perl of the prosecution pleaded that it was difficult to obtain competent evidence. Perl told the court, "We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods." He admitted to the court that the persuasive methods included various "expedients, including some violence and mock trials." He further told the court that the cases rested on statements obtained by such methods.

The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for 3, 4, and 5 months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time.

This solitary confinement proved sufficient in itself in some cases to persuade the Germans to sign prepared statements. These statements not only involved the signer, but often would involve other defendants.

III

Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken.

All but two of the Germans, in the 139 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was standard operating procedure with American investigators.

Perl admitted use of mock trials and persuasive methods including violence and said the court was free to decide the weight to be attached to evidence thus received. But it all went in.

One 18-year-old defendant, after a series of beatings, was writing a statement being dictated to him. When they reached the sixteenth page, the boy was locked up for the night. In the early morning, Germans in nearby cells heard him muttering, "I will not utter another lie." When the jailer came in later to get him to finish his false statement, he found the German hanging from a cell bar, dead. However, the statement that the German lad hanged himself to escape signing was offered and received in evidence in the trial of the others.

Sometimes a prisoner who refused to sign was led into a dimly lit room, where a group of civilian investigators, wearing United States Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and two candles burning, one on each side. "You will now have your American trial," the defendant was told.

The sham court passed a sham sentence of death. Then the accused was told, "You will hang in a few days, as soon as the general approves this sentence; but in the meantime sign this confession and we can get you acquitted." Some still wouldn't sign.

We were shocked by the crucifix being used so mockingly.

In another case, a bogus Catholic priest (actually an investigator) entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: "Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you'd tell."

Our final report on these trials has been turned over to Secretary of the Army Royall. In spite of the many instances like those I have described, we found no general conspiracy to obtain evidence improperly. With the exception of 29 cases, we saw no reason why the executions should not be carried out. For the 110 others, there was sufficient competent evidence obtained from other sources to warrant the death penalty, exclusive of the evidence obtained by the third degree.

The 29 men whose sentences we recommended for commutation certainly did not have a fair trial by American standards. Twenty-seven of them were to have their terms reduced to life, one of them was to get 10 years, and one would get 2½ years, according to our recommendations. We also recommended a permanent program of clemency for reconsideration of the sentences of other prisoners convicted in war-crimes cases.

Secretary Royall has saved our national conscience. Could we as Americans ever have held our heads up, if he hadn't looked into it? He has saved our national prestige and our international reputation.

However, in spite of Secretary Royall's action in this matter, there is little real room for complacency on the part of Americans. Rather our report reveals, by implication, that we still have a serious situation in Germany to clear up. Moreover, five of the men for whom we recommended commutations have been hanged since we turned in our report. In all, 100 of the 139 we set out to investigate are now dead.

IV

The American investigators who committed the atrocities in the name of American justice and under the American flag are going scot-free

At this point there are two objectives which should be aimed for:

1. Those 39 prisoners whose death sentences have not been commuted and who have not yet been hanged should be saved, pending full judicial review.

2. American investigators who abused the powers of victory and prostituted justice to vengeance, should be exposed in a public process, preferably in the United States, and prosecuted.

Unless these crimes committed by Americans are exposed by us at home, the prestige of America and American justice will suffer permanent and irreparable damage. We can partially atone for our own misconduct if we first search it out and publicly condemn and disavow it. If we wait for our enemies to blazon our guilt abroad, we can only bow our heads in shamed admission.

RESUME HANGING OF GERMANS PROBABLY INNOCENT

After the January 5 issue of the Christian Century told how the National Council for Prevention of War had made public a speech by Judge E. LeRoy van Roden revealing the tortures, physical and mental, by which confessions were extorted from Germans tried by Army courts, indignation rapidly mounted. Individuals wrote to the Department of the Army demanding that there be no more hangings of men convicted by such malodorous methods. Some newspapers spoke out. Under this pressure, Secretary Royall told the press that Judge van Roden and his associate, Judge Gordon Simpson, of Texas, who had investigated the convictions at his request, had recommended that 29 of the 45 awaiting execution have their sentences commuted. Press and public took this to mean that the Army would follow the jurists' recommendation. It hasn't. A few days later the hangings were resumed, and in the first six who went to the gallows there were five whose convictions rested on evidence gained in ways that were a disgrace both to the Army and to American justice. The NCPW says that these five men were probably innocent. Certainly there was enough reason for doubting their guilt to cause Judge Simpson and Judge van Roden to advise against their execution. The Supreme Court has refused to intervene because it says it lacks jurisdiction. But Congress has jurisdiction over the United States Army, and it is the Army that is committing this legal murder. What have you done to stir Congress to action? If you have any doubt about the facts, write the National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., for the supporting evidence.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts from minutes of a meeting of the Americanism committee of the American Legion posts of Allegheny County, Pa., at the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., on Monday, January 31, 1949, at which meeting a certificate was presented to Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, in recognition of his efforts toward having made official by United States statute the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.

Chairman FORSYTH. Comrades, it is a pleasure and a privilege to preside at this meeting of the Americanism committee, attended by so many distinguished Legionnaires of Allegheny County, to pay tribute to the distinguished Member of Congress from the Thirty-second District of Pennsylvania in recognition of the important part he has played in a historical accomplishment of one of the many phases of the Legion's Americanism program.

We of the Legion consider the presentation of today not only a pleasant duty but a special privilege; so great a privilege that I agreed with the committee, that the actual presentation should be made by a distinguished citizen, soldier, Legionnaire, legislator, author, and jurist, who served his country as a soldier on the field of battle in both World Wars I and II, and as President Judge of the International Court in the war crimes trials at Nuremberg.

However, before presenting the speaker of the day, I must pause to pay tribute to one of Allegheny County's foremost Legionnaires, the man whose alertness and foresight made possible this program that has its culmination in the meeting here today. The man who took the initial steps and carried through the plan which resulted in the Congress of the United States adopting the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag as the official pronouncement of every man, woman, and child in the United States; that man is Col. John H. Shenkel, honored and respected soldier, Legionnaire, under whose auspices this luncheon is being held.

May I now present to you the Honorable Michael A. Musmanno, judge of the court of common pleas of Allegheny County, Pa.

ADDRESS BY JUDGE MICHAEL A. MUSMANNO

This meeting is historic. We are here to celebrate the official acceptance by Congress of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States.

It is amazing, indeed startling, that for decades the patriotically sacred words of the allegiance to our national emblem were without official recognition. So far as acceptance of the pledge was concerned the pledgor announced his words to the empty air. He pledged allegiance but no one noted or recorded his vow. The most beautiful pledge that a citizen could make was regarded simply as a declamatory utterance. But that inexplicable and deplorable situation no longer exists, and we are here today to rejoice.

It was on October 12, 1892, the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of America, that the pledge to the flag of the United States in its present wording was first publicly spoken. Benjamin Harrison, the then President of the United States, declared that day a holiday, and at Boston, Mass., the school children en masse, standing before a large American flag, entoned the words which are now endeared to us.

But nothing further was done. Year followed year. The United States went to war in 1898, again in 1917, and still a third time in 1941, but the pledge to the flag, the flag for which so many Americans laid down their lives, had no official sanction.

Then in February 1945 the executive committee of the American Legion of Allegheny County, representing 125 posts and 30,000 members, passed a resolution calling upon Congress to invest the pledge to the flag with the same official reverence that attends the Star-Spangled Banner, our national anthem. Col. John H. Shenkel, chairman of the Americanism committee of the Legion, wrote Congressman HERMAN EBERHARTER informing him of the action of the local Legion. Mr. EBERHARTER at once introduced a bill to achieve the desired objective.

Congressman EBERHARTER'S bill became known as House Joint Resolution 180. With energy, skill, and perseverance Congressman EBERHARTER got the bill through the House and the Senate and then on December 28, 1945, it reached President Harry S. Truman, who approved the measure, and it became law. The objective had been achieved: the pledge of allegiance to our flag took its place next to the Star-Spangled Banner in respect, reverence, and official regard.

The celebration of that glorious event has been delayed until today, a delay which has benefited me because, had it taken place at a date more fittingly close to the event itself I would not have had the honor and privilege to participate in the celebration.

I saw HERMAN EBERHARTER in Nuremberg last summer and in his usual modest fashion he said nothing about this beautiful patriotic achievement of his. It was wonderful to see him there, and amid the ruins and rubble of the cradle of nazism, to talk about America, the citadel of democracy; about Pittsburgh, the arsenal of democracy; and about our friends here. His congenial and ever friendly companionship aroused a nostalgia in my soul for the hills of western Pennsylvania and all that they mean to both of us.

I was glad that he could see some of the work which was being done in Nuremberg in the cause of international peace and understanding. I am sure that he will agree with me that the day will come when every American will be as proud of Nuremberg as he is of Gettysburg. At Nuremberg the United States helped to lay the foundation for a system of jurisprudence which will assure universal man of justice, regardless of nation, race, or creed. We declared in Nuremberg, and I am proud to have had a part in declaring it, that no longer will any national tyrant be permitted to pour innocent blood into an international river with the excuse that he is reddening only the waters which flow between his own borders. The rivers of the world are the veins of mankind and they must and will be protected against the vampires of imperialism. Civilization has advanced at Nuremberg.

This flag of ours proclaimed at Nuremberg that it stands not only for the rights of Americans but for the rights of the common bond of humanity. In the last trial over which I presided at Nuremberg, known as the biggest murder trial in history, the defendants were charged with and convicted of the murder of 1,000,000 people. Not one of these victims was an American, but this did not detract from the responsibility of America to see that justice was done. The law of humanity had been violated, and when humanity weeps a responsibility devolves upon civilization itself to redress the wrong and succor the injured.

Yes, every American soldier and sailor who sacrificed for his country, every one of his children and children's children will have a better chance for the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness because of what happened at Nuremberg. With the determination of individual responsibility for universal wrongs, tyrants and international gangsters will not be so prompt to attack unoffending nations and peoples. Nuremberg has served notice on the world that he who starts a war will answer for it, he who offends against humanity will answer for it—not only in the next world but in the present one. To that extent we can look forward with more assurance to the realization of the ever-recurring dream of assured international peace.

I am proud to have been a representative of the United States on the international tribunal which announced these principles. I am proud to have served our flag in the halls of justice as well as on the field of action. As I look at it here today in all its lustrous beauty I am reminded of a war experience on the Italian front. One evening while out in no-man's land I became separated from my comrades and discovered that I had crossed the line and was on enemy territory. I crouched behind a log, expecting any moment capture or something worse. Anxiously I waited for daylight, hoping that with the dawn I might discover some landmark from which I could orient myself and get back to our own lines. Eons and ages seemed to roll down the hills of eternity as I waited. At last there was a slight cracking in the black ceiling above, and a few stars timidly revealed their presence.

I thought of the flag. This emblem, which, like a bird of brilliant plumage, had perched on the gunwale of the boat stealthily making its way through the jagged ice blocks of the Delaware; this flag, which had inspired Washington and all other defenders of liberty and freedom since, was scarcely ever seen by combat soldiers at the front in this war. In a type of fighting where concealment meant strategy and tactical superiority, the comforting and inspiring sight of our country's ensign had to give way to the iron and dirt demands of scientific battle. But now Old Glory was unfurling in the sky and an electric fever burned in my arteries. From the east, stripes of red light were undulating over the whiteness of the horizon. The night had melted into a deep blue and against this navy background the stars rippled, forming of the heavens a celestial flag which bathed my sleepless eyes in tears.

In the light of this dawn-spangled banner I presently picked out the landmarks of the previous day and bending low hurried along in the direction now made clear to me. At a point I deemed safe I straightened up and raced with singing heart toward the unseen flagpoles from which now waved a million stars and stripes.

The Star-Spangled Banner. It is a flag which flutters gorgeously from flagpoles throughout the country, it is a flag which unfurls beautifully from staffs on land and sea, it is a flag which even when physically absent may be found in the heavens above and in the abundance of our land as seen in the red harvests, the while clover, and the blue grass. But above all it is found in the heart of every American who understands its poetry, feels its heroism, and hears the symphony of its music, a music which nowhere is sweeter, nowhere is more melodious, nowhere is more comforting—"one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Mr. EBERHARTER, the American Legion of Allegheny County has struck off three beautiful certificates in commemoration of this event. One has been conferred upon the President of the United States, one will be presented to you, and I am the proud recipient of the third. I have been asked by the American Legion to present to you here today this most attractively engraved and framed document in recognition of your service in Congress in making official the pledge to the flag of the United States of America. Mr. EBERHARTER, I hand you the certificate and express to you in behalf of the American Legion, our eternal gratitude.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Comrade Commander, Judge Musmanno, and comrades of the American Legion, each of us here today to take part in this ceremony is indeed fortunate, not because of the witnessing of the bestowal upon me of an honor which I shall cherish and remember throughout the rest of my days. Rather, because we have had the privilege of hearing an address by our revered and beloved comrade, Judge Musmanno, such as we probably have never heard before and will likely never hear again.

His inspiring words—patriotic as all of us are and have been, nevertheless stimulate and fire us to a more intensified spirit of love of our country and a willingness to make any sacrifice to keep our country as we know it to be and, if possible, to make it better than our fondest dreams. We owe to Judge Musmanno heartfelt thanks.

I am most thankful to our Comrade Commander William D. Forsyth, to Col. John H. Shenkel, and to each and every member of the American Legion in Allegheny County. The small part I played in having official recognition sanctioned under the laws of the United States to the Pledge of Allegiance gives me a feeling of pride and satisfaction. But in fairness all credit must go to the Americanism committee of the American Legion posts of Allegheny County. It was they who conceived the idea of having the pledge made the law of the land, and it was they who initiated the action and gave the necessary impetus to the accomplishment.

When we think of the more than 1,000 counties in these United States, and reflect that it was our own Allegheny County of Pennsylvania that is responsible, we cannot but be grateful to the Americanism committee of our home county.

It is my fervent hope that the Pledge of Allegiance shall become deeply embedded in the mind of every man, woman, and child in the United States, and particularly in the minds of our youngsters, for it is upon them that the future of our country depends.

Twenty-nine words comprise the pledge, and practically each and every word has a significance which we do not comprehend unless we stop and think. Without going over the entire pledge, just let me illustrate briefly what I mean. The first two words, "I pledge"—the significance of those two words—we promise and stake our honor and our character; the next word "allegiance," indicating as it does, devotion and loyalty; and

the next phrase "to the flag of the United States of America," the beauty and symbolism of which you have just heard stirringly described by Judge Musmanno; the word "Republic," signifying our form of government, the leader in all righteous things of the world today; "one Nation indivisible," meaning united as one in just causes; what words bespeak more than "liberty and justice"; and finally, the last two words, "for all." Have you ever stopped to think of the significance of those last two words? Not liberty and justice for those who think and do as we, or as we would have them think and do; not for one; not for any group or class or creed or race, but for all, each and everyone.

Yes, those 29 words, the oftener repeated and the oftener pondered upon, the more beautiful they become. It is somewhat like the Lord's Prayer, the more we dwell upon it the more beautiful it becomes.

I am most grateful to you, my comrades of the American Legion, for the honor you today bestow upon me by the presentation of this certificate. I shall cherish it and keep fresh in my memory this occasion.

Fair Deal on the Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my own remarks made at a region-wide meeting of the League for CVA, Portland, Oreg., February 19, 1949:

FAIR DEAL ON THE COLUMBIA

The League for CVA meets today with a new sense of achievement. Our ideas for the welfare and progress of the Pacific Northwest have taken root and flourished. They have grown into a full-fledged objective of national policy. In a recent letter to me, President Truman wrote these simple but meaningful words "our end of the Avenue will do everything to push the Columbia Valley Authority along."

In the Nation's Capitol, the White House and the Congress are the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue that count in Government policy. Before I relate some of the recent CVA developments back there, I want to emphasize that what counts most of all is the work we do here in the Pacific Northwest.

Across my desk each day come letters from citizens in the Pacific Northwest in support of CVA. I believe they reflect fairly the sentiment of most people who are concerned about the welfare of the region. Sometimes questions are raised about one or another detail in the CVA program—important questions that must be answered in the final legislation. But the broad objectives of CVA are recognized and accepted—a healthy sign of progress and a promise that CVA legislation will make rapid headway.

It is up to the League for CVA to translate local ideas into an effective educational program, and to channelize local efforts into a mighty outpouring of support for CVA. President Truman based his CVA recommendation on the firm belief that our people stood behind him. In the coming weeks and months, let us give him solid and substantial evidence of our stand.

POWER LOBBY FIGHTS CVA

Let us be sharply aware, too, that we have a fight on our hands. Unless we retain the initiative and move ahead, private power interests will consolidate the opposition to CVA and bear down with the heavy fire of propaganda. This is no idle remark. On January 25, just one day after the White House released the news of President Truman's CVA recommendation, the New York Times reported: "President Truman's proposal yesterday for the creation of a Columbia Valley Authority has aroused the private utility industry to a degree of opposition unequaled since passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority bill." P. L. Smith, the high-bracket lobbyist for the associated private utilities, trumpeted loudly that there was no need for a CVA, and he conjured up a familiar assortment of evils about a regional superstate.

Some of our local newspapers, sadly out of step with public thinking, shudder like the Seattle Times at the grasping tentacles of a valley authority. Not all our local papers, I am glad to say, fall into such an emotional state of blind opposition. A few are honestly debating the issues and contributing helpful ideas.

An important task of the League for CVA is to analyze and evaluate the opposition to CVA. Some weeks ago, the Spokane Spokesman-Review and possibly other papers carried a story that the Pacific Northwest Development Association had compiled a list of 75 organizations alleged to oppose CVA. A friend of mine in Spokane, who was acquainted with the manager of one of the business groups listed, called him on the telephone and found out this interesting fact: The listing of his organization as opposed to CVA had never been authorized. This manager, a responsible official of the organization, did not oppose CVA in principle, although he had some ideas of his own about the composition of the CVA board.

ASSURE LOCAL INITIATIVE

If we could sit down and talk around the table with other persons purported to be in opposition, I dare say we would actually find many CVA friends. There may be differences of opinion as to details. There may be doubts or reservations on particular points. These differences can be ironed out, and these doubts resolved by frank interchange of ideas and a mutual working out of problems.

A legitimate problem, for example, is how to insure the maximum of local initiative and enterprise in CVA administration, compatible with the obligations and responsibilities of the Federal Government. Honest concern for full local participation accords with our democratic tradition. This kind of concern must be carefully distinguished from narrow self-interest which plays up local opposition to obstruct or defeat Federal legislation beneficial to the whole region.

The administrative pattern for regional development which we seek through such legislation was first worked out in the Tennessee Valley Authority. Although the pattern must be reworked to fit the specific needs and problems of the Columbia Basin, the basic principle remains; namely, taking the river basin as a unit for development, and putting a single Federal agency in charge. The TVA put this principle into operation by going to work in the Tennessee Valley with a broad mandate to build up the resources of the region. Effective control of floods and abundant low-cost power were more potent arguments than private-utility propaganda in appraising the merit of TVA. Surviving the fierce assault of its enemies, TVA proved that it was soundly conceived and successful in operation. The great experiment is now a going concern.

Franklin D. Roosevelt had seen in TVA a laboratory for regional welfare and a model for the creation of other valley authorities. President Truman expressed the thoughts of his distinguished predecessor when he reported on the state of the Union to the newly assembled Eighty-first Congress: "We should apply the lessons of our Tennessee Valley experience to our other great river basins." The theme was repeated in the budget message and promptly followed by a Presidential directive to various Federal agencies, instructing them to submit legislative recommendations for a CVA.

DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT

Presidential Aide Charles S. Murphy has been assigned to coordinate CVA efforts on the White House end, with the expert assistance of men like C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of Interior. Davidson, a sound liberal thinker who gained his knowledge of water-resource problems at first hand in the Tennessee and Columbia Valleys, will be depended upon to translate the departmental proposals into legislative form.

On the congressional side the Democrats from the Pacific Northwest are working closely with the administration in a reexamination of the CVA bill which Congressman JACKSON and I sponsored in the Seventy-ninth Congress. These earlier bills never saw the light of day, being carefully buried by unfriendly committees. The Eightieth Congress, pressured by private-power lobbyists, pushed CVA legislation still deeper into the pigeonhole. The new Congress, fresh from victory at the polls, holds forth the promise of a new approach to the problems of the Columbia.

What are the problems in the Northwest that place CVA legislation high on the agenda? Two drastic events have made our people more sharply aware of the need for comprehensive and long-range river-basin planning. One was the disastrous flood of 1948, which took 50 lives and cost more than $100,000,000 in property damage. The raging floodwaters covered 582,000 acres of land, including several whole towns and parts of cities. The town of Vanport, a war-housing project with a population of 18,000 near Portland, Oreg., was completely destroyed. Approximately 120,000 persons were evacuated from their homes during the flood, and 33,000 lost their homes. Thousands of acres of farm lands were lost outright by stream-bank erosion or severely damaged by the removal of great quantities of irreplaceable topsoil. Considerable damage was done also to salmon spawning grounds, fish fry, and nesting areas for game birds.

These stark facts, reported by the Army engineers, compel attention to the flood problem on the Columbia and its tributaries. The 1948 flood was the third largest of record in the region. In earlier times the undeveloped state of the Northwest country made the damage less noticeable and serious. Under present conditions, if no additional flood-control improvements are made, the Army engineers anticipate annual flood damages of $26,000,000. This amount of damage will increase yearly as economic development goes forward, unless the waters of the Columbia are put under effective control.

EXTENDED POWER SHORTAGE

The second factor, less dramatic and devastating in its impact, but more significant to the region's future, is the shortage of electrical power. The whole Nation is confronted with a tight power situation, but the Pacific Northwest feels the pinch more severely because of its rapid growth. Population has increased 36 percent since 1940 as compared with 11 percent for the United States. New industries, born of the war, have continued in operation. With jobs and earnings at fairly high levels, all types of consumers have demanded more electricity.

At the present rate of dam building no substantial relief is in sight for the next 4 to 6 years. Industrial expansion is virtually at

a standstill. New industrial applicants are being turned away. The aluminum industry, vital to the national economy and security and the largest single user of Northwest power, is limping along with curtailed power supply. In farm, home, store, and factory of this highly electrified area, people are being advised to use less electricity.

The threat of chronic power famine in the Northwest has intensified the demand for speedier development of the enormous hydro potential in the Columbia. The waters that flow from the Rockies to the Pacific Ocean can produce 20,000,000 more kilowatts—the energy base for an industrial empire. Presently but 2,000,000 kilowatts are generated by private and public agencies in the Pacific Northwest. The two Federal dams on the Columbia, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, now straining their facilities to the breaking point, produce more than half of the power consumed in the four Northwest States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana. A score of Federal dams proposed, authorized, or under construction, is expected to add another 4,000,000 kilowatts by 1957. Even then, only 20 percent of the Columbia power potential will have been tapped.

Flood danger and power shortage are immediate problems in the Pacific Northwest. Behind them lies a growing awareness of the need to tend and conserve our natural endowments more wisely—to prevent the erosion which now takes 100,000,000 tons of soil each year from the Columbia Basin; to restock and sustain the millions of forest acres now slashed or burned; to replenish fish and wildlife resources. Our people are coming to realize also that a river properly controlled for maximum use will create vast new economic wealth from the natural resources contained in the Columbia Valley. New farms and factories, new trades and occupations for the rapidly growing population, new outlets for local initiative and enterprise, depend upon the Columbia.

AIMS AT PERMANENT PROSPERITY

The economic base of the region must be broadened for permanent prosperity. Those who look ahead insist that more local industries must be built up to process or fabricate the raw produce of mine, field, forest, and river. The Pacific Northwest is not content to remain a colonial dependency confined to extractive operations. The average citizen looks to the CVA as the Fair Deal on the Columbia.

"What's the matter with the way we're doing it now?" asked the governor of Oregon when he heard of President Truman's CVA endorsement. The answer is plain to those who look about. So far as the Federal Government is involved, responsibility for the development of Columbia Basin resources is dispersed among numerous agencies, departments, and bureaus. Some functions are duplicative; others overlap. The lines of jurisdiction run from branch offices in the field to remote central offices in Washington, D. C., where decisions intimately affecting our welfare are now made.

Various committees of Congress receive budgetary requests for various parts of the Columbia Basin program. The separate statutory requirements under which agencies operate often give rise to conflicting policies. There is no single legislative charter, no coordinated budget, and no unified administration for the region. CVA is the instrument designed to meet those needs.

The Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior, and the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army, both dam builders on the Columbia, have each prepared a survey of the Columbia Basin and outlined a comprehensive construction program. Both reports recognize the logic and economy of unified river-basin planning, but they differ in detail and emphasis according to the primary interests of the two agencies. Since neither agency by itself has the requisite jurisdiction or responsibility to carry out a comprehensive, unified program, each assumes without warrant that all the separate departments, bureaus, etc., will cooperate towards this end.

COORDINATION STILL PROBLEM

The pressing need for coordination has inspired the establishment of an interagency committee for the Columbia Basin, which meets once a month to air conflicts and discuss policies of mutual interest. The Department of Interior, wrestling with its own unwieldy bureaus and divisions in the field (which include the General Land Office, Bureau of Reclamation, Geological Survey, Grazing Service, Bureau of Mines, Office of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bonneville Power Administration), has established its own coordinating committee for the Pacific Northwest, besides being represented on the interagency committee.

Conference groups like these, useful enough for some purposes, cannot effectively substitute for the administrative unity and direction to be gained by CVA.

Agency cooperation at best will leave large gaps in the program and at worst will perpetuate the present wasteful and inefficient arrangement. The Columbia Valley Authority is an urgent and practical necessity, not a dream of do-gooders or idealists. You hear much today about reorganization of sprawling Federal agencies in the Nation's Capital to promote efficiency and savings in tax dollars. The same logic applies to the job that must be done in the Columbia Basin. President Truman in his budget message made it a point to stress "careful surveillance * * * to prevent waste and assure sound development" when he urged application of the Tennessee Valley experience in resource development.

In conclusion let me say that I earnestly solicit your ideas and suggestions for improving the CVA legislative program which we have undertaken. No pride of authorship, no vested interest in a set way of doing things, should prevail against the best legislation that can be drafted for the permanent welfare of the Pacific northwest. Let us all join in a common endeavor to make CVA a working instrument for progress and prosperity.

Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a telegram I have received from M. R. Biddle, of the Kalamazoo City Lines, Inc., which strongly recommends that we in Congress make every effort to continue the exemption of transit employees in any action we take on the Fair Labor Standards Act. I am happy to enclose this telegram, for it reflects my convictions on this subject.

The telegram follows:

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *March 9, 1949.*

PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building:

Bill H. R. 3190 eliminates transit employees exemption in section 13 A9 of existing Fair Labor Standards Act. Passage of this bill would create an impossible burden on local transit companies and would require immediate and drastic increases in fares. Please make every effort at your command to continue the exemption of transit employees as presently contained in section 13 A9 of the existing Fair Labor Standards Act.

KALAMAZOO CITY LINES, INC.,
M. R. BIDDLE.

John Ericsson, Citizen of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the program for a memorial service at the John Ericsson monument in Washington, D. C., on Wednesday, March 9, 1949, together with an address I delivered on that occasion.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1:45 to 2 p. m.: Music by United States Navy Band.

2 p. m.: Invocation by United States Navy chaplain. Introduction of the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON, United States Senator from Colorado, by the president of the John Ericsson Society. Address and wreath laying by Senator JOHNSON. Response by the Honorable Alexis de Aminoff, Minister of Sweden. Swedish National Anthem by United States Navy Band. United States National Anthem by United States Navy Band.

NOTE.—The John Ericsson memorial is located in West Potomac Park, Independence Avenue and Riverside Drive, about one block south of the Lincoln Memorial.

A United States Navy photographer will take appropriate photos, with copies to Swedish Embassy, Senator JOHNSON, and the John Ericsson Society.

A press release will be issued by the office of Senator JOHNSON.

JOHN ERICSSON, CITIZEN OF THE WORLD

(By ED. C. JOHNSON, United States Senator, Colorado)

On this the eighty-seventh anniversary of the crucial battle between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads, it is my great honor and privilege to pay homage to John Ericsson by placing a wreath of beautiful flowers at the foot of his statue.

We assemble here today at this statue which was erected in Washington by a grateful Nation as a tribute to a great son of Sweden. The life story of John Ericsson is a superb illustration of the contribution which European nationals have made to the success of America. This great man is a product of a great people. Born in the mountains of Sweden in humble circumstances July 31, 1803, he grew to sturdy manhood. At an early age there was a clear indication that he had unusual talent and brain power. He migrated to England in 1826 where he advanced ideas which led to the development of the wonders of his age. There he became an associate in a reputable and well-known engineering firm. He preferred to be known

as an engineer rather than an inventor although the creative instinct in him was very strong. The development of steam power intrigued him, and within a year of his arrival he had begun breathtaking improvements of boilers and engines. He designed and built the fire engine and developed the screw propeller for marine use. It was this latter invention which brought him to America in 1839. In his effort to interest the Federal Government in this method of navigation, he began constructing propeller boats on the Great Lakes and even started a fleet of boats between Baltimore and Philadelphia. Next he built a small steamboat named the *Princeton* which was the first man-of-war ever to be equipped with a screw propeller and the added innovation of having the machinery placed below the water line and out of reach of shot and shell. This vessel revolutionized naval vessels and became the foundation of the navies of the modern world.

I like to think of John Ericsson as a citizen of the world, for he was precisely that. Even so, never did he lag in his devotion to his native Sweden. It grieved him to have Swedish commentators criticize him for becoming a naturalized citizen of America. His love for Sweden was so passionate and so deep-rooted that he would not tolerate the slightest hint of such a charge. He stated: "I am so thoroughly a Swede that I could never turn away from Sweden if I would."

The question is often pondered as to why America has become great while other nations have barely held their own. Many other nations have great natural resources, too; many had a start of centuries on America; then why has this country made such phenomenal progress? John Ericsson and the tens of thousands of John Ericssons who migrated to America in the past 300 years from every nation in Europe is the only acceptable answer.

Proud America must never forget the debt she owes to the intrepid pioneers who underwent every sort of hardship and privation to reach these shores and who, after reaching them, fought the good fight to the end. I do not wish to speak of John Ericsson in generalities altogether. He was distinctly a unique personage of superior qualifications. His engineering genius and capacity to deal with difficult problems served this Nation in a vital way during the War Between the States. The South had developed an ironclad ram that would drive the North off the seas and even threatened to subject New York City to attack. The South was filled with high hope, and the North was filled with dismay and fearful apprehension due to this phenomenal naval development.

Into this frightful crisis stepped John Ericsson and his engineering skill and creative resourcefulness. He wrote to President Lincoln offering to construct a vessel in 100 days that would destroy the hostile fleet at Norfolk. More in desperation than in confidence, the Union accepted his offer and in due time a fantastic-looking cheesebox mounted on a raft steamed into Hampton Roads the very morning the Confederate ironclad *Virginia* (reconstructed from the *Merrimac*) began the destruction of 16 Federal warships stationed there. Four of these vessels were badly damaged and driven ashore, causing further consternation among the Federal authorities. Then the miracle happened.

On March 9 the ironclad *Merrimac* started out to complete the destruction of the northern fleet, but was challenged immediately by Ericsson's cheesebox, the *Monitor*. In a terrific battle of 4 hours' duration, the *Monitor* suffered no material damage, but the *Merrimac* was so used up that she never ventured to battle again. John Ericsson had doomed the conventional wooden navies of the world in one fell swoop by this new, radical-designed fighting craft, and the Union was saved.

As we place this wreath at the foot of the statue of John Ericsson, we see only a block away the magnificent marble memorial to Abraham Lincoln—the most beautiful and expressive edifice in Washington, standing there guarding all that is good in America. It is fitting these two monuments should be such close neighbors. Abraham Lincoln and John Ericsson were not only contemporaries, but they had very much in common. Neither had the opportunity of formal education, but each, through patient self-instruction, reached the educational heights.

John Ericsson was honest and true in every fiber of his rugged body. He hated sham and make-believe with all his soul. Stern, yes; unbending, yes; precise, yes; a great engineer, to be sure; but loyal and considerate and kind to the last degree—that is John Ericsson. All the world may pay tribute to him, for he was indeed a citizen of the world.

Opposition to H. R. 1247

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am placing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication from Dr. Albert E. Heustis, commissioner of the Michigan Department of Health, relating to H. R. 1247, which would provide a large amount of Federal funds for a useless purpose.

As Dr. Heustis points out in his letter, 44 States already are providing for themselves what this new bill would make available through some more wild expenditure of Federal funds. Of course, the present proposal is touted as being an aid to the various State departments of labor, but those of us who know the Federal Government, through long observation, realize that this is just another camel getting his nose under the tent. Eventually, the hope is for the Federal Government to control these State labor departments, of course, thus further centralizing the power in this Nation and doing away with representative government.

The letter follows:

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Lansing, Mich., March 2, 1949.

Hon. PAUL SHAFER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SHAFER: I should like to submit my protests to House bill H. R. 1247 which would provide $5,000,000 through the Federal Department of Labor for grants to State labor departments to undertake industrial health activities.

In Michigan this service is now provided to both management and labor by the State health department; therefore, it is our contention that this legislation would merely provide for the establishment of a duplicating service in the various State departments of labor and also by the Division of Industrial Hygiene of the United States Public Health Service. At the present time, 44 of the 48 States provide this type of service through their State health departments. Two States, Massachusetts and New York, provide this service through their State labor departments. However, neither of these States provides a similar service through their State health departments and therefore no duplication of expense and effort exists. In addition, 11 city health departments and one county health department provide this service to industrial plants in local areas.

It appears to me that a portion of this money could be used to better advantage by strengthening the units now established in health departments rather than creating another agency for the same purpose. The establishment of two similar agencies in the various States can only result in confusion to both management and labor and to the official agencies concerned, and the cost of creating additional agencies in each State would be considerable.

There is a definite need for both agencies but we believe the labor departments should confine their activities to industrial accident prevention as they now do in most States. Industrial health work requires a highly skilled staff including physicians, nurses, engineers, physicists, and chemists. These are available to all employers and employees through State health departments. These should be strengthened rather than duplicated.

While it is true that the majority of the work of the industrial health bureaus is to prevent occupational diseases, we are also cognizant of the infectious diseases and the more chronic diseases of adult life, and to deal with these we have the full cooperation of the other bureaus in the State health departments in combating these types of illnesses. In other words, the State health department has at its command specialists in all types of public health work that sometimes is necessary in investigating the diseases that occur in the industrial employee groups. These other diseases include tuberculosis, venereal disease, water-borne diseases, food poisoning, and many others too numerous to mention.

It would seem just as logical for the United States Department of Agriculture to set up a public-health program for the farmers throughout the country, thereby bypassing all services now available through State and local health departments that have been established to conduct an over-all health program for all citizens of the State.

Your consideration in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,
ALBERT E. HEUSTIS, M. D.,
Commissioner.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, one of the most forthright champions of civil rights and civil liberties for all Americans is the outstanding labor statesman, Mr. Willard Townsend, the president of the United Transport Service Employees of America.

Mr. Townsend, who is also a member of the general executive board of the CIO, secretary of the national CIO committee to abolish segregation, and a member of the board of directors of the

National Urban League, has recently written a thought-provoking article on more fair play needed in American industry. The article appeared in the Chicago Defender, and I wish to bring it to your attention at this time.

MORE FAIR PLAY NEEDED IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(By Willard Townsend)

"Jim Crow and anti-Semitism are, of course, a fundamental denial of every pretension of democracy which surely emphasizes the individual worth of a human being and his rights to have a say about his life and his destiny. All men are created equal, with equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"My mother and your mother have failed to do their job unless they have taught us to appreciate motherhood as something greater and larger than our own particular family, our own city, our own particular race and Nation. Patriotism should never be degraded into hatred of other countries and after all, it is completely irrational and completely unfair to judge a person on the basis of his race or national origin.

"As the Princetonian alumnus, Andrew J. Hatcher, wrote in the students' journal of his alma mater: 'If you discriminate against me because I am uncouth, I can become mannerly. If you ostracize me because I am unclean, I can cleanse myself. If you segregate me because I lack knowledge, I can become educated. But if you discriminate against me because of my color, I can do nothing. God gave me my color, I have no possible protection against race prejudice but to take refuge in cynicism, bitterness, and hatred.' That goes for Jews as well as Negroes.

"For every reason of decency, fair play, and democratic ideals with their basic respect for individual worth and integrity, racial discrimination should be banished. For economic reasons the Negro as a citizen should have equal job opportunities and of union membership. For the future well-being of industry Negro skill in industry and Negro purchasing power, as well as those of all their fellow citizens, are necessary and powerful factors and should be utilized.

"The work of the National Urban League shows what can be done. Organized labor and other sections of the community should help it go forward at a faster rate.

"Specifically to give the Negro and the white worker a stake in the future of American industry we should: (1) Organize more Negroes into unions and encourage their participation as members and representatives, as staff members and officers; (2) work more energetically for a Nation-wide FEPC and similar laws in the States. It is regrettable that legal compulsion is necessary and we must remember that while laws educate their enforcement depends upon the cooperation of the public; (3) cooperate to get adequate housing and medical care and improved minimum wage and hour standards for all our citizens to make the future of industry really prosperous; (4) anticipate the effects of current changes in the South and secure for the displaced Negro, through cooperation between intelligent labor and management, equal opportunities of work and work training.

"The future of American industry will see great changes and new political alinements. The administration of a mixed economy combining social planning with the Bill of Rights needs the cooperation of all American citizens."

Thanks, Willard, for this very analytical observation of a very unnecessary problem in America.

What a CVA Means to the Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson before the New York Herald Tribune Forum for High Schools, New York City, March 5, 1949:

OUR VALLEY RESOURCES

Throughout the world people are interested in the development of their natural resources. We all agree that effective use of our lands, waters, and minerals is essential to raising the world's standard of living and that this, in turn, is essential to peace. The vital question facing the world today is not so much whether resources shall be developed, but how they are to be developed and for whose benefit.

That is why President Truman's proposal for "a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas" of the world is not aimed merely at development for its own sake, but "to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burden * * * and to help them realize their aspirations for a better life."

We in the United States have been slow to abandon the old practice of haphazard and wasteful development of our natural resources in favor of orderly resource development with its benefits widely shared by the people. Until recently our great natural wealth and relatively small population have led us to tolerate wasteful practices.

Our ever-opening frontier has obscured the necessity for the conservation of our natural resources—and conservation to me means not locking up our resources but rather using them wisely. Heretofore we have been able to afford underdevelopment of some parts of our country, and now only in these regions are we facing up to the problem, which is, as I see it, fundamentally akin to the problem that faces many underdeveloped countries in the world.

I am sure that our European friends in their brief tour have seen enough of the United States to realize that this country, though generally considered to be well developed, has its own underdeveloped portions. We have, of course, highly industrialized sections, but we also have areas where much needs to be done to bring about the type of balanced economy that the so-called underdeveloped countries are also seeking. Particularly in the West and in the South we have a job ahead of us, before we can achieve a more productive and stable economy throughout this broad land.

To point the way for action in these underdeveloped areas, we have the example of an experiment which has already proved itself in one region. I ned not recount to this audience the success story of the Tennessee Valley Authority in securing the cooperation of the people of the region, and its State and local governments, in developing that great river basin. In the 15 years since Congress established TVA, we have seen the creation of a navigation channel for the entire length of the Tennessee River; the river and its tributaries are now effectively controlled against previously destructive flood waters; power generated at the dams has attracted numerous job-producing industries, and the average income of the people of the Valley has been increased about twice as much as in the Nation as a whole for the same period. The TVA was charged with the responsibility of considering the needs of the valley as a whole and giving proper weight to all of its separate resources. Although it constructed multipurpose dams to prevent floods, provide navigation and generate electric power, TVA did not lose sight of its equally important responsibility for protecting the watershed from erosion and making it more productive. And because it carried out its functions from headquarters located in the valley itself and not hundreds of miles away in Washington, it was immediately responsive to the requirements of the people in the region it served.

This TVA principle of resources development by river valleys has been recommended for wider application. Recently the President asked for the creation of a valley authority to unify and hasten development in the Columbia River Basin. This potentially rich but underdeveloped area lies in the northwest corner of the United States and embraces the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Western Montana. Its population, which is, roughly, half that of the city of New York, is scattered over an area greater than that of Germany and Great Britain combined.

It is endowed with great natural resources, the most spectacular of which is the Columbia River and its tributaries. The potential economic significance of the river system is tremendous. It can be harnessed to produce twice the horsepower generated in all hydroelectric plants in the United States today; to irrigate an acreage greater than the great irrigated valley of the Nile; to carry cargo ships 500 miles inland from the sea, a distance almost equal to the navigable length of the Rhine.

The phenomenal migration of population into the Pacific Northwest in the last few years has underscored the fact that we can no longer afford underdevelopment or haphazard development of the resources there. Already the need is pressing for additional acreage in crop lands to feed these people. Therefore, we are planning to reclaim a desert wasteland now covered largely by sagebrush, which will be made productive with irrigation water from behind Grand Coulee Dam. Not only will this new land opening bring thousands of new farmers into the area but also, in the spirit of our historic homesteading laws, it will encourage development of family-sized farms worked by the people who own the land and it will prohibit speculators from monopolizing the land.

The pressure of population has made equally urgent the provision of new jobs in industry, which means that new electric power is required to turn the wheels of industry.

Given this new power, the region can reap the benefits of fabricating at home the raw materials which are there in abundance, instead of sending them elsewhere to be converted into finished goods. This development can also assure for the region continued abundance of these raw materials through the sustained-yield management of our forest and the wise use of our range and mineral resources.

We have learned, however, that floods cannot be controlled solely by building dikes and dams on the rivers; that the condition of the watershed is also of vital importance. Not only must we keep the water from running off the land, it is even more important

that we learn to keep our precious top soil on the land. It makes no sense to spend millions to create new farms if we continue to permit our present farms to go washing down the river. As an example, it is estimated that 160,000,000 tons of top soil went down the Columbia in last spring's flood—a loss equivalent to 1,320 farms of 80 acres each.

The Pacific Northwest also has a great resource in its fisheries but the salmon must find their way upstream in the Columbia and its tributaries to the place of their birth in order to spawn and reproduce. Dams, irrigation projects and water pollution interfere with the migration of the fish and a proper integration of this resource with the others is essential.

At the present time, more than 20 different Federal agencies are handling particular phases of the Government's resource-development program in the Pacific Northwest. This does not insure a well-rounded forward-looking program, and very often a particular resource is damaged by its failure to receive proper consideration from an agency not charged with its direct responsibility.

It is remarkable that things work as well as they do under present administration. Some time ago, a barge became lodged on the rocks of the John Jay Rapids in the Columbia River, and release of water from Grand Coulee was necessary to dislodge it. The barge company phoned the Army engineers, who traditionally handle navigation, and asked release of the water, but were informed that Grand Coulee was operated by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior. When the bureau was telephoned, they indicated that they would be happy to release the water, but in doing so, it would cause a dam lower down the river and owned by the power company to lose a large amount of power. This company then indicated they would be happy to cooperate, and that since the Bonneville Power Administration was not using all the power it could generate, they felt satisfactory arrangements could be made. Bonneville indicated, however, that although it would be glad to help, if it supplied the power to the company, it would have to be paid for it, since its meter records were audited by the Comptroller General. A day later, and with the full cooperation of all parties, the water was released and the barge was lifted.

This story demonstrates that good people—no matter what their handicaps—can work out difficult situations. But what is needed in the Pacific Northwest in the administration of the Federal Government's responsibility is a technique which will facilitate—not frustrate—the good work of good people. We have developed such a technique in the TVA. The President has recommended that the principles learned in that region be utilized in the development of our other great river basins. On Wednesday of this week, legislation to establish a Missouri Valley Authority was introduced in the Senate. You can hear discussions advocating the use of the valley authority technique in the Central Valley of California, in New England, on the St. Lawrence River, and elsewhere.

I believe that the technical and managerial skills that we are developing in tackling the problems of our underdeveloped areas will be of use to people in other countries. But I hope that observers will look behind these technical and scientific achievements in evaluating our program.

Our regard for the individual even more than the expertness of our engineers has been the source of our national strength and well being. Preventing monopolization of resources by a favored few is the most vital contribution of our valley programs.

I have pointed out our desire to develop to the fullest the potential resources in each area of our country. Now I want to stress that in so doing we are seeking neither regional self-sufficiency in every valley nor the domination of one by another. Rather we are working toward fitting all parts of our Nation into a healthy and balanced and unified national economy. The same principle applies for the world as a whole; we are looking forward to a balanced unity of fully developed nations.

I am sure President Truman had this fact in mind when he said, "All countries, including our own, will greatly benefit from a constructive program for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. * * * Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge. Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent satisfying life that is the right of all people."

Keep Oleo Uncolored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the members of the Flint Dairy Workers Independent Union, of Flint, Mich.

It seems to me that the bill which won acceptance from the House Committee on Agriculture the other day was a fair bill, in that it makes it mandatory for oleomargarine manufacturers to sell their product on its merits and not through attempting to disguise it as butter. Oleomargarine is a good product. None of us disputes that. But oleomargarine is not butter. Let us not forget that. Why should it be disguised to look like butter to fool the people?

The resolution is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MEMBERS OF FLINT DAIRY WORKERS INDEPENDENT UNION

Whereas in response to a widespread demand of the people, the Congress of the United States is considering measures to repeal the so-called oleomargarine tax; and

Whereas such repeal will meet with the favor of American citizens in the low income brackets since it will bring this commodity down in price, thereby reducing the cost of living to persons who need it; and

Whereas there is danger that oleomargarine, if there be no regulatory legislation, could easily be sold as a butter substitute of the same color as butter; and

Whereas the dairy industry furnishes steady employment at good wages for many thousands of union employees throughout the Nation, engaged in the procuring, processing and distribution of butter, as well as the building of motor trucks, equipment and supplies used in the dairy industry; and

Whereas there are more than 3,500 local creameries and 40,000 dairy plants located in thousands of small communities in every State, both in the North and South, whose employees' welfare is involved in protecting butter against unfair competition; and

Whereas yellow oleomargarine resembles butter so closely that it cannot be distinguished from butter by consumers and therefore invites substitution and fraud, making it necessary that the consumers be protected by prohibiting oleomargarine to be colored yellow; and

Whereas any such substitution or fraud would benefit approximately twenty-eight (28) large corporations in the United States who manufacture oleomargarine and would so benefit at the expense of consumers, the millions of dairy farmers who produce butter, and thousands of families of union employees in the dairy industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Flint Dairy Workers Independent Union, whose members are directly engaged in manufacturing and distributing butter and other dairy products, in regular session assembled in Flint, respectfully urges upon the Congress, in its consideration of the repeal of existing oleomargarine taxes, that it enact at the same time regulatory measures to prevent the sale of oleomargarine colored as butter, so that the public may distinguish between these two products; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Michigan Representatives and Senators in Congress, and to such other persons and organizations as the officers may deem advisable.

Fair Labor Standards Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, relating to section 7 (b) (3) exempting seasonal industries from maximum-hour provisions for a 14-week period; section 7 (c) exempting first processing of certain agricultural products from maximum-hour provisions and exempting first processing in the area of production of certain perishable farm products from maximum-hour provisions for a period of 14 weeks; and 13 (a) (6) and (10) exempting agricultural labor and labor employed in handling certain farm products in the area of production from both minimum-wage and maximum-hour provisions.

I feel keenly, Mr. Speaker, that every Congressman who does not want to legislate every movement of every farmer and every farm wife and every little business man in every little crossroads town ought to study this so-called Fair Labor Standards Act, soon to come before us, to see whether or not it is designed to help America or is designed to stultify enterprise and to kill every chance for entrepreneurs and small business men to progress.

The communication from the cooperatives' council is as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
FARMER COOPERATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1949.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives is opposed to the elimination of the text of the Fair Labor Standards Act

in sections 7 (b) (3), exempting seasonal industries from maximum-hour provisions for a 14-week period; 7 (c) exempting first processing of certain agricultural products from maximum-hour provisions, and exempting first processing in the area of production of certain perishable farm products from maximum-hour provisions for a period of 14 weeks; and 13 (a) (6) and (10), exempting agricultural labor and labor employed in handling certain farm products in the area of production from both minimum-wage and maximum-hour provisions.

We also are opposed to including activities affecting commerce in the minimum-wage and maximum-hour provisions of the law unless the term is strictly defined by the Congress.

It is our firm belief that the economic results from the elimination of the provisions listed above will tend to further concentrate production, packing, and processing of perishable farm products into the hands of dominant corporations operating here and abroad, and will seriously disadvantage the family farm in this country and the small local business enterprises which are trying to pack and market such products.

Also, the elimination of the exemption will provide incentives for further concentration of food processing and packing in large urban industrial centers, and will seriously hinder the decentralization of industry into rural areas, which is so desirable.

Likewise, the elimination of the present farming, rural packing, and processing exemptions will curtail the production in this country of many perishable, protective foodstuffs, and transfer our source of supply to other countries whose production, packing, and processing labor has a much lower standard of living than exists in this country. That may well be fatal to our food supply in a national defense emergency.

The council urges that the present Fair Labor Standards Act be amended to provide precise, workable definitions for area of production, first processing of agricultural products and agricultural labor, for the direction of the administrators of the act.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an admirable statement on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], before the Senate Finance Committee on February 24, 1949.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT (ACTUALLY THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT)

(U. S. Senate, Committee on Finance, Washington, D. C., Thursday, February 24, 1949)

The committee met at 9:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 312, Senate Office Building, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators GEORGE (chairman), BYRD, HOEY, MILLIKIN, TAFT, BREWSTER, MARTIN, and WILLIAMS.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

This hearing is on a continuation or the proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, H. R. 1211—(1934 Trade Agreements Act).

Senator MALONE, will you proceed?

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, the people of this Nation do not realize the deadly serious long-range effect on the workers, farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and industrialists of the permanent free-trade plan of the economic one-worlders included in this three-phase program, of which the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is but one part.

1934 Trade Agreements Act not reciprocal

In the first place, there is not now and there never has been a reciprocal trade act. There is a 1934 Trade Agreements Act in which the words "reciprocal trade" do not occur. The act was never meant to be reciprocal, and certainly it does not operate that way. That is not the effect.

This three-phase free-trade program will be deadly in its effect on the employment and economy of this Nation if finally adopted—it is the only real issue facing the Congress today.

There is no question of high or low import fees or tariffs to be discussed here. The question is whether the differential of the cost of producing an article in this country under our high-wage standard of living and producing the same article in a country having a low-wage standard of living should be represented by an import fee in order to bring such imports in on our level of costs.

The difference in production costs is mostly due to the difference in wage or labor cost, since our up-to-date machinery and technical know-how, including the assembly-line methods, are immediately available to these low-wage countries.

The three-part program

The three-part program currently advocated by the State Department is designed to undermine the basic economic structure of this country, with the one objective of dividing our markets and leveling our living standard to the low-wage living standards of the Asiatic and European nations, and includes:

First: Appropriations to make up the "trade balance" deficits of the European nations in cash each year—currently labeled the Marshall plan—our chief export is cash.

Second: Extend the selective "free trade" principle adopted by the State Department through a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Third: Adoption of the International Trade Organization—58 nations with 58 votes—each with one vote will meet each year to distribute among themselves the remaining production and markets of the world.

I want to say at this point that I think it is impossible to discuss one of these three parts without including the other two, simply because one is dependent upon the other, and the ultimate objective of the State Department, the executive department of this Government, is to level our living standards with the rest of the world through this three-phase program. Of course, this is done with the announced objective of raising the standard of living of the remainder of the world by dividing our markets with them.

All this reminds me of someone trying to average the level of the water in a water glass and the city reservoir. You could empty your water glass into the reservoir without having very much effect on the height of the water in the reservoir.

Now to the adoption of this International Trade Organization, with 58 nations, each having one vote—the United States would have the same vote as Siam or Lithuania. They would meet each year with free trade the ultimate goal, and add up the remaining production and markets of the world and divide them eventually on the basis of population.

The first step of the three-part permanent program, that of making up the trade balance deficits of the European nations each year in cash—our chief export is cash—began rather modestly with scattered gift-loans to these nations, leading up to UNRRA, and later the gift-loan of $3,750,000,000 to England in 1946, and then to the $17,000,000,000 5-year program currently known as the Marshall plan, soon to be followed by the now-suggested global recovery program.

I mentioned in the debate last year on March 4 and 5 on the floor of the Senate exactly how this thing had developed to finally make up the trade balance deficits of the European nations, and it was admitted in the debate that that is what it was for. I mentioned at that time that soon there would be another suggestion which would not be the Marshall plan but would be simply a continuation of the program of which the Marshall plan was simply a part.

The second step was inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the State Department has adopted the selective free-trade principle, and which is to be extended for 3 years at this session of Congress. The principle is later to be made permanent through the adoption of the International Trade Organization. Free trade has been sold to this country through the catch phrase "reciprocal trade." The phrase has no relation to the act, but it has never been possible to sell free trade direct to the workers of this Nation.

Catch phrase to sell "free trade"

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the act is not reciprocal—but is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people, cloaked in more involved and less understandable phraseology.

The third and final step of this very clever three-phase program to divide the markets and to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world is the adoption of the presently proposed International Trade Organization, under which the selective free-trade principles, currently adopted by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Acts, will be made permanent and become the settled policies of this Nation.

Affect the workers first

This three-phase free-trade program will affect alike farming, manufacturing, mining, lumber, textiles, and labor, as such, most of all, since they are the first affected. All this must be considered together.

Group legislation versus economic foundation of this Nation

Group legislation is attracting the attention of the Senators and Congressmen while the economic rug is being pulled right out from under our feet through this three-phase free-trade program.

Capital is fluid. It can be invested in the competitive countries where the lowering of the import fee places the industry, but American labor does not want to follow capital to the low-wage countries and does not want such low-wage labor coming here.

The resulting unemployment

There are now nearly 4,000,000 full-time idle men in this country and more than nine and one-half million part-time unemployed, and it has just started. We may partially recover at the moment, but if this

three-phase free-trade program is adopted it will continue later in renewed force.

At this point I want to call attention to a dispatch appearing in the February 23 Daily Mirror. It says in that dispatch:

"Some estimates have 4,000,000 unemployed now. Census figures reveal 9,500,000 working part time from a day to 4 days a week."

This is a special writer, and he says:

"I have been inquiring about the country, and I find jobs slackening even in the hypertension steel industry."

I simply want to emphasize at this point that if this free-trade plan is to continue and the American worker is to be put in direct competition with the low-wage labor of the Asiatic and European nations and the South Seas, then there is nothing that can happen to us except a definite lowering of our high-wage standard of living.

It simply means that approximately 7 percent of the population of the world—140,000,000 people—is trying to raise the standards of living of the 93 percent—or more than 2,000,000,000 people—through a direct division of their jobs with them.

Only a very rich nation can stand up under a division of her markets.

I see no practical difference between importing goods produced by cheap labor and importing the cheap labor itself. As a matter of fact, unrestricted immigration is a part of the long-range plan of the economic one-world thinkers.

Free trade adds up to free immigration

No one can be for free trade, in my opinion, and vote against unrestricted immigration from the low-wage countries because the effect is exactly the same in the last analysis.

Since the economy and currency exchange rates of all the 58 nations are in a continual state of flux, no fixed tariff can successfully represent this differential of cost over a period of time.

The solution can be found in a flexible import fee which is subject to adjustment when the economic factors change.

A tariff is a fixed tariff whether fixed by the Congress, by the Tariff Commission, or by the State Department under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, except that the tariff fixed by the State Department is even more rigid, because it is a treaty and cannot be changed for a definite length of time, regardless of the changes in the economic factors affecting the differential of cost, and this differential of cost of production is mostly due to the standards of living.

Senator BREWSTER. Did you say it was a treaty?

Senator MALONE. I understood it is a treaty.

Senator BREWSTER. If it were, it would have to be approved by the Senate.

Senator MALONE. Does it not have to be approved by the Senate?

Senator BREWSTER. They proceed under the agreement theory of a majority.

Senator MALONE. I am speaking about the ITO.

The CHAIRMAN. We are speaking of all three together, but this is with reference to the ITO.

Senator BREWSTER. We do not know yet whether it is a treaty or agreement.

Senator TAFT. If it is a treaty, it involves the moral obligation to keep going for 3 years.

Senator MALONE. That would be the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, but the ITO is a treaty, as I understand it.

Senator BREWSTER. They have not made up their minds what they are going to call it, nor have we.

Senator MILLIKIN. They refuse to say when they are going to submit it and they refuse to say how they are going to submit it.

International Trade Organization Treaty

Senator MALONE. I will make a prediction to you that it will be submitted following the approval of the second year of the Marshall plan and the $5,500,000,000 that we are again going to give the European nations, and following the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. Then the ITO will be brought up to make free trade the permanent and fixed policy of this Nation. In other words, it will not come in now because they hope that we will not connect the three.

But I maintain that you cannot consider any one of these programs without discussing all three, because each is an integral part of a long-range plan, carefully designed to level the high-wage living standard of this country with the low-wage living standards of the Asiatic, European, and South Seas countries.

Not first time free trade suggested

Gentlemen, this is not the first time that this suggestion has been made. Forty or fifty years ago the international bankers of Europe suggested this same thing, except they simply proposed a free-trade policy. They did not have the involved language and the three-phase part of it.

This proposal was made at the time that our Nation started to rise above the living standards of the world through the use of our import fees and protection. It was at that time that the international bankers began to try to divide our markets through the free-trade principle. It is simply a proposal to divide our markets.

The Trade Agreements Act was suggested by Mr. Hull, the then Secretary of State, after being worked out by his Department to supplant his direct suggestion of free trade. I have a high regard for the integrity of the former Secretary, but he made the mistake of asking for free trade directly, and the people of the United States understood it and would not take it.

Each part of three-part program considered emergency

Now we have it bundled up in three parts, a three-phase program that is just as plain as the suggested free trade when considered together. But, they have been considered one at a time up to this time—as an immediate emergency—and rushed through without a full understanding of their collective effect. I feel very strongly on this subject. On page 10 of a reprint of my 1948 debates on the United States Senate floor, I said, in answering Mr. LODGE:

"I thank the Senator from Massachusetts sincerely for his contribution. Now since he has raised the question, I refer him to the European recovery plan committee hearings held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, part 1, pages 116 and 117. There are two tables (and these can be easily checked), which are very interesting to me, since the Senator has brought up the fact that if we did take these minerals without pay it would further unbalance their trade balances.

"I want to point out to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that it just happens—no doubt it is a coincidence—that the money which has been asked for under the bill, $6,800,000,000 for 15 months, corresponding exactly to the $5,300,000,000 for 12 months, adds up to the unfavorable trade balances for that period of the 16 Marshall plan nations.

"In other words, the $6,800,000,000 asked for by the President for 15 months under the Marshall plan corresponds exactly in proportion to the $5,300,000,000 for 12 months so the trade-balance shortage of the 16 countries from all trade sources in the world for the 12 months exactly balances by the same coincidence the amount of the loan or gift—I hope that no one is so naive as to believe that any of it will ever be repaid."

I will skip some of the debate now.

"Senator LODGE. And the fact that the total amount requested by the Marshall plan is $6,800,000,000 is not a coincidence; it is deliberately arrived at. What we are trying to do is to bridge that gap in foreign exchange which has been caused in large part by the war. There is not any mystery about it. We have not uncovered any corpse here."

Trade-balance deficits and selective free trade

I simply want to point out that it was admitted in debate that what we were doing was making up the trade-balance deficits of the 16 Marshall-plan nations in cash.

Under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade policy simply designed to divide our markets with those nations and the countries of the world, on the theory that the greater the division of the markets, the less their trade-balance deficits will be.

They have adopted the free-trade principle, and let me say that you do not have to remove the tariff or import fee entirely to have free trade on that article. All you have to do is to cut it down below the critical point where it makes up the difference between the cost of manufacturing or producing the article here and the cost of producing it in a foreign country where our competition is located, and then you have effective free trade. Just as if you sawed 2 feet off the end of the Potomac River Bridge, you do not take much off the bridge, but you have no bridge left. That is exactly the way it works in the reduction of a tariff or import fee.

Senator MILLIKIN. I suggest to you that it is free trade only as far as we are concerned. We now have the equivalent of free trade, but no other country in the world has reduced its import restrictions to the point that we have. The others have made some concessions in the tariff part of the restriction, but the quotas and the import restrictions and the monetary restrictions are higher than ever, and it is a farce to talk about reciprocal trade. It is a farce to talk about free trade in the sense that that is reciprocal. It is free trade only so far as our market is concerned.

Senator MALONE. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution. It is a one-way street; that is exactly what it is. A higher-standard-of-living nation can do nothing but lose under a free-trade agreement. It is just like taking the partition out of a sink, the water will find its level. It must find its level; there is no place else for it to go.

Technical knowledge and efficient machinery available

Sometimes people will say, "With our great knowledge of manufacturing and production and our efficient machinery, we need not fear low-cost labor." I want to point out to this committee that at this moment every piece of machinery that we make in the United States and every bit of technical knowledge that we have is available to every other country in the world. In my conversations with Nehru in New Delhi, India, and General Smuts in South Africa, where they have 500,000 tons of chromite and tremendous quantities of manganese that we need desperately, I said, "If I were not in the Senate and were 20 years younger, I would be out in the Asiatic and African countries looking for opportunities to bring American machinery and develop a business."

President does not need to send technical knowledge

Then we have the proposal of the President to send technical knowledge all over the world. No government needs to send technical knowledge any place. Technical knowledge precedes investment; and if at any time technical men who know a particular business can find a place where the investments are safe, where they have integrity of investments, where all they take is the business risk, the technical men will go there. You cannot keep them away. If the business conditions are right they will go.

Establish integrity of investments

So if the United Nations and the Congress of the United States and the executive department would bend their efforts to estab-

lish this integrity of investment throughout the world, they need not fear but what the capital of this Nation and the technical knowledge will go there.

Senator BREWSTER. Would it not be very much more encouraging if we found one country in the world where they took that attitude, and we should give particular aid and facility to that country in order to set an example? Belgium, after the war, was one that most quickly reestablished itself, and created an atmosphere, apparently, somewhat congenial for private enterprise to succeed. Would that be within the purview of your view?

Nationalistic trend stops investment

Senator MALONE. I thank the Senator for his contribution; it would. I meant major nations. There have been no major nations which have established the integrity of the investments. Belgium did recover for the very reason that you could invest money there and get the profits out of the country. It is impossible to get anything out of England, even interest on this money, to say nothing of the profit on investment capital. As a result of the nationalistic trend and the socialization of industry in England, even the Englishmen will not invest their money at home.

I pointed out, in this debate on the Senate floor to which I have already referred, that more money than they were asking for under the Marshall plan had been run underground in the 16 nations requesting the aid.

Senator BREWSTER. You would favor operations under the Export-Import Bank of that character where you loaned to individual industries in countries where there was some guarantee of recuperation, I gather, instead of the Government loans which encourage the socialization?

Senator MALONE. I would, Senator, and in that connection I would like to read a few paragraphs on page 3 of this same reprint, that is available to the Senators if they would like to see it.

Senator MILLIKIN. Might I make an observation, please, Senator MALONE. Following up Senator BREWSTER'S suggestion, is it not perfectly obvious that if investment was guaranteed protection, you would not have to make a Government loan? Private capital would go there.

Senator MALONE. Senator, I would like to go a step further. It is not necessary to guarantee an investment, but to simply guarantee against nationalization of the investment.

Senator MILLIKIN. I am not talking about that. I am talking about a background of circumstances and of law and of treatment of foreign money, whereby they could get fair play and not be threatened with expropriation and all of the other things that have happened to our capital in foreign countries.

Senator MALONE. That is exactly my point. The Congress of the United States has never yet made any definite move to nationalize industry. The minute that they made such a move in the Congress of the United States, in my opinion, we would be dependent entirely upon appropriations from the United States Treasury for new capital investment, the same as they are in England and the 16 Marshall plan countries today. Then when these countries could no longer secure such capital from their own treasuries, they fell back on gift loans from ours.

Now, I want to read just briefly here, because the subject is very vital to me, and I think is the guts of the entire work of Congress today.

Marshall plan—1934 Trade Agreements Act—ITO

All of the group legislation—the farmers' legislation, the labor legislation, the manufacturers' legislation, and the veterans' legislation—is very important to these groups and very important to the United States. But any mistake you make in such legislation, you can correct in the following Congress. But you cannot change this free-trade policy once you have a definite treaty with 58 nations. We have the only markets in the world today that you can sell 10 cents' worth of chewing gum and get the money for it, unless we previously gift-loaned that government the money to buy it. It is our markets, then, that they are after. It is our markets that are going to be divided by these 58 nations with 58 votes, with Siam and Lithuania having 1 vote just the same as we do.

So they meet each year and divide the remaining production and the markets of the world, dividing them presumably on the basis of population. That is your ITO, and you cannot make anything else out of it.

They are holding the International Trade Treaty back now until you pass the Marshall plan again and extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act for 3 years, and then we will face the treaty.

Senator MILLIKIN. If I may suggest, Senator, if you had the time, which you do not have, to stick around here, it will not be long until you are told that you have nothing to fear about those things; that if we do not like what is going on we can withdraw, and if the others do not like what they are doing they can excommunicate us. And now, watch, within 24 hours you will hear that.

Senator MALONE. It is very good conversation, and we have lived off it now for 15 years, and I think the end of the honeymoon is right close.

Senator MILLIKIN. Get ready, Mr. Brown.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us proceed with the immediate thing.

Senator MALONE. Thank you, Senator MILLIKIN, for the contribution.

I want to read a few paragraphs here, a condensation of the 2-day debate.

First, they said in the Marshall plan that we wanted to feed hungry people, to stop communism, and to rehabilitate industry. That is the reason that I made the trip through the Marshall plan countries late in 1947, and examined the coal mines and the steel mills of the Ruhr in Germany and other industries. I say it is impossible to consider the feeding of hungry people, the stopping of communism, and the rehabilitation of industry as one subject. We only confuse ourselves, and as a result we mix our emotions with the facts and become unwilling victims of the greatest propaganda machine ever established in Washington.

Feed hungry people—Monroe Doctrine—business loans

Let us take them one at a time. Feeding emergency hungry people of Europe, or any other area, is a matter of charity, and must be so considered apart from other considerations.

Then I go to the stopping of communism, where I mention the Monroe Doctrine as stopping the spread of their systems of government into the Western Hemisphere by the empire-minded nations. We have had the Monroe Doctrine for 125 years. It has been very successful, and in that connection when we operate through the Monroe Doctrine or open door to the nations we name as important to our peace and safety, we are the judge when we go to war. We do not sign a treaty where you go to war because someone else says they are attacked.

I just want to call your attention to one thing while we are on that subject, that there has never been a time—I think I am safe in making this statement—in 2,000 years but what there was some kind of a war going on in Europe.

Now, let us get down to rehabilitating industry. That is the third thing. The rehabilitation of the industries of the 16 Marshall-plan countries, European countries, is entirely separate from feeding hungry people. It can be accomplished purely as a business transaction in the same manner as such plants were financed in this country by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the depression and during World War II.

A reasonable amount of money, say $1,000,000,000, could be appropriated and made available to the RFC or to the World Bank, for that specific purpose, simply providing that the RFC rules and regulations be applied to any foreign business loan. That would be a semiprivate bank loaning to private industry. Their rules provide for an investigation of the feasibility of such an industry by an experienced investigator in the respective fields, with an estimate of cost, together with a list of the needed machinery and supplies. They further provide for a lien or mortgage to be taken on such equipment, the stock or shares of the existing organization to be hypothecated as additional security for such loan, and then the signature of the applicant is required.

In other words, you loan money to rehabilitate the steel industry in Europe; I went through these steel industries with that particular object in view, since I still believe we were going to try to rehabilitate industry on some business basis. You would loan the money on the same basis as to an industry in Maine or in Nevada or in Ohio or Georgia. There should be no difference, no harsher terms and no milder terms. You will be very agreeably surprised, I also go on to say how small an amount of money you would loan on that basis.

That is not the basis on which they want the loan. I had a talk with Mr. Cripps, Sir Stafford Cripps, on the occasion of my visit to England; he said that they needed the Marshall-plan money very badly. That was in November of 1947. I said, "I understand from my figures that you are 114 percent recovered on the industrial index at this time." He hesitated just a moment and said, "That is true." He said further, "We do not need the money in England so badly, but we need it to build new industries in Africa, in our possessions in Africa." And I said, "Mr. Cripps"—this is all in this debate, by the way—I said, "Mr. Cripps, do you mean for our Government to give your Government money to build industries and transportation, and so forth, in Africa, in your possessions there, and that they would be clear of debt and your Government would own them?" And he said, "Yes."

The integrity of investments

Then I mentioned to him exactly the subject that you brought up, Senator BREWSTER. I said, "Why don't you establish the integrity of investments in Africa so that anyone investing money is taking only a business risk? In other words, investors from your neighbor countries will take the business risk whenever the judgment of the technicians and the men who have the money indicate that they have a chance to profit by the investment." He said that would not do at all, he just brushed it aside, because that is not what they want. They want us to give them the money so that the Government can nationalize the industry and the Government will own the industry.

Senator BREWSTER. I hoped that you would be able to comply with Senator MILLIKIN'S suggestion and remain here a little while, to have your education on the utter fallacy of all that is proposed. I think that you will then be able to crusade much more effectively against what we believe to be unsound theories. We are going to have them expounded; just as soon as we dispense with the clothespins here, we are going into the upper realms.

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest, Senator, that you may be a bit confusing to the committee by getting into the British loans and the British economy at this time, because we have this specific matter before us, and I would appreciate it if you would confine yourself to that. I understand your general

observation that you think all of these things tie together, but I would like you to be a bit more specific and not go too far afield with all of these other matters that will be upon the floor of the Senate, undoubtedly, but do not come before this committee.

Import fee does not prevent imports

Senator MALONE. I was simply following the lead of the questions of the committee. I would be happy to do that, but at the same time I would like to impress upon the chairman of this committee that you cannot separate the three-phase free trade program. They are absolutely inseparable, with one objective.

Now, the argument is sometimes made that there should not be a tariff or an import fee on an article when we do not produce enough of it for the domestic market.

An import fee does not prevent imports, but does bring the product in on our level of costs—and keeps us in the business while we are assisting the lower-wage standard of living countries to raise their own.

Many of the strategic and critical minerals and materials are in that category, including copper, zinc, and mercury. You have under consideration here a bill to extend the free trade on copper, and it is doing exactly the same thing to the small producer in this country, and it has driven the prospector out of the hills. There will be no more competition on copper if you are to continually extend the free-trade interval.

Flexible import fee

Congress recognized this undesirable feature of a fixed tariff in 1930 by enacting section 336 establishing the flexible import fee procedure. Because this provision for various reasons was not utilized, I introduced a foreign trade authority bill last year which would have changed the Tariff Commission into a foreign trade authority with full authority to reflect correctly this differential of cost in much the same manner as the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes freight rates after full investigation and hearings.

Sometimes you will hear these theorists ask, "What do you offer if you do not want the free-trade policy based on the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, miscalled reciprocal trade?" And I want to say again and emphasize that the phrase reciprocal trade has never occurred in any bill ever passed by the Congress of the United States. It is simply a catchword to sell free trade to the American people, and I think it has done a good job.

Under the proposal of the flexible import fee adjustment of rates, a definite market basis is established in the United States for the goods of all foreign nations, but they are the judges of their own living standards. However, under such a provision they would be encouraged to raise their wage living standards because they would immediately get credit for corresponding reduction in the tariff or import fee, and when their standards of living approximated our own, then the objective of free trade would be an automatic and immediate result. But in the meantime, our wage standard of living would be protected.

Leveling the living standards of the world

There is no argument against free trade when the living standards are approximately the same, but in the meantime our wage standard of living would be protected while we are assisting the lower-wage standard of living nations.

There can be no question of the objective of leveling the living standards of this country with the low-wage living standards of the world when the three-part free-trade program is considered together.

I can understand anyone who advocates an import fee lower than the differential of cost between producing an article in this country and in a foreign country where our competition is located, provided he sincerely believes that our wage standard of living is higher than it should be, and as a result should be leveled off, because that can be the only result when the goods produced by the lower-cost labor is imported into this country.

I want to call attention again to the stock answer that they have always had for this—that "Certainly with our methods of manufacture no low-cost labor can compete with us." But now everything we have, every bit of technical knowledge, and all of our machinery, is available to every country in the world, and you put them on the assembly line and in a week they will do as much or more work than an American workman.

However, I cannot understand anyone who advocates that we maintain our high-wage living standard and at the same time favors an import fee below such differential of cost, because the two simply are not compatible.

I will have more to say in debate on the Senate floor about our trade relations with the Asiatic, European, Middle East, South Seas, and Near East nations, including Africa. I have visited all of these nations and have discovered various ways utilized by them, including quotas, embargoes, currency manipulations, and other devices, to nullify any concessions that they may have made through such treaties, while we feel morally bound to live up to such commitments.

You cannot successfully criticize these nations, in my opinion, because in most cases it is from sheer necessity that they take such action; and if we continue along the road we have started, we will soon reach the point where, from sheer necessity, we will have to abrogate the treaties through the use of such subterfuges.

Free trade and employment

These questions are not new. President Woodrow Wilson said, following the passage of the Underwood Tariff Act in 1913, that we should have a tariff board set up to advise the Congress in setting up a tariff bill. Soon after that date the Tariff Commission was set up to so advise Congress.

It will also be remembered that the Underwood tariff bill lowering rates below that differential of cost basis allowed an influx of goods into this country following World War I, and that a special session of Congress had to be called to pass emergency rates preventing such importations, which were rendering idle thousands of workers in this country.

The conditions at this time are exactly the same as following World War I—the import fees are now below the critical point on many products and the dangerous unemployment cycle is under way as a direct result of the State Department's action through the three-phase program, as already pointed out.

The Daily Mirror yesterday carried a Washington story that "some estimates have 4,000,000 unemployed now" and that "census figures reveal 9,500,000 working part time, from 1 day to 4 days a week."

Free-trade suggestion not new

The three-phase free-trade program, including the long-range program of making up the trade-balance deficits of the world currently known as the Marshall plan, the division of the markets under the selective free-trade policy adopted by the State Department based on the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and the International Trade Organization treaty which would make permanent the free-trade policy, is not new and will reestablish the unemployment conditions existing at the time it was necessary to overhaul the Underwood Tariff Act following World War I.

The same principle was advocated, using different language, 40 or 50 years ago by international European bankers about the time we started to rise perceptibly above the nations of the world in our living standards through the use of the import-fee method.

Later the "free trade" policy was advocated directly without subterfuge of any kind by Secretary of State Hull. Now the same policies are advocated through this three-phase program, in more complicated language, designed to confuse the issue, but it adds up simply to the same thing—"free trade."

The basic reason for recapturing control of our own import fees lies in the necessity for a high degree of flexibility, which is impossible if changes must be made through international agreement. The tariff structure of the United States has become rigid by reason of the many trade agreements executed by the State Department.

Until recently, this had not caused any particular embarrassment, because of the abnormal trade conditions of the past few years, war conditions, subsidies, and gift-loans to foreign nations which can be used to purchase our own products. However, it is inevitable that future conditions will change with considerable rapidity, and to an hitherto unexperienced extent.

Saving our own economy

In that connection, I want to call attention to a dispatch yesterday in the Wall Street Journal; it says:

"Mounting surpluses from United States farms and factories are putting pressure on Congress to see that more European-aid dollars come back here to help relieve overproduction headaches. Many lawmakers are giving serious consideration to pleas that American goods should get first claim for purchase with the dollars given away or loaned abroad."

In that connection, I want to say that when I was examining the mines in the Ruhr in Germany, Mr. Collins, an Englishman, was superintendent of the mines. After the work of the day we were discussing the projected Marshall plan. After he had exhausted the arguments that the Marshall plan money should be given directly to the English Government, he just grinned at me and said, "You know that you are going to give us this money to save your own economy." He knew it then and I did not. I also had not realized at that time that the so-called Marshall plan was only one part of a three-phase "free trade" program. That was the first time I had heard it, but it happened about 40 times on my trip through France, England, and the Middle East. In other words, they all believe now and they will tell you that we are going to continue to give this money to Europe in some guise, to save our own economy.

Flexibility of import fees necessary

My own idea of it is that if a man is going up a stepladder to jump off, he had better jump before he gets so high that it kills him, and a little leveling off before this time would not have hurt us any.

The basic reason, then, for recapturing control is the changing economic conditions in these countries—the economies of all of the countries are in a state of flux continually—and these conditions must be taken into account. They cannot be met by a treaty where, for 3 years, tariffs are fixed and then you have to serve certain notice, taking about 4 years altogether, and then probably be accused of bad faith.

We must be ready to meet such conditions. True flexibility of our import fees is essential to our national economic welfare.

Unless the Congress of the United States takes a firm hand in the game and reverses the trend of the three-phase program instituted by the State Department, under which they are directing both the domestic and international series of programs, the producers and workers of this country are headed for a dangerously low standard of living, and an unemployment condition definitely worse than anything experienced since the early 1930's.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity of making this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator MALONE.

Senator MALONE. I believe that you mentioned that this would be the point to mention the matter of the copper extension free trade.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, before the Senator goes into that, may I ask a couple of questions?

You state there are about 4,000,000 unemployed in America. Do you know what type of work that is?

Senator MALONE. Senator, I do not have the exact figures, but in every paper you find notices that the automobile companies are laying off men, the railroads are laying off men, and the basic industries of the country are either cutting down the days of employment or laying off more men.

Senator MARTIN. I think you also stated that there are 9,000,000 partially unemployed. What do you mean by that?

Senator MALONE. I mean that their workweeks are cut down, where they normally would have a 5- or 5½-day week, they are cut down to as low as a 1-day week, or 1 to 4 days.

Senator MARTIN. In your survey, did you take into consideration the coal mines of the United States?

Senator MALONE. I believe they are included in the over-all figures, but the figures are growing so fast from day to day that it is impossible, almost, to keep in touch with them.

Now, then, mentioning one more thing in that connection that directly affects the coal mines, I want to call attention to another dispatch that the oil people are getting very worried, even as early as last fall the oil market was soft. The headline says, "Halloran wants crude oil imports cut—United States petroleum industry will be harmed unless this is done."

This indicates that there should be some authority given the State Department or some other department to determine when to cut the imports.

My whole point is, if there should be some kind of a flexible import fee arrangement so that the differential of cost could be met, it will take care of itself, without leaving the decision to the judgment of a bureau official.

This is what I mean and how it will affect the coal mines: I saw every oil well in the Middle East, in Iran and Iraq, down the Persian Gulf and through Saudi Arabia—the oil from that area under free trade, or if we should pass the Anglo-American oil treaty and throw the bars down, will come into this country at a cost that will cut the production of oil in this country and make it unprofitable to explore for further domestic sources of oil.

Coal and oil production affected

The coal industry and the oil industry have come along about equally, that is to say, both fuels are used in the production of steam power all over the country, both are living at a high-wage standard of living, and both are producing plenty of coal and plenty of oil.

But if the Middle East oil is made available on a free-trade basis to this country, it could come in for $1.50 or $1.75 instead of $2.50 or $3, and it could close every coal mine in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, and Utah that is furnishing coal for steam plants outside of their own States. That is one definite effect of this over-all free-trade policy.

Senator MARTIN. Senator MALONE, you are one of the very outstanding engineers of America. Do you have an estimate as to how long our present reserves of coal would maintain our economy?

Senator MALONE. Well, the least that I have ever heard estimated was over 1,000 years.

Synthetic fuels

Senator MARTIN. And do you think that the present plans of converting coal into gasoline and into oil and into commercial alcohol is practicable?

Senator MALONE. I have no doubt about it, Senator. Last year we had a National Resources Economic Committee, of which I was chairman, set up through the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We made a very careful investigation and brought the data on synthetic fuels up to date. Research is in the pilot plant stage, but I am told by scientists and engineers who are working on this problem that they are in about the same status now in the production of synthetic petroleum fuels from coal, as they were in the production of synthetic rubber at the beginning of World War II. In other words, if it becomes necessary and you gave them the necessary funds, they could produce all of the synthetic fuels needed from coal. There is, according to all of the best estimates, more than 1,000 years' supply of such fuels available from oil shale and coal.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking the time, and I would not have gone into this, but I think that we are fortunate to have in the Senate a man of the knowledge of Senator MALONE; and yesterday I happened to be in my own State of Pennsylvania and I was alarmed when I learned that we have over 300,000 miners that are on part time. Some of them are down as low as 1 day, and a great number of them 2 days, and some fully unemployed. I apologize for taking the time of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do you wish to address yourself to copper?

Senator FLANDERS. Might I interrupt for a moment, Senator MALONE and Mr. Chairman? I wonder if I might have 5 minutes between the general subject and copper, as I have some responsibilities elsewhere.

Senator MALONE. I will finish very quickly.

I feel very strongly on this subject which I have just outlined to you, Mr. Chairman, because I think that it is the one real basic subject faced by the Congress of the United States, that someone—I do not know how far back you have to go to find this someone—knows what the effect of this plan will be, and they do not all live in the United States, but part of them do.

Capital is fluid—workers cannot move

Capital is fluid and can be invested anywhere in the world at a moment's notice. When a certain import fee is going to be adjusted downward to a point below that critical point of protection, then the investments in that nation become profitable, and people who know about those things and have money to invest do so. They are behind this free-trade movement, and it is a much deeper long-range proposition than has ever been discussed on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Senator BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to examine this witness at somewhat more length on some of his comments on the oil situation. I hesitate, because Senator FLANDERS and Senator SMITH are here, who are going to talk about a somewhat smaller item of clothespins; and I would like to have that opportunity, if the Senator could give us the time, and permit Senator FLANDERS to speak for 5 minutes and then leave, if that will be agreeable.

Senator MALONE. I will come back.

Senator BREWSTER. I do not want you to get away before I talk with you about this oil, but I hesitate to do it because I have asked these other people here, and that is the difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator FLANDERS, you say that you have a statement?

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF VERMONT

Free trade and clothespins

Senator FLANDERS. I thank you for the privilege of speaking briefly. I am going to speak about 2½ minutes on the general subject of the reciprocal trade treaties, and 2½ minutes on clothespins. That is the relative importance, at this particular minute, of those two subjects.

The reciprocal trade treaties idea is one which we have to face. For generations, I suppose since we have been a Nation, we have exported more than we have imported.

Now, that was a perfectly logical thing to do when we were a debtor Nation. We worked part time for ourselves and part time to service and pay our debts.

We are now a creditor Nation, and we still work part time for ourselves, and part of the time for the people we send goods to for which we do not get paid.

Now, that is just plain silly. What we have to do is to find some way of getting paid by imports or gold for the things we ship abroad, because otherwise it is a dead loss to the Nation to ship out more than we get back. That applies just the same to foreign investment. There you have only a delayed result of not getting paid for what you do. You do not notice it until later. But foreign investment for which we do not get paid—and the only way we can get paid is by imports or by gold—is again just plain silly.

So we have to find some way to get paid for the stuff we ship out of this country. The only way I can see is by a carefully organized and administered rearrangement of our tariffs at rates which shall permit or encourage the payment for our exports in ways which are to the best advantage of the country.

It can be done theoretically, and I believe practically, in a way which raises our standard of living, if we swap the things which we make best for the other things which other people make best.

Now, we are on our way to clothespins. There is a good deal of trouble, friction, discontent, in the case of most industries, I imagine, for which arrangements have been made in the reciprocal trade treaties for reducing the duties involved. That is inevitable in the process, and I think that we do not have to formally serve notice. But informally, I would like to serve notice on Mr. Brown, who I believe is here in the room somewhere, or anyone else connected with the State Department, that Senators and Representatives are going to police their own constituents the details of this essential job, whose essentialness I have just described, and that again brings us to clothespins.

I want to say that we have two clothespin factories in Vermont. They make nothing else. One of them cans peas and corn in the summer, but we do not ask them to make enough on their peas and corn so that they can make clothespins as a public service.

Their wage rates run from 75 to 80 cents for women and from 90 cents to $1 an hour for men; and the Department of Commerce informs me that the Swedish competition, which is the serious competition, pays 62½ cents.

These manufacturers in Vermont—I do not know so much about those in other parts of the country—tell me that they have now lost the chain-store business. The chain stores buy their clothespins from Sweden. They have not lost the business sold to miscellaneous outlets through jobbers. Apparently the miscellaneous outlets have not yet discovered Swedish clothespins.

The folks up in my State are very much afraid of a further reduction, as requested by Sweden, and feel that they are suffering hardship under the present reduction, and wish me to present the case, and I am glad to do it.

I may say that the most efficient manufacturing plant I ever saw, of any sort, was a wooden-clothespin factory of the old-fashioned clothespin type up in Stacyville, Maine, and if the Vermont clothespin factories are as well managed as that old wooden-clothespin factory was, I want to say that they are doing very well, indeed, so far as skill and management are concerned.

That is my story, Mr. Chairman, on the reciprocal trade agreements and on clothespins.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator MALONE. Is it permissible for a Senator to ask a question who is not a member of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. We could allow it, Senator MALONE. We are working under a good deal of pressure this morning. Is it just one question?

Senator MALONE. I would like to ask just one question of the Senator, if that is not one shining example of what Sweden can do better?

Senator FLANDERS. That is a real problem. I plan to visit those two clothespin factories and see if they have any right to survive. I mentioned the Maine clothespin factory because I am sure that that thing could not be done better elsewhere, but it was the old-fashioned wooden clothespin without any spring in it.

Senator MILLIKIN. May I make a very brief observation, which will save a question.

Out in our country, Senator, we produce sugar, and we produce oil, and we produce all of the livestock products, and we produce minerals and many other things, and we are producers of primary products. There is not a thing that we produce out there that cannot be produced cheaper some place else. If we simply ran our tariff system on the basis of swapping that which the other fellow can do cheaper than we can do it, you have got about 17 States that will go back to the status of a howling wilderness.

Senator FLANDERS. May I, sir, make an observation, also, and not a question. That is that to my mind, sir, you live in a problem region, and you are completely dependent on the tariff out where you live. That is true to an extent that is not true in any other part of the country, and the State Department must recognize its responsibility for not depopulating the Rocky Mountain region.

Senator BREWSTER. I would like to ask the Senator this question: I appreciate what you say about the West, but up in Maine we have a few problems besides the clothespins, which we appreciate your solicitude for and we share it. But when we are sending 60 percent of the most modern textile machinery we manufacture to other parts of the world, do you have any doubt as to their capacity to use that intelligently and effectively in producing those things more advantageously and more cheaply than we do?

Senator FLANDERS. We had the experience of the Japanese textile industry up to prewar time.

Senator BREWSTER. It threatened us very severely.

Senator FLANDERS. Yes. And I could give General MacArthur some advice on that, so far as Japan is concerned, which is that they swap their textiles with the rice-growing countries of southern Indochina and work out a reciprocal trade arrangement there. But these arrangements that have to be made, have to be made slowly and with caution, and with all of the conditions in mind, and I think that it is perfectly proper for us to serve notice on the State Department—as I say, they probably recognize it already—that we are not going to allow any such serious maladjustments that we cannot digest them as we go.

The main problem remains that we must not make stuff and give it away. That is what we are doing now.

Senator BREWSTER. Do you share with Senator MALONE that we want to give our know-how and our technical developments to the rest of the world, if they will use those to put more cotton on the backs of Chinamen instead of inundating our markets here with their products? Is that not the theory?

Senator FLANDERS. I might say that Senator MALONE did not tell the whole story. I do not want to ship that know-how and equipment without getting paid for it, and at present we have no way of getting paid for it. We are just fooling ourselves.

Senator BREWSTER. We could get paid completely for the textile machinery and the know-how and everything else, and it is when we get into other situations that we get a very serious unbalance. If we simply exported modern machinery and know-how, that is another thing.

Senator FLANDERS. But the total of exports so far exceeds, under ordinary conditions, the total of imports, that we fool ourselves when we think that we are getting paid for them, and that is a major problem.

Senator BREWSTER. Well, we imported $7,000,000,000 worth this last year, and that is more than our exports ever were prior to the war.

Senator FLANDERS. Maybe the thing has begun to balance out. I hope so.

Senator BREWSTER. You indicate the tariff is rather a local problem, as was said many years ago.

Senator FLANDERS. It is as far as clothespins are concerned.

Senator MARTIN. Senator FLANDERS, you are an expert in manufacturing, and is not the main difference of the cost of production in our country and in foreign countries the one of labor?

Senator FLANDERS. The differences are brought about by labor, equipment, and management, which may or may not balance each other out.

Senator MARTIN. But is not the main difference in cost the wage-scale difference between our country and foreign countries?

Senator FLANDERS. For instance, in an automobile plant as it was before the war, their scale was lower, but we made them cheaper.

Senator MARTIN. We had the mass production. But you take a specialized thing like clothespins, and is not the big difference in cost the matter of so much per hour for labor?

Senator FLANDERS. That is the situation so far as I know it. I have not visited the Swedish clothespin factories, but I assume that that is the difference.

Senator MARTIN. I am for reciprocity; I was brought up on that as a boy. That is one of the first things that I learned in political economy, and it is sound. But we have got to take care of our living standards in America, and that means full employment and gainful wages of our working people.

It seems to me that the real difference is the wage scale per hour.

Senator FLANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I might suggest on the major problem, that it seems to me that the proper line to be taken in negotiating these treaties is to have them so designed and so administered that the normal growth of our industry is directed toward those things we do best, rather than having it work destructively on existing elements of industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator MALONE. I would like to add just one statement as long as it was questioned whether I had gone far enough or not. Could I do that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but would you let Mrs. Smith go first?

Maintaining wage-living standards versus foreign levels

Senator MALONE. I will make this only a short statement and then I am through.

There is no question but what we are making up our minds whether we are going to try to maintain our wage standard of living while we help foreign nations, or whether we want to level our living standards with such foreign nations and start at the bottom again with them. All you need is to have free trade and you will level our living standards with the foreign nations, and you have free trade when that differential of costs is not correctly represented by the import fee.

There is no question but what Senator MARTIN put his finger right on the subject. Labor is the important factor. These people in Europe are like us; they can do just as much work and, for the most part, will work harder; since all of the machinery is now available to them, the difference in the labor cost will represent the difference in the cost of the product. As Senator BREWSTER has said, the know-how and the machinery will go to the low-cost labor.

In the case of automobiles and the heavy machinery, we have had little competition, but right now they are coming into this country in increasing quantities and depressing the automobile market, all due to using our technical know-how, machinery, and assembly-line methods, combined with the European cheaper labor.

The differential of cost is due mostly to labor, and it is not recognized under the three-part free-trade program. The fact that the assembly-line methods have been taken to Europe by Mr. Ford is not recognized in this plan. These men are smart, and they will go where their money investment will be profitable. It is not the same name as the Ford plant here but it is the same organization and the same money. Every company in Detroit will be in the nations of Europe very soon, if this three-phase free-trade plan of the economic one-worlders is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MAINE

Senator SMITH of Maine. I appreciate your courtesy in permitting me to come in here before your committee, and I will confine my remarks to the minimum.

I am not directing my statement generally to the legislation before the committee, but taking the subject that Senator FLANDERS used, clothespins, if I may.

Protection against low-cost labor

The clothespin industry of this country, as we have already heard, needs greater protection than it now has. Foreign producers manufacture clothespins at one-half to three-fourths of the American manufacturing costs. The differential is based particularly in labor costs. In other words, we cannot compete with the low labor wages of the foreign clothespin manufacturers.

The result is that foreign imports now constitute 20 percent of our American market, foreign imports of clothespins have multiplied 15 times since the prewar years. The American clothespin industry cannot stand this low-cost labor competition, and its existence is threatened in the near future simply because the American productive capacity alone exceeds the normal demand of the American market.

Because the great preponderance of clothespin manufacturing is in my own State of Maine, this problem is very close to me. If the American clothespin industry is wiped out because of inadequate protection against foreign competition, it means that many Americans will lose their only means of livelihood. The clothespin businesses are small, but clothespin workers and the small farmers especially in the State of Maine and the existence of several small communities will be threatened by economic obliteration. The issue is as simple as that.

The Navajo Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the President has appointed a Commissioner of Indian Affairs in the person of Dr. John R. Nichols. Under that type of man we have a right to expect a practical, courageous and common-sense administration of the Office of Indian Affairs.

I am delighted also that the Secretary of the Interior and the President have now submitted to the Congress the long-range project for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians which was the result of years of study and planning with the aid of impartial committees, and on which hearings were held a year ago by the Public Lands Committee of the House and Senate. The President and Secretary Krug acted very wisely, I believe, in waiting for the submission of this program to the Congress until they had a man as Indian Commissioner in whom we may have real confidence. Under those circumstances there is no reason why the membership on both sides of the aisle cannot work together to bring about prompt passage of the bill they recommend. As the President says in this letter, the United States, which would live on Christian principles with all the peoples of the world, cannot omit a fair deal for its own Indian citizens.

Under leave from the House, I include herewith the letter from Secretary Krug and the letter by the President to him on the Navajo program:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith is a draft of a proposed bill, "To promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations, and for other purposes."

I request that this measure be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The authorization of a long-range program for the Navajo and Hopi Indians has been advocated by the President on several occasions as an essential step in the national policy of affording a fair deal to our Indian citizens. I enclose a copy of a letter, dated March 4, 1949, in which the President asks that the needs of the Navajos and Hopis be again brought to the attention of the Congress. The draft of bill transmitted herewith is designed to provide appropriate authorization for a long-range program that will assist these long-depressed Indian groups in becoming healthy, self-supporting, and enlightened.

The situation of the Navajo Indians has been the subject of national attention since a year ago last fall. The President, on December 2, 1947, declared in a public statement that the problems of the Navajos would not be solved merely by providing emergency relief for them during the ensuing winter, and pointed out the need for a long-range program of rehabilitation. The Congress, by the act of December 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 940), gave statutory recognition to a like concern over the Navajo situation. That act authorized the appropriation of $2,000,000 for an emergency grant and work-relief program for the Navajo and Hopi Indians, and of this sum $1,500,000 has been appropriated. In addition, section 2 of that act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Interior "at the earliest practicable date to submit to the Congress his recommendations for necessary legislation for a long-range program dealing with the problems of the Navajo and Hopi Indians."

In conformity with the foregoing requirement of law, I submitted to the Congress on March 17, 1948, my recommendations for a long-range Navajo and Hopi program. These recommendations had previously been approved by the President. They embodied a plan whereby the Federal Government could fulfill its responsibilities to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes in furtherance of treaty provisions and in conformity with Federal policy, as defined in numerous statutes since the founding of the Nation. The recommended plan was cast in the form of a proposed bill which would have authorized capital expenditures of $90,000,000 for a 10-year rehabilitation and resource development program.

In support of the proposed legislation, I also submitted to the Congress a report entitled "The Navajo," which comprehensively explained the grounds for my recommendations. This report was based on data collected by the Indian Service, and on analyses of various specific aspects of the Navajo problem made by independent investigators. The proposed legislation was introduced in the Eightieth Congress as S. 2363 and H. R. 5932, but these bills were not enacted. Consequently, undertaking of the recommended plan has not been possible except for the initiation of an off-reservation employment program with funds made available under the act of December 17, 1947, mentioned above.

The need for a comprehensive long-range program for the Navajos and Hopis is even greater now than it was a year ago. The Navajo population is increasing at a rate of at least 1,200 persons each year. As a result, the education, health, and other social or economic aspects of the Navajo problem are becoming progressively more critical for each year that effective action toward solution of this problem is deferred. Both the Navajos and the Hopis are living today under precarious conditions far below the living standards enjoyed by most other citizens. The very existence of many of them is imperiled, for neither their physical resources nor their personal aptitudes have been developed to a point that will admit of self-support, even at a subsistence scale of living.

Physical development of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations, through such measures as range-land protection, irrigation, and road construction, is also acutely needed for the safeguarding of other national interests. Thus, the absence of a broad-scale soil- and moisture-conservation program, adequate to check the tremendous erosion now ocurring on these reservations, is causing the San Juan River and other streams to pour an ever-increasing accumulation of silt into Lake Mead. Each of the thousands of acre-feet of reservoir capacity displaced by this unnecessary accumulation means a corresponding loss of ultimate water storage for the great cities and rich agricultural areas whose security is dependent on the ability of Lake Mead to impound the floodwaters of the Colorado River.

To meet the situation squarely and effectively, I again propose initiation of a long-range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and the better utilization of their resources. As the program recommended is a comprehensive one, involving considerable costs, and is of vital importance both to the Government and to the Indians, special legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with this specific program, is believed to be the best way of providing for its undertaking.

The proposed bill submitted herewith for the purpose of initiating the necessary program is, for the most part, identical with the bill submitted in March of last year. It differs from that bill only in the following particulars: In section 1 the Hopi Indians have been made eligible for participation in all classes of projects by omitting the clauses which restricted the benefits of projects in classes 11, 12, and 13 to Navajo Indians, and a new class 14, with respect to housing, has been added. Section 4 has been amended so as to permit the making of loans for productive purposes to the Hopis as well as to the Navajos. A new section 5 has been inserted in order to make it possible for the Navajos and Hopis to grant long-term leases of lands needed for such purposes as public airports, churches, mission schools, recreational resorts, service stations, factories, warehouses, stockyards, and the like; and old sections 5, 6, and 7 have been renumbered 6, 7, and 8, respectively. The language in section 6 (sec. 5 of last year's bill) relating to a constitution for the Navajo Tribe has been revised in order to accord the Navajos the widest practicable choice in determining the framework of their tribal government. In accordance with the wishes of the Navajo tribal officials, a new section 9 has been added authorizing the submission by the Navajo and Hopi tribal councils of recommendations concerning the administration of the rehabilitation program.

Enclosed for your information are copies of the report, The Navajo, previously mentioned. This report explains the nature and causes of the Navajo problem, and gives detailed information on the constructive approach to the solution of that problem which the attached draft of bill would authorize. Representatives of this Department will be glad to supplement these materials in any way desired by the Congress or its committees.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 4, 1949.

The honorable the SECRETARY
OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At my request, you prepared and presented to the Congress on March 15, 1948, a proposed 10-year program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians of Arizona and New Mexico. Except for one small segment of this program, the Eightieth Congress failed to enact the necessary legislative authority to place it in motion.

The needs of these Indians are as great today as they were a year ago. Indeed the severe winter storms have emphasized the serious economic conditions prevailing among these tribes. The authorization of this long-rang program is considered essential to enable these groups of Indians to become healthy, enlightened, and self-supporting. I hope you will continue to emphasize to the Congress the needs of the Navajos and Hopis.

The United States, which would live on Christian principles with all of the peoples of the world, cannot omit a fair deal for its own Indian citizens.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Montgomery, Ala., on October 7, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is good to feel beneath ones feet again the soil of his native State. Not far from here, I, like my ancestors before me, was born. To this State my forebears came in the long ago, seeking the fulfillment of the American dream. They planted, they toiled with their harvests, they reared their children, built churches and schoolhouses and their humble homes. And from Alabama's soil my grandfathers went off to wear the gray in a cause that was already lost 90 years ago.

Go back with me to 1860. The Democratic Party split because our forebears demanded Federal protection for the extension of human slavery into the new States growing up in the West. A position which the National Democratic Party would not and could not accept. In the election of 1860, northern Democrats who nominated Douglas and the southern Democrats who nominated Breckinridge got nearly one-half million votes more than the Republican nominee, Lincoln; but Lincoln, because of the Democratic split, won in the electoral college and became the President. Those who risked all upon extending slavery into the new territory wound up by losing the slaves they had even in the South, which assuredly they could have saved for decades if not generations, and have been paid for in the end.

Today speaking to you with the candor which the situation demands, history was against human slavery just as history today is on the side of the Government of the United States, which is the champion of human liberty and freedom in this world, practicing at home the democracy it preaches to mankind. Anything other or less than the Government of the United States, giving fair and just constitutional rights to every segment of our citizenship, holds us up to ridicule and scorn before the totalitarians of the world as hypocrites, as preaching one thing and practicing another. If the South throws its weight and strength against the Constitution of the United States and the basic principles of Americanism then it will and should lose.

But there is a clear and distinct sphere for the application of the Federal Constitution with utter fairness and impartiality and the operation of State laws, traditions, and customs, without one doing violence to the other. The President of the United States has been flagrantly if not designedly misrepresented in his recommendations on the so-called civil-rights measures to the Congress. He has not recommended one thing relative to segregation in the States, in the public schools, in restaurants, in hotels, in theaters, swimming pools, and the like—and, of course, he has made no recommendation concerning churches, lodges, clubs, and associations of local and personal nature. He has recommended the abolition of the poll tax as a condition precedent to any citizen, white, black, yellow or brown, voting for President, Vice President, Senator, or Congressman, as the United States Congress has the power, and in my opinion the duty to do, if the States will not strike it down themselves. He has recommended Federal jurisdiction to prosecute lynchers of any citizen whatever his color or wherever he may be, if the sheriff or his deputy or the United States marshal or his deputy willfully conspire in the lynching but only in such cases. He has advocated that in respect to commerce crossing State lines, Congress has the right to require that race, religion, color, or national origin should not be the sole basis of either hiring or firing. He has advocated that private companies have no authority to segregate passengers crossing State lines in public conveyances. And he has advocated equality of treatment and opportunity in the armed forces. But, of course, he has not recommended, and of course, Congress has no power to interfere with or to abolish local laws, traditions, customs, and practices, respecting the wise separation of the races in certain local places and institutions in the several States.

Time, education, and wise experience will determine when, whether, or to what extent the local practices requiring certain race separations should be changed. And whatever the decision is in these matters, mind you, it must be made by the people in the several States under the Constitution of the United States.

The State of New York has abolished segregation between different races. All races are assured equal access to any kind of public place. But that was not done by the Federal Government but by Governor Dewey and the Republican Legislature of New York.

What I plead for is that we not be deceived over a misunderstanding or by misrepresentation of this issue and fall into the crushing embraces of the Republican Party, which is the historical, political, and economic enemy of the South.

You know how the South has grown under 16 years of Democratic administration. You know what Franklin D. Roosevelt did for southern industry, agriculture, labor, for the aged, for welfare, for women, for children, for the physically handicapped, for public power—for the whole South. You know how things were in the South—before Roosevelt came in—under the Hoover administration. I don't need to remind you of those sad days—of a South as prostrate almost as when the Lancelot of the Confederacy sheathed his shining sword at Appomattox. I don't need to remind southern businessmen and farmers that when they fought for lower freight rates to northern markets it was Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who led the fight against them. I don't need to remind you how Republican administrations tried to strangle your Tennessee Valley and the TVA. I don't need to tell Alabama farmers of how Republican agriculture legislation in the last Congress cut down parity and the support prices for cotton, corn, and peanuts and tobacco and rice, and that this legislation alone will take hundreds of millions of dollars away from southern farmers. I don't need to remind southern labor that, if the Republicans gain full national power, they will drive the Taft-Hartley dagger all the way into labor's heart. They will strangle social security; turn over the TVA again to the private power companies.

Republican rule meant depression under Hoover. It will mean a worse depression under Dewey. Republicanism will mean pushing the South back down the hill. Following off after either the third or the fourth parties means Dewey and depression—nothing less, nothing more. Don't be deceived by those who cry wolf against Truman but who also just as loudly cried "Wolf, wolf, wolf" against Roosevelt once or twice, or maybet even three times, and strangely, the very men who clamor States' rights and their brand of democracy will not let you vote in Alabama for the President of the United States if you want to vote for the nominee of the Democratic Party.

You know that in those Roosevelt elections many men with a lot of corporation clients and big business support in the South voted against Roosevelt behind the false facade of States' rights. They did not want the Federal Government to give the public cheap public power. They did not want the Federal Government to help southern workers get fair wages. They did not want the Federal Government to protect the little investor or the farmer against northern speculators with whom they were tied in. So they used the sword of States' rights against the shield of the public welfare. The South needs more, not less, of what it has been getting of Federal aid. Our South demands a government that will fight against monopoly, not a government which will make it more dominant. Let us beware, my fellow southerners, of false prophets and false leaders. Remember the words of the Scriptures, "Where your interest is, there is your heart also." And when you hear these voices clamor against the old Democratic faith and party ask, "Where are their interests?" Then you will know why their hearts and their utterances are where they are.

Remember, "He whose bread I eat, his servant am I." When you hear these voices raised against the old Democratic principles ask whose bread they eat. Then you will know whose servants they are.

Hence I do speak to you of and for the South which I love. I call not only upon all southerners who have voted in the ranks of democracy but all liberals as well—even the erring ones—to come back into the party which is the home of the liberal—the party of Jefferson, and Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, and yes, President Harry Truman, who follows in their footsteps with a courage which they would have commended.

Yes; I have been a Democrat, I am a Democrat, and I shall be a Democrat. Toward my party I would proudly express the sentiment of him who said:

"Woodman, spare that tree. Touch not a single bough; for in my youth it sheltered me, and I will protect it now."

My fellow southerners, for a century and a half the Democratic Party has sheltered you. I know the quality of your loyalty and that you will protect it now.

Dr. Peter Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Dr. Peter Marshall, the late Senate Chaplain, being taken desperately ill on January 20, prepared a prayer to be delivered at the session of January 24. To our sorrow, he passed away on the 25th and at the funeral services on the 27th many of his associates in the ministry in Washington, among whom he was much beloved, as well as old school friends and ministers from the South, spoke feelingly of his great spirituality and fine life.

Senators will recall that the prayers delivered by Dr. Marshall in the Senate

during the Eightieth Congress were printed in a small volume for distribution, and the demand has been so great that the supply is practically exhausted. The prayers he delivered in the Eighty-first Congress of course were not included, and I ask unanimous consent that these prayers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, following the addresses at the funeral services to which I have just referred. The compilation has been made by Mr. John D. Rhodes, Official Reporter of the Senate.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make three pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $213.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SERVICES AT THE FUNERAL OF DR. PETER MARSHALL, D. D., MINISTER, NEW YORK AVENUE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, WASHINGTON, D. C., AND CHAPLAIN OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

The service was presided over by Rev. Robert T. Bridge, assistant minister, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church.

The congregation rose at the sound of the chimes at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. BRIDGE. "I am the Resurrection and the Life, saith the Lord. He that believeth on Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

"Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee: because he trusteth in Thee."

Let us pray:

O God, our Father, from whom we come and to whom we return, and in whom while we tarry here we live and move and have our being, we praise Thee for Thy good gift of life, for its wonder and mystery, its interests and joys, its friendships and fellowships. We thank Thee for the ties that bind us one to another. We bless Thee for Thy loving and patient dealings with us, whereby Thou dost ever teach us Thy truth and Thy way by the varied experiences through which we pass. We thank Thee for the meanings that lie hidden even in the very heart of sorrow, pain, disappointment, loss, and grief. And we bless Thee for Thy guiding hand along the way of our pilgrimage. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, Amen.

This is to be a funeral service that will be, in many respects, different from the usual form of service. To begin with, we will join together in singing. I will ask the entire congregation please to unite in the singing of hymn No. 213, and as the strains of music presently die away, let us keep in our minds as the service continues, the thought of this hymn, which is a prayer.

The congregation joined in singing the following hymn:

"Breathe on me, Breath of God,
Fill me with life anew,
That I may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do.

"Breathe on me, Breath of God,
Until my heart is pure,
Until with Thee I will one will,
To do and to endure.

"Breathe on me, Breath of God,
Till I am wholly Thine,
Until this earthly part of me
Glows with Thy fire divine.

"Breath on me, Breath of God,
So shall I never die,
But live with Thee the perfect life
Of Thine eternity. Amen."

Mr. BRIDGE. As I suggested just now, this is a funeral service which is to be different from the usual funeral service. For example, there is no group of mourners here at the front of the church. Mrs. Marshall, with her family, is seated in the minister's pew where she worships Sunday by Sunday.

Underlying all that we say or do, there is, of course, a very deep emotion, but this is not the time nor the place to express that emotion or to give way to it. While we should not suppress our emotions, we should now just lay them aside for a while, for unless we do so, the very purpose for which we are gathered will be frustrated. If our eyes are moist, why, let them be shining, too. We are gathered in a service of rejoicing. Let me in a few words, and in very simple words, try to express what we are trying to do this morning. We are endeavoring to establish a new relationship. We have known Peter Marshall in the flesh. From now on, we are to endeavor to know him in the spirit, and to know him in the spirit just as really as we have known him in the flesh.

That which we do has two parts. We have before us the body which was given to him by God as the earthly tabernacle for his spirit. And that body we will lay aside with loving and reverent care. The other thing that we do is to enter into fellowship with him. Peter Marshall is still and will continue to be one of the ministers of this church, though no longer visible to us. The fellowship we have had with him will remain unbroken, and may God give us vision, grace, and strength to join hands with him. We will tarry here on earth until the Lord calls us, but he is set free in the presence of his Lord, and we are one together.

So that you may know to some degree the ministers who are taking part in this service, may I name them briefly. They are seated in the order in which their names will be given. On my extreme right is Clarence W. Cranford, minister of the Calvary Baptist Church, of this city, a very dear friend of Dr. Marshall's. Dr. Cranford will have to leave us in a few minutes. As Dr. Marshall lay ill Tuesday morning, realizing that he could not expect to be at the Senate today, he suggested that Dr. Cranford might take his place. And Dr. Cranford will carry with him the prayer which Dr. Marshall had already prepared for the Senate today.

Seated next to Dr. Cranford is James D. Bryden, our own director of Christian education. The others are Harry H. Bryan, from Bessemer, Ala., a very dear friend of Dr. Marshall's from college days, seminary days, and onward. John S. Land, who is the minister of the St. Charles Avenue Presbyterian Church in New Orleans, in whose church Dr. Marshall had conducted services every spring for many years, and who became a very dear friend. Ralph K. Merker, representing the Presbytery of Washington City, a fellow Presbyter, highly regarded and loved. John W. Rustin, minister of Mount Vernon Place Methodist Chruch, another very dear friend and intimate of our departed leader. Edward H. Pruden, minister of the First Baptist Church of this city, also a close intimate of Dr. Marshall. One other name should be mentioned, that of Rev. John A. Wood, the father of Mrs. Marshall, who is seated with his daughter. We have with us also a special commission from the Washington City Presbytery appointed to attend this service: Mr. James Sherier, the moderator; Dr. Earl F. Fowler, Dr. J. Hillman Holister, Dr. John B. Kelley, Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, Dr. R. Paul Schearrer, Rev. Walter F. Wolf, and Mr. Wilbur LaRoe, Jr.

Mr. MERKER. I read from the Old Testiment:

"Behold, a King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment.

"And a man shall be as a hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

"And the eyes of them that see shall not be dim, and the ears of them that hear shall hearken.

* * * * *

"The deer is panting for the stream, and, O God, I pant for thee. I am athirst for God, the living God; when shall I reach God's presence? Day and night I have lived on my tears, taunted all day with, 'Where is your God?'

"Why are thou downcast, O my soul? Why so despairing? Wait, wait for God; I shall again be praising him, my saving help, my God.

* * * * *

"Many a trial sore hast Thou made us suffer, but Thou wilt revive us once more and raise us from the depths; Thou wilt add to our honour, and comfort us once more.

* * * * *

"Though I must pass through the thick of trouble, Thou wilt preserve me; Thy hand shall fall upon my angry foes, Thy right hand rescues me. The Eternal intervenes on my behalf: Eternal One, Thy kindness never fails, Thou wilt not drop the work Thou hast begun.

* * * * *

"All the days of my life were foreseen by Thee, set down within Thy book; ere ever they took shape, they were assigned me, ere ever one of them was mine. O God, what mysteries I find in Thee! How vast the number of Thy purposes!

* * * * *

"As a father pities his children, so the Eternal pities His worshipers; He knows what we are made of, He remembers we are dust.

* * * * *

"The Eternal is gracious and pitiful, slow to be angry, very kind; the Eternal is good to all who look to Him, and his compassion covers all that He has made."

May these words of Holy Scriptures abide in all our hearts.

Mr. BRIDGE. Dr. Cranford will at this time lead us in prayer.

Dr. CLARENCE W. CRANFORD. Let us pray together:

Our heavenly Father, we do not find it easy to put our thoughts into words, or even to speak at a time like this. We do not pretend to know why one who seems to have been needed so much here should have been taken so soon. Our temptation is to rebel and to ask of Thee why. But then we remember Thy love and Thy goodness, as they were revealed to us in Jesus Christ Thy Son. We remember Thy compassion as it was revealed in His tears at the grave of Lazarus. We remember Thy power over death as it was revealed in His glorious resurrection. And we hear again His words, "I go to prepare a place for you." We know that in Thy providence even this shall work to Thy glory and to the furtherance of Thy kingdom.

We thank Thee for what Peter Marshall taught us. In his face, we saw something of the look of Jesus. In his passion for the kingdom, we felt something of the passion of the Saviour. In his manliness and yet in his gentleness, we felt something of the Master's touch. We know he is in heaven, because heaven was in him as he lived amongst us. Grant, our Father, that we may live nobler lives and dedicate ourselves anew to Thee and to our fellowmen, because we have known and loved Peter Marshall and because we know and love Peter's Christ, in whose name we pray. Amen.

The Choir sang:

"O rest in the Lord, Wait patiently for Him,
And He shall give Thee Thy heart's desire.
O rest in the Lord, Wait patiently for Him
Commit thy way unto Him and trust in Him
And fret not Thyself because of evildoers,
O rest in the Lord, Wait patiently for Him."

Dr. EDWARD H. PRUDEN. In the New Testament we find this Scripture:

"Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

"In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

"And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also * * *

"I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.

"Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me: because I live, ye shall live also * * *

"Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.

"Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved Me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for My Father is greater than I."

Dr. JOHN W. RUSTIN. Hear these words from the New Testament:

"For the sons of God are those who are guided by the Spirit of God. You have received no slavish spirit that would make you relapse into fear; you have received the Spirit of sonship. And when we cry, Abba! Father! it is this Spirit testifying along with our own spirit that we are children of God; and if children, heirs as well, heirs of God, heirs along with Christ—for we share his sufferings in order to share his glory.

"Present suffering, I hold, is a mere nothing compared to the glory that we are to have revealed. Even the creation waits with eager longing for the sons of God to be revealed. For creation was not rendered futile by its own choice, but by the will of Him who thus made it subject, the hope being that creation as well as man would one day be freed from its thraldom to decay and gain the glorious freedom of God's children. To this day, we know, the entire creation sighs and throbs with pain; and not only so, but even we ourselves, who have the Spirit as a foretaste of the future, even we sigh deeply to ourselves as we wait for the redemption of the body that means our full sonship. We were saved with this hope ahead. Now when an object of hope is seen, there is no further need to hope. Who ever hopes for what he sees already? But if we hope for something that we do not see, we wait for it patiently.

"So too the Spirit assists us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray aright, but the Spirit pleads for us with sighs that are beyond words, and He who searches the human heart knows what is in the mind of the Spirit, since the Spirit pleads before God for the saints.

"We know also that those who love God, those who have been called in terms of his purpose, have his aid and interest in everything. For he decreed of old that those whom we predestined should share the likeness of his Son—that he might be the first born of a great brotherhood. Then he calls those whom he has thus decreed; then he justifies those whom he has called; then he glorifies those whom he has justified.

"Now what follows from all this? 'If God is for us, who can be against us?' The God who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, surely He will give us everything besides! Who is to accuse the elect of God?"

The Choir sang:

"God is ever beside me, When I greet the sun.
God is ever beside me, Tho' my task be done.
Wand'ring down the road of life, Tho' I sometimes stray,
God is ever beside me, showing the way.

"Give me the courage to carry on!
Give me the strength I need!
Let not my footsteps falter or lag,
May I be kind in word and deed.
"In my heart I hear His Voice,
'Share thy bread with others.'
In my heart I hear His Voice,
'Call all men brothers.'

"God is ever beside me, His hand doth me sustain,
Ever brighter seems the road Thru His Glory and Love Divine,
For God is ever beside me
Peace now is mine."

REV. HARRY H. BRYAN. On the day after Peter Marshall made his surrender to God, and decided that at all costs he would obey the strong Voice he had known for a long time, and prepare himself for the gospel ministry, he traveled in my father's car to begin his first year in the theological seminary. I was driving the car, going for my last year in the seminary. My father was to make the opening lecture. Peter was fresh in his conviction of absolute surrender to what God wanted him to do, no matter what the cost. He was going with faith that God had prepared a way for the first steps to be taken. Bubbling over with that confidence, he made a worthy counterpart to my father's steady faith of many years serving God. And that half-day ride 20 years ago started a deep and abiding friendship which I can treasure throughout all eternity. We studied and played and sang and preached together. God used my friend, and gave to him a joy in studying that proved that he outstudied us all; a joy in singing because he outsang us, for he sang from his heart; and a joy in playing, because he abandoned everything when he could play. The truth is he outprayed and outpreached us all. Why? Because he had sought and found delight in the doing of God's will. He believed that righteousness should be preached. And he knew God honored his unrestrained lips. God held not back His tender mercies from him.

The state of his life, as of this day, is far different from the state of his life when he first surrendered. But that is always the case when in the center of God's will we find ourselves so close to Him, so close to the Christ whom we know that we can never be far away. God's loving kindness did preserve him for life and service. I have believed so surely that your friend and mine has had the hand of God upon him that I could never think that that hand was withdrawn now, as we realize that his service is no longer here. All that he learned and then taught us about God by his vital, fresh approach to all of the questions of life is not a dream. He has inspired us too deeply and pushed us to new frontiers of sacrifice and courageous living. We can never call it something uncertain. Too much has come out of us in faithless sin and unbelief. Too much has gone into us in victory over sin and steadfast assurance for us ever to be the same. It is that our friend, this prince of God, has received a new and wider sphere of life and service. He is free for such activity as will delight his soul.

It would be untrue for anyone to question God at this hour, to question the fitness of a will that taught Peter through those days to follow it when he knew not what the day might bring forth—a Sunday-school class here, a sermon there, a friend yonder. It would be untrue to all of the witness in song that he gave with his seminary mates, as in the buoyancy of Christian testimony he told to great audiences the things that led him into the doing of God's will. It would be untrue to all of those who prayed for him and with him, from his youth upward, that they, too, might know the will of God. It would be untrue to the very church he served, for that church or any of the other places who have known him as a minister to say that what he said was not for us. For it was, and it will ever be for those who know that God's will must be triumphant in all of life, because God used the things that Peter Marshall committed unto Him against that day.

How grateful we can be, whether we be family, whether we be of the friendly circle of this group or that, how grateful we can be that the triumph of our faith and life in our God can be so strong that we cannot doubt God's tender mercy who through life has been his guide and our guide. May it constantly be in the hearts of those who leave here that this is not a time for questioning. Rather let us resolve that Peter's God be our God, even unto death.

Dr. JOHN S. LAND. As I sat in the train on the way to Washington, one verse of Scripture has been in my heart as being an expression of our friend's faith and life, and one upon which I should like to begin my remarks: "This is the victory which overcomes the world, even our faith." During these years when I have lived close to the one you loved, I have been impressed, and his friends in my part of the country have been impressed, that his faith was a radiant faith. Yea, I should say it was a robust faith.

Peter Marshall was sincerely the follower of the gleam. And I believe he is calling us to follow that same gleam. He was a man who, while sailing under sealed orders, knew the Captain and the Pilot, and was glad to entrust to His nail-pierced and loving hands the guidance of his life. So he has crowded into what might be called a brief ministry a richness, a fullness, a power, and a blessing of God which can thrill us and glorify his God and ours.

What I should like to say to myself again and to you is that in this world, being finite, being human, we can never answer and should never answer all life's questions. There are what Peter called the reticences of God. Within this hour of our inevitable wonderment, and yet not questioning or rebellion, we shall realize that he knew that the God who called him from his native land, prepared the way, brought him to this good land, so marvelously raised up friends to him, and led him forward, that God, who gave him all these evidences of grace and guidance, has not deserted him.

So we come, dear Christian friends, to the place where it is faith and not sight, absolute, unconditional surrender to the Christ of the Cross, who at 33, we believe, held out His hands in infinite love to embrace the world. That Saviour Peter loved. That Saviour Peter followed, and that Saviour he has gloriously proclaimed. The challenge of this hour—because this is a challenge—is that we consecrate ourselves and dedicate ourselves to the Saviour he followed and loved and served. He who was so courageous, outspoken, undiscouraged, he who used his marvelous gifts, his wizardry of words, his passion of deep conviction, calls us now to take the torch of truth from his hands and the word of life from his lips, in our own way, and multiply him by the grace of God through our faith and our service, shall I say hundreds of thousands, yea, millions of times and places, in this Nation and in our world. I say it reverently and humbly, but sincerely, perhaps no man has been known in these recent years for his insight and his courage and his ability to bring God to us and us to God, by his prayers in the Senate, by his ministry over the air, by his visiting all parts of our country, as this man of God. So let us today form a covenant, and let us enter into a new compact with him and with his God, that we shall carry on and prove by our faith that we, too, have the victory, and that we, too, are following in the train.

I cherish the privilege now of concluding these simple remarks, to challenge you and comfort you into a new dedication, with two extracts from his little book which many of you have, Behind the Curtain. As I read it coming up here, I felt a new meaning, a new power, and a new nearness to things spiritual:

"I stated some of my own personal convictions as to what we shall do when the clock strikes and we depart from this life. I find comfort in the belief that in the glorious life beyond we shall have the joy and the thrill"—such characteristic words of his—"of fulfilling deferred ambitions, and to the glory of God, doing the things that we had the urge to do and were never able to accomplish here. The gifts that God gave to us for cultivation here will surely be used there. Man's chief end, as the Shorter Catechism states, 'is to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever.' That will be our chief occupation there—praising and serving and glorifying God. Hence, the need for us to learn how to worship and to become familiar with the things of the Spirit."

And these final words:

"That proof is private, personal, intimate, spiritual, beyond the compass of speech, too sacred, too vast, too fragile to be poured into the cold, unsympathetic molds of human language. It is an intuitive thing that causes us to burst forth in the rapture of faith"—remember those words—"and say, 'I know that my Redeemer liveth.' And even as we say it, we thrill to hear His whisper to us, to our poor, bruised, and broken hearts, 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' "

"I know not how that Bethlehem's Babe
Could in the God-head be
I only know the Manger Child
Has brought God's life to me.

"I know not how that Calvary's Cross
A world from sin could free
I only know its matchless love
Has brought God's love to me.

"I know not how that Joseph's tomb
Could solve death's mystery
I only know a living Christ
Of immortality."

Now reverently and for a moment in silence, let us pray:

O God, we adore Thee as our Creator who hast made us in Thine own image, and breathed into our bodies the spirit of life. We adore Thee as our Redeemer, the "God who so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." We adore Thee, O God, as our Preserver, as the One whose fatherly love and heavenly wisdom we can trust all of life's way. May we know as never before that Thou art eternal, unchangeable in Thy being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, truth, and love. May we come like little children today, and say in our Gethsemane with our Master, in dynamic dedication to the Father's eternal will, "Father, not our wills, but Thy will be done."

In this commitment of ourselves to Thee may the angels of God come to us, as to him, and give us spiritual strength and victory. May we gather, O God, in deep devotion and high hopes, at the foot of the cross, and learn again the ultimate meaning of life and the final victory of grace. May we know that Christ suffered with us and for us; that He has borne our sins and carried our sorrows; that He has taken away, yea, abolished death. And now standing by the open tomb, may we hear his words of encouragement and victory: "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Our Father, we thank Thee for the faith and the consecration of those nearest and dearest to Thy servant. Grant them continued grace to dedicate their sorrow to Thee, and may Thy work of comfort and blessing be poured out richly in them and upon them. May all those, O Lord, who knew and loved Thy servant be challenged and inspired as never before to live life richly and deeply, to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith each is called. Take charge of us now and for all the days ahead, enabling us like him so to live, so to trust, so to serve that when our summons comes to join the innumerable caravan we may receive from God, our Father, our King, and our Judge, this welcome, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Amen.

The choir sang:

"The Lord's my Shepherd, I'll not want;
He makes me down to lie
In pastures green; He leadeth me
The quiet waters by.

"My soul He doth restore again;
And me to walk doth make
Within the paths of righteousness,
E'en for His own name's sake.

"Yea, though I walk in death's dark vale,
Yet will I fear no ill;
For Thou art with me; and Thy rod
And staff me comfort still.

"My table Thou hast furnished
In presence of my foes;
My head Thou dost with oil anoint,
And my cup overflows.

"Goodness and mercy all my life
Shall surely follow me;
And in God's house forevermore
My dwelling place shall be. Amen."

Mr. JAMES D. BRYDEN. The congregation will please rise and remain standing.

May the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.

The choir sang:

"How lovely is Thy dwelling place,
O Lord of Hosts, Thy dwelling place,
O Lord of Hosts.
For my soul, it longeth, yea, fainteth,
For the courts of the Lord;
My soul and body crieth out, yea, for the Living God.

"Blest are they that dwell within Thy house;
They praise Thy name evermore, they praise Thee.
How lovely is Thy dwelling place."

PRAYERS BY THE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE, REV. PETER MARSHALL, D. D., DURING THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Monday, January 3, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, look with favor upon the Members of the Senate, and bless each one of them according to his needs. May they be aware of a mandate higher than that of the ballot box, a mandate from Thee, to legislate wisely and well. We believe that Thou wilt accept these men as representatives of the people, and art willing to work in them and through them that they may become instruments of Thy will. Grant that they be willing to have it so, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who taught us to pray together:

"Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever."

Amen.

Wednesday, January 5, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, give us the long view of our work and our world.

Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

Guide us how to work and then teach us how to wait. O Lord, we pray in the name of Jesus, who was never in a hurry. Amen.

Thursday, January 6, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this prayer, O God, we come to Thee as children to a loving father. We pray that Thou wilt help our Senators to face the problems that confront them, not alone by giving them wisdom greater than their own, but also by relieving their minds of all other anxieties. May they now turn over to Thee loved ones who need the healing touch of the Great Physician, with every confidence that Thou wilt hear our prayers of intercession, and as we do the work that is before us, Thou wilt do Thy work of healing in those whom we love. May Thy help be so plain and practical in our family affairs that we shall come to believe strongly in the help Thou dost offer in our national affairs.

Deliver Thy servants from personal worries, that they may be able to give themselves wholly to the challenges of this hour. In Jesus' name we ask it. Amen.

Monday, January 10, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, since we cannot always do what we like, grant that we may like what we must do, knowing that truth will one day be vindicated and right in the end must prevail.

Bless Thy servants this day and keep them all in Thy peace. Amen.

Thursday, January 13, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Stop us, O God, for a minute of prayer.

Stop our anxious minds from wandering, and our hearts from desiring anything but to know Thy will.

Let us stand at attention before Thee and hear what Thou hast to say to us.

We believe that Thou canst tell us not only what to do, but also how to do it.

If it needs making up our minds, Thou who didst make our minds canst show us how to make them up.

If it needs changing our minds, Thou canst work that miracle, too.

Speak, O Lord, and make us hear, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

Monday, January 17, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God, to treat every human heart as if it were breaking, and to consider the feeling of others as we do our own.

Help us to be gentle, and to control our tempers that we may learn to love one another.

Give us the grace so to live this day, in the name of Jesus, who loves us all. Amen.

Tuesday, January 18, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, once again we offer unto Thee our grateful thanks for Thy mercy that cared for us during the night and brought us safely to this hour.

Today is the tomorrow we worried about yesterday, and we see how foolish our anxiety was.

Teach us to trust Thee more completely and to seek Thy help in all that we have to do, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

Thursday, January 20, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in whom we trust, and by whose guidance and grace this Nation was born, bless the Senators of these United

States at this important time in history and give them all things needful to the faithful discharge of their responsibilities.

We pray especially today for our President, and also for him who will preside over this Chamber.

Give to them good health for the physical strains of their office, good judgment for the decisions they must make, wisdom beyond their own, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.

We thank Thee for their humble reliance upon Thee. May they go often to the throne of grace, as we commend them both to Thy loving care and Thy guiding hand. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

Monday, January 24, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Today, O Lord, as the Members of the Senate pause in this moment of prayer, we unite our petitions for Thy blessing upon Thy servant who, in his new capacity, presides over this body. We thank Thee for his long years of devoted public service, for the testimony of his life and the inspiration of his example.

May he never feel lonely in this chair, but always be aware of Thy hand upon him and Thy spirit with him.

When differences arise, as they will, may Thy servants be not disturbed at being misunderstood, but rather be disturbed at not understanding.

May Thy will be done here, and may Thy program be carried out, above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Thursday, January 27, 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT. Prayer will be offered by Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, D. C.

Dr. CRANFORD. The prayer I shall offer this morning was written for this session by Dr. Peter Marshall, as one of the last things he did before he died.

PRAYER

Deliver us, our Father, from futile hopes and from clinging to lost causes, that we may move into ever-growing calm and ever-widening horizons.

Where we cannot convince, let us be willing to persuade, for small deeds done are better than great deeds planned.

We know that we cannot do everything. But help us to do something. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Need for Stronger Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Need for Stronger Rent Control," which I made yesterday in behalf of Senate bill 888 before the subcommittee on housing and rents of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR STRONGER RENT CONTROL

There is not a Senator on this committee, whether he favors my bill or some other bill on rent control, or whether he thinks rent control should be allowed to die on March 31 of this year, who has not publicly conceded the existence—the continued existence—of an acute housing shortage in America. When we look at the housing situation, we know we are not dealing with a theory, we are dealing with an alarming actuality.

The housing shortage is not something resulting just from the war. It preceded the war by many years. As long as our level of national income remained low, the housing shortage which we know existed was not necessarily visible before the war because those people who could afford decent places in which to live could find them. But many of our people lived in slums, in chicken coops, even, in some cases with which I am familiar in my own State, in abandoned coke ovens and in caves.

The level of national income and the level of personal income have each risen substantially in the years since the depression. The first desire of those whose incomes began to rise was for a decent place in which to live and to raise their families in what we term the American way.

We can end the housing shortage and thus end the need for rent control today by having a good rip-roaring depression and sending the people back to the coke ovens and the caves and the chicken coops, doubling the number of families living in the slums, foreclosing on the veterans who bought new homes with high mortgages and kicking them out, and letting those who have the money have their pick of accommodations in America. That's one solution.

That is not the solution the United States of America is going to follow. It is a solution which is no longer considered a practical solution in America. We are not going back to those days—ever—if the people of the United States have anything to say about it, and they have a lot to say about it.

Since it isn't a practical solution, let's forget that one.

There's another solution, and it is the one which this administration and those of us who support this administration, and also the majority of the American people regardless of their political affiliation, favor and are seeking to accomplish. That is the launching of a simply gigantic home-building program in this country which will assure adequate shelter for every American at a price he can afford. This committee has already done something about that. This committee has already sent out to the floor of the Senate a great, new housing bill which has bipartisan support and which I am sure will pass. It provides for nearly a million new public housing units over the next 6 years. This committee will soon, I am sure, be reporting out further legislation to take care of the vast segment of the population whose incomes make them ineligible for public housing but unable to afford new housing at present prices and present financing methods.

This administration is going to do everything it possibly can do—and that's a solemn pledge which nearly all of us in our party in the Congress are committed to by conviction—to end this housing shortage in America as rapidly, as efficiently as possible under private enterprise. We are going to get housing legislation through in this Eighty-first Congress.

That legislation is going to help to solve the housing shortage and end the need for rent control.

But where does that leave us now? We don't have enough housing because most Americans can afford to pay a decent rent for a decent home and the homes aren't available. That's why we have rent control in time of peace.

Rent control brings no new housing on the market. That's conceded. Rent control, in the absence of any other machinery for increasing the housing supply, tends to be self-defeating. Let's admit that, too. Much that was said in the Eightieth Congress about the unfairness of rent control, in keeping the landlord under control while many other segments of the economy were given what amounted to a license to charge whatever the traffic will bear, was also true.

It was true because the last Congress refused to take any steps whatsoever to curb inflation in any direction whatsoever, except in regard to rents, and the net result of its efforts there was discriminatory in the extreme because it kept most of the landlords under control, but gave the same license to practice inflationary gouging to certain groups of property owners who were removed from controls and allowed to charge what the traffic will bear.

Furthermore, the last Congress gave us no effective legislation to meet the housing shortage, and so the pressure for housing made it possible for the decontrolled owners to push their rents up and up and up, making even more glaring the spread between controlled rents and uncontrolled rents, the discrimination against the law-abiding landlord kept under controls.

This matter of rent control constitutes one of the tests of the Eighty-first Congress and its sincerity in carrying out campaign pledges.

If we do not pass a good rent-control bill, one which ends the glaring inequities of the two bills passed in 1947 and 1948, one which treats all owners of rental property in housing-short areas the same way by the same rules, and with the same rights, then we will have failed in that test.

My bill, S. 888, is designed to fulfill our pledges for good legislation. It has been described as a tough rent-control bill. In Tulsa, full-page newspaper advertisements denounced it as the slavery bill and distorted and misleading descriptions of it and of its provisions were widely circulated in an attempt to launch a psychological war against any and all rent control.

Before I get into the provisions of S. 888, I want to point out right here and now the group upon which such a bill would be tough:

It would be tough on the black marketers and the gray marketers in vacant rental property by applying to them the same laws which are applied to all the decent, law-abiding landlords.

It would be tough on the gangster landlord who holds up his tenant for side payments and bonuses and other blackmail, using the threat of eviction as ruthlessly and as cruelly and as criminally as a gangster uses a gun.

It would be tough on them only to the extent of making them comply with the law or suffer penalties for violating the law. At present just about the only penalty such a gangster would face is the penalty of having to restore the amount which he stole from his tenant, make restitution, that is. The present act treats the gangster landlord the way any other gangster would be treated if all that was required of him was to pay back the money he had stolen. The present act is an invitation to steal, hoping you won't get caught, but knowing that if you are caught, you lose nothing except what you had stolen.

My bill would be tough on owners who have managed to have their property decontrolled for one reason or another in the sense that it would eliminate their possibilities of making a killing out of their property and restrict them to a reasonable rental and a reasonable profit. Is that so tough?

My bill would be tough on landlords who seek to evict tenants capriciously or vengefully, in either event, enabling them to seek to rerent the property at any rental they can obtain in a housing-scarce market. It would not be tough on the great mass of landlords who do not seek to evict tenants just for the fun of it and who are able and would con-

tinue to be able to repossess their properties for legitimate purposes.

It is the present rent-control law which is a tough law. It is tough on the veteran who finds a vacant house or apartment for rent only to discover that it is decontrolled and that the rent on it is double or treble, in some cases, what a controlled rent would be for the same accommodation.

It is tough on the tenant who has a gangster landlord and finds that he must either pay a side payment or a bonus or suffer loss of services or be kicked around otherwise, with the alternative only of getting out or getting evicted.

It is exceedingly tough on the fair-minded, patriotic, decent landlord, particularly the small landlord, who sees what bonanza rents other property owners are obtaining from their tenants because they are uncontrolled through one technicality or another of the decontrol laws passed by the Eightieth Congress. The controlled landlord, particularly the small landlord, has a right to feel that he was discriminated against when so many other property owners were decontrolled and he was kept under control. He has a right to feel resentful, he has a right to feel that he, alone, has been required to bear the burden of combating inflation, as that burden was distributed—or, let us say, concentrated—by the present Rent Control Act.

The last Congress had every intention, I know, of ending rent control; first in June of 1947 and then again in February of 1948. In 1947 the Congress was proceeding ruthlessly to kill off every possible Government control over inflation which it could. But when it came to rents, the majority party, after doing a lot of threatening, finally had to agree with us to continue rent control and did so for 8 months. It did it grudgingly, and it was stated definitely on the floor of the Senate when the matter was up by the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee, in response to a question from me, that the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 extending rent control for only 8 months would be the last rent-control extension. This prophecy, of course, turned out to be most optimistic.

Although it did a lot of damage in that bill to effective rent control, the Congress in 1947 didn't have the nerve, didn't have the guts, to kill rent control. It recognized, however reluctantly, that the end of rent control at that time would cause turmoil and chaos and would unloose such hardship and suffering on the American people at a time of rising living costs as to be catastrophic.

Again last February many Members of the then congressional leadership were again threatening an end to rent control, citing the hardship of the small landlord (for whom they did nothing and cared less). In February of 1948 there was a sudden momentary drop in the commodity markets. The then chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee announced that this drop in the commodity markets heralded a depression which, he indicated, was probably under way, and thus, he said, rent control would no longer be necessary in 30 days or so. Of course, that was superoptimistic, for the Congress discovered again in 1948, particularly with an election coming up, that an end to rent control was wishful thinking of the most fantastic variety. So controls were extended over most landlords.

I recount this history because I think it urgent that we recognize that the last Congress, with all of its crocodile tears for the small landlords, with all of its loud protestations against any kind of anti-inflation controls, any kind of Government interference or regimentation, found it impossible to end rent control or to authorize any blanket increase in rents or to provide for any slick formula for fair return, or to decontrol each month 5 percent of all the housing under control, or to decontrol areas where there was a vacancy ratio of houses for sale as well as those for rent of 1 percent or any percent. All of these proposals were put forward at one time or another by Members of the leadership in the last Congress handling rent-control legislation or taking a hand in it.

Now, the Eightieth Congress, as I say, refused to do these things.

What in the world makes anyone think that the Eighty-first Congress, elected to serve the interests of all the people, elected to halt this still continuing inflation in housing in America, elected to bring sanity back to the American economy, elected to look out for the little fellow, what in the world, I repeat, makes anyone think that such a Congress should proceed to wreck rent control?

Doesn't the real-estate lobby know what hit them on November 2, 1948? Doesn't the real-estate lobby recognize that rent control was one of the big issues of this campaign, and so was housing? Doesn't the real-estate lobby know that they have so damaged their prestige in the public eye in America by their selfish, vicious attacks on decent housing legislation and recent rent-control legislation that their opposition to any measure at this point is considered prima facie evidence among the great mass of the American people that it is a good measure?

The real-estate lobby started even during the war to try to murder rent control and since then it has bent relentlessly on that same determination. Not once in all that time has the real-estate lobby come forward with any reasonable proposal for improving the administration of rent control, for making for better enforcement so that those who have evaded the act can be punished as a further protection for those who have conformed to it.

And why hasn't the real estate lobby come forward with any such proposals? The answer to that is simple. The real estate lobby wants to kill the patient and make a corpse out of him. They have no desire to see rent control work fairly. Their support for certain proposals made here in the last Congress in connection with rent was based on a desire to make it so unfair and so unworkable and so discriminatory as to hasten the day when people might rise up in disgust and say this thing is worse than no rent control act.

I sometimes believe that in its tactics on rent control, the real estate lobby has adopted the techniques of the Communist Party. Cause confusion, cause turmoil, throw gimmicks in the works, sabotage every worth-while proposal, and let's have dog eat dog. The Communist Party works that way. Every worth-while thing that the Communist Party supposedly stands for it has inevitably tried to undermine and sabotage in order to show that free, democratic, representative government can't work and can't serve the people. The people, then, are supposed to turn to communism in despair. The real estate lobby has used that tactic and that technique in trying to prove that rent control can't work and won't work in the hopes that we will then turn to them for a solution of this grievous housing shortage.

The real estate lobby solution for the shortage is a form of rationing. They would abandon all rent controls and force people who are now taking up too much of the rental housing space available to give up this excess space or to move into smaller accommodations or to double up with other families. Testimony will no doubt be given here by real estate representatives that there is more housing space available today per person than there was before the war. I have seen such statements before. The real estate lobby says, just redistribute the space, and all our worries are over.

This is a very interesting suggestion. How is it suggested that we carry it out? Is the Government to ration space? Oh, no.

The space would be rationed by price. Just raise the rents on the families which are taking up too much space and force them out and make that space available for others.

I think it's pretty generally recognized that families in the higher income levels are usually smaller than families in the lower income levels. It is also generally recognized that many landlords prefer to rent to families without children or without small children.

So what we would have here under this proposal for rationing living space by price, by ability to pay, is that the medium or low-income families would be priced back into the slums or from the slums into the chicken coops and the higher income families would be able to spread out at will—to the extent that their incomes would permit it.

I certainly will join in no attempt to destroy the standard of living of the American people at a time of acute shortage in housing by forcing people into the slums, forcing families already doubled up to double up some more. Census Bureau figures show that from April of 1940 to April of 1948, despite an increase in our housing supply, there are now 35 percent more doubled up married couples than there were 8 years ago.

I think we can all assume that very few of these families are living doubled up out of choice. Families like privacy. They like their own home for their very own. Few people will practice thrift in preference to privacy. Privacy is primary in family life. So we can assume that most of the doubled up couples are living that way out of sheer economic necessity as related to the housing shortage.

There are new apartment houses going up all around us and new homes. At present building prices and at the present prevailing theories of fair return, the new homes and the new apartments are beyond the reach of most of our people. Until we can bring down building costs we should have control over the prices charged for rental accommodations in shortage areas.

I have talked here about the discriminations against the small landlord, particularly through letting so many other property owners out from under control while keeping him under control. I have told how the last Congress expressed all kinds of sympathy for the small landlord, but ended up admitting abjectly that most landlords would have to be held under continued control. I am getting a great deal of mail from small landlords and I know other Senators are, too. The small landlord has been enlisted by the real estate lobby in a crusade against rent control. From the mail I get and from the attempts I have made to answer it, and from the responses I get to those replies, I have come to the conclusion that there is absolutely no way that we can satisfy the complaints of the small landlord against rent control except by ending rent control as of this month.

I have written to many of these small landlords explaining to them their rights under the present law for obtaining rent increases for a variety of causes and cost factors and hardship factors. I have told them how to go about applying for these increases if they are entitled to them. I have encouraged them to file for rent increases in those cases where the facts as they report them to me would indicate they are entitled to them.

In instance after instance the small landlord who had written me originally protesting against the unfairness of rent control and to whom I had sent a reply outlining his rights, sent me a further letter saying in effect that the increase wasn't worth bothering with and that all he wanted was an end

to rent control, get him out from under, get him free, give him back his traditional rights to manage his property as he sees fit. He further pointed out in case after case that even if he got every rent increase he might be entitled to, he still wouldn't be making as much as he could under a free economy, he wouldn't be making as much as his neighbor who was decontrolled, he wouldn't be making as much as other landlords who were evading rent control and violating it and getting away with it.

The small landlord has about as great a stake as anyone could have in a sane American economy where there is full employment and full opportunity for our citizens to raise their standards of living. The small landlord wants his tenant to be able to pay his rent. The small landlord knows that during the depression he had to carry his tenants for months and perhaps years because the tenant could not afford the rent. We do the small landlord no favor by telling him to join now in the impoverishment of the American people by great increases in rent when we know that just that sort of inflation could speed us into a depression. We are just now beginning to get some stabilization in some items, a decline in some others such as food, and, although inflationary pressures are still present in the economy, I think we can work out of it without the sort of collapse which used to follow a boom. However, a sudden spurt in the price of so basic a commodity as housing, which takes up such a large part of the average family budget, would be disastrous and would certainly lead to unstoppable pressures for fourth and fifth round wage increases.

The gains of the landlord under those circumstances would be transitory indeed; the damage to his future level of living could be extremely severe. The damage to America could be almost fatal to our hopes of achieving a decent world.

In connection with the economic status of property owners under rent control, and particularly the small property holder, there are two diamterically opposed schools of thought as to what has actually happened to them. Most of the property owners, of course, tell us that they have been squeezed against the wall by rent control. Representatives of tenant interests assert that many property owners are better off today than they were before or during the war, as far as net return is concerned.

The Housing Expediter has reported figures showing that, on an average, net incomes of property owners have risen. Unfortunately, however, the figures are based largely on investigations made up to 1946.

When you come down to it, the facts appear to be that no one really knows the facts. The Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics do some sampling in this field, the Housing Expediter does a little and the property owners do their own sampling, and the net result is a lot of figures which are not conclusive.

That brings me to a proposal which I would like to make to this committee. I suggest that instead of waiting a year or 2 years or 15 months of 8 months or whatever the case may be from one extension of the rent control law to the next to try to find out in a few brief hearings what has been happening under rent control during the preceding period, and receiving mostly conflicting testimony from a limited number of spokesmen for each of the several points of view concerned in this legislation, that this committee, perhaps in conjunction with the House committee, set up a staff for a continuing investigation into all phases of this complex problem, a staff qualified to advise the committee on what is actually happening in rent control, a staff supplied with investigators who can go into the various trouble spots and make an independent survey of the situation, and arm this committee with all of the facts as they exist.

This staff study should not necessarily be designed merely to criticize and find fault with the administration of the act, which is what many special investigating groups of the Congress consider their main function to be, but rather to provide this committee of the Senate with such factual information as it needs throughout the year to know whether the rent-control laws we enact are adequate to inadequate, too severe or too lax, effective or ineffective; to know whether they require strengthening and in what particulars.

My bill, S. 888, provides, incidentally, for the creation of a 15-man advisory committee, representing tenants, landlords, and the public, to work with the Housing Expediter or Rent Administrator and advise him on administration and on policy and enforcement. I highly recommend the creation of such a group for somewhat similar reasons to those I have already cited for the creation of a Senate staff group on this problem.

These two groups, in their activities, could, I believe, suffice to answer any of the criticisms leveled against the proposal in my bill to extend rent control for 27 months instead of the customary 1 year, or in the case of the bill reported out of the House Banking and Currency Committee the other day, 15 months. The recommendation for a comparatively short extension is based on a desire to give Congress an opportunity for another look at rent control in the near future in case there should be bad features in the bill we enact or in case it should be determined that rent control might not be necessary 15 months from now.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that although my bill extends rent control for 27 months, it provides that it can be ended at any time prior to that by action of the Congress or by action of the President, each independent of the other.

Obviously, the right of the Congress to modify the law at any time in that 27-month period is also present. This custom of extending the law for 1 year has given rise to a condition under which defects in the law which may become immediately apparent are seldom corrected until the deadline has arrived for the enactment of a new act to take the place of the one which is expiring. By extending the law for 27 months, we remove automatically any reason the Congress may have to procrastinate in meeting a specific problem on rent control. The so-called cooperatives racket in the District of Columbia would probably have been met head-on some time before this if the Congress had not felt that there would be plenty of time to take care of this matter when the bill came up extending rent control beyond this March 31.

To recapitulate briefly, I think this committee in tackling the problem of rent control, must bear in mind these things:

1. Inflationary tendencies are still strong in the economy.

2. An end to rent control at this time would be disastrous to our hopes of bringing sanity back to the economy before we are thrown into recession or depression by an evaporation of purchasing power among the mass of our people.

3. Rent control cannot and must not be regarded, as it was in the Eightieth Congress, as the only practical means of keeping a brake on inflation. Rent control must be regarded as one part of an over-all anti-inflation program which this Congress must enact, if, that is, this Congress is going to keep faith with the American people.

4. The present Rent Control Act is unfair and discriminatory to those landlords who are kept under control and must be broadened once again to include all types of scarce rental housing accommodations on which there is severe inflationary pressure.

5. In addition to being unfair and discriminatory, the present Rent Control Act defies proper enforcement in that it lacks any effective penalties to combat violations.

6. These violations are of such scope and volume as to have made a mockery of rent control, as to have caused widespread distress and hardship to tenants, and as to have further discriminated against those property owners who are law-abiding citizens and comply with the act even while they recognize that other landlords are violating it with impunity.

PROVISIONS OF S. 888

Now I want to discuss specifically my bill, S. 888, and why I think that bill, rather than some other rent-control bill, should be approved by this committee and enacted by the Congress.

First, and of great importance to all who have to deal with this legislation, it sets forth for the first time since 1947 all of the provisions of law dealing with rent control in one bill. It does not, as other bills before you would do, amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, which in turn, had amended the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The original bill I introduced in this session on rent control, S. 434, would have been as an amendment to those previous acts.

S. 888 is virtually identical with S. 434, except that, as I said, it rewrites all of the rent control laws in one bill and, further, it changes the title of the Housing Expediter to Rent Administrator, removing from his jurisdiction the responsibility for enforcing veteran preference on new housing construction and for prosecuting violations of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act. My purpose in making that change was to make the Rent Administrator responsible exclusively for administration of the rent control act and to transfer these other functions which have to do with housing matters to the agencies of the Government now dealing with housing.

Since the committee has reported out a housing bill which does not contain such provisions, I would suggest that the present arrangement be continued, and with the committee's permission, I will submit language later for an amendment to my bill to continue the present arrangement, at least until the Banking and Currency Committee has had a full opportunity to decide what it thinks should be done. Since passage of a rent-control bill now without this provision would leave a vacuum after March 31, this is probably the most practical way of meeting the situation.

Also, as a change from S. 434, which was widely publicized at the time it was introduced, S. 888 permits the Rent Administrator to recontrol permanent quarters in motor courts and trailer courts, including trailer space. The bill does not require him to recontrol these units, but permits him to do so. I made that change because I understand from Congresswoman DOUGLAS, of California, who has cosponsored this bill in the House, that this is a serious problem in her State and in several other States.

Otherwise, S. 888 and S. 434 have identical provisions. The main ones are as follows:

Extension: Rent control would be extended until June 30, 1951, with, as I said, the right of the President and of the Congress to terminate it at any time in the interim.

Recontrol: All types of housing accommodations which were under rent control prior to the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 would be subject to recontrol. The bill provides that the only types of rental housing in defense rental areas which would be free from control by statute would be housing accommodations rented or offered for rent exclusively for transient occupancy (temporary occupancy on a daily or weekly basis) in hotels or any housing accommo-

dations in any motor court, tourist home, or trailer camp (including trailer space) when such accommodation is occupied by a transient guest.

This means that new construction, which was exempted from control beginning with the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, conversions in the same category, permanent rooms in hotels, accommodations not rented for any successive 24-month period since February 1, 1945, and other types of housing decontrolled by the acts of 1947 and 1948, would all be subject to recontrol.

I underscore the word subject to recontrol because there is nothing in this bill to require the Rent Administrator to keep under control any class of housing in any area which he considers in sufficient supply to make its control unnecessary.

There is a vast amount of discretion here for the Administrator. But, as I shall explain later, there is adequate protection in this bill for the tenant and for the landlord who can appeal from any decision of the Administrator and carry his case to the Supreme Court if necessary.

The Congress cannot possibly write a rent-control law which could provide by statute for every type of problem which an administrator must face. Therefore, the broad discretion in this bill in contrast to the attempts in both of the two preceding acts to spell out in detail what course of action he should take in a wide variety of circumstances.

There has been a great deal of misapprehension and misinformation about the effects of recontrolling new construction or of placing it subject to recontrol. Spokesmen for the real-estate industry and for the home-builders have cried out in horror that placing new rental construction in the status of being subject to rent control would strangle the rental-construction program.

I am afraid I will have to say that that is nonsense.

First of all, a great deal of the new rental construction we have obtained in the last few years was begun at a time when such construction was still subject to rent control. The figures are available from the Federal Housing Administration to show this to be true. Applications for mortgage loans on new rental construction rose rapidly after the war up to July 1947 when such construction was removed from controls, and then, believe it or not, there was a drop in applications. That was because building construction materials, also out from control, were shooting up astronomically in price.

Furthermore, and this is extremely important, every large-scale rental-housing project financed by an FHA insured loan of $200,000 or more is now and has been right along, subject to a form of rent control enforced by FHA. FHA has the controlling voice in setting rent policies in these projects, and they are set in order to provide a very fair return on investment, a 6½-percent return, I think, on actual investment.

Recontrol of such units would not, I am sure, bring down their rentals, because these rentals are based on fairness as required by FHA.

On rental housing in which FHA did not participate, or on which its participation was less than $200,000 insurance, there is absolutely no check on rents. Everyone realizes that it costs much more to build today than it did a few years ago. The rentals in such projects, or in such housing, would be subject to review under this bill, and if they were found to be exorbitant, they could be reduced.

I hesitate to believe that spokesmen for the organized real-estate and housing industries maintain that the housing shortage cannot be licked unless those who build rental housing are allowed to charge exorbitant rents, yet that is the only conclusion one is justified in taking from their opposition to this provision.

No one who attempts to look at this problem fairly thinks that new housing construction can be built to rent at prices anything near the prewar or wartime rents of similar accommodations. It just is not possible under present cost factors. No one suggests enforcing a $50-a-month rental ceiling on new construction for which a fair rent based on construction at current costs might be $80 or $90. That is certainly not the intention of this provision of my bill.

Before this type of housing and also conversions and also owner-occupied property which had not been rented previously were decontrolled, rental ceilings were, in a great many cases, based on what the owner thought was a fair rent. These rentals were subject to review, and if they were found to be exorbitant, they were reduced.

With proper administration, there is no reason in the world why a similar policy would not be followed on recontrolled accommodations. Further, as I pointed out several times, all rulings of the Administrator would be, under this bill, subject to attack and to appeal with legal rights granted to both tenant and landlord which were missing from the rent-control statutes in previous years.

The present Housing Expediter has asked for power to pass on the validity of conversions prior to their decontrol. I say, place these conversions subject to recontrol along with all other types of housing accommodations, and the problem of enforcement would be solved. There would be no sense in an owner seeking loopholes in the rent-control statutes by phony conversions, as so many apparently now are doing.

As long as some property owners are held under control by accident of circumstance and others are allowed to get out from under control by other accidents of circumstance or by design, we are going to find it increasingly hard to justify any form of rent control. Most of the complaints I receive from property owners cite the fact that new construction, conversions, previously owner-occupied quarters, so-called apartment hotels and other accommodations similar to the ones they rent, are bringing their owners exorbitant returns because they are decontrolled. The controlled property owner, I think, is justifiably incensed over this discrimination. It should be ended.

There is one category of accommodations which is ostensibly under control but which, under the provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, is virtually uncontrolled, and that includes those dwellings on which 15 percent rent increase leases had been negotiated during 1947 to continue throughout 1948, but which became vacant between January 1 of 1948 and March 31. Under the 1947 act they were immediately decontrolled. Under the 1948 act, they were placed back under control, but at whatever lease rent the landlord and new tenant had agreed upon during the period from January 1 to March 31. The Senate provided in the bill which we passed here last year that the rents on those properties should revert to the original lease rent negotiated between the landlord and the original tenant during 1947. The Senator from Washington, Mr. CAIN, submitted an amendment on the Senate floor to legalize any rent which the landlord and the new tenant had decided upon prior to March 31. His amendment was defeated in the Senate. However, the House wrote in a similar provision and it was contained in the conference bill and was enacted into law.

One would think that not very many people were affected by that. However, I have heard from numerous tenants who rented such decontrolled accommodations between January and March of 1948 at rents 100 percent and more over the 15-percent lease which had been negotiated by the previous tenant. This is certainly a very necessary category of housing in which to enforce a roll-back in rents, and that would be possible under my bill. As I said, ostensibly this type of accommodation is under control, but actually the control is meaningless and the protection accorded the tenant is useless.

As a final word on recontrol provisions of this bill, I want to point out what has happened under the present act which permits property owners who have been in continuous possession of their own accommodations for a period of 2 years to rent them free from any control over ceiling rents. In instance after instance the landlord has moved out of one unit which he occupied in an apartment house into another unit for the accomplishment of two purposes: (1) To get an unlimited rent for the quarters he previously occupied, and (2) to evict the tenant whose quarters he has taken over. The absence of adequate eviction protections plus this provision of the present law decontrolling owner-occupied quarters have been used to visit hardship on two families at the same time—the family which is forced to move from a controlled unit and the family which moves into the decontrolled unit and must pay whatever rent is demanded of him.

Recontrol of various types of accommodations will be helpful, but it must be coupled with adequate eviction safeguards if we are really to have fair and effective legislation.

Under the heading of recontrol, I point to the fact that this bill provides the authority for the Administrator to recontrol any areas in the country which have been decontrolled and to control new areas, if necessary. I understand that the Housing Expediter has testified that, if he had this power, he would feel free to decontrol some areas where the housing shortage may not be overly severe. His fear is that, once such an area is decontrolled, nothing short of an act of Congress can bring it back under control, regardless of what situation may arise from defense activity or other causes.

Evictions: Throughout the period of rent control, up to 1947, the question of evictions was handled on a national basis under uniform standards. These standards caused an occasional inconvenience or even hardship to a purchaser of a tenant-occupied home who had to wait unusually long, perhaps, to obtain possession. That was because the tenant, in most cases, was finding it extremely difficult to find other quarters. Tenants, in turn, bought houses and evicted their tenants, and perhaps they, too, had to wait for possession.

Since 1947 numerous efforts have been made to write into legislation specific provisions for obtaining occupancy of a dwelling under all types of circumstances. They haven't worked in many of the areas where the housing shortage is most critical for the simple reason that local authorities immediately rushed into the breach to set up iron-clad restrictions on evictions. Meanwhile, numerous landlords in no urgent need for quarters occupied by tenants, took advantage of the provisions in the 1947 act to evict tenants right and left for a variety of excuses and often flimsy pretexts.

Quarters were ostensibly removed from the market, and lo and behold, shortly thereafter, they were discovered to have been rented to someone else. Some owner, as I noted before, evicted tenants so that the landlord could move from one apartment into another and thus decontrol one of them and reap a financial windfall.

The 1948 act sought to remedy some of the difficulties created by the 1947 act, but it has not succeeded. Owners are still evicting tenants in order to change from one apartment to another and thus decontrol one of them. The good faith provisions of the present act in respect to landlords recovering possession for their own immediate and personal use have not been observed and are hard to enforce. The 60-day notice provision of the act is defective.

Above all, by seeking to define by statute those instances under which eviction can be had, the present act allows for no discretion, allows for no flexibility in meeting changing circumstances or conditions, and is bad law. With a multitude of courts acting on this matter, each of them acting independently and with no coordination, we find the same provisions of the act dealing with evictions being interpreted in widely different manner throughout the country.

My bill restores to the Federal agency dealing with rent control the authority to devise standards for eviction and to change them when necessary in the light of new circumstances and conditions. It makes the Rent Administrator a friend of the court on the background in individual cases.

We know of numerous instances in which tenants, seeking to take advantage of the admittedly weak protections of this act, have complained to the Housing Expediter of violations, only to be slapped in the face immediately by a notice from the landlord to move. If the landlord can devise a pretext on which to evict under the act, he proceeds to do so, and the court, in many instances, has no knowledge of the background of the case and the revenge motive involved in the eviction effort.

As a matter of fact, the lack of adequate eviction safeguards has probably done more than any other one thing to break down effective rent-control enforcement in the last 2 years. Tenants know that they can be evicted easily and often capriciously. They, therefore, hesitate to complain to the authorities against any overcharge in rent or decrease in services. I recently received a letter from a man in San Francisco who has been making a side payment of $20 a month to his landlord. He had no hesitation in telling me about it, but he said that he would not dare report it to the authorities. If he did, he said, "I'd be in the street hunting for a place to sleep."

I have received similar letters from all over the country. We are dealing here with a fact and not a theory. We are dealing with the frailties of human nature. When one is desperate for shelter and can obtain that shelter only by joining in a conspiracy with the landlord—and that's what it is—to pay a higher rent than the legal rent, he will pay that rent and join in the evasion of the law and keep silent about it.

Our whole black market in rents is based primarily on the ease with which tenants can be evicted. Another factor, of course, is the complete lack of any effective enforcement machinery.

Enforcement: The present Rent Control Act is about the only Federal statute I can think of which provides absolutely no penalties for violation of its important provisions. It is the only Federal law I know which encourages the people affected by it to violate it, because it provides that in case of violation, and in case the violator is caught in his violation, the worst thing that can happen to him, in the case of an overcharge in rents, whether inadvertent or deliberate, whether casual or continuous, is to be forced to make restitution of the amount which he may have stolen.

My bill provides for criminal sanctions and for civil actions by the Rent Administrator—and we know that his is the only effective agency for enforcement in view of tenant reluctance to sue the landlord. This provision is similar to the provision which we had in effect under OPA.

Now anyone who says that this provision would be used to throw into jail for a year and to fine $5,000 any landlord guilty of some minor violation of the act is uttering pure nonsense. I do not know exactly how many people went to jail for violation of OPA during the war—at the height of the intense patriotic drive to have black marketing regarded almost as a traitorous thing—but I am sure the number was very small. I think it is generally conceded that fines, in those days, for violations of OPA statutes were, on the whole, modest—perhaps too modest.

Federal judges do not sentence reputable citizens to jail for minor infractions of the law. At the same time, however, our Federal courts should be fortified and our Federal agencies should be fortified with the right to proceed vigorously against any citizen who defiantly and continually violates the law and thumbs his nose at the sanctity of the law. I warrant that there are very few landlords so lacking in ordinary decency as to commit such continual violations of the law as to become threatened with jail terms under my bill. But, unfortunately, there are some such landlords, and the last 2 years have been for them a veritable holiday in extortion.

Let us, therefore, have the machinery and the power to deal with them as they must be dealt with if we are to have any moral ground for requiring a decent and law-abiding landlord to bear the restraints of rent control.

But any law, regardless of how strict it might be, how stern the attempts at enforcement might be, cannot succeed unless it has public support, and above all, public understanding. That brings me to the place of the local boards.

Local advisory boards: The 1947 act for the first time established the principle of local advisory boards in connection with rent control. The idea by itself was a good idea and my bill, I might say, provides for the continuation of local advisory boards.

However, the present Control Act clothes these boards with powers which amount to administrative powers and psychologically gives them a function of looking out primarily for the landlord interests. The methods by which many of these boards were established underscored that idea, for in many cases they were heavily loaded with real-estate representatives. The original act setting up these boards in 1947 provided only that they should consist of representative citizens of the community, but did not say whom they should be representative of. The landlords look upon these committees or boards as their defenders, and in many cases they had a right to do so from the complexion of the boards themselves. The 1948 act sought to correct this situation by stating that the local boards should be representative of the affected interests in the area. This has meant, in many cases, reorganizing the boards that had been operating, but even so, the status of the local board has remained psychologically that of a defender of the landlord interest.

Part of the blame here rests in the fact that these boards have wide powers in obtaining rent increases for all the landlords in a given area. If a local board, even an unrepresentative one loaded in the landlords' favor, has recommended an area-wide rent increase, and even if the housing expediter finds it unsubstantiated, the recommendation has an automatic green light to the emergency court of appeals for a prompt hearing on this matter. The courts, therefore, can grant the increases, as they should, of course, have the right to do, but the instrument for obtaining this increase is the local board. Obviously, then, the landlords in any area are going to do their utmost to influence the local board at every opportunity.

My bill, besides requiring that the boards be fully representative, places them in an exclusively advisory status. They do not have the power by themselves to guarantee a rent increase. Their recommendations can be accepted or rejected by the rent administrator, but in every instance, the rent administrator must give his reasons in writing and document them with all economic facts which he has taken into consideration in reaching a decision for accepting or rejecting a recommendation of a local board. Any person or group affected—except the local board, which alone has the power now—can appeal the rent administrator's decision and can, if necessary, carry it to the emergency court and even to the Supreme Court. I might say parenthetically that in this bill the opportunities for judicial review and for appeal in connection with any decision of the rent administrator are extended to all parties of interest, tenant or landlord, and this, I think, is of vital importance to a fair administration of a law which affects so many of our people so intimately.

The local boards, under my bill, are given a new responsibility—the responsibility for interpreting to the local community the laws regarding rent control, the need for them, the purpose of them. Thus, their functions run in two directions. They would be expected to keep the Rent Administrator fully informed of developments in their own communities as they involve rent control. They would be expected, in case they determined an area rent increase was warranted, to press the recommendation vigorously, as many of them now do. If they became convinced after thorough study of the local situation that rent control was no longer necessary in their communities, they would not only be permitted to, but they would be expected to press vigorously for decontrol.

However, if the boards take seriously their further responsibilities under this bill to exercise such functions for educational, administrative, and compliance purposes as are delegated to them by the national Administrator, they will also be active and vigorous in supporting the enforcement of the act, in exposing abuses, and in keeping their communities informed on the "why" of rent control and of the regulations.

Such boards, I believe, would be much more effective in obtaining a fair break for the landlord, when the landlord is entitled to an area increase, than would a local board which regards its function to be primarily an agency of landlord interests.

In other words, any community group which is not only supposed to be representative of the community interests as a whole but actively tries to be, will have standing not only in the community itself but in the national office as an objective group trying to serve the community and all the interests in the community. Its recommendations, I am sure, would therefore be accorded the most serious consideration.

My bill removes from the local boards the present power they have to review individual cases. It is my understanding that very few boards have taken advantage of that power. It is easy to see how a board which attempted to review every individual case on which there was a complaint could easily get bogged down hopelessly. Since there are very broad appeal rights granted under my bill, I think all interests are fully protected.

I spoke earlier of my proposal for a 15-man National Advisory Committee and I have also suggested the creation of a staff by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee or by both the House and Senate committee jointly to make continuing studies of rent control and with the local boards given a broader scope, including educational functions, I think we would have adequate machinery for guaranteeing the fairest kind of administration of rent control and prompt revision either of the law or of the regulations whenever that is found to be necessary.

District of Columbia: My bill proposes the inclusion of the District of Columbia, for the first time, in the Federal rent-control bill. During most of the life of rent control, the District has had a more effective rent-control statute than the rest of the country in holding down rents. It had rent control before the rest of the country did.

There never was a 15-percent-rent-increase feature in the District bill. On the other hand, the District law has provided, in recent years, for almost automatic increases in rent for every increase in operating costs, regardless, as I understand it, of net return. In addition, there has been no provision in the District Act up to now for protecting the tenants of an apartment house which the owner seeks to convert into a cooperative.

My bill would permit the establishment by the Rent Administrator of the same standards for the District of Columbia as for the rest of the country, and in this respect I think would be most desirable.

On the other hand, since the committees of Congress having jurisdiction over District affairs may want to retain a separate District bill, I think this is a matter which your committee and the Senate District Committee might well want to discuss before a decision is made.

Conclusion: S. 888 represents in essential form the restoration of the rent-control laws to the effectiveness which they had prior to the passage of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The President on June 30, 1947, signed that act because he had no recourse except to let rent control die the next day. In a message to Congress on that date, however, he denounced the act which had been presented to him and prophesied correctly that it would encourage a great inflationary spiral in housing and in rents. He said that this bill in 1947 represented the abandonment of a system which had been both fair and effective.

In July of 1947 I introduced S. 1741 of the Eightieth Congress to repair the damages done to effective rent control by the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. The Housing and Rent Act of 1948 which was enacted corrected only a few of the many unfair provisions of the previous act. The Senate last year voted for a much stronger act than the one which was eventually agreed upon in conference and enacted.

We have now the opportunity, however late, to go back and correct the deficiencies of the last two rent-control acts. I am assuming, of course, that this Congress recognizes the continued need for rent control. I am assuming that in the recognition of that need, this Congress—and particularly this committee which has already acted so forthrightly in respect to good housing legislation—will insist that rent control be fair and be applied in the same manner to all owners of rental property in areas of scarce housing supply.

Controls in peacetime, in normal times, are repugnant to all of us; it is not necessary, however, for me to point out to this Congress that times are far from normal, that the world situation is most delicate, that a great share of our national budget is being spent in defense against possible war, and that under the circumstances, inflation is not just a matter of concern to us in the United States, but to all that part of the civilized world which depends upon America for the assistance and the encouragement needed to achieve peace and international security against military aggression and against the stealthy aggression, but aggression, nevertheless, of a world movement which seeks to establish totalitarianism throughout the world.

It may appear farfetched for me to say that rent control in America, effective rent control, is an important weapon for democracy in the cold war with communism, but it is not farfetched. Communism fears a strong, healthy American economy more than anything else, and this is one of our instruments toward maintaining that kind of an economy in these critical times.

Address by Ralph E. Becker Before the Ohio Young Republican State Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Ralph E. Becker, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, before the Ohio Young Republican State Convention, at Columbus, Ohio, on February 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Republican Party has many problems today, but the most important problem is how to bridge the gap between victory and defeat. In order to build this bridge, it becomes immediately apparent that there is a strong and urgent need for new ideas and more leadership.

The question immediately presents itself as to where this new leadership and ideas are coming from. My experience in traveling throughout the country to the extent of over 150,000 miles during the past 2½ years has convinced me that the Young Republican movement is one real source which can supply this need. I am confident that if given the proper tools, we can build the bridge that will close this gap.

We Young Republicans must not picture ourselves as starting off at the top or the major general level of politics. The vast and most important work to be done is to dig the foundations at the precinct level, and we young people are the logical choice to do this kind of work. This is a challenge to all of us, and it is only through experience of this kind that we will be able to develop the leadership which is needed. We must do more than merely pass resolutions and discuss things abstractly. We must participate in the very fullest and most practical sense.

Therefore, I would like to suggest tonight two ways in which we Young Republicans can meet this challenge if we really mean business:

1. Every Young Republican in the land, if his personal situation permits, should run for every available office from dog catcher up or give his active and real support to some worthy Republican candidate. The local municipal elections coming up this year and elections for office in your loal political organizations, such as precinct committeemen, afford an immediate opportunity.

Moreover, this will provide excellent preparation for the all-important congressional elections of 1950. The success that must be ours will be ours if we begin now.

2. Each club should begin at once to strengthen its own campaign organization on a year-round basis. It is imperative that you start immediately to organize and coordinate the activities and members of each club in your State league in an aggressive campaign against the bungling administration and fraudulent promises of the Democrats.

Now a moment ago, you heard me refer to the fraudulent promises of the Democrats. When I said "fraudulent," I really meant fraudulent, and I am going to tell you why.

Let us go back to the last campaign, and recall again just what Truman and his cohorts said they would do. Let me detail a few of their phony promises, one by one:

First, there was a great hub-bub made over the so-called slave labor law, more commonly known as the Taft-Hartley Act. The union bosses and their spokesmen, the Democratic Party, all during the campaign made an emotional appeal to the voters and distorted the facts. They went up and down the land urging outright repeal up until election day. To hear them talk, one would think the workers in our country suffered under conditions worse than those in Russia.

As we Republicans know, the workers are far better off under the Taft-Hartley Act than ever before, and the membership in unions since 1947, when the law was put into effect, has expanded to unprecedented heights.

What is the Democrat position now? We find that the Congress has spent fifty-odd days and fifty-odd nights in the midst of bickering and confusion among its own members. They are now even willing to admit that the American people would not stand for its repeal. We know that every law may be subject to improvement. The complete truth is that this attack by the Democrats was a downright misrepresentation of a fraudulent nature. It was made because they needed the support of the labor bosses in order to win the election. They bought this support sacrificing all principle in order to achieve their end.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is not only a discredit to the Democrats themselves and their leadership, but it is a real tribute to the Republican Party, and your distinguished and able Senator TAFT. The American people, and Ohioans in particular, can well be proud of the fact that men of such great intelligence, the highest integrity, and clarity of purpose are fighting their battles in Washington. Yes, people all over the land are coming to a realization that the highest qualities like those possessed by BOB TAFT pay off in politics every young Republican and every American considering entry into public life should take heed of this wonderful example. Send him back to us in Washington in 1950. The country needs him there.

Referring back again to the fall of 1948, the Democratic Party promised immediate and effective legislation dealing with the high cost of living. They proposed that there be a reimposition of controls—another peacetime OPA or planned economy.

We all are concerned about the seriousness of this problem. But what has the Eighty-first Democratic dilly-dally Congress does toward solving this problem? Have they taken any affirmative action to establish another program of price control? The answer is simply "No" in large capital letters. The dilly-dally Congress has spent fifty-odd days and fifty-odd nights, and in all this time not a single step has been taken to meet this emergency.

Why is all this? The answer lies in the fact that even the Democrats have not forgotten the terrifying situation which existed back in 1946. The economy of our country was paralyzed by the peacetime OPA. There was no meat in the butcher shops. The black markets were rampant all because of the economic strangulation of the peacetime OPA and controlled economy. Therefore, I say to you now that the Democratic Party never intended to enact price controls. They were merely appealing to the emotions of the people. They knew that many people had forgotten the evils of price control and there was political hay to be made as a result

of these fraudulent misrepresentations of fact. If they really believed in OPA as a proper solution to the problem the present Democratic administration would already have a statute on the books.

While it is generally known today that there are certain basic materials in short supply, such as steel, and while I carry no brief for steel or any other particular industry, I do want to take issue with the President's recent proposal that the Government should go into the steel business. Certain political circles will undoubtedly crown him a hero for such preposterous action.

The Democratic administration may believe in the nationalization of industry, but they know full well that this cannot be forced down the throats of the American people. However, they had to continue this lip service to please those few people who are rabid about the nationalization of industry. The entire proposal was something they never intended to carry out. It is just another example of the fraud with which they have been deluding the American people.

Without digressing too far from the subject at hand, I do want to say here that too few of our leaders today choose to defend our great free enterprise system. Instead we find that a large number, and in many cases people who are the most articulate, joining the opposition. It is high time that we Young Republicans roll up our sleeves, go to work, and defend a system which last year resulted in almost total employment, of almost no industrial disputes, and an expansion of wealth and productive capacity to unprecedented heights. We Young Republicans and all young people are more vitally concerned about the outcome of this struggle than anyone else.

And now let us briefly consider another promise of the Democratic Party. They told us last summer when the Congress was called into extraordinary special session, that it would take no longer than 10 or 15 days to enact a long-range comprehensive housing program. What has the present Democratic Congress in 50-odd days and 50-odd nights done for the American people in the way of solving this critical problem? We find that this matter like most of the program has bogged down in a welter of confusion and cross purposes in the Congressional Committees with no hope of any affirmative action being taken for a long time. The only tangible things we can point to are conflicting statements issued to the press from time to time by various spokesmen. This again is more evidence of a concerted effort to deceive the public on the basis of an emotional appeal, and they know as well as we do that the answer isn't to be found in the mere passage of a law. If they believed in this solution, the present dilly-dally Congress would already have a statute on the books, and they would have done it in 10 days as they charged we could have done.

As we review the bubble of lies about the Taft-Hartley Act, the unfulfilled promises in regard to the high cost of living, the vicious threat to nationalize the steel industry with the ultimate objective of undermining the free enterprise system, the astounding lack of action in regard to solving the housing problem, it is obvious that the Democratic Party has no objective but to perpetuate itself in office by making empty fraudulent promises.

We Republicans have the job of selling the principles of the Republican Party. We young Republicans can build our bridge to victory. It takes salesmanship and honesty. But remember this—we have the greatest system of government in the world to sell. We believe in it. We would not destroy it with statism—with governmentalized industry. We would build on it.

Here then is where we will build our bridge—over the deception—the fraud—and the lack of American principle that I have outlined to you. Let us take it from here—for we are the engineers—the stone masons—the riveters, the welders, and the riggers. We are young Republicans and we—together—are going to build our bridge and sell our ideas. This is the greatest job in the world today.

Proclamation of March 7 as Czechoslovak Day in the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a proclamation issued by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of the State of New York, proclaiming March 7, which is the anniversary of the birthday of former President Masaryk, whose name goes down in history as one of the great patriots of all time, as Czechoslovak Day in the State of New York.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION—STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY

The virtual enslavement of the once free people of Czechoslovakia was a particular shock to us. Americans were justly proud of the United States in the establishment of the independence of that country. Its actual foundation stone was the historic Lansing declaration of May 1918.

Under the brilliant leadership of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and Eduard Benes, Czechoslovakia became one of the most enlightened, progressive, and prosperous nations of the earth within an amazingly brief period. Its well-being was cut short after 20 years by Adolf Hitler. Throughout the dark and bloody days of Nazi oppression the people of Czechoslovakia were sustained by their confidence that the forces of freedom must triumph eventually and restore their just rights.

Their hopes were destroyed by the Communist seizure of February 1948. After all their sufferings from Brown fascism, after a pathetically short interlude, they now find themselves in thrall to Red fascism. The lifework of the great Thomas G. Masaryk lies in the dust of a police state.

The destruction of Czechoslovak freedom was quickly followed by the death of Eduard Benes from sheer grief; likewise of Jan Masaryk, who perished, directly or indirectly, by the action of the ruthless oppressors of his country.

The people of America feel the utmost indignation and the utmost sympathy with the tragic plight of the people of Czechoslovakia. Many men and women of Czechoslovak's origin are our friends and good neighbors, true American citizens. At present one of the few methods we have of showing our sympathy is to commemorate the brief happy period of Czechoslovakia's history and the achievements and sacrifices of her unforgettable leaders, also to express our hope that eventually her people may again realize their just rights and aspirations.

Now, therefore, I, Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim March 7 as Czechoslovak Day in the State of New York, that being the anniversary of the birthday of former President Masaryk, whose name goes down in history as one of the great patriots of all time.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 3d day of March in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-nine.

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

By the Governor:

PAUL E. LOCKWOOD,
Secretary to the Governor.

Soviet "Immigration" Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ZALES N. ECTON

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Soviet 'Immigration' Increases," written by Herbert C. Watts and published in a recent issue of the Havre (Mont.) Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET "IMMIGRATION" INCREASES

In increasing numbers Russian airmen and soldiers are deserting their country and attempting to reach a haven in the United States. This is welcome news in a time when we have been assuming that there is no such person as a Russian deserter.

Certain international complications are developing because of the propensity for wanderlust as exhibited by some people in Soviet uniform. Evidently those who have chosen to shake the dust of the U. S. S. R. off their shoes and take French leave are treated like dignitaries here. It's all a part of our educational process to satisfy the curiosity of the Russian who has been given an inkling through rumor of what a generous land this is.

Russia wants to know what we are going to do with unofficial visitors from the U. S. S. R. We had better have a good answer ready before long because one bright day a cattle boat loaded with eager-beaver Russians will come steaming up to the Battery and an announcement will be made that they left the U. S. S. R. with nothing but a phooey to you, Joe Stalin. An immigration problem is certainly posed.

Then there is the problem of culling those who are sincerely against communism from those who may be spies posing as individuals who are crazy about this democracy business we have enjoyed for over 100 years. Americans are inwardly tickled that Russians, military personnel in particular, are getting more gumption as time goes along. These Russians, with no passports, few worldly effects and a lot of courage are supplying valuable information as to what is going on behind the iron curtain. The service is free. All we have to do is furnish them board, room, and protection.

Undoubtedly there are some Russians who have made their escape from the U. S. S. R. and are special guests of this country. Their identities perhaps are a secret because they have families in Russia or the nature of their work is such that they can give invaluable military or commercial information to our government.

The fact that Russians are traveling more than ever endeavoring to reach the United

States appears to be proof that our own propaganda campaign is fairly successful. Some of the "guests" have pointed out that they have heard this or that on U. S. programs beamed at that country. Their curiosity is tremendous. Believe it or not, millions of Russians have heard that Mr. Truman was elected President last year. They know that the Democratic and Republican Parties are firmly united on the furtherance of democratic ideals. The defeat of Henry A. Wallace, Vladimir Barashkov, a Russian flier who fled into American territory, said, left a strong impression on his people.

So, the Russian escapists are coming over thick and fast. They face death if ever turned over to Russian authorities and apparently our Government is willing to take chances. Communists can note that some Americans have sold out and joined forces with the Russians but we think that a comparison of characters and objectives of persons who are deserting from Russia are different in quality from those of Americans who have decided that communism with its contradictory ideologies holds some kind of salvation for their twisted lives. Basic checkups of those Russians who have deserted the U. S. S. R. disclose that they are in the main well educated and with talents that this Nation can well use. More important, they bring us the information.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to express my views on the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. A careful study of its provisions clearly convinces me that it is not only cruelly discriminatory, but unworkable. It requires immediate change. Some wise man once said "Change is the only certain thing in this world." The question therefore is, In changing the displaced persons law by H. R. 1344, are we prepared to change enough of it to meet the needs of today?

If we are not prepared to make such a change, we shall fail to heed the courageous words of President Truman who, on July 27, 1948, in his message to the special session of Congress, in urging that the displaced persons law be amended, stated:

> The Displaced Persons Act in its present form discriminates unfairly against some displaced persons because of their religion, land of origin, or occupation. These provisions are contrary to all American ideals. This act should be promptly amended to wipe out these discriminations. Furthermore, the present act permits the entry of only 200,000 persons, and charges them against future immigration quotas. I believe strongly that the act should provide for the entry of 400,000 persons over a 4-year period, and they should be outside the normal immigration quotas. The act can and should be amended promptly.

For nearly a century and a half our country has enjoyed an enviable reputation as a haven of refuge for victims of religious persecution and as an asylum for those who suffered political oppression and economic misery. Throughout its history the United States has been enriched in many ways by the persecuted of other lands.

The termination of World War II brought freedom to several million Europeans who had been forced into German servitude during the war. Most of these former Nazi slaves were quickly repatriated to their countries of origin, to their homes and their families. Approximately one million men, women, and children of various nationalities and creeds remained in the displaced persons camps of Germany, Austria, and Italy still waiting for their day of liberation. Many of these individuals have lost their entire family and all their earthly possessions and do not wish to return to their former homes; others advance religious or political reasons for not desiring to return to eastern European countries which are now in the Soviet Russian orbit. They cannot remain indefinitely in the displaced persons camps. Consequently, the only satisfactory solution would be to resettle them permanently elsewhere, preferably outside of Europe and preferably also in the less populated countries, including the United States, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Latin America, and so forth.

The world at large has turned to the United States for moral leadership in settling this tragic problem by becoming the first country to admit a substantial number and thereby encouraging other countries to take a proportionate number.

The original Stratton bill was based mainly on the principle of humanitarianism, on this country's tradition as a haven of refuge for the homeless and the oppressed, on our moral obligation to care for the displaced in the American occupation zones, and on the need for a permanent solution of the problem by admitting a fair share of the displaced persons into the United States and setting an example for other countries.

But the dilemma of the displaced persons has not been solved because the United States has not shown leadership and taken its fair share of the victims of old and new European tyrannies. Our country can be redeemed in the esteem of the world if the Congress of the United States would liberalize the Displaced Persons Act in amending Public Law 774 of 1948 for the following good and substantial reasons:

First. The cut-off date of eligibility in the present act is December 22, 1945. This is inequitable because it bars 135,000 Jews and other persons who are displaced persons under the classification of the International Refugee Organization. A new cut-off date such as January 1, 1949, would be more equitable and would take care of persons fleeing from the Communist tyranny in Czechoslovakia during the last year.

Second. The present coverage of the law, which calls for the admission of a maximum of 205,000 persons, should be broadened to a maximum of 400,000 persons in order to be adequate to meet the needs involved. This change has been recommended by representatives of all religious groups.

Third. One clause of the act provides that 40 percent of the visas issued pursuant to the act shall be available exclusively to persons whose countries have been annexed by a foreign power—Baltic States, East Prussia, and so forth. Since a very small proportion of the displaced persons from this area are Jews and Catholics, the result is that undue preference is given to non-Jews and non-Catholics among the displaced persons.

Fourth. Perhaps the most shameful adaptation of Nazi racist theories contained in the act is the clause which provides that 50 percent of the German and Austrian quotas shall be made available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin, sometimes referred to as Volksdeutsche. This provision extending preference to these antidemocratic people, who were the vanguard of Hitler in central and eastern Europe, should be eliminated.

Fifth. The provision in the act which makes it necessary for 30 percent of the displaced persons admitted to be farmers, discriminates against Jews, who are mostly nonagricultural.

Sixth. The provision whereby certain conditions must be satisfied, such as a job and housing arrangements, before a visa is granted is unworkable. The task of fulfilling these requirements should be left up to the various religious groups operating in this country, after admission.

Seventh. The clause which mortgages the future quotas of countries whose present quotas are being filled by displaced persons should be removed. Under this proviso, Poland, for example, cannot for 30 years send its full quota to the United States.

Eighth. The immigration status of displaced persons now in the country is not clarified in this act and this should be done by amendment.

Ninth. There is no effective screening procedure to make ineligible those who advocated or joined in persecutions of racial, religious, or ethnic minorities.

Tenth. Little if any eligibility is given to displaced persons living outside of camps (those firmly resettled) by this act, whereas in matter of fact many of these are presumably as eligible as those in the camps. The present act penalizes those who went out and got jobs instead of remaining in the camps.

Eleventh. The time span for the operation of this act should be doubled to 4 years.

Twelfth. A revolving fund should be established for loans to cover transportation from the port of entry to the place of resettlement.

Thirteenth. Some provision should be made for political refugees from countries recently imprisoned behind the iron curtain.

In conclusion, it is my considered opinion that the Displaced Persons Act in its present form is contrary to all American ideals and traditions. These terrified and stateless humans were the victims of the Nazis, and now they fear the Communist. They are material for

democracy; they are the people who resisted totalitarianism from its inception, and who were tough enough to survive all its efforts to extinguish them. They are people who prize freedom, prize it enough to have suffered for it deeply. They are the kind of people in whose behalf the American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our society from its earliest days forward. They are the wounded in a great battle for liberty.

We must change them from displaced into placed persons. Maybe then, as we work and pray for peace, for a better world, the Great Architect will listen, for we cannot expect to receive the blessings of life if we do not give of ourselves in service to others.

Public Law 774, of the Eightieth Congress, in view of the foregoing, should be promptly amended.

Broadcast by George E. Sokolsky on Lincoln and Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a broadcast by George E. Sokolsky on February 13, 1949, over the American Broadcasting Co. stations. The broadcast is entitled "Lincoln and Edison."

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINCOLN AND EDISON

Two birthdays are being celebrated this week end. Yesterday was the birthday of Abraham Lincoln; on Friday was the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of Thomas A. Edison.

In these days of universal fear and Government control of the individual, these two figures stand as peaks of human liberty.

I speak of liberty not in general terms but specifically as the right of the individual to think, to plan, to dream, to experiment, to create, to build, according to his own judgment, assuming his own responsibilities and obligations without fear of any man, any government, any majority or minority, anyone upon this earth. That is liberty.

We all know the personality and character of Abraham Lincoln, but few realize how lonely he was; how he walked alone in this sad world where man so often hates man, where man's inhumanity to man brings in its wake wars, destruction, chaos.

I once visited the little village of Salem in Illinois. It still stands, much as it used to be, in a State park. Every American should make a pilgrimage to that village to see the lowly origin, the humble beginnings of one of the greatest figures in our history.

Lincoln read by candlelight in the attic of an inn. There all alone, without the aid of teachers, of high school, of college, he mastered the English language until he could speak with a beauty of words altogether unknown in our day of slang, of double talk, of cheap vulgarities. Here, in the log building, in a village remote from big cities and great centers of learning, among farmers, lumbermen, and small storekeepers, he made of himself a competent scholar, a lawyer, a great thinker and debater, eventually President of the United States.

We always think of Lincoln as the emancipator of the Negro slaves, as the author of the Emancipation Proclamation and the Gettysburg Address. But there is one thing that Lincoln wrote that I love for the grandeur of its thought and language. It was only a Presidential proclamation announcing a day of thanksgiving. Every President writes several of those and nobody bothers to read them. But each year, on Lincoln's birthday, I like to read out loud parts of that proclamation. I like to read it because it belongs to these days as it did to his day. It belongs to all time.

Let me read you some of it:

"Whereas it is the duty of nations as well as of men to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins and transgressions in humble sorrow, yet with assured hope that genuine repentance will lead to mercy and pardon, and to recognize the sublime truth, announced in the Holy Scriptures and proven by all history, that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord:

"And, insomuch as we know that by His divine law nations, like individuals, are subjected to punishments and chastisements in this world, may we not justly fear that the awful calamity of civil war which now desolates the land may be but a punishment inflicted upon us for our presumptuous sins, to the needful end of our national reformation as a whole people? We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of heaven; we have been preserved these many years in peace and prosperity; we have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us, and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us.

"It behooves us, then, to humble ourselves before the offended power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness."

Let us pause a moment to look at this tall, homely man, walking the world alone and sadly, foreseeing the future with great uncertainty.

Abraham Lincoln never forgot humility; never hated any man; always dreamed of a world of justice, of the brotherhood of man in the fatherhood of God.

Thomas A. Edison also walked alone. He also was unable to have much schooling. No professor in a college taught him physics. No university gave him a Ph. D. or a Phi Beta Kappa key. He wrote no learned thesis nor did anyone laud him for his brilliance.

Whatever he achieved was his own doing—the product of one man—of the genius, the perseverance, the diligence of one man. The disappointments were his; the achievements were his.

No government subsidized him. No bureau or commission directed him. No RFC made loans to him. He passed no civil-service examinations, nor did he ask the consent of any Presidential commission to pursue his experiments. Thomas Edison was a free man. Untutored, unschooled, the master of his personality, he went his way, and before he died he had 1,097 United States patents issued to him—more than to any other individual.

I stand here tonight and talk to all of you through a microphone and over electric wires. You are far away, but, were I on television, you would see me in all my fullness. You are sitting in your well-lighted homes, comfortable perhaps with a cold drink out of an electric refrigerator. You take all this in your stride. Many of you have never known when such wonders were not possible. You press a button and a dark room is illuminated. You are bored and go to a movie to spend an amusing evening or you sit at home and see a performance on your television set. The room can be light or dark at your wish and convenience.

I remember when I was a small boy on the East Side of New York. The only light we had was an open gaslight. Then came the Welsbach mantle and we were all excited by the great improvement. Then, one day, we saw electric lights all about us. We were amazed at this wonder. But soon we took that in our stride. We even complained that the streets were still lighted by gaslight. We demanded streets lighted by electricity.

In the many years I lived in China I saw literally millions of men and women who had never seen an electric light. The only artificial lighting they had—as a matter of fact, still have—is an oil lamp or a candle; most of them go to bed with the dark and rise at dawn. They are limited in their reading, their learning, their leisure by the darkness, and what I say of peasant and village life in China was equally true of Siberia in very recent years. It is true of much of this world. They live in darkness.

Thomas Edison's lamp, which we, in our generation, take in our stride, is the product of the unending labor of a free man—financially poor, uneducated, insecure—who dared to dream. He often failed, and after each failure he had to borrow the money to take another risk.

He had to find a container for his light. The sealed glass bulb that would not collapse when it warmed up was no small matter to work out. Then the problem of finding a filament that would produce light but not burn itself out or overheat the container—that problem faced the inventor with many failures. He tried every known fiber. He even tried hair out of a beard. Everything went wrong, except his great soul, which shouted, "There shall be light."

And finally, he found the exact carbonized cardboard which was suitable. But he still faced problems. He had to generate the electricity and to carry it from the generator to the light. This he had in 1879, but it was not until September 1882 that a service for the public was started in New York City.

Altogether, Thomas Edison had to obtain 356 patents, involving original inventions in an altogether untried field, before he could call his work in power generation and distribution a success.

Had he only done this, he would have been one of the greatest minds of all time. But Thomas Edison invented the phonograph, the motion-picture camera, and he laid the foundation for electronics which makes possible radio and television.

No government, no committee, no majority, no minority could ever produce the genius of Abraham Lincoln or Thomas Edison. No group ever wrote a poem or painted a picture. Nor need a man be rich in money or have the advantages of formal education or the assurance of security from the cradle to the grave to achieve greatness. What were the advantages of Beethoven or what the security of Mozart? Were they greater than those of Lincoln in the log house in Salem or Edison when he peddled newspapers on a railroad train?

The gods among men walk alone. They dream and create and nothing can hold them back. They do not fear failure any more than they fear insecurity. They are driven by their personalities to high accomplishment and when they have completed their work, the world is a better place to live in because they have been of it.

And this happens in every age, in every country, among all peoples, great and small. Perhaps someone who is listening to these words has in his soul some task to do. He may fear the consequences of his dream and courage.

Go forth, as Lincoln and Edison did, for your start today could not be more lowly than theirs; your disadvantages today could not be as great as theirs. They hurdled every handicap, alone, unaided. They reached their goals alone—by will and choice and daring.

And America remembers them everlastingly and celebrates their births.

Thank you. This is George Sokolsky.

The Netherlands Policy in Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by A. M. Rosenthal and two news items from The Hague, published in the New York Times of March 11, 1949, and an article by Daniel L. Schorr, published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 8, 1949, dealing with the Netherlands policy in the East Indies.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 11, 1949]

UNITED STATES DEMANDS DUTCH PERMIT INDONESIA TO REVIVE REGIME—AUSTIN ALSO CALLS FOR RETURN OF REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT TO JOGJAKARTA FOR TALKS—VAN ROYEN FEARS CHAOS—NETHERLANDS DELEGATE SAYS SECURITY COUNCIL PLAN WOULD PRECIPITATE BLOODSHED

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

LAKE SUCCESS, March 10.—The United States hit out today at Netherlands policy in the East Indies and insisted that The Hague allow the Republic of Indonesia to set itself up again as a working government.

Less than an hour after the Netherlands had again told the United Nations Security Council that she was unable to abide by all its recommendations on the Indonesian situation, the United States delegation went out of its way to make it clear that this country stood firmly behind the Council's resolution.

Warren R. Austin, United States representative, strongly urged the Dutch to allow Republican leaders to return to the city of Jogjakarta and make it their administrative headquarters. The Jogjakarta issue has moved to the center of the complex Indonesian picture and the Netherlands reaffirmed her position that return of the city to the Republicans would bring chaos and bloodshed.

COUNCIL RESOLUTION BACKED

Mr. Austin's statement to the Council was designed to squelch reports that the United States was backing down in its support of the Council's Indonesian resolution—a resolution that asked for the return of Jogjakarta. Unofficially, the attitude here is that if the United States sticks to its guns on the restoration of the Republican government in the city, the Netherlands may decide to make concessions.

The 11 members of the Council met for 3 hours on Indonesia and decided to hold another session tomorrow. Before each delegate was a copy of the report of the United Nations Commission for Indonesia warning that the situation was becoming gloomier in the islands of Java, Sumatra, and Madura.

After the meeting it became clear that the delegates still had come to no agreement on what action, if any, the Council should take now. Most of the delegations seemed reluctant to come forward with any sort of resolution.

For the last few days there have been reports that the Dutch were getting ready to give diplomatic ground, but Dr. Jan H. van Royen, Netherlands delegate, said again today that to accept the Council's plan for Indonesian independence would bring disaster to the islands.

The Netherlands representative told the Council that imprisoned Republican leaders had been freed, but that his country feared that if they were allowed to return to Jogjakarta, Republican armed forces would carry out reprisals against native supporters of the Dutch.

The Netherlands plan for a round-table discussion in The Hague, he went on, represented a way of bringing Indonesia to sovereignty even before the Council had planned. He urged the Council to give its support to the round-table conference.

ROMULO HITS ROUND-TABLE PLAN

Dr. van Royen was followed by two speakers who condemned Dutch action in Indonesia—Brig. Gen. Carlos Romulo, of the Philippines, and Dr. L. N. Palar, of the Republic. General Romulo attacked the round-table idea as a substitute for the Council's resolution.

"The decisions and recommendations of the Security Council," he said "are being circumvented, ignored, or violated by smooth double talk, outright defiance, or the all-too-familiar tactic of the fait accompli."

Dr. Palar, for his part, said the Republic no longer put any stock in Dutch promises and Dutch plans and for that reason were unable to accept the round-table scheme. The Republican leader also accused the Netherlands Indies Army of using Nazi torture methods on captured guerrillas.

Mr. Austin's speech was delivered in mild tones, but had some strong phrases about Dutch policy. He said that the extensive guerrilla warfare was a direct result of the Netherlands decision to abandon talks in favor of military action. As far as the round table was concerned, he repeated Washington's position that restoration of the Republic was a prime condition for any discussion.

MARSHALL AID HELD DIVERTED

The Netherlands diverted Marshall plan funds earmarked for reconstruction in Indonesia and used them "as a political weapon to reestablish their colonial empire," Dr. Djojohadikusumo Sumitro, the Indonesian Republic's financial and trade representative plenipotentiary here, charged yesterday.

Denying Dutch allegations that the collapse of the Republic's economy had resulted from the subsequent withholding of European-recovery-program aid on the part of the United States, Dr. Sumitro declared that the Indonesian people had never benefited from the ERP funds allocated for their assistance.

BENELUX DISCUSSES FULL ECONOMIC UNION

THE HAGUE, March 10.—An important meeting of 22 Cabinet ministers from Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg (Benelux), supported by their financial and economic experts, opened here this morning to begin the 3-day series of conferences on the future of Benelux.

Deliberations will determine when and how or even if full economic union of the three countries can be achieved.

Benelux has a workable customs union. Complete integration of economies has been tentatively scheduled for the end of this year. There unquestionably will be some delay.

The Netherlands Premier Willem Drees told the delegates:

"We know the basic issue is the monetary problem and linked to it is the question of how far a common economic policy will have to be pursued, and in what respect each country can remain free to determine its own economic and social policies."

The key to success or failure of Benelux lies in the convertibility of the Dutch florin which is weak, whereas the Belgian franc is strong. Economies of these countries cannot be integrated so long as their currencies remain so far apart.

Six committees will cover consumption rationing and subsidies, investment policy, social affairs, agriculture, fiscal and monetary policies.

THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS, March 10.—Reliable sources said tonight that the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxemburg have agreed to pool all available capital in the three countries for joint investment.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of March 8, 1949]

DUTCH IGNORE BOYCOTT OF JAVA PARLEY PLAN

(By Daniel L. Schorr)

THE HAGUE.—Dutch officials are preparing for an Indonesian round-table conference March 12, although very few persons expect the meeting to be held on that date.

About 100 rooms in the best Hague hotels have been reserved beginning March 11 for Indonesian leaders and members of the United Nations Commisison on Indonesia.

The historic Hall of Knights is being prepared as a conference room. Press facilities and radio booths are being installed nearby. Piles of documents are being prepared.

An official said, "We stick to the March 12 date as a symbol of our eagerness to hold the conference as soon as possible."

DEADLOCK LOOMS

The Dutch Cabinet faces a deadlock arising from Indonesian President Soekarno's refusal to come to The Hague unless his Republican government is reinstated in Jogjakarta.

And the situation is made more serious for the Dutch by the fact that the Republican viewpoint has some support among Indonesian Federalists.

According to private advices from Batavia, the Federalists adopted a resolution backing up the Republican position. This resolution was termed unacceptable by High Commissioner Louis Beel, and the Federalists are divided over what to do next.

DUTCH STAND

Dutch authorities have refused to permit reinstatement of the Republican government or even the return of Republican leaders to Jogjakarta. They base their stand on the conviction that such action would give impetus to guerrilla activities.

A week ago, a high Dutch official said that restoring the Republican government was as impossible as reconstructing an egg from an omelet.

There are signs that the Dutch will not be able to maintain their stand without Federalist support. In addition, there has been some diplomatic pressure.

British Ambassador Sir Philip Nichols saw Premier Willem Drees on March 6 to convey a message from Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, and according to informed sources the burden of this message was advice to the

Dutch to take a broader viewpoint of the matter.

PRESS URGES CONCESSIONS

Some Roman Catholic papers in the Netherlands have pleaded with the Government to make whatever concessions are necessary to hold the conference. One of them referred to the present situation as the last chance to achieve a settlement.

But the Volkskrant, organ of Prof. Carl Romme, parliamentary leader of the Roman Catholic Party, continues to hold out against reinstatement of the Republicans in Jogjakarta.

Previously, the Dutch had planned to hold a conference with the Federalists alone if the Republicans refused to come. On March 5 the parliamentary leader of the Labor Party, Jonkheer van der Goes van Naters, wrote in the party organ Vrije Volk that absence of the Republicans would leave a severe gap at the table, but the meeting should be held anyway.

FEDERALISTS HINT BALK

However, it has become clear that many Federalists are not inclined to come unless the Republicans are induced to attend. Hence the Dutch may be obliged—however reluctantly—to make further concessions to the Republic.

It is not believed, however, that any such decision will be made before this week's discussion of the question in the Security Council. There are indications that Batavia also is awaiting the results of the Security Council meeting.

The Dutch Government had asked the Council for help in furthering its round-table conference plan. One has the impression on talking to Dutch officials that they are gravely concerned over the way the problem has developed.

Nomination of Mon C. Wallgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several newspaper comments, telegrams, and letters relating to the nomination of Mon C. Wallgren as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News of February 22, 1949]

AS WE SEE IT—TOO MUCH FOR WALLGREN

Monrad C. Wallgren, the lame-duck Washington Governor, is unquestionably an amiable gentleman, a good fishing companion, graduate of an optometry school, a skillful golfer, and a champion billiard player.

Those qualifications, plus membership on the Senate War Investigating Committee when President Truman, then Senator, was chairman, are his recommendations for the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board, to which Mr. Truman has appointed him.

It is an assignment of staggering importance. It was given after Mr. Truman had scanned the field for a place for his chum which would be neither beneath his dignity nor beyond his capacity.

Senator CAIN, of Washington, is fighting bitterly against confirmation of Mr. Wallgren. The hearings produced some acrid exchanges, such as that Senator CAIN has been divorced, and that Mr. Wallgren douses himself with cologne.

This petty nonsense aside, we think Mr. CAIN has the better of the argument. In the post to which he was named, Mr. Wallgren would be the President's chief adviser on the mobilization of industry and civilians in the event of war. This calls for an overall plan of strategic relocation of industries, a stock-piling program, and integration of Government activities with all other facets of our economic life.

It is a job that should have superlative performance, since false confidence in our preparedness could be worse than total neglect. Many of the President's appointments have revealed his craving for personal loyalty; certainly any man in his position prefers to have around him men whom he knows he can trust. This has resulted in an uncomfortable level of mediocrity in high administration posts, which will not be raised by Mr. Wallgren's confirmation.

[Excerpt from column The Daybook, by Tris Coffin, Washington Times-Herald of March 9, 1949]

Wings clipped—Republican policy chiefs in the Senate have a great surprise for Mon Wallgren, the President's good friend.

They will not oppose Mon's confirmation as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. But they will toss in an amendment cutting his job down more to the size of the likable, poker-playing ex-governor of Washington.

A good many Senators on the other side of the aisle will support this move. They get dizzy-headed when they think of happy-go-lucky Mon presiding over the almost unlimited power of the NSRB.

If playing a good hand of poker is any help, Wallgren ought to go great guns. He was one of the top money winners on the Hill when he was in Congress. He boasted once of making more "dough-ray-me" with cards than he did on his salary as a lawmaker.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 28, 1949.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand against Wallgren's appointment. Firmly believe him unqualified for the position for which he is appointed by President. This is far more important for the national welfare than the governorship of any one State for which he was rejected by the voters in recent election. I suggest constitutional amendment prohibiting Presidential appointment of defeated candidates to more important positions than the one for which they were rejected by the voters and for which the New Deal has been conspicuous.

LLOYD M. WOLFE, *Bellevue, Wash.*

TACOMA, WASH., *March 5, 1949.*
Senator HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We hope you will be able to indicate clearly to your fellow Senators that the issue over Wallgren is a moral one and that he was defeated in Washington because of that reason.

LOYAL H. VICKERS.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 24, 1949.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

My associates at Seattle Hardware Co. as well as the vast majority of our business friends feel you should be assured of our appreciation of your efforts in opposing the appointment of our former Governor. It is indeed heartening to feel that we have in Washington a representative willing to fight for his convictions.

C. H. BLACK,
President, Seattle Hardware Co.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 21, 1949.*

MY DEAR SENATOR CAIN: In the King County treasurer's office where I work, several coworkers have known Mon. C. Wallgren's life from boyhood, and knew his father and their business at Everett, Wash., before Wallgren broke his father financially, and my friends cannot for their lives see or understand where the money came from to build Wallgren's new home at Palm Desert, Calif.

Until within the last very few years, both Mon C. Wallgren and Lt. Gov. Vic Meyers, have been consistently considered very modestly financed.

No wonder there is an investigation under way into the bridge deal, and other manipulations out here, the last few years.

I cannot learn where or when Mon Wallgren ever was considered much of a business success. How, then, can he build a $60,000 home, in times like the present?

The writer and thousands of others in Washington State hope you can find the answer.

Believe me, as ever
Sincerely yours,

JERRY MILLER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*
Hon. Senator HARRY CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Let me take this opportunity of thanking you for your excellent work in showing the Nation that the man we didn't want for the office of Governor is also the man we do not want as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

Please do not forget that patriotic gesture of Mr. Wallgren's in 1945 when he stated that no Republican veteran would get a State position and also that insipid statement of his that he doubted if there were many Republican war veterans.

As you well know there were no bullets, shells, or pieces of shrapnel, as well as any draft board that bothered to tell the difference between a Republican and a Democrat.

Please accept my best personal wishes during your term in office and for the years to come.

Respectfully yours,
GILBERT M. HOUGHTON.

[From the New York Mirror of March 9, 1949]

WALLGREN AND MEYER NIGHT-CLUB CRONIES

(By Lee Mortimer)

Mon Wallgren and Johnny Meyer, high-powered page-1 press agent and tab-signer, were a pair of gay birds in the late spots during 1946 and 1947, according to cafe society habitues.

While Wallgren was Governor of the State of Washington he was frequently seen in the company of Meyer at bars and cafes here. It was a running gag in the supper clubs that the capital of Washington had been moved from Olympia to El Morocco.

Meyer, the perfect host, always picked up the tab. Frequently the rotund publicity man enlisted visiting Hollywood beauties and New York party girls to lend the feminine touch to these late gatherings.

Night clubbers said Johnny's interest in Wallgren was not purely social, but was centered on Wallgren's direct pipe line to the White House.

TWA air lines, which lacked a trans-Pacific link to complete its dream of circling the globe, held an option to purchase North-

west Airlines. Wallgren, who hails from the Northwest was instrumental in obtaining for that line the franchise which TWA was unable to get for itself.

However, it turned out that Meyer's work was wasted. Before TWA could pick up its option, the stock market picture changed considerably and TWA lost interest in Northwest.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 25, 1949.*
Re Mon C. Wallgren.
Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The enclosed clipping from today's San Francisco Examiner prompts me to write to you.

At the time of the political campaign of 1944, I was living in Washington State. On one occasion I was handed, on the streets of Seattle, a copy of a paper called the New World, Terry Pettus, editor, 231 Lyon Building, Seattle. I understand this paper was more or less an organ of local Communists. One of the contributors to the issue I received was State Representative William Pennock, who later, I believe, held an administrative position in the department of finance, budget, and business under Governor Wallgren's administration.

Although my observations of State politics were more or less incidental, I think investigation would bring out that Mr. Pennock, Representative Hugh DeLacy, and State Senator Thomas C. Rabbit were actively identified with Communists at the time of the 1944 campaign, although nominally they were Democrats. These men, as well as Mr. Pettus, were leaders of a group who were most aggressive on two or three occasions in attempting to break up meetings to which they were opposed by shouting, heckling, seizing of the microphone, and more or less strong-arm methods. I think Seattle dailies of June 1944 would have accounts of some of these incidents.

Mr. Carl Reeve, secretary of the Communist Political Association (of Washington State) appeared on the platform along with Mr. DeLacy and Mr. Pettus at a rally of the Washington Pension Union, of which Mr. Pennock was executive secretary and later president. This was in June 1944.

The New World strongly supported the campaigns of Governor Wallgren, Representative Pennock, and Representative DeLacy.

I do not know what relations existed among Governor Wallgren, Mr. Pennock, and these other men. However, as stated above, Mr. Pennock did serve, as I recall, in Governor Wallgren's administration where he must have been appointed, directly or indirectly, by the Governor.

The above information may or may not be helpful to you. It is respectfully submitted.

Sincerely yours,

LLOYD A. HALL.

INDIO, CALIF., *February 25, 1947.*
HARRY CAIN.

DEAR SIR: Have watched and appreciated your conduct in our behalf and specially appreciate your efforts to protect us from having such men as Mon C. Wallgren as our officials. I know him well. Even his kid days in Everett. Too bad Senator BYRD, of Virginia, doesn't, for BYRD is one Democrat who usually seems to be right.

Did you know that Wallgren is building a $60,000 house between here and Palm Springs. Not so bad. Can't be ferry money, but where did he get it?

Believe me, this comes from the grass roots; been content to let our elected officials run it to suit their own judgment, but its getting too rotten for me. Was on the faculty of the University of Washington for many years, now retired. My friends think as I do in this matter. Hope you win and glad you are getting credit for leading the fight.

J. G. FLETCHER.

NORGARD-LATTA INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,
Yakima, Wash., February 22, 1949.
Senator HARRY CAIN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: If former Gov. Mon C. Wallgren has been able to acquire sufficient funds from his senatorship and governorship salaries to build such a winter-resort home, he certainly ought to be able to literally put aside millions from such a position as friend Harry Truman is offering him now.

As a citizen of the State of Washington and with the rumors that have been current relative to the Wallgren administration it would seem to me this warrants investigation.

Sincerely,

MEADE G. ELLIOTT.

SCARSDALE, N. Y., *March 6, 1949.*
Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Have reason to believe Wallgren not qualified for position as Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Strongly urge you resist appointment.

L. B. DAVIS.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 27, 1949.*
Senator HARRY CAIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We appreciate your efforts to prevent the Senate approval of the Mon Wallgren appointment.

Alice B. Crummett, Alice J. Bronson, Albert H. Crosetti, Virginia M. Crosetti, William De Hollander, Helen De Hollander, Vincent H. Nelson, A. Marion Nelson, Mary Stensby, Lydia Anderson.

SPOKANE, WASH., *February 23, 1949.*
HON. HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: The enclosed clipping is from the Spokane Daily Chronicle of February 21st and to my mind indicates that ex-Gov. Mon Wallgren accumulated a remarkable amount of money on a $500 a month salary. Perhaps he would like to tell you how he accomplished this and at the same time purchased a substantial interest in a broadcasting station in Seattle.

Trusting that this may aid you in keeping this menace to the public welfare from getting his hands on any of the country's funds, I am

Yours very truly,

FRED M. ACKLEY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 27, 1949.*
Senator HARRY P. CAIN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Some of us folks in Washington State are wondering if and when ex-Governor Wallgren is made Chairman of the National Security Resources Board will he install slot machines in his department and will there be 100-percent Blue Springs on tap for all Washington State visitors. This may be essential to the welfare of our country.

From another S. O. B.

A. D. PATTEN.

SEATTLE.

DEAR SENATOR CAIN: Rather a nice house this chap is able to build on a $6,000 salary.

If the Senate knew him as we do out here in the State of Washington they would not confirm him as a page boy. He is absolutely lacking in basic integrity.

We are all for you in your fight against him.

Sincerely,

TOWNSEND COALE.

Tribute by Rabbi William F. Rosenblum to Thomas A. Edison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BRICKER

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 10 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "And There Was Light," preached at Temple Israel, New York, by Rabbi William F. Rosenblum in commemoration of Thomas Alva Edison on February 11, 1949.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AND THERE WAS LIGHT

(By Rabbi William F. Rosenblum)

Lives of great men do remind us of the footprints they have left on the sands of time. They also quicken our heartbeats as in review of their achievements we realize how much of life's purpose and life's enjoyments is due to their genius and their work.

Especially significant in this regard is this month of February when the birth of some of America's immortals is celebrated. Washington and Lincoln, Longfellow and Lowell—all are February's children, and this year we add another illustrious name to the roster of our Nation's glorious and great as we formally observe the anniversary of birth of a man whose career has few parallels in history, whose genius none has surpassed, whose inventions have left not only our generation but all the generations of the future in his debt. That name is Thomas Alva Edison, the wizard of Menlo Park.

Edison was born February 11, 1847, a little over a century ago this day. He was interred in October 1931. The moment his body returned to the earth his spirit became part of the soul of America and of the world. It is, indeed, fitting that we here, in our synagogues, pay tribute to this one of February's immortals—an American who benefited all mankind.

There are many sermons in the life of Edison but his major discoveries illustrate graphically one of the attributes that our rabbis exalt in man. The psalmist sings of him:

I

"Thou hast made him little lower than the angels.
Thou gavest him dominion over the works of Thy hands,
Thou hast put all things under his feet."

Man is no mere pawn on a cosmic chessboard. He is, as our sages put it, "a partner of God" in creation and in the scheme of the universe. When God created the world and brought order out of the chaos and the void he said "Let there be light." He placed the sun in the heavens to give us the day; the moon and the stars to relieve the darkness of the night. Man soon discovered that the sun was often eclipsed by clouds and the night skies oft without a single star. Therefore, from the first he sought for the means with which to penetrate the darkness. And as he grew in mastery over nature he wanted something less flickering than the candle, something more dependable than his oil lamp. It was Edison who invented the incandescent lamps which have turned night into day, who started us on the way to defy the whims of fog and cloud.

Edison had little formal schooling. He educated himself. He needed little sleep,

because his mind was so everlastingly awake. One can fancy him pondering upon the words "Let there be light" and hearing a still small voice assure him that in God's unfolding plan there was place for man-made lamps as well as nature's lights. Today we speak glibly of our great white ways, but only because to Thomas Edison came the flash of revelation which enables us today to say "there is light."

II

There are three things on earth which have always engendered fear in the heart of man and which, from the very beginning, he knew he had to overcome in order to find happiness and peace of mind. Next to utter darkness that which affrights man so much is silence. While quietude sometimes has its magic and its charm, man is lonely and miserable in a silent world. Edison has helped the world to find its voice. Today we take for granted the eloquence of the life about us. We need but turn a switch or press a button or lift a receiver and words and music are ours to command. The songs of yesterday are ours today, the speech that is made at the other end of the globe finds all humanity in the radio audience. And even more miraculous is the fact that in the centuries to come posterity will be able to listen to the playing of a Heifetz, or the oratory of a Franklin D. Roosevelt, or the sermons of our modern preachers and hear them as clearly as if they were in the concert hall, or the East Room, or the sanctuary today.

How marvelous it would be if we, in our time, could hear the voice of Moses as he thundered forth the words of the Decalog at Sinai. How helpful and how quickly unfounded hatreds and bigotries could be resolved if we had a recording today of the Jew of Galilee pleading with his generation, as the loyal member of the synagogue he was, to walk in the ways of the Torah and not change a jot or tittle of the heritage he held so precious. Then no one could distort his gospel of love and his love for his people into tides of prejudice and hate.

There are great spiritual leaders in church and synagogue today whose voices reach around the world to millions of men. These men will die but their sermons will be reproduced faithfully for the unborn millions because Edison, after creating the automatic telegraph, while watching the progress of a perforated piece of paper, suddenly decided that if the paper could give out a humming sound as the dots and dashes blended together, why could he not reproduce the human voice. Edison, who went from invention to invention, whose mind never stopped thinking until his heart stopped beating, thus created the phonograph—and gave humanity eternal speech.

III

The third fear which man has nursed is that of utter stillness. Have you ever been in a place where nothing moved, where all around you seemed one total paralysis? The motors and devices Edison brought into being are too many to catalog here but his facile mind drew upon nature's powerhouse to make it possible for men to travel more speedily and to manufacture things more quickly. He helped to bring continents nearer and it was his hope that thus countries would be brought closer. His motion-picture inventions have turned all the world not only into a stage but into a meeting house. The impact of the cinema on the human mind is only now beginning to be discerned and we shall yet go from mere entertainment to enlightenment by way of the screen. Yes, it is a far cry from the nickelodeons of the turn of the century to the films and the picture palaces of today, but tomorrow's history will be more faithful and true than the record of our past because the generations of the future will be able to have the events of our era pass in accurate review before them in their times. And because they will not have to dig the knowledge of their predecessors out of layers of sand nor decipher it out of shards and clay tablets, the peace which is so hard for us to establish may be the lasting peace which they will enjoy. All because of a man like Edison who seemed to be little lower than the angels, who performed miracles with the work of his hands and who put so many things under the feet of mankind.

IV

A nation grows great not only through its generals and its political leaders, not only through its bards and its authors nor through its merchants and its preachers, but through those men in every field who, in their own quest for success, have added to the happiness of their fellow men; who, in their search for fame have added to the glory of living; who, in their time of greatness, did not lose the common touch; who, above all else, despite their own moments of doubt nonetheless strengthened people in their faith.

Washington is best remembered as the Father of our Country and in that one word "father" is expressed the major import he will always have for our people. Lincoln is the Great Emancipator, the man to whom freedom and union had to be more than words in a document. The faith of Washington in our Republic started us on our career; the faith of Lincoln assured our existence. But there have been and there will be moments when some of our leaders and some of our people will falter in their faith in our democracy and became apprehensive of our future, when they may listen to voices of allurement foreign to our traditions and inimical to our liberties. The words of Edison, shortly before he died, should then be recited as a litany of faith in this America, our native land, made more beautiful and infinitely more rich by Thomas Alva Edison's long labors and many inventions, words which echo those of Moses when he laid his charge upon Joshua, "Chazak Veamatz," words which our generation needs today: "Be courageous. I have lived a long time. I have seen history repeat itself again and again * * * always America has come out stronger and more prosperous. Be as brave as your fathers before you. Have faith. Go forward."

Edison, February's child, now belongs to the ages. Edison, the wizard of Menlo Park, is now one of the world's immortals. Edison, tireless worker with mind and hands, has left a challenge which reflects the very spirit of our people, a call not alone to our Nation but to our world which the synagogue can echo and reecho:

"Be as brave as your fathers. Have faith. Go forward."

History of the Word "Filibuster"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Malcolm W. Bingay, dealing with the history of the word "filibuster," published in the Detroit Free Press of March 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD MORNING

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

FULL O' BUSTER

Who said that?

No, this is not a radio quiz hour. This is me talking to myself. The other night I was awakened from a sound sleep by a guy on the phone who wanted me to settle a bet. I do not know why they always have to settle bets around 2 o'clock in the morning. He wanted to know who coined the word "filibuster" in connection with legislative skulduggery.

I had to confess I did not know.

The Dictionary of American English says that in 1853 a Member of Congress termed the tactics of his opponents filibustering against the United States. That is no help at all. What we want to know is what Congressman?

In the Dictionary of American Language we are told that it was first quoted in The Congressional Globe on May 21, 1858—or 5 years after the date given by the Dictionary of American English. Furthermore, a Congressman John McQueen from South Carolina is credited with having coined it.

Was he the unsung hero who gave us the word to denote such rascality?

Up to that historic moment the word "filibuster" just meant an all-around dirty criminal. The word was adopted into English from the Spanish filibustero. The Spanish got it from the French flibustier, while the French got it from the Dutch vrijbuiter, which the Dutch took from the English word freebooter, which means one who goes around plundering—or freely stealing his booty. That is sure going all around the mulberry bush.

In the United States the word was used in its original sense in the years before and during the war of the States. Bands of adventurers launched military and naval expeditions to invade Central and South American Republics.

The trick was to seize power by faked revolutions then loot the country.

But the daddy of them all was William Walker. Walker was both a lawyer and an editor which, anyone will agree, is a very bad combination.

Walker sailed out of San Francisco with a small force and seized Lower California which he proclaimed as an independent republic. A little later he helped himself to Sonora. The United States moved in and stopped shipments of supplies and that ended his first venture. But he escaped.

In 1855 he entered into a conspiracy with a gang in Nicaragua to organize a revolution. This was easy with his army behind him and with the hearty cooperation of the Accessory Transit Co.

With this backing Walker captured the capital, Granada. The enemy surrendered and Walker became dictator. He was living the life of Riley as the man who would be king when the United States solemnly recognized his government in 1856.

But Walker did not figure on Cornelius Vanderbilt, who was just as tough a pirate as Walker ever was and who had a lot more money.

Cornelius wanted control of the Accessory Transit Line to complete a monopoly and Walker opposed him. That was the end of Walker almost immediately. Vanderbilt organized his own filibusters and shipped them to Central America to form a coalition against this intruder. Van blocked isthmian transit almost as high-handedly as Theodore Roosevelt grabbed land for the Panama Canal.

Walker could not get any supplies as the blockade was complete. He surrendered to an American naval captain who had been sent by the United States to offer his good services.

He was finally nailed in 1860 by Captain Salmon, of the British Navy, when we were all busy at home with a real war.

He captured Walker on the coast of Honduras as he was seeking to get back into Nicaragua. Salmon turned him over to the government of Honduras and there he got his come-uppance.

The close of the Civil War ended filibustering of that type. Ever since it has been confined strictly to the United States Senate. Senator ELLENDER holds the record for talking six straight days against the antilynching bill in 1938. Huey Long read recipes on how to make "pot likker," the star clown of them all.

The boys are allowed to talk about anything or nothing and most of them do; working in relays like 6-day bicycle racers or marathon dancers. They contend there is no way of stopping it as that might hurt the dignity of the Senate.

Subsidy Payments in the Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Legislative Overhaul Asked for Nonsubsidized Lines," written by Mr. George W. Morgan, president of the Association of American Shipowners, and published in the Journal of Commerce of February 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE OVERHAUL ASKED FOR NONSUBSIDIZED LINES—SEEK BROADER BASIS FOR MARITIME AIDS—IN WHICH GEORGE MORGAN ARGUES THAT IF BASIC TENETS OF EXISTING LAW ARE GOOD, THEY SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO MORE OF INDUSTRY

(By George W. Morgan, president, Association of American Ship Owners)

Return to the Treasury recently of the full amount of operating subsidy payments by some of the most important subsidized companies was a signficant event since it may indicate the possibility in some of the foreign-trade routes of successful operation without the aid of subsidy payments.

The fact that subsidized operators who were paid sixteen million dollars by the Government during the period of their subsidy contracts were able to repay that amount in full at the conclusion of the contract period, suggests that the subsidy payments may have been unnecessary and that use of private capital in an amount equal to the subsidy payments would have made payment of Government funds unnecessary.

QUESTION HELD "PROVOCATIVE"

In any event, the fact that several subsidized companies have been able to repay the amounts they received as subsidies is provocative. Is the success of the subsidized companies due to advantages, other than subsidy payments, that they enjoy? If so, would it not strengthen the merchant marine as a whole if such advantages were extended to those who do not have subsidy aid?

There are, of course, various advantages and financial benefits that are available to the subsidized companies. If one of the ultimate objectives of our maritime policy is successful operation in the world trades without subsidy assistance, it would seem to follow that unsubsidized operation should be encouraged wherever possible. Assuming this premise to be sound, the conclusion seems inescapable that ample opportunity should be afforded the unsubsidized owner to operate without subsidized competition and that subsidized operations, accordingly, should be strictly confined to routes and services where Government assistance is necessary.

A shipowner who is furnishing adequate service without subsidy assistance should not have to face the competition of another American operator who is subsidized. To permit subsidized owners who enjoy special privileges and advantages to compete freely with unsubsidized American shipowners to whom such privileges and advantages are denied can scarcely be said to encourage unsubsidized operation.

Oddly enough, the subsidy contracts provide:

"Competition: The operator agrees that, without the express written approval of the Commission, neither the operator nor any affiliate, subsidiary or holding company will operate or cause or permit any unsubsidized vessels owned or controlled by any of them to be operated in the subsidized service of the operator or in the foreign commerce of the United States in competition with any other service, route, or line receiving financial aid pursuant to the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936."

PROBLEMS OF OTHER LINES

Thus while a subsidized shipowner must obtain commission approval if his proposed operation would be in competition with another subsidized owner, he is free at all times to compete with an unsubsidized owner (unless such unsubsidized owner is already in competition with some other subsidized owner). It seems clear that the unsubsidized owners should have at least as much protection from the competition of subsidized owners as the subsidized owners themselves enjoy.

Important advantages enjoyed by the subsidized companies and not by unsubsidized shipowners are the ability to purchase new ships at world market prices and the right to establish special tax-free or tax-deferred funds. By making deposits of earnings in these funds, the subsidized companies are able, in effect, to amortize the capital invested in their ships very rapidly and also to accumulate reserves that can later be withdrawn to pay the losses that experience has shown must be expected in a cyclical industry such as shipping. Without having had such advantages it is problematical whether the subsidized companies could have returned their subsidy payments to the Government.

EXTENDING ITS BENEFITS

If the financial privilege enjoyed by the subsidized companies have in fact been a major contributing factor in their success, it would seem that the interests of the nation in its merchant marine could be furthered by extending those benefits to all American-flag shipping. Furthermore, it seems only fair that unsubsidized companies should be permitted to operate in as favorable an economic environment as that which the Government has provided for the subsidized section of the industry.

Under existing statutes, a favorable economic environment for the investment of capital in new, unsubsidized American-built ships does not exist because world-market prices for such ships are available only to those who qualify for construction subsidies. If anyone else builds a new ship in this country, he is obliged to pay a premium for it of at least 70 percent above its actual value as measured by the cost of building a similar ship abroad.

When any owner, subsidized or not, sells a ship, he will be paid for it not more than it is worth in the world market. If the shipowner must take his chance on the world market when he sells, it is easy to understand why he is hesitant to pay substantially more than market value when he buys. Circumstances would have to be unusual indeed for any investor to be willing to pay a large premium above market for any item of property.

FAVORABLE ENVIRONMENT

A favorable economic environment for unsubsidized American shipping also requires that the shipowner be able to amortize his capital investment so that he can replace his ships when they become obsolete or inefficient. When he is unable to do so, the merchant marine will simply deteriorate because adequate new capital will not be invested in ships if their earnings are insufficient to cover their costs during the period of their useful economic lives.

It seems clear that any reasonable amortization or depreciation procedure should conform with the earnings pattern of the industry to which it is applied.

In an industry of irregular earnings, such as shipping, a prudent businessman would accelerate his depreciation in years of high earnings. In years when he has losses he would accrue his unearned depreciation against the time when his earnings will be sufficient to enable him to charge suitable amortization payments against them.

Whether we like it or not, the record shows that high shipping earnings have been limited to brief periods of wartime unsettlement and actual war. Very small earnings or operating deficits have been the general rule in the intervening years.

PREWAR EARNINGS

For example, the composite earnings record of three large companies (representing approximately 15 percent of the industry before the war) shows that while the record of an individual company may have been somewhat better, the result of their combined operations was in the black in only 4 years during the 18-year period between 1921 and 1940.

The four profitable years, moreover, coincided with the peak of the general business cycle. While we may hope for a better record in the future, we must accept the probability that depreciation charges in the future may not be fully earned over extended periods. And if depreciation is not fully earned, then the shipowner cannot amortize his capital investment and replace his ships from earnings.

Opportunity to amortize invested capital for vessel replacement purposes is now afforded to the subsidized companies in section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Such owners may make tax-exempt earnings deposits in reserve funds. Thus heavy tax deferment is possible in years of good earnings and since they may be withdrawn to pay losses, the subsidized owner may in effect accelerate his depreciation.

TAX-FREE FUNDS

But the ability to pay losses from accumulated tax-free earnings is much more valuable than the right to accelerate depreciation, and under section 607 it is possible for the subsidized companies to set aside additional tax-free funds against periods when the shipowner will incurr losses.

A similar opportunity should be afforded to the unsubsidized owners because the use of such funds to offset operating deficits would promote greater stability, and the result of greater stability would not only be to encourage capital investment but to provide greater employment opportunities for maritime labor.

The present law offers special inducements only for the investment of capital in subsidized shipping. It is certainly not unreasonable to ask whether it is not of equal

if not greater importance that encouragement be extended to the unsubsidized companies by affording them protection against subsidized competition and by permitting them to have financial advantages, other than subsidy payments, equal to those enjoyed by the subsidized owners.

The extent to which payment of operating subsidies is in fact necessary can perhaps best be determined by permitting the unsubsidized segment of the American merchant marine to operate in as favorable an economic environment as that afforded for the subsidized companies.

The fact that it has been possible to return substantial portions of the subsidy payments to the Government suggests strongly that the more favorable economic environment of the subsidized companies is more important than actual subsidy receipts.

If this is so, the Nation's interests in its merchant marine would be admirably served by extending to all the financial benefits now enjoyed by the subsidized companies.

Operation Snowbound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, Operation Snowbound has from the first day of operations paid untold dividends in saving human lives, rescuing livestock, and opening roads to restore communications in the blizzard-stricken States of the West. Our country can ill afford to be without an agency like the Army engineers, which has functioned so ably in this humanitarian effort. The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army with the facilities of its well known civil works organization have again performed in their customary manner in emergencies. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Operation Snowbound" from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of February 14, 1949, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPERATION SNOWBOUND

Two weeks ago the West's blizzard disaster had reached such catastrophic proportions that President Truman directed use of the Armed Services' resources for relief purposes. Army Secretary Royall was designated to coordinate the activity, and the tough job of field command was given to Maj. Gen. Lewis Pick, then Missouri Valley division engineer and now Chief of Army Engineers. The President further authorized use of such flood control and rivers and harbors funds and such facilities of the Corps of Engineers' civil functions division as was necessary. In short, the job was given to those ready to tackle it on an immediate basis.

While General Pick and his men have been fighting the blizzards, the Corps, which earlier has assigned him to building the Ledo road, has been fighting at Washington for continuance of its civil functions and against the threat of removal which the pending reorganization bill contains. In that undertaking the brunt has been borne by its civilian friends and notably those who live behind the main line levees of the Lower Mississippi Valley. One champion of the Corps of Engineers who testified before the Senate Expenditures Committee, however, was Senator CHAN GURNEY, of blizzard-cursed South Dakota. He was unstinting in his praise of what they are doing for the stricken people of his State.

Strangely enough, and for reasons we do not attempt to explain, there has been no mention of Army engineer direction of the vast blizzard relief operation. Because of that we asked some questions at Omaha headquarters of Operation Snowbound and got answers that tell of a magnificent civil-functions undertaking of the Army engineers.

During the 12-day period from January 29 to February 10, 67,054 persons were released from snowbound farms and ranches by road-opening operations.

The total head of isolated livestock reached and given ground access to feed was 1,887,381.

The total number of miles of road opened in the disaster areas of Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming was 32,780.

Directing this activity, in which 5,400 persons are engaged, are 55 Army engineer officers, 19 from the Missouri Valley division, 30 from the Engineer Center at Fort Belvoir, Va., and 6 from other stations.

Holding key posts in Operation Snowbound are 540 civilian employees from the engineer district and division offices of the Missouri River Division. Working with them in the field are 450 contractor employees and contractor-hired labor diverted from Army civil functions projects. There are 1,000 contractor items of equipment being used, including 80 bulldozers, graders, and plows. From their military stores Army engineers have supplied 180 dozers, graders, and snow plows. In some instances, civil functions and military equipment have been moved into the area from tremendous distances. Operation Snowbound covers a disaster area of 138,000 square miles.

The point of this is that Army engineers are putting into a gallant fight to save humans and stock from a blizzard catastrophe the same know-how and determination that they have put into many a flood fight in this valley. They are winning there as they have won here, and if it wasn't for their civil functions organization, its equipment and skill, the job just couldn't be done.

It will take some doing to convince the people of a three-State blizzard area that a political agency of Government could or would do a better job than the Army engineers.

National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, there is printed herewith a copy of the talk given by me on January 29, 1949, before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held at the Statler Hotel here in Washington, D. C.:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

When we speak of national defense, the average individual's thoughts naturally turn to soldiers and sailors; to armies with their implements of war; to navies with their battleships, cruisers, destroyers, submarines; to the air force with its bombers and its fighting planes.

Going a step farther, when considering national defense, one thinks of mines and mills and factories, of production machinery, of assembly lines, of the Nation's ability to produce, transport, and make available at the point of danger all those things useful in defeating an enemy.

Still farther down the line, but as the real foundation of it all, one thinks of the man who tills the soil, who is first in the production line, in the production not only of the things which are necessary for munitions of war but of the food and clothing, which are the first necessities which the armed forces must have if they are to be successful.

Despite the fact that the United States of America is not first in natural resources, it is first in its ability to produce and make available the most efficient weapons of war—those things which enable the Nation to win a war.

Nor has the courage, the endurance, the know-how of the rank and file of our fighting men ever been successfully challenged.

Perhaps the most competent witness in all the world testified to our rightful position in the family of nations when Winston Churchill, speaking on the first Thanksgiving Day after the war, said:

"The United States has, in sober fact, become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world."

While all the things which have been mentioned are essential in a worth-while national defense program, none is, nor do all together, make a complete, safe defense program that will preserve us a nation, safeguard the liberty and the well-being of our citizens.

If the only threat to the citizen's liberty and the Nation's security was the armed force of our enemy or enemies, we might well rest secure in the thought that, in the future as in the past, our national strength, the resourcefulness of our citizens, might safely be relied upon to protect us.

Unfortunately, today, as in the years long past, our danger comes from within. True today as on the day when Abraham Lincoln gave voice to it on the field at Gettysburg is the statement—

"At what point is the danger to be expected? If it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

Even the framers of our Constitution realized the danger of a change in its principles. When Benjamin Franklin stepped out of old Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, on a day in September 1787, the day on which he signed the new Constitution which he helped to formulate, a friend asked him, "What kind of government have you given us?" He promptly replied, "A republic, if we can keep it."

Today, the real threat to our individual and national security comes from two sources.

Overlong, we have given sanctuary and encouragement to Communists, to Fascists, and to those with ideologies which have in other countries demonstrated their lack of soundness.

We have taken to our hearts, opened our pocketbooks to, and placed in positions of trust in the Federal Government, members of a party which has openly declared that it would overthrow this Government by force. The utter folly of our policy in this respect has been and is past understanding.

Again, under the fiction that we were serving a humanitarian purpose; that we were carrying the "four freedoms" throughout the world; that we were dispensing a needed charity, we have blindly and foolishly depleted our national resources as well as almost completely destroyed our independent thinking, by a program designed, it has been

said, to bring peace and freedom from want throughout the world.

Today, after the policy has been in operation for some years, we find the world engaged in four separate and distinct wars, and other peoples, who should be independent and self-sustaining, more and more dependent, having less freedom in their own governmental affairs.

During the last few years, the Congress gradually, but nevertheless surely and ever progressively, has been enacting legislation which, in almost every instance, took from the people and from their local governments the power reserved to the people by the Constitution.

To my mind, the greatest danger to the Republic lies in the complacence with which the Congress grants to the executive branch the power to legislate, undermines the integrity of State governments.

The most fruitful and beneficial plan for national defense must include a determination on the part of the Congress to cease delegating power to the Executive, to cease abdicating its constitutional duty to enact legislation; then, to see that it is enforced.

Any effective national defense program must have back of it skilled and competent, loyal workers.

Precision instruments are essential if any effective war is to be waged. Let me cite just one instance where we have been extremely foolish along industrial lines.

To my desk yesterday came a series of editorials, published January 17 to 21, inclusive, from the Waltham Watch Co. and the American jeweled-watch industries. These editorials call attention to the fact that wartime legislation and regulations threaten a $5,600,000 annual pay roll; that 2,300 workers, skilled in making watches, will be out of jobs—this because the watch market during the war was given to Switzerland.

If this meant only that those people would be out of jobs and must seek others, the matter would not be at all serious, but what it really means is that, unless the policy is changed, thousands of skilled workers will seek different jobs and that, in the end, in the event of war, the precision instruments needed by the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, will not be obtainable here at home.

More along the same line—during the war, while other nations permitted their medical students, their chemists, their scientists, to continue their education, we drafted them into the ranks. Result? Today, when we need doctors in every community; when there is a scarcity of dentists—in fact, of all professional men, except perhaps, the law—none is available.

In our anxiety to rehabilitate Europe, the Army and the Navy are taking practically all of certain types of fertilizer, so that the American farmer and the American fruit grower are unable to produce as they otherwise might.

Only recently have a few of our international statesmen conceded the obvious fact that, in our program of giving, we might at least take an inventory, ascertain what we had left, how much more we could give away without endangering ourselves.

A man may give away his shirt and still prosper. But, if he gives away the tools of his trade or his capital resources which he cannot replace, he is soon not only unable to help others, but to save himself.

On one occasion, the Congress not only gave to a President a billion dollars to be used, without any accounting, in any manner he saw fit, but it has on more than one occasion, issued a blank check of power to the Executive.

Either because the Congress considers our form of Government indestructible or because it is too careless or too indolent to know what it is about, it has time and time again unnecessarily granted power to the Executive.

But why continue the story? The facts are available to all. Let me quote from the testimony of Lindsay Warren, a Democrat who served the State of North Carolina in the House of Representatives for many years. He was appointed Comptroller General of the United States for a term of 15 years and has served as such approximately half of that term. He is the agent of the Congress—not the agent of the Executive.

Appearing before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Tuesday, January 25, 1949, Mr. Warren testified, and I quote:

"That is why I said, and still, on the whole, reiterate, that the present set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the tax-eaters and those who wish to keep themselves perpetually attached to the public teat, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill. That is why I say the Government should put its own house in order."

We must have reorganization, but it is not necessary to surrender our constitutional processes to get it. Delegations of authority and the misuse thereof may destroy our ability to maintain an adequate defense program.

"Most thinking, informed Americans will agree with the proposition that the United States of America is today, as Churchill said, the most powerful nation in the world. That is because, and only because, our people, in years gone by, have at least made an effort to, in a constitutional manner, follow the principles laid down in that immortal document.

Yet the Congress has on several occasions disregarded the Constitution and enabled the Executive to reverse the constitutional procedure for the enactment of legislation.

It is true that section 3 of article II of the Constitution provides that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

But nowhere is there a word which gives the President power, acting alone or with one House of Congress, to enact legislation.

Section 1 of article I of the Constitution provides that—

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Section 7 states that—

"Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall before it becomes a law be presented to the President of the United States."

Nevertheless, in the reorganization bill now pending before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and soon to be submitted to the Congress, there is carried, in section 6 of title I of that bill, an express relinquishment of the constitutional power of the Congress to legislate; a transfer of that power to the President of the United States.

Section 6 of that bill states in substance that the President may send to Congress a reorganization plan affecting the executive departments and that, unless each House of the Congress, within 60 legislative days, expressly repudiates or vetoes that plan, it shall become and be the law of the land.

We all know that, under the Constitution, to become effective as a law, a bill must receive a majority vote of each House and that, then, and only then, as provided in section 7 of article I of the Constitution, it goes to the President for his approval or disapproval.

This present reorganization bill provides, as have other reorganization plans, that the President may propose or recommend to the Congress and that, unless both Senate and House veto that plan within the prescribed time, it becomes the law of the land.

Comptroller General Warren attempted to justify the legislation with the argument that it was necessary because only in that manner could legislation establishing greater efficiency and needed economy be enacted.

But the issue still is: Do our economic demands justify a scrapping of a portion of the Constitution, and that, to my mind, the most important part of the Constitution—the power of the people's elected Representatives to enact legislation needed to protect the public health, safety, and welfare?

It is true that we need more efficiency and more economy in the Federal Government; otherwise, ultimately, we will be destroyed as a nation by a nation of taxeaters.

Fortunately, the thing sought to be accomplished by executive reorganization of the departments can be accomplished in a lawful, legal manner, and very simply and easily. All we need to do in this particular instance is to strike out section 6 of the present bill and insert, in lieu thereof, a provision that the reorganization plans which the President may desire to offer to the Congress may be submitted by him and that the Congress shall, within a 60-day period, act upon each of those plans, either approving or disapproving.

If you study the question of national defense in connection with the doings of your legislative and executive departments, you will soon discover that, while this Nation needs munitions of war and fighting men, strategic plans for war and production, the real, the threatening danger to this Republic lies in the lack of vigilance on the part of its citizens—a lack of knowledge of what, or indifference to what, their Executive and their Congress are doing.

Let us direct our thought, not only toward the weapons of war, but to those insidious things against which Abraham Lincoln warned us—the enemy within, not only the Communists and the Fascists, but the careless, thoughtless American, who permits a frittering away of his liberty, of the national security, through legislative enactment.

Oleo Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 11, 1949:

OLEO BILL

The approval by the House Agriculture Committee of a bill to remove all Federal taxes on oleo, while imposing a ban on interstate shipments of colored oleo, is a victory for the dairy interests. For while unconditional abolishment of the oleo taxes would increase sales of the colored product in States permitting such sales, a ban on interstate shipments would cut off all sales of colored oleo in 18 of the 30 States that permit such sales, since they have no factories within their borders from which local shipments could be made. Furthermore, in three other States with oleo factories (Ohio, Illinois, and California) State laws prohibit the sale of

colored oleo. Hence the net result of enactment of the miscalled compromise measure approved by the House Agriculture Committee would be a tightening of present restrictions.

The dairy interests have engineered this scheme for increasing the competitive advantages that butter producers now enjoy under the guise of a tax-repeal measure originally designed to remove discrimination at the Federal level and encourage the repeal of numerous State taxes and prohibitions on sales of colored oleo. If the dairy spokesmen succeed in carrying out their program, it will be a retrograde step that will testify to the power of pressure groups to thwart legislative action in the public interest.

The dairy organizations claim that tax-free sales of colored oleo would result in its fraudulent substitution for butter. The Washington Post takes no stock in such arguments. If, as claimed, there is now widespread evasion of regulatory laws designed to prevent fraudulent sales of oleo for butter, the remedy, obviously, lies in stricter law enforcement. Certainly there is no reason to suppose that fraudulent substitution would be checked by banning sales of colored oleo, since it would be possible to obtain coloring matter.

The expansion of the oleo industry is primarily attributable to price differentials that have led a rapidly increasing body of consumers to turn from butter to a much cheaper and equally nutritious substitute. The trend may be slowed somewhat, but it will not be arrested by banning sales of colored oleo, for housewives will continue, as at present, to "color their own," if denied the right to buy colored oleo. The real question at issue is whether the oleo industry is to be permitted to sell its product in competition with a rival industry without being handicapped in the competitive race by Federal and State taxes that impose unnecessary burdens on consumers and by a network of discriminatory prohibitions having no place in an economy of free enterprise and serving no purpose except to provide indirect subsidies for the dairy industry.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I believe that rent control must be continued in this country. Our housing shortage is so great that if rent controls were lifted now, exorbitant rent increases and mass evictions would follow; millions of families would be forced to cut down on necessary expenditures for food, clothing, medical care, and other basic living needs; and irresistible pressures for further wage increases followed by further price increases would inevitably lead to a new inflationary spiral. The facts on the housing shortage were developed by our own Joint Committee on Housing in the Eightieth Congress.

For those individuals and families who are living in cramped quarters or doubled up with other families, and who have been trying for months and even years to rent suitable housing accommodations at a figure within their reach, no statistics need be cited to prove that there is still a tremendous housing shortage. However, for those fortunate ones who have not been forced to go into the rental market to seek adequate shelter, some basic facts and figures may be cited.

The Office of Housing Expediter recently secured local estimates of the need for rental housing in 91 of our cities having a population of 100,000 or more. These estimates were made by city officials, housing authorities, real estate boards, and other responsible groups and individuals. These estimates show that at the end of 1948 there was an immediate unfilled need in these 91 cities for more than 1,000,000 rental dwelling units.

In order to appreciate how large this deficit of 1,000,000 dwelling units really is, it is useful to discuss it in relation to the volume of new construction of housing, and of rental housing in particular. For example, in those same 91 cities, it is estimated that not more than 97,000 newly constructed units were offered for rent during the first 10 months of 1948. The outlook for new permanent nonfarm dwelling units to be started in 1949 is about 875,000, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This total figure for the country as a whole is less than the one million deficit which is estimated to exist in only 91 cities. Moreover, only a small proportion of these 875,000 units will be offered for rent. During 1948 only about 17 percent of such newly constructed units were rental-type units. If 17 percent of the 875,000 units which are estimated for 1949 are offered for rent, the total number of rental units started in 1949 will be less than 150,000. This 150,000 total for the entire United States would not be enough to satisfy the need in even three or four of our larger cities.

Even these figures, extreme as they are, do not give a full measure of the acuteness of the housing shortage. This is because the newly constructed units which are coming on the rental market are too costly for the average American family. For example, most of the new rental units which were built in 1948 in the 91 cities were in the $75 to $100 per month class, while the predominant demand was for units renting for $40 to $50 per month. The Housing Expediter made a survey of rents on newly constructed units in over 700 cities in all 48 States. This survey showed that the average rent for such newly constructed rental units was $109.38 per month.

A few examples of the situation in some of our cities may also be cited. A survey made by the Housing Expediter in New Haven, Conn., showed that, according to local responsible estimates, from 1,500 to 5,000 families were seeking rental housing. Employers reported that they were having difficulty in hiring and keeping employees because of the lack of rental accommodations. Yale University had a list of 750 GI students who were looking for places to rent. Yet to meet all this unfilled demand, the survey found only one rental vacancy.

In Louisville, Ky., a similar survey revealed that an estimated 18,000 families were living doubled up, that approximately 3,000 families were on the active waiting list kept by a temporary war housing project, and that during the previous 12 months 8,000 families had contacted the Mayor's Emergency Housing Committee requesting rental housing accommodations.

In Dallas, Tex., a similar survey showed the vacancy rate for habitable rental units was only eight-tenths of 1 percent, and almost 90 percent of these were newly constructed units for which the median rent was $95 per month. The vacancy rate for habitable units offered for sale was one-half of 1 percent, and more than 70 percent of these were newly constructed with a median sales price of $11,500. The Dallas Housing Authority had 16,000 applications of tenants seeking units renting from $30 to $50 per month.

These are some of the facts which explain why, notwithstanding the amount of new construction since VJ-day, the number of married couples who are living doubled up with other families has been increasing instead of decreasing. According to the Bureau of Census, two and one-half million married couples were living doubled up in April 1948—35 percent more than the number of married couples living doubled up in April 1940.

This general picture also ties in with certain other significant facts. Under the present rent-control law, 767 local rent advisory boards are set up throughout the country with authority, among other things, to recommend decontrol of all or part of a defense rental area whenever they find that the demand for rental housing accommodations has been reasonably met. Since April 1, 1948, such rent advisory boards submitted on their own initiative decontrol recommendations for only 17 areas or portions of areas, and only 5 of these recommendations contained sufficient evidence to permit decontrol. At the same time that these local boards were functioning, the Housing Expediter was making decontrol surveys on his own initiative. Within the past 9 months, his staff made surveys in 986 counties throughout the United States. The facts produced by these surveys enabled the Expediter to decontrol only 31 areas or portions thereof.

I have said that the lifting of rent controls at this time would result in exorbitant rent increases. This statement is not only proved by the facts and figures concerning the housing shortage, but also by actual experience in connection with housing units that have already been decontrolled. Under the present rent law, there are no rent ceilings on newly constructed or converted housing, on permanent units in hotels, and certain other dwelling units. In the last 3 months, the Housing Expediter has investigated more than 62,000 of these decontrolled housing units located in over 1,000 cities and towns in all 48 States. The average rent for all 62,000 units is

60 percent higher than the last rent under rent control or comparable controlled rent; and for more than 14,000 of these units the present rent is more than double.

Although we must have a continuation of Federal rent control, I believe that rent ceilings should be fair to both landlords and tenants. So much has been said by opponents and critics of rent control concerning hardships on landlords, and landlords being forced to operate at a loss, that I think some of the facts on the other side should also be cited. For example, under the present regulations, a landlord is entitled to obtain an adjustment if his current net operating income falls below the net operating income which he had in any two consecutive years since 1939. The landlord may select for this purpose his best 2-year period since 1939, and if his current net income is below the net income for his best 2 years, he receives a rent adjustment to bring him up to that 2-year level.

There is also a provision for adjustment in any case where a landlord is currently operating at a loss. This provision was written into the rent regulations in July 1948. The Housing Expediter's records show that since that time only 1,524 petitions were filed by landlords under this provision, that 1,221 of these have been processed, and that in only 124 of these cases was the landlord actually operating at a loss.

Moreover, the local rent advisory boards have authority to recommend general rent increases whenever the facts show that landlords generally need relief. A number of such recommendations have been made by local advisory boards and many have been approved and put into effect.

Some comment on the operating position of landlords generally should also be made. Before the acute housing shortage developed landlords ordinarily counted on a substanial loss from vacancies and nonpayment of rents. They were also forced to spend considerable sums for painting and decorating and minor repairs. Under present conditions, the situation is reversed; loss from vacancies and nonpayments have virtually disappeared, the need for competitive expenditures has vanished and most tenants have been forced to assume the cost of minor repairs. Landlords' incomes have also been greatly increased by almost 1,800,000 individual adjustments, by general area rent increases affecting about 430,000 housing units, and by 15 percent leases signed for more than 2,000,000 dwelling units since July 1947. As a result, all indications point to the conclusion that the net operating income of landlords generally is substantially higher today than it was before the war. If, however, there is still a hardship situation in the case of any area or in the case of any individual landlord, the provisions of the rent law continue to be available for the relief of such situations.

Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star of March 9, 1949, commenting on Senator FULBRIGHT'S discussion of the proposed change in the rules of the Senate.

It is my understanding that this editorial was written by Mr. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., editor of the Winchester newspaper.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR FULBRIGHT GIVES A LESSON IN CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which records the debates and votes of the Congress, usually is rather dull reading. But to one who has an interest in government, in history, and in constitutional law, the issues of March 4 and March 5, we believe, will prove fascinating.

The hero of the debate, to our mind, was the able young Senator from Arkansas, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. Senator FULBRIGHT, 43, who had served as president of the University of Arkansas prior to his election to the Congress, discussed in detail the importance of preserving freedom of debate within the Senate of the United States. He spoke for the better part of 2 days and tangled with the experienced Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, the blunt Senator MORSE, of Oregon, and the demagogic Senator PEPPER, of Florida. But in each case, it seems to us, the scholarly Arkansan used his opponent's argument to effectively buttress his own.

For instance, to Senator MORSE's contention that a majority should be able to do as it wished, Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out that only that morning the Oregon Senator had experienced, and bitterly condemned, the arbitrary and tyrannical rule of a majority of the Labor Committee which refused to permit the minority members of the committee even to propose amendments to a bill which the majority wanted. The committee not only would not permit the discussion of the merits of the prospective amendments, but would not even permit the amendments to be presented. Senator FULBRIGHT concluded that the Senate as a whole could expect similar treatment if freedom of debate is abolished. The present rule which the administration would change permits limitation of debate by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT traced the history of the British Parliament and of the Italian and Polish systems to show the importance—indeed the necessity—of safeguarding the rights of a minority by free debate if a democratic government is to long endure. Freedom of debate, he emphasized, is not a parliamentary procedure that permits a minority to control a majority. "What the minority has the right to do is to exercise the power of resistance to arbitrary actions by the majority." Actually, he continued, the experience in the Senate under the present rule (which the Administration would discard) "is that very few measures for which there was real support, I am almost tempted to say that no measures which a great and strong majority of the American people have favored, have been defeated. Some have been delayed." But, he stated, "It is the power of delay which forces explanations, consideration. * * *" As an example he mentioned the now completely discredited proposal of the late President Roosevelt to pack the Supreme Court, which in the words of veteran Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, was "the most important and far-reaching proposal placed before the American people and the American Congress in my day and time * * * and which would have changed the whole character of the American government, in my opinion." It was freedom of debate in the Senate, Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out, freedom to bring out the disastrous possibilities of such a plan that caused the American people to turn against it, although it was advocated by a strong and popular President.

In discussing the importance of preserving the integrity of the Senate, Senator FULBRIGHT stated: "There is no question about the fact that the President of the United States is the most powerful person in the world today. There is no king, no potentate, who has the power that the head of our country has with its tremendous wealth and the distribution of $40,000,000,000 throughout the world * * * he has the power to appoint members of the Supreme Court; but the Senate is the only remaining branch of our Government which the President has not been able to dominate." But if the President gains what he advocates, the right of 25 Senators to shut off debate, the entire color of our constitutional Government will be changed.

"Did anyone ever hear of a legislative body which ever enslaved the people in any country?" he asked. "The people begin usually by the establishment of the kind of government they really want * * * but it always ends," he said, "by the executive department * * * swallowing up the legislature." And history shows it always has. Senator FULBRIGHT continued: "In my opinion the power of the legislature in the United States to check the Executive is the reason why we have not been completely enveloped."

Senator FULBRIGHT quoted liberally from Woodrow Wilson, generally recognized as not only a great President, but a famous historian and a foremost authority on constitutional government. Mr. Wilson stressed the necessity of preserving the Senate as a forum where measures can be considered realistically and temperately, less susceptible to the passions of the day. "What gives the Senate its real character and significance as an organ of constitutional government," said Woodrow Wilson, "is the fact that it does not represent population but regions of the country. * * * the Senate represents the variety of the Nation as the House does not. It does not draw its membership chiefly from those parts of the country where the population is much denser, but draws it in equal parts from every State and section."

We are convinced of the accuracy of Senator FULBRIGHT'S statement "that the right of free debate is the only real protection of the rights of minorities." It is difficult to believe that President Truman could have been serious when he urged that 25 Senators be given the power to silence the remaining. But, as Senator FULBRIGHT points out, "an executive always thinks the legislature is thwarting him."

Going back to Roman times, Senator FULBRIGHT asked, "What was the principal quarrel at the beginning of the decline of the

Roman Republic?" It was a quarrel between the senate which was the guardian of the constitution and the proconsuls who were the executives. The proconsuls won and they became the first emperors. In such circumstances, it is the usual thing, he declared, for legislative bodies to be wiped out. We, of course, do not mean to imply that President Truman would wipe out the Legislature, but we do believe that if what he advocates comes to pass that a foremost safeguard to constitutional government will cease to exist.

We reiterate today what we wrote last week, that every minority and indeed those who are not now in a minority, should fight against President Truman's proposal to eliminate free debate. Times change and those in the majority today may well be in the minority tomorrow.

In 1925, a Republican Vice President, Mr. Dawes, undertook to reform the Senate rules in much the same way, although less radically, than is proposed today. This was vigorously opposed at the time by the American Federation of Labor because the Senate was regarded as the only protection against the threats of the Republican majority. Now the situation is somewhat reversed and, as Senator FULBRIGHT states, "Labor, feeling that it has a majority, wants to destroy the same thing that in 1925 labor thought was its whole salvation."

How unwise and how short-sighted. A majority today can easily become a minority tomorrow. That's why it is vital that we have a government of laws and not of men; laws that will endure where the frailties of human nature fail. Senator FULBRIGHT'S concluding words are important:

"Unlimited debate in the Senate is essentially a device for protection from a transient majority, protection against the imposition of arbitrary power."

Amendment of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation of the Governor of Connecticut:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, duly convened in special session at Hartford in August 1948, did enact the following act which was duly approved by the governor on August 26, 1948:

"An act concerning question concerning Charter of United Nations: Section 1871 of the 1947 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: 'The following question shall be voted upon at the general election to be held on November 2, 1948, and the designation thereof hereinbelow provided may be placed on the same ballot or voting machine as the names of the candidates to be voted for at such general election: "Do you, as a sovereign citizen of Connecticut and the United States of America, direct our Representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war?" The designation of said question which shall be used on ballots and voting machine ballot labels shall be "Question re recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, Yes" and "Question re recommendation providing for strengthening of United Nations to prevent war, No," and, in voting machine towns, shall be provided for use in accordance with the provisions of section 722 of the general statutes; and, in towns which do not use voting machines, the vote shall be taken in the manner provided by section 106f of the 1941 supplement to the general statutes. Said question shall be voted upon in accordance with the applicable provisions of law concerning voting upon the acceptance of amendments to the constitution of this state' "; and

Whereas a copy of said question was, in pursuance of said act, transmitted by the secretary of the state to the town clerk in each town in the State, and said question was presented to the inhabitants thereof for their consideration, at a town meeting in each town, legally warned and held for that purpose on the second day in November 1948; and

Whereas pursuant to said act, the secretary, the treasurer, and the comptroller, as the board of canvassers, did, as provided by law, duly canvass said votes and did then transmit to the Governor their certificate under their hand in the words and figures following, to wit:

"To His Excellency, JAMES C. SHANNON, Governor:

"We, the undersigned, having been designated by law to canvass the votes cast in favor of and against the proposed world-government referendum by the electors of this State at town meetings warned and held for the purpose of submitting said referendum to said electors, as specified by law, do hereby certify that we have duly canvassed said votes which were received from all the towns in this State as by law provided.

"The whole number of votes received and counted relative to said proposed world-government referendum was 155,757, of which number 141,625 were in favor of the adoption of said referendum and 14,132 were against the adoption of said referendum.

"FRANCES BURKE REDICK,
"Secretary.
"JOSEPH A. ADORNO, *Treasurer.*
"FRED R. ZELLER, *Comptroller."*

And whereas it appears from said certificate that a majority of said votes are in favor of directing our Representatives in the National Congress to urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war;

I do, therefore, herein so declare, and I do herein declare that a majority of the electors present at the town meetings aforesaid have indicated their intention that our representatives in the National Congress urge the President and the Congress to take the lead in calling for amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war.

In testimony whereof, I have caused the seal of the State to be hereunto affixed and have hereunto set my hand at Hartford on this 24th day of February in the year of our Lord, 1949, and of the independence of the United States, the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

[SEAL] CHESTER BOWLES, *Governor.*

By His Excellency's command:

WINIFRED MCDONALD,
Secretary of the State.

Resolutions of Westmoreland County, Pa., Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein two resolutions adopted by the Westmoreland County, Pa., Federation of Women's Clubs at its spring meeting on March 3, 1949. One resolution condemns the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and the 15 Protestant ministers under indictment in Hungary; the other protests the attitude of the Soviet government in Hungary toward the United States and particularly the American military attaché, Col. Peter Kopcsak, whose home is in my congressional district of Westmoreland County.

It is with a great deal of pride that I am able to place in the RECORD these two resolutions, coming from a highly intelligent and educated group. It is time that the State Department takes cognizance of conditions in Hungary and uses its full influence toward bettering them.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas the high-handed seizure, persecution, indictment, and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty, a last bulwark of militant justice and national honor, has revolted all just and free people; and

Whereas the cardinal has been pilloried with audacious and unscrupulous zeal; and

Whereas this overt act of violence and injustice serves notice on all free peoples; and

Whereas the so-called trial is the culmination of a full program of persecution of justice, honor, and freedom: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Westmoreland County Federation of Women's Clubs deplore and condemn this whole condition of affairs and the misuse of governmental function in Hungary; and be it also

Resolved, That the said federation see, in the evil progress of the ideology that provokes such action, an immediate threat to other enslaved peoples, including the 15 Protestant ministers in Hungary now under indictment, and a threat to all free peoples; and be it likewise

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the Pennsylvania Federation of Women's Clubs, and the Secretary of State, and to the Attorney General of the United States of America in Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That all federated clubwomen take counsel as to intelligent action aimed at preventing even the shadow of these evils from falling on the United States of America.

Proposed by Mrs. Eula Menoher, of Jeannette.

Seconded by Mrs. French Cason, of Greensburg.

Unanimously adopted by the Westmoreland County Federation of Women's Clubs on March 3, 1949.

Whereas the news issuing day-to-day from the Soviet puppet state of Hungary is increasingly obnoxious to citizens of a democratic republic; and

Whereas the news of the recall of Lt. Col. Peter Kopcsak, American military attaché is a typical example; and

Whereas Lieutenant Colonel Kopcsak is a native of Westmoreland County, and therefore this news brings home to the citizens in a special way the unspeakably deadly program of the Soviet states against all free peoples; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Westmoreland County Federation of Women's Clubs protest this diabolical program; and be it also

Resolved, That they protest the incident of Lieutenant Colonel Kopcsak; and be it likewise

Resolved, That this protest be made public at the annual spring meeting of the Westmoreland County Federation of Women's Clubs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the family of Lieutenant Colonel Kopcsak residing in Westmoreland County; to the newspapers in Westmoreland County; to His Excellency James H. Duff, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in Harrisburg; and to the Attorney General and the Secretary of State of the United States of America in Washington, D. C.

Proposed by Mrs. W. G. Hoehle, of Trafford.

Seconded by Mrs. W. O. Linhart, of Jeannette.

Unanimously adopted by the Westmoreland County Federation of Women's Clubs on March 3, 1949.

Address of Hon. Petras Dauzvardis, Lithuanian Consul at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago, before the Rotary Club of Waukegan, Ill., February 23, 1949:

The fundamental thought for my address is the Fourth of July of Lithuania—February 16—the thirty-first anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania. Thinking about Lithuania and bearing in mind George Washington's birthday I turn back in memory to the eighteenth century: to the years of 1776 and 1795. In those years America's independence was declared, Lithuania's 600-year-old independence was suppressed: Lithuania and Poland were partitioned by and among Austria, Germany, and Russia. Their heroes and symbols of freedom: Kosciusko, Pulaski and many others came to America to work for the cause of freedom so that eventually freedom would be restored to their homelands: to Lithuania and Poland. Their ideas and objectives did not fall on barren soil, for the roots they set in the fertile land of free America, nourished by the everlasting national spirit of freedom and the principles of self-determination proclaimed by United States President Woodrow Wilson, came to fruition in their homelands in 1918.

Russian-occupied and oppressed Lithuania gave America more than a million sons and daughters of the best stock of the nation; they helped to build America's industrial might and a country of the people and for the people. America, in return, helped Lithuania and other freedom-loving nations to restore their freedom and to become ever-grateful sisters of America. The relations of these sister nations were and are of the utmost sincerity and friendliness. All freedom-loving peoples, be they free or enslaved, are looking to their ideal—to America—for liberation and security.

My country, Lithuania, is among the unfortunate countries behind the iron curtain, occupied and dominated by the police state of Soviet Russia, without lawful authority and without the recognition of other states. The American-like people of Lithuania have been converted into chattels of the Soviet state. They are deprived of the right to own property, of human rights and of every vestige of fundamental freedoms. They have nothing that they can call their own. Even their lives are at the mercy of the totalitarian state.

To illustrate the above I shall state a few essential facts which will give you a brief sketch depicting the Soviet policies (not their pronouncements) and the plight of Lithuania, which, together with Poland and the other two Baltic states, were the first victims of Soviet aggression and injustice.

As a result of the conspirative Soviet-Nazi agreement of August 23 and September 28, 1939, to divide eastern and central Europe between them, Lithuania was invaded and occupied by the Soviet Union in 1940. The seizure was an act of unprovoked aggression, and is a flagrant violation of international law and of the treaties signed by Lithuania and Soviet Russia. There are four pertinent treaties: (1) The Peace Treaty of 1920, (2) the Nonaggression Pact of 1926, (3) the Convention for the Definition of Aggression of 1933, and (4) the Mutual Assistance Pact of 1939. Each of these solemn instruments provided for the respect of national independence, territorial integrity, and noninterference in one another's states. Lithuania discharged these obligations implicitly. Russia, on the contrary, explicitly violated her pledges. Soviet leaders had planned the seizure of Lithuania and of the other Baltic states, despite all their agreements, pledges, and the assertions of Stalin and Molotov. Stalin has stated, before the war, that: "The Soviet Union will not surrender an inch of its own territory and will not covet a foot of foreign territory."

Shortly after this statement and Molotov's declaration of October 31, 1939, that "all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries is only to the interests of our common enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs," the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania and usurped the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian people, deposed the lawful government, and replaced it with an unlawful puppet regime. This illegal puppet government, controlled and directed by Soviet Deputy Commissar of Foreign Affairs Dekanozov and the notorious Soviet gestapo, the NKVD, arrested cultural, political, and religious leaders of the country, disbanded all non-Communist organizations, closed non-Communist newspapers, nationalized (confiscated) real estate and all private enterprises, imposed confiscatory taxation, and introduced terrorism and spying everywhere, from public offices to kindergartens. This was followed by mass arrests, executions, and deportations. During the first occupation, from June 1940 to June 1941, over 10,000 people were slain and more than 40,000 banished to Siberia. More than half of these exiles have already perished from exposure, malnutrition, and slave labor. Among the victims are former President of Lithuania Aleksandras Stulginskis, Minister of Justice Stasys Silingas, Deputy Prime Minister Kazys Bizauskas, and many other prominent leaders.

The present occupation, dating from midsummer of 1944, has already cost Lithuania over 300,000 people. In the last months of 1944, about 37,000 Lithuanians were either slain or banished to remote parts of Russia. During the years of 1945 to 1948, more than 30,000 Lithuanian partisans have perished in the struggle against the special Soviet gestapo—the "istrebiteli" (exterminators). In 1938 alone, approximately 200,000 Lithuanians were deported to Soviet slave camps. The Soviet and Nazi occupation deprived Lithuania of approximately 700,000 people.

Annihilation of the population continues. Some 2,000 to 3,000 Lithuanians disappear from Lithuania every month. According to the Soviet plan of 1941, one-fourth of the Lithuanian people were to have been deported from Lithuania. This plan still is in operation. An order signed by Moscow Commissar Abakumov in July, 1948, orders the arrest and deportation of all political prisoners; former Lithuanian army officers; former government officials; teachers and university professors; priests (what is left of them—one bishop and just half of the clergymen) and members of religious organizations; all persons suspected of espionage, rumor-mongering (this refers mainly to farmers), escaping from deportation convoys, and of the members of their families. According to reliable reports, the Moscow regime has already imported more than one-half million Russians and Mongolians into Lithuania. This number includes the Soviet troops, police, agents, and various officials. They are the masters in Lithuania. Lithuanians are their slaves, without property, without rights, without liberty, and without even any assurance of security of life. Privation and starvation are their lot. The Four Freedoms, human rights and fundamental freedoms enunciated in the United Nations Charter are nonexistent in Lithuania. Terror and genocide are substituted for the inalienable rights and cherished liberty of the Lithuanian people and their country.

Attention to the plight of Lithuania is very aptly called by Prof. W. Elmer Ekblaw of Clark University in his article published in the Worcester Telegram of February 14, 1949. The article is entitled: "Look to Lithuania," and it reads:

"Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's treaties of non-aggression such as that Russia has just offered Norway. Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's treatment of minorities! Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's communist improvement of economic standards! Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's regards for the rights of man, for his freedom, for his social security! Look to Lithuania for an example of Russia's ruthless imperialism, both in territory and sovereignty! Look at Lithuania, and recognize once and for all the gruesome travesty upon democracy and liberal government that Russia's sovereignty represents."

Having focused attention on Lithuania and its suffering people, Professor Ekblaw expands his article into the international field and concludes by warning and exhorting the free people of the world that—

"The time has come * * * when Americans and the rest of the democratic peoples of the world must doff their present tolerance and passive acceptance of Russian territorial and political aggression and imperialistic expansion of virtual sovereignty, and don the definite, unequivocal and undeniable role of leader not only in militant opposition to further Russian encroachment upon the rights, and sovereignties, and territories of autonomous peoples still free, but also in militant leadership of restoration of rights, sovereignties, and territories to once free and autonomous peoples whom Russia has conquered. It is just as important that Lithuania should be free of the enslavement and bondage, as it is that Finland and Greece, Turkey and all the Near East, should be spared the dread and horror of further Russian expansion and debasement of economy and culture. * * * Complacently and appeasingly * * * the democratic and righteous folk of the world, have permitted the cruel devastation of a proud, free, enterprising Christian people and state, like Lithuania and her people, without even effective

protest. Only the Lithuanians themselves, and their emigrant relatives, have dared to oppose and challenge Russia's ruthless might. It is time that we and our democratic allies bestirred ourselves."

What are the Lithuanians doing and what do they demand? The Lithuanians in Lithuania have a strong underground force and they fight the ruthless occupant of Lithuania with everything at their command. The Lithuanians in western Europe have their liberation committee with cultural, economic, and political departments which are working and preparing the ground for the liberation and restoration of Lithuania. The Lithuanians in America and in other free countries have their organized bodies for the cause of freedom and for the defense of the nation from extermination by the Soviets. Together with the official representatives of free Lithuania, they all demand in unison: (1) That genocide by murder and deportation of innocent people be halted at once in Lithuania and other occupied countries; (2) that the deportees be immediately returned from the slave labor camps in Siberia and other parts of Russia; (3) that Soviet armies, police, and agents be removed from Lithuania and the other two Baltic countries; and (4) that freedom, sovereign rights, and self-government be restored to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who have been forcibly deprived of them by the Soviet Union.

Now, gentlemen, in view of the above word picture and the fact that the United States of America does not recognize the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, I appeal to you to help Lithuania to become free again by raising your voice in its behalf and in behalf of liberty and human rights against slavery and enemy No. 1 of the free world.

Steel Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United States Steel Quarterly:

PRODUCTION IS MEANS OF MEETING NEEDS OF STEEL CONSUMER

In a statement before the Subcommittee on Profits of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report in Washington, on December 21, Benjamin F. Fairless, president of United States Steel Corp., said that production, not capacity, is the means of meeting the needs of the steel consumer.

"Much has been written concerning the steel industry's capacity to produce in relation to current demand and estimated future requirements," Mr. Fairless declared. "The terms 'capacity' and 'production' have been used as if they were interchangeable—as if they were in fact the same. But no statement could be more fallacious.

"Capacity is the theoretical amount which can be produced if raw materials of proper quality and required quantities are made available to run the equipment. Production is the amount of product available for shipment as a result of the operation of the equipment. Production, not capacity, is the means of meeting the needs of the steel consumer.

"Demands have been made for increased capacity while too little has been said about increased production. There has been so much discussion concerning theoretical capacity, current demand, and future requirements, that confusion continues to exist. To me it seems essential that we examine the matter from a practical standpoint in order that we may see where we are and where we are headed.

"During 1948, the steel industry will produce and ship to consumers, 65,000,000 tons of finished steel products, more than in any previous year, peacetime or wartime, in our Nation's history.

"In my judgment, the industry is capable of producing in 1949 a much greater tonnage. My guess is that it can produce 68,000,000 tons of finished steel products, and I am not speaking of theoretical capacity. The steel industry, if not interfered with by labor difficulties, will be capable of producing and shipping during 1949 approximately 5,000,000 tons of finished steel products more than it shipped during the year 1947, and nearly 7,500,000 tons more than the average shipments during the 4 war years of 1942–45.

"World War II was fought and won with an annual average production of 60,600,000 tons of finished steel. Because of strikes and reconversion problems, the year 1946 was a year of relatively low production—48,800,000 tons. In 1947, the industry had a good operating year, and production rose to 63,000,000 tons, almost equaling the best war year.

"In the postwar period, large sums of money have been spent to increase and improve the availability of raw material and steel facilities. Some of our critics have indicated that they think too little is going into basic steel-making capacity because of certain ideas currently held with respect to inadequate capacity. This question of capacity is a serious one and one to which we in United States Steel have devoted and continue to devote a great deal of attention—now, more than ever before. But when the several members of the steel industry went to work in their own individual way to cure the shortage of steel, a job was done, and is being done. Some members increased ingot capacity; some worked primarily on raw materials; some devoted their time and money to more adequate finishing facilities. All worked under the pressure of the greatest pent-up demand for steel in the Nation's history, where each pound of steel used to construct steel facilities meant a pound less for the needs of some customer.

"Moreover, new construction is still going on. For example, we will add, and by that, I mean actually get into operation, during 1949, about 600,000 tons of additional ingot capacity. We expect to spend over $250,000,000 for plant and equipment in 1949.

"The best test of what the industry has done and can do, in my opinion, is to be judged by the products shipped. If we in United States Steel choose to spend many millions of dollars to get better coal so that our coke quality improves and our pig-iron supply is increased, we may not change our rated ingot capacity one ton, but the resulting increased production will permit us to ship more tons to our customers. The shipments in 1948 prove that postwar expenditures have meant more steel for our customers.

"The steel industry will continue to improve and increase its production. Inability to meet simultaneously all the extraordinary demands, does not mean that the industry is not progressive or that it will not increase its capacity, nor is there any proof that the demand will continue indefinitely at the present pace. Whatever develops, I am satisfied the steel industry will continue to accept full responsibility for steel production in the United States."

An Excellent Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 9, 1949

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport (La.) Times:

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

In nominating Louis A. Johnson as Secretary of Defense, President Truman has made an excellent choice—one that should bring satisfaction to the public generally in view of the fact that the defense post unquestionably is the most important in the Nation except for the Presidency itself.

Mr. Johnson's background is such as to give him especial qualifications for the post of Secretary of Defense. He is a former Assistant Secretary of War—under the late Franklin D. Roosevelt—a former Member of Congress, a past national commander of the American Legion, a captain in World War I. He knows the national security problems of both war and peace from first-hand experience both in uniform and in an administrative capacity; plus his legislative experience.

Actually, Mr. Johnson's ability to handle such an important job already has been proven. It is not too much to say that if his defense recommendations in the late 1930s had been carried out there still might have been a Pearl Harbor but there never would have been the terrible period of helpless aftermath for this Nation's fighting forces. As Assistant Secretary of War at that time, Mr. Johnson urged the launching of a billion-dollar program of construction of long range land-based bombers. Failing to get the needed backing from either the War Department or the Budget Bureau, he appealed to President Roosevelt, but the latter took no action and the construction program died as a result. It was this Nation's lack of long-range land-based bombers that largely enabled Japan to sweep the Pacific immediately after Pearl Harbor. The war itself proved Mr. Johnson to be right. Now, the Navy, the Army, and all others of the armed forces agree that the long-range land-based bomber is the foundation of strategic warfare. All of our security against war, and all of our preparations for war if it should become inevitable, now find the big land-based bomber as the keystone of the foundation.

In addition to the appointment of Mr. Johnson, which is certain to go breezing through the Senate with enthusiastic confirmation from all factions, there is also the restoration of General Marshall to active service and the recall of General Eisenhower to active advisory work in the national defense set-up. Mr. Johnson is the type of man who can get along with the generals and with the department secretaries under him—as well as with Congress and with the President; this latter is testified to by his intimate association with, and valuable support of, Mr. Truman during the presidential campaign. All of this indicates a smooth-running defense set-up in the Washington administration, something that is essential to national security against aggression.

The resignation of Secretary of Defense Forrestal has been expected for some time. The only question involved in it for the past half year or so has been the date. He has wanted to get out to attend to his many private financial interests. In addition, he has at times become somewhat of a bone of contention; that was unavoidable in a period

where unification of the armed forces was being attempted. Mr. Forrestal has been a conscientious Secretary of Defense, at times compelled by circumstances to travel paths not of his own choosing. Aside from his wartime service as Secretary of the Navy, and his prewar service as Under Secretary perhaps one of his best contributions is his recent first annual report of the Department of Defense, pointing out the need for strengthening and clarifying the unification law.

In fairness to Mr. Johnson, Congress should delve deeply into these recommendations by Mr. Forrestal—with full hearing of Mr. Johnson's views, of course—to determine just what should be done legislatively. This is especially true in phases of the law which Mr. Forrestal said place heavy responsibilities on the shoulders of the Secretary of Defense without giving him the authority necessary to meet them.

Fair Trade Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 11 (legislative day of Monday, February 21), 1949

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Apothecary, a magazine published in Boston, Mass., the article being entitled "Consistency, Thou Art a Jewel," to be followed by another page from the same magazine entitled "Time—Life—Fortune Are Fair Traded."

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"CONSISTENCY, THOU ART A JEWEL"

Long ago the Romans had a god called Janus. All the other gods but Janus could be relied upon for what they said. Janus had two faces and he told two different stories for every occasion. The decadent Romans looked up to Janus as the distilled essence of hypocrisy.

Now the Janus theory didn't go out of business when Janus lost his seat in the Eighty-first Congress of Roman dieties. Janus still has some disciples left and quite a following among the unthinking proletariat—not to speak of a few sycophantic idolaters among the intellectual parlor-pinks. However, ordinary Americans—particularly druggists—are not supposed to peek behind the curtain and see what these modern Januses really think. But, alert Sam Silverman of the MSPA has punched a hole in that opaque fabric that we know as mental inertia, and in a full-page ad accompanying his Massachusetts News has exposed to public gaze a piece of inconsistency so blatantly brazen it sounds silly coming from a group of well-trained grown-up boys that ought to know better; for they run a big Forty-eighth Street publishing house which boasts the confidence of over 25,000,000 readers. Read what Sam says about Time and Life and fair trade on page 36.

To me this is too serious for a joke. It is the kind of hypocrisy that is breaking down our national morale because, like some comics it appears to prove that a great material reward can be directly associated with intellectual dishonesty. I criticize it also as a stupid piece of top-management strategy. Today business needs more confidence, not less. For those in honest business, it is not necessary to play the hypocrite. The reward in respect that comes from courageously thumbing your nose at the two-faced Janus is very important to our country now. It guards against the breaking down of faith and confidence that always springs from publicly practicing his hypocritical teachings.

Think of the embarrassment ahead for those innocent front-line salesmen for the publishers. What reception will they now get when they ask the druggist for a little extra space to put up a card advertising an advertiser who uses the kind of magazine that makes itself a hypocrite, working to belittle the very fair-trade price-maintenance principle it uses itself, and on which the independent retailers' solvency so largely depends. Consistency is only one form of honesty; and, we can never regain our national moral fiber if we find those we look to for leadership, themselves practicing cheap deceits. Who can a man believe?

TIME—LIFE—FORTUNE ARE FAIR TRADED

What can a man believe?

Here's what the business end of Time thinks of fair trade:

"Price maintenance: We have been granted authority from publishers to accept subscriptions only from those people who are engaged in selling subscriptions at the retail prices set forth in this trade price list. The publishers are not willing to have any agents pass on to any of their subscribers any part of the agent's commission in the form of a discount from the retail price, nor are they willing to have individuals (other than bona fide agents), or organizations order their own subscription on a reduced price basis." Reproduced from an official subscription price book of Time, Fortune, and Life agents.)

But, the editorial ends, with modern ideas preaches differently.

And Fortune too, preaches that fair trade is unfair—yet insists that it's own line must be fair traded.

Now, druggists, why not accept a few cut-price subscriptions and see what happens when you send them in. Write us how Time explains its silly two-faced position.

The management of Time knows the principles of fair trade are too fundamentally sound to be ignored by any serious-minded magazine agency.

Let's be honest. Why kid trusting readers? Why kid the druggists who sell these magazines, and of whom Time asks free displays?

Massachusetts State Pharmaceutical Association, fair trade commission, Boston, Mass.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1949, I had the pleasure of participating in a broadcast on the American Forum of the Air program on the subject What Kind of Health Insurance Do You Want? The other speaker was Dr. Louis Bauer, chairman of the executive committee and vice chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association.

This outstanding radio forum has been in existence for more than two decades under the able leadership of Mr. Theodore Granik. He has presented stimulating discussions of most of the controversial issues of our time. Many Members of the Congress and leaders from all segments of our society have appeared on this program and had an opportunity of presenting their views to the public. Mr. Granik is to be commended for his fine work in presenting these issues to the public.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the text of the health-insurance discussion:

Mr. GRANIK. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen: What kind of health insurance do you want? Which plan do you favor? Should Congress pass the administration's health insurance bill, or should we accept the recommendations of the American Medical Association?

Here to discuss both plans are Congressman ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Democrat, of Wisconsin, member of the House Interstate Commerce Committee which will shortly conduct hearings on this vital problem; and Dr. Louis H. Bauer, chairman of the executive committee and vice chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association.

And now gentlemen, you both agree there is no question of the need for more medical care, and that this need must be met. My question to you, both of you, is: How? Congressman BIEMILLER?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I stand squarely behind the President's proposal for national health insurance, and which I might add, has in principle been endorsed by Governor Warren of California. In this modern day and age, we are beset by four problems that the individual cannot handle for himself—old age, unemployment, industrial accidents, and the cost of sickness. We have met three of these by one form or another of social insurance—through social security, unemployment compensation, and workmen's compensation.

I now propose that the fourth, the cost of sickness, be met by the logical extension of social insurance into the field of costs of medical care.

Mr. GRANIK. I direct the same question to you, Dr. Bauer: How?

Dr. BAUER. I disagree with Congressman BIEMILLER because I think the program can be carried out on a voluntary basis and not a compulsory one. We have many deficiencies in our medical care which can be corrected by other means than compulsory insurance. We have deficiencies in public health facilities and in diagnostic centers and in hospitals, all of which would lessen the need for medical care and also would render that care available to the people at a lower cost and near at hand.

The voluntary insurance program is growing at the most tremendous rate in history.

Mr. GRANIK. Is it possible, Congressman, to dovetail sound voluntary health insurance plans with the national program about which you speak?

Congressman BIEMILLER. Most of the voluntary health insurance plans which are in existence can be brought in under a national health insurance plan without any difficulty whatsoever, but I do not share Dr. Bauer's optimism by any voluntary procedure we will ever cover the entire Nation and the problems we have. Exactly the same argument was advanced on the questions of old-age pensions and unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation.

Mr. GRANIK. How about that, Doctor?

Dr. BAUER. I cannot agree on that. What was the first part of the question?

Mr. GRANIK. I asked whether you can dovetail voluntary insurance with the national program.

Dr. BAUER. The members of the Social Security Board themselves testified before the congressional committees that the voluntary insurance would be put out of business if the compulsory insurance program was put through.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I think we have an important point that ought to be made, that the AMA has shifted its own position in this field considerably in the last few years. At one time the AMA decried voluntary insurance as "socialism, communism, incitement to revolution."

Dr. BAUER. Congressman BIEMILLER, the AMA was quite correct in what it said about voluntary insurance at that time, because the only experience we had was in foreign countries, and there was no such program in this country; and if the AMA had backed a voluntary insurance program at that time, it would have been deluding the people. But we did approve investigating the subject, and investigating and experimenting with it in small areas and in a small degree, and that has resulted in their developing three types of voluntary plans.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Of course, a lot of the AMA experimentation in those days took the form of suppressing voluntary health insurance, such as group health right here in Washington.

Dr. BAUER. The AMA was always against any plan that did not deliver good medical care and which interfered with free choice of physician—and still is.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I think we have to recognize the fact that the AMA shift has been of a rather peculiar nature. I remember debating this subject with Dr. Echols, a past president of the Milwaukee County Medical Society, and he said the only reason the doctors are now for voluntary health insurance is because they are trying to head off a compulsory health-insurance plan; that they never would have started any voluntary insurance plans had it not been for the threat of a compulsory plan.

Dr. BAUER. That might be Dr. Echols' opinion, but it is not the opinion of most doctors.

Mr. GRANIK. Congressman, Senator TAFT has recently said if we are going to give medical care free to all people, why not provide them with free transportation, free food, free housing, and clothing, all at the expense of the taxpayer?

Congressman BIEMILLER. In the first place, this bill does not call for providing free medical and health service at the expense of the taxpayer. It is based exactly on the form of unemployment compensation and other forms of social insurance. It is a pay-roll tax proposal that we are making in this respect.

In the second place, Senator TAFT himself, of course, has proposed a lot of free housing for some people that has got him some strictures from some of his own people. But, by and large, Senator TAFT knows as well as I do that he is raising a bogey issue when he raises that question. This is a matter of social insurance. It is not a matter of free medical care.

Dr. BAUER. I most thoroughly agree it is not free medical care—it is anything but—but I cannot agree it is not taxation. Of course it is taxation. How are they going to collect the money otherwise? Even its advocates admit there is going to be at least a 3-percent pay-roll tax—and, if they would tell the truth, it would be probably nearer an 8-percent tax. In fact, some members of the Social Security Board admitted it would probably be that.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would quarrel with you about the percentage of the tax. The taxpayer is interested in trying to meet the cost of medical care; he doesn't care whether you call it insurance or taxation. What he wants is a way of making small periodic payments that will insure him good medical care when he needs it.

Dr. BAUER. Yes; and you are going to load another tax on him so he will be less able to pay for it than ever before.

Mr. GRANIK. Bernard Baruch said some time ago that in time these deductions from pay rolls and deductions from employers and workers will become absorbed in general costs of production. How about that, Dr. Bauer?

Dr. BAUER. I do not see how they will because in every country that has adopted the scheme the tax has gone up and up and up.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I cannot agree about its going up and up and up. More important to note is that every country that ever adopted the scheme has never gone back on it, and, contrary to the impression given out by the American Medical Association, organized medicine in other countries, although sometimes reluctantly opposing the proposal in the first place, has, as the plan developed, come out foursquare for it and asked for the extension of compulsory health insurance.

Dr. BAUER. I agree no country has been able to get rid of it, once it was started, because such a tremendous bureaucracy is built up that they cannot get rid of it. I would like to ask you a question right there. In every country which has compulsory health insurance they have at least two employees for every doctor. In this country that would mean we would have 300,000 new people on the Federal pay roll. Can you see its being done for less?

Congressman BIEMILLER. Yes, it certainly can be done for less. In the first place, the only thing that is compulsory about health insurance is the inclusion of the tax feature on the pay roll tax plan. Outside of that, there is nothing compulsory in the bill that is now pending before the Congress of the United States, and those taxes would be collected through the existing agency of social security. It would not be necessary to add one single person to the Federal bureaucracy to collect the pay roll taxes for health insurance.

Dr. BAUER. How about the administration and all the regulations that have to be set up for the administration of the act, and the local area committees and the local professional committees, and so forth and so on, all over the country?

Congressman BIEMILLER. Doctor, let's get that straight right here and now. In the first place, let's remember—and I am glad you stress the fact that these are going to be local people who are going to be running this show, because a lot of your friends do not admit that. But over and above that, let's see what the question is as compared to the kind of bureaucracy, if you want to call it that, that you now have running the existing voluntary plans. You are now having costs of somewhere between 12 and 14 percent in your voluntary plans, for administration, and no national health insurance plan with which I am familiar has ever come near that figure.

Dr. BAUER. Voluntary plans do run approximately 13 percent, which is probably as low as any insurance can be run if you actually assess the cost against it.

Mr. GRANIK. Gentlemen, what do you think of the plan suggested a few days ago by Dr. Paul Magnuson, the Veterans' Administration medical director, to attack the weakest link in medical care by setting up public diagnostic centers throughout the Nation? I understand the plan is based entirely on community and State control. Do you want to comment on that, Congressman?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would be glad to comment on it. I have no objection to that plan as far as it goes, at all. It is part of the President's national health insurance plan. My own belief is that it does not go far enough and will not meet the answer, that we still have to have all costs of medical care met upon the principle of social insurance.

Dr. BAUER. I agree that the plan is not very different from the one suggested by the AMA. One of the great lacks in our present system of medical care is that we do not have sufficient diagnostic facilities available, and that results in the people in those areas not getting good medical care, having to go distances for it or else go without it, making it more expensive; and, furthermore, doctors are not attracted to areas where they cannot practice good medicine and it is an exceedingly important link in the chain.

Mr. GRANIK. Do I understand, Doctor, the AMA is now agreeable to a form of socialized medicine which would in part or in full subsidize doctors in areas where there is not sufficient economic demand for a doctor to exist under the present system?

Dr. BAUER. The AMA has come out for a program of increased hospital and diagnostic facilities to attract doctors to those areas. There may possibly be some areas in which it will not be possible to attract a doctor there because there are insufficient people to support him and some form of subsidization may have to be made. What that subsidization will be, I do not know, and nobody else does.

Congressman BIEMILLER. That gets dangerously close to the old bugaboo of the AMA, of socialized medicine.

Dr. BAUER. I do not think it does. The subsidization does not necessarily have to come from the Federal Government.

Congressman BIEMILLER. It will have to come from the State government. You have a bill in the Wisconsin Legislature now trying to do that thing, but it still is socialized medicine in the terms of Dr. Fishbein and yourself and other spokesmen of the AMA. I want to go on record here and now that I want to stop socialized medicine if it can be done in this country; I want to go for a principle of compulsory health insurance.

Dr. BAUER. You are approving the greatest socialized program there is in compulsory health insurance. This business of saying compulsory health insurance is not socialized medicine is sheer bunk. When the Government collects the money by taxes and pays it out under its own regulations, and prescribes the regulations under which patients may take part in it, and the manner in which doctors and dentists and nurses may take part in the plan, and the hospitals also, and prescribes the rate at which they may be paid, that is certainly socialization and nothing else.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Let me quarrel with your description of the bill, because the bill doe not say any such thing as you say it does. The Federal Government does not lay down the rules and regulations. As you well know, the doctors themselves will choose the form of payment which they desire; under the bill now pending, the hospitals will have full voice in the administration of that side of the bill and so will other professional groups.

Dr. BAUER. The regulations are to be set up by the board that is administering the act.

Congressman BIEMILLER. But on recommendation of the advisory boards composed of doctors and other interested groups.

Dr. BAUER. Recommendations, maybe, but they do not have to take their advice if they do not want to, and not a word in the bill says they have to.

Mr. GRANIK. Congressman, won't doctors, in effect, become employees of the Federal Government?

Congressman BIEMILLER. Most certainly not, and that is the point I am making. They would not be employees of the Government. They could still accept or reject patients, just as they do today, and patients can choose their doctors just as they do today.

Dr. BAUER. But what it will really amount to is that the doctors do not choose the patients.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Certainly they do.

Dr. BAUER. There is definitely a third party between the doctor and his patient. The doctor is responsible to the Government if it pays him and not to the patient. We had an example during the depression when the Federal Emergency Relief Administration told doctors how many visits they could make to a patient. If there was a complication, he had to get further authority to treat that patient, and he was told what he could prescribe and what he could not prescribe. That has been the history in every country that has adopted the scheme: The prescribing has increased and the Government has stepped in and said,„"You cannot prescribe so much; you will have to cut down on it."

Congressman BIEMILLER. You have to recognize the old FERA was run on an out-and-out socialized medicine basis, which, I repeat, is what I am trying to prevent; but I would like to draw for a moment the analogy of workmen's compensation. I think it is worth noting in the first place for the record that the medical societies fought workmen's compensation when it first came into existence. So did employers. Secondly, there are many States where there are panels that force, within certain limitation, the patient under workmen's compensation to accept a certain doctor. I have yet to find a State where the medical societies fight that system.

Dr. BAUER. The medical societies approved workmen's compensation as soon as workmen's compensation was put on a basis where there was no interference with free choice of doctors. Many of the early schemes did interfere with that free choice.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Come, come, doctor, you know many States still have a panel on this matter, and I have not seen the AMA fight those panels in those States.

Dr. BAUER. There are no panels in most of the States.

Mr. GRANIK. Congressman, yesterday's press announced that Republican Senators are expected to introduce in a few days a bill calling for Federal aid to State-controlled health programs.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would have a good hunch that this pronouncement of Senator TAFT and some of his associates is simply a revival of S. 545 of the Eightieth Congress. Senate 545 was a scheme for socialized medicine for what Senator TAFT calls the lowest economic 20 percent.

Mr. GRANIK. How about it, Dr. Bauer; what do you say about the Republican proposal?

Dr. BAUER. The Taft bill was approved, in principle, by the American Medical Association. We felt there were some things about it that could be improved, and I think Senator TAFT felt that way himself. It places it on a State level, and it does take into consideration the voluntary plans, and it takes care of the people not only who are indigent, but those who are medically indigent—those who cannot pay the whole bill but can pay part of it. Incidentally, the provisions of the administration bill for the indigent are pretty sketchy.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I cannot agree with you there at all, Doctor. It makes it very clear any local unit of government that wants to run under the health-insurance system instead of under a direct socialized system as proposed by Senator TAFT, can simply pay the amount needed into the fund for the indigent.

Dr. BAUER. More pay and more taxes.

Mr. GRANIK. Gentlemen, let us pause now to give our studio audience a chance to ask questions. These questions, selected at random, are completely unrehearsed.

Let's take the first question from our audience. I see a lot of doctors, a lot of Congressmen. Here is Congressman ARTHUR KLEIN, from New York.

Question. I am Congressman KLEIN, from New York. My question is directed at Dr. Bauer. You speak here this evening, Dr. Bauer, for the AMA. Isn't it a fact that there is a difference of opinion among your own people, your own doctors? Recently a number of outstanding doctors, members of the AMA, have come out with a plan different from your own. Would you care to comment on that?

Dr. BAUER. Yes; I would be glad to. The American Medical Association consists of about one hundred thirty-five to one hundred thirty-seven thousand doctors. Naturally, in any organization of that size there are bound to be differences of opinion. It would not be healthy if there were not. But I may say this—and I think I could prove it if it became necessary to do so—that 90 percent of the doctors are against compulsory health insurance.

Mr. GRANIK. How about the Congressman?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would be amazed if it is only 90 percent, considering the fact that most doctors get their information from the American Medical Association Journal and Dr. Fishbein, the editor, has thrown an iron curtain around that Journal and you cannot find out that there is any case for compulsory health insurance by reading the AMA Journal.

Mr. GRANIK. How about that iron curtain, Doctor?

Dr. BAUER. No iron curtain exists there at all. As far as that is concerned, there is plenty in the public press coming out of Washington from the Federal administration on the other side of the fence which can be read equally well.

Congressman BIEMILLER. But you know most of the doctors get most of their views on this subject from the AMA Journal, and if you would like to have a couple of articles, I can get them for you.

Dr. BAUER. I can show you a few articles coming out of Washington, too.

Mr. GRANIK. Let's take another question from the audience. Go ahead.

Question. After health insurance, do we then go into life insurance and everything else that goes with socialism?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I am not sure I catch the question but if I interpret it correctly, may I point out we already have social insurance in the field of what you can call life insurance, if you want—the old-age and survivors' benefits under Federal Security. We do have job insurance and we do have workmen's compensation, and I reiterate I am simply trying to extend that field logically to the costs of medical care.

Dr. BAUER. When you come right down to it, Congressman BIEMILLER, there is no government on record that has medical insurance where it is paying the physician, that wants to continue. You recall the scandals in the Medical Department of the Veterans' Administration, until they were cleared up by General Bradley and General Hawley, and I can think of the medical care of the Indians in this country who have been wards of the Government for a great many years.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Again, may I remind you, you are talking about direct employment of physicians. I am delighted that General Hawley cleaned up the Veterans' Administration situation as well as he has. I think there is still room for improvement. With the Indians, as you know, the problem has been direct employment of physicians, such as Senator Taft and others still favor.

Mr. GRANIK. May I take another question. Go ahead, sir.

Question. This is to Dr. Bauer. Is it not a fact the British Medical Society is cooperating now with the British Government in the socialized medical program, according to Lester Velie, contributor to Collier's Magazine, published in a recent issue of Collier's magazine?

Dr. BAUER. The British Medical Association hasn't any choice in the matter. It is the law of the land and they have to cooperate, and they are trying to make it work to the best of their ability. I do not think anyone yet can make any statement about the British system because it has not been in effect long enough. We hear many reports on both sides of the question and can argue either way. But there is one thing we know: It is three times as expensive as they thought it was going to be.

Mr. GRANIK. How about it, Congressman?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would like to add, first of all, the British Medical Association wanted to expand the program of compulsory health insurance in England, and that on two separate occasions with which I am familiar, the secretary of the British Medical Association has forced the AMA Journal to publish statements from the British physicians in which they decried the attacks made on the British medical plan by the AMA, and, in fact, called them gross libel. I do not know any words that could be stronger.

Dr. BAUER. Yes; and those attacks which were published in the AMA Journal were taken directly from the British Medical Association journal, the Lancet, themselves.

Congressman BIEMILLER. But you inferred it was the position of organized medicine in Britain, which it was not at all.

Dr. BAUER. It did not infer that. It spoke of the attitude of some of the doctors, and you can pick up any number of the Lancet and find any number of letters of the same order in there.

Congressman BIEMILLER. And I can find you doctors in America who disagree with the AMA's position on compulsory health insurance.

Dr. BAUER. Of course you can, but I am saying 90 percent of them favor it.

Mr. GRANIK. May I take another question.

Question. This question is directed to Congressman Biemiller. It is obvious President Truman does not like the term "socialized medicine," but what is the significant difference between socialized medicine and his proposals concerning health insurance?

Congressman BIEMILLER. Socialized medicine means that you are putting doctors directly on the Federal pay roll, that they will be employees of the Government. Compulsory health insurance means that you raise a health insurance fund through pay roll taxes; the doctors continue to practice medicine exactly as they do today, rejecting or accepting patients; patients choosing their own doctors and the doctors choosing the method of payment, whether it be on a fee basis, a capitation basis, or salary basis.

Dr. BAUER. What you are describing is state medicine and not socialized medicine. State medicine is socialized medicine but there is more than one knd, and the doctors do not have entirely free choice—or the patient doesn't, rather. The patient has free choice of his physician if the doctors take part in the plan. He has free choice of his physician if he takes part in the plan and if his panel is not already filled—and that is not free choice.

Congressman BIEMILLER. There is nothing about panels in this bill, as you well know.

Dr. BAUER. It says in the bill that doctors will be limited as to the number of patients they may have. It does not specify.

Congressman BIEMILLER. Only by action of doctors themselves; and may I point out there the AMA likes to boast we have more doctors per population than any other country in the world—which is true—but you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. If that is true, you know the panels are not going to be overloaded because the doctors themselves will make certain they are not.

Mr. GRANIK. Do you think compulsory health insurance will effect a better distribution of doctors than we now have, Congressman?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I think the overall health plan of the President will certainly provide for more doctors; and secondly, I think once doctors are assured their bills will be paid, which will be a delightful novelty to some doctors I know, we will have better care all round.

Dr. BAUER. Compulsory health insurance never improved the distribution of doctors. Countries that have it have exactly the same difficulties we have in this country, and even here our distribution, as Congressman BIEMILLER has already admitted, is better than it is in any other country in the world. Doctors are not worried about the financial end of this at all. That is not a factor. The factor is that the people are going to get a pretty poor type of medical care. In every country which has had it, the medical care has deteriorated. It is the great leveler; it does not bring the poor physician up to the level of the good one; it brings the good one down to the level of the poor one.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I want here and now to say I do not agree with the statement that the quality of medical care has deteriorated in the countries that have had health insurance. Doctors in those countries and sociologists say just the reverse; and I think it is also worth noting the first country to adopt compulsory health insurance was Germany in 1883, and Austria in 1888, and in the years immediately following the adoption of health insurance in those countries American doctors flocked to those countries for their advanced medical training.

Dr. BAUER. And as soon as the thing was made fully effective over there the cost increased 600 percent and medical care fell out of the bottom.

Mr. GRANIK. Can we squeeze in one more question from the audience? Here is one:

Question. Congressman BIEMILLER, under socialized medicine, will the States be interested in exerting as great an effort in research and treatment of noncontagious diseases?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I am not sure I follow the question.

Question. I am interested in whether, under socialized medicine, the States will be interested in exerting as great an effort in research and treatment of noncontagious diseases as they are at the present time?

Congressman BIEMILLER. I think there has been a great expansion of interest in research in all forms of diseases, and certainly that is a program that I will foster to the utmost of my ability. I do not think your question affects the question of compulsory health insurance. I frankly do not see a connection.

Mr. GRANIK. I know we have many more questions, but we just have time for brief summaries. First, Congressman BIEMILLER.

Congressman BIEMILLER. I would like to say the best brief summary I can make is to read a statement published by the American Medical Association originally in 1934, and stated again in 1938, by the AMA Bureau of Medical Economics. They said, "Without some form of compulsion, voluntary insurance fails of its objective of distributing the cost of sickness among large classes of the population with even approximate fairness. The young and healthy will not join and the aged and sickly, if accepted, will raise the cost to a prohibitive point, and if rejected, remove protection from those most in need. Sickness insurance cannot distribute the burden of sickness among the low-income classes unless it is compulsory."

I agree with that statement, and I wish the AMA would stick to it. I think, as a modern-day concept in the field of the costs of medical care, of a famous statement of Abraham Lincoln when he said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well for themselves." That is my philosophy in this field.

Mr. GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman BIEMILLER. And now, Dr. Bauer, your summary.

Dr. BAUER. Compulsory health insurance will not give the people what it is supposed to. It is infinitely more expensive. Costs have increased tremendously wherever it has been adopted. The standards of medical care deteriorate, free choice is limited, a large bureaucracy is developed. Furthermore, it is unnecessary. The voluntary program is growing at the fastest rate of any insurance program in history. Other factors are equally important, such as development of further public health facilities, with preventive medicine making a lot of medical care unnecessary by preventing it at the source, and developing further hospitals and diagnostic facilities.

We also need a program for the care of the aged, and chronic diseases. We talk about people having their lives saved, and so forth, by medicine. Doctors do not prevent death; they merely postpone it, and the longer we postpone it, the more people there are of chronic and middle age and old age to have diseases of the degenerative type, and that number is going to increase and we must have provision for them.

Mr. GRANIK. I am sorry, Dr. Bauer and Congressman BIEMILLER, but our time is up. Thank you for being with us tonight and helping us better to understand this important subject.

General Pulaski Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have today presented to the House a resolution adopted by the City Council of Clifton, N. J., urging the establishment of a memorial day in honor of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish soldier who became an American hero in the Revolutionary war.

I hope that such a day will be established, and under leave to extend my remarks I want to pay tribute to another group of Polish soldiers—the 30,000 Polish war veterans who fought on the Allied side during the last world war, after the Nazis overran their country, so many of whom I saw in my journeys abroad. Because of the iron curtain these men cannot and will not return to their native land. I am pleased to have the opportunity of helping these men through supporting the bill introduced by the able gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], to give them preferential treatment under our immigration laws. They deserve it. I concur in the sentiments of the following editorial from the New York World Telegram of March 10:

PREFERENCE FOR POLISH VETERANS

Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, proposes preferential treatment under the Displaced Persons Act for 30,000 Polish war veterans who fought on the Allied side after the Nazis overran their own country.

We believe these men have earned the right to such priority.

They fought for the common good of mankind when their own cause was lost, and today are stateless because they refuse to return to a Communist Poland. Good soldiers, they should be good material for American citizenship. We are in their debt. We should give them a break.

Rent Controls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

FORT WORTH, TEX., *February 28, 1949.*

WINGATE LUCAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the letter I wrote to you on February 22 about my opposition to rent controls.

Today, your letter of February 25 was received, in which you asked permission to have my letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Certainly. It would make me very happy to have it printed, and I feel it would be a privilege and an honor on my part.

Thank you very much.

Yours truly,

Mrs. SIDNEY L. HARDAWAY,
(Housewife and mother of two children.)

FORT WORTH, TEX., *February 22, 1949.*

Subject: Opposing rent controls.

Congressman WINGATE LUCAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a tenant but—

This is still supposed to be the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Even I can see the unfairness of rent control. The bill, No. 434, introduced by Senator MYERS, of Pennsylvania, if passed, will undoubtedly take away all rights, ambition, and freedom to do as they wish with what they own from the rental property owners of America.

Either everything, down to toothpicks, should be controlled in price, or nothing should be. And if everything is controlled we would have nothing short of a dictatorship.

Rent control discourages a tenant from buying a home which would ease the apartment shortage.

Rent control destroys a property owner's ambition or desire to spend any money to repair or redecorate their own apartments. Therefore if the tenants of America want to continue to live in nicely kept apartments they had better hope that rent controls are abolished.

It is a fact that hundreds of apartments and houses are standing empty—vacant—because under rent control the property owner has to bow to every wish and whim of the tenant—or else. If he acquires an undesirable tenant, and there are many, since there are all kinds of people in this old world; and one can't always judge desirable tenants by looking at them—I know because my parents have had experience—it is just his hard luck, for to evict someone is almost impossible.

Only the minority of all landlords are large-scale operators, while approximately

80 percent are retired small-business men, widows, elderly couples, and veterans. These last named, who depend partially or solely on rent for their income are the only people in this country who haven't had a raise or a chance at one. True, there was a slight percentage raise on rents last year, but it was like pulling out teeth to put it in effect. A tenant is free to change his occupation if his wages are so low that he can't live on them. That is not true with some who rent apartments for a living.

Where is our freedom slipping to?

We had no rent controls before the war and it worked out—because there was ambition and competition, and you could rent to whom you wished and oust them if they became undesirable.

If rent control should be abolished, it is undoubtedly true there would be a great shuffling of tenants on the property owners' part—but why not?

My views coincide with the majority of people I've discussed this with.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SIDNEY L. HARDAWAY
(Housewife and mother).

Way of a Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Christian Herald, edited by Rev. Daniel A. Poling. It evaluates the recent startling report by General Chennault of events in China during and since the war—and America's role, both good and bad, in the developments there so tragic for everybody save the Kremlin and its devotees, in China and here in America.

WAY OF A FIGHTER, BY CLAIRE LEE CHENNAULT

To the American people this is the most important book since VJ-day. Chennault makes the Chinese people speak English without an accent. He does something more. For this reviewer at least he fastens on our Government responsibility for Chiang's defeat, which may become the triumph of communism throughout Asia. These pages flame until they blister. The man who made his "Tigers" the scourge of the Japanese spares no words and is impartial in naming those whom he holds responsible for what he believes to be the major debacle of the Allies in World War II. But he documents his material. The foreword written in January of this year in itself is a complete statement of what General Marshall's trip to China meant to President Chiang who was then at the moment of complete victory. But the author calls attention to the fact that Marshall as a good soldier was carrying out orders for which he was not responsible. Chennault also raises that painful unanswered question: Why has General Wedemeyer's report been suppressed? It is not denied that this report supports Chiang. The betrayal of the man whom I believe history will write down as one of the four preeminent figures of World War II and of his generation (nor is he last among the four) will be a lasting shame upon this country.

Sport in the Everglades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 10, 1949

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by that great and world-renowned sports writer, Grantland Rice, who just recently has been through the Everglades National Park which is located in my district in South Florida. He has written a most interesting and illuminating article about that park.

We in Florida have long maintained that this park would be the only one of its kind in the world; would, over the course of the next few years attract more people than any other park in the United States; and would more than justify any expense the Federal Government has made or will make toward its establishment. His article is as follows:

SPORT IN THE EVERGLADES

Shark River flows through the heart of the Everglades and it is here you can find the tops in sport. Especially fishing.

We have had no desire to kill a panther or a puma, but they are still around. The only thrill such hunting offers is the dead gameness of the Florida hound that will attack a 160-pound puma or a 400-pound bear. Unfortunately, he will also attack a 6-foot rattlesnake.

I've seen hounds hit by bear or puma, badly jolted, and knocked yards away, only to rebound and come back to the attack.

It has been said the pit bulldog is the gamest animal on earth. But I believe the Florida hound can match him. They would tackle either a grizzly or a lion or tiger—even when outweighed 30 to 1—with joy and abandon. I've seen them charge back on three legs, with the fourth dangling and broken.

The Florida hound dog deserves a better break than he has gotten. Two of them will tackle a 400-pound bear. I believe one would. You can kill one of these hounds, but you can't make him quit. After all, the pit bulldog doesn't tackle a puma or a big bear.

Bird life in the Everglades is something beyond belief. I've seen landscapes blotted out by thousands of egrets, clouds of snow-white, moving beauty.

I recall a moving picture Paul Waner made south of Key West. Waner happened to harpoon a rare action shot of a sawfish, 20 feet in length. The sawfish was taking them out to sea when a Florida kid grabbed the harpoon line and climbed upon the back of the fish, standing up and saluting.

Waner had one of the best sporting pictures I ever saw. Unfortunately, his photography was not as good as his batting eye. For he was a fellow who could hit. His invasion of Key West and the Everglades with a camera deserved a better fate.

Paul and Lloyd Waner were two of the best. Paul was a great ball player. He was also a 72 or 74 golfer. He was one of the best fishermen I've seen in many years. And, with Max Carey, he was one of the four Ring Lardner insisted on having with his quartet. The four were Lardner, Carey, Waner, and Reinald Werrenrath, who happened to be a grand-opera star. Ring Lardner always insisted on perfection.

Federal Grants to States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 27, 1949:

TIME FOR CURTAILMENT

The steady increase in the extension of Federal subsidies to State governments has been unhealthy for democracy.

It has helped to swell the budget of a Central Government that is now paying interest of more than $5,000,000,000 on its debt.

It has formed a tentacle through which social planners in the Central Government have been able to exert pressures in the shaping of State-government operation and policies.

It has become a barrier to the imperatively needed reordering of the scrambled system of Federal-State-local taxation in the United States.

It has imbued a large part of the population with the false notion that, through Federal subsidies, State governments can give the people services and benefits without the people paying for them.

The expansion of Federal grants-in-aid to the States, amounting last year to $1,120,000,000 and representing about 15 percent of all State operating expenditures, should be halted.

A strong case for this has been presented in the newly released study by the Tax Foundation of New York, an authoritative agency for research in taxes and public expenditures, of State-government finances between 1942 and 1947.

In an illuminating analysis of State-government expenditures during that period the foundation points out that, while the Federal debt was mounting from $72,000,000,000 to $258,000,000,000, the States amassed an aggregate surplus of almost $1,000,000,000 in excess of their gross long-term debt.

The foundation's study reveals that strong gains by the Southern States—many of them the so-called poor States for which, it was long contended, Federal subsidies were especially necessary—"have contributed greatly to lessening regional discrepancies in the level of State-government expenditures. With careful planning of future fiscal programs," the study goes on to say, "there is no reason why this sound State financial position cannot be maintained."

Yet in the face of this situation, Federal grants to the States are still on the rise. They rose 40 percent between 1942 and 1947 and 52 percent between 1945 and 1947.

The Tax Foundation report pointed out that under the Federal Highway Act of 1944, a 3-year appropriation of $500,000,000 a year for aid to the States in road construction was authorized. Yet at the end of fiscal 1947, only $136,000,000 of the $15,000,000,000 postwar highway aid fund had been spent.

The report further cited increases in Federal aid to the States for welfare purposes, for airports and for hospitals and added:

"Demands are being made for increasing Federal aid for other purposes. Educators are championing the plea for a program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. Bills introduced in the second session of the Eightieth Congress called for Federal aid for such varied purposes as teachers' salaries, public works, a labor extension

service program, public health services, nursing homes for the aged, recreation facilities and water-pollution programs."

The curtailment of Federal aid to the States, the Tax Foundation holds, "would appear to be both a desirable and a practical measure." We believe that conclusion is unassailable.

What is needed far more than bigger and better Federal subsidies to the States is a thorough overhauling of our whole system of taxation to eliminate duplicating, overlapping imposts and to set up, to the fullest possible extent, separate areas of taxation for each of the three major levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

National Theater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, appended hereto is an interesting article from the George Washington University alumni publication, Confidential—From Washington. 'Certainly the university theaters throughout the country must be an integral part of the effort for a truly national theater. This is, and must be, based on bringing theater to the people everywhere rather than just in the few big cities which now have a regular opportunity to see the living theater. The fact that the university-theater movement is making so much progress shows rather that there are great prospects for a national theater in the immediate future.

The article follows:

TOWARD A LIVING THEATER

(By Edward Mangum, A. M., assistant professor of speech, George Washington University)

There has been a great deal of talk of late about establishing an American national theater, taking as precedent, among others, the state-owned theaters of France, Sweden, and Germany, and the work of organizations like the Arts Council of Great Britain, and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to which the United States is a contributor. Some people feel that the time is ripe for establishing a Department of Cultural Affairs within the Cabinet, and rumors are heard of a "lobby" in Washington to promote an endowed theater.

The reason for all this talk is apparent to any man who loves the teater and tries to buy a ticket to one of its show places: There are very few legitimate playhouses outside of New York. Yet when he saves his money for that occasional trip to the city, theater tickets are not to be had. This is something of a paradox: There are no theaters, yet there is a great demand on the part of the public for theatrical fare. In any other commercial field, producers would work night and day on the supply line to meet this demand. In the field of theater, however, commercialism itself has been one of the prime causes of our cultural desert.

Those who work in the noncommercial theater are not the only ones who believe this. Some of the best actors, designers, directors, and producers in New York are in agreement. Perhaps their thoughts are best summed up by Mr. Brooks Atkinson, drama critic for the New York Times, in an article in his paper on November 17, 1946. "A real theater," he says, "is not a piece of real estate, nor a manager in an office risking other people's money on actors hired on a piecework basis. It is, or should be, an institution in which a group of actors work under inspiring management. The entire organization of the American theater is absurd—economically as well as artistically; and its treatment of the individual who works in the theater is medieval in its lack of social attitudes. It will be difficult to find any other modern enterprise in which the people who do the work are treated so badly."

There has never been a time when someone didn't think something was wrong with the theater. Even in idyllic Greek times, when the great dramatic festivals meant so much to so many, men like the statesman Solon fought the theater, calling it lying and falsifying. Even the immortal Shakespeare, in his sonnet beginning "when, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes," wrote with a feeling of humiliation because of his connections with the stage. And 200 years later we read from Carlyle, "Nay, do not we English hear daily for the last 20 years, that the drama is dead, or in a state of suspended animation; and are not medical men sitting on the case, and propounding their remedial appliances, weekly, monthly, quarterly, to no manner of purpose?"

To these cries and hundreds of others, why add one more? The theater has enough troubles already, someone says, and unconsciously he has joined the chorus of discontent. The theater does have troubles, and troubles are solved only by exposing them and suggesting solutions.

Would a government-endowed national theater be the solution to these problems? Possibly. Is it likely that such a theater is in prospect for the immediate future? Hardly. Is there some other way to foster great drama and at the same time further the cause of a truly national theater? Definitely.

Across the Nation, in cities large and small, an institution exists which dates from the 12th and 13th centuries. This institution is the repository of much that is great in the culture of the past. It is also the laboratory for much of the social and scientific progress of today. It could become the home for the greatest theater the world has ever known. That institution is the university.

Since its founding, the university has been the body responsible for the conservation, dissemination, and advancement of learning. Through the dark ages of man's progress for the past 800 years, the university has maintained its position as a leader in man's struggle for perfection. What better place, then, to view the great plays of the past, present, and future? Here could be established the theater where the people might be spiritually uplifted by viewing, night after night, great plays produced in the highest artistic manner by trained, intelligent people laboring through an intense love for their work. Such a theater would be a stimulating and inspiring factor in our national life and culture.

How could such a theater be established in the university? The answer is as simple as putting the plan into operation. Briefly, the plan is this:

1. Enlarge the curriculum to include advanced courses in all fields of drama, offering thorough training in practical theory and craftsmanship.

2. Maintain on the teaching staff resident professional directors, playwrights, designers, technicians, and actors as instructors in regular drama classes.

3. Establish a small but permanent producing company on a salary basis, this company to be composed of qualified students, who would aid in the production of a full schedule of major plays for paying audiences. These students would also act as laboratory assistants in regular drama classes.

4. Bring in, from time to time, professional guest actors and directors to participate in the production of particular plays.

5. Create a laboratory theater primarily for student actors, directors, designers, etc., with a full schedule of plays for paying audiences.

6. Establish touring companies of qualified students to make plays available to communities unable to finance theaters of their own.

Such a plan as this would not be substituting a commercial theater within the university for the commercial theater without. It would, instead, contribute to the culture of the community it serves by making good theater available to all. It would contribute to the training of the student who, under present methods, gets classroom lectures and projects but meager laboratory work. It would contribute to the curricula of university departments other than speech and drama by making available in live form many of the world's classics now studied only from the printed page.

There is nothing new in this plan. Most of it is already in operation, but generally on a small scale, and not all of it within any one university. Outstanding among the schools making definite progress in such an endeavor is Stanford University. The drama staff includes several professionals. In the summer of 1944 three professional actors were engaged to supplement students and faculty in their productions. Equity salaries were paid the guest actors and production expenses were high, yet the shows paid for themselves and there was money left over. During the following years the plan was expanded to include several theatrical fellowships, granted annually to outstanding young actors and technicians throughout the United States. These students made up the nucleus of an acting and producing company. Last summer was, with additional professional actors on the campus, the most ambitious and successful season, artistically and financially.

The University of Utah has been operating a similar plan for the past 2 years. As a result of the tremendous interest evidenced in the Salt Lake City area, construction has started on a new $1,500,000 building on the campus to house their new theater, and a member of their staff has been sent to New York for 2 years to study theater management in preparation for a big job when he returns. The University of Virginia Theater last summer invited in two guest actors, and as a result the summer's business increased 40 percent.

What has been done at these and other universities indicates that the ventures in every instance have been financially successful. There is no reason why this should not be the case since a theater-going folk, who might be reluctant to buy a ticket to a nonprofessional performance by a university group, subscribe heavily for the opportunity to see shows in which qualified professionals are playing. Later, they are anxious to see other plays by the same group whether supplemented by professionals or not. University theaters should take heart at the tremendous response from the public toward such projects already under way.

Box-office receipts, in nearly every instance, have been the sole source of revenue, and these have been more than enough, as has been indicated, to pay all production expenses. For universities located in large cities there is, therefore, virtually no problem with regard to financing a program such as is envisioned, except for an initial outlay which could certainly be recouped after two seasons, if not after one. For universities in smaller towns, where students make up the bulk of the audience, activity fees could

be slightly enlarged to provide additional income. There is no reason, of course, why the city university could not do likewise.

Such a venture would meet the immediate approval of the press, which could be counted upon to give support where it is most needed. Boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and other business and civic organizations would no doubt go all out to back a plan which would add to the prestige of the community. Cultural, educational, and religious bodies would welcome the advent of good theater designed to raise the standards of the society in which they work. Such a plan should find immediate support from alumni organizations which are ordinarily most anxious to see their university move forward in all pursuits.

The American National Theater and Academy, chartered by Congress in 1935, is in happy accord with such a plan as advocated here. ANTA was organized "for the purpose of stimulating interest in the drama and bringing to all Americans their heritage of the past, the best of the present, and to aid the development of better drama in the future." It could be counted upon to assist with its expert advice in the setting up of any program of promise and to help obtain the best professional talent available.

A project of this kind, administered by people who know theater from both the artistic and business angles, could within a few short years be the major American theater. Twenty-five or thirty pioneering universities, with a vision for the future, would be the start of a great movement to bring drama back to the respected place it occupied 2,000 years ago.

Under this plan, classics and new works would be playing in universities every night in the year. In the end it would not only pay for itself through increased box-office receipts and student enrollment but would also make available great plays to the millions who get only superficial movie and radio fare, and all-important jobs to thousands of young men and women who yearn to share with others their artistic talents.

Universities have often been accused, and many times with justification, of pedantry, conservatism, and indifference to contemporary activities. They played an important part, however, in public affairs of the Middle Ages, even to joining in the great church councils of the fifteenth century. In the twentieth century, when men like Gen. Omar Bradley can say that we are living in "a world of nuclear giants and ethical infants" surely the great universities must be looked to for cultural leadership. A truly national theater, fostered with pride and devotion by these universities, might be the means whereby, in part at least, will be caught the conscience of the people.

4–H Club Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of recently attending a preview of a motion picture called The Green Promise at the Jefferson Auditorium of the Agriculture Department here in Washington. It deals with one of the most important activities in which the Department of Agriculture and the land-grant colleges are engaged, that of 4–H Club work.

I was invited to the premiere because the star of the picture was a member of a 4–H Club from my own district in southern Indiana, little Jeanne LaDuke of Mt. Vernon, Ind., who was picked for the part from 12,000 candidates. I think Jeanne almost stole the show. It is my understanding that this picture will have a premiere at Houston, Tex., March 18 before it is released to other theaters in the country.

I was impressed with the picture, not only because of Jeanne's part and excellent performance in the play, but because in an entertaining and educational way it explains the work the 4–H Clubs are doing. It is truly a good picture.

The Green Promise has been recommended by several national women's organizations representing a membership of more than 10,000,000 and including the Daughters of the American Revolution; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the Girl Scouts; the American Legion Auxiliary; the American Association of University Women; the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; the Southern California Council of Church Women; and the Parent-Teachers Association.

More Revenues to Counties From National Forest Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill (H. R. 3357) to establish a new procedure governing contributions to the cost of local government with respect to Federal-owned forest lands. This bill proposes that the Federal Government shall make annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments for distribution to their respective county governments in proportion to the acreage and value of the national forest lands situated in said counties. The bill fixes the amount of such annual payments as equaling 2 percent of the appraised value of the national forest lands within each county.

I should mention that this is not the first proposal of its kind. During the Eightieth Congress, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] introduced Senate bill 582, and this bill passed the other body in an amended form. Other similar measures have been introduced in this and previous Congresses specifying differing amounts of annual payments.

I will speak briefly on the rationale of this bill—the fiscal problems of county governments arising from Federal ownership of vast sections of untaxable forest land has not been generally understood, and some elaboration of the scope and nature of this problem is necessary.

In the first place, let me point out that the effect of Federal ownership is felt by many more county governments than most people realize—the millions of acres of land in the national forests embrace substantial portions of over 20 percent of all counties in the United States. To illustrate this point, I quote briefly from the Agriculture Department's report on S. 582, which was submitted on May 21, 1947, and reads as follows:

> Parts of 706 counties, situated in 40 of the States, are now within the exterior boundaries of the national forests or of the national forest purchase units established under the Weeks law with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission. Of these counties, 38 now contain no national forests, while 15 others each contain less than 100 acres of national forest land. At this time 653 counties are actively participating in returns from national forest lands. In other words, more than one-fifth of all the counties or parishes in the United States are immediately concerned.

These large property holdings of the Federal Government are not taxable by either State or local government. Thus, Federal ownership of large tracts of forest land in any county automatically reduces the amount of taxable property in the county, and thus reduces the county's volume of revenue to meet its operating expenses. This leads to serious fiscal problems in such counties, and especially serious problems in those counties where Federal ownership exceeds one-third of the total acreage of the county.

The counties are vital elements in our governmental structure and necessary units in functioning of local self-government—the public interest requires that they shall be full functioning and financially solvent. It has long been recognized that some form of in-lieu-of-tax payments must be forthcoming from the Federal Government to the counties to offset the loss of taxable property and subsequent revenues resulting from Federal ownership.

The Federal Government and Congress has recognized this financial responsibility to the counties by enacted legislation—acts of May 23, 1908, and March 1, 1911, as amended—which give the counties 25 percent of all national-forest receipts to help meet the costs of local government.

However, experience proves that the 25-percent-of-total-receipts formula, as a means of granting in-lieu-of-tax payments to the counties, is far from satisfactory, and that it is subject to a number of serious objections.

First, the revenue received by the counties tends to fluctuate widely, depending upon the size of the timber sales. In prosperous times the payments may be substantial, but they may be drastically reduced at other times. Secondly, the distribution of revenues among the counties is inequitable—if a national forest is in more than one county the counties share in proportion to the acreage in each county, which is an unfair arrangement when the productive proportion of the area may be centered chiefly in one county. Third, payments in general have not been adequate to protect local taxpayers from undue tax burdens. Finally, the purposes for which contributions may be used are now confined to schools and roads, and often prevents the best use of this money.

In other words, the 25-percent formula is inequitable, inadequate, and subject to wide fluctuations, and its effect is to contribute to fiscal insolvency in county government.

The bill which I have offered for consideration by the House would establish a new principle governing Federal contributions to county government. It would increase the amount of revenue to be forthcoming to the counties, and would provide a greater measure of stability and equity of contribution. It would guarantee a fixed amount to the counties year after year, and enable local governments to formulate their financial programs on the basis of a fairly stable income from the Federal Government. I am convinced that this bill would provide a more workable program of Federal contributions, and that it will more adequately meet the fiscal needs of county governments by increasing Federal contributions from the present annual total of less than $4,000,000 to between twelve and fifteen million dollars. On this basis, I offer this measure for consideration by the House, and urge its enactment into law.

Asks Relaxation of Taxes on Admission to School Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from Lee M. Thurston, superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction for the State of Michigan, who asks Congress to consider the relaxation of Federal taxes on admissions to events held in public, parochial, or private schools. I believe his reasons for asking this consideration are well taken. Mr. Thurston's letter follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Lansing, March 8, 1949.

Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SHAFER: Recent information from Washington indicates that there is a possibility of some relaxation on certain tax laws. I should like to suggest that in any changes in excise-tax laws, first consideration be given the matter of Federal taxes on admissions to public-, parochial-, or private-school events.

A Federal tax on admission to any type of public-school event virtually is a tax upon a tax, since all such schools are supported by State and local taxes. School events involve the use of a school building with heat, light, and other services whose cost is borne by the taxpayer. There usually are several teachers, also paid by State and local taxes, who participate in these programs. None of these events produces a profit to any individual.

Funds from school events, whether they are school plays, dances, athletic events, or other activities, are all operated for the benefit of students, and funds realized are used to buy equipment or materials. For instance, in football and basketball games, receipts are used to purchase uniforms and protective equipment of various types for the boys, and these funds also are used to subsidize sports, such as track, baseball, and the other sports where admission fees are negligible.

There are few schools in the State of Michigan where the revenue equals the expense of these various events. It could follow that football players are or might be out on the playing field with unsafe protective equipment because there are not sufficient funds in the schools' athletic accounts.

The amounts of Federal taxes collected on school events are not available to this office. We have but one example to offer which concerns the taxes on the State high school basketball tournaments in Michigan. Last year this tax alone amounted to $31,925.75. It would probably be safe to estimate that as much as one million dollars are collected in Michigan alone on school events. This sum of money which is collected for Federal taxes, if they were eliminated, could be used for the welfare of youth, not only in Michigan but throughout the Nation.

It is significant to note that in most instances the admissions tax on school events actually is absorbed by the schools themselves rather than passing it on to students and school patrons. Most school people feel that the admission price to school activities should be kept to a minimum in order that as many students, parents, and school-tax payers as possible can attend them.

This communication is being sent to all Members of the Congress from Michigan. You may be assured that any action taken will be appreciated by parents and children of the State.

Sincerely,

LEE M. THURSTON.

Seek United States Aid for Red China in Name of People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Daily Tribune of March 7, 1949:

SEEK UNITED STATES AID FOR RED CHINA IN NAME OF PEOPLE—AMERICAN BUSINESS LEADS DRIVE

(By Walter Simmons)

SHANGHAI, March 6.—A drive for continued economic aid to the Chinese people—meaning the population in China's growing Communist-controlled area—is expected to be opened soon, with American businessmen as its leaders.

The campaign is already under way in the United States, led by such "Chinese experts" as Harold Ickes, Owen Lattimore, and prominent figures in the Communist-dominated institute of Pacific relations. American aid for Chinese economic rehabilitation is strongly favored by many American businessmen here. Some admit privately they are not particularly interested in the political aspects of helping the new Communist government to succeed. Their interest is in doing business profitably under any regime.

LEFTIST OPINION

American leftist opinion in Shanghai has been expressed in the China Weekly Review, edited by John W. Powell, which has recently advocated an end of ECA (Economic Cooperation Administration) help to Nationalist China, and the inauguration of a new aid program for Communist areas.

The China Economist, an economic supplement to the Review, which frequently prints Communist propaganda without identifying it as such, recently denounced aid to Nationalist China as "partiality," and, while belittling the $400,000,000 program which terminates in April, proposed that continued aid be given the Chinese people. This phrase is consistently used by those who urge American aid for the Communist areas.

Although unanimously anti-Communist, businessmen fear that a discontinuance of ECA aid will be interpreted as a slap in the face by the new Red government. British commercial firms have no such problem, it is pointed out, since Britain has given no recent aid to China.

A CONFUSED GROUP

Observers here have found the American business community a confused and irresolute group. Except in a few cases, individual competence seems amazingly lacking. Scores of these Americans have lived in Shanghai for a dozen years or more without bothering to learn the language. Visitors who question them are amazed at their ignorance of Chinese history and customs. Except for essential business contacts, most Americans insulate themselves against the Chinese at home and in clubs which Chinese enter only as servants. At parties where Chinese guests are invited, the two races usually sort themselves quickly into separate groups.

Some observers feel these businessmen are misguided, and are unwittingly serving as stooges for Communist leaders who currently profess disinterest in American economic help, but who would like to have it pressed on them, to be administered without any strings.

Increase in Federal Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal of February 25, 1949:

THE EASY ALTERNATIVE

There doesn't appear to be any serious effort to prune operating expenses, either in the Federal Government or the lesser units of Government. The easy alternative is finding new sources of tax money, and that is going on right now all over the country. Not only the Federal Government but nearly every State, it seems, has under consideration new and raised levies. Why this should be so when it is so clearly in violation of good business judgment is hard to understand. Is there no longer such a thing as statesmanship?

When it comes to the Federal Government, the following comment from a business review issued by the Cleveland Trust Co. seems pertinent: "Those who are little concerned with efficiency in government often point to the 76 percent of the total budget which

covers national defense, foreign aid, veterans, and interest on the national debt, and ask, 'Where would you cut?' This apparently implies that it is hardly worth while bothering about the remaining 24 percent (which amounts to $9,935,000,000). Actually there is plenty of room for substantial savings through more efficient operation of functions included in both the 76 percent and the 24 percent. This is clearly evident from information already released by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The Commission has pointed out that the Nation is paying heavily because the Federal Government, now the biggest business in the world, is not running smoothly; and it supports this conclusion with detailed facts and figures."

Referred to are the so-called Hoover Commission reports. The people, who foot the bills, should scrutinize these reports intensively and demand of their representatives in Congess that corrective action be taken. It is well known that Mr. Hoover was reluctant to undertake this vast project, but once convinced that it was his duty he, to quote the magazine Newsweek, "plunged into his job with an energy that eventually was to exhaust the younger men working under him. He first set up 22 task forces, each to study a particular branch of the Government. Never before had so many top figures in American business and the professions been collected so quickly for any governmental project. They streamed in from the Ford Motor Co., the Prudential Life Insurance Co., Young & Rubicam, the Curtis Publishing Co., Montgomery Ward, General Motors, and the Reynolds Tobacco Co.; from the Brookings Institution, and the University of Minnesota. They brought in nearly 300 experts to work for them."

Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George S. Benson, president of Harding College:

LOOKING AHEAD

(By George S. Benson, president, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.)

YOU AND YOUR SHARE

If ever this Nation needed an economy-minded Congress, it is now. The cost of Government has shot up all out of sight. Current high costs of government represent more than just dollar inflation. What we have had, without clearly realizing it, is a boom in government. This boom has flourished until there is danger of collapse from the very size of the super-structure itself. Our ship of state is indeed topheavy.

Lumping all government together—Federal, State, local—tax collections for the 1948 fiscal year came to 26 percent of the national income. Perhaps you can see it better if we should divide up that $55,200,000,000 of tax collections, to find what was your part. It amounts to $377 for each man, woman, and child in the Nation. You didn't pay that much? Brother, your share was tucked away in the price of everything you spent your money for.

Fuel for bureaucracy

You can see how much taxes have grown, if you compare the above figures with those for 1940. Then tax collections were $14,400,000,000, or 18.9 percent of national income. The amount for each person in 1940 was only $109. In 8 years, therefore, we have more than tripled our taxes. A lot of it results from the war. We're spending a lot in Europe, certainly. But let us not use that as an excuse for lack of vigilance about the rest of it. We ought to find a place to stop this mushrooming of government.

The biggest collector and spender is the Federal Government, of course. A government can spend only what it receives from the people. The fuel on which bureaucracy feeds is public money. For this reason, Americans ought to be more conscious of taxation and its purposes. Tax bills should interest us even more than budgets. It may be impossible to educate Federal bureaus to lower their budgets. But lower taxes will turn the trick.

Government unlimited

We are inclined to justify boom government and resulting high taxes in a number of strange ways. In depression times, we call for more and more spending. That means taxes, but we put them off until later. Then in time of plenty, we think up more things that government can do better for us, feeling sure that we can afford it. At the same time, we make little or no effort to catch up and get out of the red. Today, we ignore wartime debt, and forget that we ever did any deficit spending.

Must we dedicate ourselves to unlimited government? Since the founding of America, we have looked to Congress to control taxes. Knowing that "power to tax is power to destroy," the founding fathers placed tax power upon Congress. This power was not meant to be abused. Citizens then were aware that government was meant to serve them, not they to serve the Government. That viewpoint still means good citizenship. It is the viewpoint of taxpayers.

Voters are taxpayers

But times have changed. Nowadays American voters (though they be taxpayers to the tune of billions) look upon themselves first as receivers of Government benefits, last as payers of tax. Our Federal Government is now making payments direct to 15,830,889 persons. Some of these are necessary. But too many of us, far too many for the good of the Nation, have a personal interest in seeing Government expenditures continue. Will any of these 16,000,000 bite the hand that feeds them?

You see, this is the way we ourselves can undermine the cornerstone of freedom. Almost without knowing it, we have created a huge central government, then given it power to perpetuate itself. If big government can minimize the dangers of entrenched bureaucracy, keep public waste and extravagance out of sight, and go on taxing, then this thing will continue regardless of the party in power. When big government sells people on the idea of lavish hand-outs which they themselves pay for by high taxes, you can call this bribing people with their own money.

A DANGEROUS TAX

There's talk in Washington of a $4,000,000,000 tax increase. If Congress permits this new siphoning of income and savings from the people into the Federal Treasury, the results can be dangerous for the whole Nation. This is fact, regardless of whether or not the President and his administration would be cramped in spending a proposed $42,000,000,000 budget. Of course, like our Senator MCCLELLAN told home folks recently, Mr. Truman's program means that taxes can go only one way—up, up, up.

Senator FULBRIGHT, our other distinguished Senator, tried to ease the misgivings of the economy-minded by pointing out that saving Federal money and reducing taxes is a question of "what you are willing to give up." That is a problem, all right. And it takes courage and unselfishness from each citizen, to get the answer to it. One reason that economy is not the rule, is that courage and unselfishness are so little known.

Spending is easy

Too many of us have the attitude of the well-known politician, who said that he had never voted for a tax bill nor against an appropriations bill. If we manage to fool ourselves into thinking the other fellow is going to have to pay for the hand-outs, we then show no enthusiasm about economy. Citizens and Congressmen alike too often see economy as a fine thing when it's not close to home, but work like mad for all the Government aid they can get—for themselves.

One thing is wrong with the question our Senator asked, about what we would give up. It puts the burden of proof on the citizen who would economize. That proof belongs elsewhere. Every bureaucrat who demands funds should explain and justify the expenditure of every dollar. Spending is the easiest thing in the world to do. Whether some buréaucrat spends wastefully and needlessly out of tax funds—that's something he should have an answer for.

A present danger

Wherein lies the danger to the Nation in heavier taxes at this time? It is proposed that the burden of a $4,000,000,000 tax increase be placed upon corporations and businesses. This might look to some like an easy way to shift the tax load onto somebody else. Actually, a tax that is shouldered by business is still borne by the people—because people buy the products of corporations that are owned by people.

At present the Nation's business corporations pay a 38 percent tax on income. Earnings distributed to owners may get taxed up to 92 percent. (Other taxes, also, are levied upon corporations.) Tremendous sums, therefore, are handed to Uncle Sam by industry. But right now, the Nation's economists are agreed that America's industry must have huge amounts of additional capital for growth and for expansion. There's danger, if instead these billions must be poured into Washington.

Don't kill incentive

Any industrial plant that is not able to spend money continually for expansion or for newer, better equipment is a corporation moving toward failure. An amount roughly equal to the President's proposed budget of $42,000,000,000 is the least we ought to put this year into our industrial plant. If America is to have the industrial strength it should have, if jobs are to remain plentiful, and if wages are to be high—then we had better have a care about penalizing our industry. America can lose out, by exacting too much "take" from business.

If we permit taxes that take away nearly all profits, we're heading for bankruptcy and depression. Our socialist-minded politicos say a lot about the need for this give-away and that hand-out. But unless industry is allowed to expand, modernize, and meet today's needs, there'll be nothing at all to tax one of these days. When taxes take what would be invested, and when incentive to invest is killed—the country will go into reverse. Another $4,000,000,000 in taxes on corporations would be most unwise.

SOCIALISM AND TAXES

Can high taxes take us down the road to socialism? Yes, a whole lot farther than most people think. Already, the blighting effect of high taxes is visible, despite today's good times and high over-all output. Top economists are pointing right now to danger signs that affect you and your job. With taxes having long ago neared the breaking point,

it is just possible that unwise legislation for more spending and more taxes could upset the Nation.

The plight our Nation is in right now, because of a tax load that requires more than a quarter out of every dollar of national income, was apparent in the President's recent message. Mr. Truman stressed the need for high steel production and for expanded facilities. Steel output is hitting new all-time peaks—even better than wartime highs. "It would be the part of the Federal Government to build plants and produce steel, if private industry did not," Mr. Truman said. For this, who would put up the capital?

Contradiction?

Obviously, you would. By paying taxes. When government goes into business, the effect is to spend money, not make it. That has been proved too many times. But on the face of it, Mr. Truman's proposition—that the Government get into the steel business—is nothing more nor less than socialism pure and simple. Continuing, Mr. Truman said there must be $4,000,000,000 in new taxes, mostly from corporations. The contradiction of it all makes food for serious thought.

With one breath the Government thus orders business to plan for steady, vigorous expansion, and with the next proposes taxing policies that will make it impossible for industry to have funds for expansion. Despite already high taxes that make capital timid, the steel industry has somehow reached enormous production levels. But more taxes remain a dangerous threat. What Congress does about taxes this year may have great influence on the production of the future.

Incentive destroyer

Heavy taxes are a certain hindrance to production, and hence to prosperity and national well-being. More than any other one factor, taxes can smother initiative. They destroy incentives to get ahead, to save, and to invest. Taxes take at least half the total income of all persons with incomes of $5,000 a year or more. This group represents only one-tenth of America's families, but it is from this group that the bulk of risk capital must continually flow into new enterprises.

Unwise tax laws, which steal the fruits of labor from those who work, can cause stagnation in America just as they have done in Europe—in France, in Italy, and in England. That high taxes are now keeping funds away from business enterprise in America is a sobering fact. Figures will show that in the 8-year period from 1940 through 1947, individuals cut back their holdings of corporate investments by nearly a billion and one-third dollars. Taxes do prevent savings for investment.

A plague of taxes

Unfair taxes hinder our national well-being further by making it hard for business and industry to retain earnings for use in creating new job opportunities. All the way down the line, incentive is subject to tax penalties that put the damper on enterprise. We may well fear the future, if we permit taxes to plague us into a slump. Perhaps the worst feature of heavy taxation is that the whole Nation is weakened for the trying times that may lie ahead.

Be assured that if the Federal budget takes $42,000,000,000 from the people, the price of everything from bread to shoestrings will contain its share of that multibillion dollar figure. That is why Government spending must interest you. The more Government spends, the more it must collect. And Government has nothing, except what it gets from the people. Then when people say, incentive is in grave danger. The Gargantua that can overthrow America is Big Government. This destroyer feeds on taxes.

Would Cut Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fall River (Mass.) Herald-News of Tuesday, March 8, 1949, on excise-tax reduction:

WOULD CUT EXCISE TAX

Republican House Leader (JOE) MARTIN'S bill to reduce excise taxes generally to their prewar rates were unanimously endorsed by the House Republican policy committee last week, and Washington observers predict that it will also have the support of rebellious southern Democrats when it comes up for action.

Certainly the anti-excise-tax movement has the support of the vast number of consumers who find their wallets still assailed by high prices, and by the many businessmen who feel that business now needs a shot in the arm from increased consumer purchasing. Increased purchasing would be certain to follow the removal of wartime excise taxes, say the businessmen.

These taxes, commonly called luxury taxes, are levied on many articles hardly to be called luxuries: Light bulbs, 20 percent; telephone service, 15 percent; entertainment admissions, 20 percent; toilet articles, 20 percent; transportation tickets, 15 percent. The most productive of the excise taxes is that of a cent and a half a gallon on gasoline, which yielded the Federal Government $498,000,000 in 1948.

The 7-percent tax on automobiles produced $275,000,000; the 3 percent on freight, $339,000,000; the admissions tax, $387,000,000; the 20 percent on jewelry, $215,000,000. Light bulbs yielded $26,000,000; jewelry, $26,000,000; phonograph records, $7,000,000; sporting goods, $21,000,000. Excluding tobacco and liquor imposts, but including certain other minor miscellaneous taxes, the total take from excise taxes by the United States Treasury was almost $4,000,000,000 in 1948.

If the antiexcise movement is successful, this will be $4,000,000,000 that the Government must save by not spending, or that must be raised by other increased taxes. It appears, then, that coupled with the movement, there must be a spirited drive for Government economy. We are reminded that it was about $4,000,000,000 that Herbert Hoover said could be saved by a reorganization of the administrative division of the Federal Government.

Americans Without Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 1, 1949:

AMERICANS WITHOUT CITIZENSHIP

Once again an attempt is being made in Congress to end a policy of disgraceful discrimination which prevents thousands of Americans from enjoying citizenship.

Five Members of the House have introduced a bill practically identical with the Judd bill of the Eightieth Congress. This would allow persons of Japanese ancestry who are legally entitled to permanent residence in the United States to become citizens—just as other legal immigrants can.

This is not now possible. American-born persons of Japanese ancestry now have American citizenship. But there are between 80,000 and 90,000 persons, mostly of Japanese extraction, presently barred from citizenship. This number includes persons who have lived nearly all their lives in the United States and many whose sons died on the battlefields for the United States.

All that is asked in the new Judd bill is to round out the immigration laws to remove the last remaining discrimination preventing citizenship for any permanent legally admitted residents. This discrimination was ended for Chinese, Filipinos, and (oriental) Indians several years ago.

The Judd bill was unanimously approved by a House subcommittee in the Eightieth Congress, but got caught in the closing rush and could not be brought up. It was, and again is, a bipartisan bill. It is an American bill to allow a group of Americans in fact to enjoy the citizenship that all their fellow residents enjoy.

Testimony on the Judd bill in the last Congress was overwhelmingly favorable. It should be speeded through now without much delay or controversy.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES P. NELSON

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a resolution received from the City Council of the City of Auburn, Maine:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as "General Pulaski's Memorial Day" for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Auburn and State of Maine:

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Maine.

Presented to the council by Alton J. McFadden, councilman, ward IV.

A true copy.

Attest:

LEON H. COLE,
City Clerk of Auburn, Maine.

President Truman and the Special Interests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer for February 26, 1949:

WHAT SPECIAL INTEREST?

During the course of his Jefferson-Jackson Day address, President Truman assailed on 10 separate occasions the special interests which he claimed are trying to wreck his program in Congress.

Seldom have the American people been treated to a display of such colossal impudence. The man who accused the special interests did not even make a pretense of concealing the fact that he was speaking in behalf of the most powerful special interest now seeking to influence Congress—the labor lobby which wants to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to restore the vicious, one-sided Wagner law.

Truman declared the Taft-Hartley Act was a device to make unions so weak they could not carry on effective collective bargaining. This is an amazing statement in view of the fact that during the period since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act labor unions have been able to negotiate the most favorable contracts they ever had.

But it is true that some restrictions have been imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act on labor union activities with which the Federal Government did not concern itself under the Wagner Act. An example of this kind was related in a dispatch from Washington Thursday concerning a ruling by the National Labor Relations Board that the CIO United Furniture Workers Union had violated the Taft-Hartley Act while attempting to organize employees of the Smith Cabinet Manufacturing Co., of Salem, Ind.

According to testimony before the Board, goon squads beat up nonstrikers, nails were strewn in the road to puncture automobile tires, bricks and clubs were wielded, automobiles were overturned, and executives were prevented by pickets from entering the plant.

Then there was the recent commando raid during which union strong-arm squads invaded and wrecked the plant of the Shakespeare Manufacturing Co. in Michigan.

Does the President of the United States have the effrontery to contend that labor unions should be allowed to engage in these nefarious practices in order to carry on effective collective bargaining?

We suggest it is not any special interests which are blocking the enactment of Truman's legislative program, but the conflicting interests which he, himself, invoked in the recent campaign and which he has since been attempting to appease.

The President must think the American people are a bunch of nincompoops to forget so quickly the fiasco which accompanied the introduction of his fair labor bill in the Senate. Secretary Tobin assured the Senate Labor Committee that the President needed no injunctive power to prevent strikes affecting the national health and safety. Public opinion would prevent such strikes, he said. When this conclusion was questioned, Attorney General Clark told the committee that the President had the inherent power to obtain such injunctions anyhow.

It is not likely the American people have forgotten how Truman bewailed the high cost of food during the campaign and denounced the Eightieth Congress for refusing to enact his price-control remedy, while at the same time he was telling the farmers they would be ingrates if they didn't reelect him because of the high prices they were getting for their products.

But what happened when grain prices took a nose dive recently? Secretary Brannan announced the Government would buy up every bushel of grain it could ship abroad in order to prevent lower prices, although only a year or so before Truman and former Secretary Anderson were assuring the people that there was no connection between high prices and the Government grain purchases.

The president's current difficulties with Congress arise from the fact that he made too many promises to too many people when he was campaigning for election, with the result that he cannot fulfill any of his pledges without offending large groups of people who are represented in Washington by congressmen having similar viewpoints.

Truman's petulant denunciation of special interests reflects an attitude that persons who disagree with him should not have representation in Congress. We hope he carries out his threat to get back aboard his campaign train to tell the people how their Government is getting on. Last year he sold a bill of goods when he was denouncing the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. A similar campaign against the Democratic-controlled Eighty-first Congress should produce enlivening results.

Selective Service System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter I wish to discuss is selective service, and in view of the fact that I was unable to appear before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to call my remarks to the attention of my very good and able friend the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The 1949 appropriation for the Office of Selective Service Records was $2,476,700, and for Selective Service System it was $25,000,000, or a total of $27,476,700.

This amount provided for 5,455 full-time positions and 500 man-years of part-time employment, and the induction of 210,000 registrants. Due to the curtailment of inductions, employment as of February 1, 1949, was only 4,825 full-time employees, including military personnel, and 474 man-months of part-time employment.

Now I understand the request for the 1950 appropriation for the Selective Service System is $16,700,000. This amount provides for 2,905 full-time positions and 1,515 man-years of part-time employment, but does not provide for inductions.

In view of the fact this organization is not functioning, why there should be a request for 2,905 full-time employees and 1,515 man-years of part-time employment, is beyond my comprehension. It is serving no purpose and under the present circumstances I cannot see any reason why an appropriation should be made other than to keep a stand-by, skeletonized force in existence.

Certainly here is one opportunity where we can save several millions of the American taxpayers' dollars, and I trust the Appropriations Committee will carefully examine this whole matter.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of February 20, 1949]

DRAFT SLOWED BY VOLUNTEERS—ARMY UNDERESTIMATED WHAT RECRUITING COULD ACHIEVE

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

The Army, a few short months ago crying for men and spending millions preparing to handle them, is now turning away volunters and cutting down its size.

And the Selective Service System, mobilized last June to supply the Army with as many as 30,000 men monthly, is now drafting no one.

Why?

Go back to last spring, just before Congress enacted the draft law and authorized an Army manpower ceiling of 837,000 men and officers plus 110,000 1-year volunteers. At that time the Army was down to a postwar low of 560,000.

Military intelligence foresaw a war possibility. Czechoslovakia had just been taken over by a Russian-dominated government. Our Army was dwindling.

President Truman and Congress said we should act fast to get our war fist cocked into position. The draft, rather than universal military training, was picked as the best way.

ARMY UNDERESTIMATED

On June 21 a highly placed Army official said the Army would probably call between 200,000 and 225,000 draftees during the first 12 months of the new draft.

No one knew just how much the draft would stimulate enlistments. As it turned out, the Army has drafted only 25,000 men and it may not have to draft any more at all.

The Army simply underestimated what its recruiting service could do with the draft as a selling point. Voluntary enlistments

more than doubled between May and July and they have stayed around the 35,000-a-month level ever since.

If this trend started so quickly why didn't the Army call off its draft plans at once?

For one thing, it wanted to get to the 700,000 mark fast and the draft would naturally help. (Actually, it only had money to support 700,000. Congress, although it authorized 837,000, did not appropriate money for that many.)

As early as October Army personnel officials saw a possibility that actual drafting might not be needed to get to full strength. But if they had announced this just before the November presidential election, it was felt even the deaf would have heard cries of playing politics.

PLAYED IT SAFE

And there was this paradox. Just 1 month after the draft act was passed President Truman told Defense Secretary Forrestal that he would recommend a budget ceiling for the defense establishment of $15,000,000,000 for the 12 months starting next July 1.

This was less than Mr. Forrestal wanted. The Army's share would not support it at a strength near the congressionally authorized 837,000.

It wasn't till after the election that Mr. Forrestal announced allocation of the $15,000,000,000 among the three services. The Army's cut will restrict it to a total of 677,000 for next fiscal year, even less than its present strength of about 700,000.

Today the Army has had to abolish 2-year enlistments and put a ceiling on the number of men who may enlist for 3-, 4-, 5-, and 6-year terms. Its reenlistment rate is running high (more than 40 percent) and a proposed pay raise won't discourage volunteers.

But if the voluntary enlistment curve should suddenly plummet the Army has the draft to fall back on.

Those Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pawtucket (R. I.) Times of Tuesday, March 8, 1949:

THOSE EXCISE TAXES

House Republicans headed by former Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of North Attleboro, may well expect popular support of their efforts to cut back excise taxes. Such taxes are accepted as a natural consequence during period of war, but their continuance in time of peace has little public support, especially when they are levied upon necessities.

The Republican bill would reduce to prewar level most excise taxes except that imposed on liquor and now set at $9 per gallon. It would cut excise taxes on jewelry, furs and admissions from 20 to 10 percent, on electric lights and bulbs from 20 to 5 percent, on cable, radio and leased wire messages and telephone tolls from 20 to 10 percent, on local telephone bills from 15 to 6 percent, on luggage from 20 percent, on retail sales to 10 percent, to 10 percent on manufacturers and upon toilet goods, from 10 percent on retail sales, to 11 percent on manufacturers.

A reading of the list of items on which Mr. MARTIN proposes a cut in taxes reveals that in most cases the cuts would help to reduce the cost of many items which are regarded as necessary to daily living, especially those imposed upon toilet goods, so necessary in infant care; and those Government taxes levied upon telephones, electric light bulbs, and upon admissions to various forms of public entertainment.

If, as has been claimed in Washington, the cut in excise taxes would cost the Government from $800,000,000 to more than $1,000,000,000 yearly, there is no reason why the American people should not expect relief from the emergency wartime taxes almost 4 years after the defeat of Germany. The pennies thus saved could be used to advantage elsewhere in family budgets at a time of high price levels.

The Republicans are on sound ground also at a time of rising unemployment when they declare a cut in excise taxes would help to provide jobs and encourage business, both of which would tend to offset any revenue loss to government, and which could be expected to increase total Federal revenues through other taxes. It is well enough for us to help to relieve other areas of the world where there is distress, but a little relief from nuisance taxes would be appreciated by the much abused American taxpayer.

Ten-Year Navajo Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, only through substantial improvement in their lot can any lasting benefits be given to the Navajo Indians. The 10-year program to build schools, to construct roads, to improve the lands of the Navajo Reservation, and to provide reservation businesses and encourage off-the-reservation employment and settlement is the first requirement. I join the President in pressing for hearings and favorable action on the Navajo program.

I include here the announcement by the Interior Department regarding the Navajo rehabilitation program:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
INFORMATION SERVICE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

10-YEAR NAVAJO PROGRAM RESUBMITTED TO CONGRESS

Acting on direction of President Truman, a 10-year program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes was resubmitted to Congress today by Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug.

"The United States," President Truman wrote in his instructions to Secretary Krug, "which would live on Christian principles with all of the peoples of the world, cannot omit a fair deal for its own Indian citizens."

The program, similar to the one submitted to Congress last year and upon which no action was taken, except for a minor grant, calls for the expenditure of $90,000,000 for capital investments on the reservations.

"At my request," the President wrote, "you prepared and presented to the Congress on March 15, 1948, a proposed 10-year program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians of Arizona and New Mexico. Except for one small segment of this program, the Eightieth Congress failed to enact the necessary legislative authority to place it in motion.

"The needs of those Indians are as great today as they were a year ago. Indeed, the severe winter storms have emphasized the serious economic conditions prevailing among these tribes. The authorization of this long-range program is considered essential to enable these groups of Indians to become healthy, enlightened, and self-supporting. I hope you will continue to emphasize to the Congress the needs of the Navajos and Hopis."

A draft of a bill designed to accomplish the purpose of the long-range program is made part of the report sent to the Congress.

Similar in most respects to the 1948 program, except for wider benefits to the Hopis, the program provides for the expenditure of $25,000,000 for the construction of school buildings, the purchase of equipment and for other educational improvements on the reservation. An additional $20,000,000 is sought for the construction of roads and trails.

The Secretary's proposals for carrying out the program are summarized as follows:

Purpose of expenditure and amount needed	
1. Soil and water conservation and range improvement	$10,000,000
2. Completion and extension of existing irrigation projects	9,000,000
3. Surveys and studies of timber, coal, mineral, and other physical and human resources	800,000
4. Development of community enterprises and industries	1,500,000
5. Relocation and resettlement of Colorado River Indian Reservation	5,750,000
6. Development of opportunities for off-reservation employment and assistance in adjustments related to such employment	3,500,000
7. Hospital buildings and equipment and other health conservation measures	4,750,000
8. School buildings and equipment and other education measures	25,000,000
9. Establishment of a revolving loan fund	5,000,000
10. Construction of roads and trails	20,000,000
11. Construction of air transport facilities	1,000,000
12. Telephone and radio communication systems	500,000
13. Agency and institutional water supply and other service facilities	3,500,000
Total	90,000,000

The 1948 report was based on information secured over many years including four separate studies which were initiated by Secretary Krug in 1947 and 1948. These surveys made by Department of the Interior experts, prominent educators and representatives of the American Medical Association, cover most phases of the problem of the Indians.

The report declares that education is one of the important and probably the most difficult aspect of the entire problem.

The ultimate educational goal is to provide school facilities for all of the 24,000 Navajo children, between the ages of 6 and 18 years. At present there are facilities for only 7,500 children, of which 6,500 are accommodated in Government schools and 1,000 in mission schools. It is recommended that plans be immediately launched for the expansion and repair of eight existing reservation schools and that two additional boarding schools on the reservation will be built. Other improvements contemplated in the program are the conversion of 17 day schools to semiboarding schools and the enlargement or conversion of 33 day schools. Also recommended is the increased use by Navajos of existing off-reservation boarding schools and the use of the schools at the

Colorado River Indian Reservation. These measures will increase total school capacity to 13,290 seats.

Construction of 636 miles of primary and 633 miles of secondary roads is of fundamental importance to the program. The primary system will provide transportation service to the chief centers of population and to main school, hospital, and business locations. The primary roads will connect with State roads off the reservations. The secondary system will provide transportation to areas which cannot be served by the primary system.

Improvement and development of reservation resources, which include range, soil, and moisture conservation measures, are included in the program. Included also are extensions of irrigation systems, surveys of timber and minerals, development of arts and crafts and community enterprises and industries.

Resource development and utilization and off-reservation employment can be expected to contribute to the support of only 6,950 families out of the 12,000 families on the reservation. The remaining 5,050 families must find some other means of earning a living, the report points out. Some progress has been made in the off-reservation settlement, but it is proposed that 1,000 families resettle on the Colorado River reservation, which has excellent soil suitable for farming. Additional development on the Shiprock-San Juan irrigation project is designed to provide a living for an additional 2,600 families. However, the report points out that the balance of 1,450 families must look to off-reservation employment and resettlement.

The Shiprock-San Juan project, it is pointed out, will provide a livelihood for the greatest number of Navajo families. The proposed area recommended comprises 117,000 acres, of which 115,000 acres are tribal lands and approximately 2,000 acres non-Indian lands.

Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the California Federation of Labor Newsletter entitled "AMA Raises Huge Fund To Oppose Health Insurance":

AMA RAISES HUGE FUND TO OPPOSE HEALTH INSURANCE

SAN FRANCISCO (California Federation of Labor).—A grass-roots doctors' rebellion against the American Medical Association's plan to raise a $3,500,000 war chest to fight the Truman administration's proposed national health-insurance program has been predicted by Dr. Channing Frothingham, twice president of the Massachusetts State Medical Society, and chairman of the committee for the Nation's health.

President William Green is an honorary vice chairman of the committee for the Nation's Health, a national group of doctors and laymen spearheading the fight for national health insurance. Also active on the committee is Vice President Matthew Woll and director of social insurance activities, Nelson Cruikshank.

Dr. Frothingham commented, "It is particularly disturbing to note that although many physicians of the AMA's membership support national health insurance, the proposal to embark on a Nation-wide multimillion dollar campaign against it was not made known to the membership in advance of the closed session at which the decision was reached."

He further charged that the AMA's ruling body, the house of delegates, is not representative of its 140,000 members. "Whereas half of the country's active physicians are under 45," he pointed out, "only 5 percent of the delegates are below this age level. Half of our active doctors are general practitioners, but only 10 percent of the delegates fall within this category. The rest are specialists."

Dr. Frothingham criticized the house of delegates for pursuing a course unworthy of the medical profession and repugnant to the ethics of American doctors. He declared that AMA officers are failing to take the leadership in conjunction with the AFL, CIO, farm, business, and consumer organizations to work out a program to bring adequate medical care within the reach of all Americans.

The committee for the Nation's health, Dr. Frothingham announced, would support wholeheartedly the administration's proposals for national health insurance.

Let's Look at the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 31, 1949, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] inserted in the RECORD a speech he had previously inserted in the RECORD of February 13, 1947. Since the theme of the speech was an attack on FEPC as enacted and in operation in the State of New York, I forwarded a copy of the speech to the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and asked for their comments. I have just received a reply from the general counsel to the commission, the pertinent parts of which are as follows:

You enclose a copy of Mr. RANKIN's speech of February 13, 1947, and request an analysis of its accuracy as it applies to the New York State law against discrimination. My comments with respect thereto are as follows:

1. Mr. RANKIN states: "FEPC is the chief plank in the Communist platform. It is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened in all its history."

Comments: It is quite clear upon any reflection at all that the type of legislation exemplified by the New York State law against discrimination constitutes one of the most effective methods of combating communism. The New York State law simply seeks to afford every inhabitant of the State of New York, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin, an equal opportunity to obtain employment for which he is qualified by training and experience. The existence of artificial barriers against such equal opportunity permits the creation and stimulation of racial tensions which further communistic aims.

It should also be made clear that while the law against discrimination requires the elimination of discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin, it does not in any sense whatsoever compel an employer to hire any person who is not qualified to perform the job for which he has applied.

As American citizens in a democratic state, we are all deeply concerned with the spread of the communistic ideology throughout the world. All too frequently, Americans abroad, seeking to impress the peoples there with American democratic ideals, are met by the inquiry, "What are you doing about your Negroes?" Words alone will not answer this question. Corrective measures will.

There are 15,000,000 colored people in this country—comprising one-tenth of the total population, as well as millions of people belonging to other minority groups. In fact, those who constitute a minority in one section of the State constitute a majority in another and vice versa. Many of these people were recently called upon to risk their lives for the democratic ideal on battlefields throughout the world. All that the law against discrimination provides is that these people shall now have the civil right to work regardless of the color of their skin, the place of their birth, or the manner of their worship—if they are qualified. If we deny them this basic democratic right, to what ideology will they turn for salvation?

2. Mr. RANKIN states: "This vicious measure was written into the laws of that State (New York) without consulting the people, suffering under it.

Comments: This remark contains a double-barrelled misstatement: (a) The people of the State of New York were consulted before the enactment of the law, and (b) the people of the State of New York are not "suffering" under it.

As to (a) the law was drafted by a statutory commission consisting of 29 members, of whom 15 were designated by the Governor and 14 by the legislature. Before submitting the proposed law to the legislature, the commission conducted six public hearings in the cities of Albany, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, and New York. Representatives from leading trade, management, civic, religious, educational, union and veterans' associations and organizations appeared at these hearings and were afforded full opportunity to be heard. After the bill was introduced into the legislature, further public hearings were held before the New York State Senate Finance Committee and the New York State Assembly Ways and Means Committee.

At all the public hearings held on the bill, the predominant expression of opinion was in favor of the proposed legislation. When the bills were reported out of the committees and on to the floor of the senate and assembly, extended debates ensued. Thus, it was after full and open discussion, not only by the elected representatives of the people in the legislature, but by the chosen representatives of the various and numerous trade, management, civic, religious, educational, union and veterans' associations and organizations, with full opportunity afforded to all to be heard, that the proposed bill was passed by the legislature and subsequently signed by the Governor.

In an analysis of the history and development of the New York law entitled "Fair Employment Legislation in New York State," issued by the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations, it is said:

"What was achieved in New York State, in drafting principle into law, is itself an important signpost pointing forward on the road toward a more democratic way of life.

"Witness how the drafting was done, how the citizens of New York State made their opinion felt, how they participated in the actual process of legislation. This was by no means a minor episode in government of, by, and for the people. The history of the enactment of this legislation is one of the most signal and potent refutations of the many

cynical arguments that democracy will not work."

As to (b), after almost 4 years of experience under the New York law against discrimination, there is absolutely no evidence of any suffering by anyone in New York State as a result of the law's administration. On the contrary, the beneficial effects of the law's operations have been noteworthy. Witness the following remarks:

By a representative of the New York Council of Retail Merchants, Inc.:

"The manner in which the law has been administered by the competent commissioners appointed by Governor Dewey has been a model of fair-mindedness, efficiency, and good sense."

By Joseph Quinn, general chairman of the Dining Car Employees Union, Local 370, A. F. of L.:

"We feel we would be remiss in our duty as citizens of the sovereign State of New York if we did not let you and the world at large know of our appreciation and esteem for the marvelous work you are so unostentatiously accomplishing.

"Dining-car employees throughout our Nation join us in wishing you continued success and assuring you that we will everywhere spread the praise your Commission so richly deserves."

By Irwin Ross, in Tolerance by Law, Harper's magazine, November 1947:

"Two years of State FEPC's have done more to end job discrimination than 50 years of private agitation, good-will conferences, and educational campaigns."

By Royal Parkinson in Fair Employment Practices Legislation, Harvard Business Review, January 1948:

"It probably cannot be questioned that the administration of the antidiscrimination laws has and will have more to do with the kind of results achieved than the laws themselves. In turn, a large part of the administrative record will be determined by the type of personnel selected to administer the laws—their common sense, their patience, tolerance, and restraint, and their sense of justice, irrespective of politics and pressures. The four States which now have these laws have from the beginning been most fortunate in this respect."

By Yale Law Journal, May 1947:

"None of the predictions made by its original opponents has proved valid."

By Louis Coleridge Kesselman in the Social Politics of FEPC (1948), published by the University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, N. C.:

"In the States having laws with teeth the record has been good. The much-feared controls over the employer's freedom to select his own workers have not produced the dangerous situations predicted by opponents. Employers have not had to hire incompetents or crackpots, nor have they had to dismiss white employees to make room for Negroes. The fact that no decision from any State commission has been appealed to the courts at the time of writing is a tribute to their skill in negotiating satisfactory adjustments of complaints at the conference level. Nearly all of the commissions have placed much emphasis upon educating employers rather than upon prosecuting them."

3. Mr. RANKIN states: "Somebody put a colored fellow up to come and apply for it (rent a house) and the court now says I must let him have it."

Comments: Neither the New York law against discrimination nor any other New York law requires an owner of a house to rent it to any person to whom he does not choose to rent it. There is, of course, no court decision such as the one referred to.

4. Mr. RANKIN states: "You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on."

Comments: Prior to the New York law's enactment, opponents of the measure stated that if enacted into law businesses would leave the State in droves. After close to 4 years of administration of the law, quite the contrary has resulted. No business has left the State of New York as a result of the enactment or the administration of the law. In fact, the number of firms established and doing business in the State of New York has increased since the law's enactment. Witness the following figures, compiled by the New York State Department of Commerce, as to the estimated number of firms in New York State in August 1945 (the law became effective on July 1, 1945) and in January 1948:

Type of industry	August 1945	January 1948
Finance, insurance, and real estate	57, 590	64, 510
Service industries	89, 730	111, 410
Mining	530	600
Contract construction	19, 940	31, 420
Manufacturing	49, 540	63, 460
Transportation, communication, and other public utilities	25, 400	30, 310
Wholesale trade	21, 290	28, 290
Retail trade	172, 230	214, 000
Total number of firms:	436, 250	544, 000

As of December 1948 the total number of firms (which in January 1948 was 544,000) had increased further to 568,100.

5. Mr. RANKIN was asked by Mr. Mason: "What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?" Mr. RANKIN replied, "Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would have the Germans and so would every other enemy country."

Comments: These remarks overlook a very important provision of the New York law against discrimination, namely, the provision which permits employers to inquire as to an applicant's race, creed, color, or national origin if the inquiry is based on a bona fide occupational qualification. With respect to employment in work involving the national security, the commission has had a very clearly defined policy which in all respects safeguards the security of this country. Where an employer is required by reason of governmental regulation and national security to inquire into the nationality and place of birth of an applicant for employment, he may do so since the question is in such a case based on a bona fide occupational qualification.

Furthermore, it is permissible under the rulings of the New York State commission (but Mr. RANKIN fails to point this out) to inquire of an applicant for employment whether or not he is a citizen of the United States, whether or not he is a member of the Communist Party, or whether or not he is a member of the German-American Bund.

Thus, the suggestion of impairment of national security by reason of the New York rulings is utterly unfounded.

6. Mr. RANKIN states: "Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination."

Comments: This, too, is a misstatement of the commission's rulings. If a publisher of literature for a particular religious organization required personnel of that religious denomination by reason of a bona fide occupational qualification, he would be permitted, under the rulings of the commission, to inquire as to whether or not the applicant is an atheist.

7. Mr. RANKIN states: "Here is another unlawful practice: requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograh. That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks."

Comments: The commission has made this ruling because photographs can disclose characteristics which are assumed to be indicative of race, creed, color, or national origin (sometimes correctly, sometimes incorrectly); and it is the commission's desire to prevent screening of applicants in advance of interviews on the basis of such characteristics. The commission is of course aware that a personal interview will in itself reveal the same characteristics as would a photograph, but the commission's intent is to assure an interview to the applicant and an opportunity for him to sell himself to the employer. The experience of the commission has shown that where business concerns have discontinued their former practice of requiring a photograph, they have found that no serious inconvenience resulted.

It is noteworthy that in 1934, John W. Bricker, then attorney general of the State of Ohio, rendered an official opinion (vol. I, 1934–35, opinion No. 2426) wherein he ruled that the Civil Service Commission of Ohio cannot lawfully require an applicant for a civil-service position to attach a photograph to his application. The opinion states in part:

"It could not ordinarily be said that the requirement that an applicant set forth his race or attach his photograph to his application has any relation to his fitness as a public servant, nor could it be said that the power to make such a requirement would be implied from the power expressly granted to require an applicant to set forth matters touching merit and fitness."

The Ohio attorney general's opinion is particularly significant because it was made in the absence of a law against discrimination.

8. Mr. RANKIN states: "Here is another unlawful practice in New York: Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

Comments: In answering an inquiry into his general military experience, an applicant for employment may reveal the fact that he served, for example, in the Italian, or French, or English army, thus revealing his national origin. The commission has ruled (although Mr. RANKIN does not mention this fact) that it is permissible in any case for an employer to inquire into an applicant's military experience in the armed forces of the United States or in a State militia. Further, if inquiry into all military service of the applicant is based on a bona fide occupational qualification in any particular situation, as for example, work on a contract affecting national security, it would be permissible.

The above comments relate to some of the salient points of Mr. RANKIN's speech. They do not cover all of his misconceptions.

A Commemorative Stamp for Greeneville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAYTON E. PHILLIPS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Post Office De-

partment to issue a special postage stamp in honor of Greeneville, Tenn. I am making this request on behalf of the civic and patriotic organizations of Greene County, Tenn.

This is not an ordinary request for a commemorative stamp to pay tribute to an American city. I know that it is not customary for the Post Office Department to issue stamps of this character because of the vast scope of the category. It has been the policy of Congress not to encourage a tremendous number of similar applications resulting in numerous issues which would be localized in the community so honored. For many years it has been the policy and purpose of the Congress to authorize and to direct the Postmaster General to issue commemorative stamps to mark historical events of great national importance, or for the payment of tribute to individuals whose careers have exerted some marked influence for good upon the national welfare.

Today I am introducing this bill by reason of the peculiar and national significance of Greeneville, Tenn. The bill provides that a special postage stamp of the denomination of 3 cents of the design to be determined by the Postmaster be issued, and that the stamp be issued during the year of 1949.

Greeneville, Tenn., qualifies for this high honor because it is the one time historically important capital of the Free State of Franklin, the home of America's most interesting political personalities—Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States, and Davy Crockett, hero of the Alamo—and is the location of the old tailor shop, home, and burial place of Andrew Johnson, which today is a national shrine of great public and historical and national significance.

Overlooking this beautiful little city is the Andrew Johnson National Cemetery. It may be of interest to my colleagues to know that Andrew Johnson holds the distinction of having been elected to practically every public office within the gift of his people. Andrew Johnson was elected to the following offices. justice of peace, alderman, mayor, State representative, State senator, governor, United States Representative, United States Senator, Vice President of the United States, and President of the United States. Andrew Johnson is a product of the American dream and opportunity. He was born in Raleigh, N. C., and moved to Tennessee, where, as a tailor boy, a beautiful and charming young school teacher taught him to read and write. Andrew Johnson was known as an honest, brave, and courageous debater, public servant, and statesman.

Not only does Greeneville, Tenn., enjoy the great pride and honor of having located within its boundaries the Andrew Johnson National Shrine, it is also the location of Tusculum College, the oldest chartered institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains. It is the location of the largest loose-leaf burley tobacco market in Tennessee, and the second largest in the world. On the way from our Nation's Capital down the Shenandoah Valley on into Tennessee, Greeneville is the western entrance to the great and beautiful Smoky Mountain National Park. It is a large diversified agricultural center, whose products consist of grain, livestock, dairy products, poultry, and tobacco. It is noted for its fine 4–H Club membership.

Greeneville is rich in civic culture. The Greeneville Lodge, No. 3, F. and A. M., is the only Masonic lodge in the United States to have had as members two Presidents of the United States—Andrew Johnson and Andrew Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this little town in east Tennessee is of such national importance as to deserve the honor of having a commemorative stamp issued in tribute to its greatness and fine American tradition, and historical importance in the development of this great Republic.

The bill referred to follows:

A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Greeneville, Tenn.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp of the denomination of 3 cents, and of such design and for such period, during 1949, as he may determine, in honor of the town of Greeneville, Tenn., old capital of the historically important Free State of Franklin; home and burial place of Andrew Johnson, seventeenth President of the United States; home of Davy Crockett, frontiersman, former Representative in Congress, and hero of the Alamo; location of the Andrew Johnson tailor shop; and location of Tusculum College, oldest chartered institution of higher learning west of the Allegheny Mountains. Such special postage stamp shall be placed on sale in Greeneville, Tenn., one day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

General Property Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will establish a General Property Office to exercise management control over the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property.

For your information, I introduced a similar bill in the last Congress which was not as comprehensive in scope but which was identical in approach.

We all are striving to cut the cost of government by improving administrative procedures and promoting efficiency throughout the Federal establishment. Pursuant to legislation of the Congress, a distinguished bipartisan commission was created, directed by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, to study the reorganization of the Government, and report to the Congress. Regardless of party, the Members of this Congress have eagerly awaited completion of the Commission's final report and recommendations.

As you know, the Commission has already recommended substantial improvements in the Government's supply organization. However, one important feature of the report may be overlooked as a result of the emphasis placed upon organizational improvements. That aspect of the problem is of utmost importance and it is fundamental. It is just this—efficient management control cannot be attained unless we repeal the maze of unrelated property laws and enact one uniform law for all executive agencies.

That is the purpose of my bill—to make the necessary organizational changes and provide a uniform law for all, thus to permit better coordination and more uniformity in procedures.

This bill conforms closely to the Commission's recommendations with respect to administrative organization and goes on to establish comprehensive and uniform policies and procedures with respect to property utilization, contract termination, surplus-property disposal, contractual claims and disputes, and civil and criminal liabilities relating to these matters.

Another important feature is that the bill would be inapplicable to the armed services. The armed services are presently concentrating on an intensified defense program. Unification has presented enough problems of interagency coordination and consolidation. To impose additional controls from another source would slow down unification and inhibit the defense program. The armed services can cooperate to the extent practicable considering defense needs, but they should not be burdened with any superimposed restrictions at this time. When unification has been completed, we can dispose of such coordination problems as may then remain.

In conclusion, this bill is offered in a nonpartisan spirit. It is comprehensive in scope and covers every aspect of the supply problem. I believe it warrants the active support of each and every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Elmira (N. Y.) Star-Gazette of March 8, 1949, and from the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of March 7, 1949, commenting on statements made by the Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING on the subject of social security:

[From the Elmira (N. Y.) Star-Gazette of March 8, 1949]

IS MORE PROMISE THAN FULFILLMENT

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING has put his finger on the weakness of the social-security system by calling attention to the fact that since the beginning of the system the Government has collected more than $12,000,000,000 in pay-roll taxes for the fund, most of which has been spent for other purposes.

Obviously, if that part of the fund which has been spent for other purposes were now available, there would be no need for increased pay-roll taxes to finance expanded payments for beneficiaries.

This weakness in the system was scored by careful economists when the plan was proposed back in 1936. The plan was sold to voters as a form of old-age insurance, in which, in return for stated payments, they would receive back modest old-age pensions.

Unlike private insurance plans, however, the rate was to increase over a period of years, because the Government, instead of setting the money aside in a separate fund,

intended to spend most of it and set up a reserve of Government bonds which would have no value except as promises to pay.

Returns from the pay-roll taxes have been greater than expected, largely because of wartime inflation. Two or three times Republicans in Congress have prevented the proposed increase in pay-roll taxes, the result being that taxpayers have not been required to pay more than the original 1 percent of pay rolls with which the program began.

Even with this rate, added to the 1 percent which employers also pay, the fund would be close to twelve billions if the Government had not spent most of it.

Workers now reaching retirement age and who have been contributing regularly to social security have every good reason to feel, says Representative KEATING, "that social security partakes more of the character of lofty promise than tangible fulfillment."

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post-Standard of March 7, 1949]

ARE POLITICIANS ABOVE LAW?

At last the mismanagement of social-security funds is given recognition at Washington.

In the last 12 years, Government administrations have taken more than $12,000,000,000 in funds supposed to be used for retirement pensions and similar purposes and spent them as they wished.

Representative KENNETH B. KEATING described the irresponsible manner in which these moneys are being used at a committee hearing and charged that the methods employed are being kept secret from the people whose funds are misused in this manner.

These funds should be employed to reduce the national debt and for no other purpose. Thus the money of the people would be doubly protected and made more valuable by the increased confidence given business and agriculture and the reductions in prices made possible by lower debt requirements and taxes.

But in effect they are used to increase the debt. The money is spent as soon as it comes in and Government I O U's are placed in the social-security treasury. The policy under which they are handled is just the opposite of what it should be; the social-security laws should be amended to prevent it.

If any insurance company or other financial concern used the funds of its policy holders in this manner, the Government would immediately have it on the carpet and its officials would probably land in jail. But when the Government does it, that is a different matter. Or is it? Should not the Government be subjected to the same honesty that a private enterprise must observe?

Do we have a double standard of ethics in this country, one for businessmen and another for politicians? Are public officials in charge of the people's funds above the law?

Traitorous Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 11, 1949

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article that appeared in the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., March 10, 1949:

The statement by two American Communist leaders that they would support Russia in the event of war is quite different from recent statements by Communist leaders in France and Italy. The words sound about the same, since Moscow announced the text. But the circumstances were not similar.

Thorez and Togliatti spoke in countries where Communists are more numerous than here. They spoke in countries which would be in real danger of speedy Russian occupation if war broke out. And they spoke to people still suffering from the horror, exhaustion, and destruction of the last war.

Their appeal was based on the assumption that many Frenchmen and Italians would prefer Soviet serfdom to battle. It was not, we believe, a safe or reasonable assumption. But at the time it was the best answer that Moscow had for the challenge of the North Atlantic alliance.

The statement of Foster and Dennis was only a faint echo of the others. These men were not silly enough to ask Americans to welcome the Soviet armies as liberators. They simply said that they would support Russia in any unjust, aggressive, imperialistic war brought on by Wall Street.

Well, everybody knows that's what they would do. They've said so before and they will probably say so again. But one would think that something new had been added.

A Presidential press conference made quite a big thing out of Mr. Truman's permitting a direct quote when he called these Communists traitors. Senator EASTLAND indignantly proclaimed that he would take legal provisions to curb these traitorous agents of a foreign power and to prevent sedition, espionage, and treason.

The president of the National Association of Manufacturers called on labor to cooperate with management in driving the Reds out of industry. William Green said the A. F. of L. would take no part in strikes to sabotage American defense. Even Henry Wallace got into the act by saying he was not in accord with the Communist statements.

Apropos all the flurry, General Eisenhower said something sensible—as is his custom—in a talk to the New York Bar Association. Speaking of the Russian-American relations generally, he said he deplored Americans' tendency to view the international situation with doubt, fear, and even hysteria.

"The 146,000,000 people in this great land," he said, "are the mightiest temporal power that ever existed. Let us look on our problems like a man who knows he is strong no matter how humble he is."

That is sound advice. The Communists in America are traitorous agents of a foreign power. Their aim is sedition, espionage, and treason. That is why their party leaders are now on trial. But the American people knew all that before two of those leaders made their latest public declaration of loyalty to Russia. So why all the excitement?

The greatest temporal power that ever existed can certainly cope with the danger of domestic communism, which is a real menace even with virtually no popular support. It can cope with communism as it has coped with other dangers and menaces—by action, not by fear and hysteria.

There has already been action against the Communists. But there has also been a lot of hollering, handwriting, and breast beating. There seems little point now in any more of it. The people are now fully aware of the basic facts. Shouted denunciation of the Reds simply wastes time and energy and doesn't hurt the Reds a bit.

But there is a need for action. And the most pressing need, it seems to us, is for a decision by the Government. Shall the Communist Party be outlawed, all its known officers arrested, and other strong measures taken? Or shall it be allowed to continue, under very close surveillance, as a disgusting but minor menace which is less dangerous in the open?

Many other positive measures depend on that decision. And whatever the decision may be, it can be carried out calmly, confidently, firmly, and without emotional fireworks.